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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. 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: Φερε δὴ ημῖς ὑπὲρ τούτου απολογησμένα, δείξαντες οὐ ω καὶ Αριστοτέλης καταδρομὴ κατὰ τούτων εὑρησατο. μελλὼν δὲ τοὺς τούς παρασκευάζοντα, αλλὰ τοὺς κακὸς τὰ παρ᾽ αὐτῶν λογομανία διαλαμβάνωσιν. ὁ γὰρ οὗ σὺ φης ὁ δαίμων φαμὲν Αριστοτέλης, ὁ Πλατωνίου ἔλεγε τοῦ ὑδάτος ἐλεγεν οὖν τοὺς τονταρταῖαν, αλλὰ τοῦτο ἐλευθερίαν. ὁ γὰρ οὖν τὰ μυθικά λογομανία, φωτικάς ἐκλεμμέναι. αλλὰ ταῦτα ἐλευθερίαν ο Πλατωνίου ἀλλὰ τίνα αἰνιττομένως. Here he says that Aristotle does not rightly blame Plato for asserting in the Phædo.

1 "Hucusque pertinuit veteris elegantiorisque doctrinæ proventus, qui paullatim exaruit Justiniano imperio ac deinceps. Hic Atheniensem clauses scholas, in qua floruerant Plutarchus, Nestorii filius, Syrius, Proclus, Marinus, Damascius, unde Simplicius, Olympiodorus, alique prodierant: philosophi expuls: vexati per orbem Romanum atque religionis cultores, ex quorum numero fere erant docti homines. Per trecentos annos stupor et barbaries omnia obtinuerunt. Ergo in hoc tempore spatio plurimorum veterum librorum, in his etiam Plutarchorum, ponendus est interitus." These are the words of Wyttenbach in Praetexte ad Plutarch. Moralia p. 14.
that Tartarus is the ἔλοτης¹ 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, θειός, 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. 39) it is said, πλὴν εἰ καὶ λεγὼ αἰώνιος κολασθησόμεναι δια το αναστημα, μὴν νομίζῃς, στὶς αὐτῶν αἰωνίων κολασθῆται η ψυχὴ εν τῷ Ταρταρῷ. εἰ γάρ οὐ διὰ μὴν τοῦ θεοῦ κολασθῆται η ψυχὴ, ἀλλ’ ἵστειας χαρίν. ἀλλ’ αἰωνίως φαμέν κολασθῆται τὴν ψυχήν, αἰώνα καλουντες τὸν αὐτής βιον καὶ τὴν μερίκην αὐτῆς περιοδον, τῷ γὰρ αὐτῷ μεγίστα πλημμελήσαιται ψυχαί οὐχ αρκοῦνται μιᾷ περιοδῷ καθαρβοῦν, ἀλλ’ εἰσίν εν τῷ βιον διηνόκοις ὡσπερ εν τῷ ταρταρῷ, ἡν περιοδον, αἰώνα εκαλοῦν ο Πλατὼν. 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, εἰ δὲ καὶ ἀλλαχιν λέγει αἰωνιν τὴν κολασίν, ἀλλ’ ουν αἰώνα καλεί περιοδον τίνα, καὶ ἀποκαταστασίν.² 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

¹ ἔλοτης 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.
² I quote this from a copy of the Harlesian 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 αυτον 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 Syranus 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, ας Αριστοτέλης φησι, καιρός εστι χρόνος προσλάβων το δεόν. In p. 40. φησι δέ καί εν τῷ περι Ερμηνείας ο Αριστοτέλης καὶ τοσαυτα μεν λαγεται προς τας σοφιστικας ενοχλήσεις αντι τον αποριας, ει μεταφορας του ουχλου, και αυτος ουκαριην επι την αποριαν ενοχλησιν, αποριαν τοις. Π. 71, ας Αριστοτέλης ημας εν ηρωικαις τεχναις εδιδαξε. P. 118, εφ' οις δεικνυσι και δια τριτου συλλογισμου, οτι παν καλον σχεδον, και το ανακαλυ, και κεχρηται δειξης, εν αφελη Αριστοτελης εν τη περι Ουρανου. P. 122, διο και ο διαμονος Αριστοτελης, αρχην υποθεμενος ου το πρωτον αιτιον, αλλα τον νου, εν τη μετα τα φυσικα, περι αυτο διαλεγομενοι ελεγε διπτον ειναι το εν το μεν εν τω στρατηγωρ, το δε εν τω στρατακεδω και αιτον ειναι το εν τω στρατηγωρ του εν τω στρατακεδω. This last passage is employed by Syranus 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 καβ-
Observations on Creuzer’s Edition of

