

The Platonist.

"Platonism is immortal because its principles are immortal in the Human Intellect and Heart."

Esoteric Christianity is identical with True Philosophy.

VOL. II.

OSCEOLA, MO., SEPTEMBER, 1885.

No. 9.

AN IMPORTANT ORACLE.

Probably no more noteworthy, significant Oracle ever emanated from the world-famous Delphic fane than that delivered in response to the query of Amelios as to where the soul of Plotinos had migrated. The answer of the God (Apollon) is eminently perspicuous, satisfactory, and fraught with the deepest philosophy. It will amply repay close study. In our last issue this Oracle was given in Taylor's translation, and we now present our readers with the version made by the learned Dr. Henry More, the celebrated Cambridge Platonist.*

In relation to the origin of this Oracle Dr. More sarcastically says: "As for the Oracle's answer to Amelios, if any vulgar, conceited man think it came from a devil with bat's wings and a long tail, the Seventies translation of the eighth verse of the 32d chapter of Deuteronomy may make it at least doubtful: 'When the Most High divided to the nations their inheritance, when he separated the sons of Adam, he set the bounds of the people according to the number of the angels of God.' He did not deliver them into the hand and jurisdiction of devils, nor to be instructed and taught by them.

But if Apollo who gave so good a testimony of Sokrates while he was living, and of Plotinos after his death, was some foul fiend, yet 'tis no prejudice to their esteem, since our saviour Christ was acknowledged by the devil."†

A PARAPHRASICAL INTERPRETATION OF THE ANSWER OF APOLLO, WHEN HE WAS CONSULTED BY AMELIOS WHITHER PLOTINOS' SOUL WENT WHEN HE DEPARTED THIS LIFE.

I tune my strings to sing some sacred verse
Of my dear friend; in an immortal strain
His mighty praise I loudly will rehearse
With honey-dewed words: some golden vein
The stricken chords right sweetly shall resound.
Come, blessed Muses, let's with one joint noise,
With strong impulse, and full harmonious sound,
Speak out his excellent worth. Advance your voice,
As once you did for great Aeacides,
Wrapt with an heavenly rage, in decent dance,
Mov'd at the measures of Meonides.
Go to, you holy quire, let's all at once
Begin, and to the end hold up the song,
Into one heavenly harmony conspire;
I Phoebos with my lovely locks among
The midst of you shall sit, and life inspire.

Divine Plotinos! yet now more divine
Than when thy noble soul so stoutly strove
In that dark prison, where strong chains confine
Keep down the active mind it cannot move
To what it loveth most. Those fleshly bands
Thou now hast loos'd, broke from necessitie.
From bodies storms, and frothie working sands

Of this low restless life now setten free,
Thy feet do safely stand upon a shore,
Which foaming waves beat not in swelling rage,
Nor angry seas do threat with fell uprore;
Well hast thou swommen out, and left that stage
Of wicked actours, that tumultuous rout
Of ignorant men. Now thy pure steps thou stay'st
In that high path, where God's light shines about,
And perfect Right its beauteous beams displays.
How oft, when bitter wave of troubled flesh,
And whirlpool-turnings of the lower spright,
Thou stoutly s'rov'st with, heaven did thee refresh,
Held out a mark to guide thy wandring flight,
While thou in tumbling seas didst strongly toil
To reach the steadie Land, strackst with thy arms
The deafing surges, that with rage do boil;
Stear'd by that sign thou shunn'st those common harms.
How oft, when rasher cast of thy soul's eye
Had thee misguided into crooked wayes,
Wast thou directed by the Deitie?
They held out to thee their bright lamping rayes,
Dispers'd the mistie darkness, safely set
Thy feeble feet in the right path again.
Nor easie sleep so closely ere beset
Thy eyelids, nor did dimness ere so stain
Thy radiant sight, but thou such things didst see
Even in that tumult, that few can arrive
Of all are named from Philosophie
To that high pitch, or to such secrets dive.

But sith this body thy pure soul divine
Hath left, quite risen from her rotten grave,
Thou now among those heavenly wights dost shine,
Whose abode this glorious lustre doth embrace:
There lovely friendship, mild-smiling Cupid's there,
With lively looks and amorous suavities,
Full of pure pleasure, and fresh flowring cheer;
Ambrosian streams, sprang from the Deitie
Do frankly flow, and soft love-kindling winds
Do strike with a delicious sympathie
Those tender spirits, and fill up their munde
With satisfying joy. The puritie
Of holy fire their heart doth then invade,
And sweet perswasion, meek tranquillitie,
The gentle-breathing aire, the heavens nought sad
Do maken up this great felicitie.
Here Rhadamanthos, and just Aeakos,
Here Minos abides, with those that liv'd of gore
I th' golden age; here Plato vigorous
In holy virtue, and fair Pythagore.
These been the goodly offspring of Great Jove,
And liven here, and whose fill'd the quire
And sweet assembly of immortal love
Purging their spirits with refining fire;
These with the happie angels live in blisse,
Full fraught with joy, and lasting pure delight,
In friendly feasts, and life-outfetting kisse.
But, ah! dear Plotin, what smart did thy spright
Endure, before thou reach'st this high degree
Of happiness? What agonies, what pains
Thou underwent'st to set thy soul so free
From baser life? It now in heaven remains
Mongst the pure Angels. O thrice happy wight!
That now art got into the Land of Life,
Fast plac'd in view of that Eternal Light,
And sitt'st secure from the foul bodie's strife.

But now, you comely virgins, make an end,
Break off this music, and deft seemly round,
Leave off your dance: For Plotin my dear friend
Thus much I meant my golden harp should sound.

* Dr. More was born Oct. 12th 1614, and died Sept. 1st 1687.

† The Dr. refers to the opinion formerly prevalent, but now held by no one who possesses even a modicum of a liberal education, that the gods of the so-called "heathen" were evil spirits or fiends.

SOLUTION OF PHILOSOPHICAL PROBLEMS.

From *La Clef Des Grands Mysteres* of Eliphas Levi.

Translated by William Throckmorton, F. T. S.

FIRST SERIES.

What is truth? It is the idea identical with existence.

What is reality? It is the science identical with existence.

What is reason? It is the word identical with existence.

What is justice? It is the motive of action identical with existence.

What is the absolute? It is existence.

Can we conceive anything above existence? No, but we can conceive in existence itself something supereminent and transcendental.

What is *that*? The supreme cause of existence.

Do you know what it is, and can you define it? Faith alone affirms it and calls it God.

Is there anything above truth? Above the known truth there is the unknown truth.

How can we reasonably suppose this truth? By analogy and proposition.

How can we give a definition of it? By the symbols of faith.

Can we say the same of reality that we do of faith? Exactly the same.

Is there anything above reason? Above finite reason is the infinite reason.

What is the infinite reason? It is that supreme reason of existence which faith calls God.

Is there anything above justice? Yes, according to faith, there is providence with God, and sacrifice with men.

What is sacrifice? It is a benevolent and spontaneous forsaking of rights.

Is sacrifice reasonable? No, it is a species of folly greater than reason, because reason is forced to admire it.

What kind of a man is one who acts according to truth, reality, reason and justice? He is a moral man.

And what kind if for justice he sacrifices his inclinations? He is an honorable man.

And if, to imitate the greatness and goodness of providence, he does more than his duty and sacrifices his rights for the good of others? He is a hero.

What is the principle of true heroism? It is faith.

What is its support? Hope.

What its rule? Charity.

What is goodness? It is Order.

What is wickedness? Disorder.

What is permitted pleasure? The enjoyment of order.

What is forbidden pleasure? The enjoyment of disorder.

What are the consequences of both? Life and death in the moral order.

Hell, then, with all its horrors has its place in reli-

gious dogma? Yes, it is the rigorous consequence of a principle.

What is that principle? Liberty.

What is liberty? It is the right to do one's duty with the possibility of not doing it.

What is to fail to do one's duty? It is to lose one's right. For the right being eternal, to lose it is to incur an eternal loss.

Can we not repair a fault? Yes, by atonement.

What is atonement? It is an increase of work. For instance, because I was lazy yesterday, I must accomplish a double task to-day.

What must we think of those who impose voluntary suffering on themselves? If it is to remedy the brutal inclinations of pleasure, they are wise; if to suffer in the place of others, they are generous; but if they do these things without advice and to excess, they are imprudent.

Therefore, before true philosophy, *is* religion wise in everything that it commands? You see it.

But, if in the end we were mistaken in our eternal expectations? Faith does not admit of a single doubt. But philosophy itself must answer that all worldly pleasures are not worth a day of wisdom, and that all the triumphs of ambition are not worth one instant of heroism and charity.

SECOND SERIES.

What is man? Man is an intelligent and material being made after the image of God and of the world, one in essence, treble in substance, immortal and mortal.

You say treble in substance. Should man have two souls or two bodies? No, there is in him a spiritual soul, a material body, and a plastic mediator.

What is the substance of this mediator? It is light partly movable and partly immovable.

What is the moveable part of this light? It is the magnetic fluid.

What is the immovable part? It is the fluid body.

Is the existence of this fluid body demonstrated? Yes, by experiences the most curious and convincing. We will treat of them in the third part of this work.

Are these experiences articles of faith? No, they belong to science.

But does science bother itself about them? It already bothers itself about them, since we have written this book, and you read it.

Give us some idea of this plastic mediator? It is formed of astral or terrestrial light, and transmits to the human body the double properties of the magnet. The soul, in acting on this light by its volitions, can dissolve or coagulate it, project or withdraw it. It is the mirror of the imagination and of dreams. It reacts on the nervous system, and thus produces the movements of the body. This light can spread itself out indefinitely and exhibit its images at great distances, it rubs magnetically the bodies subject to the action of man, and can, in withdrawing itself, attract them towards him. It can take on all the forms conjured up by thought, and, in the transient coagulations of its radiating portion, appears before the eyes and offers,

also, a kind of resistance to contact. But these manifestations and habits of the plastic mediator being abnormal, the luminous instrument of precision can not produce them without being forced, and necessarily they cause either habitual hallucination or madness.

What is animal magnetism? It is the action of one plastic mediator on another for the purpose of dissolving or coagulating it. In augmenting the elasticity of the vital light, and its force of projection, we send it as far as we wish, or withdraw it loaded with images, but it is necessary that this operation be assisted by the sleep of the subject, which is produced by further coagulation of the immovable portion of its mediator.

