

*Observations on CREUZER's edition of the Commentary of OLYMPIODORUS on the First Alcibiades of Plato. 8vo. Francof. 1821.*

THE learned Editor commences his preface to this work with an account of the celebrated men that have been called by the name of Olympiodorus, and satisfactorily shows that the author of this Commentary was not Olympiodorus the Peripatetic, whose school was frequented by Proclus, for the sake of imbibing the doctrine of Aristotle; and in short that he was not a Peripatetic, but a Platonist. He also asserts with the greatest probability, that he flourished under the Emperor Justinian, when the schools of the philosophers were not yet closed, and the sacred and salutary light of wisdom was not entirely intercepted by unparalleled barbarism, and lost in its attendant gloom.<sup>1</sup> It seems, however, to have escaped the notice of this very learned editor, that the Olympiodorus, whose Commentaries on the Meteors of Aristotle are extant, is the same with the Olympiodorus who wrote the Commentaries on the First Alcibiades, Phædo, Philebus, and Gorgias of Plato. For that the Commentator of this name on the Meteors of Aristotle was a Platonist, is evident in the first place from what he says in p. 32 of that work in defence of Democritus and Plato, against the opposition made by Aristotle to their opinion about the sea; for his words are: *Φερὶ δὲ ἡμεῖς ὑπερ τοῦτου ἀπολογησομεθα, δειξάντες ὅτι οὐ καλῶς Ἀριστοτέλης καταδρομὴν κατὰ τούτων ἐχρησάτο. μάλλον δ' οὐ τούτοις ἐναντιοῦται, ἀλλὰ τοῖς κακῶς τὰ παρ' αὐτῶν λεγόμενα διαλαμβάνουσιν. οὐ γὰρ ὡς σὺ φησὶ ὡ δαιμονίῃ φαμεν Ἀριστοτέλης, ὁ Πλάτων ἐλοῦσθαι τοῦ ὕδατος ἐλεγεν ὄντα τὸν τάρταρον, ἀλλὰ τούτου ἐλεγε μυθικῶς. οὐ χρὴ οὖν τὰ μυθικῶς λεγόμενα, φυσικῶς ἐκλαμβάνειν. ἀλλὰ ταῦτα ἐλεγε ὁ Πλάτων ἀλλὰ τίνα ἀνιπτομένους.* Here he says that Aristotle does not rightly blame Plato for asserting in the Phædo

<sup>1</sup> "Hucusque pertinuit veteris elegantiorisque doctrinæ proventus, qui paulatim exaruit Justiniano imperio ac deinceps. Hic Atheniensem clausit scholam, in qua floruerant Plutarchus, Nestorii filius, Syrianus, Proclus, Marinus, Damascius, unde Simplicius, Olympiodorus, alique prodierant: philosophi expulsi: vexati per orbem Romanum avitæ religionis cultores, ex quorum numero fere erant docti homines. Per trecentos annos stupor et barbaries omnia obtinuerunt. Ergo in hoc temporis spatio plurimorum veterum librorum, in his etiam Plutarchorum, ponendus est interitus." These are the words of Wyttenbach in Præfatione ad Plutarch. *Moralia* p. LV.

that Tartarus is the *ολοτης*<sup>1</sup> or *wholeness of water*; because Plato said this mythologically, obscurely indicating something else; and that what is asserted mythologically, is not to be assumed physically. And in the second place, this is evident from his calling Proclus in p. 59. *θειος*, by which appellation, as also by *μεγας*, he is usually designated by the Platonists posterior to him.

