

B
111
A1P69
v. 3-4

The Platonist.

"Platonism is immortal because its principles are immortal in the Human Intellect and Heart." The Esoteric doctrine of all religions and philosophies is identical.

COMMENTARY OF PROKLOS ON THE FIRST ALKIBIADES OF PLATON.

Translated from the Original Greek.

PREFATORY NOTE.

The important dialogue entitled the First Alkibiades should be mastered first by the student, as it is the introduction to the whole of the Platonic Philosophy. Moreover, it supplies a key to some of the greatest arcanæ of the mystic wisdom of Antiquity.

The Commentary of Proklos on this profound work has been justly called an invaluable treasury of wisdom. There is no knowledge more important to man than that of his own nature which, as Taylor truly says, is unfolded in this Commentary with the most consummately scientific skill, and in a way which by the Platonic reader will be considered as no less luminous than acute. It is very unfortunate that the whole of this inestimable exposition is not extant, or at least has not yet come to light. The work as printed extends only to about one-third of the dialogue. The admirable exegesis of the same dialogue by Olympiodoros partially supplements that of Proklos.

Extracts from this work were translated into Latin by Marsilius Ficinus, the famous Platonist, and published under the title of Proclus in *Platonicum Alcibiadem de Anima ac Daemone, de Sacrificio et Magia*, at Venice 1497, and 1516, fol. by Aldus. They were reprinted at Lyons, Basle, and other places, and are contained in the collection of the writings of Ficinus published at Basil. 1561, 1576; Paris, 1641, fol.

Three editions of this Commentary have appeared: Two by Cousin (Paris, 1820, and 1864), and one by Creuzer, (Frankfort, 1821). The best text is that given by Cousin, in his last edition.

No English version of this work has ever been published. Taylor translated parts of it in his notes on the First Alkibiades.

INTRODUCTION (*Προοίμιον*).

The most fundamental and characteristic principle of the Platonic dialogues, and in fact of the whole theory of the philosopher, is the knowledge of our own nature; for, this being rightly established as an hypothesis, we shall be able to accurately learn the good which is adapted to us, and the evil which is antagonistic to this good. As the essences of things are different, so are their proper perfections; to some one, to others another, according to a diminution of essence. For whether *being* and *the good* proceed, as Aristoteles says, from the same abode and first fountain, it is certainly necessary that the intellectual part of perfection should be imparted to everything according to the measures of essence; or whether the good proceeds from a cause more ancient and holy, and essence and being are imparted to things from another cause, still, as everything participates of being more obscurely or more clearly, so likewise must it participate of good—first beings in a greater and more perfect manner, those that rank in the

middle orders secondarily, and the last of things according to the lowest order of participation. How otherwise, the Divinities and Providence governing things, can beings participate of the good according to their merit? For it must not be conceded that Mind leads things into order and imparts to each an appropriate measure, and that *the good*, which is more ancient than mind, communicates its gifts to beings in a disordered manner, viz.: that it imparts to causes and things caused the same portion of goodness, or distributes to the same things according to essence the perfection of primary and subsequent natures. For it neither was nor is lawful, says Timaios, for the best of natures to effect anything except that which is most beautiful and commensurate. And the same good is not most commensurate to primary and secondary natures; neither is there according to essence a distinct perfection to similar beings; but, as the Athenian guest says, a distribution of inequality to things unequal and of equality to things equal, of the great to such as are greater and of the less to such as are lesser, is of all things the most musical and the best. According to this reasoning, therefore, good is different in different beings, and a certain good is naturally coordinated to the essence of everything. Hence the perfection of mind is in eternity, and of the rational soul in time; the good of the rational soul is in an intellectual energy, while the good of the body is in a subsistence according to nature. And, again, there is one perfection of the divinities, another of angels and dæmons, and another of partial (human) souls. Wherefore he who thinks that, though the essence in these is different, yet the perfection is the same, has an erroneous conception of the truth of things, since there is no similar genus, as Homeros says, of either gods or men, or of those natures which exist between these genera, or again of each of the extremes.

If these things are rightly apprehended, it is necessary that in each order of beings essence should be known prior to perfection; for perfection is not of itself, but of essence, by which it is participated. Hence, with respect to the essence of a thing, we must first consider whether it belongs to^kimpartible essences, or to such as are^ydivisible about bodies, or to such as exist between these. Likewise, whether it ranks among eternal entities, or such as exist according to the whole of time, or such as are generated in a certain part of time. Moreover, whether it is simple and subsists prior to all composition, or is indeed a composite, but is always being bound with indissoluble bonds,—or, again, may be resolved into those things from which it is composed. And if we thus consider everything we will be able to understand in what its good consists. It is evident, therefore, that the good of those natures which are allotted an impartible essence is eternal, and that the good of partible natures is connected with time and motion; and that the good of things existing between these must be considered according to the measures of subsistence (hypostasis) and perfection, viz.: that such a nature is indeed indigent of time, but of first time, which is able to measure incorporeal periods. Wherefore we repeat that the most appropriate principle of all philosophy, and especially of the Platonic, is pure and genuine self-knowledge, circumstanced by scientific boundaries, and firmly linked to the reasonings from cause. For where else is it proper to begin, except from the purification and perfection of ourselves: whence also the Delphian divinity exhorts us to begin. For, as those who enter the Eleusinian grove are ordered by a notice not to enter into the adyta of the temple unless they have been purified and initiated, so the inscription KNOW THYSELF, on the Delphic fane, manifests, as it appears to me, the mode of ascending (returning) to

a divine nature, and the most expeditious path to purification; all but plainly declaring to the *intelligent* that he who knows himself, beginning from his inmost nature, may be able to be conjoined with that divinity who unfolds into light the whole of truth, and is the leader of a cathartic life; but that he who is ignorant of himself, being unpurified and uninitiated, is neither fit nor adapted to participate the providence of Apollon. Self-knowledge, therefore, is the principle of the philosophy of Platon. It is proper, then, I think, that a disciple of Apollon should begin the perfecting of imperfect things according to the mandate of the god. And Sokrates himself, who says that of Apollon he is a fellow-servant with the swans, and who received no less a gift from the divinity than the art of prophesying, also declared that philosophy should begin with self-knowledge; he obeying the Pythian inscription, and believing that it was the mandate of the god. Wherefore let us also begin conformably to the Apollonian mandate, and investigate in which of his dialogues Platon especially makes the speculation of our essence his principal design, in order that we may thence properly begin the study of this. What other work, then, of Platon can we arrange prior to the First Alkibiades, and the conference of Sokrates, which is delivered in this dialogue? Where else shall we say our essence is unfolded? In what other book are man and the nature of man investigated? Finally, where else is the Delphic inscription thoroughly examined, or in what manner shall we seek, prior to the investigation of these subjects, any other thing, whether of true being or of things in generation,—hearing Sokrates himself saying: “It seems ridiculous to me that I, being ignorant of myself, should investigate other things,”—since nothing is nearer to us than ourselves. If we are ignorant of things directly present to us, by what contrivance or art will we be able to know things

at a distance, which are naturally known through us? If you understand not only these things in this dialogue, which are clearly described and explained, but also that it is Sokrates who engages in the first conversation with Alkibiades, and that he says that the beginning of perfection is suspended from the contemplation of ourselves, you will no longer deny that hence [*i. e.*, from self-knowledge] all must begin who are hastening to be perfected. For each of us is more or less bound by the passions which manacled the son of Klinias. For we are ignorant of ourselves in consequence of being in a certain oblivion produced by our descent into generation, and being agitated by the tumult of the irrational forms of life. In the meantime we think that we know many things of which we are ignorant, because we essentially possess innate reasons of things. And we need the same assistance [as if we really lacked innate reasons], in order that we may eliminate from our minds superfluous opinion and give proper attention and care to the work of self-purification.*

But the fact that the acquisition of self-knowledge should precede the investigation of every other speculation, and, so to say, the whole doctrine of the philosopher, has been previously set forth. Perhaps, however, some one will censure us for having thus hastily as it were posited self-knowledge as the scope of the Alkibiades, when many celebrated interpreters hold differently; some declaring the scope to be one thing, and others another. And indeed we should be ashamed if, lacking a knowledge of the most important aim of this dialogue, which is comprehensive of all intellectual problems, and especially shows what our essence is, and even extends to the consideration of secondary, imper-

*For the benefit of our new readers, and in order that the whole Introduction may appear in one number, the preceding part, somewhat emended, is reprinted from No 3. Vol. I.

fect, and particular things,—we should rashly establish the scope of the work.

It is not right that the object of speculation in this dialogue should be referred to the Alkibiades alone, as some think,—for the scientific theory always takes cognizance of that which is common and extended to every similar habitude (relation)—nor must the instruments of Dialectic, such as exhortation, the maieutic art, refutation, be considered the aim of the conversation; but it is requisite to see to what end these are referred. Again, we must not abandon the proposed speculation, and transfer the investigation to other essences, divine and dæmonian, which are of no benefit to us—for it is necessary that the proper scope of this dialogue be placed on the first basis of the Platonic theory, since Sokrates himself says that he now *first* approaches the youth Alkibiades. In short, no other proposition of the dialogue must be considered to the exclusion of the chief, viz.: self-knowledge, to the importance of which Sokrates himself bears witness. For if it is necessary that the acquisition of self-knowledge precede every other speculation, what more appropriate aim could the first conference have than the acquiring of this knowledge? Moreover, if this be not the aim of the dialogue, exhortations and dehortations, refutations and maieutic arts, praises and censures, would be causelessly introduced; for without the aid of these instrumentalities a knowledge of his own nature cannot be given to any one. For it is essential that there be an exhortation to the true Good, and a dehortation from things that are really evil; the maieutic art, that the soul may bring forth right opinions; refutation, that there may be a purification from two-fold ignorance; praise, to produce the union and intimacy of those who are to be perfected; and finally, censure, to assist and correct those who act badly. Similarly, as in the Mysteries, purifications

precede both lustrations and expiations, which are the exercises of those who reach the arcane rites and a divine participation—so, in my judgment, a philosophic initiation purifies and prepares those who rightly obtain it for the reception of self-knowledge, and a self-appearing (*αυτοφανη*) speculation of our essence: wherefore a knowledge of our own nature and no other is the scope of this dialogue. Of other aims which are shown to be likewise contained in it, some precede and others follow the primary and fundamental proposition; and are conclusions which depend on the principal end. For the hypothesis of two-fold ignorance, exhortation, and things of this kind, precede; then follow the demonstration of the respective natures of Virtue and Felicity, and the knowledge of many arts, for the benefit of those who are ignorant of themselves, their own affairs, and in short of all things. And many similar things are collected at the end of the dialogue.

