NOTICE OF


The volume containing these commentaries, is the fourth which Professor Cousin has most laudably given to the public, of the works of Proclus; and I trust that the same zeal and the same ability, which induced him to bring to light these inestimable works, from an oblivion no less long than disgraceful to countries which profess to be polished, will also enable him to publish all that remains of the writings of this Coryphæan Platonist, and incomparable man.

These commentaries, indeed, are justly called by the Professor, "an ancient, great, and venerable monument of Grecian and Egyptian wisdom:" and to the generality of readers, and in short, to every one who has not legitimately studied the philosophy of Plato, they will also be what he denominates them, obscure. But by the man who has happily penetrated the depths of that philosophy, at which, as Bishop Berkeley well observes, "many an empty head is shook," they will be found to be as clear an explanation of dogmas and truths, which, though in their own nature most luminous, but to the multitude impenetrably dark, as it is possible for the most enlightened genius to effect. And hence this work is very properly said by Damascius to be ὑμιχθων σύνεσις, a super-excellent exposition. 4

Among the Harleian manuscripts in the British Museum, there is a copy of these commentaries, of which, by permission of the Trustees of that excellent Institution, I made a transcript, upwards of thirty years ago. And the following are the emendations, which from a frequent perusal of this work, I have been induced to consider as not only probable, but for the most part indispensably necessary.

In the first place, in p. 4. 1. 12, which is towards the close of a most splendid exordium, in which Proclus magnificently invokes the several orders of those divine powers that are

---

2 In his Siris.
3 Vid. Photii Biblioth. p. 1070.
4 I refer the English reader, who has a genius for such speculations, to the 5th volume of my translation of Plato, in the notes on which, I have given the substance of this admirable commentary.
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eternally rooted and centred in the great first cause of all, he also invokes his preceptor, Syrianus, as follows: αὐτῷ καταστάτας ἔστιν καὶ καθ’ ἔστιν καθ’ ὑποδοχήν τοῦ Ἡλέαν μεν συμβασίσεται τὸς αἰληθῶς, καὶ ὅ μετόσ κατάτατος τῆς θείας αἰληθείας, τῆς ἑδικείας ἡμίν γνώμην τῶν χαίνων καὶ τῶν θείων τούτων λόγων οὕτως ἵσομεντι. In this passage, ὅ μετόσ κατάτατος, is evidently erroneous. The Harleian Ms. has ὁμοτάτους καταστάς; but this is not more sound than the other. Instead of these therefore, I read ὁμοτάτους καταστάς. For as both Syrianus and Proclus laboured in endeavouring to restore the philosophy of Plato, hence Proclus very properly calls Syrianus his associate in the restoration of divine truth.

The words that immediately follow are, ὁ γὰρ φαίην ἀπὸ τῆς φιλοσοφίας τούτης καὶ ἀνθρώπους αὐτῆς, ἐπ’ ἐνεργείᾳ τῶν τριῶν φύσεων, αἵτὶ τῶν ἀγαλμάτων, αἵτὶ τῶν οὐρανῶν, αἵτὶ τῆς ὁλης αἰγισ- τείας αὐτῆς, καὶ σατανίας ἀξιώματος τοῖς γα τοῖς οὐσίν ἀνθρώποις, καὶ οἰς ἔστιν ἐνδοτομείς. And they apply, according to Professor Cousin, to Syrianus. But though grammatically considered, they evidently admit of this construction; yet when they are attentively examined, it will be found to be impossible that they should be applicable to any individual of the human species, however exalted above the rest of mankind by superior genius and virtue. I conceive therefore, that as Proclus had just before implored divine assistance, in order that he might participate in perfection of the most mystic theory of Plato, which is unfolded in the Parmenides, he afterwards speaks of the philosophy of Plato in the above beautiful manner. Hence it appears to me that two or three lines are wanting, and that this passage is a part of a sentence containing a most magnificent encomium of the Platonic philosophy; viz. "that it came to men for the benefit of the souls that are here, instead of statues, instead of temples, instead of the whole of sacred institutions, and that it is the primary leader of salvation to the men that now are, and to those that shall exist hereafter."

This conjecture is greatly confirmed by the following passage in Suidas, in which philosophy is said to proceed from the first cause, through all the middle divine genera, and the more excellent natures ¹ posterior to the Gods, as far as to the dregs of beings [i.e. as far as to matter itself, which is the last of things]; but that religion which is the worship of the Gods, originates from adorning causes. ἰματική, καὶ φιλοσοφία, οὐκ εἴπει τῶν αὐτῶν ἀρχῶν. ἀλλ' ἡ μον ἑκάστος ἀρχήν ἡ μοι τῆς πρῶτην αἰτίας εἰς τὴν ὑποστάθην τῶν οὗτων καθήκουσα, διὰ μέσων τῶν ὄντων γενων

¹ These more excellent natures are demons, and heroes.
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Plato says in the Timæus, that a greater good than philosophy was never imparted by divinity to man. Proclus therefore, living at a period in which the Grecian theoloby was in a most fallen condition, speaks thus magnificently of the philosophy of Plato, as of a thing designed by Divinity to be a substitute for temples and statues, and the worship of the Gods.