That he was likewise the same with the author of this Commentary on the First Alcibiades, is I think evident from what Olympiodorus on the Meteors, and Olympiodorus on the Phædo assert about the perpetuity of the punishments in Tartarus. For souls that have committed the greatest and incurable offences are said by Plato to be hurled into Tartarus, and to be there punished *eternally*. In the former of these works therefore (p. 32) it is said, *πλην ει και λεγω αιδιως κολασθησομεναι δια το ανιατα ημαρτηκαναι εν τω Ταρταρω, μηδε νομισης, οτι εις απειρους αιωνας κολαζεται η ψυχη εν τω Ταρταρω. ευγε ου δια μηνιν του θειου κολαζεται η ψυχη, αλλ' ιατρειας χαριν. αλλ' αιωνιως φαμεν κολαζεσθαι την ψυχην, αιωνα κολουντες τον αυτης βιον και την μερικην αυτης περιодον. τω γαρ οντι τα μεγαιστα πλημμελησασαι ψυχαι ουκ αρκουνται μιζ περιодω καθαρθηναι, αλλ' εισιν εν τω βιω διηνεκως ωσπερ εν τω ταρταρω, ην περιодον, αιωνα εκαλεσεν ο Πλατων.* In this very remarkable passage Olympiodorus observes, that the soul is not punished by divinity through anger, but medicinally; and that by *eternity* we must understand the soul's partial period, because, in reality, souls that have committed the greatest offences cannot be sufficiently purified in one period. If we compare this with what is said by Olympiodorus on the Phædo, we shall find the same thing asserted in a more summary way, *ει δε και αλλαχου λεγει αιωνιον την κολασιν, αλλ' ουν αιωνα καλει περιодον τινα, και αποκαταστασιν.*<sup>2</sup> For here it is said that when Plato speaks of eternal punishment, he denominates a certain *period* and *apocatastasis* of the soul *for ever*. What this period is, Olympiodorus on the Gorgias admirably explains as follows: "There are seven spheres, the sphere of the moon, that of the sun, and those of the other planets; but the inerratic is the eighth sphere. The lunar sphere therefore, makes a complete revolution more swiftly: for it is accomplished in thirty days. That of the sun

<sup>1</sup> *Ολοτης* in the philosophy both of Plato and Aristotle signifies a whole with a perpetual subsistence, and which comprehends in itself all the multitude of which it is the cause.

<sup>2</sup> I quote this from a copy of the Harleian Ms. of this work which I have in my possession, not having the edition of these Scholia by Mustoxyd. and Schin. Venet. 1817.

is more slow: for it is accomplished in a year. That of Jupiter is still slower: for it is effected in twelve years. And much more that of Saturn: for it is completed in thirty years. The stars therefore are not conjoined with each other in their revolutions, except rarely. Thus, for instance, the sphere of Saturn and the sphere of Jupiter are conjoined with each other in their revolutions in sixty years. For if the sphere of Jupiter comes from the same to the same in twelve years, but that of Saturn in thirty years, it is evident that when Jupiter has made five, Saturn will have made two revolutions; for twice thirty is sixty, and so likewise is twelve times five; so that their revolutions will be conjoined in sixty years. Souls therefore are punished for such like periods. But the seven planetary spheres conjoin their revolutions with the inerratic sphere through many myriads of years; and this is the period which Plato calls *τον αιι χρονον, for ever.*" See more on this most interesting subject from the same author in Vol. 4, p. 455, of my Plato. Nor is it at all wonderful that Olympiodorus, though a Platonist, should write a Commentary on the Meteors of Aristotle: for it was no unusual thing with the best of the disciples of Plato to publish elucidations of Aristotle's works, which they considered as introductory to the more sublime speculations of Plato. Hence the great Syrianus commented on his *Metaphysics*, treatise on the Heavens, and on Interpretation, and Iamblichus on his *Categories*, and treatise on the Soul. In this Commentary therefore on the First Alcibiades, Olympiodorus conciliates, wherever he can, Aristotle with Plato, as knowing that the writings of the former are subservient to a development of the mysteries of the latter. Hence in p. 39. και, ως Αριστοτελης φησι, καιρος εστι χρονος προσλαβων το δεον. In p. 40. φησι δε και εν τω περι Ερμηνειας ο Αριστοτελης και τοσαυτα μεν λεγεται προς τας σοφιστικας ενοχλησεις αντι του αποριας, εκ μεταφορας του οχλου, και αυτος οχλησιν ειπε την αποριαν ενοχλεισιν, απορειν ποιεις. P. 71, ως Αριστοτελης ημας εν ρητορικαις τεχναις εδιδαξε. P. 118, εφ' οις δεικνυσι και δια τριτου συλλογισμου, οτι μεν καλον αγαθον, και το ανακαλιν, και κεχρηται δειξει, ην ωφελθη Αριστοτελης εν τη περι Ουρανου. P. 122, διο και ο δαιμονιος Αριστοτελης, αρχην υποθεμενος ου το πρωτον αιτιον, αλλα τον νουν, εν τη μετα τα φυσικα, περι αυτου διαλεγομενος ελεγε διττον ειναι το ευ το μεν εν τω στρατηγω, το δε εν τω στρατοπεδω και αιτιον ειναι το εν τω στρατηγω του εν τω στρατοπεδω. This last passage is employed by Syrianus and Simplicius to show that Aristotle must necessarily admit with Plato the subsistence of Ideas in the intellect of deity, which are the paradigms and producing causes of all material forms. And in the last place in p. 177, επι δε του καθ-

