

be made, to the governor of the province to which the embassy has access. He sends it to Peking, to *Li-fan-youan* (the college of foreign affairs), which never fails to give an answer. But there is no instance wherein the Chinese have treated with an ambassador, unless he commanded an army. The Mandchoux have, indeed, made some concessions to Russia, because at the time they feared them, and because they foresaw that the commerce at the frontier of Siberia, and the Russian caravans which journeyed to Peking, would be of service to the *Kalka* Mongols, ruined by long wars with the *Galdan of the Euleuts*. In other circumstances, and in other times, the court of Peking would not probably have shown itself so tractable.

The most useless thing then that can be done, is, to send embassies to China, since they will invariably terminate without a result, and only serve to place European governments in a humiliating situation. Let the ambassadors perform, or omit to perform, the ceremonies prescribed by the regulations of the *celestial empire*, it is of no consequence. The evil that we would avoid, in refusing to submit to the nine genuflections before the Emperor, or before his throne, is already performed by the arrival of the mission.

J. G. JACKSON.

Sceaux, March, 1824.

Observations on the Excerpta from the SCHOLIA of PROCLUS on the CRATYLUS OF PLATO, published by PROFESSOR BOISSONADE; Lipsiæ, 1820.

PART I.

THE students of the mythology and theology of the Greeks will doubtless be much gratified by the perusal of these Scholia, edited from Mss. by a man so eminently learned as Professor Boissonade; and originally written by a philosopher, who, for his transcendent genius, was deservedly considered by his contemporaries, and by all those that followed him, to be the coryphæus of the Platonists.

In order, however, to render these remains of the mystic lore of antiquity still more valuable, I shall present the reader with

emendations of the Professor's text, derived from a Ms.¹ of this work, in the possession of Mr. Heber of Oxford, of which I have a transcript, and which is so rare, that I have not been able to find that there is any other original manuscript of it in Great Britain. I shall only premise farther, that my observations will be confined to those passages, the reading of which in the abovementioned Ms. is to be preferred to that of the Professor's copies, neglecting to notice those which are faulty in the former, or less accurate than those in the latter; occasionally at the same time adding emendations from my own conjecture.

In the first place, in p. 6, Proclus observes, that Pythagoras being asked what was the wisest of things, answered, number; and in answer to the question what was the next in wisdom to this, said, it was that which gave names to things, by which he signified soul. *Ηιγιττετο δε δια μεν του αριθμου τον νοητον διακοσμον τον περιεχοντα το πληθος των νοερων ειδων· εκει γαρ ο πρωτος και κυριως αριθμος μετα το εν υπεστη το περιουσιον.* Here, for the last word *περιουσιον*, my Ms. has, rightly, *υπερουσιον*, which reading the Professor also found in the Ms. B. V.; and very properly observes, "*quam prætuli lectionem.*" For it is a well-known dogma of Plato, and the best of his disciples, that *the one*, or the great first principle of things, is superessential.

P. 22. l. 20. *επει και ο ολος δημιουργος κατ' αυτον (i. e. Τιμαιον) πρωτιστος εστιν ονοματουργος· αυτος ουν εστιν, ως ο Τιμαιος λεγει, ο την μεν των περιφορων αυτου, την δε θατερου προσαγορευσας.* Here, for *αυτου* my Ms. has rightly *ταυτου*. For Proclus here alludes to what is said in the *Timæus* of Plato, about the circle of *the same*, and the circle of the different, the former being in soul the *dianoëtic*, or ratiocinative power, and the latter the *doxastic* power, or that which is characterised by opinion.

P. 27. l. 15. *Αι γαρ ουρανιοι περιοδοι αλλοις αλλα αποπληρουσι, και αλλοτε αλλα παραγουσι, και εν το εκ παντων λεγμα συντελουσιν προς την του παντος συμπληρωσιν απεργαζονται.* In this passage, for *λεγμα*, which my Ms. also has, I conceive it to be perfectly necessary to read *πλεγμα*. In p. 31, Proclus speaks of the twofold circulations in the universe, mentioned by Plato in his *Politicus*, one of which is *anagogic*, or elevating, and is Saturnian; but the other is *providential*, and suspended from Jupiter. *Διο καν τω παντι διτται ανακυκλησεις, η μεν αναγωγος και Κρονια, η δε προνοητικη και του Διου εξηρτημενη.* He

¹ This Ms. was lent to me thirty years ago, by a gentleman of the name of Mason, with permission to transcribe it, and at his death it came into the possession of Mr. Heber.

