

**Hans LEWY**

**CHALDAEAN ORACLES  
AND THEURGY**

Troisième édition par Michel TARDIEU  
avec un supplément « Les Oracles chaldaïques 1891-2011 »

Institut d'Études Augustiniennes

PARIS

2011



**CHALDAEAN ORACLES AND THEURGY**

**Mystic Magic and Platonism in the Later Roman Empire**

Troisième édition par Michel TARDIEU  
avec un supplément « Les Oracles chaldaïques 1891-2011 »

**Collection des Études Augustiniennes**

**Fondateurs : F. CAYRÉ † et G. FOLLIET**  
**Ancien Directeur : Jean-Claude FREDOUILLE**

**Directeur : Frédéric CHAPOT**

**Conseil scientifique : M. ALEXANDRE, N. BÉRIOU, A.-I. BOUTON-TOUBOULIC,**  
**N. DUVAL, J. FONTAINE, J.-Cl. FREDOUILLE, Cl. LEPELLEY,**  
**P. PETITMENGIN, V. ZARINI**

**Diffuseur exclusif**

**BREPOLS Publishers**  
**Begijnhof 67**  
**B – 2300 Turnhout (Belgium)**  
**Tél. 00 32 14 44 80 20**  
**Fax. 00 32 14 42 89 19**  
**email : info@brepols.com**  
**www.brepols.net**

**Comptes Bancaires**

<b>Crédit du Nord :</b>	<b>Banque ING Lille :</b>
<b>Crédit du Nord Centre Aff. Roubaix</b>	<b>ING France-Lille</b>
<b>RIB 30076 02919 61068404200 14</b>	<b>RIB 30438 00008 33894 03 6002 40</b>
<b>IBAN FR76 3007 6029 1961 0684 0420 014</b>	<b>IBAN FR76 3043 8000 0833 8940 3600 240</b>
<b>BIC NORDFRPP</b>	<b>BIC INGFRPP</b>

Hans LEWY

# CHALDAEAN ORACLES AND THEURGY

*Mysticism Magic and Platonism  
in the Later Roman Empire*

Troisième édition par Michel TARDIEU  
avec un supplément « Les Oracles chaldaïques 1891-2011 »

Institut d'Études Augustiniennes  
PARIS  
2011

Tous droits réservés pour tous pays. Aux termes du Code de la Propriété Intellectuelle, toute reproduction ou représentation, intégrale ou partielle, faite par quelque procédé que ce soit (photocopie, photographie, microfilm, bande magnétique, disque optique ou autre) sans le consentement de l'auteur ou de ses ayants droit ou ayants cause est illicite et constitue une contrefaçon sanctionnée par les articles L 335-2 à L 335-10 du Code de la Propriété Intellectuelle.

© Institut d'Études Augustiniennes, 2011  
ISBN : 978-2-85121-243-6  
ISSN : 1158-7032

**PAULI KRAUS**  
**MEMORIAE**  
**S.**





## AVANT-PROPOS

*L'impression du présent ouvrage débutait à peine que l'auteur mourut. Son manuscrit, par bonheur, était presque entièrement au point ; on fut donc en mesure de poursuivre le travail commencé, mais ce dernier, par la force des choses, se trouva quelque peu ralenti. En particulier les circonstances nous amenèrent à chercher et à trouver plusieurs collaborateurs bénévoles, sans l'aide desquels les épreuves n'auraient pu être corrigées dans de bonnes conditions. L'essentiel de cette tâche ingrate a été confiée à la grande autorité scientifique et à la bonne volonté inlassable de notre collègue le Docteur Walter Zander qui, seules, ont permis de la mener à bonne fin. A lui tout d'abord et aussi à ses prédécesseurs, le Professeur Polotzky et le Docteur Goldschmidt, la Direction de l'Institut français tient à exprimer sa profonde et sincère gratitude.*

*Le livre présente, malgré tout, quelques imperfections, dont il faut que le lecteur soit, d'emblée, honnêtement prévenu. D'abord, si poussée qu'ait été l'élaboration du manuscrit, il y subsistait, parfois dans le corps même du texte, plus souvent dans les références, des lacunes que l'auteur s'était promis de combler sur épreuves. Partout où la chose était possible, les compléments nécessaires ont été introduits. En revanche, on a dû supprimer quelques références par trop rudimentaires.*

*D'autre part, dans la mise au point d'un ouvrage aussi dense, consacré à une matière aussi complexe, rien ne pouvait remplacer tout à fait l'œil de l'auteur, sa connaissance intime du sujet, la compétente et amoureuse minutie avec laquelle il aurait dirigé et contrôlé le travail des typographes. Ni le Docteur Zander, ni la Direction de l'Institut français ne se sentaient le droit de procéder aux suprêmes retouches que le Docteur Hans Lewy n'aurait pas manqué d'apporter à son livre,*

*sur les dernières épreuves. Cet ouvrage, sous sa forme actuelle, comporte assurément des renvois inexacts et un certain manque d'unité se remarque dans les procédés typographiques employés pour énoncer les références, les noms d'auteur, les abréviations.*

*Si ces défauts sont regrettables, ils apparaissent bien excusables aussi pour les raisons indiquées à l'instant. Telle que nous la présentons au public, la synthèse monumentale, si richement documentée, réalisée par Hans Lewy, garde, selon nous, toute sa valeur.*

Le Caire, Mars 1956.

LA DIRECTION DE L'I.F.A.O.

## INTRODUCTION

There is reason to fear that the title of this work : « Chaldæan Oracles and Theurgy » will mean little to the student of the history of ancient religions, to whom it is primarily addressed. With the first part of the title he associates the notion of incoherent and only partly intelligible fragments of a collection of Greek magico-mystical poems of later antiquity which, by a strange conversion, was elevated by the Neoplatonists to the rank of a scripture of holy revelation. With the second part of the title, one is accustomed to associate a magical science which, in the twilight of the Greek genius, took possession of philosophy and defrauded it of its fruits. Both concepts finally go back to the Neoplatonist Iamblichus who was the first systematizer of the occult sciences : it was he, too, who adopted the doctrines of the Chaldæan Oracles and incorporated them into his *mysteriosophy* to which he gave the name « Theurgy ». The task of the present work is to bring light into this darkness and to elucidate the genesis of this last spiritual discipline of Antiquity. Thereby, some of the veils woven by its ancient transmitters and their modern adepts will be raised. The name and subject of theurgy were the creation of two hellenized Orientals, Julian the Chaldæan and his homonymous son, surnamed « the Theurgist », who flourished in the times of the Emperor Marcus Aurelius. These two men were the founders of a religious system the principles of which they enunciated in the so-called Chaldæan Oracles, and in other writings. There is little need to comment on the importance of a detailed knowledge of a religious doctrine, the date of

whose origin is ascertainable, for the understanding of the general state of ancient creeds in one of their most critical periods. Many of the matters followed up in this investigation may throw light on problems of special interest to the historian of religious thought. For the rest, we shall be content, if we succeed in making clear the inner connections of the Chaldæan system and the origin of its elements. The broader aspect of its later influence which coincides roughly with that of Neoplatonism will be viewed only in so far as it is indispensable for the comprehension of its sources.

The vagueness of the concepts currently linked with the subject of this work may be explained by the fact that the classical philologists, conscious of their duty to pave the way for the understanding of ancient tradition, have neglected their obligation in this minor domain. They have more or less excluded the study of the Chaldæan Oracles from that of the religious documents of later Antiquity—a task which they have, in common with theologians and orientalist, pursued during the last two generations with striking success. The fragments of this Collection, all of them quotations by Neoplatonic writers, were brought together, systematically arranged and commented at the end of the last century (1894) by W. Kroll. This study was not followed up. Occasionally the teachings of the Oracles were compared with analogous religious ideas, but no one assumed the toil of testing Kroll's conclusions or even of taking up his researches at the point where he left off. The excellence of Kroll's work is unanimously acknowledged. It undubitably constitutes a vast advance on that of his predecessors (whose rudimentary attempts need now no more to be recorded) and has widely promoted the research in this field. Yet truth compels us to say that its author did not reach the principal goal of his efforts. Kroll's particular merit lies in the elucidation of the complicated nature of the tradition and in

establishing sound critical principles for the separation of the genuine material from subsequent retouching. Beyond that, however, he succeeded neither in connecting the single parts into a coherent unity nor in satisfactorily explaining their content or origin. One of the major reasons for his shortcomings has to be sought (as Bidez was the first to point out) in his neglect of the obvious relations between the theological teachings of the Oracles and the theurgical practices described by the same authors in these texts and in their other writings. Thus, Kroll not only sketched a rather one-sided picture of the character of these Chaldæan doctrines, but he also deprived himself of one of the principal means of interpretation. Yet it would be unjust to hold this or any other deficiency against him. His work falls into the first period of the critical investigation of the religious documents of later Antiquity. The results of these studies have since then sharpened the eye for many phenomena which, in his time, still flowed together in the nebulous picture of «syncretism». The fact remains, however, that the obscurity which still veils the meaning of most of the Chaldæan Oracles prevents their true importance from being recognized. In many respects, indeed, they are still terra incognita for the investigator<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> For the reasons mentioned above and in order not to expand unduly an already lengthy volume, we shall abstain from entering into a continuous debate with the opinions of Kroll and from noting (except in a few instances of major importance) the agreement or difference between our views and those of our fore-runner. We shall simply restrict ourselves to quoting the relevant pages of his work.

Since the appearance of Kroll's study (*De Oraculis Chaldaicis*. Breslauer Philologische Abhandlungen, VII. I. Breslau, 1894, 76 pp. Cf. also the short survey of his results given by him in *Rheinisches Museum*, 1895, p. 636-639), two scholars have dealt with the same subject without adding anything new to the results of their predecessor. The first was L. H. Gray who, in the *Appendix* to A. V. W. Jackson's *Zoroaster* (New York, 1898, p. 259-273) presented a

From this brief glance at the present stage of the research we may turn to the plan and the scope of our work. But first, its extent requires justification. The main reason for it lies in the state of the preservation of the Chaldæan Oracles. These texts have not come down to us as a whole, but in the form of countless quotations ranging in length from two or three words to a dozen lines, and scattered throughout the vast expanse of Neoplatonic writing. It goes without saying that in such unfavourable circumstances it was not possible to arrive immediately at explicit results. Often, slight allusions had to be investigated as to their true reference and gaps to be filled up by hypotheses which, in their turn, necessitated a detailed proof. These disquisitions could have been abandoned only if the real aim of this attempt—the comprehension of the logical cohesion of the single parts of the Chaldæan system—had been given up. For it is indeed our conviction that we have to deal here with a system in the proper sense of the word.

The arrangement of this investigation is conditioned by its aim and the peculiarities of the tradition. Completeness of material is the prerequisite of every attempt at explanation. For this reason, the first chapter will be devoted to the proof that, apart from some 300 lines of the Oracles collected by Kroll, about 100

---

reprint (distorted by many misunderstandings) of the Greek fragments of the Chaldæan Oracles collected by Kroll. Besides him, G. R. S. MEAD, *The Chaldæan Oracles*. Echoes from the Gnosis, vol. VIII-IX. (The theosophical publishing society. London and Benares, 1908) published a highly coloured and very often too free rendering of the same fragments with short explanations which, too, are mostly borrowed from Kroll (who by writing Latin happily evaded the ingrateful task of translation). It is clear that as the aspect and the aims of Mead widely differ from ours, so our methods could not conform to those used in his work. We may, however, gratefully acknowledge that in the task of putting these enigmatic verses into English we were considerably helped by his courageous attempt.

lines are still extant which have not yet been recognized as such. These new fragments, which have come down to us through other channels than those followed by the main group, admit of a more discriminating view of the literary character of these Oracles and the intention of their authors, a view varying sensibly from that accepted hitherto. The demonstration of the Chaldæan origin of these fresh texts may serve also as a primary introduction to the trend of the ideas of their authors. In this section, anticipation of results which can be proved only later has been inevitable.

By completing the collection of the extant material, our study fulfils the first condition for the reconstruction of the Chaldæan system of belief in its entirety. Chapters II-V will be devoted to this task. Chapter II will be introduced by a brief account of the Neoplatonic sources, their nature and the principal rules for their critical examination; thereupon, the exposition of the system of the «Intelligible World», the main theme of Chaldæan theosophy, will follow immediately. Chapter III contains a description of the Chaldæan mystery of the «Immortalization of the Soul», by which the Chaldæan Theurgists entered into competition with other mystery-cults of their epoch. Chapter IV will deal with the practices of the Theurgists and their relation to magic. In Chapter V we shall be occupied with Chaldæan demonology and its affinity with Persian dualism.

The dispersion of the systematic description into several chapters often necessitates the separate treatment of related subjects. The disadvantage resulting from frequent cross-references may, we hope, be offset by the possibility of basing the procedure of reconstruction upon the original texts (offered in literal translation and quoted in Greek in the annotations) on which it rests. In this way, not only may fresh life be given to the enquiry, but the critical reader may also be enabled to pursue independently the trend of the arguments and to check the respective conclusions

or conjectures by reference to their premisses. This continuous control seems to be the more necessary, as the piecing-together of the system can be performed only by giving attention even to the smallest debris of tradition.

The purpose of the second part of the present work is the detailed investigation of the genesis of the Chaldæan system. The separation of the synthesis from the historical analysis may cause the reader the inconvenience of comparing the treatment of the same theme in the first and the second part (he will be spared this, however, as far as possible, by recapitulations). On the other hand, it avoids the intermixture of two different questions : that of the meaning of a single tenet within the framework of the whole system and that of its source. It is a basic rule that the origin of an idea implies nothing definite about its significance within the system in which it has later been embodied. Neglect of this rule has caused considerable confusion in two neighbouring areas of research : the philosophy of later antiquity and that of gnosticism. This has served as a warning to us. The separation of synthesis and analysis will be abandoned only when it happens that fragments of the Chaldæan Oracles which are not intelligible in themselves reproduce an opinion preserved more completely elsewhere.

In the first chapter of the second part (Chap. vi) the obvious relations between the metaphysics of the Chaldæans and that of the Platonists of their time will be fully dealt with. The respective doctrines of the Oracles reflect, as will be shown there, a hitherto incompletely known variant of Middle Platonism which helps to explain the genesis of several traits of the philosophy of Philo and especially of Plotinus. In the second chapter of this second part (Chap. vii) the question of the contact between the Chaldæan Theurgists and that complex of Oriental creeds to which they owe their ethnical designation will be answered. The



investigation of the religious background will allow us to give a broader characterization of the position and importance of the Chaldæans within the spiritual movements of their time.

We may add a short comment on the arrangement of the Appendix. It will contain a series of preliminary investigations which are more than mere annotations, and a collection of all the extant fragments of Chaldæan writings<sup>1</sup>. It is true that these texts will have been already adduced in the foot-notes to the main investigation. A separate collection of the material, together with a short reference to the appropriate pages of the investigation, may, however, be useful to critical readers of this subject and especially to occasional users. The want of such a collection has often been felt and has possibly discouraged some students from a closer occupation with the whole subject.

This brief sketch of the plan is intended to inform the reader to whom the title of this book is too compressed, what he may expect of it and, more especially, what he will not find therein. Of its inadequacies the author is himself fully conscious. He knows that during his six years of occupation with the subject he has found his way only gradually and that more than a few points of detail seem to him uncertain. On the other hand, he acknowledges with gratitude that he could not have reached the aim which he set himself without the assistance he derived from the masterly researches in the history of religions of the later Roman empire by F. Cumont and J. Bidez, of Neoplatonism by K. Praechter, E. Bréhier and E. R. Dodds, and from H. Jonas' searching analysis of gnostic structure of thought. It may be appropriate to conclude this introduction with a sentence of the great scholar mentioned first in this list of acknowledgments: «The expansion of the Oriental cults is, besides the development

<sup>1</sup> See Postscript, p. xxi.

of Neoplatonism, the most important fact in the cultural history of the pagan Empire». The present work dealing with the coalition of these two spiritual movements may be regarded as an attempt to justify the truth of the above dictum of Cumont.

The author wishes to express his thanks to Dr. S. Pines and Dr. Robert Morton Smith who have translated the bulk of the manuscript and revised the translation of the other parts.

H. L.

## POSTSCRIPT

The author of this book, Hans Lewy, did not live to see its publication. He died in 1945.

For certain corrections in chapters I and II H. J. Polotsky is responsible, for those in other chapters E. D. Goldschmidt.

During the printing of the book a slight change had to be made in chapter II which affected the numbering of the notes. The references to them are one number higher than as indicated in the text.

The collection of all the extant fragments of Chaldaean writings, to which the author referred on p. XIX of the introduction to the book, was not found among the papers which he left. The only reference which was found was a note relating to the order of the fragments in the texts in chapter II of the book; we wish to add it for the benefit of the reader although it was only in the form of a rough draft :

### CHAPTER II

- Fragment I : Nos. 38, 42, 43, 45, 47, 48, 52.  
— II : Nos. 54-56, 58, 59, 62, 64, 65.  
— III : Nos. 69, 70, 74-77, 83 ff., 91, 94.  
— IV : Nos. 97, 101, 106-109, 111-114, 121, 126 and 130-132, 134.  
— V : Nos. 134, 138, 149, 151, 153.  
— VI : Nos. 163-165, 168, 170, 172, 173, 177.  
— VII : Nos. 187 (I, no. 23), 181, 184, 187, 190-192, 195.  
— VIII : Nos. 198, 200-202, 205, 209, 218, 221 a.  
— IX : Nos. 221 b-d, 225, 226, 232, 233, 236, 238, 240.  
— X : Nos. 246, 247 a-b, 249, 250, 252-254.

- Fragment XI : Nos. 255, 256, 259, 260, 266, 267, 270-275.  
— XII : Nos. 281, 283, 287, 291, 293, 295, 296, 300.  
— XIII : Nos. 303-305, 309, 311, 313, 314, 317, 320,  
322.  
— XIV : Nos. 239, 331, 333, 334, 351, 353-355, 359,  
365, 373, 379, 387, 388.  
— XV : Nos. 395-397, 402, 403, 406.

WALTER ZANDER.

# ABBREVIATIONS

---

## ANCIENT TEXTS

- ALBINUS = ALBINUS, *Didascalicus*, ed. C. F. HERMANN (*Appendix Platonica*, p. 152-189, Teubner), quoted by pages and lines.
- ANON. TAUR. = *Anonymus Taurinensis*, fragments of a commentary on Plato's *Parmenides*, edited by W. KROLL in *Rhein. Museum*, XLVII, 599-627.
- APULEIUS = APULEI PLATONICI *de Philosophia libri*, rec. P. THOMAS (Teubner, 1921): *De deo Socratis*, p. 6-35; *De Platone et eius dogmate*, I-II, p. 82-134.
- ASCLEPIUS = ps-Apulcius, *Asclepius*, ed. P. THOMAS (see *Apuleius*), p. 36-81.
- CORP. HERM. = *Hermetis Trismegisti Poemanderes*, rec. G. Parthey, Berlin, 1854. Sometimes quoted with a page-reference to R. REITZENSTEIN, *Poimanderes* (Leipzig, 1904), sometimes to W. SCOTT, *Hermetica* (vol. I-IV [Oxford, 1924]).
- DAW. = DAMASCIUS, *Dubitationes et solutiones*, ed. C. A. RUELLE, vol. I-II (Paris, 1889).
- EXC. VAT. = vide *PROCL. Exc. Vat.*
- HERMIAS *Phaedr.* = HERMIAE in *Platonis Phaedrum scholia*, ed. F. Ast in *Platonis Phaedrus*, Leipzig, 1810.
- HIEROCL. *Carm. Aur.* = HIEROCLIS, *Commentar. in aureum carmen Pythagorae*, in MULLACH, *Fragm. philos. Graec.*, I, 416 ff.
- IAMB. *Myst.* = IAMBlichus, *De mysteriis*, ed. Parthey (Berlin, 1857); other works of Iamblichus by pages and lines of Teubner edition.
- LYDUS *Mens.* = *Ioannis Laurentii Lydi liber de mensibus*, ed. R. WÜNSCH (Teubner, 1898).
- MARINUS, *Vit. Procl.* = *Marini Proclus*, in V. COUSIN, *Procli opera inedita* (Paris, 1864), p. 1-66.
- MAX. TYR. = MAXIMI TYRII *Philosophumena*, ed. H. Hobein (Teubner, 1910).
- MICH. ITAL. = CRAMER, *Anecdota Oxoniensia*, III, 180-183 (see *Excursus*, VI, 1 f.).
- NUMENIUS = *Studie over den Wijsgeer Numenius van Apamea mit mitgave der fragmenten* door E.-A. LEEMANS. Gant, 1937 (quoted by pages and lines).

- OLYMPIODOR. *Phaed.* = OLYMPIODORI *scholia in Platonis Phaedonem*, ed. W. NORVIN (Teubner, 1913).
- OLYMPIODOR. *Proleg. in Plat. philos.* = Προλεγόμενα τῆς Πλάτωνος Φιλοσοφίας, in *Appendix Platonica*, p. 196-222, ed. C. F. Hermann (Teubner).
- P. MAG. = *Papyri Graecae Magicae*, by K. PREISENDANZ, I (1928), II (1931).
- ORPH. FRAGM. = *Orphicorum Fragmenta, collegit* O. KERN (Berlin, 1922), quoted by the numbers of the fragments.
- PORPH. *Abst.* = *Porphyrri opuscula selecta*, rec. A. NAUCK (Teubner, 1886), *De abstinentia ab esu carnis*, I-IV, p. 85-270.
- PORPH. *Antr.* = *De antro nympharum*, NAUCK, p. 55-81.
- PORPH. *Epist. Aneb.* = *Epistola ad Anebonem*, in Parthey's edition of *Iambl. Myst.*, p. XXIX-XLV.
- PORPH. *Hist. Philos. Fragm.* = ἐκ τῆς φιλοσόφου ιστορίας, NAUCK, p. 3-16.
- PORPH. *Marc.* = *Ad Marcellam*, NAUCK p. 271-297.
- PORPH. *Philos. Orac.* = *Porphyrri de philosophia ex oraculis haurienda librorum reliquiae*, ed. G. WOLFF, Berlin, 1856.
- PORPH. *Regr.* = *De regressu animae*, in J. BIDEZ, *Vie de Porphyre* (1913), *Appendix*, p. 27\*-44\*.
- PORPH. *Sent.* = *Sententiae*, ed. B. MOMMERT (Teubner, 1907).
- PROCL. *Alc.* = *Procli commentar. in Platonis Primum Alcibiadem*, in V. COUSIN, *Procli opera inedita* (Paris, 1864), p. 281-602.
- PROCL. *Crat.* = *Procli in Platonis Cratylum comm.* ed. G. PASQUALI (Teubner, 1908).
- PROCL. *Dub. Prov.* = *De decem dubitationibus circum providentiam*, in V. COUSIN, *op. cit.*, p. 76-145 (the Latin translation of William of Morbecca).
- PROCL. *Exc. Vat.* = *Excerpta Vaticana*, ed. PITRA, *Analecta sacra et class.* V, 2 (1888) 192 ff. (see chap. II, n. 18).
- PROCL. *Hymns* = PROCLI *Hymni*, in *Eudociae Procli Claudiani carmina*, rec. A. LUDWICH (Teubner, 1897), p. 133-158.
- PROCL. *Mal. Subs.* = *De malorum subsistentia*, in COUSIN, *op. cit.*, p. 196-267 (Latin translation of William of Morbecca).
- PROCL. *Parm.* = *Commentar. in Platonis Parmenidem*, COUSIN, 617-1314.
- PROCL. *Prov.* = *De providentia et fato*, COUSIN, 146-195 (translation of William of Morbecca).
- PROCL. *Rp.* = *In Platonis Rem publicam commentar.*, ed. W. KROLL, vol. I-II (Teubner, 1899-1901).
- PROCL. *Th. Pl.* = *Theologia Platonica*, ed. Aem. Portus, Hamburg, 1618.

- PROCL. *Tim.* = *In Platonis Timæum commentar.* ed. E. DIEHL, vol. I-III (Teubner, 1903-1906).
- PROCL. *περι τῆς καθ' Ἑλληνους ιερατικῆς τέχνης*, ed. BIDEZ, *C. M. A. G.*, VI, p. 148-151. Proclus' philosophical writings are quoted by volume, page and line.
- PSSELLUS *C. M. A. G.*, VI *vide* Bidez.
- PSSELLUS *Comm.* = *Ἐξήγησις τῶν Χαλδαικῶν ῥητῶν*, MIGNE, *P. G.*, CXXII, 1123-1150.
- PSSELLUS *De operat. daem.* = *De operatione daemonum*, ed. J. F. BOISSONADE, *Michael Psellus*, Nuremberg, 1838, 1-36. MIGNE, *P. G.*, CXXII, 820 A-876 A. BIDEZ, *C. M. A. G.*, VI, p. 119-131.
- PSSELLUS *Εξρος.* = *Ἐκθεσις κεφαλαιώδης τῶν παρὰ Χαλδαίοις ἀρχαίων δογμάτων.* MIGNE, *P. G.*, CXXII, 1149 C-1153 B.
- PSSELLUS *Hyp.* = *Ἰποτύπωσις κεφαλαιώδης τῶν παρὰ Χαλδαίοις ἀρχαίων δογμάτων*, ed. W. KROLL, *De Oraculis Chaldaicis*, p. 73-76.
- PSSELLUS *Quaenam sunt* = *Quaenam sunt Graecorum opiniones de daemonibus*, ed. BOISSONADE, *op. cit.*, p. 36-43. MIGNE, *P. G.*, CXXII, 876 B-881.
- PSSELLUS *Script. Min.* = *Michaelis Pselli scripta minora*, ed. Kurtz-Drexl, Milano, 1936.
- PSSELLUS *Mél. Cumont.* = BIDEZ, *Proclus περὶ τῆς ιερατικῆς τέχνης*, in *Mélanges Cumont.* As to these and other works of Psellus see *Excursus VI.*
- SIMPL. *Phys.* = *Simplicii Commentar. in Aristot. Physica*, ed. H. DIELS, 1882-95 (*Comm. in Arist. gr.* vol. 10-11).
- ST. V. FR. = *Stoicorum veterum fragmenta*, coll. von Arnim, Leipzig, 1921-47, vol. I-IV.
- SYNES. *Hymn.* = *SYNESII Hymni*, in MIGNE, *P. G.*, LXVI, p. 1587-1616.
- SYNES. *Insomn.* = *De insomniis*, MIGNE, 1281-1320.
- SYNES. *Prov.* = *De providentia*, I-II, MIGNE, 1210-1281.
- THEOS. = *Χρησιμοὶ τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν Θεῶν, Theosophia Tubingensis*, ed. K. BURESCH, Leipzig, 1889, p. 95-126 (quoted by the numbers of Buresch's edition).

## MODERN WORKS.

- BIDEZ, *C. M. A. G.*, VI = *Catalogue des MSS. Alchimiques Grecs*, vol. VI (various works of Psellus, with introduction).
- B.-C., *Mages hell.* = J. BIDEZ et F. CUMONT, *Les mages hellénisés*, vol. I-II (Paris, 1938).
- CUMONT, *After Life* = F. CUMONT, *After Life in Roman paganism*, New Haven, 1922.
- CUMONT, *M. d. M.* = *Die Mysterien des Mithra*, 3rd ed., 1923.
- CUMONT, *M. M. M.* = *Textes et monuments figurés relatifs aux mystères de Mithra*, 2 vol. Paris, 1896-1899.

- CUMONT, *Rel. Orient.* = *Les religions orientales dans le paganisme romain*, 4th ed., Paris, 1929.
- CUMONT, *Théol. sol.* = *La théologie solaire du paganisme romain*, Mém. prés. par divers savants Acad. Inscr. XII, 2<sup>e</sup> partie, 1909, 447-449.
- DODDS, *Proclus* — E. R. DODDS, *Proclus, The Elements of Theology*, Oxford, 1933.
- HOPFNER, *O.-Z.* = Th. HOPFNER, *Griechisch-Aegyptischer Offenbarungszauber*, vol. I-II (*Studien zur Paläographie und Papyruskunde*, her. von C. WESSELY, vol. XXI, 1921, and XXIII, 1924), quoted by paragraphs.
- KERN, *Orph. Fragm.* = *Orphicorum fragmenta*, coll. O. KERN, Berlin, 1922.
- KOCH = H. KOCH, *Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita in seinen Beziehungen zu Neuplatonismus und Mysterienwesen*, Mainz, 1900.
- KROLL = Guil. KROLL, *De Oraculis Chaldaicis*, Breslauer Philologische Abhandlungen, VII, 1. Breslau, 1894, 76 p.
- J. KROLL, *Lehren des Hermes* = JOS. KROLL, *Die Lehren des Hermes Trismegistos*, Münster, 1914.
- P. W. = PAULY-WISSOWA-KROLL, *Realencyklopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*.
- PRAECHTER = ÜBERWEG-PRAECHTER, *Die Philosophie des Altertums* (Überweg's Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie, vol. I), 12th ed. Berlin, 1926.
- ROSCHE = *Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie*, by W. H. ROSCHER.
- WITT = R. E. WITT, *Albinus and the History of Middle Platonism*, Cambridge, 1937.
- WOLFF = *Porphyrri de philosophia ex oraculis haurienda librorum reliquiae*, ed. G. WOLFF, Berlin, 1856.
- ZELLER III, 2<sup>a</sup> = E. ZELLER, *Die Philosophie der Griechen*, Dritter Teil, zweite Abteilung (4th ed.).



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Pages.
AVANT-PROPOS .....	XI
INTRODUCTION .....	XIII
POSTSCRIPT .....	XXI
ABBREVIATIONS .....	XXIII
<b>CHAPTER I.</b> <b>New Chaldæan Oracles in Porphyry's work « On the Philo-</b> <b>sophy of the Oracles » .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>II.</b> <b>The Chaldæan system of the intelligible world .....</b>	<b>67</b>
--- <b>III.</b> <b>Theurgical elevation .....</b>	<b>177</b>
--- <b>IV.</b> <b>The Magical Ritual of the Chaldæans .....</b>	<b>227</b>
--- <b>V.</b> <b>Chaldæan Demonology .....</b>	<b>259</b>
--- <b>VI.</b> <b>The Platonic elements .....</b>	<b>311</b>
--- <b>VII.</b> <b>The Oriental elements .....</b>	<b>399</b>
<b>EXCURSUS I.</b> <b>On the Neoplatonist's mode of quoting the Chaldæan Ora-</b> <b>cles .....</b>	<b>443</b>
--- <b>II.</b> <b>Porphyry and the Chaldæans .....</b>	<b>449</b>
--- <b>III.</b> <b>Neologisms and rare words in the Chaldæan Oracles .....</b>	<b>457</b>
--- <b>IV.</b> <b>The meaning and the history of the terms « Theurgist » and                                     « Theurgy » .....</b>	<b>461</b>
--- <b>V.</b> <b>The Caller and the Call .....</b>	<b>467</b>
--- <b>VI.</b> <b>Psellus and the Chaldæans .....</b>	<b>473</b>
--- <b>VII.</b> <b>Proclus' exposition of the Chaldæan system of the Noetic                                     Entities .....</b>	<b>481</b>
--- <b>VIII.</b> <b>On the designation of the Theurgical Sacrament of Immor-</b> <b>tality as Elevation (ἀναγωγή) .....</b>	<b>487</b>
--- <b>IX.</b> <b>Proclus' « Fire-Song » .....</b>	<b>491</b>
--- <b>X.</b> <b>The « Telectic art » of the Chaldæan Theurgists .....</b>	<b>495</b>
--- <b>XI.</b> <b>The work of the Neoplatonist Origen « concerning the De-</b> <b>mons » .....</b>	<b>497</b>
--- <b>XII.</b> <b>The source of the « Hellenic Theology » quoted by Eusebius ..</b>	<b>509</b>



CHAPTER I

NEW CHALDÆAN ORACLES

—ON THE PHILOSOPHY

I

THE EXPOSITION OF THE CHALDÆAN SYSTEM

graphy of their authors

<sup>1</sup> Suidas, s. l. Ιουλιανός (No. 434  
no p. 2, note 5) οὐδὲ γὰρ οὐδὲ (emendation)  
α. Μαρτυροῦν Ἀνακτοῦ τοῦ βασιλέως.  
ὁ δὲ αὐτὸς ἐπὶ τῆς αἰτίας ὄντος  
noed n. 434). — Loewy, *Agiosophicus*  
statement of Suidas — supposed Julian  
is was followed by Kroll (p. 74),  
*Berlin. Philolog. Wochenblatt*  
diaries No. 9, p. 17). Suidas  
mean that the spurious biographical  
self (see note 3) may be traced back  
to the. Cf. J. Bidez in Michel Pichard  
C. M. A. G., vol. VI, Bruxelles  
Julian's stay in Rome is presupposed  
XXXII, 145 A) statement (emendation  
omitted (1), in the course of  
Kroll, *Über die Haggada in der*  
*Agiosophia*, s. XLV, Leiden 1916, p.  
lived the city from plague; cf.



## CHAPTER I

---

### NEW CHALDÆAN ORACLES IN PORPHYRY'S WORK "ON THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE ORACLES"

1. *The metaphysical Oracles.*—The peculiar character of the Chaldæan Oracles is evinced by the existence of accurate data concerning the biography of their authors<sup>1</sup>. There were two of these : Julian, surnamed

---

<sup>1</sup> SUIDAS, s.v. *Ιουλιανός* (No. 434 Adler): ὁ τοῦ προλεχθέντος (sc. τοῦ Χαλδαίου, see p. 5, note 4) υἱός, γεγωνώς (« flourished », see E. ROUNDE, *Kleine Schriften*, I, 114 f.) ἐπὶ Μάρκου Ἀντωνίου τοῦ βασιλέως. Ἐγραψε καὶ αὐτὸς Θεουργικά, Τελεστικά, Λόγια δ' ἐπ' ὧν καὶ ἄλλα ὅσα τῆς τοιαύτης ἐπιστήμης κρύφια τυγχάνουσιν (continued n. 434). LOBECK, *Aglaophamus*, 102, was the first who—because of this statement of Suidas—supposed Julian to be the author of the Chaldæan Oracles. He was followed by Kroll (p. 71), who however was induced by Wendland's review (*Berlin. Philolog. Wochenschrift* 1895, 1040) to change his opinion (*P. W.*, s. v. *Julianos* No. 9, p. 17). Suidas' accuracy has been finally proved by Bidez, who has shown that the concordant biographical data given by the Byzantine Neoplatonist Psellus (see note 8) may be traced back to Proclus' lost commentary on the Chaldæan Oracles. Cf. J. Bidez in Michel PSELLUS, *Catalogue des manuscrits alchimiques grecs* (*C. M. A. G.*), vol. VI, Bruxelles 1928, p. 106 f.

Julian's stay in Rome is presupposed in Anastasius Sinaita's (s. VII, Migne, *P.G.*, LXXXIX, 525 A) statement (embroidered by legendary traits) that in the time of Domitian (!), in the course of a magical combat with Apollonius of Tyana (cf. P. KRAUS, *Jābir ibn Ḥayyān et la science grecque. Mémoires présentés à l'Institut d'Égypte*, t. XLV. Le Caire 1942, p. 291) and Apuleius (see ch. v, note 109), he delivered the city from plague; cf. *Hist. Aug.* Marc. Ant. 13, 1. It fits in with the fact that he took part in Marcus Aurelius' campaign against the Marcomans; see next note.

“ the Chaldæan ”, and his son, Julian “ the Theurgist ”. The younger of them was born at the time of Trajan and lived in Rome in the second half of the 2nd century. He took part in the campaign of Marcus Aurelius against the Marcomans and claimed to have worked a celebrated rain-miracle (A. D. 174). According to him, the storm which after a period of prolonged drought burst over the Roman camp, saving the soldiers from dying of thirst and frightening off the barbarians, was brought about by his conjurations; a pretension disputed by the Christian soldiers of the *Legio fulminata*, who ascribed this effect to their own prayers, by the adherents of the “ old faith ”, who attributed it to the offerings of the Emperor, and by a third group who believed in the occult powers of an Egyptian magician—a diversity of opinions which illustrates the competition of the various religions within the Roman army<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> SUIDAS, s. v. *Ιουλιανός* (No. 434 Adler): *ὅτι τοῦτόν Φασι διψεῖ ποτὲ καμόντων τῶν Ῥωμαίων, ἐξαιφνης ποιῆσαι νέφη τε ἀγερεθῆνα: ζοφώδη καὶ ὕμβρον ἀφείναι λάβρον ἄμυ βρονταῖς τε καὶ σέλασιον ἐπαλλήλοισι· καὶ τοῦτο σοφία τινὶ ἐργάσασθαι Ιουλιανόν, οἱ δὲ Φασιν Ἄρνουφιν, τὸν Αἰγύπτιον φιλόσοφον, τοῦτο πεποιημέναι τὸ θαυμάσιον. Similarly *ibid.*, s. v. *Ἄρνούφης* (No. 3987); *Hist. Aug.* Heliogab. 9, 1; DIO CASS. LXXI. 8; CLAUDIAN, *De VI cons. Honor.*, 348. Now also PSELLUS, *πῶς γένη τῶν φιλοσοφουμένων λόγων*, in *Scripta minora* p. 446, 28, ed. Kurtz-Drexl, Milano 1936), and in Bidez, *Mélanges Cumont*, I, 1936. p. 93, 8: *Ιουλιανὸς ὁ συστρατεύσας Μάρκῳ τῷ βασιλεῖ ἐπὶ Δάκης στρατεύοντι. As to this historical event cf. RENAN, Marc-Aurèle, 273 ff.; HARNACK, Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie 1894. 835-882; J. GEFFCKEN, Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie, 1898, 253 ff.**

Dio Cassius, who does not mention Julian, relates that when the Egyptian magician Arnuphis conjured certain demons and the “ Hermes of the air ”, the sky suddenly became clouded and rain poured down over the thirsty army; bolts of lightning at the same time spread confusion among the enemy. HOFFNER, *O.-Z.*, I, 730, assumes by mistake that this Arnuphis was one of the Chaldæan theurgists. As to the interpretation of W. Weber, see WILAMOWITZ, *Glaube der Hellenen* II, 494, n.

The statement of the *Hist. Aug.*, l. c., that the Marcomans were induced by the conjurations of the Chaldæans and the Magi to keep peace, does not refer to the miracle of the rain, which took place during the war, but to another magical operation which will be examined below, chap. IV, n. 72. See also HOFFNER, *O.-Z.*, I, 813.

CLAUDIANUS, l. c., relates that the magical conjuration of the Chaldæans caused the gods to send forth lightnings against the enemy, but does not mention the miracle of the rain, attributed to Julian by SUIDAS, l. c., who probably draws his information (as does Pselus) from Proclus. Cf. KRÖLL, *P. IV.*, s. v. *Julianos* No. 9, p. 15.

This Julian inherited his wisdom from his father, a contemporary of Trajan, Hadrian and the Antonines, who bore the same name<sup>3</sup>; Suidas, who has collected some biographical data concerning the two Julians, calls the older "the Chaldæan", in contradistinction from his son "the Theurgist"<sup>4</sup>. The Neoplatonists, when quoting the Chaldæan Oracles, frequently ascribe them to both of them; the authors are often named by them "the Chaldæans" or "the Theurgists" or "one of the Theurgists". The reason for these appellations must be sought in a tradition affirming the collaboration of the father and the son<sup>5</sup>. Suidas attributes to Julian the father the authorship of only one work, *On the Demons*<sup>6</sup>; while the son is named by him as the author of a number of books<sup>7</sup>, among them of the "Oracles (*Logia*) in verses" (*λόγια δι' ἐπῶν*) which, according to an authentic tradition, are identical with the "Chaldæan Oracles" (*Logia*) quoted by the Neoplatonists<sup>8</sup>.

<sup>3</sup> PSELLUS, *κατηγορία τοῦ ἀρχιερέως* (in: *Scripta minora*, p. 241, 29 f., and in Bidez, *Mélanges Cumont*, p. 93, l. 13): *Ἰουλιανὸς δὲ τις ἀνὴρ ἐπὶ Τραιανοῦ βασιλείως* (continued note 8). Psellus (Bidez, *C. M. A. G.*, VI, p. 178, n. 2), whose source is Proclus, designates the two Julians as *οἱ ἐπὶ τοῦ Μάρκου Ἰουλιανοί*; cf. PROCL., *Rp.* II, 123, 12 *τοῖς ἐπὶ Μάρκου Θεουργοῖς*; id. *Crat.* 72, 10 *τοῖς ἐπὶ Μάρκου γενομένοις* (see note 1) *Θεουργοῖς*. See below, note 177 and chap. III, n. 40.

<sup>4</sup> SUIDAS, s. v. *Ἰουλιανός* (No. 433): *Χαλδαῖος, φιλόσοφος, πατὴρ τοῦ κληθέντος Θεουργοῦ Ἰουλιανοῦ. ἔγραψε περὶ δαιμόνων βιβλία Δ.*

<sup>5</sup> See BIDEZ-CUMONT, *Mages hellénisés*, I, 176: "La science ésotérique des Mages se transmettait de père en fils", the references *ibidem*. A. DIETENICH, *Mithrasliturgie* 52 f. 230.

<sup>6</sup> See *supra*, n. 4.

<sup>7</sup> See the list given by Suidas, in note 1. As to Julian's other writings see KROLL, *P. W.*, s. v. *Julianos*, No. 9, p. 15 and below, chap. II, notes 156 and 220.

<sup>8</sup> PSELLUS, *Script. min.*, p. 241, 29 f. (see *supra*, n. 3): *Ἰουλιανὸς δὲ τις ἀνὴρ ἐπὶ Τραιανοῦ βασιλείως ἐν ἔπεισι τὰ τούτων (sc. τῶν Χαλδαίων) ἐξέθετο δόγματα, ἃ δὴ καὶ «λόγια» φασὶν οἱ τὰ ἐκείνων (sc. τῶν Χαλδαίων) σεμνύνοντες. Ibidem*, p. 446, 10: *ἔστι δὲ τις καὶ Θεολογία παρ' αὐτοῖς (sc. τοῖς Χαλδαίοις)... δι' ἐπῶν μὲν συγκειμένη. IDEM*, *Ad Gregor. Naz. Orat.* XXIX, 2 (see Bidez, *C. M. A. G.* VI, p. 163, 19, and *Mélanges Cumont* I, 93, 22 f.) (after having quoted Chaldæan doctrines): *Τῶν δὲ τοιούτων ὀνομάτων τε καὶ δοξῶν ὃ ἐπὶ Μάρκου Ἰουλιανὸς καθηγῆσατο, ἐν ἔπεισι αὐτὰ συγγραψάμενος, ἃ δὴ καὶ ὡς «λόγια» ἐθymνεῖται παρὰ τῶν μετὰ ταῦτα.*

According to the first passage of Psellus, the Chaldæan Oracles were composed by

These Chaldæan Oracles claim to contain the doctrines which the gods disclosed to the two Julians. They are revelations which the Theurgists have written down. Accordingly, the Neoplatonists who believed in the legitimate character of the inspiration frequently quoted the Chaldæan Oracles as utterances of the gods themselves and did not mention quite so often their Chaldæan hypophets who, in their opinion, had only played a secondary part.

Who are the gods to whom the Chaldæans owed their wisdom? The Neoplatonists employ in their quotations various expressions: "The god", "One of the gods", "The gods", etc.<sup>9</sup> While the plural remains unexplained, Damascius, one of the chief transmitters of the Chaldæan Oracles, adds sometimes to the singular the attribute: "The prophesying"<sup>10</sup>. The oracle-giving god *par excellence* is Apollo; he is evidently considered as one of the utterers of the Chaldæan Oracles. After quoting an Oracle Proclus designates the priests of the Chaldæan mysteries as those who "preside at the sacraments of Apollo"<sup>11</sup>. The functions of the priests must be discussed further on. There is no doubt, however, that one group of the Chaldæan Oracles was thought to have been communicated to the Julians by Apollo.

It can be shown that some of the Chaldæan Oracles were ascribed to another divinity. In one of the fragments Psyche speaks in the second person of her place in the supercelestial world, and of her functions<sup>12</sup>. Psyche, the Cosmic Soul, is identical with Hecate, who plays a very consi-

Julian the father. We have no means of ascertaining whether Porphyry's work *eis τὰ Ιουλιανου τοῦ Χαλδαίου* (see below p. 8, n. 19) was directed against the father or the son; but this philosopher, too, seems to have ascribed the Oracles to a single author.

<sup>9</sup> See Excursus I.

<sup>10</sup> DAMASCIUS, *Dub.* I, 155, 15 and II, 16, 6: *φησὶν ὁ χρησµωδῶν Θεός; ibid.* II, 88, 6: *ὁ χρησµωδῶν; I, 309, 25: οἱ χρησµοὶ τῶν Θεῶν; I, 317, 2: οἱ Θεοί. . . χρησµωδοῦσιν.* II, 29, 18 the author designates a Chaldæan Oracle as *χρησµωδία*.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. PROCL., *Crat.*, 101, 3: *διὸ καὶ ὁ Θεουργὸς ὁ τῆς τελετῆς τούτου (sc. τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος) προκαθηγούμενος ἀπὸ τῶν καθάρσεων ἀρχεται καὶ τῶν περιεργάνσεων,* followed by the fragment, quoted n. 139 below.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. chap. II, n. 70.



derable part in the Oracles <sup>13</sup>. It follows that this goddess too was deemed one of the inspirers of this work.

Probably there were other gods who, in their oracles, imparted to the Chaldæans knowledge of their divine secrets <sup>14</sup>. It can, at all events, be taken as certain that the Chaldæan Oracles were not published anonymously, but as a collection of the revelations of various gods <sup>15</sup>. Consequently, we are not obliged to limit our investigations to the half-anonymous quotations of the Neoplatonists, but may reckon with the possibility of discovering Chaldæan theosophy in oracles ascribed to Apollo, Hecate and also other divinities.

The Chaldæan Oracles were brought to the notice of the Neoplatonists (to whom we owe all the information we possess upon this subject) by Porphyry. According to his own statement <sup>16</sup>, this philosopher has had frequent recourse to these Oracles in his treatise *On the Return of the Soul (De regressu animae)* <sup>17</sup>. It is evident that the Chaldæan Oracles were the source of many of the religious ideas discussed in this treatise <sup>18</sup>. Porphyry describes their verses as "sayings of divine wisdom", that is to say he believes in the inspiration of the Chaldæan hypophets. It is

<sup>13</sup> Further fragments of the Chaldæan Oracles delivered by Hecate-Psyche will be quoted below, n. 152 and 165, and chap. II, n. 97 and 117.

<sup>14</sup> IAMBLICUS, *De mysteriis*, II, 10, states that gods, angels and good demons habitually impart to men the knowledge of their own nature. He probably refers in this passage, as in many others, to the Chaldæan Oracles. A Chaldæan Oracle delivered by the ministering angels will be quoted below, p. 29, n. 77; also one delivered by the "souls", chap. III, n. 22.

<sup>15</sup> Thus Wendland, see p. 3, note 1.

<sup>16</sup> AUGUSTINE, *De civ. dei*, X, 32 : "(Porphyrius) se a Chaldaeis oracula divina sumpsisse, quorum adsiduam commemorationem facit, tacere non potuit". See next note.

<sup>17</sup> The work of PORPHYRY, *De regressu animae*, is only known to us by the quotations from a Latin translation figuring in AUGUSTINE, *De civ. dei*, X, 9-32, and further on. The fragments have been collected and annotated by J. BIDEZ, *Vie de Porphyre* (1913), Appendix II, pp. 27\* — 44\*. Brief summaries of the contents may be found in BIDEZ, *l.c.*, pp. 88-97, 158-162; J. GEFFCKEN, *Ausgang des griechisch-römischen Heidentums* (1920), 69 f.; and H. LIETZMANN, *Geschichte der alten Kirche*, III (1938), 26 f. Cf. EXCURSUS II of the present work.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Kroll, 6; Bidez in the notes to his edition.

probable that this work of Porphyry formed a part of his monograph "On the doctrines of Julian the Chaldæan" (*εἰς τὰ Ἰουλιανοῦ τοῦ Χαλδαίου*) mentioned by Suidas<sup>19</sup>.

The principal work of Porphyry dealing with the oracular poetry bore the title *On the Philosophy of the Oracles* (*περὶ τῆς ἐκ λογίων φιλοσοφίας*); it comprised three volumes<sup>20</sup>. We know it chiefly by the long excerpts inserted by Eusebius into his *Praeparatio Evangelica*. Porphyry's intention—as revealed in the title, and set forth in the introduction—was to demonstrate in this work the concordance of the cognitions of the philosophers with the oracles of the gods. The mental weariness, the distrust of the intellect, the spiritual disillusionment of the epoch, are expressed in Porphyry's introductory remarks: "The utility of this collection can be appreciated most of all by those who having experienced at some time the birth-throes of truth (*i. e.* metaphysical perception) have prayed to receive a divine revelation, and thus to obtain through the trustworthy teaching of its spokesmen a surcease of philosophical perplexity"<sup>21</sup>.

This yearning for revelation accounts for Porphyry's readiness to admit the inspired character of the Chaldæan Oracles. It seems therefore strange that in his principal work on the philosophical significance of the oracles there has been found no trace of a utilisation of these Chaldæan prophecies<sup>22</sup> of which he speaks with such reverence elsewhere. As a matter of fact, the philologists were at fault in this question. This was not for lack of a pointer to the true facts of the case. A quotation, transmitted by the Byzantine Neoplatonist Lydus and mentioning a basic Chaldæan concept, is plainly described in his introductory formula as

<sup>19</sup> See Bidez, p. 52\*, 18; p. 70\* No. 50. The work used by Augustine may have formed a part of Porphyry's *εἰς τὰ Ἰουλιανοῦ τοῦ Χαλδαίου*. The arguments in favour of this supposition will be found in Excursus II.

<sup>20</sup> *Porphyrii de philosophia ex oraculis haurienda librorum reliquiae*, ed. G. Wolff. Berlin 1856. Cf. also Bidez, *Vie de Porphyre*, 17 ff. The attempt of G. HEUTEN, *Mélanges Cumont* I, 253-9, to show that the monograph of Porphyry on Helios (cf. Bidez, *l. c.*, p. 73, No. 76) formed a part of his *Philosophy of the Oracles*, is not convincing.

<sup>21</sup> Wolff, 110 f. (EUSEB., *Pr. Ev.* IV, 7, 2).

<sup>22</sup> Thus Kroll, 6, who follows Lobbeck, *Agliophamus*, 103 f., and Wolff, 29.

deriving from Porphyry's treatise *On the Philosophy of the Oracles*<sup>23</sup>. The natural inference is that in this work he made use of the Chaldæan Oracles; however, it was not drawn, the quotation being ascribed to another of this philosopher's writings<sup>24</sup>. Our contention with regard to this capital work of Porphyry is borne out by a scrutiny of the prophecies figuring in it, many of which are of Chaldæan origin. We shall begin our examination with the most important of these texts.

Porphyry quotes, in the second book of his *Philosophy of the Oracles* a mystic hymn, which served to its re-discoverer, the humanist Augustine Steuchus (author of the *Philosophia Perennis*, a. 1540) as welcome corroboration of his universal theistic religion<sup>25</sup> :

“Ineffable Father of the immortals, Eternal, Mystes, O Lord, Thou who

<sup>23</sup> LYDUS, *De mensibus* IV, 53, p. 110, 18 f., ed. Wuensch : ὁ μέντοι Πορφύριος ἐν τῷ ὑπομνήματι τῶν λογίων (similarly also Eus., *Pr. Ev.* V, 10, 13; Wolff, 129 : ἐν τῇ δηλωθείσῃ τῶν λογίων συναγωγῇ) τὸν ‘Δις ἐπέκεινα’ (a Chaldæan term designating the Second world-fashioning Intellect, see chap. II, n. 187), τοὔτῃσι τὸν τῶν δλων δημιουργόν, τὸν παρὰ Ἰουδαίων τιμώμενον εἶναι ἀξίον, ὃν ὁ Χαλδαῖος δεύτερον ἀπὸ τοῦ ἄπαξ ἐπέκεινα (see ch. II, n. 43), τοὔτῃσι τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ, Θεολογεῖ. Porphyry's interpretation may be influenced by an oracle, quoted in the same work, which praises the Chaldæans and the ‘Hebrews’ as the pure worshippers of the ‘Self-created God-Ruler’ (Eus., *Pr. Ev.* IX, 10, 4; Wolff, 141). The identification of the God of the Jews with the demiurge implied, according to Neoplatonic doctrine, his subordination to the First Principle.

<sup>24</sup> Kroll while at work on his study of the Chaldæan Oracles (finished 1894) could not yet draw upon this passage of Lydus, which was first published by Wuensch in 1898. In his article on Julian the Theurgist in Pauly-Wissowa written afterwards he supposes that this text refers to a special monograph of Porphyry on the Chaldæan Oracles. There is however no evidence whatever for the existence of such a work. Kroll, it is true, refers to a statement of Marinus, *Vita Procli*, 26 (see below, ch. II, n. 13) as to the ‘innumerable (*sic*) writings of Porphyry and Iamblichus on the *Logia* and similar works of the Chaldæans’, but this is an indication of the subject-matter of these writings, and not of their titles. Bidez, *Vie de Porphyre*, p. 70, No. 50 assigns the passage of Lydus to Porphyry's treatise *eis τὰ Ἰουλιανοῦ τοῦ Χαλδαίου* (upon which cf. p. 8, n. 19), but gives no proof of this assertion.

<sup>25</sup> Wolff, 144 f., reprinted in *Anthologia Graeca*, vol. III, p. 519, No. 261, ed. Didot; Buresch, *Klaros* (Leipzig 1889), No. 27-8, p. 102 f. has provided a much more satisfactory edition, concerning which see below, p. 16, n. 39. On Steuchus see Wolff, 106 f., 143; Buresch, 92, n. 3.

ridest on the ethereal back of the revolving worlds where the Vigour of Thy Strength is fixed ; to Thee, Who seest, and with Thy beauteous ears hearest everything (we pray). Hear Thy children whom Thou hast begotten in the times. For Thy golden, abundant, eternal Strength abides above the world and the starry heaven. Above Her (Strength), Thou art exalted, moving thyself through Light, and suckling, through eternally flowing channels, the equipoised Intellect ; Who brings forth this all by shaping the imperishable matter, of which the creation was resolved upon when Thou boundest it by forms. Therefrom flow the procreations of the Holy Rulers, who are about Thee, most kingly All-Father and only Father of the mortals and of the happy immortals. The others are separated, though descending from Thee, and transmit everything in messages to Thy first-born Intellect, and to Thy Might. Beside these, Thou hast also created a third class of Rulers, who constantly bear Thee and praise Thee in their songs, in accordance with their will and with Thine, they sing till to-day. . . ” 26.

“ *Theos.*, No. 27 : Ὅτι Πορφύριος ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ βιβλίῳ τῆς ἐκ λογίων φιλοσοφίας αὐτοῦ παρατίθεται χρησμὸν περὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ἀθανάτου, ἔχοντα οὕτως :

- 1 Ἀθανάτων ἄρρητε πατήρ, αἰώνιε, μύσῃ,  
κόσμων ἀμφιδρόμων ἐποχούμενε, δέσποτα, νότοις  
αἰθερίοις, ἄλλῃς ἴνα σοι Μένος ἐσλήρικται.  
πάντ' ἐπιδερκομένῳ καὶ ἀκούοντ' οὐασι καλοῖς·
- 5 κλυθὶ τεῶν παιδῶν, οὐς ἤρσας αὐτὸς ἐν ὥραις.  
σὴ γὰρ ὑπὲρ κόσμον τε καὶ οὐρανὸν ἀστερόεντα  
χρυσῇ ὑπέρκειται πολλῇ αἰώνιος ἄλλῃ,  
ἧς ὑπὲρ ἠώρησαι, ὀρίνων Φωτὶ σεαυτὸν,  
ἀεναίοις ὀχτοῖσι τιθηνῶν Νοῦν ἀτάλαντον,
- 10 ὃς ῥα κύει τόδε πᾶν, τεχνώμενος ἀφθιτον ὕλην,  
ἧς γένεσις δεδόκηται, ὅτε σφε τύποισιν ἔδησας.  
ἐνθεν ἐπεισρείουσι γοναὶ ἀγίων μὲν ἀνάκτων  
ἀμφὶ σέ, παντόπατορ βασιλέσσι τε καὶ μόνε θνητῶν  
ἀθανάτων τε πάτερ μακάρων. αἱ δ' εἰσὶν ἄτερθεν
- 15 ἐκ σέο μὲν γεγαῶσαι, ὑπ' ἀγγελίαισι δ' ἕκαστα  
πρεσβυγενεὶ διάγουσι νόῳ καὶ κάρτει τῷ σῷ.  
πρὸς δ' ἔτι καὶ τρίτον ἄλλο γένος ποιήσας ἀνάκτων,  
οἱ σε καθ' ἡμᾶρ ἔγουσιν ἀνυμνεῖοντες αἰδαῖς  
βουλόμενόν ῥ' ἐθέλοντες, αἰδιδαῖσιν δ' ἐσῶδε.

These enigmatic verses concord in their vocabulary and in their tenets with the Chaldæan Oracles; they use the same distinctive words: "Strength" (*ἀλκῆ*), and "Vigour of Strength" (*ἀλκῆς μένος*), "channels"

*MSS* (according to Buresch).

*T*(ubingensis), a copy of a MS of Strasburg (the original was burned in 1870), dating from 1580.

*L*(aurentianus 32. 16), with which *St*(enchus) mostly concords.

*B*(orbonicus Neapolitanus II. F. 9). The various readings found in an Ambrosianus used by Angelo Mai (see Wolff, 106 f.) need not be considered.

*Apparatus criticus* (Slips of the pen and other obvious mistakes will not be noted) v. 8 *ἡώρησαι* B L *St* *ἡρόρησαι* T v. 9 *τιθηνῶν* *codd.* *τιταινῶν* *corr.* Buresch v. 10 *τεχνώμενος* T *St* *τεχνούμενος* B *τεκνώμενος* L v. 11 *ἦε*] *ἦν* *codd.*, *corr.* Wolff et Buresch *ὅτε*] *ὅτι* *codd.*, *corr.* Wolff. v. 13 *παντόπατορ* T *in marg.* B *St* *παντόκρατορ* L T *βασιλέσλατε* T *βασιλεύτατε* L B *St* v. 15 *γεγαῶσαι* T *St* *γεγαυῖαι* L B.

*Explanatory remarks.* An exhaustive explanation of all the details of this hymn can only be given as a part of the systematic account of Chaldæan ontology which will be attempted in the next chapter. At this point it would be premature to have recourse to quotations from the Chaldæan Oracles, as these must be subjected to a minute interpretation before they can serve as evidence for Chaldæan doctrines.

v. 1 For *ἄρρητε* see ch. II, n. 38; for *μύσλα* ch. II, n. 45.

v. 2 *ἐποχούμενε* figures in the same position in the fragment quoted ch. II, n. 260. Cf. also *P. Mag.* IV, 436; EUSEB., *Laus Constant.* 6. p. 206, 25. ed. Heikel (*ὁ αἰὼν*) *φέρει* (*τὸν αὐτοῦ βασιλέα*) *ἐπὶ νότων ὀχοούμενον.* See ch. II, n. 39.

v. 4 is modelled on HOMER, *Il.* XVI. 515 (see Ed. NORDEN, *Vergilius Aeneis Buch VI*<sup>2</sup>, p. 157 (*ad vers.* 117) and III, 277.

v. 6. Cf. HOMER, *Od.* XX, 113 and *passim.*

v. 8 *ἡώρησαι*: see ch. II, n. 91.—*ἰωτί* is *abl. instr.*

v. 9. The image implied by the participle *τιθηνῶν* is followed up by *κῦσι* (v. 10).

v. 12 *ἐνθεν* refers to the *πατήρ*, as is proved by v. 15 *ἐκ σέο μὲν γεγαῶσαι.*

v. 13 *παντοπάτωρ*, *ἄπ. λεγ.*, is probably formed under the influence of Plato, *Tim.*, 28, c 3 f. See ch. II, n. 37.

v. 16 *Νόρ* and *κάρτει* are *dativi auctoris*, that is to say they are described as the two hypostases by whom the angels are charged with their tasks, not as the recipients of their messages. See n. 74.

*Composition.* The hymn is modelled on the fixed scheme of ancient religious hymnology (Ed. NORDEN, *Agnostos Theos*, 143 ff.). The invocation (v. 1) and the mention of the abiding-place of the divinity (v. 2-3) is followed by a prayer to be given a favourable hearing (v. 5) introduced by a reference to the specific aptitude of the

(ὄχρητοι) and "Might" (κάρτος)<sup>27</sup>; and the main ontological and cosmological ideas which can be discerned in the two texts are alike. We cannot interpret at this stage of our investigation all the details of this hymn. A full discussion of the subject will be found in a subsequent chapter, which treats of the Chaldæan system as a whole. At this point, we shall in examining this text only deal with those doctrines which may be considered as having a capital importance for the Chaldæan teachings.

Porphry's hymn recognizes a supreme ineffable Father of the gods who is called "mystes", because he does not disclose the mystery of his nature. His unity is emphatically affirmed in a series of predicates vv. 13-14: "Most kingly All-Father and only Father of the mortals and the happy immortals". Thus we meet in these verses with one of the main ideas of Chaldæan theology, which insists upon the fundamental difference between the supreme king of gods and the other immortals<sup>28</sup>.

The hierarchy of the supercelestial world is relatively the easiest to understand. Three powers must be distinguished: the supreme Father

invoked power to fulfil the prayer (v. 4; cf. PROCL., *Hymn.* II. 14, and the parallels adduced by LUDWIG, *ad loc.*). Next (v. 6) comes an exposition of the might of the god, in this case an enumeration of the "Powers" (δυνάμεις) subservient to him; its beginning is marked by the typical γάρ. The hymnic form accounts for the use of σοι instead of σοῦ in v. 3 (NORDEN, *loc. cit.*, 150 and 158. Cf. IDEM, *Geburt des Kindes*, p. 67, n. 1) and of the participles in v. 2 and 4 (see NORDEN, *Agn. Theos*, 166 f.).

<sup>27</sup> Already Wolff, p. 144, n. 10-11 (after Thilo), has remarked upon this terminological concordance, but without drawing the obvious conclusion. A. D. Nock, *Conversion*, 110, also points out a "suspicious" resemblance between the hymn of the "Theosophy" and the Chaldæan Oracles. Concerning ἀλήκη and ἀλκήs μένος cf. ch. II, n. 73; concerning κάρτος *ibid.*, n. 74; concerning ὄχρητοι, *ibid.*, n. 181.

<sup>28</sup> This belief obliged Porphyry to defend the Chaldæans against the charge of disguised monotheism: *Apud* PROCL., *Tim.*, I, 208, 20 Καλδαῖοι δὲ καὶ τὸ ἄλλο θεῖον ἐθεράπευσαν καὶ αὐτὴν τὴν ἀρετὴν (= δύνσμιν, virtue) τῶν θεῶν 'θεῶν' εἰπόντες 'ἐσθθησας', πολλοῦ δέουτες διὰ τὴν ἀρετὴν ὑπερφρονεῖν τῆς ἱερᾶς θρησκείας. Cf. PORPHY., *De abst.* IV, 9, p. 242, 1, f., a similar interpretation of the Egyptian worship of the Zodiac.

of the gods enthroned above the back of the "revolving worlds" (*κόσμοι* : the plural is employed, in the language of the Chaldæans, in the sense of stars and stellar spheres)<sup>29</sup>. He is exalted above the "Eternal Strength" whose "Vigour" is fixed on the ethereal back above the "cosmos" (in the singular : meaning the world of the planets) and the "starry heaven" (the zone of the fixed stars). By means of the "golden" rays of His "Vigour of Strength", which are called "Eternally flowing channels", the supreme Father suckles the third hypostasis, the "Intellect" (*νοῦς*); it is the Intellect who is the actual maker of this world. He fashions the "imperishable matter" in accordance with the forms with which the Supreme God has "bound" it.

The specific relationship obtaining between the members of this triad : The Father of the gods, the feminine principle, the Intellect creator of the world, conforms exactly to the doctrine of the Chaldæan Oracles<sup>30</sup>. In his active aspect, the supreme God, the noetic primordial Fire, causes His "Vigour of Strength", known as the "First Intellect", to generate the ideas who form the "Second Intellect" (which is designated in the hymn as *νοῦς*). These ideas constitute the "spiritual immortal form" which the Supreme God has created before the corporeal world, and serve as a model for it. As He himself does not enter in to contact with matter, He has charged with the copying of this form the Second Intellect, whom the Chaldæans for this reason call "the Artisan".

The relationship between the "Second Intellect" and his originator, the primordial Source of the Ideas, is described in the hymn quoted by Porphyry as that between a son and his mother. The feminine principle "suckles" this world-forming Intellect by means of the "eternally flowing rays", that is to say the Forms which spring forth from her ; the Second Intellect is the sum total of these Forms.

The second part of the hymn (vv. 13-19) contains a description of the ministering spirits. Its meaning is elucidated by a scholium added by Porphyry : "This oracle gives knowledge of three orders of angels : those who perpetually stand before God ; those who are separated

<sup>29</sup> See ch. II, n. 86.

<sup>30</sup> On what follows see ch. II, sect. 2 and 7.

from Him and who are sent forth with a view to certain messages and ministrations; those who perpetually bear His throne . . . and perpetually sing" <sup>31</sup>.

The Chaldæan Oracles differentiate between various classes of angels. Unfortunately, we possess but scanty information on this subject. The first of the angelic orders figuring in the hymn is not mentioned elsewhere in the extant Oracles, but is known from Jewish angelology. It is composed of the archangels who perpetually surround the highest God <sup>32</sup>. Some further details as to the second angelic order will be obtained later on from a new Chaldæan fragment <sup>33</sup>. This order comprises the ministering angels, who inhabit all the parts of the world (cf. the hymn, v. 14 : "They are separate from Thee"); and who, acting upon the decision of the "Father", help the faithful in their need. The hymn describes them as the messengers of the "First-born Intellect", and of the "Might" of the Supreme God. As the "Father" has no contact with the lower world, these angels are sent forth by two of His hypostases.

The third order (likewise not mentioned in the other extant Chaldæan Oracles) is constituted by the angels who bear the throne of the Supreme God and praise Him perpetually in their chants. It is evident that the origin of these bearers of the Throne must be sought in Jewish angelology; there we find the Cherubs who form the mystic chariot of

---

<sup>31</sup> Wolff, 145 f.; Buresch, 104, No. 28 : Ὅτι τρεῖς τάξεις ἀγγέλων ὁ χρησμὸς οὗτος δηλοῖ τῶν αἰεὶ τῷ Θεῷ παρεστώτων, τῶν χωριζομένων αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς ἀγγελίας καὶ διακονίας τινὰς ἀποστελλομένων καὶ τῶν φερόντων αἰεὶ τὸν αὐτοῦ Θρόνον. Τοῦτο "οἱ σε καθ' ἡμᾶρ ἄγουσι", τούτεστι· διηνεκῶς φέρουσι· τὸ δὲ "αἰοιδίουσιν ἐσῶδε" ἀντὶ τοῦ ἄδουσιν ἕως νῦν.

Cf. PORPHYRY, *Against the Christians* (Fragm. 76 Harnack) Εἰ γὰρ ἀγγέλους φετὲ τῷ Θεῷ παρεσθάναι ἀπαθείς καὶ ἀθανάτους καὶ τὴν φύσιν ἀφθάρτους, οὓς ἡμεῖς Θεοῦς λέγομεν διὰ τὸ πλῆσιον αὐτοῦ εἶναι τῆς Θεότητος.

<sup>32</sup> See e. g. BOUSSET-GRESSMANN, *Religion des Judentums* (1926), 325 f.; CUMONT, *Les anges du paganisme*, Rev. hist. relig., LXXII, 1915, p. 173 n. 3 (see also BIDEZ-CUMONT, *Mages hell.*, II, 292, 4) is wrong in using the hymn as a document of pagan angelology. The fact that the hymn substitutes an enumeration of angels for one of divine attributes is characteristic. The pagan δυνάμεις or ἀρεταὶ Θεοῦ are replaced by the Jewish ones.

<sup>33</sup> See below, p. 29, n. 77.



God<sup>34</sup>, as well as the Seraphs (Is. vi. 12) who praise God and continually sing the Trisagion (cf. the hymn, v. 19: "They sing till to-day")<sup>35</sup>. The text of the Chaldæan hymn is paralleled by magical oath-formulas, influenced by these Jewish doctrines, which invoke the God "Who rides upon the chariot of the Cherubs and is hymned by the orders of the angels"<sup>36</sup>. It is an interesting fact that the hymn—as well as the Jewish apocalyptic writings—designates the angels as "saints" and "sons of God"<sup>37</sup>.

These traces of Jewish influence can be adduced in support of the Chaldæan origin of the hymn. For Kroll has shown that this influence can be perceived in the doctrine of the Theurgists<sup>38</sup>. There is reason to suppose that the Chaldæans acquired their knowledge of Jewish teaching in an indirect way, through the medium of the Judaizing magical writings. These have probably brought also Jewish angelology to their ken, an angelology which at that time exercised a deep influence (proved by the magical papyri) on the votaries of the occult sciences.

At this point we shall conclude for the time being the interpretation of the hymn. Many of the problems posed by the text (such as that of the identity of the "sons" who are supposed to chant this hymn) are best answered in the course of the general account of the Chaldæan system which will be given in the next chapter.

<sup>34</sup> ὁ καθήμενος ἐπὶ τῶν Χερουβείμ: LXX Ps. LXXIX, 2; XCVIII, 1; Ezek. IX. 3; X, 1. etc. Dan. III, 55, etc. The expression is often found in *P. Mag.*, cf. VII, 634, XIII, 255, 334; see VII, 205 ἐπὶ Χερουβείν καθήμενον, βασιάζοντα τὸν Θρόνον τὸν Ἰδιον.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. in particular *Apoc. Jo.* IV, 8 καὶ ἀνάπαυσιν οὐκ ἔχουσιν ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτὸς λέγοντες Ἅγιος, etc. Other passages in R. H. CHARLES, *Commentary on the Revelation of St. John* (New-York 1920), I, 125 f. Cf. also the magical text quoted by REITZENSTEIN, *Poimandres*, 294, according to which the angels τὸ 'ἅγιος' . . . ἀκαταπίσιον φωνῆ κατακράζουσιν.

<sup>36</sup> M. BERTHELOT, *Collection des anciens alchimistes grecs*, I, 28, 3 Θεόν . . . τὸν ἐπὶ ἀρμάτων χερουβικῶν ἐποχούμενον καὶ ὑπὸ ταγματῶν ἀγγελικῶν ἀνυμνούμενον; quoted by CUMONT, *Les anges du paganisme* (see above, p. 14, n. 32.), 175, 4.

<sup>37</sup> BOUSSET-GRESSMANN, *op. cit.*, 321.

<sup>38</sup> As we shall see, the influence exercised by Jewish ideas upon the conceptions of the Theurgists is exaggerated by Kroll; it is however undeniable.

Before resuming our research for further Chaldæan Oracles we must inquire into the transmission of the hymn. It has been handed down in a late extract from the so-called *Prophecies of the heathen Gods*, a Christian compilation dating from the end of the 5th century, which is perhaps better known as the *Theosophy of Tuebingen*, a designation given to it by its editor Buresch, after the locality where the most important of its Mss. was found<sup>39</sup>. The author of this work wishes to prove that the prophecies of the heathen gods and the utterances of the Oriental and Greek sages "concord with the intention of the Holy Scriptures"<sup>40</sup>. With a view to this demonstration he quotes a series of oracles and amongst them the hymn which has engaged our attention. This is introduced by him in express terms as an extract from the second book of Porphyry's *Philosophy of the Oracles*. The source of the other oracles quoted in the *Theosophy* and ascribed, for their greater part, to Apollo is not indicated with the same explicitness. It seems probable that other oracles figuring in the *Prophecies of the heathen Gods* may have been extracted from Porphyry's celebrated work. Photius who knew the Christian compilation in its entirety, remarks that it contained among other matters also Chaldæan Oracles<sup>41</sup>. It may consequently be presumed that the

<sup>39</sup> K. BURESCH, *Klaros. Untersuchungen zum Orakelwesen des späteren Altertums. Nebst einem Anhang, das Anecdoton Χρησμοί τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν Θεῶν enthaltend*. Leipzig 1889, pp. 87-126. As to the dating of this collection of *χρησμοί* cf. K. J. NEUMANN, *ibid.*, p. 90.

<sup>40</sup> Buresch, 95, 6.

<sup>41</sup> PHOTIUS, *Bibl. cod.* 170, p. 117 a 4 f. ed. Bekker : *χρήσεις . . . Χαλδαϊκῆ*. Cf. Kroll, 9, and Bidez-Cumont, *Mages*, II, 364. BRINKMANN, *Die Theosophie des Aristokritos*, *Rheinisches Museum*, LI (1896), 273 ff. (cf. *P. W.*, s. v. *Theosophie*) propounds the thesis that the author of the *Theosophia* used a compilation composed by a Manichæan named Aristocritus, but the arguments employed by his opponents (e. g. SCHÜRER, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes*, III<sup>1</sup>, 586, n. 150) seem to carry weight. The most probable supposition is that both Aristocritus and the author of the *Theosophia* had recourse to the same Christian florilegium of Oracles. We shall see below (p. 26, n. 67) that such a work was known already to Didymus of Alexandria, the teacher of Hieronymus. One thing is certain : the unknown Christian author, whose work was used by the author of the *Theosophy*, has drawn to no small extent upon Porphyry's work *On the Philosophy of the Oracles*.

A minute scrutiny of the *Theosophy* would be a necessary preliminary to a rec-dition of this work of Porphyry.

excerptor, whose negligent and unintelligent manner of working can be illustrated by many examples, has left out the indications of the sources found in the original compilation.

Another of the oracles of the *Theosophy*, the 13th according to Buresch's numeration, possesses the characteristics of Chaldæan mystagogy. At the same time, the scholium attached to it permits to regard it as an extract from Porphyry's work *On the Philosophy of the Oracles*<sup>42</sup>, for Porphyry has added similar, almost literal, prose paraphrases to various other oracular poems quoted by him<sup>43</sup>. An examination of the terminology of the scholium should transform this supposition into virtual certainty. The term "noetic fire" and the explanation of the Homeric expression "to tear the heart away from" (*Odys.*, I, 48) as "soul's division with regard to the sensible world" point unmistakably to Neoplatonic speculation<sup>44</sup>. Indubitably, this oracle was likewise extracted by the author of the *Prophecies of the heathen Gods* from Porphyry's work.

<sup>42</sup> *Theosophy*, No. 14, Buresch. 98. Ἔστι, Φησί, πῦρ ὑπεράνω τῆς κοιλότητος τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, διηλεκτῶς κινούμενον, ἀπειρον, (ἀεὶ) ὑπάρχον, καὶ μηδὲ ταῖς οὐρανίαις δυνάμεσι θεωρητόν, εἰ μὴ ἑαυτὸν ὁ πατήρ παρασκευάσῃ ὀφθῆναι· καὶ τῷ αἰθέρι δὲ καὶ τοῖς ἀστράσι καὶ τῇ σελήνῃ καὶ τοῖς (λεγομένοις) Θεοῖς ἀγνωστός ἐστὶ ἢ ὁδὸς τοῦ νοητοῦ πυρὸς καὶ ἐμοί, Φησί, αὐτῷ τῷ Ἡλίῳ διὰ τοῦτο δέ, Φησί, πᾶσι φοβερόν ἐστὶ ἐκεῖνο τὸ πῦρ, διότι ὁ μακρότατος αὐτοῦ αὐλῶν, εἶτ' οὖν ἡ καρ' εὐθεῖαν ὄξεια ὀρμὴ μετὰ συστροφῆς καὶ ἤχου γίγνεται. οὐτινος πυρὸς ὁ ἀψάμενος οὐκέτι μερίσειε τὴν ἐντοῦ ψυχῆν πρὸς τὰ αἰσθητά. οὐ γὰρ ἔχει μερισμὸν ἐκεῖνο τὸ πῦρ, ἀλλ' ἀεὶ αἰδίως τοῖς αἰδίῳ ἐπιμίγνεται· τὸ δὲ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ οὐδὲ εἰπεῖν τις δύναται· τοῦτο οὖν, Φησί, τὸ πῦρ ἀληθῶς Θεός, ἡμεῖς δὲ ἐλαχίστη δύναμις ἀγγελικὴ ὑπάρχομεν.

<sup>43</sup> The most characteristic example is Porphyry's paraphrase of Apollo's Oracle on Plotinus (*vita Plotini*, 23). Similar paraphrases figure also in Eusebius' quotations from Porphyry's *Philosophy of the Oracles* (e. g. Wolff, 118 f. and 141. Cf. also below, note 137).

<sup>44</sup> Cf. e. g. PLOTINUS IV, I, 1 : ὁ μερισμὸς αὐτῆς (τῆς ψυχῆς) τὸ ἀποσῆναι καὶ ἐν σῶματι γενέσθαι. See Zeller, III, 2<sup>a</sup>, 590-2 n. 5.

My insertion of ἀεὶ before ὑπάρχων in the second line of the Scholium provides an adequate explanation for αἰών in the second verse of the Oracle. The Aristotelian etymology 'αἰών' ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀεὶ εἶναι (*De caelo*, I, 9, 279 a 27) is often quoted by Neoplatonists who follow herein the example of Plotinus (III, 7, 4 fin.); cf. e. g. Procl. *Tim.*, III, 9, 15 f. *Theol. Plat.*, 147, 34 f.; Dam., II, 16, 31.

This second oracle belonging to Porphyry's collection is preceded by an introduction (a characteristic which has no parallel in the hymn), and is supposed to be the reply to the question of a pious man mentioned by name. "Apollo, when a certain Theophilus asked him, whether he or another was God, delivered the following oracle"<sup>45</sup>. This preliminary remark will be discussed further on. Now we shall give a literal translation of the oracle (which contains many obscure passages only partly elucidated by the prose paraphrase):

"Above the supercelestial vault, there subsists an unbounded mobile fire, the infinite Aion. Invincible, he strides among the Blessed Ones, unless the Great Father resolves that he (Aion) shall be seen. There, the ether does not bear the radiant stars, nor is the luminous moon set aloft there. No god encounters him on his way, nor I myself who hold together with my rays, spread out in the whirl of the ether. But there is a long path of the fiery god, winding spiralwise, sounding. Whoever has touched the ethereal fire of that (god), cannot tear his heart away from it; for it has no power to burn. Through incessant care, in virtue of the action of God himself, an æon mingles with the æons... Self-generated, untaught, motherless, unshakable, His name not to be apprehended by words, dwelling in fire—that is God. We angels are only a small troop of God"<sup>46</sup>.

<sup>45</sup> See the following note.

<sup>46</sup> *Theos.*, No. 13. Buresch, 97, cf. also 55 f.; Wolff, 231 f.; *Anthol. Græc.*, vol. III, p. 490 No. 140 Didot :

- 1 Ἔσθ', ὑπερουρανίου κύτεος καθύπερθε λελογχῶς,  
φλογμὸς ἀπειρέσιος, κινούμενος, ἀπλετος Αἰῶν.  
εἰσι δ' ἐνὶ μακάρεσσιν ἀμήχανος, εἰ μὴ ἑαυτὸν  
βουλὰς βουλεύσῃσι πατὴρ μέγας, ὡς ἐσιδέσθαι.
- 5 ἐνθα μὲν οὐτ' αἰθὴρ φέρει ἀστέρας ἀγλαοφεγγεῖς  
οὔτε σεληναῖη λιγυφεγγέτις αἰωρεῖται,  
οὐ Θεὸς ἀντιάει κατ' ἀταρπιτόν, οὐδ' ἐγὼ αὐτὸς  
ἀκτίσιν συνέχων ἐπικιδναμαι αἰθεροδινῆς.  
ἀλλὰ πέλει πυρσοῖο Θεοῦ περιμήκετος αὐλῶν,
- 10 ἐρπων εἰλίγδην, ροιζούμενος· οὐ κεν ἐκεῖνον  
ἀψάμενος πυρὸς αἰθερίου δαίσειέ τις ἦτορ·  
οὐ γὰρ ἔχει δαίην· ἀζηχεῖ δ' ἐν μελεδιθμῶ

The oracle indicates first of all the abode of this ineffable God. It is situated above the highest celestial vault, that is to say above the sphere of the fixed stars regarded as the outermost of the heavenly spheres.

αἰὼν αἰώνεσσ' ἐπιμίγνυται ἐκ Θεοῦ αὐτοῦ. . .  
 αὐτοφωής, ἀδίδακτος, ἀμήτωρ, ἀστνφέλικτος,  
 15 οὐνομα μὴδὲ λόγῳ χωρούμενος, ἐν πυρὶ ναίων,  
 τοῦτο Θεός· μικρὰ δὲ Θεοῦ μερίς ἀγγελοι ἡμεῖς.

*Transmission.* See above, p. 10, n. 26. LACTANTIUS, *Inst. div.*, I, 7, 1 must also be referred to in this connection. Drawing upon the same source, Porphyry's *Philosophy of the Oracles*, he maintains that the oracle derived from Apollo of Colophon and comprised 21 verses, the last three of which he quotes. Thus Wolff, 231 f., and Buresch, 57, are proved to have been justified in assuming a lacuna of 5 verses after v. 13. The scholium shows that this omission is due to Porphyry.

The attribution to Apollo of Colophon is certainly erroneous, as the contents of the oracle prove. Lactantius' mistake is probably due to the fact that before the text with which we are dealing Porphyry quotes an authentic oracle of Apollo of Clarus whom Lactantius, with no justification whatever, assumed to be identical with the Apollo of the present oracle. The hypotheses propounded, after Buresch, by Ch. PICARD, *Éphèse et Claros* (Paris 1922), 715 f. are thus unjustified.

*Text* (cf. the critical observations of Buresch, 56).

3 εἰσι] εἰσι T, restit. Buresch ἐσί· LB ἐσί· St 5 μὲν T κὲν LB κὲ St οὐ] οὐδ' TLB, corr. Piccolo 7 αὐτὸς LBSt αὐταῖς T 8 συνέχων] συνεὼν codd., corr. Wolff 9 Θεοῦ LBSt schol. Porph. (αὐτοῦ) Θεός T, Buresch 10 οὐ κεν] οὐ μὲν codd., corr. Wolff 13 αἰώνεσσ' T αἰῶσι LBSt 16 Θεοῦ μερίς T Lactant. μερίς Θεοῦ LBSt.

#### *Explanatory remarks.*

Concerning the name "Theophilus" see below, p. 31, note 86.

v. 1 cf. the analogous beginning of the fragment of the Oracles, quoted in ch. II, note 64; λελογχώς after HOMER, *Il.* XV, 190 f.

v. 3 must be construed: εἰ μὴ ὁ μέγας πατήρ βουλὰς βουλευέσθω (for the expression see HOMER, *Il.* IX, 75) ὡς ἐκντὸν (sc. τὸν αἰῶνα, not τὸν πατέρα, as Porphyry supposes in his scholium) εἰσιδέσθαι: When the Father decides to appear, he causes Aion to become manifest; accordingly, the latter reveals the Supreme Being Who Himself remains unconceivable. Ἀμήχανος is used 'ad hominem' (not 'ad astra', as Porphyry explains in his scholium): Aion cannot be compelled, unless the father "wills".

v. 6 λιγυφεγγέτις, v. 8 αἰθεροδινής, v. 12 δαίη and μελεληθμός are *Harax Le-gomena*. See Excursus III.

v. 8 συνέχων: see ch. II, n. 245.

v. 10 ροίζος is the technical term for the sound given forth by the revolving stars;

Below him is the zone of the ether. It is there that the fixed stars, the moon, the "gods" (that is the deified planets) and Apollo himself (identified with Helios, the god of the sun)<sup>47</sup> subsist. Above this zone the "fiery God" wends his serpentine way, in solitary majesty. He is fire and dwells in fire, that is in the highest zone situated above the ether. There, the æons are "mingled".

This god of Eternity, whose subordinates or "angels" all the other gods are said to be, is called by Apollo "Infinite Aion" and "God" (*Θεός*), in the absolute sense of this word. He has, however, a superior: the "Great Father", and, according to the oracle, he becomes visible when the "Father" wills it; a mysterious epiphany the nature of which we cannot as yet determine. This God's relation to the terrestrial spheres seems to be clearer. Man is illuminated but not consumed by His fire. "Whoever has touched" it, "cannot tear his heart away".

This allusion to a process of illumination furnishes a decisive argument in favour of the Chaldæan origin of these verses. For it has its counterpart in passages found in several of the extant Chaldæan Oracles<sup>48</sup>, which describe the soul's ascent "towards the light and the rays of the Father", Whose fire descends and "enkindles" the soul of the initiate: "The mortal who approaches the fire will obtain light from God"<sup>49</sup>. "The illuminated souls repose in God, inhaling the potent fires which descend from the Father"<sup>50</sup>. Thus, the illuminating fire descends from the "Father" towards "God", so that the initiate "obtains light"

---

see Ps.-MANETHO, *Apotelesm.*, B[A] 66; LAMBlich., *Vit. Pyth.*, XV, 65, and *De myst.*, III, 9, p. 191, 3. Cf. ch. III, note 63 and 76.

v. 12 Buresch is right in remarking that the play upon the words *δαίσειε* (from *δαίω* = *μερίζω*) and *δαίην* (a neologism deriving from the Homeric *δαίω* = *κίω*; both explanations are given by MACROB., *Sat.*, I, 23, 7) must be preserved. Similar etymological puns are often to be found in the Oracles; see ch. II, n. 70.

v. 13 is a variant of a formula of eternity, cf. C. LACKERT, *Aion*, Dissertat. Koenigsberg 1914, p. 88 f. 95.

<sup>47</sup> Cf. the scholium of Porphyry, quoted p. 17, n. 42.

The attribute *αἰθεροδίνης* (v. 8) indicates a planet.

<sup>48</sup> As to what follows, cf. ch. II, sect. 15 and ch. III, sect. 3.

<sup>49</sup> Cf. ch. II, n. 106.

<sup>50</sup> Cf. ch. III, n. 84.

not from the Supreme Being himself, but from "God", that is to say, from a subordinate potency. The Chaldæans (as well as the Oracle of Apollo) distinguish between the inaccessible "Father" and the fiery Aion, whom they designate elsewhere as the "Father-begotten Light"<sup>51</sup>. This Aion must accordingly be considered as the transmitter of the mystic fire.

Having established the Chaldæan origin of the poem consecrated to God Aion, we shall have no great difficulty in showing that the Oracle No. 21 of the *Theosophy*, which is likewise attributed to Apollo, must also be ascribed to the Theurgists.

"Apollo, having been asked, who is God, gave the following answer : Self-manifest, engendered without birth, incorporeal, and immaterial. Therefrom, fires go forth in a circle round the Olympus. And therefrom a feeble refulgence of the ether appears which illumines the sun, the moon and the stars. This I know and have understood in my mind ; about the rest I am silent, as I am Phoebus. And thou, cease to ask that which is unlawful ; and do not, because of thy knowledge of nature, consider any more these supreme things"<sup>52</sup>.

<sup>51</sup> Cf. ch. II, n. 138.

<sup>52</sup> *Theos.* No. 21, BURESCH, 101; WOLFF, 238; *Anth. Graec.*, vol. III, p. 494, No. 151, Didot.

ὅτι ἐρωτηθεῖς ὁ Ἀπόλλων, τί Θεός, ἐξείπεν οὕτως·

- 1 Ἄυτοφανής, ἀλόχευτος, ἀσώματος ἠδὲ τ' ἄυλος.  
κείθεν δ' ἐκ σέλα εἰσι πέραξ σφαιρηδὸν Ὀλύμπου.  
ἐνθεν δ' αὐ τυτθὴ διαειδεται αἰθέρος αὐγή,  
ἠέλιον, μῆνην καὶ τεῖρεα φωτίζουσα.
- 2 ταῦτ' ἐδάην ἐμαθὸν τε νόω, τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ σιωπῶ  
Φοῖβος ἑών· σὺ δὲ πειθε τὰ μὴ Θέμις ἐξερεεῖων  
χ' εἰνεκα σῆς φυσικῆς σοφίης τὰδ' ὑπέρτερα νωμῶν.

Nothing need be remarked as to the transmission of the text. Buresch 93, who follows Steuchus, in assuming that this oracle is a continuation of the three verses quoted *Theos.* No. 15. This supposition is contradicted by the fact that the adjectives in the first verse of *Theos.* 21 serve as attributes to Θεός; thus it is impossible to insert three verses between the question and the reply. We shall subsequently see (cf. ch. II, n. 62) that *Theos.* 15 is concerned with another entity.

Leaving out of account, for the time being, the personal tone and the other literary peculiarities of this text, we find that the description of "God" conforms to the doctrine of the preceding Oracle and to that of the Chaldæans. *Θεός* is—as the omission of the article proves—the divine being in the absolute sense of the word. He is said to be "engendered without birth", a term corresponding to the attribute "motherless" figuring in the preceding Oracle. Two other words which describe him are "incorporeal" and "immaterial", both of which are habitually applied to transcendent entities. "Self-manifest" which, as the first word of Apollo's reply, is emphasised, points once more to the Chaldæan origin of this Oracle. For it fits in with a passage of the first of Apollo's Oracles examined here which states that "God" becomes visible when the "Father" wills it, and that His fiery epiphany effects the mystic illumination of the soul. Proclus relates that the Theurgists used the magical art to bring about a "self-manifestation" (*αὐτοφάνεια*) of the god Chronos; we shall see that this God is identical with the Aion of the *Theosophy*<sup>53</sup>. Iamblichus does nothing but develop this Chaldæan doctrine when he affirms that the "illumination" of the invoked gods is "self-manifest"<sup>54</sup>.

From this "God", "fires go forth in a circle round the Olympus"; in other words, the heavenly spheres are enclosed by an outer zone of fire<sup>55</sup>, in which, according to the first oracle of Apollo, "the fiery God" wends His way. The sphere of the ether is situated beneath this zone and draws from it its light. It is in this sphere that the sun, the moon and the planets (between which this text—as well as the first Oracle of Apollo—differentiates) move. Their light is "feebler", because the ray of the Primordial Fire becomes less powerful, as the distance between it and its source increases. The Chaldæan Oracles describe it accordingly as being "dimmed" in the course of its descent<sup>56</sup>.

<sup>53</sup> See ch. II, sect. 5.

<sup>54</sup> IAMBL., *Myst.* I, 12, p. 40, 17 f. *Αὐτοφάνης γάρ τις ἐστὶ καὶ αὐτοθελής ἡ διὰ τῶν κλήσεων ἐλλαμψίς*. Of course *αὐτοθελής* (thus CD) should be read (cf. *ἡ θεία βούλησις* in the subsequent passage), and not *αὐτοτελής* (as ABO have it). Cf. Excursus V, n. 8.

<sup>55</sup> *Ὀλυμπος* is employed metonymically for the supercelestial place.

<sup>56</sup> See ch. II, n. 228.



The three Oracles which have already been interpreted have given us some knowledge of the mythical-symbolic language used by the Chaldeans. This knowledge may be extended by a scrutiny of the three concluding verses of the Hymn transmitted in the *Theosophy* (No. 29) which has engaged our attention at the beginning of this chapter. These verses are separated from the Hymn by a disquisition on the angelic orders inserted by Porphyry who seems to have been particularly interested in the subject, but are described by him as belonging to the same Oracle, and appear to continue, with no sign of a break, the text of the Hymn<sup>57</sup>. Accordingly, we may legitimately infer that they reproduce the "perpetual" song of praise which the angels address to their Father—evidently corresponding to the Trisagion. The practice of alining a considerable number of divine predicates in an invocation of the Supreme Being has many counterparts in Oriental and Hellenistic doxologies<sup>58</sup>. His omnipotence is described in the following terms :

"Thou art the Father; the Mother's radiant form; the Children's

---

<sup>57</sup> Several times, in the *Philosophy of the Oracles* Porphyry quotes parts of the same oracle separately. Thus, the seven verses transmitted by EUSEBIUS, *Praep. Ev.* IX, 10, 2 (Wolff, 140), concerning the nations of the East (among them the Jews) which have found "the way to the blessed immortals" are to be regarded as the introductory part of a lengthy sacrificial oracle (quoted by EUSEB., *Praep. Ev.* IV, 9, 2 f. Wolff, 112 f. *τήνδε Θεόδοτον εἰς τρίβον* is identical with *ὁδὸς μακάρων*). The instructions concerning the consecration of a statue of Hecate (EUSEB., *Praep. Ev.*, V, 12, 1-2; Wolff, 130 f.) are similarly to be considered as a continuation of those relating to its construction (EUSEB., *Praep. Ev.*, V, 13, 3; Wolff, 133 f.). See below. n. 162.

<sup>58</sup> The author of the oracle quoted n. 59 seems to have been desirous of imitating certain doxologies of chanting angels. We may cite, by way of comparison, a hymn of the angels, quoted, with a few variations, both by DIDYMUS, *de trinitate*, III, 21 (Migne, P. G., XXXIX, 913 A) and EPIPHANIUS, *Ancoratus*, 37, 5, and probably deriving from a common apocryphical source, which we have no means of identifying: "Thine is the Glory, Thine is the Power, Thine is the Force, Thine is the Strength" (Epiphanius, *Δοξολογία... ὑπὸ ἀγγέλων... βοώντων... Σὴ ἐστὶν ἡ δύναμις, σὸν ἐστὶ τὸ κράτος, σὴ ἐστὶν ἡ ἰσχύς, (δέσποτα)*; similarly also the passage in Didymus).

The second hymn of Synesius forms a strange blend of Chaldean, Neoplatonic and Jewish-Christian motifs; cf. v. 39 f. *Ὅθεν ἐγκόσμιος ἤδη / χορὸς ἀφθίτων ἀνάκτων*

tender flower; existent as Form within the Forms; Soul and Spirit, Harmony and Number”<sup>59</sup>.

It has been said that these verses contain “ein ganzes Stück Religionsgeschichte”<sup>60</sup>. We must however content ourselves for the moment with showing that their doctrine concords with that of the Chaldæans, without tracing it back to its source.

The doxology contains a series of symbolic terms, intended to express the identity of the Supreme Being with the entities in which He unfolds Himself. For, according to a fundamental Chaldæan doctrine, the “Father” is the ineffable One, from which the entire hierarchy of the celestial beings and powers springs. This teaching is summed up in the two following sentences: “The Father is noetically everything”; “Everything

(planetary gods) / γενετήριόν τε κῦδος / τό τε πρωτόσπορον εἶδος / νοεραῖς ἐμελψεν ὕμνοις / πέλας εὐμενῶν τοκήων. / Στρατὸς ἀγγέλων (the ministering angels) ἀγίως / τὰ μὲν ἐς Νόον δεδορκῶς / δρέπεται κάλλεος ἀρχάν (see ch. II. n. 24), / τὰ δ' ἐς ἀντυγας δεδορκῶς / διέπει βένθεα κόσμου (the earth, see ch. IV, n. 63; and in particular v. 63 f.) Σὺ πατήρ, σὺ δ' ἐσσι μήτηρ / σὺ μὲν ἄρρην, σὺ δὲ Θῆλυς / . . . μονὰς ἀμβρότων ἀριθμῶν (the Ideas) / παρουσιῶν ἀνάκτων.

The last verses we have quoted seem to prove that Synesius was familiar with the hymn of the *Theosophy*. Cf. also the hymn composed by BOETHIUS, *De cons. phil.*, III, 9, v. 28, and the remarks of F. KLINGNER, *De Boethii consolatione* (Philologische Untersuchungen, vol. XXVII, 1921), p. 57.

<sup>59</sup> *Theos.*, No. 29. Buresch, 104; Wolff, 146 f. Ἐἴτα ἐπάγει (ὁ χρησμός ταῦτα.)

Τύνη δ' ἐσσι πατήρ καὶ μητέρας ἀγλαὸν εἶδος  
καὶ τεκῶν τέρεν ἄνθος, ἐν εἰδεσιν εἶδος ὑπάρχων  
καὶ ψυχὴ καὶ πνεῦμα καὶ ἀρμονίη καὶ ἀριθμός.

The scholium which is appended (δηλοῖ δὴ διὰ τούτων, ὅτι καὶ πατὴρ καὶ μητὴρ Φιλοσοφίαν ἐνδείκνυται περὶ ἡμᾶς ὁ Θεὸς καὶ ὅτι συγκαταβαίνει διὰ Φιλανθρωπίαν καὶ γίνεται καὶ αὐτὸς ὡς ἄνθρωπος καὶ ὡσεὶ Θεοῦ τέκνον ἦτοι δημιούργημα), is not to be ascribed to Porphyry, but to the Christian author of the *Theosophy*, who wishes to prove the concordance of the heathen oracles “with the intention of the Holy Scriptures”. See above, p. 16, n. 40, and below, p. 29, n. 76.

<sup>60</sup> Ed. NORDEN, *Agnostos Theos*, 228. As a matter of fact, “Philosophiegeschichte” would have been the more appropriate term.

has been generated by one Fire" (namely the first transcendent Fire, which is the "Father")<sup>61</sup>.

The second manifestation of the Supreme Being is "the Mother's radiant form". The feminine Power subsisting in the "Father" is invoked in the Chaldæan Oracles as "Source of Sources" and "Womb that contains everything"<sup>62</sup>.

"The children's tender flower" is probably to be taken as a symbolic designation of the Ideas which, according to the Chaldæan Oracles, have been generated by the "Father", through the union of His Intellect and His Will; both of whom issue forth out of Him, when He is in His active aspect. The Chaldæans often apply to the noetic substances the term "flower"<sup>63</sup>.

The "Father" subsists as "Form within the Forms". This formula conforms likewise to the opinions of the Chaldæans. It is true that the Supreme Being in Himself is invisible and separate from all that appertains to matter. But in view of the fact that His Fire is the creative power which produces all the portions of the universe, He may be said to manifest Himself as a phenomenon among the phenomena. His Intellect generates the ideas, and these inform the amorphous primordial matter and cause the sensible world to appear<sup>64</sup>. "One Fire having generated everything" one Form, that of the Supreme Principle, appears in all phenomena<sup>65</sup>.

The four last principles, "Soul, Spirit, Harmony and Number", are clearly of Platonic origin. According to the *Timæus* or later commentators of this work, they are different aspects of the Cosmic Soul<sup>66</sup>.

<sup>61</sup> See ch. II, n. 54 and 55. For similar doctrinal reasons, the Hermetic writings, likewise, give an account of the omnipotence of the Supreme Being by enumerating the entities included in Him. Cf. Scott, *Hermetica*, vol. I, p. 542, Fr. 23 πάντων γὰρ ἐστὶν κύριος καὶ πατήρ καὶ Θεὸς, καὶ πηγὴ καὶ ζωὴ καὶ δύναμις καὶ φῶς καὶ νοῦς καὶ πνεῦμα καὶ πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ ὑπ' αὐτόν ἐστιν. A similar list *Corp. Herm.*, III, 1 ed. Parthey.

<sup>62</sup> See ch. II, n. 59.

<sup>63</sup> See ch. II, n. 177. For *πυρός* or *νοῦς ἀνόθος* see ch. II, notes 379-384. The expression *τέρεν ἀνόθος* derives from Hesiod, *Theog.* 988.

<sup>64</sup> See ch. II, n. 84.

<sup>65</sup> Cf. [IAMBL.] *Theol. Arithm.*, 4 (p. 2, 22 de Falco) ἡ μονάς . . . εἶδος εἰδῶν τυγχάνει. See ch. VI, n. 303.

<sup>66</sup> ΠΛΑΤΩ, *Tim.*, 35 b f.; 37 a 1. Concerning *πνεῦμα* see ch. VI, n. 188.

Thus, the enumeration of the doxology indicates the following sequence of the divine procession : First Principle, His Feminine Power, the Ideas and the Cosmic Soul.

A similar list of the noetic potencies figures in another Oracle of Apollo preserved in the *Theosophy* (No. 35). As the terminology of the prose introduction shows, this Oracle is likewise extracted from Porphyry's work *On the Philosophy of the Oracles* <sup>67</sup> :

"Apollo, revealing that everything depends on the immortal God, and that He alone is to be adhered to, delivered the following oracle <sup>68</sup> :

"All is subject to the Nodding of the Intellect of the Great God : the Beginning and Source of Life and Surpassing Glory, Might and Power and the Imperishable Strength of Energy, Potent Power and Revolving Necessity. Therefore, pray to the Supreme King of the Blessed".

This Oracle too contains a series of Chaldæan symbolic terms. While that which figures in the preceding text is meant to bring out the identity of the Supreme Being with the entities in which He unfolds Himself, the

<sup>67</sup> *Theos.*, No. 35. Buresch, 105. Ὅτι ὁ Ἀπόλλων, δηλῶν ὡς πάντα τοῦ ἀθανάτου Θεοῦ ἐξήρηται καὶ αὐτῷ μόνῳ δεῖ προσανέχειν, ἐχρησεν οὕτως

- 1 Πάντα Θεοῦ Μεγάλοιο Νόου ὑπὸ Νεύμασι κεῖται.  
Ἀρχὴ πηγὴ τε Ζωῆς καὶ ὑπείροχον Εὐχὸς  
καὶ Κράτος ἠδὲ Βίη καὶ ἰσχύος ἀφθίτος Ἄλκι)  
καὶ Δύναμις κρατερὴ καὶ ἀμφιέλικτος Ἀνάγκη).
- 5 Εὐχεο τοιγάρτοι μακάρων Βασιλῆι Μεγίστῳ.

The transmission of the text does not call for any observations. The first four lines are also cited by DIDYMUS, *De trinitate*, III, 21 (ΜΙΧΑΕ, P. G., XXXIX, 913 B) as heathen verses [οἱ ἔξω. As to this manner of quoting (deriving from the usage of the New Testament) cf. BOISSONADE, *Michael Psellus*, Nuremberg 1838, 218 and Ed. NORDEN, *Agnostos Theos*, 231, n. 1]. It has already been noted (p. 16, n. 41) that Didymus had recourse to the same source as the author of the work upon which the *Theosophy* is based. We may thus account for the fact that he cites two further fragments of the Chaldæan Oracles which are otherwise unknown. See ch. II, notes 74, 173, 403.

<sup>68</sup> The prose introduction must be attributed to the Christian compiler (see above, p. 24, n. 59), who seems to have introduced an expression deriving from Porphyry (as to πάντα τοῦ . . . Θεοῦ ἐξήρηται cf. Plotinus, I, 6, 7 ἀφ' οὗ πάντα ἐξήρηται, an Aristotelian formula : *Met.* A 7, 1072 b 14 and Zeller, III, 2<sup>a</sup>, 553, n. 3).

one we are examining now enumerates the noetic potencies subject to His Will. The "Great God", as the Father is called here in contradistinction from "God", is in this text too regarded as separated from the lower grade of the divine hierarchy; He is represented by His organs. The term "Nodding of Intellect" is applied to the volitions of His mind<sup>69</sup>. "Intellect" and "Nodding" are, according to the Chaldæan Oracles, two "like-minded" divine faculties. "Nodding" (*νεῦμα*), like many other Chaldæan terms, derives from a line of Homer. The nodding of Zeus which shakes the Olympus (*Iliad* I, 527/8) serves in the Chaldæan Oracles as a designation for the "Father's" will: "The Father's Intellect commanded that all things should be divided into three parts. His Will nodded, and immediately all was divided"<sup>70</sup>. "Nodding" is thus a poetical equivalent for "Volition" (*Βουλή*), a faculty of the "Father", which, together with His Intellect, issues out of Him, when He is in His active aspect.

The identity of the seven potencies enumerated in the same Oracle as being subject to the "Great God" and the Will of His "Intellect" is not certain, but this is only a natural consequence of the fragmentary state in which the Chaldæan Oracles have been transmitted, of the fluidity of their terminology and of the intentional obscurity of their language. The last tendency is particularly noticeable in this Oracle owing to the accumulation of no less than six synonymous terms for Divine Strength within two lines. Two facts may, however, help to elucidate the exact meaning of this list. In the first place, as in the foregoing Oracle, the terms figuring in this passage may be supposed to signify noetic potencies. Since the First Principle and His Intellect are introduced in the first line as the ruling powers, only Aion and the Cosmic Soul can be taken into account. In the second place, other parallels in the Chaldæan Oracles lead to the conclusion that the first entity of this sequence, "Beginning and Source of Life", as well as the last, "Revolving Necessity", refer to the Cosmic Soul, and that some of the synonymous terms used there for Strength also

<sup>69</sup> On the Chaldæan hypostasis of the Will, see ch. II, sect. 3, in particular n. 49.

<sup>70</sup> See ch. II, n. 165.

appear in the extant Chaldæan Oracles as designations of this entity<sup>71</sup>. Thus, we may be justified in inferring that the seven terms are all of them different periphrastic designations of the Cosmic Soul<sup>72</sup>. This terminological exuberance is paralleled by that in the foregoing Oracle; Aion not mentioned in this enumeration is, likewise, omitted in the doxology.

The Oracle we have just examined is intended to proclaim the monarchical rule of the Supreme God and to dissuade from the worship of inferior powers. A similar monotheistic tendency is evinced by the Oracle on the God Aion which ends upon Apollo's confession that Aion alone may fitly be called God, and that "We, the angels are only a small troop of God"<sup>73</sup>. A statement which draws our attention to the yet unexamined problems of Chaldæan angelology.

The second order of the angels is described in the Hymn as "separated" from the "Father", "though descending from Him"; they transmit all messages to His "First-born Intellect" and to His "Might"<sup>74</sup>. The former is identical with the "Paternal Intellect"; he is named "first-born" so as to be distinguished from the "Second Intellect" who, as we have seen, is the demiurge. "Might" designates, in this passage and elsewhere, the energy of the supreme Intellect. This term is used instead of "Will" when the author intends to lay stress upon this Intellect's executive power<sup>75</sup>. These hypostases act as intermediaries between the "Father" and the lower order of the hierarchy.

As the order of the ministering angels "is separated" from the "Father", they must be represented as standing in a closer relationship to the terres-

<sup>71</sup> See ch. II, n. 63 (ἀρχὴ πηγὴ τε ζωῆς). n. 74 (κράτος), n. 78 (ἀλήθ), n. 133 and n. 136 (ἀνάγκη). The expression κράτος ἡδὲ βίη is taken from Hesiod., *Theog.*, 385.

<sup>72</sup> It is an interesting fact that the first Orphic hymn (v. 2) designates Ilcate, the Supreme Goddess, as Εὐχὴ (ΔΙΕΤΕΡΙΧ, *De hymnis Orphicis*, in *Kleine Schriften*, 80). But we should by no means be justified in following the example of *ЛОВЕЦК. Aglaophamus*, 444, and *ΚΕΡΝ, Orphicorum fragmenta*, No. 168, p. 207, and regarding, merely on the strength of this terminological concordance, the oracle of Apollo that we have quoted as Orphic.

<sup>73</sup> See the oracle, quoted p. 18, n. 46, v. 16.

<sup>74</sup> See the oracle, quoted p. 10, n. 26, v. 15.

<sup>75</sup> See below, n. 152 concerning the πνευματικὸς νοῦς, and ch. II, n. 74.

trial world. The messages, which they transmit to the two hypostases of the "Father" must be connected in some way with events occurring in the lower sphere. The activity of these angels is set forth in another Oracle ascribed to Apollo, which figures in the *Theosophy* under No. 34. Its introduction bears the impress of the Christian author of the compilation, who replaced Porphyry's explanatory remarks by his own<sup>76</sup>. But its style and its tenets point unmistakably to a Chaldæan origin :

"We are the swift helpers of the pious mortals, we whose lot it is always to abide scattered in the drifting world. Quickly we hasten towards the afflicted men, obeying the perdurable resolutions of our Father"<sup>77</sup>.

<sup>76</sup> *Theos.* No. 34. Buresch, 105. Ὅτι οἱ λεγόμενοι θεοί, τιμὴν ἑαυτοῖς μνώμενοι καὶ τοῖς ἀγγέλοις παρενεύοντες ἑαυτούς, ὑπηρετεῖσθαι ὁμολογοῦσι ταῖς βουλαῖς τοῦ ἀοράτου θεοῦ καὶ τοῖς περὶ ἐκεῖνον εὐσεβοῦσιν ἀκολουθεῖν· διὸ καὶ ὁ Ἀπόλλων ἐχρησεν οὕτως. (continued *infra* n. 77).

The principal idea of this introduction fits in with the harmonistic tendencies of the Christian compiler (see above, p. 16, n. 41 and p. 24, n. 59), who introduces with almost identical words the (non-Chaldæan) Oracle 36 of the *Theosophy*; it is one of the themes of Christian apologetics. The debate between the Christians and the Heathens centred in the definition of the position of the inferior gods. While these were regarded by the Heathens as autonomous helpers of the supreme God, the Christians refused to allow them even a limited independence and attacked those who worshipped the servants instead of the master (E. PETERSON, *Der Monotheismus als politisches Problem*, Leipzig 1935, 47 f.). For this reason, the Christians were wont to quote Heathen texts which represent the gods as angels (MINUC. FELIX, 26. 11; CYPRIAN, *Quod idola dii non sint*, 6; cf. BIDEZ-CUMONT, *Mages hell.* 11. 289 f.; AUGUSTINE, *Civ. dei* IX. 19; etc.); among them the Oracle treating of Aion (quoted above p. 18, n. 46) in which Apollo calls himself an angel (cf. LACTANTIUS, *Inst. div.*, I, 7. 1 f.). The author of the *Theosophy* was moved by similar considerations: Among the Chaldæan Oracles, he picked out those of monotheistic tendencies (see above, p. 12, n. 28).

<sup>77</sup> *Theos.* No. 34 (continuation of note 76).

Εὐσεβέσιν μερόπεσσιν ὀτρήμονες ἐσμεν ἀρωγοί,  
οἱ λάχομεν περὶ κόσμον ἀλήμονα ναιέμεν αἰεὶ·  
ῥίμφα δ' ἐπ' ἀνθρώποισι πονειομένοισι περῶμεν,  
πειθόμενοι πατρὸς ἡμετέρου πολυαρκέσι βουλαῖς.

v. 1 ὀτρήμων is a neologism, see Buresch on this passage and Excursus III 5. —  
v. 2 is an imitation of *Iliad*, XV, 190 «ἦ τοι ἐγὼν ἐλαχον πολλὴν ἄλα ναιέμεν αἰεὶ».

The last verse enables us to establish the Chaldæan origin of this Oracle, for it contains the characteristic doctrine which conceives the ministering spirits as sons of the "Father", whose "perdurable resolutions" they obey. "The Father's Will that compells obedience" is often named in the Chaldæan Oracles as the supreme authority whose decisions must be executed by the lower orders of the celestial hierarchy<sup>78</sup>. The substitution of the Will for the "Father" is due to the principle that the faculties of the Supreme Being must serve as intermediaries in all the relations subsisting between Him and the world. It seems reasonable to suppose that the spirits "that hasten towards the afflicted men" are not Apollo-Helios and the other planetary divinities, as the Christian compiler would have us believe, but the angels assigned to these sidereal divinities. This supposition is confirmed by the location of these spirits: they are said to "abide scattered in the drifting world". "Drifting world", *κόσμος ἀλήμων*, should be understood here as a pictorial designation of the planetary cosmos, which is often termed similarly in later Greek poetry<sup>79</sup>. Accordingly, we may infer that the Oracle which we are examining is pronounced by the sidereal angels<sup>80</sup>; the assertion of its Christian transmitter that it is uttered by Apollo as the spokesman of the (planetary) gods must be regarded as erroneous. This conclusion is in accord with the fact that by no means all the Chaldæan Oracles were attributed to Apollo; as we have already pointed out<sup>81</sup>, some of them were ascribed to other celestial beings. As an example we may mention a Chaldæan fragment in which the Souls describe—in the first person, as the angels do in the Oracle—their entering into the human bodies<sup>82</sup>. We may consequently take it as established that the Oracle contains a description of one of the principal functions of the order of the ministering angels.

<sup>78</sup> See ch. II, n. 49.

<sup>79</sup> *κόσμος ἀλήμων* as designation of the planetary world is frequently used by Nonnus. *ἀλήμων* or *ἀλήτης* is synonymous with *πλανήτης* or *πλάνης*.

<sup>80</sup> As to the stellar angels see CUMONT, *Les auges du paganisme* (quoted above p. 14, n. 32), p. 174 f. Cf. also ch. II, n. 251 et *passim* (as to the angelic nature of the Iynges connected with the spheres).

<sup>81</sup> See p. 7, n. 13 and 14.

<sup>82</sup> See ch. III, n. 22.



The examples which have been given of the concordance existing between the Oracles extracted from the *Theosophy* and the teaching of the Theurgists appear to carry a sufficient weight of proof. On any supposition, a connexion of some kind must have existed between the two. Its nature however cannot be determined with the requisite precision before their apparent or real divergencies have been examined.

First of all we may deal with the seemingly different literary tone of the *Prophecies* of the *Theosophy* (*χρησμοί*) as compared with the Chaldæan Oracles (*λόγια*) collected by Kroll. The subjective note is much more perceptible in the first group. There we are confronted with Apollo's personal reaction to the questions. The God proclaims his intention to keep the secret of his supreme knowledge; reproves the temerity of the questioner who presumes on his familiarity with natural science<sup>83</sup>; gives practical instructions<sup>84</sup>; and humbly acknowledges the supremacy of the one and only God<sup>85</sup>.

The realistic literary form of the *Prophecies* of the *Theosophy* may be regarded as another distinctive trait. These texts contain the exact wording of the questions and, in one case, even mention the name of the questioner (Theophilus)<sup>86</sup>. Details of this nature are absent from the fragments of the Chaldæan Oracles; most of these verses transmitted by the Neo-Platonists confine themselves to objective statements of doctrine.

There is however one exception: an Oracle quoted by Proclus in his Commentary on Plato's Republic. Kroll has contested—without alleging any reason—its belonging to the Collection of the Chaldæans<sup>87</sup>; yet Proclus designates it as a *Logion*, a term constantly applied by him to

<sup>83</sup> *Theos.* No. 21, 5 f., quoted p. 21, n. 52.

<sup>84</sup> *Theos.* No. 35, 5. quoted p. 26, n. 67.

<sup>85</sup> *Theos.* No. 13, 16. quoted p. 18, n. 46.

<sup>86</sup> *Theos.* No. 13, quoted p. 18, n. 46. Has the common name Theophilus, as used in this text, the symbolic significance which the Fathers of the Church read into it when it designates the person to whom the Gospel according to Luke is addressed? The question must remain unanswered.

<sup>87</sup> Procl., *Rp.* II, 126, 14 *app. crit.* "oraculum a Chaldaicis alienum".

quotations from the Chaldæan Oracles<sup>88</sup>. He inserts it in his text because it expresses the yearning of the soul for immortality<sup>89</sup> :

‘This is also shown by the *Logion* which teaches us as follows :

“All are filled with a sweet desire always to dwell on the Olympus as the companions of the immortal gods. But not all are allowed to enter those mansions”.

<sup>88</sup> See Excursus Ia. The reverence felt by Proclus for the Chaldæan Oracles puts the supposition that he has made a mistake in quoting them out of court

<sup>89</sup> PROCL., *Rp.* II, 126, 14 f. Δηλοῖ δὲ καὶ τὸ λόγιον ταῦτα διδάσκον·

« πᾶσας μὲν γὰρ ἔχει γλυκερὸς πόθος, ὡς κεν Ὀλυμπον  
ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσι συνέμποροι αἰὲν ἔχωσιν·  
οὐ πάσαις δὲ θέμις ἐπιθήμεναι τῶνδε μελάρων·  
εἴτα τοῦ λαμβάνοντος τοὺς χρησμούς διὰ πλειόνων  
ἐκδοθέντας ἐρομένοι, τίς οὖν ἐστὶν ὁ τυχεῖον  
τῆς εἰς θεοῦ ἀνόδου, καὶ εἰ ὁ τὸν θυτικὸν βίον  
μάλιστα προσήσάμενος, ἐπάγει πάλιν ὁ θεός·  
« οὐχ ὅστις σπλάγχθοισιν ἐπίφρονι θήκατο βουλήν·  
ἤδη καὶ πρὸς Ὀλυμπον ἀποσκεδάσας τότε σῶμα  
ἧζεν ἀειρόμενος ψυχῆς κούφαις πτερύγεσσιν,  
ἀλλ’ ὅστις σο[φ]. . . »

At this point, there is a lacuna of approximately 100 letters in the unique MS., that is to say the ending of this verse as well as the one which follows, the last of the Oracle, are missing. Proclus goes on to comment upon the third verse of the first Oracle and thereupon propounds an allegoric interpretation of the first verse of the second Oracle (the term *σπλάγχνα* denotes, according to him, the carnal impulses); he characterizes the two Oracles as *θεῶν μύησεις* (see Excursus I h; m).

The form and the style of the passages of prose appertaining to this Oracle recall the double Oracles quoted by Porphyry in his *Philosophy of the Oracles*; see below n. 166. We must reckon with the possibility that Proclus has extracted this *Logion* from Porphyry’s commentary on the Myth of Plato’s Republic, a work which was his principle source (and in which Porphyry may have cited the ‘*Logion*’ as well as in the *Philosophy of the Oracles*; but this supposition does not legitimate the assumption that Proclus was misled by Porphyry’s manner of quoting into designating a non-Chaldæan Oracle as one delivered to the Theurgists.

When the recipient of this oracle which was given in full<sup>90</sup> asked who it was that was privileged to ascend towards the gods and whether it was he who in his life chose to offer up particularly frequent sacrifices<sup>91</sup>, the God began again :

“Not he that has set his reflective mind on the entrails (of the sacrificial animals) will ascend, after the dissolution of the terrestrial body, towards the Olympus and rise aloft on the light wings of the soul, but only he that is wise . . .”

Unfortunately, the following one and a half verse of the Logion are illegible in the unique manuscript of Proclus ; it is obvious that they contain a definition of the wisdom that procures immortality after death<sup>92</sup>. However, the preserved text provides sufficient evidence for including this Logion in the collection of the Oracula Chaldaica.

Thus we find that the oracle-giving god of the Chaldæans also expresses elsewhere his aversion from haruspicy : “The slicings of victims and of entrails are never true”<sup>93</sup>. He promises immortality after the “dissolution” of the body<sup>94</sup> only to those who in their life have not engaged in

<sup>90</sup> διὰ πλειόνων, in extenso, signifies, perhaps, that the Oracle had a continuation and is quoted by Proclus in an abridged form. Porphyry, too, notes in his *Philosophy of the Oracles* (e. g. Wolff, 153) that only an incomplete text of one of the oracles is known to him; he often quotes only the first verses of the oracles (see Wolff, 186).

<sup>91</sup> Cf. ΠΟΡΦ., *Vit. Plot.*, 10, φιλοθύτου δὲ γεγονότος τοῦ ἄμελιου.

<sup>92</sup> On the lacuna see p. 32, n. 89. For σο(φός) cf. note 152, concerning the designation of the Theurgists as σοφοὶ θεοφῆται. See also ΚΑΙΒΕΛ, *Carm. Epigr.* 228, 7 (Rhode, *Psyche*, II, 383, n. 2) «ναίω δ' ἠρώων ἱερὸν δόμον . . . τοῖον γὰρ βίτου τέμμα σοφοῖσιν ἐνι». Elsewhere the Chaldæan Oracles mentioned the “halls of the gods” (A. JΛΗΝ, *De Philosophia Chaldaica* [see ch. II, n. 19] I, 1 «αὐλαὶ τῶν θεῶν» etc.; imitation of *Od.* IV, 74 Ζητὸς αὐλή, imitated by SYNESIUS, *Hymn.* III, 37, 709; IV, 292), to which the disembodied soul ascends.

<sup>93</sup> “Augury is never true” : «οὐ θουσιῶν σπλάγγων τε τομαί τὰδ' ἀθύρματα πάντα»; continued p. 34, n. 95. See also ch. IV, n. 99.

<sup>94</sup> «ἀποσκεδάσας τὸδε σῶμα» applies to the dissolution of the human body through the return of its constituent parts to the elements of which it was composed; cf. ch. III, n. 164. As to the expression cf. ch. V, n. 73. The criticism of the exaggerated importance attached to sacrifices as compared with moral qualities is a commonplace of philosophical ethics.

this "vain pastime"<sup>95</sup>. The positive complement to this interdiction is stated in the concluding clause of the Oracle quoted above, which begins with the word "wise". Later on we shall be able to form an accurate idea of its nature.

This *Logion* of Proclus has the same characteristics as the quoted *Prophecies* of the *Theosophy*. Like them it contains the precise wording of a question bearing on a theological problem; and this question is followed up by the answer. The verses of this *Logion*, as well as those figuring in the *Theosophy* are called "prophecies" (*χρησμοί*). Proclus does not name the answering god; but the course of our investigation leaves no room for doubt that he was none other than Apollo, the prophesying god *par excellence*.

The *Logion* of Proclus proves that the literary form of the Chaldæan Oracles was much less simple and more variable than the quotations of the Neoplatonists would lead us to suppose. The interest of these philosophers was obviously engaged by the doctrinal passages of these texts, which, as they believed, corroborated their own teaching. Their distinctive literary form seemed, from this particular point of view, to be irrelevant. Accordingly, the choice of quotations made by the Neoplatonists could not but produce a deceptive impression. Moreover the determination of the original form of these texts is hampered by the fact that the extant Neoplatonic writings apparently quote only two Chaldæan Oracles in full, and even in these cases omit the interrogative formula<sup>96</sup>. However, an attentive examination of the problem cannot fail to discover that a number

---

<sup>95</sup> (Continued p. 33, n. 93)

«τάδ' ἀθύρματα πάντα,  
ἐμπορικῆς ἀπάτης σιληρίγματα· Φεῦγε σὺ ταῦτα  
μέλλων εὐσεβίης ἱερὸν παράδεισον ἀνοίγειν» etc.

Concerning the «Paradise» of the Chaldæans, see ch. III sect. 4. Similar animadversions on the rapacity of the magicians and soothsayers are often to be found in the writings of the ancient critics of religious belief.

<sup>96</sup> They will be quoted and interpreted ch. II. sect. 7 and 15. The first Oracle may probably be regarded as a reply to the question τί εἰσιν αἱ ἰδέει, the second to the question πῶς ἔσθι νοεῖν τὸ νοητόν.

of the Chaldæan verses quoted by the Neoplatonists conform in some of their formal characteristics to the *Prophecies* of the *Theosophy* and to the *Logion* of Proclus which we have just discussed. In many Chaldæan Oracles the god addresses directly the questioner, apostrophizes him in the second person singular, or, if his words concern mortals in general, in the second person plural<sup>97</sup>. The tone of these divine utterances is sometimes very subjective. A case in point is the attack on those "who do not know that every god is good. O fools, become sober"<sup>98</sup>! The Chaldæan Oracles speak with scathing contempt of the "herd-animals" and the "somatics"<sup>99</sup>, and stigmatize with bitter scorn the over-weening "conceit of the puny humans"<sup>100</sup>; and again and again they express their reprobation for "impure" matter<sup>101</sup>. Moreover the Chaldæan Oracles contain numerous imperatives, commandments as well as interdictions<sup>102</sup>. The gods of the Theurgists often seem to adopt the style of moralizing preachers of religion, which is also characteristic of some treatises in the Hermetic writings<sup>103</sup>. Thus, the expository mode was by no means as predominant in the Chaldæan Oracles as the quotations of the Neoplatonists would lead us to believe.

At this point we must recall that the first of the texts quoted in the present work from the *Theosophy* was not an oracle, but a hymn addressed to the Supreme God. The quotations of the Chaldæan Oracles made by Proclus and his disciples also include passages from hymns to the celestial powers; among them a fragment from a prayer to the gods

<sup>97</sup> Cf. e. g., the lines quoted ch. II, n. 181 as well as ch. IV, n. 57 and n. 68; and approximately six other instances.

<sup>98</sup> Cf. ch. V, n. 50.

<sup>99</sup> See n. 171 and ch. II, n. 395.

<sup>100</sup> See n. 165 and ch. IV, n. 98.

<sup>101</sup> See ch. V, n. 14 and *passim*.

<sup>102</sup> Approximately eight Chaldæan Oracle-verses begin with *οὐ χροῖ, οὐ θεμις, μη*: three with *χροῖ*; six with imperatives.

<sup>103</sup> The fragment quoted *supra* n. 98 is compared by Kroll p. 15, n. 2 with the Hermetic *Poinandres*, 27. Other parallels are indicated in my study *Sobria ebrietas* (Giessen 1929), 74 ff.

“who know the hypercosmic depth by thinking it”<sup>104</sup>; the beginning of a hymn that reads: “Ether, sun, pneuma of the moon, conductors of the air”<sup>105</sup>; four verses from a hymn to the spirits of the air, the earth, and the waters<sup>106</sup>. The Theurgists have been taught these prayers by the Chaldæan gods. For they believe, in accordance with a basic principle of magical science, that only the gods themselves knew the spells that could compell their presence. Proclus often affirms that the gods themselves had communicated to the founders of Chaldæan mystagogy their own divine secrets and those of the cosmic orders; a supernatural teaching that enabled these men to perform their conjurations. Hymns were also chanted in the course of the rites described in the magical papyri; and they too are supposed to have been communicated to the officiants in a like manner<sup>107</sup>.

It has been suggested that all the extant verses of the Chaldæan Oracles are extracted from a didactic theological poem<sup>108</sup>. This is highly improbable. For one thing the dialogue between the god and the human interlocutor appears to be incompatible with the assumption of a continuous exposition. The variations in the use of doctrinal terms which are to be found in the Chaldæan Oracles can be better accounted for on the supposition that these (like the *Prophecies* of the *Theosophy*) form a collection of oracular pronouncements; all of these must have been informed by an identical theological doctrine, but for the rest there was no external connection between them. They were answers given to diverse theological interrogations; and while they all reflected one coherent system,

---

<sup>104</sup> This verse (as to which see ch. II, n. 351), is introduced by Procl., *Crat.*, 57, 25 with the words λέγει δ ὕμνος, by Damascius, I, 284, 8, with οἱ Θεοὶ ἀνομνήκασι, *ibid.*, I, 291, 20, with οἱ τε ἐκδεδωκότες Θεοὶ τὰ πολυτίμητα λόγια — an example which illustrates the various ways in which the Chaldæan Oracles are quoted by the Neoplatonists. See Excursus I.

<sup>105</sup> Cf. ch. III, n. 35.

<sup>106</sup> Cf. ch. V, n. 25.

<sup>107</sup> Cf. n. 177.

<sup>108</sup> Thus Wendland (see above p. 3 n. 1), followed by CHRIST-SCHMID, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*, II, 2<sup>6</sup> p. 975, ÜBERWEG-PRAECHTER, *Philosophie des Altertums* 11 (Berlin 1926), 523, and others. Kroll himself does not seem to have recorded his opinion as to the literary form of the Chaldæan Oracles.

they propose in each particular case a new formula. A decisive argument in favour of this view is furnished by the title of the work from which the Chaldæan Oracles derive: the natural unbiased interpretation of *λόγια δι' ἐπῶν* is "Oracles in Verses"<sup>109</sup>. It seems probable that their authors introduced each particular Oracle which they edited by a brief remark relating the occasion on which it was given; and a few of these remarks must have been preserved, sometimes *verbatim*, in the text adopted by Porphyry.

The fact that the *Prophecies* quoted in the *Theosophy* (which as we have shown derive from Porphyry's capital work on the *Philosophy of the Oracles*) are not referred to by Proclus and his disciples calls for an explanation. It can hardly be due to chance. We may suppose that the later Neoplatonists (perhaps already Iamblichus) have singled out one particular group out of the collection of the Theurgists in order to canonize it if we may use this expression. A parallel instance can be found in their treatment of the Orphic literature. One only of these texts, a long theogonic poem (*ὁ ἱερός λόγος*), comprising 24 rhapsodies, which was likewise first introduced to the Neoplatonists by Porphyry, was considered by the later members of this school as the authentic document of Orphism; and it was the only one quoted by Proclus<sup>110</sup>. The Chaldæan literature may have been subjected to a similar process of selection.

<sup>109</sup> The various meanings of *ἐπη* are 1° poems or verses in hexameters; 2° oracles, because they were usually delivered in hexameters; cf. *e. g.* Eus., *Pr. Ev.*, XI. 6, 37, *δι' ἐπῶν φήσας*, and *P. Mag.*, I. 328, *περι ἐποποιίας*; 3° poetry in general, even lyrics, or verses of poetry. See below n. 200.

<sup>110</sup> Cf. RONDÉ, *Psyche*, II, 414 f.; KERN, *Orphic. Fr.*, p. 140 f. Though Damascius sets forth another Orphic theogony (*Fr.* 54 Kern), all the verses he quotes are extracted from the *ἱερός λόγος* (called by him I, 317, *14 ἡ συνήθης Ὀρφικῆ Θεολογία*; see also 378, 6).

It seems that the reason for which the Neoplatonists singled out the *ἱερός λόγος* among the other Orphic texts and invested it with a canonical authority, may be found in its proem: for it is there that Orpheus claims to have written down his chants under the dictation of the god Apollo, who thus vouchsafed him the revelation for which he had prayed (about this proem see KERN, *Orphic. Fr.* 62, p. 145. RONDÉ, *Psyche*, II, 113, n. 1. NORDEN, *Vergilius Aeneis Buch VI*, p. 208 f.).

However we may also envisage another explanation. In the writings of the later Neoplatonists we find some infrequent citations of works of Julian the Theurgist other than the Chaldæan Oracles. Thus Proclus quotes from a work bearing the title *On the Celestial Zones* (otherwise unknown) the paraphrase of a hymn to Chronos, with which the Theurgists conjured the god<sup>111</sup>. The next chapter will show that this God of Eternity is identical with the Aion of the *Prophecies* of the *Theosophy*, and that the very peculiar conceptions on which this hymn is based conform in every particular to the doctrines of the Chaldæan Oracles. It follows that at least one of the other works of Julian also contained magical hymns of which he was the author and that these derive from a theosophical system identical with that of the Chaldæan Oracles. It may thus be argued that the Oracles quoted by Proclus and the *Prophecies* quoted by Porphyry are extracted from two different collections of revealed Chaldæan verses. In any case, one thing is certain: the Chaldæan Oracles quoted by Proclus and by his disciples do not differ either in their style or in their tenets from the *Prophecies* quoted by Porphyry. In consequence, the fact that the *Prophecies* of the *Theosophy* with which we are concerned are not mentioned in the writings of Proclus' school can by no means be regarded a sufficient reason for contesting the attribution of these texts to the Chaldæans<sup>112</sup>.

2. *The ritual oracles.*—The Chaldæan theurgists did not confine themselves to a theoretical exposition of the relationship between God, the world and man; as their very name implies<sup>113</sup> (*Θεουργός* meaning “worker

<sup>111</sup> See ch. II, n. 150 and n. 155.

<sup>112</sup> Kroll, 9, mentions the *χρησμοί* collected in the *Theosophy* and in Porphyry's *Philosophy of the Oracles* but, because they are not quoted by the later Neoplatonists, he denies the possibility of their belonging to the Chaldæan Oracles. On p. 69 he cites from Porphyry's *Philosophy of the Oracles* an oracle of Hecate as a parallel to the Chaldæan Oracles of Hecate, but without recognising the Chaldæan origin of this text. The same is true with the quotation from the *Theosophy* (Nr. 15: see ch. II, n. 63) adduced by Kroll p. 68, n. 3.

<sup>113</sup> The term “theurgy” is a Chaldæan neologism; as to its exact meaning and history, see Excursus IV.



of divine things"), they were also the initiators into the rites and the mysteries of a sacramental community, the priests of which were able by their magical craft to render the higher powers subject to their will. Thus their secret cult is a blend of sublime mysticism, centring in the noetic Fire, and of magical materialism. Several of its ceremonies are described by Proclus and by the Byzantine Neo-Platonist Psellus (whose information derives from the Athenian philosopher). But to eke out our knowledge of the mystagogy of the theurgists we must once more have recourse to a series of oracles quoted by Porphyry in his *Philosophy of the Oracles*. The identification and interpretation of this new group of documents will form the subject-matter of the second half of the first chapter. A full account of the Chaldæan ritual, the neglect of which by Kroll detracts—as Bidez has pointed out<sup>114</sup>—from the validity of his conclusions, will be given in the course of an exposition of the complete theurgical system.

The persons officiating at the secret gatherings were : the priests, the "callers" (*κλήτορες*) and the "recipients" (*δοχεῖς*)<sup>115</sup>. The preserved texts furnish no information as to the functions of the members of the first group ; those of the second invoked the gods with magical formulæ and compelled them to appear ; those of the third "received" the conjured god, and served as a medium for his oracle.

We find in the works of Proclus only one verse referring to the function of the Chaldæan "recipients" ; one of the Chaldæan gods utters the enigmatic words : "The recipient's wretched heart does not sustain me"<sup>116</sup>. The meaning of these words becomes clearer if they are taken

<sup>114</sup> See BIDEZ-CUMONT, *Magies helléniques*, I. 163.

<sup>115</sup> PROCL. *Rp.* II. 246, 23 f. *καὶ οἱ τῶν Θεῶν* (see Excursus I b) *ἱεροὶ* (or, according to a probable emendation, *ἱερεῖς*; see note 139) *καὶ οἱ κλήτορες καὶ οἱ δοχεῖς πολυειδέσιν ἐχρῶντο χιτῶσιν καὶ καταζώσεσιν, μιμούμενοι τὰς Θεῖας ζωάς* (i. e. the zodiac cf. PROCL. *Tim.* I 60. 26), *εἰς ἃς ἀνήγον τὴν ἐαυτῶν πραγματείαν* (magical operation); cf. below ch. IV. n. 29, IDEM, *Crat.* 100, 21 *αἱ Θεουργίαι τοὺς μὲν κλήτορας καὶ τοὺς δοχέας . . . προκαθαίρειν παρακλύονται*; see notes 11 and 139, and ch. IV, note 1 (b).

<sup>116</sup> Procl. *Rp.*, I, 111, 28 f. (Kroll 9) :

« Οὐ φέρει με τοῦ δοχῆος ἡ τάλαινα καρδιά », φησὶν τις Θεῶν, *δοχέως cod. corr.*

in conjunction with a group of isolated verses quoted by Porphyry in his *Philosophy of the Oracles* <sup>117</sup>. These purport to be exclamations uttered by invoked gods and express their desire to be "loosed" so as to return to their own place. The quotation transmitted by Proclus is more particularly paralleled by the following verse of this group: "Loose the Ruler at last. The mortal can no longer contain the god" <sup>118</sup>. The Chaldæans and others apply the title "Ruler" (ἄναξ) to Apollo <sup>119</sup>; it is he who possesses the "recipient" and who demands to be loosed, as the mortal can no longer "contain" him. We may accordingly suppose that the "recipient" had "contained" the god <sup>120</sup> for some length of time and that the latter had spoken out of his mouth. Either of the two quoted verses probably formed the conclusion of an oracle uttered by the god while sojourning in the body of his "recipient". In another verse cited by Porphyry the god himself imparts the knowledge of the magical rite which "looses" him: "Spread out the cloud of linen, and loose the recipient" <sup>121</sup>. In this case at least the "loosing" was effected by means of a magical ceremony <sup>122</sup>.

The function of the officiant who "received" the oracle-giving god, and who becomes as it were his abiding place for as long as he can sustain him, corresponds to that of the Pythia and of other prophetesses who are possessed by the god. The Jewish Sibyl and the one described by

Wolff, 160, 6; *prob.* Kroll. Wolff, 163, 3 mentions that one MS. has *δοχέα* instead of *δοχήη* in the verse quoted note 121. As to the metrical form of the fragment see below note 200.

<sup>117</sup> *ap.* EUSEB. *Praep. Ev.*, V, 9, 1. Cf. Wolff, 162, ff.

<sup>118</sup> « Λύετε λοιπὸν ἀνακτὰ βροτῶς θεὸν οὐκέτι χωρεῖν ».

<sup>119</sup> See below note 184.

<sup>120</sup> As to *χωρεῖν θεὸν* see *e. g.*, LAMBL. *Myst.*, III, 11, p. 125, 6; and the speech addressed by the gnostic Marcus to the prophetess, Iren. 1, 13, 3 *χώρησον αὐτὸν (τὸν νόμφιον) καὶ χωρήθητι ἐν αὐτῷ*; cf. REITZENSTEIN, *Poimandres*, 19, 2 and 221.

<sup>121</sup> EUSEB. *Praep. Ev.*, V, 9, 6:

« Συνδόκος ἀμπέτασον νεφέλην λύσον τε δοχήη ». See Wolff, 163.

<sup>122</sup> *νεφέλη* probably means in this connection, as Vigerus remarks (see Wolff 163, 3), "fine cloth": cf. Publ. Syri fragm. *ap.* PETRON., *Cena*, 55 "*nebula lineæ*". On the use of linen (*σινδῶν*) for magical conjurations see ABT, *Die Apologie des Apuleius (Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten, IV, 2, 1908)*, p. 215 f.

Virgil experience an anguish similar to that of the "recipient"<sup>123</sup>. An even closer parallel to the Chaldæan Oracles is to be found in Lucan's naturalistic description of the raging Pythia who almost collapses under the burden of the god who possesses her and speaks out of her mouth<sup>124</sup>. The Delphic priestess visited by the god is often compared to a woman that conceives<sup>125</sup>. The term "recipient" applied by the Chaldæans to their prophets originated in similar materialistic notions. It is a noteworthy fact that this term is only found in the Chaldæan Oracles and in the two verses quoted by Porphyry; it is not encountered in any Greek text independent of Chaldæan tradition<sup>126</sup>. It appears to have been a neologism coined by the Chaldæans, who systematically derived from the verbe employed in their terminology *nomina agentis* designating either the officiants of their cult or cosmic powers<sup>127</sup>.

The conjuration which ended with the god being "loosed" began with his being "bound". The power of the magician consists in binding and in loosing<sup>128</sup>. For this reason, the formula of the invocation (*ἐπι-κλησις*) is often followed in the magical papyri by the formula that "looses" (*ἀπόλυσις*) the demon and sends him back to his own place without his

<sup>123</sup> οὐκέτι χωρεῖ (see n. 117) is paralleled by VIRGIL, *Aeneid*, VI, 77 «*Phoebi nondum patiens*»; and οὐ φέρεί με (see n. 116) by LUCAN, VI, 174 «*te, Phoebe, ferens*». Cf. also *Orac. Sibyll.*, III, 4. See NORDEN, *Vergilius Aeneis Buch VI*, p. 144.

<sup>124</sup> Lucan, V, 161. ff. See REITZENSTEIN, *Hellenist. Mysterienrel.*<sup>3</sup>, 323 f.

<sup>125</sup> ORIGEN, *c. Cels.*, VII, 3, ἡ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος προφητῆς δέχεται πνεῦμα διὰ τῶν γυναικείων κόλπων (similarly STRABO, IX, 3, 5; 419 C); other examples are quoted by NORDEN, *op. cit.*, 146. Cf. especially LUCAN, V, 163 «*Concepit pectore numen*». IANBL., *Myst.*, III, 11, p. 127, 7 (RORDE, *Psyche*, II, 60, 3). HOFFNER, *O. Z.*, II, 277 f.

<sup>126</sup> The testimonies referring to the *δοχεύς* were collected by LOBECK, *Aglaophamus*, 108 and WOLFF, 160, 6. Only the passages quoted above in the notes 115, 116, 120 have a firsthand evidential value, as IANBL., *Myst.*, III, 6 (quoted n. 137), HERNIAS, in *Plat. Phaedr.*, p. 105, 2 Ast (to be compared with Proclus *ap. PSELL.*, *Script. min.*, p. 248, 8 f. Kurtz-Drexl), Proclus (quoted n. 133), SYNESIUS, *Epist. CL* and EUSEB., *Praep. Ev.*, III, 16, 2 (quoted in the notes 136 and 176) draw upon the Chaldæan Oracles.

<sup>127</sup> e. g. ἀναγωγεύς, ἀνοχεύς, συνοχεύς. See Excursus, III, 1 a.

<sup>128</sup> See G. KITTEL, *Theolog. Wörterbuch zum N. T.*, s. v. δέω and λύω. The composita ἀπολύω and ἐκλύω are used in the same sense.

doing any harm<sup>129</sup>. In the Chaldæan mysteries both rites, the invocation and the "loosing", were probably performed by the "callers".

Several texts speak of the theurgists' binding and loosing. For instance, Porphyry in his treatise *On the Return of the Soul*, which discusses the principal doctrines of Julian the Chaldæan. He relates there that a Chaldæan charged the failure of his magical operations upon another practiser of the occult arts: for the latter had bound the powers conjured by the Chaldæan, who was unable to loose them<sup>130</sup>. Porphyry's narration is corroborated by Psellus, according to whom the Chaldæans used to bind and to loose the gods<sup>131</sup>. These texts enable us to interpret the meaning of the following verse of the Chaldæan Oracles, transmitted by Proclus:

"The sluggish mortal, who turns (his mind) thither (to the earth), is the loosing of the god"<sup>132</sup>.

The Oracle signifies that the theurgist whose mind turns to earthly thoughts is unable to hold the conjured up god and to prevent his taking himself off<sup>133</sup>. "Hätt ich die Kraft dich anzuziehn besessen, so hätt ich

<sup>129</sup> As to these magical rites see HOPFNER, *O.-Z.*, I, 878. See also below, ch. IV, II, 79.

<sup>130</sup> PORPHYR. *Regr.*, p. 29, 16 f. ed. Bidez. See below, ch. V, n. 105-6.

<sup>131</sup> PSELLUS, *Script. min.*, p. 446, 25 Kurtz-Drexel (see also BIDEZ, *Mélanges Cumont*, 93, 5) οἱ Χαλδαῖοι. . . κατάγουσι τε τοὺς πρὸ ἐαυτοῖς Θεοὺς Θελεκτηρίοις ᾠδαῖς (see n. 184) καὶ δεσμοῦσι καὶ λύουσιν. See ch. V, n. 109.

<sup>132</sup> PROCL., *Parm.*, 1094, 25 (Kroll 56) τὸ περὶ τῶν Θεῶν ῥηθέν, λέγον ὡς ἄρα « Ἐκλυσις ἐστὶ Θεοῦ καθρὸς βροτῶς ἐς τὰδ' ἔχων (νοῦν). » The MSS., have ἐς τὰδ' ἔχων, I propose to complement νοῦν. Cousin corrects ἐς τὰδε νεῦν. The words ἐς τὰδε probably refer to the ὑλικὰ πάθη described in the preceding verse.

The positive statement is found in another fragment of the Oracles quoted by Procl., *Tim.*, I, 212, 17 (Kroll 56):

« Διθύονται βροτῶ κριπινοὶ μάκαρες τελέθουσιν ».

<sup>133</sup> Proclus, quoted by PSELLUS, *Script. min.*, p. 249, 5 f., states that the apparition of gods often sets in motion material spirits (ὕλικὰ πνεύματα), "whose violent onslaught cannot be borne by the weaker recipients" (οὐ φέρουσιν οἱ ἀσθενέστεροι δοχεῖς). Apparently, Proclus refers in this passage to a lost Chaldæan Oracle: cf. note 126.

According to a basic doctrine of Chaldæan demonology, the hylic spirits are attracted to men whose life is dominated by physical impulse.

dich zu halten keine Furcht", says Faust to the invoked Spirit of the Earth. For this reason, the Chaldæans and the magicians enjoined upon the adepts of their art to mortify their body and thus purify themselves from every material pollution <sup>134</sup>.

While, as regards the practice of the rites of *epiclesis* and *apolyxis*, the magicians had much in common with the Chaldæans, they did not seem to have recognized the need of an officiant—other than the "caller"—whose particular function was that of the "recipient". We do not find in the entire magical literature, consisting of the papyri and of the literary texts, a single mention of a "recipient" into whom the god or the demon enters and out of whose mouth he speaks. Moreover such a medium seems unnecessary, for the invoked god, or one of his ministering spirits, appear in person or enter into the "caller" <sup>135</sup>. We may therefore suppose that the Chaldæans derived their conception of the "recipient" (as well as their idea of the function performed by Apollo) from oracular usage.

This supposition is corroborated by an oracle of Apollo which Porphyry quotes in full; he is justified in considering this oracle a classical example of prophetic pneumatology :

"The stream separating from the splendour of Phoebus on high, and enveloped in the sonorous breath of the pure air, falls enchanted by songs and by ineffable words about the head of the blameless recipient. It fills the soft integument of the tender membranes, ascending through the stomach and rising up again, and it produces out of the mortal pipe (or flute) a lovely song" <sup>136</sup>.

<sup>134</sup> See ch. iv. n. 1. Cf. HOPFNER, *O.-Z.*, I. § 838 ff.

<sup>135</sup> Cf. the passages quoted by DIETERICH, *Mithrasliturgie*, 97, and NORDEN (see note 123).

<sup>136</sup> PORPH., *ap.*, *Eus.*, *Praep. Ev.*, V. 8, 11 (Wolff 160, *Anthol. Graec.*, III, p. 495, No. 158 Didot) : *καὶ πάλιν ὁ Ἀπόλλων.*

Ἐϋμα τὸ Φοιβείης ἀπονεύμενον ὑψόθεν αἴγλης  
 πνοιῇ ὑπαι λιγυρῇ κεκαλυμμένον ἥερος ἀγνοῦ  
 θελγόμενον μολπαῖσι καὶ ἀρρήτοις ἐπέεσσι,  
 κάμπτεσεν ἀμφὶ κάρηνον ἀμωμήτοιο δοχῆος·  
 λεπταλέων ὑμένων μαλακὸν δ' ἐνέπλησε χιτῶνα,  
 ἀμβολάδην δ' ἀ γαστήρος ἀνεσσόμενον παλινόρσον·  
 αὐλοῦ δ' ἐκ βροτέοιο φίλην ἐτεκνώσατο φωνήν.

Wolff, 161, supposes unnecessarily that there is a lacuna of one verse after v. 4.

The following explanatory remarks of Porphyry may help us to understand this oracle : "No description could be clearer, diviner, and more in accordance with nature. For the descending pneuma, having entered as an effluence of the celestial power into the organic and animate body, and using the soul as a base (there is no allusion to this point in the Oracles) gives forth a sound through the mouth as through an instrument" <sup>137</sup>.

In the first place, the points in which this Oracle of Apollo concurs with the Chaldæan Oracles will be indicated.

a) The Chaldæan term "recipient" figures in this oracle.

b) The "recipient" is described in it as "blameless". This attribute can only be understood here as signifying ritual integrity <sup>138</sup>. In the Chaldæan Oracles, the "priest of the holy fire" who, according to Proclus, was the performer of the Chaldæan mysteries of Apollo, is bidden to cleanse himself in sea-water before he proceeds with his sacred

δέ is placed towards the end of v. 5 in order to produce a positional long syllable. This is in accordance with the practice of the Chaldæans; cf. e. g. the fragment quoted ch. v, n. 116 (v. 1). It may be remembered that the position of δέ in poetic texts is much less determined than in prose.

Eus., *Praep. Ev.*, III, 16, 1 : Οὐ γὰρ δὴ ὁ ἥλιος οὐρανόθεν αὐτοῖς καταβάς, ἐπειτα τὸν δοχέα πληρώσας, τὸν χρησμὸν ἀπεφοίβιζεν (continued note 174) is, as Wolff 160, 6 points out, a paraphrase of this oracle.

<sup>137</sup> Eus. *Praep. Ev.*, V, 8, 12, (Wolff 160) Τούτων οὔτε σαφέστερα οὔτε θειώτερα καὶ φυσικώτερα γένοιτ' ἂν πνεῦμα γὰρ τὸ κατιὸν καὶ ἀπόρροια ἐκ τῆς ἐπουρανίου δυνάμεως εἰς ὀργανικὸν σῶμα καὶ ἐμψυχον εἰσελθούσα, βάσει χρωμέτη τῆ ψυχῆ, διὰ τοῦ στόματος ὡς ὀργάνου φωνὴν ἀποδίδωσιν. IAMBLL., *Myst.*, III, 6, p. 112, 10 ff. paraphrases the same Oracle, as already remarked by Th. Gale in his notes *ad loc.*, p. 222.

Σαφέστερα indicates the realistic, θειώτερα the metaphysical, φυσικώτερα the anatomic aspect of the description given by the Oracle. Porphyry interpreted the Oracle as containing an allusion to the soul, in order to support his doctrine of the Pneuma (cf. Dodds, *Proclus*, etc. 314).

<sup>138</sup> ἀμωμος viz ἀμώμητος figures as attribute of unblemished victims in the Jewish-Hellenistic literature. JOSEPHUS, *bell.*, V, 229 uses this epithet for the priests of the temple in Jerusalem.

task. And like him, the “callers” and the “recipients” had, according to another statement of Proclus, to undergo purifying ceremonies before they accomplished their theurgical functions <sup>139</sup>.

c) The stream of prophetic pneuma springs forth from the “splendour of Phoebus”, that is to say, from the sun. The hymn of the “Theosophy” quoted above <sup>140</sup> also considers the oracle-giving Apollo as identical with the ruler of the sun. According to the Chaldæan conception, the sun’s existence is maintained by the noetic primordial Fire, while the solar rays bring about the mystic illumination <sup>141</sup>. The luminous stream of prophetic pneuma likewise originates in the divine substance which the sun is deemed to be <sup>142</sup>.

d) The prophetic pneuma, in the course of its descent from the etherial zone, is “enveloped in air”. According to a kindred Chaldæan doctrine, the fiery spark of the human soul, during its descent from its super-celestial place of origin into the earthly body, acquires a vesture formed out of the substances of the spheres which it traverses <sup>143</sup>. The aerial envelope of the prophetic pneuma corresponds to the outermost layer of this psychic body; for, as the last of the cosmic zone to be traversed consists of air, this layer is formed out of that substance <sup>144</sup>.

e) In the prophet’s body the luminous pneuma is transformed into a voice which utters the oracle. This metamorphosis is described with anatomical accuracy. The pneuma “falls about the head of the recipient”, is inhaled by him, and thus enters the stomach; then it ascends and becomes a breath, which makes the vocal tube resound like a “flute”

<sup>139</sup> PROCL., *Crat.*, 101, 6 (see note 11).

«Αὐτὸς δ’ ἐν πρώτοις ἱερέυς πυρὸς ἔργα κυβερνῶν κύματι ῥαινέσθω πιγερωῦ βαρυχέου ἀλμυρῆς,» ὡς Φησι τὸ λόγιον περὶ αὐτοῦ, and *ibidem*, 100, 21 f., quoted note 115. As to the purification by sea water see ch. IV, n. 1.

<sup>140</sup> See above, note 46 (v. 8).

<sup>141</sup> See above, note 46.

<sup>142</sup> See below, note 191.

<sup>143</sup> See ch. III, sect. 1.

<sup>144</sup> Cf. also NOXNUS, *Paraphr. Ev. Joh.*, I, 115, αἰθερίων κατανεύμενον... κόλπων Θεοῦ

(*αὐλός* signifies both "vocal tube" and "flute", the musical instrument). Thus, the corporal organs of the "recipient" serve as the instruments of the god.

This conception which supposes that the human body is possessed by the god and that the "recipient", when in the state of enthusiasm, is entirely passive, conforms to notions that were widely disseminated in later Antiquity. According to Plutarch, the interrogators of the Pythia believed that the god—like the demon in the case of the soothsaying ventriloquists—entered into the body of the prophetess<sup>145</sup>, spoke out of her mouth and used her voice as an instrument. Philo is persuaded that the words uttered by a genuine prophet do not belong to him, but to Another, Whose interpreter he is. He compares him to a musical instrument touched by God. His mouth and his tongue are organs which, in accordance with unknown laws, give forth melodious speech. Philo, personally, has experienced states in which an invisible pneuma speaks out of him<sup>146</sup>. Similar views are evinced in the ecstatic speeches of the Christian gnostic Montanus, a contemporary of the author of the Chaldaean Oracles. Like the latter, Montanus delivers the speech of the spirit by whom he is possessed in the first person, and speaks of himself in the third. His "spirit" also uses the simile of the musical instrument. "Behold, the man is like a lyre, and I fly up to him like a plectrum"<sup>147</sup>.

The voice of the pneuma is compared in the Oracle to a pipe (or to a flute). The mystical character of this simile is obscured by the anatomical aetiology, the precision of which has its counterpart in the explanation of the musical instrument given by Plutarch and Philo. In Hellenistic literature, the image of the flute of the spirit is encountered

<sup>145</sup> PLUTARCH, *def. orac.*, 9; cf. RODE, *Psyche*, II, 60, 3. HOPFNER, *O.-Z.*, II, S 276.

<sup>146</sup> Cf. REITZENSTEIN, *Poimandres*, 204, 1.

<sup>147</sup> MONTANUS, *ap.*, EPIPHAN., *Panar. Haer.*, XLVIII, 4, 1, ἰδοῦ, ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὡσεὶ λύρα καὶ ἐφίπταται ὡσεὶ πλῆκτρον. Cf. also *Odes of Salomo*, (the translation according to the edition of R. R. Harris and Mingana, vol. II, Manchester, 1920) VI, 1-2: "As the hand moves over the harp and the strings speak, so speaks in my members the Spirit of the Lord"; *ibid.*, XIV, 8; XXVI, 3. The Syriac poet Narsai (s. v) was called the "Lyre of the Holy Ghost"; A. BAUMSTARK, *Geschichte der syrischen Literatur* (BONN 1922), 110.



only in one other passage<sup>148</sup>. It is however frequently employed in Persian mystical poetry which expresses, with an unsurpassed plenitude, the potential motifs of mystical language.

f) The realistic description of the *epiclesis*<sup>149</sup> of the prophetic spirit and of his effluence is akin, in its insistence on material details, to the Chaldæan account of the Fire which flows through channels (that is the solar rays) out of the sun to the earth, and is inhaled by the initiate. The "recipient" and the initiate are enkindled by the selfsame substance.

g) This pneuma is moved to descend by "enchanting songs" and "ineffable words". These terms designate the hymns and the magical formulæ recited by the "callers". Some information regarding these conjurations can be drawn from several of the oracles quoted in Porphyry's work *On the Philosophy of the Oracles*. The terminology and the tenets of these oracles point once more to a Chaldæan origin.

The first of the oracles which will now engage our attention is delivered by Hecate. This goddess plays a capital part in Chaldæan theology. She is the Cosmic Soul, who manifests herself to the Theurgist and reveals her place in the divine hierarchy : "I dwell behind the Father's thoughts, I, the Soul, who with heat, do ensoul all things"<sup>150</sup>. Proclus and the members of his school have also transmitted other Chaldæan Oracles purporting to have been uttered by Hecate. The oracles of this almighty goddess which have been preserved by Porphyry are likewise numerous. One of them is set apart from the others by its terminology and literary form, which point to a Chaldæan origin<sup>151</sup> :

"Among the immortal gods Hecate has never said to the wise spokesmen

<sup>148</sup> ATHENAGORAS, *Apology*, ch. 9, describes the prophets of the Old Testament who spoke in ecstacy *συγχερησαμένου τοῦ πνεύματος, ὡς εἰ καὶ ἀλητῆς ἀλλὸν ἐμπνεύσαι*. J. GEFFCKEN, *Zwei griechische Apologeten* (1907), p. 180 draws attention to parallel passages in Philo collected by Reitzenstein (see note 146).

<sup>149</sup> See p. 41.

<sup>150</sup> See ch. II, scct. 4.

<sup>151</sup> The oracle of Hecate quoted in the subsequent note is cited by Kroll, 69. because of the close analogy it presents to the Chaldæan Oracles. He did not however discern its origin.

of the gods anything vain or unfulfilled ; but descending out of the domain of the Father from the omnipotent Intellect, she is always irradiated by Truth, and about her stays firm Understanding striding with irrefragable words. Now, call me with a binding spell. For thou leadest such a mighty goddess as was able to ensoul the highest world of all" <sup>152</sup>.

Hecate, the primordial source of all life, "ensouls", according to a Chaldæan Oracle <sup>153</sup>, a) the Light, b) the Fire, c) the Ether, and d) the Worlds ; that is to say : a) the god Aion, who is the "Father-begotten Light", b) the fiery sphere of the Empyrean, c) the ether, d) the planetary spheres situated in the ether. The "highest world of all", the ensouling of which is alone alleged by Hecate in the oracle quoted by Porphyry as proof of her infinite power, is according by the fiery zone in which the noetic entities subsist.

Hecate "descends" from the "omnipotent Intellect", who figures here, once more, as the potency charged with accomplishing the Will of the Father, Who has no contact with the lower orders of the celestial hierarchy <sup>154</sup>. Hecate indicates in this utterance that she the Cosmic Soul

<sup>152</sup> Eus., *Praep. Ev.*, V. 71 (Wolff 122, *Anthol. Graec.*, III, p. 503, No. 194) :

« Οὐδὲν ἐν ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖς ποτε διὰ μάταιον  
οὐδ' ἀκράντων ἔλεξε σοφοῖς Ἐκάτη θεοφύταις  
ἀλλ' ἀπὸ παγκρήτιοιο νόου πατρόθεν κτιοῦσα  
αἰὲν Ἀληθειῇ σελαγίζεται, ἀμφὶ δὲ Μητις  
ἐμπεδος ἀρήκτοισι μένει λογίοις βεβρυῖα·  
Δεσμῶ δ' οὖν κλήιζε· θεῖην γὰρ ἀγεις με τοσήνδε,  
ἄσση ψυχῶσαι πανυπέρτατον ἤρκεσα κόσμον. »

Two corrections proposed by Wolff (v. 3 *παγκρατεροῖο*; v. 5 *βεβρυα*), may be left out of account. WILANOWITZ, *Griechische Verskunst*, 372, 3 substitutes on the authority of the later MSS of Eusebius v. 2 *θεοφοίτοις* (= *φοιτηταῖς θεῶν*) for *θεοφύταις*, but the «unglaubliche» formation of the latter word corresponds exactly to that of *θεουργός*; see Excursus IV, and cf. also the nouns *θεοφάντωρ*, *θεόφημος* etc. His correction v. 3 *παγκράνταο* cannot be accepted in the light of the parallel passages in the Chaldæan Oracles; cf. ch. II, note 74.

The last verse of the Oracle quoted above imitates *Iliad*, V, 839 *δεινὴν γὰρ ἄγην θεῶν* and alludes, at the same time, to the magical term *ἀγωγή* (see ch. II, n. 15), viz. *θεαγωγή*.

<sup>153</sup> See ch. II, n. 83 (a), v. 3.

<sup>154</sup> *πατρόθεν* or *ἐκ πατρὸς* always indicates in the Ch. Or. the mediate action of the transcendent Father of the gods; cf. II, n. 48.

is an offspring of the First Intellect. The passage in which, affirming the truth of her oracles, she recalls this descent has its counterpart in a Chaldæan Oracle which states that "nothing unaccomplished rushes (i. e. proceeds) from the Paternal Principle" <sup>155</sup>.

Hecate is the goddess from whom the infallible prophecies of the "wise spokesmen of the gods" derive. This function is common to her and to the Apollo of the Chaldæan mysteries. Both of them deliver oracles; and as we shall see, Apollo, too, was invoked by the theurgists by means of binding spells.

The similarity between the Chaldæan Apollo and Hecate is not only manifested in the fact of their being the two oracle-giving divinities; it is also evinced by their localisation in the universe. Hecate proclaims that she is "irradiated by Truth" (*ἀληθεια*) and that "about her stays firm Understanding striding with irrefragable words". The verbs appear to indicate that the terms "Truth" and "Understanding" apply to astral powers <sup>156</sup>. According to the popular belief adopted by the Chaldæans, Hecate is the mistress of the moon <sup>157</sup>; consequently she receives light from the all-seeing Sun, who as the abode of the oracle-giving Apollo was worshipped as a symbol of Truth <sup>158</sup>. "Understanding" who stays about the moon "striding with irrefragable words" (*ἀρρηκτοισι λογίοισι*) must accordingly connote the spiritual faculty of the planet Mercury-Hermes, the sphere of which revolves around that of the moon. This planet appears to have been endowed with this particular quality because

<sup>155</sup> Cf. ch. II, n. 191.

<sup>156</sup> *ἀμφεβαίνω* (in prose *περιτρέχω*, *περιπολέω*), is applied to the course of the sun in *Iliad.*, VIII, 68, and to that of the moon in ps. MANETHO, *Apotelesm.*, A[E] 277 B[A] 391. For v. 4 of the Oracle see NONNUS, *Dion.*, I, 175 *Ἡελίῳ σελάγιζε . . . Σελήνη*.

<sup>157</sup> See ch. II, n. 92-93.

<sup>158</sup> Apollo, because of his being the god of the oracles, is often called the incarnation of Truth; e. g. AESCH., *Eum.*, 615 *μάντις ὧν δ' οὐ ψεύσομαι*; PLATO, *Crat.*, 405 c 2; *Anth. Pal.*, IX, 525 (*εἰς Ἀπόλλωνα*), v. 24; DIOG. LAERT., VIII, 21; TERENCE, *Andria*, 698; CICERO, *Ep., ad Brut.*, I, 2, 6; OVID, *Ars amat.*, III, 789. The Neoplatonic worship of the sun as the image of Truth (according to PLATO, *Rep.*, 517 c) may also be recalled in this connection; cf. e. g. JULIAN, *Or.*, IV, 133 A; PROCL., *Crat.*, 78, 24, F. 101, 9, F., *Parm.*, 188, 13. See ch. II, n. 312.

of its being the dwelling-place of "Eloquent (*λόγιος*) Hermes". Thus this oracle of Hecate seems to prove that the planets, identified by the Chaldæan theurgists with the Greek gods whose name they bore, could also be designated by the distinctive virtues of these gods. Planetary virtues of a similar nature are mentioned several times in the Chaldæan Oracles. Thus Hecate is once characterized as containing in herself the "source of virtue"<sup>159</sup>, a description due to her being the mistress of the moon; the supposed faculty of which was in this case determined by her traditional connection with Proserpina, known as "The Virgin" (*Κόρη*). According to another oracle "Virtue, Wisdom and thoughtful Truth are manifested" within Cosmic Soul (i. e. within the intramundane zone "engirdled" by this entity)<sup>160</sup>. The verb "manifested" indicates once again that we are confronted with an astral allegory. Virtue being the moon and Truth the sun, Wisdom placed between the two can be identified, with some degree of probability, with the "Understanding" of the oracle of Hecate quoted by Porphyry, viz. with the planet Mercury; this explanation fails however to account for the omission of the planet Venus situated between Mercury and the sun. The faculties of "Virtue, Wisdom and Good-rule" which, according to a third oracle, "are met together" in the Chaldæan paradise also seem to indicate planetary virtues<sup>161</sup>. Though the details of the proposed interpretations of these passages may not be equally convincing, we seem to have established that the Oracles described in the extant texts as Chaldæan, as well as the Oracle of Hecate quoted by Porphyry, designate the planets by the names of their qualities. This point of agreement lends further strength to the view which attributes to the latter Oracle a Chaldæan origin.

<sup>159</sup> See ch. II, note 83 (*b*), v. 1.

<sup>160</sup> *DAI.*, II, 45, 10 (Kroll 27) *Διὰ τοῦτο οἶμαι καὶ ἐφάνησαν ἐν αὐτῇ (τῇ μέσῃ τάξει τῶν νοερῶν) ἡ τε ἀρετὴ καὶ ἡ σοφία καὶ ἡ πολύφρων ἀτρέκεια κατὰ τὸ λόγιον.*

The verse probably read :

« ἐνθ' ἀρετῇ σοφίῃ τε καὶ ἡ πολύφρων ἀτρέκεια . . . ἐφάνησιν ». Ἀτρέκεια is the epic equivalent of ἀλήθεια. The "midmost of the intellectual orders" is that of Hecate-Psyché; cf. ch. II, n. 283, 286 and Excursus VII. (ἀνα)φαίνεσθαι points to an intramundane order.

<sup>161</sup> « ἐνθ' ἀρετῇ σοφίῃ τε καὶ εὐνομίῃ συναγοντι ». Cf. ch. III, n. 177. ch. IV, n. 99.

At least twelve other fragments of oracles of Hecate quoted in Porphyry's treatise *On the Philosophy of the Oracles* have come down to us. Some points of difference (enumerated in the notes)<sup>162</sup> prove that

<sup>162</sup> The non-Chaldæan origin of one of these Oracles of Hecate (Eus., *Pr. Ev.*, V, 8, 4; Wolff, 155 f.) may be inferred from its describing the moon as a permanent abode of the goddess (the "aery house" behind which Hecate is staying is the sun; consequently the moon is her dwelling-place); this conception is opposed to that of the Chaldæans who believe that this goddess descends to the moon from her noetic dwelling-place when invoked by one of them. (The two last verses of this oracle are almost entirely identical with an oracle of Hecate, which Porphyry quotes immediately afterwards; see Eus., *Pr. Ev.*, V, 8, 5 and Wolff 156). Another oracle quoted by Porphyry (Eus., *Pr. Ev.*, IV, 23, 7; Wolff 151) can be shown to be non-Chaldæan, as Hecate affirms in it her identity with Persephone and Artemis, and boasts her empire over the demons of the ether, air and earth. This unification of the three goddesses formed no part of doctrine of the Chaldæans who moreover invoked Hecate as the "driver of the aery, earthy and watery dogs" (*i. e.* demons; see ch. v, u. 41), that is a different group of three elements. In three other non-Chaldæan oracles quoted by Porphyry (*apud* Eus., *Pr. Ev.*, V, 8, 6-7; Wolff 156 f.), Hecate complains of the magicians who compell her to appear against her will. It is true that the Chaldæans also employ binding-spells (see note 184), but these as well as the magical ritual are communicated to them by the invoked gods themselves. Consequently a misuse of the power conferred by this knowledge could only result in failure, and would by no means have a coercive effect on the gods.

Another trait common to all the oracles of this group is the lack of any mention of the Supreme God. Against this must be held the doctrine of the Chaldæans who taught that Hecate like all the other celestial powers, was subject to the "Father's" will (*viz.* that of His Intellect) and that her manifestations during the conjuration of the chaldæans were consequent upon his decision.

Other oracles quoted in Porphyry's *Philosophy of the Oracles* may also be distinguished from those of the Chaldæans. For instance, the four fragments which contain instructions as to how to make and consecrate Hecate's statue and thus create the requisite conditions for a nocturnal apparition of the goddess (Nos. 1 and 2: Eus., *Pr. Ev.*, V, 12, 1-2; Wolff 130 f. No. 3: *Pr. Ev.*, V, 13, 3; Wolff 133 f. The three fragments derive from one and the same oracle, see above note 56) contain a description of a statue of Hecate different from that worshipped by the Chaldæans cf. ch. 11, sect. 4. Another of the Hecatean oracles (*apud* Eus., *Pr. Ev.*, V, 15, 1 Wolff 137) does not contain any Chaldæan term. A further oracle spoken by Hecate (*apud* Φιλοπονος, *De opif. mund.*, IV, 20; Wolff 176) alludes to astrological notions

ten of them are of non-Chaldæan origin. On the other hand, we may conclude from the similarity of the literary form, that the Chaldæans imitated the style of the normal type of Hecatean oracles. Thus this relationship reflects the competition between theurgy and the lower forms of magic <sup>163</sup>.

The remaining two oracles of Hecate quoted by Porphyry have recourse to fundamental Chaldæan notions, and thus betray their origin. One of them is composed of two answers (resembling in this respect the *Logion* on the soul that we have shown to be Chaldæan) <sup>164</sup> :

‘Hecate when invoked during an unfavourable constellation of the stars, answered :

‘I do not speak, I shall shut the gates of the long aerial tube. For upon the most unpropitious vaults of heaven the horned goddess Titania approaches, looking at the malignant Ares’.

And when some persons asked whether the gods themselves were subject to the domination of the stars, as they were heedful of it, Hecate began again :

‘Free thyself from the bonds of nature in order that I obey thy bonds!  
‘O man, what babblest thou, stricken with impotence? Desirest thou

---

which did not belong to the Chaldæan doctrine; see ch. iv, n. 103. There are also the anti-Christian Oracles of Hecate (Eus., *Dem. Ev.*, III, 6; AUGUSTINE, *Civ. Dei*, XIX, 23; Wolff 180 f.) expressive of the politico-religious tendencies of their time.

<sup>163</sup> According to the general scheme of magical oracles the conjured god declares his identity and names the place where he heard the invocation. Besides the first two oracles of Hecate quoted note 162, cf. also the beginning of an oracle of Hermes quoted by Porphyry (Eus., *Pr. Ev.*, III, 14, 7; Wolff 127): «Ὡδ' ἐγώ, ὄν καλέεις, Ζηνὸς καὶ Μαϊάδος υἱός, Ἑρμείης προβέβηκα, λιπῶν ἀστραῖον ἀνακτα». (i. e. Helios; see ch. III, n. 197).

This type is a counterpart to the *ὑμνοὶ κλητικοί*, in which the name and the abiding-place of the invoked god had to be mentioned (see MENANDER, *Rhet. Græc.*, III, p. 334 f. SPENGLER and WÜNSCH, *P. W.* s. v. *Hymnus*, col. 142 f.).

<sup>164</sup> Cf. the notes 89 and 188. As the oracle of Ostanès quoted by Porphyry (Wolff 138; see Bidez-Cumont, *Mages hell.*, II, 284 f.) proves the Chaldæans were not the first to compose oracles consisting of two parts.

‘to learn that which thou art not allowed to ask in this manner? Forgo this desire, desist from violence, you who are few!’<sup>165</sup>.

This double pronouncement of Hecate may be juxtaposed with the following oracle also transmitted in Porphyry’s collection; the name of the divinity whose words are reported is not mentioned:

‘When a certain person demanded to receive the god, the latter said that he (that demanded) was incapable of it because he was bound by Nature, and after having suggested to him apotropaic remedies, he added:

For Strength in a demonic onslaught has attacked thy kind, whom thou must flee during these magical rites’’<sup>166</sup>.

<sup>165</sup> PHILOPONUS, *De officio mundi*, IV, 20 (p. 201 ed.; Reichardt, Wolff 176 ff., *ΑΠΘΟΛ.*, *Græc.*, III, p. 505) ἢ τε Ἐκάτη κληθεῖσα ἐν τοιαύτῃ καταστίσει τοῦ περιέχοντος (i. e. in an unfavourable constellation) φησίν.

«Οὐ λαλέω, κλείσω δὲ πύλας δολιχοῖο Φάρυγος·  
νυκτὸς γὰρ κέντροις ἀχρειοτάτοις προσελαύνει  
Τιτηνίς κερόεσσα Ξεὴ κακὸν Ἄρη ἰδοῦσα».

καὶ πάλιν. . . τινῶν εἰπόντων, εἰ καὶ αὐτοὶ οἱ Ξεοὶ ὑπὸ τὴν εἰμαρμένην εἰσίν, ὅτι φυλάττονται ταῦτα, ἐπήγαγε·

«Λυέσθω φύσεως δεσμῶν, ἵνα σοῖσι πῖθωμαι.  
Ὡ κραδίη, τί λέληκας ἀναλκείησι τυπεῖσα;  
Οὐ ποθέεις μαθέειν, ὃ σε μὴ Ξέμις ᾧδ’ ἐρεεῖνειν,  
Στήθε πόθου· παύσασθε βίης τυτθοὶ περ ἔοντες.»

In the first verse of the second oracle, δεσμῶν should be read instead of δεσμά which is metrically impossible. Cf. *Aescn. Prom.*, 1006 λῦσαι με δεσμῶν τῶνδε. Λυέσθω is in this oracle a medial imperative. (The corrections proposed by Wolff λυέσθω φύσεως σου δέσμ’, ἵνα Ξεοῖσι πῖθωμαι and Reichardt λυέσθω φύσεως μου δέσμ’, ἵνα σοῖσι πεδῶμαι introduce serious and avoidable alterations into the transmitted text).—For πῖθωμαι see note 184.

<sup>166</sup> *Eus., Praep. Ev.*, VI, 4, 1; Wolff 165. Δεηθέντος γὰρ τινος καταδέξασθαι Ξεόν, εἰπὼν ὁ Ξεὸς ὅτι ἀνεπιτήδειός ἐστι διὰ τὸ ὑπὸ φύσεως καταδεδῆσθαι, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἀποτροπιασμούς ὑπαγορεύσας, ἐπάγει.

«Ῥιπῆ δαιμονίη γὰρ ἄλις ἐπιδέδρομεν ἄλκῃ  
σαῖσι γοναῖς, ἄς χρῆ σε Φυγεῖν τοῖαισι μαγεῖαις».

The MSS read Ῥιπῆ δαιμονίη; Vigerus proposes the emendation Ῥιπῆ; there should be added the correction δαιμονίη.—Porphyry mentions in the *Philosophy of the Oracles* (Wolff 177) sudden attacks of the evil demons upon men.

The reason given in both oracles for the questioner's failure to attain magical contact is his being bound by "Nature" (*Physis*). In the second oracle, this Nature is called "Strength" (*ἀλκμῆ*), a designation familiar to us from the Chaldæan Oracles which apply this term to the Cosmic Soul, i. e. Hecate<sup>167</sup>. At the same time they identify Hecate with Nature and Destiny (*Heimarmene*); for she rules the stars in accordance with the law of Necessity, and the terrestrial zone by means of the "multifluous streams" of demons descending from her. These maleficent spirits lead man astray and bid him to give way to his appetites; for then his thoughts are no longer turned towards divine things, and he is in the power of the demons. For this reason, the Chaldæan Oracles utter the following warnings: "Nature wishes to persuade you that the demons are pure and the offsprings of evil Matter good and noble"; and "The demons are beguiling the soul and drawing her away from the purifications"<sup>168</sup>. Man can only defend himself against the overwhelming power of the demons, if his body and his soul are always pure. This holds good to much greater extent for the theurgist: every rite designed to bring about a contact with the celestial powers has to be preceded by manifold lustrations: "For before thou hast consecrated thy body, thou art not allowed to see the gods"<sup>169</sup>. If the theurgist fails to perform the magical rites according to the divine commandments, "god turns man away from Himself and sends him through the agency of Living Power on vain paths"<sup>170</sup>. "Living Power"—as well as "Strength"—is a term applying to Hecate-Psyche-Physis-Heimarmene. The passage is meant to convey that the theurgist who commits a ritual fault is abandoned by Hecate to her demonic satellites who, by the delusions which they produce, bring about the failure of all the efforts of their victim.

These doctrines on which Chaldæan demonology is based not only help us to understand the two oracles quoted from Porphyry, but also to prove their Chaldæan origin. First we shall attempt to interpret the second oracle. "Strength", whose troops have "in a demonic onslaught attacked" mankind, is Hecate, mistress of the evil spirits. The theurgist

<sup>167</sup> As to what follows compare ch. II, sect. 4. — <sup>168</sup> Cf. ch. v, n. 14 and 15. —

<sup>169</sup> Cf. ch. IV, n. 1 a. — <sup>170</sup> Cf. ch. v, n. 11.



had been defiled by his intercourse with men who, unprotected by lustrations, had succumbed to the machinations of the demons<sup>171</sup>. In consequence, he is "bound by Nature", that is to say by the evil spirits subject to Hecate, and must avoid the men with whom he habitually consorts, in order to become capable of "receiving the god"<sup>172</sup>. As we may infer from Porphyry's introductory remark, the oracle also taught other apotropaic rites which help to sustain the demonic onslaught. Some of these rites will be examined in the chapter treating of Chaldæan demonology<sup>173</sup>.

A similar doctrine underlies the first oracle quoted from Porphyry, as is shown by the concordance between its introductory verse and the interrogative formula of the second oracle. The answer signifies that not the gods but the mortals are "bound by Nature", or, in other words, ruled by the stars. Hecate addresses a stern rebuke (the wording of which is almost identical with that of the second of the Apollonic oracles of the *Theosophy* examined by us)<sup>174</sup> to the puny men who presume to gain knowledge of the secrets of the divine powers<sup>175</sup>. For none but the consecrated theurgists are vouchsafed by the gods a full revelation of the nature of the demonic bonds and the way to loose them<sup>176</sup>.

<sup>171</sup> The injunction of a Chaldæan Oracle to flee the crowd of men "going in herd" seems to be due to the dread of being contaminated by the demons rather than to a sense of superiority; cf. PROCL., *Alc.*, 517, 36 (Kroll 59) *φευκτέον τὸ πλῆθος τῶν ἀνθρώπων τῶν ἀγγελῶν ἰόντων*, ὡς φησι τὸ λόγιον. As to the formula *χρή σε φυγεῖν* cf. the passages quoted ch. II, n. 403.

<sup>172</sup> The expression *καταδέχισθαι θεὸν* (see note 166) as used by Porphyry probably contains no allusion to the function of the *δοχεῖς*. Cf. *ad Marc.*, c. 19, p. 287:7 and *de regt.*, p. 28,7 f. "animam spiritalem... per teletas... idoneam fieri... susceptioni spirituum".

<sup>173</sup> Cf. ch. v, n. 116.

<sup>174</sup> Compare «Οὐ ποθέεις μαθεῖν, ὃ σε μὴ θεῖμις ὦδ' ἐρεείνει» with «σὺ δὲ παῦε τὰ μὴ θεῖμις ἐξερεείνων» (quoted note 51).

<sup>175</sup> Cf. also PSELLUS, *Comm.*, 1136 A (Kroll 50) «ὦ τολμηρᾶς φύσεως, ἄνθρωπε, τέχνασμα». An imperative, perhaps *σῖγ'* should be added at the beginning; cf. ch. IV, n. 98.

<sup>176</sup> The astrological notions, on which the first of the two Oracles quoted note 165 are based, are discussed by Wolff 176,5 and 6, who correctly interprets *κέντρα* as

The texts that have been examined show that Chaldaean practice has much in common with that of the magicians (whom the Neoplatonists contemptuously designated as "goëts"). The point of doctrine, according to which the gods themselves communicate to the theurgists the various conjurations<sup>177</sup>, also derives from magical notions current at that time<sup>178</sup>. This fiction which postulates that the theurgists obtain their knowledge of the name, nature and localisation of—as well as the way to gain power over—the various gods from these gods themselves, underlies the whole doctrinal system of the Chaldaean Oracles, and accounts for the literary form of those which are didactic. The god whose appearance the Chaldæans bring about is regarded as the teacher of his questioner<sup>179</sup>; a pedagogic relationship which explains the

---

designating the four cardinal points of the Zodiac; we may add that the latter are mentioned in the Chaldaean Oracles, see ch. II, n. 213. For *ιδούσα* see ΒΟΥΚΗ-ΛΕΚΛΕΝΟ, *L'astrologie grecque*, p. 163.

The fact that Hecate declares that she "will shut the gates of the long aerial pipes" seems to confirm the supposition that the oracle is of Chaldaean origin. The goddess does not refer to her own mouth, but to that of the "recipient" through whose intermediary she speaks. The "recipient's" "aerial pipe" is mentioned in the Oracle of Apollo quoted note 136. EUSEBIUS, *Praep. Ev.*, III, 16, 2 (Wolff 160,6; see above note 136) states that an oracle quoted by Porphyry shows that also Hecate delivered her oracles through the intermediary of a "recipient": *εἰ γὰρ τὴν Ἑκάτην αὐτὴν (sc. σελήνην) εἶναι φήσουσι καὶ πως . . . διὰ τοῦ δοχέως* (see note 126) *χρᾶν* . . . The relevant oracle was doubtless of Chaldaean origin.

<sup>177</sup> Procl. *Crat.*, 72,8 Ὅτι πολλοὶ καὶ θεοὶ καὶ δαίμονες ἐκφῆναι τὴν τῶν θεῶν φύσιν ἀξιώσαντες καὶ τὰ προσήκοντα αὐτοῖς ὀνόματα παρέδωσαν οὕτω καὶ τοῖς ἐπὶ Μάρκον γενομένοις θεουργοῖς (see note 3) οἱ θεοὶ καὶ νοητὰς καὶ νοερὰς τάξεις ἐκφαίνοντες, ὀνόματα τῶν θεῶν διακόσμων ἐξαγγελτικὰ τῆς ιδιότητος αὐτῶν παραδεδώκασιν, οἱς καλοῦντες ἐκεῖνοι τοὺς θεοὺς ἐν ταῖς προσηκούσαις θεραπεύαις τῆς παρ' αὐτῶν εὐηχοῖας ἐτύχανον. From the same tradition derives Iamblichus, *De Myst.*, I, 15, p. 48,4 Εἰ δέ τις ἐνοήσῃ καὶ τὰς ἱερατικὰς (see Excursus IV. 2) ἱκετείας, ὡς ἀπ' αὐτῶν τῶν θεῶν ἀνθρώποις κατεπέμθησαν, and II, 10, p. 90, 12 διδασχῆ μὲν γὰρ τῆς οἰκείας οὐσίας θεοῦ καὶ ἀγγελος καὶ δαίμων ἀγαθὸς χρῆται πρὸς ἄνθρωπον. See below note 182 and ch. IV, n. 23.

<sup>178</sup> Cf. HOPFNER, *O.-Z.*, I, § 727, 729, II, § 3 (who does not distinguish between the Theurgists and the Egyptian magician Arnuphis; see above note 2).

<sup>179</sup> PORPHYRY (see above note 21) refers to the ἀξιώσιμος διδασκαλία of the

dialogue-character of many Chaldæan Oracles and their subjective tone<sup>180</sup>.

The magical formulæ are also communicated to the theurgists by the gods. Proclus relates that the Theurgists were taught by the gods the name of the various divine powers; when they used these names in their invocations, performing at the same time the appropriate magical rites, the gods granted them their wishes<sup>181</sup>. These divine names are divided into two classes, the "unutterable" and the "utterable"; the latter are applied to the visible cosmic orders, while the former, also termed "symbols", or "watchwords", designate the invisible powers. Incomprehensible save to the gods, they correspond to the *voces mysticæ* which figure in the magical papyri<sup>182</sup>. They are the "ineffable words" which are mentioned in one of the oracles of Apollo that we have quoted, and are said to occasion the descent of this god's prophetic pneuma<sup>183</sup>. The same oracle attributes a similar power to songs (*μολπαι*). Accordingly it would seem that the invocations of the "callers" consisted of hymns interspersed with *voces mysticæ*. If this was the case they have numerous parallels in the incantations figuring in the magical papyri. Both the hymns and the *voces mysticæ* had power to bind. They brought about the manifestation of the god by "enchanting him", by "persuading him",

Oracles. Proclus introduces many quotations from the Ch. Or. with the formula *οι Θεοί... διδάσκοντες* or similar expressions. See Excursus I m.

<sup>180</sup> Several non-Chaldæan Oracles quoted by Porphyry in the *Philosophy of the Oracles* are of the didactic type and may be used to prove that this type was not invented by the Chaldæans. The formal characteristics of these oracles recall in many respects Ovid's *Fasti* (See REITZENSTEIN, *Die Göttin Psyche*, Sitzungsberichte Heidelberg 1917, Abh. 10, p. 18, 4) modelled upon Callimachus' *Aitia*. There is however no need to postulate any connection between Alexandrine poetry and the literary form of the Chaldæan Oracles.

<sup>181</sup> See note 177.

<sup>182</sup> PROCL., *Tim.*, I, 274, 16 Διὸ καὶ τοῖς Θεουργοῖς ὀνόματα Θεῶν κοσμικὰ παραδέδοται, τὰ μὲν «ἄρητα» καλούμενα, τὰ δὲ «ῥήτα» παρ' αὐτοῖς, τὰ μὲν τῶν ἀφανῶν ἐν αὐτῷ δυνάμεων ὄντα, τὰ δὲ τῶν ἐμφανῶν στοιχείων, ἐξ ὧν συμπεπλήρωται. See above note 177. Iamblichus frequently states (see e. g. Excursus IV, 1) that the "symbols" may only be understood by the gods.

<sup>183</sup> Cf. note 136, v. 3 «Θελογόμενον μολπαῖσι καὶ ἀρήτοις ἐπέεσσι».

or by "using compulsion"<sup>184</sup>. They were known as "coercive enchantments" or "binding spells"<sup>185</sup>.

The Chaldæans use the "ineffable words" of the magical formula also in order to draw to themselves the divine fire through which they are united with the Godhead. The "binding" of the mystic light is figured by the Chaldæans as the onslaught of the theurgist armoured with a luminous body and weaponed with magical words. An oracle of Apollo which has recourse to equally impressive imagery is transmitted in Porphyry's *On the Philosophy of the Oracles*; it consists of two parts, a single hexameter and several anapestic verses.

First Apollo communicates a binding spell; he that utters it gains power over the god: "This name of Necessity is mighty and weighty".

Then he continues: "Hasten storming hitherward with these words, that I may lift thee up from my heart, while the pure Fire is pressed

<sup>184</sup> *Σελγομένων*: cf. Psellus' statement (quoted note 131) as to the *Σελκτήριοι ᾠδαί* with which the Chaldæans "bound" the gods (The magical hymns to Apollo are also called *μολπαι*; see e.g. *P. Mag.* III. 290 and PSELLUS, *C. M. A. G.* VI. 62, 5 f). The Chaldæans though employing the current terms *δεσμοί*, *ανάγκη*, *βία*, to designate the conjuration-spells, did not claim to have power over the gods, as the latter had communicated to them these spells (According to Iamblichus, *de myst.* VI. 7 p. 249, f. 3 the Chaldæan Theurgists did not use "threatening formulæ", *ἀπειλαί*, see HORRENB, *O.-Z.*, I § 787). This circumstance explains the different attitude of the gods invoked by the Chaldæans as compared with those conjured by the magicians. The former do not complain, as do the latter, of having been forcibly compelled to appear, but refer to the "persuasive power" of the spells (see note 165 *πιθωμαί*), a term which also figures in non-Chaldæan texts; cf. Eus., *Praep. Ev.* V. 8, 4 v. 4; Wolff 155 *πειθοῖ τ' ἀρρήτων ἐπέων*, and *P. Mag.* I. 51. Plotinus II. 9, 14 differentiates between *γοήταιαι*, *Σέλξις* (see above) and *πεισις*. Porphyry (Wolff 155, 4; Rohde, *Psyche*, II. 87, 3) calls this sublimated magic *πειθανάγκη* (a term which contains an allusion to the euphemistic expression, by which Plato *Rep.* 364 c 3 *ἐπιγαγαῖς τισιν καὶ καταδέσμοις τοὺς Θεούς, ὡς φασιν, πειθοντές σφισιν ὑπηρετεῖν* designates the binding spells). Iamblichus' theory of the "calling" (*κλήσις*) of gods, which endeavours to reconcile divine autonomy with the magical doctrine of compulsion applied to the gods, is dealt with in Excursus V.

<sup>185</sup> See Rohde, *Psyche*, II. 87. 3.

by holy forms. It is Paian, the Nature of Thy descent, who dares to reveal this, O Immortal" 186.

The quotation of the first part of the oracle is perhaps incomplete 187. Apollo pronounces "this name of Necessity" to be "mighty and weighty". The pronoun indicates that the name has been previously disclosed. At the beginning of the verses that follow 188 the god bids to utter "these"

<sup>186</sup> Eus., *Praep. Ev.* V. 8, 8-10; Wolff 159.

Ἐπει καὶ ἐπανάγκους ἑαυτῶν ἐκδιδώσιν (sc. οἱ Θεοί), ὡς δηλώσει ὁ ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος ἐκδοθεὶς (see Excursus I m) περὶ ἑαυτοῦ ἐπανάγκος (see note 184). λέγεται δὲ οὕτως.

«Οὔνομ' ἀναγκαίης τόδε καρτερόν ἢδ' ἐπιβριθύ».

καὶ ἐπήγαγε.

«Μόλε δ' ἐσσυμένως τοισίδε μύθοις,  
ὡς (σ') ἀπ' ἐμῆς κραδῆς ἀνάγω,  
ἱεροῖσι τύποις  
συνθλιβομένου πυρὸς ἀγνοῦ.  
Τολμᾶ δὲ φύσις ταῦτα προφαίνειν  
τῆς σῆς γενέθλης, ἄμβροτε, Παιάν».

*Text*: v. 1 ἢδὲ τι vel ἦδε τι : MSS.; ἢδ' ἔτι : Gaisford and Wolff; however ἔτι does not make sense in the context. I propose the emendation ἢδ' ἐπιβριθύ : the adjective should be added to the large number of Chaldæan neologisms (see Excursus III 5); it derives from βριθύς and is modelled upon ἐπιβριθύς.

v. 3 οὖς ἀπ' ἐμῆς κραδῆς ἀνάγω : MSS. The first word should be emended, as the relative clause calls for a verb in the future tense and as ἀνάξω is impossible for metrical reasons. I propose therefore to replace οὖς by ὡς (final significance) : the ἀναγωγή follows, according to Chaldæan teaching, upon the utterance of the binding spells. The pronoun σ' should be added after ὡς (haplography), as otherwise the verse would mean that the "word" themselves are drawn up by Apollo, which is absurd. There are many examples of an anapestic dimeter beginning with a dactyle; accordingly, we may leave out of account Wolff's emendation (οἴ)οις.

v. 7 a comma should separate ἄμβροτε from Παιάν; otherwise the passage would mean that Apollo is his own son.

Wolff's remarks p. 159, 5 are of no greater value than the rest of his commentary to this oracle, which refers throughout to a corrupt text.

<sup>187</sup> Porphyry, who was solely interested in the magical term ἀνάγκη, is responsible for this abbreviation.

<sup>188</sup> The two Oracles were already joined together in the original text; Porphyry merely followed it. It has been proved in the course of our investigation that two "double" oracles of the same type (see notes 164 and 165) are of Chaldæan origin.

words; which consequently may be supposed to be identical with the "name of Necessity" to which the preceding verse refers. According to the magicians, the name is the potency of the gods. By possessing it, one can dispose of the strength of its bearer<sup>199</sup>. We may accordingly infer that the first pronouncement of Apollo was preceded by a passage setting forth the manner in which a particular god could be rendered subservient by the utterance of his mystic name. The god referred to can only be Apollo. He himself teaches his theurgists the method which they must use in order "to bind" him. Thus this oracle conforms to the didactic type, in which the god himself communicates the "ineffable names" to which he "gives heed"<sup>190</sup>.

Apollo says that he will "lift up" the person who utters the compelling formula "from his heart". We must recall in this connection that, according to Chaldæan theology, Apollo dwells in the sun which, being situated in the midmost planetary sphere, is called the "centre" of the ethereal zone<sup>191</sup>. He is consequently supposed to draw up the theurgist with the solar rays. These are called by the god the "holy forms by which the pure fire is pressed". This expression also appertains to the terminology of the Chaldæans, who distinguish between the amorphous manifestations of fire and those provided with a form: "When thou seest the most holy Fire flash up without a form as it leaps over the depths of the whole world, hear the voice of the Fire"<sup>192</sup>. This amorphous fire of the lightnings differs from the rays sent forth by Apollo; for these are endowed with form.

The process described in the last oracle of Apollo is frequently mentioned in the texts treating of the Chaldæan cult; it is the so-called "elevation", the principal sacrament of the Chaldæan theurgists, which culminates in the union of the soul of the initiate with the ray sent towards him from the sun<sup>193</sup>. Our contention that the oracle refers to this sacrament can be proved by the occurrence in the text of the word *ἀναγωγή*, which is the usual term applied to this Chaldæan mystery<sup>194</sup>; and also by the

---

<sup>199</sup> DIETERICH, *Mithrasliturgie*, 112. — <sup>190</sup> See note 177. — <sup>191</sup> See note 46, ch. II, note 221 *b, d, e*. ch. III, n. 76. — <sup>192</sup> See ch. IV, n. 63. — <sup>193</sup> On what follows, see chapter III. — <sup>194</sup> Cf. Excursus VIII.

resemblance between the description figuring in the oracle and some other Chaldæan passages. A parallel to Apollo's bidding "to hasten storming" with the magical "words" towards the rays of the sun is provided by the following injunctions of the Chaldæan Oracles: "Rush to the centre of the roaring light" (viz. the sun, the centre of the starry spheres which revolve in the ether); "Cast in the mind the watchword of the manifold universe, and move with a firm step towards the fiery rays"<sup>195</sup>. The warlike imagery renders in both cases the compulsion exercised by the magical operation.

The details of the mystery with which the oracle of Apollo is concerned will be discussed in the third chapter; here we may round off our observations by an interpretation of the two last verses of the oracle. In these, the oracle-giving god calls himself by his traditional name "Paian" and alleges his descent from the "Immortal" in justification of his venturing to reveal the mystery. These remarks of Apollo should be likewise interpreted in accordance with Chaldæan belief. Apollo-Helios—as well as all the other gods of the Chaldæans—"is generated" by the "All-Father". Like all the other celestial entities, he performs his functions when called upon to do so by a particular decision of this Supreme Being<sup>196</sup>. Apollo's reference to this Being is consequently meant to convey that the god's revelations are given with the consent of the transcendent Father of the gods<sup>197</sup>. We have encountered a similar passage in the first oracle of Hecate, in which the goddess alleges her descent from the "Paternal

<sup>195</sup> See chapter III, n. 59 and 75.

<sup>196</sup> Cf. *Theos.* No. 27, quoted above note 26.

<sup>197</sup> This statement may be held against the passage of the second Oracle of Aion (quoted note 52), in which Apollo accounts for his not answering the questions posed by an unauthorized person as to the nature of god. The reason for his silence is that he "is Phoebus", i. e. that he has been charged by the Supreme God not to divulge to all and sundry the mysteries of heavenly hierarchy. He ventures to do this only when dealing with theurgists.

In the two concluding verses of this oracle of Apollo, the god makes himself known. It would have been more normal for him to do this at the beginning of the oracle (see note 163); however in two other Chaldæan Oracles transmitted by Porphyry (see notes 52 and 152) a similar self-introduction figures likewise at the end of the text.

Intellect" as a crowning proof of the truth of her assertions<sup>198</sup>. A reference to the Supreme Being may be supposed to have instilled in the Chaldæan theurgists the conviction that the revelation vouchsafed to them derived from the "Father" considered as the fountain-head of all wisdom.

We have seen that the Chaldæan doctrine furnishes a complete explanation for this last enigmatic oracle of Apollo. Does this fact entitle us to include this oracle in the collection of the Chaldæan Oracles? Only metrical considerations militate against this supposition. This oracle is anapestic, the other Chaldæan verses hexametric. There is however one exception, and it invalidates this argument. The first of the series of verses dealing with the "recipient" is a trochee : in spite of which, Proclus describes it as a quotation from the Chaldæan Oracles<sup>199</sup>. In face of this positive assurance that a trochaic verse figured in these Oracles, we may no longer exclude from them anapestic verses on no grounds but the metrical<sup>200</sup>. The style and the contents of these verses which give a powerful expression to the enthusiasm of the Chaldæan theurgists harmonize (as well as those of the trochaic verse) with the other Chaldæan texts. Rather than attribute to them a different origin, we must modify our conception of the literary character of the Chaldæan Oracles. These varied in their form (a fact which attests the literary aspirations of the theurgists) as much as in their contents.

This diversity of forms is due to the development of oracular poetry

<sup>198</sup> See note 152.

<sup>199</sup> See note 116.

<sup>200</sup> A chapter of Wolff's work ("Oracula non hexametris, sed aliis metris edita", pp. 68-90) deals with oracles written not in hexameters, but in iambic trimeters, trochees and distichs. The utterance of Apollo with which we are dealing is the only extant example of an anapestic oracle. It seems that the theme of the text determined the choice of the meter. The injunction to "hasten stormily" could be fittingly given in anapestic rhythm, as these were generally employed in descriptions of attacks.

There was no incongruity in the fact that trochaic or anapestic oracles were introduced into a collection named *λόγια δι' ἐπῶν*, for the designation *ἐπη* was not exclusively reserved to poems written in hexameters; see above note 109.



in the historical period at the beginning of which the authors of the Chaldæan Oracles lived. Every type of oracle employed by them has its counterpart in the non-Chaldæan oracular poetry. Thus the hymn of the *Theosophy* to the Supreme Being examined at the beginning of the present work has a parallel in a hymn to the Ruler of the worlds, which is also supposed to derive from Apollo<sup>201</sup>. Oracles of Apollo and of Hecate conforming in the literary composition to those of the Chaldæans have already been mentioned<sup>202</sup>. Those two oracle-giving gods were said to manifest themselves to the magicians and to instruct them in the nature and method of conjurations; it is this fiction which accounts for their reception into the magical Pandemonium. The Chaldæan Apollo and Hecate derive from the magical conceptions of these divinities, not from the tradition of long-established seats of oracles. Hecate reveals the rites of her adjurations and the way to make and to consecrate her image to other adepts of magical art as well as to the Chaldæans.

The theological themes of the Chaldæan Oracles also originate in the oracular poetry of their time. The *Logion* that speaks of the yearning of the soul for its heavenly place of origin, is paralleled by three oracles dealing with the destiny of the soul after its separation from the body; two of these are ascribed to Apollo of Miletus and to Apollonius of Tyana respectively, the third is anonymous<sup>203</sup>. In conjunction with these we may also mention the famous oracle of Apollo describing in answer to a

---

<sup>201</sup> Irs.-JUSTIN, *Cohortatio ad Graecos*, c. 38, quotes from a hymn in honour of the *παντοκράτωρ* the following verse *ὡς πρῶτον πάσας μερόπων, ἄδᾱμ δὲ καλέσασα*. As to the wording cf. *Orac. Sibyll.* III 24. But the mention of Adam does not prove the Jewish origin of the hymn. An argument based upon it would be as little conclusive as those founded upon the praise of the "pure Hebrews" occurring in three oracles of Apollo cited by Porphyry in the *Philosophy of the Oracles*; see Wolff 140-1 and GERFCKEN, *Zwei griechische Apologeten*, 268.

<sup>202</sup> The mention of the name of the person who puts the questions is a feature of the style of these literary fictions. As to the name Timotheus, see above note 86. The name Polites is mentioned in another, non-Chaldæan, oracle (p. 177 Wolff). In *Theosophy* No. 30, the proper name is not transmitted, but the MSS. leave a blank for it.

<sup>203</sup> Wolff 178. NORDEN, *Vergilius Aeneis Buch VI*, p. 22.

question the happy lot of Plotinus' soul after this philosopher's death<sup>204</sup>. Besides these, numerous theological oracles of Apollo are extant. Amongst them are two answers to a question as to the nature of the interrogated god<sup>205</sup>; further an answer dealing with the god Iao<sup>206</sup>, as well as the functions of various other gods<sup>207</sup>. We may also mention the god's reply when asked in what sense it is possible to speak of several heavens<sup>208</sup>, and whether immortality may be obtained through an austere life<sup>209</sup>. The most interesting oracle of this class is the god's answer when asked: which was better, the Word (the Christian Logos), the Intellect (the Nous of the philosophers), or the Law (the Nomos of the Jews)<sup>210</sup>. Apollo is ready with an ingenious answer to this conundrum, doubtless posed by a theologian familiar with the religious discussions of the time.

There is no need to prove that these oracle have nothing in common with Apollo's historical prophecies. They neither foretell the future nor do they give advice as to how to deal with personal difficulties. Their purpose is the revelation of the divine mysteries and theological instruction, and their literary form is intended by their authors to serve as a sanction for the ideas which they propagate. The stylistic principles proper to the genre were taken over by the Chaldæan theurgists, who wished to invest their religious system with supernatural authority. Their originality lies in the consistency with which they pursued their literary task. No exposition of the doctrine of the mysteries in oracular verse had existed prior to them, and their example found no imitators. Porphyry who sought to find a metaphysical revelation must have been particularly attracted both by their tenets and by the literary form to which they had recourse. Chaldæan Oracles appear to have constituted

<sup>204</sup> PORPHYRY, *Vit. Plot.*, 22; BIDEZ, *Vie de Porphyre*, 122 f.

<sup>205</sup> EUS., *Praep. Ev.* III. 15, 3 (Wolff 127 f.) and XI. 6, 37 (This oracle, omitted by Wolff, is also taken from Porphyry).

<sup>206</sup> MACROBIUS, *Saturn.*, I. 18, 19 f.

<sup>207</sup> *Theos. No.* 41. EUS. *Praep. Ev.* V. 7, 5 (Wolff 123 f.). MACROBIUS, *Saturn.*, I. 20, 16.

<sup>208</sup> EUS., *Praep. Ev.* IX. 10, 5; Wolff 141.

<sup>209</sup> *Theos. No.* 44.

<sup>210</sup> LACTANTIUS, *De ira dei*, 23; AUGUSTINE, *Civ. dei*, XIX, 23 (Wolff 142).

the nucleus of the collection published in his book *On the Philosophy of the Oracles*; a work which is the main source from which the ecclesiastical writers draw their information concerning these Oracles. Eusebius, for instance, quotes the ritual injunctions with a view to demonstrating the absurdity of magical polytheism, and the author of the *Theosophy* cites the metaphysical oracles in order to show the conformity of their sublime conception of God to the Christian doctrine. The Chaldæan Oracles are considered by these two Christian writers as authentic oracles, and it is as such that they have survived in their compilations; unrecognized for what they are and indeed almost entirely ignored.



## CHAPTER II

---

# THE CHALDÆAN SYSTEM OF THE INTELLIGIBLE WORLD<sup>1</sup>

1. *The literary tradition.*—Our analysis of Porphyry's treatise *On the Philosophy of the Oracles* has shown that eleven of the oracles quoted there are extracted from the Chaldæan Oracles. These new texts taken in conjunction with those collected by Kroll, legitimate our attempt to reconstruct the system of the Chaldæan theurgists in its entirety. Some preliminary remarks seem, however, to be called for; these must deal with the special conditions of the transmission of those fragments of the Chaldæan Oracles that hitherto have alone been recognized as such, a full understanding of these texts being impossible without an introductory survey<sup>2</sup>.

The Neoplatonists are the only transmitters of the extant fragments of the Chaldæan Oracles and of the other writings of the Theurgists<sup>3</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Νοητός*, literally "perceptible to the intellect", designates in the writings of the later Platonists also the intellectual substance, of which the supercelestial entities are thought to consist, and their spiritual force. As the usual renderings "intelligible" or "intellectual" do not express these various meanings, we have kept the Greek term "noetic". Only with regard to *κόσμος νοητός*, we have adopted the usual equivalent "intelligible world".

<sup>2</sup> The survey given here of the history of the transmission of the Chaldæan Oracles is based upon Kroll's work, p. 2-10, but many details are rectified. The most important additions are due to Bidez.

<sup>3</sup> K. PRÆCUTER'S outline in ÜBERWEG-PRÆCUTER, *Die Philosophie des Altertums* (12th ed. 1926) is up to date the best introduction to the study of the internal

The first name to be mentioned in this connection is that of Porphyry who, as it were, rediscovered the Chaldæan Oracles; a collection composed about a century before his time, but apparently little known until then. The various works (the *Philosophy of the Oracles*, *On the Return of the Soul*, etc.) in which he treats of the doctrine and writings of the Chaldæans have already been characterized<sup>4</sup>. They are the source of the Christian tradition, through which a certain number of these texts have come down to us. Porphyry was the first to propound a platonizing interpretation of the Chaldæan Oracles<sup>5</sup>; and his method was consistently applied by his disciple Iamblichus who, in his turn, served as a model to all the later exegetes. Iamblichus' lost principal work, a great commentary on the Chaldæan Oracles, which apparently comprised about 30 volumes, has been largely drawn upon by all the posterior commentators of the Chaldæan Oracles<sup>6</sup>. Another of this Neoplatonist's works, the treatise *On the Mysteries*, published under the pseudonym of an Egyptian priest, also evidences the author's intense preoccupation with the writings of the Theurgists<sup>7</sup>. Members of Iam-

---

evolution of Neoplatonism. It is based upon a great number of monographs generally cited by the author. E. R. Dodd's masterly edition and study, *Proclus, The elements of Theology*, Oxford 1933, is of fundamental importance for the understanding of Proclus and his predecessors.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. ch. 1, n. 17 ff. See Excursus II "Porphyry and the Chaldæans".

<sup>5</sup> See Excursus II. fin.

<sup>6</sup> This commentary is mentioned by Damascius I 154, 13 (*ἐν τοῖς Χαλδαίμοις*. . . ὁ ἰάμβελιχος; see also Lydus, *Mens.* IV 159 p. 175, 10) and I 86, 5, where he refers to the 28th book of this work of Iamblichus (see Excursus I d); cf. Zeller III 2 p. 739, 1. This work served to introduce the future emperor Julian to Chaldæan theological teaching; cf. Julian *Epist.* 12 ed. Bidez-Cumont, see Kroll in *P. W. s.* v. Julianos No. 9 p. 16, Bidez, *Vie de l'Empereur Julien* (Paris 1930), 73, and in *Mélanges Cumont*, 190, 3.

<sup>7</sup> The Chaldæans as well as the Hermetics and the philosophers are stated by Iamblichus to have been his authorities in his work *On the Mysteries*; cf. I 1, p. 4, 11 f. He designates their teachings as τὰ Ἀσσυρίων πάτρια δόγματα (I 2, p. 5, 8. See Excursus I c), cites them twice in express terms (VI 7, p. 249, 3 and III 31 p. 176, 2); and often makes use of their doctrines without mentioning them. The citations of *de mysteriis* figuring in the present work refer to Parthey's edition

blichus' school brought these writings and their master's commentaries to the notice of the future Emperor Julian, and finally initiated him into the Chaldæan mysteries which they had resuscitated<sup>9</sup>. The Emperor's two theological Orations on Helios and on Magna Mater attest his familiarity with Iamblichus' interpretation of Chaldæan mystagogy. These doctrines were afterwards professed in the Athenian Neoplatonic school the founder of which Plutarch transmitted them to his disciple Syrianus<sup>9</sup>. The information at our disposal does not enable us to reconstitute either the former's teaching, or the latter's *Harmony of the doctrines of Orpheus, Pythagoras and Plato with the Chaldæan Oracles*<sup>10</sup>; a system

---

(Berlin 1857). I have made use of the annotations of Th. Gale (Oxford 1678) and of Th. Hopfner (in the annotations to the German translation of Iamblichus' treatise Leipzig 1922). As to Iamblichus' attitude towards Chaldæan theurgy see J. Bidez' important study, *Le philosophe Jamblique et son école*, *Rev. Ét. Gr.* XXXII, 1919, 36 ff. See also DODDS, *Proclus*. Introd. p. xix.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. J. BIDEZ, *Note sur les mystères néo-platoniciens*, *Rev. Belge de Phil.* VII, 1928, 1477 ff., and *La Vie de l'Empereur Julien*, 74 ff. Several passages quoted by Bidez do not seem to be connected with the Chaldæan mysteries. *Th. Pl.* I 19 p. 55, 30 f. refers, as appears from the parallel *Alc.* 340, 1 (see ch. iv, n. 41), to the Eleusinian mysteries, and so also *Rp.* I 80, 17. *Rp.* I 111, 1 (see Excursus I e) cannot serve as proof that the Chaldæan mysteries were still practised; cf. ch. iv, n. 41. As to Libanius *Orat.* XVIII 18, cf. ch. v, n. 72. The title  $\delta$  τελεστικός bestowed on Sopater, the successor of Iamblichus, by Julian. *Epist.* p. 158, 19 B.-C. (cf. p. 214, 21 and 245, 22 : τὸν ἱερὸν Σώπατρον) and Lydus *Mens.* IV 2 p. 65, 21 f.) refers, as appears from Lydus, to the function which Sopater performed in consecrating the newly founded Constantinople. This "telestic art" was no monopoly of the Chaldæans; see Excursus X and ch. iv, sect. 5.

On Maximus of Ephesus, the Neoplatonist who initiated the future Emperor Julian into Chaldæan theurgy, see ch. iv, n. 41, 76, ch. v, n. 38-40.

<sup>10</sup> Knowledge of Chaldæan theurgy was transmitted to the Neoplatonist Plutarch by his grand-father (not as stated by Zeller III 24. 808; Proclus' testimony *Rp.* II 64, 6 carries more weight than that of Simplicius, *Anim.* 260, 1, and Suidas, s. v. Πρόκλος) Nestorius (see Marinus, *Vit. Procl.* 28), chief priest of Eleusis in 375 (Zosimus IV 182), who as far as theurgical tradition is concerned, was probably the link between Iamblichus' school and the Athenian Neoplatonists. Cf. also Excursus IV 2 fin.

<sup>11</sup> Suidas s. v. Συριανός: ἐγραψεν... συμφωνίαν Ὀρφείως Πυθαγόρου Πλάτωνος πρὸς (περὶ *codd.*, *corr.* Kroll 7. 1) τὰ λόγια βιβλία δέκα; mentioned by Procl. *Th.*

which influenced in decisive fashion the thought of Proclus, Syrianus' most eminent disciple and the most fervent devotee of the Chaldæan Oracles on record<sup>11</sup>. They and the *Timæus* (in this order) were, according to the testimony of his disciple and biographer Marinus<sup>12</sup>, the only works of the Ancients which he (Proclus) would not have wished to be withdrawn from circulation; because of the "infringement of the holy laws" by the victorious church<sup>13</sup>, it was, in his opinion, desirable that this fate should overtake for his time all the other works of the ancient sages. His interpretation of the Chaldæan *Logia*, in which he drew upon the exegesis of Porphyry, Iamblichus and Syrianus, was set down in a voluminous commentary, on the composition of which he spent five years<sup>14</sup>.

---

*Pl.* 215, 41. ZELLER III 2.822, 4. Praechter, *Byzant. Zeitschr.* XXVI, 1926, 256 f., whose contention p. 259, 4 as to Syrianus' reticent attitude towards Chaldæan theology is refuted by the passages quoted n. 10 and 13. Cf. also Dodds, *Proclus*, p. xiv, 1.

<sup>11</sup> Concerning the relationship between Syrianus and Proclus see Prächter, *P. W.* s. v. Syrianus, and Dodds, *Proclus*, p. xxiv ff. The most important statement we possess regarding the Chaldæan doctrine of immortality derives from one of Syrianus' writings quoted by Proclus; see ch. III, n. 32. 34. 127. A Neoplatonist, who lived in the period between Iamblichus and Syrianus, is the author of the fragments of a commentary on Plato's *Parmenides* edited by Kroll in *Rhein. Mus.* XLVII. 599-627 from a MS. of Turin (and accordingly called *Anonymus Taurinensis*) which contains an interesting passage dealing with the Chaldæan conception of the First Principle; see notes 45; 47; 54; 164; 181.

<sup>12</sup> Marinus, *Vita Procl.* 38 Εἰώθει δὲ πολλάκις καὶ τοῦτο λέγειν, ὅτι Κύριος εἰ ἦν, μόνα ἂν τῶν ἀρχαίων ἀπάντων βιβλίων ἐποίουν φέρεσθαι τὰ Λόγια καὶ τὸν Τιμαίον, τὰ δὲ ἄλλα ἠφάνιζον ἐκ τῶν νῦν ἀνθρώπων διὰ τὸ καὶ βλάπτεσθαι ἐνίοις τῶν εἰκῆ καὶ ἀσασανίστως ἐντυγχανόντων αὐτοῖς. Cf. Bidez, *Rev. Belge de Philol.* VII, 1928, 1477 f. and XI, 1932, 642 f. Dodds, *Proclus*, p. xiii.

<sup>13</sup> Dodds, *Proclus*, p. xxviii. 4 cites the passages in which Proclus expresses the distress caused to him by the σύγχυσις τῶν ἱερῶν Θεσμῶν viz. εὐσεβείας. *Procl. Parm.* 954, 1 f. and *Tim.* III 44, 4 f. should be added to the list. These passages call for a detailed examination.

<sup>14</sup> Marinus, *Vit. Procl.* 26 Λαβὼν δ' οὖν . . . παρὰ τοῦ καθηγεμόνος (Syrianus) τὰς ἀφορμὰς (sc. τὰ τῆς Χαλδαϊκῆς Θεολογίας στοιχεῖα) καὶ μετ' ἐκεῖνον (after Syrianus' death) . . . ἐπιμελῶς ἐντυγχάνων . . . τοῖς Πορφυρίου καὶ Ἰαμβελίχου μυρίοις ὅσοις εἰς τὰ λόγια καὶ τὰ σόστοιχα ("things belonging to the same category", see



He wrote also a special treatise on the methods of theurgy<sup>15</sup>; an art which was practised by him personally<sup>16</sup>, and which appears to be identical with the mystery-cult adopted since the foundation of the Athenian school by some of its members forming an esoteric circle<sup>17</sup>. These two works are lost. We may, however, form an approximate idea of their principal doctrines, if we avail ourselves of the extant materials. These are : the many quotations and interpretations of the Chaldæan Oracles found in Proclus' preserved writings<sup>18</sup>; a few direct excerpts from

---

Diehls, *Elementum* 58) συγγράμματα, αὐτοῖς τε τοῖς Θείοις λογίοις ἐντρεφόμενος... τὰς τε ἄλλας Χαλδαϊκὰς ὑποθέσεις (see Excursus I l) καὶ τὰ μέγιστα τῶν ὑπομνημάτων εἰς τὰ Θεοπαράδοτα (Excursus I e) λόγια κατεβάλετο ("he composed", see Porph. *Vit. Plot.* 26. Procl. *Th. Pl.* 107, 114), ἐν πέντε ὄλοις ἔτεσιν αὐτὰ συμπληρώσας. See Bidez, *C. M. A. G.* VI, p. 107 f.

Proclus refers to his commentary on the Chaldæan Oracles *Rp.* I 40, 21 ἐν τοῖς ἐς τὰ λόγια γεγραμμένοις. According to Damascius, *apud* Suid. *s. v.* Ἡγίας, Proclus used to give esoteric lectures on the Oracles to which only chosen disciples were admitted.

<sup>15</sup> According to Suidas, *s. v.* Πρόκλος, Proclus composed two volumes *περὶ ἀγωγῆς* (*i. e.* on methods of magical conjuration), while Marinus, *Vit. Procl.* 28 (quoted ch. iv, n. 64) states that one of his writings (title not mentioned) treated of the manifestations of Hecate. Praechter, *Byzant. Zeitschrift* XXVI (1926), p. 259, n. 4 suggests that this work may be identical with the one referred to by Suidas: cf. Excursus X, as well as ch. v, n. 109. Concerning the ἀγωγή Ἐκάτης of the Theurgists see ch. I, n. 152. Procl. *Tim.* III 131, 26 calls Hecate, as her initiate, "mistress" (δέσποινα). There is no evidence that Psellus (see notes 22-23) knew this work of Proclus.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Marinus, *Vit. Procl.* 28, and below, ch. iv, n. 2. According to Marinus, Proclus was instructed in the methods of Chaldæan theurgy by Asclepiogeneia, daughter of his teacher Plutarch, whose knowledge derived in the last instance from her great grandfather Nestorius; see above note 9.

<sup>17</sup> See Bidez, quoted note 6.

<sup>18</sup> Lists of all the known writings of Proclus may be found in Zeller III 24. 838, 2 f., Praechter 623 f. and Dodds XIII f. The following works contain quotations of the Chaldæan Oracles: Commentary on Plato's *Republic* (Procl. *Rp.*). Commentary on the *Timaeus* (Procl. *Tim.*). Excerpts from the commentary on the *Cratylus* (Procl. *Crat.*). Commentary on the *Alcibiades I* (Procl. *Alc.* and the *Parmenides* (Procl. *Parm.*). Commentary on the first book of Euclid (Procl. *Euc.*). The treatises preserved in the Latin translation of William de Morberca: *De decem*

his Commentary on the Chaldæan Oracles<sup>19</sup>; the information furnished by his disciple and biographer Marinus<sup>20</sup>; several citations made by Lydus<sup>21</sup> (who was in touch with Proclus' doctrines through his master Agapius); and most important of all, several extracts due to the Byzantine Neoplatonist Psellus<sup>22</sup>, a writer who had direct knowledge of Proclus' lost Commentary on the Chaldæan Oracles and refers to Chaldæan theurgy also in many other treatises<sup>23</sup>. As all the information on this subject which was available to Psellus derived from Proclus<sup>24</sup>, his statements may be regarded as having a direct evidential value.

Most of the extant texts of the Chaldæan Oracles have been preserved by the quotations of Proclus. Second to him in this respect is Damascius who carried on the tradition of Proclus, as transmitted by this philosopher's immediate disciples. In the *Dubitationes*, his only preserved work<sup>25</sup>, Damascius draws largely upon Iamblichus, Proclus and his own

*dubitationibus circa providentiam* (Procl. *Dub. Prov.*); *De Providentia et fato* (Procl. *Prov.*); *De malorum subsistentia* (Procl. *Mal. Subs.*); *Platonic Theology* (Procl. *Th. Pl.*). A fragment entitled *περι τῆς καθ' Ἑλληνως ιερατικῆς τέχνης*. The editions used in this work are mentioned above p. xviii. The citations always refer to the page and the line.

<sup>19</sup> Published by Pitra, *Analecta sacra et class.* V 2 (1888), 192 ff. from cod. Vaticanus 1026 s. XIV: re-edited by A. Jahn, *Eclogæ e' Proclo de philosophia Chaldaica*, Halle 1891. Quoted by the siglum *Exc. Vat.* See Excursus VI 1 g.

<sup>20</sup> The quotations refer to V. Cousin's edition *Procli opera, edit. altera*, Paris 1864, p. 1-66.

<sup>21</sup> Laurentius Lydus, *De mensibus* (Lyd. *Mens.*), ed. R. Wuensch, Leipzig 1898. This is the first complete edition of the fragments of this compilation. Its new portions contain several quotations of the Chaldæan Oracles, of which Kroll could have no knowledge when he was writing his study on the Chaldæan Oracles. See ch. I, n. 24. ch. II, n. 43.

<sup>22</sup> See Excursus VI 1. These summaries contain the Chaldæan system of Proclus.

<sup>23</sup> See Excursus VI 2.

<sup>24</sup> See n. 22.

<sup>25</sup> Damascius, *Dubitationes et solutiones de primis principiis* (= Dam.), ed. C. A. Ruelle, 2 vol., Paris 1889. The severe judgement about the editor passed by Kroll 8, 2 seems to be justified.

lost Commentary on the Chaldæan Oracles<sup>26</sup>. His activity marks the end of the Athenian school of Neoplatonists; and he is the last of the exegetes of the Oracles produced by it<sup>27</sup>. Some of the quotations of these Chaldæan texts are also to be found occasionally in the writings of the later Alexandrine Neoplatonists. We must mention in this connection Hierocles, a disciple of Plutarch (the master of Syrianus)<sup>28</sup>; Hermias, a disciple of Syrianus<sup>29</sup>; Olympiodorus, belonging to the second generation of the disciples of Hermias<sup>30</sup>. Greater importance than to any of these attaches from our point of view to Sinesius, the disciple of Hypatia: he quotes in his treatise *On Dreams* several verses of the Chaldæan Oracles, and his Hymns, composed after his conversion to Christianity, set out the concordance between the Chaldæan, the Neoplatonic and the Christian conception of God<sup>31</sup>. Proclus' theological

<sup>26</sup> Damascius refers to his own exegesis of the Chaldæan *Logia* II 9, 2; 11, 11; 132, 9. We do not know whether he published these lectures (*συνουσιαί*). See Zeller III 2<sup>d</sup> p. 902, 3.

<sup>27</sup> The only passage in which Simplicius mentions the *Logia* is in his commentary to Aristotle's *Physics* (*Simpl. Phys.*) in a polemical excursus directed against Proclus' doctrine *περὶ τόπων* (*Comm. in Aristot. Graeca* vol. IX, p. 601-645 ed. H. Diels). The immediate source of the verses cited there is not the original text of the Chaldæan Oracles, but Proclus' writings; see n. 84.

<sup>28</sup> Hierocles, *Comm. in aureum carmen Pythagoræ*, and excerpts from his *De providentia et fato* (made by Photius, *Bibl. cod.* 214 and 251), ed. Mullach, *Fragm. philos. Graec.* I 408 ff. According to Photius, *Bibl.*, cod. 214, p. 173 a 13 (see Kroll p. 7). Hierocles' work *On providence* contained a demonstration of the conformity existing between the doctrines of the Chaldæans and those of Plato. His interpretation of *Carm. Aur.* v. 67 f. derives in the last resort from Iamblichus' doctrine concerning the "hieratic ascent" of the philosopher's soul. See Praechter in *P. W.* s. v. Hierokles No. 18.

<sup>29</sup> I was unable to consult *Hermiae in Platonis Phaedrum scholia*, ed. P. Couvreur, Paris 1901; the quotations refer to the edition of F. Ast in *Platonis Phaedrus*, Lipsiae 1810, p. 69-216. See Praechter in *P. W.* s. v. Hermeias No. 13.

<sup>30</sup> *Olympiodori scholiae in Platonis Phaedonem*, ed. Norvin, Leipzig 1931. The excerpts from this commentary on *Alcibiades I* contain two fragments (see n. 365 and ch. v, n. 25), those from his other commentaries on Platonic writings only one (ch. v, n. 100).

<sup>31</sup> The citations of Synesius' work *On Dreams* and of his Hymns refer to the

hymns, written some decades later, also contain variations on Chaldæan themes<sup>32</sup>. Thus both the Heathen and the Christian found in the Chaldæan Oracles the poetical expression of their personal belief.

The Neoplatonists that we have had to name are many; and this fact in itself enables us to gauge to some extent the powerful influence which the Chaldæan Oracles, in the course of a period of more than 250 years, exercised on the principal representatives of this school<sup>33</sup>. Unfortunately, however, this influence, great as it was, did not preclude the loss of the major portion of this Collection. In the extant writings of Proclus and Damascius only three Chaldæan Oracles are quoted in full. Generally the Neoplatonists cite brief, sometimes very brief fragments<sup>34</sup>. Moreover, these texts do not set out the pure Chaldæan doctrine, but rather the Platonic interpretation of it. In many cases, these quotations are not clearly marked off as such; unlike the Chaldæan Oracles which figured in Porphyry's *Philosophy of the Oracles*, they do not stand out clearly from the rest of the text, but constitute a part of the system of their Neoplatonic transmitters. The belief in the pre-established

---

reprint of Petavius' edition Migne, *P. G.* LXVI. The important study of Wilamowitz, *Die Hymnen des Proklos und Synesios*, x, *Sitzungsberichte der Berliner Akademie*, 1907. XIV, has been consulted. I had not the possibility of using the new edition of Synesius' hymns made by Terzaghi (1915).

<sup>32</sup> ed. A. Ludwich in *Eudociae Augustae, Procli Lycii, Claudiani carminum Graecorum reliquiae*, Leipzig 1897. Cf. Wilamowitz' critical remarks. The obvious influence of the Chaldæan Oracles upon Synesius' and Proclus' hymns has not yet been studied. Many verses of these hymns will be quoted in this work, as they throw light on the doctrine of the Oracles; it will however be impossible to investigate their specific characteristics. Bidez, *C. M. A. G.* VI 226 f. points out the influence exerted by Porphyry's and Iamblichus' writings on the Chaldæan Oracles upon Synesius' work *On Dreams*.

<sup>33</sup> As Hugo Koch has shown in his well-known work *Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita in seinen Beziehungen zum Neuplatonismus und Mysterienwesen*, Mainz 1900, many Chaldæan conceptions and themes live on in the writings of Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita, who derives his knowledge of them from writings of Proclus. As he does not cite the Chaldæan Oracles, he may be left out of account here.

<sup>34</sup> About 250 Oracles-verses are cited by Kroll: these are made up of 1 poem of 16 and 2 of 11 verses; of one fragment of 7, two of 5, seven of 4, fifteen of 3, ca. thirty-five of 2 verses, the others are monostichs.

harmony between Plato's teaching and the utterances of the Chaldæan gods had established the authority of the Oracles; and acting upon it, their interpreters felt themselves entitled to impose a Platonic meaning upon the Chaldæan terms, or to replace these by their own. These substitutions frequently blur the distinction between the two doctrines; and the affinity between them only renders the task of differentiating between the original Chaldæan conception and its interpretation more difficult. The Platonic element subsisting in the system propounded by the Chaldæan theurgists accounts for this affinity, and at the same time provides the reason for the success of this doctrine among the Neoplatonists. The latter, however, enlarged upon and span out the ideas which they found congenial, and their additions are not always easily recognizable for what they are<sup>35</sup>. A further difficulty derives from the poetical diction of the Chaldæan Oracles which tends to veil the essential meaning, hinted at, rather than expressed, in brief allusions and in obscure paraphrases. These texts only follow in this respect the laws of their literary genre, in which the use of cryptic style was considered as obligatory<sup>36</sup>. The saying of Heraclitus describing the oracular style of the God of Delphi who "neither utters nor hides his meanings, but shows it by a sign" applies likewise to the gods of the Chaldæan Oracles. The description of the Oracles as mere riddles would, however, be inapt. For the deliberate opacity of these theological revelations must not blind us to their being founded in a definite system of thought, provided with a consistent terminology. Had the complete Collection come down to us, it would, assuredly, not have been unduly difficult to determine the real meaning of the text. If the task of its interpreter is often ungrateful,

---

<sup>35</sup> This is one of the major differences between the methods to be followed in extracting Chaldæan quotations on the one hand and Orphic on the other from Neoplatonic texts.

<sup>36</sup> This peculiar diction (about which Excursus III may be compared) can serve in doubtful cases as a criterium of the Chaldæan origin of a passage, especially in an abstract philosophical context which sets off its particularities. Proclus often embellishes his prose with phrases drawn from the Chaldæan Oracles, without indicating that they are quotations. His appreciation of the aesthetic qualities of the Oracles is proved by his Hymns.

and if the problem he sets out to solve sometimes seems to partake of the nature of a jigsaw puzzle, the reason is to be sought in the fragmentary character of the tradition and in the necessity of keeping in check the constant temptation to adopt the Neoplatonic explanations.

The particular conditions of the transmission of the Chaldæan Oracles determine the methods to be used in extracting them from the texts in which they are embedded, as well as in interpreting them. This investigation must rely in the first place on the direct quotations. The explanations of the Neoplatonists should be adopted only when supported by external or internal proof. Kroll was the first to apply himself consistently to the task of differentiating between the Chaldæan and the Platonic ideas; in our analysis of the relevant texts, we shall have to appraise the extent of his success or of his failure. After having extracted the dispersed fragments, the investigator should aim at a synthesis of the portions that are correlated; and this should lead to a reconstruction of the entire system. In this research, "binding" and "loosing" should go hand in hand. Some suppositions will be made which temporarily will have to go without proof, the arguments in their favour belonging to a later stage of this investigation. As in all such attempts, only the complete reconstituted system can, by bearing the impress of truth, compel conviction, and justify, at the same time, the various hypotheses necessitated by its reconstruction. "Il est impossible de ranger les pièces, à qui n'a une forme du total en sa teste" (Montaigne).

2. *The Supreme Being*.—The Chaldæan hierarchy is headed by a Supreme God, Whose mythical predicates are: "Father", "Great Father", "All-Father", "Father of the Fathers", "Only Father of the mortals and of the blessed immortals", "Father of men and of gods", "Supreme King of the blessed", "Great God", "Lord"<sup>37</sup>. But all these

---

<sup>37</sup> πατήρ : passim. πατήρ μέγας : *Theos.* 13, 4 (ch. 1, n. 45). παντοπάτωρ : *Theos.* 27, 13 (ch. 1, n. 26). πατήρ πατέρων : *Procl. Crat.* 59, 2 (Kroll 16). Θνητῶν ἀθανάτων τε πάτερ μακάρων : *Theos.* 27, 14. πατήρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε : Homeric, cf. ch. III, n. 23. μακάρων βασιλῆ μεγίστῳ : *Theos.* 35, 5 (ch. 1, n. 67). Θεοῦ μέγαλοιο : *Theos.* 35, 1 (in contradistinction from Θεός, *Theos.* 35, 16). δέσποτα : *Theos.* 27, 2. ἀναξ : note 177 (v. 5).

appellations are merely descriptive, not positive designations, for His real name is "ineffable"<sup>38</sup>.

The 'Father' is enthroned in solitary majesty above the starry spheres, in the intelligible world, which encloses the eight spheres (those of the seven planets and the zone of the fixed stars)<sup>39</sup>, and is composed of pure fire<sup>40</sup>. Considered as the source of this spiritual substance, He is also called: "First transcendent Fire"<sup>41</sup>, "Holy Fire"<sup>42</sup>. "The uniquely Transcendent"<sup>43</sup>. The 'intelligible'

<sup>38</sup> ἀρρητε: *Theos.* 27. 1 (ch. 1, n. 26, v. 1). Cf. Psellus, *Hyp.* 1. 1 (p. 73, 4) ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀρρήτου... ἐνός and the sentence quoted by Bidez, *C. M. A. G.* VI 163, 9 Χαλδαῖοι ἐν Φασί τὸ πρῶτον αἰτίον, ὃ δὴ καὶ ἀφθελγυκτότατον λέγουσιν.

<sup>39</sup> *Theos.* 27. 2 (ch. 1, n. 26) «κόσμων ἀμφιδρόμων ἐποχούμενε... νῶτοις χιθερλοῖς». As the sphere of the fixed stars (designated *ibid.* v. 6 by the words οὐρανὸν ἀστερόεντα see n. 129) is comprised in the notion "the revolving worlds", the First Principle is supposed to abide above *i. e.* outside the ethereal world. Cf. Martian. Capella II 202 (see ch. III, n. 3 (b)) "partem... empyrio quodam intellectualique mundo gaudentem iuxta ipsum extimi ambitus murum".

<sup>40</sup> The Oracles designate the highest world κόσμος πύριος (see notes 184 and 270), παννύκτερος κόσμος (note 81), ὑπέροσμος πατρικὸς βυθὸς (note 351). Cf. Martian. Capella (quoted note 39) "empyrio... intellectualique mundo". Procl. *Crat.* 76, 22 τῷ πρωτίῳ τῶν κόσμων καὶ ἐμπυρίῳ καὶ ἑορῶ. *Tim* II 58, 8 f.

<sup>41</sup> πῦρ ἐπέκεινα τὸ πρῶτον; see note 184.

<sup>42</sup> Mich. Ital. 181, 12 (Kroll 13) Αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ πατήρ «ἱερὸν (see n. 277) πῦρ» ἀνυμνούμενος παρ' αὐτοῖς (sc. τοῖς Χαλδαίοις).

<sup>43</sup> Ἄπαξ ἐπέκεινα and δις ἐπέκεινα (as to the latter notion see note 187) are mentioned as Chaldæan terms by: Psellus, *Hyp.* 6-9 and *Expos.* 1152 A. Mich. Ital. 182, 8 ff. Procl. *Crat.* 59, 19 αἱ δὲ Θεοπαράδοτοι φῆμαι (see Excursus I e) τὴν Θεότητα ταύτην (sc. Κρόνος, see Excursus VII) ... λέγουσαι «ἄπαξ ἐπέκεινα» Mart. Cap. II 205 "secundum Platonis quoque mysterium ἄπαξ καὶ δις ἐπέκεινα potestates" (cf. ch. III, n. 3 (b)). In addition to these passages (as well as those to be quoted note 187) which are adduced by Kroll 16 ff., we may call attention to a text which was not edited at the time when he wrote his study: Lydus' quotation from Porphyry (see ch. 1, n. 23). As this passage is extracted from Porphyry's *Philosophy of the Oracles* which very probably did not quote any Chaldæan writings but the Oracles, it may serve to disprove Kroll's supposition that the two terms in question derive from some other work of Julian the Theurgist.

Ὁ ἄπαξ ἐπέκεινα means "He Who is transcendentally One"; cf. Psellus, *Hyp.* 9

space is named in the Oracles "the Father's Depth" or "Silence"<sup>44</sup>,

3. *Power, Intellect and Will of the Supreme Being.*—The Supreme Being is said to be "withdrawn" from the inferior entities; but He "does not enclose His Fire in His Power"<sup>45</sup>; that is to say the personality of the "Father" remains transcendent, but His action unfolds itself through His Power. Power, *δύναμις*, is the sum of the noetic potencies included

---

(p. 74, 19) ὁ δὲ ἀπαξ ἐπέκεινα λέγεται, ὅτι ἐνιαῖος ἐστίν. (see note 187). Kroll p. 17, 2 proposed a different explanation, but later withdraw it; see *P.-W.* s. v. Julianos No. 9, p. 16. His final interpretation is that ἀπαξ and δις ἐπέκεινα designate "different modes of transcendency of two divine beings", but this solution cannot be accepted without qualification. Porphyry's genealogical explanation (δις = δεύτερος ἀπό, see ch. 1, n. 23) is untenable from the linguistic point of view; it presupposes the Plotinian doctrine of the three noetic principles; cf. Porphyry, *Hist. Philos. Fragm.* XVI, p. 14, 5 and XVII, p. 14, 17 ed. Nauck.

<sup>44</sup> See notes 351 and 353.

<sup>45</sup> Psellus, *Comm.* 1144 A (Kroll 12) «Ὁ πατήρ ἑαυτὸν ἤρπασεν (the metrical form would be ἤρπασεν αὐτόν, cf. the analogous use of the reflexive pronoun in *Theos.* 27, 8, quoted below note 146) οὐδ' ἐν ἧ δυνάμει νοερά κλείσας ἰδὸν πυρ», misinterpreted by Kroll, is to be translated: "The Father rapted himself away, but did not enclose His own Fire in His noetic Power". The passage quoted note 184 pre-supposes likewise that the Primal noetic Fire causes its Power to exert an action upon the lower worlds.

As for ἀρπάζειν (a poetical equivalent of χωρίζειν, διαιρεῖν, ἐξαιρεῖν; cf. Procl. *Parm.* 628, 10 f. 620, 22 f. 1070, 4 f. 14 f. Concerning the πρώτος Θεὸς ἔξω ὑπάρχων see below note 240) cf. *Anon. Taur.* IX 1 (Kroll 12): οἱ δὲ (later Neoplatonists who referred to the Chaldaean Oracles) ἀρπάσαι ἑαυτὸν ἐκ πάντων τῶν ἑαυτοῦ εἰπόντες, continued note 46. Proclus often uses the Chaldaean expression ἀρπάζειν ἑαυτὸν in order to qualify the transcendental character of the Supreme Being; cf. the passages quoted by Kroll 12: *Parm.* 628, 11. 1067, 3. *Th. Pl.* 270, 8. *Exc. Vat.* 194, 29. *Crat.* 58, 8. In one passage (*Parm.* 1071, 2) he ventures to form the neologism ὑπερήρπασται, analogous to ὑπερήνωται which attempts to exaggerate the transcendent significance of Iamblichus' ἐνοῦσθαι, and ὑπερήπλωται (*Parm.* 1070, 7; according to Iamblichus) goes a stage beyond the Plotinian ἀπλωσις; cf. Koch 163 ff. and Dodds, *Proclus* 248 f.

The attribute μύστης (*Theos.* 27, 1; see ch. 1, n. 26) signifies that the Supreme God does not reveal the mystery of his transcendence. It corresponds to the Orphic term κρύβιος (Kern, *Orph. Fragm.* p. 159, No. 87 v. 5) as used by Proclus (see Koch, 120).



in the Supreme God; and as these fill the whole Empyrean, the term is also used to designate the *mundus intelligibilis*<sup>46</sup>. The "Father" himself has no direct external activity; He uses intermediaries.

These intermediaries are His faculties who in their virtuality are identical with the Supreme Being, but acquire in the state of actuality a particular existence<sup>47</sup>. The action of the transcendent God is thought, consequently the first entity that issues from Him is His Intellect, the *πατρικὸς νοῦς*<sup>48</sup>. His Will (*βουλή*)<sup>49</sup> acts in harmony with this

<sup>46</sup> *Δύναμις* is the sum of the noetic powers of the "Father"; cf. the passages quoted in the notes 45, 47, 65, 75, 184.

<sup>47</sup> That is the meaning of the verse quoted by Procl. *Th. Pl.* 365, 3 (Kroll 13): «ἢ μὲν γὰρ δύναμις σὺν ἐκείνῳ [sc. τῷ πατρὶ], νοῦς δ' ἀπ' ἐκείνου», κατὰ τὸ λόγιον (the *Nous* separated from the "Father is not the *πατρικὸς νοῦς* but the latter's emanation, the demiurgical *Nous*; see below sect. 6) *Δύναμις* and *Νοῦς* are contained in the "Father", cf. Anon. *Taur.* IX 1 (see note 45) οἱ δέ... δύναμιν τε αὐτῷ (sc. τῷ πατρὶ) διδόναι καὶ νοῦν ἐν τῇ ἀπλότητι αὐτοῦ συνηνώσθαι (continued note 181); see note 48.

The Neoplatonist doctrine of the triad *πατήρ-δύναμις-νοῦς* (cf. e. g. Procl. *Tim* I 389, 26. III 229, 25. *Dam.* I 100, 20. 108, 17. 309, 24. Olympiodor. *Phaed.* 240, 17 f.) is based upon this verse; cf. Psellus, *Expos.* 1149 C. It is however at variance with the corresponding Chaldæan conception; cf. Kroll 12 f. and Excursus VII.

<sup>48</sup> *Νοῦς πατρὸς* or *πατρικὸς νοῦς* are often substituted for *πατήρ* in descriptions of the action of the Supreme God; see notes 165, 177 (v. 1), 232, 260. Cf. also Procl. *Th. Pl.* 321, 3 (Kroll 16) ὁ Κρόνος (= ὁ ἀπαξ ἐπέκεινα (see Excursus VII) ὑπὸ τῶν Θεῶν (Excursus I h) καὶ τῷ νῷ συνωδεῖν (see note 50) λέγεται. PSELLUS, *Hyp.* 7 (p. 74, 7) is right in saying that the Supreme God is "Paternal Intellect with respect to the νοητῶν" (ἔστι δὲ ὁ ἀπαξ ἐπέκεινα νοῦς πατρικὸς ὡς πρὸς τὰ νοητῶν). His immediate action is often described in the Oracles by (ἐκ) *πατρόθεν*; cf. e. g., ch. I, n. 154; ch. II, n. 51 and 249; ch. III, n. 104. ἐξ *πατρόθεν* is modelled upon homeric ἐξ οὐρανόθεν. See KÜHNER-BLASS, *Griechische Grammatik*, I, 1. p. 491.

The Paternal Intellect is designated as *αὐτογένεθλος* in the Oracle quoted note 232 and as *ἀγήραος* in the Oracle quoted by Procl., *Th. Pl.*, 264, 19: τῶν δὲ Θεολόγων τὸ ἀγήρων τῇ τάξει ταύτῃ, sc. τῇ τοῦ Κρόνου, προσήκειν λεγόντων, ὡς οἱ τε βάρβαροι (Excursus I k) φασί.

<sup>49</sup> God's Will is mentioned in the Chaldæan Oracles in the following contexts:

(1) All is subject to the noetic powers, "serving the persuading Will of the Father" (*πατρὸς πειθηνίδι βουλή*); cf. n. 246.

entity<sup>50</sup>; for His volition is thought, and His thought is action<sup>51</sup>. Intellect, Will and Power constitute as the immediate faculties of the "Father", the "Paternal Monad"<sup>52</sup>. This recognition of the various attributes of the

(2) The angels obey ("the perdurable resolutions" of their "Father" (πατρός ἡμετέρου πολυαρκέσι βουλαῖς; cf. ch. 1, n. 77) and chant his praise "in accordance with their Will and with Thine" (βουλόμενον ῥ' ἐθέλοντες; cf. ch. 1, n. 26, v. 19).

(3) The sun moves "in accordance with the Will eternal of the Father"; cf. ch. 1v, n. 99 (v. 4).

(4) The created souls descend into the terrestrial world "according to the Paternal Will" (διὰ βούλησιν πατρικῆν); cf. ch. 111, n. 17.

(5) The Iynges move "according to the unessable will of the Father" (βουλαῖς ἀφθέγκτοις); cf. n. 249.

(6) God Aion manifests himself only when the "Father" decides (εἰ μὴ . . . βουλαῖς βουλεύσῃσι πατήρ μέγας); cf. ch. 1, n. 46 (v. 3).

(7) "The Father's Intellect thinking with His vigorous Will" (ἀκμάδι βουλή) creates the Ideas; cf. n. 177 (v. 1).

Βουλή is sometimes replaced by its Homeric equivalent νεῦμα (or by the verb (κατανεύω):

(8) "All is subject to the Nodding of the Intellect (νόου ὑπὸ νεύματι) of the great God"; cf. ch. 1, n. 67 (v. 1).

(9) The "Father" mingles the spark of the soul "with Intellect and Divine Nodding" (νῶν καὶ νεύματι θεῶν); see ch. 111, n. 8.

(10) "The Father's Will nodded (οὗ τὸ τέλειν κατένευσε, according to *Iliad*, 1. 521 f.) and every thing was already divided"; cf. n. 165.

The term "resolution" is likewise synonymous with Will.

(11) "Creation was resolved upon (γένεσις δεδόχεται), when Thou boundest it in forms"; cf. ch. 1, n. 26 (v. 11), ch. 11, n. 186.

<sup>50</sup> Νοῦς and νεῦμα are called in another Oracle (quoted ch. 111, n. 8) ὁμόνοιαι "like-minded" (cf. note 48 *συνωδεῖν* and ΠΟΡΡΗ., *Regr.*, 35, 27: «πατρικὸν νοῦν... qui paternae est conscius voluntatis.»)

<sup>51</sup> «Πατρόθεν γὰρ ἐστὶν βουλή τε τέλος τε»; see n. 177, v. 3 «πάντα γὰρ ἐξετέλεσσαε πατήρ»; see n. 181.

<sup>52</sup> Procl., *Alc.*, 356, 23 (Kroll 15):

«(ὅπου πατρικὴ μονὰς ἐστὶν».

τὸ λέγιον φησι; cf. IDEM, *Eucl.*, p 98, 17. According to Proclus ὅπου refers to τὸ ἀγαθὸν a notion which does not figure in the extant fragments, but is attested by Pselus as having been used by the Chaldæans; cf. *Comm.*, 1149 C (Kroll 10): Μίαν

“Father” is a corollary to the principle of the absolute transcendence of the Supreme Being, taught in Chaldean theology. The ‘Father’s’ external activity is conditional upon His detaching from Himself those of His aspects that are destined to create and rule the lower orders of the hierarchy. For this reason, He makes His Will and His Intellect cooperate in the unfolding of His Power.

Every act of thought of the Paternal Intellect brings forth new noetic orders, described as procreations, effluences and divisions of the Supreme Principle<sup>53</sup>. They constitute the “intelligible world”, “begotten” of Him. Their powers and entities, which issue forth in a certain order, fill the noetic universe, which at the same time is nothing but the Supreme Being, the Father. “All things descend from one Fire”<sup>54</sup>, and “the Father is everything, but noetically”<sup>55</sup>, are the two principal statements that describe the nature and the action of the Supreme Being Who is also called “He Who cannot be dismembered”, because He is an indivisible unity<sup>56</sup>.

*ἀρχὴν τῶν πάντων δοξάζουσιν καὶ « ἐν » αὐτῇ» (see n. 54) καὶ « ἀγαθὸν » ἀνυμνοῦσιν.* We must not however lose sight of the fact that Proclus identifies the Chaldean conception of the *πατρικόν* with the Platonic *ἀγαθόν*; cf. Excursus, VII.

<sup>53</sup> As to the various types of representations of the process of emanation, see ch. vi, sect. 7.

<sup>54</sup> PSELLUS, *Comm.*, 1145 A (Kroll 15).

« Ἔστι (δὲ) πάντα ἐνὸς πυρὸς ἐκγεγῶτα ».

(*εἰσι codd.*, *corr.*). According to PSELLUS, *Hyp.*, 1 (p. 73, 4) ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀρρήτου . . . ἐνός (see n. 38); *Comm.*, 1149 C (quoted n. 52) and *Script. min.*, p. 446, 21 οὗτοι (οἱ Χαλδαῖοι) καὶ τὸ πρὸ πάντων ἐν δοιμάζουσι, the Chaldean Oracles named the Supreme Being “One” (ἐν); according to *Anon. Taur.*, IX 1 (Kroll 12) καὶ τὸ ἐν» λέγειν αὐτὸν εἶναι παντελῶς παραιτεῖσθαι they avoided the term. Proclus, who is the source of Psellus, may have based his statement on the Chaldean expression ἐνὸς πυρὸς.

<sup>55</sup> *Dam.* I 147, 27 (Kroll 19); cf. 153, 20 et *passim* : « Πάντ’ ἐστὶ γάρ, ἀλλὰ νοητῶς » (sc. τὸ ἐν), *Φησὶ τὸ λόγιον*.

<sup>56</sup> PROCL., *Crat.*, 59, 2 (Kroll 19) ἐστὶ γὰρ (ὁ ἀπαξ ἐπέκεινα), ὡς *Φησὶ τὸ λόγιον*, « ἀμισύλλευτος ». He interprets the last word as meaning *ἐνοειδής* and *ἀδιαίρετος*; cf. also *Dam.* II, 148, 11. *Damascius* II, 43, 23 renders *ἀμισύλλευτος* correctly by the term *ἀμερής*, but errs in citing II, 139, 11 this Neoplatonic equivalent as a Chaldean notion.

The sequence in which the noetic orders become manifest is set forth in the Hymn of the Angels figuring in the *Theosophy*<sup>57</sup>. After the ‘‘Father’’ and the ‘‘Mother’’, ‘‘the children’s tender flower’’ is mentioned, that is to say, the Ideas generated by the Intellect, viz. the Power of the Father. After these comes Psyche, the World-Soul, last of the noetic entities. Beneath the Intellect, and close to Psyche, perhaps in her sphere, we may situate Aion, whose exact position in the hierarchy will be discussed further on. Notwithstanding the above-mentioned sequence of the noetic entities, we shall examine the conceptions of Psyche and of Aion before treating of the Ideas. This inversion of the order of the emanations is due to practical reasons : for the exposition of the theory of Ideas leads us by natural transition to the discussion of cosmogony and cosmology.

As ‘‘Power’’ is the transmitter of the ‘Father’s’ activity, she constitutes, as it were, a reservoir of all the powers enclosed in Him. Accordingly, He is called the ‘‘Connective of all Sources’’<sup>58</sup>, and she ‘‘the Source of Sources’’, and ‘‘Womb connecting all things’’<sup>59</sup>. As ‘‘Power’’ belongs in Greek to the feminine gender, this entity, considered as the hypostasis of the Supreme Father, is addressed in the Hymn of the Angels figuring in the *Theosophy* as ‘‘the Mother’s radiant Form’’<sup>60</sup>. The Supreme Being constitutes in conjunction with Power an androgynous primordial principle.

<sup>57</sup> Cf. ch. I, n. 58 et seq.

<sup>58</sup> PROCL., *Crat.* 59, 3 (Kroll 19; see above n. 56) Ἐστὶ γάρ (ὁ ἀπαξ ἐπέκεινα), ὡς φησὶ τὸ λόγιον. . . πασῶν συνοχεύς (see n. 240) τῶν πηγῶν. *Ibidem* 58, 11 ἐν τοῖς λογίοις τὴν πρωτίστην πηγὴν τῶν ἀφειλικτῶν (the world-shaping Ideas: see n. 200) λέγεται περιέχειν (sc. ὁ ἀπαξ ἐπέκεινα).

<sup>59</sup> PROCL., *Tim.*, I 451, 17 (Kroll 19) Τὰ λόγια τὸν μέγιστον τοῦτον Θεὸν « πηγὴν πηγῶν » προσαγορεύει continued n. 200. DAM. II, 67, 3 « πηγὴ τῶν πηγῶν » καὶ πηγὴ ἀπασῶν, κατὰ τὸ λόγιον, « μήτρα συνέχουσα (see n. 240) τὰ πάντα ». Using these quotations Kroll reconstitutes the following verse :

« Πηγὴ τῶν πηγῶν, μήτρα συνέχουσα τὰ πάντα ».

According to Damascius, the verse refers to the αὐτοζῶον, which corresponds in the system of Proclus and himself to the Chaldean πατρικὸς νοῦς; cf. n. 62 and Excursus VII. Synes. *Hymn.*, III, 171 and IV, 69 παγὰ παγῶν imitates the Oracle.

<sup>60</sup> « μητέρος ἀγλαὸν εἶδος »; see ch. I, n. 59.

Power, the "primordial Source", conveys the thoughts of the Paternal Intellect to the lower orders of the hierarchy. An allusion to this process is to be found in the phrase: "All of them spring from one Source". This effluence of the supreme thoughts is sometimes also called "Paternal Source", and the "First, self-produced Source of the Father"<sup>61</sup>. As the First Intellect is the originator of all the potencies which fill the "womb" of Power, the terms "Source of Sources", etc. apply also to him.

4. *Hecate-Psyche, the Cosmic Soul*.—From this Intellect the Supreme Being causes immediately to spring forth the principle of Life. The Paternal Intellect is therefore called in the Oracles: "The Giver-forth of the life-sustaining Fire" who causes to flow "the nutritive Strength of the mighty Fire"<sup>62</sup>; whereas Life herself receives the epithets: "Beginning and Source of Life"<sup>63</sup> and "Life-giving Flame, Source of all things and Principle of all things"<sup>64</sup>. This Source of Life, called "the first

<sup>61</sup> « Πηγῆς δὲ μιᾶς ἀπο πᾶσαι (sc. αἰ ἰδέαι) ἐξέθορον ». « Μία πηγῆ ». « Πηγῆς πατρικῆς ». « Πρώτη πατρός. . . αὐτοτελῆς πηγῆ » cf. n. 177, v. 2, 8, 13, 15.

<sup>62</sup> Procl., *Tim.*, I 420, 12 (Kroll 19) Ἡ τρίτη τοῖνυν τριάς ἡ νοητὴ τὸ αὐτοζῶνον (= ὁ πατρικὸς νοῦς, see note 59), περὶ ἧς καὶ τὰ λόγια φησιν, ὅτι « ἐμγάτις » (cf. *Dam.* II, 51, 27. 60, 23), ὅτι « ἐκδότις » (see *Excursus* III, 1 c) ἐστὶ « πυρὸς ζωηφόρου », ὅτι καὶ τὸν « ζυρογόνου » πληροῖ « τῆς Ἐκάτης κόλπου » (see notes 69, 111, 209) καὶ ἐπιρρεῖ τοῖς « συνοχεύσιν » (see n. 242).

« ἀλκὴν ζειδώρου πυρὸς μέγα δυναμένοιο ».

We may attempt to reconstruct the metre :

« ἐκδότις (ἡ πηγῆ) ζωηφορίου πυρὸς ἐστὶ. . . ἐμπλήσας (τ') Ἐκάτης κόλπου προχέει συνοχεύσιν ἀλκὴν ζειδώρου πυρὸς μέγα δυναμένοιο. » (ἐπιρρέω is Proclus' equivalent for the Chaldæan *προχέω*, as is shown in the paraphrase of the fragment quoted in note 65).

<sup>63</sup> « Ἀρχὴ πηγῆ τε ζωῆς »; cf. ch. 1, n. 67, v. 2 and n. 71.

<sup>64</sup> *Theos.*, No. 15 :

« Ἔσθ ὑπερουρανίου πυρὸς ἀφθίτος αἰθομένη φλόξ, ζωογόνος, πάντων πηγῆ, πάντων δὲ καὶ ἀρχῆ, ἣτε φύει μάλα πάντα φύουσά τε πάντ' ἀναλύει ».

The Chaldæan origin of this text is evinced by its terminology as well as by the fact that *Theos.*, No. 13 (a text deriving from the Chaldæan Oracles, see ch. 1, n. 46), begins with the same words. While ἀφθίτου figures in cod. T. the other MSS. have ἐφθίτας. When there are several attributes, the substantive usually comes first or last. The appended scholium πάντα μὲν φύει τὰ κατὰ δημιουργικῶς, πάντα δὲ τὰ θαῦλα προνοητικῶς ἀναλίσκει derives from Porphyry, as is shown by the two adverbs.

in power", "conceives in ineffable Wombs and pours forth on the All a rushing generation" <sup>65</sup>.

This hypostasis of Life is identical with Psyche, the Cosmic Soul. It is true that the Neoplatonic transmitters of the Oracles, habituated to a differentiated ontology, distinguish between Psyche and Zoé (Life) <sup>66</sup>;

<sup>65</sup> PROCL., *Crat.*, 81. 2 (Kroll 30 f.) Περὶ δὲ τῆς ζωογόνου πηγῆς Ῥέας . . . οὕτως φησὶν τὰ λόγια.

«Ῥεῖη τοι νοερῶν μακάρων πηγῆ τε ῥοή τε. πάντων γὰρ πρώτη δυνάμει κόλποισι ν ἀφρόστοις δεξαμένη γενεὴν ἐπὶ πᾶν προχέει τροχάουσαν.»

Kroll, misled by Proclus ambiguous language, did not interpret the Oracle correctly, and for this reason suspected that it was a Neoplatonic forgery. Ῥεῖη is not however in this passage the name of the Mother of Gods, as stated by Proclus, whose opinion is based upon his identification of Rhea with Hecate (cf. note 66) and upon the Platonic etymology *Crat.*, 402 b Ῥέα = ῥοή (cf. *Th. Pl.*, 266, 24 f. *Dam.* II, 154, 15 f. Proclus' source was Iamblichus, a point which may be proved by the concordance between him and JULIAN, *Orat.*, V, 166 A. 179 D). Rhea does not figure in the Chaldæan pantheon. The term in question is the feminine of ῥᾶδιος (cf. the pun ῥεῖα . . . ῥοή which alludes, according to Proclus' own remark (*Crat.*, 81. 14), to the Homeric *Ἐοὶ ῥεῖα ζῶντες*. As for other puns of this kind see note 70). Kroll's misinterpretation, adopted by WENLAND, *Philol. Week.*, 1895, 1039 f. A. D. Nock, *Sallustius*, Cambridge 1926, p. LII f., and BIDEZ, *Vie de Julien*, 76, has led Kern to connect the ῥεῖη πηγῆ of this Chaldæan Oracle with the Orphic Rhea (*Orph. Fragm.*, 132). — In the second verse, δυνάμει, which Kroll after Taylor replaces by δυνάμεις, should stand; cf. «ψυχῆ πῦρ δυνάμει πατρὸς οὔσα Φαιδόν», quoted note 75. — πάντων, for which Kroll proposes to substitute πατρὸς, should likewise cause no difficulty; it refers to the νοεροὶ μάκαρες. A full interpretation of the Oracle, which deals with the creation of the heavenly gods, may be found below, sect. 14 (see n. 350).

<sup>66</sup> Proclus identifies the Chaldæan Hecate with the "Life-generating Goddess" (ἡ ζωογόνος Θεός) who occupies the second place in the intellectual (νοερά or πηγία) hebdomad, (see note 283 and Excursus VII) and is represented by Rhea in the so-called "Hellenic theology", i. e. that of the Orphics (cf. *Th. Pl.*, V c. 11 ff.). Accordingly, Proclus regards the various aspects of this Chaldæan goddess: ψυχῆ, Φύσις, εἰμαρμένη, as processions (πρόοδοι, σειραὶ) of the ζωογόνος Θεά; cf. e. g. *Tim.* I, 11, 9 ff. (quoted n. 91) III 271. 1 ff. *Pl. Th.*, V c. 32. *Prov.*, 179, 22 ff. (quoted ch. v, n. 21). As the "Source" is the highest link of every "chain" (PSELLUS, *Hyp.*, 28, p. 76, 2 f. ἐκástης δὲ σειρᾶς ἡ ἀκρότης «πηγῆ» ὀνομάζεται; cf. PROCL., *Tim.*, I, 319, 5 and *passim*), Ζωή is described by PROCLUS, *Tim.*, III 271, 23 as πηγία ψυχῆ and by *Dam.* II, 59, 21 (Kroll 22, 4) as πηγία Ἐκάτη, and Hecate by PSELLUS, *Expos.*, 1152 B as ἡ τῶν ζωογόνων ἀρχῶν ἀκρότης. See also note 152 f.

but the concordance of the statements of the Chaldæan texts concerning the two hypostases proves that these are identical. In one Oracle, Psyche is called "The mistress of Life" <sup>67</sup>; another states that the "Source of Sources" "fills the life-generating womb of Hecate" <sup>68</sup>, that is Psyche; a third one speaks of the life-generating sound of Hecate" (regarded as the fountain-head of Life) <sup>69</sup>. Consequently, Life and Soul are but two aspects of the same entity.

Only fragments of the Oracles dealing with the nature and the action of Psyche are extant; but their statements enable us to form a general idea of this entity. Psyche is situated "behind the Father's Thoughts", that is to say her place in the noetic hierarchy is behind the Paternal Intellect <sup>70</sup>. She was created by the "Father" without any intermediary <sup>71</sup>, and is filled with His Intellect <sup>72</sup> who, being her ruler, is desi-

<sup>67</sup> See note 75.

<sup>68</sup> See note 62.

<sup>69</sup> Dam. II, 154, 18 (Kroll 29) Ἰί τε μεγάλη Ἐκάτη. . . ζωογόνον ροιζήμα προήσιν; 156, 15 ἡ ζωογόνος. . . διακεκριμένην ἔχει. . . τήν τε ἐπὶ πάντα φοιτῶσαν ἐκροί-ζησιν τοῦ ζωογόνου.

As to the meaning of ροιζέω see note 177, *ad v.* 1 and note 83 (a).

<sup>70</sup> Procl., *Tim.* 11, 61, 22 (Kroll 28) Οὕτω δὴ (*sicut* ΠΛΑΤΟ, *Tim.*, 32 c 8 *διανοηθείς*) καὶ τὰ λόγια τὰς μεριστάς τοῦ δημιουργοῦ νοήσεις (the particular ideas, see below note 177, v. 8 and PSELLUS, *Expos.*, 1153 A *ἰδέας δὲ νομίζουσι. . . τὰς τοῦ πατρὸς ἐνοίας*) «διανοίας» προσεέφηκε.

«Μετὰ δὴ πατρικὰς διανοίας Ψυχὴ ἐγὼ ναίω Θέρμη ψυχοῦσα τὰ πάντα».

Cf. *Tim.*, I, 408, 12, *Parm.*, 925, 16. HERMIAS. *Phaedr.*, p. 161 fin. ed. Ast (ad *Phaedr.* 251 c 8), Dam. II, 16, 13. The pun Θέρμη (referring to the noetic Fire of the substance of the World-Soul, see note 98) ψυχοῦσα (the verb also means to "cool") is similar to that which concerns *ρετα* and *ροή* (note 65); see also *σῶμα σώσεις*, note 387. Kroll 28 and 66 regards the Oracle as a Neoplatonic forgery, because he considered it as impossible that ψυχὴ could be subordinated to νοῦς before the time of Plotinus; about this question see ch. vi, sect. 3.

The Oracle contains an utterance of Psyche herself, see note 118.

<sup>71</sup> Psyche is called for this reason *πατρογενής* (see note 209, v. 3) or *ἀρχιγένεθλος* (see note 83 (a) v. 3).

<sup>72</sup> The "lightnings" which according to a fragment quoted n. 209 fill the "wombs" of Hecate, are the particular ideas. Cf. also Procl. *Crat.* 105, 28 (Kroll

gnated as the "Vigour of Strength", or "Power of Strength"<sup>73</sup>. The distich: "The Might of the immeasurable God and the boundless Strength dominate all things, and rule over all things"<sup>74</sup>, probably refer to the Paternal Intellect and Psyche. In another Oracle we find the following definition: "Psyche is a Fire, luminous through the Power of the Father. She remains immortal, and is mistress of Life"<sup>75</sup>. According to a fragment which may be quoted in the same connection, the Fire which renders

98) Ἐκάτη . . . πεπλήρωται μὲν ἀχράντων δυνάμεων ἀπὸ τῶν ἀμειλίκτων Θεῶν (i. e. the ideas, see note 201) and Dam. II, 156, 16 f. (see note 62) ἡ ζωογόνος . . . ἔχει καὶ ἐκφανῆ . . . τὴν ἀμειλίκτον δύναμιν.

<sup>73</sup> Cf. *Theos.*, 27. 3 «ἀλκῆς μένος» (see ch. I, note 26 and ch. II, note 247 (a)); the literary model is *Iliad*, IX, 706 *et passim* μένος ἐστὶ καὶ ἀλκῆ) and «ἀλκῆς ἀμφιφροῦς» (designation of the World-Soul, see note 112) δύναμις» (cf. note 376).

<sup>74</sup> DIDYMUS, *De Trinitate*, III, 18. MIGNÉ, *P. G.*, XXXIX, 945 D :

«Κάρτος ἀμετρήτοιο Θεοῦ καὶ ἀπείριτος ἀλκῆ  
πάντων μὲν κρατέει, παντέσσι δὲ μούνος ἀνάσσει».

The Chaldean origin of this anonymous distich may be proved by its use of the words κάρτος and ἀλκῆ. Concerning Didymus' recourse to the Oracles see ch. I, n. 67. As to the repetition of πάντων cf. *Theos.*, 15 v. 2 (quoted note 64) and as to the verbs cf. Proclus, *Hymn*, I. V. 17 «περὶ γὰρ κρατέεις, περὶ δ' Ἰφὶ ἀνάσσει» (modelled upon *Iliad*, XXI, 214 and I, 38, see LUDWICK, *ad loc.*) and *ibid.*, V. 47 «κρατῆρην γὰρ ἔχεις καὶ ἀπείριτον ἀλκῆν». Concerning the use of μόνος as a predicate in prayers see Ed. NORDEN, *Agnostos Theos.*, 350. 1 *et passim*.

κράτος and ἀλκῆ are mentioned together also *Theos.*, 35 v. 3 (see ch. I, n. 67 and 71) «καὶ κράτος ἠδὲ βίη καὶ ἰσχύος ἀφθίτος ἀλκῆ».

The Supreme Intellect is described as πάγκρητος (a neologism of the Chaldeans, see Excursus III, 5. Usually παγκρατής, here with a false *productio epica*) in the Oracle of Hecate quoted ch. I, n. 152 v. 3, a fact which proves that κράτος is one of this faculties. *Theos.*, 27, 6 (see ch. I, n. 26) differentiates between νοῦς and κράτος; accordingly we may regard κράτος as the active force of the νοῦς (i. e. δύναμις in its active aspect).

<sup>75</sup> PSELLUS, *Comm.*, 1141 C (Kroll 47), reconstituted by Bidez-Cumont, *Mages hell.*, I 159, with the help of the text of Pletho (see Excursus VI, 12).

«Ὅτι ψυχῇ πῦρ δυνάμει Πατρός οὔσα φαινόν,  
ἀθάνατός τε μένει καὶ ζωῆς δεσπότις ἐστίν,  
καὶ ἴσχει κόσμου πολλὰ πληρώματα κόλπων.»

v. 1 δυνάμει has (as in the fragment quoted note 65) an instrumental meaning. As for v. 3 which derives from the same Oracle (otherwise Kroll) see below note 210.



the Cosmic Soul luminous is a "portion of the divine fire" and a "Paternal Thought"<sup>76</sup>; in other words, it is an offshoot of the noetic Fire (hence her name "Fire-glowing Thought")<sup>77</sup>, and is produced, like all the other noetic orders, by an act of the supreme Intellect. Psyche's radiance derives from Him as regulator of Power, the feminine Principle included in the "Father". Psyche is therefore called in the Oracles : "Strength of the Father", "Eternal Strength" and "Living Power"<sup>78</sup>.

Psyche is not only a noetic entity, but also a goddess worshipped in the Chaldæan cult. An Oracle in which Psyche herself describes her action states that she "ensouls the All with her warmth"<sup>79</sup>. In another Oracle, the full text of which will be found below, Psyche is described as the "Ensouler of Light, of Fire, of the Ether and of the Worlds"<sup>80</sup>. On the other hand, in an oracle of Hecate, extracted from Porphyry's *Philosophy of the Oracles* and proved in the first chapter of the present work to be of Chaldæan origin, the goddess glorifies her own power which is capable "of ensouling the highest of all worlds" (viz. the Empyrean)<sup>81</sup>. Accordingly, Hecate and Psyche perform in the universe

<sup>76</sup> PSELLUS, *Expos.*, 1152 C (Kroll 47. 2) *Εἰ γὰρ* (sc. ἡ ψυχὴ) *κατὰ τὸ λόγιον :*

(a) «μοῖρα τοῦ πυρός» ἐστὶ «τοῦ Θείου» καὶ

(b) «πῦρ φαινόν» καὶ

(c) «νόημα πατρικόν», εἰδὸς ἐστὶν ἄυλον καὶ ἀύθυπόστατον.

The source of the proodos is Proclus who recapitulates a definition of Iamblichus; cf. Dodds 224 and below ch. vi, n. 176. Psellus combines in this passage 3 fragment of the Oracles : (b) derives from the verses quoted note 75. As for (c) see note 70.

<sup>77</sup> «περιθαλπῆς ἐννοια». whom Proclus *Tim.*, I, 211. 11 (Kroll 56) believes to occupy the "highest order" (*πρωτισίην ἔχειν τάξιν*) in the "holy cult" (*τὸ λόγιον... ἐν τῇ ἱερᾷ θρησκείᾳ*) of the Chaldæans, is Psyche. Cf. besides Dam. II, 102. 17 *ὄθεν καὶ* (sc. ἡ Ζωή, i. e. Ψυχὴ; see note 66) *πρώτη ἐκφαίνεται τοῖς Θεουργοῖς καὶ εἰς τὰ μεθ' αὐτὴν πρώτη προέρχεται ἢδε ἡ Θεός.*

<sup>78</sup> *Theos.*, 27. 6 (ch. 1, n. 26) «σὴ (sc. τοῦ πατρός)... αἰώνιος ἀλκή»; cf. «πατρός ἀλκή» in the fragment quoted note 138, and *Theos.*, 35, 3 (ch. 1, n. 67 and 71) «ισχύος ἀφθίτος ἀλκή». As to the attribute *ζῶσα δύναμις* cf. ch. 1, note 170 and ch. v. notes 11-12.

<sup>79</sup> See note 70.

<sup>80</sup> See note 83 (a) v. 3.

<sup>81</sup> «ὄσση ψυχῶσαι πανυπέρτατον ἤρκεσα κόσμον»; cf. ch. 1, n. 152 v. 7.

the same function<sup>82</sup>. Several texts attest their identity. The most important is a lengthy Chaldæan Oracle which interprets the emblems of the cultual image of Hecate as being symbols of the cosmic orders dominated by her.

This Oracle contains the following description of two orifices with which the hips of the statue or two pitchers attached to these were provided :

“About the cavity of the right hip is poured forth in abundance the plenteous liquid of the first- (*lit.* primordially) generated Soul, who entirely ensouls the Light, the Fire, the Ether and the Worlds. In Hecate’s left hip exists the source of Virtue, which remains wholly within and does not give away its virginity”<sup>83</sup>.

The source of the “First-generated Soul”, which spring from the right flank of the statue of Hecate, represents the potency of the Cosmic Soul; a power which ensouls (*a*) the Light, (*b*) the Fire, (*c*) the Ether and (*d*) the

\* The localization of Psyche “behind the thoughts of the Father” (note 70) conforms to the statement of another Chaldæan Oracle (ch. 1, n. 152 v. 3) that Hecate conjured by the Theurgists descends “from the omnipotent Intellect from (the realm of) the Father”.

<sup>82</sup> (*a*) PROCL., *Rp.*, II 201, 10 (Kroll 28) Τοῦτό μοι δοκεῖ καὶ τὰ λόγια λέγειν τὸ φῶς, ἠνίκα ἀν διδάσκοντα περὶ τῆς ψυχώσεως, ἣν ἡ πηγὴ τῶν ψυχῶν τὰ πάντα ψυχοῖ, λέγει·

« Δεξιτέρης μὲν γὰρ λαγόνος περὶ χήραμα χόνδρων πολλὴ ἄδην βλύζει ψυχῆς λιβᾶς ἀρχιγενέθλου, ἀρδην ἐμψυχοῦσα φάος πῦρ αἰθέρα κόσμους. »  
v. 1 literally “round the hollow of the gristle of the right calf”. As to v. 2 cf. PROCL., *Tim.*, III 257, 3 f.

(*b*) PSELLUS, *Comm.*, 1136 A (Kroll 28).

« Λαίης ἐν λαγόσι (δ') Ἐκάτης ἀρετῆς πέλε πηγὴ,  
ἐνδον ὄλη μίμουσα, τὸ παρθένον οὐ προϊέισα. »

*Text*: v. 1 λαγόσι κοίτης *codd.*, *corr.* Opsopoeus et Kroll. *Testim. Procl.*, *Crat.*, 106. 1. Olympiodor. *Phaed.*, 116, 18. PSELLUS, *Script. min.*, p. 253, 5 f. Kurtz-Drexl.

Fragment (*b*) follows immediately upon Fragment (*a*), Hecate herself is mentioned in Fragment (*b*). Cf. also PSELLUS, *Comm.*, 1133 B ἡ δὲ Ἐκάτη Θεός ἐστι παρὰ Χαλδαίοις, ἐν δεξιᾷ μὲν αὐτῆς (confusion between the right and the left side, as *Script. min.*, l. c.) ἔχουσα τὴν πηγὴν τῶν ἀρετῶν, and *Hyp.* 8 (p. 74, 13) τῶν δὲ ἐν τῇ λαγόσι πηγῶν (sc. Ἐκάτης) ἡ μὲν τῶν ψυχῶν ἐστὶ δεξιᾷ, ἡ δὲ τῶν ἀρετῶν ἐν λαιοῖς. Thus also the scholium appended to (*b*).

Worlds<sup>84</sup>; that is to say, (a) Aion, "the Father-begotten Light" (about whom later on<sup>85</sup>); (b) the Emyrean, as a whole, named in the Hecatean Oracle quoted by Porphyry: "the highest world of all"<sup>86</sup>; (c) the Ether, probable signifying the region of the fixed stars, as it is distinguished from (d) the Worlds, viz. the zone of the planets, which also includes the terrestrial world<sup>87</sup>. This power of "ensouling" is represented as contained in Hecate<sup>88</sup>.

An orifice could also be seen on the left hip of Hecate's statue, but no water flowed from it. We are unable to divine the original meaning of this symbol; the Oracles, however, interpreted it as representing the source of Virtue, which is unwilling to imperil its purity by contact with the external world<sup>89</sup>, and accordingly "remains within". "Virtue" cannot mean here an anthropological concept; like the other attributes of the statue, it must signify a cosmic power. We have suggested in the foregoing chapter that the term might apply to the nature of the moon<sup>90</sup>. This interpretation is indirectly confirmed by a further fragment of the same Oracle, which gives a cosmological interpretation of another of the

---

" Proclus in his monograph *περι τόπου* (see note 27) explains *πῦρ αἰθέρα κόσμους* to be appositions to *φᾶος* in order to identify the three complements with the "three worlds", the *ἐμπύριος*, *αἰθέριος* and *ὕλαιος κόσμος* (see note 270). This misinterpretation is rejected by Simplicius, *Phys.*, 612, 616, 617 (cf. Diels, *ad*, 611. 11), who remarks quite correctly that the sequence of the portions of the cosmos in the enumeration of the Chaldæan Oracle is determined by their order of descent. Simplicius is, however, mistaken in identifying *φᾶος* with the "Monad" (*i. e.* the *πατρικὴ μονάς*) localized by him above the Emyrean. For this Monad creates, according to Chaldæan teaching, the World-Soul and, consequently, cannot be determined by her.

<sup>84</sup> Concerning Aion = *φῶς* see note 146.