But the most perfect and principal object of the whole conversation is to set forth the method of acquiring self-knowledge; and he who posits the main design of this dialogue to be the purification of our essence, and a knowledge of this, rightly apprehends it. Let him understand, therefore, that it follows from those facts that have been enounced that this end and this good properly belong to us: for how to know ourselves is the problem to be investigated, and for the sake of which all the syllogisms are framed. For the acquisition of self-knowledge is one object of the dialogue, and the attainment of the good another, which latter is based on the former. It is necessary, therefore, that we state among other things concerning the writings of Platon, that each of them has whatever the whole contains. Hence, in every dialogue one thing is arranged analogous to The Good, another to Intellect, another to Soul, another to Form, and another to Matter. In this work,

consequently, it must be said, that an assimilation to a divine nature is analogous to The Good; the knowledge of our own essence to Intellect; the multitude of demonstrations leading us to the conclusion, and in short everything syllogistic, to the Soul; the character of the diction, and whatever else pertains to the power of speech, to Form; and the persons, occasion, and that which is called by rhetoricians the hypothesis, to Matter. These things are indeed found in the whole dialogue but, we cannot repeat too often, that the principal and leading object of the work is the acquiring a knowledge of our own essence. This knowledge is particularly desirable, since through it we can obtain our special and characteristic perfection. And as in causes themselves Intellect is suspended from The Good, so everything which is investigated in this dialogue is suspended from the principal end of the conversation; and this end is what we have declared it to be.

Let these things therefore be written about the design of this dialogue, since we have previously demonstrated that hence, viz.: from a pure self-knowledge, must be begun the perfecting of our interior nature. This dialogue therefore is the beginning of all philosophy, in the same manner as the knowledge of our essence. Hence many logical and ethical theorems are enunciated in it, together with such as contribute to the entire speculation of felicity. It likewise contains information relating to many things which elucidate physiology, and those dogmas which lead us to the truth concerning divine natures themselves; so that in this work a one, common, and perfect description of all philosophy is as it were comprehended, appearing through the primary conversion of ourselves to our interior, higher nature. And it seems to me that by reason of this fact the divine Iamblichos assigned to this book the first rank in the ten dialogues in which he

thought the whole philosophy of Platon was contained, as if in this dialogue as in a seed was precomprehended the principles of all the other Platonic writings. But the names of these fundamental dialogues, their order, and in what manner they are finally contracted into two [which contain all the others] we have elsewhere explained.

But since these facts have been sufficiently set forth the division of the dialogue must now be noted. Some interpreters divide the work according to the rhetorical artifices that are used,—separating the conversation into praise and reprehension, exhortation and dehortation, and persuasion: asserting that the philosopher used praise in order that he might render the youth kind and friendly; reprehension, that he might purify him from superfluous opinions; exhortation, that he might incite him to the participation of virtue; dehortation, that he might free him from the slightest resemblance to demagogues, and from envy towards the rulers of the state; and persuasion, that he might lead him to the contemplation of human nature, and the care of what properly belongs to it. Such is the argument of those who thus divide this dialogue, but their division is defective in that it does not extend to the whole work. For they waste their time about things third (remote) from the truth, and labor about things last; and, confining themselves only to the mere forms of the discourse, fail to grasp the inner meaning. Other interpreters, better than these, are indifferent as to the rhetorical (formal) division of the dialogue: they direct their attention to its syllogistic and demonstrative content, and conceive that from this the division should be made, and make it thus: The first syllogism is that in which Sokrates shows Alkibiades that he does not know what is just. The second, that in which it appears clear that the multitude are not good teachers of what is just.

The third, that which demonstrates that the respondent is the author of an opinion, and not the interrogator, in conversations where interrogation and response are used. The fourth, that in which it is shown that the special work of science is to persuade mankind, collectively and individually alike, [to embrace the good]. The fifth, that which proves that just things are likewise beautiful. The sixth, that there is another conclusion from this, viz.: the fifth syllogism, which shows that the good alone is beautiful. The seventh, that which demonstrates that Alkibiades through two-fold ignorance lacks a knowledge of himself and his own affairs. The eighth, that in which Sokrates censures Alkibiades for wasting time with those who are not true (worthy) antagonists. The ninth, that in which it is shown that Alkibiades is entirely ignorant of the mode of giving proper attention to psychical science. The tenth syllogism follows, and in it Sokrates again purifies our essence, explains its triple mode of cognition, and the species of nurture adapted to it. We must to a certain extent endorse these interpreters, as they are more skillful than their predecessors, and approach nearer by their method to things themselves. We cannot, however, admit that they made their division entirely according to right principles, but they may be allotted the second rank among interpreters, though in fact they did not wholly abandon the discussion about forms.

The mode of dividing the dialogue adopted by the philosopher Iamblichos is, in my judgment, the most perfect and accurate of all. He began from things themselves, and collecting the whole content of the conversation into three sections, referred to these all syllogistic methods and dialectical disputations. It is necessary therefore that secondary and formal things should always correspond to first and principal parts, and be directed to their ends. May we not say, there-

fore, that this work is divided into proximate and principal parts? How can there be otherwise than this division, since the scope of the dialogue is to disclose the essence of man, and to convert each one to himself from the strong (material) impulse to look to external things, and to attend to business alien to our true nature? It is necessary that this should take place when we purify our intuitive reason from the things contrary to it which prevent a conversion from externals to ourselves; correcting and educating the irrational nature, and recalling it to a condition of perfection in harmony with reason. The argument of the first part or division destroys the ignorance of reason, and the impediments to knowledge which are in reason, through its descent into the world of generation [the sensuous or material sphere], by many certain and omnifarious syllogisms. The second part is logically sequent to the first, and explains in what manner one abounding in material (sensuous) desires should not yield to them, and abandon the cause of life which is ordained according to perfect virtue. The third part logically follows the preceding, and sets forth the method of procuring a reminiscence of our true essence, and the discovery of the right way to cure our psychical maladies, and leads us to the end congruous to the general proposition of the arguments. There are therefore these three divisions or parts of the dialogue, strictly speaking: all others, whether demonstrative or rhetorical, are subordinate to and assumed on account of these.

Each of the syllogisms may be considered as leading to one end, viz.: the contemplation of our essence, and the knowledge of our own nature. For if you wish to view each syllogism in and by itself, and to consider what force of reasoning it has, you will find that all tend to this one principle. The first syllogism shows that from childhood we are all ignorant of what is just, and posits

as the cause of this ignorance an absence of self knowledge. For in our essence we undoubtedly have the principles of justice, but as we are not converted to ourselves neither do we receive an accurate knowledge of these principles. And this is the cause why we merely *opine* that we know, and become the subject of argumentations. The second, despising the vast herd of mankind as ignorant of what is just, separates us from every multitude, and a life merged in and controlled by opinions, and leads each of us to one reason (principle) and science, essentially subsisting in the soul itself. The third shows that the respondent is the one who affirms the spontaneous motion of the soul, and posits the principles of reasons and disciplines to be reminiscences, the special use of which is to convert to himself from externals the one who is to be perfected (initiated). The fourth is that in which Sokrates collects arguments demonstrating that of the same science there is one and many: he shows that such is the perfect form of energy, not departing from but intellectually converted to itself,—that it fills all things and yet is not diminished, and is present alike to many and one. Neither is it divided among those participating of it, nor alienated from itself by them, but remaining one and the same in itself, perfects other things. The fifth demonstrates that just things alone are truly advantageous, and posits in the soul the usefulness of each thing, in which is also the just (principles of justice),—persuading us to seek in no other place for our essence than in the soul, where the good subsists in conjunction with the just. For our usefulness (good) is not in one place, and our essence in another. The sixth demonstrates that the beautiful is the same as the good, separates us from apparent (phenomenal) beauty, conducts the soul to intellectual, rational, and scientific beauty, and prepares it for a conversion to itself, and for the specula-

tion of beauty in itself, and not in things external to itself. The seventh purifying us from every obstacle of two-fold ignorance to self-knowledge, which turns us from a conversion to ourselves, demonstrates that self-ignorance is the greatest of evils: at the same time it is shown that the greatest and most perfect of goods has its subsistence in self-knowledge. The eighth syllogism shows Alkibiades who are his real enemies. This syllogism contributes to the elucidation of the whole intent of the dialogue, since our self-ignorance is caused by either a psychical, corporeal, or external power. In order therefore that Alkibiades may not be wholly ignorant of himself, and the manner in which he is vanquished in all things by his enemies, concealed from him by the dire miseries which are inseparable from his sensuous environment,—it is necessary I conceive that this syllogism should relate to the whole purpose and content of the dialogue. The ninth showing that Alkibiades is ignorant of the way to cure psychical maladies, also demonstrates that the principle of the remedy for these maladies is a knowledge of our own essence. For on this is based the judgment of the right method of psychical healing, and it is distinguished (defined) according to this knowledge. For whatever is motive *per se* perfects itself by self-conversion; and whatever knows itself likewise comprehends in itself the cure for its own maladies. The tenth syllogism, showing that the essence of man is constituted in the psychical nature, thus evidences the idea or form of our essence, and gives to us the most perfect knowledge of self-energizing life; comprehending demonstratively in one syllogism our essence and perfection. If therefore we affirm that each and all of the syllogisms in this dialogue lead us to a knowledge of our true nature or essence, we will perhaps apprehend the conception of Platon.

IAMBLICHOS: ON THE MYSTERIES.

A NEW TRANSLATION BY ALEXANDER WILDER.

[Part V. Continued.*]

X. We however admit every thing that you have said. The things of the natural world move in concert together as in a single animal, according to relationship or sympathy, because of being in other respects subordinate, obedient and subject to the essence that is the cause of the celebration of the sacrifices. The races of dæmons also, and the spirits about the earth or over the universe are assigned as first according to order in relation to us. We declare nevertheless that the most perfect and dominant essences that are the causes of the celebrations in the matter of sacrifices, are closely united with the demiurgic and supreme powers. Hence, because they comprehend in themselves all the active essences, however many they are, we say that all the creative forces whatever they are, act together in concert as one; and that from them all in common, a beneficial influence goes forth into the whole phenomenal world—at times to cities and districts, or to various nations or to greater or smaller divisions of them; but at other times the benefits are extended to households and to every individual with an ungrudging willingness, and their distributions are made freely and without partiality, being decided without feeling, according to relationship and affiliation, as it is proper to make the apportionment: one love (attraction) connecting all and creating this bond by an arcane communion.