likewise observes: *Αλλα και αυτος ο Πλατων τους επι Κρονου ευδαιμονως ζωντας και του θεου τροφιμους, κατα την διαλεκτικην φησιν ενεργειν αλληλοις*—τους δε τον ιδιον βιον ανακυκλουντας της νομοθετικης δεδεσθαι, κ. τ. λ. In the latter part of this extract, for *ιδιον*, my Ms. has *διον*, and very properly. For it is the *Jovian* life which is here alluded to. P. 33. l. 20. *Παντα γαρ υφισταγοντες οι πατερες των ολων συνθηματα και ιχνη πασιν ενεσπειραν της εαυτων τριαδικης υποστασεως. Εκει και η φυσικη τοις σωμασιν εντιθησιν της οικειας ιδιοτητος ενανυσμα, δι ου και κινει τα σωματα, κ. τ. λ.* Here, for *Εκει*, my Ms. has *Επει*, and rightly. For what Proclus says, is in English as follows: “For the fathers of wholes,¹ in giving subsistence to all things, disseminated in all things impressions and vestiges of their own triadic hypostasis; since nature also inserts in bodies latent igneous seeds, through which she is the cause of motion to bodies.” P. 36. l. 3. *Εστι δ’ ου παν το των θεων γενος ονομαστον. ο μεν γαρ επεκεινα των ολων οτι αρρητος, και ο Παρμενιδης ημας υπεμνησεν’ ουτε γαρ ονοματα αυτου, φυσικη, ουτε λογος εστιν ουδεις.* In this passage, for *φυσικη*, my Ms. has *φησιν*, which is the true reading; for Proclus here cites the very words of Plato in the *Parmenides*, respecting *το εν, the one*, or the supreme principle of all things. For Plato says, at the conclusion of the first hypothesis of that dialogue: *Ουδ’ αρα ονομα εστι αυτω, ουδε λογος, ουδε τις επιστημη, ουδε αισθησις, ουδε δοξα.*

P. 50. l. 12. *Και γαρ αι ψυχαι, δια της προς τους αδικους συνταξεως μετοχοι γινονται της αδικιας, και τα σωματα αυτων απο σπερματων υπεστη πονηρων, και τα εκτος εξημαρτημενων ελαβε την αρχην.* Here, for *εξημαρτημενων*, which is also the reading of my Ms., it appears to me to be necessary to read *εξ ημαρτημενων*. For then the meaning of Proclus will be, “that souls, through a co-arrangement with the unjust, become partakers of injustice, their bodies consist of depraved seed, and their external affairs receive their origin from crimes.” P. 52. l. 14. *Τριχως αρα πατηρ ο Ζευς, θεων, ψυχων, μερικων ψυχων, νοερον και διον ελομενων βιον.* In this passage, the punctuation being erroneous, alters its real meaning; but in my Ms. the punctuation is correct, and is as follows: *Τριχως αρα πατηρ ο Ζευς, θεων, ψυχων μερικων,*

¹ Among these fathers, according to the Platonic, which is the same with the Orphic theology, Jupiter ranks; who is therefore called by Plato, *δημιουργος των ολων*, because he produces the universe so far as it is a *whole*, and likewise all the *wholes* it contains, by his own immediate energy, other subordinate powers co-operating with him in the production of parts. Hence, he produces the universe *totally*, and *at once*.

ψυχων νοερον και διον ελομενων βιον ; i. e. " Jupiter is father in a threefold respect ; for he is the father of gods, of partial souls, and of souls that voluntarily embrace an intellectual and Jovian life." But by *partial souls*, Proclus means souls of a human characteristic. And Jupiter, according to the Grecian theology, is not only the father of gods, but also of human souls, and *particularly* of those that are of an intellectual and Jovian nature. Perhaps, therefore, after the words ψυχων μερικων, the words και εξηρημενωσ are wanting, in order to render the meaning of Proclus more complete. P. 57. l. 9. Proclus, speaking of Jupiter, says, και γαρ διττους υφιστησι διακοσμοις, τον τε ουρανιον, και τον υποουρανιον. But here, for υποουρανιον, my Ms. has, rightly, υπερουρανιον, as is evident from what immediately follows: οθεν αυτου και το σκηπτρον ειναί φησιν ο θεολογος

— πισυρων και εικοσι μετρων,
ως διττων αρχοντος δυοδεκαδων. For it is largely shown by Proclus, in the 6th book of his treatise, " On the Theology of Plato," that Jupiter, or the Demiurgus, rules over and gives subsistence to a twofold *dodecad*, the *supermundane*, and the *mundane*; the *supermundane dodecad*, which is sometimes called by the Platonic writers, *supercelestial*, consisting of four triads, the first of which is Jupiter, Neptune, Pluto; the second of Diana, Proserpine, Minerva; the third of the three Corybantes, who, as Proclus informs us, are analogous to the Curetes in the intellectual order; and the fourth of Mercury, Venus, Apollo. But the *mundane dodecad* consists of the four following triads: Jupiter, Neptune, Vulcan; Vesta, Minerva, Mars; Ceres, Juno, Diana; Mercury, Venus, Apollo. And concerning this latter *dodecad*, Sallust, in his treatise " De Diis et Mundo," informs us, that the first triad *fabricates*; the second *guards*; the third *vivifies*; and the fourth *harmonises* the world.