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 expresses enthusiasm, 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 ενθυσιασμος εστιν εν τη Πελτεια, ενα μουσολητος γεγονος υπερικη τας Μουσας, ας εξιωσας την λυσιν της υπ’ αυτου συναγες πολιτειας ενδιαφρον, x. t. l. The learned editor justly remarks in a note on the words τας Μουσας ας εξιωως, x. t. l. “Proxima non sana videtur.” But it appears to me that if for ας εξιωσας we read εξιωσας, 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 βουλία, ουκερ. Ὀμαρος, ευχομένα τας Μουσας ειπεν ημιν εκεις ημιν προς την ποιησιν εµπρον, και προς την ποιησιν τραγικιν, ας προς παιδας ημιν παιζουσας και εργαζουσας, ας δη στουδη λεγουσας, υπερυπογυμπυς λεγων; τοις; εκει τοις. Χαλεπτ' μεν ειςφημι πολιν, επεις ειςφημαν, αλλ' εκει γενημαν παιδα ψευδο ειπεν, και ευνοικε ευστασος τινων αναιτη χρονον, αλλα λυθησεται. Vol. II. p. 101. Edis. Majs. In p. 17, 18, Olympiodorus speaking of the differences of daemons, 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 daemons, 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, Of δε προς την τον ευγενων αλογον συναντουτος ημας αλογοι. The learned editor in a note at the word αλογοι observes, “Au aut excidit vocabulum, aut lectio mendosa est.” A word is certainly wanting, and that word is so
obviously ὑπάρχω, 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 demons that are allotted to mankind as their guardians, says, Ἄλλα ἐπείδη δαίμονας εἰλαχίστας αἱρήματι, δει γνωσκείν, οτι καὶ παρὰ τὴν κοινὴν συνήθειαν συνεργασται ταῦτα, ει καὶ μὴ τοις αὐτοῖς ονομάζον. Αὕτη γὰρ τοῦ δαίμονος ἀλλὰ εἰκοστοῦ φασιν’ αμαλσ ἐστιν αὐτῶν ἀκούνων τὸν αὐγγελον σου, κ. τ. λ. But in this passage, for δαίμονος ἀλλα, it is doubtless necessary to read δαίμονος ἀγγελον, κ. τ. λ. as is evident from what Olympiodorus adds immediately after these words.

The following passage respecting our allotted daemon, 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 τὰ πρώτα μεν οἱ ἑξορυκτήν περὶ τὸ δαίμονον καί ἐλαχίστον ἡμᾶς δὲ συμβιβαστικός τοις παρασκευαστὲς διέξελθην καὶ γὰρ ἐπισκεπτότος καὶν ἁλατηριαν, σα σαῦρα δαίμονα τοῦ νεοὶ ἀισχυνο- μένου, καὶ δεότι τοξικετός οὗτ τὸ πολὺς ὑπὸ γηγού δεόν, ρητον ἵνα ἐπηρεαστῇ δαίμονα τὸ συνεδρίον ὑπαρχέν, σαντο αἰχου ἀκοῦ τῆς ἄγγελου, καί ἀκακάς δικαστῆς, καὶ μαρτυρίας τοῦ εὐερήμου τοῦ Μενοῦ καὶ τῆς Ρεθαμανθί, τοῦ δὲ καὶ συνεργιας ήμῶν αὐτοῖς γίνεσθαι, σα συμβαστικός καὶ δαίμονον εἰς ἡμᾶς, καὶ μὴ συγκαταθυμίζομεν τὰς γιὰ τῆς ἰσχίας αμεστώτερος, ἀλλὰ καὶ απλομένην εἰς τὸν τοὺς, καὶ εὐπρεπον αὐτῶν πρὸς τὸ δεῖν.— ὁ συνεδρός οὐν ἐλαχίστας καλὰς δαίμονας εἰς ἐν αὐτῶς ἀμαρτιῶς. ἰστεθοῦ δὲ, οτι τοῦ συνεδρός τοῦ μεν εἰς τοὺς γυναικεῖς ήμῶν δυνασίας λεγεται συνεδρός αμεστος το γενε. (p. 23.) i. e. "This is what is said by the interpreters [of Plato] concerning demons, 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 daemonic 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 demon 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 daemon 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 to δι' επι τας ἁτικας. 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 demon 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 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 demon αυρων αατων της ψυχης, the supreme flower of the soul. For the summit or the one of the soul, is frequently called by Platonic writers to απος, the flower, but not αυρων αατων, the supreme flower. So that the addition of supreme will distinguish the presiding daemon 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 daemon, "quin omnia curiose ille participet, omnia visat, omnia intelligat; in ipsis penitissimis mentibus vice conscientia diversetur." 2

