Corruption of Demiurgus.

The Israelites tempted God in the wilderness of sin, when they murmured for bread, and they proved him when he furnished them with manna. They tempted him at Rephidim, afterwards called Massah, where they murmured for water, and said, Is the Lord among us or not? And they proved him when he made water to issue from the rock in Horeb to remove their thirst. At Sinai they provoked God by making a golden calf, and worshipping the work of their own hands. At another place they tempted him by demanding flesh to eat, and they proved him when he sent quails to gratify their sensual appetites. In these and in a variety of other instances they tempted God, proved him, and saw his works forty years. The supply of manna and of water was indeed uninterruptedly continued, but in the other things there was a succession; and the sum of the series amounts to forty years. The words of the apostle may be arranged and translated in the same manner, as it has been proposed to render the verse which has been subjected to a critical examination: "Harden not your hearts as in the provocation, in the day of temptation in the wilderness; where, through the space of forty years, your fathers tempted me, proved me, and saw my works."

W. V.

Idle, near Bradford,
Dec. 1828.

CORRUPTION OF DEMIURGUS:

In the ancient Scholia on the Thebaid of Statius, which by some are ascribed to Lutatius, or Luctatius Placidus, or, as he is called by others, Placidus Lactantius, there is a passage in which it is asserted that the highest god, of whom Statius speaks in the 4th book, is called Demogorgon. But the lines in Statius where this occurs are as follow:

"Seimus enim et quidquid dici, nescieque timeth,
Et turbare Hecaten, ni te, Thyymbri, vererer:
Et triplicis mundi summum, quem scire nefastum est:
Illum sed taceo."—Lib. iv. v. 514, &c.

"Dicit [Statius] Deum Demogorgona summum," says the scholiast. On this, however, Gale in his notes on the fifth section of Iamblichus de Mysteriis, rightly observes, "Caeterum Lactantii illum locum, a multis tentatum, liber hic in melius, ut spero, restituere.—Quis sit iste Demogorgon, vel, ut alii scribunt inepit, Dæmogorgon? Wierus de Preæst. Deaemonum inter Magus infames commemorat Dæmogorgona (alii Damigeronat. Scholiastes Ms.) Adno—
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Prior, however, to Gale, Farnaby appears to have conjectured that Dæmogorgon is the Demiurgus. For in his note on the lines in the sixth book of Lucan's Pharsalia,—

"Paretis? an ille
Compellantus erit, quo nunquam terra vocato
Non concussa fremit;"—

he observes: "Dæmogorgon Deorum princeps, sive Demiurgus ille sit (Platonia) Deus summus, omnium rerum creator, cujus nomen arcanum et ineffabile inter cætera Deorum nomina citare nefas, nisi summa urgente necessitate." But that Farnaby’s Lucan was prior to the Lamblichus of Gale is evident. For the first edition of the former, as we learn from Fabricius, was Loud. 1618, 8vo. and the second edition, Francof. 1624, 8vo.; but of Gale’s Lamblichus there is only one edition, and that was published at Oxford, 1678, fol. It is singular, therefore, that Gale should claim the merit of a discovery which Farnaby prior to him had made; and the singularity is greatly increased when we consider that Gale, being a scholar and a schoolmaster, ought not to have been ignorant of the contents of Farnaby’s Lucan.

Gale, too, in asserting that the Demiurgus according to Plato in the Timæus is acratonomastos, i. e. nameless, is egregiously mistaken. For Plato says of this divinity in the Timæus: τὸν μὲν σὺν ποιήσιν καὶ πατέρα τούτῳ τὸν πάντας ευρεῖν τε εργον, καὶ ευροντα, εις ακάντας ἀκάντων λέγων: i. e. "It is therefore difficult to discover the maker and father of this universe, and, when found, it is impossible to speak of him to all men." But the Demiurgus or Jupiter, both according to the Chaldean and Grecian theology, is not the highest god; since he subsists at the extremity of the intellectual triad of gods, which consists of Saturn, Rhea, and Jupiter.1 Hence he is not perfectly ineffable. Of the great first principle, however, of all things, or the one, Plato says in the Parmenides: Οὐδ’ ἄρα οὐνομα εστιν αὐτῷ, οὐδε λόγος, οὐδε τι εκποιητη, οὐδε αισθησε, οὐδε δοξα. Οὐ φανεται. Οὐδ’ ονομαζεται ἄρα, οὐδε λεγεται, οὐδε δοξα-ζεται, οὐδε γιγνωσκεται, οὐδε τι των οντων αυτων αισθανεται. Οὐκ εισεχει: i. e. "Neither therefore does any name pertain to it, nor

---

1 See this copiously and beautifully unfolded by Proclus in Plat. Theol. lib. v. And in the same book, p. 306. see also the above passage from the Timæus most satisfactorily explained.
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discourse, nor any science, nor sense, nor opinion. It does not appear that there can. Hence, it can neither be named nor spoken of, nor conceived by opinion, nor be known, nor perceived by any being. So it seems.

To these two causes, viz. the Demiurgus and the ineffable principle of all things, Plato likewise alludes as follows, in his sixth Epistle: Και τον των παντων Θεον ηγεμονα των τε οντων και των μελλοντων, τον τε ηγεμονα και αυτων πατερα κυριον επιμνητα: ον οντως φιλανθρωπων εισομεθα παντες σαφω εις δυναμιν ανθρωπων ενδαιμονων: i. e. "And swearing by that God who is the leader of all things present and future, and by the father and lord of this leader and cause, whom we shall all of us, if we truly philosophise, clearly know, as far as this is possible to be effected by felicitous men." This likewise is corroborated by the following very remarkable passage from the works of Ficinus: "In Epistola ad Syracusanos inquit Plato, Mundri quinestiam architectum verbis exprimi vulgo non posse, testis est is meus, multo minus architecti patrem,"


I only add, that Milton, notwithstanding his great learning, appears to have had no conception that the word Demogorgon is a corruption of Demiurgus: for in the second book of his Paradise Lost, v. 965, he says,

“and by them stood
Oreus and Ades, and the dreaded name
Of Demogorgon.”

THOMAS TAYLOR.

Manor Place, Walworth.

ON THE WRITINGS OF AUSONIUS.

From the era of the civil wars to the reign of Trajan, the series of extant Latin poets, though unequally divided among the different periods, continues tolerably uninterrupted. Lucretius, Catullus,—the Augustan constellation, Phaedrus, Lucan, Persius, and Seneca,—and last, and not least in number or excellence, the third great cluster of wits who illustrated the reigns of Domitian and Trajan—carry on, though not all in metal of the same purity or brightness, the chain of which Father Ennius was the commencing link. At this latter point, however, a great and remarkable chasm ensues. From the times of Trajan to those of Theodosius, a space of two hundred years, with the exception of the eclogues of Calpurnius, one or two indifferent ecclesiastical poets, and perhaps

---1 Where Ficinus found this passage I know not; for it is not in any of the Epistles of Plato that are now extant.---