P. 59. l. 6. Δια τι ουν ει και υβριστικον ην το τοιουτον ονομα, [subintel. του Κρονου] ουκ ευφημασ και πρεπουση θεοισ σιγη τουτο παρεδραμεν; η οτι της βασιλικης των θεων σειρας αρχομενης μεν απο Φανητος, κατανωσσης δ' εις τον δεσποτην ημων τον Διονυσον, κ. τ. λ. On the word σειρας in this passage, there is the following note in my Ms., made, I have no doubt, by the epitomiser of these Scholia; viz. Φανης, Νυξ, Ουρανος, Κρονος, Ζευσ, Διονυσος. And the epitomiser's annotation is perfectly correct, as is evident from what is immediately after added by Proclus. Indeed, that according to the Grecian theology, the royal series of gods consists of the abovementioned six divinities, may be inferred from the testimony of Syrianus, in his commentary on the 14th book of Aristotle's *Metaphysics*. For he there observes, " Ancient

theologists assert that Night and Heaven reigned, and prior to these, the mighty father of Night and Heaven, who distributed the world to gods and mortals, and who first possessed royal authority, the illustrious Ericapæus.

Τοιον ελων διενειμε θεοις, θνητοισι δε κοσμον

Ου πρωτος βασιλευσ περικλυτος Ηρικεπαιος.¹

Night succeeded Ericapæus, in the hands of whom she has a sceptre,

Σκεπτρον εχουσ' εν χειρσιν Ηρικεπαιου.—

To Night, Heaven succeeded, who first reigned over the gods after mother Night.

Οσ πρωτος βασιλευσ θεων μετα μητερα Νυκτα.

Chaos transcends the habitude of sovereign dominion: and with respect to Jupiter, the oracles given to him by Night, manifestly call him not the first, but the *fifth* immortal king of the gods." Hence, according to Syrianus, the first of the royal series of divinities is Ericapæus or Phanes, the second is Night, the third is Heaven, and the fifth is Jupiter. But as Saturn is the father of Jupiter, Saturn is the fourth king; and from the testimony of Orphæus himself, as cited by Proclus in the abovementioned page of these Scholia, Bacchus is the sixth king of the gods. This royal series is likewise enumerated by Proclus in Tim., lib. v. p. 291, and is said by him to be an Orphic tradition.

P. 60. l. 17. Αλλ' οταν μεν ο Κρονος νους λεγεται, διανοιασ επεχει ταξιν ο Ζευσ, οταν δ' αυ Κρονος διανοια, παντως που προς αλλον τινα νουν υπερτερον κατ' αναλογιασ φησομεν ουτως καλεισθαι. Ειτ' ουν τον νοητον και κρυφιον νουν λεγειν εθελοισ, ειτε τον εκφαντορικον, ειτε τον συνεκτικον, ειτε τον τελεσιουργον, ειη αν ο Κρονος διανοια προς τουτους απαντας. On the latter of these sentences, my Ms. has the following remark in the margin: νους νοητος ο Φανης, εκφαντορικος νους ο Ουρανος, συνεκτικος νους η Γη, τελεσιουργος δε νους η πουρανιασ αφισ. And the truth of this remark is confirmed by what Proclus demonstrates in the 3rd and 4th books of his treatise. "On the Theology of Plato;" and in the 5th book of his Commentary on the Timæus. P. 62. l. 11. Proclus unfolding what Plato says of Saturn, observes: Ταυτην τοιουν την μεριστην αυτου και αμεθεκτον

¹ These and the two following lines, which are Orphic, are not inserted by either Gesner or Hermann in their editions of the Orphic Remains, and are not, perhaps, extant in any other writer than Syrianus. The above work of Syrianus is only extant in a barbarous Latin version; but my copy of it formerly belonged to the celebrated Gale, who has everywhere corrected it from a Greek Ms. in his possession, and from the same Ms. has given the original of these Orphic lines.

σπεροχη η καθαροτης ενδεικνυται. Here, for *μεριστην*, which my Ms. also has, it is necessary to read *αμεριστην*. This is evident from what immediately follows: *το γαρ ανεπαφον της υλης, και το αμεριστον, και το ασχετον δια του καθαρου σημανεται*. The whole, therefore, of this sentence thus connected, will be in English: "Purity, therefore, indicates the *indivisible* transcendency of Saturn, and which is incapable of being participated. For the not coming into contact with matter, the *indivisible*, and the unrestrained, are signified by purity." P. 66. l. 3 from the bottom: *Και δη και αυτος ο Ουρανος παντα μεν τα δευτερα πληρει των οικειων αγαθων, παντα δε φρουρειταις ακμαιοταταις εαυτου δυναμεισιν, και τας αιζωους αυγας αυτη παρεδωκε συντηρειν και φρουρειν ανωθεν ο πατηρ*. In this passage, for *αυγας* my Ms. has *αιτιας*, which I am persuaded is the true reading. For Proclus is not here speaking of the visible Heaven, but of that which is intellectual. P. 68. l. 7. *και τον Ουρανον ο Σωκρατης [εχαρακτηρισεν] τω οραν τα ανω, δηλαδη τον υπερουρανιον τοπον, και οσα τη θεοδρεμوني σιγη περιειληπται των κατερων*. On this passage, the very learned Professor observes, "*Verba θεοδρεμوني σιγη habet ex hymno aliquo, vel oraculo*." The Professor is right in the latter part of his conjecture: for the words *θεοδρεμوني σιγη* are derived from a Chaldean Oracle, which is to be found under the head of *Πατηρ και Νους* in Stanley's collection of these oracles, and which is as follows:

*Μηδε προηλθεν, αλλ' εμενεν εν τω πατρικω βυθω
Και εν τη αδυτω κατα την θεοδρεμονα σιγην.*

i. e. "Nor has it proceeded, but it abides in the paternal profundity, and in the adytum, according to the god-nourished silence." This oracle also is to be found in my collection of the Chaldean oracles in the *Classical Journal*; and relates to the extremity of the intelligible order of gods.¹

P. 68. l. 10. *ωσπερ ουν ο Παρμενιδης δια της ολοτητος εκατερων των ταξεων τουτων εσημανεν, την μεν δια της νοητης, την δε δια της νοερας, ουτως αρα και δια της προς τα κρειττονα στροφης ο τε Τιμαιος και ο Σωκρατης αυτον εκφαινουσιν. αλλ' η στροφη διαφορος ωσπερ και η ολοτης· νοητη μεν γαρ η του αιωνος διοπερ εκεινον ουχ οραν ειπε το προς εαυτου νοητον ο Τιμαιος, αλλα μενει σταθερας μονον νοερα δ' η του ουρανου, και δια τουτο φησιν αυτον ο Σωκρατης οραν τα ανω, κ.*

¹ The learned Professor, who in his remarks on these Scholia of Proclus frequently notices this collection of mine, and in p. 23 does me the honor to call me, "*vir in Platoniorum philosophia versatissimus*," has not in his notes adverted to the above oracle.

τ. λ. Here, for *αυτον*, after *και ο Σωκρατης*, my Ms. has *αυτο*, but the true reading is *αυτας*. In like manner for *προς εαυτου νοητον ο Τιμαιος*, which also my Ms. has, it is necessary to read *προ εαυτου*, κ. τ. λ. For Proclus is here speaking of those two great *ολοτητες*, as they are called by Platonic writers, Eternity, and Heaven, the former of which constitutes the middle of the *intelligible triad*, and the latter the middle of the *intelligible and at the same time intellectual triad*. Hence, what Proclus says in this place will be in English: "As, therefore, Parmenides [in Plato] indicates to us each of these orders through *wholeness*,¹ the one [i. e. Eternity] through intelligible, but the other [i. e. Heaven] through intellectual wholeness; thus, also, both Timæus and Socrates unfold *them* through a conversion to more excellent natures. The conversion, however, is different, as well as the wholeness. For that of Eternity is intelligible. Hence, Timæus [in Plato] does not say that it sees the intelligible prior to it, but only that it *stably abides* [in it.] But the conversion of Heaven is intellectual; and on this account Socrates says that it sees things above, [or the natures superior to it.] P. 69. l. 5. *Ο τοιων Κρονος, ως διαιρετικος θεος, χωριζει την εαυτου βασιλειαν απο της του Ουρανου, ως δε νους καθαρος, εξηρηται της εις την υλην ποιησεως· διο και το δημιουργικον γενος παλιν επ' αυτου διακρινεται.* In the last line of this sentence, my Ms. for *επ' αυτου*, has rightly *απ' αυτου*: for the demiurgic genus of which Jupiter is the summit, is separated from Saturn. P. 70. l. 3. from the bottom: *ουδε γαρ δι' ονοματων γνωριζεσθαι πεφυκασιν, αλλα και οι θεολογοι πορωθεν αυτο σημαινουσι, και της των φαινομενων προς εκεινα αναλογιας.* In this passage, for *αυτο*, it is necessary to read *αυτα*, and for *της των φαινομενων*, the sense requires *δια της των φαινομενων*. For Proclus is here speaking of the natures prior to the intellectual Heaven (*τα προ του Ουρανου*), of which he had before asserted that they can only be indicated through analogy, the boundary of them alone, i. e. Phanes, being excepted.

T.

¹ See the second hypothesis in the *Parmenides* of Plato, where both these orders are unfolded by dialectic epithets, as Proclus most satisfactorily demonstrates in his *Commentary* on the *Parmenides*.

ladder in something similar at the Cave of Trophonius), was raised by pulleys, supported by beams, fixed in those holes to the door of the Vestibule.

Observations on the Excerpta from the SCHOLIA of PROCLUS on the CRATYLUS OF PLATO, published by PROFESSOR BOISSONADE; Lipsiæ, 1820.

PART II.—[Continued from No. LIX.]

