

OBSERVATIONS ON

PROFESSOR COUSIN'S Edition of the COMMENTARIES of PROCLUS on the First Alcibiades of Plato, in 2 Vols. 8vo. Paris, 1820 and 1821; and also on CREUZER'S Edition of the same COMMENTARIES, together with those of Olym-piodorus on that Dialogue, in 2 Vols. 8vo. Francof. 1820 and 1821.

No. I.

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

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

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

¹ See the Remarks on the Professor's edition of the two first books of Proclus on the Parmenides of Plato, in the preceding Number of this Journal.

of the readings of this manuscript with those from which these two very able and laudable scholars formed their editions.

In Tom. ii. p. 6. of Cousin, and p. 3. of Creuzer, we have *Διο νου μεν εστιν εν αιωνι το τελειον, κ. τ. λ.*; but for *διο* the Harleian MS. has *δια τουτο*, which I prefer, as being more conformable to the manner of Proclus. In p. 14. of Cousin, after *και που φησομεν ουτως αλλαχου δεικνυσθαι την ουσιαν ημων ητις εστιν*; the words, *που δε τον ανθρωπον εξητησθαι και την ανθρωπου φυσιν*, immediately follow, and so likewise in the Harleian MS.; but they are not in the text of Creuzer, nor are they mentioned by him in his notes. In p. 9. of Creuzer, after the words, *ωσπερ ουν εν ταις τελειαις καθαρσαις ηγονται και περιρραντηρια και αγνισμοι α των εν απορρητοις δρωμενων και της του θειου μετουσιας*, the words *γυμνασματα εισιν* are wanting, which, however, the Harl. MS. has, and also the text of Cousin, as may be seen in p. 22. of his edition. Creuzer in his notes observes, that the manuscripts A. F. B. and D. have these words, and that they are also to be found, together with the whole passage, in an English Treatise entitled, A Dissertation on the Eleusinian and Bacchic Mysteries. Amsterd. sine anni nota; which treatise was one of my juvenile productions. P. 11. of Creuzer, and p. 26. of Cousin: *ταυτα δε περι της προθεσεως ημιν αναγεγραφα προαποδειξασιν*; but the Harleian MS. for *προαποδειξασιν* has *προ αποδειξεσιν*, which is evidently erroneous. P. 14. of Creuzer: *πως ουν φαμεν τον διαλογον εις τα προσεχη και κυριωτερα μερη διαιρεισθαι*; and this is also the reading of Cousin: but the Harleian MS. has *παντα ουν φαμεν, κ. τ. λ.* and the sentence is not interrogative. The true reading, however, is evidently that of the editors: for the sentence that immediately follows, viz. *πως δε αλλως η επειδη σκοπος μεν εστιν αυτω κ. τ. λ.*, is obviously an answer to the preceding interrogation. In the same page of Creuzer, and also in p. 38. of Cousin, we have, *τρια τοιουν ταυτα του προκειμενου διαλογου μερη τα δε αλλα παντα τουτων ενεκα παραλαμβανεται και προς ταυτα συντελει, τα τε αποδεικτικα, και τα λεκτικα καθηκοντα*; except that Cousin for *τα λεκτικα* has *τα τω λεκτικω*, and Creuzer in his notes observes that the MSS. A. B. and D. have *τα τη λεκτικη*. But the Harleian MS. has *τα τη διαλεκτικη*, which appears to me to be the true reading.

Again, Cousin, p. 50. *το γαρ εξεταζειν την αιτιαν δι' ην ο Σωκρατης μονος των εραστων ουκ απεληξε του ερωτος, αλλα και ηρξατο προ των αλλων, και πεκαυμενων εκεινων ουκ απαλλαττεται, θεατην αυτον αποφαινει της ολης του Σωκρατους ζωης*. This is also the reading of the Harl. MS. and is correct; but the text of Creu-

136 Observations on Prof. Cousin's & Creuzer's

zer omits *εκεινων*; nor is the omission mentioned by him in his notes, though I wonder this very learned man did not see the necessity of inserting it. Creuzer p. 45. *και ολας το αμεθεκτον ετερον εστι του μαθεκτου, και το καθ' αυτο του μετ' αλλου συνθεωρουμενου, και το εξημμενον του προς ετερον τινα συνταξιν λαχοντος.* So the Harl. MS. and so Cousin. But for *εξημμενον* in this passage it is requisite to read *εξηρημενον*. For then Proclus will say, "And, in short, the imparticipable is different from the participable, that which subsists by itself, from that which is surveyed in conjunction with something else, and *that which is exempt*, from *that which is allotted a co-arrangement with a certain other thing.*" And in the words that immediately follow in Creuzer, viz. *Επειδη τοιουν ο Αλκιβιαδης νοειται διχως και ως ψυχη, καθοσον μεν εστι ψυχη του νου σωζει προς αυτον αναλογιαν ο Σακρατης, καθοσον δε σωματι χρωμενη ψυχη, την του αγαθου δαιμονος,* there are wanting the words *και ως ψυχη σωματι χρωμενη*, between the words *και ως ψυχη*, and the word *καθοσον*, which are also wanting in the Harl. MS., but which are very properly inserted in the edition of Cousin, p. 121. In p. 51. of Creuzer, Proclus speaking of the summit of the intelligible triad, which consists of *being, life, and intellect*, says, "that it is characterised by *the good*, which it intellectually perceives, where according to the oracle *the paternal monad resides,*" *της μεν πρωτης τω αγαθω χαρακτηριζομενης, ταγαθον αυτο νοουσα, οπου πατρικη μονας εστι, το λογιον φησι.* Creuzer in his note on this passage observes, "Voces extreinas: *οπου πατρικη μονας εστι, ut ex Psello depromptas, quasi primum oraculorum Zoroastris versum edidit F. Patricius. Vid. Clerici Opera Philos. p. 304.*;" by which it appears that this most learned man was not at the time of his writing this acquainted with my collection of the Chaldean Oracles,¹ published in the Classical Journal. (See Nos. 29. 32. and 33.) For he would there have seen the whole of the Oracle of which these words are the conclusion, and the source whence it was derived, which is the 2nd book of Proclus on Euclid p. 27., and is mentioned by that philosopher as follows: *και γαρ η μονας εκει πρωτον, οπου πατρικη μονας εστι, φησι το λογιον.*