Is magnetism contrary to morality and religion? Yes, when it is abused.

How may it be abused? By using it in an irregular manner or for a bad end.

What is using it in an irregular manner? It is the act of sending out unhealthy fluid, and with bad intention; for example, to know the secret of others or to arrive at iniquitous ends.

What is, then, the result? It forges, in the magnetiser and magnetised, the fluid instrument of precision. It is from this cause that is to be attributed the immoral acts and shameful imprudences of a great number of persons who busy themselves with magnetism.

What are the requisite conditions for magnetising properly? Health of mind and body, proper intentions, and discreet practice.

What advantageous results can we obtain by magnetism properly directed? The cure of nervous diseases, the analysis of presentiments, the restoration of fluid harmony, and the discovery of certain secrets of nature.

THE MAGNETIC MYSTERIES.

CHAPTER I

THE KEY OF MESMERISM.

Mesmer has found the secret science of nature again, he has not invented it.

The sole first elementary substance of which he proclaims the existence in his aphorisms was known to Hermes and Pythagoras. Synesios who sang of it in his hymns, had found the revelation of it among the Platonic souvenirs of the school of Alexandria:

* * * * *

"One only source, one only root of light burst forth and blossomed in three branches of splendor. One breath circulates around the world and imparts life to innumerable forms, *all* parts of that animated substance." (Hymns of Synesios, Hymn II.)

Mesmer saw in elementary matter a substance indifferent to motion or rest. Put in motion, it is movable, relapsed into rest it is immovable; he has not understood that motion is inherent to the first substance, that it is the result not of its indifference, but of its combined aptness to motion and rest, one balanced by the other; that absolute rest is no where to be found in universal living matter, but that the immovable attracts the movable to stop it, whilst the movable torments the immovable to set it in motion.

That the pretended rest of the apparently immovable particles is but the most obstinate struggle and greatest tension of their fluid forces, which render each other immovable by neutralization.

It is thus, according to Hermes, that that which is above is as that which is below, the same force which expands the vapor, contracts and hardens the piece of ice; everything obeys the laws of life inherent to the first substance; that substance attracts and repels, coagulates and dissolves, with constant harmony; it is double, it is androgenous; it embraces itself and renders itself fruitful; it struggles, it triumphs, it destroys, it renews, but it never abandons itself to sluggishness, for sluggishness, for it, would be death.

It is this substance that the recitation of Genesis designates when the word of the Gods (elohim) creates light by ordering it to be.

The Gods (elohim) said: Let light be, and light was. This light, of which the Hebrew name is *aur*, is the living fluid gold of the hermetical philosophers. Its positive principle is their sulphur. Its negative principle their mercury, and its principles balanced form what they call their salt.

We must, then, in place of Mesmer's sixth aphorism, stated as follows: "Matter is indifferent to being either in motion or rest."—

Establish this: Universal matter is of necessity in motion by virtue of its double magnetic rubbing, and inevitably seeks equilibrium.

Consequently we will draw the following conclusions: The regularity and variety in the motion are the result of the various combinations of equilibrium.

A point balanced on all sides rests immovable for the same reason that it is endowed with motion.

Fluid is matter in great motion, and always agitated by the change of equilibrium.

Solid is the same matter in slight motion or apparent rest, because it is more or less solidly balanced.

That is not a solid body which can be immediately pulverised, vanish in smoke, and become invisible, if the equilibrium of its particles is disturbed instantly.

That is not fluid which can become instantly harder than the diamond, if we could balance immediately its constituent particles.

To direct the magnets, is to destroy or create forms, it is to produce appearances or annihilate bodies, it is to exercise the omnipotence of nature.

Our plastic mediator is a magnet which attracts or repels the astral light, under the pressure of the will.

It is a luminous body which reproduces with the greatest facility forms corresponding to ideas.

It is the mirror of the imagination. This body nourishes itself on the astral light exactly as the organic body nourishes itself on the products of the earth.

During sleep it absorbs the astral light by immersion, and when awake by a kind of respiration more or less slow.

When the phenomena of natural somnambulism is produced, the plastic mediator is overcharged with nourishment which it digests badly.

The will, then, though bound by the numbness of

sleep, repels instinctively the mediator towards the organs to release it, and it causes a reaction, somewhat mechanical, which balances by the motion of the body the light of the mediator.

It is for this reason that it is so dangerous to awaken somnambulists suddenly, for the cramped mediator can withdraw itself in a sudden manner towards the common reservoir and abandon entirely the organs, which find themselves separated then from the soul, and it is that which causes death.

The state of somnambulism, be it natural or artificial, is therefore extremely dangerous, because in reuniting the phenomena of wakefulness with that of sleep, there is formed a kind of a grand flight between two worlds.

The soul moving the springs of the particular life, in bathing in the universal life, experiences an inexpressible happiness, and slackens willingly the nervous branches, which hold it suspended above the current.

In extasy of all kinds the situation is the same. If the will plunges itself into the condition by a violent effort, or what is the same, gives itself up to it entirely, the subject may remain, an idiot, paralysed or dead.

TAYLORIANA.

I.

There are also prose poets. Thomas Taylor, the Platonist, for instance, is really a better man of imagination, a better poet, or perhaps I should say a better feeder to a poet, than any man between Milton and Wordsworth.—Emerson:—Letters and Social Aims.

II.

We talked of English national character. I told him it was not creditable that no one in all the country knew anything of Thomas Taylor, the Platonist, whilst in every American library his translations are found.—Emerson: English Traits. Interview with Wordsworth.

III.

I am not quite sure whether I understand the bent of what you say as to danger to be apprehended from 'the elegance, the ingenuity, and the seeming wisdom of some part of the heathen mythology.' I have never heard but of one instance in confirmation of your suggestion. There is, I am told, a man now living who is an exceeding admirer of Plato, and who sacrifices to Jupiter. But if this be true he is certainly unique.—Letters Literary and Theological of Connop Thirlwall, Lond., 1881. Letter to Mr. John Candler, dated Jan. 17th, 1817.

IV.

Verses by the late Thomas Taylor, the Platonist.

To M. DE H. S.—

How the mind's perfections shine
Through a form, fair maid, like thine!
Where each grace and every charm
That the coldest breast might warm—
Mixed with dignity and ease—
All restless, join to please:
Where with eyes serenely bright,
Formed to fascinate the sight;
Symmetry of shape conspires
Wide to spread Love's dormant fires,
And the mind-illumined face
Splendour gives to every grace.

He who views such charms as these,
And can keep his wonted ease,
Is one whom beauty can't impress,
Is more than man, or something less.—

From the Gentleman's Magazine for July, 1836.

To E. C.— BY THE SAME.

Plucked by my hand will Rhodoclea wear
The varied wreath which mingled flowers compose;
The Pink and Hyacinth are mingled there;
The pure Narcissus and the blushing Rose:
They gaily bloom; yet turn thy thoughts aside
And whisper to thyself, delightful maid!
These flowers, like me, now bloom in beauty's pride,
And I, like them, must quickly droop and fade.—

From the Gentleman's Magazine for July, 1836.

V.

*** ——— He [Dr. Parr.] would have had the full consciousness that he had the command of the language, and a knowledge of its writers in every class and age, and a philosophical view of its structure and its terms; he would never have made the same remark, which Porson once made to my friend, Mr. Thomas Taylor, the Platonist, at a book sale, when he took up and read a few pages of Maximus Tyrius, 'I did not think that he could have written at the period in which he flourished such good Greek;' Dr. Parr would never have made to the same gentleman the reply which Porson modestly and earnestly made when Mr. Taylor asked him what he thought of Plutarch, 'Aye, he is too much for me.'—Parriana, By E. H. Barker.

VI.

LETTERS.

MADAM

Permit me to request your acceptance of the accompanying little work, as a small remuneration for your most valuable present of "A Sketch of the character of the late Dr. Parr," which I read with no less admiration than delight. From the perusal of it indeed, I should have conceived very highly of your talents, even if Mr. Barker had not informed me that you are "a prodigy of genius, and will be of learning."

Excuse the leaves of the book which I have sent you being cut open as it was the only copy then in my possession.

I remain, Madam, with the greatest esteem for your talents and worth, your much obliged, and most obedient servant,

THOMAS TAYLOR

Manor Place Walworth, Aug. 5th, 1825.*

Professor Lobeck and the Chaldean Oracles.

[From the Athenæum (No. 189.) for June 11th, 1831.]

We insert the following abridged reply of Mr. Taylor to the charges brought against him by Professor Lobeck, and which have been adverted to by the *Foreign Quarterly Review*, without giving any opinion of our own on the question, but simply to enable that gentleman to make his own refutation through a public channel.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE ATHENÆUM.

Sir:—When I found in the *Foreign Quarterly Review* (No. 13. p. 51.), that, according to the reviewer, Professor Lobeck had convicted me not only of ignorance, almost incredible, but of what is worse, literary dishonesty,—though my conscience fully acquitted me of the latter charge, yet I concluded I must have committed some gross error, of which I was not aware, so as in some degree to justify the former accusation.

When, however, I read what Professor Lobeck says respecting me in his "Orphica," I found that his charges, when accurately examined, are not only malignant and scurrilous in the extreme, but also as idle and unsubstantial as, in Pindaric language, "the dream of a shadow."

*I am indebted for the original manuscript of this interesting letter to the courteous liberality of Mr. Bertram Dobell, 62 Queen's Crescent, Haverstock Hill, London, Eng. Mr. Dobell has for sale many of Taylor's rare works.

The following selection of a few instances of the ignorance of Lobeck will, I am fully persuaded, convince the intelligent and learned reader of the truth of what I have said.

In the first place, the Professor appears to be ignorant that, prior to my Collection of the Chaldean Oracles in the 'Classical Journal,' there were three editions of them:—the first by Patricius, the second by Stanley, and the third by Le Clerc. My collection is a *faithful* transcript of the Oracles published by the above mentioned celebrated men, with the addition of more than fifty Oracles to the former editions. Of these learned editors, and also of my additions, Lobeck makes no mention; but whatever his ignorance induced him to conceive to be erroneous, in any one of these venerable relics of antiquity, he ascribes to me, and not to the authors from whom I derived them.

