OBSERVATIONS ON

PROFESSOR COUSIN'S EDITION OF THE COMMENTARIES OF PROCLUS ON THE FIRST ACLIBIADES OF PLATO, IN 2 VOLS. 8vo. PARIS, 1820 AND 1821; AND ALSO ON CREUZER'S EDITION OF THE SAME COMMENTARIES, TOGETHER WITH THOSE OF OLYMPIODORUS ON THAT DIALOGUE, IN 2 VOLS. 8vo. FRANCOF. 1820 AND 1821.

No. I.

The lovers of the Platonic philosophy, who at the present period, and especially in this country, are very rare, will certainly acknowledge themselves to be much indebted to the labors of Professor Cousin¹ and Creuzer, for publishing these remains of the Commentaries of two of the best disciples of Plato, on one of the most important of all the Dialogues of that prince of philosophers. For what can be more important to man, than the knowledge of what man is? which in these Commentaries is unfolded with the most consummately scientific skill, and in a way which, by the Platonic reader, will be considered as no less luminous than acute.

The merits of these two editions of the Commentaries of Proclus are nearly equal. For though Creuzer consulted a greater number of manuscripts than Cousin, with the different readings of which he has enriched his notes, yet the text of the latter is far more accurate than that of the former; and, besides this, the Professor's edition is accompanied by Gogava's Latin translation of a part of these Commentaries, and by the Epitome made of them by Ficinus; so that to the reader who is not an adept in the philosophy of Plato, the edition of Cousin is the most valuable, and to the critic that of Creuzer.

As the Harleian manuscript of these Commentaries of Proclus, of which I have a copy, appears to me to be on the whole superior to any of those consulted by Cousin and Creuzer; (for it contains nearly all the accurate readings noticed by the latter of these editors, and has some which are not to be found in other copies;) my remarks will be the result of a comparison

¹ See the Remarks on the Professor's edition of the two first books of Proclus on the Parmenides of Plato, in the preceding Number of this Journal.
of the readings of this manuscript with those from which these two very able and laudable scholars formed their editions.

In Tom. ii. p. 6. of Cousin, and p. 3. of Creuzer, we have διο νευ μεν οστίν εν αιοιν το τελειον, κ. τ. λ.; but for διο the Harleian MS. has δια τουτο, which I prefer, as being more conformable to the manner of Proclus. In p. 14. of Cousin, after και ποι φθοραν ουτως αλλαχω δεικνυθαι την ουσιαν μενον της οστιν; the words, ποι δε τον ανθρωπον εξητηθαι και την ανθρωπου φωσιν, immediately follow, and so likewise in the Harleian MS.; but they are not in the text of Creuzer, nor are they mentioned by him in his notes. In p. 9. of Creuzer, after the words, ὁσπερ όνεν εν ταις τελεταις καθαρεις ηγουνται και περίπατηρια και αγνοσμοι α των εν απορρητοις δρωμενοι και της ιειν μετουσιας, the words γυμνασματα εισιν are wanting, which, however, the Harl. MS. has, and also the text of Cousin, as may be seen in p. 22. of his edition. Creuzer in his notes observes, that the manuscripts A. F. B. and D. have these words, and that they are also to be found, together with the whole passage, in an English Treatise entitled, A Dissertation on the Eleusinian and Bacchic Mysteries. Amsterd. sine anni nota; which treatise was one of my juvenile productions. P. 11. of Creuzer, and p. 26. of Cousin: ταυτα δε περι της προθεσεως ημιν αναγγεγραθω προαποδειξιν; but the Harleian MS. for προαποδειξιν has προ αποδειξιν, which is evidently erroneous. P. 14. of Creuzer: πως ουν φαμεν τον διαλογον ης τα προσεχι και κυριωτερα μερη διαμερισθαι; and this is also the reading of Cousin: but the Harleian MS. has παντα ουν φαμεν, κ. τ. λ. and the sentence is not interrogative. The true reading, however, is evidently that of the editors: for the sentence that immediately follows, viz. πως δε αλλας ἡ σπειρη σκοτος μεν οστιν αυτω κ. τ. λ., is obviously an answer to the preceding interrogation. In the same page of Creuzer, and also in p. 38. of Cousin, we have, τρια τοινυν ταυτα του προχειματον διαλογου μερη τα δε αλλα παντα τοινυν ουκε παραλαμβανεται και προς ταυτα συντελει, τα τα αποδεικτικα, και τα λεκτικα καθηκοντα; except that Cousin for τα λεκτικα has τα τη λεκτικα, and Creuzer in his notes observes that the MSS. A. B. and D. have τα τη λεκτικη. But the Harleian MS. has τα τη διαλεκτικη, which appears to me to be the true reading.