<sup>85</sup> See note 81.

<sup>86</sup> See the notes 39, 127, 200, 218, 250.

<sup>87</sup> Dam. II 235, 8 ἡ *πηγὴ τῆς ψυχῆς ἐν τῇ ἑκάτῃ ἐστίν*, and often.

<sup>88</sup> Cf. *Hymn. Hom. ad Cer.* 99 *παρθενίῳ φρέατι* "pure water", analogous to the *aqua virgo* of the Roman aqueduct (see Dio Cass. LIV. 11, 7). Aesch., *Pers.*, 613 *λαβᾶσιν ὑδρηλαῖς παρθένου πηγῆς μετὰ* (see W. SCHADEWALDT, *Monolog and Selbstgespräch*, Berlin 1926, p. 44, 1).

<sup>89</sup> See ch. 1, n. 157.

emblems of Hecate : "Over the goddess back measureless Nature is exalted"<sup>91</sup>. The moon is the abode of Hecate regarded as "Physis", the ruler of the visible world, and is called, because of this, "The self-manifesting image of Nature"<sup>92</sup>. Consequently, the symbol placed on the goddess back was the disk of the moon, one of the most characteristic attributes of Hecate<sup>93</sup>. According to the Chaldæans, this emblem represented the power over the intramundane zone possessed by the goddess, in addition to her psychogonic faculties.

The same Oracle probably propounded a cosmological interpretation of Hecate's hairs. An isolated verse bearing on this subject is transmitted by Proclus : "For her hairs are seen by the glaring terrifying light"<sup>94</sup>. According to a magical hymn, Hecate's hairs consisted of snakes which wound around her forehead and her body<sup>95</sup>. Proclus, in a hymn addressed

<sup>91</sup> PROCL., *Tim.*, I 11. 19 (Kroll 29) ἡ φύσις . . . προεληλυθεν ἀπὸ τῆς ζωογότου Σεᾶς (see note 66).

« νότοις δ' ἀμφὶ Σεᾶς φύσις ἀπλετος ἠώρηται ».

Cf. *ibid.*, III, 271. 2 ff. *Rp.*, II, 150. 21 f. *Dam.* II, 157. 15; *ibid.*, 150. 6 and 235. 15. PSELLUS, *Hyp.* (p. 74, 11) ἔχει δὲ περὶ αὐτὴν ἡ ἑκάτη πηγᾶς διαφόρων φύσεων τῶν δὲ κατὰ τὸν ζωογήρα (see note 108) πηγῶν ἡ μὲν φύσις τὸ τέλος συμπεραίνει τῶν τῆς ἑκάτης νότων ἀπαιωρουμένη.

As to ἠώρηται cf. *Theos.*, 13, 6 (quoted ch. 1, n. 46) and 27, 8 (quoted ch. 1, n. 26).

Aratus often employs the verb αἰωρεῖσθαι in order to designate the course of the stars.

<sup>92</sup> Φύσις is sometimes used in the Ch. Or. as a metonymous appellation of the moon; see note 134. The Chaldæan Hecate sojourns in the moon while delivering her Oracles; a point which is proved by her statement that she "descends" when invoked by the Theurgist from the noetic region (see ch. 1, n. 152) as well as by her refusal to prophesy as long as the moon "regards Mars" (see ch. 1, n. 165).

<sup>93</sup> Concerning Hecate, goddess of the moon, see e. g. ROSCHER, s. v. *Hekate*, 1888 f. *P. W.* s. v. *Hekate*, 2778 f.

<sup>94</sup> PROCL., *Rp.*, I 137. 21 (Kroll 29).

« Χαῖται μὲν γὰρ ἐς ὄξυ πεφρικότε φωτὶ βλέπονται », φησὶν τις Σεῶν. ἐς ὄξυ is an adverbial expression determining πεφρικότε φωτὶ which has an instrumental significance (similar to that of κεραυνοῖς after βλέπεται in the fragment quoted ch. IV, n. 57).

<sup>95</sup> *P. Mag.*, IV, 2800 « ἡ φοβερῶν ὑφίων χαίτην σείουσα μετώποις ».

to Artemis-Hecate, uses the following appellations : "Snake that terrifies with fire", "She that is girdled with snakes"; "She that is wrapped about with girdles of snakes" <sup>96</sup>. The meaning of this emblem is indicated in an isolated verse of a Chaldæan Oracle delivered by Hecate herself : "These are the thoughts of the Father, behind which is my winding fire" <sup>97</sup>. We have seen that the Cosmic Soul dwells "behind the Father's thoughts"; consequently she is identical with the "winding fire" <sup>98</sup>. We are dealing here with an emphatic expression of the Chaldæan opinion that Hecate-Psyche's abode in the noetic region is situated beneath the Ideas; a significant conception, conforming as it does to the doctrine of the Platonists as to the place of the Cosmic Soul. In accordance with the *Timæus*, this entity was conceived by the philosophers of this school as a noetic power which "envelops" the cosmos from without <sup>99</sup>. A similar doctrine seems to be alluded to in several passages of the Oracles. Thus, a fragment names among the noetic potencies issuing from the

---

" According to PSELLUS, *Epist.*, 187 and the text edited by Bidez, *C. M. M. G.*, VI, 62, 5 (cf. 61, 23 and Bidez' note), Proclus used in his commentary on the Chald. Oracles the following epithets in his hymn on Artemis (identified by him with Hecate, see n. 119) : *Ξιθηφόρον* (see n. 119), *σπειροδρακοντόζωνον* (cf. *P. Mag.*, IV, 2864 and XXIII 8), *λεοντούχον* (see n. 114), *τρίμορφον* (see n. 111), *τρικάρηνον*, *δρακοντόζωνον* (cf. *P. Mag.*, IV, 1404 *πυριδρακοντόζωνε*), *μαστιγοφόρον*, *δαδοφόρον*. Mich. Ital. 182, 24 (Kroll 29), who draws on Psellus, adds to this list the epithets *πυριπλήτιν* (neologism modelled on *δασπλήτις*, which is used as predicate of Hecate by Theocrit. II, 14 and *P. Mag.*, IV, 2544), and *δράκαιναν* (*δράκαιναν cod.*). This list (as well as the monostich quoted n. 164) should be added to the collection of Proclus' poetic fragments by Ludwig.

" Procl., *Parm.*, 895, 7 (Kroll 24) λέγει οὖν (τὰ λόγια)

« Ἐννοιαὶ πατὴρ + αἰδεύμεθα σε μὲν εἰλυμένον + πῦρ ».

The text can be reconstituted, if we accept a small emendation :

« Ἐννοιαὶ πατὴρ αἰδε, μεθ' ἅς ἐμὲν εἰλυμένον πῦρ ».

Psyche speaks in person in the Oracle, see note 118. *ἐννοιαὶ* are the Ideas, see n. 177. *ad v.* 13 and ch. v. n. 84.

" Cf. *πῦρ* with *Θέρμη*, note 70, and with *πυριθαλήτης*, note 77. *εἰλύω* figures as an habitual predicate of the serpent.

" ΠΛΑΤΟ, *Tim.* 36, 3 κύκλω τε αὐτὸν (sc. τὸν οὐρανὸν) ἐξῶθεν περικαλύψασα; see ch. vi, n. 159.

Paternal Intellect "the girdling flower of Fire" <sup>100</sup>. The meaning of this peculiar expression may be inferred from another fragment, which states that the intelligible world is separated from the visible by "a girdling spiritual (noetic) membrane" <sup>101</sup>. The Cosmic Soul was, according to the teaching of the Platonists, the boundary between the intelligible and the sensible world <sup>102</sup>. The term "membrane" used in the Oracle reflects a similar conception, and indicates at the same time the incorporeal nature of the boundary <sup>103</sup>. As to the term "girdling", we may suppose that it is applied in the Oracle to the Cosmic Soul, because she "constricts", as the Platonists put it, the universe which she envelops <sup>104</sup>. This function of the Chaldæan Cosmic Soul was apparently symbolized by the windings of the snakes with which the body of the statue was wreathed. This body consequently represented the Universe; the hairs visible 'by the glaring, terrifying light' of the fiery snakes symbolizing the spheres <sup>105</sup>.

We may infer from the indications of the Neoplatonists that the symbolic meaning of the hands <sup>106</sup> of Hecate and of the wreath circling her head <sup>107</sup> was judged by the Chaldæans to be akin to that of the other

<sup>100</sup> « ὑπεζωκὸς πυρὸς άνθος », cf. notes 209 and 217.

<sup>101</sup> DAM. II 131, 29 (Kroll 22).

« ὡς γὰρ ὑπεζωκὸς τις ἕμην νοερὸς διακρίνει ».

<sup>102</sup> See ch. VI, n. 157. For this reason, ὁ ὑπεζωκὸς was regarded by Proclus and his school as the lowest god of the "intellective (νοερὰ) hebdomad"; see n. 267 and PROCL., Rp. II 225, 3.

<sup>103</sup> See note 205, 3.

<sup>104</sup> See ch. VI, n. 159.

<sup>105</sup> Concerning the symbolic interpretation of divine statues see ch. VI, n. 195-8.

<sup>106</sup> According to PROCL. *Crat.* 161. 27 (ταῖς δημιουργικαῖς δυνάμεσιν, ἅς δὴ Ξευρῶν παῖδες « χεῖρας » ἀποκαλοῦσιν) and *Th. Pl.* 380, 51 f., the powers which have created the world were called by the Chaldæans "hands" and the right and the left one were considered to have different qualities, but these are not mentioned. See the subsequent note.

<sup>107</sup> PROCL. *Tim.* II 260, 26 (Kroll 29) mentions that the life-giving force of Psyche was symbolized in the Chaldæan doctrine by her temples (κρόταφοί), hands (see note 106) and loins (λαγόνες see note 83). The statement of DAM. I 242, 12 f. (Kroll 29) that the girdle (see note 91), loins (see note 83), wreath (στῆφανος).

attributes we have mentioned. A girdle enclosing her hips also figured among the symbolic emblems of Hecate's statue<sup>108</sup>; Pselus has set down its interpretation. It was held to signify the Zone (= girdle, in Greek) of dreams<sup>109</sup>, which derives from Hecate. According to a widespread belief, dreams are conveyed to man through the agency of the demons of the moon or those of the aerial sphere<sup>110</sup>. Consequently, it is Hecate, the mistress of the demons, who sends dreams.

Further details concerning the statue of Hecate may be gleaned from the Chaldæan Oracles, which mention various other attributes belonging to this object of Chaldæan worship. It is described as "provided all around her with mouths, faces, visages" and, consequently, resembled the well-known image of the three-headed Hecate<sup>111</sup>. We may mention in the same connection the attribute "circumsplendent Strength", figuring

temple (κρόταφοι) and forehead (μέτωπον) were regarded as cosmic symbols is based on Chaldæan teaching. The wreath about the forehead (or about the temples) signified according to Dam. I 241. 24 the ἀρχικὴ πηγὴ; cf. note 152 (concerning ἀρχικὴ).

<sup>108</sup> The girdle of the Chaldæan Hecate is mentioned by both Damascius and Pselus, see notes 107 and 91. Cf. also PSELLUS, *Comm.* 1136 B (ἡ Ἐκάτη) ζωστήρι κόσμηθεῖσα παρθενικῶ.

<sup>109</sup> PSELLUS, *Hyp.* 14 (p. 74, 34) ἔστι δὲ καὶ οὐείρου ζώνη ἀπὸ τῆς πηγῆς ψυχῆς (see note 66) τὴν ἀρχὴν ἔχουσα. The girdle may accordingly have symbolized the limit of the ethereal and the sublunar (hylic) world.

<sup>110</sup> Cf. Roudé, *Psyche*, II 84, 3. Mart. Cap. II 151 et alibi.

<sup>111</sup> PROCL., *Tim.* II 129, 25 (Kroll 30, 1) Μέσην γὰρ καὶ ἐν τοῖς θεοῖς ἔχει χώραν ἢ τῆς ψυχῆς αἰτία θεὸς (see note 66), ὡς δοκεῖ καὶ τοῖς θεολόγοις (see Excursus I d), συναγωγὸς οὐσα τῶν δύο πατέρων (see note 283) καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἐαυτῆς λαγόνων τὴν τῆς ψυχῆς προιεμένη ζῶην (see note 83 a). *Ibid.* 130 23 «ἀμφιφθῆς» καὶ «ἀμφιπρόσωπος» οὐσα καὶ «τοῦ μὲν παντὸς ἔχουσα τοὺς οὐρανούς» (see note 132), ὑποδεχομένη δὲ τοῖς ἐζυτῆς κόλποις τὰς ἀπὸ τῶν νοητῶν προόδους εἰς αὐτὴν (see notes 62 and 209, v. 2-3)... προιεμένη δὲ καὶ αὐτὴ τοὺς ὀχετοὺς τῆς σωματοειδοῦς ζωῆς (see note 62) καὶ συνέχουσα τὸ κέντρον τῆς προόδου τῶν ὄντων ἀπάντων ἐν ἑαυτῇ (see note 283).

The Chaldæan epithets ἀμφιφθῆς (cf. also Dam. I 315, 20, II 152, 23 ἀμφιφθῆς Ἐκίτη) and ἀμφιπρόσωπος, to which we may add ἀμφίστομος (cf. PROCL., *Tim.* II 246, 19 ἀμφίστομος γὰρ ἡ ψυχὴ καὶ ἀμφιπρόσωπος), refer, as Kroll has observed, to the statue of Hecate which had three or four heads (known as τριπρόσωπος or

several times in the Oracles <sup>112</sup>. Like the three other epithets we have discussed, it probably alludes to the function of mediating between the intelligible and the sensible world assigned to the Cosmic Soul by the Platonists <sup>113</sup>. The characteristics of Hecate's statue give us likewise a clue to the meaning of other epithets applied to Hecate by the Chaldæans. Thus she is called "possessor of lions" either because one of her heads was provided with a lion's face, which was one of the characteristic insignia of her image, or because her statue was flanked with the figures of lions <sup>114</sup>. We can also understand the significance of the pitcher affixed to the left hip of the statue, "which does not give away its virginity <sup>115</sup>"; it is the symbol of Proserpine the Virgin (Κόρη), whom the principal figure of the image of the many-headed Hecate usually represented <sup>116</sup>; a fact which also accounts for Hecate being called in the Oracles "Virgin of the Source" <sup>117</sup>. A further characteristic of the images of this goddess elucidates the meaning of the following verse of the Oracles, in which Hecate announces her presence to the theurgist who invoked her :

τετραπρόσωπος); see ROSCHER s. v. Hecate 1900 f. *P. W.* s. v. Hecate 2782 and HORNÉ, *O.-Z.*, I 806. In similar fashion *Ianus bifrons* was called ἀμφιπρόσωπος by PLUTARCH, *Vit. Num.* 19.

<sup>112</sup> Besides the texts cited in note 111, cf. also note 73 «ἀλκῆς ἀμφιφαούς» and 172 «εἰς τόπον ἀμφιφαόντα».

<sup>113</sup> See ch. VI, n. 157.

<sup>114</sup> PSELLUS, *Comm.*, 1133 B and in accordance with him, MICHEL. ITAL. 182, 26 (quoted note 96) state that the Chaldæans designated Ἐκάτη as λεοντούχος, an attribute which Psellus connects with the sign of the Zodiac *Leo*. (See GUNDEL in *P.-W.* s. v. *Leo* 1980). He is certainly mistaken. In all probability the adjective contains an allusion to the lions squatting at the foot of the statue of Hecate; cf. *P. Mag.* IV 2812 μορφᾶς δ' ἐν κνήμαιοις ὑποσκεπάουσα λεόντων. The symbol of the lion derives from the animal symbolism of the Hecatean cult (cf. PORPH., *Abst.* III 17, p. 206, 13 and IV 16, p. 254, 21), not from that of Cybele as supposed by Kroll.

<sup>115</sup> See note 83 b.

<sup>116</sup> See *P.-W.*, s. v. Hecate 2773. Hecate is called by Pindar, *Pæan.*, II, 77 f. παρθένος and *P. Mag.*, IV 2745 παρθένε, κόυρο.

<sup>117</sup> MARTIAN. CAP. II 206 (a paraphrase of a theurgical prayer, see ch. III, note 3. (b) *Quandam etiam fontanam virginem deprecatur*).



.. For I, the Divine, came in full armour and with all weapons" <sup>118</sup>.

The images of Hecate <sup>110</sup> often had six arms, bearing respectively a sword, a shield, a sheath, etc. <sup>120</sup>. Thus, the epithets "the terrible", "the fearful", applied in the Oracles to this divinity <sup>121</sup>, may likewise be understood as alluding to the aspect presented by the goddess's statue <sup>122</sup>.

Hecate represents in the Chaldæan system not only Psyche, the Cosmic-Soul, but also Physis, Nature conforming to her own laws. Hecate and

<sup>118</sup> PROCL., *Th. Pl.* 324, 3 (Kroll 36). AS PLATO, *Leg.*, 796 c 1, so also "the gods" (see Excursus I h) describe Athene as armed :

« και γὰρ δὴ πάντευχος ἐνόπιος ἦκα Θεεῖη ».

*Text*: *Σέη cod.*, corr. LUDWICH, ad PROCL., *Hymn.*, II 16. — *εἰκα cod.*, correxi. The alterations proposed by Kroll, 36, 6 are not convincing.

The verse derives, as do those quoted ch. 1, n. 152, ch. II, n. 70 and 97, from a passage in which Hecate having been conjured up introduces herself. In the non-Chaldæan Oracle quoted by Porphyry (ap. Eus., *Pr. Ev.*, V 8, 5; Wolff, 156) this goddess likewise announces her coming by the word *ἤλυθον*; cf. ch. 1, notes 162 and 163.

<sup>119</sup> The Oracle-verse does not refer to Athene (who does not figure in the Chaldæan pantheon), but to Hecate, interpreted by Proclus as the "life-giving trinity" (Ἐκάτη - Ψυχὴ - Ἀρετή, see note 66) in which the goddesses Athene, Artemis and Persephone are united; cf. *e. g.* *Th. Pl.*, 372, 2 f. and *Crat.* 95, 2 f. 105, 18 f. (Concerning this theocracy, founded upon Orphic traditions, see KEAN, *Orph. Fragm.* p. 215 f.). For this reason, Proclus could utilise in his description of Kore and Artemis fragments treating of the Chaldæan Hecate; cf. *Crat.* 106, 1 f. with note 83 b and *Th. Pl.* 373, 28 f. with note 121.

<sup>120</sup> See ROSCHER, s. v. Hecate 1909. *P.-W.*, s. v. Hecate 2782 D. cf. also.

<sup>121</sup> PROCL. *Th. Pl.*, 373, 28 (Kroll 31) « Δεινὴν » γὰρ Θεὸν (cf. ch. 1, n. 152) και οἱ βάρβαροι (see Excursus I K) καλοῦσιν τὴν τῆς τριάδος ταύτης ἡγεμονοῦσαν (see note 119) και « Φοδερᾶν ». Cf. the epithet *συριμπλήτης*, quoted n. 96, and the magic hymn on Hecate quoted by HIPPOLYT. *Refr.*, IV. 35, 4, v. 6 *φόβον θνητοῖσι φέρουσα*. See *P. W.*, s. v. Hecate 2776.

<sup>122</sup> PSELLUS, *Expos.* 1152 B (Kroll 30, 1), asserts that the Chaldæans posited the existence of several Hecates "not fixed in one zone" (ἄζωνοι Ἐκάται, see note 152); Hecate of crossways (*τριодίτης*, the "trivia"; see Rohde. *Psyche*, II 83), the Chaldæan (? *Χαλδαική*), the "revelling" (*κωμάς*, Rohde II 84) and the *ἐκκλυσιική* (? *ἐκκλυσιική V*; *ἐκκλυσιική V*; cf. KROLL, ad loc.). It would seem however that this enumeration does not derive from Chaldæan tradition, but from Proclus' differentiation of the various predicates of Hecate; see n. 96.

Physis are identical ; in the absence of a direct statement to this effect, our assertion seems to be warranted by the comparison of two quotations. One of these describes the moon placed over the back of the statue of Hecate<sup>123</sup>, and symbolizing the Goddess's domination as the "self-manifesting image of Nature"<sup>124</sup>; the other designates the moon by the name of this goddess<sup>125</sup>. An Oracle which descants on the might of Physis reads as follows (only a short summary of its final verses having come down to us) :

"Tireless Nature rules the worlds and the works that heaven may hasten on, drawing down its eternal course, that the swift sun may go, as is its custom, around its centre < and that the other cycles of time : of the moon, of the seasons, of day and of night should be accomplished >"<sup>126</sup>.

The "worlds" ruled by "Nature" are the planetary spheres<sup>127</sup>; the "works" the visible created world<sup>128</sup>; "heaven" the outermost sphere of the ethereal world, the region of the fixed stars<sup>129</sup>, which are "drawn down" by its revolutions<sup>130</sup>. The "centre" around which the sun revol-

<sup>123</sup> See note 91.

<sup>124</sup> See note 134.

<sup>125</sup> See note 282.

<sup>126</sup> *Dum.* II 157. 15 (Kroll 36) Τὰ δὲ λόγια ἀπλῶς Φύσιν λέγει τὴν ἐπὶ πάντων χαροῦσαν ἀπηρωῆσθαι τῆς μεγάλης Ἑκάτης (see note 90) ἢ καὶ τῆς σωματικῆς ἀπάσης κινήσεως προκατάρχειν εἶρηται τῆς Ἑκάτης πρεπούσης.

« Ἄρχει δ' αὐθύσις ἀκαμάτη κόσμων τε καὶ ἐργῶν, οὐρανὸς ὄφρα Ξέη δρόμον αἰδιον κατασύρων καὶ ταχὺς ἡέλιος περὶ κέντρον, ὅπως ἐθάς ἔλθη ».

*Procl.*, *Tim.*, III, 274, 6 quotes v. 1b-2 and paraphrases the continuation of the same Oracle with the words καὶ ὅπως ἂν αἱ ἄλλαι περιόδοι πληρῶνται, ἡλίου (cf. v. 3), σελήνης, ὥρων, νυκτός, ἡμέρας. In *Tim.*, I, 11, 30. he quotes v. 1-2. As for other allusions to this Oracle see note 65. In *Pl.*, II, 236, 4, he appears to refer to the second verse when he states that the Chaldean Oracles professed that the sphere of the fixed stars moves (τὴν ἀπλανῆ κινεῖσθαι); see note 130.

<sup>127</sup> See note 87.

<sup>128</sup> See note 184.

<sup>129</sup> Since Aristotle, οὐρανὸς designates the sphere of the fixed stars; cf. notes 28. 221, 227.

<sup>130</sup> For κατασύρων (here transitive) cf. e. g. *Arat. schol.*, ad v. 10 συμπεριάζονται (οἱ ἀπλανεῖς) δὲ τῆ τῶν ὀλων ῥύμη. *De mundo* 392 a 10 *S.T.V.F.* II No. 650.

ves is the earth. Physis keeps watch over the heavenly bodies, so that they should continue to move in the courses assigned to them by nature. A paraphrase of another passage of the Oracles (cited by Proclus together with the last fragment we have quoted) seems likewise to describe the action of Physis, though it does not name this entity. It states that the "stars become accustomed" to a certain mode of existence, "and do not change their custom"<sup>131</sup>; an expression which recalls the passage of the foregoing fragment speaking of the sun conforming to its "custom", when going round its "centre", the earth. It seems certain that a further fragment, which describes Hecate as "holding the helm of the All"<sup>132</sup>, also alludes to her function as Physis. This goddess may accordingly be considered as representing, among other things, the law of Necessity manifest in the movements of the stars, and is thus identical with "Revolving Necessity", named in an Oracle of the *Theosophy* quoted in the first chapter<sup>133</sup>.

---

Pseudo-Heraclit, *Quaest. Hom.* c. 36 (p. 53, 16 f. ed. Oelmann) συγκαθέλκεται γὰρ ἡ τῶν ἀπλανῶν σφαῖρα. Cf. note 122.

The continuation of Pseudo-Heraclit *πάσαι γε μὴν αἰ ἀπὸ τοῦ περιέχοντος ἀνωτάτω κύκλου φερόμεναι (σφαῖραι) πρὸς τὸ κέντρον εὐθείαι καὶ κατ' ἀναγωγῆς εἰσιν ἀλλήλαις ἴσαι* explains another fragment of the Oracles quoted by Procl., *Eucl.*, 155, 3 (Kroll 65) οὕτω δὴ καὶ τὰ λόγια τὸ κέντρον ἀφορίζεται: «κέντρον, ἀφ' οὗ πάσαι μέχρις ἀντυγῶς ἴσαι ἔασιν».

*σφαῖραι* has to be supplied as subject; ἀντυξ is accordingly identical with the vault of the sphere of the fixed stars.

<sup>131</sup> Procl., *Rp.* II, 306, 1 Ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐπ' αὐτῶν τῶν θεῶν ἀκούω τῶν λογίων λεγόντων, ὅτι ἐθίσαντα (intrans.) τὰ στοιχεῖα τοιῶσδε ζῆν οὐ παραλλάττει τὸ ἔθος, καὶ περὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἡλίου, ὅτι περὶ τὸ κέντρον ἐθῆς ἔρχεται τὸν ἐκτετακτὸν δρόμον ἐξανύων (see note 126). As always in the Oracles (see note 232) the term *στοιχεῖα* designates in this passage the stars. Proclus, who believed that this ambiguous term applies to the physical elements, was forced to replace the original verb of the Oracle, which probably described the regular motion of the stars, by the words *τοιῶσδε ζῆν*. In another fragment of the Oracles quoted by Olympiodor *Phaed.* 239, 3 (Kroll 34) «οἱ τῶν στοιχείων αἰθέρες», ὡς φησι τὰ λόγια, the noun *στοιχεῖα* refers likewise to the stars (concerning *αἰθέρες* see ch. III, n. 64).

<sup>132</sup> «τοῦ μὲν παντὸς ἔχουσα τοὺς οἴκους», see note 111.

<sup>133</sup> See ch. I, n. 71.

Destiny, Heimarmene, is the third manifestation of the Chaldæan Hecate-Psyche. "Do not look at Physis, for her name is determined by destiny!"<sup>134</sup> The name of Physis is Hecate, her face the moon, her satellites the demons that rule the sublunar zone. The latter, described by an other Oracle as the "streams of Heimarmene" will be studied at some length in the chapter dealing with Chaldæan demonology<sup>135</sup>.

Zoë, Psyche, Physis (also called : Ananke) and Heimarmene are four manifestations of the Chaldæan Hecate<sup>136</sup>. The first produces the pure life of the blessed immortals, the second ensouls the worlds, the third rules by the law of necessity over the spheres, the fourth, mistress of the demons, dominates the terrestrial zone. The reason for the diversity of the qualities attributed to this goddess is to be sought in the Chaldæan system of the universe. The diverse manifestations of Hecate-Psyche, regarded as the power that ensouls all the worlds, correspond to the difference of these worlds. In the region of the stars, known as the "ethereal world", the action of "ensouling" produces regular motion, which in the absence of a contrary force bears the character of pure necessity and is accordingly a manifestation of Nature. Beneath the moon lies the "hylic world", where Spirit is opposed to Matter; there the demonic satellites of the latter are active, dominated by Hecate, who has "ensouled" them. In the noetic region the soul is sublimated and transmuted into the pure principle of Life, by virtue of whose "Strength" she fills even the "highest of all the worlds". Thus the manifestations of Hecate appear to correspond to the various modifications of the one principle of "ensouling" Life.

<sup>134</sup> PROCL., *Th. Pl.* 317, 29, *Prov.* 155, 26, 164, 7. See also *Tim.* III 271. 16 (Kroll 49) «Μη φύσιν ἐμβλέψης· εἰμαρμένον ὄνομα τῆσδε». With this fragment may be compared PSELLUS, *Comm.* 1136 C «Μη φύσεως καλέσης αὐτοπλον ἀγαλμα» and PROCL., *Hp.* II 133, 17 *eis tēn selēniakēn. . . sphaīran, ēn hē. . . , ōs phsīn tis iēros λόγος* (Excursus I i), τὸ αὐτοπλον ἀγαλμα τῆς φύσεως» προσλάμπει. Cf. note 123. These three fragments will be interpreted ch. v. n. 44 ff.

<sup>135</sup> See ch. v. sect. 1.

<sup>136</sup> For ἀνάγκη see also ch. IV. n. 99 (v. 5). Concerning the "chain" πηγὴ - ψυχὴ - φύσις - εἰμαρμένη, which, according to PROCLUS, *Prov.* 179. 22 ff. and *Th. Pl.* 317. is of Chaldæan origin, see note 66 and ch. v. n. 21.

5. *Aion*.—The Chaldæan speculations concerning Psyche-Hecate are marked by the specific combination of ontology, theology and magic that gives the whole system its peculiar stamp. The same characteristic is to be found in the Chaldæan doctrine regarding *Aion*; an entity which the Oracles call the "Father-begotten Light". This expression is explained as follows :

"He is a subtle Monad that generates two<sup>137</sup>. For alone he has plucked the abounding flower of Intellect from the Father's Strength, and is therefore able to cognize the Paternal Intellect and to bring <light> to all Sources and Principles, to whirl them around and to keep them in incessant circular motion"<sup>138</sup>.

<sup>137</sup> Dam. II 29, 12 (Kroll 15) Ἡ . . . ὀλότης ἢ αὐτὴ καὶ αἰὼν ἐστὶ καὶ ζωὴ . . . «ταναή» γὰρ «ἐστὶ μονάς», κατὰ τὸ λόγιον, «ἢ (ἢ RUELLE, corr. Kroll) δύο γεννᾶ»; cf. *ibid.*, II 21, 15.

See also PROCL., *Eucl.* 98, 23 Διὰ ταῦτα τοῖνον τὴν ὀλότητα μιμεῖται καὶ τὴν τάξιν ἐκείνην (sc. τὴν δευτέραν τῶν νοητῶν), ἢ καὶ «ταναή μονάς ἐστὶν» καὶ «δύο γεννᾶ» (who does not mention that he quotes Chaldæan notions). Proclus and his school regarded *Αἰὼν* viz. *νοητὴ ζωὴ* as the midmost of the three triads of the *νοητὸς διάκοσμος*; cf. *Th. Pl.* III c. 14 ff. (p. 144 ff.). Dam. II 21, 15 f. See Excursus VII.

<sup>138</sup> PROCL., *Tim.*, III, 14, 3 (Kroll 27) Διὸ καὶ (sc. ἢ τοῦ αἰῶνος τάξιν) ὑπὸ τῶν λογίων «πατρογενὲς Φᾶος» εἰρηται, διότι δὴ τὸ ἐνοποιὸν Φᾶς πᾶσιν ἐπιλάμπει

«πολὺ γὰρ μόνος ἐκ πατρὸς ἀλκῆς

δρεψάμενος νόου ἄνθος ἔχει τὸ νοεῖν πατρικὸν νοῦν

(καὶ Φᾶος) ἐνδιδόναι πᾶσαις πηγαῖς τε καὶ ἀρχαῖς

καὶ τὸ δινεῖν αἰεὶ τε μένειν ἀόκνω στροφάλιγγι».

Πατρικῆς γὰρ Θεότητος διακορῆς ὧν, ἣν καλεῖ «νόου ἄνθος» (sc. τὸ λόγιον), νοῦν ἐπιλάμπει (sc. ὁ αἰὼν) τοῖς πᾶσι καὶ τὸ αἰεὶ ὡσαύτως νοεῖν καὶ ἐρωτικῶς περὶ τὴν πάντων ἀρχὴν στρέφειν καὶ ἐνεργεῖν. Ἀλλὰ ταῦτα μὲν «ἐν ἀβάτοις σηκοῖς τῆς διανοίας» (the last words allude perhaps to a Chaldæan phrase, see KROLL in the *app. crit.* and below, ch. IV, n. 20) ἀνελίττω.

*Testim.* v. 3-4 is paraphrased by PROCL., *Parm.*, 1161, 28 f. The end of v. 4 is quoted by PROCL., *Th. Pl.*, 149, 17 and Dam. II, 29, 17. Dam. observes that the fragment quoted in the preceding note forms a part of the same Oracle. The two fragments might be combined in the following manner :

«Αἰὼν πατρογενὲς Φᾶος (ὡς) ταναή μονάς ἐστὶ, ἢ δύο γεννᾶ (καὶ, or ἢ) πολὺ γὰρ μόνος ἐκ πατρὸς ἀλκῆς», etc. As to the inner connection of the two fragments see

Aion is a noetic ("subtle" <sup>139</sup>) monad with a dual aspect <sup>140</sup>; on the one hand, he, alone, is sustained by the Vital Force ("Strength") of the Supreme Being <sup>141</sup>, Whose Intellect he, by virtue of his noetic quality, is able to cognize. On the other hand, his function is to transmit the supreme light to the "Sources and Principles" who are, as we shall see <sup>142</sup>, the general and particular ideas, and to keep these in perpetual circular motion <sup>143</sup>.

The two newly identified Oracles of the *Theosophy* treating of Aion <sup>144</sup> add considerably to our information concerning the position of this entity in the Chaldaean system. According to them, Aion proceeds in perpetuity on his "sounding path", which winds in serpentine wise within the zone of the noetic fire. After having accomplished a revolution, he mingles one aeon with another, and illuminates with his ray the ethereal zone and the planets situated in it. Above him is enthroned

note 140. *Text*, v. 1 Kroll's correction μένος instead of μόνος deprives the sentence of its point and of its syntactic structure.

v. 2. A dactyle is missing before ἐνδιδόναι. Kroll, following a suggestion of Scheider, inserts καὶ νόον, but Proclus' paraphrase νοῦν ἐπιλάμπει τοῖς πᾶσι suggests that the missing words were καὶ Φάος.

v. 4. PROCL., *Tim*, III, 14, 10 reads «καὶ τὸ νοεῖν αἰεῖ» and explains this text by the words καὶ τὸ αἰεῖ ὡσαύτως νοεῖν; on the other hand, he reads *Parm.* 1161, 29 «καὶ τὸ δινεῖν αἰεῖ», and Kroll was right in accepting this reading. For dogmatic reasons (see note 161) Proclus, in his commentary on the *Timæus*, prefers to quote the variant νοεῖν and to explain αἰεῖ as referring to this infinitive rather than to μένειν which follows.

The attribute πατρογενής accounts for the expression «αιωνοτόκου πατρὸς» used by SYNESIUS, *Hymn.*, VII, 12; cf. *ibid.*, II, 67 «σὺ δ' ἀναξ, αἰῶνος αἰῶν». See also LYDUS, *Mens.*, II, 12, p. 36, 13 τὸ ἀρχέτυπον εἶδος τοῦ νοητοῦ καὶ πατρογενεὺ αἰῶνος.

<sup>139</sup> For ταναός = νοερός see note 385.

<sup>140</sup> Cf. the text of the Oracle concerning the Second Intellect, quoted note 187: «ἀμφοτέρων γὰρ ἔχει», etc.

<sup>141</sup> As to πατρὸς ἀλή see note 78. As to δρεψάμενος νόου ἄνθος see note 380.

<sup>142</sup> Cf. note 178 and 192.

<sup>143</sup> δινεῖν is intransitive; Aion receives from the Paternal Intellect the faculties of eternal movement.

<sup>144</sup> *Theos*, 13 (ch. 1, n. 46), 21 (ch. 1, n. 52), 27 v. 8 (ch. 1, n. 26).

the "Great Father", Who has created him out of Himself<sup>145</sup>, and manifests Himself in him to man. Aion may accordingly be regarded as identical with the "Light" through which, according to the Hymn of the *Theosophy*, "the Father moves"<sup>146</sup>. The Light of Aion is the motion of the Supreme God<sup>147</sup>, and also the primal measure of all time; it represents, accordingly, a particular faculty of the Supreme Principle, resembling in this respect the Paternal Intellect, His Power and Will. There is, however, a difference: the three entities we have named last cannot be detached from the "Father", while Aion (as well as Psyche) has a separate existence.

This "fiery god" of eternity superior to all the other astral gods, whom the Chaldæan regard as his angels, is, in a sense, the chief numen of the Theurgists; for the absolutely transcendent 'Father' manifests Himself in him. Because of this, Aion is described as the "self-manifesting"<sup>148</sup>. His name, like that of the Father, "is not to be apprehended through speech"<sup>149</sup>, Aion being merely a designation deriving from one of the god's qualities.

This "self-manifesting" God Aion, described in the two Oracles of the *Theosophy*, is identical with the God Chronos, whose "self-manifestation" (*αὐτοφάνεια*) used to be brought about, according

<sup>145</sup> *Theos*, 13, 14 *αὐτοφύης*, "selfgrown", means that Aion has originated without any assistance from another; cf. *ibid.*, *ἀμήτωρ* and *Theos*, 21. 1 *ἀλόχεντος*. *Theos*, 13, 14 *ἐδίδακτος* means that Aion possesses his knowledge, i. e. the power "to think the Paternal Intellect" (see note 138), since his birth.

<sup>146</sup> *Theos*, 27, 8 «ὀρίων φωτὶ σεαυτὸν». Aion is called *Φάος* also in the Oracle quoted note 84.

<sup>147</sup> The "Father" Himself (viz. His Intellect) is described as immobile in the Oracles; cf. *Theos*, 27, 3 «ἀλκιῆς ἵνα σοὶ μένος (see note 73) ἐσθήρικται» (the verb is an astronomical term used in connection with fixed heavenly bodies).

<sup>148</sup> *Theos*, 21. 1 *αὐτοφάνης*, see note 149.

<sup>149</sup> *Theos*, 13, 15 «οὐνομα μηδὲ λόγῳ χωρούμενος».

PROCL., *Tim.*, III, 20, 21 (Kroll 46) οἱ Θεουργοί... Θεὸν αὐτὸν (τὸν Χρόνον) εἶναι Φασιν καὶ ἀγωγήν (magical term, see note 15) αὐτοῦ παρέδοσαν ἡμῖν, δι' ἧς εἰς αὐτοφάνειαν (see note 148 and ch. IV, II, 67) κινεῖν αὐτὸν δυνατὸν (continued note 151). SIMPL., *Phys.*, 795. 4 Πρόκλος (τὸν χωριστὸν χρόνον, see note 152)... Θεὸν... ἀποδεικνύει πειρᾶται (see note 160), ὡς καὶ εἰς αὐτοψίαν ὑπὸ τῶν Θεουργ-

to Proclus, by the magical rites of the Chaldæans<sup>150</sup>. Proclus quotes from the hymnic prayer which accompanied the theurgical conjuration of Chronos a series of attributes; among these several identical with those applied to Aion in the two Oracles of the *Theosophy* others being more or less equivalent. Thus Proclus reports that the Theurgists described Chronos as "eternal", "infinite", "young and old", "winding spiralwise", "moving in a circle"; they glorified his immutability, his immense power<sup>151</sup>, his rulership over the zone of the Em-pyrean, which he "turns around", and over various other cosmic regions, these of the fixed stars, of the sun and of the moon<sup>152</sup>. The concordance

ἡμῶν κληθῆναι; cf. *ibid.* 785, 8. Dam. II, 253, 22 ὁ Θεουργοῖς ἐκφάνει ποτε χρόνος.

<sup>150</sup> The hymn from which the predicates cited in note 151 derive was the magical invocation (κλήσις) which caused Chronos to "manifest himself". This may be proved from Procl., *Tim.*, III, 20, 22 f. (see note 149) and from the explanation *Tim.*, III, 27. 9, οἱ τῶν Θεουργῶν ἀκρότατοι (Excursus I g) Θεὸν καὶ τοῦτον (sc. τὸν χρόνον). ὡς Ἰουλιανὸς ἐν ἐξδόμῳ τῶν Ζωνῶν (see note 155), καὶ τοῖς ὀνόμασι τοῦτοις ἐσέμυσαν, continued note 151.

<sup>151</sup> Procl., *Tim.*, III, 20. 25 (see note 149): In their hymns (ὑμνοῦσιν) the Theurgists call God Chronos «πρεσβύτερον καὶ νεώτερον» (= Dam. II, 231. 1 f. 235, 24) καὶ «κυκλοεῖλικταν». . . καὶ «αἰώνιον» (cf. *Theos.*, 13, 2 ἀπλετος αἰών)... καὶ πρὸς τοῦτοις «ἀπέραντον» (*Theos.*, 13, 2 ἀπειρέσιος). . . καὶ «ἐλικοειδῆ» (*Theos.*, 13, 10 ἔρπων εἰλιγδῆν). — *Tim.*, III, 40, 21 οἱ Θεουργοί. . . Θεὸν ἐγκόσμιον (see notes 152 and 159) τὸν χρόνον ὑμνοῦντες «αἰώνιον, ἀπέραντον, νέον καὶ πρεσβύτην» (the comparatives in the preceding passage are not a direct citation; they derive from PLATO, *Tim.*, 28 a 3. see note 158). «ἐλικοειδῆ», πρὸς τοῦτοις ὡς (transition from the mode of direct quotation to a paraphrase of Chaldæan notions) ἔχοντα τὴν οὐσίαν ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι (see note 159) καὶ μένοντα αἰεὶ τὸν αὐτὸν (cf. PLATO, *Tim.*, 37 d 6 μένοντος αἰῶνος ἐν ἐνι and the Oracle quoted note 138 «αἰεὶ τε μένειν») καὶ ὡς ἀπειροδύναμον (cf. *Theos.*, 13, 3 ἀμήχανος). Thus also, the paraphrase *Tim.*, III, 27. 12 (the continuation of the quotation figuring in note 150. Dam. II, 235, 25 mentions as another Chaldæan predicate of Chronos τὸ μισογύναιον: which probably refers to the "self-generating Time" (cf. Critias, 81 B 18 Diels); if we use Gnostic terminology. Chronos is ἄζυγος.

<sup>152</sup> Procl., *Tim.*, III, 43, 11 οἱ Θεουργοί. . . τὸν χρόνον αὐτὸν ἀνυμνήκασιν ὡς Θεόν:

(a) καὶ ἄλλον μὲν τὸν ζωναῖον, ὡς εἶπομεν (see *ibid.*, III, 40, 21, cf. notes 151 and 159):

(b) ἄλλον δὲ ἄζωνον, μετροῦντα τὴν περίοδον τοῦ τρίτου τῶν αἰθερίων (Proclus'



of the predicates <sup>153</sup> shows that this theurgical god of Time may be considered as identical with the god of Eternity of the Oracles of the *Theosophy* <sup>154</sup>. There is only one difference between them which

enumeration begins with the lowest sphere. The 'third orbit' signifies the moon. As to Proclus' misunderstanding see note 280):

(c) ἄλλον δὲ τὸν ἐπὶ τοῦ μέσου τῶν κόσμων ἐκείνων, ἀρχαγγελικὸν τινα χρόνον (i. e. the sun, see note 280);

(d) ἄλλον δὲ ἀρχικὸν αὐτῷ ἐφεστώτα τῷ πρωτίστῳ τῶν αἰθερίων (the sphere of the fixed stars, see note 282);

(e) ἐφ' ἅπασιν δὲ τούτοις πηγαῖον ἄλλον, ὅς τὸν ἐμπύριον κόσμον ἄγει καὶ περιάγει καὶ ἀφορίζει τὴν ἐκείνου περίοδον (see note 143), ἀπ' αὐτῆς προελθὼν τῆς πηγῆς Θεοῦ τῆς πᾶσαν μὲν ζῶν, πᾶσαν δὲ κίνησιν τεκούσης (i. e. of the World-Soul [see note 140] which according to the doctrine of the Neoplatonists generates Time. However, according to Chaldæan doctrine Aion is *πατρογενής*. Consequently, Proclus' genealogy is not based on Chaldæan teachings).

Proclus' differentiating between several time-gods is due to his assigning different properties of the Chaldæan Chronos-Aion to the successive stages (see note 66) of the procession of the divine entities. As to the underlying scheme *πηγαί-ἀρχαί-ἀρχάγγελοι-ἄζωνοι-ζῶναι* see PSELLUS, *Hyp.*, 12-19 (where the same scheme is applied to the Chaldæan doctrine concerning Psyche-Hecate; see above note 66 and Excursus VII). Dam. I, 241, 18 f. II, 9, 17 f. In reality, the Chaldæans posited only one Psyche and one Chronos, the *χωριστὸς χρόνος* (Simpl., *Phys.*, 759. 4 f. quoted note 149).

<sup>153</sup> These predicates correspond to the expressions "ever-moving course" and "without beginning and end" (*περιφορὰ ἀεικίνητος, ἀναρχὸς καὶ ἀτελεύτητος*) cited by Dam. II, 45. 2 f. The verb *ὑμνηται* employed by him does not make it clear whether Chaldæan or other hymnic predicates are referred to; cf. ARISTOT., *de caelo*, II, 1 and SIMPLICIUS, *ad. loc.*, p. 367. 21 (quoted by C. LACKEIT, *Aion*, Dissert. Kœnigsberg 1916, p. 61, 1). We may however add that Damascius mentions Chaldæan doctrines several times in this passage.

<sup>154</sup> The supposition that the Oracles on Aion quoted by Porphyry and Proclus and the Hymn in honour of Chronos paraphrased by the latter refer to the same divinity may be proved indirectly by the fact that a contamination of the two themes figuring in the Oracles of both groups is to be found in the ninth hymn of Synesius, v. 65 s. (I quote from Wilamowitz [see note 31], p. 18 f.) «ἀλλ' αὐτὸς ἀγήραος αἰῶν ὁ παλαργενῆς νέος ἄν ἄμα καὶ γέρον, τᾶς ἀενάου μονᾶς (cf. *αἰεὶ τε μένειν* etc. note 138) ταμίαις πέλεται Θεοῖς». The Θεοί are, as is proved by v. 33 «ἀκηράτων χόρος ἕμμερος ἀστέρων» the stellar divinities. The statement of Wilamowitz 19, 5 who did not recognize the Chaldæan origin of the motives used by Synesius, must be rectified.

appears to be of some moment : their designations are not the same. According to Proclus the "self-manifesting" god bears the name of Chronos, while the Oracles of the *Theosophy* call him "God", without any qualification, and, once, Aion, after his faculty. There are, however, several possible explanations for this divergency :

a) Proclus's knowledge of the Chaldæan Chronos derives from the work of Julian the Theurgist, entitled *On the Zones* (viz. the starry spheres)<sup>155</sup>, which appears to have been in prose and to have contained astrophysical disquisitions<sup>156</sup>. This subject-matter gave the author the latitude to apply to the ineffable god a designation which describes him only indirectly, by his most characteristic quality, and Proclus may have imitated him in this respect. For the rest, Proclus, describing another Chaldæan magical rite, calls this god by a somewhat different periphrastic name "the Ruler of Time" (*Χρονόδραχης*)<sup>157</sup>.

b) Dogmatic considerations prevented Proclus from designating as Aion the Chaldæan god of Time, whose attributes are inconsistent with those of Aion as described by Plato (who conceives this entity as "eternally motionless" and "neither old nor young"<sup>158</sup>). In order to do away with this discrepancy, Proclus endowed with these attributes Time (*χρόνος*), defined by Plato as the moving image of Eternity ; thus the super-celestial god of the Theurgists was reduced to the state of an intramundane numen<sup>159</sup>. This solution was fraught with difficulties, of which later

<sup>155</sup> Cf. note 150. Kroll in *P. W.*, s. v. Julianos No. 9, p. 15 proposes to emend ἐν ἑξῶν μὲν τῶν ζώνων; he supposes that each book of the work treated a different zone.

<sup>156</sup> Similar to Julian's Ἰζηγητικά which dealt in prose with the seven planetary zones; see note 220.

<sup>157</sup> Cf. ch. iv, n. 27.

<sup>158</sup> PLATO, *Tim.*, 38 a 3 concerning Aion τὸ δὲ αἰεὶ κατὰ ταῦτα ἔχον ἀκινήτως οὔτε πρῶτον οὔτε νεώτερον προσήκει γίνεσθαι διὰ χρόνου. Therefore, χρόνος is called 37 d 5 "a moving likeness of everlastingness" (εἰκὼν . . . κινήτὸν τινα αἰῶνος; cf. 38 a 7). The Platonic Aion is ungenerated (*Tim.*, 38 a 5), the Chaldæan πατρογενής.

<sup>159</sup> According to Proclus, the predicates which he cites from the Chaldæan hymn on Chronos refer to the ζωναῖος or ἐγκόσμιος χρόνος; cf. note 152.

representatives of the school were aware <sup>160</sup>. Even Proclus' own interpretation does not sufficiently disguise the original identity of the Chaldæan divinity <sup>161</sup>. The adoption of the name Aion could not, however, be envisaged; for its use would have given the lie to the dogma of the harmony existing between the Platonic and the Chaldæan doctrine <sup>162</sup>.

6. *The Ideas*.—Hecate and Adion are personal gods as well as noetic principles. We must now turn from them to the examination of other transmundane entities and of the emanations of these. The Neoplatonists report that the Chaldæans distinguished three noetic triads: which they identify with concepts appertaining to their own system <sup>163</sup>. For this reason, their interpretation cannot help us to reconstruct the original doctrine of triads professed by the Chaldæans. Our foremost task is accordingly that of scrutinizing the relevant fragments of the Oracles that have come down to us.

<sup>160</sup> Dam. II, 235, 23 f. states that the attributes of the Chaldæan Chronos quoted note 151 can not be reconciled with the interpretation of Proclus, who regards him as intramundane divinity. See also Simplicius, quoted note 149.

<sup>161</sup> See note 138 (v. 4).

<sup>162</sup> In the Oracle quoted note 177 (v. 14). Aion is described as ἀκοίμητος χρόνος, in the Oracle quoted note 232 (v. 3) ἀπέραντος χρόνος.

<sup>163</sup> (a) LVDUS, *Mens.*, IV, 122, p. 159, 5 Θεῖος ὁ τῆς ἐννεάδος ἀριθμὸς ἐκ τριῶν τριάδων πληρούμενος καὶ τὰς ἀκρότητας τῆς Θεολογίας κατὰ τὴν Χαλδαϊκὴν Φιλοσοφίαν, ὡς φησὶν ὁ Πορφύριος, ἀποσώζων. The quotation probably derives from one of the two works of Porphyry dealing with the Chaldæan teaching: see Excursus II. Concerning Porphyry's doctrine regarding the noetic triads see Dam. I, 86, 8 f. 288, 12 f. (quoted by Zeller, III, 24, p. 704, 2 and 705, 1.)

(b) Dam. I. 285; 5-316, 9 (cf. especially I 285, 5-288, 12 f.) treats at length of the three noetic triads of the Chaldæans which are subordinate to the First Principle. He mentions the ὑμνουμένη ἐννεάς I. 299, 18 and 305. 17 (see also I, 196, 5 f. and 221, 23), but without giving details as to the original doctrine of the Theurgists.

(c) Procl., *Parm.*, 1090, 26 f. and PSELLUS, *Hyp.*, 2 (p. 73, 5) πατρικόν... βυθόν (see note 351) ἐκ τριῶν τριάδων συγκείμενον. See Excursus VII.

Iamblichus is the source of the explanations of Proclus and Damascius; cf. Zeller III, 24, p. 748 f.

One of these speaks of a Monad, "which rules the Triad that shines in every world" <sup>164</sup>. Two other passages of the Chaldaean Oracles help to elucidate to a certain extent the nature and origin of this Monad and Triad. One of them reads :

"The Father's Intellect commanded that everything should be divided into three. His Will nodded, and everything was already divided" <sup>165</sup>.

We appear, accordingly, to be justified in supposing that the Monad named in the Oracle that has been quoted above is identical with the "Paternal Monad" <sup>166</sup>, consisting of the "Father's" Intellect, Will and Power (which last is not named in the passage we have cited, because it

<sup>164</sup> Dam. I, 87, 3 (Kroll 18).

« Παντί γὰρ ἐν κόσμῳ λάμπει τριάς, ἣς μονὰς ἄρχει », φησὶ τὸ λόγιον. Cf. Dam. II, 87, 14. Procl., *Th. Pl.*, 27, 14.

This verse has been imitated by Proclus; see the isolated verse of a hymn on the ἀπαξ ἐπέκεινα (see note 43) transmitted by I. ΝΟΥΣ, *Mens.*, II, 6, p. 23, 12 :

« Μούναδα γὰρ σε τριούχον ἰδὼν ἐσεβάσαστο κόσμος ». Cf. also *Anon. Taur.*, IX, 5 (Kroll 11) καὶ τῆς τριάδος αὐτὸν (sc. τὸν πατέρα) οὐκ ἐξελόντες ἀναιρεῖς (10 prophesy) « ἀριθμὸν » ἀξιοῦσι (sc. οἱ Χαλδαῖοι).

<sup>165</sup> Procl., *Parm.*, 1091, 6 (Kroll 18).

« Εἰς τρία γὰρ νοῦς εἶπε πατρὸς τέμνεσθαι ἅπαντα », φησὶ τις Θεῶν

« οὐ τὸ θελεῖν κατένευσε, καὶ ἤδη πάντα ἐτέτμητο ».

Cf. Dam. I, 253, 25; II, 60, 28, 62, 28. Kroll 18, 1 has had recourse to this passage in emending the corrupt text of Procl., *Tim.*, III, 243, 20 and has succeeded in extracting from the continuation the second part of the following verse :

« (πατρὸς) αἰδίου νῆ πάντα κυβερνῶν » (sc. τὸ θελεῖν, cf. note 49. No. 10). I suppose that the fragment quoted note 173 (ὄφρα until ἀνάγκης) was the direct continuation of this third verse. The literary model was *Iliad*, XV, 189 τριχθὰ δὲ πάντα δέδασται.

The view that the utterance of the divine word coincides with its execution is not peculiar to the Bible, as Kroll 46, 2 seems to think.

Concerning the formula see *Iliad*, XIX, 242 « αὐτὴν ἔπειθ' ἅμα μῦθος ἔην, τετέλεστο δὲ ἔργον ». Herodot III, 134, 6, IX, 92, 1 and the proverb quoted by Diogenian I, 36 ἄμ' ἔπος, ἔμ' ἔρον. Cf. also VIRGIL, *Aeneid*, I, 142 "Sic ait et dicto citius. . ." κατένευσε is taken from *Iliad*, I, 528, see note 49, No. 11. Cf. also MAX. TYR., *Diss.*, XLII, 2 f. (after having quoted the Homeric line) ὁμοῦ δὲ τοῦ Διὸς νεύματι γῆ ξυνέστη. Aristides, *eis Δία* 13, p. 342 Keil.

<sup>166</sup> See note 52.

is immanent in the two first faculties<sup>167</sup>). The cooperation of these entities effects the division of the world into triads<sup>168</sup>. This division affects immediately only the intelligible world, for it is due to an act of the Paternal Intellect, and the "Father is everything, but noetically"<sup>169</sup>.

The second fragment describing the functions of this Triad and the relationship obtaining between it and its creator reads :

"From these two yonder flows the bond of the first Triad, which is not the first, but the (bond) whose noetic (essence) is measured"<sup>170</sup>.

This Triad is called here in obscure terms "the first Triad which is not the first" for the reason that the Paternal Monad which "rules" it, likewise constitutes in its active aspect a trinity; thus the Triad with which the Oracle is concerned is in a sense the second of its kind. It differs from the triple aspect of the Paternal Monad in so far as its noetic essence "is measured". Consequently the Paternal Monad (the "First Triad") is regarded as an unmeasurable unity; this conclusion is confirmed by two Oracular fragments which mention the indivisibility of the Primal Being<sup>171</sup>. According to the Neoplatonic commentators, the "two", from whom the "bond" of the measurable Triad "flows", are a monad

<sup>167</sup> See notes 47 and 74.

<sup>168</sup> This division of the *νοητὸν* was according to another fragment of the Oracles "the beginning of all division": cf. Dam. II, 58, 20 *ἐροῦμεν τὴν νοητὴν τομὴν «πάσης τμησίου ἀρχεῖν» κατὰ τὸ λόγιον*; cf. 56, 29.

<sup>169</sup> See note 55.

<sup>170</sup> Dam. II, 63, 21 (Kroll 15):

«Ἐξ ἀμοφοῖν δὴ τῶνδε ῥέει τριάδος δέμα πρώτης, οὐσης οὐ πρώτης, ἀλλ' οὐ τὰ νοητὰ μετρεῖται».

Huelle and Kroll have rectified the principal faults of the corrupt text transmitted in the MSS. It read: v. 1 *ἔξ ἀμοφοῖν τῆ... πρὸ τῆς*, v. 2 *οὐσίας* (see ch. vi, n. 306). Kroll's reading v. 2 *οὐ τὰ* (instead of *οὐ τὰ*) is based on an arbitrary correction of another Oracle (see note 373, *ad* v. 6). *δέμα*, "band" refers to the "connecting" faculty of this triad, see note 173.

Procl., *Th. Pl.*, 167, 31 alludes to the same Oracle. His explanation and that of Damascius show that the preceding verse dealt with a dyad and a monad; but their interpretations of this monad and dyad as the first and second noetic triad are founded upon speculations foreign to the Chaldæan doctrine.

<sup>171</sup> See note 56 concerning *ἀμισύλλευτος*, and note 375.

and a dyad. The monad apparently signifies the Paternal Monad; the identity of the dyad will be determined later on in this chapter.

The origin of this 'measurable' Triad is described in various ways: once it is said to be produced by the "Command" and the "Will" of the Paternal Intellect; another time it is said to "flow forth". We are thus confronted with a voluntaristic and an emanationistic explanation. These variations suggest the existence of a theory which regarded every creation of a new noetic entity as occasioned by a particular decision, while the process itself was considered as partaking of the nature of an emanation.

A fourth fragment bears on the function of this "measurable" noetic Triad: it is said "to measure and to delimit all things"<sup>172</sup>. According to a fifth fragment, it "holds the All together, measuring it in its entirety, in the beginning, the end and the middle, according to the order of Necessity"<sup>173</sup>. Thus, this Triad is identical with the "First Triad" of

<sup>172</sup> Procl., *Th. Pl.*, 386, 29 f. (Kroll 18) concerning the measure of the triad « τὰ πάντα μετροῦν καὶ ἀφορίζον », ὡς τὰ λόγιά φησι, possibly paraphrases the fragment quoted in the following note.

<sup>173</sup> The anonymous verse quoted by ΔΙΔΥΜΟΣ, *De trinit.*, II, 27 (*P. G.*, XXXIX, 756 A « χρῆσιμός »):

« ὄφρα τὰ πάντα τριάς συνέχῃ κατὰ πάντα μετροῦσα ».

is proved Chaldaean by its concordance with the fragment of the Chaldaean Oracles quoted by HERMIAS, *Phædr.*, 248 a (p. 146, Ast., p. 157 Couvreur); καὶ γὰρ πᾶν ἀπλῶς, ὃν ἂν ἀπαξ ἀπὸ τοῦ πρώτου προέλθῃ, τριαδικὸν ὀφείλει εἶναι τέλειον γὰρ ὃν πρῶτα καὶ μέσα καὶ τέλη ἔξει κατὰ τὸ λόγιον

« τριάς κατὰ πάντα μετροῦσα ».

KERN, *Orph. Fragm.*, 310 is mistaken in considering this quotation as Orphic.

This verse was followed by the one quoted by Dam. I, 291. 11 (Kroll 43): ἡ συνοχικὴ φύσις . . . διορίζουσα τὴν συνοχήν (cf. Procl., *Crat.*, 63, 9 τὸ γὰρ συνεκτικὸν ὀριστικὸν τοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ πλήθους)

« εἰς ἀρχὴν καὶ τέρμα καὶ εἰς μέσα τάξει ἀνάγκης ».

The fact that these two fragments belong together may be proved by a recourse to Procl., *Parm.*, 904, 12 ὃ δὲ εἰς πατρικὸς νοῦς πᾶσιν ἀφορίζει τὰ μέτρα τῆς μεθέξεως . . . ἀρχάς τε καὶ μέσα καὶ τέλη τῆς ἐκάστου τῶν εἰδῶν σειρᾶς προλαβῶν. Probably this distich was the continuation of the fragment quoted note 165. τάξει ἀνάγκης alludes possibly to the three Fates who are regarded by PLATO, *Rep.*, 617 c

the Pythagoreans, which determines the "beginning the middle and the end", and by which "the All and everything is delimited"<sup>174</sup>; it is conceived by the Chaldæans as the principle which measures the Universe and gives it its form.

The mode of being of this Triad is described in the cited fragments as an "outflow", and its origination as a "division". These two images figure together in a sixth fragment which treats of the cognition of the noetic entities. According to it, "the Power of circumsplendent Strength flashes in (by) noetic divisions"<sup>175</sup>. The "Power of Strength" is the Paternal Intellect<sup>176</sup>, whose "divisions" are, consequently, identical with the primal triadic measures "that shine in every world". The latter are the Ideas; an assertion which may be proved to be correct with the help of a lengthy Oracle dealing with the divine thoughts that have fashioned the world. This text, fortunately preserved in full, is of fundamental importance for the understanding of the Chaldæan doctrine of the Ideas. It reads :

"The Father's Intellect, thinking with his vigorous Will, caused to rush forth multiform Ideas. All these sprang forth from one source; for Will and Perfection came from the Father. They (the Ideas) were divided into other noetic (Ideas), after having been dissected by noetic

---

as the daughters of Ananke. Concerning *συνέχω* see note 170 (*δέμα*) and note 244.

In one of the Oracles, perhaps the one with which we are dealing, the triadic ideas are called "connectives": Procl., *Eucl.*, 129, 6 τὰ λόγια τὰς γωνιακὰς συμβουλὰς τῶν σχημάτων «*συναρτηῖδα*» ἀποκαλεῖ. Kroll 58, and after him HOFFNER. *O. Z.*, 1, 820, interpret this Chaldæan notion as referring to geometrical figures which were used for magical purposes.

<sup>174</sup> ANISTOTLE, *De caelo*, A 1, 268 a 10 (45 B 17 Diels) καθάπερ γὰρ φασὶ καὶ οἱ Πυθαγόρειοι τὸ πᾶν καὶ τὰ πάντα τοῖς τρισὶν ὄρισται τελευτῆ γὰρ καὶ μέσον καὶ ἀρχὴ τὸν ἀριθμὸν ἔχει τὸν τοῦ παντός, ταῦτα δὲ τὸν τῆς τριάδος. Ocellus (35 a, 8 Diels) ἡ τριάς πρώτη συνέστησεν ἀρχὴν, μεσότητα καὶ τελευτήν. THEO SMYRN., p. 46, 15 and 100, 14; HILLER, *Porph. Vit. Pyth.*, 51 [IAMBlich.] *Theol. Arithm.*, p. 17, 4; DE FALCO, *Theos.*, No. 64; PHOTIUS, 143 b 19; MARTIAN, *Capella*. VII, 733 (whose source is Varro). See WEINREICH, *Arch. f. Rel.*, 1919, p. 182 f.

<sup>175</sup> «ἀλκῆς ἀμφιφαοῦς δύναμις νοεραῖς σφράπιουσα τομαῖσιν», see note 373 (v. 3-4). Concerning *σφράπιουσα* cf. note 177, ad v. 11 and note 209.

<sup>176</sup> See note 74.

Fire. For the Ruler has set before the many-shaped Cosmos a noetic imperishable Form; hastening upon the unworldly track of which the Cosmos became visible, after having been graciously provided with many-fold Ideas. These (the Ideas) have one Source, from which rush forth other mighty divided (Ideas), which are broken upon the bodies of the world, and move about the terrible Wombs like bees, flashing all around in various directions, the noetic thoughts of the Paternal Source, which pluck the plenteous flower of Fire through the tireless vigour of Time. The first-born Source of the Father, perfect in itself, caused these primordially generated Ideas to well forth'' 177.

177 Procl., *Parm.*, 800, 11 f. (Kroll 23 f.).

Νοῦς πατὴρ ἐρροίησε νοήσας ἀκμάδι βουλή  
 παμμόρφους ιδέας, πηγῆς δὲ μιᾶς ἀπο πᾶσαι  
 ἐξέθορον· πατὴρθεν γὰρ ἔην βουλή τε τέλος τε.  
 ἀλλ' ἐμερισθησαν νοερῶ πυρὶ μοιρηθεῖσαι

- 5 εἰς ἄλλας νοεράς· κόσμῳ γὰρ ἀναξ πολυμόρφῳ  
 προύθηκεν νοερὸν τύπον ἀφθιτον, οὐ κατ' ἄκοσμον  
 ἰχνος ἐπειγόμενος μορβῆς μετὰ κόσμος ἐφάνθη  
 παντοίαις ιδέαις κεχαρισμένος· ὧν μια πηγῆ,  
 ἐξ ἧς ροιζοῦνται μεμερισμένοι ἄλλα; ἀπλοτοι  
 10 ῥηγνύμεναι κόσμου περὶ σώμασιν, αἱ περὶ κόλπους  
 σμερδαλέους σμήνεσσι ἐοικνῖαι φορέονται  
 σῖράπτουσαι περὶ τ' ἀμφὶ παρασχεδὸν ἄλλυδις ἄλλη,  
 ἐννοιαὶ νοεραὶ πηγῆς πατρικῆς ἀπο πουλὸ  
 δρεπτόμεναι πυρὸς ἀνθος ἀκοιμήτου χρόνου ἀκμῆ·  
 15 ἀρχεγόνους ιδέας πρῶτῃ πατὴρ ἐβλυσε τάσδε  
 αὐτοτελῆς πηγῆ.

*Testim.* — The entire Oracle is quoted by Procl., *Parm.*, 800, 11 f., who adds a detailed commentary (till p. 804, 37) which may give us an idea of his lost commentary on the Chaldaean Oracles. As to v. 1-2, cf. *ibid.*, 935, 14, see *Tim.*, I, 318, 13 and *Dam.* II, 178. 1. As to v. 7, cf. Procl., *Tim.*, I, 340, 11. As to v. 10-11, cf. *ibid.*, III, 103. 10. *Text.*, v. 2 ἀποπῖᾶσαι *codd.*, *corr.*, Schneck (cf. Kroll 76). LUDWICH, *ad Procl.*, *Hymn.*, VI, 2. WILAMOWITZ, *Hymnen des Proklos* (see note 31). p. 2, 1. v. 5 εἰς ἄλλας εἰς νοεράς, *codd.*, *corr.* Patricius. v. 6 κατὰ κόσμον, *codd.*, *corr.* Kroll. v. 8 παντ' ἐν ιδέαις, *codd.*, *corr.* Patricius, κεχαρισμένος. *codd.*, κεχαρημένος, *corr.* Kroll. v. 12 τραπούσαι, *codd.*, *corr.* Thilo. v. 14, δρατλόμεναι, *codd.*, *corr.* Thilo.

Proclus' introduction seems to prove that the Oracle was in answer to a question concerning the nature of the ideas; cf. ch. 1, n. 96. This would explain the three-fold repetition of the same principal formula in the Oracle.

*Interpretation*, v. 1: cf. note 49 No. 7. ἐρροίησε (transitive, explained by ἐκρο-



The Platonizing character of the doctrine propounded in this Oracle does not call for further proof. Leaving the inquiry into its historical derivation to the analytical part of this work, we shall at this point of our investigation confine ourselves to examining the statements of the Oracle concerning the origin, the nature and the action of the Ideas. By transposing the enigmatic terms of the text into philosophical language, we obtain the following capital theses : The primordial Ideas are the thoughts of the Supreme God. His Intellect and Will caused them to emanate from the primeval "Source" (an origin which accounts for their being designated as "Sources" in other Oracles)<sup>178</sup> and to "divide", after

*ἰδεῖ, apud Procl., Tim., I, 318, 13 and Dam. II, 178, 1* is (like v. 9 *ροίζοῦνται*) synonymous with v. 15 *ἐέλυσσε*; cf. notes 69 and 83. Procl., *Parm.*, 801, 30, explains *ροίζησις* by *πρόοδος*.

v. 2, *πηγῆς*, see note 61.

v. 3, *ἐξέθορον* : the image derives from the outflow of a spring of water; cf. notes 192, 200, 234. *πατρόθεν γὰρ ἦν βουλή τε τέλος τε* : cf. SENECA, *De otio*, 5 "Voluntas etenim dei ipsa est summa perfectio, utpote eum voluisse et perfecisse uno eodemque temporis puncto complacet". Poimander 14 *ἀμα δὲ τῇ βουλῇ ἐγένετο ἐνέργεια* (other Hermetic passages are quoted by J. KROLL, *Lehren des Hermes*, 148, but they may perhaps be influenced by Biblical formulas). See also notes 50 and 165.

v. 5 f. Cf. note 186.

v. 10. For *ῥηγνόμεναι* (explained by Proclus, *Parm.*, 802, 18 by *προσρήγνυσθαι*) cf. notes 201 and 230. *κόσμου σώματα* are the cosmic bodies composed out of the four elements; cf. note 204.

v. 11 f. The simile of the bees is suggested by *Iliad*, II, 87 f. see especially v. 90 *καὶ μὲν τ' ἐνθα ἄλις πεποτήσεται, αἱ δὲ τε ἐνθα*. The "wombs" (see note 208 f.) are compared with mountain caves about which the bees swarm. v. 14 *δρεπτόμεναι* and *ἄνθος* (see notes 141 and 380) belong to the same imagery. As to *σῖρέπλουςαι* cf. notes 175, 209.

v. 13 *ἐννοιαί* (see note 97), called also *δίνοιαί* (see note 70), are the ideas.

v. 16. See note 61.

<sup>178</sup> The *πηγαί*, also mentioned in the Oracle on Aion quoted note 138, are according to Procl., *Parm.*, 801, 33 f. (*ἀπὸ τῶν πηγαίων ιδεῶν ἄλλα προεληλύθασιν αἱ κατὰ μέρος κληρωσάμεναι τὴν τοῦ κόσμου δημιουργίαν*) and Dam. II, 9, 17, the principal ideas, and their "divisions" the demiurgical ideas; cf. *Tim.*, III, 103, 11. The Oracle quoted note 177 shows that *πηγή* is the sum (cf. *ibid.*, v. 4 *πᾶσαι*) of ideas while they are as yet undivided. See note 193. Concerning *κρηνήσις ἀρχή* see note 192, and concerning *πηγαῖοι κρατῆρες* see note 236. As to the use of the plural (*πηγή* - *πηγαί*) for designating a part of the singular see note 194.

having issued forth. While the primordial Ideas constitute the spiritual form upon which the visible world is modelled, the particular ("divided") Ideas inform the amorphous matter.

The primordial Ideas created by the Paternal Intellect and Will are clearly identical with the triadic measures mentioned in the six fragments that have been quoted before; for they have been created by the same powers and perform the same functions. The description of the latter recalls the Platonists' definition of the Ideas as "measures with respect to the material world"<sup>179</sup>. Accordingly, the action of "measuring and delimiting the All" attributed to the Chaldæan Triad is identical with the forming of the amorphous "world-bodies" into the "many-shaped Cosmos".

Before going on with our account of this Triad, we must inquire into the relationship obtaining between the general and the particular Ideas. The Oracles lay stress on the difference between the two, as in this point they run counter to the generally accepted opinion (the origin of which will be discussed too in the sixth chapter)<sup>180</sup>. One of their gods delivers in reply to a question the following pronouncement :

..For the Father perfected everything and committed it to the Second Intellect, whom ye, o children of man, call the First"<sup>181</sup>.

<sup>179</sup> Cf. e. g., Albinus, p. 163, 14 (ἡ ιδέα) . . . ὡς . . . πρὸς τὴν ὕλην μέτρον.

<sup>180</sup> Cf. ch. vi, sect. 3.

<sup>181</sup> PSELLUS, *Comm.*, 1140 (Kroll 14) :

« Πάντα γὰρ ἐξέτελεσσε πατήρ καὶ νῶ παρέδωκε δευτέρῳ, ὃν πρῶτον κληίζετε πᾶν γένος ἀνδρῶν ». The fragment quoted note 187 is a possible continuation.

The "second Intellect" is also mentioned *Anon. Taur.*, IX, 1 (the continuation of the fragment quoted note 47) δύναμιν . . . διδάσσει (sc. τῷ πατρὶ) καὶ νοῦν . . . καὶ ἄλλον πάλιν νοῦν.

The designation of the "Father" as "first Power of the holy Word" in another Oracle, possibly refers to the relationship between the intellection of the formation of the world and its realization; *Procl., Exc. Vat.*, 194, 31 (Kroll 13, 1) « καὶ πρῶτην δύναμιν ἱεροῦ λόγου » (metrically ἠδὲ λόγου ἱεροῦ πρῶτην δύναμιν). The absence of the demiurgic λόγος Θεοῦ in the Oracles may be accounted for by a consideration of an axiom figuring in another Oracle « ἂ νοῦς λέγει, τῷ νοεῖν δήπου λέγει »; PSELLUS, *Comm.*, 1145 B who transmits it regards it quite correctly as referring to the Divine Intellect.

The "Father perfected"—with the help of His Intellect and Will, as the Oracle treating of the world-shaping Ideas enables us to add<sup>182</sup>—the primordial Ideas, which constitute the "imperishable form" upon which the Second Intellect models himself in fashioning the world. For this reason, the hymn of the *Theosophy* calls the "Father" : "Form within the Forms"<sup>183</sup>. It is from Him that all the Ideas which constitute the primal noetic form of the visible world spring forth. As to the Second Intellect, he is the veritable Demiurge ; called—in contradistinction from the Paternal Intellect, the "Artisan of the fiery (viz. noetic) world"<sup>184</sup>—the "Artisan of the works"<sup>185</sup>. The hymn of the *Theosophy* describes in similar fashion the action exercised by the "Father" and His Intellect upon the formation of the visible world :

"Thou sucklest through eternally flowing channels the equipoised

<sup>182</sup> Cf. note 50.

<sup>183</sup> *Theos.*, 29, 2 (quoted ch. 1, n. 59) « ἐν εἶδεσιν εἶδος ὑπάρχων ».

<sup>184</sup> *Procl., Tim.*, II, 57, 30 (Kroll 13) « Οὐ γὰρ ἐς ἄλην πῦρ ἐπέκεινα τὸ πρῶτον ἐὶν δύναμιν κατακλείει ἐργοῖς, ἀλλὰ νόῳ· νοῦ γὰρ νόος ἐστὶν ὁ κόσμος τεχνίτης πύριου ».

*Testim., Procl., Th. Pl.*, 333, 28, *Crat.*, 57, 14, *Dam.* II, 136, 10 and 218, 4, *Procl., Th. Pl.* and *Crat., l. c.*, have κατακλίνει, but the correct reading κατακλείει is attested by the other sources, and, what is even more important, by the parallel quoted note 45.

The beginning reads in a literal translation : "Not through the works, but through the Intellect does the First Transcendent Fire enclose its Power in Matter". The Oracle attacks the belief that the transcendent God has a direct action upon matter. The right opinion is that He transmits His "Power" in immediate fashion solely to His "First" Intellect who creates the prototype of the universe; it is in imitation of this prototype that the Second Intellect forms matter (The correct interpretation is propounded by *Dam.* II, 136, 19 f.). The polemic tendency of this fragment is analogous to that found in the one quoted note 181. Both derive probably from the same Oracle.

As to πῦρ ἐπέκεινα τὸ πρῶτον see note 41, as to δύναμις see note 46. The term ἐργα is applied in the Oracles (according to ΠΛΑΤΟ, *Tim.*, 41 a 7; cf. *Procl., Tim.*, II, 89, 26 f.) to the created world; cf. notes 128, 185 (ἐργοτεχνίτης), 190 (αἰσθητὰ ἐργα). The Paternal Intellect is called νοῦ νόος in contradistinction to the Second Intellect; cf. ΣΥΝΕΣ., *Hymn.*, IV, 231 « νόος ἐσσι νόου ». As to κόσμος πύριος see notes 40 and 270.

<sup>185</sup> *Procl., Tim.*, II, 89, 25 (Kroll 19) τὰ λόγια τὸν δημιουργὸν τοῦ παντός

Intellect, who brings forth this All by shaping the imperishable matter, whose creation was resolved upon when Thou boundest it in (by) Forms'' 186.

The "eternal rays" which "suckle" the demiurgical Second Intellect spring forth from the First Intellect and constitute the model of the visible world.

«ἐργοτεχνίτην» κέκληκεν; cf. *ibid.*, I, 12, 18 and 142, 23. The verse «ἔργα νοήσας γὰρ πατρικὸς νόος αὐτογένεθλος» (see note 232) proves likewise that the Paternal Intellect thinks the world without shaping it.

<sup>186</sup> *Theos.*, 27, v. 9-11 (ch. i. n. 26)

«ἀενάοις ὀχετοῖσι τιθηνῶν νοῦν ἀτάλαντον,  
ὅς ῥα κύει τὸδε πᾶν, τεχνώμενος ἀφθιτον ὕλην,  
ἧς γένεσις δεδόκηται, ὅτε σφε τύποισι ἐδήσας».

As to ἀτάλαντον see note 187. As to ὀχετοῖ see note 192. τιθηνῶν and νοῦς κύων belong to the same imagery. For ἀφθιτος ὕλη see note 198, as to δεδόκηται see note 49, No. 11.

<sup>187</sup> *PROCL.*, *Crat.*, 51, 26 (Kroll 14) Καὶ ἡ μουσικωτάτη παράδοσις καὶ αἱ παρὰ τῶν Θεῶν φῆμαι (Excursus I h. I.) λέγει ὡς

«Δυάς παρὰ τῷδε (sc. τῷ δευτέρῳ νῷ) κίθηται»,

καὶ φησὶν·

«Ἀμφότερον γὰρ ἔχει· νῷ μὲν κατέχειν τὰ νοητά,  
αἴσθησιν δ' ἐπάγειν κόσμοις».

Καὶ τί δεῖ λέγειν; αὐτόθεν γὰρ αὐτὸν προσαγορεύει «dis ἐπέκεινα» καὶ «dis ἐκεῖ» καὶ ὅλον αὐτὸν διὰ τῆς δυνάδος εὐφημεῖ.

Cf. also SYRIAN, *Metaph.*, p. 89. 17; *PROCL.*, *Tim.*, I, 224, 5; II, 82, 3; 246, 28; 306, 32; *Rp.*, I, 99, 1; 135, 31; *Pl. Th.*, 260, 5; *DAM.*, II, 177, 22; 205, 21, etc.; *PELLUS. Hyp.*, 12 (p. 74, 13).

For *δυάς* as designation of the twofold aspect of this noetic potency see *PELLUS. Hyp.*, 9 (p. 74, 17) καλεῖται δὲ «dis ἐπέκεινα», ὅτι δυαδικὸς ἐστὶν «νῷ μὲν κατέχων τὰ νοητά, αἴσθησιν δὲ ἐπάγων τοῖς κόσμοις», and note 140. For this reason the Second Intellect is called "equiposed" (ἀτάλαντος, explained by *schol.* in *Arat.* 22 *ισος ἐξ ἐκατέρου μέρους*) in *Theos.* 27, 9 (quoted note 186).

I should suppose that the "mirrors" (διόπτραι), whose "source" according to *PELLUS, Hyp.* 13 (p. 74, 32) and *Mich. Ital.* 183, 12 f. (Kroll 23), subsists in the *dis ἐπέκεινα*, designate the capacity of the latter to receive the reflection of the Primal Spiritual Form of the sensible world. There seems to be no possible connection between this notion and the mirror symbolism either of the Orphic (*Kern Fr.* 209) and Hermetic texts (*J. KROLL, Lehren des Hermes*, 116 f.) or of Plotinus (*Koch*, 246-7).

The double aspect of the Second Intellect, who is both dependent on the First Intellect and active with regard to the visible world, which he has fashioned, is termed "duality" in Chaldæan vocabulary :

"Duality is attached to him (the Intellect, who has fashioned the world) ; for he is able to do both things : to apprehend the noetic beings and to direct his sensual perceptions to the worlds" <sup>187</sup>.

For this reason, the demiurgical Intellect is known as the "doubly transcendent", in contradistinction from the First Intellect designated as the "singly transcendent" <sup>188</sup>. His duality is also expressed by the epic attribute "equipoised" (*i. e.* here, equal as to both sides or directions). Accordingly, it is he who is signified by the dyad, which, together, with the Paternal Monad, constitutes the Source, wherefrom the "bond" of the "measurable Triad" (*i. e.* the world-shaping Ideas) "flows forth" <sup>189</sup>.

These world-forming Ideas subsisting in the Second Intellect are, likewise, designated in the Oracles by various names. In one fragment they are called the "Principles" (*ἀρχαί*), "who by thinking the works thought by the Father envelop them with visible works and bodies" <sup>190</sup>. The expression "the works thought by the Father" signifies the primordial noetic Forms of the visible world <sup>191</sup>. The choice of the term "Principles" is due to the Supreme Creator being called "the Principle of the All" : "Nothing imperfect rushes from the Principle of the Father", according

<sup>187</sup> See note 43.

<sup>188</sup> See note 170.

<sup>189</sup> Dam. II 200, 23 (Kroll 37), « Ἀρχάς, αἱ πατρός ἔργα νοήσασαι τὰ νοητὰ αἰσθητοῖς ἔργοις καὶ σώμασιν ἀμφεκάλυψαν ». Paraphrased *ibid.* 203, 27 οἱ Θεοὶ καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ Θεουργὸς (see note 220 f.) τὴν αἰσθητὴν τοῖς μαγικοῖς πατρίσιν (= ἀρχαῖς, see note 174) ὑποτίθεται δημιουργίαν. A fragment which Procl., *Tim.* II 300, 12 (Kroll 65) quotes without any reference to its context seems to allude to the same action : τῆς ἐπαφῆς (cf. PLATO, *Tim.* 37 a 6 ἐφάπληται) τὴν ἐναργῆ . . . γνώσιν δηλοῦσης καὶ τὰ αἰσθητὰ νοούσης « ὡς ἐπαφητά », *Ἐπί τις Θεῶν*.

<sup>190</sup> PSELLUS, *Comm.* 1145 D (Kroll 15).

<sup>191</sup> « Οὐ γὰρ ἀπὸ πατρικῆς ἀρχῆς ἀτελέες τι τροχάζει » (imitation of *Iliad* I 526 f.). LVDUS, *Mens.* IV 159 p. 175, 17 quotes from the first book of Iamblichus' commentary on the Chaldæan Oracles (see note 6) a paraphrase of this verse : Οὐδὲν ἀπὸ τῆς πατρικῆς τριάδος προχωρεῖ ἀτελέες. As to *τροχάζω* see note 177 (*ad. v.* 3).

to a verse which exalts the perfection of the Father's thoughts <sup>192</sup>. The "Principles" are, accordingly, offshoots of the "Principle", just as the "Sources" are offshoots of the "Source" <sup>193</sup>. As further examples show, the Chaldæan Oracles sometimes employ the plural to indicate the parts of one primal substance <sup>194</sup>.

At this point, we may take up again the problem of the "measuring" Triad, into the nature of which the texts referring to the functions of the First and Second Intellect have given us some insight. This Triad is said to have originated through a division of the All into trinities, and to "measure" and "delimit" the All. On the other hand, it is by it that "the noetic essence is measured". The reason for these various statements must be sought in the relationship between the First and the Second Intellect, the latter of whom is but the actualization of the thoughts of the former. He springs from him, and is sustained ("suckled") and ruled by him. If we consider the action exercised by the First Intellect on the intelligible world, we are justified in saying that his thoughts are the measures of this world. However, in order to exercise a similar action upon the sensible world, he must "commit" the realization of his thoughts to the Second Intellect. Thus, it is the latter who "measures" and fashions the All, for which the primordial Idea serves him as a prototype. It is, accordingly, probable that he is referred to in the following isolated verse: "In the Womb of this Triad everything is sown" <sup>195</sup>.

<sup>192</sup> According to Dam. II 206. 11 (Kroll 39), the class of the ἀφομοιωτικοὶ Θεοὶ (who were identified with the Chaldæan ἀρχαί; see Dam. II 200, 19 f.) were called in the Oracles κρηνήσιος ἀρχή. The schema quoted by Psellus. *Hyp.* 28 (cf. Mich. Ital. 183, 25. See Kroll, *ibid.*) Ἐκάστῃς δὲ σειρᾶς ἢ ἀκρότης «πηγή» ὀνομάζεται (see note 66), τὰ δὲ προσεχῆ «κρῆναι», τὰ δὲ μετὰ ταῦτα «ὄχετοι» (see note 186). τὰ δὲ μετ' ἐκεῖνα «ρεῖθρα» (ch. iv. n. 53) contains Chaldæan notions, but is based upon a construction of Proclus.

<sup>193</sup> See note 178. In the noetic hierarchy of the Chaldæans, the ἀρχαί follow immediately upon the πηγαί, as may be proved by the sequence in which they are enumerated in the Oracle on Aion, quoted note 138. and by Proclus' doctrine concerning the «chains»; see note 152.

<sup>194</sup> Cf. e. g. the relationship between δύναμις and δυνάμεις (see n. 46 and 252). κόλπος and κόλποις (see n. 62 and 211) ψυχή and ψυχαί (see ch. III, n. 22-3).

<sup>195</sup> Lydus, *Mens.* II 8 p. 28, 1 (Kroll 18) πάντα γὰρ τὰ νοητὰ ἐν τῇ τριάδι

This explanation accounts for the tradition of the Neoplatonists as to a noetic Chaldæan Ennead. We must, however, bear in mind that the interpretations of this teaching current in the school of Proclus carry no weight, as they are based upon the theories of Iamblichus<sup>196</sup>. The "Chaldæan Ennead" consists, as the cited verses of the Oracles make probable : a) of the Paternal Monad, which constitutes in its active aspect the Supreme Triad ; b) of the triadic primordial Ideas, which immediately proceed from it ; c) of the triadic particular Ideas, which spring from these<sup>197</sup>. We must admit that the extant fragments do not always differentiate between the Triad of the First and that of the Second Intellect ; but this fluctuation must be imputed to the fact that the Second Intellect possesses only with respect to the sensible world an existence independent of the First, from Whom he is not separated in the noetic region, and Who contains him.

7. *The Creation of the World.*—The speculations of the Chaldæans regarding the relationship between the First and the Second Intellect are bound-up with their teaching concerning the creation of the world. The fundamental conceptions of their cosmogony are set out in the principal Oracle (quoted in the foregoing section) which deals with the origin, the mutual relationship and the action of the Ideas. According to this text, the Second Intellect, known as the "Artisan", fashioned the world in the likeness of the "imperishable form" set before him by the Paternal Intellect. Matter was created before the world by the "Father", whose Intellect had taken this "resolve" ; for this reason, matter is described as "begotten of the Father"<sup>198</sup>.

---

περιέχεται και πᾶς ὁ Θεῖος ἀριθμὸς ἐν τῇ τάξει ταύτῃ προελήλυθεν, ὡς και αὐτὸς ὁ Χαλδαῖος ἐν τοῖς λογιῶις. «Τῆσδε γὰρ ἐν τριάδος κόλποις ἐσπαρται ἅπαντα». Proclus, *Th. Pl.* 236, 50 f. refers that verse to the three *συναρχαίς* (see Excursus VII), probably with regard to the *τριάς συνέχουσα τὰ πάντα* mentioned in the oracle quoted note 173.

<sup>196</sup> see note 163.

<sup>197</sup> The question whether the Chaldæans had already the notion of an Ennead must remain undecided.

<sup>198</sup> Lydos, *Mens.*, IV, 159, p. 175, 5 (Kroll 20) ὁ Χαλδαῖος ἐν τοῖς λογιῶις «πατρογενῆ» τὴν ὕλην ὀνομάζει. PSELLUS, *Hyp.* 27 (p. 75, 33) και ἡ μὲν ὕλη

“The creation of the imperishable Matter was (already) resolved upon, when Thou boundest it in (by) forms”<sup>199</sup>.

As we have seen, the Paternal Intellect had produced the noetic form of the sensible world which was to be created. The following Oracle bears on this doctrine :

“From here (the “Source of the Sources”, *i. e.* the First Intellect) springs in abundance the generation of manifold Matter”<sup>200</sup>.

Thus, the creation of the visible world was conceived as an imitation of a spiritual prototype. The demiurgical Second Intellect used as his instruments the Forms (Ideas) contained in him. These are said in the principal Oracle about the world-shaping Ideas to “break upon the bodies of the world”. The underlying conception is that these Ideas by virtue of their noetic fire exercise upon the Primal Matter of the world an action similar to that of the smith who melts iron in fire and moulds it with a hammer. For this reason, they are called in another Oracle “implacable Thunderbolts”—an obvious allusion to the emblem of Zeus interpreted

*πατρογενής ἐστὶ* (continued note 203). Aeneas Gaz., *Theophrast.*, p. 51 Boiss. οὐ γὰρ ἀγέννητος οὐδὲ ἀναρχος ἢ ὕλη· τοῦτό σε καὶ Χαλδαῖοι διδάσκουσι καὶ ὁ Πορφύριος (continued Excursus II, n. 6 and 22), ἔλη ἄφθιτος is mentioned *Theos.* 27, 10; cf. note 186.

<sup>199</sup> See note 186.

<sup>200</sup> PROCL., *Tim.* I 451. 17 (Kroll 20) Οὕτω δὲ καὶ τὰ λόγια τὸν μέγιστον τοῦτον Θεὸν «πηγὴν πηγῶν» προσαγορεύει (see n. 59) καὶ μόνον ἀπογεννησάι τὰ πάντα φησίν.

« ἔνθεν ἄδην θρώσκει γένεσις πολυποικίλου ὕλης·  
ἐνθεν συρόμενος περὶ στήρ ἀμυδροὶ πυρὸς ἄθος  
κόσμων ἐνθρώπων κοιλώμασιν· πάντα γὰρ ἐνθεν  
ἔρχεται εἰς τὸ κάτω τεύειν ἀκτίνας ἀγητῆς ».

*Testim.* A different sequence (v. 3 b. 4. 1) *apud* Dam. I. 251. 15.-v. 1 : Procl., *Tim.* I 388, 21.-v. 2; 3 a : *Th. Pl.* 172, 10.-v. 3 b; 4 : *Th. Pl.* 171. 11. *Text* : v. 1 ἄδην θρώσκει Procl. ἀποθρώσκει Dam. As to ἄδην cf. note 83, a, v. 2 πολλὴ ἄδην βλύζει. The subject of the fragment is πηγὴ τῶν πηγῶν (*i. e.* the *πατρικὸς νοῦς*, cf. note 58), which explains the metaphorical significance of ἄδην θρώσκει. As Kroll has supposed, the fragment quoted n. 209 appears to derive from the same Oracle. For *πολυποικίλου* see n. 204. For *ἀμυδροὶ* see n. 228, *κόσμοι* are the planetary worlds, see n. 87.



as a demiurgical instrument<sup>201</sup>. Accordingly, the primordial Ideas provide the model of the Universe, while the particular Ideas (the Forms) are instrumental in its creation.

A series of fragments, apparently belonging to one and the same or, alternatively, to two cognate Oracles, furnish some information as to the functions of the latter class of Ideas. One of these verses states that the Demiurge created the whole world :

“Out of fire, water, earth and the all-nourishing air”<sup>202</sup>.

It would, consequently, appear that the Chaldæans distinguished between primal matter and the four elements formed out of it. Psellus touches upon this problem in his exposition of the principal Chaldæan dogmas :

“Primal Matter is begotten of the Father ; it is the substratum of the (world)-body. The (world)-body, in itself, is void of qualities ; but, having acquired various forces, it was divided into four elements, out of which the Universe was fashioned”<sup>203</sup>.

<sup>201</sup> Compare « ῥηγνύμεναι κόσμον περι σώμασι » (note 177. v. 10) with « ἀμείλικτοι τε κεραυνοί » (note 209, v. 1) and « ἀμείλικτου πυρός » (note 260). The “lightnings” are the particular Ideas which spring from the First Intellect who is their “primal source” and which are “flashing in divisions”: see n. 175 and 177 (*ad* v. 11). Cf. also PROCL., *Tim.* I 112, 9 δημιουργίας γὰρ σύμβολον ὁ κεραυνός; see ch. vii n. 109. The Oracles also name them εὐλυτα φέγγη (see n. 266) and ὑπὲρ τὸν οὐρανὸν φῶτα (PROCL., *Rp.* II 155, 6 f.). The attribute ἀμείλικτος signifies that the Ideas are characterised as ἀμείλικτοι δεσμοί (Hesiod. *Theog.* 658), which “bind matter in forms”; cf. *Theos.* 27, 11 «τύποισι ἐδήσας», quoted n. 186. Proclus who identifies the ἀμείλικτοι with the three ἀχραντοί Θεοί (see Excursus VII), interprets their name *Rp.* I 138, 5 as meaning τὸ ἀδάμαστον.

<sup>202</sup> PROCL., *Tim.* II 50, 20 (Kroll 35) καὶ μὴν ἡ τῶν ἁσσυρίων Θεολογία (Excursus I c) τὰ αὐτὰ (*sicut* Plato *Tim.* 32 c 6) παραδίδωσι Θεόθεν ἐμφανθέντα· καὶ γὰρ ἐν ἐκείνοις ὁ δημιουργὸς τὸν ὅλον κόσμον λέγεται ποιεῖν «ἐκ πυρός, ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ γῆς καὶ παντρώφου αἰθήρης».

In this passage αἶθρα is synonymous with αἴηρ but in the fragment quoted n. 287 d with αἰθήρ.

<sup>203</sup> PSELLUS, *Hyp.* 27 (p. 75, 34) καὶ ἡ μὲν ὕλη πατρογενῆς ἐστὶ (see n. 198) καὶ ὑπέσθρωται τῷ σώματι, τὸ δὲ σῶμα καθ' ἑαυτὸ ἀποῖον ἐστὶ (see ch. v. n. 139). δυνάμεις δὲ διαφόρους λαβὸν εἰς τέτταρα στοιχεῖα διηρέθη, ἐξ ὧν ὁ σύμπας ἐμορφώθη

This summary account elucidates at least one point : the Chaldæans, who, in this case, as in so many others, conformed to the Platonic doctrine, believed that the formation of the visible world was posterior to the division of primal matter into four elements provided with qualities. The whole mass of matter subsisting in the world was called by them "Body", or "World-Body"<sup>204</sup>.

The element of fire is charged with the fashioning of this world-stuff : "For there was another mass of Fire, which worked all this by itself : that the World-Body should be perfected, that the World should become visible and not seem membrane-like"<sup>205</sup>.

This "other" Fire, which is distinguished expressly from the noetic fire, fashions the visible world ; which, without its action would, according to the Oracle, "seem membrane-like". The meaning of this last attribute may be elucidated once more with the help of the Platonic *Timæus* according to which the universe "being bodily must be visible and tangible, and without fire nothing visible can come to be"<sup>206</sup>. The concordance of the two passages shows that the Oracular fragment is a mere paraphrase of the Platonic text<sup>207</sup>.

8. *The "Wombs" and the Pneuma of the Cosmic Soul.*—The formation of the visible world out of the Cosmic Body was not effected solely by

---

κόσμος και τὸ ἡμέτερον σῶμα. (As to the last words of this sentence see ch. III. n. 95). In this connection we may recall that Psellus' Platonistic terminology may stand in very close relationship to that of the Chaldæan Oracles.

<sup>204</sup> σῶμα or κοσμικὸν σῶμα (see n. 177. *ad v.* 10 : 205) is the world-stuff which is differentiated into the four elements ; cf. PLATO, *Tim.* 32 c 1. 34 b 2. It is called πολυποικίλος ὕλη in the fragment quoted n. 200 ; cf. also ch. v, n. 146.

<sup>205</sup> PROCL., *Tim.* II 50. 25 (continuation of the fragment quoted n. 202. See Kroll 35).

«καὶ γὰρ τις πυρὸς ὄγκος ἔην ἕτερος τὰδε πάντα αὐτουργῶν, ἵνα σῶμα τὸ κοσμικὸν ἐκτολυπεύθῃ, κόσμος ἰν' ἐκδηλος καὶ μὴ φαίνηθ' ὑμενώδης».

<sup>206</sup> PLATO, *Tim.* 31 b 1 f. (quoted by Kroll 35) σωματοειδὲς δὲ δὴ καὶ ὁρατὸν ἀπ' ὧν τε δεῖ τὸ γενόμενον εἶναι· χωρισθὲν δὲ πυρὸς οὐδὲν ἂν ποτε ὁρατὸν γένοιτο.

<sup>207</sup> Concerning ὑμενώδης see also note 101 (ὕμην).

the union of the Forms with Matter. The Oracles treating of the world-forming Ideas says that these "move about the terrible Wombs like bees"<sup>209</sup>. We are given a clue to the meaning of the term "Womb" in the fragment of an Oracle which enumerates four noetic entities generated by the First Intellect<sup>209</sup>. After the "implacable Thunderbolts", viz. the world-shaping Forms<sup>210</sup>, it names the "Lightning-receiving Wombs of the all-illuminating ray of Father-begotten Hecate". Hecate being the Cosmic Soul, the "Wombs" of her "all-illuminating ray" may be conceived as receptacles destined to receive the effluence of this Soul. This interpretation is corroborated by another fragment which states that the "Cosmic Soul possesses many plenitudes of Cosmic Wombs"<sup>211</sup>; These Wombs appear to be situated in the "Cosmic body"; we may, accordingly, infer that the formation of the latter was preceded by its becoming ensouled, a process probably represented as the filling-up of the hollows of the cosmic body with soul-substance.

As the lightnings of the Ideas penetrate into the Wombs and as these "conceive", the union of the Intellect and of the Soul is consummated. Through it the Cosmos becomes both rational and ensouled. We shall see that this mythical act of generation may be regarded as a figurative representation of the cosmogony of Plato's *Timæus*.

<sup>209</sup> See note 177 *ad* v. 11 f.

<sup>210</sup> PROCL., *Crat.* 58, 16 (Kroll 20) ἔστιν δ' οὖν (sc. ὁ ἀπαξ ἐπέκεινα) καθαρὸς νοῦς (see Excursus VII) ὡς . . . τῆς νοεράς ὅλης διακοσμῆσεως ἡγεμών.

« τοῦδε γὰρ ἐκθρόσκουσι ἀμείλικτοι τε κεραυνοὶ  
καὶ πρηστῆροδόχοι κόλπαι (παμφεγγέος ἀγῆης)  
πατρογενοῦς ἑκάτης καὶ ὑπεζωκὸς πυρὸς ἀνθος  
ἠδὲ κραταῖον πνεῦμα πόλων πυριων ἐπέκεινα ».

v. 1-4 is quoted in full by Dam. II 133. 3; almost in full *ibid.* 89, 31. This passage supplies the second half of the fourth line which is missing in Proclus' text. v. 4: PROCL., *Crat.* 81, 1.

According to Proclus the subject is the First Intellect. Already Kroll has observed that these four verses derive very probably from the same Oracle as those quoted n. 200. The details will be interpreted further on.

<sup>210</sup> See note 201.

<sup>211</sup> « καὶ ἰσχει κόσμου πολλὰ πληρώματα κόλπων », sc. ψυχῆ: cf. n. 75 (v. 3).

A fourth entity is named in the Oracle of which two lines have already been quoted : "The strong Pneuma beyond the fiery poles"<sup>212</sup>. The term "fiery poles" has more than one meaning ; in this passage it is applied to the four cardinal points localized in the sphere of the fixed stars<sup>213</sup>. Thus, the Pneuma mentioned in the Oracle is differentiated by the indication of its noetic place from the "terrestrial *pneumata*", identical with the demons<sup>214</sup>. The term "Pneuma" is used in the doxology of the angels of the *Theosophy* as a designation of the Cosmic Soul<sup>215</sup>. Other fragments describe it as the envelope of the individual souls which descend into the human body<sup>216</sup>. As the "ensouling" of man and that of the world are conceived in the Chaldæan doctrine as analogous processes, we may assume that this Pneuma was also the envelope of the portions of the Cosmic Soul, which fill up the hollows of the Cosmic Body and constitute its Wombs. The sensible World, ensouled by these portions of the Cosmic Soul, and endowed by the "Thunderbolts" of the Ideas with Reason, receives from Pneuma the breath of life. Thus, if we consider the four classes of entities generated by the First Intellect, namely, the "Thunderbolts", the "Wombs", the "girdling Fire", the "Pneuma", all of which collaborate in perfecting the sensible world, we find that the first may be identified with the Forms, and the three others with diverse aspects of the Cosmic Soul<sup>217</sup>.

In conclusion we shall cite the full text of these verses in their proper order : "From this (the First Intellect) spring in abundance the implacable Thunderbolts, the Lightning-receiving Wombs of the all-illuminating ray of Father-begotten Hecate, the girdling blossom of Fire and the strong Pneuma beyond the fiery poles".

9. *The Firmaments*.—One Oracle treated, in particular, of the creation of the firmaments. One of its few extant fragments reads : "The Father

<sup>212</sup> See note 209 (v. 4).

<sup>213</sup> See n. 322 and ch. I, n. 176.

<sup>214</sup> See ch. I, n. 133 and ch. v. n. 2.

<sup>215</sup> See ch. I, n. 66.

<sup>216</sup> See ch. III, n. 29-30.

<sup>217</sup> Concerning the "girdling Fire" see n. 100.

set up on high the seven firmaments of the worlds''<sup>218</sup>: that is to say, the seven vaults of heaven<sup>219</sup>, to which the planets are fixed.

The creation of the firmaments was described in more detail in a didactical prose work by Julian the Theurgist, one passage of which is quoted more than once and with several variations by Proclus (who does not mention the full title of his source)<sup>220</sup>. A combination of these quotations reads :

“The demiurge bent heaven into a curved shape, and attached to it the great multitude of the fixed stars, forcing fire to fire, so that they may not move through wearisome strain, but by a fixture that is not subject

<sup>218</sup> Simpl. *Phys.* 616. 34 (Kroll 31) τὰ λόγια φησιν.

« Ἐπίτ' ἄρ' ἐξώγκωσε πατήρ σφερώματα κόσμων ».

Cf. Dam. II 178. 4. Lydus, *Mens.* I 12, p. 6, 9.

The division of the firmaments proposed by PSELLUS, *Expos.* 1149 C ἐπίτ' φασί σωματικούς κόσμους (= σφερώματα. see n. 219), ἐμπύριον ἓνα καὶ πρῶτον καὶ τρεῖς μετ' αὐτὸν αἰθερίους, ἔπειτα τρεῖς ὑλαίους (continued ch. v, n. 138) and Dam. II 88, 21 ὥστε εἰ ἐστὶ τῶν σφερωμάτων σειρὰ τὸ ἐμπύριον καὶ αἰθέριον καὶ ὑλαῖον ἰπὸ μονάδος τοῦ ἀπλῶς σφερωματος ὑποβᾶσα (cf. also *ibid.* 87. 10) may be explained by a confusion between the seven planetary worlds and the three world-circles: see n. 270. And the view of Mich. Ital. 182, 7 (Kroll 23) τῶν νοερῶν πηγῶν τὰς διακοσμήσεις, ἃς καὶ φασιν « ἐπίτ' κεραυνούς » by a confusion of the seven planetary worlds with the “intellective hebdomad”: see n. 266. We are in the dark as to the exact meaning of Damascius' and Proclus' statement that the Chaldæans “doubled” the seven heavenly zones in the sublunar region: Dam. II 232, 15 (Kroll 22, 3) ὥσπερ καὶ οἱ Χαλδαῖοι τὰ ὑπουράνια γένη τῶν οὐρανίων διπλασίως παραδιδάσκειν and Procl., *Rp.* II 239, 2 οὕτω καὶ τῶν Θεολόγων πολλαχοῦ τὰς οὐρανίας ζώνας διπλασιαζόντων ἐν τοῖς ὑπὸ σελήνην.

<sup>219</sup> σφερῶμα is an astronomical term (also used in the *Septuaginta*, see *Gen.* I. 6) of which Psellus (see n. 218) proposes an etymological explanation (σφερῶς = σωματικός; so also Pwilo, *de orif. mund.* 36).

<sup>220</sup> According to Proclus, the work of Julian the Theurgist was named Ἰσηγητικά (and according to Damascius whose source he was, Ἰσηγηματικά); see n. 221 a and f. These designations describe, however, only the literary genre (the term Ἰσηγητικά means works of instruction) and are not the real title. I conjecture that περὶ ζώων should be added to the name indicated by Proclus. In this case the work would be identical with the monograph quoted above, n. 150 (see also n. 155-6).

to vagaries. He sent underneath six planets, and in their midst the seventh : the Fire of the Sun ; and He suspended their disorder on the well-ranged girdles of the spheres''<sup>221</sup>.

<sup>221</sup> We know six versions of the fragment (see Kroll 38 f.) which complement each other :

a) PROCL., *Tim.* III 124. 32 ὁ Θεουργός (Excursus I ff) ἐν τοῖς Ὑψηγητικοῖς (see n. 220) λέγων περὶ τοῦ τρίτου πατρὸς (the demiurge, see note 283).

« Ἐπήξε δὲ καὶ πολλὸν ἑμιλον ἀστέρων ἀπλανῶν, τὸ πῦρ πρὸς τὸ πῦρ ἀναγκάσαι : πῆξει πλάνην οὐκ ἐχούση φέρεσθαι ».

b) PROCL., *Tim.* III 132. 28 (ὁ Θεουργός) περὶ μὲν γε τῶν ἀπλανῶν τῆς δημιουργίας λέγων φησὶν.

« Ἐπήξε δὲ καὶ πολλὸν ἑμιλον ἀστέρων ἀπλανῶν μὴ τάσει [ἐπιπόνῳ] πονηρᾷ, πῆξει δὲ πλάνην οὐκ ἐχούση φερομένων » (coll. *χρωμένων*, *corrupti* : cf. (a)).

... περὶ δὲ τῶν πλανωμένων, ὅτι

« Ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἐπέστησεν ἑβδομον ἡλίου μεσεμβολήσας πῦρ, τὸ ἄτακτον αὐτῶν εὐτάκτοις ἀνακρεμάσας ζώναις ».

« Μὴ τάσει πονηρᾷ » (ἐπιπόνῳ is a gloss, as already remarked by Diehl, which may allude to Arist. *De caelo* II 1. 284 a 17) signifies that the fixed stars do not move by their own exertions, i. e. by drawing their spheres onwards. This polemical remark is apparently directed against Aristotle's hypothesis of the movers of the spheres.

c) PROCL., *Tim.* I 317. 22 Δοκεῖ μὲν οὖν ὅσα τῶ τρίτῳ τῶν ἀρχικῶν (the demiurge, see note 283) ὁ Θεουργός ἀνατίθῃσι, τζῦτα καὶ οὗτος (the Platonic demiurge) τῶ κόσμῳ δίδοναι καὶ δημιουργεῖν μὲν,

« τὸν οὐρανὸν κυρτῶ σχήματι περικλάσας, πηγύναι δὲ πολλὸν ἑμιλον ἀστέρων ἀπλανῶν, ζωνῶν δὲ πλανωμένων ὑφιστάναι ἐπὶ ἅδα ».

On the continuation : καὶ γῆν ἐν μέσῳ τιθέναι καὶ ὕδωρ ἐν τοῖς κόλποις τῆς γῆς καὶ ἀέρα ἄνωθεν τούτων which also belongs to the quotation, see ch. vi, n. 253.

d) PROCL., *Rp.* II. 220. 11 ἀλλὰ τῶν παρὰ Χαλδαίους Θεουργῶν ἀκούσας, ὡς ἄρα ὁ Θεὸς ἐμεσεμβόλησεν τὸν ἡλίου ἐν τοῖς ἐπὶ ἅ και ἀνεκρέμασεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ τὰς ἐξ ἄλλας ζώνας, καὶ τῶν Θεῶν αὐτῶν (in the Oracles), ὅτι τὸ ἡλιακὸν πῦρ « καρδίας τόπων » ἐσήριξεν . . . *ibid.* 7-21 εἰ δὲ δὴ κρατοῖη τὸν μὲν ἡλίου ἐν τῶ μέσῳ τάττει τῶν ἐπὶ ἅ, καθάπερ οἱ Θεουργικοὶ λόγοι (prose writings) καὶ Θεοὶ (in the Oracles) φασιν. See note 309. Proclus invokes the theurgists in order to counter-balance the authority of the "divine Plato" by that of Ptolemy ; see TAYLOR, *A commentary on Plato's Timæus*, p. 193 f.

e) PROCL., *Tim.* III 63. 21 ὁ δὲ Θεουργός οὕτως οἰεταὶ σαφῶς εἰπεῖν τὸν δημιου-

This brief description of the creation of the firmaments conforms to the basic conceptions of Hellenistic cosmophysics. According to these, the fixed stars are attached to their sphere ("heaven")<sup>222</sup>, the circular motion of which is the cause of their revolutions<sup>223</sup>; the planets, on the other hand, are endowed with a double movement (called "disorder"), participating both in the revolutions of their spheres and in those of their epicycles. The only distinctive feature of the sole preserved prose quotation deriving from the writings of the second of the founders of Theurgy is the pronounced anthropomorphism characterizing the account of the demiurge's actions; this trait—also found in the corresponding passages of the Oracles—may be set down to the influence of the parallel description figuring in Plato's *Timæus*<sup>224</sup>.

The following fragment of the Oracles also refers to the creation of heaven :

"It is true that it is an image of the Intellect, but something corporeal is inherent in the product"<sup>225</sup>.

To all these texts we may add a Chaldæan thesis formulated by Proclus, whose wording lacks precision, but is substantially correct : "Matter extends throughout the whole of the Universe"<sup>226</sup>.

ῤῥὸν ἐξ ἀνακρεμάσαι ζώνας ἐξδομον ἡλίου μεσεμβολήσαντα πῦρ ᾧ μὴ Θέμις ἰπιστεῖν (see Excursus I 0).

f) Dam. II 203, 29 (ὁ Θεουργός) . . . τὸν τρίτον (sc. πατέρα, see a) τάτε ἄλλα διακρίναι φησιν ἐν τοῖς ὑφηγηματικοῖς (see note 220) καὶ τὸν ἡλίον μεσεμβολῆσαι τοῖς ἐπιτά κοσμοκράτορσιν.

<sup>222</sup> Cf. note 129.

<sup>223</sup> As to the well-known etymological explanation of ἀπλανεῖς as stars fixed to the sphere see F. BOLL in *P. W.* s. v. Fixsterne 2407. Cf. also above, note 130.

<sup>224</sup> See ch. vi, n. 252.

<sup>225</sup> PROCL., *Tim.* I 286, 10 (Kroll 35) remarks on Plat. *Tim.* 28b 7 (ὄρατος γὰρ ἀπλὸς τε ἐστὶν καὶ σώμα ἔχων, sc. ὁ οὐρανός) : καὶ τοῦτω πάλιν ἐκεῖνο τὸ λόγιον εἰρηται συμφώνως

«Νοῦ μὲν γὰρ μίμημα πέλει (sc. ὁ οὐρανός), τὸ δὲ τευχθὲν ἔχει τι σώματος». Cf. *Simpl. Phys.* 615, 6 *Τι οὖν*; ὁ οὐρανός οὐκ ἐνυλος ὠμολόγηται καὶ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ (a Proclo) καὶ ὑπὸ Πλάτωνος καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν λογίων ὡς «ἐνυλος» παραδέδοται; Concerning the meaning of οὐρανός see note 227.

<sup>226</sup> PROCL., *Tim.* II 10, 7 (Kroll 20) Ἐπει μαθητόμεθα διὰ παντός τοῦ κόσμου τὴν ὕλην διήκειν, ὡσπερ καὶ οἱ Θεοὶ φασιν.

These passages seem to warrant the following reconstruction of the Chaldæan doctrine : the proportion of Reason to Matter is not the same in all the regions of the Universe ; it depends on the distance of a given zone from the celestial place of origin. The noetic world is immaterial ; it is pure Intellect. In the celestial vault (viz. the sphere of the fixed stars)<sup>227</sup>, which adjoins the noetic Empyrean, the ideal element predominates, but there is an admixture of "something corporeal". Because of this, the ray of the Ideas is said to be "dimmed", when penetrating into the world of the spheres<sup>228</sup>. The material element is preponderant in the sublunar region, which is therefore called in the Oracles "dark-glowing" or "light-hating"<sup>229</sup>; the "Thunderbolts" of the Ideas are said to "break themselves" on its resistance<sup>230</sup>. As we shall see later on, the Chaldæans—in consistent application of the principle that ideality decreases proportionately to the distance from the noetic place of origin—conceive Hades as Primal Matter, touched by no ray of the supercelestial Fire<sup>231</sup>.

10. *Eros*.—The powers that preserve the world, as well as those that create it, have their place in the Chaldæan scheme : they are supposed to be the guarantors of the harmonic existence of the Universe. Eros is one of the principal entities appertaining to this class ; he is referred to in the following fragment of the Oracles.

"For the Paternal Self-begotten Intellect, thinking (of) works, sowed into all (works) the bond of Eros, potent through fire ; so that the All should continue to love for a limitless time, and that the weavings of the Father's noetic Light should not collapse. Together with this Eros, the stars of the world keep revolving (*lit.* "running")"<sup>232</sup>.

<sup>227</sup> Proclus regards (in conformity with Plato *Tim.* 28b 2) οὐρανός mentioned in the Oracle quoted n. 225 as synonymous with κόσμος, but the noun is used in the Oracles constantly as designation of the sphere of the fixed stars ; see note 129.

<sup>228</sup> Cf. « ἀμυδροῖ » quoted n. 200, v. 2 (see also PROCL., *Parm.* 903, 9) and « τυτθῆ . . . αἰθέρος αὐγῆ » (*Theos.* 21 v. 3 ; ch. 1, n. 52 and 56).

<sup>229</sup> ὁ μελαναυγῆς ἢ μισοφαιῆς κόσμος ; cf. ch. v, n. 137 (v. 1) and 138.

<sup>230</sup> Cf. note 177 *ad* v. 10.

<sup>231</sup> Cf. ch. v, sect. 3.

<sup>232</sup> PROCL., *Tim.* II 54, 8 (Kroll 25) : The Logia call the principle of analogy with



Thus, Eros, who is interfused with all the Ideas (the thoughts of the Supreme Intellect), causes the continuance of the movement of the cosmic bodies by instilling into them a common desire that the existing order of the Universes should be maintained. Another fragment, probably extracted from the same Oracle, treats of the origin of Eros :

(The portions of the world are held together) "by the bond of admirable Eros, who first leapt forth out of the Intellect, wrapping his binding fire in the fire (of the Intellect), that he might mix the mixing-bowls of the Sources, presenting the flower of his Fire" <sup>253</sup>.

Eros is called the first issue of the Paternal Intellect, because all the divine thoughts subsequent to him have an admixture of his qualities. His substance is fiery, because he has "leapt forth" from the noetic

which the demiurge connects the elements of the world (Plato *Tim.* 31 c 2) "the bond of Eros fiery-strong"

« Ἐργα νόησας γὰρ πατρικὸς νόος αὐτογένεθλος  
 πᾶσιν ἐνέσπειρεν δεσμὸν πυριβριθῆ ἔρωτος,  
 ὄφρα τὰ πάντα μένη χρόνον ἐς ἀπέραντον ἐρώντα  
 μηδὲ πῆσῃ τὰ πατρὸς νοερῶ ὑφασμένα φέγγει.  
 ᾧ σὺν ἔρωτι μένει κόσμου στοιχεῖα θεόντα ».

*Tradition* : v. 1 PROCL., *Tim.* II 89, 29. v. 2 *ibid.* 256, 26. *Alc.* 317, 36  
 v. 4 PROCL., *Tim.* I 348, 22.

*Explanation* : The works thought by the Paternal Intellect are the noetic models of the sensible world; cf. n. 185 and 247 c. ch. III, n. 142. "Infinite Time" is synonymous with Aion; see note 162. The *στοιχεῖα* are not the four physical elements, as supposed by Proclus because of the meaning of the term in the philosophical literature, but the stars (see DIELS, *Elementum*, 44 f.), as *θεόντα* shows. The same misinterpretation is mentioned n. 131.

<sup>253</sup> PROCL., *Parm.* 769, 7 (Kroll 25) Διακέρνεται ἕμα καὶ συγκέρνεται (sc. τὰ εἶδη τὰ νοητά) « δεσμῶ ἔρωτος ἀγητοῦ », κατὰ τὸ λόγιον, « ὃς ἐκ Νόου ἐκθορε πρῶτος ἐσάμενος πυρὶ πῦρ συνδέσμιον, ὄφρα κεράσῃ πηγαίους κρατήρας, ἐοῦ πυρὸς ἄνθος ἐπισχῶν ».

Cf. PROCL., *Alc.* 372, 31. 373, 13 who quite correctly considers that the "bond of Eros" refers not only to the intelligible, but also to the sensible world. See also *ibid.* 376, 8.

Fire<sup>234</sup>. With his first act, he introduces his own "binding fire"<sup>235</sup> into the fiery Ideas of the Paternal Intellect. This superadded element endows them with the power of connecting the portions of the world subject to their action. The description of this mixture is that of a real happening. The "Sources", in the mixing-bowls of which Eros "mixes" his fire, are the Ideas which spring forth from the "Primeval Source", that is to say, from the Paternal Intellect<sup>236</sup>. Accordingly, they are endowed from the outset with Eros' faculties, and are consequently capable of holding the world together<sup>237</sup>. Thus, the second fragment treating of Eros contains a quasi-mythical account of the origin and action of the Ideas<sup>238</sup>.

The human soul, also, contains an admixture of the "chaste Eros, the Binder of all things and their sublime guide", as he is called in an Oracle treating of the composition of the soul's noetic substance<sup>239</sup>. He is,

<sup>234</sup> *έκθορε* : as a stream of fire ; see n. 177, *ad v. 3*. The influence of the emanatic conception is discernible in the simile of the mixing of the *πηγαί κρατήρες* ; cf. n. 247 (a) « *έγκεράσας* ».

<sup>235</sup> As *πῦρ συνδέσμιον* is the substance of Eros himself, *v. 2* *πυρι* (not *περί*, as Kroll proposes to correct the word) must be identical with the "fiery" Ideas of the First Intellect. The action of filling (*άνθος έπισχών* is analogous to Homer's expression *οίνον έπισχών*, *Iliad IX 489*. Cf. *οίνος άνθοσμίας*, "wine with a fine bouquet") corresponds to that of mixing. Both metaphors indicate that Eros is an ingredient of the substance of the Ideas.

<sup>236</sup> Procl., *Th. Pl.* 318, 27 (Kroll 25, 2) « *πηγαίους* γοῦν « *κρατήρας* » και οί Θεοί προσειρήκασι τās πρωτουργούς τών μερικων αιτας. *Tim.* III 250, 8 « *πηγαίους* » μέν « *κρατήρας* » και οί βάρβαροι (Excursus I k) και τās μερικās πηγās προσειρήκασιν ; cf. *Parm.* 777, 9. That is to say that the *πηγαίοι κρατήρες* contain the sum of the particular ideas ; cf. note 178. Cumont's (*M. M. M.* II 43) supposition that the *βάρβαροι* mentioned in the second passage are the Mithraists seems to be mistaken.

<sup>237</sup> Cf. the next section of this chapter.

<sup>238</sup> The Oracles designate Eros the noetic potency as "deep Eros". Cf. Procl., *Th. Pl.* 4, 26 (Kroll 26) « *έρωτι* » μέν « *βαθει* » κατά τὸ λόγιον *άναπλήσας τήν ψυχήν*.

<sup>239</sup>

« *έγνόν έρωτα*

*συνδετικόν πάντων έπιθήτορα σεμνόν* .

Cf. ch. III, n. 8. Concerning *έπιθήτορα* see note 250.

as it were, an ingredient which is commingled with all the noetic orders, bringing about the concord of the Universe.

11. *The "Connectives"*.—The Chaldæans often name entities other than Eros, who are assigned the specific task of connecting the various portions of the Universe. The "Connectives" (*συνεχείς*) spring forth, as do all noetic entities, from the Supreme God, the "Father", Who does not exercise a direct action on the lower orders of the hierarchy, and is, for this reason, described as the "First Connective, who himself subsists wholly outside" <sup>240</sup>. The function of "connecting" is entrusted by him to his Power from whom the "Source" of all Life (*i. e.* the Cosmic Soul) and of all divine thoughts (*i. e.* the Ideas) flows forth. The Supreme Transcendent Principle is, consequently, also called the "Connective" of all Sources" (that is, the Ideas), or the "Womb that holds all things together" <sup>241</sup>; the latter expression alluding to his containing the primordial Feminine Principle. This Womb causes the "nourishing strength of potent Fire to flow through the agency of the Connectives" into the Cosmic Soul <sup>242</sup>. The latter entity acquires through this admixture the power of "connecting", and proceeds to transmit it, as well as her own qualities, to the orders subjacent to her. Thus "Life" cooperates in maintaining cosmic harmony.

The doctrine of the "Connectives" apparently played a large part in the Oracles, the authors of which were interested in the subject for reasons

<sup>240</sup> Procl., *Th. Pl.* 212, 46 (Kroll 42): (ὁ πρῶτος συνοχεύς) πάντα . . . συνέχων τῆ ἑαυτοῦ μὴ τῆς ὑπάρξεως ἀκρότητι (= τῷ πατρικῷ; cf. Dam. I 108, 17 f. 131, 16 f. See Kroll 13 and below, Excursus VII) κατὰ τὸ λόγιον

« αὐτὸς wās έξω ὑπάρχει ».

The prayer of Julian the Chaldæan, that his son the future Theurgist should have an archangel's soul, was addressed to this transcendental "Connective of the all"; see ch. III, n. 195. Proclus, *Crat.* 65, 25 (cf. *ibid.* 32, 29 f.) stating that the theurgical conjurations "rise to the upper boundary of the νοητόν", has in mind the πατήρ, supreme divinity of the Chaldæans, but subordinated in the system of Proclus to the One and to the Henads. Cf. Excursus VII.

<sup>241</sup> See n. 59 and 52.

<sup>242</sup> See n. 64. On the 'connecting' power of the Cosmic Soul *qua* Physis see n. 126.

which an interpretation of the relevant texts will lay bare. This scrutiny presupposes an examination of the other world-preserving potencies named in the Oracles. Unfortunately, the direct quotations bearing on this subject have come down to us in a particularly fragmentary state; moreover, the original meaning of these texts was distorted by the Neoplatonists, who sought to identify the beings named in the Oracular passages in question with the entities of their own ontological hierarchy. In consequence, the task of discovering the true opinions of the Chaldæans entails rather laborious investigations. In the following analysis, we shall chiefly rely upon the passages expressly stated to be quotations from the Oracles. The explanations of the Neoplatonists will not be held to carry weight, unless they can be proved to reproduce a genuine Chaldæan tradition.

The text of the Oracles and the interpretation of the Neoplatonists seem to lend colour to the view that the potencies that "connect" constitute a particular class of entities. But, the three passages treating of Eros the "Binder", and the fact that this attribute is also applied to the Supreme Being, or to the hypostasis closest to him, prove that this term designates in the Oracles a specific mode of action of the Ideas. This was personified owing to the general tendency of the Chaldæans to express in mythical terms the dynamic character of the noetic substances. As we have seen, Eros is hypostatized for similar reasons; in reality, he is only a mode of the First Intellect by whom he is secreted, but not endowed with separate existence in the proper sense of the term: for he may act only when "wrapt" in Intellect, from whom he springs <sup>243</sup>. We have found that Eros is interfused with all the noetic orders and brings about their cooperation in the task of holding the world together. The term "Connectives" seems to apply to a similar power appertaining to the active aspect of the Ideas. This view is corroborated by the fact that these Ideas are designated in an Oracle (which has been already quoted) "Connectives of the All" <sup>244</sup>. When this function is especially emphasized, the name of this faculty is substituted for that of the entity. As this power pervades the whole Cosmos, the term in question is applied to diverse

---

<sup>243</sup> See note 233. — <sup>244</sup> See n. 173

entities subsisting in different parts of the worlds; thus, in the extant fragments to the Sun <sup>245</sup> and to some undefined potencies of the Hylic World <sup>246</sup> (whose function will be dealt with later). The fact that these two examples of the use of the term—and not some of the others that must have also figured in the Oracles—have come to our knowledge is, of course, due to the chance that has governed the transmission of these texts. We have reason to think that when it was complete the collection of the Chaldæan Oracles contained a systematical account of the action exercised by the Ideas upon all the regions of the universe, as well as a description of the continuous process by which they issue forth. In the course of the present chapter, we shall gain some insight into the principles followed by the Chaldæans in the systematization of this doctrine.

The task of “connecting”, incumbent upon the Ideas, is practically identical with that of watching over the permanence of the intramundane order. One passage of the Oracles assigns to the “Lightnings” of the Ideas the function of “watchers”, but it does not define the precise nature of this activity <sup>247</sup>.

<sup>245</sup> Cf. *Theos.* 13, 8 (see ch. 1, n. 46) «ἀκτίσιν συνέχων».

<sup>246</sup> *Dam.* II 87, 21 (Kroll 41 f.) Ὅτι γάρ... οἱ Θεοί... ἡμῖν παραδιδόασι... καὶ τοὺς συνοχεάς πολλούς, δηλοῖ ἐκεῖνα τὰ λόγια:

« Ἀλλὰ καὶ ὑλαίοις ὅσα δουλεύει συνοχεῦσιν »

οὐχ εἰς ἄρα ὁ ὑλαίος συνοχεύς, ἀλλὰ πολλοί· οὕτω δὲ καὶ ὁ ἐμπύριος.

« Τοῖς δὲ πυρὸς νοεροῦ νοεροῖς πρησιῆρσιν ἅπαντα εἰκαθε, δουλεύοντα (πατρὸς πειθηνίδι βουλή) ».

The three verses are quoted in the reverse order by *Dam.* II 59, 26 f. and *PROCL.*, *Parm.*, 941, 25; cf. 942, 25 (v. 2 b. 3). v. 3 is completed according to *PROCL.*, l. c.

Proclus identified the συνοχεῖς with the second of the νοητὴ καὶ νοερά τριάς; see *Excursus VII.*

<sup>247</sup> a) *Dam.* II 125, 19 (Kroll 42) Μάλιστα δὲ συγκεκλήρωται (ἢ φρουρητικῆ) ιδιότης τοῖς συνοχεῦσι, ἅτε περιειληφόσι πάντα ἐν ἑαυτοῖς καὶ συνέχουσι οὕτω δὲ καὶ οἱ Θεοὶ λέγουσι· «Φρουρεῖν αὐ πρησιῆρσιν ἐοῖς ἀκρότητας ἔδωκεν, ἐγκεράσας ἀληθῆς ἰδιον μένος ἐν συνοχεῦσιν».

The subject is πατρικὸς νοῦς (see n. 74), as is proved by v. 2 ἰδιον. ἐοῖς shows that the νοεροὶ πρησιῆρσες quoted n. 246 are meant with. Concerning the ἀκρότητες see n. 334, concerning ἐγκεράσας see n. 234.

b) *PROCL.*, *Th. Pl.* 320, 32 (Kroll 42) τὰ λόγια

12. *The Iynges*.—The so-called Iynges constitute another class of noetic powers. *Ἰνγξ* is a term applied to the magical top, which is spun by the conjurers who wish to compel gods or spirits to appear. The Chaldæans, among others, made use of this magical instrument in their invocations<sup>248</sup>. Apart from this, the Iynges are described in the Oracles as noetic entities who “are thought by the Father”, and who “think themselves, as they are moved by the ineffable Will” (viz. that of the “Father”, from whom they descend)<sup>249</sup>. The Iynges are, consequently, the thoughts of the Supreme Being: thinking through circular motion. According to another Oracle, “many of them bestride the resplendent worlds, leaping into them”<sup>250</sup>. The “resplendent worlds” are the

« προστήριδι φρουρᾶ »

περιέχουσθαι φησι τὴν δημιουργικὴν τάξιν.

c) PROCL., *Th. Pl.* 205, 45 (Kroll 40) αἱ τρεῖς Θεότητες (τῆς συνοχικῆς τάξεως) . . .

« φρουροὶ τῶν ἔργων » εἰσι « τοῦ πατρὸς »

κατὰ τὸ λόγιον.

The “Father’s works” are the *νοητὰ ἔργα*, i. e. the ideas; see n. 185 and 232.

PSSELLUS, *Hyp.* 10 (p. 74, 20) οἱ δὲ ἐμειλικτοὶ (the world-shaping Ideas, see note 101) ὑποδεξάμενοι τὴν προσηγήριον τῶν συνοχῶν δύναμιν φρουροῦσι τὰς ὑπάρξεις ἄνωθεν τῶν πατέρων (see n. 240) indicates that the “lightnings” are identical with the “connectives”.

<sup>248</sup> This question is discussed ch. iv, sect. 6.

<sup>249</sup> PSSELLUS, *Comm.* 1149 A (Kroll 40).

« Ἢ Αἱ Ἰνγγες νοοῦμεναι πατρόθεν νοέουσιν καὶ αὐταί,  
βουλαῖς ἀφθέγκτοις κινούμεναι, ὥστε νοῆσαι ».

Cf. PROCL., *Th. Pl.* 179, 9. Psellus has introduced the words *αἱ Ἰνγγες* which figured in a preceding portion of the same Oracle, into his quotation in order to produce syntactic unity; see Excursus VII 1 a. The beginning of the first verse may have read: « αἴτε νοοῦμεναι ἐκ πατρόθεν (see n. 48) ». etc.

Proclus identifies the Iynges with the first triad of the *νοητῆ καὶ νοερά τάξις*. Cf. Psellus, quoted n. 254 and Excursus VII.

<sup>250</sup> Dam. II 88, 2 (Kroll 40) Ὁμοίως (see n. 246) δὲ καὶ τὰς Ἰνγγας πολλὰς παραδιδόασιν οἱ Θεοί.

« Πολλὰ μὲν δὴ αἶδε ἐπεμβαίνουσι φασιν οἱ  
κόσμοις ἐνθρώσκουσι ἐν αἷς ἀκρότητες ἔασιν  
τρεῖς (πυρὴν γ' ἠδ' αἰθερὴν καὶ ὑλώδη) ».

Cf. *ibid.* II 59, 23, where the faulty reading of *πᾶσαι* instead of *αἶδε* has been

planets, or their spheres<sup>251</sup>. The Iynges are said to "leap" into these, because they, like all the other noetic entities produced by the Paternal Intellect, are represented as fiery bodies, of the nature of lightning. They are also regarded as messengers of the gods. The Oracles describe them as "Powers of the Father"<sup>252</sup>, who "swiftly hasten forth from the Father and back towards Him"<sup>253</sup>; and as "ferry-men", *i. e.* transmitters of messages<sup>254</sup>. This transmission is effected by magical communication, as is proved not only by the attribute "ineffable" applied to the Iynges<sup>255</sup>, but also by another fragment, which reads: "The sublime name (of the

---

transmitted (Kroll proposes to emend *πλᾶσαι* instead of *πᾶσαι*). v. 3 is completed in conformity with the passages quoted n. 255 and 270. As to *ἐπεμβαίνουσι*, cf. the *nomen agentis ἐπιδήτωρ*, which is applied in the Oracles to Eros (n. 239) and to moon and water spirits (ch. v, n. 25 and 26) and indicates that these potencies inhabit and "rule" the various portions of the cosmos. Concerning the *ἀρότῃτες* see n. 334.

<sup>251</sup> *κόσμοι* are the stellar zones, see n. 87.

<sup>252</sup> Dam. II 92, 23 (Kroll 40) τὰ λόγια «πατρικὰς δυνάμεις» ἀποκαλεῖ τὰς ἰγγας. Cf. *ibid.* II 78, 13. 79, 22. 103, 11.

<sup>253</sup> Procl., *Crat.* 74, 26 (Kroll 40) τὰς τε πρὸ τούτου (sc. τοῦ οὐρανοῦ) αἰτίας ἀφθέγκτους (see n. 255) . . . «Θεᾶς» . . . τὰ λόγια ἰαλεῖ καὶ προιούσας ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς «Θέειν» ἐπ' αὐτόν. The noetic order which precedes that of οὐρανός is the first of the three νοηταὶ καὶ νοεραὶ τριάδες; it is identified by Proclus with that of the Chaldaean Iynges; see n. 249 and Excursus VII.

<sup>254</sup> Procl., *Parm.* 1199, 36 (Kroll 40), concerning the order of the Iynges, ἥτις ἔχει «διαπόρθμιον» δύναμιν, ὡς οἱ Θεολόγοι λέγουσιν, πάντων ἀπ' ἐκείνης (sc. τῆς νοητῆς καὶ νοερᾶς τάξεως) μέχρι τῆς ὕλης καὶ πάλιν ἐπ' ἐκείνην τῶν πάντων. Dam. II 201, 2 (Kroll 44, 1) οἱ γὰρ ἐπὶ μαγεῖων πατέρες (see note 273) εἰς τε τὸ ἐμφανὲς πάντα προάγουσι καὶ πάλιν εἰς τὸ ἀφανὲς περιάγουσιν ὡς ἂν «διαπόρθμιοι» ἐσιῶτες, κατὰ τὸ λόγιον φάναι, τῷ πατρὶ καὶ τῇ ὕλῃ. Damascius transfers a formula which was applied by the Chaldaeans to the Iynges, to the "magical fathers": cf. Procl., *Crat.* 33, 14 τὸ διαπόρθμιον ὄνομα (see note 255) τῶν ἰγγῶν (continued n. 263). The term διαπόρθμιος is taken from Plato *Conv.* 202 e. 3: see n. 254.

<sup>255</sup> Cf. Psellus, *Hyp.* 3 (p. 73, 7 f.) μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα (sc. τὰς τρεῖς νοητὰς τριάδας) φασὶν εἶναι νοητὰς τε καὶ νοερὰς (sc. τριάδας), ὧν πρώτην μὲν εἶναι τὴν ἰγγα, μεθ' ἣν τρεῖς ἑτέρας «πατρικὰς» (n. 252) καὶ «νοητὰς» (n. 241) καὶ «ἀφθέγκτους», διαιρούσας τοὺς κόσμους τριχῇ κατὰ τὸ ἐμπύριον καὶ τὸ αἰθέριον καὶ τὸ ὑλαῖον (n. 270). Mich. Ital. 181, 17 f. (Kroll 39 f.) draws on Psellus. A similar passage is to be found in Dam. II 88, 20. The third verse of the Oracle quoted n. 250 is to be completed in conformity with these passages.

Iynges) leaps in tireless revolution into the worlds (viz. the spheres of the planets) at the mighty command of the Father”<sup>256</sup>. “Ineffable name” signifies, in the vocabulary of the magicians, the formula expressing the power of a spirit, whose presence it compels<sup>257</sup>. Accordingly, the Iynges are, essentially, magical names sent forth by the Supreme Father into the spheres. An Oracle, which shall be examined in detail later on<sup>258</sup>, may help us to explain this curious conception. According to this text, the Paternal Intellect has sown the magic words over the whole world, so that the human soul should succeed with their aid in apprehending the noetic beings. Thus, the magical names used by the theurgists, in order to communicate with the supramundane powers, are identical with the thoughts of the Supreme Transcendent Being. It is he who sends them forth so that they should be conjured by the adepts; for he intends them to serve as mediators between the theurgists and himself. This conception accounts for the twofold definition of the Iynges as the “bestriders” of the spheres and as the transmitters of messages. As the Iynges are regarded as localized in the spheres, the conjuration of their “ineffable name” by the theurgist presupposes his knowing to which particular sphere they descend when invoked. As in the case of the “Connectives”, we are thus led to pose the problem of the division

---

<sup>256</sup> PROCL., *Crat.* 20, 29 (Kroll 43; see also ch. III, n. 55): the *nomina propria* which the supreme Intellect assigns to all things are thought both in the theoretical writings of the Theurgists (*οἱ Θεουργοί*, see Excursus I g) and in the Chaldaean Oracles (*αἱ παρὰ τῶν Θεῶν φήμαι*)

« ἄλλ' ἃ ὄνομα σεμνὸν καὶ ἀκοιμήτῳ στροφάλιγγι  
κόσμοις ἐνθρόσκον κραιπνὴν διὰ πατρὸς ἐνιπήν »

PROCL., *Crat.* 33, 15 regards v. 1 as referring to the *τελεταρχικὸν ὄνομα* and *Alc.* 441, 30 to the *διαπόρθμιον ὄνομα*. *Διαπόρθμιος* is an attribute of the Iynges (see n. 254), while the three *ἀκρότητες* of the Iynges are to be assigned to the *τελετάρχαι* (see n. 334). The second verse of this fragment and that of the distich quoted n. 249 concord; another point in favour of the view that the fragment refers to the Iynges.

The beginning of the first verse does not fit into the metre. I propose to read *ὄνομα (δ' αὖ) σεμνόν*, etc. See Excursus VI. 1 a.

<sup>257</sup> Cf. ch. I, n. 182 and 189. ch. II, n. 369. ch. III, n. 56-7. ch. IV, n. 47.

<sup>258</sup> See ch. III, n. 55.



of the Universe imagined by the Chaldæans; a doctrine which evidently determines the mutual relationship between the different entities, as well as the rank and station assigned to each of them.

At this point, we shall conclude for the time being our remarks on the mediating activity of the Iynges, a group of potencies which belong to the class of the ministering angels (as we shall prove in the section treating of Chaldæan angelology). Besides their theurgical, they have also a cosmic function, evinced by their connection with the powers known as the "Upholders" (*ἀνοχῆς*). "For every sphere has inflexible noetic Upholders" proclaims an Oracle<sup>259</sup>. Apparently this term designates noetic potencies which preserve the framework of the spheres<sup>260</sup>, represented as steel rings, from "collapsing" (as an Oracle which we have quoted puts it<sup>261</sup>). The spiritual substance of these "Upholders" is

<sup>259</sup> PSELLUS, *Comm.* 1132 C (Kroll 40).

« πᾶς (γάρ) ἔχει κόσμος νοερὸς ἀνοχῆς ἀκαμπεῖς ».

For πᾶς κόσμος cf. n. 164 ("καὶ γὰρ ἐν κόσμῳ", see also n. 268). As to the *nomen agentis* ἀνοχῆς see Excursus III 1 a. For ἀκαμπεῖς see n. 256.

<sup>260</sup> According to the scholium of Psellus who transmits the verse quoted n. 259, the ἀνοχῆς are powers who uphold the whole world (but the Oracles speak of πᾶς κόσμος not of ὁ πᾶς κόσμος, or should the passage read πᾶς (ὁ γ') ἔχει κόσμος, etc.?) by the inflexible quality of their rigid power: τὸν πάντα κόσμον ἀνεχούσας τῷ μὲν «ἀκαμπεῖ», τῆς σταθερᾶς αὐτῶν δηλωμένης δυνάμεως, τῷ δὲ «ἀνοχικῶ» τῆς φρουρητικῆς. The notion ἀνοχῆς may derive from the myth of Atlas; cf. Pausanias V 11, 5. PROCL., *Tim.* I 173, 6.

This inflexible capacity is to be regarded as an attribute of the spheres, as is proved by PROCL., *Crat.* 58, 11 (Kroll 21)

«Νοῦς πατρὸς ἀρράτοις ἐποχούμενος ἰθυνηῖρσι  
ἀκνα(μ)πλον σῖράπλουσιν ἀμειλίκτου πυρὸς ὀλκῆς».

i. e. "The Father's Intellect riding upon irrefragable guides, who flash the inflexible through the furrows of the implacable Fire". The MSS. have ἀραιοῖς, Croenert emends ἀρράτοις (= σκληροῖς; cf. Plato *Rp.* 535 c 1. *Crat.* 407 d 3 see also note 219 concerning στερῶμα). ἀκνα(μ)πλος (= ἀγναμπλος) is synonymous with ἀκαμπῆς (see n. 259). σῖράπλω is here transitive, ἀκνα(μ)πλον an internal accusative. ἀμειλίκτου πυρὸς is identical with the ἀμειλίκτοι κεραυνοὶ of the Ideas; see n. 201. The term ὀλκοί is often applied to the courses of the stars or comets; cf. Apollonius Rhod. III 141. 1377. IV 296.

<sup>261</sup> See n. 232 (v. 4).

identical with that of the "Sources" (*i. e.* Ideas<sup>262</sup>) which according to a fragment, "are upheld" by the Iynges<sup>263</sup>. It appears therefore that the Iynges play an active part in the maintenance of the movement of the planets.

Those are by no means the only passages of the Oracles which mention noetic rulers of the spheres. We may recall in this connection the fragment which describes the "lightnings" of the Ideas issuing from the Paternal Intellect, as "leaping" into the "cavities of the worlds", *i. e.* the spheres<sup>264</sup>. Those "cavities" are identical with the "irrefragable guiders" of another fragment upon which the Paternal Intellect is said to "ride"<sup>265</sup>. According to a third fragment, the world-fashioning Intellect (*i. e.* the totality of the Forms) "sows" his "swift-moving lights over the (seven) worlds"<sup>266</sup>. The Neoplatonists probably conform to a Chaldæan tradition in assigning to every sphere a "zoneless god", who

<sup>262</sup> See n. 178.

<sup>263</sup> PROCL., *Crat.* 33, 14 (Kroll 40) τὸ διαπρόρριμιον ὄνομα τῶν ἰύγγων (see n. 254). ὁ «πίας ἀνέχειν» λέγεται «τὰς πηγὰς». Hermias *Phaedr.* 248 c 3 (p. 149, 29 Ast) explains that certain "upholding demons" (δαίμονες τινες ἀνοχεῖς) prevent the souls which have contemplated the Being from "falling down" (πεσεῖν εἰς γένεσιν) into the world of becoming. He employs the Chaldæan term as a near synonym of ἀναγωγοὶ ἄγγελοι; see ch. v, n. 7.

<sup>264</sup> Cf. n. 200 (v. 2-3).

<sup>265</sup> See note 260.

<sup>266</sup> Mich. Ital. 182, 15 (Kroll 17) ὁ δὲ δις παρ' αὐτοῖς (sc. τοῖς Χαλδαίοις) ἐπέκεινα μεταδίδωσιν ἐαυτοῦ τοῖς κόσμοις καὶ «κατασπείρει εὐλута φέγγη» (see note 201). ἵνα καὶ τοῖς χρῆσθωμαι ῥήμασιν. Similarly Dam. I 237. 11 . . . ὡς ὁ ἐπιταχὴ προῖον ὄλος δημιουργὸς παρὰ τοῖς Χαλδαίοις. *Ibid.* I 240, 25 οἱ ἐπιτὰ «δις ἐπέκεινα» (see n. 187) δημιουργοὶ παρὰ τοῖς Θεουργοῖς.

These three texts show that Proclus derived his division of the νοερὰ τάξις into a hebdomad (see Zeller III 24, p. 863) from an Oracle (not preserved) describing the creation of seven astral intelligences. The order which he assigns to this hebdomad (cf. PROCLUS, *Hyp.* 6, p. 74, 6 : 1. ὁ ἀπαξ ἐπέκεινα. 2. Ἐκάτη. 3. ὁ δις ἐπέκεινα. 4-6. οἱ τρεῖς ἀμειλικτοί, viz. ὁ ἐμπύριος, ὁ αἰθέριος, ὁ ὑλαῖος. 7. ὁ ὑπεζωκῶς. See Excursus VII) may be regarded as an arbitrary interpretation of the Oracle quoted n. 209 (cf. Dam. II 133, 1 f. 22 f. See also *ibid.* 128, 20 *ei passim*).

dominates it and its planets<sup>267</sup>. We may accordingly assume that this class of divinities is identical with the entities referred to in a fragment quoted at the beginning of the section dealing with the Chaldæan doctrine of the Ideas: "In every world shines a Triad which is ruled by a Monad"<sup>268</sup>. The term "Triad" denotes an Idea, while Monad may be understood as signifying the "Paternal Monad", whose Intellect generates the luminous cosmocrators. The Oracles, from which the five fragments of this last paragraph are extracted, must accordingly have treated of the Ideas that rule the planets; in other words, of the astral intelligences<sup>269</sup>.

13. *The three Worlds and their Rulers.*—The doctrine of the Chaldæans concerning the powers that maintain and rule the Cosmos presupposes a definite conception of the way in which the Universe is divided. Though the verses of the Oracles which set forth the principles of this division are lost, the main points of this theory can be reconstructed through recourse to the numerous passages which contain undirect allusions to them. It would appear that the Chaldæans distinguished between three concentric world-circles: the Emyrean, viz. the Intelligible World, forming the outermost circle; the Ethereal World, comprising the zone of the fixed stars, as well as that of the planets; the so-called Hylic World, viz. the sublunar region including the earth<sup>270</sup>. These world-circles

<sup>267</sup> Cf. PROCL., *Parm.* 647. 6 (Kroll 46) τὰ τοῖς Ἀσσυριοῖς ὑμνημένα, ζῶναι καὶ ἄζωνοι. . . *Tim.* III 127, 16 (with reference to the Oracles) ἐν ἐκάστῳ γὰρ τῶν κοσμοκρατόρων ἐστὶν ἀζωνικὴ τάξις Θεῶν. Dam. II 214, 15 (concerning the ἀπόλυτοι Θεοί, i. e. the twelve Olympian gods mentioned in the myth of the *Phaedrus*) διὸ καὶ ἄζωνοι κέκληνται πρὸς αὐτῶν τῶν Θεῶν, ὡς οὐ περιβάλλοντες ἑαυτοῖς τὸν κόσμον οὐδὲ ἐνδεθέεντες αὐτοῦ ταῖς μοῖραις οἷον ζῶναις τισίν. Cf. *ibid.* I 241, 18. PSELLUS, *Hyp.* 18 (p. 75, 7) «ἄζωνοι» δὲ καλοῦνται ὡς εὐλύτως ἐξουσιάζοντες ταῖς ζῶναις καὶ ὑπεριδρῦμενοι τῶν ἐμφανῶν Θεῶν (i. e. above the planets). Cf. *id.*, *Expos.* 1152 B. The term ἄζωνος is also mentioned Serv. Verg. *Aen.* XII 118. Mart. Capella I 61. SYNES, *Hymn.* III 281-2.

<sup>268</sup> See n. 164.

<sup>269</sup> The νόες ἀστέριοι (so SYNES, *Hymn.* III 273), known not only to the Platonists and Peripateticians, but also to the Hermetics and Gnostics, are assimilated to the cosmocrators of the astral religion.

<sup>270</sup> PROCL. *Tim.* II. 57. 9 (Kroll 31) states expressly that the Chaldæans divided the

are ruled by three entities, who are called in the Chaldaean Oracles by various names : "Leaders of the world" (*κοσμοαγοί*)<sup>271</sup>, "Rulers"

universe into an empyrean, ethereal and hylic world : *Τί οὖν; Φαίη τις ἂν τῶν ἐκ τῆς ὑπερορίου Θεοσοφίας ὠρμημένων* (see Excursus I, Γ) *καὶ τὰ πάντα διαιρουμένων εἰς ἐμπύριον αἰθέριον ὑλαῖον καὶ μόνον τὸ ἐμφανές ὑλαῖον καλούντων*. He interprets the triad *πῦρ αἰθέρα κόσμους*, mentioned in the Oracle quoted n. 84 as referring to the empyrean, ethereal and hylic world (*apud Simpl. Phys.* 613, 4), thus supposing the Chaldaean origin of this division. Cf. also PSELLUS, *Script. min.*, p. 446, 12 Kurtz-Drexl *Φασι δὲ (οἱ Χαλδαῖοι) καὶ κόσμους ἐπὶ τὰ* (see n. 218. 266), *ὧν τὸν ἐσχατον τὸν ὑλαῖον καὶ χθόνιον καὶ μισοφθῆ* (see n. 229), *πρῶτον δὲ τὸν πύριον* (n. 40) *καὶ ἀκρότατον*, and *Hyp.* 3, quoted n. 255. Psellus confuses the Chaldaean distinction of three *cosmoi* with that of the seven planetary *cosmoi*; see note 214.

Another division described as Chaldaean by Dam. II, 219, 11 *τῶν ἀρχικῶν* (Θεῶν) *οἱ μὲν οὐράνιοι καλοῦνται, οἱ δὲ χθόνιοι, οἱ δὲ μέσοι, ἢ Χαλδαικῶς εἰπεῖν, οἱ μὲν ἐμπύριοι οἱ δὲ ἀέριοι οἱ δὲ χθόνιοι* is derived from the Oracle quoted n. 275. *Lyd. Mens.* II, 8 p. 26, 14 (Kroll 31. 1) *τρεις δὲ σωμάτων διαφοραὶ: τὰ μὲν γὰρ ἐστὶν ὑλικά, τὰ δὲ ἀέρια, τὰ δὲ ἐμπύρια, ὡς ὁ Χαλδαῖος παραδίδωσι* who distinguishes between *ἐμπύριον, ἀέριον ὑλικόν* (viz. *χθόνιον*), does not refer to the division of the three world-circles, but, as is proved by Procl. *Crat.* 86, 1 *κἀν τὸ γενητὸν* (sc. *διαίρησ*), *εἰς τὸ πύρινον καὶ τὸ χθόνιον καὶ τὸ μεταξύ*. of the sublunar zone.

*Simpl. Phys.* 643, 27 (Kroll 31, 1) states that *ἡ Ἀσύριος Θεολογία καὶ ὑπὲρ τόνδε τὸν κόσμον ἄλλο σῶμα Φειότερον τὸ αἰθέριον παραδέδωκεν*; an identification of *ἐμπύριον* with *αἰθέριον* due to a substitution of Aristotelian (*τὸ πέμπτον σῶμα*) for Chaldaean terminology.

<sup>271</sup> PSELLUS, *Hyp.*, 6 (p. 74, 4) *μετὰ δὲ τούτους* (sc. *τοὺς τελετάρχας*) *τοὺς πηγαίους πατέρας δοξάζουσιν ἡγουν τοὺς κοσμοαγούς. ὧν πρῶτος μὲν ὁ ἴπαι λεγόμενος, μεθ' ὃν Ἑκάτη δευτέρα καὶ μέση, τρίτος δὲ ὁ δις ἐπέκεινα* (source of *Mich. Ital.* 182, 8, quoted by Kroll 16. Cf. also Dam. I, 291, 7 and *passim*... (7) *καλοῦνται δὲ οὗτοι πατέρες καὶ κοσμοαγοὶ ὡς προσεχῶς* (immediately) *ἐπιβαίνοντες τοῖς κόσμοις*. Cf. *Io., Script. min.* p. 215, 17 Kurtz-Drexl.

The title *κοσμοαγοί* refers to the rulers of the three world-circles (see n. 270), as the meaning of the appellation suggests. The reasons for Psellus' misinterpretation will be explained n. 274 and 283. Synesius, *Hymn*, III, 271 regards the *κοσμοαγοί* as identical with the *νόες ἀστέροι*. (see n. 269). See also PSELLUS, *Comm.* 1132 D *δυνάμεις ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ οἱ Χαλδαῖοι τίθενται καὶ ὠνόμασαν αὐτὰς κοσμοα[ω]γούς ὡς τὸν κόσμον ἀγούσας*, but instead of *τὸν κόσμον* we should understand *τοὺς κόσμους*. In the texts edited by Boissonade, p. 151, 26 and Bidez, *C. M. A. G.*, VI, p. 163, 16, Psellus mentions ten *κοσμοαγοί*, perhaps with reference to the ten heavens of Christian medieval cosmology.

(ἀρχαί)<sup>272</sup>, "Ruling Fathers" (ἀρχικοί πατέρες)<sup>273</sup> "Fathers set over the magical actions" (οἱ ἐπὶ μαγείων τρεῖς πατέρες)<sup>274</sup>. The last name connotes that these Rulers of the world-circles played a part in theurgical practice. The several extant fragments bearing on these three "Ruling Fathers" are complementary, each of them contributing to the understanding of the others.

a) According to the first fragment of this series, there are in the three worlds "subservient to these three mighty Rulers", "three courses". The first of them is called "holy"; in the second, "midmost", course is situated the third, described as "aëry". We are told that the latter

<sup>272</sup> ἀρχαί : see n. 275.

<sup>273</sup> ἀρχικοί πατέρες : see n. 275.

<sup>274</sup> PSELLUS, *Hyp.*, 14 (p. 74, 33) καὶ ἐπὶ μαγείων δὲ τρεῖς πατέρες ἀρχικὴν ἐχουσιν τάξιν.

The ἐπὶ μαγείων (οἱ μαγικοί) πατέρες, who are mentioned by Dam., I, 241, 29. 237, 23. II, 200, 15. 201, 2 (see n. 254). 203, 28. 204, 4. 206, 9 (see also PROCL. *Tim.* I 318, 1 ff.), are regarded by the later Neoplatonists as identical with the ἀφομοιωτικοὶ Θεοί, i. e. the world-shaping Forms (see n. 190). They are the "three gods" ("quosdam tres deos") invoked by *Philologia* before her apotheosis (Mart. Capella II, 204; cf. ch. III, n. 3).

The later Neoplatonists differentiated between these τρεῖς ἀρχικοί (οἱ ἐπὶ μαγείων) πατέρες and the τρεῖς πνευματικοὶ πατέρες and regarded the latter as the leaders of the νοερά ἑξομάς (see n. 283). There is, however, reason to suppose that the Oracles did not distinguish between these two groups of "Three Fathers". This assumption is rendered probable by the employment of the identical terms τρεῖς πατέρες and confirmed by the fact that the magical function of the three ἀρχικοί πατέρες indicated in the Oracles corresponds to that attributed by the Neoplatonists to the three πνευματικοὶ πατέρες. We may further note that the differentiation between the πνευματικά and the ἀρχικὴ τάξις (evolved from the Oracle on Aion, quoted n. 138; see also n. 152) is a later Neoplatonist elaboration and cannot accordingly be regarded as deriving from Chaldæan tradition. The origin of this confusion has to be sought in the fact that the Neoplatonists identified the three ἀρχαί of the Oracle quoted n. 275 with the ἀρχαί mentioned in the Oracle quoted n. 190, ignoring the different meaning of the noun, which in the first passage signifies "Rulers" and in the second "Principles". The originator of this (deliberate) misinterpretation was Porphyry; see Excursus II, n. 25.

“warms the earth in the fire” (of the second course)<sup>276</sup>. We may, accordingly, presume that an unnamed “holy” planet<sup>276</sup> is situated in the noetic zone<sup>277</sup>; and the sun in the central (“midmost”), ethereal region; wherefrom it sends its earth-warming rays to the hylic world<sup>278</sup>. This third world, the lowest of all (or the innermost, as the orbits of the planets are represented as concentric circles, with the earth in their centre) contains an “aëry course”, concerning which we are not given any details. This fragment shows, accordingly, that the three world-circles are closely related to three planets. Subsequently, we shall be able to identify the two superior courses; and, with a certain degree of probability, also, the third one.

b) Further insight into the nature of the “Rulers” of the three worlds

<sup>275</sup> Dam. II, 217. ὁ (Kroll 37 f.) *Εἰ δὲ ἐν οὐρανῷ λέγεται οὗτος ὁ Ζεὺς (Πλάτο, Phaedr. 247 a). ἔστι καὶ ἀρχικούς ὄντας (see n. 174) εἰς οὐράνιον (see n. 282) δηρησθαι καὶ χθόνιον (see n. 280) καὶ τὸν μέσον τοὺς τρεῖς πατέρας, ὡς μαρτυρεῖ καὶ τὰ λόγια.*

«Ἐν τούτοις ἱερός πρῶτος δρόμος, ἐν δ' ἄρα μέσσω  
 ἡέριος τρίτος ἄλλος (sc. δρόμος), ὅς ἐν πυρὶ τὴν χθόνα θάλπει.  
 Ἀρχαῖς γὰρ τρισὶ ταῖσδε λάβροις δουλεύει ἅπαντα».

Cf. *ibid.* II, 95, 22.

Kroll did not understand these enigmatic verses and proposed to emend :

*ἔστι γὰρ αἰθέριος πρῶτος δρόμος, ἐν δ' ἄρα μέσσω ἡέριος, τρίτος ἄλλος, ὅς,*  
 etc. That makes three corrections in two lines.

The conjunction of *ἀρχαῖ* and *δουλεύειν* shows that the noun signifies here “Rulers”, not “Principles” (as in the Oracle quoted n. 190). *Ἀρχικός* likewise always means in these texts “ruling”, never “beginning”.

*Ἐν τούτοις* has a locative meaning (see n. 292) and refers to the *τρεῖς πατέρες* mentioned before by Damascius; these *πατέρες* are identical with the *τρεῖς ἀρχαῖ* of the last verse.

<sup>276</sup> *δρόμος* is (like *κύλων* see n. 281) the technical term for the motion of the stars. Cf. the fragments quoted, n. 287 (a) and (e).

<sup>277</sup> *ἱερός* figures three times in the Oracles as an attribute of a noetic being Cf. n. 42. *ἱερὸν πῦρ*, ch. 1, n. 186 *ἱεροῖσι τύποις*, ch. 1v, n. 63 *εὐίερων πῦρ*.

<sup>278</sup> *ἐν πυρὶ* (like *ἐν μέσσω*) has a locative meaning; it has to be complemented by *τοῦ ἡλίου*, cf. n. 221 (d) *ἡλιακὸν πῦρ* and (e) *ἡλίου πῦρ*. The second “midmost” course is not designated, as it is defined in function of the “third course”.

For *τὴν χθόνα θάλπει* see n. 328 and Lyd. *Mens.* II 7 p. 23, 20 f. *σελήνη... μετρῶς Θερμαινούση* as well as Procl., *Tim.* III, 84, 26 ff.

may be gained from the continuation of the paraphrase of a Chaldæan hymn in honour of Chronos-Aion, transmitted by Proclus (and already cited in this chapter)<sup>279</sup>. Leaving out of account this philosopher's additions and misconceptions we find that in this hymn the Chaldæans represent Aion as a divinity which rules the Empyrean World and conducts it in a circle; measuring its revolutions, as well as those of the fixed stars, the sun and the "third" world<sup>280</sup>. These views conform to the description of Aions' movement figuring in the Oracle of the *Theosophy*. According to this text, there is to be found in the Empyrean "a long path winding spiral-wise", along which the "fiery God" wends his eternal way, "mingling aeon with aeon"<sup>281</sup>. We may, accordingly, infer that the god Aion is identical with the noetic planet which, according to the Oracle on the "three Rulers" already known to us, is engaged in the "first, holy course"<sup>282</sup>. Aion is, thus, conceived both as the chief of the "Rulers" and as the regulator of the movements of the two others; the

<sup>279</sup> See n. 152.

<sup>280</sup> Proclus, quoted n. 152 (b), describes the *ἄζωνος χρόνος* as *μετροῦντα τὴν περιόδον τοῦ τρίτου τῶν αἰθερίων* (sc. *κόσμων*), but I do not see why the planet Venus (Proclus' enumeration starts with the lowest sphere) should be charged with this function. His interpretation may be understood if we suppose that the Oracle which he paraphrases spoke of the same *τρίτος δρόμος* as the fragment quoted by Damascius (see n. 275); an ordinal number which Proclus mistakenly interpreted as referring to the spheres (compare also note 152 d *τῷ πρωτίστῳ τῶν αἰθερίων* with note 274 v. 1 *πρῶτος δρόμος* and note 152 c *τὸν ἐπὶ τοῦ μέσου τῶν κόσμων*, sc. *χρόνον* with note 275 v. 1 *ἐν δ' ἄρα μέσσω*). Damascius interprets the passage as referring to the *χθόνιος πατήρ* and is accordingly likewise unaware of the true nature of the "third course".

<sup>281</sup> Cf. *Theos.* 13, 9-10. 13 (quoted ch. 1, n. 46). This interpretation is supported by the fragment of a Chaldæan Oracle quoted by Dam. II 88, 8 and 95, 21 (Kroll 38) concerning the ruling path subject to the Teletarchs" (*ὑποκέλτεται αὐταῖς ἄρχιος αὐλῶν*); the latter being identical with the three "Rulers". as will be shown in the paragraph (e) of this section. *αὐλῶν* is accordingly synonymous with *δρόμος*; see n. 276.

<sup>282</sup> Proclus, quoted n. 152 d, interprets *ιερός δρόμος* like Damascius (see n. 275 *οὐράνιον*); concerning the significance of the term see n. 128) as referring to the sphere of the fixed stars, we may however observe in this connection that *ιερός* is an attribute of the noetic potencies; see n. 277.

sun "midmost" of the three courses is his subordinate. Their relationship will be clarified at a later stage of this investigation.

c) The following isolated verse also treats of the three "Rulers": "Midmost of the Fathers, the Centre of Hecate is born on"<sup>283</sup>. The verb employed in this verse implies an astral being<sup>284</sup>. Hecate is named instead of the moon, her intramundane abode<sup>285</sup>. The verse must, accordingly, be understood as identifying the "centre" of the moon with the "midmost" of the three "Fathers", that is to say, with the Ruler of the sun. The term "centre" is used here (as in other fragments of the Oracles) with reference to the central position of the sun in the system of the planets<sup>286</sup>. The mention of Hecate appears to indicate the nature of the third "Ruler". It seems probable that this designation applies to the moon which is almost always mentioned in the Chaldæan Oracles immediately after the sun, and before the other planets<sup>287</sup>. It is true that

<sup>283</sup> «Μέσσον τῶν πατέρων Ἐκάτης κέντρον πεφορηῆσθαι». Dam. II, 164, 19: cf. 43, 26. 152, 23. 154, 17. etc. PROCL. *Th. Pl.*, 265, 45. *Crat.* 91. 11. *et passim*. PSELLUS, *Hyp.*, 6. 7 (quoted n. 270). *Expos.* 1152 A.

Proclus and his school interpret Ἐκάτης κέντρον as signifying the origin of the "chain of Life" proceeding from Hecate, the ζωογόνος Θεός (see n. 66), and take the first "Father" mentioned in this verse as referring to the ἀπαξ ἐπέκεινα and the third to the δις ἐπέκεινα: ὁ ἀπαξ, Ἐκάτη and ὁ δις being the first three members of the "intellective" (νοερά) triad (see n. 266). This interpretation was inaugurated by Porphyry (see Excursus II, n. 25) and elaborated by Iamblichus (cf. PROCL., *Tim.*, I 308, 22 f.). As a consequence of this exegesis, the κοσμομαγοί, the Chaldæan synonym of these τρεῖς πατέρες (see n. 271), were also taken to refer to this "intellective" triad. The simple consideration that the goddess Hecate could never have been called πατήρ in the Chaldæan Oracles, suffices to overthrow this construction.

<sup>284</sup> Φορά is applied since Plato to the motion of the heavenly bodies, while φορεῖσθαι is constantly used in this sense by Aratus.

<sup>285</sup> See n. 92, 93.

<sup>286</sup> Thus, in the Oracle quoted ch. III, n. 76, the sun is called "centre of sounding light" (i. e. of the ether). Proclus explains (Ἐκάτης) κέντρον as designation of the central position of Hecate between the two "Fathers", the ἀπαξ ἐπέκεινα and δις ἐπέκεινα; see n. 283.

<sup>287</sup> Cf. PROCL., *Tim.* III, 61. 8 (Kroll 33f.) καὶ τῶν λογίων... πανταχοῦ μετὰ τὸν ἥλιον τὴν σελήνην τατίζοντων καὶ μετὰ τὴν σελήνην τὸν ἀέρα...



the fact, that its "course" is called "aëry" in the Oracle we have quoted, does not agree with the teaching of cosmophysics, according to which the moon moves at the limit of the ethereal and aerial zone and consists of a mixture of the two substances<sup>288</sup>; but it conforms to the widespread belief, which attributes to it the overlordship over the sublunar world—

(a) « αἰθέριός τε δρόμος καὶ μῆνης ἀπλάτος ὁρμηΐ,  
φησίν,

« ἡέριοι τε ῥοαί ».

καὶ πάλιν·

(b) « αἰθήρ, ἥλιε, πνεῦμα σελήνης, ἡέρος ἀγοί ».  
καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις (sc. λογίοις)·

(c) « ἡλιακῶν τε κύκλων καὶ μηναιῶν καναχισμῶν  
κόλπων τ' ἡεριῶν ».

καὶ ἐξῆς

(d) « αἰθρης μέρος ἡελίου τε  
καὶ μῆνης ὀχετῶν ἡδ' ἡέρος ».

(e) καὶ ἀλλαχοῦ

« καὶ πλατὺς ἀήρ

μηναιῶς τε δρόμος καὶ ἀέτιπος ἡελίοιο ».

The fragment (c) is mentioned by PROCL., *Tim.*, III, 111. 20. For fragment (e) cf. the isolated verse of the Oracles quoted by PROCL., *Tim.*, III, 124, 29 (Kroll 34).

« μηναιῶν τε δρόμημα καὶ ἀστέριον προσπόρευμα ».

Proclus' interpretation (necessitated by the planetary order adopted by Plato, and maintained against that of the Ptolemaean system) is at variance with the Oracles which situate the sun in the centre of the planetary spheres; cf. n. 221. 309. 322. The fact that the ether, the sun, the moon and the stars are named together is not to be explained by some cosmo-physical scheme, but by the mystery doctrine concerning the "Elevation of the Soul". Cf. ch. III, n. 26 and 35, where fragment (b) and (d) are interpreted. The ether, the stars, the sun and the moon are also enumerated separately in *Theos.* 13, 5-8 (see ch. I, n. 46) and in the Oracle quoted ch. IV, n. 99. Cf. also the distinction between αἰθήρ and κόσμοι in the Oracle quoted n. 83 (a), v. 3.

<sup>288</sup> The Stoics called the moon ἀερομιγής (see Gundel in *P. W.* s. v. *Mond* 82) and interpreted the name of Artemis, considered as the goddess of the moon, as meaning "she who cuts the air", ἀερότομος; cf. ΡΟΥΡΗΝΟΥ, *περὶ ἀγαλμάτων*, p. 14\*, 14 ed. Bidez and the annotation there (to add Clem. Al. *Strom.* V 6; 37, 1. *P. Mag.* IV 2816). See also *Hymn. Orph.*, IX (Σελήνης) v. 2 ἡεροφοῖτι. ΡΗΜΙΟ *quis rer. div. her.* 224 τὸν ἀέρος γείτονα σελήνης. PROCL., *Tim.*, II, 268, 8 εἰρηται μὲν οὖν ὑπὸ τῶν, ὅτι τὸ τετράστοιχον πᾶν ἐν τῷ κύκλῳ συνείληπται τῷ τῆς σελήνης. LINDS,

named after it. The triple division of the world adopted by the Chaldæans speaks, likewise, in favour of the identification of the third "Ruler" with the moon. As Aion rules the intelligible, and the sun the ethereal world, it is probable that the moon is considered as dominating the "hylic" world. It is the only planet ("course") which qualifies for this rôle.

d) Another fragment of the Chaldæan Oracles bears likewise on the three "Rulers". It has gained some celebrity because of the controversy which has arisen as to its real meaning. However none of the interpretations which have been attempted take account of the Chaldæan system; a fact which dispenses us from expounding them<sup>289</sup>. The fragment is transmitted by Proclus, who quotes it isolated from its context and partly in periphrastic form and relates it, moreover, to Platonic conceptions having no direct connection with the Chaldæan doctrine<sup>290</sup>. We learn from the relevant passage of Proclus that this Oracle conceived "Faith", "Truth" and "Love" (in this sequence) as a trinity of correlated virtues; that it taught that "within these Three all things are governed and subsist"; that it enjoined upon the theurgists "to communicate with god through the medium of this Triad"<sup>291</sup>. The three virtues named

---

*Mens.*, II, 7 p. 23, 21 (σελήνη) τῆ τῆς ὕλης ἐφόρω. III, 8, p. 42, 5 αὐτῆς οὖν τῆς σελήνης τῶν τεσσάρων στοιχείων κρατούσης. ΠΟΡΦΥΡΑ., *Ant.*, 18, p. 69, 12. Concerning the pneuma of the moon see Gundel, *l. c.*, 104.

<sup>289</sup> This fragment of the Chaldæan Oracles has been interpreted by the following scholars: R. REITZENSTEIN, *Historia Monachorum* (1916), 100 f. 242 f. Idem, *Historische Zeitschrift*, 1916, 189 ff.; *Göttinger Gelehrte Nachrichten*, 1916, 267 ff. and 1917, 130 ff.; *Hellenistische Mysterienreligionen*<sup>3</sup>, 383 ff. A. v. HARNACK, *Preussische Jahrbuecher*, 1916, 2 ff. P. CORSEN, *Sokrates* 1919, 18 ff. J. GEFFCKEN, *Ausgang des Heidentums* (1920), 271. W. THEILER, *Die Vorbereitung des Neuplatonismus* (1930), 149 ff.

<sup>290</sup> None of the scholars mentioned in the preceding note distinguished between the original meaning of the Chaldæan Oracle and its Neoplatonic interpretation. We are here only concerned with the meaning of the Oracles and leave the Neoplatonic explanations as far as possible out of account.

<sup>291</sup> (a) The main relevant text figures in PROCL., *Alc.* 357, 12 (Kroll 26) concerning the three monads πίστις και ἀλήθεια και ἐρως (cf. *ibid.* 356, 31).

«Πάντα γὰρ ἐν τρισὶ τοῖσδε (φησὶ τὸ λόγιον) κυβερνᾶται τε και ἐσθίν», και διὰ τοῦτο και τοῖς Θεουργοῖς οἱ Θεοὶ παρακαλεῦνται διὰ τῆς τριάδος ταύτης ἐαυτοὺς τῷ Θεῷ συνάπτειν.

in the Oracle are to be regarded as the faculties of the three "Rulers"; this contention can be proved by the following considerations. In the first place, the verse quoted by Proclus in its original form employs a spatial term ("within") which points to the three virtues being entities ruling three world-circles and thus fulfilling a function similar to that

(b) PSELLUS, *Hyp.*, 11 (p. 74, 23) ἐστὶ δὲ καὶ πηγαία τριάς πίστεις ἀληθείας καὶ ἔρωτος.

(c) PROCL., *Tim.*, I, 212, 21 f. (a free paraphrase of Iamblichus' doctrine regarding the different stages of prayer; cf. H. SCHMIDT, *Veteres philosophi quomodo iudicaverint de precibus*, 1907, and KOCH, 178 ff.). He who makes true orison must ἀρετὰς τε ἀπὸ τῆς γενέσεως καθαρτικὰς καὶ ἀναγωγούς προβεβλήσθαι καὶ πίστιν καὶ ἀλήθειαν καὶ ἔρωτα, τούτην ἐκείνην τὴν τριάδα, καὶ ἐλπίδα τῶν ἀγαθῶν.

(d) IAMBL., *Myst.*, V, 26, p. 239, 6 (ἡ εὐχή) τὸν τε Θεῖον ἔρωτα συναυξάνει ... ἐλπίδα τε ἀγαθῶν καὶ τὴν περὶ τὸ Φῶς πίστιν τελειοῖ.

(e) Porphyry's enumeration (but not his interpretation) of the four virtues of "God's friend" in *Marc.*, 24, p. 289, 17 f. derives from the same Oracle: τέσσαρα στοιχεῖα (the term is borrowed from the designation of the four physical elements; cf. PROCL., *Parm.*, 333, 14) μάλιστα κεκρατύθω περὶ Θεοῦ · πίστις, ἀλήθεια, ἔρωσ, ἐλπίς.

(f) *Simpl. Phys.*, 5, 19 : Wonder (Θαῦμα, cf. PLATO, *Theaet.*, 155 d, *Epinomis*, 986 c 6) at the marvels of creation is followed up by "sympathy with the divine" (= ἔρωσ), πίστις and ἐλπίς.

(g) *Simpl. Cael.*, 55, 18 f. ed. Heiberg enumerates the succession of ἀναγωγὸς ἔρωσ, ἀληθῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ κάλλους ἐκφανσις, βέβαιος πίστις, μετὰ ἀπόδειξιν, thus distinguished from the irrational faith; the latter leads to ἐνωσις (sc. πρὸς τὸ Θεῖον κάλλος).

(h) The assertion that πίστις is the highest degree of knowledge is due to Proclus (if not already to Iamblichus, see fragm. d). The former prizes this virtue *Th. Pl.*, I, c. 26, p. 61, 34 f. above γνώσις (i. e. philosophy) identifying it with the Θεουργικὴ δύναμις, and explains that through πίστις, ἀλήθεια, ἔρωσ "everything is conjoined with the divine" (cf. *ibid.*, p. 63, 8 f.). Thus, Platonism, in its ultimate stage, professes the superiority of illumined Faith over Knowledge, ending with the same doctrine with which Christian theology had started.

(i) PROCL., *Th. Pl.*, 194, 1 where the same Chaldæan Triad is interpreted and πίστις (like h) correlated with ἐνωσις.

(k) PROCL., *Parm.*, 927, 27 f. calls πίστις ἀλήθεια ἔρωσ, τὰ σώζοντα τὰς ψυχὰς κατ' ἐπιτηδειότητα τὴν πρὸς ἐκεῖνα τὰ τρία συνάπτουσιν.

(l) PROCL., *Exc. Val.*, 193, 15; cf. Excursus IX.

of the "Rulers"<sup>292</sup>. In the second place, we know from the Oracles that we have already examined that the Chaldæans regarded "Truth" as an attribute of the sun<sup>293</sup>, and "Love" as the primary quality of the noetic substance<sup>294</sup>. While the sun is the midmost of the three "Rulers", "Truth" occupies the same position with regard to the two other virtues. We may, accordingly, infer that "Love" and "Faith" are the respective attributes of the Rulers of the intelligible and of the hylie world. That "Faith"—not mentioned in the other extant Oracles—is correlated with the lowest of the World-Circles is proved by the sequence of the three Virtues. The "Why" of this correlation is not known to us, as we have no clear insight into the nature of the last of these "three Ruling Fathers". The Chaldæan "Faith" possibly derives from the terminology of the mystery-religions<sup>295</sup>. This origin seems to be indicat-

<sup>292</sup> ἐν αὐτοῖς has a locative sense and corresponds accordingly to ἐν τοῦτοις of the Oracle quoted n. 275; πάντα κυβερνᾶται being parallel to δουλεύει of the passage.

<sup>293</sup> For ἀλήθεια: see ch. I, n. 158. We are accordingly able to interpret the fragment quoted by LYDUS, *Mens.*, IV, 107, p. 147, 5 κατὰ γὰρ τὸ λόγιον «τὸ δ'ἀτρικὲς ἐν βαθεῖ ἐστι». Βάθος is a designation of the ether, as in the Oracle quoted n. 313; cf. also EURIPI., *Medea*, 1297 αἰθέρος βάθη.. The hemistich «οὐδὲν ἀληθείης φυτόν ἐν χθονί», quoted ch. IV, n. 99 (v. 2), has also a cosmological significance, as is proved by the context. Cf. CICERO, *De nat. deor.*, II, 21, 56. *Hermes Trism.* (Scott, I, 384, 11): ἀλήθεια μὲν οὐδαμῶς ἐστι ἐν τῇ γῆ; PHILO, *Spec. Leg.*, I, 66.

<sup>294</sup> As to ἔρωσ: see sect. 10 of this chapter.

<sup>295</sup> The term πίστις is applied in the mystery cults to the oath of silence, which the neophyte must swear before his initiation; cf. G. ANRICH, *Das antike Mysterienwesen* (1894), 68 f. Proclus is certainly mistaken in regarding this Chaldæan term as referring to the Pythagorean oath of silence; for he applies σιγή to the ἄρρητον, which signifies the νοητὴ τάξις (see KOCH, 129 f.). The astral conceptions which account for the description of the supreme place where God is enthroned as τῆς ἀληθείας καὶ πίστεως κύκλος in *P. Mag.*, IV, 1014 are unknown to us. Chaldæan πίστις is assuredly not of Platonic origin. If there were no other evidence, this could be proved by Proclus' unsuccessful attempt (*Th. Pl.*, I, ch. 25) to discover a metaphysical equivalent of this term, which is always applied by Plato to an inferior degree of knowledge; cf. *Rp.*, 511 e 1 and *Tim.*, 29 c 3, 37 b 8.

ed by another fragment extracted from the same Oracle which gives the following instruction to the theurgist : "Fire-containing Hope shall feed thee" <sup>296</sup>. The attribute "Fire-containing" proves that "Hope" is a noetic faculty <sup>297</sup>. Now, the trust of the initiated in a happy life after death is called "Hope" in the language of the mystery-cults <sup>298</sup>. The term, as used in the Oracle, has apparently, likewise, this eschatological meaning.

This explanation disposes of the far-reaching hypotheses which posited a connection between the Chaldæan Triad (or Tetrad) and that of Paul, which consists of Faith, Charity and Hope. The conceptions which account for the composition of the Chaldæan Triad can have no direct

We do not know whether *πειθῶ* is connected with the *πίστις* of the third "Ruler" in the isolated verse transmitted by PSELLUS, *Comm.*, 1141 D (KROLL, 15) : «πατήρ οὐ φόβον ἐνθρώσκει, πειθῶ δ' ἐπιχέυει». ("The Father does not make fear flow in, but pours forth trust"). The verse is very probably directed against the belief current among the sorcerers according to which the apparition of the invoked God causes terror. It is transmitted correctly, except for the fact that Psellus has inserted into it the subject *πατήρ* named in the preceding verse and omitted the particle of conjunction; see Excursus VI, 1a. The beginning of the verse may possibly have read : οὐ (μὲν γὰρ) φόβον ἐνθρώσκει, etc. The emanistic doctrine which accounts for the two predicates of the verse is discussed ch. vi, section 7.

<sup>296</sup> OLYMPIODOR., *Phaed.*, p. 39, 11 (KROLL, 26, 2) «Ἐλπίδα» δὲ ἀνουστέον ἐνταῦθα (PLATO, *Phaedo*, 67 c, 8) . . . τὴν Φείαν καὶ ἀπὸ νοῦ κατιοῦσαν καὶ βεβαίαν, περὶ ἧς τὸ λόγιον ἔφη :

«Ἐλπίς δὲ τρεφέτω πυρήνοχος»; cf. *ibid.*, 42, 7.

He calls the Chaldæan *ἐλπίς*, p. 94, 25 *ιερατική* (see Excursus IV, 2). The passages quoted n. 291 c-f prove that *ἐλπίς* was mentioned in the same Oracle together with *πίστις*, *ἀλήθεια* and *ἔρως*. IAMBlichus, *Myst.*, II, 6, p. 83, 3 f. also refers to Chaldæan *ἐλπίς* : The manifestation of the angels *ἀναγωγός ἐστι καὶ ψυχῆς σωτήριος ἐπ' ἐλπίδι τε ἱερᾷ ἐμφαίνεται, καὶ ὧν ἡ ἐλπίς ἢ ἱερὰ ἀντιποιεῖται ἀγαθῶν, τούτων παρέχει τὴν δόσιν*. Cf. also PROCL., *Parm.*, 770, 29 f.

<sup>297</sup> Like all the attributes figuring in the Chaldæan Oracles of which *ωῦρ* is a constituent part. Olympiodorus (see n. 296) accordingly regarded *ἐλπίς* as descending from the Supreme Intellect.

<sup>298</sup> *ἐλπίς* signifying the hope of the initiates for immortality derives from the terminology of the mysteries of Eleusis; cf. ЛОВЕЦК, *Aglaophantus*, 69 ff. and РОМЕР, *Psyche*, I, 290, 1.

or indirect relation to Paul's teaching concerning the three Christian virtues; for "Love" as a quality of the noetic essence is a notion which has its first source in Plato's writings, and the ascription of "Truth" to the sun derives from mantic lore.

According to Proclus, the Oracle we are concerned with enjoined upon the theurgists "to communicate with god through the medium of this Triad" which, consequently, played an effective part in the Chaldæan mysteries. The three "Rulers", also, had a function to perform in these rites; this is proved not only by their being designated as the "Fathers set over the magical actions"<sup>299</sup>, but also by an Oracle which teaches that "the (three) Rulers purify"<sup>300</sup>. The term "purification" is applied in the vocabulary of the Chaldæans not only to the lustrations preceeding the principal mystery; the sacrament itself is called "purification of the soul"<sup>301</sup>. We shall now attempt to prove that the Oracle on the three virtues has in view this holy Chaldæan rite.

e) We have seen that the "Rulers" are said to "purify". This statement seems to indicate that they are identical with the "Rulers of the mysteries" (τελετάρχαι), mentioned several times in the Oracles: there are three of these and they are assigned to the three world-circles<sup>302</sup>.

<sup>299</sup> See n. 274.

<sup>300</sup> ΠΟΡΦΗ., *Regr.*, p. 36\*, 5, Bidez (KROLL, 6): "Dicit etiam Porphyrius divinis oraculis fuisse responsum: Nos non purgari lunae teletis atque solis; . . . denique eodem dicit oraculo expressum: Principia posse purgare" (καθαίρειν). Porphyry quotes a Chaldæan Oracle, as is proved, even if we leave out of account the subject-matter of the work, by the mention of the "principia", i. e. ἀρχαί; cf. Bidez, *ad loc.* Porphyry's interpretation of this Oracle (see Excursus II, n. 24) shows that the Oracle referred to three ἀρχαί.

<sup>301</sup> See ch. v, n. 106.

<sup>302</sup> PSELLUS, *Hyp.*, 5 (p. 73, 15) *προσεχεις δὲ τοῖς συνοχεῦσι τοὺς τελετάρχας τιθέασι τρεῖς καὶ αὐτοὺς ὄντας· ὧν ὁ μὲν ἐμπύριος, ὁ δὲ αἰθέριος, ὁ δὲ ὑλάρχησ*. Cf. DAM., I, 286, 8; II, 87, 9 (KROLL, 40). Proclus and his school identified the three Teletarchs with the third triad of the *νοητὴ καὶ νοερὰ τάξις*. These come after the first Triad, consisting of the three Iynges and the second composed of the three *συνοχεῖς*, and constitute together with these two other groups the whole of the *νοητὴ καὶ νοερὰ τάξις*. This division is obviously a Neoplatonic construction and cannot be used in re-constituting Chaldæan tradition. See Excursus VII.

Their identity with the "Rulers", rendered probable by the similarity of their names<sup>303</sup>, may be proved by a scrutiny of their functions, as described in the extant texts. According to Proclus' paraphrase of an Oracle, the first of the "Rulers of the mysteries" "conducts the wings of fire"; the second, also known as the "dominator of the soul"<sup>304</sup>, "consecrates" the ether; and the third performs a like function with respect to the hylic world<sup>305</sup>. The attribute "dominator of the soul" shows that the second of the "Rulers of the mysteries" is none other than the Lord of the sun, the rays of which draw upwards the soul of the Chaldæan initiate<sup>306</sup>. This identification leads to the inference that the "wings of fire" signify the soul, whose theurgical ascension is accomplished, according to another Oracle, upon the vehicle of its "fiery Intellect"<sup>307</sup>.

The first "Ruler of the mysteries", described as the conductor of these "wings", appears to be identical with Aion, the source of all light, who, as we shall see, is designated in express terms as the Ruler and Origin of the light of the sun. The third and last of the "Rulers of the mysteries" must in that case be the Lord of the aery zone, traversed by the solar rays in the course of their descent towards the earth. Accordingly the three "Rulers of the mysteries" perform, as their very name signifies, the principal part in the ritual of the theurgical elevation.

f) The fragments we have quoted show that the principal function necessary for the accomplishment of the Chaldæan mysteries is assigned to the sun and to its rays. This doctrine is necessarily dependent on the views held by the Theurgists as to the position and the rank of the sun

<sup>303</sup> Cf. DAM., II, 125, 8 (KROLL, 44) οἱ δὲ Θεοὶ τοῖς Χαλδαίοις τὴν τελεστικὴν μάλιστα παραδίδασιν τῆσδε τῆς τάξεως (i. e. that of the Teletarchs, cf. n. 302) ἰδιότητα καὶ ἀρχουσαν ἀποφαινοῦσι τῶν τελετῶν.

<sup>304</sup> PROCL., *Tim.*, II, 58, 7 (KROLL, 43) having quoted several fragments of the Oracles states: καὶ «ψυχοκράτωρ» ὁ τοῖς αἰθερίοις ἐπιβεσηκῶς (see n. 250) ἐστὶ «τελετάρχης».

<sup>305</sup> PROCL., *Th. Pl.*, 240, 25 (KROLL, 42) ὁ μὲν πρῶτος (τελετάρχης)... ἠνιοχεῖ «τὸν ταρσὸν τοῦ πυρός», ὁ δὲ μέσος τελειοῖ... τὸν αἰθέρα, ὁ δὲ τρίτος τὴν... ὕλην τελειοῖ.

<sup>306</sup> See ch. III, sect. 2-3.

<sup>307</sup> See notes 396, 398.

in the Universe, a point which we will now proceed to investigate, relegating the examination and the interpretation of the rites which were supposed to constitute the Chaldæan mystery to the next chapter. In the first place, we find that some of the opinions held by the Theurgists on the matter with which we are concerned conform to the views current in the astrophysics of later antiquity. In the Oracle on Aion transmitted in the *Theosophy*, the sun is said "to hold together with its rays"<sup>308</sup>. Other Oracles lay stress on its central position in the midst of the seven spheres : it is their "heart"<sup>309</sup>. The epithet "the seven-rayed" applied to the sun<sup>310</sup> likewise alludes to its functions as the ruler and mover of the planets.

On the other hand, the doctrine of the Chaldæans regarding the origin

<sup>308</sup> *Theos.* 13, 8 (see note 245) «ἀκτίσιν συνέχων».

<sup>309</sup> See note 221 *b, d, e, f.* Cf. also PROCL., *Crat.*, 96, 16 (KROLL, 36), Apollo : τὰς ἡλιακὰς ἀρχὰς εἰς μίαν ἐνωσιν ἐπιστρέφει, «κατέχων τὴν τρίπτερον ἀρχὴν», ὡς τὸ λόγιόν φησι. This trinity signifies the 2 × 3 planets which are the satellites of the sun. Cf. PHILO, *De congressu*, 8 and PROCL., *Tim.*, III, 62, 7, concerning the astronomers who situate τὸν ἥλιον... μέσον τῶν ἑπτὰ πλανήτων..., συνάγοντα καὶ συνδέοντα τὰς ἐφ' ἐκάτερα αὐτοῦ τριάδας. See also PROCL., *Rp.*, II, 221, 1 and 10.

PSSELLUS, *Expos.*, 1152 A (KROLL, 33) φασὶ δὲ (οἱ Χaldaῖοι) καὶ ἀρχικὸν ἥλιον ἀπὸ τῆς ἡλιακῆς πηγῆς καὶ ἀρχαγγελικόν concords with *Hyp.*, 12 (p. 74, 25) αἱ δημιουργικαὶ πηγαί... ὡς ἡ τοῦ ἡλίου πηγὴ πρὸ τῶν ἡλιακῶν ἀρχῶν ἰδρυμένη. ἔστι γὰρ τῶν μὲν ἡλιακῶν ἀρχῶν ὁ δημιουργὸς αἴτιος... ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς ἡλιακῆς πηγῆς (ὁ) ἀρχικὸς ἥλιος προέρχεται καὶ ὁ ἀρχαγγελικὸς. This construction is based on the Proclean scheme πηγαί-ἀρχαί-ἀρχάγγελοι (see n. 152) and cannot, accordingly, be regarded as deriving from Chaldæan tradition.

DAM., II, 126, 22 (KROLL, 65) reports that both the third triad of the νοητὴ τάξις and the order of the three Teletarchs were called in the Oracles "key" (κλείς). The statement concerning the νοητὴ τάξις refers probably to the Orphic (see Excursus I d on the confusion of the Orphic and Chaldæan θεολογοί) designation of Phanes (the equivalent of the relevant Platonic order; see Excursus VII) as κληῖδα νοῦ (see KERN, *Orph. Fr.*, 82), that concerning the Teletarchs probably to the first of the three : Aion; cf. ch. VII, n. 26. We may, however, mention that the symbol of the key was attributed also to the god of the sun (PROCL., *Hymn.*, I, v. 3), and the moon (see ch. VI, n. 200).

<sup>310</sup> ὁ ἑπτάκτις : see ch. III, n. 97.



of the solar light was all their own. It was, however, retouched and elaborated by the Neoplatonists; and it is in this altered form that it is set forth in the texts which we shall now proceed to examine.

Proclus reports that the Chaldæans were persuaded that, besides the intramundane, there also exists a transmundane sun; standing to the visible planet in a relationship similar to that of a pattern to its copy<sup>311</sup>. This formulation is clearly influenced by the well known simile used in Plato's Republic and by the distinction posited by Iamblichus between an intellectual and a visible sun<sup>312</sup>. Nevertheless, it is true that the Chaldæans distinguished between two fiery bodies: one possessed of a noetic nature and the visible sun. The former was said to conduct the latter.

According to Proclus, the Chaldæans call the "solar world" situated in the supramundane region "entire light"<sup>313</sup>. In another passage, this

<sup>311</sup> PROCL., *Tim.*, III, 82, 31 (KROLL, 32 f.) διχῶς ἄρα θεωρήσομεν τὸν ἥλιον... ὡς ἐγκόσμιον καὶ ὡς ὑπερκόσμιον... 83, 13 οἱ γε μυστικώτατοι τῶν λόγων (see Excursus I I) καὶ τὴν ὁλότητα αὐτοῦ (sc. τοῦ ἡλίου) τὴν ἐν τοῖς ὑπερκόσμοις παραδεδώκασιν· ἐκεῖ γὰρ «ὁ ἡλιακὸς κόσμος» καὶ τὸ «ὄλον φῶς», ὡς αἱ τε Χαλδαίων φῆμαι λέγουσι καὶ ἐγὼ πείθομαι (cf. Excursus I o).

<sup>312</sup> PLATO, *Rep.*, 517 b, c, and under his influence PLUTARCH, *Def. orac.*, 42, 433 D.; PHILO, *De virt.*, 104; *Quaest. in Gen.*, IV, 1, in *Exod.*, II, 51, calls God ὁ νοητὸς ἥλιος. As for the Neoplatonic references we may mention the oration of the Emperor Julian in honour of Helios, and the following passages of PROCLUS: *Tim.*, III, 82, 27 f.; *Th. Pl.*, 97, 36 f., 109, 42; *Crat.*, 101, 9 f. and 20. Cf. also PROCL., *Parm.*, 1044, 9 f. ἡ φαινομένη τοῦ ἡλίου περιφορὰ... ἀνωθεν ποθεν ἐκ τοῦ κρυφίου φωτός (i. e. τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ, see n. 311) προελθούσα καὶ ὑπερουμανίου διακόσμου. (COUSIN, *ad loc.* and KROLL, 33 read with some Mss. φασὶ instead of φωτός and consider the verb as referring to the Chaldæan Oracles, but Proclus never introduces his quotations from these texts anonymously). See ch. 1, n. 158.

<sup>313</sup> See n. 311. PSELLUS, *Expos.*, 1151 C (KROLL, 33, 1), also mentions this dogma adding that according to the Chaldæans this "solar world" situated above the sphere of the fixed stars "served the ethereal deep": καὶ ἄλλος μὲν παρ' αὐτοῖς (sc. τοῖς Χαλδαίοις) κύκλος (sc. above the ἀπλανῆς) ὁ ἡλιακὸς κόσμος τῷ αἰθερίῳ βέθει δουλεύων. The three last words seem to be a literal quotation. Cf. PROCL., *Th. Pl.*, 98, 17 τὸν ἥλιον... ἀπὸ τῶν αἰθερίων προελθόντα βυθῶν. Porphyry (ap. MACROB., *Sat.*, I, 17, 70) states that the solar fire originates in the highest part of the ether; cf. G. MAU, *Die Religionsphilosophie Julians* (1908), 25, 5.

philosopher states that the supramundane sun was known to them as "time of time"<sup>314</sup>; an appellation which is related to the nature of Aion, who "mingles aeon with aeon" and communicates his own movement to the sun<sup>315</sup>. The reason for his identification with the transmudane sun must be sought in the perpetual circular movement of the "fiery God" who, in the noetic sphere, accomplishes revolution after revolution, and is, accordingly, represented in the Oracle of the *Theosophy* treating of Aion as a noetic planet. The attribute "entire light" also fits in with the qualities of Aion; for, as he is the source of all intramundane light, its as yet undivided substance is contained in him.

The Chaldæan Aion, as interpreted by the Neoplatonists, who identify him with the transmudane sun, appears to be mentioned by the Emperor Julian in his Oration in honour of Helios. He invokes there a secret tradition<sup>316</sup>, according to which the disk of the sun moves over the starless sphere situated far above the sphere of the fixed stars<sup>317</sup>. This

<sup>314</sup> PROCL., *Tim.*, III, 36, 19 (KROLL, 33) κατὰ τὴν ἀφανῆ καὶ ἐπαναβεβηκυῖαν (sc. δημιουργίαν) ὁ ἀληθέστερος (sc. ἥλιος, according to Plato, see n. 312) συμμετρῆι τῷ χρόνῳ τὰ πάντα, «χρόνου χρόνος» ὡν ἀτεχνῶς κατὰ τὴν περὶ αὐτοῦ τῶν Θεῶν ὁμοίην. This explains *ibid.*, III, 55, 30 διὸ καὶ «χρόνου χρόνος» οὗτος (ὁ ἥλιος) κλειῖται παρὰ τοῖς θεολόγοις ὡς τὸν πρῶτιστον ἐκφαίνων χρόνον, a passage which applies the Chaldæan attribute of Aion to the visible sun (see G. R. S. MEAD, *The Chaldæan Oracles*, I, 78).

<sup>315</sup> «αἰὼν αἰώνεσσ' ἐπιμύνηται ἐκ Θεοῦ αὐτοῦ»: *Theos*, 13, 13; quoted ch. I, n. 46. Cf. also JOH. GAZ., *Descript. mundi*, 143 concerning Aion «καὶ χρόνον εἰς χρόνον ἄλλον ἐρεύγεται...» The "supramundane sun" is called "time of time" as the Paternal Intellect "Intellect of the Intellect" (see n. 184); the two expressions indicating the origin of Time or of the Intellect.

<sup>316</sup> JULIAN, *Orat.*, IV, 148 A καίτοι σιωπᾶσθαι κρείσσον ἦν· εἰρήσεται δὲ ὁμῶς; similarly *Orat.*, V, 172 D (see ch. III, n. 38). As to analogous formulas see LOBECK, *Aglaoph.*, 740 ff.; WOLFF, 110, 15; O. CASEL, *De philosophorum silentio mystico* (Giessen 1919), p. 111 ff.

<sup>317</sup> JULIAN, *Orat.*, IV, 148 A, B (KROLL, 32) λέγεται γοῦν, εἰ καὶ μὴ πάντες ἐτοίμως ἀποδέχονται, ὁ δίσκος ἐπὶ τῆς ἀνάστρου φέρεσθαι πολὺ τῆς ἀπλανοῦς ὑψηλότερος· καὶ οὕτω δὴ τῶν μὲν πλανωμένων οὐχ ἔξει (sc. ὁ δίσκος) τὸ μέσον, τριῶν δὲ τῶν κόσμων κατὰ τὰς τελεστικὰς ὑποθέσεις (as for the continuation see Excursus I o). The *ἕναστρος* is the "ninth" sphere posited by Ptolemy (after Hipparchus). It is situated above the sphere of the fixed stars (cf. SYNES.,

localization of the transmundane sun above the starless sphere may be used to prove the identity of this noetic luminary with Aion, described in the Oracle of the *Theosophy* as “wending his way” “above the vault” of the sphere of the fixed stars, where he “encounters neither the sun, nor the moon, nor the stars”<sup>318</sup>. In the second of the Oracles of the *Theosophy* treating of Aion, he is said to generate the ethereal light which illuminates the planets (“the sun, the moon and the stars”)<sup>319</sup>. Accordingly, he is both the source of the solar light and the lord of the sun.

One further fragment of the Oracles treats of the noetic origin of the sun’s fire. Only two of its verses have been preserved; though couched in enigmatic language, they can be interpreted, for their greater part, with the help of our foregoing investigations :

“And a fifth, midmost, other fire-containing, life-bringing Fire descends there (thither?) up to the hylic (ray-) channels”<sup>320</sup>.

The five attributes prove that this Fire designates the sun. For this luminary is situated in the *fifth* of the spheres, if these, including that

---

*Hymn.*, II, 14 f.), and is the place of Aristotle’s First Mover. See P. DUPEN, *Le système du monde*, II, 86 ff., 90, 1.

The three worlds mentioned by Emperor Julian cannot possibly be the Chaldæan *ἐμπύριος*, *αἰθέριος*, *ὕλαιος κόσμος*; they would seem to be identical with the *νοητός*, *νοερός*, *αἰσθητός κόσμος* of Iamblichus, who may have ascribed this division to the Chaldæans (who are meant with by the term *telestæe*; cf. Excursus X). The oration of Emperor Julian on Helios is based upon the axiom that the sensible sun has its origin in the “intellective” (*νοερός*) cosmos.

There seems to be no connection between this teaching and Zoroaster’s doctrine according to which the sun is situated above the fixed stars. See LYDUS, *Mens.*, II, 6, p. 23, 17; cf. BIDEZ-CUMONT, *Mages hell.*, II, 229, 2 f.

<sup>318</sup> *Theos.*, 13, l. 5-8 (quoted ch. 1, n. 46).

<sup>319</sup> *Theos.*, 21, 2-4 (quoted ch. 1, n. 52). According to PLATO, *Rep.*, 517 c, 3 sq. (see n. 312) it is the *νοητόν*, which “generates” the light of the sun.

<sup>320</sup> PROCL., *Tim.*, II, 107, 6 (KROLL, 34 f.) *μέχρι γὰρ τοῦ κέντρου* (of the earth) *πρόεισι* ὁ τῆς ζωογονίας ὄχετός, ὡς καὶ τὰ λόγια φησι, διαλεγόμενα περὶ τοῦ μέσου τῶν πάντε κέντρων ἀνωθεν δῆλοντος διαμπὰξ ἐπὶ τὸ καταπτικρὸν διὰ τοῦ κέντρου τῆς γῆς.

«Καὶ σέμπτον μέσον ἄλλο πυρήχορον ἐνθα κάτεισι  
μέχρις ὑλαίων ὄχετῶν ζωφόριον πῦρ.»

of the fixed stars, are counted from above <sup>321</sup>; it is the *midmost* of the seven planets <sup>322</sup>; in contradistinction from the noetic fire, it is called the *other* <sup>323</sup>; it *contains* the transcendental fire <sup>324</sup>; it is *life-bringing* <sup>325</sup>. We may add that this solar fire descends from the transcendent fire <sup>326</sup> in channels <sup>327</sup>, which attain the region of the material world and bring through their warmth life to the earth <sup>328</sup>. Because of this, the sun is

<sup>321</sup> This mode of numbering may be explained by a reference to the heavenly aspect of the oracle-giving gods who, for this reason, call the terrestrial zone in one passage (ch. iv, n. 63) the "deep of the world". The Chaldæans apparently counted in this case the zone of the fixed stars as the "first sphere"; cf. PSELLUS, *Hyp.*, 19 (p. 75, 9) ὁ ἀπλανῆς κύκλος περιέχων τὰς ἑπτὰ σφαίρας.

<sup>322</sup> See n. 309. Proclus (see note 320) is mistaken in supposing that the words *πέμπτον μέσον* refer to the equatorial zone, the midmost of the five diameters (*κέντρα*). On the other hand, the "centres of the hylic world" which according to the Oracles "were fixed upon the world above this world", i. e. above the hylic world (cf. *Simpl. Phys.*, 614, 2; KROLL, 33 *εἰ γὰρ τὰ λόγια φησι τὰ κέντρα τοῦ ὑλαίου κόσμου ἐν τῷ ὑπὲρ αὐτὸν* (sc. τὸν ὑλαῖον κόσμον) *αἰθέρι πεπηγένα*: [intrans.]) are the three cardinal points situated above the earth; cf. e. g. LYDUS, *Mens.*, II, 8, p. 26, 20 *τρία γὰρ τὰ ὑπέργεια κέντρα· ἀνατολή, δύσις, μεσουράνημα*, and PROCL., *Crat.*, 85, 30. See ch. i, n. 176.

<sup>323</sup> See n. 205 (v. 1).

<sup>324</sup> According to PROCL., *Tim.*, II, 9, 16 (KROLL, 33), the sun was called by the Chaldæans «*πυρὸς ταμίαις*» see n. 329. The same epithet is to be found in the hymn to Helios *P. Mag.*, II, 88. Cf. also LYDUS, *Mens.*, II, 6, p. 23, 15; NONNUS, *Dion.*, XII, 36; XXXVIII, 116; K. REINHARDT, *Kosmos und Sympathie*, 373 mentions in this connection MENANDER, *Rhet. Graec.*, IX, p. 321 who quotes a hymn to Helios describing the god as *φωτὸς ταμίαις*; cf. also PROCL., *Hymn.*, I (*εἰς Ἡλίον*), v. 2 *φάους ταμίαις*. Those concordances show that the Chaldæan Oracles are influenced by hymns to the sun.

<sup>325</sup> Cf. PLAT., *Rep.*, 509 b, 3; *Hymn. Orph.*, VIII (Ἡλίου), 18 *ζωῆς φῶς*; *P. Mag.*, VII, 529; PROCL., *Rp.*, II, 220, 28; *Hymn.*, I (*εἰς Ἡλίον*), v. 2 *ζωαρκεός... πηγῆς... ἔχων κληῖδα καὶ ὑλαίσις ἐνὶ κόσμοις... ἀρμονίης ῥύμα... ἐξοχετεῦν*; LYDUS, *Mens.*, IV, 86, p. 135, 14. Other parallels are collected by CUMONT, *La théologie solaire du paganisme romain* (*Mém. prés. Acad. Inscr.*, XIII, 2, 1909), p. 462, 1, and A. J. FESTUGIÈRE, *Hermetica*, *Harv. Theol. Rev.*, 1938, p. 17.

<sup>326</sup> *ἐνθα* is ambiguous: if taken to mean "there", it refers to Aion; if explained as "thither", to the earth.

<sup>327</sup> As to *ὄχετοί* see n. 329.

<sup>328</sup> See n. 278.

described in one of the Oracles as "Fire, pourer-forth of Fire"<sup>329</sup>.

β) The foregoing investigations have proved that in the opinion of the Chaldæans the light of the sun originates in Aion. As we shall see in the next chapter, the relationship between these entities plays an important part in the Chaldæan mystery of immortality; it also accounts for the origin and the function of the "Connectives"<sup>330</sup>. This designation applies to the currents of the noetic fire, which are sent forth, at the behest of the "Father", the "Connector of the All", from his "Power", the "Connective of all Sources", through the medium of Aion, towards the Sun, the "connective" of the ethereal world, and from these, by means of the solar rays, regarded as the "hylic Connectives", towards the earth. These "Connectives" disseminate life, movement and intelligence throughout the Universe, and preserve its harmonious existence. An Oracle describes them as "those who are endowed with quality entire"<sup>331</sup>, because they descend from the "entire light" of Aion<sup>332</sup>.

These entities are the vehicles of theurgical ascension. The Oracles state that the Chaldæans effected their "elevation" towards their noetic goal with the help of the "Connectives"<sup>333</sup>, "enclosed in the three Rulers of the mysteries"<sup>334</sup>. Accordingly, the mystery seems to have

<sup>329</sup> PROCL., *Tim.*, II, 9, 16 (KROLL, 33) τῶν Θεολόγων ἀκούων «πῦρ πυρὸς ἐξοχτέυμα» τὸν ἥλιον καλοῦντων (for the continuation καὶ «πυρὸς ταμίαν» see n. 324); i. e. the solar fire is poured out in rays (ὄχεται) downwards to the earth. As to the origin of the Chaldæan expression see EMPEDOCLES, 21 B, 35, 2 Diels λόγου λόγον ἐξοχετεύων, and PLATO, *Leg.*, 666 a 5 πῦρ ἐπὶ πῦρ ὀχετεύειν.

<sup>330</sup> Cf. sect. 11 of this chapter.

<sup>331</sup> DAM., II, 43, 20 (KROLL, 42) διὸ καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν Θεῶν οἱ συνοχεῖς «ὀλόποιοι» παραδέδονται τῶν νοερῶν διακόσμων. ὀλόποιος is not composed of ὀλος + ποιέω, as Damascius would have it, but of ὀλος + ποιός. It is a neologism analogous to ἄποιος (as παντοιός, quoted ch. III, n. 74, is modelled upon μονάς).

<sup>332</sup> See n. 311.

<sup>333</sup> PROCL., *Th. Pl.*, 192, 35 διὰ γὰρ τῶν συνεκτικῶν Θεῶν καὶ παρὰ τοῖς Θεουργοῖς ἡ ἀνοδος ἐπὶ τὰς ἀφράστους καὶ νοητὰς δυνάμεις. (See also *ibid.*, 320, 1 ff.). The συνεκτικοὶ Θεοὶ are identical with the Chaldæan συνοχεῖς; cf. PROCL., *Th. Pl.*, IV ch. 9. See Excursus VII.

<sup>334</sup> DAM., I, 290, 17 (KROLL, 43) οἱ μὲν τελετάρχει συνοιλημπτὰ τοῖς συνοχεῦσι κατὰ τὸ λόγιον. αὐτοὶ δὲ οἱ συνοχεῖς τρεῖς εἰσι.

consisted in an ascending movement of the soul drawn up by the solar rays towards the noetic place of origin of this "Light". The "Rulers" of the three world-circles directed this movement; their action being called forth by a magical invocation. Chaldæan tradition states that three Iynges, called the "Heights" (*ἰκρότητες*), were especially assigned to the three world-circles<sup>335</sup>. We may suppose that they were the mediators, with whose help the Theurgist communicated in the course of his invocation with the three "Rulers of the mysteries".

h) The analysis of the Oracles treating of the world-preserving entities shows us that, according to the Chaldæans, these were divided into different categories, which were designated by names descriptive of their various functions. We have encountered the following designations: "Connectives", "Upholders"<sup>336</sup>, "Watching Lightnings", "Rulers" (and the equivalents of this last term<sup>337</sup>). All these entities belong to the class of the Ideas; and, in the last resort, their various names designate the diverse activities of the same order of being. Thus, the potencies which fashioned the world are identical with those which watch over the harmony of its existence. As all of them belong to one class, their functions are not clearly delimited; a circumstance which renders the relevant fragments of the Oracles particularly difficult to understand. At least some measure of justification must be allowed to the Neoplatonists, who used certain Chaldæan names of the world-preserving powers as attributes of their own divine hierarchy<sup>338</sup>.

Our enquiry into the nature of the world-preserving entities began with an examination of Chaldæan cosmology; and this was followed up by a discussion of theurgy in the proper sense of the word. This transition from one branch of Chaldæan lore to another is not due to mere chance. It has been shown that even those statements which seem to

---

Cf. also PROCL., *Th. Pl.*, 240, 23. Concerning the triadic division of the *ἰγγες*, *συνοχεῖς* and *τελετάρχαι* see note 301.

<sup>335</sup> See n. 247 (a) and 250.

<sup>336</sup> *συνοχεῖς*, *ἰνοχεῖς* (n. 259), *φρουροί* (n. 247), *ἀρχαί* (n. 274).

<sup>337</sup> *ἀρχικοί πατέρες* (n. 273), *κοσμογνοί* (n. 271).

<sup>338</sup> See DONNS, *Proclus*. p. 278 f.

be purely theoretical are closely bound up with the practice of the mystery-cult. This connection is a consequence of the basic principle of the system, which represents the entities that accomplish the theurgical operation as identical with those that rule the Universe; the selfsame power is drawn upon in the practice of magic and in the organization of the Cosmos. Believing this, the Chaldæans could not but regard a full understanding of the forces of the Universe as a necessary preliminary to theurgy, which aims at dominating those forces. Accordingly, their exposition of the system of the Cosmos has a preeminently practical object, manifested in the choice of the various themes and in the way in which these are dealt with.

There are many indications which show that the Chaldæans are particularly interested in the governance and the cohesion of the world. This preoccupation is not due to love of knowledge for its own sake, but to the exigencies of magical world-orientation. In the Chaldæan system, the basic magical belief in the sympathy of all the powers of the world is bound up with the conception of a rational organization of the Cosmos, headed by a Supreme Intellect, who is both the originator of all the intelligences existing in the world and the goal of the human soul which aspires to participate in the eternal harmony. In order to ascend towards the First Principle, it is necessary to have the aid of the powers charged by the Supreme Being with the harmonious governance of the various parts of the Universe. This aid may be secured only through knowledge of the nature and the activity of these powers; a branch of science which is, accordingly, indispensable to the Chaldæan who wishes to perform the theurgical act.

14. *God, the Gods and the Angels.*—The Chaldæans teach that the Universe is one, that it has emanated in manifold gradations from the Supreme Being, and that there is a dynamic cohesion between its various parts. The noetic powers subsisting in the orders of the cosmical hierarchy represent the energy which is at work in the Universe, and render thereby manifest the action of the Supreme Principle. At the same time, these powers are endowed with individual faculties and function as the executors of the Supreme decree. Thus, the mythological character of the Chaldæan system is not essentially the result of an artificial adaptation

of a conceptualistic doctrine to a polytheistic system; it is rather the natural consequence of a mode of thought which regards metaphysical concepts as the agents of the transcendent First Principle.

We have already treated at some length of the nature of Aion, the Supreme God. He reveals, without any intermediary, the inconceivable First Being; and is, for this reason, the Chaldæan God par excellence<sup>339</sup>. As he only "manifests himself" when impelled to do so by a decision of the Supreme Father, the Oracles exhort the pious to address their prayers to the "Supreme King of all the blessed gods", Whose Intellect and Will rule over all the other divine entities<sup>340</sup>. The Chaldæan pantheon seems to be organized as a patriarchal hierarchy; headed by the Supreme God, its Creator and Overlord, called the "Ruler" and the "Father of the blessed immortals"<sup>341</sup>.

Besides the transmundane gods (the "Father", Aion, Hecate), the Chaldæans recognize a second class of divine beings: the gods of the planets. In the Oracle on Aion transmitted in the *Theosophy*, Apollo affirms that "no god encounters" Aion in his course through the noetic sphere, neither the stars, nor the moon, "nor I myself, who hold together with my rays and spread out in the whirl of the ether"<sup>342</sup>. This passage proves that the planets are regarded by the Chaldæans as gods. They seem to be given the usual Greek names; for Apollo identifies himself with the sun<sup>343</sup>, and Ares and Titania figure in one or the other Chaldæan Oracles preserved by Porphyry as appellations of planets<sup>344</sup>. Moreover, we have seen that the designation of the sun as "Truth", of Mercury as "Understanding" or "Wisdom" and of the moon as "Virtue" may be explained as a metonymic way of naming the Greek planetary gods<sup>345</sup>.

<sup>339</sup> See p. 99 f.

<sup>340</sup> See ch. I, n. 67 (v. 1 and 5).

<sup>341</sup> See n. 37.

<sup>342</sup> See ch. I, n. 46 (v. 5-8).

<sup>343</sup> See also the Oracle quoted ch. I, n. 186.

<sup>344</sup> See ch. I, n. 165 (the first Oracle, v. 3).

<sup>345</sup> "Truth" as designation of the sun: ch. I, n. 158; ch. II, n. 293. "Understanding" or "Wisdom" as appellations of Mercury: ch. III, n. 184-185. "Virtue" as appellation of the moon: ch. I, n. 160, ch. II, n. 83, ch. III, n. 181.



These planetary gods are identical with the "sons" of the hymn of the *Theosophy*, whom the Supreme God "has begotten in the times" <sup>346</sup>. "In the times" is apparently a mere poetical periphrase, which indicates the temporal creation of this class of gods <sup>347</sup>. This hymn also states that the "procreations of the holy Rulers flow" from the realm of the "Father" <sup>348</sup>. The verb signifies that they were produced by emanation. Their creation (as well as that of all the other divine entities) is referred to in the following Oracle, a part of which has already been quoted in this chapter, though without the foregoing investigations we are unable to elicit its full meaning :

"The Source and Stream of the spiritual Blessed ones is easy-flowing ; for She (the Source and Stream), the first in power, conceives in ineffable Wombs, and pours forth on the All a rushing life (*lit.* birth)" <sup>349</sup>.

This Oracle indicates that the "blessed" planetary gods are emanations of the Paternal Intellect, called "the Source and Stream first in power" <sup>350</sup>. As the planetary gods are noetic entities, they are able to cognize in their mind the "Father". A Chaldæan hymn, very probably addressed to the planetary gods, begins :

"You, who know the supercelestial Paternal Depth by thinking it" <sup>351</sup>.

<sup>346</sup> *Theos.*, 27, 5 (quoted ch. I, n. 26) : « κλυθι τεῶν παίδων, οὓς ἤρσασα αὐτὸς ἐν ὥραις ».

<sup>347</sup> ὥρα can only mean "time" in this passage, which refers to the κατὰ χρόνον γεννητοὶ Θεοί.

<sup>348</sup> *Theos.*, 27, 12 « ἐνθεν ἐπερσειουσι γοναὶ ἀγίων μὲν ἀνάκτων ». ἐνθεν refers to the "Father", as is shown by v. 15 « σέο μὲν γεγαῶσαι ».

<sup>349</sup> See n. 64.

<sup>350</sup> The designation πηγὴ... πρώτη δυνάμει refers to the Paternal Intellect, as is proved by the parallels quoted n. 59-60. The "womb" is identical with the μήτρα, see n. 59. The planetary gods are described as μήκαρες in *Theos.*, 13, 3 (ch. I, n. 46) and 27, 14 (ch. I, n. 26).

<sup>351</sup> PROCL., *Crat.*, 57, 25 (KROLL, 18) : « οἱ τὸν ὑπέρκοσμον πατρικὸν βυθὸν ἴτε νοοῦντες », λέγει πρὸς αὐτοὺς (sc. τοὺς νοερούς Θεούς) ὁ ὕμνος ; see Excursus I i : *Testimonies* : DAM., II, 16, 6 ; cf. *ibid.*, I, 284, 8 ; 291, 22 ; *Simpl. Phys.*, 614, 6 ; PROCL., *Tim.*, II, 92, 7 (see n. 353) ; PSELLUS, *Hyp.*, 2 (p. 73, 5) μεθ' ὃ (sc. τὸ ἐν) πατρικὸν τινα... βυθόν. Proclus uses πατρικὸς βυθὸς as designation of the νοητόν ; see Excursus VII. SYNES., *Hymn.*, II, 27 ; MART. CAP., II,

The term "Depth" is applied here to the Pleroma of the intelligible world, called "paternal", because the Supreme God is Himself the noetic All <sup>352</sup>. The place in which the transcendent god abides is called also "Silence". It is qualified by the attribute "God-nourishing" <sup>353</sup>, because "every (divine) Intelligence thinks the Father" <sup>354</sup> and "the noetic essence is nourishment for him who thinks (it)" <sup>355</sup>. We are thus given to understand that the planetary gods are endowed with intellectual

203 (see ch. III, n. 2) : "Veneraturque... universumque totum infinibilis patris profunditate (βυθῶ) coercitum".

The planetary gods are called *νοεροὶ μάκαρες* in the Oracle quoted n. 65. We may accordingly suppose that the hymn quoted in this note was in reality addressed to the *κοσμοζοί*, who were assigned by Proclus to the *νοερά τάξις*. Cf. n. 283. See also ch. VI, n. 57.

<sup>352</sup> See n. 54-55.

<sup>353</sup> PROCL., *Crat.*, 63, 25 (KROLL, 16) : τὸν υπερουράνιον τόπον καὶ ὅσα «τῆ Θεοθρέμμοσι σιγῇ» περιεἰληπταὶ τῶν πατέρων. PROCL., *Tim.*, II, 92, 6 ὁ ἐκεῖ νοῦς... ἐμεινεν ἐν τῷ πατρικῷ βυθῷ (see n. 351) καὶ ἐν τῷ ἀδύτῳ κατὰ τὴν «Θεοθρέμμοσι σιγῇ». PROCL., *Alc.*, I, 364, 2. Those three texts are silent as to the Chaldaean origin of the expression, which may, however, be proved by the context and by the poetical nature of the attribute; cf. n. 37. *σιγῇ* is a Chaldaean designation of the "Father", see PROCL., *Th. Pl.*, 320, 51 (KROLL, 16) ἀνυπερβλήτος γὰρ ἐστὶν ἡ ἐνωσις... τοῦ πρώτου πατρὸς (i. e. Κρόνου = τοῦ ἀπαξ ἐπέκεινα)... καὶ διὰ τοῦτο «σιγώμενος» καλεῖται ὑπὸ τῶν Θεῶν. Πατρικὴ σιγῇ is also mentioned PROCL., *Tim.*, III, 222, 14; *Crat.*, 59, 6; *Parm.*, 1171, 4. Cf. also DAM., I, 56, 10; ANON. *Taur.*, II, 20; SYNES., *Hymn.*, IX, 50 (60); cf. *ibid.*, II, 22.

<sup>354</sup> DAM., II, 16, 16 (KROLL, 19, 1) εἶρηται γὰρ (παρ' αὐτῶν τῶν Θεῶν) «τόνδε (sc. τὸν πατρικὸν νοῦν) νοεῖ πᾶς νοῦς Θεόν».

The preceding remarks of Dam. show that *νοῦς* cannot signify here human intellect, but only that of the gods.

<sup>355</sup> PROCL., *Tim.*, I, 18, 25 (KROLL, 19, 1) «τροφή δὲ τὸ νοητὸν τῷ νοοῦντι» κατὰ τὸ λόγιόν ἐστι. *Crat.*, 92, 12 καὶ γὰρ «τροφή τὸ νοητὸν» ἐστὶ κατὰ τὸ λόγιον ταῖς νοεραῖς διακοσμήσεται τῶν Θεῶν. We may consequently regard the verse as referring to the *νοεροὶ Θεοὶ* (see n. 351). Cf. also *Th. Pl.*, 261, 47; DAM., I, 146, 15. The metrical form of the verse may have read : «ἐστὶν γὰρ τὸ νοητὸν (ἐκεῖνο) τροφή νοεόντι». The combination of the fragments quoted n. 354 and 355 is rendered probable by PLATO, *Phaedr.*, 247 d 1 Θεοῦ διάνοια νῶ... τρεφομένη.

knowledge of the intelligible world. A probable inference is that they are supposed to constitute the choir which chants the great hymn to the "Ineffable Father or the Immortals" preserved in the *Theosophy*. Πάντα γὰρ εὔχεται πλὴν τοῦ Πρώτου<sup>356</sup>. They are the "sons, begotten in the times", who pray Him to listen to them<sup>357</sup>. They, and none but they, are able to expound the mystery of his intellectual emanations and of the hierarchic order of His supercelestial court; for they alone have been given the power to "think the Paternal Depth"<sup>358</sup>. Only one of them could have disclosed the mysteries of supreme existence to the Chaldæans, who wrote them down; as we know, these divine revelations were made chiefly by Apollo<sup>359</sup>.

The rulers of the planets are the only gods inferior to Aion recognized by the Chaldæans; and even they are not fully entitled to divine rank. Apollo-Helios concluded the Oracle on Aion transmitted in the *Theosophy* with the statement that in reality only Aion, "who dwells in fire" is "God" (without the article): "We angels are only a small troop of God"<sup>360</sup>. Since the planets are subordinate to Aion who imparts to them light and perpetual movement, their rulers do not possess that portion of individuality which is an indispensable constituent of the notion of godhead. The title of "gods" by which they are nevertheless designated in the same Oracle<sup>361</sup> may be a (perhaps unconscious) concession

<sup>356</sup> The author of this celebrated diction is Theodorus, the disciple of Iamblichus; it is delivered by PROCL., *Tim.*, I, 213, 2. Cf. Excursus V, n. 20.

<sup>357</sup> The verse quoted n. 351 contains the self-appellation of the chanters of the hymn.

<sup>358</sup> Synesius, too, seems to have regarded the hymn of the *Theosophy* as a chant of the planetary gods; see ch. I, n. 58.

<sup>359</sup> *Theos.*, 21, 5 (see ch. I, n. 52). Apollo refuses to answer a question regarding the nature of the Supreme God and forbids to inquire into this mystery. But the person who questions him is unlike the Theurgists not an "initiate" and has boasted beforehand of his knowledge of natural philosophy; cf. ch. I, n. 197. In another Chaldæan Oracle, the god describes the order of the supercelestial world as "ineffable" (ἀφθελκτα) adding «σῖγ' ἔχε, μύστα». Cf. PROCL., *Crat.*, 67, 19 (KROLL, 40 and 55). See ch. III, n. 2, ch. IV, n. 98.

<sup>360</sup> See *Theos.*, 13, v. 15-16 (ch. I, n. 46).

<sup>361</sup> See *Theos.*, 13, 7 οὐ θεὸς ἀντιέει, etc.

to the dogm of the divine nature of the planets which was generally admitted at that epoch. The true rank of these entities, however, is defined in Apollo's statement, which is clearly directed against the doctrines of star-worship : they are mere satellites of God and, as such, debarred from active participation in the governance of the world.

The Chaldaean hierarchy of supercelestial entities assigns to the angels a rank next to that of the gods, and divides them, as we learn from the hymn of the *Theosophy* <sup>362</sup>, into three groups : (a) the "holy Rulers", who constantly surround the Supreme Being ; (b) the ministering angels, who live "far" from Him, scattered all over the ethereal world, functioning as the transmitters of the messages of the Paternal Intellect : according to another Oracle of the *Theosophy*, they "hasten", at the command of the "Father", to the help of the afflicted pious <sup>363</sup>. (c) The angels of the Throne. This differentiation of three groups of angels derives, as we have shown, from Jewish angelology <sup>364</sup>. All three of them are of noetic origin, having emanated from the Paternal Intellect.

The extant Oracles furnish no further details as to the functions of the first and the third class of angels who, because of their state of permanent transcendence, may not have been in the line of the main preoccupations of the Theurgists. For the authors of the Oracles are chiefly concerned with the action of the supracelestial upon the intramundane sphere ; a fact which accounts for the interest which they take in the ministering angels, through whose agency the two domains communicate. The various groups into which this class of angels was subdivided and the specific function assigned to each of these will be studied in the following chapters <sup>365</sup>. It seems probable that the Iynges, of whom we have already

<sup>362</sup> See *Theos.*, 27, 12-18 (ch. I, n. 26).

<sup>363</sup> *Theos.*, 34 (ch. I, n. 76).

<sup>364</sup> See ch. I, n. 32-37.

<sup>365</sup> See PSELLUS, *Hyp.*, 21 (p. 75, 12) οἱ τῶν Θεῶν ὀπαδοὶ ἄγγελοι· ἐφ'οἷς αἱ τῶν δαιμόνων ἀγγέλαι, αἱ μὲν ὀλικώτεραι, αἱ δὲ μερικώτεραι μέχρι τῶν ὑλικωτάτων· καὶ μετὰ τούτους οἱ ἥρωες, and OLYMPIODOR, *Alc.*, 22 (KROLL, 44). Both authors state that the Theurgists divided the spirits commanded by the gods into angels,

spoken <sup>366</sup>, constitute one of these groups; for the accounts of their nature and of their activities concord with those bearing on the ministering angels. These, as well as the Iynges, are described as "Powers" or thoughts of the "Father", who "speedily hasten forth from Him and back to Him", and function as mediators between Him and the Theurgists. The original bearers of the title "ferry-men" (*διαπρόρῳμοι*) applied to the Iynges, are Plato's good daemons who, like the ministering angels of the Theurgists, "interpret between gods and men, conveying and taking across to the gods the prayers and sacrifices of men, and to men the commands and replies of the gods" and who also mediate "all prophecies and magical incantations" (Plato *Conviv.* 202 e). These good daemons are identified by the later Pythagoreans and Platonists with (Jewish and Persian) angels <sup>367</sup>. This assimilation is also one of the bases of Chaldæan angelology. Their common sources account for the similarity between the Chaldæan doctrine of the Iynges and the angelology of Philo, who regards the angels as pure souls, powers or ideas of God, assimilates

---

demons and heroes; it is however certain that this classification originated with the later Neoplatonists; see ch. v, n. 8. For the Platonists distinguish between good and evil demons, while the Chaldæans use the term exclusively *in malam partem*; see ch. v, n. 14. The souls of the Theurgists who descend again upon the earth were considered by the Neoplatonists as belonging to the class of heroes; see ch. III, n. 19/1.

Proclus, when treating of angelology, likewise invokes the authority of the Chaldæans; cf. *Rp.*, II, 255, 20 ἀγγελοι... Θεῶν μὲν ὑπηρέται, δαιμόνων δὲ ἐπιστάται: καὶ οὐ ξενικὸν τὸ ὄνομα (sc. τῶν ἀγγέλων) καὶ βαρβάρων Θεοσοφίας μόνης (cf. *Ex-cursus I f*), ἀλλὰ καὶ Πλάτων ἐν Κρατύλῳ (407 e 6, 408 b 5) etc.

<sup>366</sup> See sect. 12 of this chapter.

<sup>367</sup> The oldest text which can be dated is composed by Nicomachus of Gadara (a Pythagorean and an early contemporary of the Theurgists, see Bidez-Cumont, *Mages hell.*, II, 283) who refers to the angelology of the "Babylonians" Ostanes and Zoroaster. Celsus (*ap. ORIG.*, *Contra Cels.*, VII, 68) and Labeo (*ap. AUGUSTINE*, *Civ. dei*, IX, 19), both of them Platonists who lived at about the same time as the Theurgists (see Kroll's dating of Labeo in *Rhein. Mus.*, 1916, 316), identify the demons with the angels,—an identification already taken for granted by Philo. See CUMONT, *Les anges du paganisme*, *Rev. de l'hist. des rel.*, LXXII, 1915, 159-182. See also below, ch. v, n. 8.

them to the daemons of Plato, and uses this philosopher's words in describing their activity <sup>368</sup>.

As we have shown, the Iynges are identical with the "ineffable magical names" disseminated by the Paternal Intellect throughout the world, so that they should help the human souls to accomplish the theurgical "elevation" (of which more later on). The personification of these names is due to the conceptions of magical science. The Hellenistic magicians regard the "ineffable names" with which they invoke the gods as hypostases of the divinities to whom they are applied and whose will they carry out <sup>369</sup>. Because of the latter function, the "names" could fitly be included by the Chaldæans in the group of the ministering angels.

The ministering angels are apparently also designated by the expression "beauteous ears", with which, according to the hymn of the *Theosophy*, the Supreme Being hears all things <sup>370</sup>. This peculiar appellation may be explained once again by a passage of Philo <sup>371</sup>, who compares the angels with the "eyes and ears of the King" (Persian titles), who hear everything and report the afflictions of the creatures to the "Father", — a description which again alludes to the disquisition on the good daemons in Plato's *Banquet*. It concords, almost word for word, with the passage of the Oracle of the *Theosophy* dealing with the activities of the ministering angels. The term "beauteous ears" refers accordingly to the latter, regarded as divine thoughts or Ideas (τὰ καλλῆ), in the terminology of the later Platonists <sup>372</sup>.

15. *The cognition of the noetic beings.* — The Chaldæan exposition of the organization of the intelligible world is not only intended to give the theurgists a knowledge of the magical cohesion of the powers of the Uni-

<sup>368</sup> On Philo's angelology see E. BRÉHIER, *Les idées philosophiques et religieuses de Philon d'Alexandrie*, 126 f.

<sup>369</sup> HOPFNER, *O.-Z.*, I, 682.

<sup>370</sup> *Theos.*, 27, 4 (ch. I, n. 26) :

«πάντ' ἐπιδερκομένῳ καὶ ἀκούοντ' ὅσατι καλοῖς».

<sup>371</sup> PHILO, *De somn.*, I, 140. See BRÉHIER, *loc. cit.*, 126 f. In this passage, Philo sets forth Platonizing views.

<sup>372</sup> See ch. III, n. 55.

verse; it also prepares them to grasp the methods which must be used in order to gain mastery over these powers. As the world is ruled by noetic entities, the ways of communicating with them are also conceived as noetic. For this reason, the Chaldæans regard the science treating of the cognition of the intelligible world as being of basic significance.

This central theme of Chaldæan theosophy, referred to in numerous Oracles, was of particular interest to the Neoplatonists, to whom we owe the preservation of several of the relevant texts. Some of these are of capital importance, as they enable us to form a sufficiently distinctive idea of the main characteristics of this doctrine, and of its relation to theurgy in the proper sense of the word.

The most instructive of the texts of this group is a lengthy Chaldæan Oracle quoted by Damascius from the monograph of Iamblichus on Chaldæan Theology, that fundamental work of Neoplatonic oracular exegesis. This Oracle is couched in the obscure symbolic language characteristic of the Chaldæan Oracles; every word has a terminological significance, which may be discovered by a rigorous interpretation of the text and by a comparison with parallel verses:

“There is a certain noetic being (τι νοητόν) which thou must think with the flower of thought. For, shouldst thou incline thine intellect to It, and think It as if thinking something, thou shalt not think It. For It (the noetic being) is the Power of circumsplendent Strength, flashing with noetic divisions. In good sooth, one should not think that noetic being with vehemence, but with the subtle flame of subtle intellect, that measures all things—except that noetic being. Thou shouldst not think It in a forthright manner, but keeping the pure eye of the soul turned away, thou shouldst stretch out the vacant intellect towards the noetic being, in order to learn to know It; for It subsists beyond the (human) intellect”<sup>373</sup>.

<sup>373</sup> DAM., I, 154, 14 (KROLL, 11): μαρτυροῦνται δὲ οὖν καὶ οἱ αὐτοὶ (sc. ὁ λάμβλιχος ἐν τοῖς Χαλδαϊκοῖς καὶ οἱ μετ’αὐτόν), i. e. in the first place Proclus in his commentary on the Chaldæan Oracles) τοὺς Θεούς, ἐν οἷς ἔπεισιν λέγουσι πρὸς τὸν Θεουργόν (see Excursus I g, h):

1 ἔστιν γὰρ τι νοητόν, ὃ χρεῖσ σε νοεῖν νόου ἀνθεῖ.  
2 ἦν γὰρ ἐπεγκλήτης σὺν νόῳ κάκεινο νοήσης

Damascius observes that these verses define the peculiar nature of the cognition of the Primal Being (the highest of all noetic objects) : "This cognition is not vehement, and it does not strain against that which is to be cognized, nor does it hurry to appropriate the noetic object, but it surrenders itself to It" <sup>374</sup>. This explanation gives an accurate account of the difference between the two ways of cognition : the intentional, directed to the sensible objects, and the passive, by means of which man may achieve the knowledge of the highest object of thought.

Two types of thought are contrasted in the Oracle : one seeks to attain to the noetic "It" (τι), the other is turned to an object which is fixedly and actively regarded by the human intellect. Thought of the second type cannot bring about the cognition of the object of thought spoken of in the Oracle ; for that is not a definable object. It "subsists beyond the (human) intellect", i. e., beyond the scope of this intellect's conceptual thinking ; and cannot be "measured" by it ; for it is One, Infinite and "Indivisible" <sup>375</sup>. For this reason, he who would recognize it is

- 3 ὡς τι νοῶν, οὐ κείνο νοήσεις · ἐστὶ γὰρ ἀλκιῆς  
 4 ἀμφιφαοῦς δύναμις νοεραῖς στράπτουσα τομαῖσιν.  
 5 Οὐ ἐῖη χρῆ σφοδρότητι νοεῖν τὸ νοητὸν ἐκεῖνο,  
 6 ἀλλὰ νόου ταναοῦ ταναῆ φλογὶ πάντα μετρούσῃ  
 7 πλὴν τὸ νοητὸν ἐκεῖνο · χρεώ δὴ τοῦτο νοῆσαι  
 8 [ἦν γὰρ ἐπεγκλιη· σὸν νοῦν, κἀκεῖνο νοήσεις]  
 9 οὐκ ἀτενώς, ἀλλ' ἀγνὸν ἀπόστροφον ὄμμα φέροντα  
 10 σῆς ψυχῆς τεῖναι κενεὸν νοῦν ἐς τὸ νοητὸν,  
 11 ὄφρα μάθῃς τὸ νοητὸν, ἐπεὶ νόου ἔξω ὑπάρχει».

*Testimonies* : v. 1 is quoted by PSELLUS, *Comm.*, 1144 B, and v. 11, *ibid.*, 1148 D (in the latter passage the text is corrupt). For v. 4 cf. PROCL., *Tim.*, II, 246, 28 and 256, 25. The Oracle is mentioned DAM., I, 58, 15 (see n. 376).

*Text* : v. 2 reads, according to Ruelle, ἦν γὰρ ἐπεγκλιη ὡς ἂν νοῦν, κἀκεῖνο νοήσει : the text was reconstituted as above by Kroll who used v. 8 which repeats v. 2.—v. 6 Thilo followed by Kroll replaced οὐδέ by ἀλλά and falsified the meaning of the whole Oracle.—v. 8, which repeats v. 2, should be omitted, as proposed by Thilo. Kroll regards the verse as a parenthesis.

<sup>374</sup> DAM., I, 155, 2 : ...οὐχ ἡ σφοδρὰ (sc. γνώσις) καὶ ἀντερειδουσα πρὸς τι γνωστὸν οὐδὲ ἡ σπειδουσα ἐκτυπῆς ποῆσαι τὸ νοητὸν, ἀλλ' ἡ ἀφιεῖσα ἐκτυπῆν ἐκείνω, etc. In the passage which follows Dam. identifies this knowledge with the ἐνωσις or ἀνάπλωσις (see n. 45) of Plotinus ; an interpretation which is probably to be ascribed to Iamblichus.

<sup>375</sup> See n. 56 and 171.



enjoined to turn his organ of thought, "the eye of the soul", away from all the definable objects, and to stretch it out directly towards the highest noetic goal. For, the latter can only be cognized by the human intellect, when this is in a state of unpurposive tension and of "vacancy", *i. e.* when it is void of all thought-contents <sup>376</sup>.

The Oracle defines the noetic being which is to be cognized as the "Power of circumsplendent Strength flashing with noetic divisions". As we have seen, each of these terms designates in the Oracles a definite intellectual order and the faculties with which it is endowed. The expression "Power of circumsplendent Strength" applies to the faculties of the Paternal (or First) Intellect <sup>377</sup>. His "fiery" thoughts, represented as flashes of lightning, are produced through "divisions" that measure and limit the All and constitute the Second, world-shaping Intellect. Consequently, the apposition "flashing with noetic divisions" signifies the totality of the ideas that have issued forth from the First Intellect <sup>378</sup>. The identity of the noetic essence with the thoughts of the Supreme Intellect is clearly stated in another Oracle (in which this view is opposed to other theories, of which more later on) : "The (divine) Intellect does not subsist far from the noetic (essence), and the noetic (essence) does not subsist apart from the (divine) Intellect" <sup>379</sup>.

The organ which renders possible the cognition of the highest noetic object is designated in the Oracle treating of this question as the "flower

<sup>376</sup> ἀπόστροφον as well as κενόν demand the complement ἀπὸ τοῦ 'τί'. Cf. DAM., I, 58, 4 as to the First Being lacking all determination : ἀπαγε, ἄνθρωπε, μὴ προσενέγκῃς τὸ τί· αὐτὸ γὰρ τοῦτὸ σε ἐμποδίζει πρὸς τὴν ἐκείνου γνῶσιν. Further on (l. 15) in the passage Dam. invokes the authority of the Chaldæan Oracles, probably referring to our passage.

Concerning the expression see AESCH., *Coeph.*, 99 ἀστροφῶσιν ὄμμασιν.

<sup>377</sup> See n. 73.

<sup>378</sup> See n. 175.

<sup>379</sup> PROCL., *Tim.*, III, 102, 10 (KROLL, 11) and DAM., II, 16, 20; 57, 26 :

«Οὐ γὰρ ἄνευ νόου (subject) ἐστὶ νοητοῦ καὶ τὸ νοητὸν

οὐ τοῦ χωρὶς ὑπάρχει».

According to DAM., II, 16, 18, the "Father" was called in the same Oracle «νοητὸν» and «ἐχῶν τὸ νοῦν ἐν ἐστυῶ». Cf. ch. VI, n. 40.

of the intellect", the "subtle flame of the subtle intellect that measures all things" and as the "eye of the soul". "Flower of the intellect" is the name applied in the Oracles to the offshoots of the Paternal Intellect, by means of which He imparts His essence to the noetic orders. To express their reception of this essence the Oracles employ the image of the "plucking" of the "fiery" (viz. noetic) flowers or fruits. This expression is used in the Oracles in the case of Aion and the Forms<sup>300</sup>. It is noteworthy that it also figures in another Oracle treating of the cognition of the Ideas. According to this passage, the souls of those, "who think the works of the Father" (viz. the Ideas), "pluck the soul-nourishing flower of the fiery fruits"<sup>301</sup>.

The "flower of the intellect" with which the highest noetic being must be cognized is, as we have seen, offshoot of that which is to be cognized. This homogeneity appears to be consequent upon the conception that a portion of the Paternal Intellect is commingled with the human soul, endowing it with the faculties of this Intellect from whom it descends<sup>302</sup>. The intellectual substance subsisting in the human soul cognizes the primordial noetic substance because of its organic affinity with it. The cognition of the noetic being is an apprehension of like by like, or, more accurately, of the whole by one of its parts<sup>303</sup>.

The particular organ, which apprehends the noetic beings is variously designated in the Oracles. "Subtle flame of the subtle intellect" is an expression synonymous with "flower of the fire", which derives from a similar image; the Greek word for flower (*ἄνθος*) applying also to the finest qualities of a substance<sup>304</sup>. The attribute "subtle" connotes the imma-

<sup>300</sup> See n. 141, n. 177 (v. 14).

<sup>301</sup> See ch. III, n. 84, 87, 142.

<sup>302</sup> See ch. III, n. 8. Cf. also Mart. CAP., II, 206 (see ch. III, n. 3). "flore in ignis".

<sup>303</sup> The expression *ἄνθος νοῦ* coined by the Chaldæans signifies in Neoplatonic terminology the organ of supra-rational cognition. Cf. the passages quoted by KROLL, 11, 1 and KOCH, 154 ff.

<sup>304</sup> Like "flower" and "fleur", *ἄνθος* signifies the finest quality of an essence. Cf. LUCRETIVS, I, 900, „flammai... flore", compared by the modern commentators with ÆSCH., *Prom.*, 7.. The two poets probably modelled themselves upon

terial nature of the substance <sup>385</sup>, while the apposition "that measures all things" refers to the faculty of thought, inherent in the noetic Fire. Finally, "eye of the soul" is a well-known and widely used simile coined by Plato <sup>386</sup> with a view to expressing the ability of the human intellect to contemplate the ideas.

Besides these figurative expressions applied to the organ of intellectual vision, we encounter in the Oracles a series of kindred hyperbolic designations. These may be likewise found in the writings of the Platonists, from which they were taken over by the Chaldæans. However, the latter differ from the former by the occurrence of bolder flights of mystical fancy. The licence of poetic diction permitted them to express with less restraint the excentricity of their spiritual mood.

One Oracle describes the organ of thought as a "fiery intellect" <sup>387</sup>, because the thinking portion of the human soul derives from the primordial noetic Fire. Another Oracle enjoins: "Let the immortal depth of the soul be opened, strongly spread out all the eyes upwards" <sup>388</sup>. The expression "immortal depth of the soul" is synonymous with the "eye of the soul" closed, according to the teachings of the Platonists, when human Psyche succumbs to bodily temptations <sup>389</sup>. The term "Depth" is applied in the Oracles to noetic space <sup>390</sup>; in our passage it figures as

*Iliad*, IX, 212 *αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πυρὸς ἀνθος ἀνέπτειτο*, according to the variant preferred by Aristarchus; cf. A. JAHN (quoted n. 18), note 77. JULIAN, *Orat.*, IV, 134 A, describes the rays of the sun as *ἀνθος φωτός* and PLOTINUS, VI, 7, 32 the First Being as *ἀνθος κάλλους*. Cf. also MAX. TYR., XIX, 2 n.

<sup>385</sup> The Oracle seems to have imitated Empedocles, 21 B, 84, 5, Diels: *φῶς δ' ἔξω διαθρῶσκον, ὅσον ταναώτερον ἦεν*. See also note 138.

<sup>386</sup> PLATO, *Rep.*, 519 b 3; 533 d 2.

<sup>387</sup> PSELLUS, *Comm.*, 1140 B (KROLL, 54): «*ἐκτείνας πύριον νοῦν*

*ἔργον ἐπ' εὐσεβείης ῥευστόν καὶ σῶμα σαώσεις*».

The second verse will be explained ch. III, n. 80, 152 ff., ch. V, n. 72.

<sup>388</sup> PSELLUS, *Comm.*, 1137 B (KROLL, 51): «*Οἰγνύσθω ψυχῆς βάθος ἀμειροτον, ὄμματα [δὲ] πάντα ἄρδην ἐκπέτασον ἄνω*».. Cf. PROCL., *Exc. Vat.*, 193, 1. As to Psellus' explanation see n. 400.

<sup>389</sup> The metaphor *μύειν τὸ ὄμμα ψυχῆς* is familiar to Philo (as KROLL, 51, 2 points out). See also PROCL., *Th. Pl.*, 7, 27 *et passim*.

<sup>390</sup> See n. 351 (*πατρικὸς βυθός*). The expression *νοητὸν βάθος* is frequently used by Proclus.

a designation of the place in which the "spark" of the divine Intellect "bound up" with the soul's substance subsists<sup>391</sup>. The hyperbolic expression "all eyes" is meant to indicate that the passage refers not to the two bodily organs of vision, but to the "eye of the soul", the "noblest" eye, as it is called in another Oracle<sup>392</sup>. The "spreading out" of this eye "upwards" corresponds to the "stretching out" towards the noetic goal enjoined by the principal Oracle of this group. In another fragment, the glances of this "eye of the soul" are described as "inflexible rays"<sup>393</sup>. The attribute designates the immediate character of this pure vision "upwards"; it marks its difference from the cognition of the sensible objects towards which the human intellect "inclines"<sup>394</sup> in oblique fashion.

Other accounts of the supreme vision are focussed upon a different set of images; they do not describe the apprehension of the spiritual organ of vision, but the soul's ascent towards the noetic goal. Equivalents of these spatial representations are known from the writings of Plato (especially from the seventh and eighth book of the *Republic*, the *Phaedrus* and *Phaedo*) which enable us to explain the variations of Chaldean imagery. The ascent to pure vision is seen in contrast with the lowly condition of the soul ensnared in the body and aspiring upwards to its place of origin, a conception also derived from Plato. The simplest formulation of this idea is to be found in the following Oracle :

"For the divine is not accessible to mortals who think bodily (thoughts), but only to those who hasten naked upwards, towards the height"<sup>395</sup>.

<sup>391</sup> See ch. III, n. 8.

<sup>392</sup> See n. 403.

<sup>393</sup> See n. 403.

<sup>394</sup> See n. 373, v. 2 : « ἦν γὰρ ἐπεγκλίτης σὸν νοῦν ».

<sup>395</sup> PROCL., *Crat.*, 88, 4 (KROLL, 52) :

« Οὐ γὰρ ἐφικτὰ τὰ θεῖα βροτοῖς τοῖς σῶμα νοοῦσι,  
ἀλλ' ὅσοι γυμνήτες ἀνω σπεύδουσι πρὸς ὕψος ».

Proclus quotes γυμνήτες from the Chaldean Oracles, *Alc.*, 433, 16 ; 465, 10 ; without mentioning them *Mal. Subs.*, 222, 25 ; and with reference to the ritual of the mysteries of Eleusis *Th. Pl.*, 7, 16 : γυμνήτας, ὡς ἂν ἐκεῖνοι (sc. ἐν ταῖς τῶν τελετῶν ἀγιωτάταις, see ch. IV, n. 39) φαίεν, τὸν θεὸν μεταλαμβάνειν ».

As the two terms "bodily" and "naked" are antithetical, the latter clearly refers to the state of the soul divested of her attachment to corporeal things. The "height" towards which the soul ought "to hasten", is described in another fragment as her place of origin and as the "light and the rays of the Father"<sup>396</sup>. The reason for the twofold designation of this noetic substance is to be sought in the doctrine of the First Paternal Intellect who causes the ideas "to flash in divisions". It is these ideas who are the "rays of the Father".

The soul ascending to the noetic goal is represented in the Oracles as a charioteer; an image obviously related to the myth in Plato's *Phaedrus* :

"Pull the reins of the Fire with a wholly unadulterated soul"<sup>397</sup>.

The term "Fire" is applied in this passage as in so many others to the noetic substance of the human intellect that subsists in the soul; in the course of the ascent it spreads, as it were, its wings and serves as the soul's vehicle<sup>398</sup>. Accordingly, the power to elevate inherent in the human intellect is described in another Oracle as the "Fire's wing"<sup>399</sup>. This ascent can only succeed, if the soul has been purified from all bodily defilement and has been re-transformed into the "unadulterated" primordial substance<sup>400</sup>. Through this lustration, it becomes endowed,

---

The comparison derives in this instance from PLOTINUS, I, 6; 7; cf. KOCH, 167 f. See also PLATO, *Gorg.*, 524 d 5 : ἐπειδὴν (ψυχῆ) γυμνωθῆ τοῦ σώματος.—For τοῖς σώμα νοοῦσι see ch. v, n. 80; for σπεύδουσι see n. 396 and 403.

<sup>396</sup> PSELLUS, *Comm.*, 1144 D (KROLL, 52) :

«Χρή σε σπεύδειν πρὸς τὸ Φῶς καὶ πρὸς πατὸρ ἀγίας,  
ἐνθεν ἐπέμθη σοι ψυχὴ πολὺν ἐσσαμένη νοῦν».

Concerning the second versè see ch. III, n. 14 and 17. As to σπεύδειν etc. cf. IAMBLL., *Myst.*, II, 6, p. 82, 12 : τοὺς ἐπὶ τὸ πῦρ σπεύδοντας (continued ch. v, n. 5) and n. 403.

<sup>397</sup> PSELLUS, *Comm.*, 1133 C (KROLL, 53) : «Παντόθεν ἀπλάστῳ ψυχῆ πυρὸς ἠνία τεινόν».

<sup>398</sup> Psellus' interpretation *ad loc.*, 1133 D : «Ἠνία» δὲ "τοῦ πυρὸς" τῆς τοιαύτης ψυχῆς τῆς Θεουργικῆς ἐστὶν ἡ ζωῆς εὐλυτος (see ch. III, n. 124) ἐνέργεια, ἀνατρίνουσα τὸν νοῦν τὸν ὑρίνον (see n. 387) εἰς αὐτὸ τὸ Θεῖον Φῶς.

<sup>399</sup> See n. 306. The idea that the soul is winged seems to be alluded to by the verb ἐκπέτατον, quoted n. 388.

<sup>400</sup> PSELLUS, *ad loc.*, explains ἀπλαστος ψυχῆ as τὴν ἀμόρφωτον καὶ ἀδιατύπωτον (correct from the etymological point of view, but not in fact) ἢ τὴν ἀπλουστάτην

in the words of another Oracle, with the "swift mobility" of a vehicle <sup>401</sup>.

The human body clogs the soul as this strives upwards. Its affections lie heavy on her, drag her downwards or hold her fast to the ground. This is the reason of the Oracles' exhortation :

"Being a thinking mortal, thou must curb the soul, that she should not be dashed against the ill-fated earth, but should be saved" <sup>402</sup>.

The vehicle of the soul, weighed-down by the load of corporality, descends towards the earth and is in danger of sinking on to it. It must be curbed, or, in other words, as the following Oracle (already quoted in part) explains, its besetting passions must be held in check :

"Flee swiftly from the earthly passions, flee far from them, thou that possesseth the most noble eye of the soul and the inflexible rays, in order that the oppressive rains of the body be pulled by the pure soul and the ethereal resplendence of the Father" <sup>403</sup>.

(the pure soul is according to the Platonists *ἀπλῆ φύσις*) *καὶ καθαρωτάτην* (correct; cf. the Oracle quoted n. 403, v. 4 : *ἐκ καθαρῆς ψυχῆς*).

Psellus' interpretation of 'παντόθεν' (*ἀπὸ τῆς νοερᾶς δυνάμεως καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς διανοητικῆς καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς δοξαστικῆς*) is founded upon the Neoplatonic doctrine regarding the faculties of the soul; his explanation 1137 C of 'ψυχῆς βάθος' and 'ὄμματα' (see n. 388), which agrees with *Exc. Vat.*, 193, 1 (KROLL, 4), is based upon the same principle.

<sup>401</sup> See ch. III, n. 4.

<sup>402</sup> LYDUS, *Mens.*, I, 11, p. 3, 5 (KROLL, 52) :

«Χρὴ δὲ χαλινῶσαι ψυχὴν βροτὸν ὄντα νοητόν,  
ὄφρα μὴ ἐγκύρωση χθονὶ δυσμόρω, ἀλλὰ σωθῆ».

An allusion *apud* SYNES., *Insomn.*, 1296 D *μέχρις ἐγκύρωση τῷ μέλανι καὶ ἀμφικνεφεὶ χωρῶ* (concerning the two attributes see ch. v, n. 15). *νοητός* is apparently used instead of *νοητικός* (see LIDDELL-SCOTT-JONES, s. v.) Lydus himself indicates the Platonic passage upon which the Oracle is modelled (it is *Phaedo*, 81 c, not *Phaedrus*, 253 ff.; as stated by Wuensch). For *ἐγκύρωση* see, however, *Phaedr.* 246 c 3). As to *σωθῆ* see n. 387.

<sup>403</sup> DIDYMUS, *De trinitate*, III, 21 (MIGNE, P. G., XXXIX, 904 B) :

«Φεῦγε τάχος (χ)θονίων παθέων ἄπο, τηλόσε Φεῦγε,  
ψυχῆς ὄμμα φέριστον ἔχων καὶ ἀκλινέες αὐγὰς,  
σώματος ὡς ἀνέχοιτο μέγα βρῆθοντα χαλινὰ  
ἐκ καθαρῆς ψυχῆς τε καὶ αἰθερίης πατρὸς αἰγλης».

The curbing of the body is brought about by the purification of the soul from the influence of the corporeal affections <sup>404</sup> and by the vision of the ideas mediated "by the ethereal resplendence of the Father" <sup>405</sup>. Here the Platonic image of the Soul's chariot is taken over in its original form. The pure intellect is represented as the driver and the subduer of the horses, symbolizing the passions, which threatens to drag the chariot downwards.

The movement of the cognizer towards the noetic goal is figured in the following two verses of the Oracles by a different image :

"The mortal that has approached the fire, will obtain light from God" <sup>406</sup>.

This fragment may be compared with a verse of the Oracle on Aion transmitted in the *Theosophy* :

The terminology, form and contents of this quotation, which Didymus describes as a pagan oracle (*οἱ ἔξω*, see ch. I, n. 67), prove its Chaldæan origin. As to *Φεύγε*, cf. ch. I, n. 171 and ch. IV, n. 99 (v. 9). The theme of the swift flight derives from PLATO, *Theæt.*, 176 a, 8 : διὸ καὶ πειρᾶσθαι χρὴ ἐνθένδε ἐκείσε (interpreted by the Chaldæans as well as by the Platonists as referring to the world of the Ideas) *Φυγεῖν ὅτι τάχιστα*. In other Oracles, "haste" is expressed by the verb *σπεύδειν*; see n. 395-396. Cf. NORDEN, *Agnostos Theos*, 107, 2; HARDER, *Über Ciceros Somnium Scipionis (Schriften der Königsberger Gelehrten Gesellschaft, VI, 3, 1929)*, p. 121, 1; A. J. FESTUGIÈRE, *Hermetica, Harv. Theol. Rev.*, 1938, p. 8, 41. An allusion to this *locus classicus* is contained in Plotinus' celebrated formula VI, 9, 1 : *Φυγὴ μόνου πρὸς μόνον*; cf. also III, 4, 2 : *διὸ Φεύγειν δεῖ πρὸς τὸ ἄνω*. See also PLATO, *Phaedo*, 65 d 1 (*ἡ τοῦ φιλοσόφου ψυχή*)... *τὸ σῶμα... Φεύγει* and 80 e 4, as well as PHILO, *Leg. All.*, III, 172 : *ὁ τὸν Θεὸν ὁρῶν Φυγὴν τὴν ἀπὸ τῶν παθῶν μελετᾷ*, and *passim*. As to v. 2 a, see n. 391. For v. 2 b, see n. 392. For v. 3 see PLATO, *Phaedr.*, 253 ff.; *Phaedo*, 81 c (quoted n. 402). For v. 4 b see n. 405.

<sup>404</sup> See also n. 400.

<sup>405</sup> The designation of the noetic essence as *αιθερική* (instead of *ἐμπυρική*) *πατρὸς ἀγλή* is due to their being mediated by the solar rays; see n. 407 and ch. III, n. 106.

<sup>406</sup> Iamblichus *ap. Procl.*, *Tim.*, I, 211, 20 (KROLL, 53) regarding the *ἐμπέλασις*, the fourth degree of prayer (see n. 291 c) : *οὕτως γὰρ αὐτὴν καλεῖ τὸ λόγιον*.

«τῷ πυρὶ γὰρ βροτὸς ἐμπελάσας Θεὸθεν φάος ἔξει».

“Whoever touches the ethereal fire of this God, cannot tear his heart away” <sup>407</sup>.

In both passages, “Fire” signifies the noetic substance; this is clearly shown by the sentence following upon the second quotation: “For this fire has no power to burn”. Thus, the terms “approach” and “touch” are in fact equivalent to “reaching out” and “stretching out”.—

These descriptions of the cognition of the noetic objects in the terms of the sensible world seem at first to be figurative accounts of purely spiritual experiences. This view appears to be confirmed by the significance which the Neoplatonists attach to the Chaldæan images: they use them to figure the mystic act of spiritual self-perfection <sup>408</sup>. However, a closer examination of the quoted fragments and the comparison of these with another group of Oracles show that these images drawn from the external world reflect the internal experiences called forth by the theurgical act.

In the last verse we have quoted there is for the first time a clear mention of the particular noetic order, which brings about the vision of the Ideas. This is effected by the god Aion who sends forth all the noetic light spread out over the world. According to a quoted fragment it is from this Chaldæan deity that the “mortal will obtain light”. This light is identical with the highest object of thought, the cognition of which is described in the principle Oracle of this group; a conclusion which is warranted by the following Oracle: “Those who think the works of the Father (*i.e.* the Ideas), ...repose in God (without the article, *i.e.* Aion), inhaling the mighty flames that descend from the Father” <sup>409</sup>. Aion, the “Father-begotten Light”, receives his Fire from the Supreme Being and transmits it to those “who think”, so that they are filled with it. Thus, the general account of the metaphysical act of cognition, *i.e.*

<sup>407</sup> *Theos.*, 13, 10 f. (see ch. 1, n. 46):

« οὐ κεν ἐκείνου

ἀψίμενος πυρὸς αἰθερίου δαίσειέ τις ἦτορ

οὐ γὰρ ἔχει δαίην... »

Concerning *αἰθερίου*, see n. 405.

<sup>408</sup> See Excursus IV, 1; V, 2; VIII C.

<sup>409</sup> See ch. III, n. 84 and 142.



of the ascent towards the noetic light or the approach to it, are intended to elucidate the peculiar nature of the soul's union with the light that proceeds from Aion. As we shall show in the next chapter, this union was the supreme goal of the Theurgists ; it could only be attained through initiation into the sacramental mystery of immortality. Accordingly, the gnoseological expositions and the figurative descriptions that have been quoted bear on spiritual experiences called forth by definite cultural actions, with which they are correlated. For instance, the spatial succession of the degrees of the soul's elevation marked in the mystery by theurgical rites was interpreted in the quoted Oracles as symbolizing the qualitative sequence of an immanently spiritual experience.

The practical identity of the cognition of the noetic objects with the mystery of the elevation of the soul towards the divine light is also proved by the passivity characterizing the organ of thought while the act of cognition takes place. This act is described in the principle Oracle of this group as a "stretching out" of the "eye of the soul" towards the noetic goal accompanied by the intentional suspension of all discursive thinking. This account defines the purposive character of this spiritual act, but not the way in which the perception of the noetic object may be achieved. The Oracle which states that the soul "will obtain light from God" proves that the functions of the organ of thought in the course of the act of vision are of a receptive nature. A fuller account will be found in the Oracles treating of the mystery which are quoted *in extenso* in the following chapter. They describe this act as a union of the soul with the divine light which inclines towards it. The soul absorbs it, is "en-ebriated" by it and "reposes" in it. These and similar images show that the process of "cognition" was not regarded as an autonomous act of apprehension, but as the state of being filled with the divine light. The intellectual concepts express mystical experiences. Human reason is transformed from an instrument of dialectical thinking, into the organ receiving the divine light, through which the noetic object is imparted to the purified soul. As we shall see, this mystical transfiguration of Plato's doctrine of metaphysical cognition conforms to a general tendency characteristic of the Platonism of the period in which the Chaldæan Theurgists lived.

Owing to their assimilation of illumination received in the course of the sacramental mystery with metaphysical vision, the Chaldæans could adopt for their own ends the relevant doctrines of the Platonists. This usurpation was legitimated by their contention that it was the realm of the Ideas which was the object of the vision accorded to them in their mysteries; that realm which Platonic philosophy strives to cognize. Plato compared the illumination accompanying the vision of the Ideas with that experienced by the initiate at the culminating point of the mystery<sup>410</sup>. The Chaldæans, on the other hand, used the image of philosophical vision in order to represent the illumination of their initiate. Their equivocal mode of expression gave the Neoplatonists the possibility to interpret the injunctions of the Oracles concerning ritual ceremonies as figurative expressions of spiritual experiences; they could thus identify the Chaldæan mystery of the ascent of the soul towards the divine light with the Plotinian intellectual process of self-perfection which is independent of all external action. The greater part of their injunctions relating to the accomplishment of the Chaldæan mystery of immortality receive in the texts in which they have come down to us a spiritual interpretation. The discovery of the veritable Chaldæan conceptions, which are veiled by this interpretation, will be one of the main objects of the next chapter, which attempts to re-constitute the theurgical mystery.

---

<sup>410</sup> PLATO, *Conv.*, 209 e 5 f., 210 e 4. *Phaedr.*, 249 c 7, 250 b. Cf. PLUTARCH, *De Iside*, 77, 382 D. *Quæst. Conv.*, VIII, 2; 718 D. CLEMENT ALEX., *Strom.*, V, 11; 71, 2.

## CHAPTER III

### THEURGICAL ELEVATION

Theurgical elevation, known as *ἀναγωγή*<sup>1</sup>, is the chief mystery of the Chaldæan sacramental community<sup>2</sup>, its goal being the immortalization of the soul<sup>3</sup>. In order to reconstitute, as far as possible, the doctrines underlying this initiation and the rites accompanying it, the

<sup>1</sup> On the significance and origin of the term *ἀναγωγή* see Excursus VIII.

<sup>2</sup> That the Chaldæan Oracles treated not only of a mystery science but also of a mystery cult, is suggested by the appellation "Mystes" applied to the Theurgists (see ch. II, n. 359 and PROCL., *Tim.*, III, 271, 24 [KROLL, 55] *κατὰ τὴν (τῶν) Θεῶν αὐτῶν Φήμην, ἣν τοῖς ἐκνυτῶν μύσταις παρέδοσαν*) and expressly stated by PROCL., *Rp.*, I, 128, 29 : *τῶν ἐν ἀπορρήτοις δρωμένων παρὰ τοῖς Θεουργοῖς*.

<sup>3</sup> The following testimonies prove that the immortalization of the soul was the goal of the chief sacrament of the Chaldæans :

(a) PROCL., *Rp.*, I, 152, 10 calls the consecration *τὸν παρὰ τοῖς Θεουργοῖς τῆς ψυχῆς ἀπαθαντισμὸν*; see n. 32.

(b) MARTIANUS CAPELLA, *De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii*, II, 202-207, describes the deification (cf. *ibid.*, 207 "apotheosis") of Philologia, guided by Athanasia, the daughter of Apotheosis (cf. *ibid.*, I, 140), after the pattern of the Chaldæan mystery of immortalization. See J. BIDEZ, *Un faux dieu des oracles Chaldaïques*, *Rev. de philol.*, XXVII, 1903, 79 ff.; IDEM, *Note sur les mystères néo-platoniciens*, *Rev. belge de philol.*, VII, 1928, 1477 ff.; BIDEZ-CUMONT, *Mages hellénisés*, II, 285, n. 2. The details of this description are explained ch. II, n. 39, 40, 43, 117, 274, 350, 381; ch. III, n. 71, 97, 125.

(c) PORPHYR., *De regr. anim.*, p. 32<sup>a</sup>, 2 (see also 28<sup>a</sup>, 20) attacks the Chaldæan dogma that "the soul can be immortalized by the theurgical sacrament" (*purgatione theurgica ... animam ... immortalem ... non posse fieri*). See Excursus II.

(d) The prayer of the Emperor Julian in which he asks for "perfection in theurgy" likewise refers to the promise held out in the Chaldæan mystery of immortality; see n. 141 and ch. v, n. 40.

relevant fragments must be arranged and assorted. This task will be undertaken in the present chapter.

1. *The Vehicle of the Soul.*—Like all ceremonies of this kind, the Chaldæan mystery is preceded by ritual ablutions, intended to cleanse the impure body and soul. These are described by Psellus, who draws upon Proclus, in the following passage :

“The Chaldæan says that we cannot be borne upwards towards god, unless we strengthen the vehicle of the soul by material sacraments. For he believes that the soul is purified by stones, herbs and conjurations and consequently becomes more agile with a view to the ascension”<sup>4</sup>.

The ritual of this purification of the soul will be discussed in the next chapter<sup>5</sup>. The purpose of the “material sacraments” is, according to Psellus, the strengthening of the “vehicle of the soul”. This term designates the organ, with the aid of which the Chaldæans accomplish the theurgical “ascension”.

The theosophists of later antiquity taught different versions of the doctrine of the “vehicle of the soul” (*ὄχημα ψυχῆς*)<sup>6</sup>, a term which an Oracle quoted by the Neoplatonist Hierocles<sup>7</sup> proves to have been

<sup>4</sup> PSELLUS, *Comm.*, 1132 A (cf. BIDEZ, *C. M. A. G.*, VI, 142, 2) ὁ δὲ Χαλδαῖος οὐκ ἄλλως φησὶν ἡμᾶς ἀνάγεσθαι πρὸς Θεόν (see Excursus VIII, B, 4) εἰ μὴ δυνατώσομεν τὸ τῆς ψυχῆς ὄχημα διὰ τῶν ὑλικῶν τελετῶν· οἴεται γὰρ καθαίρεσθαι τὴν ψυχὴν λίθοις καὶ πόαις καὶ ἐπωδαῖς, ὡς εὐτροχον εἶναι πρὸς ἀνάβασιν. Cf. *ibid.*, 1129, 1) τελεστική δὲ ἐπιστήμη ἐστὶν ἡ οἶον τελοῦσα τὴν ψυχὴν διὰ τῆς τῶν ἐνταῦθ' ὑλῶν δυνάμεως; see Excursus X, a. *δυναμόω* figures here as a magical term as in *P. Mag.*, IV, 196; XXII b, 23.—*εὐτροχος* (*vox Homericæ*, used by PLATO, *Tim.*, 37 c, 2, see PROCL., *Tim.*, II, 312, 22 f.) refers to the “vehicle” (*ὄχημα*) of the Chaldæan “elevation”. See also HERMIAS, *ad Plat. Phædr.*, 246 c, 6, p. 131 Ast.

<sup>5</sup> See ch. iv, n. 9 ff.

<sup>6</sup> An excellent account of the history of the doctrine is given by DODDS, *Proclus*, 313 ff., Appendix II “The astral body in Neoplatonism”, in which the Chaldæan Oracles are only mentioned incidentally (318, 6, 320, 2). See also CUMONT, *Rel. Orient.*, 282, 69.

In this case, as in all the others, we shall restrict ourselves to determining the special function of this widespread doctrine in the Chaldæan system and cult.

<sup>7</sup> HIEROCLES, *In Carm. Aur.*, p. 214, 2, Needham (p. 478 b, 20, Mullach) *περὶ τὸ ἀγοσιδὲς ἡμῶν σῶμα, ὃ καὶ «ψυχῆς λεπτὸν ὄχημα» (Penthemimeres) οἱ χρησμοὶ*

adopted by the Chaldæans, together with the substance of the theory which it implies.

The Chaldæan modification of this doctrine was determined by their general view of the nature and the destiny of the human soul. The fragments give us some insight into their beliefs relating to this problem. The most important text bearing on the composition of the human soul reads :

“Having mingled the Spark of the Soul with two like-minded faculties, with Intellect and divine Will (the Father) added to them as a third chaste Eros, the Binder of all things and their sublime guide”<sup>8</sup>.

Consequently, the human soul is composed of a spark of the Cosmic Soul, mingled with portions of the “Paternal Intellect” and of “Will”. Both faculties of the Supreme Being are called “likeminded”, as each of them conforms in its actions to the other<sup>9</sup>. To them Eros is added<sup>10</sup>

καλοῦσιν. The Chaldæan Oracles are designated as *χρησιμοι* by Porphyry and by Damascius; cf. *Excursus I p.* In a preceding passage, Hierocles cites another Chaldæan expression without stating its origin; see n. 66.

KROLL, 47 could not find an indubitably genuine Chaldæan text containing the term *δχημα*. Psellus (see n. 4) is suspect, as Proclus whom he follows could have inserted the expression. The Neoplatonists with the exception of Porphyry (see n. 26) do not invoke the authority of the Chaldæans when treating of the doctrine of *δχημα*.

<sup>8</sup> LYDUS, *Mens.*, I, 11, p. 3, 14 (KROLL, 26) : Τὸ λόγιον ὅλην τὴν ψυχὴν (not the Cosmic Soul, ἡ ὅλη ψυχὴ, but the individual soul as a whole) *τριάδα θεῶν παραδίδωσι. φησι γὰρ ὁ αὐτὸς* (sc. ὁ Χαλδαῖος).

«Ψυχαῖον σπινθήρα δυοὶ κράσας ὁμοιοίαις,  
νῶ καὶ νεύματι θεῶν, ἐφ' οἷς τριτὸν ἀγνὸν ἔρωτα  
συνδετικὸν πάντων ἐπιβήτορα σεμνὸν ἔθηκε».

The subject is ὁ πατήρ. A part of the last last verse is quoted by PROCL., *Alc.*, 372, 31. This fragment was possibly continued by the isolated verse quoted by LYDUS, *Mens.*, II, 8, p. 28, 7 (KROLL, 18)

«τῆσδε γὰρ ἐκ τρᾶδος πᾶν πνεῦμα πατήρ ἐκέρασσε».

<sup>9</sup> See ch. II, n. 49, No. 9. The corrections proposed by KROLL, 26, 1, who replaces *νεύματι* by *πνεύματι*, and by THEILER, *Porphyrios und Augustin (Schriften der Königsberger Gelehrten Gesellschaft, 1933)*, 52, who replaces it by *νόματι*, are consequently unnecessary.

<sup>10</sup> See ch. II, n. 238.

The faculties of the human soul are determined by the specific combination of its noetic constituents. The Spark gives it immortal life<sup>11</sup>, the Intellect the ability to think divine things, Will the decision to descend to earth and to return from there to the realm of the noetic beings<sup>12</sup>; finally Eros, who binds together the parts of the soul, keeps alive the nostalgia for the divine<sup>13</sup>. Accordingly, the various substances of the soul have a natural tendency to return to the place of their supramundane origin.

The human soul descends into the body provided with these spiritual faculties. In the words of an Oracle, she is "sent forth from the Father's Light and rays, after having been clothed with Intellect"<sup>14</sup>; this Intellect is identical with the first constituent of the soul. Will and Eros are not specifically mentioned, because their faculties are included in the divine Intellect; "Will" being merely a mode of divine thought<sup>15</sup> and Eros being "sown" into every noetic order<sup>16</sup>.

The newly created soul descends at the command of the Supreme Being<sup>17</sup>. As in the case of all His volitions this command and its realization are simultaneous<sup>18</sup>:

<sup>11</sup> See ch. II, n. 75.

<sup>12</sup> See n. 17 and 51.

<sup>13</sup> See ch. II, Sect. 10, and ch. V, n. 17.

<sup>14</sup> See ch. II, n. 396. For *ἐννυμαι* see n. 55 and ch. II, n. 233: « Ἐρως... ἐσσίμενος πυρὶ πῦρ συνδέσμιον ». The literary model was *Iliad*, XIV, 282: *ἕρα ἐσσαμένω*.

<sup>15</sup> See ch. II, sect. 3.

<sup>16</sup> See ch. II, n. 232 (v. 2).

<sup>17</sup> PSELLUS, *Hyp.*, 24 (p. 75, 23) τῶν δὲ ἡμετέρων, φασὶ (οἱ Χαλδαῖοι) ψυχῶν αἴτια διττὰ πηγαῖα, ὃ τε πατρικὸς νοῦς καὶ ἡ πηγαία ψυχὴ (i. e. the World-Soul). τὸν μὲν γὰρ πατέρα ἐλκύσαι αὐτήν (sc. τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην ψυχὴν) ἀπ' ἐκείνης (sc. τῆς πηγαίας ψυχῆς) καὶ κελεύσαι προελθεῖν. The two verbs ἐλκύσαι and κελεύσαι seem to be quotations from an Oracle. See also IDEM, *Hyp.*, 26 (p. 75, 31) καὶ προῆλθεν μὲν (ἡ ἀνθρωπίνη ψυχὴ) ἀπὸ τῆς πηγαίας κατὰ βούλησιν πατρὸς, and *Expos.*, 1152 D: καὶ κατασιβάζουσιν δὲ τὴν ψυχὴν... διὰ βούλησιν πατρικῆν (see ch. II, n. 49, No. 4). The three statements of Psellus concord with an Oracle quoted ch. II, n. 396 (cf. *ἐπέμφοθι*).

<sup>18</sup> See ch. II, n. 165.

“The Father thought this, and the mortal was already ensouled”<sup>19</sup>.

The origin, nature and destiny of the human soul are the particular theme of another Chaldæan Oracle. A feature of its literary presentation merits special interest, namely the fact that it is delivered by the souls themselves. Proclus, followed by Psellus, reports that the Chaldæans used to conjure up souls<sup>20</sup>. We may, accordingly, infer that our Oracle contained the answer given by invoked souls to the question as to their existence before they entered the human body and after this event<sup>21</sup>. Two verses of this oracle are extant :

“The Father of men and gods put the Intellect into the Soul, but us into the sluggish body”<sup>22</sup>.

The disembodied souls who pronounce these verses differentiate between themselves and the soul (in the singular); the latter cannot but be the Cosmic Soul<sup>23</sup>. This surmise is borne out by the fact that

<sup>19</sup> PROCL., *Tim.*, III, 316, 9 (KROLL, 46) : *φησι και τὸ λόγιον·  
«ταῦτα πατήρ ἐνόησε, βροτὸς δὲ οἱ ἐψύχωτο».*

<sup>20</sup> See ch. iv, n. 93, 94, 96.

<sup>21</sup> This was one of the subjects regarding which the Theurgists needed metaphysical indoctrination. We do not know whether other fragments of the Oracles concerning this subject (quoted below) likewise derive from an Oracle delivered by the souls themselves.

<sup>22</sup> PROCL., *Tim.*, I, 318, 13 (KROLL, 47) : *τὰ λόγια παραδιδωσιν (τὸν δημιουργόν)· . . τὰς ἡμετέρας γενιῶντα ψυχὰς και εἰς γένεσιν πέμποντα (see n. 14), περιού και ταῦτά φησιν (sc. τὰ λόγια), & και ὁ Τιμαῖος· κατέθετο γάρ*

*νοῦν μὲν ψυχῇ, ἐνὶ σώματι δ' ἀργῶ*

*ἡμέας ἐγκατέθηκεν πατήρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε».*

Cf. *ibid.*, 408, 18 ff., where ὁ *dis ἐπέκεινα*, i. e. the demiurge, must be understood as the subject. Kroll who did not grasp the meaning of the verses proposes to read in the two passages *δήσας* (according to PLATO, *Tim.*, 44 b, 1; see n. 25) instead of *ἡμέας*.