Thus, in a passage from Proclus, in which he says, "that, not perceiving the error of the printer, I have adopted *ὁ ἄρχων* instead of *ὁ ἄρχων*," I only observe that if the Professor had consulted anyone of the above mentioned editors of these Oracles, he would have found the whole of this Oracle exactly in the same state as I have given it; and if he understood anything solidly of ancient theology, of which it is evident he is profoundly ignorant, he would have found that *ὁ ἄρχων* is the true reading. For the Oracle relates to Jupiter, the artificer of the universe; and he is constantly celebrated by ancient theologians, and especially by Plato, in the *Timæus*, as the cause by which things that are in their own nature disorderly and confused, are disposed in a proper order, and from being discordant are bound in union and consent. My version, too, perfectly accords with that of the prior editors of these Oracles. Thus, Patricius:

Ditas enim apud hunc sedet, et intellectualibus fulget sectionibus.

Et gubernare cuncta, et ordinare quodcumque non ordinatum.

Thus, too, Stanley as reedited by Le Clerc:

Dyas enim apud hanc sedet, et intellectualibus fulgurat sectionibus.

Et gubernare omnia, et ordinare unumquodque non ordinatum.

As to the words *νοεραὶ ἀσπραττεῖ τομαίς*, which are not to be found in the above mentioned printed passage of Proclus, I concluded that Patricius had derived them from some MS. of Proclus, in which the whole Oracle existed in a perfect state, and I consequently ascribed the whole line to Proclus.

The Professor's next accusation of me is so replete with malicious misrepresentation, that indignation is too powerless to reprobate it as it deserves. His words are, "Alium ejusdem Procli locum, in Tim. III, 167, τοιούτος γὰρ ὁ κεῖνος νοῦς προενεργείας ἐνέργων, οὐ μὴδε προήλθεν, ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ πατρικῷ βυθῷ εἶπε. Taylorus sic truncavit, ut Schema Alabandicum, sensus autem nullus appareat: Μηδε προήλθεν, ἀλλ', T. XVII. 182. Neque hoc bis terque fecit, sed fere omnibus locis verba ad intellectum sententiae necessaria resecurit, aliena et supervacanea addidit, quasi ex ipsis Oracula deprompta" etc.

If the reader consults the page or the volume of the 'Classical Journal' referred to by Lobeck, he will find this Oracle given *wholly* in the exact words of Proclus, viz:

Μηδε προήλθεν ἀλλ' ἐμεινεν ἐν τῷ πατρικῷ βυθῷ,

Και ἐν τῷ ἀδύτῳ κατὰ τὴν θεοδρεμῶνα δὴν.

And this oracle, as I have there observed, is respecting the extremity of the Chaldean intelligible Triad. It is also a faithful transcript from the editions of Patricius, Stanley, and Le Clerc.

Lobeck proceeds, after this, to adduce other oracles, in which he presents and mutilates what I have said,—displaying in his invective equal malignity and fraud.

The English reviewer, also, in what he says of me, must either have taken for granted, without any examination, that Lobeck's assertions were true, or must be equally malevolent with the Professor. In the former case, his negligence is unpardonable; and his conduct in the latter, as the charges brought against me are wholly unfounded, is impudently libellous, and deserves the castigation of the law. I say this, not because I have received an injury, (for I have not), but because he has done one.

THOMAS TAYLOR

Manor Place, Walworth.

ON THE FABLES OF ANTIQUITY.

BY THOMAS TAYLOR.

Reprinted from the Monthly Magazine for January, 1798.

Though the fables of the ancients are, in their secret meaning, utility, and construction, the most beautiful and admirable pieces of composition which the mind of man is capable of framing, yet nothing has been so little understood, or so shamefully abused. Of the truth of this observation, the philosophic part of my readers will, I persuade myself, be fully convinced, by

comparing the following explanations of some of these fables, with those given by the Abbe Banier, and other modern writers on mythology, in those ridiculous and contemptible publications called *Pantheons*.

That these moderns, indeed, should have grossly erred in their interpretation of ancient fables, is by no means wonderful, if we consider that they appear to have been ignorant that these fables were invented by theological poets,* and adopted by intellectual philosophers;† and, consequently, that their meaning can only be unfolded by recurring to the theology and intellectual philosophy of the ancients.

It is, indeed, easy for ingenious men to give an explanation of an ancient fable, which to the superficial observer shall appear to be the precise meaning which its inventor designed to convey, though it be in reality very far from the truth. This may be easily accounted for by considering, that all fables are images of truths, but those of the ancients of truths with which but few are acquainted. Hence, like pictures of unknown persons, they become the subjects of endless conjecture and absurd opinion, from the similitude which every one *fancies* he discovers in them to objects with which he has been for a long time familiar. He who understands the explanations given by the Platonic philosophers of these fables, will subscribe to the truth of this observation; as it is impossible that these interpretations could so wonderfully harmonize with the external or apparent meaning of the fables, without being the true explanations of their latent sense. Even Lord Bacon himself, though he saw enough to be convinced that these fables were replete with the highest wisdom of which he had any conception, yet was far from penetrating the profound meaning they contain. He has, indeed, done all in attempting to unfold them that great genius, without the assistance of *intellectual philosophy* is able to effect: but the most piercing sagacity, the most brilliant wit, and the most exquisite subtlety of thought, without this assistance, are here of no avail.

This being premised, it will be necessary, in the first place, to observe, that between us and the highest god there are certain mighty powers, which, though rooted in, yet possess energies distinct from their ineffable cause; for we, in reality, are nothing more than the dregs of the universe. These mighty powers are called by the poets a *golden chain*, on account of their *connection* with each other, and *incorruptible* nature. Now, the first of these powers you may call *intellectual*; the second *vivific*; the third *pæonian*, and so on, which the ancients desiring to signify to us by names, have symbolically denominated. Hence, says Olympiodoros (in MS. Comment. in Gorgiam) we ought not to be disturbed on hearing such names as a *Saturnian* power, the power *Jupiter*, and such like, but explore the things to which they allude. Thus, for instance, by a *Saturnian* power rooted in the first cause, understand a *pure intellect*: for *Κρονος*, or *Saturn*, is *κροος νοῦς*, i. e. *ο καθαρος*, or a *pure intellect*. He adds, hence we call all those that are pure and virgins, *κοραι*.

*Orpheus, Homer, Hesiod, &c.

†Pythagoras, Plato, &c.

On this account, too, poets* say, that Saturn devoured his children, and afterwards again sent them into the light, because *intellect* is converted to itself, seeks itself, and is itself sought: but he again refunds them, because intellect not only seeks and procreates, but produces into light and profits. Hence, likewise, Saturn is called *αγκυλομηγης*, or *inflected counsel*, because an inflected figure verges to itself.

Again, as there is nothing disordered and novel in intellect, they represent Saturn as an old man, and as slow in his motion: and hence it is that astrologers say, that such as have Saturn well situated in their nativity are *prudent* and *endued with intellect*.

In the next place, the ancient theologists called life by the name of Jupiter, to whom they gave a twofold appellation, *δία* and *ζήνα*, signifying by these names, that he gives *life through himself*.† Farther still, they assert that the sun is drawn by four horses, and that he is perpetually young, signifying by this his power, which is motive of the whole of nature subject to his dominion, his fourfold conversions, and the vigour of his energies. But they say that the moon is drawn by two bulls: by *two*, on account of her *increase* and *diminution*; but by *bulls*, because as these till the ground, so the moon governs all those parts which surround the earth.

I persuade myself every liberal and intelligent mind will immediately perceive the propriety and accuracy of the above interpretations; and be convinced, from this specimen, that the fables of the ancients are replete with a meaning no less interesting than novel, no less beautiful than sublime.

That your readers may be still farther convinced of this, I shall subjoin the division of fables given by the Platonic philosopher Sallust, in his elegant Treatise on the Gods and the World: "Of fables, some are *theological*, others *physical*, others *psychical*, others *material*, and, lastly, others mixed from these.

"Fables are *theological*, which employ nothing corporeal, but speculate the very essence of the gods; such as the fable which asserts that Saturn devoured his children: for it obscurely intimates the nature of an intellectual god, since every intellect returns into itself.

"But we speculate fables *physically*, when we speak concerning the energies of the gods about the world; as when considering Saturn the same as Time, and calling the parts of time the children of the universe, we assert that the children are devoured by their parents.

"We employ fables in a *psychical* mode when we contemplate the energies of soul; because the intellects of our souls, though by a discursive energy they proceed into other things, yet abide in their parents.

"Lastly, fables are *material*, such as the Egyptians ignorantly employ, considering and calling corporeal natures divinities; such as Isis, earth; Osiris, humidity; Typhon, heat: or again, denominating Saturn, water;

* So in Hesiod in his Theogony.

† These etymologies of Saturn and Jupiter, are given by Plato in the Cratylus; a dialogue in which he every where etymologises agreeably to the Orphic theology. Most critics, not perceiving that Plato's design in this dialogue was to speculate names *philosophically*, and not *grammatically*, have very ridiculously considered his etymologies as for the most part false.

Adonis, fruits; and Bacchus, wine. Indeed, to assert that these are dedicated to the gods, in the same manner as herbs, stones, and animals, is the part of wise men; but to call them gods, is alone the province of mad men; unless we speak in the same manner as when, from established custom, we call the orb of the sun, and its rays, the sun itself.

"But we may perceive the *mixed* kind of fable, as well in many other particulars, as in the fable which relates that Discord, at a banquet of the gods, threw a golden apple, and that a dispute about it arising among the goddesses, they were sent by Jupiter to take the judgment of Paris who, charmed with the beauty of Venus, gave her the apple in preference to the rest. For in this fable the banquet denotes the supermundane* powers of the gods; and on this account they subsist in conjunction with each other: but the golden apple denotes the world, which, on account of its composition from contrary natures, is not improperly said to be thrown by Discord, or Strife. But again, since different gifts are imparted to the world by different gods, they appear to contest with each other for the apple. And a soul living according to sense (for this is Paris) not perceiving other powers in the universe, asserts that the contended apple subsists alone through the beauty of Venus."