These things are far more true, and express the fact more correctly in regard to the essence and power of the divinities than what you suspect:“ that they are especially allured by the exhalations from sacrificed

*From page 158, Vol. II.

animals." For if there is after some manner a body pertaining to the dæmons, this is immutable, without sensibility, brilliant, and in want of nothing. Hence nothing flows forth from it, nor does it stand in need of receiving anything from without. If, however, after all, this is supposed to be otherwise, even then the universe and its atmosphere contain an incessant exhalation from the region about the the earth, a current of this being diffused equally in every direction. What need, then, can they have of sacrifices?

Nevertheless, according to this sentiment, the substances received do not in equal amount or proportionately supply the deficiency created by that which is cast forth, so that neither excess prevails nor is deficiency sometimes occasioned, but all equality and evenness in the condition of the bodies of the dæmons uniformly exists. The Creator undoubtedly has not supplied to all the animals in the earth and sea food in abundance and ready prepared, but has produced the necessity for it in the races superior to us. Nor has he given to other living beings innate means of providing easily for their daily wants. To the dæmons, however, he gave a food of alien nature to be contributed by us of the human race. Hence, it would seem, that if we through laziness, or some other occasion, are negligent of these contributions, the bodies of the dæmons will suffer from want, and will experience privation and disorder.

Why then, do not they who say these things change the whole order of things, so as to establish us in a better and more powerful class? If they make us the agents to supply food and other things to the dæmons, we shall be in a category superior to the dæmons. For every thing receives its food and all that it requires from the source from which it came. This may be seen in the visible order of things. It is also to be observed in the whole universe. The races living about the earth

are nourished from the celestial regions. This fact becomes more especially manifest among the invisible essences. Soul is sustained from intelligence, and nature from soul; and other things are nourished in like manner from their sources. If, then, it is impossible for us to be the parents or originators of the dæmons, by the same reasoning we are not the sources of their support.

XI. It seems to me likewise that the question now under consideration runs wide of the mark in another particular. It ignores the passing of the sacrifices through the fire, that it is rather a consuming and destroying of the matter, an assimilation of it to itself, but by no means itself an assimilating to the matter—an exaltation to the nature of divine, celestial, immaterial fire but in no case weighing downward toward matter and objective existence. If, indeed, the delight of the exhalations from material substance "allured," it would be necessary for the matter to be pure of all mixture, as then there would take place a greater emanation from it to the dæmons receiving it. Now, however, it is all burned and consumed, and changed into the purity and tenuity of the fire, which itself is a clean proof of the contrary of what you say. The superior races likewise are without sensation, and it is a desirable thing to them to cut away the material substance by means of the fire, and to render us impassive. The qualities in us become like the divinities as fire also reduces all solid and refractory substances to luminous and tenuous bodies. They likewise carry us up by the sacrifices and the mystic fire to the fire of the gods, in the same way that fire rises to fire, by attracting and bringing those qualities which debase and resist, upward to the divine and celestial.

PURIFICATION BY SACRIFICIAL FIRE.

XII. So speaking to the point, it is neither from mat-

ter, nor the elements nor from any other of the bodies known to us, that the corporeal which pertains to the dæmons is derived. What gratification then, can take place from one kind of essence to another kind; or what delight can be transmitted between alien natures? Certainly none at all, but far the other way. As the gods with the lightning cut matter asunder, separating from it the principles essentially immaterial but mastered and fettered by it, and evolve impassive qualities from the impassive,—so the sacrificial fire with us imitates the operation of the divine fire, and separates every thing material in sacrifices. It purifies the things brought to the fire, releaseth hem from the bonds of matter, and renders them by means of its purity of nature, suitable for the community of gods. It also releases us after the same modes, from the bonds of changing existence, makes us like the divine beings, renders us worthy of their love, and leads our material nature to the immaterial.*

XIII. Having thus generally confuted your extraordinary suppositions in regard to sacred rites, we will introduce in their place the true concepts; without detail in respect to each form of sacrifices as the peculiar reason in respect to them requires, which belongs to another argument, but at the same time, from what has been said, whoever possesses discernment will be able to extend his understanding from one point to many, and easily know from these the things which have been left unconsidered. Indeed, I think that these things have been sufficiently discussed, both in their different aspects, and because they have duly set forth the purity of the nature of divine beings.

*The telestic fire, at the initiatory rites, it is here taught, purifies the whole nature. "The mortal who approaches the fire," says the *Chaldaean Oracle*, "shall have light from divinity." Proklos declared that Herakles was burned only symbolically, and becoming thus purified was received by the gods, as every true initiate will be.

Since, however, this may appear equally incredible to others and by no means to be clear, and even suspicious as not setting the reasoning faculty at work, nor affecting the discussions in regard to the soul, I mean to consider a few of the more important points in relation to them, and if possible to bring forward proofs more conclusive than what have been already uttered.

XIV. The best introduction of all is one which sets forth the institution of Sacred Rites which was established in the divine arrangement of things. At the outset therefore we lay down the hypothesis, that part of the gods belongs to the sphere of matter, and part are supramaterial; and that the material divinities encompass matter in themselves and regulate it, but the non-material gods are entirely separate from matter and superior to it. In the sacerdotal ritual however it is necessary for the sacred worship to be begun from the material divinities, for otherwise there would be no going upward to the supramaterial gods. They therefore are in union with matter in so far as they have a hold upon it. They, therefore, rule over those things which have their origin in relation to matter; as for example the division into parts, repulsion, change, coming into objective existence, and decay, of all material bodies. If any one therefore desires to worship the divinities of this kind according to theurgic rites, as is proper for them and for the realm to which they have been allotted, he must employ for them a worship which is of the material sphere as they belong to the region of matter. We shall thus be brought wholly into family relationship with them all, and will offer them in worship what is befitting to kindred beings. Hence, dead bodies and things deprived of life, the slaughter of animals, and consuming of their bodies, the manifold change, decay and vicissitude which befall to matter pertain to these divinities in the sacred rites; not to them on account of

themselves, but because of the matter of which they are rulers. For though they are to the highest degree separate from it, nevertheless they are likewise present with it; and though they take hold of it by a supra-material power they exist along with it. The things which are governed are not alien to those who govern, and things which are arranged in their order are not unsuitable to those whom they serve as organs. Hence the offering of any material substance by holy rites is utterly repugnant to the supra-material divinities, but is most proper to all those allied to matter.

XV. We will next consider what is in harmony with what has been said, and with our two-fold constitution. Sometimes we become as if entirely soul, we are out of the body, soaring on high with all the supramaterial divinities who are busy with lofty concerns. At other times again we are bound fast to the oyster-like body, held fast by matter, and are thoroughly corporeal in feeling and desire. In turn, therefore, there is a two-fold form of worship. The one which is for undefiled souls will be simple, without taint of the corporeal nature, free from every thing of the world of creation; but the other, which is for souls that are not pure or free from the world-life, is full of what is corporeal and of the material world.

I admit therefore that there are two kinds of Sacred Rites: those of the individuals wholly purified, as may rarely be the case at any time beyond a single instance, as Herakleitos affirms, or a few that may easily be counted; and those who are of material and corporeal quality, and existing by means of change, such as are yet held fast by the corporeal conditions. Hence, unless such a form of worship shall be instituted for cities and districts, that are not relieved from the hereditary allotment, they would fail utterly of both kinds of good, the supramaterial or the material. The one can not be

received, and for the other they bring nothing of kindred nature. At the same time every one bestows particular care upon the sacrifice, according to what he is, not I assure you according to what he is not; hence it is necessary that it should exceed the worshipper's own measure. I have the same thing to say in respect to the intimate union in which the men that worship and the powers worshipped are joined together; for this should require a mode of religious worship to be selected as fitting to itself: this intimate union mingling the non-material after a non-material manner, and joining incorporeal beings together by pure incorporeal powers in a pure manner; but knitting together the corporeal natures to bodies after a corporeal manner, mingling with the bodies the essences which pervade them.

XVI. Let us not, therefore, disdain to speak still further of such matters. Thus, for example, on account of the necessary requirements of the body, we often perform some act of worship to the guardians of the body, the gods and good dæmons; such as purifying it from old defilements, freeing it of diseases, and filling it with health, or cutting away from it heaviness and torpor, but supplying to it lightness and activity, or providing for it other benefits. We do not, then, I presume, treat the body intellectually or non-corporeally; for the body is not competent to participate in such modes of proceeding, but if it is granted boons which are of a kindred nature with itself a body is fostered and purified by bodies. The law of the sacred rites will be therefore of necessity, from such requirement, according to the bodily nature; on the one hand pruning away whatever in us is superfluous, and on the other hand supplying whatever is wanting in us, and bringing whatever is greatly disordered into symmetry and order. We often engage in sacred rites beseeching of the superior races

to accomplish for us things necessary to human life. These things are doubtless such as promote the welfare of the body, or relate to those things which we procure on account of our bodies.

XVII. What, then, will there be for us from the divine beings who are entirely excepted from all human existence, pertaining to barrenness, or anxiety, or wealth, or any other concern of life? Nothing whatever. It is not for those who are apart from all these things to be connected with gifts of this kind.

But suppose some one says: that the divinities who are wholly beyond matter induce all such goods, and contain their gifts in themselves as being the one First Cause. He would also say there thus decended from them an abundance of divine gifts. It may not however be permitted to any one to say that these divinities, engage directly in the affairs of human life, and so themselves do these things. Such a superintendence of our affairs is capable of division into departments; it is accomplished with a certain moving about in various ways; it is in no sense apart from bodily conditions, and cannot be endowed with a pure and untainted authority. Is not that form of holy rite, therefore, most suitable, in performances of this kind, which is mingled with bodily condition, and belongs to objective existence; and not by any means that which is entirely apart from matter and bodily condition? For the pure form is wholly above us and has no common relation with us; but that form which makes use of bodily conditions, and of the powers that operate by means of bodies, is most properly akin in every respect. It can create prosperity, and also assure a just correspondence and tempering of conditions to the mortal race.

XVIII. According to another division, the great multitude of human beings is classified under the head of nature, is governed by natural forces, looks down-

ward to the operations of nature, completes the jurisdiction of Fate, receives the order of things when being accomplished according to fate, and always employs effective reasoning in regard to those things alone which are according to nature. There are a few, however, who make use of a certain extraordinary power of intelligence, and are indeed removed from the classification of nature, but are allotted to that of separate and pure intelligence; and such take rank at once as superior to the natural power.