In p. 52. of Creuzer, Proclus speaking still further of the

¹ The reader will see that in this collection each Oracle is accurately arranged under its proper head, and the authors and places given (a few only excepted) where each may be found. And he will likewise find that the collection of Patricius is there increased by the addition of upwards of fifty Chaldæan Oracles, and fragments of Oracles.

intelligible triad, says : και η τριας αυτη προεισιν εντευθεν επι παντας τους θεους διακοσμουσ, και πασιν επιλαμπει την προς το νοητον ενωσιον. Αλλως δε κατ' αλλας εκφαινεται ταξεις δυναμεις. But the Harleian MS. very properly adds, after the word ταξεις, the words ταισ ιδιοτησι των θεων συμπλεκουσα τας εαυτης. And this addition is also to be found in the text of Cousin p. 141. ; but does not appear to have been in any of the manuscripts consulted by Creuzer, or he would doubtless have noticed it. In the same page, Proclus cites the following Chaldaic Oracle :

παντα γαρ εν τρισι τοις δε κυβερναται τε και εστιν.

i. e. " For all things are governed by and subsist in these three ;" i. e. in *faith, truth, and love* ; of which he had been before speaking. And Creuzer in a note says, " Hoc λογω augeri possunt τα του Ζωροαστρου λογια, quæ post Fr. Patricium et Th. Stanlejum edidit Jo. Clericus, &c." But it was many years ago published by me in the before-mentioned collection of Chaldean oracles. Creuzer adds, " Ceterum his Platonicorum philosophorum oraculis oraculum aliud in hac ipsa questione opponit scriptor anonymus in Cod. Darmstad. mscr.—εκ μεν γαρ αρχης παντα γεγεννηται ως τα ιερα φασι λογια και ουχ ετερον αφ' ετερου ως τα Πορφυριου και Ιαμβλιχου ληρουσι περι των προοδων συνταγματα. It is singular that so learned a man as Creuzer should not have discovered that this anonymous writer means by τα ιερα λογια *the Scriptures*, and that consequently he is not quoting any heathen oracle. For that this writer was a Christian, is evident from his calling the theory of Porphyry and Iamblichus about the progression of the divine orders delirious. In thus defaming, however, the theological dogma of these great men, this anonymous author has only exposed his own ignorance of the Platonic theology, for, according to this theology, the great first cause of all energises prior to, together with, and posterior to, all the other causes that proceed from him, as is demonstrated by Proclus in his *Elements of Theology*. So that though one thing proceeds from another, an inferior from a superior principle, yet all things originally proceed from the first principle, who is therefore called in this *Theology* the Principle of principles, the God of Gods, and a unity prior to all things.

In p. 71 of Creuzer, Proclus, after speaking about the order of dæmons in common, adds : των γαρ δαιμονων τουτων κατα το μεσον, ως ειπομεν, τεταγμενων, οι μεν πρωτιστοι θειοι δαιμονες εισι, κ. τ. λ. But after πρωτιστοι the Harl. MS. adds και ακροτατοι, and Cousin also, p. 193, has this addition ; though it does not appear to have been found in any of the MSS. consulted by