If the intellectual philosophy, then, is alone the true key to ancient mythology, surely nothing can be more ridiculous than the attempt of the Abbe Banier to explain ancient fables by history; not to mention that his interpretations are always trifling, and frequently impertinent; are neither calculated to instruct nor amuse, and are equally remote from elegance and truth. That this is not mere declamation, the following instance from his *Mythology*, will, I persuade myself, abundantly evince: "I shall make it appear (says he) that the *Minotaur*, with *Pasiphae*, and the rest of that fable, contain nothing but an intrigue of the queen of Crete with a captain named Taurus; and the artifice of Dædalus, only a sly confident." Let the reader contrast with this the following explanation of this fable, given by Olympiodorus in his MS. Commentary on the Gorgias of Plato: "The *Minotaur* signifies the savage passions which our nature contains: the *thread* which Ariadne gave to Theseus, a certain divine power connected with him: and the *labyrinth*, the obliquity and abundant variety of life. Theseus therefore being one of the most excellent characters, vanquished this impediment, and freed others together with himself."

EXHORTATION TO THE READERS AND HEARERS OF PLOTINOS.

BY MARSILIUS FICINUS.

Translated from the Original Latin.

Primarily I advise all of you who come hither to hear the Divine Plotinos, that you should think that you will hear Platon himself speaking in the form of Plotinos. For whether Platon once lived again or

* By this is to be understood, powers which are wholly unconnected with every thing of a corporeal nature.

† Vol. 1, of the translation of his *Mythology*, p. 29.

Plotinos, which the Pythagoreans will readily concede may have been the case, or whether the same Dæmon that first inspired Platon afterwards inspired Plotinos, the possibility of which no Platonists will deny—however this may be, it must be admitted that the same Divinity inspired both the Platonic and Plotinian discourse. But in Platon he pours forth by inspiration a more abundant, in Plotinos a more divine, power—perhaps I should not say *more* divine but it is at least not less divine, and sometimes almost more profound (recondite). And thus the same deity through each of these individuals announces to the human race divine oracles, worthy in every respect of a most acute interpreter. Whereas Platon vigorously applies his intellect to unfolding the signification of ideas from their manifold coverings, Plotinos diligently labors in investigating the most sacred thoughts, universally, and in portraying them in terse, pregnant language.

Remember, moreover, that you will not be able by sensuous perception or mere human reason to penetrate the profound intellect of Plotinos, but only by using certain higher intellect (intuitive reason). Indeed, to speak Platonically, we call other men rational souls, but Plotinos himself intellect, and not a soul. This was the appellation given him by all the philosophers of his age, especially the Platonists. And would that in the interpretation of the mysteries of this philosopher there was present to us the aid of Porphyrios, Eustochios or Proklos, who arranged and expounded the works of Plotinos. I hope nevertheless that, which would be still more fortunate, divine assistance will not be wanting to Marsilius Ficinus in translating and expounding the divine books of Plotinos. But let us at once happily proceed, under celestial auspices, to translate and briefly explain the first book of Plotinos, and successively the rest of his writings.

And you should think therefore that you hear Platon himself thus exclaiming to Plotinos: "This is my beloved son with whom I am wholly pleased; hear ye him."

THE ELEMENTS OF THEOLOGY.

BY PROKLOS.

Translated from the original Greek.

PROPOSITION CXXIII.

Every thing divine is itself indeed, on account of its superessential union, ineffable and unknown to all secondary natures; but it is comprehended and known by its participants. Hence, *that which is first*, is alone perfectly unknown, as being imparticipable.

For all knowledge which subsists through reasoning and language, pertains to beings, and in beings possesses the apprehension of truth. For it comes into contact with conceptions, and subsists in intellections. But the Gods are beyond all beings. Neither, therefore, is that which is divine doxastic, or the object of opinion, nor is it dianoetic, nor intelligible. For every being is either sensible, and on this account doxastic, or truly existing being, and on this account intelligible, or it is between these, subsisting as *being* and at the same time *generation*, and on this account is dianoetic.

If, therefore, the Gods are superessential, and subsist prior to beings, there is neither any opinion of them, nor science and dianoia, nor intellection. But the nature of their peculiarities is known by the beings that are suspended from them. And this by a necessary consequence. For the differences of participants are co-divided conformably to the peculiarities of the participated natures. And neither does every thing participate of every thing; for there is no co-ordination of things perfectly dissimilar. Nor does any casual thing participate of that which is casual. But that which is kindred is conjoined to that which is kindred, and proceeds from that to which it is allied.

PROPOSITION CXXIV.

Every God knows partible natures impartibly, temporal natures without time, things which are not necessary necessarily, mutable natures immutably; and in short, all things in a manner more excellent than the order of the things known.

For if every thing which is with the Gods, is with them according to their peculiarity, it is evident that the knowledge in the Gods of things inferior, will not subsist according to the nature of the inferior things, but according to the exempt transcendence of the Gods. Hence, their knowledge of multiplied and passive natures, will be uniform and impassive. If, therefore, the object of knowledge is partible, divine knowledge will be impartible. If the objects that are known are mutable, the knowledge of the Gods will be immutable; if they are contingent, they will be known by the Gods necessarily; and if they are indefinite, definitely. For that which is divine, does not receive knowledge from subordinate beings, in order that thus the knowledge may be such as is the nature of the thing known. But subordinate beings become indefinite about the definite nature of the Gods, are changed about their immutability, receive passively that which is impassive in them, and temporally that which in them is without time. For it is possible for subordinate to be surpassed by more excellent natures; but it is not lawful for the Gods to receive any thing from beings inferior to themselves.

PROPOSITION CXXV.

Every God, from that order from which he began to unfold himself into light, proceeds through all secondary natures, always indeed multiplying and dividing the communications of himself, but preceiving the peculiarity of his own hypostasis.

For progressions being effected through diminution, first natures are every where after a manner multiplied into the decrements of secondary natures. But these proceeding according to a similitude to their producing causes receive their orderly distribution, so that the whole of that which proceeds is after a manner the same with, and different from, that which abides; through its diminution indeed, appearing to be different, but though continuity with its cause, not departing from sameness with it. But such as that which abides is among first, such as that which proceeds among secondary natures; and thus an indissoluble communion of the series is preserved. Each of the Gods, therefore, is unfolded into light appropriately, in

the orders in which he makes his evolution. But he proceeds from thence, as far as to the last of things, through the generative power of first natures. He is always, however, multiplied according to a progression from unity into multitude. But he preserves sameness in the progression, through the similitude of the things that proceed to the leader and primary cause of each series.

PROPOSITION CXXVI.

Every God who is nearer to *the one* is more total, but the God who is more remote from it is more partial.

For the God, who is the cause of a greater number of effects, is nearer to that which produces all things; but he who is the cause of a less number is more remote from it. And he indeed, who is the cause of a greater number of effects, is more total; but he who is the cause of a less number is more partial. And each indeed, is a unity; but the one is greater, and the other less in power. The more partial Gods also are generated from the more total; the latter not being divided, for they are unities; nor changed in quality, for they are immoveable; nor multiplied by habitude, for they are unmingled. But they generate secondary progressions from themselves, which are the decrements of the natures prior to them, through abundance of power.

PROPOSITION CXXVII.

Every thing divine, is especially primarily simple, and on this account most sufficient to itself.

For that it is indeed simple, is evident from its union; since every thing divine is most unical. But a thing of this kind is transcendently simple. That it is also most sufficient to itself, may be learnt by considering that a composite nature is indigent, if not of other things to which it is external, yet of those things of which it is composed. But that which is most simple and unical, and which establishes itself in *the good*, is most sufficient to itself. Such, however, is every thing divine. Neither, therefore, is it indigent of other things, existing as goodness itself, nor of things requisite to composition, because it is unical.

PROPOSITION CXXVIII.

Every God, when participated by natures nearer to himself, is participated without a medium; but when participated by natures more remote from himself, the participation is through a less or greater number of media.

For the former through their alliance being uniform, are immediately able to participate of the divine unities; but the latter through their diminution, and extension into multitude, require other things which are more united, in order that they may participate of the unities themselves, and not of things united. For united multitude subsists between unity itself and divided multitude; being indeed able to coalesce with unity, but allied in a certain respect to divided multitude, through the representation of multitude.

PROPOSITION CXXIX.

Every divine body is divine through a deified soul. But every soul is divine through a divine intellect. And every intellect is divine through the participation

of a divine unity. And unity indeed is of itself a God; intellect is most divine; soul is divine; but body is deiform.

For if every number of the Gods is above intellect, but participations are effected through kindred and similiar natures, the impartible essence will primarily participate of the superessential unities. But the nature which comes into contact with generation will participate of them secondarily. And generation in the third place. Each of these likewise participates of them through the proximately superior natures. And the peculiarity of the Gods indeed proceeds as far as to the last of things, in its participants; but through media allied to itself. For unity indeed imparts the transcendent power of itself to the first intellect, among divine natures, and causes this intellect to be like itself according to unical multitude. But through intellect it is also present with soul, conjoining soul with intellect and co-inflaming it [with divine fire], when this intellect is participable. And through the echo* of soul, imparting also to body its own peculiarity, if it is a body which participates something of soul. And thus body becomes not only animated and intellectual, but also divine. For it receives life indeed and motion from soul; but indissoluble permanency from intellect; and divine union from participated unity. For each of these imparts its own hyparxis to the subsequent nature.

PROPOSITION CXXX.

In every divine order, such things as are first, are in a greater degree exempt from the natures proximately arranged under them, than these latter are from things subsequent. And secondary natures in a greater degree adhere to their proximate superiors, than following natures to these.

For by how much more unical and total any thing is, by so much the more is it allotted a greater transcendency with respect to subsequent natures. And by how much the more diminished it is according to power, by so much the more is it connascent with the natures posterior to itself. And more elevated natures indeed are more united with their more principal causes; but inferior natures are less united with them. For it is the province of a greater power to be more exempt from subordinate, and to be more united to better natures. As on the contrary, it is the province of a diminution of power, to recede in a greater degree from more excellent, and to be co-passive with subordinate natures. And this happens to secondary, but not to first natures, in every order of things.

PROPOSITION CXXXI.

Every God begins his own energy from himself.