Again, Cousin, p. 50. το γαρ εξεταιν την αιτιαν δι' ην ο Σωκρατης μονος των ερωτων ουκ απελεξε του ερωτος, αλλα και γειστο προ των αλλων, και πεπαλαιωσ ακεινων ουκ ακαλαλτεται, θεατην αυτων αποθανει της ολη του Σωκρατους ζωης. This is also the reading of the Harl. MS. and is correct; but the text of Creu-
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zer omits εἰσηκνων; nor is the omission mentioned by him in his notes, though I wonder this very learned man did not see the necessity of inserting it. Creuzer p. 45. καὶ ἀλογὸ το αὑτῆς τον εἰσηκνων εἰσὶ τον μεθεκτον, καὶ το καλ' αυτο το μετ' ἀλλω συνδεμεριμουν, καὶ το εἰσηκνων τον προς εἰσηκνων τινα συνταξιν λαχοτος. So the Harl. MS. and so Cousin. But for εἰσηκνων in this passage it is requisite to read εἰσηκνων. For then Proclus will say, "And, in short, the imparticiple is different from the participle, that which subsists by itself, from that which is surveyed in conjunction with something else, and that which is exempt, from that which is allotted a co-arrangement with a certain other thing." And in the words that immediately follow in Creuzer, viz. Ἐρείδη τοινον ο Αλκιβιάδης νοεται διχας ... καὶ ας ψυχη καθος αι μεν εισηκνη τον του σώκης προς αυτον αναλογιγον ο Σωκρατους, καθος δε σωκης χρωμητη ψυχη, την του αγαθου δαιμους, there are wanting the words καὶ ας ψυχη σωκης χρωμητη, between the words καὶ ας ψυχη, and the word καθος, which are also wanting in the Harl. MS., but which are very properly inserted in the edition of Cousin, p. 121. In p. 51. of Creuzer, Proclus speaking of the summit of the intelligible triad, which consists of being, life, and intellect, says, "that it is characterised by the good, which it intellectually perceives, where according to the oracle the paternal monad resides," της μεν προτης το μαγια χαρακτηριζομενη, το γαρ αυτο νοεσαι, και χαριτικη μονας εισι, το λογιον φησι. Creuzer in his note on this passage observes, "Voces extemnas: σου πατρικη μονας εισι, ut ex Psello depromtas, quasi primum oraculorum Zoroastro versum edidit F. Patricius. Vid. Clerici Opera Philos. p. 304.5." by which it appears that this most learned man was not at the time of his writing this acquainted with my collection of the Chaldean Oracles,1 published in the Classical Journal. (See Nos. 29, 32 and 33.) For he would there have seen the whole of the Oracle of which these words are the conclusion, and the source whence it was derived, which is the 2nd book of Proclus on Euclid p. 27., and is mentioned by that philosopher as follows: καὶ γαρ η μονας ενει πρωτην, σου πατρικη μονας εισι, φησι το λογιον. In p. 52. of Creuzer, Proclus speaking still further of the

1 The reader will see that in this collection each Oracle is accurately arranged under its proper head, and the authors and places given (a few only excepted) where each may be found. And he will likewise find that the collection of Patricius is there increased by the addition of upwards of fifty Chaldean Oracles, and fragments of Oracles.
intelligible triad, says: καὶ τὴν τριάς αυτὴ προσελθὼν επὶ πατὴς τοὺς διὸν διακοσμοὺς, καὶ πατὴν εἰκάλαμπε τὴν πρὸς τὸ γονῆν εὐροτεῖ. Αλλ᾽ αὐτὸ κατ᾽ ἀλλαξ. εὐκαίρια ταῖς δυνάμεις. But the Harleian MS. very properly adds, after the word ταξις, the words ταξις εἰς ταῖς τοὺς θεοὺς συμπληκούσα τας ευροτεῖς. And this addition is also to be found in the text of Cousin p. 141.; but does not appear to have been in any of the manuscripts consulted by Creuzer, or he would doubtless have noticed it. In the same page, Proclus cites the following Chaldaic Oracle:

παντα γὰρ τὴν τριάς τοις δὲ πυβεγγαῖαι τοις καὶ κατ᾽ εὐροτεῖ.

i. e. "For all things are governed by and subsist in these three;" i. e. in faith, truth, and love; of which he had been before speaking. And Creuzer in a note says, "Hoc logum augeri possunt ut τον Ζαροστατον λογια, quae post Fr. Patricium et Th. Stanlejum edidit Jo. Clericus, &c." But it was many years ago published by me in the before-mentioned collection of Chaldean oracles. Creuzer adds, "Ceterum his Platonicorum philosophorum oraculis oraculum aliud in hac ipsa quatione opponit scriptor anonymus in Cod. Darmst. mscr.—εν μὲν γὰρ αρχὴ παντα γεγενηται ως τα ιερα λογια τας τετελεσθαι τετελεσθαι τον εφεδρον εκ τον προοδον συνταγματα. It is singular that so learned a man as Creuzer should not have discovered that this anonymous writer means by τα ιερα λογια the Scriptures, and that consequently he is not quoting any heathen oracle. For that this writer was a Christian, is evident from his calling the theory of Porphyry and Iamblichus about the progression of the divine orders delirious. In thus defaming, however, the theological dogma of these great men, this anonymous author has only exposed his own ignorance of the Platonic theology, far, according to this theology, the great first cause of all energies prior to, together with, and posterior to, all the other causes that proceed from him, as is demonstrated by Proclus in his Elements of Theology. So that though one thing proceeds from another, an inferior from a superior principle, yet all things originally proceed from the first principle, who is therefore called in this Theology the Principle of principles, the God of Gods, and a unity prior to all things.