138 Observations on Prof. Cousin's & Creuzer's

Creuzer. Again, Creuzer p. 74. and Cousin p. 201. οὕτω γὰρ οἶμαι, καὶ ὁ ἐν Πολιτείᾳ Σωκράτης δαίμονας ἐκάλεσε τοὺς εὐβελήκοτας καὶ ἐς ἀμείνω λήξιν μεταστάντας καὶ τοῖον ἀγίωτερον. But for μεταστάντας the Harl. MS. has καταστάντας, and for τοῖον ἀγίωτερον, τοκοὺς ἀγίωτεροὺς. And the latter appears to have been the reading which Ficinus found in his MS.; for his version of this passage is: "Hac arbitrator ratione Socratem in Republica dæmonas animos appellasse qui vitam bene transegerint et in meliorem translati sint sortem *locaque augustiora jam colant.*" Instead of τον ἔρωτα τον θειον, and πραγμασιὶν ἀνορθοῦ in p. 80. of Creuzer, and p. 211. of Cousin, the Harl. MS. has τον δαίμονα τον θειον, and πραγμασιὶν ἀνωθεν, but erroneously. In p. 82. of Creuzer, Proclus, speaking of the different powers possessed by different dæmons, says: Μειζονῶς δὲ ἐτι λεκτεον, οτι τῶν δαίμονων οἱ μὴ καθαριστικὴν ἐλαχον δυνάμιν καὶ ἀγχαντον, οἱ δὲ γεννητικὴν, οἱ δὲ δημιουργικὴν κ. τ. λ. But the Harl. MS. after, οἱ δὲ γεννητικῶν adds οἱ δὲ τελεσιουργῶν; and this addition is also in Cousin p. 215., but does not appear to have been in the MSS. of Creuzer. It is however very properly inserted; for the telesurgic power of dæmons is often celebrated by Proclus and other Platonists, and Ficinus also appears to have found these words in his MS.; for his version of this passage is: "Præterea dæmonum alii purgatoriam et incontaminabilem possident potestatem, alii vero genitricem, alii perfectoriam, &c." Creuzer p. 85. ἐκείνη δὲ ἀκραιφνῆς προὔπαρχει καὶ δραστηριὸς προ τῶν παρ' ἡμῖν θαυμάζομενων. But the Harl. MS. and also Cousin p. 219. have very properly δυναμῶν after θαυμάζομενων. In p. 87. of Creuzer, and p. 223. of Cousin, for πῶς δὲ οὐχ ὀρωμεν οτι πολλα καὶ τῶν τοῖς χειροσιν ἡμῶν ἐς γνῶσιν ἀδυνατῶν ἡμῖν ἐστιν εὐγνώστα; the Harl. MS. has πῶς δὲ οὐχ ὀρωμεν οτι πολλα καὶ ζῶντοῖς χειροσιν ἡμῶν κ. τ. λ. And immediately after in Creuzer for καθ' ὅλον in the sentence τὴν γὰρ τῶν καθ' ὅλον φύσιν τὰ μὲν ἀλόγα γινώσκουσιν οὐ πεφύκεν, ἡμεῖς δὲ συναίρειν δυνάμεθα, the Harl. MS. and also Cousin have very properly καθόλου. For irrational animals have no knowledge of *universals*, but we have.

Again, in p. 91. of Creuzer, and p. 228. of Cousin, the Harl. MS. has ἀπολαβεῖν instead of ἀπολαυεῖν in the following passage: καὶ ὡσπερ ἥλιος ἀφίησι τὸ φῶς οὐ διωρισμένως, ἀλλὰ πᾶσι τοῖς δυναμένοις ἀπολαυεῖν, μετεχειν δὲ ὁ δυναμένος. In p. 93. of Creuzer in the following passage, δια δὲ τὴν τοῦ προνοουμένου φύσιν εὐμεταβολὸν οὐσαν ἀμφιβολίας ἐνδεικτικόν, the Harl. MS. and also Cousin p. 231. have rightly ἐστιν after ἀμφιβολίας. In the following passage in p. 100. of Creuzer, and p. 241. of Cousin, viz. Ἄλλα τι, φαίης ἂν, ὁ Σωκράτης εἰς ἐπαινον καθίησι τοῦ νεανίσκου, the Harl. MS. has καθίστησιν for καθίησι. In p. 103.

of Creuzer in the following passage, Προστίθῃσι γὰρ οὗτος τὰ ἀναγκαῖα τῶν ἀρτῶν καὶ τὰ ἐπομένα τῶν ἡγουμένων, for προστίθῃσι, which is also the reading of the Harl. MS., it is requisite to substitute προτίθῃσι, as in the text of Cousin p. 245. For Proclus is speaking of the absurdity of him who fancies that his proper good originates from the body, and not from the soul, and very justly observes that such a one prefers the necessaries [of the animal life] to virtue, and things that rank as consequent to those that have a precedency and a leading order. Again in p. 104. of Creuzer, and p. 246. of Cousin, Proclus speaking of the τὸ αὐταρκῆς, or that which is sufficient to itself, observes, ὅτι τὸ αὐταρκῆς πρῶτως ἐν αὐτοῖς ἐστὶ τοῖς θεοῖς ἀγαθοὶ γὰρ εἰσὶν οἱ θεοὶ, καὶ ἀγαθοτήτος ὑπερουσίοι, καὶ πληρωματὰ τῶν ὄντων ἀπαντῶν. So likewise the Harl. MS. But for ἀγαδοτήτος it is necessary to read ἀγαδοτήτης: for the Gods are every where celebrated by Proclus as ἀγαδοτήτες ὑπερουσίοι; because, according to the Platonic theology, every effect is *secondarily* what its cause is *primarily*. Hence as the first God is τ'ἀγαθόν, the good, all the other Gods are ἀγαδοτήτες, goodnesses; conformably to which Simplicius in Epictet. calls the supreme principle of all things ἀγαδοτήτης ἀγαδοτήτων. Ficinus also in his version of this part evidently found in his MS. ἀγαδοτήτης. For his translation is, "Ipsa per se sufficientia primum est penes Deos. Boni namque sunt Dii, atque *superessentiales bonitates* quædam, et entium omnium plenitudines." With respect to the word πληρωμα, which is so frequently employed by Proclus in his Theology of Plato and other works, and is used by other Platonists, it accurately signifies a whole which gives completion to the universality of things. In p. 107. of Creuzer, and p. 250. of Cousin, in the following passage: τι γὰρ ἄλλο διὰ τῆς προσθήκης ἐνδεικνύται ταύτης, ἢ ὅτι οἱ μὲν, οὐ μὲντοι ἔχει ταῦτα οὕτως; so also the Harl. MS. But for οὕτως here, it is necessary to read ὄντως. For Proclus had just before informed us, that the word οἱεῖ employed by Socrates in his conference with Alcibiades, is a sufficient indication of false opinion. Hence he adds: "what else is indicated by this addition than that Alcibiades *falsely* opined indeed that he possessed these things, [i. e. the greatest beauty and power,] but that he did not possess them in reality?" In p. 120. l. 20. of Creuzer, for ἐπιμελουμένη, the Harl. MS. has ἐπιτελουμένη, which I prefer; and this is also the reading of Cousin p. 270. In p. 123. of Creuzer, and p. 274. of Cousin, Proclus speaking of the participation of intelligible essences observes, Κῶλυει γὰρ ἐπὶ τούτων (i. e. τῶν νοητῶν) τὴν μεταδοσὶν μὴ τῶν ἐπιδοχόμενων ἀνεπιτηδεύτητος, ἐπεὶ τὰ γὰρ μεταδόντα αἰεὶ διδάσκει καὶ πανταχοῦ ἐστὶν ὁμοίως. But for τὰ γὰρ μεταδόντα in this passage, the Harl. MS.