In the following passage, p. 87, Olympiodorus having observed that it is Jupiter whom Socrates calls φιλος, adds, Και γαρ αμφιθεορὸς προσηκε πατα το αρχικον ο Ζες. Σωκρατει μειδι την ϕιλοσοφιαν γειμαν γαρ αυτη πασων των αλλων τεχνων.

1 This dogma is to be found at the end of his treatise on the Descent of the Soul.

2 The celebrated poet Menander appears to have been the source of this dogma: for one of the excerpts from his fragments is, Βυρως αυτων η σωρευς θεος, i. e. "To every mortal conscience is a God."
the Commentary of Olympiodorus.

καὶ οτι κατα τους Στωϊκους ο εἴδας πας δει αρχιν, αρχιν οτι η καὶ μη κεχρηται τη αρχη ταυτοτε δε οι φιλοσοφοι διοι καὶ ειν Φεδερ 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, "Hec verba non sunt in Platonis Phaedro." But it is singular it should have escaped the notice of this learned man, that the words μετα μεν Διος ημεις are in the Phaedrus, 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 Phaedrus (Ast. p. 157) as follows: εν τα τιμαερ φησιν ο Πλατων, οτι κοινως ο δημιουργος του κοσμον, ενεπεκτε βοηθος ισαριθμους των αστρων, ίσιοι ει ςι χιλιακοεις 'δηλον μη γαρ αλλ ομως κατα τα ειδη ακουσωμενοι κοινως ουν νηλαιας, σεληνακας, Διας, εστιερ τα μεν εις γην, τας δε αλλαξου η λεγει ουν επομενοι μετα μεν Διος ημεις, ας το οικειον θεου επιγους ο Πλατων. τουτο γαρ εστιν ευδαιμονια ανθρωπινης βοηθεις το συμπεριτολησαι τοις οικειοις θεους 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 Timaeus.

In p. 95, Olympiodorus, adverted to what had been said by Alcibiades respecting το ελληνικαν, observes: ιστοιν γαρ οτι οι Πυθαγορειοι ειδωμαζον οι πρωτοι ευροντος των αριθμων λεγοντες εγνωνικαν τουτους την ουσιαν του νου ειγε αριθμους εκαλον τας ιδεας, αι δε ιδεις εν το νοι εισιν. Ειδωμαζον δε και οι πρωτοι ινατα τα ονοματα ουτοι γαρ, βασι, την ουσιαν εγγυσαι της ψυχης. Ταυτης γαρ το ονοματοθενει, και ου νου. Conformably to this also it is said by Proclus in Crat. (p. 6, of Boissoneade's excellent edition) Εσωτηθης γιαν Πυθαγορειαν, τι σοφιστατον των οστων; αριθμους εις τι δε δεντρον εις σοφιαν ο τα ονοματα τως πραγματ θημενος. Ηινιτετο δε δια μεν του αριθμου του νοημον διακοσμον τον περιχωνα το σκηνον των νουων ειδαν, 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 τοιχητης ο Ηραιος, και οι παρ αυτω φυσιν 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, dia τουτο γαρ και ειν φυσιει εχραζεται, αυτι του ειν αυτω φυσει. In p. 216, in the following passage, ουτω και ο παρ' Ομηρω Ουσισεως ευ το καινον αμα εκαστο, αλλ' εκαστον εισδρακεν εφαλμοίσειν, for τι καινον I read το καινον.

In the last place, Olympiodorus having observed (p. 217)
that the images in mirrors are not according to Plato ἀκαλλασμένα, reflections, as Proclus thought they were, but απορροια, effusions, and υποστασις, or things which have a natural and real subsistence, adds (p. 219) οτι δι' τοῦτο ἀληθείς ἐστι, κατασκευαζοντιν όι πτώσεις, τουτοτι το εἶναι υποστασις τας σκιας προτεν μεν οτι, ει κυνος καθοδουντος αν υψηλα τοκον η σκια αυτου εκτραποιτο εις την γην, ναια διαλθουσα, και πατησατα την σκιαν, κατασκευαζον τοις την κυνα. Δελον αρα, οτι εις ευτυχεις αλλα απορροιαι. Ξεσε- 