With the help of the prose-paraphrase of Proclus, the beginning of the first verse may be reconstructed as follows : (*ἐνθετο γάρ*) *νοῦν μὲν ψυχῇ*, etc. For *ἐντίθημι* see n. 50.

<sup>23</sup> The term *ψυχῇ*, in the singular, without any determining attribute, is always applied in the Chaldæan Oracles to the World-Soul; cf. ch. II, n. 69, 75, 83 a (v. 2). As the World-Soul is a goddess, the supreme God has the full title *πατήρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε*; see ch. II, n. 37.

the description of that entity given in the Oracle concords with that found in Plato's *Timæus*, according to which God "framed" the Cosmic Intellect within the Cosmic Soul<sup>24</sup>. The Oracle may, accordingly, be understood to formulate the difference between the individual and the Cosmic Soul in the following manner : the former is enclosed by the human body ; the latter is the "body" of the Cosmic Intellect<sup>25</sup>.

The Chaldæans held that when the human soul enters the body she is no longer in the pure original state in which she was created. In the course of her descent from the supramundane region, when she traverses the zones of the ether, of the sun, of the moon and of the air, she is clothed with portions of these four substances<sup>26</sup>. She enters

<sup>24</sup> PLATO, *Tim.*, 30 b, 4 (quoted by KROLL, 47) νοῦν μὲν ἐν ψυχῇ, ψυχὴν δὲ ἐν σώματι συνιστάς τὸ πᾶν συνετεκταίετο.

<sup>25</sup> Also modelled upon PLATO, *Tim.*, 44 a, 8 : ψυχὴ, . . . ὅταν εἰς σῶμα ἐνθεθῆ Ἐνητόν. The same antithesis as in the Oracle is to be found in PLUTARCH, *Quæst. Plat.*, III, 2, 1002 C.; PLOTINUS, II, 9, 7; III, 9, 3; IV, 3, 22; V, 5, 9; IAMBLICHIUS, *ap. STOB.*, *Ecl.*, I, c. 41, s. 40 [908].

<sup>26</sup> PROCL., *Tim.*, III, 234, 26 (KROLL, 47) καὶ δοκοῦσιν (οἱ περὶ Πορφύριον, see DODDS, 318, 5) ἐπεσθαι τοῖς λογίοις ἐν τῇ καθόδῳ τὴν ψυχὴν λέγουσι συλλέγειν αὐτὸ (sc. τὸ ὄχημα τῆς ψυχῆς) λαμβάνουσιν

« αἰθέρος μέρος ἡελίου τε σεληναίης τε καὶ ὄσας ἡέρι συννήχονται »,

concording almost word for word with another fragment already quoted ch. II, n. 287 d :

« αἰθέρος μέρος ἡέλιου τε  
καὶ μῆνης ὄχετων ἠδ' ἡέρος »,

which must refer to the same doctrine (the correction of KROLL, 33 : μένος instead of μέρος, is accordingly superfluous). For συννήχονται cf. the ἡέριοι ῥοαὶ of another Oracle quoted ch. II, n. 287 a.

These layers were regarded by the Neoplatonists, who conformed herein to astrological belief, and by the Gnostics, as provided with faculties, which the soul in turn assumed and put off. It is however improbable that the Chaldæans held this opinion ; for they believed that ether, sun, moon and air were the diverse stages of the soul's descent and ascent, not the planetary spheres. Proclus, who often mentions the doctrine of the planetary vestures, never cites in this connection the Chaldæan Oracles. Our opinion on this point is apparently in contradiction with the testimony of LYDUS, *Mens.*, IV, 22, p. 80, 20 : οἱ Χαλδαῖοι δὲ φασιν τὴν ψυχὴν ἀπλὴν εἶναι καὶ νοερὰν καὶ λογικὴν, προϊῶσαν δὲ ἐκ τῶν νοητῶν ἐπὶ τὸν αἰσθητὸν κόσμον ἀπὸ μὲν τοῦ αἰθέρος προσλαμβάνειν τὸ Ξυμικόν.



the human body provided with these "raiments"; they are the "vehicle of the soul" <sup>27</sup>.

Her entering into the human body marks the beginning of the "soul's drama" which is the principal theme of Chaldæan anthropology <sup>28</sup>. She is ensnared into being the serf of the body, is tempted and tormented by demons, becomes subject to the influence of the stars, is dragged down to the ground by the weight of what is material. The vehicle is in danger of being defiled and of losing its power of flight.

καὶ γὰρ ἐμπύριος ὁ αἰθήρ· ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς σεληνιακῆς σειρᾶς τὸ ἐπιθυμητικόν· καὶ γὰρ ὕγρα τὴν φύσιν ἢ σελήνη. Lydus however seems to quote a Neoplatonic interpretation (originally deriving from Porphyry; cf. PORPH. *ap. PROCL.*, *Tim.*, I, 165, 17 f. and IDEM, *Sententiae*, 29, 2, p. 14, 14 f.) of the Chaldæan doctrine of the descent of the soul. For the Chaldæan Oracles do not adopt the Platonic trichotomy of the soul and insert between the stations of the ether and the moon that of the sun.

<sup>27</sup> The Emperor Julian, as an initiate, only ventures to allude to an analogous mystery doctrine regarding the "safe descent" of the newly created soul upon the "light and tense quality of the divine ray" given by the sun "as a vehicle": *Orat.*, IV, 152 B: τὸ λεπτόν καὶ εὐτόνον τῆς Θείας αἴγης οἶον (!) ὄχημα (see n. 7) τῆς εἰς τὴν γένεσιν ἀσφαλοῦς διδόμενον καθόδου ταῖς ψυχαῖς (see PLATO, *Tim.*, 41 e, 3) ὑμνεῖσθω (in the Oracles? Cf. Excursus I n) τε ἄλλοις ἀξίως καὶ ἀφ' ἡμῶν πιστευέσθω μᾶλλον (see Excursus I o) ἢ δεικνύσθω (term of the mystery cults; see LOBECK, *Aglaoph.*, 48) τὰ δὲ ὅσα γνώριμα (see n. 38) κτλ. Julian's source was probably Iamblichus' commentary on the Chaldæan Oracles; see ch. II, n. 6 and CUMONT, *Etudes syriennes*, 105 f.

Porphyry (and Proclus after him) hold that the souls descending into the bodies are accompanied by good demons who defend them, as they enter the lower aerial sphere, against the attack of the evil spirits dwelling there; see Excursus XI, 2. Julian replaces these demonic companions by solar rays, who assure the "safe" (ἀσφαλοῦς) descent of the soul into the human body. This substitution is due to the belief that the solar rays are guided by angels (cf. JULIAN, *Orat.*, IV, 141 B, 142 A; *Epist. ad Athen.*, 275 B; PROCL., *περὶ τῆς ἱερατικῆς τέχνης*, p. 150, 22 f. ed. Bidez) and that sunlight drives away the evil spirits (see n. 161). The designation of the solar rays as vehicles of the soul is certainly not to be ascribed to the Chaldæans who held that the ὄχημα consist of ethereal, solar, lunar and aerial rays (see n. 26). It probably derives from an adaptation of Chaldæan tradition to the religion of Helios based by Iamblichus upon the Platonic doctrine propagated by the Emperor.

<sup>28</sup> See ch. v, sect. 1-2.

The Oracles warn : "Not to soil the Pneuma" <sup>29</sup>, viz. the vehicle <sup>30</sup>. It is the mission of the Chaldæan theurgists to help the soul in this distress : they show her the way which leads to a deliverance from all earthly affliction and a return to her pure primitive state. The "hylic sacraments" serve to prepare her ascent by purifying the vehicle and removing from it the material particles which had become attached to it. The "elevation" itself constitutes the principal act of the Chaldæan mystery.

2. *The ascent of the soul.*—No continuous account of the theurgical sacrament of immortality has come down to us, but the Neoplatonic texts contain numerous fragments which directly bear on it, as well as numerous allusions to it, and these enable us to form an approximate idea of this magico-mystical initiation.

Syrianus, according to the report of his disciple Proclus, conceived the rites of the sacrifice offered up by the Homeric Achilles at the funeral pile of Patroclus (*Iliad*, XXIII, 192 f.) as an "imitation" of the "soul's immortalization" <sup>31</sup> (*ἀπαθανατισμὸς ψυχῆς*) <sup>32</sup>, performed by the

<sup>29</sup> PSELLUS, *Comm.*, 1137 C (KROLL, 64) :

«μη πνεῦμα μολύνῃς μηδὲ βλάβῃς  
τούπιπέδον».

As to the second part of the warning, see ch. VI, n. 308. SYNESIUS, *Hymn.*, III, 56 : πνεῦμα μολύνει uses the Chaldæan expression.

<sup>30</sup> Concerning the πνεῦμα considered as the envelope of the substance of the soul see ch. II, sect. 8. Its identity with the ὄχημα is proved by the synonymous use of the two terms in Hermetic (J. KROLL, *Lehren des Hermes*, 283 f.) and Neoplatonic (DODDS, *Proclus*, 306 f., 314 f.) texts. It is also suggested by the attribute λεπτόν (see n. 7) used by the Chaldæans to describe the pneumatic quality of the "vehicle".

<sup>31</sup> See Excursus I n.

<sup>32</sup> PROCL., *Rp.*, I, 152, 7 : Εἰ δὲ δεῖ καὶ τῶν ἀπορρητότερον ὑπὸ τοῦ καθηγμένου ἡμῶν (Syriani) τεθεωρημένων κἀν τούτοις ποιήσασθαι μνήμην, ῥητέον, ὅτι πᾶσα ἡ περὶ τὴν πυρὰν ἐκείνην τοῦ Ἀχιλλέως πραγμάτεια (magical operation, see n. 118) μιμεῖται (see n. 31) τὸν παρὰ τοῖς Θεουργοῖς τῆς ψυχῆς ἀπαθανατισμὸν (see n. 3 a), εἰς τὴν χωριστὴν ζωὴν ἀνάγουσα (see Excursus VIII A, 3 b) τὴν τοῦ Πατρόκλου ψυχὴν (continued n. 34 and 127). Homer describes an immortalization of the soul and not of the body : this inference is drawn by Syrianus, Proclus'

Chaldæan theurgists. Thus, he interprets Achilles' invocation to the winds (*ibid.*, v. 194) as proceeding from the wish that the vehicle<sup>33</sup> of Patroclus' soul "should be cleansed and restituted to the order which is native to it, being drawn upwards by the rays of the air, of the moon and of the sun, as one of the (Chaldæan) gods says"<sup>34</sup>. Thus, according to the Chaldæan conception of the mysteries, the rays which bring about the elevation of the soul by drawing her upwards proceed from the same spheres (that of the ether being omitted) as those which the soul had to traverse in the course of its descent.

Syrianus' interpretation presupposes that the Chaldæan theurgists practised an invocation analogous to that addressed by Achilles to the winds. Such an invocation figures in one of the fragments which probably formed the first line of a Chaldæan hymn: "Ether, Sun, Pneuma of the moon, Leaders of the air"<sup>35</sup>. This verse differs in one point

source, from the invocation of the soul of Patroclus in Achilles' prayer; cf. *Iliad*, XXIII, 221: «ψυχὴν κικλήσκων Πατροκλῆος δειλοῖο» (see n. 127). Syrianus composed a hymn in honour of Achilles; cf. ZOSIMUS, IV, 18, 4.

KROLL, 47 only cites the fragment of the Oracles (see n. 34), omitting the crucial introductory sentence. In his edition of Proclus' commentary on Plato's Republic, he refers in the *adnotatio* to the parallel in the magical papyrus of Paris; see below n. 85 and 96. HOFFNER, *O.-Z.*, II, § 78 quotes Proclus' statement, but is unaware of the fact that it alludes to the Chaldæan mystery; see n. 129.

<sup>33</sup> We may leave here out of account the distinction drawn by Syrianus and Proclus between the visible and invisible vehicles. This point is, as DONDS, *Proclus* 320 has remarked, not mentioned in the Chaldæan Oracles. The same distinction is to be found in Psellus' interpretation of the fragment quoted n. 29. See also n. 168 and BIDEZ, *Mélanges Cumont*, 99, 10.

<sup>34</sup> PROCL., *Rp.*, I, 152, 14 (continuing the text quoted n. 32) *ἵνα τὸ . . . ὄχημα . . . καθαρῶς καὶ εἰς τὴν οἰκειὰν ἀποκαταστῆ λήξιν* (see n. 189), *ὑπὸ τῶν ἀερίων καὶ τῶν σεληναίων καὶ τῶν ἡλιακῶν ἀγῶν ἀνελκόμενον, ὡς πού φησὶ τις τῶν Θεῶν* (see Excursus I h).

<sup>35</sup> PROCL., *Tim.*, III, 61, 16 (quoted ch. II, n. 287 b):

«Αἰθήρ, ἡλιε, πνεῦμα σελήνης, ἡέρος ἀγοί».

The vocative *ἡλιε* proves that the verse derives from a ἕμνος κλητικός; see ch. I n. 105. Concerning the Pneuma of the Moon see ch. II, n. 287. The "leaders of the air" are the winds. Cf. «ἡέριοί τε ρυαί» (quoted ch. II, n. 287 a) and PROCL., *Tim.*, III, 187, 29.

from the quotation given by Syrianus; it invokes the ether, besides the three other entities. At a later stage, we shall be able to account for this difference.

The Emperor Julian also mentions the Chaldæan doctrine of the elevation of the soul<sup>36</sup>; the obscurity of his language is due to the awe which makes him shrink from disclosing the mystery. Having spoken of the Iamblichean theory which attributes both the growth of the plants and the rising-up of the souls to the same attraction, physical and psychical, exerted by the solar rays<sup>37</sup>, the Emperor continues :

“If I should touch upon the ineffable mystery concerning the seven-rayed God of Whom the Chaldæan spoke in ecstatic language, as through His agency he (the Chaldæan) caused the souls to ascend, I should utter unknown things, unknown especially to the mob, but known to the blessed theurgists”<sup>38</sup>.

<sup>36</sup> JULIAN, *Orat.*, V, 172 A ff.; see n. 38.

<sup>37</sup> According to REINHARDT, *Kosmos und Sympathie*, 380 f., this psychophysical theory is derived from Posidonius. Cf. also PROCL., *Tim.*, III, 82, 4 ff., quoted ch. II, n. 311 and ch. III, n. 98.

Julian holds that the “uplifting rays of the sun” (172 A : τὰς ἀναγωγούς ἀκτῖς ἀσθλίου; 172 C : ἀναγωγὸν Φύσει τὸ τῶν ἀκτῖνων τοῦ Θεοῦ, sc. Φῶς) “draw and uplift” (ἔλξει καὶ ἀνάξει : the formula is borrowed from PLATO, *Rep.*, 533 d, 2; cf. Excursus VIII C) the “happy souls” of the philosophers (172 B : τὰς εὐτυχεῖς ψυχάς : cf. PLOTINUS, VI, 9, 11, modelled upon PLATO, *Phaedr.*, 250 b, 6) who want to be delivered from the world of generation. This doctrine is described by Julian as a *credo* (πιστευτέον, see Excursus I o). The mode of quotation and the contents prove that it is based upon Chaldæan dogms, platonized by Iamblichus.

<sup>38</sup> JULIAN, *Orat.*, V, 172 D : Εἰ δὲ καὶ τῆς ἀρρήτου μυσταγωγίας (see Excursus I e) ἀψάμην (cf. 173 C : οἱ τῶν ἀρρήτων ἀπτόμενοι). ἦν ὁ Χαλδαῖος (see Excursus I b) περὶ τῶν ἐπάκτινα Θεῶν (see n. 97) ἐβάνχευσεν, ἀνάγων (see Excursus VIII B, 2) δι’ αὐτοῦ τὰς ψυχάς, ἄγνωστα ἐρῶ, καὶ μάλᾳ γε ἄγνωστα τῷ συρφετῷ (PLATO, *Theæt.*, 152 c, 9), Θεουργοῖς δὲ τοῖς μακαρίοις (see n. 141) γνώριμα· διόπερ αὐτὰ σιωπήσω τανῦν (cf. ch. II, n. 316).

According to KROLL, 17, this passage does not derive from the Chaldæan Oracles but from another work of the Theurgists. The metre (ἐπάκτινα Θεῶν scans as a *penthemimeres*) and the use of the word ἐβάνχευσε which indicates the inspired character of revealed poetry (cf. e. g. JULIAN, *Orat.*, IV, 136 B and 149 C. See

The "ineffable mystery" whose secret Julian refuses to reveal is, as we shall see, identical with the "soul's immortalization" referred to by Syrianus. Some precise details as to the ascent spoken of by these two authors may be obtained from Proclus' account of certain "hieratic methods".

Proclus<sup>39</sup> mentions, as one of the arguments in favour of the possibility of separating before death the soul from the body, the teaching of the "Hieratics": "These separate the soul from the body preserving the latter from dissolution, while they confer upon the soul the power to be delivered from the body and to cast off the bonds of nature". Proclus relates further on that these "doctrines of the Hieratics" were set down in the writings of the "theurgists who lived at the time of the Emperor Marcus"; these are none other than Julian the Chaldæan and his son Julian the Theurgist<sup>40</sup>. Proclus continues: "For these accomplish, by means of a certain sacrament, the same thing with him who is initiated into this sacrament"<sup>41</sup>. Accordingly, Proclus states that the "separation of the soul from the body" belonged to the ritual of the

---

also Procl., *Th. Pl.*, 9, 47 f. as to the *ένθεαστικός λόγος* of the Theurgists. The stylistic model was PLATO, *Phaedr.*, 245 a) militate against this hypothesis.

CUMONT, *M. M. M.*, II, 20 (cf. I, 34, 5) and DIETERICH, *Mithrasliturgie*, 90, are mistaken in supposing that the passage refers to the mysteries of Mithra.

<sup>39</sup> PROCL., *Rp.*, II, 119, 5: *και γάρ οι ιερατικοί λόγοι* (see Excursus, IV, 2) *τούτο δρῶσιν* (the verb refers to a mystical rite, see n. 41), *χωρίζοντες από των σωμάτων τας ψυχάς και τοίς μέν σώμασι του μη διαπνεύσθαι* (cf. PLATO, *Phaedo*, 80 c, 4) *φρουράν περιβάλλοντες, ταίς δέ ψυχαίς την απόλυτον των σωμάτων προξενοῦντες ενέργειαν και την άφεσιν των φυσικών δεσμών*. *Ibid.*, I, 13: *ει γάρ και τοίς ιερατικοίς* (masc.) *τούτο δυνατόν, φυλάττειν άτρεπία τά σώματα χωριζόμενων των ψυχών και αυτές* (sc. *τας ψυχάς*) *χωρισθεισας των σωμάτων, etc.*

<sup>40</sup> PROCL., *Rp.*, II, 123, 8: *Τούτο μέν ούν όπερ λέγω, τὸ την ψυχήν εξιέναι τε δύνασθαι του σώματος και αύθις εσιέναι και εμπνοον ποιεῖν όπερ άπελελοιπει, . . . και όσα τοίς επί Μάρκου Θεουργοίς* (see ch. I, n. 3) *έκδέδοται* (see Excursus I n), *πίστιν έναργή πορίζει του λόγου*. See the next note.

<sup>41</sup> PROCL., *Rp.*, II, 123, 13 (continuation of the passage quoted n. 40) *Και γάρ εκείνοι (οί επί Μάρκου Θεουργοί) διά δή τινας τελετήs τὸ αυτό δρῶσιν* (see n. 39) *εις τον τελούμενον· και έστι πᾶν τὸ τοιούτον ούκ ανθρώπινον, αλλά δαιμόνιον τὸ μηχανημα και Θειον*, i. e. only he who possesses an angelic soul is able to accomplish this 'hieratic' operation; see n. 173, 194, 196.

Chaldæan mystery. He confirms the view that this "hieratic" (i. e. theurgical) operation was accomplished by means of a certain consecration which he does not describe for the like reasons as the Emperor Julian.

Iamblichus who refers in his work *On the Mysteries* to the same mystery models himself in his description of the theurgical act on Plotinus' account of the mystic union with the Supreme Being. He says that "the gods" brought about "the union of the theurgists' soul by accustoming them to separate themselves from their bodies, while they were still sojourning in them"<sup>42</sup>. Hereby, he adds, "the soul is saved"<sup>43</sup> : for "when the soul contemplates the blessed visions, she takes in exchange another life . . . and no longer believes that she is a human mortal"<sup>44</sup>. The soul delivered from the body is immortalized by theurgical ascension—Iamblichus' spiritualistic formulas fail to disguise this cardinal Chaldæan dogma.

This mystic ascent of the soul separated from the body is described in several fragments of Oracles which at this stage of our investigation we are able to recognize as accounts of the sacrament of the "immortalization of the soul" :

"Inquire after the ray of the soul, wherefrom she (descended) in a certain order to serve the body (and how) thou, having com-

<sup>42</sup> IAMB., *Myst.*, I, 12, p. 41, 4 : οἱ θεοὶ τὸ φῶς ἐπιλάμπουσιν εὐμενοῖς ὄντες καὶ ἰλεω τοῖς θεουργοῖς, τὰς τε ψυχὰς αὐτῶν εἰς ἑαυτοὺς ἀνακαλούμενοι (see Excursus V, n. 5) καὶ τὴν ἔνωσιν αὐταῖς τὴν πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς χορηγοῦντες, ἐθίζοντες τε αὐτὰς καὶ ἐπὶ ἐν σώματι οὐσας ἀφίστασθαι τῶν σωματίων, ἐπὶ τε τὴν αἰδιον καὶ νοητὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀρχὴν περιάγεσθαι : a Chaldæan doctrine, but the formulation shows the influence of the account of the χωρισμὸς ψυχῆς in PLATO's *Phaedr.*, 67c, d and of the θεὰ τοῦ ὄντος in the *Phaedrus*.

<sup>43</sup> IAMB., *Myst.*, I, 12 (continuation of the passage quoted n. 42) : δῆλον δὲ καὶ ἀπ' αὐτῶν τῶν ἔργων, ὃ νοεῖ φάμεν εἶναι τῆς ψυχῆς σωτήριον. Porphyry, in particular, frequently uses the expression ψυχῆς σωτηρία to designate philosophical self-deliverance. See ZELLER, III, 2<sup>1</sup>, p. 702, 2.

<sup>44</sup> IAMB., *Myst.*, I, 12 (continuation) : ἐν γὰρ τῷ θεωρεῖν τὰ μακάρια θεάματα (PLATO, *Phaedr.*, 247 a, 4, 250 b, 6) ἡ ψυχὴ ἄλλην ζωὴν ἀλλάττεται (PLOTINUS, I, 2, 7 quoted by MARINUS, *Vit. Procl.*, 25) . . . καὶ οὐδ' ἄνθρωπος εἶναι ἠγεῖται (PLOTINUS, VI, 9, 9 *et passim*. See Excursus IV, 1 and 3).

bined the (ritual) act with the holy word, shalt lead her again upwards to her ordered place" <sup>45</sup>.

The Oracle apparently insists upon the correspondence of the descent of the soul to its ascension. Its "ray", *viz.* the soul's spark <sup>46</sup>, descended "in a certain order", namely through the ether, the sun, the moon and the air, into the body of the neophyte who is bidden

<sup>45</sup> PSELLUS, *Comm.*, 1129 C (KROLL, 51) :

« Δίκησι ψυχῆς ὀχετόν, ὅθεν ἐν τινι τάξει  
σώματι Σητεύουσος' (ὑπέβη καὶ πῶς) ἐπὶ τάξιν  
αὐθις ἀναστήσεις, ἱερῶν λόγων ἔργον ἐνώσας ».

The Oracle which has been transmitted in a mutilated form, is paraphrased by PSELLUS, *Comm.*, 1129 D, as follows : ζήτηι τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς ψυχῆς, πῶθεν παρήχθη καὶ ἐδούλευσε σώματι καὶ πῶς ἐν τῆς ταύτην ἀναστησίμενος καὶ ἐγείρας (*ἐγείρας* is an interpretative addition of Proclus, according to PLATO, *Phædr.*, 245 a, 3) διὰ τῶν τελιστικῶν ἔργων ἐπαναγάγη, ὅθεν ἀφικετο. Consequently the reconstruction of the text by Kroll is by and large correct. V. 1 : the MSS. read ἡ τινι τάξει, I correct ἐν τινι τάξει. Psellus did not understand the words corrupted in the transmission and left them out in his paraphrase.—V. 2 : Σητεύουσος (sc. ὁ ὀχετός) (cf. Pselli paraphras. ἐδούλευσε), Σητεύουσος' (sc. ἡ ψυχὴ) corr. Kroll. Psellus (*i. e.* Proclus) interprets the descent as referring to the reincarnation of the soul after its defilement in the course of a previous sojourn in a body, but the Oracles speak of the *πρώτη κάθοδος* of the soul, who is immaculate when sent down by "God's decision" (see n. 17).—Kroll proposes to insert *ὑπέβη*, but *παρήχθη* of the paraphrase requires a verb in the third person.

For *θητεύουσα*, cf. PROCL., *Hp.*, II, 99, 1 (KROLL, 48) καὶ οἱ θεοὶ φασὶν τὴν γένεσιν ἐπιστρεφόμενας (sc. ψυχὰς) Σητεύειν, ἀλλ' « ἀδαμάστω τῶ ἀυχένι » Σητεύουσας ἀνάγεσθαι πάλιν ἐντεῦθεν, καταλιπούσας τὴν γένεσιν. This sentence, a paraphrase of a similar Oracle, employs Chaldaean terminology. The souls who have served the body "without bowing down their necks", *i. e.* without submitting to the power of Matter (cf. PROCL., *Th. Pl.*, 302, 3 : τῆς περὶ τὴν ὕλην Σητείας and *Tim.*, I, 34, 4 : τὸ Σητεύον περὶ τὴν γένεσιν) are able to return to their celestial place of origin. SYNESIUS, *Insomn.*, 5, 1296 B, has apparently these verses in mind when he distinguishes between the soul which hires out her services to the body for a limited period (*ἤσσω*) and the soul which is enslaved to it (*δουλεύει*). The same distinction recurs in his *Hymn.*, III, 527 : ἀντὶ δὲ Σήσσας γενόμεν δούλα.

<sup>46</sup> See n. 83 concerning the "ray of the soul".

to lead the soul's spark back to its noetic place of origin<sup>47</sup>. He prepares himself for this return, which is the goal of the consecration<sup>48</sup>, by means of ritual operations and of "holy words"<sup>49</sup>. Another fragment treats of these "words" :

"The Paternal Intellect does not receive her (*viz.* the soul's) volition, until she have issued forth out of forgetfulness and have spoken the word, having taken in the remembrance of the paternal holy watchword"<sup>50</sup>.

The realization of the soul's wish to return to the place from which she was sent down by the Paternal Intellect<sup>51</sup> is only possible, when she has remembered<sup>52</sup> the magical "watchword" forgotten by her at the moment of entering the body<sup>53</sup>. This "*synthema*" which being

---

<sup>47</sup> ἐν τινι τάξει and ἐπι τάξιν do not refer, as it seems, to one and the same "order". The first expression probably applies to the sequence of stations traversed by the soul in the course of her first descent (see n. 27); the second signifies the celestial order to which she aspires to return. This order is called *μερίς* in the Oracle quoted n. 144, a term which Synesius who transmits the fragment interprets as meaning *τάξις*; see n. 150. The "search" for the "ray of the soul" is accordingly a remembering of its supramundane origin.

<sup>48</sup> The future *ἀναστήσεις* indicates the consequence of the "union" of "word" and "action".

<sup>49</sup> ἔργον (sc. τελεστικόν; see Psellus, quoted n. 80) signifies the magical action (see Excursus X), λόγος the magical prayer.

<sup>50</sup> PSELLUS, *Comm.*, 1148 A (KROLL, 50) :

« Ἄλλ' οὐκ εἰσδέχεται κείνης (sc. τῆς ψυχῆς) τὸ θελεῖν Πατρικὸς Νόος,  
μέχρις ἂν ἐξέλθῃ (sc. ἡ ψυχὴ) λήθῃ καὶ ῥῆμα λαλήσῃ,  
μημίην ἐνθεμένη πατρικοῦ συνθήματος ἀγνοῦ. »

<sup>51</sup> It is the substance of the "divine Will" mixed with the soul (see n. 8 and 17) which incites the soul to "will" this.

<sup>52</sup> This "remembrance" is a consequence of the "search" alluded to in the Oracle quoted n. 45.

<sup>53</sup> *λήθη* (a term which does not figure elsewhere in the Oracles) probably applies to the state of "ignorance" after the fall of the soul into the body described not only by the Neoplatonists (with reference to PLATO, *Phaedr.*, 250 a; *Rep.*, 621 a; cf. PLOTINUS, IV, 3, 26; PORPHYR., *Sent.*, 29, 2, p. 14, 17; *Marc.*, 6, p. 278, 2; *ad Gaurum*, p. 34; IAMBL., *Myst.*, III, 20, p. 148, 13 f.; SYNES., *Insoma.*, 5, 1296 B.; PROCL., *Alc.*, 472, 20; 502, 3; 545, 14; *Parm.*, 670, 16; *Tim.*, 1,



uttered disposes the Supreme Intellect in favour of the soul's wish is identical with the one of the "symbols" (*i. e.* the *voces mysticae*<sup>54</sup>) which this Intellect, according to another Oracle, "has sown throughout the world" and which are assimilated to the "ineffable beauty" of the Ideas<sup>55</sup>. The metaphysical terms used in this Oracle fail to mask a

82, 30), but also by the Gnostics (H. JONAS, *Gnosis und spätantiker Geist*, 113 f.) and Hermetics (J. KROLL, *Lehren des Hermes*, 341, 4; 399). A precise formulation of the difference between the Chaldæan and Platonic notion is to be found in PROCL., *Exc. Vat.*, 195, 16 (KROLL, 50, 3): ἡ φιλοσοφία τὴν τε λήθην καὶ ἀνάμνησιν τῶν αἰδίων λόγων αἰτιᾶται . . . , τὰ δὲ λόγια τῶν πατρικῶν συνθημάτων.

<sup>54</sup> See p. 56.

<sup>55</sup> PROCL., *Crat.*, 21, 1 (KROLL, 50): ἡ τοῦ δημιουργικοῦ νοῦ ἀφομοιωτικὴ ἐνέργεια . . . ἐπιφημίζει πρέποντα ὄνματα ἐκάστοις (*sc.* μέρεσι τοῦ ὅλου κόσμου), περὶ ὧν . . . οἱ Θεουργοὶ διδάσκουσιν καὶ αἱ παρὰ τῶν Θεῶν αὐτῶν φῆμαι (*see* EXCURSUS I h). The Oracle quoted ch. II, n. 256 follows; καὶ ἄλλο λόγιον τοῦτο.

«Σύμβολα γὰρ πατρικὸς νόος ἐσπείρειν κατὰ κόσμον,  
ὅς τὰ νοητὰ νοεῖ καὶ ἄφραστα κάλλη (ἐφ)εῖται.»

Both verses refer to the human soul, as is proved by PSELLUS, *Comm.*, 1141 A: σύμβολα πατρικὸς νόος ἐσπείρει ταῖς ψυχαῖς and PROCL., *Tim.*, I, 211, 1: συμβόλοις ἀρρήτοις τῶν Θεῶν, ἃ τῶν ψυχῶν ὁ πατὴρ ἐνέσπείρειν αὐταῖς. PROCL., *Alc.*, 441, 27: τὰ γὰρ ἀρρητὰ ὀνόματα τῶν Θεῶν ὅλον πεπλήρωκε τὸν κόσμον, ὥσπερ οἱ Θεουργοὶ λέγουσιν, is a paraphrase of the first verse of the distich, on which the statement of PROCL., *Crat.*, 29, 21 (*see* p. 56) is likewise based.

The end of the second verse has been transmitted in a slightly corrupted form: κάλλη εἶται A: καλλεῖται B: καλεῖται F: κάλλη νοεῖται P. Cod. A is the nearest to the archetype, the other copyists have tried to better the text. Before εἶται (*perf. med.* of ἐννυμι, *cf.* the Chaldæan expression «ἐσσάμενος πυρὶ πύρ» and «πολὸ ἐσσαμένη νοῦν», quoted ch. III, n. 14) a syllable has been dropped. I propose to read ἐφείται (*sc.* ἡ ψυχή). Regarding the Paternal Intellect "who thinks the noetic", *see* ch. II, n. 177, v. 1-2. The κάλλη ἄφραστα are those of the νοητόν: this may be proved not only by a reference to Plato and to the Platonists (*cf.* *e. g.* PHILO, *Opif. mund.*, 71: τὰς ιδέας Θεασάμενος, ὑπερβάλλοντα κάλλη), but also by the description of Eros as a faculty of the Paternal Intellect (ch. II, n. 232 f.). Accordingly, the "symbols" are, on the one hand, identical with the thoughts of the Paternal Intellect, on the other, with the potencies of Eros holding together the parts of the universe.

The emendations of Kroll and Ludwich (*ad* PROCL., *Hymn.*, V, 14) need not be considered.

fundamental doctrine of Chaldæan theurgy : the magical formulæ <sup>56</sup> by means of which the theurgist brings about the "unification" with the deity are identical with the thoughts of the Supreme Father disseminated by Him throughout the world with the intention of preserving its harmonious existence <sup>57</sup>. Because of her noetic origin, the human soul has knowledge of these world-ruling "names" <sup>58</sup>, but forgets them after her descent to the realm of matter and remembers them again only after her deliverance from her earthly bondage. Through the utterance of these magical "watchwords" the theurgist gains mastery over the invoked cosmic powers, and aids his soul to be united to the "ineffable beauty" of the supercelestial world.

The use made of these magical words during the theurgical ascent is described in another fragment of the Oracles :

"Having clad thyself with the all-armoured vigour of sounding light and having equipped Intellect and Soul with three-barbed Strength (thou must) cast in the mind the watchword of the manifold Universe and move towards the fiery rays not scatteredly, but collectedly" <sup>59</sup>.

<sup>56</sup> The *σύμβολα* and the *συνθήματα* are identical with the *voces mysticæ* (*ἄρρητα ὀνόματα* ; see ch. I, n. 182), as is proved by the synonymous use of the three terms by Proclus (*Tim.*, I, 211, 1 ; quoted n. 55. Cf. *Crat.*, 29, 21 ff. : *περὶ Θεῶν ὀνομάτων*, designated *ibid.*, 31, 4 as *σύμβολα*, and *ibid.*, l. 6 as *συνθήματα ἄρρητα*. See also *Tim.*, I, 210, 16 ff. and Dodds, *Proclus*, 223) and by the magical papyri (*P. Mag.*, IV, 945 ; VII, 883, etc.). The term *σύμβολον* is also applied to the words or tokens, by which an initiate may be recognized by his fellows (see *DIETHEICU*, *Mithrasliturgie*, 64) ; it signifies in the magical texts either the secret names or rites which have an action upon the evoked god or the attributes by which he is known to the magician ; see HOFFMANN, *O.-Z.*, I, 382 ff.

<sup>57</sup> Cf. the Oracle quoted ch. II, n. 256, which speaks of the "sublime name" of the Iynges.

<sup>58</sup> A conclusion which follows from the identity of *συνθήμα* and *σύμβολον* (see n. 56) in the fragments quoted n. 50 and 55.

<sup>59</sup> *DAM.*, I, 155, 11 (KROLL, 51) :

Ἐσσάμενον πάντευχον ἀκμὴν φωτὸς κελάδοντος  
ἀληθῆ τριγλῶχιν νόον ψυχὴν θ' ὀπλίσαντα  
παντοιάδος σύνθημα βαλεῖν φρενὶ μηδ' ἐπιφοιτᾶν  
ἐμπυροῖσι σποράδην ὀχετοῖσι ἀλλὰ στ.βαρηδόν ,

φρσι... περὶ αὐτῆς (sc. τῆς νοητῆς γνώσεως) ὁ χρησιμωδῶν Θεός. *χρή σε* or *some*

This Oracle refers to two actions which have to be performed before the invocation of the "fiery rays". Both of them render the intellect and the soul of the initiate fit for the principal theurgical act<sup>60</sup>. Accordingly, they belong of their nature to the lustration preceding the mystery<sup>61</sup> and intended, as we have shown<sup>62</sup>, to purify the soul's vehicle or pneuma, soiled by its union with material things. These considerations enable us to gain an approximate idea of the nature and of the origin of the substances "Light" and "Strength" with which the intellect and the soul of the initiate are to be clad or armoured. Moreover, the attributes applied to these substances contain helpful indications: "Sounding Light" alludes to the sound produced by the revolutions of the spheres<sup>63</sup>. Accordingly, the "vigour" of the "sounding Light" may be taken to signify the ether, in which the spheres revolve, and out of whose substance the "raiments" of the soul are made<sup>64</sup>. The nature of "Strength" can likewise be divined with the aid of its attribute. Probably, it is called "three-barbed", because it is composed of three substances<sup>65</sup>. This threefold substance with which the initiate is to be armed, seems to be identical with "Strength bound together by God" by means of which, according to another Oracle,

equivalent may be completed. *στισαρηδόν* or *σποράδην* can, properly speaking, only determine a subject which is in the plural, but the number of the two participles proves that the Oracle addressed a single person. This is also true of the Oracle quoted ch. 1, n. 186.

<sup>60</sup> The Chaldæans believe, as do the Platonists, that the Nous is the thinking part of the soul, which is "clothed" by him; ch. n. 14.

<sup>61</sup> See ch. iv, n. 1 regarding the Chaldæan *προκαθαίρεισις*.

<sup>62</sup> See n. 4 ff.

<sup>63</sup> *ρόϊζος* is the sound caused by the planets; see n. 76 and ch. 1, n. 46 (ad v. 10).

<sup>64</sup> The expression *στοιχειών αιθέρες* used in the fragment quoted ch. II, n. 130 probably applies to the spheric vestures of the soul.

<sup>65</sup> *τριγλώχης* (vox Homericæ, applied to Poseidon's trident) characterizes the function of "Strength" as a magical weapon (cf. the Homeric expression *Θούριδος ἄλκῆς*) and its trichotomy; cf. DAM., II, 62, 29 and 95, 23, who explains *τριγλώχης* as identical with *τριμερής*. See also SYNES., *Hymn.*, I, 66: *μονάς . . . τρικώρυμβον ἔσχεν ἀλκάν* (the passage applies to the Christian Trinity identified with the Chaldæan Triad).

the soul is separated from the body<sup>66</sup>. Apparently, these terms signify the soul's spark<sup>67</sup>; as a "portion of the Father's thought"<sup>68</sup> it has, like all the parts of the noetic essence, a triadic nature. According to the passage of Psellus quoted at the outset of this chapter, the soul's vehicle acquires through the material lustrations the power to ascend<sup>69</sup>. This faculty is represented in the Oracle as the armour put on with a view to the magical "combat"<sup>70</sup>.

Protected by this equipment made out of the substance of the spheres, the initiate utters in his mind<sup>71</sup> the "watchword" of the "manifold Universe" and assails the fiery rays. This magical operation is represented as a warlike action. The raiments formed of the substance of the spheres are supposed to be the defensive armour; the magical words the battle cry<sup>72</sup>; and the fiery rays the position which is to be

<sup>66</sup> HierocL., *In Carm. Aur.*, p. 212, 11, Needham (p. 478 b, 7 ff. Mullach) : Δεῖ οὖν πρὸς . . . κάθαρσιν τοῦ αὐγοειδοῦς ἡμῶν σώματος (the vehicle of the soul) τῆς τῶν ὑλικῶν μολυσμῶν ἀποθέσεως καὶ τῶν ἱερῶν καθαρῶν παραλήψεως καὶ τῆς ἐπεχειρούσης ἡμᾶς πρὸς τὴν ἐντεῦθεν ἀνάπτησιν «Θεοσυνδέτου ἀλκῆς» etc. Further in the text (l. 20) the term Θεοσύνδετος ἀλκή is used as an equivalent of λύσις ψυχῆς. The expression derives from the Oracles, as is proved not only by its metrical form, but also by the Chaldaean term ἀλκή and by the fact that shortly afterwards, when treating of the δχημα ψυχῆς, Hierocles invokes the authority of the Oracles; see n. 7.

<sup>67</sup> Procl., *Rp.*, II, 112, 21 (Kroll, 52) : ψυχὴν ἔχων σώματος ὑπερορῶσιν καὶ πρὸς τὸ ἄνω ἐλέπειν ἐπιτηδεῖαν καὶ «δι' ἑῆς ἀλκῆς», κατὰ τὸ λόγιον, χωριζομένην ἀπὸ τῶν ὑλικῶν ὀργάνων. Cf. *ibid.*, II, 120, 4 : τὴν «δι' ἑῆς ἀλκῆς» εἰς Θεοὺς ἀνάτασιν τῆς τοιαύτης ψυχῆς. Alc., 463, 5 : τῶν φύσεων αἱ μὲν ἐρρωμενέστεραι δι' ἐαυτῶν Θεῶνται τὸ ἀληθές καὶ εἰσιν εἰρετικώτεραι, σωζόμεναι «δι' ἑῆς ἀλκῆς», ὡς φησι τὸ λόγιον. Also in these passages, ἀλκή means the noetic power of the soul delivered from matter. Synes., *Hymn.*, III, 560 and 580 regards ἀλκή as equivalent of σπινθήρ νοῦ. Cf. also n. 114.

<sup>68</sup> See ch. II, n. 75.

<sup>69</sup> See n. 4.

<sup>70</sup> See n. 73.

<sup>71</sup> Martianus Capella, II, 203 (see n. 3 b) also states that the ἄρρητα ὀνόματα of the invocation are spoken *voce mentis*. Both texts refer to "une prière murmurante à voix basse" (Bidez-Cumont, *Mages hell.*, II, 285, n. 3).

<sup>72</sup> The Oracle makes play with the two senses of the word σύνθημα; see n. 56.

stormed. The use of these images is not due to epic license, inspired by the example of Homer : they express the violence inseparable from the magical operation <sup>73</sup>.

The "watchword" of the "manifold Universe" is constituted by the *voces mysticae*, disseminated by the Supreme Intellect throughout the whole world, in order to rule its parts <sup>74</sup>. The magical formula is the sympathetic instrument through which the initiate subjugates the powers of the Cosmos.

The object of the magical assault made with the help of the *voces mysticae* is indicated in another fragment of the Oracles, which is probably extracted from an analogous description. There the initiate is bidden "to rush to the centre of the sounding light" <sup>75</sup>; viz. the sun which is the centre of the spheres, "the heart" of the world of planets <sup>76</sup>. The "fiery rays" of the preceding Oracle must accordingly be the sunbeams. In this connection we may recall the Emperor Julian's enigmatic words concerning the "seven-rayed god", who causes the soul to ascend <sup>77</sup>. This operation is also described in the anapestic Oracle, the Chaldæan origin of which has been demonstrated in the first

<sup>73</sup> Cf. *P. Mag.*, IV, 210 : *μαγικὴν ψυχὴν ἔχων ὀπισθεῖς* and REITZENSTEIN, *Hellenistische Mysterienreligionen*<sup>2</sup>, 187 f. LAMBL., *Myst.*, II, 10, p. 92, 12 calls the theurgists *οἱ ἀληθεῖς ἀθληταὶ περὶ τὸ πῦρ*. The conception of the armour of the pious belongs to another sphere; see M. DIBELIUS, *ad « Ephesians »*, VI, 11.

<sup>74</sup> *παντοιάδος* (neologism, modelled upon *μονάς*. Ruelle and Kroll propose to correct *πᾶν τριάδος*) may be explained with the help of the passages quoted n. 55 and especially of PROCL., *Alc.*, 441, 27, who states according to theurgic doctrine the *ἄρρητα ὀνόματα* fill the whole cosmos. See also PROCL., *Crat.*, 32, 16 : *τὰ (Θεῖα) ὀνόματα διὰ πάντων Φοιτῶν*.

<sup>75</sup> PROCL., *Tim.*, II, 312, 27 (KROLL, 51) :

*« κέντρον ἐπισπέρχων σεαυτὸν φωτὸς κελάδοντος »,*

*φῆσι τις Θεῶν.*

*ἐπισπέρχων* corresponds to *ἐπιφοιτῶν σιβαρηδόν* in the Oracle quoted n. 69. The literary model is *Iliad*, XXIII, 430. For the interpretation of Proclus, see n. 76.

<sup>76</sup> *φῶς κέλαδον* : the spheres; see n. 63. The sun is regarded as the heart of the planets; see ch. II, n. 221 *b, d, e*. Proclus interprets *κέντρον* as referring to the midmost of the three *νοηταὶ τριάδες*; see Excursus VII and ch. II, n. 287.

<sup>77</sup> See n. 38.

chapter <sup>78</sup>; its terse account of the theurgical elevation is pregnant with meaning. Appollo-Helios bids the initiate to hasten on in onslaught, "that I may lift thee up from my heart, while the pure fire is pressed by holy forms". We may accordingly conclude that the utterance of the magical formula effected the contraction of the solar light into consistent rays, which descend towards the earth and lift up the soul of the initiate towards the "heart", that is to say the sun.

Another Oracular verse also refers to the process of unification: "As the rays commingle, the soul accomplishes the work of the imperishable fire" <sup>79</sup>. We learn from this verse that the theurgical operation <sup>80</sup> is concluded by the union of the rays. Apparently, they are said to "commingle" because of the confluence of the solar ray as it is sent down <sup>81</sup> with the soul-substance as it rises up <sup>82</sup>; the

<sup>78</sup> See ch. 1, n. 184 ff.

<sup>79</sup> PROCL., *Rp.*, 1, 178, 17 (KROLL, 55):

«μικνυμένων δ' ὀχετῶν πυρὸς ἀφθίτου ἔργα τελοῦσα» (sc. ἡ ψυχή), κατὰ τὸ λόγιον. For the interpretation of Proclus see n. 82. The stylistic model is *Odyssey*, XXII, 479: «τετέλεστο δὲ ἔργον».

<sup>80</sup> ἔργον is the theurgical sacramental action; besides the fragment quoted n. 49 cf. the Oracle quoted ch. II, n. 387, ἔργον εὐσεβείης (explained by PSELLUS, *Comm.*, 1140 B as *παρὰ Χαλδαίοις αἱ τῶν τελετῶν μέθοδοι*). In a fourth text the priest of the theurgical sacrament is called *πυρὸς ἔργα κυβερνῶν*; see ch. 1, n. 139. The term derives from Greek cultural language; cf. DIETERICH, *Mithrasliturgie*, 125 concerning *ἐργασάμενος* figuring in the "synthema" of the mysteries of Eleusis. *ἱερουργία* is a current term which was applied to all religious acts, more particularly to sacrifices. It is for this reason that Proclus speaks of the *ἱερὰ ἔργα* of the cults. This meaning of ἔργον accounts for the formation of the neologism *θε-ουργός*; see Excursus IV, 1.

<sup>81</sup> The solar rays are called *ἐμπύριοι ὀχετοί* in the Oracle quoted n. 59.

According to MART. CAP., II, 207-208 (see n. 3 b), *Philologia*, by her theurgical invocation causes the milky way to flow downwards and to form the path upon which she is able to approach the palace of Jupiter. This fanciful notion is apparently a contamination of the Chaldæan belief described in the text with a motif derived from Ovid; cf. *Metamorph.*, I, 167: «Est via sublimis, caelo manifesta sereno: Lactea nomen habet, candore notabilis ipso. Hac iter est superis ad magni tecta Tonantis».

<sup>82</sup> Proclus (see n. 79) interprets the "mingling of the rays" as the "union of the filler with the filled"; an expression which correctly describes the origin

latter assumes, after leaving the body, the appearance of a ray<sup>43</sup>.

Three other verses referring to this process describe the state of the soul which has attained her goal<sup>44</sup> :

“They (the souls of the initiates) repose in God, drawing in the vigorous flames that come down from the Father, from which as they come down the soul plucks the soul-nourishing flower of the fiery fruits”.

The souls draw in the fire of the solar rays, like a *pneuma*<sup>45</sup>. No longer violently agitated, they are in a state of blissful immobility. Their “repose in God” is conceived in concrete fashion<sup>46</sup>, the mystic rays enveloping the soul-vehicle.

of these rays. Cf. also SYNES., *Hymn.*, III, 718 f. «νεύσον προγόνω φωτι μιγῆναι».

<sup>43</sup> According to the Oracle quoted n. 45 the soul before she enters the body is called *όχετός*. It assumes a similar form after leaving the human body in the course of the theurgical “elevation”. The analogous expression *αύγή* applied to the soul is current among the Platonists (in account of ΠΛΑΤΟ, *Rep.*, 540 a, 7); cf. also PLUTARCH, *De facie lunae*, 28, 943 D, concerning the purified souls *άκτινι την όψιν έοικυίαι*.

<sup>44</sup> PROCL., *Tim.*, III, 266, 21 (KROLL, 54) : *ώς φησι τὸ λόγιον*.

*έν δέ Θεῷ κείνται πυρσούς έλκουσαι άκμαίους  
έκ πατρόθεν κατίοντας, άφ' ὧν ψυχή κατίοντων  
έμπυρίων δρέπεται καρπῶν ψυχοτρόφον άνθος».*

v. 1 is quoted by OLYMPIODOR, *Phaed.*, 122, 10; *Simpl. Cat.*, p. 337, 18, ed. Kalbfleisch. For v. 3 cf. PROCL., *Tim.*, III, 82, 12.—On the preceding verses see n. 142.

The two last verses have grave formal defects : the repetition of *κατίοντας—κατιόντων* in one and the same verse (see also *ψυχή—ψυχοτρόφον*) and the metaphor *άνθος καρπῶν* which proves that the author completely neglected the original meaning of *άνθος*.

<sup>45</sup> Cf. especially *P. Mag.*, IV, 537 f. : *έλκε από τῶν άκτινων πνεύμα τρις άνασπῶν ὁ δύνασαι, και ὄψη σευτον άνακουφιζόμενον*, and *ibid.*, 627 f. : *έλκε από τού Θεου άπεικων εις σεαυτον τὸ πνεύμα*, and the explanation of DIETHEICH, *Mithrasliturgie*, 96 : “Der Myste atmet den Lichthauch ein... dadurch steigt er auf zu dem Göttlichen... und wird neugeboren”. See below, n. 138.

<sup>46</sup> Iamblichus regards the Chaldaean *κείσθαι έν Θεῷ* as identical with Plotinus' *ένιδρύσθαι έν Θεῷ* (see *Enneads*, IV, 8, 1, quoted by KROLL, 54, 1, and *ibid.*, VI, 9, 11, *οιον στάσις γενόμενος*). Cf. also IAMBL., *Myst.*, V, 26, p. 238, 3, *ή άρρητος ένωσις... τὸ πᾶν κύρος (sc. της εύχης) ένιδρύουσα τοῖς Θεοῖς και τελέως έν αὐτοῖς κείσθαι την ψυχήν ήμῶν παρέχουσα*, and SYNES., *Dio*, 7, 1132 B. See rh. VI, n. 241.

The Chaldæans use numerous images in order to figure the filling of the soul with the fiery ray. Thus, in the last verse of the quoted Oracle, they compare the light with the subtle flower of a fruit<sup>87</sup>. The most adequate expression of their ecstatic experience is to be found in three verses, the lacunae of which can easily be made good :<sup>88</sup>

“The soul of the mortals will press God into herself, having nothing mortal... she is utterly drunk. For she glories in the harmony, beneath which the mortal body subsists”<sup>88</sup>.

In this case, the concreteness of the imagery recalls the most daring conceits of the mysticism of later antiquity<sup>89</sup>; the divine light which fills the soul is said to be swallowed by her. The emphatic language expresses the compulsory character of the act of taking possession<sup>90</sup>.

The reception of the sun-ray effects the final purification of the soul. The divine fire does away with all the “slains” which had defiled her during her sojourn on earth<sup>91</sup>. She recovers the state which was hers

<sup>87</sup> See ch. II, n. 379 f.

<sup>88</sup> PSELLUS, *Comm.*, 1137 A (KROLL, 48) :

«( ἀμπαμένη?) ψυχὴ μερόπων Θεὸν ἀγξει ἐς αὐτήν  
(ἄ) οὐδὲν θνητὸν ἔχουσα (παρ' αὐτῆ) ὅλη μεμέθυσται  
ἀρμονίαν αὐχεῖ γάρ, ὕφ' ἣ πέλε σῶμα βρότειον».

As to the reasons for the mutilated form of this Oracle, see Excursus VI, 1. Kroll who refers to Psellus' paraphrase (see n. 90) proposes to read Θεοῦ ἀγξει πῦρ ἐς ἑαυτήν, but the realistic expression Θεὸν ἀγχειν corresponds to ἐν Θεῷ (not ἐν Θεοῦ πυρι) κείσθαι of the preceding Oracle. My reconstitution of the text is of course hypothetical. Pletho completes Psellus' text as follows : Ψυχὴ (ἡ) μερόπων Θεὸν ἀγξει (ῶς) ἐς ἑαυτήν . . . ὅλη (Θεόθεν) μεμέθυσται.

<sup>89</sup> DIETERICH, *Mithrasliturgie*, in his famous chapter on mystic imagery, leaves out of account the symbolism of the Chaldæan Oracles.

<sup>90</sup> PSELLUS, *Comm.*, 1137 B, correctly explains ἀγξει as meaning τὸ Θεῖον πῦρ ἢ ψυχὴ βιάζεται εἰς ἑαυτήν (τοῦτο γάρ ἐστι τὸ ἀγχειν) διὰ τῆς ἀθανασίας καὶ τῆς καθαρότητος. The soul is sometimes conceived as abiding in God, and sometimes as containing God. These variations are characteristic of the common notion of *unio mystica*. Cf. RONDE, *Psyche*, II, 21, 1; 60, 3 and Dieterich's masterly account (quoted n. 89).

<sup>91</sup> See ch. v, n. 7.



before her descent from her noetic place of origin ; henceforward, "nothing mortal" subsists in her<sup>92</sup>.

The state of the soul during this union is described as ebriety. This metaphor, the history of which has been traced elsewhere<sup>93</sup>, is used in the mystical texts of later antiquity in order to express the supra-intellectual character of the union with the godhead. We have seen that the experience of being filled with fire is represented as the inhalation of a pneuma. In this case, it is figured as the absorption of an intoxicating liquid<sup>94</sup>.

The soul, exalted by the awareness of its own deification "glories in the harmony beneath which the mortal body subsists". This body is composed of the four elements, whose domain ends at the sphere of the moon<sup>95</sup>. The "harmony" which is represented as existing above the sublunar region<sup>96</sup>, can only be that of the astral orders. This interpretation is confirmed by the Emperor Julian's reference to the Chaldæan mystery of the "seven-rayed god" who causes the soul to ascend<sup>97</sup>. As the anapestic Oracle of Apollo proves, this seven-rayed

<sup>92</sup> Cf. Psellus (quoted n. 90) *διὰ τῆς ἀθανασίας καὶ τῆς καθαρότητος*.

<sup>93</sup> Cf. my study *Sobria Ebrietas*, Giessen, 1929. At the time, I had neither knowledge of the verse of the Chaldæan Oracles nor of Baudelaire's "Élévation" : "Envole-toi bien loin de ces miasmes morbides ; / Va te purifier dans l'air supérieur, / Et bois, comme une pure et divine liqueur, / Le feu clair qui remplit les espaces limpides".

<sup>94</sup> PSELLUS, *Comm.*, 1137 B, likewise explains 'μεμέθυσται' by *πληροῦται τῆς κρείττονος ζωῆς καὶ ἐλλάμψεως καὶ οἶον ἐξίσταται ἐαυτῆς*.

<sup>95</sup> Cf. PSELLUS, *Hyp.*, 27 (p. 76, 1) *τὰ τέσσαρα στοιχεῖα, . . . ἐξ ὧν . . . ἐμορφώθη τὸ ἡμέτερον σῶμα*, and *ibid.*, 20 (p. 75, 10) *τὰ δὲ ὑπὸ σελήνην ἐν τοῖς τέτρασι στοιχείοις ὑφέστηκεν*. See also ch. II, n. 202.

<sup>96</sup> This "harmony" cannot be, as KROLL, 48 in conformity with Pythagorean teaching supposes, the union of soul and body, for it is antithetic to Matter, moreover the soul of the initiate leaves the body during the theurgical "elevation". In the *ἀπαθαντισμός* of the Parisian magical treatise (*P. Mag.*, IV, 530 ff.), the magician solemnly announces that his soul which is about to ascend in a solar ray, is leaving the mortal body ; see n. 32.

<sup>97</sup> See n. 38. As for the title *ὁ ἐπτάκτις* (a neologism of the Chaldæans ; see *Excursus III*, 1 a), cf. also PSELLUS, *Script. min.*, p. 262, 19 and 446, 26 (see ch. V, n. 109) and PROCL., *Tim.*, I, 34, 20 : *ἠλίω, παρ' ᾧ καὶ ἡ ἐγκόσμιος Δίκη*

god is identical with Helios-Apollo<sup>98</sup>. According to the Chaldæan doctrine, the sun, as the centre of the planetary world, holds the spheres together with its rays<sup>99</sup>, and thereby watches over the harmonious relationship of the revolving spheres. A fragment of an Oracle states that Apollo "boasts of the harmony of light"<sup>100</sup>. Accordingly the solar ray, which draws the soul upwards, brings about its union with the ruler of the cosmic harmony<sup>101</sup>, the splendour of which is praised by it<sup>102</sup>.

*καὶ ὁ Ἀναγωγεὺς καὶ ὁ Ἐπτάκτις κατὰ τοὺς Θεολόγους.* The "theologians" are both the Orphics and the Chaldæans; cf. Excursus I d. *Δίκη* derives from the former (see KERN, *Orph. Frag.*, 158, 160, 181), *Ἀναγωγεὺς* (see Excursus VIII A, 2) and *Ἐπτάκτις* from the latter. Proclus interprets those epithets of Apollo as designating entities which "assist" that god; an explanation which is based upon Proclus' theological teaching regarding Apollo; cf. *Crat.*, 96, 12-103, 23, *Th. Pl.*, 376 ff. and *Hymn.*, I (*εἰς Ἥλιον*). CUMONT, *M. M. M.*, I, 123 and KROLL, *P. W.*, s. v. JULIANOS, No. 9, p. 16 recall in this connection that the representations of Helios are often provided with seven rays. MART. CAP., II, 204 (see n. 3 b): "Pascit... aliquos dici noctisque septimo radiatos (= *ἐπτάκτις*)" is influenced by Iamblichus; cf. ch. II, n. 266 the passages quoted from Damascius.

<sup>98</sup> See ch. I, n. 184 f. PROCL., *Tim.*, III, 82, 11 (see n. 37): *ὁ ἥλιος... ἀχραντον ἐνδίδωσιν αὐταῖς (ταῖς ψυχαῖς) δύταμιν ἀναγωγὸν καὶ ταῖς ἀκτίσι ταῖς ἑαυτοῦ... πληροὶ τὰς ψυχὰς τῶν «ἐμπυρίων καρπῶν»* (see n. 84) proves likewise that the mystic ray which lifts the soul up is no other than the ray of the sun.

<sup>99</sup> Cf. *Theos.*, 13, 8 (see ch. I, n. 46).

<sup>100</sup> PROCL., *Crat.*, 98, 14 (KROLL, 36): *Ἀπόλλων... «ἁρμονία φωτὸς γαυρούμενος», ὡς φησι τις τῶν Θεουργῶν.* Cf. PROCL., *Hymn.*, I (*εἰς Ἥλιον*) (*Ἥλιος*) «*ὑψόθεν ἁρμονίης ῥύμα πλούσιον ἐξοχετεύων*», and SYNES., *Hymn.*, IX, 36 (*Ἥλιος*) «*σοφὸς ἁρμονίας πατήρ*».

<sup>101</sup> Psellus, in his scholium to the Oracle quoted n. 88, interprets "harmony" as referring to the mutual relationship between the noetic orders and discovers in the Oracle an allusion to the correspondence of the harmony of the noetic macrocosmos and the composition of the microcosmos which is the human body. This explanation is quite arbitrary.

<sup>102</sup> We do not possess a Chaldæan hymn in which the soul exalts her union with the "harmony" of the universe. A reference to such a hymn may be contained in a verse of the Oracles according to which the soul of the theurgist "sings a paean during its elevation"; cf. OLYMPIODOR, *Phaed.*, 244, 20: *διὸ καὶ τὸ λόγιον φησι τὰς ψυχὰς ἀναγομένας τὸν παιᾶνα ἀδειν* and *ibid.*, 205, 26: *μήποτε δὲ κατὰ τὸ λόγιον καὶ αὐτὸς τὸν παῖνα ἄδων βούλεται ἰναδραμῆν εἰς τὰς οἰκείας ἀρχάς*;

3. *The stations of the Fire.*—The texts we have quoted give various explanations of the origin of the sacramental fire. The “fiery rays”, invoked by the theurgist and drawing his soul upwards, are sometimes identified with the sunbeams. But another passage states that the “Flames” which the initiate inhales and in which he reposes are themselves God. According to yet a third passage, those flames come “from the Father”.

That these three definitions are by no means opposed to each other, is a conclusion imposed by the doctrine of the Chaldæans regarding the nature and the activity of the two supreme divine beings in which they believed. The principles of their theology of Light have been examined at length in the last chapter<sup>103</sup>; a short recapitulation will suffice for our present purpose. The “Father”, *viz.* the Primal Fire, is in His transcendence inaccessible to perception; He manifests Himself to men by means of a second divinity, emanating from Him, that is the “Father-begotten Light”, who as an epiphany of the Inconceivable is named the “Self-manifesting” God, or simply “God”. Eternity is one of the attributes of this second god; for this reason, he is designated as “Aion”. One of the functions incumbent upon him is that of transmitting his noetic light and his eternal movement to the sun, which rules and gives light to the planets. Thus, the fire of the sun derives from the god Aion. There is accordingly no incongruity in the fact that the Oracles identify, on the one hand, the mystic solar ray with God, and, on the other, regard it as descending “from the Father”<sup>104</sup>. The same conception underlies, as we have already seen<sup>105</sup> the two Oracle-verses : “The mortal, who approaches the fire, will

cf. KROLL, 54. But here *ἀναγωγή* may apply to the final separation of the soul from the body; cf. PROCL., *Rp.*, I, 121, 19 f. and MAXIMUS TYRIUS, *Dissert.*, IX, 6 f. concerning the *μακαρισμός* of the soul after she has departed from the body.

NORDEN, *Vergilius Aeneis Buch*, VI, p. 296 draws a parallel between the Chaldæan paean and that chanted by the blessed soul in Virgil's Elysium (*Aeneid*, VI, 657). We may however observe that the souls of the theurgists sing the hymn *during* their elevation.

<sup>103</sup> See ch. II, sect. 5.

<sup>104</sup> For *ἐκ πατρόθεν* (equivalent to *πατρόθεν* or *ἐκ πατρός*, modelled upon *Iliad*, VIII, 19, *ἐξ οὐρανόθεν et alibi*) see ch. II, n. 48.

<sup>105</sup> See ch. II, n. 404-406.

obtain light from God" and "Whoever touches His (the god Aion's) ethereal fire, cannot tear his heart away". The light of the sun, with which the initiate is filled derives "from God" (Aion). It is called "ethereal", as it is sent down from the Empyrean, its noetic place of origin, towards the sun, the "heart" of the ethereal world<sup>106</sup>. From the sun, the mystic rays flow down towards the earth and "mingle" with the "rays" of the rising soul of the theurgist; thus, the mystic union is accomplished. As we have already seen, this light is conducted downwards by the three "Rulers of the initiation" set over the noetic, ethereal and terrestrial worlds, whose action is called forth by the magical invocation of the theurgists.

The doctrine of the stations of the primordial light proves that the lofty conceptions of the theurgists were far removed from heliolatry which characterizes many of the religious currents of the time. Aion himself, the mediator between the solar light and the Supreme God, was not the ultimate goal, towards which the Chaldæan theologians aspired. Their religious consciousness was centred in the Supreme 'Father'. It was He who received the desire of the soul for deliverance<sup>107</sup> and "resolved" to manifest himself in the Light of Aion<sup>108</sup>, which He sent to the sun<sup>109</sup>; wherefrom it descended towards the aspirant. Aion and the sun functioned as mere executors of His will, "to whose Nod everything is subservient"<sup>109</sup>. To Him alone the believers must address their prayers<sup>110</sup>; an injunction which Proclus obeyed, when he composed the magnificent prose hymn, inspired by the description of the theurgical elevation given in the Oracles: "Let us become fire, march through fire. We know the agile way of return: the Father leads us, unfolding the ways of the fire"<sup>111</sup>.

---

<sup>106</sup> For this reason, it is not possible to regard *ἐκείνου* in the verse *αὐτὸ κεν ἐκείνου ἀψάμενος πυρὸς αἰθερίου δαίσειέ τις ἦτορ* (quoted ch. II, n. 407) as an attribute of *πυρὸς*. The fire of Aion has an empyrean, not an ethereal quality.

<sup>107</sup> See n. 50.

<sup>108</sup> See ch. I, n. 46, v. 3 f.

<sup>109</sup> See ch. I, n. 67, v. 1.

<sup>110</sup> See ch. I, n. 67, v. 5.

<sup>111</sup> See Excursus IX.

The derivation of the solar fire from the transcendent light accounts for the peculiar properties of the rays, with which the initiate is united during the principal Chaldæan sacrament. Since the Empyrean is constituted by pure Intellect, the rays given forth by it are also of notice nature. Accordingly, the flames with which the initiate is filled effect a spiritual illumination; the union of the soul with this substance being an essentially intellectual process. At this point, magical doctrine is transmuted into mysticism; the theurgical elevation takes on the character of a union of the human spirit with the transcendent world of the supreme Intelligence.

Identifying as they did the magical and the intellectual processes, the Chaldæans were deeply interested in the Platonic description of the contemplation of pure Being. The accounts found in the Oracles of the soul turning away from the world of becoming and of her ascension towards the apprehension of the noetic objects have already been quoted and somewhat summarily interpreted<sup>112</sup>; their Platonic elements will be examined more fully later on<sup>113</sup>. As we have shown, these accounts must be regarded as descriptions of the spiritual experience of "epopteia" in the course of a Chaldæan sacrament of immortality. This view is not contradicted by the statement of one of the Oracles that the ability to cognize God can be acquired without performing the theurgical ritual :

"To some God has granted to obtain knowledge of Light by learning, others he fecundated in their sleep with His Strenght"<sup>114</sup>.

<sup>112</sup> See ch. II, sect. 15.

<sup>113</sup> See ch. VI, sect. 10.

<sup>114</sup> SYNESIUS, *De insomniis*, c. 3, 1288 D (KROLL, 59) : Ἀκουσάτω τῶν ἱερῶν λογίων, ἃ λέγει περὶ διαφόρων ὁδῶν· μετὰ δὲ τὸν ὄλον κατάλογον τῶν οἰκοθεν εἰς ἀναγωγῆν (see Excursus VIII B, 5) ἀφορμῶν, καθ' ὃν ἔξεστι «τὸ ἐνδοθεν σπέρμα αὐξῆσαι»,  
«Τοῖς δέ».

φησι,

«διδακτὸν ἔδωκεν φάους γνώρισμα λαβέσθαι,

τοὺς δὲ καὶ ὑπνώοντας ἐῆς ἐνεκάρπισεν ἀλκῆς».

The Oracle does not describe the various ways of knowing God, but the means of "increasing the internal sperm", which confers the power to "ascend"; τὸ

In both cases mentioned in this Oracle, knowledge of God is not an autonomous act of human thought <sup>115</sup>, but a gracious gift accorded by the deity to some favoured persons : the philosophers and the visionaries <sup>116</sup>, the charismatic inspiration of whom is—tacitly—contrasted by the Chaldæans with their own system which is capable of general application. The “gods themselves” have revealed to them the methods permitting to cognize the deity : they are accordingly able to satisfy both the strivings of the thinkers and the aspiration of the believers. The mysteriosophy of the Chaldæans attains the supreme goal of religion as well as that of philosophy and is to supersede both. It claims to show mankind “the universal way of liberating the soul” <sup>117</sup>.

4. *The death of the body.*—The ascent of the theurgist’s soul was the concluding act of the principal Chaldæan sacrament <sup>118</sup>. Several

*ἐνδοθεν σπέρμα* is accordingly identical with the “spark of the soul”, whose envelope is cleansed by the “hylic sacraments” from terrestrial defilement and thus strengthened for the elevation. The “increase” corresponds to the *δυνάμωσις* of the *όχημα ψυχῆς* (see n. 4), which in the two cases mentioned in the Oracle quoted by Synesius is accomplished by a divine act of grace, not by theurgical ritual ceremonies.

Synesius employs the Chaldæan term in *Dio*, c. 8, 1136 C, when describing the Egyptian hermit Amous, who achieved the vision of God through pure intuition (*λίχα του*) : *τὸ γὰρ ἐνδοθεν πνεῦμα δεινὸς ἀξίησαι καὶ σμικρὸν σπιωθῆρα λόγου παραλαβὼν πυρκαϊᾶν ὕλην ἀνάψαι* (with reference to the *πυρσοί* mentioned in the Oracle quoted n. 84). Cf. also *Hymn.*, III, 596 : «*Σὺ δὲ λάμψον, ἀναξ, ἀνάγωγα φάη, ἄψον δὲ σέλαι καὶ πυρκαϊᾶν, σπέρμα τὸ βαιὼν ἀξίων*».

The Hermetic and Gnostic texts cited by Kroll deal with conceptions foreign to our subject.

<sup>115</sup> The insufficiency of natural philosophy when attempting to conceive the supra-sensible world is pointed out in another Chaldæan Oracle, quoted ch. 1, n. 51 (v. 7).

<sup>116</sup> In the Oracle just quoted *ἀλκή* applies probably to Hecate, the mistress of the dreams ; cf. ch. II, n. 77 and 109. The expression *δι’ ἑῆς ἀλκῆς* quoted n. 67 also refers to the inspiration which is granted to certain privileged persons.

<sup>117</sup> See Excursus II, n. 18.

<sup>118</sup> Cf. «*πυρὸς ἀφροῦτου ἔργα τελοῦσα*» (quoted n. 79) and IAMBLL., *Myst.*, III, 31, p. 179, 8 : *ἡ πρὸς τὸ νοητὸν πῦρ ἀνοδος ὁ δὴ... τέλος... πάσης Θεουργικῆς πραγματείας* (magical operation, see n. 32).

texts prove that it was preceded by another act which signified the death of the mortal body.

Proclus reports that "in the most mystic of all consecrations" the Theurgists bade "to bury the body, with the exception of the head" <sup>119</sup>. Dieterich arrives at the correct conclusion that this interment is meant to represent the death of the person who is initiated <sup>120</sup>. The head is not buried, because the soul which abides in it <sup>121</sup> does not undergo "death". This sacramental act has an additional peculiar feature : it is the initiate who at the bidding of the theurgists buries his own body. This requirement explains the glorification of voluntary death figuring in one of the Chaldæan fragments : "The souls of those who have left their body violently are the purest" <sup>122</sup>. "Violently" here may be taken to refer to the mystic voluntary suicide <sup>123</sup>, as the following passage proves : "Those who thrust out the soul and inhale (sc. the "Flames" ?) are easy to loose" <sup>124</sup>. The choice of an emphatic

---

<sup>119</sup> PROCL., *Th. Pl.*, IV, 9, p. 193, 38 : *καὶ ὁ πάντων ἐστὶ θανάσιμότητον, ὅτι τῶν θεουργῶν θάπτειν τὸ σῶμα κελεύοντων πλὴν τῆς κεφαλῆς ἐν τῇ μυστικωτάτῃ τῶν τελετῶν, ὁ Πλάτων καὶ τοῦτο προείληψεν* (cf. *Phædr.*, 250 c, 4 f.). According to LOBECK, *Aglaophamus*, 115, the ceremony referred to in the text is a Chaldæan ritual, according to DIETERICH, *Mithrasliturgie*, 167 an Orphic-Dionysian or Eleusinian, according to DIELS, *Sibyllinische Blätter*, 70, 1 (who is followed by H. HEPDING, *Attis*, 196, 6) it belongs to the Phrygian *taurobolia*. The terminology proves however that Lobeck's supposition was the right one; see *Excursus I g*. In the same chapter Proclus refers at least four times to the Chaldæan mysteries.

<sup>120</sup> DIETERICH, *Mithrasliturgie*, 167.

<sup>121</sup> The localization of the "reasonable soul" in the head derives from PLATO, *Tim.*, 70 a, who is followed by the later Platonists. Cf. *Doxographi Graeci*, p. 293 a, 15, 391 a, 3, Diels; PHILO, *Spec. Leg.*, IV, 92; PLUTARCH, *Quæst. Plat.*, IX, 1, 3, 1008 A; ALBINUS, p. 172, 20 f.; APULEIUS, *De Plat. dogm.*, I, 13, p. 97, 4, Thomas.

<sup>122</sup> PSELLUS, *Comm.*, 1141 B (KROLL, 61, 3) : «βίη ἐτι σῶμα λιπόντων ψυχαὶ καθαρῶτατα:». Kroll who (like Psellus, see next note) did not recognize the symbolic character of the passage proposes to emend : *κατάρατοι*.

<sup>123</sup> In Psellus' erroneous interpretation this verse exalts the veritable suicide.

<sup>124</sup> PSELLUS, *Comm.*, 1144 C (KROLL, 53) :

«ψυχῆς ἐξωστῆρες ἀνάπνοες εὐλυτοὶ εἰσιν».

Psellus adds the following explanation : *αὶ ἐξωθοῦσαι τὴν ψυχὴν δυνάμεις ἀπὸ τῆς*

expression for the soul's departure from the body is meant to convey that their separation is due to an act of violence. Accordingly, the "disembodiment" of the soul is interpreted by the Chaldæans as a mystic suicide, "*ad instar voluntariae mortis*" (Apuleius referring to the mysteries of Isis), and figured by a symbolic act <sup>125</sup>.

This explanation is confirmed by a more detailed interpretation of the analogy already known to us <sup>126</sup>, which Proclus' master Syrianus traced between the sacrifice offered up by Achilles at Patroclus' funeral pyre and the Chaldæan sacrament of immortality. Syrianus asserts that all the ritual acts performed by the Homeric Achilles at the funeral pyre "imitate" the Chaldæan mystery, "as thereby (by the ritual acts) Patroclus' soul is elevated to a life separated from the body. For this reason, Achilles standing before the funeral pyre is said (in the Homeric narrative) to invoke the winds . . . and to pour out the whole night

---

*σωματικῆς φύσεως καὶ οἶον ἀναπνεῖν αὐτὴν ποιῶσαι ἀπὸ τῶν ἐν σώματι μόχθων. . . εὐλυτοὶ εἰσιν.* He correctly adds *ἀπὸ τῆς σωματικῆς φύσεως το ἐξωστῆρες*, but gives a spiritual interpretation of *ἀναπνεῖν* (*οἶον*; cf. PROCL., *Rp.*, I, 75, 9 f.) which refers to a real action. As to the *nomen agentis ἀνάπνοες* (= *οἱ ἀναπνεύουσιν*), a typical Chaldæan neologism, see Excursus III, 1 b. Psellus takes *ἐξωστῆρες* to be an attribute in the feminine gender; it applies in reality, as proved by *ἀνάπνοες*, to the class of the ecstasies. *εὐλυτος*, "mobile" (sometimes used in the Oracles as an attribute of the Ideas; cf. ch. II, n. 201, 266) signifies in this passage that the purified soul is easily attracted by the ray of the sun; cf. ch. II, n. 398 and Excursus IX, *ad v.* 11.

The deliverance of the soul from the body is also referred to in the promise of another Oracle (quoted ch. II, n. 395) that "only those who hasten naked upwards, towards the heights" attain the divine.

<sup>125</sup> Proclus often identifies the Chaldæan mystery with the doctrine of PLATO'S *Phaedo* as to the voluntary death of the true philosopher. Cf. the analogous interpretation of Attic burial ceremonies as symbolizing mystic knowledge *apud* ΟΛΥΜΠΙΟΔΟΡ., *Phaed.*, 204, 19 f., 243, 13 f. See also PROCL., *Crat.*, 96, 2: *ἡ Περσεφὼνη κέκληται. . . διὰ τὸ χωρίζειν τὰς ψυχὰς τελέως ἐκ τῶν σωμάτων διὰ τῆς πρὸς τὸ ἄνω ἐπιστροφῆς, ὅπερ ἐστὶν εὐτυχέστατος θόνος καὶ θάνατος τοῖς ἀξιουμένοις τούτου*, and MACROBIUS, *Somn. Scip.*, I, 13, 5, 10, 20 (quoting Plotinus).

The apotheosis of *Philologia* described by Martianus Capella (see n. 3 b) is likewise preceded by a death of the body effected through magical formulæ (MART. CAP., II, 140-141).

<sup>126</sup> See n. 32.



libations onto the pyre from the golden bowl,... calling the soul of the unfortunate Patroclus" (*Iliad*, XXIII, 219)<sup>127</sup>.

Syrianus regards Achilles as the prototype of the theurgical officiant and Patroclus as that of the aspirant who is to be initiated into the Chaldæan mystery; in the course of which his soul will be separated "by hieratic rites"<sup>128</sup> from the body and made to ascend. Patroclus laid out upon the pyre "resembles" the initiate who has undergone a symbolic burial<sup>129</sup>, while Achilles represents the officiant of the consecration who calls forth the initiate's soul. Accordingly, the Chaldæan mystery is to be regarded as the "drama" of the death of the body and of the ascension of the soul to eternal life. Our insufficient sources of information do not enable us to distinguish with precision between the various phases of this action, but the attested details give us a clear idea of the internal cohesion and the meaning of the sacramental mystery as a whole; which may be imagined to have taken by and large the following course :

5. *The phases of the sacramental action.*—The neophyte, who by a strictly ascetic mode of life has prepared himself for the principal sacrament und has undergone the prescribed lustrations<sup>130</sup>, is bidden to lie down upon the ground and to cover up his body, but not his head<sup>131</sup>. Sacrifices for the dead are offered up as he lies. This sacramental action represents his bodily death. After this the second act of the

<sup>127</sup> PROCL., *Rp.*, I, 152, 12 (continuing the text quoted n. 32) διὸ καὶ σῆς (ὁ Ἀχιλλεύς) πρὸ τῆς πυρῆς ἐπικαλεῖσθαι λέγεται τοὺς ἀνέμους (*Iliad*, XXIII, 134 f.)... καὶ πάννυχος (see n. 131) ἐπισπένδειν παραδέδοται τῇ πυρῇ « χρυσέου ἐκ κρητῆρος»... « ψυχὴν κικλήσκων Πατροκλήος δειλεῖο» (*Iliad*, XXIII, 219 f.).

<sup>128</sup> PROCL., *Rp.*, I, 153, 12 as regards Achilles' sacrificial rites κατὰ τινὰς ἱερατικούς (see Excursus IV, 2) θεσμούς... ἄπασαν τὴν πραγματείαν ταύτην πραγματεῖσασθαι and *ibid.*, l. 18 f. ἱερῶν μεθόδοις χρώμενος ἐπραξεν.

<sup>129</sup> Hopfner (quoted n. 32) drew this inference from Syrianus' words, but did not perceive that the Neoplatonist alluded to the Chaldæan mystery rites. Cf. the critical remark in Excursus IV, 1.

<sup>130</sup> See ch. IV, n. 1.

<sup>131</sup> πάννυχος (n. 127) seems to allude to a nocturnal operation. See ch. IV, n. 57 and 59 regarding the conjuration of Hecate at night.

consecration begins, the separation of the soul from the body and its elevation leading to the union with the mystic ray. It is a purely spiritual process, but probably symbolized by various mystery rites. First the officiant at the sacrament conjures up the soul of the initiate. Then the initiate invokes with magic formulæ the three "Rulers" of the mystic rays, marches towards the streams of light which begin to shine before him and appear to extend indefinitely upwards, enters the cone of light, inhales its divine substance, and filled with it, has the impression that the solar ray draws up his soul and unites him with the centre of cosmic harmony. If we take account of the fact that this symbolic representation was accompanied by magical operations, invocations, recitals and above all, by numerous luminous visions, we shall perhaps be able to realize the sensual effect produced by the theurgical ritual upon the excited imagination of the neophyte.

The reader who has followed our foregoing investigation will be able to determine for himself the part played by pure hypothesis in our attempt to reconstitute the external course of the principal mystery<sup>132</sup>. We may add that this reconstruction is borne out by the fact that the two main operations of the Chaldæan sacrament, the conjuration of the soul and its elevation, are very similar to the rites familiar from the common magical practices of the epoch.

The external rites of the first act of the mystery, which must be represented as analogous to those performed by the Homeric Achilles, recall the ceremonial of the necromancers<sup>133</sup>. They used to fire a pile of

<sup>132</sup> We are in the dark as to the way in which the summoning of the soul was mimically connected with her elevation. The latter followed immediately upon the former as is proved by Syrianus' interpretation of Homer, according to which the *ἐνταφιασμός* was preceded by the *ἀπαθαντισμός*. The mimic action which followed upon the soul's separation from the body probably resembled the action described in the *ἀπαθαντισμός* of the Parisian magical text. There, the soul is said to leave the body before she has been drawn up by the ray : the magician is supposed to act as if he had a body even after the soul has issued forth. In neither case do we know the symbolic actions which represented this mystic state.

<sup>133</sup> Cf. the detailed description of necromantic methods given by HOPFNER, *O.-Z.*, II, 328 ff. and *P. W.*, s. v. *Nekromantie*. Our description rests in the first place upon HELIODORUS, *Aethiopica*, IV, 14-15 ; see HOPFNER, *O.-Z.*, II, 353.

wood placed near the open grave of a person who had just died; they then proceeded to pour into this grave wine and other libations<sup>134</sup> and to invoke with magic formulae the soul of the departed—which as yet was not at a great distance from the grave<sup>135</sup> and therefore, when invoked, returned for a short time into the body. The Chaldæan initiate had also to act the part of a dead person. In the meantime, his soul, “thrust” by his own force out of the body<sup>136</sup>, was conducted by the officiant towards its goal, and, her purification being accomplished, brought back into her body. Thus, the sacramental action of the first phase of the mystery consisted in a free variation upon a real magical rite, to the ceremonies of which the Chaldæans gave a spiritual interpretation.

The second act, the “elevation” of the soul by means of a solar ray, is largely in accordance with the instructions given for the soul’s ascension heavenwards in the well-known description of the sacrament of immortality found in the great Paris magical papyrus (erroneously called “Mithrasliturgie” by Dieterich)<sup>137</sup>. The soul of the magic adept

<sup>134</sup> Achilles’ sacrificial offerings: sheep, wine, oil and honey, are those current among the necromants; HOFFNER, *op. cit.*, II, 339. This concordance may be accounted for by the affinity existing between the rites of the sacrifices for the dead and those which are intended to induce the *Ἄεροι χθόνιοι* to release the soul of the invoked person (ROHDE, *Psyche*, I, 14-17).

<sup>135</sup> Achilles, too, invokes Patroclus’ soul, for he believes that she is in the neighbourhood of the grave (ROHDE, *Psyche*, I, 17 f.; cf. TERTULIAN, *De anima*, c. 56 and BIDEZ-CUMONT, *Mages hell.*, II, 288, 3). The Homeric expression *ψυχὴν κικλήσκων* (see n. 127) concords with necromantic terminology; cf. *e. g.* AESCHYL., *Pers.*, 620 f. *τὸν τε δαίμονα* (the soul of Darius) . . . *ἀνακλείσθε*. JUSTIN, *Apology*, I, 18, 4, *ψυχῶν ἀνθρώπων κλήσεις*. LUCIAN, *Philopseudes*, 13.

<sup>136</sup> Because of his “voluntary death” the Chaldæan initiate may be ranged in the category of those who have committed suicide. The necromants are much given to practicing their arts upon them, as according to universal belief their souls stay near to grave; HOFFNER, *O.-Z.*, I, 351. This analogy which is clearly referred to in the Oracles (see n. 122-124) may have been expressed in a symbolic way in theurgical ritual.

<sup>137</sup> This concordance was first noted by BOUSSET, *Die Himmelsreisen der Seele*, *Archiv f. Religionswissenschaft*, IV, 1901, followed by DIETERICH, *Mithrasliturgie*, 205, who did not however investigate the problem in detail.

indoctrinated in this text, as well as that of the Chaldæan neophyte, is separated from "perishable human nature" and carried upwards by "the golden flaming glow of the immortal luminary", viz. the sun, whose pneuma she inhales<sup>138</sup>.

Our reconstitution is further corroborated by the fact that the significance of the Chaldæan sacrament concords with that of other contemporary mysteries. The action of the principal theurgical sacrament represents the destiny of the soul of the initiate after his bodily death and is accordingly parallel to the mystery of Isis described by Apuleius and to the sacrament of immortality of the above-mentioned Paris manuscript, in both of which the *δρῆμα μυστικόν* of death, union with God and rebirth is likewise enacted<sup>139</sup>. The fact that these two mysteries are described in texts dating from the epoch in which the Chaldæan sacramental community was founded, is by no means an accident. A theological system of the end of the second century A. D. could not but centre in the aspiration to be delivered from the burden of the body and to ascend into a better world. "The aim of the mysteries is to lead the souls upwards to that goal from which they made their first descent". "Ascent and descent, death and rebirth", the natural "passion" of the soul<sup>140</sup>—those were the objects of all fears and of all hopes.

<sup>138</sup> Cf. *P. Mag.*, IV, 529 ff. : ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἐστὶν μοι ἐφικτὸν θνητὸν γεγῶτα συναν-  
εῖναι ταῖς χρυσοειδέσιν μαρμαρυγαῖς τῆς ἀθανάτου λαμπηδόνας (i. e. the sun)...  
ἐστῆθι, φθαρτὴ βροτῶν φύσις, ... ἔλκε ἀπὸ τῶν ἀκτίων πνεῦμα... καὶ ὄψη  
σεαυτὸν ἀνγκυφίζόμενον, etc.

<sup>139</sup> The fundamental studies of Cumont, Dieterich and Reitzenstein upon this subject are well-known. It may be recalled that the ceremonies of the mystery cults, which enact the death and resurrection of a god (Bacchus, Osiris, Attis, Adonis) are supposed to derive from burial rites.

<sup>140</sup> OLYMPIODOR., *Phaed.*, 121, 9 : ὅτι σκοπὸς τῶν τελετῶν ἐστὶν εἰς τέλος ἀνα-  
γαγεῖν τὰς ψυχὰς ἐκεῖνο, ἀφ' οὗ τὴν πρώτην ἐποίησατο κάθοδον ὡς ἀπ' ἀρχῆς  
(see n. 45). DAM., II, 250, 17 : καὶ γὰρ οἱ ἱερατικοὶ (see Excursus IV, 2) καὶ  
οἱ θεολόγοι ὁμολογοῦσιν, ὡς τὰ αὐτὰ πάσχει τοῖς (ὑποσεληναίοις) θεοῖς ἢ ἡμε-  
τέρῃ ψυχῇ, ἀνιούσα καὶ κατιούσα, ἀποθνήσκουσα καὶ ἀναβιωσκόμενη, καθόσον ἀπὸ  
τῶν τοιούτων (sc. τῶν ὑποσεληναίων) παράγεται θεῶν. The "sublunary gods"  
are the demons whose souls are sent down to earth in order to aid pious

This basic soteriological interest may be discerned in the doctrines of many mysteries; it created, notwithstanding all the differences of the mythical concepts and ritual practices, a type of religious consciousness common to all cults, but especially influential in a newly founded one, which was not bound by hard and fast traditions and could therefore adapt itself more easily to the spirit of the time. For this reason, these aspirations manifest themselves more clearly in the Chaldæan theosophy than in the doctrines of other cults, who would only give way to the religious tendencies of the epoch at the cost of a sometimes violent reinterpretation of their mythical tradition.

6. *The After Life*.—We have concluded for the time being the interpretation of the fragments concerning the Chaldæan "Immortalization of the Soul". We shall now turn our attention to the promises held out in this supreme sacrament.

The neophyte is reborn through initiation to a new superhuman life, the splendor of which was to be fully realised only after the soul's final departure from the body. The Emperor Julian designates the Chaldæan theurgists as "blessed" (*μακάριοι*), and Iamblichus affirms that they acquire through blissful contemplation divine faculties<sup>141</sup>. Two

men and to escort their souls after death; cf. PROCL., *Alc.*, 381, 15; OLYMPIODOR., *Phaed.*, 189, 25; 231, 10, etc.

The main text (quoted by DIETERICH, *Mithrasliturgie*, 163 f.), which deals with the liturgic idea of death and resurrection effected by the mystery (*τελευτῶν = τελειοθῶν*), does not derive from Themistius, as stated by STOBAEUS, *Flor.*, IV, p. 107 M who transmits the passage, but from Plutarch's work "On the Soul" (a fact already pointed out by WYTTENBACH, *Animadversiones in Plutarchi Moralia*, II, 598 ff.; I am quoting from the reprint, Leipzig, 1821. See *Plutarchi Opera*, t. VII, p. 23, ed. Bernardakis). It does not refer to the mysteries of Dionysus, but to those of Eleusis; cf. PINDAR, *Fragm.*, 137, ed. Schroeder (quoted by DIETERICH, *op. cit.*, 169).

<sup>141</sup> See n. 38. The object of the prayer of Emperor Julian for "perfection in theurgy" (*Orat.*, V, 180 B : *ἐν Θεουργίᾳ τελειότητα*) is the fulfilment of the promises held out in the Chaldæan mysteries; see note 2 d. As known the initiates were called *τέλειοι*. For Iamblichus see n. 44 and Excursus IV.

fragments of the Chaldæan Oracles explain these hypertrophic descriptions. The first reads :

“The souls who have known the works of the Father (the Ideas), escape from fate’s reckless wing, subject to destiny”<sup>142</sup>, and the other :

“The theurgists are not counted into the herd of men subject to destiny”<sup>143</sup>.

<sup>142</sup> PROCL., *Tim.*, III, 266, 18 (KROLL, 54) «νοήσασαι» (sc. *αι ψυχαι*) «τα έργα τοῦ πατρὸς» (i. e. the Ideas, see ch. II, n. 231) : «μοίρης † εἰμαρμένης † τὸ πτερόν φεύγουσιν ἀναιδες», ὡς φησι τὸ λόγιον (the continuation is quoted above n. 84). IDEM, *Prov.*, 164, 26 : “Quicumque autem patris opera intelligentes reverendi fiunt, sortis fatalem alam effugiunt”. The Greek text should be emended according to Kroll’s suggestion *μοίρης εἰμαρτόν τὸ πτερόν*, etc. The attribute *ἀναιδής*, here signifying “reckless” (cf. e. g. PIND., *Olymp.*, X, 124 : ἀναϊδέα... θάνατον), was either omitted in William of Morbecca’s translation or left out in the second passage by Proclus himself.

The preceding verse may perhaps have read in the original : «ὄσσοι δ’ αὖ πατρὸς ἔργα νοήσασαι εὐλαβέονται». Its continuation was modelled upon Homer’s well-known verse *Iliad*, VI, 488 : «μοῖραν δ’ οὐ τινα φημι πεφυγμένον ἔμμεναι ἀνδρῶν» (*μοῖρα* meaning, as *schol. ad HOMER, Iliad*, VIII, 69 explains, τὸ τῆς μίρας ἀπαράβατον ὡς τὸ δεῖν θνητὸν ὄντα ἀποθανεῖν).

<sup>143</sup> LYDUS, *Mens.*, II, 10, p. 31, 16 (KROLL, 59) : τὰς ἱποκαθισταμένας (see n. 189) ψυχὰς ὑπερβαίνειν τὴν εἰμαρμένην φησι τὸ λόγιον, «οὐ γὰρ ὕφ’ εἰμαρτὴν ἀγέλην πίπτουσι θεουργοί». This verse has been regarded as attesting a doctrine of astral fatalism; see CUMONT, *Fatalisme astral*, etc., *Rev. d’hist. et de litt. rel.*, N. S., III, 1912, 540, 5; IDEM, *Rel. Orient.*, 291, 73; BIDEZ-CUMONT, *Mages hell.*, II, 244, 3; J. KROLL, *Lehren des Hermes*, 383, 1; HOPFNER, *O.-Z.*, II, 107; H. JONAS, *Gnosis und spätantiker Geist*, I, 204, 1. But this interpretation is put out of court by the fact that the Chaldæan theurgists rejected the conception of astral providence; cf. the Oracle quoted ch. IV, n. 99, v. 6. This erroneous explanation is due (a) to a mistake in the translation of *πίπτω ὑπό* which in this case does not signify “to fall under the influence”, but “to belong to a class” and (b) to an arbitrary identification of the Chaldæan term *ἀγέλη* with the astral spheres called by Nicomachus of Gerasa (who follows a Babylonian tradition) *ἀγέλαι* (or *ἀγγελοί*); see BIDEZ-CUMONT, *Mages hell.*, II, 283. The term *εἰμαρτὴ ἀγέλη* applies in the Oracle not to the stars, but, as is proved by PROCL., *Prov.*, 164, 11 “*compolitizari* [= *συμπολιτεύεσθαι*] *fatalibus gregibus*”, to the human race subjected to generation and corruption. The term has this meaning also in the fragment of the Oracles quoted ch. I, n. 171.

The neophyte who has achieved the supreme initiation of the sacrament (identified with the contemplation of the Ideas) is exempt from the law of necessity ruling mankind, for his soul has gained immortality.

Several fragments of the Oracles speak of the lot of the initiated after death; the most important of these reads :

“Thou wilt not leave behind the dung of matter for the precipice, but the image also has its portion in circumsplendent place”<sup>144</sup>.

In order to understand these enigmatical verses, we must interpret correctly the terms (a) “precipice” (*κρημνός*), (b) “image” (*εἶδωλον*), and (c) “circumsplendent place” (*ἀμφιφάης τόπος*).

a) In another connection the term “precipice” is applied in the Oracles to Hades “who joys in images”<sup>145</sup>. Consequently, the Oracle quoted above promises the neophyte that his body (contemptuously called the “dung of matter”<sup>146</sup>) shall not be given over to Tartarus.

“ οὐδὲ τὸ τῆς ὕλης σκύβαλον κρημνῶ καταλείψεις,  
ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰδώλω μερὶς εἰς τόπον ἀμφιφάοντα ».

The use of *eis* instead of *én* is current in later Greek. SYNESIUS, *Insomn.*, c. 5, 1297 B transmits both verses together. PSELLUS, *Comm.*, 1125 A quotes the first verse in the version *μηδὲ τὸ* etc. *καταλείψης* and 1124 A the second verse as an independent sentence : *ἔστι γὰρ εἰδώλω* etc. (cf. Excursus VI, 1 a). *Script. min.*, p. 447, 7 he paraphrases the Oracle : *οὗτοι* (sc. *οἱ Χαλδαῖοι*) . . . *παραγγέλουσί τε τοῖς ἀναγομένοις μηδὲ τῶ τῆς γῆς* (he interprets *Comm.*, 1125 B, C *κρημνός* as referring to the *περίγειος τόπος*) *κρημνῶ σκύβαλον καταλείπειν*. Synesius who quotes the first verse in the following version : *οὐ τῶ τῆς ὕλης κρημνῶ σκύβαλον καταλείψεις* follows the same tradition as Psellus; see ch. v, n. 142 as to the dogmatic reasons for this variant. The text was reconstituted by KROLL, 61.

The Emperor Julian several times applies to Matter viz. Earth the epithet *σκύβαλον*; cf. *Orat.*, V, 170 D, 179 D, and invoking the authority of the Oracles, 175 B : *ἔσχατον μὲν γὰρ τῶν ὄντων ἡ γῆ . . . καὶ διὰ τῶν λογίων οἱ θεοὶ «σκύβαλον» αὐτὸ πολλαχοῦ καλοῦσι καὶ φεύγειν ἐντεῦθεν πολλαχοῦ παρακελεύονται*. See also LUD., *Mens.*, I, 12, p. 6, 13 : *τὸ τοῦ παντὸς ὑλικοῦ «σκύβαλον» κατὰ τὸ λόγιον*.

<sup>145</sup> See ch. v, n. 146.

<sup>146</sup> See ch. v, n. 70-71.

This promise bears on the judgment after death. Another fragment describes the tortures of the sinners in Hades<sup>147</sup>; accordingly, we may infer that the Chaldæans were familiar with the doctrine of retributive justice in after-life. The Chaldæan initiate was not doomed to dwell in the place of the sinners: he was destined for the abode of the pious<sup>148</sup>.

b) The Chaldæan gods promised the initiated that, contrary to the ancient Greek belief<sup>149</sup>, his phantom-image (*εἰδωλον*) would not be relegated to Hades, but would subsist in a celestial place<sup>150</sup>. This conception postulating the immortality of the "image" seems to be contradicted by other verses of the Chaldæan Oracles, which appear to refer to a corporeal after-life of the initiate after his bodily death. The Chaldæan gods affirm to the theurgist purified by the sacrament of the mystery that "the perishable envelope of bitter matter shall be saved"<sup>151</sup>; on another occasion they hold out to him the promise of the "salvation" of his "fluid body"<sup>152</sup>. If we regard this salvation" bearing on after-life, we must conclude that the Chaldæan initiate had

<sup>147</sup> See ch. v, n. 151 ff.

<sup>148</sup> The distinction between *χῶρος ἀσεβῶν* and *εὐσεβῶν* which is characteristic for the conception of After Life current in late Antiquity (see RORDE, *Psyche*, II, 381 f.) may be discerned in the distich quoted n. 144. From the formal point of view, this distich shows an alteration of the usual scheme of thought found in the sepulchral epigrams. Cf. the epitaph on Plato attributed to Speusippus (*Anthol. Lyr. Græc.*, vol. I, No. XXXXIII, Diehl):

«σῶμα μὲν ἐν κόλποις κατέχει τὸδε γαῖα Πλάτωνος.

ψυχὴ δ' ἰσόθεος τάξιν ἔχει μακάρων». Cf. n. 170.

<sup>149</sup> RORDE, *Kleine Schriften*, II, 281, 1; WILANOWITZ, *Glaube der Hellenen*, I, 371 f.

<sup>150</sup> *μερις* is in this passage synonymous with *τάξις*. Cf. *Theos.*, 13, 16 and Porphyry's scholium (quoted ch. I, n. 31). See also the epigram on Plato quoted in n. 148. SYNESIUS, *Insomn.*, 5, 1297 C, holds that *μερις* applies to the stars to which the souls of the departed return. This is a Platonic doctrine; cf. n. 191.

<sup>151</sup> JULIAN, *Orat.*, V, 178 C (KROLL, 61): «σώζεσθαι γὰρ σφισι καὶ τὸ πικρᾶς ὕλης περιβλήμα βρότειον» οἱ θεοὶ τοῖς ὑπερέργοις παρακελευόμενοι τῶν θεουργῶν καταπαγγέλλονται. "Bitter matter" is the dregs of the elements, while the "mortal envelope" is the body. See ch. v, n. 70.

<sup>152</sup> See ch. II, n. 387.



the privilege of rising up to eternal life, without undergoing the separation of the soul from the body. Accordingly, we should have to suppose that they were promised a continuance of corporeal life after death. That is the contention of Kroll, who derives the Chaldæan dogma of immortality from Jewish belief in corporeal resurrection and indicates in this connection other points of Chaldæan theology—for instance the designation of the Elysium as Paradise<sup>153</sup>—which appear to mark the influence of Jewish eschatology<sup>154</sup>. However, this interpretation of the Chaldæan doctrine of “salvation” is open to weighty objections. First of all, it may be argued that it is difficult to reconcile such a promise for life after death with a sacrament aiming at the immortalization of the *soul* and preceded by the symbolic burial of the *body*. We may also remark that the belief in corporeal life after death is at variance with the dualistic anthropology of the Chaldæans, according to which the human body is in this life a perpetual source of temptation; it is called “the perishable envelope of the bitter matter” and even “the root of all evil”<sup>155</sup>. It is only the temporary residence of the soul, who yearns to abandon it. What part could it play in the existence of the blessed, who do not experience sensual pleasures, but spiritual joy? For these reasons, among others<sup>156</sup>, it seems preferable not to interpret the “salvation of the body” as bearing on after-life.

An explanation conforming to the anthropology of the Chaldæans is suggested by a correct interpretation of their view on the “salvation of the body”. This notion is, according to non-Jewish and non-Christian

<sup>153</sup> See n. 178. We may also recall Chaldæan angelology (see ch. I, n. 32 ff.).

<sup>154</sup> KROLL, 61.; see also *ibid.*, 46, 2 and 70. After him HOFFNER, *O.-Z.*, I, 377. But this supposed doctrine would seem to have greater affinity with the belief in the translation of just men into paradise.

<sup>155</sup> See ch. v, n. 75.

<sup>156</sup> How is it possible that the body continues to subsist in the purely spiritual Empyrean? How could the Neoplatonists accept a theology which teaches the resurrection of the body (cf. the objections of PLUTARCH, *Vit. Romuli*, 28 and CICERO, *De rep.*, III, 40)? We may note that Porphyry attacks the Jewish-Christian dogm in a passage *De regressu* (p. 41\*, 35 f.) treating of the Chaldæan Oracles.

usage, a medical, not an eschatological term<sup>157</sup>. In accordance with that usage, the Neoplatonists, who quote the relevant Oracular fragments, apply this salvation to the corporal state of the initiated<sup>158</sup>. This explanation is in harmony with the Chaldæan beliefs concerning the causes of human disease. They hold, in common with the majority of their contemporaries, that many illnesses are occasioned by evil demons who possess themselves of the bodies of men and work their physical ruin<sup>159</sup>. The apotropaic rites, by which the Chaldæans tried to protect themselves against the demonic agents of disease, will be studied later on<sup>160</sup>. Here it may suffice to remark that the Chaldæan Oracles dealing with the "salvation of the body" do not apply to corporeal resurrection, but to the immunity against demonic infection with disease.

The "salvation of the body" from perdition at the hands of the demons constituted the immediate reward of the Chaldæan initiate<sup>161</sup>.

<sup>157</sup> See the epigram of Plato (quoted by OLYMPIODORUS, *Vita Plat.*, p. 195, Hermann) : Apollo created Asclepius and Plato, τὸν μὲν ἵνα ψυχὴν, τὸν δ' ἵνα σῶμα σοῖοι. SYNESIUS, *Hymn*, IV, 275 f. : σῶμα δὲ σώζοι καθ' ἅρῳ νούσων. Other parallels are to be found in O. WEINREICH, *Antike Heilungswunder (Religionsgesch. Versuche und Vorarbeiten, VIII, 1, 1909)*; cf. p. 32, 1 on Asclepius' (ὁ Σωτήρ) right hand as σωτήριον σύμβολον, and p. 117 ff. (ἐσώθη = ἰάθη). KAIBEL, *Epigramm. Graec.*, No. 1026, v. 7; DITTENBERGER, *Sylloge*, II<sup>2</sup>, No. 807, l. 12; ARISTIDES, *Orat.*, vol. II, p. 357, § 17 f., ed Keil. The Greek translator of the *Monumentum Ancyranum*, c. 9, renders *pro valetudine mea* by ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐμῆς σωτηρίας. Cf. PHIL., *Legatio ad Gai.*, 355.

As to «ρευστὸν σῶμα σαώσεις» (see n. 152), see MESOMEDES, *eis τὴν φύσιν Πυθαγόρου* (WILAMOWITZ, *Griechische Verskunst*, 596), v. 22.

<sup>158</sup> PSELLUS, *Comm.*, 1140 B, explains the Chaldæan expression «σῶμα σαώσεις»: ποιήσεις . . . καὶ τὸ σῶμα σου ὑγιεινότερον, and the emperor Julian (see n. 151) also regards it as referring to the health of the body. See WEINREICH, *op. cit.* p. 32, 1.

<sup>159</sup> See G. KITTEL, *Wörterbuch zum N. T.*, s. v. δζίμων.

<sup>160</sup> See ch. v, n. 122 and 128 ff.

<sup>161</sup> Cf. *Corp. Herm.*, XV (XVI), 16 (REITZENSTEIN, *Poimandres*, 353) : (ὁ)τῷ οὖν ἐν τῷ λογικῷ ἀκτῖς ἐπιλάμπει διὰ τοῦ ἡλίου, τούτων καταργοῦνται οἱ δαιμονες. PROCL., *Hymn.*, I, 27 and *Th. Pl.*, 379, 1 ff. LACTANTIUS, *Inst. Div.*, II, 15 : "Denique affirmat eos Hermes, qui cognoverint deum, non tantum ab incurisibus daemonum tutos esse", etc.

After death he was to receive, according to the promise held out to him, a further favour. The affirmation of the Oracle that the initiated will not "leave behind" his body to Hades means that the privileged body will be exempt from judgment; and also that it will not be consigned to the Place of Punishment<sup>162</sup>. We may accordingly infer that the body of the deceased was saved from the grasp of the demons by vanishing from their domain. What was the manner of this disappearance? We have already shown that the initiated must not be represented as being "translated" together with his body. A more probable interpretation is suggested by a statement of Olympiodorus concerning the "supernatural death" of the theurgists. According to him the theurgists died "in a divine manner" by "dissolving" of their own will the elements of their body<sup>163</sup>. The notion that death signifies the return of the corporal substance to the four elements of which it is composed is frequently found in the religious literature of later Hellenism<sup>164</sup>; men chosen by God are represented as dying in this manner. Thus, Philo describes the decease of Moses as a dissolution of his nature composed of body and soul by a transfiguration of this duality into the unity of the "sunlike" intellect<sup>165</sup>. Apelles, the disciple of the gnostic Marcion, also founds upon this conception his doctrine of the

<sup>162</sup> This conclusion is imposed by the concordance between the formula figuring in the first of the two Oracular verses quoted n. 144 and that which is found in MAX. TYR., *Diss.*, IX, 6 d : *ἐπειδὴν γὰρ ἀπαλλαγῆ ψυχῆ ἐνθὲνδε ἐκείσε, ἀποδυσμαμένη τὸ σῶμα καὶ καταλιπούσα αὐτὸ τῆ γῆ φθαρησόμενον.*

<sup>163</sup> OLYMPIODOR., *Phaed.*, 243, 4 concerning the various kinds of death (cf. THEILER, *Porphyrios und Augustin*, 24, 1) : *ἔκτος ὁ ὑπερφυῆς (Θάνατος), οἷον ὁ κατὰ διίλωσιν τῶν στοιχείων ἢ ὄλωσ καθ' ὃν πολλοὶ τῶν Θεουργῶν τρόπον ἀπέθανον. Ibid.*, l. 11 : *εἰ δὲ ἐκούσιος ὁ Θάνατος, ἢ βιαζομένων ἡμῶν τὴν φύσιν* (by a real suicide) *ἢ τὸν Θεϊότερον τρόπον διαλύοντων.* The words *ἢ ὄλωσ* signify that while death by the dissolution of the elements may be ranged in the general category of "theurgic death", this description is by no means exhaustive.

<sup>164</sup> Cf. e. g. PHILO, *Leg. Spec.*, I, 266; *Post. Cain.*, 5; *Quis rer. div.*, 281; *Quaest. in Gen.*, III, 11; VELLEIUS PATERC., II, 123, 3 "in sua resolutus initia animam caelestem caelo reddidit"; DIELS, *Elementum*, 46. See also above ch. I, n. 94.

<sup>165</sup> PHILO, *De vita Moysis*, II, 288; cf. REITZENSTEIN, *Hellenistische Mysterienreligionen*, 270 f. See also *Corp. Herm.*, I, 24.

phantom-body which was Jesus during his earthly life <sup>166</sup>. According to him, the Saviour effected himself the composition of his body upon his descent to earth, and its dissolution before his ascension. A similar idea probably underlies the Chaldæan doctrine concerning the volitional dissolution of the initiated's body after the soul has abandoned it. We do not know what were the actual signs of this "supernatural death" (magical ceremony during the cremation of the earthly body ? <sup>167</sup>), nor are we informed as to whether it was prefigured in the sacrament of immortality which symbolized the dissolution of body and soul.

At this point, we shall take up once again the explanation of the Oracle which described the fate of the body and of the "image" after the

<sup>166</sup> See HARNACK, *Marcion*, 329\* f.

<sup>167</sup> RÖHDE, *Psyche*, I, 31, 2, 320 f.; II, 101, 2 indicates many passages expressive of the notion that the destruction of the body by fire bring about the purification of the soul which returns to the place of its heavenly origin. JULIAN, *Orat.*, VII, 219 when he states that Dionysus was deified through theurgy after his birth, refers (as is shown by 220 B) to the divine child translated by Hermes out of his mother Semele's house destroyed by Zeus' lightning. This lightning was identified by Julian with the ἀναγωγὸν πῦρ of the Chaldæan mystery; cf. the passages quoted ch. v, n. 7 and OLYMPIODOR, *Phaed.*, 4, 24 f. According to Bardesanes (*apud* PORPHY., *Abst.*, IV, 18, p. 258, 25 f.) "the Indians gave their bodies to the fire in order to separate the soul from the body in the purest form" (cf. RÖHDE, *Psyche*, I, 31, 1 who adduces parallels from Indian literature).

Iamblichus' theory of the sacrifices set out *De Myst.*, V, 11-12 seems to derive from similar Chaldæan ideas. He declares that burnt-offerings cannot serve as nourishment to the demons, as Porphyry supposes, for fire destroys all material things, transforms them into a substance similar to that of the heavens, and draws them upwards towards the divine original fire. This interpretation of the faculty of the sacrificial flame concords, as is proved by the terminology (τῆ τοῦ πυρός ἀναγωγῆ, etc.) with the Chaldæan conception of elevation in mystic fire. It is however possible that the Chaldæan interpretation of the incineration of the corpses of their initiates was similar to that propounded by Iamblichus with regard to burnt-offerings; and this philosopher might accordingly have derived his conception regarding the purification and the uplifting of all material things through fire not from the Chaldæan notion of the mystery of immortalization, but from their burial rites.

death of the initiated <sup>168</sup>. The opposition posited in that text between the body and the "image" points to the latter term being applied to the human soul. Like other cryptic terms, this peculiar designation derives from a famous Homeric passage. The description of the souls of the dead as "images of those who have gone to their rest" (*εἰδωλα καμόντων* <sup>169</sup>) is employed by the author of the Chaldæan Oracle as a poetic equivalent for the soul of the theurgist. Thus the two lines describe the destiny of the body and of the soul of the Chaldæan initiate after death; the body is saved from the persecution of the demons by means of a miraculous dissolution of its material constituents; and the soul is carried heavenwards <sup>170</sup>.

c) The celestial place assigned to the blessed theurgists as their abode after death is designated in the extant fragments of the Oracles by four symbolic terms; all of which refer to the same supramundane order of being. The Oracle we have quoted holds out to the Chaldæan initiate the promise of a "portion" assigned to him in "circumsplendent place" <sup>171</sup>. The adjective, which figures more than once in the Chaldæan Oracles, serves to describe the Cosmic Soul <sup>172</sup>. A second Oracle

<sup>168</sup> SYNESIUS, *Insomn.*, 5, 1297 C, after quoting the Oracle cited n. 144, identifies the *εἰδωλον* with the vehicle of the soul, composed of fire and air. But this platonizing interpretation, with which KROLL, 61 agrees, cannot be correct, as, according to Chaldæan opinion, the vehicle dissolves during the ascension (see DODDS, *Proclus*, 320), and only the pure soul-spark attains the supraterritorial goal (see also n. 172). The identification of the *εἰδωλον* with the irrational part of the soul set out by PSELLUS, *Comm.*, 1124 A (see n. 33), rests upon the doctrine of Syrianus and Proclus regarding the immortality of the vehicle of the irrational soul (see DODDS, *loc. cit.*), a conception unknown to the Chaldæans.

<sup>169</sup> Cf. e. g. *Odyssey*, XXIV 14: «ἐνθα τε ναίουσι ψυχῆι, εἰδωλα καμόντων». See RONDE, *Psyche*, I, 3. Cf. also the quotation from a tragedy adduced by CICERO, *Disp. Tusc.*, I, 37.

<sup>170</sup> See n. 148. This distich may allude to the famous verse, *Odyssey*, XI, 602, concerning Hercules, whose *εἰδωλον* is banished into Hades while he himself abides among the immortal gods. The Chaldæan rectified this opinion by the addition of the words: ἀλλὰ καί.

<sup>171</sup> See n. 150.

<sup>172</sup> See ch. II, n. 111. Synesius' description of the ascension of the soul (cf. *loc. cit.*, 1297 C) proves that he identified the "circumsplendent place, in

states that the soul of the dead theurgist "lives as an angel in Power" <sup>172</sup> another pointer in the same direction, as the term "Living Power" is used as a predicate of Hecate <sup>174</sup>. Those indications are borne out by a third Oracle which states that the theurgist abodes (after death) "in the angelic space" <sup>175</sup>. For, according to Chaldæan belief, the angels are noetic beings who descend at the command of the Supreme God from the Empyrean <sup>176</sup>. They are, accordingly, the "portion" of "circumspendent place" to which the soul of the neophyte is assigned. Those three quotations suggest an interpretation of the obscure, by no means self-explanatory, symbolic language used in a fourth fragment treating of the Chaldæan Elysium. In this Oracle the neophyte is bidden to refrain from the lower forms of divination,

"if thou wouldst enter true worship's paradise, where Virtue, Wisdom and Good-Rule are met together" <sup>177</sup>.

The abode of the blessed is designated here by the name of "Paradise", a term exclusively employed by the Jews and the Christians <sup>178</sup>.

accordance with the Platonic doctrine (see n. 191), with the ether. PSELLUS, *Comm.*, 1124 B (*i. e.* Proclus) presents the same interpretation. Consequently, their common source was Iamblichus' commentary on the Chaldæan Oracles.

<sup>172</sup> PROCL., *Rp.*, II, 154, 17 (KROLL, 60) : *καὶ γὰρ οἱ τῆδε τελεστικοὶ* (the "purifying priests", see Excursus X a) *τάξεως εἰσι τοιαύτης* (*sc. ἀγγελικῆς*). «*Θέει ἄγγελος ἐν δυνάμει ζῶν*», *Φησι τὸ λόγιον*. *ὅσις ἐστὶν ὡς ἀληθῶς ἱερατικός* (see Excursus IV, 2). Cf. *ibid.*, 118, 16 f. *οἱ ἐκφάντορες τῆς ἱερατικῆς ἐπιστήμης* possess *ἀγγελικὰς ψυχὰς*. See n. 194, 196.

<sup>174</sup> See ch. II, n. 78.

<sup>175</sup> OLYMPIODOR., *Phaed.*, 64, 2 (KROLL, 60) : *ἀλλὰ μὴν οὐδὲ τὰς τῶν Θεουρῶν ψυχὰς βούλεται* (Plato) *μένειν αἰεὶ ἐν τῷ νοητῷ* (cf. *ibid.*, 191, 26 f., 232, 29 f.), *ἀλλὰ καὶ κατιέναι εἰς γένεσιν, περὶ ὧν* (*sc. τῶν Θεουργικῶν ψυχῶν*) *φησὶν τὸ λόγιον*.

«*ἀγγελικῶ ἐνὶ χωρῶ*»

<sup>176</sup> See ch. I, n. 77.

<sup>177</sup> «*μέλλων εὐσεβείης ἱερὸν παράδεισον ἀνοίγειν, ἐνθ' ἀρετῆ σοφίη τε καὶ εὐνομητὴ συνάγονται*».

The Oracle is quoted in full ch. IV, n. 99.

<sup>178</sup> The addition *εὐσεβείης* transforms the *nomen proprium* *παράδεισος* into an appellative, which signifies "pleasure-ground" or "garden" and, accordingly, calls to mind Homer's Elysian plains or the "place of the pious" ([PLATO], *Arriochus*,

Its localization in the Universe is determined by the three qualities which "meet together" in it <sup>179</sup>. As we have already shown, these may be regarded as symbolic designations of stellar powers <sup>180</sup>, two of which may be identified with complete certainty. The term "Virtue" is used in the Oracles to describe the moon <sup>181</sup>; and, according to Proclus, "Good rule" was regarded by some theologians whom he does not name (and who were probably later Orphics) as an attribute of the sphere of the fixed stars <sup>182</sup>. Consequently, "Wisdom" must be identical with one of the planets situated above the moon; it must also be localized below the sun, as according to one of the extant fragments it is placed between "Virtue" and "Truth", viz. the sun <sup>183</sup>. It seems therefore probable that "Wisdom" designates Mercury, to whom another fragment applies the synonymous term "Understanding" <sup>184</sup>; who

---

371 c) often called by the poets a "meadow" (λειμών, see n. 179) or a "grove" (nemus), cf. the passages collected P. W. s. v. *Elysion*, 2473. PROCL., *ad Hesiod. Opera*, 169 accordingly has no scruples about regarding the term Paradise, as used by the Chaldæans, as synonymous with the "Islands of the Blessed". As for ἀνοίγειν see HORAT., *Carm.*, III, 2, 21 "virtus recludens... caelum" and LUCAN, *Pharsalia*, VI, 600 "Elysia resera sedes". The parallels prove that the Chaldæans adapted the biblical term to Hellenistic beliefs. It was probably taken over by them together with their angelology; in these two points only is Jewish-Christian influence perceptible in the extant Oracles.

<sup>179</sup> PSELLUS, *Comm.*, 1137 D: "παράδεισος" ἐστὶ Χαλδαϊκῶς (Χαλδαϊκός *codd.*) πᾶς ὁ περὶ τὸν πατέρα χορὸς τῶν θεῶν δυνάμεων καὶ τὰ ἐμπύρια κάλλη τῶν δημιουργικῶν πηγῶν and 1192 B: ὁ ἱερὸς παράδεισος, οὐχ ὁ τοῦ Μωσέως, ἀλλ' ὁ λειμών (see n. 178) τῶν ὑψηλοτάτων θεωριῶν. Psellus considers the Chaldæan Paradise as metonymy of the noetic world (cf. OLYMPIODOR., *Phaed.*, 117, 6), an explanation which probably derives in the last instance from Plotinus' interpretation of the garden (κῆπος) mentioned in the myth of Diotima; see *Enneads*, III, 5, 9; IV, 9, 9.

<sup>180</sup> See above p. 31 f.

<sup>181</sup> See ch. II, n. 345.

<sup>182</sup> PROCL., *Tim.*, III, 118, 3c ff. (*Orph. Fragm.*, 181, Kern).

<sup>183</sup> See ch. I, n. 158. It may be remarked that this fragment describes the World-Soul likewise as a space "within which Virtue (the moon), Wisdom (Mercury) and the thoughtful Truth (the sun) appear" (ἐφάνησαν alludes to the celestial phenomena).

<sup>184</sup> See ch. I, n. 152, v. 4 (Μῆτις).

moreover, is generally considered as the "star of Apollo" and the abode of the soul-escorting Hermes<sup>185</sup>; facts which seem to fit in with our hypothesis. Thus, the three qualities designate two planets and the sphere of the fixed stars. Those are made to "meet" through the agency of the World-Soul; who, according to a Chaldæan opinion deriving from the Platonists, "envelops" the visible world<sup>186</sup>.

The texts we have quoted appear to show that the World-Soul, who is the originator of the individual souls, is also their Elysium after they have been delivered from the bonds of the body. The following statement made by Psellus proves that the beliefs of the Chaldæans as to the localization of the souls in afterlife were rather more differentiated: "The Chaldæans reintegrate the souls after the so-called death in all parts of the world; and even make out that some of them ascend above this world"<sup>187</sup>. The last group is obviously constituted by those of the initiates whose souls are borne upwards into the supracæstrial region of the World-Soul<sup>188</sup>. On the other hand, "after the so-called death" all the souls are said to be "reintegrated"; Psellus' use of this last word, which is a term of Platonic eschatology<sup>189</sup>, indicates belief in the transmigration of souls, which is attested as a Chaldæan dogma<sup>190</sup>. We may thus surmise that the souls dispersed in all parts

<sup>185</sup> On Mercury, the star of Apollo, see BOUCHÉ-LECLERCQ, *L'astrologie grecque*, 100, 5; CUMONT in *L'Antiquité Classique*, IV (1935), 16.

<sup>186</sup> See ch. II, n. 99.

<sup>187</sup> PSELLUS, *Expos.*, 1153 A (KROLL, 54, 2): ἀποκαθιστάσι δὲ τὰς ψυχὰς μετὰ τὸν λεγόμενον θάνατον (which is not a real death as the soul continues to exist after her departure from the body) κατὰ τὰ μέτρα τῶν οἰκείων κινήσεων ἐν βλοῖσι τοῖς τοῦ κόσμου μέρεσι, τινὰς δὲ καὶ ὑπὲρ τὸν κόσμον ἀναβιβάζουσι.

<sup>188</sup> The region ὑπὲρ τὸν κόσμον is the Emphyrean. Cf. PROCL., *Tim.*, II, 57, 12 the question of a Chaldæan: τὰ ὑπὲρ τὸν κόσμον σιγερῶματα... ἐμπύριον (χρὴ καλεῖν);

<sup>189</sup> See DOUGS, *Proclus*, 302 f.

<sup>190</sup> PROCL., *Rp.*, II, 336, 27 (KROLL, 62): ὅτι δὲ παρὰ φύσιν ταῖς ἀνθρωπίαις ψυχαῖς ἢ εἰς τὰ ἄλογα μετέσσις, οὐ τὰ λόγια μόνον διδάσκει λέγοντα

«Θεσμὸν ἀπαι μακάρων»

εἶναι τοῦτον

«ἀλύτων»

τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην ψυχὴν



of the world belonged to different classes, which according to the degree of their purification dwelt in the higher or lower regions of the cosmos<sup>191</sup>. It is possible that the Chaldæans combined the dogma of transmigration with the cognate doctrine regarding the different orders of spirits to which the souls are assigned after death. This latter conception is not expressly attested in the extant texts, but the statement that some of the souls of the theurgists are elevated to the rank of angels<sup>192</sup> (or assigned to their order) proves that the Chaldæans were aware of its basic principle. We have however no means of establishing whether they systematized this teaching.

Accordingly, we may only affirm with certainty that the souls of the Chaldæan initiates were supposed to be elevated, after their final separation from the body, to the one of the planetary spheres or to the supra-mundane region of "Living Power", *i. e.* the Cosmic Soul. The latter supreme goal was probably only attained by the souls of a few chosen theurgists. When these, according to the "irrefragable law of the gods"<sup>193</sup>, re-descended into the human bodies, they conferred upon the persons whom they ensouled the capacities of a theurgist<sup>194</sup>. It

«αὐτὶς ἐπ' ἀνθρώπων περάσσει βίον, οὐκ ἐπὶ Θηρῶν» ἀλλὰ... καὶ Πλάτων, etc.

PORPHYRY, *De regressu* probably referred to the same Oracle; cf. Excursus II, n. 21.

<sup>191</sup> Psellus' formula ἐν ὅλοις τοῖς τοῦ κόσμου μέρεσι is that of the Platonists; cf. *e. g.* IAMBLICUS, *De anima* (ap. STOB., *Ecl.*, I, c. 41, s. 39 [906]) who mentions Platonists localizing the souls καθ' ὅλας τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τὰς σφαίρας, ἀφ' ὧν δὴ δεῦρο κατιέναι, and PROCL., *Rp.*, I, 122, 1 f. The origin of this doctrine is PLATO, *Phaedr.*, 249 a, 7 : εἰς τοῦρανοῦ τινα τόπον and *Tim.*, 42 b, 3 ff.

<sup>192</sup> Besides the Oracles quoted n. 173 and 175, cf. also IAMB., *Myst.*, II, 2, p. 69, 8 f., who likewise declares that the soul consecrated by theurgy (διὰ... τῆν ἀπ' αὐτῶν, sc. τῶν Θεῶν, ἐνδιδομένην ζωτὸς ἐκλαψίῳ) often rises to the order of the angels (ἐπὶ μείζονά τε τάξιῳ τῆν ἀγγελικὴν ἀναγομένη).

<sup>193</sup> See n. 190.

<sup>194</sup> This dogm is mainly attested by the fragments quoted n. 173 and 175. The first of them probably stated that after the soul of a theurgist was transformed into an angel it "hastened" towards the earth (*suppl.* (κάτω) θέσει?), in order to illumine the soul of a neophyte. The second fragment which is transmitted in a very mutilated form is probably to be understood as likewise referring to this belief. Our interpretation is supported by the text quoted n. 195.

PORPHYRY, *Regr.*, 33\*, 10 ff. distinguishes between angels who are summoned

is reported that before he begot Julian (the future "Theurgist"), Julian the Chaldæan addressed to the "Connective of the All", that is, to the supreme Father of the gods, the prayer that his son might be given the soul of an archangel<sup>195</sup>. The belief that the souls of the great philosophers were of superhuman origin was current among the later Platonists who were influenced by Pythagorean doctrines<sup>196</sup>. It had

by the theurgists so that they should prophesy to them and those who "reveal on earth the faculties of the Father" (*ea, quae patris sunt, τὰ τοῦ πατρὸς*, misunderstood by Augustine's source which renders the expression l. 20 by "patris voluntatem"), "His height and His depth" ("altitudinem eius profunditatemque", *ὕψος καὶ βίθος*; a mystic formula; cf. M. DIBELIUS in his commentary on "Ephesians", III, 18). The first group of these angels is identical with the ministering angels of the Oracles (see ch. II, sect. 14), the second with the souls of the theurgists. These latter were identified by Proclus with the souls of the heroes; cf. PROCL., *Crat.*, 68, 25 f. and PSELLUS, *Hyp.*, 22 (p. 75, 16) τὸ δὲ τοῖς θνητοῖς συναπτόμενον τὸ ἡρωϊκὸν γένος.

<sup>195</sup> PSELLUS, *De aurea catena* (ed. SATHAS, *Rev. ét. grecq.*, 1875, p. 217, 2 f.; *Bull. Corr. Hell.*, I, 1877, 310; BIDEZ, *C. M. A. G.*, VI, 160, 7 and *Mélanges Cumont*, I, 88) ὡς (Ιουλιανὸς) ὁ πατήρ, ἐπεὶ γεννησάι τούτου (sc. τὸν Θεουργόν) ἐμελλεν, ἀρχαγγελικὴν ἤτησε ψυχὴν τὸν συνοχέα τοῦ παντὸς (cf. ch. II, n. 240) πρὸς τὴν τούτου ὑπόστασιν (existence) καὶ ὅτι γέννηθέντα τοῖς θεοῖς πᾶσι συνέσθησε (ch. IV, n. 5) καὶ τῇ Πλάτωνος ψυχῇ ἀπόλλωνι συνδιαγούση καὶ τῷ Ἐρμῇ. On the second part of this passage see n. 197, as to the continuation ch. IV, n. 96.

<sup>196</sup> According to OLYMPIODOR., *Proleg. in philos. Plat.*, p. 196, 21 f., ed. Hermann, Plato's soul was Apollinian (concerning this class of souls, see PROCL., *Tim.*, III, 159, 24, 262, 26; HOFFNER, *O.-Z.*, II, 22), as was Pythagoras', according to LUCIAN, *Somnium s. Gallus*, 16, 726 and IANBL., *Vit. Pythag.*, II, 8. Proclus (quoted by Psellus, see BIDEZ, *C. M. A. G.*, VI, p. 214) explains that Pythagoras, Socrates and Plato had Apollinian souls, and compares that of Pythagoras with the "hidden sun" (*κεκρυμμένον ἥλιον*) i. e. the noetic origin of the sunlight (see ch. II, n. 310-312); that of Socrates with the manifest (*ἐμφανῆ*) sun and that of Plato with that which is between the two (*μέσως πως ἔχοντα*), i. e. the "archangelic sun" (see ch. II, n. 309).

This doctrine of the soul, which goes back to Orphic-Pythagorean traditions, should not be confused with the belief in ministering spirits who accompany chosen mortals; cf. e. g. MAX. TYR., *Diss.*, VIII and IX regarding Socrates' daemonium. According to PORPHYRY, *Vit. Plot.*, 10 the daimon (not the soul) of Plotinus was of divine origin. The belief in heroes gave rise to the conception that

an especial significance for the Chaldæans, as they believed that the theurgists had the power to be "conjoined" with these philosophers' souls<sup>197</sup>. The fact that one of the two authors of the Chaldæan Oracles claimed to have the soul of an archangel proves that the Chaldæans extended their doctrine of transmigration so as to include the souls of the angels. But the latter's return to the terrestrial bodies was

---

the souls of Plato and Pythagoras abide in the society of divine demons (cf. the oracle of Apollo quoted by PORPHY., *Vit. Plot.*, 23); it is also responsible for the notion that Plato, Hercules and Romulus have been raised to the rank of demigods (*semidei*; cf. LABEO *ap.* AUGUSTIN, *Civ. Dei*, II, 14; VIII, 13. See also CICERO, *De rep.*, III, 40).

<sup>197</sup> According to Psellus (see n. 195), the soul of Plato abides with Apollo and Hermes, *i. e.* she belongs to the chain of souls which proceeds from one of those gods (see below). Proclus himself believed that his soul belonged to the "chain" of Hermes (MARINUS, *Vit. Procl.*, 28), whom accordingly he called "my Lord" (PROCL., *Crat.*, 68, 12 : ὁ δεσπότης ἡμῶν). Thus he must have regarded as "Hermetic" the soul of the Neopythagorean Nicomachus of Gerasa which, as he believed, had been transmigrated into him (MARINUS, *loc. cit.*). Emperor Julian's devotion to Helios was due to his belief that his soul proceeded from this god; see BIDEZ, *Vie de l'Empereur Julien*, 391, 3.

The juxtaposition of Apollo and Hermes may be explained by the belief, that the latter was a companion of the former. Cf. PORPHYR., *περι ἀγαλμάτων*, p. 17\*, 19, ed. Bidez; JULIAN, *Orat.*, IV, 150 D and, the most significant text, the distich quoted ch. 1, n. 163, in which Hermes declares to the magician who evoked him that he has just left the "ruler of the stars", ἀστραίων ἀνακτα. Helios is called ἄστρον Βασιλεύς in the Oracle quoted by EUS., *Praep. Ev.*, III, 15, 3 (from Porphyry, see WOLFF, 127 f.) and ἄστρον ἡγεμῶν by Menander (*Rhet. Graec.*, III, 446, 8, ed. Spengel. See REITZENSTEIN, *Iranisches Erlösungsmysterium*, 200, 1); see also JULIAN, *Orat.*, IV, 135 B. Other parallels are collected by CUMONT, *La théologie solaire*, 453, 1; *Rel. Orient.*, 270, 116; PROCL., *Crat.*, 37, 18 and 68, 12 designates Hermes as an archangel (see also PROCL., *Rp.*, II, 255, 23 f.), probably because his function was to escort the souls of the dead towards the sun; cf. CUMONT, *Rel. Orient.*, 265, 90 and *Mysterien des Mithra*, 131, 1. 198 Porphyry's statement (*Regr.*, 39\*, 6 f., 41\*, 13 f. *et saepius*) that the soul which has been purified through many transmigrations or through having achieved vision of the pure being should return for ever to the "Father", is a Platonic, not a Chaldæan doctrine. See RONDE, *Psyche*, II, 286, 1; NORDEN, *Vergilius Aeneis*, Buch VI, 18; DODDS, *Proclus*, 305 f.

not regarded (as was that of inferior souls) as the accomplishment of an ineluctable decree of destiny or as the expiation of sins committed in a former life; but as an honour from the Highest and a blessing to men.

## CHAPTER IV

---

### THE MAGICAL RITUAL OF THE CHALDÆANS

The principal Chaldæan sacrament consisted of a continuous sequence of magical actions, which represented the various stages of the progressive purification of the soul as it strove upwards to attain immortality. Some of these ceremonies have already been described and interpreted. Proclus, however, and Psellus, who draws his information from the writings of the Athenian Neoplatonist, have transmitted to us a great number of details concerning isolated theurgical rites. In many cases we are reduced to hypotheses as to the manner in which they are connected; but those texts prove that besides the mystery of immortalization other magical operation were practised by the Chaldæans. We shall now proceed to the task of sorting out and critically examining these dispersed reports. In the course of this investigation we shall seldom attain absolute certainty; we shall however have attained our purpose if we give a clearer idea of theurgical ritual, and thus eke out the foregoing chapters, which are sometimes inadequate in their treatment of these questions. On the other hand, there is no point in examining once again the ceremonies which we have already discussed; nor can we, in view of the scanty data at our disposal, give a distinctive description of the ritual lustration performed by the Chaldæans before every cultual act<sup>1</sup>. In the course of our investigation we shall have to

---

<sup>1</sup> The following references to the Chaldæan rites of lustration have been preserved :

(a) Regarding the necessity of bodily purification before the gods are invoked, cf. the text quoted ch. 1, n. 139 and PROCL., *Alc.*, 340, 6 (KROLL, 55) : διὸ καὶ

keep in mind the fact to which we have repeatedly alluded, that many theurgical rites and dogmas concord with those of contemporary magic. The truth and the importance of this remark will stand out even more clearly as we advance in our researches. Accordingly, theurgy can be regarded as closely connected with the powerful religious movement reflected in the magical papyri; a circumstance which helps us in our present task, as it permits us to interpret isolated data concerning the Chaldæan ritual by a reference to the extensive contemporary magical literature.

1. *The "Conjunction"* (σύστας).—It seems to be expedient to begin our enquiry with an examination of a text of Marinus, whose biography of his master Proclus contains a paragraph especially devoted to that philosopher's theurgical activity. Marinus states that Proclus employed the σύστας of the Chaldæans<sup>2</sup>. The term derives from the current vocabulary of the magical science and applies to the "conjunc-

οἱ θεοὶ παρακλεύονται μὴ πρότερον εἰς αὐτοὺς βλέπειν, πρὶν ταῖς ἀπὸ τῶν τελετῶν φραχθῶμεν δυνάμεσιν.

«οὐ γὰρ χρὴ κείνους σε βλέπειν, πρὶν σῶμα τελεσθῆς».

(b) PROCL., *Crat.*, 100, 21 : αἱ θεουργίαι τοὺς μὲν κλητόρας καὶ τοὺς δοχέτας (see ch. 1, n. 115) τούτοις τοῖς τρόποις (sc. διὰ τῶν περιρράνσεων καὶ τῶν περιθειώσεων) προκαθαίρειν παρακλεύονται.

On περιθειώσεις, lustrations with sulphur, see (c) and HOFFNER, *O.-Z.*, I, 867.

(c) MARINUS, *Vit. Procl.*, 18 reports that Proclus constantly resorted to arctopaic rites, took purifying baths and performed other, Orphic (see ROHDE, *Psyche*, II, 127) or Chaldæan (see n. 64), lustrations (ἀποτροπαῖς καὶ περιρραντηρίους καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις καθαρμοῖς χρώμενος, ὅτε μὲν Ὀρφικοῖς, ὅτε δὲ Χαλδαϊκοῖς); he used to bathe in the sea, one to three times every month. An Oracle, quoted ch. 1, n. 139, enjoins upon the priests of the Chaldæan mysteries to purify themselves by bathing in the sea. ROHDE, *Psyche*, II, 405 f. (see also HOFFNER, *O.-Z.*, I, 590, 838, 864) has shown that the rite was widely practised; it is mentioned, together with the lustration through sulphur, by Proclus himself in his treatise *περὶ τῆς καθ' Ἑλληνᾶς ἱερατικῆς τέχνης*. Cf. Bidez, *C. M. A. G.*, VI, 151, 8 ff. Analogous purifications enjoined on the members of the Greek mystery-cults are recorded by PROCL., *Alc.*, 293, 19 f., 461, 28 f.

<sup>2</sup> MARINUS, *Vit. Procl.*, 28 : ταῖς γὰρ τῶν Χαλδαίων συστάσεσι καὶ ἐντυχίαις (see n. 42) καὶ τοῖς θείοις καὶ ἀφθέγκτοις στροφάλοις (see n. 81) ἐπέχρητο..

tion" of a magician with a god or with one of his ministering spirits, called the "assistant demon" (*δαίμων πάρεδρος*), who aids the theurgist by granting him the superhuman powers required for the accomplishment of the magical act<sup>3</sup>. Thus the "conjunction" precedes the main magical operation. As in the case of all magical practices, it is achieved through the performance of certain rites (*πραξις*) and through the recital of an invocation (*κλήσις*) consisting of divine predicates, formulæ of prayers and of inarticulate magical names (the *voces mysticæ*)<sup>4</sup>.

This practice of theurgy among the Chaldæans can be traced back to the founder of that religious community. Psellus reports that Julian the Chaldæan "conjoined" his newborn son (who was to become "the Theurgist") "with all the gods and with Plato's soul"<sup>5</sup>. The assistance (*παρεδρία*) of the entire pantheon and of Plato's soul enabled the author of the Chaldæan Oracles to achieve that harmonization of practical magic and Platonic philosophy, which is a characteristic feature of his system.

The magical act of *σύσταςις* is also mentioned in connection with the conjuration of the Chaldæan gods of time. Proclus reports that the Chaldæans communicated in their Oracles the "divine names" of the night, of the day, of the month and of the year which effected the "conjunction"<sup>6</sup>. Thus we learn that "conjunction" was brought about by a recital of the "divine names" (that is, the *voces mysticæ*) of the gods who were called upon to participate in it. The "conjunction" of the

<sup>3</sup> The papyri frequently mention magical practices destined to bring about "conjunction" (*σύσταςις*) with a ministering spirit; cf. PRISTER, *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift*, 52 (1932), 925, who corrects Preisendanz' mistaken translation of *σύσταςις* as "Empfehlung". The term derives from demonology; cf. MAX. TYR., VIII, 6 g: *τινας δαιμονίους δυνάμεις. . . συνιστάμενους τῶν ἀνθρώπων τοῖς εὐμοιροτάτοις*. PORPHYRY, *Epist. ad Anebon.*, 14, also mentions the *σύσταςις* of the magicians.

<sup>4</sup> See n. 47. The term *σύσταςις* is often applied to the prayer (*λόγος*) which effects "conjunction"; cf. *P. Mag.*, I, 57; III, 198, 495, etc.

<sup>5</sup> See ch. III, n. 195.

<sup>6</sup> PROCL., *Tim.*, III, 89, 17, *ἡ ἱερά φήμη* (see Excursus I i) . . . *ὀνόματά τε θεῶν νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας ἐκιδουῖσα καὶ μηνὸς καὶ ἐνιαυτοῦ συστακὰ καὶ κλήσεις καὶ ἀτοφανεῖας* (see n. 7, 30, 67 a). Cf. also *ibid.*, 32, 18.

Chaldæans with the lords of the portion of time at which the theurgical operation was to take place, was intended to win the favour of the ambivalent powers for that particular undertaking. This conjunction of the theurgist served apparently as a preparation for the conjuration of Aion. Proclus says that the Chaldæans transmitted the magical "rite of leading" (*ἀγωγή*) the supreme god of time towards "self-manifestation"<sup>7</sup>. A magical papyrus states that the "conjunction" with the "Lord of the hour" and "of the day" was a preparation for the conjuration of Aion<sup>8</sup>. If we combine those two pieces of information, we may legitimately infer that the Chaldæans, when conjuring the supreme Lord of Time, sought the help of the gods of particular moments of time who were his subordinates.

An account of the theurgical ritual of such a "conjunction" figures in a magical formulary transmitted by Psellus (who draws on Proclus) and described by him as Chaldæan :

"I shall sum up briefly the efficacy of the (magical) power possessed by the hidden covenant concluded by the Chaldæans. First of all, they prepared a purifying sacrifice : spices, plants and stones, crocus, myrrh and laurel, mystically purified by fire. These were planted or buried in a circularly marked-off space. Then, he who concluded the covenant, a man of great magical powers, named the business, with a view to which he offered up the sacrifice. On the next day, he betook himself again to the place of the sacrifice. Digging up the soil in which plants and the purified hylic substances were buried and suddenly lifting up all these together with his left hand, he invoked certain hidden powers : these were the teacher of the lifted-up sacrifice, the masters of the hylic substances, the ruler of the day, the lord of time and the demon lord of the Four"<sup>9</sup>.

<sup>7</sup> PROCLUS., *Tim.*, III, 20, 22 f., quoted ch. II, n. 149.

<sup>8</sup> *P. Mag.*, XIII, 54 f., 378 f. See BEZOLD-BOLL, *Sternglaube und Sterndeutung*<sup>3</sup>, 181. The adorers of Mithra worship the stars which determine the divisions of time regarding them as satellites of Time whom they consider as the First Cause. See CUMONT, *Mysterien des Mithra*, 110 f.

<sup>9</sup> PSELLUS, *Quænam sunt Graecorum opiniones de daemonibus*, c. 7 (p. 43, 1 f., BOISSONADE; MIGNE, *P. G.*, CXXII, 881 BC). The relevant passage is quoted



The magical operation described by Psellus<sup>10</sup> has the character of a so-called "raising-up of plants"<sup>11</sup>. The magician obtains the help of the demon who lives in plants (also in stones, according to Psellus) by the following operation. First, he consecrates these plants by means of magical rites<sup>12</sup>, tears them after a certain interval out of the ground, lifts them up<sup>13</sup> and invokes their spirit.

by Bidez-Cumont, *Mages hell.*, II, 172, 2 (see also II, 74, 8), who mention several parallels to the rites described by Psellus and refer to A. DELATTE, *Herbarius*, Paris, 1936, whose study (reviewed by PFISTER, *Byz. Zeitschrift*, XXXVII, 1937, p. 381-390) was unfortunately not accessible to me.

Ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ πρακτικοῦ τῆς ἀπορρήτου παρὰ Χαλδαίους συνθήκης ἦντινα δύναμις εἶχε, τοῦτό σοι ἐπὶ κεφαλαίων ἐπιτεμοῦμεν. Πρῶτον μὲν θυσία τούτοις ἀγνεύουσα παρσκεύαστο, ἀρώματά τε καὶ βοτάναι καὶ λίθοι, κρόκος τε καὶ μυρσίνη καὶ δάφνη, μυρσινῶδες πυρὶ καθαιρόμενα. Χωρὸς τε τούτοις περιεγράφετο φυτευομένοις καὶ βοθρευομένοις. Ἐφ' οἷς ὁ τὴν συνθήκην ποιοῦμενος, δεινὸς τις ὦν ἀνήρ τὰ γοητικά, καὶ ὀνομάσας τὸ πρᾶγμα ἐφ' ᾧ τὴν θυσίαν πεποίηται, ἰσπερ αἰεὶ αὐθὶς εἰς τὸν τῆς τελετῆς παρεξίστετό τόπον. Καὶ ἀναχωννύων τὰς τε τῶν φυτῶν βάσεις καὶ τὰς ἀφαγισθεισας ὑλας καὶ τῇ λυγρῇ ταῦτα ἀναλαμβάνων χειρὶ ἀθρόα πάντα καὶ ἐξαπιναιώς δυνάμεις τινὰς ἀνεκαλεῖτο κρυφίους. Αἱ δὲ ἦσαν ὁ τῆς ληθθείσης θυσίας καθηγεμών, οἱ τῶν ὑλῶν κύριοι, ὁ τῆς ἡμέρας προστάτης, ὁ χρονοάρχης, ὁ τετράρχης δαίμων.

*Συνθήκη*, signifying a Chaldæan rite, is mentioned in another passage quoted by Bidez, *Mélanges Cumont*, I, 96, from Nicetas (MIGNE, *P. G.*, XXXVIII, 632 B), who draws on Psellus: Ἀσσύριοι (see Excursus I c) δὲ συνθήκαις τισὶ καὶ ὀνόμασι ἀρρήτοις (see n. 47)... ἑαυτοὺς καθαγιαζόντες τὸ ὑπεσπρωμένον φῶς ταῖς ἀσωμάτοις δυνάμεσιν (see n. 69 a) ἐθεάσαντο.

<sup>10</sup> The term *πρακτικόν* (= *πρᾶξις* or *ποίησις*) is applied in the *P. Mag.* to the magical recipe as distinguished from the magical formula, *λόγος*, *ἐπίκλησις*, etc. See n. 17.

<sup>11</sup> The nearest parallel to the description cited by Psellus is to be found *P. Mag.*, IV, 2967 f., to be complemented by 286 f. (*βοτανήαρσις*); cf. HOPFNER, *O.-Z.*, I, 481 f. and *P.-W.*, s. v. *Pflanzenaberglaube*, 1455. This action, too, was destined to "consecrate" the conjuration that followed.

<sup>12</sup> *πυρὶ καθαιρόμενα* *cod.* A in *margin*, *περικαθαίρομενα* *codd.* AB. The "mystic purification" of the stones, plants and spices was probably effected through the brandishing of a torch; regarding *καθαρμοὶ διὰ πυρός*, cf. *e. g.* PROCL., *Tim.*, I, 118, 21; 119, 4. Other parallels are collected by ANRICH, *Das antike Mysterienwesen*, 214 f.

<sup>13</sup> The sacrifice is called by Psellus (see n. 9) *ληθθεῖσα θυσία*, because the plants

Psellus designates the magical operation described by him as *συνθήκη*, "covenant". His account gives no clue to the technical meaning of the term, as he does not name the other party to the covenant; that point can however be elucidated by a reference to two parallel magical passages. The great Paris magical papyrus contains directions for a covenant with an "assistant demon" who is called upon to be present at the conclusion of the compact<sup>14</sup>. Cyprian, the magician converted to Christianity, (well known in medieval lore) also mentions in his "Confession" "covenants" (*διαθήκαι*) between demons and magicians<sup>15</sup>. Psellus obviously describes such a compact. He does not speak of the apparition of the ministering demon, whose aid the theurgist<sup>16</sup> wishes to secure, as he only means to set forth the "power" of the magic ritual and accordingly can confine himself to an account of the ritual action<sup>17</sup>. But a reference to analogous magical passages legitimizes the assumption that the demon who was called upon to be

---

and stones which figured in it were lifted up. Cf. *P. Mag.*, IV, 2967, *βοτάναι λαμβάνονται*. The rite had to be performed "suddenly", so that the demon should not be able to escape into the earth; HOFFNER, *O.-Z.*, I, 510.

<sup>14</sup> *P. Mag.*, IV, 2060 : *ἐξορκίζω (σε) . . . παραγενέσθαι πρὸς ἐμέ . . . και συνθέσθαι μοι τὸ διακονῆσαι . . . ἐπὶν δὲ συνθῆται . . .* The service of the invoked spirit is referred to *P. Mag.*, I, 89 (*ὑπηρετοῦντα*) and IV, 2180 (*ὑπηρετεῖ μοι*). Cf. also CLEMENT ALEX., *Protr.*, IV, 58, 3.

<sup>15</sup> *Cypriani confessio*, c. 4 : *ἐγὼν τὰς πρὸς ἀλλήλους διαθήκας και ἐξεπλάγην ἐτι ὄρκους ἰδίους κεράτηται*; quoted by HOFFNER, *O.-Z.*, I, 786. See also LUCAN, *Phars.*, VI, 493, *commercii pacti*, quoted by HOFFNER, *loc. cit.*, 785. A compact of a magician with a demon is also mentioned in the texts edited by BIDEZ, *C.M.A.G.*, VI, 129, 27 and 130, 8. The magical recipe of "binding" a demon by means of *λεκανομαντεία* is ascribed by PSELLUS, *op. cit.*, p. 129, 26 to the *περιττοὶ Ἀσσύριοι*, but it is not clear whether the ethnic appellation refers to the Chaldæan theurgists. Varro (*ap.* AUGUSTIN, *Civ. Dei*, VII, 35; compared with Psellus by BIDEZ-CUMONT, *Magus hell.*, II, 287) reports that this kind of mantic is of Persian origin.

<sup>16</sup> He is referred to by Psellus' words *δεινὸς τις ὢν ἀνὴρ τὰ γοητικά*; cf. Proclus (quoted n. 73) *οἱ περὶ Θεουργίαν δεινοί*. When Psellus sets up to be an orthodox Christian, he refers to the theurgists as "goëts".

<sup>17</sup> Psellus describes the *πρᾶξις* (see n. 10) in detail and alludes in the last sentence to the contents of the *λόγος*.

present, was bound over to do service by means of oath-formulae<sup>18</sup>.

The list of the names of the invoked powers gives us further insight into the magical practice of the Chaldæans. We may surmise that it derives from a Chaldæan hymn in which the cited powers were consecutively conjured<sup>19</sup>. Proclus, however, whom Psellus transcribes, seems in this case as in many others not to have reproduced their names as given in the original, but to have replaced them by general terms descriptive of the nature of these powers and partly deriving from Neoplatonic vocabulary<sup>20</sup>. Owing to this process of transmission, some of the names cannot be interpreted with certainty.

The numina invoked in the first and the third place are known to us from the magical texts. The invocation of the lord of the day was a part of the current magical ritual<sup>21</sup>. The current notions of the magical craft of the epoch, elaborated by the theurgists, account likewise for the conjuration of the "teacher of sacrifice"<sup>22</sup>. The magicians claimed a divine sanction for their art, affirming that the gods themselves taught them the methods and the formulas which compel their presence<sup>23</sup>. The relationship between the god who grants revelations and the theurgist who poses questions corresponds in the Chaldæan Oracles to that of a master and a disciple and determines the didactic character of many oracles<sup>24</sup>. Since the superhuman being who taught the theurgists that particular magical operation is invoked by

<sup>18</sup> Cf. *e. g.* *P. Mag.*, I, 80 f. and Cyprian, quoted n. 15.

<sup>19</sup> Its form was probably similar to that of the *ὑμνος κλητικός* quoted ch. v, n. 25.

<sup>20</sup> The periphrase is either due to Proclus being apprehensive of pronouncing the names of the demonic powers at the wrong time or his regarding the Aion-theology as a mystery which should not be spoken of openly. Cf. the sentence *ἀλλὰ ταῦτα μὲν ἐν ἀθέτοις σκηνοῖς διανοίας ἀνελίττω*, with which he breaks off his allusions to the Chaldæan doctrine of Aion; ch. II, n. 138.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. *e. g.* *P. Mag.*, II, 8-79; XIII, 30; 58 f. (see n. 8); 118; 430, etc.

<sup>22</sup> The Platonists called their teacher, in accordance with a current usage, *καθηγεμών*. The Emperor Julian referred in this way to Maximus (*Epist.*, 89 a, p. 123, 21 and 138, 18 B.-C.) and Proclus to Syrianus.

<sup>23</sup> HOPFNER, *O.-Z.*, I, 727 f. See ch. I, n. 178.

<sup>24</sup> See ch. I, n. 179.

his "disciple" in the first place, we may assume that this divinity had some connection with the "masters of the hylic substances"—that is to say of the consecrated offerings—who assigned one of the spirits subordinate to them to the theurgist's service. We may further surmise that the purpose of the invocation of the other "hidden powers" mentioned by Psellus was to obtain their help in securing the services of such a spirit<sup>25</sup>. As the overwhelming majority of the Chaldaean Oracles is delivered by Apollo, it seems plausible to suppose that he is identical with the "teacher of the sacrifice". According to the belief of the magicians, Apollo who dwells in the sun imparted his power to certain stones and herbs and by this means rendered them suitable for magical purposes<sup>26</sup>. Thus, it would seem that the term "masters of the hylic substances" applies to demons who held sway over certain classes of material objects and were in the service of Apollo himself.

The two other numina invoked constitute a separate group. They are gods of time. The "Lord of Time" is none other than Aion, the supreme god of the Chaldaean<sup>27</sup>. The "Lord of the Four" is probably the year, which governs the four seasons<sup>28</sup>. Proclus reports that signs of the Zodiac were represented on the garments and girdles of the Chal-

---

<sup>25</sup> According to common magical usage, mighty numina are bidden by the magician who invokes them to exert an influence upon less powerful spirits whom he wishes to control.

<sup>26</sup> See HOPFNER, *O.-Z.*, I, 393-394, 560; BIDEZ, *C. M. A. G.*, VI, 227; BIDEZ-CUMONT, *Mages hell.*, I, 194.

<sup>27</sup> See ch. II, n. 157. The formation of the noun *χρονοάρχης* conforms to that of *τελετάρχης* and *ύλάρχης* (see ch. II, n. 302), *κοσμάρχης* (Damascius), *οὐσιάρχης* (Asclepius, c. 19, p. 54, 6, Thomas) and *νοητάρχης* (IAMBLICHIUS, *Myst.*, VIII, 2).

<sup>28</sup> The *ένιαυτοκράτωρ* is mentioned in a magical recipe quoted by PROCL., *Rp.*, 66, 2 f. (see n. 86). Our interpretation renders superfluous the correction *τελετάρχης* proposed by K. SVOBODA, *La démonologie de Michel Psellos* (Bruenn, 1927), p. 45, 2, and adopted by ΒΕΝΒΕΝΙΣΤΕ, *Journal Asiatique*, CCXV, 1929, p. 293, 3. We may recall in this connection that the moon is often described by Proclus as the ruler of the four elements (see the passages quoted ch. II, n. 287), but this characterisation does not seem to be sufficient proof for an identification of the *τετράρχης* with this planet.

dæan officiants and were conjured by them <sup>29</sup>. According to the general opinion each of the signs of the zodiac rules one of the months and three consecutive signs represent together one of the four seasons. It follows that they are the divinities of the month and of the year with whom the Chaldæans, according to a passage already quoted <sup>30</sup>, entered in "conjunction" before the accomplishment of the principal magical operation. These considerations explain likewise the designation of the year as "Lord of the Four".

The method used, according to Psellus, with a view to securing the services of a ministering spirit was apparently not bound up with any particular magical practice. The fact that the magician is bidden "to name the business with a view to which he offered the sacrifice" <sup>31</sup> shows that the main theurgical operation which was to follow could be adapted so as to correspond to any particular purpose which was pursued <sup>32</sup>. This latitude is probably due to the many uses to which this method was put. To obtain the service of a ministering spirit—this was apparently considered as the indispensable prelude to all theurgical operations.

The necessity of such a compact was consequent upon the Chaldæan teaching as to the rôle of the demons in the sublunar sphere <sup>33</sup>. The authors of the Oracles shared the current opinion according to which the aerial zone (especially its lower stratum) was full of evil spirits, which endeavoured to possess themselves of man. This chronic risk was transformed into an immediate peril at the hour of death. The soul who was unprotected when she departed from the body, was assailed by the demons and dragged down to Hades <sup>34</sup>. The fate of the

<sup>29</sup> See ch. 1, n. 115. Cf. ΡΟΡΗ., *Phil. Orac.*, p. 164, Wolff (*Eus., Pr. Ev.*, V, 9, 9) and *Abst.*, IV, 16, p. 254, 13.

<sup>30</sup> See n. 6.

<sup>31</sup> As for the necessity of mentioning the purpose of the rite, see Bidez-Cumont, *Mages hell.*, II, 173, 2.

<sup>32</sup> Those magical recipes were habitually described as *κωνά* in the magical papyri.

<sup>33</sup> At to what following, see ch. v, sect. 1.

<sup>34</sup> CUMONT, *Etudes Syriennes*, 104, 1; *Afterlife, passim, Rel. Orient.*, 281, 55. To the texts quoted by Cumont we may add Proclus' statement *De mal. subs.*,

person who had entered upon a compact with a ministering spirit was different. When his soul had left the body, she had a companion whose escort enabled her to reach unattacked her heavenly goal<sup>35</sup>. This is the reason for Porphyry's advising "to secure the friendship of a ministering spirit" whose help gives the possibility of ascending "a little" (that is, above the lower part of the aerial zone) after death<sup>36</sup>. According to theurgical teaching the angels function as companions of the soul; Psellus reports the Chaldæan belief that the angels were the "assistants" (*παρεδροι*) of the souls of the initiates, and "elevated them to a certain place but not above the cosmos"<sup>37</sup>. The situation of this place to which the "assistant" ministering spirits accompany the souls of those "conjoined" with them is not defined by Psellus, we may however surmise that it was localized at the upper limit of the aerial zone, up to which the evil spirits waited in ambush for the ascending soul.

The danger of being overpowered by demons became likewise acute

---

214, 7-36, ed. Cousin which derives from Porphyry's commentary on the myth of Plato's Republic (the main source of Proclus' exegesis of this text). This contention may be proved by the concordance with PROCL., *Rp.*, II, 180, 11 f., PORPHYRY, *Epist. ad Aneb.*, 26 and *De Philos. ex Oraculis*, p. 47-50, ed. Wolff. Proclus calls the authors of his source *Θεῖοι* (*Mal. Subs.*, 214, 35), an epithet which can only refer to Platonists. He applies the same adjective to PORPHYRY in *Tim.*, II, 105, 3 and mentions *Tim.*, III, 234, 18, *οἱ περὶ Πορφύριον*. See also ch. VI, n. 286 and Excursus XI, n. 45.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. *P. Mag.*, I, 178 : σου δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα βιστίξας (ἄγγελος) εἰς ἀέρα ἄξει σὺν αὐτῷ· εἰς γὰρ Ἄϊδην οὐ χωρήσει ἀέριον πνεῦμα συσταθὲν κραταιῷ παρεδρῷ.

<sup>36</sup> PORPH., *Regr.*, 29\*, 3 : "et admoneat utendum alicuius daemonis amicitia, quo subvectante vel paululum a terra possit elevari (cf. p. 34\*, 10 : isto aere transcenso) quisque post mortem"; according to PORPH., *Abst.*, II, 39, p. 168, 19 (quoted Excursus XI, 1), the evil demons inhabitate only the lower part of the aery zone. CUMONT, *Rel. Orient.*, 264, 90, who quotes this text of Porphyry and the one mentioned in the foregoing note, refers to similar conceptions of divine or angelic escorts of the soul. Cf. also C. B. WELLES-A. D. NOCK, *Harvard Theol. Rev.*, 1941, 88 and 104 f.

<sup>37</sup> PSELLUS, *Hyp.*, 22 (p. 75, 14, KROLL, 53) : καὶ ἐστὶ τοῖς μὲν Θεοῖς οικειόταρον τὸ ἀγγελικόν, ὃ ἢ καὶ πρὸς τὰς παρεδρείας σύστοιχον (sc. τοῖς Θεοῖς; see n. 65) καὶ μέχρι τινὸς ἀνάγον τὰς ψυχάς, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὑπὲρ τὸν κόσμον.

at another moment : during the main theurgical sacrament. As we have shown in the foregoing chapter, this sacrament was supposed to bring about the abandoning of the body by the soul and the elevation of the latter towards divine light. The soul which the mystic ceremonies caused to ascend, was likewise obliged to traverse the domain of the evil spirits and needed protection against their onslaught. The Chaldæans employed various methods designed to obviate this demonic menace. These apotropaic rites will be studied in the next chapter. One of them was apparently the "conjunction" with a ministering spirit, whose function it was to accompany the soul during the theurgical elevation. Proclus mentions repeatedly, in connection with the Chaldæan mystery of immortalization, the order of the angels regarded as the conductors of the soul during her ascent<sup>38</sup>. These passages do not indicate whether an angel of this order was sent forth to meet the ascending soul of the initiate, or whether it was assigned to its service before the commencement of the sacrament, but the second hypothesis is the more probable one because of the analogy which it presupposes between the mystery of elevation and the ascension of the soul after death. Another argument in its favour is furnished by a statement of Olympiodorus as to the sequence of the sacramental rites in the official mystery-cults. According to his information (which probably derived from Proclus) the neophyte after having undergone a "public" and a "secret" purification, accomplished the "conjunction" followed by the "initiation" and the "vision"<sup>39</sup>. The insertion of the "conjunction" into the traditional mystery-ritual proves that the belief in demons had transformed even the most conservative mystery-cults<sup>40</sup>.

<sup>38</sup> See ch. v, n. 7.

<sup>39</sup> OLYMPIODOR., *Phaed.*, 120, 29 (quoted by LOBECK, *Aglaophamus*, 40 f.) : *ὅτι ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς ἡγούνο μὲν αἱ πάνδημοι καθάρσεις, εἶτα ἐπὶ ταύταις ἀπορητότεροι, μετὰ δὲ ταύτας συστάσεις, παρελαμβάνοντο καὶ ἐν ταύταις μύσεις, ἐν τέλει δὲ ἐποπτεῖαι. Τὰ ἱερά* are the permanent sites of worship ; in this passage τὰ Ἐλευσίνια ἱερά are referred to in the first place (see n. 41). The imperfect tense in this text means that they did not exist any longer at the time of Olympiodorus (see ROWE, *Psyche*, II, 398, 1).

<sup>40</sup> The Eleusinian τελετή consisted of *ὑποπαρασκευή* (or *καθαρμοί*), *μύσεις*, *ἐπόπτεια* : LOBECK, *Aglaoph.*, 57.

A statement of Proclus fits in with this line of argument. According to him, "effluvia of chthonic demons and phantoms became manifest" during the Eleusinian mysteries "terrifying those to be initiated, drawing them away from the gifts of the gods and luring them towards matter" <sup>41</sup>. As we shall see, the Chaldæans held similar beliefs. We may accordingly surmise that the function assigned to "conjunction" in the Eleusinian mysteries and in those of the Chaldæans was analogous. This assumption would explain the fact that in the quoted conjuration, which according to the Chaldæans was efficacious in bringing about "conjunction" with the "Lords of the substances" of the plants and stones, Apollo was invoked in the first place. He was the veritable mystagogue of the Chaldæan sacrament of immortality and, as the ruler of the sun, the goal of the "elevation". For these reasons, his interest, before that of the other gods, had to be engaged in favour of the "conjunction" of the initiate with the ministering spirit, that necessary prelude to initiation.

The only Chaldæan magical rites known to us in some detail are those set forth in the quoted text of Psellus concerning the "covenant" with the "conjoined" spirit. They conform by and large to those current in general magic and corroborate accordingly our assertion that the magical art of the Chaldæan theurgists did not differ in essentials from that of their competitors (the "goëts").

2. *Supplications, Binding Spells, Divine Names.*—Marinus' quoted enumeration of the operations of Chaldæan magic performed by Proclus

<sup>41</sup> PROCL., *Alc.*, 340, 1 : Ἐν ταῖς ἀγιωτάταις τῶν τελετῶν πρὸς τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ παρουσίας δαιμόνων χθονίων τιῶν ἐκβολαὶ προβαίνονται καὶ ὄψεις ἐκταράττουσι τοὺς τελουμένους καὶ ἀποσπᾶσαι τῶν ἀχράντων ἀγαθῶν καὶ εἰς τὴν ὕλην προκαλοῦμεναι. The designation αἱ ἀγιωτάταις τῶν τελετῶν is invariably applied in the writings of Proclus to the Eleusinian mysteries; cf. *Rp.*, II, 185, 10; 312, 20; *Th. Pl.*, 371, 12, *et passim*. Proclus employs a fixed terminology, as appears from *Ps.-DEMOSTH.*, XXV, 11. JULIAN, *Orat.*, VII, 217 C (see KERN, *Orph. Fragm.*, p. 307). DITTENBERGER, *O. G. I.*, 721; ZOSIMUS, IV, 3 (the latter quoted by ROHDE, *Psyche*, II, 398, 1). The opinion of LOBECK, *Aglaoph.*, 114 f. is erroneous.

An exorcism of the demons appearing before the epiphany of Hecate is described by GREGORY NAZIANZEN, *Orat.*, IV in JULIAN, I, 55 f.; cf. n. 76 and ch. v, n. 38.



mentions, besides the "conjunction", *έντυχίαι*, i. e., "supplications", "prayers" <sup>42</sup>. This term, unlike that of *σύσταςις*, is not specifically magical <sup>43</sup>; it is mentioned only once in connection with Chaldæan theurgy. Proclus states that the theurgists have taught supplications and invocations (*έντυχίαι καὶ κλήσεις*) addressed to the Chaldæan gods of time <sup>44</sup>. The fact that he distinguishes between the two terms, as well as several parallels found in the general magical literature <sup>45</sup> appear to indicate that *έντυχία* designates a supplicatory prayer, which preceded the conjuration <sup>46</sup>.

The conjuration itself was accomplished—in conformity with current magical usage—by binding-spells (*δεσμοί*). It has already been pointed out <sup>47</sup> that these consist of "utterable" and "ineffable" divine names, that is of series of predicates figuring in the hymns, and of compounds of consonants and vowels. The letters of these "*voces mysticæ*" seem to have been arranged in accordance with certain numeric relations <sup>48</sup>; Proclus reports that the theurgists employed numerals in their secret

<sup>42</sup> See n. 2.

<sup>43</sup> *έντυγγάνω τινί* (or *πρός τινα*): "to pray" is a word which was in common use in the *κοινή*. MARINUS, *Vit. Procl.*, 19 mentions his master's nocturnal prayers, *έντυχίαι άγρυπνοί*, but does not refer in this connection to Chaldæan rites. In the *P. Mag.*, *έντυχία* is synonymous with *ίκεσία*, *δέσεις*, *λιτανεία*; cf. *P. Mag.*, IV, 1930, 1960; VII, 690, *et passim*.

<sup>44</sup> PROCL., *Tim.*, III, 41, 3: *καὶ τούτων (ήμέρας, νυκτός, μηνός, ένιαυτού) δ' οὖν έντυχίας καὶ κλήσεις καὶ θεσμούς τελεστικούς* (see Excursus X d) *έκεινοί (οί θεουργοί) παρέδωσαν*. This passage concords almost word for word with the one quoted n. 6.

<sup>45</sup> *P. Mag.*, VII, 690 ff. (quoted n. 43) distinguishes between *έντυχία* and *κλήσις* (i. e. recitation of the *άγια όνόματα*, see n. 47).

<sup>46</sup> MARINUS, *Vit. Procl.*, 28 (see n. 2) distinguishes between *έντυχίαι* and *έκφωνήσεις*. The latter term signifies, as Boissonade correctly remarks, the recitation of the *voces mysticæ*; cf. PROCL., *Crat.*, 31, 27, *ή θεουργία... δι' έκφωνήσεων... άδιαρθρότων* (see n. 47) and *P. Mag.*, III, 158, *τήν του σου μεγίστου όνόμα(τος)... έκφώνησιν ιεράν*.

<sup>47</sup> See ch. 1, n. 177, 182. The *άρρητα όνόματα* are also mentioned in the second of the quotations from Psellus quoted n. 9.

<sup>48</sup> See F. DORNSEIFF, *Das Alphabet in Mystik und Magie*<sup>2</sup>, p. 61 f. concerning the magical method of composing names out of letters signifying certain numbers.

ceremonies<sup>49</sup>. The mystery surrounding these divine names was enhanced by their being taken over unchanged from foreign languages. An injunction of the Chaldean gods reads: "Do not ever alter the foreign names (of the gods)"<sup>50</sup>. It is impossible to translate the magical formula, because its power is not due to its external sense<sup>51</sup>.

3. *The conjuration of Hecate*.—The apparition of the invoked god was usually preceded by signs that announced his arrival. A lengthy fragment of the Oracles describes the forerunners of the divine epiphany:

"When in addition thou wilt have spoken thus, thou shalt either see a fire like a child, stretched over the vortex of the air, or a formless fire, from which a voice rushes forth, or an abundant light, rumbling spiralwise round the field. Thou mayest also see a horse flashing more brightly than light, or a boy sitting upon the back of a swift horse, a fiery (boy) or one covered over with gold or a naked one or one shooting with a bow and standing on a horse"<sup>52</sup>.

<sup>49</sup> PROCL., *Th. Pl.*, 233, 44: Διλοῦσι δὲ καὶ τῶν Θεουργιῶν αἱ σεμνότεταί τοις ἀριθμοῖσιν ὡς ἀρρήτοις δρᾶν δυναμένοις χρώμεναι, καὶ διὰ τούτων τὰ μέγιστα καὶ ἀπορρητότατα τῶν ἔργων ἀπεργαζόμεναι.

<sup>50</sup> PSELLUS, *Comm.*, 1132 C (KROLL, 58): «Ὄνόματα βάρβαρα μήποτ' ἀλλάξῃς». . . εἰσι γὰρ ὀνόματα παρ' ἐκάστοις ἔθνεσι Θεοπαράδοτα δύναμιν ἐν ταῖς τελεταῖς ἀρρητον ἔχοντα.

<sup>51</sup> As regards the rule, cf. the parallels quoted by R. GANSCHINIETZ, *Hippolytos' Capitel gegen die Magier* (Texte und Untersuchungen, XXXIX, 2), p. 33, and the bibliography given by CUMONT, *Rel. Orient.*, 241, 85 and by HOPFNER, *O.-Z.*, I, 707 f. The lacunæ in our knowledge of the subject may be illustrated by the fact that not a single magical formula used by the Chaldeans (consequently not a single βαρβαρικὸν ὄνομα) is known to us.

<sup>52</sup> PROCL., *Rp.*, I, 111, 1 (KROLL, 57): καὶ ταῦτα καὶ ἡ Θεοπαράδοτος μυσταγωγία (see Excursus I e) παραδέδοκεν·

«ταῦτα»,

γὰρ φησιν,

«ἐπιφωνήσας ἢ παιδί κατόψη

πῦρ ἱκελον σκιρτηδὸν ἐπ' ἠέρος οἶδμα τιταῖνον (intrans.)

ἢ καὶ πῦρ ἀτύπωτον ὅθεν φωνὴν προθέουσα»,

ἢ φῶς πλούσιον ἀμφὶ γύην ροικαῖον ἐλιχθέν.

ἀλλὰ καὶ ἵππον ἰδεῖν (sc. ἐξεστίν) φωτὸς πλέον ἀστράπτοντα,

These various shapes, the significance of which is not stated, preceded the divinity. They may be divided into two groups : *a*) visions of formless fire or light (vv. 1-4), and *b*) horses and boys (vv. 5-8). The luminous or igneous character of the phenomena of the first group indicates that the approaching deity was none other than Hecate, who was habitually preceded by fiery phantoms<sup>53</sup>. The shapes of the second group may also be identified with the apparitions, which according to a widespread belief accompanied this goddess. The boys are "those who have come to an untimely end" (ἄωροι); disincarnate souls who, having been deprived of burial and of the proper funereal rites, are doomed to escort Hécate on her roving. The archer represents those who have suffered violent death in fight (ἥρωες) and have not been buried; condemned for similar reasons to perpetual unrest, they

ἢ καὶ παῖδα θεοῖς νότοις ἐποχοῦμενον ἵππου  
 ἔμπυρον ἢ χρυσῶ πεπυκασμένον ἢ πάλι γυμνόν,  
 ἢ καὶ τοξεύοντα καὶ ἐστηῶτ' ἐπὶ νότοις,

καὶ ὅσα τούτοις ἐφεξῆς (see n. 59) τὰ λόγια προσθήσῃσιν.

As regards the introductory words ταῦτα ἐπιφωνήσας we may observe, that the pronoun refers to the ἄρρητα ὀνόματα and indicates that the conjuration was accompanied by a sacramental action, i. e. by a sacrifice. Cf. the fragment quoted ch. v, n. 119.

<sup>53</sup> Cf. the passage from Marinus quoted n. 64, the fragment quoted ch. II, n. 96 (πυριπλήτης) and even more important *P. Mag.*, IV, 2727 « Δεῦρ', Ἐκάτη, τριοδίτι, πυρίπνοα φάσματ' ἔχουσα »; *ibid.*, 2748, πυρίφοιτε. See also Hippolytus, *Ref.*, IV, 35, 4, Ἐκάτην δέ... ἔμπυρον διατρέχειν ἐν ἀέρι, and the oracle of Hecate quoted by Euseb., *Præp. Ev.*, IV, 23, 7 (Wolff, 151), v. 6, « ἤερα δ' ἀργεννοῖσι τροχίσμασιν (with effulgent whirls) ἀμφικάθημαι ». A fragment quoted by Simplicius, *Phys.*, 616, 18 (Kroll, 57), τοὺς τύπους τῶν τε χαρακτηρῶν (see n. 92) καὶ τῶν ἄλλων θεῶν φασμάτων... ἐν τῷ αἰθέρι λέγουσιν (οἱ Χαλδαῖοι)... φαίνεσθαι seems likewise to refer to this Oracle or to a similar one. Cf. also Nicetas of Serres, *Ad Greg. Nazianz. Oration.*, XLI (edited by Bidez, *Mél. Cumont*, 95) quoting Psellus who designates the luminous apparitions of the gods ρεῖθρα (see ch. II, n. 192). The fact that the conjuration was performed in the open country (v. 4 ἀμφὶ γῆν) points also to Hecate, the *trivia* (see ch. II, n. 122).

The absence of any mention of the dogs in this Oracle may be due to the fact that they are numbered not among the forerunners (πρόπολοι), but among the followers of Hecate; they are mentioned in another fragment (quoted ch. v, n. 36).

also join Hecate's band<sup>54</sup>. As for the horse, it is one of the typical symbols of Hecate—one of the heads of her four-headed image being equine<sup>55</sup>.

The description of the signs which precede the apparition of Hecate was not only intended to illustrate the might of the goddess; it had also a practical purpose. If the signs enumerated by the Oracles became manifest, the theurgist acquired the certainty that the magical operation was proceeding correctly. For similar reasons the practical instructions relating to a magical operation are followed in the magical papyri by an enumeration of the "signs" (*σημεία*)<sup>56</sup>, the absence of which points to the operation having been disturbed by some hostile influence. The next chapter will deal with the detailed accounts figuring in the Oracles as to the nature of these powers and the means of warding them off.

Other precursory signs are described in the following fragment :

"If thou sayest this to me often, thou wilt see that all things grow dark. The curved mass of the heaven is not visible nor do the stars shine, the light of the moon is veiled, the earth is not firm, all things are illuminated by the lightnings"<sup>57</sup>.

<sup>54</sup> See RORDE, *Psyche*, II, 83 f.; 411 f.; CUMONT, *After Life in Roman Paganism*, 128 f.; BIDEZ-CUMONT, *Mages hell.*, I, 180 f. The main text is *P. Mag.*, IV, 2730, τὰν ἑκάταν σὲ καλῶ σὺν ἀποθθιμένοισιν ἀώροις κελ τινες ἠρώων (warriors killed in battle) ἔθανον ἀγύραιοι τε ἀπαιδες. *Hais* figures as one of the symbols of Menecate in *P. Mag.*, IV, 785. I may suggest that the naked boy symbolized exposed children regarded as ἀωροι. As to the archer considered to be the prototype of warriors killed in battle, see ch. VII, n. 100. The similarity with *Odyssey*, XI, 607 (regarding the εἰδωλον of Hercules) γυμνὸν τόξον ἔχων is due to a mere literary reminiscence.

<sup>55</sup> PORPH., *Abst.*, IV, 16, p. 254, 21; LYDUS, *Mens.*, III, 8, p. 41, 20. See also *P. Mag.*, IV, 2549, ἵπποπρόσωπε θεά, 2614, ἵπποκύνων. Other parallels are collected by GRUPPE, *Griechische Mythologie*, II, 1292, 3.

<sup>56</sup> Cf. e. g. *P. Mag.*, IV, 2940; VII, 780 f.; IAMBL., *Myst.*, II, 3 (γνωρίσματα θεῶν καὶ δαιμόνων); see HOPFNER, *O.-Z.*, I, 74 f. Cf. also ch. v, n. 3 regarding the deceptive signs of the evil demons.

<sup>57</sup> PSELLUS, *Comm.*, 1133 B (KROLL, 57) :

« Πολλάκις ἦν λέξης μοι, ἀθήρησεις πάντ' ἀχλύοντα  
οὔτε γὰρ οὐράνιος κυρτὸς τότε φαίνεται ὄγκος,

Once more we find that the name of the divinity, whose invocation brings about the cosmic perturbation described in the text <sup>58</sup>, is not mentioned; but a scrutiny of the form and of the contents of this passage leads to the discovery of several indications, which not only point to Hecate being the deity involved, but also to the probability of these verses belonging to the same Oracle and being the direct continuation of the previously quoted passage describing this goddess' "vanguard" <sup>59</sup>. It would seem that the phenomena manifested themselves in the following order. First, upon the recital of the binding-spell, the

ἀστέρες οὐ λάμπουσι, τὸ μήνης φῶς κεκάλυπται,  
χθῶν οὐχ ἔστηκεν, βλέπεται δὲ (τὰ) πάντα κεραινοῖς ».

v. 1 : πάντα λέοντα *codd.*; *corr.* LOBECK, *Aglaoph.*, 104.—v. 4 : βλέπετα: *codd.*; φλέγεται *corr.* LOBECK et KROLL.

This fragment of the Oracles is paraphrased by IAMBL., *Myst.*, II, 4, p. 75, 10 (see n° 63) τὸ μέγεθος τῶν ἐπιφανεῶν παρὰ μὲν τοῖς θεοῖς τοσοῦτον ἐπιδείκνυται, ὡς καὶ τὸν οὐρανὸν ὅλον ἐνίοτε ἀποκρύπτει καὶ τὸν ἥλιον (the sun is not mentioned in the Oracle which describes a nocturnal scene; see n° 59) καὶ τὴν σελήνην, τὴν τε γῆν μηκέτι δύνασθαι ἐξίταται αὐτῶν κατιόντων (the Chaldæan Hecate is not, like that of the magicians, a chthonic divinity, but a supercelestial goddess and is for this reason said to "descend" at her epiphany; see the Oracle quoted ch. 1, n. 152). In his commentary on IAMBLICHUS, p. 209, valuable even now, Th. Gale indicates the Chaldæan source of the passage.

" Cf. the parallel passages collected from magical texts by KROLL, 57, 2 and HOFFNER, *O.-Z.*, II, 153 regarding earthquakes that precede divine epiphanies; especially *P. Mag.*, IV, 695 and III, 205 « ἀρρήτοις ἐπεσιν κόσμος ξενίζεται αὐτός ».

" The remark which Proclus appends to the fragment of the Oracles quoted n. 52 proves that the description of Hecate's van was followed by an enumeration of further signs. The introductory words of the fragment quoted n. 57, *πολλάκις ἢν λέξης μοι*, which show that the magical names have been already pronounced several times by the theurgists in the preceding portions of the operation, complement the thought set out at the beginning of the first fragment (*ταῦτ' ἐπιφωνήσας*, see n. 52). Both fragments concord moreover in that the magical operation which they describe takes place at night in the open country (see n. 53). The disappearance of the stars can only be observed at night. In a hymn quoted by HIPPOLYTUS, *Ref.*, IV, 35, 5, v. 3, Hecate is called "foe of the day and friend of the night"). We may also note that the two fragments are formally alike inasmuch as in both of them the goddess informs the theurgist of the successive magical operations (cf. *ἢν λέξης μοι*).

“forerunners” became visible, then, when the spell was uttered anew, the sky darkened, the earth trembled and lightnings illumined all things <sup>60</sup>: the cosmic Hecate, the “fearful one”, as one of the Oracles calls her <sup>61</sup>, is nigh <sup>62</sup>.

After this upheaval of nature, the goddess herself appears. The description of her “epiphany” is to be found in another fragment, which —syntactically and in its subject-matter—seems to be consecutive to the last of the two fragments we have quoted; thus it probably continues the same Oracle.

“<But> when thou dost behold the formless, most sacred fire flashing with quivering flames through the depths of the whole world, then harken to the voice of the fire” <sup>63</sup>.

<sup>60</sup> Cf. SERVIUS, *Ad Aen.*, VI, 510: “In... sacris imitabantur tonitrua, sed praecipue in Hecatae”.

<sup>61</sup> See ch. II, n. 121.

<sup>62</sup> BOUSSET, *Archiv f. Religionswissenschaft*, IV, 1901, 265 is mistaken in supposing that the fragment refers to the “Himmelsreise” of the soul.

<sup>63</sup> PSELLUS, *Comm.*, 1136 B (KROLL, 58):

ἡνίκα (δε) βλέψης μορφῆς ἄτερ εὐίερον πῦρ  
λαμπόμενον σκιρτηδὸν ὅλου κατὰ βένθεα κόσμου,  
κλύθι πυρὸς φωνήν».

ἡνίκα δὲ βλέψης is related with *πολλάκις ἢ λέξης μοι* of the foregoing fragment; see n. 59.—As to *μορφῆς ἄτερ*, cf. the fragments quoted by PROCL., *Crat.*, 31, 12 (KROLL, 57): *διὸ καὶ παρακελεύονται οἱ θεοὶ νοεῖν «μορφὴν φωτὸς προταθεῖσαν»* and by SIMPL., *Phys.*, 613, 7 (KROLL, 57): *ἐν τούτῳ (τῷ ἐμπυρίῳ φωτί) γὰρ «τὰ ἀτύπωτα τυποῦσθαι» φησι (Proclus) κατὰ τὸ λόγιον; both of which should be compared with the fragment referred to in ch. I, n. 190.—As to *εὐίερον πῦρ* (the attribute designates the luminous substance of the supercelestial world), see ch. II, n. 277.—For *σκιρτηδὸν* see n. 52 (v. 2).—The expression *βένθεα κόσμου* is applied here to the terrestrial zone and may be regarded as containing a reference to the heavenly aspect of the gods; cf. ch. II, n. 321.—IAMBL., *Myst.*, II, 4, p. 77, 18 (cf. the passage quoted n. 57) alludes to this fragment with the words *τὸ τῶν θεῶν πῦρ... πληροὶ τὰ ὅλα βάθῃ τοῦ κόσμου πυρίως*.—Regarding *πυρὸς φωνήν*, cf. the fragment quoted n. 52, v. 3: *«πῦρ ἀτύπωτον, ὅθεν φωνὴν προθέουσιν»*.*

That this fragment of the Oracles refers to Hecate appears also from IAMBL., *Myst.*, II, 7, p. 84, 6, who, in the section dealing with the apparitions of the gods, states that “the fire of the World-Soul is seen formless throughout the whole world”: *ψυχῆς δὲ τῆς μὲν ὅλης... πῦρ ὀραῖται ἀνείδεον περὶ ὅλον τὸν κόσμον*.

Hecate herself appears in this "most sacred fire"; out of it she answers the questions of the conjuring theurgist. From these verses we learn that the goddess did not manifest herself in a corporal shape but in fire. It was thus that she was perceived by Proclus, when he (according to Marinus' report based on the master's own account), "after having performed the Chaldæan purifying rites, held intercourse with Hecate's luminous manifestations seen by him with his own eyes"<sup>64</sup>. Possibly, however, it was sometimes not the goddess herself but one of her satellites who appeared in these fiery visions. The Oracles state that the angels "were passing glad when, invoked by the name of the god that ruled them, they manifested themselves in his stead"<sup>65</sup>. The magical papyri are also aware of the fact that sometimes a ministering demon appeared instead of the invoked god<sup>66</sup>.

The account of Hecate's epiphany given in these three relatively long fragments enables us to form a clearer idea of the external setting and the various phases of a Chaldæan magical operation. The scenario of this secret nocturnal assembly held in the open country consists of a succession of sacrifices and recitations alternating with hallucinations of light and atmospheric disturbances; it is hardly different from that of many other magical operations described in the papyri and

<sup>64</sup> MARINUS, *Vit. Procl.*, 28 : ἐν τάξει (see ch. v, n. 10) ὁ φιλόσοφος τοῖς Χαλδαίοις καθαρμοῖς καθαιρόμενος (see n. 1 c) φάσμασι μὲν ἑκατικοῖς φωτοειδέσι αὐτοπτούμενος (see n. 67 a) ὠμίλησεν (see ch. v, n. 109), ὡς και αὐτός που μέμνηται ἐν ἰδίῳ συγγράμματι (titled *περὶ ἀγωγῆς*; see ch. II, n. 15).

<sup>65</sup> PROCL., *Rp.*, I, 91, 19 : τὸ διὰ τῶν αὐτῶν ὀνομάτων τοὺς τε ἡγεμόνας και τοὺς ὀπαδοὺς προσχγορεύειν . . . και εἰ τῶν βαρβάρων τελεταί (Excursus Ik) παραδεδώκασιν· και γὰρ καλυμένους τοὺς ἐξημμένους τῶν Θεῶν ἀγγέλους ταῖς αὐταῖς ἐπωνυμίαις ἐκείναις χαιρειν διαφερόντως φασίν . . . και τοῖς Θεουργοῖς ἐντ' ἐκείνων προφαίνειν ἑαυτούς. IANBL., *Myst.*, IX, 9, p. 284, 2 : ἀεὶ γὰρ ἐν τῇ Θεουργικῇ τάξει διὰ τῶν ὑπερχόντων τὰ δεύτερα καλεῖται· και ἐπὶ τῶν δαιμόνων τοῖσιν εἰς κοινὸς ἡγεμῶν τῶν περὶ τὴν γένεσιν κοσμοκρατόρων κατιπέμπει τοὺς ἰδίους δαιμόνας ἐκάστοις. PSELLUS, *Hyp.*, 22 (p. 75, 14 s.), quoted n. 37. See also PROCL., *Alc.*, 377, 35 f.; *Parm.*, 674, 37 f. (quoted by HOFFNER, *O.-Z.*, I, 91). Proclus appears to refer to PLUTARCH, *De def. orac.*, 21, 421 E (see DODDS, *Proclus*, 267).

<sup>66</sup> Cf. e. g. *P. Mag.*, II, 53 f.; VII, 891 f.

denounced by the Christian polemist Hippolytus because of the means of deception practised at them <sup>67</sup>.

4. *The "self-manifestation" of the gods.*—The invocation of the god was followed by his manifestation, the *αὐτοφάνεια* <sup>67</sup>. The gods manifested themselves in a form perceptible to the senses, as is proved by the fragment of an Oracle addressed to the theurgists and stating that though the divine beings were incorporeal, "bodies were attached for your sake to the self-revealed manifestations, as you are grafted upon a corporeal nature" <sup>68</sup>. This general explanation, which resorts to a

<sup>67</sup> Cf. HIPPOLYTUS, *Ref.*, IV, 32, 1 f. : βρονη; 39 : σεισμός; 35, 4 : Ἐκάτην δέ... ἐμπυρον διατρέχειν ἐν ἀέρι (see n. 53). See the monograph of Ganschietz quoted n. 51 and the quotation from Servius adduced n. 60. A vivid description of the means of deception which were practised by the magicians is given, upon Hippolytus' authority, by J. BURCKARDT, *Die Zeit Constantins des Grossen*, chap. vi.

<sup>68</sup> The term *αὐτοπτος* applies in the magical papyri to a recipe which brings about the personal apparition of the invoked goddess; cf. BIDEZ, *Mél. Cumont*, 99, 12 who quotes S. EITREM, *Symbolae Osloenses*, t. VIII, p. 49 f. See also above note 6 as to the *αὐτοφάνεια* of the Chaldæan gods of Time, and ch. I, n. 52 (v. 1) and 54, ch. II, n° 148 and 149 as to the *αὐτοφανής Θεός*.

<sup>68</sup> PROCL., *Rp.*, II, 242, 8 (KROLL, 56) : ταῦτα καὶ τῶν Θεῶν εἰπόντων πρὸς τοὺς Θεουργοὺς· ἀσωμάτων γὰρ ὄντων, φασίν, ἡμῶν

«σώματα τοῖς αὐτόπτοις φάσμασιν ἡμῶν  
εἵνεκεν ἐνδέδεται»

*Ibid.*, I, 39, 18 : δηλοὶ δὲ καὶ τὰ λόγια πρὸς τὸν Θεουργὸν λέγοντα σαφῶς, ὅτι ἀσώματα μὲν ἐστί τὰ Θεῖα πάντα, σώματα δὲ αὐτοῖς ἡμῶν εἵνεκεν ἐνδέδεται, μὴ δυναμένων μεταστρεῖν ἀσωμάτως τῶν ἀσωμάτων, διὰ τὴν σωματικὴν, εἰς ἣν "ἐνεκεν-τρισθητε" φύσιν.

*Ibid.*, II, 241, 22 : πάσαι καὶ τῶν Θεουργῶν ἡμᾶς διδαξάντων, ὅτι τὰς αὐτοφάνειας τῶν Θεῶν μεμορφωμένας τῶν ἀμορφώτων... ἀνάγκη γενέσθαι; see also *ibid.*, I, 37, 9 f. πῶς αἱ αὐτοφάνειαι γίνονται τῶν Θεῶν. IAMBVL., *Myst.*, V, 23, p. 234, 7 : πειθεσθαι δὲ χρῆ (see Excursus, I o) τοῖς ἀπορρήτοις λόγοις (i. e. the Chaldæan Oracles), ὡς καὶ διὰ τῶν μακαρίων Θεαμάτων (see ch. III, n. 44) ὅλη τις ἐκ Θεῶν παραδοιοι and *ibid.*, II, 6, p. 81, 18 regarding the divinity which, during its epiphany, τὸ μὴ ὄν σῶμα ὡς σῶμα τοῖς τῆς ψυχῆς ὀφθαλμοῖς (Platonizing addition) διὰ τῶν τοῦ σώματος ἐπιδεικνυσθαι.

See the Oracle quoted ch. I, n. 52 (v. 1) regarding the incorporeal form of the "self-manifest" Aion.—ἐγκεντριζῶ is a poetical equivalent of ἐμφυτεύω. DAM., I,



conventional argument of the apologists of theomorphism<sup>69</sup>, throws no light upon the capital question : we do not learn from it whether the Chaldæan gods appeared in the form in which they were represented in Hellenistic art, or in other symbolic shapes<sup>69a</sup>. The quoted description of Hecate's epiphany which was no "autophany", as the goddess revealed herself by a voice from the fire, proves that the invoked gods did not in all cases manifest themselves in a human form.

5. *The consecration of Hecate's statue.*—The Chaldæans seem to have not only practised the conjuration of the corporeal form of the gods, but also the casting of a spell over their statues which they inspired with life. The ritual of this "telestic art" was universally observed in the later antiquity; it was part of the established ceremonial of the consecration of new cultual images<sup>70</sup>. According to Proclus, who in this connection draws not only upon the Chaldæan tradition<sup>71</sup>, one of the so-called telestic operations consisted in making the statues of the deities capable of receiving divine light, in vivifying them and in causing them to deliver oracles; all this was accomplished by special magical actions. Julian the Theurgist composed a book entitled *τελεστικά* which certainly contained instructions concerning this craft, and practised himself the art of "consecrating" during the campaign against the Marcomans which marks the beginning of his and his father's celebrity. It was then that he placed according to Proclus on the demarcation line against the barbarians a human head made out of clay and "consecrated" by him (*i. e.* charged with magical power);

162, 15 and SYNESIUS, *Insomn.*, 5, 1293 C, use the verb as it is employed in the Oracle, while *Excerpt. ex Theodoto*, 56, follow PAUL, *Rom.*, XI, 17 (the three passages are quoted by KROLL, 56, 2).

<sup>69</sup> Cf. Ch. CLERC, *Les théories relatives au culte des images chez les auteurs grecs*, Paris, 1924; J. GEFFCKEN, *Archiv f. Religionswissenschaft*, XIX, 1919, 286 f.

<sup>70</sup> Proclus explains the corporality of the "self-manifest shapes" of the gods as τὸ ὑπεσθρωμένον φῶς τοῖς ἀσωμάτοις δυνάμει. Cf. n. 9 and BIDEZ, *Mél. Cumont*, 99, 14.

<sup>71</sup> WOLFF, 206 f.; HOPFNER, *O.-Z.*, I, 808 f.; CUMONT, *Rel. Orient.*, 240, 71; 294, 77.

<sup>72</sup> As to what follows see Excursus X.

it had the virtue of sending down lightnings upon the hostile troops when they wished to cross the frontier, and thus driving them away <sup>72</sup>. The same author reports that statues of gods played likewise a part in the Chaldæan cultural rites <sup>73</sup>. As we have shown in the second chapter, a series of Oracular fragments which are transmitted in a disconnected form, but can be proved to belong to one and the same Oracle, describe and interpret symbolically the cultural image of Hecate and her emblems <sup>74</sup>. The "vivification" of Hecate's statue was a widespread magical practice <sup>75</sup>. It was one of the operations performed by Maximus, one of the members of the school of Iamblichus, in a subterranean temple of Hecate situated in Ephesus, where he initiated in due course the future Emperor Julian into the mysteries of theurgy, conforming to the Chaldæan rites <sup>76</sup>. Accordingly, we may suppose that the "vivification" of the statue of Hecate also belonged to the practices of the theurgists.

<sup>72</sup> PSELLUS, *Script. min.*, p. 446, 28 : Ἰουλιανὸς ὁ σοσφρατεύσας Μάρκῳ τῷ βασιλεῖ ἐπὶ Δάκας σφρατεύοντι (see ch. 1, n. 2) ὅς δὴ καὶ ἐτέρᾳ τε πολλὰ τῷ βασιλεῖ συγκατάρθωσε (refers to the magical lustration of Rome from the plague and the "rain-miracle", see ch. 1, n. 1-2) καὶ τοὺς Δάκας τῶν Ῥωμαϊκῶν ὄρων ἀπόσατο· πρῶσωπον γὰρ ἀνθρώπου πλάσιμενος ἐκ πηλοῦ ἐθήκε βλέπειν εἰς τοὺς βαρβάρους· οἱ δὲ ἐπειδὴν αὐτῷ πηλσιάσαιεν, κεραινοῖς ἀφορήτοις ἐκειθεν ἐκπεπομένοις ἠλαύνοντο. HOPFNER, *O.-Z.*, I, 813 f. (after WOLFF, 212) refers to two similar magical actions said to have taken place in the 1vth and vth centuries.

<sup>73</sup> PROCL., *Alc.*, 398, 6 : οἱ περὶ Θεουργιῶν δε.νοι καὶ τὰς φαινομένης εἰκόνας τῶν Θεῶν σέβουσιν.

<sup>74</sup> See ch. II, n. 82 ff.

<sup>75</sup> WOLFF, 130-137. See ch. 1, n. 162.

<sup>76</sup> BIDEZ, *Vie de l'Empereur Julien*, 71, 79 f., 369, n. 9-12 (after LOBECK, *Aglaoph.* 109) combines the description of EUNAPIUS, *Vit Soph.*, p. 50 f. Boissevain (alluded to by PSELLUS, *Quenam sunt*, p. 41, 4 f. Boissevain, and completed by the text edited by BIDEZ, *C. M. A. G.*, VI, p. 202, 1; cf. *idem.*, p. 190) with that of GREGORY NAZIANZEN, *Orat. IV in Julian*, I, 55 f (see above n. 41), in order to describe the details of Emperor Julian's initiation. We may however observe that the texts quoted by Wolff (see n. 75) and Excursus X prove that magicians other than the Chaldæan theurgists also effected the "vivification" of Hecate's statue. That the description given by Gregory refers to Julian's initiation into the Chaldæan mysteries is proved by the arguments furnished ch. v, n. 38-40.

6. *The magical top*.—Hecate's magical top, the *στρόφαλος*, provided another means of compelling the presence of gods or demons<sup>77</sup>. According to Psellus, this instrument consisted of a golden disk—triangular, circular or of some other shape—, its surface covered with mystical characters, with a sapphire inset in its centre. A leather thong attached to the disk enabled the theurgist to swing it around, while reciting magic spells. In the intervals of these recitals the theurgist uttered inarticulate sounds : these were mostly imitations of animal cries which, in accordance with ordinary magical practice, were intended to frighten off the evil spirits, who were liable to disturb the operation ; the same purpose was pursued by whipping the air and by emitting laughing sounds<sup>78</sup>. When this magical top was made to spin inwards, "gods were called upon" to come, and when, on the other hand, it was spun in an outward direction, they "were set loose"<sup>79</sup>. The Chaldæan Oracles commanded "to operate with the top of Hecate", and Marinus reports that Proclus employed the "divine and ineffable tops" of the Chaldæans<sup>80</sup>. This instrument was also called "Iynx" (after the name of

<sup>77</sup> On the use which the Chaldæans made of the Iynxes, cf. Bidez, *C. M. A. G.*, VI, 107, 4. See also HOFFNER, *O.-Z.*, I, 604 ; A. S. F. Gow, *Ινυξ* etc., *Journ. of Hell. Stud.*, 1934, 12.

<sup>78</sup> PSELLUS, *Comm.*, 1133 A (sec n° 80) : Ἐκατικὸς στρόφαλος σφαιρὰ ἐστὶ χρυσῆ, μέσον σίμφειρον περικλείουσι, διὰ ταυρείου στρεφόμενη ἱμάντος, δι' ὅλης ἔχουσα χαρακτῆρας. Ἦν δὲ στρέφοντες ἐποιοῦντο τὰς ἐπικλήσεις καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα κλεῖν εἰώθασιν ἰνυγες, εἴτε σφαιρικὸν εἶχον, εἴτε τρίγωνον, εἴτε καὶ ἄλλο τὸ σχῆμα, τοὺς ἀσήμεους ἢ κτηνώδεις ἐξεφώνουν ἤχους, γελῶντες καὶ τὸν ἀέρα μαστίζοντες. Cf. also the brief allusion figuring in another text of Psellus edited by Bidez, *C. M. A. G.*, VI, p. 201, 20 : ἡ Ἐκατικὴ δὲ στρόφαλιγὲ μετὰ τοῦ ταυρείου ἱμάντος καὶ τῆς ἰνυγικῆς ἐπικλήσεως ὀνόματα μόνα κενά.

On the magical rite of uttering animal cries see HOFFNER, *O.-Z.*, 780, who remarks that it had not always an apotropaic tendency, but was also used to attract the gods or spirits (see n. 83). On whipping the air see ch. vi, n. 205.

<sup>79</sup> DAM., II, 95, 15 (KROLL, 56) : ἐπεὶ καὶ τὸ ὄργανον (ἰνυξ) εἰσῶ μὲν στρεφόμενον προκαλεῖται θεοὺς, ἐξῶ δὲ ἀπολύει τοὺς κληθέντας (see ch. I, n. 128-129). See E. TAVENNER, *Iynx and Rhombos*, *Amer. Phil. Assoc. Trans.*, 1934, 114, who quotes HORACE, *Epod.*, 17, 6 f.

<sup>80</sup> PSELLUS, *Comm.*, 1133 A (KROLL, 41, 2) :

« ἐνέργει περὶ τὸν Ἐκατικὸν στρόφαλον »

the magical bird) and especially under this designation it was well-known to the magicians<sup>81</sup>. We have already seen that the function assigned to the "Iynges" by the Oracles is that of a magical mediation between the Supreme God and the invoking theurgist<sup>82</sup>. They are designated in these texts as the "powers" or "thoughts" of the "Father" who, when their "ineffable magical names" are invoked, "hasten forth" out of Him, "leap" into the spheres and then "return" to Him. The connection of these noetic powers with the ritual of the magical top is proved by Marinus designating the Iynges employed by Proclus as "divine" and "ineffable". We may accordingly suppose that when the magical instrument was set in motion, it affected *per analogiam* the revolving heavenly spheres, and attracted the celestial Iynges. The process of the conjuration was possibly represented in the following manner : when one of the planetary gods is invoked, the Supreme Being, from whom every "Resolve" comes, sends forth one of his Iynges to the sphere of the planet invoked ("they leap into the radiant worlds"). This Lynx descends onto the invoking theurgist, to whom he manifests himself as a ministering spirit prepared to transmit his wish to the Supreme God. This practice of theurgy is accordingly, judged by its action, a magic of the celestial sphere, a trait whose importance lies in the light projected by it on the origin of the Chaldæan magical art<sup>83</sup>.

---

Psellus' interpretation of this fragment contains the description of the magical top quoted n. 78. For Marinus see n. 2.

<sup>81</sup> HOPFNER, *O.-Z.*, I, 602-604.

<sup>82</sup> As to what follows see ch. II, n. 248 ff. and 365 ff.

<sup>83</sup> NICOMACHUS OF GERASA, *Excerpta de Musica*, c. 6, p. 277, ed. Jan (quoted and explained by DIETERICH, *Mithrasliturgie*, 34 and DORNSEIFF, *Das Alphabet in Mystik und Magie*, 52), after having mentioned the widespread belief that the sound of every sphere corresponds to one of the seven vowels, adds p. 277, 5 : διὸ δὴ ὅταν μάλιστα οἱ θεουργοὶ (θερμιοὶ *cod.*, *corr.* Th. Gale) τὸ τοιοῦτον σεβάζονται (i. e. they invoke the spheres by pronouncing vowels), σιγμοῖς τε καὶ πομπυμοῖς καὶ ἀνάβροισ καὶ ἀσυμφώνοις ἤχοις συμβολικῶς ἐπικαλοῦνται. HOPFNER, *O.-Z.*, I, 780, illustrates this rite by numerous parallels collected from magical texts. Cf. also ROSCHER, s. v. *Planeten*, 2530 ff.

The terminology proves that this excerpt was composed by no other than Proclus who claimed to possess the soul of Nicomachus ; see ch. III, n. 197. As it is

This view of the functions of the Iynges is corroborated by Marinus' report that Proclus, "by setting a Lynx in suitable motion brought on the rains and delivered Attica from a terrible drought"<sup>86</sup>. A similar miracle was accomplished by Julian, the founder of Theurgy, during the Roman campaign against the Dacians<sup>85</sup>. Bidez supposes that Proclus performed his magical operation according to a formula identical to that of Julian, or at least similar to it; and this view has much to recommend it<sup>86</sup>. It is a well-known fact that the ancient belief in the possibility of influencing the weather was founded to some extent on the belief in the action of the stars. The Chaldæans practised this form of magics by "binding" the spheres.

The traditions concerning the conjuration of the Chaldæan gods of time (night, day, month, year) seem to legitimize some further surmises as to the manner in which the Chaldæans set about these operations. As we have seen<sup>87</sup>, these gods were identical with the rulers of the planets and with those of the signs of the zodiac. Now, Proclus declares with some emphasis that these gods of time render, while they were worshipped, the soil fertile, but that when they were neglected, "all earthly circumstance became contrary to nature"<sup>88</sup>. This explanation of the draught proves that the Chaldæan worship of the gods of time must be regarded as a fertility-cult. The magical use of the Iynges

---

impossible that the theurgists were already known to Nicomachus (who lived in the first half of the third century A. D.), we may suppose that Proclus is responsible for the fact that they are mentioned in this text: he may either have substituted the name *Θεουργοί* for another (for instance *Χαλδαίοι*, cf. the passage quoted ch. III, n. 143 from another treatise of Nicomachus) or have added the whole sentence.

<sup>85</sup> MARINUS, *Vit. Procl.*, 28: *ὄμβρους τε ἐκίνησε, Ινγγά τινα προσφόρωσ κινήσας, καὶ ἀύχμων ἐξαισιῶν τὴν Ἀττικὴν ἠλευθέρωσεν.*

<sup>86</sup> See ch. I, n. 2.

<sup>87</sup> BIDEZ, *C. M. A. G.*, VI, 107, 4. PROCLUS, *Rp.*, II, 66, 2 f. (see n. 28) quotes a non-Chaldæan recipe of harvest magic, which he learnt from Nestorius.

<sup>88</sup> See above p. 234 f.

<sup>89</sup> PROCL., *Tim.*, III, 89, 23 f. (the continuation of the passage quoted n. 6). In a neutral form, Proclus repeats an accusation which was often directed against the Christians.

had a similar purpose. It affected the celestial spheres, supposed to be the abode of the rulers of time, and could accordingly serve, when necessary, to bring about favourable weather. Now these rulers of time were, as we have seen, subordinate to the god Aion; who could be invoked with their help<sup>89</sup>. Accordingly, we may infer that this god of eternity was regarded by the Chaldæans as the Lord of fertility. As we shall see later on<sup>90</sup>, the notion of *Aion frugifer* was current in those religious circles of later antiquity, from which the Chaldæan theurgists derived.

7. *The "characters"*.—The magic disk of Hecate was covered with mystic signs (*χαρακτήρες*). The Neoplatonists mention several times the fact that the Chaldæans use graphic signs of this nature, but do not indicate their function<sup>91</sup>. Pselus reports that the theurgists wore metallic plates covered with such "characters" and regarded, according to a common magic belief, as talismans<sup>92</sup>.

Two passages of Proclus complementary to each other deal with a second group of magical signs. According to this author, the Chaldæans believed that the "sign" (*χαρακτήρ*) "set in the heart" of the human soul consisted of a combination of semicircles and of the

<sup>89</sup> See n. 6-8.

<sup>90</sup> See ch. vii, n. 95.

<sup>91</sup> DAM., II, 128, 4 (KROLL, 34) : πολλή τοῦ γραμμαίου σχήματος παρ' αὐτοῖς (τοῖς θεοῖς ἐν τοῖς λόγοις) ἢ χρῆσις.

<sup>92</sup> Nicetas (Bidez, *Mélanges Cumont*, I, 96. See above, n. 9) : Ἀσσύριοι δέ... γράμμασι ἀπορρήτοις ἐν ἱερατικοῖς πετάλοις ἐντοῦς καθαγιάζοντες... (continued n. 9).

A fragment quoted by PSELLUS, *Expos.*, 1152 A (KROLL, 23), according to which the "source" of the *χαρακτήρες* "is carried on upon the unknowable symbols" (*ἐπιδατεύουσιν τοῖς ἀγνώστοις συνθήμασι*; cf. also IDEM, *Hyp.*, 12, p. 74, 32; KROLL, 23) requires another explanation. The term *χαρακτήρες* probably applies in this passage to the luminous forms (cf. PROCL., *Crat.*, 31, 8, *φωτὸς χαρακτήρες*), seen at the divine epiphanies; while the *ἀγνώστα συνθήματα* are the noetic potencies which subsist in these divine apparitions and direct them (cf. PROCL., *Crat.*, 31, 6, *συνθήματα ἄρρητα... καὶ ἀγνώστα*). This doctrine is of Proclean, not Chaldæan origin.

character X<sup>93</sup>, and that "the gods themselves" had communicated the psychic signs of several Greek heros and of Plato, as well as their "mystic names" which bring about their apparition<sup>94</sup>. The last piece of information bears on Chaldæan theurgy only to the extent in which it concerns Plato<sup>95</sup>. For Psellus relates that Julian the Chaldæan "beheld" Plato's soul and "questioned it at will"<sup>96</sup>. We have no knowledge of his method of interrogation, but the Chaldæan psychological doctrine permits us to form some idea of the manner in which Plato's soul was supposed to appear. While the apparition of Hecate was represented as that of a speaking flame, the philosopher's soul

<sup>93</sup> PROCL., *Tim.*, II, 255, 31 : ἡ Θεουργία . . . διὰ τῶν χιασμῶν καὶ τῶν ἡμικύκλων τὸν χαρακτῆρα συμπληρώσασα τῆς ψυχῆς. *Rp.*, II, 143, 23 (KROLL, 47, 1) τοῦτο τὸν χαρακτῆρα (sc. τὸ Χί) τῆ οὐσία τῶν ψυχῶν  
«ἐγκάρδιον ἐνθεῖς»

πάσης ἰδιον ὄντα ψυχῆς . . .

ταῦτα . . . Θεουργῶν καὶ Θεῶν ἀγνωστὰ γραφόντων :

As to ἐγκάρδιον, cf. IAMBL., *Myt.*, II, 7, p. 84, 11, who states that when the "purified souls" appear, their ἐγκαρδιαῖον φῶς becomes visible. See also PROCL., *Mal. Subst.*, 259 = ps.-DIONYS., *Areopagitica*, τὰ ἐγκάρδια τῆς ἀγαθότητος φῶτα : quoted by KOCH, 163, 1.

<sup>94</sup> PROCL., *Tim.*, II, 256, 3 f. (continuing the passage quoted n. 93) δεῖ γὰρ οἰεσθαι καὶ ψυχικοὺς εἶναι χαρακτῆρας . . . ἰδίους ἄλλης (ψυχῆς) ἄλλους, ὥσπερ δὴ καὶ ἐξεδόθησαν παρ' αὐτῶν τῶν Θεῶν (Excursus I h, n) Ἡρακλέους, Πενθέως, Ἀγαύης, καὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ Πλάτωνος.

<sup>95</sup> The conjuration of the souls of Hercules, Pentheus and Agaue was not part of the Chaldæan ritual, which ignored Greek myths. Hercules was invoked by Greek conjurers ; see MAX. TYR., *Diss.*, IX, 7 b and RONDÉ, *Psyche*, II, 350, 3 ; 365, 1. The souls of Agaue and of her son Pentheus, whom in her Bacchic ecstasy she had torn to pieces, were conjured in the ritual of the later Orphic-Dionysian mysteries. Cf. DESSAU, *Inscript. Lat.*, 3384 : "Deae Semelae et sororibus eius deabus" (misunderstood by CUMONT, *Rel. Orient.*, 309, 49, but correctly explained by W. F. OTTO, *Dionysos*, 64), and the important passage *apud* ΟΛΥΜΠΙΟΝΟΝ.. *Phaed.*, 172, 6 f. not yet utilized, to which the Dionysian lustration rites mentioned by SERV., *Aen.*, VI, 741 and *Georg.*, II, 389 provide a key.

<sup>96</sup> PSELLUS, *De aurea catena* (continuation of the passage quoted ch. III, n. 195) καὶ ὅτι (Ιουλιανὸς ὁ Χαλδαῖος) ταύτην (sc. τὴν τοῦ Πλάτωνος ψυχὴν, with which he had "conjoined" his son's soul, see n. 5) ἐποπτεύων ἐκ τινος τέχνης ἱερατικῆς (see Excursus IV, 2) ἐπνυθάνετο περὶ ὧν ἐβούλετο.

became visible as a geometrical luminous figure. The belief that the apparition of the soul consists of semi-circles and of the character X derives from Plato's *Timæus*, upon which Chaldæan metaphysics are based. For according to this work the Cosmic Soul consists of two axes having the shape of the letter X which are bent so as to form semi-circles and joined together<sup>97</sup>. We may accordingly surmise that the individual souls, regarded as the offshoots of the Cosmic Soul, were represented by the Chaldæans as being, as it were, her miniature copies. This transmutation of Platonic doctrines into magical diagrams is in entire conformity with the "hermeneutic method" used by the author of the Chaldæan Oracles.

8. *Technical mantics and Theurgy*.—The fact that the Chaldæans based theurgy upon a metaphysical system accounts for their hostile attitude towards all the rival methods of prognostication; these are to be rejected wholesale. This exigency is formulated in an Oracle which sets forth the Chaldæan program in this subject, apparently in reply to a question regarding the efficacy of the prevalent forms of divination. The oracle-delivering god begins by reproving human presumption that seeks to master the divine powers: "a creature of overweening nature<sup>98</sup>", that is his name for man. He goes on:

<sup>97</sup> PLATO, *Tim.*, 34 b, 36 b 6 f. Referring to this passage of the *Timæus*, Porphyry (*ap. PROCL.*, *Tim.*, II, 247, 18 f.) remarks that the Egyptians likewise used the sign of the Platonic World-Soul to designate this entity; he may have alluded to the hieroglyph of the so-called *crux ansata*, which designates "Life" (on  $\Psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ -*Zwê* see ch. II, n. 65, Excursus II, n. 26-27). An exact parallel to this interpretation of Porphyry is quoted and explained by NORDEN, *Die Geburt des Kindes* 121. IUSTINUS, *Apology*, I, 60, 1-5 believes that the form of the Platonic World-Soul imitates the cross prefigured by the, 'serpent of brass' mentioned *Numbers*, XXI, 9. I conjecture that the sign of the cross by which, according to the report of Gregory Nazianzen, the Neoplatonist Maximus of Ephesus exorcised the evil demons, was in reality the sign of Hecate-Psyche, the mistress of the demons; cf. ch. v, n. 39.

<sup>98</sup> PSELLUS, *Comm.*, 1136 A (KROLL, 50):

«(σίγ'), ὃ τολμηρᾶς φύσεως, ἀνθρώπου, τέχνασμα».

This line derives from the Oracle quoted in the subsequent note, as is proved



“Submit not to thy mind earth’s vast measures, for that the plant of thruth grows not on earth, and measure not the course of the sun by joining rods, for that he moves in accordance with the will eternal of the Father, not for the sake of thee. Let go the moon’s sound; she ever runs by operation of necessity. The stars’ procession was not brought forth for sake of thee. The wide-winged aerial flight of birds is never true, nor yet the slicings of the victims and of other entrails. These are all toys, lending support to mercenary fraud. Flee thou these things, if thou woulds tenter true worship’s paradise, where Virtue, Wisdom and Good-Rule are met together”<sup>99</sup>.

by Psellus’ scholium : « τολμηράν δὲ φύσιν » (sc. τὸν ἄνθρωπον) ἠνύμασε τὸ λόγιον, ὡς τὰ κρείττονα περιεργαζόμενον (cf. *Theos.*, 2 1, 7, quoted ch. 1, n. 52) καὶ δρόμον μὲν ἀστέρων καταμετροῦντα (see the Oracle quoted n. 99, v. 3 ff.), ὑπερφυσῶν δὲ δυνάμεων τάξεις διακριβοῦντα καὶ (τὰ) ἐξωτάτω τῆς οὐρανόιο σφαίρας (i. e. the νοητὸς τόπος) διασκοποῦντα καὶ περὶ Θεοῦ τι λέγειν διατεινόμενον. Consequently, I propose to complement *σῖγα*; cf. the fragment *σιγ’ ἔχε, μύστα*, quoted ch. 11, n. 359. PHILLO, *De somn.*, I, 53-54 and *Kore Kosmou* (W. SCOTT, *Hermetica*, I, 482, 9 f.) use similar arguments, when taxing the astronomers with *τόλμα*.

“ PSELLUS, *Comm.*, 1128 B (KROLL, 64) :

- 1 « μὴ τὰ πελώρια μέτρα γαίης ὑπὸ σὴν φρένα βάλλου·  
οὐ γὰρ ἀληθείης φυτὸν ἐν χθονί (ἐστίν).  
μηδὲ μέτρει δρόμον ἡελίου κανόνας συναθροίσας·  
αἰδίω βουλή φέρεται πατρός, οὐχ ἔνεκεν σοῦ.
- 5 μήνης ροῖζον ἔασον· αἰεὶ τρέχει ἔργῳ ἀνάγκης.  
ἀστέριον προπόρευμα σέθεν χάριν οὐκ ἔλοχεύθη.  
αἰθριος ὀρνίθων ταρσὸς πλατὺς οὐποτ’ ἀληθής,  
οὐ Ψυσιῶν σπλάγχων τε τομαί· τὰδ’ ἀθύρματα πάντι,  
ἐμπορικῆς ἀπάτης στηρίγματα. Φεῦγε σὺ ταῦτα
- 10 μέλλων εὐσεβῆς ἱερὸν παράδεισον ἀνοίγειν,  
ἐνθ’ ἀρετῇ σοφίῃ τε καὶ εὐνομίῃ συναγόνται. »

*Testimonies* : v. 3, *cit.* PROCL., *Tim.*, I, 202, 17; III, 81, 24 f.—v. 6, *cit.* PROCL., *Tim.*, III, 124, 31.—v. 8, SYNESIUS, *Insomn.*, 4, 1289 B (who reads οὐ Ψυσιῶν σπλάγχων τ’ ὀθομαι).

*Appar. crit.* : v. 2 : ἐστίν, *supplevi*.—v. 3 : δρόμον, Proclus, μέτρον Psellus.—v. 8 : τε, *om.* Psellus, *habet* Synes.

*Interpretation* : v. 2 : cf. ch. 11, n. 293.—v. 4 *init.* : cf. ch. 11, n. 49, No. 3.—v. 5 *fin.* : cf. ch. 11, n. 136.—v. 8-9 : cf. ch. 1, n. 93 and 95.—v. 10-11 : cf. ch. 11, n. 177 f.

The Oracle enumerates the diverse types of divination, and in each case indicates briefly the reason for which these occult arts should not be indulged in <sup>100</sup>. The list, whose sequence is due to cosmological considerations, mentions geomancy, the measurement of the sun's orbit <sup>101</sup>, the conjuration of the moon (who in answer to the magician's invocation produces a sound <sup>102</sup>), astrology <sup>103</sup>, bird-divination and haruspicy <sup>104</sup>. The Chaldæans defend their negation of the possibility of interpreting the heavenly presages by the axiom that these are caused by the workings of divine Necessity, which accomplishes the Will of the Supreme Father. The contrast between the anthropocentric vision of nature, which characterizes the votaries of mantics, and the worship of the cosmic rule, which manifests itself in the autonomous effects of natural necessity, is inspired by Plato; and likewise the denial of the possibility of discovering truth from earthly measures <sup>105</sup>. This conception accounts for the fact that the quoted Oracle mentions, in connection with its rejection of technical mantics, the doctrine of

---

<sup>100</sup> The various kinds of magic are classified in cosmological order: earth—sun—moon—stars—air.

<sup>101</sup> Both the Egyptians and the Chaldæans were held to have invented the measurement of the course of the sun for magical purposes.

<sup>102</sup> Cf. *P. Mag.* VII, 884: ἐξακούσασα τὰ ἱερά σου (Selene) σύμβολα δὸς ῥοίζων. Those and other parallel passages are quoted by KROLL, 65, 1. See also ROSCHER, s. v. *Mondgöttin*, 3165.

<sup>103</sup> The rejection of astrological mantic does not involve the negation of the influence of the stars. The Chaldæans believed in the noxious influence of Mars (see ch. I, n. 174), conjured before every magical operation the planet which ruled the day (ch. IV, n. 8), adorned the girdle of their ritual dress with the images of the zodiac, whose signs considered as figuring divine beings they used to conjure (ch. I, n. 115 and ch. IV, n. 29). Julian the Theurgist in his work "On the Zones" (see ch. II, n. 155) probably treated of astrological theory and ritual.

<sup>104</sup> See ch. I, n. 93 and 95. A distinction is made between the examination of the victim and of the liver. It is a noteworthy fact that neither necromancy (see ch. III, n. 113 f) nor the interpretation of dreams (see ch. III, n. 114) are mentioned among the rejected kinds of mantic (all of which belong to the so-called *τεχνικὸν εἶδος τῆς μαντικῆς*; cf. IANBL., *Myst.*, III, 15, p. 135, 7).

<sup>105</sup> See PLATO, *Leges*, 903 c; PLOTINUS, II, 3, 6; III, 2, 3 and 8. Other passages are quoted by WITT, *Albinus*, 122, 2.

immortality. The mantical methods which this Oracle enumerates cannot further the soul on its way to this goal, as the science on which they rely neglects the fact that the phenomena immanent to the world are subject to the laws of the transcendent governance of the universe<sup>106</sup>. As Iamblichus contends<sup>107</sup>, theurgy is the only legitimate form of divination, as it is bound up with the apprehension of the noetic powers which are the real rulers of the cosmos<sup>108</sup>.

---

<sup>106</sup> The Oracle deigns to refute astrological mantic, but holds that ornithoscopy and haruspicy are nothing but a swindle.

<sup>107</sup> IAMBL., *Myst.*, III, 27-28, 31 (see ch. v, n° 66); X, 5, etc.

<sup>108</sup> The concordance noted by GEFFCKEN, *ad loc.*, between *Orac. Sibyll.*, III, 221 f. and the Oracle, is nothing but a coincidence, as is proved by the verses which follow; both texts model themselves upon Homer (the works of the giants symbolize the hybris of the mortals). The sole trace of Jewish influence in the Chaldæan Oracle is the use of the word *παράδεισος* (see ch. III, n. 178). It may be remarked that Kroll changed his opinion as regards the Judaizing tendency of the Chaldæan Oracle; see GEFFCKEN, *Ausgang des Heidentums*, 276, 94.



## CHAPTER V

### CHALDÆAN DEMONOLOGY

1. *The evil demons.*—The Chaldæans, in common with the magicians and, probably, with the majority of their contemporaries<sup>1</sup>, held to the belief in the existence of troops of evil demons, who inhabit the terrestrial zone. All cosmic calamities<sup>2</sup> and all individual passions were attributed to their activities; they were supposed to be always on the watch for an opportunity to lead the theurgists astray and to render ineffectual their pious actions. “Out of the wombs of the earth leap chthonic dogs, that unto mortal never show true sign”<sup>3</sup>. These

<sup>1</sup> Cf. CUMONT, *Rel. Orient.*, 175 f.

<sup>2</sup> PROCL., *Tim.*, I, 121, 21 (KROLL, 65) : Τί δέ, εἰ τὰ ὄρη συμπέσοι, πνεύματος αὐτὰ ῥήξαντος ἀπὸ τῶν ὑπογείων τόπων, ὑφ’ οἴου τὰ λόγια καὶ «αὐτάνδρους πόλεις ἀπόλλυσθαι (the metrical would be πόλεις γ’ ἀπολέσθαι) φασίν.

This passage proves that the Chaldæan Oracles spoke of evil spirits destroying whole cities by earthquakes; cf. PORPH., *Abst.*, II, 40, p. 169, 13; *Corp. Herm.*, I, 14; XVI, 10 (see REITZENSTEIN, *Poimandres*, 352; BIDEZ-CUMONT, *Mages hell.*, II, 278, n. 4). Proclus who, according to MARINUS, *Vit. Procl.*, 28, used to “attach” amulets against earthquakes (he probably did it in Athens like Nestorius, cf. ZOSIMUS, IV, 18, 2), identified because of the twofold meaning of πνεύματα the subterranean winds which in the opinion of the ancient seismologists (cf. *Tim.*, I, 187, 28 f., with reference to ARISTOTLE, *Meteor.*, II, 8, 368 a, 34 f.) are the cause of earthquakes, with the subterranean demons of the Chaldæan Oracles. Cf. also PSELLUS, *Hyp.*, 23, quoted n. 3, and the new text edited by BIDEZ, *C.M.A.G.*, VI, p. 122, 29 with the note *ibid.*, p. 99, 2.

<sup>3</sup> PSELLUS, *Comm.*, 1140 B (KROLL, 45) :

ἐκ δ’ ἄρα κόλπων  
γῆης θρώσκουσιν χθόνιοι κύνες οὐποτ’ ἀληθές  
σῆμα βροτῶν δεικνυntες.

Cf. the scholium *ad loc.*, περὶ δαιμόνων ἐνύλων ὁ λόγος and *Hyp.*, 23 (p. 75, 22, KROLL, 45) concerning the race of the evil demons ὁ καὶ ἐν τῷ κοιλώματι φέρεται

“multifluous troops”<sup>4</sup> of demons were the antagonistic forces against whom the fight for the human soul had to be waged.

According to Psellus, the Chaldæans distinguished between two kinds of demons : the good and the evil ; the former help the soul in her “hieratic ascent” and in her fight against the evil spirits, who seek to prevent the souls’ union with the divine and to drag her down<sup>5</sup>. Other reports enable us to grasp with greater precision the points which are left vague in this passage of Psellus. First we may state that “hieratic ascent” is identical with the theurgical “elevation”<sup>6</sup>, which culminates in the mystic union of the soul separated from the body with the divine ray of light. Proclus mentions several times the good demons, who help the soul to attain this goal, and adds that they belong to the class of angels, who “enkindle the soul with divine fire” and thereby “cut out the stain” of her union with the body<sup>7</sup>. Con-

cf. also PROCL., *Crat.*, 76, 13 (both passages will be explained n. 186). See HOPFNER, *O.-Z.*, I, 244.

The deceptions of the demons account for the importance ascribed in the Chaldæan Oracles to true *σημεία* : cf. ch. iv, n. 56. On the designation of the demons as dogs see n. 41.

<sup>4</sup> PSELLUS, *De operat. daem.* (p. 30, Boiss., Migne, P. G., CXXII, 866 A) τὰ τῶν δαιμόνων “πολυχέυμονα φύλα” (the termination of an hexameter) is conjectured by KROLL, 46, 1 to derive from the Chaldæan Oracle. This supposition is supported by the facts that only several lines afterwards Psellus refers to another Chaldæan notion (*μισοφαγίς*, see n. 144) and that Proclus in his “Song of Fire” (see Excursus IX) calls the passions provoked by the demons *ταπεινὸν χεῦμα*.

<sup>5</sup> PSELLUS, *Hyp.*, 23 (p. 75, 18) : (τοῦ δαιμονίου) τὸ μὲν δύναμιν ἀγαθοειδῆ κέκτηται συλλαμβάνον τοῖς ἱερατικοῖς ἀνόδοις ἐπὶ τοὺς ἐναντίους ταύταις (sc. ταῖς ἀνόδοις) δαιμονας κινούς· τὰ δὲ καθέλκει τὰς ψυχάς. Cf. IAMBLL., *Myst.*, II, 6, p. 82, 12 : (ἡ τῶν δαιμόνων τάξις) . . . τοὺς ἐπὶ τὸ πῦρ σπεύδοντας (the Theurgists, see ch. II, n. 396) κτέχει περὶ τὸν τῆδε τόπον, and PROCL., *Rp.*, II, 3, 20 : παρὰ δὲ τῶν δημιουργίας ἐφόρων (the good demons. Kroll’s correction *Θεουργῶν* is superfluous) τὰ τοῖς ἱερατικοῖς (*μασc.*) εἰωθότα συμπίπτειν ἐν αὐτοῖς τοῖς ἱεροῖς ἀθλοῖς (sc. λύεται).

<sup>6</sup> See Excursus IV, 2.

<sup>7</sup> (a) PROCL., *Tim.*, III, 300, 16 (KROLL, 53) : ἡ τελεστική (see Excursus X a) . . . διὰ τοῦ Θείου πυρὸς ἀφανίζουσα τὰς ἐκ τῆς γενέσεως ἀπάσας τὰς “κηλίδας”, ὡς τὰ λόγια διδάσκει (cf. «οὐδὲν θνητὸν ἔχουσα» : ch. III, n. 88).—(b) IDEM.,

sequently, the "good demons" of Psellus are none others than the Chaldaean angels. In conformity with the Iamblichean tradition Proclus (from whom Psellus derives his information) identifies them with the higher class of demons and thus marks their place in the Neoplatonic hierarchy of spirits<sup>8</sup>. What was the precise part which they

*Crat.*, 71, 17 : καθαίρουσι... ἄγγελοι τὰς ψυχὰς, ἀποτέμνοντες τὰς ἐκ τῆς γενέσεως κηλίδας καὶ ἀνάγοντες (Excursus VII B, 3) αὐτὰς πρὸς τοὺς Θεοὺς. In the last two passages there is no reference to the Chaldaean Oracles, κηλὶς being a term habitually used by the Platonists to designate all that is material; cf. e. g. PHILO, *Decal.*, 10; *Aetern. mund.*, 2; PLUTARCH, *Num. vind.*, 20, 562 B.—(c) IDEM, *Exc. Vat.*, 192, 13 (KROLL, 53) : ἡ δὲ τῶν ἀγγέλων μερίς (see *Theos.*, No. 13, 16, quoted ch. I, n. 46) πῶς ἀνάγει ψυχὴν; "Φέγγουσα" Φησι (sc. τὰ λόγια), *πυρι τὴν ψυχὴν*.—(d) IDEM, *Th. Pl.*, 118, 11 : τὴν ὠδῖνα τῶν ψυχῶν... τελεωσαμένη (cf. PLOTINUS, V, 9, 2, after PLATO, *Phaedr.*, 251 e, 5) καὶ τὸν ἐν (ταῖς ψυχαῖς)... ἀνάψασα πυρσόν (for πυρσός see ch. III, n. 84).—(e) IDEM, *Alc.*, 472, 9 : τοὺς πυρσοὺς ἀνάπτουσαι τοὺς ἀναγωγούς; similarly *Hymn.*, IV, 2 (Θεοί), οἱ ψυχὰς μερόπων ἀναγώγιον ἀψάμενοι πῦρ ἔλκετ' ἐς ἀθανάτους.—(f) IDEM, *Rp.*, II, 296, 9 : τὸ λόγιον εἴρηκεν εἶναι... τινα «τμήσεως (the epical form would be τμήσιος; KROLL, *ad loc.* See ch. II, n. 168) ἀγόν» (see «ἡέρος ἀγοί» : ch. II, n. 287 b). The "leader of the separation" should accordingly be considered as the chief of the detachment of angels (μερίς : see above [c]) which draw the soul aloft and delete the defilement of matter.—(g) PSELLUS, *Hyp.*, 22 (p. 75, 15) τὸ ἀγγελικόν... ἀνάγον... τὰς ψυχὰς (see ch. IV, n. 37).

All the seven Proclean passages we have quoted paraphrase the same verses of a Chaldaean Oracle, adapting their content to Neoplatonic doctrine so as to render the task of reconstituting them in their original form impossible.

<sup>8</sup> The angels are mentioned by the Platonists, with whom alone we are concerned, since the II<sup>nd</sup> century (see ch. II, n. 367), but Iamblichus was the first who assigned them a fixed place in the hierarchy of gods and spirits. Following the example of Porphyry (but see already PLUTARCH, *Def. Orac.*, 39, 431 E and APULIUS, *De deo Socr.*, 16, p. 24, 20) he distinguished between two classes of demons : those dwelling permanently in the supra-terrestrial region (known to the Neoplatonists as ἀτρεπτοι, ἀχραντοι, Θεῖοι, κατ' οὐσίαν δαιμονες) and the pre-existent human souls, who after leaving the body acquire for a millenium the rank of demons (because of this they are named οἱ κατὰ σχέσιν δαιμονες) and then descend for a new incarnation. Iamblichus identifies the angels with the first class, thus positing the sequence : Θεοί - ἄγγελοι - δαιμονες - ἥρωες. (The relevant testimonies are quoted, although not systematically arranged, by O. GRUPPE, *Griech. Mythologie*, II, 1470, 1; MAU, *Die Religionsphilosophie Kaiser Julians*, 71 f. ;

were supposed to play in the sacramental mysteries at which they cooperated? The extant texts do not enlighten us as to the conceptions of the theurgists regarding this point. Perhaps these spirits conducted the "purifying" ray on its downward journey from the "Father" to the aspirant<sup>9</sup>. At all events, they are certainly identical with Psellus' "good demons" who help the theurgist in the fight against the evil spirits waged by him during his "elevations".

The temptations produced by the evil demons which beset the theurgists were manifold. The gods bade the Chaldæans to take care lest they disregard in the course of the holy ceremonies the right measure; and depart from the order laid down for the ritual<sup>10</sup>:

CUMONT, *Les anges du paganisme* [quoted ch. 1, n. 32], p. 170 f.; HOPFNER, *O.-Z.*, I, 43 ff.; PROCLUS, *Tim.*, I, 77, 9 f. [see Excursus XI, n. 4] uses Iamblichus' distinctions while expounding Porphyry's demonology; cf. *ibid.*, 52, 16 f.). Proclus took over the former's classification identifying the "unchanging demons" with the Chaldæan angels; cf. ch. II, n. 365.

<sup>9</sup> See ch. III, n° 84 and ch. v, n. 7.

<sup>10</sup> (a) MARINUS, *Vit. Procl.*, 13 : *εις την Πλάτωνος ἤγε μυσταγωγίαν ἐν τάξει καὶ «οὐχ ὑπερβάθμιον πόδα», κατὰ τὸ λόγιον, «τείνοντα».*

(b) DAMASCIUS, *Vit. Isid.* (ap. SUIDAM, s. v. *ὑπερβάθμιος*) «οὐδὲ ὑπερβάθμιον πόδα ῥίπτων», κατὰ τὸ λόγιον, *εις την Θεοσέβειαν, ἀλλὰ μέτρα ὀρθῶν*, etc.

(c) OLYMPIODOR., *Schol. in PLAT., Theast.*, 413 A, p. 236, Hermann : *παροιμία «ὑπὲρ τὰ ἐσκαμμένα πηδᾶς», ὅμοιον τῷ ὑπερβάθμιον πόδα τείνεις».*

(d) *Epitome Heidelbergensis* (*F. Gr. Hist.*, No. 155, p. 836, 9, Jacoby) : the successors of Alexander *ἤρξαντα ὑπερβάθμιον τείνειν πόδα*. The use of the Chaldæan expression in the sense of (c) proves that the author of the epitome lived in the Byzantine epoch.

(e) AGATHIAS, II, 29.

(f) ASCLEPIUS in ARIST., *Metaph.*, 98, 11.

(g) PHILOPON. in ARIST., *Categ.*, 6, 13. *Et sapiens*.

The primitive meaning of this expression which became proverbial among the Neoplatonists may be elucidated from the context in which it figures in the texts of Marinus and Damascius. In another passage (see ch. IV, n. 64) Marinus states that Proclus performed the Chaldæan lustrations *ἐν τάξει*; cf. also *P. Mag.*, IV, 2628 : *μη ἀτάκτως τῇ πρᾶγματεία* (the magical operation) *προσερχόμενος* as well as IAMB., *Myst.*, III, 13, p. 131, 8 f. and 31, p. 177, 13 (see n. 63). See the following note.



..For no other reasons, God turns man away from Himself and sends him, through the agency of Living Power, on vain path" <sup>11</sup>.

Thus, according to Chaldæan doctrine, God Himself leads astray the man who has failed to observe with the required strictness the magical rites prescribed by the supreme revelation. "Living Power", which performs this task, is, as we have already indicated <sup>12</sup>, identical with Hecate, mistress of the evil demons. Charged with the execution of God's decision she bids the spirits subservient to her to deceive the officiant who, in this manner, is made to expiate his offence against ritual.

The evil demons were feared by the Chaldæans not only because they experienced their antagonism in the course of the theurgical operations. They were also the constant tempters who exerted a pernicious influence during the whole of life. They inhabited the realm of "Nature" (*Φύσις*) that is the intramundane, and, more especially, the sublunar zone. There they practised their arts of delusion <sup>13</sup>.

"Nature persuades us to believe that the demons are pure, and the offsprings of evil matter useful and good" <sup>14</sup>.

<sup>11</sup> PROCL., *Parm.*, 990, 27 (KROLL, 56) : *καὶ γὰρ ἐπὶ Θεωρίας καὶ ἐπὶ τελεστικῆς* (see Excursus X a) *καὶ τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ ποιοῦν ἀσφαλῆ καὶ ἰπταίσιον ἡμῖν τὴν ἀνοδον, ἢ ἐν τάξει πρόδος· ὡς γοῦν φησί καὶ τὸ λόγιον·*

*«Οὐδενὸς εἰνεκεν ἄλλου ἀποσπρέφεται Θεὸς ἄνδρα  
καὶ ζώση Δυνάμει κενεάς ἐπὶ πέμπει ἀταρπούς»,*

*ὡς ὅταν ἀτάκτως καὶ πλημμελῶς ἐπὶ τὰ Θεϊότατα τῶν Θεωρημάτων ἢ τῶν ἔργων* (see Excursus IV, 1) *... ποιησώμεθα τὴν ἀνοδον* : cf. n. 10 ; PSELLUS, *Hyp.*, 23 (p. 75, 21. See also KROLL, 44) paraphrases the same fragment of the Oracles as follows (*τὸ κακοεργὲς δαιμόνιον*)... *κολάζον τὰς ἐρήμας ἀπολειφθείσας* (sc. *ψυχάς*) *τοῦ Θείου φωτός*. Apparently he makes the mistake of relating *ζώση Δυνάμει* (paraphrased *τοῦ Θείου φωτός*) to *κενεάς* instead to *πέμπει*.

<sup>12</sup> See ch. II, n. 77 and ch. I, n. 168.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. PSELLUS, *Hyp.*, 23 (p. 75, 20) concerning the race of the evil demons : *τὴν φύσιν ἐπισπρέφόμενον*.

<sup>14</sup> PSELLUS, *Comm.*, 1137 A (KROLL, 44) :

*«Ἡ φύσις πείθει πιστεύειν [εἶναι] τοὺς δαίμονας ἀγνοῦς  
καὶ τὰ κακῆς ὕλης εἰλαστήματα χρῆστα καὶ ἐσθλά»*

SYNESIUS, *Hymn.*, II, 52 : *«ἵνα δαιμόνων ὄμιλον φύσις ἰζάνουσα τίκτει»* alludes to these verses. The sentence *καὶ τὴν κακίαν δὲ βλάστημα τῆς ὕλης γεγονέναι*

The Chaldæans demonized the entire terrestrial zone. Not only does "Nature" accord an abode to the powers of evil, she herself is the most dangerous of tempters. The mortal who does not constantly perform the prescribed lustrations, cannot keep himself free from the delusions that she provokes :

"Enchanting the soul, they (the evil demons) draw her away from the mysteries" <sup>15</sup>.

These demons lure the soul to corporeal passions and to an "animal" life <sup>16</sup>. They bring about, as an Oracle says, the "stifling of true Eros" <sup>17</sup>

---

(without reference to the demons) is to be found in PLUTARCH, *Epitome de anim. procr.*, 2, 1030 f; see also note 180. This and other fragments show that the Chaldæans were at one with the Jews and Christians (see K. SVOBODA, *La démonologie de Psellos*, 6, 29. Cf. also ORIGEN., *Contra Celsum*, VIII, 31) in never using the term *δαίμονες* in good part. Psellus (see BIDEZ, *C. M. A. G.*, VI, 110, 2, 128, 11 f.) who explains that according to the Chaldæan Oracles there exist good demons, whereas in the Christian view, there are only evil ones, is deceived by Proclus' reinterpretation of the Oracles.

For Psellus' explanation of this fragment see n. 36.

<sup>15</sup> PROCL., *Alc.*, 340, 8 (KROLL, 55) : τὰ λόγια προστίθησιν (sc. *ad orac. cit. in cap.*, IV, n. 1 a), ὅτι

« τὰς ψυχὰς θέλοντες αἰεὶ τελετῶν ἀπάγουσιν »

("Hoc de pravīs daemonibus dictum" : Kroll). PSELLUS, *Hyp.*, 23 (p. 75, 21) on the species of the evil demons : θέλον τὰς ψυχὰς.

<sup>16</sup> PROCL., *Rp.*, II, 309, 10 (KROLL, 60) :

« οἶδε γὰρ οὐκ ἀπέχουσι κυνῶν ἀλόγων πολὺ μέτρον »,

οἱ ζῶντες πονηρὰν ζωὴν, φησὶ τὸ λόγιον. Cf. *Tim.*, III, 157, 27 : εἴπερ γὰρ εἰσὶν ἄλογοι δαίμονες, ὡς οἱ θεουργοὶ λέγουσιν.

<sup>17</sup> PROCL., *Rp.*, I, 176, 22 (KROLL, 26) : τὸν ὑβριστὴν ἔρωτα καὶ ὃν οἱ θεοὶ « πνιγμὸν ἔρωτος ἀληθοῦς » προσειρήκασιν ; cf. *Alc.*, 417, 13. *Rp.*, II, 347, 7 : διὸ καὶ τὰ λόγια παρακελεύεται « πλατύνειν » ἡμῖν . . . « ἐάντους » (see n. 23), ἀλλὰ μὴ ἀποστενοῦν, « πνιγμὸν ἔρωτος ἀληθοῦς » ἐφελκομένους. See also *Alc.*, 357, 28 f. (quoted n. 173) where we find a clearer description of the demonic character of evil Eros.

According to *LXX Reg.*, I, XVI, 14 (JOSEPH., *Ant.*, VI, 166) Saul was a victim of throttling demons (δαίμονια πνιγμοὺς αὐτῷ . . . ἐπιφέροντα) and these were probably in the mind of the author of the Oracle. Cf. besides PLUTARCH, *De gen. Socr.* 20, 588 D : πεπνιγμένοι γε θορόδω τῶν παθῶν. We may note that the passions are attributed by the Chaldæans to demonic influence.

that had been blent with the soul at the time of her creation and kept awake her yearning for a return to her divine place of origin<sup>18</sup>. Gradually they take up their abode in the body of the person they have seduced: "Thy vessel the beasts of the earth shall inhabit"<sup>19</sup>.

Temptation by the demons cannot be avoided; for it is inherent in earthly existence<sup>20</sup>. Through her residence in the human body the soul finds herself in the sphere of influence of Heimarmene<sup>21</sup>, the

<sup>18</sup> See n. 8. In the fragment transmitted by PROCL., *Exc. Val.*, 193, 22 (KROLL, 64): « μὴ σθέσαι φρενί» the object τὸν ἀγνὸν ἔρωτα or τὸν ψυχᾶιον σπιυθῆρα (see ch. III, n. 8) or τὸ ψυχῆς ὄμμα (see ch. II, n. 388) may be reconstituted.

<sup>19</sup> PSELLUS, *Comm.*, 1140 A (KROLL, 60):

«σὺν (δὲ γὰρ) ἀγνεῖον Θῆρες χθονὸς οἰκήσουσιν».

Psellus correctly remarks that "vessel" means in this context (as in many other texts, cf. the parallels collected by W. KROLL, *ad loc.* and J. KROLL, *Lehren des Hermes*, 127 f.) the human body and "beasts of the earth" the demons. See also the fragments quoted n. 3 (χθόνιοι κύνες) and 14 (ύλης βλαστηματα) and PSELLUS, *Hyp.*, 23 (p. 75, 20) according to which the race of evil demons was described in the Chaldaean Oracle as "beast-like", *Θηροπόλον*. For οἰκήσουσιν see PORPH., *Marc.*, 11, p. 281, 24: κακοδαίμων ἄνθρωπος... πονηρῶν διαιμόνων ἐνδιαίτημα and *ibid.*, 21, p. 287, 22f.; CLEM. AL., *Ecolg. Proph.*, 46, 1: ἐμπαθῆς ἄνθρωπος λεγεῶν δαιμόνων. The future tense does not refer to the state after death but after the victory of the demonic principle; cf. PSELLUS, *ad loc.*, 1140 A: τὴν οὖν ζωὴν ἡμῶν πλήρη γενομένην παθῶν οἱ τοιοῦτοι Θῆρες (i. e. οἱ δαίμονες) εἰκήσουσι (continued n. 62).

<sup>20</sup> PSELLUS, *Hyp.*, 25 (p. 75, 30; KROLL, 48): εἰ δὲ συμπάθοι τῷ σώματι (sc. ἡ ψυχῆ; see Excursus VI, 1 b), Θεραπεύειν (see ch. III, n. 45) ἀνάγκη καὶ ὑπὸ τῇ μοῖρα τετάχθαι (see ch. III, n. 142-143) καὶ ὑπὸ τῆς φύσεως ἄγεσθαι (see n. 35).

<sup>21</sup> PROCL., *Pron.*, 179, 22 (KROLL, 28 and 49) reads in Greek retranslation: οἱ δὲ Θεοπαράδοτοι λόγοι τὴν πηγὴν καθ' ἑαυτὴν ὑμνοῦσι τῆς ὀλικῆς ψυχῆς τῆς ἐμπυρίας καὶ ταύτην διακρίνουσι ἀπὸ τῆς ὅλης ζωογόνου Θεᾶς, ἀφ' ἧς καὶ τὴν ὀλην εἰμαρμένην ἐξαρτῶντες δύοσ ποιοῦσι σειράς, τὴν μὲν ψυχικὴν, τὴν δὲ, ὡς εἴπομεν, μοιραίαν· καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν ἐκ τῆς δευτέρας ἐλκύοντες τότε λέγουσι «τῇ εἰμαρμένη δουλεύειν», ὅταν ἀλογισθεῖσα τὸν κύριον μεταλλάξῃ ἀντὶ προνοίας εἰμαρμένην.

In this speculation concerning the relationship of Providence and Destiny only the statement that souls which turn towards the earthly things "serve Heimarmene" is Chaldaean. Concerning Proclus' distinction between ζωὴ and ψυχῆ and his theory of the "psychic chains", see ch. II, n. 65 and 135. The differentiation

force of Destiny endowed by the Chaldæans with numerous demonic traits and regarded by them as the primary source of all evil powers. According to Psellus, the theurgists used apotropaic images with a view to warding off the "streams springing from Heimarmene"<sup>22</sup> that is the demons. Another fragment identifies Heimarmene with the material principle in man. The injunction of the Oracles "not to aggrandize Heimarmene"<sup>23</sup> means : Do not aggrandize in thyself the dominion of the corporeal, as it is the abode of the demons. The concreteness of the expression proves the reality of the Chaldæan belief in demons : the evil powers take possession of that part of man which is left undefended against their assaults<sup>24</sup>.

These few texts bring out very clearly the demonic character of the Chaldæan notion of destiny. As the theurgists conceived it, Destiny is a power thought of as personal, which becomes individualised in its demonic satellites. The immediate effect of the Chaldæan initiation was to eliminate this danger. The theurgist who had accomplished the sacramental rites was immune against the action of the demons ; for he belonged already to the "Father's" kingdom.

The power of the demons is manifested in the dimensions of the region they inhabit, extending as it did throughout the entire intramundane space. The fragment of an Oracle which constituted the

between *πρόνοια* and *εἰμαρμένη* (cf. also PSELLUS, *Comm.*, 1145 D : *καὶ ὑπὸ πρόνοιαν μὲν κείμεθα, ὅταν νοερώς ἐνεργῶμεν ὑπὸ εἰμαρμένην δέ, ὅταν καὶ σωματικῶς*) is likewise Proclean, not Chaldæan ; cf. KROLL, 49 who proves that also the doctrine of providence ascribed by PROCL., *Dub. Prov.*, 76, 9 f. to the Chaldæans does not derive from the Oracles. See ch. vi, sect. 9, in which we examine the influence of Middleplatonic speculation on both Proclus and the Chaldæans.

<sup>22</sup> « τὰ ἐξ εἰμαρμένης ρεύματα » : see n. 126.

<sup>23</sup> PSELLUS, *Comm.*, 1145 C (KROLL, 50) : « μὴ συννεύῃσης τὴν εἰμαρμένην ». As to the verb, see n. 17, « πλατύνειν ἑαυτοῦς » and ch. iii, n. 114, « τὸ ἐνδοθεν σπέρμα αὐξῆσαι ».

PROCL., *Prov.*, 164, 8 quotes two further words of the verse : *Neque coaugeas fatum, cuius finis...* (*gr. ἢς τέλος*). The missing predicative noun was *nihil*, according to Kroll ; I propose to supply *ἄιδης*, see below sect. 2-4.

<sup>24</sup> See also ch. vi, n. 311 f.

beginning of a conjuring hymn, enables us to form an idea of the multiplicity of the spirits appertaining to the Chaldæan pandemonium :

“You nymphs of the sources, and all the water spirits; terrestrial and aerial wombs and those situated under the rays; you male and female lunar bestriders of all matter, that of the heaven and stars and that of the abysses”<sup>25</sup>.

The list of demons figuring in this hymn does not distinguish between the sub- and supralunar spirits. All of these are divided into three classes : a) the water spirits (designated in another Oracle as the “water bestriders”<sup>26</sup>) ; b) the “wombs”, that is the elemental spirits<sup>27</sup>

<sup>25</sup> LYDUS, *De mensibus*, III, 7, p. 41, 7 (KROLL, 10) :

« Νύμφαι πηγαῖαι καὶ ἐνύδρια πνεύματα πάντα,  
καὶ χθόνιοι κόλποι τε καὶ ἡέριοι καὶ ὑπανγοί,  
μνηαῖοι πάσης ἐπιθήτορες ἢδ' ἐπιθήται  
ὑλης οὐρανῆς τε καὶ ἀστερῆς καὶ ἀβύσσων »

Those four verses are described by Lydus as *λόγια*, while OLYMPIODORUS. in *Ale.*, p. 19, ed. Creuzer, who quotes the last verse, designates it as Orphic (see *Orph. Fragm.*, 353, Kern). Lydus' statement is based on tradition, as is proved by *De mens.*, II, 11, p. 32, 3, where he quotes in another context two words of the fourth verse, also as *Logia*. The explanation of Psellus (quoted n. 36) proves that the fragment is of Chaldæan and not Orphic origin. Olympiodorus' mistake may be due to the verses being ascribed in his source (Proclus) to the *Θεόλογοι*, a term applied both to the Orphics and the Chaldæans; cf. *Excursus I d.* The Emperor Julian committed the inverse error in ascribing, *Epist.*, 89, p. 132, 6 f. B.-C., an Orphic doctrine (LOBECK, *Aglaoph.*, 565 f.; KERN, *Religion der Griechen*, II, 165, 3) to the Chaldæan theurgists.

We need not consider Olympiodorus' explanation of the four verses, as it is based on Proclean speculations; see HOPFNER, *O.-Z.*, I, 114 and below, n. 34.

<sup>26</sup> PROCL., *Tim.*, III, 110, 4 (KROLL, 45) τὸ λόγιον « ὑδροβατῆρας » καλεῖ τοὺς Θεοὺς τούτους (τοὺς ἐνύδρους). Other texts referring to waterspirits are cited by M. NINCK, *Die Bedeutung des Wassers im Kult und Leben der Alten* (*Philologus, Suppl.*, XIV, 2, 1921); SVOBODA, *La démonologie de Michel Psellos*, 36 and BIDEZ, *C. M. A. G.*, VI, 100, 1. As to the formation of the word see *Excursus III*, 1 b and ch. II, n. 250.

<sup>27</sup> The Chaldæan term *κόλποι* probably signifies the souls of the demons which have been put into the cosmic elements. Cf. ch. II, sect. 8.

whose dwelling-place is upon the earth and in the air (the latter are called for this reason in another Oracle "guides of the air" <sup>28</sup>) attaining to the solar rays <sup>29</sup>; c) male and female <sup>30</sup> lunar spirits whose domain reaches from the zone of the fixed stars (the "heaven") and that of the planets (the "stars") <sup>31</sup> downwards to the "abysses" of the sublunar world and the earth and its "caverns" below. A distinction characteristic of these spirits is their attachment to the material component in the cosmos <sup>32</sup>. The list may be completed by a mention of the "offsprings of evil matter" referred to in one of the Oracles we have already quoted in this chapter <sup>33</sup>: these are, as we shall see, the terrestrial demons, who play an important part in the system of the Theurgists <sup>34</sup>.

<sup>28</sup> The expressions *ἡέριοι ροαί*, *ἡέρος ἀγοί*, *κόλποι ἡέριοι* are interchangeable in the fragments quoted ch. II, n. 287.

<sup>29</sup> Supposed that the sequence of the attributes indicates the spatial order of the elemental spirits, *ὑπανγοί* may be regarded as an equivalent of the Homeric *ὑπ' αὐγὰς ἠελίοιο*. The astrologers apply the term *ὑπανγος* to the star which is situated in the same meridian as the sun; cf. BOUCHÉ-LECLERCQ, *L'astrologie grecque*, 112. Accordingly, the *ὑπανγοί κόλποι* inhabit the lower half of the ethereal world.

<sup>30</sup> PSELLUS, *Hyp.*, 32 (p. 75, 23): *εἰς ἄρρεν καὶ θῆλυ δηρημένον*, likewise reports that the Chaldæans distinguished between male and female demons. Cf. PROCLUS, *Schol.* in HESIOD., *Op.*, v. 151. For other, non-Chaldæan, parallels see HOFFNER, *O.-Z.*, I, 210 f.

<sup>31</sup> The term *οὐρανός* is applied in the Chaldæan Oracle to the sphere of the fixed stars (see ch. II, n. 129); the "stars" are the planets.

<sup>32</sup> This statement of the Oracle seems to be referred to by PSELLUS, *Hyp.*, 20 (p. 75, 10): *εἰσι δὲ θεῖαι τάξεις καὶ γένη περὶ ἕκαστον τῶν στοιχείων* (sc. of the sublunar world). See n. 34 and PROCL., *Tim.*, III, 58, 20 f.

<sup>33</sup> See n. 14.

<sup>34</sup> The later Neoplatonists divided the demons according to the following six regions: heaven, ether, water, earth, netherworld. SVOBODA, *La démonologie de Psellos*, 10 f. has proved that this division derives from Proclus (cf. the five divisions of PROCL., *Tim.*, I, 137, 3 f.) and is based on PLATO, *Tim.*, 39 e (see also *Epinomis*, 984 f., to which PROCL., *Tim.*, III, 108, 2 refers). BIDEZ, *C. M. A. G.*, VI, in his chapter on the demonology of Psellus, p. 105 ff. (see also p. 100 and 223 f.), points out that Proclus based this classification on a symbolic explanation

These demons were subject to Hecate. Their subservience to this highest goddess of the Theurgists can be inferred not only from the fact that Physis ("Nature") and Heimarmene were metonyms of Hecate<sup>35</sup>, but also from a direct statement of Psellus. After having quoted the fragment of the Oracles referring to "Nature", who tries to "persuade" men of the goodness of the maleficent demons, Psellus adds that it is not "Nature" herself who "persuades", but after she has been "called" (*i. e.* adjured) and before she appears there come forward manifold demonic phantoms "roused from all the elements and consisting of all the parts of the course of the moon [*sic*]"<sup>36</sup>. It is evident that the demons mentioned by Psellus are identical with those recorded in the fragment of the Hymn. Accordingly, we may infer that this fragment constituted the beginning of a placatory prayer intended to prevent the invoked demons from exercising their delusions and, thereby, frustrating the chief theurgical action of conjuring "Nature". "Nature" is one of the appellations of Hecate : consequently, the conjuration of the spirits mentioned in the Hymn belongs to the sequence of rites

of the hexad. BOISSONADE, *Psellus*, 229, has drawn attention to the parallel in the Orphic Hymns, *Εὐχὴ πρὸς Μουσαίην*, 32 :

« δαίμονας οὐρανίους τε καὶ εἰσαλίους καὶ ἐνύδρους  
καὶ χθονίους καὶ ὑποχθονίους ἡδ' ἡεροφοίτους »

and *ibid.*, p. 225, to MILTON, *Paradise Regain'd*, II, 122 : "Demonian spirits now, from the element Each of his reign allotted, rightlier called Powers of fire air water and earth beneath" which continues the Platonic traditions.

<sup>35</sup> See ch. II, sect. 4. Cf. also PSELLUS, *Hyp.*, 23 (p. 75, 20) regarding the race of the evil demons : *ταῖς μοιραῖαις δόσεσιν ὑπηρετοῦν*. The "gifts of destiny" are the Proclean equivalent to the Chaldæan belief in the power of Hecate ; see n. 21.

<sup>36</sup> PSELLUS, *Comm.*, 1137 A (explaining the Oracle quoted n. 14) : οὐχ ὅτι αὐτῇ (ἢ Φύσει) *πειθεῖται τούτο, ἀλλ' ὅτι κληθείσης* (*sc. τῆς Φύσεως*) *πρὸ τῆς παρουσίας αὐτῆς . . . πολυεῖδεις προφαίνονται μορφαὶ δαιμονιώδεις, ἀπὸ πάντων μὲν τῶν στοιχείων* (see n. 32) *ἀνεγειρόμεναι, ἀπὸ πάντων δὲ τῶν μερῶν τοῦ σεληνιαίου δρόμου συγκείμεναι τε καὶ μερζόμεναι*. IAMBL., *Myst.*, V, 21 explains that before the descent of the heavenly gods, there appear the potencies subservient to them who announce the manifestation of their superiors and demand reverence, which only the theurgist knows how to accomplish.

indispensable for the invocation of this deity and, thus, the fragment has to be added to the testimonies which we have studied in the relevant section of the foregoing chapter<sup>37</sup>. A vivid description of this demonic temptation is to be found in the account given by Gregory of Nazianzus of the initiation of the future Emperor Julian into the Chaldæan mystery<sup>38</sup>. At every downward step upon the staircase leading to the crypt of Hecate, where the consecration was to take place, new troops of demons appeared, who terrified the imperial neophyte, but were driven away by his mystagogue, the Neoplatonist Maximus of Ephesus. Gregory emphasizes that even that sacrilegious sorcerer took refuge in his distress to Christian rites and used the sign of the cross for exorcizing the evil spirits. This affirmation does not seem to have been an invention of the Christian adversary. We should not, of course, identify this sign with the Christian symbol; but as we have seen<sup>39</sup>, the sign of the cross was regarded by the Chaldæans as the sign of the Cosmic Soul, *i. e.* Hecate. We may therefore suggest that Maximus frightened off the demons with the symbol of Hecate-Psyche, their mistress. This theurgical action would be in complete conformity with the common practice of the magicians who terrorized the minor spirits by appealing to their superiors<sup>40</sup>.

<sup>37</sup> See ch. iv, sect. 3. According to Iamblichus, the placatory rite of offering a gift to the hylic powers in order to enable the soul to ascend in the course of the holy action to the celestial gods was in universal use among the priests; cf. *IAMBL., Myst.*, V, 14, p. 217, 8: κατὰ δὲ τὴν τῶν ἱερέων τέχνην (the notion is borrowed from *PLATO, Conv.*, 202 e, 8) ἀρχεσθαι χρὴ τῶν ἱερουργιῶν ἀπὸ τῶν ὑλαίων (*sc. Θεῶν*). οὐ γὰρ ἂν ἄλλως ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀύλους Θεοὺς γένοιτο ἂν ἡ ἀνάσσις. *PROCL., Th. Pl.*, 262, 7 states likewise that in the ritual of the theurgists the higher sacraments must be preceded by those which are concerned with the intramundane gods.

<sup>38</sup> *GREGORY NAZIANZEN, Orat. IV in Julian.*, 55; see ch. iv, n. 41 and 76.

<sup>39</sup> See ch. iv, sect. 7.

<sup>40</sup> A further argument in favour of Bidez' supposition that Julian's consecration in the crypt of the temple of Hecate was identical with the Chaldæan mystery of immortalization is furnished by the fact that the Emperor addressed his prayer for "perfection in theurgy" (*Orat.*, V, 180, quoted ch. iii, n. 141) to Hecate; this goddess having been identified by Iamblichus with the Mother of Gods to whom Julian appealed; see *Excursus VII*.



There are, besides, several other allusions figuring in the extant fragments of the Oracles which point to the rule of Hecate over the demons enumerated in the Hymn. This text names as the first group of spirits those of the water, the earth and the air. Accordingly, we must assume that it is again Hecate who is meant with when an isolated fragment (which is apparently quoted from another hymn of this kind) invokes the (female) "driver of the aery, earthy and watery dogs" <sup>41</sup> An intimate connection existed between Hecate and the demons of the moon mentioned in the hymn after the elementary spirits. For this goddess descends to the moon, when she is invoked by the theurgist; this is the reason for her refusal to prophesy at the period when the moon ("Titania") is at the sign of Mars <sup>42</sup>. Another fragment employs the name of the goddess to designate the planet in which she has her abode <sup>43</sup>. Three other fragments bearing on Hecate treat of the moon <sup>44</sup> called in one of them the "self-manifest image of Nature", *i. e.* Hecate. The interdiction: "Do not invoke the moon" as well as the injunction: "Heed not the sounding of the moon, for it moves eternally through the working of necessity", are directed against the widespread practice of the magicians, who used to adjure the Hecate that is in the moon <sup>45</sup>.

<sup>41</sup> ΟΛΥΜΠΙΔΟΡ., *Phaed.*, 230, 32 (KROLL, 45) : διὸ καὶ τὸ λόγιόν φησιν.

«ἐπείρων ἐλάτειρα κυνῶν χθονίων τε καὶ ὑγρῶν».

Olympiodorus is correct in remarking that the dogs are the *ἄλογοι δαίμονες*. ΡΟΡΡΗΥ., *De orac. philos.*, p. 151, Wolff (*Eus. Pr. Ev.*, IV, 23, 8) interprets the dogs of Hecate as referring to the evil demons. *P. Mag.*, IV, 2722 f. Hecate is called *σκυλακάγεια*. See also n. 3 (*χθόνιοι κύνας*) and PROCL., *Rp.*, II, 337, 17 : τὰ λόγια 'κυσίν' ἀπεικάζειν εἰωθε (τὸ δαιμόνιον γένος) καὶ 'πῆρόν' ἀποκαλεῖν ὡς νοῦ καὶ διανοίας ἄμοιρον. Non-Chaldæan parallels are quoted by O. GRUPPE, *Griechische Mythologie*, II, 1288, 7. The Chaldæan designation of the race of evil demons as *ἀναίδες* (PSELLUS, *Hyp.*, p. 75, 20; see also *Quænam sunt*, p. 37, 23, Boiss.; MIGNÉ, *P. G.*, CXXII, 877 a) derives from a similar conception. This adjective is habitually used to describe the nature of dogs; the *ἀναίδεια* of the Cynics was proverbial.

<sup>42</sup> See the Oracle quoted ch. I, n. 152 and the first Oracle quoted *ibid.*, n. 165. Cf. ch. II, n. 92.

<sup>43</sup> See ch. II, n. 92 and 284.

<sup>44</sup> As to what follows see ch. II, n. 134.

<sup>45</sup> See the Oracle quoted ch. IV, n. 99, v. 5.

An other Oracle gives the reason for the interdiction : " Do not glance at Nature, for her name is ruled by destiny". It behoved to avert one's face when worshipping Hecate <sup>46</sup>; for a glance at her and also the utterance of her name in vain <sup>47</sup> bring about the attack of the "streams of the Heimarmene" <sup>48</sup>, *i. e.* the demons.

However this is not the only conception of Hecate known to the Chaldæan Oracles. These also describe her as a supercelestial potency descending from the "Paternal Intellect" to prophesy to the theurgist: and none of her pronouncements are "vain and unaccomplished" <sup>49</sup>. Thus she is an ambivalent divinity capable both of aiding and of harming man. The theurgist stands to her in a relationship analogous to that of the magician to the god whom he invokes and whom at the same time he fears; aware as he is that he risks to draw upon himself the displeasure of the divine power whose grace he seeks. The theological difficulties inherent in the ambivalent conception of Hecate are smoothed away by the Chaldæans who affirm that by her demonic activities the goddess fulfills the divine Will. Contrary to the magicians <sup>50</sup>, they do not regard Hecate's demons as the wilful authors of the deceptions she practised, but as the executors of the divine decrees. Faithful to the dogma that "the gods are good" <sup>51</sup>, the theurgists felt

---

<sup>46</sup> RONDE, *Psyche*, II, 85, 2; GRUPPE, *Griech. Myth.*, II, 876, 1. Cf. especially HIPPOLYT, *Ref.*, IV, 35, 4. The expression may also refer to the face of the moon; see PLUTARCH, *De facie in orbe lunae*, 29, 6; 944 C and CLEMENS ALEX., *Strom.*, V, 8; 49, 4 concerning the superstition attaching to the face of the moon. The lunatics (*σεληνιακοί, σεληνόεργοι* etc.) were called *κάτοχοι ἐξ Ἑκάτης*: see HOPFNER *O.-Z.*, II, 285; ROSCHER, s. v. *Mondgöttin*, 3155.

<sup>47</sup> Hecate is therefore called *ἄφραστος*; see HESYCH., s. v. ROSCHER, s. v. *Hecate*, 1895.

<sup>48</sup> See n. 22 and 129.

<sup>49</sup> See ch. I, n. 152.

<sup>50</sup> See n. 3 and 11. IANBL., *Myst.*, II, 10, p. 91, 7 f. explains (perhaps with reference to the Oracle quoted n. 11) that if a theurgist fails to perform correctly the magic ritual, inferior spirits appear instead of the invoked divinities. Pretending to be gods they lead the theurgist astray.

<sup>51</sup> See n. 50. Similarly IANBL., *Myst.*, I, 13, p. 43, 4 f. states that the wrath of the gods is equivalent to the withdrawal of their beneficent care.

themselves obliged to fit into the plan of divine providence even the delusions provoked by the demons<sup>52</sup>.

At this point, we may tackle the problem of the authenticity of the principal text bearing on Chaldæan demonology. Iamblichus sets forth in his work *On the Mysteries* (III, 31) a theory concerning the nature and the activity of the evil demons, which, according to his own statement, derives from the "Chaldæan prophets" i. e. the two Julians<sup>53</sup>. He considers this theory as furnishing a satisfactory answer to Porphyry's question as to the truth of the belief in the existence of lying demons who pretend to be gods or demigods and lead man astray by their false oracles and by the delusion they provoke. Iamblichus' wordy exposition of the Chaldæan doctrine boils down to the following essential points.

The true gods<sup>54</sup> are only capable of good<sup>55</sup> and hold intercourse

<sup>52</sup> For the same reason, Proclus attacked Porphyry's opinion as to a separate existence of evil demons who torment the soul after its departure from the body (*Mat. Subs.*, 214, 7-36. See ch. IV, n. 34). According to him (*ibid.*, 214, 36 ff.) these torments were destined to effect purification (cf. also *Crat.*, 71, 19 f.; 75, 23 f.; *Rp.*, II, 180, 11 f. See below, n. 157).

<sup>53</sup> IAMBLL., *Myst.*, III, 31, p. 176, 1 : Ἐρῶ δὴ σοὶ καὶ πρὸς ταῦτα λόγον, ὃν ποτε ἠκουσα Χαλδαίων ποτὲ προφητῶν λεγόντων. Immediately afterwards the adherents of these prophets are called "theurgists", and their ritual "hieratic". Accordingly the prophets referred to seem to be Julian the Chaldæan and his son; cf. Excursus I b and IV, 2. This important text is quoted by HOFFNER, *P. W.*, s. v. *Theurgie*, 269-270, who does not, however, mention its connection with Chaldæan theurgy.

ὃν ποτε ἠκουσα is a stylistic mannerism modelled on PLATO, *Meno*, 81 a, 5; cf. BERNAYS, *Theophrastos' Schrift über Frömmigkeit*, 145. Ed. NORDEN, *Vergilius Aeneis Buch VI*, p. 209. Χαλδαίων ποτὲ προφητῶν λεγόντων means 'that the Egyptian priest Abammon, that pseudonym of Iamblichus, did not hear the prophets themselves, but only their λόγος. The designation of the Chaldæans as προφήται has to be understood as in PLATO, *Rep.*, 366 b, 1; cf. E. FASCHER, *Prophetes* (Giessen, 1927), p. 18..

<sup>54</sup> Opposed to the deceiving spirits, called ἀντίθεοι (see n. 97).

<sup>55</sup> Cf. PROCL., *Rp.*, I, 28, 1 (KROLL, 15) : τῶν λογίων... μαρτυρούντων...

«οὐδ' ὅτι πᾶς ἀγαθὸς θεὸς εἰδότες· ᾧ, ταλαεργοί, νήψατε».

As to the conclusion of the fragment see ch. I, n. 97 and 102. Porphyry defends this Platonic axiom (see *Rp.*, 379 a) against the Christians (see *Fragm.*, 42, Harnack) and IAMBLL., *Myst.*, I, 18, p. 52, 18 against the astrologers.

only with good men and with those that have purified themselves by hieratic rites<sup>56</sup>. The evil spirits flee at their appearance "as darkness flees from light"<sup>57</sup>. The theurgists delivered from the "menaces" of these powers perfect themselves in all the virtues, free themselves of all passions and "all disorderly movement"<sup>58</sup> and are cleansed from the taint of godless customs. The impious, on the other hand, who "importune the gods unlawfully and without observing the holy order cannot attain to them, because of the feebleness of their power or for lack of theurgical force"<sup>59</sup>. If, moreover, they are prevented by some taint from holding intercourse with pure spirits<sup>60</sup>, they come in contact with evil demons, whom they begin to resemble, filled as they are under their influence with sacrilegious thoughts and lusts<sup>61</sup>. Their passions are food for the demons and are in their turn fed by them<sup>62</sup>. The magical operations of these impious persons (enumerated by Iamblichus in strict conformity with Porphyry's text)<sup>63</sup> are not related in

<sup>56</sup> See ch. iv, n. 1 a.

<sup>57</sup> τούτων (sc. τῶν θεῶν) ἐπιλαμπόντων, ἀφανὲς τὸ κακὸν καὶ δαιμόνιον ἐξίσταται τοῖς κρείττοσιν, ὥσπερ φῶτι σκότος. See n. 93. Cf. also *ibid.*, III, 13, p. 130, 12 f. See Dodds, *Proclus*, 275.

<sup>58</sup> The ἀτακτος κίνησις is the motion of the hylic principle; cf. PLATO, *Tim.*, 30 a, 4 f.

<sup>59</sup> See n. 10-11 and ch. III, n. 114.

<sup>60</sup> See ch. 1, n. 166 and 171.

<sup>61</sup> See n. 16 and the passage from SYNESIUS, *De providentia*, quoted n. 180.

<sup>62</sup> See n. 19 and the scholium of Psellus appended to the fragment quoted there: καὶ γὰρ οὐσίωται ἐν τοῖς πάθεσι τὰ τοιαῦτα γένη (sc. τῶν δαιμόνων), καὶ τὴν ἔβραν ἔχει καὶ τὴν τάξιν ὀλικὴν· διὸ καὶ οἱ ἐμπαθεῖς πρὸς ταῦτα συγκολλῶνται, τῷ ὁμοίῳ τὸ ὁμοίον ἐφελκόμενοι, κινητικὴν δυνάμιν ἔχοντες ἐκ τῶν παθῶν.

<sup>63</sup> Iamblichus mentions further on in this passage the sacrilegious doings of the goets such as the performances of the "holy works" (see n. 10-11, and Excursus IV, 1) which are contrary to the rules. Their illegitimate character is intensified by the evil spirits dwelling in the "goets". These transgressions of the rules lead (a) to the apparition of divinities other than those invoked, (b) to the possession by evil spirits known as antigods to the goets, instead of by the entities conjured up (see n. 97).

This division does not derive from Chaldæan traditions, but from Porphyry, quoted and refuted by Iamblichus. The sentence must accordingly be added to

any way to the "hieratic elevation". On the contrary : the companions of the lying demons (the "goëts") combat the theurgists<sup>64</sup> who put the maleficent spirits to flight, cause the disappearance of all evil and of all passions, and after having been purified are favoured with the pure presence of god who fills them with his heavenly fire<sup>65</sup>. Thus theurgy is the only legitimate form of mantics<sup>66</sup>, teaching truth through its oracles and also filling the soul with perfect virtue<sup>67</sup>. Those two effects of this holy art enable the theurgists to ascend to the noetic fire, the goal of all prophecy and all theurgical activity.

The foregoing investigations permit us to establish the indubitable authenticity of this exposition ; several of the details of which concord with the extant fragments of the Oracles ; while those which are not directly confirmed (the relevant Chaldæan Oracles being probably lost) can be proved to be Chaldæan by their general characteristics and also by the logical connection between them and the theurgical notions known to us<sup>68</sup>.

An ascetical morality is one of the chief consequences of this demonology. The terrestrial world is given over to the evil powers, who menace not only the body but also the soul of man. Every psychic affection to which man is subject and every evil deed which he commits attracts those spirits and invests them with power over him. Occasional rites do not afford sufficient protection against these tempters ;

---

the *Epistula ad Anebonem*, the reconstruction of which by Th. Gale in 1678 has never been critically examined. Bidez, *La vie de Porphyre*, 81, 1, and others have drawn attention to its deficiencies.

<sup>64</sup> See n. 104. .

<sup>65</sup> The polemics which follow against the "goëts" and against Porphyry's doubt as to the kind of magic which is preferable (cf. also *Regr.*, p. 27\*, 13 f.) is due to Iamblichus himself and does not derive from Chaldæan tradition.

<sup>66</sup> See ch. iv, n. 107.

<sup>67</sup> See also IAMBL., *Myst.*, X. 4 as to the moralizing action of theurgy.

<sup>68</sup> We cannot determine the special work of the Chaldæans which is the source of the opinions set out by Iamblichus. The Oracles seem of course to be the first choice, but the fact that Julian the Chaldæan has written a theoretical work on demons (see ch. 1, n. 4) should not be forgotten.

constant danger requires permanent purity. The strictest observance of ritual "order" can achieve its object only if the purity of the body and the soul has been preserved beforehand by a cathartic way of life<sup>69</sup>. Accordingly the conduct followed during the "holy action" is to be regarded as a model to which man should endeavour to conform in the rest of his life.