In the next place, Proclus, speaking of the analogy of the persons in this dialogue to the things which are discussed in it, and to the order of beings in the universe, says, (p. 19. l. 7.) ο δὲ δὴ Κεφαλής, καὶ οι τὰς Κλαζομενίας φιλοσοφοὺς τῶν μεγάλων φυσικῶν καὶ τὰ φυσικά συμπλήρωμα τῶν ομοίων οὐκ ὄντως ἐν τούτῳ μόρφῳ, αὐτῇ δὲ καὶ αὐτῷ φωσικῷ τινὶ τινες. In this passage, for πυμπληρωμαίοις, it appears to me to be necessary to read πυμπληρωμαίοις. So that the meaning will be, that Cephalus and the philosophers from Clazomenia, are analogous to partial souls, [i. e. to such as human souls] and to such as are conversant with nature, because they have a rank similar to that of these philosophers, who were physiologists, as being of the Ionic school.

P. 35. 1. 19. καὶ αὐτοὶ ἀναλόγως αὐτοὶ δημιουργοὶ πρὸς τὰ συγκεκριμένα, τὸ εἰ τῶν πλεῖστες ἀπολύεις δὲ ὅν τῶν τῶν γνώσεως καὶ ὁ πόρος τοῖς τοις ὁποῖοι καὶ ὁ πόρος τοῖς τοῖς γνώσεως; τὸ δὲ τῆς τοιαῦτης τοιαύτης τῆς δημιουργίας, καὶ ἀλλάς συνεχείς διδακτικά, διοίκησις, εἰς μὲν, εἰς μὲν διδακτικά. To this passage some words are wanting, and there is also in it an erroneous punctuation. The words which I conceive to be wanting are τοισ δημιουργοῦν ενος τινος οντος, which should be inserted immediately after το εἰ τῶν πλεῖστες. And the erroneous punctuation is in τις γνωρίσιν καὶ αὐτός, and also in τις τοις τοιαύταις δημιουργίας, neither of which is interrogative. Hence the whole passage will be accurately as follows: καὶ αὐτοὶ ἀναλόγως αὐτοὶ δημιουργοὶ πρὸς τὰ συγκεκριμένα, τὸ εἰ τῶν πλεῖστες τοισ δημιουργοῦν ενος τινος οντος, ἀπολέσας δὲ ὅν τῶν τῶν γνώσεως καὶ αὐτός, ὁ γὰρ κατὰ τοῦ εἰ τῶν τῶν γνώσεως, καὶ αὐτὸς ἀκόμη τοῖς τοιαύταις δημιουργίας, διοίκησις, ἀκόμη τοῖς τοιαύταις, κ. τ. λ. i. e. "As the Demiurgus is to mundane natures so is the one [or the ineffable principle of principles] to all things; the Demiurgus being a certain one, but not simply one. For the Demiurgus is a certain God. For the God which subsists according to [or is characterised by] the one is not a certain God, but simply God. But the
Demiurgus is a certain God; because the demiurgic peculiarity is the peculiarity of a certain God, there being also other peculiarities, which are indeed divine, yet not demiurgic. What Proclus here says, necessarily follows from the Platonic theory, that as the first God is the one, all the other Gods are unities, proceeding from and at the same time rooted in the one itself.

Page 38. l. 1. for ἐμορφιαν, the Harleian Ms. has ἐμορφιαν, which is the true reading. But the passage in which this word occurs is the following: τα μεν γαρ οτι βεσι και οτι απελευ θη του εσο ορισματα, την ακαλλακτου εμορφιαν, [ἐμορφίαν] ους φαι νη του τα οτια θεων, διαφεροντας ανακαλας και προσευθητα τους ανα ποιησιν δυναμενις. i.e. "For some things are divine, being established in the simplicity of the one; transcendently rejoicing in, and extending to those who are able to survey them, an undaunted privation of form, as some one of the piously wise says." That ἐμορφιαν is the true reading, is evident from this, that according to the Platonic philosophy, divine natures are more properly celebrated by negations than by affirmations.