[*To be Continued.*]

NOTES ON THE KABBALAH.*

A system of religious philosophy, or more properly of theosophy, which not only exercised for hundreds of years an extraordinary influence on the mental development of so shrewd a people as the Jews, but captivated the minds of some of the greatest thinkers of Christendom in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, claims the closest attention of both the philosopher and the theologian. When it is added that among its captives were Raymond Lully, the celebrated scholastic, metaphysician and chemist (born 1235, died 1315); John Reuchlin, the renowned scholar and reviver of oriental literature in Europe (born 1455, died 1522); John Picus de Mirandola, the famous philosopher and classical scholar (1473—1494); Henry Cornelius Agrippa, the distinguished philosopher, divine and physician (1486—1535); John Baptist Von Helmont, a remarkable chemist and physician (1577—1644); Robert Fludd, the famous physician and philosopher (1574—1637), and Dr. Henry More (1614—1687); and that these men, after restlessly searching for a scientific system which should

*Chiefly compiled from the works of Dr. Ginsburg and Eliphas Levi. The extracts from Eliphas Levi are given in the excellent translation of Mr. A. R. Waite, which was recently published in London.

disclose to them "the deepest depths" of the Divine nature, and show them the real tie which binds all things together, found the cravings of their minds satisfied by this theosophy, the claims of the Kabbalah on the attention of students in literature and philosophy will readily be admitted. The claims of the Kabbalah, however, are not restricted to the literary man and the philosopher: the poet too will find in it ample materials for the exercise of his lofty genius. How can it be otherwise with a theosophy which, we are assured, was born of God in Paradise, was nursed and reared by the choicest of the angelic hosts in heaven; and only held converse with the holiest of man's children on earth. The story of its birth, growth and maturity, as told by its followers, is this:

The Kabbalah was first taught by God himself to a select company of angels, who formed a theosophic school in Paradise. After the fall the angels communicated this doctrine to the child of earth, to furnish him and his descendants with the means of returning to their pristine condition. From Adam it passed to Noah, and then to Abraham, who emigrated with it to Egypt where the patriarch allowed a portion of this mysterious doctrine to go out. Moses, who was learned in all the wisdom of Egypt, was first initiated into it in the land of his birth, but became most proficient in it during his wanderings in the wilderness, when he not only devoted to it the leisure hours of the whole forty years, but received lessons in it from one of the angels. By the aid of this mysterious science the law giver was enabled to solve the difficulties which arose during his management of the Israelites, in spite of the pilgrimages, wars, and the frequent miseries of the nation. He covertly laid down the principles of this secret doctrine in the first four books of the Pentateuch, but withheld them from Deuteronomy. Moses

also initiated the seventy elders into the secrets of this doctrine, and they again transmitted them from hand to hand. Of all who formed the unbroken line of tradition, David and Solomon were most initiated into the Kabbalah. No one, however, dared to write it down till Simon ben Jochai, who lived at the time of the destruction of the second Temple. Having been condemned to death by Titus, Rabbi Simon managed to escape with his son and concealed himself in a cavern where he remained for twelve years. Here in this subterranean abode he occupied himself entirely with the contemplation of the sublime Kabbalah, and was constantly visited by the prophet Elias, who disclosed to him some of its secrets which were still concealed from the theosophical Rabbi. Here, too, his disciples resorted to be initiated by their master into these divine mysteries; and here Simon ben Jochai expired with this heavenly doctrine in his mouth, whilst discoursing on it to his disciples. His son, R. Eliezer, and his secretary, R. Abba, as well as his disciples, then collated R. Simon ben Jochai's treatises and out of these composed the celebrated work called *Sohar*, i. e. *Splendor*, which is the grand store house of Kabbalism.

From what has been said it will be seen that the followers of this secret doctrine claim for it a pre Adamite existence, and maintain that ever since the creation of the first man it has been received uninterruptedly from the hands of the patriarchs, prophets, etc. It is for this reason that it is called *Kabbalah* from the Hebrew word meaning *to receive*, which primarily denotes *reception*; and then *a doctrine received by oral tradition*. The Kabbalah is also called by some *Secret Wisdom*, because it was only handed down by tradition through the initiated, and is indicated in the Hebrew Scriptures by signs which are hidden and unintelligible to those who have not been instructed in its mysteries.

The following is a brief summary of those doctrines which are peculiar to the Kabbalah, or which it expounds and elaborates in an especial manner, and which constitute it a separate system within the precincts of Judaism:

1. God is boundless in his nature. He has neither will, intention, desire, thought, language, nor action. He cannot be grasped and depicted, and for this reason is called *En Soph*, i. e. Boundless, Infinite.

2. He is not the direct creator of the universe, since he could not will the creation; and since a creation proceeding directly from him would have to be as boundless and as perfect as himself.

3. He at first sent forth ten emanations, or *Sephiroth*, which are neither begotten nor made, and which are both infinite and finite.

4. From these Sephiroth, which are the Archetypal Man, the different worlds gradually and successively evolved. These evolutionary worlds are the brightness and the express image of their progenitors, the *Sephiroth*, which uphold all things.

5. These emanations (Sephiroth) gave rise to or created in their own image all human souls.* These souls are preexistent; they occupy a special hall in the upper world of spirits, and there already decide whether they will pursue a good or bad course in their temporary sojourn in the human body, which is also fashioned according to the archetypal image.

6. No one has seen the *En Soph* at any time. It is the Sephiroth, in whom the *En Soph* is incarnate, who have revealed themselves to us, and to whom the anthropomorphisms of Scripture and the *Hagada* refer. Thus when it is said, "God spake, descended upon earth.

*This, to say the least of it, is a very inadequate and misleading statement. The "soul" (spirit) is *eternal* in its nature, and therefore was never "created."—*Editor*.

ascended into heaven, smelled the sweet smell of sacrifices, repented in his heart, was angry," etc., etc., or when the Hagadic works describe the body and the mansions of the Deity, etc., all this does not refer to the En Soph, but to these intermediate beings.

7. It is an absolute condition of the soul to return to the Infinite, whence it came, after developing all those perfections the germs of which are indelibly inherent in it. If it fails to develop these germs it must migrate into another body, and in case it is still too weak to acquire the virtues for which it is sent to this earth, it is united to another and stronger soul which, occupying the same human body with it, aids its weaker companion in obtaining the object for which it came down from the world of spirits.*

8. When all the preexistent souls shall have passed their probationary period here below, the restitution of all things will take place; Satan will be restored to an angel of light, hell will disappear, and all souls will return to the Deity whence they came.

The books which according to the Kabbalists expound their doctrines are: I. The *Sepher Jetzirah* or Book of Creation; II. The *Sohar*; III. The Commentary on the Ten Sephiroth. As the Book of Creation is acknowledged by all to be the oldest we shall examine it first.

I. The *Sepher Jetzirah* or Book of Creation. This marvellous and famous document professes to be a monologue of the patriarch Abraham, and premises that the contemplations it contains are those which led the father of the Hebrews to embrace the faith of the true God. Hence the remark of the celebrated philosopher, R. Jehudah Ha-Levi (born about 1086): "The

*This sensuous world is a place of exile and punishment, and the vast majority of souls are sent hither to expiate sins and crimes committed by them in the ideal or spiritual sphere.—*Editor*.

Book of the Creation, which belongs to our father Abraham, * * * * demonstrates the existence of the Deity and the Divine Unity by things which are on the one hand manifold and multifarious, whilst on the other hand they converge and harmonize; and this harmony can only proceed from One who originated it." The whole treatise consists of six chapters, subdivided into thirty-three very brief sections. The doctrines which it propounds are delivered in the style of aphorisms or theorems, and, professing to be the dicta of Abraham, are laid down very dogmatically in a manner becoming the authority of this patriarch.

The design of this treatise is to exhibit a system whereby the universe may be viewed methodically in connection with the truths given in the Bible, thus showing, from the gradual and systematic development of the creation, and from the harmony which prevails in all its multitudinous component parts, that One God produced it all, and that He is over all. The order in which God gave rise to this creation out of nothing, and the harmony which pervades all the constituent parts of the universe are shown by the analogy which subsists between the visible things and the signs of thought, or the means whereby wisdom is expressed and perpetuated among men. Since the letters have no absolute value, nor can they be used as mere forms, but serve as the medium between essence and form, and like words assume the relation of form to the real essence, and of essence to the embryo and unexpressed thought, great value is attached to these letters, and to the combinations and analogies of which they are capable. Abraham therefore employs the double value of the twenty-two letters of the Hebrew alphabet; he uses them, both in their phonetic nature and in their sacred character, as expressing the divine truths of the Scriptures. But, since the Hebrew alphabet is also used as

numerals, which are represented by the fundamental number *ten*, and since the vowels of the language are also *ten* in number, this decade is added to the twenty-two letters, and these two kinds of signs—i. e. the twenty-two letters of the alphabet and the ten fundamental numbers—are designated *the thirty-two ways of secret wisdom*.*

II. The *Sohar*.—This noted treatise, which is a commentary on the five books of Moses, according to the division into Sabbatic sections, was originally called *the Midrash or Exposition, Let there be light*, from the words in Gen. 1. 4; because the real Midrash begins with the exposition of this verse. The name, *Sohar*, i. e. *Light, Splendor*, was given to it afterwards, either because this document begins with the theme light, or because the word *Sohar* frequently occurs on the first page. Interspersed throughout the *Sohar* are the following dissertations: 1. Tosephta and Mathanithan, or Small Additional Pieces. They briefly discuss, by way of supplement, the various topics of the Kabbalah, as the Sephiroth, the emanation of the primordial light, etc., etc. 2. Hechaloth or the Mansions and Abodes. This portion of the *Sohar* describes the topographical structure of Paradise and Hell. 3. Sithre Tora or the Mysteries of the Pentateuch. It discusses the divers topics of the Kabbalah. 4. Midrash Ha-Neelam, or The Hidden Midrash. This endeavors more to explain passages of Scripture mystically, by way of *Remasin* and *Gematrias*, and allegorically, than to propound the

*An English version of the *Sepher Jetzirah* will appear in this volume of THE PLATONIST. This treatise was first published in a Latin translation by the celebrated William Postel, Paris, 1552. It was then printed in the original with five commentaries, Mantua, 1565. Another Latin version is given in *Jo. Pistorii Artis Cabalisticæ Scriptorum*, Basil, 1587, which is ascribed to Reuchlin and Paul Riccii; and a third Latin version, with notes and the Hebrew text, was published by Rittangel, Amsterdam, 1662. The book is also printed with a German translation and notes by Meyer, Leipsic, 1830.