P. 72. l. 12. Οτι του περι θεων λογου τριττου οντος, του μεν φανταστικου, οιος ην ο Ευθυφρων μαχας και επιβουλας θεων αλογως φανταζομενος, του δ' επιστημονικου, οιος ην Σωκρατης, του δε δοξαστικου μεταξυ τούτων, οστις και απο της δοξης του ονοματοθετου επι τας ουσιας των θεων επιστημονικως ανεισι και εχει τινα και προς τον οησισιφον Ευθυφρονα φανταστικην κοινωριαν' κ. τ. λ. Thus also my Ms.; but for επιστημονικως, in the latter part of this passage, it is requisite to read ανεπιστημονικως. For Proclus here asserts, that the conception of Euthyphron, concerning the gods (see Plato's Euthyphron), was phantastic, or entirely derived from imagination; but that of Socrates scientific; and that the conception which subsists between these two is *doxastic*, or characterised by opinion. He adds; that this conception ascends from the opinion of the founder of names to the essences of the gods; but that the ascent is *unscientific*, and possesses a certain phantastic agreement with the false opinion of wisdom with which Euthyphron was inflated.

P. 74. l. 8 from the bottom: Αλλα πως εσθ' οτε μεν θεοι θνηταις λεγονται μιγυσθαι, εσθ' οτε δε θεοις θνηται; η η μεν των θεων προς θεας κοινωρια θεους υφιστησιν η δαιμονας αιδιους; In this passage my Ms., for the last word αιδιους, has rightly αιδιως. For Proclus is here speaking of *dæmons*, κατ' ουσιαν, and not of those that subsist, κατα σχεσιν. But all *essential*, are *perpetual*, *dæmons*, according to the Orphic and Platonic theology. What Proclus, therefore, says in this place, will be, in English: "How, at one time, are gods said to have connexion with mortal females, and at another time, mortal females with gods? Is it not because the communion of gods with goddesses gives subsistence *perpetually* to gods or *dæmons*?" After which, he admirably explains

the manner in which heroes among men are, at one time, said to have a god for their father, and at another, a goddess for their mother. In p. 80. l. 7. Proclus, speaking of the genera posterior to the gods, which consist, according to the Grecian theology, of angels, dæmons, and heroes, says, *τουτων δε τα μεν αγγελικα προσαγορευουσιν οι τα θεια δεινοι, κατ' αυτην την υπαρξιν των θεων ισταμενα και το ενοειδες της φυσικης συμμετρον ποιουντα τοις δευτεροις.* In this passage, for *το ενοειδες της φυσικης*, which my Ms. also has, it is necessary to read *το ενοειδες της θειας φυσικης*. For Proclus says, "that with respect to the genera superior to man, those that are skilled in divine concerns denominate one kind angelic, which is established according to the *hyparxis*, or essence itself, of the gods, and makes that, which is characterised by unity in a *divine* nature, to be commensurate to things which have a secondary subsistence." P. 84. l. 2. η δ' *Ηρα την προδον και τον εις τα δευτερα πολλαπλασιασμον ενδιδωσι, και εστι ζωοποιος πηγη των λογων, και των γονιμων δυναμειων μητηρ.* Here, for *των λογων*, my Ms. has rightly *των ολων*. For, as Proclus immediately after observes, Juno is *μητρικως οσα ο Ζευς πατρικως*. But Jupiter is the demiurgus of wholes (*δημιουργος των ολων*), i. e. he is the *father* and fabricator of wholes, and therefore Juno is the *vivific* fountain of wholes. P. 85. l. 7 from the bottom, *περι δε της ζωογονου πηγης Ρεας, εξ ης πασα ζωη θειατε και νοερα και ψυχικη και εγκοσμιοσ απογεννεται, ουτως φασιν τα λογια*

*Ρειη τοι νοερων Μακαρων πηγη τε ρη τε.
Παντων γαρ πρωτη δυναμει κολποισιν αφραστοισ
Δεξαμενη γενεην, επι παν προχρει τροχουσαν.*

On this Chaldean oracle the Professor observes: "*Hinc sumsit Taylorus, et inseruit Collectioni Oraculorum Chald. t. 17. p. 246. Ephem. Class. Taylorus δυναμεις scripsit.*" I substituted in this oracle *δυναμεις* for *δυναμει*, not from having found it in my Ms.; for this has *δυναμει*; but because it appeared to me that this alteration was requisite. For Proclus immediately after adds: *Και γαρ την της ζωης απασης απειρον χυσιν υφιστησιν η θεος αυτη, και τας ανεκλειπτους απασας δυναμεις.* P. 86. l. 17. *η δε Τηθυς την μονην εντιθησι τοις υπο του Ωκεανου κινουμενοις, και την εδραιοτητα παρεχεται τοις διεγειρομενοις υπ' εκεινου εις την απογεννησιν των δευτερων, και την καθαροτητα της ουσιας τοις ακμαιωσ παντα παραγειν εφισμενοις, κ. τ. λ.* In this passage, for *ακμαιωσ* my Ms. has *αενναωσ*, which, as Tethys is a *fontal* deity, is doubtless the true reading.