P. 40. l. 2. for ουμετα τω θεων, the Harleian Ms. has rightly ουμετα των θεων.

P. 41. l. 3. ἀναπτροφιν, which is also the reading of the Harleian Ms., should be ἀναπτροφιν. This will be evident from an inspection of the passage in which this word occurs, viz. αι μεν τι την διαλεκτικην μοναρχιαν προειρη ην ἡ αριστοτελεια, και ο Σωκρατης τη Πολιτεια φησι, μη λει αυτων εις παραπομπην έλαλητε, τη δεινης των λογων χρωματος προς την των ενυποτοφιων [ἀναπ-τροφων] τιμων ει ημη αναπτροφην. No expression is more common in Platonic writers than ἀναπτροφιν ευμετα, unperturbed conceptions. And that this is the true reading is evident from the place in the Republic of Plato which forms a part of that to which Proclus alludes: for it is the following, ειτι του μεν δοκηματο κατα πρωτα και των διως ειναι καλας, ει τι σεντομουμεθα, στοτο υπο γονιμω, τω δοκωμο σου με τω τιμωντε, αυτω (lib. vii. p. 146). Contra... 1713). For these dogmas concerning things beautiful and just, which we have been nourished from our childhood, are the unperturbed conceptions, mentioned by Proclus.

For according to Plato the Demiurgus is not the supreme God; since in the Timæus he says, "that it is difficult to discover the Demiurgus and father of the universe; and when found, impossible to reveal him by language to all men; but in the Parmenides, he celebrates the one, or the first principle of things, as perfectly ineffable. For he says, at the conclusion of the first hypothesis concerning it, "Neither therefore does any name belong to it, nor discourse, nor any science, nor sense, nor opinion."
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P. 57. 1. 12. των ανομων; but the Harleian Ms. has rightly των υπωμων. For Proclus says, των μεν γαρ φυσικων ειδων το πληθος των ανομων [ατομων] χειριν, μεταξει δε το πληθος του συντηγματαν σως του εν τοις τολλοις, προ δε τουτου εστι το εξηγημαν τινα προ των τολλων, ο δη ιδει εστι παρα Πλατωνι, i. e. "For in physical forms multitude [i. e. the multitude of them] is less excellent than the individuals [in which these forms are inherent]; but the multitude participates of that one which is co-aranged with the many. Prior, however, to this [i.e. to this co-aranged monad], is the exempt one, antecedent to the many, which with Plato is idea." For forms when materialised become inferior to their recipients, because they are wholly dependent on them for their subsistence, having departed from their own simplicity and indivisibility into foreign compositions and intervals.

P. 80. 1. 12. For εξηγημανας, which also the Harleian Ms. has, it is necessary to read εξηγητημανας. The erroneous substitution of one of these words for the other, frequently takes place, not only in the manuscripts, but also in the printed copies of the writings of Proclus.

P. 88. 1. 20. προς τον, so the Harleian Ms., but it is requisite to read προς τον, as will be at once evident to the Platonic reader from an inspection of the following passage in which these words occur: εν αυτως τοις θεως, τα δευτερα εν τοις πρωτοις εστι, και παντα ακλος συνηναιται προς τον [τον] αρ'ου και η προοδος και η εκτασις τοις ουσιν.

P. 94. 1. 13. Proclus, here speaking of the arrangement of the persons of the dialogue, and what the arrangement indicates, says: τινος ουν ευδεξη της του τοιουν, και δια τοιον αιτιον ο Αριστοτελης τω Παρμενιδη συνετηται και αυτε εκεινον εφελιται. Πιθανον δε τη Ζηνωνι προ Σωκρατους προτερος γεραι διακινον τους λογους, Σωκρατης δε αμφοτεροι των σοφων, προκαλομενος μεν των Παρμενιδουν νων, επακολουθην απο τους Ζηνωνος λογους. In this passage, it appears to me, that between the words Σωκρατης δε, and αμφοτεροι των σοφων, it is necessary to insert το μεσον ουσιν.