140 *Observations on Prof. Cousin's & Creuzer's*

has τα γενητα δωσοντα. The former, however, appears to me to be the true reading. Instead of τελιον μνον in p. 129. l. 21. of Creuzer, the Harl. MS. has τελιουμενον, which is the true reading, and is conjectured to be so by Creuzer. For he says in his notes, "Mendum esse suspicor in hac periodo. An leg. τελιουμενον?" And Cousin has in his text (p. 284.) τελευμασι.

In the words Ουτα τοινυν και ο Σωκρατης κατα τον του θειου ζηλον κ. τ. λ. p. 131. of Creuzer, and p. 286. of Cousin, the Harl. MS. for τον του θειου ζηλον has τονθειον ζηλον, which is doubtless the true reading. In p. 133. of Creuzer, and p. 288. of Cousin, in the following passage, Διοτι δε ο Σωκρατης τολμα την αυτου διανοιαν φραζειν, κατεισιν εις υποδεεστεραν ενεργειαν της αυτου αυτω μενουσης, the Harl. MS. for τολμα την αυτου διανοιαν φραζειν has τολμα την αυτου διανοιαν φραζει: but this is doubtless erroneous. In the following passage in the same page of Creuzer, viz. αλλ' ομως κατεισιν ο Σωκρατης ιν' ωσπερ Ηρακλης εξ Αιδου τον ερωμενον αναγη και πειση της μεν φαινομενης αποστησαι ζωης, επι δε την νοεραν καιθειαν αναδραμειν, αφ' ης και αυτον γνωσεται, και τοθειον ολον εξηρητημενον των οντων απαντων, και αιτιον αυτω προυπαρχον, the Harl. MS. has very properly εξηρημενον, for εξηρητημενον, and so likewise has Cousin p. 289. For nothing is more frequently asserted by Proclus, than that divinity is exempt from all beings. But if εξηρητημενον is retained, Proclus will be made to say, that divinity is suspended from all beings, than which nothing can be more absurd. I very much wonder, therefore, that the learned Creuzer should say in a note on this passage, "Cod. E. habet εξηρημενον pro εξηρητημενον. Perperam." P. 135. of Creuzer, λεγομεν, οτι μενουσαι μεν αι ψυχαι παρα τοις αυτοις νοερας ενεργουσι. But for τοις αυτοις the Harl. MS. has rightly τοις θεοις, and so likewise has Cousin p. 292. In p. 136. of Creuzer, and p. 293. of Cousin, Proclus says, Και ο λογος εστιν ο διαβαλλων επι νουν απ' ολισθησεως και φαντασιας; and this is also the reading of the Harl. MS. But for απ' ολισθησεως, I conceive it necessary to read απ' αισθησεως. In the same page, Proclus observes that souls in the present life pursue the images of the paradigms which they formerly surveyed in the intelligible world. Hence he says, Αλλαι μεν ουν των ψυχων αλλοις εισιν οικειαι θαυμασι διο και αι μεν αλλοις, αι δε αλλοις ειδωλοις επιτρεχουσιν' ω γαρ ιδων, εκει τα ειδωλα και τας σκιας φιλοφρονονται. This is also the reading of the Harl. MS. But Cousin p. 293. for ω γαρ ιδων has very properly αν γαρ ιδον. And this reading is confirmed by Ficinus' version of this passage, which is, "Alia namque animæ alius sunt accommodatæ spectaculis, ideo alia alius imaginibus incumbunt; eorum enim quæ illic inspexerant, similitudines amant."