P. 92. l. 10 from the bottom, *Οτι και τους δια τον εκ της γης*

πλουτον των δια των καρπων και των μεταλλων αναλυοντας τον Πλου-
 τωνα και ουτως εκλαμβανομενους αποδεχεται ο θειος Προκλος. This
 is also the reading of my Ms., but it is evidently erroneous.
 For in the same page, l. 6, it is said, Οτι κακως τινας αναλυοντας
 το μεν του Πλουτανος ονομα εις τον εκ της γης πλουτον δια τε τους
 καρπους και τα μεταλλα. According to Proclus, therefore, some
 badly analyse the name of Pluto into wealth, produced from the
 earth through fruits and metals. Hence in the above passage,
 for αποδεχεται ο θειος Προκλος, it is necessary to read ουχ αποδεχε-
 ται, κ. τ. λ. P. 93. l. 15. Οτι τω ερωτι των θεων και τω βουλευ-
 ματι αυτων συντρεχει η αναγκη αυτων, προς ην ουδε θεος μαχεται.
 Here, for βουλευματι my Ms. has βουληματι, which is doubtless
 the true reading; and I am much surprised that the very learned
 Professor did not perceive the necessity of this emendation, be-
 cause he observes in a Note on this passage: "Locus similis
 est Procli in Tim. i. θεια αναγκη συντρεχει τη θεια βουλησει. P.
 97. l. 7 from the bottom, και γαρ τροφη το νοητον εστι, κατα το
 λογιον, ταις νοεραις διακοσμησεσι των θεων. On this passage the
 learned Professor observes: "Taylor hinc sumsit in Collectione
 Oracul. Chaldaic. t. 17. p. 133. Class. Ephemeridis Valpyanae:
 sed Codicum non videtur sequi diligenter. Contulit vir doctiss.
 opportune Hesych. in Νοερον." The oracle which the Professor
 here alludes to, and which is to be found in my Collection of
 Chaldean oracles, in the Classical Journal, was not derived from
 these Scholia of Proclus, but from the Chaldean oracles first
 published by Patricius, and afterwards by Stanley and Joannes
 Clericus; and this oracle, according to them, is

Τροφη δε τω νοουντι το νοητον.

What Proclus says has the same meaning; but he does not
 quote the oracle literally. P. 101. Η δε φερεφαττα κατα μεν την
 της γενεσεως επαφην τη δευτερα αρμοζει, κατα δε την σοφιαν και την
 γνωμην τη τριτη. This also is the reading of my Ms.; but it ap-
 pears to me that after τη δευτερα the word αρχη is wanting, and
 this αρχη is ψυχικη αρχη. In like manner, by τη τριτη the prin-
 ciple of virtue is implied. This is evident from what Proclus
 says of Κορη, in p. 100. l. 14. Και κατα μεν την υπαρξιν την υπερ-
 ανευχουσαν των αλλων δυναμεων του ζωογονου τουτου τριπλου διακοσ-
 μου, ιδρυται η της Εκατης αρχη, κατα δε την μεσην δυναμιν και γεν-
 ηητικην των ολων η ψυχικη, κατα δε την νοεραν επιστροφην η της
 αρετης. P. 103. l. 8. Proclus, speaking of Apollo, says, Ρητεον
 ου, οτι πασαι μεν αι του θεου τουτου ενεργειαι εν πασαις εισι ταις των
 οντων διακοσμησεσιν, ανωθεν αρχομεναι εως των τελευταιων, αλλαι δε

εν αλλαις δεκουσι μαλλον ἢ ἦττον επικρατειν' οιον η μεν ιατρικη του
θεου μαλλον εν τοις υπο σεληνην,

Ενθα κοτος τε φονος τε και αλλων ενθεα κηρων
Λυχμηραι τε νοσοι και σηψεις, εργα τε ρευστα'

On this passage the Professor remarks as follows: "Ap. Werfer. *ibid.* p. 143. ab *Ρητεον* ad *ρευστα*. Versus esse putat Orphei: non velim id negare. Forte tamen petita sunt ex Oraculo." Both Werfer, however, and the learned Professor are mistaken with respect to the source whence the verses were derived. For they are neither Orphic, nor part of an oracle, but the author of them is Empedocles, as is evident from Hierocles, in *Aur. Carm.* p. 186. *Cantab.* 1709. For he there says: *Κατεισι γαρ και αποπιπτει της ευδαιμονος χωρας ο ανθρωπος, ως Εμπεδοκλης φησιν ο Πυθαγορειος,*

———— φυγας θεθεν, και αλητης
Νεικει μαινομενω πισυνος. ————

Ανεισι δε, και την αρχαιαν εξιν απολαμβάνει, ει φυγοι τα περι γην, και τον ——— ατερπεα χωρον, ως αυτος λεγει,

Ενθα φονος τε κοτος τε και αλλων ενθεα κηρων.

As the first of the above lines, therefore, is from Empedocles, there can be no doubt that the second also is from the same poet.