P. 111. 1. 15. Proclus in this place, speaking of the difference between the dialectic of Zeno, and that of Parmenides, and having observed that the former is more logical, but the latter more intellectual, adds: ο δε Παρμενιδης αυτω μονο τω χρωματως, αυτων την ενωσιν εδεατο του ουτω, τη νοησι διαλεκτικη χρωματως, εν ακλος επισολαις το χωρος εκουση διο και ο μεν [i. e. Zeno] αει πληθος κατμεν λογους, o δε [i. e. Parmenides] της νοησις επισολης αει της αυτης μονοιδας αντικειτο των ουτων. In this passage,
instead of ἐ添加ς ἐπιβολῆς καὶ τὸς ἱστής, I conceive it
necessary to read, ὦ ἔδει τὴς νοσακισμένης ἐπιβολῆς ἀντίτιτον ὑποτρήσ.
For the energy of ἐπιβολῆς, by which Platonic writers
usually express the intuitive perception of intellect, is invincible,
because it is superior even to scientific demonstration.
P. 121. 1. 12., &c. Ὅτι δὲ εἶναι δεῖ τὸ ἐν τὸν πληθοῦς,
λαθοὶς ἐν δια μιᾶς μὲν ἐφόδου λογικῆς τοιαύτης· ὅμοιονος λέγεται
τὸ ἐν κατὰ τοὺς ὄντας κατόν, ὅ συννημαῖς, ὅ ὡς ἂν ἐπὶ καὶ πρὸς
ἐν ἀλλ' ἐπιθυμίας κατανόησιν, ὅπερ τὸ μὲν μαλλον ὁπι σαμεν, τὸ δὲ
ἡττον' τὸ γαρ μᾶλλον καὶ ἢπον οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν τοῖς ὑπομνήμασιν ἐπὶ δὲ
ἐπιθυμίας ἔστιν ἐν κατὰ πᾶσαις λεγομέναις. In this passage there
are three mistakes, and they also occur in the Harleian MS.
For instead of ὑπομνήμασι in ἀλλ' ὑπομνήματος κατανόησι, it is neces-
sary to read συνεπιθυμίας; since being itself is not predicated of
all beings synonymously, for the reason assigned by Proclus,
viz. that one thing is being in a greater, but another in a less
degree. And for the same reason in τὸ γαρ μᾶλλον καὶ ἢπον οὐκ
ἔστιν ἐν τοῖς ὑπομνήμασι, we must substitute συνεπιθυμίας for ὑπομνή-
μασι. But for συνεπιθυμίας ἔστιν ἐν ὧς κ. τ. ι., in the last part of
this passage, it is obviously requisite to read ὑπομνήμασι; the
former emendations being admitted.
P. 123. 1. 15., &c. Proclus, in speaking in this place of the
opinion of the vulgar, who survey multitude as having a dissi-
pated subsistence, but do not see the absurdities which must
necessarily ensue from separating multitude from unity,
observes as follows: Ζητεῖ δὲ πρὸς τὴν Παρμενίδειον θεωτιν ἐνδώ
ἀποιδεῖ τοις τῶν πολλῶν δοκεῖ διηλεύχει τὰ πόλλα καὶ
dιεικταῖς θεαούσαις, καὶ ταυτάρας ἑλεγχόνων, ἀντίθετον ἐπι το εἴ,
tοις πολλοῖς ἐπιθυμίας αὐτοίς εἰς εἰ μὲν καρποῦν τά πόλλα τοις εὐς,
pολλα καὶ αὐτοῖς συμβρέθησαι τῷ λογίῳ. Here instead of ἀντίθετον ἐπι το εἴ,
tοις πολλοῖς ἐπιθυμίας κ. τ. ι., it is necessary to read
ἀντίθετον ἐπι το εἴ τοις πολλαῖς, ἐν ἐπιθυμίας κ. τ. ι.; and then
this passage will be, in English, “Zeno does not oppose the position
of Parmenides, but confutes the opinion of the vulgar, who
survey multitude and things which are dispersed, or have a dis-
pipated subsistence, and elevates them to the one which is in the
many, indicating that if the many were separated from the one,
many absurdities would follow.” For the proper ascent is from
the one or the incorporeal form which multitude participates,
and by which it is connected and held together, to the form or
idea which is exempt from multitude, and which has a subsis-
tence auto καὶ auto.
of the Harleian MS., it is requisite to read κατ' αυτον αυτων μετα, etc. But the whole passage is as follows: 

"δι' αυτα των παραθεσεων κατ' αυτον το πλαθος, αυται και εντατικαι εν τω τυχων της εικονας κατ' αυτον στατον ειν. The causal subsidence of a thing is better than that thing when it has proceeded out of its cause—i.e. than when it subsists καθαρως. Hence the one being the cause of union, is more excellent than union, and is therefore κατ' αυτον στατος."

P. 141. l. 11., etc. 

δι' κατ' αυτον και εντατικαι εντατικαι, και διαθεσεως κατ' αυτον ειναι, εφαρμοστε και τον θεσσαλον ειναι εαυτως, και εις εαυτον συνεναι των καλλων και εντατικων δια των καλλων δειν. So likewise the Harleian MS.; but for κατ' αυτον στατον ειναι κατ' αυτον διαθεσεως, δια των καλλων και εντατικων του καλλων δειν.

P. 154. l. 9. 

οτιι αισι εις τω διαθεσεωι των διακοσιων και αυτων των διεθνων ποιηματων κατ' αυτον. But the Harleian MS. has, δια των διακοσιων, διαθεσεως, which is the true reading.

