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 Mandchou 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 genuflexions 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 PLATÔ, published by PROFESSOR BOISSONADE; Lipsiae, 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 corphæus 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. 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. Ην υπερτερον τον αριθμόν τον νοητόν διακοσμούν τον περιεχόντα το σημείον των νοερών ειδών' εκεί γαρ ο πρωτός και κυρίως αριθμός 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 superressential.

P. 22. 1. 20. εκεί καί ο ολος δημιουργος κατ' αυτον (i. e. Τιμαιον) πρωτοτος εστιν οοματουργος: αυτος ουν εστιν, ως ο Τιμαιος λεγει, ο την μειν των περιφορων αυτου, την δε βατευν οροσραισας. Here, for αυτον my Ms. has rightly ταυτου. For Proclus here alludes to what is said in the Timeaus of Plato, about the circle of the same, and the circle of the different, the former being in soul the diastic, or ratiocinative power, and the latter the doxastic power, or that which is characterised by opinion.

P. 27. 1. 15. Αι γαρ ουρανοι περιοδοι αλλοις αλλα αποσπηρουσι, και αλλοτε αλλα παραγουσι, και εν το οκ παντων λεγμα συντελουν 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 Saturniun; but the other is providential, and suspended from Jupiter. Διο κατ' τον παντι διται ανακυλησεις, η μεν ανακυ- γος και Κρονια, η δε προνοια αν και του Διος εργητημεν. He

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: Ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ Πλάτων τοὺς εἰς Κρόνου εὐδαι-
μονας ξανατα καὶ τοῦ θεοῦ προφίμους, κατὰ τὴν διαλεκτικὴν φύσιν
αναγεννήσας αλλήλοις—τοὺς δὲ τὸν θεόν βιον ενακυκλούντας τῆς νομο-
θετικῆς δεδομένης, κ. τ. λ. In the latter part of this extract, for
θεον, my Ms. has βιον, and very properly. For it is the θεόν
life which is here alluded to. P. 33. l. 20. Πάντα γὰρ υφιστα-
νότας οἱ πάτερες τῶν οὐρανῶν συνθῆκατα καὶ ἤχη πασίν εὐπαρκείαν τῆς
εαυτῶν τριάδικης υποστάσεως. Εἰκεί καὶ η̂ φυσὶς τῶν σωμάτων έντι-
θησά τις οἰκείας ἁρμονίας, δι οὗ καὶ κινεῖ τὰ σώματα, κ. τ. λ.
Here, for Εἰκεί, my Ms. has Εἰκεί, and rightly. For what
Proclus says, is in English as follows: “For the fathers of
wholes, 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. Εἰς τὸ
οὐ παν τοῦ θεοῦ γενοῦς οὐγομαστον. ο μὲν γὰρ επεκεῖνα τῶν οὐρα-
νων οὕτως ἡμῖν, καὶ ο Παρμενίδης ημᾶς έπεμψεν οὔτε γαρ οὐγομᾶτα
αὐτοῦ, φυσὶς, οὔτε λογος οὕτως οὐδὲς. In this passage, for φυσιν,
my Ms. has φυσιν, which is the true reading; for Proclus here
 cites the very words of Plato in the Parmenides, respecting τὸ

the one, or the supreme principle of all things. For Plato
says, at the conclusion of the first hypothesis of that dialogue:
Οὐδὲ αὐτῶν οὐδὲς φυσιν, οὐδὲ λογος, οὐδὲ τύχη, οὐδὲ αἰσθήσις,
οὔτε δόξα.