doctrines of the Kabbalah. 5. Raja Mehemna, or the Faithful Shepherd. This derives its name from the fact that it records the discussions which Moses the Faithful Shepherd held in conference with the prophet Elias, and with Rabbi Simon ben Jochai, the celebrated master of the Kabbalistic school, who is called *the sacred light*. The chief object of this portion is to show the profound and allegorical import of the Mosaic commandments and prohibitions, as well as of the Rabbinic injunctions and religious practices which obtained in the course of time. 6. Raze Derazin, or the Secret of Secrets, is specially devoted to the physiognomy of the Kabbalah, and the connection of the soul with the body, based upon the advice of Jethro to his son-in-law Moses,—“and thou shall look into his face.” (Exod. xviii, 21). 7. Saba Demishpatim, or the Discourse of the Aged in Mishpatim. The Aged is the prophet Elias who holds converse with Rabbi Simon ben Joschai about the doctrine of metempsychosis, and the discussion is attached to Exod. xxi, 1—xxiv, 18, because the Kabbalah finds its psychology in this section. So enraptured were the disciples when their Master discoursed with Moses on this subject, that they knew not whether it was day or night, or whether they were in the body or out of the body. 8. Siphra Detzniutha, or the Book of Secrets or Mysteries. This is divided into five sections, and is chiefly occupied with discussing the questions involved in the creation, *ex. gr.* the transition from the infinite to the finite, from absolute unity to multifariousness, from pure intelligence to matter, the double principle of masculine and feminine, expressed in the Tetragrammaton, the androgynous protoplast, the Demonology concealed in the letters of Scripture, as seen in Gen. vi. 2; Josh. ii. 1; Kings, viii. 3, 16; the mysteries contained in Isa. i, 4, and the doctrine of the *Sephiroth* concealed in Gen. i;

etc., as well as with showing the import of the letters composing the Tetragrammaton which were the principal agents in the creation. 9. *Idra Rabba*, or the Great Assembly, derives its name from the fact that it purports to give the discourses which Rabbi Simon ben Jochai delivered to his disciples who congregated around him in large numbers. It is chiefly occupied with a description of the form and various members of the Deity, a disquisition on the relation of the Deity, in his two aspects of the *Aged* and the *Young*, to the creation and the universe; a dissertation on pneumatology, demonology etc. 10. *Januka* or the Discourse of the Young Man, forms part of the text of the *Sohar* on the Sabbatic section called *Balak*, i. e. Numb. xxii, 2.—xxv, 9. It derives its name from the fact that the discourses therein recorded were delivered by a young man. 11. *Idra Suta*, or the Small Assembly, derives its name from the fact that many of the disciples of Rabbi Simon ben Jochai had died during the course of these Kabbalistic revelations, and that this portion of the *Sohar* contains the discourses which the Sacred Light delivered before his death to the small assembly of six pupils, who still survived. It is to a great extent a recapitulation of the *Idra Rabba*, occupying itself with speculations about the Sephiroth, the Deity in his three aspects or principles, which successively developed themselves from each other, viz.: the *En Soph*, or the Boundless in his absolute nature, the *Macroprosopon*, or the Boundless as manifested in the first emanation, and the *Microprosopon*, the other nine emanations; the abortive creations, etc., and concludes with recording the death of Simon ben Jochai, the Sacred Light and the medium through whom God revealed the contents of the *Sohar*.

From this brief analysis of its component parts and contents it will be seen that the *Sohar* does not [appar-

ently] propound a regular Kabbalistic system, but dilates upon the diverse doctrines of this theosophy, as indicated in the forms and ornaments of the Hebrew alphabet, in the vowel points and accents, in the Divine names and the letters of which they are composed, in the narratives of the Bible, and in the traditional and national stories. The long conversations between its author, R. Simon ben Jochai, and Moses which it records; the short and pathetic prayers inserted therein; the religious anecdotes; the attractive spiritual explanations of scripture passages, appealing to the hearts and wants of men; the description of the Deity and of the Sephiroth under tender forms of human relationships, comprehensible to the finite mind, such as father, mother, primeval man, matron, bride, white head, the great and small face, the luminous mirror, the higher heaven, the higher earth, etc., which it gives on every page, made the *Sohar* a welcome text-book for the students of the Kabbalah, who, by its vivid descriptions of divine love, could lose themselves in rapturous embraces with the Deity.*

It is almost unnecessary to remark that Dr. Ginsburg denies the ancient origin of both the *Sepher Jetzirah*, and the *Sohar*. Other scholars differ from him. One thing seems clear, and that is that both of these noted works expound genuine Kabbalistic doctrines. It is therefore rather immaterial exactly when and by whom these doctrines were first committed to writing.

III. *The Commentary on the Ten Sephiroth*: This is an ancient and very valuable document embodying the doctrines of the Kabbalah. The author, R. Azariel ben Menachem, was born in Valladolid, Spain, about 1160

*The *Sohar* was first published by Da Padova and Jacob ben Naphtali, Mantua, 1560, 3 vols. 4to; Cremona, 1560, fol.; Lublin, 1623, fol.; Sulzbach, 1684, fol., edited by von Rosenroth; with an additional Index of matters. Amsterdam, 1714, 3 vols. 8vo; *ibid.* 1728; 1772, and 1805.

He distinguished himself as a philosopher, Kabbalist, Talmudist, and commentator, as his works indicate; he was a pupil of Isaac the Blind, and master of the celebrated Rabbi Moses Nachmanides, a distinguished pillar of Kabbalism. R. Azariel died A. D. 1238, at the advanced age of seventy-eight years. This Commentary is in questions and answers, and the following is the lucid analysis of it as given by the erudite Jellinek, according to Spinoza's form of ethics.

1. DEFINITION.—By the Being who is the cause and governor of all thing I understand the *En Soph* i. e. a Being infinite, boundless, absolutely identical with itself, united in itself, without attributes, will, intention, desire, thought, word or deed.—(Answers 2 and 4).

2. DEFINITION.—By Sephiroth I understand the potencies which emanated from the absolute *En Soph*, all entities limited by quantity, which like the will, without changing its nature, wills diverse objects that are the possibilities of multifarious things. (Answers 3 and 9.)

(i.) PROPOSITION.—The primary cause and governor of the world is the *En Soph*, who is both immanent and transcendent.—(Answer 1.)

(a.) PROOF.—Each effect has a cause, and every thing which has order and design has a governor.—(Answer 1.)

(b.) PROOF.—Every thing visible has a limit, what is limited is finite, what is finite is not absolutely identical; the primary cause of the world is invisible, therefore unlimited, infinite, absolutely identical, i. e. he is the *En Soph*.—(Answer 2.)

(c.) PROOF.—As the primary cause of the world is infinite, nothing can exist *without* him; hence he is immanent (*Ibid.*)

SCHOLION.—As the *En Soph* is invisible and exalted, it is the root of both faith and unbelief. (*Ibid.*)

ii. PROPOSITION.—The Sephiroth are the media be-

tween the absolute En Soph and the real world.

PROOF.—As the real world is limited and not perfect, it cannot directly proceed from the En Soph, still the En Soph must exercise his influence over it, or his perfection would cease. Hence the Sephiroth, which in their intimate connection with the En Soph are perfect, and in their severance are imperfect, must be the media. (Answer 4.)

Scholion.—Since all existing things originated by means of the Sephiroth, there are a higher, a middle, and a lower degree of the real world. (*Vide infra*, Proposition 6.)

iii. PROPOSITION.—There are ten intermediate Sephiroth.

PROOF.—All bodies have three dimensions, each of which repeats the other (3×3); and by adding thereunto space generally we obtain the number *ten*. As the Sephiroth are the potencies of all that is limited they must be *ten*. (Answer 4.)

(a.) *Scholion.* The number ten does not contradict the absolute unity of the En Soph, as *one* is the basis of all numbers, plurality proceeds from unity, the germs contain the development, just as fire, flame, sparks and color have *one* basis, though they differ from one another. (Answer 6.)

(b.) *Scholion.*—Just as cogitation or thought, and even the mind as a cogitated object, is limited, becomes concrete and has a measure, although *pure thought* proceeds from the En Soph,—so limit, measure, and concretion are the attributes of the Sephiroth. (Answer 7.)

4. PROPOSITION.—The Sephiroth are emanations and not creations.

1. PROOF.—As the absolute En Soph is perfect, the Sephiroth proceeding therefrom must also be perfect; hence they are not created. (Answer 5.)

2. PROOF.—All created objects diminish by abstrac-

tion; the Sephiroth do not lessen, as their activity never ceases; hence they cannot be created. (*Ibid.*)

Scholion.—The first Sephira was in the En Soph as a power before it became a reality; then the second Sephira emanated as a potency for the intellectual world, and afterwards the other Sephiroth emanated for the sensuous and material World. This, however, does not imply a *prius* and *posterius* or a gradation in the En Soph, but just as a light whose kindled lights shine sooner and later and variously, so it embraces all in a unity. (Answer 8.)

5. PROPOSITION.—The Sephiroth are both active and passive.

PROOF. As the Sephiroth do not set aside the unity of the En Soph, each one of them must receive from its predecessor, and impart to its successor,—i. e. be receptive and imparting. (Answer 9.)

6. PROPOSITION.—The first *Sephira* is called Inscrutable Height; the second, Wisdom; the third, Intelligence; the fourth, Love; the fifth, Justice; the sixth, Beauty; the seventh, Firmness; the eighth, Splendor; the ninth, the Righteous is the Foundation of the World; and the tenth, Righteousness.

(a) *Scholion.*—The first three Sephiroth form the world of thought; the second three the world of soul; and the four last the world of body—thus corresponding to the intellectual, moral, and material worlds. (Answer 10.)

(b) *Scholion.* The first *Sephira* stands in relation to the soul, inasmuch as it is called a *unity*; the second, inasmuch as it is denominated *living*; the third, inasmuch as it is termed *spirit*; the fourth, inasmuch as it is called *vital principle*; the fifth, inasmuch as it is denominated *soul*; the sixth operates on the blood, the seventh on the bones, the eighth on the veins, the ninth on the flesh, and the tenth on the skin. (*Ibid.*)

(c) The first *Sephira* is like the concealed light, the second like sky-blue, the third like yellow, the fourth like white, the fifth like red, the sixth like white-red, the seventh like whitish-red, the eighth like reddish-white, the ninth like white-red-whitesh-red-reddish-white, and the tenth is like the light reflecting all colors.*

[To be Continued.]

THE HISTORIC POSITION AND VALUE OF NEO-PLATONISM, &c.

By C. H. A. BJERREGAARD.

I.

When original and primitive truths become lost, either in the assumptions of priestcraft or from neglect, "the dark ages" set in, mankind suffers and longs for a savior.

In the course of time the savior comes, and the sun of freedom shines once more. The savior is "the Mystic."

After "the sages, who had mystic communication with the abyss" disappeared, came in the length of time the Tao-te-King to restore and to explain. Upon the *Vedas* followed the *Vedanta*: the conclusion of the Veda, the key and the life of the wisdom of the Rishis. When the *Mazdayacnian* religion vanished in ritualism, the *Bundehesch* preserved the doctrine of unity and wisdom. (Zeruane-Akerene.)