P. 156. l. 16. 

Proclus, in speaking of demiurgic similitude and dissimilitude (συμμετρητικα και αναμετρητικα), says, κατ' αυτον διακοσια τρεις ακοντια, διακοσια ποιηματων και τυπωματων και τρεις ακοντια των διακοσιων, διακοσιων και αλλων, και επιστημων και διακοσιων. But in this passage for διακοσια, which the Harleian MS. likewise has, it is requisite to read διακοσιας. For as the powers of similitude are μονοδιακοσια, those of dissimilitude are διακοσιας; that which is more excellent being everywhere characterised by the μονοδιακοσια, but the less excellent by the διακοσιας.

P. 157. l. 13. 

μετα δε, οσα των μη επιθετων εκτοιτων, μη κα τοια παντα τα αυτα ενεργην τω γαρ διακοσια, ει βουλειν, συναγωγειν, συναγωγειν δε αναμετρητικα, και εντατικα των και αυτων των ενεργην. In this passage the Harleian MS. has also μη επιθετων, but erroneously; as it should be μη επιθετων. For Proclus had a little before been speaking of the most generic forms, viz. essence, sameness, and difference, and also of the most special, which he denominates the monads in individuals such as man, dog, &c. (μοναδας εν των ατομων) and then he observes, that the media between these, are such forms as extend farther indeed than the latter, but do not [like the former] energize on all beings. The last part of this
passage differs from the reading in the Harleian MS. For this instead of σαμασι ἐν τοις και αυτοις τοις ανυχωις, has σαμασι ἐν τοις και αυτοις τοις ανυχωις; which appears to be the true reading. For then Proclus will say, "For justice [which is part of these middle forms], is indeed inherent in souls, but how is it present with bodies, and inanimate natures themselves?"

P. 169. 1. 7. &c. λέγει δι' οὗν τα ἐν τοὶ μεταχείρει ταὶ τοῖς εν τῷ μεταχειρεί δευτεράν τοις αντών εἴδον αὐτες ἐχειναν. In the Harleian MS. δευτεράν is omitted, and also τῶν ἐντων, so that the reading there is τα ἐν τῷ μεταχειρεί εἴδον αὐτες ἐχειναν. And this appears to be the true reading.

P. 169. 1. 18. ταῦτα ὁμοια εἴρηται. But the Harleian MS. has, vary properly, ταῦτα τοιτα ὁμοια εἴρηται, as will be evident from a perusal of the words—which immediately follow.

P. 174. 1. 12. ἀλλα κατὰ τοῦτον εἴρηται ὁμοια καὶ ἀνυχωις, καὶ ὁκαὶ εἰς μετατροπὴν τῆς αὐτοῦ ὁμοιοτητος τοις μεταλαχθηκοι τῇ τοις αὐτοῖς. So likewise the Harleian MS. But there is evidently an omission in this passage of καὶ τῆς αὐτοῦ ἀνυχωις, immediately after αὐτοῦ ὁμοιοτητος.

P. 184. 1. 7. τα ὑπὸ τὴν ἐντων ἐχει τὴν αὐτοῖς προσώπῳ καὶ τὴν σαμασιν ἐν ἀλλαγαὶ δεικνυ. Thus too the Harleian MS. But for δεικνυ, I read δεικνυ. So that the meaning of Proclus in this passage will be, "that intelligibles possess an union adapted to their nature, and pass through each other without confusion."

In p. 186. Proclus shows that similitude and dissimilitude participate of each other; and in line 10th observes, "that if similitude imparts itself to other things, it becomes dissimilar to them [because it is different from them]: for thus the former will impart, but the latter receive." οἷος γὰρ εἰ μετατροπῆς τοις μεταλαχθεὶσ τοις ἀνυχωις ἡ ὁμοιοτητα εἱστιν, ἀνυχωιοίται αὐτοῖς εἰς γεμι (sic Harl. MS., sed lege oüve γεμι) αὐτοῖς μετατροπῆς, τα καὶ μεταλαμβάνειν.

P. 188. 1. 1. Καὶ τοῦτα ἡ ὁμοιοτητις αὐτοῖς αὐτοῖς εὑστιν, οὕτω καὶ τοῦ ἀνυχώις. So also the Harleian MS.; but it is necessary to add after αὐτοῖς ἡ ὁμοιοτητις the words αὐτοῖς αὐτοῖς. Thus too in l. 3., &c. of the same page, αὐτοῖς ἡ ὁμοιοτητις is wanting immediately after αὐτοῖς. So that instead of οὕτω ἐκείνης ὁμοιοτητις, ἀλλὰ μετατροπής τῆς αὐτοῖς ἐναι αἰτίης, we must read οὕτω ἐκείνης ὁμοιοτητις, ἀλλὰ μετατροπῆς. For the design of Proclus in this part of his commentary is, to demonstrate that similitude itself and dissimilitude itself participate of each other, yet so as not to confound their proper natures in the participation.