P. 50. l. 12. Καὶ γὰρ αἱ φυσὶς, διὰ τὰς πρὸς τοὺς αἰσθητοὺς 
συντα-
ξιῶς μετοχοί γίνονται τῆς αἰσθητικῆς, καὶ τὰ σώματα αὐτῶν αὑτὸ 
σωρό-
ματων υποστήν πονηρών, καὶ τὰ εὑρὼς εξημαρτημένων ελάβε τὴν 
ἀρχήν.
Here, for εξημαρτημένων, which is also the reading of my Ms.,
it appears to me to be necessary to read εξημαρτημένων. 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. Τρίχως αρια
πατήρ ὁ Ζεὺς, θεόν, ψυχον, μαρακιαν ψυχουν, νοερον καὶ διον ελλομανω
βιον. In this passage, the punctuation being erroneous, alters
its real meaning; but in my Ms. the punctuation is correct, and
is as follows: Τρίχως αρια πατήρ ὁ Ζεὺς, θεόν, ψυχον μαρακιαν,

Among these fathers, according to the Platonic, which is the same
with the Orphic theology, Jupiter ranks; who is therefore called by
Plato, δημιουργός τῶν ὀλῶν, 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.
On Prof. Boissonade's Proclus

"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 ἐκεῖνοι μερικοὶ, the words καὶ εἰκοσιοίοιοι are wanting, in order to render the meaning of Proclus more complete. P. 57. 1. 9. Proclus, speaking of Jupiter, says, καὶ γαρ διττοὶς υφισταίται διακοσμοῖς, τὸν τε οὐρανόν, καὶ τὸν υπορανόν. But here, for υπορανόν, my Ms. has, rightly, υπερορανόν, as is evident from what immediately follows: οὖν αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸ σκηνέρον εἶναι φησίν τὸ θεολόγος.

πνευμα καὶ εἰκοσι μεταγενήσιον, ἐς διττοὶς ἀρχοντος διοδοκεδόν. 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 Platonist 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 viofies; and the fourth harmonises the world.

P. 59. 1. 6. Αἰα τι ὦν εἰ καὶ ὑπεριστικόν ἦν το τοιοῦτον οὐσια, [subintell. τοι Κρονο] οὐκ ἐυφήμεα καὶ πρεποῦση θεοῖς συγγ αὐτῷ παράδοσιν; ἦ στι τῆς βασιλικῆς τῶν θεῶν σφαίρας αἰχμολειν ἐκ τοῦ Φαντος, καταγονής δ' εἰς τὸν δεξιότομον λειμ. τον Διονυσον, κ. τ. λ. On the word σφαίρας 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, Οὐρανος, Κρονος, Ζως, 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 ενων διενεμε τοις, θυτοις δε κοσμον
Ου πρωτος βασιλεως περικλυτος Ηρικεπαιος.¹

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

Σκεπτρον εγου’ en χεραν Ηρικεπαιου’

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

Ος πρωτος βασιλεως 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 Orpheus 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. Ἀλλ’ οταν μεν ο Κρονος νους λεγηται, διανοιας επεχει ταξιν ο Ζευς, οταν δ’ αυ Κρονος διανοια, παντως που προς αλλον τινα νουν υπερτερων κατ’ αναλογιαν φησομεν ουτως καλειται. Ειτ’ ουν τον νοη- τον και κρισιον νουν λεγειν εθελοις, ειτε τον εκφαντορικον, ειτε τον συνεκτικον, ειτε τον τελειουργον, ειται αυ ο Κρονος διανοια προς τουτοις απαν- τας. Ον τον παρεδειγματικας, της διανοιας αποταμιας, ενσυνεκτοχας της Θεως, εντελονον δε νους της θουρανιας ασις.

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, τελειουργον δε νους η θουρανιας ασις.

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 Timaeus.