When Asia fell away from its "first love" and gave itself up to idolatry, the Wisdom-Religion was preserved in the "secret places" for the future Asia, but

*This Commentary was first known through the Kabbalistic works of Meier Ibn Gabbai, entitled the Path of Faith (Padua, 1563), and the Vision of the Lord (Mantua, 1545; Venice, 1567; and Cracow, 1578). It is printed in Gabriel Warschawer's volume entitled "A Collection of Kabbalistic Treatises," Warsaw, 1798; and an edition was published in Berlin, 1850.

came again before the world in its primitive glory among the people of "the classical age." The *Hermetic books* preserved the theological secrets, the *Neo-Platonistic devotees* cultivated its theosophy, and the *Neo-Pythagorean schools* taught its philosophical science, while *Christism* was intended to be a living embodiment of all its forms. All these forms contain elements which may be considered the keys to the ancient Wisdom-Religion.

Way, away up in the North a *Younger Edda* reveals the cosmosophic key to the Great Grandmother's tale, (the Elder Edda). Across the ocean the *Popul-Voh* tells us the mind of the good genius that watched over the red race of men.

And when the doctrine of the Christ was buried beneath the shrine of the saint, and the sweet voice of the gospel of Humanity was silenced *ex cathedra*, then the meek *Mystic* cultivated the lore that sets men free, and once more restored and revived the inner life.

Thus, mankind has again and again seen the Sun of Righteousness and Wisdom. Thus, mankind has again and again turned away from it, but it has not forsaken us, the light has shone again and again, and each time in the Interior.

Such is the history of Revelation and the keys thereto.

The inmost element of all the primary systems is the same. THAT WHICH IS appears and manifests itself in each under a varied form. The idea of the manifestation is eternal, infinite, &c., but the form is not. The form is delusive, and when the leaders of men gave themselves up to the senses and to dominion, that form became an evil to mankind, for they were forced to live in delusion.

But before the darkness became too thick THAT WHICH IS illuminated some one mind or more to see through the delusion, and to discover the *hidden sense* under the form.

"These minds are the saviors and restorers of truth: they are the *Mystics*, like the evening star they rise while it is still day, and they remain as morning stars till the new day is come.

Such a position as a reader of the hidden sense, as a savior, a restorer of truth, we find those forms of Philosophy called Neo-Platonism, Neo-Pythagoreanism, Hermetic Philosophy and Christism, *all of which are the revival of the classical age plus some new elements.*

We say deliberately the classical age, and reckon its life from a very early date down to Ficinus. We call it classical, because the whole movement is more or less antagonistic to the Orient, inspite of their inner connection. It is a movement for the realization of the idea of Humanity rather than that of the Deity, and the classical age is pre-eminently that of Man.

Plotinus organized the antagonism to the East. The theosophic literature of the East was analyzed and opposed. He wrote against the Astrologers of the time, and against the Gnostics. Prophyry launched a large work against the false Zoroaster, and Amelius published forty books against Zostrianus. Porphyry continued his labors in Sicily. His letter to Nectanebo combats the Egyptian priesthood, and his writings on the Chaldean Oracles seem to be aimed against Babylonian Astrology. The Neo-Platonism faught the Christian church with the greatest vigour, and with success.

This then is the value of Neo-Platonism, Neo-Pythagoreanism, Hermetic Philosophy and Christism: They are the various manifestations of a life and a wisdom, which is the key to the ancient Wisdom-Religion. The distinctive form of the key is that of *Humanity*, i. e. THE PERSONAL, the only true and complete revelation of the Deity.

*HYMNS OF SYNESIOS.**

Translated from the Original Greek.

Come, O sonorous lyre!
 After Teian melody,
 After Lesbian song,
 In loftier measures
 Sing a Doric ode:
 Not to delicate maidens
 Gracefully rejoicing,
 Nor to blooming youths
 With vigorous passions:
 The pure inward working
 Of Wisdom divine
 Impells me to sound the lyre
 To a divine melody;
 And prompts to fly the attractions sweet
 Of desires terrene.
 Of what value is power,
 Beauty, wealth, or fame
 And even regal honors,
 Compared with Divine visions?
 One may equine sports pursue,
 Another toxic skill increase,
 Another guard his golden treasury
 And work to fill it more;
 One may decorate his flowing hair,
 Another with sparkling countenance
 May famous be among youths and maidens:
 But give to *me* a tranquil life, secluded,
 Virtues to the many alien,
 And only to the Deity known.
 Grant wisdom fitting to me,
 Things adapted to youth,
 Things to properly guide old age,
 Things superior far to riches,
 Poverty without onerous toil,
 Wisdom serene, inaccessible
 To the cruel cares of life.
 All I crave is enough
 To keep me independent of the world,
 That necessity may not me impell

*In this version of the precious and profoundly mystical Hymns of Synesios I have *only* aimed to give the English reader a somewhat adequate conception of the sublime ideas of the original. The translation is almost literal.

THE PLATONIST.

To delve amid affairs mundane.
 Hark! the cicada sings,
 Drinking the matutinal dew:
 Behold! for me the chords spontaneously sound
 And in me flows the divine afflatus.
 What, therefore, in me produces
 The influx divine of song?
 He indeed, the self-begotten,
 Of all things the lord and father;
 Unborn, above celestial heights enthroned,
 Delighting in immortal glory
 The Deity eternally abides.]
 Of unities the sacred Unity,
 Of monads the primeval Monad,
 Uniting simplicities of the highest
 And being generated by superessential throes
 Whence issuing forth through its first-born form
 Unity was diffused in a manner ineffable
 And received a three-fold energy;
 And as the superessential fount
 Is crowned with the beauty of offspring,
 Which emanates from the centre
 And around the centre revolves.
 Hold! O audacious lyre,
 Hold, nor to the vulgar herd
 Reveal the arcane Mysteries:
 Sing instead terrestrial things,
 Those of the supernal realm *Silence* hides.
 Intellect intuitive naturally ranges
 Amidst the intelligible spheres alone.
 Thence come human goods
 And the spirit of man
 Which is indivisibly divided.
 The immortal spirit has fallen into matter,
 A fragment of the divine progenitors,
 A small fragment indeed,
 But it is everywhere one and all,
 All diffused through the all.
 Filling the celestial expanse
 And the universe preserving,
 Separated into diverse forms, it is present:
 Part of it is to the courses of the stars,
 Part to the choir of the angels,
 Part manacled with a heavy bond
 Found a terrene form
 And, separated from its parents,
 Drank a dark oblivion.
 Immersed in sensuous delights
 It admires an unhappy abode;

But Deity to human things is ever-present.
 Yet there is *some* light even in darkened eyes:
 To those who have fallen hither
 There is a certain power remaining
 To the celestial sphere recalling them,
 When, from mortal waves emerging,
 Rejoicing, they enter on the sacred path
 Leading to the regal, parental abode.
 Happy he who, the voracious bark of Hyle escaping
 And from earthly bonds released,
 With joyful and enlightened mind
 To Deity directs his hasty flight.
 Happy he who, after mortal vicissitudes,
 After hardships, after heavy terrene cares
 Having ascended the path of Intellect intuitive
 Beholds his goal, shining with light divine.
 Laborious it is the whole soul to extend
 In conjunction with all the energies
 Of aspirations anagogic.
 Do thou make this necessary effort certain
 By giving attention most strenuous
 To all impulses leading to the sphere supernal;
 Thy Parent his aid extending
 Will to thee close appear:
 For a certain ray, shining before,
 Will illuminate the path occult,
 And to thee will unfold the intelligible plain,
 Of ideal Beauty the fount and principle.
 Arouse thyself, O Soul, drinking
 Of the fount perennial of immortal goods,
 Supplicating thy eternal Parent:
 Ascend, nor for an instant linger
 But at once, and totally, leave the things of earth;
 And *then*, truly united with the Father,
 A deity in Deity you will eternally rejoice.

For "I and the Father are one."

ON THE ARTIFICER OF THE UNIVERSE.

Reprinted from the Monthly Magazine for Oct. 1797.

The author of the Enquirer, in your Magazine for last month, asserts that the opinion that the producing cause of the universe is both one and many is paradoxical, apparently confounds all our numerical ideas, and is, after all, impossible to be understood.

If he considers this hypothesis as implying that Deity

contains in himself a multitude of principles equal to himself in dignity and power, his assertion is undoubtedly right; but, if he means to pass this censure on the doctrine that paradigmatic, or exemplary and producing causes of things, subsist concentrated and rooted in one first producing cause, but with due subordination to their comprehending principle, he opposes one of the most sublime conceptions of the human mind, endeavors to subvert the heaven-built fabric of intellectual philosophy, and, in mythological language, wars on the Olympian gods.

To such, indeed, as have not *regularly* studied the scientific writings of Plato, it will doubtless, in the first place, seem absurd to introduce a multitude of principles in order to the production of the universe. To these, one principle appears sufficient for the purpose; and the hypothesis of a multitude subsisting in conjunction and co-operating with him is considered as useless, and as tending to diminish the power, and sully the dignity of the Parent of Things. In the next place, they will deem it impossible to conceive how a multitude of principles can have a distinct energy of their own, at the same time that they are comprehended in, and energize together with, a higher cause.

The first of these objections may be easily removed, by considering that the most perfect mode of production is the *essential*, or, in other words, when a being produces by its very nature or essence. Instances of this *essential* mode of production are seen in fire and snow, the former *essentially* imparting heat, and the latter cold. This mode is more perfect than that which is attended with *deliberation*, because more extended. Thus all such beings as produce *deliberatively*, as is the case with rational souls like ours, are at the same time connected with the *essential operation*; such as is the energy of nature in generation, nutrition, and increase.

But the energy of nature is present with beings to whom the power of deliberation is unknown. And hence the *essential* is more extended than the *deliberative* energy. The essential energy, therefore, must be the prerogative of the highest producing cause, because more powerful than the deliberative: for, superiority of power is always characteristic of a superior cause.

Hence, since the Artificer of the Universe in producing all things operated *essentially*, if he is an intellectual nature, if he fabricated the world without the conjunction of subordinate causes, the world would have been profoundly intellectual in all its parts. For, in *essential* productions the effect is always of the same kind *secondarily*, which the cause is according to a *primary* mode of subsistence. The existence of body, therefore, in the universe, necessarily proves the existence of lesser producing causes, co-operating with the *one* intellectual Father of all in the production of things. And it is likewise evident that this is not through any defect or imbecility in the Great Artificer, but on the contrary, through transcendency of generating power.