αρκτου μαλλον εμποδιον γινεται το σωμα' καλωσ ειρημηου του υπο  
 Αριστοτελους, κ. τ. λ.

Having, therefore, endeavoured to prove that the Olympiodorus who commented on the *Meteors* of Aristotle, is the same that wrote this Commentary on the *First Alcibiades* of Plato, I shall make some remarks on certain passages in this work, which will be both philosophical and critical. In the first place, Olympiodorus having observed that Plato energises *enthusiastically*, or *from divine inspiration*, in four dialogues, and that one specimen of this energy is to be found in the *Timæus*, where he represents the Demiurgus addressing the celestial, whom he calls the junior Gods, concerning the administration of mortal concerns;—adds, (p. 2,) *Δευτερος ενθουσιασμος εστι εν τη Πολιτεια, ενθα μουσοληπτος γεγονωσ υπεκριθη τας Μουσας, ας εξιουσας την λυσιν της υπο αυτου συστασης πολιτειας ενθα φησιν, κ. τ. λ.* The learned editor justly remarks in a note on the words *τας Μουσας ας εξιουσας, κ. τ. λ.* “*Proxima non sana videntur.*” But it appears to me that if for *ας εξιουσας* we read *διεξιουσας*, the passage will be correct. For then what Olympiodorus says will be in English: “The second instance of enthusiastic energy in Plato is in [the 8th book of] the *Republic*, where being inspired by the Muses, he represents them narrating the dissolution of the polity constituted by him.” The following are the words of Plato in that work, to which Olympiodorus alludes, and confirm the above emendation: *η βουλει, ωσπερ Ομηρος, ευχαριμεθα ταισ Μουσαισ επειν ημιν οπως δη πρατον στας εμπεσε, και φημεν αυτας τραγικωσ, ωσ προς παιδασ ημασ παιζουσασ και ερεσχειλουσασ, ας δη σπουδη λεγουσασ, υψηλολογουμενασ λεγειν; τωσ; οδα πωσ. Χαλεπον μεν κινηθηναι παλιν, ουτω ζυστασαν, αλλ' επει γενομενωσ πατι φθαρα εστιν, ουδ' η τοιαυτη ζυστασισ τον ακαιατα μνει χρονον, αλλα λυθησεται.* Vol. 11. p. 161. Edit. Mada. In p. 17, 18, Olympiodorus speaking of the differences of dæmons, and having observed that in the celestial orbs there are deity, intellect, a rational soul, an irrational soul, form, and matter, says, that such of them as conjoin us to the deity of the celestials, are called divine dæmons, and preside over enthusiastic energies; but those that unite us to the intellect of these orbs are called intellectual, and preside over those common conceptions [or axioms] through which we have a knowledge above demonstration, and indemonstrably. And those that conjoin us to the rational soul of these divinities, are denominated rational. After which he adds, *Οι δε προς την των ουρανιων αλογον συσταντες ημασ αλογοι.* The learned editor in a note at the word *αλογον* observes, “*Aut excidit vocabulum, aut lectio mendosa est.*” A word is certainly wanting, and that word is so

obviously ψυχήν, that I wonder the necessity of inserting it in this place should have been unperceived by so learned a man. In the following passage, p. 21, Olympiodorus speaking of the dæmons that are allotted to mankind as their guardians, says, Ἄλλ' ἐπειδὴ δαίμονας εὐλαχότας εἰρηκαίαν, δεῖ γινώσκειν, ὅτι καὶ παρὰ τὴ κοινῇ συνθήσῃ συνγεγασται ταυτα, εἰ καὶ μὴ τοῖς αὐτοῖς ονομασθῆναι. Ἀντὶ γὰρ τοῦ δαίμονος ἄλλων ἑκάστου φασὶν ἀμάλει ἐστὶν αὐτῶν ἀκουεῖν τοῦ ἀγγέλου σου, κ. τ. λ. But in this passage, for δαίμονος ἄλλων, it is doubtless necessary to read δαίμονος ἀγγέλου, κ. τ. λ. as is evident from what Olympiodorus adds immediately after these words.