P. 62. l. 11. Proclus unfolding what Plato says of Saturn, observes: Ταυτην τοινυν την μεριστην αυτου και αμεθηκτον

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.
On Prof. Boissonade’s Proclus

ὅσα μὲν ἡ καθαρότης εὑρίσκεται. Here, for μετρητή, which my Ms. also has, it is necessary to read αμετρητή. This is evident from what immediately follows: τὸ γὰρ αὐτοῦ τῆς υλῆς, καὶ τὸ αμετρήτον, καὶ τὸ αὐχετόν διὰ τοῦ καθαροῦ σημαντεῖ. The whole, therefore, of this sentence thus connected, will be in English: “Purity, therefore, indicates the invisible transcend-ency of Saturn, and which is incapable of being participated. For the not coming into contact with matter, the invisible, and the unrestrained, are signified by purity.” P. 66. 1. 3 from the bottom: Καὶ δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ Ουρανός πωτὰ μὲν τὰ διευτα χιωρ 

τῶν οἰκείων αγαθῶν, ποιῶν δὲ φρονεῖι ταῖς ακραίωταται ἐναυτοῦ ὑπονοίας, καὶ τὰς αἰσθανόμενα συνεχεῖς αὐτῷ περισότερον συνεχεῖς καὶ φορεῖν αἰσθητικῶν ποτης. In this passage, for αἰσθητικῶν my Ms. has αἰσθιας, 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. 1. 7. καὶ τον Ουρανόν ο Σωκράτης [σχαρακτητεν] 

το οραν τα ανω, δηλαδη τον υπερουρανον τοτου, και σος τι θεοθρεμμομεν σιγγς. In this passage, the very learned Professor observes, “Verba theodreymoun σιγγς habet ex hymno aliquo, vel oraculo.” The Professor is right in the latter part of his conjecture: for the words θεοθρεμμοι σιγγς are derived from a Chaldean Oracle, which is to be found under the head of Πατης και Νους in Stanley’s collection of these oracles, and which is as follows:

Μηδε προηλθεν, αλλ’ εμενεν εν τω πατρικῳ βουθα 

Και εν τη αυτῳ κακα την θεοθρεμμονα 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. 1. 10. ὁσπερ ουν ο Παρμενιδῆς δια της ολοτης εκετεραν 

tων ταξεων τουτων εσημανεν, την μεν δια της νοητης, την δε δια της νοηρας, ουτως αρα και δια της προς τα κρειττονα στραφης ὁ τε Τιμαιος 

καὶ ο Σωκρατης αυτον εκφαινουσιν. αλλ’ η στροφη διαφορος ὁσπερ 

καὶ η ολοτης’ νοητη μεν γαρ η του αιωνος διοτερ εκεινον ουκ οραν ειπε 

το προς εαυτον νοητον ο Τιμαιος, αλλα μενει σταθερας μονων νορα δ’ 

η του ουρανου, και δια τουτο φησιν αυτον ο Σωκρατης οριζεν τα ανω, x.

---

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.
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τ. λ. Here, for αὐτον, after καὶ ο Σωκρατῆς, my Ms. has αυτό, but the true reading is αὐτός. In like manner for πρὸς αὐτόν νομοσ ὁ Τιμαῖος, which also my Ms. has, it is necessary to read πρὸ σαν τοῦ, x. τ. λ. For Proclus is here speaking of those two great ὀλοθρήσκες, 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, the one [i. e. Eternity] through intelligible, but the other [i. e. Heaven] through intellectual wholeness; thus, also, both Timaeus 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, Timaeus [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. ὁ τοινυ Κρονος, ὁς διαμετάκτω ότος, κωρίζει τὴν ἐναυτοῦ βασιλείαν ἀπὸ τῆς τοῦ Οὐρανοῦ, ὡς δὲ νοῦς καθαρός, ἐξερρήται τῆς εἰς τὴν υλὴν ποιηματικοῦ διὸ καὶ τὸ δημιουργικὸν γενός παλιν επ’ αὐτοῦ διακρίνεται. In the last line of this sentence, my Ms. for επ’ αὐτοῦ, has rightly απ’ αὐτοῦ: for the demiurgic genus of which Jupiter is the summit, is separated from Saturn. P. 70. l. 3. from the bottom: οὐδὲ γαρ δ’ ὀνοματων γνωρίζεται περικεφαλήν, αλλὰ καὶ οἱ θεολογοὶ πορεόθεν αὐτο σκηνούσι, καὶ τῆς τῶν φαινομένων πρὸς ἐκείνα αναλογίας. In this passage, for αὐτό, it is necessary to read αὐτά, and for τῶν φαινομένων, the sense requires διὰ τῆς τῶν φαινομένων. For Proclus is here speaking of the natures prior to the intellectual Heaven (τα πρὸ τοῦ Οὐρανοῦ), 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.
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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.
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PART II.—[Continued from No. LIX.]