The second objection, respecting the distinct energy of subordinate causes, or principles, may be removed by diligently attending to the different powers of the human soul. For in these powers, as images, we shall conspicuously see how a multitude of divine natures may possess a distinct energy of their own, at the same time that they are comprehended in, and energize together with, a superior essence. If we survey then the Gnostic powers of the soul, we shall find that they are accurately five in number, viz. *intellect*, *cogitation* (*διανοία*), *opinion*, *phantasy*, and *sense*.

INTELLECT is that power by which we understand simple self evident truths, called by axioms, and are able to pass into contact with intellectual forms separated from all connection with matter.

COGITATION is that power by which we reason scientifically.

OPINION is that which knows the universal in sensuous particulars, as that every man is a biped; and the conclusion of cogitation, as that every rational soul is immortal; but it only knows the *οτι* or that a thing is, but is perfectly ignorant of the *διοτι*, or *why* it is.

The PHANTASY is that power which apprehends things clothed with figure, and may be called a *figured intelligence*, (*μορφωτική νοησις*).

Lastly, SENSE is that power which is distributed about the organs of sensation, which is mingled with passion in its judgment of things, and alone apprehends that by which it is externally agitated.

Now it is evident, since the energies of these powers are perfectly distinct from each other, that the powers themselves, which are the sources of these energies, must also be distinct.

Again it is evident that desire, which tends to one thing, anger, which aspires after another thing, and that deliberative tendency to things in our power, which the Greeks call *προαιρεσις* (*προαιρεσις*), are so many distinct vital powers of the soul. But above both the gnostic and vital powers is the *one*, or the summit or vertex of the soul, by means of which we are enabled to say, I perceive—I opine—I reason—I desire—I deliberate—which summit follows all these energies, and energizes together with them; for we should not be able to know all these, and to apprehend in what they differ from each other, unless we contained a certain indivisible nature, which subsists above the common sense, and which, prior to opinion, desire, and will, knows all that these know and desire, according to an indivisible mode of apprehension.

In a similar manner, therefore, a multitude of mighty powers subsist in the intellect of the Father of the

Universe, distinct from each other, and from their comprehending cause. But they are not only transcendently more distinct in the divine mind, than in the human soul, on account of their unmingled purity, and proceeding into different orders; but they are fabricative, as well as vital and gnostic.

No objections of any weight, no arguments but such as are sophistical, can be urged against this sublime Platonic mode of conceiving multitude and unity as subsisting together in the intellect of Divinity. It is this theory which those who declaim against the theology of the ancients, should first *endeavour* to understand, before they attempt to subvert. At the same time, unfortunately, it is a theory so entirely neglected, that it is not to be discovered in any writing, since the time of the emperor Justinian. Indolence and priestcraft have hitherto conspired to defame those inestimable works* in which this, and many other equally sublime and important theories can alone be found; and the theology of the Greeks has been attacked with all the fury of ecclesiastical zeal, and all the imbecile flashes of mistaken wit, by men whose conceptions on the subject, like those of a man between sleeping and waking, have been turbid and wild, phantastic and confused, preposterous and vain!

The modern Trinity, I shall leave the Right Reverend Clergy to defend. My province extends no farther than to show that neither Plato, nor any of his genuine disciples, had any conception of a trinity such as that which is now established by law! To prove this, it is necessary, in the first place, to observe, that the highest God is every where celebrated by Plato under the epithets of *the one* and *the good*; and is considered by him as a nature so transcendently excellent, as to be superior

*Those of the latter Platonists, viz. Plotinus, Porphyry, Iamblichus, Proclus, etc.

to being itself. Thus towards the conclusion of the first hypothesis in the Parmenides, he expressly asserts that *the one* in no respect participates of essence. And in the sixth book of his Republic, he says that "*the good* is superior to essence, transcending it both in dignity and power." In the Sophista too, he shows that *being* participates of, and is therefore posterior to *the one*. In short the First God is considered by Plato as exempt from all habitude, proximity, or alliance with being, or any of its attributes or powers. Hence, he justly observes in the Parmenides, "Neither therefore does any name belong to *the one*, nor discourse, nor any science, nor opinion." In consequence of which, he adds, "It can neither be named, nor spoken of, nor conceived by opinion, nor be known, nor perceived by any being."

Hence it follows that the Highest God is not, according to Plato, the immediate cause of the universe. For as he is the same with *the one*, an unifying or uniting energy must be the prerogative of his nature; and as he is likewise superessential, if the world were his immediate progeny, it must, from the preceding theory, be in a *secondary* degree superessential, and profoundly one. As this, however, is not the case, other subordinate principles are necessary to its production. The two great primary causes by which this is immediately effected, are particularly celebrated by Plato in the Timæus, and are intellect and soul; by the first of which the universe is formed, and by the second moved. That these two principles are subordinate to *the one*, and likewise are essentially different from each other, is evident from the Sophista, Laws, and Timæus. For in the Sophista, Plato asserts that *being* neither abides, nor is moved; and in the twelfth book of his Laws, that intellect is moved similarly to a sphere round its abiding centre. Intellect therefore, according to Plato, is essentially posterior to being, and, consequently, is far in-

ferior to *the one* which is superessential. Lastly, in the *Timæus*, he asserts that soul is a medium between an indivisible nature, i. e. intellect, and a nature divisible about bodies, i. e. the whole of that corporeal life which the world participates. The one, intellect, and soul, therefore, which are the three primary principles of things, so far from forming a consubsistent or co-equal triad, are essentially different from each other, according to Plato, and have no more similitude to the Christian trinity, than scientific evidence to the dreams of fancy.

Reserving a farther discussion of this matter to another opportunity, I shall only add at present that in the *Enquirer* *το ον*, or being, is erroneously confounded with *το αγαθον*, or the good, and that *λογος*, reason, is the same with Plato as rational soul.

THOMAS TAYLOR.

ETRUSCAN NOTES.

I.

As the modern English land-law reformer is said not to be "discouraged by the bones of the knights who have preceded him," so the student of Etruscology is bound to be undaunted by the vast and acknowledged difficulties of the subject, to make from time to time new efforts toward the solution of the problems which the study so plentifully affords. For material to some extent increases; and intelligent efforts, even when in themselves failures, are by no means useless, inasmuch as they may supply suggestive material to other investigators, and at the least show that certain paths are to be avoided in future.

Of late years Etruscology has been enriched by the laborious but unsuccessful efforts of Corssen, the bold

speculations of Canon Taylor, and the careful and very valuable monographs of Doctor Deecke and Doctor Paali; whilst the inscriptions have been edited by Fabretti, and the ground has been admirably described by Mr. George Dennis, the Pausanias of Etruria. It is not my intention to refer to the long series of efforts to explain the Etruscan language, and to the successive theories which have connected it with almost every tongue spoken by man. I propose to examine to some extent certain archaic god-names, and to note what conclusions may be drawn from the result; premising this much: that I do not believe Etruscan either to be *sui generis* and a survival, or connected with any Aryan or Semitic dialect, or with ancient Egyptian. I quite accept the familiar statement of Dionysios of Halikarnassos, that the Etruscan race was "very ancient, and not like any other [known to him] either in speech or manners."

II.

Let us, then, taking the extremely important idea involved in the terms *High—Sky—God*, examine several archaic god-names of those remarkable Akkadians, who, descending into the Euphrates Valley at an extremely early period, imparted civilisation to subsequent Semitic invaders in the same way that Etruria bestowed much art and science upon Rome. In the following list the Akkadian (*Ak.*) and Etruscan (*Et.*) words are printed in Roman capitals:—

1. *Ak.* AN, — A-NA., AN-NA ('High', 'Sky,' 'God'): from which the Assyrian *Anu* (the god Anu; and, generally, god); and thence the *Anos* of Damaskios the Neo-Platonist. Cf. the North Asian (Turanian) god-names: Permian *jen*, 'god', Votiac, *in*, 'heaven', etc. Hence the compound name Anam-melech (Kings II., xvii, 31), *i. e.* "Anu-the-king."

Et. ANI: whence Old Latin form *Janis*; later form

Janus, the well-known non-Aryan and Etruscan divinity imported by the Romans.

Ak. NA ('Sky,' 'puioce'): whence by reduplication NANA, the Babylonian love and lunar goddess, consort of Ana, called Ninikasi ("the-lady-with-the-horned-countenance"), Nanaia, (*Maccabees* II., i, 13. Cf. *Nirvior*, a 'courtesan'—*Athenaios* xiii, 5). Nana is the "Great Goddess" of Asia Minor, the Hittite *Atargatis* and *Ephesian Polymastes*.*

2. *Ak.* DIMIR, DINGIR ('god'), variant forms; *m* and *ng* being often subject to permutation in Akkadian. Lengthened form, DINGARA,—feminine, DINGARI (equivalent to Nana). Cf. Yakute, *Tangara* ('sky,' 'god'); Mongolian, *Tengri*; Turkish, Tangry; Hungarian, Is-ten ('god'), Mongol, *den* ('high.');

Chinese, *Tien* ('sky,' 'sky-god' god'); *Et.* TIN-NA, TINIA, TINA, the Supreme God.

3. *Ak.* SA ('heaven'), ES-SA ('Brightness-of-heaven'); explained in Assyrian as 'the divinity of corn,' *i. e.*, the sunlit sky. Cf. the Hungarian *Is-ten* (also *Ak.*, ESSA-DING-IR); Yenisseean, *es*, *eis*, *ais*, ('heaven,' 'god'); Altaic. *es* ('sky'); Kamacintzi, *esch* ('god.');

Arintzi, *eis-ch* ('god.'). According to Suetonius, AESAR meant 'god' in Etruscan; and Hesychios gives AISOI, (a Greek form of the name) as Etruscan for *θεοι*, which is correct, AR being a plural form. In Etruscan, AI, at times AIE; so the proper Etruscan form would probably be AIES-AR, ('gods').

III.

Scholars will easily appreciate the highly-important results of the above linguistic observations. The researches of Lenormant have demonstrated the connex-

*More popularly known as Rhea or Kybele, Derketo or Astarte, and "Diana of the Ephesians." The latter divinity was represented as many-hearted, like the Hindoo Bhavani, and later forms of Isis or Asi of Egypt. The "Amazons" from Assyria are reputed to have introduced his worship into Asia Minor.—*Ed.*

ion between the Akkadian language and the dialects of Northern Asia; whilst those of Professor Terrien de Lacouperie are tending to show the links which connect the archaic and hitherto isolated Empire of China with the Euphrates Valley. Here as the historic mist partly rises, we begin to catch glimpses of a mighty Turanian, by which convenient term I mean *non-Aryan* and *non-Semitic*, brotherhood of nations and of dialects; of which group China forms the Eastern, and Etruria, isolated no longer, the Western sister. It is indeed remarkable that when we take three archaic Akkadian god-names, we find each reappearing in Etruscan: ANA in ANI, DING-IR in TINA, and ESSA in AIESA[R]—a three-fold cord not easily to be broken.