In p. 71 of Creuzer, Proclus, after speaking about the order of deities in common, adds: των γὰρ δαιμονων τουτων κατα το ματων, ως ειπομαι, τεταγμενων, οι μεν πρωτοτοι θεοι δαιμωνες ειναι, κ. τ. λ. But after πρωτοτοι the Harl. MS. adds καὶ εκροτατοι, and Cousin also, p. 193, has this addition; though it does not appear to have been found in any of the MSS. consulted by
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Creuzer. Again, Creuzer p. 74. and Cousin p. 201. ouste γε γε 
ομω, και εν Πολιτεία Σωκράτης δαίμονας εκλάθε τους αι βε 
βίου και και εις αμήν λήσεν μεταταντας και τοπον αγιώτερον. 
But for metatantas the Harl. MS. has κατασταντας, and for το 
τοπον αγιώτερον, τοπον αγιώτερον. And the latter appears to 
have been the reading which Picinus found in his MS.; for his version of 
this passage is: "Hac arbitror ratione Socratem in Republica daemon 
as animos appellasse qui vitam bene transegerint et in meliorem 
translati sint sortem locaque augustiora jam colant." Instead of 
τον εραστα τον θειον, and πραγμασιν ανορθον in p. 80. of Creuzer, 
and p. 211. of Cousin, the Harl. MS. has τον δαιμονα τον 
θειον, and πραγμασιν ανοδον, but erroneously. In p. 82. of Creuzer, 
Proclus, speaking of the different powers possessed by different 
demons, says: Μονον δε εις λεκτον, οτι των δαιμωνων οι με 
kαθετησιν ελαχον δυναμιν και αιγιωτην, οι δε γεγενητικών, οι δε δι 
μουργυγιν κ. τ. λ. But the Harl. MS. after οι δε γεγενητικων 
adds οι δε τελεστηριον; and this addition is also in Cousin p. 815., 
but does not appear to have been in the MSS. of Creuzer.

It is however very properly inserted; for the telesiurgic power 
of demons is often celebrated by Proclus and other Platonists, 
and Ficinus also appears to have found these words in his MS.; 
for his version of this passage is: "Præterea daemonum aliis purg 
toriam et incontinentabili possident potestatem, aliis vero genet 
triciem, aliis perfectioriam, &c." Creuzer p. 85. ekim δε ακμα 
δραειτε και δραστηρεις προ των παρ' ημιν δαμαζομενων. But the 
Harl. MS. and also Cousin p. 219. have very properly δυ 
νεμεων after δαμαζομενων. In p. 87. of Creuzer, and p. 223. of 
Cousin, for πας δε ουχ οραμεν οτι τολλα και τον τοις χειροιν ημω 
ει γηναν αδιατον ημιν εστιν εγγοντος; the Harl. MS. has 
πας δε ουχ οραμεν οτι τολλα και ζοντων χειροιν ημων κ. τ. λ. 
And immediately after in Creuzer for καθο ολον in the sen 
tence την γαρ των καθο ολον τυχιν τα μεν αλογα γηναικειων 
οι και οικες, ημις δε συναιρεν δυναμεια, the Harl. MS. and also 
Cousin have very properly καθολου. For irrational animals have 
no knowledge of universals, but we have.

Again, in p. 91. of Creuzer, and p. 228. of Cousin, the 
Harl. MS. has απολαβεων instead of απολαειν in the following 
passage: και εοτερ ηλιος αφης το φοις ου διαιρισμενος, αλλα παι 
tοις δυναμεις απολαειν, μετεχει δε ο δυναμειος. In p. 93. of 
Creuzer in the following passage, δια δε την το προνουμενον 
φυτιν ευμεταβολων ουσαν αμφιβολοις ευδιεκτικοι, the Harl. MS. 
and also Cousin p. 231. have rightly εστιν after αμφιβολοις. 
In the following passage in p. 100. of Creuzer, and p. 241. of 
Cousin, viz. Αλλα τι, φαινει αν, ο Σωκρατης εις επαινον καθη 
την καινηκου, the Harl. MS. has καθιστησιν for καθηνι. In p. 105.
of Creuzer in the following passage, Προστίθητι γαρ ουτος τα
αναγκαια των αρτιων και τα παμμα των ηγουμενων, for προστίθητι,
which is also the reading of the Harl. MS., it is requisite to
substitute προστίθητι, as in the text of Cousin p. 245. For Pro-
clus is speaking of the absurdity of him who fancies that his
proper good originates from the body, and not from the soul,
and very justly observes that such a one prefers the necessaries
[of the animal life] to virtue, and things that rank as consequent
to those that have a precedence and a leading order. Again in
p. 104. of Creuzer, and p. 246. of Cousin, Proclus speaking of
the τα αυταρχες, or that which is sufficient to itself, observes, οτι τα
αυταρχες πρωτος εν αυτοις στι τοις θεοις αγαθοι γαρ εισιν οι θεοι, και
αγαθοτητος υπεροχοι, και πληρωματα των ουτων ανεκτην. So like-
wise the Harl. MS. But for αγαθοτητας it is necessary to read
αγαθοτητας: for the Gods are every where celebrated by Pro-
clus as αγαθοτητας υπεροχοι; because, according to the Platonic
theology, every effect is secondarily what its cause is primarily.
Hence as the first God is τα αγαθα, the good, all the other Gods
are αγαθοτητας, goodnesees; conformably which Simplicius in
Epicetet. calls the supreme principle of all things αγαθοτητας αγα-
θοτητας. Ficinus also in his version of this part evidently found
in his MS. αγαθοτητας. For his translation is, "Ipsa per se
sufficientia primum est pene Deos. Boni namque sunt Dii, atque
supressentiales bonitates quaedam, et entium omnium plenitudi-
nes." With respect to the word πληρωμα, which is so frequently em-
ployed by Proclus in his Theology of Plato and other works, and
is used by other Platonists, it accurately signifies a whole which
gives completion to the universality of things. In p. 107. of
Creuzer, and p. 250. of Cousin, in the following passage: τι γαρ
αλλο δια της προστιθης ενδικουται ταυτας, ή οτι οι μεν, ου μενοι
συνε ταυτα ουτας; so also the Harl. MS. But for ουτας here,
it is necessary to read ουτως. For Proclus had just before in-
formed us, that the word ουτως employed by Socrates in his con-
ference with Alcibiades, is a sufficient indication of false opin-
ion. Hence he adds: "what else is indicated by this addi-
tion than that Alcibiades falsely opined indeed that he pos-
sessed these things, [i. e. the greatest beauty and power,] but
that he did not possess them in reality?" In p. 120. l. 20. of
Creuzer, for επιελουμαι, the Harl. MS. has επελουμαι, which
I prefer; and this is also the reading of Cousin p. 270. In p.
125. of Creuzer, and p. 274. of Cousin, Proclus speaking of the
participation of intelligible essences observes, Καλοι γαρ
ει τουτων (i. e. των νοητων) την μεταδοσιν μονη η των ειδοχωμενων
ανεκπτησοντας, εμπε τα γα μεταδωσοντα ας διδωσι και παντες κατοικειν
ομους. But for τα γα μεταδωσοντα in this passage, the Harl. MS.
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has τα γενητα δεισυνα. The former, however, appears to me to be the true reading. Instead of τελεσιον μεσον in p. 129. 1. 91. of Creuzer, the Harl. MS. has τελεσιομεθανον, which is the true reading, and is conjectured to be so by Creuzer. For he says in his notes, "Mendum esse suspicor in hac periodo. An leg. τελεσιομεθανον?" And Cousin has in his text (p. 284.) τελεσιομεθανον.