Again, in the following passage in p. 146. of Creuzer, and p. 305. of Cousin, *Διωνυται μεν ευθυς εκ τούτων, οποσον ην το διαφορον του τε Αλκιβιαδου και του θειου Σωκρατους ειπερο μεν εδειτο του γνωσαι παρ' αυτου, τινα ελπιδα εχων υπομενει των αλλων αποφευγοντων ερασταν.* But the Harl. MS. instead of *αποφευγοντων* has *αποφευγοντων*. Creuzer proposes to read *αποπεφευγοντων*, and Cousin has *αποφευγοντων*. The Harleian, however, appears to me to be the true reading; as doubtless the lovers of Alcibiades did not *openly*, but *secretly*, forsake him. In the following passage also in p. 149. of Creuzer, and p. 310. of Cousin, viz. *Εκει γαρ και ο μεγας ηγερμων Ζευς διακοσμων παντα και επιμελουμενος, ως φησιν ο εν Φαιδρω Σωκρατης,* the Harl. MS. after *παντα* adds *τα εν κοσμω ταις δυναμεσι*, which addition appears to be requisite. In p. 150. of Creuzer, l. 11. and p. 312. of Cousin, l. 12. for *οι θεουργοι*, the Harl. MS. has *οι θεολογοι*. And shortly after, to the words in Creuzer, *Και γαρ το διαπορθμιον ονομα το εν απειροις κοσμοις ενδρωσκον τοιαυτην ελαχε,* the Harl. MS. after *ελαχε* very properly adds *δυναμιν*, which is evidently wanting to the completion of the sentence, and is also in the text of Cousin. Again, in the following passage in p. 152. of Creuzer, *τον μεν γαρ παιδευοντα προσηκει τας των παιδευομενων επιτηδειοτητας ακριβων διαγιγνωσκειν,* the Harl. MS. has rightly *ακριβως* instead of *ακριβων*, and so likewise has the text of Cousin p. 314. Again, in p. 153. of Creuzer, and p. 316. of Cousin, Proclus speaking of what is requisite to be done by him who is properly instructed says, *τον δε παιδευομενον εαυτον επιδιδοναι προσηκει τω παιδευοντι, και ηρεμα περιαγεσθαι προς το αληθες των ειδωλων αφισταμενον, και απο του καταγειου σπηλαιου προς το φως και την οντως ουσιαν ανατεινομενον πανταχου της αμιγους προς το εναντιον και αφιεπτα μεν το μεριστον και ειδωλικον, του δε καθ' ολου και αμεριστου τελως ορθομενον.* This is also the reading of the Harl. MS. except that it has rightly *καθολου* for *καθ' ολου*, as likewise the text of Cousin, who in a note after the words *προς το εναντιον* says, "*Hic nonnulla deesse videntur.*" To me also it appears that something is wanting in this passage, yet not after *εναντιον*; but I conceive that after *πανταχου*, the words *και επι της φυσεως* ought to be inserted. So that the whole passage will be in English: "But it is requisite that he who is instructed should deliver himself to his preceptor, and in a gradual circuitous course be led to the truth, separating himself from images, and every where extending from the subterranean cavern, to the light, and truly-existing being, and to a nature unmingled with its contrary; dismissing also that which is partible and pertaining to an image, but perfectly aspiring after that which is universal and impar-

ble." In this passage also what Proclus says about being led to the light from the subterranean cave is derived from the 7th book of Plato's Republic.

ACCOUNT OF BARON NIEBUHR'S DISCOVERIES

IN THE VATICAN, AT ROME.

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

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

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

¹ De Brosse's Hist. de la Rép. Romaine par Salluste T. i. p. 578, *note*.

² M. Tullii Ciceronis Orationum pro M. Fonteio et pro C. Rabirio fragmenta, T. Livii lib. XCI. fragmentum plenius et emendatius, L. Senecæ fragmenta, ex membranis Bibliothecæ Vaticanæ, edita a B. C. Niebuhr, C. F. Romæ, 1820, in 8vo.

OBSERVATIONS ON

PROFESSOR COUSIN'S Edition of the **COMMENTARIES** of **PROCLUS** on the *First Alcibiades* of *Plato*, in 2 Vols. 8vo. Paris, 1820 and 1821; and also on **CREUZER'S** Edition of the same **COMMENTARIES**, together with those of *Olympiodorus* on that Dialogue, in 2 Vols. 8vo. Francof. 1820 and 1821.

No. II,—[Concluded from No. XLIX.]

P. 155 of Creuzer, *Ἐπρεπε γὰρ τῶ μαιευτικῶ καὶ κριτῆ τῶ τε γονιμῶν λογῶν καὶ τῶν ἀναμιαίων πρὸς τὸ μαιευόμενον, οὗτος ὁ τροπος τῆς διαίτησεως.* In this passage for *καὶ κριτῆ* the Harleian Ms. has *τῶ κριτῆ*, and so likewise has Cousin p. 319. But for *ἀναμιαίων* which has no signification, Creuzer very properly substitutes *ἀνεμιαίων*, which is also the reading of Cousin. P. 161 of Creuzer, *καὶ τὸ θεὸν αὐτὸν ἐκονομαζέσθαι ὑπερ ταύτην αὐτῶ τάξιν ἐν τῶ γενεῖ τῶν δαιμονῶν μαρτυρεῖ.* But for *ὑπερ ταύτην*, the Harl. Ms. has *ὑπερταύτην*, and so likewise has Cousin p. 328, which is doubtless the true reading. For then Proclus will say what he had before said in these Commentaries, “that Socrates by calling his dæmon a God, testifies that this dæmon has the highest order in the genus of dæmons.” Again, in Creuzer p. 172, *καὶ ἀναπερανταὶ πάλιν ἐν τούτοις ὁ Ἀλκιβιάδης ὁ τοῖς φίλοις πασι τοῖς ἀριστοῖς χρωμένος νυνὶ Σωκράτους ὑπηρετῆς.* But the Harl. Ms. for *ἀριστοῖς* has rightly *ἀοριστοῖς*, and also very properly adds *ὑπηρεταῖς*. Cousin likewise, tom. III, adds this word, but then he has *ἀριστοῖς ὑπηρεταῖς*, which is erroneous. For Socrates was the best friend of Alcibiades; all his other friends being of an indefinite description. Creuzer p. 176, *Ὁ ἀρα ἀγαθὸς συμβουλος, ἐπεὶ ἐπιστήμων ἐστὶν ἐν οἷς ἀν οἱ συμβουλευόμενοι ἀνεπιστήμονες, ἢ ἐμάθε ταῦτα, ἢ ἐπιστάται, ἢ εὐρε.* But the Harl. Ms. has rightly *ἀ ἐπιστάται* for *ἢ ἐπιστάται*, and so likewise has Cousin, p. 14. Again, in p. 187 of Creuzer, and p. 29 and 30 of Cousin, Proclus having observed that the human soul, though she contains all reason [i. e. participations of divine forms or ideas] in herself, yet in consequence of being darkened through generation, in the survey of the forms she possesses, requires *discipline* and *invention*, in order that through the former she may excite her inherent intellections, but through the latter may discover herself, and the plenitude of forms she contains: he then adds, *Καὶ ἐστὶ ταῦτα τὰ δῶρα θεῶν εὐεργετούντων αὐτὴν πετούσαν, καὶ*