Thus the goal and the nature of the ideal Chaldæan life are determined by demonistic dualism. The constant cleansing of the body by lustrations and of the soul by ascetic conduct is an indispensable condition of "sanctification" through which it is possible gradually to achieve the "immortalization of the soul"; that is the supreme purification. The material and spiritual lustrations of the Chaldæans form the ritual of a religion of purity which is interested both in the purification of the body and in the salvation of the soul.

The belief in the demonic nature of the passions entails the demonization of the human body; proved to be pernicious *a*) by the poor quality of the substance of which it is made; *b*) by its perishable nature; *c*) by the adverse influence exerted by it upon the soul whose salvation it impedes.

The body is called in the Chaldæan Oracles *a*) the "mortal envelope of bitter matter" (*i. e.* the basest qualities of the latter<sup>70</sup>), its "dung"<sup>71</sup> *a*

<sup>69</sup> See ch. iv, n. 1. Iamblichus is responsible for the identification of the demonistic method of "catharsis" with the ethical one set out by Plato.

<sup>70</sup> «τὸ τῆς πικρᾶς ὕλης περιβλημα βρότειον»; see ch. iii, n. 151. "Bitter matter" signifies the terrestrial dregs of the elements; cf. PLOTINUS, II, 3, 17. PSELLUS, *Comm.*, 1125 A explains ὕλης σκύβαλον (see next note) as τὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου σῶμα τὸ ἐκ τεσσάρων στοιχείων συγκείμενον.—For περιβλημα cf. EURIP., *Herc.*, 1269 *σαρκὸς περιβόλαια* (see also IDEM, *Bacch.*, 746) and PHILO, *Quod deus immut.*, 56, τὸ σαρκῶν περιβλημα. χιτῶν is used as a synonym, see J. KRÖLL, *Lehren des Hermes*, 347, 4; DODDS, *Proclus*, 307 f.

<sup>71</sup> «τὸ τῆς ὕλης σκύβαλον», quoted ch. iii, n. 144. See ch. vi, n. 275 on τρύξ and ὑποστάθη. λύθρος and πηλός have the same deprecatory sense; the first of these terms: "gore", figures frequently in Marcus Aurelius; the second is used by the Greeks in connection with the legend of Prometheus, by the Jews and Christians with reference to the story of Creation.

“flowing vessel<sup>72</sup> scattered” at death<sup>73</sup>. Through its substance *b*) it is bound up with the terrestrial world and through its desires it attracts the demons. For this reason, the Oracles warn the adept : “Flee from the earthly passions, flee far away from them”<sup>74</sup>. The body is further called *c*) the “root of all evil”<sup>75</sup>, as the earthly passions originating in it torment the soul with the “stings of earth”<sup>76</sup>, “submerge” it<sup>77</sup>,

<sup>72</sup> PROCL., *Rp.*, II, 95, 10 (KROLL, 48) : τὸ « ῥότιον κύτος » ἡμῶν. For ῥότιος cf. *ρευστὸν σῶμα* quoted ch. II, n. 386. This attribute is often used by the dualists. For κύτος cf. PLATO, *Tim.*, 44 a, 6 : τὸ τῆς ψυχῆς ἅπαν κύτος, i. e. the body, and DIODOR., I, 35, 8 (Agatharchides) τὸ ὅλον κύτος τοῦ σώματος. ἀγγεῖον is synonymous with κύτος; see n. 73. Other kindred terms are τὸ γήινον... κέλυφος (“shell” : SYNES., *Insomn.*, 5, 1297 B), σκῆνος (J. KROLL, *Lehren des Hermes*, 341, 5), ἐλυτρον (“shell”, PLATO, *Rep.*, 588 e, 1), ὄστρεον (PLATO, *Phaedr.*, 250 c, 6; cf. *Rep.*, 611 d, 5).

<sup>73</sup> See ch. I, n. 94 and ch. III, n. 164. Kroll's (p. 48) reasons for regarding PROCL., *Rp.*, II, 336, 1 : τῷ σώματι τῷ « σκιδναμένῳ » (see also *Th. Pl.*, 210, 22 f.) as deriving from the Oracles seem to be insufficient. The expression is also used by NUMENIUS, p. 133, 17, Leemans.

<sup>74</sup> See ch. II, n. 403 (v. 1).

<sup>75</sup> PROCL., *Exc. Vat.*, 193, 17 (KROLL, 48) : « ῥίζα τῆς κακίας » τὸ σῶμα. The expression derives from EURIPIDES, *Trag. Graec. Frag.*, p. 912, 11, Nauck<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>76</sup> PROCL., *Th. Pl.*, 297, 34 (KROLL, 52) : τὸν Πιρομηθεά... προνοοῦντ : τῆς λογικῆς ἡμῶν ζωῆς, ἵνα μὴ « βαπτθεῖσα χθονὸς οἰστροῖς » καὶ « ταῖς τῆς φύσεως ἀνάγκαις », ὡς φησὶ τις τῶν Θεῶν, ἀπόληται. This Chaldæan imagery derives from PLATO, *Phaedr.*, 240 c, 7 : ὑπ' ἀνάγκης τε καὶ οἰστροῦ ἐλαύνεται (see also *Rep.*, 577 e, 2; *Tim.*, 91 b, 7, etc.) and *ibid.*, 248 a, 7, ὑποβρύχια etc. See ch. II, sect. 15 regarding the influence of *Phaedrus* on Chaldæan symbolic language.

<sup>77</sup> βαπτισθεῖσα designates the soul's submersion in the stream of passions. The verb is used in this sense in *Corp. Herm.*, XII, 2 (quoted by KROLL, 52, 1. Cf. also *Kore Kosmou*, 49, p. 484, 20, Scott and A. FESTUGIÈRES, *Hermetica*, *Harvard Theol. Rev.*, 1938, p. 7, 34). PLUTARCH, *De genio Socratis*, 22, 591 E; PHILO, *Leg. all.*, III, 18; *Quod det. pot. ins.*, 176 etc. PLOTINUS, I, 4, 9; I, 8, 13 : ψυχὴ ἐν σώματι βεβαπτισμένη. The description of the Neoplatonic studies of the Emperor Julian given by LIBANIUS, *Orat.*, XVIII, 18 (... τῆσι βαπτίζεται, sc. ἡ ψυχῇ, etc.) is influenced by Plotinus, and should accordingly not be taken as referring to Julian's initiation into the Chaldæan mysteries (thus BIDEZ, *Vie de l'Empereur Julien*, 80 f.), but into the Neoplatonic philosophy. Cf. also SYNES., *Dio*, 6, 1129 B : τὸ ἐν λόγοις κάλλος... οὐ βαθύνεται πρὸς ὕλην οὐδὲ ἐμβριπίζει τὸν νοῦν

“enslave” it to the body <sup>78</sup>, “make it forget” its heavenly origin <sup>79</sup> and “think” only “corporeal thoughts” <sup>80</sup>. Hence the exhortations of the Oracles to “disburden the heart from earth”, i. e. to free the seat of reason from the load of corporeal passions <sup>81</sup>. Hence also their promise that the angel who guides the purifying ray of salvation towards the initiate will cleanse him of the “taint” of earthly things <sup>82</sup>.

The intense consciousness of the duality of human existence which distinguishes the Chaldæans is indicated by the frequency and the violence of the metaphors expressive of the contempt in which the body was held. While the fashion of speech of the authors of the Chaldæan Oracles is intentionally imitative, the sentiment to which we refer spring neither from the Platonic exigency of an escape from the sensual world which impedes the beatific vision, nor from moral rigorism, but rather

---

*ταῖς ἐσχάταις δυνάμεσι.* PROCL., *Tim.*, I, 117, 6 : τὸ ἐπιθυμητικόν... βαπτίζεται τοῖς τῆς ὕλης ρεύμασι. On φύσεως ἀνίσταται see n. 20 and 35.

Referring to PROCL., *Crat.*, 61, 9 : τοὺς ἀναγωγὸν βίον ἐλομένους καὶ... μὴ ὄντας ἐμβριθεῖς καὶ ὀπισθοβαρεῖς and *Rp.*, II, 77, 7 : οἷα δὴ καὶ ἡ τῶν παθῶν ἐστὶν φύσις... λόγῳ δύσκαμπτος καὶ ὀπισθοβαρῆς καὶ ἄμοιρος ὡς εἰπεῖν λόγου φωτὸς ὄντος Schoell (quoted by KROLL, 60) reconstitutes the following verse of the Chaldæan Oracle :

«δύσκαμπτος καὶ ὀπισθοβαρῆς καὶ φωτὸς ἄμοιρος»,

but he has left out of account two facts : ὀπισθοβαρῆς is a Plotinian word (*Enn.*, VI, 9, 4); and Proclus never introduces Chaldæan terms by the words ὡς εἰπεῖν. ἐμβριθεῖς derives from PLATO, *Phaedo*, 81 c, 8.

<sup>78</sup> See ch. III, n. 45 and ch. v, n. 21. Cf. PLATO, *Phaedo*, 66 d, 1; 81 b, 2 f. The metaphor was widespread in later antiquity; cf. FR. AST, *Comm. in Plat. Phaedr.* (Leipzig 1810), p. 317.

<sup>79</sup> See ch. III, n. 53.

<sup>80</sup> See ch. II, n. 395. The σώμα νοοῦντες are the Platonic φιλοσόφωται (*Phaedo*, 68 c, 1), incapable of φρονεῖν ἀθάνατα καὶ θεῖα (PLATO, *Tim.*, 90 c, 1).

<sup>81</sup> PROCL., *Exc. Vat.*, 193, 3 (KROLL, 48) : γῆ, ἀφ' ἧς δεῖ «κουφίζειν τὴν καρδίαν». καρδία is the poets' name for the seat of psychic-spiritual life. Another fragment of the Oracles may be mentioned in this connection, but it throws no new light on the matter. PROCL., *Exc. Vat.*, 193, 19 (KROLL, 64) : τὸ δὲ «καταβάλλειν εἰς γῆν» τὸ ἀφ' ἡμῶν ἐκκόψαι; ἐξοσι δὲ αὐτό, ὅποιπερ ἐτάχθη, φέρεσθαι. The object of καταβάλλειν has not been transmitted. γῆ means the *massa perditionis*.

<sup>82</sup> See n. 7.



from a strong sense of the ubiquity of demonic powers, who threaten the soul's "spark" regarded as the sole assurance of deliverance from diabolic existence. Thus, the Chaldæan beliefs, feelings and mode of conduct are centred in the terror inspired by the demons.

2. *The god Hades.*—The hostile demonic powers are headed by a divinity in which the principle of evil is individualized : the god Hades. We learn the opinion of the Chaldæans as to the prince of the demons from a scholium of Psellus, which sets forth the alleged opinions of the theurgists as to Hades. This text based on the interpretations of Proclus has not been utilized until now in the investigations of the Chaldæan doctrine. Its statements deriving as they do from different layers of tradition must be thoroughly examined with a view to distinguishing between those that reflect authentic Chaldæan belief and later additions ; the minuteness of this scrutiny will be justified by the results. The fragment reads :

"The Chaldæans divide Hades in manifold ways : sometimes (1) they call him god, chief of the terrestrial domain ; (2) sometimes they name thus the region below the moon, (3) sometimes the midmost line of the ethereal and the hylic world, and (4) sometimes the irrational soul" <sup>83</sup>.

Psellus ascribes to the Chaldæans four different definitions of Hades, the first of which contains a genuine quotation, while the three others use Neoplatonic notions. The questions as to the authenticity of these three definitions must be decided *a priori* : the statement that the Chaldæans professed four different opinions as to one subject is improbable on the face of it and at variance with the conclusions that can be drawn from the foregoing investigations. It runs counter to the axiom of a uniform theurgical system ; and the Chaldæan doctrines bearing

<sup>83</sup> PSELLUS, *Expos.*, 1152 D (οἱ Χαλδαῖοι) τὸν Ἄϊδην πολλαχῶς καταμερίζουσι· καὶ (1) νῦν μὲν αὐτὸν «Θεὸν» ὀνομάζουσιν «ἀρχηγὸν τῆς περιγείου λήξεως», (2) νῦν δὲ τὸν ὑπὸ σελήνην τόπον φασί, (3) νῦν δὲ τὴν μεσατάτην τοῦ αἰθερίου κόσμου καὶ τοῦ ὑλαίου, (4) νῦν δὲ τὴν ἄλογον ψυχὴν.

Nicephorus Gregoras (Migne, *P. G.*, CXLIX, 574 B) paraphrases this passage of Psellus and adds a few explanations of his own ; see Excursus VI, 1 c.

on other subjects afford no example whatever of such a diversity of views. Consequently, only two explanations are possible. Either the four definitions derive from one and the same fundamental conception, or Proclus, who was Psellus' authority, has interpreted the various Chaldæan verses which mention Hades according to his own preconceptions. In this case the statement as to the diversity of the opinions regarding Hades would not reflect the views of the Chaldæans, but those of their interpreter. We shall see that both factors have played a part in the production of these definitions<sup>84</sup>.

A comparison of the four definitions shows that the first, second and fourth are modifications of the same fundamental conception; which must have been genuinely Chaldæan in view of the fact that the first definition derives from a quotation. On the other hand the third definition seems to have originated in another complex of beliefs. It situates Hades in the "midmost line of the ethereal and the hylic world" The source of this information seems to be the Neoplatonic explanation of the eschatological myths of Plato. Referring to one of their passages, Proclus situates the place of punishment of the departed souls "in the midst of heaven and earth", *i. e.*, as he explains, the domain which is immediately below the moon<sup>85</sup>. We may accordingly infer that Proclus repeated this opinion in his (lost) commentary on the

<sup>84</sup> The nature of the passage of Psellus quoted n. 83 may be best illustrated by the analogous collection of definitions of the Chaldæan doctrine concerning the Ideas which is to be found further on in the same text of Psellus; cf. *Expos.* 1135 A (οἱ Χαλδαῖοι) ἰδέας νομιζοῦσι (1) νῦν μὲν τὰς τοῦ πατρὸς ἐννοίας, (2) νῦν δὲ τοὺς καθόλου λογούς καὶ φυσικούς καὶ ψυχικούς καὶ νοητούς, (3) νῦν δὲ τὰς ἐξηρημένους τῶν ὄντων ὑπάρξεις. Here again, the first of the three definitions derives from the Chaldæan Oracles themselves (see ch. II, n. 97), whereas the two others are identical with Proclus' definition of Plato's doctrine concerning the Ideas (cf. the new text of Psellus edited by Bidez, *C. M. A. G.*, VI, p. 132, 1-12).

<sup>85</sup> PROCL., *Rp.*, II, 128, 2, till 134, 23. Cf. CUMONT, *After Life*, 87 f. Nicéphorus Gregoras (see n. 83) considers the fourth definition as referring to the σελήνια σφαῖρα. According to OLYMPIODOR., *Gorg.*, 237, 10, Norvin, the place of judgment is situated ἐν τῷ αἰθέρι (corr. ἀέρι?) μετὰ τὰ ὑπὸ σελήνην, a localization which concords with that of Iamblichus, see n. 96.

Logia (the aim of which was a harmonization of Plato's doctrines with those of the theurgists) and that Psellus mistakenly regarded this construction of Proclus as a view deriving from the genuine Chaldæan tradition<sup>86</sup>.

Having eliminated the third definition we must turn our attention to the other three which are at variance with it and appear all of them to spring from one and the same fundamental conception. They concord in situating Hades in the world of generation and corruption, but differ in designating this sphere by diverse Neoplatonic appellations which are not quite equivalent to the original Chaldæan notion. The second definition, which localizes Hades in the sublunar zone is founded on a widespread belief shared by the latter Platonists<sup>87</sup>. That zone is called by the Chaldæans the "hylic world". But according to the first "authentic" definition, the Chaldæan Hades only extended as far as the terrestrial domain<sup>88</sup>. Accordingly, Proclus must have replaced the original Chaldæan notion by a more comprehensive one which enabled him to harmonize the doctrines of the Chaldæans with those of the Platonists<sup>89</sup>. Consequently, the second definition cannot

<sup>86</sup> PROCL., *Rp.*, II, 133, 5 refers to his lost commentary on the myth of the *Phædo*. We may suppose that in his commentary on the Chaldæan Oracles, used by Psellus, he interpreted the Chaldæan conception in conformity with his exegesis of Plato.

<sup>87</sup> CUMONT, *After Life*, 81; NORDEN, *Vergilius, Aeneis Buch VI*, p. 24. Neoplatonic parallels: PROCL., *Th. Pl.*, 368, 9 f. (see n. 96); MACROB., *Somn. Scip.*, I, 11, 6 f. (following Porphyry). See n. 89.

<sup>88</sup> *ὑπεργυῖος* signifies everything situated in the immediate vicinity of the earth. Cf. the passages quoted n. 94.

<sup>89</sup> As Hades was considered to be situated in the sublunar region, Proclus and the members of his school ignored the Chaldæan distinction between the terrestrial zone and the "abyss" under the earth. DAM., II, 316, 17 and 22 considers that the Oracle quoted n. 137 is concerned with *περὶ τῶν ὑπὸ σελήνην*, see the other Neoplatonists quoted n. 139. PSELLUS, *Comm.*, 1124 B regards the attribute *ἀμφικνεφής* (used in the same Oracle) as referring to *ὑπὸ σελήνης τόπος*; likewise SYNESIUS, *Insomn.*, 5, 1296 D and 6, 1297 D and [HERMIPPUS], *De astrologia*, p. 26, 3 f., ed. Kroll-Viereck, *ὁ ἐπιγυῖος . . . τόπος, ἀμφικνεφής τε καὶ Τάταρος*.

be regarded as representing the authentic Chaldæan tradition<sup>90</sup>.

The origin of the fourth definition, which identifies Hades with the irrational soul, can be similarly explained. According to Plato, the soul is impeded in its ascent to the contemplation of the ideas by its irrational part. Thus the identification of Hades with the *ἄλογον μέρος ψυχῆς* can be regarded as an anthropological inference which the Platonists drew from the cosmological equation "Hades = sublunar world". This inference seems moreover to have some roots in Chaldæan ideas, a point which shall be elaborated later on<sup>91</sup>. For the moment we shall content ourselves with recalling the Chaldæan doctrine that the passions are caused by the demons and that they imprison in the terrestrial zone the souls subject to them.

The first of Psellus' definitions seems to be the only one which can be regarded with some degree of certainty as authentic. It states that Hades is "god, chief of the terrestrial domain". This localization of Hades in the earthly zone conforms to some extent to the second definition (according to which the term signifies the sublunar world) and accounts for its formulation, and thus indirectly for that of the fourth definition derived from the second. But while the Neoplatonists regarded Hades as a cosmological or anthropological notion, the Chaldæans conceived him as a divinity, lord of the earthly zone<sup>92</sup>; a conception fun-

---

<sup>90</sup> The interpretation of Tartarus as referring to this world (Rohde, *Psyche*, II, 178, 1 : 179, 2) and of its torments as symbolizing sensual impulse may also have had some influence. It was particularly sponsored by the Cynics (cf. *Teletis reliquiae*, p. 34, 9, ed. Hense, with the testimonies. Philo, *Post. Cain.*, 31 : ἐκ τοῦ τῶν παθῶν ἄδου; other parallels are quoted by E. Bréhier, *Les idées philosophiques et religieuses de Philon d'Alexandrie*, 241 f. See Cumont, *Rel. Orient.*, 282, 68) and modified by the Platonists (cf. Apuleius, *De deo Socr.*, 5, p. 12, 7, ed. Thomas : "In haec terrae tartara" and Plotinus, I, 8, 13).

<sup>91</sup> See p. 174.

<sup>92</sup> *ληξίς*, not a Chaldæan, but a Platonic term, signifies in this context the domain attributed to a divinity and derives from a celebrated Homeric verse dealing with the division of the earth among the three sons of Kronos, *Iliad*, XV, 191 : « Ἄϊδης δ' ἔλαχε ζόφον ἠερόεντα », cf. e. g. Plato, *Critias*, 113 b, 7 and Procl., *Tim.*, I, 136, 24 f.; 141, 27 f. See also Synesius, *Provid.*, I, 1, 1212 C : καταπέμπεται μὲν γὰρ (ἡ ψυχή), ἐφ' ᾧ κοσμήσα τὴν περιγείον λῆξιν. Accordingly,

damentally different from the ordinary Greek view which regarded Hades-Pluto as king of the nether-world and of the shades whose abode it is. Thus the Chaldæan notion is not based either on Platonic or Greek theological doctrine. Its origin must be sought elsewhere. We may surmise that God Hades, chief<sup>93</sup> of the terrestrial zone, is related to the demons who, according to Chaldæan belief, dwell in this zone and dominate it<sup>94</sup>; a connection illustrated by Psellus' fourth definition "Hades = the irrational (that is demonized) soul"<sup>95</sup>. And this surmise should lead us to examine the Iranian theological doctrine which regarded Hades as a god, the prince of the demons; a conception which travelled westward and spread throughout the eastern countries of the Mediterranean zone. Various versions of it were known in the Hellenistic world in the Ist and IInd century of the Christian era<sup>96</sup>. Several

*λήξις ψυχῆς* means the order (*τάξις*) assigned to the soul before and after her incarnation according to her deserts. Psellus employs the expression *περίγειος λήξις* also in the text edited by Bidez, *C. M. A. G.*, VI, p. 193, 2.

<sup>93</sup> *ἀρχηγός* meaning the ruler of a country or of a people was originally a *vox poetica*.

<sup>94</sup> *ὁ περίγειος τόπος* is the region assigned to the evil demons as proved by the following passages: CELSUS *apud* ORIG., *C. Cels.*, VIII, 60: *περιγείων δαιμόνων*, etc. PORPH., *Abst.*, II, 39, p. 168, 19: (*οἱ κακοὶ δαίμονες*) *νέμοντες τὸν περιγείων τόπον* (in accordance with him EUSEB., *Pr. Ev.*, V, 2, 1). ATHENAGORAS, *Apology*, c. 25, p. 144, 21, ed. Geffcken concerning the *τῶν περιγείων* (sc. *δαιμόνων*) *διολκῆσις*; IAMBL., *Myst.*, VI, 7, p. 248, 15; PROCL., *Crat.*, 69, 6: *πνεύματα περιγεία*; [HERMIPPUS], *De astrologia*, p. 26, 3: *ὁ ἐπιγείος οἰκείος τόπος αὐτοῖς* (sc. *τοῖς ὑλικοῖς πνεύμασι*); MICHAEL GLYCAS, *Annales* (MIGNE, *P. G.*, LVIII, 215 D) quoted by Bidez, *C. M. A. G.*, p. 132, 15, mentions *τοὺς περιγειοτέρους δαίμονας*.

Psellus' literal quotation seems to be confined to the two words *Θεός* and *ἀρχηγός*, but there is no doubt that the attributive expression *τῆς περιγείου λήξεως* had its exact equivalent in the Chaldæan text.

<sup>95</sup> See n. 91 and 181.

<sup>96</sup> The relevant texts have been collected by Bidez-Cumont, *Magis hellénisés*, I, 59 f.; see also II, 69, 13 and 73, 3. Cf. CUMONT, *Rel. Orient.*, 279, 51. Psellus' text must be added to this collection.

Proof of the worship of Hades in later antiquity is very scanty and attests in most cases the existence of unimportant local cults. In the writings of the later Neoplatonists the ruler of the netherworld is almost invariably called Pluto.

The doctrine transmitted by Iamblichus (*apud* LYD., *Mens.*, IV, 25, p. 83, 13 f.),

points of concordance between the Zoroastrian and the Chaldæan conceptions tell in favour of the hypothesis that the Chaldæan notion of Hades was of Iranian origin.

1) According to Greek tradition, the Zoroastrian mages designated Ahriman, lord of the infernal spirits (the *Dēvs*<sup>96 a</sup>) as "Hades" and regarded him as a god<sup>97</sup>.

2) We have already seen that according to Iamblichus' account the Chaldæan theurgists protected themselves by an ascetic life against the pernicious influence of these demons, called the "anti-gods", who were driven away by their action, "as light is put to flight by darkness"<sup>98</sup>. "Light" and "Darkness" are the well-known Iranian designations for the good (Ormuzdic) and evil (Ahrimanic) principles<sup>99</sup>.

---

which regards Pluto as the ruler of the sublunar demons, derives from a combination of Stoic speculation (cf. PLUTARCH, *De facie in orbe lunae*, 28; REINHARDT, *Kosmos und Sympathie*, 313 f.) with Hermetic conceptions (see LYD., *Mens.*, IV, 32, p. 90, 24 f.) originated in the theology of Serapis (cf. PORPHY., *De phil. orac.*, p. 147 f., Wolff). This is also the origin of the classification of these demons divided according to the same passage of Iamblichus into terrestrial spirits who punish the soul, of the air who purify it, and lunar ones who "save" it. CUMONT, *Rel. Orient.*, 279, 51 has shown on the evidence of other testimonies that the assimilation of the theological doctrines concerning Serapis-Pluto, the Egyptian god of the netherworld, to those connected with Ahriman begun to occur already in comparatively early times.

PROCL., *Th. Pl.*, 368, 9 f., who draws on Porphyry or Iamblichus, regards Pluto as the warden of the sublunar world including the earth and the Tartarus and as the master of the souls of the deceased, who, according to PLATO, *Gorgias*, 523 b, must traverse the purgatory of Tartarus.

<sup>96 a</sup> The usual form *Devas* belongs to a later period of Iranian theology.

<sup>97</sup> Cf. the beginning of n. 96. The *ἀρχηγός* of the Chaldæans corresponds, accordingly, to the *daemoniarches* of the Hermetists (see LACTANT., *Inst. Div.*, II, 14, 6); to *ὁ τῆς ὕλης ἀρχων* mentioned by ATHENAGORAS, *Apology*, c. 25, p. 144, 12, Gesscken; to Pluto, *ὁ δαιμόνων ἀρχων* mentioned by PORPHYR., *De phil. orac.*, p. 147, Wolff (see the preceding note); to the *ἀρχηγέτης τῶν κακῶν δαιμόνων* quoted by JUSTIN, *Apol.*, I, 28, 1.

<sup>98</sup> See n. 52.

<sup>99</sup> BIDEZ-CUMONT, *Mages hell.*, II, 280, 3. Eusebius' outline of "Hellenic theology" (*Praep. Ev.*, IV, 5, 1-2), which likewise divides the gods into those of

3) The account of the nature and activity of the evil spirits given by Porphyry<sup>100</sup>, in accordance with the teaching of other Platonists, concords in many details with Iamblichus' exposition of Chaldæan demonology. The similarity of the two texts has been explained by Cumont as due to their common derivation from Mazdaean dogma<sup>101</sup>. This supposition is confirmed by the fact that the Chaldæans recognized not only the *Dēvs* but also their Lord Ahriman.

4) According to Porphyry's and Iamblichus' account the evil demons and their chiefs help the magicians in practising their deceptions. In return they are worshipped by these as "anti-gods"<sup>102</sup> and were offered bloody sacrifices. These magicians are opposed by Iamblichus to the Chaldæan theurgists who obtained the favour of the good spirits through an ascetic life and through the performance of cathartic rites and aided by them could frustrate the action of the powers of evil. The same distinction is found in the doctrines of the orthodox Mazdæans who condemn sorcery as a deception of Ahriman and of his worshippers and who forbid the pious, regarded as the companions of Ormuzd, to worship the *Dēvs*<sup>103</sup>.

5) The profound antagonism which opposes, according to Iamblichus<sup>104</sup>, the theurgists to the "goëts" corresponds to that obtaining between the adherents of Ormuzd and those of Ahriman. The former are aided by the angels, the Avestic *Iazatas*, the latter by the infernal

---

Light and of Darkness, is based on an excerpt from Porphyry's *Philosophy of the Oracles*; see Excursus XII.

<sup>100</sup> PORPHYR., *De Abst.*, II, 37-43. On Porphyry's source see Excursus XI.

<sup>101</sup> CUMONT, *Rel. Orient.*, 142; cf. 280, 53; BIDEZ-CUMONT, *Mages hell.*, I, 178 f.; II, 275 ff., particularly 279, 2 and 281, 1. See Excursus XI, n. 1.

<sup>102</sup> IAMBLL., *Myst.*, III, 31, p. 177, 16 (quoted n. 63) *δαίμονας πονηρούς...*, *οὗς δὴ καὶ καλοῦσιν ἀντιθέους*. The missing subject was not *οἱ Χалδαῖοι* (thus BIDEZ-CUMONT, *op. cit.*, II, 281, 1), but *οἱ πονηροί*, i. e. the "goëts" (the correct view is to be found in CUMONT, *Rel. Orient.*, 278, 49, where the passages relating to the *ἀντιθεοί* are collected and the Mazdaean origin of this superstition is proved). The *μέγας ἡγεμῶν τῶν δαιμόνων* mentioned before (*Myst.*, III, 31, p. 175, 6) is the demiurge of the Platonic *Timæus*.

<sup>103</sup> BIDEZ-CUMONT, *op. cit.*, I, 60 f., 143 f.

<sup>104</sup> See n. 65.

*Devs.* The fight which the good and evil principle wage for the soul of man is described in the Oracles by the adherents of the power of Light.

6) The fear in which the theurgists were held by the pernicious activity of the magicians aided by the evil spirits is shown by an anecdote which is quoted by Augustine from Porphyry's *Philosophy of the Oracles* and in the last resort derives from a work of Julian the Chaldæan himself<sup>105</sup>. Porphyry relates—somewhat ironically—that “a good man from among the Chaldæans complained of having been frustrated of success in a great spiritual endeavour undertaken with a view to purifying his soul, because a man moved by jealousy and endowed with equal magical power had “bound” by the fear of an even mightier demon the powers conjured by the Chaldæan with holy prayer and thus prevented them from granting the wishes of the Chaldæan”<sup>106</sup>.

We have already treated of the magical operations of “binding” and “loosing”<sup>107</sup>. This story shows that the theurgists credited the “goëts” with extraordinary magical abilities which might enable them even to frustrate the theurgists when these endeavoured to achieve

<sup>105</sup> Cf. PORPH., *Regr.*, 29\*, 16 f. and Bidez' note. Porphyry tells the story in order to prove that theurgy is an art (*disciplina*, τέχνη) which “produces both good and evil among men and gods”. Because of this ambivalence, the philosopher warns against the pursuit of theurgy : p. 35\*, 22 f.

<sup>106</sup> “Conqueritur, inquit (Porphyrius), vir in Chaldæa bonus (translated ἀνὴρ τις ἐν Χαλδαία χρηστός) purgandae animae magno in molimine (μεγάλῳ ἐν ἀγῶνι vel ἀθλῳ) frustratos sibi esse successus, cum vir ad eadem potens (ἀνὴρ περὶ τὰ αὐτὰ δεινός, see ch. IV, n. 16) tactus invidia adiuratas sacris precibus potentias alligasset (τὰς ἐπασθείσας δι' ἀγίων εὐχῶν δυνάμεις κατέδησε), ne postulata concederent”. Augustine adds (*Regr.*, p. 30\*, 22 f.) that the powers invoked by the Chaldæans were held in check by the fear of a mightier divinity (“per metum valentioris numinis impediti”), i. e. the spirit conjured up by the Chaldæan's adversary. This observation likewise derives from PORPHYRY'S *De regressu*.

The “vir in Chaldæa bonus” was apparently Julian the Chaldæan himself, as supposed by Bidez after ЛОВЕЦК, *Aglaopham.*, 99 f. The parallel tradition figuring in Psellus (see n. 109) renders this supposition even more probable. “Bonus” and “conqueritur” are ironical.

<sup>107</sup> See ch. I, n. 128-129 and ch. IV, n. 79.



union with the gods and ministering spirits. The adverse demonic powers, with whose help the theurgists are frustrated by their rivals, are identical with the "antigods". The spiritual combat between the Chaldæan and his antagonist may thus be interpreted as an example of the hostility subsisting between the adherents of Ormuzd and those of Ahriman <sup>108</sup>.

The theurgical operation rendered ineffective by the adversary is called by Porphyry "purification of the soul". Psellus' parallel account proves that this "purification" is identical with the principal action of the Chaldæan mystery of immortality, the "elevation" of the soul towards the "seven-rayed" god of the sun <sup>109</sup>.

---

<sup>108</sup> CUMONT, *Rel. Orient.*, 280, 53 quotes Porphyry's tale as an example of the spread of Iranian theology in the West.

<sup>109</sup> This story also accounts for Psellus' remark *Script. min.*, p. 446, 25 (see BIDEZ, *C. M. A. G.*, VI, 103 and *Mél. Cumont*, I, 93, 5 f.): "The Chaldæans draw their gods down through flattering songs and bind and loose them (see ch. I, n. 130). Apuleius for instance compelled through conjurations the Seven-rayed one not to hold intercourse with the Theurgist" (*ὡςπερ τὸν Ἑπτ(τ)άκτιν(α)* [see ch. III, n. 97] *ὁ Ἀπουλήιος ὄρκοις κατανιγκάσας ἢ προσομιλῆσαι τῷ Θεουργῷ*).

The opposition between Apuleius and Julian does not derive from Chaldæan tradition. Apuleius was no magician, but was transformed into one (with reference to his apology *pro se de magia liber*) by the legend of the 11th and 14th century A. D. Anastasius Sinaita (see ch. I, n. 1) shows that tales of the rivalry between the two were known in the 10th century.

Both men are mentioned as "magicians of the fields" in another of Psellus' works quoted by ALLATIUS, *De templis Græcorum*, Rome, 1645, p. 177 (see KROLL, *P. W.*, s. v. JULIANOS, No. 9, p. 15. For unidentified quotations from Psellus preserved by Allatius see KERN, *Hermes*, LIV, 1919, 217): "Both Julian the Chaldæan and Apuleius practised magic (*δύο ἦσθην ἄνδρες σοφῶ τὰς ἀπορρήτους δυνάμεις ἐξησηκημένα*). Apuleius was more material in his methods (*ὕλικώτερος*), Julian more spiritual (*νοερώτερος*)... The latter destroyed vermin in the fields without conjurations and amulets" (*ἐπρῶτον ἄτερ κτι περιαιμάτων*). Psellus alludes to the same occurrence in his letter to Emperor Joannes Ducas, quoted by F. DREXL, *Byzant. Zeitschr.*, XXXVII, 1937, 301. Concerning the ritual see O. WEINREICH, *Antike Heilungswunder*, 162 f.

Psellus' statement derives, in so far as it concerns Julian, from Proclus who, according to *Schol. ad Lucian. Philopseud.*, 12; IV, 224 Jac. (cf. BIDEZ, *C. M. A. G.*,

7) The rigours of the Zoroastrian priests could not vanquish the fear of the power of darkness felt by their adherents. Despite their prohibitions, Ahriman and his infernal satellites were recognized and even worshipped as divine beings. This cult had officially an apotropaic character, and its rites differed from those performed in honour of the good gods of light<sup>110</sup>. Apparently, the Chaldæans accepted a similar compromise. Iamblichus, treating of the fight waged by the theurgists against the demons, does not mention the Chaldæan belief as to the necessity of placating the powers of evil by sacrifices and invocations and thus obtaining some protection against their wiles; a view which runs counter to the spiritual doctrine which forbids every contact with the impure powers. Psellus, however, states that "the Chaldæans worship the subterranean gods and transmit in their Oracles instructions as to the various ways of sacrificing to them"<sup>111</sup>. The hymnic

---

VI, p. 85, 1), "explained" the magic rites of the lustration of the fields—probably in his work *περι ἀγωγῆς* (see Excursus IX d).

The spiritual character of Julian's magic was held by his partisans to prove his superiority over other thaumaturgists. They affirmed that by the force of a word he could divide a stone with his hand (SOZOMENUS, I, 18, *λίθον βία λόγου τῆ χειρὶ διελεῖν*). Those adepts probably referred to a well-known magical formula similar to that quoted *P. Mag.*, XII, 242, τὸ κρυπτόν ὄνομα ἀρρητόν. . . οὐ. . . αἱ πῆτραι ἀνοῦσασαι ρήγνυται; for other parallels see PRADEL, *Griechische Gebete. Rel. Vers. und Vorarb.*, III, 3, 1907, p. 296.

The fact that Psellus has inserted the name of Apuleius into the passage indicates that the magician hostile to Julian the Chaldæan was anonymous in the original source. The identity of this magician with the antagonist of the Chaldæan referred to by Porphyry is proved by Psellus' remark that Apuleius "bound" the "Seven-rayed" so that he could not hold intercourse with the theurgist. Porphyry relates that the magician hampered the Chaldæan "in a great spiritual endeavour undertaken with a view to purifying his soul". The purification of the soul was effected by the solar rays, whose ruler is designated by the Oracles as the "Seven-Rayed One". Psellus' and Porphyry's narratives refer accordingly to the same theurgical operation and consequently derive from the same source. That of Psellus is probably taken from Proclus, who knew its original form and divested it of its anecdotic traits, preserving its biographic character.

<sup>110</sup> BIDEZ-CUMONT, *Mages hell.*, I, 60 f., 143 ff.

<sup>111</sup> PSELLUS, *Script. min.*, 446, 23 f. (cf. BIDEZ, *Mélanges Cumont*, I, 93, 4 f.)

invocations which, according to Porphyry, the theurgists addressed to the "terrestrial and the subterranean gods" accompanied these sacrifices <sup>112</sup>.

While the extant sources are silent as to the Chaldæan hymns addressed to the terrestrial and subterranean powers, we may gather from them some information as to Chaldæan sacrificial rites connected with the demonology of the theurgists. Psellus relates that the Chaldæans offered up animal sacrifices <sup>113</sup>. They were probably meant as a tribute to these evil demons <sup>114</sup> and seem to have served besides as an introductory ceremony to the principal mystery of immortalization <sup>115</sup>.

Stone offerings were also made to the demons. The single sacrificial Oracle preserved out of the many that have doubtless existed, enjoins :

"But when thou dost perceive an earthly demon drawing nigh, make offering with the stone Mnizuris uttering a conjuration" <sup>116</sup>.

οι Χαλδαῖοι . . . και καταχθονίους Θεούς ἐσεβάσθησαν και τοιῶσδε ἢ τοιῶτδε Θύειν ἐθέσπισαν. The last word indicates that the instructions regarding sacrifices were given in oracular form.

<sup>112</sup> PORPHYR., *Epist. ad Anebon.*, 3 (IAMBL., *Myst.*, I, 9) *χθονίων και ὑποχθονίων εἰσι παρὰ τοῖς Θεουργικοῖς κλήσεις*. Concerning the nominal form *Θεουργικός* preferred by Porphyry cf. *Regr.*, 33\*, 10 : "hominibus theurgicis" (elsewhere "theurgis").

<sup>113</sup> PSELLUS, *Script.*, *min.*, 446, 23 (CUMONT, *Mél. Cumont*, I, 93, 2) : *οι Χαλδαῖοι . . . τὴν ἰσρατικὴν τέχνην συνέστησαν* (see Excursus-IV, 2) : *καὶ ζωοθυσίαν εἰσηγάγαντο* (sc. *εἰς τὴν ἰσρατικὴν τέχνην*).

<sup>114</sup> As to these sacrifices to the demons see the texts collected by CUMONT, *Rel. Orient.*, 295, 97; BIDEZ-CUMONT, *Mages hell.*, II, 281, 2 and 292, 10; HOFFNER, *O.-Z.*, I, 224.

<sup>115</sup> See ch. III, n. 134.

<sup>116</sup> PSELLUS, *Comm.*, 1148 BC (KROLL, 58) :

« ἤνικα δαίμονα δ' ἐρχόμενον πρόσγειον ἀθήσης,  
 Θῦε λίθον Μνίζουρι ἐπαυδῶν ».

Kroll's correction *ἐπάδων* is unnecessary; see HOFFNER, *O.-Z.*, I, 574 regarding consecrations of magical stones through magical spells. This injunction may have figured in the description of a theurgical operation which attracted the terrestrial demon; see n. 36-37. Psellus' interpretation of this fragment is not based on Chaldæan tradition.

We do not know what the non-Greek name of the stone signifies<sup>117</sup>. Offerings of stones and of plants served also to effect the purification of the "soul's vehicle" which preceded the theurgical "elevation"<sup>118</sup>. The "purifying offerings" by means of which the theurgist secured the help of the demonic power for this principal magical action consisted also of stones and plants<sup>119</sup>. These consecrated substances had, when offered up to the accompaniment of a conjuration, not only the power of drawing demonic defilement from the soul, but also that of attracting demons and subjecting them to the magician. According to Psellus, the Oracles affirmed the doctrine of organic sympathy between terrestrial and divine things which is the fundamental principle of all magic<sup>120</sup>.

The Chaldæans neutralized the activities of the evil demons not only by these offerings destined either to placate them or drive them away, but also by other apotropaic means and methods, equally used in ordinary magic<sup>121</sup>. Thus they wore amulets supposed to protect them against diseases. Proclus praises the instructions transmitted by the Chaldæans as how to make "efficacious phylacteries for every limb of

---

<sup>117</sup> See HOPFNER, *O.-Z.*, I, 494 f. and BIDEZ-CUMONT, *Mages hell.*, I, 128 f.; II, 197 f. as to Aramaic and Persian names of magical stones. The first syllable of *mnizuris* may recall the Aramaic goddess named *Mani* in *Isaiah*, LXV, 11 and characterized as *εἰμαρμένη* by Philo of Byblus; cf. Baudissin in HERZOG-HAUCK, *Protestantische Realenzyklopädie* s. v. *Meni*. The two last syllables may be a slightly distorted rendering of the word *zori* which means in the Bible the resin of the mastix-tree (*ρότινη*).

<sup>118</sup> See ch. III, n. 4.

<sup>119</sup> See ch. IV, n. 9.

<sup>120</sup> PSELLUS, *Εσπος.*, 1153 A: τοὺς δὲ περὶ μαγείων λόγους συνιστῶσιν (οἱ Χαλδαῖοι) ἀπὸ τε τῶν περιγείων ὑλῶν. Συμπαθῆ δὲ τὰ ἄνω τοῖς κάτω φασὶ καὶ μάλιστα τὰ ὑπὸ σελήνην.

Regarding the basic principle of magic *ὡς τὰ κάτω συμπαθεῖν τοῖς ἄνω* see the bibliography given by HOPFNER, *O.-Z.*, I, 385 f. and CUMONT, *Rel. Orient.*, 288, 41.

<sup>121</sup> These sacrifices are called *μειλιγματα*; cf. ROHDE, *Psyche*, I, 273; PSELLUS, *De operat. daem.*, p. 35, 11, Boiss.; MIGNÉ, *P. G.*, CXXII, 873 A. and BIDEZ, *C. M. A. G.*, VI, 131, 7: οἱ τοὺς ἀποτροπιασμοὺς τεχναζόμενοι... ἢ ταῖς ἀντιπαθείαις ἢ ταῖς συμπαθείαις μείλισσοντες (sc. τὸ δαιμόνιον).

the human body" <sup>122</sup>. The plates inscribed with mystic signs with which according to Psellus the Chaldæans sanctified themselves with a view to the reception of divine light (*i. e.* for the mystery of immortality) were also amulets <sup>123</sup>. During the magical action, the theurgists frightened off the evil spirits by sounds of brass instruments <sup>124</sup>.

A similar purpose was pursued by the setting up of apotropaic figures. According to Psellus, the Chaldæans employed statuettes made of diverse substances as talismans against diseases <sup>125</sup>. Elsewhere Psellus gives a full description of this practice <sup>126</sup>. He relates that the

<sup>122</sup> SUIDAS, *s. v.* *Ιουλιανός* (No. 433 Adler) : *ἰνθρώπων δὲ ἐστὶ φυλακτήριον πρὸς ἑκάστον μὲριον, ὁποῖα τὰ τελεσιουργικὰ (vox Procliana) Χαλδαϊκά.*

Suidas' quotation probably derives from a lost work of Proclus, who may have drawn upon the *Τελεστικά* of Julian the Theurgist (see ch. 1, n. 1). The fact that amulets were worn on each member of the body may be accounted for by the doctrine that there is sympathy between the seven or twelve members of the body and the planets or the signs of the zodiac. See F. BOLL, *Aus der Offenbarung Johannis*, 1914, 144 (Addenda to p. 61) as to the relevant astrological theories, and BEZOLD-BOLL, *Stern Glaube und Sterndeutung*<sup>3</sup>, 105; 136 f.

<sup>123</sup> See ch. IV, n. 92. Similar amulets inscribed with magical characters are often mentioned in the magical papyri.

<sup>124</sup> PROCL., *Crat.*, 35, 3 (KROLL, 66) : *ἡ δὲ «χαλκίς» διὰ τὸ λιγυρὸν καὶ εὐήχον δίκην χαλκοῦ ἠχοῦντος τορὸν οὕτως ἐκλήθη· ἀμέλει καὶ Χαλδαῖοι οὕτως αὐτὸ καλοῦσι παρὰ Θεῶν ἀκούσαντες.*

The mention of *χαλκίς* in the Oracles is probably connected with a widespread superstitious belief, according to which the clang of brass (*χαλκοῦ ἠχώ*) drives the demons away. Cf. the texts collected by RONDE, *Psyche*, II, 77, 2 and HOFFNER, *O.-Z.*, I, 207 and 596.

<sup>125</sup> PSELLUS, *Script. min.*, 447, 8 : *(οἱ Χαλδαῖοι) μιγνύντες δὲ τὰ μεμερισμένα καὶ διαφόροις ὕλαις ἀνδρείκελα πλάττοντες ἀποτρόπαια νοσημάτων ἐργάζονται.*

Practical instructions of this kind account for Porphyry's blaming the theurgists who "importune the divine intellect with petty matters" (*Epist. ad Aneb.*, 48 [apud IAMBLL., *Myst.*, X, 7]) : *περὶ σμικρῶν οἱ Θεουργοὶ τὸν Θεῖον νοῦν ἐνοχλοῦσι.*

<sup>126</sup> Psellus (BIDEZ, *Mél. Cumont*, I, 98, 6) : *καὶ ἡ ἀρχαιοτέρα δὲ τῶν Ἀσσυρίων σοφία* (see the subsequent note) *ἐντεῦθεν ἀγάλματα κατεσκευάζεν ἀντιπαθῆ πρὸς τὰ ἐξ εἰμαρμένης ρεύματα* (see n. 22), *ὡς ἐκείνη τῷ λόγῳ φησὶν· ἐξελέγοντο δὲ πρὸς τὴν κατασκευὴν τριχρωμὸν γῆν, εἰς δὲ τὴν πλάσιν στέαρ ἀετοῦ καὶ κορώνης. ἐπέπλαστο δὲ τὸ ἀγαλμα τῇ μὲν δεξιᾷ ἀετὸν ὑπερπετώμενον τῷ σχήματι ἔχον, τῇ δὲ λαίᾳ δράκοντα, εἶτα δὴ ἐδεῖκνυν τὴν ἀντιπάθειαν.* The same ritual is referred

Chaldæans used to make images <sup>127</sup> which had an "antipathetic" effect upon the "streams of Heimarmene"; that is the demons subservient to Hecate, who were considered as agents of diseases <sup>128</sup>. The Chaldæans employed for this purpose a three-coloured earth, mixed with the fat of eagles and crows. The image formed out of this material consisted of a poised eagle on the right side and of a serpent on the left side. The significance of this group can be divined from the analogy which it presents to the images used in ordinary magic. Thus, the statuettes of Hecate made by the magicians were out of white, red and black wax <sup>129</sup>; the earth used by the Chaldæans showed probably the same colours. In this connection, we may quote a non-Chaldæan oracle of the later antiquity transmitted by Porphyry, which glorifies Hecate the mistress of the three elements : the fiery ether, the white radiant air and the dark earth <sup>130</sup>. Accordingly the red, white and black of the earth used for the images symbolized the three elements dominated by Hecate. It seems probable that the three colours of the statues made by the Chaldæans were meant likewise to represent the elements of the world

---

to by PSELLUS, *Quæenam sunt*, p. 40, 26, Boiss.; MIGNÉ, *P. G.*, CXXII, 889 B; BIDEZ, *C. M. A. G.*, VI, 129, 5 : *ἀγάλματα τε ὑφίστησεν* (sc. ἡ μαγεία) *ὑγείας περιποιητικά... και ἀετοὶ μὲν και δράκοντες βιώσιμος αὐτοῖς πρὸς ὑγείαν ὑπόθεσις... , κηρὸς δὲ και πηλὸς εἰς τὰς τῶν μορίων συμπλάσεις παραλαμβάνονται.*

<sup>127</sup> Psellus calls the "wisdom of the Assyrians" (i. e. of the theurgists, see Excursus I c and BIDEZ, *C. M. A. G.*, VI, 103, 1) the "older one", distinguishing it by this adjective from the Assyrian magic of his time (that of the Mesopotamian monk Marcus, for instance, who figures in his dialogue *De operatione daemonum*). Cf. also PSELLUS, *Script. min.*, 241, 27 (BIDEZ, *Mélanges Cumont*, 93, 11) : *ἡ τῶν Χαλδαίων ἱερατικὴ τέχνη... ἀρχαία... φιλοσοφία.* He entitles his extract of the Chaldæan dogms *ὑποτύπωσις... τῶν παρὰ Χαλδαίους ἀρχαίων δογμάτων* (see Excursus VI, 1 b).

<sup>128</sup> See n. 22 and ch. III, n. 160.

<sup>129</sup> PORPHY., *De philos. orac.*, p. 134 f., Wolff : *ἐστὶ δὲ σύμβολα μὲν τῆς Ἑκάτης κηρὸς τρίχρωμος ἐκ λευκοῦ και μέλανος και ἐρυθροῦ συνεστῶς* (quoted by BIDEZ, *Mél. Cumont*, 98, 6).

<sup>130</sup> PORPHY., *De philos. orac.*, p. 151, Wolff. See above, ch. I, n. 162 and ch. IV, n. 53. On the use of black-white-red threads \*in magic see HOFFNER, *O.Z.*, I, 617-618.

(and perhaps the three Chaldæan world-circles : the empyrean, the ethereal and the hylic).

The other details of the group can also be interpreted by recourse to magical notions. The eagle and the crow were reputed to be mantic birds. The animal-symbolism of the Orient provides an explanation for the composition of the group : the eagle poised on the propitious side represents the good principle and neutralizes the serpent which symbolizes the powers of evil (or matter) <sup>131</sup>.

These were by no means the only apotropaic rites known to the Chaldæans. Psellus reports that they protected their altars (*i. e.* the places of sacrifice) against the attacks of the demons by attaching to them diamonds, corals, swords and thunderbolts. The practice of using these materials for protective purposes also conforms to that of ordinary magic <sup>132</sup>.

3. *Hades and Hyle*.—The Oracles describing the location and the nature of the nether world show us a new aspect of Chaldæan demonology. In one of them the gods utter the following warning :

“Incline not downwards : beneath the earth is a precipice that

<sup>131</sup> On the eagle as mantic bird see *P. W.* s. v. ADLER, 373 f., on the crow *ibid.*, s. v. KRÄHE, 1564. As to the group described in the text cf. R. WITKOWER, *Eagle and Serpent, Journal of the Warburg Institute*, II (1939), 299 ff., in particular 308. Cf. also WEINREICH, *Antike Heilwunder*, 162 f. According to Porphyry (*apud* MACROB., *Sat.*, I, 17, 67 f.), the statue of Apollo of Hierapolis had an eagle with outspread wings over its head, and at its feet a woman with a serpent winding around it. The eagle represents the sun, the woman the earth, the serpent the windings of the stars.

<sup>132</sup> BIDEZ, *C. M. A. G.*, VI, p. 61, 22 f. : Οὐ γὰρ πειστέον ταῖς Χαλδαιαῖς ληρωδῖαις, ὡς ἔστι τι δαιμόνων γένος τὸν τε ἀδαμάντινον λίθον φοβούμενον καὶ τὸ κουρίλιον καὶ τὸ ἀνδροφόνον ξίφος καὶ τὸν κεραυνόν, ἃ δὴ καὶ οἱ ἀποτροπέμενοι τὸ τοιοῦτον γένος τῶν δαιμόνων Χαλδαῖοι μάντις ἐν ταῖς ἀνιέροις αὐτῶν πράξεισι τοῖς βωμοῖς ἐπιφέρουσιν.

BIDEZ, *ad loc.* and p. 83, 11 quotes several passages from Psellus (among them *περὶ ἱερατικῆς τέχνης*, p. 151, 6 f. and *Script. min.*, p. 322, 8 f.), where he mentions the same apotropaic rites.

drags one down <perforce> beneath the sevenfold ladder”<sup>133</sup>.

The term “precipice” is a Chaldæan metonymic designation of Tartarus<sup>134</sup>. The “sevenfold ladder” signifies the seven planetary spheres, which the soul of the initiate must climb up halfway in its “elevation” towards the Empyrean<sup>135</sup>. The “downward inclination” expresses in the vocabulary of the Platonists imitated by the Chaldæans the action of turning towards the material world, away from the noetic goal<sup>136</sup>.

<sup>133</sup> PSELLUS, *Comm.*, 1132 B (KROLL, 63) :

«Μη(δε) κάτω νεύσης· κρημνός κατά γῆς ὑπόκειται  
ἐπταπόρου σύρων κατά βαθμίδος  
[ὕψ' ἦν ὁ τῆς Ἀνάγκης Θρόνος].

The last six words are in prose, and consequently do not belong to the Oracle. ὁ τῆς Ἀνάγκης Θρόνος is borrowed from PLATO, *Rep.*, 621 a, 1. Psellus appears to have taken a passage of his source Proclus for a continuation of the Oracle. See Excursus VI, 1 a. The meaning of the reference to Plato's Ἀνάγκης Θρόνος appears from PROCL., *Parm.*, 692, 21 who interprets the Platonic expression as designating the ἐμπαθῆς ἐν γενέσει ζωή. Accordingly Psellus, who in his scholium to the fragment quoted explains ἀνάγκη as referring to the desire of the soul for the terrestrial zone, draws on Proclus' interpretation. For κατά γῆς (“under earth”), cf. e. g. PIND., *Ol.*, 2, 65; AESCH., *Eum.*, 1007; PLATO, *Tim.*, 25 d, 2. ὑπόκειται conforms to *Iliad*, VIII, 14 (quoted n. 149) ὑπὸ χθονός ἐστί. The same Oracle is referred to by PSELLUS, *Script. min.*, 447, 5 : οὔτοι οἱ (Χαλδαῖοι) τὴν ψυχὴν ἐπταπόρου σύρουσι κατά βαθμίδος (τοῖς γὰρ ἐκείνων λογιόσι κρήσομαι).

<sup>134</sup> See n. 146 and ch. III, n. 145.

<sup>135</sup> Cf. PSELLUS, *Comm.*, 1132 B (scholium appended to the distich quoted n. 133) “ἐπτάπορος δὲ βαθμὶς” αἱ τῶν ἐπτά πλανητῶν σφαιραὶ εἰσ.ν. Cf. *Hymn. Hom.*, 8, 6 (quoted by Kroll) ἐπταπόροις ἐνι τερεσιν.

<sup>136</sup> νεύω or νεύσις applying to the fall of the soul is only found in the writings of the Platonists (viz. of writers influenced by them); as far as I know for the first time in PLUTARCH, *De anima* (*Mor.*, vol. VII, p. 22, 9, Bernard.) and *Num. Vind.*, 27, 566 A who interprets γένεσις as νεύσις ἐπὶ γῆν καὶ ῥοπή, an etymology akin to those proposed by Plato. The term is used with the same meaning by PLOTINUS, I, 6, 5 : νεύσει τῇ πρὸς τὸ σῶμα ; I, 8, 4 : πρὸς ὕλην νενευκένα (= πρὸς γένεσιν ὄραν) ; I, 8, 15 : νεύουσαν εἰς τὸ χειρὸν ; II, 9, 10 (against the Gnostics) : ψυχὴν γὰρ εἰπόντες νεύσαι κάτω. After him PORPHYR., *De antro*, 11, p. 64, 25 : ἐκ τῆς πρὸς τὴν γένεσιν νεύσεως ; IAMBL., *Myst.*, I, 7, p. 21, 15 ; II, 7, p. 84, 14 : ἡ δὲ κάτω νεύουσα (ψυχὴ) ; JULIAN, *Orat.*, V, 166 C : τὸ πρὸς τὴν ὕλην νεύσαν ; cf. *ibid.*, 168 A : ῥέπειν καὶ νεύειν εἰς τὴν ὕλην ; DAM., II, 206, 7 ; OLYMPIODOR.



To give in to the impure forces of corporeal nature is—in symbolic language—to sink; and the soul guilty of this act of surrender is doomed to plunge down after death into the Tartarus where it is punished.

This Chaldæan Tartarus is described in the following verses of an Oracle<sup>137</sup> :

“Incline not downwards into the dark-glowing world, beneath which is spread the Deep, for ever devoid of structure and form, dark all round, foul, joying in images, irrational, precipitous and sinuous, whirling round for ever its own maimed depth, in eternal marriage with a shape void of appearance, inert, not breathing”.

The first verse of this Oracle and the attribute “precipitous” prove that the “Deep” spread beneath the “dark-glowing world” (that is

*Phaed.*, 109, 10 f.; TATIANUS, *Orat. ad Graec.*, 13, p. 14, 22 and 16, p. 17, 21, ed. Schwartz (in a Platonizing paragraph) : *πρὸς τὴν ἕλην νεύει κάτω*. The author of the two Chaldæan Oracles quoted n. 133 and 137 follow this Platonic usage.

*ρέπω*, synonymous with *νεύω*, derives from PLATO, *Phaedr.*, 247 b, 4 and is used by the Platonists who employ *νεύω*. As WYTTENBACH, *Animadvers. in Plutarch. Op. Mor.* (ed. 1820), II, 585 f. referring to PLATO, *Phaedr.*, 247 b, 4 and *Phaedo*. 81 c, 10 has pointed out, *νεύω* and *ρέπω* are synonymous with *βαρύνομαι* (see ch. II, n. 402), *ἐλκομαι* and *πίπτω*.

Plotinus occasionally applies the verb *νεύω* to the turning of the soul (*ἐπιστροφή*) towards the One : VI, 9, 9 : *νεύουσιν πρὸς αὐτό* (sc. τὸ ἓν) ; I, 8, 4 : *πρὸς νοῦν νεύουσα πυχή* ; cf. also VI, 6, 1. Accordingly SYNES., *Dio*, 8, 1140 B : *ἐπὶ τὰ ἄνω νεύει*. Those passages are quoted by W. THEILER, *Porphyrus und Augustin* (quoted ch. III, n. 9), 23, 4, but his differentiation between Plotinus' and Porphyry's terminology must be rectified. Cf. already MAX. TYR., *Diss.*, XXXVIII, 6, 1 : *τῆτ ἐπὶ . . . τὰ κρείττω ῥοπῆς*.

<sup>137</sup> DAM., II, 317, 3, v. 1-5 ; SYNES., *Insomn.*, 5, 1293 D, v. 1-3 (KROLL, 62) :

«Μηδὲ κάτω νεύσης εἰς τὸν μελαναυγέα κόσμον,  
ὃ βυθὸς αἰὲν ἀμορφὸς ὑπέσθρωται καὶ ἀειδής,  
ἀμφικνεφῆς ῥυπόων εἰδωλοχαρῆς ἀνόητος  
κρημνώδης σκολιὸς πηρὸν βάθος αἰὲν ἐλίσσων  
αἰεὶ νυμφεύων ἀφανὲς δέμας ἀργὺν ἀπνευμον»

V. 1 : *νεύσης* Synes. ; *βλέψεις* Dam. On the other variants in the text of Synesius see n. 141-142.

the sublunar zone)<sup>138</sup> is identical with the "precipice" of the preceding Oracle.

The attributes describing the abyss can be divested of their cryptic character by the observation that they are habitually applied by the Platonists to Primal Matter<sup>139</sup>. According to the Platonic doctrine<sup>140</sup>, Hyle is the principle of negation : a shapeless<sup>141</sup> and invisible<sup>142</sup> entity perpetually agitated by a disorderly movement<sup>143</sup>, the womb of all

<sup>138</sup> Another Oracle (quoted n. 168) designates the sublunar world as *ὁ μισοφαῖς κόσμος*. Cf. PSELLUS, *Expos.*, 1149 C : *ὁ ἔσχατος κόσμος* (i. e. *ὁ ὑλικὸς κόσμος*, see n. 139). On *ἔσχατον* = *ύλη*, see PLOTINUS, I, 8, 7 and the Neoplatonists) *εἶρηται*: *καὶ "μισοφαῖς"*, *ὅ ἐστιν ὁ ὑπὸ σελήνην τόπος* (continued n. 139); IDEM, *Script. min.*, 446, 13; *De operat. daem.*, p. 15, 18, 21, 30, Boiss. The light "hated" of the terrestrial world is the *Lumen intelligibile*; see n. 163.

<sup>139</sup> Proclus identifies the Chaldaean *βυθός* with the *υλικὸς κόσμος*. Cf. PSELLUS, *Comm.*, 1149 C (continuation of the passage quoted n. 138) : *ὁ χθόνιος (κόσμος) . . . ἔχων ἐν ἑαυτῷ καὶ τὴν ὑλην, ὃν καλοῦσι (οἱ Καλδαῖοι) «βυθόν»*; accordingly Nicephorus Gregoras (quoted n. 84) *«βυθόν» δὲ φασιν τὴν ὑλην, ἣν ἐν τῷ ὑπὸ τὴν σελήνην τόπῳ τάττουσι*. PSELL., *Hyp.*, 27 (p. 75, 34 f.) : *καὶ ἡ μὲν ὑλη . . . ὑπέσθρωται* (see n. 137, v. 2) *τῷ σώματι* (an Aristotelizing interpretation : *Μεταρῆ.*, Δ, 1024 b, 9 quoted by PLOTINUS, I, 8, 7; II, 4, 1 *et passim*) : *τὸ δὲ σῶμα καθ' ἑαυτὸ ἀποιὸν ἐστὶ*; see ch. II, n. 203. Cf. also PROCL., *Rp.*, II, 347, 26 : *τὸν ἔσχατον . . . βυθὸν τῆς ὑλῆς*. Synesius and Psellus who quote the first line of the Oracle adduced ch. III, n. 144 : *«οὐ τῷ τῆς ὑλῆς κρημῶν σκύβαλον καταλείψει»*, identify the "precipice" with the hylic (sublunar) world.

<sup>140</sup> The cosmological attributes of Matter derive mostly from PLATO's *Timaeus* (as to them see ALBINUS, 162, 24 f., ed. Hermann and APULIUS, *De deo Plat.*, I, 5), the mythological from *Phaedo* and *Gorgias*.

<sup>141</sup> V. 2 : *ἄμορφος* : PLAT., *Tim.*, 50 c, 1 : *μορφήν οὐδεμίαν . . . εἰληφεν*; d, 7 : *ἄμορφον . . . ἀπασῶν τῶν ιδεῶν*; 51 a, 7 : *εἶδος τι . . . ἄμορφον*. Synesius replaces *ἄμορφος* by *ἀπιστος*, on account of PLAT., *Tim.*, 52 b, 2 : *μόγις πιστόν*.

<sup>142</sup> V. 2 : *ἀειδής* : PLATO, *Tim.*, 51 a, 7 : *ἀόρατον εἶδος τι*. Cf. v. 5 : *ἀφανὲς δέμας* : the noun is a poetical equivalent of *εἶδος*. Hades is explained as *ἀειδής* by PLATO, *Gorg.*, 493 b, 4; *Phaedo*, 80 d, 6; *Crat.*, 403 a, 5 f., a current etymology; accordingly Synesius replaces v. 2 *ἀειδής* by *ἄιδης*.

<sup>143</sup> V. 4 : *πηρὸν βάθος αἰὲν ἐλλίσσων* : PLATO, *Tim.*, 52 e, 3 : *ἀνωμάλως . . . σείεσθαι*. Matter is void of qualities and has consequently spatial extension; its "deep" is accordingly designated "imperfect" (*πηρός*) in the Oracle. Cf. NUMENIUS, p. 132, 15, Leemans : *ποταμὸς γὰρ ἢ ὑλη ροώδης καὶ ὀξύροπος βάθος καὶ*

the things that are to be generated; which will acquire their shape only by a conjunction with the "rational" forms<sup>144</sup> issuing from the demiurge<sup>145</sup>. Thus the "Deep" of the Chaldæans is the chaotic matter anterior to and excluded from the "orderly arrangement" (*διακόσμησις*) of the universe; situated outside the bounds of the created world.

In addition to the Platonic designations of chaotic primal matter, the Oracle employs several attributes deriving from the mythical view of the nether-world; which is described, for instance, as "joying in images"<sup>146</sup>, because it is the abode of the shades. The windings of the "sinuous" depth are meant to recall the rivers of Hades<sup>147</sup>; and the attributes "dark all round" and "foul" to refer to the "darkness" and "slime" into which, according to Orphic and Platonic teaching,

*πλάτος και μήκος άόριστος και άνήνυτος*. The attribute *πολυποικίλος* applied to Matter in another Oracle (see ch. II, n. 200 and 204) derives also from Plato; cf. *Tim.*, 50 d, 5 : *ποικίλου πάτας ποικιλίας*; 52 e, 1 : *παντοδαπήν*.

v. 5 : *άργόν* : cf. PLUTARCH., *De anim. procr.*, VI, 3, 1015 A : *άργόν έξ έαυτού*; PORPHYR., *De antr.*, 5, p. 59, 12.

v. 5 : *άπνευμον* : "without breath" or "without pneuma"; cf. ch. II, n. 211-215.

In another Oracle (PROCL., *Rp.*, II, 156, 17; 347, 1; KROLL, 48) Matter is called "arid", *άύχηρός* (= *άγονος*, Proclus).

<sup>144</sup> V. 3 : *άνήνυτος* : Primal Matter is without ratio; cf. PLATO, *Tim.*, 53 a, 8 : *είχεν άλόγως*; NUMENIUS, p. 132, 19, Leemans.

<sup>145</sup> PLATO, *Tim.*, 50 d, 2 : *και δη και προσεικάσαι πρέπει τό μέν δεχόμενον μητρι*. 51 a, 4 : *τήν του γεγενότος... μητέρα και ύποδοχήν*; 51 a, 7 : *πανδεχές*; 52 d, 5 (= 49 a, 6) : *τήν δε γενέσεως τιθήνην*. These Platonic metaphors seem to have induced the author of the Oracle to coin the daring image of the "eternal marriage" between the "Deep" and shapeless Matter.

<sup>146</sup> For v. 3 : *είδωλοχαρης* (taken over by SYNES., *Hymn.*, III, 92) cf. ch. III, n. 145.

<sup>147</sup> V. 4 : *σκολιός. πηρόν βάθος ατέν έλίσσων* : cf. PLATO, *Phaedo*, 113 b, 1 (concerning the Pyriphlegethon) *Θολερός και πηλώδης* (see n. 148) . . . *περιελιττόμενος*. For *σκολιός*, cf. n. 170 and *Poimandres*, 4 regarding Primal Matter *σκολιώς πεπερασμένον*. It may be remarked that according to a doctrine of the later Orphics (see KERN, *Orph. Fragm.*, No. 123 and 125) which was frequently quoted by the Neoplatonists, the four rivers of the nether world symbolize the four elements. See ch. VI, n. 260.

the sinners are plunged in the nether-world<sup>148</sup>. The "Deep" is called "precipitous" because the Tartarus is pictured as chasm<sup>149</sup>.

The Chaldæan nether-world has three characteristics. (1) It is situated in the earth's interior. (2) It is the abode of the sinful souls who after death expiate there their guilt. (3) It consists of primal matter.

Mythical tradition accounts for the two first characteristics<sup>150</sup>. The second of these is bound up with a complex of beliefs with which the Chaldæans were familiar, as is proved by three fragments which speak of the Tartarus as the place of punishment of the sinner. One of them quoted by Psellus mentions the "avenging spirits throttling man"<sup>151</sup>; a second one reading "Woe woe, the earth doth roar at them until the children"<sup>152</sup>, is interpreted by the same author as concerned with the Tartarus<sup>153</sup> which cries out for an expiation of the evil deeds of the

<sup>148</sup> V. 3 : *ρύπτων* : cf. PLATO, *Phaedo*, 113 a, 8 (see n. 147); *Rep.*, 363 d, 6 et *passim*; RONDE, *Psyche*, I, 313, 1.

V. 3 : *ἀμφικνεφής* conforms not only to the Platonistic mythological conceptions of Tartarus, but also to their cosmological notion of Primal Matter. Besides the texts quoted n. 142, cf. PLATO, *Tim.*, 49 a, 3, *ἀμυδρὸν εἶδος*. PLUTARCH., *De proc. anim.*, 5, 1014 C; PLOTINUS, II, 4, 5. Proclus often refers to the darkness of Hyle, but *ὁ ἀμφικνεφής χώρος* is interpreted by him as referring to the sublunar zone, see n. 89.

<sup>149</sup> PLATO, *Phaedo*, 112 a, 2 quotes in his description of Tartarus, *Iliad*, VIII, 14 : « τῆλε μάλ' ἤχι βάθιστον ὑπὸ χθονός ἐστι βέρεθρον ». *Bathús* is a frequent attribute of Hades; he is called *βύος*, *P. Mag.*, IV, 2338.

<sup>150</sup> This "mythical" tradition need not tally with the Greek one. J. KROLL has shown in his important work *Gott und Hölle (Studien der Bibliothek Warburg, Leipzig, 1932)*, that Hell and its torments were described by the Persians, the Greeks and the Jews in a similar way.

<sup>151</sup> PSELLUS, *Comm.*, 1141 A (KROLL, 62) : « ποινὰι μερόπων ἀκτιραὶ ». The last word should be emended *ἀγκιτηραὶ*; see PROCL., *Rp.*, II, 150, 25 and *Alc.* 341, 24. As to throttling spirits see n. 17; PROCL., *loc. cit.*, and *Crat.*, 76, 13, mentions throttling spirits which torment the soul of the sinner in the nether world.

<sup>152</sup> PSELLUS, *Comm.*, 1145 B (KROLL, 63) :

« Ἄ ἄ τούσδε καταρύεται χθὼν ἐς τέκνα μέχρις ».

(*χθὼν καταρύεται codd., transposui.*)

<sup>153</sup> Psellus (explaining the fragment quoted n. 152) : τὰς γὰρ ὑποχθονίους κολάσει ὑποδεικνύμενον τὸ λόγιον. "Αὐτούς", φησί, "καταρύεται", τουτέστι ἐπιμυκῆται αὐτοῖς ὁ ὑπὸ γῆν τύπος καὶ οἶον λεοντώδες ἐπηχεῖ ὄρυγμα; see n. 158.

fathers by their children <sup>154</sup>. The spirits meting out punishment are probably identical with the subterranean demons who torment the soul of the sinner <sup>155</sup>; the Eumenides <sup>156</sup> mentioned in another Oracle were also of their number <sup>157</sup>. The roaring of the earth may be taken as a metaphorical expression signifying the desire of vengeance which possesses the terrestrial powers <sup>158</sup>. The fact that these three passages bear on the torments of the netherworld is corroborated by the injunction of the Oracle not to incline "downwards" towards the earth, because the precipitous deep is spread out beneath it <sup>159</sup>. This interdiction signifies that "somatic man" is faced with the menace of falling into this abyss.

The third characteristic of the Chaldæan Tartarus (Netherworld = Hyle) can be grasped in its full significance only after we have considered the relation of the Chaldæan conception of matter to the whole of their system. First we may note that they use the term of "Hyle"

<sup>154</sup> For *ἐς τέκνα μέχρις* cf. the Orphic doctrine regarding the expiation of misdeeds in Hades up to the third generation. PLATO, *Rep.*, 366 a, 4 : ἀλλὰ γὰρ ἐν Αἴδου δίκην δάσσομεν ὧν ἐν ἐνθάδε ἀδικήσωμεν ἢ αὐτοὶ ἢ παῖδες παιδῶν, and the parallels quoted by KERN, *Orph. Fragm.*, p. 82 f.

<sup>155</sup> On punishing spirits see DIETERICH, *Nekyia*, 58 f.

<sup>156</sup> As regards the Eumenides, a reference to *Iliad*, XIX, 259 f. « Ἐρινύες, αἱ δ' ἰπὸ γαῖαν / ἀνθρώπους τίνυνται » may suffice. They are often identified with the *ποιναι* (DIETERICH, *loc. cit.*).

<sup>157</sup> According to PSELLUS, *Hyp.*, 13 (p. 74, 32), the "sources of the Eumenides" issue from the demiurge, i. e. the avenging spirits are sent forth by the Creator. This doctrine recalls the Chaldæan conception of deceiving demons who, at God's command, are sent forth from Hecate in order to punish transgressions against ritual; cf. n. 11. According to the Platonists the existence of spirits of this nature is part of the divine plan; cf. LAMBICHUS, quoted n. 96, and the passages referred to n. 52.

<sup>158</sup> For the roaring of the Erinyes cf. EURIP., *Iph. Taur.*, 293 f.; KROLL, 63 recalls the motif of the roaring chasm of the Tartarus, PLATO, *Rep.*, 615 e (cf. DIETERICH, *Nekyia*, 124); this passage is referred to the roaring of subterranean avenging spirits by PROCL., *Rp.*, II, 180, 8 f. Other parallels are quoted by W. PEECK, *Der Isishymnus von Andros*, Berlin, 1930, p. 45, note 1.

<sup>159</sup> See n. 137.

in the sense current among the Platonists of their time <sup>160</sup>. According to their conception, the transcending God "generated" primal matter, moved by blind impulse; created through the medium of His Intellect the noetic pattern of the visible world; and charged the Second Intellect with the task of fashioning the material cosmos, through the conjunction of the formative ideas and of amorphous matter. This mode of creation accounts for the fact that, though everything in the universe has a corporeal character, none of the substances found in the world exists without an admixture of formative reason. The two extremes of the created world are on the one hand the Forms which are void of all corporality, on the other primal matter into which no Forms have penetrated. The first constitute the supramundane noetic sphere, the second is the subterranean "deep" of the Tartarus.

The amorphous matter that antecedes all becoming and all formative activity is called "irrational", as it has not received the spiritual qualities of the formative Ideas. The fact that this primal matter is the substratum of all generated things accounts for the negative quality perceptible to a greater or less degree in all the portions of the world of sense. The various proportions in which matter is commingled with the Ideas determine the positive or negative quality of the resultant mixture. The penetration of the material world by the rational Ideas, springing from the "first transcendental Fire", is conceived as analogous to an illumination proceeding from a primordial supramundane light. The greater the distance of the created world from the source of the Ideas, the poorer their quality. This gradation of the effects of divine action corresponds to the system of the universe, which includes the world of the fixed stars, the seven spheres of the planets and the lowly terrestrial zone. The spheres of the fixed stars and of the planets constitute the "ethereal world", characterized by the fact that the material substances of which it has an admixture are of the most subtile quality <sup>161</sup>. The "hylic world" which includes the terrestrial zone

<sup>160</sup> See ch. vi, sect. 11 as to the Platonic doctrine, and ch. ii, sect. 7-9 as to the Chaldean conceptions.

<sup>161</sup> The Chaldeans distinguish between the matter of the fixed stars and that of the planets; see n. 25 and 31.

begins beneath the moon; its name is due to the fact that in it matter prevails over the influence of divine light. For this reason it is also described as the "dark-glowing" or "light-hating" world<sup>162</sup>; light being in this case not a physical but a metaphysical concept<sup>163</sup>. This terrestrial sphere is subject to the law of generation and corruption. After it comes the "deep" which is nothing but pure matter, into which the ray of the ideas does not penetrate; called for this reason the "dark all round" world<sup>164</sup>. Thus the universe is ruled by two opposed principles, the strenght of whose influence depends on their greater or lesser share in the mixture.

Man is placed between the two antagonists, who wage their war in him and about him; he is the victor's prize. The system of the Chaldæans centred in a conception of human life; it is but natural that their dualism should have left the deepest impress on their anthropology. According to them, the human body is formed of the vilest of all created substances<sup>165</sup>. Because of this, all irrational impulse must be imputed to it. On the other hand, the soul sojourning in this material integument is of noetic origin. It is the divine principle in man and is held down by the predominance of matter in the "hylic world", which tends to strengthen the corporal impulses of man: a being determined by three factors, the body, the soul and material environment.

The opposition existing between matter and the Ideas has an immediate influence upon the internal nature of man. And he in his turn is able to exert an action upon the proportion of the two principles

<sup>162</sup> See n. 138.

<sup>163</sup> The fifteen stairs which lead towards Hades are called by the alchemist Zosimus σκοτοφεγγεῖς. See REITZENSTEIN, *Hellenistische Mysterienreligionen*, 313. The officiant of the mystery of immortalization described in the magical papyrus of Paris calls the terrestrial world "void of light" as opposed to the celestial "splendid" world (*P. Mag.*, IV, 497: ἐν ἰφωτισίῳ καὶ δισυγεῖ κόσμῳ). In *Poimandres*, 28 the faithful are bidden to leave the "obscure light" of this world (ἀπαλλάγητε τοῦ σκοτεινοῦ φωτός).

<sup>164</sup> ἀμφικνεφής: see n. 137 (v. 3).

<sup>165</sup> See n. 70 f.

in the mixture which constitutes his own self. By turning his aspiration towards the intelligible world, he narrows down the domain of the material principle subsisting in him; and, on the contrary, "Hyle" gains power over him, as soon as he gives away to the passions of the body<sup>166</sup>. The Chaldæans represented this process not only as a quantitative one, but also as a spatial descent and ascent. The soul who aspires to her noetic place of origin is dragged down by the body towards the "ill-fated earth". On the other hand, the soul of the ascete who eschews earthly passions rises aloft "towards the rays of the Father"<sup>167</sup>. She is bidden "not to incline" during this ascent towards the "dark-glowing world" (the terrestrial zone), because the "deep" of primal matter void of divine essence is spread beneath it. These expressions, which are clearly of Platonic origin, are not mere metaphors: they apply not only to the various stations of salvation or condemnation, but also to the actual portions of the universe (deep, earth air, moon, sun, ether, etc.) which correspond to these stations. The grades of qualitative purification have their spatial counterparts, which mark the various stages in the road to the supramundane Empyrean. For this road to salvation is conceived both as an ascent in space to the upper regions of the universe and as a mystic transfiguration.

This psycho-physical doctrine of matter accounts for the twofold meaning attached to this notion in the Oracles. Hyle is both a cosmological and an anthropological principle. The term connotes not only the material quality and the deficiencies of the sensible world as opposed to the formative substance of the Ideas, but also man's corporeal and irrational nature, which is the cause of all evil. Accordingly, matter is said to be endowed with "animal impetuosity"<sup>168</sup>, an attribute apply-

<sup>166</sup> See n. 168.

<sup>167</sup> See ch. II, n. 396; 402-403.

<sup>168</sup> PROCL., *Tim.*, III, 325, 29 (KROLL, 63): *πάσαν τὴν γενεσιουργὸν φύσιν, ἐν ἧ... καὶ ἐτὸ λαβρὸν τῆς ὕλης καὶ «ὁ μισοφαῆς κόσμος»* (see n. 138), *ὡς οἱ θεοὶ λέγουσι καὶ τὰ σκόλια ρεῖθρα, ὕφ' ὧν οἱ πολλοὶ κατασύρονται, ὡς τὰ λογιά φησιν* (see n. 170).



ing not only to the irrational quality of its chaotic movement<sup>169</sup>, but also to man's blind impulses proceeding from his corporeal nature. This second connotation provides the clue to the Oracle which states that the majority of men "are swept along by the winding streams of Hyle"<sup>170</sup>. Hyle signifies in this passage the source of all earthly passions, from which man, according to the injunction of the Oracles, should "flee far away"<sup>171</sup>. The contemptuous description of the human body as the "mortal envelope of the bitter (*i. e.* inferior) matter"<sup>172</sup> alludes to the negative effect of corporality, the "root of evil"<sup>172</sup> considered both as the objective nature of matter and as the action exerted by this principle on human life.

The fact that the term "matter" is applied to corrupt human nature accounts for the anthropological connotation acquired by the related term Hades. Hades is described in the Oracles as pure matter, which is not illuminated by the light of the Ideas : an extreme case of material existence void of all spirituality which has its counterpart in a purely corporeal human life. Was the fall into the "deep" of the Tartarus considered as a penalty imposed after death ; or was it regarded as an automatic consequence—experienced even before death—of life bounded by the senses ? The two fragments bearing on Hades do not elucidate this point ; and their silence is significant. The Neoplatonists are similarly ambiguous when speaking of Hades or of the Tartarus both as a really existing place of punishment and as the internal state of the

<sup>169</sup> See n. 143 and 147.

<sup>170</sup> See n. 168. The verse may have read : ὕλης,

« ἤς κατασύρονται πολλοὶ σκολίοισι ρέεθροισι ».

This verse is alluded to by PROCL., *Crat.*, 104, 6 : τῶν τε σκολίων ἀτραπῶν τῆς ὕλης and SYNES., *Hymn.*, IX, 55 (see n. 180). The fact that it refers to Hyle is proved by the use of σκολιός in the Oracle quoted n. 137 and of ρενσθή applied by the Pythagoreans (*Doxogr. Graec.*, 307 a, 24 ; 308 b, 1 ; NUMENIUS, p. 92, 18, Leemans) and Platonists (*cf. e. g.* ALBINUS, 166, 27, Hermann) to ὕλη.

<sup>171</sup> See ch. II, n. 403. The comparison of the affections with a rushing stream is frequent, it is a favourite one with Philo. *Cf.* his description of the fall of the souls *De gig.*, 13 : ὡσπερ εἰς ποταμὸν τὸ σῶμα καταβάσαι ποτὲ μὲν ὑπὸ σурμοῦ δίης βιαιοτάτης ἀρπατθεῖσαι κατεπόθησαν.

<sup>172</sup> See n. 70 and 75.

slaves of hyle<sup>173</sup>. These considerations enable us to account for Proclus' identification of the Chaldæan Hades with the "irrational soul"<sup>174</sup>. For the human soul, susceptible of being transfigured by its divine aspiration into pure light, was equally liable to approach the state of pure matter to which it becomes akin when yielding to its lower impulses.

4. *The hyleic demons.*—The Chaldæan views on matter conform to those of the later Platonists, but they are bound up with demonological and magical beliefs which changed the spirit of the Platonic doctrine.

Matter is designated in one of the Oracles as the "worker of evil"<sup>175</sup>. This description runs counter to the teaching of the Platonists who denied that matter possessed qualities and accordingly could not impute to it any conscious action whatever. We have seen that the Chaldæans accepted this view of matter as pure privation. The problem presented by the existence of these two apparently divergent Chaldæan doctrines can be solved by a recourse to an Oracle we have already quoted which describes the demons as the "offsprings of evil matter"<sup>176</sup>. We must

<sup>173</sup> Cf. PHILO, *De execrat.*, 152 on the sinner : ὑποσύρεται κατωτάτω πρὸς αὐτὸν Τάρταρον καὶ βαθὺ σκότος ἐνεχθεῖς ; cf. *De somniis*, I, 150-151 ; *Quaest. in Exod.*, II, 40 ; PLOTINUS, I, 6, 8 ; I, 8, 13 ; PROCL., *Rp.*, II, 147, 9 : ἀλογία καὶ σώματος βαρύτης εἰς τὸ σκοτώδες κατασπῶσα καὶ ἐσχατον (see n. 138) καὶ συνάπτει... ὕλικοῖς δαίμοσι ; IDEM, *Alc.*, 357, 28 : ὁ ψευδῶνυμος ἐρσιλής... καθέλκει τὰς ψυχὰς εἰς τὸ βάθος τῆς ὕλης (see n. 139), ἀποσπρέφει τοῦ θεοῦ... παραδοὺς ἐκυτὸν... τῷ σκότει τῆς ὕλης. SYNES., *Insomn.*, 5, 1293 B. The last verses of a poem of BOETHIUS, *Philosoph. consolat.*, III, 12 (cf. F. KLINGNER, *De Boethii consol. philos.* [quoted ch. I, n. 58], p. 31) are analogous : "Nam qui Tartareum in specus / victus lumina flexerit (as Orpheus to Eurydice), quidquid praecipuum trahit, perdit, dum videt inferos".

<sup>174</sup> See n. 91 and 95.

<sup>175</sup> PSELLUS, *Script. min.*, 446, 21 (Bidez, *Mélanges Cumont*, I, 93, 2 f.) : οἱ Χαλδαῖοι... τὴν ὕλην εἰσάγουσιν ὡς «κακίης ἐργάτιν». For ἐργάτις (explained by DAM., II, 60, 23 as ἐνεργοῦσα), see ch. II, n. 62.

<sup>176</sup> See n. 14. On ὕλικοι δαίμονες, see HOPFNER, *O.-Z.*, I, 70 ; 76 ; 244 f. ; 796 f.

suppose that the corrupting action of matter is due to the beings it has procreated, *i. e.* the hylic demons, whose sphere of activity extends to all corporeal things. It is their aggressive habit which is the cause of the negative attitude of the Chaldæans towards all corporality. In the belief that the human body, designated by them as the "dung of matter", exerted because of its impure desires a particular attraction upon the evil demons, they strove to mortify it by severe ascetic exercises and thus bring about the extinction of the material principle subsisting in themselves. The fear of the demons developed among them as in many of the religions of later antiquity an excessive spiritualism, which condemned Hyle as the diabolic principle.

Thus the conviction of the Chaldæans as to the power of corruption inherent in material things was due not only to the Platonic doctrine which denies Hyle a share in the divine illumination, but also to the belief in the practical identity of the material with the demonic principle. By assimilating the antagonism between spirit and matter to that existing between the good and the evil demons they altered the nature both of matter and of the demons. For the Neoplatonists matter was nothing but an obscuring and defiling element which hindered man from uniting with the divine principle. For the Chaldæans it was more than that; not only a passive obstacle, but an active and even aggressive negative power. The man who yields to bodily impulse draws towards himself demons who take possession of him. Devotion to material things leads not only to the loss of man's "ideal" capacities, but also to his being vanquished by the powers of evil, who bring about his utter ruin.

The passage we have quoted in which Iamblichus sets forth the principles of Chaldæan demonology alludes briefly to the way in which this work of destruction was encompassed. Some of the details which are not touched upon there may be found in Synesius' *Egyptian Myth about Providence*; a text which contains what is probably the most vivid extant account of demonic temptation given by a Platonist<sup>177</sup>.

<sup>177</sup> SYNESIUS, *Aegyptius, sive De Providentia*, I, 9-10; MIGNÉ, P. G., LXVI, 1225 C ff.

A summary of his chief doctrines which contain free variations on Porphyrean <sup>178</sup> and Chaldæan themes will introduce us to the subject.

According to Synesius' tale, the father of the gods bids his son Osiris, the representative of the good principle, whom he has chosen to rule the world, to beware of the demons who, following their earth-begotten natures, attack everybody who in their territory observes foreign laws... "Take heed lest thou being alone and a stranger shouldst be overwhelmed by the superior strenght of the natives". Even the help of the souls of the heroes sent down in a new incarnation to man's rescue <sup>179</sup> does not suffice to ward off the demonic assault. "When Matter sends her own offspring into the fight <sup>180</sup>, the earthly resistance of the heroes grows weak, as the gods are far away. For every one is strong only in his own domain. These démons would make thee one of themselves. They employ the following manner of fighting : everything that exists on earth has an irrational part of the soul... As this part is akin to the demons, they make use of it in their attacks upon the created beings... When the nature of the demons, which is affective or more exactly a living and moving affection <sup>181</sup>, approaches a soul, it sets in movement the affection subsisting in her and transforms its potentiality into actuality. It brings this about by its nearness. For everything that is affected resembles the affecting agency. Thus the demons inflame the desires, the impulses and the kindred evil qualities by entering in

<sup>178</sup> Already CUMONT, *Rel. Orient.* (3rd German edition), 288, 53, supposes that Synesius in his exposition has drawn upon Porphyry (cf. especially *De abst.*, II, 37-43. See Excursus XI).

<sup>179</sup> As to the function of the heroes see *e. g.* PROCL., *Crat.*, 68, 16-69, 3; 75, 25-76, 4. For other passages see HOFFNER, *O.-Z.*, I, 86 f.

<sup>180</sup> SYNESIUS, *De providentia*, I, 10, 1229 B : ἀλλ' ὅταν εἰς πόλεμον ψυχῆς ὕλη κινήσῃ τὰ οἰκεία βλαστήματα refers to the Oracle quoted n. 14. *Ibid.*, 1228 B he calls the demons "inhabitants of the mobile elements, of a capricious and insolent nature", and *Hymn.*, IX, 54 f. : κῆρες ἀναιδέες (reckless) βαθυκύμονος (see n. 170) ὕλας.

<sup>181</sup> The identification of the hylic demons with the affections derives from Porphyry; cf. PROCL., *Tim.*, I, 171, 19 f. (quoted Excursus XI, n. 18).

contact with the soul through the medium of those of her parts which are related to them<sup>182</sup>. These parts perceive the presence of the demons in virtue of their own nature, begin to move and obtain from the demons the power to rebel against reason, until they possess themselves of the entire soul. This is a mighty struggle. For there is no moment, no manner of fighting and no place of which the demons do not avail themselves in their onslaught. They attack at the point where they are least expected. Everywhere, there is menace of traps and stratagems<sup>183</sup>, all things take part in this struggle, until they have conquered the fortress or have lost hope of achieving this. And from above, the gods watch this noble fight..."

The powers of good take up the struggle against the forces of evil. And while the demons prevail when the soul is dominated by the body, the good spirits come to the rescue of the man who has purified his soul and his body. The alliance between the spiritual principle and the celestial powers on the one hand and that between matter and the demonic powers on the other hand make for the concretisation of the cosmic antagonism of spirit and matter<sup>184</sup>.

A further point may be noted. The demons have a fixed place in the Chaldæan system being assigned to the hylic principle. This is an example of the theurgical method of classifying spirits according to the divisions of the universe to which the entities concerned were supposed to conform in their qualities. This method enabled the theurgists to combat the evil powers by magical means depending for their validity on the universal cosmic laws.

The doctrine of the hylic demons elucidates furthermore the relationship between a) the "deep" of primal matter, the place of punishment of the damned, b) the terrestrial and subterranean demons, and c) the god Hades, Prince of the impure spirits. The fall of the sinful

<sup>182</sup> The rational part of the soul is the λογιστικόν, the two irrational ones are the θυμοειδές and επιθυμητικόν. The Chaldæans ignore the Platonic trichotomy of the soul; cf. ch. III, n. 26.

<sup>183</sup> Cf. ΡΟΥΡΗΤΑ., *De philos. orac.*, p. 149, Wolff.

<sup>184</sup> See ch. VI, sect. 11.

soul into the Tartarus is a consequence of her "demonized" life, which delivers her up to the satellites of the god Hades. This fate is conformable to Chaldæan anthropology. For the man whom the passion of the body induced to disown his divine part, has begun his downward progress which would lead to an utter negation of the spiritual principle and thus to a state which resembles that of pure matter. He has been transformed into Hyle agitated by irrational motion and void of intellectual qualities, and this even before the soul plunges into the abyss.

This process in which the soul gradually assumed the nature of matter is accelerated by the terrestrial demons, who take possession of the "hyleic" man abandoned by all the celestial powers and "drag" his soul "downwards". Consequently we may surmise that there also existed other demons belonging to the same genus<sup>185</sup> who cast the soul after death into the abyss of Tartarus<sup>186</sup>. These demons of the "deep" as well as those of the terrestrial zone may be assumed to be under

---

<sup>185</sup> The class of the *καταγωγοὶ δαίμονες* is often mentioned by Proclus (whose views are based on Porphyry's demonology). Cf. *Rp.*, II, 147, 9 (quoted n. 173); *Crat.*, 75, 23; *Mal. Subs.*, 214, 7-36 (quoted ch. IV, n. 34); *Tim.*, I, 77, 8 f. (quoted Excursus XI, n. 3).

<sup>186</sup> Porphyry's statement (see n. 112) seems to show that the Chaldæans invoked at the same time the terrestrial and subterranean divinities. The two groups of demons belong, according to Proclus, to the same category; besides the passages quoted n. 185, cf. PROCL., *Crat.*, 76, 11 : (τὰ ἄλογα γένη δαιμόνων)... τῇ ὕλῃ καὶ τοῖς ἀβεργαστάτοις τοῦ παντός (i. e. the Tartarus) ἐνοικεῖ καὶ συνδεῖ τὰς ψυχὰς τοῖς εἰδωλοποιοῖς κόλποις (i. e. the wombs of the earth inhabited by the demons; see n. 3). According to PSELLUS, *De operat. daem.*, p. 16, 2, Boiss., the hyleic demons dwell in the sublunar region, the subterraneous included (καὶ τοὺς μυχό-τάτους καὶ βυθίους τόπους). In an Oracle quoted n. 25 the demons of the earth, the water and the nether world are called by a common appellation the dwellers of the *ἀβυσσοί*. According to another fragment of the Oracles (see n. 3), the terrestrial demons originate in the wombs of the earth. According to a third Oracle paraphrased by Psellus (see n. 3) they dwell in the "cavern" of the earth (ἐν τῷ κοιλώματι), which seems to be identical with the caves of Tartarus; cf. PROCL., *Tim.*, II, 183, 21 : ὁ Τάρταρος... κοιλώματος τόπος and J. KROLL, *Gott und Hölle*, 390, 5-6.

the domination of the god Hades <sup>187</sup>. In support of this supposition, we may allege not only the god's name with its associations, but also the Iranian doctrine—from which the Chaldæan derives—that the nether-world is the abode of Ahriman, ruler of the evil spirits.

---

<sup>187</sup> The Chaldæan identification of the place Hades with Hyle points likewise to the probability of the rule of the god Hades over the hyleic demons.





## CHAPTER VI

---

### THE PLATONIC ELEMENTS

1. *Introduction.*—The reconstruction of the theory and practise of the Chaldæan theurgists, to which the five foregoing chapters have been devoted, has attempted to show that their teaching presented a closed and self-consistent intellectual system. This internal unity assures the Chaldæans a place among the founders of the theological systems of latter antiquity. However, the self-consistency of their doctrine, when considered as a whole, must not be allowed to conceal the fact that they borrowed the elements of their construction from diverse religious and philosophical doctrines of their time. A full understanding of their peculiarity is therefore attainable only by means of an examination of the original relationship of these elements. The systematic exposition already given requires to be completed by an historical analysis.

This genetic treatment must, if it is not to renounce its major aim, go beyond a mechanical establishment of the origin of the particular tenets. Such a limitation of it is already made impossible by the fragmentary state of the literary tradition, which is not sufficient to enable us to name precisely the sources used by the authors of the Chaldæan Oracles. Consequently, to the historical analysis must be added the task of determinating these sources. Such reconstruction of the model by means of inferential argument from the image in the reflector opens up of itself new points of view, the discussion of which may, indeed, take us sometimes rather far afield from the starting point of our study, but which, not infrequently, make clear for the first time the wider significance of the Chaldæan doctrines concerned. The ever-present danger in such studies of the history of particular motifs—that of neglecting the context in which the particular thought appears—has been

eliminated by the foregoing presentation of the complete system, the valuation of which as a whole need not now be dependent upon the results of any inquiries concerning the origins of its various parts.

Any inquiry which wishes to be considered as a contribution to the history of religion is further required to set forth the relation of the system discussed to the general spiritual movement which called it into existence. The consequent widening of the field of our study in this history will make us acquainted with a whole series of phenomena in which a similar religious need is expressed and similar fundamental questions find adequate answer. It cannot be considered an accident that the origination of the Chaldæan system should be temporally coincident with the most flourishing period of the Oriental mystery-religions, of the Hermetic theosophy and of western gnosticism, as well as with the revival of the metaphysical tendencies of Platonism. The question of the immediate reciprocal influence of these systems becomes from this higher view-point the question of their spiritual similarity. Only on the basis of such a wide survey of contemporary religious movements can a more just evaluation of the peculiar accomplishments of the theurgists be also, at last, attained.

2. *The contemporary Platonism.*—Most manifest is the relationship of the Chaldæans to the teachings of Plato. This dependence was stated openly—in a form appropriate to their magical notions—by the authors of the Chaldæan Oracles themselves. Psellus (*i. e.* Proclus) reports, on the ground of a direct statement of Julian the Chaldæan, that he (Julian) conjured up the soul of Plato in order to question it at will, and made it the familiar spirit of his son, the future theurgist<sup>1</sup>. Consequently the Platonism of the Chaldæans claimed for itself the authority of an authentic self-interpretation of Plato, who speaks again, to a certain extent, in the Oracles of the Chaldæans. On the ground of this “preestablished identity” between the Chaldæan and the Platonic teaching, the later Neoplatonists made the farreaching under-

---

<sup>1</sup> See ch. III, n. 195.

taking to harmonize the two systems, and exalted theurgy to the position of the mystery-cult of the inner circle of their philosophic school.

A closer examination of the platonizing opinions reproduced in the Chaldæan Oracles shows, however, that these agree, not with the original teachings of the philosopher, but with the interpretations of Plato made by representatives of the Platonic school contemporary with the originators of the Chaldæan Oracles. The Chaldæans were fully aware of this relationship, as their polemics against divergent opinions prove, and saved themselves from critical contradiction by recourse to the infallibility assured by their inspiration. From this situation there arises, for a sober observer, the question as to the nature of this Platonism which was known to the Chaldæans. The treatment of this question leads us deeper into the history of this school of philosophy. Consequently before attempting it, we must call to mind a few of the principal data concerning the chief figures of this period of the Platonic school—(the period of "Middle Platonism")—data which will be indispensable for the understanding of what follows<sup>2</sup>.

A sure point of departure for the nearer determination of that milieu in which the Platonism known to the Chaldæans must be sought, is furnished by the tradition concerning the place and time of the theurgists. Julian the Chaldæan and his son worked in Rome at the time of the two Antonines. At the same period there lived in Rome the Platonists Numenius<sup>3</sup> and Celsus, the latter of whom was made famous by his attack on Christianity<sup>4</sup>. Concerning the possible Roman

<sup>2</sup> The best introduction to Middle Platonism is UEBERWEG-PRAECHTER, *Die Philosophie des Altertums*<sup>12</sup> (Berlin, 1926), § 70 (quoted as "Praechter"). E. ZELLER, *Die Philosophie der Griechen*, Teil III, 4th (and 5th) ed., unparalleled for his systematic treatment, was not able, for want of preparatory studies, to pay sufficient attention to the historical development of the doctrines of the school.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. LYDUS, *Mens.*, IV, 80, p. 132, 11 : *Νουμηνίος ὁ Ῥωμαῖος*. The fragments of Numenius are cited according to the collection of E. A. LEEMANS, *Numenius van Apamea*, Gent, 1937.

<sup>4</sup> Celsus, apparently of Roman descent (see ZELLER, III, 2, 231, 4), composed his work against the Christians ca. 179 A. D.

sojourns of other contemporary Platonists nothing has been reported.<sup>5</sup> However, by reason of the close contact between the scholarchs of the west and the east, the question of their residence is not decisive for the estimation of the influence of their teachings. It is to be remarked that the strong influence of the Middle-Platonic tradition on the writings of the Christian apologist Justin, who was then living in Rome, as well as on those of the Gnostic Valentinus and of his western disciples (among whom must also be reckoned Tatian and some of the Gnostics opposed by Plotinus)<sup>6</sup>—this widespread Platonic influence seems to evidence the development in the capital of a Platonic movement which yet did not bring to the fore any dominant personality. Moreover, it must be remembered that the spiritual power of Plato began at this time to extend itself far beyond the limits of the teaching in the Platonic school. The otherworldly dualism then everywhere prevalent recognized, in the sacral pathos of transcendental Platonism, the expression of its own experience of life, and this long before Plotinus had expressed these religious impulses in strictly philosophical form.

Middle Platonism itself shows, in this situation, the appearance of a transitional and preparatory period. Orthodoxy believing every letter found itself side by side with levelling eclecticism, logical scholasticism with mystical transcendentalism. The Platonism of the Chaldæans shows close relationship to the last-named type, of which the representative we best know was in their time this Numenius already spoken of<sup>7</sup>.

---

<sup>5</sup> Maximus of Tyre lectured in Rome at the time of Commodus, but represents the pre-Numenian phase of Platonism (ZELLER, III, 2, 219 f.).

<sup>6</sup> Justin Martyr was a Platonist before his conversion to Christianity (*Apol.*, II, 12) and lived in Rome from ca. 150 on (died ca. 165). Valentinus came from Alexandria to Rome ca. 135 (lived there until 160). The most important of his Italian disciples were Ptolemaeus (active ca. 145-180) and Heracleon (died ca. 200). Tatianus, Justin's pupil in Rome, was also influenced by Valentinus. PLOTINUS, in *Enn.*, II, 9, apparently attacks Gnostics living in Rome; see n. 47.

<sup>7</sup> The orientalism of Numenius is overestimated. The origin of his principal doctrines can be explained by the inner development of Platonic-Pythagorean transcendental philosophy; his frequent references to Oriental doctrines, by his theory of the Oriental origin of the Pythagorean philosophy reflected in Platonism;

However this metaphysical tendency is actually older than Numenius, as is proved in the first place by the Platonic elements of the theology of Philo<sup>8</sup> and Plutarch. The intensity of the metaphysical interest of the Platonists at the time of the Chaldæans is shown also by the teaching of the influential scholar Gaius, the main outlines of whose system are known to us through the writings of his disciples Albinus (in extract)<sup>9</sup> and of Apuleius in his work on the principal teachings of Plato<sup>10</sup>. This transcendental tendency received its systematic expression at the hands of Plotinus, about 80 years after the Chaldæans, and by reason of the propaganda carried on by Plotinus' disciple Porphyry became thereafter the principal feature of what is called Neoplatonism. It is noteworthy that Porphyry, not only in the writings of his pre-Plotinian period, but also afterwards frequently refers back to doctrines of the Platonic school which precede in time those of his master<sup>11</sup>.

the prevalence of citations referring to Judaism, by the interest which this particular class of citations had for the Fathers of the Church, who handed them down. His knowledge of Philo is no more demonstrable than is that of Plotinus. His principal work, *περι τήχρηθου*, was a dialogue (cf. p. 140, 1, *ῶ ξέρε*) which may have resembled those of Plutarch, and offered plentiful opportunities for Oriental and other adornments.

<sup>8</sup> That, considering the loss of the prior tradition, Philo is the oldest preserved "Neoplatonist", has often been remarked. Cf. ZELLER, III, 2, p. 470 ff. W. JAEGER, *Nemesius von Emesa* (Berlin, 1914), 48. PRAECHTER, 575 f. W. THEILER, *Die Vorbereitung des Neuplatonismus* (Berlin 1930), 30 et *passim*.

<sup>9</sup> ALBINUS, *Didascalicus Platonis dogmatum*, in *Appendix Platonica*, by C. F. HERMANN, p. 152-189. See J. FREUDENTHAL, *Hellenistische Studien*, III (Berlin, 1879). PRAECHTER, 541 f. R. E. WITT, *Albinus and the History of Middle Platonism*, Cambridge, 1937. Witt touches on several of the problems treated in this chapter, but restricts his enquiry to the Platonists of the school and does not consider the influence of Middle Platonism upon Philo, the Hermetics and Gnostics.

<sup>10</sup> Apuleius (born about 125 A. D.), *De Platone et eius dogmate*, 1; I-II, in *Apulei opera*, vol. III, ed. P. Thomas (Teubner), p. 82 ff. Cf. Th. SINKO, *De Apulei et Albini doctrinae Platonicae adumbratione*, Cracoviac, 1905. PRAECHTER in *P. W. Suppl.*, III, 535 f., s. v. Gaius. WITT, *passim*.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Excursus XI. Plotinus lectured in Rome from 243 until 269. Porphyry (born 223) lived, with interruptions, in Rome from 263 (6 years before Plotinus' death). He died about 304.

The Platonizing Oracles of the Chaldæans reflect a new variant of this pre-Plotinian Platonism. Their teachings help us to attain a certain insight into the spiritual condition of the Platonism to which Plotinus attached himself, and thereby a clearer general view of the inner development of this school of philosophy in one of their most critical periods. At the same time it must not, of course, be overlooked that the Platonism of Plotinus actually differs not only in quality, but also formally, from that of the Chaldæans. The Platonic precursors of the Chaldæans cannot be compared in systematizing power with Plotinus (no more can any of the other representatives of Middle Platonism). Moreover, the authors of the Oracles produce no dialectical discussions, but only dogmatic results. It is plausible that they took over this dogmatic digest of a system from one of the teachers of the Middle Platonic school, and that it may have resembled in its outer forms that of Albinus. They retained the doxographic character of these communications, for it seemed to them that best fitted for the positive fashion of speech required in divine vaticinations.

3. *The dependence of the Chaldæans upon the contemporary Platonism (The doctrines of the ideas and of the sequence of the noetic principles).*—The study of this point must begin with the proof that the Platonism of the Chaldæans presents neither a free selection nor an individual rearrangement of the original teachings of the founder of the school, but took over the results of a contemporary interpretation of Plato<sup>12</sup>. This proof can be given most clearly by reference to the doctrine of ideas, which in the period of Middle Platonism went through a fundamental reformation. In this question the Chaldæans stand on the side of the “innovators” who sometimes oppose themselves to the conservative members of the school in sharp polemic. Just as Albinus, they also define the ideas as eternal thoughts, complete in themselves, of

---

<sup>12</sup> This aspect was first remarked by WENDLAND, *Philol. Wochenschrift*, 1895, 1040. KROLL, 66, wanted to rule out, as Neoplatonic forgeries, the Chaldæan Oracles which seemed to him influenced by Plotinian doctrines. No attempt has hitherto been made to situate the Chaldæan theology in the history of Platonism.

the supreme God<sup>13</sup>, and they distinguish between the principal and particular ideas. The first<sup>14</sup> constitute the spiritual archetype after which, as after a model, the visible world has been formed;<sup>15</sup> while the second, which have come into being through the division of the noetic unity<sup>16</sup>, serve to give form<sup>17</sup> to the shapeless matter<sup>18</sup>. This

<sup>13</sup> Cf. ALBINUS, 163, 27 : εἶραι γὰρ τὰς ἰδέας νοήσεις Θεοῦ (cf. WITT, 71, 127) *αἰώνιους τε καὶ αὐτοτελεῖς* (cf. DODDS, 235) with the Oracle quoted ch. II, n. 177, v. 1 : νοῦς πατὴρς . . . νοήσας . . . ἰδέας (v. 13 : ἐνοιοίαι) . . . v. 16 : αὐτοτελεῖς πηγῆ. Albinus' *αἰώνιους* corresponds with *ἀκοιμήτου χρόνου ἀκμῆ*, in the same Oracle, v. 14.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. ALBINUS, 155, 34 : τὰ πρῶτα νοητά with Chaldaean Oracle, *loc. cit.*, v. 15 : ἀρχηγόνους ἰδέας.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. ALBINUS, 167, 5 (according to PLATO, *Tim.*, 50 d) : ἀναγκαῖον . . . τὸν κόσμον ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ δεδημιουργῆσθαι πρὸς τινα ἰδέαν κίσμον ἀποβλέποντος, παράδειγμα ὑπάρχουσαν τούδε τοῦ κόσμου, and *ibid.*, 163, 18 (see WITT, 70) δεῖ τὸ παράδειγμα προνοικεῖσθαι (similarly PHILO, *Opif. mund.*, 16 : βουληθεῖς τὸν ὀρατὸν κόσμον τοντοῖ δημιουργῆσαι προεξετύπου τὸν νοητόν) with Chaldaean Oracle, *loc. cit.*, v. 5 : κόσμῳ ἀναξ πολυμόρφῳ προῦθηκεν νοερὸν τύπον-ἄφθιτον.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. ALBINUS, 169, 20 : εἰνὶ τινα νοητὴν οὐσίαν ἀμέριστον καὶ ἄλλην περὶ τὰ σώματα μεριστήν (see also 155, 34 f.) with Chaldaean Oracle, *loc. cit.*, v. 4 f. : ἐμερισθησαν . . . εἰς ἄλλας νοεράς (ἰδέας), and the two Oracles quoted ch. II, n. 372, v. 3 f. : ἀκλῆς . . . δύναιμις νοεραῖς σφράπτουσα τομαῖσιν and ch. II, n. 105 : νοῦς εἶπε πατὴρς τέμενεσθαι ἅπαντα. etc. Cf. also PLOTINUS, V, 9, 6 : ὁ δὲ πᾶς νοῦς περιέχει ὡσπερ γένος εἶδη καὶ ὡσπερ ὄλον μέρη; 8 ὄλος μὲν ὁ νοῦς τὰ πάντα εἶδη; 9 καὶ τὸ μὲν κοσμητὴν ἔχει τὸ εἶδος μεμερισμένον . . . τὸ δὲ ἐν ἐνὶ πάντι; IV, 1, 1; V, 5, 11; VI, 9, 5 et *passim*.

<sup>17</sup> Albinus designates the world-shaping Forms (τὰ δευτέρα νοητά as *εἶδη τὰ ἐπὶ τῇ ὕλῃ ἀχώριστα ὄντα τῆς ὕλης* (the Aristotelian definition; cf. PRAECHTER, 542; DODDS, 206; WITT, 58). For other Middle Platonic evidences (in particular SENECA, *Epist.*, 58), see THEILER, *op. cit.*, 10 f. and WITT, *loc. cit.* In accordance with this doctrine, the "Father" is called in the Oracles (see ch. I, n. 58, v. 2) ἐν εἰδεσῶν εἶδος ὑπάρχων. Cf. also PHILO, *Leg. all.*, I, 22 f.; ZÉLLER, III, 2, p. 419, 1; 425, 2.

<sup>18</sup> According to ALBINUS, 167, 16, Matter possesses before its formation the "vestiges" (*ἰχνη*) of the four elements and the faculty of "receiving" (τὸ δεκτικόν) their potency (cf. PLATO, *Tim.*, 51 a, 53 b; PROCL., *Tim.*, I, 388, 23 : *ἰχνη πρόδρομα τῶν εἰδῶν* and n. 274). Consequently, the Oracle quoted ch. II, n. 177, v. 6, explains : « οὐ (i. e. of the noetic paradigm) κατ' ἀκοσμον ἰχνης ἐπειρόμενος μορφῆς μετὰ κόσμος ἐφάνθη » Matter "longs" for visibility through union with the Forms; cf. PLUTARCH, *De Iside*, 53, 372 E and below, n. 274.

division between principal and particular ideas lead to a doubling of the divine Intellect. The so-called "First Intellect" remains immediately and peculiarly related to the Supreme God, whereas the Second Intellect is entrusted with the task of the formation of the world. This new doctrine, which had been already laid down by Platonists of the first century<sup>19</sup>, was nevertheless long opposed by the principal representatives of the school. In the period of the Chaldæans it found an outstanding advocate in Numenius. He distinguished between a highest and a second—demiurgic—God. The first is pure thinking and exalted above all action. The second God beholds the archetypes contained in the first and, working on matter, forms the world according to their pattern<sup>20</sup>. Just so the Chaldæans represent the "Father" as a being "withdrawn" from all direct influence on the finite, whereas the Second Intellect forms matter inasmuch as He "apprehends by his Intellect the noetic and directs his sensual perceptions to the worlds"<sup>21</sup>. As Numenius called the first, self-contained God "simple", and the second (by reason of his attention which is divided between noetic and sensible objects) "double"<sup>22</sup>, so the Chaldæans refer

<sup>19</sup> On these Platonists depends Philo, for whom the Logos replaces the First Intellect and contains the Ideas as the *genus* contains the *species*; cf. ZELLER, III, 2, 419, 1; 425, 2; PRAECHTER, 576. See in particular PHILO, *Vit. Mos.*, II, 127 regarding the double Logos and *Opif. mund.*, 25, the designation of the Logos as *παράδειγμα* and *ἀρχέτυπος ιδέα τῶν ιδεῶν* (similarly *Migr. Abr.*, 103).

<sup>20</sup> See PRAECHTER, 521. Attention should be paid to the detailed exposition of the doctrine of Numenius in the apparently altogether forgotten work of E. W. MOELLER, *Geschichte der Kosmologie in der griechischen Kirche bis auf Origenes* (Halle, 1860), p. 91-108.

<sup>21</sup> See ch. II, n. 187. Cf. PORPHYR. *ap. STOB.*, *Ecl.*, I, 12, s. 6 a [326], concerning the Platonic concept of the Idea *πατρὸς ἐπέχουσα τοῖς αἰθητοῖς τάξιν*, and NUMENIUS, p. 140, 10 : *ὁ δεύτερος (Θεός) περὶ τὰ αἰσθητὰ καὶ νοητὰ* and p. 138, 4 : *διὰ τὸ <πρὸς> τὴν ὕλην βλέπειν*.

<sup>22</sup> *ἀπλοῦς* : NUMENIUS, p. 135, 12; 137, 29. *διττός* : NUMENIUS, p. 87, 23; 137, 30; 141, 1. Cf. also the Oracle (quoted ch. II, n. 47) «*νοῦς* (the Second Intellect) *δ'ἀπ' ἐκείνου*» (*i. e.* separated from the "Father") with NUMENIUS, p. 138, 3 on the "Second God" *τῷ οὖν μὴ εἶναι πρὸς τῷ νοητῷ*. PHILO, *Quod deus immut.*, 82 explains *Ps. LXI*, 12 : «*ἀπαξ κύριος ἐλάλησε*» as referring to the divine monad which is *ἀπλῆ φύσις*; cf. also *Leg. all.*, II, 2 f.; *Mut. nom.*, 184; ZELLER, 402, 6.



to the First Principle as "the singly transcendent" (*ὁ ἄπαξ ἐπέκειντα*) and to the Second, demiurgic, Intellect as "the doubly transcendent" (*ὁ δις ἐπέκειντα*) or as this "to whom duality is attached"<sup>23</sup>. The division of the First Principle (called "Supreme King" (*βασιλεύς*)<sup>24</sup> which remains in its transcendence, from the Second, demiurgic, Intellect, is represented by Numenius as a revelation given by Plato to a humanity which knew the Demiurge, but knew nothing of the existence of a First Intellect : "Therefore Plato spoke as one who should say : O men, the Intellect of which ye think, is not the First, but there is yet another Intellect there-above, which is older (or, nobler) and more divine"<sup>25</sup>. Similarly speak, also, the gods of the Chaldæans in the

<sup>23</sup> See notes 42 and 188.

<sup>24</sup> See n. 52.

<sup>25</sup> NUMENIUS, p. 141, 8 : Ἐπειδὴ ἤδει ὁ Πλάτων παρὰ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τὸν μὲν δημιουργὸν γιγνωσκόμενον μόνον, τὸν μέντοι πρῶτον νοῦν, ὅστις καλεῖται αὐτὸ ὄν', παντάσῃν ἀγνοούμενον παρ' αὐτοῖς, διὰ τοῦτο οὕτως εἶπεν, ὥσπερ ἂν τις λέγῃ. ὦ ἄνθρωποι, ὄν τοπάχετε ὑμεῖς νοῦν, οὐκ ἔστι πρῶτος ἀλλ' ἕτερος πρὸ τούτου νοῦς πρεσβύτερος (cf. *ibid.*, p. 140, 9 and *Rep.*, 509 b, 9) καὶ Θεϊότερος.

The passage in which Plato is thought to suggest this distinction is the famous one in *Tim.*, 28 c, 3 : τὸν μὲν οὖν ποιητὴν καὶ πατέρα τοῦδε τοῦ παντὸς εὐρεῖν τε ἔργον καὶ εὐρόντα εἰς πάντας (the humanity) ἀδύνατον λέγειν. To the explanation of this passage, PROCL., *Tim.*, I, 303, 24 f. attaches, in accordance with an old tradition of the school, the discussion of the question *τίς ὁ δημιουργός*.

E. NORDEN, *Agnostos Theos*, 72 f. (see also 109) compares with this passage of Numenius the doctrine of Valentinus the Gnostic as to the unknown God who reveals Himself to the world through His only son, His *Nous*. Norden maintains that Numenius took over from Valentinus his doctrine of the first unknown God and assigned to Plato the office of the son of God who mediates the knowledge of Him. This derivation is open to serious objections. Norden overlooks, in the first place, the inner development of Platonism which of itself led to the division carried through by Numenius ; in the second place the receptivity of Valentinus to the Platonism of his time ; in the third place, the fundamental distinction in the meaning of the two doctrines concerned. According to Valentinus, the unknown God begets His son with the intention of becoming known by means of him, whereas, according to Numenius, Plato himself achieved the autonomous apprehension of the Primal Being. According to Valentinus, the "Father" is the cause of his own revelation, and Christus-Nous is the mediator ; according to

Oracles : "For the Father perfected everything and committed it to the Second Intellect, whom ye, o children of men, call the First" <sup>26</sup>. Both Numenius and the Chaldæans represent the proclaimers of the new wisdom as addressing themselves to a humanity to which the existence of a double divine Intellect is unknown. The similarity of the stylistic formulation is, in fact, striking, and makes plausible the supposition that the authors of the Chaldæan Oracles depend directly on Numenius <sup>27</sup>. This supposition, however, loses in stringency if we recall the profound differences between the attitude of Numenius and that of the Chaldæans on other questions of Platonic metaphysics <sup>28</sup>. One would therefore conclude either that Numenius took over this parænetic motif from earlier Platonists of similar tendency <sup>29</sup> who transmitted

---

Numenius the "Father" is the object and Plato the founder of the knowledge.

Norden finds in the prophetic tone of Plato's address to humanity an additional proof of the influence exerted upon Numenius by Gnostics. In doing so he forgets his own brilliant demonstration, that this type of religious exhortation is a Greek invention. Plato is represented by Numenius as a teacher of wisdom who shows an erring humanity the right way to the knowledge of God. It is sufficient here to recall Lucretius' hymns to Epicurus (I, 62 f., V, 1 f.; cf. also *PHILO, Migr. Abr.*, 184 f.). Such ornamentation corresponds throughout to the flowery style of the philosopher.

<sup>26</sup>

« Παντὰ γὰρ ἐξετέλεισσε πατήρ και νῶ παρέδωκε  
δευτέρῳ, ὃν πρῶτον κληρίζετε πᾶν γένος ἀνδρῶν ».

See ch. II, n. 181.

<sup>27</sup> The similarity was noted by KROLL, 14, 1 and BOUSSET, *Goett. gel. Anz.*, 1914, 713. A reversal of the relation between Numenius and the Chaldæans is out of question, if only for the reason that the philosopher never gives any sign of knowing the Oracles. In the list of the Orientals to whose doctrine he appeals (p. 130, 10, Leemans) the Chaldæans are lacking. For the same reason, Bousset's hypothesis (*loc. cit.*) that both Numenius and the Chaldæans are dependent on the Hermetics, cannot be accepted.

<sup>28</sup> The Chaldæans do not know the doctrine of Numenius concerning the evil World-Soul. On the other hand, Numenius lacks the Chaldæan doctrine of the divine Powers and the connected doctrine of emanations.

<sup>29</sup> The passage of disputed meaning in the *Timæus* (28 c, 3 f.), to which both Numenius and the Chaldæans refer (see n. 25), is called by Celsus *ap. ORIG.*, VII, 42, the way, shown by Plato, to the true knowledge of God. MAXIMUS OF TYRE, XI, 6 c, calls Plato the theologian a prophet who made known the secret of the

it also to the Chaldæans; or that both parties developed it independently<sup>30</sup>.

The division of the Highest Principle into a First and Second Intellect was not enough for the extreme transcendentalists among the Platonists. They required a concept of God which surpassed all limiting descriptions and therewith all rational knowledge. Consequently they set the highest divinity free from its Intellect and established it as an unknowable being, yet further above reason and above the intelligible world. Thereupon the First Intellect was transformed from the totality of the highest divinity to the organ of its activity. This separation also had been carried through by some Platonists of the time of Philo<sup>31</sup>, it was, however, accepted before the time of Plotinus by only a few members of the Platonic school. Numenius holds fast to the identity of the supreme godhead and of its Intellect; while Albinus represents an opinion which forms a compromise between the traditional conception and that of more radical transcendentalism. He explains, on the one hand, that the First God (the "Father") is exalted above all predicates<sup>32</sup> and is the cause of the First Intellect<sup>33</sup>; on the other hand,

---

Supreme God. According to LACTANTIUS, *Epitom.*, 37, 1, 4, "Plato spoke of the first and the second God like a prophet, not like a philosopher"; cf. SCOTT-FERGUSON, *Hermetica*, IV, 20, n. 2; OLYMPIODORUS, *Gorg.*, 31, 7, ed. Norvin (cf. *ib.*, *Prolegom. in Plat. philos.*, 201, 15 f.) reports that Plato "discovered" the Ideas in the "paradigmatic" world, not in the "creative" which is posterior to it, as did his fore-runners (as appears from *Prolegom.*, *loc. cit.*, and in *Phaed.*, 179, 4 f., these predecessors were Pythagoras and Anaxagoras). Porphyry in his *Letter to Anebo*, 35, asks the Egyptian, whether the First Cause is the Intellect or superior to the Intellect; evidently he seeks after an authoritative tradition concerning this point in dispute among the Platonists (see n. 38).

<sup>30</sup> The Chaldæans employ also in other passages the religious exhortation as a stylistic design; cf. ch. 1, n. 102 f. Moreover, the appeal to humanity has a different character, if it proceed from the Gods, than if it proceed from Plato.

<sup>31</sup> Philo invokes the authority of the Pythagoreans (see n. 217), but develops his doctrine of the unknowable god with the help of Platonic concepts; see n. 210.

<sup>32</sup> ALBINUS, 165, 4 f., 181, 36 f.

<sup>33</sup> ALBINUS, 164, 18 f., 35 f. Cf. CELSUS *ap.* ORIG., VII, 45. For other evidence see DODDS, *Proclus*, 207, 1.

he does not always keep the one separate from the other<sup>34</sup>. A similarly fluctuating position is adopted by the Chaldæans. They explain that the Supreme God has "withdrawn himself"<sup>35</sup>, and consequently they often replace Him by His Intellect when they speak of His action; but they just as often forget this differentiation and make the First Principle itself a power which, without intermediaries, brings to completion noetic activities<sup>36</sup>. The distich cited above, concerning the First Intellect which is unknown to humanity, and other like expressions of the Chaldæan Oracles, are understandable only under the supposition of an identity of this Intellect with the supreme God. This uncertainty shows that the Chaldæans did not consistently follow out the principle of a radical transcendentalizing of the Supreme Being. They are found to occupy a transitional position in a Platonism in which ratiocination was not able to keep step with religious consciousness<sup>37</sup>. Concerning the deeper causes of this discrepancy—which even by Plotinus was not altogether eliminated—we shall speak later.

The exaltation of the divinity to absolute transcendence necessitated a new determination of the sequence of the noetic entities. The earlier Platonists had treated the divine intelligence, the demiurge, the highest

---

<sup>34</sup> ALBINUS, 164, 19 : ὁ πρῶτος Θεός is identical with 1, 24 : ὁ πρῶτος νοῦς but cf. 164, 18 : καὶ ὅπερ ἐν ἐπι ἀνωτέρω τούτων; cf. also 165, 21 and in particular 179, 36 : τοῦ πρώτου ἀγαθοῦ, ὅπερ Θεόν τε καὶ νοῦν τὸν πρῶτον προσαγορεύσαι ἐν τῆς. But 181, 36, the first God is called ὑπερουράνιος Θεός and the first Nous ἐπουράνιος Θεός. Cf. THEILER, *op. cit.*, 56. Philo also refers to God sometimes (*Opif. mund.*, 8; *Migr. Abr.*, 192) as τὸν τῶν ὅλων νοῦν; cf. ZELLER, III, 2, p. 404, 2. Similarly the Hermetics; cf. J. KROLL, *Die Lehren des Hermes*, 11.

<sup>35</sup> See ch. II, n. 45 : « ὁ πατήρ ἐζυτὸν ἤρπασεν ».

<sup>36</sup> Also the designation ὁ πατρικὸς αὐτογένεθλος νοῦς (see ch. II, n. 231) is intended to express the practical identity of the First Intellect with the Supreme God. So also, the designation of the Creator of the *mundus intelligibilis* as νοῦ νοῦς (see ch. II, n. 184) is explicable only on the ground of the identity of the supreme principle with his Intellect. According to Damascius (see ch. II, n. 379), the "Father" was called in the Oracles νοητόν and the πατρικὸς νοῦς "God". See n. 214.

<sup>37</sup> KROLL, 14 has rightly remarked the fluctuation of the Chaldæan view, but has not recognized the reason of this fact inherent in the nature of contemporary Platonism.

idea of the good, which is at once the source and sum of all ideas—as aspects of the supreme God. This traditional opinion was yet represented in the time of Plotinus by the other disciples of Ammonius Saccas, Origen (not to be confused with the contemporary Christian writer) and Longinus, also followed by Porphyry in his first period<sup>38</sup>. These thought to satisfy the need for a concept of a transcendent God by the fact that they supposed the demiurgic intellect (which was for them identical with the supreme God) to produce the ideas, and considered these (at once the models of the phenomenal world and the objects contemplated by the Highest Being) as following Him in the order of noetic beings. The localization of the ideas outside the divine intellect was attacked by Plotinus in a particular treatise in which he proved their immanence<sup>39</sup>. That the discussion among the former disciples of Ammonius Saccas was only the reopening of a dispute carried on among the Platonists at the time of the Chaldæans can be seen from one of their Oracles which anticipates the thesis of Plotinus: “The Intellect does not exist far from the noetic (essence) and the noetic (essence) does not exist apart from the Intellect”<sup>40</sup>. The opposing thesis was then, as Porphyry records, defended by the well-known Platonist

<sup>38</sup> See ZELLER, III, 2, p. 138, 4; 517, 1; 518, 4; PRAECHTER, 595; ZELLER, 515, 1 translates the title of the work of the Neoplatonist Origen *ὄτι μόνος ποιητῆς ὁ βασιλεύς* (mentioned by PORPH., *Vit. Plot.*, 3) correctly: “Dass (der höchste) Gott allein Weltschöpfer sei” (explained by JAEGER, *Nemesius von Emesa*, 65, 3. Cf., e. g., PHILLO, *Quaest. Exod.*, II, 66; J. R. HARRIS, *Fragments of Philo Iudaeus*, p. 65: ὁ Θεὸς εἰς ὧν καὶ ποιητῆς ἐστὶ καὶ βασιλεύς. For the meaning of *βασιλεύς* see also n. 52); whereas both BRÉHIER, *Plotin, Ennéades*, I (Paris, 1924), p. 4, 1 and HARDER, *Plotins Schriften*, V (Leipzig, 1937), p. 170, 20 repeat the old, mistaken translation. *Ἐπι Γαλιήνου* added by PORPHYRY, *loc. cit.*, is a date (as also *ibid.*, c. 4) to remind his readers that this late work of Origen was directed less against Numenius than against Plotinus, the alleged plagiarist of Numenius (thus JAEGER, *loc. cit.*, against ZELLER, *loc. cit.*). The fact, that Porphyry in his treatise *περὶ ἀγαλμάτων* p. 7\*, 1 designates the *δημιουργικὸς νοῦς* as *βασιλεύς τοῦ κόσμου* (cf. also p. 6\*, 9; 18\*, 15), proves that he composed this work when he was still Longinus’ pupil or before he accepted Plotinus’ doctrine of the three hypostases; see n. 136.

<sup>39</sup> PLOTINUS, *Enn.*, V, 5. See PRAECHTER, 602. DODDS, *Proclus*, 286.

<sup>40</sup> See ch. II, n. 379.

Atticus<sup>41</sup>. Which teacher was the authority of the Chaldæans, and who lead the polemic against Atticus, cannot be determined; but at all events the obvious *parti pris* of the Chaldæans in a contemporary dispute of the members of the Platonic school is evidence for the close relationship of their Platonism to that of their time<sup>42</sup>.

As a result of its exaltation above the suprasensible world, the Supreme God changes from the Totality to the cause of His Intellect. This latter is thereby separated from Him and receives a place of its own as a first hypostasis. Moreover, this Intellect, as that which forms the intelligible world, remains exalted above any direct relationship with the sensible world, and the task of maintaining the relationship is given over to the Second Intellect, which derives from the First and which shapes the universe according to that model which the First has already formed. Thus the actual demiurge moves back to third place in the sequence of noetic entities. Behind him, in fourth place, the Chaldæans located the Cosmic Soul, which enlivens the universe<sup>43</sup>. A similar distinction of four noetic principles—a supreme God, a First and a Second Intellect, and a Cosmic Soul—is referred to by the ecclesiastical apologist Arnobius as a doctrine of pre-Plotinian Platonists<sup>44</sup>.

<sup>41</sup> PROCL., *Tim.*, I, 394, 2 ff.; PORPH., *Vit. Plot.*, 18. See ZELLER, III, 1, p. 839, 3; BRÉNIER, *Plotin, Ennéades*, I, 19, 5.

<sup>42</sup> The theory concerning the immanence of the ideas in the divine thinking is already evidenced in Philo and Seneca; cf. ZELLER, III, 2, p. 411, 3-4; THEILER, *loc. cit.*, 40; DODDS, 206, 4; WITT, 73.

<sup>43</sup> See ch. I, n. 58 and ch. II, p. 51.

<sup>44</sup> ARNOBIUS, *Adv. nat.*, II, 25 (quoted by KROLL, 28, 2): "Hæcine est anima docta illa, quam dicitis, immortalis, perfecta, divina, post deum principem rerum et post mentes geminas locum obtinens quartum, et affluens ex crateribus vivis?" Arnobius adds II, 52 that the *crater* is identical with the mixing-bowl of the *Timæus* (35 a, 3; 41 d, 4). Arnobius opposes *ibid.*, II, 14-62 the theories of the philosophers on the nature of the soul. He cites as chief authorities in ch. 11, Plato, Cronius and Numenius, ch. 13, Hermes, Plato and Pythagoras, and in his polemic refers essentially to the Platonists. BOUSSET, *Arch. f. Religionswissenschaft*, XVIII (1915), 141 and W. KROLL, *Rhein. Mus.*, 1916, 354 f. trace the passage cited above back to the Chaldæan Oracles, although *dicitis* refers to the philosophers. FERGUSON-SCOTT, *Hermetica* have repeated Bousset's hypothesis.

Manifest tendencies to a similar teaching concerning four principles are found in the exposition of the chief doctrines of Plato given by Apuleius, a member of the school of Gaius<sup>45</sup>. Also the Gnostics whose teachings Plotinus opposes distinguish four similar noetic orders: the Being, the Intellect, "another" (i. e. demiurgic) Intellect, and the World-Soul<sup>46</sup>. Plotinus correctly remarks that in the last analysis this division goes back to the *Timaeus* of Plato<sup>47</sup>; the formulation of Arnobius, as well as that of the Chaldæans, evidently supposes that same point of departure<sup>48</sup>. This repeatedly evidenced teaching of the four noetic principles derives therefore from the second century exegesis of Plato. Again, the originators of the view cannot be named<sup>49</sup>. Certain it is, however, that they considered themselves as belonging to the Platonic school, but were ignored by Plotinus and his

<sup>45</sup> APULEIUS, *De Platone*, I, 6, p. 88, 9: "et primae quidem substantiae vel essentiae primum deum esse et mentem formasque rerum et animam". *Ibid.*, c. 5, p. 86, 9 Apuleius distinguishes only God and the Ideas which he (c. 6, p. 87, 20) calls "simple and eternal and incorporeal forms" (see n. 13). In the first quoted passage he—as Albinus (PRAECEPTA, 592)—inserts the *Nous* between God and the Forms and therewith prepares for the distinction of the two classes of Ideas.

<sup>46</sup> PLOTINUS, *Enn.*, II, 9, 6: *καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν νοητῶν δὲ πλῆθος ποιῆσαι, τὸ ὄν καὶ τὸν νοῦν καὶ τὸν δημιουργὸν ἄλλον* (cf. III, 2, 1: *νοῦν ἄλλον*) *καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν, ἐκ τῶν ἐν τῷ Τιμαίῳ λεχθέντων εἰληπτὰι*.

<sup>47</sup> Plotinus cites in addition PLATO, *Tim.*, 39 e, as the (misunderstood) model of the Gnostic doctrine. The question which Gnostics Plotinus had in mind has been examined by C. SCHMIDT, *Plotinus Stellung zum Gnosticismus* (Leipzig, 1901), who did not, however, succeed in accurately determining the sect. It seems certain that Plotinus referred to Gnostics living in Rome (cf. PORPHYR., *Vit. Plot.*, 16) who were strongly influenced by Plato, especially by the *Timaeus* (see below note 206). That this influence went back not only to an immediate reading of Plato but also to the exegesis current in the Platonic school of the 1st and 2nd centuries can be seen from the agreement established above in the text. It seems unnecessary here to go in more detail into the question of the Gnostic modification of this doctrine of Middle Platonism.

<sup>48</sup> See n. 178 f.

<sup>49</sup> This view is represented, as the agreement between Apuleius and Albinus proves, by members of the school of Gaius.

followers<sup>50</sup>. For us the certain conclusion to be drawn from this general agreement is, that the teachings of the Chaldæan Oracles referred to in this section reflect a variant of the Platonism which was contemporary to them<sup>51</sup>.

On the basis of these results we may venture an inference from the particular to the general. The hitherto cited examples show that the theurgists attached themselves, in metaphysical questions, to the doctrines of the Platonic school of their time. They could do so the more freely inasmuch as they themselves had openly invoked Plato as one of the sources of their inspiration. Now, in addition to the tenets treated above, there are to be found in the Chaldæan Oracles a large number of doctrinal opinions of which the motive and drift can be explained only on the grounds of Platonic fashions of thought. They constitute a further development of certain tendencies contained in the Platonic system itself. We are justified, then, in treating these elements as borrowings from the tradition of the Platonic school, even if it is not always possible to find in our fragmentary information concerning this tradition, direct evidence for the existence there of the elements borrowed. In the following pages, these tenets will be studied in their relationship to Middle Platonism; and the knowledge of the Chaldæan system of noetic entities, already described in Chapter II above, will be presupposed.

<sup>50</sup> The list of the Platonists whose doctrines are discussed by Plotinus (see PORPHY., *Vit. Plot.*, 14) is almost identical with that of the commentators used by Porphyry in his commentary on the *Timæus* and on the myth of the *Republic*: whose views are known to Proclus not directly but by the medium of Porphyry. Cf. PROCL., *Tim.*, III, p. 359 f. (*index auctorum*) and *Rp.*, II, 96, 11 f.

<sup>51</sup> Another distinction of the noetic principles: *ὄλος νοῦς—ψυχὴ—νοῦς μερικὸς* is cited as a "Persian doctrine" by Antonius, one of the pupils of Ammonius Saccas; cf. PROCL., *Tim.*, II, 154, 4 f.; ZELLER, III, 2, 688, 1; 704, 2; DODDS, 298 (I suggest that this distribution is based upon an interpretation of the Mithraic triad Jupiter-Juno-Neptun). As to Porphyry's triad *πατήρ-ζωή-πατρικὸς νοῦς* see Excursus II, n. 27. Cf. also *Corp. Herm.*, XII, 13 f.: *Θεὸς-νοῦς-ψυχὴ*. The division of the sequence *ἐν-νοῦς-νοῦς δημιουργικὸς* is traced back by IAMBLICUS, *Myst.*, VIII, 2 to the Hermetics (cf. SCOTT-FERGUSON, *Hermetica*, IV, 54 f.); in this instance, however, one must reckon with the possibility of a Neoplatonic reworking.



4. *The designations of the Supreme Being.*—The greater number of the terms reserved in the Chaldæan Oracles for the Supreme Being correspond to the fashion of thought and expression of the later Platonists. The mythical designations “Father” and “Supreme King” which had already appeared in striking passages of Plato<sup>52</sup>, were also employed by Numenius and Plotinus to distinguish the highest God from that properly called the demiurge<sup>53</sup>. From the same circle derives the designation likewise borrowed from Plato of the supreme Being as the “Beyond”<sup>54</sup>, together with the concept of His “self-withdrawal”<sup>55</sup> and His location in the highest region of the intelligible world<sup>56</sup>. This

<sup>52</sup> πατήρ; PLATO, *Tim.*, 28 c, 3 (see n. 25); 41 a, 7 (see n. 53); *Epist.*, VI, 323 d, 4 (cf. PLOTINUS, V, 1, 8). βασιλεύς; PLATO, *Rep.*, 509 d, 2; *Epist.*, II, 312 e (cf. PORPH., *Hist. Philos. Fragm.*, XVII, p. 14, 10 f. Nauck; Procl., *Tim.*, I, 393, 19 f.).

<sup>53</sup> For Numenius see ZELLER, III, 2, 515, 1; PRÆCHTER, 521; for his pupil Harpocration, *ibid.*, 550. Cf. APULEIUS, *Apologia*, 64, p. 72, 16 f.; PLOTINUS, II, 9, 9; V, 1, 8; 3, 12 (see n. 58); 8, 1. For Philo see J. KROLL, *Lehren des Hermes*, 31, 6.

The Chaldæan designation of the Ideas as έργα πατρός (see ch. II, n. 247 c) viz of His Intellect is dependent on the interpretation of the words of the Platonic *Timæus*, 41 a, 7 : δημιουργός πατήρ τε έργων which distinguishes the πατήρ from the δημιουργός. Origen opposes this division in his work cited above n. 38.

<sup>54</sup> Cf. the fragment quoted ch. II, n. 43 with PLATO, *Rep.*, 509 b, 8 : οὐκ οὐσίας ὄντος τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ, ἀλλ' ἐπι ἐπέκεινα τῆς οὐσίας πρεσβεία καὶ δυνάμει ὑπερέχοντος (see n. 113); in accordance with him CLEMENS ALEX., *Strom.*, V, 6, 38, 6 : ἐπέκεινα τοῦ νοητοῦ. PLOTINUS, V, 1, 8 : τὸ ἐπέκεινα νοῦ καὶ ἐπέκεινα οὐσίας; cf. V, 3, 12 f.; VI, 8, 19 et *passim*.

<sup>55</sup> « ὁ πατήρ ἤρπασεν αὐτόν » (Proclus interprets ἰρπάζειν as synonymous with χωρίζειν); cf. ch. II, n. 44. PLOTINUS, V, 3, 4 employs the same verb, with allusion to the translation of the “hero”, in connection with the elevation of the thought to the *Nous* (the second hypostasis); cf. also *Enn.*, V, 3, 4 : συναρπάσαντα ἑαυτὸν εἰς τὸ ἄνω (accordingly PROCL., *Parm.*, 661, 16). As to the use of the reflexive with regard to the activity of the Supreme Being, cf. IAMBL., *Myst.*, VIII, 2, p. 262, 2 : ὁ αὐτάρκης θεὸς ἑαυτὸν ἐξέλαμψε and the hymn of the “Theosophy” quoted ch. I, n. 26, v. 8 : « ὀρίων φωτὶ σεαυτὸν ».

<sup>56</sup> Cf. the hymn quoted in the preceding note.

spatial determination<sup>57</sup> is intended to motivate His exaltation above His Intellect which thereby became the immediate creator of the noetic beings<sup>58</sup>. Finally, the recognition that the Supreme Being is "ineffable" is also familiar to Middle Platonism<sup>59</sup>.

<sup>57</sup> This localization was evolved from a combination of the *ἐπέκεινα* of PLATO's *Republic* (see n. 54)—which was originally intended only to indicate the causality of the Good—with the *ὑπερουράνιος τόπος* mentioned in *Phaedrus*, 247 c, 2 (see n. 58).

<sup>58</sup> PHILO, *Op. mund.*, 71 : God, ὁ μέγας βασιλεύς, is situated above the ἀκρα ἀψις τῶν νοητῶν. NUMENIUS, p. 131, 15 : τὸ ἀγαθὸν . . . ἐποχοῦμενον ἐπὶ τῇ οὐσίᾳ; in accordance with him, PLOTINUS, I, 1, 8; IDEM, V, 3, 12 (concerning the First Being) ἐπ' ἀκρῶ τῶ νοητῶ ἐστήκητα βασιλεύειν ἐπ' αὐτοῦ (analogously PROCL., *Rp.*, I, 270, 9 f.).

The Chaldæan view that the Supreme God is situated "above the back of the (astral) worlds" (see ch. II, n. 39) is derived from PLATO, *Phaedr.*, 247 c (see n. 57); cf. APULEIUS, *Apologia*, 64, p. 72, 12 f.; IDEM, *De Platone*, 11, p. 95, 9, "supramundaneus"; ALBINUS, 181, 36, *ὑπερουράνιος*. SYNESIUS, *Hymn.*, IX, 66 (56); BOETHIUS, *Consol. philos.*, IV, 1, v. 17; CLEM. AL., *Strom.*, VI, 68, 3. See BOUSSER, *Goetting. Gel. Anz.*, 1914, 710 f.

The same Platonic passage (*Phaedrus*, 247 b-d) was also the source of the Middle Platonic view that the astral gods alone have pure knowledge of the Supreme God (ALBINUS, 164, 5 : καθαρῶς τὰ νοητὰ νοοῦσι θεοί : the θεοί are the planetary gods, cf. *ibid.*, 171, 11). This view also recurs in the fragment of a Chaldæan hymn (quoted ch. II, n. 351) on the astral gods, «οἱ τῶν ὑπερκόσμιον βυθὸν ἴσῃε νοῦντες».

<sup>59</sup> ἀρρητός viz. ἀφθεγχτός πατήρ (cf. ch. II, n. 38) : For Philo, see ZELLER, III, 2, p. 421, 4 (cf. also 403); ALBINUS, 164, 28; APULEIUS, *De Plat.*, I, 5, p. 86, 16; *De deo Socratis*, 3, p. 9, 16; *Apologia*, 64, p. 73, 5; CELSUS *ap. ORIG.*, VII, 42; cf. VI, 65; MAXIM. TYR., II, 10 a; IX, 9 c-d; CLEM. ALEX., *Strom.*, V, 10 (65, 2); 12 (81, 5 f.); PLOTINUS, V, 3, 13.

a) The above quoted Platonists employ the term ἀρρητός in order to mark the impossibility—resultant from the inherent limitations of all conception—of an adequate description of the divinity. (From this indescribability, however, as Albinus, Apuleius, Celsus and Maximus show, there does not necessarily follow the unknowability of God). In this sense, the Hermetics also use the term; see J. KROLL, *Lehren des Hermes*, 20.

b) Christian Platonists add the argument that human speech is not adequate to describe God's perfection.

c) Others call God ἀρρητός, because he has withheld the revelation of his name from men; so the Gnostics, see BOUSSER, *Hauptprobleme der Gnosis*, 84; cf. also the fragment of the *Revelation of Zephania*, quoted by CLEM. ALEX., *Strom.*, V, 11,

5. *The Will of God.*—The supreme Being is a monad which, in the state of activity, unfolds itself into the triad: Intellect, Power and Will, of which the first undertakes the planning and the third its actualization, while the second forms either the instrument of the worker or the substance of the worked<sup>60</sup>. The hypostasis of the divine Will, which shall be treated as the first, appears in the systems of those theologians of later antiquity (Hermetics<sup>61</sup> and Gnostics<sup>62</sup>) who exalted the Supreme God to the transcendental cause without giving up the concept of His personality<sup>63</sup>. The Chaldæans also mention the Will of the "Father", as much in order to give concrete expression of His

77, 2. Philo explains this view on the basis of the argumentation mentioned in (a).

d) Another group describes as *ἀρρητος* the prohibition to reveal the *nomen arcanum* (*ἀρρητον ὄνομα*) of God. The term is used in this meaning by initiates of the mysteries and by the magicians. The Chaldæans combine this explanation with that mentioned in (a).

Cf. J. GEFFCKEN, *Zwei griechische Apologeten*, 175; E. NORDEN, *Agnostos Theos, passim*; DODDS, *Proclus*, 310-313 (fundamental); E. BICKERMANN, *Anonymous Gods, Journal of the Warburg Institute*, I (1938), 187-196.

<sup>60</sup> See ch. II, sect. 3.

<sup>61</sup> The Hermetics are, apart from the Chaldæans, the only non-Jewish or non-Christian theologians (the Gnostics being included among the Christians) in whose system the hypostasis of the divine Will plays a special role. The evidence is collected by REITZENSTEIN, *Poimandres*, 39, 1 (whose attempt to trace this Hermetic doctrine from an Isis-theology is not convincing) and by J. KNOLL, *Lehren des Hermes*, 27 f. (who adduces much irrelevant material). The function of the Hermetic *βουλή θεοῦ* agrees with that of the Chaldæans. The Hermetics also have not definitely located this hypostasis within their system. The beginning of an hypostasization of the divine Will is found in the writings of the later Orphics; cf. *Orphic. Fragm.*, No. 65 and 242 Kern.

<sup>62</sup> For the Barbelo-gnostics (IREN., *Haer.*, I, 29, 1-2) the Will of the Father (*Θέλημα*) forms, together with the "Eternal Life", a syzygy from which four potencies emanate, among them *Θέλησις* (also called *Raguel*, i. e. Ἰαγγεγ, derived from the Aramaic נגג, "to will"). In the system of Ptolemaeus, the disciple of Valentinus, *Θέλημα* is the Primal Being's Will to emanation (IREN., I, 12, 1. See n. 117). The development of the doctrine of the divine Will in the school of Valentinus deserves separate treatment.

<sup>63</sup> The "mythical" character of the concept of the divine Will is especially prominent in the Chaldæan Oracles relative to angelology; cf. ch. II, n. 49, 2 and 5.

omnipotence as to free Him from the burden of any direct act <sup>64</sup>. The danger of any anthropomorphization accompanying the attribution of this faculty was so much the less noticeable to them inasmuch as their concept of God rested altogether upon the "mythical" notion of a creative personality. They fenced themselves off from earthly notions only insofar as they emphasized the rationality of the supreme Will and the simultaneity of the formation of God's plans with their actualization <sup>65</sup>.

From what has been said it is obvious that the Chaldæan hypostasis of the Divine Will cannot be referred back to a particular "source". Nevertheless, it can be proved that among the teachings of the later Platonists are found the beginnings of a hypostasization of this faculty, and to these the Chaldæans could have attached their dogma. In the *Timæus* the Will of the demiurge is twice mentioned <sup>66</sup>: "Because it was his Will that all things should be good", he transformed into order the anarchy of matter. It is also his Will that the "created gods" should be "indissoluble". Both statements of Plato were interpreted by later exegetes as referring to the cosmogonic Will of the Supreme Being: the first by means of an identification between His Will and His Godness, "the source of all becoming"; and the second by means of interpretation of the "created gods" as the agents of the Ideas which accomplish the "order" of the universe <sup>67</sup>. In the Chaldæan Oracles the Will of God is twice mentioned with this meaning <sup>68</sup>. Both at-

<sup>64</sup> Since the decree precedes the action (cf. *Jes. Sir.*, XXXVII, 16) and contains it within itself in the case of simultaneity; cf. CLEMENS ALEX., *Protr.*, IV, 63, 3, God ψιλῶ τῷ βούλεσθαι δημιουργεῖ καὶ τῷ μόνῳ ἐβελῆσαι αὐτὸν ἐπειτα τὸ γεγενῆσθαι. Cf. n. 65.

<sup>65</sup> Cf. ch. II, n. 49, 10. Irenæus defends, against the Gnostic differentiation, the identity of God's will, thought and action; cf. the passages collected by MOELLER. *op. cit.*, 487, 1.

<sup>66</sup> ΠΛΑΤΩ, *Tim.*, 29 e; 41 a, b. WIRT, 130, draws attention to "the importance of the Divine Will in the cosmological speculation of the Platonists of the Empire", but overlooks the relevant texts (except those of Plotinus).

<sup>67</sup> See n. 136 ff.

<sup>68</sup> See the texts quoted ch. II, n. 49, 7 and 10; 50. Analogously PHILO, *Opif. mund.*, 16, quoted n. 15; *Poimandres*, 8; PROCL., *Parm.*, 802, 22 explains «προὐθηκεν ἀναξ» (see n. 15) as referring to the δημιουργικὴ βούλησις. It may be

tations must therefore be treated as reflections of a specifically Platonistic view of the Divine Will<sup>69</sup>.

The Will is designated in the Chaldæan Oracles once as attribute, a second time as instrument of the divine Intellect, and a third time as a faculty of the "Father", "likeminded" to this Intellect<sup>70</sup>. Frequently it appears instead of this Intellect Himself. These variations prove that the Chaldæans had not perfected their theoretical account of the simultaneous relationship of the two hypostases. A similar uncertainty has met us in their description of the relationship between the First Principle and His Intellect. As in the former case, so here; the personal concept of God prevails over the metaphysical and causes the Chaldæans to forget the consequences which should logically have followed from their doctrine of the withdrawal of the Supreme God. The establishment of this fact carries with it an indication of the general presuppositions behind the development of the Chaldæan view of the divine Will, and, indeed, on their whole doctrine of hypostases. They

remarked that Philo was prevented by his doctrine of the Logos from developing a peculiar speculation as to the divine Will; cf. the passages collected by G. KITTEL, *Theolog. Wörterbuch zum N. T.*, s. v. βουλή, p. 633. The passages of Philo cited by J. KRÖLL, *Lehren des Hermes*, 30 (*Post. Cain.*, 175, *Ebriet.*, 164 f.) treat not of the divine but of the human will.

<sup>69</sup> The divine Βουλή is mentioned in connection with the doctrine of the ἀγαθόν by the following Platonists: [PLUTARCH], *De fato*, 9, 573 BC; NEMESIUS, *De nat. hom.*, MIGNÉ, P. G., XL, 796 A (cf. SCOTT-FERGUSON, *Hermetica*, IV, Introd., p. XXI, 1). MAX. TYR., XXXVIII, 6 c.; FIRM. MATERN., *Math.*, V, praef. 3 (vol. I, p. 280, 17); JULIAN, *Orat.*, IV, 142 d. Cf. also *Asclepius*, 20, p. 56, 9 and 26, p. 64, 15, ed. Thomas; *Corp. Herm.*, X, 2 (see THEILER, *Gnomon*, 1934, 496). The doctrine of the Good serves Plotinus as basis for the explanation of the divine Will as the natural abundance of his beneficence. Cf. *Enn.*, VI, 8, 13; followed by PROCL., *Tim.*, I, 371, 18; 389, 20 f.; *Th. Pl.*, V, 17 *init.* Plotinus' doctrine should be compared with that of the Gnostic Basilides (*ap. HIPPOLYT.*, *Ref.*, VII, 21, 2 f.).

The Stoics, in their interpretation of the Divine Will as Fate (*St. V. F.*, II, No. 932-933; 937; K. REINHARDT, *Poseidonios*, 449; IDEM, *Kosmos und Sympathie*, 255), appeal to *Iliad*, I, 5.

<sup>70</sup> Attribute: ch. II, n. 49, 10. Instrument of the Divine Intellect: ch. II, n. 49, 7. "Likeminded" faculties of the "Father": ch. II, n. 50.

set themselves to connect the Middle-Platonic opinion as to the transcendence of the Supreme Being with the dogma of the absolute efficacy of His personality. This synthesis of the metaphysical with the henotheistic principle brought about that multiplicity of potencies, which function now as instruments of the divine omnipotence, now as representatives of his supermundan exaltation, and which accordingly take on, now the character of ministering powers, now that of particular faculties. On the basis of similar religious and philosophical presuppositions had Philo likewise developed his doctrine of the divine potencies, which are intended, on the one hand, to enable the finite to participate in divinity, on the other, to relieve the divinity of all contact with the world.

6. *The Power of God.*—The Platonic foundation of the Chaldæan teaching concerning the hypostases appears more significantly in their views on the divine "Power". This "Power" is the sum of the potentialities of the Supreme Being, the substance and medium of His activity, and—since His energy acts immediately only upon the intelligible world—the designation of the totality of that world. The parts of that totality, the ideas, receive, by reason of the source of their substance, the name "Powers" <sup>71</sup>.

The historic assignments of this teaching concerning the divine Power can be seen from the polemic of the Chaldæans against other opinions as to its nature. They emphasize, on the one hand, that the "Father" has, indeed, "withdrawn" Himself from all direct activity, "but He does not enclose His Fire within His Power" <sup>72</sup>, *i. e.* He witholds within His transcendence only His existence, not His efficacy. On the other hand, they explain that "the first transcendent Fire" (*i. e.* the "Father") "encloses his Power in matter not by acting, but by thinking" <sup>73</sup>; *i. e.* He enters into matter not immediately but by the mediation of His Second Intellect which forms the world. The opinion contested in the second oracular fragment is that of the Stoics, who supposed the original divine power (the "noetic fire") to permeate

<sup>71</sup> See ch. II, n. 46, 47, 252.—<sup>72</sup> See ch. II, n. 45.—<sup>73</sup> See ch. II, n. 184.

matter<sup>74</sup>. Against their view is directed also the explanation, found in another Chaldæan Oracle, that God is "all, but noetically"<sup>75</sup>. With similar words does Philo likewise—when applying the anti-Stoic arguments of contemporary Platonists to the notion of a direct commingling of the divine with matter—object : the divine employs rather, in the formation of the world, certain "bodiless powers of which the proper name is ideas"<sup>76</sup>. Philo, in this passage, platonizes, as has often been remarked already<sup>77</sup>, the Stoic concept of the immanent power of the divine within the world, and his platonizing is accomplished by the identification of this power with the transcendent ideas. A similar modification is also the basis of the Chaldæan view of the power of God.

As the second fragment of the Oracle ruled out the Stoic doctrine of substantial immanence, so the first disassociates itself from the theory of an absolute transcendence of the Supreme God. The representatives of this view were the Peripatetics who exalted the divinity, sunk in blessed self-contemplation, above all participation in the world<sup>78</sup>. Similar repudiation of both the Stoic and Peripatetic doctrines, in the definition of the supreme Being, was undertaken by "certain Platonists" whom Porphyry cites. They defined the "first God" as one "who

<sup>74</sup> ZELLER, III, 1, 146 f. Cf. PLUTARCH, *Def. orac.*, 29, 426 BC : "The gods should neither be represented as queen-bees who never fly forth [so they are by the Peripatetics, see n. 78] nor put on sentry go by being shut up in matter (*συγκλείσαντας τῇ ὕλη*) . . . , as they are by the Stoics" (*St. V. Fr.*, II, 1055). Similarly IDEM, *Ad princ. inerudit.*, 5, 781 F : οὐ γὰρ . . . τὸν Θεὸν ἐν ὕλῃ . . . ὑπάρχειν ἀναμεμυγμένον ; ZELLER, III, 2, 185, 3.

<sup>75</sup> « Πάντ' ἐστὶ γὰρ, ἀλλὰ νοητῶς ». Cf. ch. II, n. 55. The restriction serves to exclude Stoic pantheism.

<sup>76</sup> PHILO, *Leg. spec.*, I, 329 (quoted by KROLL, 13, 2). Cf. ZELLER, III, 2, p. 409, 6 ; 410, 1. PORPH., *Antr.*, 7, p. 60, 23 f. also designates the world-forming Ideas as *ἀόρατοι δυνάμεις* : see n. 136.

<sup>77</sup> M. HEINZE, *Die Lehre vom Logos in der griechischen Philosophie* (1872), 245. ZELLER, III, 2, 185, 3 ; 407 f. BRÉHIER, *Les idées philosophiques et religieuses de Philon d'Alexandrie*, 157.

<sup>78</sup> See n. 74. Cf. also MART. CAP., VII, 731 concerning the First Being called by Aristotle "cupido (see n. 153), siquidem in se proprios detorquet ardores".

neither is existent within anything nor bound within himself”<sup>79</sup>. Porphyry’s immediate source was, as will be shown in the appendix, the work of the Neoplatonist Origen (the teacher of Longinus who was Porphyry’s first master) “concerning the Daemons”<sup>80</sup>. From all this it appears that, in the dogmatic formulas of the Chaldæan Oracles above quoted there is reflected the actual controversy from which developed the “dynamic” concept of God found by the Neoplatonists.

From the double negative limitation in the definitions of the Oracles it is possible to arrive at the explanation of the purpose behind the development of the Chaldæan doctrine of the divine Power : this doctrine is intended to constitute a compromise between an utterly sublimated concept of the divine principle, and the consciousness of a universe vaded by divine Powers. The Power is, indeed, as the unity of the divine nature demands, identical with the Supreme God, but is nevertheless, for the purpose of fulfilling its particular task, separated from Him. The Primal Being can restrain Himself within His transcendence only by means of making His Power the organ of all energies which work upon the world. Thereby the supracelestial world is transformed to the sum of spiritual substances endowed with divine energy. The necessity of this redefinition of the intelligible world followed from the reinterpretation of the ideas, which, formerly, the thoughts of God, now become His active Powers. This new teaching about the divinity as the whole of Power, and the Ideas as the partial Powers thereof, appears in the philosophical literature which has come down to us, for the first time in Philo. It is represented by him as synthesis of the Stoic view of the power immanent in the world, and of the Platonic doctrine of Ideas<sup>81</sup>. The polemic exclusions of the Oracles suggest a similar relationship. Plotinus, too, concedes power as the proceeding effect of the transcendent God<sup>82</sup>. The teaching of

<sup>79</sup> PORPH., *Abst.*, II, 37, p. 166, 3 : ὁ μὲν πρῶτος Θεός... οὔτε ἐν τινὶ ὄν· οὔτ' ἐνδεδεμένος εἰς ἑαυτὸν.

<sup>80</sup> See Excursus XI.

<sup>81</sup> See n. 77. Cf. also NUMENIUS, p. 89, 3 f.

<sup>82</sup> ZELLER, III, 2, 476 f., 548 f. Cf. in particular *Ēnn.*, VI, 4, 3 (quoted by ZELLER, 554, 1) αὐτὸ (τὸ ἐν) ἐφ' ἑαυτοῦ εἶναι (cf. « ὁ πατήρ ἑαυτὸν ἤρπασεν »),



the Chaldæans, therefore, represents a phase of the development of the philosophy of the Platonic school between Philo and Plotinus, and explains the well-known agreement of these two authors as the result of their common dependence on a "dynamic" Platonism.

7. *The origin of the Chaldaean doctrine of emanations.*—The Chaldæan doctrine concerning God's emanations stands in direct relations to their view of His Power. The Oracles represent the entities of the intelligible world as potencies which proceed from the Primal Being<sup>83</sup>. This process is described by comparisons with sensible events—comparisons drawing on various fields of experience. Most frequently appears a) the metaphor of flowing : from the Paternal Intellect flows forth the primary source of the Ideas ; from these, the Forms ; from the Cosmic Soul her enlivening substance<sup>84</sup>. To this type of metaphors—emanative in the exact sense of the word—belongs also the figure of mixing. The First Intellect mixes in all things Eros and in the "Connectives" his own power ; the "Father" mixes the Pneuma from a triad of psychological essences<sup>85</sup>. In second place b) follow the metaphors of procreation. Power is called "mother" or "maternal womb", inasmuch as the "Father" procreates therein His thoughts. The Paternal (First) Intellect "suckles" the Second Intellect which "becomes pregnant" with the universe ; or Aion resembles a monad which "procreates" a dyad<sup>86</sup>. In connection with the metaphors of procreation occurs also the figure of sowing. "In the womb of this Triad (the substances of the soul) are all things sown"<sup>87</sup>. A third group c) is constituted by the metaphors taken from the life of plants. The First Intellect "seeds"

see n. 55), *δυνάμεις δὲ ἐπ' αὐτοῦ. εἶναι ἐπὶ πάντα, καὶ οὕτως* (i. e. in the sense of a dynamic, not of a substantial immanence) *αὐτὸ* (sc. τὸ ἐν) *πανταχοῦ λέγεσθαι εἶναι*. *Ibid.*, VI, 9, 5 concerning the nature of the One as *δύναμιν γεννώσαν τὰ ὄντα μένουσαν ἐν ἑαυτῇ*.

<sup>83</sup> See ch. II, n. 53.

<sup>84</sup> See ch. II, n. 58, 59, 61, 62, 64, 65, 69, 83.

<sup>85</sup> See ch. II, n. 232-235, 246 ; III, n. 8.

<sup>86</sup> See ch. II, n. 58, 59, 86, 177, v. 1, 186.

<sup>87</sup> See ch. III, n. 8.

the lightning-like ideas, the "symbols" and Eros<sup>88</sup>. The substance of this Intellect is called a "fiery flower" which is "plucked" by Aion, the ideas and the human soul<sup>89</sup>. A fourth and last group *d*) is constituted by the metaphors of fire and light which are frequently intermingled with those of the three other groups. Thus the Ideas are described as lightnings which "leap forth" from the First Intellect, "leap into" the spheres, plough "fiery furrows" etc.<sup>90</sup>.

This brief survey shows first of all that the Chaldæans know of no doctrine of a ladder of emanations. The characteristic of such a doctrine is lacking, *viz.* : a consistent theory as to the fixed sequence of the potencies which proceed as a series of steps from the divine principle. The reason of this lack is to be sought, as we have shown before, in the fluctuating state of the Middle-Platonic theories (on which the Chaldæans are dependent) as to the sequence of the noetic hypostases. On the other hand it is withal clear that the Chaldæan metaphors describing the emanation are no mere figures of speech. In a few cases, truly, it can be recognized that the figurative representation is artificial; so in the Oracular verse : "The Father does not make fear flow in, but pours forth trust"<sup>91</sup>. However, this example and others like it prove only that the Chaldæans employed a certain concept of emanation in a stylistic device which they sometimes overworked<sup>92</sup>. We have therefore in our judgment of the Chaldæan doctrine of emanations to distinguish between a metaphysical principle of their philosophy, and the stylistic hypertrophy of this principle.

The fondness of the authors of the Oracles for this sort of metaphors is understandable for three reasons, of which the first two are of formal nature, while the third touches on the general character of the Chaldæan theology. First and foremost, the obligation to represent their theo-

<sup>88</sup> See ch. II, n. 265, 232; III, n. 55.

<sup>89</sup> See ch. II, n. 138, 177; III, n. 84.

<sup>90</sup> See ch. II, n. 200, 209, 245, 246, 260.

<sup>91</sup> See ch. II, n. 295.

<sup>92</sup> Cf. the expression *άνθος καρπών* (ch. III, n. 84) and the verse *ἀστέριον πρό-  
πόρευμα σέθεν χάριν οὐκ ἐλοχεύθη* (ch. IV, n. 99, v. 6).

ries figuratively was laid upon the Chaldæans by the stylistic laws of the literary *genre* on which they modelled their poetic productions. Their metaphysical Oracles imitate the style of the didactic philosophical poems, which favour the individualization of abstract concepts<sup>93</sup>. For the illustration of these views moreover the above-mentioned metaphors were a peculiarly well-adapted means<sup>94</sup>. Beside this, the Chaldæans in choosing this method of expression had in mind their claim to inspiration; the mythical form of speech was the speech of the gods, in whose names the theurgists proclaimed their teaching. A third motive can be recognized by means of comparison with other contemporary religious systems. At that time the mythical account passed—as is shown, above all, by the Gnostics and the Hermetics—as the form of expression adequate for all true theologies. This axiom certainly resulted, in many cases, in a conscious translation of speculative theories into realistic events, but nevertheless is not therefore to be understood as a mere stylistic device; it was, in fact, the consequence of an immediate mythical apperception of the divine energy. The religious experience of these theologians shaped for itself a special form of expression, in which idea and picture blend in a peculiar unity of thought<sup>95</sup>. They not only take over the philosophic myths of Plato (especially of the *Timæus*) in the images of which, so manifold in their connotations, they recognized the symbols of their own views: but they also penetrated the substance of Plato's teaching with their spirit. The reawakening of the mythical consciousness is perhaps to be considered as the most powerful cause of the inner transformation of the Platonic Ideas from static concepts into "flowing"

<sup>93</sup> See Excursus III. The classic example of the mythical reworking of philosophical thoughts is the didactic poem of Lucretius.

<sup>94</sup> The most significant example is provided by the Oracle on the world-forming ideas (quoted ch. II, n. 177). Cf. also the second fragment on Eros (quoted ch. II, n. 233).

<sup>95</sup> Cf. Chr. F. BAUR, *Die christliche Gnosis* (Tuebingen, 1835), 231 f., who, however, under the influence of Creuzer, does not distinguish between true myth and the symbolism of the Gnostics; p. 239 is clearer, but there too it is not sufficiently emphasized that this mythical symbolism is intentional.

energies <sup>96</sup>. The interest in the thinking God (metaphysics) is replaced by that in the spiritual fullness of the hidden life of the transcendent God (theosophy). The divine existence itself becomes the myth of an eternal interplay of Powers in which the dynamic of the structure of the universe is reflected. This divine existence unfolds itself in a plurality of potencies which to the analytic thought of the symbolists constantly provided new aspects for fresh concretization. Under the influence of this tendency the Chaldæans presented their metaphysical conclusions not in abstract concepts but in sensible vividness. That they thereby attached themselves not to the Gnostics but to Platonic predecessors is clearly shown, when the four types of emanative metaphors, distinguished above, are studied with respect to their general applications and their sources.

a) The image of *flowing forth* as representation of the way noetic entities come into being is known both to Philo and to Plotinus, the two chief representatives among the Platonists, of the doctrine of emanations. The first uses the metaphor without proviso <sup>97</sup>, while the second expressly repudiates the associated notion of a quantitative emanation <sup>98</sup>—a limitation which the Chaldæans accomplish in the form of their reference to the Supreme Being as “indivisible” <sup>99</sup>. A second limitation of Plotinus concerns the cause of the emanative process : he will have it instituted neither by an intellectual nor by a volitional act of the Primal Being, on the contrary it follows of itself by reason of the efficacy latent in his nature <sup>100</sup>. In this point the three systems differ. Philo

---

<sup>96</sup> As against both the phantastic hypothesis of Darmesteter that the Avestic doctrine of the *Amesha Spentas* is dependent on Philo's of the Divine Powers, and the reverse hypothesis, which is represented especially by J. PASCHER, *ἡ βασιλικὴ ὁδὸς* (1931) and E. R. GOODENOUGH, *By Light, Light* (New Haven, 1935), it is still worth-while to compare what was said by BAUR, *Christliche Gnosis*, 71 f.

<sup>97</sup> Cf. ZELLER, III, 2, 414, 4.

<sup>98</sup> ZELLER, III, 2, 551 f.; DODDS, 214 f.

<sup>99</sup> See ch. II, n. 56.

<sup>100</sup> ZELLER, III, 2, 561.

and the Chaldæans make no difficulty of admitting the volitional action of the Supreme God. Their religious conviction of His absolute power allowed them to comprehend His efficacy only as a spontaneous act of an omnipotent personality. They could also appeal for justification of their voluntaristic construction to that given in the account contained in Plato's *Timæus*, which furnished the literary model of their cosmogony. They thought sufficiently to satisfy the demands of transcendentalization in that they substituted the Supreme Intelligence as *agent* of the divine efficacy. However, inasmuch as they made the Supreme Intelligence the practical ruler of the world, they allowed the religious dogma of the creative freedom of God to be equated with the metaphysical axiom of the rationality of His rule of the world. Consequently the factual division between the Plotinian and the Chaldæan explanation of the dynamic of the emanative process is considerably diminished. For if Plotinus refers the efficacy of the Primal Being to mere natural necessity, and the Chaldæans to the "Intellect" of His "Power", it follows that the correction of Plotinus—who could have allowed the efficient named by the Chaldæans to pass as natural modes of the Supreme Being—is reduced to the conceptual firmness with which the latter carried through the abstraction of the transcendental aspect of the divinity. His radical denial of any action of the Primal Being brought him, as is often emphasized<sup>101</sup>, into contradiction with the notion, which he advocated with equal firmness, of God's creative efficacy. There is no need here to enter further into the dialectical subtleties with which he attempted to eliminate the discrepancy which was implicit in this system<sup>102</sup>. The fact that he did not wholly give up the description in terms of emanations, although this only increased the difficulty, proves that his metaphysical system could neither fully throw off nor fully assimilate the mythical conception of an active Primal Being. This emanative element was, however, as the Oracles prove, an integral component of the Platonism to which Plotinus attached himself. So the discrepancy remarked above explains itself by reason

<sup>101</sup> ZELLER, III, 2, 549 f.—<sup>102</sup> ZELLER, III, 2, 533 f.

of his attachment to the doctrines of his Platonic predecessors whose mythical concept of God did not permit him to develop with absolute consistency his concept of the transcendental character of the Primal Being.

b) The second type of the Chaldæan description of emanation, the metaphors of *procreation*, are found in similar application as well in the writings of Plotinus as in those of Philo and the Hermetics<sup>103</sup>. As the Oracles explain that the Paternal Intellect "suckles" by means of his Power the Second Intellect and this last becomes "pregnant" with the universe<sup>104</sup>, so also does Philo term the Logos, (the totality of the intelligible world) "the first-born son of God" who "becomes pregnant" with the "divine lights" (the Ideas)<sup>105</sup>; and he once ventures to call the "Understanding" (*ἐπιστήμη*) of the Creator "Mother of all things born", inasmuch as the Creator "sowed" in her his world-forming Ideas from which "Understanding" bore the only begotten and beloved son, this world"<sup>106</sup>. Numenius agrees with the Chaldæans in the distinction of three "generations"; he calls the First God (*viz.* First Intellect) "grandfather", the Second Intellect, which formed the world, "son", and the sensible world "grandson"<sup>107</sup>. Plutarch, also, shows the Platonic character of this genealogical form of description. "Plato", he explains, "called the eternal God 'Father and maker of

<sup>103</sup> For Plotinus cf. *e. g.* *Enn.*, V, 1, 7. In accordance with him, MACROBIUS, *Somn. Scip.*, I, 14, 6 (following an outline—which reached him through Porphyry—of the Plotinian doctrine of the three noetic hypostases) "Deus (prima causa)... superabundanti maiestatis fecunditate de se mentem creavit". On Philo see n. 105-106. On the Hermetics see n. 109-110.

<sup>104</sup> See ch. II, n. 186.

<sup>105</sup> PHILO, *Leg. all.*, III, 104 : τὸν ἐγκύμονα θεῶν φῶτῶν λόγον. With this cf. *De fuga*, 51, where Wisdom is called bisexual daughter of God, and *de fuga*, 109 f., where God and Wisdom are made father and mother of the Logos. On the Logos as sum of the *mundus intelligibilis* cf. M. HEINZE, *Lehre vom Logos*, 219 ff.; ZELLEN, III, 2, 419, 1.

<sup>106</sup> PHILO, *De ebriet.*, 30; cf. *quod deter.*, 54 and *Leg. all.*, II, 49; J. KROLL, *Lehren des Hermes*, 136, 157. See below, n. 112.

<sup>107</sup> Cf. NUMENIUS, p. 88, 18 ff.

the world and of all things which have come into being', not, indeed, by seed, but in that God, through another power, begot a fertile beginning in matter" <sup>108</sup>. From similar circles, finally, springs also the Hermetic doctrine of the bisexual divine Father, containing in Himself Life and Light and representing the Supreme Intellect who, by means of his Will or of the Logos, "bore another, demiurgic Intellect" <sup>109</sup> and "is alone all things, full of the fertility of both sexes; ever becomes pregnant to His Will and ever gives birth to that which He wills to bear" <sup>110</sup>. The five authors cited base their genealogical representation on the Platonic description of the Supreme God as "Maker and Father of all" <sup>111</sup>. By taking this mythical formula literally they lend the Supreme Being the character of a personality capable of procreation, and activate His immanent energy in a theogonic efficacy. The Power of the Primal Being becomes an independent entity and is made the maternal womb of His procreative Will; He Himself, however, becomes the head of a noetic family of which the composition varies according to the various metaphysical principles underlying it <sup>112</sup>.

<sup>108</sup> PLUTARCH, *Quaest. Conv.*, VIII, 1, c. 3, 4 (718 B) explains that Plato calls the eternal God *πατέρα καὶ ποιητὴν τοῦ τε κόσμου καὶ τῶν ἄλλων γεννητῶν* (cf. *Tim.*, 28 c, 3, quoted n. 25), *οὐ διὰ σπέρματος δήπου γενομένων, ἀλλῆ δὲ δυνάμει τοῦ Θεοῦ τῆ ὕλη γόνιμον ἀρχήν. . . ἐντεκόντος* (this "power" is the good World-Soul; see n. 151).

<sup>109</sup> *Poimandres*, 9 : *ὁ δὲ νοῦς ὁ Θεὸς* (called before *πατήρ* and substituted, in His active aspect, by *βουλή Θεοῦ*; cf. *ibid.*, 7-8) *ἀρρενόβηλος ὢν, ζωὴ καὶ φῶς ὑπάρχων, ἀπέκυσεν λόγῳ ἕτερον νοῦν δημιουργόν*. Cf. J. KROLL, *Lehren des Hermes*, 60.

<sup>110</sup> *Asclepius*, 20, p. 56, 6, Thomas : "Hic ergo solus ut omnia, utraque sexus fecunditate plenissimus, semper voluntatis praegnans suae parit semper, quidquid voluerit procreare".

<sup>111</sup> PLATO, *Tim.*, 28 c, 3 (quoted n. 25); cf. 37 c, 7 : *ὁ γεννήσας πατήρ*; 34 b, 9 : *ἐγεννήσατο*; 41 a, 5 : *ὁ τότε τὸ πᾶν γεννήσας*. See also PLUTARCH, *Quaest. Conv.*, II, 1, 4 ff. (1001 B) : God is not only *ποιητής*, but also the begetting *πατήρ τῶν πάντων*. See J. KROLL, *op. cit.*, 157.

<sup>112</sup> E. NORDEN, *Die Geburt des Kindes*, 98, following REITZENSTEIN, *Poimandres*, 39 f., explains the agreement between PHILO, *De ebriet.*, 30 (quoted n. 106) and PLUTARCH, *De Iside*, c. 53-54, by the common dependence of the two authors

The Chaldæans do not merely set up a feminine power beside the Primal Being, but speak of this itself as a bisexual entity : "Thou art the Father, thou the Mother's radiant form, thou the children's (the Ideas) tender flower" <sup>113</sup>. Both concepts, that of the pairing (*syzygy*) as well as that of the division of the highest principle into two sexes, belong to the traditional material of Gnostic mythology <sup>114</sup>. There the feminine primal power appears in the most various forms; sometimes as a mother goddess whose derivation from Oriental nature-cults can still be recognized <sup>115</sup>, sometimes as the noetic hypostasis of the creative faculties of the Supreme Being <sup>116</sup>. In several Gnostic systems she is termed "Power" of the Primal Being; and in that of some Valentinians as His "Thought" who, assisted by His "Will", gives birth to the "First-born Intellect" and to "Truth" <sup>117</sup>. The last named version furnishes a further parallel to the Chaldæan doctrine of the Supreme Intellect who, with the help of His Will, emanated the Ideas. On the other hand it may be remembered that the concept of the bisexual nature

---

on a Graeco-Egyptian mysticism. This, as far as it concerns the locality, should be accepted (cf. WIRRE, 22 f. on the spread of Middle Platonism in Alexandria). However, it must be emphasized that the mythical elements in the doctrines of the authors in question can hardly be traced back to a specific Egyptian theosophy. This possibility is finally excluded by the addition of the Chaldæans to this group. Moreover, Plutarch (or his source) interprets the Isis-Osiris myth *more Platonic*, as other representatives of the Platonic school (*e. g.* Celsus; see n. 260 and 265) do with other non-Greek myths. Their interpretations are speculative exegeses without traditional bases. Cf. A. D. NOCK, *Gnomon*, 1937, 156 f., with whose criticism of Pascher and Goodenough (who carry further the hypothesis of Reitzenstein-Norden) I agree.

<sup>113</sup> As the Chaldæans call the First Intellect *πρωθυγενής* (see ch. I, n. 26, v. 16), so Numenius calls him *πρωστύτερος* (see n. 25) and Philo the Logos *πρωστύτερος* (see ZELLER, III, 2, 421, 5).

<sup>114</sup> Chr. F. BAUR, *Christliche Gnosis*, 231; W. BOUSSET, *Hauptprobleme der Gnosis* ch. II.

<sup>115</sup> Bousset, indeed, goes too far in his derivation of the feminine hypostasis from Oriental nature-cults.

<sup>116</sup> Thus the Barbelo-agnostics call the "Barbelo" "Power" of the unseen God (BOUSSET, 60) and the Sethites call the "Higher Power" "Mother" (BOUSSET, 16).

<sup>117</sup> See n. 62.



of the supreme God was a famous doctrine of the Orphics, which found acceptance both in Stoic and in later Platonic theology<sup>110</sup>. It seems as if the Orphic formula "Zeus is male, Zeus is female" had exercised direct influence on the external form of the last-quoted citation from the Oracles<sup>119</sup>. It must be, however, emphasized that the thought itself stems from the theosophical milieu, to which the Platonists named belong, and from which the Western Gnostics as well as the Hermetics borrowed many of their metaphysical formulae<sup>120</sup>.

c) The metaphors taken from the life of *Plants* belong to another class of realistic representations. The figure of "seeding", one of the most common metaphors for the activity of the creator of the world<sup>121</sup>, again presupposes a personalistic concept of God. Otherwise to be explained is the designation of the substance of the First Intellect as "fiery flowers" which are "plucked" by the noetic beings to him subordinate. This metaphor is basic both to the comparison, used also by Valentinus, of the Primal Being with a tree and of the entities which proceed from him with fruit, as well as to Philo's allegory of the Manna explained by him as the symbol of the divine Logos<sup>122</sup>. This vegetable

<sup>110</sup> See KERN, *Orph. Fragm.*, 21 a, p. 93 and 168, p. 201 ff. Porphyry, Tiberianus and Synesius, who quote the Orphic verses, are Platonists.

<sup>119</sup> NORDEN, *Agnostos Theos*, 229, 1; CLEMENT AL., *Strom.*, V, 14, 126, 2 compares the *μητροπάτωρ* of the Orphics with the *σύζυγος Θεός* of the Gnostics.

<sup>120</sup> One should carefully distinguish this doctrine from that of the Pythagoreans concerning the bisexual monad (ZELLER, III, 2, 130, 4), for here the feminine principle does not mean the primal formative power, but matter: J. KROLL, *Lehren des Hermes*, 52 f., in his survey of the concept of the bisexuality of the First Principle, has not sufficiently distinguished the two concepts. So again p. 128 f., where he confuses the percept of the Primal feminine Power with the Platonic comparison of matter to the maternal womb (*Tim.*, 49 ab).

<sup>121</sup> PLUTARCH, *Quaest. Plat.*, II, 1, 6, 1001 B. NUMENIUS, p. 139, 7; cf. J. KROLL, *Lehren des Hermes*, 32. Philo (cf. Leisegang's *index s. v. σπειρω* and *γεννώ*) frequently describes with this metaphor the doctrine of the *σπερματικός λόγος*.

<sup>122</sup> Valentinus ap. HIPPOLYT., *Ref.*, VI, 37, 7 : *ἐκ δὲ βουθού* (see n. 316) *καρπύους φερομένους*; cf. ZELLER, III, 2, p. 489, 4. Plotinus compares the Primal Being with a root, the derivation with a plant, in order "to make clear the immanence of this relationship" : ZELLER, III, 2, 551.

symbolism recommended itself to the Chaldæans not only because it transformed the notion of the participation of the lower in the higher into the dynamic image of a seizure, but also because it gave concrete expression to the concept of the divine powers as noetic substances. As opposed to this, the picture of the blossom of the Intellect (which taken strictly excludes that of the fruit) derives from the symbolism of fire, for "flower of fire" designates in Greek the finest substance of a flame <sup>123</sup>.

d) The last and most important group of metaphors for emanation is constituted by those taken from the appearances of *light* and *flame* <sup>124</sup>. They stand, as will be more fully explained below, in close relationship to the Platonistic metaphysics of light <sup>125</sup>. The Chaldæans give the figures associated with this a peculiar application of their own. In the centre of their imagery there stands, not, as in that of the Platonists, the sun which beams on all alike, but the primal fire, which divides itself into flashes of lightning. This type of symbolism is chosen deliberately. It is intended to present the effects proceeding from the Primal Being both as parts of a whole and as energies of a primal power. It follows that here also the doctrine that the Ideas are Powers of God is basic. Consequently we must consider the Chaldæan symbolism of lightning as a deliberate modification of the Platonic symbolism of Light <sup>126</sup>.

Herewith the inquiry concerning the nature and source of the Chaldæan doctrine of emanations is concluded. It has shown that the Chaldæans stand in the closest relation to a special form of Middle Platonism of which the influence is reflected with varying intensity also in the writings of Philo, Numenius and Plotinus as well as those of the

<sup>123</sup> See ch. II, n. 384.

<sup>124</sup> An abundant documentation on light-symbolism is collected, if not critically examined, in J. P. WERTEN's *Phos*, Uppsala, 1915.

<sup>125</sup> See ch. VII, n. 104 f. Notice that in the Chaldæan Oracles  $\omega\upsilon\rho$  and  $\phi\acute{\omega}\varsigma$  are frequently interchanged; cf. e. g. the fragments quoted ch. II, n. 406 and ch. III, n. 114.

<sup>126</sup> See ch. VII, n. 109.

Hermetics and of the Gnostic Valentinus. This conclusion will admit of further precision in what follows. We progress towards this goal, the more exact determination of the Platonic models of the Chaldæans, as we turn now to the doctrine of the latter concerning Eros.

8. *Eros and the "Connectives"*.—Eros is represented in the Chaldæan Oracles as spontaneously generated by the Paternal Intellect, and as holding the parts of the universe in their constant harmony and the stars in their perpetual circuit. He accomplishes this effect by means of the Ideas, to which he communicates his peculiar character and which thereby receive the name "connectives"<sup>127</sup>.

This view of Eros as the "Chain of the Universe" can, again, be traced back to the tradition of Middle Platonism. In Plato's writings the thought of the harmonious connection (*συνδεσμός*) of the parts of creation is mentioned only with reference to the axiom of the four elements<sup>128</sup>, but the Stoic Posidonius elevated it to the principle of his monistic explanation of the world, and exercised with this doctrine a powerful influence on the succeeding Platonists<sup>129</sup>. They usurped the thought concerning cosmic sympathy, by placing in the noetic sphere the source of the primal power which permeates the universe. As dogmatic point of departure they used the sentence of the *Timæus* concerning the harmonious order into which the demiurge brought matter which before moved irregularly. They explained this "order" as an inner connection of the parts of the cosmos which were formed and guided by the Ideas<sup>130</sup>. In this Platonic reinterpretation the Stoic doctrine of

<sup>127</sup> See ch. II, sect. 10-11.

<sup>128</sup> PLATO, *Tim.*, 31 b-c, 32 b-c. The remark in PLATO, *Phædo*, 99 c, 5 about the good and the necessary which connects and holds together the parts of the worlds, can hardly have been the point of departure of the Middle Platonic doctrine of *συνδεσμός*. Cf. also *Gorgias*, 507 e, 6 f.

<sup>129</sup> W. JÆGER, *Nemesius von Emesa*, ch. II : *Syndesmos*. K. REINHARDT, *Kosmos und Sympathie*, *passim*.

<sup>130</sup> PLATO, *Tim.*, 30 a, 5 : *εἰς τάξιν . . . ἤγαγεν ἐκ τῆς ἀταξίας*; 53 b, 4 : *διεσχηνάτισατο εἰδεσί τε καὶ ἀριθμοῖς*; 69 b, 5 : *ἀνάλογα καὶ σύμμετρα* (see ALBIN., 169, 5 f.). That these three passages, together with *Tim.*, 31 b-32 c (see n. 128)

the cohesion of the cosmos is first found in the writings of Philo<sup>131</sup>. He calls the Ideas "invisible powers" which "hold together" the universe "with unbreakable chains, in order that which has been bound together beautifully should not be loosed"<sup>132</sup>. The Philonic Logos, which forms the sum and source of these connective powers, is, like the Eros of

---

formed the point of departure of the Middle Platonic theory of *συνδεσμός*, is proved, apart from Philo and Numenius (see n. 151), by Porphyry *ap. Procl., Tim., I, 366, 16 f.*, and above all by the common relationship of Philo and Porphyry to the Platonic doctrine of the Good.

<sup>131</sup> That the Platonists of the 1st century developed their concept of cosmic sympathy in opposition to the Stoic axiom of immanence can be seen from the account given by Philo, who contrasts it with the doctrine of the divinization of the world (a *mixtum compositum* of Stoic physics and astrology; see BRÉNIER, *Les idées philosophiques... de Philon*, 162 f.; REINHARDT, *Kosmos und Sympathie*, 52, 2; 129, 2), which he calls "Chaldæan"; see I. HEINEMANN, *Philons griechische und jüdische Bildung* (Breslau, 1932), p. 55, 2. Cf. also PROCL., *Parm.*, 888, 5 f.; 889, 24 f.; M. HEINZE, *Die Lehre vom Logos*, 124.

Antiochus of Ascalon (*ὅς τὴν Στοᾶν μετήγαγε εἰς τὴν Ἀκαδημίαν* : SEXT., *Pyrrh.*, I, 2, 5) as the initiator of this doctrine had been plausible, even had it not been alluded to in the summary from his system preserved in CICERO, *Acad. post.*, I, 24 : "neque enim materiam ipsam cohaerere potuisse, si nulla vi contineretur". In characterizing this *vis* Cicero uses the Stoic concept of *causa efficiens*, which is identified by Philo with the Logos and by the Platonists with the Nous containing the Ideas viz. *Logoi*. In this instance, the Alexandrian Eudorus, the disciple of Antiochus, can have been the medium through which Philo Judæus learned the doctrine. On the Eudorus hypothesis see THEILER, *Vorbereitung des Neuplatonismus*, 39 f. WITT, 25, deals at length with Eudorus, but does not mention Philo Judæus.

<sup>132</sup> PHILO, *Migr. Abr.*, 181 (in polemic against the Stoic concept of sympathy) : *συνέχεσθαι μὲν τότε τὸ πᾶν ἰοράτοις δυνάμεσι, ἅς... ὁ δημιουργὸς ἀπέτεινε τοῦ μὴ ἀνεθῆναι: τὰ δεθέντα κλωῶς* (cf. PLATO, *Tim.*, 41 b, 1 : τὸ... κλωῶς ἀρμωσθέν) *προμηθηόμενος· δεσμοὶ γὰρ αἱ δυνάμεις τοῦ παντὸς ἀρρηκτοί*. In the same connection he calls this demiurgic power *ἀγαθότης*; see n. 146. As to the identity of these "invisible powers" with the Ideas see n. 76 and ZELLER, III, 2, p. 410, 5. Authority may have been found in PLATO, *Soph.*, 217 e. 3 : τὰ ὄντα... ἐστὶν οὐκ ἄλλο τι πλὴν δύναμις (see ZELLER, II, 1<sup>a</sup>, p. 689, 3) and *Rep.*, 477 c, 1 : *Φήσομεν δυνάμεις γένος τι ὄντων*. PLOTINUS, IV, 8, 3 also calls the particular Ideas *νοεραὶ δυνάμεις*; see n. 136.

the Chaldeans, the guarantee of the eternity of creation<sup>133</sup>. The Chaldean hypostasis is therefore no other than a personification of the "Beauty" of the intelligible world<sup>134</sup>, which is composed of the ideal powers holding the cosmos together<sup>135</sup>.

Philo attaches his doctrine of the cosmic sympathy to a famous passage of the *Timaeus* (41 *ab*), in which the demiurge addresses himself to the created gods by calling them "bound together beautifully" by the chain of His "Will" and therefore His "indissoluble works", and exhorts them, to "imitate" His own "power" in their creative activity.

<sup>133</sup> The view that the Logos is the bond which holds the parts of the world together and preserves them from dissolution, is frequently set out by Philo; HEINZE, *op. cit.*, 236; ZELLER, III, 2, 425, 7-8. Cf. PHILO, *Plant.*, 9; *Fuga*, 112; *Quis rer. div.*, 23 and 188; *ibid.*, 246 there is found, instead of the Logos, the Divine Will (according to PLATO, *Tim.*, 41 *b*, 4; see n. 66), and *Vit. Mos.*, II, 132 the divine Goodness; cf. PORPHYRY, *ap. PROCL.*, *Tim.*, I, 382, 12 f. concerning the ἀγαθοειδής βούλησις and γόνιμος δύναμις of the demiurge.

<sup>134</sup> On the νοητὰ κάλλη see the Oracle quoted ch. III, n. 55; PHILO, *Opif. mund.*, 71, and the passages from Plotinus quoted by ZELLER, III, 2, p. 587, 1. Cf. also PROCL., *Tim.*, II, 13, 19 : ὁ μὲν δεσμός (PLATO, *Tim.*, 31 *c*; cf. n. 128) ὡς εἰκόνα παρεχόμενος ἑαυτὸν τῆς ἐνώσεως τῆς θείας παραλαμβάνεται καὶ τῆς κοινωνίας τῶν δυνάμεων, . . . τὸ . . . 'κάλλος' ὡς ἐνοποιὸν ἔχον καὶ συνδετικὴν οὐσίαν τε καὶ δύναμιν ἀναβαίνεται. IDEM, *Parm.*, 909, 12 ff. In *Tim.*, II, 53, 25 f. (*ad Tim.*, 32 *c*, 2), he explains, that the Φιλία τοῦ παντός (*i. e.* the συνδεσμός) is maintained (1) by the "analogy" which connects the four elements (see n. 128); (2) by Physis who is the source of "sympathy"; (3) by Psyche who gives the universe "One Life"; (4) by Nous who establishes "order" (τάξις), by the νοητὸς καὶ νοερός θεός, (6) by the ἐν. As confirmation Proclus adduces the Oracle on Eros quoted ch. II, n. 231. The sequence of the noetic entities enumerated in this passage is that of Proclus, but it may be noted that Physis, Psyche, Nous and the "Paternal Monad" (the ἐν) are also named in the Oracles as agents of the cosmic "bound"; cf. ch. II, n. 231-241.

<sup>135</sup> Cf. PHILO, *Opif. mund.*, 20; *Conf. ling.*, 172; *Leg. Spec.*, I, 46, f.; *Vit. Mos.*, II, 132 : ἁρμονία γὰρ πάντων ἐστὶν ἡ ἀγαθότης καὶ ἰλευς (= κοσμοποιητική. see n. 143) δύναμις αὐτοῦ. . . τοῦ συνέχοντος καὶ διοικοῦντος τὰ σύμπαντα. See Porphyry, quoted n. 130. Thus is to be explained the agreement between the Philonic description of the Logos, the sum of the ideal powers (see n. 105), and the second principle of Plotinus (ZELLER, III, 2, 583). Philo calls the Logos δεύτερος θεός : ZELLER, 422, 3 and 5 and 428, 1.

These created gods were, by Philo, identified with the "invisible powers" of the Logos<sup>136</sup>. On the same statement of Plato the Neoplatonists founded their doctrine of the demiurgic gods, who form the bond which holds all things together, and who by their procreator were provided with the power to care for the eternal cohesion of the cosmos and to watch over the universe<sup>137</sup>. The powers by the help of which these demiurgic gods perform their task, are described by Proclus as "Logoi", which represent the emanations of the ideal power contained in the demiurge<sup>138</sup>. The agreement between Philo and the Neoplatonists sur-

<sup>136</sup> The transition is formed by the Stoic doctrine of the λόγοι σπερματικοί viz. δυνάμεις γόνιμοι; cf. M. HEINZE, *Lehre vom Logos*, 110 ff.; ZELLER, III, 2, 433; H. MEIER, *Geschichte der Lehre von den Keimkräften*, Bonn, 1914; DODDS, *Proclus*, 215. The most instructive text illustrating this transition is to be found in Porphyry's *περι ἀγαμάτων*, composed, before its author became Plotinus' pupil, and reproducing the doctrines of Longinus (see n. 38). Porphyry explains there (p. 6, 9 f.), that the statue of Zeus represents the νοῦς, καθ' ὃν ἐδημιούργει καὶ λόγοις σπερματικοῖς ἀπετέλει τὰ πάντα, and characterizes these λόγοι σπερματικοί (as did Philo, see n. 132, 144) as ἀσώματοι ἰδέαι and νοεραὶ, λογικαὶ δυνάμεις of the Supreme God (EUSEB., *Pr. Ev.*, III, 6, 7; 13, 5. See Bidez' notes to *Fragm.* 1), by which he fills, pervades and rules the universe (ἐνα γὰρ ὄντα θεὸν παντολαῖς δυνάμεσι τὰ πάντα πληροῦν καὶ δια πάντων δηκνείν καὶ τοῖς πᾶσιν ἐπι-στιάσειν, ἀσωμάτως καὶ ἀφανῶς ἐν πᾶσιν ὄντα : EUSEB., *Pr. Ev.*, III, 13, 5; BIDEZ, *loc. cit.*). As Bidez has shown, this treatise is full of Stoicizing formulae (Porphyry borrowed also the allegorical method from the Stoics and much of his material).

<sup>137</sup> Procl., *Tim.*, III, 162 ff. (*ad Tim.*, 40 d); cf. in particular 208, 8 f. regarding the φρουρητικὴ καὶ σωστικὴ δύναμις (see also 241, 20) conferred upon these demiurgic gods. *Ibid.*, 208, 14 f. : δημιουργικὴν δύναμιν, τὴν διήκουσαν δι' ὅλων καὶ συνέχουσαν αὐτὴ διαιωνίως· αὐτὴ γὰρ ἐστίν ἡ φρουρὰ καὶ θεῖος δεσμός ὁ πάντων συνοχεύς. These demiurgic gods are ruled by the Will of the Supreme God (according to *Tim.*, 41 b, 4; see n. 66); cf. 209, 16 : τοῦτο γὰρ (τὸ θέλημα) καὶ αὐτοῖς ἐνέδωκεν δύνανται τῆς ἀτρέπτου μνήης.

<sup>138</sup> The class of the ἀφομοιωτικοὶ θεοὶ, so called because they "imitate" the "power" of the demiurge in their own work of formation (PLATO, *Tim.*, 41 c, 5) : μιμούμενοι τὴν ἐμὴν δύναμιν περὶ τὴν ἡμετέραν γένεσιν; 42 e, 8 : μιμούμενοι τὸν σφέτερον ἡμιουργόν. Cf. *ibid.*, 50 d, 1 : τὸ δ' ὅθεν ἀφομοιούμενον and 51 a, 2. See PROCL., *Tim.*, III, 241, 24; *Th. Pl.*, 284, 37) receive from the demiurge the "demiurgical Logoi" (cf. Procl., *Tim.*, III, 198, 6 : εἰσι γὰρ οἱ λόγοι δυνάμεων μεταδόσεις) with which they "inform and maintain the world". These *Logoi*

nishes further proof of their common relationship to a Middle-Platonic doctrine concerning the Powers of God <sup>139</sup>.

By the dependance of the Chaldæans on this tradition can be explained also both their division of the Ideas into diverse classes and their delegation of these classes to diverse activities. In the Chaldæan Oracles the Ideas are found not only as "connectives" but also as powers which give form to matter (*ἀρχαί*) and as guardians (*Φρουροί*) <sup>140</sup>. Likewise, Iamblichus distinguishes four activities of the intramundane gods : the demiurgic, the vivifying, connecting and guarding <sup>141</sup>. That Iamblichus drew this division not from the Oracles <sup>142</sup> but from a Middle-Platonic tradition is proved by its partial agreement with the Philonic

---

are "emanations of the powers contained in the Father" (PROCL., *Th. Pl.*, 285, 1 : *ἐπιφορία τῶν ἐν τῷ πατρὶ μονίμως ἰδρυμένων δυνάμεων*) and constitute, in their totality, the "monad of the demiurgical powers" (PROCL., *Tim.*, III, 229, 26). Consequently, these demiurgic Logoi correspond to the Logoi of Philo (see HEINZE, *Lehre vom Logos*, 220 f., 278 f.) and their monad to the Logos.

<sup>139</sup> With reference to PLATO, *Tim.*, 40 d, 6 and *Conv.*, 202 e, 7, the Neoplatonists identify these demiurgic gods with the "leaders" of the demonic souls. In the same way, Philo designates the powers of the Ideas both as partial energies of the Logos and as angelic souls (ZELLER, III, 2, 408). Thus the Platonists attach their doctrine of the divine potencies no less to that of the Ideas than to that of the Cosmic Soul (the "source" of the demonic souls). The variations result from the difference of the point of view : in one case, the personified executors of the divine thoughts, in the other, the thoughts themselves are considered. The Chaldæans regard both the angels and the Iynges as procreations of the divine Intellect (see ch. II, sect. 12 and 14).

<sup>140</sup> See ch. II, n. 190, 247.

<sup>141</sup> SALLUSTIUS, *De deis et mundo*, 6, p. 12, 1, Nock : τῶν δὲ ἐγκοσμίων οἱ μὲν εἶναι ποιοῦσι τὸν κόσμον, οἱ δὲ αὐτὸν ψυχούσιν, οἱ δὲ ἐκ διαφόρων ὄντα ἀρμόζουσιν, οἱ δ' ἠρμοσμένον φρουροῦσι. Sallust's source was Iamblichus (see Nock, p. C), as is shown also by the agreement with HERMIAS, *Phaedr.*, 246 e, 4, p. 134, 41 f. Ast and with PROCL., *Tim.*, I, 79, 3 f. On the later development of this distinction see DODDS, *Proclus*, 278 ff. The source of Ps.-DIONYSIUS AREOPAGITA, *Cael. Hier.*, 7, 3 and *Div. Nom.*, 11, 6 (quoted by DODDS, 279) is PROCL., *Tim.*, III, 1, 12 ff.

<sup>142</sup> As DODDS, *Proclus*, 280 seems to suppose. Philo derives the "animating power" (with reference to Stoic and Biblical traditions ; see HEINZE, *Lehre vom Logos*, 258 f.) from the Pneuma and consequently does not count it as one of the functions of the powers of the Ideas.

doctrine of the powers of the Logos. Philo distinguishes two principal powers : the creative and the ruling. Both guard over this world, the first "in order that the created should not be dissolved", the second in order that the parts of the universe remain in proper relation one to another. It seems unnecessary here to go into the details of this central Philonic doctrine, which contains both Jewish and Stoic elements <sup>143</sup>. The similarities between it and the doctrine of the Neoplatonists concerning the demiurgic gods, as well as the Chaldæan doctrine of Ideas, is evidence for a common Middle-Platonic basis. Philo himself suggests such an origin in that he refers to the powers of God with the same words which he uses for the Logos, as invisible chains which hold the universe together <sup>144</sup>, and, above all, in that he describes the power of God which formed the cosmos as His "goodness" <sup>145</sup>. This last description, again, goes back to Plato's *Timæus* which derives the source of all becoming from the goodness of God <sup>146</sup>. All later Platonists foun-

<sup>143</sup> The Philonic doctrine of the divine Powers has been treated, from other view points, by E. GOODENOUGH in *By Light, Light* and the relevant material has been set forth by him; see above note 112. Cf. also the bibliography given by LEISEGANG in *P. W.*, s. v. Logos, 1077-1078. Philo finds his distinction upon the two designations of God in the LXX : *θεός* (= *ὁ θεός*, *ἡ κοσμοποιὸς δύναμις*, *ἡ ἀγαθότης*) and *κύριος* (= *δεσπότης*). A Middle Platonic interpretation of PLATO, *Tim.*, 28 c, 3 : *τὸν ποιητὴν καὶ πατέρα τοῦδε τοῦ παντός* (see n. 25) seems to have influenced the elaboration of this division; cf. *Fragments of Philo*, p. 70 a fin. Harris : *ἀμήχανον ἁρμονίαν καὶ τάξιν καὶ λόγον καὶ ἀναλογίαν καὶ τοσαύτην συμφωνίαν. . . ἀπαυτοματισθεῖσαν γενέσθαι. ἀνάγκη γὰρ εἶναι ποιητὴν καὶ πατέρα. . . , ὃς γεγέννηκεν καὶ γεννηθέντα σῶζει.*

<sup>144</sup> PHILO, *Conf. ling.*, 136 : God extends His power over the whole world, *πάντα δὲ συναγαγὼν διὰ πάντων ἀοράτοις ἐσφιγξας δεσμοῖς, ἵνα μὴ ποτε λυθεῖν.* This Power is called *θεός*; i. e. it is the *κοσμοποιητικὴ δύναμις* (see the preceding note). Cf. also *Conf. ling.*, 166 : *θεοῦ, ὃς τοῖς ὅλοις δεσμοῦς τὰς ἑαυτοῦ δυνάμεις περιήψεν ἀρρήκτους, αἷς τὰ πάντα σφιγξας ἅλντα εἶναι βεβούλευται* (the three last words are quoted from PLATO, *Tim.*, 41 b, see n. 66 and 132).

<sup>145</sup> Cf. PHILO, *Opif. mund.*, 21 ; *Migr. Abr.*, 181-183 (see n. 132). *Vit. Mos.*, H, 132 (quoted n. 133), *et passim*; cf. ZELLER, III, 2, 417, 2.

<sup>146</sup> PLATO, *Tim.*, 29 e, 1 f., in connection with the axiom that God is not jealous (see n. 148, quoted by PHILO, *Op. mund.*, 21).



ded their teaching of the formation of the cosmos upon this axiom<sup>147</sup>; even Plotinus, who contests the attribution even of goodness to the Primal Being, is compelled to fall back upon it when he wishes to give a name to the causality of the primal power<sup>148</sup>. Thereby it is proved that Philo developed his speculation, as to the primal powers of the divinity, on the basis of the Middle-Platonic formation of the doctrine of the Good, in which the Ideas receive the character of individualized powers and are entrusted by the supreme God with the activity of forming the cosmos, holding it together and keeping watch over its consistency. Philo finds in Goodness not only the source of God's creative abundance, but also the subjective ground of his emanative activity<sup>149</sup>. It is possible that his Platonic predecessors had also developed the representation of God's activity as emanative, which, as was remarked above, forms a characteristic of the "dynamic pantheism" of the latter Platonic school.

From this tracing back of the Philonic doctrine of the powers of God to Philo's Platonic predecessors, it follows that also those elements of the Chaldæan doctrine which agree with Philo's depend from the same tradition<sup>150</sup>. Thereby the thesis as to the Middle-Platonic source, both

<sup>147</sup> J. KROLL, *Lehren des Hermes*, 35 f., describes the influence of this Platonic doctrine of the divine Goodness on the Hermetics and on Philo. See also PRAECHTER, 575 f.; DODDS, 213. For Iamblichus, cf. SALLUSTIUS, *De deis et mundo*, 5, p. 10, 17, Nock. For Proclus see *Th. Pl.*, 280, 24 ff.; *Tim.*, I, 356, 4 f.; III, 6, 27 f.

<sup>148</sup> ZELLER, III, 2, 546 f., in particular 547, 2; DODDS, *loc. cit.*; PLOTINUS, *Enn.*, IV, 8, 6; V, 4, 1 appeals to the Platonic axiom that God grudges nothing in order to describe His formative activity, although he derives the causality of this not from His goodness but from the necessity inherent in His nature.

<sup>149</sup> ZELLER, III, 2, 406, 3; BRÉHIER, *op. cit.*, 147; J. KROLL, *loc. cit.*; THEILER, *op. cit.*, 29.

<sup>150</sup> Another proof of common dependence is afforded by the agreement between Philo's doctrine of the Logos as the director of the divine Powers (*De Fuga*, 101 : *ἡνίοχον μὲν εἶναι τῶν δυνάμεων τὸν λόγον*) and the Chaldæan description of the Supreme Intellect as "riding" the lightnings of the Ideas (see ch. II, n. 260), as well as by the common description of the beaming forth of the divine light as "stretching out" (cf. Philo : *τρίνειν εἰς γένεσιν*, quoted by ZELLER, III, 2, 414, 2,

of the Chaldæan speculation concerning the powers of God, and of the doctrine of emanations therewith associated, receives new confirmation <sup>151</sup>.

Two further elements—hitherto not considered—of the Chaldæans' definition of Eros deserve a short notice. The view that the stars continue "together with him" in eternal circuit <sup>152</sup>, is perhaps nothing else than a mythical translation of the Platonic notion of the eternal harmony of the universe, a harmony which manifests itself in the motion of the planets. It is possible that the famous Aristotelian doctrine of a transcendent Divine Intellect which moves the heaven *ὡς ἐρώμενον* (a doctrine current among Middle Platonists) <sup>153</sup> has also exerted its influence here. Thus the striking agreement of the appropriate verse of the Chaldæan Oracles just quoted with the last verse of the *Divina Commedia* : "*L'amor che move il sole e l'altre stelle*" would be explained on the ground of dependence on a similar model. To Platonic notions is, further, to be referred the Chaldæan theory as to the intermingling of Eros in the substance of the soul, and of the soul's consequent longing for its noetic origin <sup>154</sup>.

with the Oracle quoted ch. II, n. 200, v. 4). Whether the Oracular fragment *πρώτην δύναμιν ἰσροῦ λόγου* (see ch. II, n. 181) refers to a Chaldæan speculation about the Logos (PHILO, *Somn.*, I, 186 calls the Logos *πατήρ ἰσρών λόγων*) can no longer be decided.

<sup>151</sup> Traces of a doctrine similar to that of the Chaldæans on the connective power of the Ideas is found in NUMENIUS, p. 141, 20 : *ὁ δημιουργὸς τὴν ὕλην . . . ἀρμονία ξυνησάμενος* (cf. 138, 1 : *ἐνοί*) . . . *τὴν ἀρμονίαν δὲ ἰθύνει, ταῖς ἰδέαις οἰακίζων*, and p. 89, 6 : Not the substance, but the powers of the demiurge (i. e. the Forms) are mixed with matter. Cf. also p. 140, 14 f., where he teaches that the order (*τάξις*), eternity (*ἡ μονὴ ἢ αἰδίος*) and preservation (*σωτηρία*, cf. DODDS, *Proclus*, 200) of the universe derive from the First Intellect. PLUTARCH, *Quæst. Plat.*, II, 1, 5, 1001 B : *ἡ δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ γεννησαντος ἀρχῆ καὶ δύναμις ἐγκράταται τῷ τεκνωθέντι* (sc. *τῷ γεννητῷ κόσμῳ*) *καὶ συνέχει τὴν φύσιν* means by the 'connective power' of the universe the good World Soul; cf. note 108. See ATTICUS *ap. Eus.*, *Pr. Ev.*, XV, 12, 3; ALBINUS, 170, 6; NUMENIUS, p. 89, 26 f.

<sup>152</sup> See ch. II, n. 232, v. 5.

<sup>153</sup> ARISTOT., *Met.*, Λ 1072 b. 3. On the influence of this doctrine upon the Middle Platonists see WIRTH, 125.

<sup>154</sup> See ch. III, n. 8.

The mythical thinking of the Chaldæans represented the capacity of the diverse anthropological principles in the figure of their substantial origin. Once this figurative husk be stripped away, the doctrine of Plato as to the soul's Eros for the good remains.

9. *The Cosmic Soul*.—The Chaldæan beliefs as to the nature of the World-Soul are also explicable on the basis of Platonic views<sup>155</sup>. The Cosmic Soul derives from the Paternal Intellect and is subordinate to him and to his ideas. In this description is presented the doctrine of the World-Soul as the third hypostasis, sprung from the divine Intellect, a doctrine already hinted at by Plutarch and Albinus<sup>156</sup>, and then made by Plotinus the foundation of his teaching concerning the three principles of the noetic world.

The World-Soul of the Chaldæans forms, as that of the Platonists, the boundary (*ὄρος*) between the intelligible and the sensible world<sup>157</sup>. The Oracles represent this capacity in three figures, of which two have, at the same time, relations with the symbolism of the statue of Hecate which personifies the World-Soul. They call Hecate, the World-Soul, the "girdling blossom of the fire", "the fire which turns upon itself", (in which expressions the name of the element, *viz.* of its blossom, refers to the noetic substance). She is also called "two-faced"<sup>158</sup>. All three metaphors are also found in the writings of contemporary Platonists. The comparison of the World-Soul with a girdle, which encircles the cosmos, goes back to Plato's *Timæus* (36 e 3), where it is said that the universe is "wrapped about from without" by the

<sup>155</sup> See ch. II, sect. 4.

<sup>156</sup> ΠΡΑΕΧΤΕΡ, 592; *ibid.*, 538 as to other predecessors of Plotinus; WITT, 125.

<sup>157</sup> The point of departure for the interpreters was PLATO, *Tim.*, 35 a, 5 : ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ τε ἀμερούς αὐτῶν (= τοῦ νοητοῦ) καὶ τοῦ κατὰ τὰ σώματα μεριστοῦ (= τοῦ ζισθητοῦ). Cf. DODDS, 297. Accordingly NUMENIUS, p. 97, 8 : μέση τῶν φυσικῶν καὶ ὑπερφυσικῶν. PLOTINUS, IV, 2, 1; VI, 4, 2. Other parallels, n. 166. In PROCL., *Tim.*, II, 1, 14 : ἡ δὲ ψυχὴ . . . τῶν ἀμερισίων καὶ μερισίων μέση . . . τῶν ἀγενήτων . . . καὶ τῶν γενητῶν ὄρος . . . καὶ τῶν . . . ἀειδόντων πέρας the three characteristics of the Cosmic Soul μέση, ὄρος, πέρας, are to be found together.

<sup>158</sup> See ch. II, n. 111-112.

encompassing Cosmic Soul<sup>159</sup>. From the same work is derived the comparison with a being which turns upon itself in serpentine fashion. According to Plato the Cosmic Soul laid about the world "twists upon itself in circles"<sup>160</sup>. To this snake-symbolism there is found a close (to all appearances not yet correctly interpreted) parallel in the Gnostic literature which borrowed several symbols from the Platonic representation of the Cosmic Soul. The sect of the Ophites used, in a drawing of their schema of the cosmos, a circular snake, which enclosed the intramundane zone. They called this snake "Leviathan" or "the Soul which pervades the universe". Thus personification of Psyche as Leviathan, which is said in the Bible (*Isaiah XXVII, 1*) to be a "crooked serpent", is explicable on the basis of the same Platonic passage (cited above) concerning the World-Soul<sup>161</sup>, on which the Chaldæans

<sup>159</sup> PLATO, *Tim.*, 36 e, 3 : κύκλω... ἔξωθεν περικαλύψασα. Followed by PROCL., *Hymn.*, II (eis Ἀφροδίτην), v. 15 :

«εἶτε περισφίγγεις μέγαν οὐρανόν, ἔνθα σε φασὶ  
ψυχὴν ἀνάοιο πέλειν κόσμοιο θεεῖην»

(the explanation of Aphrodite as a metonymous designation of the Cosmic Soul derives from PLOTINUS, III, 5). The analogous comparison, in the Oracles, of the Cosmic Soul with a "girdling noetic membrane", which divides the intelligible from the sensible world, has been explained above ch. II, n. 99 f. J. KROLL, *Lehren des Hermes*, 159, 3 compares therewith *Corp. Herm.*, X, 11, where the cosmos is described as a human head which is divided into two parts by a membrane, and the soul is localized above the membrane in the noetic part of the cosmos. However, this phantastic speculation does not agree with that of the Chaldæans, for according to them the Cosmic Soul itself constitutes the dividing membrane and the image serves as metonymy for the transparent substance of the noetic.

<sup>160</sup> PLATO, *Tim.*, 36 e, 3 : αὐτὴ ἐν αὐτῇ στρεφομένη; 97 a, 5 : αὐτὴ ἀνακυκλουμένη πρὸς αὐτήν.

<sup>161</sup> ORIGEN *C. Cels.*, VI, 25 and 35. Cf. the graphic description given by H. LEISEGANG, *Die Gnosis* (Leipzig, 1924), 169, from whose interpretation, however, I differ. The Ophites wrote the name of Leviathan twice, both around the circle and also in its centre, because the Platonic World-Soul "encloses" the cosmic body "from the centre outwards in all sides in circle" (PLATO, *Tim.*, 36 e, 2).

As to other Gnostic transformations of the Platonic doctrine of the Cosmic Soul see the excellent study of W. BOUSSET, *Platons Weltseele und das Kreuz Christi*, *Z. N. T. W.*, 1913, 273-285.

founded their interpretation of the serpentine symbols of the statue of Hecate.

By reason of the mediating position of the World-Soul in the Platonic system, it is possible to determine also the significance—unexplained in the preserved fragments of the Chaldæan Oracles—of the third predicate of Hecate : “She who has mouths, faces, visages on every side”<sup>162</sup>. This the Theurgists most probably interpreted (as did Proclus)<sup>163</sup> with reference to the double orientation of the Cosmic Soul : toward the intelligible world, from the Intellect of which she is “illuminated”; and toward the sensible world, to which she transmits her “light”<sup>164</sup>. She is therefore also called in the Chaldæan Oracles the “circumspicent”. The most precise explanation of this notion is given by Plotinus : he calls the Soul a light which streams forth from the Intellect, and which “on the one hand is fed by him and so satiates herself”, and on the other hand occupies herself with the things behind her (*i. e.* the phenomenal world)<sup>165</sup>. “She is the boundary-line and has the appropriate position : consequently she faces in both directions”<sup>166</sup>.

The Chaldæans attribute to Hecate three activities : She is the “Mistress of Life”, who enlivens all the orders of created objects ; Physis or Ananke, the ruler over the regular movement of the stars ; Heimarmene, who rules over human beings by means of her demons<sup>167</sup>. Of

<sup>162</sup> See ch. II, n. 111-112.

<sup>163</sup> PROCL., *Tim.*, II, 130, 23 ; 246, 19 ; 293, 23. The following interpretation was already suggested by DODDS, 297, 1. Cf. also BRÉNIER, *La philosophie de Plotin* (Paris, 1938), 48.

<sup>164</sup> By the preposition *ἀμφί* the Oracles use to describe the double relationship of the respective noetic potency, *i. e.* the reception of the noetic substance from above and its transmission to the lower order. See ch. II, n. 111-112.

<sup>165</sup> PLOTINUS, V, 1, 7 ; ZELLER, III, 2, p. 589, 1.

<sup>166</sup> PLOTINUS, IV, 4, 3 : *μεθόριον οὐσα καὶ ἐν τοιοῦτῳ κειμένη ἐπ' ἀμφω φέρεται*. Similarly III, 8, 9, where the *Nous* is called *ἀμφιστομος* : *i. e.* turned in two directions, towards the One and towards the Soul. Cf. already PLUTARCH, *De procr. animae*, 23, 7, 1024 B concerning the Cosmic Soul : *ἐν μέσῳ . . . ἀμφοῖν καὶ πρὸς ἀμφοτέρα συμπιθῆ καὶ συγγενῆ φύσιν εἶχε* etc. Cf. also CHALCIDIOUS, quoted n. 207.

<sup>167</sup> See ch. II, n. 91, 126, 134, 136.

these three descriptions the first evidently goes back to Plato himself, from whom is also derived the association of the concepts of soul and life<sup>168</sup>. The second, again, derives from the tradition of Middle-Platonism. Plato made the Cosmic Soul mistress of the cosmic body and of the movements of its parts<sup>169</sup>. Later Platonists called her, by reason of her characteristic as the source of the natural order, *Physis*<sup>170</sup>. In conjunction with them Plotinus distinguished two aspects of the World-Soul, of which the above remains without relation to the sensible world, while the lower, directing itself toward this world, gives form to all things in which and through which it moves<sup>171</sup>. This lower aspect of the World-Soul was called by Plotinus *Physis*<sup>172</sup>. It seems therefore

<sup>168</sup> Cf. DODDS, 297, who quotes PLATO, *Phaedo*, 106 d; see also *Leges*, 895 c, 12. ps.-PLATO, *Definit.*, 411 c, 7. Plotinus also uses *ψυχή* and *ζωή* promiscuously. On the post-Plotinian hypostasis of Life see DODDS, 252 f. and above ch. II, n. 65. HERMIAS, *Phaedr.*, p. 118, 5 and 42 Ast, explaining PLATO, *Phaedr.*, 245 c, 6-7, states that the movement of the soul and the movement of life are identical notions. PROCL., *Crat.*, 53, 2, with reference to the same passage of the *Phaedrus*, designates the Cosmic Soul, the origin of Life, as *πηγή και ἀρχή κινήσεως* (cf. also PLATO, *Leges*, 896 b, 3), and *Th. Pl.*, 266, 37 as *ἀρχή και πηγή ζωῆς*. The same formula is used by the Chaldæans; see ch. II, n. 63. As to the First Intellect regarded as the origin of the source of Life (cf. ch. II, n. 62) see PLOTINUS, V, 4, 2 : *ζωή ἐν αὐτῷ* (τῷ νῷ).

<sup>169</sup> PLATO, *Tim.*, 34 c, 5 : *ψυχὴν σώματος ὡς δεσπότιν και ἄρξουσαν* and 37 c, 6. *Phaedr.*, 245 c, 9; *Leges*, 896 c. 2 f.

<sup>170</sup> ATTICUS ap. EUSEB., *Praep. Evang.*, XV, 12. ALBINUS, 165, 3 : (ὁ νοῦς τῆς *ψυχῆς*) *κοσμηθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς διακοσμεῖ σύμπασαν φύσιν ἐν τῷδε τῷ κόσμῳ*, where the three principles of Plotinus (*plus Physis*) are already found together. PLUTARCH, *De genio Socr.*, 22, 591 B (see DODDS, 207) and *Quaest. Plat.*, 8, 4, 4, 1007 C : *ἡ τοῦ ὄλου φύσις ἐμψυχος οὔσα κινεῖται, μᾶλλον δὲ κίνησις οὔσα* etc. The equation *ψυχή-φύσις* goes back to PLATO, *Leges*, 892 c, 2 (cf. *Epinomis*, 982 b, 5). PROCL., *Parm.*, 821, 1 f. and *Tim.*, I, 10, 8, quotes this passage.

<sup>171</sup> PLOTINUS, V, 1, 2 (ZELLER, III, 2, 611, 1), especially the sentence *αὐτὴ δὲ ἐν τάξει περιάγει* (τὸν οὐρανόν); cf. PLATO, *Leges*, 896 e, 8 f.

<sup>172</sup> PLOTINUS, III, 8, 4 *et passim* (ZELLER, III, 2, 594 f. See also H. F. MÜLLER, *Physis bei Plotin*, *Rhein. Mus.*, 1916, 232-245). Accordingly PROCL., *Tim.*, I, 10, 13 ff., who cites the *Physis* of the Chaldæans. Cf. also HERMES ap. STOB., *Eclog.*, I, 41, s. 6 [810].

certain that the Chaldæan description of Hecate-Psychè as Physis, the mistress of the regular movement of the stars, goes back to a pre-Platonic stage of the Platonic doctrine as to the activity of the lower World-Soul, which would, at the same time, explain the distinction of that Soul's two aspects. In that event Plotinus would have—as so often—taken over a doctrinal formula of Middle-Platonic tradition and given it a new meaning.

The concept of Nature was filled out by the Chaldæans with the content of the belief in fate common in later antiquity. The movement of the parts of the cosmos is not only a result of their possession of life, but also the source of all temporal transitoriness<sup>173</sup> and material limitation, of *Ananke viz. Heimarmene*. The personification of these two powers through Hecate also goes back to the doctrine of contemporary Platonists about the World-Soul. Four representatives of Middle-Platonism refer to her as charged with the enforcement of the divinely ordained laws of the world<sup>174</sup>. They again base their theory on a passage of the *Timæus*: The demiurge “showed” the souls which have just been created “the nature of the universe, and explains to them the rules of fate”: embodiment, wandering as expiation for earlier transgressions, and final deliverance<sup>175</sup>. “Nature” and “Fate” thus become domains of operation for the Cosmic Soul, which also receives rulership

<sup>173</sup> According to PLOTINUS, III, 7, 11 and 12, PORPHYR., *Sent.*, c. 44, p. 45, 16 f. and PROCL., *Alc.*, 512, 10 (who refer to PLATO, *Tim.*, 38 b, 6), the Cosmic Soul creates Time.

<sup>174</sup> Ps.-PLUTARCH, *De fato*, 2, 568 E, F; as to the character and sources of this work see PRÆCHTER, 555 f.; CHALCIDIUS in *Tim.*, c. 142, 144, 148 f.; NEMESIUS, *De nat. hom.*, 38, 753 B. Cf. also PLUTARCH, *De procreat. anim.*, 27, 1, 1026 B ATTICUS *ap. EUSEB.*, *Praep. Evang.*, XV, 12, 1; PLOTINUS, III, 1, 7; PROCL., *Rp.*, II, 356, 28 ff. The interpretation of the Cosmic Soul as Heimarmene was a consequence of the discussions between the Platonists and the Stoics; the latter made Physis, Heimarmene and Psyche the agents of Fate (ZELLER, III, 1, 145 f.). Stoic influence is perceptible in *Hymn. Orph.*, X (Φύσεως), 22 f.

<sup>175</sup> PLATO, *Tim.*, 41 e, 2: τὴν τοῦ παντὸς φύσιν ἐδιδίξεν νόμους τε τοὺς εἰμαρμένους εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, etc. Cf. ps.-PLUTARCH, *De fato*, 1, 568 D; PROCL., *Tim.*, III, 273, 20 f.; *Rp.*, II, 357, 16 f.; *Th. Pl.*, 317, 31. Proclus quotes also PLATO, *Politic.*, 272 e, 5: τὸν δὲ δὴ κόσμον ἀνέστρεφεν εἰμαρμένη.

over the earthly existence of humanity. The soul of man, as a part of the universal soul, is, as Iamblichus explains in his work *On Destiny* <sup>176</sup>, the source of Nature and of all movements; she strives with her spiritual power towards the noetic realm, but subjects herself, inasfar as she gives in to the sensible, to *Heimarmene*, and serves the necessities of Nature. Therefore she is permitted, in delivering herself from the fetters of the sensible, to shake off the servitude to *Heimarmene* and to return to the freedom of her first noetic condition. Concerning the consequences which the Chaldæans drew from this ethico-religious postulate, we shall speak at the end of this section. Here it is enough to have established the fact that the three manifestations of the Chaldæan Hecate : Psyche—Physis—Heimarmene, derive from the Middle-Platonic speculation as to the Cosmic Soul <sup>177</sup>.

The Cosmic Soul of the Chaldæans is, like that of the Platonists, not only the originator of all life but also the source of human souls. The Oracles describe the origin of these last in mythical figures : “Having mingled the Spark of the Soul with two like-minded faculties, with Intellect and divine Will, the Father added to them as a third chaste Eros, the Binder of all things and their sublime guide” <sup>178</sup>. This representation, to all appearances, goes back to the exegesis of a famous passage of the *Timæus* (41 d),—a passage described by Plotinus as divine riddle <sup>179</sup>—, in which the making of the individual souls is described. Plato explains there that the demiurge mixes, in

---

<sup>176</sup> IAMBlichus, *De fato*, ap. STOB., *Eclog.*, II, c. 7, s. 43-47; IDEM, *Myst.*, VIII, 7 (cf. the commentary of SCOTT-FERGUSON, *Hermetica*, IV, 80 ff.) and *Epist. ad Sopatr.*, ap. STOB., *Ecl.*, I, 5, s. 18; cf. ZELLER, III, 2, 761 f.; HERMIAS, *Phaedr.*, 255 b, 1, p. 171, 13. See already PLOTINUS, III, 1, 8 *et passim*; PORPHYRY ap. PROCL., *Tim.*, III, 272, 16. Cf. GUNDEL in *P. W.*, s. v. Heimarmene, 2636 (who quotes p. 2642 the Chaldæan Oracles); Nock, *Sallustius concerning the Gods*, p. LXX f.

<sup>177</sup> Proclus' (*Tim.*, I, 11, 9ff. Other passages, ch. II, n. 66) doctrine of the five degrees of the principle of Life (Life, Soul, Nature or Necessity, Destiny, Fate) is dependent on the Middle Platonic doctrine of the Cosmic Soul which was transmitted to him by Iamblichus. Proclus, indeed, asserts that he owes this “chain” to the Chaldæan Oracles; actually he did not even borrow all the terms from them.

<sup>178</sup> See ch. III, n. 8.

<sup>179</sup> PLOTINUS, IV, 2, 2.



the same vessel in which he has prepared the World-Soul, the remaining psychic substances, and mixes them indeed "in much the same fashion, yet not in the same purity, but *seconds* and *thirds*" (*i. e.* components of second and third quality)<sup>180</sup>. The two ordinal numbers left unexplained in the original are employed in the above-cited Oracle for the numeration of the component parts of the human souls. That this agreement is not accidental, but rests on actual exegesis of the *Timæus*, is shown to be probable by a comparison of the components of the soul named by Plato with those named by the Chaldæans. According to the *Timæus* (35 a) the demiurge makes the Cosmic Soul (the process of her mixture is a model for the mixing of the individual souls) by mixing at first from two substances—the indivisible and self-constant, as well as that which is divisible in the bodily region—a "middle-third form of the substance". By the undivided and divided substances Plato means, according to the interpretation of the greater number of his ancient exegetes, the substances of the noetic and sensible worlds respectively<sup>181</sup>. If so, the three psychic substances mentioned in the Oracle: Intellect, Will and Eros, can be explained as equivalents of those given by Plato<sup>182</sup>. The undivided is equivalent to the Intellect, the divided to the Will, and the mixing to "Eros, the binder of all things". The first and the third of these equations are self-explanatory<sup>183</sup>, so that only the second is in need of evidence.

<sup>180</sup> PLATO, *Tim.*, 41 d, 4 f. According to PLOTINUS, IV, 3, 6, *δευτέρα και τρίτα* (*Tim.*, 41 d, 7) signify the various grades of proximity and remoteness of the individual souls in relation to the One; according to PROCL., *Alc.*, 502, 1/4 f. the "garments" (*χιτῶνες*) which are attached to the soul in the course of its descent (cf. DODDS, 307).

<sup>181</sup> A. E. TAYLOR, *A commentary on Plato's Timæus* (Oxford, 1928), 120, 124 f. (on Chalcidius, Plotinus and Proclus. Cf. in particular PROCL., *Tim.*, II, 153, 24 f.).

<sup>182</sup> The "spark of the soul" would then represent that part of the remainder of the substance of the Cosmic Soul from which the demiurge mixes the particular souls. The second procedure of the mixing may have been described in the continuation of the Oracle which has not been preserved.

<sup>183</sup> It is also possible that the Chaldæan Eros represents the numerical proportion of the mixing (*ἀρμονία* : *Tim.*, 36 e, 7).

“Divine Will” means in this and other Oracles the decision of the creator to send the created souls down to earth<sup>184</sup>. Later Platonists who trace back the descent of the soul to its own initiative, derive this initiative from the “desiring part” of the soul<sup>185</sup>; the Chaldæans replace the “desiring will” of the soul by the rational will of its creator. It seems, consequently, scarcely dubious that the Chaldæan account of the mixing of the human souls rests on the exegesis of the *Timæus*.

This relationship appears, most clearly, in the Chaldæan designation of the World-Soul as “Pneuma, harmony and number”<sup>186</sup>. Of these three concepts the two last derive directly from the *Timæus*<sup>187</sup> and the first from Middle-Platonists who identified the Cosmic Soul of Plato with the Cosmic Pneuma of the Stoa<sup>188</sup>. So the search after the philosophic sources of the Chaldæans leads us ever again back to the exegesis of the *Timæus*. This fact is a new proof of their immediate dependence on contemporary Platonism, in which the centre of interest was occupied by just this essential work of natural philosophy, explained in a large number of commentaries (of which only scanty fragments have been preserved).

We may treat more briefly here the Chaldæan view of the descent and reascent of the human soul, its service under the compulsion of the body, its forgetfulness of its heavenly source and its recollection of its own nature, its wandering and eventual release<sup>189</sup>. Here the

<sup>184</sup> See ch. III, n. 17. For *ἐπέμφοθη* there see ALBINUS, 572, 4: *κατέπεμψέν ἐπὶ γῆν τὰς . . . ψυχὰς ὁ τῶν ὄλων δημιουργός*, and the Platonist Taurus, quoted by IAMBlichus, *De anima* (ap. STOB., *Ecl.*, I, c. 41, s. 39 [906]) *πέμπεσθαι τὰς ψυχὰς ὑπὸ Θεῶν εἰς γῆν*.

<sup>185</sup> Cf. the passages quoted by WITT, 139; IAMBlichus, *De anima* (ap. STOB., *Ecl.*, I, c. 41, s. 39 [908]); NUMENIUS, p. 105, 5 ff.

<sup>186</sup> See ch. I, n. 59, v. 3.

<sup>187</sup> See ch. I, n. 65, *ψυχὴ* = *ἀρμονία*: PLATO, *Tim.*, 37 a, 1; PLUTARCH, *De anim. procr.*, 33, 1029 E; 7, 1015 E; 27, 1026 B. *ψυχὴ* = *ἀριθμὸς*: cf. A. E. TAYLOR, *op. cit.*, 111 f. For other parallels see WITT, 20, 2.

<sup>188</sup> The author of the summary of the Platonic system, whom Diog. LAERT. III, 67, quotes, designates the Cosmic Soul as *ἰδέα τοῦ πάντη διασῶτος πνεύματος*. Cf. PRAECHTER, 554.

<sup>189</sup> Cf. ch. II, sect. 15 and ch. III, sect. 1, 2, 6.

Oracles, in their formulations, show their Platonic models themselves<sup>190</sup>. Consequently Porphyry was able to treat several Oracles of this group within the framework of a monograph on the Platonic theme of the return of the soul (*de regressu animae*)<sup>191</sup>. He there rightly remarked that the Chaldæans substituted, for the ethico-dialectical purification of the soul demanded by Plato as precondition of its "ascent", the ritual lustration of their mystery-cult; but he omitted to add that they thereby gave back its primary, ritualistic significance to the concept of *catharsis* borrowed by Plato from the Orphics<sup>192</sup>.

From the inquiry concerning the Platonic elements of the Chaldæans' concept of the World-Soul, we turn to the question of the source of its identification with Hecate. To this a direct answer cannot be given, inasmuch as the tradition concerning the late forms of the cult of Hecate is not sufficient<sup>193</sup>. As point of departure may be taken the fact that the Chaldæans got hold of Hecate, as also of Apollo, through magic. This relationship finds its clearest expression in their appropriation of the statue used in the cult of this goddess of magic. The Chaldæans carried through the transition from magic to metaphysics by interpreting the attributes of this figure according to the characteristics of the Cosmic Soul of the Platonists<sup>194</sup>.

The allegorical interpretation of a cult-statue was a usual means of giving a particular divinity universal character<sup>195</sup>. This method, which was developed by the Stoics and carried further by the Neoplatonists,

<sup>190</sup> The Neoplatonists frequently reverse the relationship in using the relevant Chaldæan Oracles to sanction the Platonic thoughts.

<sup>191</sup> See Excursus II.

<sup>192</sup> Cf. E. ROHDE, *Psyche*, II, 281 f., and the excellent excursus on the role of the Platonic language and mode of expression in Gnosis by H. JONAS, *Gnosis und spätantiker Geist*, I, 251-254. He says p. 253: "Indem Plato die Philosophie als Scheinreligion stilisierte, ermöglichte er einer späteren Religion die Stilisierung als Scheinphilosophie".

<sup>193</sup> The relevant material is collected by ROSCHER, s.v. Hecate.

<sup>194</sup> See ch. II, n. 82-121.

<sup>195</sup> H. USENER, *Götternamen*, ch. 20. The Chaldæans seem to have made no use of the means of transferring attributes of other gods to the principal god. Their statue of Hecate agrees in type with that which was familiar in their time.

served many priestly theologians or devout laymen for the extension of the domain of the divinity whom they worshipped. Close analogies to the practice of the Chaldæans are offered, *e. g.* by the interpretations of the insignia of the statues of the Magna Mater, of Serapis, Isis, Jupiter of Heliopolis and Apollo of Hierapolis<sup>196</sup>. Porphyry, in his works "On the statues of the gods" and "On the god of the sun"<sup>197</sup>, has collected the results of this art of interpretation<sup>198</sup>. So also the aged goddess of magic, Hecate, whose three-faced statue showed her connection with Kore (Persephone) and Artemis, assumed about the second century A. D. the character of an all-powerful goddess. She usurped the characteristics of Selene and Aphrodite and received in the hymns of the magical papyri the predicates: "Shaper of all things cosmic, Nature, Mother of all, Beginning and End, Ruler of all", etc.<sup>199</sup>. In the so-called Orphic hymns, the hymnbook of a sect then found in

<sup>196</sup> Magna Mater: JULIAN, *Orat.*, V; Serapis: MACROB., *Sat.*, I, 20, 16; cf. REITZENSTEIN-SCHAEFER, *Studien zum antiken Synkretismus* (Leipzig, 1926), 99; Isis: APULIUS, *Metam.*, XI, 2-5; PLUTARCH, *De Iside, passim*; Juppiter Heliopolitanus: CUMONT, *Relig. Orient'*, plate IX, 1; Apollo of Hierapolis: MACROB., *Sat.*, I, 17, 66 f.

A work attributed to Orpheus, of which only the title *ἱεροσολικά, κλήσεις κοσμικαί* (KERN, *Orph. Fragm.*, p. 300), has been preserved, contained probably cosmological interpretations of the *ornatus vestitusque* of Dionysus-Phanēs (cf. KERN, *Orph. Fragm.*, No. 238, see n. 198), as well as adjurations of this god by these attributes; cf. *P. Mag.*, IV, 1170, *κοσμικαῖς κλήζω λιταῖς* and ch. 1, n. 180 on the designation of the *voces mysticae* as *ὀνόματα θεῶν κοσμικά*.

<sup>197</sup> The fragments of Porphyry's *περὶ ἀγαλμάτων* were published, with an excellent commentary, by BIDEZ, *Vie de Porphyre*, Appendix I. Porphyry's monograph on the Sun-god is the basis of the account given by MACROB., *Sat.*, I, ch. 17-22.

<sup>198</sup> Closest to the symbolic interpretation of the Chaldæans is an Orphic poem (*Orph. Fragm.*, No. 238; probably quoted from the *ἱεροσολικά*, see n. 196), which contains instructions for the consecration (*τελετή*) of the statue of Dionysus-Phanes by robing it with *πέπλος* (= *ἀκτίνες*), *νεβρός* (= *ἄστρα*) and *ζωστήρ* (= *Ὠκεανός*). For the ritual (v. 1: *ἤρι* indicates the morning hour, appropriate to the worship of the sun-god) see the Oracles of Hecate quoted ch. 1, n. 56 and 160.

<sup>199</sup> *P. Mag.*, IV, 2553 (quoted by KROLL, 69): *σὺ τὰ κοσμικὰ πάντα τέθεικας. 2833: Φύσι παμμήτωρ* (Aphrodite, s. 2916) . . . *ἀρχὴ καὶ τέλος εἶ, πάντων δὲ σὺ μόνῃ ἀνάσσεις, ἐκ σέο γὰρ πάντ' ἐστὶ καὶ εἰς σ', αἰώνις, πάντα τελευτᾷ.*

Later Orphics called the moon *Φύσιν διέκρων* (*Fragm. Orphic.*, 274, Kern).

Asia Minor, she is invoked as the first goddess of the pantheon. Here we encounter also the symbolic interpretation of one of her attributes : the key which she holds in her hands is interpreted as the emblem of her office as guard of the universe<sup>200</sup>. In Asia Minor, where her cult enjoyed particular respect, she was received by the worshippers of Mithra<sup>201</sup>. In an oracle cited by Porphyry in his "Philosophy of the Oracles"—an oracle which has the closest external resemblance to the Chaldæan Oracles of Hecate—she presents herself to the conjuring magician as mistress over the zones of ether, heaven and earth<sup>202</sup>. In the formula of a magical oath, the three faces of the statue of Hecate are identified with the three Fates<sup>203</sup>, and in another magical incantation

<sup>200</sup> *Hymn. Orph.*, I, 6 : πάντες κόσμου κλειδοῦχον ἀναστυν. See P. W., s. v. Hecate, 2773.

<sup>201</sup> The explanation given by FIRM. MATERN., *De errore prof. rel.*, c. 5, p. 12, 6 f. 13, 1 f., that the three faces of the Mithraic statue of Hecate represent Athene, Artemis and Aphrodite and symbolize the three parts of the soul *ira mens libido*, goes back to Neoplatonic interpretation, as CUMONT, *Die Mysterien des Mithra* (1923), p. 102, 3, rightly remarked in contradicting ZIEGLER, *Arch. f. Religionswissenschaft*, XIII (1910), 247 f. It can be shown that Firmicus' source was Porphyry's "Philosophy of the Oracles", which he cites several times and uses yet more often without citation. Porphyry explains there (cf. p. 122 f., Wolff) likewise, in connection with the Oracle of Hecate quoted above ch. 1, n. 152, that the triple face of the statue refers to the trichotomy of the soul (according to PLATO, *Tim.*, 69 c f.). The passages of Proclus quoted by Ziegler depend on Porphyry. As for the alleged triad Ἐκάτη-ψυχή-ἀρετή see ch. II, n. 65 and 82. Consequently, Firmicus' interpretation of Hecate as Psyche does not derive from the tradition of Mithraists, but from Porphyry, who took it from the Chaldæan Oracles. See Excursus II, n. 26.

<sup>202</sup> PORPH., *De philos. orac.*, 151, Wolff (EUSEB., *Praep. Evang.*, IV, 23, 7). In HESIOD, *Theog.*, 413 f., 427, and in *Hymn. Orph.*, I, 2, Hecate is the mistress of the air, the water and the earth; by others (see P. W., s. v. Hecate, 2782) she is described as mistress of the heaven, the earth and the netherworld. The Chaldæans (see ch. v, n. 41) subordinate to her the demons of the air, the earth and the water.

<sup>203</sup> Alchemistic Isis-document, quoted by SCOTT-FERGUSON, *Hermetica*, IV, 148 : ὀρνίθω σε εἰς τὰς τρεῖς ἀνάγκας καὶ μίσσηγας καὶ εἶφος. Since the scourge and the sword are symbols of Hecate (see ch. II, n. 96), the three faces viz. figures of the statue of Hecate must be meant by the three ἀνάγκαι. The three Fates

“Three-faced Selene” is explained as “Clotho, Lachesis and Atropos”, the “thread of the Fates”, and predicated as Ananke and “inescapable Moira”<sup>204</sup>.

Hecate’s rise to the position of an universal goddess made her identification with a supramundane power understandable. However, there is no evidence for her association with the Cosmic Soul before the time of the Chaldæans<sup>205</sup>, and the silence of the tradition should be looked upon as a proof that the Chaldæans themselves first carried through this identification. Internal evidence also argues in favour of this supposition. The Cosmic Soul is a metaphysical, not a mythical, concept, and wherever it is found in ancient theology, there is to be presupposed some influence—however mediated—of Plato<sup>206</sup>. Now nothing is known of an association of Platonic metaphysics with any sort of religious, magical or cosmological notions related to Hecate, before the time of the Chaldæans. Consequently these may be considered as the creators of this synthesis.

The reason for this identification is to be found in the inner relationship between the concept of the nature of Hecate current in later antiquity and the meaning of the metaphysical hypostasis in the thoughts

---

are interpreted by ps.-PLUTARCH, *De fato*, 2, 568 E, as the three domains of the Cosmic Soul *qua* Heimarmene. It seems therefore that the Stoic interpretation of Hecate as Heimarmene (*St. V. F.*, II, No. 930 = *Schol.*, HESIOD., *Theog.*, 411) : *διὰ τὸ ἐκάστου προνοεῖσθαι τῶν γὰρ ἐν γῆ καὶ ἐν θαλάσῃ πάντων ἔχει τὴν ἐξουσίαν* [cf. HESIOD., *Theog.*, 413] *ἢ εἰμαρμένη· ὡς γὰρ θεᾶ πάντες εὐχονται τῇ Μοίρᾳ*) is more than an etymological pun.

<sup>204</sup> *P. Mag.*, IV, 795 : *νήματα Μοιρῶν, Κλωθὴ καὶ Λάχσις ἠδ’ Ἄτροπος εἰ. 2858 : σὺ γὰρ δυσάλυκτος Ἀνάγκη, Μοῖρα δ’ ἔφες.*

<sup>205</sup> The attempt of REITZENSTEIN, *Die Göttin Psyche*, Sitzungsberichte, Heidelberg, 1917, to prove the existence of an Iranian doctrine of the Cosmic Soul, cannot be regarded as successful. The Chaldæan Oracles, which form one of the principal supports of his hypothesis, must be left out of account, since they depend on Plato, to whose doctrine even that of Mani concerning the Cosmic Soul finally goes back; cf. the study of BOUSSER quoted n. 161.

<sup>206</sup> Plotinus reports that the Gnostics conjured the Cosmic Soul (*Enn.*, II, 9, 14 : *ὅταν γὰρ ἐπαοιδᾶς γράφωσιν... πρὸς... τὴν ψυχὴν*). Unfortunately, neither he nor the Christian critics of Gnosticism have explained this statement.

of contemporary Platonists. Hecate, princess of the demons, commands the dark powers which enslave the corporeal existence of men, and extends her dominion over all natures, which their fear of the demons had given up to her. The concept—associated with Hecate—of demonic fate, found its metaphysical equivalent in the concept of the Cosmic Soul current in Middle Platonism. Psyche causes the fatal compulsion which rules the world and man; she represents all-powerful Destiny, in the reverence of which all the pagan religions of this time found themselves in accord. The Cosmic Soul of the Platonists is, however, not only the ruler of destiny, but also the redeemer from its rule. Turned alike towards the sensible and towards the noetic realm, she personifies not only the compulsion of natural existence, but also the freedom of the mind. So she became, for the Platonists, the prototype of the need of men, and of their salvation. In this ambivalence of the metaphysical potency should be sought the real ground of her identification with the highest goddess of the Theurgists, and the key to the understanding of her character. Hecate, the pure, undivided life in the sphere of the divine, the motive power behind intramundane fate and ordainer of demonic servitude, personifies the essential thoughts of the soteriology of later antiquity: the dogma of the divine origin of the human soul, its fall and entanglement, its return and redemption. The Chaldæan Hecate encountered the human souls in forms always adequate to their internal conditions: for those sunk in the body she was necessity; for the erring, demonic temptation; for the renegade, a curse; for those who recalled their divine nature, a guide; and for those who returned home, grace. This companionship during all phases of the existence of the human soul was at the same time self-encountering of the universal soul with her parts. She herself fell and cast down others, strayed and lead astray, was judged and was judge, and, in the individual soul, she redeemed herself. Her capacity to sympathize with all individual needs, without herself abandoning the norm of perfect existence, aroused between her and her worshippers a sympathy in which a genuine feeling of personal religion found expression. It seems that Proclus describes accurately the character, as a saviour, of the Chaldæan goddess of souls, when in his hymn to Hecate and Janus, the two

divinities watching over the ways of mankind, he prays : "Draw the soul, which rages over the earth, on high, after it have purified itself in initiations which awaken the mind. Teach me, in my longing, the path which God has made known. I would behold the venerable light from whence it is possible to escape the dark evil of birth. Reach forth, I pray, your hands and bear me, who am weary, upon your wings to the harbour of piety" <sup>207</sup>.

10. *The cognition of the noetic beings.*—The Chaldæan Oracles which speak of the knowledge of the intelligible world transport us into the pure atmosphere of later Platonic thought <sup>208</sup>. This is especially true of that Oracle, unusually rich in content, which replies to the question as to the nature of this knowledge <sup>209</sup>, and which may be described as a classic witness to the transcendental philosophy of later antiquity. Treated from a historical point of view, the testimonies of this group reflect thoughts which were developed by the Platonists of the first and second centuries and then, by Plotinus, brought into harmony with the principles of his doctrine of the Absolute.

The main Oracle of this group explains that the Highest Being is no object subdue to qualification ( $\tau\iota$ ); and exhorts him who would know it to turn away his organ of thought, the "eye of the soul", from every object, in order that after its "emptying" he may stretch it forth without mediation toward the supreme noetic goal. The theory of intui-

---

<sup>207</sup> PROCL., *Hymn.*, VI, 6 f. The cult of Ianus-Hecate to which this hymn of Proclus refers is unknown (cf. LYDUS, *Mens.*, IV, 2, p. 65, 11 f. and IV, 58, p. 113, 5 f.). Cf. also the fine description of CHALCIDIUS, *In Plat. Tim.*, 53 : "Haec est illa rationabilis anima mundi, quae gemina iuxta meliorem naturam veneratione tutelam praebet inferioribus, divinis dispositionibus obsequens, providentiam nativis impertiens, aeternorum similitudine propter cognationem beata, dissolubiliū rerum auxiliatrix et patrona, cuius in consulendo ratiocinandoque virtutis in moribus hominis apparent insignia, qui cultor eximius dei diligentiam mansuetis impertit animalibus". PLATO, *Leges*, 896 e, 8 ff. We may also recall Plotinus' famous description of the Cosmic soul as the sister of the human (*Enn.*, II, 9, 18; IV, 3, 6).

<sup>208</sup> See ch. II, sect. 15.

<sup>209</sup> Quoted ch. II, n. 373.



tive knowledge developed in this Oracle depends on the Middle-Platonic axiom that the Supreme Principle is without accidents, and consequently allows itself to be grasped only by way of abstraction<sup>210</sup>. Close to the Chaldæans in the representation of this so-called negative theology comes Plotinus<sup>211</sup>. He explains that man cannot conceive the primal being, as he can the other objects of thought, by way of mere thinking, but only by means of a presence which is of a higher sort than knowledge; for whatever knowledge conceives, is a concept and a concept is a plurality, whereas the primal being is not any particular thing ( $\tau\iota$ ), since it is neither a qualitative nor a quantitative entity. Therefore that soul which strives towards the primal Being, must not only "lead itself upwards" from sensible objects, but must also rise above knowledge. Only when it have cleansed itself from all outer things and have entrusted itself to the conduct of its intellect may it, with the purified and superior power of its (this) intellect ( $\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \nu\omicron\upsilon\ \tau\eta\acute{\iota}\ \pi\rho\acute{\omega}\tau\eta$ ) behold the pure One.

Plotinus and the Chaldæans agree throughout that the highest goal of all thoughts possesses no accidents; it is therefore exalted not only above all sensible observation, but also above any discursive thought, and can be grasped only in immediate contemplation freed of all thought-content.

As against this the two systems differ a) in the representation of the process of knowledge and b) in the description of the goal of thought.

a) Both Plotinus and the Chaldæans explain that the soul must turn away from all outer things. However, the contrary to these outer things is called by the Chaldæans that "above", by Plotinus, that

<sup>210</sup> The earliest witnesses for the so-called negative theology, after Philo, are ALBINUS, 165, 4-17 ( $\nu\acute{\omicron}\eta\sigma\iota\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\tau'\ \acute{\alpha}\phi\alpha\iota\rho\epsilon\sigma\iota\omega$ ); cf. PRAECHTER, 602; CELSUS *ap. ORIG.*, VII, 42 ( $\pi\rho\acute{\omega}\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \epsilon\pi\iota\nu\omicron\iota\alpha\upsilon\ \dots\ \acute{\iota}\nu\alpha\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\epsilon\iota\ \acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\ \tau\acute{\omega}\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omega\upsilon$ ); MAX. TYR., XI, 11 e; CLEM. ALEX., *Strom.*, V, 11; 71, 2 and 12; 81, 5 f. (who mingles the doctrines of contemporary Platonists with those of Philo). See R. E. WITT, *The Hellenism of Clement of Alexandria*, *Class. Quart.*, XXV (1931), 197; IDEM, *Albinus*, 132 f.

<sup>211</sup> PLOTINUS, VI, 9, 3-7. For other parallels see ZELLEN, III, 2, p. 668 f.

“within”<sup>212</sup>. The latter describes the “ascent” to the contemplation of Being as introvertive progress; the Chaldæans on the contrary, as real elevation in mundane space. The vision of Plotinus is accomplished by means of step-by-step assimilation of the organ knowing to the object which is to be known, with which at the final stage it is blent into a higher unity; while the vision of the Chaldæans is obtained by the immediate self-outstretching of the organ of knowledge in the direction of the goal of thought, and its subsequent reception of the divine light issuing from this object. Their knowledge of God is, therefore, no self-perfection of the inner condition of their mind, but an illumination transmitted from without<sup>213</sup>.

b) The object of the supreme vision is, according to the Chaldæans, the Intellect of the First Being; according to Plotinus, the First Being Himself. The divergence is a matter less of the names given than of the concepts associated with the names. The Chaldæans indeed make the personality of this Supreme Being transcendent beyond all possibility of being attained by reason, and give over His efficacy to His Intellect, which thereby becomes not only the subject of all divine action, but also the object of all sublimest thought; nevertheless, they often explain that this First Intellect is identical with the Supreme Being<sup>214</sup>. From this fluctuation it is clear that they could attribute to the First Intellect predicates (such as freedom from qualification and exaltation beyond all discursive comprehensibility) which Plotinus ascribed to the Supreme Being. The first and second principles of Plotinus are consequently, for the Chaldæans, during the act of knowledge, coincident<sup>215</sup>.

<sup>212</sup> PLOTINUS, VI, 9, 2 and 7: πάντων τῶν ἔξω ἀφόμενον δεῖ ἐπιστραφῆναι πρὸς τὸ εἶσω πάντη (thus already MAX. TYR., X, 3 a; XI, 10 b, see DODDS, 218; WITT, 203), μὴ πρὸς τι τῶν ἔξω κεκλισθαι. ZELLER, III, 2, 672, 1-2. See DODDS, Introduction p. XIX.

<sup>213</sup> We may note the difference between the exhortation of PLOTINUS, I, 6, 9: ἀπεισας ἴδε and that of the Oracles (ch. II, n. 373, v. 7 f.): χρεὼ δὴ τοῦτο νοῆσαι οὐκ ἀπειῶς.

<sup>214</sup> See n. 36. PSELLUS, *Comm.*, 1147 D, explains the νοητόν, described in the chief oracle of this group, as ὁ Θεός, τὸ πρῶτον νοητόν, and DAM., II, 16, 18, reports that the Oracles called the “Father” νοητόν. See n. 36.

<sup>215</sup> We need not here mention other profound differences, as to the knowledge

Nearer in many ways to the Chaldæan theory of the intuitive knowledge of God is that of Philo. He also begins from the position that God's freedom from qualification makes the "direct and straight vision" of Him impossible, for by any such vision His qualitative character would be indicated;<sup>216</sup> and he concludes from this that the human intellect cannot grasp God's nature, but only his existence and even this only by means of the Ideas, which are the thoughts of the primal divine power<sup>217</sup>. Just so do the Chaldæans define the highest noetic

---

of the Primal Being, between the system of the Chaldæans and that of Plotinus, for these do not immediately concern the question of the origin of the Chaldæan theology. However, it is certain that Plotinus' doctrine of the One developed on the basis of a mystical theory of knowledge reflected by the Chaldæans. Plotinus restored to knowability the transcendent Primal Being (which for the previous Platonists had threatened to disappear in the "cloud of unknowing") by transcendentalizing intellection. His doctrine of the union of the soul with the One prevailed—historically considered—over that excessive spirituality which, precisely in the Chaldæan Oracles, expressed itself so clearly, and to which the future belonged.

<sup>216</sup> PHILO, *Posterit. Cain.*, 169 : ἀκατάληπτός γε ἐκ τῆς ἀντικρὺς καὶ κατ' ἐὸθῦ Ψευρίαν προσβολῆς, etc.

<sup>217</sup> BRÉHIER, *Les idées philosophiques... de Philon*, 198 ff. Cf. e. g. PHILO, *Opif. mund.*, 71 ; *Posterit. Cain.*, 14 f., 167 f. ; *Mut. nom.*, 4 ff. ; *Leg. Spec.*, I, 37-50 ; *Praem.* 37 f. ; *Quaest. Gen.*, IV, 1 and 4 ; *Quaest. Exod.*, II, 67 (cf. HARRIS, *Fragmenta of Philo*, 66) ; and the extensive fragment of *Quaest. Exod.*, printed by HARRIS, 73 f. In *Leg. Spec.*, II, 165, Philo appeals to the Pythagoreans (τὰ περὶ τὰ μαθημάτων καὶ τὴν ἄλλην φιλοσοφίαν ; cf. 177 : οἱ ἀπὸ τῶν μαθημάτων). The primal divine Power is the Logos, the sum of the ideas, which, accordingly, corresponds to the First Intellect of the Chaldæans (and to Plotinus' second hypostasis ; see n. 135). In place of the Logos is found also the syzygy of the Creative and the Ruling Powers (see n. 143), which are subjected to the Logos as primal ideas. This speculation on the Logos is behind the Christian Alexandrians, when they make the "Son" a revelation of the Father who is exalted above all knowledge ; cf. CLERM. ALEX., *Strom.*, V, 11 ; 71, 5 with PHILO, *Posterit. Cain.*, 16.

In Philo's writings, the supra-rational concept is mixed with pneumatic and ecstatic concepts : the purified *Nous* is filled by the divine pneuma or goes outside the body in order to make room for the presence of the divine pneuma. Intellectual cognition can be entirely dispensed with, if God by His own action reveal Himself, in causing the vision of Himself (i. e. of His Ideas) to stream into the

object of thoughts as the Supreme Intellect which "flashes with noetic divisions" (*i. e.* Ideas) <sup>218</sup>. Thus all statements of Philo's and of the Chaldæans are related, even when it is not expressly said so, to the vision of the Ideas. They are the limit and goal of human knowledge of the divine essence <sup>219</sup>. Just so do both systems agree throughout in their representations of the process of knowledge. According to Philo the knowledge of the Supreme Being is accomplished when the organ of thought (which here again is described with the Platonic metaphor the "eye of the soul") <sup>220</sup>, having been purified from all sensible accretions, "stretches" itself toward the goal <sup>221</sup> and is illuminated by the light of the Ideas <sup>222</sup>. On the act of out-stretching the rays of the soul follows a reaction of the intended object of thought, during which the organ of thought remains passive. Also the Chaldæan Oracles explain that when the knowing "stretches out" the "flower of his intellect" towards the divine, this sends down its light and fills the soul with itself <sup>223</sup>.

A presupposition of this union is the organic relation of the organ knowing with the object known. The "eye of the soul" is a part of the Primal Intellect, which is mixed in with the substances of the human soul. When this is purified from all foreign components, the man

soul. Personal experience of the superiority of this "knowledge", in which the soul (or her rational part, the *Nous*) became a mere receptive organ, convinced Philo of the fact that self-effacement of the human mind is a precondition of the union with the divine. Cf. *Migr. Abrah.*, 31 f.

<sup>218</sup> See ch. II, n. 373, v. 4.

<sup>219</sup> Plotinus seems to refer to this view when he explains (VI, 9, 5), that the One which thrones over the Being is to be known but with difficulty and therefore easier conceived by the *Nous* generated by the One.

<sup>220</sup> See ch. II, n. 385. PHILO, *Migr. Abr.*, 191 : τὸ ψυχῆς ὄμμα, ᾧ νοητὰ βλέπειν ἔδωκεν ὁ Θεός; *Conf. ling.*, 92; *Mut. nom.*, 3, etc. The Platonic metaphor τὸ ψυχῆς ὄμμα frequently interchanges with τὸ τῆς διανοίας ὄμμα viz. ὀφθαλμός.

<sup>221</sup> See ch. II, n. 373, v. 10; 386; 387 and PHILO, *De provid.*, ap. EUSEB., *Praep. Evang.*, VIII, 14, 9 : τὸ τῆς ψυχῆς ὄμμα τείνας; *Ebriet.*, 106; *De Abrah.*, 58; *Leg. Spec.*, III, 2.

<sup>222</sup> PHILO, *Somn.*, I, 112, 115; *Ebriet.*, 44; *Mut. nom.*, 6; *De Abrah.*, 119; *De Virt.*, 164; *Vit. Cont.*, 27; *Quaest. Gen.*, IV, 1 and 4.

<sup>223</sup> See ch. II, n. 373, v. 10-11.

receives the capacity—as Plotinus says—“by virtue of the similarity of the nature of this substance, and by means of the power dwelling within it, which is related to that divine being and derives from it (supposed that this inner power be in the condition in which it was when it proceeded forth from God) to behold the divine in such wise as it, according to its nature, is visible”<sup>224</sup>. The Chaldæans refer to this organic relationship by the metaphor “flower of the intellect” or “subtle flame of the intellect”, both of which designate the noetic, “empyrean”, substance of the organ of thought<sup>225</sup>. The sentence of the Platonists—so often cited in this connection<sup>226</sup>—about the like which is known by the like, forms thus the basis of the Chaldæan theory of the organic sympathy of the human soul with the divine.

Philo, the Chaldæans and Plotinus<sup>227</sup> base their theories of intuitive knowledge on the description which Plato gives, in the sixth and seventh books of the *Republic*, of the vision of the noetic essence. Plato there represents the primal divine nature by the image of a light which “exalted in nobleness and power above the Being”<sup>228</sup> beams out its

<sup>224</sup> PLOTINUS, VI, 9, 4.

<sup>225</sup> See ch. II, n. 383, 384. On Proclus' elaboration of the doctrine of *ánthos vou* see Excursus IV, n. 9.

<sup>226</sup> With reference to PLATO, *Tim.*, 37 b, the Pythagorean sentence (DIELS, *Vors.*, 32 a, 29; cf. 21 B, 109) : τῷ ὁμοίῳ τὸ ὁμοίον γνωρίζεται is cited as the fundamental proposition of the Platonic theory of knowledge by ARISTOTLE, *De anima*, A 404 b, 16. ALBINUS, 169, 24, MAX. TYR., XI, 9 d, PLOTINUS, I, 6, 9, PORPH., *Sent.*, 25, p. 11, 6, IAMBlichus, *De comm. math. scient.*, c. 8, p. 36, 7, 38, 6 and by Proclus (see the passages collected by KOCH, 153, 162). For other (non-Platonic) parallels see DIETERICH, *Mithrasliturgie*, 55-57.

<sup>227</sup> A similar sympathetic doctrine of the knowledge of the noetic God is represented by the Hermetics. They also appeal to the fundamental proposition of the identity of the substance of the knowing organ (the “eyes of the Intellect” or the “eyes of the heart”) with that of the object of knowledge, the divine *Nous* (see *Corp. Herm.*, XI, 20). The organ of thought which “stretches itself out towards” (*Corp. Herm.*, I, 31) this goal, is inflamed by the beams of light which issue thence (*Corp. Herm.*, V, 2; X, 4 and 6; XII, 3; XIII, 18). That the Hermetic metaphysics of light had taken in many elements of Platonic doctrine, is known.

<sup>228</sup> PLATO, *Rep.*, 509 b, 9, see n. 54.

brilliance over all things and lends the intellect in the soul the power to know it. This "eye" of the human soul is, however, first able, after it has cleansed itself from sensible perceptions, "to incline its own beam of light upwards" and to gaze immediately on the primal light, which appears to it "last of all, and is seen only with an effort"<sup>229</sup>.

These explanations of Plato form the basic text, into which later thinkers<sup>230</sup> read their doctrine of the suprarational knowledge of the divine<sup>231</sup>. From the large number of variants, we may once again treat those which concern the real process of the knowing. According to Plato and Plotinus the eye of the soul beholds the primal light by its own effort, after it have purified itself from sensible components and concentrated in the vision. If Plotinus (V. 3, 17) says that the eye of the soul "suddenly grasps light", he does not thereby mean that the primal light reveals itself to the visionary by coming to him from outside (for it shines perpetually and does not alter its nature, but that it eventually becomes visible to him in its undimmed beam after the course of a long attention during which the sensible veils loose themselves gradually from his inner eye. Also the Chaldæans and Philo believe that the inner eye can direct its vision to the primal light only after cleansing and concentration; however they believe this light to be visible finally not by reason of the vision of the thinker, but by reason of the forthstreaming activity of this light's brilliance. The man seeing

<sup>229</sup> PLATO, *Rep.*, 517 b, 8 : ἐν τῷ γνωσθῆι τελευταία ἡ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ ἰδέα καὶ μόνη ὁραῖσθαι. *Rep.*, 540 a, 7 f.

<sup>230</sup> Of the Middle Platonists, MAX. TYR., XI, 9 d and CELSUS *ap. ORIG.*, VII, 45, reproduce the Platonic doctrine of the knowledge of the divine without any transformation. The most detailed extant interpretation of PLATO, *Rep.*, 507-511 is that of PROCL., *Rp.*, I, 269-287 titled περὶ τοῦ ἐν Πολιτείᾳ λόγου τοῦ δεικνύοντος, τι ποτε ἐστὶν ἀγαθόν.

<sup>231</sup> The Platonic stylistic model of the Chaldæans can still be clearly glimpsed in the syntactical structure of the first three verses of the Oracle quoted ch. II, n. 372. Cf. PLATO, *Rep.*, 529 b, 5 (concerning the astronomers) εἰν τέ τις ἄνω κερηνῶς τῶν αἰσθητῶν τι ἐπιχειρῆ μαθάνειν, οὔτε μαθεῖν ἂν ποτέ φημι αὐτόν. . . (the verb μάθησ, used in the Oracle v. 11, derives from PLATO, *Rep.*, 505 a, 2). See also NUMENIUS, p. 131, 15 f.; PLOTINUS, I, 6, 9 : εἰν δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν θεάν. . . οὐ κεκαθαμένος. . . , οὐδὲν βλέπει.

apprehends the light by being illuminated by it. He receives it in order to behold it. It is, therefore, a gift of God, which is granted. Knowledge becomes revelation, *θεωρία, γνώσις*.

This mystical theory of knowledge developed a terminology which extended the Platonic metaphors in peculiar way. Thus there is found the metaphor of the "stretching out" of the eye of the soul; not, indeed in Plato, but (apart from the Chaldæans) in Philo, the Hermetics, Valentinus, Celsus and Plotinus—a characteristic list of the representatives of this metaphysical spiritualism<sup>232</sup>. The description of thinking of the highest object of thought as oblique "self-inclination" was perhaps coined by the Chaldæans as a figure answering to the Platonic metaphor of straight "turning upwards" of the rays of the soul during the supreme vision<sup>233</sup>; the same Platonic metaphor is again imitated by the Chaldæan description of the sight of the eye of the soul as "unbent beams"<sup>234</sup>. Of strictly mystical character is the Chaldæan metaphor of "stretching all eyes upward"<sup>235</sup>. The hyperbole is intended, as often in the Oracles, to hinder the formation of any concrete association. Plutarch already plays upon it when he call the eye of the soul a possession "which is equivalent to innumerable eyes"<sup>236</sup>. Later Platonists recall the same paradox in more pointed form when they report that Plato remarked after his "discovery of the ideas" that

<sup>232</sup> *τείνειν νοῦν* : see the Oracles quoted ch. II, n. 373, v. 10; 386. For Philo cf. the passages quoted n. 221, for the Hermetics n. 227. VALENTINUS *ap. CLEM., Eclog. proph.*, 10, 1; CELSUS *ap. ORIG.*, VIII, 63; PLOTINUS, V, 1, 6. Cf. also HIEROCLES, *Carm. Aur.*, p. 208, 6 f., Needham; PROCL., *Alc.*, 398, 2 f.

<sup>233</sup> Cf. « ἦν γὰρ ἐπεγκλίτης σὸν νοῦν » (quoted ch. II, n. 373, v. 2) with PLATO, *Rep.*, 540 a, 7 : *ἀνακλιναντες τὴν τῆς ψυχῆς αὐγὴν*. This passage is explained by PROCL., *Rp.*, I, 280, 26 f. as referring to *ἄνωτος νοῦ*, the supra-rational organ of thought (see n. 225).

<sup>234</sup> Cf. « ἀκλινέας αὐγὰς » (see ch. II, n. 403, v. 2) with PHILO, *Quaest. Exod. (Fragments of Philo)*, p. 72, HARRIS : *ιδρύοντα πηλῶς (= ἀκλινῶς) γνώμη μιξ.* MAX. TYR., XI, 10 a : *ὀρθῇ τῇ ψυχῇ. Corp. Herm.*, XIII, 11 : *ἀκλινῆς γενόμενος*.

<sup>235</sup> « ὄμματα πάντα ἄρδην ἐκπέτασον ἄνω », see ch. II, n. 388.

<sup>236</sup> PLUTARCH, *Quaest. Conv.*, VIII, 2, 1, 5, 718 D, alluding to PLATO, *Rep.*, 527 e, 2, who designates this supreme organ of the soul as *κρείττον ὃν σωθῆναι μωρίων ὀμμάτων*. Cf. also ORIGEN., *C. Cels.*, VII, 39 : *τὰ περὶ διττῶν ὀφθαλμῶν*.

he had three eyes<sup>237</sup>. It is Philo who again comes closest to the Chaldæans. He interprets the Biblical verses (*Gen.*, XVIII. 2) : Abraham lifted up his eyes to the angels" (who symbolize the divine Powers) as referring to the spiritual eyes of the wise : "The Scripture says beautifully that Abraham lifted up not one eye, but *all* the eyes of his mind, so that one could say he had become altogether eyes"<sup>238</sup>. As the Chaldæans, so Philo also demands that these mental eyes "be fully opened", "stretched out" and that with them one gaze "straight" into the noetic essence<sup>239</sup>.

We may treat more briefly the Chaldæan concepts which represent the union with the noetic light as the soul's spatial approach to it. The Chaldæans speak of "approaching", "touching" and "resting in" it<sup>240</sup>. All three metaphors are found again, with similar functions, in Plotinus, Porphyry and Iamblichus<sup>241</sup>; they therefore belong also to

<sup>237</sup> OLYMPIODOR., *Phaed.*, 32, 22; *Proleg. ad Plat. philos.*, p. 201, 18 f., ed. Hermann (see n. 29) : the "third eye" is the *ὄμμα ψυχῆς*. SYNESIUS, *De Provid.*, 9, 1228 C, explains that during the contemplation of the mysteries the bodily eyes have to be closed in order that the higher may be opened; cf. PLOTINUS, I, 6, 8-9.

<sup>238</sup> PHILO, *Quaest. Gen.*, IV, 2 (p. 243, Aucher).

<sup>239</sup> «ὄμματὰ πάντα ἀρῆν ἐκπέτασον ἄνω», see ch. II, n. 388. Cf. PHILO, *Plant.* 58 : τῷ διανοίας ὄμματι . . . αἰεὶ ἀναπεπταμένῳ καὶ εὐθιυτενῶς βλέποντι; *ibid.*, 169; *Sobrietas.*, 3 : τὸ ψυχῆς ὄμμα ὄλον ἰσχύσαι δι' ὄλων (cf. «ἀρῆν») διοιχθῆνα; *Cogn. Herm.*, X, 5 : ἀναπετάσαι ἡμῶν τοὺς τοῦ νοῦ ὀφθαλμούς.

<sup>240</sup> «ἐμπελάσας» : ch. II, n. 406; «ἀψάμενος» : ch. II, n. 407; «κεῖνται» (ἐν Θεῷ) : ch. III, n. 84.

<sup>241</sup> ἐμπελάσας : cf. PLOTINUS, V, 1, 5 : πελάσασα οὖν (ἢ ψυχῆ) αὐτῷ (τῷ Θεῷ) καὶ ὄλον ἐν γενομένη (cf. VI, 7, 22); in accordance with him, PORPHYR., *Vit. Plot.*, 23 (paraphrasing the oracle of Apollo on Plotinus) : τέλος γὰρ αὐτῷ καὶ σκοπὸς ἦν τὸ ἐνωθῆναι καὶ πελάσαι τῷ ἐπὶ πᾶσι Θεῷ. IAMBlichus, *ap. Procl.*, *Tim.*, I, 211, 20 f., quotes the relevant line from the Chaldæan Oracles (see ch. II, n. 406) and designates with ἐμπελάσις the fourth grade of prayer; IDEM, *De comm. math. scient.*, c. 8, p. 33, 22. On Iamblichus is dependent PROCL., *Parm.*, 669, 32.

ἀψάμενος : (borrowed from PLATO, *Conv.*, 211 b, 7 : ἄποστε τοῦ τέλους; 212 a, 5 : τοῦ ἀληθοῦς ἐφακτομένῳ, cf. also *Rep.*, 511 b, 7) PLOTINUS, VI, 9, 7 : τῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐπαφῇ, et passim. For Clement see WITT (quoted n. 211), p. 202, 11;



the mystical terminology transmitted to them by Middle Platonism. We have already spoken of the form of representation, fundamental to the Chaldæan Oracles, of the ascent of the soul to the supreme vision<sup>242</sup>. It derives from Plato's *Phaedrus*, *Phaedo*, and above all from the parts of the *Republic* cited above, where it is developed by the comparison of the visionary to a cave-dweller who comes up to the light of the sun<sup>243</sup>. Plotinus interprets the Platonic metaphor of ascent as a metonymous reference to an introversive process, whereas the Chaldæans regard the stations of the real journey of the soul at the same time as phases of mystical transformation. It is possible that for their sacrament of immortality they choose the term "Elevation" (*ἀναγωγή*) with Plato in mind. Herein also they represent themselves as fulfilers of the Platonic heritage, since they reveal the universally effective method for attaining the supreme vision which the philosopher had revealed only to a chosen few<sup>244</sup>.

11. *Hyle, Hades and the Demons*.— A principle theme of the Chaldæan Oracles is formed by speculations concerning matter<sup>245</sup>. Since this is bound up with cosmogonic speculation, the question of the sources of the few fragments concerned has first to be briefly discussed. As Plato, so also the Chaldæans explain that matter is created, but eternal<sup>246</sup>. In the same way, their explanation that the lightning-like Ideas in their action of shaping the cosmos "break" themselves

---

ORIGEN., *C. Cels.*, VII, 4 : ἀφή τοῦ πνεύματος. PLOTINUS, IV, 3, 10 and VI, 9, 4 uses ἀφή and ἐφαπτεσθαι (like PLUTARCH, *De Iside*, 77, 382 D) as synonymous with εἰργάνω. The latter expression was first used by ARISTOTLE, *Metaph.*, 1051 b, 24-25; 1072 b, 21. On συναφή in Iamblichus' writings see Nock, *Sallustius concerning the gods*, p. xcviij, n. 4-5. For later parallels see Koch, 173.

κείναι : PLOTINUS, IV, 8, 1 : ἐν αὐτῷ (τῷ θεῷ) ἰδρυθεῖς; VI, 9, 9 : ἐν μόνῳ σῆμαι τούτῳ. Other parallels ch. III, n. 86.

<sup>242</sup> See ch. II, sect. 15.

<sup>243</sup> See Excursus VIII.

<sup>244</sup> See ch. III, n. 117 and Excursus II, n. 18.

<sup>245</sup> See ch. V, sect. 3-4.

<sup>246</sup> See ch. II, n. 198 and Excursus II, n. 6 and 22.

upon matter<sup>247</sup>, answers to the Platonic theory concerning the reciprocal relationship of the two principles. The formative Ideas cannot altogether conquer the anarchy of matter. Thus the latter, even after its formation, maintains the remainders of those negative qualities which form the eternal obstacle to the realization of the good. The insufficiencies of the formative ideas are explained, on the other side, by the fact that their power of "illuminating" becomes weaker with the increase of their distance from the primal noetic light. "The lightning which leaps into the cavities of the worlds "dims the flower of Fire"<sup>248</sup>. This law of the diminishing powers of the Ideas—a law on which not only the cosmology of the Chaldæans, but that of all later Platonists including Plotinus rests<sup>249</sup>—forms the necessary complement to the doctrine of the divine Powers which rule the world, inasmuch as it establishes the limits of the divine efficacy and therewith explains the deficiencies of the "hylic world", *i. e.* the sublunar zone where the material principle prevails.