In the words ουτω τωνν και ο Σωκρατης κατα την την δεν ζηλον κ. τ. λ. p. 191. of Creuzer, and p. 286. of Cousin, the Harl. MS. for τον του θεου ζηλον has του θεου ζηλον, which is doubtless the true reading. In p. 135. of Creuzer, and p. 288. of Cousin, in the following passage, Διοτι δε ο Σωκρατης τουλα παν εαυτου διαιοιαν φραζην, κατευθι εις υπεδεικτεραν ενεργειαν την την αυτορ μενους, the Harl. MS. for τολμα την αυτου διαιοιαν φραζην has τολμα την αυτου διαιοιαν φραζη: but this is doubtless erroneous. In the following passage in the same page of Creuzer, viz. αλλ' ομοι εις τον κατευθυνον ζηλον Ηρακλης εξ αιτου τον θεου μενους αναγη και εν τη πολι η την φαινομενης αποστηματι ζωης, συνε, την νοημα και θεου αναδρομειν, αδεις και αυτου θεωσιμα, και των ολων εξηρτημενον των οντων ακατω, και αυτου αυτου προτεινοντων, the Harl. MS. has very properly εξηρτημενον, for εξηρτημενον, and so likewise has Cousin p. 289. For nothing is more frequently asserted by Proclus, than that divinity is exempt from all beings. But if εξηρτημενον is retained, Proclus will be made to say, that divinity is suspended from all beings, than which nothing can be more absurd. I very much wonder, therefore, that the learned Creuzer should say in a note on this passage, "Cod. E. habet εξηρτημενον προ εξηρτημενον. Perperam." P. 335. of Creuzer, λεγομεν, οτι μενουσα μεν αι ψυχαι παρα τοις αυτοις νοεραι ενεργους. But for τοις αυτοις the Harl. MS. has rightly τοις θεοις, and so likewise has Cousin p. 292. In p. 136. of Creuzer, and p. 293. of Cousin, Proclus says, Και ο λογος εστιν ο διειβαλλω ενας νομος αι ολοκληρως και φαντασιαις; and this is also the reading of the Harl. MS. But for ας ολοκληρως I conceive it necessary to read ας αισθησιαις. In the same page, Proclus observes that souls in the present life pursue the images of the paradigms which they formerly surveyed in the intelligible world. Hence he says, Αλλα μεν αν τον ψυχων αλλοις εισιν οικιαι θαραματι διο και αι μεν αλλοις, αι δε αλλοις ειδωλοις επιτρεπουσιν ορ γαις ειδωλος, εκε τε ειδωλα και τας εκκαις φιλοφιλονται. This is also the reading of the Harl. MS. But Cousin p. 293. for γαις ειδωλος has very properly αν γαις ειδωλος. And this reading is confirmed by Ficinus' version of this passage, which is, "Alius namque animae alius sunt accommodata spectaculis, ideo alie alii imaginibus incumbunt; eorum enim quae illic inspexerant, similitudines amant."
Again, in the following passage in p. 146. of Creuzer, and p. 305. of Cousin, Δικύντω μὲν εὑρη τοι τοῦτον, ὡς σοι τὸ διαφο- οῦ τοῦ τοῦ Ἀλκιβιάδου καὶ τοῦ θείου Σωκράτους εἰπερ ο μὲν εἶδος τοῦ γνωστού παρ’ αὐτῷ, τινα εὐτίκα ἐκ των ὑπομενε τῶν αλλῶν αὐτόμενας εραστῶν. But the Harl. MS. instead of ἀυτόμενας has ἀυτομενον. Creuzer proposes to read ἀποστεροῦντων, and Ἀκουστήριος has ἀποστεροῦτον. The Harleian, however, appears to me to be the true reading; as doubtless the lovers of Alcibiades did not openly, but secretly, for sale. In the following passage also in p. 149. of Creuzer, and p. 310. of Cousin, viz. ἐκα γὰρ καὶ ὁ μέγας θεὸς τοῦ διακριόμενον παντα καὶ ἐπιμελο- μένον, ὡς φησὶν ο ὁ Φαίδρος Σωκράτης, the Harl. MS. after πάντα adds τα ἐν κοσμῷ ταῖς δύναμεσι, which addition appears to be requisite. In p. 30. of Creuzer, l. 11. and p. 312. of Cousin, l. 12. for οἱ θεοῦργοι, the Harl. MS. has οἱ θεολογοί. And shortly after, to the words in Creuzer, ἐν αὐτῷ εἰσέπρεπεν οὖν τοι ἑλάχιστα τοι ὑπομενε, the Harl. MS. after ἑλάχιστα very properly adds δυναμιν, which is evidently wanting to the completion of the sentence, and is also in the text of Cousin. Again, in the following passage in p. 152. of Creuzer, τὸν μὲν γὰρ παρ᾽ αὐτὸν προσήκει ταῖς τοῦ παρ᾽ αὐτοῦ εἰσερ- μόμενον, καὶ ἑπειδὴ παραγωγὴν πρὸς τὸ αὐξήσης τῶν εἰσερχόμενοις ἀκριβῶς δικαίωσκειν, the Harl. MS. has rightly ἀκρίβως instead of ἀκριβῶς, and so likewise has the text of Cousin p. 314. Again, in p. 153. of Creuzer, and p. 316. of Cousin, Proclus speaking of what is requisite to be done by him who is properly instructed says, τὸν δὲ παρ᾽ αὐτοῦ εἰσέπρεπεν προσήκει τῷ ἐν αὐτῷ, καὶ ἑπειδὴ παραγωγὴν πρὸς τὸ ἀυξήσης τῶν εἰσερχόμενοις ἀκριβῶς δικαίωσκειν, καὶ ἑπειδὴ παραγωγὴν πρὸς τὸ τάς τοῖς τινὰς αὐτῷ αὐτοῦ ἐν αὐτῶ ἀναφέρουσαν, τῶν εἰσερχόμενοις τῷ καθ᾽ ὅλῳ καὶ ἀμφότεροι τόλμων ἐργαζόμενοι. This is also the reading of the Harl. MS. except that it has rightly καθόλου for καθ᾽ ὅλου, as likewise the text of Cousin, who in a note after the words πρὸς τὸ εναντίον says, “Hic nonnulla deesse videntur.” To me also it appears that something is wanting in this passage, yet not after εναντίον; but I conceive that after πανταξὸν, the words καὶ εἰς τῆς φύσεως ought to be inserted. So that the whole passage will be in English: “But it is requisite that he who is instructed should deliver himself to his preceptor, and in a gradual circuitous course be led to the truth, separating himself from images, and every where extending from the subterranean cavern, to the light, and truly-existing being, and to a nature unmingled with its contrary; dismissing also that which is partible and pertaining to an image, but perfectly aspiring after that which is universal and imparti-
ble." In this passage also what Proclus says about being led to the light from the subterranean cave is derived from the 7th book of Plato's Republic.