For he first exhibits the peculiarity of his presence with secondary natures, in himself; because he imparts himself to other things also according to his own ex-

*By the echo of soul, Proclus means, that vital quality by which the soul is united to the body; and which is nothing more than the last image and shadow of the soul. The necessity of such a connecting quality will easily appear, from considering that a truly incorporeal nature, like that of soul, cannot be connected with body without a vital medium. In consequence of this we may consider with Plotinus (Ennead. 4. lib. 4) the animated body as resembling illuminated and heated air. And the pains and pleasures of the body will be conversant with this shadow of the soul.

berant plenitude. For neither is deficiency adapted to the Gods, nor fulness alone. For every thing deficient is imperfect, and not being itself perfect, it is impossible it should make another thing to be perfect. But that which is full is alone sufficient to itself, and is not yet prepared to communicate. It is necessary, therefore, that the nature which fills other things, and which extends to other things the communications of itself should be super-plenary or exuberantly full. Hence, if a divine nature fills all things from itself with the good which it contains in itself, it is exuberantly full. And if this be the case, establishing first in itself the peculiarity which it imparts to others, it will extend to them the communications of super-plenary goodness.

PROPOSITION CXXXII.

All the orders of the Gods are bound in union by a medium.

For all the progressions of beings are effected through similars; and much more will the orders of the Gods possess an indissoluble continuity, as subsisting uniformly, and being defined according to *the one*, which is the principal cause of their existence. The decrements, therefore, are produced unitedly, and alone according to the similitude in beings of secondary to first natures. And this, because the hyparxis of the Gods much more consists in union than the subsistence of beings. All the divine genera, therefore, are bound together by appropriate media; and first natures do not proceed into progressions perfectly different without a medium, but through the genera common to each, from which they proceed and of which they are immediately the causes. For these congregate the extremes into one union, being spread under some things connacently, but proximately exempt from others. And they preserve the well-ordered generation of divine natures.

PROPOSITION CXXXIII.

Every God is a beneficent unity or an unific (*ενομοιος*) goodness; and each, so far as a God, possesses this hyparxis. The first God, however, is simply good, and simply one. But each posterior to the first, is a certain goodness, and a certain unity.

For the divine peculiarity distinguishes the unities and goodnesses of the Gods, so that each according to a certain peculiarity of goodness, such as that of perfecting or connectedly-containing, or defending, benefits all things. For each of these is a certain good, but not every good. But the first God pre-establishes a unical cause. Hence, that is *the good*, as giving subsistence to all goodness. For all the hyparxes of the Gods, are not together equal to *the one*; so great a transcendency is the first God allotted with respect to the multitude of the Gods.

PROPOSITION CXXXIV.

Every divine intellect intellectually perceives indeed, as intellect, but energizes providentially as a God.

For it is the illustrious prerogative of intellect to know beings, and to have its perfection in intellections. But it is the province of a God to energize providentially, and to fill all things with good. This communication, however, and replenishing with good, is accomplished

through the union of the replenishing natures with the causes prior to themselves; which intellect, also imitating, passes into sameness with intelligibles. A divine intellect, therefore, so far as it energizes providentially, is a God; providence being established in an energy prior to intellect. Hence, as a God it imparts itself to all things; but as intellect it is not present with all things. For a divine nature extends to things into which the intellectual peculiarity does not proceed. For beings which are without intellect desire to energize providentially, and to participate of a certain good. But this is because all things indeed do not aspire after intellect, not even all such as are able to participate of it. All things, however, aspire after good, and hasten to obtain it.

PROPOSITION CXXXV.

Every divine unity is participated by some being immediately, or without a medium; and every deified nature is extended to one divine unity. As many also as are the participated unities, so many are the participating genera of beings.

For neither two or more unities are participated by one being. For since the peculiarities in the unities are different, must not that which is connascent with each be different also, since contact is effected through similitude? Nor is one unity participated in a divided manner by many beings. For many beings are unadapted to be conjoined with unity, and as beings they are unconjoined with the unity which is prior to beings, and as *many*, they are separated from unity. It is necessary, however, that the thing which participates should be partly similar to that which is participated, and partly different and dissimilar. Since, therefore, that which participates is something belonging to beings, but unity is superessential, and according to this they are dissimilar; it is necessary that the participant should be one, in order that according to this, it may be similar to *the one* which is participated, though of these, the latter is one in such a manner as to be unity, but the former, so as to be passive to *the one*, and to be united through the participation of unity.

PROPOSITION CXXXVI.

Every God who is more total, and arranged nearer to the first, is participated by a more total genus of beings. But the God who is more partial, and more remote from the first, is participated by a more partial genus of beings. And as being is to being, so is one divine unity to another.

For if unities are as many in number as beings, and vice versa, and one unity is participated by one being, it is evident that the order of beings proceeds according to the order of the unities, being assimilated to the order prior to beings. And more total beings indeed are connascent with more total unities, but more partial beings with more partial unities. For if this were not the case, again similars would be conjoined with dissimilars, and there would not be a distribution according to desert. These things, however, are impossible. Since from thence the one, and an appropriate measure are luminously imparted to all things,

and from these proceed. Much more, therefore, will there be an order of participation in these, similars being suspended as much as possible from similars.

PROPOSITION CXXXVII.

Every unity in conjunction with *the one* gives subsistence to the being which participates of it.

For *the one*, as it gives subsistence to all things, so likewise it is the cause of the participated unities, and of beings suspended from these unities. But the unity belonging to every being produces the peculiarity which shines forth in that particular being. And *the one* indeed is the cause of existence simply; but unity is the cause of alliance, because it is connascent with *the one*. Hence, unity is that which of itself defines the being which participates of it, and essentially exhibits in itself a superessential peculiarity. For everywhere, from that which is primary that which is secondary is that which it is. If, therefore, there is a certain superessential peculiarity of deity, this also belongs to the being which participates of it superessentially.

PROPOSITION CXXXVIII.

Of all the deified natures which participate of the divine peculiarity, the first and highest is *being itself*.

For if being is beyond intellect and life, as has been demonstrated, and if it is also after *the one* the cause of the greatest number of effects, being will be the highest deified nature. For it is more single than life and intellect, and is on this account entirely more venerable. But there is not anything else prior to it except *the one*. For prior to unical multitude what else can there be except *the one*? But being is unical multitude as consisting of bound and infinity. And in short, the superessential one is prior to essence. Since also in the illuminations which are imparted to secondary natures, *the one* alone extends beyond being. But being is immediately posterior to *the one*. For that which is being in capacity, but is not yet being, is nevertheless according to its own nature one. And that which follows the being that is in capacity is now being in energy. Hence, in the principles of things, non-being is immediately beyond being, as something more excellent, and no other than *the one itself*.

PROPOSITION CXXXIX.

All things which participate of the divine unities, originate indeed from being, but end in a corporeal nature.

For being is the first of participants, but body the last; for we say that there are divine bodies. For the highest of all the genera of bodies, souls and intellects, are attributed to the Gods, that in every order, things analogous to the Gods may connect and preserve secondary natures, and that each number may be a whole, containing all things in itself, according to the whole which is in a part, and possessing prior to other things the divine peculiarity. The divine genus, therefore, subsists corporeally, psychically, and intellectually. And it is evident that all these are divine according to participation. For that which is primarily divine subsists in the unities. Hence, the participants of the divine unities originate indeed from being, but end in a corporeal nature.

IAMBlichOS: ON THE MYSTERIES.

A NEW TRANSLATION BY ALEXANDER WILDER.

THE PROBLEM EXPLAINED.

XII. It is necessary, however, to enquire particularly in respect to these things, now they occur and what reason there is for them. It behooves us to keep in mind that the universe is as a single Living Being; and that the parts in it are separated by spaces, but have a single nature and are eager to be with each other.* The entire uniting principle, the cause of the intimate conjunction, draws the parts spontaneously to a commingling with each other. It is possible for this, however, to be set a going and urged on beyond what should be. This cause, extending from itself to the whole universe, is good and the source of completeness; it joins the divided parts together in a common relationship, union and due proportion; and by virtue of the union it establishes the indissoluble principle of Love which holds and preserves the things that are, and those that belong to the region of change. In the parts, however, through their separation from each other and from the integral body, and because they are in their own individual nature incomplete, deficient and weak, it effects union by means of passion; wherefore desire, as well as inborn appetite, abound in them generally. Observing that it is sown by Nature and apportioned universally, the Art,† being itself distributed through nature in many parts, attracts it to itself in a variety of ways, and draws it off as by accord. That which is orderly it leads into disorder, and that which is beautiful it transforms into dispropor-

*See Plotinos: *Ennead*, IV. iv. 32. "This universe is one, and as a single living being. As it is a living being and made complete in the unity, there is nothing in it so distant in space as not to be near to the peculiar nature of the one living being by reason of mutual sympathy."

†Psellus in his *Treatise on Demons* has elaborately set forth this technique of "Black Magic." He describes it as the exhibition of an actual energy, which reminds one of the elemental and elementary spirits treated of by Paracelsus. "Goeteia" (black magic or witchcraft), he declares, "is a technique relating to the demons of the material universe and the Underworld. It brings their apparitions into the view of seers; some of them from the region below, and others from above, all of them of very bad character. It renders phantoms visible to spectators, causes streams to flow before them, and announces liberations from bonds, abundance of luxuries, and other things ample to satisfy every wish. They bring these energies into activity by means of songs and incantations." Zoroaster, it will be remembered, ascribed all these spells to the *Mantras* of the Brahmins.

"The Magian Technic is regarded by Hellenic Sages as of the greatest account. They declare it to be truly the extreme of Sacred Knowledge. It discloses the nature and quality of all sublunary things, namely: of the elements and their component parts, living animals, plants of all kinds and their fruits, stones and herbs,—and in short everything, its essence and power. Hence, therefore, it works out results of itself; it employs images productive of health; and makes devices of every kind, and other fabrications causing disease. The hypothesis is that eagles and serpents, which are long-lived are conducive to health; and that cats, dogs and crows are symbols of vigilance. Wax and potter's clay are used in the construction of the phallic emblems. Often, too, in addition to these things, there is a manifestation of flaming fire from the sky; images laugh, and torches are lighted by fire blazing up spontaneously."

Apuleius affirms similar things. "By magic mutterings," says he, "swells streams are made to flow backward, the sea to be congealed, the winds to lose their force, the sun to be held still in his course, the moon to shed a poisonous spume, the stars to fall from their places, the day to be eclipsed, and the night prolonged." (*The Golden Ass*.)