P. 72. l. 12. Οτι του πειρ θεων λογου τριττου οντος, του μεν φανταστικου, οιος ην ο Ευθυφρον μαχας και επιζουλας θεων αλογας φανταξομενος, του δε επιστημονικου, οιος ην Σακρατης, του δε δοξαστικου μεταξυ τουτων, ουτις και απο της δοξης του ουροματοδευτου επι τας ουσιας των θεων επιστημονικας ανειει και οις τινα και προς τον οινοσισιφον Ευθυφρονα φανταστικην κοιναν αν τ. λ. Thus also my Ms.; but for επιστημονικως, in the latter part of this passage, it is requisite to read ανειεισι μενα. 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: Ἀλλα πως εσθ’ οτε μὲν θεων θυταις λεγονται μιγνουσαι, εσθ’ οτι δε θεως θυται; γη μεν των θεων προσ θεας κοιναν θεως υφιστασιν γη δαιμονιας αιδιους; In this passage my Ms., for the last word αιδιους, has rightly αιδος. For Proclus is here speaking of daemons, κατ’ ουσιαν, and not of those that subsist, κατα σχεσιν. But all essential, are perpetual, daemons, 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 daemons?” 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, demons, and heroes, says, touton de ta μεν αγγελία προσαγωρεύουσιν οι τα θεια δεινοι, κατ' αυτην την υπαρξιν των θεων ισταμενα και το ενοείδες της φυσεως συμμετοχην στηνουτα τοις δευτεροις. In this passage, for το ενοείδες της φυσεως, which my Ms. also has, it is necessary to read το ενοείδες της θειας φυσεως. 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' Ήρα την προοδον και τον εις τα δευτερα πολλαπλασιασαμον ενδιωσα, και εστι ζωοποιος πηγη των λογων, και των γονιων δυναμεων μητης. Here, for των λογων, my Ms. has rightly των ολων. For, as Proclus immediately after observes, Τυνο is μητηρικος οσα ο Ζεως πατρικος. But Jupiter is the demiurgus of wholes (δημιουργος των ολων), i.e. he is the father and fabricator of wholes, and therefore Τυνο is the vivific fountain of wholes. P. 85. l. 7 from the bottom, περι δε της ζωογονου πηγης Ρειας, εξ ης πασα ζωη θειατε και νοερα και ψυχικη και σχοσμιος απογενεσται, ουτως φασιν τα λογια:

Ρειη τοι νοερων Μακαρων πηγη τε ροη τε.
Παντων γαρ πρωτη δυναμει κολποσιν αφρατοις
Δεξαμενη γενεν, επι παν προχει τροχαουσαν.

On this Chaldean oracle the Professor observes: "Hinc summis Tylorius, et inseruit Collectioni Oraculorum Chalda. t. 17. p. 246. Ephem. Class. Tylorius dvnmeis scripsit." I substituted in this oracle dvnmeis for dvnami, not from having found it in my Ms.; for this has dvnami; but because it appeared to me that this alteration was requisite. For Proclus immediately after adds: Και γαρ την της ζωης απασης απειρου χωσιν υφιστησιν η θεια αυτη, και τας ανεκλειστους απασας δυναμεις." P. 86. l. 17. η δε Τηθως την μονην εντιθησι τοις υπ' του Γκεαυου χιομουμενως, και την εδραιωτητα παρεχεται τοις διεγειρομενωις υπ' εκεινου εις την απογενεσιν των δευτερων, και την καθαρητητα της ουσιας των ακμων παντα παραγειν εφικεμενοις, κ. τ. λ. In this passage, for ακμων my Ms. has ακμωως, which, as Tethys is a fental deity, is doubtless the true reading.