ACCOUNT OF BARON NIEBUHR'S DISCOVERIES
IN THE VATICAN, AT ROME.

Having in No. 46, given a detailed account of M. Angelo Majo's discoveries in ancient Literature, we cannot do better than present to our readers the labors of M. Niebuhr in the same field. We have taken the following from the Literary Gazette, as containing the most detailed particulars we could collect:

Among the MSS. which made a part of the famous Palatine Library, given by the Duke of Bavaria to Gregory 15th, after the taking of Heidelberg, and united with that of the Vatican, there was one which for a long time was supposed, from its appearance, to contain only some books of the Old Testament. Jos. Blanchini made it known in this point of view. But in 1772, Paul Bruns and V. M. Giovenazzi discovered, under the MS. of the Sacred Books, other writing more ancient, from which they extracted a fragment of the 91st book of Livy, and they acknowledged that they had been able to read only a part of the writing, because it had been injured by washing and by time. This discovery gave great celebrity to the Palatine MS., and it had long been wished that some chemical process could be employed to revive the faded lines.¹ On the application of Baron Niebuhr, the Pontifical government permitted a trial to be made. M. Niebuhr has published a very curious work, containing the result of this trial, of which the following is an analysis.²—

M. N. gives a most detailed and perspicuous descrip-

¹ De Brosse’s Hist. de la Rép. Romaine par Salluste T. i. p. 578, note.
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P. 155 of Creuzer, Ἐρετα γαρ τῷ μαθητώ καὶ κρίτῃ τῷ τε γονίμῳ λόγῳ καὶ τῶν αναμιμαίον πρὸς τὸ μαθηματικὸν, οὕτως οἱ φρονοὶ τῆς διακής. In this passage for καὶ κρίτῃ the Harleian Ms. has τῷ κρίτῃ, and so likewise has Cousin p. 519. But for αναμιμαίον which has no signification, Creuzer very properly substitutes αναμιμαίον, which is also the reading of Cousin. P. 161 of Creuzer, καὶ τὸ θεὸν αὐτὸν εκακομβήθη ὑπὲρ ταύτην αὐτὸρ ταξιν ἐν τῷ γενει τῶν δαιμόνιν μαρτυρεῖ. But for ὑπὲρ ταύτην, the Harl. Ms. has ὑπερταύτην, and so likewise has Cousin p. 328, which is doubtless the true reading. For then Proclus will say what he had before said in these Commentaries, “that Socrates by calling his demon a God, testifies that this demon has the highest order in the genus of demons.” Again, in Creuzer p. 178, καὶ ανακεφαλαιαὶ πάλιν ἐν τούτοις ὁ Ἀλκιβιάδης ὁ τοὺς φιλοὺς πᾶσι τοῖς αριστοῖς χραμένος γνω Σωκράτους ὑπηρετείς. But the Harl. Ms. for αριστοῖς has rightly αριστοῖς, and also very properly adds ὑπηρετέας. Cousin likewise, tom. 111, adds this word, but then he has αριστοῖς ὑπηρετείς, which is erroneous. For Socrates was the best friend of Alcibiades; all his other friends being of an indefinite description. Creuzer p. 176, ὁ ἄρα ἀγαθὸς συμβουλός, εἰτερ εἰστιν ὁ συμβουλευομένιοι αἰσχιστηρίων, ἡ εἰκάθα ταύτα, ἡ εἰστινται, ἡ εὑρεῖ. But the Harl. Ms. has rightly κ α εἰστινται for η εἰστινται, and so likewise has Cousin, p. 14. Again, in p. 187 of Creuzer, and p. 29 and 30 of Cousin, Proclus having observed that the human soul, though she contains all reason [i.e. participations of divine forms or ideas] in herself, yet in consequence of being darkened through generation, in the survey of the forms she possesses, requires discipline and invention, in order that through the former she may excite her inherent intelllections, but through the latter may discover herself, and the plenitude of forms she contains: he then adds, Καὶ εἰστὶ ταύτα τα διὰ τα θεῶν εὐεργετοῦσιν αὐτὴν κυρίου, καὶ