The origin of the other cosmogonic theories mentioned in the few preserved fragments of the Chaldæan Oracles can easily be fixed. The differentiation of the three world-zones : the intelligible ("empyrean"), ethereal and sublunar ("hylic"), is a common view of later Platonism<sup>250</sup>. On the other hand, the doctrines of the four elements from which the sensible world is composed, of the fire which makes the cosmic body visible and tangible<sup>251</sup>, of the seven firmaments and of the zone of the

<sup>247</sup> See ch. II, n. 177, v. 10 and n. 229.

<sup>248</sup> See ch. II, n. 228.

<sup>249</sup> ZELLER, III, 2, p. 556 f.; PLOTINUS, VI, 9, 9 : τὸ πόρρω εἶναι . . . καὶ ἕττω εἶναι. AMELIUS *ap.* PROCL., *Rp.*, I, 306, 9 f. (ZELLER, 690, 1). PHILO, *Opif. mund.*, 91 explains that the noetic light is the source of the light of the stars, but its pure radiance is dimmed (*ἀμαυρουμένης*) upon its entering the sensible world.

<sup>250</sup> The differentiation between the noetic and the sensible world needs no attestation. The division of the latter into the ethereal (astral) and sublunar world derives from the early works of Aristotle and was adopted by Plato's other pupils. The triple partition of the Chaldæans is presupposed, *e. g.*, by PHILO, *Opif. mund.*, 70-71 and *Congr. erud. causa*, 104-105. Cf. also LYDUS, *Mens.*, II, 8, p. 28, 10 f.

<sup>251</sup> Cf. ch. II, n. 202, 205-206, and the texts quoted there.

fixed stars and its movement <sup>252</sup>—all, again, are derived from the *Timæus* of Plato. The division of the sublunar world given in one of the prose compositions of the Chaldæans agrees almost word for word with that given by Albinus <sup>253</sup>—a further pointer to the dependence of the Chaldæans on Middle Platonic school tradition.

Thus there remains only the explanation of the Chaldæan doctrine as to the nature and efficacy of matter. This becomes a problem, in virtue of the fact that the attributes which are assigned to Hyle by the Platonists, recur in the Oracles as characteristics of Hades, who is made Lord and realm of the hylic demons <sup>254</sup>. Thus arises the question as to the origin of the connection of Hades-Hyle-Hylic demons. This connection does, indeed, possess many ear-marks of Middle Platonic speculation, but is not found as a whole in the writings of the Platonists independent of the Chaldæans. On the other hand, close parallels to it are found in the systems of various Gnostics, the elements of whose doctrines must however be themselves first traced to their sources. Therefore we must prepare ourselves for an excursion through outlying regions of the religious thought in the period of the Chaldæans. The first rule of this survey is that of concentration on those particular phenomena which assist the understanding of the Chaldæan theories in question <sup>255</sup>.

<sup>252</sup> Cf. ch. II, n. 218 and 221. As against this it must be emphasized that in the question of the sequence of the planetary spheres the Oracles do not follow the system of Plato, but that of the *Chaldaei* canonized later by Ptolemy. See ch. II, n. 221 f. and 286.

<sup>253</sup> Cf. the passage quoted ch. II, n. 221 c : « και γην εν μέσῳ τοιθέναι και ὑδωρ εν τοις κόλποις της γης και ἀέρα ἀνωθεν τούτων » with ALBINUS, 171, 31 : μεθ' ἧς (sc. τῆν τῶν ἀπλανῶν σφαίραν και τῆν τῶν πλανωμένων) ἡ τοῦ ἀέρος ὑπάρχει, και εν μέσῳ ἡ γῆ συν τῷ ἐαυτῆς ὑγρῷ. See also PHILO, *De congr. erud. caus.*, 104.

<sup>254</sup> See ch. V, sect. 2-4.

<sup>255</sup> This task is made difficult by the lack of suitable preparatory studies on the problem of Matter in later antiquity. The well-known monograph of BÄUMKER, *Das Problem der Materie in der griechischen Philosophie* (Münster, 1890) treats the pre-Plotinian Platonists too summarily. E. SCHWÖBER, *Plotins Abhandlung πόθεν τὰ κακά* (*Enn.*, I, 8), Dissert. Rostock, 1916, touches only briefly on Iamblichus and Proclus. I have received much assistance from the important work—forgotten

As point of departure we take the identification Hades-Hyle. It derives, again, from the tradition of Middle Platonism<sup>256</sup>. Lydus reports that the Platonists called Hyle Hades, since it is invisible (*ἀϊδής*), and Tartarus, since it is in chaotic movement (*ταραττομένη*)<sup>257</sup>. This etymological explanation is dependent on the wording of the description of primal matter in the *Timaeus*<sup>258</sup>. The equation Hyle-Tartarus is also frequently mentioned by Proclus, who owes it apparently to one of the earlier Neoplatonists dependent on Middle-Platonic tradition<sup>259</sup>. For it is already known to Celsus who interprets the Titans

---

by scholarship—of E. W. MOELLER, *Geschichte der Kosmologie in der griechischen Kirche bis auf Origenes*, Halle, 1860. The students of Gnosticism have generally focussed their interest on the explanation of the “myth”, although the Western “philosophical” Gnostics have themselves specified the point of departure for an understanding of their theological intentions by declaring the starting point of their own thought to be the question of the origin of evil (see the testimonies collected by BAUR, *Manichäisches Religionssystem*, 173, 20 and *Christliche Gnosis*, 19, 16).

<sup>256</sup> The corrupt text of the Hermetic *Asclepius*, c. 18, p. 52, 9 f. Thomas, may possibly have read in retranslation: *ὄθεν τὸ ἐνέστρατον αὐτῆς* (sc. *τῆς ὕλης*, i. e. of the created world; cf. c. 14, p. 49, 17; c. 17, p. 51, 20) *ἢ ἔσω* (*par = ἴσον. correxi*) *μέρος, εἶγε τόπος ἐστὶ τὸ ἐντὸς τῆς σφαιρας* (cf. c. 17, p. 52, 6, *ὕλη nullis* [i. e. by the Platonists, see PLATO, *Tim.*, 52 a, 8] *loci instar... creditur*), *Ἰδης κέκληται*. From this passage can be concluded only that the author used the Platonic etymology of the notion Hades (= *ἀϊδής*, see ch. v, n. 142) for the explanation of the invisibility of Primal Matter, but not, as SCOTT-FERGUSON, *Hermetica*, IV, 406 suggest, that he identified Hades with Hyle.

<sup>257</sup> LYDUS, *Mens.*, IV, 159, p. 175, 3 : *τὴν ὕλην Ἰδην οἱ φιλοσοφῆσαντές φασὶ καὶ Τάρταρον, ὡς ταραττομένην καὶ οὐκ ἡμερούσαν κατὰ φύσιν δια τὸ ἀνείδειον αὐτῆς*. The last four words properly belong after *φασὶ*. According to the general belief, Tartarus was the lowest stratum of Hades; see ch. v, n. 149.

<sup>258</sup> PLATO, *Tim.*, 51 a, 7 calls Hyle *ἀνόρατον εἶδος* and 30 a, 4 : *οὐκ ἴσυχίαν ἄγον ἀλλὰ κινούμενον πλημμελῶς καὶ ἀτάκτως*; cf. 52 e, 4. Lydus' explanation is based on the etymology quoted in *Étyim. M.*, 747, 15 : *ἄλλοι (Τάρταρον) τὸν σκοτεινότερον τόπον, παρὰ τὸ ἐκτεταμάχθαι καὶ συγκεχύσθαι τὰ ἐν αὐτῷ πάντα*. That this etymology is of Stoic origin, is evident from the parallels adduced by H. FLACH, *Glossen und Scholien zur Hesiodischen Theogonie* (Leipzig, 1876), 40.

<sup>259</sup> The identity of Tartarus with Primal Matter is presupposed in the writings of Proclus. Cf. *Tim.*, I, 190, 19 : *τὴν ἐνυλοτάτην καὶ ἀόριστον τοῦ Ταρτάρου... κίνησιν* and *Rp.*, II, 183, 17 : *ὁ Τάρταρος, χῶρος ὦν πάσης ἀτάκτου καὶ σκοτεινῆς*

as the chaotic movement of the primal matter and their imprisonment in Tartarus (HOMER, *Iliad*, XIV, 279) as the exclusion of unregulated power from the sphere of matter after forms had been imposed on it<sup>260</sup>. This monistic explanation is adapted to his dualistic doctrine by Plutarch. In his exposition of the Egyptian myth of Typhon and Osiris — mentioned also by Celsus in the same connection — he interprets Typhon the enemy of the gods, as an allegory of Tartarus and of the evil World-Soul<sup>261</sup>. Plutarch sets himself apart from the three Platonists named above, in that he makes, not the primal material itself, but the power of a second evil World-Soul, active in it, the cause of its chaotic movement<sup>262</sup>. The Chaldæans attach themselves to the expla-

ύλης. In the last passage Proclus refers to a detailed interpretation of Tartarus in his monograph, no longer preserved, on the myth of the netherworld in PLATO'S *Phaedo* (cf. PROCL., *Rp.*, II, 183, 24 f. See also *ibid.*, 179, 13). In this work he quoted the views of the "theologians" (cf. *ibid.*, 183, 25), i. e. not only the Chaldæans but also the Orphics (see *Orph. Fragm.*, 55, p. 132, Kern on the origin of Chaos ἐξ ἀπειρου τῆς ύλης... ἀπειρου τινὸς βυθοῦ ἀειρέοντος). This work of Proclus was used by Olympiodorus in his commentary on *Phaedo*; see there p. 202, 30 : ὁ Τάρταρος πάντων ἐστὶ τῶν αγαθῶν στέργσις (Plotinus' definition of Matter) and 121, 22 : ἐν γὰρ τῇ τρυγί τῆς γενέσεως (see n. 275), αὐτῷ τῷ Ταρτάρῳ. In the passage there 201, 9 (= 240, 2 f.) ὁ Τάρταρος θεὸς ἐστὶ τὰς ἐσχατίας τοῦ κόσμου (see *ibid.*, 176, 8) ἐπισκοπῶν, Tartarus figures as metonymy for Pluto (cf. *ibid.*, 191, 21 f. and 240, 2 f., with reference to PLATO, *Phaedo*, 112 a), and ἐσχατία τοῦ κόσμου is synonymous with ὑπὸ γῆν οἰκισίς.

<sup>260</sup> CELSUS *ap. ORIG.*, VI, 42 (the chapter deserves a special analysis). The same interpretation is cited by PROCL., *Tim.*, I, 390, 27 f. and *Schol. ad Hesiod. Theog.*, v. 663 (see Flach, quoted n. 258, p. 128 and 271) and, as Platonic doctrine, presented in *Th. Pl.*, 104, 16 f. Notice should be taken also of the Orphic interpretation of the four rivers of the netherworld as the four elements; see ch. v, n. 147.

<sup>261</sup> PLUTARCH, *De Iside*, 57, 374 C. Cf. 49, 371 B. ZELLER, III, 2, 187 f. MOELLER, 42 f.

<sup>262</sup> Cf. PLUTARCH, *De procreat. anim.*, 5, 5, 1014 C; 7, 4-5, 1015 E : God delivered τὴν ύλην ἀπὸ τῆς ἀνοήτου ταραττομένην αἰτίας; 9, 2; 27, 6. On the basis of the same doctrine of the evil World Soul, similar attributes are assigned to Primal Matter by Numenius (cf. *e. g.* p. 95, 8 f.).

nation given by the Platonic monists. Their description of Hades (viz. Tartarus) by means of the attributes of primal matter goes back, consequently, to a Middle-Platonic tradition <sup>263</sup>.

The identification made by these Platonists had in view the harmonization of the essential concepts of their cosmology with those of mythic religion : If the light of the Ideas diminishes with increasing distance from their source, it follows that the deepest layer of the world, the Hades (or its lowest part, the Tartarus) must form the extreme negation of "ideality" <sup>264</sup>. It is to be supposed that the Platonists who proposed the identification Hades-Hyle did not believe in a mythical Hades and more or less interpreted it away by means of etymological explanation <sup>265</sup>. But this identification received another meaning in the consciousness of those who—as the Chaldæans—took myth and metaphysics with equal seriousness. For them the identification meant that Hades consisted of a part of the primal matter, which was excepted from formation and therefore kept unchanged its primitive character.

Through the association of the equation Hades-Hyle with the belief in a god Hades and his hylic demons, Hyle is changed from a cosmological principle to a personal potency. It becomes the practical procreator of powers, hostile to the gods, which cause the evil of the world—and explain it. The connection of the doctrine of demons with the doctrine of Hyle put the Chaldæans in a position to answer the crucial question as to the origin of evil from the basis of the cosmological pre-

---

<sup>263</sup> This Middle Platonic interpretation seems to be itself dependent on a Stoic allegory of which the reflex has been preserved by ps.-CLEMENS ROMANUS, *Homil.*, VI, 6 ff. in the explanation of the cosmic myth of the Orphics (see *Orph. Fragm.*, 56, p. 134, Kern). The author derives the name of Pluto from *πλήθος* and explains it as *πλήθος τῆς ὑποκειμένης οὐσίας* which sinks downward in the process of the *διαδόμησις* (CLEM., *op. cit.*, VI, 12 : ἡ κάτω παραχώρησις ὑποστῆθῶν), see n. 275), and forms the lowest stratum of the world.

<sup>264</sup> See n. 249 and 274.

<sup>265</sup> With similar tendency, CELSUS *ap. ORIG.*, VI, 42 interprets also the myths of the combat of Zeus with Kronos, of the Titans with the Gigants, and of Typhon with Horus, in terms of the Platonic notion of the eternal struggle of cosmic mind with cosmic matter.

suppositions of their own system. The demonology was cited by several Platonists of this period for like purpose. Plutarch, the Platonist Origen (the source of Porphyry), and in dependance on the Platonists of his time, the Christian apologist Athenagoras, maintain the dogma of the divine goodness by laying the responsibility for the evil of the world to the charge of the demons<sup>266</sup>. It seems that the Chaldæans also employed this argument as warrant for the goodness of the heavenly gods<sup>267</sup>.

The demonological explanation of the evil of the world possessed for the Platonists the advantage that it permitted the maintenance of a metaphysical monism. In order to save themselves from the necessity of a confession to dualism, Athenagoras and the Platonist Origen trace the source of the evil spirits to a fall by sin, of angelic souls originally good<sup>268</sup>. The Chaldæans also accepted, along with the Platonic

<sup>266</sup> PLUTARCH, *De def. orac.*, 10, 415 A; cf. CUMONT, *Rel. Orient.*, 280, 54, and below, n. 269. On Origenes the Neoplatonist see EXCURSUS XI. ATHENAGORAS, *Apology*, c. 25-26, in particular p. 144, 30 f., ed. GEFFCKEN, *Zwei griechische Apologeten* (Leipzig, 1907). Geffcken supposes, without sufficient reason, that Athenagoras depends on a Stoic source, but the differentiation between a generic and a particular Providence was advocated also by Middle Platonists; cf. DODDS, *Proclus*, 271, 1. On Athenagoras' Platonism see MOELLER, 121 f. As Geffcken rightly remarks, the Epicureans are meant by the philosophers who are led, by the influence of the demons, to the belief in a world directed by blind chance; cf. PORPH., *Abst.*, II, 40, p. 170, 6 f. and *Contr. Christ.*, *Fragm.* 49, p. 77, 1 f. ed. Harnack.

<sup>267</sup> Cf. ch. v, n. 55 with PORPH., *Abst.*, II, 40, p. 169, 19 f.

<sup>268</sup> Athenagoras (who wrote his *Apology* in Athens about 177) attaches his teaching to the legend of the fall of Satan and of the sinful angels told in the Book of Enoch (GEFFCKEN, 216). On the basis of the same legendary tradition AUGUSTIN., *Civ. Dei*, XII, 1 and 3 explains that the existence of Satan affords no support for a dualistic view of the world, for Satan's nature is good, and only his will is corrupted. PORPHYRY (*i. e.* the Neoplatonist Origen, see EXCURSUS XI), *Abst.*, II, 38, p. 167, 10 and 26 f. (see BIDEZ-CUMONT, *Mages hellénisés*, II, 276, 2; 291, 1), explains the transformation of good into evil demons by the supposition that the rational substance of their soul was overpowered by the affective pneuma which enveloped it. This pagan theory of the fall of the demons goes back in the last analysis to the account, in PLATO'S *Phaedrus*, of the fall of the soul (for the demons are regarded by the Platonists as offsprings of the Cosmic Soul).

axiom of the divine creation of matter, the principle of a monistic explanation of the genesis of the world. How they set this at one with the existence of a god such as Hades, or of the hylic demons, can no longer be known<sup>269</sup>. In any event it is clear that the metaphysical monism of the above-named demonologists found no support in their anthropology. The hylic demons loose Matter from the divine causality to which it owed its origin, and set it up against that causality as a practically second evil principle.

The question as to the nature of matter, which occupied the Platonists of whom we have spoken, was also treated in their epoch by the Gnostics, and by them answered with formulae which at times are in close contact with those of the Chaldæans. Three of these Gnostic parallels will in the following pages be subjected to a detailed examination. The Gnostics whose theories here interest us were, in contradistinction to the Platonists cited (except for Plutarch), determined dualists. Their cosmology rest on the dogm of the original corruption of the preexistent matter. In the exposition of this view, which often took the literary form of a cosmogonic myth, they frequently refer to the description of Hyle in the *Timæus* of Plato. Since Plato's supposition that matter was created and originally without qualities doubly contradicted their axiom, they chose, instead of expounding the passages of the essential Platonic text, to correct it.

This critical attitude appears significantly in the way in which Valentinus, the principal representative of Western Gnosticism, applies the Platonic formula of "flowing matter". It serves him as a term for the primal matter from which the terrestrial soul of man was created and

---

<sup>269</sup> PLUTARCH, *De def. orac.*, 10, 415 A (see n. 266) treats demonology and the doctrine of the preexistence of the evil World Soul as alternative solutions for the question as to the origin of evil; he decides, however, in favour of the second—the dualistic, hypothesis. Porphyry, who opposes the second solution (see *Abst.* I, 40, p. 116, 11 f. and Excursus XI; *ap. Procl.*, *Tim.*, 1, 391, 4 ff. Cf. *ibid.* 393, 14 ff. his collection of monistic testimonies from Plato), accepts the first thesis—a proof for the fact that the supposition of the existence of evil demons made unnecessary the derivation of evil from a second World Soul.



to which it owes its inborn corruption<sup>270</sup>. On this definition of the substance of the soul the Gnostic Hermogenes, also a contemporary of the Chaldeans, founded his description of the nature of matter and of the human souls made from it<sup>271</sup>. He postulated a preexistent, chaotic, primal matter, which God so shaped as to set in order the great mass but to leave over, in its primitive condition, a remainder which, by reason of its deprivation of the better qualities, became evil. This "untamed" residuum forms the substance of the soul, which therefore possesses the same hylic qualities as its primal matter<sup>272</sup>. Another

<sup>270</sup> CLEMENS, *Exc. ex Theodot.*, 50, 1 : 'λαβὼν χοῦν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς' (*Gen.*, II, 7), οὐ τῆς ξηρᾶς (cf. *Gen.*, I, 9 f.), ἀλλὰ τῆς πολυμερούς καὶ ποικίλης ὕλης (cf. ch. v, n. 143), ψυχὴν γεώδη καὶ ὑλικὴν ἐτεκτίνατο ἄλογον... οὗτος ὁ 'κατ' εἰκόνα' ἄνθρωπος. IREN., *Haer.*, I, 5, 5 : *σποικιλέναι καὶ τὸν ἄνθρωπον τὸν χοικὸν οὐκ ἀπὸ ταύτης δὲ τῆς ξηρᾶς γῆς. ἀλλ' ἀπὸ τῆς ἀοράτου οὐσίας* (see n. 273), ἀπὸ τοῦ κεχυμένου καὶ ρευστοῦ τῆς ὕλης (cf. ch. v, n. 170) λαβόντος. The contradiction becomes significant, if one compare Valentinus with PHILO, *Opif. mund.*, 136-137, according to whose explanation the Creator employed, for the formation of the body of Adam, the best material of the four elements.

<sup>271</sup> Cf. TERTULLIAN, *Adv. Hermogenem*, 18-19; 36; 38-43; *De anima*, 1 and 11, he refers to his no longer preserved work *De censu animae*, which was directed against Hermogenes' psychology. Cf. also HIPPOLYT, *Ref.*, VIII, 17. That Hermogenes stands close to the Valentinians is already emphasized by TERTULLIAN, *De anima*, 11. E. HEINTZEL, *Hermogenes, der Hauptvertreter des philosophischen Dualismus in der alten Kirche* (Berlin 1902), was not available to me. Cf. A. HILGENFELD, *Ketzergeschichte* (Leipzig, 1884), 553 ff.

<sup>272</sup> Hermogenes' description of the anarchic movement of Primal Matter (HIPPOLYT, *Ref.*, VIII, 17, 2 : *ἀεὶ γὰρ ἀγρίως καὶ ἀτάκτως φερομένην*) is derived from PLATO'S *Timaeus* (see n. 258 and Hippolyt himself), the comparison with the movement of boiling water in a pot (TERTULLIAN, *Adv. Hermog.*, 41) from *Job* (LXX), XLI, 22 (23) : *« ἀναζει τὴν ἄβυσσον* (related to *Gen.*, I, 2; cf. CLEM., *Ecl. proph.*, 2, 3 : *« ὕδωρ ἄβυσσος ἢ ὕλη ἀλληγορεῖται ὡσπερ χαλκεῖον »*). Thus Lietzmann's hypothesis (*Geschichte der alten Kirche*, II, Berlin, 1936, 270) of the dependence of Bardesanes on Hermogenes loses one of its principal supports. Hermogenes' characterisation of Primal Matter *dans locum bono et malo* also goes back to the *Timaeus* and agrees with that presupposed by PLUTARCH, *De Iside*, 53, 372 F. The notion of the separation of the two matters (HIPPOLYT, *loc. cit.*, *ἐχώρισε*) is derived from the wording of *Gen.*, I, 7. HIPPOLYT, *loc. cit.*, already refers to Plato as the model of Hermogenes.

unknown Valentinian advocated a doctrine of primal matter in substantial agreement with the cosmogony of Hermogenes : Matter was partially formed by God, but he excluded as unusable and left in its primitive chaotic condition a "muddy sediment" from which all human evil derives <sup>273</sup>.

This account of the rise of an evil matter can be recognized as an intentional correction of the Platonic model. According to Plato the demiurge formed the primal matter in its entirety <sup>274</sup>, according to the Valentinians he excluded a portion unfit for his purposes. The term

<sup>273</sup> ADAMANTIUS, *Dialog. de recta fide in Deum*, ed. Bakhuyzen (Leipzig, 1901), p. 142, 4 : τὰ δ' ὅσα αὐτῆς (sc. τῆς ὕλης), ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν, τρυγῶδη ἐτύγχανε, ταῦτα ἀνάμοστα ὄντα πρὸς δημιουργίαν ὡς εἶχε κατέλειψε, κατ' οὐδὲν αὐτῶ προσήκοντα ἐξ ὧν δοκεῖ μοι νῦν παρ' ἀνθρώποις ἐπιρρεῖν τὰ κακά. Similarly p. 156, 15 f. : ὕλην εἶναι ἄτακτον καὶ ἀνείδειον (with reference to *Gen.*, I, 2 and *PLATO, Tim.*; see n. 258, 272 and ch. v, n. 142). Cf. BAUR, *Christliche Gnosis*, 161 f., who follows NEANDER, *Entwicklung der gnostischen Systeme*, 205 f.

<sup>274</sup> Cf. *PLATO, Tim.*, 30 a, 2; 32 c, 7-8. Followed by *APULEIUS, De Platone*, I, 5, p. 87, 6 : (materiam) conformat universam, and *ibid.*, I, 8, p. 90, 10.

According to Proclus, "the Good" is present also in the ἐσχάτων; cf. *Tim.*, I, 209, 20 f. (DODDS, *Proclus*, 231, 275); *Alc.*, 466, 27 : τὸ ἀγαθόν. . . πάρεσι καὶ αὐτῇ τῇ ὑποστάθμῃ τῶν ὄντων ἀπάντων (see n. 275), τῇ ἀμόρφῳ ὕλῃ. This "presence" of the Good consists in the "longing" (ὄρεξις), "fitness" (ἐπιτηδειότης) or potentiality of matter for formation, which is manifest in the "vestiges" (ἵχνη) mentioned by *PLATO, Tim.*, 52 b, 2 (see n. 18. Cf. also *PLATO, Tim.*, 51 b, 1), cf. *DAM.*, II, 281, 21 : αὐτὸς (sc. Proclus) ἐν τοῖς εἰς Τίμιον (probably in his lost explanation of *Tim.*, 53 b, 2) ἡξίου μὴ πάντῃ ἀνείδειον εἶναι τὴν θεῖαν ὕλην. εἰ δὲ καὶ ἀνείδειος, ἀλλὰ τραπῶς ἔχουσα τὸ δυνάμει καὶ ἐγγύς τι εἶδους; cf. also *DAM.*, II, 282, 5 f., 283, 21 f., 285, 5 f., 288, 18 f.; *PROCL.*, *Tim.*, I, 381, 5; *Parm.*, 839, 25; *ap. IOANN. PHILOP.*, *De aet. mund.*, XIV, p. 539, 4 ff., ed. Reichardt. This inherent capacity of Matter for formation is safeguarded by the subterranean demons identical with the former Titans who were banished by Zeus into the deepest layer of the universe in order to cause them to partake in the maintenance of the divine plan; cf. *PROCL.*, *Tim.*, I, 189, 8 f.; 190, 28 f.; *Alc.*, 382, 8 f.— This theory, a skilful combination of the Platonic doctrine of μέθεξις, of Aristotle's doctrine of Matter (see DODDS, 242) and of Iamblican demonology, enables Proclus to "save" the monistic view of Platonism threatened both by the assumption of Primal Matter exempted from formation and by that of the existence of hylic demons independent on the divine Providence (cf. ch. v, n. 52 and 157).

“sediment” is applied by the Platonists to the least valuable part of the formed cosmic matter<sup>275</sup>; by the Valentinians to the residuum of the primal matter<sup>276</sup>. The Chaldæans agree with this Gnostic reinterpretation of the Platonic doctrine in one important detail: They also give up the dogma of the total formation of primal matter, and suppose the continued existence of an hyleic residuum, unused in the formation, which constitutes the source of all the evil of the world.

Rich material on the Gnostic interpretation of Hyle is preserved in the remains of the Marcionite literature, from which a later account, handed down by Theodoret, is especially interesting to us<sup>277</sup>. According to this “the evil demiurge of the evil world” at first subjugated

<sup>275</sup> JULIAN, *Orat.*, V, 170 D calls Hyle (*ibid.*, 175 B the earth) σκύβαλον (a Chaldæan term; ch. v, n. 71), ἀποκείμενα καὶ τρύγα καὶ ὑποστάθμη. According to DAM., II, 282, 5, the two last nouns were terms used by the Platonists for Hyle; cf. also PROCL., *Alc.*, 466, 28 (quoted n. 274) and OLYMPIODOR., *Phaed.*, 121, 22 (quoted n. 259); IDEM, *Gorg.*, 233, 23. Consequently, the Platonists borrowed ὑποστάθμη from PLATO, *Phaedo*, 109 c, 2, which was also the source of ZENO, *St. V. F.*, I, 105; PLUTARCH, *De facie in orbe lunæ*, 25, 28, 940 E; SYNESIUS, *Prov.*, 9, 1228 B. Other parallels are quoted by WYTTENBACH *ad PLAT.*, *Phaed.*, p. 300 f. and GATAKER *ad MARC. AUREL.*, IX, 36.

τρύξ as a designation of Hyle is also found in SYNESIUS' *Hymn*, III, v. 320: τρύγα τῶν κόσμου and corresponds to Latin *faex*: MACROB., *Somn. Scip.*, I, 19, 12. Cf. OVID, *Metam.*, I, 68: “terrenae faecis”; PLAUT., *Aulul.*, 79: *defaecato animo* (imitated by MACROB., *Somn. Scip.*, I, 8, 9; 22, 6; II, 12, 5).

Consequently, neither ὑποστάθμη nor τρύξ can be regarded as Chaldæan (as KROLL, 62, 2 supposed they could), although both concepts agree as to their content with the *termini* of the Oracles *πικρὰ ἔλη* (see ch. v, n. 70) and σκύβαλον.

<sup>276</sup> Cf. also the Ophites, *ap. IREN.*, *Haer.*, I, 30, 5: *in subiacentem faecem materiae* (Greek *ap. THEODORET.*, *Haer. fab.*, I, 14; MIGNÉ, *P. G.*, LCCCIII, 365 B: *eis τὴν τρύγα τῆς ἔλης* and EPIPHANIUS, *Panar. Haer.*, 37, 4, 4: *πρὸς τὴν ὑποστάθμη τῆς ἔλης*), and *Pistis Sophia*, p. 22, 17 *et passim*, ed. C. Schmidt (Leipzig, 1905). For Bardesanes see n. 294-296.

<sup>277</sup> THEODORET, *Haer. fab.*, I, 24; HARNACK, *Marcion*, 291\* f. The much-discussed question, what role the doctrine of Hyle played in the cosmology of Marcion himself, need not occupy us here, as we are now interested in the “vulgar” gnostical elements of the later development of the Marcionite system. See HARNACK, *Neue Studien zu Marcion, Texte und Untersuchungen*, 44, 4 (1923), 18 f.

Satan, whom Hyle serves, to himself, thereafter laid hold upon Hyle and from it shaped the universe. From the pure parts of Hyle he made the heavens, from the "remainder" the four elements, and from the "sediment" Hades and Tartarus<sup>278</sup>. In this representation three heterogeneous explanations of the evil of the world are artificially harmonized :

1. The New Testament doctrine of the devil as the Prince of This World. This is inserted into the cosmogonic process by dint of making him the ruler of Hyle, which, however, really does not owe its evil to him at all, for it was already evil by nature. In fact the doctrine that matter is evil is found also among the Marcionites without any mention of the "Evil One": on the other hand one also finds there the substitution of the "Evil One" for matter<sup>279</sup>. The account given by Theodoret represents therefore a contamination of the mythological and cosmological versions one by another.

2. The division of Hyle into matter of three qualities is to be understood only relatively, since all Hyle is bad. The three qualities represent only three grades of the same essentially inferior substance. The condemnation of the creation by reason of the deficient quality of its material was a fundamental doctrine of the Gnostic cosmology.

3. The distinction of the materials of heaven, of the sublunar world including the earth, and of Hades (*viz.* Tartarus) is a Gnostic transformation of the Platonic doctrine that the formed cosmos gradually becomes worse by reason of the declining activity of the noetic light. In the Marcionite version the Ideas (*viz.* the Logos), which give form to the unshaped primal matter, are lacking, for neither before nor

---

<sup>278</sup> THEODORET, *loc. cit.* : τὴν ὕλην κακὴν τε οὖσαν καὶ ὑπ' ἄλλω κακῷ τελοῦσαν τὸν δὲ δημιουργὸν περιγεγόμενον τοῦ κακοῦ, τὴν ὕλην λαβεῖν τε καὶ ἐκ τούτης δημιουργῆσαι τὰ σύμπαντα, ἐκ μὲν τοῦ καθαρωτάτου τὸν οὐρανόν, ἐκ δὲ τοῦ λοιποῦ τὰ στοιχεῖα τὰ τέτταρα, ἐκ δὲ τῆς ὑποστάθμης (see p. 275-276) τὸν Ἄϊδην καὶ τὸν Τάρταρον.

<sup>279</sup> HIPPOLYT, *Ref.*, X, 19; HARNACK, *Marcion*, 205, 255\*. See already E. W. MOELLER, *op. cit.*, 384.

after its organization does matter, according to them, undergo the influence of a spiritual principle. It is damned and shall at the end of days fall heir to its deserved destruction. Therefore the distinction of its qualities remains unmotivated. This defect provides evidence for the conscious mutilation of a tradition, of which we find the traces in the cosmology of the Chaldæan theurgists. Here that primal material left unformed is the stuff of which Hades is made. Since in this account the distinction of qualities is well grounded, we may assume that the doctrine of Hyle adopted by the Chaldæans formed the basis of the analogous speculation of the Marcionites known to Theodoret <sup>280</sup>.

In the Gnostic testimonies cited here recur two of the characteristics attributed by the Chaldæans to matter : the supposition of the continued existence of an unimproved part after the great mass had been given form ; and the identity of this sediment with Hades. It seems scarcely dubious that these points of agreement give evidence of a common starting point. The more exact determination of this origin cannot, however, be accomplished without further deliberations. Direct influence of the Chaldæans on the Gnostics is already out of the question, for the reason that their doctrines give no sign of a relationship to this religious movement. The same goes for the reverse relationship. Also, the supposition of a Gnosticizing Platonism, as a mediating link, finds no support in the history of this philosophic school. So we must look for another explanation of this correspondence.

The way to this explanation is pointed by the origin and character of the Chaldæan doctrine of the divinization of Hades. This religious doctrine, as was shown in the foregoing chapter, stems from Persia <sup>281</sup>. The doctrine of Ahriman and his demonic satellites connected itself, on its way through the hellenized world, with the ever-rising belief in the prevalence of demonic power and formed a constitutive element of the dualism of later Antiquity. Its suitability for the explanation

---

<sup>280</sup> It goes without saying that the Middle Platonic doctrine of Hyle was transmitted to these Marcionites not directly but through Gnostic intermediaries (cf. n. 276).

<sup>281</sup> See ch. v, sect. 2.

of the evil in the world secured it acceptance by the later Platonists. Plutarch interpreted the doctrine of the Zoroastrian faith on Ahriman-Hades as referring to the evil World-Soul which constitutes the potency latent in all material objects, of opposition to the divine<sup>282</sup>. The Neoplatonist Origen explained with its help the source of all cosmic and human defect<sup>283</sup>. Porphyry identified the Iranian dogma of the antagonism between the powers of Light and Darkness by means of that between the good gods and demons, who participate on the idea of the good, and the spirits of destruction, who participate in the nature of the evil<sup>284</sup>. This identification of the religious dualism of Iran with the ethical antinomy of Plato leads near to the cosmological contrast of spirit and matter on which the Chaldæan demonology is founded. It appears that the Iranian elements of their theology have passed through the medium of a Platonic interpretation. One may consider Julian the Chaldæan himself, the founder of Theurgy, as the originator of this transformation. He composed—as did Origen, the chief authority for Porphyrian demonology—a theoretical treatise “On the demons”<sup>285</sup>, of which, indeed, no direct citations are preserved, but whose tendency can be determined on the ground of the Chaldæan Oracles, Julian’s principal work. It is to be supposed that their author, true to his claim of inspiration by Plato and in conformity with the character of his Oracles, sought to bring the principles of his own demonology, mingled as it was with Iranian elements, into harmony with the dualistic teachings of Plato, *viz.* those of the contemporary representatives of the Platonic school. We should imagine the method of his harmonization as analogous to Porphyry, who developed it on the basis of the same presupposition but independently from the Chaldæans.

---

<sup>282</sup> PLUTARCH, *De Iside*, 46, 370 E. See CUMONT, *Rel. Orient.*, 278, 48; 279, 51. W. JAEGER, *Aristoteles*, 134 f. who has shown that Plato, in the *Laws*, 896 E, was led, by the influence of Zoroastrianism, to the supposition of an Evil World Soul, suggests that Plutarch’s comparison goes back to the tradition of the earlier Academy.

<sup>283</sup> See Excursus XI.

<sup>284</sup> See Excursus XII.

<sup>285</sup> See ch. I, n. 4.

Some examples of Porphyry's demonological interpretation of basic statements of Plato as to the nature of evil should help to make clear the character of this attempt. Plato explains in the *Theaetetus* (176 e 2) that "two patterns stand in the realm of Being : one divine, which is the highest happiness ; and the other undivine, which is complete unhappiness". Porphyry gives this antithesis the following application : "The divine is radiant and goodlike, the undivine (the location of the evil demons, as was previously explained) is, on the contrary, dark and evil-doing"<sup>286</sup> ; he there identifies the ethic antinomy with the cosmological and explains the undivine as the location of a (demonic) activity hostile to the divine. Plato explains in the conclusion to the sentence of the *Theaetetus* just referred to (177 a 1), that man makes himself, by good deeds, like the divine and unlike the undivine. Porphyry draws thence the consequence that the wise man "must make himself unlike evil men, demons and, in general, all that rejoices in the mortal and the material"<sup>287</sup>. In the same chapter of the *Theaetetus* (176 a 7) Plato declares that "evil encircles mortal nature and our earthly dwelling-place with necessity"<sup>288</sup>. A Chaldæan Oracle interprets this "earthly dwelling-place" as the source of "earthly passions" caused by the demons<sup>289</sup>.

<sup>286</sup> PROCL., *Mal. Subs.*, p. 214, 17 : "et haec dicentes putant etiam Platonem huius doctrinae praesidem fuisse, duplicia exemplaria (*παράδειγματα*) ponentem in omni (*ἐν τῷ παντί*. Corrigendum *ἐν τῷ ὄντι*?), hoc quidem divinum et lucidum et boniforme (*ἀγαθοειδῆ* : PLATO, *Rep.*, 509 a, 3), hoc autem *ἄθεον* et tenebrosum et malificum", etc. Porphyry, the source of Proclus (see ch. IV, n. 34), quotes *Abst.*, I, 38, p. 114, 10 f., the same passage of the *Theaetetus*.

<sup>287</sup> PORPHY., *Abst.*, II, 43, p. 172, 21 f. In the same way, Porphyry interprets immediately afterwards a saying of the "theologians" (*i. e.* the Pythagoreans) about the "force of the passions" as referring to the "evil force" of the demonic.

<sup>288</sup> CELSUS *ap. ORIG.*, IV, 65 explains, with reference to this famous passage of the *Theaetetus*, that the evil is neighbour to Matter (*ὄλη δὲ πρόσκειται*) and has settled among the mortals. JULIAN, *Orat.*, II, 90 A-C, also alludes to this passage and explains that the demiurge banished evil from heaven into the terrestrial zone, set up the good demons as saviours and judges of the human soul and divided the good from the evil demons.

<sup>289</sup> See ch. II, n. 403.

This evidence of the demonological interpretation of a famous chapter of Plato on the nature of evil, should serve as example for the method with the help of which Julian the Chaldæan sought to bring his demonology into harmony with the Platonic formulæ of ethic dualism. On the basis of similar methods he may also have carried through—in loose contact with the explanations of contemporary Platonists—the identification of Hyle and Hades on the one side and of Hyle and God Hades and his demons on the other. It seems doubtful whether he would have known that he thereby overstepped the limits of the Platonic dualism. His recession from the standpoint of the “school” explains itself, without the supposition of Gnostic influence, from the tendencies implicit within the Chaldæan system itself. The so-called hylic world becomes, by reason of the demons lodged in and ruling over it, the location of powers opposed to God which deprive it not only of the influence of the good principle, but also of the positive faculties in which it became participant through the formation of its primal material. Seen from the viewpoint of the demonology, the Platonic doctrine of the harmonious connection of the formed matter loses much if not all of its optimistic aspect. The confusion of the original chaos was not confined by the shaping of the cosmos, but continued to propagate itself, unhindered; and, on earth, a power of equal strength worked in opposition of the divine. This practical depreciation of the distinction between primal matter and material world gave the Chaldæans freedom for unrestrained expression of their hostility to all things called hylic. They remain, nevertheless, true to the theory of Plato, in that they limit their “hylophobia” to the sublunar world, a point of decided difference from the Gnostics, who gave up the entire creation as a *massa perditionis*.

The account of the inner development of the Chaldæan notions of Hyle shows the way to the explanation of the rise of the Gnostic parallels quoted above. In Gnostic circles an analogous process went on: the religious conviction of the corruption of the world and of all things worldly—concretized in the consciousness of the omnipresence of Satan and of his demonic ministers—passed through the medium of theoretical reflection and objectified itself in speculative systems which traced back



the defects of human existence to those of the universe. As the Chaldeans, so also many Gnostics took over certain elements of Middle-Platonic doctrine in order to lend their depreciative concepts of all things wordly the character of a natural necessity, and they developed the elements of the Platonic dualism in the direction which accorded to the drift of their thoughts. This statement implies at the same time the decision as to which of the theories common to the Chaldeans and to the Gnostics cited above stem from one and the same source, and which rest on an analogical twisting of the same fundamental proposition of the Platonic cosmology. Since there were no Gnosticizing Platonists, but only Platonizing Gnostics, the congruence of those views which remain within the limits of Platonism (such as the equation Hades-Hyle) is to be explained by the common use of some Platonic source<sup>290</sup>; whereas those which go beyond this basis (such as the theory as to a residuum of the primal matter, the depreciation or abolition of the Platonic distinction between primal matter and material world, and the assignation to it of a power hostile to the divine) are to be explained by analogous development.

The course of this analogous process can still be followed clearly by means of the Gnostic explanations of the nature of Satan. The "Prince of the Abyss" is called by Ptolemaeus, one of the chief disciples of Valentinus, "hyleic as to nature"<sup>291</sup> and by Athenagoras (probably in dependance on the Valentinian Tatian) "the Ruler of Matter"<sup>292</sup>.

<sup>290</sup> See n. 257-262.

<sup>291</sup> PTOLEMAEUS, *Epist. ad Flor.*, 5, 6, ed. Harnack (quoted by EPIPHAN., *Panar. haer.*, 33, 7, 7) : τοῦ μὲν γὰρ ἀντικειμένου (i. e. Satan) ἐστὶν ἡ οὐσία φθορά τε καὶ σκότος· ὑλικὸς γὰρ οὗτος καὶ πολυσχιδής. Ptolemaeus follows Valentinus; see HIPPOLYT., *Ref.*, VI, 34, 4 : ἐκ τῆς ὑλικῆς οὐσίας οὖν καὶ διαβολικῆς ἐποίησεν ὁ δημιουργὸς τρεῖς ψυχαῖς τὰ σώματα (see n. 270), and 5 : ὁ ὑλικὸς . . . ἐκ τῆς διαβολικῆς οὐσίας πεπλασμένος. Cf. also Heracleon (see n. 6) *ap. ORIGEN., Comm. in Joann.*, XIII, 16, p. 239, 33, ed. Preuschen : μέρος ἐν ὁ διάβολος ὅλης τῆς ὕλης. Heracleon interprets *ibid.*, XX, 20, p. 352, 25 f. and 24, p. 359, 4 f. : « ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ διαβόλου ἐστὶ » (*John*, VIII, 44) as ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ διαβόλου. As to the designation of the four elements as *πατέρες* see PHILO, *Quis rer. div. her.*, 281.

<sup>292</sup> ATHENAGORAS, *Apology*, c. 24, p. 143, 26, Geffcken : ὁ τῆς ὕλης καὶ τῶν ἐν αὐτῇ εἰδῶν ἀρχῶν, and p. 144, 5 f. and 12. Cf. GEFFCKEN, p. 215 f.,

Thereby the foundation was laid for an exchange of the characteristics inherent in the mythological and cosmological description. Late Marcionites substitute Satan and Hyle for one another<sup>293</sup>. Bardesanes, who refers to the "uncreated devil" as "the dregs of the principle of darkness"<sup>294</sup> carries over to him not only the Gnostic theory of the preexistent, primal matter<sup>295</sup>, but also the Middle-Platonic term for the least valuable part of all the cosmic material<sup>296</sup>. Mani, finally, makes Satan proceed from the elements of Darkness, which latter is identified with Hyle<sup>297</sup>.

These parallels are the more worthy of note as the Christian and still more the Gnostic concept of the nature of Satan developed under the influence of the religious doctrine of Ahriman. As against this it must be emphasized that neither the Iranian nor the Christian dualism arrived by its own efforts at the abstract opposition of spirit and matter<sup>298</sup>. This connection was first made possible by the intermingling of Platonic ingredients which was carried through by the

219 f. I suppose that the source of Athenagoras' demonology was Tatian's lost work "Concerning the Demons" (mentioned by TATIAN, *Orat. ad Graec.*, 16, p. 17, 16, Schwartz). Cf. the agreements noted by GEFFCKEN, 215, 4 and R. HEINZE, *Tertullians Apologeticum*, 407, 1-2, between Athenagoras and Tatian's preserved work *Orat. ad Graecos*.

<sup>293</sup> See n. 279.

<sup>294</sup> Cf. A. HILGENFELD, *Bardesanes*, 33 and *Ketzergeschichte*, 521; W. BOUSSET, *Hauptprobleme der Gnosis*, 97.

<sup>295</sup> The view of Bardesanes as to the uncreated devil (cf. BOUSSET, *loc. cit.*) plays an important role in the doctrine of one of his students who appears in the dialogue *De recta fide* (p. 116; 118; 126 f., ed. Bakhuyzen).

<sup>296</sup> See n. 275-276.

<sup>297</sup> As to the Manichaean doctrine of Hyle see BAUR, *Das manichäische Religions-system* (Tübingen, 1831), 9 f., 19 f., and H. H. SCHAEFER, *Ursprung und Fortbildungen des manichäischen Systems* (Warburg Vorträge, IV, 1927), 112 ff. We cannot here enter into the debate between Reitzenstein and Schaefer on the origin and nature of Hyle in the doctrine of Mani, where it is both a cosmological principle and a personified power.

<sup>298</sup> Cf. the fundamental remarks of H. JONAS, *Gnosis und spätantiker Geist*, I, 27-49 in his criticism of Bousset's thesis as to the origin of the Gnostic dualism in the Iranian religion.

Gnostics and the Chaldæans independently of one another and in different degrees<sup>299</sup>. The Chaldæans limited themselves to the coordination of the demonic with the hyleic principle, without equipping the latter itself with the traits of a personal potency. The Hyle receives its aggressiveness only as a result of the fact that the god Hades and his demons take possession of it and make it the place of their activity. Hyle therefore remains, when seen in its cosmological aspect, mere material, but becomes, in its anthropological aspect, a personified principle. In the difference of these two aspects the heterogeneity of their origins is still clearly reflected.

If we at the end of this survey turn our attention once more towards Platonism, we see with especial clarity, by reason of the attachment which these Oriental theologians felt for it, the crisis of its inner existence. Platonism threatens to become untrue, at the dictate of dualistic experience, to the thought of the unity of the world-order. The doctrine of the evil World-Soul and the progressive development of demonology are symptoms of this over-tension of opposites<sup>300</sup>. The Theurgists joined themselves to Platonism at a time when the Platonists had also internally prepared themselves for the dualistic doctrine of Iran<sup>301</sup>. What they took from it, invariably found in their own

<sup>299</sup> As Plutarch (see n. 282), Ahriman and his demons, so does CLEMENS ALEX., *Strom.*, V, 14; 92, 5-6 identify the devil and his demons with the evil World Soul of Plato; and AUGUSTINE, *De duabus animabus contra Manichæos*, imputes to Mani the doctrine of Numenius (see Excursus XI, n. 29) as to the two souls; cf. BAUR, *Manichäisches Religionssystem*, 162 f.

<sup>300</sup> On the spread of the doctrine of the evil World Soul among the Middle Platonists see WITT, *Albinus*, 121. It may be remarked that Porphyry and Iamblichus (*ap. Procl.*, *Tim.*, I, 382, 12. Cf. III, 213, 2 and I, 333, 7, *cum notis*) turn against the Platonists Plutarch and Atticus arguments used by Plotinus against the Gnostics (*Enn.*, II, 9, 8-9; 15 f.), and Iamblichus (*ap. Procl.*, *Tim.*, I, 153, 7 f.) opposes with antignostic arguments (cf. PLOTINUS, II, 9, 6) Porphyry's doctrine of the compulsory reincarnation of the soul.

<sup>301</sup> Ammonius Saccas seems to have reawakened among his students the interest of the Academy in Iranian dualism. Plotinus, when he was his disciple, decided to travel to Persia (see PORPH., *Vit. Plot.*, 3). Origen reproduces doctrines of Iranian beliefs in his work "Concerning the Demons" (see Excursus XI). A third

system a place already reserved and prepared for its acceptance. Thus also in this unification is demonstrated the truth of their own fundamental rule : Like is only known to like.

12. *Pythagorean doctrines in the Chaldæan Oracles.*—The treatment of this theme within the framework of an inquiry concerning the Platonic elements of the Chaldæan theology justifies itself first of all on general reasons. The previous investigation has shown that the metaphysical formulæ of the Oracles stem from the contemporary Platonism. Also the few Stoic motifs which are found in the Oracles have been transmitted to the Chaldæans not directly but, as is proved by the context in which they appear, through the mediation of the Platonists. They are, historically considered, residues of the last phase of the development of the Academy, which sought to prove the practical identity of its doctrine with that of the Stoa by means of Platonizing interpretation of the terms used in the competing school<sup>302</sup>. In similar fashion are to be explained the Pythagorean elements which turn up in the Oracles. Platonic and Pythagorean doctrines had, as known, already been confused with each other in the Old Academy. In carrying on this tradition, Neo-Pythagoreanism subjected the—genuine and fictitious—fundamental doctrines of its founder to a Platonizing interpretation, and so prepared the synthesis of the two systems. It can be shown that the Chaldæans drew their knowledge of Pythagorean doctrinal opinions from Platonists who had brought these into harmony with the principal concepts of their own school-philosophy. These terms will here be given special study.

The Pythagoreans derive the primal principles from numbers. In the Oracles, the first three numbers are mentioned in a way which

---

student Antonius cites a Persian doctrine concerning the noetic principles (see n. 51). Plotinus' dream was, unfortunately, fulfilled by the last Neoplatonists who, after the close of the Athenian school by Justinian, followed the invitation of the Persian king.

<sup>302</sup> On Antiochus, the first Platonist who carried through the harmonization between the doctrines of the Academy and those of the Stoa (see n. 131), and his school see now WIRT, *Albinus*, 22 ff.

recalls the arithmetical metaphysics of the Pythagoreans. The reference to the Primal Being as a "Monad" or as "One" belongs to those same Pythagorean teachings which were yet received during the lifetime of Plato<sup>303</sup>. The designation of the demiurgic Intellect as a dyad is based in the Oracles on the Middle-Platonic theory of its double direction toward the intelligible and sensible world<sup>304</sup>; nevertheless the use of the numerical name seems to go back to a Platonic reinterpretation of the Pythagorean explanation of duality as the source of all becoming<sup>305</sup>. The proof therefore is derived from the source of the Chaldaean designation of the Ideas as triads. One of the Oracles explains that the (Paternal) Monad and the Dyad (of the second Demiurgical Intellect) constitute the source wherefrom the world-shaping Ideas "flow forth"<sup>306</sup>. This derivation of the Ideas recalls a famous doctrine of the older Plato, according to which the Ideas consist of two elements: The One (or the Good) and the Unlimited Dyad<sup>307</sup>. This doctrine is quoted by the Pythagoreans in a version very similar to that of the Oracle quoted. They assign the Monad to the Creator of the World, the Dyad to Procreative Matter and the Triad to the Ideal Forms<sup>308</sup>.

<sup>303</sup> See ch. II, n. 52 and 56, and WITT, 17. The Chaldaean designation of the Supreme God as "Number" (see ch. II, n. 164) also derives from Pythagorean tradition; see ZELLER, I, 1<sup>o</sup> p. 465 ff.

<sup>304</sup> See n. 21 and ch. II, n. 187.

<sup>305</sup> On the Pythagorean dyad see ZELLER, *loc. cit.*

<sup>306</sup> See n. 170-171, 188 a. The reading of the MSS. *οὐσίς οὐ πρώτης* was emended by Ruelle and Kroll: *οὐσίς οὐ πρώτης*, see ch. II, n. 170. It is true that *οὐσίς* fits rather awkwardly into the metre, but, on the other hand, attention should be drawn to NUMENIUS, p. 141, 5, who differentiates between the *οὐσίς* of the First and that of the Second Intellect.

<sup>307</sup> See the passages quoted by ZELLER, II, 1, p. 947 f. and, on the question of the Ideal Numbers, J. STENZEL, *Zahl und Gestalt bei Plato und Aristoteles*, Leipzig, 1924. This doctrine is quoted also by PLOTINUS, V, 4, 2: *διὸ καὶ εἰρηται: ἐκ τῆς ἀορίστου δυάδος καὶ τοῦ ἐνὸς τὰ εἶδη καὶ οἱ ἀριθμοί*.

<sup>308</sup> MARTIAN. CAPELLA, VII, 733 (whose source is Varro, who draws on Pythagorean tradition): "Nam monadem fabricatori deo, dyadem materiae procreanti, triadem idealibus formis consequenter aptamus". IAMBlichus *ap. DAM.*, I, 86, 20 (quoted by KROLL, 15): *εἶτε γὰρ μονὰς καὶ δυὰς ἀόριστος καὶ ἐπὶ ταύταις τριάς, αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ νοητὴ ὄλη τριάς, ὡς οἱ Πυθαγόρειοι λέγουσιν*.

The only difference between this Pythagorean doctrine and that of the Chaldæans relies in the definition of the Dyad. As we have already suggested, this difference may be explained by a Middle Platonic correction of the respective Pythagorean doctrine. In favour of this supposition we may point to another concordance between the Chaldæan and Pythagorean views on the number three. The latter describe it as the perfect measure because it is the first number which has "beginning, middle and end" <sup>309</sup>. The same formula is employed in the Oracles to characterize the Ideas as primal noetic measures <sup>310</sup>. Thence it follows that the Chaldæans depend from Platonists who transposed to the Ideas the Pythagorean description of the number three. No further use of numbers as metaphysical principles is found in the preserved Chaldæan Oracles; nevertheless, the Pythagorean interpretation of the tetrad seems to have been known to their authors. The Oracular fragment: "Do not deepen the plane" <sup>311</sup> is explicable on the ground of the Pythagorean interpretation of the plane as the number three (because of the number of points by which it is determined) and of space as the number four <sup>312</sup>. The number three is in the Oracles the measure of the noetic and therefore the purport of the Oracular warning is that the mortal should not "materialize" his mental substance by extension into the realm of the somatic <sup>313</sup>. The last example shows clearly that the Chaldæans preferred

<sup>309</sup> See ch. II, n. 174.

<sup>310</sup> See ch. II, n. 173.

<sup>311</sup> «μηδὲ βαθύνης τοῦπίπεδον»; see ch. III, n. 29.

<sup>312</sup> See the passages quoted by ZELLER, III, 2, p. 149, 1; in particular SEXT. EMPIR., *Adv. math.*, X, 279: τὴν δὲ γραμμὴν ῥοεῖσιν ἐπίπεδον ποιεῖν, τούτο δὲ εἰς βάθος κινήθην τὸ σῶμα γενεῖν τριχῆ διαστατόν. Cf. also THEO SMYRN., p. 46, 16; 100, 21 f., ed. Hiller. [IAMBL.], *Theol. Arithm.*, 17, 7, ed. de Falco.

<sup>313</sup> According to PROCL., *Rp.*, II, 52, 5 (similarly *Tim.*, I, 146, 14), the Chaldæan notion ἐπίπεδον refers to the world of becoming into which the soul descends; according to HERNIAS, *Phaedr.*, 246 c, 3, p. 130, 50 Ast and PSELLUS, *Comm.* 1137 C, it designates the soul's "luminous vehicle" (see DODDS, *Proclus*, 320). Kroll, in his note to PROCL., *Rp.*, II, 51, 26, quotes PLATO, *Leges*, 904 c, 10, but τὸ τῆς χώρας ἐπίπεδον means there "the surface of the earth".

Pythagorean terms by reason of their suitability as elements of the oracular style.

From Pythagorizing Platonists the Chaldæans borrowed also the descriptions of the realm of the intelligible world as "silence" and "deep"<sup>314</sup>. Since these two concepts appear also in the teachings of Valentinus, it has been hastily concluded that the Chaldæans were in direct connection with the Gnostics, and thence have been drawn far-reaching conclusions<sup>315</sup> into the discussion of which we here need not further enter. It has been overlooked that Valentinus—whose dependence on Plato and Pythagoras was already emphasized by the Fathers of the Church—himself indicated his source, in that he designated "Deep and Silence" as the first two components of the "first and first-born tetrad" of the Pythagoreans<sup>316</sup>. The proof of the Pythagorean origin of the first concept can also be furnished on the evidence of a direct witness. Mesomedes, a Greek poet of the time of Hadrian, designates with the predicate "Silence" the first principle of Pythagoras<sup>317</sup>. Both designations correspond, moreover, to the Pythagoreans' concept of the space above the heavens, which extends itself, beyond the "sounding" spheres, into infinity<sup>318</sup>. It is therefore to be supposed that the same Pythagorizing Platonists who were the originators of the doctrines of noetic triades found in the Oracles, also

<sup>314</sup> See ch. II, n. 351 and 353.

<sup>315</sup> KROLL, 16, 1; 18, 2; 70, 2, calls the Chaldæans, essentially because of this agreement, "Pagan Gnostics", and BIRDZ, *La Vie de Porphyre*, 88, 2, repeats this inadequate designation.

<sup>316</sup> IREN., *Haer.*, I, 1, 1. On the Pythagoreism of Valentinus see HIPPOLYT., *Ref.*, VI, 23 f.; on the tetrad of the Pythagoreans DELATTE, *Etudes sur la littérature Pythagoricienne* (Paris, 1915), 249 ff.

<sup>317</sup> MESOMEDES, *Eis tēn Phūsin Pythagōrou*, v. 3 (printed by WILAMOWITZ, *Griechische Verakunst*, 596, who, because of the agreement with Valentinus, also speaks of Gnostic influences on Mesomedes). I hope to treat this interesting poem separately elsewhere.

<sup>318</sup> Cf. ZELLER, I, 1<sup>a</sup>, p. 543, 1 on the Pythagorean doctrine of Unlimited Space. See also Philo's question in *Somn.*, I, 21 : ἡ ἀπλανής καὶ ἐξωτάτω σφαῖρα πρὸς τὸ ἄνω βάθος ἔχει. On Pythagoras' doctrine of the "sounding spheres" (ψόφος, ἦχος) see above ch. I, n. 45, *ad. v.* 10, and DIELS, *Vors.*, 45 B, 35.

transferred the Pythagorean concept "silence" and "deep" to the intelligible world and, in this Platonic reinterpretation, passed them on to the Chaldæans.

No other traces of Pythagorean influence on the Chaldæan Oracles can be demonstrated. Thence it is to be concluded that the Theurgists stood to the Pythagoreans in no direct relationship, but learned to know their formulæ through the mediation of the contemporary Platonism. This latter formed, therefore, the single source of the entire philosophical information<sup>319</sup>. With this brief statement we terminate the chapter on Plato and the Chaldæans and turn to the question of the Oriental sources of their theology.

---

<sup>319</sup> WENDELAND, *Philol. Wochenschrift*, 1895, 1040, has rightly observed that for the combination of Platonic, Pythagorean and Stoic teachings found in the Chaldæan Oracles not the Chaldæans, but the philosophers on whom they depend were responsible. As we have tried to show, these philosophers were Platonists. Accordingly, we cannot accept the view of PRÄECHTER, 523, who counts the Chaldæans among the group of theologians influenced by Pythagoreans.



## CHAPTER VII

---

### THE ORIENTAL ELEMENTS

1. *Preliminary remarks.*—The Platonic elements of the Chaldæan theology, which occupied us in the foregoing chapter, form the surface of the system and lend it the cast of a theoretical structure of doctrines. That the speculative aspects are thus put in the foreground proves that the Chaldæans wished above all to win for themselves the educated class. As to their success in their own time tradition is silent; the following which they attained among the later Neoplatonists corresponded, at any event, to their intention which was to appear as the heirs of philosophy. In this aspiration they were in conformity with other Oriental religious sects of their epoch and environment, above all with the Hermetics and Valentinians. In the community of this endeavour is reflected a tendency of significance for the general history of religion: the Orient, after it has won the masses by the mystery-religions, sets out to bring over into its camp the educated also. It prepares itself for this task by association of its fundamental religious ideas with the theological elements of Greek philosophy. However, this mixture could not be accomplished without reciprocal modification of the Oriental religions by the action of the Hellenistic ideas. These manifest their immense vitality in many instances and assimilate or disintegrate the Oriental substance. The Orientalizing of Hellenic speculations runs parallel with the Hellenizing of Oriental religious doctrines, or, in personal terms, the preachers of the sacred traditions of the East succumb to the intellectual power of Greek theory and become the mouthpieces of its fashion of thought and speech. This process, which is known to us above all from the history of Jewish Hellenism and of Christian theology, was carried through also in the consciousness of the Chaldæan

theurgists and worked itself out in a farreaching transformation of the concepts of the Oriental belief in the name of which they spoke. Only a few of these were retained by them in their original forms; most were accommodated to analogous doctrines of Platonic metaphysics, and such of them as contradicted these metaphysical axioms were neutralized or fully given up. This complicated state of affairs should not be overlooked by the historical analysis. The fact that Oriental beliefs have nevertheless preserved themselves—and in no small number—in the system of the Chaldæans, proves that the religious tradition of their original Eastern milieu possessed the power to present effective opposition to the levelling influence of Western speculation even after its transition into the area beneath the latter's dominion.

Therefore, if the inquiry as to the Oriental elements of the Chaldæan theology turn out in fact to be materially shorter than that on the philosophic motifs, the reason for this is not to be sought in the lesser intensity of their influence. The limitation is rather imposed upon us by the paucity of our knowledge concerning the forms of Eastern religions to which the Chaldæans were attached. We do dispose (thanks, above all, to the masterly studies of Cumont) of a concrete view of their general tendencies and even of a detailed knowledge of some of their principal creations, such as Mithraism as well as sun—and star—worship<sup>1</sup>; but there are lacking not only the fixed details which would determine the various phases of their inner development, but

---

<sup>1</sup> The following works of Cumont will be frequently referred to in this chapter :

a) *Textes et monuments figurés relatifs aux mystères de Mithra* (*M. M. M.*), 2 vol., 1896-1899. The synthetic part of this principal work on Mithraism has been published separately with brief annotations, with the title *Les mystères de Mithra* (*M. d. M.*); the third and last edition is quoted here according to the enlarged German translation (Leipzig, 1923), enlarged by the author.

b) *La théologie solaire du paganisme romain* (*Théol. sol.*). Mémoire présenté par divers savants Acad. Inscr., XII, 2<sup>e</sup> partie, 1909, p. 447 ff.

c) *Les religions orientales dans le paganisme romain*, 4th ed., Paris, 1929 (*Rel. Orient.*).

d) *After Life in Roman paganism*, New Haven, 1922.

e) Bidez-Cumont, *Les mages hellénisés* (*Mages hell.*), 2 vol., Paris, 1938.

also, and above all, adequate notions of the mass of variations which the mingling of their elements produced. This lack in sure points of reference compels us often to stop short with the establishment of general relationships and to renounce a closer determination of their terms.

The present chapter also distinguishes itself from the previous one by heterogeneity of the material used in its proofs. Platonism was transmitted to the Chaldæans by a school-tradition fixed in literary form and could therefore be dissected out of their Oracles by means of exact comparison with the preserved texts of this literary group. The religious beliefs of the Chaldæans, on the contrary, do not derive from a tradition fixed in book-form, but from the living creed of their Eastern home. The theology of these cults underwent, precisely in the second century A. D., a profound modification which could not attain expression in the ritual. The inquiry must therefore keep in mind also the religious ideas which developed apart from the liturgy and dogma. Similarity in this ideological sphere has the same right as that in the outer forms of the cult to be interpreted as sign of a common origin. We shall see that it was precisely the speculations of Oriental priests which made possible the transition of the Chaldæan theurgists to Platonism and thereby gave them the right to call their system by the name of their Oriental home.

2. *Aion*. The question as to the relation of the Chaldæans to the religion of Iran, which was already discussed in the chapter on demonology, presents itself again in the treatment of their doctrine of *Aion*<sup>2</sup>. Here also the "mythical" substance is enveloped in a thick husk of philosophical notions. For the *Aion* of the Chaldæans is not only a divinity, but also a noetic hypostasis. As such he comes, for the Platonists, into relation with the idea of eternity which, according to the account of the *Timæus* (37 c), was created by the demiurge as the model of time. Also the *Aion* of the Chaldæans is an offspring of the Primal Being ("begotten of the Father") and forms the primal measure of all temporality, in that he "mixes" the ages of the universe

<sup>2</sup> See ch. II, sect. 5 and 13, regarding the Chaldæan concept of *Aion*.

("Aeons")<sup>3</sup>. Further evidence of Platonic origin is given by the explanation of the Oracles that Aion "alone" is satiated with the noetic substance of the Primal Being, and thence derives his capacity "to think the Paternal Intellect"<sup>4</sup>. Later Platonists refer to Eternity as a characteristic of the Supreme Intellect<sup>5</sup>. The Chaldæans, as often, replace the logical by a genealogical relationship; Plotinus also once calls Aion a mode inherent in this Intellect, a mode which "proceeds from it and is with it"<sup>6</sup>.

The Aion of the Platonists is distinguished from that of the Chaldæans in two respects: In the first place it remains an unmoving norm<sup>7</sup>,

<sup>3</sup> These Chaldæan "Aeons" (see ch. I, n. 46, v. 13) are most probably identical with Plato's "Great Years" (*Tim.*, 39 d, 3); cf. PROCL., *Rp.*, II, 11, 22 f.: ὁ μὲν (ᾤσῃ αἰῶν) τῆς τοῦ νοητοῦ ζώου ζωῆς μέτρον. ὁ δὲ τῆς τοῦδε τοῦ κόσμου ζωῆς, ὁ χρόνος. Καὶ εἴη ἅν τῆς τῶν ἐν αὐτῷ (sc. τῷ χρόνῳ) πάντων ἀσωμάτων κινήσεως καὶ σωματικῶν πασῶν (sc. κινήσεων) κοινῆς συναποκαταστάσεως (the return of the heavenly bodies to their original relative position) μέτρον παντελές (sc. ὁ χρόνος) ὁ δὲ πολλὰ ἀνελλισσόμενον ποιεῖ τὸν ἄπειρον χρόνον; cf. *ibid.*, 17, 17 ff.

<sup>4</sup> See ch. II, n. 138.

<sup>5</sup> PLOTINUS, III, 7, 3-6; V, 1, 4. See INGE, *The philosophy of Plotinus*, II, 92-103; PORPHYRY, *Philos. Hist. Fragm.*, XVIII, p. 14, 19 f., ed. Nauck, and *apud* PROCL., *Th. Pl.*, 27, 33 f. Authority was found in PLATO, *Tim.*, 37 d, 3: ἡ μὲν οὖν τοῦ ζώου (i. e. the αὐτοζώον, the intelligible cosmos) φύσις ἐτύγγαθεν οὐσα αἰώνιος.

<sup>6</sup> PLOTINUS, III, 7, 4. Cf. PORPH., *Sent.*, 45, 4. The view mentioned by PROCL., *Tim.*, III, 24, 8 that Aion is the offspring of the Intellect (γέννημα τοῦ νοῦ) comes near to that of the Chaldæans.

According to the Oracles (ch. II, n. 137), Aion "puts his light into the 'Sources and Principles', i. e. the Ideas". This doctrine is a mythical representation of the Middle Platonic definition of the ideas as eternal thoughts of the Supreme Being; cf. ch. VI, n. 13 and the Oracle quoted ch. II, n. 177, v. 14. According to PLUTARCH, *De def. orac.*, 22, 422 c, Aion subsists "around" (περὶ) the noetic models of the sensible world.

<sup>7</sup> PLATO, *Tim.*, 37 d, 6: μένοντος αἰῶνος ἐν ἐνί. ALBINUS, 170, 22: αἰῶνος, ὅς ἐστι μέτρον τοῦ αἰωνίου κόσμου τῆς μονῆς. CHALCIDIUS in *Tim.*, c. CIV: "ævi... manentis in suo statu". APULEIUS, *De Plat.*, I, 10, p. 92, 24: "perennitatis fixa et immota natura est". PORPHYR., *Sent.*, 45, 17: τῇ τοῦ νοῦ μονῇ τῇ ἐν ἑαυτῷ (παρῳφίσταται) ὁ αἰών. SYNESIUS, *Hymn.*, IX, 59 (69): Αἰών... τᾶς ἀνάου μονᾶς ταμίας.

whereas that of the Chaldæans is in constant motion<sup>8</sup>; the source of this difference will be more fully discussed later on<sup>9</sup>. In the second place, it is no divinity and therefore leads no separate existence in the noetic world<sup>10</sup>. If Iamblichus introduces the God of eternity into the noetic system of the Neoplatonic deities, he is led to do so by his recognition of the Chaldæan theosophy, of which Aion was the chief *numen*, as the esoteric wisdom of his school<sup>11</sup>. The lack of any separate Aion-hypostasis in the Platonism contemporary with the Chaldæans results in a logical obscurity in the latter's system. The relationship of Aion to the Cosmic Soul, which by nature has many functions in common with him, is not accurately determined in the Chaldæan Oracles<sup>12</sup>. In

<sup>8</sup> See ch. II, n. 138 : «ἀεί τε μένειν ἀόκνω στροφάλιγγι». It seems that this verse reflects an interpretation of the Platonic association between αἰών and μονή (see n. 7).

<sup>9</sup> See n. 46. It is not impossible that the Chaldæan view of the eternal movement of Aion is related in some way to the teachings of contemporary Platonists. The current definition of Aion as "Life of the intelligible World" (quoted also by Ρηλο, *Mut. nom.*, 267 : αἰών δὲ ἀναγράφεται τοῦ νοητοῦ βίος κόσμου) could have been associated both with the Platonic doctrine of Life as eternal movement (see ch. VI, n. 168) and with that of the cyclic movement of Nous (*Soph.*, 248 e ff. ; *Leges*, 898 a. See Dodds, *Gnomon*, 1931, 309); but the tradition of Middle Platonism throws no light on this point.

The revolution of Aion is described in the hymn of the "Theosophy" as the self-actuated movement of the immobile First Being; cf. ch. II, n. 146-147 : «ὀρίων φωνὴ σεαυτὸν». The Hermetic *Asclepius* (c. 30, p. 69, 14, ed. Thomas) rejects the supposition that God's motion has been eternally existent and affirms the Platonic thesis which posits his motionless eternity ("nisi aliquis audeat dicere ipsius, sc. dei, commotionem in aeternitate esse; sed magis est ipsa immobilis aeternitas... deus ergo stabilis fuit semper...").

<sup>10</sup> Plotinus' (III, 7, 5) words καλῶς ἐν λέγοιτο (not λέγεται) ὁ αἰὼν θεὸς ἐμφαινων καὶ προφαίνων ἐαυτὸν οἷός ἐστι τὸ εἶναι, etc., do not mean that Aion is God, but that he might well be called a manifestation of the divine in its pure existence (see Nock, *Harv. Theol. Rev.*, 1934, 99).

<sup>11</sup> The suggestion of Dodds, *Proclus*, 228, is confirmed by SIMPL., *Phys.*, 795, 4 f. (see ch. II, n. 149) who states that Iamblichus and Proclus "tried" to deify Aion, because he was conjured by the Theurgists.

<sup>12</sup> The Hermetics frequently identify Aion with the World-Soul and for this reason ignore almost entirely the latter hypostasis. Cf. *Asclepius*, c. 30, p. 68,

the doxology of the angels preserved in the "Theosophy", which gives the sequence of the noetic beings in accordance with the doctrine of contemporary Platonism, Aion is altogether lacking<sup>13</sup>. This want of ontological precision proves that god Aion was interpolated by the Chaldæans into the schema of Platonism and only thereafter equipped with some of the attributes given by the Platonic doctrine to eternity. He derives from another, a religious, sphere<sup>14</sup>, to the closer definition of which we now turn.

Aion was, at the time of the Chaldæan theurgists, honored by many religious communities of the East and the West<sup>15</sup>. The most powerful influence was exercised by the Iranian doctrine of the divine incarnation of Infinite Time : *Zervan Akarana*. It associated itself with notions taken from the astral religions of the surrounding Semitic world, and began, in this association, its march of conquest over the provinces of the Roman Empire. It penetrated into the religion of Mithra, mixed itself in Egypt, Phoenicia, Punic Africa, and Rome, with analogous religious ideas, and altered, according to the milieu, its outer form, but not its character. The Chaldæan god of Eternity, too, no longer pre-

---

21 ff.; *Corp. Herm.*, XI, 2; FERGUSON-SCOTT, *Hermetica*, IV, 421 (in particular note 9). The Hermetic Aion is the demiurge and the latter designated for this reason as *διωὸν ποιζω* (cf. the Chaldæan *ποιζούμενος* quoted n. 22) in *Poimandres*, 11.

<sup>13</sup> See ch. I, n. 58 and 67.

<sup>14</sup> DODDS, *Proclus*, 228 draws attention to the analogous "blending of the Greek philosophical concept with the religious phantasy" observable in *Corp. Herm.*, XI. See the detailed analysis of this Hermetic treatise in SCOTT-FERGUSON, *op. cit.*, 420 ff.

<sup>15</sup> Many excellent studies published in the last decades deal with the nature of the god Aion and the cults of which he was the object. We may cite, in particular, R. REITZENSTEIN, *Das iranische Erlösungsmysterium*, 1921, 171-206, and Cumont's numerous contributions (mainly in his work on Mithra), whose conclusion were summed up and developed in *Les Mages hellénisés*. A. D. NOCK's study, *A vision of Mandulis Aion*, *Harv. Theol. Rev.*, XXVII, 1934, 78-99, is distinguished by its critical sifting of tradition and differentiation between the various types of religion. ZEPF, *Der Gott Aion in der hellenistischen Theologie*, *Arch. f. Rel.*, XXV (1927), p. 225-244 contributes many valuable observations, but overstresses the influence of the Aristotelian concept of Aion upon pre-Plotinian theology. Other bibliographical notes are to be found *ad loc.*

sents the Iranian model in its original form, but it has preserved many Oriental traits of character in purer form than have the other variants<sup>16</sup>.

First of all let us face the most obvious points of agreement between the Iranian and the Chaldæan notions of Aion. The Chaldæan Aion is called a "fiery god"<sup>17</sup>. Fire is also the essence of the Iranian divinity; fire streams from the mouth of his lion-faced statue, and on his breast are placed lightnings<sup>18</sup>. In the representation of the initiation into immortality delivered in the magical papyrus of Paris (which Dieterich erroneously called a "Mithrasliturgie") Aion is invoked with 21 epithets, which consistently refer to him as God of light and fire<sup>19</sup>. Some of the predicates there employed, such as "Walker in fire", "Maker of light", "Ruler of light", "Fiery bodied", "Mover of light", agree in content, and at times even verbally, with those of the Chaldæan Oracles<sup>20</sup>.

According to the description of the Oracles, Aion stands above the zone of the fixed stars; in the figurative representation of the Mithraists, above the globe of the cosmos<sup>21</sup>. His body is, according to

<sup>16</sup> Cumont (*M. M. M.*, I, 76; cf. 34-36; *Mages hell.*, I, 64, 2), who was followed up by DIETERICH, *Mithrasliturgie*, 205, 3, was the first to point out the connection between the Chaldæan and the Iranian Aion, but he could not investigate this relationship in detail, relying as he did upon Kroll's monograph which only cites four oracular verses referring to Aion (quoted ch. II, n. 137).

<sup>17</sup> Cf. ch. I, n. 46, v. 2: «Φλογυδός... κινούμενος, ἀπλετος Αἰών»; v. 9: «πυρροῖο Θεοῦ»; v. 15: «ἐν πυρὶ ναίων».

<sup>18</sup> See CUMONT, *M. M. M.*, I, 76 ff.; *M. d. M.*, 97 and plate I, 6; *Rel. Orient.*, plate I, 1.

<sup>19</sup> DIETERICH, *op. cit.*, 65 f. I am quoting from *P. Mag.*, IV, 587 f.

<sup>20</sup> The attributes mentioned in the text are: πυρίπολε, φωτὸς κτίστα, φωτοκράτωρ, πυρσιώματε, φωτοκινῆτα. The Iranian origin of this Aion invoked in the Paris treatise of magic is admitted also by Cumont (though he rejects—quite rightly—Dieterich's thesis regarding the Mithraic origin of the text). It may, however, be remarked that in this magical text Aion functions as doorkeeper of the planetary zone; not as supercelestial numen; see REITZENSTEIN, *Iranisches Erlösungsmysterium* 238 f.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. ch. II, n. 152 d: «ἐθεστῶτα τῷ πρωτίστῳ τῶν αἰθερίων» with CUMONT, *M. M. M.*, I, 85. A Hermetic Oracle (quoted by W. SCOTT, *Hermetica*, I, p. 531 f.)

this representation, wound round with snakes; in the Oracles he is called the "entwined", for he moves, in his route through the noetic region, in spirals<sup>22</sup>. On the body of his statue known to the Mithraists are placed the signs of the zodiac and the emblems of the seasons which were honored by the Mithraists as divine beings<sup>23</sup>. In the Oracles also he is described as ruler of the fixed stars, of the sun and of the moon; and the gods of time, who were also worshipped by the Chaldæans, are made his satellites<sup>24</sup>.

These points of agreement may be sufficient as proof of the Iranian origin of the Chaldæan god of eternity. In the course of our foregoing interpretation the cult-statue of Aion honored by the worshippers of Mithra served us as the most important object of comparison<sup>25</sup>.

---

—as well as other Hermetic writings—regard Aion as the personification of the Zodiac; cf. *Asclepius*, 19, p. 54, 10 f. (*παντόμορφος* is an attribute of Aion; see SCOTT-FERGUSON, *Hermetica*, IV, 423, 7).

<sup>22</sup> Cf. «*ἔρπων εἰλήθην, ροιζούμενος*» and «*εἰλικιοεἶδη*» (quoted ch. II, n. 151) with CUMONT, quoted n. 18.

<sup>23</sup> CUMONT, *M. d. M.*, 97 f.; 110; 154, 2; 173; *Rel. Orient.*, 288, 50.

<sup>24</sup> See ch. II, n. 158 b-e, and ch. IV, n. 21-30. The signs of the Zodiac were represented on the garments and girdles of the Chaldæan officiants; see ch. I, n. 114 and ch. IV, n. 29.

The designation of the Chaldæan Aion as "young and old" (ch. II, n. 151) is taken from the conventional terminology; see C. LACKEIT, *Aion*, Dissert., Königsberg, 1914, p. 90 and 94; R. REITZENSTEIN, *Iran. Erlösungsmyst.*, 186; VALENTINUS ap. EPIPHAN., *Pan. Haer.*, 31, 5, 2.

The suggestion of LACKEIT, *op. cit.*, 62, 2, and NORDEN, *Geburt des Kindes*, 143, 5, that the formula *ἐξ αἰῶνος εἰς αἰῶνα* (quoted by them from [ARISTOTLE], *De mundo*, 397 a, 10; 400 a, 16 and [PHILOLAUS], *De anima*, DIELS, *Vors.*, 32 B, 21, p. 318, 19 and p. 319, 3) is never found in purely Hellenic literature, but only in Greek literature influenced by Oriental, especially Semitic, ideas, is contradicted by MARCUS AURELIUS, IX, 28 and SEXT. EMPIR., *Adv. phys.*, I, 62. Cf. already PLAUTUS, *Miles gloriosus*, 1079: "Quin mille annorum perpetuo vivont ab saeclo ad saeculum". (None of these passages are adduced either in LIDDELL-SCOTT-JONES or in KITTEL's *Wörterbuch zum N. T.*, s. v. *αἰών*.)

<sup>25</sup> Nock, *op. cit.*, 79, points out that the Mithraists seldom call this god Aion, their usual names for him being Kronos or Saturn. Proclus calls him *Χρόνος* or *Χρονοάρχης* (ch. II, n. 149; 162; ch. IV, n. 27), the Oracles in one passage



Cumont who has interpreted its symbols, holds it to be a creation of Mithraic art, but, on the other hand, explains that it imitates an Oriental prototype<sup>26</sup> and that the religious concepts associated with it go back to Iranian and later Babylonian doctrines. Since the beliefs of the Chaldæans allow no direct relationship to the Mithraic theology to be recognized, the agreement is therefore to be explained by common dependence on a form of an Iranian belief about Aion which was temporally precedent to Mithraism.

Proof of this relationship is furnished above all by the difference in the rank of the god in the two religious systems. The Aion of the Mithraists is the highest god of their pantheon, that of the Chaldæans is an offspring of the Supreme God. In this divergency is reflected the difference between the canonical theology of Iran and that of one of its transformations which had most far-reaching effects<sup>27</sup>. According to the official belief of the Zoroastrian priests, Ahura Mazda is the supreme god. He creates the universe; and also Zervan, Time, is one of his

(ch. II, n. 313), χρόνου χρόνος—a designation which recalls the name Kronos explained by the Mithraists (in accordance with the habitual interpretation) as Time (*Seculum*); see CUMONT, *M. M. M.*, I, 77. Eudemus, the most ancient Greek author (s. IV B. C.) who mentions Zervan, calls him χρόνος. The Chaldæans state, as do the Mithraists (CUMONT, *M. d. M.*, 97) that "his name may not be apprehended with a word" (ch. II, n. 148), *i. e.* he had a magical secret name (*ἀρρητον ὄνομα*) as also in *P. Mag.*, XII, 240; XIII, 983.

<sup>26</sup> CUMONT, *M. M. M.*, I, 75; 79 ff.; II, 58 f.; *M. d. M.*, 215; cf. 97. ARNOBIUS, VI, 10, describing the same statue, calls the god which it represents "Frugifer", a name which conforms to the nature of the Phoenician Aion (CUMONT, *M. M. M.*, I, 78; 83, 4-5; BOUSSER, *Hauptprobleme der Gnosis*, 353. See below, note 95). We may infer that this statue was worshipped not only by Mithraists.

We do not know whether the Chaldæans worshipped images of Aion (as they did those of Hecate). The key, the only attribute which might refer to the image of Aion (see CUMONT, *M. M. M.*, I, 83 f.), is not attested with certainty and might also be explained metaphorically (see ch. II, n. 308). Aion's "self-manifestation" (ch. II, n. 148, 150) could have taken place in fire.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. the following with BIDEZ-CUMONT, *Mages hell.*, I, 63 ff., who cite p. 64, 2 their own preliminary investigations and p. 63, 3 the works of the Iranists on which their theories are based.

productions. This orthodox theology of Mazdaism experienced, under the influence of the later Babylonian astral religion, a fundamental transformation: Ahura Mazda gave up his place to Zervan, who became the begotter of him and of his opponent Ahriman. This doctrine of the so-called Zervanites formed the foundation of the cult of Aion practiced by the worshippers of Mithra. The Chaldæans (together with the overwhelming majority of Greek and Hellenized witnesses) follow the doctrine of official Mazdaism. Ahura Mazda has many traits in common with the Supreme God of the Chaldæans. He is enthroned above the heavens in a region of endless light; he creates, at first, Infinite Time, and, with the help of his Reason, the essence of the gods; and he is surrounded with potencies which, as to their nature, closely resemble archangels. These concepts of the Mazdaean belief concerning the Supreme Being were spread through the Greek world of the second century A. D. by means of various pseudepigrapha, composed by Oriental Hellenists and attributed to Zoroaster himself or to one of his later successors, the legendary founder of magic, Ostanes. In one of the chief works of this sort, the supreme, invisible God, surrounded by archangels, is contrasted with the earthly demons, the "enemies of humanity"<sup>28</sup>. There is reason to suppose that, as the demonology, so also the Chaldæan angelology goes back, in the last instance, to Iranian origins, of which traces have not been made fully unrecognizable even by the Judaizing transformation<sup>29</sup>.

If the Mazdaean groundwork be still recognizable in the Chaldæans' notion of the Supreme God, yet, on the other hand, the peculiar position which they assign to the god Aion offers proof of the penetration of Zervanism. Aion is the proper god of the Chaldæan theurgists: whom the planetary gods serve as angels, and in whom the Primal.

---

<sup>28</sup> Bidez-Cumont, *Mages hell.*, II, 290.

<sup>29</sup> Cumont (*Mages hell.*, II, 292, 4; *Rel. Orient.*, 279, 52) believes that the angels of the hymn of the "Theosophy" (see ch. I, n. 32)—whose true origin he did not discover—are related to the Avestan Amesha Spentas. The appellation "Holy Rulers" applied to the angels in this hymn recalls the Avestan term "Holy Immortals".

incomprehensible Being reveals Himself. Whether or not this Chaldæan notion goes back to a fusion of the two Persian theologies must be left to the decision of Iranists. It may, however, be remarked that the Chaldæan account of the relationship of the Supreme God to the god Aion resembles in some essential points to that in the first chapter of the *Bundahishn*<sup>30</sup>. In this representation of the Avestan cosmogony the eternal ('infinite') light which is created by Ormuzd (Ahura Mazda) and in which he dwells, is called "location" or "place"; "place" is, according to the report of Aristotle's disciple Eudemus, one of the names of Zervan<sup>31</sup>. In the Chaldæan Oracles Aion is designated as "father-begotten Light" in which the Supreme God reveals Himself. Both witnesses therefore treat Aion as a supracelestial light which the Supreme God brings forth in order to dwell in it<sup>32</sup>.

3. *The Solar Theology*.—In the Chaldæan system are found clear traces of another theology of the Near East which associated itself with Zoroastrism and which helps us to definite more closely the racial and intellectual descent of the authors of the Chaldæan Oracles: it is the solar religion. The sun takes, in the religious thought of the Chaldæans, a place immediately following that of the supermundane gods. Its worship is founded on a highly developed physical cosmology<sup>33</sup>. The sun forms the heart of the world, holds together the planets by means of its beams, and rules over the harmony of the etherial world. Its light derives from Aion, who governs it; its power, which generates

<sup>30</sup> *Bundahishn*, ch. 1, p. 1, Justi, according to the interpretation of H. S. NYBERG, *Questions de cosmogonie et de cosmologie Mazdéennes*, *Journal Asiatique*, CCXIV, 1929, 193-310, especially 207, and CCXIX (1931), 1-134, especially 52 ff.

<sup>31</sup> Bidez-Cumont, *Mages hell.*, I, 62, 4; 63 f.; *M. d. M.*, 97, 1; NYBERG, *op. cit.*, p. 103 f.

<sup>32</sup> The Phœnician Hellenist Philo of Byblus (*ap. LYD.*, *Mens.*, IV, 53, p. 111, 1 f.) holds that the name Iao means in Phœnician *Ἰᾶς νοητόν* (cf. JULIAN, *Orat.*, IV, 134 A, as to the Phœnician conception of the noetic nature of light). This interpretation seems to be based on the equation Iao = Aion, which is found in *P. Mag.*, IV, 593-594; 1170; 1201; VII, 584.

<sup>33</sup> As to what follows cf. ch. II, sect. 13 f., and ch. III, sect. 2-3.

life and which warms the earth, from the primal noetic substance of which it is the reservoir. This cosmological descriptions of the Oracles forms the basis of their solar mysteriosophy. The sun is the central one of the three Rulers of the worlds who were invoked by the Chaldæans during their principal sacrament. Its beams purify the soul of the initiate, draw it upward, and accomplish its union with the primal light, which bends down toward it—a union which bestows immortality upon the soul.

These notions concerning the spiritual substance of the light of the sun and the sun's rule over planets and souls— notions composed of physical theories and mystical beliefs—derive from the Syrian Solar religion. Cumont, in a series of far-seeing investigations<sup>34</sup>, has described the rise, development and expansion of this faith, and thereby has also laid the foundations for the explanation of the solar theology of the Chaldæan theurgists (of which the evidences were known to him only in small part and that part transmitted in such form as to be hardly understandable)<sup>35</sup>. We shall first treat here the Solar cosmology of the Chaldæans. It appears, from Cumont's expositions as completed by Reinhardt, that the physical theories of the Syrian Solar theology proceeded from an association of Semitic faiths and of Stoic theorems. In particular, the heliocentric cosmology of the Stoic Posidonius exercised the strongest influence on the speculations of the Syrian priests of the sun<sup>36</sup>. The Chaldæan theurgists learned the Syrian beliefs concerning the sun when these were already in that philosophical form. Thence are derived the physical formulæ concerning the sun as heart of the universe, guard of its harmony, "connective" of the ethereal

---

<sup>34</sup> We may refer in the first place to CUMONT in *Théologie solaire*, 449 ff.: *After Life*, 100 ff. et passim; *Rel. Orient.*, in particular ch. v.

<sup>35</sup> Cumont mentions briefly the Chaldæan Oracles *Théol. sol.*, 464, 4; *After Life*, 101; 160 (on the ἀναγωγός). See n. 37.

<sup>36</sup> K. REINHARDT, *Kosmos und Sympathie* (1926), 308-385, has investigated in detail the part played by Posidonius in the theoretical elaboration of the Syrian solar theology. Cumont had already referred in this connection to the Stoic philosopher (*Théol. sol.*, 473 ff.).

world, ruler of the stars<sup>37</sup>. This solar theology went through, with the general change of religious consciousness, from pantheism to transcendentalism. Above the ruler of the planets was exalted a super-celestial divinity removed from this world, whom the sun served and from whom he, the formerly source of all cosmic and human intelligence, received his spiritual light<sup>38</sup>. This metamorphosis corresponds to the change of the philosophical schools who patronized the Solar faith. Stoicism, which had taken its part in the development of the pantheistic Solar theology, was superseded by Platonism<sup>39</sup>. The sun is men-

---

<sup>37</sup> In the absence of preliminary studies, Cumont could not investigate in detail the concordance between the Chaldæan system and Syrian solar theology; the texts he has collected make it possible to complete his research. We shall deal here in the first place with the cosmological parallels. (a) Concerning the sun as the centre and ruler of the planets (ch. II, n. 220; 309; 321) see CUMONT, *Théol. sol.*, 452 f.; 454, 1-2 (where he notes the relevant fragments of the Oracles). (b) The sun as heart of the world (ch. II, n. 220 b, d, e) : *ibid.*, 458, 2 and REINHARDT, *Kosmos und Sympathie*, 331 f.; 411. (c) The sun as ruler of the cosmical harmony (ch. II, n. 100) : *ibid.*, 459, 2. (d) as source of Life, see ch. II, n. 325. (e) as "connective" of the planetary world : see n. 75. (f) The designation of the sun as "warden of the fire" (*πυρὸς ταμίης*; see ch. II, n. 232 and 238) derives from the same tradition.

<sup>38</sup> CUMONT, *Théol. sol.*, 461; 467; *Rel. Orient.*, 123 f. The influence of this transcendental movement upon the inner transformation of the Oriental religious systems has been pointed out by ZEPF (quoted note 15), p. 237 ff. This development explains also the subordination of Mithra, identified with the Syrian solar god (CUMONT, *M. d. M.*, 175), to a supercelestial divinity.

<sup>39</sup> CUMONT, *Théol. sol.*, 461, 2-3; 467 f.; 473; 477. The rhetor Menander—a contemporary of the Chaldæans—reproducing the schema of a solar hymn, states that the philosophers debate the question whether the sun is the creator of the world or a second power subordinate to him; cf. REINHARDT, *op. cit.*, 372 f. Philo, who indicates the way of transition, characterises the Chaldæans as Stoic pantheists and opposes their doctrine to the Platonic conception of a transcendent god; see ch. VI, n. 131 and CUMONT, *Théol. sol.*, 467. He applies already (but in a purely metaphorical way, in accordance with PLATO, *Rep.*, 517 b-c) to the *Logos* the expression *νοητὸς ἥλιος*, which was the base of Iamblichus' solar theology; see ch. II, n. 311. On the sun as "second god" see also J. KROLL, *Lehren des Hermes*, 101, 4; ZEPF, *op. cit.*, 240. The same transformation is also reflected in the magical papyri; cf. *P. Mag.*, XIII, 258 f.; 337; 450; XIV a, 5.

tioned in his role as a servant ("the second power") in a Hermetic tract, the solar theology of which derives from the same milieu as that of the theurgists; he is there referred to as the demiurge, who is filled by the "Father of all", the proper God, with the noetic substance which make his beams noetic potencies<sup>40</sup>. A similar place is also given to the sun in the system of the Chaldæan theurgists. They subordinate the ruler of the planetary world to a supramundane deity which makes its noetic light to stream into its subordinate, thereby transforming the latter's rays also to noetic light.

In the system of the Chaldæans Aion is inserted between the Supreme Being and the sun. Thereby the formerly ruler of the universe is moved back one step further. This modification is most probably to be explained by a synthesis of Iranian and Syrian religious elements. Ahura Mazda and Aion, the two supreme gods of Iran, are exalted over the intamundane sun-god of the Syrians and degrade him to be their servant. At the same time, the supreme divinity of the Persian religion fuses with the supracelestial god of the transcendental Syrian theology and assumes his character<sup>41</sup>. But also the Iranian Aion changes his nature. He is described in the Chaldæan Oracles as a "fiery god" who travels his spiral route in the noetic region, "rushing"<sup>42</sup>. He has both the sound and the ecliptic route in common with the planets<sup>43</sup>. The entire empyrean, which he, as the Oracles explain, "leads round in a circle", is affected by his movement<sup>44</sup>. Consequently, as Aion is represented in the Oracles as the model of the planetary god, so is the noetic zone as the model of the planetary spheres. This view of Aion, as can be clearly recognized, has arisen through the projection of astral

<sup>40</sup> *Corp. Herm.*, XVI, 16 : (ὁ) γὰρ οὖν ἐν τῷ λογικῷ (τῆς ψυχῆς) ἀκτῖς (sc. τοῦ Θεοῦ) ἐπιλάμπει διὰ τοῦ ἡλίου . . . , τούτων καταργοῦνται οἱ δαίμονες. The substance of the sun is designated *ibid.*, 6 as a νοητὴ οὐσία. As to the origin of the Hermetic theology see J. KROLL, *op. cit.*, 104; W. KROLL in *P. W.*, s. v. *Hermes Trismegistos*, 807; REINHARDT, *op. cit.*, 365 f. See also note 71.

<sup>41</sup> See CUMONT, *M. M. M.*, I, 87 f.; *Rel. Orient.*, 118 f.; 140.

<sup>42</sup> See n. 22.

<sup>43</sup> As to *ροιζόμενος* see ch. I, n. 46, *ad v.* 10.

<sup>44</sup> See ch. II, n. 152 (e).

concepts into the supramundane region<sup>45</sup>. An astral notion of god, therefore, brought about the association of the doctrines of the Iranian and the Syrian faiths, and impressed upon them both the stamp of its nature.

4. *The journey of the soul through the heavens.*—The determination of this connecting factor follows from the inquiry concerning the origin of the beliefs fundamental to the ritual of the Chaldæan mysteries. The principal action of their initiation into immortality was the journey of the soul through the heavens (*ἀναγωγή*)<sup>46</sup>. This ascent formed the content of the holy practices of many Oriental mystery cults of this period. It was celebrated in its most nearly complete form in the mystery of the Mithraists<sup>47</sup>. Their initiation consisted of the mimic representation of the descent of the soul from the region of its divine origin, and its reascent after severance from the body. The neophyte had to pass, first downwards and then upwards, through the seven doors—which symbolized the six planetary spheres and the sphere of the fixed stars—of a ladder graphically represented in the sanctuary; and he had finally to enter through the “eighth door” into the supramundane elysium. This belief in the descent and ascent of the soul through the spheres is, as Cumont and Bousset have shown, a creation of the late Babylonian astral religion, as transformed by Hellenistic

<sup>45</sup> The supposed influence of Middle Platonic theorems concerning the movement of Aion (see n. 9) could not explain the origin of this belief, but only its theoretic formulation.

<sup>46</sup> On what follows, see WENDLAND'S summary (*Hellenistisch-römische Kultur*, etc.,<sup>3</sup> 1912, 170 ff.), based on the researches of BOUSSET, *Die Himmelsreise der Seele*, *Arch. f. Rel.*, IV, 1901, 160 ff.; GOETT. *Gel. Anz.*, 1905, 707 ff.; DIETERICH, *Mithrasliturgie*, 179 ff.; CUMONT, *Rel. Orient.*, 265, 91 and REITZENSTEIN, *Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen*, *passim*. The copious use of the name of Posidonius has to be restricted in accordance with the results of Reinhardt's researches. Jewish Gnosticism provides an interesting example of the development of the doctrine of the ascension of the soul. The relevant texts are interpreted and assigned their place in the history of religion by G. SCHOLEM, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism*, Jerusalem, 1941, 48 ff.

<sup>47</sup> CUMONT, *M. M. M.*, I, 38 f.; 117 f.

cosmological physics<sup>48</sup>. It recurs in manifold variations in the eschatological speculation of the theologians of later Antiquity and forms the basis of many Gnostic systems<sup>49</sup>. The Chaldæan Oracles also retain many evidences of this siderial eschatology. The "drama of the soul", the history of its supermundane origin, descent through the spheres, embodiment, enslavery, and release through the sacrament, and final reascent, is one of the chief themes of their doctrine. In the mystery of the Chaldæans itself, however, not the whole history of the soul, but only its "return" was represented, and this also, not to its supermundane termination, but only up to the sun of which the noetic light, directed by Aion, completed its purification. The solar theology determines the extent and meaning of the journey through the heavens acted out during the Chaldæan mystery. On the other hand, the general descriptions of the journey of the soul given in the Chaldæan Oracles agree with those of the Mithraists. Their "ladder with seven doors" corresponds to the "sevenfold ladder" which the Theurgist had to climb<sup>50</sup>. Whether the Oracles use this figure only as a metaphorical description of an intellectual ascent to the apprehension of the noetic world, or whether they refer thereby to a specific practice in the celebration of the mystery, which was acted out apart from the "elevation" to the sun, can no longer be known. It is not impossible that the ascent to the supramundane (the "eighth" zone) formed the initiation of the highest class of initiates, to whose souls the final translation into the empyrean was promised<sup>51</sup>.

<sup>48</sup> See CUMONT, *Rel. Orient.*, 265, 91; 283, 69 (with bibliography).

<sup>49</sup> See W. ANZ, *Zur Frage nach dem Ursprung des Gnostizismus*, 1897, which according to him derives from Babylonian mythology, an untenable supposition; cf. H. JONAS, *Gnosis und spätantiker Geist*, I, 25 f.

<sup>50</sup> See ch. v, n. 133 and 135. The similarity between the *επταπόρος βαθμῆς* of the Chaldæans and the *κλίμαξ ἐπτάπυλος* of the Mithraists (see ORIG., *C. Cels.*, VI, 22) was investigated by ANZ, *op. cit.*, 87, 2; 89; CUMONT, *M. M. M.*, I, 38, 3 and by BOUSSSET, *Arch. f. Rel.*, IV, 264.

<sup>51</sup> On this class of Chaldæan initiates see ch. III, sect. 6. The fact that the title *Heliödromus* designated the second and *Pater* the first grade of the Mithraic initiates (see CUMONT, *M. M. M.*, I, 315 f.), may perhaps point to the existence



Another type of mystery dealing with the journey through the heavens is described in the great magical papyrus of Paris. The general agreement between the initiation to immortality there represented and that of the Chaldæan theurgists has been already indicated<sup>52</sup>. It concerns above all four points : the ascent is accomplished by the separation of the soul from the body and the inhalation of sunbeams ; it culminates in the vision of God<sup>53</sup> ; this vision produces immortality ; the action as a whole represents the death and rebirth of the initiate. As to the origin of the concepts which appear in this magical papyrus, opinions differ, and in fact, it is impossible to trace such a product of contamination to a single source<sup>54</sup>. The agreement with the views of the Chaldæans, which already struck Bousset and Dieterich (who were yet without knowledge of the existence of a Chaldæan mystery of immortality<sup>55</sup>) proves that the beliefs mentioned derive from Syro-Iranian religious circles<sup>56</sup>.

---

of a supreme Mithraic sacrament similar to the Chaldæan one whose existence is supposed in the text.

The comparison of the soul's ascent with the climbing up of a ladder is to be found in PHILO, *De somn.*, I, 150 f. (quoted by CUMONT, *After Life*, 154). HERMIAS in *Phaedr.*, 249 c, 7, p. 154, 50 f. Ast compares the Platonic τελετή of the vision of the true Being with "the seventh mystery" (τῆς ἐβδομῆς τελετῆς) achieved only by a chosen few, whereas the majority stops short at the first or second step ; but it is not clear whether he refers to Mithraism or to another mystery (immediately afterwards he quotes the famous Orphic saying πολλοὶ μὲν νάρθηκοφόροι, πύργοι δὲ τε βάρχοι: *Orph. Fragm.*, 5, Kern).

<sup>52</sup> See ch. III, n. 85 ; 132 ; 138.

<sup>53</sup> See note 120.

<sup>54</sup> Cf. Weinreich's exposition of the divergent opinions in the third edition of DIETERICH's *Mithrasliturgie*, p. 234 f.

<sup>55</sup> BOUSSET, *Arch. f. Rel.*, IV, 264 ff. ; DIETERICH, *op. cit.*, 205 f.

<sup>56</sup> BOUSSET, *op. cit.*, DIETERICH, *op. cit.*, and after them REITZENSTEIN, *Hellenistische Mysterienreligionen*, 174 and 387, suppose the influence of Iranian beliefs. This ethnic appellation must be restricted as above. Πρόνοια καὶ Ψυχή invoked by the magician in the beginning of his conjuration are, however, not Iranian terms (REITZENSTEIN, *Hellenistische Mysterienreligionen*, 178), but the Stoic designations of the Cosmic Soul representing Destiny (*St. V. Fr.*, II, 110, 613), as are also Φύσις and Πρόνοια invoked by VETTIUS VALENS, p. 293, 25, ed. Kroll (cf. *St. V. Fr.*, I, 176, etc. See also *Hymn. Orph.*, X, 27).

During the passages of the doors of the seven heavens the soul, according to the teachings of the Mithraists, laid off the passions and characteristics which it had taken on as it accomplished its descent to earth, and so received again its original purity which made it worthy of companionship with the divinity<sup>57</sup>. The notion that the soul descending from heaven takes on the characteristics of the planetary spheres through which it passes, before it enters into corporal existence, and that after death it makes its journey through the heavens in reverse direction and with opposite effect—this derives from the same religious circles as those in which the doctrine of the voyage of the soul through the spheres had developed : the later Babylonian astral theology<sup>58</sup>. It was widespread and, through association with other systems, assumed diverse forms. It appears again in the mysteries of the Chaldæan theurgists, with, however, material variations. The Oracles teach that the descending soul clothes itself during its passage through the zones of the world, with the “parts” of the ether, the sun, the moon and the air, and then again puts these off during its return<sup>59</sup>. These “garments”, nevertheless, lend no faculties to the soul, but merely serve it as vehicles for the reascent<sup>60</sup>. A further divergence consists of the fact that the Chaldæans replace the astral degrees of the ascent by physical (air and ether) and retain only two of the planetary (moon and sun). This modification is explicable from the character of the astral religion which they had adopted and which we shall soon have to discuss<sup>61</sup>.

<sup>57</sup> CUMONT, *M. d. M.*, 130.

<sup>58</sup> CUMONT, *Rel. Orient.*, 283, 69; BOUSSER, *Hauptprobleme der Gnosis*, 361 ff. and *Goetting. Gel. Anz.*, 1914, 732 ff.

<sup>59</sup> See ch. III, n. 26; 34. The extant oracular fragments do not state that the soul in the course of her re-ascent divests herself of these “envelops”, but this opinion seems to be a corollary of the Chaldæan conception of a “vehicle of the soul”.

<sup>60</sup> See ch. III, n. 26.

<sup>61</sup> We do not know for certain the origin of Porphyry's doctrine (*Sent.*, 29, 2, p. 14, 13 f.; see DODDS, 318) concerning the descent of the soul traversing the ether, the sun and the moon. Contrary to Proclus' supposition (*Tim.*, III, 234, 26) it does not derive from the Oracles in spite of its affinity with their conception; cf. ch. III, n. 26 *fin.*

The absence of a planetary derivation of the "garments of the soul" strengthens the conclusion, already reached from other evidences, that the Chaldæan theurgists were no representatives of the astral fatalism. Their views as to the nature of Destiny (Heimarmene) were connected not with the planets or fixed stars, but with their mover, the Cosmic Soul<sup>62</sup>. They determinedly contested the independent influence of the stars on human life; for them the stars are simple executors of the divine Will, "to Whose nod all is subjected"<sup>63</sup>. Thus their relationship to the stars is not conditioned by any fundamental prejudice, and is, even in part, outspokenly positive. Whereas, according to the view of the representatives of astral fatalism, the rulers of the spheres (the "Archons") had to be compelled by magical formulæ to give the ascending soul free passage, in the Chaldæan mysteries, on the contrary, the sun and moon function as "Rulers of the initiation", who assist the ascent of the soul when invoked. In this positive attitude of the gods of the stars appears the principal difference between Chaldæan theurgy and Gnosticism. The Gnostic religions are the reaction against the siderial religion which placed human fate under the rule of the planetary gods; they wished to free it from the tyranny of the diabolic "Archons". The Theurgists, on the contrary, worship sun and moon as purifying the mortals from their stain and aiding them in their mystical ascent.

5. *The three Rulers of the Chaldæan initiation.*—The doctrine of the Chaldæan theurgists as to the three "Rulers of initiation"—Aion, Sun, Moon—with whom the aspirant was directed to "communicate himself"<sup>64</sup>, bears, likewise, the traces of Near Eastern star-worship. Direct parallels have not been preserved; however, both the structure of the whole and the particular elements of this doctrine give evidence of Oriental origin. As point of departure for closer inquiry may be taken the established fact that the Theurgic "elevation" was made possible through magical invocation of the three "Rulers of the initiation". The magical words effect the personal cooperation of the invoked potencies

<sup>62</sup> See ch. VI, sect. 9.—<sup>63</sup> See ch. IV, n. 99, v. 3-6; 103.—<sup>64</sup> Cf. ch. II, sect. 13.

who undertake the transport of the initiate's soul. They therefore function as her guides in the ascent. The principal role in this falls to the sun who therefore receives in the Oracles the names "Raiser" (*ἀναγωγεύς*) and "Ruler of the soul" (*ψυχοκράτωρ*)<sup>65</sup>. The belief that the souls of the pious were led by the god of the sun or his ministering angels to his star derives from the eschatology of the Syrian Solar religion<sup>66</sup>. There also is to be sought the origin of the mystery of the sunbeams which possess the power to draw up the soul,—a belief which, apart from its occurrence in the teachings of the Chaldæan theurgists, is mentioned also in the account of the initiation to immortality given in the magical papyrus of Paris<sup>67</sup>. Also the worshippers of Mithra took over the Syrian belief in the sun as the power which translated to itself souls after their depart from the body<sup>68</sup>. The title of their initiates of second highest grade "Runner with the Sun", *Heliodromus*<sup>69</sup>, strikingly recalls the principal Theurgic action : the ascent of the soul in a beam from the sun. Perhaps it is possible to conclude from this agreement that the attribution of the mentioned title to the Mithraic initiates followed on the completion of a sacramental action analogous to the Chaldæan<sup>69a</sup>.

The Chaldæans acted out the ascent to the sun in a mystery of immortality which anticipated the eschatological process. Accordingly theurgical "elevation" was also founded on the Syrian faith that the sun

<sup>65</sup> See ch. II, n. 304 and ch. III, n. 97.

<sup>66</sup> CUMONT, *Rel. Orient.*, 264, 90; *Théol. sol.*, 464 f.; *After Life*, 100 ff.; REINHARDT, *op. cit.*, 380 ff.

<sup>67</sup> See n. 52.

<sup>68</sup> CUMONT, *M. M. M.*, I, 40, 2; *Théol. sol.*, 464, 4; *After Life*, 160. As regards Mithraism, one of the principal texts is DRACONTIUS, *Medea*, 503 and 538 f. (quoted by CUMONT, *M. d. M.*, 238, where the witch, regarded because of her name as a Mede, dedicates the soul of her children to the sun, "Mithra in Persian", their bodies to the moon, their blood to the Furies, their shades to Pluto and their breath to the wind. A funeral altar of Rome quoted by CUMONT, *After Life*, 102, 26, bears the inscription "Sol me rapuit").

<sup>69</sup> See CUMONT, *M. d. M.*, 139.

<sup>69a</sup> In this case, the mythical account on Mithras' race with the sun would have undergone the spiritual explanation proposed in the text.

was the elysium of souls departed from their bodies. Now, as against this, the Theurgists promise the souls of their neophytes no solar, but a supramundane paradise <sup>70</sup>. Thus the ascent of the soul in the course of the mystery does not perfectly correspond with her final return after her separation from the body. Thence it follows that two distinct views of the domicile of the released souls are mingled in the Chaldæan eschatology. This fusion may be explained on the basis of the historical development of the Syrian religion, which was described above in its general characteristics. The enthronement of a supramundane god who degraded the sun to the position of a servant power brought about the translation of elysium into the supramundane sphere. The solar goal, indeed, maintained itself in the mystery, yet the original notion of the ascent to heaven as there acted out was replaced by another interpretation. As goal of the ascent the Chaldæan Oracles put the purification of the soul; the sunlight eradicates the material influences which had stained the soul during its earthly existence, and restores it to its pure, primal condition. This account derives also from Oriental Solar theology. The author of the Hermetic tract cited above, whose view as to the world-dominion of the sun derives from the same milieu as that of the Theurgists, explains that the soul of the mortal which is met by the noetic ray of this ruler of the planets is protected against demonic persecution <sup>71</sup>. This spiritual doctrine is associated in the system of the Chaldæans with their fundamental concept of the nature of the mystery as a continually progressive lustration of the soul. The elevation to the sun is thereby made the last stage of the ritual of purification. It is transformed from an eschatological to a cathartic act <sup>72</sup>.

Along with purification as the objective consequence of the "elevation", the Oracles also give prominence to a subjective effect. The

<sup>70</sup> See ch. III, sect. 6.

<sup>71</sup> See n. 40.

<sup>72</sup> According to the Iamblichean doctrine of the divine attributes, the *ἀναγωγόν*, the character of Helios (cf. Excursus VIII A, 2), is made a particular grade of τὸ ἀποκαθαριστικόν : DODDS, 281.

soul freed from the body and filled with the noetic light of the sun-beams "glories in the harmony" with which it is "drunken"<sup>73</sup>. This enthusiastic exultation of the soul, which, as a result of union with the center of the cosmic harmony enjoys by anticipation the prize of immortality, is founded likewise on the pantheistic ideas of the Syrian Solar religion<sup>74</sup>. The priests of Emesa designated the sun as the "god who connects and rules all", and the priests of Heliopolis (Baalbek) invoked him with the words "Helios, ruler of all, mind of the world, power of the world, light of the world"<sup>75</sup>. Formulae of this sort prove that the inherited religion immunized the Chaldæan theurgists both against the dull resignation of the astrological fatalism and against the Gnostic hate of the "archons". Their religious sentiment rested on the belief in the harmonious order of the divine stars ruled by the sun. In this positive relationship to the sidereal world they agree with the Greek philosophers. Thus the Neoplatonists could find in the astral mysticism of the Chaldæans a new support for their own astral theology.

The Chaldæan description of the exultation which the soul experiences on its union with the light of the sun gives expression to a state of emotion the achievement of which signified the fulfilment of all promises. In this way, the elevation to the sun is transformed from a preparation for blessedness to the full enjoyment of blessedness itself. Eschatology is absorbed in mysticism : for the beyond is no more than the eternal duration of that suprême experience which the soul undergoes during

---

<sup>73</sup> See ch. III, n. 88 and 92.

<sup>74</sup> See CUMONT, *Le mysticisme astral dans l'antiquité*, Bruxelles, 1909 (summarized in *After Life*, 126), but (as F. BOLL, *Sokrates*, 1921, 8, points out) he does not make a sufficiently clearcut distinction between the "contemplation mystique du ciel", a principal theme of the philosophy of later antiquity, and the mystic union with celestial powers.

<sup>75</sup> ATHENAEUS, XIV, 693 e; MACROB., *Sat.*, I, 23, 21; REINHARDT, *op. cit.*, 365, 2. The Chaldæan designation of Helios as *συνέχων* (see ch. II, n. 245) recurs (apart from Athenaeus) in the following sun hymns : *P. Mag.*, IV, 1282; VII, 529. Tiberianus (see n. 126), v. 17; CLAUDIAN, *Prob. et Olybr.*, v. 1; RUTILIUS NAMATIANSUS, I, 57; MARTIAN. CAPELLA, II, 186, v. 9.

the initiation. This spiritualization of the sacramental practice represents the final stage of a process which took place in many mystery religions <sup>76</sup>. The belief in the divine descent of the soul, which was proclaimed by the doctrine of salvation taught in the mysteries awakened a new consciousness of the self which demanded immediate satisfaction. The longing for the exaltation of the inner state was set in motion by the solemnization of the sacred ritual of which the progress became the cause and symbol of an ever strengthening tension of religious feeling. The final action of the initiation, which sealed the eschatological promise, effected a profound excitement in which the soul was made fully aware of its divine birth, and which therefore formed the culminating point of the entire religious life. This sacramental mysticism determined also the religious content of the Theurgic initiation to immortality. It explains the spiritualized descriptions of the mystery in the Oracles and is, as will be shown soon, itself one of the essential motives which impelled the Chaldæans to associate, with Platonic metaphysics, the Oriental mysteriosophy handed down to them.

The elevation of the soul to the sun is accomplished, not by direct ascent, but in three stages. The Oracles explain that it "is borne aloft by the beams of the air, of the moon and of the sun" <sup>77</sup>, i. e. that, on magical appeal, special guides of the soul were sent forth from all three stations. In a fragment of a Chaldæan hymn, after ether, the sun and moon the "guides of the air" are mentioned <sup>78</sup>; these last, accordingly, undertake the transport for the first stage. This belief agrees with that of the worshippers of Mithra, according to which both the souls descending to incorporation and those released from the body and "returning" are guided by winds <sup>79</sup>.

<sup>76</sup> CUMONT, *Rel. Orient.*, 191 ff.; *After Life*, 212 f.; G. MISCHE, *Geschichte der Autobiographie*, 317 ff.

<sup>77</sup> See ch. III, n. 34.

<sup>78</sup> See ch. III, n. 35.

<sup>79</sup> PORPHYR., *Antr.*, c. 25, p. 73, 11 (CUMONT, *M. M. M.*, I, 110): ψυχαῖς δ' εἰς γενέσων ἰούσαις καὶ ἀπὸ γενέσεως χωριζόμεναις εἰκότως ἔταξαν ἀνέμους. The passage which follows is not an authentic part of the tradition, but an interpretation, as shown by the words ὡς τινες ᾤθησαν.

The monuments of Mithraism often represent the winds in company with Helios and Selene<sup>80</sup>, but the meaning of this association is, neither by the literal nor by the figurative tradition, more accurately explained. Since the Mithraists treated not only the winds, but also the sun as a guide of souls, it is not impossible that this pictorial representation of the triad sun-moon-winds is to be explained by the same function as which was attributed to them by the Chaldæans. It seems certain, at any rate, that the Chaldæan belief in the psychopompic activity of the spirits of the air goes back to the same source as the Mithraic. That this is to be sought in Iranian tradition is made probable by the cult of the winds as divine beings in the Persian religion<sup>81</sup>.

The second station of the Theurgic elevation is the moon. Since Aion himself functions during the initiation as the director of the sunlight, only the two lower "Rulers of the initiation" serve as direct guides of the souls. Thence it follows, that the Chaldæan mystery developed on the basis of the notion of the sun and moon as the stages of the ascent of the soul. There is evidence that this doctrine also belongs to the Syro-Mesopotamian astral religion<sup>82</sup>. The Oracles them-

<sup>80</sup> CUMONT, *M. M. M.*, I, 96; DIETERICH, *op. cit.*, 63.

<sup>81</sup> BIDEZ-CUMONT, *Mages hell.*, I, 75, 1; II, 160, 3. The study of CUMONT, *Les vents et les anges psychopompes (Pisciculi)*, presented to F. J. Dölger, 1938, p. 70-75) was not accessible to me. The Mandæans, too, are familiar with the belief that the soul is borne aloft by the winds; cf. REITZENSTEIN, *Hell. Myst.*<sup>3</sup>, 223, 1. Hermes, whose planet is mentioned in the Oracles together with the sun (see ch. III, n. 197), was regarded as the god of the winds.

<sup>82</sup> CUMONT, *Rel. Orient.*, 264, 86; *After Life*, 93 f.; 96 f.; REINHARDT, 308 ff.; BIDEZ, *Vie de Porphyre*, Appendix, p. 36\*, 5.

CUMONT, *Etudes Syriennes*, 106, 2 (see also *Théol. sol.*, 465, 1), compares the Chaldæan doctrine of ἥλιος ἐπτάκτις ἀναγωγέως (see ch. III, n. 97) with the Manichaean eschatology as formulated in *Act. Arch.*, 8, p. 13, 1: τὰς ψυχὰς ὁ μέγας Φωστὴρ ταῖς ἀκτίσι λαβὼν καθαρίζει. We may add that the whole Manichaean doctrine of the ascent of the "perfect" soul in three stages: moon, sun, "new aeon" (see BAUR, *Manichäisches Religionssystem*, 306 ff.; POLORSKY in *P. W.*, *Supplement.*, VI, s. v. Manichäismus, 261) seems to rest on an astral belief similar to that of the Chaldæans. This observation also holds good with regard to the trinitarian cosmology of the Manichees, according to which the Father lives in the



selves indicate this origin, in that they oppose their mystery of the three "purifying Rulers" to the belief of the "initiation by the moon and the sun"<sup>83</sup>. This opposition does not mean denial of the purifying power of the two planets, but contestation of their sufficiency when without the cooperation of Aion. The basic belief of the dominion of supramundane potencies over the powers within the world demanded the exaltation of a metaphysical potency above the sidereal world-rulers. To this tendency Aion owed his installation as chief of the "Rulers of the initiation"<sup>84</sup>.

Direct dependence on Oriental beliefs is shown further by the designation of the "Rulers of the initiation" as *ἀρχαί* or "Conductors of the World" (*κοσμοῦχοι*)<sup>85</sup>. Both names recall those of the *archons* viz.: *cosmokrators* of the late Babylonian astral religion. The Chaldæans imitate the nomenclature of this theology, but replace the sidereal apparatus, the planets, by a cosmological division: the three "Rulers" dominate the empyrean (noetic), etherial, and hylic (sublunar) worlds. However, in that the Chaldæans entrust the conduct of these three zones of the universe to divine beings who, by origin, are gods of the celestial bodies (Aion also is, as to his characteristics, a planet), they indicate clearly that their division of the world arose by a harmonization of a metaphysical and an astral system. Platonism gave to the Chaldæans the distinction of three worlds<sup>86</sup>; and the Orient, the belief in the astral character of their Rulers.

From the same milieu apparently derive also the magical practices

---

"Supreme and Primal Light", the Son in sun and moon, and the Holy Ghost in the air (AUGUSTINE, *Contr. Faust.*, XX, 2; BAUR, 233). On the sun and the moon in Manichean belief see BAUR, 226 ff. NYBERG, *Journal Asiatique*, CCXIX, p. 56 (cf. p. 108) interprets the "four-fold Zurvan" of the Manichees as the god of the firmament, manifesting himself in sun, moon and the zodiac.

<sup>83</sup> See ch. II, n. 300.

<sup>84</sup> Astral triads of gods often figure in Syrian cults. One of them mentioned in an Aramaic inscription (quoted by CUMONT, *Rel. Orient.*, 262, 77): heaven, moon, sun (*Beel-shemin, Sahr, Samsh*), recalls the Chaldæan triad of the Teletarchs.

<sup>85</sup> See ch. II, n. 272, 273.

<sup>86</sup> See ch. VI, n. 250.

which the Chaldæan theurgists used for the conjuration of the three Rulers. An exact reference cannot be given, for the primary tradition abandons us in this point, and the syncretistic literature of magic only seldom makes possibly a distinction of national varieties. The magical ceremonies with which the Theurgists fight the demons give evidence, as was shown before, of significant relationships to those of the Zoroastrians<sup>87</sup>. On the other hand, the names of the chief magical gods of the Chaldæans—Hecate and Apollo—as well as many of their practices, show that the Oriental components of their magic had been closely associated with Western elements of this discipline. Since, however, the so-called Greek magic had long, in the time of the Theurgists, been fused with Oriental elements, the extent of Oriental and Occidental influence on the magical notions of the Chaldæans can no longer be estimated with sufficient certainty. It is still possible, however, to remark that precisely to the mystery of the journey of the soul through the heavens—a mystery which was based on the speculation of the Babylonian priests—certain magical notions were attached which probably belonged to this doctrine from the beginning and therefore must be traced back to the milieu from which the mystery itself originated. According to the account of the initiation to immortality in the magical papyrus of Paris, the neophyte accomplishes his ascent through the various spheres of the universe to the Supreme God by means of a continuous sequence of magical actions. Many Gnostic accounts of the journey through the heavens rest on the same principal: the ascending soul speaks before the door of each planet a magic formula which compels the archon to permit it freely to pass<sup>88</sup>. The Chaldæans, it is

---

<sup>87</sup> See ch. v, sect. 2. On Mithraic dedications "deo Arimanio", see CUMONT, *Mages hell.*, I, 59, 4. Ostanes was regarded as the inventor of magical recipes protecting against diseases which were supposed to be caused by demonic influence (see BIDEZ-CUMONT, *Mages hell.*, I, 188 ff. Cf. in particular TATIAN, *Adv. Graec.* 16, quoted by BIDEZ-CUMONT, II, 293 f.). These recipes seem to have been similar to those employed by the Chaldæans (see ch. v, n. 128 ff.). We may recall also the Semitic character of the name of the magic stone mentioned in one of the Oracles (quoted ch. v, n. 116-117).

<sup>88</sup> See ANZ (quoted n. 49), 56, and WENDLAND, 174 f.

true, in accordance with their positive evaluation of the siderial powers, replaced the violent subjection of the planets by appeals for their assistance, but they also could assure themselves of this help only by magical power. The same fundamental thought of a journey of the soul through the heavens made possible by magical action, is therefore basic to the various accounts spoken of. So we should conclude that the Theurgic rites concerned stem from the same Oriental tradition as the doctrines associated with them. In support of this supposition we may yet in conclusion refer to the fact that Mesopotamia and, especially, the later Babylonian religion, formed one of the chief centers of ancient magics<sup>89</sup>, and the "magic of the spheres"<sup>90</sup> was (according to a tradition of Oriental theologians for which the evidence, though indeed late, is esoteric) was traced back to Ostanes the "Prince of the Magians"<sup>91</sup>.

6. *The meaning of the name "Chaldeans".*—As general result of the analysis undertaken in this chapter it appears that essential religious notions of the Chaldæan theurgists agree with those of Persian, late Babylonian and Syrian religions. This triple relationship is explicable from the internal history of the mutual relationship of the Oriental religious systems named<sup>92</sup>. The Zoroastrian beliefs undergo, through the influence of the cults of Mesopotamia and Syria (the lands of the Persian kingdom oldest in civilization) a profound transformation; Mazdaism is fused with the Babylonian astral religion and with the Syrian cult of the heavens and this Irano-Syro-Babylonian theocracy was spread in many ways and forms over the Eastern borderland of the Roman dominium and thence began its way across the provinces of the whole Empire. Babylon was the point of departure for this syncretistic movement which extended itself over long periods of time and experienced in its later stage the strong influence of Hellenistic cosmology<sup>93</sup>. The

<sup>89</sup> On Chaldaic magic see CUMONT, *Rel. Orient.*, 173 f.; 294, 87.

<sup>90</sup> On the magic of the spheres practised by the Theurgists see ch. IV, n. 83.

<sup>91</sup> See BIDEZ-CUMONT, *Magies hell.*, II, p. 284, 11 (OSTANES, *Fragm.*, 11) and p. 286, n. 5. Cf. also I, 176 f.

<sup>92</sup> See CUMONT, *Rel. Orient.*, 136 f.

<sup>93</sup> CUMONT, *Rel. Orient.*, 113 f.

powerful priestly caste of the Chaldæans established in Babylon, whose emissaries spread themselves over the entire Near East, filled both Mazdaism and the Syrian astral and celestial cults with the spirit and content of their theology, and thereby created the preconditions of a mutual assimilation and equalization of the diverse regional beliefs<sup>94</sup>. Under the influence of these Babylonian theologians the Syrian belief in the sun received its theoretical foundations, Ahura Mazda took on the character of the Syrian God of the Sky, and the Iranian hypostasis of Infinite Time rose to the position of a supreme divinity. Like Zervanism, Mithraism which was attached to it, is also a product of the fusion of Mazdaean beliefs with Semitic siderial theology. To this Irano-Syro-Babylonian circle of creeds lead back also those tracks which we followed during the investigation as to the Oriental sources of the religious ideas of the Theurgists. The syncretism of the doctrine laid down in their Oracles is a true picture of that specific mingling of religions of which the evidence furnishes the closest parallels to the religious speculations of the Theurgists. It is therefore probable that the various doctrines of Oriental beliefs which are met in the Oracles were not first brought together by their authors, but were already, before their time, united in a peculiar theological system, which may be supposed to have been the contemporary form of belief in their Eastern milieu<sup>95</sup>.

For this view it is possible to cite a direct witness, which was hitherto not taken into consideration, for it here first finds its adequate explanation : the self-designation of the Theurgists as "Chaldæans". This name was used by Greek and Roman writers in various meanings<sup>96</sup>.

---

<sup>94</sup> The penetration of the theology of the Babylonian priests into the sphere of Mazdaism and of the Syrian celestial cults is reflected in the evolution of the biographic tradition concerning Zoroaster, regarded as a Chaldæan or a Syrian and the founder of astronomy : BIDEZ-CUMONT, I, 36 ff.

<sup>95</sup> The Iranian Aion was worshipped in Phœnicia and in its Punic colonies as the god of fertility (CUMONT, *M. M.*, I, 78, 1-2; 83, 4-5; REITZENSTEIN, *Iran. Erlös.*, 201; NOCK, 86 f. See above, n. 26); a character which was apparently also attributed to him by the Chaldæans (see ch. IV, n. 88-90). This concordance may serve a further proof that the Chaldæan theurgists took over a Semitic adaption of Aion.

<sup>96</sup> CUMONT, *Théol. sol.*, 469 f.; P. W. s. v. Chaldaioi; HOFFNER, *O. Z.*, II, 18.

It referred primarily to the members of the priestly caste of Babylon and to their Hellenistic disciples; then, however, also to the charlatan who read the future from the stars or performed magical tricks for pay. In the second century A. D., in the period of the increasing authority of the teaching and tradition of foreign Oriental cults, the credit of the name increased also. It now designated rather the possessor of age-old divine wisdom, to whom the greatest Greek philosophers of early time, Pythagoras, Plato etc., had gone seeking enlightenment<sup>97</sup>. The name always remained attached to the esoteric knowledge of the science of the heavenly bodies and of the theology based upon it. If therefore the two founders of Theurgy in the period of the general high estimation of all Oriental wisdom appeared in Rome before both the educated and common people with the name Chaldæans, they thereby gave expression to their claim to be regarded as descendants<sup>98</sup> and spiritual heirs<sup>99</sup> of the priestly sages of Babylon. Whether this claim was founded on direct descent can no longer be determined. It may be in any case remarked that Porphyry, who could yet verify the genealogical relationships, did not doubt their Oriental origin<sup>100</sup>. It is a

---

<sup>97</sup> The Chaldæans are the first people named in the list of "divine" nations figuring in Celsus (*ap. ORIG.*, VI, 78). Their pure worship of the divine is praised (together with that of the "Hebrews") in an oracle transmitted by Porphyry in his "Philosophy of the Oracles" (p. 141, Wolff; *EUSEB.*, *Praep. Evang.*, IX, 10, 4) and apparently fabricated at that period. The legend found already in the early Hellenistic period and widely accepted in the third century of the Christian era—that Pythagoras, Plato and other philosophers were disciples of the Chaldæans—is dealt with by HOFFNER, *Orient und griechische Philosophie* (Leipzig, 1925), 1-8.

<sup>98</sup> These reasons explain the fact that the Chaldæan theurgists did not wish, contrary to the customs of other Orientals, to remain anonymous or to assume borrowed names (Zoroaster, Ostanes, Hystaspes). Their ethnic appellation was haloed with a reputation of esoteric wisdom.

<sup>99</sup> In fact, the title of one of their prose works, "On the Zones" (see ch. II, n. 155), corresponds to the character of an astronomical or astrological didactic composition.

<sup>100</sup> Porphyry calls Julian the Chaldæan "vir in Chaldæa bonus", see ch. V, n. 105. The later Neoplatonists also regarded the appellation "Chaldæans" as *ethnicon*,

suggestive conjecture of Bidez that the older of the two founders of Theurgy, Julian the Chaldæan, migrated to Rome after the triumphant Oriental campaign of Trajan had opened for him the way from his Mesopotamian homeland to the West<sup>101</sup>. In any case the ethnic term is to be understood as having a double meaning, as a designation both of the home-land and of membership in the priestly caste of the Babylonian theologians. Thus explained the name provides direct evidence for the Oriental origin of the fundamental religious ideas of the men who bore it<sup>102</sup>.

---

as is shown by the following introductory formulas : *οἱ παρὰ Χαλδαίοις* (without article) *Θεουργοί* (see Excursus I g), *ἡ ὑπερόριος Θεοσοφία* (*ibid.*, f), *ἡ βάρβαρος Θεοσοφία* (*ibid.*, f), *τὰ Ἀσσυρίων πάτρια δόγματα* (*ibid.*, c), etc. The Hellenistic science of the Chaldæan theurgists is no counter-argument, as they were brought up in a milieu penetrated with Greek culture. Their contemporaries Numenius, Lucian and Tatian, all three of them natives of Eastern Syria, have had a complete Hellenistic education.

In this connection attention may be drawn to the fact that the warriors killed in battle whose souls join the vanguard of Hecate are represented in the Chaldæan Oracles by a mounted archer (see ch. iv, n. 54). Roman contingents of this kind were levied in Syria. Mithra was represented as a mounted archer (see F. SAXL, *Mithras*, Berlin, 1931, 77), and the first apocalyptic rider "with a bow" (*Rev.* VI, 2) may be regarded as a symbol of the Parthian king. See R. H. CHARLES, *The Revelation of St. John*, New York, 1920, I, 163.

<sup>101</sup> See BIDEZ, *Vie de l'Empereur Julien*, 75. CUMONT, *Théol. sol.*, 476, has already pointed out the possibility of a connection between Trajan's campaigns in the East and the appearance of Julian the Chaldæan in Rome. The name Julian is particularly common at the end of the 2nd century.

We may also refer to the biography of Iamblichus, the author of a novel called "Babyloniaca". He relates that he was born in Syria, and that Syrian was his native language; that later he had learned Babylonian wisdom and magic from a Babylonian sage taken prisoner at the time of Trajan's entering Babylon (a. 115-116) and sold as a slave to Syria; that still later he also became master of the Greek language. He states that he wrote his novel, based on Babylonian tales, under the reign of Marcus Aurelius and prides himself on having foretold the course which the Roman-Parthian war would take. Cf. E. RONDE, *Der griechische Roman* (2nd ed., Leipzig, 1900), 388 ff.

<sup>102</sup> This provenance is supported by the authority of Cumont who, having studied the few heliolatric Chaldæan texts collected by Kroll, takes the following

7. *The synthesis of Oriental beliefs, magic and metaphysics.*—The Chaldæan system is composed of three elements : the doctrines of Oriental faiths, magic (which, in part, also derives from the Orient) and Platonic metaphysics. This synthesis can be recognized *in nuce* in the name by which the Chaldæans designate their mystery of immortality. *Ἀναγωγή* is intended to refer not only to the term for the journey through the heavens but also to the homonymic designation used by the Platonists for the ascent to the contemplation of pure being<sup>103</sup>. A more detailed picture of the complicated relationship in composition of those elements which were absorbed into the Chaldæan system is provided by the analysis of their magico-mystical beliefs concerning light and fire. Historically considered, the lowest stratum is formed by the Iranian doctrine that light is the nature of Ahura Mazda and of the gods and assistants created by him<sup>104</sup>. Significant relations exist further between the Zervanistic teaching of light as the character of Infinite Time and of the Chaldæan dogm of Aion as the “Father-begotten Light”, as well as between the Syrian religious doctrine of the sun as the source of all light, life and intelligence and the Chaldæan Solar theology. These

---

view of the Chaldæan Oracles (*Théol. sol.*, 476) : “Ces œuvres... sont vraiment en partie ce pour quoi elles se donnent : de vieilles croyances s’y allient à des théories hellénistiques et notamment les idées maîtresses de l’héliolatric “chaldæenne” y sont nettement formulées”. See also *M. M. M.*, I, 34-36.

<sup>103</sup> See Excursus VIII.

<sup>104</sup> KNOLL, 68 (*id.*, *Rhein. Mus.*, 1895, 638 f.), who is followed by Bidez, *Vie de Julien*, 75 and Bidez-Cumont, *Mages hell.*, I, 161, supposes that the Chaldæan theurgists were influenced by the Zoroastrian fire-cult, but a thorough investigation of the relevant texts does not seem to conform this hypothesis. The Chaldæan theurgists distinguish between the physical element (cf. ch. II, n. 205 : « πῦρ δὲ ὄγκος... ἕτερος »), which they did not worship, and the supercelestial noetic fire, which was never identified by the Mazdaeans with the fire they adored. Moreover, the Chaldæan theurgists did not practise the rite of entertaining an ever-burning fire. The figurative language of the Oracles sometimes veils the real significance of their fire-imagery. Thus, in the expression “ruler of the works of fire”, applied in the Oracles to Apollo’s priest (see ch. I, n. 138), the name of the element signifies the solar ray conjured up by this priest and supposed to carry upwards the soul of the initiate (see ch. II, n. 81).

Oriental theories were associated by the Chaldæans with the Platonic metaphysic of light <sup>105</sup>. In their report of the Platonic formulae and concepts concerned there are to be recognized traces of Stoic influence. This is shown especially by the designation of the noetic essence as Fire. The process of the appropriation of the Stoic term *πῦρ νοερόν* <sup>106</sup> can yet be imagined. The Stoics had placed the source of the "noetic Fire" which forms and maintains the world, in the outermost circle of the ethereal zone which consists of pure heat <sup>107</sup>. This sphere was apparently separated by the Chaldæans from the rest of the ethereal world and identified with the circle of the noetic world <sup>108</sup>. It is very probable that in this speculation Stoicizing Platonists (whose influence is discernable also in other formulae of the Chaldæan ontology) had anticipated them <sup>109</sup>. The term "Empyrean" is, in any case, one of the

<sup>105</sup> A noteworthy parallel is provided by the Platonizing interpretation of Aion by the Phœnician Hellenist Philo of Byblus (who lived until the beginning of Hadrian's reign); see n. 32. The Persian Hellenists ps.-Zoroaster and ps.-Ostanes whom he cites (see Bidez-Cumont, *Mages hell.*, II, 157; 271; cf. I, 101) apply to Ahura-Mazda the terms of the transcendental philosophy of Platonism. The adherence of the Hermetics and Valentinians to contemporary Platonism has already been pointed out.

<sup>106</sup> The principal texts concerning the Stoic *πῦρ νοερόν* are quoted by ZELLER, III, 1<sup>a</sup>, p. 139, 4; 144, 1; 145, 1; 147, 1-3; 188-189.

<sup>107</sup> As to the igneous substance of the external layer of aether, see e. g. CORNUTUS, c. 1, p. 2, 10 f., Lang.; ps.-HERACLIT., c. 23, p. 35, 11; SENECA, *Nat. Quaest.*, VI, 16, 2; DIOG. LAERT., VII, 139; cf. ZEPF, *op. cit.*, 229. This conception is also known to the poets: LUCRET., V, 585; CICERO, *De consulatu* (quoted *De divinat.*, I, 17), v. 1; HORAT., *Carm.*, III, 3, 10 and 33; OVID., *Metam.*, I, 26 f. We may recall that *αἰθήρ* means "the burning".

<sup>108</sup> The differentiation should be imagined as similar to that between the air and the aether, which latter was originally regarded as the highest layer of the air.

<sup>109</sup> See ch. VI, n. 131 and 302. The Chaldæan theurgists took over from the Stoics (through the channel of Stoicising Platonists) other attributes of the Primal Fire: (a) In contradistinction to the physical fire-element (*ἕτερος πυρὸς ὄγκος*): ch. II, n. 205) it possesses no power to burn; cf. *Theos.*, 13, 12 (quoted ch. I, n. 46) *«οὐ γὰρ ἔχει δαίνν»* with the passages collected by ZELLER, III, 1<sup>a</sup>, p. 145, 2 and SERV., *Aen.*, VI, 747.—(b) It is named *πρωτόν πῦρ*; cf. ch. II, n. 184 with *F. St. V.*, I, No. 98 and II, No. 413.—(c) The world-forming ideas are compared



new Chaldæan word-formations which was richest in effects,—it was taken over by the Neoplatonists and through their transmission found the widest distribution<sup>110</sup> which extended as known until Dante and Milton<sup>111</sup>.

To this theology of Light and Fire, constituted from Oriental and Platonic elements, was added as third component the Light and Fire magic. This is found in its original form in the Chaldæan descriptions of the conjuration of Hecate<sup>112</sup>. Also the God Aion reveals himself in this element, and likewise angels and souls are visible in the form of light<sup>113</sup>. This fundamental magical axiom of Light as the substance of superhuman nature was connected by the Chaldæans with the

---

to bees swarming about caves : cf. ch. II, n. 177, v. 10 f. with *St. V. F.*, I, No. 155.

—(d) The emanations of the Primal Fire are compared to lightnings : Heraclitus had described the divine Fire, regarded by him both as the substance of the world and the power which forms it, as lightnings (*κεραυνοί* ; see *DIELS, Vors.*, 12 B, 64. *USENER, Kleine Schriften*, IV, 472 f.). This metaphor was taken over by the Stoic Cleanthes (see *DIELS, Vors.*, 12 C, 4 ; *WILAMOWITZ, Hellenistische Dichtung*, II, 259) and recurs in this meaning also in Proclus (see ch. II, n. 201).

<sup>110</sup> Porphyry was the first Platonist to apply the term “fiery” to Plato’s *mundus intelligibilis* (ps.-JUSTIN’S definition, *Coh. ad Graec.*, 5, is due to his misunderstanding a sentence of the ps.-Aristotelian *de mundo* ; see J. GEFFCKEN, *Zwei griechische Apologeten*, 269 f.). Porphyry’s formulae show the influence of the Stoic definition ; cf. e. g. : *περι ἀγαμάτων*, p. 2, 1 f., Bidez : *Φωτοσιδοῦς δὲ ὄντος τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ ἐν πυρὸς αἰθέρου περιχύσει διάγοντος* (cf. *CORNUTUS*, 18, p. 33, 13). In the scholium to the Oracle on Aion preserved in the “Theosophy” (see ch. I, n. 41), Porphyry designates the Emyrean of the Chaldæans as *πῦρ νοητόν* (cf. *CLEM. AL., Paed.*, II, 10 ; 99, 5 ; *DIELS, Vors.*, 12 B, 16) ; *De regr.*, 29, 3 as *αἰθέριον* (so does also *PROCL., Tim.*, II, 144, 29 f., who *ibid.*, 58, 8 invokes the Chaldæan testimony regarding the noetic origin of the Emyrean ; cf. ch. II, n. 39).

<sup>111</sup> It is a curious fact that transcendentalism owes to the Chaldæan Oracles not only one of its most spiritual terms (“Emyrean”), but also one of its most material, “theurgy”.

<sup>112</sup> See ch. IV, sect. 3.

<sup>113</sup> As to Aion see n. 26. On the luminous apparition of the souls : ch. IV, sect. 7, of the angels ch. V, n. 7. The Valentinians too identify the angels with the irradiations of the noetic Fire ; *Excerpt. ex Theod.*, 12, 2, cf. *ibid.*, 81, 1. In their terminology we may likewise distinguish Platonic and Stoic elements.

metaphysical theory that Light was the nature of the intelligible world and of its emanations. The luminous apparitions of the gods and spirits were explained as the outflows of the one primal Light which propagates them in order to enter into contact with the mortal by their means. This identification had as consequence the comprehension of these gods and spirits as a single, unified organization subordinated to the will of the Supreme Being. The metaphysical henotheism served the Chaldæans not only for the explanation of the origin, nature, and powers of the spirits, but also for the determination of their rank.

When we turn from the inquiry as to the origin of the elements from which the Chaldæan system was composed, to the question of the motives of their composition, it is clear, that in determining the factors of this fusion both the disposition of its subjects and the character of the connected objects must be taken into account. The cooperation of these two efficient appears significantly in a closer study of the course of the intellectual development of the Chaldæans, as it is seen on the grounds of the foregoing analysis. It can be recognized that the transition from the beliefs of their Oriental home-land to Platonic philosophy conformed to a general process which gave to their individual decision the character of a necessary progress. The Solar religion of Syria had given rise to a theology in which substantial components of hellenistic speculation had found acceptance. The Theurgists thus learnt to know Solar religion of their native land in theoretical form and were already directed towards Greek philosophy by the tradition of their Eastern environment. This Syrian religion had gone through profound changes since its first encounter with Western speculation. The general turning from an intramundane to a supramundane concept of God, which was accomplished in the religious consciousness of the period, took the form, in Syrian religious circles, of the enthronement of an omnipotent divinity of the heavens to whom the sun was subordinated, and of the increased readiness to accept dualistic elements of Iranian religion. The product of this second phase of development was the "Chaldaized" Mazdaism, which the Chaldæan Oracles reflect, and which accordingly represents the religious aspect ruling at the time of the Theurgists in the spiritual milieu of their Eastern homeland. This

theology was in more than one respect related to the spiritual type of Platonism. The development of the religious ideas of their Oriental environment had therefore made the Theurgists virtual Platonists even before they went to school to the Platonic scholarchs. With full awareness of this affinity they carried through the unition of their Oriental priestly wisdom with Western philosophical speculation. Plato lent them the forms of expression with which to secure to the faiths of their native land a place among the theological systems of the Hellenistic-Roman world.

Several points of convergence which presented opportunities for the fusion of the Middle-Platonic metaphysics with the Oriental religious doctrines transmitted to the Theurgists, have already been remarked : the concept of Destiny (*i. e.* the doctrine of the Cosmic Soul), the demonology (to which, according to Platonic view, angelology also appertained), and the metaphysical and anthropological dualism. The religious dualism of the Persian religion was already cited by the earliest Platonists as a confirmation of the dualistic tendencies in the metaphysics of Plato<sup>116</sup>. As the Platonists discovered in the Iranian theology one of the basic views of their own theology, so the Chaldæans in the "Mazdaizing" theology of their native religion, could find the leading thoughts of Plato. There they met also with the essential traits of their doctrine of the fate of the human soul. The Platonic account of the divine origin of the soul, its descent into corporeal existence, and its seduction, its severance from all things earthly and its redeeming ascent to the vision of Pure Being (an ascent which was called, by the Platonists also, *ἀναγωγή*) and its final return to its supermundane place of origin : all this must have seemed to the Chaldæans as the equivalent of their Oriental "myth of the soul". In this association, also, the Platonists of their time had made advances to them. Both Celsus and Numenius explain the Platonic eschatology on the basis

---

<sup>116</sup> See ch. vi, n. 282. It may be noted that the Greeks who expound in later antiquity the doctrines of Iranian dualism were all of them Platonists; see ch. vi, n. 301. Eubulus, the author of a comprehensive work on Mithra, was likewise a Platonist; see CUMONT, *M. d. M.*, 73, 4.

of the late Babylonian doctrines of the descent and reascent of the soul through the spheres <sup>115</sup>. It is not impossible that attempted identifications of the same sort, made by contemporary Platonists, showed the Chaldæans the way to the harmonization of their indigenous with the Platonic doctrine of the soul.

Three further relationships of general nature between Platonism and the Oriental faiths of the Theurgists are here to be regarded specially, since they make particularly clear the convergencies of the two systems. The first concerns the religious tendency of Middle-Platonic philosophy. It had, under the dominant influence of the transcendental mood, fully expanded the religious capacity of its metaphysics and assumed the character of a creed of salvation. Plato had fixed as the task assigned to human effort, the cleansing and the freeing of the soul from all things not divine (the "striving for death"); as its way the ascent to the vision of the primal divine Light; and as its fare the return to the divine place of origin. The Chaldæan mysteries guaranteed the fulfilment of these teachings. The Platonic ideas had taken the form of divine powers, which interfered, to awaken and to deliver, in darkened lives of men which were ruled by the prevailing force of the material. The Chaldæan gods and spirits fulfilled the same mission of salvation. The Platonists honoured a single, otherworldly, absolute being from which sprang and to which were subordinated all other divine beings. The Oriental theology, transmitted to the Theurgists, proclaimed the belief in an all-encompassing, all powerful *deus exsuperantissimus* enthroned high above the stars, to whom the mundane gods as angels served <sup>116</sup>.

In the same way the doctrines of the Oriental faiths of the Chaldæan

---

<sup>115</sup> Celsus *ap. ORIG.*, VI, 21; NUMENIUS, 147 ff. Contemporary Platonists quote an alleged work of Zoroaster who declares himself to be identical with the Armenian Er, the son of Pamphylus, the narrator of the closing myth of Plato's *Republic*. See BIDEZ-CUMONT, *Mages hell.*, II, 158 ff. Cf. *ibid.*, I, 109 ff. We may also note the frequent references to Mithraism figuring in Porphyry's *De antro* and *de abst.* See CUMONT, *After Life*, 106 f.; 169; *Rel. Orient.*, 282, 69; 301, 28.

<sup>116</sup> See CUMONT, *Jupiter summus exsuperantissimus*, *Arch. f. Rel.*, IX (1906), 323-336; BOUSSER, *Goett. Gel. Anz.*, 1914, 709 ff.

theurgists coincide with Platonism in the spiritualizing account of the act of salvation. It is frequently represented in the Oracles as a pure act of contemplation or of vision. The verse "He who has known the works of the Father, escapes the reckless wing of Destiny" means strictly that the knowledge of the divine thoughts (the Ideas) effects the release from the law of temporality which governs created beings<sup>117</sup>. The knowledge of the noetic is therefore the achievement of immortalization, for the sacramental operation of the mystery cumulates in an act of contemplation. Also the Hermetics explain, that "whoever has known God, is not only safe from attacks of the demons, but cannot more be held fast by fate"<sup>118</sup>. This view of the spiritual character of the real act of salvation<sup>119</sup> represents, as has been pointed out above, the result of an inner development of the mystery religions, a development which came about from their doctrine of the soul as a shoot of the Divine Spirit in man. The correlative of this antimaterial concept of the soul could only be an act of consecration freed of all material associations, in which the soul in its purity encountered its own divine source. "To behold" or "to contemplate" the divine is now no longer—as in the age-old liturgies of many mystery-cults—the sight of a real epiphany of the bringer of salvation who descends into the sensible in order to give the desired blessing<sup>120</sup>, but a spiritual elevation of the soul to the suprasensible god in order to reassure itself, by the contemplation of Him or His Powers, of its own divinity. This spiritualization of the act of salvation was carried on, as should be emphasized, without assistance of philosophy. However, it was the more easily able to find its metaphysical equivalent

<sup>117</sup> See ch. III, n. 142-143.

<sup>118</sup> LACTANTIUS, *Div. Inst.*, II, 15. This and other parallels are collected and treated by CUMONT, *Fatalisme astral et religions antiques*, *Revue de l'Hist. et de Litt. Rel.*, N. S. III, 1912, 535 ff. See also *Rel. Orient.*, 291, 73.

<sup>119</sup> On *γνώσις Θεοῦ* see R. REITZENSTEIN, *Hellenistische Mysterienreligionen*, 284 ff. W. BOUSSET, *Kyrios Christos*, 167 ff. H. JONAS, *Gnosis und spätantiker Geist*, I, 206, 2.

<sup>120</sup> G. ANRICH, *Das antike Mysterienwesen*, 30 f.; 63 f.; CUMONT, *After Life*, 121; 207; BOUSSET, *Kyrios Christos*, 164.

in the Platonic account of the supreme contemplation, since the latter itself rested on a spiritual reinterpretation of the vision (*ἐπόπτεια*) of the mysteries <sup>121</sup>.

Thus, many routes lead from the doctrines of the Oriental faith of the Chaldæans to Middle Platonic metaphysics which had become religion. But all objective convergencies, *viz.* subjective associations, had not been sufficient, had not Platonism developed from itself the disposition of a magical concept of god and the world, which first made possible the association with a magico-religious system. Plato himself had opened the door for this development by means of his doctrine concerning the nature of the demonic. The demons, thus Diotima explains to Socrates (*Conv.* 202 d 13 ff.), form the bond between god and man, inasmuch as they convey and take across to the gods the prayers and sacrifices of men, and to men the commands and replies of the gods; by their mediation are accomplished also prophecy, mysteries and magic. This beginning was systematized by early Platonists who made the demons partial powers of the Cosmic Soul <sup>122</sup>. But this demonological speculation expanded its full strength only in the second century A. D., with the reawakening of the metaphysical Platonism. Magical orientation was first indicated in the personal interests of the Platonists of this period. Plutarch and Maximus of Tyre treat with the sympathy of believers of the lives and nature of the spirits <sup>123</sup>; Apuleius who considered himself a Platonist justified his belief in magic with reference to the description of Plato, just quoted, of the nature and activity of the demons <sup>124</sup>; Numenius mentions with appreciation the magical works of legendary Egyptian priests and admires the magical power of the prayer of Moses <sup>125</sup>; the approximately con-

<sup>121</sup> See ch. II, n. 409 and ch. VI, n. 192.

<sup>122</sup> See ch. VI, n. 139.

<sup>123</sup> R. HEINZE, *Xenocrates*, 99 ff.

<sup>124</sup> APULEIUS, *Apologia*, c. 43, p. 50, 2 f. Cf. IDEM, *De deo Socrat.*, 6, p. 13, 18 ff.

<sup>125</sup> NUMENIUS, p. 137, 1 : ἀνδρὶ γενομένῳ θεῶν εὐξασθαι δυνατωτάτῳ presupposes belief in the magical power of prayer.

temporary author of a hymn attributed to Plato represents the philosopher as with magical formulae demanding of the Supreme God the revelation of the secrets of the formation of the world<sup>126</sup>. From these outer regions the magical tendency penetrated into the centre of Platonic metaphysics and encounters us, in sublimated form, in the speculation of Plotinus concerning the Cosmic Soul, a speculation the relationship of which with the Chaldæan doctrine of the nature of Hecate has been pointed out in the foregoing chapter. According to Plotinus<sup>127</sup> the Cosmic Soul pervades the universe as a living organism and brings it about that the parts of the world work together as the parts of a body. This sympathetic connection of the "members" of the cosmic organism shows itself in the course of the stars, in the activity of the demons, in prophecy, in magic and also in the efficacy of prayer, which of itself progresses towards its goal by virtue of the natural connection of all psychic powers contained in the universe<sup>128</sup>.

While Plotinus traced back the magical coherence of the parts of the world to a cosmic organ of sensations, the Chaldæans referred it to the supramundane Intelligence itself. Unfortunately, the Oracles which treat this central theme of Chaldæan theurgy are no longer preserved, so that we must reconstruct the theories concerned by means of the combination of sparse allusions contained in the tradition. The agents

<sup>126</sup> NORDEN, *Agnostos Theos*, 78, 1; 155, 1; 350, has drawn attention to Tibertianus' poem which, in the *Anthologia Latina*, I, 2, ed. Buecheler-Riese, No. 490, bears the superscription: *Versus Platonis de deo... de Greco in Latinum translati*. It is a free translation of a Greek ὕμνος κλητικός composed in the period of pre-Plotinian Platonism. This poem will be interpreted separately elsewhere.

<sup>127</sup> See ZELLER, III, 2<sup>a</sup>, 610 ff.; 683 ff.; PROCL., *Rp.*, II, 258, 12 ff. (quoted by CUMONT, *Rel. Orient.*, 288, 41) follows Plotinus.

<sup>128</sup> Plotinus considers that the effects of magical actions are natural and holds consequently the view that the sphere of these actions is restricted to "Nature", i. e. the domain of the sensible world. He regards the noetic world as incapable of being affected by any physical or magical means; hence his indignation at the "temerity" of the Gnostics who attempted to conjure the Cosmic Soul (see ch. vi, n. 206). Porphyry follows Plotinus (see Excursus II, n. 14), but Iamblichus ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐσκαμμένα πηδᾶ with his doctrine of the "magical chains"; see n. 130.

of the magical sympathy are the "symbols", which "the Paternal Intellect sowed over the world" <sup>129</sup>. These symbols are identical with the *vores mysticae* which the Theurgist employs in his conjurations <sup>130</sup>. Since these magical words are products of the supreme Intellect, they must have the character of Ideas. With this conclusion agree the statements of other fragments of the Oracles : that the soul by nature possesses the knowledge of the "symbols", forgets them at its incarnation, but is enabled by purification through the consecration of the mysteries to recall them and with their help to "know the noetic" <sup>131</sup>. This view of the primal magical disposition of the soul rests, as can easily be recognized, on a magical interpretation of the Platonic doctrine of the soul. The Chaldæans put the "symbols" in place of the Ideas which the soul had beheld in its earlier existence <sup>132</sup>. Thence follows a further argument for the assignment of the "symbols" to the class of the ideas. Finally, this assignment is confirmed by the result of the analysis of the Chaldæan view of the *Iyngees* <sup>133</sup>. These magical beings, which maintain the communication between the Supreme God and the Theurgists, are called in the Oracles, "Powers of the Father", *i. e.* Ideas, "Transmitters" of His commandments, *i. e.* angels, "Un-speakable names", *i. e.* magical formulae, and on the other hand spirits of the spheres which hold the planets in their courses. The "symbols" of the Chaldæans are therefore identical with the spiritual powers which

<sup>129</sup> See ch. III, n. 55.

<sup>130</sup> See ch. III, n. 56. Iamblichus interprets these Chaldæan "symbols" as referring to a natural faculty pervading all the portions of the universe and attaching them to the First Being. The theurgist who is cognizant of these "ineffable names" can control by their means the sympathetic disposition of the world-stuff and communicate with the spirits ruling its particular substances. Cf. IAMBL., *Myst.*, I, 12, p. 42, 15 f.; I, 21, p. 65, 4 f.; IV, 2, p. 184, 1f.; IV, 12, p. 195, 12 ff. See Excursus V, n. 17.

<sup>131</sup> See ch. III, n. 50; 59; 84; 142.

<sup>132</sup> Cf. *Exc. Vat.*, 195, 16 (quoted ch. III, n. 53) : ἡ φιλοσοφία τὴν τε λήθην καὶ ἀνάμνησιν τῶν αἰδίων λόγων αἰτιάται... τὰ δὲ λόγια τῶν πατρικῶν συνθημάτων.

<sup>133</sup> See ch. II, sect. 12; ch. IV, sect. 6.



connect and maintain the universe. The consensus of Ideas which brings about the harmony of the world depends accordingly on their magical connection; therefore the magical words of the Theurgists are also called in the Oracles "Watchwords of the manifold universe", *παντοιαδος σύνθημα* <sup>134</sup>. Thereby the spiritual organism which guarantees the order of the universe becomes the medium of magical action and, on the other hand, the spiritual substance of the soul becomes the magical potency of the Theurgists. The soul which with the help of the "symbols" thinks the noetic, unites itself with the cosmic power and accomplishes by means of it the theurgical action.

The views of the Chaldæans on the cosmic power of the magical names of gods derive from the speculation of the magicians as to the origin and nature of the magical formulae. These were identified by them with the "Secret Name" through which the Supreme God rules the world <sup>135</sup>. The magical papyri contain many traces of this dogma. "I call upon Thy secret name, which extends from the firmaments unto the depth of the earth", "with which God rules the entire world", "which permeates the universe" <sup>136</sup>. This "Name" therefore represents the power of the supreme God working in the universe; the possession of it makes the magician capable of god-like actions. It is therefore identified in the papyry with His "Strength", His "Vigour" <sup>137</sup>; the magician who has gained it boasts then that "he possesses in his soul" the all-powerful "Name" <sup>138</sup>.

In this doctrine of the "Name of God" we find one of the fundamental theories of the Chaldæan theurgists as to the identity of the spirit

<sup>134</sup> See ch. III, n. 59; cf. *ibid.*, n. 74.

<sup>135</sup> HOPFNER, *O.-Z.*, I, 681 ff.; F. DORNSEIFF, *Alphabet in Mystik und Magie*, 118 ff.

<sup>136</sup> Cf. *P. Mag.*, I, 217 (for parallels, see REITZENSTEIN, *Poinandres*, 17, 6); III, 160; XIII, 732 (where we should read τὸ ὄνομα τὸ[υ] διοικούν τὰ πάντα). Cf. also IANBL., *Myst.*, VIII, 5 (SCOTT-FERGUSON, *Hermetica*, IV, 74). PROCL., *Crat.*, 32, 16 (quoted ch. III, n. 74).

<sup>137</sup> *P. Mag.*, IV, 216: ἐδυναμώθη τῷ ἱερῷ σου ὀνόματι. Cf. also *P. Mag.*, XXXV, 20: διὰ τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ ἰάω καὶ τὴν ἰσχὺν τοῦ Σαβαώθ... καὶ τὸ κρᾶτος τοῦ Ἰδωνάι. See also ch. III, n. 4.

<sup>138</sup> Cf. *P. Mag.*, XIII, 800: διὰ τὸ σὸν ὄνομα, ὃ ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ ἔχω; cf. *ibid.*, 796.

of the cosmos with the magical power. In connection with this speculation regarding the cosmic character of the magical words the Chaldæans carried through the identification of the "symbols" with the Ideas. This harmonization was made possible for them by the fact that the Platonists of their time interpreted the Ideas as powers, which formed and set in order the cosmos, which derived from the Supreme God and carried out His regiment of the world.

This new doctrine of the Platonists itself represents a significant step in the direction of magic. For their system of the noetic powers is the outflow from a Primal inexpressable Being Whose efficacy does indeed manifest itself in the harmony of the visible world, but Who Himself is not exhausted in this harmony. Thus the cosmos is transformed from the receptacle of the divine powers to a symbol of an occult organism which represents a higher reality complete in itself<sup>139</sup>. This universal agent, exalted above of the world of phenomena, reveals himself in his true nature only to him who "thinks the noetic". Consequently the point of crucial interest removes from cosmology to the occult power of the spiritual in man : the noetic substance in the soul. This psychic substance too receives, with the new interpretation of the noetic as the sum of intellectual energies, dynamic faculty and becomes a center of power which is able, by means of the pure thought of the divine, to insert itself in the system of the supramundane powers and to transfer the energies of their organized structure to itself. Thus the knowledge of the divine becomes the control of the unity of its powers : power of thought, power of magic. As the Platonists explain power as a faculty of mind, so the Chaldæans explain mind as faculty of power. Or, in formal terms : the metaphysical concept of the *δύναμις Θεοῦ* is absorbed in the homonymous magical concept. The large number of synonyms which the Chaldæans use for the designation of the divine power<sup>140</sup>

<sup>139</sup> See K. REINHARDT, *Kosmos und Sympathie*, 249 (who overlooks the influence of Platonism upon this development).

<sup>140</sup> The Chaldæans use the following synonymous designations of Power : *δύναμις* (see ch. II, n. 46) ; *ἐλκνη* (ch. II, n. 62 ; 73 ; 74 ; 78 ; III, 59 ; 66 ; 114) ; *μένος* (ch. II, n. 73) ; *κάρτος* (ch. II, n. 74) ; *ισχύς* (ch. II, n. 78) ; *βίη* (ch. I, n. 67).

recur in the terminology of the magicians <sup>141</sup>; they are the expression of the Chaldæans' magical concept of the divine dynamics.

We have reached the end of our investigation. Many questions regarding the enigmatic phenomenon called "Chaldæan Theurgy" have remained unanswered, but the outline of its true picture can be discerned through the mist with which the spiritual interpretations of the Neoplatonists had enveloped it. The fusion of mysticism, magic and Platonism, the constitutive elements of the Chaldæan system, was to become the last form of Pagan religion. This compound of beliefs incorporated into the body of Neoplatonic thought continued, under the surface of the official orthodoxy, to exist through the Middle Ages. It was assimilated to analogous conceptions of Eastern Christianity by ps.-Dionysius Areopagita, and its memory was revived by the Byzantine Neoplatonist Psellus. At the end of the medieval era, Pletho found in Psellus' Chaldæan treatises one of the mainstays for his program of an universal theistic religion. His proclamation of the new faith induced Cosimo de' Medici to found a Platonic academy; and Marsilio Ficino, the hierophant of the new community, regarded the Chaldæan texts as an inspired attestation of the truth of the Platonic philosophy. Like him, Pico della Mirandola, Patrizzi and other thinkers of the Renaissance quoted the sayings of the Chaldæan gods with a particular reverence; and thus, the astral mysticism of antique paganism in its decline was merged in the cosmocentric piety of the modern mind. But here we must stop; for the history of the after life of the Chaldæan Oracles would be the subject of another book of similar length and perhaps wider interest, which the author of this one is not qualified to write. He shall be content if he has succeeded in casting a ray of light on some of the obscurer pages of the religion and philosophy of later antiquity.

---

<sup>141</sup> See RÖHR, *Der okkulte Kraftbegriff im Altertum* (Philologus, Supplement XVII, Heft 1, Leipzig, 1923) and G. KITTEL, *Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, s. v. *δύναμις/δύναμις*, 290 f.



## EXCURSUS I

### ON THE NEOPLATONISTS' MODE OF QUOTING THE CHALDÆAN ORACLES.

Proclus and the members of his school used to introduce their quotations from the Chaldæan Oracles by fixed formulæ which may serve as indications as to the origin of these quotations. Some of these formulæ are enumerated by KROLL 9; by DIEHL in his edition of Proclus' Timæus commentary, vol., III, *Index auctorum*, p. 366; and by PASQUALI in his edition of the excerpts from Proclus' Cratylus commentary, *index auctorum*, p. 115; but a systematic survey comprising all extant variations seems to be indispensable for the separation of the Chaldæan material from the body of Neoplatonic writing.

a) The most frequent designation of the Chaldæan Oracles is τὸ λόγιον or τὰ λόγια: cf. ch. I, n. 1 and 8. See also DAM., I, 291, 20 τὰ πολυτίμητα λόγια. Also τὰ Θεῖα λόγια or τὰ ἱερὰ λόγια (see ch. III, n. 114) occur.

b) οἱ Χαλδαῖοι; αἱ τῶν Χαλδαίων Φῆμαι; τὰ Χαλδαικὰ λόγια (PROCL. *Parm.*, 800, 19. DAM., *ap.* SUIDAM s. v. Ἡγίας. PSELLUS); ὁ Χαλδαῖος (thus constantly LYDUS and the Emperor JULIAN); ὁ ἱερὸς λόγος ὁ παρὰ Χαλδαίων (PROCL., *Tim.*, III, 111, 19, in order to distinguish this tradition from the ἱερὸς λόγος of Orpheus; cf. (c) and (d) and ch. I, n. 109); οἱ Χαλδαῖοι προφῆται (IAMBL., *Myst.*, III, 31, p. 176, 2). Proclus, on the other hand, frequently uses the name Χαλδαῖοι without article in order to designate the Chaldæan astronomers; (see *Rp.* II 236, 3. *Crat.*, 32, 6. *Tim.*, III, 124, 24. Cf. also JULIAN, *Orat.*, IV, 156 B); this manner of quoting goes back to Ptolemy.

c) οἱ Ἀσσύριοι; ἡ Ἀσσύριος (or ἡ τῶν Ἀσσυρίων) Θεολογία (in order to distinguish this tradition from ἡ τῶν Ἑλλήνων Θεολογία, whereby the Orphic doctrines are meant with); cf. also IAMBLL., *Myst.*, I, 2, p. 518 τὰ Ἀσσυρίων πάτρια δόγματα. On the promiscuous use of the names of the Chaldæans and Assyrians in Greek literature see NOELDEKE, *Hermes*, V (1871) 453, f.

d) οἱ Θεολόγοι can refer both to the Chaldæans and to the Orphics. In this case, the choice lies only between these two possibilities. The Emperor JULIAN (*Epist.*, 89; p. 132, 6, Bidez-Cumont. Cf. LOBECK, *Aglaophamus*, 565 f. O. KERN, *Religion der Griechen*, II, 165, 3), OLYMPIODORUS (see ch. v, n. 25) and PSELLUS (see Excursus VI, 1 a), who were deceived by this ambiguity, attributed Orphic teachings to the Chaldæans. The same error was also committed by KROLL, p. 9; for the monostich quoted by PROCL., *Tim.*, III, 131, 30, is not of Chaldæan, but Orphic origin. KERN, *Orph.*, *Fragm.*, p. 216, who follows Kroll, should be rectified accordingly. Iamblichus' work on the Chaldæan Oracles is quoted by DAM., I, 86, 5, with the formula ἐν τῷ πῆ βιβλίῳ τῆς Χαλδαικῆς τελειοτάτης Θεολογίας (IDEM, I, 154, 13 ἐν τοῖς Χαλδαιοῖς). The designation ἡ Χαλδαικὴ Θεολογία is also found in MARINUS, *Vit. Procl.*, 26.

e) ἡ Θεοπαράδοτος Θεολογία; αἱ Θεοπαράδοτοι Φῆμαι; ἡ Θεοπαράδοτος μυσταγωγία (PROCL., *Rp.* I, 111, 1 and II, 217, 15); τὰ Θεοπαράδοτα λόγια (MARINUS, *Vit. Procl.*, 26, et passim).

f) οἱ Θεόσοφοι; ἡ ὑπερβριος Θεοσοφία (PROCL., *Tim.*, II, 57, 10); ἡ βάρβαρος Θεοσοφία (PROCL., *Rp.*, III, 225, 4). The appellation Θεόσοφος was introduced into Neoplatonic terminology by Porphyry.

g) ὁ Θεουργός : The singular frequently indicates that the quotation is taken from another work of Julian the Theurgist than the Chaldæan Oracles (see e. g. ch. II, n. 220); οἱ Θεουργοί; τῆς τῶν Θεουργῶν; οἱ Θεουργικὸι λόγοι; οἱ παρὰ Χαλδαίοις Θεουργοί; ἡ Θεουργία; αἱ Θεουργίαι; οἱ τῶν Θεουργῶν ἀκρότατοι; τοῖς ἐπὶ Μάρκου γενομένοις Θεουργοῖς (see ch. I, n. 4). Cf. Excursus IV.

h) (οἱ) Θεοὶ (αὐτοὶ); Φησὶ τις Θεῶν; ἢ τῶν Θεῶν (αὐτῶν) Φήμη or ὁμφῆ or αἰ (παρὰ) τῶν Θεῶν Φῆμαι (perhaps with reference to the Chaldæan neologism Θεοφῆτης, see Excursus IV, 1); ὁ χρησμοφθῶν Θεός (see ch. I, n. 10).

i) ἢ ἱερὰ Φήμη (PROCL., *Tim.*, III, 89, 17); ὁ ὕμνος (PROCL. *Crat.*, 57, 26; cf. ch. I, n. 103); ὡς Φησὶν τις ἱερὸς λόγος (PROCL. *Rp.*, II, 133, 17, see ch. II, n. 133); ὁ ἱερὸς λόγος ὁ παρὰ Χαλδαίοις (in contradistinction to that of the Orphics).

k) οἱ βάρβαροι; ἢ ἐκ τῆς βαρβάρου (or ἢ ὑπερόριος) Θεοσοφία; αἰ τῶν βαρβάρων τελεταί.

l) ἢ μυστικὴ τῶν τελετῶν (see ch. III, n. 119); τὴν πασῶν (sc. τῶν πικλαιῶν Θεολόγων ὑποθέσεων) μυστικωτάτην εἶναι ὁμολογουμένην τὴν Χαλδαϊκὴν (DAM., I, 285, 1 f.); ἢ μυστικωτάτη παράδοσις (PROCL., *Crat.*, 51, 26); οἱ μυστικώτατοι τῶν λόγων (PROCL., *Tim.*, III, 83, 13).

For the appellation οἱ τελεσταί see Excursus X.

m) The verbs used in connection with the Chaldæan Oracles are παραδίδωμι, (ἀν)υμνέω, διδάσκω, μνηύω, δηλώω, ἐκδίδωμι, ἐκφαίνω (never ἐχρησε or ἀνεῖλε; the passage quoted ch. II, n. 65 derives from an author who lived before Proclus). For ἐκδίδωμι cf. e. g. SIMPL. *Phys.* 613, 1 ἀπὸ τῶν λογίων δὲ τῶν Χαλδαίοις ἐκδοθέντων and PROCL., *Rp.*, I 40; 24. The formula τὰ λόγια (viz. οἱ Θεοὶ) παρακελεύεται likewise occurs. The verb ὑποτίθημι (viz. the noun ὑποθέσεις) indicates in Neoplatonic terminology the doctrines propounded by Julian the Theurgist in one of his theoretical writings, where he speaks in his own name, not as in the Oracles in the name of "the gods". Cf. DAM., II, 203, 28, *et passim*. As to MARINUS see ch. II, n. 13.

n) Since the wisdom of the prophesying gods exists—like themselves—from eternity (IAMBLL., *Myst.*, III, 31, p. 178, 16 τὸ... ἱερατικὸν [i. e. theurgy, see ch. V, n. 53 ff. and Excursus IV, 2]... Θεῖόν τε ὡς ἀληθῶς γένος τῆς μαντείας... αἰδίου προϋπάρχον; cf. also PROCL., *Rp.*, II, 118, 8), the teachings of the Chaldæan Oracles (not of the theurgists; see PROCL., *Th. Pl.*, 193, 41, quoted ch. III, n. 199) are regarded by Proclus as prior to those of Plato (cf. PROCL., *Tim.*, III, 257, 4

Πλάτων καὶ πρὸ Πλάτωνος οἱ Θεοί. *Th. Pl.*, 324, 3 καὶ μοι δοκεῖ δ... Πλάτων τὰ αὐτὰ λέγειν ὑψίτερον τοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν Θεῶν πεφασμένοις), of HOMER (PROCL., *Rp.*, I, 152, 10 : Homer... μιμεῖται [sic] τὸν παρὰ τοῖς Θεουργοῖς τῆς ψυχῆς ἀπαθανατισμόν; see ch. III, n. 31-32), and even of the Chaldæan and Egyptian astronomers of primitive times (PROCL., *Rp.*, II, 236, 4. *Tim.*, III, 124, 24).

o) In those cases, in which the "hypotheses" of the astrophysicists, especially of Ptolemy, are opposed to the doctrines of the Chaldæan Oracles or to those expounded in the theoretical writings of the Theurgists, Proclus follows the latter and emphasizes his decision with a *credo*. Cf. *Tim.*, III, 63, 24 ὁ Θεουργός..., ᾧ μὴ Θέμις ἀπιστεῖν (ch. II, n. 220 e). *Rp.* II, 220, 18. *Ibidem*, 236, 10 αἱ τῶν Θεῶν Φῆμαι... καὶ οἱ χρησμοί..., οἷς χρὴ πειθομένοις, etc., *Tim.*, III, 83, 16 (see ch. II, n. 310) ὡς αἱ τε Χαλδαίων Φῆμαι λέγουσι καὶ ἐγὼ πείθομαι. This principal was already observed by Iamblichus, as is shown by the polemic of the Emperor JULIAN, *Orat.*, IV, 148 AB, against the designation of the teachings of the Theurgists as "hypotheses" (see m). Julian declares there that this term befits only the teachings of the astronomers (135 B σφαιρικοί: ὑποθέσεις τῶν πλανωμένων is the title of a work of Ptolemy quoted by PROCL., *Tim.*, III, 62, 22 and dealt with in the latter's *Hypotyposes astron.*), and demands for the doctrines of the Chaldæans (called by him *telestæ*, i. e. "purifying priests", see Excursus X), the name *δόγματα*, as the latter "have heard their views from gods or mighty demons" (cf. JULIAN, *Epist.* 89, p. 132, 6 f. BIDEZ-CUMONT), whereas the former only put forward theories of probability (PROCL., *Tim.*, III 63, 21 also calls Ptolemy's arguments mere *πιθανολογία*): "thus one has indeed to praise those, but to believe (*πιστεύειν*) the others" cf. ch. II, n. 316. The formula of this *credo* is borrowed from PLATO, *Tim.*, 40 d-e, who says about the ancient theologians : ἀδύνατον οὖν Θεῶν παισὶν ἀπιστεῖν... ἀλλὰ... πιστευτέον. The Theurgists were also reckoned among the "sons of gods"; cf. ch. III, n. 195.

p) Proclus avoids the designation *χρησμοί* for the Chaldæan Oracles cf. *Rp.* II, 236, 4 f. See also *Tim.*, III, 89, 22 his differentiation between *χρησμοί* (i. e. prophecies delivered at the established seats of the



oracles, *χρηστήρια* or *μαντεῖα*) and *θεῶν φῆμαι* (i. e. oracles written down under direct inspiration). In contradistinction to Proclus, Porphyry employed the term *χρησμοί* also for the Chaldæan Oracles (as did DAMASCUS, see ch. I, n. 10, and Hierocles, see ch. III, n. 7). We may note that Philo (*Vit. Mos.*, II 289. *Leg. Spec.*, I 315) and Philostratus (*Vit. Apoll.*, VIII, 7) are at one with Porphyry in not distinguishing between *λόγια* and *χρησμοί*.

g) Some of the formulæ of quotations mentioned above may be traced back to Porphyry's "Philosophy of the Oracles"; cf. e. g. *οἱ θεοὶ αὐτοί* and *τις τῶν θεῶν* (WOLFF, 134; 176); and *οἱ θεοὶ διδάσκουσιν* (frequently); cf. ch. I, n. 177.



## EXCURSUS II

### PORPHYRY AND THE CHALDÆANS

Porphyry mentions the Chaldæan Oracles for the first time in his "Philosophy of the Oracles", an early work. He quoted them there together with non-Chaldæan prophecies<sup>1</sup>. Besides he composed a treatise of which only the title *εἰς τὰ Ἰουλιανοῦ τοῦ Χαλδαίου* is known (quoted by Suidas in the list of Porphyry's writings<sup>2</sup>) and another work comprising at least two volumes and entitled "On the return (lit. reascend) of the soul" (*de regressu animæ*, retranslated *περὶ ἐπανόδου ψυχῆς*) by Augustine who knew it in a Latin translation and quotes from it several passages<sup>3</sup>. Augustine states that in this work Porphyry made constant use of the Chaldæan Oracles<sup>4</sup>, and cites some lines literally. Augustine's excerpts, which are the only extant fragments of this work of Porphyry, indicate that the themes treated there were related throughout to the doctrines of the Theurgists. Besides, Aeneas of Gaza (who

<sup>1</sup> See ch. I, n. 20 ff. Concerning the early date of Porphyry's "Philosophy of the Oracles", see Bidez, *Vie de Porphyre*, 15, 3.

<sup>2</sup> See ch. I, n. 19.

<sup>3</sup> See ch. I, n. 16 ff. AUGUSTINE, p. 42\*, 7 (the collection of the relevant fragments by Bidez, in the Appendix to his *Vie de Porphyre*, p. 27\*-44\*) quotes a passage from the end of the first book of PORPHYRY'S *De regressu animæ*. The Greek retranslation of *regressus*, *ἐπάνωδος*, was proposed (together with *ἀνώδος*) first by Bidez, p. 161 and confirmed, on the evidence of PORPH., *Marc.*, 6, p. 277, 19; PROCL., *Tim.*, I, 208, 14; OLYMPIODOR., *Phaed.*, 208, 7; HIEROCL. *ap. PROTIUM*, 463 a, 11) (cf. also SYNESIUS, *Insomn.*, 5, 1293 BC), by W. THEILER, *Porphyrios und Augustin* (Schriften der Königsberger gelehrten Gesellschaft, Geisteswissenschaftliche Klasse, X, 1, 1933), p. 8. The noun *ἐπάνωδος* is taken from PLATO, *Rep.*, 521 c, 7.

<sup>4</sup> PORPH., *Regr.*, p. 27\*, 2 f.; 43\*, 2 f. (see ch. I, n. 16).

borrowed his information from Proclus)<sup>5</sup> mentions another work of Porphyry, "in which the Oracles of the Chaldæans are quoted"<sup>6</sup>. The title of this work figures in the extant text of Aeneas in the corrupted form καθόλου, but the emendation καθόδου, already proposed by several critics<sup>7</sup>, is very slight from a graphical point of view, and we may assume that περι has been left out before the noun. Περὶ καθόδου, sc. ψυχῆς, is, from the Platonic aspect, the complementary theme to περι ἐπανόδου ψυχῆς<sup>8</sup>. It is therefore very probable that the two writings of Porphyry on the psychology of the Chaldæans quoted by Augustine and Aeneas (i. e. Proclus) were originally parts of one and the same work. This hypothesis was already propounded by G. WOLFF (p. 28, 2); we may venture to add to it the conjecture that the work

<sup>5</sup> Aeneas (see next note) borrowed his information from a lost work of Proclus who quoted there Porphyry's view together with that of Iamblichus (see ZELLER, III, 2, p. 713, 4 and 716, 2).

<sup>6</sup> AENEAS GAZ., *Theophrastus*, p. 51, Boissonade (Paris, 1836); MIGNÉ, P. G., LXXXV, 961 A (quoted by KROLL, 6) : οὐ γὰρ ἀγέννητος οὐδὲ ἀναρχος ἢ ὕλη. τοῦτό σε καὶ Χαλδαῖοι διδάσκουσι καὶ ὁ Πορφύριος· ἐπιγράφει δὲ + καθόλου + τὸ βιβλίον, ὃ εἰς μέσον προάγει τῶν Χαλδαίων τὰ λόγια, ἐν οἷς γεγονέαι τὴν ὕλην ἰσχυρίζεται.

<sup>7</sup> BOISSONADE, *loc. cit.*; G. WOLFF, *Porphyrii de philosophia ex oraculis haurienda* (Berlin, 1856), p. 28, 2; WENDLAND, *Philol. Wochenschrift*, 1895, 1045. As to the formula of quotation cf. PORPH., *Vit. Plot.*, 17 : γέγραπεν ὁ ἀμέλιος βιβλίον, ὃ ἐπέγραψε μὲν «περὶ τῆς κατὰ τὰ δόγματα τοῦ Πλωτίνου... διαφορᾶς»; EUSEB., *Praep. Evang.*, IV, 8, 4 : (Πορφύριος) ἐν αὐτοῖς οἷς ἐπέγραψε «περὶ τῆς ἐκ λογίων φιλοσοφίας»; SOCRATES, *Hist. Eccl.*, III, 1, 57 (quoted in *Iuliani imperat. epistulae*, p. 214, 10, ed. Bidez-Cumont) : ἐν τῷ λόγῳ, ὃν ἐπέγραψε «Καίσαρας». The corrections of SATHAS, *Bull. corr. hell.*, I (1877), 318 f. and of W. THEILER, *op. cit.*, 16, are too far-fetched. Bidez' proposition (*Vie de Porphyre*, 160, 5; repeated *C. M. A. G.*, VI, 86, 1) to keep the transmitted text and to punctuate ἐπιγράφει δὲ καθόλου τὸ βιβλίον, ὃ εἰς μέσον προάγει, «τῶν Χαλδαίων τὰ λόγια», is hardly tenable.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. PLOTINUS, *Enn.*, IV, 8 : περι τῆς εἰς τὰ σώματα καθόδου τῆς ψυχῆς. According to LYDUS, *Mens.*, IV, 149, p. 167, 23, Iamblichus composed a monograph entitled περι καθόδου ψυχῆς, and treated this theme more fully in his work περι ψυχῆς, from which Stobaeus quotes numerous passages (see BIDEZ, *Vie de Porphyre*, 160, 2-4). Both themes constitute also the subject-matter of Porphyry's allegorical explanation of the Platonic myth on Atlantis; see Excursus XI, 2.

supposed by Wolff was identical with the treatise quoted by Suidas. There are several arguments to be mentioned in favour of this assumption. First the formula *eis τὰ* followed by the *nomen auctoris* often serves as title of works dealing, either in the form of a running commentary or of "questions and answers" (*ζητήματα καὶ λύσεις*), with the teachings proposed by the author named in the title<sup>9</sup>. As the excerpts of Augustine show, *De regressu animae* belongs to the latter type. Since the doctrine concerning the descent and re-ascent of the soul formed the central conception of the Chaldæan system, it was natural that this theme formed the main object of Porphyry's criticism of the Chaldæan dogms. We may, moreover, point out that Augustine did not use the original text of Porphyry, but a Latin translation composed most probably by a member of the Roman school of Neoplatonists<sup>10</sup>. It is therefore quite possible that this translator did not deal with the entire work of Porphyry, but only with a part of it, to

<sup>9</sup> Cf. e. g. SUIDAS, s. v. Πρόκλος· *Eis τὴν πολιτείαν Πλάτωνος βιβλία δ'*. *Eis τὴν Ὀρφέως Θεολογίαν*, etc., and the titles of Proclus' commentaries *Eis τὸν Πλάτωνος πρῶτον Ἀλκιβιάδην*, *eis τὸν Πλάτωνος Παρμενίδην*. JULIAN, *Epist.*, 12, p. 15, 8, Bidez-Cumont, designates Iamblichus' writings on the Chaldæans as *τὰ ἱαμβλίχου πάντα . . . τὰ eis τὸν ὁμώνυμον* (sc. Iulianum). EUSTATHIUS in *Homer. Iliad.*, II, 557, p. 285 (*Aristot. Fragm.*, p. 394, 27 Rose), who quotes ὁ Πορφύριος ἐν τοῖς *eis τὸν Ὀμηρον*, means by this title the *Ὀμηρικὰ ζητήματα* (partly preserved); see Bidez, *op. cit.*, p. 71\*, No. 58. See also the title (transmitted by Suidas) of a work of Porphyry *eis τὴν Μινουκιανοῦ τέχνην*, which probably contained an apology of the theories of Porphyry's teacher in rhetorics; cf. Bidez, p. 71\*, No. 64. PROCL., *Rp.*, I, 40, 21 quotes his own commentary on the Chaldæan Oracles with the formula *ἐν τοῖς eis τὰ λόγια γεγραμμένοις*, and DAM., II, 281, 21 Proclus' commentary on the Timæus with the formula *ἐν τοῖς eis Τίμαιον*. Cf. also MARINUS, *Vit. Procl.*, 26 on Proclus who studied *τοῖς Πορφυρίου καὶ ἱαμβλίχου μυρίοις ὁμοῖς eis τὰ λόγια . . . συγγράμμασι* (quoted above, ch. II, n. 13).

<sup>10</sup> See Bidez, *Vie de Porphyre*, p. 158, 3. It may be added here that Augustine used also Porphyry's "Philosophy of the Oracles" in a Latin translation; this results from his introductory formula of the following two quotations (*Civ. Dei*, XIX, 23; WOLFF, 183 f.) : "Ut ipsa verba eius, quemadmodum ex lingua graeca in latinam interpretata sunt (perf.!), ponam", and : "Deinde post hos versus Apollinis, qui non stante metro latine interpretati sunt, subiunxit (sc. Porphyrius) atque ait".

which he gave the sub-title *De regressu animae*. Consequently, we may assume that the full title of the complete work of Porphyry read εἰς τὰ Ἰουλιανοῦ τοῦ Χαλδαίου περὶ καθόδου καὶ ἐπανόδου ψυχῆς.

The general contents and the tendency of this work have been characterized by Bidez, *Vie de Porphyre*, p. 88-97. Porphyry composed it, after he had become Plotinus' pupil. This is shown by the differentiation made by him between the first and second noetic principles (πατήρ and νοῦς)<sup>11</sup>, a distinction contested by Porphyry's former teacher Longinus<sup>12</sup>. Porphyry expounds in this work the teachings of Plotinus also as regards other questions. He declares that only the intellectual apprehension of the divine enables the soul to be released, after its separation from the body, from the circle of births and to return to its noetic origin<sup>13</sup>. Accordingly he refuses to admit the Chaldæan claim that this highest grade of immortality can be achieved by the theurgical consecration. Since this initiation purifies only the irrational part of the human soul<sup>14</sup>, it effects only the ascent of the disembodied soul to the astral gods<sup>15</sup>, but not to the Supreme Being who dwells in the noetic zone. As the sojourn of the souls in the domain of the astral gods (as temporary companions of the angels assigned to these gods) forms only an interlude before a new incarnation<sup>16</sup>, the Chaldæan sacrament does not conduct to the highest goal. Thus, theurgy is useful merely to those who are unable to lead a philosophical life. It is they who are bidden to seek initiation into the Chaldæan sacrament<sup>17</sup>.

The views which we have briefly outlined prove that in *De regressu animae* Porphyry takes up a critical attitude towards the Chaldæans

<sup>11</sup> PORPH., *Regr.*, p. 37\*, 22 f. See below, n. 24 f.

<sup>12</sup> ZELLER, III, 2\*, p. 518, 4.

<sup>13</sup> PORPH., *Regr.*, p. 37\*, 12 f.; 40\*, 14 f.; 41\*, 15; 24; 31; 34; 42\*, 2; 4.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. PORPH., *Regr.*, 28\*, 16 f., with Bidez' annotation p. 89, 1, as well as DODDS, *Proclus*, Appendix II. Porphyry follows Plotinus who declares (*Enn.*, IV, 4, 43-44) that magic affects only the ἀλογος ψυχή, but θεωρία is ἀγοητευτος.

<sup>15</sup> PORPH., *Regr.*, p. 32\*, 23 f.; 34\*, 10 f.

<sup>16</sup> PORPH., *Regr.*, p. 28\*, 20 f.; 32\*, 2 f.

<sup>17</sup> PORPH., *Regr.*, p. 29\*, 4 f. See above, ch. iv, n. 36.

(different from that evinced in the "Philosophy of the Oracles"). He does not regard their sacraments as valid for himself, *viz.* for those of his kind, *i. e.* the Platonists, and admit their importance only as far as non-philosophers are concerned. At the same time, however, he is conscious of the fact that the philosophical "purification" is attainable only to a chosen few (in conformity with Plato's saying *φιλόσοφον πλῆθος ἀδύνατον εἶναι*), and therefore concludes the first book *De regressu animæ* with the statement that neither the Chaldæan mystery of the "elevation of the soul" (the *ἀναγωγή*) nor any other doctrine (he mentions as examples those of the "true philosophy" and that of the Indians) have found "a universal way of the soul's liberation"<sup>18</sup>. Thus, he concludes upon a note of that perplexity which provides the undertone for his entire religious thought<sup>19</sup>.

What we have said shows that Porphyry's work on the psychology of the Chaldæans belongs to the group of polemic treatises, by which Plotinus and his pupils tried to defend the supremacy of Plato's "true philosophy" against the aspirations of religious sects, especially of the Christians and Gnostics (see PORPH., *Vit. Plot.*, 16). It seems probable that it was for reasons of actuality that Porphyry composed this work, but tradition does not give us any insight into the personal side of his activity. In any case, Porphyry's interest as well as the fact that he recommends the Chaldæan purification for the non-philosophers, may be regarded as an indirect proof of the fact that the Chaldæan mystery-community still existed in his time<sup>20</sup>.

<sup>18</sup> PORPH., *Regr.*, p. 42\*, 8 ff. : "Universalem (καθολικὴν) viam animæ liberandæ". Cf. above ch. III, n. 117, and BIDEZ, p. 95. By "e verissima quadam philosophia", Porphyry indicates his opposition to the pseudo-philosophy of the Gnostics. On the Indians see PORPH., *Abst.*, IV, 18, p. 258, 16 : *σπεύδειν δὲ τὰς ψυχὰς ἀπολύσαι τῶν σωμάτων*, and in particular HIPPOLYT., *Ref.*, I, 2/4, 5; PHILOSTRAT., *Vit. Apollon.*, III, 14 f.; VI, 11 f.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. especially Porphyry's "Letter to Anebo", 46 (see BIDEZ, *Vie de Porphyre*, p. 42\*, 8 note); Porphyry mentions the Chaldæan Theurgists several times in this treatise.

<sup>20</sup> Julianus the Chaldæan is mentioned in the list of the magicians quoted by ANTONIUS, *Adv. Nat.*, I, 52 (see BIDEZ-CUMONT, *Mages hell.*, II, 15, 6).

His critical attitude to the principal dogm of the Chaldæans did not hinder Porphyry from treating them (if we disregard the slight irony which sometimes creeps in) with an incomparably higher respect than the Gnostics, who were stigmatised by Plotinus and him as "deceived deceivers", falsifiers and corruptors of Platonic wisdom. Porphyry acknowledges freely the divine source of the revelations written down in the Chaldæan Oracles and declares only that they are intended for another public than the élite of the "true philosophers". In various particular questions he agrees with the Chaldæan Oracles and quoted them in corroboration of his own doctrines. Thus he mentions them when contesting the view held (in conformity with Plato) by both of his masters, Longinus and Plotinus, that the soul in its wanderings enters also the body of animals<sup>21</sup>. Likewise, he appeals to the Chaldæan Oracles in order to refute the doctrine proposed by the Platonist Atticus as to the eternity of matter<sup>22</sup>. This method of consecrating metaphysical axioms by divine revelations was employed by Porphyry already in his "Philosophy of the Oracles"<sup>23</sup>. He used it not

<sup>21</sup> BIDEZ, *Vie de Porphyre*, p. 38\*, 10 f. quotes in the note the relevant passages from Plato. Cf. also ZELLER, III, 2', p. 240, 3; 644 f.; 713, 4. Porphyry treated this question probably with reference to the Chaldæan Oracle quoted above ch. III, n. 190. According to Proclus (cf. *ibidem*), Porphyry quoted the same oracle also in his commentary on the *Timæus* as confirmation of his own view. Augustine (*Regr.*, p. 38\*, 12 f.) relates that "*Porphyrii doctor* (i. e. Longinus) *et Plotinus*" defended the doctrine of the wandering of the soul through the bodies of the animals, whereas "it displeased" (*displicuit*) to Porphyry. Since Augustine borrowed this information from PORPHYRY'S *De regressu animæ* itself (Porphyry used to quote his opponents by name), this citation forms an additional proof for the fact that Porphyry composed *de regressu animæ*, when he was already Plotinus' pupil.

<sup>22</sup> See n. 6. That it was Atticus against whom Porphyry invoked the authority of the Chaldæan Oracles, results from his polemics quoted by PROCL., *Tim.*, I, 283, 27 f.; 384, 3 f. (other passages are quoted by ZELLER, III, 1', p. 838, 3). See also AENEAS, *Theophrastus*, MIGNÉ, P. G., LXXXV, 964 B.

<sup>23</sup> Thus Porphyry quotes in his "Philosophy of the Oracles" (WOLFF, 142 f.) a non-Chaldæan oracle in order to prove that the god of the Jews has in truth to be considered as the chief of many gods (*δαίμονες*). For another example see ch. I, n. 23.



only in *de regressu animae*, but also in his other writings and became thereby the model of the later Neoplatonists.

In one of the passages of *De regressu animae* excerpted by Augustine, Porphyry attempts a Platonic reinterpretation of a Chaldæan verse. The Oracles declared that "Not the sun and the moon, but the three Rulers purify"<sup>24</sup>. We have shown that in their terminology these "three Rulers" (*ἀρχαί*) signify Aion, the sun and the moon. Porphyry, however, explained that the three *ἀρχαί* mean the three noetic principles *πατήρ*, *πατρικὸς νοῦς* and a *μέσος ἀμφοῖν*. Augustine declares that the wording of Porphyry's explanation did not give him any understanding of the nature of the middle hypostasis, but that in any case Porphyry by inserting it contradicts the doctrine of Plotinus as to the sequence of the noetic principles *πατήρ*, *νοῦς*, *ψυχή*. This *aporia* can be solved, if we consider the later exegesis of the Chaldæan Oracles as well as Plotinian formulas which were apparently unknown to Augustine. It seems that Porphyry based his doctrine of the three noetic principles as quoted by Augustine, upon the verse of the Chaldæan Oracles «*μέσσον τῶν πατέρων Ἐκάτης κέντρον πεφορῆσθαι*» (which Proclus afterwards regarded as referring to the three *πηγαῖοι πατέρες ἀπαξ ἐπέκεινα—ζωή—δὲς ἐπέκεινα*)<sup>25</sup> and identified the middle hypostasis (explained afterwards by Proclus as equivalent to Hecate, the Cosmic Soul) with *ζωή*<sup>26</sup>—hence the perplexity of Augustine. This exegesis could invoke the authority of Plotinus, inasmuch as the latter frequently designated *ζωή* as coordinate with *δν* and *νοῦς*; with (tacit) reference to this teaching Porphyry introduced the noetic triad *δν—ζωή—νοῦς* also

<sup>24</sup> PORPH., *Regr.*, p. 36\*, 5 f. On what follows cf. ZELLER, III, 2<sup>4</sup>, p. 705, 1, and above ch. II, n. 299 f. The interpretation proposed by BOUSSET, *Arch. f. Rel.*, XVIII (1915), p. 142, 1, is erroneous.

<sup>25</sup> See ch. II, n. 273; 282.

<sup>26</sup> Hecate, as Cosmic Soul, has been mentioned also in *De regressu animae*; this follows from a lengthy passage from this work quoted by AUGUSTINE in *Sermo CCXLII*, ch. 6-7: "... Ipsam animam mundi vocari Iovem vel vocari Hecatē", etc. (Bidez refers to this quotation only in his annotations to *De regressu animae*, p. 38\*, 4 note). The explanation of Iupiter as Cosmic Soul is to be traced back to Plotinus (ZELLER, III, 2<sup>4</sup>, p. 680, 1), that of Hecate to the Chaldæan Oracles.

in his commentary on the *Timæus* <sup>27</sup>. This supposed interpretation of a famous verse of the Chaldæan Oracles by Porphyry was modified afterwards by Iamblichus, whose new interpretation (reflected in Proclus' commentation) formed the basis of the unfortunate confusion of the cosmogonic and theurgic ἀρχαί, found in the later Neoplatonic speculation, the rules of which we have tried to elucidate in the second chapter <sup>28</sup>. Porphyry's explanation of the triad "Faith-Truth—Love", the original meaning of which has been explained in the same section of the second chapter, rests likewise on a Platonic reinterpretation of a Chaldæan doctrine. Hence it follows that Porphyry was not only the first Platonist who introduced the Chaldæan Oracles to the Plotinian school and quoted their verses for sanctifying the axioms of the Neoplatonic ontology, but also the first who, by a radical reinterpretation, harmonized the teachings of the Chaldæans with the major principles of Neoplatonism. In these three respects he showed the way to the exegesis of the Chaldæan Oracles by Iamblichus and, later on, by Proclus.

---

<sup>27</sup> PROCLUS, *Tim.*, III, 64, 8 f. (already quoted by ZELLER, III, 2, p. 705, 1); see DODDS, *Proclus*, 253. Cf. also LYDUS, *Mens.*, II, 8, p. 27, 14 f.

<sup>28</sup> See ch. II, sect. 13.

### EXCURSUS III

---

## NEOLOGISMS AND RARE WORDS IN THE CHALDÆAN ORACLES

In the Chaldæan Oracles a large number of newly-coined or rare words is to be found, some of which were taken over by the Neoplatonists who gave them currency. This accumulation of rare words is a general characteristic of the oracular style the rules of which were followed by the Chaldæans also in this respect<sup>1</sup>. Not every word, however, which is missing in Lidell-Scott-Jones, deserves the name of neologism. As we have only a scanty knowledge of oracular poetry of the second century, the lexicæ are not able to present a complete picture of the linguistic licences of this literary genre. When we consider, moreover, the inexhaustible productivity of the Greek language in the formation of new word-compositions as well as the facility in changing adjective-suffixes, it follows that many *hapax legomena* adduced in the subsequent list were not felt at their time as unusual. This is not the place to enter upon a full discussion of this question, which can be answered only by a comprehensive study of the entire extant Greek religious poetry of the later antiquity.

---

<sup>1</sup> For the hymn of the "Theosophy" (quoted ch. 1, n. 26) cf. Callimachus, who song of Athene *γρίφῳ βαθιστῶ καὶ δυσζυρέτοις λόγοις*. (see WILAMOWITZ, *Glaube der Hellenen*, II, 315, 4). EUNAPIUS, *Vit. Sophist.*, p. 25 (?) Boiss. (p. 464, 42 of the edition of Philostratus, Eunapius, Himerius, Paris 1878) relates that the Neoplatonist Aedesius remembered only the content of the hexametrical oracles revealed to him when sleeping, but forgot *τὸ ὑπερφυῆς καὶ οὐρανόμεγες τῶν ἐπῶν*. We may also recall the parodical neologisms found in the oracles of Alexander Pseudomantis (the contemporary of the Chaldæans), according to the account of Lucian.

## 1. NOUNS.

a) A special group is constituted by the *nomina agentis* ending in *-eus* : 2  
*δοχεύς* (ch. I, n. 125), "recipient" ("master of ceremonies" : Inscript-  
 ions). *συνδοχεύς*<sup>o</sup> (ch. II, sect. 11), "connective" with another meaning  
 also Horapollon II, 116). *ἀνοχεύς* (ch. II, n. 259), "uplifter" (elsewhere  
 used as medical term). *ἀναγωγεύς* (ch. III, n. 97) "the Raiser" (usually  
 employed as designation of "straps holding a shield or the sandal".

b) *Nomina agentis* ending in *-τηρ* : *ἐξωστήρ* (ch. III, n. 124). *ὑδρο-  
 βατήρ* (ch. V, n. 26).

c) *Nomina agentis* ending in *-is* : *πειθηνίς* (usually *πειθήνιος*. See  
 ch. II, n. 246). *ἐκδοτίς* (ch. II, n. 62. See also *P. Oxy.* 1273, 26,  
 s. III A. D.). *πρηστηρίς*\* (ch. II, n. 247 b)<sup>3</sup>.

## 2. ADJECTIVES (MOSTLY DEVERBATIVES) :

Ending in *-as* : *ἀκμάς*\* (ch. II, n. 177, v. 1. Usually *ἀκμαῖος*).

*-ημων* : *ἰτρήμων*\* (ch. I, n. 77. Usually *ἰτράλεος*).

*-ios* : *ἐμπύριος*\*<sup>o</sup> (ch. II, n. 270 *et passim*). *ρότιος* (ch. V, n. 72.  
 Usually *ρευστός*). *πύριος*\*<sup>o</sup> (ch. II, n. 184. Usually *πυρινός*). *ὑπερ-  
 κόσμιος*<sup>o</sup> vel *ὑπέρκοσμος* (ch. II, n. 351).

*-aios* : *ροϊζαῖος* (ch. IV, n. 52, v. 4).

*-ης* : *αὐτοφανής* (ch. I, n. 52, *et passim*).

## 3. VERBS :

*ἀμυδρῶ*\* (ch. II, n. 200, v. 2. Usually *ἀμαυρῶ*). *ἐγκαρπιζῶ*\* (ch. III,  
 n. 114).

## 4. NOMINA SIMPLICIA :

*δαίη*\* (ch. I, n. 46, v. 12). *καναχισμός*\* (ch. II, n. 287 c. Usually

<sup>2</sup> The above list will contain also those words (mostly verbal adjectives), which were in use already before the time of the Chaldæans, but were employed by them with a new meaning. Words signed with an asterisc are missing in Liddell-Scott-Jones. A small circle (°) means that the Neoplatonists adduced by Liddell-Scott-Jones depend on the Chaldæans.

<sup>3</sup> Other *Nomina agentis* (no neologisms) found in the Chaldæan Oracles are : *ἐπιβήτωρ*, *ἐργάτις*, *ἐλάτειρα*.

παναχῆ). μελεθηθμός (ch. I, n. 46, v. 12). παντοίαις (ch. III, n. 59 and 74. Modelled upon μονάς).

5. NOMINAL COMPOSITA :

αἰθεροδινῆς\* (ch. I, n. 46, v. 8). ἀμιστύλλευτος<sup>o</sup> (ch. II, n. 56). ἀνάπνουσ\* (ch. III, n. 124). ἐπιβριθύς (? See ch. I, n. 186). ἐπίκτις<sup>o</sup> (ch. III, n. 97). Θεοβρέμμων (ch. III, n. 352). Θεοσύνδετος (ch. III, n. 66). Θεουργός (Excursus IV). Θεοφήτης\* (ch. I, n. 152). Θηρόπολος (ch. V, n. 19). κοσμαγός (ch. II, n. 271). λιγυφεγγέτις\* (ch. I, n. 46, v. 6). ὀλόποιος (ch. II, n. 331). πάγκρητος\* (ch. I, n. 152, ch. II, n. 74). πάντευχος (ch. II, n. 118). παντοπάτωρ\* (ch. I, n. 26, v. 13). πυρήχοχος (ch. II, n. 296). πυριβριθῆς (ch. II, n. 232). ὑλάρχης (ch. II, n. 302). ὑπερβάθμιος<sup>o</sup> (ch. V, n. 10).

A few general remarks on the style of the Chaldæan Oracles which do not claim to exhaust the theme, may be added. The strongest influence was exerted by the Homeric model which was obligatory together with the metre and the literary genre<sup>4</sup>. The Chaldæans borrowed from Homer many terms and gave, under his influence, epic color to their description of metaphysical speculations. The creation of the world is depicted after the pattern of a theogony<sup>5</sup>. Platonic notions are not infrequently replaced by epic equivalents<sup>6</sup>. Apart from Homer the Chaldæans imitated—although to a much smaller extent—the style of the Greek philosophical didactical poems of earlier times<sup>7</sup>. Further, they show the influence of contemporary religious poetry, but we know too little of this type in order to fix the extent of their dependence<sup>8</sup>.

<sup>4</sup> The respective models have been quoted in the course of the investigation *ad loc.* A characteristic is the abundance of epic formation of adverbs ending in *-δην οἱ* or *-δου*; as *ἄδην, ἀμβολάδην, εἰλιγδην, σκιρτηδόν, σποράδην, στιβαρηδόν*.

<sup>5</sup> See ch. II, n. 177.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. e. g. *ἀρπάζειν*. instead of *χωρίζειν* (see ch. II, n. 144) *ἀμιστύλλευτος*, instead of *ἀμερῆς* (ch. II, n. 56).

<sup>7</sup> See ch. II, n. 328 and 384.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. e. g. *Hymn. Orph.*, LXVI, 6 : « *αἰθηρ, ἥλιος, ἄστρα, σελήνη, φῶς ἀμείωντον* » with the oracle quoted ch. III, n. 35. Concerning the dependence of the Chaldæans on hymns on the sun see ch. II, n. 232 and ch. VII, n. 75.



## EXCURSUS IV

### THE MEANING AND THE HISTORY OF THE TERMS "THEURGIST" AND "THEURGY"

1. *Θεουργός* is a neologism of the Chaldæans<sup>1</sup>, which recurs in the extant fragments of the Chaldæan Oracles only once<sup>2</sup>, but it seems that *Θεουργικά* was the title of a treatise composed by the second of the two Julians<sup>3</sup>. The noun is coined after the pattern of *Θεολόγος*: as the theologians are *οἱ τὰ Θεῖα λέγοντες*, so the theurgists *οἱ τὰ Θεῖα ἐργαζόμενοι*. Also Iamblichus understood the noun in this way<sup>4</sup>. In a like manner, the noun *Θεοφῆται* (also a neologism of the Chaldæans meaning *οἱ τὰ Θεῖα φάσκοντες*)<sup>5</sup> was coined after the model of *Θεομάχταις*.

Psellus quotes another etymological explanation of *Θεουργός* which he borrowed from Proclus; cf. *de omnifaria doctrina*, Migne, P. G. CXXII 55,721 D : *ὁ Θεουργός... Θεοῦ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἐργάζεται*, similarly *Ibid.*, C. 52,721 A : *τὸ δὲ δύνασθαι Θεοποιεῖν ἄνθρωπον καὶ τῆς ὕλης ἐξάγειν καὶ τῶν παθῶν ἀπαλλαστεῖν, ὥστε δύνασθαι καὶ αὐτὸν Θεουργεῖν (i. e. Θεὸν ἐργάζεσθαι) ἕτερον*. Bidez<sup>6</sup> accepts this etymology, yet the

<sup>1</sup> CUMONT, *Rel. Orient.*, 294, 89.

<sup>2</sup> See ch. III, n. 143.

<sup>3</sup> See ch. I, n. 1.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. IAMBL., *Myst.*, I, 9, p. 33, 9 : *ἡ τῶν Θεῶν ἐργῶν τέχνη*. II, 11, p. 96, 13 : *τὰ Θεῖα ἐργα*; *ibid.*, p. 96, 17 : *ἡ τῶν ἐργῶν τῶν ἀρρήτων... τελεσιουργία*. See Excursus V, n. 8.

<sup>5</sup> See ch. I, n. 152.

<sup>6</sup> BIDEZ, *Vie de l'Empereur Julien*, 369, 8 (repeated *C. M. A. G.*, VI, p. 169, 2) : "Nom imaginé pour renchérir sur le "théologien" et rappeler que le théurge, au lieu de se borner à parler des dieux, sait 'agir' en conférant une nature divine".

Chaldæans do not promise deification (*ἀποθέωσις*), but immortality (*ἀθάνατισμός*). It seems therefore that the explanation adopted by Psellus is based upon the Neoplatonic view of the deification effected by the contemplation of the true Being<sup>7</sup>.

The difference between philosophy and theurgy is explained by IAMBlichus, *De Myst.*, II 11. He states that it is not mere thinking which unites the theurgist with the god, for if it were so the philosopher would possess the means of a theurgical communication with the divine. As opposed to them the theurgist achieves his goal through the correct ritual performance of certain magical actions (*ἔργα*), which may not be intelligible to the officiant, but whose significance is known to the gods who react in accordance with their own cognitions. The purity of soul and body are merely cooperative agents (*συνάττια*) to the theurgical union. The divine volition is set in motion by the divine "symbols" (*i. e.* the magical formulae). Therefore the "active union" (*ἡ δραστηκὴ ἔνωσις*) is carried through not without thinking, but is not identical with the latter<sup>8</sup>.

According to this theory, theurgy and philosophy are two different methods aiming at the same goal, the union with the gods. Iamblichus (who is followed by Proclus) uses, however, the term "theurgy" also in another, metaphysical, sense : human intelligence is unable to perceive the supreme God in His perfect nature ; its strength suffices for the vision of the Ideas in their plurality, but not for their source, the undivided unity of the *νοητόν*. This higher goal can be reached only with a superior organ of apperception, the "flower of intellect" (*ἄνθος νοῦ*). Yet this apperception is no longer a process of intellection, but the result of a supra-rational state identical with the "divine frenzy" of Plato<sup>9</sup>. The "virtue" which enables to this supreme vision is

<sup>7</sup> See ch. III, n. 44.

<sup>8</sup> See DOBBS, *Proclus*, Introd. p. xx.

<sup>9</sup> The relevant passages of Proclus have been collected and explained by H. Koch, *Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita*, etc., 153-162. Koch points out (p. 154, 2) that Proclus took over Iamblichean doctrines. We may add to Koch's collection of passages PSELLUS, *De omnifaria doctrina*, 49 and 51 (on Psellus' source see notes 25/26).



called by Iamblichus "theurgical" <sup>10</sup>, and the Chaldæan Oracles describing the "Elevation of the Soul" explained it as referring to this supreme act of vision. It follows that the notion "theurgy" designates in the writings of the later Neoplatonists both a "practical" method of union with the gods (*πραγματικὴ ἐνωσις*) and the supra-rational union with the highest order of the divine attainable to a human being. The source of this ambiguity is, as we have shown, to be sought in the Chaldæan Oracles themselves which describe the ritual of the "Elevation" by intellectual terms.

By the noun *Θεουργός* Proclus and the members of his school constantly designate the Chaldæan theurgists. Bidez <sup>11</sup> has correctly remarked that Hopfner, in his chief work on the magic of antiquity as well as in his various articles contributed to Pauly-Wissowa <sup>12</sup>, has overlooked this fact and thus left unused an important principle for the assortment of many testimonies quoted by him.

The appellation *οἱ Θεουργοὶ* is applied not only to Julian the Chaldæan and his son, the "Theurgist" <sup>13</sup>, but also to the initiates of the mystery-community founded by them and revived by the later Neoplatonists <sup>14</sup>. In this way, the differentiation made by the Emperor Julian between "the Chaldæan" and the "blessed Theurgists" is to be explained <sup>15</sup>.

Exceptions from this rule are to be found only in the quotations made by Iamblichus in his work "On the Mysteries" (published under the pseudonym of an Egyptian priest Abammon). The teachings of this work are a free combination of Neoplatonic, Chaldæan and Hermetic doctrines. Iamblichus calls this syncretistic theology *Θεουργία*,

<sup>10</sup> See notes 30-31.

<sup>11</sup> BIDEZ, *Vie de Julien*, 369, 8.

<sup>12</sup> HOPFNER, *Griechisch-ägyptischer Offenbarungszauber* (Studien zur Paläographie und Papyruskunde, edited by C. Wessely, XXI, 1921, and XXIII, 1924). IDEM in *P. W.*, s. v. Mageia, Mantike, Mysterien, Theurgie.

<sup>13</sup> They are called by PROCL., *Tim.*, III, 27, 9 : *οἱ τῶν Θεουργῶν ἀκρότατοι*.

<sup>14</sup> See ch. II, n. 7.

<sup>15</sup> See ch. III, n. 38. Cf. also Proclus (quoted ch. I, n. 3) : *τοῖς ἐπὶ Μάρκου γενομένοις Θεουργοῖς* and Olympiodorus (quoted ch. III, n. 163) *πολλοὶ τῶν Θεουργῶν*.

but also *ιερατική Θεουργία*<sup>16</sup>. In these cases a conclusion from the bare terminology as to the source of the respective doctrine is impossible.

2. Like "theurgy", so the term "*hieratike*" (*ἡ ιερατική*, sc. *τέχνη*; its representative is called *ὁ ιερατικός*, "the priestly man"), is used by the later Neoplatonists as designation of a magico-mystical method based upon ascetic rules and theosophic erudition, and aiming at a direct communication with the divine. The term may be traced back to the Egyptians<sup>17</sup> and was introduced into the Neoplatonic school-tradition by Iamblichus, who borrowed it probably from the Hermetics<sup>18</sup>. Iamblichus regards the hieratic life as higher than the philosopher's and was considered by the later Neoplatonists as the founder of the "hieratic" direction of the school<sup>19</sup>.

The Neoplatonists regarded the practices of the Chaldaean theurgists as one of the "hieratic" methods, but not as the only one. It is true that Psellus called Julian the Theurgist the founder of the "hieratic art"<sup>20</sup>, but it is probable that in this statement he went beyond his source<sup>21</sup>; for Proclus considers both the "hieratic art" and "theurgy" as disciplines belonging to the same genus and accordingly differentiates between them<sup>22</sup>. Sometimes when Proclus speaks of a

<sup>16</sup> Cf. e. g. IAMB., *Myst.*, VIII, 4; IX, 6; X, 5.

<sup>17</sup> BIDEZ, *Mél. Cumont*, I, 89, 5. Cf. DAM. ap. SUID., s. v. *ιερατική*.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. the passages quoted n. 16 and IAMB., *Myst.*, X, 6.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. OLYMPIODOR., *Phaed.*, 123, 4 : *οἱ δὲ τὴν ιερατικὴν* (sc. *προτιυῶσι*, in contradistinction to the "philosophers", i. e. Plotinus and Porphyry), *ὡς Ἰαμβλῖχος καὶ Συριανὸς καὶ Ἠρόκλος καὶ οἱ ιερατικοὶ πάντες*. See BIDEZ, *Le philosophe Iamblique et son école*, *Rev. Et. Gr.*, XXXII (1919), 35 ff.; DODDS, *Proclus*, p. xxiii.

<sup>20</sup> PSELLUS, *Script. min.*, p. 446, 22 f., ed. Kurtz-Drexl (see BIDEZ, *Mél. Cumont*, 93, 2) : *οἱ Χαλδαῖοι . . . τὴν ιερατικὴν τέχνην συνέστησαν*.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. PSELLUS, *Script. min.*, p. 241, 25 : *τῆς δὲ γε Χαλδαίων ιερατικῆς τέχνης* and 242, 5.

<sup>22</sup> Cf. e. g. PROCL., *Rp.*, I, 37, 11 f. : *τὴν ιερατικὴν ὄλην . . . καὶ τὰ ἔργα τῶν Θεουργῶν*; *ibid.*, 110, 22 : *ταῖς ιερατικαῖς ἀπάσαις πραγματεῖαις . . . καὶ ταῦτα καὶ ἡ Θεοπαράδοτος μυσταγωγία* (see Excursus I e) *παραδίδωσιν*. *Parm.*, 647, 4 : *ἡ δὲ τῶν ιερατικῶν . . . ὅλα τὰ τοῖς Ἰσσυροῖς* (see Excursus I c) *ὑμνημένα*. According to this passage, theurgy belongs to the genus of the "hieratic art".

“hieratic art of the Greeks”<sup>23</sup>, he has in mind particularly the secret teachings of Nestorius<sup>24</sup>.

3. An ambiguous passage of Psellus has to be discussed in this connection. He says in his treatise *De omnifaria doctrina* that as the possessor of the philosophical virtue is called “god” (θεός), so that of the theurgical, “father of gods” (θεοπάτωρ)<sup>25</sup>. A pointer to the right understanding of this enigmatic remark is given by the context in which it is to be found. Psellus sets forth his view in the source of a systematic disquisition “Concerning the Virtues” (περι ἀρετῶν). The views expressed in these chapters derive, as their content shows, from Proclus who had propounded them very probably in his lost commentary on the Chaldæan Oracles, Psellus’ only source of information as regards the Chaldæans<sup>26</sup>. The first Neoplatonist who elaborated a systematic theory concerning the various grades of virtues was Porphyry<sup>27</sup>. He distinguishes four grades of them<sup>28</sup>: the political, cathartic, theoretic and paradigmatic virtues, and declares that the agent of the theoretic virtue is “god” and that of the paradigmatic “father of gods” (θεῶν πατήρ)<sup>29</sup>. Iamblichus<sup>30</sup> (who is followed by Proclus) identifies

<sup>23</sup> PROCL., *Rp.*, II, 154, 5; 243, 17. For the appellation ἡ παρ’ ἡμῶν ἱερατικὴ cf. the title of the excerpt *περι τῆς καθ’ Ἑλληνας ἱερατικῆς τέχνης* transmitted by Psellus; see Excursus VI, 1 h.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. PROCL., *Rp.*, II, 65, 3; 324, 14. See above ch. II, n. 8.

<sup>25</sup> PSELLUS, *De omnifaria doctrina*, 55, Migne, P. G., CXXII, p. 721 D: ὁ μὲν ἔχων τὴν θεουργικὴν ἀρετὴν ‘θεοπάτωρ’ κατονομάζεται. ἐπειδὴ γὰρ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὗτος ἐργάζεται, διὰ ταῦτα ‘θεοπάτωρ’ καλεῖται. ὁ δὲ ἔχων τὴν θεωρητικὴν ἀρετὴν, ‘θεὸς’ ὀνομάζεται (quoted by Bidez, *C. M. A. G.*, VI, 169, 21).

<sup>26</sup> See Excursus VI, 1 i.

<sup>27</sup> For the Neoplatonic doctrine of the grades of virtues see ÜBERWEG-PRAECITER, *Philosophie des Allertums*, 611; 617; 632; K. PRAECITER, *Zur theoretischen Begründung der Theurgie*, *Archiv f. Rel.*, 1927, 209-213; O. SCHISSEL VON FLESCHENBERG, *Marinus von Neapolis und die neuplatonischen Tugendgrade*, Athen, 1928; W. THEILER, *Gnomon*, 1929, 310 f.; Bidez, *loc. cit.*

<sup>28</sup> PORPH., *Sent.*, 32.

<sup>29</sup> The last virtue after PLOTINUS, I, 2, cf. OLYMPIODOR., *Phaed.*, 46, 6 f.

<sup>30</sup> In his lost treatise *περι ἀρετῶν*, quoted by OLYMPIODOR., *Phaed.*, 114, 21; 25. See ZELLER, III, 2<sup>4</sup>, p. 770, 1.

this highest grade with that distinguished by theurgic virtue<sup>31</sup>. As the latter enables the theurgist to "act in a paradigmatic manner"<sup>32</sup>, it should follow that its possessor deserves the title *Θεοπάτωρ*. Psellus modifies this theory by saying that the title *Θεοπάτωρ* is due to the theurgists, because they are able to deify men<sup>33</sup>. It is, however, doubtful whether he borrowed this definition from his Neoplatonic source or added it on his own account<sup>34</sup> with reference to the etymology of the name examined above in the first section of this Excursus<sup>35</sup>. In any case the relevant passage of Psellus may be explained as a reproduction *viz.* modification of a definition of Proclus : which is not based on a genuine Chaldæan tradition, but on the Neoplatonic speculation concerning the nature of theurgy.

---

<sup>31</sup> Cf. MARINUS, *Vit. Procl.*, 26. See THEILER, *op. cit.*, 311; 314.

<sup>32</sup> Cf. OLYMPIODOR., *Phaed.*, 46, 16 : *Θεουργίας δὲ ἔργον... ἐνεργεῖν παραδειγματικῶς* (vel *ἐνοειδῶς*).

<sup>33</sup> See n. 25.

<sup>34</sup> The sentence 721 D (quoted n. 25) : *ἐπειδὴ γὰρ Θεοὺς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους οὗτος ἐργάζεται, διὰ ταῦτα 'Θεοπάτωρ' κλεῖται*, makes the impression of an insertion in the original context (*i. e.* Proclus); similarly 721 A (quoted p. 17) : *ὥστε δύνασθαι καὶ αὐτὸν Θεουργεῖν ἕτερον*.

<sup>35</sup> See n. 7.

## EXCURSUS V

### THE CALLER AND THE CALL

1. The Chaldæans designated the officiants of the theurgical operation, who attracted the gods by magical formulas, with the name "callers", κλητορες<sup>1</sup>. This *Nomen agentis* is a term peculiar to the Chaldæans, but the notion itself was in common use already since early times. The noun κλησις means "calling on the gods in prayer" and was employed by the magicians as name of the binding spells by which they cited gods and spirits. With the transition into the magical sphere the meaning of the term changed : the invocation becomes an evocation<sup>2</sup>. This magical belief was opposed to the axiom of the philosophers concerning the apathy and autonomy of the divine. Porphyry raises therefore in his "Letter to the Egyptian priest Anebo" (which contains a canon of religious problems) the following question<sup>3</sup> : Since many holy actions are performed under the presupposition that the gods are subdued to passion, the divine, however, is in truth subject neither to compulsion nor to flattery, the binding spells which are intended to lead the godhead to "incline itself towards" (προσκλίνειν) the caller, are vain efforts. This question is answered by Iamblichus in his work "On the Mysteries" (the reply to Porphyry's "Letter to Anebo" in which Iamblichus is disguised as another Egyptian priest bearing the name Abammon) by the following arguments<sup>4</sup> : The irradiation of divine light upon the calling of the magician does not mean that the divinity is drawn downwards, but that it manifests itself of its own free

<sup>1</sup> See ch. I, n. 115.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. V. Cousin in his *Avertissement to Procli philosophi Platonici opera inedita* (Paris, 1864), p. xiv : "On n'invoqua plus seulement les dieux, on les évoqua".

<sup>3</sup> IAMBLL., *Myst.*, I, 10 ; 14 (*Epist. ad Aneb.*, 4-5, p. xxx f., Parthey).

<sup>4</sup> IAMBLL., *Myst.*, I, 12, *init.* (partly quoted ch. III, n. 42). Cf. HOFFNER, *O.-Z.*, I, 794.

will. Being benevolent and gracious the gods, whose will is to be regarded as free, make their light shine forth to the theurgists, by "calling upwards their souls towards them" and by granting them the union with themselves". The "ascent brought about by calling" does not therefore draw downward the passionless gods into the sphere of passion, but rather delivers the men who are slaves to it. Iamblichus reverts to the same question several times. He denies that the godhead can be "attracted" to apparition by compulsory spells, as it is stronger than any force<sup>7</sup>; every irradiation activity of the divine Fire is "self-called" and "self-effected", so that the differentiation between the "caller" and the "called" loses its validity with regard to them<sup>8</sup>.

2. Iamblichus' explanation (which is taken over by Proclus)<sup>9</sup> is based, as we have shown<sup>10</sup>, upon the Chaldæan doctrine concerning

<sup>5</sup> τὰς ψυχὰς τῶν Θεουργῶν εἰς ἑαυτοὺς ἀνακαλούμενοι.

<sup>6</sup> ἡ διὰ τῶν κλήσεων ἀνοδος.

<sup>7</sup> IAMB., *Myst.*, III, 18; cf. 17.

<sup>8</sup> IAMB., *Myst.*, IV, 3, p. 185, 7: The divine manifestation occurs ἀθαιρέτως, αὐτόκλητός τε καὶ αὐτενέργητος. Iamblichus frequently emphasizes (cf. I, 12, p. 41, 3 f.; I, 14, p. 44, 14; IX, 9, p. 284, 1f.), that the gods appear to the theurgists of their own will (κατὰ τὴν ἰδίαν βούλησιν) and not, as the "goëts" think, by force. He explains therefore the attribute αὐτοφανείας, which was employed by the Chaldæans with the meaning usual in magic: "personal appearing" (see ch. 1, n. 54; II, n. 150; IV, n. 67), as "voluntary appearing". Likewise, he re-interprets the Chaldæan hypostasis of the divine Will (βουλή: see ch. II, n. 49) as expression of the free volition of the divine (cf. also *ap. Procl.*, *Tim.*, I, 211, 5). Further, he employs sometimes the term Θεία ἔργα, which originally designated the activity of the theurgists (οἱ τὰ Θεία ἐργαζόμενοι, see Excursus IV, n. 4), with reference to the activity of the "self-manifest" gods (cf. *e. g.* *Myst.*, III, 18, p. 144, 1; III, 20, p. 148, 6 and IV, 3, p. 149, 7).

<sup>9</sup> See Excursus IX, note to v. 6. PROCL., *Alc.*, 398, 14 explains that "in the callings and self-manifestations (ἐν ταῖς κλήσεσι καὶ αὐτοφανεῖαις) it seems as if the gods would approach men, whereas in fact the latter are drawn upwards by the former. For in reality the mystes is moved, while the godhead does not leave its place". Cf. also SYNESIUS, *Hymn.*, IV, 296: «Σὺ δὲ χεῖρας δίδου, σὺ κίλει, σὺ μάκαρ, ὕλας ἀναγὰς ἐκείνῃ ψυχάν». PROCL., *Parm.*, 666, 38 f. explains χεῖρας δίδοναι as the activity of the ἀναγωγοὶ δαίμονες.

<sup>10</sup> See ch. III, sect. 2.

the sacrament of the soul's ascent within the ray of the sun. The irradiation of this light is explained by Iamblichus as the "call" of the godhead. This view has not been developed by a mechanical inversion of the original relationship, necessitated by dogmatical obligations. It can be proved that Iamblichus was influenced by another, metaphysical use of the noun *κλίσεις*, for which he invoked the authority of Plato, although, in reality, Plotinus was the initiator of his theory. Alluding to the Platonic description of the philosophical Eros, Plotinus designated the striving of the philosopher as a "turning" of his soul "towards" the Being (*ἐπιστροφή*) and compared this "conversion" of the soul with a "being called" by the love of the Beautiful<sup>11</sup>. Proclus and his co-disciple Hermias take over this image<sup>12</sup>, and the latter explains it by reference to the Platonic etymology (*Crat.* 416 c 7) *καλὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ καλεῖν*<sup>13</sup>. As Hermias quotes this opinion in his commentary

<sup>11</sup> PLOTINUS, VI, 7, 23, describes the Primal Light which awakens the love of the soul as follows : *δύναμιν ἔχει ἔλκον πρὸς αὐτὸ καὶ ἀνα.αλούμενον* (literally : calling back) *ἐκ πάσης πλάνης, ἵνα πρὸς αὐτὸ ἀναπαύσασατο*. On Plotinus' doctrine of "conversion" (*ἐπιστροφή*) see DONDS, *Proclus*, 220 f. See also ΠΟΡΦΥΡΑ., *Marc.*, 10. p. 281, 7 : *ὁ Θεῖος Πλάτων ἀπὸ τῶν αἰσθητῶν ἐπὶ τὰ νοητὰ τὰς ἀνακλήσεις πεποιήται*; Plato himself uses in this connection the nouns *περιαγωγή* (*Rep.*, 518 c, 8; 521 c, 6), *μεταστροφή* (*Rep.*, 525 a, 1 and c, 5; 532 b, 7) and *ἐπιτραγωγή* (*Rep.*, 532 c, 5). Cf. A. D. NOCK, *Conversion* (Oxford, 1933), p. 179 and W. JAEGER, *Paideia*, II (Oxford, 1944), p. 417, 77. Attention may be drawn to PHILO, *Plant.*, 23; 26; 27 and *Leg. All.*, III, 172 who explains *Levit.*, I, 1 «*καὶ ἀνεκάλεσεν Μωυσῆν*» as allegory of the divine call for the contemplation of the true Being.

<sup>12</sup> PROCL., *Th. Pl.*, 60, 26 f. (quoted by KOCU, *Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita*, 65) : *ἐπιστρέφει πάντα πρὸς ἑαυτὸ* (sc. τὸ κάλλος) *καὶ κινεῖ καὶ ἐνθουσιᾶν ποιεῖ καὶ ἀνακαλεῖται δι' ἔρωτος*. *Alc.*, 325, 23 : *ἡ τοίνυν ἐρωτικὴ πᾶσα σειρά, τῆς τοῦ κάλλους αἰτίας προβεβλημένη, συνάγει πάντα πρὸς αὐτήν καὶ ἀνακαλεῖται πρὸς τὴν μέθεξιν αὐτῆς*; 320, 12 : *τὸ γὰρ εἰς ἑαυτὸν ἐπιστρέφει τὸν ἐρώμενον καὶ ἀνακαλεῖσθαι... οικειὸν ἐστὶ τοῖς ἐνθέοις ἐρασταῖς*; *ibid.*, I. 25 : *ἐπιστρεπτικὸς* (ὁ ἐρωτικὸς)... *καὶ ἀνακλητικὸς*; 317, 19 *Socrates ἀνακαλεῖται τὸν νεανίσκον, σύνθημα τὴν τοιαύτην κλήσιν οἰόμενος εἶναι τῆς ἐπὶ τὰς ἀφανεῖς αἰτίας τῶν ψυχῶν περιτηγῶς*. 352, 16 f. *Parm.*, 782, 32; 783, 29.

<sup>13</sup> HERMIAS, *Ad Phaedr.*, 227 a, 1, p. 65, 24, Ast (quoted by KOCU, *loc. cit.*) : *τὸ καλὸν κλητικὸν ὃν εἰς ἑαυτὸ καὶ ἐπιστρεπτικόν· διὸ καὶ καλὸν λέγεται παρὰ τὸ καλεῖν εἰς ἑαυτὸ τοὺς ἐρῶντας*. p. 157, 35, Ast : (τὸ κάλλος) *οἷον γὰρ φῶς ἐστὶν*

on the *Phaedrus*, where he refers frequently to Iamblichus' commentary on the same work of Plato<sup>14</sup>, we may infer that this lost work of Iamblichus represented his source as well as that of Proclus<sup>15</sup>. We arrive in this way at the conclusion that Iamblichus' explanation of the Chaldæan *κλήσις* is based upon the correlation of the theurgical and the metaphysical "elevation" (*ἀναγωγή*). As we have seen in the precedent Excursus, this correspondence constituted the basic axiom of Iamblichus' explanation of the Chaldæan mysteriosophy.

3. Iamblichus' view of the divine "call" is associated with his central doctrine of the magical sympathy which holds together the portions of the universe. The potencies which effect this connection are the "symbols" or the "synthemata" (the terms are taken from the Chaldæan Oracles)<sup>16</sup>. For the Creator "sowed" them into every part of the world : not only into the gods and the spirits attached to the gods, but also into the portions of the celestial and terrestrial world and also into the human soul, in order to keep awake in all of them the desire for the First Being<sup>17</sup>. This inward Force causes every entity to turn towards the suprajacent order and constitutes thus a continuous chain extending from the lowest order of the universe until the Primal Being. As this inherent force "calls" for the participation in the perfection of the One, it is also termed the "calling power", *ἡ ἀνακλητικὴ δύναμις*<sup>18</sup>. With the help of this all pervading Force, both

---

*ἐξαποστὰλὲν ἀπὸ τῆς πηγῆς τῶν νοητῶν ἐπὶ τὸν τῆδε κόσμον καλοῦν πρὸς ἐαυτὸν καὶ ἐνωτικὸν γινόμενον τῶν ἐράντων πρὸς τὸ ἐραστόν· διὸ καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ ἡ ἀναγωγή γίνεται.*

<sup>14</sup> See ZELLER, III, 2<sup>a</sup>, p. 741, 3.

<sup>15</sup> Proclus also composed a commentary on the myth of the *Phaedrus* which has not been preserved.

<sup>16</sup> See ch. III, n. 56.

<sup>17</sup> The principal passages setting forth Proclus' doctrine of the *σύμβολα* are : *Crat.*, 30, 15 ff. ; *Tim.*, I, 209, 13 ff. (referring to Iamblichus) ; *ibid.*, 214, 12 ff. ; *Alc.*, 41, 27 ff. ; *Th. Pl.*, I, 104 ff. *Περὶ τῆς ἱερατικῆς τέχνης*, p. 148, 1 f., ed. Bidez. Cf. ch. VII, n. 130 ; HOFFNER, *O.-Z.*, I, 383 ff. ; DONDS, *Proclus*, 223.

<sup>18</sup> PROCL., *Tim.*, III, 1, 13 calls the *ἐπιστρεπτικὴ δύναμις* of the demiurge (cf. *ibid.*, I, 11 : *ἐπιστρέφει ἀνακλητικὴν δύναμις*. See already JULIAN, *Orat.*, V, 175 B ; 179 C.



the philosopher and the theurgist achieve the union with the divine : the philosopher, who concentrates his thought in the supreme cognition, discovers in his soul the "synthema" of the One, the "flower of the Intellect", and unites with the One through its psychical likeness inherent in him<sup>19</sup>. The theurgist who utters the "symbols" (*i. e.* the magical names) of the gods, causes the invoked gods link themselves with him through the "chain" of the demons attached to each of them, who draw him upwards to the desired goal<sup>20</sup>. In both cases, the same "calling power"—inherent in the universe and in the human soul—is the agent of the mystical or magical union<sup>21</sup>.

<sup>19</sup> See Excursus IV, n. 6.

<sup>20</sup> PROCL., *Tim.*, I, 213, 8 : αἰτίας δὲ τῆς εὐχῆς ὡς μὲν πομπτικὰς ἀπολογιζόμεθα εἶναι τὰς δραστηρίους τῶν θεῶν δυνάμεις, τὰς ἐπιστρεφούσας καὶ ἀνακαλουμένας πάντα ἐπ' αὐτοὺς τοὺς θεοὺς. IAMBL., *Myst.*, II, 11, p. 96, 19; PROCL., *Crat.*, 30, 15 ff. On the magical nature of prayer see *περὶ ἱερατικῆς τέχνης*, p. 148, 12 f., where he alludes to Theodorus' saying quoted above ch. II, n. 356.

<sup>21</sup> See also ch. VII, n. 130. There seems to be no connection between Iamblichus' view of *κλήσις* and that of the Mysteries of Isis whose "call" came in dreams (see REITZENSTEIN, *Mysterienreligionen*, 252 f.). We may, however, note that the description of death as being called upwards by the deity—a notion related to hero-worship—could have had some indirect influence upon Iamblichus (cf. DIOG. LAERT., VII, 28; MAX. TYR., XI, 11 a; XLI, 5 f.; PHILO, *Vit. Mos.*, II, 288; LIBANIUS, *Orat.* LIX, 72, vol. IV, p. 244, 7 f., Förster). It may be mentioned in this connection that the term *ἀναγωγή* is also associated with the concept of the apotheosis of heroized mortals; cf. Excursus VIII E.

The German mystics of the ninth and tenth centuries quoted by K. HOLL, *Die Geschichte des Wortes Beruf* (*Gesammelte Aufsätze*, III, 204 f.) are dependent on Ps.-Dionysius Areopagita, who draws on Proclus; cf. the passages collected by KOCU, *loc. cit.*



## EXCURSUS VI

---

### PSELLUS AND THE CHALDÆANS

The Byzantine Neoplatonist Michael Psellus (1018-ca. 1098) was brought to interest himself in the Chaldæans by Proclus, to whom he owes his entire knowledge about them. His source of information was the latter's commentary on the Chaldæan Oracles, and as this work has not been preserved, Psellus' quotations serve us as main aid for the reconstruction of Proclus' exegesis and of the Chaldæan texts treated by him there. The question of the relationship between Psellus, Proclus and the Chaldæans has been fully dealt with in two magnificent studies of J. BIDEZ, (*Catal. des manuscrits alch. grecs*, VI, *Michel Psellus*, Bruxelles 1928. *Mélanges Cumont*, Bruxelles, 1936, p. 85-100). Bidez has published there many precious *Inedita Pselliana* and considerably enlarged the material concerning Chaldæan theurgy. As we are less interested here in Psellus than in the Chaldæan documents transmitted by him, a short survey of the relevant works in which he mentions Chaldæans teachings may be sufficient.

1. Three works of Psellus deal exclusively with the doctrine of the Chaldæans :

a) Ἐξήγησις τῶν Χαλδαϊκῶν ρητῶν = *Comm.* (concerning the variants of the title in the MSS. see KROLL 3, 1 and BIDEZ-CUMONT, *Mages hellénisés*, II, 251). This text was first edited by Opsopoeus (Paris, 1599), afterwards by Gallæus (Amsterdam, 1689) and reprinted by MIGNE, *P. G.* CXXII, 1123-1150. Kroll quotes the text of Migne, but emends it with the help of three MSS. (enumerated by him p. 3, 1) : Paris. 1182 s. XIII (= P) (as BIDEZ-CUMONT, *Op. cit.*, I, 158, 4 note, this is the best MS); Vatic. gr. 1026 s. XIV (= V); Vatic. gr. 573 s. XV (= v). This

treatise of Psellus contains many quotations and interpretations of fragments of the Chaldæan Oracles which, as KROLL 3 f. has shown, derive directly from Proclus' commentary on the Chaldæan Oracles. This fact accounts, as again Kroll, p. 4 notes, for the alterations undergone by several of these quotations. There are passages in which Psellus corrected the beginning of an oracular verse transmitted to him by Proclus in an incomplete form in order to produce syntactic unity: cf. the quotations adduced ch. II, n. 249; 255; 295; ch. III, n. 88; 144. In two cases, Psellus mistook a Proclean passage for a quotation from the Oracles: (1) *Comm.* 1125 D the pseudo-Oracle *μη ἐξάξης, ἵνα μη ἐξίη ἔχουσα τι* derives from Plotinus (quoted by Psellus himself) I, 9 *οὐκ ἐξάξεις, ἵνα μη ἐξίη· ἐξελεύσεται γὰρ ἔχουσα τι*, etc. (cf. OLYMPIODORUS, *Phaed.* 5, 23 f. who also draws on Proclus). Though contested by CUMONT, *Rev. ét. gr.*, 1919, 153 f. this statement of Kroll, p. 5 still holds good. See also BRÉHIER, *Plotin. Ennéades*, vol. I, p. 131 f. Psellus' error may be explained by the assumption that Proclus, his source, referred in this passage to the doctrine of the *Θεολόγοι*, whereby he did not mean the Chaldæans, but the Orphics (cf. *Fragm. Orphic.*, 7, p. 84 Kern): see Excursus I d. (2) *Comm.* 1132 B (see below, ch. v, n. 133) the relative clause *ὅφ' ἦν ὁ τῆς ἀνάγκης ἑρόνος* derives from PLATO, *Rep.* 621 a, 1. Kroll 63, who mentions this point, does not draw the obvious conclusion that this prose addition is no part of the quoted Oracle, but an interpretation appended by Proclus.

This work is the source of Pletho's commentary on the *μαγικά λόγια* of Zoroaster (the name attributed by Pletho to the Chaldæan Oracles). This is the opinion of KROLL, p. 2, 2, but it was contested by BIDEZ-CUMONT, *Mages hell.* I, 158 f., who try to prove that Pletho had recourse to some other and better source than Psellus' *ἐξήγησις* (they do not define more closely the nature of this source). As a proof they adduce three lines of a Chaldæan Oracle (quoted ch. II, n. 75) transmitted by Psellus in a mutilated form and by Pletho in a complete version and corrected also from a metrical point of view. This example does not, however, suffice to prove the case. For the existence of this ameliorated text allows also the explanation that it was Pletho himself who completed and rectified the mutilated text handed down to him by Psellus. That

this is the true reason for Pletho's better text can be proved by several arguments :

1) Pletho does not quote any other fragment of the Chaldæan Oracles than those to be found in Psellus' *ἐξήγησις*. 2) The readings of Pletho's quotations from the Chaldæan Oracles frequently concord with those of one of the *codd. deteriores* of Psellus (*Vaticanus gr.* 573, s, XV, = v.) 3) Analogous attempts to complete and to correct the mutilated quotations from the Chaldæan Oracles transmitted by Psellus are to be found also in other passages of Pletho's treatise, but they are much less successful and sometimes even so faulty that they exclude the possibility of his having used another better source. We shall quote two examples : (1) the oracular fragment quoted below ch. v, n. 133 reads in Pletho's version (n° 2, according to the reprint of Opsopæus' edition in MIGNÉ, *P. G.* CXXII, p. 1115 f.).

« μηδὲ κάτω νεύσης· κρημνὸς κατὰ γῆς ὑπόκειται  
ἐπιταπόρου σύρων κατὰ βαθμίδος, ἢν ὑπὸ δεινῆς  
ἀνάγκης ( - - - ) ἑρόνος ἐστί ».

The emendator tries in vain to force the Platonistic expression (see above) into the metrical form. (2) the fragment quoted ch. III, n. 45 reads in Pletho's version (n° 1) :

δίξεο (σὺ) ψυχῆς ὑχετόν, ὅθεν ἢ τινι τάξει  
σώματι θετεύσας ἐπὶ τάξιν (ἀφ' ἧς ἐρρύης) [ - - - ]  
αὔθις ἀνασλήσεις, etc.

(The completion is perhaps taken from ps. HERMIPPUS, *De astrologia*, I, 95, p. 20, 28 ed. KROLL-VIERECK). The metrical slips show that the emendator had not great skill in antique prosody. This impression is also produced by the hymns fabricated by Pletho himself. Accordingly, we may assume that Pletho is responsible for the alterations which are to be found in his quotations from the Chaldæan Oracles. We are therefore justified to neglect Pletho's readings for our investigation.

b) Ὑποτύπωσις κεφαλαιώδης τῶν παρὰ Χαλδαίοις ἀρχαίων δογμάτων = *Hyp.* first edited by KROLL in the *Appendix*, p. 73-76. The end of the

MS., *Laurentianus* 58, 29, used by Kroll is disarranged. The correct sequence is : §§ 24, 26, 25 ; § 25 : *ᾧν γὰρ σύνθετον* till *δεῖται πηγῆς*, is a parenthesis and should be put into brackets. This treatise is arranged systematically, the basic system is identical with that of the Chaldæans according to the interpretation of Proclus ; see Excursus VII. (The short survey of the Chaldæan dogms presented in the text edited by Bidez, *C. M. A. G.*, IV, p. 163, 9-19 reproduces the same Proclean scheme). Psellus' source was in this case also Proclus' commentary on the Chaldæan Oracles.

c) *Ἐκθεσις κεφαλιώδης τῶν παρὰ Χαλδαίοις ἀρχαίων δογμάτων* = *Expos.* A reprint of previous editions (PATRICIUS, *Ferrara*, 1591. For Opsopoeus and Gallaeus, see (a) *apud* MIGNE, *P. G.*, CXXII, 1149 C-1153 B. Kroll frequently emends the text collated by him with two Vatican MSS. (adduced above in a). This text is very similar to the *Hyp.*, but shorter and less accurate.

This work of Psellus as well as that described in (a) is the source of the passages relative to the Chaldæans figuring in Nicephorus Gregoras' commentary on Synesius work "On Dreams" (reprinted by MIGNE, *P. G.*, CXLIX, 521-642 ; cf. M. ALLATIUS, *Diatriba de Psellis*, reprinted by MIGNE, *P. G.*, CXXII, 503 A and KROLL p. 5. The opinion hold by TERZAGHI, *Studi italiani di filol. classica*, XII, 1904, p. 188 ff. and by BIDEZ, *C. M. A. G.*, VI 104 f. 105, 2. 225, that Gregoras knew another source dependent on Proclus' commentary on the Chaldæan Oracles, is erroneous. We should not been mislead by Gregoras' free way of citing the passages of Psellus nor overlook the fact that he sometimes combines passages of Psellus with extracts from Porphyry's "Philosophy of the Oracles", known to him by the excerpts contained in EUSEBIUS' *Praeparatio Evangelica*.

d). The brief summary of the Chaldæan doctrines quoted by Psellus in the text edited by Bidez, *C. M. A. G.*, VI, p. 163, 9-22 comes very near to (b) and (c), but contains some details not mentioned there. Concerning the arrangement of this text see (b).

e) A short treatise of Psellus published by Patricius (the Renaissance philosopher F. Patrizzi, editor of the *Hermetica* ; see REITZENSTEIN,

*Poimandres*, 321 f. 367) is left out of account, as Kroll p. 5 has pointed out that it does not contain new material.

f) Kroll, p. 5 points out that Psellus is the source of the 17th letter of a collection of letters published by CRAMER, *Anecdota Oxoniensia*, vol. III, Oxford 1836, 180-183 and ascribed to MICHAEL ITALICUS (s. XII) by TREU, *Byzant. Zeitschr.*, IV (1895), 1-22. Kroll who could not yet know the results of Treu's study, quotes the text with the siglum *Anon. Oxon.*; we cite it with the name of its author. As appears from the passages adduced ch. II, n. 42 and 266, Michael Italicus used some text of Psellus dealing with the Chaldæans which has not yet discovered.

g) Psellus is also the author of the excerpts from Proclus' commentary on the Chaldæan Oracles preserved in cod. Vatic. 1026 (see ch. II, n. 19). This appears from the almost literal concordance between these *Excerpta Vaticana* and many passages of Psellus' *ἐξήγησις* (see the synopsis by KROLL, p. 4). Kroll surmises that Psellus used an epitome of Proclus' commentary on the Chaldæan Oracles and that this presupposed epitome was also the source of the *excerpta Vaticana*, but this complicated assumption seems to be unnecessary. It may be remarked that Psellus published also his epitome *περὶ τῆς καθ' Ἑλλήνας ἱερτικῆς τέχνης* (see h) in the name of Proclus; cf. BIDEZ, *C. M. A. G.*, VI 142. *Mél. Cumont*, 88, 6.

h) The treatise *περὶ τῆς καθ' Ἑλλήνας ἱερτικῆς τέχνης*, first published in a Latin translation by Marsilio Ficino and now edited by BIDEZ, *C. M. A. G.*, VI, p. 148-151 who succeeded in recovering the Greek original, is, as BIDEZ, *Mélanges Cumont*, 86, suggests, an excerpt made by Psellus from another part of Proclus' commentary on the Chaldæan Oracles.

i) The eleven chapters *περὶ ἀρετῶν* figuring in Psellus' treatise *de omnifaria doctrina* (MIGNE, *P. G.* CXXII, 717 ff. §§ 48-58) are a compilation from Proclus' exposition of the Neoplatonic doctrine concerning the grades of virtues; see Excursus IV, 3. The treatment of this subject constituted very probably a part of Proclus' commentary on the Chaldæan Oracles.

2. References to Chaldæan doctrines and rites are also found in Psellus' following works :

a) *De operatione daemonum*, ed. by J. F. BOISSONADE, *Michael Psellus*, Nurenberg, 1838, p. 1-36; reprinted by MIGNÉ, *P. G. CXXII*, 820 A-876 A. BIDEZ, *C. A. M. G.*, VI 119-131 has published another redaction of this work deriving from Psellus himself.

b) *Quaenam sunt Graecorum opiniones de daemonibus* (quoted : *Quaenam sunt*), ed. by BOISSONADE, *op. cit.*, p. 36-43; reprinted by MIGNÉ, *P. G.*, CXXII, 876 B-881 C. BIDEZ' *Ineditum* mentioned in a contains at the end some explications which appear in *Quaenam sunt* in an epitomised form. A further new text edited by BIDEZ, *op. cit.*, p. 157-158 reproduces another passage of *Quaenam sunt* in a more developed version. It follows (as BIDEZ, 156 points out) that *Quaenam sunt* is a compilation (made by Psellus himself) from which we know at time several elements.

c) *De aurea catena*, ed. K. SATHAS, *Rev. Ét. Gr.*, 1875, 216 f.

d) *πόσα γένη τῶν φιλοσοφουμένων λόγων*, first edited by SATHAS, *Bull. de corr. hell.*, 1877, 121 ff.; now *Michaelis Pselli scripta minora*. ed. KURTZ-DREXL, Milano, 1936, p. 441-450 (on the Chaldæans p. 446, 8-447, 14. In the lacuna 446, 15, *περὶ τῆς Ἐκδότης* is to be inserted.

e) *κατηγορία τοῦ ἀρχιερέως* (sc. *Κερουλαρίου*) first edited by L. BRÉHIER, *Rev. Ét. Gr.*, XVI, 1903, 375 ff.; XVII, 1904, 35 ff. and now in *Pselli script. min.* ed. KURTZ-DREXL, p. 232-328. Psellus cites p. 248, 8-249, 8 KURTZ-DREXL (= BIDEZ, *Mélanges Cumont* 97) two quotations from Proclus which, as appears from p. 247, 24, are taken from Proclus' commentary on the Chaldæan Oracles.

f) A meteorological treatise, edited by BIDEZ, *C. M. A. G.*, VI 55 f. (the relevant passage p. 61, 22 ff.).

g) *Epistula CLXXXVII*, first edited by Sathas; the relevant passage reprinted and explained by BIDEZ, *Mél. Cumont* 95 f.



*h*) Nicetas of Serres (*s.* XI) *Ad. Greg. Naz. Orat.* XLV. The Greek original of the relevant passage (known before only by a Latin translation) was first edited by Bidez, *Mélanges Cumont* 95 f. Nicetas draws on a lost text of Psellus quoting from Proclus' Commentary on the Chaldæan Oracles.

The other texts of Psellus edited by Sathas, Bidez and Kurtz-Drexel do not contain new Chaldæan doctrines.

Two general statements may terminate this Excursus :

*a*) that Psellus borrowed his knowledge concerning the Chaldæans exclusively from Proclus' commentary on the Chaldæan Oracles :

*b*) that the Byzantine authors contemporary with or later than Psellus (Nicetas of Serres. Michael Italicus. Nicephorus Gregoras) borrowed their knowledge concerning the Chaldæans from Psellus and not from Proclus himself.



## EXCURSUS VII

### PROCLUS' EXPOSITION OF THE CHALDÆAN SYSTEM OF THE NOETIC ENTITIES

Proclus based his interpretation of the Chaldæan Oracles upon the axiom that the theology of the Theurgists concords both with that of Plato and of the Orphics. This rule of "harmony" was systematically elaborated by him in three works : the *Platonic theology*, the *Orphic theology* and the *Commentary on the Chaldæan Oracles*. Whereas his work on the Platonic system is preserved<sup>1</sup>, his expositions of the Chaldæan system and of that of the Orphics have, owing to the loss of the two other works mentioned, to be reconstituted. Thanks to the excerpts from his commentary on the Chaldæan Oracles delivered by Psellus, the establishment of the main tenets of his Chaldæan System does not, however, afford special difficulties. For it has been overlooked that Psellus arranges, both in his *Hypothesis* and his *Expositio*<sup>2</sup>, the doctrines of the Chaldæans according to a deliberate order<sup>3</sup> which con-

<sup>1</sup> The exposition of the system of Proclus as presented by ZELLER, III, 2<sup>1</sup>, p. 851 ff. rests essentially upon the "Platonic Theology" of Proclus. In this work Proclus makes lavish use of Orphic nomenclature, while only seldom mentioning the Chaldæan equivalents. The difference in the treatment of the *Orphica* and *Chaldaica* in the "Platonic Theology" may be explained by Proclus' belief that Plato indirectly depends on Orpheus, the first theologian of the Greeks, whereas the Chaldæans owe their wisdom to the gods (cf. *Th. Pl.*, 13, 3 f.).

<sup>2</sup> See Excursus VI, 1 b and c.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *Expos.*, Psellus, 1 : ἐν ; 2 : νοητῆ τάξις ; 3-5 : νοητῆ καὶ νοερά τάξις ; 6-10 : πηγαία ἐξδομάς ; 11-13 : πηγαί ; 14-16 : ἀρχαί ; 17 : ἀρχάγγελοι ; 18 : ἄζωνοι ; 19 : ζῶναι ; 20-28 : τὰ ὑπὸ σελήνην. The technical arrangement of this treatise concords with the summary of the Platonic system given by ΟΛΥΜΠΙΟΔΟΡ., *Proleg. in Plat. philos.*, c. 12, p. 207, 18 f.

cords with that applied throughout by Proclus for his interpretation of the Chaldæan Oracles. It follows that the order adopted by Pselus is identical with the Chaldæan system as it was presupposed by Proclus. This contention is confirmed by the fact that the sequence of the system delivered by Psellus has its exact counterpart in the Platonic system of Proclus. Less completely known is the Orphic system of Proclus, but the numerous interpretations of Orphic texts to be found in his preserved writings allow at least the reconstitution of the major instances of his nomenclature<sup>4</sup>. Besides, Proclus' arrangement of the *νοητὸς διδασμος* as presupposed in the three theological systems harmonized by him, is set forth by Damascius<sup>5</sup>.

We may add for practical purposes a schematic synopsis of the three systems. Such a synopsis seems to be indispensable for the reconstitution of the original teachings of the Chaldæans; for Proclus, the main transmitter of the Chaldæan texts, in view of his axiom concerning the identity of the Platonic, Orphic and Chaldæan systems frequently interchanges the basic notions of the three doctrines or employs Chaldæan (*viz.* Orphic) notions with a meaning conforming to his Platonic system.

---

<sup>4</sup> Cf. in particular the summary given in the scholia to Procl., *Tim.*, printed I, p. 474, ed. Diehl.

<sup>5</sup> DAM., I, 284, 22-317, 14 (as to the passage dealing with the Orphics see KERN, *Orph. Fragm.*, No. 60). The Orphic equivalents have been identified (apart from the passages quoted n. 4 and 5) with the help of the following quotations collected by KERN, *Orph. Fragm.*: *τρεις νόκτες*, Fr. 99; *Οὐρυνός*, Fr. 107; *Ἐκαστόγχειρες*, Fr. 40; *Τιτᾶνες*, DAM., II, 134, 18 ff.

SYNOPSIS OF THE THREE THEOLOGICAL SYSTEMS OF PROCLUS

THE PLATONIC SYSTEM	ORPHIC SYSTEM	THE CHALDEAN SYSTEM
Τὸ ἓν (ἄρρητον καὶ ἄγνωστον)	ΧΡΟΝΟΣ	Τὸ ἄρρητον ἓν
Ἐνάδες ὑπεροῦσιοι	?	?
Τὸ νοητόν (τὸ ἐν ὧν. ὁ πρῶτος διάκοσμος) τρεῖς τριάδες	Ὁ κρύφιος διάκοσμος	Ὁ πατρικὸς βυθὸς
1. ἡ πρώτη νοητὴ τριάς :	αἰθέρ-χάος-ὠόν	1. πατήρ (vel ἡ. πατήρ πατρικὸς διάκοσμος) :
a. πέρασ μονή		b. δύναμις
b. ἀπειρον πρόδος		c. νοῦς
c. μικτὸν ἐπιστροφή		
(= ἡ μονή, ἡ οὐσίη, τὸ πέρασ, ὑπαρξίς, ἀγαθόν)		
2. ἡ δευτέρα νοητὴ τριάς :	τὸ κύον (?) - ἀργήσ χιτών - νεφέλη	2. αἰών vel δύ-ι (a) v. s. (b) v. s. ναιμις (c) v. s.
αἰών		
(a) v. s. (b) v. s.		
(c) v. s.		
(= ἡ πρόδος, ὁλότις, κέντρον τῶν νοητῶν, ἀπειρον, σοφόν)		
3. ἡ τρίτη νοητὴ τριάς :	Φάνης Φάνης - Ἡρικεπαῖος - Μητις	3. ὁ νοῦς (a) v. s. (b) v. s. (c) v. s.
αὐτοζῶον vel νοῦς νοητός		
(a) v. s. (b) v. s.		
(c) v. s.		
(= ἐπιστροφή, πέρασ τῶν νοητῶν, μικτόν, καλόν)		
Τὸ νοητόν καὶ νοερὸν (ὁ δεύτερος διάκοσμος) τρεῖς τριάδες		Ἡ νοητὴ καὶ νοερὰ ἵτις
1. ἡ πρώτη τριάς :	αἱ τρεῖς Νύκτες	1. τρεῖς ἱυγ-γες (a) ἐμπόριος (b) αἰθέριος (c) ὑλαῖος
ὑπερουράνιος τόπος, ἕνωσις		
2. δευτέρα τριάς :	Οὐρανός	2. τρεῖς συνο-χεῖς (a) v. s. (b) v. s. (c) v. s.
οὐρανία περιφορά, οἱ συνεκτικοὶ θεοὶ		

<p>3. τρίτη τριὰς } ὑπουράνιος ἀψίς, οἱ τελεσιουργοὶ τῆς φρουρητικοὶ θεοὶ</p>	<p>οἱ ἑκατόγχειρες</p>	<p>3. τρεῖς τελετάρχαι } (α) ἢ κ. (β) ἢ σ. (γ) ἢ σ.</p>
<p>Τὸ ΝΟΕΡὸΝ (ὁ τρίτος διάκοσμος) ἐπὶ τὰ νορὰι ἐβδομάδες</p>		
<p>1. καθαρὸς, ἀπήρατος, πρῶτος νοῦς. αὐτόνοος.</p>	<p>1. Κρόνος</p>	<p>1. ὁ ἀπαξ ἐπέκεινα νεὶ νοῦς πατρικὸς νεὶ ὁ πρῶτος πατήρ } τρεῖς πηγαῖοι</p>
<p>2. ἡ ζωογόνος θεά.</p>	<p>2. Ῥέα</p>	<p>2. Ἐκάτη νεὶ ζωογόνος πηγὴ νεὶ ὁ δεύτερος πατήρ νεὶ κέντρον τῶν πατέρων } πατέρες νεὶ κοσμαγοὶ</p>
<p>3. νοῦς δημιουργός. ἀπλῶς νοῦς.</p>	<p>3. Ζεὺς</p>	<p>3. ὁ δις ἐπέκεινα νεὶ ὁ τίτος πατήρ</p>
<p>4. οἱ τρεῖς 5. ἀχραντοὶ 6. θεοὶ</p>	<p>4. } 5. οἱ τρεῖς Κούρητες 6. }</p>	<p>4. } 5. οἱ τρεῖς ἀμείλικτοι 6. }</p>
<p>7. ἡ διακρίσεως πηγὴ νεὶ ἡ ἑτερότης</p>	<p>7. οἱ Τιτᾶνες</p>	<p>7. ὁ ὑπεζωκός (*)</p>

(\*) From the *πηγαῖα ἐβδομάς* as a whole issue : (1) *πηγαί*, (2) *ἀρχαί*, (3) *ἀρχάγγελοι*, (4) *ἀγγελοι*, (5) *ἀζωνοί*, (6) *ζῶναι*. After them comes the *ἀπλανὴς κόσμος* and *αἱ ἐπὶ σφαιραί*.

If we compare the exposition of this Chaldæan system of Proclus with the results of our analysis of the original testimonies, it appears that Proclus often employs synonymic notions of the Chaldæan Oracles as designations of diverse noetic orders : *e. g.* *ἐν, πατήρ ἀπαξ ἐπέκεινα. Ἐκάτη, ὑπεζωκός. ἀρχαί, συνοχεῖς. πατέρες, τελετάρχαι.* These artificial differentiations are not due to a lack of understanding on the part of the interpreter, but to the necessity with which he was faced to find Chaldæan equivalents for his own system of Platonic entities (which in truth was the alone "preexistent"). The way in which Proclus

interpretation forces the meaning of the Chaldæan texts, has been demonstrated in the respective notes of the precedent investigation<sup>6</sup>.

---

<sup>6</sup> We may add a list of the notes in which the various orders of the Chaldæan system of Proclus, together with their Platonic and Orphic equivalents, are discussed. All the numbers refer to the notes of ch. II of this work. *ἐν* and *ἀγαθόν* : 5. *πατρικὸς βυθός* : 350. *πατήρ, δύναμις, νοῦς* : 47. *τρεις τριάδες τοῦ νοητοῦ* : 163, 170. *αἰών* : 138. *λυγγες* : 248, 252. *συνοχεῖς* : 245, 332. *τελετάρχαι* : 245, 270, 301, 332. *νοερά ἐβδομάς* : 205. *τρεις πηγαῖοι πατέρες* : 270 ff., 282. *ἄπαξ ἐπέκεινα* : 42, 208. *ζωογόνος Θεά* : 65, 282, 285. *δις ἐπέκεινα* : 187. *τρεις ἀμειλικτοί* : 200. *ὁ ὑπεζωκός* : 101. *πηγαί, ἀρχαί, etc.* : 65, 152, 192, 308. *ἄζωνοι, ζῶναι* : 266.





## EXCURSUS VIII

### ON THE DESIGNATION OF THE THEURGICAL SACRAMENT OF IMMORTALITY AS ELEVATION

(ἀναγωγή)

A. The following testimonies prove that the chief mystery of the Chaldæans bore the name ἀναγωγή, "elevation" :

1. The Latin translator of Porphyry "*De regressu animæ*" (see Excursus II) designates the Chaldæan method of "liberating the soul from the Body" (*viam liberandæ animæ* : see Excursus II, n. 18) as "inductio", the exact equivalent of ἀναγωγή; cf. ΠΟΡΡΗ., *Regr.*, p. 42\*, 11 and Bidez' note.

2. In the Chaldæan Oracle quoted ch. I, n. 164 Apollo declares that by means of the rays of the sun he "lifts" the *mystes* "upwards" (ἀνάγω). The god is therefore predicated in the Oracles ὁ ἀναγωγεύς, "the Raiser"; cf. ch. III, n. 97.

B. The same theurgical operation is called ἀναγωγή (ψυχῆς) by the following authors :

1. Iamblichus, *Myst.*, I, 12, p. 42, 13 and 16; VIII, 6, p. 269, 11; X, 6, p. 292, 13 and 17. See ch. III, n. 167.

2. Emperor Julian, see ch. III, n. 38 and 167.

3. Proclus : a) ἄγγελοι... ἀνάγουτες (τὰς ψυχάς)... πρὸς τοὺς Θεούς (ch. v, n. 7 b; cf. also 7 c and 7 e). b) εἰς τὴν χωριστὴν ζωὴν ἀνάγουσα τὴν... ψυχὴν (ch. III, n. 32).

4. Psellus : a) ἀνάγεσθαι πρὸς Θεόν (see ch. III, n. 4). b) τὸ ἀγγελικὸν... ἀνάγον... τὰς ψυχάς (see ch. v, n. 7 g).

5. Synesius : see ch. III, n. 114.

C. On the other hand, *ἀναγωγή*, *ἀνάγειν* is employed by the Neoplatonists as designation of the soul's ascent to the contemplation of the Being. They borrowed this term from Plato's description *Rep.*, 521 c 2 *ἀνάξει. . . εἰς Φῶς, ὡσπερ ἐξ Ἄιδου λέγονται δὴ τινες εἰς Θεοῦ ἀνελθεῖν.* 533 d 2 *τὸ τῆς ψυχῆς ὄμμα. . . ἔλκει καὶ ἀνάγει ἄνω.* Cf. also 517 b 4 *τὴν δὲ ἄνω ἀνάβασιν καὶ Θεὸν τῶν ἄνω τὴν εἰς τὸν νοητὸν τύπον τῆς ψυχῆς ἐπάνοδον τιθεῖς.* Plato introduced the notion, as he explains *Rep.*, 521 c, with regard to mythical tales on the "ascent" of chosen mortals from the Hades to the light (e. g. of Sisyphus, cf. THEOGNIS 703. SOPHOCLES, *Philoct.* 449, 625. See also AESCH., *Agam.*, 1023. The lifting up of Semele by her son Dionysus from the Hades to the Olymp was enacted in the Dionysiac mysteries and called *ἀναγωγή Σεμέλης*; cf. DIETERICH, *Nekyia*, 111, 3. W. F. OTTO, *Dionysos*, 65). These legends formed the point of departure of Plato's simile on the cave-dweller.

With this Platonic meaning the term *ἀναγωγή* recurs in Plotinus' *Enneads* (where, similarly as in Plato, the verbs *ἀνάγεσθαι*—with a reflexive, not passive meaning, as in the Chaldaean passages—, *ἀναβαίνειν*, *ἄνω ἔρχεσθαι* etc., alternate with each other); cf. I, 3, 1 f.; I, 6, 6 f.; III, 8, 10; IV, 9, 4; V, 1, 1; V, 4, 1. V, 7, 1. In these passages (adduced, for the most part, in the useful index to Plotinus composed by BRÉHIER. *Plotin, Ennéades*, VI 2, Paris, 1938, p. 197 ff.), the complements are *ἐπὶ τὸ πρῶτον*, *ἐπὶ τὸ* (or *εἰς τὸ*) *ἔν*, *ἐπὶ τὸ νοητὸν*. As the Plotinian *ἀναγωγή* is, by nature, an introversive process, Plotinus sometimes employs the expression *ἀνάγειν* or *ἀνέρχεσθαι ἐφ' ἑαυτὸν*, "to ascend to himself"; cf. e. g. I 6, 9. IV 7, 10. On Plotinus depends Porphyry, *Vit. Plot.*, 23 *ἀνάγουσι ἑαυτὸν εἰς τὸν πρῶτον καὶ ἐπέκεινα Θεὸν ταῖς ἐννοαῖς*; cf. also *ibid.* c. 2 (the passages quoted by REITZENSTEIN, *Hell. Myst.* 3 184, 3 are to be understood as indicated here; cf. R. E. WITT. *Class. Quart.*, XXV, 1931, p. 203, 11). *Idem, Sent.*, 30, p. 15, 19 and 37, p. 33, 19. *Abst.*, II, 34 p. 164, 1. *Marc.* 26, p. 291, 8. Hence IAMBlichus, *De anima* (ap. Stob., *Ecl.*, I c. 41. s. 42 [918] *κατὰ Πλάτωνα καθάρσει καὶ ἀναγωγῇ καὶ τελειώσει τῆς ψυχῆς.* *Idem, Comm. math. scient.* 6, p. 26, 11 ed. FESTA, *et passim.* *Protrept.* 4, p. 24, 13 ed. PISTELLI, *et passim.* And very frequently, Proclus.

D. As the Chaldæans modelled their description of the "elevation" upon the Platonic description of the soul's ascent to the contemplation of the Being, the later Neoplatonists found it an easy task to identify the theurgical operation with the metaphysical process. Iamblichus, the originator of this identification, employs in his work "On the Mysteries" the term *ἀναγωγή* sometimes in the Chaldæan (cf. *Myst.*, VIII, 8, p. 271, 13 *ἀναγωγοὶ Θεοί. . . διὰ τινῶν ἱερατικῶν ἀνόδων*; see also V, 11, p. 214, 8 f.) and sometimes in the Platonic sense (*Myst.*, X, 6, p. 292, 10 *τῆ πρὸς ἀλήθειαν τὴν νοητὴν ἀναγωγῆ*). The same remark applies to Proclus. Cf. Excursus V 2.

E. The Chaldæans borrowed the term *ἀναγωγή* very probably from the terminology concerning the apotheosis of heroized mortals. Cf. e. g. Theognis 1347 (on Ganymedes). EUR., *Bacch.*, 289 *Ζεὺς εἰς δ' Ὀλυμπον βρέφος* (Dionysus) *ἀνήγαγεν Θεῶν*. XENOPHON, *Conviv.*, VIII, 30 (on Ganymedes). LUCIAN, *Hermotim.* 7; 746 (on Hercules). JULIAN, IMP., *Orat.*, IV 154 D (on Romulus) and VII 219 B ff. (quoted ch. III, n. 167). Besides, the term was intended to recall the widespread idea of the soul's journey through the heavens, which was termed *ἀνοδος*, *ἀνάβασις* (cf. *P. Mag.*, IV, 529, quoted ch. III, n. 138), *ἀναφορά* (cf. *P. Mag.*, III, 584. 588 : of Hermetic origin), *ἀνάληψις* (in Jewish-Christian texts). Cf. the bibliography given by Weinreich, *ap.* DIETERICH, *Mithras-liturgie*<sup>3</sup>, p. 254-255.

As a curiosity may be noted that Psellus (*C. M. A. G.*, VI, p. 167, n. 1) identifies Moses' ascension to the Sinai with the Platonic-Chaldæan *ἀναγωγή* (cf. PHILO *Quaest. Gen.*, IV, 46. *Exod.*, II, 40, etc.).



## EXCURSUS IX

### PROCLUS "FIRE-SONG"

The prose hymn of Proclus on the Supreme God of the Chaldæans, briefly mentioned above ch. III, n. 111, should be examined separately on account of its form as well as of its content. The text figures in the *Excerpta Vaticana* 193, 12 ff. ed. Pitra (JAHN, *De phil. Chald.* p. 2, 15. KROLL, 54. MEAD, II, 62), *i. e.* in the excerpts from Proclus' commentary on the Chaldæan Oracles made by Psellus (see Excursus VI 1 β).

1. Ἕμνον οὖν τῷ Σεῦ τοῦτον ἀναθῶμεν·
2. καταλίπωμεν τὴν ῥέουσιν οὐσίαν,
3. ἔλθωμεν ἐπὶ τὸν ἀληθῆ σκοπόν, τὴν εἰς αὐτὸν ἐξομοίωσιν.
4. γνωρίσωμεν τὸν δεσπότην,
5. ἀγαπήσωμεν τὸν πατέρα,
6. καλοῦντι πεισθῶμεν.
7. τῷ Σεραμῶ προσδράμωμεν
8. τὸ ψυχρὸν ἐκφυγόντες.
9. πῦρ γενώμεθα,
10. διὰ πυρὸς ἐδεύσωμεν.
11. ἔχομεν εὐλυτον ἔδδον εἰς ἀνέλευσιν.
12. πατήρ ἐδηγεῖ πυρὸς ἔδοις ἀναπτύξας.

The hymn is arranged κατὰ κῶλα καὶ κόμματα. V. 4-6 constitute a τρίκωλον, v. 7-8 and 9-10 each a δίκωλον. The single κῶλα conclude with *clausulæ*; *dítrochæus*: v. 7-8, *creticus*: v. 2, 4, 5, 12, *cret. + troch.*: v. 6, 10, 12, (adoneus) v. 11. On these *clausulæ* see Ed. NORDEN, *Kunstprosa*, II, 909 ff. Text: v. 2 Kroll corrects γῆν into τῆν. v. 3 τὴν εἰς

αὐτὸν ἐξομοίωσιν follows in the MS. after v. 1 ἀναθῶμεν. The transposition is indispensable, as the *regens* is missing. Ἐξομοίωσις εἰς Θεόν is characterised by Plato *Theaet.* 176 b (*locus classicus* of later Platonism, see ÜBERWEG-PRÄCHTER, *Philosophie des Allertums*, p. 15) as ἀληθῆς σκοπός. PSELLUS, *De omnifaria doctrina* 52 (MIGNE, *P. G.*, CXXII, 721A), following Proclus (see Excursus IV, 3), designates the “theurgical virtue” as τελειοτάτη πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν ὁμοίωσις. v. 12 Kroll corrects ἀναπτύξασθαι into ἀναπτύξας. Content: The prose hymn consists of a combination of Chaldæan and Neoplatonic arguments. As the majority of them has been treated in the course of the investigation, a reference to the respective paragraphs seems to be sufficient in these cases.

V. 2 ρέουσα οὐσία is a metaphorical designation of Matter.

V. 4-6 contains the Chaldæan triad “Faith, Truth (= philosophical cognition), Love”, in the reinterpretation of Proclus (see ch. II, n. 291 a). On the motif of the divine “call” see Excursus V.

V. 7-8 seem to refer to Chaldæan notions harmonized with Platonic ones. For *Θερμῶ* see the Oracle dealing with the “warming” World-Soul (ch. II, n. 70) and, on the other hand, PLATO, *Phaedr.* 251 b 2 ἐθερμάνθη. 251 c 8 Θερμαίνηται. 253 e διαθερμήνας τὴν ψυχὴν; cf. HERMIAS *ad loc.*, ‘Θέρμη’ καλεῖ τὴν ἀναγωγὸν δύναμιν, as well as to 258 e 7 ἀναγωγὸν ἐστὶ Θερμὸν. The “warm” can also be explained as referring to the Empyrean and the “cold” to Matter (the last metonymy perhaps with regard to Aristotle’s doctrine of the Elements). Kroll compares IAMBL., *Myst.*, II, 6, p. 81, 14 ἡ... τῶν Θεῶν παρουσία... τὸ μὲν ψυχρὸν ἐν ἡμῖν καὶ φθοροποιὸν ἀφανίζει, τὸ δὲ Θερμὸν αὔξει.

V. 9-10. See ch. III, n. 84. Διὰ πῦρὸς ἵέναι means usually “to dash through any danger” and is intended to recall the μέγιστος ἀγών of the theurgical *viz.* metaphysical achievement.

V. 11. For εὐλυτος see ch. III, n. 124. “Return” (ἀνέλευσις) means the reascent of the soul to its noetic origin. F. KLINGNER, *De Boethii consolatione philos.* (*Phil. Unters.* XXVII, 1921), 49, quotes as parallel the hymn of Boethius (III, 9, v. 20): “*Quas (animas) lege benigna / Ad te conversas reduci facis igne reverti*”.

V. 12. The “ways of Fire” “unfold themselves” in the sun rays. For the expression, cf. EUR., *Hippol.*, 601 ἡλίου τ’ ἀναπτυχαί (scholium : ἀκτῖνες).

The subsequent line μὴ ταπεινὸν ἐκ λήθης ρεύσωμεν χεῦμα does not fit in the context. We may assume that Psellus, the author of the excerpt has transferred it from another passage or left out the passage connecting it with the preceding text. As to the content of this line cf. the passages quoted ch. III, n. 53 as well as PROCL. *Hymn.*, III, 6 ὑπὲρ βαθυχεύμονα λήθην, and *ibid.* IV 8 ληθαίοις ὑπὸ χεύμασιν.