ROBERT BROWN, jun'r.

Barton-on-Humber, Eng.

September, 1885.

POSTSCRIPT.—Our worthy friend has since communicated the following translation made by himself, using the Akkadian dialect as his key:

It is the inscription on the Foiano Libation-bowl, which reads thus:

EKUTHUTHIIALZRECHUVAZELESULZIPULTHESUVAP-
URTISURAPRUEUNETURAKETI.

There is no Aryan word in this inscription. Mr. Brown submits this reading:

1. EKU—THUTHII—AL—Z—RECHU—VA
O Moon! of the setting sun daughter the queen and
Ak Aku Tutu rakki va

ZEL

of-the-desert

Zu

2. ESULZI PULTH ESU VA
Triple Revealer! three (times) and
Ak. Essakam Pul eesa va

PURTISURA.

Sovereign lady!

Pal-Zur

3. PRU E UNE TURAREK ETL.
 On the ground water I pour out to the Lady Moon
 Ak. *Pur* *a* *une* *turr-kir* *Ease-b.*

Substituting an English idiom for the archaic mode of expression, the inscription may be read as follows:

"O Moon! daughter of the setting sun, and Queen of the Night. Greatest unfolders of occult lore and highest Queen; I pour out water in honor of her the supreme goddess, the Moon."

Mr. Brown is a scholar of great merit, and the author of several treatises and monographs which throw a world of light on ancient faiths and mythology. I need but enumerate *The Great Dionysiak Myth*, *Poseidon*, *the Myth of Kirke*, *Aratos*, *Eridanus*, *Zoroaster*, *The Unicorn*, *the Law of Kosmic Order*.

The importance of understanding these matters is indicated in this utterance of Plato: "Parties have, through being persuaded, established sacrifices mixed up with Mystic Rites, emanating either from their own country, or being exotic from Tyrrhenia, or Cypros." It is generally supposed that the local Roman cultus was Etrucan. Mr. Brown indicates the ethnic as well as theosophic origin: that prior and apart from Aryan and Semitic origins, a mighty people extended from China over Siberia, Middle Asia, and Europe as far as Etruria; having dialects of language and religious worship pertaining to a common source. Many of the Skythic tribes seem to have been of the number. I have noticed what appeared to be Semitic peculiarities in Roman rites; which this hypothesis would account for. For example, the *Bona Dea*, the good goddess Amma, is evidently the *Uma* of the Orient; and the *Thalassia* of the hymeneal chant the *Thalotth* of Berossos.

This name *Turanian*, though sadly misapplied, is pretty well established among ethnographers. I sur-

mise that the Aethiopes of the archaic period, the Cushites of the Bible, are either the same, or else an archaic division of them. Stephanos of Byzantium gives them the credit of establishing commonwealths, the worship of the gods, and laws or rituals; and derives from them the Persian worship of Mithras and the Pelasgic cult of Phlegyas. Assyrian research demonstrates the same thing in another form. The Akkadians or Highlanders of Middle Asia gave Babylon and Assyria their institutions, gods and sacerdotal order; or as it is enigmatically expressed in *Genesis*: "Cush begot Nimrod, the beginning of whose realm was Bab-El."

Curiously, the legends of many peoples indicate an origin in Northern Asia. The Airyana-Vaejo was there, the arrow-head or triangle character originated there, and show the primal home of the earliest known colonists of the valley of the Euphrates. Significantly the *Vendidad* remarks that the Evil Spirit (Anro-mainyas) introduced the Serpent there, and winter the creation of the devils. Then ensued migrations and the colonisation of other regions. Even now however, the region is a hive capable of swarming its millions to other regions.

A. W.

BOOK REVIEWS.

Prisciani Lydi Quae Extant Metaphrasis in Theophrastum et Solutionum ad Chsroem Liber, Edidit I. Bywater, Berolini 1886.

In A. D. 529 a barbarous edict issued by the bigoted Justinian, instigated by the enemies of intellectual freedom, closed the schools of Philosophy at Athens. Damaskios, the last Schoolarch of the Platonic Academy, accompanied by six of his associates, viz: Simplikios, Priskianos, Eulalios, Hermias, Diogenes, and Isidoros, all of whom were philosophers noted for their learning and purity of life, went to Persia, to the Court of King Chosroes, who was well skilled in the philosophy of Pla-

ton and Aristoteles, and a generous patron of learned men. After a residence of several years in Persia the philosophers desired to return to Hellas. In the treaty of peace made between Persia and the Roman Empire in A. D. 533 it was specially stipulated by Chosroes, be it said to his great and lasting honor, that Damaskios and his associates should be allowed to return to their native country without hindrance, and retain complete liberty of belief. During the sojourn of the Platonic sages in Persia many conversations of a philosophic character were held between them and the King, and the substance of some of these conferences was reduced to writing by Priskianos, and entitled "*Solutiones eorum de quibus dubitavit Chosroes Persarum Rex.*" The Greek original of this valuable treatise is unfortunately lost, but an ancient Latin version is extant. This was first edited, though in an imperfect form, by Fr. Deubner (Paris, 1855). The work now appears in a better and more complete form, with a greatly improved text, admirably edited by Mr. Ingram Bywater, Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford, and one of the foremost classical scholars of England.

The questions discussed in this treatise are partly psychological, partly physical. The former are alike valuable and interesting; the latter of less value but still well worth the attention of the scientific student. Priskianos' Interpretations of the books of Theophrastos "On Sensuous Perception" (*Περὶ Αἰσθησεως*), and "On Phantasy" (*Περὶ Φαντασίας*), are fairly well known to philosophic scholars. These "Interpretations" are in the nature of very valuable commentaries, which follow the speculations of Iamblichos as expounded in his precious treatise "On the Soul," of which only fragments remain. Mr. Bywater's notes will enable one to recover much of the Iamblichian book.

The Life of Philippus Theophrastus Bombast of Hohenheim known by the name of Paracelsus and the substance of his Teachings concerning Cosmology, Anthropology, Pneumatology, Magic and Sorcery, Medicine, Alchemy and Astrology, Philosophy and Theosophy, extracted and translated from his rare and extensive works and from some unpublished manuscripts, by Franz Hartmann, M. D., London, 1886.

All students of Paracelsus, and the mystical mediæval philosophy generally, are greatly indebted to Dr. Hartmann for this work. It is the only book in any language which gives an *adequate* account of the life and teachings of the polyonymous mystic and alchemist usually called Paracelsus. Gradually the dense clouds which envelope the great mediæval "magicians" are rolling away, and the reading public are beginning to see, what the student has long known, that they were grand men of high aspirations, and lofty genius. Court-ed by the learned and noble, shunned and hated by the mass of the people, who regarded them as the instruments and familiars of the "devil," they lived a strange adventurous existence. Most of them died persecuted and in poverty, if not at the stake. They were martyrs to that thirst for a knowledge of the occult which from time immemorial has driven daring minds to incur multitudinous dangers, and even death at the stake, in order that they *might know*. Of these seekers after forbidden knowledge Paracelsus was not the least, and the more he is known the better will he be appreciated. Dr. Hartmann, in rescuing from unmerited obloquy and oblivion the character of Paracelsus, has simply done an act of *justice*, which was rightly due the great spirit which during its terrestrial career was so basely injured and calumniated.

"Astrology Theologized:"—The Spiritual Hermeneutics of Astrology and Holy Writ, Being a Treatise upon the Influence of the stars on Man and on the art of ruling them by the law of Grace:

(Reprinted from the original of 1649), with a Prefatory Essay on the True Method of Interpreting Holy Scripture By Dr. Anna Kingsford. London 1886.

The "Astrology Theologized" of Valentine Weigel is a rare and valuable book, and richly deserved a new edition. Weigel, whose name is hardly known to this generation, was the founder of a school of mystics. He was born at Grossenhain, Saxony, in 1533, and died in 1588. The *Theologia Germanica* is the source of his leading theological principles, and he is indebted to Paracelsus for many Theosophical conceptions. He had numerous disciples, among whom was the noted Jakob Bohme. His writings, which were not published until after his death, are very scarce.

4E Astrology as expounded by Weigel does not mean the science commonly known by that name. His conceptions on this subject may be best expressed in his own words: "For their opinion is of no moment who, not rightly knowing the Macrocosm, are fallen into that error that they doubt not to determine that man, by the external influence of the stars, by a certain natural necessity is conditioned, predestinated, constellated, directed, compelled, and driven to this or that good or evil. Hence those false proverbs,—*"the stars incline"*—*"the stars rule men"*—which is in no sort so, if, according to their opinion, it be understood of the external stars.

But we must know that all things whatsoever that are done by men, as well in soul as in body, arise and proceed *from within*, from their own proper inclination and nature.

< Within I say, in Man, is that Heaven, that Planet that Sidus or Star, by which he is inclined, constituted, predestinated, and signed to this or that; and not from without, by the constitution of the external Heaven.

< And the saying, *"a wise man shall rule the stars,"* is not to be understood of the external stars, in the Heav-

en or Firmament of the great world, but of the internal stars, bearing sway and running up and down in man himself; which will more and more appear by that which followeth. But this we premise for the beginning to be noted—*That the external Heaven with its continual revolution, hath a most convenient correspondency with the inward Heaven in the Microcosm, and this with that.*"

Dr. Kingsford's Prefatory Essay is of great value to those who desire to rightly apprehend the inner meaning of the Christian Scriptures, and we heartily commend it. The book is elegantly printed, and illustrated with engravings.

TOTEMISM.

"Totemism" is the title of a little humorous monograph bearing the imprint of Edward Bumpus, 5 and 6, Holborn Bars, E. C., London. Conjecture assigns the authorship to Mr. Robert Brown, jun'r. of Barton on Humber. It is an admirable burlesque upon the scientific absurdities now current, and bears date April 1, 4886. It defines Totemism as the belief that one is descended from any natural object except man and woman. The belief of man in early times, it sets forth, ran exactly contrary to his experience. Interpretation of the British myths of the Victorian Period is thus exhibited: "The efforts of a great ancestral Fox are said to have been stopped by a Pitt (pit?), into which no doubt he fell, trapped by some early hunter; that the Anti-Foxites are reported to have sent a chieftain named Wolf to Egypt—probably to Lycopolis where as Strabo informs us the Wolf was worshipped, probably as a totem-ancestor." "It seems too that there existed a mysterious tribe of mythologists who were popularly credited with the extraordinary power of turning every thing into the sun." We predict, says our author, that the gospel according to Agnchekikos will be admired and adopted when Homer and Virgil are forgotten, although probably not until then.