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ἐκανακαλουμένων εἰς τὴν νοερὰν ζωήν αμόφω μεν γὰρ εἰ τὴν Ἑρμαῖθης ημετερα ταξιών, ἀλλ' ἡ μὲν καθοδὸν εστιν ὁ θεὸς οὕτος Μαίας, τῆς Ἀτλαντίας, οἷος, ἡ δὲ καθοδὸν ετῶν ἀγαγός τοῦ Διὸς. Ἐκφαινοι μὲν γὰρ τὴν πατρίκην βουλὴν εὐδίδωσι τοὺς φύσις· εἰ δὲ τῆς Μαίας πρῶτον, παρὰ ἡ κρυφίως ἡ ἔγκρισις, τὴν εὐρεσιν δορείται τοις εὐαντοῖς τροποῖς. Τὸ δὲ εἰς τὴν μακρὴν. For Proclus having before observed, that both discipline and invention (ἡ μακριαν καὶ ἡ εὐφρατία) proceed from the Hermaic order, now adds, "that one of these gifts is imparted by him, so far as he is the son of Maia, but the other, so far as he is the messenger of Jupiter. For as unfolding the paternal will, he imparts to souls discipline, but as proceeding from Maia, who occultly contains in herself investigation, he imparts invention to those who are under his guardian care." In p. 189 of Creuzer, and p. 31 of Cousin, Proclus, speaking of twofold ignorance, (ὅπλη γενεών,) or that condition of the soul in which he who is ignorant does not know that he is ignorant, and which is the disease of the multitude, observes that through this, as Dio-
tima says in the Banquet of Plato, that which is neither beautiful, nor good, nor wise, is fancied to be sufficient. And he then adds, Τὸ δὲ αὐτῶν, ότα κατελθοῦσα εἰς γενεών αἱ φύσις πλα-
ρεῖς κατ' ουσίαν τῶν εἰσιτημίων υπαχούσα, τὴν εἰς τὴν γενοσει λήθην εἰσεχονταὶ, καὶ τὸ μὴ εἰρίν τοὺς λογους τῶν πραγμάτων οἷον σφυριζότας, εννοις εἰρίνωι περὶ αὐτῶν, τὸ δὲ τῆς λήθης ποτεις πρα-
tουμαίης διαφοράς ταῖς εὐαντοῖς διανοήσεις καὶ εἰς εἰσιτήμαθα ἀναπηριμένης. This too is the reading of the Harl. Ms. But for τὸ μὴ εἰρίν τοὺς λογους, it is necessary to read τῷ μὲν εἰρίν τοὺς λογους. For the human soul through the oblivion arising from generation, or her connection with a flowing condition of being, has the reasons or forms of things in a palpitating, and scarcely breathing condition; but in consequence of being vanquished by the potion of Oblivion, she is incapable of giving a distinct subsistence to her conceptions, and referring them to science. And in the same page of Creuzer, and p. 32 of Cous-
in, Proclus observes, concerning matter and divinity, Ὁ γὰρ ἡ ὕλη αὐνιδος, καὶ ὁ θεὸς· καὶ ὁ καὶ εἰρίνον εἰκαστήρ καὶ ἀγνωστὸν, εἰ καὶ πάντα, ὁ μὲν κατὰ τὸ κρείττον, ἡ δὲ κατὰ τὸ καθορ. Thus too the Harl. Ms. But for εἰ καὶ πάντα, I read εἰ καὶ πάντα. And then what Proclus says will be in English, "For as matter is formless, so likewise is God. Each also is infinite and un-
known, though the latter is entirely so, according to that which is more excellent, but the former according to that which has a more deteriorated subsistence."
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Again, in p. 197 of Creuzer, and p. 41 of Cousin, Prox speaking of the Athenian pipe, says, Καὶ γὰρ τὰ παναγρόμων ἡ πολυχρόνια μμῆμα τῶν ὁλιγῶν εἶναι εὐκατον γὰρ τριήμην ὁλιγῶν, (Harl. τριήμην,) ὡς ἀρχήν, τουλάχιστον εἰς ὑδ καὶ τα παρατρυπήματα αὐξῆσθαι, πλεοῦσι. In passage, after παρατρυπήματα the Harl. Ms. adds τῶν αὐτού Creuzer well observes in his Notes, "Et est hic locus insti- nd explicandam tibiariun rationem, quae apud veteres invis- rat." I add, that Isaac Vossius, in his excellent treatise Poematum Cantu, et Viribus Rythmi, (p. 110) quotes and il- trates this passage of Proclus. In p. 212 of Creuzer, and 60 of Cousin, for τὰς περίτες οἴσεως in the following words Μετὰ τὴν καθαρίαν τοινύν της περίτες οἴσεως παρακελευθεὶς γεινίσχος σκοπεῖν αἰνεγισίζειν εὐστον τ. τ. λ., the Harl. Ms. τὴν περί της οἴσεως, which is doubtless the true reading. As οἴσεις always signifies in the philosophy of Plato, disaster opinion, it cannot be supposed that Proclus would use the pression περίτη οἴσεως. For νομον in p. 219. 1. 19 of Creu- and p. 69.1.121 of Cousin, the Harl. Ms. has rightly νομίζων. p. 231 of Creuzer, and p. 84 of Cousin, Proclus says, ὥς γὰρ ὅσον παραιτεώντων ποιούστω η ὁρία δεχεται μεν εἰς εὐστη, τ. τ. and this is likewise the reading of the Harl. Ms. But after χειράτη, it is necessary to add παραιτεών. For then Proclus1 say what he frequently and most truly asserts, that God produ- all things impartially, but that matter receives partially, what produces.