## EXCURSUS X

### THE «TELESTIC ART» OF THE CHALDÆAN THEURGISTS

Τελεσται are called by Proclus «purifying priests'» who

a) cleanse by secret rites the body and the soul of men from the stain of terrestrial life; cf. *Tim.*, III, 300, 16 (quoted ch. v, n. 7). *Rp.* I 120, 12; 255, 17; II 154, 17 (quoted ch. III, n. 173). *Alc.*, 461, 30. Cf. PSELLUS, *P. G.*, CXXII, 1129 D (quoted by BIDEZ, *C. M. A. G.*, VI, p. 142, 2) τελεστικὴ δὲ ἐπιστήμη ἐστὶν ἡ οἷον τελοῦσα τὴν ψυχὴν διὰ τῆς τῶν ἐνταῦθ' ὑλῶν δυνάμεως.

b) who set up (ιδρύειν, οἰκίζειν) and consecrate (τελεῖν) cult-statues. Cf. *Tim.*, I, 140, 15; III, 6, 9; 155, 18. *Parm.*, 847, 25. HERMIAS, *Phaedr.*, 105, 38 Ast. The Chaldæans are not specifically mentioned as belonging to this group, but a passage of Psellus (see ch. v, n. 125-126) proves that they too practised these rites.

c) who «vivify» statues of gods, *i. e.* induce the deity by conjurations to enter its image and to prophecy therefrom. Cf. *Tim.*, I, 51, 25. 273, 11. 330, 31. III, 6, 9. 155, 20. *Rp.* II, 212, 22. *Crat.* 19, 12. HERMIAS, *Phaedr.*, 104, 50. The rites mentioned (b) and (c) were performed by the same priests.

In the descriptions of the activity of this third class Proclus had in mind among others also the Chaldæans. This is shown by :

1. *Th. Pl.* 70, 9 f. where he declares expressly that the Theurgists «call forth» the gods by magic rites and cause them to illuminate their statues. The lightning up of the statue was regarded as the sign of the divinity's entrance. After the sign was obtained, the *telestes* put questions which were answered by the «vivified» statue through «movements» (κινήσεις).

2. *Th. Pl.* 9, 45 where he calls the Theurgists οἱ ἀκρότατοι τῶν τελεστών. He explains the meaning of this honorary title *Tim.* III, 6, 8,

where he says that *οἱ ἄκροὶ τῶν τελεσίων* (1. 13 *οἱ τῶ ὄντι τελεσίοι*) consecrate, vivify and "move" the statues of the gods.

3. IAMBL. *Myst.* V, 23, p. 233, 10 f. reports that the practiser of the "theurgical art" (*ἡ Θεουργικὴ τέχνη*) "often combine consecrated and godlike stones, herbs, animals and spices, and establish from them a complete and pure receptacle (*sc.* for the gods)". Psellus, *Epist.* 187 (adduced by CUMONT, *Mélanges Cumont*, 95), drawing on Proclus' commentary on the Chaldæan Oracles, completes Iamblichus' report in saying that "the practisers of the telestic science (*ἡ τελεστικὴ ἐπιστήμη*) fill the cavities of the statues with substances belonging to the potencies presiding over them (*i. e.* over the statues) : animals, plants, stones, herbs, seals, engravings, sometimes also sympathetic spices; and set up (*i. e.* dedicate) together with them mixing bowls, vessels for offering libation, censers; vivify the images and move them with a secret power". BIDEZ, *op. cit.*, 98, n. 7, has drawn attention to the similarity existing between the rites described in the last passage and those referred to in Proclus' explanations *περὶ τῆς ἱερατικῆς τέχνης*; and HOPFNER, *O.-Z.* I, 807 f. illustrates the use of composing divine images from various substances by many parallels. But the question : whether Iamblichus and Psellus (*i. e.* Proclus) refer in the two passages quoted to Chaldæan rites exclusively or to those of wider circles cannot be answered with certainty : for neither uses the former the term *Θεουργία* nor the latter the term *τελεστικὴ* only with regard to the Chaldæans. That Psellus refers among others also to statues of Hecate, results from PROCL. *Crat.* 25, 1 f., who says that the *telestæ* use for sympathetic purposes as symbols of the divine powers, shuttles, mixing bowls (see above), sceptres and keys (the latter symbol is one of the signs of Hecate).

d) BIDEZ, *C. M. A. G.*, VI, 85, n. 1, has correctly concluded from an allusion of Procopius of Gaza that Proclus set out his views on the nature of the "telestic art" in a special work. He supposes that this was a commentary on the *τελεστικὴ* of Julian the Theurgist (see ch. 1, n. 1). But as the existence of such a work is nowhere attested, we should better suppose that it was identical with *περὶ ἀγωγῆς* mentioned by Suidas (see ch. II, n. 14).

## EXCURSUS XI

---

### THE WORK OF THE NEOPLATONIST ORIGEN "CONCERNING THE DEMONS"

1. In his work *De abstinentia* (II, 36-43), the principal exposition of Neoplatonic ascetism, Porphyry quotes a lengthy description of demonology, which he borrowed, according to his own statement, from "some Platonists" (τῶν Πλατωνικῶν τινες). Cumont was the first to stress the importance of this description for the history of ancient religion; he has proved that the doctrines proposed there concerning the nature and activity of the evil demons go back to Iranian beliefs, but could not determine the immediate literary source of Porphyry<sup>1</sup>. The present excursus purposes to elucidate this special problem. Porphyry deals in the beginning of the relevant section with the question of the principles according to which sacrifices to the superhuman beings should

---

<sup>1</sup> See CUMONT, *Rel. Orient.*, 280, 53, and now, *Mages hell.*, II, 275-282 (cf. also *ibid.*, I, 178 f.), where he reprints the whole digression from PORPHYRY'S *De abstinentia*, adding a detailed commentary which deals with the history of the religious ideas set out there. ZELLER, III, 2<sup>1</sup>, p. 728, 2, after him CUMONT, *Rel. Orient.*, *loc.cit.* (who later, *Mages hell.*, I, 179 designated this hypothesis as "assez fragile"). TREDINGA, *Rheinisches Museum*, XXVI, 1927, 97 f., and PUECH, *Mélanges Bidez*, 756, identify the Platonists cited by Porphyry with Numenius and Cronius, but fail to adduce any convincing proof. Numenius may fall out of account as Porphyry does not reckon him among the Platonists (he calls him a Pythagorean, see the texts collected by LEEMANS, *Numenius*, 85); and about Cronius we know practically nothing.

It may be noted that ZELLER, III, 2, p. 721 ff., gives an excellent summary of the demonological views of Porphyry. See also HOPFNER, *O.-Z.*, I, § 43 ff.

be offered up. As the answer to this question depends, in his opinion, on a correct distinction of their various orders, he quotes for this reason the theological doctrines of some unnamed Platonists, which, briefly summarized, run as follows : After the Supreme Being, the Cosmic Soul and the "visible gods" (*i. e.* the planets) there follow in the divine hierarchy the powers called "demons" by Plato. The common view that these demons are beneficent to those who try to conciliate them by prayers and sacrifices, but take vengeance if they are neglected, is erroneous and has led to a falsification of religion. In truth, two different classes of demons have to be distinguished : both of them consist of souls which, issuing from the Cosmic Soul, are clothed, in the course of their descent through the planetary spheres, with air-like envelopes (*πνεύματα*) constituting the passions. Those souls whose reason rules over their passions, are the beneficent demons. These inhabit the upper layer of the aery zone which extends immediately below the moon. From there they watch over the plants and animals, provide both of them with favourable conditions of climate and temperature and impart to men the arts, the knowledge of the general ("encyclic") sciences, of medicine and of gymnastics. To this group of good demons belong also the heavenly messengers called "ferry-men" by Plato; they are the mediators between gods and men, carrying over to the gods the prayers of men, and to men the exhortations and signs of the gods. These good demons are not capable of harming men. Other souls, however, who have been overpowered by the passions of their "pneumatic" envelopes, are maleficent potencies. They inhabit and rule the aery space adjoining the earth and are the originators of human misery : they cause epidemics and drought, arouse fatal desires, stir up wars and riots, and also spread the belief that their own evil deeds are effected by the good demons. They even dare to impute their crimes to the celestial powers. As they, and on the first place their chief, aspire to the highest place, they slander the Supreme God by asserting that it is he who turns all things upside down; whereas he, like the good demons, is in truth capable only of good deeds. They are also the friends and helpers of the sorcerers : they favourize their delusions and are fed by them with bloody sacrifices which are offered

up to them and to their chief. Therefore, every judicious man should be careful not to attract them; a pure soul, however, cannot be touched by them.

2. Porphyry proposes similar views on the nature and activity of the diverse classes of demons in his allegorical explanation of the Platonic legend of Atlantis. Fragments of this explanation, which formed the beginning of his commentary on Plato's *Timaeus*, are preserved in Proclus' commentary on the same work. The latter quotes several passages from Porphyry's exegesis and refers to it frequently without mentioning the name of his source<sup>2</sup>. According to Proclus' report, Porphyry explained the war of the prehistoric Athenians with the inhabitants of the legendary island Atlantis as an allegory of the struggle between the "souls which strive upwards" (*i. e.* the good demons) and the hylic demons, who attempt to "draw downwards" the human souls on their way to a new incorporation<sup>3</sup>. According to Proclus' schematic summary, Porphyry distinguished three classes of demons: the "divine ones" whose celestial existence has suffered no change; the individual souls of the departed which for a certain time, until new descent, dwell in the realm of the "divine demons"; and the evil demons<sup>4</sup>. The first two groups are represented by the Athenians; and the third one by the Atlantics.

In accordance with this typology, Porphyry explained the five castes of prehistoric Athens mentioned in Plato's tale, as the classes of the

<sup>2</sup> Proclus derived his information regarding the views held by Porphyry's predecessors only from the quotations adduced by Porphyry himself,—whose commentary was, besides that of Iamblichus, his chief source.

<sup>3</sup> PROCL., *Tim.*, I, 77, 7 (Porphyry) ψυχῶν πρὸς δαίμονας ἐναντιώσωιν . . . τῶν μὲν δαιμόνων καταγωγῶν ὄντων, τῶν δὲ ψυχῶν ἀταγομέων. Cf. l. 18 (ἐναντιώσωιν) . . . τῶν ψυχῶν πρὸς τοὺς ὑλικοὺς δαίμονας. See also *ibid.*, p. 174, 24 f.

<sup>4</sup> PROCL., *Tim.*, I, 77, 9 f. παρ' οἷς (*sc.* the adherents of Porphyry) ὁ δαίμων τριχῶς· καὶ γὰρ εἶναι φασὶ τὸ μὲν θείων δαιμόνων γένος, τὸ δὲ κατὰ σχέσιν (*cf.* ch. v, n. 8) ὁ μερικαὶ (*see* n. 12) συμπληροῦσι ψυχὰι δαιμονίας τυχοῦσαι λήξεως, τὸ δὲ πονηρὸν ἄλλο καὶ λυμαντικὸν τῶν ψυχῶν. See ZELLEN, III, 2, p. 727, 3.

supra- and sublunar pandemonium. The "priests" mentioned there are the "archangels turned towards the gods" and transmitting their messages<sup>5</sup>; they are accordingly identical with the first of the three groups of demons distinguished by Porphyry. The "warriors" are the demons descending into human bodies, *i. e.* the souls which, after the temporary sojourn in community with the demons, return to terrestrial life and are equipped with body and emotion (*Θυμός*), the "weapon" of earthly life<sup>6</sup>; accordingly they correspond to the second of the three groups of the demons. The "shepherds" are the demons who are put over the "herds of the living beings": they keep guard not only over the beasts, but also over the flock of men: nations, cities as well as individuals<sup>7</sup>. The "hunters" are demons who "chase the souls and enclose them in the bodies". With the "farmers" at last, the demonic guardians of the produces of earth are meant with<sup>8</sup>.

Porphyry referred in his allegorical explanation of the myth of Atlantis also to other classes of demons. These are, indeed, not mentioned in the fragmentary report of Proclus, but can be inferred both from the Platonic context and from the general tendency of Porphyry's exegesis. According to Plato (*Tim.*, 23 d 5), Athene, the guardian and foster-mother of prehistoric Athens, created the inhabitants of the city

<sup>5</sup> PROCL., *Tim.*: I, 152, 13 (Porphyry) τοὺς μὲν ἱερέας ἀναλογεῖν τοῖς ἐν οὐρανῷ ἀρχαγγέλοις τετραμμένοις πρὸς Θεούς, ὧν εἰσιν ἄγγελοι (with reference to PLATO, *Tim.* 24 a, 4: τὸ τῶν ἱερέων γένος ἀπὸ τῶν ἄλλων χωρὶς ἀφωρισμένον). The "separation" of the "priests" from the other castes was the consequence of their "conversion" towards the gods.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. PROCL. *Tim.*, I, 156, 24 f.

<sup>7</sup> PROCL., *Tim.*, I, 152, 15 f. (Porphyry) τοὺς δ' αὖ νομέας τοῖς ἐπὶ ταῖς τῶν ζῶων ἀγέλαις τεταγμένοις (ἀναλογεῖν)... ἐπεὶ καὶ ἀνθρώπων ἀγέλης ἐστὶ τις κηδεμῶν καὶ μερικοί τινες, οἱ μὲν ἔθνη, οἱ δὲ πόλεις, οἱ δὲ καὶ τοὺς καθ' ἑκάστου ἐπισκοποῦντες. The sub-division of the "shepherds" is taken from PLATO, *Politicus*, 271 d ff.; cf. also *Leges* 713 d ff.

<sup>8</sup> PROCL., *Tim.*, I, 152, 21 ff. The hunters, being Athenians, also belong to the class of the good demons. They are charged with compelling the souls, which because of former defilement are forced to reincarnation, to enter the human bodies, their "prison" (see PLATO, *Cratyl.*, 400 c. PORPHE., *Sent.*, 28, p. 121, 10 f., *et passim*).

by taking over the seed from earth and Hephaestus'. Porphyry remarks on this passage that Athene, the allegory of Reason<sup>9</sup>, dwells in the moon which forms the door through which the souls descend unto earth for new incorporation<sup>10</sup>; whereas Hephaestus personifies the "faculty of artistic skill", and "earth" the sphere of the moon<sup>11</sup>. Consequently, he inferred from the Platonic sentence the view, that the souls of the demons which descend from the sphere of the moon into human bodies transmit to the inhabitants of earth the arts and the technical abilities<sup>12</sup>. They are also identical with those demons who, according to Plato's tale, invented medicine<sup>13</sup> and gymnastics<sup>14</sup>, as well as "the other sciences"; i. e. geometry, astronomy, practical and theoretical mathematics and the remaining mathematic disciplines<sup>15</sup>.

Porphyry explained Plato's tale of the victorious war of Athens with the Atlantics as an allegory of the struggle between the good and the evil, hylic, demons<sup>16</sup>. He based his identification of the Atlantics with the hylic demons upon the interpretation of the Atlantic sea, which

<sup>9</sup> Cf. PORPHYRY, *περι ἀγαμάτων*, p. 14, 17, and the testimonies adduced by Bidez. See also PLATO, *Cratylus*, 407 b and GEFFCKEN, *Zwei griechische Apologeten*, p. 210, 1.

<sup>10</sup> PROCL., *Tim.*, I, 165, 16 f.

<sup>11</sup> PROCL., *Tim.*, I, 147, 6 f.

<sup>12</sup> PROCL., *Tim.*, I, 147, 9 (Porphyry) τὰς οὖν ψυχὰς τὰς ἀπὸ μὲν Θεοῦ ὑποστάσας (i. e. the human souls sent from the Cosmic Soul according to the will of the Supreme God. They are called μερικαὶ ψυχαί, see n. 4), τοῦ δὲ τεχνικοῦ νοῦ μετεχούσας εἰς τὸ τῆς σελήνης σῶμα 'σπείρεσθαι' (according to PLATO, *Tim.*, 42 d, 4-5) φησιν, ὡς ἐκεί πολιτευομένους τὰς τεχνικὰς τῶν ψυχῶν, σώματα δ' ἐχούσας ἀπορροίας ὄντα τῶν αἰθερίων σωμάτων. These "bodies" are the "pneumatic envelopes" put on by the human souls in the course of their descent through the planetary spheres towards the moon.

<sup>13</sup> PROCL., *Tim.*, I, 159, 25.

<sup>14</sup> The gymnastics are neither mentioned by Platon nor by Proclus, but we may suppose that Porphyry found an allusion to them in the wording of PLATO, *Tim.*, 24 c 1 *ιατρικῆς πρὸς ὑγίειαν*. See n. 41.

<sup>15</sup> Compare PLATO, *Tim.*, 24 c 3 with PROCL. *Tim.*, I, 159, 20 f. (Porphyry) 'μαθήματα' λέγει (ὁ Πλάτων) δῆπου γεωμετρίαν, ἀστρονομίαν, λογιστικὴν, ἀριθμητικὴν καὶ τὰς τούτων ἑυγενεῖς.

<sup>16</sup> See n. 3 and 18.

brought forth and swallowed the legendary island, as an allegory of the hylic principle<sup>17</sup>. Consequently the princes of this island, whose power is extolled by Plato, represent the rulers of the evil demons<sup>18</sup>. Proclus reports that Porphyry explained these hylic demons as "characters" (τρόποι). We may, accordingly, infer that he treated them as personifications of the passions<sup>19</sup>.

The outline of Porphyry's allegorical explanation of the combat itself can be reconstituted with the help of some allusions preserved by Proclus<sup>20</sup>. The struggle begins, when the souls of the "warriors" (i. e. the souls which owing to their lack of purity cannot escape reincarnation) descend towards the terrestrial zone and enter the realm of the evil, "Atlantic", demons<sup>21</sup>. These attempt to "draw" the descending souls "downwards" and to subjugate them to their power, while the good demons try to protect them against this onslaught. It appears that Porphyry described, in the image of this mythical war, the "second descent" of the human souls and their reincarnation, with all the dangers connected with it. His allegory sets forth a principal theme of the later Platonic doctrine of the *καθόδος ψυχῆς*<sup>22</sup>.

<sup>17</sup> Compare PROCL., *Tim.*, I, 175, 18 f. (where no sources are mentioned) with the quotation from Porphyry adduced n. 18 and the latter's doctrine quoted by PROCL., *Tim.*, I, 117, 6 f.

<sup>18</sup> PROCL., *Tim.*, I, 171, 19 ὁ δὲ Πορφύριος 'μεγάλα' μὲν 'ἔργα' καὶ 'Θαυμασιὰ' (PLATO, *Tim.*, 24 d, 6 f.) ψυχῶν ἠκουσεν ὅσα πρὸς ὕλην καὶ τοὺς ὕλικούς πρᾶτται τρόπους (see n. 30). ὕλικούς δὲ τρόπους ἀποκαλεῖ τοὺς δαίμονας... εἶναι δὲ τούτους ὕλικὰς δυνάμεις, ἠθοποιούς τῆς ψυχῆς. Cf. PORPH., *De Styge* (ap. STOB. *Eclog.* I, 41 s., 53 [1028]). See ch. v, n. 181.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. PORPH., *De Styge*, quoted n. 22.

<sup>20</sup> PROCL., *Tim.*, I, 77, 13 τοὺς οὖν ἐσχάτους δαίμονας τὸν πόλεμον τοῦτον συζηροτεῖν καὶ τὰς ψυχὰς ἐν τῇ εἰς γένεσιν καθόδῳ.

<sup>21</sup> PROCL., *Tim.*, I, 77, 18 f. (Porphyry) πρὶν δὲ εἰς τὰ στερῆὰ σώματα (cf. *Sent.*, 29, p. 13, 8) κατελθεῖν, (ἐναντιῶσιν) παραδίδωσι τῶν ψυχῶν πρὸς τοὺς ὕλικούς δαίμονας. Concerning the dangers connected with the soul's crossing of the aëry zone, see ch. iv, n. 36.

<sup>22</sup> See Excursus II, n. 8. Porphyry's explanation of the destruction of Atlantis is omitted by Proclus, but may be reconstituted with the help of Porphyry's explanations preserved in the fragments of his treatise "On Styx" (ap., STOB., *Eclog.*, I,



3. We may now turn to the question of the sources employed by Porphyry. In *De abstinence* he designates their authors rather vaguely as "some Platonists", whereas in his allegorical commentary on the legend of Atlantis, he calls them by name. He declares there that he has combined the views held by Numenius with those held by the Neoplatonist Origen<sup>23</sup>. As Proclus reproduces, though in a very concise form, the basic concepts of these two authors, we are able to determine more closely Porphyry's relationship to his two models.

We may begin with the study of the explanation of Numenius. According to Proclus, he interpreted the war of the Athenians with the Atlantics as "contrast between nobler souls fostered by Athene, and between other souls concerned with the world of generation which also<sup>24</sup> belong to the god who rules over the world of becoming" (*i. e.* the sublunar zone)<sup>25</sup>. The god mentioned at the end of the passage is Poseidon (the progenitor of the Atlantics)<sup>26</sup>, who was regarded by Numenius as the personification of the world of the senses (the "sea")<sup>27</sup>. We may

---

*c.* 41 s. 53 [1028]), which agree with certain arguments of his interpretation of the legend of Atlantis (*cf.* Procl., *Tim.*, I, 189, 4 f. 190, 20 f., who depends on Porphyry). These passages indicate that Porphyry explained the annihilation of Atlantis and of its inhabitants after the pattern of the Orphic version of the myth of the fall of the Titans (*see* Procl., *Tim.*, I, 172, 14 f. Cf. 79, 27 f. with 77, 15 f. and Macrobius, *Somn. Scip.*, I, 2, 11, who depends on Porphyry; *cf.* MRS, *Sitzungsberichte*, Berlin, 1933, p. 232 ff. As the vanquished Titans, so the evil demons—symbolized by the Atlantics—were, after their defeat, cast into the nethermost abyss of the Tartarus and given over to eternal torture.

<sup>23</sup> Procl., *Tim.*, I, 77, 6 f. 21 f. Proclus' mordant remark on Porphyry, the plagiarist of Numenius, is taken over from Iamblichus. *See* the testimonies collected by Leemans, *Numenius*, p. 87, n. 20-21.

<sup>24</sup> *i. e.* in contradistinction from Origen, according to whom both parties consisted of demons.

<sup>25</sup> Procl., *Tim.*, I, 77, 3 f. *οἱ δὲ εἰς ψυχῶν διάσλασιν καλλίωνων καὶ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς τροβίμων* (according to Plato, *Tim.*, 23 d 7) *καὶ γενεσιουργῶν ἄλλων, αἱ καὶ τῶ τῆς γενέσεως ἐφόρῳ θεῶν προσήκουσι. καὶ ἐστὶ τῆς ἐξηγήσεως ταύτης προσίτης Νουμήνιος*. The formulation is that of Proclus.

<sup>26</sup> *Cf. e. g.* Procl., *Tim.*, I, 182, 21 f. *Rp.* II, 239, 8.

<sup>27</sup> *Cf.* Leeman, *Numenius*, p. 104, 1 f. *See also* Procl., *Tim.*, III, 325, 25 f. and *Rp.*, II, 348, 13 f.

suppose that Numenius interpreted Athene, in accordance with a widespread allegory<sup>28</sup>, as symbolizing Reason. We obtain in this way as principal motif of Numenius' explanation of the legend of Atlantis the antagonism between the souls turned towards reason and those turned towards the temporal world. This opposition agrees with Numenius' basic doctrine of two antagonistic human souls : a rational and a hylic one. We may consequently presume that Numenius explained the war between Athens and Atlantis as the struggle between the λογικαί and the ἀλογοὶ ψυχαι<sup>29</sup> and the victory of the former as the triumph of reason over the passions. This surmise is confirmed by a closer examination of Porphyry's explanations of this mythical war. He interprets it as the struggle between rational souls (*i. e.* demons) and the agents of the hylic passions<sup>30</sup>. Since Porphyry, according to his own explanation, draws on two sources and Origen's explanation is based (as we will see immediately) on another view, we may infer that Numenius was the source of Porphyry's psychological dualism. We may therefore assume that Numenius identified the Atlantics with the psychical passions, by which the irrational (hylic) soul is dominated. It follows from this supposition that Numenius ignored the difference between the two classes of demons<sup>31</sup>. Thus, this view stems from Origen, Porphyry's other source. According to Proclus, this philosopher explained the war of the Athenians with the Atlantics as the combat of a class of demons "who were better and stronger in number" with another class of demons "who were worse, but superior by strength"<sup>32</sup>. The gene-

<sup>28</sup> See n. 9.

<sup>29</sup> ZELLER, III, 2, p. 239, 2, was the first to conjecture some relationship between Numenius' explanation of the war and his theory concerning the two souls. As to this chief doctrine of Numenius see also PRAECHTER, 521 f. PORPHYRY, *Abst.* I, 40, p. 116, 11 f. and CLEM. ALEX, *Strom.*, II, 20 ; 114, 2 refer likewise to this doctrine.

<sup>30</sup> See n. 18.

<sup>31</sup> In favour of this supposition may be added that the derivation of the passions from an evil soul would make superfluous the assumption of hylic demons. Cf. ch. VI, n. 269.

<sup>32</sup> PROCL., *Tim.*, I, 76, 30 f. οἱ δὲ εἰς δαιμόνων τινῶν ἐναντιώσιν, ὡς τῶν μὲν

ral tendency of Porphyry's explanation of the legend of Atlantis is largely in accordance with the antagonism posited by Origen.

4. Before going on to determine more precisely Porphyry's debt to Origen's demonology, we may study the personality of this second author and his writings. The literary tradition as regards Origen is indeed very scanty, but the few facts which are reported suffice to answer the question as to his share in Porphyry's exposition of demonology. Origen (who should not be confused with his namesake and contemporary, the Christian ecclesiastical writer), the pupil of Ammonius Saccas, master of Longinus (who was Porphyry's first teacher) and co-student of Plotinus composed only two works (both of which are known only by their titles) : a polemical treatise against Plotinus, in which he defended the traditional view of the Platonists as to the identity of the "First God" with the demiurge<sup>33</sup>; and a work "Concerning the Demons"<sup>34</sup>. It seems certain that in the latter treatise Origen propounded the explanation of the legend of Atlantis quoted by Porphyry in his commentary on Plato's *Timaeus*<sup>35</sup>. A reflexion of the doctrine set out by Origen in the former work may be discerned in the introductory passage of the lengthy quotation from the doctrines of the unnamed Platonists figuring in Porphyry's *De abstinentia*. The author of this quotation distinguishes only between two noetic principles : the "First God" and the Cosmic Soul<sup>36</sup>. The description of this First

---

ἀμεινόνων, τῶν δὲ χειρόνων, καὶ τῶν μὲν πλήθει, τῶν δὲ δυνάμει κρείττονων, καὶ τῶν μὲν κρατούντων, τῶν δὲ κρατούμενων, ὡς περ Ὀριγένης ὑπέλαβεν. The antithesis of "number" and "virtue" is derived from the wording of PLATO, *Tim.*, 24 d 7.

<sup>33</sup> See ch. VI, n. 38.

<sup>34</sup> PORPH., *Vit. Plot.*, 3 Ὀριγένης... ἔγραψεν... οὐδὲν πλὴν τὸ περὶ δαιμόνων σύγγραμμα καὶ ἐπὶ Γαλήνου ὅτι μόνος ποιητῆς ὁ βασιλεύς. See *ibid.* ch. 20. Cf. ZELLER, III, 2, p. 514, 1. 515, 1-2. W. JAEGER, *Nemesius von Emesa*, 65.

<sup>35</sup> The assumption that Origen proposed his allegorical explanation of the legend of Atlantis in his work "Concerning the Demons" was first made by ZELLER III, 2, p. 516, 3. We may add that Porphyry drew his quotations of Origen's exegesis from a literary source, not from oral teaching.

<sup>36</sup> PORPH., *De abst.*, II, 37, p. 166, 3 ff. Nauck. It seems unnecessary to deal here with the other peculiarities of this ontological speculation.

God as an entity which "is neither existing within anything nor confined (lit. bound) within itself" is directed, as we have shown above<sup>37</sup>, both against the Stoic concept of an immanent deity and against the extreme transcendentalism of the Peripatetics (whose doctrine exercised an important influence upon Plotinus' differentiation between a First and a Second, demiurgic, God). The unnamed author quoted by Porphyry makes this differentiation superfluous in that he postulates an immediate action of the Supreme Being upon the universe. This view conformed to the thesis defended by Origen against Plotinus. Accordingly, he may be regarded as the source of the relevant passage quoted by Porphyry<sup>38</sup>.

The classification of the good demons presented by Porphyry in his *De abstinentiâ* may also be traced back to Origen. Porphyry distinguishes there three classes : the guardians of the animals and plants who accord them favourable climatic conditions ; the helpers of men who impart to them the knowledge of the encyclic sciences, of medicine, gymnastics etc. ; and the Platonic messengers of the gods who carry over the prayers of the men and the exhortations of the gods<sup>39</sup>. The same classes of demons (all of whom derive from the Cosmic Soul) are distinguished by Porphyry in his explanation of the five castes of the prehistorical constitution of Athens<sup>40</sup> : the "shepherds" represent the demons put over the beasts ; the "farmers" those put over

---

<sup>37</sup> See above, ch., vi, n. 79.

<sup>38</sup> M. POHLENZ, *Vom Zorne Gottes* (Göttingen, 1909), p. 144, 1, has already pointed out that the author of the source quoted by Porphyry was no Neoplatonist, because he did not know of the Plotinian doctrine of the three hypostases. J. BERNAYS, *Theophrastos' Schrift über Frömmigkeit*, p. 136, suggested that Porphyry himself was the author of this digression and that his ascribing it to other members of the Platonic school was merely a pretence, but this view is refuted by the consideration that in his later period Porphyry would have hardly been prepared to give up Plotinus' doctrine of the three hypostases. We may further remark that Porphyry was attached to Origen personally through his former master Longinus, who was Origen's pupil.

<sup>39</sup> See above p. 498.

<sup>40</sup> See above p. 499 f.

the plants<sup>41</sup>; the "Hephaestic souls" teach the various crafts; and those assigned to Athene the mathematic sciences<sup>42</sup>, medicine and gymnastics<sup>43</sup>. It seems that Porphyry's demonology developed in his interpretation of the myth of Atlantis was the model of that propounded in *De abstinētia*; that is to say that the latter may be regarded as a summarized recapitulation of the former. Two facts may be mentioned in favour of this contention: first that the differentiation of the diverse classes of demons made by Porphyry becomes fully understandable only by their reference to the particulars of Plato's story of Atlantis; and secondly that Porphyry's allegorical interpretation of the myth of Atlantis names some classes of demons which are not mentioned in *De abstinētia*<sup>44</sup>. It follows that this classification of the good demons goes back to Origen. This author may, accordingly, be considered with certainty as one of the unnamed Platonists whose views are reproduced

<sup>41</sup> The weather-demons are not mentioned in the excerpts from Porphyry cited by Proclus, but we may assume that Porphyry treated of them in his explanation of PLATO, *Tim.*, 24 c, 6 (Athene) τὴν εὐκρασίαν τῶν ὡρῶν . . . κατιδοῦσα (cf. *De abst.*, II, 38, p. 167, 15 f. εὐκρασίας τῶν ὡρῶν τοῦ ἔτους). An analogous case is dealt with in n. 14.

<sup>42</sup> In his commentary on the *Timaeus* (see n. 15), Porphyry ascribed the origin of the mathematic disciplines, in *De abst.* of the encyclic sciences to the good demons. We may accordingly infer that he explained the ambiguous term μαθηματῶν used by PLATO, *Tim.* (see n. 15) once as "learnings" and the other time as "mathematics". It is also possible that Proclus excerpts from Porphyry are incomplete as regards this point.

<sup>43</sup> The identity of the Platonic messengers of the gods (see above p. 45) with the archangels mentioned by Porphyry in his allegorical explanation of the myth of Atlantis may be inferred from the excerpt from Porphyry delivered by Proclus (see n. 5). Unlike the "shepherds", "hunters" and "farmers" they do not belong to the class of the sublunar demons (cf. PROCL. *Tim.*, I, 152, 25 f.): for they do not dwell in the air, but in the ether (cf. ΠΟΡΦΥΡ., *De Regr.*, 29, 2, f.).

<sup>44</sup> See n. 14 and 41. In *De abst.*, both the "warriors", i. e. the souls descending for reincarnation, and the "hunters" who include the descending souls into the human bodies, are missing. The reason of this omission seems to be that Porphyry did not deal in *De abst.* with the question of the relationship between the demonic and the human souls.

by Porphyry in his *De abstinence*. The plural "some Platonists" may signify one of two things : either that Porphyry combined the demonology of Origen with that of other Platonists ; or that Porphyry designated by the plural Origen and his followers <sup>45</sup>. The second supposition would be in conformity with the manner of quoting adopted by the Neoplatonists. It seems therefore not improbable that Origen was the only literary source of Porphyry propounded in *De abstinence* <sup>46</sup>.

---

<sup>45</sup> See Procl., *Mal.*, 214, 35, quoted ch. iv, n. 34. Cf. also *Tim.*, III, 234. 17 τούς Ἀπταίους . . . καὶ Ἀλβίνους and I, 391. 7 τούς περὶ Ἀπταίων.

<sup>46</sup> The relationship posited above between Origen and Porphyry would agree with that which W. JAEGER, *Nemesius von Emesa*, p. 66, supposed with regard to the transmission of the excerpt from Origen quoted by Nemesius.

## EXCURSUS XII

### THE SOURCE OF THE "HELLENIC THEOLOGY" QUOTED BY EUSEBIUS

Eusebius quotes in his *Praep. Evang.* (IV, 5, 1-2) a short description of the "Hellenic theology" without mentioning his source<sup>1</sup>. The author of this system distinguishes between four classes of divinities : the first and supreme god, "the father and king of all gods"; the (planetary) gods; the demons; the souls of the heros. These four orders "participate in the idea of the Good", "partly lead and partly are led" and are called together "Light". They are separated from the evil demons who "hate the Good" and are called "Darkness". The gods dominate the celestial zone till the moon (they are therefore called "celestial and ethereal gods"); the good demons the zone

<sup>1</sup> EUSEB., *Praep. Evang.*, IV, 5, 1-2; Οἱ μὲν δὴ τὴν Ἑλληνικὴν Θεολογίαν ἐξηκριβωκότες... εἰς γένη τέτταρα πάντα τὸν λόγον διαιροῦντες, πρῶτιστ' αὖ πάντων τὸν πρῶτον ἀφορίσαντες Θεόν, εἰδέναι φασὶ τοῦτον εἶναι τὸν ἐπὶ πᾶσι πρῶτον τε ὄντα καὶ πάντων Θεῶν πατέρα τε καὶ βασιλέα, μεθ' ὃν γένος τὸ Θεῶν ὑπάρχειν δεύτερον, ἐπόμενον δὲ τὸ δαιμόνων, τὸ δὲ ἡρώων τέταρτον ἢ πάντα τῆς τοῦ κρείττους ιδέας μετασχόντα πῆ μὲν ἄγειν, πῆ δὲ ἄγεσθαι, καὶ «Φῶς» ἅπαν προσαγορεύεσθαι τὸ τοιούδε Φωτὸς μετοχῇ. ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς τοῦ χειρόνος οὐσίας τὸ κακὸν ἡγεῖσθαι φασί· τοῦτο δὲ εἶναι μοχθηρῶν δαιμόνων γένος, Φιλῶ μὲν οὐδαμῶς χρώμεγον τὰ γὰρ ἄθῳ, δύναμιν γε μὴν ἐν τῇ τῶν ἐναντιῶν φύσει κεκτημένον πρῶτην καθάπερ ἐν τοῖς κρείττοσιν ὁ Θεός· πᾶν δὲ τὸ τοιούδε «σκοτός» προσαγορεύεσθαι., ταῦτα τοῦτον διαστειλάμενο: τὸν τρόπον Θεοῖς μὲν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὸν ἄχρι σελήνης αἰθέρα φασὶν ὑποτετάχθαι, δαίμοσι δὲ τὰ περὶ σελήνην καὶ ἀέρα, ψυχαῖς δὲ τὰ περὶ γῆν καὶ ὑπόγεια. τοιοῦτῳ δ' ἀφορισμῷ κεχωρημένοι πρῶτον ἀπάντων φασὶ τοὺς οὐρανίους δεῖν καὶ αἰθερίου Θεοὺς φεραπέυειν δεύτερον τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς δαίμονας· τρίτον τὰς τῶν ἡρώων ψυχὰς, τέταρτον τοὺς φαύλους καὶ πονηροὺς ἀπομειλίσησθαι δαίμονας.

surrounding the moon, as well as the air; the souls of the heroes the terrestrial zone; and the evil demons the subterranean world<sup>2</sup>. The good powers have to be worshipped according to the order of their hierarchy; and the sacrifices offered to the evil demons are to be regarded as placatory gifts.

It can be shown that the source of this "Hellenic Theology" quoted by Eusebius was Porphyry's "Philosophy of the Oracles"<sup>3</sup>. That their author was a Platonist is proved by his reference to the Platonic antithesis of the Ideas of Good and Evil, and to a famous passage of Plato's *Phaedrus*<sup>4</sup>. The designation of the supreme god as *ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων θεός* is an appellation familiar to Porphyry<sup>5</sup>. The double designation of the planetary gods as "celestial and ethereal gods" is taken from the exten-

<sup>2</sup> The division of the domains ruled by the various classes of gods and spirits has been disarranged by Eusebius, as the localisation of the evil demons is missing in his description. We may suppose that the original text read *Ψυχαῖς δὲ δὴ τὰ περὶ γῆν, δαίμοσι δὲ κακοῖς τὰ ὑπόγεια*; cf. PORPHY., *Epist. ad Aneb.* 2.

<sup>3</sup> BIDEZ-CUMONT, *Mages hell.*, II, 276, 1. 280, 3. 282, 2 were the first to draw attention to the relationship between the "Hellenic Theology" and Porphyry's theology.

<sup>4</sup> *ὅτι πάντα τῆς τοῦ κρείττονος ἰδέας μετασχόντα* alludes to PLATO, *Phaedr.*, 246 d 8, the continuation *ἢ μὲν ἀγειν, ἢ δὲ ἀγεσθαι* to 246 e 4 f.

<sup>5</sup> The designation of the First God as *ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων θεός* recurs in PORPHY., *Abst.*, II, 33, p. 163, 15, the paraphrase of a quotation from the writing of Apollonius of Tyana "Concerning sacrificing"; EUSEB., *Praep. Evang.*, IV, 13 quotes the same passage literally (see NORDEN, *Agnostos Theos*, 343 f.). Cf. also *Abst.*, II, 49, p. 176, 19. III, 5, p. 193, 1. *Vit. Plot.*, 23.

*ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων θεός* is used as designation of the transcendent god of the Platonists first by CELSUS (*ap. ORIG.*, I, 24. VII, 15), who was the model of Origen (*contra Celsum*). Later on, it passed, perhaps through the mediation of Porphyry, to JULIAN, *Contra Galil.*, p. 211, 1 ed. C. NEUMANN, and to SYNESIUS, *De Regno*, c. 5, 1068 B and *Epist.*, 57. 1388 D. Eusebius employs constantly the variant *ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων* (gen.) *θεός*, with regard to *Ephesians*, IV, 6 (cf. also *PAUL Rom.*, IX, 5 *ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεός*), and puts the dative only in his quotations from Porphyry (*Pr. Ev.*, IV 10, 1 and the passage quoted above). Consequently, we may assume that in his quotation from Apollonius of Tyana (*Pr. Ev.*, IV, 13, see above) he replaced the dative (attested by the paraphrase of PORPHY., *Abst.*, *loc. cit.*), by the genitive on his own account.



sive oracle concerning the sacrifices which is quoted by Porphyry in the first book of his "Philosophy of the Oracles" (which deals with the question of sacrificing<sup>6</sup>. Porphyry employs there the same designation twice in the paraphrase of the mentioned oracle<sup>7</sup> and stresses the importance of the classification of the gods proposed in this oracle. Consequently, we may not only infer that Eusebius borrowed his "Hellenic Theology" from Porphyry's "Philosophy of the Oracles", but also that Porphyry had propounded this theology not long after having quoted the lengthy sacrificial oracle. In favour of this supposition may be added that the "Hellenic Theology" concludes with an instruction concerning sacrificing and that this topic constitutes the main theme of this part of Porphyry's "Philosophy of the Oracles". Moreover, the ascription of the "Hellenic Theology" to this work of Porphyry is rendered probable by the context in which it is found in the work of Eusebius. A little before the excerpts from the "Philosophy of the Oracles" begin anew. Eusebius, whose knowledge of Greek literature was far from being so comprehensive as it would appear from the list of the authors quoted by him, has borrowed from Porphyry many quotations and references without mentioning the transmitter<sup>8</sup>.

We may now proceed to study the sources of the beliefs expressed in the "Hellenic Theology". The division of the beneficent powers : Supreme God, astral gods, good demons and heros has evolved from a differentiation usual in the writings of the Platonists<sup>9</sup>. Most peculiar, however, is the fact, that the four good orders of divinities are comprehended under the notion of "Light", and their opposition to the "Darkness" of the evil demons. This "theology" constitutes a

<sup>6</sup> Eus., *Pr. Ev.*, IV, 9. WOLFF, 112 f. See above ch. 1, n. 57.

<sup>7</sup> *ap. Eus., Pr. Ev.*, IV, 9, 5 and 7.

<sup>8</sup> Eusebius borrowed from Porphyry *e. g.* the excerpts from PHILO of BYBLUS (*Pr. Ev.*, IV, 16, 11; cf. I, 10, 42), many passages from Plutarch, and also the "Hellenic Theology". FREUDENTHAL, *Alexander Polyhistor*, p. 6 ff., has given a just characterisation of Euseb's method in using his literary sources.

<sup>9</sup> The division *θεοί, δαίμονες, ήρωες* is to be found in PLATO, *Rep.*, 392 a 4 f. *Crat.*, 397 d ff. *Leges* 717 b, and recurs constantly in the writings of the Platonists (see DONNS, *Proclus*, 295).

harmonization of Hellenic views on the organisation of the celestial hierarchy with a foreign creed. The "Hellene" may have been reminded of the Pythagorean opposition of God who is identified with Light, and the Darkness of Matter<sup>10</sup>; but this Pythagorean doctrine cannot be regarded as the origin of the division put forward in the "Hellenic Theology", as it rests on metaphysical principles and not on the opposition between the good powers of heavens and the evil powers of the netherworld. Bidez and Cumont have already pointed out that this opposition concords with the Iranian antinomy of Light as the good principle and Darkness as the evil (demonic) principle<sup>11</sup>. Accordingly, the "Hellenic Theology" consists of a combination of the Iranian antinomy with Plato's antithesis of the Ideas of Good and Evil and his division of the celestial hierarchy. Elsewhere Porphyry discovers, through his method of interpretation, an allusion to this Iranian antinomy in a passage of Plato's *Theaetetus* dealing with the ethical-religious opposition between Good and Evil<sup>12</sup>—a further proof that he has to be considered as the author of the "Hellenic Theology" quoted by Eusebius.

<sup>10</sup> See ZELLER, I, 1<sup>e</sup>, p. 459 f. DIELS, *Vors.*, 45, B 5. It may be added that in the Pythagorean "table of opposites" *φῶς* and *σκότος* constitute only one among many pairs.

<sup>11</sup> See ch. v, n. 99.

<sup>12</sup> See ch. vi, n. 286.

# COMPLÉMENTS

par

**Michel TARDIEU, E. R. DODDS, Pierre HADOT**

- 1 - Préface, par Michel Tardieu
- 2 - Errata, par M. T.
- 3 - Addenda, par M. T.
- 4 - Index locorum, par M. T.
- 5 - Index verborum, par M. T.
- 6 - Index rerum, par M. T.
- 7 - Index des auteurs récents, par M. T.
- 8 - Concordance, par M. T.
- 9 - New Light on the " Chaldaean Oracles ", by E.R. Dodds
- 10 - Bilan et perspectives sur les " Oracles chaldaïques ", par  
Pierre Hadot
- 11 - Notice sur Hans Lewy, par M. T.
- 12 - Bibliographie de Hans Lewy, par M. T.

## Préface

Hans Lewy rédigea en allemand les sept chapitres et les douze excursus de *Chaldaean Oracles and Theurgy*. Voulant que ce livre fût publié en anglais, il en confia lui-même la traduction à Salomon Pinès et à Morton Smith. Le manuscrit de l'original allemand ainsi que celui de la traduction anglaise ont été déposés le 4 décembre 1960 au Département des manuscrits et archives de la Jewish National and University Library de Jérusalem, où ils sont actuellement conservés sous la cote Ms. Var. 376, Hans Lewy Archive, Chaldaean Oracles and Theurgy.

Travailleur méticuleux, Lewy ne cessait de revenir sur les textes grecs traduits et analysés par lui, apportant retouches, corrections et ajouts. G. Scholem raconte (*Memorial Addresses*, p. 13) qu'étant venu un soir visiter Lewy et l'ayant trouvé particulièrement tendu, ce dernier lui déclara : « Voici que je viens de passer une semaine à écrire des choses fantastiques sur les *Oracula*, le premier chapitre de mon livre, et voici que j'ai passé la journée à vérifier ces choses : j'ai trouvé qu'il n'y avait pas une once de vérité en elles, alors j'ai tout effacé. Quel dommage, elles étaient si belles ! » Un premier jeu d'épreuves aurait permis à Lewy de reprendre une dernière fois son texte, d'en combler d'un coup les lacunes en composant les tables. Pressé par ses amis et sûr de pouvoir lui-même procéder aux corrections, il envoie au début de 1945 le manuscrit de la traduction anglaise à Charles Kuentz, alors directeur (1940-1953) de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale du Caire.

La parution, à première vue étrange, d'un livre de philosophie chez un éditeur d'ouvrages d'égyptologie s'explique par la vive amitié de Lewy pour Paul Kraus, dédicataire de *Chaldaean Oracles*, établi au Caire depuis 1936 et décédé tragiquement à l'âge de 40 ans, le 12 octobre 1944. Lewy, qui avait fait la connaissance de Kraus à Berlin en 1930, le retrouvait deux ans plus tard à Paris.

Tous les deux cherchaient alors à rompre avec l'Allemagne. Le sionisme du premier désignait la Terre d'Israël ; Kraus, qui à cette date n'était plus sioniste, avait momentanément trouvé refuge et travail auprès de Louis Massignon. Le 17 janvier 1945, Hans Lewy prononçait à l'Université hébraïque de Jérusalem l'éloge funèbre de son ami ; le 20 avril de la même année, le grand Max Meyerhof, cadet de 7 ans de Julius Ruska (en 1929 Kraus avait succédé à Martin Plessner comme assistant de Ruska à l'Institut de Diepjen), s'éteignait à son tour au Caire ; le 22 juillet toujours de la même année 1945, Lewy mourait à Jérusalem à l'âge de 44 ans. Meyerhof, Kraus et Lewy : trois frères d'infortune, compagnons dans l'exil comme dans la science, rejetés par l'Occident vers l'Orient...

Paul Kraus n'avait eu aucune difficulté à persuader Charles Kuentz, curieux de philosophie et d'histoire, d'ouvrir l'une des collections qu'il venait de créer au livre auquel Lewy mettait la dernière main. Sitôt arrivé à l'Institut, le manuscrit anglais de Lewy fut envoyé à la composition. Kraus n'étant plus là pour veiller au grain, les choses traînèrent comme s'étire, languissante, l'eau du Nil. Puis il fallut compter avec les événements du Proche-Orient, rendant impossibles et impensables toutes relations entre « voisins ». Les amis de Lewy en Israël ne purent rien faire, ni pour relancer le travail ni pour corriger les épreuves. Ce n'est qu'en 1956 que les plombs furent enfin libérés. Mais la malchance poursuivit encore l'ouvrage. Entre autres conséquences de l'équipée franco-anglaise sur le Canal, le livre de Lewy resta confiné dans les cartons de l'Institut. Le black-out qui suivit la guerre empêcha tout service de presse et la diffusion vers l'Europe. Se procurer un exemplaire de l'ouvrage devint dès lors un exploit de bibliophile.

L'examen des deux manuscrits de *Chaldaean Oracles*, dont le microfilm m'a été aimablement communiqué par M. Nadav, Conservateur en chef au Département des manuscrits et archives de la Jewish National Library, permet de constater que le texte publié est bien effectivement l'impression du manuscrit anglais, mais évidemment pas l'édition soignée qu'on était en droit d'attendre et que l'Auteur seul eût pu établir. Les renseignements, qu'apporte la lecture comparée des deux manuscrits et du texte imprimé, sont répertoriés dans les *Addenda*.

Lorsqu'en 1968 je lus moi-même pour la première fois *Chaldaean Oracles and Theurgy*, ébloui par tant de richesses accumulées mais ignorant tout de la personnalité et des autres travaux de l'Auteur, hormis l'opuscule « *Sobria Ebrietas* », je questionnai amis et professeurs. Tous ne connaissaient de Lewy que ces deux titres. Les fichiers de la bibliothèque de la Sorbonne, de la bibliothèque de l'École Normale (rue d'Ulm) et de la Bibliothèque Nationale n'en disaient pas plus. Le répertoire de l'*Année Philologique* était

un peu plus loquace : quand j'arrivais au t. 22 (1951) p. 166-167, était mentionné sous la rubrique Lewy (H.) le titre suivant : *The Period of the Second Commonwealth in the Light of Graeco-Roman Literature : Commentationes I. Lewy*, p. 1-12, avec l'annotation : *témoignages d'antisémitisme chez les auteurs anciens*. Pour en savoir davantage, je me reportai à la rubrique « recueils de mélanges » du t. 21 (1950) p. 410, où je pus lire : *Commentationes Iudaico-Hellenisticae. In memoriam J. Lewy (1901-1945), ed. cur. M. Schwabe et J. Gutmann (en hébreu), Jerusalem, Hebrew Univ. Pr., 1949, 280 p.* Intrigué par le titre de l'article de Lewy et me demandant qui étaient ces I., J. (et Y.) Lewy, je me rendis à la bibliothèque de l'Alliance Israélite Universelle (45, rue de la Bruyère). Le mystère s'éclaira d'un coup : il s'agissait bien de la même personne, Hans Lewy ; quant au « Second Commonwealth », il fallait comprendre le « second Temple ». Outre l'ouvrage en question qui contenait la bibliographie de Lewy établie par Martin Plessner, la bibliothèque possédait les petits écrits de Lewy publiés à Jérusalem en 1960 sous le titre « *'Olamot niḡashim* ».

C'est pour tenter de lever le voile qui dans le milieu philologique occidental entoure la personnalité et les travaux scientifiques de Hans Lewy que j'ai décidé de composer les tables de *Chaldaean Oracles*, de mettre à jour la liste des travaux préparée par Plessner en 1946 et d'écrire une notice biographique. La transcription phonétique et la traduction française des titres des articles et ouvrages de Lewy en hébreu permettront de ne plus invoquer l'ignorance comme refuge. La notice biographique, si succincte soit-elle et tributaire de ce qui a été déjà dit — mais en hébreu — sur Hans Lewy éclairera un tant soit peu le personnage.

L'*Index locorum* reproduit toutes les références aux auteurs anciens utilisés par Lewy. Quantité de renvois erronés ou par trop allusifs ont été corrigés ou précisés par référence à l'édition ordinairement suivie par Lewy. Car il lui arrive de passer d'une édition à une autre, souvent plus récente, sans que les précédents renvois soient corrigés. Également, bien des erreurs proviennent des références de seconde main, recopiées par Lewy et non vérifiées.

A sa décharge, il faut rappeler que l'auteur de ce livre, écrit au milieu des conflits, était éloigné des bibliothèques universitaires de son pays d'origine et isolé de ses collègues européens attachés au même domaine. Lewy a eu à sa disposition une documentation qui n'était à jour que pour les années 20, et c'est par rapport à elle seulement qu'il faut juger son travail. A partir de cette date, elle n'est que fragmentaire.

Lewy signale lui-même les trous de sa documentation : il n'a pu se procurer l'édition Terzaghi de Synésius (*Hymni*, 1939) ni le volume d'hommages offert à Fr. J. Dölger, *Pisciculi* (1939), qui contient l'article de Cumont sur *Les vents et les anges psychopompes* et celui de Hopfner sur *Hekate-Selene-Artemis*.

Le grand article de Sathas sur les commentaires byzantins des poètes grecs, paru dans l'*Annuaire de l'association pour l'encouragement des études grecques en France* (9, 1875, p. 187-222), ne lui a été connu que par les citations qu'en donne Bidez dans les *Mélanges Franz Cumont* et dans le t. VI de la *Collection des Manuscrits Alchimiques Grecs*. Les volumes de la *Bibliotheca Graeca Medii Aevi* de Sathas lui ont été inaccessibles, et il ne pourra que renvoyer aux citations des lettres 187 et 188 de Psellus, que fournit Bidez dans les *Mélanges Franz Cumont*. Il indique p. 230 n 9 que l'*Herbarius* de Delatte ne lui est connu que par le compte rendu de Pfister dans la *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* (1937). Il n'a pas eu accès à la *Revue de Philologie*, où Bidez révélait en 1903 l'existence dans l'*In De caelo* de Simplicius d'un logion inconnu de Kroll. Il n'a pas connu l'édition Sbordone des *Hieroglyphica* d'Horapollon (1936) ni l'édition Erbse de la *Théosophie* (1941). Il n'a pu profiter d'aucune des trois contributions sur les *Oracles chaldaïques* parues en 1942 : L. G. Westerink dans *Mnemosyne*, S. Eitrem dans les *Symbolae Osloenses* et W. Theiler dans les *Schriften der Königsberger Gelehrten Gesellschaft*. Un an avant la mort de Lewy paraissaient le premier volume de la *Révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste* d'A.-J. Festugière et l'édition Terzaghi des *Opuscula* de Synésius (1944) et, deux ans après sa mort, l'article de Dodds sur *Theurgy and its Relationship to Neoplatonism* dans *The Journal of Roman Studies* (1947).

Onze années séparent la mort de Lewy de la publication de son texte par l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale du Caire (1956). Il faudra attendre cinq ans encore pour que *Chaldaean Oracles and Theurgy* soit révélé au monde savant par l'article de Dodds dans *The Harvard Theological Review* (1961) : *New Light on the « Chaldaean Oracles »*. C'est par cet article de Dodds que l'*Année Philologique* (32, 1961, p. 138) apprend l'existence du livre de Lewy, c'est-à-dire sept ans (puisque le t. 32 de l'*Année Philologique* n'a été publié qu'en 1963) après sa parution, soit presque vingt ans après avoir été annoncé « à paraître » par Martin Plessner ! L'article de Dodds demeure aujourd'hui le seul compte rendu critique écrit sur *Chaldaean Oracles and Theurgy*, et il était normal d'associer à la réimpression du Lewy les quelques pages qui l'ont sorti de l'oubli.

Lewy n'était plus là pour surveiller l'impression de son livre. Kraus non plus. Bien des erreurs auraient pu tout de même être évitées lors de la correction des épreuves. L'avocat Walter Zander, alors membre du bureau de la Société londonienne des Amis de l'Université hébraïque de Jérusalem et commissionnaire de cette dernière auprès de l'Institut Français du Caire, ne put se charger efficacement de la tâche. De là un nombre incalculable de fautes dans les références, les citations, les abréviations — qui changent



d'une page à l'autre —, les renvois — tout le système de correspondances d'une note à l'autre est quasiment inutilisable —, l'orthographe des noms propres, la typographie. Donner aujourd'hui un livre lisible eût nécessité une recomposition du texte. Outre le coût de l'opération, il eût fallu tenir compte des travaux que Lewy ignorait, écrits avant lui ou après. Comment aurait-il réagi à ces analyses nouvelles ? Bref, recomposer le Lewy eût été le récrire. Qui d'autre que Lewy eût pu s'acquitter de cette tâche ? La présente réimpression n'est donc qu'un pis-aller. Reconnaissons-lui néanmoins le mérite de permettre, de cette étude depuis longtemps non disponible et qui en dépit du caractère caduc de nombre de ses analyses (essentiellement chap. I et VII) reste de première importance, une consultation grandement facilitée par les multiples index qui la complètent. De la sorte, corriger tout le système de renvois d'une note à l'autre ne s'imposait plus. La table des *errata* fournit les fautes relevées (470 environ) lors de ma fréquentation du volume, mais elle est loin d'être exhaustive. La contribution de Pierre Hadot (*Bilan et perspectives sur les Oracles chaldaïques*) apporte de précieuses informations de bibliographie critique et ouvre les voies de la recherche de demain.

La table des thèmes (*index rerum*) et celle des auteurs modernes feront connaître au lecteur l'étonnante variété des questions abordées par Hans Lewy et l'étendue de son information. La *concordance* s'appuie sur la numérotation des fragments par les pages et les lignes de l'édition de Kroll ; citations et paraphrases des *Oracles chaldaïques* (= « theologi », « dii », « dii responsantes », « theologorum famae »), provenant de la fin du livre VII de l'*In Parmenidem* de Proclus, sont signalées dans la colonne Theiler, puisqu'en cette matière il fut l'informateur des deux éditeurs R. Klibansky et C. Labowsky. Dans l'*index verborum*, j'ai pris soin de répertorier tous les mots grecs et latins, y compris pour les *Oracles chaldaïques* prépositions et particules, qui remplissent les notes de Lewy. Les termes proprement chaldaïques ou utilisés dans les logia sont indiqués à l'aide d'un astérisque, ainsi que cela est précisé dans la note liminaire de l'index. Ce système de repérage a l'avantage de ne pas isoler, tout en les distinguant, vocabulaire chaldaïque et terminologie des interprètes, texte et paraphrase.

Pour que ce dernier index fût à jour, il a fallu y intégrer les mots provenant de fragments qui ont échappé à Lewy (I) ou qui ont été découverts après lui (II). En voici la liste :

## I

πῦρ πρῶτον καὶ πῦρ ἕτερον σπεύδοντα μιγῆναι

hexamètre cité par Simplicius, *In Arist. De caelo*, p. 375, 19 Heiberg, identifié par J. Bidez, *Revue de Philologie* 27 (1903) p. 80 et aussi — mais en ignorant le précédent — par A.-J. Festugière, *Symbolae Osloenses* 26 (1948) p. 75-77.

Dans l'*index verborum*, signalé par le sigle : B.\*\*

## II

## 1

... πάμμορφον ἄγαλμα...

fragment cité par Olympiodore, *In Alc.*, p. 125, 23-24 Westerink (Amsterdam 1956).

Dans l'*index verborum*, signalé par le sigle : Wk.\*\*

## 2

ψυχαι ἀρηϊφατοι καθαρῶτεραι ἢ ἐνὶ νοῦσοις

vers attribué à Héraclite dans une glose d'Aréthas à Épictète IV 7, 27 ; identifié par M. L. West (*Classical Review* N. S. 18, 1968, p. 257-258) comme appartenant à l'oracle cité par Psellus, *Comm.*, 1141 B (= 61 n 3 Kr. et 205 n 122 Lewy).

Dans l'*index verborum*, signalé par le sigle : W.\*\*

## 3

ψυχαιὸν σπινθήρα δυσὶν κεράσας ὁμοιοίαις,  
νῶ καὶ πνεύματι θεῖῳ, ἐφ' οἷς τρίτον ἀγνὸν ἔρωτα  
συνδετικὸν πάντων ἐπιβήτορα σεμνὸν ἔθηκεν.

logion *περὶ ψυχῆς* provenant des scholies du Ms. E d'Aristote (*Paris. gr.* 1853), fol. 312 r° ; découvert et publié par P. Moraux (*Scriptorium* 21, 1967, p. 26) ; identifié par H.D. Saffrey (*Revue de Philologie* 95, 1969, p. 61) comme étant l'oracle cité par Lydus I 11 (= 26, 5-7 Kr. et 179 n 8 Lewy). La leçon πνεύματι du v. 2 confirme la conjecture de Kroll 26, 6. Oracle commenté par M. Tardieu, *REAug* 21 (1975) p. 243-249.

Dans l'*index verborum*, signalé seulement s. v. πνεῦμα par le sigle : MS.\*\*

4

μηδ' ἐπι μισοφαῖ κόσμον σπεύδειν λάβρον ὕλης  
 ἔνθα φόνος στάσιές τε καὶ ἀργαλέων φύσις ἀτμῶν  
 αὐχμηραὶ τε νόσοι καὶ σήψιες ἔργα τε βευστά·  
 ταῦτα χρεῶ φεύγειν τὸν ἔρᾶν μέλλοντα πατρὸς νοῦ.

quatre hexamètres entièrement nouveaux provenant des scholies du Ms. E d'Aristote (*Paris. gr.* 1853) ; découverts, édités et reconnus chaldaïques par H. D. Saffrey (*Revue de Philologie* 95, 1969, p. 64) à partir des citations du v. 1 chez Proclus, *In Tim.*, III, p. 325, 31-32 Diehl (= 63, 24-25 Kr. et 302 n 68 Lewy).

Dans l'*index verborum*, signalés par le sigle : S.\*\*

5

ὄντες γὰρ χθόνιοι χαλεποὶ κύνες εἰσιν ἀναιδεῖς  
 καὶ ψυχὰς θέλγοντες ἀεὶ τελετῶν ἀπάγουσιν.

logion sur les démons maléfiques provenant des scholies du Ms. E d'Aristote (*Paris. gr.* 1853), fol. 68 r° ; découvert, édité et identifié par H. D. Saffrey (*Revue de Philologie* 95, 1969, p. 67-68) comme appartenant à l'oracle transmis par Proclus, *In Alc.*, p. 18, 2-7 Westerink (= 55, 27-32 Kr. ; 228 n 1a et 264 n 15 Lewy), qui cite le v. 2 et l'hexamètre précédant le v. 1.

Dans l'*index verborum*, signalé par le sigle : S.\*\*

6

πάντας γὰρ συνέχων αὐτὸς πᾶς ἔξω ὑπάρχει.

hexamètre cité par Proclus, *Theol. Plat.*, IV, p. 212, 46-48 Portus (= 42, 25-27 Kr. et 129 n 240 Lewy). Kroll n'a intégré aux *Oracles* que le second hémistiche. La lecture πάντας que donne le manuscrit, au lieu de πάντα (Portus), permet d'obtenir un vers complet. Quelques lignes plus loin, le verbe κλείσας (p. 212, 51 Portus) est une allusion au fragment 12, 11 Kr. Ces renseignements m'ont été fournis par H. D. Saffrey et L. G. Westerink.

Dans l'*index verborum*, signalé par le sigle SWk.\*\*

Au terme de cette préface, il m'est agréable de remercier ceux qui d'une façon ou d'une autre m'ont apporté leur concours : Prof. E. R. Dodds, Oxford ; G. Folliet, Directeur de l'Institut des Études Augustiniennes, Paris ; Mme M. Hadas-Lebel, maître-assistant à l'I.N.L.C.O., Paris ; Prof. P. Hadot, Paris ; Prof. G. MacRae, Harvard, ainsi que la Direction de la *Harvard Theological Review* ; Dr. M. Nadav, Head, Department of Manuscripts and Archives, The Jewish National and University Library, Jerusalem ; H. D.

Saffrey, Maître de recherche au C.N.R.S., Paris ; Prof. G. G. Scholem, Jérusalem ; G. G. Stroumsa, Université hébraïque de Jérusalem ; Dr. P. Tishby, Head Librarian, The Jewish National and University Library, Jerusalem ; Mrs. R. Tronik, The Jewish National and University Library, Jerusalem ; J. Vercoutter, Directeur de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale, Le Caire. A tous, j'adresse l'expression de mes hommages reconnaissants.

## Errata

Le premier chiffre renvoie aux pages ; n = note ; le chiffre qui suit la virgule renvoie aux lignes.

- xxiii, 18 — **HIEROCLIS**,  
lire : **HIEROCLIS**
- xxiii, 28 — *mitgave*  
lire : *uitgave*
- xxiv, 23 — *circam*  
lire : *circa*
- xxiv, 26 — 18  
lire : 19
- xxv, 8 — Nurenberg  
lire : Nürnberg
- xxvi, 4 — 447-449  
lire : 447-479
- 3 n 1, 4 — δ'ἐπὼν  
lire : δι'ἐπὼν
- 3 n 1, 5 — 434  
lire : 2
- 3 n 1, 12 — Michel PSELLUS, *Catalogue...*  
lire : *Michel Psellus. Catalogue...*
- 4 n 2, 1 — διψει ποτὲ καμόντων  
lire : δίψει ποτὲ καμόντων
- 4 n 2, 2 — Ῥωμαίων  
lire : Ῥωμαίων
- 5 n 5, 2 — *Mithrasiturgie*  
lire : *Mithrasiturgie*
- 6, 21 — second  
lire : first
- 6 n 10, 3 — χρησμοφδια  
lire : χρησμοφδια
- 7 n 14, 1 — II, 10  
ajouter : p. 90, 12-14
- 9 n 24, 7 — 13  
lire : 14
- 11 n 26, 19 — IV 436  
lire : VIII 75 (= IV 436)
- 11 n 26, 25 — *abl. instr.*  
lire : *dat. instr.*
- 11 n 26, 28 — ἄπ. λεγ.  
lire : *Hapax leg.*
- 12 n 26, 5 — σοι  
lire : σοί
- 12 n 27, 1 — (after Thilo)  
lire : after Thilo
- 12 n 27, 5 — 181  
lire : 192
- 15 n 34, 1 — 44  
lire : 34
- 16 n 41, 10 — Hieronymus  
lire : Jerome
- 17 n 44, 1 — IV, I, 1  
lire : IV, 1, 1
- 19, 21 — *Buresch*  
lire : Buresch
- 19, 22 — *Piccolo*  
lire : Piccolo
- 19, 24 — *Lactant.*  
lire : Lactant.
- 20 n 46, 2 — 191  
lire : 119
- 26 n 67, 11 — Nurenberg  
lire : Nürnberg

- 33 n 92, 2 — *Carm. Epigr.* 228, 7  
lire : *Epigr. Gr.* 228, 7-8
- 33 n 92, 3 — ΡΗΟΔΕ  
lire : ΡΟΗΔΕ
- 36 n 104, 2 — ὕμνος  
lire : ὕμνος
- 37 n 110, 1 — *Orphic. Fr.*  
ajouter : No. 59 (4)
- 37 n 110, 4 — 378  
lire : 318
- 39 n 116, 2 — θεῶν,  
lire : θεῶν
- 40 n 121, 2 — Σινδόνοϛ  
lire : Σινδόνοϛ
- 41 n 126, 5 — 248, 8  
lire : 249, 8
- 41 n 126, 6 — CL  
ajouter : 1552 B
- 42 n 130 — 29  
lire : 29\*
- 42 n 132, 2 — ναθρός  
lire : ναθρός
- 42 n 132, 2 — MSS.,  
lire : MSS.
- 46 r 145, 1 — 9  
lire : 9, 414 E
- 46 n 147, 3  
lire : J. R. Harris and A. Mingana
- 47 n 148, 1 — chap. 9  
ajouter : (p. 127, 3-4 Geff.)
- 48 n 152, 1 — 71  
lire : 7, 1
- 49 n 156, 3 — 277 B  
lire : 277, B
- 49 n 158, 7 — F. 101, 9, F., *Parm.*  
lire : f. 101, 9 f. *Alc.*
- 52 n 163, 8 — *Graek.*  
lire : *Graec.*
- 52 n 163, 9 — SPENGL  
lire : Spengel
- 53 n 165, 1 — 201 ed. ; Reichardt  
lire : 201 ed. Reichardt
- 53 n 165, 2 — 505  
ajouter : No. 201-202
- 53 n 165, 7 — εἰμαρμένην  
lire : εἰμαρμένην
- 53 n 166, 4 — Ἄλκῆ  
lire : Ἄλκῆ
- 55 n 172, 3 — 28  
lire : 28\*
- 55 n 174, 2 — 51  
lire : 52
- 56 n 177, 2 — παρέδοσαν  
lire : παρέδοσαν
- 59 n 186, 5 — ἀναγκαίης  
lire : ἀναγκαίης
- 59 n 186, 22 — word  
lire : words
- 63 n 202, 2 — Timotheus  
lire : Theophilus
- 68, 13 — volumes  
lire : books
- 68 n 3, 2 — Dodds'  
lire : Dodds'
- 68 n 7, 3 — 1 2, p. 5, 8  
lire : I 2, p. 5, 8
- 69 n 8, 4 — p. 55  
lire : p. 53
- 69 n 9, 5 — 182  
lire : 18, 2
- 70 n 10, 3 — refuted  
lire : contradicted
- 70 n 12, 4 — εἰκῆ  
lire : εἰκῆ
- 70 n 14, 2 — θεολογίας  
lire : θεολογίας
- 71 n 14, 1 — Diehls  
lire : Diels
- 72 n 25, 1 — *principiis*  
lire : *principiis*
- 73, 9 — Sinesius  
lire : Synesius
- 73 n 28, 6 — 67 f.  
ajouter : p. 478 A-B Mullach
- 74 n 31, 4 — 1915  
lire : 1939
- 77 n 38, 1 — *Hyp.* 1, 1  
lire : *Hyp.* 1
- 77 n 39, 3 — revolving  
lire : revolving
- 77 n 43, 2 — *Hyp.* 6-9  
ajouter : p. 74, 4-20
- 77 n 43, 2 — *Mich. Ital.*  
lire : *Mich. Ital.*
- 78 n 43, 1 — ἐναίος ἐστι  
lire : ἐναίος ἐστι
- 78 n 45, 3 — ἐῆ  
lire : ἐῆ
- 78 n 45, 18 — goes  
lire : which goes

- 79 n 47, 3 — « Father  
lire : « Father »
- 79 n 47, 7 — note 181  
lire : notes 54, 181 and 164
- 79 n 48, 3 — 321, 3  
lire : 321, 2-4
- 80 n 49 (10) — τέλειν  
lire : θέλειν
- 81 n 54, 5 — δοκιμάζουσι  
lire : δογματίζουσι
- 81 n 55, 1 — *et passim*  
lire : *et passim*
- 82 n 58, 3 — ἀφειλίκτων  
lire : ἀμειλίκτων
- 82 n 58, 4 — 200  
lire : 201
- 82 n 59, 8 — IV, 69  
lire : IV, 63
- 83 n 62, 8 — ἐμπλήσας  
lire : /ἐμπλήσας
- 83 n 62, 9 — ἀλκὴν  
lire : /ἀλκὴν
- 83 n 64, 2 — ζωογόνος  
lire : /ζωογόνος
- 83 n 64, 3 — ἦτε  
lire : /ἦτε
- 84 n 65, 3 — τε.  
lire : τε/
- 84 n 65, 4 — δεξαμένη  
lire : /δεξαμένη
- 84 n 65, 5 — Proclus ambiguous language  
lire : the Proclus' ambiguous language
- 84 n 66, 2 — θεός  
lire : θεός
- 84 n 66, 4 — V. c. 11 ff.  
lire : V. c. 11, p. 265, 28 ff.
- 84 n 66, 7 — V, c. 32  
ajouter : p. 316, 17 ff.
- 84 n 66, 10  
lire : PROCLUS, *Tim.*, III 248, 13  
as πηγαία ψυχή, III 271, 23 as  
πηγαία φύσις
- 85 n 69, 3 — ζωογόνου  
ajouter : φωτός
- 85 n 70, 1 — *Tim.* 11  
lire : *Tim.* II
- 85 n 70, 4 — προσεύρηκε  
lire : προσείρηκε
- 86 n 74, 1 — 18  
lire : 28
- 86 n 74, 2 — θεοιο  
lire : θεοῦ
- 86 n 74, 7 — I, V, 17  
lire : I, v. 17
- 86 n 74, 8 — V, 47  
lire : v. 47
- 86 n 74, 11 — ἀλκή  
lire : ἀλκή
- 86 n 75, 7 — 210  
lire : 211
- 87 n 77, 1 — περιθαλπής  
lire : πυριθαλπής .
- 88, 6 — these  
lire : these
- 88 n 83, 4 — πολλή  
lire : /πολλή
- 88 n 83, 5 — ἄρδην  
lire : /ἄρδην
- 90 n 91, 5 — *Hyp.*  
ajouter : 8
- 90 n 95, 1 — ὄφρων  
lire : ὄφρων
- 91 n 96, 1 — *Epist.* 187  
ajouter : p. 474, 17-20 Sathas
- 91 n 96, 1 — *C.M.M.G.*  
lire : *C.M.A.G.*
- 91 n 97, 2 — εἰλωμενον  
lire : εἰλωμένον
- 91 n 99, 1 — 36, 3  
lire : 36 E 3
- 92 n 102, 2 — n. 167  
lire : n. 266
- 92 n 106, 1 — 161  
lire : 101
- 93 n 111, 2 — θεός  
lire : θεός
- 93 n 111, 3 — ἀμφιφαής  
lire : ἀμφιφάης
- 94 n 111, 3 — *Vit. Num.* 19.  
lire : *Vit. Num.* 19, 72 F
- 94 n 112, 2 — 172  
lire : chap. III, n. 144
- 94 n 116, 2 — κούρο  
lire : κούρα
- 95 n 118, 1 — 324, 3  
lire : 324, 8
- 95 n 118, 4 — θέη  
lire : θεή
- 95 n 119, 5 — *Fragm.*  
ajouter : No. 188

- 95 n 121, 4 — *Refr.*  
lire : *Refut.*
- 95 n 122, 5 — V  
lire : v
- 96 n 126, 1 — παντων  
lire : παντων
- 96 n 126, 2 — 90  
lire : 91
- 96 n 126, 4 — οδρανός  
lire : /οδρανός
- 96 n 126, 5 — και  
lire : /και
- 97 n 130, 4 — εἰσιν  
lire : εἰσιν
- 99 n 137, 7 — ζωῆ  
lire : ζωῆ
- 99 n 138, 6 — και τὸ δινειν  
lire : και δινειν
- 99 n 138, 16 — ἡ δύο  
lire : /ἡ δύο
- 100 n 138, 3 — Kroll  
lire : Kroll,
- 100 n 138, 4 — Scheider  
lire : Schneider
- 100 n 138, 6 — αἰει  
lire : αἰει
- 100 n 143, 1 — faculties  
lire : faculty
- 101 n 149, 3 — εἶναι  
lire : εἶναι
- 102 n 150, 5 — ζωνων  
lire : ζωνων
- 102 n 151, 3 — κυκλοελεκταν  
lire : κυκλοελεκτον
- 102 n 151, 10 — αυτων  
lire : αυτων
- 103 n 152, 16 — 12-19  
ajouter : p. 74, 24-75, 10
- 103 n 153, 5 — 11, 1  
ajouter : 283 B 27-28
- 103 n 154, 7 — χορος  
lire : χορος
- 104 n 158, 3 — εικω  
lire : εικω
- 105, 6 — Adion  
lire : Aion
- 105 n 163, 9 — εννεας  
lire : εννεας
- 105 n 163, 12 — πατρικόν  
lire : πατρικόν
- 105 n 163, 15 — 24  
lire : 24
- 106 n 164, 3 — 27, 14  
lire : 271, 15-17
- 106 n 164, 6 — μούναδα  
lire : μουνάδα
- 106 n 164, 7 — άναιρεις  
lire : άναιρειν
- 106 n 165, 16 — ερον  
lire : εργον
- 106 n 165, 17 — No. 11  
lire : No. 10
- 107 n 170, 2 — οδσης  
lire : /οδσης
- 108 n 172, 1 — 386, 29 f.  
lire : 386, 31-32
- 108 n 173, 3 — σφρα  
lire : σφρα
- 108 n 173, 9 — KERN, *Orphic. Fragm.*,  
310  
lire : P. Couvreur, *ad loc. cit.*
- 109 n 174, 4-7  
lire : THEO SMYRN., p. 46, 15  
and 100, 14 Hiller; PORPH.,  
*Vit. Pyth.*, 51; (IAMBlich.),  
*Theol. Arithm.*, p. 17, 4 de  
Falco; *Theos.*, No. 64; PHOTIUS,  
143 b 19; MARTIAN. CAPELLA,  
VII, 733 (whose source is Varro).
- 109 n 175, 2 — 11  
lire : 10
- 110 n 177, 12 — σμήνεσσι  
lire : σμήνεσιν
- 110 n 177, 22 — *corr.*,  
lire : *corr.*
- 111 n 177, 8 — Poimander  
lire : Poimandres
- 111 n 177, 18 — στρέπτουσαι  
lire : στράπτουσαι
- 111 n 177, 19 — 209  
lire : 260
- 111 n 178, 8 — πηγαι  
lire : πηγαι
- 112 n 181, 1 — 1140  
ajouter : C
- 112 n 181, 2 — δευτερω  
lire : /δευτέρω
- 112 n 181, 9 — 194, 31  
lire : 194, 32
- 112 n 181, 12 — ε  
lire : ε



- 113 n 184, 1 — πῶρ  
lire : /πῶρ
- 113 n 184, 2 — ἔργοις  
lire : /ἔργοις
- 113 n 184, 2 — τεχνίτης  
lire : /τεχνίτης
- 114 n 187, 11 — 12 (p. 74, 13)  
lire : 9 (p. 74, 17-19)
- 115 n 190, 2 — αἰσθητοῖς  
lire : /αἰσθητοῖς
- 116 n 192, 3 — 28  
ajouter : p. 76, 2-4
- 117 n 198, 2 — ἦ  
lire : ἦ
- 118 n 200, 6 — κοιλάμασιν  
lire : κοιλάμασι
- 118 n 200, 9 — 172, 10  
lire : 172, 11
- 118 n 200, 10 — ἀποθρόσκει  
lire : ἀποθρόσκει
- 119 n 202, 4 — αἰθρης  
lire : αἰθρης
- 120 n 204, 3 — 146  
lire : 147
- 123 n 218, 16 — οὖτω  
lire : οὖτω
- 124 n 221 b, 11 — movers  
lire : movers
- 124 n 221 c, 6 — ὕδωρ  
lire : ὕδωρ
- 124 n 221 c, 7  
ajouter : Kroll 34 (Damascius II 128, 3)
- 125 n 225, 4 — σώματος  
lire : /σώματος
- 127 n 233, 3 — ἐσσάμενος  
lire : /ἐσσάμενος
- 127 n 233, 3 — πηγαίους  
lire : /πηγαίους
- 128 n 236, 2 — αἰτίας  
lire : αἰτίας
- 129, 5 — συνοχεις  
lire : συνοχεις
- 131 n 247, 3 — αἶ  
lire : αἶ
- 131 n 277, 3 — ἔγκεράσας  
lire : /ἔγκεράσας
- 132 n 247, 1 — προστηρίδι  
lire : προστηρίδι
- 132 n 247, 3 — 205, 45  
lire : 205, 43-46
- 132 n 249, 2 — νοέουσιν  
lire : νοέουσι
- 132 n 249, 7 — αἶγε  
lire : αἶ γε
- 133 n 255, 1 — νοητ ς  
lire : νοητάς
- 134 n 256, 2 — thought  
lire : taught
- 135 n 259, 3 — καντι  
lire : παντι
- 135 n 260, 11 — ὀλκῆς  
lire : ὀλκοῖς
- 137 n 267, 8 — ὑπερδρόμεναι  
lire : ὑπερδρόμενοι
- 138 n 271, 6 — 215, 17  
lire : 252, 17
- 139 n 274, 6 — 190  
lire : 192
- 141 n 280, 10 — πατήρ  
lire : πατήρ
- 142 n 283, 2 — 265, 45  
lire : 265, 46-47
- 142 n 283, 3 — 6, 7 (quoted n. 270)  
lire : 6, p. 74, 4 (quoted n. 271)
- 143 n 287, 1 — ἀπλετος  
lire : ἀπλετος
- 143 n 287, 10 — αἰθρης  
lire : αἰθρης
- 143 n 288, 3 — ἀερότοιμος  
lire : ἀερότεμις
- 144 n 289, 5 — *Sokrates* 1919  
lire : *Sokrates*, N.F. VII (1919)
- 144 n 291, 2 — ἔρως  
lire : ἔρως
- 145 n 291 e, 4 — *Parm.*  
lire : *Alc.*
- 145 n 291 f — 193, 15  
lire : 193, 13-14
- 146 n 295, 9-10 — I, chap. 25  
lire : I, c. 25, p. 61, 44
- 147 n 296, 4 — τρεφέτω πυρήοχος  
lire : τρεφέτω σε πυρήοχος
- 151 n 312, 8 — δια κόσμου  
lire : διακόσμου
- 155 n 333, 2-3 — 320, 1 ff.  
lire : 220, 1-24
- 155 n 333, 4 — IV chap. 9  
ajouter : p. 193, 3-6
- 155 n 334, 1 — οἱ ... συνοχεῦσι  
lire : « οἱ ... συνοχεῦσι »

- 159 n 349 — 64  
lire : 65
- 160 n 353, 1 — *υπερουράνιον*  
lire : *υπερουράνιον*
- 163 n 367, 1 — *Gadara*  
lire : *Gerasa*
- 169 n 384, 2 — 18  
lire : 19
- 169 n 385, 2 — 138  
lire : 139
- 169 n 388, 2 — *αρδην*  
lire : */αρδην*
- 172 n 402, 4 — *μέλανι*  
lire : *μελαναυγεί*
- 173 n 403, 12 — *ψυχή*  
lire : *ψυχή*
- 177 n 3d, 1 — *Julian*  
ajouter : (*Or.*, V 180 B)
- 178 n 4, 5 — 1129, 1  
lire : 1132 C
- 180, 10 — *Oracle*  
ajouter : (*Kr.* 52)
- 181 n 22, 2 — 14  
lire : 17
- 181 n 22, 5 — *εγκατέθηκεν*  
lire : *εγκατέθηκε*
- 188 n 42, 6 — *Phaedr.*  
lire : *Phaedo*
- 188 n 42, 1 — *εδμενοίς*  
lire : *εδμενείς*
- 188 n 42, 2 — *Γλαω*  
lire : *Γλαφ*
- 189 n 45, 9 — *τελαστικῶν*  
lire : *τελεστικῶν*
- 189 n 45, 30 — 527  
lire : 574-575
- 191 n 55, 16 — *expression*  
lire : *expressions*
- 195 n 75, 4 — 69  
lire : 59
- 196, 2 — *Appollo*  
lire : *Apollo*
- 196 n 81, 6 — 167  
lire : 168
- 198 n 88, 3 —  $\langle \kappa \rangle$   
lire :  $\langle \kappa^* \rangle$
- 200 n 100, 2 — I  
lire : I 4
- 201 n 105 — 404-406  
lire : 406-407
- 203, 4 — *notice*  
lire : *noetic*
- 204 n 115, 3 — n. 51  
lire : n. 52
- 204 n 116, 1 — *quoted*  
ajouter : p. 203, n. 114
- 205 n 118, 3 — *πραγματείαν*  
lire : *πραγματείας*
- 205 n 119, 3 — *προείληφεν*  
lire : *προείληφεν*
- 206 n 125, 7 — 5, 10,  
lire : 5, 10.
- 207 n 127, 4 — *δειλοιο*  
lire : *δειλοιο*
- 209 n 137, 1 — *Himmelsreisen*  
lire : *Himmelsreise*
- 211 n 140, 5 — p. 107 M  
lire : p. 107, 23 M.
- 212 n 142, 7 — X, 124  
lire : X, 105
- 212 n 143, 1 — 189  
lire : 187
- 213 n 144, 7 — 447, 7  
lire : 447, 6-8
- 214, 16 — *salvation* \*  
lire : \* *salvation* \*
- 215 n 156, 3 — *Vit. Romuli*, 28  
lire : *Vit. Romuli* 28, 35 C-36 B
- 216, 2 — *Neoplatonists*  
lire : *Neoplatonists*
- 216 n 157, 10 — *Gai.*  
lire : *Cai.*
- 217 n 162, 2 — *Oracular*  
lire : *Oracular*
- 218 n 167, 4 — 219  
lire : 219 A
- 219 n 171 — 150  
lire : 144
- 221 n 178, 6 — *Elysia*  
lire : *Elysias*
- 221 n 179, 1 — 178  
lire : 179
- 221 n 179, 3 — 1192 B  
lire : 1129 B
- 222, 6 — *word*  
lire : *world*
- 227, 10 — *operation*  
lire : *operations*
- 230 n 9, 1 — c. 7 (p. 43, 1 f.,  
lire : p. 43, 1-17

- 231 n 9, 8 — Χωρός τε  
lire : Χῶρος τε
- 231 n 9, 17 — Nicetas (ΜΙΓΝΞ, P. G., XXXVIII, 632 B)  
lire : Nicetas (*Scholium in Gregorii Nazianzeni Orationem XLV*, P. G. 36, 632 B),
- 231 n 12, 3 — δὰ πυρός  
lire : διὰ πυρός
- 233 n 20, 4 — σκηνοίς  
lire : σηκοίς
- 234 n 27, 4 — VIII, 2  
ajouter : p. 262, 7
- 234 n 28, 1 — Rp.,  
ajouter : II
- 238 n 41, 8 — p. 307  
lire : No 300 (29) p. 315
- 238 n 41, 11 — 55 f.  
lire : 55, col 577 C - 580 A
- 240 n 52, 2 — παραδέδοκεν  
lire : παραδέδωκεν
- 240 n 52, 9 — ἴππον  
lire : ἵππον
- 241 n 53, 10 — XLI  
lire : XLV
- 242 n 56, 1 — II, 3  
ajouter : p. 70, 9-10
- 243, 7 — vanguard  
lire : vanguard
- 244 n 63, 3 — σκιρτηδόν  
lire : σκιρτηδόν
- 244 n 63, 6 — 59  
lire : 57
- 246 n 67, 5 — BURCHKARDT  
lire : BURCHHARDT
- 246 n 68, 2 — τοῦς  
lire : τοῦς
- 248 n 72, 2 — ἑτέρά τε  
lire : ἑτερὰ τε
- 248 n 76, 2-3 — Boissevain  
lire : Boissonade
- 248 n 72, 4 — Ῥωμαϊκῶν  
lire : Ῥωμαϊκῶν
- 248 n 76, 5 — 55 f.  
lire : 55, col. 577 C - 580 A
- 250 n 83, 5 — θερῖνοι  
lire : θερῖνοί
- 252 n 92, 6 — 12  
lire : 13
- 253 n 94, 4 — Ἀγαυῆς  
lire : Ἀγαυῆς
- 255 n 98, 6 — σιγ΄  
lire : σιγ΄
- 255 n 98, 7 — *Kore Kosmou*  
ajouter : 44
- 256 n 100, 1 — magic  
lire : mantic
- 257 n 107  
lire : III, 27 (p. 164, 10 ff.) ;  
28 (168, 11 ff.) ; 31 (p. 178, 16-18)  
... ; X, 5 (p. 290, 6 ff.)
- 259 n 2, 3 — ἀπόλλυσθαι  
ajouter : \*
- 260 n 4, 1 — p. 30 Boiss. —  
lire : p. 30, 8 Boiss.
- 260 n 4, 5 — 144  
lire : 138
- 262 n 10a, 2 — ὑπερβάθμιον  
lire : ὑπερβάθμιον
- 262 n 10b, 2 — ῥιπτῶν  
lire : ριπτῶν
- 262 n 10c, 1 — *Theael.*  
lire : *Craf.*
- 262 n 10c, 2 — ὑπέρ  
lire : ὑπέρ
- 262 n 10d, 2 — ἤρξαντα  
lire : ἤρξαντο
- 263 n 11, 5 — κενέας  
lire : κενεάς
- 263 n 14, 2 — εἶναι  
lire : εἶναι
- 264 n 14, 2 — 1030 f.  
lire : 1030 F
- 265 n 18, 1 — 193, 22  
lire : 193, 24
- 265 n 19, 2 — ἀγγεῖον  
lire : ἀγγεῖον
- 265 n 19, 13 — εἰκῆσουσι  
lire : οἰκῆσουσι
- 268 n 30, 1 — 32  
lire : 23
- 270 n 38, 1 — 55  
lire : 55, col. 577 C - 580 A
- 271 n 41, 10 — *Hyp.*,  
ajouter : 23
- 272 n 48 — 129  
lire : 126
- 273, 12 — points.  
lire : points :
- 273, 13 — The true gods  
lire : 1) The true gods

- 274, 2 — The evil spirits  
lire : 2) The evil spirits
- 274, 3 — The theurgists  
lire : 3) The theurgists
- 274, 6 — The impious  
lire : 4) The impious
- 274, 9 — If  
lire : 5) If
- 274, 12 — Their passions  
lire : 6) Their passions
- 274, 14 — The magical operations  
lire : 7) The magical operations
- 274 n 57, 2 — 93  
lire : 94
- 275, 1 — On the contrary  
lire : 8) On the contrary
- 275, 5 — Thus theurgy  
lire : 9) Thus theurgy
- 275, 9 — activity.  
lire : activity.-
- 277 n 72, 1 — *ρότιον ... ρότιος*  
lire : *ρόθιον ... ρόθιος*
- 277 n 72, 2 — 386  
lire : 387
- 277 n 76, 1 — *προνοοῦντ*  
lire : *προνοοῦντα*
- 277 n 76, 2 — *βαπτ σθεῖσα*  
lire : *βαπτισθεῖσαι*
- 277 n 77, 3 — Festugières  
lire : Festugière
- 278 n 81, 4 — 193, 19  
lire : 193, 18-19
- 281 n 89, 9 — *τάταρος*  
lire : *τάρταρος*
- 282 n 92, 4 — *Ἄιδης*  
lire : *Ἄιδης*
- 283 n 94, 8 — LVIII  
lire : CLVIII
- 284 n 96, 2 — 28  
ajouter : 943 E
- 284 n 97, 3 — 25  
lire : 24
- 286 n 106, 5-6 — ... concederent \*.  
lire : ... concederent \* (Regr. p. 29\*, 16-20).
- 287 n 109, 6 — *Ἀπουλήιος*  
lire : *Ἀπουλήιος*
- 287 n 109, 18 — *ἐξησκημμένα*  
lire : *ἐξησκημμένα*
- 287 n 109, 21 — Emperor  
lire : Caesar
- 290 n 117, 3 — *Mani*  
lire : *Meni*
- 290 n 117, 6 — *zori*  
lire : *gori*
- 290 n 121, 2 — p. 35, 11 —  
lire : p. 35, 8-12
- 290 n 121, 3-4 — *ἀντιπαθείαις ἢ*  
intercaler : *ἐκτροπιάζοντες*
- 291 n 122, 2 — *τελεσιουργικά*  
lire : *τελεσιουργικά*
- 291 n 126, 1  
lire : Psellus in SATHAS, *Mes. Bibl.*, t. V, p. 478, 8 f. (Bidez, *Mél. Cumont*, I, p. 98, n. 6)
- 291 n 126, 2 — *κατεσκεύεζεν*  
lire : *κατεκεύαζεν*
- 292 n 126, 2 — *ὄφιστησεν*  
lire : *ὄφιστησιν*
- 293 n 131, 1-2 — ADLER ... KRÄHE  
lire : Adler ... Krähe
- 293 n 132, 3 — *ξιφος*  
lire : *ξίφος*
- 294 n 133, 1 — *Μη<δε>*  
lire : *Μη<δὲ>*
- 294 n 133, 3 — *βαθμῖδος*  
lire : *βαθμῖδος*
- 294 n 135, 3 :  
lire : *Hymn. Hom. ad Martem*, 7 (quoted by Kroll) *ἑπταπόροις ἐνὶ τείρεσιν*
- 294 n 136, 6 — *νενευκένα*  
lire : *νενευκέναι*
- 295 n 136, 16 — *τῆτ*  
lire : *τῆς*
- 296 n 138, 5  
lire : *De operat. daem.*, p. 15, 25-26 ; 18, 2. 6. 12 ; 21, 19 ; 30, 12 Boiss.
- 296 n 139, 4 — 84  
lire : 83
- 296 n 139, 9 — *βυθόν*  
lire : *βυθόν*
- 296 n 140, 2 — *De deo Plat.*  
lire : *De Plat.*, I, 5 (p. 87, 2 Thomes)
- 296 n 141, 2 — *εἰδός τι*  
lire : *εἰδός τι*
- 298 n 149, 3 — *βυός*  
lire : *βυθός*
- 299 n 154, 4 — *Fragm.*  
ajouter : No. 3

- 302 n 168, 3 — σκόλια  
lire : σκολιά
- 303 n 170, 2 — σκυλίοισι  
lire : σκολίοισι
- 308 n 186, 7 — p. 16, 2  
lire : p. 16, 2-5
- 318 n 21, 2 — αἰθητοῖς  
lire : αἰσθητοῖς
- 319 n 25, 2 — δστις  
lire : δστις
- 319 n 25, 2 — αὐτό ὄν »  
lire : « αὐτό ὄν »
- 324 n 41, 2  
lire : ΒΡΕΝΙΕΡ, *Plotin. Ennéades*,  
t. I, p. 19, n 5
- 326 n 51, 2 — Antonius  
lire : Antoninus
- 327 n 55, 2 — χωριζειν  
lire : χωρίζειν
- 328 n 58, 10 — *Strom.*  
lire : *Protrep.*
- 329 n 61, 3 — role  
lire : rôle
- 331 n 69, 9 — V, 17 *init.*  
lire : V, c. 17, p. 280, 47-48
- 341 n 108, 1 — 718 B  
lire : 718 A
- 341 n 111, 2 — *Conv.*  
lire : *Plat.*
- 341 n 112, 3 — 53-54  
ajouter : 372 E-373 C
- 346 n 131, 10 — I, 2, 5  
lire : I, 235
- 346 n 132, 3 — κλῶς  
lire : καλῶς
- 348 n 138, 1 — θεοι  
lire : θεοί
- 349 n 138, 2 — ἀπόρροια  
lire : ἀπόρροιαί
- 350 n 144, 5 — βεβούλευται  
lire : βεβούληται
- 351 n 147, 4 — 24 ff.  
lire : 29 ff.
- 354 n 160, 1 — 97 a  
lire : 37 a
- 360 n 184, 1 — 572  
lire : 172
- 361 n 192, 1 — role  
lire : rôle
- 362 n 196, 6 — *Fragm.*  
ajouter : No. 290 (15)
- 362 n 199, 3 — αἰώνις  
lire : αἰώνια
- 366 n 207, 3 — 53  
lire : 54
- 373 n 236, 1 — 718 D  
lire : 718 E
- 374 n 239, 3 — διοιχθῆνα  
lire : διοιχθῆναι
- 378 n 258, 1 — Ἄιδην  
lire : Ἄιδην
- 378 n 258, 1 — εἶδος  
lire : εἶδος
- 379 n 262 — 9, 2 ; 27, 6  
lire : 9, 2, 1016 C ; 27, 6, 1026 A
- 383, 8 — residium  
lire : residuum
- 384 n 274, 13 — Reichardt  
lire : Rabe
- 385 n 275, 7 — 25, 28  
lire : 25
- 389 n 286, 1 — 300  
lire : 286
- 396 n 312, 2 — 279  
lire : 281
- 397 n 316, 3 — *Pythagorienne*  
lire : *Pythagoricienne*
- 406 n 24, 14 — vivont  
lire : vivunt
- 424 n 87, 5 — 16  
ajouter : p. 18, 3
- 431 n 110, 5 — p. 2, 1  
lire : p. 2\*, 1
- 438 n 132, 2 — αἰδιῶν  
lire : αἰδίων
- 441, 20 — Patrizzi  
lire : Patrizi
- 444c, 4 — 518  
lire : 5, 8
- 444f, 2 — III  
lire : II
- 444g, 6 — 4  
lire : 3
- 445n, 6 — 193, 41, quoted chap. III,  
n. 199  
lire : 193, 38-41, quoted chap. III,  
n. 119
- 446o, 8 — principal  
ajouter : difference
- 451 n 9, 15 — 13  
lire : 14
- 453 n 18, 2-3  
lire : « a philosophia verissima  
aliqua »

- 457 n 1, 1 — Callimachus  
ajouter : *Proem.*, 10
- 457 n 1, 2 — song  
lire : sang
- 458, 16 — ῥότιος  
lire : ῥόθιος
- 459, 3 — Nominal  
lire : Nomina
- 462, 6 — II, 11  
ajouter : p. 96, 7-9
- 464 n 16  
lire : VIII, 4 (p. 267, 8-9) ;  
IX, 6 (p. 280, 17-18) ; X, 5  
(p. 291, 12-13)
- 465 n 25, 1 — p. 721 D  
lire : col. 721 D
- 465 n 25, 3 — οὔτος  
lire : οὔτος
- 467 n 3, 1 — I, 10 ; 14  
lire : I, 10 (p. 34, 3) ; 14 (p. 45, 4)
- 468 n 7 — III, 18 ; cf. 17  
lire : III 18 (p. 145, 6) ; cf. 17  
(p. 139, 17-18)
- 468 n 8, 13 — 149  
lire : 185
- 469, 6 — κλίσεις  
lire : κλήσεις
- 470 n 17, 3  
lire : *Alc.* 341, 27 f. ; *Th. Pl.* II,  
104, 51 f.
- 471 n 20, 2 — εἶναι  
lire : εἶναι
- 475, 13 — Opsopeus  
lire : Opsopoeus
- 475, 14 — p. 1115  
col. 1115
- 476, 7 — IV  
lire : VI
- 476, 11 — PATRICIUS, *Ferrara*  
lire : PATRITIUS, Ferrara
- 476c, 15 — mislead  
lire : misled
- 478, 4 — Nurenberg  
lire : Nürnberg
- 483, 8 — αἰθήρ  
lire . αἰθήρ
- 484, 7 — νο ραι  
lire : νοεραῖ
- 484, 17 — τίτος  
lire : τριτος
- 485 n 6, 6 — 205... 270... 282  
lire : 218... 271... 283
- 485 n 6, 7 — 208  
lire : 209
- 485 n 6, 9 — 266  
lire : 267
- 487 B, 4 — p. 292, 13  
lire : p. 292, 11
- 489 E, 5 — 746  
lire : I, 746 Jacobitz
- 491, 23 — (σdoneus) v. 11  
lire : σων : v. 11
- 495, 29 — 9, 45  
lire : 9, 49
- 496, 6 — *Epist.* 187  
ajouter : p. 474, 8-15 Sathas
- 499 n 4, 2 — εἶναι  
lire : εἶναι
- 503 n 27, 1 — Leeman  
lire : Leemans
- 509 n 1, 6 — ἰδέας  
lire : ἰδέας
- 511 n 8, 1 — Byblus  
lire : Byblos

## Addenda

Le texte allemand de *Chaldaean Oracles* comprend 650 pages en grande partie dactylographiées, réparties de la façon suivante : 6 pour la préface, 50 pour le texte du chap. i plus 7 p. additionnelles intercalées, 30 pour les notes du chap. i, 71 pour le texte du chap. ii plus 6 p. add. et 29 provenant du brouillon manuscrit, 74 pour les notes du chap. ii plus 3 p. add., 39 pour le texte du chap. iii plus 3 p. add., 35 pour les notes du chap. iii plus 1 p. add., 16 pour le texte du chap. iv plus 11 p. add., 16 pour les notes du chap. iv plus 1 p. add. et 1 provenant du brouillon manuscrit, 39 pour le texte du chap. v plus 12 p. add., 33 pour les notes du chap. v plus 1 p. add., 52 pour le texte du chap. vi et 22 pour les notes, 29 pour le texte du chap. vii et 9 pour les notes, 52 pour les excursus et 2 provenant du brouillon manuscrit. Les notes des chap. vi et vii ne sont qu'ébauchées.

Le texte de la traduction anglaise, révisé pour les chap. i et ii par Hans Jacob Polotsky et pour les suivants par Ernst D. Goldschmidt (ancien bibliothécaire à Berlin, nommé en 1938 bibliothécaire à la Bibliothèque Nationale et Universitaire de Jérusalem) comprend 3 p. non numérotées pour le titre et la table des matières, 11 p. pour l'introduction et les abréviations, 260 p. en numérotation continue pour le texte des chap. i-vii, 241 p. en numérotation continue pour les notes des chap. i-vii, 60 p. pour les excursus, soit en tout 575 p., format 27 × 21.

Dans l'avant-propos du texte imprimé (p. xi), la Direction de l'I.F.A.O. signale que « partout où la chose était possible, des compléments nécessaires ont été introduits » et que « quelques références par trop rudimentaires » ont dû être supprimées. La lecture comparée des manuscrits allemand et anglais et du texte imprimé montre que ce dernier reproduit très exactement le manuscrit anglais et que les très rares suppressions et ajouts ont été l'œuvre de Lewy lui-même ou de ses collaborateurs de l'Université hébraïque. Cependant, une fois son texte anglais envoyé au Caire, Lewy a continué à travailler sur le manuscrit allemand en apportant quelques corrections et compléments, qui méritent d'être relevés.

Tout d'abord, aussi bien l'intitulé précédant le chap. VI dans le manuscrit allemand que la table des matières du texte anglais montrent que Lewy avait divisé son ouvrage en deux parties :

*Part I : The exposition of the Chaldaean system*, qui comprenait les cinq premiers chap. (le titre de cette partie est bien noté dans l'édition imprimé ; cf. p. 1) ; *Part II : The origin of the Chaldaean system*, qui comprenait, ainsi que Lewy le précise également dans l'introduction (p. XVIII), les chap. VI et VII (le titre de cette partie ne figure pas dans l'édition du Caire).

A la suite des 12 excursus formant l'appendice de l'ouvrage, est annoncé, à la fin de la table des matières du manuscrit anglais, le titre suivant : *Collection of all the extant Chaldaean fragments*, qui devait comprendre, ainsi que l'indique Lewy lui-même, une soixantaine de pages. Walter Zander (*Postscript*, p. XXI-XXII) signale que cette collection n'a pas été retrouvée. Il semble plutôt que Lewy, qui projetait cette nouvelle édition des *Oracles*, ne l'avait pas encore établie quand la mort l'a surpris.

Les compléments à ajouter au texte imprimé sont les suivants :

p. 23 n 58, 5

après « source », ajouter : (vgl. z. B. das von SCHÜRER III<sup>4</sup> 367 angeführte Zitat aus der Sophoniasapokalypse, CLEM. AL., *Strom.*, V 11 ; 77, 2).

p. 31 n 86, 4

ajouter à la fin de la note : Sicher fingiert ist der Name Hierotheos des angeblichen Lehrers des Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita und wahrscheinlich auch der der Theosebeia, der Adressatin einer Schrift des Alchemisten Zosimus (Suidas, s. v. Ζώσιμος), vielleicht auch der der Theoxena, einer « Weiehpriesterin der Barbaren » (erwähnt von Theodor von Asine, Schüler des Jamblich, bei PROCL., *Rp.*, I 255, 18).

p. 47, 3

après « language », ajouter la citation suivante :

« Ich ruh' als Flöt' an deinem Munde,  
Als Laut' in deinem Schoss alleine.  
Gib einen Hauch mir, dass ich seufze,  
Gib einen Schlag mir, dass ich weine ».  
(Mewlana Dschelaleddin Rumi, übersetzt von Rückert).

On trouvera ce poème dans les *Gesammelte Gedichte* de Friedrich Rückert, t. II, Erlangen 1836, p. 465.

p. 71 n 14, 3

— après « see », ajouter : PLATO, *Soph.*, 232 D 7.

p. 73 n 29

— Lewy indique qu'il n'a pu se procurer l'éd. Couvreur de l'*In Phaedrum* d'Hermias ; ce qui était vrai lorsqu'il se mit à écrire. Mais aussi bien le texte allemand que le texte anglais prouvent qu'il se la procura par la suite (cf. p. 108 n 173).



p. 83 n 62, 8

— Dans le manuscrit allemand, Lewy a barré *ἔστι* et écrit *οἷσα* qui termine le vers 1 sans point de suspension.

p. 91 n 98, 2

— ajouter : S. auch das aus Porphyrs *Orakelphilosophie* von Eus., *Praep. Ev.*, V 13, 3 (Wolff 134) zitierte Hekateorakel : *δράκοντες ... σπειρηδόν* (s. Anm. 96)... *ἔλισσόμενοι* und ARISTOPH., frg. 500-1 Kock : *χθονία θ' Ἐκάτη σπειρας ὄψεων ἐλελιζομένη*.

p. 102 n 151, 15

— après « Diels », ajouter : Vgl. JOH. GAZAEUS, *Descr. tab. mund.*, 137 : *αὐτόσκοπος Αἰών*.

p. 106 n 164, 6

— après la citation du vers de Proclus transmis par Lydus, ajouter cette annotation manuscrite de Lewy : Der Vers ist in der Sammlung der Gedichtfragmente des Proclus bei A. Ludwich nachzutragen.

p. 106 n 165, 13

— après « think », ajouter : Vgl. JAMBL., *Myst.*, III 16, p. 137, 15-16 : *ἅμα τε ἐπινοοῦσιν οἱ θεοὶ καὶ εὐθὺς ἀνακαίεται* (sc. ὁ ἀκρότατος ἄηρ).

p. 117 n 196

— Dans la marge du texte allemand, Lewy a ajouté ceci : It may be suggested that Iamblichus based his theory concerning the three triads merely upon the verse « *παντὶ γὰρ ἐν κοσμῷ λάμπει τριάς, ἥς μονὰς ἄρχει* » (quoted note 164) by interpreting (as Proclus did, see *Th. Pl.* 271, 14) *παντὶ ἐν κοσμῷ* as referring to the three *διακόσμοι* (*νοητός, νοερός, αἰσθητός*).

p. 132 n 247, 11

— après « connectives », ajouter : Vgl. auch PROCL., *Th. Pl.*, 312, 34 : *τὸ ... ἀπὸ τῶν συνεκτικῶν θεῶν* (cf. Anm. 333) ... *τῆς φρουρᾶς ἀγαθόν*, und DODDS 280.

p. 146 n 292, 1

— après *ἐν αὐτοῖς*, ajouter : (zur Verdeutlichung der lokalen Bedeutung, vgl. z. B. PROCL., *Tim.*, I 209, 26 : *πάντα δὲ τὰ ὄντα κύκλω περιέληπται ὑπὸ τῶν θεῶν καὶ ἐν αὐτοῖς, ἔστι*).

p. 147 n 297, 2

— après « constituent part », ajouter : (*πυριβριθῆς, πυριθάλπης, πυρίπνους*).

p. 153 n 318

— ajouter à la fin de la note : Vgl. SYNES., *Hymn.*, II 14 f.

## p. 169 n 390, 2

— après « Proclus », ajouter cette annotation de Lewy écrite en anglais dans le manuscrit allemand : (*Tim.*, I 424, 24 ; III 177, 28). PROCLUS, *Th. Pl.*, 7, 23, says that the soul which has « deepened » (βαθύνουσαν) its introspection finds in itself the Intellect, the second hypostase.

## p. 185 n 32, 8

— ajouter à la fin de la note : Die Quelle des Proclus war wahrscheinlich Syrianus, « *Symphonie* » ; s. chap. II, n. 10.

## p. 191 n 53, 1-2

— En tenant compte du texte allemand, il faut lire la note ainsi : ... but also by the Gnostics (« *Song of the Pearl* », v. 33-34 ; HIPP., *Ref.*, V 7, 30), Manichaeans (H. JONAS, *Gnosis und spätantiker Geist*, 113 f.), Hermetics (J. KROLL, *Lehren des Hermes*, 341, 4 ; 399).

## p. 191 n 55, 25

— ajouter ceci écrit dans la marge du texte allemand : Vgl. HERMIAS, *Phaedr.*, p. 107, 2 Ast : τοῦτο ἐστὶν ἔργον τῆς (θείας) ἐρωτικῆς συνάψαι τὴν ψυχὴν τοῖς θεοῖς καὶ τῷ ἀφραστῷ αὐτῶν κάλλει. JAMBL., *Myst.*, VI, 6, p. 274, 4 : τὴν πρὸς θεοῦς ἐνωσιν, ἣν παρέσχευεν αὐτῷ (τῷ θεουργῷ) τῶν ἀπορρήτων συμβόλων ἡ γνώσις. PROCL., *Tim.*, I 211, 3 (ἡ εὐχή, sc. ἡ διὰ τῶν συμβόλων) ... ἐνοῦσα μὲν τοὺς εὐχομένους ἐκείνοις (sc. τοῖς θεοῖς), πρὸς οὓς εὐχονται.

## p. 192 n 56, 10

— ajouter à la fin de la note : Das gleiche gilt für σύνθημα ; vgl. z. B. das *Theosophie* No. 44 zitierte Orakel, in dem Apollo erklärt (v. 6), dass der Sterbliche die Himmlischen nur schauen könne, wenn er « das göttliche watchword » (σύνθημα θείον) besitzt, womit hier die *vox magica* gemeint ist, die entweder den Gott zur Erscheinung oder die Freigabe der Passage zur Himmelfahrt erzwingt.

## p. 192 n 58, 2

— ajouter à la fin de la note : PROCL., *Tim.*, I 211, 1 (zit. Anm. 55) interprétiert die Orakelworte σύμβολα ἔσπειρε (τῆ ψυχῆ) κατὰ κόσμον als wäre überliefert : ὁ πατρικὸς νοῦς τὰ τοῦ κόσμου σύμβολα ἐν ταῖς ψυχαῖς ἐνέσπειρε, um die chaldäischen Symbole mit den « *ideae animae innatae* » zu identifizieren (*id.* bei PSELLUS, *Comm.*, 1141 B). In Wahrheit ist ψυχῆ (bzw. ψυχαῖς) dat. commodi und οὗς instrumental. Dass die Seele aber auch nach Glaube der Chaldäer die Symbole ursprünglich kannte, ergibt sich aus der Mahnung der Orakel, sich an das heilige watch-word zu « erinnern » und aus dem « Vergessen » herauszutreten ; nur beruht dieses Wissen nicht auf seiner « Einsäung » (*sic*) in die Seele, sondern auf deren intelligiblem Ursprung.

## p. 196 n 81, 8

— ajouter à la fin de la note : Vgl. ROHDE, *Psyche*, II 54, n. 1 ; HARDER, *Über Ciceros Somnium Scipionis*, p. 123, n. 3.

## p. 197 n 85, 5

— après la citation de Dieterich, ajouter ceci écrit dans la marge du texte allemand : Vgl. auch AUGUSTIN., *Conf.*, X 27 : *fragrasti, et duxi spiritum et anhelo tibi.*

## p. 214 n 152, 2

— après « also », ajouter : PHILO, *De exsecr.*, 152 (zitiert bei Cumont, *Rel. Orient.*<sup>4</sup>, p. 282, n. 68) τὴν ἐν οὐρανῷ τάξιν βεβαίαν und...

## p. 215, dernière ligne

— après « body », ajouter : (σωτηρία σώματος)

## p. 216 n 160-161

— La n. 161 du texte imprimé appartient à 160 ; ajouter : Cf. CUMONT, *Fatalisme astral*, 535 ; H. JONAS, *Gnosis und spätantiker Geist*, I 204.

La n. 161 se compose comme suit : PROCL., *Rp.*, I 75, 5 τίς γάρ οὐκ ἂν συνομολογήσειεν τὰ τε μυστήρια καὶ τὰς τελετάς ἀνάγειν (Exkurs VIII) μὲν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐνύλου καὶ θνητοειδοῦς ζωῆς τὰς ψυχὰς καὶ συνάπτειν τοῖς θεοῖς, ἀφανίζειν δὲ ἅπασαν τὴν ἐκ τῆς ἀλογίας (= ὄλης, cf. *Tim.*, I, 175, 22) παρεϊδυομένην ταραχὴν (cf. *Tim.*, I 57, 27 τὴν ἐνύλον ταραχὴν und Kap. v, Anm. 53) ταῖς νοεραῖς ἐλλάμψεσιν, ἔξωθειν (s. Anm. 124) δὲ τὸ ἀόριστον καὶ τὸ σκοτεινὸν τῶν τελουμένων τῷ φωτὶ τῶν θεῶν ;

## p. 256 n 101, 2

— ajouter à la fin de la note : (Ps. Callisth. I 1). Vgl. Cumont, *Théologie solaire*, 450. Nach Philo, *De somn.*, I 53, beschäftigen sich die Chaldäer damit.

## p. 279, 4

— ajouter le texte suivant qui conclue le § 1 : Auf Grund dieser dämonistischen Anthropologie erklärt sich auch die Verheissung der Orakel, dass der durch die Mysterienweihe « gereinigte » Theurg nicht nur seine Seele, sondern auch den Körper « retten » werde. Diese Rettung bezog sich, wie wir gesehen haben (= p. 215-216), nicht auf die leibliche Auferstehung, sondern auf die Immunisierung gegen den Einfluss des Dämonischen. Die Bedeutung dieser Verheissung ermisst sich an dem Ausmass der akuten Not und ihrer Folge. Die Erlösung vom Verhängnis der dämonischen Verstrickung bedeutet zugleich Befreiung von dem Zwang allen kreatürlichen Daseins (Heimarmene) und bildete daher Voraussetzung und Garantie für das mit dem leiblichen Tode verheissene Los einer seligen Unsterblichkeit.

## p. 287 n 109, 12

— ajouter à la fin du paragraphe : Psellus' Quelle waren wahrscheinlich die Geoponica, deren Kompilatoren das Werk das Ps.-APULEIUS *de herbis* benutzten (vgl. P.-W. s. v. Geoponica 1221 und s. v. Apuleius 257). Hier wird Apuleius gemeinsam mit Julian dem Chaldäer unter den « Flurzauberern » genannt ; vgl. BAUMSTARK, *Syrische Geoponica*, Neue Jahrbücher XXI 392 (angeführt von KROLL, P.-W., X/1, s. v. Julian Nr. 9, col. 15, der auch die im folgenden angeführten Zeugnisse z. T. nach ЛОВЕЦК, *Aglaoph.*, 100 zusammengestellt hat).

p. 309

— lire comme fin du chap. v le texte suivant ajouté par Lewy :

Diese Bemerkungen zur chaldäischen Lehre von den hylischen Dämonen mögen vorerst genügen. Über die Bedeutung dieser Dämonologie für die chaldäische Theodizee soll im folgenden Kapitel gesprochen werden. Wir wenden uns jetzt der Frage nach der Bedeutung der Marterie für die praktische Theurgie zu. Da diese auf den Voraussetzungen der allgemeinen Magie beruht, empfiehlt es sich, die dort herrschenden Ansichten über dieses Thema kurz zu rekapitulieren.

Denken und Handeln der Zauberer begründet sich auf dem Axiom einer sympathetischen Wechselwirkung zwischen der sinnlichen Materie und dem übersinnlichen Geisterreich. Viele der in den Stoffen lebenden und wirkenden Geister gehörten übergeordneten Mächten an, die jenen bestimmte Substanzen anvertrauten, um ihr Wirken in der sichtbaren Natur in Erscheinung treten zu lassen. Einige dieser Stoffe waren den oberen, andere den unterirdischen Göttern durch « Sympathie » zugeeignet. Nicht jeder an einen Stoff gebundene Geist galt also als unrein. Über seinen Charakter entschied nicht sein Aufenthaltsort, sondern das Wesen der Macht, unter deren Einfluss er stand. Diejenigen Stoffe, die im Sympathieverhältnis zu den oberen Göttern standen, waren Träger guter und hilfreicher Geister, die den unteren Göttern zugeeigneten Materialien wirkten schädlich. Die « Weisheit » des Zauberers bestand in der Kenntnis dieser Stoffe, der in ihr wohnenden Geister und deren magischem Zusammenhang mit den sie beherrschenden Mächten sowie in der Kenntnis der sympathetischen Mittel, durch die die guten Stoffgeister gewonnen, bez. der antipathetischen Praktiken, durch die die bösen paralytisiert wurden. Das Gesetz der magischen Sym- und Antipathie suspendierte den dualistischen Gegensatz zwischen Geist und Stoff und führte zu einer Wertung der Materie, die der der platonisierenden Dämonologen widersprach.

In diesem Widerstreit zwischen dämonistischer und magischer Bewertung der Materie nahmen die Theurgen eine eigentümliche Mittelstellung ein. Auch sie glaubten an die Möglichkeit einer magischen Bannung hylischer Dämonen, verwarfen aber diese Beschwörungen, da sie die an die Hyle gebundenen Geistermächte für von Herkunft und Natur unrein erachteten, und beschuldigten die niederen Zauberer (die « Goeten »), dass sie ihre Erfolge diesen schädlichen Gewalten verdankten. Nur durch die Not getrieben setzten sie sich zu diesen unreinen Geistern in Beziehung. Sie mussten den Einfluss dieser hylischen Mächte paralytisieren, um von jenen nicht an der Kommunikation mit den reinen Himmelsmächten gehindert zu werden. Während die Goeten also ihre magischen Fähigkeiten benutzten, um sich die hylischen Dämonen dienstbar zu machen, bemühten sich die Theurgen, deren Gegenwirkung auszuschalten. Ihre Helfer waren die Götter und die von ihnen abhängigen Geisterordnungen. Dem Pandämonium der materiellen Welt stellten sie ein Pantheon der vom höchsten Prinzip ausgehenden reinen Himmelsmächte entgegen, als deren auserwählte Diener sie sich betrachteten. Die Theurgen erstrebten die Überwindung des Dämonischen durch die Macht des Göttlichen. Dass dieses Göttliche dazu erst instandgesetzt wurde, nachdem es alle Eigenschaften des Dämonischen angenommen hatte, ist eine religionsgeschichtliche Erkenntnis, die das Bewusstsein der Chaldäer nicht reali-

sieren konnte, da ihr magischer Weltbegriff keinen Unterschied zwischen Geist und Kraft kannte.

Diese « Hypophobie » der Theurgen scheint im Widerspruch zu ihrem Ritual zu stehen. Während der magischen Operation, die die Verpflichtung eines « Hilfsgeistes » bezweckte, wurden u. a. auch die « Herren der Materien » (d. h. der geweihten Pflanzen und Steine) angerufen. Aber in dem gleichen Hymnus werden auch Apoll und der « Zeitherrscher » beschworen, und hinter der letzten Bezeichnung verbirgt sich der höchste Gott der Chaldäer. Also standen die « Herren der Materien » unter dem Einfluss einer oberen Gottheit, die ihre Kraft band und ihren Charakter bestimmte. Ähnlich sind auch die Riten der anderen uns überlieferten « hylischen Weihen » zu verstehen. Nur diejenigen Stoffe, die in einem Sympathieverhältnis zu den oberen Mächten standen, gehörten der höheren Ordnung an und waren gegen die depravierende Wirkung des Hylischen gefeit. Mit ihrer Hilfe bekämpften die Theurgen den Einfluss der bösen Stoffdämonen und durchbrachen den Ring, den die Materie und ihre dämonischen Trabanten um sie geschmiedet hatten.

p. 423 n 82, 5

— ajouter à la fin de la note : Die Archonten der Sonnen- und Mondscheibe werden in der gnostischen Schrift *Pistis Sophia* erwähnt (Kap. 136).

*Traduction allemande des « Oracles chaldaïques ».*

La quasi-totalité des fragments des *Oracles* ont été traduits par Hans Lewy. Le lecteur trouvera avantage à les voir ici commodément rassemblés dans leur traduction primitive. Ils sont numérotés d'après les pages et les lignes de l'édition de Kroll.

11, 8-18

Es gibt ein gewisses Intelligibles, das du mit der Blüte des Verstandes denken musst. Denn wenn du deinen Verstand hinneigst und jenes (das Intelligible) denkst, wie wenn du etwas Bestimmtes dächtest, so wirst du es nicht denken. Denn es (das Intelligible) ist die Gewalt der ringsum leuchtenden Stärke, die in geistigen Teilungen erblitzt. Man darf überhaupt jenes Intelligible nicht mit Ungestüm denken, sondern mit des feinen Verstandes feiner Flamme, die alles ausser jenem Intelligiblen misst. Dieses sollst du nicht geradezu denken, sondern das reine Auge deiner Seele abgewandt haltend den leeren Verstand zum Intelligiblen ausstrecken um es zu erfahren ; denn es befindet sich ausserhalb des Verstandes.

11, 23-24

Der (göttliche) Verstand ist nicht ausserhalb des Intelligiblen und das Intelligible existiert nicht abgesondert vom Verstand.

*12, 10-11*

Der Vater entrückte sich selbst, schloss aber sein eigenes Feuer (das von ihm unterschieden wird) nicht in seine Kraft ein.

*14, 4-5*

Denn alles vollendete der Vater und übergab es dem zweiten Verstande, den ihr Menschenkinder alle den ersten nennt.

*14, 9-11*

Eine Zweiheit befindet sich bei diesem (dem weltgestaltenden Verstand); denn er vermag beides : durch den Verstand das Intelligible zu begreifen und auf die Welten sinnliche Qualitäten zu übertragen.

*15, 6*

Alles stammt von einem Feuer ab.

*15, 18-19*

Aus diesen beiden dort fließt das Band der ersten Triade, die nicht die erste ist, sondern durch die das Intelligible gemessen wird.

*15, 27*

Nichts Unvollendetes dreht sich aus dem väterlichen Anfang.

*15, 29*

Der Vater lässt nicht Schrecken einströmen, sondern giesst Überzeugung aus.

*16, 4*

Götternährendes Schweigen (= der Ort, an dem der transzendente Gott weilt).

*16, 28-29*

ὁ ἄπαξ ἐπέκεινα : (der erste Verstand), der eine transzendente Einheit Bildende (oder : der in seiner Transzendenz eine Einheit Bildende).

ὁ δις ἐπέκεινα : (der weltgestaltende Verstand), der in der Transzendenz eine Zweiheit Bildende.

*17, 22*

Der siebenstrahlige Gott (oder : der Gott mit den sieben Strahlen).

*18, 3-4*

Der Verstand des Vaters befahl, dass alles in drei geteilt werde. Dessen Wille nickte zu und bereits war alles geteilt.

*18, 9*

(Die Engel) schneiden (den Makel der Seele) aus.

*18, 11*

In jeder Welt leuchtet eine Triade, über die eine Monade herrscht.

*18, 19*

Im Schosse dieser Triade ist alles eingesät.

*18, 21*

Aus dieser Triade mischt der Vater jegliches Pneuma.

*18, 33*

Die ihr die überweltliche väterliche Tiefe wisst, indem ihr sie denkt.

*19, 6*

Der Vater ist alles, aber auf intelligible Weise.

*19 n 1, 1*

Jeder (göttliche) Verstand denkt den Vater.

*19 n 1, 2*

Das Intelligible ist Nahrung für den Denkenden.

*20, 3-5*

Von hier (dem ersten Verstand) entspringt die Schöpfung der mannigfaltigen Materie. Von hier entspringt der Blitz, der des Feuers Blüte verdunkelt, indem er in die Höhlungen der Welten hineinspringt.

*20, 25-28*

Aus diesem (dem ersten Verstand) entspringen die unerbittlichen Blitze, sowie die die Blitze aufnehmenden Schösse des alleuchtenden Strahls der vatergeborenen Hekate und die gürtende Blüte ihres Feuers und das starke Pneuma jenseits der feurigen Pole.

*21, 22-23*

Der Verstand des Vaters, reitend auf unzerbrechlichen Lenkern, die das Unbiegsame durch die Furchen des unerbittlichen Feuers erblitzen lassen.

*23, 27-24, 7*

Der Verstand des Vaters, mit seinem kraftvollen Willen denkend, rauschte vielgestaltige Ideen hervor. Diese sprangen alle aus einer Quelle hervor; denn vom Vater kam Wille und Vollendung. Diese (Ideen) teilten sich, nachdem sie durch das geistige Feuer geschieden worden

waren, in andere geistige (Ideen). Denn der Herrscher setzte dem vielgestaltigen Kosmos eine geistige unvergängliche Form voraus, auf deren unweltlicher Spur eilend der Kosmos sichtbar wurde, nachdem er mit mannigfachen Ideen begnadet worden war. Diese (Ideen) haben eine Quelle, aus der andere gewaltige geteilte (Ideen) hervorrauschen, die sich an den Körpern der Welt brechen und um die furchtbaren Schösse wie Bienen sich bewegen, indem sie ringsumher sofort in verschiedenen Richtungen erblitzen, die geistigen Gedanken der väterlichen Quelle, die die reiche Blüte des Feuers durch die unermüdliche Kraft der Zeit pflücken. Diese urgeborenen Ideen liess die erste, in sich vollendete Quelle des Vaters sprudeln.

*24, 21*

Dieses sind die Gedanken des Vaters, hinter denen mein gewundenes Feuer sich befindet.

*25, 3-7*

Indem der väterliche selbstgeborene Verstand Werke dachte, säte er in alle (Werke) das feuerstarke Band des Eros, damit das All für unbegrenzte Zeit liebend bliebe und das vom geistigen Licht des Vaters Gewebte nicht zusammenstürze. In Gemeinschaft mit diesem Eros verbleiben die Gestirne der Welt im Umlauf (wörtlich : laufend).

*25, 26-28*

(Die Teile der Welt werden zusammengehalten) durch die Fessel des herrlichen Eros, der als erster aus dem Verstand heraussprang, indem er sein verbindendes Feuer in (das) Feuer (des Verstandes) hüllte, um die Mischkrüge der Quelle zu mischen, indem er die Blüte seines Feuers hinreichte.

*26, 5-7*

(Der Vater) mischte den Seelenfunken mit zwei gleichgesinnten Qualitäten, dem göttlichen Verstand und Willen, und setzte darüber als dritten den reinen Eros, den erhabenen, zusammenbindenden Lenker des Alls.

*26, 19*

(Die Dämonen bewirken das) Ersticken des wahren Eros.

*26, 30. 32-33*

... Glaube, Wahrheit und Liebe...  
Alles wird innerhalb dieser drei beherrscht und befindet sich in ihnen.

*26 n 2*

Die feuerhaltige Hoffnung soll dich nähren.



## 27, 7-12

... Vatergeborenes Licht. Denn er (der Aion) allein hat die reiche Blüte des Verstandes von der Stärke des Vaters gepflückt und vermag daher den väterlichen Verstand zu denken (und Licht) einzugeben allen Quellen und Anfängen und (sie) zu drehen und stets in unaufhörlicher Kreisbewegung zu erhalten.

## 27, 23

Als mittlerer der Väter bewegt sich das Zentrum der Hekate.

## 28, 5-7 et 28, 24-25

Um die Höhlung der rechten Hüfte (wörtlich : um die Höhlung der Knorpel der rechten Weiche herum) ergießt sich in Fülle reichliches Nass der urgeborenen Seele, die vollauf beseelt Licht, Feuer, Äther und die Welten. An der linken Weiche der Hekate entspringt der Quell der Tugend, der gänzlich im Inneren bleibt und seine jungfräuliche Reinheit nicht preisgibt.

## 29, 2

Über dem Rücken der Göttin schwebt die unermessliche Natur.

## 29, 15

Denn ihre Haare sind durch das grelle erschreckende Licht sichtbar.

## 30, 15-17

Leicht ist Quelle und Fluss der geistigen Seeligen ; denn sie, die erste an Kraft, nimmt die sich drehenden Geburten in unsagbaren Schössen auf und ergießt sie über das All.

## 31, 31

Der Vater errichtete in der Höhe die sieben Firmamente der Welten.

## 33, 9

Zeit der Zeit (= die überweltliche Sonne).

## 33, 13

(Die Sonne) : Feuer, das Feuer ergießt.

## 33, 26

Äther, Sonne, Pneuma des Mondes, Führer der Lüfte...

## 33 n 1

(Die über der Fixsternsphäre gelegene Sonnenwelt) dient der ätherischen Tiefe.

*35, 3-4*

Und ein fünftes mittleres anderes feuerhaltiges lebenbringendes Feuer steigt hier (hierhin ?) bis zu den hyllischen (Strahlen)röhren herab.

*35, 12*

(Der Demiurg erschuf die gesamte Welt) aus Feuer, Wasser, Erde und der allnährenden Luft.

*35, 15-17*

Denn es gab eine andere Masse des Feuers, das dieses alles selber wirkte, damit der Weltkörper vollendet würde, damit die Welt sichtbar würde und nicht hautartig erschiene.

*35, 27-28*

Er (der Himmel) ist zwar ein Abbild des Verstandes, das Verfertigte hat aber etwas vom Körperlichen an sich.

*36, 15*

(Helios-Apollo) brüstet sich mit der Harmonie des Lichtes.

*36, 24*

Denn ich kam mit allen Waffen, in voller Rüstung, die Göttliche.

*37, 22-23*

... die Anfänge, die des Vaters gedachte Werke denkend, sie mit sinnlichen Werken und Körpern umhüllten.

*42, 1-2*

Alles dient den intelligiblen Blitzen des intelligiblen Feuers nach des Vaters zum Gehorsam zwingenden Willen.

*42, 23*

(Die Zusammenhalter) : mit ganzer Qualität versehen.

*42, 26-27*

(Der erste Zusammenhalter, der) selber ganz ausserhalb existiert.

*42, 31*

(Der erste der Weiheregenten lenkt) die Flügel des Feuers.

*43, 20*

(Die intelligible Triade) hält das All zusammen, indem sie es in allen Stücken misst in Anfang, Ende und Mitte nach der Ordnung der Notwendigkeit.

43, 26-27

Seelenherrscher Weiheregent.

44, 18-19

Die Natur überredet dazu zu glauben, dass die Dämonen rein und (dass) die Sprösslinge der bösen Materie gütig und edel seien.

45, 5-7

Aus den Schössen der Erde springen die chthonischen Hunde hervor, die dem Sterblichen kein wahres Zeichen zeigen.

45, 16

(Hekate) Führerin der luftigen, irdischen und feuchten Hunde.

45, 18

Wasserbesteiger.

46, 31

Dieses dachte der Vater, und der Sterbliche ward bereits beseelt.

46 n 1

Die reichströmenden Scharen (der Dämonen).

47, 1-2

Der Vater der Menschen und Götter setzte den Verstand in die Seele, uns aber in den untätigen Körper.

47, 7-8

Psyche ist ein Feuer, das vermittelt der Kraft des Vaters leuchtet. Sie bleibt unsterblich und ist Herrscherin über das Leben.

47 n 1

(Das im) Herzen (der menschlichen Seele) eingesetzte (Zeichen).

48, 4-6

Die Seele der Sterblichen wird Gott in sich hineinpressen, nichts Sterbliches... besitzend ist sie ganz trunken. Denn sie rühmt sich der Harmonie, unterhalb derer der sterbliche Leib entstand.

48, 23. 24-25. 27

(Der menschliche Leib ist ein) fließendes Gefäss, (das sich mit dem Tod) zerstreut, (die) Wurzel allen Übels.

49, 7

Rufe das selbsterscheinende Bildnis der Natur nicht an.

49, 12

Schaue Natur nicht an ; ihr Name ist schicksalsmächtig.

50, 1

Vergrößere nicht die Schicksalsgewalt.

50, 5

Mensch, du Gebilde leichtfertiger Natur.

50, 16-18

Nicht eher aber nimmt die Vernunft des Vaters den Willen jener (der Seele) entgegen, als bis sie aus dem Vergessen herausgetreten ist und das Wort gesprochen hat, nachdem sie die Erinnerung an das väterliche heilige Kennwort in sich eingefügt hat.

51, 4-6

Forsche nach dem Strahl der Seele, woher sie in einer bestimmten Ordnung < herabstieg >, um dem Körper zu dienen < und wie > du sie wieder zur Ordnung heraufführen wirst, nachdem du die (rituelle) Handlung mit dem heiligen Wort vereint hast.

51, 13-16

Nachdem du dich mit der allgepanzerten Vollkraft des rauschenden Lichtes bekleidet und Verstand und Seele mit dreifacher Stärke gewappnet hast, (musst du) im Geiste den Feldruf der Allheit schleudern und auf die feurigen Strahlen nicht in aufgelöster Reihe, sondern mit gedrängter Macht zuschreiten.

51, 21

Anstürmend auf das Zentrum des rauschenden Lichtes.

51, 26-27

Die göttliche Tiefe der Seele soll sich öffnen, spanne alle Augen ganz und gar nach oben aus.

52, 3-4

Du musst die Seele zügeln, da du ein denkendes Geschöpf bist, damit sie nicht an der unheilvollen Erde ausftösst, sondern gerettet werde.

52, 9

(Die) in den Stacheln der Erde versunkene (Seele).

## 52, 15-16

Denn nicht erreichbar ist das Göttliche den Sterblichen, die Körperliches denken, sondern nur denen, die nackt aufwärtseilen zur Höhe.

## 53, 4

Wenn der Sterbliche sich dem Feuer genähert hat, wird er von Gott her Licht erhalten.

## 53, 9

(Die Ordnung der Engel, die) die Seele durch das (göttliche) Feuer entzünden.

## 53, 21

Diejenigen, die (die Seele) herausstossen und (die Feuerlohen ?) einatmen, sind leicht zu lösen.

## 53, 28

Spanne die Zügel des Feuers mit einer von allen Seiten unverfälschten Seele.

## 54, 9. 11-13

Sie (die Seelen der Mysten, die die Werke des Vaters gedacht haben) entfliehen dem vom Schicksal beherrschten schamlosen Flügel der Moira. Sie ruhen in Gott, indem sie die kraftvollen Feuerlohen einziehen, die (aus dem Bezirk) vom Vater herabkommen, von denen während ihrer Herabkunft die Seele die seelennährende Spitze der feurigen Früchte pflückt.

## 54, 25

(Die Seelen der Mysten) singen während ihrer Erhebung den Paian.

## 55, 24

Indem sich die Strahlen mischen, vollendet die Seele die Werke des unvergänglichen Feuers.

## 55, 32

Indem sie (die Dämonen) die Seele ständig betören, ziehen sie sie von den Weihnen ab.

## 56, 8-9

Denn nur deswegen wendet Gott den Menschen von sich ab und schickt ihn durch die lebendige Kraft auf leere (eitle) Wege.

*56, 21*

Der träge Sterbliche, der sich dorthin (zur Erde) neigt, ist die Ablösung des Gottes.

*56, 31-32 et n 2*

Um euretwillen sind den von selbst sichtbaren Erscheinungen Körper eingebunden, da ihr in eine leibliche Natur eingepropft seid.

*57, 15-23*

Wenn du dieses dazu gesprochen hast, so wirst du entweder ein Feuer erblicken, das einem Knaben ähnelt und sich springend über den Wirbel der Luft hin ausspannt, oder auch ein formloses Feuer, aus dem eine Stimme hervoreilt, oder ein reiches Licht, das sich brausend um das Feld herumwindet. Auch kannst du ein Pferd erblicken, das heller als Licht erblitzt, oder einen Knaben, der auf dem Rücken eines schnellen Pferdes sitzt, einen feurigen oder einen mit Gold bedeckten oder einen Nackten oder einen Bogenschiessenden und auf dem Rücken liegenden.

*57, 26-29*

Wenn du dies zu mir häufig sprichst, so wirst du sehen, wie sich alles verdunkelt. Die gebogene Masse des Himmels wird dann nicht mehr sichtbar sein, die Sterne nicht scheinen, des Mondes Licht verbirgt sich, die Erde steht nicht fest, alles flammt von Blitzen.

*58, 2-4*

Wenn du aber ein gestaltloses hochheiliges Feuer erblickst, das in zuckenden Flammen über die Tiefen der ganzen Welt leuchtet, so höre auf die Stimme des Feuers.

*58, 8-9*

Wenn du einen irdischen Dämon sich dir nähern siehst, so opfere den Stein Mnzuris, indem du dazu eine Beschwörungsformel sprichst.

*58, 14*

Verändere niemals die fremdsprachigen (Götter)-namen !

*59, 11-12*

Den einen gab Gott, das Licht durch Lernen zu begreifen, andere befruchtete er im Schlafe mit seiner Stärke.

*59, 21*

Nicht rechnen zu der vom Schicksal beherrschten Herde die Theurgen.

60, 2. 6

(Die Seele des abgeschiedenen Theurgen) lebt als Engel in der Kraft.  
(Sie weilt) im englischen Bereich.

60, 23

Dein Gefäss werden die Tiere der Erde bewohnen.

61, 6-7

Nicht wirst du den Kehricht der Materie dem Felshang überlassen,  
aber auch für das Schattenbild besteht eine Ordnung am ringsumstrahlen-  
den Ort.

61, 19-20

Rettet auch die vergängliche Hülle der bitteren Materie.

61 n 3

Die Seelen derjenigen, die den Körper mit Gewalt verlassen haben,  
sind die reinsten.

62, 17

Die die Menschen würgenden Strafgeister.

62, 19-23

Neige dich nicht abwärts zu der schwarzschimmernden Welt, unter der  
sich ein ewig gestalt- und formloser Abgrund ausbreitet, ringsum  
dunkel, schmutzig, sich an den Abbildern erfreuend, ohne Vernunft,  
abschüssig, gewunden, eine unvollkommene Tiefe ständig drehend,  
ständig eine Ehe eingehend mit einem unscheinbaren, untätigen, nicht  
atmenden Gebilde.

63, 12-13

Neige dich nicht abwärts : ein Felshang liegt unter der Erde, der  
< mit seinem Zwang > unter die siebenfache Stufenleiter hinab fort-  
reisst.

63, 25-26

Die Mehrzahl (der Menschen) wird von den sich windenden Strömen  
der Hyle mitgerissen.

63, 29

Weh, weh, bis zu ihren Kindern brüllt die Erde wider diese !

64, 4-5

Beflecke nicht das Pneuma (= das Vehikel) und vergrößere nicht  
die Ebene.

64, 28-65, 2

Setze dir nicht die Riesenmasse der Erde in den Sinn ; denn das Gewächs der Wahrheit gedeiht nicht auf Erden. Miss nicht den Lauf der Sonne, indem du die Richtschnuren vereinigt ; sie bewegt sich nach dem ewigen Willen des Vaters, nicht um deinetwillen. Lass das Geräusch des Mondes ; er läuft ständig nach dem Wirken der Notwendigkeit. Das Vorwärtsschreiten der Sterne wurde nicht um deinetwillen erschaffen (wörtl. : erzeugt) ; der luftige breite Fittich der Vögel zeigt niemals die Wahrheit an ; auch nicht die Zerteilungen der Opfer und Eingeweide. All dies ist Spielerei, Grundlage zu geschäftigem Betrug. Fliehe dieses, wenn du den heiligen Garten der Frömmigkeit zu öffnen wünschst, wo sich Tugend, Weisheit und Gesetzmässigkeit vereinigen.



## Index locorum

## ADAMANTIUS

De recta in deum fide, ed. W. H. van de Sande Bakhuysen (*GCS* 4, Leipzig 1901)

p. 116	392 n 295
118	392 n 295
126	392 n 295
142, 4	384 n 273
156, 15	384 n 273

## AENEAS GAZAEUS

Theophrastus sive dialogus de animarum immortalitate et corporum resurrectione (*PG* 85)

961 A	118 n 198 ; 450 n 6
964 B	454 n 22

## AESCHYLUS

Agamemnon

1023	488
------	-----

Choephoroi

99	167 n 376
----	-----------

Eumenides

615	49 n 158
1007	294 n 133

Persae

613	89 n 89
620	209 n 135

Prometheus

7	168 n 384
1006	53 n 165

## ALBINUS

Didaskalikos, ed. C. F. Hermann (Leipzig 1864)

155, 34	317 n 14. 16
162, 24	296 n 140
163, 8	317 n 15
14	112 n 179
27	317 n 13
164, 5	328 n 58
18	321 n 33 ; 322 n 34
19	322 n 34
28	328 n 59
35	321 n 33
165, 3	356 n 170
4	321 n 32
4-17	367 n 210
21	322 n 34
166, 27	303 n 170
167, 5	317 n 15
16	317 n 18
169, 5	345 n 130
20	317 n 16
24	371 n 226
170, 6	352 n 151
22	402 n 7
171, 11	328 n 58
31	377 n 253
172, 4	360 n 184
20	205 n 121
179, 36	322 n 34
181, 36	...
...	321 n 32 ; 322 n 34 ; 328 n 58

*Alchymica*

Catalogue des Manuscrits Alchimiques Grecs, ed. J. Bidez (vol. VI, Bruxelles 1928)

61, 22	293 n 132
23	91 n 96
62, 5	58 n 184; 91 n 96
85, 1	287 n 109; 496
86, 1	450 n 7
100, 1	267 n 26; 268 n 34
103, 1	287 n 109; 292 n 127
105	268 n 34
107	71 n 14
107, 4	249 n 77; 251 n 86
110, 2	264 n 14
122, 29	259 n 2
128, 11	264 n 14
129, 27	322 n 15
130, 8	232 n 15
131, 7	290 n 121
132, 1-12	280 n 84
15	283 n 94
142, 2	178 n 4; 477; 495
151, 8	228 n 1
160, 7	224 n 195
163, 9	77 n 38
9-22	476
16	138 n 271
169, 2	461 n 6
21	465 n 25
193, 2	283 n 92
201, 20	249 n 78
202, 1	248 n 76
214	224 n 196
223	268 n 34
226	74 n 32
227	234 n 26

Collection des Anciens Alchimistes Grecs, edd. M. Berthelot-Ch. Aem. Ruelle (vol. I, Paris 1888)	
28, 3	15 n 36
Zozimus Panopolitanus, edd. W. Scott-A.S. Ferguson ( <i>Hermetica</i> , t. 4)	
148, 1	363 n 203

## ANASTASIUS SINAITA

Quaestiones et responsiones (PG 89)	
525 A	3 n 1

*Anonymus Taurinensis*

ed. W. Kroll ( <i>Rheinisches Museum</i> 47, 1892, p. 599-627)	
II 20	160 n 353
IX 1	78 n 45;
79 n 47; 81 n 54; 112 n 181	
5	106 n 164

*Anthologia Graeca*

edd. J.-Fr. Boissonade, F. Dübner et E. Cougny (I-III, Paris 1864-1892)	
II, p. 108, n° 525, 24	49 n 158
III, p. 490, n° 140	18 n 46
494, n° 151	21 n 52
495, n° 158	43 n 136
503, n° 194	48 n 152
505, n° 201-202	53 n 165
519, n° 261	9 n 25

*Anthologia Latina*

edd. F. Bücheler-A. Riese (Leipzig 1869-1870)	
I 2, n° 490	420 n 75; 437 n 126

*Anthologia Lyrica Graeca*

ed. E. Diehl (Leipzig 1925)	
I, n° 44	214 n 148

## APOLLONIUS RHODIUS

Argonautica	
III 141	135 n 260
1377	135 n 260
IV 296	135 n 260

## APULEIUS

Apologia, ed. R. Helm (Leipzig 1905)	
43, p. 50, 2	436 n 124
64, p. 72, 12-16	328 n 58
64, p. 72, 16-19	327 n 53
64, p. 73, 5	328 n 59

De deo Socratis, ed. P. Thomas (Leipzig 1908)	
3, p. 9, 16	328 n 59
5, p. 12, 7	282 n 90
6, p. 13, 18	436 n 124
16, p. 24, 20	261 n 8

De Platone et eius dogmate, ed. P. Thomas ( <i>ibid.</i> )	
I 5, p. 86, 9	325 n 45
5, p. 86, 16	328 n 59
5, p. 87, 2	296 n 140
5, p. 87, 6	384 n 274
6, p. 87, 20	325 n 45
6, p. 88, 9	325 n 45
8, p. 90, 10	384 n 274
10, p. 92, 24	402 n 7
11, p. 95, 9	328 n 58
13, p. 97, 4	205 n 121

- Metamorphoses  
 XI 2-5 ..... 362 n 196
- [ARATUS]  
 Scholia in Aratum, ed. E. Maass  
 (Berlin 1898)  
 10 ..... 96 n 130  
 22 ..... 114 n 187
- ARISTIDES  
 Orationes, ed. B. Keil (vol. II, Berlin  
 1898)  
 p. 342, § 13 ..... 106 n 165  
 357, § 17 ..... 216 n 157
- ARISTOTELES  
 De anima  
 404 B 16 ..... 371 n 226
- De caelo  
 268 A 10 ..... 109 n 174  
 279 A 27 ..... 17 n 44  
 283 B 27-28 ..... 103 n 153  
 284 A 17 ..... 124 n 221
- Metaphysica  
 1024 B 9 ..... 296 n 139  
 1051 B 24-25 ..... 375 n 241  
 1072 B 3 ..... 352 n 153  
 14 ..... 26 n 68  
 21 ..... 375 n 241
- Meteorologica  
 368 A 34 ..... 259 n 2
- Fragmenta, ed. V. Rose (Leipzig 1886)  
 p. 394, 27 ..... 451 n 9
- PSEUDO-ARISTOTELES  
 De mundo  
 392 A 10 ..... 96 n 130  
 397 A 10 ..... 406 n 24  
 400 A 16 ..... 406 n 24
- ARNOBIUS  
 Adversus nationes  
 I 52 ..... 453 n 20  
 II 14-62 ..... 324 n 44  
 25 ..... 324 n 44  
 52 ..... 324 n 44  
 VI 10 ..... 407 n 26
- ASCLEPIUS  
 In Aristotelis Metaphysica, ed. M.  
 Hayduck (CAG VI/2, Berlin 1888)  
 98, 11 ..... 262 n 10
- ATHENAEUS  
 Deipnosophistae  
 XIV 693 E ..... 420 n 75
- ATHENAGORAS  
 Supplicatio pro Christianis, ed. J. Gef-  
 fcken (*Zwei griechische Apologeten*,  
 Leipzig, 1907, p. 115-154)  
 9, p. 127, 3-4 ..... 47 n 148  
 24, p. 143, 26 ..... 391 n 292  
 p. 144, 5 ..... 391 n 292  
 25, p. 144, 12 .....  
 .... 284 n 97; 391 n 292  
 21 ..... 283 n 94  
 30 ..... 381 n 266
- AUGUSTINUS  
 Contra Faustus  
 XX 2 ..... 423 n 82
- De civitate dei  
 II 14 ..... 225 n 196  
 VII 37 ..... 232 n 15  
 VIII 13 ..... 225 n 196  
 IX 19 ..... 29 n 76; 163 n 367  
 X 9-38 ..... 7 n 17  
 32 ..... 7 n 16  
 XII 1.3 ..... 381 n 268  
 XIX 23 .....  
 .. 52 n 162; 64 n 210; 451 n 10
- Sermo  
 CCXLII 6-7 ..... 455 n 26
- Biblica  
 Vetus Testamentum  
 Genesis  
 1, 2 ..... 383 n 272; 384 n 273  
 6 ..... 123 n 219  
 7 ..... 383 n 272  
 9 ..... 383 n 270  
 2, 7 ..... 383 n 270  
 18, 2 ..... 374
- Leviticus  
 1, 1 ..... 469 n 11

Numeri	
21, 9 .....	254 n 97
I Regnorum	
16, 14 .....	264 n 17
Iob	
41, 22 .....	383 n 272
Psalmi	
61, 12 .....	318 n 22
79, 2 .....	15 n 34
98, 1 .....	15 n 34
Siracides	
37, 16 .....	330 n 64
Isalas	
6, 12 .....	15
27, 1 .....	354
65, 11 .....	290 n 117
Ezechiel	
9, 3 .....	15 n 34
10, 1 .....	15 n 34
Daniel	
3, 55 .....	15 n 34
Novum Testamentum Secundum Ioannem	
8, 44 .....	391 n 291
Ad Romanos	
9, 5 .....	510 n 5
11, 17 .....	247 n 68
Ad Ephesios	
3, 18 .....	224 n 194
4, 6 .....	510 n 5
Apocalypsis	
4, 8 .....	15 n 35
6, 2 .....	428 n 100
<b>BOETHIUS</b>	
De consolatione philosophiae	
III 9, 20 .....	492
28 .....	24 n 58
12 .....	304 n 173
IV 1, 17 .....	328 n 58
<b>CALLIMACHUS</b>	
ed. U. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorf (Berlin 1907)	
Prooemium 10 .....	457 n 1

**CHALCIDIUS**

## In Platonis Timaeum

54 .....	355 n 166 ; 366 n 207
104 .....	402 n 7
142 .....	357 n 174
144 .....	357 n 174
148 .....	357 n 174

**CICERO**

## Academica

I 24 .....	346 n 131
------------	-----------

## De divinatione

I 17, 1 .....	430 n 107
---------------	-----------

## De natura deorum

II 21 .....	146 n 293
56 .....	148 n 293

## De republica

III 40 ..	215 n 156 ; 225 n 196
-----------	-----------------------

## Disputationes Tusculanae

I 37 .....	219 n 169
------------	-----------

## Epistolae, ad Brutum

I 2, 6 .....	49 n 158
--------------	----------

**CLAUDIANUS**

## De sexto consulatu Honorii

348 .....	4 n 2
-----------	-------

## In Probinii et Olybrii fratrum consulatum

1 .....	420 n 75
---------	----------

**CLEMENS ALEXANDRINUS**

## Eclogae propheticae

2, 3 .....	383 n 272
10, 1 .....	373 n 232
46, 1 .....	265 n 19

## Excerpta ex Theodoto

12, 2 .....	431 n 113
50, 1 .....	383 n 270
56 .....	247 n 68
81, 1 .....	431 n 113

## Paedagogus

II 10 .....	431 n 110
-------------	-----------

## Protrepiticus

IV 58, 3 .....	232 n 14
63, 3 .....	330 n 64
VI 68, 3 .....	328 n 58

Stromata, ed. O. Stählin ( <i>GCS</i> 15, Berlin 1906)	154, 13	68 n 6 ; 444
II 20 (114, 2)	14	165 n 373
V 6 (37, 1)	155, 2	166 n 374
(38, 6)	11	192 n 59
8 (49, 4)	15	6 n 10
10 (65, 2)	162, 15	246 n 68
11 (71, 2)	196, 5	105 n 163
(71,5)	221, 23	105 n 163
(77, 2)	237, 11	136 n 266
12 (81, 5)	23	139 n 274
14 (92, 5-6)	240, 25	136 n 266
(126, 2)	241, 18	103 n 152 ; 137 n 267
	24	93 n 107
	29	139 n 274
	242, 12	92 n 107
	251, 15	118 n 200
	253, 25	106 n 165
	284, 8	36 n 104 ; 159 n 351
	22-317, 14	482 n 5
	285, 1	445
	5-288, 12	105 n 163
	5-316, 9	105 n 163
	286, 8	148 n 302
	288, 12	105 n 163
	290, 17	155 n 334
	291, 7	138 n 271
	11	108 n 173
	20	36 n 104 ; 443
	22	159 n 351
	299, 18	105 n 163
	305, 17	105 n 163
	309, 24	79 n 47
	25	6 n 10
	315, 20	93 n 111
	317, 2	6 n 10
	14	37 n 110
	318, 6	37 n 110
	II, p. 9, 2	73 n 26
	17	103 n 152 ; 111 n 178
	11, 11	73 n 26
	16, 6	6 n 10 ; 159 n 351
	13	85 n 70
	16	160 n 354
	18	167 n 379 ; 368 n 214
	20	167 n 379
	31	17 n 44
	21, 15	99 n 137
	29, 12	99 n 137
	17	99 n 138
	18	6 n 10
	43, 20	155 n 331
	23	81 n 56
	26	142 n 283
	45, 2	103 n 153
	10	50 n 160
	51, 27	83 n 62
<b>CLEMENTINA</b>		
Homiliae		
VI 6	380	n 263
12	380	n 263
<b>CORNUTUS</b>		
Theologiae Graecae compendium, ed. C. Lang (Leipzig 1881)		
1, p. 2, 10	430	n 107
18, p. 33, 13	431	n 110
<b>PSEUDO-CYPRIANUS CARTHAGINENSIS</b>		
Quod idola dñi non sint		
6	29	n 76
<b>CYPRIANUS MAGUS</b>		
Confessio		
4	232	n 15
<b>DAMASCUS</b>		
Dubitationes et solutiones de primis principis, ed. Ch. Ruelle (Paris 1889)		
I, p. 56, 10	160	n 353
58, 4	167	n 376
15	166	n 373
86, 5	68	n 6 ; 444
8	105	n 163
20	395	n 308
87, 3	106	n 164
100, 20	79	n 47
108, 17	79	n 47 ; 129 n 24
131, 16	129	n 240
146, 15	160	n 355
147, 27	81	n 55
153, 20	81	n 55

56, 29	107 n 168
57, 26	167 n 379
58, 20	107 n 168
59, 21	84 n 66
23	132 n 250
26	131 n 246
60, 23	83 n 62; 304 n 175
28	106 n 165
62, 28	106 n 165
29	193 n 65
63, 21	107 n 170
67, 3	82 n 59
78, 13	133 n 252
79, 22	133 n 252
87, 9	148 n 302
10	123 n 218
14	106 n 164
21	131 n 246
88, 2	132 n 250
6	6 n 10
8	141 n 281
20	133 n 255
21	123 n 218
89, 31	121 n 209
92, 23	133 n 252
95, 15	249 n 79
21	141 n 281
22	140 n 275
23	193 n 65
102, 17	87 n 77
103, 11	133 n 252
125, 8	149 n 303
19	131 n 247
126, 22	150 n 309
128, 4	252 n 91
20	136 n 266
131, 29	92 n 101
133, 1	136 n 266
3	121 n 209
22	136 n 266
134, 18	482 n 5
136, 10	113 n 184
19	113 n 184
139, 11	81 n 56
148, 11	81 n 56
150, 6	90 n 91
152, 23	93 n 111; 142 n 283
154, 15	84 n 65
17	142 n 283
18	85 n 69
156, 16	86 n 72
157, 15	90 n 91; 96 n 126
164, 19	142 n 283
177, 22	114 n 187
178, 1	110 n 177
4	123 n 218
200, 15	139 n 274
19	116 n 192

23	115 n 190
201, 2	133 n 254; 139 n 274
203, 27	115 n 190
28	139 n 274; 445
29	125 n 221
204, 4	139 n 274
205, 21	114 n 187
206, 7	294 n 136
9	139 n 274
11	116 n 192
214, 15	137 n 267
217, 5	140 n 275
218, 4	113 n 184
219, 11	138 n 270
231, 1	102 n 151
232, 15	123 n 218
235, 8	89 n 88
15	90 n 91
23	105 n 160
24	102 n 151
25	102 n 151
250, 17	210 n 140
253, 22	102 n 149
281, 21	384 n 274; 451 n 9
282, 5	384 n 274; 385 n 275
283, 21	384 n 274
285, 5	384 n 274
288, 18	384 n 274
316, 17	281 n 89
22	281 n 89
317, 3	295 n 137

## DEMOSTHENES

## In Aristogitonem oratio prior

11	238 n 41
----	----------

## DIDYMUS ALEXANDRINUS

## De Trinitate (PG 39)

II 27, 756 A	107 n 173
III 21, 904 B	172 n 403
913 A-B	23 n 58; 26 n 67
28, 945 D	86 n 74

## DIO CASSIUS

## Historiae Romanae

LIV 11, 7	89 n 89
LXXI, 8	4 n 2

## DIDORUS SICULUS

## Bibliotheca historica

I 35, 8	277 n 72
---------	----------

DIOGENES LAERTIUS

Vitae philosophorum  
 III 67 ..... 360 n 188  
 VII 28 ..... 471 n 21  
 139 ..... 430 n 107  
 VIII 21 ..... 49 n 158

DIOGENIANUS

Centuria, edd. E. L. von Leutsch-  
 F. G. Schneidewin (*Paroemiographi*,  
 II, Göttingen 1851) ..  
 I 36 ..... 106 n 165

PSEUDO-DIONYSIUS AREOPAGITA

De caelesti hierarchia  
 7, 3 ..... 349 n 141  
 De divinis nominibus  
 11, 6 ..... 349 n 141

Doxographi Graeci

ed. H. Diels (Berlin 1879)  
 293 A 15 ..... 205 n 121  
 307 A 24 ..... 303 n 170  
 308 B 1 ..... 303 n 170  
 391 A 3 ..... 205 n 121

DRACONTIUS

Medea  
 503 ..... 418 n 68  
 538 ..... 418 n 68

EPIPHANIUS

Ancoratus  
 37, 5 ..... 23 n 58  
 Panarion  
 31, 5, 2 ..... 406 n 24  
 33, 7, 7 ..... 391 n 291  
 37, 4, 4 ..... 385 n 276  
 48, 4, 1 ..... 46 n 147

Epitome Heidelbergensis

ed. F. Jacoby (*Die Fragmente der  
 griechischen Historiker*, II B, Berlin  
 1930)  
 n° 155, p. 836, 9 ..... 262 n 10

*Etymologicon Magnum*,

ed. Th. Gaisford (Oxford 1848)  
 747, 15 ..... 378 n 258

EUNAPIUS

Vitae Sophistarum, ed. J. F. Bois-  
 sonade (Paris 1878)  
 p. 464, 42 ..... 457 n 1  
 474, 25 ..... 248 n 76

EURIPIDES

Bacchae  
 289 ..... 489  
 746 ..... 276 n 70

Hercules  
 1269 ..... 276 n 70

Hippolytus  
 601 ..... 493

Iphigenia Taurica  
 293 ..... 299 n 158

Medea  
 1297 ..... 146 n 293

Fragmenta, ed. A. Nauck (*Tragicorum  
 Graecorum Fragmenta*\*, 1889)  
 p. 912, 11 ..... 277 n 75

EUSEBIUS CAESARIENSIS

De laudibus Constantini  
 6 ..... 11 n 26

Demonstratio evangelica  
 III 6 ..... 52 n 162

Praeparatio evangelica  
 I 10, 42 ..... 511 n 8  
 III 6, 7 ..... 348 n 136  
 13, 5 ..... 348 n 136  
 14, 7 ..... 52 n 163  
 15, 3 ..... 225 n 197  
 16, 1 ..... 44 n 136  
 2 .. 41 n 126; 56 n 176  
 IV 5, 1-2 ... 284 n 99; 509 n 1  
 7, 2 ..... 56 n 179  
 8, 4 ..... 450 n 7  
 9 ..... 511 n 6  
 9, 2 ..... 23 n 57  
 5. 7 ..... 511 n 7  
 10, 1 ..... 510 n 5

13	510 n 5
16, 11	511 n 8
23, 7	51 n 162; 241 n 53; 363 n 202
8	271 n 41
V 2, 1	283 n 94
7, 1	48 n 152
5	64 n 207
8, 4	51 n 162; 58 n 184
5	51 n 162; 95 n 118
6-7	51 n 162
8-10	59 n 186
11	43 n 136
12	44 n 137
9, 1	40 n 117
6	40 n 121
9	235 n 29
10, 13	9 n 23
12, 1-2	23 n 57; 51 n 162
13, 3	23 n 57; 51 n 162
15, 1	51 n 162
VI 4, 1	53 n 165
VIII 14, 9	370 n 221
IX 10, 2	23 n 57
4	9 n 23; 427 n 97
5	64 n 208
XI 6, 37	37 n 109
XV 12	356 n 170
12, 1	357 n 174
3	352 n 151

## EUSTATHIUS THESSALONICENSIS

In Homeri Iliadem, ed. G. Stallbaum (Leipzig 1825)	
II 557, p. 285	451, 9

## FIRMICUS MATERNUS

De errore profanarum religionum, ed. K. Ziegler (Leipzig 1907)	
5, p. 12, 6	363 n 201
13, 1	363 n 201
Mathesis, ed. W. Kroll-F. Skutsch (Leipzig 1897-1913)	
V, praef. 3	331 n 69

## Gnostica

Pistis Sophia, transl. C. Schmidt (GCS 13, Leipzig 1905)	
p. 22, 17	385 n 276
Ptolemaeus, <i>Epistula ad Floram</i>	
5, 6	391 n 291

## GREGORIUS NAZIANZENSIS

Oratio IV. Contra Julianum, I (PG 35)	
col. 577C-580A	
238 n 41; 248 n 76; 270 n 38	

## HEGEMONIUS

Acta Archelai, ed. C. H. Beeson (GCS 16, Leipzig 1906)	
8, p. 13, 1	422 n 82

## PSEUDO-HERACLITUS

Questiones Homericae, ed. F. Oelmann (Leipzig 1910)	
23, p. 35, 11	430 n 107
36, p. 53, 16	97 n 130

## Hermetica

Asclepius, ed. P. Thomas ( <i>Apulei opera</i> , vol. III : <i>De philosophia libri</i> , Leipzig 1908)	
14, p. 49, 17	378 n 256
17, p. 51, 20	378 n 256
52, 6	378 n 256
18, p. 52, 9	378 n 256
19, p. 54, 6	234 n 27
10	406 n 21
20, p. 56, 6	341 n 110
9	331 n 69
26, p. 64, 15	331 n 69
30, p. 68, 21	403 n 12
69, 14	403 n 9

Corpus Hermeticum I-XIV, ed. G. Parthey (*Hermetis Trismegisti Poemander*, Berlin 1854); XVI-XVIII, ed. R. Reitzenstein (*Poimandres*, Leipzig 1904)

I 4	297 n 147
7-8	341 n 109
8	330 n 68
9	341 n 109
11	404 n 12
14	111 n 177; 259 n 2
24	217 n 165
28	301 n 227
31	371 n 227
III 1	25 n 61
V 2	371 n 227
X 2	331 n 69
4	371 n 277
5	374 n 239
6	371 n 227



11 .....	354 n 159
XI 2 .....	404 n 12
20 .....	371 n 227
XII 2 .....	277 n 77
3 .....	371 n 227
13 .....	326 n 51
XIII 11 .....	373 n 234
18 .....	371 n 227
XVI 10 .....	259 n 2
16 ...	216 n 161 ; 412 n 40

Fragmenta, ed. W. Scott (vol. I, Oxford 1924)

23, p. 542, 1-3 ..... 25 n 61

Korè Kosmou, ed. W. Scott (*ibid.*)

44, p. 482, 9 ..... 255 n 98

49, p. 484, 20 ..... 277 n 77

Stobaei Hermetica, ed. W. Scott (*ibid.*)

Exc. II A, 6, p. 384 11-12 .....  
..... 146 n 293

HERMIAS

In Platonis Phaedrum scholia, ed. Fr. Ast (Leipzig 1810)

p. 65, 24 .....	469 n 13
104, 50 .....	495
105, 2 .....	41 n 126
38 .....	495
118, 5 .....	356 n 168
42 .....	356 n 168
130, 50 .....	396 n 313
131 .....	178 n 4
134, 41 .....	349 n 141
146 .....	108 n 173
149, 29 .....	136 n 263
154, 50 .....	415 n 51
157, 35 .....	469 n 13
161 fine .....	85 n 70
171, 13 .....	358 n 176

PSEUDO-HERMIPPUS

De astrologia, edd. W. Kroll-P. Viereck (Leipzig 1905)

p. 20, 28 .....	475
26, 3 ....	281 n 89 ; 283 n 94

HERODOTUS

Historiae

III 134, 6 .....	106 n 165
IX 92, 1 .....	106 n 165

HESIODUS

Theogonia

385 .....	28 n 71
411 .....	364 n 203
413 ....	363 n 202 ; 364 n 203
427 .....	363 n 202
658 .....	119 n 201
663 .....	379 n 260
998 .....	25 n 63

HIEROCLES

In aureum carmen Pythagorae, ed. F. G. A. Mullach (Paris 1860)

p. 477 a 14-15. 21-22 ..	373 n 232
478 a-b .....	73 n 28
b 1-4 .....	194 n 66
20-21 .....	178 n 7

HIPPOLYTUS

Refutatio omnium haeresium

I 24, 5 .....	453 n 18
IV 4 (v. 6) .....	95 n 121
32, 1 .....	246 n 67
39 .....	246 n 67
35, 4 .....	241 n 53 ; 246 n 67 ; 272 n 46
5 (v. 3) .....	243 n 59
VI 23 .....	397 n 316
34, 4-5 .....	391 n 291
37, 7 .....	343 n 122
VII 21, 2 .....	331 n 69
VIII 17 .....	383 n 271
17, 2 .....	383 n 272
X 19 .....	386 n 279

Scriptores Historiae Augustae

Marcus Antoninus

13, 1 .....	3 n 1
-------------	-------

Heliogabalus

9, 1 .....	4 n 2
------------	-------

HOMERUS

Ilias

I 5 .....	331 n 69
38 .....	86 n 74
521 .....	80 n 49
526 .....	115 n 191
527-528 .....	27
528 .....	106 n 165

II 87	111 n 177
90	111 n 177
III 277	11 n 26
VI 488	212 n 142
VIII 14	294 n 133; 298 n 149
19	201 n 104
68	49 n 156
69	212 n 142
IX 75	19 n 46
212	162 n 384
489	128 n 235
706	86 n 73
XIV 279	379
282	180 n 14
XV 189	106 n 165
190	19 n 46; 29 n 77
191	282 n 92
XVI 515	11 n 26
XIX 242	106 n 165
259	299 n 156
XXI 214	86 n 74
XXIII 134	207 n 127
192-194	184-185
219	207 n 127
221	185 n 32
430	195 n 75
<b>Odyssea</b>	
I 48	17
IV 74	33 n 92
XI 602	219 n 170
607	242 n 54
XX 113	11 n 26
XXII 479	196 n 79
XXIV 14	219 n 169
<b>Hymni</b>	
ad Cererem, 99	89 n 89
ad Martem, 7	294 n 135
<b>HORAPOLLO</b>	
<b>Hieroglyphica, ed. Sbordone (Napoli 1940)</b>	
II 116, p. 214, 3-5	458
<b>HORATIUS</b>	
<b>Carmina</b>	
III 2, 21	221 n 178
3, 10	430 n 107
3, 33	430 n 107
<b>Epodon</b>	
XVII 6	249 n 79

**LAMBLICUS**

**De communi mathematica scientia, ed. N. Festa (Leipzig 1891)**

VI, p. 26, 11	488
VIII p. 33, 22	374 n 241
36, 7	371 n 226
38, 6	371 n 226

**De mysteriis, ed. G. Parthey (Berlin 1857)**

I 1, p. 4, 11	68 n 7
2, p. 5, 8	68 n 7; 444
7, p. 21, 15	294 n 136
9, p. 29, 18-30, 1	289 n 112
9, p. 33, 9	461 n 4
10, p. 34, 3	467 n 3
12, p. 40, 17-18	22 n 54; 467 n 4
12, p. 41, 3	468 n 8
12, p. 41, 4-9	188 n 42
12, p. 41, 10-11	188 n 43
12, p. 41, 11-13	188 n 44
12, p. 42, 13	487
12, p. 42, 15	438 n 130
12, p. 42, 16	487
13, p. 43, 4	272 n 51
14, p. 44, 14	468 n 8
14, p. 45, 4	467 n 3
15, p. 48, 4	56 n 177
18, p. 52, 18	273 n 55
21, p. 65, 4	438 n 130
II 2, p. 69, 8	223 n 192
3, p. 70, 9-10	242 n 56
4, p. 75, 10	243 n 57
4, p. 77, 18	244 n 63
6, p. 81, 14	492
6, p. 81, 18	246 n 68
6, p. 82, 12	171 n 396; 260 n 5
6, p. 83, 3	147 n 296
7, p. 84, 6	244 n 63
7, p. 84, 11	253 n 93
7, p. 84, 14	294 n 136
10, p. 90, 12-14	7 n 14; 56 n 177
10, p. 91, 7	272 n 50
10, p. 92, 12	195 n 73
11, p. 96, 7-9	462
11, p. 96, 13	461 n 4
11, p. 96, 17	461 n 4
11, p. 96, 19	471 n 20
III 6, p. 112, 10	41 n 126; 44 n 137
9, p. 119, 3	20 n 46
11, p. 125, 6	40 n 120
11, p. 127, 7	41 n 125
13, p. 130, 12	274 n 57

13, p. 131, 8 ..... 262 n 10  
 15, p. 135, 7 ..... 256 n 104  
 17, p. 139, 17-18 .... 468 n 7  
 18, p. 144, 1 ..... 468 n 8  
 18, p. 145, 6 ..... 468 n 7  
 20, p. 148, 6 ..... 468 n 8  
 20, p. 148, 13 ..... 190 n 53  
 27, p. 164, 10 ..... 257 n 107  
 28, p. 168, 11 ..... 257 n 107  
 31, p. 175, 6 ..... 285 n 102  
 31, p. 176, 1 ..... 273 n 53  
 31, p. 176, 2 ... 68 n 7 ; 443  
 31, p. 176, 7-9 ..... 274 n 57  
 31, p. 177, 13 ..... 262 n 10  
 31, p. 177, 16 ..... 285 n 102  
 31, p. 178, 16-18 .....  
 ..... 257 n 107 ; 445  
 31, p. 179, 8 ..... 204 n 118  
 IV 2, p. 184, 1 ..... 438 n 130  
 3, p. 185, 7 ..... 468 n 8  
 12, p. 195, 12 ..... 438 n 130  
 V 11, p. 214, 8 ..... 489  
 11-12, p. 214, 5-216, 7 .. 218 n 167  
 14, p. 217, 8 ..... 270 n 37  
 21, p. 228, 16 ..... 269 n 36  
 23, p. 233, 10 ..... 496  
 23, p. 234, 7 ..... 246 n 68  
 26, p. 238, 3 ..... 197 n 86  
 26, p. 239, 6 ..... 145 n 291  
 VI 7, p. 248, 15 ..... 283 n 94  
 7, p. 249, 3 . 58 n 184 ; 68 n 7  
 VIII 2, p. 261, 10-262, 13 .....  
 ..... 326 n 51  
 2, p. 262, 7 ..... 234 n 27  
 2, p. 262, 2-3 .... 327 n 55  
 4, p. 267, 8-9 ..... 464 n 16  
 5, p. 267, 14-268, 3 .....  
 ..... 439 n 136  
 6, p. 269, 11 ..... 487  
 7, p. 270, 7-11 ... 358 n 176  
 8, p. 271, 13 ..... 489  
 IX 6, p. 280, 17-18 ..... 464 n 16  
 9, p. 284, 1 ..... 468 n 8  
 9, p. 284, 2 ..... 245 n 65  
 X 4, p. 289, 6-8 ..... 265 n 67  
 5, p. 290, 6 ..... 257 n 107  
 5, p. 291, 12-13 ..... 464 n 16  
 6, p. 292, 10 ..... 489  
 6, p. 292, 11. 17 ..... 487  
 6, p. 292, 16-17 ..... 464 n 18  
 7, p. 293, 6 ..... 291 n 125  
 De vita Pythagorica  
 II 8 ..... 224 n 196  
 XV 65 ..... 20 n 46  
 Protrepticus, ed. H. Pistelli (Leipzig  
 1888)  
 IV, p. 24, 13 ..... 488

Theologoumena arithmeticae, ed. V.  
 de Falco (Leipzig 1922)  
 p. 2, 22 ..... 25 n 65  
 17, 4 ..... 109 n 174  
 7 ..... 396 n 312

Inscriptiones

Epigrammata Graeca ex lapidibus  
 conlecta, ed. G. Kaibel (Berlin 1878)  
 228, 7-8 ..... 33 n 92  
 1026, 7 ..... 216 n 157

Inscriptiones latinae selectae, ed.  
 H. Dessau (Berlin 1892-1916)  
 3384 ..... 253 n 95

Monumenti Ancyрани versio Graeca,  
 ed. E. Diehl (*Res Gestae Divi Augusti*,  
 Bonn 1918)  
 9 ..... 216 n 157

Orientis Graeci Inscriptiones selectae,  
 ed. W. Dittenberger (Leipzig 1903-  
 1905)  
 721 ..... 238 n 41

Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum, ed.  
 W. Dittenberger (Leipzig 1898-1901)  
 II, n° 807, 12 ..... 216 n 157

IOANNES GAZAEUS

Descriptio tabulae mundi, ed. E. Abel  
 (Berlin 1882)  
 143 ..... 152 n 315

IOSEPHUS FLAVIUS

Antiquitates judaicae  
 VI 166 ..... 264 n 17

Bellum judaicum  
 V 229 ..... 44 n 138

IRENAEUS

Adversus haereses  
 I 1, 1 ..... 397 n 316  
 5, 5 ..... 383 n 270  
 13, 3 ..... 40 n 120  
 29, 1-2 ..... 329 n 62  
 30, 5 ..... 385 n 276

IULIANUS IMPERATOR

Contra Galilaeos, ed. C. J. Neumann  
 (Leipzig 1880)  
 p. 211, 1 ..... 510 n 5

- Epistula ad Athenienses, ed. F. C. Hertlein (Leipzig 1875-1876)  
 275 B ..... 183 n 27
- Epistulae, edd. J. Bidez - F. Cumont (Paris 1922)  
 p. 15, 8 ..... 68 n 6 ; 451 9  
 123, 21 ..... 233 n 22  
 132, 6 ..... 267 n 25 ; 444  
 138, 18 ..... 233 n 22  
 158, 19 ..... 69 n 8  
 214, 21 ..... 69 n 8  
 245, 22 ..... 69 n 8
- Orationes, ed. F. C. Hertlein (Leipzig 1875-1876)  
 II 133 A ..... 49 n 158  
 IV 134 A . 169 n 384 ; 409 n 32  
 135 B ..... 225 n 197 ; 446  
 136 B ..... 186 n 38  
 141 B ..... 183 n 27  
 142 A ..... 183 n 27  
 D ..... 331 n 69  
 148 A ..... 152 n 316  
 A-B ... 152 n 317 ; 446  
 149 C ..... 186 n 38  
 150 D ..... 225 n 197  
 152 B ..... 183 n 27  
 154 D ..... 489  
 156 B ..... 443  
 V ..... 362 n 196  
 V 166 A ..... 84 n 65  
 C ..... 294 n 136  
 168 A ..... 294 n 136  
 170 D . 213 n 144 ; 385 n 275  
 172 A ..... 186 n 36-37  
 C ..... 186 n 37  
 D ..... 152 n 316 ; 186 n 38  
 173 C ..... 186 n 38  
 175 B ..... 213 n 144 ;  
 385 n 275 ; 470 n 18  
 178 C ..... 214 n 151  
 179 C ..... 470 n 18  
 D .. 84 n 65 ; 213 n 144  
 180 B ..... 177 n 3 ;  
 211 n 141 ; 270 n 40  
 VII 217 C ..... 238 n 41  
 219 A ..... 218 n 167  
 B ..... 489  
 220 B ..... 218 n 167
- IUSTINUS MARTYR
- Apologiae  
 I 18, 4 ..... 209 n 135  
 28, 1 ..... 284 n 97  
 60, 1-5 ..... 254 n 97  
 II 12 ..... 316 n 6
- PSEUDO-IUSTINUS MARTYR
- Cohortatio ad Graecos  
 5 ..... 431 n 110  
 38 ..... 63 n 201
- LACTANTIUS
- De ira dei  
 23 ..... 64 n 210
- Divinae institutiones  
 I 7, 1 ..... 19 n 46 ; 29 n 76  
 II 14, 6 ..... 284 n 97  
 15 ..... 216 n 161
- Epitome divinarum institutionum  
 37, 1, 4 ..... 321 n 29
- LIBANIUS
- Orationes  
 XVIII 18 ... 69 n 8 ; 277 n 77  
 LIX 72 ..... 471 n 21
- LUCANUS
- Pharsalia  
 V 161 ..... 41 n 124  
 163 ..... 41 n 125  
 VI 174 ..... 41 n 123  
 493 ..... 232 n 15  
 600 ..... 221 n 178
- LUCIANUS
- Hermotimus sive de sectis  
 7 ..... 489
- Philopseudes  
 13 ..... 209 n 135
- Scholla in Philopseudem  
 12 ..... 287 n 109
- Somnium sive gallus  
 16 ..... 224 n 196
- LUCRETIIUS
- De rerum natura  
 I 62 ..... 320 n 25  
 900 ..... 168 n 384  
 V 1 ..... 320 n 25  
 585 ..... 430 n 107

LXIVUS

De mensibus, ed. R. Wünsch (Leipzig 1898)

I 11, p. 3, 5	172 n 402
14	179 n 8
12, p. 6, 9	123 n 218
13	213 n 144
II 6, p. 23, 12	106 n 164
15	154 n 324
17	153 n 317
7, p. 23, 20	140 n 278
21	144 n 288
8, p. 26, 14	138 n 270
20	154 n 322
p. 27, 14	456 n 27
p. 28, 1	116 n 195
7	179 n 8
10	376 n 250
10, p. 31, 10	212 n 143
11, p. 32, 3	267 n 25
12, p. 36, 13	100 n 138
III 7, p. 41, 7	267 n 25
8, p. 41, 20	242 n 55
p. 42, 5	144 n 288
IV 2, p. 65, 11	366 n 207
21	69 n 8
22, p. 80, 20	182 n 26
25, p. 83, 13	283 n 96
32, p. 90, 24	284 n 96
53, p. 110, 18	9 n 23
p. 111, 1	409 n 32
58, p. 113, 5	366 n 207
80, p. 132, 11	313 n 3
86, p. 135, 14	154 n 325
107, p. 147, 5	146 n 293
122, p. 159, 5	105 n 163
149, p. 167, 23	450 n 8
159, p. 175, 3	378 n 257
5	117 n 198
10	68 n 6
17	115 n 191

MACROBIUS

In somnium Scipionis

I 2, 11	503 n 22
8, 9	385 n 275
11, 6	281 n 87
13, 5. 10. 20	206 n 125
19, 12	385 n 275
22, 6	385 n 275
II 12, 5	385 n 275

Saturnalia

I 17-22	362 n 197
17, 66	362 n 196
67	293 n 131
70	151 n 313

18, 19	64 n 206
20, 16	64 n 207 ; 362 n 196
23, 7	20 n 46
21	420 n 75

PSEUDO-MANETHO

Apotelesmatica sive de viribus et effectis astrorum, ed. H. Köchly (Leipzig 1858)

A 277	49 n 156
B 66	20 n 46
391	49 n 156

MARCUS AURELIUS ANTONINUS

Commentariorum quos sibi ipsi scripsit libri

IX 28	406 n 24
36	385 n 275

MARINUS

Vita Procli

13	262 n 10
18	228 n 1
19	239 n 43
25	188 n 44
26	9 n 24 ; 70 n 14 ; 444 ; 451 n 9 ; 466 n 31
28	69 n 9 ; 71 n 15-16 ; 225 n 197 ; 228 n 2 ; 239 n 46 ; 245 n 64 ; 251 n 84 ; 259 n 2
38	70 n 12

MARTIANUS CAPELLA

De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii

I 61	137 n 267
140	177 n 3
II 140-141	206 n 125
151	93 n 110
186	420 n 75
202	77 n 39
202-207	177 n 3
203	159 n 351 ; 194 n 71
204	139 n 274 ; 200 n 97
205	77 n 43
206	97 n 117 ; 168 n 382
207-208	196 n 81
VII 731	333 n 78
733	109 n 174 ; 395 n 308

MAXIMUS TYRIUS

Dissertationes, ed. H. Hobein (Leipzig 1910)

II 10a	328 n 59
--------	----------

VIII	224 n 196
VIII 6g	229 n 3
IX	224 n 196
IX 6	201 n 102
6d	217 n 162
7b	253 n 95
9c-d	328 n 59
X 3a	368 n 212
XI 6e	320 n 29
9d	371 n 226 ; 372 n 230
10a	373 n 234
10b	368 n 212
11a	471 n 21
11e	367 n 210
XIX 2n	169 n 384
XXXVIII 6, 1	295 n 136
6c	331 n 69
XLI 2	106 n 165
5	471 n 21

## MENANDER RHETOR

Orationes, ed. L. Spengel ( <i>Rhetores Graeci</i> , vol. III, Leipzig 1856)	
p. 334, 26-32	52 n 163
446, 8	225 n 197

## MESOMEDES

Εἰς τὴν φύσιν Πυθαγόρου, ed. U. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorf ( <i>Griechische Verskunst</i> , Berlin 1921)	
p. 596, 3	397 n 317
22	216 n 157

## MICHAEL GLYCAS

Annales (PG 158)	
215 D	283 n 94

## MICHAEL ITALICUS

Epistula XVII, ed. J. A. Cramer ( <i>Anecdota graeca</i> , vol. III, Oxford 1836)	
p. 181, 12	77 n 42
17	133 n 255
p. 182, 7	123 n 218
8	77 n 43 ; 138 n 271
15	136 n 266
24	91 n 96
26	94 n 114
p. 183, 12	114 n 187
25	116 n 192

## MINUCIUS FELIX

Octavius, ed. J.-P. Waltzing (Leipzig 1912)	
XXVI 11, p. 45, 9	29 n 76

## NEMESIUS EMESEUS

De natura hominis (PG 40)	
753 B	357 n 174
796 A	331 n 69

## NICEPHORUS GREGORAS

Explicatio in Synesii librum De insomniis (PG 149)	
574 B	
279 n 83 ; 280 n 85 ; 296 n 139	

## NICETAS SERRONIUS

Ad Gregorii Nazianzeni Orationem XLV, ed. J. Bidez ( <i>Mélanges Franz Cumont</i> , Bruxelles 1936)	
p. 95	241 n 53
96	231 n 9 ;
241 n 53 ; 252 n 92	

## NICOMACHUS GERASENUS

Excerpta de musica, ed. C. von Jan ( <i>Musici scriptores graeci</i> , Leipzig 1895)	
6, p. 277	250 n 83

## NONNUS

Dionysiaca	
I 175	49 n 156
XII 36	154 n 324
XXXVIII 116	154 n 324

Paraphrasis in Ioannem, ed. A. Scheindler (Leipzig 1881)	
I 115	45 n 144

## NUMENIUS

Fragmenta, ed. E. A. Leemans (Bruxelles-Gant 1937)	
p. 87, 23	318 n 22
88, 18	340 n 107
89, 3	334 n 81
6	352 n 151

26	352 n 151
92, 18	303 n 170
95, 8	379 n 262
97, 8	353 n 157
105, 5	360 n 185
130, 10	320 n 27
131, 15	328 n 58 ; 372 n 231
132, 15	296 n 143
19	297 n 144
133, 17	277 n 73
135, 12	318 n 22
137, 1	436 n 125
29-30	318 n 22
138, 1	352 n 151
3	318 n 22
4	318 n 21
139, 7	343 n 121
140, 9	319 n 25
10	318 n 21
14	352 n 151
141, 1	318 n 22
5	395 n 306
8	319 n 25
20	352 n 151
147	434 n 115

*Odae Salomonis*, edd. J. R. Harris -  
A. Mingana (Manchester 1920)

VI 1-2	46 n 147
XIV 8	46 n 147
XXVI 3	46 n 147

OLYMPIODORUS

In Platonis Alcibiadem, ed. F. Creuzer  
(Frankfurt 1821)

p. 19	267 n 25
22	162 n 365

In Platonis Gorgiam, ed. W. Norvin  
(Leipzig 1936)

p. 31, 7	321 n 29
233, 23	385 n 275
237, 10	280 n 85

In Platonis Cratylum, ed. C. F. Her-  
mann (Leipzig 1864)

p. 236, 21-22	262 n 10c
---------------	-----------

In Platonis Phaedonem, ed. W. Norvin  
(Leipzig 1913)

p. 4, 24	218 n 167
5, 23	474
32, 22	374 n 237
39, 11	147 n 296
42, 7	147 n 296
46, 6	465 n 29

16	466 n 32
64, 2	220 n 175
94, 25	147 n 296
109, 10	295 n 136
114, 21, 25	465 n 30
116, 18	88 n 83
117, 6	221 n 179
120, 29	237 n 39
121, 9	210 n 140
22	379 n 259 ; 385 n 275
122, 10	197 n 84
123, 4	464 n 19
172, 6	253 n 95
176, 8	379 n 259
179, 4	321 n 29
189, 25	211 n 140
191, 21	379 n 259
26	220 n 175
201, 9	379 n 259
202, 30	379 n 259
204, 19	206 n 125
205, 26	200 n 102
208, 7	449 n 3
230, 32	271 n 41
231, 10	211 n 140
232, 29	220 n 175
239, 3	97 n 131
240, 2	379 n 259
17	79 n 47
243, 4, 11	217 n 163
13	206 n 125
244, 20	200 n 102

Prolegomena in Platonis philoso-  
phiam, ed. C. F. Hermann (Leipzig  
1892)

p. 196, 21	224 n 196
201, 15	321 n 29
18	374 n 237
207, 18	481 n 3

Scholia in Platonis Cratylum, ed.  
C. F. Hermann (*ibid.*)

p. 236, 21-22	262 n 10
---------------	----------

Vita Platonis, ed. C. F. Hermann  
(Leipzig 1892)

p. 195	216 n 157
--------	-----------

*Oracula Chaldaica*, ed. W. Kroll  
(Breslau 1894)

p. 2	474
3	473 ; 474
4	172 n 400 ; 477
5	474 ; 476 ; 477
6	7 n 18 ;
8 n 22 ; 148 n 300 ; 450 n 6	
7	69 n 10 ; 70 n 14

8	70 n 12	96 n 126; 150 n 309; 200 n 100
9	16 n 41; 38 n 112; 39 n 116; 443; 444	37 ..... 115 n 190; 140 n 275
10	80 n 52; 267 n 25	38 ..... 124 n 221; 141 n 281
11	106 n 164; 165 n 373; 167 n 379; 168 n 383	39 ..... 116 n 192; 133 n 255
12	78 n 45; 79 n 47; 81 n 54	40 ..... 132 n 247-250; 133 n 252-254; 135 n 259; 136 n 263; 148 n 302; 161 n 359
13	77 n 42; 79 n 47; 112 n 181; 113 n 184; 129 n 240; 333 n 76	41 ..... 131 n 246; 249 n 80
14	112 n 181; 114 n 187; 320 n 27; 322 n 37	42 ..... 129 n 240; 131 n 247; 149 n 305; 155 n 331
15	80 n 52; 81 n 54; 99 n 137; 107 n 170; 115 n 191; 147 n 295; 273 n 55; 395 n 308	43 ..... 108 n 173; 134 n 256; 149 n 304; 155 n 334
16	76 n 37; 77 n 43; 79 n 48; 138 n 271; 160 n 353; 397 n 315	44 ..... 133 n 254; 149 n 303; 162 n 365; 263 n. 11. 14
17	136 n 266; 186 n 38	45 ..... 259 n 3; 267 n 26; 271 n 41
18	106 n 164-165; 108 n 172; 116 n 195; 159 n 351; 179 n 8; 397 n 315	46 ..... 101 n 149; 137 n 267; 181 n 19; 215 n 154; 260 n 4
19	81 n 55-56; 82 n 58-59; 83 n 62; 113 n 185; 160 n 354-355	47 ..... 86 n 75; 87 n 76; 179 n 7; 181 n 22; 182 n 24. 26; 185 n 32; 253 n 93
20	117 n 198; 118 n 200; 121 n 209; 125 n 226	48 ..... 189 n 45; 198 n 88; 265 n 20; 277 n 72-75; 278 n 81; 297 n 143
21	135 n 260	49 ..... 98 n 134; 265 n 21
22	92 n 101; 123 n 218	50 ..... 55 n 175; 190 n 50; 191 n 53. 55; 254 n 98; 266 n 23
23	110 n 177; 114 n 187; 123 n 218; 252 n 92	51 ..... 169 n 388-389; 189 n 45; 192 n 59; 195 n 75
24	91 n 97	52 ..... 170 n 395; 171 n 396; 172 n 402; 194 n 67; 277 n 76-77
25	126 n 232; 127 n 233; 128 n 236	53 ..... 171 n 397; 173 n 406; 205 n 124; 236 n 37; 260 n 7
26	128 n 238; 144 n 291; 147 n 296; 179 n 8-9; 264 n 17	54 ..... 169 n 387; 197 n 84. 86; 201 n 102; 212 n 142; 222 n 187; 491
27	50 n 160; 99 n 138	55 ..... 161 n 359; 177 n 2; 196 n 79; 227 n 1; 264 n 15
28	85 n 70. 72; 88 n 83; 265 n 21; 324 n 44	56 ..... 42 n 132; 87 n 77; 246 n 68; 249 n 79; 263 n 11
29	85 n 69; 90 n 91. 94; 92 n 107	57 ..... 240 n 52; 241 n 53; 242 n 57; 243 n 58; 244 n 63
30	84 n 65; 93 n 111; 95 n 122	58 ..... 109 n 173; 240 n 50; 244 n 63; 289 n 116
31	95 n 121; 123 n 218; 137 n 270	59 ..... 55 n 171; 203 n 114; 212 n 143
32	151 n 311; 152 n 317	60 ..... 220 n 173. 175; 264 n 16; 265 n 19; 278 n 77
33	142 n 287; 150 n 309; 151 n 312-313; 152 n 314; 154 n 322. 324; 155 n 329; 182 n 26	61 ..... 205 n 122; 213 n 144; 214 n 151; 215 n 154; 219 n 168
34	97 n 131; 143 n 287; 153 n 320; 252 n 91	62 ..... 222 n 190; 295 n 137; 298 n 151; 385 n 275
35	119 n 202; 120 n 205-206; 125 n 225	63 ..... 294 n 133; 298 n 152; 299 n 158; 302 n 168; 474
36	95 n 118;	64 ..... 184 n 29; 255 n 99; 265 n 18; 278 n 81
		65 ..... 97 n 130; 115 n 190; 150 n 309; 256 n 102; 259 n 2



66 ..... 291 n 124  
 68 ..... 429 n 104  
 69 ..... 47 n 151 ; 362 n 199  
 70 ..... 215 n 154 ; 397 n 315  
 71 ..... 3 n 1  
 73 ..... 475-476  
 74 ..... 475-476  
 75 ..... 475-476  
 76 ..... 110 n 177

*Oracula Sibyllina*, ed. J. Geffcken  
 (GCS 8, Leipzig 1902)

III 4 ..... 41 n 123  
 24 ..... 63 n 201  
 221 ..... 257 n 108

ORIGENES

*Contra Celsum*, ed. P. Koetschau  
 (GCS 2-3, Leipzig 1899)

I 24 ..... 510 n 5  
 IV 65 ..... 389 n 288  
 VI 21 ..... 434 n 115  
 22 ..... 414 n 50  
 25 ..... 354 n 161  
 35 ..... 354 n 161  
 42 ..... 379 n 260 ; 380 n 265  
 65 ..... 328 n 59  
 78 ..... 427 n 97  
 VII 3 ..... 41 n 125  
 4 ..... 375 n 241  
 15 ..... 510 n 5  
 39 ..... 373 n 236  
 42 .....  
 320 n 29 ; 328 n 59 ; 367 n 210  
 45 ..... 321 n 33 ; 372 n 230  
 68 ..... 163 n 367  
 VIII 31 ..... 264 n 14  
 60 ..... 283 n 94  
 63 ..... 373 n 232

*In Ioannem*, ed. E. Preuschen (GCS  
 10, Leipzig 1903)

XIII 16, p. 239, 33 .... 391 n 291  
 XX 20, p. 352, 25 .... 391 n 291  
 24, p. 359, 4 ..... 391 n 291

*Orphica*

*Fragmenta*, ed. O. Kern (Berlin 1922)

3 ..... 299 n 154  
 5 ..... 415 n 51  
 7 ..... 474  
 21a ..... 343 n 118  
 40 ..... 482 n 5  
 54 ..... 37 n 110

55 ..... 379 n 259  
 56 ..... 380 n 263  
 59(4) ..... 37 n 110  
 60 ..... 482 n 5  
 62 ..... 37 n 110  
 82 ..... 150 n 309  
 87 (5) ..... 78 n 45  
 99 ..... 482 n 5  
 107 ..... 482 n 5  
 123 ..... 297 n 147  
 125 ..... 297 n 147  
 132 ..... 84 n 65  
 158 ..... 200 n 97  
 160 ..... 200 n 97  
 168 ..... 28 n 72 ; 343 n 118  
 181 ..... 200 n 97 ; 221 n 189  
 188 ..... 95 n 119  
 209 ..... 114 n 187  
 238 ..... 362 n 196. 198  
 274 ..... 362 n 199  
 290 (15) ..... 362 n 196  
 300 (29) ..... 238 n 41  
 310 ..... 108 n 173  
 353 ..... 267 n 25

Hymni

prooemium 32-33 ..... 269 n 34  
 I 2 ..... 28 n 72 ; 363 n 202  
 6 ..... 363 n 200  
 VIII 18 ..... 154 n 325  
 IX 2 ..... 143 n 288  
 X 22 ..... 357 n 174  
 27 ..... 415 n 56  
 LXVI 6 ..... 459 n 8

OVIDIUS

*Ars amatoria*

III 789 ..... 49 n 158

*Metamorphoses*

I 26 ..... 430 n 107  
 68 ..... 385 n 275  
 168 ..... 196 n 81

*Papyri Graecae Magicae*,

ed. K. Preisendanz (Leipzig 1928-  
 1931)

I 51 ..... 58 n 184  
 57 ..... 229 n 4  
 80 ..... 233 n 18  
 89 ..... 232 n 14  
 178 ..... 236 n 35  
 217 ..... 439 n 136  
 328 ..... 37 n 109  
 II 8-79 ..... 233 n 21  
 53 ..... 245 n 66

88	154 n 324
III 158	239 n 46
160	439 n 136
198	229 n 4
205	243 n 58
290	58 n 184
495	229 n 4
584	489
588	489
IV 196	178 n 4
210	195 n 73
216	439 n 137
286	231 n 11
436	11 n 26
497	301 n 163
529	210 n 138 ; 489
530	199 n 96
537	197 n 85
587	405 n 19
593-594	409 n 32
627	197 n 85
695	243 n 58
785	242 n 54
795	364 n 204
945	192 n 56
1014	146 n 295
1170	362 n 196 ; 409 n 32
1201	409 n 32
1282	420 n 75
1404	91 n 96
1930	239 n 43
1960	239 n 43
2060	232 n 14
2180	232 n 14
2338	298 n 149
2544	91 n 96
2549	242 n 55
2553	362 n 119
2614	242 n 55
2628	262 n 10
2722	271 n 41
2727	241 n 53
2730	242 n 54
2745	94 n 116
2748	241 n 53
2800	90 n 95
2812	94 n 114
2816	143 n 288
2833	362 n 199
2858	364 n 204
2864	91 n 96
2916	362 n 199
2940	242 n 56
2967	231 n 11. 13
VII 205	15 n 34
529	154 n 325 ; 420 n 75
584	409 n 32
634	15 n 34

690	239 n 43. 45
780	242 n 56
883	192 n 56
884	256 n 102
891	245 n 66
XII 240	407 n 25
242	288 n 109
XIII 30	233 n 21
54	230 n 8
58	233 n 21
118	233 n 21
255	15 n 34
258	411 n 39
334	15 n 34
337	411 n 39
378	230 n 8
430	233 n 21
450	411 n 39
732	439 n 136
796	439 n 138
800	439 n 138
983	407 n 25
XIVa 5	411 n 39
XXIIb 23	178 n 4
XXIII 8	91 n 96
XXXV 20	439 n 137

## PAUSANIAS

## Graeciae descriptio

V 11, 5	135 n 260
---------	-----------

## PETRONIUS

## Cena Trimalchionis

55	40 n 122
----	----------

## PHILO

## De Abrahamo

58	370 n 221
119	370 n 222

## De aeternitate mundi

2	261 n 7
---	---------

## De confusione linguarum

92	370 n 320
136	350 n 144
166	350 n 144
172	347 n 135

## De congressu eruditionis gratia

8	150 n 309
104	377 n 253
104-105	376 n 250

## De decalogo

10	261 n 7
----	---------

- De ebrietate  
 30 ..... 340 n 106 ; 341 n 112  
 44 ..... 370 n 222  
 106 ..... 370 n 221  
 164 ..... 331 n 68
- De exsecrationibus  
 152 ..... 304 n 173
- De fuga et inventione  
 51 ..... 340 n 105  
 101 ..... 351 n 150  
 109 ..... 340 n 105  
 112 ..... 347 n 133
- De gigantibus  
 13 ..... 303 n 171
- De migratione Abrahami  
 31 ..... 370 n 217  
 103 ..... 318 n 19  
 181 ..... 346 n 132  
 181-183 ..... 350 n 145  
 184 ..... 320 n 25  
 191 ..... 370 n 220  
 192 ..... 322 n 34
- De mutatione nominum  
 3 ..... 370 n 220  
 4 ..... 369 n 217  
 6 ..... 370 n 222  
 184 ..... 318 n 22  
 267 ..... 403 n 9
- De officio mundi  
 8 ..... 322 n 34  
 16 ..... 317 n 15 ; 330 n 68  
 20 ..... 347 n 135  
 21 ..... 350 n 145-146  
 25 ..... 318 n 19  
 36 ..... 123 n 219  
 70-71 ..... 376 n 250  
 71 ..... 191 n 55 ;  
     328 n 58 ; 347 n 134 ; 369 n 217  
 91 ..... 376 n 249  
 136-137 ..... 383 n 270
- De plantatione  
 9 ..... 347 n 133  
 23 ..... 469 n 11  
 26 ..... 469 n 11  
 27 ..... 469 n 11  
 58 ..... 374 n 239  
 169 ..... 374 n 239
- De posteritate Caini  
 5 ..... 217 n 164  
 14 ..... 369 n 217  
 16 ..... 369 n 217  
 31 ..... 282 n 90  
 167 ..... 369 n 217
- 169 ..... 369 n 216  
 175 ..... 331 n 68
- De praemiis et poenis  
 37 ..... 369 n 217
- De sobrietate  
 3 ..... 374 n 239
- De somniis  
 I 21 ..... 397 n 318  
   53-54 ..... 255 n 98  
   112. 115 ..... 370 n 222  
   140 ..... 164 n 371  
   150 ..... 415 n 51  
   150-151 ..... 304 n 173  
   186 ..... 352 n 150
- De specialibus legibus  
 I 37-50 ..... 369 n 217  
   46 ..... 347 n 135  
   66 ..... 146 n 293  
   266 ..... 217 n 164  
   315 ..... 447  
   329 ..... 333 n 76  
 II 165 ..... 369 n 217  
   177 ..... 369 n 217  
 III 2 ..... 370 n 221  
 IV 92 ..... 205 n 121
- De virtutibus  
 104 ..... 151 n 312  
 164 ..... 370 n 222
- De vita contemplativa  
 27 ..... 370 n 222
- De vita Mosis  
 II 127 ..... 318 n 19  
   132 .....  
     ... 347 n 133. 135 ; 350 n 145  
   288 ..... 217 n 165 ; 471 n 21  
   289 ..... 447
- Legatio ad Caium  
 355 ..... 216 n 157
- Legum allegoriae  
 I 22 ..... 317 n 17  
 II 2 ..... 318 n 22  
   49 ..... 340 n 106  
 III 18 ..... 277 n 77  
   104 ..... 340 n 105  
   172 ..... 173 n 403 ; 469 n 11
- Questiones in Exodum  
 II 40 ..... 304 n 173 ; 489  
   51 ..... 151 n 312  
   66 ..... 323 n 38  
   67 ..... 369 n 217

## Questiones in Genesim

III 11	217 n 164
IV 1	151 n 312 ; 369 n 217
2	374 n 237
4	369 n 217 ; 370 n 222
46	489

## Quis rerum divinarum heres sit

23	347 n 133
188	347 n 133
224	143 n 288
246	347 n 133
281	217 n 164 ; 391 n 291

## Quod deterius potiori insidiari solet

54	340 n 106
176	277 n 77

## Quod deus sit immutabilis

56	276 n 70
82	318 n 22

## Fragmenta, ed. J. R. Harris (Cambridge 1886)

p. 65	323 n 38
66	369 n 217
70a	350 n 143
72	369 n 217 ; 373 n 234

## PHILOPONUS

## De aeternitate mundi, ed. H. Rabe (Leipzig 1899)

XIV, p. 539, 4-5	384 n 274
------------------	-----------

## De opificio mundi, ed. W. Reichardt (Leipzig 1897)

IV 20, p. 201	51 n 162 ; 53 n 165
---------------	---------------------

## In Aristotelis Categorias, ed. A. Busse (CAG 13 /1, Berlin 1898)

VI 13	262 n 10
-------	----------

## PHILOSTRATUS

## Vita Apollonii

III 14	453 n 18
VI 11	453 n 18
VIII 7	447

## PROTIUS

## Bibliotheca, ed. E. Bekker (Berlin 1824-1825)

117 A 14	16 n 41
143 B 19	109 n 174
173 A 13	73 n 28
463 A 11	449 n 3

## PINDARUS

## Olympionica

II 65	294 n 133
X 105	212 n 142

## Paeanes

II 77	94 n 116
-------	----------

## Fragmenta, ed. O. Schroeder (Leipzig 1900)

137	211 n 140
-----	-----------

## PLATO

## Axiochus

371 C	221 n 178
-------	-----------

## Convivium

202 D 13	436
202 E	163
202 E 3	133 n 254
202 E 7	349 n 139
202 E 8	270 n 37
209 E 5	176 n 410
210 E 4	176 n 410
211 B 7	374 n 241
212 A 5	374 n 241

## Cratylus

397 D	511 n 9
400 C	500 n 8
402 B	84 n 65
403 A 5	296 n 142
405 C 2	49 n 158
407 B	501 n 9
407 D 3	135 n 260
407 E 6	163 n 365
408 B 5	163 n 365
413 A	262 n 10c
416 C 7	469

## Critias

113 B 7	282 n 92
---------	----------

## Definitiones

411 C 7	356 n 168
---------	-----------

## Epinomis

982 B 5	356 n 170
984	268 n 34
986 C 6	145 n 291

## Epistulae

II 312 E	327 n 52
VI 323 D 4	327 n 52

## Gorgias

493 B 4	296 n 142
507 E 6	345 n 128

523 B	284 n 96
524 D 5	171 n 395
<b>Leges</b>	
666 A 5	155 n 329
713 D	500 n 7
717 B	511 n 9
796 C 1	95 n 118
892 C 2	356 n 170
895 C 12	356 n 168
896 B 3	356 n 168
896 C 2	356 n 169
896 E	356 n 169
896 E 8	356 n 171 ; 366 n 207
898 A	403 n 9
903 C	256 n 105
904 C 10	396 n 313

**Meno**

81 A 5	273 n 53
--------	----------

**Phaedo**

65 D 1	173 n 403
66 D 1	278 n 78
67 C 8	147 n 296
67 C-D	188 n 42
68 C 1	278 n 80
80 C 4	187 n 39
80 D 6	296 n 142
80 E 4	173 n 403
81 B 2	278 n 78
81 C	178 n 402 ; 173 n 403
81 C 8	278 n 77
81 C 10	295 n 136
99 C 5	345 n 128
106 D	356 n 168
109 C 2	385 n 275
112 A	379 n 259
112 A 2	298 n 149
113 A 8	298 n 148
113 B 1	297 n 147

**Phaedrus**

227 A 1	469 n 13
240 C 7	277 n 76
245 A	187 n 38
245 A 3	189 n 45
245 C 6-7	356 n 168
245 C 9	356 n 169
246 C 3	172 n 402 ; 396 n 313
246 C 6	178 n 4
246 D 8	510 n 4
246 E 4	349 n 141 ; 510 n 4
247 A	140 n 275
247 A 4	188 n 44
247 B-D	328 n 58
247 B 4	295 n 136
247 C	328 n 58
247 C 2	328 n 57
247 D 1	160 n 355

248 A	108 n 173
248 A 7	277 n 76
248 C 3	136 n 263
249 A 7	223 n 191
249 C 7	176 n 410 ; 425 n 51
250 A	190 n 53
250 B	176 n 410
250 B 6	186 n 37 ; 188 n 44
250 C 4	205 n 119
250 C 6	277 n 72
251 B 2	492
251 C 8	85 n 70 ; 492
251 E 5	261 n 7
253	172 n 402 ; 173 n 403
253 E	492
255 B 1	358 n 176
258 E 7	492

**Politicus**

271 D	500 n 7
272 E 5	357 n 175

**Res publica**

363 D 6	298 n 148
364 C 3	58 n 184
366 A 4	299 n 154
366 B 1	273 n 53
379 A	273 n 55
392 A 4	511 n 9
477 C 1	346 n 132
505 A 2	372 n 321
507-511	372 n 230
509 A 3	389 n 286
509 B 3	154 n 325
509 B 8	327 n 54
509 B 9	319 n 25 ; 371 n 228
509 D 2	327 n 52
511 B 7	374 n 241
511 E 1	146 n 295
517 B-C	151 n 312 ; 411 n 39
517 B 4	488
517 B 8	372 n 229
517 C	49 n 158
517 C 3	153 n 319
518 C 8	469 n 11
519 B 3	169 n 386
521 C 2	488
521 C 6	469 n 11
521 C 7	449 n 3
525 A 1	469 n 11
525 C 5	469 n 11
527 E 2	373 n 236
529 B 5	372 n 231
532 B 7	469 n 11
532 C 5	469 n 11
533 D 2	169 n 386 ; 186 n 37
535 C 1	135 n 260
540 A 7	197 n 83 ; 372 n 229 ; 373 n 233

577 E 2	277 n 76	35 B	25 n 66
588 E 1	277 n 72	36 B 6	254 n 97
611 D 5	277 n 72	36 E 2 et 37 A 5	354 n 161
615 E	299 n 158	36 E 3	91 n 99 ; 354 n 159-160
617 C	108 n 173	36 E 7	359 n 183
621 A	190 n 53	37 A	25 n 66
621 A 1	294 n 133 ; 474	37 A 1	360 n 187
<b>Sophista</b>		37 A 6	115 n 190
247 E 3	346 n 132	37 B	371 n 226
248 E	403 n 9	37 B 8	146 n 295
<b>Theaetetus</b>		37 C 2	178 n 4
152 C 9	186 n 38	37 C 6	356 n 169
155 D	145 n 291	37 C 7	341 n 111
176 A 7	389	37 D 3	402 n 5
176 A 8	173 n 403	37 D 5	104 n 158
176 B	492	37 D 6	102 n 151 ; 402 n 7
176 E 2	389	38 A 3	104 n 158
177 A 1	389	38 A 5	104 n 158
<b>Timaeus</b>		38 A 7	104 n 158
23 D 5	500	38 B 6	357 n 173
23 D 7	503 n 25	39 D 3	402 n 3
24 A 4	500 n 5	39 E	268 n 34 ; 325 n 47
24 C 1	501 n 14	40 D	348 n 137
24 C 3	501 n 15	40 D-E	446
24 C 6	507 n 41	40 D 6	349 n 139
24 D 6	502 n 18	41 A-B	330 n 66 ; 347
24 D 7	505 n 32	41 A 5	341 n 111
25 D 2	294 n 133	41 A 7	113 n 184 ; 327 n 52-53
28 A 3	102 n 151	41 B	350 n 144
28 B 2	126 n 227	41 B 1	346 n 132
28 B 7	125 n 225	41 B 4	347 n 133 ; 348 n 137
28 C 3	319 n 25 ; 320 n 29 ; 327 n 52 ; 341 n 108. 111 ; 350 n 143	41 C 5	348 n 138
29 C 3	11 n 26 ; 146 n 295	41 D	358
29 E	330 n 66 ; 350 n 146	41 D 4	359 n 180
30 A 2	384 n 274	41 D 7	359 n 180
30 A 4	274 n 58 ; 378 n 258	41 E 2	357 n 175
30 A 5	345 n 130	41 E 3	183 n 27
30 B 4	182 n 24	42 B 3	223 n 191
31 B-32 C	345 n 130	42 D 4-5	501 n 12
31 B-C	345 n 128	42 E 8	348 n 138
31 B 1	120 n 206	44 A 6	277 n 72
31 C	347 n 134	44 A 8	182 n 25
32 B-C	345 n 128	44 B 1	181 n 22
32 C 1	120 n 204	49 A-B	343 n 120
32 C 2	127 n 232 ; 347 n 134	49 A 3	298 n 148
32 C 7-8	384 n 274	49 A 6	297 n 145
32 C 8	85 n 70	50 C 1	296 n 141
34 B	254 n 97	50 D	317 n 15
34 B 2	120 n 204	50 D 1	348 n 138
34 B 9	341 n 111	50 D 2	297 n 145
34 C 5	356 n 169	50 D 5	297 n 145
35 A	359	50 D 7	296 n 141
35 A 3	324 n 44	51 A	317 n 18
35 A 5	353 n 157	51 A 2	348 n 138
		51 A 4	297 n 145
		51 A 7	296 n 141-142 ; 297 n 145 ; 378 n 258

51 B 1	384 n 274
51 A 8	378 n 256
52 B 2	296 n 141 ; 384 n 274
52 D 5	297 n 145
52 E 1	296 n 143
52 E 3	296 n 143
52 E 4	378 n 258
53 A 8	297 n 144
53 B	317 n 18
53 B 2	384 n 274
53 B 4	345 n 130
53 B 4	345 n 130
69 B 5	345 n 130
69 C	363 n 201
70 A	205 n 121
90 C 1	278 n 80
91 B 7	277 n 76

PLAUTUS

*Anularia*

79 ..... 385 n 275

*Miles gloriosus*

1079 ..... 406 n 24

PLOTINUS

*Enneades*

I 1, 8	328 n 58
2	465 n 29
2, 7	188 n 44
3, 1	488
4, 9	277 n 77
6, 5	294 n 136
6, 6	488
6, 7	26 n 68 ; 171 n 395
6, 8	304 n 173
6, 8-9	374 n 237
6, 9	368 n 213 ;
	371 n 266 ; 372 n 231 ; 488
8, 4	295 n 136
8, 7	296 n 138-139
8, 13	277 n 77 ; 282 n 90 ; 304 n 173
8, 15	294 n 136
II 3, 6	256 n 105
3, 17	276 n 70
4, 1	296 n 139
4, 5	298 n 148
9	314 n 6
9, 6	325 n 46 ; 393 n 300
9, 7	182 n 25
9, 8-9	393 n 300
9, 9	327 n 53
9, 10	294 n 136
9, 14	58 n 184 ; 364 n 206

9, 15	393 n 300
9, 18	366 n 207
III 1, 7	357 n 174
2, 1	325 n 46
2, 3	256 n 105
2, 8	256 n 105
4, 2	173 n 403
5	354 n 159
5, 9	221 n 179
7, 3-6	402 n 5
7, 4	17 n 44 ; 402 n 6
7, 5	403 n 10
7, 11-12	357 n 173
8, 4	356 n 172
8, 9	355 n 166
8, 10	488
9, 3	182 n 25
IV 1, 1	17 n 44 ; 317 n 16
2, 1	353 n 157
2, 2	358 n 179
3, 6	359 n 180 ; 366 n 207
3, 10	375 n 241
3, 22	182 n 25
3, 26	190 n 53
4, 3	355 n 166
4, 43-44	452 n 14
7, 10	488
8	450 n 8
8, 1	197 n 86 ; 375 n 241
8, 3	346 n 132
8, 6	351 n 148
9, 4	488
9, 9	221 n 179
V 1, 1	488
1, 2	356 n 171
1, 4	402 n 5
1, 5	374 n 241
1, 6	373 n 232
1, 7	340 n 103 ; 355 n 165
1, 8	327 n 52-54
3, 4	327 n 55
3, 12	327 n 53-54 ; 328 n 58
3, 13	328 n 59
3, 17	372
4, 1	351 n 148 ; 488
4, 2	356 n 168 ; 395 n 307
5	323 n 39
5, 9	182 n 25
5, 11	317 n 16
7, 1	488
8, 1	327 n 53
9, 2	261 n 7
9, 6	317 n 16
9, 8	317 n 16
9, 9	317 n 16
VI 4, 2	353 n 157

4, 3	334 n 82
6, 1	295 n 136
7, 22	374 n 241
7, 23	469 n 11
7, 32	169 n 384
8, 13	331 n 69
8, 19	327 n 54
9, 1	173 n 403
9, 2	368 n 212
9, 3-7	367 n 211
9, 4	278 n 77; 371 n 224; 375 n 241
9, 5	317 n 16; 335 n 82; 370 n 219
9, 7	368 n 212; 374 n 241
9, 9	188 n 44; 295 n 136; 375 n 241; 376 n 249
9, 11	186 n 37; 197 n 86

## PLUTARCHUS

## Moralia

## Ad principem ineruditum

781 F	333 n 74
-------	----------

## De animae procreatione in Timaeo

1014 C	298 n 148; 379 n 262
1015 A	297 n 143
1015 E	360 n 187; 379 n 262
1016 C	379 n 262
1024 B	355 n 166
1026 B	357 n 174; 360 n 187
1026 A	379 n 262
1029 E	360 n 187

## De defectu oraculorum

414 E	46 n 145
415 A	381 n 266; 382 n 269
421 E	245 n 65
422 C	402 n 6
426 B-C	333 n 74
431 E	261 n 8
443 D	151 n 312

## De facie in orbe lunae

940 E	385 n 275
943 D	197 n 83
943 E	284 n 96
944 C	272 n 46

## De fato

568 D	357 n 175
568 E	364 n 203
568 E-F	357 n 174
573 B-C	331 n 69

## De genio Socratis

588 D	264 n 17
-------	----------

591 B	356 n 170
591 E	277 n 77

## De Iside et Osiride

370 E	388 n 282
371 B	379 n 261
372 E	317 n 18; 383 n 272
372 E-373 C	341 n 112
374 C	379 n 261
382 D	176 n 410; 375 n 241

## De sera numinis vindicta

562 B	261 n 7
566 A	294 n 136

## Epitome de animae procreatione in Timaeo

1030 F	264 n 14
--------	----------

## Questiones convivales

718 A	341 n 108
718 D	176 n 410
718 E	373 n 236

## Questiones Platonicae

1001 B	341 n 111; 343 n 141; 353 n 151
1002 C	182 n 25
1007 C	356 n 170
1008 A	205 n 121

## Vitae parallelae

Numa	
72 F	94 n 111
Romulus	
35 C-36 B	215 n 156

## PORPHYRIUS

## Ad Gaurum, ed. K. Kalbfleisch (Berlin 1895)

p. 34	190 n 53
-------	----------

## Ad Marcellam, ed. A. Nacuk (Leipzig 1886)

p. 277, 19	449 n 3
278, 2	190 n 53
281, 7	469 n 11
24	265 n 19
287, 7	55 n 172
22	265 n 19
289, 17	145 n 291
291, 8	488

## Contra Christianos, ed. A. von Harnack (Berlin 1916)

fr. 42	273 n 55
49	381 n 266
76	14 n 31



De abstinentia, ed. A. Nauck (Leipzig 1886)

I 38, p. 114, 10 ..... 389 n 286  
 40, p. 116, 11 .....  
 ..... 382 n 269 ; 504 n 29  
 II 33, p. 163, 15 ..... 510 n 5  
 34, p. 164, 1 ..... 488  
 37, p. 166, 3 .....  
 ..... 334 n 79 ; 505 n 36  
 37-43 ..... 285 n 100  
 38, p. 167, 10 ..... 381 n 268  
 15 ..... 507 n 41  
 26 ..... 381 268  
 39, p. 168, 19 .....  
 .... 236 n 36 ; 283 n 94  
 40, p. 169, 13 ..... 259 n 2  
 19 ..... 381 n 267  
 p. 170, 6 ..... 381 n 266  
 43, p. 172, 21 ..... 389 n 287  
 49, p. 176, 19 ..... 510 n 5  
 III 5, p. 193, 1 ..... 510 n 5  
 17, p. 206, 13 ..... 94 n 114  
 IV 9, p. 242, 1 ..... 12 n 28  
 16, p. 254, 13 ..... 235 n 29  
 21 .....  
 .... 94 n 114 ; 242 n 55  
 18, p. 258, 16 ..... 453 n 18  
 25 ..... 218 n 167

De antro nympharum, ed. A. Nauck (Leipzig 1886)

5, p. 59, 12 ..... 297 n 143  
 7, p. 60, 23 ..... 333 n 76  
 11, p. 64, 25 ..... 294 n 136  
 18, p. 69, 12 ..... 144 n 288  
 25, p. 73, 11 ..... 421 n 79

De cultu simulacrorum, ed. J. Bidez (Gand 1913)

p. 2\*, 1 ..... 431 n 110  
 6\*, 9 ..... 348 n 136  
 14\*, 14 ..... 143 n 288  
 14\*, 17 ..... 501 n 9  
 17\*, 19 ..... 225 n 197

De philosophia ex oraculis haurienda ed. G. Wolff (Berlin 1856)

p. 110 ..... 8 n 21 ; 152 n 316  
 112 ..... 511 n 6  
 118 ..... 17 n 43  
 122 .... 48 n 152 ; 363 n 201  
 127 .....  
 52 n 163 ; 64 n 205 ; 225 n 197  
 129 ..... 9 n 23  
 130 ..... 51 n 162  
 130-137 ..... 248 n 75  
 133 ..... 23 n 57 ; 51 n 162  
 134 ... 292 n 129-130 ; 447  
 138 ..... 52 n 164 ; 425 n 91  
 140 ..... 23 n 57

140-141 ..... 63 n 201  
 141 ..... 17 n 43 ; 427 n 97  
 142 ..... 454 n 23  
 144 ..... 9 n 25 ; 12 n 27  
 145 ..... 14 n 31  
 146 ..... 24 n 59  
 147 ..... 284 n 96-97  
 149 ..... 307 n 183  
 151 ..... 241 n 53 ;  
 271 n 41 ; 292 n 130 ; 363 n 202  
 153 ..... 33 n 90  
 155 ..... 51 n 162 ; 58 n 184  
 156 ..... 51 n 162 ; 95 n 118  
 159 ..... 59 n 186  
 160 . 40 n 116 ; 41 n 126 ; 43 n  
 136 ; 44 n 137 ; 56 n 176  
 162 ..... 40 n 117  
 163 ..... 40 n 116. 121-122  
 164 ..... 235 n 29  
 165 ..... 53 n 166  
 176 ..... 51 n 162 ;  
 53 n 165 ; 55 n 176 ; 447  
 177 ..... 53 n 166  
 178 ..... 63 n 203  
 180 ..... 52 n 162  
 183 ..... 451 n 10  
 186 ..... 33 n 90  
 206 ..... 247 n 70  
 212 ..... 248 n 72  
 231 ..... 18 n 46  
 238 ..... 21 n 52

De regressu animae, ed. J. Bidez (Gand 1913)

p. 27\*, 2 ..... 449 n 4  
 27\*, 13 ..... 275 n 65  
 28\*, 7 ..... 55 n 172  
 28\*, 16 ..... 452 n 14  
 28\*, 20 ... 177 n 3 ; 452 n 16  
 29\*, 2 ..... 507 n 43  
 29\*, 3 .. 236 n 36 ; 431 n 110  
 29\*, 4 ..... 452 n 17  
 29\*, 16 . 42 n 130 ; 286 n 105-106  
 30\*, 22 ..... 286 n 106  
 32\*, 2 ... 177 n 3 ; 452 n 16  
 32\*, 23 ..... 452 n 15  
 33\*, 10 .. 223 n 194 ; 289 n 112  
 33\*, 20 ..... 224 n 194  
 34\*, 10 ... 236 n 36 ; 452 n 15  
 35\*, 27 ..... 80 n 50  
 36\*, 5 ... 148 n 300 ; 455 n 24  
 37\*, 12 ..... 452 n 13  
 37\*, 22 ..... 452 n 11  
 38\*, 12 ..... 454 n 21  
 39\*, 6 ..... 225 n 197  
 40\*, 14 ..... 452 n 13  
 41\*, 13 ..... 223 n 197  
 41\*, 15. 24. 31. 34 .. 452 n 13  
 41\*, 35 ..... 215 n 156

- 42\*, 2, 4 ..... 452 n 13  
 42\*, 7 ..... 449 n 3  
 42\*, 8 ..... 453 n 18  
 42\*, 11 ..... 487  
 43\*, 2 ..... 449 n 4
- Epistola ad Anebonem, ed. G. Parthey  
 (Iamblichus. De mysteriis, Berlin 1857,  
 p. XXIX-XLV)**
- fr. 2 ..... 510 n 2  
 3 ..... 289 n 112  
 4-5 ..... 467 n 3  
 14 ..... 229 n 3  
 26 ..... 236 n 34  
 46 ..... 453 n 19  
 48 ..... 291 n 125
- Philosophica historia, ed. A. Nauck  
 (Leipzig 1886)**
- fr. XVI, p. 14, 5 ..... 78 n 43  
 XVII, p. 14, 10 ..... 327 n 52  
 p. 14, 17 ..... 78 n 43  
 XVIII, p. 14, 19 ..... 402 n 5
- Sententiae ad intelligibilia ducentes,  
 ed. B. Mommert (Leipzig 1907)**
- 25, p. 11, 6 ..... 371 n 226  
 28, p. 12, 10 ..... 500 n 8  
 29, p. 13, 8 ..... 502 n 21  
 29, p. 14, 13 ..... 416 n 61  
 29, p. 14, 14 ..... 183 n 26  
 29, p. 14, 17 ..... 190 n 53  
 30, p. 15, 19 ..... 488  
 32, p. 17, 12 ..... 465 n 28  
 37, p. 33, 19 ..... 488  
 44, p. 45, 16 ..... 357 n 173  
 44, p. 45, 17 ..... 402 n 7
- Vita Plotini**
- 2 ..... 488  
 3 .....  
 323 n 38 ; 393 n 301 ; 505 n 34  
 4 ..... 323 n 38  
 10 ..... 33 n 91 ; 224 n 196  
 14 ..... 326 n 50  
 16 ..... 325 n 47 ; 453  
 17 ..... 450 n 7  
 18 ..... 324 n 41  
 22 ..... 64 n 204  
 23 ..... 17 n 43 ; 225 n 196 ;  
 374 n 241 ; 488 ; 510 n 5  
 26 ..... 71 n 14
- Vita Pythagorae**
- 51 ..... 109 n 174
- Presocratici**
- ed. H. Diels (*Die Fragmente der  
 Vorsokratiker*<sup>1</sup>, Berlin 1934)
- Heraclitus**
- 12 B 16 ..... 431 n 110  
 12 B 64 ..... 431 n 109  
 12 C 4 ..... 431 n 109
- Empedocles**
- 21 B 35, 2 ..... 155 n 329  
 21 B 84, 5 ..... 169 n 385  
 21 B 109 ..... 371 n 226
- Philolaos**
- 32 A 29 ..... 371 n 226  
 32 B 21 ..... 406 n 24
- Ocellus**
- 35a 8 ..... 109 n 174
- Pythagorici**
- 45 B 5 ..... 512 n 10  
 45 B 17 ..... 109 n 174  
 45 B 35 ..... 397 n 318
- Critias**
- 81 B 18 ..... 102 n 151
- PROCLUS**
- Ad Hesiodi Opera et Dies, ed. Th.  
 Gaistford (*Poetae Graeci Minores*,  
 vol. III, Oxford 1821, p. 9)**
- ad v. 151 ..... 268 n 30  
 ad v. 169 ..... 221 n 178
- De decem dubitationibus circa provi-  
 dentiam, ed. V. Cousin (*Procli opera  
 inedita*, Paris 1864, p. 76-145)**
- p. 76, 9 ..... 266 n 21
- De malorum subsistentia, ed. V.  
 Cousin (*ibid.*, p. 196-267)**
- p. 214, 7-36 .....  
 236 n 34 ; 273 n 52 ; 308 n 185  
 214, 17 ..... 389 n 286  
 214, 35 ..... 236 n 34 ; 508 n 45  
 222, 25 ..... 170 n 395  
 259 ..... 253 n 93
- De providentia et fato, ed. V. Cousin  
 (*ibid.*, p. 146-195)**
- p. 155, 26 ..... 98 n 134  
 164, 7 ..... 98 n 134  
 164, 8 ..... 266 n 23  
 164, 11 ..... 212 n 143  
 164, 26 ..... 212 n 142  
 179, 22 .....  
 84 n 66 ; 98 n 136 ; 255 n 21

Excerpta Vaticana, ed. J. B. Pitra  
(*Analecta sacra et classica*, V/2,  
Rome - Paris 1888, p. 192-195)

p. 192, 12 ..... 39 n 92  
13-14 ..... 261 n 7

193, 1-2 .....  
... 169 n 388; 172 n 400  
3-4 ..... 278 n 81  
12-15 ..... 491-493  
13-14 ..... 145 n 291 l  
17 ..... 277 n 75  
18-19 ..... 278 n 81  
24 ..... 265 n 18

194, 29-30 ..... 78 n 45  
32 ..... 112 n 181

195, 16-18 .....  
..... 191 n 53; 438 n 132

Hymni, ed. A. Ludwich (Leipzig 1897)

I 1 ..... 200 n 97  
2 ..... 154 n 324-325  
3 ..... 150 n 309  
4 ..... 200 n 100  
17 ..... 86 n 74  
27 ..... 216 n 161  
47 ..... 86 n 74

II 14 ..... 12 n 26  
15 ..... 354 n 159  
16 ..... 95 n 118

III 6 ..... 493

IV 2 ..... 261 n 7  
8 ..... 493

V 14 ..... 191 n 55

VI 2 ..... 110 n 177  
6 ..... 366 n 207

In Platonis Cratylum, ed. G. Pasquali (Leipzig 1908)

p. 19, 12 ..... 495  
20, 29 ..... 134 n 256  
21, 1 ..... 191 n 55  
25, 1 ..... 496  
29, 21 ..... 191 n 55; 192 n 56  
30, 15 ..... 470 n 17; 471 n 20  
31, 4-6 ..... 192 n 56  
6 ..... 252 n 92  
8 ..... 252 n 92  
12 ..... 244 n 63  
27 ..... 239 n 46

32, 6 ..... 443  
16 ..... 195 n 74; 439 n 136  
29 ..... 129 n 240

33, 14 ..... 133 n 254; 136 n 263  
15 ..... 134 n 256  
35, 3 ..... 291 n 124  
37, 18 ..... 225 n 197  
51, 26 ..... 114 n 187; 445  
53, 2 ..... 356 n 168  
57, 14 ..... 113 n 184

25 ..... 36 n 104; 159 n 351  
26 ..... 445

58, 8 ..... 78 n 45  
11 ..... 82 n 58; 135 n 260  
16 ..... 121 n 209

59, 2 ..... 76 n 37; 81 n 56  
3 ..... 82 n 58  
6 ..... 160 n 353  
19 ..... 77 n 43

61, 9 ..... 278 n 77  
63, 9 ..... 108 n 173  
25 ..... 160 n 353

65, 25 ..... 129 n 240  
67, 19 ..... 161 n 359  
68, 12 ..... 225 n 197  
68, 16-69, 3 ..... 306 n 179  
68, 25 ..... 224 n 194  
69, 6 ..... 283 n 94  
71, 17 ..... 261 n 7  
19 ..... 273 n 52  
72, 8 ..... 56 n 177  
10 ..... 5 n 3

74, 26 ..... 133 n 253  
75, 23 ..... 273 n 52; 308 n 185  
75, 25-76, 4 ..... 306 n 179  
76, 11 ..... 308 n 186  
13 ..... 260 n 3; 298 n 151  
22 ..... 77 n 40  
78, 24 ..... 49 n 158  
81, 1 ..... 121 n 209  
2 ..... 84 n 65  
14 ..... 84 n 65

86, 1 ..... 138 n 270  
88, 4 ..... 170 n 395  
91, 11 ..... 142 n 283  
92, 12 ..... 160 n 355  
95, 2 ..... 95 n 119  
96, 2 ..... 206 n 125  
12-103, 23 ..... 200 n 97  
16 ..... 150 n 309  
98, 14 ..... 200 n 100  
100, 21 .....  
39 n 115; 45 n 139; 228 n 1

101, 3 ..... 6 n 11  
6 ..... 45 n 139  
9 ..... 49 n 158; 151 n 312  
20 ..... 151 n 312  
27 ..... 92 n 106  
104, 6 ..... 303 n 170  
105, 18 ..... 95 n 119  
28 ..... 85 n 72  
106, 1 ..... 88 n 83; 95 n 119

In Platonis Parmenidem, ed. V. Cousin (*Procli opera inedita*, Paris 1864, p. 617-1314)

p. 620, 22 ..... 78 n 45  
628, 10-11 ..... 78 n 45

647, 4	464 n 22	27	470 n 17
6	137 n 267	352, 16	469 n 12
661, 16	327 n 55	356, 23	80 n 52
666, 38	468 n 9	357, 12	144 n 291
669, 32	374 n 241	28	264 n 17 ; 304 n 173
670, 16	190 n 53	364, 2	160 n 353
674, 37	245 n 65	372, 31	127 n 233 ; 179 n 8
692, 21	294 n 133	373, 13	127 n 233
789, 7	127 n 233	377, 35	245 n 65
770, 29	147 n 296	381, 15	211 n 140
777, 9	128 n 236	382, 8	384 n 278
782, 32	469 n 12	398, 2	373 n 232
783, 29	469 n 12	6	248 n 73
800, 11	110 n 177	14	468 n 9
19	443	417, 13	264 n 17
801, 30	111 n 177	433, 16	170 n 395
33	111 n 178	441, 27	191 n 55 ; 195 n 74
802, 18	111 n 177	30	134 n 256
22	330 n 68	461, 28	228 n 1
821, 1	356 n 170	30	495
839, 25	384 n 274	463, 5	194 n 67
847, 25	495	465, 10	170 n 395
888, 5	346 n 130	466, 27	384 n 274
889, 24	346 n 131	28	385 n 275
895, 7	91 n 97	472, 9	261 n 7
903, 9	126 n 228	20	190 n 53
904, 12	108 n 173	502, 3	190 n 53
909, 12	347 n 134	14	359 n 180
925, 16	85 n 70	512, 10	357 n 173
927, 27	145 n 291	517, 36	55 n 171
935, 14	110 n 177	545, 14	190 n 53
941, 25	131 n 246		
942, 25	131 n 246		
954, 1	70 n 13		
990, 27	263 n 11		
1044, 9	151 n 312		
1067, 3	78 n 45		
1070, 4, 7, 14	78 n 45		
1071, 2	78 n 45		
1090, 26	105 n 163		
1091, 6	106 n 165		
1094, 25	42 n 132		
1161, 28-29	99 n 138		
1171, 4	160 n 353		
1199, 36	133 n 254		
In Platonis Primum Alcibiadem, ed. V. Cousin ( <i>ibid.</i> , p. 281-602)		In Platonis Rem publicam, ed. W. Kroll (vol. I-II, Leipzig 1899-1901)	
p. 288, 13	49 n 158	t. I, p. 28, 1	273 n 55
293, 19	228 n 1	37, 9	246 n 68
317, 19	469 n 12	11	464 n 22
317, 36	127 n 232	39, 18	246 n 68
320, 12, 25 ; 325, 23	469 n 12	40, 21	71 n 14 ; 451 n 9
333, 14	145 n 291	24	445
340, 1	69 n 8 ; 238 n 41	75, 29	206 n 124
6	227 n 1	80, 17	69 n 8
8	264 n 15	91, 19	245 n 65
341, 24	298 n 151	99, 1	114 n 187
		110, 22	464 n 22
		111, 1	69 n 8 ; 240 n 52 ; 444
		28	39 n 116
		120, 12	495
		121, 19	201 n 102
		122, 1	223 n 191
		128, 29	177 n 2
		135, 31	114 n 187
		137, 21	90 n 94
		138, 5	119 n 201
		152, 7	184 n 32
		10	177 n 3 ; 446
		12	207 n 127

14	185 n 34
153, 12	207 n 128
18	207 n 128
176, 22	264 n 17
178, 17	
196	n 79 ; 204 n 118
255, 17	495
269-287	372 n 230
270, 9	328 n 58
280, 26	373 n 233
t. II, p. 3, 20	260, 5
11, 22	402 n 3
17, 17	402 n 3
51, 26	396 n 313
52, 5	396 n 313
64, 6	69 n 9
65, 3	465 n 24
66, 2	
234	n 28 ; 251 n 86
77, 7	278 n 77
95, 10	277 n 72
96, 11	326 n 50
99, 1	189 n 45
112, 21	194 n 67
118, 8	445
119, 5	187 n 39
13	187 n 39
120, 4	194 n 67
123, 8	187 n 40
12	5 n 3
13	187 n 41
126, 14	
	31 n 87 ; 32 n 89
128, 2-134, 23	280 n 85
133, 5	281 n 86
17	98 n 134 ; 445
143, 23	253 n 93
147, 9	
304	n 173 ; 308 n 185
150, 21	90 n 91
25	298 n 151
154, 5	465 n 23
17	220 n 173 ; 495
155, 6	119 n 201
17	297 n 143
179, 13	379 n 259
180, 8	299 n 158
11	236 n 34 ; 273 n 52
183, 17	378 n 259
24-25	379 n 259
185, 10	238 n 41
201, 10	88 n 83
212, 22	495
217, 15	444
220, 11	124 n 221
18	446
28	154 n 325
221, 1	150 n 309

10	150 n 309
225, 3	92 n 102
4	444
236, 3	443
4	96 n 126 ; 446
10	446
239, 2	123 n 218
8	503 n 26
241, 22	246 n 68
242, 8	246 n 68
243, 17	465 n 23
246, 23	39 n 115
255, 20	163 n 365
23	225 n 197
258, 12	437 n 127
296, 9	261 n 7
306, 1	97 n 131
309, 10	264 n 16
312, 20	238 n 41
324, 14	465 n 24
336, 1	277 n 73
27	222 n 190
337, 17	271 n 41
347, 7	264 n 17
26	296 n 139
348, 13	503 n 27
356, 28	357 n 174
357, 16	357 n 175

In Platonis Timaeum, ed. E. Diehl  
(vol. I-III, Leipzig 1903-1906)

t. I, p. 10, 8	356 n 170
13	356 n 172
11, 9	84 n 66
19	90 n 91
30	96 n 126
12, 18	114 n 185
18, 25	160 n 355
34, 4	189 n 45
20	199 n 97
51, 25	495
52, 16	262 n 8
60, 26	39 n 115
76, 30	504 n 32
77, 3	503 n 25
6	503 n 23
7	499 n 3
8	308 n 185
9	
	262 n 8 ; 499 n 4
13	502 n 20
15	503 n 22
18	499 n 3 ; 502 n 21
21	503 n 23
79, 3	349 n 141
27	503 n 22
82, 30	191 n 53
112, 9	119 n 201
117, 6	278 n 77 ; 502 n 17

118, 21	.....	231	n 12
119, 4	.....	231	n 12
121, 21	.....	259	n 2
136, 24	.....	282	n 94
137, 3	.....	268	n 34
140, 15	.....	495	
141, 27	.....	282	n 92
142, 23	.....	114	n 185
146, 14	.....	396	n 313
147, 6	.....	501	n 11
9	.....	501	n 12
152, 13	.....	500	n 5
15	.....	500	n 7
21	.....	500	n 8
25	.....	507	n 43
153, 7	.....	393	n 300
156, 24	.....	500	n 6
159, 20	.....	501	n 15
25	.....	501	n 13
165, 16	.....	501	n 10
17	.....	183	n 26
171, 19	.....		
306	n 181 ;	502	n 18
172, 14	.....	503	n 22
173, 6	.....	135	n 260
174, 24	.....	499	n 3
175, 18	.....	502	n 17
182, 21	.....	503	n 26
187, 28	.....	259	n 2
189, 4	.....	503	n 22
8	.....	384	n 274
190, 19	.....	378	n 259
20	.....	503	n 22
28	.....	384	n 278
202, 17	.....	255	n 99
208, 14	.....	449	n 3
20	.....	12	n 28
209, 13	.....	470	n 17
20	.....	384	n 274
210, 16	.....	192	n 56
211, 1	.....		
191	n 55 ;	192	n 56
5	.....	468	n 8
11	.....	87	n 77
20	.....		
173	n 406 ;	374	n 241
212, 17	.....	42	n 132
21	.....	145	n 291
213, 2	.....	161	n 356
8	.....	471	n 20
214, 12	.....	470	n 17
224, 5	.....	114	n 187
273, 11	.....	495	
274, 16	.....	57	n 182
283, 27	.....	454	n 22
286, 10	.....	125	n 225
303, 24	.....	319	n 25
306, 9	.....	376	n 249

308, 22	.....	142	n 283
317, 22	.....		
124	n 221 ;	377	n 253
318, 1	.....	139	n 274
13	.....		
110	n 177 ;	181	n 22
319, 5	.....	84	n 66
330, 31	.....	496	
333, 7	.....	393	n 300
340, 11	.....	110	n 177
348, 22	.....	127	n 232
356, 4	.....	351	n 147
366, 16	.....	346	n 130
371, 18	.....	331	n 69
381, 5	.....	384	n 274
382, 12	.....		
347	n 133 ;	393	n 300
384, 3	.....	454	n 22
388, 21	.....	118	n 200
23	.....	317	n 18
389, 20	.....	331	n 69
26	.....	79	n 47
390, 27	.....	379	n 260
391, 4	.....	382	n 269
7	.....	508	n 45
393, 14	.....	382	n 269
19	.....	327	n 52
394, 2	.....	324	n 41
408, 12	.....	85	n 70
18	.....	181	n 22
420, 12	.....	83	n 62
451, 17	.....		
82	n 59 ;	118	n 200
t. II, p. 1, 14	.....	353	n 157
9, 16	.....		
154	n 324 ;	155	n 329
10, 7	.....	125	n 226
13, 19	.....	347	n 134
50, 20	.....	119	n 202
25	.....	120	n 205
53, 25	.....	347	n 134
54, 8	.....	126	n 232
57, 9	.....	137	n 270
12	.....	222	n 188
30	.....	113	n 184
58, 7	.....	149	n 304
8	.. 77 n 40 ;	431	n 110
61, 22	.....	85	n 70
82, 3	.....	114	n 187
89, 25	.....	113	n 185
26	.....	113	n 184
29	.....	127	n 232
92, 6	.....	160	n 353
7	.....	159	n 351
105, 3	.....	236	n 34
107, 6	.....	153	n 320
129, 25	.....	93	n 111

130, 23 .....	16 .....	446
93 n 111 ; 355 n 163	84, 26 .....	140 n 278
144, 29 .....	89, 17 ....	229 n 6 ; 445
153, 24 .....	22 .....	446
154, 5 .....	23 .....	251 n 88
183, 21 .....	102, 10 .....	167 n 379
246, 19 .....	103, 10 .....	110 n 177
93 n 111 ; 355 n 163	11 .....	111 n 178
28 .....	108, 2 .....	268 n 34
114 n 187 ; 166 n 373	110, 4 .....	267 n 26
247, 18 .....	111, 19 .....	443
255, 31 .....	20 .....	143 n 287
256, 3 .....	118, 30 .....	221 n 182
25 .....	124, 24 .....	443 ; 446
166 n 373	29 .....	143 n 287
26 .....	31 .....	255 n 99
127 n 232	32 .....	124 n 221
260, 26 .....	127, 16 .....	137 n 267
92 n 107	131, 26 .....	71 n 15
268, 8 .....	30 .....	444
143 n 288	132, 28 .....	124 n 221
293, 23 .....	155, 18 .....	495
355 n 163	20 .....	495
300, 12 .....	157, 27 .....	264 n 16
115 n 190	159, 24 .....	224 n 196
306, 32 .....	162 .....	348 n 137
114 n 187	198, 6 .....	348 n 138
312, 22 .....	208, 8, 14 ....	348 n 137
178 n 4	209, 16 .....	348 n 137
27 .....	213, 2 .....	393 n 300
195 n 75	222, 14 .....	160 n 353
t. III, p. 1, 12 .....	229, 25 .....	79 n 47
349 n 141	26 .....	349 n 138
13 .....	234, 17 .....	508 n 45
470 n 18	18 .....	236 n 34
6, 9 .....	26 .....	
495	182 n 26 ; 416 n 61	
27 .....	241, 20 .....	348 n 137
351 n 147	24 .....	348 n 138
9, 15 .....	243, 20 .....	106 n 165
17 n 44	248, 13 .....	84 n 66
14, 3 ... 99 n 138 ; 403 n 8	250, 8 .....	128 n 236
10 .....	257, 3 .....	88 n 83
100 n 138	4 .....	445
20, 22 .....	262, 26 .....	224 n 196
101 n 149 ;	266, 18 .....	212 n 142
102 n 150 ; 230 n 7	21 .....	197 n 84
25 .....	271, 1 .....	84 n 66
102 n 151	2 .....	90 n 91
24, 8 .....	16 .....	98 n 134
402 n 6	23 .....	84 n 66
27, 9 . 102 n 150 ; 463 n 13	24 .....	177 n 2
12 .....	273, 20 .....	357 n 175
102 n 151	274, 6 .....	96 n 126
32, 18 .....	300, 16 ..	260 n 7 ; 495
229 n 6	316, 9 .....	181 n 19
36, 19 .....	325, 25 .....	503 n 27
152 n 314	29 .....	302 n 168
40, 21 .... 102 n 151-152		
41, 3 .....		
239 n 44		
43, 11 .....		
102 n 152		
44, 4 .....		
70 n 13		
55, 30 .....		
152 n 314		
57, 10 .....		
444		
58, 20 .....		
268 n 32		
61, 8 .....		
142 n 287		
16 .....		
185 n 35		
62, 7 .....		
150 n 309		
22 .....		
446		
63, 21 .... 124 n 221 ; 446		
24 .....		
446		
64, 8 .....		
456 n 27		
81, 24 .....		
255 n 99		
82, 4 .....		
186 n 37		
11 .....		
200 n 98		
12 .....		
197 n 184		
27 .....		
151 n 312		
31 .....		
151 n 311		
83, 13 ... 151 n 311 ; 445		

In primum Euclidis elementorum librum, ed. G. Friedlein (Leipzig 1873)	
p. 98, 17 .....	80 n 52
23 .....	99 n 137
129, 6 .....	109 n 173
155, 3 .....	97 n 130

Περὶ τῆς ἰερατικῆς τέχνης, ed. J. Bidez  
(*Catalogue des manuscrits alchimiques  
grecs*, vol. VI, Bruxelles 1928, p. 148-  
151)

p. 148, 1 .....	470 n 17
12 .....	471 n 20
150, 22 .....	183 n 27
151, 6 .....	293 n 132

Theologia platonica, ed. Aem. Portus  
(Hamburg 1618)

I p. 4, 26-27 .....	128 n 238
7, 16 .....	170 n 395
7, 27 .....	169 n 389
9, 47 .....	187 n 38
9, 49 .....	495
27, 33 .....	402 n 5
53, 30 .....	69 n 8
60, 26 .....	469 n 12
61, 34 .....	145 n 291h
61, 44 .....	146 n 295
63, 8 .....	145 n 291 h
70, 9 .....	495

II p. 97, 36 .....	151 n 312
98, 17 .....	151 n 313
104, 16 .....	379 n 260
104, 51 .....	470 n 17
107, 44 .....	71 n 14
109, 42 .....	151 n 312

III p. 118, 11-14 .....	261 n 7
144, 9 .....	99 n 137
147, 34-35 .....	17 n 44
149, 17 .....	99 n 138
167, 31 .....	107 n 170
171, 11-12 .....	118 n 200

IV p. 179, 9 .....	132 n 249
192, 35-38 .....	155 n 333
193, 3-6 .....	155 n 333
193, 38-41 .....	205 n 119; 445 n
194, 1 .....	145 n 291i
205, 43-46 .....	132 n 247c
210, 22-23 .....	277 n 73
212, 46-48 .....	129 n 240
215, 41-42 .....	69 n 10
220, 1-24 .....	155 n 333
233, 44-47 .....	240 n 49
236, 50-51 .....	117 n 195
240, 23-24 .....	156 n 334
240, 25-30 .....	149 n 305
V p. 280, 5-6 .....	114 n 187
261, 47-48 .....	160 n 355

262, 7-12 .....	270' n 37
264, 19 .....	79 n 48
265, 28 .....	84 n 66
265, 46-47 .....	142 n 283
266, 24-30 .....	84 n 65
37 .....	356 n 168
270, 8 .....	78 n 45
271, 15-17 .....	106 n 164
280, 29 .....	351 n 147
280, 47-48 .....	331 n 69
284, 37 .....	348 n 138
285, 1 .....	349 n 138
297, 34-38 .....	277 n 76
302, 3-4 .....	189 n 45
316, 17 .....	84 n 66
317, 26-27 .....	98 n 136
317, 29-30 .....	98 n 134
317, 31-32 .....	357 n 175
318, 27-29 .....	128 n 236
320, 32-33 .....	131 n 247
320, 51-321, 3 .....	160 n 353
321, 2-4 .....	79 n 48
324, 3-5 .....	446
324, 8 .....	95 n 118
333, 28-30 .....	113 n 184
VI p. 365, 3-4 .....	79 n 47
368, 9-11 .....	
281 n 87 ; 284 n 96	
371, 12 .....	238 n 41
372, 2-3 .....	95 n 119
373, 28-30 .....	95 n 119
376-377 .....	200 n 97
379, 1 .....	216 n 161
380, 51-52 .....	92 n 106
386, 31-32 .....	108 n 172

PSELLUS

De aurea catena Homeri, ed. C. Sathas  
(*Annuaire... des études Grecques*, IX,  
1875, p. 215-219)

p. 217, 2-5 .....	224 n 195
217, 5-7 .....	253 n 96

De omnifaria doctrina, ed. J. A.  
Fabricius (= PG 122, col. 687-784)

49, 718 D-720 A .....	462 n 9
51, 720 C-D .....	462 n 9
52, 721 A .....	
..... 461 ; 466 n 34 ; 492	
55, 721 D .....	
..... 461 ; 465 n 25 ; 466 n 34	

De operatione daemonum, ed. J. F.  
Boissonade (Nürnberg 1838, p. 1-36)

p. 15, 25-26 .....	296 n 138
16, 2-5 .....	308 n 186
18, 2. 6. 12 ; 21, 19 ..	296 n 138



30, 8. 12 . . . . 260 n 4 ; 296 n 138  
 35, 8-12 . . . . . 290 n 121

Epistolae, ed. C. N. Sathas (*Bibliotheca Graeca Medii Aevi*, t. 5, Paris 1876)

187, p. 474, 8-15 . . . . . 496  
 474, 17-20 . . . . . 91 n 96  
 188, p. 478, 8-14 . . . . . 291 n 126

Expositio (ἐξήγησις, *commentarius* apud H. Lewy) in Oracula Chaldaica (PG 122, 1124 A-1149 B)

1124 A . . . . . 213 n 144 ; 219 n 168  
 B . . . . . 220 n 172 ; 281 n 89  
 1125 A . . . . . 213 n 144 ; 276 n 70  
 B-C . . . . . 213 n 144  
 D . . . . . 474  
 1128 B . . . . . 255 n 99  
 1129 B . . . . . 221 n 179  
 C . . . . . 189 n 45 ; 475  
 D . . . . . 189 n 45 ; 495  
 1132 A . . . . . 178 n 4  
 B . . . . .  
 294 n 133. 135 ; 474 ; 475  
 C . . . . .  
 135 n 259 ; 178 n 4 ; 240 n 50  
 D . . . . . 138 n 271  
 1133 A . . . . . 249 n 78. 80  
 B . . . . .  
 88 n 83 ; 94 n 114 ; 242 n 57  
 C . . . . . 171 n 397  
 D . . . . . 171 n 398. 400  
 1135 A . . . . . 280 n 84  
 1136 A . . . . . 55 n 175 ; 88 n 83  
 B . . . . .  
 93 n 108 ; 244 n 63 ; 254 n 98  
 C . . . . . 98 n 134  
 1137 A . . . . .  
 198 n 88 ; 263 n 14 ; 296 n 36  
 B . . . . .  
 169 n 388 ; 198 n 90 ; 199 n 94  
 C . . . . . 184 n 29 ; 396 n 313  
 D . . . . . 221 n 179  
 1140 A . . . . . 265 n 19 ; 274 n 62  
 B . . . . . 169 n 387 ;  
 196 n 80 ; 216 n 158 ; 259 n 3  
 C . . . . . 112 n 181  
 1141 A . . . . . 191 n 55 ; 298 n 151  
 B . . . . . 205 n 122  
 C . . . . . 86 n 75  
 D . . . . . 147 n 295  
 1144 A . . . . . 78 n 45  
 B . . . . . 166 n 373  
 C . . . . . 205 n 124  
 D . . . . . 171 n 396  
 1145 A . . . . . 81 n 54  
 B . . . . . 112 n 181 ; 298 n 152-153  
 C . . . . . 266 n 23

D . . . . . 115 n 191 ; 266 n 21  
 1147 D . . . . . 368 n 214  
 1148 A . . . . . 190 n 50  
 B-C . . . . . 289 n 116  
 D . . . . . 166 n 373  
 1149 A . . . . . 132 n 249

Hypotyposis, ed. W. Kroll (*De Oraculis Chaldaicis*, Breslau 1894, p. 73-76)

1, p. 73, 4 . . . . . 77 n 38 ; 81 n 54  
 2, p. 73, 5 . . . . . 105 n 163 ; 159 n 351  
 3, p. 73, 7 . . . . . 133 n 255 ; 138 n 270  
 5, p. 73, 15 . . . . . 148 n 302  
 6-9, p. 74, 4-20 . . . . . 77 n 43  
 6, p. 74, 4 . . . . . 138 n 271 ; 142 n 283  
 p. 74, 6 . . . . . 136 n 266  
 7, p. 74, 7 . . . . . 79 n 48  
 8, p. 74, 11 . . . . . 90 n 91  
 p. 74, 13 . . . . . 88 n 83  
 9, p. 74, 17-19 . . . . . 114 n 187  
 p. 74, 19 . . . . . 77 n 43  
 10, p. 74, 20 . . . . . 132 n 247  
 11, p. 74, 23 . . . . . 145 n 291  
 12-19, p. 74, 24-75, 10 . . . . . 103 n 152  
 12, p. 74, 25 . . . . . 150 n 309  
 13, p. 74, 32 . . . . .  
 114 n 187 ; 252 n 92 ; 299 n 157  
 14, p. 74, 33 . . . . . 139 n 274  
 p. 74, 34 . . . . . 93 n 109  
 18, p. 75, 7 . . . . . 137 n 267  
 19, p. 75, 9 . . . . . 154 n 321  
 20, p. 75, 10 . . . . . 199 n 95 ; 268 n 32  
 21, p. 75, 12 . . . . . 162 n 365  
 22, p. 75, 14 . . . . . 236 n 37 ; 245 n 65  
 p. 75, 15 . . . . . 261 n 7  
 p. 75, 16 . . . . . 224 n 194  
 23, p. 75, 18 . . . . . 260 n 5  
 p. 75, 20 . . . . . 263 n 13 ;  
 265 n 19 ; 269 n 35 ; 271 n 41  
 p. 75, 21 . . . . . 263 n 11 ; 264 n 15  
 p. 75, 22 . . . . . 259 n 2-3  
 24 p. 75, 23 . . . . . 180 n 17 ; 268 n 30  
 25, p. 75, 30 . . . . . 265 n 20  
 26, p. 75, 31 . . . . . 180 n 17  
 27, p. 75, 33 . . . . . 117 n 198  
 p. 75, 34 . . . . . 119 n 203 ; 296 n 139  
 p. 76, 1 . . . . . 199 n 95  
 28, p. 76, 2 . . . . . 84 n 66  
 p. 76, 2-4 . . . . . 116 n 192

Πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς ἀμελοῦντας ed. J. F. Boissonade (Nürnberg 1838, p. 147-153)

p. 151, 26 . . . . . 138 n 271

Quaenam sunt Graecorum opiniones de daemonibus, ed. J. F. Boissonade (Nürnberg 1838, p. 36-43)

p. 37, 23-24 . . . . . 271 n 41

- 40, 26-41, 3 ..... 292 n 126  
 41, 4 ..... 248 n 76  
 43, 1-17 ..... 230 n 9
- Scholia ad Gregorii Nazianzen Ora-  
 tiones, XXIX, 2, ed. J. Bidez (*Col-  
 lection des Manuscrits Alchimiques  
 Grecs*, vol. VI, Bruxelles 1928, p. 163,  
 9-30)**  
 p. 163, 19-22 ..... 5 n 8
- Scripta minora, ed. E. Kurtz-F. Drexl  
 (Milano 1936)**  
 241, 25 ..... 464 n 21  
     29 ..... 5 n 3. 8  
 242, 5 ..... 464 n 21  
 247, 27 ..... 292 n 127  
 249, 9 ..... 42 n 133  
     8 ..... 41 n 126  
 252, 17 ..... 138 n 271  
 253, 5 ..... 88 n 83  
 262, 19 ..... 199 n 97  
 322, 8 ..... 293 n 132  
 446, 10 ..... 5 n 8  
     12 ..... 138 n 270  
     13 ..... 296 n 138  
     21 .... 81 n 54 ; 304 n 175  
     22 ..... 464 n 20  
     23 .... 288 n 111 ; 289 n 113  
     25 ..... 42 n 131 ;  
     58 n 184 ; 287 n 109  
     26 ..... 199 n 97  
     28 .... 4 n 2 ; 248 n 72  
 447, 5 ..... 294 n 133  
     6-8 ..... 213 n 144  
     8-10 ..... 291 n 125
- Summaria et brevis expositio (ἔκθεσις)  
 dogmatum Chaldaeorum (PG 122,  
 1149 C-1153 B)**  
 1149 C .. 79 n 47 ; 80 n 52 ;  
     81 n 54 ; 123 n 218 ; 296 n 138-139  
 1151 C ..... 151 n 313  
 1152 A ..... 77 n 43 ;  
     142 n 283 ; 150 n 309 ; 252 n 92  
     B .....  
     84 n 66 ; 95 n 122 ; 137 n 267  
     C ..... 87 n 76  
     D ..... 180 n 17 ; 279 n 83  
 1153 A .....  
     85 n 70 ; 222 n 187 ; 290 n 120
- RUTILIUS NAMATIANS**
- De reditu suo**  
 I 57 ..... 420 n 75
- SALLUSTIUS**
- De diis et mundo, ed. A. D. Nock  
 (Cambridge 1926)**  
 5, p. 10, 17 ..... 351 n 147  
 6, p. 12, 1 ..... 349 n 141
- SENECA**
- De otio**  
 5 ..... 111 n 77
- Epistulae ad Lucilium**  
 58 ..... 317 n 17
- Naturalis questiones**  
 VI 16, 2 ..... 430 n 107
- SERVIUS**
- Ad Vergilii Aeneid**  
 VI 510 ..... 244 n 60  
     741 ..... 253 n 95  
     747 ..... 430 n 109  
 XII 118 ..... 137 n 267
- Ad Vergilii Georgica**  
 II 389 ..... 253 n 95
- SEXTUS EMPIRICUS**
- Adversus mathematicos**  
 X 281 ..... 396 n 312
- Adversus physicos**  
 I 62 ..... 406 n 24
- Pyrronenses hypotyposes**  
 I 235 ..... 346 n 131
- SIMPLICIUS**
- In Aristotelis Categorias, ed. C.  
 Kalbfleisch (CAG 8, Berlin 1907)**  
 p. 337, 18 ..... 197 n 84
- In Aristotelis De anima, ed. M.  
 Hayduck (CAG 11, Berlin 1882)**  
 p. 260, 1 ..... 19 n 9
- In Aristotelis De caelo, ed. J. L. Hei-  
 berg (CAG 7, Berlin 1894)**  
 p. 55, 18 ..... 145 n 291  
     367, 21 ..... 103 n 153
- In Aristotelis Physica, ed. H. Diels  
 (CAG 9-10, Berlin 1882-1895)**  
 p. 5, 19 ..... 145 n 291

612	89 n 84
613, 1	445
4	138 n 270
7	244 n 63
614, 2	154 n 322
6	159 n 351
615, 6	125 n 225
616	89 n 84
616, 18	241 n 53
34	123 n 218
617	89 n 84
643, 27	138 n 270
759, 4	103 n 152
785, 8	102 n 149
795, 4	101 n 149 ; 403 n 11

SOCRATES

Historia ecclesiastica	
III 1, 57	450 n 7

SOPHOCLES

Philoctetes	
449. 625	488

SOZOMENUS

Historia ecclesiastica	
I 18	288 n 109

STOBAEUS

Eclogae physicae et ethicae, ed. A. Meineke (I-IV, Leipzig 1860-1863)	
I 5, 18 [Iamblichus, <i>Epist. ad Sophr.</i> ]	358 n 176
12, 6a [Aetius]	318 n 21
41, 6 [Hermes Trismegistus]	356 n 172
41, 39 [Iamblichus, <i>De anima</i> ]	223 n 191 ; 360 n 184-185
40	182 n 25
42	488
41, 53 [Porphyrius, <i>De Styge</i> ]	502 n 18. 22
II 7, 43-47 [Iamblichus, <i>De fato</i> ]	358 n 176

Florilegium, ed. A. Meineke (Leipzig 1857)	
t. IV, p. 107,23 [Themistius, <i>De anima</i> ]	211 n 140

Stoici

ed. J. von Arnim ( <i>Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta</i> , vol. I-IV, Leipzig 1921-1947)	
I, n° 98	430 n 109
105	385 n 275
155	431 n 109
176	415 n 56
II, n° 110	415 n 56
413	430 n 109
613	415 n 56
650	96 n 130
930	364 n 203
932-933. 937	331 n 69
1055	333 n 74

STRABO

Geographica	
IX 3, 5 (419 C)	41 n 125

SUIDAS

Lexicon, ed. A. Adler (Leipzig 1912-1938)	
s. v. Ἄρνοβφις	
n° 3987	4 n 2
s. v. Ἥγίας	
n° 60	71 n 14 ; 443
s. v. ἱερατική	
n° 159	464 n 17
s. v. Ἰουλιανός	
n° 433	5 n 4 ; 291 n 122
n° 434	3 n 1 ; 4 n 2
s. v. Πρόκλος	
n° 2473	69 n 9 ; 71 n 15 ; 451 n 9
s. v. Συριανός	
n° 1662	69 n 10
s. v. ὑπερβάθμιον	
n° 234	262 n 10

SYNESIUS

De insomniis (PG 66, 1281-1320)	
3, 1288 D	203 n 114
4, 1289 B	255 n 99
5, 1293 B	304 n 173
B-C	449 n 3
C	247 n 68
D	295 n 137
1296 B	189 n 45 ; 190 n 53
D	172 n 402 ; 281 n 89
1297 B	213 n 144 ; 277 n 72
C	
.....	214 n 150 ; 219 n 168. 172

## De providentia sive Aegyptius (PG 66, 1210-1281)

1212 C	282 n 92
1225 C	305 n 177
1228 B	306 n 180 ; 385 n 275
1228 C	374 n 237
1229 B	274 n 61 ; 306 n 180

## De regno ad Arcadium imperatorem (PG 66, 1053-1112)

5, 1068 B	510 n 5
-----------	---------

## Dio vel de ipsius vitae instituto (PG 66, 1111-1164)

6, 1129 B	277 n 77
7, 1132 B	197 n 86
8, 1136 C	204 n 114
1140 B	295 n 136

## Epistolae (PG 66, 1321-1560)

57, 1388 D	510 n 5
150, 1552 B	41 n 126

## Hymni (PG 66, 1587-1616)

I, 66	193 n 65
II, 14	152 n 317
22	160 n 353
27	159 n 351
39	23 n 58
52	263 n 14
67	100 n 138
III, 37	33 n 92
56	184 n 29
92	297 n 146
171	82 n 59
271	138 n 271
273	137 n 269
281-282	137 n 267
320	385 n 275
560	194 n 67
574-575	189 n 45
580	194 n 67
596	204 n 114
709	33 n 92
718	197 n 82
IV, 63	82 n 59
231	113 n 184
275	216 n 157
292	33 n 92
296	468 n 9
V, 12	100 n 138
IX, 36	200 n 100
50 (60)	160 n 353
54	306 n 180
55	303 n 170
59 (69)	402 n 7
65	103 n 154
66 (56)	328 n 58

## SYRIANUS

In Aristotelis Metaphysica, ed. W. Kroll (CAG 6/1, Berlin 1902)	
p. 89, 17	114 n 187

## TATIANUS

## Oratio ad Graecos, ed. E. Schwartz (TU 4, Berlin 1888)

13, p. 14, 22	295 n 136
16, p. 17, 16	392 n 292
17, 21	295 n 136
18, 3	424 n 87

## Teles

ed. O. Hense (Teletis reliquiae <sup>2</sup> , Tübingen 1909)	
p. 34, 9	282 n 90

## TERENTIUS

Andria	
698	49 n 158

## TERTULLIANUS

## Adversus Hermogenem

18-19. 36. 38-43	383 n 271
41	383 n 272

## De anima

1. 11	383 n 271
56	209 n 135

## THEOCRITUS

## Idyllon

II 14	91 n 96
-------	---------

## THEODORETUS

## Haereticarum fabularum compendium (PG 83, 335 C-556 A)

I 14, 365 B	385 n 276
24, 372 D ; 373 C	385 n 277 ; 386 n 278

## THEOGNIS

ed. T. Bergk (Poetae Lyrici Graeci<sup>4</sup>, Leipzig 1882)

703	488
1347	489

## THEON SMYRNAEUS

<i>Expositio rerum mathematicarum,</i>	
ed. E. Hiller (Leipzig 1878)	
p. 46, 15 .....	109 n 174
16 .....	396 n 312
p. 100, 14 .....	109 n 174
21 .....	396 n 312

*Theosophia*

ed. K. Buresch (*Theosophia Tubingensis*, Leipzig 1889)

n° 13 .....	18 n 46 ;
31 n 86 ; 83 n 64 ; 100 n 144	
13, 2 .....	102 n 151
13, 3 ...	102 n 151 ; 159 n 350
13, 4 .....	76 n 37
13, 5-8 ...	143 n 287 ; 153 n 318
13, 6 .....	90 n 91
13, 7 .....	161 n 361
13, 8 .....	131 n 245 ;
150 n 308 ; 200 n 99	
13, 9-10 .....	141 n 281
13, 10 ...	102 n 151 ; 174 n 407
13, 12 .....	430 n 109
13, 13 ...	141 n 281 ; 152 n 215
13, 14 .....	101 n 145
13, 15 .....	101 n 149
13, 15-16 .....	161 n 360
13, 16 .....	
... 31 n 85 ; 214 n 150 ; 261 n 7	
14 .....	17 n 42
15 .....	21 n 52 ; 83 n 64
15, 2 .....	86 n 74
21 .....	21 n 52 ;
61 n 197 ; 100 n 144	
21, 1 .....	101 n 145
21, 2-4 .....	153 n 319
21, 3 .....	126 n 228
21, 5 .....	31 n 83 ; 161 n 359
21, 7 .....	255 n 98
27 .....	10 n 26 ; 61 n 196
27, 1 .....	77 n 38 ; 78 n 45
27, 2 .....	76 n 37. 39
27, 3 ...	86 n 73 ; 101 n 147
27, 4 .....	164 n 370
27, 5 .....	159 n 346
27, 6 .....	86 n 74 ; 87 n 78
27, 8 .....	78 n 45 ; 90 n 91 ;
100 n 144 ; 101 n 146	
27, 9 .....	114 n 187
27, 9-11 .....	114 n 186
27, 10 .....	118 n 198
27, 11 .....	119 n 201
27, 12 .....	159 n 348

27, 12-18 .....	162 n 362
27, 13-14 .....	76 n 37. 39
27, 14 .....	159 n 350
27, 15 .....	159 n 348
28 .....	14 n 31
29 .....	23 ; 24 n 59 ; 342
29, 2 .....	113 n 183
30 .....	63 n 202
34 ...	29 n 76-77 ; 162 n 363
35 ...	26 n 67-68 ; 31 n 84
35, 1. 5. 16 .....	76 n 37
35, 3 .....	86 n 74 ; 87 n 78
36 .....	29 n 76
41 .....	64 n 207
44 .....	64 n 209
64 .....	109 n 174

## VELLEIUS PATERCULUS

*Historia Romana*

II 123, 3 .....	217 n 164
-----------------	-----------

## VERGILIUS

*Aeneis*

I 142 .....	106 n 165
VI 77 .....	41 n 123
510 .....	244 n 60
657 .....	201 n 102
741 .....	253 n 95
747 .....	430 n 109
XII 118 .....	137 n 267

*Georgica*

II 389 .....	253 n 95
--------------	----------

## VETTIUS VALENS

*Anthologiarum libri*, ed. W. Kroll  
(Berlin 1908)

p. 293, 25 .....	415 n 56
------------------	----------

## XENOPHON

*Convivium*

VIII 30 .....	489
---------------	-----

## ZOSIMUS

*Historia nova*

IV 3 .....	238 n 41
18, 2 .....	69 n 9 ; 259 n 2
18, 4 .....	185 n 32



## Index verborum

L'astérisque \* indique que le terme est chaldaïque ou utilisé dans les oracles chaldaïques. Les mots se trouvant dans les oracles porphyriens et théosophiques, ainsi que dans l'oracle cité par Proclus, *Rp.*, II 126, 14 (= 32 n 89 Lewy) et dans le tétramètre trochaïque cité par Proclus, *Rp.*, I, 111, 28 (= 39 n 116 L. ; *contra* : Kroll 9, 22 et Dodds, *New Light*, 267 n 17), ne reçoivent pas l'astérisque. Les chiffres entre parenthèses, qui suivent l'appel de note, renvoient aux hexamètres.

Les termes provenant d'oracles identifiés comme chaldaïques avant ou après Lewy sont signalés par un double astérisque \*\*, avec référence à l'inventeur. Les fragments d'oracles mentionnés par Kroll mais non clairement signalés par Lewy sont indiqués par le renvoi aux pages et aux lignes de l'édition de Kroll (= Kr.).

L'astérisque intervenant à la fin des appels de notes indique que le terme, non retenu comme chaldaïque par Lewy, l'est par Kroll, Jahn ou Theiler ; *contra* expose la situation inverse.