P. 92. l. 10 from the bottom, Οτι και τους δια τον εκ της γης
on the Cratylus of Plato.

Πλούτος τού δια τών καρπών καὶ τών μεταλλῶν αναλυομένας τον Πλούτονα καὶ οὕτως ἐκλαμβανομένους αποδεχεται ο θεὸς Προκλος. This is also the reading of my Ms., but it is evidently erroneous. For in the same page, l. 6, it is said, Οἵ τινας αἰσθήσεως απαθετεῖ το μεν τοῦ Πλούτου οὐσία εἰς τὴν μὲν καρπῶν δια τοὺς καρποὺς καὶ 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 απαθετεῖ ο θεὸς Προκλος, it is necessary to read ὅνως απαθετεῖ ται, κ. τ. λ. Ρ. 93. l. 15. Οτι τοι θεσὶ τῶν θεῶν καὶ το βουλήματι αὐτῶν συντρέχει η αναγκή αὐτῶν, πρὸς την οὐδὲ θεὸς μαχεται. Here, for βουληματι 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, because he observes in a Note on this passage: "Locus simplis est Procli in Tim. i. θεῖα αναγκή συντρέχει τη θεῖα βουλησει. Ρ. 97. l. 7 from the bottom, καὶ γαρ τροφή το νοστον εστί, κατα το λογίον, ταϊς νοεραίς διακομησει των θεων. On this passage the learned Professor observes: "Taylor hinc sumsit in Collectione Oracula. Chaldaica. t. 17. p. 133. Class. Ephemerides Valpyanae; sed Codicum non videtur sequi diligentem. Contulit vir doctiss. opportune Hesych. in Nosov." The oracle which the Professor bere 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

Τροφή δε τω νοστοι τω νοστον.

What Proclus says has the same meaning; but he does not quote the oracle literally. Ρ. 101. Η δε φιλοσωτα κατα μεν την της γενεσις επαφη τη διενεργης αρμοζει, κατα δε την σοφιαν και την γνωσιν τη τριτη. This also is the reading of my Ms.; but it appears to me that after τη διενεργης the word αρχη is wanting, and this αρχη is ψυχη της αρχης. In like manner, by τη τριτη the princible of virtue is implied. This is evident from what Proclus says of Κόρη, in p. 100. l. 14. Και κατα μεν την υπαρξη την υπεραναχωσαν των αλλων δυναμεων του ζωογονου τουτου τριπλου διακομου, ιδιαυται η της Εκκενδος αρχης, κατα δε την μεσην δυναμει και γεγυντευν των ολων της ψυχης, κατα δε την νοεραν ειστροφην τη της αρχης. Ρ. 103. l. 8. Proclus, speaking of Apollo, says, Ετεων ου, οτι καισαι μεν αι του θεου τουτου ενεργαια ευ πασαι εις ταις των αντων διακομησεσιν, ανωθεν αρχωμεν εις των τελευταιων, αλλα δε
On Prof. Boissonade's Proclus

On this passage the Professor remarks as follows: "Ap. Werfer. ibid. p. 143. ab Ῥητοῖον ad ρευστα. Versus esse putat Orpheus: 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: Κατεισίγ γαρ και αυτόπτηται της ευδαιμόνον χορος ο ἀνθρώπος, ως Εμπεδοκλῆς φησίν ο Πυθαγόρειος,

— φυγας θεοθεν, και αλητης
Νεικεί μανινεμω πισυνος.