In p. 234 of Creuzer, and p. 89 of Cousin, Proclus, in com- menting on the words of Socrates, Οὐ μα τὸν φιλιον τὸν εὐμον καὶ εὐμον, οὐ εγὼ ηκιαστα επαρκησαιμαι, having shown that the phi- δες is Jupiter, observes, ηκιαστα γαρ επιστησαιμαι τὸν εὐμον εὐ- προς Ἀλκιβιαδὴν λογος, ηκιαστα δ' αν τὸν Ξενιον εὐμον εὐμον εὐμον εὐμον εὐμον εὐμον εὐμον εὐμον. The Harl. Ms. for δ' αν Ξενιον, has διαι τὸν Ξενιον. But this is evidently corrupt. For should be Δια τὸν Ξενιον, which is doubtless the true readi- In p. 236 of Creuzer, and p. 91 of Cousin, Proclus, alludi- to what Diotima in the Banquet of Plato says about the ori- of Love, observes as follows: Ἡ μὲν οὖν πεινη ἡ εἰς ημιν αἰτια- εκπειραστε ἐκτα καα εκτα ἐκτα της ξηπθην εγειρετή της τελειας γνωσεως ἀπο τον ων καα της ξυρχης ληπτον αυ ιων. Ανωθεν γαρ η- εει τε ουσιωδες ημαν απο τον δειον νου, το δε δυναται το εν ημιν τη πτη καα η αξιοστα της ξυρης. This too is the reading of the Ha- Ms. But for εν τα οιτι, I read εις τον ουσιωδει. And as som- thing appears to be wanting in καα της ξυρης, both according the Mss. of Creuzer and Cousin, I add after καα της ου- τη νοερα φυσει. In the words, Οτε μεν γαρ περι των καα ολον τι
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... λογίων εκτείνοι, ἡ οἰκετημία μοι ἐπὶ τὴν λήψιν ἐξήρτο τὴς αληθείας, p. 238 of Creuzer, the Harl. Ms. rightly for καθ' ἀλον, καθολου, and so likewise has Cousin, p. 94. Again, in p. 243 of Creuzer, Proclus observes, Εὐτανθὰ δὴ οὐν ὁ Σοῖκρατης, ὠστερ τις Ἡμαχλῆς τὰς τῆς ὕπαιρκας κεφαλῆς εκείνον, δεικνύσιν, οτι οὐ παν το πλήθος αξιόπιστον οτι πειρὶ τὴν γνώσιν των τε δικαίων και των αδικίων. The Harl. Ms. for οτι οὐ παν το πλήθος x. t. λ., has erroneously οτι καὶ τὸ πλήθος, and the reading of Creuzer is not correct. For according to Plato, the multitude are universally unworthy of belief with respect to the knowledge of what is just and what is unjust. I therefore conceive that the reading of Cousin, p. 101, οτι παν το πλήθος αναξιόπιστον οτι x. t. λ., is perfectly accurate. In p. 247. of Creuzer, and p. 103 of Cousin, Proclus having observed that science is not the summit of knowledge, but that intellect is prior to it, adds, οὐ λεγω τον εξαρχημένων τῆς ψυχῆς νοημ, ἀλλ' αυτὴν τὴν εκείνην ελαφρῶς τὴν εφηκούσαν τῇ ψυχῇ x. t. λ. And this is also the reading of the Harl. Ms. But instead of οὐ λεγω, it is requisite to read οὐ μονον λεγω. And Ficinus evidently found μονον in his Ms.; for his version of this passage is, "non intellectum inquam duntaxat ab anima separatum."

Again, in p. 247 of Creuzer, and p. 105 of Cousin, Proclus observes: Μη γαρ νου μετέχοιμα κατα τον ειρήμον νου, ουτω και του πρώτου, παρ' ου παρ' η γνώσις κατα το εν και οιν αυθος της υσιας ἡμας, παρ' ο και μαλιστα τα τειρ συναπτομεθα. This too is the reading of the Harl. Ms. But for η γνώσις, it is necessary to read η ενωσις. For as all knowledge proceeds from the first intellect, so all union proceeds from the one, or the great first principle of all things. Ficinus also appears to have had ενωσις and not γνώσις in his Ms. For he thus translates this passage: "Quemadmodum enim per intellectum nostrum divinum tangimus intellectum, sic et primum unum, a quo omnibus inest unita per unum, et tanquam essentiae nostra florem attingere licet; per quod sane nostrum unum divino maximo jungimur."