The following passage respecting our *allotted dæmon*, or in modern language, our *guardian angel*, is most remarkable, and contains an opinion concerning this presiding power, which is not to be found in any other of the Greek interpreters of Plato: Καὶ ταυτα μὲν οἱ εἰρηγῆται περὶ τὰ δαίμονων καὶ εὐλαχότων ἡμῶν δε συμβιβαστικῶς τοῖς παρῶσι ταυτα πειρασόμεθα διεξελθεῖν καὶ γὰρ Σακρατοῦς κῶνιον καταψηφισθῆ, ὡς καινα δαίμονια τοῖς νοῖς εἰσπρουμένου, καὶ θεοὺς νομιζόντος οὗς ἡ πόλις οὐκ ἤγειτο θεοὺς. ρητέον οὖν εὐλαχότα δαίμονα τὸ συνείδος ὑπαρχειν, ὅπερ ἀκρον αὐτῶν ἐστὶ τῆς ψυχῆς, καὶ ἀναμαρτήτων ἐν ἡμῇ, καὶ ἀκλήνης δικαστῆς, καὶ μαγτῶς τῶν ἐνταυθα γινόμενων τῶ Μινῶϊ καὶ τῶ Ραδάμανθυῖ. ταυτο δὲ καὶ σωτηρίας ἡμῶν αὐτίων γίνεσθαι, ὡς ἀναμαρτήτων αἰ διαμένον ἐν ἡμῖν, καὶ μὴ συγκαταψηφίζομενων τοῖς ὑπο τῆς ψυχῆς ἀμαρτακόμενοις, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀνιλλόμενων ἐπὶ ταυτοῖς, καὶ ἐπιστρέφον αὐτὴν πρὸς τὸ δεόν.— τὸ συνείδος οὖν εὐλαχότα κελῶν δαίμονα οὐκ ἀν ἀμαρταῖς. ἴστέον δὲ, ὅτι τοῦ συνείδοτος, τὸ μὲν ἐπὶ ταῖς γνωστικαῖς ἡμῶν δυναμεσι λεγεται συνείδος ἀμῶνυμῶς τῶ γενεῖ. (p. 23.) i. e. "This is what is said by the interpreters [of Plato] concerning dæmons, and those which are allotted to us. We, however, shall endeavour to discuss these particulars in such a way as to reconcile them with what is at present said by Plato. For Socrates was condemned to take poison, in consequence of introducing to young men novel dæmoniacal powers, and for thinking those to be Gods which were not admitted to be so by the city. It must be said therefore, that the allotted dæmon is *conscience*, which is the supreme flower of the soul, is guiltless in us, is an inflexible judge, and a witness to Minos and Radamanthus of the transactions of the present life. This also becomes the cause to us of our salvation, as always remaining in us without guilt, and not assenting to the errors of the soul, but disdaining them, and converting the soul to what is proper. *You will not err, therefore, in calling the allotted dæmon conscience.* But it is requisite to know that of conscience one kind pertains to our gnostic powers, and which is denominated conscience [co-intel-

ligence] homonymously with the genus." In this passage, as Creuzer well observes, something is wanting at the end; and a part at least, if not the whole, of what is deficient, I conceive to be the words *το δε επι ταις ζωτικαις*. For the great division of the powers of the soul is into the *gnostic* and *vital*.