Ανεισι δε, και την αρχαίαν εξιν απολαμβανει, ει φυγοι τα περι γην, και τον — ατερπεα χορον, ως αυτος λεγει,

Ενθα φονος τε κοτος τε και αλλων ενθα 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 ουρανω εκει γαρ μαλιστα η εκφαινομαι τον θεου δυναμις διαλαμπει, τα νοητα αγαθα τοις ανθρωποις εκφαινουσα. In this passage my Ms., for ιατρικης, has rightly μαντικης, and ουρανως 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 κατεληθεν. But Proclus had a little before observed that the medicinal power of Apollo is principally apparent in the sublunar 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 καθαρσιν μη μονον επι της ιατρικης οραν, αλλα και επι της μαντικης δεικνυν, οτι γενικως η καθαρτικη του Απολλωνος δυναμις περιεχει τας δυο.
Here, for γενικῶς, which is also the reading of my Ms., it appears to me to be requisite to read ενίκως, or rather ενικῶς, the latter of which words is very frequently used by Proclus. P. 107. l. 6. Proclus, still speaking of Apollo, says: Ενικοῖς ουν υπαγ-χαν καὶ ταυτὴ πρὸς τοὺς εὐγοσμίους θεοὺς αναλογὸν ταχεῖαν τιταμῆ-νος, κ. τ. λ. Here, for τεταμένος, my Ms. has rightly τεταγμένος. 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, ἀλλα καὶ ταῖς ψυχαῖς τήν τῆς αρετῆς τελεσιουργίαν ενδιώσω, καὶ τὴν ελλαμψαν τὴν αναγούσαν αὐτας ἐν τοῦ νοερον τοῦ πατρός, τῶν τε σκοιλίων ατραπῶν τῆς ὀλής αναρχα-ζουσα καί τῆς πολυπλοκοῦ κακίας, καὶ τῆς εν τῇ γενεσί τραχυτητι, πρὸς α αἱ δοκοῦσι καὶ οἱ θεολογοι λεγοῦσε Λητώ προσεῖας αὐτὴν, διὰ τὸ τὸ λειον τοῦ θουον ποριζεῖν ταῖς ψυχαῖς καὶ το τῆς εκουσίου ζωῆς παρεκτικόν, καὶ τῆς θείας μακροτης χρησίν. In this passage, for λεγούσε, which my Ms. also has, I read βλέποντες, a word frequently used by Proclus when speaking of Plato, or the ancient theologians. P. 111. l. 7 from the bottom. In this place Proclus, speaking of Diana, says: Καὶ γαρ εκείνη το παρθενίον ου-προίησαν, ὡς φησι το λογιον νοοῦσα δ' εκείνην υφιστηριν καὶ την αρχι-κὴν αρετὴν, καὶ εἰρητὴν παρὰς κοινωνιας καὶ συζευγιας, καὶ της κατα-την γενεσιν προοδον. Here, for νοοῦσα, my Ms. has rightly μενου-σα. 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: ὅθεν δὲ καὶ η Κορη κατὰ μὲν τὴν Αρτέμιν τὴν εν εαυτῇ καὶ τὴν Αθηναν, παρθενοι λέγεται μενεν. 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, ετεὶ καὶ τὴν Αρτέμιν Εκατην Οψεφις κεχληκαν,

H ὅ ἀρα δι Εκατη παιδὸς μελη αυθι λιπουσα
Λητους ευπλοκαμοιο χορη προσεβησατ Ολυμπον.

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

H ὅ ἀρα Εκατη παιδὸς μελη αυθι λιπουσα.