P. 192. 1. 10. Proclus having observed, that the different intellectual orders are to be surveyed, in which the form of similitude subsists, adds, καὶ τοῦτο το εἴδος εν ἕκαστῃ τοις ἄλλοις ὑπομονεῖν.
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οικείας υπεροχόμε|ς μεν εν τοις υπεροχόμε|ς ευχομε|ς δέ εν τῷ υ̣π̣ερ τοῦ κόσμου μεταχείμοις. In which passage, for υπερ τοῦ κόσμου, it is necessary to read υπο τοῦ κόσμου.

P. 193. l. 5. εκάστον δὲ τὰ λοιπὰ οὐχ ἔχει, ἀλλ' ἔχει μετὰ τὴν κοινωνίας καὶ τὴν αμβιαν. So likewise the Harleian MS.; but for οὐχ ἔχει, I read οὐκ ἔστιν.

P. 194. l. 1. τὸ γὰρ κοινὸν τινὸς μετεληχος, εἰς ἐστι κατ' αὐτό τοῦτο τὸ κοινὸν οὕτως ἐκ τοῦ κοινοῦ αὐτούς τὸ οἷος ἐν ἐστιν, ἐν τῇ πολλῇ κατὰ τὸ οἷος εἰς καὶ πάλιν τὸ οἷος εἰς αὐτοὺς εἰς τῇ ἐν πασιν εἰς τὸν τούτων. This is also the reading of the Harleian MS., but it is in more respects than one erroneous. For in the first place the punctuation is wrong in οὕτως εἰς κοινον' αὐτούς τὸ οἷος εἰς εστιν, ἐν τῇ πολλῇ, κ. τ. λ., which should be οὕτως εἰς κοινον' αὐτούς τὸ οἷος εἰς εστιν ἐν τῇ πολλῇ κ. τ. λ. And in the next place, for ἐν τῷ ἐν πασιν εἰς τούτων, it is necessary to read ἐν τῷ ἐν πασιν οὐκ εἰς τούτων. For the design of Proclus in this part, is to illustrate the reasoning of Zeno, in confuting those who separate the many from the one. Hence, after having observed that things which thus subsist, are many, in consequence of not participating of unity: for things in which unity is not predominant are many; and since it is common to them not to be one, again, they are on this account one,—he then adds, "For that which participates of a certain something which is common, is one through this something common: so that if the not being one is common to the many, the many will be one, through the not-one[being common to them.] And again in a similar manner they will not be one, in consequence of there not being in all of them the same thing [because where there is the same thing in the many, there is a participation of unity]." For sameness, as it is accurately defined by Aristotle in the 6th book of his Metaphysics, is a participation of unity.

P. 195. l. 15. καὶ τὸ αὐτοῦν πρὸς τὸ ζων. So likewise the Harleian MS. But for πρὸς τὸ ζων, it is necessary to read πρὸς τὸ αἰών. This will be evident from what Proclus says prior to this. For a little before, he had observed, that each of us is both one and many, and that we are evidently so through a similitude to the universe. And he then adds, πολλὰ γὰρ προτερον ο ἐκμος ουτος ο παρμεγας εἰς ἐστὶ καὶ πολὺς πολὺς μὲν, οὐ κατὰ τὸ σωματικὸν μοιον καὶ κατὰ τοῦτο μὲν γὰρ τοσαυτὴν εχον εξαλλαγην, οὐκ ἐν τῷ αἰῶν πρὸς τὸ φθαρτον, καὶ τὸ αὐλὸν πρὸς τὸ αἰὼν, καὶ τὸ αὐτοκτὸν πρὸς τὸ ζων [αἰῶν], ἀπὸ τῆς οἰκείας εὐστατεσ.

P. 198. l. 20. καὶ γὰρ τὸ εὐστοιον τοῦ πλήθους πέρας εστίν, ἀλλ' οὐκ ανακαλω. This is also the reading of the Harleian
MS. But after περας εστιν, it is requisite to add, καὶ τὸ πληθον ἀνυστρόφουν ἄνυστρόφουν εστιν; and after ἀνακαλιν to add, τὸ ἀνυστρόφουν πληθον εστί. This will be obvious to the Platonic reader, from an inspection of the reasoning of Proclus in this place.