The singularity in this dogma of Olympiodorus respecting our allotted dæmon is this, that in making it to be the same with *conscience*; if conscience is admitted to be a part of the soul, the dogma of Plotinus <sup>1</sup> must also be admitted, "that the whole of our soul does not enter into the body, but that something belonging to it always abides in the intelligible world." But this dogma appears to have been opposed by all the Platonists posterior to Plotinus. And Proclus has confuted it in the last proposition of his *Elements of Theology*: for he there demonstrates, that every partial soul in descending into generation, or the sublunary realms, descends wholly; nor does one part of it remain on high, and another part descend. Hence, if Olympiodorus was likewise hostile to this dogma of Plotinus, it must follow according to him, that *conscience* is not a part of the soul, but something superior to it, and dwelling in its summit. Perhaps, therefore, Olympiodorus on this account calls the allotted dæmon *ακρον αωτον της ψυχης*, *the supreme flower of the soul*. For the summit or *the one* of the soul, is frequently called by Platonic writers *το ανθος*, *the flower*, but not *ακρον αωτον*, *the supreme flower*. So that the addition of *supreme* will distinguish the presiding dæmon from the summit of the soul.

But though it is singular that this dogma is not to be found in any Platonic Greek writer except Olympiodorus, it is still more singular that an expression which perfectly accords with it, should be found in a Latin Platonist considerably prior to Olympiodorus. The author I allude to is Apuleius, who in his treatise *De Deo Socratis* says of this dæmon, "quin omnia curiose ille participet, omnia visat, omnia intelligat; *in ipsis penitissimis mentibus vice conscientia diversetur.*"<sup>2</sup>

In the following passage, p. 87, Olympiodorus having observed that it is Jupiter whom Socrates calls *φιλος*, adds, *Και γαρ αμφοτεροι προσηκει κατα το αρχικον ο Ζευς. Σωκραται μεν δια την φιλοσοφιαν ηγεμων γαρ αυτη πασαν των αλλων τεχνων*

<sup>1</sup> This dogma is to be found at the end of his treatise *on the Descent of the Soul*.

<sup>2</sup> The celebrated poet Menander appears to have been the source of this dogma: for one of the excerpts from his fragments is, *Βροτοι απαν η συνειδησις θεος*, i. e. "To ev'ry mortal conscience is a God."

και οτι κατα τους Στωϊκους ο ειδως πως δει αρχειν, αρχων εστι ει και μη κεχρηται τη αρχη· τοιουτοι δε οι φιλοσοφοι· διο και εν Φαιδρω φησι· μετα μεν δη Διος ειμι. Creuzer in a note on the last part of this passage, viz. μετα μεν δη Διος ειμι, rightly observes, “*Hæc verba non sunt in Platonis Phædro.*” But it is singular it should have escaped the notice of this learned man, that the words μετα μεν Διος ημεις are in the Phædrus, and that these are the words to which Olympiodorus alludes, who perhaps quoting from memory, which he frequently does, substitutes ειμι for ημεις; or else ειμι was erroneously written by the transcriber for ημεις. But that Socrates, (or Plato,) intended by this to signify that Jupiter was his peculiar god, is shown by Hermias in his Scholia on the Phædrus (Ast. p. 157) as follows: εν τω Τιμαιω φησιν ο Πλατων, οτι ποιησας ο δημιουργος τον κοσμον, ενεστηρε ψυχας ισ αριθμους τοις αστροις, ουχ οτι ει τυχοι χιλιας ποησε· δηλον μεν γαρ· αλλ’ ομως κατα τα ειδη ακουσομεν· ποιησας ουν ηλιακας, σεληνιακας, Διϊας, εσπειρε τας μεν εις γην, τας δε αλλαχου. λεγει ουν νυν επομενοι μετα μεν Διος ημεις, ως το οικειον θεον επιγνους ο Πλατων. τουτο γαρ εστιν ευδαιμονια ανθρωπινης ψυχης το συμπριπολησαι τοις οικειοις θεοις· ουδε γαρ υπερβηναι θεους δυνατον. The same explanation of Plato’s assertion that the Demiurgus disseminated souls equal in number to the stars, is also given by Proclus in the 5th book of his Commentaries on the Timæus.