P. 152 of Creuzer, and p. 110 of Cousin: Ταυτα μεν ουν περι του πνευμονομ μεν ειρήμονα συλλογισθησαι, την δια παντων διηκουσων αφελειαν αι' αυτον καταδημομεθαι. In this passage the Harl. Ms. for κατα-δημομεθαις has κατατημαμεθαις, which I have no doubt is the true reading. In the following passage, p. 258 of Creuzer, and p. 118 of Cousin, Πολιτε χαρ ω δυα βαμπαζειν εις εν τον Θεοταραν ψυχας καλαξμενας ιδίως (τοιουτω γαρ η το εκει τοπος), the Harl. Ms. for ο εκει τοπος has οικειον τοπος; but perhaps the true reading will be οικειος το εκει τοπος. In p. 259 of Creuzer, and p. 120 of Cousin, there is a lacunula in the following passage, Ἐστι και ο Πολιτερας των μεν ουτων παντων σοφωτατον ειναι ελεγε τον αριθμον, δευτερον θε
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eis sofian to tois plagmasi ta onomata theveni ta prosekhontai men yap estin o prwtos arístos, phsyx de noper meta touton anádon theasagynikh, to de en kai pro phsyxh kai pro ton genon gnw Creuzer conjectures that the word arístos is wanting; but appears to me that the deficiency will be accurately supplied the words nous kai tihu phsyxh. In the following passage i 304 of Creuzer, viz. Lóteor ouc ouc kathairosin proteroi ton evklynta xýmon kathairosin farmakiai, evn adoutas anai tais dunameis dianais u. t. l. the Harl. Ms. for kathai farmakiai, has rightly eisballoinu farmakiai, and so like has Cousin, p. 181. In p. 308 of Creuzer, for touton is words Tiron d' ouc euton touton Theikwou u. t. l., the Harl. has rightly touton, and so also has Cousin, p. 188. In p. 190 of Cousin, the Harl. Ms. for ton Peivon in the following passage, Euvkonta'arai kai ouc ouc sofi tis episthme chréhip tovtheon ton Peivon ton Peivon synokhioun, has right theon ton Peivon. In p. 314 of Creuzer, l. 2, and p. 195, l. 4 Cousin, for dhxhentos, the Harl. Ms. has leghentos. And in 315 of Creuzer, l. 17, and p. 197, l. 12, of Cousin, for pro anfrapitn eudaimonian, the Harl. Ms. has pros ton anfrapitn eudaimonian. In p. 328 of Creuzer, and p. 215 of Cousin, clus, speaking of beauty, says, Etoimous, eite dia to xalavn eautou xeklytai, eite dia to kinein kai thelignia ta pros auta dhvna blexevn estrapon esti kata phugin. But the Harl. Ms. for to xalavn. And Ficinus had this word also in his Ms. is evident from his version, "Re enim vera xalavn, id est chrum, sive dicitur dia to xalavn, id est quia provocat anii sive dia to xalavn, id est quia permutat intuitentes, certe sed dum naturam est amabile."

Again, in p. 330 and 331 of Creuzer, Proclus obscr Δηλον γαρ, ouc proes mon ton to xalavn ouc proes mon kathairosin armei kathairosai, proes de ton tois merikis apofor proostemon ouc anagki to xalavn ouc xalavn kathairosin kathairosin kai poihsi o Theartes labon, ouc to symferon ouk xalavn ou: ton apoforkei ton xalavn, allas tisou monon. In this pass where xalavn occurs in two places, the Harl. Ms. has rig xalavn, and so likewise has Cousin, p. 219. But instead ou panton apoforkei u. t. l., which is also the reading of Harl. Ms., it is necessary to read panton apoforkei, with the ou. For then Proclus will say, "that Alcibiades did deny the profitable of all just things, but only of some," which is doubtless his true meaning.

Lastly, Cousin, p. 277, in a note at the end of the Epitom by Ficinus of these Commentaries, observes as follows: "


finis omnium quos novimus Codicum. Sequentia sunt quae
Cod. Ambros. 285. ait a Ficino ex his Procli Commentariis
Latine versa. Vid. p. 230. Quo autem de Codice versa fuerint,
plane ignoro; adulterinaque an vera, Procli an alterius existi-
manda sint, alias inquiretur." The sequentia, of which Cousin
here speaks, consist of a Latin version of a treatise ascribed
to Proclus, De Sacrificio et Magia; and I am pleased to find
that a conjecture of mine respecting this little work, made by
me seventeen years ago, is strengthened by the authority of the
Ambrosian Ms. For in Vol. i. of my translation of Plato, p.
63, I have given a translation in English of this treatise, in a
note on the following passage from the First Alcibiades: ον ο
μεν μαγείαν τη διδασκει την Ζωρωστρου του Αχοματου εστι δε τουτο
θεου θεραπεια. And I there observe: "The following account
of Magic by Proclus, originally formed, as it appears to me, a
part of the Commentary written by him on the present passage.
For the Ms. Commentary of Proclus, which is extant on this
Dialogue, does not extend to more than a third part of it; and
this Dissertation on Magic, which is only extant in Latin, was
published by Ficinus the translator, immediately after his Ex-
cerpta from this Commentary. So that it seems highly proba-
ble, that the Ms. from which Ficinus translated his Excerpta,
was much more perfect than those which are now extant, in
consequence of containing this account of the Magic of the
ancients."

The lovers of the philosophy of Plato will, I am sure, unite
with me in ardently hoping that Professor Cousin will publish
as soon as possible the remaining books of Proclus on the
Parmenides of Plato, and Creuzer his edition of the Works of
Plotinus, in the preparation of which for the Press I under-
stand he is at present engaged. For all genuine Platonists will
doubtless say to each of these learned men, what Plotinus said
to Porphyry, from the Iliad, 1


1 Lib. Θ. v. 282. But Plotinus, in applying this verse to Porphyry, sub-
stituted αριστερος for Δαμασκι.