P. 205. l. 5., &c. εἰς αὐτὴν τὴν τελευτάτην τὴν Σωκράτης καθαρώθηκεν ὑπὸ χάρις περὶ τὴς κοινωνίας τῶν εἰδῶν, καὶ συγκρινοῦσας πάντα εἰπὼν 'ταύτα γαρ παραχθὲν ἄμα, αμφότεροι δὲ τοῖς θείοις εἰκονισὶ πραγματικῶς, ἐνσώσε το αὐτήρως καὶ διακρίνων ἀνυστρόφων, ἰσαὶ καὶ ἐν ἀλλήλοις ἂν καὶ ἵνα τὴν καθαρότητα τὴν επιτὴν. So the Harleian MS.; but after τῶν εἰδῶν, it is necessary to add διακρινοῦσας; and after διακρινών ἀνυστρόφων, something is obviously wanting, and this I conjecture to be the word παρεχθοῦν. So that what Proclus says will be, in English, as follows: "Socrates recurs to the most perfect hypothesis concerning the communion of forms, asserting that all of them are separated from, and yet mingled with each other. For these properties are at one and the same time present with them. And both these impart to those divine things, unconfused union, and an indivisible separation or distinction, in order that they may subsist in each other, and yet preserve their own purity." But that it is necessary to add διακρινοῦσας in the place above mentioned, is evident from the following text of Plato, the beginning of the Commentary on which, is the passage I have quoted: καὶ τὸς τῶν δὲ ἔγω ἐλεγον, προτότων μὲν διακρίνεται χωρὶς αὐτὰ καὶ αὐτὰ τὰ εἰδή, οἰον ὀμοιότητα τα καὶ αὐτομοιότητα, καὶ πλῆθος καὶ τὸ ἐν, καὶ στάσις, καὶ κινήσις, καὶ πάντα τα τοιαύτα· εἰτα ἐν αὐτοῖς ταῦτα δυναμένα συγκεκριμένα τα καὶ διακρινοῦσας ἀπόταμην, αὐγαμήν αὐν ἐνγογ διαμαστάς, ἐφ' ὁ χώραν.

P. 205. l. 19. ταύτην οὖν ζητεῖ τὴν συγκρασίαν ο Σωκράτης μετὰ τῆς διακρισίας δειν ἐπὶ τῶν ἄμερων καὶ νοητῶν ὑποστήκας, καὶ εἰς ταύτην προσαλλεῖ τοὺς ἄμερους· καὶ ταύτην ἰσαίτω τὴν θεώριαν τὴν νῦσσαν αὐτὰ καὶ διακρινοῦσαν τὰς νοητὰς δυνάμεις τῶν αἰσθήματος, ομοιότητα εἰκονισθῇ καὶ αὐτομοιότητα, πλῆθος τὸ εἰκατ' ἐν, στάσις τὴν θυαν καὶ κινήσις. In this passage for αἰσθήτων, which is also the reading of the Harleian MS., it is necessary to substitute νοητῶν. This is evident from the above words of Plato, in which, as Proclus justly observes, Socrates is represented as admiring the theory which unites and at the same time separates the intellectual powers of intelligibles; which powers are similitude and dissimilitude, the multitude and the one which are there, and divine permanency and motion.

P. 206. l. 12. πρὸ το ιστομένον εἰν τινι εστιν εἰς, καὶ παν τὸ κατορθούσατι τοῦ ἐνος, σωτε θα πολλα εὶ μὴ μετεχοι τίνος ἐνος, ἑταῖ τα ἐστι καὶ καλὺν εἰ αὐτω τοῦτο εἰνοι κοινοῖ εἰ μὴ μετεχεῖν τίνος, ἐν
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τὸν οὖσαν. So the Harleian MS. But for ἄρας γὰρ ἐπὶ τοῖς τινὶς κ. τ. λ. it is necessary to read τὴν τοῦ ἑτέρου κ. τ. λ. "every thing which stands still is in a certain thing." And for τὸ μὴ μετέχειν τινς, τὸν οὖσαν, it is requisite to read, τὸ μὴ με-
tεχνούσαν τινς, τὸν οὖσαν, "if it is common to the many, not to participate of a certain one, they will be in a certain thing." For that which is common comprehends the multitude to which it is common.

P. 206. l. 15. αὐτὸ καὶ οἱ ἄρας τοῦ ὅλου κοσμοῦ κ. τ. λ. In the Harleian MS., by an unaccountable mistake, these words, and all those that follow, are omitted, as far as to the words τοῦτος μὲν εὐς ὑπάρχειν κ. τ. λ.: in l. 19. p. 218: and then all that is here omitted is to be found in what follows in p. 220., after the words ὅτι ἑξεστώς πρᾶξιν αὐτῷ κ. τ. λ., in the last line of that page.1

P. 209. l. 1. αὐτὸ καὶ, ὅσα θεών καὶ μόνη τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τῶν ἐκκλησίων οὐκ η ημέρας. So the Harleian MS.; but for ημέρας it is necessary to read σαβατών. For Proclus is here citing the well-known saying of Aristotle, "that motion is as it were the life of bodies."