P. 103. l. 21. Proclus, speaking of the power of Apollo in the heavens, says, *η δε ιατρικη εν τω ουρανῳ' εκει γαρ μαλιστα η εκφαντορικη του θεου δυναμις διαλαμπει, τα νοητα αγαθα τοις ανθρωποις εκφαινουσα*. In this passage my Ms., for *ιατρικη*, has rightly *μαντικη*, and *ουρανοις* for *ανθρωποις*. That *μαντικη* indeed is the true reading, is evident from this, that in l. 6 of the same page, Proclus says that Socrates, *απο της ιατρικης αρξαμενος και δια της μαντικης και τοξικης διελθων εις την μουσικην κατεληξεν*. But Proclus had a little before observed that the *medicinal* power of Apollo is principally apparent in the sublunary region. And in what follows the above passage, he shows that the *arrow-darting* power of the god is displayed among the *liberated* gods; but his *harmonic* power, among the *supermundane*, or *ruling* gods. His *prophetic* power, therefore, is principally exerted in the *heavens*, in which Proclus adds, "he unfolds into light intelligible good to celestial natures." P. 106. l. 1. *Οτι την καθαρισμην μονον επι της ιατρικης οραν, αλλα και επι της μαντικης δεικνυσιν, οτι γενικως η καθαρτικη του Απολλωνος δυναμις περιεχει τας δυο.*

Here, for γενικως, which is also the reading of my Ms., it appears to me to be requisite to read ενικως, or rather ενιαιος, the latter of which words is very frequently used by Proclus. P. 107. l. 6. Proclus, still speaking of Apollo, says: *Ενωτικος ουν υπαρχων και ταυτη προς τους εγκοσμιους θεους αναλογον ταγαθω τεταμενος, κ. τ. λ.* Here, for τεταμενος, my Ms. has rightly τεταγμενος. For Apollo, according to Plato, in the 6th book of his Republic, has an arrangement in the sensible, analogous to that of the good in the intelligible world. P. 109. l. 5 from the bottom, Proclus, speaking of Latona, says, *αλλα και ταις ψυχαις την της αρετης' τελεσιουργιαν ενδιδωσι, και την ελλαμψιν την αναγουςαν αυτας εις το νοερον του πατρος, των τε σχολιων ατραπων της υλης αναρπαζουσα και της πολυπλοκου κακιας, και της εν τη γενεσει τραχυτητος, προς α μοι δοκουσι και οι θεολογοι λεγοντες Αητω προτειπειν αυτην, δια τε το λειον του ηδους ποριζειν ταις ψυχαις και το της εκουσιου ζωης παρεκτικον, και της θειας ραστωσης χορηγον.* In this passage, for λεγοντες, which my Ms. also has, I read βλεποντες, a word frequently used by Proclus when speaking of Plato, or the ancient theologists. P. 111. l. 7 from the bottom. In this place Proclus, speaking of Diana, says: *Και γαρ εκεινη το παρθενιον ου προΐησιν, ως φησι το λογιον' νοουσα δ' εκεινην υφιστησιν και την αρχικην αρετην, και εξηρηται πασης κοινωνιας και συζευξεως, και της κατα την γενεσιν προδου.* Here, for νοουσα, my Ms. has rightly μενουσα. For Proclus, in this passage, says, "that Diana does not emit her virginal nature, but abiding in it, gives subsistence to ruling virtue, and is exempt from all communication and conjunction with a progression which subsists according to generation." And that this is the true reading, is evident from what Proclus immediately after adds: *οθεν δε και η Κορη κατα μεν την Αρτεμιν την εν εαυτη και την Αθηναν, παρθενος λεγεται μενειν. i. e.* "Whence also Core, according to the Diana and Minerva, which she contains in herself, is said to remain a virgin." P. 112. l. 5 from the bottom, *επει και την Αρτεμιν Εκατην Ορφευς κεκληκεν,*

*Η δ' αρα δι Εκατη παιδος μελη αυθι λιπουσα
Αητους ευπλοκαμοιο κορη προσεβησατ' Ολυμπον.*

These two Orphic lines are quoted by Gyraldus in Syntag. p. 360; but the first line is with him,

Η δ' αρα Εκατη παιδος μελη αυθι λυκουσα.

P. 115. l. 1 from the bottom: *Γεννασθαι μεν ουν την πρατιστην Αφροδιτην φασιν απο διττων αιτιων, του μεν ως δι ου, του δε ως γεννητικου τον μεν γαρ Κρονον αυτης, ως το δι ου τη προοδη συνεργειν, ως την γοιμον δυναμιν του πατρος καλουμενον, και εις τους νοερους διακοσμους*