In p. 95, Olympiodorus, adverting to what had been said by Alcibiades respecting το ελληνιζειν, observes: ιστευον γαρ οτι οι Πυθαγορειοι εθαυμαζον τους πρωτους ευροντας τους αριθμους λεγοντες εγνωκεναι τουτους την ουσιαν του νου· ειγε αριθμους εκαλουν τας ιδεας, αι δε ιδεαι εν τω νω εισιν. Εθαυμαζον δε και τους πρωτους ληπτας τα ονοματα· ουτοι γαρ, φασι, την ουσιαν εγνωσαν της ψυχης. Ταυτης γαρ το ονοματοθετειν, και ου νου. Conformably to this also it is said by Proclus in Crat. (p. 6, of Boissonade’s excellent edition) Ερωτηθεις γουν Πυθαγορας, τι σοφωτατον των οντων; αριθμος εφη· τι δε δευτερον εις σοφιαν; ο τα ονοματα τοις πραγμασι λεμενος. Ηνιττετο δε δια μεν του αριθμου τον νοητον διακοσμον τον περιεχοντα το πληθος των νοερων ειδων, κ. τ. λ. In p. 211, Olympiodorus says, “that Vulcan is the first artist, and that the *bellows* employed by him indicate *nature*,” Και πρωτος τεχνητης ο Ηφαιστος, και αι παρ’ αυτω φυσαι την φυσιν δηλουσιν. Thus also Olympiodorus in his Mss. Scholia in Gorgiam, after having observed that Vulcan is a certain power presiding over bodies, adds, δια τουτο γαρ και εν φυσαις εγραζεται, αντι του εν ταις φυσισι. In p. 216, in the following passage, ουτω και ο παρ’ Ομηρω Οδυσσευς ου το καινον αμα εθεασατο, αλλ’ εκαστον εσεδρακεν οφθαλμοισιν, for το καινον I read το κοινον.

In the last place, Olympiodorus having observed (p. 217)

that the images in mirrors are not according to Plato ανακλασεις, reflections, as Proclus thought they were, but απορροιαι, effluxions, and υποστασεις, or things which have a natural and real subsistence, adds (p. 219) Οτι δε τουτο αληθες εστι, κατασκευαζουσιν οι παλαιοι, τουτεστι το ειναι υποστασεις τας σκιας' πρωτον μεν οτι, ει κυνος καθυδοντος εν υψηλω τοπω η σκια αυτου εκπερποιτο εις την γην, ναια διαλθουσα, και πατησασα την σκιαν, καταπεσειν ποιει τον κυνα. Αηλον αρα, οτι ουκ εισιν εμφανσεις, αλλα απορροιαι. Δεσπερον, οτι αι καθαιρομεναι γυναικες την επιμηνιον φοραν, η ιδουεν εις κατοπτρον, ευθως αυτο κηλιδουσιν, ωστε σαφες εξ απορροιας αυτων τουτο γινεσθαι. i. e. "That this is true, that shadows have a real existence, the ancients inferred in the first place, because if the shadow of a dog that is sleeping in a lofty place should be transmitted to the ground, an hyæna passing by, and trampling on the shadow, will cause the dog to descend. It is evident therefore that shadows are not representations of, but effluxions from things. In the second place, if women when they are undergoing their monthly purgation, look into a mirror, they will immediately defile it, so that it is clear that this is effected through an effluxion from them."

In these passages, the first remarkable circumstance that presents itself, and which is not noticed by the learned editor, is the mistake of Olympiodorus in asserting that Proclus thought the images in mirrors to be reflections, and not effluxions; as Proclus in Plat. Polit. p. 431, most clearly says that they are effluxions. For his words are, εκ δε τουτων συλλογισθησθε ημιν, και οτι κατα Πλατονα αι εμφανσεις υποστασεις εισιν ειδωλων τιμων δαιμονια μηχανη δημιουργουμεναι, καθαπερ αυτος εν τω Σοφιστη διδασκει. και γαρ αι σκιαι, εις τα ειδωλα συζυγειν φησι, τω αυτην εχουσι φυσιν. και γαρ αυται σωματων εισι και σχηματων εικονες, και παμπολυν εχουσι προς τα αφ'ων εμπικτουσι συμπαθειαν, ως δηλουσι, και οσα μαχων (lege μαγαν) τεχναι προς τε τα ειδωλα δραν, και επαγγελονται και τας σκιας. και τι λεγω τας εκεινων δυναμεις, α και τοις αλογοις ηδη ζωης υπαρχη προ λογου παντος ενεργειν. η γαρ υμιν φασιν την του κυνος εν υψη κηλιδουσαν πατησασα σκιαν καταβαλλει, και θοιγην ποιηται τον κυνα. Here we see Proclus mentions the same thing as Olympiodorus respecting the hyæna and the shadow of the dog, and with the same view, to prove that representations in mirrors have a real existence, and also observes that this is confirmed by what the arts of magicians are able to effect through images and shadows. The second remarkable thing is, that the learned editor has not noticed that the circumstance of a mirror being defiled when looked into by a woman during her menstrual purgation, is mentioned by Aristotle in his treatise De Insomniis cap. 11. as follows: εταν