P. 209. l. 14. ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ μὲν οὐκι οὐκί καὶ οὐκί καὶ οὐκί, ἐκεῖ τούτων, καὶ αὐτό τίς οὖσαν τῆς οὐσίας τοιαύτης καὶ τὸ τῆς ὑπονοούσας ὑπόγειον. But for οὐκί, in this passage the Harleian MS. has οὐκί, which I have no doubt is the true reading: for as permanency is the perpetuity of demurrage intellecation, so motion is that which gives efficacy to the energy of the Demurragus.

P. 216. l. 15. τελευταίον τοῦτον τοῖς καὶ ζήσον, διὰ τῆς αἰσθητικῆς προσφορὰς ἐμβαίνει τῆς εἰκότητος αὐτοῦ κ. τ. λ. So the Harleian MS.; But for προσφορᾶς I read πρόκλησιν.

P. 221. Proclus, speaking of Pythodorus, one of the persons of the dialogue, says of him: οὐδὲ οἰκλειόφορος οὔτε ματά τὸ γένος, οὔτε σοφιτάκες, οὔτε γενὸς τῆς συνοίνιας συγγελάν, οὔτε τοῦ γενοῦς καθός απεκρύψει, εἰ μή δὲ εξώγελε τὴν ζωήν καὶ εὐχήν ταῦτα τῷ τῷ προτίθεν οὖσαν τεταλειωμένον. This is likewise the reading of the Harleian MS.; but instead of εἰς τὴν προτίθεν οὖσαν it is necessary

1 Thus too in the Commentaries of Proclus on the Timæus, as I have observed in my translation of that admirable work, after the words ὅτι καὶ τὸ λογικὸν ὑποθέτετος καὶ καὶ τὸς θεὸς τούτος (p. 270), the words τῷ δὲ αὐτοῦ καὶ διὰ ταύτα immediately follow, which belong to the Commentary in p. 266. And the part which should immediately follow ὑποθέτετος, and begins with εἰς τῷ δὲ τῶν σφαιρῶν τοῖς θεῶς γεγονὸς, is to be found in p. 272. line 6. from the bottom.
to read εἰς τὴν προοίμων, as will be evident from a perusal of the commentary of Proclus on the Introductory part of the Parmenides.

P. 223. l. 2. Proclus having observed, that Socrates could not endure to remain in visible objects, nor to be busily employed in the monads which are coarranged with them, adds, ἀλλ' εὖ αυτὰς τὰς αἰώνιας καὶ ἀμεσώς καὶ νοεράς μοναδὰς αναφερᾶν τοῖς εὐαυτῷ νοοῦ, καὶ απὸ τῆς προοίμου τῆς κατὰ τὸ πλῆθος, κατὰ δὲ τίνα κυκλοῦ, εὖ αὐτὸ καλὲν τὸ εἰ προοίμων παρὰ θεῖα παρὰ μετὰ τὴν γνώμην διαπεραίτης διηθεοῦν, τῆς προοίμου τού πλῆθους, εἰς τὴν οἰκείαν προοίμων αναλυόμενα. So also the Harleian MS. But after the words εὖ αὐτὸ καλὲν τὸ εἰ προοίμων, I conceive the words τὴν αποτρεψίν μακροορθέων are wanting. So that the whole passage in English, thus amended, will be: “But elevating his intellect to the immaterial, impartible, and intellectual monads, and from a progression according to multitude; and in a certain circle again making a regression to the one itself; [in so doing] imitating divine natures, who after the prolific power of secondary natures convolve the end of the progression to the proper principle of it.” For in every divine order there are μοὺς, προοίμων, διαπεραίτης, καί αποτρεπόν, permanency, progression, and regression.

P. 223. l. 12. οἰκεία γαρ τοῖς μεν πατρικικοῖς καὶ μοναδικοῖς διηθεοῖς, απὸ τοῦτον ἡ γνώμης διαπεραίτης, καὶ ἡ μεθοῦς τοῦ πλῆθους. So likewise the Harleian MS. But after πατρικικοῖς καὶ μοναδικοῖς, it is requisite to add ἡ μοὺς, and also after διηθεοῖς to add ὅτι. So that this passage will be in English, conformably to what we have above observed of every divine order, as follows: “For permanency is adapted to paternal and monadic natures, but prolific power, and a progression as far as to multitude, to the natures which are secondary to these.”

In the last line of the same page, I conceive with the Professor, that παρὰ is wanting after the word αποτρεπόν. And there is the same deficiency in the Harleian MS.