επανακαλουμενων εις την νοεραν ζωην' αμφω μεν γαρ εκ της Ερμαϊκης ηκοντα ταξεως, αλλ' η μεν καθοσον εστιν ο θεος ουτος Μαιας, της Ατλαντος, υιος, η δε καθοσον εστιν αγγελος του Διου. Εκφαινων μεν γαρ την πατρικην βουλησιν ενδιδωσι ταις ψυχαις' εκ δε της Μαιας προϊαν, παρ η κρυφίως η ζητησις, την ευρεσιν δωρεται τοις εαυτου τροφιμοις. This is also the reading of the Harl. Ms. But after ενδιδωσι ταις ψυχαις, it is necessary to add την μαθησιν. For Proclus having before observed, that both *discipline* and *invention* (η μαθησις και η ευρεσις) proceed from the Hermaic order, now adds, "that one of these gifts is imparted by him, so far as he is the son of Maia, but the other, so far as he is the messenger of Jupiter. For as unfolding the paternal will, he imparts to souls *discipline*, [but as proceeding from Maia, who occultly contains in herself *investigation*, he imparts *invention* to those who are under his guardian care." In p. 189 of Creuzer, and p. 31 of Cousin, Proclus, speaking of twofold ignorance, (διπλη αγνοια,) or that condition of the soul in which he who is ignorant does not know that he is ignorant, and which is the disease of the multitude, observes that through this, as Diotima says in the Banquet of Plato, that which is neither beautiful, nor good, nor wise, is fancied to be sufficient. And he then adds, Το δε αιτιον, οτι καταλθουσαι εις γενεσιν αι ψυχαι πληρεις κατ' ουσιαν των επιστημων υπαρχουσαι, την εκ της γενεσεως ληθην εισδεχονται, και το μη εχειν τους λογους των πραγματων οιον σφυζοντας, εννοιας εχουσι περι αυτων, τω δε της ληθης ποματι κρατουμεναι διαρθρουν τας εαυτων αδυνατουσιν εννοιας και εις επιστημην αναπεμπειν. This too is the reading of the Harl. Ms. But for το μη εχειν τους λογους, it is necessary to read τω μεν εχειν τους λογους. For the human soul through the oblivion arising from generation, or her connection with a flowing condition of being, has the reasons or forms of things in a palpitating, and scarcely breathing condition; but in consequence of being vanquished by the potion of Oblivion, she is incapable of giving a distinct subsistence to her conceptions, and referring them to science. And in the same page of Creuzer, and p. 32 of Cousin, Proclus observes, concerning matter and divinity, Ως γαρ η υλη ανειδεος, και ο θεος' και δη και απειρον εκατεραν και αγνωστον, ει και παντα, ο μεν κατα το κρειττον, η δε κατα το χειρον. Thus too the Harl. Ms. But for ει και παντα, I read ει και παντη. And then what Proclus says will be in English, "For as matter is formless, so likewise is God. Each also is infinite and unknown, though the latter is *entirely* so, according to that which is more excellent, but the former according to that which has a more deteriorated subsistence."

Again, in p. 197 of Creuzer, and p. 41 of Cousin, Pro speaking of the Athenian pipe, says, *Και γαρ τα παναρμονια η πολυχωρδια μιμηματα των αυλων εστιν· εκαστον γαρ τρυπημα αυλων τρεις φθογγους, (Harl. τριφθογγους,) ως φασι, τουλαχι αφησιν· ει δε και τα παρατρυπηματα ανοιχθειη, πλειους.* In passage, after *παρατρυπηματα* the Harl. Ms. adds *των αυ*. Creuzer well observes in his Notes, "Et est hic locus insid ad explicandam tibiaram rationem, quæ apud veteres invari rat." I add, that Isaac Vossius, in his excellent treatise *Poematum Cantu, et Viribus Rythmi*, (p. 110) quotes and illustrates this passage of Proclus. In p. 212 of Creuzer, and 60 of Cousin, for *της περιττης οησεως* in the following passage *Μετα την καθαρσιν τοινυν της περιττης οησεως παρακελευεσθαι νεανισκω σκοπειν και ανεγειρειν εαυτον κ. τ. λ.,* the Harl. Ms. *την περι της οησεως*, which is doubtless the true reading, as *οησις* always signifies in the philosophy of Plato, *distort opinion*, it cannot be supposed that Proclus would use the expression *περιττη οησις*. For *νομον* in p. 219. l. 19 of Creuzer and p. 69. l. 21 of Cousin, the Harl. Ms. has rightly *νομιμον*. p. 231 of Creuzer, and p. 84 of Cousin, Proclus says, *ως γαρ θεου παντα αμεριστως ποιουντος η υλη δεχεται μεν εις εαυτην, κ. τ.* and this is likewise the reading of the Harl. Ms. But after *χεται*, it is necessary to add *μεριστως*. For then Proclus says what he frequently and most truly asserts, that God produces all things *impartibly*, but that matter receives *partibly*, what produces.