εκδιδόντα, κ. τ. λ. Here, for *καλουμενον*, which my Ms. also has, Werfer substitutes from conjecture *κληρουμενον*, and the Professor says, "ad sensum bene." The true reading, however, is *πρακαλουμενον*, a word much used by Proclus, and in this place peculiarly apposite. "For Venus calls forth the prolific power of her father Saturn, and imparts it to the intellectual orders." In p. 117. l. 3. Proclus, speaking of the supermundane Venus, the offspring of Heaven, and of the mundane, the offspring of Dione, says: *Η μὲν γὰρ ἐκ τοῦ Οὐρανοῦ υπερκοσμῖος ἐστίν, καὶ ἀναγωγὸς ἐπὶ τὸ νοητὸν κάλλος, καὶ ἀχραντοῦ ζωῆς χορηγὸς, καὶ γενεσεως χωριζει· ἡ δὲ διαίωνα ἐπιτροπεύει πάσας τὰς ἐν τῷ οὐρανοῦ κόσμῳ καὶ γῆ συστοιχείας, κ. τ. λ.* In a note on this passage, the Professor observes: "Creuzer. legendum monet *Διωναια*." And this is doubtless the true reading: for Proclus, in the latter part of this extract, is speaking of the Venus who is the offspring of Dione. My Ms. has erroneously *διαίωνα*, as well as that of the Professor; but in the Notes to my Pausanias, published in 1794, I substituted *Διωναια* for *διαίωνα*, in the translation which I have there given of all that is said by Proclus in this place concerning Venus. P. 118. l. 4 from the bottom: *μειμικται γὰρ φησὶν ὁ Τιμαῖος τὸ παν ἐκ νοῦ καὶ ἀναγκῆς, πειδομένης τῷ νοῦ τῆς ἀναγκῆς, καὶ τῶν ἐνυλῶν παντῶν αἰτιῶν ὑπεσταλμένων πρὸς τὴν βούλησιν τοῦ πατρὸς.* In a Note on the word *Τιμαῖος*, in this passage, the Professor refers the reader to "*Timæus de An. Mundi*, l. 1." But Proclus, in this extract, quotes the *Timæus* of Plato, and not the book of *Timæus*, the Locrian de *Anima Mundi*. For the following are the words of Plato, to which Proclus alludes: *μειμιγμένη γὰρ οὐδ' ἡ τοῦδε τοῦ κόσμου γενεσις ἐξ ἀναγκῆς τε καὶ νοῦ συστάσεως ἐγένηθη. νοῦ δὲ ἀναγκῆς ἀρχόντος τῷ πείθειν αὐτὴν τῶν γιγνομένων τὰ πλείστα ἐπὶ τὸ βελτιστὸν ἀγεῖν, κ. τ. λ.* P. 119. l. 10. Proclus, speaking of *Minerva*, says: *διὸ καὶ Νίκη προσηγορεῖται καὶ Ἑγεία, τὸν μὲν νοῦν κρατεῖν ποιοῦσα τῆς ἀναγκῆς, καὶ τὸ εἶδος τῆς ὑλῆς, ὅλον δ' αἰεὶ καὶ τελεῖον καὶ ἀγῆρων καὶ ἀνοσον διαφυλαττοῦσα τὸ κόν. οἰκειὸν οὖν τῆς θεοῦ ταύτης καὶ τὸ ἀναγεῖν καὶ μερίζειν, καὶ διὰ τῆς νοεράς χορείας συναπτὴν τοῖς θεοῖσι, καὶ ἐνιδρύειν καὶ φρουρεῖν ἐν * * * ** In this passage, for *τὸ κόν*, which is evidently defective, my Ms. has *τὸ κακόν*; but the true reading is undoubtedly *τὸν κόσμον*. For Proclus, in what he here says, alludes to the following words of Plato in the *Timæus*, respecting the fabrication of *the world*: *διὰ δὲ τὴν αἰτίαν καὶ τὸν λογισμὸν τὸν δὲ, ἐν ὅλον ἐξ ἀπαντῶν τελῶν καὶ ἀγῆρων καὶ ἀνοσον αὐτὸν [i. e. τὸν κόσμον] ἐκτῆνατο.* In all the editions of Plato's works, however, there is a very erroneous omission in this passage. For from the text of Proclus (in *Tim.*), and also from

what Plato previously says, instead of *εν όλων εξ απαντων*, it is necessary to read *εν όλον εξ όλων απαντων*. And then the passage will be, in English: "Through this cause, and from this reasoning process, he [i. e. the Demiurgus] fashioned the world one perfect whole, consisting of all wholes, exempt from age, and free from disease. In the latter part of the above passage also, after the word *μεριζειν*, it is necessary either to add, or conceive to be implied, *τα δευτερα*. And after the words *φρουρειν εν* * * * *, my Ms. has *αυτοις*, which renders the sense of the whole passage complete, and terminates the Scholia.

T.

NOTICE OF
BAGSTER'S *SCRIPTURE HARMONY*.
1823. 8vo. pp. 773.

THE value of Concordances, of either kind, is universally acknowledged: of those to the language of Scripture, Cruden's is the foundation, and the most copious, and Bellamy's the most defective: of those to parallel passages there is none better than the one before us, which combines several important particulars.

1. The chronology of Scripture, in which Blaney is followed, his being deemed the best for general use.

2. The Various Readings, in which a judicious method is used; the words of the text are printed at length, and the Various Readings follow in a different type, so that the unlearned reader may satisfy himself as to the sense of difficult passages.

3. The References are selected from the most approved authors, (Canne, Brown, Scott, &c.) and amount to half a million: "the verse of the chapter under illustration is first marked; then follow the parallel passages in the book itself in which the chapter stands; afterwards, the References are placed regularly in the order of the books of Scripture. Perhaps this comprehensive plan may occasionally admit the introduction of a text not strictly appropriate: but the intentions of authors are so varied in their choice of texts, that none should be rejected without first allowing it to dwell a moment on the mind, and per-