γον, οτι αι καθαιρομεναι γεναις την επιμηνην φοραν, ει ἵναν εις κατοπτρον, ευθειας αυτον κυλουσιν, ὡστε σερες εις απορροιαις αυτων τουτο γινεθαι, 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 hyena passing by, and trampling on the shadow, will cause the dog to descend. It is evident therefore that shadows are not representations of, but effusions 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 effusion 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 effusions; as Proclus in Plat. Polit. p. 431, most clearly says that they are effusions. For his words are, ει δε τοιον συλλογιστην ημιν, και οτι κατα Πλατανα αι εμφασεις υποστασις εις ειναιαν των δαιμονια μυχην δημιουργουμεναι, καθοτε αυτοι εν τοι Εθιοπτη δι- 

δασκαι. και γαρ αι σκιαι, εις τα δαιμαλα συγειει φορει, τοιοτων επεκαθει φωσιν, και γαρ αυτοι σωματων εις και σχηματων ειδεις, και σκαμ- 

πολιν εχουσι προς τα αυτο εμπιστουσι συμπαθειαν, εις διπους, και 

οντα μαχαν (λεγε μαχαν) τεχνας προς τα δαιμαλα δριν, και επεγκελλουσαι και τας σκιας. και τι λεγω τας εχιονον δυναις, α 

και τοις αλογοις ήδη ξωνες υπαρχει προ λογου σκαντος ενεργειν. η γαρ 

υναια πολει την του κυνος εν υνει καθαιρουνα πατησα αυτην κατα- 

βαλλει, και βοηθη πουται τον κυνα. Here we see Proclus mentions the same thing as Olympiodorus respecting the hyena 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: ετιν
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γαρ καταρκησον τας γυναιξις γυναικων, εμβληματις εις τον κατατροπην, γινεται το επικολοις της ενστροφην, ουιν νεφελη αματωθης και μεν καινος λεω τον κατατροπην, ου διδον εμφανει την τοιαυτην κηλευην εκειν εκείνους, ρεπο. Ανδρισ ευχετο αναμελησις της ενστροφης ιδιοτητης, αματωθη χατε ενστροφη λεωνις εἰς τον κατατροπην και το εμφασιαν ευδοκων.

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 effusions, 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 Πορφυρος, 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 egregiously blunder.

T.

In DEMOSTHENEM Commentarii JOANNIS SEAGER, Bicknor Wallice in Com. Monemethiae Rectoris.

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

In Philippum iv. p. 134. l. 4. ου στήρεται, πάντας ἄνθρωπους ἀθικῶν, καθ' ὅσον αὐτῷ ποιομένος Φίλιππος, εἰ μὴ τις αὐτὸν καλύπτει.

Probabilium, πάντας ἄνθρωπους ἀθικῶν ΚΑΙ ὅσον αὐτῷ ποιομένοις.

In Philippum iv. p. 156. l. 5. τούτα τούτων ἐκαστον εἰδώτα καὶ γνώσκοντα παρ' αὐτῷ ἐκ μὲν δὲ ου γράφει κελεύων κόλομον τοῦ τὰ βέλη πάσι δικαίους συμβουλεύοντα τούτο μὲν γὰρ ἐστὶν ότι τον πολυμέρους λαβειν βουλομένων, οὐκ ὡς τῇ πόλει συμφέρει πράττειν.

Eadem constructio, Adversus Leptin. p. 457. l. 11. ὡς δ' ἐν τοῖς τινῶν κατηγοροῦντα πάντας ἰἀφαίρεται τῆς διαφορᾶς ΤΩΝ ΔΙΙΚΩΝ ΕΞΤΙΝ, έκατον.

- In Philippum iv. p. 196. l. 19. ἀλλ' αὐτήν τοῦτον μὲν ἐκείνης πολαμεί τρόπων, τοῦτον ἀμυνούσθα τοῖς μὲν ἀμυνομένοις ὧδ' χρήματα καὶ τάλλα, ἢ μὲν διάκατος, διδότας, αὐτὸν δ' εἰσφέροντες, αὐτὸς ἀμφότεροι—

κ. τ. λ.

τοὺς ἀμυνομένοις ὧδ' Diopithi et militibus eius in Cherroneso.

In Philippum iv. p. 140. l. 10. ὃπερ δ' ἐκ τούτων ἀπαίτον οἴερα διὰ ὑμᾶς προσβείναι εκπήκτων, ὡς τοῖς βασιλεῖς (Persarum sc.) διαλι-