## A) Index graecus

- \***ἄ** ..... 273 n 55 (1); 298 n 158  
**ἄβασανίστως** ..... 70 n 12  
**ἄβατος** ..... 99 n 138; 233 n 20  
\***ἄβυσσος** ..... 267 n 25 (4);  
308 n 186; 383 n 272; *contra*: 10, 6 Kr.  
**ἀγαθοειδής** .....  
260 n 5; 347 n 133; 389 n 286  
\***ἀγαθός** ..... 9 n 23;  
56 n 177; 80 n 52; 145 n 291;  
147 n 296; 151 n 312; 223 n 192;  
238 n 41; 273 n 55; 315 n 7; 322 n 34;  
327 n 54; 331 n 69; 372 n 229-230;  
379 n 259; 384 n 274; 483;  
485 n 6; 505 n 32; 509 n 1 (9. 14)  
**ἀγαθότης** ..... 253 n 93;  
346 n 132; 347 n 135; 350 n 143  
\***ἀγαλμα** ..... 98 n 134; 291 n 126;  
OLYMP., *In Alc.*, 125, 23-24 Wk\*\*.  
**ἀγαπᾶν** ..... 491 (5)  
\***Ἀγαπή** ..... 253 n 94  
\***ἀγγελιον** ..... 265 n 19; 277 n 72  
**ἀγγελία** ..... 10 n 26 (15); 14 n 31  
\***ἀγγελικός** .....  
15 n 36; 17 n 42 (10-11); 220 n 175;  
223 n 192; 236 n 37; 261 n 7; 487  
\***ἄγγελος** .... 14 n 31-32; 18 n 46 (16);  
24 n 58; 29 n 76; 56 n 177;  
136 n 263; 162 n 365; 212 n 143;  
220 n 173; 236 n 35; 245 n 65;  
261 n 7-8; 484; 487; 500 n 5  
**ἄγειν** ..... 10 n 26 (17); 14 n 31;  
48 n 152 (6); 103 n 152e; 138 n 271;  
236 n 35; 261 n 7; 262 n 10a;  
265 n 20; 345 n 130; 378 n 258;  
509 n 1 (6); 510 n 4; 194 J.\*  
**ἀγείρειν** ..... 4 n 2  
\***ἀγέλη** .....  
162 n 365; 212 n 143; 500 n 7  
\***ἀγεληδόν** ..... 55 n 171  
**ἀγέννητος** ..... 353 n 157  
**ἀγέννητος** ..... 118 n 198; 450 n 6  
**ἀγήραος** ..... 79 n 48; 103 n 154  
**ἀγήρωος** ..... 24 n 58  
\***ἀγητός** ..... 118 n 200 (4); 127 n 233  
**ἄγιος** ..... 10 n 26 (12);  
15 n 35; 159 n 348; 170 n 395;  
238 n 41; 239 n 45. 47; 286 n 106  
\***ἄγκτειρά**  
(ἄκτειρα, ἀγκτηρα) ..... 298 n 151  
**ἀγλαός** ..... 24 n 59 (1); 82 n 60  
**ἀγλαοφεγγής** ..... 18 n 46 (5)  
\***ἄγναμπος** ..... *cf.* **ἀκναμπος**  
**ἀγνεύειν** ..... 231 n 9  
**ἀγνοεῖν** ..... 319 n 25  
\***ἄγνός** ..... 43 n 136 (2);  
59 n 186 (5); 128 n 239; 166 n 373 (9);  
179 n 8 (2); 263 14 (1); 265 n 18  
**ἄγνωστος** ..... 17 n 42 (4);  
186 n 38; 252 n 92; 253 n 93; 483  
**ἀγοήτευτος** ..... 452 n 14  
**ἄγονος** ..... 297 n 143  
\***ἄγός** ..... 143 n 28; 143 n 287b  
**ἀγρίως** ..... 383 n 272  
**ἀγρυπνος** ..... 239 n 43  
**ἀγόνυαιος** ..... 242 n 54  
\***ἄγχειν** ..... 198 n 88. 90  
**ἀγωγή** .....  
48 n 152; 71 n 15; 101 n 149;  
230; 245 n 64; 288 n 109; 496  
**ἀγών** ..... 286 n 106; 492  
\***Ἄδάμ** ..... 63 n 201  
**ἀδαμάντινος** ..... 293 n 132  
\***ἄδαμαστος** ..... 119 n 201; 189 n 45  
\***ἄζειν** ..... 200 n 102  
\***ἄδην** .....  
88 n 83a; 118 n 200 (1); 459 n 4



- ἀδιαίρετος ..... 81 n 56  
 ἀδιάρθρωτος ..... 239 n 46  
 ἀδιατόπωτος ..... 171 n 400  
 ἀδίδακτος ... 18 n 46 (14); 101 n 145  
 ἀδικεῖν ..... 299 n 154  
 ἀδύνατος .... 319 n 25; 446ο; 453  
 ἄδυτον ..... 160 n 353; 195 J.\*  
 Ἄδωναί ..... 439 n 137  
 \*ἀεὶ (αἰεὶ, αἰέν) .....  
 14 n 31; 17 n 42 (9); 17 n 44;  
 29 n 77 (2); 32 n 89 (2); 48 n 152 (4);  
 99 n 138 (4); 102 n 151; 103 n 154;  
 104 n 158; 220 n 175; 255 n 99 (5);  
 264 n 15; 295 n 137 (2.4-5); 296 n 143;  
 297 n 147; 353 n 157; 373 n 239;  
 379 n 259; 383 n 272; 403 n 8  
 \*ἀειδής (ἀιδής) .....  
 ... 295 n 137 (2); 296 n 142; 378  
 ἀεικνίντος ..... 103 n 153  
 \*ἀεῖπολος ..... 143 n 287e  
 ἀένσος .... 10 n 26 (9); 103 n 154;  
 114 n 186 (1); 354 n 159; 402 n 7  
 \*ἀέριος (ἠέριος) .....  
 ..... 138 n 270; 140 n 275 (2);  
 143 n 287; 185 n 34; 236 n 35;  
 267 n 25 (2); 268 n 28; 271 n 41  
 ἀερόεις, cf. ἠερόεις .....  
 ἀερομηγής ..... 143 n 288  
 ἀερότεμις ..... 143 n 288  
 ἀετός ..... 291 n 126  
 ἀζηχής ..... 18 n 46 (12)  
 ἄζυγος ..... 102 n 151  
 ἀζωνικός .. 137 n 267; 282 n 103 Th.\*  
 ἄζωνος .....  
 95 n 122; 102-103 n 152; 137 n 267;  
 141 n 280; 481 n 3; 484; 485 n 6  
 \*ἄηρ ..... 43 n 136 (2);  
 119 n 202; 124 n 221; 143 n 287-288;  
 180 n 14; 182 n 26; 185 n 35;  
 236 n 35; 240 n 52; 241 n 53;  
 246 n 67; 249 n 78; 261 n 7; 268 n 28;  
 280 n 85; 277 n 253; 509 n 1 (12)  
 ἀθανασία ..... 198 n 90; 199 n 92  
 \*ἀθάνατος ..... 10 n 26;  
 14 n 31; 26 n 67; 32 n 89 (2);  
 48 n 152 (1); 76 n 37; 86 n 75 (2);  
 210 n 138; 261 n 7; 278 n 80  
 ἄθεος ..... 389 n 286  
 Ἄθηνα ..... 503 n 25  
 ἀθλητής ..... 195 n 73  
 ἄθλος ..... 260 n 5; 286 n 106  
 \*ἄθρεῖν ..... 242 n 57; 289 n 116 (1)  
 ἄθροός ..... 231 n 9  
 \*ἄθρυμα.. 33 n 93; 34 n 95; 255 n 99 (8)  
 \*αἶγλη .....  
 43 n 136 (1); 172 n 403 (4); 173 n 405  
 Αἰγύπτιος ..... 4 n 2  
 Ἄιδης (Ἄδης) .....  
 236 n 35; 266 n 23; 279 n 83;  
 282 n 90. 92; 296 n 142; 299 n 154;  
 378 n 256-257; 386 n 278; 488  
 \*αἶδιος .....  
 17 n 42 (9); 96 n 126; 106 n 165;  
 188 n 42; 191 n 53; 255 n 99 (4);  
 352 n 151; 438 n 132; 445 n  
 αἰδίως ..... 17 n 42 (9)  
 \*αἰθέριος .....  
 10 n 26 (3); 18 n 46 (11); 45 n 144;  
 77 n 39; 89 n 84; 102 n 152 b;  
 123 n 218; 132 n 250 (3); 133 n 255;  
 136 n 266; 138 n 270; 140 n 275;  
 141 n 280; 143 n 287; 148 n 302;  
 149 n 304; 151 n 313; 153 n 317;  
 172 n 403 (4); 173 n 405; 174 n 407;  
 202 n 106; 279 n 83; 405 n 21;  
 431 n 110; 483; 501 n 12; 509 n 1 (14)  
 αἰθεροδινής . 18 n 46 (8); 20 n 47; 459  
 αἰθεσθαι ..... 83 n 64  
 \*αἰθήρ ..... 17 n 42 (4);  
 18 n 46 (5); 21 n 52 (3); 88 n 83a;  
 89 n 84; 97 n 131; 119 n 202;  
 126 n 228; 138 n 270; 143 n 287;  
 146 n 293; 149 n 305; 154 n 322;  
 182 n 26; 185 n 35; 193 n 64;  
 241 n 53; 280 n 85; 430 n 107;  
 459 n 8; 483; 509 n 1 (12)  
 \*αἰθρα (αἰθρη) .....  
 119 n 202; 143 n 287d; 182 n 26  
 \*αἰθριος ..... 255 n 99 (7)  
 αἰρεῖν ..... 278 n 77  
 αἰρειν ..... 32 n 89 (10)  
 \*αἰσθησις ..... 114 n 187 (3)  
 \*αἰσθητός .....  
 17 n 42 (8); 113 n 184; 115 n 190;  
 153 n 317; 182 n 26; 318 n 21;  
 358 n 157; 372 n 231; 469 n 11  
 αἰτσειν ..... 32 n 89 (10)  
 αἰτεῖν ..... 224 n 195  
 αἰτία ..... 93 n 111;

- 128 n 236 ; 133 n 253 ; 180 n 17 ;  
379 n 262 ; 469 n 12 ; 471 n 20  
αἰτιάσθαι ..... 191 n 53 ; 438 n 138  
αἰτιος ..... 77 n 38 ; 150 n 309  
\*αἰών ..... 11 n 26 ; 17 n 44 ;  
18 n 46 (2. 13) ; 89 n 85 ; 99-105 ;  
152 n 315 ; 401-409 ; 483 ; 485 n 6  
\*αἰώνιος .....  
10 n 26 (1. 7) ; 87 n 78 ; 102 n 151 ;  
317 n 13 ; 362 n 199 ; 402 n 5. 7  
αἰωνότοκος ..... 100 n 138  
\*αἰωρεῖσθαι .....  
... 10 n 26 (8) ; 18 n 46 (6) ; 90 n 91  
Ἄκαδημία ..... 346 n 131  
\*ἀκάματος ..... 96 n 126  
\*ἀκαμπής ..... 135 n 259-260  
ἀκατάληπτος ..... 369 n 216  
ἀκατάπαυστος ..... 15 n 35  
ἀκήνυτος ..... 297 n 143  
ἀκήρατος ..... 103 n 154 ; 484  
ἀκινήτως ..... 104 n 158  
\*ἀκλινής ..... 172 n 403 ; 373 n 234  
ἀκλινώδης ..... 373 n 234  
\*ἀκμαῖος ..... 197 n 84 (1) ; 458  
\*ἀκμάς .....  
.... 80 n 49 (7) ; 110 n 177 (1) ; 458  
\*ἀκμή .....  
110 n 177 (14) ; 192 n 59 ; 317 n 13  
\*ἀκναμπτος ..... 135 n 260 (2)  
\*ἀκοίμητος ..... 105 n 162 ;  
110 n 177 (14) ; 134 n 256 (1) ; 317 n 13  
ἀκολουθεῖν ..... 29 n 76  
\*ἀκοσμος ..... 110 n 177 (6) ; 317 n 18  
ἀκούειν ..... 10 n 26 (4) ;  
97 n 131 ; 124 n 221 ; 155 n 329 ;  
164 n 370 ; 203 n 114 ; 273 n 53 ;  
288 n 109 ; 291 n 124 ; 502 n 18  
ἀκουστέος ..... 147 n 296  
ἀκράαντος ..... 48 n 152 (2)  
ἄκρος ..... 102 n 150 ; 138 n 270 ;  
328 n 58 ; 444g ; 463 n 13 ; 495-496  
\*ἀκρότης .....  
105 n 163 ; 116 n 192 ; 129 n 240 ;  
131 n 247 ; 132 n 250 ; 134 n 256 ; 156  
\*ἀκτίς .....  
18 n 46 (8) ; 118 n 200 (4) ; 131 n 245 ;  
150 n 308 ; 186 n 37 ; 197 n 83. 85 ;  
200 n 98 ; 210 n 138 ; 216 n 161 ;  
362 n 198 ; 412 n 40 ; 422 n 82 ; 493  
Ἄλβινος ..... 508 n 45  
\*ἀλήθεια . 48 n 152 (4) ; 49 ; 50 n 160 ;  
144 n 291 ; 146 n 293. 295 ; 489  
\*ἀληθής ..... 145 n 291g ; 194 n 67 ;  
195 n 73 ; 255 n 99 (2. 7) ; 259 n 3 ;  
264 n 17 ; 374 n 241 ; 491 (3)  
ἀληθῶς .....  
... 17 n 42 (10) ; 220 n 173 ; 445 n  
ἀλήμων ..... 29 n 77 (2) ; 30  
ἀλήτης ..... 30 n 79  
ἄλις ..... 53 n 166 (1) ; 111 n 177  
\*ἄλική .....  
11 ; 12 n 27 ; 26 n 67 (3) ; 28 n 71 ;  
53 n 166 (1) ; 54 ; 83 n 62 ;  
86 n 73-74 ; 87 n 78 ; 94 n 112 ;  
99 n 138 (1) ; 100 n 141 ; 109 n 175 ;  
131 n 247 ; 166 n 373 (3) ; 192 n 59 (2) ;  
193 n 65 ; 194 n 66-67 ; 203 n 114 ;  
204 n 116 ; 317 n 16 ; 440 n 140  
Ἄλκιβιάδης ..... 451 n 9  
\*ἄλλά .....  
81 n 55 ; 107 n 170 ; 110 n 177 (4) ;  
113 n 184 ; 131 n 246 (1) ;  
134 n 256 (1) ; 165 n 373 (6. 9) ;  
170 n 395 (2) ; 172 n 402 (2) ;  
190 n 50 (1) ; 192 n 59 (4) ;  
213 n 144 (2) ; 240 n 52 (5)  
\*ἄλλάττειν ..... 188 n 44 ; 240 n 50  
ἄλλαχού ..... 143 n 287e  
\*ἄλλη ..... 110 n 177 (12)  
ἄλληγορεῖν ..... 383 n 272  
ἄλληλος ..... 97 n 130  
\*ἄλλος ... 110 n 177 (5. 9) ; 112 n 181 ;  
138 n 270 ; 140 n 275 (2) ; 151 n 313 ;  
152 n 315 ; 153 n 320 (1) ; 183 n 27 ;  
188 n 44 ; 263 n 11 (1) ; 317 n 16 ;  
325 n 46 ; 341 n 108 ; 346 n 132 ;  
367 n 210 ; 369 n 217 ; 386 n 278 ;  
499 n 4 ; 500 n 5 ; 503 n 25  
\*ἄλλουδης ..... 110 n 177 (12)  
ἄλλως ..... 178 n 4 ; 270 n 37  
\*ἄλμη ..... 45 n 139  
ἄλογία ..... 304 n 173  
ἄλογίζεσθαι ..... 265 n 21  
\*ἄλογος ..... 222 n 190 ;  
264 n 16 ; 271 n 41 ; 279 n 83 ; 282 ;  
308 n 186 ; 383 n 270 ; 452 n 14 ; 504  
ἄλόγως ..... 297 n 144

- ἀλόχευτος . . . . 21 n 52 (1); 101 n 145  
 \*ἄλυτος . . . . 222 n 190 ; 350 n 144  
 ἄμα . . . . . 106 n 165 ; 111 n 177  
 ἄμαυροδν . . . . . 376 n 249 ; 458  
 ἀμβολάδην . . . 43 n 136 (6) ; 459 n 4  
 \*ἄμβροτος . . . . . 24 n 58 ;  
 59 n 186 (7) ; 103 n 154 ; 169 n 388  
 \*ἀμείλικτος . . . . 82 n 58 ; 86 n 72 ;  
 119 n 201 ; 121 n 209 (1) ; 132 n 247 c ;  
 135 n 256 ; 136 n 266 ; 484 ; 485 n 6  
 ἀμέλει . . . . . 291 n 124  
 \*Ἀμέλιος . . . . . 450 n 7  
 ἀμερής . . . . .  
 . . . 81 n 56 ; 353 n 157 ; 459 n 6  
 ἀμέριστος . . . . . 317 n 16 ; 353 n 157  
 \*ἀμέτρητος . . . . . 86 n 74  
 ἀμήτωρ . . . . . 18 n 46 (14) ; 101 n 145  
 ἀμήχανος . . . . .  
 19 n 46 (3) ; 102 n 151 ; 350 n 143  
 ἀμίαντος . . . . . 459 n 8  
 \*ἀμιστύλλευτος . . . . .  
 . . . . . 81 n 56 ; 107 n 171 ; 459  
 ἄμοιρος . . . . .  
 . . 271 n 41 ; 278 n 77 = 60, 15 Kr.\*  
 \*ἄμορφος . . . . .  
 295 n 137 (2) ; 296 n 141 ; 284 n 274  
 ἀμόρφωτος . . . 171 n 400 ; 246 n 68  
 ἀμυδρός . . . . . 298 n 148  
 \*ἄμυδροδν . . . . .  
 . . . 118 n 200 (2) ; 126 n 228 ; 458  
 \*ἄμφί . . . . .  
 10 n 26 (13) ; 48 n 152 (4) ; 90 n 91 ;  
 110 n 177 (12) ; 240 n 52 (4) ; 355 n 164  
 ἀμφιβαίνειν . . . . . 49 n 156  
 ἀμφίδρομος . . . 10 n 26 (2) ; 77 n 39  
 ἀμφιέλκτος . . . . . 26 n 67 (4)  
 ἀμφικαθῆσθαι . . . . . 241 n 53  
 \*ἀμφικαλύπτειν . . . . . 115 n 190  
 \*ἀμφικνεφής . . . 172 n 402 ; 281 n 89 ;  
 295 n 137 (3) ; 298 n 148 ; 301 n 164  
 \*ἀμφιπρόσωπος . . . . . 93 n 111  
 \*ἀμφίστομος . . . . 93 n 111 ; 355 n 166  
 \*ἀμφιφαής . . . . 93 n 111 ; 94 n 112 ;  
 109 n 175 ; 166 n 373 (4) ; 213 n 144  
 \*ἀμφιφάων . . . . . 94 n 112  
 \*ἀμφοτέρος . . . . .  
 100 n 140 ; 114 n 187 ; 355 n 166  
 \*ἄμφω . 107 n 170 ; 355 n 166 ; 455  
 ἀνώμητος . . . . . 43 n 136 (4) ; 44 n 138  
 ἄνωμος . . . . . 44 n 138  
 ἀναβαίνειν . . . . . 488  
 ἀνάβασις . 178 n 4 ; 270 n 37 ; 488-489  
 ἀναβιβάζειν . . . . . 222 n 187  
 ἀναβιώσκεισθαι . . . . . 210 n 140  
 \*ἀνάγειν . . 39 n 115 ; 59 n 186 (3) ;  
 178 n 4 ; 184 n 32 ; 186 n 37-38 ;  
 189 n 45 ; 200 n 101 ; 210 n 140 ;  
 213 n 144 ; 223 n 192 ; 236 n 37 ;  
 261 n 7 ; 468 n 9 ; 487-489 ; 499 n 3  
 \*ἀναγκάζειν . . . . . 124 n 221  
 ἀναγκαῖος . . 59 n 186 (1) ; 317 n 15  
 \*ἀνάγκη . . . . 26 n 67 (4) ; 28 n 71 ;  
 58 n 184 ; 59 n 187 ; 98 n 136 ;  
 106 n 165 ; 108 n 173 ; 246 n 68 ;  
 255 n 99 (5) ; 265 n 20 ; 277 n 76 ;  
 278 n 77 ; 294 n 133 (3) ; 350 n 143 ;  
 357 ; 363 n 203 ; 364 n 204 ; 474-475  
 ἀναγράφειν . . . . . 403 n 9  
 ἀναγωγός . . . . . 41 n 127 ;  
 200 n 97 ; 204 n 114 ; 410 n 35 ; 418 ;  
 422 n 82 ; 458 ; 487-489 ; 295 Th.\*  
 ἀναγωγή . . . . . 59 n 186 ;  
 60 ; 97 n 130 ; 177 ; 201 n 102 ;  
 203 n 114 ; 218 n 167 ; 413 ; 433 ;  
 453 ; 470 ; 471 n 21 ; 487-489  
 ἀναγώγιος . . . . . 261 n 7  
 ἀναγωγός . . . . .  
 136 n 263 ; 145 n 291 ; 147 n 296 ;  
 186 n 37 ; 200 n 98 ; 218 n 167 ;  
 261 n 7 ; 278 n 77 ; 419 n 72 ;  
 468 n 9 ; 489 ; 492 ; 294-295 Th.\*  
 ἀναδραμεῖν . . . . . 200 n 102  
 ἀναζειν . . . . . 383 n 272  
 \*ἀναιδής . . . . .  
 212 n 142 ; 271 n 41 ; 306 n 180 ; 67S\*\*  
 ἀναιρεῖν . . . . . 106 n 164 ; 445m  
 ἀνακαλεῖν . . . . .  
 188 n 42 ; 209 n 135 ; 231 n 9 ;  
 468 n 5 ; 469 n 11-12 ; 471 n 20  
 ἀνάκλησις . . . . . 469 n 11  
 ἀνακλητικός . . . . . 469 n 12 ; 470  
 ἀνακλίνειν . . . . . 373 n 233  
 ἀνακουφίζειν . . 197 n 85 ; 210 n 138  
 \*ἀνακρεμαννῶναι . . . . . 124 n 221  
 ἀνακυκλεῖν . . . . . 354 n 160

- ἀναλαμβάνειν ..... 231 n 9  
 ἀνάληψις ..... 489  
 ἀναλίσκειν ..... 83 n 64  
 ἀνάλκεια ..... 53 n 165 (5)  
 ἀναλογεῖν ..... 500 n 5, 7  
 ἀναλογία ..... 350 n 143  
 ἀνάλογος ..... 345 n 130  
 ἀναλύειν ..... 83 n 64; 367 n 210  
 ἀναμιγνύναι ..... 333 n 74  
 ἀνάμνησις .. 191 n 53; 438 n 132  
 \*ἀναξ .....  
 10 n 26 (12, 17); 23 n 58; 40; 52 n 163;  
 100 n 138; 110 n 177 (5); 159 n 348;  
 204 n 114; 317 n 15; 330 n 68  
 ἀναπαύειν ..... 469 n 11  
 ἀνάπαυσις ..... 15 n 35  
 ἀναπετανύοναι .... 40 n 121; 374 n 239  
 \*ἀναπέτεσθαι ..... 198 n 88 (1) c) L.  
 ἀναπιμπλάναι ..... 128 n 238  
 ἀνάπλωσις ..... 166 n 374  
 ἀναπνεῖν ..... 206 n 124  
 \*ἀνάπνοος ..... 206 n 124; 459  
 (ἀνάπνοος)  
 \*ἀνάπτειν .....  
 ... 169 n 384; 204 n 114; 261 n 7  
 ἀνάπτυσις ..... 194 n 66  
 ἀναπτύσσειν ..... 491 (12); 492  
 ἀναπτυχή ..... 493  
 ἀναρθρος ..... 250 n 83  
 ἀνάρμοστος ..... 384 n 273  
 ἀναρχος .....  
 .. 103 n 153; 118 n 198; 450 n 6  
 ἀνασειεσθαι ..... 43 n 136 (6)  
 ἀνασπᾶν ..... 197 n 85  
 \*ἀνάσσειν .....  
 ... 86 n 74; 362 n 199; 363 n 200  
 ἀναστρέφειν ..... 357 n 175  
 ἀναστρως ..... 152 n 317  
 ἀνάτασις ..... 194 n 67  
 ἀνατείνειν ..... 171 n 398  
 ἀνατιθέναι ..... 124 n 221; 491 (1)  
 ἀνατολή ..... 154 n 322  
 ἀναφαίνεσθαι .... 50 n 160; 347 n 134  
 ἀναφορά ..... 489  
 ἀναχωννύοναι ..... 231 n 9  
 ἀνδρείκελον ..... 291 n 125  
 ἀνδροφόνος ..... 293 n 132  
 ἀνεγείρειν ..... 269 n 36  
 ἀνείδειος (ἀνείδειος) .....  
 244 n 63; 378 n 257; 384 n 273-274  
 ἀνέλευσις ..... 491 (11); 492  
 ἀνελίττειν . 99 n 138; 233 n 20; 402 n 3  
 ἀνέλκειν ... 185 n 34; 47, 23-24 Kr.\*  
 ἄνεμος ..... 207 n 127; 421 n 79  
 ἀνεπιτήδειος ..... 53 n 166  
 ἀνέρχεσθαι ..... 210 n 140; 488  
 \*ἄνευ ..... 167 n 379  
 \*ἀνέχειν .....  
 135 n 260; 136 n 263; 172 n 403 (3)  
 \*ἀνήρ .....  
 76 n 37; 112 n 181; 181 n 22 (2)-23;  
 212 n 142; 263 n 11 (1); 286 n 106;  
 287 n 109; 320 n 26 (2); 436 n 125  
 \*ἄνθος ..... 24 n 59 (2); 25 n 63;  
 92 n 100; 99 n 138; 100 n 141;  
 110 n 177 (14); 118 n 200 (2);  
 121 n 209 (3); 127 n 233; 128 n 235;  
 165 n 373 (1); 168-169; 197 n 84;  
 336 n 92; 371 n 225; 373 n 233; 462  
 ἄνθοσμία ..... 128 n 235  
 ἀνθρώπινος ..... 180 n 17;  
 187 n 41; 209 n 135; 222 n 190  
 ἄνθρωπος .....  
 24 n 59; 29 n 77 (3); 46 n 147;  
 55 n 171. 175; 70 n 12; 167 n 376;  
 188 n 44; 223 n 190; 229 n 3;  
 248 n 72; 254 n 98; 265 n 19;  
 276 n 70; 291 n 122; 299 n 156;  
 319 n 25; 383 n 270; 384 n 273; 461;  
 465 n 25; 466 n 34; 500 n 7  
 ἀνίεμαι ..... 346 n 132  
 ἀνίερος ..... 293 n 132  
 \*ἀνιστάναι .....  
 ... 189 n 45 (3); 190 n 48; 475  
 ἄνοδος ..... 32 n 89 (6);  
 155 n 333; 204 n 118; 260 n 5;  
 263 n 11; 449 n 3; 468 n 6; 489  
 \*ἀνόητος .....  
 295 n 137 (3); 297 n 144; 379 n 262  
 \*ἀνοίγειν ..... 34 n 95;  
 220 n 177; 221 n 178; 255 n 99 (10)  
 ἀνόρατος ..... 378 n 258  
 \*ἀνοχεύς ..... 41 n 127;  
 135; 136 n 263; 156 n 336; 458  
 \*ἀνοχικός ..... 135 n 260

- ἀντρείδειν ..... 166 n 374  
 ἀντί ..... 189 n 45  
 ἀντιᾶν ..... 18 n 46 (7); 161 n 361  
 ἀντίθεος ..... 273 n 54; 285 n 102  
 ἀντικείμενος ..... 391 n 291  
 ἀντικρός ..... 369 n 216  
 ἀντιπάθεια .. 290 n 121; 291 n 126  
 ἀντιπαθής ..... 291 n 126  
 ἀντιποιεῖν ..... 147 n 296  
 \*ἄνωξ ..... 24 n 58; 97 n 130  
 ἀνομνεῖν .....  
 10 n 26 (17); 15 n 36; 36 n 104;  
 77 n 42; 81 n 52; 102 n 152; 445m  
 ἀνυπέρβλητος ..... 160 n 353  
 \*ἄνω .....  
 169 n 388; 170 n 395; 173 n 403;  
 194 n 67; 206 n 125; 290 n 120;  
 295 n 136; 327 n 55; 372 n 231;  
 373 n 235; 374 n 239; 397 n 318; 488  
 \*ἄνωθεν ..... 124 n 221; 134 n 247c;  
 151 n 312; 153 n 320; 377 n 253  
 ἀνωμάλως ..... 296 n 143  
 ἀνωτάτω ..... 97 n 130  
 ἀνωτέρω ..... 322 n 34  
 ἀξιόπιστος ..... 56 n 179  
 ἀξιόσθον ..... 9 n 23; 56 n 177;  
 106 n 164; 206 n 125; 384 n 274  
 ἀξίως ..... 183 n 27  
 ἄοιδῆ ..... 10 n 26 (17)  
 ἄοιδιᾶν ... 10 n 26 (19); 14 n 31  
 \*ἄοκνος ... 99 n 138 (4); 403 n 8  
 ἄορατος .....  
 29 n 76; 296 n 142; 333 n 76;  
 346 n 132; 350 n 144; 383 n 270  
 ἄοριστος .....  
 297 n 143; 378 n 259; 395 n 307  
 \*ἄπαγειν ..... 167 n 376; 264 n 15  
 ἀπαθανατισμός ..... 177 n 3;  
 184; 199 n 96; 208 n 132; 446n; 462  
 ἀπαθής ..... 14 n 31  
 ἄπαις ..... 242 n 54  
 ἀπαιωρεῖν ..... 90 n 91; 96 n 126  
 ἀπαλλάττειν .....  
 ..... 217 n 162; 301 n 163; 461  
 ἀπαξ ..... 108 n 173; 318 n 22  
 \*ἄπαξ ἐπέκεινα ..... cf. ἐπέκεινα  
 ἀπαράβατος ..... 212 n 142  
 \*ἄπας ..... 82 n 59;  
 93 n 111; 96 n 126; 103 n 152e;  
 106 n 165; 117 n 195; 131 n 246 (2);  
 140 n 275 (3); 207 n 128; 260 n 7;  
 277 n 72; 296 n 141; 317 n 16;  
 384 n 274; 464 n 22; 509 n 1 (6. 13)  
 \*ἄπάτη ..... 34 n 95; 255 n 99 (9)  
 ἀπαυτοματίζειν ..... 350 n 143  
 ἀπεικάζειν ..... 271 n 41  
 ἀπειλή ..... 58 n 184  
 ἀπειρέσιος ..... 18 n 46 (2); 102 n 151  
 \*ἀπειρίτος ..... 86 n 74  
 ἀπειροδύναμος ..... 102 n 151  
 ἄπειρος .....  
 17 n 42 (2); 379 n 259; 402 n 3; 483  
 \*ἄπεραντος .....  
 102 n 151; 105 n 162; 127 n 232 (3)  
 ἀπεργάζεσθαι ..... 240 n 49  
 \*ἄπέχειν ..... 264 n 16  
 ἀπιστεῖν ..... 125 n 221e; 446o  
 ἄπιστος ..... 296 n 141  
 \*ἄπλανῆς .....  
 96 n 126. 130; 124 n 221; 125 n 223;  
 151 n 313; 152 n 317; 154 n 321;  
 377 n 253; 397 n 318; 484; 34 n 2 Kr.  
 \*ἄπλαστος ..... 171 n 397. 400  
 \*ἄπлатος ..... 110 n 177 (9)  
 \*ἄπλετος .. 18 n 46 (2); 90 n 91;  
 102 n 151; 143 n 287a; 405 n 17  
 ἀπλότης ..... 79 n 47  
 ἀπλοῦς . 171 n 400; 182 n 26; 318 n 22  
 ἀπλῶς .....  
 96 n 126; 108 n 173; 123 n 218; 484  
 ἀπλωσις ..... 78 n 45  
 \*ἀπνεύμων ... 295 n 137 (5); 297 n 143  
 \*ἀπό (ἀπαί) .....  
 ... 78 n 43; 79 n 47; 83 n 61;  
 86 n 72; 97 n 130; 110 n 177 (2. 13);  
 172 n 403 (1); 197 n 84 (2); 222 n 190  
 ἀποβλέπειν ..... 317 n 15  
 ἀπογεννᾶν ..... 118 n 200  
 ἀποδεικνύναι ..... 101 n 149  
 ἀπόδειξις ..... 145 n 291g  
 ἀποδέχεσθαι ..... 152 n 317  
 ἀποδιδόναι ..... 44 n 137  
 ἀποδοῖν ..... 217 n 162

ἀποθανεῖν . . . . . 212 n 142 ; 217 n 163  
 ἀπόθεσις . . . . . 194 n 66  
 ἀποθέωσις . . . . . 462  
 \*ἀποθρῦσκεῖν . . . . . 118 n 200  
 ἄποιος . . . . .  
 119 n 203 ; 155 n 331 ; 296 n 139  
 ἀποκαθαρτικός . . . . . 419 n 72  
 ἀποκάθαρμα . . . . . 385 n 275  
 ἀποκαθιστάναί . . . . .  
 185 n 34 ; 212 n 143 ; 222 n 187  
 ἀποκαλεῖν . . . . . 92 n 106 ; 109 n 173 ;  
 133 n 252 ; 271 n 41 ; 502 n 18  
 ἀποκρύπτειν . . . . . 243 n 57  
 ἀποκεῖν . . . . . 341 n 109  
 ἀπολείπειν . . . . . 187 n 40 ; 263 n 11  
 \*ἀπολλύναί . . . . . 250 n 2 ; 277 n 76  
 \*Ἀπόλλων . . . . . 6 n 11 ;  
 21 n 52 (1) ; 26 n 67 ; 29 n 76 ;  
 41 n 125 ; 43 n 136 ; 49 n 158 ;  
 59 n 186 ; 200 n 100 ; 224 n 195  
 ἀπολογίζεσθαι . . . . . 471 n 20  
 ἀπολύειν . . . . .  
 41 n 128 ; 249 n 79 ; 453 n 18  
 ἀπόλυσις . . . . . 41 ; 43  
 ἀπόλυτος . . . . . 137 n 267 ; 187 n 39  
 ἀπομειλίχσασθαι . . . . . 509 n 1 (15-16)  
 ἀπονεύειν . . . . . 43 n 136 (1)  
 ἀπόρρητος . . . . . 177 n 2 ; 184 n 32 ;  
 231 n 9 ; 237 n 39 ; 240 n 49 ;  
 246 n 68 ; 252 n 92 ; 287 n 109  
 ἀπόρροια . . . . .  
 . . . 44 n 137 ; 349 n 138 ; 501 n 12  
 ἀποσκεδαννόναι . . . 32 n 89 (9) ; 33 n 94  
 ἀποσπᾶν . . . . . 238 n 41  
 ἀποστέλλειν . . . . . 14 n 31  
 ἀποστενοῦν . . . . . 264 n 17  
 \*ἀποστρέφειν . . . 263 n 11 (1) ; 304 n 173  
 \*ἀποστροφος . . . . . 167 n 376  
 ἀποσφᾶζειν . . . . . 105 n 163  
 ἀποτεινεῖν . . . . . 346 n 132  
 ἀποτελεῖν . . . . . 348 n 136  
 ἀποτέμνειν . . . . . 261 n 7  
 ἀποτρεπόμενος . . . . . 293 n 132  
 ἀποτρόπαιος . . . . . 291 n 125  
 ἀποτροπή . . . . . 228 n 1  
 ἀποτροπιασμός . . . 53 n 166 ; 290 n 121

\*Ἀπουλήτιος . . . . . 287 n 109  
 ἀποφαίνειν . . . . . 149 n 303  
 ἀποφθίνειν . . . . . 242 n 54  
 ἀποφοιβάζειν . . . . . 44 n 136  
 ἄπταιστος . . . . . 263 n 11  
 ἄπτειν . . . . . 17 n 42 (7) ; 18 n 46 (11) ;  
 174 n 407 ; 186 n 38 ; 202 n 106 ;  
 204 n 114 ; 261 n 7 ; 374 n 240-241  
 ἄπτως . . . . . 120 n 206 ; 125 n 225  
 ἀπῶθειν . . . . . 248 n 72  
 \*ἄρα . . . . .  
 140 n 275 (1) ; 151 n 311 ; 259 n 3 (1)  
 \*ἄραιός . . . . . 135 n 260  
 \*\*ἄργάλεος . . . . . 64 (2) S.  
 ἄργεννός . . . . . 241 n 53  
 \*ἄργός . . . . . 181 n 22 ;  
 295 n 137 (5) ; 297 n 143 ; 483  
 \*ἄρδην . . . . . 88 n 83a ;  
 169 n 388 ; 373 n 235 ; 374 n 230  
 \*ἄρετή . . . . . 12 n 28 ;  
 14 n 32 ; 50 n 160-161 ; 88 n 83b ;  
 95 n 119 ; 145 n 291 ; 220 n 177 ;  
 255 n 99 (11) ; 363 n 201 ; 465 ; 477  
 \*ἄρηιφάτος . . . . . 257 W.  
 ἄρης . . . . . 53 n 165 (3)  
 ἀριθμητική . . . . . 501 n 15  
 \*ἀριθμός . . . 24 n 58-59 (3) ; 105 n 163 ;  
 106 n 164 ; 109 n 174 ; 117 n 195 ;  
 240 n 49 ; 345 n 130 ; 360 n 187  
 ἄριστος . . . . . 109 n 174  
 ἄρκειν . . . . . 48 n 152 (7) ; 87 n 81  
 ἄρμα . . . . . 15 n 36  
 ἄρμόζειν . . . . . 346 n 132 ; 349 n 141  
 \*ἄρμονία . . . . . 24 n 59 (3) ; 154 n 325 ;  
 200 n 100-101 ; 347 n 135 ; 348 n 143 ;  
 352 n 151 ; 359 n 183 ; 360 n 187  
 \*Ἄρνούφης . . . . . 4 n 2  
 ἄροῦν . . . . . 10 n 26 (5) ; 159 n 346  
 \*ἄρπάζειν . . . . .  
 78 n 45 ; 303 n 171 ; 322 n 35 ;  
 327 n 55 ; 334 n 82 ; 459 n 6  
 \*ἄρρατος . . . . . 135 n 260  
 ἄρρενόθηλος . . . . . 341 n 109  
 ἄρρηκτος . . . . .  
 48 n 152 (5) ; 49 ; 346 n 132 ; 350 n 144  
 ἄρρην . . . . . 24 n 58 ; 268 n 30

- \***ἄρρητος** ..... 10 n 26 (1);  
43 n 136 (3); 57 n 182-183; 58 n 184;  
77 n 38; 81 n 54; 146 n 295;  
186 n 38; 191 n 55; 192 n 56;  
194 n 71; 195 n 74; 197 n 86;  
231 n 9; 240 n 49-50; 241 n 52;  
243 n 58; 252 n 92; 288 n 109;  
328 n 59; 407 n 25; 461 n 4; 483
- ἀρχαγγελικός** .....  
103 n 152c; 150 n 309; 224 n 195
- ἀρχάγγελος** ..... 103 n 152;  
150 n 309; 481 n 3; 484; 500 n 5
- ἀρχαῖος** ..... 70 n 12;  
291 n 126; 292 n 127; 475-476
- \***ἀρχέγονος** .. 110 n 177 (15); 317 n 14
- \***ἀρχεῖν** .... 96 n 126; 106 n 164;  
107 n 188; 149 n 303; 356 n 169
- \***ἀρχεσθαι** .. 118 n 200 (4); 270 n 37
- ἀρχέτυπος** .. 100 n 138; 318 n 19
- \***ἀρχή** ..... 24 n 58;  
26 n 67 (2); 28 n 71; 81 n 52;  
83 n 63-64; 84 n 66; 93 n 109;  
99 n 138 (3); 103 n 152; 108 n 173;  
109 n 174; 111 n 178; 115;  
116 n 192-193; 139-140; 148 n 300;  
150 n 309; 156 n 336; 188 n 42;  
188 n 45; 200 n 102; 210 n 140;  
341 n 108; 349; 352 n 151; 356 n 168;  
362 n 199; 391 n 292; 423; 455;  
456; 481 n 3; 484; 485 n 6
- ἀρχηγέτης** ..... 284 n 97
- \***ἀρχηγός** .....  
279 n 83; 283 n 93-94; 284 n 97
- \***ἀρχιγένεθλος** .... 85 n 71; 88 n 83a
- ἀρχιερεύς** ..... 478
- \***ἀρχικός** .....  
93 n 107; 103 n 152d; 124 n 221;  
138 n 270; 139-140; 150 n 309;  
156 n 337; *contra*: 36, 29 sq Kr.
- \***ἀρχιος** ..... 141 n 281
- ἀρχων** ..... 284 n 97; 423
- ἀρωγός** ..... 29 n 77 (1)
- ἄρωμα** ..... 231 n 9
- ἀσεβής** ..... 214 n 148
- ἀσημος** ..... 249 n 78
- ἀσθενής** ..... 42 n 133
- \***Ἀσσύριος** ..... 68 n 7;  
119 n 202; 137 n 267; 138 n 270;  
231 n 9; 232 n 15; 252 n 92;  
291 n 126; 428 n 100; 444; 464 n 22
- ἀστέριος** .....  
137 n 269; 138 n 271; 143 n 287;  
255 n 99 (6); 267 n 25 (4); 336 n 92
- ἀστερόεις** ..... 10 n 26 (6); 77 n 39
- \***ἀστήρ** .....  
17 n 42 (4); 18 n 46 (5); 103 n 154;  
124 n 221; 243 n 57; 255 n 98
- ἀστραῖος** ..... 52 n 163; 225 n 197
- \***ἀστράπτειν** ..... 240 n 52
- ἄστρον** .....  
.... 225 n 197; 362 n 198; 459 n 8
- ἀστρονομία** ..... 501 n 15
- ἄστροφος** ..... 167 n 376
- ἀστυφέλκτος** ..... 18 n 46 (14)
- ἀσύμφωνος** ..... 250 n 83
- ἀσφαλής** ..... 183 n 27; 263 n 11
- ἀσώματος** .....  
21 n 52 (1); 231 n 9; 246 n 68;  
247 n 69a; 348 n 136; 402 n 3
- ἀσωμάτως** .... 246 n 68; 348 n 136
- \***ἄτακτος** .....  
124 n 221; 378 n 259; 384 n 273
- ἀτάκτως** ..... 262 n 10g;  
263 n 11; 378 n 258; 383 n 272
- ἀτάλαντος** .. 10 n 26 (9); 114 n 186-187
- ἀταξία** ..... 345 n 130
- ἀταρπιτός** ..... 18 n 46 (7)
- \***ἀταρπός** ..... 263 n 11 (2)
- ἀτελεύτητος** ..... 103 n 153
- \***ἀτελής** ..... 115 n 191
- ἀτενίζειν** ..... 197 n 85; 368 n 213
- \***ἀτενώδης** ... 166 n 373 (9); 368 n 213
- \***ἄτερ** ..... 244 n 63 (1); 287 n 109
- ἄτερθε(v)** ..... 10 n 26 (14)
- ἀτεχνῶς** ..... 152 n 314
- \***ἄτμός** ..... 64 (2) S.
- ἄτραπός** ..... 303 n 170
- \***ἀτρέκεια** ..... 50 n 160
- ἀτρεκής** ..... 146 n 293
- ἀτρεπτος** .....  
... 187 n 39; 261 n 8; 348 n 137
- ἄτροπος** ..... 364 n 204
- ἄττική** ..... 251 n 84
- ἄττικός** ..... 508 n 45
- \***ἀτύπωτος** ..... 240 n 52 (3); 244 n 63

- \*αὐ ..... 96 n 126 ; 131 n 247 ; 212 n 142
- \*αὐγή ..... 21 n 52 (3) ;  
121 n 209 (2) ; 126 n 228 ; 171 n 396 ;  
172 n 403 ; 183 n 27 ; 185 n 34 ;  
197 n 83 ; 268 n 29 ; 373 n 233-234
- αὐγοειδής ..... 178 n 7 ; 194 n 66
- αὐθαίρετος ..... 468 n 8
- \*αὐθις (αὐτις) ..... 187 n 40 ;  
189 n 45 (3) ; 223 n 190 ; 475
- αὐθυπόστατος ..... 87 n 76
- \*αὐλή ..... 33 n 92
- αὐλητής ..... 47 n 148
- αὐλος .....  
... 21 n 52 (1) ; 87 n 76 ; 270 n 37
- αὐλός ..... 43 n 136 (7) ; 46-47
- \*αὐλόν ..... 17 n 42 (6) ;  
18 n 46 (9) ; 140 n 276 ; 141 n 281
- \*αὐξάνειν, αὐξιν .....  
..... 203 n 114 ; 266 n 23 ; 492
- \*αὐτανδρος ..... 259 n 2
- αὐτάρ ..... 169 n 384
- αὐτάρκης ..... 327 n 55
- αὐτενέργητος ..... 468 n 8
- αὐτίκα ..... 106 n 165
- \*αὐτις ..... cf. αὐθις
- \*αὐτογένεθλος .....  
... 79 n 48 ; 114 n 185 ; 322 n 36
- αὐτοζῶον .....  
82 n 59 ; 83 n 62 ; 402 n 5 ; 483
- \*αὐτοθελής ..... 22 n 54
- αὐτόθεν ..... 114 n 187
- αὐτόκλητος ..... 468 n 8
- αὐτόνοος ..... 484
- αὐτοπτειν ..... 245 n 65
- \*αὐτοπτος ... 98 n 134 ; 246 n 67a-68
- \*αὐτός ..... 45 n 139 ;  
124 n 221b ; 129 n 240 ; 132 n 249 (1) ;  
141 n 281 ; 146 n 292 ; 198 n 88 (2)
- \*αὐτοτελής ..... 22 n 54 ;  
83 n 61 ; 110 n 177 (16) ; 317 n 13
- \*αὐτουργεῖν ..... 120 n 205 (2)
- αὐτοφάνεια .....  
22 ; 101 ; 229 n 6 ; 246 ; 468 n 9
- αὐτοφανής ..... 21 n 52 (1) ;  
22 n 54 ; 101 n 148 ; 246 ; 458 ; 468 n 8
- αὐτοφυής ... 18 n 46 (14) ; 101 n 145
- αὐτοψία ..... 101 n 149
- \*αὐχεῖν ..... 198 n 88 (3)
- \*αὐχὴν ..... 189 n 45
- \*αὐχμηρός .... 297 n 143 ; 64 (3) S.\*\*
- αὐχμός ..... 251 n 84
- ἀφαγνίζειν ..... 231 n 9
- ἀφαίρεσις ..... 367 n 210
- \*ἀφανής ..... 57 n 182 ;  
133 n 254 ; 152 n 314 ; 274 n 57 ;  
295 n 137 (5) ; 296 n 142 ; 469 n 12
- ἀφανίζειν .. 70 n 12 ; 260 n 7 ; 492
- ἀφανῶς ..... 348 n 136
- ἀφεγγής ..... 308 n 186
- ἄφεσις ..... 187 n 39
- ἄψη ..... 375 n 241
- ἄφθαρτος ..... 14 n 31
- \*ἄφθελκτος ..... 77 n 38 ;  
80 n 49 (5) ; 132 n 249 ; 133 n 253. 255 ;  
161 n 359 ; 228 n 2 ; 328 n 59
- \*ἄφθοιτος ..... 10 n 26 (10) ; 23 n 58 ;  
26 n 67 (3) ; 83 n 64 ; 86 n 74 ; 87 n 78 ;  
110 n 177 (6) ; 114 n 186 ; 118 n 198 ;  
198 n 79 ; 204 n 118 ; 317 n 15
- ἀφιέναι ..... 4 n 2 ; 166 n 374
- ἀφικνεῖσθαι ..... 189 n 45
- ἀφιστάναι ... 17 n 44 ; 188 n 42
- ἀφομοιοῦν ..... 348 n 138
- ἀφομοιωτικός ..... 116 n 192 ;  
139 n 274 ; 191 n 55 ; 348 n 138
- ἀφόρητος ..... 248 n 72
- \*ἀφορίζειν ... 97 n 130 ; 103 n 152e ;  
108 n 172-173 ; 500 n 5 ; 509 n 1 (3)
- ἀφορισμός ..... 509 n 1 (13)
- ἀφορμή ..... 70 n 14 ; 203 n 114
- \*ἀφραστός ..... 84 n 65 ;  
155 n 333 ; 191 n 55 ; 272 n 47
- \*Ἀφροδίτη ..... 354 n 159
- ἀφώτιστος ..... 301 n 163
- \*Ἀχιλλεύς ..... 184 n 32 ; 207 n 127
- \*ἀχλύειν ..... 242 n 57 (1)
- ἄχραντος .....  
86 n 72 ; 119 n 201 ; 200 n 98 ;  
238 n 41 ; 261 n 8 ; 484 ; 278 Th.\*
- ἄχρειος ..... 53 n 165 (2)
- ἄχρι ..... 509 n 1 (11)
- ἄχρηστος ..... 317 n 17



- ἀψίς ..... 328 n 58 ; 484  
 ἄωρος ..... 241 ; 242 n 54  
 \*βαθμῖς .....  
 294 n 133 (2) ; 135 ; 414 n 50 ; 475  
 \*βάθος .....  
 146 n 293 ; 151 n 313 ; 169 n 388 ; 390 ;  
 172 n 400 ; 224 n 194 ; 244 n 63 ;  
 295 n 137 (4) ; 296 n 143 ; 297 n 147 ;  
 304 n 173 ; 396 n 312 ; 397 n 318  
 βαθυκόμων ..... 306 n 180  
 \*βαθύνειν .....  
 ... 184 n 29 ; 277 n 77 ; 396 n 311  
 \*βαθύς ..... 128 n 238 ; 146 n 293 ;  
 298 n 149 ; 304 n 173 ; 457 n 1  
 βαθυχεύμων ..... 493  
 βαίνειν ..... 48 n 152 (5)  
 βαιός ..... 204 n 114  
 βακχεύειν ..... 186 n 38  
 βάκχος ..... 415 n 51  
 \*βάλλειν .. 192 n 59 (3) ; 255 n 99 (1)  
 \*βαπτίζειν ..... 277 n 76-77  
 βαρβαρικός ..... 240 n 51  
 \*βάρβαρος .....  
 79 n 48 ; 95 n 121 ; 128 n 236 ;  
 163 n 365 ; 240 n 50 ; 245 n 65 ;  
 248 n 72 ; 428 n 100 ; 444f ; 445k  
 \*βαρυηχής ..... 45 n 139  
 βαρύνεσθαι ..... 295 n 136  
 βαρύτης ..... 304 n 173  
 βασιλείος ..... 10 n 26 (13)  
 βασιλεύειν ..... 328 n 58  
 βασιλεύς ... 3 n 1 ; 4 n 2 ; 11 n 26 ;  
 26 n 67 (5) ; 76 n 37 ; 225 n 197 ;  
 248 n 72 ; 319 ; 323 n 38 ; 327 n 52 ;  
 328 n 58 ; 505 n 34 ; 509 n 1 (4)  
 βασιλικός ..... 338 n 96  
 βάσις ..... 44 n 137 ; 231 n 9  
 βαστάζειν .... 15 n 34 ; 236 n 35  
 βέβαιος ..... 145 n 291g ; 147 n 296  
 \*βένθος ..... 24 n 58 ; 244 n 63  
 βέρεθρον ..... 298 n 149  
 \*βία (βιη) .. 26 n 67 (3) ; 28 n 71 ;  
 53 n 165 (7) ; 58 n 184 ; 86 n 74 ;  
 205 n 122 ; 288 n 109 ; 440 n 140  
 βιάζεσθαι ..... 198 n 90 ; 217 n 163  
 βίαιος ..... 303 n 171  
 βιβλίον . 5 n 4 ; 10 n 26 ; 69 n 10 ;  
 70 n 12 ; 444d ; 450 n 6-7 ; 451 n 9  
 \*βίος ..... 32 n 89 (6) ;  
 223 n 190 ; 278 n 77 ; 403 n 9  
 βίσιος ..... 33 n 92  
 βιώσιμος ..... 292 n 126  
 βλάπτειν ..... 70 n 12  
 \*βλάστημα .....  
 263 n 14 (2) ; 265 n 19 ; 306 n 180  
 \*βλέπειν ..... 90 n 94 ; 194 n 67 ;  
 228 n 1 ; 243 n 57 ; 244 n 63 ;  
 248 n 72 ; 295 n 137 (5) ; 318 n 21 ;  
 370 n 220 ; 372 n 231 ; 374 n 239  
 \*βλύζειν .....  
 88 n 83a ; 110 n 177 (15) ; 118 n 200  
 βλώσκειν ..... 59 n 186 (2)  
 βοάν ..... 23 n 58  
 βοθρεύεσθαι ..... 231 n 9  
 βοτάνη .... 231 n 9 ; 232 n 13  
 βοτανήαρσις ..... 231 n 11  
 βούλεσθαι ..... 10 n 26 (17) ;  
 80 n 49 (2) ; 200 n 102 ; 220 n 175 ;  
 253 n 96 ; 317 n 15 ; 330 n 64  
 βουλεύειν .....  
 18 n 46 (4) ; 80 n 49 (6) ; 350 n 144  
 \*βουλή ..... 18 n 46 (4) ;  
 27 ; 29 n 76-77 (4) ; 32 n 89 (8) ;  
 79-80 ; 110 n 177 (13) ; 131 n 246 ;  
 132 n 249 ; 255 n 99 (4) ; 329 n 61 ;  
 331 n 68-69 ; 341 n 109 ; 468 n 8  
 βούλησις .....  
 22 n 54 ; 80 n 49 (4) ; 180 n 17 ;  
 330 n 68 ; 347 n 133 ; 468 n 8  
 βρέφος ..... 489  
 \*βρίθειν ..... 172 n 403 (3)  
 βριθός ..... 59 n 186  
 βροντή ..... 4 n 2 ; 246 n 67  
 \*βρότειος ..... 43 n 136 (7) ;  
 198 n 88 (3) ; 214 n 151 ; 276 n 70  
 \*βροτός ..... 40 n 118 ; 42 n 132 ;  
 170 n 395 ; 172 n 402 (1) ; 173 n 406 ;  
 181 n 19 ; 210 n 138 ; 259 n 3  
 βύθιος ..... 308 n 186  
 \*βυθός ..... 77 n 40 ;  
 105 n 163 ; 151 n 313 ; 159 n 351 ;  
 160 n 353 ; 169 n 390 ; 295 n 137 (2) ;  
 296 n 139 ; 298 n 149 ; 328 n 58 ;  
 343 n 122 ; 379 n 259 ; 483-485  
 βομός ..... 293 n 132

\*γατα (γαίη, γύη) ..... 214 n 148 ;  
 255 n 99 (1); 259 n 3; 299 n 156  
 Γαλιθνος ..... 323 n 28; 505 n 34  
 \*γάρ .... 79 n 45; 81 n 55; 82 n 58;  
 84 n 65; 86 n 74; 88 n 83a; 90 n 94;  
 92 n 101; 95 n 118; 99 n 138;  
 100 n 140; 106 n 164. 165;  
 110 n 177 (3. 5); 112 n 181; 113 n 184;  
 114 n 185. 187 (2); 117 n 195;  
 118 n 200 (3); 120 n 205 (1);  
 121 n 209 (1); 123 n 218;  
 125 n 225; 127 n 232 (1); 135 n 259;  
 140 n 275 (3); 144 n 291a;  
 165 n 373 (1. 2. 3. 8.); 167 n 379;  
 170 n 394. 395 (1); 173 n 406;  
 179 n 8; 191 n 55 (1); 198 n 88 (3);  
 212 n 143; 228 n 1a;  
 242 n 57 (2); 255 n 99 (2);  
 264 n 16; 67 S.\*\*; SWk.\*\*  
 γαστήρ ..... 43 n 136 (6)  
 \*γαυροδσθαι ..... 200 n 100  
 \*γε ..... 132 n 249. 250 (3)  
 γείτων ..... 143 n 288  
 γελᾶν ..... 249 n 78  
 \*γενεά ..... 84 n 65  
 γενέθλη ..... 59 n 186 (7)  
 γενεσιουργός ... 302 n 168; 503 n 25  
 \*γένεσις ..... 10 n 26 (11);  
 80 n 49 (11); 114 n 186 (3);  
 118 n 200 (1); 136 n 263; 145 n 291;  
 181 n 22; 183 n 27; 189 n 45;  
 220 n 175; 245 n 65; 260 n 7;  
 294 n 133. 136; 297 n 145;  
 348 n 138; 351 n 150; 379 n 259;  
 421 n 79; 502 n 20; 503 n 25  
 γενετήριον ..... 24 n 58  
 γένητος ..... 138 n 270; 353 n 157  
 \*γεννᾶν .....  
 99 n 137-138; 181 n 22; 224 n 195;  
 335 n 82; 341 n 111; 343 n 121;  
 350 n 143; 352 n 151; 396 n 312  
 γέννημα ..... 402 n 6  
 γεννητής ..... 341 n 108  
 \*γένος ..... 10 n 26 (17);  
 112 n 181; 123 n 218; 224 n 194;  
 268 n 32; 271 n 41; 274 n 62;  
 293 n 132; 308 n 186; 317 n 16;  
 320 n 26 (2); 346 n 132; 445n; 478;  
 499 n 4; 500 n 5; 509 n 1 (2. 4. 8).  
 γέρων ..... 103 n 154  
 γεώδης ..... 383 n 270

γεωμετρία ..... 501 n 15  
 \*γῆ .....  
 106 n 165; 119 n 202; 124 n 221;  
 146 n 293; 153 n 320; 213 n 144;  
 217 n 162; 243 n 57; 278 n 81;  
 291 n 126; 294 n 133 (1). 136;  
 298 n 153; 360 n 184; 364 n 203;  
 377 n 253; 379 n 259; 383 n 270;  
 475; 491; 509 n 1 (13); 510 n 2  
 γήινος ..... 277 n 72  
 γίγνεσθαι . 3 n 1; 5 n 3; 10 n 36 (15);  
 17 n 44; 24 n 59; 33 n 91;  
 56 n 177; 104 n 158; 111 n 177;  
 120 n 206; 159 n 347-348; 189 n 45;  
 197 n 86; 210 n 138; 246 n 68;  
 263 n 14; 265 n 19; 270 n 37;  
 297 n 145; 330 n 64; 341 n 108;  
 350 n 143; 373 n 234; 374 n 241;  
 436 n 125; 444g; 450 n 6;  
 463 n 15; 470 n 13; 491 (9)  
 γιγνώσκειν .... 232 n 15; 319 n 25  
 γλυκερός ..... 32 n 89 (1)  
 \*γνώμη ..... 373 n 234  
 γνωρίζειν ..... 371 n 226; 491 (4)  
 γνώριμος .... 183 n 27; 186 n 38  
 \*γνώρισμα .... 203 n 114; 242 n 56  
 γνῶσις .....  
 115 n 190; 145 n 291; 166 n 374;  
 167 n 376; 192 n 59; 373; 435 n 119  
 γνωστός ..... 166 n 374; 372 n 229  
 γοητεία ..... 58 n 184  
 γοητικά ..... 231 n 9; 232 n 16  
 γονή .....  
 10 n 26 (12); 53 n 166 (2); 159 n 348  
 γόνιμος .....  
 341 n 108; 347 n 133; 348 n 136  
 γοῦν ..... 263 n 11  
 γράμμα ..... 252 n 92  
 γραμμ(η)αίος ..... 252 n 91  
 γραμμή ..... 396 n 212  
 γράφειν ..... 3 n 1; 69 n 10;  
 71 n 14; 253 n 93; 364 n 206;  
 450 n 7; 451 n 9; 505 n 34  
 γρίφος ..... 457 n 1  
 \*γύη ..... 240 n 52 (4); 241 n 53  
 \*γυμνής ..... 170 n 395  
 \*γυμνός ..... 241 n 52; 242 n 54  
 γυμνοῦν ..... 171 n 395  
 γυναικεῖος ..... 41 n 125  
 γωνιακός ..... 109 n 173

- θαδοφόρος ..... 91 n 96  
 θαῖναι ..... 21 n 52 (5)  
 θαίειν (A) ..... 20 n 46  
 θαίειν (B) .. 18 n 46 (11); 20 n 46;  
 106 n 165; 202 n 106; 174 n 407  
 θαίη .....  
 20 n 46; 174 n 407; 430 n 109; 458  
 Θάκες ..... 4 n 2; 248 n 72  
 θαμονάρχης ..... 284 n 97  
 θαμόνιος ..... 53 n 166 (1);  
 187 n 41; 229 n 3; 260 n 5;  
 263 n 11; 264 n 17; 271 n 41;  
 274 n 57; 290 n 121; 499 n 4  
 θαμονιῶδης ..... 269 n 36  
 \*θαίμων ..... 56 n 177; 136 n 263;  
 162 n 365; 209 n 135; 216 n 161; 229;  
 231 n 9; 238 n 41; 242 n 56;  
 245 n 65; 259 n 3; 260 n 4-5;  
 261 n 8; 263 n 14 (1); 264 n 16;  
 265 n 19; 269 n 34; 271 n 41;  
 274 n 62; 283 n 94; 284 n 97;  
 285 n 102; 289 n 116 (1); 293 n 132;  
 304 n 173. 176; 308 n 185-186;  
 412 n 40; 454 n 23; 468 n 9;  
 499 n 3-4; 502 n 18-21; 504 n 32;  
 505 n 34; 509 n 1 (5. 8. 12. 14. 16);  
 510 n 2; 511 n 9  
 θασπλήτης ..... 91 n 96  
 θάφνη ..... 231 n 9  
 \*θέ ..... 44 n 136;  
 45 n 139; 90 n 91; 96 n 126;  
 110 n 177 (2); 124 n 221a. b. c.;  
 131 n 246 (2); 140 n 275 (1);  
 146 n 293; 147 n 295-296;  
 160 n 355; 169 n 388; 172 n 402 (1);  
 196 n 79; 197 n 84 (1);  
 203 n 114; 212 n 144; 244 n 63 (1);  
 259 n 3 (1); 289 n 116 (1)  
 θεδορκῶς ..... 24 n 58  
 θέσις ..... 239 n 43  
 \*θεικόναι ..... 183 n 27; 259 n 3;  
 291 n 126; 357 n 175; 372 n 230  
 θειλός ..... 185 n 32; 207 n 127  
 θεῖν (θεῖ) .....  
 ... 12 n 28; 26 n 67; 53 n 166;  
 120 n 206; 173 n 403; 184 n 32;  
 194 n 66; 212 n 142; 253 n 94;  
 278 n 81; 317 n 15; 368 n 212; 476  
 θεῖν (δέω) ..... 10 n 26 (11);  
 41 n 128; 114 n 186; 119 n 201;  
 181 n 22; 346 n 132; 509 n 1 (14)  
 \*θεινός ..... 48 n 152;  
 95 n 121; 204 n 114; 231 n 9;  
 232 n 16; 248 n 73; 286 n 106; 475  
 δεκτικός ..... 317 n 18  
 \*δέμα ..... 107 n 170; 109 n 173  
 \*δέμας ..... 295 n 137 (5); 296 n 142  
 \*δεξιός ..... 88 n 83; 291 n 126  
 δεσμεῖν ..... 42 n 131  
 \*δεσμός .....  
 48 n 152 (6); 53 n 165 (4); 58 n 184;  
 119 n 201; 127 n 232 (2)-233;  
 187 n 39; 239; 346 n 132;  
 347 n 134; 348 n 137; 350 n 144  
 δέσποινα ..... 71 n 15  
 δεσπότης ..... 10 n 26 (2); 76 n 37;  
 225 n 197; 350 n 143; 491 (4)  
 \*δεσπότης ..... 86 n 75 (2); 356 n 169  
 δεῦρο ..... 223 n 191; 241 n 53  
 \*δεύτερος ..... 99 n 137; 112 n 181;  
 138 n 271; 245 n 65; 265 n 17;  
 318 n 21; 320 n 26 (2); 347 n 135;  
 483-484; 509 n 1 (5. 14)  
 \*δέχεσθαι .....  
 ... 41 n 125; 84 n 65; 297 n 145  
 \*δῆ .....  
 85 n 70; 95 n 118; 107 n 170;  
 132 n 250 (1); 165 n 373 (5. 7)  
 \*δηθύνειν ..... 42 n 132  
 δηλοῦν ..... 9 n 23; 14 n 31;  
 24 n 59; 26 n 67; 32 n 89; 59 n 186;  
 115 n 190; 131 n 246; 135 n 260;  
 188 n 43; 240 n 49; 246 n 68; 445m  
 δημιουργεῖν .. 124 n 221; 317 n 15;  
 330 n 64; 348 n 136; 386 n 278  
 δημιούργημα ..... 24 n 59  
 δημιουργία ..... 111 n 178;  
 115 n 190; 119 n 201; 124 n 221;  
 152 n 314; 260 n 5; 384 n 273  
 δημιουργικός .....  
 92 n 106; 132 n 247b; 150 n 309;  
 191 n 55; 221 n 179; 323 n 38;  
 326 n 51; 330 n 68; 348 n 137  
 δημιουργικῶς ..... 83 n 64  
 δημιουργός .....  
 9 n 23; 85 n 70; 113 n 185;  
 119 n 202; 124 n 221c; 136 n 266;  
 150 n 309; 181 n 22; 319 n 25;  
 325 n 46; 327 n 52; 341 n 109;  
 346 n 132; 348 n 138; 352 n 151;  
 360 n 184; 386 n 278; 391 n 291; 484

- \*δήπου .....  
 .. 112 n 181 ; 341 n 108 ; 501 n 15
- \*διά ..... 125 n 226 ; 134 n 256 (2) ;  
 194 n 67 ; 204 n 116 ; 246 n 68
- διαβολικός ..... 391 n 291
- διάβολος ..... 391 n 291
- διάγειν ..... 10 n 26 (16) ; 431 n 110
- διαείδεσθαι ..... 21 n 52 (3)
- διαθερμαίνειν ..... 492
- διαθροφσκειν ..... 169 n 385
- διαθήκη ..... 232
- διαίρειν ..... 78 n 45 ;  
 119 n 203 ; 133 n 255 ; 138 n 270 ;  
 140 n 275 ; 288 n 109 ; 509 n 1 (2)
- διαιώνως ..... 348 n 137
- διακονεῖν ..... 232 n 14
- διακονία ..... 14 n 31
- διάκορος ..... 99 n 138
- διακοσμεῖν ..... 356 n 170
- διακόσμησις ..... 121 n 209 ;  
 123 n 218 ; 160 n 355 ; 297 ; 380 n 263
- διάκοσμος ..... 56 n 177 ; 99 n 137 ;  
 151 n 312 ; 155 n 331 ; 482-483
- διακριβόν ..... 255 n 98
- \*διακρίνειν ..... 85 n 69 ; 92 n 101 ;  
 125 n 221f ; 127 n 233 ; 265 n 21
- διάκρισις ..... 484
- διαλέγειν ..... 153 n 320
- διάλυσις ..... 217 n 163
- διαμπᾶξ ..... 153 n 320
- διανοεῖν ..... 85 n 70
- διανοητικός ..... 172 n 400
- \*διάνοια ..... 85 n 70 ; 99 n 138 ;  
 111 n 177 ; 160 n 355 ; 233 n 20 ;  
 271 n 41 ; 370 n 220 ; 374 n 239
- διαπλασιάζειν ..... 123 n 218
- διανυεῖσθαι ..... 187 n 39
- \*διαπόρθμιος .....  
 133 n 254 ; 134 n 256 ; 136 n 263 ; 163
- διασκοπεῖν ..... 255 n 98
- διάστασις ..... 503 n 25
- διαστατός ..... 396 n 312
- διαστέλλειν ..... 509 n 1 (11)
- διασχηματίζειν ..... 345 n 130
- διατείνειν ..... 255 n 98
- διατρέχειν ..... 241 n 53 ; 246 n 67
- διαυγεῖν ..... 301 n 163
- διαφερόντως ..... 245 n 65
- διαφορά ..... 138 n 270 ; 450 n 7
- διάφορος ..... 90 n 91 ; 119 n 203 ;  
 203 n 114 ; 291 n 125 ; 349 n 141
- \*διδάκτος ..... 203 n 114
- διδασκαλία ..... 56 n 179
- διδάσκειν ..... 32 n 89 ; 56 n 177 ;  
 57 n 179 ; 88 n 83a ; 118 n 198 ;  
 191 n 55 ; 222 n 190 ; 246 n 68 ;  
 260 n 7 ; 445m ; 447 (9) ; 450 n 6
- \*διδόναί ..... 79 n 47 ;  
 112 n 181 ; 124 n 221 ; 131 n 247 ;  
 183 n 27 ; 203 n 114 (1) ; 256 n 102 ;  
 299 n 154 ; 370 n 220 ; 468 n 9
- διέπειν ..... 24 n 58
- \*δίξεσθαι ..... 189 n 45 (1) ; 475
- \*δήκειν .....  
 125 n 226 ; 153 n 320 ; 348 n 136-137
- διηνεκῶς ..... 14 n 31 ; 17 n 42 (2)
- δυστάναι ..... 360 n 188
- δίκερος ..... 362 n 199
- δίκη ..... 119 n 97 ; 299 n 154
- δίκην ..... 291 n 124
- δίκωλον ..... 491
- \*δινεῖν .....  
 99 n 138 (4) ; 100 n 143 ; 404 n 12
- δίνη ..... 303 n 171
- διό ..... 173 n 403 ; 200 n 102 ;  
 207 n 127 ; 227 n 1a ; 244 n 63 ;  
 250 n 83 ; 264 n 17 ; 271 n 41 ;  
 271 n 41 ; 274 n 62 ; 395 n 307
- διοίγειν ..... 374 n 239
- διοικεῖν ..... 347 n 135 ; 439 n 136
- διοίκησις ..... 283 n 94
- διόπτρα ..... 114 n 187
- διορίζειν ..... 108 n 173
- διπλασιῶς ..... 123 n 218
- \*δῖς ..... cf. ἐπέκεινα
- δίσκος ..... 152 n 317
- διττός .....  
 ... 180 n 17 ; 318 n 22 ; 373 n 236
- δίψος ..... 4 n 2
- διχῶς ..... 151 n 311
- δόγματα .....  
 5 n 3 ; 68 n 7 ; 292 n 127 ; 428 n 100 ;  
 444c ; 446o ; 450 n 7 ; 475-476

- δογματίζειν ..... 81 n 54  
 δοκεῖν ..... 10 n 26 (11); 80 n 49 (11);  
 88 n 83a; 93 n 111; 114 n 186 (3);  
 124 n 221; 182 n 26; 384 n 273; 446n  
 δολιχός ..... 53 n 165 (1)  
 δόμος ..... 33 n 92  
 δόξα ..... 5 n 8  
 δοξάζειν ..... 81 n 52; 138 n 271  
 δοξαστικός ..... 172 n 400  
 δοξολογία ..... 23 n 58  
 δόσις ..... 147 n 296; 269 n 35  
 \*δουλεύειν (*servire*) ..... 131 n 246;  
 140 n 275 (3); 146 n 292; 151 n 313;  
 189 n 45; 265 n 21 = 49,17 Kr.  
 δούλη ..... 189 n 45  
 δοχεύς ..... 39-40 n 116; 40 n 121;  
 41 n 126; 42 n 133; 43 n 136 (4);  
 55 n 172; 56 n 176; 228 n 1; 458  
 δράκαινα ..... 91 n 96  
 δρακοντόζωνος ..... 91 n 96  
 δράκων ..... 291 n 126  
 δράμα ..... 210  
 δράν .....  
 187 n 39. 41; 240 n 49; 177 n 2  
 δραστήριος ..... 471 n 20  
 δραστικός ..... 462-463  
 \*δρέπειν .... 24 n 58; 99 n 138 (2);  
 100 n 141; 110 n 177 (14); 197 n 84 (3)  
 \*δρόμημα ..... 143 n 287  
 \*δρόμος .....  
 96 n 126; 97 n 131; 140 n 275 (1)-276;  
 141 n 280. 282; 143 n 287;  
 255 n 98-99 (3); 269 n 36  
 δουαδικός ..... 114 n 187  
 \*δουάς .... 114 n 187 (1); 395 n 308  
 \*δύναμις ..... 12 n 26. 28;  
 14 n 32; 17 n 42 (3. 10); 23 n 58;  
 25 n 61; 26 n 67 (4); 44 n 137;  
 57 n 182; 78-79; 84 n 65; 86 n 72-75;  
 87 n 78; 92 n 106; 109 n 175;  
 112 n 181; 113 n 184; 116 n 194;  
 119 n 203; 132 n 247c; 133 n 252. 254;  
 135 n 260; 138 n 271; 145 n 291;  
 155 n 333; 159 n 350; 166 n 373 (4);  
 172 n 400; 178 n 4; 200 n 98;  
 205 n 124; 220 n 173; 221 n 179;  
 228 n 1; 229 n 3; 231 n 9;  
 240 n 50; 247 n 69a; 255 n 98;  
 260 n 5; 263 n 11 (2); 274 n 62;  
 278 n 77; 286 n 106; 287 n 109;  
 317 n 16; 327 n 54; 333 n 76;  
 335 n 82; 341 n 108; 346 n 132;  
 347 n 133-135; 348 n 136-138;  
 350 n 143-144; 351 n 150;  
 352 n 151; 384 n 274; 439 n 137;  
 440; 441 n 141; 469 n 11; 470;  
 471 n 20; 483-485; 492; 495;  
 502 n 18; 505 n 32; 509 n 1 (9)  
 δυναμούν ..... 178 n 4; 439 n 137  
 δυνάμωσις ..... 204 n 114  
 \*δύνασθαι .....  
 ..... 83 n 62; 187 n 40; 197 n 85;  
 246 n 68; 441 n 141; 461; 466 n 34  
 δυνατός ..... 187 n 39; 436 n 125  
 \*δύο ..... 93 n 111; 99 n 137-138;  
 179 n 8 (1); 265 n 21; 287 n 109  
 δυσάλυκτος ..... 364 n 204  
 δυσεύρετος ..... 457 n 1  
 δύσις ..... 154 n 322  
 δύσκαμπος ... 278 n 77 = 60,15 Kr.\*  
 \*δύσμορος ..... 178 n 402 (2)  
 \*ἐάν ..... 97 n 130;  
 132 n 250 (2); 255 n 99 (5); 278 n 81  
 \*ἐάν (άν, ἦν) ..... 165 n 373 (2. 8);  
 170 n 394; 190 n 50 (2); 242 n 57 (1)  
 \*ἐαυτοῦ ..... 78 n 45; ἐαυτῷ  
 167 n 379; ἐαυτόν 78 n 45;  
 ἐαυτήν 87 n 77; αὐτήν 198 n 88 (1);  
 ἐαυτοῦς 264 n 17; 266 n 23  
 ἐβδομάς .....  
 139 n 274; 481 n 3; 484; 485 n 6  
 \*ἐβδομος ..... 102 n 150;  
 104 n 155; 124 n 221; 415 n 51  
 ἐγγός ..... 384 n 274  
 ἐγείρειν ..... 189 n 45  
 \*ἐγκάρδιος ..... 253 n 93  
 \*ἐγκαρπίζειν ..... 203 n 114 (2); 458  
 \*ἐγκατατιθέναι ..... 181 n 22 (2)  
 \*ἐγκεντρίζειν ..... 246 n 68  
 \*ἐγκεραννῶναι .....  
 128 n 234; 131 n 247; 352 n 151  
 ἐγκόσμιος .....  
 .... 23 n 58; 102 n 151; 104 n 159;  
 151 n 311; 199 n 97; 349 n 141  
 ἐγκύμων ..... 340 n 105  
 \*ἐγκύρειν ..... 172 n 402 (2)

\*ἐγώ ..... 85 n 70; 242 n 57 (1)  
 ἔδρα ..... 274 n 62  
 \*ἔθάς ..... 96 n 126; 97 n 131  
 ἔθειν ..... 70 n 12  
 \*ἔθέλειν (θέλειν) .....  
 ... 10 n 26 (19); 80 n 49 (2. 10);  
 106 n 165; 190 n 50 (1); 330 n 64  
 ἔθιζειν ..... 97 n 131; 188 n 42  
 \*ἔθνος ..... 240 n 50; 500 n 7  
 ἔθος ..... 97 n 131  
 \*εἰδέναι ... 159 n 351; 273 n 55;  
 319 n 25; 328 n 58; 509 n 1 (3)  
 εἶδος ..... 24 n 58-59 (1-2);  
 25 n 65; 82 n 60; 87 n 76;  
 100 n 138; 108 n 173; 113 n 183;  
 127 n 233; 256 n 194; 296 n 141-142;  
 298 n 148; 317 n 16-18; 345 n 130;  
 378 n 258; 384 n 274; 391 n 292  
 \*εἶδωλον ... 213-214; 219; 242 n 54  
 εἶδωλοποιός ..... 308 n 186  
 \*εἶδωλοχαρής . 295 n 137 (3); 297 n 146  
 \*εἰκαθεῖν ..... 131 n 246 (3)  
 εἰκῆ ..... 70 n 12  
 εἰκότως ..... 421 n 79  
 εἰκῶν .....  
 ... 248 n 73; 347 n 134; 328 n 270  
 εἰλίγηδον .....  
 18 n 46 (10); 102 n 151; 406 n 22; 459  
 εἰλικοειδής ..... 406 n 22  
 \*εἰλύειν . 91 n 97-98 = 273 n 34 Dodds  
 \*εἰμαρμένη ..... 53 n 165;  
 84 n 66; 98 n 136; 212 n 142-143;  
 265 n 21 = 49,17 Kr.; 266 n 22-23;  
 357 n 175; 358; 364 n 203  
 \*εἰμαρμένος ..... 98 n 134; 357 n 175  
 \*εἰμαρτός ..... 212 n 142-143  
 \*εἶναι . 14 n 31; 17 n 42; 23 n 58;  
 24 n 59; 25 n 61; 29 n 77 (1);  
 32 n 89 (5); 42 n 132; 80 n 52;  
 81 n 54-55; 82 n 58; 83 n 62;  
 84 n 65; 86 n 73. 75; 87 n 76;  
 88 n 83; 93 n 111; 97 n 130;  
 99 n 137-138; 101 n 149; 107 n 170;  
 108 n 173; 110 n 177 (3); 113 n 184;  
 120 n 205 (1). 206; 133 n 254-255;  
 140 n 275; 144 n 291; 146 n 293;  
 148 n 302; 149 n 304; 150 n 309;  
 152 n 316; 155 n 334; 160 n 353. 355;  
 165 n 373 (1. 3); 167 n 379; 169 n 385;  
 171 n 398; 172 n 402 (1); 178 n 4;

182 n 26; 187 n 41; 188 n 42-43;  
 194 n 67; 205 n 119. 124;  
 210 n 138. 140; 212 n 142; 220 n 173;  
 221 n 179; 222 n 190; 231 n 9;  
 236 n 37; 240 n 50; 253 n 93;  
 255 n 99 (2); 263 n 11.14; 264 n 16;  
 268 n 32; 278 n 77; 287 n 109;  
 289 n 112; 291 n 122; 292 n 129;  
 293 n 132; 294 n 133. 135;  
 296 n 138-139; 298 n 149;  
 317 n 13. 16; 318 n 22; 323 n 38;  
 327 n 54; 333 n 75; 334 n 79. 82;  
 341 n 109; 346 n 132; 347 n 135;  
 348 n 136-138; 349 n 141; 350 n 143;  
 351 n 150; 355 n 166; 356 n 170;  
 362 n 199; 372 n 230; 376 n 249;  
 378 n 256; 379 n 259; 384 n 273;  
 386 n 278; 391 n 291; 395 n 308;  
 402 n 3. 5. 7; 403 n 10;  
 431 n 110; 445f; 453; 469 n 12;  
 471 n 20; 475; 495; 499 n 3-4;  
 500 n 5. 7; 501 n 12; 502 n 18;  
 503 n 25; 509 n 1 (3. 4. 8); 67 S.\*\*  
 εἰνάλιος ..... 269 n 34  
 \*εἷς (ἕς) ..... 42 n 132; 106 n 165;  
 108 n 173; 113 n 184; 118 n 200 (4);  
 127 n 232 (3); 165 n 373 (10);  
 198 n 88 (1); 213 n 144 (2); 246 n 68;  
 278 n 81; 295 n 137 (1); 298 n 152  
 \*εἷς .....  
 .. 77 n 38; 80 n 52; 81 n 54-55;  
 83 n 61; 108 n 173; 110 n 177 (2. 8);  
 123 n 218; 129 n 240; 131 n 246;  
 150 n 309; 159 n 351; 317 n 16;  
 323 n 38; 326 n 51; 347 n 134;  
 348 n 136; 373 n 234; 391 n 291;  
 402 n 7; 483; 485 n 6; 488  
 εἰσάγειν ..... 304 n 175  
 \*εἰσδέχεσθαι ..... 190 n 50 (1)  
 εἰσέρχεσθαι ..... 44 n 137; 187 n 40  
 εἰσορᾶν ..... 18 n 46 (4)  
 εἰσφέρειν ..... 289 n 113  
 εἶσω ..... 249 n 79; 368 n 212  
 εἶτα ..... 32 n 89 (4)  
 εἶωθα .....  
 .. 249 n 78; 260 n 5; 271 n 41  
 \*ἐκ (ἐξ) .....  
 99 n 138 (1); 107 n 170; 110 n 177 (9);  
 119 n 202; 124 n 221b; 127 n 233;  
 172 n 403 (4); 179 n 8; 197 n 84 (2);  
 201 n 104; 259 n 3 (1); 290 n 127 Th.\*\*  
 ἕκαστος ..... 191 n 55; 268 n 32;  
 291 n 122; 364 n 203; 500 n 7

- \*Ἐκάτη . . . . . 48 n 152 (2); 53 n 165 ;  
56 n 176 ; 71 n 15 ; 83 n 62 ; 84 n 66 ;  
85 n 69 ; 86 n 72 ; 88 n 83b ; 89 n 88 ;  
90 n 91 ; 93 n 108 ; 94 n 114 ;  
95 n 119. 122 ; 96 n 126 ; 121 n 209 (3) ;  
136 n 266 ; 138 n 271 ; 142 n 283-286 ;  
241 n 53 ; 242 n 54 ; 272 n 46 ;  
292 n 129 ; 363 n 201 ; 455 ; 478 ; 484
- \*Ἐκατικός . . . . . 245 n 64 ; 249 n 78. 80
- Ἐκατόγχειρες . . . . . 482 ; 484
- ἐκβολή . . . . . 238 n 41
- \*ἐκγεγῶς . . . . . 81 n 54
- \*ἐκδηλος . . . . . 120 n 205 (3)
- ἐκδιδόναι . . . . .  
32 n 89 (5) ; 36 n 104 ; 59 n 186 ;  
187 n 40 ; 229 n 6 ; 253 n 94 ; 445m
- \*ἐκδότις . . . . . 83 n 62 ; 458
- ἐκεί . . . . . 114 n 187 ;  
151 n 311 ; 160 n 353 ; 501 n 12
- ἐκείθεν . . . . . 248 n 72
- \*ἐκεῖνος (κεῖνος) . . . . . 79 n 47 ;  
160 n 355 ; 165 n 373 (2. 3. 5. 7. 8) ;  
166 n 374 ; 167 n 376 ; 170 n 395 ;  
174 n 407 ; 180 n 17 ; 190 n 50 (1) ;  
202 n 106 ; 210 n 140 ; 228 n 1a ;  
291 n 126 ; 294 n 133 ; 318 n 22
- ἐκεῖσε . . . . . 173 n 403 ; 217 n 162
- ἐκθεσις . . . . . 476
- \*ἐκθρόψκειν . . . . . 83 n 61 ; 110 n 177 (3) ;  
121 n 209 (1) ; 127 n 233 ; 128 n 234
- ἐκκλυστικός . . . . . 95 n 122
- \*ἐκκόπτειν . . . . . 278 n 81
- ἐκλάμπειν . . . . . 327 n 55
- ἐκλαμψις . . . . . 223 n 192
- ἐκλέγειν . . . . . 21 n 52 ; 291 n 126
- \*ἐκλυσίς . . . . . 42 n 132
- ἐκλύειν . . . . . 41 n 128
- ἐκούσιος . . . . . 217 n 163
- ἐκπέμπειν . . . . . 242 n 72
- \*ἐκπετανόνναι . . . . . 169 n 388 ;  
171 n 399 ; 373 n 235 ; 374 n 239
- ἐκπλήσσειν . . . . . 232 n 15
- ἐκπροΐζησις . . . . . 85 n 69
- ἐκταράττειν . . . . . 238 n 41 ; 378 n 258
- \*ἐκτείνειν . . . . . 169 n 387
- \*ἐκτελεῖν . . . . .  
80 n 51 ; 112 n 181 ; 320 n 26 (1)
- ἐκτιθέναι . . . . . 5 n 8
- \*ἐκτολυπεύειν . . . . . 120 n 205 (2)
- ἔκτος . . . . . 217 n 163
- ἐκφαίνειν . . . . .  
56 n 177 ; 86 n 72 ; 87 n 77 ; 102 n 142 ;  
119 n 202 ; 147 n 296 ; 152 n 314 ; 445m
- ἐκφανσις . . . . . 145 n 291g
- ἐκφάντων . . . . . 220 n 173
- ἐκφύγειν . . . . . 491 (8)
- ἐκφωνεῖν . . . . . 249 n 78
- ἐκφώνησις . . . . . 239 n 46
- ἐκχρᾶν . . . . . 228 n 2
- \*ἐλάττειρα . . . . . 271 n 41 ; 458 n 3
- ἐλαύνειν . . . . . 248 n 72 ; 277 n 76
- ἐλευθεροῦν . . . . . 251 n 84
- Ἐλευσίνα . . . . . 237 n 39
- \*ἐλικοσιδής . . . . . 102 n 151 ; 406 n 22
- \*ἐλίττειν . . . . . 240 n 52 (4) ;  
295 n 137 (4) ; 296 n 143 ; 297 n 147
- \*ἐλκύειν (ἐλκειν) . . . . . 180 n 17 ; 186 n 37 ;  
197 n 84-85 ; 210 n 138 ; 261 n 7 ;  
265 n 21 ; 295 n 136 ; 469 n 11 ; 488
- ἐλλαμψις . . . . . 22 n 54 ; 199 n 94
- Ἐλλην . . . . . 444c ; 465 n 23 ; 477
- Ἐλληνικός . . . . . 509 n 1 (1)
- \*ἔλις . . . . . 145 n 291 ; 147 n 296-298
- ἔλυτρον . . . . . 277 n 72
- \*ἐμβλέπειν . . . . . 98 n 134
- ἐμβριθής . . . . . 278 n 77
- \*ἐμός . . . . . 91 n 97
- ἐμπαθής . . . . .  
265 n 19 ; 274 n 62 ; 294 n 133
- ἐμπεδος . . . . . 48 n 152 (5)
- \*ἐμπελάζειν . . . . . 173 n 406 ; 373 n 240-241
- ἐμπέλασις . . . . . 173 n 406 ; 374 n 241
- ἐμπλήρημι . . . . . 43 n 136 (5) ; 83 n 62
- ἐμπνέειν . . . . . 47 n 148
- ἐμπνοος . . . . . 187 n 40
- ἐμποδίζειν . . . . . 167 n 376
- \*ἐμπορικός . . . . . 34 n 95 ; 255 n 99 (9)
- \*ἐμπόριος . . . . .  
77 n 40 ; 89 n 84 ; 103 n 152e ;  
123 n 218 ; 131 n 246 ; 133 n 255 ;  
136 n 266 ; 138 n 270 ; 148 n 302 ;  
153 n 317 ; 173 n 405 ; 183 n 26 ;  
192 n 59 (3) ; 196 n 81 ; 197 n 84 (3) ;  
200 n 98 ; 221 n 179 ; 222 n 188 ;  
244 n 63 ; 265 n 21 ; 458 ; 483

- \*ἐμπυρος ..... 241 n 52-53 ; 246 n 67  
 ἐμφαίνειν ..... 403 n 10  
 ἐμφανής ..... 57 n 182 ; 133 n 254 ;  
 137 n 267 ; 138 n 270 ; 224 n 196  
 ἐμψυτεύειν ..... 246 n 68  
 ἐμψυχος ..... 44 n 137 ; 356 n 170  
 \*ἐμψυχῶν ..... 88 n 83a  
 \*ἐν (ἐνί) .....  
 .. 45 n 139 ; 78 n 45 ; 88 n 83b ;  
 106 n 164 ; 117 n 195 ; 131 n 247 ;  
 132 n 250 (2) ; 140 n 275 (1. 2) ;  
 144 n 291a ; 146 n 292-293 ; 167 n 379 ;  
 181 n 22 ; 189 n 45 (1) ; 197 n 84 (1) ;  
 220 n 173. 175 ; 255 n 99 (2) ; 257 W.\*\*  
 ἐναντιος ..... 260 n 5 ; 509 n 1 (9)  
 ἐναντιῶν . 499 n 3 ; 502 n 21 ; 504 n 32  
 ἐναργής ..... 115 n 190 ; 187 n 40  
 ἐνάς ..... 483  
 ἐνδεικνύειν ..... 24 n 59  
 \*ἐνδεῖν .....  
 .. 137 n 267 ; 246 n 68 ; 334 n 79  
 ἐνδιαίτημα ..... 265 n 19  
 \*ἐνδιδόναι ..... 99 n 138 (3) ;  
 200 n 98 ; 223 n 192 ; 348 n 137  
 \*ἐνδοθεν ..... 203 n 114 ; 266 n 23  
 \*ἐνδον ..... 88 n 83b  
 \*ἐνεκα (ἐνεκεν, εἵνεκεν, εἵνεκα) .....  
 ..... 21 n 52 (7) ;  
 246 n 68 (2) ; 255 n 99 (4) ; 263 n 11 (1)  
 ἐνέργεια ..... 111 n 177 ;  
 171 n 398 ; 187 n 39 ; 191 n 55  
 \*ἐνεργεῖν ..... 99 n 138 ; 249 n 80 ;  
 266 n 21 ; 304 n 175 ; 466 n 32  
 ἐνέρτατος ..... 378 n 256  
 \*ἐνθα ..... 18 n 46 (5) ;  
 50 n 160-161 ; 111 n 177 ; 153 n 320 ;  
 154 n 326 ; 219 n 169 ; 220 n 177 (2) ;  
 255 n 99 (11) ; 354 n 159 ; 64 (2) S.\*\*  
 ἐνθάδε ..... 299 n 154  
 ἐνθεαστικός ..... 187 n 38  
 \*ἐνθεν ..... 10 n 26 (12) ;  
 21 n 52 (3) ; 118 n 200 (1. 2. 3. ) ;  
 159 n 348 ; 171 n 396 (2)  
 ἐνθένδε ..... 173 n 403 ; 217 n 162  
 ἐνθεος ..... 469 n 12  
 ἐνθουσιᾶν ..... 469 n 12  
 \*ἐνθρῶσκειν .....  
 118 n 200 (3) ; 132 n 250 (2) ;  
 134 n 256 (2) ; 147 n 295 ; 78 n 43  
 ἐνιαῖος ..... 78 n 43  
 ἐνιαυτοκράτωρ ..... 234 n 28  
 ἐνιαυτός ..... 229 n 6  
 ἐνιδρῶσθαι ..... 197 n 86  
 ἐνίστε ..... 243 n 57  
 \*ἐνιπή ..... 134 n 256 (2)  
 ἐννεάς ..... 105 n 163  
 ἐννοεῖν ..... 56 n 177  
 \*ἐννοια ..... 85 n 70 ;  
 87 n 77 ; 91 n 97 ; 110 n 177 (13) ;  
 280 n 84 ; 317 n 13 ; 488  
 \*ἐννόησις ... 127 n 233 ; 171 n 396 (2) ;  
 180 n 14 ; 191 n 55 ; 192 n 59 (1)  
 ἐνοσιδής ..... 81 n 56  
 ἐνοσιδῶς ..... 466 n 32  
 ἐνοικεῖν ..... 308 n 186  
 \*ἐνόπλιος ..... 95 n 118  
 ἐνοποιός ..... 347 n 134  
 \*ἐνοῦν .. 78 n 45 ; 352 n 151 ; 374 n 241  
 ἐνοχλεῖν ..... 291 n 125  
 \*ἐνοσπείρειν ..... 191 n 55  
 ἐνταῦθα ... 147 n 296 ; 178 n 4 ; 495  
 ἐνταφιασμός ..... 208 n 132  
 ἐντεθῶν .....  
 194 n 66 ; 213 n 144 ; 291 n 126  
 \*ἐντιθέσθαι ..... 181 n 22 ;  
 182 n 25 ; 190 n 50 (3) ; 253 n 93  
 ἐντίκτειν ..... 341 n 108  
 ἐντός ..... 378 n 256  
 ἐντρέφειν ..... 71 n 14  
 ἐνωγγάνειν ... 70 n 12. 14 ; 239 n 43  
 ἐνωχία ..... 228 n 2 ; 239  
 ἐνοποιός ..... 99 n 138  
 ἐνοσπείρειν ..... 127 n 232 (2)  
 \*ἐνύδριος .....  
 .. 267 n 25 (1) ; *contra* : 10, 3 Kr.  
 ἐνυδρος ..... 267 n 26 ; 269 n 34  
 \*ἐνυλος .....  
 125 n 225 ; 259 n 3 ; 378 n 259  
 ἐνωσις .... 145 n 291 ; 150 n 309 ;  
 160 n 353 ; 166 n 374 ; 188 n 42 ;  
 197 n 86 ; 347 n 134 ; 462-463 ; 483  
 ἐνωπικός ..... 470 n 13  
 \*ἐξ ..... 124 n 221b  
 ἐξαγγελτικόν ..... 56 n 177  
 ἐξάγειν ..... 461 ; 474 ; 203 J.\*



- ἐξαιρῖν . 78 n 45 ; 106 n 164 ; 280 n 84  
 ἐξαισίος . . . . . 251 n 84  
 ἐξαιφνης . . . . . 4 n 2  
 ἐξακούειν . . . . . 256 n 102  
 ἐξακριβοῦν . . . . . 509 n 1 (1-2)  
 ἐξανύειν . . . . . 97 n 131  
 ἐξαπινάιος . . . . . 231 n 9  
 ἐξαποστέλλειν . . . . . 470 n 13  
 ἐξάπτειν . . . . . 245 n 65  
 ἐξαρτάν . . . . . 26 n 67-68 ; 265 n 21  
 ἐξασκεῖν . . . . . 287 n 109  
 ἐξεῖναι . . . . . 203 n 114  
 ἐξερεσίνειν . . . . . 21 n 52 (6) ; 55 n 174  
 \*ἐξέρχασθαι . . . . . 187 n 40 ;  
 190 n 50 (2) ; 474 ; 203 J. s.σ. ἔξεμι  
 ἐξήγησις . . . . . 473-475 ; 477 ; 503 n 25  
 ἐξῆς . . . . . 143 n 287c  
 ἐξιστάναι . . . . . 199 n 94 ; 274 n 57  
 \*ἐξογκοῦν . . . . . 123 n 218  
 ἐξομοίωσις . . . . . 491 (3) ; 492  
 ἐξουσία . . . . . 364 n 203  
 ἐξουσιάζειν . . . . . 137 n 267  
 ἐξορκίζειν . . . . . 232 n 14  
 ἐξοχετεύειν . . . . .  
 154 n 325 ; 155 n 329 ; 200 n 100  
 \*ἐξοχέτευμα . . . . . 155 n 329  
 \*ἐξω . . . . . 26 n 67 ;  
 78 n 45 ; 129 n 240 ; 166 n 373 (11) ;  
 169 n 385 ; 173 n 403 ; 368 n 212  
 ἐξωθεῖν . . . . . 205 n 124  
 ἐξωθεν . . . . . 91 n 99 ; 354 n 159  
 \*ἐξωστήρ . . . . . 205 n 124 ; 458  
 ἐξωτάτω . . . . . 255 n 98 ; 397 n 318  
 \*ἐουκέναι . . . . . 110 n 177 (11) ; 197 n 83  
 \*ἔός . . . . . 78 n 45 ; 113 n 184 ;  
 127 n 233 ; 131 n 247 ; 194 n 67 ;  
 203 n 114 ; 204 n 116 ; 203 J.  
 \*ἐπάγειν . . . . . 24 n 59 ;  
 32 n 89 (7) ; 53 n 165-166 ; 114 n 187 (3)  
 ἐπαγωγή . . . . . 58 n 184  
 ἐπάδειν . . . . . 286 n 106 ; 289 n 116  
 ἐπάλληλος . . . . . 4 n 2  
 ἐπαναβαίνειν . . . . . 152 n 314  
 ἐπανάγειν . . . . . 189 n 45  
 ἐπάναγκος . . . . . 59 n 186  
 ἐπαναγωγή . . . . . 469 n 11  
 ἐπάνοδος . . . . . 449 n 3 ; 450 ; 452 ; 488  
 ἐπαουδιή . . . . . cf. ἐπφδιή  
 \*ἐπαυδάιν . . . . . 289 n 116 (2)  
 ἐπαφή . . . . . 115 n 190 ; 374 n 241  
 \*ἐπαφητός . . . . . 115 n 190  
 ἐπεγείρειν . . . . . 194 n 66  
 \*ἐπεγκλίνειν . . . . . 165 n 373 (2) ; 373 n 233  
 \*ἐπεῖ . . . . . 165 n 373 (11)  
 \*ἐπειγεσθαι . . . . . 110 n 177 (7) ; 317 n 18  
 ἐπεισεῖν . . . . . 10 n 26 (12) ; 159 n 348  
 \*ἐπέκεινα . . . . .  
 77 n 41 ; 113 n 184 ; 121 n 209 (4) ;  
 327 n 54 ; 328 n 57 ; 488  
 \*〈ἀπαξ ἐπέκεινα . . . . .  
 . . . . . 9 n 23 ; 77 n 43 ; 81 n 56 ;  
 82 n 58 ; 106 n 164 ; 136 n 266 ;  
 138 n 271 ; 142 n 283. 286 ;  
 160 n 353 ; 319 ; 455 ; 484 ; 485 n 6  
 \*〈δις ἐκεῖ . . . . . 114 n 187  
 \*〈δις ἐπέκεινα . . . . . 9 n 23 ;  
 77 n 43 ; 114 n 187 ; 136 n 266 ;  
 138 n 271 ; 142 n 283. 286 ;  
 181 n 22 ; 319 ; 455 ; 484 ; 485 n 6  
 \*ἐπεμβαίνειν . . . . . 132 n 250 (1)  
 ἐπεσθαι . . . . .  
 182 n 26 ; 330 n 64 ; 509 n 1 (5)  
 ἐπέχειν . . . . . 318 n 21  
 ἐπη . . . . . 37 n 109 ; 62 n 200  
 ἐπηχεῖν . . . . . 298 n 153  
 \*ἐπί . . . . . 84 n 65 ; 139 n 274 ;  
 169 n 387 ; 179 n 8 (2) ; 189 n 45 (2) ;  
 222 n 190 ; 240 n 52 (2. 8) ;  
 263 n 11 (2) ; 64 (1) S.\*\*  
 ἐπιβαίνειν . . . . . 32 n 89 (3) ; 138 n 271  
 ἐπιβατεύειν . . . . . 252 n 92  
 ἐπιβεβηκώς . . . . . 149 n 304  
 \*ἐπιβήτης . . . . .  
 . . . . . 267 n 25 (3) ; *contra* : 10, 5 Κρ.  
 \*ἐπιβήτωρ . . . . . 128 n 239 ; 133 n 250 ;  
 179 n 8 (3) ; 267 n 25 (3) ; 458 n 3  
 ἐπιβριθός . . . . . 59 n 186 (1) ; 459  
 ἐπιγίειος . . . . . 281 n 89 ; 283 n 94  
 ἐπιγράφειν . . . . . 450 n 6-7  
 ἐπιδεικνόναι . . . . . 243 n 57 ; 246 n 68  
 ἐπιδέρκεσθαι . . . . . 10 n 26 (4) ; 164 n 370

- επιθυμητικός .....  
 .. 183 n 26 ; 278 n 77 ; 307 n 182  
 επικαλείν .. 207 n 127 ; 250 n 83  
 επικίδνημι ..... 18 n 46 (8)  
 επίκλησις . 41 ; 47 ; 231 n 10 ; 249 n 78  
 επικλίνειν .... 165 n 373 ; 170 n 394  
 επιλάμπειν ... 99 n 138 ; 188 n 42 ;  
 216 n 161 ; 274 n 57 ; 412 n 40  
 επιμελᾶς ..... 70 n 14  
 επιμιγνύναι .....  
 17 n 42 (9) ; 18 n 46 (13) ; 152 n 315  
 επιμύειν ..... 298 n 153  
 ἐπίνοια ..... 367 n 210  
 \*ἐπίπεδον ... 184 n 29 ; 396 n 311-313  
 \*ἐπίπικονος ..... 124 n 221  
 \*ἐπιρρεῖν ..... 83 n 62 ; 384 n 273  
 ἐπισκοπεῖν .... 9, 27 Kr.\* ; 204 J.\*  
 ἐπισκοπός .... 379 n 259 ; 500 n 7  
 \*ἐπισπένδειν ..... 207 n 127  
 \*ἐπισπέρχειν ..... 195 n 75  
 ἐπιστατεῖν ..... 348 n 136  
 ἐπιστάτης ..... 163 n 365  
 ἐπιστήμη ..... 3 n 1 ;  
 178 n 4 ; 220 n 73 ; 340 ; 495-496  
 ἐπιστρεπτικός ... 469 n 12-13 ; 470  
 ἐπιστρέφειν ..... 150 n 309 ; 189 n 45 ;  
 263 n 13 ; 469 n 12 ; 470 ; 471 n 20  
 ἐπιστροφή .....  
 206 n 125 ; 295 n 136 ; 469 ; 483  
 \*ἐπίσχειν ... 127 n 233 ; 128 n 235  
 ἐπιτέμνειν ..... 231 n 9  
 ἐπιτήδειος ..... 194 n 67  
 ἐπιτηδεϊότης .. 145 n 291k ; 384 n 274  
 ἐπιτρέχειν ..... 53 n 166 (1)  
 ἐπιφάνεια ..... 243 n 57  
 ἐπιφέρειν ..... 264 n 17 ; 293 n 132  
 ἐπιφημίζειν ..... 191 n 55  
 \*ἐπιφοιτᾶν ... 192 n 59 ; 195 n 74  
 ἐπίφωνον ..... 32 n 89 (8)  
 \*ἐπιφωνεῖν .... 240 n 52 ; 243 n 59  
 ἐπιχειρεῖν ..... 372 n 231  
 \*ἐπιχεύειν ..... 147 n 295  
 ἐποποιεῖν ..... 37 n 109  
 ἐπόπτεια ..... 203 ; 237 n 39-40 ; 436  
 ἐποπτεύειν ..... 253 n 96  
 ἔπος ..... 3 n 1 ; 5 ; 37 n 109 ;  
 43 n 136 (3) ; 57 n 183 ; 58 n 184 ;  
 62 n 200 ; 106 n 165 ; 165 n 373 ;  
 243 n 58 ; 384 n 273 ; 457 n 1  
 ἑπουράνιος ..... 44 n 137 ; 322 n 34  
 \*ἐποχεῖσθαι .....  
 10 n 26 (2) ; 15 n 36 ; 77 n 39 ;  
 135 n 260 (1) ; 241 n 52 ; 328 n 58  
 \*ἐπτά ..... 123 n 218 ;  
 124 n 221d-f ; 136 n 266 ; 138 n 270 ;  
 150 n 309 ; 154 n 321 ; 294 n 135 ; 484  
 \*ἐπτάκτις .....  
 150 n 310 ; 186 n 38 ; 199 n 97 ;  
 287 n 109 ; 422 n 82 ; 459 ; 295 Th.  
 \*ἐπτάπορος .....  
 294 n 133 (2). 135 ; 414 n 50 ; 475  
 ἐπτάπυλος ..... 414 n 50  
 \*ἐπτάς ..... 124 n 221c  
 ἐπταχῆ ..... 136 n 266  
 ἐπφδῆ . 178 n 4 ; 287 n 109 ; 364 n 206  
 ἐπωνυμία ..... 245 n 65  
 \*ἐρᾶν ..... 127 n 232 (3) ;  
 352 ; 469 n 12-13 ; 64 (4) S.\*\*  
 ἐραστής ..... 304 n 173 ; 469 n 12  
 ἐραστός ..... 470 n 13  
 ἐργάζεσθαι .....  
 4 n 2 ; 196 n 80 ; 291 n 125 ; 461 ;  
 465 n 25 ; 466 n 34 ; 468 n 8  
 \*ἐργάτις . 83 n 62 ; 304 n 175 ; 458 n 3  
 \*ἔργον ..... 45 n 139 ; 96 n 126 ;  
 106 n 165 ; 113 n 184-185 ; 115 n 190 ;  
 127 n 232 (1) ; 132 n 247c ; 169 n 387 ;  
 190 n 49 ; 196 n 79-80 ; 204 n 118 ;  
 212 n 142 ; 240 n 49 ; 255 n 99 (5) ;  
 263 n 11 ; 319 n 25 ; 327 n 52 ;  
 461 n 4 ; 462 ; 464 n 22 ; 466 n 32 ;  
 468 n 8 ; 502 n 18 ; 64 (3) S.\*\*  
 \*ἐργοτεχνίτης ... 113 n 184 ; 114 n 185  
 ἐρεσίνειν ..... 53 n 165 (6)  
 ἔρεσθαι ..... 32 n 89 (5)  
 ἐρεύγεσθαι ..... 152 n 315  
 ἐρῆμος ..... 263 n 11  
 Ἐρινύς ..... 299 n 156  
 Ἐρμῆς .... 52 n 163 ; 224 n 195  
 ἔρπειν .....  
 ... 18 n 46 (10) ; 102 n 151 ; 406 n 22  
 ἐρρωμένος ..... 194 n 67  
 ἐρυθρός ..... 292 n 129

- \*ἐρχεσθαι . . . . 21 n 52 (2); 55 n 171 ;  
95 n 118; 96 n 126; 97 n 131 ;  
289 n 116; 335 n 82; 373 n 231 ;  
421 n 79; 488; 491 (3); 492
- ἔρωξ . . . . . 126-128; 144 n 291 ;  
146 n 294; 179 n 8 (2); 180 n 14 ;  
264 n 17; 265 n 18; 469 n 12
- ἐρωτᾶν . . . . . 21 n 52
- ἐρωτικός . . . . . 469 n 12
- ἐρωτικῶς . . . . . 99 n 138
- \*ἐσθλός . . . . . 263 n 14 (2)
- ἐσκαμμένα . . . . . cf. σκάπτειν
- ἐσσυμένως . . . . . 59 n 186 (2)
- ἐσχατιά . . . . . 379 n 259
- ἐσχατος . . . . . 138 n 270 ;  
213 n 144; 278 n 77; 296 n 138-139 ;  
304 n 173; 384 n 274; 502 n 20
- ἔσω . . . . . 378 n 256
- ἐσῶδε . . . . . 10 n 26 (19); 14 n 31
- \*ἔτερος . . . . . 120 n 205 (1); 133 n 255 ;  
319 n 25; 341 n 109; 429 n 104 ;  
430 n 109; 461; 466 n 34; 80 B.\*\*
- ἐτερότης . . . . . 484
- ἐτοιμῶς . . . . . 152 n 317
- ἔτος . . . . . 71 n 14; 507 n 41
- ἐθηκοῖα . . . . . 56 n 177
- εὐηχος . . . . . 291 n 124
- εὐθός . . . . .  
.. 17 n 42 (7); 97 n 130; 369 n 216
- εὐθυτενῶς . . . . . 374 n 239
- \*εὐτερος . . . . . 140 n 277; 244 n 63
- εὐκρασία . . . . . 507 n 41
- εὐλαβεῖσθαι . . . . . 212 n 142
- \*εὐλυτος . . . . . 119 n 201; 136 n 266 ;  
171 n 398; 205 n 124; 491 (11); 492
- εὐλύτως . . . . . 137 n 267
- εὐμένης . . . . . 24 n 58; 188 n 42
- εὐμοιρος . . . . . 229 n 3
- \*εὐνομία . . . . . 50 n 161; 255 n 99 (11)
- εὐρετικός . . . . . 194 n 67
- εὐρίσκειν . . . . . 319 n 25
- \*εὐσεβεία (εὐσεβίη) . . . . . 34 n 95; 70 n 13 ;  
169 n 387; 220 n 177; 255 n 99 (10)
- εὐσεβεῖν . . . . . 29 n 76
- εὐσεβής . . . . . 29 n 77 (1); 214 n 148
- \*εὐτακτος . . . . . 124 n 221
- εὐτονος . . . . . 183 n 27
- εὐτροχος . . . . . 178 n 4
- εὐτυχής . . . . . 186 n 37; 206 n 125
- εὐφημεῖν . . . . . 114 n 187
- εὐχεσθαι . . . . .  
26 n 67 (5); 161; 364 n 203; 436 n 125
- \*εὐχή . . . . . 28 n 72 ;  
145 n 291d; 286 n 106; 471 n 20
- εὐχος . . . . . 26 n 67 (2)
- ἐφάπτειν . . . . . 115 n 190; 374 n 241
- ἐφέλκειν . . . . . 264 n 17; 274 n 62
- ἐφεξής . . . . . 241 n 52
- \*ἐφικτός . . . . . 170 n 395; 210 n 138
- ἐφίπτασθαι . . . . . 46 n 147
- ἐφιστάναι . . . . . 103 n 152d; 405 n 21
- ἐφορος . . . . .  
.. 144 n 288; 260 n 5; 503 n 25
- ἐφουμνεῖν . . . . . 5 n 8
- \*ἔχειν . . . . .  
18 n 46 (12); 32 n 89 (1. 2); 42 n 132 ;  
85 n 69; 86 n 72. 74; 87 n 77 ;  
93 n 109. 111; 97 n 132 ;  
102 n 151; 109 n 174; 124 n 221a-b ;  
125 n 225; 133 n 254; 135 n 259-260 ;  
139 n 274; 152 n 317; 154 n 325 ;  
161 n 359; 167 n 379; 172 n 403 (2) ;  
173 n 406; 174 n 407; 193 n 65 ;  
194 n 67; 195 n 73; 198 n 88 (2) ;  
224 n 196; 260 n 7; 274 n 62 ;  
291 n 126; 296 n 139; 297 n 144 ;  
317 n 16; 347 n 134; 355 n 166 ;  
364 n 203; 384 n 273; 397 n 318 ;  
430 n 109; 439 n 138; 465 n 25 ;  
469 n 11; 474; 491 (11); 501 n 12
- \*ζείδωρος . . . . . 83 n 62
- \*Ζεὺς . . . . . 33 n 92; 52 n 163 ;  
106 n 165; 140 n 275; 484; 489
- \*ζῆν . . . . . 84 n 65; 87 n 78; 97 n 131 ;  
220 n 173; 263 n 11 (2); 264 n 16
- ζητεῖν . . . . . 189 n 45; 205 J.\*
- ζήτημα . . . . . 451
- ζόφος . . . . . 282 n 92
- ζοφώδης . . . . . 4 n 2
- ζωαρκέος . . . . . 154 n 325
- \*ζωή . . . . . 25 n 61; 26 n 67 ;  
28 n 71; 39 n 115; 83 n 63 ;  
84 n 66; 86 n 75 (2); 87 n 77 ;

- 93 n 111; 99 n 137; 103 n 152e; 154 n 325; 171 n 398; 184 n 32; 188 n 44; 199 n 94; 254 n 97; 264 n 16; 265 n 19. 21; 277 n 76; 294 n 133; 326 n 51; 341 n 109; 256 n 168; 402 n 3; 455; 483; 487
- \*ζωηφόριος ..... 153 n 320 (2)
- \*ζωηφορός ..... 83 n 62
- ζωνατος ..... 102 n 152a; 104 n 159
- ζώνη ..... 93 n 109; 102 n 150; 103 n 152; 104 n 155; 123 n 218. 220; 124 n 221; 137 n 267; 481 n 3; 484; 485 n 6; 30 n 1,5 Kr.\*
- \*ζωογονία ..... 153 n 320
- \*ζωογόνοος ... 83 n 62. 64; 84 n 65-66; 85 n 69; 86 n 72; 90 n 91; 142 n 283; 265 n 21; 484; 485 n 6
- ζωοθυσία ..... 289 n 113
- ζφον ..... 402 n 3. 5; 500 n 7
- ζωστήρ . 90 n 91; 93 n 108; 362 n 198
- \*η ... 240 n 52 (1. 3. 4. 7. 8); 257 W.\*\*
- ήγεισθαι .....  
.. 188 n 44; 237 n 39; 509 n 1 (8)
- ήγεμονείν ..... 95 n 121
- ήγεμών ..... 121 n 209; 225 n 197; 245 n 65; 285 n 102
- Ήγίας ..... 71 n 14; 443
- ήγουν ..... 132 n 271
- \*ήδέ .. 112 n 181 cj L.; 121 n 209 (4); 143 n 287d; 182 n 26; 267 n 25 (3)
- \*ήδη ..... 32 n 89 (9); 106 n 165
- ήερόεις ..... 282 n 92
- \*ήέριος ..... cf. άέριος
- ήεροφοίτις ..... 143 n 288
- ήερόφοιτος ..... 269 n 34
- ήήρ ..... cf. άήρ
- ήθοποιός ..... 502 n 18
- \*ήκα ..... 95 n 118
- ήκειν ..... 32 n 89 (10)
- \*ήλιακός .....  
124 n 221d; 140 n 278; 143 n 287c;  
150 n 309; 151 n 313; 185 n 34
- \*ήλιος (ήέλιος) ..... 17 n 42 (5); 21 n 52 (4); 44 n 136; 49 n 156; 96 n 126; 97 n 131; 124 n 221d; 140 n 278; 142 n 287; 150 n 309;
- 151 n 311-313; 152 n 314; 154 n 324-325; 155 n 329; 182 n 26; 185 n 35; 186 n 37; 199 n 97; 200 n 98. 100; 216 n 161; 224 n 196; 243 n 57; 255 n 99 (3); 268 n 29; 411 n 39; 412 n 40; 422 n 82; 459 n 8; 493
- ήμαρ ..... 10 n 26 (17); 14 n 31
- \*ήμείς ..... 181 n 22; 277 n 72
- ήμέρα .....  
15 n 35; 96 n 126; 229 n 6; 231 n 9
- ήμίκυκλος ..... 253 n 93
- \*ήνικά .....  
88 n 83a; 244 n 63 (1); 289 n 116 (1)
- \*ήνιον ..... 171 n 397-398
- ήνιοχείν ..... 149 n 305
- ήνιοχος ..... 351 n 150
- Ήρακλής ..... 253 n 94
- ήρεμείν ..... 378 n 257
- ήρι ..... 362 n 198
- Ήρικεπατος ..... 483
- ήρωϊκός ..... 224 n 194
- ήρωος .....  
33 n 92; 162 n 365; 241; 242 n 54;  
261 n 8; 509 n 1 (5. 15); 511 n 9
- ήσυχία ..... 378 n 258
- ήτορ .....  
18 n 46 (11); 174 n 407; 202 n 106
- ήττον ..... 376 n 249
- ήχείν ..... 291 n 124
- ήχος ..... 17 n 42 (7); 249 n 78; 250 n 83; 397 n 318
- ήχώ ..... 291 n 124
- θαλασσα ..... 364 n 203
- \*θάλλειν ..... 140 n 275 (2). 278
- θάνατος ..... 206 n 125; 212 n 142; 217 n 163; 222 n 187
- θάπτειν ..... 205 n 119
- θαδμα ..... 145 n 291
- θαυμάσιος ..... 4 n 2
- θαυμαστός ..... 205 n 119; 502 n 18
- \*θεά .....  
48 n 152 (6); 53 n 165 (3); 84 n 66;  
90 n 91; 95 n 118; 242 n 55;  
265 n 21; 364 n 203; 484; 485 n 6

- θέα .... 188 n 42 ; 372 n 231 ; 488  
 θεαγωγία ..... 48 n 152  
 θέαμα ..... 188 n 44 ; 246 n 68  
 θεᾶσθαι . 191 n 55 ; 194 n 67 ; 231 n 9  
 θεϊκώτερα ..... 44 n 137  
 \*θεῖν (θέειν) .....  
 96 n 126 ; 127 n 232 (5) ; 133 n 253 ;  
 220 n 173 ; 223 n 194 ; 350 n 143  
 \*θεῖος .....  
 12 n 28 ; 22 n 54 ; 39 n 115 ;  
 57 n 182 ; 71 n 14 ; 80 n 49 (9) ;  
 87 n 76 ; 95 n 118 ; 97 n 131 ;  
 105 n 163 ; 117 n 195 ; 138 n 270 ;  
 145 n 291d ; 147 n 296 ; 170 n 395 ;  
 171 n 398 ; 179 n 8 ; 183 n 27 ;  
 187 n 41 ; 192 n 56 ; 195 n 74 ;  
 197 n 85 ; 198 n 90 ; 217 n 163 ;  
 221 n 179 ; 228 n 2 ; 229 n 6 ;  
 236 n 34 ; 241 n 53 ; 248 n 68 ;  
 260 n 7 ; 261 n 8 ; 263 n 11 ;  
 268 n 32 ; 278 n 80 ; 291 n 125 ;  
 304 n 173 ; 319 n 25 ; 340 n 105 ;  
 347 n 134 ; 348 n 137 ; 354 n 159 ;  
 362 n 196 ; 374 n 241 ; 384 n 274 ;  
 431 n 110 ; 443a ; 445n ; 461-466 ;  
 468 n 8 ; 469 n 11 ; 499 n 4  
 \*θέλγειν ..... 43 n 136 (3) ;  
 57 n 183 ; 58 n 184 ; 264 n 15  
 \*θέλειν ..... cf. ἐθέλειν  
 θέλημα ..... 329 n 62 ; 348 n 137  
 θέλησις ..... 329 n 62  
 θελκτήριος ..... 42 n 131 ; 58 n 184  
 θέλις ..... 58 n 184  
 θέμις ..... 21 n 52 (6) ;  
 32 n 89 (3) ; 35 n 102 ; 53 n 165 (6) ;  
 55 n 174 ; 125 n 221 ; 446o  
 \*θεόθεν . 119 n 202 ; 173 n 406 ; 198 n 88  
 \*θεοθρέμμων ..... 160 n 353 ; 459  
 θεολογεῖν ..... 9 n 23  
 θεολογία .....  
 5 n 3 ; 37 n 110 ; 70 n 14 ;  
 105 n 163 ; 119 n 202 ; 138 n 270 ;  
 444 ; 451 n 9 ; 509 n 1 (1)  
 θεόλογος ..... 79 n 48 ; 93 n 111 ;  
 123 n 218 ; 133 n 254 ; 152 n 314 ;  
 155 n 329 ; 200 n 97 ; 210 n 140 ;  
 276 n 25 ; 444-445 ; 461 ; 474  
 θεόμαντις ..... 461  
 θεοπαράδοτος .....  
 71 n 14 ; 77 n 43 ; 240 n 50. 52 ;  
 265 n 21 ; 444e ; 464 n 22  
 θεοπάτωρ ..... 465-466  
 θεοποιεῖν ..... 461  
 \*θεός (ἡ) .....  
 84 n 66 ; 87 n 77 ; 93 n 111 ; 95 n 121  
 \*θεός (ὁ) ... 6 n 10 ; 10 n 26 ; 12 n 28 ;  
 14 n 31 ; 15 n 36 ; 17 n 42 (4. 10) ;  
 18 n 46 (7. 9. 13. 16) ; 20 ;  
 21 n 52 ; 22 ; 24 n 59 ; 25 n 61 ;  
 26 n 67-68 ; 29 n 76 ; 32 n 89 (2. 6. 7) ;  
 36 n 104 ; 39 n 115 ; 40 n 118. 120 ;  
 42 n 131-132 ; 45 n 144 ; 48 n 152 (1) ;  
 53 n 165-166 ; 55 n 172 ; 56 n 177 ;  
 57 n 179 ; 58 n 184 ; 59 n 186 ;  
 76 n 37 ; 78 n 45 ; 79 n 48 ; 82 n 59 ;  
 84 n 65 ; 86 n 72. 74 ; 88 n 83 ;  
 90 n 94 ; 101 n 149 ; 102 n 150-152 ;  
 103 n 153 ; 106 n 165 ; 112 n 181 ;  
 114 n 187 ; 115 n 190 ; 116 n 192 ;  
 118 n 200 ; 119 n 201 ; 124 n 221d ;  
 125 n 226 ; 128 n 236 ; 131 n 246-247 ;  
 132 n 250 ; 134 n 256 ; 137 n 267 ;  
 138 n 270 ; 139 n 274 ; 142 n 283 ;  
 144 n 291 ; 149 n 303 ; 152 n 314-315 ;  
 155 n 331. 333 ; 159 n 347. 351 ;  
 160 n 353-355 ; 161 n 361 ; 162 n 365 ;  
 165 n 373 ; 170 n 395 ; 173 n 403 ;  
 177 n 2 ; 178 n 4 ; 181 n 22 (2)-23 ;  
 185 n 34 ; 186 n 37-38 ; 188 n 42 ;  
 189 n 45 ; 191 n 55 ; 192 n 59 ;  
 194 n 67 ; 195 n 75 ; 197 n 84 (1). 86 ;  
 198 n 88 (1) ; 209 n 134 ; 210 n 140 ;  
 213 n 144 ; 214 n 151 ; 223 n 192 ;  
 224 n 195 ; 228 n 1a ; 236 n 37 ;  
 238 n 41 ; 242 n 56 ; 243 n 57 ;  
 244 n 63 ; 245 n 65 ; 246 n 67-68 ;  
 248 n 73 ; 249 n 79 ; 252 n 91 ;  
 253 n 93-94 ; 255 n 98 ; 261 n 7-8 ;  
 263 n 11 (1) ; 264 n 17 ; 267 n 26 ;  
 270 n 37 ; 273 n 55 ; 274 n 54 ;  
 277 n 76 ; 279 n 83 ; 283 n 97 ;  
 289 n 11 ; 291 n 124 ; 302 n 168 ;  
 317 n 13. 15 ; 318 n 21 ; 322 n 34 ;  
 323 n 38 ; 326 n 51 ; 327 n 55 ;  
 328 n 58 ; 329 n 61 ; 333 n 74 ;  
 334 n 79 ; 341 n 108-109 ; 343 n 119 ;  
 347 n 134-135 ; 348 n 136. 138 ;  
 350 n 143-144 ; 360 n 184 ;  
 368 n 214 ; 370 n 220 ; 374 n 240-241 ;  
 379 n 259 ; 403 n 10 ; 405 n 17 ;  
 412 n 40 ; 435 n 119 ; 436 n 125 ;  
 440 ; 445-447 ; 461-466 ; 483-484 ;  
 471 n 20 ; 487-489 ; 491 (1) ; 492 ;  
 500 n 5 ; 501 n 12 ; 503 n 25 ;  
 509 n 1 (3. 4. 10. 11. 14) ; 510 ; 511 n 9  
 θεόσδοτος ..... 23 n 57  
 θεοσέβεια ..... 262 n 10b

- θεοσοφία ..... 138 n 270 ;  
 163 n 365 ; 428 n 100 ; 444f ; 445k  
 θεόσοφος ..... 444f  
 \*θεοσύνδετος ..... 194 n 66 ; 459  
 θεότης ..... 14 n 31 ;  
 77 n 43 ; 99 n 138 ; 132 n 247c  
 θεουργείν ..... 261-266  
 θεουργία .... 39 n 115 ; 211 n 141 ;  
 239 n 46 ; 240 n 49 ; 248 n 73 ;  
 253 n 93 ; 444g ; 461-466 ; 496  
 θεουργικός ..... 3 n 1 ;  
 124 n 221d ; 145 n 291h ; 171 n 398 ;  
 204 n 118 ; 220 n 175 ; 245 n 65 ;  
 289 n 112 ; 444g ; 461-466 ; 496  
 \*θεουργός ..... 5 n 3-4 ; 6 n 11 ;  
 38-39 ; 48 n 152 ; 56 n 177 ; 57 n 182 ;  
 87 n 77 ; 92 n 106 ; 101 n 149 ;  
 102 n 150-152 ; 115 n 190 ; 124 n 221 ;  
 134 n 256 ; 136 n 266 ; 144 n 291 ;  
 155 n 333 ; 165 n 373 ; 177 n 2 ;  
 184 n 32 ; 186 n 38 ; 187 n 40-41 ;  
 188 n 42 ; 191 n 55 ; 196 n 80 ;  
 200 n 100 ; 205 n 119 ; 212 n 143 ;  
 214 n 151 ; 217 n 163 ; 220 n 175 ;  
 224 n 195 ; 239 n 44 ; 245 n 65 ;  
 246 n 68 ; 250 n 83 ; 253 n 93 ;  
 260 n 5 ; 264 n 16 ; 287 n 109 ;  
 291 n 125 ; 428 n 100 ; 444g ;  
 446 n-o ; 459 ; 461-466 ; 468 n 5  
 θεοφάντωρ ..... 48 n 152  
 θεόφημος ..... 48 n 152  
 θεοφήτης ..... 33 n 92 ;  
 48 n 152 (2) ; 445h ; 459 ; 461  
 θεραπεία ..... 56 n 177  
 θεραπεύειν .....  
 12 n 28 ; 265 n 20 ; 509 n 1 (14)  
 θερμαίνειν ..... 140 n 278 ; 492  
 \*θέρμη ..... 85 n 70 ; 91 n 98  
 \*θερμός ... 491 (7) ; 492 ; 53, 11 Kr.  
 \*θεσμός ..... 70 n 13 ;  
 207 n 128 ; 222 n 190 ; 239 n 44  
 θεσπίξιν ..... 289 n 111  
 θεωρείν ..... 17 n 42 (3) ;  
 151 n 311 ; 184 n 32 ; 188 n 44  
 θεώρημα ..... 263 n 11  
 θεωρητικός ..... 465 n 25  
 θεωρία ..... 221 n 179 ;  
 263 n 11 ; 369 n 216 ; 373 ; 452 n 14  
 θήλυς ..... 24 n 58 ; 268 n 30  
 \*θήρ ..... 223 n 190 ; 265 n 19  
 \*θηρόπολος ..... 265 n 19 ; 459  
 θής ..... 189 n 45  
 θητεία ..... 189 n 45  
 \*θητεύειν ..... 189 n 45 (2) ; 475  
 θηγγάνειν ..... 375 n 241  
 θήσκειν ..... 242 n 54  
 \*θνητός .....  
 10 n 26 (13) ; 76 n 37 ; 95 n 121 ;  
 182 n 25 ; 198 n 88 (2) ; 210 n 138 ;  
 212 n 142 ; 224 n 194 ; 260 n 7  
 θολερός ..... 297 n 147  
 \*θοός ..... 133 n 253 ; 241 n 52  
 θόρυβος ..... 264 n 17  
 θοδρίς ..... 193 n 65  
 θρησκεία ..... 12 n 28 ; 87 n 77  
 θρόνος ..... 14 n 31 ;  
 15 n 34 ; 294 n 133 (3) ; 474 ; 475  
 \*θρόσκειν ..... 118 n 200 (1) ; 259 n 3  
 \*θύειν ..... 289 n 111. 116 (2)  
 θυμικός ..... 182 n 26  
 θυμοειδής ..... 307 n 182  
 θυμός ..... 500  
 \*θυσία .....  
 33 n 93 ; 231 n 9 ; 255 n 99 (8)  
 θυτικός ..... 32 n 89 (6)  
 \*ΐαμβλικός ..... 68 n 6 ; 70 n 14 ;  
 165 n 373 ; 451 n 9 ; 464 n 19  
 ἰασθαι ..... 216 n 157  
 ἰατρική ..... 501 n 14  
 \*ἰάω ..... 439 n 137  
 \*ἰδέα .....  
 34 n 96 ; 83 n 61 ; 85 n 70 ;  
 110 n 177 (2. 8. 15) ; 111 n 178 ;  
 112 n 179 ; 191 n 55 ; 280 n 84 ;  
 296 n 141 ; 317 n 13-16 ; 318 n 19 ;  
 348 n 136 ; 352 n 151 ; 360 n 188 ;  
 372 n 229 ; 509 n 1 (6) ; 510 n 4  
 \*ἴδιος .....  
 15 n 34 ; 78 n 45 ; 131 n 247 ;  
 245 n 65 ; 253 n 93-94 ; 468 n 8  
 ἰδιότης .....  
 .. 56 n 177 ; 131 n 247 ; 149 n 303  
 ἰδρύειν ..... 150 n 309 ;  
 349 n 138 ; 373 n 234 ; 375 n 241 ; 495  
 ἰερατικός ..... 56 n 177 ; 147 n 296 ;  
 187 n 39 ; 207 n 128 ; 210 n 140 ;

- 220 n 173; 252 n 92; 253 n 96;  
260 n 5; 289 n 113; 292 n 127;  
445n; 464-465; 477; 489; 496
- \*ιερεύς ..... 39 n 115;  
45 n 139; 270 n 37; 500 n 5
- \*ιερός ..... 12 n 28;  
33 n 92; 34 n 95; 37; 39 n 115;  
59 n 186 (4); 69 n 8; 70 n 13;  
77 n 42; 87 n 77; 98 n 134;  
112 n 181; 140 n 275 (1). 277;  
141 n 282; 147 n 296; 189 n 45 (3);  
194 n 66; 196 n 80; 203 n 14;  
207 n 128; 220 n 177; 221 n 179;  
237 n 39; 239 n 46; 255 n 99 (10);  
256 n 102; 260 n 5; 352 n 150;  
439 n 137; 443; 445
- \*Ιεροστολικά .... 362 n 196. 198
- ιερουργία .... 196 n 80; 270 n 37
- ιζάνειν ..... 263 n 14
- ιθύνειν ..... 352 n 151
- \*ιθυντήρ ..... 135 n 260 (1)
- \*ίκελος ..... 240 n 52
- ικεσία ..... 239 n 43
- ικετεία ..... 56 n 177
- ικέτις ..... 468 n 9
- ίλαος ..... 188 n 42; 347 n 135
- ίμάς ..... 249 n 78
- \*ίνα ..... 120 n 205 (2. 3)
- \*Ιουδαίος ..... 9 n 23
- \*Ιουλιανός . 3 n 1; 4 n 2; 5 n 3-4. 8;  
102 n 150; 224 n 195; 248 n 72;  
253 n 96; 291 n 122; 449; 452
- ίπποκόων ..... 242 n 55
- ίπποπρόσωπος ..... 242 n 55
- \*ίππος ..... 240 n 52 (5)
- ισόθεος ..... 214 n 148
- \*ίσος .....  
97 n 130; 114 n 187; 378 n 256
- \*Ιστανάνι ... 53 n 165 (7); 133 n 254;  
207 n 127; 210 n 138; 241 n 52 (8);  
243 n 57; 328 n 58; 375 n 241
- \*Ισχειν ..... 86 n 75 (3); 121 n 211
- ισχύειν ..... 374 n 239
- ισχυρίζεσθαι ..... 450 n 6
- ισχύς ..... 23 n 58; 26 n 67 (3);  
86 n 74; 87 n 78; 439 n 137; 440 n 140
- ιυγγικός ..... 249 n 78
- \*ιυγξ ..... 132-137; 156;  
249 n 77; 251 n 84; 438; 483; 485 n 6
- ΐφι ..... 86 n 74
- \*ΐχνος .....  
110 n 177 (7); 317 n 18; 384 n 274
- καθαγιαζειν ..... 252 n 92
- \*καθαίρειν ..... 148 n 300;  
178 n 4; 185 n 34; 231 n 9;  
245 n 64; 261 n 7; 372 n 231
- καθάπερ ..... 109 n 174
- καθαρίζειν ..... 422 n 82
- καθαρισμός ..... 194 n 66; 228 n 1;  
231 n 12; 237 n 40; 245 n 64
- \*καθαρός ..... 121 n 209;  
172 n 400. 403 (4); 205 n 122;  
216 n 157; 386 n 278; 484; 257 W.\*\*
- καθαρότης ..... 198 n 90; 199 n 92
- κάθαρισις .....  
.. 6 n 11; 194 n 66; 222 n 187;  
237 n 39; 276 n 69; 361; 488
- καθαριστικός ..... 145 n 291c
- καθαρός ..... 328 n 58
- καθέλκειν ..... 260 n 5; 304 n 173
- καθηγεῖσθαι ..... 5 n 8
- καθηγεμών ..... 70 n 14;  
184 n 32; 231 n 9; 233 n 22
- \*καθηθῆσθαι .... 15 n 34; 114 n 187 (1)
- καθιέναι ..... 181 n 22
- κάθοδος ..... 182 n 26; 183 n 27;  
189 n 45; 210 n 140; 450; 452; 502
- καθολικός ..... 453 n 18
- κάθολος ..... 280 n 84; 450
- \*καθοράν ..... 240 n 52
- καθόσον ..... 210 n 140
- καθύπερθε ..... 18 n 46 (1)
- \*καί ..... 86 n 74. 75 (2-3);  
95 n 118; 96 n 126; 99 n 118;  
102 n 151; 106 n 165; 108 n 172-173;  
112 n 181; 115 n 190; 119 n 202;  
120 n 205 (1. 3); 121 n 209 (2. 3). 211;  
124 n 221a-b; 131 n 246 (1);  
132 n 249 (1). 250 (3); 134 n 256 (1);  
143 n 287; 144 n 291a; 153 n 320 (1);  
165 n 373 (2. 8); 167 n 379;  
169 n 387; 171 n 396; 172 n 403 (2. 4);  
179 n 8 (2); 182 n 26; 189 n 45 (2);  
190 n 50 (2); 191 n 55 (2); 203 n 114;  
213 n 144 (2); 240 n 52 (3. 5. 6. 8);  
255 n 99 (11); 263 n 11 (2). 14 (2);

- 267 n 25 (1. 2. 4) ; 271 n 41 ; 278 n 77 ;  
295 n 137 (2) ; 80 B.\*\* ; 64 (2-3) S.\*\*
- καίαν ..... 40 n 46
- Καίσαρας ..... 450 n 7
- \*κακία . 263 n 14 ; 277 n 75 ; 304 n 175
- κακοδαίμων ..... 265 n 19
- κακοεργής ..... 263 n 11
- \*κακός .... 53 n 165 (3) ; 260 n 5 ;  
263 n 14 (2) ; 274 n 57 ; 283 n 94 ;  
284 n 97 ; 384 n 273 ; 386 n 278 ;  
505 n 32 ; 509 n 1 (7) ; 510 n 2
- \*καλεῖν .....  
5 n 4 ; 52 n 163 ; 53 n 165 ; 56 n 177 ;  
57 n 182 ; 63 n 20 ; 95 n 121 ;  
98 n 134 ; 99 n 138 ; 102 n 149 ;  
114 n 185 ; 133 n 253 ; 137 n 267 ;  
138 n 270-271 ; 152 n 314 ; 155 n 329  
160 n 353 ; 173 n 406 ; 179 n 7 ;  
191 n 55 = Dodds 273 n 34 ; 206 n 125 ;  
209 n 135 ; 213 n 144 ; 222 n 188 ;  
242 n 54 ; 245 n 65 ; 249 n 78-79 ;  
267 n 26 ; 269 n 36 ; 285 n 102 ;  
291 n 124 ; 296 n 139 ; 319 n 25 ;  
378 n 256 ; 465 n 25 ; 466 n 34 ;  
468 n 9 ; 469 ; 491 (6) ; 492
- κάλλος . 24 n 58 ; 145 n 291g ; 164 ;  
169 n 384 ; 191 n 55 ; 221 n 179 ;  
277 n 77 ; 347 n 134 ; 469 n 12-13
- καλός ..... 10 n 26 (4) ; 83 n 64 ;  
164 n 370 ; 469 ; 483 ; 503 n 25
- \*καλύπτειν ..... 43 n 136 (2) ; 243 n 57
- καλῶς ..... 346 n 132 ; 403 n 10
- κάμνειν ..... 4 n 2 ; 219
- καναχή ..... 459
- \*καναχισμός ..... 143 n 287c ; 458
- \*κανών ..... 255 n 99 (3)
- \*καρδία (κραδίη) .....  
39 n 116 ; 53 n 165 (5) ; 59 n 186 (3) ;  
124 n 221 d ; 278 n 81 ; 48,26 Kr.
- κάρηνον ..... 43 n 136 (4)
- \*καρπός ..... 197 n 84 ;  
200 n 98 ; 336 n 92 ; 343 n 122
- καρτερός ..... 59 n 186 (1)
- \*κάρτος .....  
10 n 26 (16) ; 12 ; 86 n 74 ; 440 n 140
- \*κατά .....  
108 n 173 ; 110 n 177 (6) ; 191 n 55 (1) ;  
244 n 63 (2) ; 294 n 133 (1. 2)
- καταβαίνειν .... 44 n 136 ; 303 n 171
- \*καταβάλλειν ... 71 n 14 ; 278 n 81
- καταβιβάζειν ..... 180 n 17
- κατάγειν ..... 42 n 131
- καταγιάζειν ..... 231 n 9
- καταγωγός ..... 308 n 185 ; 499 n 3
- καταδεῖν ..... 53 n 166 ; 286 n 106
- κατάδεσμος ..... 58 n 184
- καταδέχεσθαι ..... 53 n 166 ; 55 n 172
- καταζωννόναι ..... 39 n 115
- \*κατακλείειν ..... 113 n 184
- \*κατακλίνειν ..... 113 n 184
- κατακράζειν ..... 15 n 35
- \*καταλείπειν .....  
189 n 45 ; 213 n 144 ; 217 n 162 ;  
296 n 139 ; 384 n 273 ; 491 (2)
- κατάλογος ..... 203 n 114
- καταμερίζειν ..... 279 n 83
- \*καταμετρεῖν ..... 255 n 98
- καταναγκάζειν ..... 287 n 109
- \*κατανεύειν .....  
45 n 144 ; 80 n 49 (7. 10) ; 106 n 165
- καταντικρύ ..... 153 n 320
- καταπέμπειν ..... 56 n 177 ;  
245 n 65 ; 282 n 92 ; 360 n 184
- καταπίνειν ..... 303 n 171
- καταπίπτειν ..... 43 n 136 (4)
- κατάρματος ..... 205 n 122
- καταργεῖν .... 216 n 161 ; 412 n 40
- κατασκευάζειν ..... 291 n 126
- κατασκευή ..... 291 n 126
- κατασπᾶν ..... 304 n 173
- \*κατασπείρειν ..... 136 n 266
- κατάστασις ..... 53 n 165
- \*κατασύρειν .....  
96 n 126. 130 ; 302 n 168 ; 303 n 170
- καταχθόνιος ..... 289 n 111
- κατεπαγγέλλεσθαι ..... 214 n 151
- \*κατέχειν ..... 150 n 309 ;  
214 n 148 ; 260 n 5 ; 114 n 187 (2)
- κατηγορία ..... 478
- κατιδεῖν ..... 507 n 41
- \*κατιέναι ..... 44 n 137 ;  
48 n 152 (3) ; 147 n 296 ; 153 n 320 (1) ;  
197 n 84 ; 210 n 140 ; 220 n 175 ;  
223 n 191 ; 243 n 57 ; 502 n 21
- κατονομάζειν ..... 465 n 25
- κάτοχος ..... 272 n 46



- \*κάτω ..... 118 n 200 (4) ;  
290 n 120 ; 294 n 133. 136 ;  
295 n 137 (1) ; 380 n 263 ; 475
- \*κατωρέεσθαι ..... 298 n 152-153
- κατωτάτω ..... 304 n 173
- κειθεν ..... 21 n 52 (2)
- \*κείσθαι ... 26 n 67 (1) ; 197 n 84. 86 ;  
266 n 21 ; 355 n 166 ; 374 n 240 ;
- \*κελάδων ..... 192 n 59 ; 195 n 75. 76
- κελεύειν ..... 180 n 17 ; 205 n 119
- κέλυφος ..... 277 n 72
- \*κενός (κενεός) ..... 166 n 373 (10) ;  
167 n 376 ; 249 n 78 ; 263 n 11 (2)
- \*κέντρον . 53 n 165 (2) ; 55 n 176 ;  
93 n 111 ; 96 n 126 ; 97 n 130-131 ;  
142 n 283. 286 ; 153 n 320 ; 154 n 322 ;  
195 n 75 ; 455 ; 483-484
- \*κεραυνόναι .... 127 n 233 ; 179 n 8 (1)
- \*κεραυνός  
90 n 94 ; 119 n 201 ; 121 n 209 (1) ;  
123 n 218 ; 135 n 260 ; 213 n 57 ;  
248 n 72 ; 293 n 132 ; 431 n 109
- κερόεις ..... 53 n 165 (3)
- κεφάλαιον ..... 231 n 9
- κεφαλαϊώδης ..... 475-476
- κεφαλή ..... 205 n 119
- κηδεμών ..... 500 n 7
- \*κηλίς ..... 260 n 7
- κήπος ..... 221 n 179
- κήρ ..... 306 n 180
- κηρός ..... 292 n 126. 129
- κυκλήσκειν .....  
185 n 32 ; 207 n 127 ; 209 n 135
- \*κινεῖν .....  
17 n 42 (2) ; 18 n 46 (2) ; 96 n 126 ;  
132 n 249 (2) ; 251 n 84 ; 306 n 180 ;  
356 n 170 ; 378 n 258 ; 296 n 312 ;  
405 n 17 ; 469 n 12 ; 34 n 2 Kt.
- κίνησις .....  
96 n 126 ; 103 n 152 e ; 356 n 168. 170 ;  
378 n 259 ; 402 n 3 ; 495
- κινητικός ..... 274 n 62
- κινητός ..... 104 n 158
- κλειδοβχος ..... 363 n 200
- \*κλείς ..... 150 n 309 ; 154 n 325
- \*κλείειν ..... 53 n 165 (1) ; 78 n 45
- \*κλήζειν ..... 48 n 152 (6) ;  
112 n 181 ; 320 n 26 (2) ; 362 n 196
- κληροδν ..... 111 n 178
- κλήσις ..... 22 n 54 ;  
58 n 184 ; 102 n 150 ; 229 ; 239 ;  
289 n 112 ; 362 n 196 ; 467-471
- κλητικός .. 52 n 163 ; 185 n 35 ;  
233 n 19 ; 437 n 126 ; 469 n 13
- κλήτωρ .... 39 ; 228 n 1 ; 467-471
- κλίμαξ ..... 414 n 50
- κλίνειν ..... 368 n 212
- \*κλόειν .....  
10 n 26 (5) ; 159 n 346 ; 244 n 63
- Κλωθώ ..... 364 n 204
- κνήμη ..... 94 n 114
- κότιλος ..... 308 n 186
- κοιλότης ..... 17 n 42 (1)
- \*κοίλωμα .....  
118 n 200 (3) ; 259 n 3 ; 308 n 186
- κοινός .....  
235 n 32 ; 239 n 43 ; 245 n 65 ; 402 n 3
- κοινωνία ..... 347 n 131
- κοίτη ..... 88 n 83 (codd.)
- κολάζειν ..... 263 n 11
- κόλασις ..... 298 n 153
- \*κόλος  
41 n 125 ; 44 n 144 ; 83 n 62 ;  
84 n 65 ; 86 n 75 (3) ; 93 n 111 ;  
110 n 177 (10) ; 116 n 194 ; 117 n 195 ;  
121 n 209. 211 ; 124 n 221 ; 143 n 287 ;  
214 n 148 ; 259 n 3 ; 267 n 25 (2). 27 ;  
268 n 28-29 ; 308 n 186 ; 377 n 253
- κόμμα ..... 491
- Κόρη ..... 50 ; 94 n 116 (κούρα)
- κορώνη ..... 291 n 126
- \*κοσμαγός (κοσμαγωγός) .....  
138 ; 142 n 283 ;  
156 n 337 ; 160 n 351 ; 423 ; 459 ; 484
- κοσμάρχης ..... 234 n 27
- κοσμεῖν ..... 93 n 108 ;  
282 n 92 ; 317 n 16 ; 356 n 170
- \*κοσμικός ..... 57 n 182 ;  
120 n 204-205 (2) ; 362 n 196. 199
- κοσμοκράτωρ .....  
125 n 221 ; 137 n 267 ; 245 n 65 ; 423
- κοσμοποιητικός .. 347 n 135 ; 350 n 144
- κοσμοποιός ..... 350 n 143
- \*κόσμος ..... 10 n 26 (2. 6) ;  
13 ; 24 n 58 ; 29 n 77 (2) ; 30 ;  
48 n 152 (7) ; 67 n 1 ; 77 n 39-40 ;

- 86 n 75 (3) ; 87 n 81 ; 88 n 83a ; 89 n 84 ; 96 n 126 ; 103 n 152 c-e ; 106 n 164 ; 110 n 177 (5. 7. 10) ; 111 n 178 ; 113 n 184 ; 114 n 187 (3) ; 118 n 200 (3) ; 119 n 201-202 ; 120 n 203. 205 (3) ; 121 n 211 ; 123 n 218 ; 124 n 221 ; 125 n 226 ; 126 n 227. 229 ; 127 n 232 (5) ; 132 n 250 (2) ; 133 n 251-255 ; 134 n 256 (2) ; 135 n 259-260 ; 136 n 266 ; 137 ss ; 138 n 270-271 ; 141 n 280 ; 143 n 287 ; 151 n 311. 313 ; 152 n 317 ; 154 n 322. 325 ; 182 n 26 ; 191 n 55 ; 222 n 187-188 ; 223 n 191 ; 236 n 37 ; 243 n 58 ; 244 n 63 ; 279 n 83 ; 295 n 137 (1) ; 296 n 138-139 ; 301 n 163 ; 302 n 168 ; 317 n 15-18 ; 323 n 38 ; 341 n 108 ; 349 n 141 ; 352 n 151 ; 354 n 159 ; 356 n 170 ; 357 n 175 ; 363 n 200 ; 379 n 259 ; 385 n 275 ; 402 n 3. 7 ; 403 n 9 ; 470 n 13 ; 484 ; 64 (1) S.\*\*
- κούρα ..... 94 n 116
- κουράλιος ..... 293 n 132
- Κούρητες ..... 484
- \*κουρίζειν ... 278 n 81 ; 53,11 Κρ.
- κοῦφος ..... 32 n 89 (10)
- \*κραϊπνός .... 42 n 132 ; 134 n 256 (2)
- \*κραταιός ... 121 n 209 (4) ; 236 n 35
- \*κρατεῖν ..... 86 n 74 ; 124 n 221d ; 144 n 288 ; 232 n 15 ; 505 n 32
- \*κρατερός .... 26 n 67 (4) ; 86 n 74
- \*κρατήρ ..... 111 n 178 ; 127 n 233 ; 128 n 234. 236 ; 207 n 127
- κράτος ..... 23 n 58 ; 26 n 67 (3) ; 28 n 71 ; 86 n 74 ; 439 n 137
- κρατύνειν ..... 145 n 291e
- κρείττων ..... 152 n 316 ; 199 n 94 ; 255 n 98 ; 274 n 57 ; 295 n 136 ; 373 n 236 ; 505 n 32 ; 509 n 1 (5-6. 10) ; 510 n 4
- \*κρημνός ..... 213 n 144 ; 294 n 133 (1) ; 296 n 139 ; 475
- \*κρημνώδης ..... 295 n 137 (4)
- \*κρήνη ..... 116 n 192 ; *contra* : 39 Κρ.
- \*κρηνήτος ..... 111 n 178 ; 116 n 192
- κρόκος ..... 231 n 9
- \*Κρόνος ..... 77 n 43 ; 79 n 48 ; 160 n 353 ; 484
- \*κρόταφος ..... 92 n 107
- κροτίζειν ..... 110 n 177
- κρυπτός ..... 288 n 109
- κρύπτειν ..... 224 n 196
- κρύφιος . 3 n 1 ; 78 n 45 ; 151 n 312 ; 483
- κτᾶσθαι ..... 280 n 5 ; 509 n 1 (9)
- κτηνώδης ..... 249 n 78
- κτίστης ..... 405 n 20
- \*κυβερνᾶν ... 45 n 139 ; 106 n 165 ; 144 n 291 ; 146 n 292 ; 196 n 80
- κῶδος ..... 24 n 58
- κύειν .. 10 n 26 (10) ; 114 n 186 ; 483
- κυκλοέλικτος ..... 102 n 151
- \*κύκλος ..... 91 n 99 ; 97 n 130 ; 143 n 287-288 ; 146 n 295 ; 151 n 313 ; 154 n 321 ; 354 n 159
- \*κῶμα ..... 45 n 139
- κύριος .. 25 n 61 ; 70 n 12 ; 231 n 9 ; 265 n 21 ; 318 n 22 ; 350 n 143
- κύρος ..... 197 n 86
- \*κυρτός ..... 124 n 221c ; 242 n 57 (2) ; 34,17 Κρ.
- \*κύτος ..... 18 n 46 (1) ; 277 n 72
- \*κύων ..... 259 n 3 ; 264 n 16 ; 265 n 19 ; 271 n 41 ; 67 S.\*\*
- κῶλον ..... 491
- κωμάς ..... 95 n 122
- \*λάβρος ..... 4 n 2 ; 140 n 275 (3) ; 302 n 168 ; 64 (1) S.\*\*
- λαγχάνειν .... 29 n 77(2) ; 282 n 92
- \*λαγών . 88 n 83a-b ; 92 n 107 ; 93 n 111
- \*λαιός ..... 88 n 83b ; 231 n 9 ; 291 n 126
- \*λαλεῖν ..... 53 n 165 (1) ; 190 n 50 (2) ; 318 n 22
- \*λαμβάνειν ... 32 n 89 (4) ; 70 n 14 ; 119 n 203 ; 182 n 26 ; 203 n 114 (1) ; 232 n 13 ; 296 n 141 ; 325 n 46 ; 383 n 270 ; 386 n 278 ; 422 n 82
- \*λάμπειν ..... 106 n 164 ; 204 n 114 ; 243 n 57 ; 274 n 63
- λαμπηδών ..... 210 n 138
- λάσκειν ..... 53 n 165 (5)
- Λάχσις ..... 364 n 204
- \*λέγειν ..... 36 n 104 ; 42 n 132 ; 48 n 152 (2) ; 53 n 165 ;

- 59 n 186 ; 70 n 12 ; 77 n 38. 43 ;  
 78 n 45 ; 79 n 48 ; 81 n 54 ;  
 82 n 58 ; 88 n 83a ; 91 n 97 ;  
 96 n 126 ; 97 n 131 ; 99 n 138 ;  
 106 n 165 ; 107 n 168 ; 112 n 181 ;  
 114 n 186 ; 119 n 202 ; 124 n 221 ;  
 125 n 225 ; 131 n 247 ; 133 n 254 ;  
 136 n 263 ; 138 n 270-271 ; 140 n 275 ;  
 143 n 288 ; 147 n 296 ; 151 n 311 ;  
 152 n 316-317 ; 159 n 351 ; 160 n 354 ;  
 165 n 373 ; 182 n 26 ; 184 n 32 ;  
 186 n 38 ; 187 n 40 ; 191 n 55 ;  
 203 n 114 ; 207 n 127 ; 222 n 187. 190 ;  
 242 n 57 ; 244 n 63 ; 246 n 68 ;  
 255 n 98 ; 261 n 7 ; 264 n 16 ;  
 265 n 21 ; 273 n 53 ; 278 n 77 ;  
 294 n 136 ; 298 n 138 ; 302 n 168 ;  
 317 n 16 ; 319 n 25 ; 325 n 46 ;  
 335 n 82 ; 357 n 175 ; 384 n 273 ;  
 395 n 307-308 ; 403 n 10 ; 446 n-o ;  
 461 ; 469 n 13 ; 488 ; 501 n 15
- λεγαῖον ..... 265 n 19  
 λειμών ..... 221 n 178-179  
 \*λείπειν ..... 52 n 163 ; 205 n 122  
 λεκανομαντεία ..... 232 n 15  
 λελογχῶς ..... 18 n 46 (1)  
 λεοντοῦχος ... 91 n 96 ; 94 n 114  
 λεοντώδης ..... 298 n 153  
 λεπταλέος ..... 43 n 136 (5)  
 \*λεπτός ... 178 n 7 ; 183 n 27 ; 184 n 30  
 λευκός ..... 292 n 129  
 \*λέων ..... 94 n 114  
 λήθαιος ..... 493  
 \*λήθη ..... 190 n 50 (2). 53 ;  
 438 n 132 ; 493 = 290 n 127 Th.\*  
 \*ληξίς ..... 185 n 34 ; 279 n 83 ;  
 282 n 92 ; 283 n 94 ; 499 n 4  
 ληρωδία ..... 293 n 132  
 ληφθεῖσα ..... 231 n 9. 13  
 \*λίβας ..... 88 n 83a ; 89 n 89  
 λιγυρός .... 43 n 136 (2) ; 291 n 124  
 λιγυφεγγέτις ..... 18 n 46 (6) ; 459  
 \*λίθος ..... 178 n 4 ; 231 n 9 ;  
 288 n 109 ; 289 n 116 (2) ; 293 n 132  
 λιτανεία ..... 239 n 43  
 λιτή ..... 362 n 196  
 λογικός ..... 182 n 26 ; 216 n 161 ;  
 277 n 76 ; 348 n 136 ; 412 n 40 ; 504  
 λόγον ..... 3 n 1 ; 5 ; 9 n 23 ;  
 10 n 26 ; 31 ; 32 n 89 ; 36 n 104 ;  
 37 ; 45 n 139 ; 48 n 152 (5) ; 49 ;  
 50 n 160 ; 55 n 171 ; 62 n 200 ;  
 69 n 10 ; 70 n 12. 14 ; 79 n 47 ;  
 80 n 52 ; 81 n 55-56 ; 82 n 58-59 ;  
 83 n 62 ; 84 n 65 ; 85 n 90 ;  
 87 n 76-77 ; 88 n 83a ; 91 n 77 ;  
 96 n 126 ; 97 n 130-131 ; 99 n 137-138 ;  
 106 n 164 ; 107 n 168 ; 108 n 172-173 ;  
 113 n 185 ; 117 n 195. 198 ; 118 n 200 ;  
 123 n 218 ; 125 n 225 ; 127 n 233 ;  
 128 n 238 ; 129 n 240 ; 131 n 246-247 ;  
 133 n 252-254 ; 140 n 275 ; 142 n 287 ;  
 144 n 291 ; 146 n 293 ; 150 n 309 ;  
 153 n 320 ; 154 n 322 ; 155 n 334 ;  
 160 n 355 ; 173 n 406 ; 179 n 8 ;  
 181 n 19. 22 ; 182 n 26 ; 191 n 53. 55 ;  
 194 n 67 ; 196 n 79 ; 197 n 84 ;  
 200 n 102 ; 203 n 114 ; 212 n 142-143 ;  
 213 n 144 ; 220 n 173. 175 ; 222 n 190 ;  
 241 n 52 ; 246 n 68 ; 252 n 91 ;  
 255 n 98 ; 259 n 2 ; 260 n 7 ;  
 262 n 10a-b ; 264 n 15-17 ; 267 n 25-26 ;  
 271 n 41 ; 273 n 55 ; 294 n 133 ;  
 298 n 153 ; 302 n 168 ; 438 n 132 ;  
 443-447 ; 450 n 6-7 ; 451 n 9
- λόγιος ..... 50  
 λογιστικός ..... 307 n 182 ; 501 n 15  
 \*λόγος .. 18 n 46 (15) ; 37 ; 98 n 134 ;  
 112 n 181 ; 124 n 221d ; 151 n 311 ;  
 155 n 329 ; 187 n 38-40 ; 189 n 45 (3) ;  
 189 n 49 ; 191 n 53 ; 204 n 114 ;  
 229 n 4 ; 231 n 10 ; 232 n 17 ;  
 246 n 68 ; 259 n 3 ; 265 n 21 ;  
 273 n 53 ; 277 n 77 ; 280 n 84 ;  
 288 n 109 ; 289 n 120 ; 291 n 126 ;  
 340 n 105 ; 341 n 109 ; 343 n 121 ;  
 348 n 136. 138 ; 350 n 143 ; 351 n 150 ;  
 372 n 230 ; 438 n 132 ; 443-445 ;  
 450 n 7 ; 457 n 1 ; 478 ; 509 n 1 (2)
- \*λοιπά .....  
 ... 21 n 52 (5) ; 40 n 118 ; 386 n 278  
 \*λοχεύειν ... 255 n 99 (6) ; 336 n 92  
 \*λύειν .....  
 40 n 118. 121 ; 41 n 128 ; 42 n 131 ;  
 53 n 165 (4) ; 260 n 5 ; 350 n 144  
 λύθρος ..... 276 n 71  
 λυμαντικός ..... 499 n 4  
 λύρα ..... 46 n 147  
 λύσις ..... 194 n 66 ; 451
- μαγεία ..... 53 n 166 (2) ; 292 n 126  
 \*μαγειός .....  
 133 n 254 ; 139 ; 290 n 120 ; 39,12 Kr.

- \*μαγικός ..... 115 n 190 ;  
139 n 274 ; 195 n 73 ; 39,9 Kr.
- μάθημα .....  
369 n 217 ; 501 n 15 ; 507 n 42
- Μαϊάς ..... 52 n 163
- \*μάκαρ .... 10 n 26 (14) ; 18 n 46 (3) ;  
23 n 57 ; 26 n 67 (5) ; 42 n 132 ;  
76 n 37 ; 84 n 65 ; 159 n 350 ; 211 ;  
214 n 148 ; 222 n 190 ; 468 n 9
- μακάριος .....  
... 186 n 38 ; 188 n 44 ; 246 n 68
- μακαρισμός ..... 201 n 102
- μακρός ..... 17 n 42 (6)
- μάλα ..... 83 n 64 ; 186 n 38
- μαλακός ..... 43 n 136 (5)
- μάλιστα .....  
32 n 89 (7) ; 131 n 247 ; 145 n 291e ;  
149 n 303 ; 250 n 83 ; 290 n 120
- μάλλον ..... 183 n 27 ; 356 n 170
- \*μανθάνειν .....  
21 n 52 (5) ; 53 n 165 (6) ; 55 n 174 ;  
125 n 226 ; 166 n 373 (11) ; 372 n 231
- μαντεία ..... 445n
- μαντεῖον ..... 447p
- μαντική ..... 256 n 104
- μάντις ..... 49 n 158 ; 293 n 132
- Μαρκός Ἄντ. .... 3 n 1 ;  
5 n 3. 8 ; 56 n 177 ; 187 n 40-41 ;  
248 n 72 ; 444g ; 463 n 15
- μαρμαρυγή ..... 210 n 138
- μαρτυρεῖν .....  
... 140 n 275 ; 165 n 373 ; 273 n 55
- μαστιγοφόρος ..... 91 n 96
- μαστιζειν ..... 249 n 78
- μάστιξ ..... 363 n 203
- μάταιος ..... 48 n 152 (1)
- \*μέγας .... 18 n 46 (4) ; 26 n 67 (1) ;  
76 n 37 ; 80 n 49 (6) ; 83 n 62 ;  
85 n 69 ; 96 n 126 ; 172 n 403 (3) ;  
285 n 102 ; 286 n 106 ; 328 n 58 ;  
354 n 159 ; 422 n 82 ; 502 n 18
- μέγεθος ..... 243 n 57
- μέγιστος .....  
26 n 67 (5) ; 71 n 14 ; 76 n 37 ; 82 n 59 ;  
118 n 200 ; 239 n 46 ; 240 n 49 ; 492
- μέθεξις .....  
108 n 173 ; 384 n 274 ; 469 n 12
- μέθοδος ..... 196 n 80 ; 207 n 128
- μεθόριος ..... 355 n 166
- \*μέθυειν ..... 198 n 88 (2) ; 199 n 94
- μειλιγμα ..... 290 n 121
- μειλίσσειν ..... 290 n 121
- μέλαθρον ..... 32 n 89 (3)
- \*μελαναυγής .. 126 n 229 ; 295 n 137 (1)
- μέλας ..... 172 n 402 ; 292 n 127
- μελεδηθμός ..... 18 n 46 (12) ; 459
- μελετῶν ..... 173 n 403
- \*μέλλειν .... 34 n 95 ; 220 n 177 (1) ;  
224 n 195 ; 255 n 99 (10) ; 64 (4) S.\*
- μέλπειν ..... 24 n 58
- \*μέν ..... 90 n 94 ; 93 n 111 ;  
97 n 132 ; 132 n 250 (1) ; \*μέν... δέ  
79 n 47 ; 86 n 74 ; 88 n 83a-b ;  
114 n 187 (2. 3) ; 125 n 225 ; 181 n 22
- \*μένειν ... 48 n 152 (5) ; 86 n 75 (2) ;  
99 n 198 (4) ; 102 n 151 ; 103 n 154 ;  
127 n 232 (3) ; 160 n 353 ; 220 n 175 ;  
335 n 82 ; 402 n 7 ; 403 n 8
- \*μένος ..... 10 n 26 (3) ;  
11 ; 12 n 27 ; 86 n 73 ; 101 n 147 ;  
131 n 247 ; 182 n 26 ; 440 n 140
- \*μερίζειν . 17 n 42 (8) ; 110 n 177 (4. 9) ;  
269 n 36 ; 291 n 125 ; 317 n 16
- μερικός .....  
128 n 236 ; 162 n 365 ; 326 n 51 ;  
499 n 4 ; 500 n 7 ; 501 n 12
- \*μερίς ..... 18 n 46 (16) ; 190 n 47 ;  
213 n 144 ; 214 n 150 ; 261 n 7
- μερισμός ..... 17 n 42 (8) ; 17 n 44
- μεριστός . 85 n 70 ; 317 n 16 ; 353 n 157
- \*μέρος ..... 111 n 178 ; 114 n 187 ;  
143 n 287d ; 182 n 26 ; 191 n 55 ;  
222 n 187 ; 223 n 191 ; 269 n 36 ; 282 ;  
317 n 16 ; 378 n 256 ; 391 n 291
- \*μέρωσ ..... 29 n 77 (1) ; 63 n 201 ;  
198 n 88 (1) ; 261 n 7 ; 298 n 151
- μεσεμβολεῖν ... 124 n 221 ; 210 J.\*
- \*μέσος (μέσσοσ) ... 50 n 160 ; 93 n 111 ;  
103 n 152c ; 108 n 173 ; 109 n 174 ;  
124 n 221 ; 138 n 270-271 ; 140 n 275 ;  
141 n 280 ; 142 n 283 ; 149 n 305 ;  
150 n 309 ; 153 n 320 ; 154 n 322 ;  
249 n 78 ; 279 n 83 ; 353 n 157 ;  
355 n 166 ; 377 n 253 ; 450 n 6 ; 455
- μεσότης ..... 109 n 174
- μεσουράνημα ..... 154 n 322
- μέσως ..... 224 n 196
- \*μετά ..... 85 n 70 ;  
87 n 77 ; 91 n 97 ; 110 n 177 (7)

- μετάβασις ..... 222 n 190  
 μετάγειν ..... 346 n 131  
 μεταδιδόναι ..... 136 n 266  
 μετάδοσις ..... 348 n 138  
 μεταλαμβάνειν ..... 170 n 395  
 μεταλλάσσειν ..... 265 n 21  
 μεταξύ ..... 138 n 270  
 μεταστροφή ..... 469 n 11  
 μετέχειν ..... 246 n 68 ;  
 501 n 12 ; 509 n 1 (6. 7) ; 510 n 4  
 \*μετρέειν .....  
 102 n 152b ; 107 n 170 ; 108 n 172-173 ;  
 141 n 280 ; 166 n 373 (6) ; 255 n 99 (3)  
 μετρίως ..... 140 n 278  
 \*μέτρον ..... 108 n 173 ;  
 112 n 179 ; 222 n 187 ; 255 n 99 (1) ;  
 262 n 10b ; 264 n 16 ; 402 n 3. 7  
 \*μέτωπον ..... 90 n 95 ; 93 n 107  
 \*μέχρι ..... 133 n 254 ;  
 153 n 320 ; 162 n 365 ; 236 n 37  
 \*μέχρις .. 97 n 130 ; 172 n 402 ;  
 190 n 50 (2) ; 298 n 152 ; 299 n 154  
 \*μή .....  
 98 n 134 ; 120 n 205 (3) ; 124 n 221b ;  
 172 n 402 (2) ; 184 n 29 ; 255 n 99 (1) ;  
 265 n 18 ; 266 n 23 ; 54, 21 Kr.  
 \*μηδέ ..... 127 n 232 (4) ;  
 184 n 29 ; 192 n 59 (3) ; 255 n 99 (3) ;  
 294 n 133 (1) ; 295 n 137 (1) ; 64 (1) S.\*\*  
 μήκος ..... 297 n 143  
 μήν ..... 229 n 6  
 \*μηναιος .. 143 n 287c-e ; 267 n 25 (3)  
 \*μήνη ..... 21 n 52 (4) ;  
 143 n 287a-d ; 243 n 57 ; 255 n 99 (5)  
 μηνύειν ..... 445m  
 μήνυσις ..... 32 n 89  
 \*μήποτε .....  
 .... 240 n 50 ; μηδέποτε 290 n 127 Th.  
 μήτηρ (μάτηρ) .....  
 24 n 58. 59 (1) ; 82 n 60 ; 297 n 145  
 Μητις . 48 n 152 (4) ; 221 n 184 ; 483  
 \*μήτρα ..... 82 n 59 ; 159 n 350  
 μητροπάτωρ ..... 343 n 119  
 μηχανήμα ..... 187 n 41  
 \*μιγνύναι .....  
 196 n 79 ; 197 n 82 ; 291 n 125 ; 80 B.\*\*  
 μικρός ..... 18 n 46 (16)  
 μικτός ..... 483  
 μμείσθαι ..... 39 n 115 ;  
 99 n 137 ; 184 n 32 ; 348 n 138 ; 446n  
 \*μίμημα ..... 125 n 225  
 \*μίμνειν ..... 88 n 83b  
 μμνήσκειν ..... 245 n 64  
 Μινουκιανός ..... 451 n 9  
 \*μισογύναιον ..... 102 n 151  
 \*μισοφαής .....  
 126 n 229 ; 138 n 270 ; 260 n 4 ;  
 296 n 138 ; 302 n 168 ; 64 (1) S.\*\*  
 μνῶσθαι ..... 29 n 76  
 \*μνήμη ..... 184 n 32 ; 190 n 50 (3)  
 \*μνίζουρις .. 289 n 116 (2) ; 290 n 117  
 μόγις ..... 296 n 141 ; 372 n 229  
 \*μοῖτρα ..... 87 n 76 ; 137 n 267 ;  
 212 n 142 ; 265 n 20 ; 364 n 203-204  
 μοιραίος ..... 265 n 21 ; 269 n 35  
 \*μοιρεῖν ..... 110 n 177 (4)  
 μολπῆ ... 43 n 136 (3) ; 57 ; 58 n 184  
 \*μολύνειν ..... 184 n 29  
 μολυσμός ..... 194 n 66  
 \*μονάς (μουνάς) .. 24 n 58 ; 25 n 65 ;  
 80 n 52 ; 89 n 84 ; 99 n 137-138 ;  
 103 n 154 ; 106 n 164 ; 123 n 218 ;  
 155 n 331 ; 193 n 65 ; 395 n 308 ; 459  
 μονή .....  
 352 n 151 ; 402 n 7 ; 403 n 8 ; 483  
 μονίμως ..... 349 n 138  
 μόνον ..... 138 n 270 ; 222 n 190  
 \*μόνος (μοῦνος) ..... 10 n 26 (13) ;  
 26 n 67 ; 70 n 12 ; 86 n 74 ;  
 99 n 138 (1) ; 118 n 200 ; 163 n 365 ;  
 173 n 403 ; 249 n 78 ; 319 n 25 ;  
 323 n 38 ; 330 n 64 ; 348 n 137 ;  
 362 n 199 ; 375 n 241 ; 505 n 34  
 μόριον ..... 291 n 122 ; 292 n 126  
 \*μορφή .....  
 94 n 114 ; 110 n 177 (7) ; 244 n 63 ;  
 269 n 36 ; 296 n 141 ; 317 n 18  
 μορφοδν .....  
 ... 119 n 203 ; 199 n 95 ; 246 n 68  
 μοχθηρός ..... 509 n 1 (8)  
 μόχος ..... 206 n 124  
 μύειν ..... 169 n 389  
 μύησις ..... 237 n 39-40  
 μῦθος ..... 59 n 186 (2) ; 106 n 165

·μύριος . . . . 70 n 14 ; 373 n 236 ; 451 n 9  
 μυρσίνη . . . . . 231 n 9  
 μυσταγωγία . . . . . 186 n 38 ;  
 240 n 52 ; 262 n 10a ; 444e ; 464 n 22  
 \*μύστης . . . . . 10 n 26 (1) ; 78 n 45 ;  
 161 n 359 ; 176 n 2 ; 255 n 98  
 μυστικός . . . . . 114 n 187 ;  
 151 n 311 ; 205 n 119 ; 210 ; 445f  
 μυστικός . . . . . 231 n 9  
 μυχός . . . . . 308 n 186  
 Μωσής . . . . . 221 n 179 ; 469 n 11  
 \*ναίειν . . . . .  
 18 n 46 (15) ; 29 n 77 (2) ; 33 n 92 ;  
 85 n 70 ; 219 n 169 ; 405 n 17  
 ναρθηκοφόρος . . . . . 415 n 51  
 νεανίσκος . . . . . 469 n 12  
 νεβρός . . . . . 362 n 198  
 νέμειν . . . . . 283 n 94  
 \*νέος - νεώτερος . . . . .  
 102 n 151 ; 103 n 154 ; 104 n 158  
 \*νεύειν . . . . . 42 n 132 ; 197 n 82 ;  
 294 n 133. 136 ; 295 n 137 (1) ; 475  
 \*νεύμα . . . . . 26 n 67 (1) ;  
 27 ; 80 n 49 (7-9)-50 ; 179 n 8-9  
 νεύσις . . . . . 294 n 136  
 νεφέλη . . . . . 40 n 121-122 ; 483  
 νέφος . . . . . 4 n 2  
 νήμα . . . . . 364 n 204  
 \*νήφειν . . . . . 273 n 55  
 \*νοεῖν . . . . . 34 n 96 ; 99 n 138 (2) ;  
 110 n 177 (1) ; 114 n 185 ; 115 n 190 ;  
 127 n 232 (1) ; 132 n 249 ; 159 n 351 ;  
 160 n 354-355 ; 165 n 373 (1-3. 5. 7) ;  
 170 n 395 ; 181 n 19 ; 191 n 55 (2) ;  
 212 n 142 ; 244 n 63 ; 278 n 80 ;  
 317 n 13 ; 328 n 58 ; 368 n 213  
 \*νοερός . . . . . 24 n 58 ;  
 50 n 160 ; 56 n 177 ; 77 n 40 ; 78 n 45 ;  
 84 n 65-66 ; 92 n 101-102 ; 100 n 139 ;  
 109 n 175 ; 110 n 177 (4-6. 13) ;  
 121 n 209 ; 123 n 218 ;  
 127 n 232 (4) ; 131 n 246-247 ;  
 132 n 249 ; 133 n 253-255 ;  
 135 n 259 ; 136 n 266 ; 139 n 274 ;  
 142 n 283 ; 148 n 302 ; 153 n 317 ;  
 156 n 331 ; 159 n 351 ; 160 n 355 ;  
 166 n 373 (4) ; 172 n 400 ; 182 n 26 ;

287 n 109 ; 317 n 15-16 ; 346 n 132 ;  
 347 n 134 ; 348 n 136 ; 430 ; 481-485  
 νοερῶς . . . . . 266 n 21  
 \*νόημα . . . . . 87 n 76  
 νόησις . . . . .  
 . . . 85 n 70 ; 317 n 13. 16 ; 367 n 210  
 νοητάρχης . . . . . 234 n 27  
 νοητικός . . . . . 172 n 402  
 \*νοητός . . . . . 17 n 42 (5) ;  
 34 n 96 ; 56 n 177 ; 67 n 1 ;  
 79 n 48 ; 83 n 62 ; 93 n 111 ;  
 99 n 137 ; 100 n 138 ; 107 n 168-169 ;  
 114 n 187 (2) ; 115 n 190 ; 116 n 195 ;  
 127 n 233 ; 129 n 240 ; 131 n 246 ;  
 132 n 247c. 249 ; 133 n 253-255 ;  
 146 n 295 ; 148 n 302 ; 150 n 309 ;  
 151 n 312 ; 153 n 317. 319 ;  
 155 n 333 ; 159 n 351 ; 160 n 355 ;  
 165 ; 166 n 373 (1. 5. 10-11)-374 ;  
 167 n 379 ; 172 n 402 ; 182 n 26 ;  
 188 n 42 ; 191 n 55 ; 192 n 59 ;  
 195 n 76 ; 204 n 118 ; 220 n 175 ;  
 255 n 98 ; 280 n 84 ; 317 n 13-17 ;  
 318 n 21-22 ; 322 n 36 ; 325 n 46 ;  
 327 n 54 ; 328 n 58 ; 347 n 134 ;  
 357 n 157 ; 368 n 214 ; 370 n 220 ;  
 395 n 308 ; 402 n 3 ; 403 n 9 ;  
 409 n 32 ; 411 n 39 ; 412 n 40 ; 462 ;  
 469 n 11 ; 470 n 13 ; 481-485 ; 488-489  
 \*νοητῶς . . . . . 81 n 55 ; 333 n 75  
 νομεύς . . . . . 500 n 7  
 νομίζειν . . . . . 85 n 70 ; 280 n 84  
 νόμος . . . . . 357 n 175  
 νόσημα . . . . . 291 n 125  
 \*\*νόσος (νοσος) . . . . .  
 . . . . 216 n 157 ; 257 W. ; 64 (3) S.  
 Νουμήνιος . . . . . 313 n 3 ; 503 n 25  
 \*νόος (νόος) . . . . .  
 10 n 26 (9. 16) ; 13 ; 21 n 52 (5) ;  
 24 n 58 ; 25 n 61 ; 26 n 67 (1) ; 28 n 75 ;  
 42 n 132 ; 48 n 152 (3) ; 79-80 ;  
 81 n 59 ; 83 n 62 ; 85 n 70 ;  
 86 n 74 ; 99 n 138 (2) ; 100 n 141 ;  
 106 n 165 ; 108 n 173 ; 110 n 177 (1) ;  
 112 n 181 ; 113 n 184-185 ;  
 114 n 187 (2) ; 118 n 200 ; 121 n 209 ;  
 125 n 225 ; 127 n 232 (1)-233 ;  
 131 n 247 ; 135 n 260 (1) ; 137 n 269 ;  
 138 n 271 ; 147 n 296 ; 150 n 309 ;  
 160 n 354-355 ; 165 n 373 (1-2. 6. 10-11) ;  
 166-171 ; 179-192 ; 271 n 41 ;  
 277 n 77 ; 291 n 125 ; 295 n 136 ;

- 317 n 13-16; 318 n 22; 319 n 25; 320 n 26 (1); 322 n 34-36; 323 n 38; 325 n 46; 326 n 51; 327 n 54; 341 n 109; 348 n 136; 356 n 168. 170; 367; 369 n 217; 370 n 219; 371 n 225; 373 n 232-233; 374 n 239; 402 n 6-7; 452; 455; 462; 483-485; 501 n 12; 64 (4) S.\*\*
- \*νυμφεύειν ..... 295 n 137 (5)
- \*νύμφη .. 267 n 25 (1); *contra*: 10,3 Kr.
- νύμφιος ..... 40 n 120
- νῦν ..... 188 n 43; 279 n 83; 280 n 84; 384 n 273
- νύξ ..... 15 n 35; 53 n 165 (2); 96 n 126; 229 n 6; 482-483
- \*ναθρός ..... 42 n 132
- ναμίαν ..... 21 n 52 (7)
- \*νάπτον ..... 10 n 26 (2); 77 n 39; 90 n 91; 241 n 52
- ξενίζειν ..... 243 n 58
- ξενικός ..... 163 n 365
- ξένος ..... 315 n 7
- ξηρός ..... 383 n 270
- ξίφος ..... 293 n 132; 363 n 203
- ξιφηφόρος ..... 91 n 96
- \*δγκος ..... 120 n 205; 242 n 57; 429 n 104; 430 n 109
- \*δδε ..... 42 n 132; 91 n 97; 98 n 134; 107 n 170; 110 n 177 (15); 114 n 187 (1); 117 n 195; 120 n 205 (1); 121 n 209 (1); 132 n 250 (1. 3); 140 n 275 (3); 144 n 291a; 160 n 354; 179 n 8; 255 n 99 (8); 264 n 16; 298 n 152
- όδεύειν ..... 491 (10)
- όδηγειν ..... 491 (12)
- όδός ..... 17 n 42 (5); 23 n 57; 203 n 114; 338 n 96; 491 (11-12)
- \*δθεν ..... 189 n 45 (1); 240 n 52 (3); 378 n 256; 475
- δθεσθαι ..... 255 n 99
- \*οί ..... 181 n 19
- οιακίζειν ..... 352 n 151
- οιαξ ..... 93 n 111; 97 n 132
- \*οιγύναι ..... 169 n 388
- \*οϊδμα ..... 240 n 52
- οϊεσθαι ..... 50 n 160; 124 n 221e; 178 n 4; 253 n 94; 421 n 79; 469 n 12
- \*οικεϊν ..... 265 n 19
- οικεϊος ..... 56 n 177; 185 n 34; 200 n 102; 222 n 187; 236 n 37; 283 n 94; 306 n 180; 469 n 12
- οϊκησις ..... 379 n 259
- οικίζειν ..... 495
- \*οϊκοθεν ..... 203 n 114; 59,9 Kr.
- οϊνος ..... 128 n 235
- οϊον ..... 178 n 4; 183 n 27; 197 n 86; 199 n 94; 206 n 124; 217 n 163; 278 n 77; 298 n 153; 374 n 241; 469 n 13; 495
- \*οϊστρος ..... 277 n 76
- όλικός ..... 162 n 365; 265 n 21
- \*όλκός ..... 135 n 260 (2)
- \*όλόποιος ..... 155 n 331; 459
- \*όλος ..... 9 n 23; 88 n 83b; 96 n 130; 114 n 187; 136 n 266; 151 n 311; 179 n 8; 191 n 55; 198 n 88 (2); 203 n 114; 222 n 187; 223 n 191; 243 n 57; 244 n 63; 265 n 21; 277 n 72; 317 n 16; 322 n 34; 326 n 51; 348 n 137; 350 n 144; 356 n 170; 360 n 184; 374 n 239; 391 n 291; 395 n 308; 464 n 22
- όλότης ... 99 n 137; 151 n 311; 483
- Όλυμπος ..... 21 n 52 (2); 22 n 55; 32 n 89 (1. 9); 489
- όλως ..... 217 n 163
- δμβρος ..... 4 n 2; 251 n 84
- Όμηρικά ..... 451 n 9
- Όμηρος ..... 451 n 9
- όμιλειν ..... 245 n 64
- \*δμιλος .... 124 n 221 (a-b); 263 n 14
- \*δμμα .... 166 n 373; 167 n 376; 169 n 388-389; 172 n 400. 403; 265 n 18; 370 n 220-221; 373 n 235-236; 374 n 237-239; 488
- δμοιος ..... 274 n 62; 371 n 226
- όμοίως ..... 132 n 250
- όμοίωσις ..... 492
- όμολογειν ..... 29 n 76; 125 n 225; 210 n 140; 445/

- \***δόμνοια** ..... 80 n 50; 179 n 8 (1)  
**όμοσ** ..... 106 n 165  
**όμφή** ..... 152 n 314; 445h  
**όμόνυμος** ..... 451 n 9  
**όμως** ..... 152 n 316  
**όν, όντα** .....  
 93 n 111; 280 n 84; 317 n 17;  
 319 n 25; 325 n 46; 335 n 82;  
 346 n 132; 349 n 141; 353 n 157;  
 384 n 273-274; 389 n 286; 455  
**όνειρος** ..... 93 n 109; 30 n 1, 5 Kr.  
**\*όνομα (ούνομα)** ..... 5 n 8;  
 17 n 42 (9); 18 n 46 (15); 56 n 177;  
 57 n 182; 59 n 186 (1); 98 n 134;  
 102 n 150; 133 n 254; 134 n 256 (1);  
 136 n 263; 163 n 365; 191 n 55;  
 192 n 56; 194 n 71; 195 n 74;  
 229 n 6; 231 n 9; 239 n 45-47;  
 240 n 50-51; 241 n 52; 245 n 65;  
 249 n 78; 288 n 109; 329 n 59;  
 362 n 196; 407 n 25; 439 n 136-138  
**ονομάζειν** .. 84 n 66; 116 n 192;  
 117 n 198; 138 n 271; 231 n 9;  
 255 n 98; 279 n 83; 465 n 25  
**όξύρροπος** ..... 296 n 143  
**\*όξύς (έξ όξύ)** ..... 17 n 42 (7); 90 n 94  
**όπαδός** ..... 162 n 365; 245 n 65  
**όπισθοβαρής** .. 278 n 77 = 60,15 Kr.\*  
**\*όπλίζειν** .... 192 n 59 (2); 195 n 73  
**\*όπου** ..... 80 n 52  
**\*όπως** ..... 96 n 126  
**\*όρᾶν** ..... 17 n 42 (3);  
 46 n 147; 53 n 165 (3); 56 n 176;  
 106 n 164; 173 n 403; 197 n 85;  
 210 n 138; 240 n 52; 244 n 63;  
 294 n 136; 368 n 213; 372 n 229  
**όρατός** .....  
 .... 120 n 206; 125 n 225; 317 n 15  
**όργανικός** ..... 44 n 137  
**όργανον** .....  
 ... 194 n 67; 249 n 79; 44 n 137  
**όρεξις** ..... 384 n 274  
**όρθός** ..... 373 n 234  
**όρίζειν** ..... 262 n 10b  
**όρίνειν** ..... 10 n 26 (8);  
 101 n 146; 327 n 55; 403 n 9  
**όριον** ..... 248 n 72  
**όριστικός** ..... 108 n 173  
**όρκίζειν** ..... 363 n 203  
**όρκος** ..... 232 n 15; 287 n 109  
**όρᾶν** ..... 138 n 270  
**\*όρμη** ..... 17 n 42 (7); 143 n 287a  
**\*όρνις** ..... 255 n 99 (7)  
**όρος** ..... 353  
**όρος** ..... 259 n 2  
**\*Όρφεός** ..... 69 n 10; 451 n 9  
**\*Όρφικός** ..... 37 n 110; 228 n 1c  
**\*ός** ..... 91 n 97; 97 n 130;  
 99 n 137-138; 106 n 164. 165;  
 107 n 170; 110 n 177 (6. 8. 9. 10);  
 112 n 181; 115 n 190;  
 127 n 232 (5). 233; 132 n 250 (2);  
 140 n 275 (2); 159 n 351; 165 n 373 (1);  
 179 n 8 (2); 191 n 55 (2);  
 197 n 84 (2); 198 n 88 (3);  
 246 n 68; 295 n 137 (2); 303 n 170  
**\*όςος (δσος)** .. 87 n 81; 131 n 246 (1);  
 170 n 395 (2); 182 n 26; 212 n 142  
**όστρεον** ..... 277 n 72  
**\*ότι (όττι)** .....  
 86 n 75 (1); 205 n 122; 273 n 55 (1)  
**ότράλεος** ..... 458  
**ότρήμων** ..... 29 n 77 (1); 458  
**\*οδ (οδκ)** .... 88 n 83b; 107 n 170;  
 113 n 184; 124 n 221a-b;  
 147 n 295; 165 n 373 (3. 5. 9);  
 167 n 379; 170 n 395 (1); 190 n 50 (1);  
 212 n 143; 223 n 190; 228 n 1a;  
 242 n 57 (3. 4); 255 n 99 (2. 4. 6. 8);  
 262 n 10a; 264 n 16  
**οδσ** ..... 10 n 26 (4); 164 n 370  
**οδσάμωδς** ..... 146 n 293  
**\*οδδέ** ..... 78 n 45;  
 213 n 144 (1); 262 n 10b; 273 n 55 (1)  
**\*οδδεις** .....  
 198 n 88 (2); 263 n 11 (1); 296 n 141  
**\*οδποτε** .... 255 n 99 (7); 259 n 3 (2)  
**\*οδράνιος** ... 17 n 42 (2-3); 123 n 218;  
 138 n 270; 140 n 275; 141 n 282;  
 242 n 57; 255 n 98; 267 n 25 (4);  
 269 n 34; 483; 509 n 1 (14)  
**\*οδρανόθεν** .....  
 .... 44 n 136; 79 n 48; 201 n 104  
**οδρανομήκης** ..... 457 n 1  
**\*οδρανός** .. 10 n 26 (6); 17 n 42 (2);  
 77 n 39; 91 n 99; 96 n 126. 129;  
 119 n 201; 124 n 221; 125 n 225;



- 126 n 227; 133 n 253; 140 n 275; 223 n 191; 423 n 57; 268 n 31; 354 n 159; 356 n 171; 386 n 278; 482-483; 500 n 5; 509 n 1 (11)
- οδασία ..... 56 n 177; 102 n 151; 107 n 170; 253 n 93; 261 n 8; 317 n 16; 327 n 54; 328 n 58; 347 n 134; 380 n 263; 383 n 270; 391 n 291; 395 n 306; 412 n 40; 483; 491 (2); 492; 509 n 1 (7)
- οδισάρχης ..... 234 n 27
- οδισιοδν ..... 274 n 62
- \*οὔτε ..... 242 n 57 (2)
- \*οὔτος .. 140 n 275 (1); 146 n 292; 165 n 373 (7); 181 n 19; 255 n 99 (9)
- οὔτως ..... 335 n 82
- ὄφειλιν ..... 108 n 173
- ὄφθαλμός ..... 246 n 68; 370 n 220; 373 n 236; 374 n 239
- ὄφις ..... 90 n 95
- \*ὄφρα ..... 96 n 126; 106 n 165; 108 n 173; 127 n 232 (2)-233; 166 n 373 (11); 172 n 402 (2)
- ὄχεῖσθαι ..... 11 n 26
- ὄχετεύειν ..... 155 n 329
- \*ὄχετός . 10 n 26 (9); 12; 93 n 111; 114 n 186; 116 n 192; 143 n 287; 153 n 320 (2); 154 n 327; 155 n 329; 182 n 26; 189 n 45; 192 n 59 (4); 196 n 79-80; 197 n 83; 475
- \*ὄχημα .....  
..... 178-185; 194 n 66; 204 n 114
- ὄψις ..... 197 n 83; 238 n 41
- \*παγερός ..... 45 n 139
- παγίως ..... 373 n 234
- παγκρατής ..... 28 n 75; 86 n 74
- \*πάγκρητος . 48 n 152 (3); 86 n 74; 459
- \*πάθος ..... 42 n 132; 172 n 403 (1); 264 n 17; 265 n 19; 274 n 62; 278 n 77; 282 n 90; 461
- Παιάν ..... 59 n 186 (7)
- \*παιάν ..... 200 n 102
- \*παῖς .....  
10 n 26 (5); 92 n 106; 159 n 346; 240 n 52; 242 n 54; 299 n 154; 446ο
- πάλαι ..... 246 n 68
- παλαιγενής ..... 103 n 154
- παλαιός ..... 445ι
- \*πάλιν .....  
32 n 89 (7); 43 n 136; 53 n 165; 112 n 181; 125 n 225; 133 n 254; 143 n 287; 189 n 45; 240 n 52 (7)
- παλινόρσος ..... 43 n 136 (6)
- παμμήτωρ ..... 362 n 199
- \*πάμμορφος ..... 110 n 177 (2);  
OLYMP. *In Alc.*, 125, 23-24 Wk.\*\*
- \*παμφεγγής ..... 121 n 209 (2)
- \*πᾶν ..... 84 n 65; 93 n 111; 97 n 132; 108 n 173; 109 n 174; 113 n 185; 114 n 186 (2); 182 n 24; 187 n 40; 195 n 74; 213 n 144; 224 n 195; 308 n 186; 319 n 25; 341 n 111; 346 n 132; 347 n 134; 350 n 143; 357 n 175; 476
- πανδεχής ..... 297 n 145
- πάνδημος ..... 237 n 39
- πάννυχος ..... 207 n 127. 131
- \*πάντα ..... 10 n 26 (4); 25 n 61; 26 n 67-68; 80 n 51-52; 81 n 54-55; 82 n 59; 83 n 64; 84 n 65; 85 n 69-70; 86 n 74; 88 n 83a; 96 n 126; 106 n 165; 108 n 172-173; 109 n 174; 112 n 181; 116 n 195; 118 n 200; 120 n 205 (1); 127 n 232 (3); 128 n 239; 129 n 240; 131 n 247; 133 n 254; 138 n 270; 144 n 291; 146 n 292; 152 n 314; 161; 164 n 370; 166 n 373 (6); 169 n 388; 179 n 8 (3); 195 n 74; 205 n 119; 242 n 57; 248 n 68; 267 n 25 (1); 269 n 36; 317 n 16; 320 n 26 (1); 333 n 75; 335 n 82; 341 n 111; 347 n 135; 348 n 136-137; 350 n 144; 362 n 199; 364 n 203; 368 n 212; 373 n 235; 374 n 241; 378 n 258; 402 n 3; 439 n 136; 451 n 9; 469 n 12; 471 n 20; 509 n 1 (2. 3. 4. 5.); 510
- παντάσιον ..... 319 n 25
- πανταχού ..... 142 n 287; 335 n 82
- παντελής ..... 402 n 3
- παντελής ..... 81 n 54
- \*πάντευχος .....  
..... 95 n 118; 192 n 59 (1); 459
- πάντη (πάντη) .. 360 n 188; 384 n 274
- παντοδαπός ..... 297 n 143
- \*παντόθεν .... 171 n 397; 172 n 400
- \*παντοιάς ..... 155 n 331; 192 n 59; 195 n 74; 439; 459

\*παντοῖος ... 110 n 177 (8); 348 n 136  
 παντοκράτωρ ..... 11 n 26; 63 n 201  
 παντόμορφος ..... 406 n 21  
 παντοπάτωρ . 10 n 26 (13); 76 n 37; 459  
 \*πάντροφος ..... 119 n 202  
 πανυπέρτατος .....  
 48 n 152 (7); 77 n 40; 87 n 81  
 \*παρά .. 114 n 187 (1); 198 n 88 (2)  
 παράγειν ..... 189 n 45; 210 n 140  
 παραγγέλειν ..... 213 n 144  
 παραγίγνεσθαι .. 231 n 9; 232 n 14  
 παράδειγμα .....  
 ... 317 n 15; 318 n 19; 389 n 286  
 παραδειγματικῶς ..... 466 n 32  
 \*παράδεισος ... 34 n 95; 220 n 177-178;  
 221 n 179; 255 n 99 (10); 257 n 108  
 \*παραδιδόναί .....  
 56 n 177; 57 n 182; 101 n 149;  
 112 n 181; 119 n 202; 123 n 218;  
 125 n 225; 131 n 246-247; 132 n 250;  
 138 n 270; 149 n 303; 151 n 311;  
 155 n 331; 177 n 2; 179 n 8;  
 181 n 22; 239 n 44; 240 n 52;  
 245 n 65; 246 n 68; 304 n 173;  
 320 n 26 (1); 445m; 464 n 22; 502 n 21  
 παράδοσις ..... 114 n 187; 445l  
 παραιτεῖσθαι ..... 81 n 54  
 παρακελεύειν ..... 39 n 115;  
 144 n 291; 213 n 144; 214 n 151;  
 228 n 1; 244 n 63; 264 n 17; 445m  
 παραλαμβάνειν ..... 204 n 114;  
 237 n 39; 292 n 126; 347 n 134  
 παράληψις ..... 194 n 66  
 παραλλάττειν ..... 97 n 131  
 \*παράσχεδον ..... 110 n 177 (12)  
 παρατιθέναι ..... 10 n 26  
 παραχωρεῖν ..... 380 n 263  
 παρεῖναι ..... 384 n 274  
 παρενεῖρειν ..... 29 n 76  
 \*παρέχειν ..... 197 n 86; 347 n 134  
 παρθενικός ..... 93 n 108  
 \*παρθένος . 88 n 83b; 89 n 89; 94 n 116  
 παρασκευάζειν ... 17 n 42 (3); 231 n 9  
 παρεδρία ..... 229; 236 n 37  
 πάρεδρος .....  
 229; 236; 9,27 Kr.\*; 215 J.\*  
 παρέχειν ..... 147 n 296

παρθένιος ..... 89 n 89  
 \*παρθένος ..... 94 n 116  
 παριστάναί ..... 14 n 31  
 Παρμενίδης ..... 451 n 9  
 παροιμία ..... 262 n 10c  
 παρουσία .. 238 n 41; 269 n 36; 492  
 παρुφιστάναί ..... 402 n 7  
 \*πᾶς - πάντες .....  
 83 n 61; 97 n 130; 99 n 138;  
 103 n 152e; 106 n 164; 107 n 168;  
 108 n 173; 110 n 177 (2); 112 n 181;  
 117 n 195; 125 n 226; 127 n 232 (2);  
 129 n 240 (πάντας SWk.\*\*);  
 135 n 259-260; 136 n 263; 152 n 317;  
 160 n 354; 179 n 8; 184 n 32;  
 197 n 86; 204 n 118; 221 n 179;  
 224 n 195; 273 n 55; 297 n 143;  
 302 n 168; 317 n 16; 319 n 25;  
 320 n 26; 363 n 200; 364 n 203;  
 378 n 259; 389 n 286; 402 n 3;  
 445l; 464 n 19; 469 n 11-12;  
 509 n 1 (10); cf. πᾶν, πάντα  
 πάσχειν ..... 210 n 140  
 \*πατήρ .....  
 10 n 26 (1. 14); 17 n 42 (3); 18 n 46 (4);  
 24 n 58-59 (1); 25 n 61; 29 n 77 (4);  
 76-78; 79-83; 84 n 65; 85 n 90;  
 86 n 75; 87 n 78; 91 n 77;  
 93 n 111; 99 n 138 (1); 100 n 141;  
 106 n 164-165; 110 n 177 (1. 15);  
 112 n 181; 115 n 190; 123 n 218;  
 124 n 221; 127 n 232 (4); 129 n 240;  
 131 n 246; 132 n 247c; 133 n 253-254;  
 134 n 256 (2); 135 n 260 (1);  
 138 n 271; 139; 140 n 275; 141 n 280;  
 142 n 283; 147 n 295; 156 n 337;  
 160 n 353; 171 n 396 (1);  
 172 n 403 (4); 173 n 405;  
 179 n 8; 180 n 17; 181 n 19. 22;  
 200 n 100; 212 n 142; 221 n 179;  
 224 n 194-195; 255 n 99 (4);  
 280 n 84; 317 n 13. 16; 318 n 21;  
 319 n 25; 320 n 26 (1); 322 n 35;  
 326 n 51; 327 n 52. 55; 328 n 59;  
 334 n 82; 341 n 108-111; 349 n 138;  
 350 n 143; 352 n 150; 356 n 170;  
 391 n 291; 452; 455; 465; 483-485;  
 491 (5. 12); 509 n 1 (4); 64 (4) S.\*  
 \*πατριός .....  
 77 n 40; 79-81; 81 n 52; 82 n 59;  
 83 n 61-62; 85 n 70; 87 n 76;  
 89 n 84; 99 n 138 (2); 105 n 163;  
 108 n 173; 110 n 177 (13); 114 n 185;  
 115 n 191; 118 n 200; 127 n 232 (1);  
 129 n 240; 131 n 247; 132 n 252;

- 133 n 255; 159 n 351; 160 n 353;  
169 n 390; 180 n 17; 190 n 50 (1. 3);  
191 n 53. 55 (1); 322 n 36;  
326 n 51; 438 n 132; 455; 483-485
- πάτριος .. 68 n 7; 428 n 100; 444
- \*πατρογενής ..... 85 n 71;  
99 n 138; 103 n 152; 104 n 158;  
117 n 198; 119 n 203; 121 n 209 (3)
- \*πατρόθεν ..... 48 n 152 (3). 154;  
79 n 48; 80 n 51; 110 n 177 (3);  
132 n 249; 197 n 84; 201 n 104
- Πατρόκλης .... 184 n 32; 207 n 127
- παύειν .....  
21 n 52 (6); 53 n 165 (7); 55 n 174
- παυρός ..... 415 n 51
- πειθανάγκη ..... 58 n 184
- \*πείθειν .....  
263 n 14 (1); 269 n 36; 491 (6)
- πείθεσθαι ... 29 n 77 (4); 53 n 165 (4);  
58 n 184; 151 n 311; 246 n 68; 446ο
- \*πειθηνίς . 79 n 49 (1); 131 n 246; 458
- \*πειθῶ ..... 147 n 295
- πειρᾶν ..... 101 n 149; 173 n 403
- πείρειν ..... 29 n 77 (3)
- πείσις ..... 58 n 184
- πειστήειν ..... 293 n 132
- πελάζειν ..... 374 n 241
- πέλας ..... 24 n 58
- \*πέλειν .....  
18 n 46 (9); 88 n 83b; 103 n 154;  
125 n 225; 198 n 88 (3); 354 n 159
- \*πελώριος ..... 255 n 99 (1)
- \*πέμπειν .. 171 n 396 (2); 180 n 17;  
181 n 22; 263 n 11 (2); 360 n 184
- \*πέμπτος .....  
138 n 270; 153 n 320 (1); 154 n 322
- Πενθέως ..... 253 n 94
- πέντε ..... 153 n 320
- πέπλος ..... 362 n 198
- \*περᾶν ..... 223 n 190
- πέρας ..... 353 n 157; 483
- \*περί ..... 86 n 74; 88 n 83a;  
96 n 126; 110 n 177 (10. 12);  
119 n 201; 249 n 80; 402 n 6
- περιάγειν ..... 103 n 152e;  
133 n 254; 188 n 42; 356 n 170
- περιαγωγή ..... 469 n 11-12
- περίαμμα ..... 287 n 109
- περιάπτειν ..... 350 n 144
- περιβάλλειν ..... 137 n 267; 187 n 39
- \*περιβλήμα ..... 214 n 151; 276 n 70
- περιβόλαιον ..... 276 n 70
- \*περίγειος ..... 213 n 144; 279 n 83;  
282 n 92; 283 n 94; 290 n 120
- περιγίγνεσθαι ..... 386 n 278
- περιγράφειν ..... 231 n 9
- περιελίττειν ..... 297 n 147
- περιεργάζεσθαι ..... 255 n 98
- \*περιέχειν ..... 53 n 165;  
82 n 58; 97 n 130; 117 n 195;  
132 n 247b; 154 n 321; 317 n 16
- περιθειώσις ..... 228 n 1
- περικαλύπτειν .. 91 n 99; 354 n 159
- \*περικλᾶν ..... 124 n 221c
- περικλείειν ..... 249 n 78
- περιλαμβάνειν ... 131 n 247; 160 n 353
- περιμήκετος ..... 18 n 46 (9)
- πέριξ ..... 21 n 52 (2)
- περίοδος ..... 96 n 126;  
102 n 152b; 103 n 152e; 141 n 280
- περιποιητικά ..... 292 n 126
- περιπολεῖν ..... 49 n 156
- περίρρασις ..... 6 n 11; 228 n 1
- περίρρανηθῆριον ..... 228 n 1
- περισφιγγειν ..... 354 n 159
- περιττός ..... 232 n 15
- περιτρέχειν ..... 49 n 156
- περιφορά . 103 n 153; 151 n 312; 483
- περιχειν ..... 431 n 110
- Περσεφόνη ..... 206 n 125
- πεσεῖν ..... 136 n 263
- πέταλον ..... 252 n 92
- πέτρα ..... 288 n 109
- \*πηγαῖος ..... 84 n 66; 93 n 109;  
103 n 152e; 111 n 178; 127 n 233;  
128 n 236; 138 n 271; 139 n 274;  
145 n 291; 180 n 17; 267 n 25 (1);  
455; 481 n 3; 484; 485 n 6
- \*πηγή .. 25 n 61; 26 n 67; 28 n 71;  
82 n 58-59; 83 n 61-64; 84 n 65-66;  
88 n 83 a-b; 89 n 88-89; 90 n 91;  
93 n 107; 98 n 136; 99 n 138 (3);  
103 n 152; 110 n 177 (2. 8. 13. 16);  
116 n 192-193; 118 n 200; 123 n 218;  
128 n 234. 236; 136 n 263; 150 n 309;

- 154 n 325 ; 159 n 350 ; 221 n 179 ;  
265 n 21 ; 317 n 13 ; 356 n 168 ;  
470 n 13 ; 476 ; 481 n 3 ; 484 ; 485 n 6
- \*πηγνόναι ... 124 n 221 ; 154 n 322  
πηδᾶν ..... 262 n 10c ; 437 n 128  
πηλός .....  
.. 242 n 72 ; 276 n 71 ; 292 n 126  
πηλώδης ..... 297 n 147
- \*πηρός ..... 271 n 41 ;  
295 n 137 (4) ; 296 n 143 ; 297 n 147  
πιθανολογία ..... 446o
- \*πικρός .....  
214 n 151 ; 276 n 70 ; 385 n 275
- \*πίπτειν ..... 127 n 232 (4) ;  
136 n 263 ; 212 n 143 ; 295 n 136
- \*πιστεύειν ..... 183 n 27 ;  
186 n 37 ; 263 n 14 (1) ; 446o
- \*πίστις ..... 144 n 291 ;  
146 n 295 ; 147 n 296 ; 187 n 40  
πιστός ..... 296 n 141
- \*πλανᾶν ..... 124 n 221 ;  
152 n 317 ; 377 n 253 ; 446o
- \*πλάνη ..... 124 n 221 ; 469 n 11  
πλάνης ..... 30 n 79  
πλανήτης .....  
30 n 79 ; 150 n 309 ; 294 n 135  
πλάσις ..... 291 n 126  
πλάσσειν ..... 63 n 201 ;  
248 n 72 ; 291 n 125 ; 391 n 291  
πλάτος ..... 297 n 143
- \*πλατόνειν ..... 264 n 17 ; 266 n 23
- \*πλατός ... 143 n 287e ; 255 n 99 (7)  
Πλάτων ..... 69 n 10 ; 125 n 225 ;  
163 n 365 ; 205 n 119 ; 214 n 148 ;  
223 n 190 ; 224 n 195 ; 253 n 94. 96 ;  
262 n 10a ; 319 n 25 ; 446n ;  
451 n 9 ; 469 n 11 ; 488 ; 501 n 15  
Πλατωνικός ..... 497  
πλειών ..... 32 n 89 (4) ; 33 n 90
- \*πλέον ..... 240 n 52
- \*πλήθος ..... 55 n 171 ; 108 n 173 ;  
325 n 46 ; 380 n 263 ; 453 ; 505 n 32  
πληκτρον ..... 46 n 147  
πλημμελώς ..... 263 n 11 ; 378 n 258
- \*πλήν ..... 161 ; 166 n 373 (7) ;  
205 n 119 ; 346 n 132 ; 505 n 34  
πλήρης ..... 265 n 19
- \*πληροῦν ..... 44 n 136 ;  
83 n 62 ; 86 n 72 ; 96 n 126 ;  
105 n 163 ; 191 n 55 ; 199 n 94 ;  
200 n 98 ; 244 n 63 ; 348 n 136
- \*πλήρωμα ... 86 n 75 (3) ; 121 n 211  
πλησιάζειν ..... 248 n 72  
πλησίος ..... 14 n 31
- \*πλούσιος ... 200 n 100 ; 240 n 52  
Πλώπινος ..... 450 n 7
- \*πνεῦμα ..... 24 n 59 (3) ;  
25 n 61. 66 ; 41 n 125 ; 42 n 133 ;  
44 n 137 ; 47 n 148 ; 121 n 209 (4) ; 122 ;  
143-144 ; 179 n 8-9 (= 26 M. 61S.\*\*) ;  
184 n 29-30 ; 185 n 35 ; 197 n 85 ;  
204 n 114 ; 210 n 138 ; 236 n 35 ;  
259 n 2 ; 267 n 25 (1) ; 283 n 94 ;  
360 n 188 ; 375 n 241 ; 498 ; 53,11 Kr.
- πνίγειν ..... 264 n 17
- \*πνιγμός ..... 264 n 17  
πνοή ..... 43 n 136 (2)  
πόα ..... 178 n 4  
ποθεῖν ..... 53 n 165 (6) ; 55 n 174  
πόθεν ..... 151 n 312 ; 189 n 45
- \*πόθος ... 32 n 89 (1) ; 53 n 165 (7)
- \*ποιεῖν ..... 4 n 2 ;  
10 n 26 (17) ; 70 n 12 ; 119 n 202 ;  
166 n 374 ; 184 n 32 ; 187 n 40 ;  
206 n 124 ; 210 n 140 ; 216 n 158 ;  
249 n 78 ; 265 n 21 ; 325 n 46 ;  
349 n 141 ; 383 n 270 ; 391 n 291 ;  
396 n 312 ; 402 n 3 ; 469 n 11-12
- ποίησις ..... 231 n 10  
ποιητής .... 319 n 25 ; 323 n 38 ;  
341 n 108. 111 ; 350 n 143 ; 505 n 34  
ποιητικός ..... 471 n 20  
ποικιλία ..... 297 n 143  
ποικίλος ..... 297 n 143 ; 383 n 270
- \*ποινή ..... 298 n 151 ; 299 n 156  
ποιῶν ..... 263 n 11  
πόλεμος ..... 306 n 180 ; 502 n 20
- \*πόλις ..... 259 n 2 ; 500 n 7  
Πολιτεία .... 372 n 230 ; 451 n 9  
πολιτεύειν ..... 501 n 12
- \*πολλάκις ..... 70 n 12 ; 242 n 57 (1) ;  
243 n 59 ; 244 n 63 ; 402 n 3  
πολλαχού .... 123 n 218 ; 213 n 144  
πολλαχῶς ..... 279 n 83  
πολλός ..... 10 n 26 (7)
- \*πόλος ..... 121 n 209

- πολυαρκής ... 29 n 77 (4); 80 n 49 (2)  
 πολυειδής ... 39 n 115; 269 n 36  
 πολυμερής ..... 383 n 270  
 \*πολύμορφος . 110 n 177 (5); 317 n 15  
 \*πολυποικίλος .....  
 118 n 200 (1); 120 n 204; 297 n 143  
 \*πολύς (πουλός) ..... 12 r 28;  
 86 n 75 (3); 88 n 83a; 99 n 138;  
 110 n 177 (13); 121 n 211; 124 n 221;  
 131 n 246; 132 n 250; 152 n 317;  
 171 n 396 (2); 191 n 55; 217 n 163;  
 252 n 91; 264 n 16; 302 n 168;  
 303 n 170; 415 n 51; 463 n 15  
 πολυσχιδής ..... 391 n 291  
 πολυτίμητος ..... 36 n 104; 443  
 \*πολύφρων ..... 50 n 160  
 \*πολυχεύμων ..... 260 n 4  
 πονεῖν ..... 29 n 77 (3)  
 \*πονηρός .....  
 124 n 221; 264 n 16; 265 n 19;  
 285 n 102; 499 n 4; 509 n 1 (15)  
 ποπνυσμός ..... 250 n 83  
 πορίζειν ..... 187 n 40  
 πόρρω ..... 376 n 249  
 Πορφύριος ..... 9 n 23;  
 10 n 26; 70 n 14; 105 n 163;  
 118 n 197; 182 n 26; 236 n 34;  
 450 n 6-7; 451 n 9; 502 n 18  
 ποταμός ..... 296 n 143; 303 n 171  
 ποτᾶσθαι ..... 111 n 177  
 πότε ..... 273 n 53;  
 303 n 171; 350 n 144; 372 n 230-231  
 \*ποῦς ..... 262 n 10a-d  
 πρᾶγμα ..... 231 n 9  
 πραγμάτεια .....  
 39 n 115; 184 n 32; 204 n 118;  
 207 n 128; 262 n 10g; 464 n 22  
 πραγματεύειν ..... 207 n 128  
 πρακτικός ..... 231 n 9-10  
 πρᾶξις .....  
 229; 231 n 10; 232 n 17; 293 n 132  
 πράττειν ..... 207 n 128; 502 n 18  
 πρέπειν .....  
 .. 96 n 126; 191 n 55; 297 n 145  
 πρεσβεία ..... 327 n 54  
 πρεσβυγενής .....  
 .... 10 n 26 (16); 342 n 113  
 \*πρεσβύτερος .....  
 102 n 151; 319 n 25; 342 n 113  
 \*πρεσβύτερος . 102 n 151; 104 n 158  
 \*πρηστήρ .....  
 ... 118 n 200 (2); 131 n 246 (2)-247a  
 πρηστήριος ..... 132 n 247c  
 \*πρηστηρίς ..... 132 n 247b; 458  
 \*πρηστηροδόχος ..... 121 n 209 (2)  
 \*πρῖν ..... 228 n 1a  
 προάγειν ..... 133 n 254; 450 n 6-7  
 προανούσιος ..... 24 n 58  
 προβαίνειν ..... 52 n 163  
 προβάλλειν ... 145 n 291c; 469 n 12  
 πρόγονος ..... 197 n 82  
 πρόδρομα ..... 317 n 18  
 προεκτυποῦν ..... 317 n 15  
 προέρχεσθαι .....  
 87 n 77; 103 n 152e; 108 n 173;  
 136 n 266; 150 n 309; 151 n 312-313;  
 153 n 320; 180 n 17; 217 J.\*  
 \*προθεῖν ..... 240 n 52; 244 n 63  
 \*προτίεναι ..... 85 n 69; 88 n 83b;  
 93 n 111; 133 n 253; 182 n 26  
 προκαθαίρειν ..... 39 n 115; 228 n 1  
 προκαθαίρεισις ..... 193 n 61  
 προκαθηγεῖσθαι ..... 6 n 11  
 προκαλεῖν ..... 238 n 41; 249 n 79  
 προκατάρχειν ..... 96 n 126  
 Πρόκλος . 69 n 9; 71 n 15; 101 n 149;  
 125 n 225; 451 n 9; 464 n 19  
 προλαμβάνειν .. 108 n 173; 205 n 119  
 προλέγειν ..... 3 n 1  
 προλύειν .....  
 90 n 91; 111 n 178; 117 n 195  
 προμηθεῖσθαι ..... 346 n 132  
 Προμηθεύς ..... 277 n 76  
 προνοεῖν ... 277 n 76; 364 n 203  
 προνοητικῶς ..... 83 n 64  
 πρόνοια ..... 265 n 21; 415 n 56  
 προξενεῖν ..... 187 n 39  
 πρόοδος ..... 84 n 66;  
 93 n 111; 111 n 177; 263 n 11; 483  
 προπαρασκευή ..... 237 n 40  
 πρόπολος ..... 241 n 53  
 \*προπόρευμα .....  
 143 n 287; 255 n 99 (6); 336 n 92  
 \*πρός ..... 124 n 221a;  
 170 n 395 (2); 171 n 396 (1)

- προσαγορεύειν ..... 82 n 59 ;  
 114 n 187 ; 118 n 200 ; 245 n 65 ;  
 322 n 34 ; 509 n 1 (6-7. 10)  
 προσανέχειν ..... 26 n 67  
 προσβολή ..... 369 n 216  
 \*πρόσγειος ..... 289 n 116 (1)  
 προσεικάζειν ..... 297 n 145  
 προσελαύνειν ..... 53 n 165 (2)  
 προσεχής ... 116 n 192 ; 148 n 302  
 προσεχώς ..... 138 n 271  
 προσήκειν ..... 56 n 177 ; 79 n 48 ;  
 104 n 158 ; 384 n 273 ; 503 n 25  
 προσιέναι ..... 262 n 10g  
 προσιστάναι ..... 32 n 89 (7)  
 προσκείσθαι ..... 389 n 288  
 προσκλίνειν ..... 467  
 προσλαμβάνειν ..... 182 n 26  
 προσλάμπειν ..... 98 n 134  
 προσλέγειν .....  
 ... 85 n 70 ; 128 n 236 ; 264 n 17  
 προσομιλείν ..... 287 n 109  
 προσρήγγυσθαι ..... 111 n 177  
 προστάτης .... 231 n 9 ; 503 n 25  
 προστιθέναι ..... 241 n 52 ; 264 n 15  
 προστρέχειν ..... 491  
 προσφέρειν ..... 167 n 376  
 προσφόρος ..... 251 n 84  
 πρόσωπον ..... 248 n 72  
 \*προτεινείν ..... 244 n 63  
 πρότερον ..... 228 n 1a  
 \*προτιθέναι .....  
 110 n 177 (6) ; 317 n 15 ; 330 n 68  
 προτιμᾶν ..... 464 n 19  
 προφαίνειν .. 59 n 186 (6) ; 238 n 41 ;  
 245 n 65 ; 269 n 36 ; 403 n 10  
 προφήτης ..... 273 n 53 ; 443b  
 προφήτις ..... 41 n 125  
 προυπάρχειν ..... 445n  
 προυποκείσθαι ..... 317 n 15  
 \*προχεῖν ..... 83 n 62 ; 84 n 65  
 προχωρεῖν ..... 115 n 191  
 \*πρώτιστα ..... 509 n 1 (2)  
 \*πρώτος .... 45 n 139 ; 63 n 201 ;  
 77 n 38. 40-41 ; 78 n 45 ; 82 n 58 ;  
 83 n 61 ; 84 n 65 ; 87 n 77 ;  
 103 n 152d ; 107 n 170 ; 108 n 173 ;  
 109 n 174 ; 110 n 177 (15) ; 112 n 181 ;  
 113 n 184 ; 123 n 218 ; 127 n 233 ;  
 129 n 240 ; 133 n 255 ; 138 n 270-271 ;  
 140 n 275 (1) ; 141 n 280 ;  
 149 n 305 ; 152 n 314 ; 159 n 350 ;  
 160 n 353 ; 161 ; 189 n 45 ; 210 n 140 ;  
 317 n 14 ; 319 n 25 ; 320 n 26 (2) ;  
 322 n 34 ; 352 n 150 ; 367 n 210 ;  
 368 n 214 ; 395 n 306 ; 405 n 21 ;  
 430 n 109 ; 451 n 9 ; 483-484 ;  
 488 ; 509 n 1 (3. 9. 13) ; 80 B.\*  
 πρατόσπορος ..... 24 n 58  
 πρατουργός ..... 128 n 236  
 \*πτερόν ..... 212 n 142  
 πτέρωξ ..... 32 n 89 (10)  
 Πυθαγόρας ..... 69 n 10 ; 216 n 157  
 Πυθαγόρειοι .... 109 n 174 ; 395 n 308  
 \*πυκάζειν ..... 241 n 52  
 πύλη ..... 53 n 165 (1)  
 πυνθάνεσθαι ..... 253 n 96  
 \*πύρ ... 17 n 42 ; 18 n 46 (11. 15) ;  
 45 n 139 ; 59 n 186 (5) ; 77 n 41-42 ;  
 78 n 45 ; 81 n 54 ; 83 n 62. 64 ;  
 84 n 65 ; 86 n 75 ; 87 n 76 ;  
 88 n 83a ; 89 n 84 ; 91 n 97-98 ;  
 92 n 100 ; 110 n 177 (4. 14) ;  
 113 n 184 ; 118 n 200 (2) ;  
 119 n 201-202 ; 120 n 205-206 ;  
 121 n 209 (3) ; 124 n 221 ; 127 n 233 ;  
 128 n 235 ; 131 n 246 (2) ; 135 n 260 ;  
 138 n 270 ; 140 n 275 (2). 277-278 ;  
 147 n 297 ; 149 n 305 ; 153 n 320 ;  
 154 n 324 ; 155 n 329 ; 169 n 384 ;  
 171 n 396-398 ; 173 n 406 ; 174 n 407 ;  
 191 n 55 ; 195 n 73 ; 196 n 79-80 ;  
 198 n 88. 90 ; 201-204 ; 204 n 118 ;  
 218 n 167 ; 231 n 9. 12 ; 240 n 52 ;  
 244 n 63 ; 260 n 5. 7 ; 344 n 125 ;  
 405 n 17 ; 411 n 37 ; 429 n 104 ;  
 430-431 ; 491 (9-10. 12) ; 492 ; 80 B.\*  
 πυρά ..... 184 n 32 ; 207 n 127  
 \*πυρήχοχος .. 147 n 296 ; 153 n 320 ; 459  
 \*πυριβριθής ..... 127 n 232 (2) ; 459  
 πυριδρακοντόζωνος ..... 91 n 96  
 \*πυριθαλής .... 87 n 77 ; 91 n 98  
 πύρινος ... 138 n 270 ; 171 n 398 ; 458  
 \*πύριος ..... 77 n 40 ; 113 n 184 ;  
 121 n 209 (4) ; 132 n 250 (3) ;  
 138 n 270 ; 169 n 387 ; 458  
 πυριπλήτης .....  
 ... 91 n 96 ; 95 n 121 ; 241 n 53  
 πυρίπνοος ..... 241 n 53

- πυρίπολος ..... 405 n 20  
 πυρισώματος ..... 405 n 20  
 πυρίφοιτος ..... 241 n 53  
 πυρίως ..... 244 n 63  
 πυρκαϊά ..... 204 n 114  
 \*πυρός ... 18 n 46 (9); 197 n 84;  
 204 n 114; 261 n 7; 405 n 17  
 πύχη ..... 295 n 136  
 \*πῶς .... 189 n 45 (2); 261 n 7
- ρά .... 10 n 26 (10); 114 n 186 (2)  
 ῥᾶδιος ..... 84 n 65  
 \*ῥαίνειν ..... 45 n 139  
 \*ῤέα (ῤετή) ..... 84 n 65; 484  
 ῤεία ..... 84 n 65; 85 n 70  
 \*ῤεθρον (ῤέεθρον) ..... 116 n 192;  
 241 n 53; 302 n 168; 303 n 170  
 \*ῤεῖν ..... 107 n 170;  
 379 n 259; 396 n 312; 475; 491 (2);  
 492; 493 = 290 n 127 Th.\*  
 ῤέπειν ..... 294 n 136  
 ῤεῦμα ..... 43 n 136 (1);  
 266 n 22; 278 n 77; 291 n 126  
 \*ῤευστός ..... 169 n 387;  
 216 n 157; 277 n 72; 303 n 170;  
 383 n 270; 458; 64 (3) S.\*\*  
 \*ῤηγνῶναι ..... 110 n 177 (10);  
 119 n 201; 259 n 2; 288 n 109  
 ῤηθέν ..... 42 n 132  
 \*ῤήμα ..... 136 n 266; 190 n 50 (2)  
 ῤητινή ..... 290 n 117  
 \*ῤητός ..... 57 n 182; 473  
 \*ῤίζα ..... 277 n 75  
 ῤίμφα ..... 29 n 77 (3)  
 ῤική ..... 53 n 166 (1)  
 \*ῤίπτειν ..... 262 n 10b  
 \*ῤοή . 84 n 65; 85 n 70; 143 n 287a;  
 182 n 26; 185 n 35; 268 n 28  
 \*ῤόθος ..... 277 n 72; 458  
 \*ῤοιζαίος ..... 240 n 52 (4); 458  
 \*ῤοιζειν ..... 18 n 46 (10);  
 85 n 69; 110 n 177 (1. 9);  
 404 n 12; 406 n 22; 412 n 43  
 ῤοιζήμα ..... 85 n 69  
 ῤοιζήσις ..... 111 n 177
- \*ῤοίζος ..... 19 n 46; 193 n 63;  
 255 n 99 (5); 256 n 102; 404 n 12  
 ῤοπή ..... 294 n 136  
 ῤοῶδης ..... 296 n 143  
 ῤυή ..... cf. ῤοή  
 ῤύμη . 96 n 130; 154 n 325; 200 n 100  
 \*ῤυποδὸν .. 295 n 137 (3); 298 n 148  
 \*ῤωματικός ..... 248 n 72  
 \*ῤωματός ..... 4 n 2; 313 n 3
- Σαβαῶθ ..... 439 n 137  
 σαδῆιν ..... cf. σφῆζειν  
 σάπφειρος ..... 240 n 78  
 σάρξ ..... 276 n 70  
 σαφέστερα ..... 44 n 137  
 σαφῶς ..... 124 n 221e; 246 n 68  
 \*σβεννῶναι ..... 265 n 18  
 \*σσεαυτόν ..... 195 n 75  
 σεβάζεσθαι .....  
 106 n 164; 250 n 83; 289 n 111  
 σέβειν ..... 12 n 28; 248 n 73  
 σείειν ..... 90 n 95; 296 n 143  
 σειρά ..... 84 n 66;  
 108 n 173; 116 n 192; 123 n 218;  
 183 n 26; 265 n 21; 469 n 12;  
 285 n 109 Th.\*; *contra* : 23, 1 Kr.  
 σεισμός ..... 246 n 67  
 σελαγίζειν ..... 48 n 152 (4)  
 σέλας .....  
 ... 4 n 2; 21 n 52 (2); 204 n 114  
 σεληναῖος ..... 18 n 46 (6);  
 185 n 34; 269 n 36; 47, 23 Kr.\*  
 \*σελήνη ... 17 n 42 (4); 49 n 156;  
 56 n 176; 96 n 126; 123 n 218;  
 140 n 278; 143 n 287-288; 183 n 26;  
 185 n 35; 199 n 95; 243 n 57;  
 279 n 83; 280 n 85; 281 n 89;  
 290 n 120; 296 n 138-139; 459 n 8;  
 481 n 3; 501 n 12; 509 n 1 (11-12)  
 σεληνῖαιος ..... 280 n 85  
 σεληνιακός .....  
 98 n 134; 183 n 26; 272 n 46  
 σεληνόβλητος ..... 272 n 46  
 Σεμέλη ..... 488  
 \*σεμνός ..... 128 n 239;  
 134 n 256 (1); 179 n 8 (3); 240 n 49

- σεμνόνειν ..... 5 n 8 ; 102 n 150  
 \*σή ..... 87 n 78  
 σηκός ... 99 n 138 ; 233 n 20 ; 277 n 72  
 \*σήμα ..... 259 n 3  
 σημείον ..... 242 ; 260 n 3  
 \*\*σήψς ..... 64 (3) S.  
 \*σίγα .....  
 55 n 175 ; 161 n 359 ; 254 n 98  
 \*σιγή ..... 146 n 295 ; 160 n 353  
 σιγμός ..... 250 n 83  
 \*σιγώμενος .....  
 160 n 353 ; 263 n 32. 270 n 65 Th.\*  
 σινδών ..... 40 n 121-122  
 σιωπᾶν .....  
 ... 21 n 52 (5) ; 152 n 316 ; 186 n 38  
 σκάπτειν ..... 262 n 10 ; 437 n 128  
 \*σκιδνασθαι ..... 277 n 73  
 \*σκιρτηδόν .....  
 .... 240 n 52 ; 244 n 63 ; 459 n 4  
 σκληρός ..... 135 n 260  
 \*σκολῖός ..... 295 n 137 (4) ;  
 297 n 147 ; 302 n 168 ; 303 n 170  
 σκολιδᾶς ..... 297 n 147  
 σκοπός . 210 n 140 ; 374 n 241 ; 491 (3)  
 σκοτεινός .. 301 n 163 ; 378 n 258-259  
 σκότος ..... 274 n 57 ; 304 n 173 ;  
 391 n 291 ; 509 n 1 (10) ; 512 n 10  
 σκοτοφεγγής ..... 301 n 163  
 σκοτώδης ..... 304 n 173  
 \*σκύβαλον ..... 213 n 144 ;  
 276 n 70-71 ; 296 n 139 ; 385 n 275  
 σκυλακάγεια ..... 271 n 41  
 \*σμερδάλεος ..... 110 n 177 (11)  
 \*σμηνος ..... 110 n 177 (11)  
 σμικρός ..... 204 n 114 ; 291 n 125  
 \*σός (τέος) ..... 165 n 373 (2. 8. 10) ;  
 170 n 394 ; 255 n 99 (1)  
 \*σοφία .....  
 4 n 2 ; 21 n 52 (7) ; 50 n 160-161 ;  
 255 n 99 (11) ; 291 n 126  
 σοφός ..... 33 n 92 ;  
 48 n 152 (2) ; 200 n 100 ; 287 n 109 ; 483  
 \*σπείρειν ..... 117 n 195 ;  
 191 n 55 (1) ; 343 n 121 ; 501 n 12  
 σπειροδρακοντόζωνον ..... 91 n 96  
 \*σπέρμα .....  
 203 n 114 ; 286 n 23 ; 341 n 108  
 σπερματικός .... 343 n 121 ; 348 n 136  
 \*σπεύδειν ..... 166 n 374 ;  
 170 n 395 ; 171 n 396 (1) ; 173 n 403 ;  
 260 n 5 ; 453 n 18 ; 80B.\*\* ; 64 (1)S.\*\*  
 \*σπινθήρ ..... 179 n 8 (1) ;  
 194 n 67 ; 204 n 114 ; 265 n 18  
 \*σπλάγγιον .....  
 32 n 89 (8) ; 33 n 93 ; 255 n 99 (8)  
 \*σποράδην .... 192 n 59 (4) ; 459 n 4  
 σταθερός ..... 135 n 260  
 \*\*στάσις ..... 197 n 86 ; 64(2)S.  
 στέαρ ..... 291 n 126  
 στερεός ..... 123 n 219 ; 502 n 21  
 \*στερέωμα .....  
 123 n 218-219 ; 135 n 260 ; 222 n 188  
 στέρησις ..... 379 n 259  
 στέφανος ..... 92 n 107  
 \*στήριγμα ..... 34 n 95 ; 255 n 99 (9)  
 \*στηρίζειν .....  
 10 n 26 (3) ; 101 n 147 ; 124 n 221d  
 \*στιβαρηδόν .....  
 192 n 59 (4) ; 195 n 75 ; 459 n 4  
 Στοά ..... 346 n 131  
 \*στοιχείον ..... 57 n 182 ; 70 n 14 ;  
 119 n 203 ; 97 n 131 ; 127 n 232 (5) ;  
 144 n 288 ; 145 n 291 ; 193 n 64 ;  
 199 n 95 ; 217 n 163 ; 268 n 32 ;  
 269 n 36 ; 276 n 70 ; 386 n 278  
 στόμα ..... 44 n 137  
 \*στράπτειν . 109 n 175 ; 110 n 177 (12) ;  
 135 n 260 ; 166 n 373 (4) ; 317 n 16  
 στρατεύειν ..... 4 n 2 ; 248 n 72  
 στρατός ..... 24 n 58  
 στρέφειν .....  
 99 n 138 ; 249 n 78-79 ; 354 n 160  
 \*τροφάλιγξ ..... 99 n 138 (4) ;  
 134 n 256 (1) ; 249 n 78 ; 403 n 8  
 \*σύ .....  
 100 n 138 ; 106 n 164 ; 147 n 296 ;  
 165 n 373 (1) ; 171 n 396 (1. 2) ;  
 228 n 1a ; 255 n 99 (4. 6. 9)  
 συγγενής ..... 355 n 166 ; 501 n 15  
 σύγγραμμα ..... 71 n 14 ;  
 245 n 64 ; 451 n 9 ; 505 n 34  
 συγγράφειν ..... 5 n 8  
 συγκαταβαίνειν ..... 24 n 59  
 συγκατορθοδόν ..... 248 n 72  
 συγκεῖσθαι ..... 5 n 8 ;  
 105 n 163c ; 269 n 36 ; 276 n 70



- συγκλείειν ..... 333 n 74  
 συγκληροῦν ..... 131 n 247  
 συγκολλᾶν ..... 274 n 62  
 συγκρίνειν ..... 127 n 233  
 συγκροτεῖν ..... 502 n 20  
 συγχρᾶν ..... 47 n 148  
 συγχεῖν ..... 378 n 258  
 σύγχυσις ..... 70 n 13  
 σύζυγος ..... 343 n 119  
 \*συλλαμβάνειν .....  
 143 n 288; 155 n 334; 260 n 5  
 \*συλλέγειν .... 182 n 28; cf. 47,17 Kr.  
 συμβολικῶς ..... 250 n 83  
 \*σύμβολον .... 119 n 201; 191 n 55;  
 192 n 56. 58; 216 n 157;  
 256 n 102; 292 n 129; 470 n 17  
 συμβουλή ..... 109 n 173  
 συμμετρεῖν ..... 152 n 314  
 σύμμετρος ..... 345 n 130  
 συμπάθεια ..... 290 n 121  
 συμπαθεῖν ..... 290 n 120  
 συμπαθής ..... 290 n 120; 355 n 166  
 σύμπτas ..... 119 n 203;  
 347 n 135; 356 n 170; 386 n 278  
 συμπάσχειν ..... 265 n 20  
 συμπεραίνειν ..... 90 n 91  
 συμπεριάγειν ..... 96 n 130  
 συμπίπτειν ..... 259 n 2; 260 n 5  
 συμπληροῦν ..... 57 n 182;  
 71 n 14; 253 n 93; 499 n 4  
 συμπολιτεύεσθαι ..... 212 n 143  
 συμφωνία ... 69 n 10; 350 n 143  
 συμφώνως ..... 125 n 225  
 \*σύν ..... 79 n 47; 127 n 232 (5)  
 \*συνάγειν .....  
 50 n 161; 150 n 309; 220 n 177;  
 255 n 99 (11); 350 n 144; 469 n 12  
 συναγωγή ..... 9 n 23  
 συναγωγός ..... 93 n 111  
 \*συναθροίζειν ..... 255 n 99 (3)  
 συναίτιος ..... 462  
 συνανιέναι ..... 210 n 138  
 συναποκατάστασις ..... 402 n 3  
 συνάπτειν ..... 144 n 291 a.k.;  
 224 n 194; 304 n 173; 220 J.\*  
 συναρπάζειν ..... 327 n 55  
 συναυξάνειν ..... 145 n 291d  
 \*συναυξάνειν ..... 266 n 23  
 συναφή ..... 375 n 241  
 συνδεῖν .....  
 150 n 309; 308 n 186; 358 n 151  
 \*συνδέσμιος .... 127 n 233; 128 n 235  
 συνδεσμός . 345; 346 n 130; 347 n 134  
 \*συνδετικός .....  
 128 n 239; 179 n 8 (3); 347 n 134  
 συνδιάγειν ..... 224 n 195  
 συνεκτικός .....  
 .... 108 n 173; 155 n 333; 483  
 \*συνέμπορος ..... 32 n 89 (2)  
 \*συνέχειν .... 18 n 46 (8); 82 n 59;  
 93 n 111; 108 n 173; 117 n 195;  
 129 n 240 (SWk.\*\*); 131 n 245. 247;  
 150 n 308; 346 n 132; 347 n 135;  
 348 n 137; 352 n 151; 420 n 75  
 συνήθης ..... 37 n 110  
 συνηνώσθαι ..... 79 n 47  
 συνθήκη ..... 231 n 9; 232  
 \*σύνθημα ..... 190-192;  
 194 n 72; 196 n 80; 252 n 92;  
 438 n 132; 439; 469 n 12; 470-471  
 συνθλίβειν ..... 59 n 186 (5)  
 συνιέναι ..... 106 n 165  
 συνιστάναί .....  
 109 n 174; 182 n 24; 224 n 195;  
 229 n 3; 236 n 35; 289 n 113;  
 290 n 120; 292 n 129; 464 n 20  
 \*συννήχεσθαι ..... 182 n 26  
 \*συνοχεύς . 41 n 127; 82 n 58; 83 n 62;  
 117 n 195; 129-132; 148 n 302;  
 155 n 331. 333-334; 224 n 195;  
 348 n 137; 458; 483; 485 n 6  
 συνοχή ..... 108 n 173  
 \*συνοχηῖς ..... 109 n 173  
 συνοχικός .... 108 n 173; 132 n 247c  
 συντεκταίνεσθαι ..... 182 n 24  
 συντιθέναι ..... 232 n 14; 476  
 συνφδεῖν .....  
 79 n 48; 80 n 50; 16,12 Kr.\*  
 \*σύρειν ..... 118 n 200 (2);  
 294 n 133 (2); 475; 34,17 Kr.  
 Συριανός ..... 69 n 10; 464 n 19  
 συρμός ..... 303 n 171  
 συρφετός ..... 186 n 38

- σύστασις ..... 228-239  
 συσπικά ..... 229 n 6  
 σύστοιχος ..... 70 n 14 ; 236 n 37  
 συστρατεύειν ..... 4 n 2 ; 248 n 72  
 συστροφή ..... 17 n 42 (7)  
 σφαίρα ..... 97 n 130 ; 98 n 134 ;  
 154 n 321 ; 223 n 191 ; 249 n 78 ;  
 255 n 98 ; 280 n 85 ; 294 n 135 ;  
 377 n 253 ; 378 n 256 ; 397 n 318 ; 484  
 σφαιρηδός ..... 21 n 52 (2)  
 σφαιρικός ..... 249 n 78 ; 446o  
 σφιγγειν ..... 350 n 144  
 σφοδρός ..... 166 n 374  
 \*σφοδρότης ..... 166 n 373 (5)  
 σχέσις ..... 261 n 8 ; 499 n 4  
 \*σχῆμα .....  
 109 n 173 ; 124 n 221 ; 249 n 78 ;  
 252 n 91 ; 291 n 126 ; 34,17 Kr.  
 \*σώζειν .....  
 85 n 70 ; 145 n 291k ; 169 n 387 ;  
 172 n 402 (2) ; 194 n 67 ; 214 n 151 ;  
 216 n 157 ; 350 n 143 ; 373 n 236  
 \*σῶμα .....  
 17 n 44 ; 32 n 89 (9) ; 33 n 94 ;  
 44 n 137 ; 85 n 70 ; 110 n 177 (10) ;  
 115 n 190 ; 119 n 201. 203 ;  
 120 n 205 (2) ; 125 n 225 ;  
 138 n 270 ; 169 n 387 ; 170 n 395 ;  
 172 n 403 (3) ; 178 n 7 ; 181 n 22 ;  
 182 n 24-25 ; 187 n 39-40 ;  
 188 n 42 ; 189 n 45 (2) ;  
 194 n 66-67 ; 198 n 88 (3) ;  
 199 n 95 ; 205 n 119-122 ;  
 206 n 124-125 ; 214 n 148 ;  
 216 n 157 ; 217 n 162 ; 228 n 1 ;  
 246 n 68 ; 265 n 20 ; 276 n 70 ;  
 277 n 72-75. 77 ; 278 n 80 ; 294 n 136 ;  
 296 n 139 ; 303 n 171 ; 304 n 173 ;  
 317 n 16 ; 353 n 157 ; 356 n 169 ;  
 391 n 291 ; 396 n 312 ; 450 n 8 ;  
 453 n 18 ; 475 ; 501 n 12 ; 502 n 21  
 \*σωματικός .. 96 n 126 ; 123 n 218-219 ;  
 206 n 124 ; 246 n 68 ; 402 n 3  
 σωματικῶς ..... 266 n 21  
 σωματοειδής .... 93 n 111 ; 120 n 206  
 Σώπατρος ..... 69 n 8  
 σωστικός ..... 348 n 137  
 σωτήρ ..... 216 n 157  
 σωτηρία .....  
 188 n 43 ; 216 n 157 ; 352 n 151  
 σωτήριος .....  
 147 n 296 ; 188 n 43 ; 216 n 157  
 σώειν ..... cf. σώζειν  
 τάγμα ..... 15 n 36  
 \*ταλαεργός ..... 273 n 55  
 τάλαις ..... 39 n 116  
 ταμίας .. 103 n 154 ; 154 n 324 ;  
 155 n 329 ; 402 n 7 ; 411 n 37  
 \*ταναός ..... 99 n 137-138 ;  
 100 n 139 ; 166 n 373 (6) ; 169 n 385  
 \*τάξις ..... 14 n 31 ;  
 50 n 160 ; 56 n 177 ; 79 n 48 ;  
 87 n 77 ; 99 n 137-138 ; 108 n 173 ;  
 117 n 195 ; 132 n 249 ; 133 n 254 ;  
 136 n 266 ; 137 n 267 ; 139 n 274 ;  
 146 n 295 ; 148 n 302 ; 149 n 303 ;  
 150 n 309 ; 160 n 351 ; 189 n 45 ;  
 190 n 47 ; 214 n 148. 150 ; 220 n 173 ;  
 223 n 192 ; 245 n 64-65 ; 255 n 98 ;  
 262 n 10a.g. ; 263 n 11 ; 268 n 32 ;  
 274 n 62 ; 283 n 92 ; 318 n 21 ;  
 345 n 130 ; 347 n 134 ; 350 n 143 ;  
 352 n 151 ; 356 n 171 ; 475 ; 481 n 3  
 ταπεινός ..... 260 n 4 ;  
 493 ; 54,21 Kr. = 290 n 127 Th.\*  
 ταράττειν ... 378 n 257 ; 379 n 262  
 \*ταρσός .. 149 n 305 ; 255 n 99 (7)  
 Τάρταρος .. 281 n 89 ; 304 n 173 ;  
 308 n 186 ; 378 n 257-259 ; 386 n 278  
 \*τάσις ..... 124 n 221  
 τάττειν ..... 124 n 221d ; 142 n 287 ;  
 265 n 20 ; 278 n 81 ; 296 n 139 ;  
 421 n 79 ; 500 n 7 ; 221 J.\*  
 ταύρειος ..... 249 n 78  
 τάχιστα ..... 173 n 403  
 \*τάχος ..... 172 n 403 (1)  
 \*ταχύς ..... 96 n 126  
 \*τε ..... 84 n 65 ; 86 n 75 (2) ;  
 96 n 126 ; 99 n 138 (3-4) ; 102 n 151 ;  
 110 n 177 (3. 12) ; 119 n 201 ;  
 121 n 209 (1) ; 143 n 287 ; 144 n 291a ;  
 172 n 403 (4) ; 181 n 22 ; 182 n 26 ;  
 192 n 59 (2) ; 255 n 99 (8. 11) ;  
 267 n 25 (2. 4) ; 271 n 41 ; 64 (2-3) S.\*\*  
 \*τεινειν .....  
 118 n 200 (4) ; 166 n 373 (10) ;

- 171 n 397; 262 n 10 (a. c. d.);  
351 n 150; 370 n 221; 373 n 232  
τείρα . . . . . 21 n 52 (4); 294 n 135
- \*τέκνον  
... 24 n 59; 298 n 152; 299 n 154  
τεκνοῦν . . . . . 352 n 151  
τέκος . . . . . 24 n 59 (2)
- \*τελέθειν . . . . . 42 n 132
- \*τελεῖν . . . . . 106 n 165;  
145 n 291d; 149 n 305; 178 n 4;  
187 n 41; 196 n 79; 204 n 118;  
211 n 140; 228 n 1; 238 n 41;  
261 n 7; 386 n 278; 488; 495-496  
τελειότης . . . . . 211 n 141  
τέλειος . . . . .  
108 n 173; 211 n 141; 444d; 492  
τελεσιουργία . . . . . 461 n 4  
τελεσιουργικά . . . . . 291 n 122  
τελεσιουργός . . . . . 484  
τελεστής . . . . .  
.. 69 n 8; 445l; 446; 495-496  
τελεστικός . . . . .  
... 3 n 1; 149 n 303; 152 n 317;  
178 n 4; 189 n 45; 190 n 49;  
220 n 173; 239 n 44; 247; 260 n 7;  
263 n 11; 291 n 122; 495-496
- \*τελετάρχης . . . . . 134 n 256;  
138 n 271; 148; 149 n 304;  
155 n 334; 234 n 27; 484; 485 n 6  
τελεταρχικός . . . . . 134 n 256
- \*τελετή . . . . .  
... 6 n 11; 149 n 303; 170 n 395;  
178 n 4; 187 n 41; 196 n 80;  
205 n 119; 210 n 140; 228 n 1;  
231 n 9; 237 n 40; 238 n 41;  
240 n 50; 245 n 65; 264 n 15;  
362 n 198; 415 n 51; 445 k-l
- τελευταῖος . . . . . 372 n 229  
τελευτῶν . . . . . 211 n 140; 362 n 199  
τελευτή . . . . . 109 n 174  
τελέως . . . . . 197 n 86
- \*τέλος . . . . . 80 n 51;  
90 n 91; 108 n 173; 110 n 177 (3);  
204 n 118; 210 n 140; 237 n 39;  
266 n 23; 362 n 199; 374 n 241
- \*τέμνειν . . . . . 106 n 165; 317 n 16  
τέρας . . . . . 294 n 135  
τέρην . . . . . 24 n 59 (2)  
\*τέρμα . . . . . 33 n 92; 108 n 173
- τέσσαρα . . . . .  
119 n 203; 144 n 288; 199 n 95;  
276 n 70; 386 n 278; 509 n 1 (2)
- τέταρτος . . . . . 509 n 1 (5. 15)
- τετραπρόσωπος . . . . . 94 n 111  
τετράρχης . . . . . 231 n 9; 234 n 28  
τετράστοιχος . . . . . 143 n 288
- \*τεύχειν . . . . . 125 n 225  
τεχνάζειν . . . . . 290 n 121  
τεχνᾶσθαι . . . . . 10 n 26 (10); 114 n 186 (2)
- \*τέχνασμα . . . . . 55 n 175; 254 n 98  
τέχνη . . . . .  
253 n 96; 270 n 37; 286 n 105;  
289 n 113; 292 n 127; 451 n 9;  
461 n 4; 464; 465 n 23; 477; 496  
τεχνικός . . . . . 256 n 104; 501 n 12
- \*τεχνίτης . . . . . 113 n 184  
τῆδε . . . . . 260 n 5
- \*τήλοσε . . . . . 172 n 403 (1)
- \*τιθέναι . . . . . 32 n 89 (8); 124 n 221;  
138 n 271; 148 n 302; 179 n 8 (3);  
248 n 72; 362 n 199; 377 n 253; 488  
τιθηνεῖν . . . . . 10 n 26 (9); 114 n 186  
τιθήνη . . . . . 297 n 145
- \*τίκτειν . . . . . 43 n 136 (7);  
103 n 152e; 263 n 14; 383 n 270  
τίμαιος . . . . . 70 n 12; 181 n 22;  
325 n 46; 384 n 274; 451 n 9  
τιμᾶν . . . . . 9 n 23  
τιμή . . . . . 29 n 76  
τίνυσθαι . . . . . 299 n 156
- \*τις . . . . .  
92 n 101; 115 n 191; 120 n 205 (1);  
125 n 225; 165 n 373 (1. 3);  
167 n 376; 189 n 45 (1);  
200 n 100; 202 n 106; 261 n 7;  
277 n 77; 293 n 132; 296 n 141-142;  
317 n 15-16; 319 n 25; 322 n 34;  
334 n 79; 346 n 132; 366-367;  
368 n 212; 372 n 230-231; 379 n 251;  
421 n 79; 445 h-i; 447q; 474-475;  
488-489; 497; 500 n 7; 504 n 32
- \*τιταίνειν . . . . . 11 n 26; 240 n 52  
Τιτᾶνες . . . . . 482 n 5; 484  
Τιτηνίς . . . . . 53 n 165 (3)
- \*τιμῆσις . . . . . 107 n 168; 261 n 7
- \*τοι . . . . . 84 n 65  
τοιγάρτοι . . . . . 26 n 67 (5)

- τοίως ..... 97 n 131  
 τοιδῶσδε ..... 289 n 111  
 τοκεύς ..... 24 n 58  
 τόλμα ..... 255 n 98  
 τολμᾶν ..... 59 n 186 (6)  
 \*τολημηρός .... 55 n 175 ; 254 n 98  
 \*τομή .....  
 33 n 93 ; 107 n 168 ; 109 n 175 ;  
 166 n 373 (4) ; 255 n 99 (8) ; 317 n 16  
 \*τοξεύειν ..... 241 n 52  
 τόξον ..... 242 n 54  
 τοπάζειν ..... 319 n 25  
 \*τόπος .....  
 ... 73 n 27 ; 89 n 84 ; 94 n 112 ;  
 124 n 221d ; 160 n 353 ; 213 n 144 ;  
 223 n 191 ; 231 n 9 ; 255 n 98 ;  
 259 n 2 ; 260 n 5 ; 279 n 83 ;  
 281 n 89 ; 283 n 94 ; 296 n 138-139 ;  
 298 n 153 ; 308 n 186 ; 328 n 57 ;  
 378 n 256. 258 ; 483 ; 488  
 τορός ..... 291 n 124  
 τοσόσδε ..... 48 n 152 (6)  
 \*τότε ..... 242 n 57 (2)  
 Τραιανός ..... 5 n 3. 8  
 τρανώς ..... 384 n 274  
 \*τρεῖς ..... 105 n 163 ;  
 106 n 165 ; 109 n 174 ; 123 n 218 ;  
 132 n 247c-250 (3) ; 133 n 255 ;  
 136 n 266 ; 137 ; 363 n 203 ; 482-485  
 τρέπειν ..... 500 n 5  
 \*τρέφειν ..... 147 n 296 ; 160 n 355  
 \*τρέχειν ..... 255 n 99 (5)  
 τριαδικός ..... 108 n 173  
 \*τριάς ..... 83 n 62 ;  
 95 n 121 ; 105 n 163 ; 106 n 164 ;  
 107 n 170 ; 108 n 173 ; 109 n 174 ;  
 115 n 191 ; 116 n 195 ; 131 n 246 ;  
 133 n 253. 255 ; 143 n 291 ; 144 n 291 ;  
 150 n 309 ; 179 n 8 ; 395 n 308 ; 483-485  
 τρίβος ..... 23 n 57  
 \*τριγλώχις ..... 192 n 59 ; 193 n 65  
 τρίγωνος ..... 249 n 78  
 τρικάρηνον ..... 91 n 96  
 τρίκωλον ..... 491  
 τρικάρυμβος ..... 193 n 65  
 τριμερής ..... 193 n 65  
 τρίμορφος ..... 91 n 96  
 τριοδίτις ..... 95 n 122 ; 241 n 53  
 τριοβχος ..... 106 n 164  
 τριπρόσωπος ..... 93 n 111  
 \*τρίπτερος ..... 150 n 309  
 τρίς ..... 197 n 85  
 \*τρίτος ..... 10 n 26 (17) ;  
 102 n 152b ; 124 n 221 ; 138 n 271 ;  
 140 n 275 ; 141 n 280 ; 149 n 305 ;  
 179 n 8 (2) ; 484 ; 509 n 1 (15)  
 τριχῆ ..... 133 n 255 ; 396 n 312  
 τριχθά ..... 106 n 165  
 τρίχρωμος ..... 291 n 126 ; 292 n 129  
 τριχῶς ..... 499 n 4  
 τρόπος ..... 217 n 163 ;  
 228 n 1 ; 502 ; 509 n 1 (11)  
 \*τροφή ..... 160 n 355  
 τρόφιμος ..... 503 n 25  
 \*τροχάζειν ..... 84 n 65 ; 115 n 191  
 τρόχασμα ..... 241 n 53  
 τρυγώδης ..... 384 n 273  
 τρύξ .....  
 276 n 71 ; 379 n 259 ; 385 n 275-276  
 τυγχάνειν ..... 3 n 1 ;  
 25 n 65 ; 32 n 89 (5) ; 56 n 177 ;  
 384 n 273 ; 402 n 5 ; 499 n 4  
 τώνη ..... 24 n 59 (1)  
 \*τύπος ..... 10 n 26 (11) ;  
 59 n 186 (4) ; 110 n 177 (6) ;  
 114 n 186 (3) ; 119 n 201 ;  
 140 n 277 ; 241 n 53 ; 317 n 15  
 \*τυποῦν ..... 53 n 165 (5) ; 244 n 63  
 τυτθός .....  
 21 n 52 (3) ; 53 n 165 (7) ; 126 n 228  
 ὄβριστής ..... 246 n 17  
 ὄγισια ..... 292 n 126 ; 501 n 14  
 ὄγιης ..... 216 n 158  
 \*ὄγρος .....  
 ... 183 n 26 ; 271 n 41 ; 377 n 253  
 ὄδρηλός ..... 89 n 89  
 \*ὄδροβατήρ ..... 267 n 26 ; 458  
 \*ὄδωρ ..... 119 n 202 ;  
 124 n 221 ; 377 n 253 ; 383 n 272  
 διός ..... 3 n 1 ; 52 n 163  
 \*ὄλαϊος .....  
 .. 89 n 84 ; 123 n 218 ; 131 n 246 ;

- 133 n 255 ; 136 n 266 ; 138 n 270 ;  
153 n 317. 320 (2) ; 154 n 322. 325 ;  
270 n 37 ; 279 n 83 ; 483
- ὄλαρχης ... 148 n 302 ; 234 n 27 ; 459
- \*ὄλη .....  
10 n 26 (10) ; 112 n 179 ; 113 n 184 ;  
114 n 186 (2) ; 117 n 198 ; 118 n 200 (1) ;  
119 n 203 ; 120 n 204 ; 125 n 226 ;  
133 n 254 ; 144 n 288 ; 149 n 305 ;  
178 n 4 ; 189 n 45 ; 213 n 144 ;  
214 n 151 ; 231 n 9 ; 238 n 41 ;  
246 n 68 ; 263 n 14 (2) ; 265 n 19 ;  
267 n 25 (4) ; 276 n 70-71 ;  
277 n 77 ; 284 n 97 ; 290 n 120 ;  
291 n 125 ; 294 n 136 ; 296 n 138-139 ;  
296 n 143 ; 302 n 168 ; 303 n 170 ;  
304 n 173. 175 ; 306 n 180 ;  
308 n 186 ; 317 n 17 ; 318 n 21 ;  
333 n 74 ; 341 n 108 ; 352 n 151 ;  
378 n 256-258 ; 379 n 260. 262 ;  
383 n 270. 272 ; 384 n 273-274 ;  
385 n 275-276 ; 386 n 278 ; 389 n 288 ;  
391 n 291-292 ; 450 n 6 ; 461 ;  
468 n 9 ; 495 ; 502 n 18 ; 64 (1) S.\*\*
- ὄλικός ..... 42 n 132-133 ; 138 n 270 ;  
162 n 365 ; 178 n 4 ; 194 n 66-67 ;  
213 n 144 ; 274 n 62 ; 283 n 94 ;  
287 n 109. ; 296 n 138-139 ;  
304 n 173. 176 ; 383 n 270 ;  
391 n 291 ; 499 n 3 ; 502 n 18. 21
- \*ὄλωδης ..... 132 n 250 (3)
- \*ὄμεις ..... 246 n 68 (1)
- \*ὄμενώδης ..... 120 n 205 (3). 207
- \*ὄμην .....  
43 n 136 (5) ; 92 n 101 ; 120 n 207
- ὄμνεῖν ..... 102 n 151 ;  
103 n 153 ; 105 n 163 ; 137 n 267 ;  
183 n 27 ; 265 n 21 ; 464 n 22
- ὄμνος ..... 24 n 58 ; 36 n 104 ;  
52 n 163 ; 159 n 351 ; 185 n 35 ;  
233 n 19 ; 437 n 26 ; 445i ; 491 (1)
- ὄπαγορεύειν ..... 53 n 166
- ὄπαρξίς .....  
129 n 240 ; 132 n 247c ; 280 n 84 ; 483
- \*ὄπάρχειν ..... 17 n 42 (2. 11) ;  
24 n 59 (2) ; 78 n 45 ; 113 n 183 ;  
129 n 240 ; 166 n 373 (11) ;  
167 n 379 ; 317 n 15. 17 ; 333 n 74 ;  
341 n 109 ; 377 n 253 ; 509 n 1 (4)
- \*ὄπαυγος .. 267 n 25 (2) ; *contra* 10,4 Kr.
- ὄπεζωκός .. 92 n 100 ; 121 n 209 (3)
- \*ὄπεζωκῶς ..... cf. ὄποζωννύται
- ὄπειροχος ..... 26 n 67 (2)
- ὄπέρ .....  
78 n 45 ; 138 n 270 ; 216 n 157 ;  
222 n 187-188 ; 236 n 37 ; 262 n 10c
- ὄπέραγνος ..... 214 n 151
- ὄπεράνω ..... 17 n 42
- \*ὄπερβάθμιος .... 262 n 10 a-d ; 459
- ὄπερβαίνειν ..... 212 n 143
- ὄπερβάλλειν ..... 191 n 55
- ὄπέργειος ..... 154 n 322
- ὄπερέχειν ... 245 n 65 ; 327 n 54
- ὄπερήνωται ..... 78 n 45
- ὄπερήπλωται ..... 78 n 45
- ὄπερήρπασται ..... 78 n 45
- ὄπεριδρῶειν ..... 137 n 267
- ὄπερκεῖσθαι ..... 10 n 26 (7)
- ὄπερκόσμιος .....  
... 151 n 131 ; 328 n 58 ; 458
- \*ὄπέρκοσμος .....  
... 77 n 40 ; 159 n 351 ; 458
- ὄπερορᾶν ..... 194 n 67
- ὄπερόριος .....  
138 n 270 ; 428 n 100 ; 444f ; 445k
- ὄπερουράνιος .....  
18 n 46 (1) ; 83 n 64 ; 151 n 312 ;  
322 n 34 ; 328 n 57-58 ; 483
- ὄπερούσιος ..... 483
- ὄπερπέτεσθαι ..... 291 n 126
- ὄπέρτερος ..... 21 n 52 (7)
- ὄπερφορνεῖν ..... 12 n 28
- ὄπερφυής ..... 217 n 163 ;  
255 n 98 ; 353 n 157 ; 457 n 1
- ὄπεστρωμένος ..... 247 n 69a
- ὄπηρετεῖν ..... 29 n 76 ;  
58 n 184 ; 232 n 14 ; 269 n 35
- ὄπηρέτης ..... 163 n 365
- \*ὄπνοῦν ..... 203 n 114
- \*ὄπο .....  
198 n 88 (3) ; 212 n 143 ; 255 n 99 (1)
- ὄποβαίνειν .. 123 n 218 ; 189 n 45 (2)
- ὄποβρύχιος ..... 277 n 76
- ὄπόγειος .....  
259 n 2 ; 509 n 1 (13) ; 510 n 2
- ὄποδεικνύται ..... 298 n 153
- ὄποδέχεσθαι .... 93 n 111 ; 132 n 247c
- ὄποδοχή ..... 297 n 145

\*ὕποζωννύουαι . . . . . 92 n 101-102 ;  
136 n 266 ; 484 ; 485 n 6  
ὕπόθεσις . . . . . 71 n 14 ;  
152 n 317 ; 292 n 126 ; 445 l-m ; 446o  
\*ὕποκεισθαι . . . . .  
. . . . . 294 n 133 (1) ; 380 n 263 ; 475  
\*ὕποκλίνειν . . . . . 141 n 281  
ὕπολαμβάνειν . . . . . 505 n 32  
ὕπομνημα . . . . . 9 n 23 ; 71 n 14  
ὕποσελήναιος . . . . . 210 n 140  
ὕποσκεπᾶν . . . . . 94 n 114  
ὕποστάθμη . . . . . 276 n 71 ; 380 n 263 ;  
384 n 274 ; 385 n 275-276 ; 386 n 278  
ὕπoστασις . . . . . 224 n 195  
\*ὕποστρωννύουαι . . . . . 119 n 203 ;  
247 n 69a ; 295 n 137 (2) ; 296 n 139  
ὕποσύρειν . . . . . 304 n 173  
ὕποτάττειν . . . . . 509 n 1 (12)  
ὕποτιθέσθαι . . . . . 115 n 190 ; 445m  
ὕποτύπωσις . . . . . 292 n 127 ; 475  
ὕπουράνιος . . . . . 123 n 218 ; 484  
ὕποχθόνιος . . . . .  
. . . . . 269 n 34 ; 289 n 112 ; 298 n 153  
ὕστερος . . . . . 446n  
\*ὕφαινειν . . . . . 127 n 232 (4)  
ὕφηγηματικά . . . . . 123 n 220 ; 125 n 221  
ὕφηγητικά . . . . .  
104 n 156 ; 123 n 220 ; 124 n 221  
\*ὕφιστάναί . . . . . 124 n 221  
199 n 95 ; 292 n 126 ; 501 n 12  
ὕψηλός . . . . . 152 n 317 ; 221 n 179  
ὕψοθεν . . . . . 43 n 136 (1) ; 200 n 100  
\*ὕψος . . . . . 170 n 395 ; 224 n 194  
  
\*φαιινός . . . . . 84 n 65 ;  
86 n 75 ; 87 n 76 ; 132 n 250 (1)  
\*φαινέσθαι . . . . .  
50 n 160 ; 110 n 177 (7) ; 120 n 205 (3) ;  
151 n 312 ; 221 n 183 ; 241 n 53 ;  
242 n 57 ; 248 n 73 ; 317 n 18  
φάναι . . . . .  
133 n 254 ; 138 n 270 ; 170 n 395 ;  
178 n 4 ; 179 n 8 ; 180 n 17 ;  
182 n 26 ; 188 n 43 ; 189 n 45 ;  
192 n 59 ; 194 n 67 ; 200 n 100. 102 ;  
212 n 142 ; 259 n 2 ; 261 n 7 ;  
263 n 11 ; 271 n 41 ; 277 n 76 ;

279 n 83 ; 290 n 120 ; 291 n 126 ;  
296 n 139 ; 298 n 153 ; 302 n 168 ;  
346 n 132 ; 354 n 159 ; 372 n 231 ;  
378 n 257 ; 445 h-i ; 446n ; 499 n 4 ;  
501 n 12 ; 509 n 1 (3. 8. 12. 13)  
φάνης . . . . . 483  
\*φάος . . . . . 88 n 83a ; 89 n 84 ;  
99 n 138 ; 101 n 146 ; 154 n 324 ;  
171 n 396 (1) ; 173 n 406 ; 203 n 114  
φάρυγξ . . . . . 53 n 165 (1)  
φάσκειν . . . . . 461  
\*φάσμα . . . . .  
. . . . . 241 n 53 ; 245 n 64 ; 246 n 68  
φάβλος . . . . . 83 n 64 ; 509 n 1 (15)  
\*φέγγειν . . . . . 261 n 7  
\*φέγγος . . . . .  
119 n 201 ; 127 n 232 (4) ; 136 n 266  
\*φέρειν . . . . .  
11 n 26 ; 18 n 46 (5) ; 39 n 116 ;  
41 n 123 ; 42 n 133 ; 70 n 12 ;  
95 n 121 ; 97 n 130 ; 124 n 221 ;  
152 n 317 ; 166 n 373 (9) ; 255 n 99 (4) ;  
259 n 3 ; 278 n 81 ; 304 n 173 ;  
343 n 122 ; 355 n 166 ; 383 n 272  
\*φέριστος . . . . . 172 n 403 (2)  
\*φεύγειν . . . . . 34 n 95 ; 53 n 166 (2) ;  
55 n 171 ; 172 n 403 (1) ; 212 n 142 ;  
213 n 144 ; 255 n 99 (9) ; 64 (4) S.\*\*  
φθαρτός . . . . . 210 n 138  
φθείρειν . . . . . 217 n 162  
φθορά . . . . . 391 n 291  
φθοροποιός . . . . . 492  
φήμη . . . . . 77 n 43 ;  
114 n 187 ; 134 n 256 ; 151 n 311 ;  
177 n 2 ; 191 n 55 ; 229 n 6 ; 443-447  
φιλανθρωπία . . . . . 24 n 59  
φιλία . . . . . 347 n 134  
φιλοθύτης . . . . . 33 n 91  
φίλος . . . . . 43 n 136 (7) ; 509 n 1 (8)  
φιλοσοφείν . . . . . 378 n 257 ; 478  
φιλοσοφία . . . . . 10 n 26 ;  
105 n 163 ; 191 n 53 ; 292 n 127 ;  
369 n 217 ; 438 n 132 ; 450 n 7  
φιλόσοφος . . . . . 4 n 2 ;  
5 n 4 ; 173 n 403 ; 245 n 64 ; 453  
φιλοσοργία . . . . . 24 n 59  
φιλοσώματος . . . . . 278 n 80  
\*φλέγειν . . . . . 243 n 57

- φλογμός ..... 18 n 46 (2) ; 405 n 17  
 \*φλόξ ..... 83 n 64 ; 166 n 373 (6)  
 φοβείν ..... 293 n 132  
 \*φοβέρος .....  
 ..... 17 n 42 (6) ; 90 n 95 ; 95 n 121  
 \*φόβος ..... 95 n 121 ; 147 n 295  
 Φοίβειος ..... 43 n 136 (1)  
 Φοίβος ..... 21 n 52 (6)  
 φοιτάν ..... 85 n 69 ; 195 n 74  
 φοιτητής ..... 48 n 152  
 \*φόνος ..... 206 n 125 ; 64 (2) S.  
 φορά ..... 142 n 284  
 \*φορεῖν .....  
 .. 110 n 177 (11) ; 142 n 283-284 ; 455  
 φράσσειν ..... 228 n 1  
 φρέαρ ..... 89 π 89  
 \*φρήν .....  
 .. 192 n 59 (3) ; 255 n 99 (1) ; 265 n 18  
 \*φρίσσειν ..... 90 n 94  
 φρονεῖν ..... 278 n 80  
 \*φρουρά .....  
 132 n 247b ; 187 n 39 ; 348 n 137  
 \*φρουρεῖν ..... 131 n 247 ; 349 n 141  
 φρουρητικός ..... 131 n 247 ;  
 135 n 260 ; 348 n 137 ; 484  
 \*φρουρός .. 132 n 247c ; 156 n 336 ; 349  
 φυγή ..... 173 n 403  
 \*φύειν ..... 83 n 64 ; 364 n 204  
 φυλακτήριον ..... 291 n 122  
 φυλάττειν ..... 53 n 165 ; 187 n 39  
 \*φύλον ..... 260 n 4  
 φυσικός ..... 21 n 52 (7) ; 44 n 137 ;  
 187 n 39 ; 280 n 84 ; 353 n 157  
 \*φύσις .....  
 ..... 14 n 31 ; 53 n 165 (4)-166 ;  
 55 n 175 ; 56 n 177 ;  
 59 n 186 (6) ; 84 n 66 ; 90 n 91-92 ;  
 96 n 126 ; 98 n 134. 136 ; 108 n 173 ;  
 172 n 400 ; 183 n 26 ; 186 n 37 ;  
 194 n 67 ; 206 n 124 ; 210 n 138 ;  
 216 n 157 ; 217 n 163 ; 222 n 190 ;  
 246 n 68 ; 254 n 98 ; 263 ; 265 n 20 ;  
 269 n 36 ; 277 n 76 ; 278 n 77 ;  
 302 n 168 ; 318 n 22 ; 352 n 151 ;  
 355 n 166 ; 356 n 170 ; 357 n 174-175 ;  
 362 n 199 ; 378 n 257 ; 402 n 5 ;  
 415 n 56 ; 509 n 1 (9) ; 64 (2) S.\*\*  
 φυτεύειν ..... 231 n 9  
 \*φυτόν .....  
 146 n 293 ; 231 n 9 ; 255 n 99 (2)  
 \*φωνή ..... 15 n 35 ; 43 n 136 (7) ;  
 44 n 137 ; 240 n 52 ; 244 n 63  
 \*φώς .....  
 10 n 26 (8) ; 25 n 61 ; 88 n 83a ;  
 89 n 85 ; 90 n 94 ; 99 n 138 ;  
 101 n 146 ; 119 n 201 ; 145 n 291d ;  
 151 n 311-312 ; 154 n 324-325 ;  
 169 n 384-385 ; 171 n 398 ;  
 186 n 37 ; 188 n 42 ; 192 n 59 ;  
 195 n 75-76 ; 197 n 82 ; 200 n 100 ;  
 223 n 192 ; 231 n 9 ; 240 n 52 ;  
 243 n 58 ; 244 n 63 ; 247 n 69a ;  
 252 n 92 ; 253 n 93 ; 263 n 11 ;  
 274 n 57 ; 278 n 77 ; 301 n 163 ;  
 327 n 55 ; 340 n 105 ; 341 n 109 ;  
 344 n 125 ; 403 n 9 ; 405 n 20 ;  
 409 n 32 ; 459 n 8 ; 469 n 13 ;  
 488 ; 509 n 1 (6. 7) ; 512 n 10  
 φωστήρ ..... 422 n 82  
 φωτίζειν ..... 21 n 52 (4)  
 φωτοειδής ... 245 n 64 ; 431 n 110  
 φωτοκινήτης ..... 405 n 20  
 φωτοκράτωρ ..... 405 n 20  
 χαίρειν ..... 245 n 65  
 \*χαίτα (χαίτη) ..... 90 n 94-95  
 Χαλδαία ..... 286 n 106  
 Χαλδαιικά ..... 68 n 6 ;  
 70 n 14 ; 95 n 122 ; 105 n 163 ;  
 165 n 373 ; 228 n 1c ; 245 n 64 ;  
 291 n 122 ; 293 n 132 ; 443-444 ; 473  
 Χαλδαικώς ..... 138 n 270 ; 221 n 179  
 Χαλδαίοι ..... 5 n 8 ;  
 12 n 28 ; 42 n 131 ; 77 n 38. 42 ;  
 81 n 54 ; 88 n 83 ; 106 n 164 ;  
 118 n 198 ; 123 n 218 ; 124 n 221 ;  
 136 n 266 ; 138 n 270-271 ; 149 n 303 ;  
 150 n 309 ; 151 n 311. 313 ; 180 n 17 ;  
 182 n 26 ; 196 n 80 ; 213 n 144 ;  
 228 n 2 ; 231 n 9 ; 241 n 53 ;  
 251 n 83 ; 273 n 53 ; 279 n 83 ;  
 280 n 84 ; 285 n 102 ; 289 n 111. 113 ;  
 290 n 120 ; 291 n 124-125 ; 292 n 127 ;  
 293 n 132 ; 294 n 133 ; 296 n 139 ;  
 304 n 175 ; 428 n 100 ; 443-446 ;  
 450 n 6 ; 464 n 20-21 ; 475-476  
 Χαλδαίος .....  
 3 n 1 ; 5 n 4 ; 9 n 23 ; 117 n 195. 198 ;  
 138 n 270 ; 178 n 4 ; 179 n 8 ;  
 186 n 38 ; 253 n 96 ; 443 ; 449 ; 452

- \*χαλεπός** ..... 67S.  
**\*χαλινός** ..... 172 n 403 (3)  
 χαλινούσιν ..... 172 n 402 (1)  
 χαλκείον ..... 383 n 272  
 χαλκίς ..... 291 n 124  
 χαλκός ..... 291 n 124  
 χάσος ..... 483  
**\*χαρακτήρ**  
 ... 241 n 53; 249 n 78; 252-254  
**\*χαρίζεσθαι** ..... 110 n 177 (8)  
**\*χάριν** ..... 255 n 99 (6); 336 n 92  
 χάσκειν ..... 372 n 231  
 χεῖν ..... 383 n 270  
**\*χείρ** ..... 92 n 106-107;  
 231 n 9; 288 n 109; 468 n 9  
 χειρὸν ..... 294 n 136  
 Χερουβείμ ..... 15 n 34  
 χερουβικός ..... 15 n 36  
 χεῦμα ..... 260 n 4;  
 493; 54,21 Kr. = 290 n 127 Th.\*  
**\*χήραμα** ..... 88 n 83a  
**\*χθόνιος** ..... 138 n 270; 140 n 275;  
 141 n 280; 172 n 403 (1); 209 n 134;  
 238 n 41; 259 n 3; 265 n 19;  
 267 n 25 (2); 269 n 34; 271 n 41;  
 289 n 112; 296 n 139; 67 S.\*\*  
**\*χθών** ..... 140 n 275 (2). 278;  
 146 n 293; 172 n 402 (2);  
 243 n 57; 255 n 99 (2); 265 n 19;  
 277 n 76; 294 n 133; 298 n 149. 152  
 χιασμός ..... 253 n 93  
 χιτών ..... 39 n 115;  
 43 n 136 (5); 276 n 70; 359 n 180; 483  
 χοϊκός ..... 383 n 270  
**\*χόνδρος** ..... 88 n 83a  
 χορηγεῖν ..... 188 n 42  
 χορός .....  
 ... 23 n 58; 103 n 154; 221 n 179  
 χουός ..... 383 n 270  
 χράν . 26 n 67; 29 n 76; 39 n 115;  
 44 n 137; 56 n 176-177; 136 n 266;  
 207 n 128; 228 n 1; 240 n 49;  
 294 n 133; 509 n 1 (9. 13); 445m  
**\*χρεώ** .....  
 166 n 373 (7); 368 n 213; 64 (4) S.\*\*  
**\*χρή** ..... 35 n 102; 53 n 166 (2);  
 55 n 171; 165 n 373 (1. 5.);  
 171 n 396 (1); 172 n 402 (1);  
 173 n 403; 192 n 59; 222 n 188;  
 228 n 1a; 246 n 68; 270 n 37; 446o  
 χρήσις ..... 16 n 41; 252 n 91  
 χρησμοφδεῖν .. 6 n 10; 192 n 59; 445h  
 χρησμός .....  
 6 n 10; 10 n 26; 14 n 31; 16 n 39;  
 31; 32 n 89 (4); 34; 38 n 112;  
 44 n 136; 108 n 173; 178 n 7; 446o-p  
 χρησμοφδία ..... 6 n 10  
 χρηστήριον ..... 447p  
**\*χρηστός** .... 263 n 14 (2); 286 n 106  
 χρονοάρχης .....  
 104; 231 n 9; 234 n 27; 406 n 25  
**\*χρόνος** .....  
 101 n 149; 102 n 150-152; 104-105;  
 110 n 177 (14); 127 n 232 (3);  
 141 n 280; 152 n 314-315; 159 n 347;  
 317 n 13; 402 n 3; 406 n 25; 483  
 χρουσοειδής ..... 210 n 138  
**\*χρυσός** ..... 10 n 26 (7);  
 207 n 127; 241 n 52; 249 n 78  
 χώρα ..... 93 n 111; 396 n 313  
 χωρεῖν ... 18 n 46 (15); 40 r 118. 120;  
 41 n 123; 96 n 126; 236 n 35  
 χωρίζειν .....  
 ... 14 n 31; 78 n 45; 120 n 206;  
 187 n 39; 194 n 67; 206 n 125;  
 383 n 272; 421 n 79; 459 n 6  
**\*χωρίς** ..... 167 n 379; 500 n 5  
 χωρισμός ..... 188 n 42  
 χωριστός .....  
 101 n 149; 103 n 152; 184 n 32; 487  
**\*χῶρος** .... 172 n 402; 214 n 148;  
 231 n 9; 298 n 148; 378 n 259  
 ψεύδειν ..... 49 n 158  
 ψευδώνυμος ..... 304 n 173  
 ψιλός ..... 330 n 64  
 ψόφος ..... 397 n 318  
**\*ψυχαίος** ..... 179 n 8 (1); 265 n 18  
**\*ψυχή** .....  
 17 n 42 (8); 24 n 59 (3); 44 n 137;  
 84 n 66; 85 n 70; 86 n 75;  
 87 n 76-77; 88 n 83a; 89 n 88;  
 93 n 109. 111; 95 n 119; 98 n 136;  
 116 n 194; 121 n 211; 128 n 238;  
 145 n 291k; 147 n 296; 166 n 373 (10);  
 169 n 388; 171-173; 177 n 2; 178-200;



- 204 n 114 ; 205 n 122. 124; 206 n 125 ;  
 207 n 127 ; 209 n 135 ; 210 n 140 ;  
 212 n 142-143 ; 214 n 148 ; 216 n 157 ;  
 217 n 162 ; 219 n 168 ; 220 n 173. 175 ;  
 222 n 187. 190 ; 224 n 195 ; 236 n 37 ;  
 244 n 63 ; 246 n 68 ; 253 n 93. 96 ;  
 254 n 97 ; 260 n 5 ; 261 n 7 ;  
 263 n 11 ; 264 n 15 ; 265 n 18. 19-20 ;  
 277 n 72. 77 ; 279 n 83 ; 282 ;  
 294 n 133. 136 ; 304 n 173 ; 306 n 180 ;  
 308 n 186 ; 325 n 46 ; 326 n 51 ;  
 353 n 157 ; 354 n 159 ; 356 n 168-170 ;  
 360 n 180. 187 ; 363 n 201 ; 364 n 206 ;  
 370 n 220-221 ; 373 n 233-234 ;  
 374 n 237-241 ; 383 n 270 ;  
 391 n 291 ; 412 n 40 ; 415 n 56 ;  
 421 n 79 ; 422 n 82 ; 439 n 138 ;  
 446n ; 450 ; 452 ; 453 n 18 ;  
 455 ; 468 n 5. 9 ; 469 n 12 ; 475 ;  
 487-488 ; 492 ; 495 ; 499 n 3-4 ;  
 501 n 12 ; 502 ; 503 n 25 ; 504 ;  
 509 n 1 (12. 15) ; 510 n 2 ; 257 W.\*\*
- ψυχικός .....  
 253 n 94 ; 265 n 21 ; 280 n 84
- \*ψυχοκράτωρ ..... 149 n 304 ; 418
- \*ψυχότροφος ..... 197 n 84
- \*ψυχουδν .....  
 48 n 152 (7) ; 85 n 70 ; 87 n 81 ;  
 88 n 83a ; 181 n 19 ; 349 n 141
- ψυχρός ..... 491 (8) ; 492
- ψύχωσις ..... 88 n 83a
- φδῆ ..... 42 n 131 ; 58 n 184
- ώδις ..... 261 n 7
- \*Ωκεανός ..... 362 n 198
- ών ..... 483
- ώρα ..... 10 n 26 (5) ;  
 96 n 126 ; 159 n 346-347 ; 507 n 41
- \*Ωριγένης ..... 505 n 32. 33
- ώρυγμα ..... 298 n 153
- \*ώς ..... 92 n 101 ; 99 n 138 ;  
 115 n 190 ; 165 n 373 (3) ; 172 n 403 (3)
- ώσαύτως ..... 99 n 138
- \*ώστε ..... 132 n 249 (2)

## B) Index latinus

- adiurare (ἐπιδέειν) ..... 286 n 106  
 admonere ..... 236 n 36  
 adsiduus ..... 7 n 16  
 aer (ἄήρ) ..... 236 n 36  
 aeterna ..... 366 n 207  
 aeternitas ..... 403 n 9  
 aevum (αἰών) ..... 402 n 7  
 affirmare ..... 216 n 161  
 affluere ..... 324 n 44  
 ait ..... 451 n 10  
 \*ala (πτερόν) ..... 212 n 142  
 aliquis ..... 403 n 9  
 alligare (καταδεῖν) ..... 286 n 106  
 altitudo (ὕψος) ..... 224 n 194  
 ambitus ..... 77 n 39  
 amicitia ..... 236 n 36  
 anima (ψυχή) .....  
     177 n 3c; 217 n 164; 286 n 106;  
     324 n 44; 325 n 45; 366 n 207;  
     449; 453 n 18; 455 n 26; 487; 492  
 animal (ζῷον) ..... 366 n 207  
 annus ..... 406 n 24  
 Apollo ..... 451 n 10  
 apotheosis .... 177 n 3b; 206 n 125  
 apparere (φαίνεσθαι) ..... 366 n 207  
 aptare ..... 395 n 308  
 ardor ..... 333 n 78  
 Arimanius ..... 424 n 87  
 audere ..... 403 n 9  
 auxiliatrix ..... 366 n 207  
  
 beatus ..... 366 n 207  
 benignus ..... 492  
 boniformis (ἀγαθοειδής) .. 389 n 286  
 bonum ..... 383 n 272  
 bonus (χρηστός) .....  
     ..... 286 n 106 ; 427 n 100  
  
 caelestis ..... 217 n 164  
 caelum .....  
     ..... 196 n 81 ; 217 n 164 ; 221 n 178  
 candor ..... 196 n 81  
 causa ..... 340 n 103  
 Chaldaea (Χαλδαία) .....  
     ..... 286 n 106 ; 427 n 100  
  
 Chaldaei ..... 7 n 16 ; 377 n 252  
 \*coaugere (συναύξειν) ..... 266 n 23  
 cognatio ..... 366 n 207  
 cognoscere ..... 216 n 161  
 cohaerere ..... 346 n 131  
 commemoratio ..... 7 n 16  
 commercium ..... 232 n 15  
 commotio ..... 403 n 9  
 complacere ..... 111 n 177  
 compolitizari (συμπολιτεύεσθαι) .....  
     ..... 212 n 143  
 concedere ..... 286 n 106  
 concipere ..... 41 n 125  
 conformare ..... 384 n 274  
 conqueri ..... 286 n 106  
 conscius ..... 80 n 50  
 consequenter ..... 395 n 308  
 consulere ..... 366 n 207  
 continere ..... 346 n 131  
 convertere ..... 492  
 crater (κρατήρ) ..... 324 n 44  
 creare ..... 340 n 103  
 credere ..... 378 n 256  
 cultor ..... 366 n 207  
 cupido ..... 333 n 78  
  
 daemon (δαίμων) ... 216 n 161; 236 n 36  
 daemoniarques ..... 284 n 97  
 dare ..... 383 n 272  
 deinde ..... 451 n 10  
 deprecari ..... 94 n 117  
 detorquere ..... 333 n 78  
 deus (θεός) .... 111 n 177; 139 n 274;  
     216 n 161; 324 n 44; 325 n 45;  
     340 n 103; 366 n 207; 395 n 308;  
     403 n 9; 424 n 87; 437 n 126  
 dicere ..... 148 n 300;  
     324 n 44; 389 n 286; 403 n 9  
 dies ..... 200 n 97  
 diligentia ..... 366 n 207  
 disciplina (τέχνη) ..... 286 n 105  
 displicere ..... 454 n 21  
 dissolutio ..... 366 n 207  
 dissolubilis ..... 366 n 207  
 divinus ..... 7 n 16; 148 n 300;  
     324 n 44; 366 n 207; 389 n 286