In Thessaly, the fabled abode of Aesculapios, the Kentaur priest-physician, and other superhuman races, the arts were cultivated, anciently designated magic, and in modern periods, Animal Magnetism.—A. W.

portion and disfigurement. The sacred end in every individual which is kindred to unity, it changes to a complete something unbecoming and of different character, a coming together after a fashion of those that are diverse by means of a mutual passive condition. It likewise gives forth a material from itself which is not suitable for the entire creation of that which is excellent, either not receiving beauty as well as everything else or changing it to the opposite. It also mingles many different physical powers; by which as it may see fit, it directs the commixture toward the sphere of existence. We therefore set forth from every side that the provision for sexual connections of this kind is the outcome from some technic of human origin, but not from any spiritual or divine necessity.

XIII. You will therefore examine a class of causes of a different kind; now the nature of stones and the energies of plants produce many wonderful things from themselves.* It is not the case in respect to these things alone, but the same natural superiority exists in respect to greater natures and in greater matters; which they who can not come to conclusions by reasoning, may readily impute to the operations of nature. Now therefore it may be acknowledged, that in the objective world, and in respect to human affairs, and whatever things are in the spaces about the earth, the tribe of wicked dæmons are able to maintain the superiority to the greater degree. What wonder is it then if such a tribe performs deeds of this character? Every man may not be able to discriminate which is the good and which the evil one, or by what tokens they are to be distinguished from each other. Indeed those individuals who are not able to perceive the distinction conclude absurdly the enquiry respecting the category to which these belong, and carry it up to the superior races of the realm of nature and of the order of dæmons. But even though certain powers of the divided† soul in respect to these things are grasped in order to bring it to perfection, both while it exists in a body and when it is ridded of the oyster-like and earthly corporeality, but wanders below in the regions of the transition-world with a disturbed and melting spirit, nevertheless the same opinion would be true; but it separates the category very far from the superior natures. By no means, therefore, does the divine nature or any good dæmon whatever minister to the unlawful desires of human beings in regard to sexual concerns; since there are many other existing categories of these observations.

(End of Part IV.)

PART V.

THE UTILITY OF SACRIFICES.

I. Hence the question which you display such continual solicitude about is a common source of anxious interest in the discussions of every body, so to speak,

*Emendation of the text by Marsilio Ficino. It is ungrammatical as it reads.

†The human soul is divided as being partly included in the category and influence of the body, while the nobler part is still a denizen of the Eternal Region. Hence the declaration of Paul to the Corinthians: "We know that though our earthly house of this tabernacle should be dissolved, we have a divine building, a house not made by hands, eternal in the heavens."

both among the learned and the more ignorant. I mean your question in relation to sacrifices: "what utility or power they have—whether it is in the universe and with the Gods; and also the reason for which they are presented—whether it is fitness in those who are thus honored, and advantage for those who bring the gifts." There also occurs another contradiction, namely: "that it is necessary for the interpreters to abstain from animal food in order that the divinities may not come in contact with the exhalations from it; whereas, on the contrary, they are especially brought under the dominion of charms by exhalations from animals."

II. Any one therefore may easily enough do away with the conflict of the proposition, by pointing out the supremacy of the universe to its parts, and calling to mind the excellence of the divine above human beings. Thus, for example, I say that for the universal soul to be at the head of the world-body,* and for the celestial divinities to enter the celestial body, is by no means hurtful in the reception, nor an impediment to the intellectual perceptions. But for the imperfect soul to be associated with a body is disadvantageous in both these particulars. Suppose therefore, that any one perceiving this, infuses some doubt like this—that if the body is a fetter to our soul, it will also be to the soul of the universe; and if the divisible soul is corporealised through coming into objective existence, so with the universal soul. Every one will meet this suggestion by the statement that such an individual does not know the excellence of the superior beings above human beings, and of the universe above the parts. As these objections relate to things diverse from each other they do not in any matter create any real matter of dispute.

III. Here therefore, the same reason also suffices. With us the delight of the bodies which have been heretofore united with the soul, rubs off upon us a heaviness and defilement, brings forth a disposition for pleasure, and produces many other disorders in the soul. In respect to the divine beings however, and of the cosmic powers and universal categories, the exhalation from these sacrifices being induced in some sacred manner, this delight being particular and not universal, united to the universe, but uniting the universe and the orders of divine beings to itself, is itself made harmonious with the superior beings and the universal categories, but does not prevail over them and make them at one with itself.

IV. By no means, if one understands the matter aright, is there any trouble like what suggests itself to you as you contend, concerning *Abstinence from Animal Food*. It is not in order that the gods may not be defiled by the vapors from animals, that those who conduct the worship of them obtain from animal food. What exhalations from bodies will approach the beings who, before any thing material may come near their power, cut matter impalpably away from them? Their

*Stobaios has preserved the following fragment of Iamblichos which may serve as an aid to understand this doctrine: "All souls have not the same relationship to bodies; but the complete soul, as is set forth by Plotinos, has in itself the body agreeable to itself, but never is joined to a body nor contained by it. But those which are divisible yield themselves to the bodies and become components of the bodies."

power alone, however, does not make away with the bodies, and obliterate them all without coming near them. On the other hand a celestial body is unmingled with every material element.* It does not admit any thing into itself from without, nor may it give forth any part of itself to things distinct from it. How, then, can an earthly vapor which does not rise five stades from the ground before it drops again to the earth, come near the heaven or nourish the revolving and immaterial body; or in short produce any defilement in it, or any other condition? For it is acknowledged that the ætherial body is without any contrary impulsion, and that it is free from all change—that it is entirely pure from the possibility of transformation into something else, and utterly without any tendency to the centre or from the centre, because it is without tendency in any direction or revolves in a circle. There is not, therefore, by any means, any communion of nature or power of the bodies which consist of different powers and activities that are variously changed, being moved upward or downward, or any exhalation of them mingled with the celestial bodies. They are entirely separated from these, and therefore will produce nothing in them. Being unbecomming, these have no power to receive any change in themselves from those that are subject to mutability. How then may the divine beings be defiled from these vapors, when, as I may say, they cut away at a blow the vapors of universal matter, and material bodies?

It is not proper therefore to conjecture this thing. You ought rather by far to consider that these are foreign to us and our nature. Those which are separated into divisions, can have a certain relationship to each other, actively and passively, the material with the material, and in short like natures with like natures. But those that are of another essence, that are entirely superior, and possess other natures and powers, are not capable of these things, either to act upon others or to receive any thing from one another. The pollution, therefore, from material substances occurs to those still held by a material body. From these it is necessary for those to be purified who can be contaminated by matter. But those who have not a divided nature, and who do not possess the power to receive into themselves the conditions from matter, how can they be defiled by material contaminations? How can the divine nature, which has nothing in common with us, existing prior and superior to weak humankind, be perturbed by my passions or those of any other human being?

Neither of these, therefore, is common with the divine beings—neither that we are filled with material bodies, for they have nothing at all of this kind, nor are they defiled by our stains, for they are entirely undefiled and uncontaminated; nor through these are any material emanations of bodies given forth from the earth. These things are at the greatest distance from the divine essence and power. The entire hypothesis of contrariety of nature is destroyed altogether if no part of it exists about the gods. For how can that which is not have

any contest in itself? In vain therefore do you conjecture these things so absurd; and you bring up questions unworthy of the divine beings, which one may not with good reason even adduce in regard to mankind. No human being possessing the intellective faculty and free from passion—much less any of the superior beings—would ever permit himself to be allured by the exhalations of sacrificial vapors.

These things however made the topic of discourse, a little space after this. But now, this notion of a contrariety of nature having been controverted by means of many refutations, we will now leave off the reasoning in respect to the first topic of discussion.

CONCERNING SACRIFICES.

V. The question is greater, and you enquire concerning more important matters. How will I be able, to answer briefly and fully a problem which is difficult and requires a long explanation? I will reply, nevertheless, and will not fail in readiness. Let me endeavor to comply with what you have briefly indicated, and even to certain suggestions of significance.

Let me declare my doctrine concerning *Sacrifices*. It is by no means necessary to make offerings for the sake of honor alone, for the same reason that we honor our benefactors; nor for acknowledgment as a rendering of thanks for the benefits which the gods have bestowed upon us; nor yet as a first-fruit or recompense by way of gifts for older ones which the gods have conferred upon us. These things are common to mankind, and are received by the common administration of affairs. But they by no means preserve the notion of the supremacy of the divine beings, and of their order as distinct categories.

DISCOVERY OF TWO FRAGMENTS OF A CYCLIC POEM ATTRIBUTED TO PROKLOS.

In the fifth volume of *Herimathena*, a valuable philological publication, there is an interesting paper entitled "On Two Fragments of a Greek Papyrus" by the Bishop of Limerick, in which he attempts to show, and not unsuccessfully we think, that he has discovered fragments of a cyclic poem hitherto unknown, written by Proklos the noted Platonic philosopher. Parts of this paper we will extract for the sake of our philosophic readers to whom nothing concerning Proklos is without interest.

"In the spring of 1882, during a residence of some weeks at Luxor, I was tempted by an Arab dealer in antiquities, who paid me frequent mysterious visits, to buy, one after another, several small parcels of papyrus which he assured me had been recently found in a tomb near Medinet Abu. They were plainly genuine. * * *

The small bits of papyrus offered to me were hundreds in number, many of them exhibiting only two or three letters; and I judged, perhaps hastily, that they were of no great value. They appeared for the most part to be fragments of short letters in Coptic, relating to the affairs of a convent. Medinet Abu, where I was told they were found, was the seat of a Bishop: a cathedral dedicated to St. Athanasius once stood in the

*Proklos describes a celestial body as containing the pure principle of all the elements. It is a vivifying fire that does not burn; a nucleus of vital energy.

mag
Ran
erab
of le
in v
scrap
the c
info
tory
tions
these
writt
ceede
fragn
writt
serve

Wh
them
Priam
on sor
of wh
scruti
true t
commo
consist
compa
there v
critics
an obli
iarity
class o
ingenue
works
subject

In an
andrian
ance of
the con
introdu

The r
conside
these fr
foundat
however
lieving
these he
by Prok
deserve
by his e
man of

He is
cian; bu
with dis
a comme
of his x
ter and
Greek po

*Prof. Co
sive and
THE PLATON

magnificent courtyard of the temple built there by Rameses III.; and in its neighborhood were two considerable monasteries, amongst the inmates of which men of learning were probably to be found. Keeping this in view, I continued to buy instalments of papyrus scraps, hoping in the end to complete a few documents, the contents of which would add to the scanty store of information we possess respecting the ecclesiastical history of Upper Egypt. I cannot say that these expectations have as yet been realized. However, in sorting these fragments, I observed that several of them were written in Greek. Setting these aside, I finally succeeded in putting them together, so as to form the two fragments which I am about to describe. As they are written on both sides of the papyrus, we have thus preserved four groups of incomplete hexameter lines.