P. 115. l. 1 from the bottom: Γεγυμασθαι μεν ουν την πρατιστην Ἀφρο-διτην φασιν απο δισεις αυτιν, του μεν ὡς δι ου, του δε ὡς γεγυμασι του μεν γαρ Κρονον αυτης, ὡς το δι ου τη προδοφ συνεγειν, ὡς την γο-νιμον δυναμιν του πατρος καλουμενον, καὶ εις τους νοργους διαξουσιους
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εὐδίδοτην, κ. τ. λ. Here, for καλουμένων, which my Ms. also has, Werfer substitutes from conjecture καλορμανόν, and the Professor says, "ad sensum bene." The true reading, however, is προκαλουμένων, a word much used by Proclus, and in this place peculiarly apposite. "For Venus calls forth the prolic power of her father Saturn, and imparts it to the intellectual orders." In p. 117. l. 3. Proclus, speaking of the supernumane Venus, the offspring of Heaven, and of the mundane, the offspring of Dione, says: Η μεν γὰρ εκ τοῦ Οὐρανοῦ ὑπερχομένος εστὶν, καὶ ἀναγκοὺς ἐπὶ τὸ νοστὸν καλλός, καὶ αὐχαριστοῦ ζώης χαρής, καὶ γένεσες χαρίς; ἢ δὲ διαιωνία εἰσπράττειν πάσας τὰς εν τῷ οὐρανῷ καὶ καὶ γῆς συντοχίας, κ. τ. λ. In a note on this passage, the Professor observes: "Creuzer. legendum monet Διαωνία." 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 διαωνία, as well as that of the Professor; but in the Notes to my Pausanias, published in 1794, I substituted Διωνία for διαιωνία, 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: μεμικταί γὰρ φησίν ο Τιμαῖος τὸ παν ἐν οὐ καὶ αἰσθητώς, πειθομένη τοῦ τοῦ τῆς ἀναγκῆς, καὶ τῶν ἐν τοῖς πάντων αὐτῶν υποταλμένοι πρὸς τὴν βουλής τοῦ πατρὸς. In a Note on the word Timeāus, in this passage, the Professor refers the reader to "Timeāus de An. Mundi, l. 1." But Proclus, in this extract, quotes the Timeāus of Plato, and not the book of Timeāus, the Locrian de Anima Mundi. For the following are the words of Plato, to which Proclus alludes: μελιγμένη γὰρ οὐν η τοῦτον καὶ καὶ γενεσες εἰς ἀναγκής τα καὶ καὶ συντάχεσις συγγενῆ; δον δὲ αἰσθητή ἀρχάγγελος τῷ πειθεῖν αὐτὴν τῶν γεγονόσεων τα πλείστα εἰπὶ τὸ βελτίστων αἰγεί, κ. τ. λ. P. 119. l. 10. Proclus, speaking of Minerva, says: διὰ καὶ Νική προσηγορεῖσαι καὶ Τιμιεία, τὸν μεν οὖν χρήσεων ποιοῦσα τῆς ἀναγκῆς, καὶ τὸ εἰδὼς τῆς υἱῆς, οἷον δὲ αἰτὶ καὶ τελείων καὶ αἰγήσον καὶ αὖσον διαφυλάττοσα το κοιν., οἰκεῖαν οὐν τῆς θεοῦ ταύτης καὶ τῷ αἰτούν καὶ μερίζει, καὶ διὰ τῆς νοσῆς χαρίας συναπτῶν τοῖς θειοτέροις, καὶ εἰνδρύει καὶ φρουρεῖν εν. ** ** **. In this passage, for το κοιν., which is evidently defective, my Ms. has to ταύτω; but the true reading is undoubtedly τόν κοινόν. For Proclus, in what he here says, alludes to the following words of Plato in the Timeāus, respecting the fabrication of the world: διὰ δέ την αἰτίαν καὶ τὸν λογισμὸν τον δε, εν οἷον εξ αἰταντον τελεον καὶ αἰγήσων καὶ αὖσον αὐτὸν [i.e. τὸν κοινόν] εκτιμάτο. 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 ευ ὅλων εξ απαντῶν, it is necessary to read εὐ ὅλων εξ ὅλων απαντῶν. 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 μεριζεῖν, it is necessary either to add, or conceive to be implied, τὰ δευτέρα. And after the words φθορέων εὐ なのです, my Ms. has αὐτοῖς, 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-