In p. 234 of Creuzer, and p. 89 of Cousin, Proclus, in commenting on the words of Socrates, *Ου μα τον φιλιον τον εμον και σου, ον εγω ηκιστα επαρκησαιμι*, having shown that the *φιλιος* is Jupiter, observes, *ηκιστα γαρ αν επιορκησειε τον φιλιον εν προς Αλκιβιαδην λογοις, ηκιστα δ' αν τον ξενιον εν τοις προς τον ξενιον και τον ικεσιον εν τοις προς τον ικετην.* The Harl. Ms. for *δ' αν ξενιον*, has *διαν τον ξενιον*. But this is evidently corrupt. For it should be *Δια τον ξενιον*, which is doubtless the true reading. In p. 236 of Creuzer, and p. 91 of Cousin, Proclus, alluding to what Diotima in the Banquet of Plato says about the origin of Love, observes as follows: *Η μεν ουν πενια η εν ημιν αιτια αποριας εστι και ερωσ επι την ζητησιν εγειρει της τελειας γνωσεως δε πορος εν τω οντι και της ψυχης Μητιδος αν υιος. Αναθεν γαρ πεισισι το ουσιαδες ημων απο του θειου νου, το δε δυναμει το εν ημιν η πενια και η αοριστια της ζωης.* This too is the reading of the Harl. Ms. But for *εν τω οντι*, I read *εν τω ουσιαδει*. And as something appears to be wanting in *και της ψυχης*, both according to the Mss. of Creuzer and Cousin, I add after *και* the words *τη νοερα φυσει*. In the words, *Οτε μεν γαρ περι των καθ' ολον τι*

λογους εποικειτο, τη επιστημη μονη προς την ληψιν εχρητο της αληθειας, p. 238 of Creuzer, the Harl. Ms. has rightly for καθ' ολον, καθολου, and so likewise has Cousin, p. 94. Again, in p. 243 of Creuzer, Proclus observes, *Ενταυθα δη ουν ο Σωκρατης, ωσπερ τις Ηρακλης τας της υδρας κεφαλαις εκτεμνων, δεικνυσιν, οτι ου παν το πληθος αξιοπιστον εστι περι την γνωσιν των τε δικαιων και των αδικων.* The Harl. Ms. for *οτι ου παν το πληθος κ. τ. λ.*, has erroneously *οτι παν το πληθος*, and the reading of Creuzer is not correct. For according to Plato, the multitude are *universally* unworthy of belief with respect to the knowledge of what is just and what is unjust. I therefore conceive that the reading of Cousin, p. 101, *οτι παν το πληθος αναξιπιστον εστι κ. τ. λ.*, is perfectly accurate. In p. 247 of Creuzer, and p. 105 of Cousin, Proclus having observed that science is not the summit of knowledge, but that intellect is prior to it, adds, *ου λεγω τον εξηρημενον της ψυχης νουν, αλλ' αυτην την εκειθεν ελλαμβιν την εφηκουσαν τη ψυχη κ. τ. λ.* And this is also the reading of the Harl. Ms. But instead of *ου λεγω*, it is requisite to read *ου μονον λεγω*. And Ficinus evidently found *μονον* in his Ms.; for his version of this passage is, "non intellectum inquam duntaxat ab anima separatum."

Again, in p. 247 of Creuzer, and p. 105 of Cousin, Proclus observes: *Ως γαρ νου μετεχομεν κατα τον ειρημενον νουν, ουτα και του πρωτου, παρ' ου πασιν η γνωσις κατα το εν και οιον ανθος της ουσιας ημων, καθ' ο και μαλιστα τω θειω συναπτομεθα.* This too is the reading of the Harl. Ms. But for *η γνωσις*, it is necessary to read *η ενωσις*. For as all knowledge proceeds from the *first intellect*, so all union proceeds from *the one*, or the great first principle of all things. Ficinus also appears to have had *ενωσις* and not *γνωσις* in his Ms. For he thus translates this passage: "Quemadmodum enim per intellectum nostrum divinum tangimus intellectum, sic et primum unum, a quo omnibus inest unio per unum, et tanquam essentia nostrae florem attingere licet; per quod sane nostrum unum divino maxime jungimur." P. 152 of Creuzer, and p. 110 of Cousin: *Ταυτα μεν ουν περι του παντος ημιν ειρησθω συλλογισμου, την δια παντων διηκουσαν ωφελειαν απ' αυτου καταδησαμενοις.* In this passage the Harl. Ms. for *καταδησαμενοις* has *κατασθησαμενοις*, which I have no doubt is the true reading. In the following passage, p. 258 of Creuzer, and p. 118 of Cousin, *Ωσπερ γαρ ου δει θαυμαζειν ει εν τω Ταρταρω ψυχας κολαζομενας ιδοιμεν (τουτων γαρ ην ο εκει τοπος)*, the Harl. Ms. for *ο εκει τοπος* has *οικειος τοπος*; but perhaps the true reading will be *οικειος ο εκει τοπος*. In p. 259 of Creuzer, and p. 120 of Cousin, there is a lacunula in the following passage, *Επει και ο Πυθαγορας των μεν οντων παντων σοφωτατον ειναι ελεγε τον αριθμον, δευτερον δε*