* * * * *

When first I looked at these verses, and noticed in them the names of Helen, Menelaus, Patroclus, and Priam, I hastily conceived the hope that I had lighted on some fragments of the Cyprian Epic, the argument of which has been preserved for us by Proklos. A closer scrutiny has led me to a different conclusion. It is quite true that these verses contain several archaic words commonly used by Homer. But this would not be inconsistent with the supposition that they belonged to a comparatively recent age. In the Alexandrian School there were for several centuries a host of grammarians, critics, and makers of verses, amongst whom Homer was an object of devoted study. So perfect was the familiarity with his works acquired by some of them, that a class of writers called *Homeric poets* exercised their ingenuity in forming centos of verses taken from the works of Homer, and pieced together so as to apply to subjects of a wholly different kind. * * * * *

In an epic composed by one of the poets of the Alexandrian museum we should be sure to find an abundance of Homeric words and phrases. But the date of the composition would probably be indicated by the introduction of expressions of a later period. * * *

The reader may perhaps think it worth his while to consider a very different theory as to the authorship of these fragments, though it rests upon slight and narrow foundations. It is in fact a mere guess. I venture however to state it. A critic might be excused for believing, though he could go little way to prove, that these hexameters were part of a cyclic poem written by Proklos the neoplatonist. Proklos may not have deserved the exaggerated praises bestowed upon him by his editor Victor Cousin; but he was undoubtedly a man of great capacity and varied acquirements.*

He is best known as a philosopher and a mathematician; but he was also a man of letters, and presided with distinction over the school at Athens. He wrote a commentary on Hesiod which is extant. An abstract of his *χρηστομαθία γραμματική*, a treatise on the matter and style of the writings of the most celebrated Greek poets, has been preserved in the *Bibliotheca* of

Photius. He wrote a short life of Homer, also Scholia, and a Commentary on the works of that poet. His biographer Marinus, who succeeded him as president of the School of Athens, tells us that he composed many hymns, in which he celebrated not only the divinities of the Greeks, but also those venerated by the Arabians, Nubians, and other nations. He was laborious to a miracle. If we may believe Marinus, he frequently completed in one day as many as five or even more lectures, and wrote besides many verses, often to the number of seven hundred; and he continued this career of poetic diligence in his old age, after his health had been impaired by labor and asceticism. Of all these compositions only six [seven] have been preserved: a hymn to the sun, two to Venus, and one to the Muses; also two elegiac poems, one an inscription on a statue of Dionysus, the other his own epitaph.

Thomas Taylor, who not only translated and commented on the works of Proklos, but was a devout believer in his whole system of philosophy and theology, speaks of the merit of these poems in terms of extravagant praise: "They bear," he says, "most evident marks of a mind full of a divine light, and agitated by the fury of the Muses, and possesses all that elegance of composition for which the writings of Proklos are so remarkable"; and he adds that "they breathe too much of the spirit and manner of Proklos to be the production of any other". Without discussing their merit, we are safe in recognizing their genuineness and authenticity as sufficiently proved by internal and external evidence.

Proklos then was a poet, a student of Homer, and acquainted with the poems forming the Epic Cycle. We learn from him that it existed in his time in its entirety, and was an object of general interest, not so much on account of its merit as because of the sequence of the events of which it treated. Valuing it thus, he has preserved for us the arguments of the principal works included in it—the Cyprian Epic by Stasinus; the Aithiopis and the Excidium Trojae by Arctinus; the Ilias Parva of Lesches; the Nostoi of Angias; and the Telegonia of Eugammon; and being familiar with these poems, it is not improbable that he may have written on some subject of that class, perhaps a long hymn like one of the Homeric ones. Now it will be observed that the persons and circumstances mentioned in our papyrus hexameters fall within the compass of the argument of the Cyprian Epic. It is therefore not unreasonable to suspect that their author, if it were not Stasinus himself, had before him the Cyprian Epic, and was engaged in the composition of a poem on the same subject or on some part of it. To fix the authorship on Proklos, we have almost nothing deserving the name of argument or evidence. But the following considerations point in that direction:—(1.) The visit of Achilles to Helen, plainly referred to, as I maintain, in our

*Prof. Cousin indulged in no 'exaggerated praises' of Proklos, as every attentive and appreciative student of his profound writings knows.—ED. OF THE PLATONIST.

*Taylor used no 'terms of extravagant praise' in describing the hymns of Proklos, whatever may be thought to the contrary by persons who lack the inclination or capacity to understand the divine philosophy which the great Platonic Successor enunciated in all of his writings.—ED. OF THE PLATONIST.

hexameters, is mentioned by Proklos in his analysis of the contents of the Cyprian Epic, and, so far as I have been able to ascertain, by no other writer of all those who have treated of the legends connected with the Trojan war. (2.) The few hexameters by Proklos which have come down to us contain a couple of words to which we may point as suggesting the idea that our hexameters came from his hand. One of these is the rather uncommon adjective *ἀστυφελικτος*, which seems to have been a favorite word with him. He had met with it in Orpheus, and it occurs twice in his Hymn to the Sun. Of the word *γενέθλη* the same thing may be said. It occurs three times in the Hymns of Proklos, and always at the end of a line, as in Frag. I. *verso*, l. 5. *Κατὰ θεσμόν*, found in Frag. II. *recto*, l. 4, appears in the Hymn to the Sun." * * * *

THE FAYUM MANUSCRIPTS.*

The march of events is rapid in every direction. Politics, trade, science have experienced this tendency, and such too is the case in that quieter region of scholarship which deals with the discovery of ancient manuscripts. We have scarcely recovered from the excitement attending the great discoveries of Tatian's *Diatessaron* and the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, when we hear rumors of fresh discoveries which may, in course of investigation, eclipse even these. The scene of the latest accessions to our knowledge is the Fayum province, a district which, lying fifty or sixty miles to the south of Cairo, has been from the earliest ages celebrated for its fertility.

It is just one hundred years since a very intelligent Frenchman traveled through Egypt and Syria, leaving as a result a narrative which is of great importance as showing us these countries and their internal condition while yet Mahometanism retained somewhat of its pristine vigor. Volney's *Travels* contain many interesting facts, but are specially important for our present purpose as indicating the rise of that stream of manuscript discovery which has never since ceased in Egypt. From Volney's narrative we learn that in 1778 the Arabs found in a subterranean place near the site of the ancient Memphis, fifty volumes written in a language which they understood not. They were enclosed in a case of sycamore wood and were highly perfumed. The Arabs offered them for sale to a French merchant, but he refused to purchase them all. He fortunately however bought one, while the Arabs consumed the rest, cutting them up and using them instead of tobacco, for which they served as an admirable substitute on account of their pleasant odour. The manuscript which survived proved to be the most ancient Greek document then known. It is still a common notion among even good scholars that the great Biblical codices, the Alexandrian, the Vatican, and the Sinaitic, are the oldest Greek manuscripts, whether sacred or secular. The Egyptian document thus casually rescued from an untimely fate

proved this to be a great mistake, and showed that we can scarcely dare to place limits upon our hopes and expectations in this direction. Cardinal Stephen Borgia, a munificent patron of literature, purchased it from the French merchant, and then entrusted it for publication to Nicholas Schow, a learned Dane, who printed it with an elaborate commentary, at Rome, in the year 1788. Schow deciphered the document and found that it contained a second or third century list of the workmen employed upon the canals connecting the lake Moeris in the Fayum with the Nile. * * * * Between 1815 and 1830, however, large numbers of Greek papyri were found, and scattered among the various museums and libraries of Europe—Vienna, Turin, Paris, London, Berlin. Since that time a few important Greek papyri have been here and there recovered, but no great collection of documents till within the last seven or eight years. In the year 1877 a large quantity of papyri were offered to the German Consul at Alexandria, who purchased them and sent them to Berlin, where they attracted considerable attention and raised high hopes of more important finds, as among them was found a fragment dating from the 4th century, at latest, of the *Melanippe*, a lost tragedy of Euripides.* Brugsch, the great Egyptologist, made excavations in 1880 at Medinet, the capital of the Fayum province; but without much success. Treasures like the Greek papyri often elude the most diligent searchers, and delight to bury themselves from such amid the thickest darkness. Brugsch discovered something indeed, but not much; his most important "find" being a leaf of parchment containing the first chapter of Second Thessalonians. Dr. Stern, too, under a commission from the Berlin Academy, undertook a fresh search and got some remains of the *Hippolytus* of Euripides and of Aristotle. A year or two afterwards, however, the greatest treasure of all was discovered. The Austrian Archduke Renier was travelling in Egypt, and purchased a vast quantity of papyri in Latin, Greek, Hebrew, Persian, Arabic, Coptic, as well as in the old Egyptian characters, Hieroglyphic, Hieratic and Demotic. It will suffice to show the vast quantity of these MSS. when we mention that the Coptic pieces alone are a thousand in number, including letters, legal documents, Biblical fragments in the Middle Egyptian and Sahidic dialects,† and a series of contracts which illustrate the modifications which Roman law experienced at the hands of Egyptian administrators. But then the Coptic papyri are only a small part of the collection which the Archduke brought home and deposited in the Imperial Museum at Vienna. The whole mass of documents has been submitted to the scrutiny of three scholars who have already given many proofs of their skill and knowledge in such work—Messrs. Wessely, Krall and Karabacek. They are all

*See the text of this fragment in the *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache*, 1880, Ed. Lepsius, where other fragments from Homer, Sappho, Aratus, Basil and Gregory of Nyssa are printed out of the Fayum MSS. then known. The text of Gregory is given in full in the first part of *Philologus* for 1885, pp. 1-29. It treats of the life of Moses.