γὰρ καταρμηθίων τὰς γυναῖξιν γινόμεσθαι, ἐμβλεψάσθαι εἰς τὸ κατοπτρῶν, γίνεται τὸ ἐπικολῆς τοῦ ἐνοπτρῶ, οὖν νεφέλη αἱματώδης· καὶ μὲν καινοὶ ἢ τὸ κατοπτρῶν, οὐ βραδίον ἐκμαζαίνει τὴν τοιαύτην κηλίδαν· ἐκ δὲ παλαιῶν, ῥαοῦ. And this circumstance also is noticed by Proclus in the above cited place, as a thing asserted by Aristotle: καὶ γυναῖκας καθαιρουμένης, φησὶν Ἀριστοτέλης, εἰς ἐνοπτρῶν ἰδούσης, αἱματώταται τὸ τε ἐνοπτρῶν καὶ τὸ ἐμφαινομένον εἰδῶλον.

As it is so obvious from these passages, that Proclus did not conceive the images in mirrors to be *reflections*, but asserted conformably to Plato that they were *effluvia*, it is reasonable to suppose that the name of Proclus is an error of the transcribers; and I should conjecture that for ο φιλοσοφος Προκλος, Olympiodorus originally wrote ο φιλοσοφος Πορφυριος, as the appellation of *the philosopher* was given to Porphyry by all the Platonists that succeeded him. This at least is more probable than that a man so conversant with the writings of Proclus, as Olympiodorus was, should have made such an egregious blunder.

T.

---

In DEMOSTHENEM Commentarii JOANNIS SEAGER, *Bicknor Wallicæ in Com. Monumethiæ Rectoris.*

No. II.—[Continued from No. LII. p. 239.]

In Philippum iv. p. 134. l. 4. οὐ στήσεται, πάντας ἀνθρώπους ἀδικῶν, τὰ δ' ὑφ' αὐτῶν ποιούμενος Φίλιππος, εἰ μὴ τις αὐτὸν κωλύσει.

Probabilius, πάντας ἀνθρώπους ἀδικῶν ΚΑΙ ὑφ' αὐτῶν ποιούμενος.

In Philippum iv. p. 136. l. 5. ταῦτα τοίνυν ἕκαστον εἰδὼτα καὶ γινώσκοντα παρ' αὐτῶν δεῖ μὲν ΔΙ' οὐ γράψαι κελύσειν πόλεμον τὸν τὰ βέλτεστα ἐπὶ πᾶσι δίκαιοις συμβουλευόντα· τοῦτο μὲν γὰρ ἔστιν ὅταν πολεμήσετε λαβεῖν βουλομένων, οὐχ ἂν τῇ πόλει συμφέροι πρᾶττειν.

Eadem constructio, Adversus Leptin. p. 457. l. 11. ἐγὼ δ' ἦν μὲν τινῶν κατηγοροῦντα πάντας ἀφαιρῆσθαι τὴν δαρεῖν Τῶν ἈΔΙΚῶΝ ΕΣΤΙΝ, ἴασω.

In Philippum iv. p. 136. l. 19. ἄλλ', ὃν ἐκείνος πολυμει τρόπον, τοῦτον ἀμύνησθε· τοῖς μὲν κιννομένοις ἤδη χρήματα καὶ τάλλα, ὡς ἂν δένανται, δίδόντες· αὐτοὶ δ' εἰσφύροντες, ὡς ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι—  
κ. τ. λ.

τοῖς ἀμυνομένοις ἤδη) Diopithi et militibus ejus in Cherroneso.

In Philippum iv. p. 140. l. 10. ὑπερ δὴ τούτων ἀπάντων οἴεμαι δεῖν ἡμᾶς προσβείαν ἐκπέμπειν, ἥτις τῶ βασιλεῖ (Persarum sc.) διαλέ-