304 *Observations on Prof. Cousin's & Creuze*

εις σοφίαν το τοις πραγμασι τα ονοματα τιθέναι τα προσηκοτι
 μιν γαρ εστιν ο πρωτος αριθμος, ψυχη δε νοερα μετα τουτον
 ειδαν θεωρητικη, το δε εν και προ ψυχης και προ νου' γεννα γαρ
 Creuzer conjectures that the word αριθμον is wanting; b
 appears to me that the deficiency will be accurately supplie
 the words νου και την ψυχην. In the following passage i
 304 of Creuzer, viz. Ωσπερ ουν οι ιατροι καθαιρουσι προτερο
 τον ενσχλοντα χυμον καθαιρουσι φαρμακειας, επειδ' ουτως ανα
 ται τας δυναμεις διαταις κ. τ. λ. the Harl. Ms. for καθαι
 φαρμακειας, has rightly εκβαλλουσι φαρμακειας, and so like
 has Cousin, p. 181. In p. 308 of Creuzer, for ταυτων η
 words Τριων δ' ουν οντων ταυτων δεικνυσιν κ. τ. λ., the Harl.
 has rightly τουτων, and so also has Cousin, p. 188. In p.
 of Creuzer, and p. 190 of Cousin, the Harl. Ms. for των θεω
 Πειθω in the following passage, Εικοτως' αρα και οι τα θεια σοφι
 της επιστημης χορηγησ των θεων την Πειθω συνοικιζουσι, has rightl
 θεω την Πειθω. In p. 314 of Creuzer, l. 2, and p. 195, l. 1
 Cousin, for δειχθεντος, the Harl. Ms. has λεχθεντος. And i
 315 of Creuzer, l. 17, and p. 197, l. 12, of Cousin, for προ
 ανθρωπινη ευδαιμονιαν, the Harl. Ms. has προς την ανθρωπινης
 ευδαιμονιαν. In p. 328 of Creuzer, and p. 215 of Cousin, l
 clus, speaking of beauty, says, Ετοιμως, ειτε δια το καλει
 εαυτο κεκληται, ειτε δια το κινειν και θελγειν τα προς αυτα δυνα
 βλεπειν εραστον εστι κατα φυσιν. But the Harl. Ms. for το η
 has το κηλειν. And Ficinus had this word also in his Ms.
 is evident from his version, "Re enim vera καλον, id est
 chrum, sive dicitur δια το καλειν, id est quia provocat an
 sive δια το κηλειν, id est quia permulcet intuentes, certe se
 dum naturam est amabile."

Again, in p. 330 and 331 of Creuzer, Proclus obser
 Δηλον γαρ, οτι προς μεν τον το καθολου αποφασκοντα και το με
 καταφασκον αρκει κατασκευασαι, προς δε τον της μερικης αποφα
 προϊσταμενον αναγκη το καθ' ολου κατασκευαζειν καταφατικον
 και ποιησει ο Σωκρατης λαβων, οτι το συμφερον ου καθ' ολου ου
 των αποφασκει των δικαιων, αλλα τινων μονον. In this pass
 where καθ' ολου occurs in two places, the Harl. Ms. has rig
 καθολου, and so likewise has Cousin, p. 219. But instead
 ου παντων αποφασκει κ. τ. λ., which is also the reading of
 Harl. Ms., it is necessary to read παντων αποφασκει, with
 the ου. For then Proclus will say, "that Alcibiades did
 deny the profitable of all just things, but only of some," wh
 is doubtless his true meaning.

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

finis omnium quos novimus Codicum. Sequentia sunt quæ Cod. Ambros. 285. ait a Ficino ex his Procli Commentariis Latine versa. Vid. p. 250. Quo autem de Codice versa fuerint, plane ignoro; adulterinaque an vera, Procli an alterius existimanda sint, alias inquiretur." The sequentia, of which Cousin here speaks, consist of a Latin version of a treatise ascribed to Proclus, De Sacrificio et Magia; and I am pleased to find that a conjecture of mine respecting this little work, made by me seventeen years ago, is strengthened by the authority of the Ambrosian Ms. For in Vol. I. of my translation of Plato, p. 63, I have given a translation in English of this treatise, in a note on the following passage from the First Alcibiades: *ων ο μεν μαγειαν τε διδασκει την Ζωροαστρου του Ωρομαζου' εστι δε τουτο θεων θεραπεια.* And I there observe: "The following account of Magic by Proclus, originally formed, as it appears to me, a part of the Commentary written by him on the present passage. For the Ms. Commentary of Proclus, which is extant on this Dialogue, does not extend to more than a third part of it; and this Dissertation on Magic, which is only extant in Latin, was published by Ficinus the translator, immediately after his Excerpta from this Commentary. So that it seems highly probable, that the Ms. from which Ficinus translated his Excerpta, was much more perfect than those which are now extant, in consequence of containing this account of the Magic of the ancients."

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

Βαλλ' ουτως, αικην τι φωως ανδρεσσι γενηαι.

"Thus write, and you'll illuminate mankind."

T.

¹ Lib. ε. v. 282. But Plotinus, in applying this verse to Porphyry, substituted *ανδρεσσι* for *Δαναοισι*.