†The Sahidic Version of the Bible so far as it exists has lately been published by O. V. Lemm, *Bruchstücke der Sahidischen Bibelübersetzung*, Leipzig, 1885.

*This article is extracted from a very interesting paper by Prof. George T. Stokes, of Trinity College, Dublin, in *The Expositor* for last May.

still
volv
papy
and
histo
furn
our
has
He
year
in th
devo
in w
tions
and
the
enjoy
Vien
them
of his

We
remn
four
ment
chara
valua
book
know
deed
eigh
Wess
on th
Dr. A
Thuc
Thuc
correc
corru
wheth
to th
Thuc
treati
our e
heart
was fo
Cleme
apolog
inter
from
of Al
E., vi
antic
Cumm
trict
the la
a papy
Greek
which
time o

*Prole
Vienna,

still engaged in the tedious and delicate operations involved in first unrolling and then deciphering the papyri, and have had but little time for that detailed and critical examination which alone will reveal their historical value. From time to time, however, they have furnished reports, from which we learn enough to excite our highest expectations. Thus to Professor Wessely has been assigned the Greek and Latin documents. He is a very young man indeed, being only twenty-five years of age, yet he has already done much good work in the special department of literature to which he has devoted himself. He has published a learned treatise,* in which he offers chronological and historical disquisitions on Greek papyri from Fayum previously known, and has followed it up by some able critical articles in the *Wiener Studien* on the same subject. He has indeed enjoyed exceptional advantages in this direction, as Viennese scholars have for some time specially devoted themselves to studies in this direction. A brief *resume* of his work will show its importance.

Wessely has found then among the Fayum papyri remnants of a polemic against Isocrates, dating from the fourth century B. C.; Homeric and Thucydidean fragments of the second century A. D., in very beautiful characters. The fragments of Thucydides are specially valuable as they offer a very different text of the eighth book of the celebrated history from that commonly known. The oldest extant MS. of Thucydides dates indeed only from the tenth or eleventh century, and the eighth book as therein given is very imperfect, so that Wessely's discovery throws a new and unexpected light on this important author. Unexpected indeed it is, as Dr. Arnold, in the preface to the second edition of his Thucydides, remarks, "With respect to the text of Thucydides little, I believe, will ever be done towards correcting it by the search after new manuscripts; the corruptions after all are not many, and it is doubtful whether those in the eighth book are not attributable to the imperfect state in which the text was left by Thucydides himself." *Æsthetic* and philosophical treatises dating from the second and third centuries of our era have also appeared, admitting us into the very heart and life of the great Alexandrian school when it was forming the minds and influencing the thoughts of a Clement and an Origen. For the Christian student and apologist, Wessely's discoveries have even a still greater interest. Fayum was a district devoted to theology from the earliest times. In the third century Dionysius of Alexandria, according to the report of Eusebius (*H. E.*, vii. 24), had much trouble there with a bishop who anticipated many of the speculations of the late Dr. Cumming and his school of expositors. In such a district theological works must have abounded. Some of the latest reports therefore announce the discovery of a papyrus roll containing a Gospel of St. Matthew in Greek dating from the third century—a Greek text, which must in that case take precedence in point of time of all others; a *Metanoia* of the fourth century;

large fragments of the Old and New Testament on papyrus and parchment; considerable portions of St. Cyril's works; a collection of edicts and other state documents, the earliest dated under Domitian about the year 90 A. D., and then going on almost without a break through all the Pagan and Christian Emperors down to the conquest of Egypt by the Saracens in the seventh century. Among these are documents of Marcus Aurelius, Alexander Severus, Gordian, and Philip the Arabian. The new side lights for Church history to be gained from these papyri may be estimated from one fact alone. The first Emperor of barbarian birth who ascended the imperial throne was Maximinus I. He was very hostile to the Christians, as having enjoyed the favor of his predecessor, Alexander Severus, whom Maximinus dethroned. During his reign Origen had to flee from Alexandria and seek shelter in Asia Minor, whence he addressed a work on *Martyrdom* to some of the clergy of Alexandria. Now the precise date of this Emperor's accession has hitherto been a disputed point; one of these papyri has, however, cleared up the difficulty, and shown us that he began to reign in the end of March, A. D. 235. The Latin papyri, which have also been entrusted to Wessely, are not at all so numerous as the Greek, yet even among them we have two of the oldest dated Latin documents in existence, the receipts given by an actuary, Sergius, in the year 398 A. D., as well as a formal permit to some soldiers of the Fifth Legion, to assist at the celebration of the Easter Festival at Arsinoë. We can scarcely hope to estimate properly the critical and historical value of those discoveries till they have been printed. The trouble involved in dealing with them is enormous, as the papyri have first to be unrolled with great care, then deciphered, which is often the work of the greatest difficulty owing to the imperfect condition of the Manuscripts, and then pressed and placed under sheets of glass for permanent preservation. The Greek and Latin documents form, however, a comparatively small portion of the mass of material recovered by the Archduke Renier. * * * *

Now let us give one or two examples of the illustrations of Scripture and of Church history which may be derived from these Fayum MSS. * * * * Revillout again, no later than last year, showed in the *Transactions of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*, what interesting illustrations and vivid details of early Christian life and struggles we may gain from this source. In the first number of the year he printed a Coptic manuscript, setting forth the curses of a pagan mother upon her apostate son, who had joined the Christian ranks. Here we have an original document coming from early Christian times, for doubtless no one would ever have copied anathemas which must have been devoid of meaning or interest for any person but the mother who

*Prolegomena ad Papyrorum Græcorum Novam Collectionem Edendam. Vienna, 1883.

thus solemnly and sadly cast her son off from her hopes in this world or the next. The document is most interesting and important, not only as illustrating that family separation and loss of all earthly ties which Christ so often warned His people to expect, but also because of the light it throws upon Christian and Egyptian worship. The religion of the ancient Egyptians about the second and third centuries is a somewhat obscure subject. It largely influenced Western paganism, yet we have not that intimate knowledge of it which we possess concerning the religion of Greece and Rome. In these anathemas we see their doctrine of Apotheosis. The woman's husband is dead, and she appeals to his manes as against the apostate, but she appeals to him as one elevated to a divine state—her husband has now become a new Osiris. The communications of the dead, the sacred feasts, the burial places around which the whole family life centred, their doctrines and ideas about the future punishments which have been largely adopted by the Christian Copts, are all there depicted. As to Christianity, we have the new name adopted by the convert at baptism, and that a name closely connected with the Church of St. Mark. His name was originally Petuosor, signifying gift of Osiris. He changed it to the apostolic name of Peter, which, as we learn from Dionysius of Alexandria, was in the third century a most popular one in Egypt (Euseb., *H. E.*, vii. 25). From the same writer indeed we learn that this very custom of changing names derived from idols into distinctively Christian ones was common in Egypt during the ages of persecution (Euseb., *Mart. Palest.*, c. xi.). This convert imitated Peter's rash zeal too. He had joined the clergy, and to show his devotion had mocked the pagan rites and uttered threats of violence against the temples. It is in every respect a very instructive memorial of the terrible sacrifices, the family bitterness, the social divisions which must have often followed upon a profession of faith in Christ.

The Magical or Gnostic papyri again are very numerous. It was one of the favourite arguments of the Tübingen School against the Pastoral Epistles, that they involved the existence of Gnosticism in a highly developed shape. They held that Gnosticism was a corruption of Christianity, and therefore must have been long posterior to it. Now these documents show that Oriental philosophy could just as easily combine with Judaism as with Christianity, and must therefore have been in existence long before Christianity was heard of. The inner life and spirit of the Gnostic systems have been little investigated by Western thinkers, who have been alienated by the hard names and the perplexing unsympathetic representations given by ecclesiastical historians. But yet systems which entranced a Tatian and a Valentinus, and engaged the powers of a Clement, an Irenæus and an Origen, cannot have been jargon and nonsense. We must view the Gnostic systems from

the Oriental side, and then we shall see why the Church strove against them with all its might as aimed at its very life and heart. Magical and Gnostic papyri already exist at London, Leyden, and Paris in considerable numbers, and have been used by Revillout to illustrate the life of Secundus, a Gnostic teacher of the second century. It may, however, be hoped that the Fayum Manuscripts will throw some new light on a topic which is renewing its interest for us when esoteric Buddhism and its adherents are producing, all unawares doubtless, as the latest products of modern thought, the wildest conceits of Asiatic and Egyptian Gnosticism. Space would, however, fail to tell of the varied information these papyri give us. They deal with every conceivable subjects. In the *Revue Egyptologique* of 1883, for instance, appeared a papyrus from Vienna, which would be of interest to many a special correspondent of to-day, setting forth an artist's life in Egypt with all his crosses and troubles in the first or second century; while the papyri which deal with the Nile and its inundations and constructions are simply endless. The question may naturally be asked, How have these papyri, and parchments, been preserved? The reply is very simple. Even in our damp climate there exist many documents twelve and thirteen hundred years old. The traveller can see in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin, and in the Museum of the Irish Academy, sacred manuscripts which are quite as old as many of the Egyptian, dating from the age of St. Columbia, if not from that of St. Patrick. In the case of Egypt, however, quantities of the papyri are more than twice as old. They have been preserved in tombs, or may be portions of official libraries buried at some crisis, in the sand; sometimes in vases of earthenware, sometimes, as those Greek papyri which the Arabs destroyed, in cases of sycamore wood; offering, indeed, an interesting corroboration from Egyptian practice of the Jewish custom mentioned in Jeremiah xxxii. 14, where the prophet charges Baruch: "Thus saith the Lord of Hosts, the God of Israel: Take these evidences, this evidence of the purchase, and put them in an earthen vessel, that they may continue many days."

The student wishing to pursue this subject will find abundant material in the German and French periodicals mentioned in this article. The *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Alterthumskunde*, founded by Brugsch, edited till his death by Lepsius, and now continued by Stern, has articles in almost every number about the Egyptian papyri. The very last, published in February of this year, gives two Coptic documents containing perhaps the oldest existing Christian wills. They were found at Thebes and date from Cent. vii. They illustrate the Church organization of that day. *Philologus*, vol. xliii., the *Revue Archeologique* for 1884, vol. ii. p. 101, and the *Denkschriften* of the Vienna Academy, vol. xxxiii. may also be profitably consulted.