- doctor ..... 454 n 21  
 doctrina ..... 389 n 286  
 doctus ..... 324 n 44  
 duplex ..... 389 n 286  
 dyas (δυάς) ..... 395 n 308  
  
 ea quae patris sunt (τὰ τοῦ πατρός) ...  
 ..... 224 n 194  
 \*effugere (ἐκφεύγειν) ..... 212 n 142  
 elevari ..... 236 n 36  
 Elysium ..... 221 n 178  
 exprimere ..... 148 n 300  
 \*empyrius (ἐμπύριος) ..... 77 n 39-40  
 esse (εἶναι) ..... 196 n 81 ;  
 224 n 194 ; 286 n 106 ; 325 n 45 ;  
 389 n 286 ; 402 n 7 ; 403 n 9  
 essentia ..... 325 n 45  
 exemplarium (παράδειγμα) ..... 389 n 286  
 eximius ..... 366 n 207  
 extimus ..... 77 n 39  
  
 fabricator (δημιουργός) ... 395 n 308  
 facere ..... 7 n 16 ; 492  
 faex (φρόξ) ..... 385 n 275-276  
 \*fatalis (εἰμαρτός) ..... 212 n 142-143  
 \*fatum (εἰμαρμένη) .....  
 266 n 23 ; 49,17 Kr. = 265 n 21L.  
 fecunditas ..... 340 n 103 ; 341 n 110  
 ferre (φέρειν) ..... 41 n 123  
 fieri ..... 177 n 3c ; 212 n 142  
 \*finis (τέλος) ..... 266 n 23 cj L.  
 fixus ..... 402 n 7  
 flamma ..... 168 n 384  
 flectere ..... 304 n 173  
 \*flos (ἄθος) ..... 168 n 382. 384  
 fontanus ..... 94 n 117  
 forma ..... 325 n 45 ; 395 n 308  
 frugifer ..... 252 ; 407 n 26  
 frustrari ..... 286 n 106  
  
 gaudere ..... 77 n 39  
 geminus ..... 324 n 44 ; 366 n 207  
 genus (γένος) ..... 318 n 19  
 grex ..... 212 n 143  
  
 habere ..... 196 n 81  
 Hecata ..... 244 n 60 ; 455 n 26  
 heliodromus ..... 414 n 51  
 Hermes ..... 216 n 161  
 homo ..... 289 n 112 ; 366 n 207  
  
 idealls ..... 395 n 308  
 \*ignis (πῦρ) ..... 168 n 382 ; 492  
 imitari ..... 244 n 60  
  
 immobilis ..... 403 n 9  
 immortalis ..... 177 n 3c ; 324 n 44  
 immotus ..... 402 n 7  
 impeditus ..... 286 n 106  
 impertire ..... 366 n 207  
 incursum ..... 216 n 161  
 inductio (ἀναγωγή) ..... 487  
 inferi ..... 304 n 173  
 inferiora ..... 366 n 207  
 initium ..... 217 n 164  
 insignia ..... 366 n 207  
 instar ..... 378 n 256  
 \*intellectualis (νοερός) ... 77 n 39-40  
 \*intelligere (νοεῖν) ..... 212 n 142  
 intelligibilis (νοητός) .....  
 ..... 79 ; 322 n 36 ; 340 n 105  
 interpretari ..... 451 n 10  
 invidia ..... 286 n 106  
 iter ..... 196 n 81  
 Iuppiter ..... 455 n 26  
 iuxta ..... 366 n 207  
  
 Lactea ..... 196 n 81  
 lex ..... 492  
 liberare ..... 453 n 18 ; 487  
 linea (σινδών) ..... 40 n 122  
 lingua graeca, latina ..... 451 n 10  
 locus (τόπος) .....  
 324 n 44 ; 378 n 256 ; 383 n 272  
 lucidus ..... 389 n 286  
 lumen (φῶς) ..... 304 n 173  
 luna (σελήνη) ..... 148 n 300  
  
 magnus ..... 196 n 81 ; 286 n 106  
 malestas ..... 340 n 103  
 malficus (κακοποιός) ..... 389 n 286  
 malum ..... 383 n 272  
 manere (μένειν) ..... 402 n 7  
 manifestus ..... 196 n 81  
 mansuetus ..... 366 n 207  
 massa ..... 278 n 81 ; 390  
 materia (ὄλη) ..... 346 n 131 ;  
 384 n 274 ; 385 n 276 ; 395 n 308  
 mens ..... 324 n 44 ; 325 n 45  
 metrum ..... 451 n 10  
 metus ..... 286 n 106  
 mille ..... 406 n 24  
 molimen (ἄθλος, ἀγών) ... 286 n 106  
 monas (μονάς) ..... 395 n 308  
 mores ..... 366 n 207  
 mors ..... 206 ; 236 n 36  
 multi ..... 378 n 256  
 \*mundus (κόσμος) .....  
 ... 77 n 39-40 ; 79 ; 322 n 36 ;  
 340 n 105 ; 366 n 207 ; 455 n 26  
 murus ..... 77 n 39  
 mysterium ..... 77 n 43

- nativa* ..... 366 n 207  
*natura* (φύσις) ... 366 n 207 ; 402 n 7  
*nebula* (νεφέλη) ..... 40 n 122  
*nemus* ..... 221 n 178  
*\*neque* (μή) ..... 266 n 23  
*nihil* ..... 266 n 23  
*nomen* ..... 196 n 81  
*notabilis* ..... 196 n 81  
*nox* ..... 200 n 97  
*numen* ..... 41 n 125 ; 286 n 106  
  
*obsequens* ..... 366 n 207  
*obtinere* ..... 324 n 44  
*omne* (πᾶν) ..... 389 n 286  
*omnia* ..... 341 n 110  
*\*opus* (ἔργον) ..... 212 n 142  
*oraculum* ..... 7 n 16 ; 148 n 300  
*ornatus* ..... 362 n 196  
  
*pactum* ..... 232 n 15  
*par* (ἴσος) ..... 378 n 256  
*parere* ..... 341 n 110  
*pars* ..... 77 n 39  
*\*pater* (πατήρ) .....  
    212 n 142 ; 224 n 194 ; 414 n 51 ; cf. *ea.*  
*paternus* (πατρικός) ..... 80 n 50  
*patiens* ..... 41 n 123  
*patrona* ..... 366 n 207  
*paululum* ..... 236 n 36  
*pectus* ..... 41 n 125  
*perdere* ..... 304 n 173  
*perditio* ..... 278 n 81 ; 390  
*perennitas* ..... 402 n 7  
*perfectio* ..... 111 n 177  
*perfectus* ..... 324 n 44  
*perficere* ..... 111 n 177  
*perpetuo* ..... 406 n 24  
*philosophia* ..... 453 n 18  
*Phoebus* ..... 41 n 123  
*Plato* .....  
    ... 77 n 43 ; 389 n 286 ; 437 n 126  
*plenus* ..... 341 n 110  
*Plotinus* ..... 454 n 21  
*ponere* ..... 389 n 286 ; 451 n 10  
*Porphyrius* .....  
    ... 148 n 300 ; 451 n 10 ; 454 n 21  
*poscere* ..... 200 n 97  
*posse* ..... 7 n 16 ; 148 n 300 ;  
    177 n 3c ; 236 n 36 ; 346 n 131  
*postulatum* ..... 286 n 106  
*potens* (δεινός) ..... 286 n 106  
*potentia* (δύναμις) ..... 286 n 106  
*potestas* ..... 77 n 43  
*praebere* ..... 366 n 207  
*praecipue* ..... 244 n 60  
*praecipuus* ..... 304 n 173  
*praegnans* ..... 341 n 110  
  
*praeses* ..... 389 n 286  
*preces* (εὐχαί) ..... 286 n 106  
*primus* ..... 325 n 45 ; 340 n 103  
*princeps* ..... 324 n 44  
*\*principium* (ἀρχή) ..... 148 n 300  
*procreare* ..... 341 n 110 ; 395 n 308  
*profunditas* (βάθος) ..... 224 n 194  
*proprius* ..... 333 n 78  
*providentia* ..... 366 n 207  
*punctum* ..... 111 n 177  
*\*purgare* (καθαίρειν) .....  
    ... 148 n 300 ; 286 n 106  
*purgatio* ..... 177 n 3c  
*putare* ..... 389 n 286  
  
*quartus* ..... 324 n 44  
  
*\*radiatus, cf. septimo*  
*reperere* ..... 418 n 68  
*ratiocinari* ..... 366 n 207  
*rationalis* (λογικός) ..... 366 n 207  
*recludere* ..... 221 n 178  
*reddere* ..... 217 n 164  
*reducere* ..... 492  
*regressus* (ἐπίστροφος) ..... 449  
*res* .....  
    ... 324 n 44 ; 325 n 45 ; 366 n 207  
*reserare* ..... 221 n 178  
*resolvere* ..... 217 n 164  
*respondere* ..... 148 n 300  
*reverendus* ..... 212 n 142  
*revertere* ..... 492  
  
*sacer* (ἄγιος) ..... 286 n 106  
*sacrum* ..... 244 n 60  
*saeculum* (αἰών) ... 406 n 24 ; 407 n 25  
*sedes* ..... 221 n 178  
*semideus* ..... 225 n 196  
*semper* ..... 341 n 110 ; 403 n 9  
*\*septimo radiatus* (ἐπτάκτις) . 200 n 97  
*serenus* ..... 196 n 81  
*sexus* ..... 341 n 110  
*similitudo* ..... 366 n 207  
*sol* (ἥλιος) .. 148 n 300 ; 418 n 68  
*solus* ..... 341 n 110  
*\*sors* (μοῖρα) ..... 212 n 142  
*species* (εἶδος) ..... 318 n 19  
*specus* ..... 304 n 173  
*stabilis* ..... 403 n 9  
*stare* ..... 451 n 10  
*status* ..... 402 n 7  
*subiacere* ..... 385 n 276  
*subiungere* ..... 451 n 10  
*sublimis* ..... 196 n 81  
*substantia* ..... 325 n 45  
*subvehere* ..... 236 n 36

- successus ..... 286 n 106  
 sumere ..... 7 n 16  
 summus ..... 111 n 177  
 superabundans ..... 340 n 103  
 superi ..... 196 n 81  
  
 tacere ..... 7 n 16  
 tactus ..... 286 n 106  
 Tartara ..... 282 n 90  
 Tartareus ..... 304 n 173  
 tectum ..... 196 n 81  
 teleta (τελετή) ..... 148 n 300  
 tempus ..... 111 n 177  
 tenebrosus ..... 389 n 286  
 terra ..... 236 n 36 ; 282 n 90  
 terrenus ..... 385 n 275  
 theurgicus (θεουργικός) .....  
     ..... 177 n 3c ; 289 n 112  
 theurgus (θεουργός) ..... 289 n 112  
 Tonans ..... 196 n 81  
 tonitruum ..... 244 n 60  
 trahere ..... 304 n 173  
 transcendere ..... 236 n 36  
 transferre ..... 437 n 126  
 tres (τρεῖς) ..... 139 n 274  
 trias (τριάς) ..... 395 n 308  
 trivialis (τριποδῆτις) . 95 n 122 ; 241 n 53  
 tueri ..... 216 n 161  
  
 tutela ..... 366 n 207  
 universalis (καθολικός) ... 453 n 18  
 universus ..... 384 n 274  
 unus ..... 111 n 177  
 uterque ..... 341 n 110  
 uti ..... 236 n 36  
  
 valens ..... 286 n 106  
 valetudo (σωτηρία) ..... 216 n 157  
 veneratio ..... 366 n 207  
 verbum ..... 451 n 10  
 versus ..... 437 n 126 ; 451 n 10  
 verus ..... 453 n 18  
 vestitus ..... 362 n 196  
 via ... 196 n 81 ; 453 n 18 ; 487  
 victus ..... 304 n 173  
 videre ..... 304 n 173  
 vir (ἄνθρωπος) ... 286 n 106 ; 427 n 100  
 virgo ..... 94 n 117  
 virtus ..... 221 n 178 ; 366 n 207  
 vis ..... 346 n 131  
 vivere ..... 406 n 24  
 vivus ..... 324 n 44  
 vocare ..... 455 n 26  
 volle ..... 111 n 177 ; 341 n 110  
 voluntarius ..... 206  
 voluntas (βουλή) ..... 80 n 50 ;  
     111 n 177 ; 224 n 194 ; 341 n 110

## C) Index hebraicus

מני ..... 290 n 117  
 צרי ..... 290 n 117

רעא (Aram. and Syr.) ..... 329 n 62  
 רעאל ..... 329 n 62

## Index rerum

- Abammon** .... 273 n 53 ; 463 ; 467  
**ablutions** ..... 178  
**Abraham** ..... 374  
**abyss** . 281 n 89 ; 296-304 ; 503 n 22  
**Achilles** .....  
 184-185 ; 206-208 ; 209 n 134-135  
**Adam** ..... 63 n 201 ; 383 n 270  
**Adonis** ..... 210 n 139  
**Aedesius the Neoplatonist** .... 457 n 1  
**aeon** ..... 20 ; 141 ; 152 ; 402 n 3  
**after-life** ..... 211-226  
**Agapius** ..... 72  
**Agatharchides** ..... 277 n 72  
**Agathias** ..... 282 n 10  
**Agave** ..... 253 n 95  
**Ahriman** ..... 284-288 ;  
 309 ; 387-388 ; 392-393 ; 408  
**Ahura Mazda** .....  
 407-409 ; 412 ; 426 ; 429 ; 430 n 105  
**Alon**  
 chief of the Rulers .. 141 ; 158 ; 252  
 = Chronos .....  
 .... 101-104 ; 141 ; 252 ; 406 n 25  
**Cosmic Soul** ..... 403 n 12  
**cult** ..... 404 n 15 ; 406-409  
**demurge** ..... 404 n 12  
**doorkeeper of the planetary zone** ..  
 ..... 405 n 20  
**ensouled** , by Hecate ... 48 ; 89  
**epiphany** .....  
 ..... 80 n 49 ; 101 ; 230 ; 233 n 20
- [Aion]**  
 executor of the Father's will .. 202  
 Father-begotten light .... 48 ; 89 ;  
 99-101 ; 174-175 ; 201 ; 409 ; 429  
 fiery god ..... 405 ; 412-413  
 frugifer ..... 252 ; 407 n 26  
 function . 100 ; 144 ; 152 ; 405-406  
 god .... 28 ; 104 ; 403 n 11-12  
 god of eternity ..... 38 ;  
 103-104 ; 252 ; 401-402 ; 404-405  
 god of fertillty ..... 426 n 95  
 = Iao ..... 409 n 32  
 infinite time ..... 20 ;  
 127 n 232 ; 230 ; 234-235 ; 404-5  
 midmost ..... 99 n 137 ; 202  
**Mithraic** ..... 406-409  
 noetic monad with a dual aspect ..  
 ..... 100 ; 335  
 noetic planet . 141 ; 144 ; 152 ; 423  
 offspring of the Intellect . 402 n 6  
 personification of the zodiac .....  
 ..... 406 n 21  
 platonic ..... 104 n 158 ; 402-404  
 position in the noetic hierarchy ...  
 ..... 82 ; 100 n 143 ; 202  
 regulator ..... 141-142 ; 405-406  
 revolution of Aion ..... 403 n 9  
 ruler of initiation .. 417-425 ; 455  
 rules the Empyrean world .... 141  
 rules the intelligible world .....  
 ..... 144 ; 403 n 9  
 ruling power ... 27 ; 149 ; 405-406  
 source and lord of the sun .....  
 .. 152 n 314 ; 153 ; 155 ; 201-202  
 transmitter of the mystic fire  
 ..... 21 ; 149 ; 161 ; 201

air ..... 45 ;  
 139-140 ; 143 ; 235-236 ; 249 ; 268 ;  
 271 ; 292 ; 430 n 108 ; 502 n 21

Albinus .....  
 315-316 ; 321 ; 325 n 45-49 ; 353

alchemists ..... 301 n 163 ; 363 n 203

Alexander Pseudomantis ..... 457 n 1

Alexandria ..... 314 n 6 ; 342 n 112

All ..... 116 ; 160

altar ..... 293

ambivalence ..... 272 ;  
 286 n 105 ; 355 ; 365 ; 406 n 24

Amesha Spentas ..... 338 n 96 ; 408 n 29

Ammonius Saccas .....  
 323 ; 326 n 51 ; 393 n 301 ; 505

Amous ..... 204 n 114

amulet ..... 259 n 2 ; 290-291

analogy ..... 126 ; 347 n 134

Ananke ..... 109 n 173 ; 355 ; 364

Anastasius Sinaita ..... 287 n 109

anatomy ..... 44 n 137 ; 45-46

Anaxagoras ..... 321 n 29

androgynous principle ..... 82

Anebo ..... 467

angelology  
 Chaldaean ..... 13-14 ; 28-29 ;  
 163 ; 215 n 153 ; 329 n 63 ; 408  
 Jewish ..... 14-15 ; 162-163  
 pagan ..... 14 n 32  
 Persian ..... 163 ; 408

angel(s)  
 assistant .. 236 ; 278 ; 285-286  
 astral gods . 30 ; 101 ; 161-164 ; 452  
 classes of ..... 13-15 ;  
 23 ; 28-29 ; 161-164 ; 223 n 194  
 conductor ..... 237  
 function .....  
 147 n 296 ; 162 ; 183 n 27 ; 374  
 good demon ..... 260-261  
 irradiations of the noetic fire  
 ..... 431 n 113  
 = Iynges ..... 438  
 ministering .... 7 n 14 ; 24 n 58 ;  
 28 ; 30 ; 135 ; 162-164 ; 224 n 194  
 noetic beings ..... 220  
 planetary gods ..... 408  
 procreations of the divine intellect  
 ..... 349 n 139  
 saints and sons of God ..... 15  
 solar rays guided by .... 183 n 27  
 song of praise ... 23 ; 80 n 49 ; 82

[angel(s)]  
 souls of ..... 225  
 souls of the theurgists ... 223-225

animal  
 cries ..... 249  
 sacrifices ..... 289 ; 496  
 symbolism ..... 293

*Anonymus Taurinensis* ..... 70 n 11

anonymy ..... 427 n 98

anthropology .... 183 ; 215 ; 301-304

antigod ..... 284-287

Antiochus of Ascalon .....  
 ..... 346 n 131 ; 394 n 302

Antoninus  
 pupil of Ammonius Saccas .....  
 ..... 326 n 51 ; 394 n 301

Aphrodite  
 = Cosmic Soul or Hecate . 362-363

apocalyptic ..... 15

apodosis ..... 87 n 76

Apollo  
 and Orpheus ..... 37 n 110  
 calls himself an angel .... 29 n 76  
 « centre » of the ethereal zone .. 60  
 created Asclepius and Plato .....  
 ..... 216 n 157  
 dwells in the sun . 60 ; 158 ; 234  
 generated by the All-Father ... 61  
 god of magic ..... 424  
 = Helios . 30 ; 161 ; 196 ; 200  
 incarnation of Truth .....  
 ..... 49 n 158 ; 221-222  
 Mercury star of ..... 222 n 185  
 mysteries of ..... 44-45  
 mystagogue ..... 238  
 oracle-giving god ... 6-7 ; 16 ; 18 ;  
 20-22 ; 26 ; 29 ; 43 ; 45 ;  
 49 ; 58 ; 60 ; 64 ; 161 ; 224 n 196 ;  
 225 n 197 ; 234 ; 374 n 241 ; 487  
 personal reaction to the questions .  
 ..... 31  
 prophesying god ..... 34  
 ruler ..... 40  
 spokesman of gods ..... 30  
 statue of ..... 293 n 131 ; 361  
 teacher of sacrifice ..... 238

Apollo of Colophon ..... 19 n 46

Apollo of Miletus ..... 63

Apollonius of Tyana .. 3 n 1 ; 63 ; 510 n 5

apotheosis ..... 177 n 3

apotropaic rites .....  
 ..... 53 ; 55 ; 216 ; 228 n 1 ;  
 237 ; 249 n 78 ; 288-293



- apparition**  
   nocturnal ..... 51 n 162  
   sets in motion material spirits ....  
     ..... 42 n 133  
**Apuleius** .....  
   206 ; 210 ; 287 n 109 ; 315 ; 325  
**aqua virgo** ..... 89 n 89  
**aqueduct** ..... 89 n 89  
**aramaic** ..... 290 n 117  
**Aratus** ..... 90 n 91 ; 142 n 284  
**archangel** ..... 14 ; 129 n 240 ;  
   224-225 ; 408 ; 500 ; 507 n 43  
**archer** ..... 241-242 ; 428 n 100  
**archetype** ..... 317-318  
**archons** ..... 417 ; 420 ; 423  
**Ares** ..... 52 ; 158  
**Aristarchus** ..... 169 n 384  
**Aristocritus, the Manichaeon** . 16 n 41  
**Aristotelean terminology** .....  
   138 n 270 ; 296 n 139 ; 317 n 17 ;  
   352 ; 404 n 15 ; 492 ; 506  
**Aristotle** ..... 124 n 221 ; 333 n 78  
**armour** .....  
   emblem of Hecate ..... 95  
   equipment of the soul ..... 192-195  
**Arnobius** ..... 324-325  
**Arnuphis** ..... 4 n 2 ; 56 n 178  
**Artemis** ..... 51 n 162 ; 91 ;  
   95 n 119 ; 143 n 288 ; 362 ; 363 n 201  
**artisan** ..... 13 ; 113 ; 117  
**ascent** ..... 20 ; 73 n 28 ;  
   178 ; 207 ; 260 ; 302 ; 488-489  
**ascetic life** ..... 284-287  
**Asia Minor** ..... 363  
**Asclepiogeneia**  
   daughter of Plutarch the Neoplaton-  
   nist ..... 71 n 16  
**Asclepius** ..... 216 n 157  
**astral religion** ..... 137 n 269 ;  
   182 n 26 ; 413-417 ; 422-426  
**Assyrians** ..... 292 n 127 ; 444  
**astrologers** ..... 268 n 29 ; 273 n 55  
**astrological terminology** .....  
   51 n 162 ; 53 n 165 ; 55 n 176 ;  
   137 n 269 ; 146 n 295 ; 291 n 122  
**astrology** ... 182 n 26 ; 256 ; 346 n 131  
**astronomers** ..... 443-444 ; 446  
**astronomical terms** .....  
   ... 101 n 147 ; 123 n 219 ; 142-143  
**astrophysics** .... 143 n 287 ; 150 ; 446  
**Athanasia** ..... 177 n 3  
**Athenagoras** ..... 381 n 268  
**Athene** ... 95 n 118-119 ; 363 n 201 ;  
   457 n 1 ; 500-501 ; 503-504 ; 507  
**Athens** ..... 499-501 ; 506-507  
**Atlantis** ..... 450 n 8 ; 499-507  
**Atlas** ..... 135 n 260  
**Atropos** ..... 364  
**Atticus** .... 323-324 ; 393 n 300 ; 454  
**Attis** ..... 210 n 139  
**augury** ..... 33 n 93  
**Augustine** ..... 224 n 194 ; 286 ;  
   393 n 299 ; 449-451 ; 454 n 21 ; 455  
**authority** ..... 64  
**autophany** ..... 246-247  
**Avesta** ..... 285  
**Avestic doctrine** ..... 338 n 96  
**awe** ..... 186  
**Babylonian traditions** ..... 212 n 143 ;  
   408 ; 413-414 ; 416-417 ; 423-429  
**Bacchus** ..... 210 n 139  
**Barbelo** ..... 342 n 116  
**bath** ..... 228 n 1  
**Baudelaire** ..... 199 n 93  
**beast** ..... 265 n 19  
**beauty** ..... 347  
**Beel-shemin** ..... 423 n 84  
**bees** ..... 110 ;  
   111 n 177 ; 333 n 74 ; 431 n 109  
**beyond** ..... 327-328  
**biblical terminology** .....  
   ..... 106 n 165 ; 111 n 177 ;  
   221 n 178 ; 290 n 117 ; 349 n 142  
**binding** ..... 41-42 ; 49 ; 51 n 162 ;  
   57-58 ; 60 ; 128 ; 232 n 15 ; 251 ; 286  
**binding-spells** .....  
   ..... 239-240 ; 249-250 ; 467-468  
**bird**  
   and divination ..... 256 ; 293  
   and magic ..... 249-250  
**bisexuality** ..... 340 n 105 ; 341-343

- black ..... 292  
 blood in sacrifice ..... 285  
 blossom ..... 343-344 ; 353-354  
 body  
   angelic ..... 225-226  
   clog of the soul .....  
   ... 172 ; 180-184 ; 215 ; 277-278  
   cosmic .. 376-377 ; cf. world-body  
   destruction by fire ..... 218 n 167  
   dissolution .. 33 ; 204-207 ; 217-218  
   dung of matter ..... 305  
   dwelling-place of the evil demons ..  
   ..... 264-265 ; 276-278  
   envelope .....  
   .. 214 n 151 ; 276 ; 303 ; 501 n 12  
   fiery ..... 151  
   god sojourning in the ..... 40 ; 45  
   heavenly ..... 101 n 147 ;  
   142 n 284 ; 402 n 3 ; 427  
   hyleic ..... 301-304 ; 376-377  
   image ..... 214-219  
   luminous ..... 58  
   members of ..... 291 n 122  
   microcosmos . 200 n 101 ; 291 n 122  
   mortification of the ..... 43  
   pneumatic ..... 501 n 12  
   possessed by the god ..... 45-46  
   psychic ..... 45  
   salvation of the ..... 214-219  
   separation from the .....  
   ... 63 ; 214-215 ; 273 n 52 ; 452  
 bond ..... 54-55 ;  
   115 ; 126 n 232 ; 127 n 233 ; 192  
 bow ..... 428 n 100  
 boy ..... 241-242  
 brass ..... 254 n 97 ; 291  
 breath ..... 45  
*Bundahishn* ..... 409  
 burial ..... 206 n 125 ;  
   207 ; 210 n 139 ; 215 ; 241  
 burying ..... 205  
  
 call ..... 467-471 ; 492  
 caller . 39 ; 43 ; 47 ; 57 ; 467-471  
 Callimachus ..... 57 n 180 ; 457 n 1  
 cardinal points .....  
   ..... 56 n 176 ; 122 ; 154 n 322  
 catharsis .... 275-276 ; 284-287 ; 361  
 causa efficiens ..... 346 n 131  
 causality ..... 351 n 148  
 cave ..... 111 n 177 ; 308 n 186 ; 488  
  
 cavity ..... 136 ; 268 ; 496  
 Celsus .....  
   163 n 367 ; 313 ; 320 n 29 ; 321 n 33 ;  
   328 n 59 ; 342 n 112 ; 372 n 230 ;  
   373 ; 378-379 ; 380 n 265 ; 389 n 288 ;  
   427 n 97 ; 433-434 ; 510 n 5  
 censor ..... 496  
 centre . 96-97 ; 142 ; 150 ; 195 n 76  
 ceremonies ..... 178-211 ; 262-263  
 chain ..... 84 n 66 ; 98 n 136 ;  
   103 n 152 ; 116 n 193 ; 142 n 283 ;  
   146 n 295 ; 150 n 309 ; 225 n 197 ;  
   265 n 21 ; 345-346 ; 347 ; 350 ;  
   358 n 177 ; 437 n 128 ; 470-471  
 Chaldaean Oracles  
   belief in the pre-established har-  
   mony between Plato's teaching  
   and the Oracles ..... 75  
   coherent system ..... 36  
   critical research ..... 76  
   didactic theological poem .... 36  
   difficulties of interpretation . 75-76  
   depend directly on Numenius . 320  
   esoteric interpretation ... 71 n 14  
   fragmentary character ..... 76  
   influence on Middle Ages and  
   Renaissance ..... 74 ; 441  
   jigsaw puzzle ..... 76  
   Middle-Platonic source of .....  
   ..... 316-326 ; 350-352  
   Neoplatonist harmonization be-  
   tween Oracles, magic and Plato  
   ..... 73 n 28 ; 75 ; 81 n 53 ;  
   105 ; 120 ; 229 ; 281 ; 298 n 148 ;  
   312-313 ; 326 ; 388-390 ; 456  
   Neoplatonists' mode of quoting the  
   ..... 443-447  
   nucleus of the collection published  
   in Porphyry's book *On the Philo-  
   sophy of the Oracles* ..... 64-65  
   Platonic background ..... 312-394  
   Proclian harmonization of the Pla-  
   tonic, Orphic and Chaldaean sys-  
   tems ..... 481-485  
   ..... 64  
   purpose ..... 74 n 34  
   quantity ..... 74 n 34  
   regarded by Proclus as prior to the  
   teachings of Plato ..... 445-446  
   self-consistency of ..... 311  
   survey of the transmission .. 67-76  
   syncretism ..... 429-441  
   system of thought ..... 75-76  
   their deliberate opacity ..... 75  
   two different collections ..... 38  
 Chaldaeans  
   and magic ..... 240 n 51

## [Chaldaeans]

- Chaldaei of Ptolemy ... 377 n 252  
 Chaldaized mazdaism ... 432-433  
 Hellenizing of Oriental doctrines  
 and/or Orientalizing of Hellenic  
 speculations ..... 399-401  
 meanings of the name ... 426-428  
 Oriental home of ..... 399-441  
 Pagan Gnostics ..... 397 n 315  
 Pythagorizing Platonists . 394-398  
 Stoic pantheists ..... 411 n 39  
 use of the name in Greek literature  
 ..... 444  
 channels ..... 11 ; 13 ; 47 ; 154  
 chaos ..... 297-304 ; 379 n 259  
 characters  
   mystic signs ... 252-254 ; 291 n 123  
   hylic demons ..... 502  
 chariot ..... 14-15 ; 173  
 charismatic inspiration ..... 204  
 chasm ..... 298-299  
 Cherubs ..... 14-15  
 Christ ..... 319 n 25  
 Christians  
   Christian influence . 221 n 178 ; 489  
   Christian theology ... 145 n 291  
   debate Heathens- ... 29 n 76 ; 74  
   dogm of the resurrection .....  
     ..... 215 n 156  
   Gnostics included among the .....  
     ..... 329 n 61  
 Chronos  
   = Aion .... 22 ; 38 ; 101-104 ; 141  
   intramundane divinity .. 105 n 160  
 circle .....  
   137 ; 140-141 ; 353-354 ; 412 ; 430  
 circular motion ..... 125 ; 132 ; 152  
 Cleanthes ..... 431 n 109  
 cloth ..... 40 n 122 ; 416-417  
 Clotho ..... 364  
 cognition of the intelligible world  
   ..... 165-170  
 cold ..... 492  
 colour ..... 292  
 combat ..... 194-195  
 comet ..... 135 n 260  
 Commodus Emperor ..... 314 n 5  
 communication . 133-134 ; 148 ; 165-166  
 compact ..... 232-233 ; 235  
 compulsion ..... 58 n 184  
 concept ..... 367  
 conjunction ..... 228-238  
 conjuration .....  
   ..... 207-211 ; 239-245 ; 424-425  
 connectives  
   function ..... 155-156  
   ideas ..... 109 n 173 ;  
     129-131 ; 335 ; 345-353  
   lightnings ..... 132 n 247  
 consecration ..... 190 ; 207-211 ;  
   247-248 ; 418 n 68 ; 495-496  
 Constantinople ..... 69 n 8  
 conundrum ..... 64  
 conversion ..... 469-470  
 cool ..... 85 n 70  
 coral ..... 293  
 corporality ..... 172-173 ; 301-303  
 Cosimo de' Medici ..... 441  
 cosmocrator ..... 137  
 cosmogony .....  
   117-120 ; 123-125 ; 276 n 71  
 cosmology .....  
   138 n 271 ; 146 n 293 ; 156 ; 440  
 cosmophysics ..... 142-144  
 cosmos  
   ◊ ensouled ◊ by Hecate ..... 48  
   planetary ..... 30  
   rational organization ..... 157  
   singular-plural ..... 13  
 course ... 135 ; 140 n 276 ; 142-144  
 covenant ..... 232-233  
 creation ..... 347 ; 351  
 creator ..... 13 ; 115 ;  
   322 n 36 ; 339 ; 343 ; 383 n 270 ; 395  
 credo ..... 186 n 37  
 cremation ..... 218  
 Cronius ..... 324 n 44 ; 497 n 1  
 cross ..... 254 n 97 ; 270  
 crossways ..... 95 n 122 ; 241 n 53  
 crow ..... 292-293  
 crux ansata ..... 254 n 97  
 cryptic style ..... 75  
 Cynics ..... 271 n 41 ; 282 n 90  
 Cyprian the Magician ..... 232  
 Dacians ..... 251

- Damasclus ..... 72-73 ; 262 n 10 ; 322 n 36 ; 447
- Dante ..... 352 ; 431
- Darius ..... 209 n 135
- darkness ..... 509 ; 511-512
- day ..... 229 ; 233
- death  
 and resurrection .....  
 ... 210 n 139 ; 211 n 140 ; 471 n 21  
 sacrifices for the dead .....  
 ..... 209 n 134  
 physical .....  
 .. 204-207 ; 222 n 187 ; 235-236  
 theurgic ..... 217-218  
 various kinds of ..... 217 n 163  
 voluntary ..... 206 n 125
- deep ..... 295-304 ; 397-398
- deification ..... 177 n 3
- deliverance ..... 194 n 67 ; 202 ; 357
- Delphi ..... 75
- demi-gods ..... 225 n 196 ; 273
- demiurge ..... 113-115 ; 117-120 ;  
 125 ; 126 n 232 ; 181 n 22 ;  
 285 n 102 ; 299 n 157 ; 319 ;  
 322-323 ; 327 ; 345-348 ; 352 n 151 ;  
 357 ; 384 ; 385-386 ; 389 n 288 ;  
 404 n 12 ; 412 ; 470 n 18 ; 505
- demiurgy ..... 117-120 ; 358-360
- demonology ..... 229 n 3 ; 259-309 ;  
 380-394 ; 433 ; 436-437 ; 497-508
- demons  
 affections ..... 306 n 181  
 anti-gods ..... 284-287  
 assistant ..... 229 ; 232  
 classes of ..... 266-268 ;  
 308 n 185-186 ; 498-501 ; 506-507  
 descending from Hecate . 54 ; 355  
 divine ..... 224 n 196  
 dogs ..... 51 n 162 ; 260 n 3 ; 271  
 evil ..... 53 n 166 ; 55 n 171 ; 183 ;  
 216 ; 235-238 ; 242 n 56 ; 259-279  
 good .....  
 163 ; 183 n 27 ; 260-262 ; 389 n 288  
 hyllic ..... 304-309 ; 375-394  
 of the moon ..... 93 ; 98  
 offsprings of the Cosmic Soul .....  
 ..... 381 n 268  
 sacrifices to the ..... 289 n 114  
 sex of ..... 268 n 30  
 sprits ..... 122  
 streams of the Heilmarmene .....  
 ..... 272 ; 303 n 171
- [demons]  
 sublunar gods .....  
 ..... 210 n 140 ; 235 ; 266-267  
 subterranean ..... 299  
 terrestrial ..... 308  
 throttling ..... 264 n 17 ; 298 n 151  
 upholding ..... 136 n 263  
 weather-demons ..... 507 n 41
- depth  
 name of the Pleroma of the intel-  
 ligible world ..... 160-161  
 name of the Supreme Being ... 78  
 noetic space ..... 169-170
- descent ..... 45 ; 501 n 12
- desire ..... 127
- Destiny, cf. Heilmarmene
- devil ..... 385-386 ; 393 n 299
- Devs (Devas) ..... 284-286
- diagram in magic ..... 252-254
- diamond ..... 293
- diction ..... 75 n 36
- Didymus of Alexandria ..... 16 n 41
- Dionysus ..... 211 n 140 ;  
 218 n 167 ; 362 n 196. 198 ; 488-489
- Diotima ..... 221 n 179 ; 436
- disease ... 216 ; 290-292 ; 424 n 87
- disillusionment ..... 8
- disk ..... 249
- disturbances in atmosphere ..... 245
- divination ..... 254-257
- division in intellect .... 81 ; 109 ; 116
- dogs .....  
 51 n 162 ; 241 n 53 ; 260 n 3 ; 271
- doxography ..... 316
- doxology ..... 23 ; 26 ; 122
- dreams  
 conveyed through the demons of  
 the moon ..... 93  
 girdle of ..... 93  
 Hecate mistress of the .....  
 ..... 204 n 116  
 interpretation of ..... 256 n 104
- dregs ..... 214 n 151
- dualism ..... 215 ;  
 276 ; 284-287 ; 301-309 ; 314 ;  
 387-393 ; 433 ; 503-505 ; 509-512
- duality .....  
 ..... 115 ; 217 ; 278-279 ; 395-396
- dung ..... 213 ; 276-277

- dyad ..... 107-108 ;  
     114 n 187 ; 115 ; 335 ; 395-396
- eagle ..... 292-293
- ears ..... 164
- earth .....  
     24 n 58 ; 43 ; 96-97 ; 137 ; 140 ;  
     154 n 321 ; 213 n 144 ; 271 ; 281-282 ;  
     292 ; 293 n 131 ; 298-299 ; 385 n 275
- earthquake ..... 243 n 58 ; 259 n 2
- ebriety ..... 199
- eclecticism ..... 314
- ecstasy .....  
     Bacchic ..... 253 n 95  
     mystic ..... 47 n 148 ; 198
- effluence in intellect ..... 81
- Egypt ..... 342 n 112 ; 404 ; 464
- elements .....  
     dwelling-place of the demons .....  
         ..... 51 n 162 ; 271  
     physical .....  
         ..... 145 n 291 ; 217 ; 292 ; 416  
     = stars  
         ..... 97 n 131 ; 127 n 232 ; 199 ; 416  
     world-stuff ..... 119-120
- Eleusis .. 69 n 9 ; 170 n 395 ; 211 n 140
- elevation . 60 ; 143 n 287 ; 164 ; 175 ;  
     177-226 ; 237-238 ; 260 ; 287 ; 290 ;  
     294 ; 375 ; 413-419 ; 421-425 ; 429 ;  
     452-453 ; 462-463 ; 468-470 ; 487-489
- Elysium .....  
     201 n 102 ; 215 ; 220-222 ; 419
- emanation ..... 81-83 ;  
     159 ; 320 n 28 ; 335-345 ; 348-352
- emanatistic conception .....  
     ..... 128 n 234 ; 335-345 ; 351
- embodiment ..... 357
- Emesa ..... 420
- Empfehlung ..... 229 n 3
- emphatic language ..... 198
- Empyrean ..... 48 ; 79 ; 89 ; 102 ;  
     126 ; 137-138 ; 141 ; 202-203 ;  
     220 ; 222 n 188 ; 293-294 ; 302 ;  
     371 ; 376-377 ; 412 ; 430-431 ; 492
- engravings ..... 496
- energy in the cosmos ..... 157-158
- ennead ..... 105 n 163 ; 117
- Ennoia = Psyche ..... 87 n 77
- Enoch ..... 381 n 268
- enslavement ..... 278 n 78
- enthusiasm ..... 46 ; 62
- envelope ..... 122
- Ephesus ..... 248
- epic terminology ..... 115
- Epicurus ..... 320 n 25
- epicycle ..... 125
- epigram .. 214 n 148. 150 ; 216 n 157
- epiphany ..... 240-247
- equatorial zone ..... 154 n 322
- Er the Armenian ..... 434 n 115
- Erinyes ..... 299 n 158
- Eros ..... 126-128 ;  
     130 ; 133 n 250 ; 144-148 ; 179-180 ;  
     191 n 55 ; 264 n 17 ; 335-336 ;  
     337 n 94 ; 345-353 ; 358-360 ; 469
- eschatology .....  
     eschatological meaning ..... 147  
     Jewish ..... 215-218  
     Platonic ..... 222  
     solar ..... 413-425
- eternity .....  
     103-104 ; 201 ; 352 n 151 ; 403 n 9
- ether  
     dwelling-place of the messengers of  
         the gods ..... 507 n 43  
     « ensouled » by Hecate ... 48 ; 88  
     « ensouled » by Psyche ..... 87  
     igneous substance ..... 403 n 107  
     physical (region of the fixed stars)  
         20 ; 22 ; 61 ; 89 ; 142 n 286 ;  
         146 n 293 ; 149 ; 151 n 313 ;  
         193 ; 220 n 172 ; 292  
     source of the solar fire .. 151 n 313  
     the highest layer of the air .....  
         ..... 430 n 108
- etymology .....  
     ..... 296 n 142 ; 378 n 256. 258
- Eubulus ..... 433 n 114
- Eudemus ..... 407 n 25 ; 409
- Eudorus ..... 346 n 131
- Eumenides ..... 299
- Eurydice ..... 304 n 173
- Eusebius ..... 8 ; 65 ; 509-512
- evil  
     antithesis Good-Evil .....  
         ..... 509-510 ; 512  
     origin of ... 378 n 255 ; 380-394
- evocation ..... 467-468

- eye  
 of the soul ... 169-170 ; 370-375  
 third ..... 374 n 237
- exorcism ..... 238 n 41
- faith as comic power .... 144-148 ; 492
- fall of the soul ..... 294 n 136
- family in intellect ..... 340-341
- farmer ..... 500 ; 506
- fat ..... 292
- fatalism ..... 212 n 143 ; 416-417
- Fate .....  
 108 n 173 ; 331 n 69 ; 357 ; 363-364
- Father  
 called « mystes » ..... 12  
 creates matter ... 117-118 ; 300  
 first connective ..... 129  
 first power of the holy word .....  
 ..... 112 n 181  
 fountain-head of all wisdom ... 62  
 generates Apollo ..... 61  
 has two hypostases ..... 28-29  
 his epiphany ..... 22 ; 331  
 immobile ..... 101 n 147  
 inaccessible ..... 20-21 ; 318  
 monad ..... 106-107  
 mythical predicate of the Supreme  
 Being ..... 76-77 ; 101  
 of gods ..... 465-466  
 One ..... 24  
 primal fire ..... 201-202  
 silence ..... 160 n 353  
 subsists as form within the forms  
 ..... 25 ; 113 ; 317 n 17  
 supreme king of gods .....  
 ..... 12-13 ; 76  
 the thoughts of the Father are  
 identical with the magical for-  
 mulae ..... 192  
 unknown God of the Gnostics  
 ..... 319 n 25
- Fathers  
 magical ..... 133 n 254  
 ruling ..... 139 n 274
- fault in the rite ..... 54
- Faust ..... 43
- fear of demons ..... 286-288
- feminine power ..... 26 ; 341-343
- fertility-cult ..... 251-252
- fire  
 akin to the prophetic spirit ... 47  
 and snakes ..... 91
- [fire]  
 creative power ..... 25 ; 332  
 cult ..... 429 n 104  
 dwelling-place of the approaching  
 deity ..... 241-245  
 « ensouled » by Psyche .....  
 ..... 86-87 ; 149  
 entity generated by the First  
 Intellect ..... 122 ; 154 ; 300  
 = Father .. 25 ; 77-78 ; 81 ; 201  
 flower of . 92 ; 168 ; 336 ; 343-344  
 = God ..... 20 ; 22 ; 201 ; 405  
 life ..... 83  
 mystic ..... 218 n 167  
 noetic ..... 13 ; 17 ; 39 ; 45 ;  
 85 n 70 ; 86-87 ; 100 ; 118 ;  
 126 ; 128 ; 140 ; 155 ; 168-169 ;  
 171-174 ; 332 ; 336 ; 429-431  
 priest of the holy . 44 ; 429 n 104  
 primal element .....  
 .. 119-120 ; 201-204 ; 430 n 109  
 purifying .... 218 n 167 ; 231 n 12  
 solar ..... 60 ;  
 153-155 ; 201-204 ; 429 n 104
- firmament ..... 122-126 ; 423 n 82
- fixed stars ..... 13 ; 19-20 ; 77 ;  
 89 ; 96 ; 97 n 130 ; 102 ; 122 ;  
 124 n 221 ; 125 n 223 ; 126 n 227 ;  
 137 ; 141 ; 152 ; 154 n 321 ;  
 221 ; 268 ; 300 ; 405-406
- flame .. 168-169 ; 201 ; 218 n 167 ; 344
- flight ..... 173 n 403
- flower  
 issued from the Paternal Intellect .  
 ..... 92 ; 471  
 of fire ..... 343-344  
 = solar light ..... 197-198  
 symbolic designation of the Ideas  
 25 ; 82 ; 168-169 ; 336 ; 370-371
- flowing ..... 335 ; 338-340
- flute ..... 45-46
- forehead ..... 93 n 107
- forgetting ..... 192
- forms  
 .....  
 13 ; 25 ; 113 ; 118 ; 121-122 ;  
 136 ; 139 n 274 ; 300 ; 317 n 17 ;  
 325 n 45 ; 335 ; 352 n 151 ; 395
- fruit ..... 168 ; 198
- Furies ..... 418 n 68
- Galus ..... 315 ; 325
- Ganymedes ..... 489
- garden ..... 220 n 178 ; 221 n 179

genealogy ..... 103 n 152 ; 340-341  
 general-particular ..... 112  
 generation in the Intellect .....  
 ..... 84 ; 121 ; 340-341  
 geomancy ..... 256  
 geometrical figures ..... 109 n 173  
 geometry ..... 501  
 German mystics ..... 471 n 21  
 Giants ..... 257 n 108 ; 380 n 265  
 girdle  
   emblem of Hecate ..... 92-93  
   ritual ..... 256 n 103  
 gnosticism and Gnostics  
   angels as irradiations of the noetic  
   fire ..... 431 n 113  
   Apelles ..... 217-218  
   Barbelo-gnostics .....  
   ..... 329 n 62 ; 342 n 116  
   Bardesanes ..... 218 n 167 ;  
   383 n 272 ; 385 n 276 ; 392  
   Basilides ..... 331 n 69  
   Chaldaeans as Pagan Gnostics ?  
   ..... 397 n 315  
   Chronos *azugos* ..... 102 n 151  
   community of endeavour between  
   Chaldaeans and Gnostics ... 399  
   concept of Mother ..... 342  
   conjurations of the Cosmic Soul  
   ..... 364 n 206 ; 437 n 128  
   cosmology .....  
   .. 137 n 269 ; 182 n 26 ; 382  
   descent and ascent of the soul  
   ..... 182 n 26 ; 190 n 53 ;  
   203 n 114 ; 413-414 ; 424  
   differentiation between myth and  
   symbolism ..... 337 n 95  
   doctism ..... 217-218  
   doctrine of syzygy .....  
   ... 329 n 62 ; 342 ; 343 n 119  
   doctrine of the demiurgic *Nods* ...  
   ..... 319 n 25  
   doctrine of the divine Will .....  
   ..... 329 n 62 ;  
   330 n 65 ; 331 n 69 ; 342  
   doctrine of the Primal feminine  
   Power ..... 342  
   doctrine of the unknown God  
   ..... 319 n 25 ; 328 n 59  
   dogm of the original corruption of  
   the preexistent matter ..... 382  
   dualism ..... 382  
   equation Hades - Hyle - hyllic  
   demons ..... 377 ; 391  
   falsifiers of Platonic wisdom .. 454  
   'flowing matter' according to  
   Valentinus ..... 382-383

## [Gnosticism and Gnostics]

Gnosticizing Platonism or Plato-  
 nizing Gnosticism ? .. 387 ; 391  
 Gnostics of Plotinus ..... 314 ;  
 325 ; 364 n 206 ; 437 n 128 ; 454  
 Heracleon ..... 314 n 6 ; 391 n 291  
 Hermogenes ..... 383-384  
 influence of Middle Platonism upon  
 Gnostics .. 315 n 9 ; 319 n 25 ;  
 344-345 ; 391 ; 430 n 105  
 interpretation of the Platonic Hyle  
 ..... 382-387 ; 389-393  
 Jewish Gnosticism ..... 413 n 46  
 Marcion and Marcionites .....  
 .... 217-218 ; 385-387 ; 392  
 Marcus ..... 40 n 120  
 matter as residuum and sediment  
 ..... 383-385 ; 391  
 metaphor of 'seeding' ..... 343  
 metaphor of the 'stretching out'  
 of the soul's eye ..... 373  
 Montanus ..... 46  
 mystical terminology ..... 373  
 myth and thought .....  
 ... 337-338 ; 377 n 255 ; 382  
 nature of Satan ..... 391-392  
 no influence Gnostics  $\neq$  Chaldaeans  
 ..... 387 ; 390 ; 397  
 Ophites ..... 354 ; 385 n 276  
 origin of evil ..... 377 n 255  
 Plato's 'true philosophy' against  
 the pseudo-philosophy of ... 453  
 Plotinus on the noetic orders in  
 Gnosis ..... 325  
 principal difference between Chal-  
 daeans and ..... 417  
 Ptolemaeus .....  
 .... 314 n 6 ; 329 n 62 ; 391  
 rôle of the Platonic language in  
 ..... 361 n 192 ; 391  
 Roman Gnostics influenced by the  
*Timaeus* .. 325 n 47 ; 337 ; 382  
 Sethians ..... 342 n 116  
*sigè* and *bulhos* among Pythagoreans,  
 Chaldaeans and ..... 397  
 snake-symbolism ..... 354  
 Tatian ..... 314 ;  
 391 ; 392 n 292 ; 428 n 100  
 'temerity' of the Gnostics accord-  
 ing to Plotinus .... 437 n 128  
 theosophical milieu of the Western  
 Gnostics ..... 343  
 transformations of the Platonic  
 doctrine of the Cosmic Soul  
 ..... 353-355  
 Valentinians ... 342 ; 384-385 ;  
 399 ; 430 n 105 ; 431 n 113  
 Valentinus ..... 314 ; 319 n 25 ;

## [Gnosticism and Gnostics]

- 329 n 62; 343; 345; 373;  
382-383; 391 n 291; 397  
watchwords ..... 424  
Western Gnostics ..... 312;  
314 n 6; 343; 378 n 255; 382
- God**  
abode of ..... 19-20  
first second ..... 317-318  
great ..... 27  
identity of God's will, thought and  
action ..... 330 n 65  
identity of the First God with the  
demiurge ..... 505-506  
ineffable ..... 19  
Infinite Aion ..... 20; 28; 158  
jealous ..... 350 n 146  
monarchical rule ..... 28  
noetic primordial fire .....  
..... 13; 20; 22; 201  
of the Jews, chief of demons .....  
..... 454 n 23  
possessor of the philosophical virtue  
(Psellus)  
or agent of the theoretic virtue  
(Porphyry) ..... 465-466  
power of the Philonic God .....  
..... 350 n 144  
self-manifest ..... 22  
unknown ..... 319 n 25  
goddess mother ..... 342
- gods**  
angels ..... 101; 161-164  
astral ..... 328 n 58  
demiurgic .. 348 n 137; 349 n 139  
inferior .... 29 n 76; 273; 349  
of the Chaldaeans and of the magi-  
cians ..... 58 n 184  
Olympian ..... 137 n 267  
planetary ..... 20; 24 n 58;  
103 n 154; 158-162; 510-511  
teachers of their questioners .....  
..... 56-57  
utterers of oracles . 6-7; 57; 445
- goëts** .....  
56; 232 n 16; 238; 274 n 63;  
275; 285-287; 468 n 8
- good** .....  
328 n 57; 345 n 128; 346 n 130;  
384 n 274; 395; 509-510; 512
- goodness** .....  
..... 347 n 133; 350-351; 381
- gore** ..... 276 n 71
- grace** ..... 204 n 114
- grave** ..... 209

- gristle** ..... 88 n 83
- grove** ..... 221 n 178
- gymnastics** ..... 501; 506-507

**Hades**

- cult** ..... 283 n 96  
definitions of ..... 279-283  
= Hyle ..... 375-394  
Iranian origin of the Chaldaean  
conception of ..... 283-293  
king of the nether-world and of the  
shades (Greek conception) .. 283  
irrational soul (Neoplatonic con-  
ception) ..... 282-283; 304  
localization ..... 280-283  
lord of the terrestrial zone (Chal-  
daean conception) .... 281-282  
nether-world ..... 126; 213-214;  
219 n 170; 235; 297-304; 488  
prince of the demons .....  
..... 283; 309 n 187
- Hadrian** ..... 397; 430 n 105
- hairs as emblem of Hecate** ..... 90-92
- halls** ..... 33 n 92
- hallucination** ..... 245
- hands** ..... 92
- hapax legomena** ..... 457-459
- haplography** ..... 59 n 186
- harmony**  
cosmic .....  
.. 157; 199-200; 345; 352; 439-440  
world-soul ..... 360
- harp** ..... 46 n 147
- Harpocraton** ..... 327 n 53
- haruspicy** ..... 33; 256; 257 n 106
- haste** ..... 173 n 403; 196; 223 n 194
- head**  
localization of the noetic soul .....  
..... 205 n 121; 354 n 159  
telestic ..... 247-248  
three-headed ..... 93-94; 362-364
- health** ..... 216 n 157-158
- heart** ..... 195 n 76; 196
- Heathens against Christians** .....  
..... 29 n 76; 74
- heavenly spheres** .....  
13; 19; 64; 96; 125; 268; 352
- hebdomad of intellect** ..... 84 n 66;  
92 n 102; 123 n 218; 136 n 266
- Hebrews** .. 9 n 23; 63 n 201; 427 n 97



**Hecate**

- abode ..... 91 ; 142  
 ambivalent ... 272 ; 355 ; 365-366  
 Chaldaeans imitated the style of  
 the Hecatean oracles ..... 52  
 cultural image ..... 88  
 delivers her oracles through the  
 intermediary of a 'recipient'  
 ..... 56 n 176  
 descends from the first intellect  
 ... 48-49 ; 61-62 ; 243 n 57 ; 272  
 emblems .....  
 .. 88-95 ; 363 ; 428 n 100 ; 496  
 fiery ..... 245  
 fountain-head of Life ... 85 ; 355  
 goddess of magic ..... 362 ; 424  
 = Heimarmene .....  
 .... 54 ; 98 ; 269 ; 355-358  
 living power ..... 220  
 manifestations .... 71 n 15 ; 98 ;  
 238 n 41 ; 240-246 ; 355-358  
 midmost of the intellectual orders  
 ..... 50 n 160 ; 142 n 286  
 mistress of dreams .....  
 ..... 93 ; 204 n 116  
 mistress of elements .....  
 ..... 292-293 ; 363 n 202  
 mistress of the demons and evil  
 spirits ..... 51 n 162 ; 54-55  
 93 ; 98 ; 254 n 97 ; 263 ;  
 269-273 ; 363 n 202 ; 365-366  
 mistress of the moon .....  
 ..... 49-50 ; 51 n 162 ;  
 90 n 92-93 ; 96 ; 142-144 ; 271  
 mistress over the zones of ether,  
 heaven and earth .....  
 ..... 71 n 15 ; 93 ; 355 ; 363  
 oracle-giving goddess .....  
 .... 38 n 112 ; 47-48 ; 49 ; 52-53  
 = Persephone and Artemis .....  
 ..... 51 n 162 ; 91  
 = Physis .....  
 .... 54 ; 95-97 ; 269 ; 355-358  
 primordial source of all life .... 48  
 = Psyche or cosmic soul .....  
 6-7 ; 48 ; 54 ; 85-95 ; 121 ;  
 244 ; 270 ; 353-366 ; 437 ; 455  
 = Rhea ..... 84 n 65-66  
 saviour ..... 365-366  
 source of virtue ..... 50  
 statue of . 23 n 57 ; 51 n 162 ; 88-95 ;  
 247-248 ; 353-354 ; 361-364  
 three-headed .... 93-94 ; 362-364  
 two-faced ..... 353-355  
 universal power ..... 365-366  
 virgin ..... 94 n 116  
 heights ..... 156

**Heimarmene**

- material principle in man .... 266  
 metonym of Hecate .... 54 ; 98 ;  
 269 ; 292 ; 355-358 ; 364 n 203  
 primary source of all evil powers  
 ..... 265-266  
 the Cosmic Soul .....  
 ..... 357 n 174 ; 417 ; 433  
 heliodromus ..... 414 n 51 ; 418  
 heliolatry ..... 202 ; 428 n 102  
 Heliopolis ..... 362 ; 420  
 Helios  
 = Apollo . 30 ; 61 ; 200 ; 225 n 197  
 religion of ... 20 ; 69 ; 183 n 27 ;  
 419 n 72 ; 420 n 75 ; 422  
 hell ..... 298 n 150  
 Hellenic theology .. 84 n 66 ; 284 n 99  
 helm ..... 97  
 henad ..... 129 n 240  
 Hephaestus ..... 501 ; 507  
 Heraclitus ..... 75 ; 431 n 109  
 herbs ..... 234 ; 496  
 Hercules ..... 219 n 170 ; 225 n 196 ;  
 242 n 54 ; 253 n 95 ; 489  
 herd ..... 55 n 171  
 Hermes  
 archangel ..... 225 n 197  
 companion of Apollo ... 225 n 197  
 eloquent ..... 50  
 god of the air and the winds .....  
 ..... 4 n 2 ; 422 n 81  
 oracle-giving god ..... 52 n 163  
 philosopher ..... 324 n 44  
 planet ..... 49  
 soul-escorting .....  
 .... 218 n 167 ; 222 ; 225 n 197  
 Hermetics ..... 68 n 7 ; 137 n 269 ;  
 191 n 53 ; 204 n 114 ; 284 n 96-97 ;  
 312 ; 315 n 9 ; 320 n 27 ;  
 322 n 34 ; 326 n 51 ; 328 n 59 ;  
 329 ; 337 ; 340-341 ; 345 ;  
 351 n 147 ; 371 n 227 ; 373 ; 399 ;  
 430 n 105 ; 435 ; 463-464 ; 489  
 Hermias ..... 73 ; 492  
 hero .....  
 163 n 365 ; 224 n 194 ; 306 ; 327 n 55 ;  
 471 n 21 ; 489 ; 509-511  
 Hesychius ..... 272 n 47  
 hexad ..... 268 n 34  
 Hierapolis ..... 293 n 131 ; 362

- hierarchy**  
 angelic ..... 162-163  
 celestial .... 12-13 ; 24 ; 27-28 ;  
 30 ; 48 ; 103 n 152 ; 509-512  
 noetic ..... 81-83 ; 85 ;  
 116 n 193 ; 157-158 ; 324-325  
 ontological ..... 130  
 patriarchal ..... 158  
 planetary ..... 153-155 ; 158-160
- hieratic art** ..... 273 n 53 ; 464-465
- Hierocles** ..... 73 ; 447
- hieroglyphs** ..... 254 n 97
- Himmelsreise** .....  
 .... 244 n 62 ; 413-417 ; 489
- Hipparchus** ..... 152 n 317
- hollow** ..... 121-122
- Homeric expressions** .. 17 ; 27 ; 29 n 76 ;  
 33 n 92 ; 49 n 156 ; 79 n 48 ;  
 80 n 49 (7) ; 84 n 65 ; 86 n 73-74  
 106 n 165 ; 115 n 191 ; 178 n 4 ;  
 180 n 14 ; 193 n 65 ; 195 n 75 ;  
 196 n 79 ; 209 n 135 ; 212 n 142 ; 219 ;  
 268 n 29 ; 282 n 92 ; 446 ; 459
- honey** ..... 209 n 134
- hope as noetic faculty** ..... 147
- horse** ..... 173 ; 242
- Horus** ..... 380 n 265
- hunter** ..... 500 ; 507 n 44
- hybris** ..... 257 n 108
- Hyle**  
 demonic principle .....  
 ..... 304-309 ; 380-394  
 Hades ..... 378-380  
 hylophobia ..... 390  
 primal element . 296-304 ; 375-394
- hymnology** .....  
 11 n 26 ; 63 ; 201 n 102 ; 491-493
- hymn**  
 9-16 ; 23 ; 35-36 ; 38 ; 47 ; 57 ;  
 58 n 184 ; 82 ; 90 ; 95 n 121 ;  
 102 ; 103 n 154 ; 141 ; 154 n 324 ;  
 161 ; 233 ; 239 ; 420 ; 491-493
- Hypatia** ..... 73
- hyperbolic expressions** ..... 169-170
- hypertrophy in the style** ..... 336
- hypostasis** .....  
 323 n 38 ; 324 ; 327 n 55 ; 329 n 61 ;  
 331 ; 336 ; 342 ; 353 ; 506 n 38
- hypotheses** ..... 446
- Hystaspes** ..... 427 n 98
- Iamblichus the Neoplatonist**  
 angelology of ..... 261 n 8  
 attitude towards Chaldaean theurgy  
 ..... 69 n 7 ; 468-470  
 commentator of the Oracles .....  
 ..... 68-69 ; 148 n 27  
 demonology of .. 273-278 ; 283 n 96  
 source of Proclus .....  
 358 n 177 ; 499 n 2 ; 503 n 23  
 source of Sallustius .... 349 n 141  
 theory of the sacrifices . 218 n 167  
 theory of the soul ..... 450 n 8
- Iamblichus the Novelist** ... 428 n 101
- Ianus**  
 bifrons ..... 94 n 111  
 /Hecate ..... 365-366
- Iao** ..... 64 ; 409 n 32
- iazatas** ..... 285
- ideas** ..... 13 ; 25 ; 80 n 49 (7) ;  
 82 ; 85 n 70. 72 ; 91 ;  
 100 ; 105-117 ; 118-119 ; 126 ;  
 128-131 ; 132 n 247 ; 136-137 ; 156 ;  
 164 ; 167 ; 171 ; 191 ; 206 n 124 ;  
 212-213 ; 280 n 84 ; 300 ; 316-318 ;  
 321 n 29 ; 323 ; 324 n 42 ; 325 n 45 ;  
 327 n 53 ; 333 n 76 ; 334-336 ;  
 377 n 94 ; 340 ; 342 ; 345-353 ;  
 370 ; 376 ; 386-387 ; 395-396 ;  
 402 n 6 ; 434-435 ; 438 ; 440 ; 462
- ignorance** ..... 190 n 53
- illness** ..... 216
- illumination** .....  
 22 ; 45 ; 174-176 ; 197-199 ;  
 300-301 ; 355 ; 370-376
- image**  
 cultual ..... 247-248  
 earthly body ..... 213-219  
 magical ..... 291-292  
 vehicle of the soul ..... 219 n 168
- imitation** ..... 118
- immanence** ..... 324 n 42 ;  
 333 ; 335 n 82 ; 346 n 131 ; 506
- immobility** ..... 197
- immortality**  
 mystery of .....  
 155 ; 287-289 ; 301 n 163 ; 429  
 obtained through an austere life  
 ..... 64  
 sacrament of ..... 184 ; 207-211 ;  
 218 ; 256-257 ; 415 ; 487-489  
 yearning for ..... 32-33
- incantations** ..... 57-58 ; 163
- incineration** ..... 218 n 167

- inclination ..... 294-295  
 Indians ..... 218 n 167; 453 n 18  
 ineffable . 133-134; 164 n 359; 438 n 130  
 initiation ..... 175-177 ;  
 184-185; 204-211; 417-425; 452  
 inspiration .... 6-7; 186 n 38; 204  
 instrument  
   demiurgical ..... 118-119  
   magical ..... 249-252; 291  
   oracular ..... 46  
 intellect  
   activity .. 83-86; 121; 127; 339  
   astral intelligence ..... 137  
   between God and the forms .....  
     ..... 325 n 45; 355 n 166  
   compared to Logos and Nomos . 64  
   cosmic ..... 182  
   demiurgical . 13; 79 n 47; 136; 339  
   fiery ..... 169  
   first entity issued from the Father  
     ..... 13-14;  
     28; 49; 79-80; 114-116; 130;  
     152 n 315; 157; 167; 318-325;  
     335; 342 n 113; 352 n 151;  
     356 n 168; 368; 369 n 217; 437  
   four entities generated by the First  
     Intellect ..... 122  
   monad ..... 106-107  
   nodding of ..... 27  
   second  
     9 n 23; 13; 28; 100 n 140;  
     112 n 181; 113-116; 167;  
     300; 318-325; 332; 335  
   thinking part of the soul .....  
     ..... 193 n 60  
   union of the intellect and of the soul  
     ..... 121; 179-180  
   will ..... 51 n 162; 331  
 intermediaries ..... 28; 30; 79  
 intoxication ..... 199  
 invocation ..... 41; 43; 52;  
 57; 156; 181; 194 n 71;  
 202; 229; 288-289; 467-468  
 Iranian influence  
   demonology .....  
     283-293; 387-388; 392-393; 497  
   doctrine of the Cosmic Soul .....  
     ..... 364 n 205  
   doctrine of the Infinite Time .....  
     ..... 404-409  
   dualism ..... 512  
 Irenaeus ..... 330 n 65  
 irradiation ..... 467-469  
 irrational ..... 282;  
 300; 302-303; 306-308; 452  
 Isis .....  
   206; 210; 329 n 61; 342 n 112;  
   362; 363 n 203; 471 n 21  
 islands of the blessed ..... 221 n 178  
 Iynges  
   angelic nature of .....  
     ..... 30 n 80; 162-163; 438  
   bestriders of the spheres ..... 134  
   cosmic function .....  
     .. 135-136; 192 n 57; 250-251  
   magical instruments .....  
     ..... 132; 249-252  
   mediating activity . 135; 156; 250  
   moving ..... 80 n 49; 250  
   thoughts of the Supreme Being  
     ..... 132; 250; 349 n 139  
   transmitters of messages ..... 133  
 jealousy ..... 350 n 146  
 Jesus ..... 218  
 Jewish  
   angelology ..... 14-15; 162-163;  
     221 n 178; 264 n 14; 454 n 23  
   eschatology ..... 215-218  
   influence ..... 15 n 38;  
     221 n 178; 257 n 108; 264 n 17;  
     298 n 150; 315 n 7; 350; 489  
 Joannes Ducas ..... 287 n 109  
 judgment ..... 280 n 85  
 Julian, the «Chaldaean» and the  
   «Theurgist» .... 3-5; 77 n 43;  
   104; 124; 129 n 240; 187;  
   224; 229; 247; 251; 253;  
   256 n 103; 273; 275 n 68; 286;  
   287 n 109; 291 n 122; 312-313; 388;  
   390; 427-428; 444-446; 463  
 Julian Emperor .....  
   69; 151 n 312; 152; 225 n 197; 248;  
   270; 277 n 77; 443; 463; 487  
 Juno ..... 326 n 51  
 Jupiter .....  
   196 n 81; 326 n 51; 362; 455 n 26  
 Justin Martyr ..... 314  
 key .....  
   150 n 309; 363; 407 n 26; 496  
 knowledge ..... 192; 366-375  
 Kore ..... 95 n 119; 362  
 Kronos .....  
   282 n 92; 380 n 265; 406 n 25

- Labeo** ..... 163 n 367 ; 225 n 196
- Lachesis** ..... 364
- Lactantius** ..... 19 n 46
- ladder** .... 294 ; 413-414 ; 415 n 51
- language**
- intentional obscurity** ..... 27
  - mystical** ..... 46-47
  - mythical-symbolic** ..... 23
- Law of the Jews** ..... 64
- left** ..... 89
- Legio fulminata** ..... 4
- letter X** ..... 254
- Leviathan** ..... 354
- libations** ..... 209
- life**
- degrees of** ..... 358 n 177
  - eternal** ..... 329 n 62
  - hypostasis of the Paternal Intellect** ..... 83-85 ; 254 n 97
  - movement** ..... 403 n 9
  - noetic region of the soul** ... 98 ; 356
  - power of the cosmic soul** ..... 129
- light**
- Aion** ..... 99-101 ; 201
  - celestial divinities** .. 509 ; 511-512
  - contraction of the solar light into consistent rays** ..... 196
  - ensouled by Hecate** ... 48 ; 355
  - Father-begotten** ..... 20-21 ; 99-101 ; 174-175 ; 201 ; 291
  - metaphorical sense** ..... 336 ; 344 n 124 ; 355
  - metaphysical concept** . 296 n 138 ; 300-301 ; 344-345 ; 355 ; 370-375 ; 376 n 249 ; 429-432
  - roaring** ..... 61 ; 192-194
  - solar ray** . 149-156 ; 196 ; 410-411
  - sunlight driving away the evil spirits** ..... 183 n 27
  - theology of the** . 201-202 ; 429-432
- lightning** . 60 ; 85 n 72 ; 119 n 201 ; 121 ; 131 ; 132 n 247 ; 133 ; 136 ; 167 ; 218 n 167 ; 336 ; 344 ; 351 n 150 ; 405 ; 431 n 109 ; 495
- like known by the like** ..... 371
- lion**
- emblem of Hecate** ..... 94
  - emblem of Mithra** ..... 405
  - sign of the zodiac** ..... 94 n 114
- linen** ..... 40 n 122
- literary forms**
- collection of oracular pronouncements** ..... 36 ; 63
- [literary forms]**
- dialogue-character** ..... 56-57
  - didactic type** ..... 56 ; 57 n 180 ; 60 ; 337 ; 427 n 99 ; 459
  - imperative formulas** ..... 35
  - interrogative formulas** ... 34 ; 55
  - modes of quoting** ..... 443-447
  - neologisms** ..... 457-459
  - oath-formulas** ..... 15
  - puns** ..... 84 n 65 ; 85 n 70
  - sanction for the ideas** ..... 64
  - style of moralizing preachers of religion** ..... 35
- Logos** .... 64 ; 318 n 19 ; 331 n 68 ; 340 ; 342 n 113 ; 343 ; 346-351 ; 369 n 217 ; 386-387 ; 411 n 39
- logoi** ..... 346 n 131 ; 348-349
- loins** ..... 92 n 107
- Longinus** .... 323 ; 334 ; 348 n 136 ; 452 ; 454 ; 505 ; 506 n 38
- loosing** ..... 41-42 ; 286
- love**
- cosmic power** ..... 144-148
  - quality of the noetic substance** 146
  - triad + faith, truth, love** ..... 492
- Lucian** ..... 428 n 100 ; 457 n 1
- Lucretius** ..... 337 n 93
- lumen intelligibile** ..... 296 n 138
- lunatics** ..... 272 n 46
- lustration** ..... 54 ; 148 ; 193 ; 207 ; 227 ; 228 n 1 ; 248 n 72 ; 253 n 95 ; 262 n 10 ; 276 ; 361
- Lydus** ..... 72 ; 443
- Magi** ..... 4 n 2 ; 5 n 5 ; 284
- magic**
- basic principle of** ..... 290 n 120
  - forms of** ..... 109 n 173 ; 132-137 ; 156-157 ; 164-165 ; 192-196 ; 203 ; 226-257 ; 287 n 109 ; 290-293 ; 361 ; 424-425 ; 452 n 14
  - Neoplatonist harmonization between Oracles, magic and Plato** .. 73 n 28 ; 75 ; 81 n 52 ; 105 ; 120 ; 229 ; 281 ; 298 n 148 ; 312-313 ; 326 ; 388-390 ; 456
  - restricted to 'Nature' according to Plotinus** ..... 437 n 128
- magical**
- art** ..... 22 ; 39 ; 53-54 ; 190 n 49 ; 196 ; 204 n 118 ; 207-211 ; 248 ; 290-293 ; 437 n 128 ; 462

- [magical]  
 combat ..... 194-195 ; 307  
 communication .. 133-134 ; 462-463  
 conjuration ... 4 n 2 ; 40 n 122 ;  
 41-42 ; 56 ; 63 ; 71 n 15 ;  
 102 ; 134 ; 207-211 ; 230  
 diagram ..... 252-254  
 names ... 164 ; 192 ; 229 ; 438-440  
 papyri ..... 15 ; 36 ; 41 ;  
 43 ; 57 ; 185 n 32 ; 192 n 56 ;  
 199 n 96 ; 208 n 132 ; 209-210 ;  
 228-257 ; 291 n 123 ; 301 n 163 ;  
 362-363 ; 405 ; 415 ; 418 ; 424  
 prayer ..... 190 n 49  
 recipe ..... 231 n 10 ;  
 232 n 15 ; 234 n 28 ; 235 n 32 ;  
 246 n 67a ; 251 n 86 ; 424 n 87  
 rites .....  
 42 n 129 ; 102 ; 148 ; 194-195 ;  
 207-211 ; 226-257 ; 495-496  
 science ..... 36 ; 164  
 terminology ..... 47 ; 52 ;  
 63 ; 95 n 121 ; 101 n 49 ; 178 n 4 ;  
 288 n 109 ; 329 n 59 ; 429-441  
 watchword . 190-192 ; 424 ; 438-439  
 words ..... 48 n 152 ;  
 57-58 ; 59 n 187 ; 61 ; 134-135 ;  
 192 ; 194-195 ; 206 n 125 ; 438-440
- magician .... 34 n 95 ; 43 ; 56 ; 63 ; 164 ;  
 208 n 132 ; 270 ; 286-287 ; 453 n 20
- Magna Mater ..... 69 ; 362
- Mandaeans ..... 422 n 81
- manichaeism  
 Aristocritus ..... 16 n 41  
 astral doctrine of ..... 422 n 82  
 Manichaean doctrine of Hyle . 392  
 Manichaean doctrine of the Cosmic  
 Soul .... 364 n 205 ; 393 n 299
- manifestation ..... 468 n 8-9
- Manna ..... 343
- mantic ..... 148 ; 232 n 15 ; 254-257
- Marcomans .... 3 n 1 ; 4 n 2 ; 247-248
- Marcus  
 Aurelius .... 276 n 71 ; 428 n 101  
 the Gnostic ..... 40 n 120  
 the Mesopotamian monk .....  
 ..... 292 n 127
- marriage as metaphor ..... 297 n 145
- Mars ..... 90 n 92 ; 256 n 103 ; 271
- Marsilio Ficino ..... 441 ; 477
- massa perditionis ..... 278 n 81
- master/disciple ..... 233-234
- mastix-tree ..... 290 n 117
- mathematics ..... 501 ; 506-507
- matter  
 amorphous ..... 112 ; 317  
 cold ..... 492  
 cosmological attributes .....  
 ..... 296 n 140 ; 297 n 143  
 created by the Father ... 117 ; 300  
 demonic principle .....  
 ..... 304-309 ; 375-394  
 dregs of the elements .....  
 214 n 151 ; 276 n 70 ; 317 n 17  
 dung ..... 213 ; 305  
 earth ..... 213 n 144  
 evil ..... 268 ; 304 ; 380-393  
 feminine principle .. 343 n 120 ; 395  
 Hades ..... 126 ; 375-394  
 imperishable ..... 13 ; 454  
 impure ..... 35  
 informed by the ideas or Second  
 Intellect .....  
 25 ; 113 n 184 ; 118-119 ; 317 n 17  
 opposed to Spirit ..... 98  
 primal ..... 119-120 ;  
 126 ; 296-304 ; 375-394 ; 492  
 privation ..... 300-304
- Maximus of Ephesus ..... 69 n 8 ;  
 233 n 22 ; 248 ; 254 n 97 ; 270
- Maximus of Tyre ..... 314 n 5 ; 436
- mazdaism  
 demonology of the ..... 283-293  
 doctrine of Infinite Time in .....  
 ..... 407-409 ; 425-426  
 fire-cult ..... 429 n 104
- meadow ..... 221 n 178
- measure ..... 112 ; 116
- medecine ..... 501 ; 506-507
- mediator ..... 134 ; 156
- medical terminology ... 215-216 ; 458
- medium ..... 39 ; 43
- membrane  
 cosmic ..... 120  
 noetic ..... 92 ; 354 n 159
- Menander Rhetor ..... 411 n 39
- Mene ..... 242 n 54
- Meni ..... 290 n 117
- Mercury  
 planet ..... 49-50 ; 158  
 star of Apollo ..... 222 n 185
- Mesomedes ..... 397
- messenger ..... 133
- metaphors ..... 335-345 ; 373-375

- metaphysics .....  
   .. 338 ; 361 ; 364-365 ; 380 ; 489  
 metric ..... 53 n 165 ; 59 n 186 ; 62  
 Michael Italicus ..... 477 ; 479  
 Middle Ages ..... 138 n 271 ; 441  
 Middle Platonism  
   fluctuating state of the M.-P.  
   theories ..... 336 ; 350-351  
   historical survey ..... 313-316  
   in Alexandria ..... 342 n 112  
   influence on Philo ..... 350 n 143  
   influence on the Oracles .....  
   ..... 316-394 ; 433-441  
 midmost ..... 142 ; 154 ; 280  
 might ..... 12 ; 28  
 milky way ..... 196 n 81  
 millenium ..... 261 n 8  
 Milton ..... 269 n 34 ; 431  
 mimic ..... 208 n 132  
 mirror ..... 114 n 187  
 Mithra .. 363 ; 411 n 38 ; 428 n 100  
 Mithraic triad ..... 326 n 51  
 Mithraism ..... 400 ;  
   418 n 68 ; 424 n 87 ; 426 ; 434 n 115  
 Mithraists .....  
   128 n 236 ; 230 n 8 ; 363 ; 421-422  
*Mithrasliturgie* ..... 209 ; 405  
 mixing ..... 128 n 235 ; 335 ; 358-360  
 mixing-bowl ... 128 ; 324 n 44 ; 496  
 mixture ..... 346 n 131  
 mixture ..... 300-304 ; 358-360  
 mnizuris, etymology of ... 290 n 117  
 model ..... 119 ; 127 n 232  
 Moira ..... 364  
 monad .....  
   80 ; 89 n 84 ; 100 ; 106-107 ; 115 ;  
   137 ; 318 n 22 ; 329 ; 343 n 120 ;  
   347 n 134 ; 349 n 138 ; 395-396  
 monotheistic tendency .....  
   ..... 12 n 28 ; 28 ; 29 n 76  
 Montaigne ..... 76  
 month ..... 229 ; 235  
 moon  
   abode of the ..... 20-22  
   demons of the .. 93 ; 98 ; 271 ; 501  
   door of the souls ..... 501  
   dwelling-place of Athene ..... 501  
   dwelling-place of Hecate .....  
   ..... 49-50 ; 51 n 162 ; 90 ; 142-144  
 [moon]  
   emblem of Artemis ..... 143 n 288  
   emblem of Hecate ... 89-90 ; 96  
   *epibêlêr* ..... 133 n 250  
   face of the ..... 272 n 46  
   in Manichaëism ..... 423 n 82  
   Orphic name of the ..... 362 n 199  
   = Physis ..... 90 ; 98  
   pneuma of the ..... 144 n 288  
   ruled by Alon ..... 102  
   ruler of initiation ... 417-425 ; 455  
   rules the four elements .....  
   ..... 199 ; 234 n 28  
   rules the hylc world . 144 ; 300-301  
   sound of the ..... 256  
   = Virtue ..... 89 ; 158 n 221  
 Moses ..... 217 ; 436 ; 489  
 mother as feminine power subsisting in  
   the Father .....  
   .... 25 ; 335 ; 340 ; 342 n 116  
 mouth ..... 45-46 ; 56 n 176 ; 93  
 Mover, First ..... 153 n 317  
 musical instruments ..... 45-46  
 mystagogy ..... 36 ; 39 ; 270  
 mysteriosophy ..... 204 ; 421 ; 470  
 mystery-religions  
   Chaldaean ..... 117 n 2 ; 205 n 119  
   Dionysian .....  
   ... 205 n 119 ; 253 n 95 ; 488  
   Eleusinian ..... 69 n 8 ;  
   147 n 298 ; 170 n 395 ; 196 n 80 ;  
   205 n 119 ; 228 n 1 ; 237 n 40 ; 238  
   Mithraic ..... 187 n 38  
   oath of silence ..... 146 n 295  
   Oriental ..... 312  
   revealed by Apollo ... 60-61 ; 64  
   rites and sacraments ... 148-149 ;  
   184-211 ; 237-238 ; 487-489  
   terminology ..... 39 ;  
   44 ; 146-147 ; 157 ; 329 n 59  
 mystic  
   experience ..... 169-175 ;  
   197-199 ; 203-204 ; 208 n 132 ;  
   368-375 ; 418-421 ; 434-435  
   imagery .....  
   198 n 89 ; 224 n 194 ; 373-375  
   knowledge ... 206 n 125 ; 366-375  
   suicide ..... 205-206  
 mythical terminology .....  
   128 ; 130 ; 157-158 ; 211 ; 327 ;  
   329 n 63 ; 337-338 ; 339-340 ; 341 ;  
   342 n 112 ; 352 ; 364 ; 380 ; 402 n 6

- name  
 divine names ..... 57 ;  
 76-78 ; 133-134 ; 160 ; 229-230 ;  
 233-235 ; 239-240 ; 439-440  
 literary fiction ..... 63 n 202  
 magical names .....  
 134 ; 164 ; 233 n 20 ; 239 n 48 ;  
 243 n 59 ; 249-250 ; 438-440  
 potency of the gods .... 60 ; 439  
 Narsai ..... 46 n 147  
 nations of the East ..... 23 n 57  
 Nature  
 dwelling-place of the evil demons ..  
 ..... 263-265  
 = Hecate .....  
 95-97 ; 269 ; 271 ; 355-358  
 men bound by ..... 55  
 = moon ..... 271  
 nature-cults ..... 342 n 115  
 = Paian ..... 59  
 sensible world .. 53-55 ; 437 n 128  
 = \* Strength \* ..... 54  
 Necessity .... 27 ; 54 ; 58-60 ; 97 ; 256  
 necromancy ..... 207-209 ; 256  
 negative attributes .....  
 22 ; 57 ; 77 ; 107 ; 166 ; 327-328 ; 338  
 Nemesis ..... 508 n 46  
 neologism .....  
 38 n 113 ; 41 ; 59 n 186 ; 78 n 45 ;  
 86 n 74 ; 91 n 96 ; 155 n 331 ;  
 195 n 74 ; 196 n 80 ; 199 n 96 ;  
 206 n 124 ; 445 ; 457-459 ; 461  
 Neoplatonism  
 Alexandrine School ..... 73  
 Athenian School .....  
 ..... 69-73 ; 394 n 301  
 internal evolution of ..... 67 n 3  
 mode of quoting the Oracles in  
 ..... 443-447  
 Neoplatonist interpretation .....  
 .... 130 ; 144 n 290 ; 148 ;  
 151 ; 156 ; 182 n 26 ; 186 n 37  
 Neoplatonist misinterpretation ....  
 139 n 274 ; 141 n 280 ; 261 n 7  
 of Philo ..... 315 n 8  
 transmission of the Oracles in .....  
 ..... 5-9 ; 34-38 ; 67-76  
 Neopythagoreanism .....  
 ... 163 n 367 ; 225 n 197 ; 394-398  
 Neptun ..... 326 n 51  
 Nestorius, grand-father of Plutarch  
 the Neoplatonist ..... 69 n 9 ;  
 71 n 16 ; 251 n 86 ; 259 n 2 ; 465  
 nether-world ..... 293-304  
 Nicephorus Gregoras .....  
 ..... 280 n 85 ; 476 ; 479  
 Nicetas of Serres ..... 231 n 9 ; 479  
 Nicomachus of Gerasa .... 163 n 367 ;  
 212 n 143 ; 225 n 197 ; 250 n 83  
 night .....  
 207 n 131 ; 229 ; 243 n 57. 59 ; 245  
 nodding ..... 27 ; 80 n 49 (8)  
 noetic  
 entities ..... 322-324  
 potencies ..... 25 ; 27 ;  
 81-83 ; 141 n 282 ; 157-158 ; 332  
 principles ..... 326 n 51  
 universe ..... 81  
 nomen arcanum ..... 329 n 59  
 nomina  
 agentis ..... 41 ; 458  
 composita ..... 459  
 propria ..... 134 n 256  
 simplicia ..... 458-459  
 Nomos ..... 64  
 nostalgia ..... 180  
 number  
 as world-soul ..... 360  
 ideal ..... 395 n 307  
 in the Pythagorean metaphysics  
 ..... 394-397  
 numbers' symbolic  
 three . 93 ; 139-140 ; 374 ; 396  
 four .....  
 ... 234-235 ; 297 n 147 ; 279 n 260  
 five ..... 499-500 ; 506-507  
 seven ..... 27-28 ;  
 123 ; 150 ; 199-200 ; 291 n 122  
 ten ..... 138 n 271  
 twelve .... 137 n 267 ; 291 n 122  
 fifteen ..... 301 n 163  
 numen ... 101 ; 104 ; 233 ; 403  
 Numenius ..... 313-315 ;  
 318-321 ; 323 n 38 ; 324 n 44 ;  
 346 n 130 ; 393 n 299 ; 428 n 100 ;  
 433-434 ; 497 n 1 ; 503-504  
 oath  
 in magic ..... 233 ; 363-364  
 of silence ..... 146 n 295  
 offering ..... 209 n 134 ;  
 269 n 35 ; 270 n 37 ; 289-293  
 officiant ..... 40-41 ; 467-468  
 ogdoad ..... 413-414  
 oil ..... 209 n 134

- Olymp ..... 27 ; 488  
 Olympian gods ..... 137 n 267  
 Olympiodorus ..... 73  
 One  
   name of the Supreme Being .....  
     24 ; 81 n 54 ; 395-396 ; 470-471  
   nature of the ..... 335 n 82  
   Plotinus' doctrine of the .....  
     ..... 369 n 215 ; 370 n 219  
 onslaught ..... 192-196 ; 236-238  
 oracles  
   astrophysics opposed to the ... 446  
   in paganism ..... 173 n 403  
   inspired character ..... 8 ; 447  
   utterances of the gods ..... 6-7  
 order ..... 347 n 134  
 Origen the Neoplatonist .....  
   ..... 323 ; 327 n 53 ; 334 ;  
   381 ; 388 ; 393 n 301 ; 503-508  
 Ormuzd ..... 284-285 ; 409  
 ornithoscopy ..... 257 n 106  
 Orpheus ..... 37 n 110 ;  
   304 n 173 ; 362 n 196 ; 481 n 1  
 Orphics ... 200 n 97 ; 205 n 119 ; 221 ;  
   253 n 95 ; 267 n 25 ; 297 n 147 ;  
   329 n 61 ; 343 ; 362-363 ; 379 n 259 ;  
   380 n 263 ; 443-445 ; 474 ; 503 n 22  
 Orphism .....  
   in Hellenic theology ..... 66  
   literature ..... 37 ; 75 n 35  
   Proclian harmonization of the Pla-  
   tonic, Orphic and Chaldaean sys-  
   tems ..... 481-485  
   terminology ..... 28 n 72 ;  
   78 n 145 ; 84 n 65 ; 108 n 173  
   traditions ..... 95 n 119 ;  
   224 n 196 ; 228 n 1 ; 267 n 25 ;  
   269 n 34 ; 297-298 ; 299 n 154  
 Osiris . 210 n 139 ; 306 ; 342 n 112 ; 379  
 Ostanas ..... 52 n 164 ; 163 n 367 ;  
   408 ; 424 n 87 ; 425 ; 427 n 98  
 outflow ..... 109 ; 111 n 177  
 Ovid ..... 57 n 180  
 paean ..... 201 n 102  
 Paian ..... cf. Apollo  
 Pamphylus, father of Er the Armenian  
   ..... 434 n 115  
 pandemonium ..... 266-268 ; 500-501  
 pantheism ..... 333 n 75 ; 351  
 Paradise .....  
   34 n 95 ; 50 ; 215 ; 220-221 ; 419  
 paraphrase .....  
   17 n 43 ; 38 ; 75 ; 94 n 117 ; 102 ; 120  
 passions ..... 264 n 17 ;  
   276-278 ; 303 ; 306 n 181 ; 504  
 password ..... 190-192 ; 424 ; 438-439  
 path ..... 100 ; 141  
 Patrizi ..... 441  
 Patroclus . 184-185 ; 206-207 ; 209 n 135  
 Paulinian theology ..... 147-148  
 Pentheus ..... 253 n 95  
 Peripatetics ..... 333  
 periphrastic designations ..... 28  
 Peripateticians ..... 137 n 269  
 Persephone .. 51 n 162 ; 95 n 119 ; 362  
 Persia ..... 393 n 301  
 Persian  
   angelology ..... 163  
   doctrine ..... 326 n 51  
   influence ..... 232 n 15 ;  
   283-293 ; 298 n 150 ; 387-  
   393 ; 404-409 ; 422 ; 425-429  
   poetry ..... 47  
   titles ..... 164  
 Phanes ..... 150 n 309 ; 362 n 196.198  
 phantom ..... 214-219  
 Philo of Alexandria .....  
   ..... 163-164 ; 169 n 389 ;  
   315 ; 321 ; 324 n 42 ; 327 n 53 ;  
   328 n 59 ; 332-335 ; 338-339 ;  
   340 ; 342 n 113 ; 343-344 ; 346-351  
 Philo of Byblus ..... 290 n 117 ;  
   409 n 32 ; 430 n 105 ; 511 n 8  
 Philologia ..... 139 n 274 ;  
   177 n 3 ; 196 n 81 ; 206 n 125  
 philosopher  
   opposed to the theurgist .....  
     ..... 462-464 ; 471  
   soul of the ..... 224-225  
 philosophy  
   and theurgy ..... 462-463  
   insufficiency of ..... 204 n 115  
   Plato's 'true philosophy' against  
   the new religions ..... 453-454  
 Phoebus ..... 45 ; 61 n 197  
 Phoenicia ..... 404  
 Phôs = Aion ..... 89 n 85 ; 101 n 146  
 Phrygian taurobolia ..... 205 n 119



- phylacteries ..... 290-291  
 Physis  
   = Ananke ..... 98 ; 355  
   Cosmic Soul . 129 n 242 ; 356-358  
   function ..... 98  
   metonym of Hecate  
     ..... 54 ; 95-97 ; 269 ; 355-358  
   metonym of the moon ... 90 n 92  
   source of sympathy .... 347 n 134  
 Pico della Mirandola ..... 441  
 pipe ..... 56 n 176  
 pitcher as emblem of Hecate .. 88 ; 94  
 place  
   celestial sense ... 213 ; 219-226  
   of punishment ..... 217  
   one of the names of Zervan ... 409  
 plague ..... 3 n 1 ; 248 n 72  
 planets  
   astral intelligences ... 137 ; 159  
   gods ..... 50 ;  
     137 n 267 ; 158 ; 161-162 ; 498  
   hierarchy of the .....  
     ... 13 ; 20 ; 22 ; 77 ; 100 ;  
     104 n 156 ; 125 ; 133 ; 136 ; 140 ;  
     142-144 ; 150 ; 158-162 ; 251 ;  
     268 ; 291 n 122 ; 294 ; 300 ; 352  
   qualities of the ..... 50  
   sound of the ..... 193 n 63 ; 412  
   the worlds ..... 89 ; 96 ; 134  
 plants  
   growth of the ..... 186 ; 231  
   metaphorical sense .....  
     ..... 335-336 ; 343-344  
   offerings of ..... 290 ; 496  
 plates in magic ..... 290-291  
 Plato  
   Chaldaean teachings as prior to  
     those of ..... 445-446  
   disciple of the Chaldaeans .....  
     ..... 427 n 97  
   epitaph on ... 214 n 148 ; 216 n 157  
   eschatological myths of ..... 280  
   *Gorgias* ..... 296 n 140  
   myth of the *Phaedo* .....  
     ..... 281 n 86 ; 379 n 259  
   myth of the *Phaedrus* .....  
     ..... 137 n 267 ; 381 n 268  
   myth of the *Republic* ... 32 n 89 ;  
     236 n 34 ; 326 n 50 ; 434 n 115  
   Neoplatonist harmonization between  
   Oracles, magic and Platonic  
   philosophy .....  
     73 n 28 ; 75 ; 81 n 52 ; 105 ; 120 ;  
     229 ; 281 ; 298 n 148 ; 312-313 ;  
     326 ; 388-390 ; 456 ; 492  
 [Plato]  
   on soul ..... 224 n 196 ; 225 n 197 ;  
     229 ; 253-254 ; 307 n 182 ; 312  
   *Phaedo* ..... 296 n 140  
   philosophical myths of .....  
     ..... 337 ; 450 n 8 ; 499-505  
   Proclian harmonization of the Pla-  
   tonic, Orphic and Chaldaean  
   systems ..... 481-485  
   *Republic* ..... 471-372  
   theologian and prophet . 320 n 29  
   *Theaetetus* ..... 512  
   *Timaeus* ..... 70 ; 120-121 ;  
     285 n 102 ; 296 n 140 ; 325 ;  
     326 n 50 ; 337 ; 339 ; 345 ; 347 ;  
     350 ; 358-360 ; 377 ; 382 ; 499  
 Platonism  
   dynamic character of .....  
     ..... 334-335 ; 351  
   Gnosticizing Platonism or Platoni-  
   cizing Gnosticism ..... 387-394  
   of Oracles . 316-394 ; 401 ; 433-441  
   of Plotinus ..... 316  
   spatial representations in ... 170  
   terminology of . 120 n 203 ; 203 ;  
     246 n 68 ; 273 n 53 ; 282 n 92 ;  
     294 n 133. 136 ; 297 n 145 ;  
     302 ; 372 n 231 ; 375 ; 459  
   « true philosophy » of Plato against  
   the new religions ..... 454-455  
 Platonists .....  
   137 n 269 ; 163 ; 236 n 34 ; 282 n 90 ;  
   303 n 170 ; 497-498 ; 503 ; 506-507  
 pleroma ..... 160  
 Pletho ..... 441 ; 474-475  
 Plotinus ..... 78 n 43 ; 176 ;  
   315-316 ; 321-325 ; 326 n 50 ;  
   327 ; 330 n 66 ; 334-335 ;  
   338-339 ; 340 ; 343 n 122 ;  
   344 ; 347 n 134-135 ; 368-372 ;  
   437 ; 454-455 ; 505-506  
 plural ..... 111 n 178 ; 116  
 Plutarch .....  
   211 n 140 ; 315 ; 353 ; 436 ; 511 n 8  
 Plutarch the Neoplatonist .... 69 ; 73  
 Pluto ..... 283 ; 284 n 96 ;  
   379 n 259 ; 380 n 263 ; 418 n 68  
 pneuma  
   Cosmic Soul ..... 122 ; 360  
   divine . 335 ; 349 n 142 ; 369 n 217  
   envelope of the individual souls ...  
     ..... 122 ; 184 n 30  
   of the moon ..... 185 n 35  
   physical ..... 197

- pneumatology .....  
 .... 43-47 ; 57 ; 122 ; 197-199
- poetry  
 Alexandrine ..... 57 n 180  
 oracular .... 62-63 ; 75 ; 337 ; 459  
 Persian ..... 47  
 poetic words ..... 283 n 93
- poles ..... 122
- polemic  
 against the Christians .. 313 ; 453  
 against the Jews ..... 454 n 23
- polemics ..... 113 n 184 ;  
 124 n 221 ; 147 n 295 ; 453 ; 454 n 22
- Polites ..... 63 n 202
- polytheism ..... 65
- Porphyry  
 against the Gnostics .... 453 n 18  
*De cultu simulaeorum* . 362 n 197  
 demonology of ... 261 n 8 ; 497-502  
*De regressu* ..... 7 n 17  
 doctrine of the noetic triads .....  
 ..... 105 n 163 ; 340 n 103  
 lived in Rome ..... 315 n 11  
 main transmitter of the Oracles ...  
 ..... 7-9 ; 16-18 ; 23 ; 26 ;  
 29 ; 37-38 ; 39-40 ; 42-43 ; 47 ;  
 50-53 ; 58 ; 64-65 ; 68 ; 449-456  
 Origen the Neoplatonist as literary  
 source of P.'s demonology .....  
 ..... 503-508  
 \* *Philosophy of the Oracles* \* as  
 source of the \* *Hellenic Theology* \*  
 quoted by Eusebius .... 509-512  
 plagiarist of Numenius .. 503 n 23  
 refers back to doctrines of the  
 Middle Platonism .....  
 ..... 315 ; 343 n 118  
 sources of ..... 333-334 ; 348 n 136  
 the first to propound a platonizing  
 interpretation of the Oracles  
 ..... 68 ; 456  
 titles transmitted by Suidas .....  
 ..... 449 ; 451 n 9
- portion ..... 219-220
- Poseidon ..... 193 n 65 ; 503
- Posidonius .....  
 .... 186 n 37 ; 345 ; 410 ; 413 n 46
- possession ..... 45-46
- power (δύναμις)  
 feminine principle of the Father ...  
 ..... 87 ; 106 ; 342 n 116  
 hypostasis ..... 82  
 sum of noetic potencies .... 78-79 ;  
 332-335 ; 440-441 ; 470-471
- [power (δύναμις)]  
 transmitter of the Father's activity  
 ..... 82-83 ; 113 n 184 ; 263  
 world-soul ... 341 n 108 ; 350 n 144
- powers (δυνάμεις)  
 hidden ..... 234  
 interplay of ..... 338  
 invisible — = ideas .....  
 ..... 346 n 132 ; 349 n 139  
 Iynges ..... 163  
 of God ..... 348-351  
 Philonic doctrine of the . 350 n 143  
 upholding the world .....  
 ..... 135 n 260 ; 348-349
- practice in Chaldaeism and magic ... 56
- prayer ..... 12 n 26 ;  
 35-36 ; 86 n 74 ; 94 n 117 ; 102 ;  
 129 n 240 ; 145 n 291 ; 173 n 406 ;  
 177 n 3 ; 185 n 32 ; 194 n 71 ; 202 ;  
 229 ; 239-240 ; 269 ; 270 n 40 ;  
 436 n 125 ; 437 ; 471 n 20
- precipice ..... 213-214 ; 293-296
- priests .....  
 6 ; 39 ; 44 ; 220 n 173 ; 228 n 1 ;  
 270 n 37 ; 401 ; 420 ; 424 ; 426 n 94 ;  
 427 ; 436 ; 446 ; 495-496 ; 500
- principle  
 androgynous ..... 82  
 feminine ..... 13 ; 87 ; 129  
 first .... cf. Father, Supreme Being  
 hylic ..... 274 n 58
- principles  
 good-evil ..... 284  
 ideas subsisting in the Second  
 Intellect ..... 115-116
- procession . 26 ; 84 n 66 ; 103 n 152
- Proclus  
 against the Christians .....  
 ..... 70 n 13 ; 251 n 88  
 \* fire-song \* ..... 491-493  
 his harmonization of the Platonic,  
 Orphic and Chaldaean systems  
 ..... 481-485  
 influence on the German mystics  
 ..... 471 n 21  
 mode of quoting the Oracles .....  
 ..... 443-447  
 on the localization of Hades .....  
 ..... 281 n 89  
 on the myth of the *Phaedrus* .....  
 ..... 470 n 15  
 source of Psellus .....  
 ..... 81 n 54 ; 473-474 ; 477 ; 479  
 terminology . 291 n 122 ; 431 n 109  
 transmitter of the Oracles .....  
 .... 70-72 ; 326 n 50 ; 481-482

- Procopius of Gaza ..... 496  
 procreation as metaphor .....  
     ..... 81 ; 335 ; 340-343  
 productio epica ..... 86 n 74  
 Prometheus ..... 276 n 71  
 prophecies ..... 8-9 ; 16-17 ;  
     31 ; 34-38 ; 64 ; 163 ; 446-447  
 prophet  
     and theurgist ..... 273 n 53  
     body of the ..... 45-46  
     of the Old Testament ..... 47  
 prophetess ..... 40 ; 46  
 Proserpina ..... 50 ; 94  
 prostration ..... 207-208  
 prototype ..... 113 n 184 ; 116 ; 118  
 providence  
     astral ..... 212 n 143  
     in Platonism .. 265 n 21 ; 384 n 274  
 Psellus ... 72 ; 441 ; 473-479 ; 491 ; 493  
 pseudo-Aristotle ..... 431 n 110  
 pseudo-Dionysius .....  
     74 n 33 ; 253 n 93 ; 441 ; 471 n 21  
 pseudo-Ostanes ..... 430 n 105  
 pseudo-Zoroaster ..... 430 n 105  
 Psyche  
     abode ..... 88 n 82 ; 91  
     activity ..... 87-89 ; 98  
     cult ..... 87  
     = Ennoia ..... 87 n 77  
     gives the universe one life .....  
         ..... 347 n 134  
     = Hecate ..... 6 ; 50 n 160 ; 54  
     in man ..... 169  
     = Leviathan ..... 354  
     nature ..... 84-87 ; 91  
     world-soul .... 82 ; 84-98 ; 354  
     = Zoe ..... 84-85 ; 98  
 Ptolemy .....  
     124 n 221 ; 143 n 287 ; 152 n 317 ;  
     377 n 252 ; 443 ; 446  
 Publilius Syrus ..... 40 n 122  
 Punic Africa ..... 404  
 punishment ..... 217 ;  
     298-299 ; 303-304 ; 307-308  
 puns ..... 84 n 65 ; 85 n 70  
 purgatory ..... 284 n 96  
 purification ..... 44-45 ; 148 ;  
     171-173 ; 178 ; 198-199 ; 218 n 167 ;  
     227 n 1 ; 231 n 12 ; 237-238 ;  
     273 n 52 ; 275-276 ; 286-287 ;  
     288 n 109 ; 290 ; 361 ; 453 ; 462 ; 495  
 pyre ..... 206-207  
 Pyrrhylegethon ..... 297 n 147  
 Pythagoras ..... 224 n 196 ;  
     321 n 29 ; 324 n 44 ; 397 ; 427  
 Pythagoreans ..... 109 ;  
     146 n 295 ; 163 ; 199 n 96 ; 224 ;  
     303 n 170 ; 314 n 7 ; 321 n 31 ;  
     343 n 120 ; 369 n 217 ; 371 n 226 ;  
     389 n 287 ; 394-398 ; 497 n 1 ; 512  
 Pythia ..... 40 ; 46  
 queen-bees ..... 333 n 74  
 question  
     nature of the interrogated god  
         ..... 61 n 197 ; 64  
     refusal to answer a question .....  
         ..... 161 n 359  
 questioner ... 31 ; 63 n 202 ; 233-234  
 quotations of the Oracles ..... 443-447  
 Raguel ..... 329 n 62  
 rain ..... 4 n 2 ; 248 n 72  
 ray .....  
     60-61 ; 114 ; 140 ; 149-156 ;  
     169 n 384 ; 171 ; 173 n 405 ;  
     183 n 27 ; 185-200 ; 208-210 ;  
     268 ; 288 n 109 ; 418 ; 493  
 recipient ..... 39-41 ;  
     42 n 133 ; 43-45 ; 56 n 176  
 red ..... 292  
 reincarnation .....  
     ..... 189 n 45 ; 393 n 300 ; 452 ;  
     454 ; 500 n 8 ; 502 ; 507 n 44  
 reflection ..... 114 n 187  
 remembrance ..... 190 ; 192  
 Renaissance ..... 441  
 repetition ..... 110 n 177  
 resolution ..... 80 n 49 (10)  
 resurrection  
     corporeal ..... 215-216  
     of a god ..... 210 n 139  
 return ..... 492  
*Revelation of Zephania* ..... 328 n 59  
 rhapsodies ..... 37  
 Rhea ..... 84 n 65-66  
 riddle ..... 358-359  
 right ..... 88 ; 216 n 157

- ring ..... 135
- rites .....  
38-61 ; 178-211 ; 289-293 ; 495-496
- ritual  
  fault ..... 54  
  integrity ..... 44 ; 462
- river ..... 297 n 147 ; 379 n 260
- roaring ..... 299
- Rome ..... 313-314 ;  
315 n 11 ; 404 ; 418 n 68 ; 428
- Romulus ..... 225 n 196 ; 489
- root ..... 343 n 122
- rulers  
  guides of the souls . 417-425 ; 455  
  leaders of the world . 138-148 ; 156
- sacrament  
  elevation . 60 ; 177 ; 184 ; 487-489  
  material ..... 178 ; 184  
  of Apollo ..... 6  
  of the immortalization .....  
    ..... 187-189 ; 203-211 ; 215  
  sacramental community .....  
    ..... 39 ; 177 ; 210 ; 453 ; 463  
  theurgical ..... 196 n 80 ; 237-238 ;  
    270 n 37 ; 418 ; 452-453
- sacrifice .....  
33 n 94 ; 184 ; 196 n 80 ; 206-207 ;  
209 n 134 ; 218 n 167 ; 231 n 13 ;  
233-234 ; 241 n 52 ; 285 ; 289 n 114 ;  
290 n 121 ; 497-499 ; 510-511
- Sahr ..... 423 n 84
- salvation ..... 214-216
- Samsh ..... 423 n 84
- sapphire ..... 249
- Satan .....  
381 n 268 ; 385-386 ; 390-392
- Saturn ..... 406 n 25
- Saul ..... 264 n 17
- sceptre ..... 496
- scholasticism ..... 314
- sciences ..... 501 ; 506-507
- scourge ..... 363 n 203
- sea ..... 44 ; 228 n 1 ; 503
- seal ..... 496
- seasons ..... 234-235
- secret .....  
..... 39 ; 55 ; 152 ; 192 n 56 ;  
233 n 20 ; 243 ; 329 n 59 ; 407 n 25
- sediment ..... 384-387
- seeding ..... 343
- seismology ..... 259 n 2
- Selene ..... 362-364 ; 422
- self-deliverance ..... 188 n 43
- self-manifestation ..... 246-247
- self-withdrawal ..... 327-328 ; 331-332
- Semele ..... 218 n 167 ; 488
- Seneca ..... 324 n 42
- Septuaginta* ..... 350 n 143
- Seraphs ..... 15
- Serapis ..... 284 n 96 ; 362
- sheath, emblem of Hecate ..... 95
- sheep ..... 209 n 134
- shepherd ..... 500 ; 506
- shield, emblem of Hecate ..... 95
- shuttle ..... 496
- Sibyl ..... 40-41
- sign ..... 242 ; 252-254 ; 291
- silence  
  name of the intelligible world  
    ..... 397-398  
  name of the Supreme Being .....  
    ..... 78 ; 160  
  oath of ..... 146 n 295  
  theurgic ..... 61 n 197
- Simplicius ..... 73 n 27
- Sinai ..... 489
- sinking ..... 295
- sinner ..... 214 ; 297-299 ; 304 n 173
- Sisyphus ..... 488
- smith ..... 118
- snake  
  emblem of Hecate .....  
    ..... 90-92 ; 292 ; 354-355  
  emblem of Mithra ..... 405-406  
  serpent of brass ..... 254 n 97  
  spheres or Cosmic Soul ..... 92  
  symbolism of the powers of evil  
    ..... 293  
  symbolism of the windings of the  
    the stars . 293 n 131 ; 405-406
- Socrates ..... 224 n 196 ; 436
- son  
  of God ..... 319 n 25 ; 369 n 217  
  of gods = theurgist ..... 446  
  sons = planetary gods ... 159 ; 161
- songs ..... 47 ; 57

- soothsayers ..... 34 n 95
- Sopater ..... 69 n 8
- sorcerer ..... 147 n 295
- sorcery ..... 285
- soteriology .... 210-211 ; 434-436 ;
- soul
- abode of the - in the after-life ..... 219-226
  - admixture of Eros ..... 128-129 ; 352-353
  - angel ..... 187 n 41 ; 223-225 ; 349 n 139
  - Apollinian ..... 224 n 196
  - ascent of ..... 20 ; 143 n 287 ; 149 ; 155-156 ; 171-175 ; 184-200 ; 204 ; 237-238 ; 270 n 37 ; 360-361 ; 367-368 ; 375 ; 413-419 ; 468-470 ; 488
  - cosmic ..... 6-7 ; 25 ; 27-28 ; 47 ; 50 ; 54 ; 82 ; 84-98 ; 103 n 152 ; 122 ; 129 ; 180 n 17 ; 181-182 ; 219 ; 221 n 183 ; 222-223 ; 254 ; 270 ; 320 n 28 ; 324 ; 335 ; 341 n 108 ; 349 n 139 ; 352 n 151 ; 353-366 ; 379 ; 381 n 268 ; 382 n 269 ; 393 ; 403 ; 417 ; 437 ; 455 ; 492 ; 501 n 12 ; 505-506
  - demonic ..... 349 n 139
  - descent of . 45 ; 80 n 49 ; 136 n 263 ; 163 n 365 ; 180-183 ; 189-190 ; 360-361 ; 416 ; 501 n 12 ; 502 n 21
  - disembodiment of the ..... 206 ; 214-219
  - escorters of ..... 235-236
  - heavenly origin ..... 63 ; 168-173 ; 189-191 ; 301-304 ; 433-434 ; 452 ; 492
  - Hephaestic ..... 507
  - immortalization of the ..... 177 ; 184 n 32 ; 187-226 ; 276
  - individual ..... 179 n 8
  - journey through the heavens ..... 244 n 62 ; 413-417 ; 489
  - Platonic trichotomy of the ..... 307 n 182 ; 363 n 201
  - pre-existent human souls . 261 n 8
  - raiments of the . 182-183 ; 193-194
  - separation from the body ..... 187-189 ; 205-207 ; 208 n 132 ; 214-215
  - solar rays, vehicles of the ..... 183 n 27 ; 418 ; 469
  - stages in the descent and ascent ... 182 n 26
  - union of the intellect and the ..... 121 ; 169
  - yearning for immortality ..... 32
- source
- = Hecate ..... 89 ; 94 ; 129
  - = Ideas ... 100 ; 111 ; 128 ; 136
  - = Zoe ..... 83-85
  - name of the Father's power ..... 25 ; 27 ; 77 ; 82-83 ; 115-116
- sowing ..... 335
- spark ..... 45 ; 80 n 49 (9) ; 170 ; 179-180 ; 189-190 ; 204 n 114 ; 219 n 168 ; 279 ; 358-360
- spatial terminology ..... 145
- spells ..... 51 n 162 ; 58-59 ; 239-240 ; 249-250 ; 467-468
- Speusippus ..... 214 n 148
- sphere
- abode of the individual soul ... 223
  - cavity ..... 136
  - heavenly ..... 13 ; 45 ; 102 n 152 ; 193 ; 250-252
  - of the fixed stars ..... 19 ; 104 ; 152 n 317
  - magic of the spheres ..... 425
  - planetary ..... 48 ; 96 ; 195 n 76 ; 377 n 252
  - sound of the spheres ... 250 ; 397
  - sublunar ..... 235
  - starless ..... 152-153
  - terrestrial ..... 20 ; 263-264
- spices ..... 231 n 12 ; 496
- spirit
- deceiving ..... 273 n 54
  - elementary ..... 271
  - evil ..... 54-55 ; 183 n 27 ; 307
  - hylic ..... 42 n 133 ; 122
  - ministering ..... 13 ; 30 ; 43 ; 224 n 196 ; 229 ; 235-238 ; 245 ; 250 ; 261-262 ; 287
  - prophetic ..... 45-47
  - water ..... 133 n 250 ; 267-268
- spirits
- of the air ..... 421-422
  - punishing ..... 299 n 155
  - sons of the Father ..... 30
  - throttling .. 264 n 17 ; 298 n 151
- stairs ..... 301 n 163
- stars
- dwelling-place of the souls ..... 214 n 150
  - ethereal world . 13 ; 19 n 46 ; 54-55 ; 97-98 ; 127 n 232 ; 135 n 260 ; 183 ; 230 n 8 ; 251 ; 352 ; 355 ; 376 n 249-250 ; 405-406 ; 437
  - motion of the ..... 140 n 276
  - = planets ..... 268 n 31

## [stars]

- stellar powers .....  
 ..... 221 ; 256 n 103 ; 268
- statue  
 in magic ..... 291-292  
 of Aion ..... 406-407  
 of Apollo ... 293 n 131 ; 362  
 of Hecate .....  
 23 n 57 ; 51 n 162 ; 88-95 ; 247-248  
 of Isis ..... 362  
 of Magna Mater ..... 362  
 of Serapis ..... 362  
 of Zeus .... 348 n 136 ; 362  
 symbolic interpretation .....  
 .... 92 n 105 ; 361-364 ; 495-496
- Stoicism .....  
 284 n 96 ; 331 n 69 ; 332-333 ; 343 ;  
 345-346 ; 348 n 136 ; 349 n 142 ;  
 350 ; 357 n 174 ; 360-361 ;  
 378 n 258 ; 380 n 263 ; 381 n 266 ;  
 398 n 319 ; 410-411 ; 430-431 ; 506
- stomach ..... 45
- stone ..... 231 ; 234 ;  
 288 n 109 ; 289-290 ; 424 n 87 ; 496
- strength ..... 11 ; 13 ; 27 ;  
 53-54 ; 83 ; 86-87 ; 93 ;  
 98 ; 100 ; 109 ; 167 ; 193-194
- Styx ..... 502 n 22
- substances, astral- .....  
 ..... 182 ; 189 ; 199 ; 359-360
- suddenness ..... 231 n 13
- suicide ..... 205-206 ; 209 n 136
- Suidas ..... 449-451
- sulphur ..... 228 n 1
- sun  
 ambivalent ..... 151-153  
 = Apollo ..... 49 ; 60  
 connective ..... 411 n 37  
 course ..... 49 n 156 ;  
 80 n 49 ; 96-97 ; 149 ; 256  
 demiurge ..... 411 n 39  
 dwelling-place of the soul .....  
 ..... 210 ; 418-419  
 executor of the Father's will .. 202  
 = Fire . 22 ; 47 ; 201-204 ; 344  
 god ..... 362 n 197  
 heart of the world ..... 411 n 37  
 = Helios ..... 20  
 hymns ..... 420 n 75 ; 459 n 8  
 in Manichaëism ..... 423 n 82  
 localization in the midmost plane-  
 tary sphere  
 60-61 ; 140 ; 142 ; 146 ; 150 n 309 ;  
 152-153 ; 195 ; 200 ; 411 n 37

## [sun]

- = Mithra ..... 411 n 38  
 origin ..... 153 n 317 ; 224 n 196  
 = Phoebus ..... 45  
 ruled by Aion .....  
 ..... 102 ; 141-142 ; 149  
 ruler of initiation .. 417-425 ; 455  
 rules the ethereal world .....  
 .... 144 ; 155 ; 200 ; 410-411  
 solar rays guided by angels .....  
 ..... 183 n 27  
 solar religion .....  
 .... 409-413 ; 429-430 ; 432  
 solar system .... 149-156 ; 409-413  
 source of life ..... 411 n 37  
 = Truth ..... 50 ; 146  
 worship of .....  
 18 ; 49 n 158 ; 131 ; 409-413
- supplications ..... 239-240
- Supreme Being  
 activity .... 81-83 ; 101 ; 341  
 dwelling-place of the .....  
 ..... 77 ; 160 ; 328 n 58  
 in Mazdeism ..... 408  
 knowledge of the ..... 166  
 names ..... 76-78 ; 327-328  
 nature ..... 78-81 ; 334
- sword  
 amulet ..... 293  
 emblem of Hecate .. 95 ; 363 n 203
- symbols  
 magical words .....  
 191-192 ; 336 ; 438-440 ; 462 ; 471  
 potencies which effect the connec-  
 tion of the universe ..... 470  
 terminology of .... 24-25 ; 26-27 ;  
 165 ; 169 ; 219-226 ; 337 n 95  
 understood only by the gods .....  
 ..... 57 n 182
- sympathy .. 157 ; 290 ; 345-347 ;  
 371 ; 438 n 130 ; 470-471
- syncretism ..... 425-441 ; 463 ; 512
- Synësius . 73 ; 161 n 358 ; 343 n 118 ; 476
- synonymous, accumulation of ..... 27
- Syria ..... 410-433
- Syrianus ..... 69-70 ; 184 ; 206
- syzygy .....  
 329 n 62 ; 342-343 ; 369 n 217
- talisman ..... 252-254 ; 291-292
- Tartarus ..... 213-214 ;  
 282 n 90 ; 284 n 96 ; 294-304 ;  
 308 ; 378-380 ; 386 ; 503 n 22

- taurobolia ..... 205 n 119
- Taurus the Platonist ..... 360 n 184
- teacher  
of Platonic school ..... 233 n 22  
of sacrifice ..... 233-234
- technical skill ..... 501 ; 507
- teletic art ..... 69 n 8 ; 247 ; 495-496
- Teletarchs ..... 423 n 84
- temple ..... 92 n 107 ; 248
- temptation ..... 262-266 ; 305-307
- terminological exuberance ..... 28
- tetrad ..... 147 ; 396-397
- thaumaturgist ..... 288 n 109
- Themistius ..... 211 n 140
- theocracy ..... 95 n 119
- Theodorus, disciple of Iamblichus .....  
..... 161 n 356 ; 471 n 20
- theologians  
Chaldaeans ..... 200 n 97  
Orphics .....  
200 n 97 ; 379 n 259 ; 446 ; 474  
Pythagoreans ..... 389 n 287
- theology  
hellenic . 84 n 66 ; 284 n 99 ; 509-512  
negative ..... 367
- theomorphism ..... 247
- Theophilus .... 19 n 46 ; 31 ; 63 n 202
- theosophy .....  
165 ; 211 ; 312 ; 338 ; 342 n 112
- Theosophy of Tübingen* .....  
16-17 ; 24 n 59 ; 29 n 76 ; 31 ; 65
- theurgical conjurations ..... 129 n 240
- theurgist ..... 38-39 ;  
177 n 2 ; 273 n 53 ; 274 ; 417 ;  
446 ; 461-466 ; 471 ; 495-496
- theurgy . 38 n 113 ; 71 ; 156-157 ; 228 ;  
249-252 ; 254-257 ; 274-275 ;  
286 n 105 ; 431 n 111 ; 461-466
- threatening formulae ..... 58 n 184
- throne ..... 14 ; 162
- thunderbolt . 118-120 ; 122 ; 126 ; 293
- Tiberianus .....  
.... 343 n 118 ; 420 n 75 ; 437 n 126
- time  
= Aion ..... 101 ; 103-104 ;  
127 n 232 ; 159 ; 230 n 8 ; 426  
Chaldaean gods of ..... 229-230 ;  
234-235 ; 246 n 67a ; 251-252  
of time ..... 152
- Titans ..... 378-379 ;  
380 n 265 ; 384 n 274 ; 503 n 22
- Titania ..... 52 ; 158 ; 271
- titles ..... 451
- tongue ..... 46
- top in magic ..... 249-252
- torments ..... 282 n 90 ; 298 n 150 ; 299
- Trajan ..... 428
- transcendancy ..... 77 n 43 ;  
78 ; 81 ; 101 ; 113 n 184 ; 115 ;  
319 ; 332-334 ; 368 ; 510 n 5
- transcendentalism .....  
... 314 ; 321-324 ; 339-340 ; 411 ;  
430 n 105 ; 431 n 111 ; 434 ; 506
- transgression ..... 274 n 63 ; 299 n 157
- transmigration ..... 222-226
- tree ..... 343-344
- triad .... 12-13 ; 79 n 47 ; 99 n 137 ;  
105-117 ; 132 n 249 ; 137 ;  
138 n 270 ; 144-148 ; 142 n 283 ;  
150 n 309 ; 153 n 317 ; 156 n 334 ;  
193 n 65 ; 194 ; 326 n 51 ;  
329 ; 335 ; 363 n 201 ; 395-396 ;  
421-422 ; 423 n 84 ; 455-456 ; 492
- trinity ..... 95 n 119 ;  
107 ; 116 ; 139 n 274 ; 144-148 ;  
150 n 309 ; 193 n 65 ; 422 n 82
- Trisagion ..... 15 ; 23
- truth  
attribute of Apollo-Helios .....  
..... 49 ; 146 ; 158 ; 221  
cosmic power ..... 144-148  
philosophical cognition ..... 492
- turning of the soul ..... 295 n 136
- Typhon ..... 379 ; 380 n 265
- understanding ..... 49 ; 221 ; 340
- unification ..... 192 ; 196-197
- unio mystica .... 198 n 90 ; 202 ; 260 ;  
368-375 ; 420-421 ; 462-463 ; 471
- unity ..... 81 ; 107 ; 217 ; 317
- universe  
body of Hecate ..... 92  
system of .....  
... 98 ; 108-109 ; 126 ; 134-135 ;  
137-138 ; 149-150 ; 157 ; 300-302  
harmony of .....  
.... 155 ; 157-158 ; 200 n 102
- unknowability of god ..... 328 n 59

unlimited space ..... 397 n 318  
 upholder ..... 135-136 ; 156  
**Varro** .....  
   .. 109 n 174 ; 232 n 15 ; 395 n 308  
 vault ..... 19 ; 52 ; 97 n 130 ; 126  
 vehicle ..... 149 ; 155 ; 171-172 ;  
   178-184 ; 185 n 33 ; 194 n 66 ;  
   219 n 168 ; 290 ; 396 n 313 ; 416 n 59  
 ventriloquists ..... 46  
 Venus, planet ..... 50 ; 141 n 280  
 vessel ..... 265 n 19 ; 496  
 vestige ..... 317 n 18  
 vesture ..... 45 ; 193 n 64  
 vigour ..... 11 ; 13  
 virginity ..... 94  
 virtue  
   cosmic power .... 89 ; 144-148  
   grades of virtues .....  
   ..... 465-466 ; 477 ; 492  
   nature of the moon . 89 ; 158 ; 221  
   planetary virtues ..... 50  
 vision ..... 169-170 ;  
   176 ; 368-375 ; 415 ; 435-436  
 voces mysticae ..... 57 ;  
   191-192 ; 195 ; 229 ; 239-240 ;  
   249-250 ; 362 n 196 ; 438-440  
 voice ..... 45  
 vowel ..... 250 n 83  
  
 wandering ..... 357  
 warmth ..... 87 ; 140 ; 154 ; 492  
 warrior ..... 500 ; 502 ; 507 n 44  
 watcher ..... 131  
 water .... 44 ; 89 ; 271 ; 383 n 272  
 watchword ..... 190-192 ; 194-195  
 wax ..... 292  
 weapon  
   emblem of Hecate ..... 95  
   in magic ..... 193 n 65  
 weather ..... 251-252 ; 507 n 41  
 weight ..... 183-184  
 whirl ..... 241 n 59  
 white ..... 292  
 will ..... 27-28 ;  
   48 ; 51 n 162 ; 79-80 ; 106-108 ;  
   179-180 ; 190 n 51 ; 329-332 ; 347 ;  
   348 n 137 ; 358-360 ; 468 n 8

William of Morbecca ..... 212 n 142  
 wind ..... 185 ; 259 n 2 ; 421-422  
 wine ..... 209  
 wing ..... 149 ; 171 n 399  
 wisdom  
   bisexual daughter of God .....  
   ..... 340 n 105  
   identified with the planet Mercury  
   ..... 50 ; 158 ; 221  
   mother of logos ..... 340 n 105  
   of the Assyrians ..... 292 n 127  
 witch ..... 418 n 68  
 woman  
   conceiving ..... 41  
   earth ..... 293 n 131  
 womb(s)  
   abode of the demons .. 308 n 186  
   elemental spirits ..... 267-268  
   feminine power of the Father .....  
   ..... 335 ; 341  
   name of the Father's power .....  
   ..... 25 ; 82-83  
   noetic generation .....  
   ..... 84-85 ; 110 ; 111 n 177  
   physiological- ..... 159 n 350  
   primal matter . 296-297 ; 343 n 120  
   receptacles of the Cosmic Soul . 121  
 works  
   ideas ..... 132 n 247 ; 174 ; 212  
   noetic forms of the visible world  
   ..... 115 ; 127 n 232  
   visible created world .. 96 ; 113  
 world  
   -body ..... 112 ; 120-122 ; 127  
   -circle . 123 n 218 ; 137 ; 138 n 270 ;  
   145-146 ; 156 ; 293 ; 376 n 250  
   ethereal .....  
   137-138 ; 143-144 ; 155 ; 202 ;  
   268 n 29 ; 293 ; 300 ; 423 ; 430  
   hylle ..... 93 n 109 ; 98 ; 131 ;  
   137 ; 140 ; 144 ; 149 ; 154 n 322 ;  
   281 ; 293 ; 300-304 ; 423  
   intelligible ..... 67 n 1 ; 77 ;  
   79 ; 81 ; 107 ; 126 ; 137 ; 144 ;  
   160 ; 221 n 179 ; 324 ; 327-328 ;  
   340 n 105 ; 402 n 5 ; 431 n 110  
   planetary spheres ..... 30 n 79 ;  
   89 ; 96 ; 118 n 200 ; 123 n 218 ;  
   133 n 251 ; 137 ; 138 n 270  
   -preserving potencies .... 130-131  
   sensible ..... 25 ; 112 ; 114 ;  
   116-120 ; 127 n 233 ; 317  
   -soul ..... cf. cosmic soul  
   terrestrial ..... 89 ; 96



- wrath ..... 272 n 51  
 wreath ..... 92-93
- X ..... 253-254
- year  
   as magic name ..... 229 ; 234  
   Great Year ..... 402 n 3
- Zeno ..... 385 n 275  
 Zervan Akarana ..... 404-405 ; 407-409  
 Zervanism ..... 425-426  
 Zeus .....  
   27 ; 118-119 ; 218 n 167 ; 343 ;  
   348 n 136 ; 380 n 265 ; 384 n 274
- Zodiac ..... 12 n 28 ; 39 n 115 ;  
   56 n 176 ; 94 n 114 ; 234-235 ;  
   251 ; 256 n 103 ; 291 n 122 ; 406
- Zoe  
   function ..... 98  
   = Psyche-Hecate ..... 84-85
- zones ..... 104 ; 154 n 321 ; 235-236 ;  
   244 n 63 ; 259 ; 263-264 ; 280-282 ;  
   376-377 ; 423 ; 457 n 99 ; 509-510
- Zoroaster .....  
   .... 163 n 367 ; 408 ; 426 n 94 ;  
   427 n 98 ; 434 n 115 ; 474
- Zoroastrim .....  
   283-293 ; 388 n 282 ; 425-429
- Zosimus the Alchemist ..... 301 n 163  
 Zurvan ..... 423 n 82



## Index des auteurs récents

Les noms des éditeurs des textes utilisés par H. Lewy sont mentionnés dans l'*index locorum* et ne sont pas répétés dans le présent *index*.

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>Abt Ad. .... 40 n 122</p> <p>Allatius M. .... 287 n 109 ; 476</p> <p>Anrich G. ....<br/>146 n 295 ; 231 n 12 ; 435 n 120</p> <p>Anz W. .... 414 n 49-50 ; 424 n 88</p> <p>Ast Fr. .... 73 n 29 ; 278 n 78</p><br><p>Baudissin W. .... 290 n 117</p> <p>Bäumker Cl. .... 377 n 255</p> <p>Baumstark A. .... 46 n 147</p> <p>Baur F. Ch. .... 337 n 95 ; 338 n 96 ;<br/>342 n 114 ; 378 n 255 ; 384 n 273 ;<br/>392 n 297 ; 393 n 299 ; 422 n 82</p> <p>Benveniste E. .... 234 n 28</p> <p>Bernays J. .... 273 n 53 ; 506 n 38</p> <p>Berthelot M. .... 15 n 36</p> <p>Bezold C. .... 230 n 8 ; 291 n 122</p> <p>Bickermann E. .... 329 n 59</p> <p>Bidez J. .... xv ; xix ;<br/>3 n 1 ; 5 n 5 ; 7 n 17 ; 8 n 20 ;<br/>9 n 24 ; 14 n 32 ; 16 n 41 ; 29 n 76 ;<br/>39 n 114 ; 42 n 131 ; 52 n 164 ;<br/>64 n 204 ; 67 n 2 ; 68 n 6 ; 69 n 7-8 ;<br/>70 n 12 ; 71 n 14. 17 ; 74 n 32 ;</p> | <p>77 n 38 ; 84 n 65 ; 86 n 75 ;<br/>91 n 96 ; 148 n 300 ; 153 n 317 ;<br/>163 n 367 ; 177 n 3 ; 178 n 4 ;<br/>185 n 33 ; 194 n 71 ; 209 n 135 ;<br/>212 n 143 ; 224 n 195-196 ;<br/>225 n 197 ; 228 n 1 ; 231 n 9 ;<br/>232 n 15 ; 234 n 26 ; 235 n 31 ;<br/>241 n 53 ; 242 n 54 ; 246 n 67a ;<br/>247 n 69a ; 248 n 76 ; 249 n 77-78 ;<br/>251 n 86 ; 252 n 92 ; 259 n 2 ;<br/>264 n 14 ; 267 n 26 ; 268 n 34 ;<br/>275 n 63 ; 277 n 77 ; 280 n 84 ;<br/>283 n 92. 94. 96 ; 284 n 99 ;<br/>285 n 101-103 ; 286 n 106 ;<br/>287 n 109 ; 288 n 110-111 ;<br/>289 n 114 ; 290 n 117. 120-121 ;<br/>291 n 126 ; 292 n 127. 129 ;<br/>293 n 132 ; 304 n 175 ; 348 n 136 ;<br/>362 n 196-197 ; 381 n 268 ;<br/>397 n 315 ; 400 n 1 ; 407 n 27 ;<br/>408 n 28-29 ; 409 n 31 ; 422 n 81-82 ;<br/>424 n 87 ; 425 n 91 ; 426 n 94 ;<br/>428 n 101 ; 429 n 104 ; 430 n 105 ;<br/>434 n 115 ; 449 n 1. 3 ; 450 n 7-8 ;<br/>451 n 9-10 ; 452 n 14 ; 453 n 18-20 ;<br/>454 n 21 ; 455 n 26 ; 461 n 6 ;<br/>463 n 11 ; 464 n 17. 19-20 ; 465 n 27 ;<br/>473 ; 474 ; 476 ; 477 ; 479 ; 495 ;<br/>496 ; 501 n 9 ; 510 n 3 ; 512</p> <p>Blass Fr. .... 79 n 48</p> |
|---|--|

- Boissonade J. F. .... 289 n 113-114 ; 290 n 117. 120 ;  
26 n 67 ; 239 n 46 ; 269 n 34 ; 478  
306 n 178 ; 362 n 196 ;  
Boll Fr. .... 363 n 201 ; 381 n 266. 268 ;  
230 n 8 ; 291 n 122 ; 420 n 74  
388 n 282 ; 400 ; 404 n 15 ;  
Bouché-Leclercq A. .... 405 n 16. 18. 20-21 ; 406 n 22-23 ;  
407 n 25-27 ; 408 n 28-29 ;  
409 n 31 ; 410 n 34-36 ;  
Bousset W. .... 411 n 37-39 ; 412 n 41 ;  
.... 14 n 32 ; 15 n 37 ; 209 n 137 ;  
413 n 46-47 ; 414 n 48. 50-51 ;  
244 n 62 ; 320 n 27 ; 324 n 44 ;  
416 n 57-58 ; 418 n 66. 68-69 ;  
328 n 58-59 ; 342 n 114-116 ;  
420 n 74 ; 421 n 76. 79 ;  
354 n 161 ; 364 n 205 ;  
422 n 80-82 ; 423 n 84 ;  
392 n 294-295 ; 407 n 26 ; 413 n 46 ;  
424 n 87 ; 425 n 89-93 ;  
414 n 50 ; 415 n 55-56 ; 416 n 58 ;  
426 n 94-96 ; 428 n 101-102 ;  
434 n 116 ; 435 n 119-120 ; 455 n 24  
429 n 104 ; 430 n 105 ;  
Bréhier É. .... 433 n 114 ; 434 n 115-116 ;  
282 n 90 ; 323 n 38 ; 324 n 41 ;  
435 n 118. 120 ; 437 n 127 ;  
333 n 77 ; 346 n 131 ; 351 n 149 ;  
453 n 20 ; 461 n 1 ; 473 ; 474 ;  
355 n 163 ; 369 n 217 ; 474 ; 488  
496 ; 497 n 1 ; 510 n 3 ; 512  
Bréhier L. .... 478  
Brinkmann A. .... 16 n 41  
Burckhardt J. .... 246 n 67  
Buresch K. . . . . 9 n 25 ; 11 n 26 ; 14 n 31 ;  
16 n 39 ; 18 n 46 ; 21 n 52 ;  
24 n 59 ; 26 n 67 ; 29 n 76  
Casel O. .... 152 n 316  
Charles R. H. .... 15 n 35 ; 428 n 100  
Christ W. .... 36 n 108  
Clerc Ch. .... 247 n 69  
Corssen P. .... 144 n 289  
Cousin V. .... 72 n 20 ; 467 n 2  
Couvreur P. .... 73 n 29  
Cramer J. A. .... 477  
Creuzer F. .... 337 n 95  
Crönert W. .... 135 n 260  
Cumont Fr. ....  
xix ; 5 n 5 ; 14 n 32 ; 15 n 36 ;  
16 n 41 ; 29 n 76 ; 30 n 80 ;  
39 n 114 ; 52 n 164 ; 86 n 75 ;  
128 n 236 ; 153 n 317 ; 155 n 325 ;  
163 n 367 ; 177 n 3 ; 178 n 6 ;  
183 n 27 ; 187 n 38 ; 194 n 71 ;  
200 n 97 ; 209 n 135 ; 210 n 139 ;  
212 n 143 ; 222 n 185 ; 225 n 197 ;  
230 n 8-9 ; 232 n 15 ; 234 n 26 ;  
235 n 31. 34 ; 236 n 36 ; 240 n 51 ;  
242 n 54 ; 247 n 70 ; 253 n 95 ;  
259 n 1-2 ; 262 n 8 ; 280 n 85 ;  
281 n 87 ; 282 n 90 ; 283 n 96 ;  
284 n 96. 99 ; 285 n 101-103 ;  
287 n 108 ; 288 n 110 ;  
289 n 113-114 ; 290 n 117. 120 ;  
306 n 178 ; 362 n 196 ;  
363 n 201 ; 381 n 266. 268 ;  
388 n 282 ; 400 ; 404 n 15 ;  
405 n 16. 18. 20-21 ; 406 n 22-23 ;  
407 n 25-27 ; 408 n 28-29 ;  
409 n 31 ; 410 n 34-36 ;  
411 n 37-39 ; 412 n 41 ;  
413 n 46-47 ; 414 n 48. 50-51 ;  
416 n 57-58 ; 418 n 66. 68-69 ;  
420 n 74 ; 421 n 76. 79 ;  
422 n 80-82 ; 423 n 84 ;  
424 n 87 ; 425 n 89-93 ;  
426 n 94-96 ; 428 n 101-102 ;  
429 n 104 ; 430 n 105 ;  
433 n 114 ; 434 n 115-116 ;  
435 n 118. 120 ; 437 n 127 ;  
453 n 20 ; 461 n 1 ; 473 ; 474 ;  
496 ; 497 n 1 ; 510 n 3 ; 512  
Darmesteter J. .... 338 n 96  
Delatte A. ... 231 n 9 ; 397 n 316  
Dessau H. .... 253 n 95  
Dibelius M. .... 195 n 73 ; 224 n 194  
Diehl E. .... 124 n 221 ; 443  
Diels H. .... 71 n 14 ;  
73 n 27 ; 89 n 84 ; 127 n 232 ;  
205 n 119 ; 217 n 164 ; 397 n 318  
Dieterich A. .... 5 n 5 ;  
28 n 72 ; 43 n 135 ; 60 n 189 ;  
187 n 38 ; 192 n 56 ; 196 n 80 ;  
197 n 85 ; 198 n 89-90 ;  
205 n 119-120 ; 209 n 137 ;  
210 n 139 ; 211 n 140 ; 250 n 83 ;  
299 n 155-156. 158 ; 371 n 226 ;  
405 n 16. 19-20 ; 413 n 46 ;  
415 n 54-56 ; 422 n 80 ; 488 ; 489  
Dittenberger W. . . 216 n 157 ; 238 n 41  
Dodds E. R. . . . . xix ; 44 n 137 ; 68 n 3 ;  
69 n 7 ; 70 n 10-13 ; 71 n 18 ;  
78 n 45 ; 87 n 76 ; 156 n 338 ;  
178 n 6 ; 184 n 30 ; 185 n 33 ;  
192 n 56 ; 219 n 168 ; 222 n 189 ;  
225 n 197 ; 245 n 65 ; 274 n 57 ;  
276 n 70 ; 317 n 13. 17 ;  
321 n 33 ; 323 n 39 ; 324 n 42 ;  
326 n 51 ; 329 n 59 ; 348 n 136 ;  
349 n 141-142 ; 351 n 147-148 ;  
353 n 157 ; 355 n 163 ;  
356 n 168. 170 ; 359 n 180 ;  
368 n 212 ; 381 n 266 ; 384 n 274 ;  
396 n 313 ; 403 n 9. 11 ; 404 n 14 ;  
416 n 61 ; 419 n 72 ; 452 n 14 ;  
456 n 27 ; 462 n 8 ; 464 n 19 ;  
469 n 11 ; 470 n 17 ; 511 n 9

- Dölger Fr. J. .... 422 n 81
- Dornseiff Fr. .... 239 n 48 ; 250 n 83 ; 439 n 135
- Drexler F. .... 287 n 109
- Duhem P. .... 153 n 317
- Eitrem S. .... 246 n 67a
- Falco V. de .... 109 n 174
- Fascher E. .... 273 n 53
- Ferguson A. S. .... 321 n 29 ;  
324 n 44 ; 326 n 51 ; 331 n 69 ;  
358 n 176 ; 363 n 203 ; 378 n 256 ;  
404 n 12 ; 406 n 21 ; 439 n 136
- Festugière A.-J. .... 154 n 325 ; 173 n 403 ; 277 n 77
- Flach H. .... 378 n 258 ; 379 n 260
- Freudenthal J. .... 315 n 9 ; 511 n 8
- Gaisford Th. .... 59 n 156
- Gale Th. .... 44 n 137 ; 69 n 7 ;  
243 n 57 ; 250 n 83 ; 275 n 63
- Gallaëus S. .... 473 ; 476
- Ganschinietz R. ... 240 n 51 ; 246 n 67
- Gataker Th. .... 385 n 274
- Geffcken J. .... 4 n 2 ;  
7 n 17 ; 47 n 148 ; 63 n 201 ;  
144 n 289 ; 247 n 69 ; 257 n 108 ;  
329 n 59 ; 381 n 266. 268 ;  
391 n 292 ; 431 n 110 ; 501 n 9
- Goldschmidt E. D. .... XXI
- Goodenough E. R. .... 338 n 96 ; 342 n 112 ; 350 n 143
- Gow A. S. F. .... 249 n 77
- Gray L. H. .... xv n 1
- Gressmann H. .... 14 n 32 ; 15 n 37
- Gruppe O. .... 242 n 55 ;  
261 n 8 ; 271 n 41 ; 272 n 46
- Gundel W. .... 94 n 114 ; 143 n 288 ; 358 n 176
- Harder R. .... 173 n 403 ; 323 n 38
- Harnack A. von .... 4 n 2 ;  
144 n 289 ; 218 n 166 ; 273 n 55 ;  
385 n 277 ; 386 n 279 ; 391 n 291
- Harris J. R. .... 46 n 147 ;  
323 n 38 ; 369 n 217 ; 373 n 234
- Heinemann I. .... 346 n 131
- Heinze M. .... 333 n 77 ;  
340 n 105 ; 346 n 131 ; 347 n 133 ;  
348 n 136 ; 349 n 138. 142
- Heinze R. ... 392 n 292 ; 436 n 123
- Heintzel E. .... 383 n 271
- Hepding H. .... 205 n 119
- Herzog I. I - Hauck A. .... 290 n 117
- Hermann C. F. .... 315 n 9
- Heuten G. .... 8 n 20
- Hilgenfeld A. . 383 n 271 ; 392 n 294
- Hiller E. .... 109 n 174
- Holl K. .... 471 n 21
- Hopfner Th. .... 4 n 2 ; 41 n 125 ; 42 n 129 ;  
43 n 134 ; 46 n 145 ; 56 n 178 ;  
58 n 184 ; 69 n 7 ; 94 n 111 ;  
109 n 173 ; 164 n 369 ; 185 n 32 ;  
192 n 56 ; 207 n 129 ; 208 n 133 ;  
209 n 134. 136 ; 212 n 143 ;  
215 n 154 ; 224 n 196 ; 228 n 1 ;  
231 n 11 ; 232 n 13. 15 ;  
233 n 23 ; 234 n 26 ;  
240 n 51 ; 242 n 56 ; 243 n 58 ;  
245 n 65 ; 247 n 70 ; 248 n 72 ;  
249 n 77-78 ; 250 n 81. 83 ;  
260 n 3 ; 262 n 8 ; 267 n 25 ;  
268 n 30 ; 272 n 46 ; 273 n 53 ;  
289 n 114. 116 ; 290 n 117. 120 ;  
291 n 124 ; 292 n 130 ;  
304 n 176 ; 306 n 179 ; 426 n 96 ;  
427 n 97 ; 439 n 135 ; 463 n 12 ;  
467 n 4 ; 470 n 17 ; 490 ; 497
- Inge W. R. .... 402 n 5
- Jackson A. V. W. .... xv n 1
- Jaeger W. .... 315 n 8 ;  
323 n 38 ; 345 n 129 ; 388 n 282 ;  
469 n 11 ; 505 n 34 ; 508 n 46
- Jahn A. .... 33 n 92 ; 72 n 19 ; 169 n 384 ; 491
- Jonas H. .... XIX ;  
191 n 53 ; 212 n 143 ; 361 n 192 ;  
392 n 298 ; 414 n 49 ; 435 n 119
- Justi F. .... 409 n 30
- Kaibel G. .... 33 n 92 ; 216 n 157
- Kern O. .... 28 n 72 ; 37 n 110 ; 78 n 45 ; 84 n 65 ;  
95 n 119 ; 108 n 173 ; 114 n 187 ;  
150 n 309 ; 200 n 97 ; 221 n 182 ;

- 238 n 41 ; 267 n 25 ; 287 n 109 ;  
 297 n 147 ; 299 n 154 ; 329 n 61 ;  
 343 n 118 ; 362 n 196. 199 ;  
 379 n 259 ; 380 n 263 ;  
 415 n 51 ; 444 ; 474 ; 482 n 5
- Kittel G. .... 41 n 128 ; 216 n 159 ;  
 331 n 68 ; 406 n 24 ; 441 n 141
- Klingner F. ... 24 n 58 ; 304 n 173 ; 492
- Koch H. ....  
 74 n 33 ; 78 n 45 ; 114 n 187 ;  
 145 n 291 ; 146 n 295 ; 168 n 383 ;  
 171 n 395 ; 253 n 93 ; 375 n 241 ;  
 462 n 9 ; 469 n 12-13 ; 471 n 21
- Kraus P. .... 3 n 1
- Kroll J. ....  
 111 n 177 ; 114 n 187 ; 184 n 30 ;  
 191 n 53 ; 212 n 143 ; 265 n 19 ;  
 276 n 70 ; 277 n 72 ; 298 n 150 ;  
 308 n 186 ; 322 n 34 ; 327 n 53 ;  
 328 n 59 ; 329 n 61 ; 331 n 68 ;  
 340 n 106 ; 341 n 109. 111 ;  
 343 n 120-121 ; 351 n 147. 149 ;  
 354 n 159 ; 411 n 39 ; 412 n 40
- Kroll W. ....  
 .. xiv ; xv ; xvi ; 3 n 1 ; 4 n 2 ;  
 5 n 7 ; 9 n 24 ; 15 ; 16 n 41 ; 31 ;  
 35 n 103 ; 36 n 108 ; 38 n 112 ;  
 39 ; 67 ; 68 n 6 ; 70 n 11 ;  
 72 n 21. 25 ; 73 n 28 ; 74 n 34 ; 76 ;  
 78 n 43 ; 104 n 155 ; 106 n 165 ;  
 163 n 367 ; 199 n 93 ; 257 n 108 ;  
 260 n 5 ; 265 n 19 ; 287 n 109 ;  
 294 n 135 ; 324 n 44 ; 395 n 306 ;  
 405 n 16 ; 412 n 40 ; 428 n 102
- Kühner R. .... 79 n 48
- Kurtz E. - Drexl F. .... 478 ; 479
- Lackeit C. ....  
 20 n 46 ; 103 n 153 ; 406 n 24
- Leemans E. A. ....  
 313 n 3 ; 497 n 1 ; 503 n 23. 27
- Leisegang H. ....  
 343 n 121 ; 350 n 143 ; 354 n 161
- Lewy H. .... 35 n 103 ; 199 n 93
- Liddell H. G. - Scott R. - Jones H. St.  
 172 n 402 ; 406 n 24 ; 458 n 2
- Lietzmann H. .... 7 n 17 ; 383 n 272
- Lobeck C. A. .... 3 n 1 ; 8 n 22 ;  
 28 n 72 ; 41 n 126 ; 147 n 298 ;  
 152 n 316 ; 183 n 27 ; 205 n 119 ;  
 237 n 39-40 ; 238 n 41 ; 243 n 57 ;  
 248 n 76 ; 267 n 25 ; 286 n 106 ; 444
- Ludwich A. .... 12 n 26 ;  
 74 n 32 ; 86 n 74 ; 91 n 96 ;  
 95 n 118 ; 110 n 177 ; 191 n 55
- Mai A. .... 11 n 26
- Mau G. .... 151 n 313 ; 261 n 8
- Mead G. R. S. ....  
 ..... xvi n 1 ; 152 n 314 ; 491
- Meier H. .... 348 n 136
- Migne J. P. .... 473 ; 476 ; 478
- Mingana A. .... 46 n 147
- Misch G. .... 421 n 76
- Moeller E. W. ....  
 318 n 20 ; 330 n 65 ; 378 n 255 ;  
 379 n 261 ; 381 n 266 ; 386 n 279
- Mullach F. W. A. .... 73 n 28
- Müller H. F. .... 356 n 172
- Mras K. .... 503 n 22
- Nauck A. .... 78 n 43
- Neander A. .... 384 n 273
- Neumann K. J. .... 16 n 39
- Ninck M. .... 267 n 26
- Nock A. D. .... 12 n 27 ; 84 n 65 ;  
 236 n 36 ; 342 n 112 ; 349 n 141 ;  
 358 n 176 ; 375 n 241 ; 403 n 10 ;  
 404 n 25 ; 426 n 95 ; 469 n 11
- Nöldeke Th. .... 444
- Norden Ed. .... 11 n 26 ;  
 24 n 60 ; 26 n 67 ; 37 n 110 ;  
 41 n 123 ; 43 n 135 ; 63 n 203 ;  
 86 n 74 ; 173 n 403 ; 201 n 102 ;  
 225 n 197 ; 254 n 97 ; 273 n 53 ;  
 281 n 87 ; 319 n 25 ; 329 n 59 ;  
 341 n 112 ; 342 n 112 ; 343 n 119 ;  
 406 n 24 ; 437 n 126 ; 491 ; 510 n 5
- Norvin W. .... 73 n 30
- Nyberg H. S. . 409 n 30-31 ; 423 n 82
- Opsopoeus J. . 88 n 83 ; 473 ; 475 ; 476
- Otto W. F. .... 253 n 95 ; 488
- Parthey G. .... 68 n 7
- Pascher J. .... 338 n 96 ; 342 n 112
- Pasquali G. .... 443
- Patrizi F. .... 441 ; 476
- Peeck W. .... 299 n 158
- Petau D. .... 74 n 31

- Peterson E. .... 29 n 76
- Pflister F. .... 229 n 3 ; 231 n 9
- Picard Ch. .... 19 n 46
- Pines S. .... xx
- Pittra J. B. .... 72 n 19
- Pohlenz M. .... 506 n 38
- Polotsky H. J. ... XXI ; 422 n 82
- Pradel F. .... 288 n 109
- Praechter K. .... XIX ;  
 36 n 108 ; 67 n 3 ; 70 n 10-11 ;  
 71 n 15-18 ; 73 n 28-29 ;  
 313 n 2 ; 315 n 8-10 ;  
 317 n 17 ; 318 n 19-20 ;  
 323 n 38-39 ; 325 n 45 ;  
 327 n 53 ; 351 n 147 ; 353 n 156 ;  
 357 n 174 ; 360 n 188 ; 367 n 210 ;  
 398 n 319 ; 465 n 27 ; 492 ; 504 n 29
- Preisendanz K. .... 229 n 3
- Puech H. Ch. .... 497 n 1
- Reinhardt K. ....  
 154 n 324 ; 186 n 37 ; 284 n 96 ;  
 331 n 69 ; 345 n 129 ; 346 n 131 ;  
 410 n 36 ; 411 n 37. 39 ;  
 412 n 40 ; 413 n 46 ; 418 n 66 ;  
 420 n 75 ; 422 n 82 ; 440 n 139
- Reitzenstein R. .... 15 n 35 ;  
 40 n 120 ; 41 n 124 ; 46 n 146 ;  
 47 n 148 ; 57 n 180 ; 144 n 289 ;  
 195 n 73 ; 210 n 139 ; 216 n 161 ;  
 217 n 165 ; 225 n 197 ; 259 n 2 ;  
 301 n 163 ; 329 n 61 ; 341 n 112 ;  
 342 n 112 ; 362 n 196 ; 364 n 205 ;  
 392 n 297 ; 404 n 15 ; 405 n 20 ;  
 406 n 24 ; 413 n 46 ; 415 n 56 ;  
 422 n 81 ; 426 n 95 ; 435 n 119 ;  
 439 n 136 ; 471 n 21 ; 476-477 ; 488
- Renan E. .... 4 n 2
- Rohde E. ... 3 n 1 ; 33 n 92 ; 37 n 110 ;  
 41 n 125 ; 46 n 145 ; 58 n 184-185 ;  
 93 n 110 ; 147 n 298 ; 198 n 90 ;  
 209 n 134-135 ; 214 n 148-149 ;  
 218 n 167 ; 219 n 169 ;  
 225 n 197 ; 228 n 1 ; 238 n 41 ;  
 242 n 54 ; 253 n 95 ; 272 n 46 ;  
 282 n 90 ; 290 n 121 ; 291 n 124 ;  
 298 n 148 ; 361 n 192 ; 428 n 101
- Röhr J. .... 441 n 141
- Roscher W. H. .... 90 n 93 ;  
 94 n 111 ; 95 n 120 ; 250 n 83 ;  
 256 n 102 ; 272 n 46-47 ; 361 n 93
- Ruelle Ch. É. .... 72 n 25 ;  
 107 n 170 ; 166 n 373 ; 395 n 306
- Sathas C. N. ....  
 .... 224 n 195 ; 450 n 7 ; 478-479
- Saxl F. .... 428 n 100
- Schadewalt W. .... 89 n 89
- Schaefer H. H. .. 362 n 196 ; 392 n 297
- Schissel von Fleschenberg O. . 465 n 27
- Schmid W. .... 36 n 108
- Schmidt C. .... 325 n 47
- Schmidt H. .... 145 n 291
- Schneck B. .... 110 n 177
- Schneider R. .... 100 n 138
- Scholem G. .... 413 n 46
- Schröder E. .... 377 n 255
- Schürer E. .... 16 n 41
- Scott W. .... 25 n 61 ;  
 255 n 98 ; 277 n 77 ; 321 n 29 ;  
 324 n 44 ; 326 n 51 ; 331 n 69 ;  
 358 n 176 ; 363 n 203 ; 378 n 256 ;  
 404 n 12 ; 405 n 21 ; 439 n 136
- Sinko Th. .... 315 n 19
- Smith R. M. .... xx
- Spengel L. .... 52 n 163 ; 225 n 197
- Stenzel J. .... 395 n 307
- Steuchus A. .... 9 ; 21 n 52
- Svoboda K. .... 234 n 28 ;  
 264 n 14 ; 267 n 26 ; 268 n 34
- Tavener E. .... 249 n 79
- Taylor A. E. .... 84 n 65 ;  
 124 n 221 ; 359 n 181 ; 360 n 187
- Terzaghi N. .... 74 n 31 ; 476
- Thedinga F. .... 497 n 1
- Theiler W. ....  
 144 n 289 ; 179 n 9 ; 217 n 163 ;  
 295 n 136 ; 315 n 8 ; 317 n 17 ;  
 322 n 34 ; 324 n 42 ; 331 n 69 ;  
 346 n 131 ; 351 n 149 ; 449 n 3 ;  
 450 n 7 ; 465 n 27 ; 466 n 31
- Thilo J. C. ....  
 12 n 27 ; 110 n 177 ; 166 n 373
- Treu M. .... 477
- Ueberweg F. .... 36 n 108 ;  
 67 n 3 ; 313 n 2 ; 465 n 27 ; 492
- Usener H. ... 361 n 195 ; 431 n 109

- Viger Fr. .... 40 n 122; 53 n 166
- Weber W. .... 4 n 2
- Weinreich O. ....  
 ..... 109 n 174; 216 n 157-158;  
 287 n 109; 293 n 131; 415 n 54; 489
- Welles C. B. .... 236 n 36
- Wendland P. . 3 n 1; 7 n 15; 36 n 108;  
 84 n 65; 316 n 12; 398 n 319;  
 413 n 46; 424 n 88; 450 n 7
- Wessely C. .... 463 n 12
- Wetter J. P. .... 344 n 124
- Willamowitz-Moellendorf U. von . 4 n 2;  
 48 n 152; 74 n 31-32; 103 n 154;  
 110 n 177; 214 n 149; 216 n 157;  
 397 n 317; 431 n 109; 457 n 1
- Witt R. E. .... 256 n 105; 315 n 9-10;  
 317 n 13. 15. 17; 324 n 42;  
 320 n 66; 342 n 112; 346 n 131;  
 353 n 156; 360 n 185. 187;  
 367 n 210; 368 n 212;  
 374 n 241; 393 n 300; 394 n 302;  
 395 n 303; 396 n 312; 488
- Wittkower R. .... 293 n 131
- Wolff G. .... 8 n 20-22;  
 9 n 23. 25; 11 n 26; 12 n 27;  
 14 n 31; 17 n 43; 18 n 46;  
 21 n 52; 23 n 57; 24 n 59;  
 33 n 90; 40 n 116-117. 121;  
 41 n 126; 43 n 136; 44 n 137;  
 48 n 152; 51 n 162; 52 n 163-164;  
 53 n 165-166; 55 n 176;  
 58 n 184; 59 n 186; 62 n 200;  
 63 n 201-203; 64 n 205-210;
- 95 n 118; 152 n 316; 225 n 197;  
 235 n 29; 236 n 34; 241 n 53;  
 247 n 70; 248 n 72. 75-76;  
 271 n 41; 284 n 96-97;  
 292 n 129-130; 307 n 183;  
 363 n 201-202; 427 n 97; 447;  
 450; 451 n 10; 454 n 23; 511 n 6
- Wünsch R. .... 9 n 24;  
 52 n 163; 72 n 21; 172 n 402
- Wytttenbach D. ....  
 211 n 140; 295 n 136; 385 n 275
- Zeller Ed. .... 17 n 44; 26 n 68;  
 68 n 6; 69 n 9; 70 n 10;  
 71 n 18; 73 n 26; 105 n 163;  
 136 n 266; 188 n 43; 313 n 2. 4;  
 314 n 5; 315 n 8; 317 n 17;  
 318 n 19. 22; 322 n 34; 323 n 38;  
 324 n 41-42; 326 n 51; 327 n 53;  
 328 n 59; 333 n 74. 76-77;  
 334 n 82; 338 n 97-100;  
 339 n 101-102; 340 n 105;  
 342 n 113; 343 n 120. 122;  
 346 n 132; 347 n 133-135;  
 348 n 136; 349 n 139; 350 n 145;  
 351 n 148-150; 355 n 165;  
 356 n 171-172; 357 n 174;  
 367 n 211; 368 n 212; 376 n 249;  
 379 n 261; 395 n 303. 305. 306;  
 397 n 318; 430 n 106. 109;  
 437 n 127; 450 n 15; 452 n 12;  
 454 n 21-22; 455 n 24-26;  
 456 n 27; 465 n 30; 470 n 14;  
 481 n 1; 497 n 1; 499 n 4;  
 504 n 29; 505 n 34-35; 512 n 10
- Zepf M. ....  
 404 n 15; 411 n 38-39; 430 n 107
- Ziegler K. .... 363 n 201



## Concordance

Kr. = Kroll W., *De oraculis chaldaicis*, Breslau 1894 (numérotation des fragments par les pages et les lignes).

Th. = Theiler W.,

F. = *Forschungen zum Neuplatonismus*, Berlin 1966, p. 252-301 (= *Die chaldäischen Orakel und die Hymnen des Synesios*, Schriften der Königsberger Gelehrten Gesellschaft, Geistesw. Kl., t. 18/1, Halle 1942).

KL. = R. Klibansky - C. Labowsky, *Procli Commentarium in Parmenidem. Pars ultima adhuc inedita interprete Guillelmo de Moerbeka*, Londres 1953 (pages et lignes du texte latin de la fin du livre VII de l'*In Parmenidem*).

Le. = Lewy H., *Chaldaean Oracles and Theurgy*, Le Caire 1956.

Ha. = Hadot P.,

T. = *Marius Victorinus. Traités théologiques sur la Trinité*, SC 69, Paris 1960.

M. = *La métaphysique de Porphyre*, dans : *Entretiens sur l'Antiquité Classique*, t. XII, Vandœuvres-Genève 1966, p. 127-163.

p<sup>1</sup>-p<sup>2</sup> = *Porphyre et Victorinus*, I-II, Paris 1968.

V. = *Marius Victorinus. Recherches sur sa vie et ses œuvres*, Paris 1971.

dP. = des Places É., *Oracles chaldaïques*, Paris 1971.

Les numéros suivants de cette édition doivent être retirés des *Oracles chaldaïques* :

9 (rétroversion problématique de Theiler ; par contre, tout le texte latin contenant ce frsgment doit être retenu, cf. p. 58, 28-32 Kl.-La.) ;

- 26 (vers d'un hymne perdu de Proclus, cf. Lewy p. 106 n 164 ; édité par Vogt, *Procli Hymni*, fr. II, p. 84) ;
- 98 (dubium ; cf. L. Bieler, *CCL* 94, p. 82 : « hexameter alias ignotus ex oraculo quodam Chaldaico fortasse sumptus est ») ;
- 155 (restitution de Schoell ; admis par Kroll mais refusé par Lewy p. 278 n 77) ;
- 165 (paraphrase de Psellus sur le fragment 64, 36-65, 1 Kr.) ;
- 166 (oracle porphyrien introduit dans Plotin I 9) ;
- 171 (cf. Lewy p. 493 ; restitution problématique de Theller) ;
- 172 (restitution problématique de Lewy) ;
- 173 (orphique) ;
- 174 (orphique) ;
- 177 (dubium ; vocabulaire chaldaïque dans la prose de Damascus) ;
- 178 (commentaire de Proclus) ;
- 180 (citation du logion édité par H. D. Saffrey ; cf. *supra*, Préface II 4, v. 1) ;
- 181 (*id.*)
- 183 (précepte démocritéen) ;
- 187 (orphique) ;
- 188 (œuvres en prose des Julien) ;
- 190 (vox Platonicorum) ;
- 195 (œuvres en prose des Julien) ;
- 198 (orphique) ;
- 199-200 (œuvres en prose des Julien) ;
- 203 (Homère et tradition orphique) ;
- 205 (appartient à 31, 31 Kr.) ;
- 208-226 (fragmenta extraria).

Kr.	Th.	Le.	Ha.	dP.
11, 8-18	(8-17) 272 F. (11) 265 F. (13) 294 n 140 F. (16) 294 n 141 F.	165 n 373	(13-14) 99 n 4 P <sup>1</sup> (18) 325 n 1 P <sup>1</sup>	1
11, 23-24		167 n 379	325 n 1 P <sup>1</sup>	20; 20bis
12, 10-11	258 F. ; 259 F. ; 292 n 135 F.	78 n 45	384 n 4 P <sup>1</sup>	3
12, 14-20	(15) 259 F. (16) 260 n 21 F.	79 n 47 ; 112 n 181	91 n 2 et 93 n 1-3 P <sup>2</sup>	
13, 1-5. 18	258 F. ; 266 F. 72, 25-28 KL.	79 n 47	868-869 T. ; 96 n 2 P <sup>1</sup> ; 112 n 4 P <sup>1</sup> ; 267 n 6-7 P <sup>1</sup> ; 134-135 M.	4
13, 22	279 F.	77 n 42	296 n 2 P <sup>1</sup>	
13, 23-26	(23-26) 279 F. ; 292 n 135 F. (23-25) 266 n 42 F. (24) 275 F. (25-26) 266 F.	113 n 184	(24) 296 n 1 P <sup>1</sup>	5
13 n 1	270 F.	112 n 181	295 n 1 P <sup>1</sup>	175
14, 4-5	258 F.	112 n 181	458 n 4 P <sup>1</sup> ; 93 n 1 P <sup>2</sup>	7
14, 9-11	48, 23-24 KL. ; (10) 58, 30-32 KL.	114 n 187	201 n 1 P <sup>1</sup> ; 261 n 2 P <sup>1</sup> ; 709 T.	8
15, 6	274 F ; 292 n 135 F.	81 n 54		10
15, 9-12	(11) 260 F ; 264 F.	80 n 52	(11) 261 n 1 P <sup>1</sup>	11
15, 13-16	(14) 294 n 140 F.	99 n 137		12
15, 18-19		107 n 170	261 n 2 P <sup>1</sup> ; 384 n 1 P <sup>1</sup> ; 93 n 3 P <sup>2</sup>	31
15, 27		115 n 191		13
15, 29		147 n 295		14
15, 33-34		273 n 55		15

Kr.	Th.	Le.	Ha.	dP.
16, 3-4	263 F. ; 46, 31 KL. ; 76, 6 KL.	160 n 353		16
16, 6-8	263 F.	160 n 353		
16, 12	263 n 32 F. ; 270 n 65 F.	160 n 353 ; 79 n 47 ; 80 n 50		
16, 27-30	258 F. ; 270 F. ; 60, 3-4 KL. ; 60, 6 KL.	77 n 43	724 T. ; 262 n 2-3 P <sup>1</sup> ; 293 n 2 P <sup>1</sup> ; 133 M.	169
17, 4		119 n 201 ; 136 n 266		125
17, 22	295 F.	199 n 97		194
18, 3-4		106 n 165	(3) 226 n 58 V. (3-4) 261 n 1 P <sup>1</sup>	22
18, 9	265 F.	107 n 168	226 n 58 V.	179
18, 11	260 F.	106 n 164	96 n 2 P <sup>1</sup> ; 93 n 2 P <sup>2</sup> ; 261 n 1 P <sup>1</sup>	27
18, 19	260 F. ; 284 F.	117 n 195		28
18, 21	286 F.	179 n 8		29
18, 25		192 n 59, 2		2, 2
18, 33	263 F. ; 264 F. ; 269 F.	159 n 351	1069 T. ; 99 n 6 P <sup>1</sup>	18
18 n 2	264 F.	151 n 312 ; 483	306 n 4 P <sup>1</sup>	198
19, 6	274 F.	81 n 55	724-725 T. ; 853 T. ; 283 n 4 P <sup>1</sup>	21
19, 8		81 n 56	296 n 8 P <sup>1</sup> ; 75 n 4 P <sup>2</sup>	152
19, 9		82 n 58		207
19, 12	259 n 19 F.	82 n 59	310 n 6 P <sup>1</sup>	30
19, 15-20	(18-19) 284 F. ; (18) 294 n 141 F. ; (20) 289 F. ; 292 n 135 F.	83 n 62	(17-18) 862 T. (18) 402 n 11 P <sup>1</sup>	32

Kr.	Th.	Le.	Ha.	dP.
19, 21-22		114 n 185		33, 1
19 n 1, 1		160 n 354		19
19 n 1, 2		160 n 355		17
20, 3-6	(4) 284 n 107 F. ; 287 n 115 F. (4-6) 285 F. (6) 277 n 90 F.	118 n 200		34
20, 25-28	(25) 269 F. (26) 274 F. ; 284 F. (27) 257 F. ; 266 F. ; 274 n 80 F. ; 287 n 115 F.	121 n 209	(27) 275 n 5 P <sup>1</sup> ; 227 n 63 V.	35
21, 22-23	(23) 294 F. ; 292 n 135 F.	135 n 260		36
22, 1		92 n 101	227 n 63 V.	6, 1
22, 19	285 n 109 F. ; 48,24 KL.	84 n 66		203
23, 3-4		123 n 218		
23, 27-24, 7	(27) 268 F. (27-34) 282 F. (28) 276 F. (29) 266 n 43 F. ; 268 F. ; 269 F. (30) 287 F. ; 58, 28-30 KL. (31) 275 n 82 F. (35) 58, 28-30 KL. (1) 58, 28-30 KL. (3) 293 n 137 F. (5) 286 F.	110 n 177	(27) 402 n 12 P <sup>1</sup>  (28) 988 T. (29) 261 n 3 P <sup>1</sup> ; 725 T. (30) 227 n 59 V.         (1) 1047 T.   (6) 988-989 T. (7) 753 T.	37
24, 21	260 F.	91 n 97	71 n 2 P <sup>2</sup> ; 227 n 64 V.	38
25, 3-7	(3) 261 F. ; 262 F. ; 275 n 81 F. (6) 294 F.	127 n 232	(3) 275 n 12 P <sup>1</sup>         (7) 404 n 4 P <sup>1</sup>	39
25, 26-28	(26) 277 n 90 F. (28) 287 n 115 F.	127 n 233		42

Kr.	Th.	Le.	Ha.	dP.
26, 5-7	262 F. ; 289 F.	179 n 8 ; 358-360		44
26, 19		246 n 17		45
26, 25		128 n 238		43
26, 30	42, 15-16 KL.	144 n 291a		46
26, 32-33		144 n 291a		48
26 n 2		147 n 296		47
27, 3		50 n 160	868 T.	182
27, 7-12	(7) 274 F. (9) 273 F. (10) 281 F. ; 286 F. (11) 259 n 19 F.	99 n 138	(7) 386 n 1 P <sup>1</sup>	49
27, 23	257 F. ; 258 F. ; 263 n 29 F. ; 266 F.	142 n 283	868 T. ; 139-140 M. ; 266 n 1 P <sup>1</sup>	50
27 n 2	282 n 104 F.	93 n 111	803 T.	
28, 3-7 et 31, 11	(6) 294 F. (7) 278 F.	88 n 83a	(4) 882 T.	51
28, 12-13	259 F.	85 n 70	71 n 2 P <sup>2</sup>	53
28, 24-25		88 n 83b	(24) 396 n 2 P <sup>1</sup> (25) 275 n 6 P <sup>1</sup>	52
29, 2	289 F.	90 n 91	402 n 12 P <sup>1</sup>	54
29, 15		90 n 94		55
30, 15-17	(15) 257 F. ; 267 F. ; 277 n 90 F. (16-17) 284 n 105 F. ; 266 F.	84 n 65	(15) 396 n 2 P <sup>1</sup> ; 227 n 60 V. (16) 987 T. ; 275 n 7 P <sup>1</sup>	56
30 n 1, 2	282 n 104 F.	93 n 111	803 T.	189
30 n 1, 5		93 n 109		
31, 7		95 n 121	227 n 67 V.	
31, 13-14	278 F.	89 n 84 ; 137 n 270	180 n 1 P <sup>1</sup>	
31, 31	278 F.	123 n 218		57

Kr.	Th.	Le.	Ha.	dP.
32, 4	278 F.	123 n 218-219		205
33, 2	282 n 103 F.	135 n 311		59
33, 9		152 n 314		185
33, 13-14	281 n 100 F.	154 n 324 ; 155 n 329		60
33, 20-21		154 n 322		
33 n 1		151 n 313		184
33, 24-34, 3		142 n 287 ; 182 n 26	182 n 1 P <sup>1</sup>	61
34, 10		97 n 131	884 T.	62
34, 17		124 n 221c 252 n 91		63
34, 24-25	(24) 280 n 98 F.	143 n 287		64
34 n 2		96 n 126		
35, 3-4	(3-4) 284 F. (4) 287 F. ; 292 n 135 F. ; 294 n 141 F.	153 n 320	(4) 1003. 1038 T. ; 402 n 11 P <sup>1</sup> ; 441 n 2-3 P <sup>1</sup>	65
35, 12		119 n 202		67
35, 15-17	(15-16) 266 n 42 F.	120 n 205		68
35, 27-28		125 n 225		69
35, 30-36, 1	278 F.	125 n 225		192
36, 5-7	(5) 278 F. ; 289 n 123 F. (6) 284 n 106 F.	96 n 126		70
36, 15		200 n 100		71
36, 18-19		150 n 309		168
36, 24		95 n 118		72
36, 29	259 n 19 F.	116 n 192-193		
37, 22-23		115 n 190 ; 212 n 142		40

Kr.	Th.	Le.	Ha.	dP.
37, 32-38, 2		140 n 275		73
38, 12-13		141 n 281		75
39, 9		115 n 190 ; 139 n 274		
39, 11		124 n 221 <i>d</i>		200
39,12		139 n 274		
39, 18		116 n 192		74
40, 6-8	276 F.	132 n 250	(7) 187 n 2 P <sup>1</sup>	76
40, 13-14		132 n 249		77
40, 18-19	257 F.	132 n 249		
40, 22		77 n 38 ; 328 n 59		191
40, 24-25		133 n 253		
40, 26-27		133 n 252		
40, 30		132 n 247 <i>c</i>		
40, 33		136 n 263		
40, 35		135 n 259		79
40, 37 et 44, 2		133 n 254		
41, 26		131 n 246		80
41 n 2		249 n 80		206
42, 1-2	(1) 274 F. ; 287 F. (2) 268 F.	131 n 246		81
42, 10-11	(10) 274 F. ; 276 F.	131 n 247 <i>a</i>		82
42, 15		131 n 247 <i>b</i>		
42, 23		155 n 331		83
42, 26-27		129 n 240	306 n 4 P <sup>1</sup>	84
42, 31	281 F.	149 n 305		85
43, 15		155 n 334		177



Kr.	Th.	Le.	Ha.	dP.
43, 20		108 n 173		24
43, 26-27		149 n 304		86
43, 31-32		134 n 256		87
44, 2 et 40, 37		133 n 254		
44 n 1		133 n 254		78
44, 18-19	(19) 275 n 84 F.	263 n 14	(18) 397 n 2 P <sup>1</sup> (19) 220 n 22 V.	88
44, 31	296 F.	265 n 19 ; 271 n 41		89
45, 5-7	(6) 295 F.	259 n 3		90
45, 16		271 n 41		91
45, 18	288 F.	267 n 26		92
46, 5-6		137 n 267		188
46, 15-18		102 n 152 $\alpha$		195
46, 31		181 n 19		25
46 n 1		260 n 4		93
47, 1-2	287 F.	181 n 22	340 n 5 P <sup>1</sup>	94
47 n 1		253 n 93		95
47, 7-9	(7) 259 F. ; 291 n 129 F.	86 n 75		96
47, 13		178 n 7	181 n 2 P <sup>1</sup>	120 ; 201
47, 17-18		182 n 26	180 n 1 P <sup>1</sup> ; 181 n 2 P <sup>1</sup> ; 182 n 1 P <sup>1</sup> ; 189 n 1 P <sup>1</sup>	61 $e$
47, 22-24		185 n 34	181 n 2 P <sup>1</sup>	
47 n 2		87 n 76		
48, 4-6		198 n 88		97
48, 14-16	(14-15) 291 F. (16) 293 n 138 F.	189 n 45	(15) 186 n 2 P <sup>1</sup>	99

Kr.	Th.	Le.	Ha.	dP.
48, 22		277 n 72 ; 458		128, 2
48, 23-24		277 n 73		204
48, 24-25		277 n 72		186
48, 25-26		278 n 81		
48, 27 et 64, 13		277 n 75		
48, 29		297 n 143		100
49, 3-4		98 n 134		101
49, 7		98 n 134		101
49, 12	291 F.	98 n 134		102
49, 17		265 n 21		
50, 1		266 n 23		103
50, 5		55 n 175 ; 254 n 98		106
50, 13-14		191 n 55	(13) 690 T.	108
50, 16-18	(17) 290 F. ; (18) 296 F.	190 n 50	(18) 1074 T.	109
51, 4-6	291 F.	189 n 45	(4) 441 n 2-3 P <sup>1</sup>	110
51, 13-16	(13) 286 F. (14) 265 F. (16) 272 n 72 F. ; 284 F.	192 n 59	294 n 2 P <sup>1</sup> ; 441 n 2-3 P <sup>1</sup>	2
51, 21	284 n 108 F. ; 276 F. ; 286 F.	195 n 75		111
51, 26-27	(26) 58, 30-32 KL.	169 n 388		112
52, 3-4	(4) 290 F.	172 n 402		113
52, 8-11	291 F.	277 n 76	(9) 404 n 2 P <sup>1</sup>	114
52, 12-13	(12) 294 F.	171 n 396	(12) 1074 T.	115
52, 15-16	(16) 294 n 139 F.	170 n 395		116
52, 25		194 n 67	183 n 4 P <sup>1</sup>	117

Kr.	Th.	Le.	Ha.	dP.
53, 4	292 n 135 F.	173 n 406		121
53, 5-7	(7) 290 F.	260 n 7a-b		196
53, 8-9	295-296 F.	260 n 7c		
53, 9		260 n 7c		122
53, 11		85 n 70 ; 278 n 81 ; 492		123
53, 14		260 n 7f		179 app.
53, 21		205 n 124		124
53, 25-26	271 F.	260 n 7d		126
53, 28		171 n 397		127
54, 1-2 et 61, 14-15	(1) 291 n 129 F. ; 296 F.	169 n 387	(1) 296 n 3 P <sup>1</sup> (2) 343 n 11 P <sup>1</sup>	128
54, 9	292 F.	212 n 142		130, 1
54, 11-13	(11) 271 F. (13) 286 F. ; 293 n 136 F.	197 n 84	(13) 296 n 3 P <sup>1</sup>	130, 2-4
[54, 19-20]	292 et n 135 F.	491, 10-12		
54, 21	290 et n 127 F.	260 n 4 ; 493		171
54, 25-26	293 F.	200 n 102		131
55, 7	263 F.	161 n 359		132
[55, 10]		177 n 2		
55, 11-12	(11) 292 F.	45 n 139		133
55, 24	284 F. ; 292 F.	196 n 79	1038 T. ; 441 n 2-3 P <sup>1</sup>	66
55, 30		227 n 1a		135, 1
55, 32 et 44, 33		264 n 15		135, 3
56, 8-9		263 n 11		136
56, 16		87 n 77		139

Kr.	Th.	Le.	Ha.	dP.
56, 19		49 n 132		140
56, 21		42 n 132		141
56, 31-32		246 n 68		142
56 n 2		246 n 68		143
57, 5		244 n 63		144
57, 11-12	273 F.	244 n 63	1011 T. ; 379 n 4 P <sup>1</sup> ; 407 P <sup>1</sup>	145
57, 15-23		240 n 52		146
57, 26-29		242 n 57		147
58, 2-4	(3) 285 F.	244 n 63		148
58, 8-9		289 n 116		149
58, 14		240 n 50		150
58, 18		109 n 173		151
58 n 1		112 n 181		212
59, 8-10	293 F. ; 58, 21-22 KL. ; 58, 32-33 KL.	203 n 114		
59, 11-12	293 F.	203 n 114		118
59, 21	292 F.	212 n 143		153
59, 26-27	277 F.	55 n 171		154
60, 2		220 n 173	1005 T. ; 393 n 5 P <sup>1</sup> ; 394 n 2 P <sup>1</sup>	137
60, 6		220 n 175		138
60, 15		278 n 77		155
60, 20		264 n 16		156
60, 23		265 n 19		157
61, 6-7	(6) 267 F. ; 284 n 108 F. ; 285 n 110 F.	213 n 144	(6) 84 n 4 P <sup>1</sup> ; 187 n 2 P <sup>1</sup> ; 403 n 1 P <sup>1</sup> ; (7) 343 n 11 P <sup>1</sup> ; 403 n 5 P <sup>1</sup>	158

Kr.	Th.	Le.	Ha.	dP.
61, 14-15 et 54, 1-2	296 F.	169 n 387		128
61, 19-20	297 F.	214 n 151	885 T.	129
61 n 3		205 n 122		159
62, 8-10		222 n 190		160
62, 17		298 n 151		161
62, 19-23	(19) 289 F. (22) 284 n 108 F.	285 n 137	(19) 185 n 1. 5 P <sup>1</sup> (20-23) 84 n 4 P <sup>1</sup> (23) 1003 T.	163
63, 12-13		294 n 133 ; 475	(12) 185 n 1. 5 P <sup>1</sup>	164
63, 24		302 n 168		180
63, 25		302 n 168		181
63, 26		303 n 170		172
63, 29		298 n 152		162
64, 4-5	(4) 297 F.	184 n 29	(4) 187 n 3 P <sup>1</sup>	104
64, 14		278 n 81		
64, 16		265 n 18		105
64, 28-65, 2	(31) 268 F.	255 n 99		107
65, 13		97 n 130		167
65, 14-16		259 n 2	220 n 21 V.	170
65, 18		115 n 190		41
65, 20		150 n 309		197
66, 1		291 n 124		210



## New Light on the "Chaldaean Oracles"

by E. R. DODDS<sup>1</sup>

[263] HANS LEWY'S posthumous book, the fruit of many years' devoted study, should arouse fresh interest in one of the most tantalizingly obscure of ancient Greek texts. The Chaldaean Oracles were a divine revelation in bad hexameter verse ; its authors were believed to be gods (speaking through the lips of entranced mediums ?), but it was given to the world, as Lobeck guessed and Bidez finally proved, by one "Julianus the theurgist", who lived under Marcus Aurelius. It is of serious concern to historians of religion, as the last important Sacred Book of pagan antiquity, and to historians of ideas, as one of the major influences which shaped the later development of Neoplatonism from Porphyry to Psellus. Unfortunately it has come down to us only in fragments. *Verbatim* quotations from it, totalling something like 300 lines, were collected in 1894 by Wilhelm Kroll ; and there exist in addition, scattered through the writings of Proclus, Damascius, Psellus and other Neoplatonists, numerous reports of its teaching and of the magical rites practiced by its adepts. Some of the latter are cited by Kroll, and others have been brought to light subsequently, especially by Bidez,<sup>2</sup> but they have not yet been systematically assembled.<sup>3</sup>

---

1. *The Harvard Theological Review* 54 (1961) 263-273 ; copyright 1961 by the President and Fellows of Harvard College. — Hans Lewy : *Chaldaean Oracles and Theurgy : Mysticism, Magic and Platonism in the later Roman Empire* (*Recherches d'Archéologie, de Philologie et d'Histoire, Tome XIII*). Le Caire, Imprimerie de l'Institut d'Archéologie Orientale, 1956, pp. xxvi, 512.

2. See the texts edited by him in *Catalogue des manuscrits alchimiques grecs*, vol. VI, and in *Mélanges Cumont*, 95 ff.

3. Lewy made or intended making a collection of the fragments, to be printed as an appendix to his book, but it appears that no such collection was found among his papers.

Lewy's book is the first really comprehensive examination of this material.<sup>4</sup> It is the more to be regretted that his death [264] in 1945 prevented him from giving it the final revision which it obviously required, and that he was not there to see it through the press. For it cannot be said that he has been well served by his publishers and editors. Despite the unexplained delay of eleven years in its publication, it bears few marks of editorial care. Misprints abound everywhere,<sup>5</sup> and the most obvious oversights stand uncorrected,<sup>6</sup> as does also the author's highly idiosyncratic English (he uses queer words like "hypophet," "goët," "hypertrophic" and "parodical"). What is more serious is that a book which cries out for an index has been sent into the world with only the barest table of contents. The reader who wishes to consult the Greek text of a particular passage is dependent on a system of cross-references from one footnote to another; and unfortunately many of the cross-references are wrong. These defects of presentation make the book harder to use than it should be; but no student of later paganism can afford to neglect it on that account.

It falls into two parts. Part I begins with a chapter which argues for the ascription to the Chaldaean Oracles of about 100 lines not hitherto recognized as belonging to it. The remaining chapters of this part present a synthetic account of "Chaldaean" doctrine, while in Part II the same material is handled analytically with a view to determining the sources of the system. This is no doubt a logical arrangement, though it means that every important fragment is discussed at least twice. But it has the disadvantage that the least secure part of Lewy's material — his alleged "new fragments" — is placed in the forefront and influences his treatment of the rest. I should have preferred to [265] see it placed last. For these "new fragments" differ from the old ones in that their ascription to the

---

4. Kroll confined himself to a brief though extremely valuable discussion in Latin. Individual aspects of the Oracles have been studied by Bidez ("Note sur les mystères néoplatoniciens," *Rev. Belge de Phil. et d'Hist.*, 7, 1928, 1477 ff.); by Hopfner in his *Gr.-Aeg. Offenbarungszauber und elsewhere*; by Theiler (*Die chald. Orakel u.d. Hymnen des Synesios*, 1942); by Eitrem ("La Théurgie chez les néoplatoniciens et dans les papyrus magiques," *Symb. Oslo.*, 22, 1942, 49 ff.); by the present writer ("Theurgy and its Relationship to Neoplatonism," *J.R.S.* 37, 1947, 55 ff., reprinted in *The Greeks and the Irrational*, 1951, 283 ff.); and by Festugière, *Rév. d'Hermès III*, 1953, 52-59. It is unfortunate that only the two first-mentioned of these studies were available to Lewy.

5. False Greek words which may puzzle the reader include ἀγνετον for ἀγγετον (p. 265), ῥόπιος for ῥόθιος (p. 277), σκυλίοισι for σκολίοισι (p. 303), κλίσεις for κλήσεις (p. 469).

6. E.g. "second person" for "first person" makes nonsense of an important passage on p. 6; φῶρι is described as an ablative (p. 11); the 30 books of Iamblichus' commentary on the Oracles have become "30 volumes" (p. 68); on pages 10 and 88 the translation offered in the text conflicts with the explanation given in the footnote.



Chald. Or. rests on no ancient authority (for several of them a different and incompatible origin is in fact attested), but simply on their resemblance in diction and content to attested fragments. This is a type of argument which needs to be used with caution, since (a) there was a conventional "oracle-style" to which all *soi-disant* oracles may be expected up to a point to conform; (b) the Chald. Or. belong, as Lewy himself points out (p. 312), to an age when the same religious tendencies were finding parallel expression in many different *milieux*, Stoic, Platonist, Hermetic, Gnostic or Orphic. And in fact the force of Lewy's argument seems to me to vary widely from case to case.

His "new fragments" comprise (i) a group of doctrinal oracles which are included in the Christian collection of pagan oracles known as the Tübingen Theosophia (edited by K. Buresch in his book *Klaros*, 1889); (ii) a group of ritual or magical oracles quoted by Eusebius from Porphyry's *Philosophy of Oracles* (edited by G. Wolff, *Porphyrii de philosophia ex oraculis haurienda librorum reliquiae*, 1856). According to Lewy, the two sources are reducible to one, since the first group were taken over by the Christian collector from Porphyry's book; but of this proposition there is no proof, save for the two oracles, nos. 27 (plus 29) and 30, which the collector expressly calls Porphyrian.<sup>7</sup> And in fact of all these "new fragments" Theos. 27, a 19-line hymn to the Supreme God, is the one which agrees most closely in diction and content with the attested fragments of the Chald. Or. (the agreement was already noticed by Thilo and Wolff). If we are prepared to admit (against the opinion of Bidez) that Porphyry already knew the Chald. Or. when he composed his *Philosophy of Oracles*<sup>8</sup> (as to which, see below), then we shall be strongly tempted to accept Theos. 27 as Chaldaic, though [266] Theos. 29, which the collector presents as a continuation of 27, may arouse some doubts.<sup>9</sup>

For most of the other oracles in his first group Lewy's case seems to me much weaker. And for the one which is most interesting doctrinally, the Aion-oracle (Theos. 13), I find it very weak indeed. According to the Theosophia, this oracle was delivered by Apollo in answer to one

7. Since Porphyry is quoted as source for two oracles only, the natural inference is that the remaining oracles do *not* come from Porphyry.

8. Acceptance of this view does not involve identifying the *Philosophy of Oracles* with the *De regressu*, as J. J. O'Meara has recently invited us to do. Lewy in fact follows the opinion of Eunapius, Bernays and Bidez that the *Philosophy of Oracles* is an early work from Porphyry's pre-Plotinian period: rightly, in my judgment (cf. Pierre Hadot in *Rev. des Études Augustiniennes*, 6, 1960, 205 ff.).

9. Theos. 29 introduces the notion of a bisexual Supreme God, which I cannot find explicitly attested for the Oracles; and its description of this God as εἶδος, ψυχή and πνεῦμα is at least *prima facie* inconsistent with the Chaldaean transcendence-theology, though Lewy tries to reconcile them. Cf. Norden, *Agnostos Theos*, 228 f.; Festugière, *Rév. d'Her-mès*, IV, 48.

Theophilus, who asked him "if he were God, or another"; according to Lactantius (who quotes part of it), it comes from the Apolline Oracle at Colophon (Claros). Lewy dismisses the latter attribution as "certainly erroneous" (p. 19, n. 46), but without sufficient reason.<sup>10</sup> His own attribution to a "Chaldaean" Apollo involves serious difficulty. For the author of Theos. 13 Aion is surely the Supreme God,<sup>11</sup> like the Iranian Zervan; but the Chald. Or. placed Aion "in the second rank of intelligibles", calling it "a light sprung from the Father."<sup>12</sup> Further, if we are to believe Proclus,<sup>13</sup> the personal Time-god whom the theurgists caused to appear in visible form, and who receives some of the epithets given to Aion in Theos. 13, was named not Aion but Chronos. Lewy suggests (p. 104) that Proclus may have substituted the name Chronos for Aion in order to avoid contradictions between the Oracles and the Timaeus; but we find ἀκοιμήτου χρόνου, ἀπέραντον χρόνον, and χρόνου χρόνος in *verbatim* citations from the Oracles.<sup>14</sup> To call Aion on this evidence "the Chaldaean God par excellence" (p. 158) is surely very rash.

[267] For his second group of "new fragments," the ritual oracles from Porphyry's book, Lewy makes in general<sup>15</sup> a somewhat stronger case. He rightly interprets them as trance utterances, delivered in the first person by a "god" through a human medium,<sup>16</sup> connects them with theurgic ritual practice, and calls attention to various points of agreement with known fragments of the Chald. Or. Was Bidez then mistaken in assuming that Porphyry had not yet "discovered" the Chald. Or. when he wrote the Philosophy of Oracles? Lydus, de mensibus 4.53, which Lewy quotes on p. 9, does not prove him mistaken: for Lydus' ὁπόμνημα τῶν λογίων may well represent, not the Philosophy of Oracles,

10. Cf. Picard, Ephèse et Claros, 715 ff.; Nock, R.E.A., 30 (1928), 280 ff.; Eitrem, Orakel u. Mysterien am Ausgang der Antike (Zürich, 1947), 58 ff. According to Nilsson, "the authenticity of this oracle is generally admitted, and can hardly be doubted" (Gesch. d. gr. Rel. II. 458).

11. It is so understood by Wolff, Nock, Eitrem and Nilsson. Lines 3-4 yield little sense unless Aion is identical with the πατήρ μέγας (for we surely cannot, with L., make ταυτόν refer to Aion). The αἰών and αἰώνες of line 13 I take to be world-periods, whose sequence is governed by θεός αὐτός, the Supreme God Aion: cf. P.G.M., XII. 246 Αἰὼν αἰὼνα τρέφον αἰῶσιν ἀνάσσει.

12. Dam., Dub. II 21.15; Proc., in Tim. III. 14.3. This Chaldaean Aion strikes one as an abstraction rather than a personal god.

13. In Tim. III 20.22. 43.11; cf. Simp., Phys. 795.4.

14. Kroll, pp. 24, 25, 33.

15. I should except the anapaestic lines quoted by Eus., Prep. Ev. 5.8.10 (= Wolff, p. 159). Their content as well as their metre seems to exclude the possibility of attaching them to the Chald. Or.: for they are plainly a κλήσις addressed by the magician to Apollo (and not *vice versa*, as Lewy tries to establish by juggling with the text p. 59).

16. Cf. The Greeks and the Irrational, 295 ff.

but (as Bidez thought) the commentary εἰς τὰ Ἰουλιανοῦ τοῦ Χαλδαίου which Suidas lists among Porphyry's works. It may seem odd, however, that an oracle-hunter so learned and diligent as Porphyry should have missed at this time a collection which had been in circulation for at least seventy years. On the other hand, none of Porphyry's oracles is quoted as "Chaldaean" by later Neoplatonists, and Lewy's argument from doctrinal agreement falls short of proof.<sup>17</sup> On the whole it would seem prudent to continue to keep separate the three groups of oracles — theosophical, Porphyrian, Chaldaean — rather than fuse parts of the first two with the third. We have seen in the notorious case of Posidonius how much harm can be done by treating as a "fragment" every passage which shows similarity to an attested fragment, and then using these "new fragments" as evidence from which to build up an enlarged synthetic picture.

Lewy's long second chapter provides by far the most circumstantial [268] account of "Chaldaean" theology which has yet been produced. He has taken immense pains to dovetail together the smallest scraps of information that we possess, and to extract from them something which has at least the semblance of a coherent system. The task was no easy one: so vague and imprecise is the flowery verbiage in which the "system" is clothed that, as Nock once put it, "it is very hard to be sure of the meaning of anything in the *Oracles*."<sup>18</sup> Even after Lewy's work much remains doubtful. It is difficult to form a clear picture of the relationships between the various divine principles, of which the most important are the Father, the First or "Paternal" Intellect, the Second Intellect which contains the Platonic Forms and creates the physical world, and the Cosmic Soul which is somehow equated with Hecate. In addition, a place and function have to be found for Chronos (and/or Aion), for Eros, for three World Rulers (κοσμογοί or ἀρχικοί πατέρες), for a "transmundane sun," for the planetary gods, and for entities called συνοχεῖς, ἰγγες, etc. One cannot help suspecting that in the mind of the author or authors<sup>19</sup> the hypostases of the philosophers and the gods

17. Lewy relies especially on the rare use of the word δοχεῖς for "medium" (in place of the commoner κάτοχος), which he regards as a mark of "Chaldaean" origin. But can we be sure that it is in fact "Chaldaean"? It occurs in two of Eusebius' Porphyrian oracles, and in a trochaic (and surely therefore, *pace* L., non-Chaldaean) oracle quoted by Proc., in Remp. I. 111.28, probably from Porphyry; but not, I think, in any attested *verbatim* fragment of the Chald. Or. It is true that Proclus and other late Neoplatonists use it with reference to theurgy, but it remains possible that, like Eusebius (Prep. Ev. 3.16), they learned the term from Porphyry.

18. Gnomon, 12 (1936), 607, n. 3.

19. Lewy thinks (p. 36) that the Oracles were not a continuous didactic poem but (as the title Λόγια δι' ἐπῶν would suggest) a collection of separate oracles given on different occasions. And internal contradictions are certainly easier to account for on this view.

and daemons of Greco-oriental cult are very incompletely fused.

Chapter III deals with the descent and reascent of the human soul, and with the rite of ἀναγωγή or ἀπαθανατισμός which Lewy considers "the chief mystery of the Chaldaean sacramental community." Details of the procedure are unhappily missing: in order to give the reader some picture of it (pp. 208 ff.) Lewy is compelled to draw on descriptions of parallel (?) rituals in Apuleius, Heliodorus and the great Paris magical papyrus. He thinks, no doubt rightly, that the symbolic burial mentioned by Proclus (Theol. Plat., 193.98) formed part of it: it was a ritual pre-enactment of death (p. 205).<sup>20</sup> But I cannot agree with him when he goes on to connect the symbolic burial with the strange [269] assertion quoted by Psellus (Comm. in Or. Chald., 1141 B) "βίη <δτι> σῶμα λιπόντων" ψυχᾶι καθαρῶταται "Those who have left the body by violence" cannot be equated with the Chaldaean initiates;<sup>21</sup> they are surely the βαιοθάνατοι, whom all ancient tradition represented as unquiet earthbound ghosts, and if so we must emend καθαρῶταται to κατάρτατοι (Kroll) or perhaps ἀκάθαρτοι.

Chapters IV and V are concerned respectively with "Chaldaean" magic and "Chaldaean" demonology. On magic Lewy is a little disappointing; this is not his main field of interest, and he has overlooked the helpful analogy with modern spiritualism, which employs the same techniques with comparable results.<sup>22</sup> But he is interesting and instructive on demonology, particularly on the conception of Hades (pp. 279 ff.), not as the Underworld or its king, but as the evil "lord of the terrestrial domain," corresponding to the Iranian Ahriman. He utilizes in this chapter (pp. 273 ff.) the demonology of de myst. 3. 31 (while admitting that not everything in that passage derives from the Oracles), and also the Aegyptius of Synesius. On the other hand, the much discussed demonology of Porph., de abst. 2. 37-43, which also posits a Prince of Darkness, is relegated to an appendix (Excursus XI), where from a comparison with Proclus, in Tim. I. 77.6. ff. Lewy argues that while its ultimate basis is Iranian its proximate source is the Περί δαιμόνων of the pagan Platonist Origenes.<sup>23</sup>

20. Not however, a symbolic *suicide*: I can find no warrant in the text for Lewy's statement that "it is the initiate who at the bidding of the theurgists buries his own body".

21. Cf. Olymp., in Phaed. 243.4, where "theurgic" death is distinguished from death by suicide or violence.

22. Cf. The Greeks and the Irrational, 295 ff. Incidentally, I cannot accept Lewy's curious statement (pp. 253-254) that the soul of Plato became visible to the theurgist "as a geometrical luminous figure". The geometrical χαρακτήρ was an evocative symbol, not a constituent part of an apparition.

23. Proclus, however, mentions two sources, Origenes and Numenius; and Lewy's grounds for excluding the latter (of whom Zeller, Cumont and others had thought) are hardly decisive.

In the second part of his book Lewy investigates with great thoroughness and wide learning the origins of the whole strange amalgam, distinguishing "the Platonic elements" (chap. VI) from "the oriental elements" (chap. VII). The conclusion of chapter VI, that contemporary Platonism is "the single source of the entire philosophical information", seems to me to be [270] substantially<sup>24</sup> correct. But second-century Platonism had many variant forms. Is it possible to be more precise? Lewy looks for parallels (pp. 324 ff.) to the four divine hypostases of the Oracles, — the Father, the two Intellects, and the World Soul — and finds them (a) in the unnamed philosophers mentioned by Arnobius, *adv. nat.* 2. 25, (b) in the Gnostics criticized by Plotinus, *Enn.* 2.9.6. These do not take us much further; as regards (b), Lewy holds firmly that similarities between "Chaldaean" and Gnostic doctrine are indications, not of Gnostic influence as Kroll and Bidez thought, but of parallel and independent development from Platonic and Iranian premises (pp. 390 ff.). We can, however, add (c) Chalcidius,<sup>25</sup> pp. 233.8 ff., who seems to draw here, as so often elsewhere, upon Numenius. And we have Numenius' own word for it that the recognized two Divine Intellects.<sup>26</sup> Moreover, he announces his doctrine in a form which strikingly recalls the Oracles: while these say "The Father entrusted all things to a Second Intellect, which all ye race of men call the First" (Psellus, *Comm.* 1140), Numenius has "It is as if Plato said 'Ye men, that Intellect ye guess at is not the First; prior to it is another Intellect, older and more divine'" (fragm. 26). This can hardly be pure coincidence, and the hypothesis of a common source (Lewy, p. 320) does not help much unless we can identify it.

There are a number of other points of agreement — most of them unmentioned in Lewy's book — between the Oracles and Numenius.<sup>27</sup> In both systems the Supreme God, whom both call "the Father" and "the monad", is said to transcend all "works" (*ἔργα*, Oracles, p. 13

24. Provided the term "Platonism" is used in a wide enough sense to cover Numenius, whom antiquity on the whole preferred to call a Pythagorean. But Lewy is perhaps at times a trifle over-ingenious in identifying "Chaldaean" with Platonist doctrines. Thus I can see no close relationship between the fragment quoted p. 179, n. 8 (= Kroll, p. 26) and Plato, *Tim.* 41 d, or between the World Soul pictured as a girdle (*ζώνη*) and *Tim.* 36 e.

25. Cf. Theiler, *Chald. Or. u. Synesios*, 7. On Chalcidius' use of Numenius see now J. C. M. van Winden, *Chalcidius on Matter* (Leiden, 1959). Numenian influence on the present passage is strongly suggested by the description of the Second God as *latorem legis*: Numenius had called him *ὁ νομοθέτης* (fragm. 22).

26. Numenius, fragm. 26 Leemans. His "First Intellect" is identical with the Supreme God, and this view seems to be implied in some fragments of the Oracles, whereas other fragments appear to distinguish them (Lewy, p. 322, cf. Kroll, p. 14).

27. Cf. Festugière, *Rév. d'Hermès*, III. 53 ff., IV. 132 ff.

Kroll, Numenius, fragm. 21). [271] In both, the Second Intellect is dyadic (δυάς, Oracles, p. 14 K., διτικός, Numenius, fragm. 25), since it is directed at once to the Intelligibles and to Matter. In both, Matter is evil, and informed by an active evil principle (the Chaldaean "Hades", Numenius' evil world-soul, p. 94 Leemans). In both, the human mind must make itself empty (κενόν, Oracles, p. 11 K., the ἐρημία of Numenius, fragm. 11) in order to receive God; otherwise, as both tell us, the vision will be illusory. Finally, the statement of the Oracles about the Father, πάντ' ἔστι γάρ, ἀλλὰ νοητῶς (p. 19 K.), is an application of Numenius' principle ἐν πᾶσιν πάντα εἶναι, οἰκειῶς μέντοι κατὰ τὴν αὐτῶν οὐσίαν ἐν ἑκάστοις (p. 97.26 Leemans). These agreements must seem too many and too specific to be accidental, especially when we remember that we are dealing with fragments on both sides. Some sort of bridge must have linked the two systems; but I find it hard to be quite sure which way the traffic ran.<sup>28</sup> It could even have been a two-way traffic, since so far as our scanty knowledge goes Numenius and Julianus may well have been contemporaries. In the last of the instances quoted above the oracle-maker would appear to be applying the philosopher's generalization; on the other hand, the address to mankind is much more natural in an oracle than in a philosophical dialogue.<sup>29</sup> Certainly a work like the Oracles would appeal to Numenius, who was, in Macrobius' words, *occultorum curiosior*,<sup>30</sup> just as it did to his fellow-Pythagorean Nicomachus of Gerasa, the earliest extant author to refer to theurgy<sup>31</sup>.

As to the oriental elements (chap. VII), Lewy concludes that the original theurgists (who were probably "Chaldaean" by race [272] as well as by spiritual inheritance) drew on a pre-existing "Irano-Syro-Babylonian theocracy" (p. 425). Thus the Aion (or rather Chronos) of the Oracles represents the Iranian Zervan (pp. 401 ff.); the Ἐπτάκτις θεός of the Oracles derives from Syrian solar theology (pp. 409 ff.);<sup>32</sup> the ἐπτάπορος βαθμῆς recalls the Mithraic κλίμαξ ἐπτάπυλος (p. 414); the ἀρχαί or

28. Cf. Les Sources de Plotin (Entretiens Hardt, Tome V). 10 f., 33 f.

29. This is hardly disproved by [Plat.] Clitopho 407 a ὥσπερ ἐπὶ μηχανῆς τραγικῆς θεός, θυνεὶς λέγων· ποῖ φέρεσθε, ὄνθρωποι... where the implication is that such apostrophes were felt to be alien to the dialogue style.

30. Numenius, fragm. 39. His addiction to τελεστική (p. 100.19 Leemans), on which Julianus the theurgist was the great expert, is attested by frags. 9 and 33.

31. Nicomachus, Excerpta de musica, p. 277 Jan. Lewy thinks the reference an interpolation, since Nicomachus "lived in the first half of the second century" (p. 250, n. 83). But the earliest *terminus ante quem* for Nicomachus is given by the fact that Apuleius translated one of his books; an Apuleius (born about 123-125) may well have been active quite late in the century (the date of his death is unknown). There is thus no difficulty in making Nicomachus a contemporary of Julianus.

32. Kroll's idea, that what lies behind the Oracles is the Zoroastrian fire-cult, is rejected by Lewy (p. 429, n. 104), I think rightly.

κοσμογοί are the ἄρχοντες or κοσμοκράτορες of Babylonian astral religion (p. 423). So far as I can judge, all these identifications appear plausible if not certain. And we can now add (as Nock points out, *Speculum* 34, 1959, 473 f.) the divine names "Ad" and "Adad" cited in the new portion of Proclus' commentary on the Parmenides (Plato Latinus III. 58-60). Adad appears to be the Syrian Hadad (Macrob., Sat. 1. 23.17), Ad an invented name; it seems safe to equate them respectively with the δις (Ad + Ad) ἐπέκεινα and the ἄπαξ ἐπέκεινα who figure elsewhere in the Oracles. It is a curious jumble; but as Lewy rightly points out, such syncretism was already in the air. Not only was there a coalescence between cults of diverse national origin, but Greek and oriental doctrine were drawing together. The sort of Platonists whom the theurgists read were already prepared to admit Iranian dualism (cf., e.g., Plut., Is. et Os. 46, 370 E), and to identify Plato's teaching about the soul's descent and return with its astral journey as described in the eastern cults (cf. Celsus apud Origen, c. Cels. 6.21 f.). Hence it was easy for theurgy to win acceptance as "the last form of pagan religion" (p. 441).

Appended to the book are a series of excursuses. Some of these provide most useful factual surveys: e.g., on Neoplatonic modes of reference to the Oracles (Exc. I); on neologisms and rare words in the Oracles (Exc. III); on the meaning and history of the term "theurgy" (Exc. IV). Others are concerned with particular source-problems. Especially valuable is Exc. VI, where Lewy collects the widely scattered references to the Oracles in the works of Psellus, and shows, against Bidez, that Pletho got his knowledge of them solely from Psellus.<sup>33</sup>

To sum up, despite its faults — not all of which should be [273] laid at the author's door — Lewy's book makes a solid and indispensable contribution to our understanding of this latest phase of paganism. If we are to advance any further, what is now most needed is a comprehensive collection not only of *verbatim* fragments but of all references to the doctrines and practices of theurgy. It is a matter of deep regret that Lewy did not live to carry this out himself; but he has done a great deal to prepare the ground for any future editor.<sup>34</sup>

33, To whom we also, it now appears, owe the preservation of the de mysteriis (see M. Sicherl in *Byz. Ztschr.*, 53, 1960).

34. On the textual side, intending editors should note his elegant and certain correction of the hopeless-looking line ἔννοια πατρὸς αἰδεύμεθα σε μὴ εἰλωμένον πῦρ to ἔννοια πατρὸς αἰδε, μεθ' ἧς ἐμὸν εἰλωμένον πῦρ (p. 91, n. 97.) and his ἀγκτηραι (or rather ἀγκτεραι?) for ἀκτεραι at p. 298, n. 151. Several times, on the other hand, he prints (or his editors print) what seems metrically impossible even for gods, e.g., at p. 83, n. 62, p. 86, n. 74 (read θεοῦ), p. 191, n. 55 (read perhaps καὶ κάλλη ἀφραστα καλεῖται?).





## Bilan et perspectives sur les *Oracles Chaldaïques*

par Pierre HADOT

Le livre de H. Lewy représente un moment décisif dans l'histoire de l'étude des *Oracles Chaldaïques* et du platonisme tardif. C'est tout le climat religieux et philosophique de la fin de l'Antiquité qui ressuscite dans cet ouvrage où la profondeur de la réflexion ne le cède en rien à l'immensité de la culture et de l'érudition. Toutefois, malgré sa valeur irremplaçable, le livre de H. Lewy ne résoud pas tous les problèmes que posent les *Oracles Chaldaïques*. Depuis H. Lewy, et certainement sous l'impulsion de son œuvre, les recherches sur ces énigmatiques fragments se sont poursuivies, tel ou tel aspect particulier a été approfondi, mais, dans son ensemble, l'énigme des *Oracles* est loin d'être totalement résolue. Je voudrais énumérer ici brièvement les éléments de solution déjà proposés et, éventuellement, les directions de recherche à envisager.

### I. — L'AUTEUR

Pour commencer par un problème mineur, il faut reconnaître qu'il subsiste toujours des incertitudes et des imprécisions concernant la personnalité du rédacteur des *Oracles*.

Tout d'abord, est-ce bien Julien le Théurge, qui vécut sous Marc Aurèle ? Après bien des hésitations, on s'accorde en général à le penser, en s'appuyant sur les témoignages de « Suidas » et de Psellus, qui ont tous

deux puisé à des sources néoplatoniciennes<sup>1</sup>. Tous deux distinguent deux personnages du nom de Julien, le père et le fils, qui ont vécu à l'époque de Marc Aurèle. « Suidas<sup>2</sup> » nous rapporte que le père, surnommé « le Chaldéen » n'avait composé qu'un seul ouvrage : « Sur les Démon », tandis que le fils, surnommé « le Théurge », avait rédigé des livres se rapportant à la théurgie, à la téléstique<sup>3</sup>, et des *Oracles* en vers. Psellus, de son côté, parle bien de deux Julien « qui vécurent sous Marc Aurèle<sup>4</sup> », mais il dit une fois que c'est un Julien, vivant à l'époque de Trajan, qui « a exposé en vers les dogmes appelés *Oracles* par ceux qui magnifient les dires de ces Chaldéens<sup>5</sup> » et une autre fois que c'est un Julien contemporain de Marc Aurèle « qui a rédigé en vers ces opinions (des Chaldéens) que ceux qui sont après célèbrent comme des *Oracles*<sup>6</sup>. » La mention de l'empereur Trajan est-elle une bévue, comme le pense W. Theiler<sup>7</sup> ? Ou bien Psellus veut-il parler de Julien le père ? Les néoplatoniciens eux-mêmes nous apportent sur ce point peu de renseignements précis. Proclus parle plusieurs fois des « Théurges qui vécurent sous Marc Aurèle ».

1. Hésitations : En 1829, Ch. A. Lobeck (*Aglaophamus*, p. 102) est le premier à supposer que le rédacteur des *Oracles* est Julien le Théurge. En 1839-1840, Thilo (*De coelo empyreo*, II, p. 14) a accepté cette hypothèse. W. Krohl, dans sa monographie sur les *Oracles Chaldaïques* (Breslau, 1894), l'admet lui aussi avec beaucoup de circonspection et de prudence. Il y renonce en 1918 dans son article *Iulianos* de la *Realencyclopädie* (X, 1, col. 15-18). J. Bidez se contente d'affirmer que les deux Julien furent les premiers interprètes des *Logia* (*Catalogue des manuscrits alchimiques grecs*, t. VI, Bruxelles, 1928, p. 106).

2. SUIDAS, *Lexikon*, art. *Ioulianos* (n° 433-434 Adler).

3. A lire le texte de Suidas, on a l'impression que ces *Telestika* sont différents des *Oracles* en vers. Or une scholie du *Philopseudes* de Lucien (t. IV, p. 224 Jacobitz) parle d'un commentaire de Proclus sur ces *Telestika* de Julien, et l'on s'accorde en général à reconnaître en ces *Telestika* les *Oracles* eux-mêmes (cf. L. G. WESTERINK, *Proclus, Procopius, Psellus*, dans *Mnemosyne*, 3<sup>e</sup> série, 10, 1942, p. 276 ; E. R. DODDS, *Theurgy and its Relationship to Neoplatonism*, dans *The Journal of Roman Studies*, t. 37, 1947, p. 55).

4. Psellus, dans J. BIDEZ, *Catalogue des manuscrits alchimiques grecs*, t. VI, p. 178, n. 2.

5. PSELLUS, *Accusation de Michel Cérulaire*, dans É. DES PLACES, *Oracles Chaldaïques*, Paris, 1971, p. 219.

6. PSELLUS, *Du premier discours sur le Fils* (de Grégoire de Nazianze), dans É. DES PLACES, *Oracles Chaldaïques*, p. 224. Dans son petit traité *A ceux qui avaient demandé combien il y a de genres de discours philosophiques* (É. DES PLACES, *Oracles Chaldaïques*, p. 222), Psellus parle bien de Julien le Théurge qui opéra un prodige pendant l'expédition de Marc Aurèle contre les Daces, mais il ne dit pas explicitement que ce Julien est le rédacteur des *Oracles* ; ce Julien n'intervient qu'à propos du thème des évocations de dieux, comme adversaire d'Apulée dans une joute de pouvoir incantatoire.

7. W. THEILER, *Die chaldäischen Orakel und die Hymnen des Synesios*, Halle, 1942, p. 2, n. 2 (= *Forschungen zum Neuplatonismus*, Berlin, 1966, p. 253, n. 5) ; O. GEUDTNER, *Die Seelenlehre der chaldäischen Orakel*, Meisenheim am Glan, 1971, p. 1, n. 5.

Mais, dans de tels cas, il fait allusion, non pas aux *Oracles* en vers, mais à d'autres œuvres, traitant par exemple d'opérations théurgiques consistant à faire sortir l'âme de l'initié, de son corps, puis à l'y faire rentrer<sup>8</sup>. L'empereur Julien lui-même semble ne connaître qu'un seul Julien : « Cherche pour moi tout ce que Jamblique a écrit sur mon homonyme... Pour ma part, je raffole de Jamblique en philosophie et de mon homonyme en théosophie<sup>9</sup>. » Rien, dans ce texte, ne permet d'ailleurs d'affirmer que Julien parle des *Oracles Chaldaïques* et du commentaire de Jamblique sur ces *Oracles*. On peut tout aussi bien supposer qu'il s'agit des ouvrages théurgiques de l'« homonyme » de Julien. Est-ce aussi ces ouvrages théurgiques que Porphyre avait commentés dans son livre : εἰς τὰ Ἰουλιανοῦ τοῦ Χαλδαίου<sup>10</sup> ? Il est vrai que J. Bidez avait identifié cet ouvrage avec un commentaire des *Oracles* dont parle Jean Lydus<sup>11</sup>. Mais il faudrait, dans ce cas, supposer que, pour Porphyre, c'était Julien le Chaldéen, donc le père, qui aurait été l'auteur des *Oracles*. Ou alors, il faut admettre que l'on employait indistinctement les expressions « Chaldéen » et « Théurge », et que, par suite, l'on distinguait mal entre Julien le Chaldéen et Julien le Théurge.

Ces hésitations de la tradition doivent nous inciter à montrer un très grand esprit critique dans l'examen de ce problème de « paternité ». Julien le Théurge est-il le seul rédacteur des *Oracles* ? Ou bien les deux Julien ont-ils collaboré à cette rédaction<sup>12</sup> ? Ne vaut-il pas mieux dire avec É. des Places, qu'il « reste plus sûr de garder aux *Oracles* l'anonymat<sup>13</sup> » ? Car, somme toute, l'attribution explicite des *Oracles* à Julien ou aux deux Julien est très tardive et résulte peut-être d'une confusion entre les œuvres théurgiques de ces deux personnages et les *Oracles* proprement dits<sup>14</sup>. Les néoplatoniciens eux-mêmes distinguent mal

8. PROCLUS, *In Rempubl.*, t. II, p. 123, 12 Kroll ; *In Crat.*, p. 72, 10 Pasquali (où il est question de la conjuration des dieux par leur nom).

9. L'Empereur JULIEN, *Lettres*, 12, p. 19 Bidez.

10. SUIDAS, art. *Porphyrios*. Cf. n. 64.

11. J. BIDEZ, *Vie de Porphyre*, Gand, 1913, p. 70\*, cf. Jean LYDUS, *De mens.*, IV, 53, p. 110, 18 Wünsch.

12. Cf. H. LEWY, p. 5 et n. 5 ; A.-J. FESTUGIÈRE, *La Révélation d'Hermès*, t. III, p. 53 n. 5.

13. É. DES PLACES, *Oracles Chaldaïques*, p. 7. Cf. aussi F. W. CREMER, *Die Chaldäischen Orakel und Jamblich de mysteriis*, Meisenheim am Glan, 1969, p. 10 : « Wir können der allgemeinen Gepflogenheit, Julian dem Theurgen allein die Orakel zu geben, nicht ohne Bedenken folgen ; so lässt Psellos Julian <den Chaldäer> (le texte imprimé porte : den Theurgen, mais tout le contexte montre qu'il s'agit d'une faute d'impression) sie verfassen, und die neuplatonische Zitierweise als ' die Chaldäer ', ' die Assyrer ', ' die Theurgen ', ' die Theologen ', ' die Theosophen ', ' die Barbaren ' u.a. vergrößert nur unsere Verlegenheit. »

14. On ne la trouve clairement que chez Psellus, qui a connu Proclus, par l'intermédiaire de commentaires sur Grégoire de Nazianze, eux-mêmes inspirés de Procope, cf. J. WHITTAKER, *Proclus, Procopius, Psellus and the scholia on Gregory Nazianzen*, dans *Vigiliae Christianae*, t. 29, 1975, p. 309-313.

souvent entre ces deux types d'ouvrages : c'est ainsi, par exemple, que l'expression  $\kappaυρτῶ σῆματι$  « de forme convexe » est, selon Damascius, une formule employée par les dieux, donc par les *Oracles*, et selon Proclus, par le Théurge, donc par les œuvres en prose<sup>15</sup>. Le contenu et la signification des œuvres en prose des Théurges demeure encore très imprécis<sup>16</sup>.

On se demandera aussi avec E. R. Dodds quelle a été la part exacte du rédacteur<sup>17</sup>. A-t-il tout inventé de toutes pièces ou bien s'est-il contenté de mettre en vers des réponses de médiums ? Et finalement ne faut-il pas penser avec J. Geffcken<sup>18</sup>, que les *Oracles Chaldaïques*, comme les écrits hermétiques, les *Oracles Sybillins* et les textes magiques, ont été un livre de révélation toujours en devenir, auquel de nouveaux textes sont venus sans cesse s'ajouter ?

## II. — LE TITRE

Pourquoi ces Oracles s'appellent-ils « chaldaïques » ? On n'a guère progressé depuis que Kroll écrivait en 1899 : « Ce titre provient peut-être d'un prétendu rapport avec Julien le Chaldéen ou il peut s'expliquer par le fait que ce genre d'occultisme pouvait être désigné comme « chaldéen »<sup>19</sup> ». On peut penser que le rédacteur des *Oracles* a voulu présenter ces vers comme l'expression des traditions ancestrales ( $πάτρια δόγματα$ , comme dit Jamblique), révélées originellement par les dieux aux Chaldéens et aux Assyriens<sup>20</sup>. On connaît bien le goût des philosophes de l'Antiquité tardive pour ces révélations faites aux peuples « sacrés<sup>21</sup> ». Mais il est curieux de constater que si les écrits hermétiques, qui sont une révéla-

15. PROCLUS, *In Tim.*, t. I, p. 317, 24 Diehl ; et DAMASCIUS, *Dub. et Sol.*, t. II, p. 128, 3-4 Ruelle (cf. W. Kroll, p. 34 et des Places, fr. 63). Le fr. 71 des Places (= p. 36 Kroll) est rapporté par Proclus à « τῆς τῶν θεουργῶν ».

16. Cf. plus haut, n. 3. Que sont exactement les  $ὀρηγητικά$  (PROCLUS, *In Tim.*, t. III, p. 124, 32) ou  $ὀρηγησιατικά$  (DAMASCIUS, *Dub. et Sol.*, t. II, p. 203, 29 Ruelle) ? Cf. F. W. CREMER, *Die Chaldäischen Orakel und Jamblich de mysteriis*, p. 88.

17. E. R. DODDS, *Theurgy*, p. 56.

18. J. GEFFCKEN, *Der Ausgang des griechisch-römischen Heidentums*, Heidelberg, 1929 (réimpression Darmstadt, 1963), p. 276, n. 94.

19. W. KROLL, art.  $Χαλδαϊκά λόγια$  dans *Paulys Realencyclopädie*, t. III, 2 (1899), col. 2045.

20. JAMBLIQUE, *De myst.*, I, 2, p. 5, 9 Parthey (p. 40 des Places). Sur le sens du mot « Chaldéen » chez Jamblique, cf. F. W. CREMER, *Die Chaldäischen Orakel und Jamblich de mysteriis*, p. 14-15.

21. Les peuples « sacrés », expression de JAMBLIQUE, *De myst.*, VII, 5, p. 257, 9 Parthey (p. 193 des Places). Sur l'idée que les Grecs de l'Antiquité tardive se faisait des Chaldéens, cf. l'article *Chaldaioi* de BAUMSTARK dans *Paulys Realencyclopädie*, t. III, 2 (1899), col. 2055-2061.

tion du même genre, présentent une certaine couleur locale égyptienne<sup>22</sup>, les *Oracles Chaldaïques* ne présentent apparemment aucun trait proprement « chaldéen » et n'évoquent que des dieux grecs, comme Hécate et peut-être Apollon. On se demandera aussi pourquoi la théurgie, liée aux *Oracles*, a été présentée comme « chaldéenne ». Jusqu'ici, il n'existe aucune réponse satisfaisante à ces questions.

### III. — LES TÉMOINS

Les *Oracles* ne nous sont parvenus que d'une façon indirecte, grâce aux citations que, de Porphyre à Psellus (et à Pléthon), les néoplatoniciens en ont fait. On s'accorde généralement à reconnaître que Porphyre est le premier témoin des *Oracles*<sup>23</sup>. Pourtant certains historiens ont pensé pouvoir déceler des traces de ces *Oracles* chez Plotin et même chez Numénius.

#### 1. Numénius et les « *Oracles* »

Depuis longtemps on a remarqué la parenté entre ce que nous pouvons encore fragmentairement connaître de la pensée de Numénius et la doctrine philosophique des *Oracles*<sup>24</sup>. De part et d'autre on retrouve une distinction entre deux Intellects, l'un, paternel, qui est transcendant et pur de tout contact avec la matière, l'autre, engendré par le premier, qui organise le monde sensible et présente, en vertu de son double aspect, contemplatif et actif, un caractère dyadique<sup>25</sup>. L'analogie devient presque parallèle textuel lorsque l'on compare ce fragment des *Oracles* (p. 14 Kroll = fr. 7 des Places) : « Le Père a créé toutes choses en un état de perfection et il les a livrées au second Intellect, que vous appelez le Premier, tous tant que vous êtes, race humaine » et ce fragment de Numénius (fr. 26 Leemans = fr. 17 des Places) : « Comme Platon savait que chez les hommes le démiurge est seul connu, tandis que le Premier Intellect, celui qui est l'Étant en soi, est complètement ignoré chez eux, pour cette raison il s'est exprimé comme quelqu'un qui dirait : « O Hommes, celui en qui vous conjecturez l'Intellect, n'est pas le Premier, mais il y a avant lui un autre Intellect, antérieur et plus divin. » On peut donc penser que les *Oracles* ont subi l'influence de la philosophie de

22. Par exemple, chez JAMBLIQUE, *De myst.*, VIII, 3, p. 262, 14 Parthey (p. 196 des Places).

23. Cf. H. LEWY, p. 7.

24. W. KROLL, *De orac. chald.*, p. 14 n. 1.

25. Cf. A.-J. FESTUGIÈRE, *La Révélation d'Hermès*, t. III, p. 54-56.

Numénius. C'est l'opinion d'A.-J. Festugière<sup>26</sup> et de J. H. Waszink<sup>27</sup>. On peut aussi imaginer l'inverse, en constatant notamment que dans le parallèle presque littéral que nous venons de citer, l'apostrophe adressée à l'humanité est plus naturelle dans un *Oracle* que dans un texte philosophique ; c'est l'opinion d'E. R. Dodds<sup>28</sup>, opinion qu'il a d'ailleurs nuancée dans son compte rendu de H. Lewy en parlant plutôt d'échange réciproque : a two-way traffic<sup>29</sup>. H. Lewy lui-même excluait toute influence des *Oracles* sur Numénius<sup>30</sup>, mais doutait également d'une influence de Numénius sur les *Oracles*, en insistant avec raison sur les différences capitales qui, à côté de ces analogies, séparent profondément Numénius et les *Oracles* pour d'autres questions de la philosophie platonicienne. Il songeait plutôt à une source commune ou à des développements parallèles autonomes<sup>31</sup>. Il me semble, en tout cas, qu'il ne faut pas exagérer la parenté entre Numénius et les *Oracles*. Tout d'abord, la doctrine des deux Intellects n'est pas propre à Numénius. Elle est assez répandue au 1<sup>er</sup> et au 11<sup>e</sup> siècle après Jésus-Christ<sup>32</sup>. Surtout il y a, entre Numénius et les *Oracles*, d'importantes divergences doctrinales. Pour les *Oracles*, la matière est engendrée par le Père<sup>33</sup> (c'est-à-dire pour eux, par le premier principe), alors que Numénius est violemment hostile à l'idée d'une matière engendrée<sup>34</sup>. Numénius refuse toute dérivation de la

26. A.-J. FESTUGIÈRE, *La religion grecque à l'époque hellénistique*, dans *Revue des études grecques*, t. 64, 1951, p. 482 : « Le recueil démarque, sous mode oraculaire, le traité de Numénius *Sur le Bien*. »

27. J. H. WASZINK, *Porphyrios und Numenius*, dans *Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique*, t. XII, Fondation Hardt, Vandœuvres-Genève, 1966, p. 65.

28. E. R. DODDS, *Numenius and Ammonius*, dans *Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique*, t. V, Fondation Hardt, Vandœuvres-Genève, 1960, p. 10-11.

29. Cf. plus haut, p. 700.

30. H. LEWY, p. 320, n. 27 : « A reversal of the relation between Numenius and the Chaldaeans is out of question, if only for the reason that the philosopher never gives any sign of knowing the Oracles. » É. des Places commet donc une erreur lorsqu'il range H. Lewy parmi les partisans d'une priorité des *Oracles* par rapport à Numénius (*Oracles Chaldaïques*, p. 11).

31. H. LEWY, p. 320-321. L'auteur souligne le fait que les *Oracles* ignorent la doctrine de Numénius sur l'âme mauvaise et que Numénius ignore la doctrine des *Oracles* sur les puissances divines et les émanations.

32. Cf. H. LEWY, p. 318, n. 19. La théorie des deux sagesse divines, dans la théologie chrétienne, se rattache au même courant de pensée, cf. A. ORBE, *Estudios Valentinianos*, I, 1, Rome, 1958, p. 359 et 572.

33. Πατρογενής ὄλη : PSELLUS, *Hypotyp.*, 27 (des Places, p. 201) ; dans Jean LYDUS, *De mens.*, II, 11, p. 32, 3, il faut lire probablement πατρογενή ὄλην avec le groupe X (et non πρωτογενή ὄλην, Kroll, p. 10, n. 1 ; des Places, fr. 173) ; cf. aussi Jean LYDUS, *De mens.*, IV, 159, p. 175, 9 : ὁ Χαλδαῖος ἐν τοῖς λογίοις πατρογενή τὴν ὄλην ὀνομάζει. Voir F. W. CREMER, *Die Chaldäischen Orakel und Jamblich de mysteriis*, p. 27, n. 73.

34. Cf. NUMÉNIUS, test. 30 Leemans = fr. 52 des Places (Calcidius, *In Tim.*, c. 295), qui reproche à certains Pythagoriciens de faire dériver la

dyade à partir de la monade<sup>35</sup>, alors qu'il semble bien que les *Oracles* admettent un engendrement de la dyade par la monade<sup>36</sup>.

## 2. Plotin

« Les *Oracles Chaldaïques* ont été portés à la connaissance des néo-platoniciens par Porphyre » ; cette affirmation de H. Lewy<sup>37</sup>, qui implique donc que Plotin a ignoré ou voulu ignorer les *Oracles*, se heurte à certaines difficultés.

Tout d'abord, les premiers mots du traité I, 9 : *Sur la sortie de l'âme* sont présentés comme un *Oracle Chaldaïque* dans le commentaire de Psellus sur les *Oracles*<sup>38</sup>. M. N. Bouillet, le traducteur français de Plotin au XIX<sup>e</sup> siècle, et, à sa suite, R. Volkman, dans son édition de 1883-1884, avaient accepté cette identification<sup>39</sup>. Mais W. Kroll (p. 5) a refusé de reconnaître comme chaldaïque cette formule qui ne peut provenir d'un hexamètre. Il pensait que Proclus avait, dans son commentaire des *Oracles*, cité ces quelques mots de Plotin et que, par inadvertance, Psellus avait cru qu'il s'agissait d'un *Oracle*. E. R. Dodds, lui aussi, refuse de compter cette formule parmi les *Oracles*<sup>40</sup>. Il semble bien qu'É. des Places aurait dû ranger ce texte au moins dans les fragments douteux<sup>41</sup>.

---

matière de Dieu : *ex deo silva*. Sur ce thème, cf. A.-J. FESTUGIÈRE, *La Révélation d'Hermès*, t. IV, p. 37.

35. Cf. le texte cité note 34 : « Recedente a natura sua singularitate et in duitatis habitum migrante. »

36. Je pense en effet qu'il faut traduire l'*Oracle* suivant (Kroll, p. 15, des Places, fr. 12) : *ταυη̄ μονάς̄ ἐστιν̄ καῑ δύο̄ γεννῶ̄* de cette manière : « La monade est étendue et elle engendre deux », et non pas comme H. Lewy et, à sa suite, É. des Places : « Il est une monade subtile qui engendre deux. » Dans le contexte de la citation de cet *Oracle* par Damascius (*Dub. et Sol.*, § 148), il apparaît clairement que *ταυη̄* implique l'idée de déploiement et d'extension. Le vers est appliqué à l'*Aïōn*, parce qu'il est élan et *tension* (*τετάσθαι*, c'est l'étymologie de *ταυη̄*) vers la génération. Sur cette dérivation de la dyade à partir de la monade, cf. les références données par J. H. Waszink dans l'apparat de son édition de Calcidius, § 295. Il faut probablement donner le même sens, dans le fr. 1 de des Places (= p. 11 Kroll), au mot *ταυός̄* : « Il faut penser cet Intelligible avec la flamme tendue de l'Intellect tendu ». Ce sens est confirmé par le *ταυη̄* du vers 9 (des Places) = 10 (Kroll).

37. H. LEWY, p. 7.

38. PSELLUS, *Commentaire des Oracles Chaldaïques*, 1125 d, p. 164 des Places.

39. Cf. l'apparat critique de l'édition Henry-Schwyzler, ad I, 9, 1. Voir aussi F. CUMONT, *Comment Plotin détourna Porphyre du suicide*, dans *Revue des études grecques*, t. 32, 1919, p. 116, n. 3.

40. E. R. DODDS, *Theurgy*, p. 57, n. 26 a.

41. Comme le note É. des Places lui-même, p. 165, n. 1 : Cet oracle « s'accommode mal du mètre, même avec la transposition proposée. »

D'autre part, S. Eitrem<sup>42</sup>, sans se référer à une utilisation précise et littérale des *Oracles* par Plotin, a voulu, d'une manière plus générale, faire dériver de Plotin lui-même la théurgie néoplatonicienne. E. R. Dodds<sup>43</sup> a remarquablement réfuté cette affirmation, en définissant le vrai sens de la mystique plotinienne.

Récemment, W. Theiler a cru découvrir des réminiscences littérales des *Oracles* chez Plotin<sup>44</sup>. Il s'agissait pour lui d'expliquer les allusions qu'Hiéroclès fait aux *Oracles Chaldaïques* : comme, selon son hypothèse de travail, Hiéroclès ne fait que reproduire l'enseignement d'Ammonius Saccas, il lui fallait prouver qu'Ammonius avait connu les *Oracles* et il fallait, pour cela, découvrir des traces chaldaïques chez Plotin, témoin de l'enseignement d'Ammonius. Il pense donc pouvoir reconnaître ces traces dans trois mots employés par Plotin : *πικρά* (II, 3, 17, 23), *ὀπισθοβαρής* (VI, 9, 4, 22), *ἀμφίστομος* (III, 8, 9, 31). On conviendra que ces rapprochements sont bien minces, d'autant plus que ces termes n'ont rien de spécifiquement chaldaïque. Il est vrai que les *Oracles* (p. 61 Kroll = fr. 129 des Places) emploient l'image de l'amertume de la matière, qui apparaît chez Plotin. Mais c'est là une image qui vient naturellement à partir du moment où l'on considère la mer comme le symbole de la matière. L'*Antre des Nymphes* de Porphyre fait remonter cette métaphore à Homère lui-même<sup>45</sup>. Et l'on peut voir chez saint Augustin comment cette liaison entre matière, mer et amertume se présente facilement à l'esprit<sup>46</sup>. D'ailleurs l'*Oracle* (non-chaldaïque) cité par Porphyre dans sa *Vie de Plotin* parle lui aussi des vagues amères de la vie dans la matière<sup>47</sup>. Quant à *ὀπισθοβαρής* il n'est pas du tout sûr que ce soit un terme proprement chaldaïque. H. Lewy avait noté qu'il n'était pas introduit, chez Proclus, par l'une des formules typiques de citation des *Oracles*<sup>48</sup>. Et ce mot apparaît déjà au milieu du 1<sup>er</sup> siècle av. J.-C., dans une inscription

42. S. EITREM, *La théurgie chez les néo-platoniciens et dans les papyrus magiques*, dans *Symbolae Osloenses*, fasc. 22, 1942, p. 49-79, notamment p. 50-51 et 62-66.

43. E. R. DODDS, *Theurgy*, p. 57-58.

44. W. THEILER, *Ammonios und Porphyrios*, dans *Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique*, t. XII, Fondation Hardt, Vandœuvres-Genève, 1966, p. 112-113, suivi par Ch. ELSAS, *Neuplatonische und gnostische Wellablehnung in der Schule Plotins*, Berlin, 1975, p. 272-281. Les allusions d'Hiéroclès aux *Oracles* s'expliquent par le néoplatonisme de son époque, cf. Ilsetraut HADOT, *Le problème du néoplatonisme alexandrin. Hiéroclès et Simplicius*, Paris, 1978, p. 69-71, 73.

45. Cf. PORPHYRE, *De antro nymph.*, 34 (peut-être inspiré d'ailleurs de Numénius). Voir F. BUFFIÈRE, *Les mythes d'Homère et la pensée grecque*, Paris, 1956, p. 414.

46. Cf. H. RONDET, *Le symbolisme de la mer chez saint Augustin*, dans *Augustinus Magister*, t. II, Paris, 1954, p. 691-701.

47. PORPHYRE, *Vita Plot.*, 22, 31 : *πικρὸν κύμα*.

48. H. LEWY, p. 278, n. 77. Cf. O. GEUDTNER, *Die Seelenlehre der chaldäischen Orakel*, p. 12, n. 57.



royale, pour désigner les conséquences de l'impiété<sup>49</sup>. Enfin, en ce qui concerne ἀμπίστομος, il faut bien constater que ce mot, lui non plus, n'est jamais cité comme proprement chaldaïque par les néoplatoniciens. Il fait probablement allusion aux multiples visages d'Hécate et, à cause de cela, il est utilisé par Proclus pour décrire la situation de l'âme<sup>50</sup>. Mais le mot est assez courant pour désigner un être qui regarde dans deux directions, et d'ailleurs Plotin ne l'emploie pas à propos de l'âme, mais à propos de l'Intellect<sup>51</sup>, qui n'a rien à voir avec Hécate.

Selon toute vraisemblance, Plotin n'a pas connu les *Oracles Chaldaïques* ou a refusé de s'y intéresser.

### 3. Porphyre

En ce qui concerne Porphyre, il n'y a aucun doute : il a connu et utilisé les *Oracles Chaldaïques*. Mais dans quels ouvrages ? Un premier problème surgit avec sa *Philosophie des Oracles*. Nous connaissons ce traité grâce aux citations d'Eusèbe de Césarée, Firmicus Maternus, Lactance, Augustin, Jean Philopon<sup>52</sup> et, comme l'a montré H. Lewy<sup>53</sup>, par l'intermédiaire également de la collection chrétienne publiée par Buresch<sup>54</sup> sous le titre *Prophétie des dieux païens (Theosophia Tubingensis)*. G. Wolff<sup>55</sup> a tenté en 1856 de reconstituer le plan de cet ouvrage. Un premier livre traitait des *dieux* : après une préface, il montrait successivement à l'aide de citations d'*Oracles* ce que doivent être la piété et le culte envers les dieux, ce qu'est leur genre de vie, le sens des statues qui les représentent, quelles formes ils prennent pour apparaître, les lieux qu'ils fréquentent, les sacrifices qu'il faut leur offrir, les jours où il faut les invoquer, les nations qui sont les plus savantes dans les choses divines. Le second livre traitait des *démons*, le troisième, des *héros*. On trouve dans cet ouvrage des réponses oraculaires d'Apollon, de Sérapis, d'Hécate. Jusqu'à H. Lewy,

49. *Orientalis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae*, t. I, n. 383, 120, p. 601 Dittenberger : τῆς δὲ ἀσεβείας (ἔργον) ὀπισθοβαρεῖς ἀνάγκαι cité par I. Hadot, dans les notes de l'édition (à paraître) du Commentaire de Simplicius *Sur le Manuel d'Épictète* (ad p. 35, 2 Dübner : ἵνα μὴ... ὀπισθοβαρῆς εὐρεθῆς).

50. Le mot ἀμπίστομος est plusieurs fois employé par Proclus en liaison avec ἀμφιπρόσωπος qui est peut-être un terme chaldaïque (*In Tim.* t. II, p. 246, 19 et 293, 23 Diehl). Cf. H. LEWY, p. 355, A.-J. FESTUGIÈRE, *Proclus, Commentaire sur le Timée*, t. III, p. 170, n. 1).

51. L'Intellect plotinien est ἀμπίστομος parce qu'il regarde d'une part vers lui-même, c'est-à-dire vers les Idées, d'autre part vers l'Un (en renonçant d'ailleurs alors à être Intellect). Cette situation a peu de rapport avec celle de l'Hécate chaldaïque.

52. Cf. G. WOLFF, *Porphyrii de philosophia ex oraculis haurienda librorum reliquiae*, Berlin, 1856 (réimpr. Hildesheim, 1962).

53. H. LEWY, p. 8-65.

54. K. BURESCH, *Klaros*, Leipzig, 1889.

55. G. WOLFF, *Porphyrii de philosophia ex orac. rel.*, p. 42.

on pensait<sup>56</sup> que, dans cette *Philosophie des Oracles*, Porphyre ne citait aucun *Oracle Chaldaïque*. H. Lewy lui-même, dans son premier chapitre, a cru pouvoir démontrer que certains *Oracles* cités dans la *Philosophie des Oracles* étaient des *Oracles Chaldaïques*, en raison des concepts et du vocabulaire qui y étaient utilisés<sup>57</sup>. Cette hypothèse a été admise par certains historiens<sup>58</sup>, refusée par d'autres<sup>59</sup>. Elle est loin, en tout cas, de faire l'unanimité. On lui objecte surtout le fait qu'aucun néoplatonicien tardif ne cite comme « chaldéen » un seul des *Oracles* identifiés comme chaldaïque par H. Lewy. Mais, d'un autre côté, il semble bien étrange, comme le note E. R. Dodds<sup>60</sup>, qu'un collectionneur d'*Oracles* aussi diligent que Porphyre ait pu ignorer un recueil aussi important que les *Oracles Chaldaïques*, recueil qui circulait déjà depuis un certain temps si l'on admet que Julien le Théurge ou les deux Julien en était les rédacteurs. Nous sommes ici en pleine énigme : pourquoi les *Oracles* dits *Chaldaïques* de la *Philosophie des Oracles* seraient-ils restés inconnus aux néoplatoniciens postérieurs ? Mais à l'inverse, comment Porphyre a-t-il pu ignorer les *Oracles Chaldaïques* en rédigeant sa *Philosophie des Oracles* ?

Le *De regressu animae* qui nous est connu par Augustin et probablement Macrobie, faisait un abondant usage des *Oracles Chaldaïques*<sup>61</sup>. Il y définit le rôle que la théurgie chaldaïque joue dans la remontée de l'âme : elle ne purifie que la partie irrationnelle de l'âme humaine et ne permet qu'une remontée jusqu'aux dieux astraux ; seule la philosophie, qui n'est accessible qu'à un petit groupe d'hommes, permet une totale délivrance de l'âme<sup>62</sup>. Il ne semble pas que l'on puisse identifier cet ouvrage avec la *Philosophie des Oracles*, bien que l'hypothèse ait été proposée<sup>63</sup>.

56. C'était l'opinion de G. WOLFF, p. 29 et 66 ; W. KROLL, *De oraculis chaldaicis*, p. 6 ; E. R. DODDS, *Theurgy*, p. 58.

57. H. LEWY, p. 8-65.

58. J. J. O'MEARA, *Porphyry's Philosophy from Oracles in Augustine*, Paris, 1959, p. 35 ; P. HADOT, *Citations de Porphyre chez Augustin*, dans *Revue des études augustiniennes*, t. VI, 1960, p. 208 (je serais beaucoup moins affirmatif aujourd'hui).

59. E. R. DODDS, plus haut, p. 695 ; É. DES PLACES, *Oracles Chaldaïques*, p. 55.

60. E. R. DODDS, plus haut, p. 697.

61. Cf. les principaux fragments rassemblés par J. BIDEZ, *Vie de Porphyre*, Gand, 1913 (réimpression Hildesheim, 1964), p. 27\*-44\*. Cf. MACROBE, *In Somn. Scip.*, I, 13, 15 : « In arcanis de animae reditu disputationibus. »

62. Cf. P. HADOT, *Porphyre et Victorinus*, t. I, Paris, 1968, p. 94 et 107-108.

63. J. J. O'MEARA a proposé cette identification dans son livre *Porphyry's Philosophy from Oracles in Augustine*, Paris, 1959. Voir mes objections dans *Citations de Porphyre chez Augustin*, in *Revue des études augustiniennes*, t. VI, 1960, p. 205-244 et dans *La métaphysique de Porphyre*, in *Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique*, t. XII, Fondation Hardt, Vandœuvres-Genève, 1966, p. 133. Cf. aussi E. R. DODDS, plus haut p. 695, n. 8.

On se demandera quel a pu être le contenu exact de l'ouvrage<sup>64</sup> cité par « Suidas » : εἰς τὰ Ἰουλιανοῦ τοῦ Χαλδαίου. Est-ce un commentaire des écrits d'un Julien se rapportant aux opérations théurgiques ? Est-ce un commentaire des *Oracles Chaldaïques* (dont Julien le Chaldéen serait le rédacteur) ? Faut-il identifier ce commentaire avec l'ὄψομνημα τῶν λογίων dont parle Jean Lydus<sup>65</sup> ?

Une nouvelle difficulté apparaît avec un texte d'Énée de Gaza qui n'a pas encore été expliqué jusqu'ici d'une manière satisfaisante : ἐπιγράφει δὲ καθόλου τὸ βιβλίον, ὃ εἰς μέσον προάγει τῶν Χαλδαίων τὰ λόγια<sup>66</sup>. C'est le mot καθόλου qui fait difficulté. Certains interprètes le conservent ; ils proposent alors de traduire : « Porphyre donne comme titre général au livre qui les révèle au public : *Les Oracles des Chaldéens*<sup>67</sup> », ou bien : « Porphyre donne un titre général au livre qui révèle au public les Oracles des Chaldéens<sup>68</sup>. » On voit que la première traduction fait apparaître un livre de Porphyre : *Les Oracles des Chaldéens* qui est différent de la *Philosophie des Oracles* et du *De regressu animae*, mais qui s'identifie peut-être avec l'ouvrage *Sur les écrits de Julien le Chaldéen*. L'auteur de la seconde traduction voudrait reconnaître dans ce « titre général », « *La Philosophie des Oracles*<sup>69</sup>. » D'autres interprètes corrigent en καθόδου ou περὶ καθόδου. Dans cette hypothèse, on traduirait : « Porphyre donne comme titre : « De la descente » au livre qui révèle au public les *Oracles des Chaldéens*. » Selon certains, ce titre se rapporterait à l'un des livres du grand ouvrage que Porphyre aurait écrit *Sur la matière*<sup>70</sup>. Selon H. Lewy, ce titre désignerait l'un des livres du traité de Porphyre sur les *Oracles Chaldaïques*, le titre complet de l'ouvrage étant alors : « Sur les *logia* de Julien le Chaldéen, au sujet de la descente et de la remontée des âmes »<sup>71</sup>. Le *De regressu animae* ne serait que la seconde partie de cet ouvrage. On voit que bien des incertitudes subsistent encore dans l'interprétation de ce passage.

64. « Suidas », t. IV, p. 178, 22 Adler qui donne le texte des manuscrits : εἰς τὴν Ἰουλιανοῦ τοῦ Χαλδαίου, mais il faut admettre la correction de Valesius : εἰς τὰ. La faute des manuscrits vient probablement d'une erreur d'un scribe qui a cru que la φιλοσόφων ἱστορίαν qui fait suite, était l'œuvre de Julien le Chaldéen. Ou bien faut-il lire : εἰς τὴν Ἰουλιανοῦ τοῦ Χαλδαίου <τέχνην> ?

65. C'est l'opinion de J. BIDEZ, *Vie de Porphyre*, p. 70\* ; E. R. Dodds, plus haut p. 696-697.

66. ÉNÉE DE GAZA, *Théophraste*, p. 45, 4 Colonna (Boissonade p. 51).

67. Cf. J. BIDEZ, *Vie de Porphyre*, p. 160 et W. THEILER, *Die chaldäischen Orakel und die Hymnen des Synesios*, p. 2 (dans son livre *Porphyrios und Augustin*, p. 16, W. Theiler propose de lire αὐτὸς οὗτος au lieu de δὲ καθόλου τὸ).

68. J. J. O'MEARA, *Porphyry's Philosophy from Oracles*, p. 41.

69. J. J. O'MEARA, *ibid.*, p. 42.

70. G. WOLFF, *Porphyrii de philosophia ex oraculis haurienda*, p. 28-30.

71. H. LEWY, p. 450.

On ajoutera à cette liste des ouvrages de Porphyre citant les *Oracles Chaldaïques*, les fragments du commentaire sur le *Parménide*, dont j'ai proposé l'attribution à Porphyre. On trouve, en tout cas, dans ce texte, une allusion précieuse à la doctrine des *Oracles* concernant le premier Dieu et une intéressante distinction entre les rédacteurs des *Oracles* et les dieux auxquels ces rédacteurs attribuent cette révélation<sup>72</sup>.

C'est par Porphyre que certains auteurs latins comme Arnobe, Lactance peut-être, Victorinus et Augustin, et des auteurs grecs comme Synésius, ont connu les *Oracles*<sup>73</sup>. Surtout, comme je l'ai montré ailleurs, tout le néoplatonisme postérieur, de Jamblique à Damascius, a reçu de Porphyre la problématique à laquelle il essaie de répondre : concilier la lettre des *Oracles* et l'esprit du plotinisme, c'est-à-dire d'une part un système, celui des *Oracles*, dans lequel Dieu comporte en lui-même une multiplicité virtuelle : une Puissance et un Intellect, et d'autre part un système, celui de Plotin, dans lequel Dieu est absolument un et simple. La solution de Porphyre consiste à admettre une certaine préexistence de la seconde hypostase (l'Intellect ou Un-Multiple) au sein de l'Un. Les néoplatoniciens postérieurs, à partir de Jamblique, refuseront d'appliquer cette solution au niveau du premier principe, mais ils la conserveront pour expliquer la naissance de l'Un-Multiple<sup>74</sup>. La doctrine proclienne des hénades se situe dans cette tradition porphyrienne<sup>75</sup>.

#### 4. Les néoplatoniciens, de Jamblique à Pléthon

Ce sont évidemment les principaux témoins ; grâce à eux, nous possédons la plupart des citations littérales des *Oracles* qui sont réunies dans les recueils de W. Kroll et d'É. des Places. Il semble bien que le recensement de ces citations soit maintenant complet. On peut tout au plus prévoir des progrès dans le domaine de la critique textuelle. Grâce aux admirables

---

72. Cf. P. HADOT, *Porphyre et Victorinus*, t. I, p. 107-109 et t. II, p. 91-95. Cf. W. THEILER, *Das Unbestimmte, Unbegrenzte bei Plotin*, dans *Revue internationale de Philosophie*, t. 24, 1970, p. 291, qui reconnaît Porphyre comme l'auteur du commentaire sur le *Parménide* et donne une interprétation du texte sur les *Oracles Chaldaïques*.

73. Cf. le résumé de É. DES PLACES, *Oracles Chaldaïques*, p. 29-41. Sur Porphyre et l'Occident, cf. P. HADOT, *Porphyre et Victorinus*, t. I, p. 81-86 et p. 461-474.

74. Cf. *Porphyre et Victorinus*, t. I, p. 484-485 résumant de nombreux développements.

75. Cf. la thèse inédite de Ch. GUÉRARD, *Proclus et la théologie porphyrienne, Recherches sur les traces et l'importance du commentaire sur le Parménide attribué à Porphyre dans l'In Parmenidem de Proclus*, Université de Paris-IV, 1977, p. 160-167. Sur la théorie des hénades chez Proclus, cf. H. D. SAFFREY - L. G. WESTERINK, *Proclus, Théologie platonicienne*, livre III, Paris, 1978, p. LI-LXXVII.

éditions critiques de Proclus<sup>76</sup>, qui ont été récemment réalisées, de grands progrès ont déjà été accomplis. On peut encore attendre beaucoup d'éditions qui restent à faire, par exemple de celle des *Dubitationes et Solutiones* de Damascius. Bidez et Cumont croyaient, en 1938, à l'utilité d'une édition du commentaire de Pléthon, estimant que celui-ci aurait connu une autre source que Psellus pour le texte des *Oracles* qu'il commentait ; mais H. Lewy a montré que Pléthon dépend entièrement de Psellus<sup>77</sup>.

On pourrait donc supposer que, dans ce domaine, il reste relativement peu de choses à faire. Ce serait, je crois, une erreur. Jusqu'ici on s'est presque toujours contenté de glaner, dans les écrits des néoplatoniciens, les fragments épars des *Oracles Chaldaïques*, on les a rassemblés dans un ordre plus ou moins systématique en les séparant de leur contexte. Mais il faudrait maintenant les replacer dans leur contexte : il faudrait étudier la manière dont les néoplatoniciens ont vu et commenté les *Oracles*. Il n'existe qu'un travail de ce genre, qui pourra servir de modèle pour d'autres recherches futures, c'est l'ouvrage de F. W. Cremer sur les *Oracles Chaldaïques* et le *De mysteriis* de Jamblique : la manière dont les *Oracles* s'intègrent dans le mouvement conceptuel du *De mysteriis* y est analysée avec beaucoup de précision<sup>78</sup>. Il faudrait ainsi étudier la manière dont chaque néoplatonicien a vu et utilisé les *Oracles* : dans quels ouvrages il l'a fait ; dans quel contexte précis ; quels *Oracles* il a cités ; pourquoi et comment il les a cités ; le sens qu'il leur a donné. Il faudrait étudier de la même manière l'utilisation néoplatonicienne des écrits des théurges, qui, comme le notait J. Bidez en 1919<sup>79</sup>, est inséparable de la recherche sur les *Oracles Chaldaïques*. Ces travaux permettraient peut-être, comme l'espérait J. Bidez, de reconstituer les commentaires néoplatoniciens des *Oracles* et des œuvres des théurges de Porphyre à Proclus. Ils permettraient en tout cas de suivre l'évolution qu'a suivie la découverte et l'interprétation des *Oracles* dans le néoplatonisme tardif. Ce serait

---

76. Je fais allusion ici aux éditions des œuvres de Proclus, Olympiodore et Damascius, qui ont été réalisées récemment par H. Boese, H. D. Saffrey, L. G. Westerink, Cl. Zintzen, et d'autres savants.

77. J. BIDEZ-F. CUMONT, *Les Mages hellénisés*, t. I, Paris, 1938, p. 158-163. H. LEWY, p. 474.

78. Cf. plus haut n. 13. Le travail de W. THEILER, *Die chaldäischen Orakel und die Hymnen des Synesios*, est une monographie du même genre, mais le mouvement de la pensée de Synésius, la structure littéraire des *Hymnes* y sont assez peu étudiés.

79. J. BIDEZ, *La liturgie des mystères chez les Néo-platoniciens*, dans *Bulletin de l'Académie royale de Belgique, Classe des Lettres*, 1919, p. 415-423. Cf. aussi J. BIDEZ-F. CUMONT, *Les mages hellénisés*, t. I, p. 163 : « Comme nous l'avons montré ailleurs, si l'on voulait donner une suite utile à l'entreprise de M. Kroll, on ne pourrait pas se contenter de reproduire avec ses derniers accroissements la série des hexamètres qu'il a magistralement reconstitués. Il faudrait y joindre un ensemble considérable de textes relatifs à la théurgie que ces vers prétendaient prescrire et justifier, ce qui entraînerait à réunir les fragments du grand ouvrage de Proclus sur l'accord des *Logia* avec Orphée, Pythagore et Platon. »

une contribution importante à l'étude de la formation et du fonctionnement du mode de pensée néoplatonicien. Ces travaux n'éclaireraient pas seulement la signification du néoplatonisme, ils conduiraient peut-être aussi à une meilleure compréhension des *Oracles*. En étudiant attentivement la manière dont les *Oracles* sont cités, groupés, commentés, on parviendrait peut-être à entrevoir l'ordre véritable des fragments et le contexte où ils s'inséraient. Il faudrait aussi analyser la genèse, la structure et la valeur de la systématisation néoplatonicienne des *Oracles*, qui nous est présentée plusieurs fois par Psellus<sup>80</sup>. C'est sous l'influence de cette systématisation néoplatonicienne que nous avons tendance à croire que les *Oracles Chaldaïques* proposaient originellement un système philosophique cohérent. On peut se demander légitimement si cela est justifié. Sans doute, on a parfaitement le droit d'étudier tel ou tel thème ou notion dans les *Oracles*. Et par exemple le livre d'O. Geudtner sur la doctrine chaldaïque de l'âme est extrêmement précieux<sup>81</sup>. Mais il faut bien dire que, pour être assuré de l'existence d'un système chaldaïque, il faudrait que nous soyons mieux renseignés sur la forme littéraire des *Oracles*. Il est presque sûr qu'ils ne formaient pas un poème didactique unique, car on devine çà et là les traces d'un dialogue entre le dieu et un consultant : le dieu parle souvent à la première personne ou s'adresse aux hommes<sup>82</sup>. Ces réponses sont-elles homogènes ? Ont-elles été forgées par un théurge-philosophe habillant le néoplatonisme dans ce style oraculaire ? Ou bien correspondent-elles à différentes expériences médiumniques ? Dans ce dernier cas, toutes les expressions chaldaïques ne peuvent être totalement cohérentes, et les reconstructions systématiques doivent être menées avec la plus grande prudence.

---

80. Psellus, dans É. DES PLACES, *Oracles Chaldaïques*, p. 189-191 ; 194-195 ; 198-201 ; 223-224 et Michel ITALICUS, *ibid.*, p. 214-217.

81. Pour les références bibliographiques, cf. p. 704, n. 7.

82. W. Theiler (*Die chaldaischen Orakel und die Hymnen des Synesios*, p. 1) a rassemblé les textes des néoplatoniciens qui font allusion aux réponses des dieux aux théurges : PROCLUS, *In Rempubl.*, t. I, 39, 18 : « Les dieux parlant clairement au théurge » ; *ibid.*, t. II, p. 242, 9 : « Les dieux parlant aux théurges » ; *In Alc.*, 53, 1 (p. 23) Westerink : « Les dieux recommandent aux théurges » ; DAMASCIUS, *Dub. et Sol.*, t. I, p. 154, 15 : « Les dieux, dans ces vers où ils s'adressent au théurge » ; JULIEN, *Orat.* V, 178 d : « Les dieux le promettent dans leurs recommandations aux théurges qui sont tout à fait purs. » Cette dernière citation semble laisser entendre que le mot « théurge » ne désigne pas, dans toutes ces citations, les deux Julien, mais les théurges en général, autrement dit que les *Oracles* s'adressent aux hommes qui pratiquent la théurgie. D'ailleurs les *Oracles* eux-mêmes parlent des théurges en général (p. 53 Kroll = fr. 153 des Places).

## IV. MYSTIQUE, MAGIE, THÉURGIE, GNOSTICISME

Un des grands mérites du livre de H. Lewy est certainement d'avoir analysé avec beaucoup de soin les pratiques théurgiques chaldaïques<sup>83</sup>. Parfaitement conscient de l'originalité de ce phénomène religieux, H. Lewy ne s'est pourtant pas libéré des confusions de vocabulaire qui régnaient encore au début du xx<sup>e</sup> siècle, à une époque où l'on englobait dans un même mépris le mysticisme et la magie, que l'on parvenait mal à distinguer<sup>84</sup>. Le sous-titre de l'ouvrage de H. Lewy est tout à fait significatif : après le titre *Chaldaean Oracles and Theurgy*, les mots : *Mysticism, Magic and Platonism* semblent l'expliquer, comme si « mysticisme et magie » étaient les composantes de la théurgie. De même dans l'introduction, les *Oracles Chaldaïques* sont présentés comme un « poème magico-mystique ». Heureusement, depuis H. Lewy, les études de E. R. Dodds<sup>85</sup>, de Cl. Zintzen<sup>86</sup> et, tout particulièrement, de F. W. Cremer<sup>87</sup> ont défini avec beaucoup de clarté l'essence propre de la théurgie chaldaïque en la distinguant aussi bien de l'expérience unitive plotinienne que de la magie. A la différence de la magie, la théurgie n'exerce pas de contrainte sur les dieux, pour les forcer à apparaître, mais au contraire elle se soumet à leur volonté en accomplissant les actes qu'ils veulent. D'autre part, à la différence de l'expérience unitive de type plotinien, la théurgie atteint l'union avec les dieux, non par un exercice spirituel, mais par des actions sacramentelles, des rites sensibles, incompréhensibles à l'intelligence : « L'accomplissement des opérations ineffables qui dépassent toute connaissance, selon un mode qui convient aux dieux, et la puissance des « symboles » indicibles compris par les dieux seuls produisent l'union théurgique. Ainsi n'est-ce point par l'intelligence que nous accomplissons les choses sacrées : sinon cette opération sera un effet de notre intelligence et dépendra de nous<sup>88</sup>. » Ce texte de Jamblique montre bien le supernaturalisme qui a envahi le platonisme tardif et qui sépare si profondément Jamblique de Plotin et de Porphyre.

83. H. LEWY, p. 177-309.

84. Cf. J. Bidez lui-même dans J. BIDEZ - FR. CUMONT, *Les mages hellénisés*, p. 163 : « Ils (les *Oracles Chaldaïques*) sont mystiques. » Dans son étude : *La théurgie chez les néo-platoniciens et les papyrus magiques (Symbolae Osloenses, fasc. 22, 1942, p. 49-79, S. Eitrem voudrait expliquer la contemplation plotinienne par la systasis magique (p. 53 et suiv.)).* Voir la mise au point de E. R. Dodds, dans l'article cité ci-après n. 85.

85. E. R. DODDS, *Theurgy and its Relationship to Neoplatonism*, dans *The Journal of Roman Studies*, t. 37, 1947, p. 55-69.

86. Cl. ZINTZEN, *Die Wertung von Mystik und Magie in der neuplatonischen Philosophie*, dans *Rheinisches Museum*, t. 108, 1965, p. 71-100.

87. F. W. CREMER, *Die Chaldäischen Orakel und Jamblich de mysteriis*, p. 19-36.

88. JAMBLIQUE, *De mysteriis*, II, 11, p. 96, 17 Parthey (p. 96 des Places).

Malgré ces utiles distinctions, il subsiste encore beaucoup de confusion dans les esprits, lorsqu'il s'agit d'étudier ces phénomènes religieux de l'Antiquité tardive<sup>89</sup>. Tout d'abord, il faut bien reconnaître que le mot « mystique » est un terme mal défini, que l'on emploie souvent à tort et à travers. Cette imprécision provient probablement du fait que ce mot a été employé d'une manière technique en des sens très différents. Lévy-Bruhl l'employait à propos de la croyance des « primitifs » à des correspondances ou sympathies occultes entre les parties de l'univers<sup>90</sup>. Mais les psychologues et historiens de la spiritualité réservent le terme « mystique » aux états psychologiques, analogues à l'expérience unitive plotinienne, dans lesquels le sujet éprouve une union directe et immédiate avec le principe fondamental de l'être<sup>91</sup>. Normalement, si l'on parle de « mystique » plotinienne ou néoplatonicienne, il ne faudrait employer ce mot que dans le sens qui vient d'être défini, donc en le distinguant soigneusement des notions de théurgie et de magie qui font intervenir des rites sensibles. La mystique se caractérise précisément par le détachement de toute activité corporelle : l'expérience mystique est préparée par une ascèse intérieure et des exercices purement spirituels. Mais il faut bien prendre garde au fait que le mot grec *mustikos* est employé par les néoplatoniciens dans un sens très différent de celui que nous venons de définir. Il désigne ce qui se rapporte aux mystères, donc aux rites religieux et théurgiques et, par extension, ce qui est caché, secret, mystérieux. On pourrait donc employer le mot « mystique » à propos de la théurgie, mais à condition de bien préciser alors qu'il ne s'agit pas de l'expérience mystique au sens où on peut l'employer à propos de Plotin. Il me semble que la solution la plus sage serait de bannir ce mot, source de confusion et d'obscurité.

Quoiqu'il en soit, il est important de constater que les *Oracles Chaldaïques*, s'ils proposent des techniques théurgiques d'union avec le divin, semblent connaître aussi une autre méthode de connaissance du divin, qui est très analogue à l'expérience unitive plotinienne. Un assez long fragment des *Oracles* (p. 11 Kroll = fr. 1 des Places) nous dit en effet qu'il ne faut pas chercher à saisir le principe en l'imaginant comme un objet déterminé parmi d'autres, mais qu'il faut tendre vers lui une

---

89. On trouvera un exemple de cette confusion en lisant la discussion qui suivit la conférence de É. DES PLACES, *La religion de Jamblique*, dans *Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique*, t. XXI, Fondation Hardt, Vandœuvres-Genève, 1975, p. 98-100 (B. Dalsgaard Larsen insiste avec raison sur la différence entre théurgie et magie).

90. L. LÉVY-BRUHL, *L'expérience mystique et les symboles chez les primitifs*, Paris, 1938, où l'on trouve une confusion totale entre mystique et magie (pouvoir sur les puissances invisibles).

91. Pour une initiation à ces problèmes, cf. l'article de M. de CERTEAU, *Mystique*, dans l'*Encyclopaedia Universalis*, où l'on trouvera une bibliographie, à laquelle on ajoutera R. C. ZAEHNER, *Mysticism sacred and profane*, Oxford, 1957 ; J. BARUZI, *Saint Jean de la Croix et le problème de l'expérience mystique*, Paris, 1924.



intelligence vide de tout contenu, précisément parce que ce principe se trouve hors des limites de l'intelligence<sup>92</sup>. Faut-il en conclure que les *Oracles* juxtaposent des méthodes d'union avec le divin très différentes : une méthode théurgique et une méthode purement spirituelle ? On peut imaginer, pour réduire cette incohérence, que les pratiques théurgiques sont utilisées pour l'union avec les dieux inférieurs, et la méthode purement spirituelle, lorsqu'il s'agit d'atteindre le principe suprême. Cette différence de méthode correspondrait assez bien aux conceptions porphyriennes, selon lesquelles la théurgie ne fait accéder qu'aux dieux inférieurs et seule la théologie négative permet d'atteindre le Dieu transcendant<sup>93</sup>. On peut aussi penser avec F. W. Cremer que ce texte se rapporte aux dispositions d'esprit dans lesquelles doit se trouver le théurge et qui s'opposent radicalement à celles du mage<sup>94</sup>. En effet, le fragment dont nous parlons insiste beaucoup sur le fait qu'il ne faut pas « concevoir cet Intelligible avec véhémence », mais avec une intelligence docile, prête à s'abandonner à son objet. Or ce qui distingue précisément la théurgie de la magie, c'est l'absence de véhémence, de contrainte, de menace, la docilité et la soumission à la volonté des dieux. Dans cette interprétation, le fragment n'aurait pas un sens « plotinien », il ne proposerait pas une union directe et purement spirituelle avec le divin, mais il se rapporterait aux dispositions intérieures nécessaires à la réussite de l'opération théurgique.

F. W. Cremer a bien souligné l'originalité de la théurgie : « Une confusion entre théurgie et magie n'est plus possible<sup>95</sup>. » On peut parler d'une utilisation par le théurge de certaines pratiques magiques, mais elles sont intégrées à une démarche radicalement différente de la magie. Car la théurgie est une opération dans laquelle ce sont les dieux qui donnent une efficacité divine à l'action humaine, en sorte que l'action humaine reçoit son sens en raison d'une action et d'une initiative divines. Il serait intéressant dans cette perspective de comparer la théologie chrétienne des sacrements et la théologie néoplatonicienne de l'opération théurgique.

---

92. On comparera avec Plotin, *Enn.*, VI, 7, 34, 1-4 : l'âme se dépouille de toute forme même intelligible ; V, 3, 13, 1 ; V, 5, 6, 7 : impossibilité de saisir l'Un comme un *τὸς*, une chose déterminée.

93. Cf. PORPHYRE, *De regressu animae*, p. 32\*-40\* ; dans MACROBE, *In Somn. Scip.*, I, 2, 14-21.

94. F. W. CREMER, *Die Chaldäischen Orakel*, p. 13, notamment n. 52 : « Schon hier tritt die Position der Chaldaica und des Jamblich zu Tage : Die Hingabe an die Götter, das Sichöffnen ; der Weg nach oben vollzieht sich — in Gegensatz zur plotinischen und porphyrischen Forderung nach der sittlichen Leistung — in Wahrheit als 'Passion'. Der Theurge liefert sich aus. Der handelnde Teil sind immer nur die Götter ; die Bewegung geht von oben nach unten. »

95. F. W. CREMER, *Die Chaldäischen Orakel*, p. 20 (qui donne comme exemple de cette confusion S. EITREM, *Orakel und Mysterien*, Zürich, 1947, p. 64).

W. Kroll a défini les *Oracles Chaldaïques* comme un document de gnose païenne<sup>96</sup>. Ici encore nous nous heurtons à un problème de terminologie à peu près inextricable. Dans l'emploi du mot « gnose », la plus grande confusion règne encore aujourd'hui, pour la simple raison que l'on n'a jamais défini clairement des critères absolument caractéristiques qui permettent de distinguer ce qui est « gnose » de ce qui n'est pas « gnose »<sup>97</sup>. Quoiqu'il en soit, il est bien évident qu'il faudra tenir compte désormais dans l'étude des *Oracles Chaldaïques* des progrès gigantesques faits dans les recherches sur le gnosticisme à la suite de la découverte de Nag Hammadi. Comme l'a bien montré M. Tardieu<sup>98</sup> au Congrès de Yale de 1978, il est possible d'analyser maintenant les analogies de structure entre la pensée gnostique notamment valentinienne et la pensée « chaldaïque ». On peut « considérer Valentin et les *Oracles* comme appartenant au même état de développement de la pensée-mère platonicienne ». Là encore un champ très vaste d'investigations s'ouvre aux recherches futures.

\*  
\* \*

Voilà quelques-uns des problèmes qui se posent encore à l'historien qui aborde l'énigmatique domaine des *Oracles Chaldaïques*. Souhaitons que la réédition présente de l'ouvrage de H. Lewy incite les chercheurs à s'aventurer dans ces terres qu'il a magnifiquement explorées. Il reste beaucoup de travaux à entreprendre afin de préparer la grande synthèse dont rêvait J. Bidez et qui réunirait à la fois les *Oracles*, étudiés dans leur contexte néoplatonicien, et tous les documents relatifs à la théurgie théorique et pratique.

---

96. W. KROLL, *De oraculis chaldaicis* (réimpr. Hildesheim, 1962), p. 82.

97. J'ai essayé de définir les caractéristiques du gnosticisme chrétien dans l'article « Gnosticisme chrétien » de l'*Encyclopaedia universalis*. Reste le problème de la définition du gnosticisme païen, s'il existe.

98. M. TARDIEU, *Le Congrès de Yale sur le Gnosticisme (28-31 mars 1978)*, dans *Revue des études augustiniennes*, t. 24, 1978, p. 199-200, en attendant la publication de sa communication intitulée *La gnose valentinienne et les Oracles Chaldaïques*.

## Notice sur Hans Lewy

Sur la vie et l'œuvre de Hans Lewy, on se référera à M. Schwabe, dans sa postface, datée du 23 octobre 1945, à l'ouvrage de Hans LEWY, *Philo. Philosophical Writings*, Oxford 1946, p. 110-112 (dans l'édition hébraïque, Jérusalem 5725/1965, p. 99-102), mais surtout à J. L. MAGNES, M. SCHWABE et G. SCHOLEM, *H. Lewy (1901-1945). Memorial addresses*. The Hebrew University, Jérusalem 1946. Ce petit ouvrage contient trois allocutions en hébreu à la mémoire de Hans Lewy, qui ont été prononcées à l'Université hébraïque de Jérusalem, le 18 novembre 1945, par J. L. Magnes (p. 5-6), par M. Schwabe (p. 7-11 : sur la formation intellectuelle de Lewy) et par G. Scholem (p. 12-18 : sur le portrait moral de Lewy).

Trois notices succinctes sont consacrées à Hans Lewy dans :

- G. KRESSEL, *Leksikon hasifrut ha'Ivrit badorot ha'aḥoronim*, t. 2, Jérusalem 5727/1967, col. 183 (en hébreu) ;
- *Encyclopaedia Hebraica*, t. 21, Jérusalem 5729/1969, col. 375-376 (en hébreu)
- *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, t. 11, Jérusalem 1971, col. 182-183 (en anglais). Ce dernier article, signé « Editorial Staff », donne par erreur l'année 1904 comme date de naissance de Lewy ; la faute est recopiée par G. WIGODER, *Everyman's Judaica*, Jérusalem 1975, p. 375a.

La présente notice s'inspire surtout des deux communications en hébreu de M. Schwabe et G. Scholem dans *Memorial addresses*.

Né à Berlin en 1901, Hans (Yohanan) Lewy appartenait à une famille juive assimilée. C'est très tôt pourtant qu'il fut mis en conflit. Dès ses études secondaires et contre l'avis de ses parents, il milite au sein du group « Blau Weiss » un mouvement de jeunesse sioniste et prend parti pour le lyrisme nietzschéen de Stephan George contre l'impassibilité wilamowitzienne. Après le lycée, il suit parallèlement les cours de l'École des Hautes Études Juives (séminaire rabbinique) et ceux de l'Université de Berlin. A la pratique de l'hébreu, il ajoute alors celle du syriaque, de l'arabe et de l'arménien. Mais il s'enthousiasme surtout pour la philologie classique partagée, après le départ à la retraite de Wilamowitz, entre l'idée et la lettre, Norden et Jaeger d'un côté, Diels et Ed. Meyer de l'autre. Les analyses nouvelles et brillantes de Werner Jaeger le séduisent d'emblée, mais les sympathies « aryennes » qui sous-tendent l'« humanisme hellénique » de Jaeger amèneront Lewy à rompre définitivement avec lui dès la fin des années 20. Par contre, il restera toujours très attaché à la personnalité d'Eduard Norden, qui aura sur lui une influence décisive.

Venait alors de paraître l'étude de Norden sur la IV<sup>e</sup> Églogue de Virgile : *Die Geburt des Kindes* (1924), et c'est dans cette même voie de recherche des formes du discours religieux, inaugurée en 1913 par *Agnostos Theos*, que Norden orientera Lewy. Philologue exclusivement classique, Norden voyait en Lewy — qui était en plus orientaliste — celui qui pouvait prolonger vers l'Orient des analyses jusque-là limitées au domaine gréco-romain. C'est donc ainsi, sous la direction de Norden et dans la fidélité à la méthode chère à son maître de lire les faits de l'histoire de la pensée à partir des faits de l'histoire des styles, que Lewy entreprit la rédaction de sa dissertation inaugurale, *Sobria ebrietas*, présentée à Berlin en 1926 et publiée à Giessen en 1929. La même année, Reitzenstein dira, dans son compte rendu de la *Deutsche Literatur-Zeitung*, tout le bien qu'il pense de cet opuscule.

Dès la fin de sa thèse, Lewy projette une édition des manuscrits arméniens de Philon. Norden, Meyer et Wilamowitz — ce dernier lui obtient auprès de l'Académie Prussienne des Sciences une bourse de recherche pour l'Arménie soviétique, d'où Lewy reviendra très anticommuniste — l'encouragent vivement. Les rencontres de travail le rapprochent alors de Wilamowitz, dont il conservera la photographie sur son bureau à Jérusalem.

L'arrivée des Nazis au pouvoir (1933) met un terme au projet d'édition du Philon arménien. Lewy émigre aussitôt en Palestine, où il occupe à partir de 1934 la chaire de langue et littérature latines à l'Université hébraïque de Jérusalem. C'est là qu'il poursuivra jusqu'à sa mort l'étude des questions qui s'étaient imposées à lui dès l'époque de *Sobria ebrietas* : rôle de Philon dans la rencontre du judaïsme et de l'hellénisme, corpus — resté inachevé — des vestiges et témoignages « païens » sur le judaïsme, l'antisémitisme et la littérature judéo-hellénistique — en somme, une refonte du Reinach de 1895 —, recherches sur les origines et le développement de la pensée de Julien, place du judaïsme dans cette tentative d'une

religion mondialiste, formes et thèmes des *Oracles Chaldaïques*, où se dissimulent les idées exploitées par Julien et où confluent sous le vêtement ésotérique les deux courants qui ont agité l'Orient tardif : la rationalité grecque et la mythologie des nouvelles religions.

De *Sobria ebrietas* à *Chaldaeian Oracles*, c'est une même réflexion qui anime Hans Lewy : comprendre en Juif formé à l'histoire critique des idées et à la philologie classique les tenants et les aboutissants de la rencontre de l'héritage platonicien et de l'héritage mosaïque. L'objet de ses travaux — comment être à la fois Juif et Grec — n'a été qu'un prolongement du conflit qui l'avait habité dès son plus jeune âge — comment à la fois militer pour le sionisme et admirer Stephan George. — La grande synthèse qu'il rêvait d'écrire et dont ses livres et articles ne sont que des moments particuliers ne l'a pas été. Il meurt à Jérusalem d'une crise cardiaque le 22 juillet 1945.



## Bibliographie de Hans Lewy

Cette bibliographie reprend, corrige et complète la liste des travaux scientifiques de Hans Lewy, établie en 1949 par M. M. Plessner et publiée en hébreu dans *Sefer Yohanan Lewy. Mehqarim beHelenismus yehudi*, Jérusalem 5709/1949, p. 275-278.

1. Μέθη νηφάλιος (sobria ebrietas). Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der antiken Mystik, Diss. Berlin, 1929, 62 p. Cette dissertation, revue et complétée, a été publiée sous le titre :
2. Sobria ebrietas. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der antiken Mystik, dans les « *Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* », fasc. 9, Giessen 1929, 175 p.  
 cr : Bibliotheca Philologica Classica  
 56 (1929) 213  
 Deutsche Literatur-Zeitung  
 6 (1929) col. 1956 R. Reitzenstein  
 Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique  
 26 (1930) 670-673 R. M. Martin  
 Theologische Revue  
 29 (1930) 360-363 W. Wilbrand
3. Compte rendu critique de : Robert Eisler, Ἰησοῦς βασιλεὺς οὐ βασιλεύσας (Heidelberg, 1928/1930), dans *Deutsche Literatur-Zeitung*, 7 (1930), col. 481-484.
4. Agatharchides aus Knidos, dans *Encyclopaedia Judaica. Das Judentum in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, t. 1, Berlin 1928, col. 1039-1040.
5. Bel und der Drache, *ibid.*, t. 4, Berlin 1929, col. 15-16.
6. Berenikanus, *ibid.*, col. 190.
7. Berenike (Stadt), *ibid.*, col. 190-191.

8. Berenike (Gemahlin des Aristobul, des Sohnes des Herodes), *ibid.*, col. 191.
9. Berenike (Prinzessin aus dem herodianischen Hause), *ibid.*, col. 191-193.
10. Bithynien, *ibid.*, col. 840.
11. Cäsarea, *ibid.*, t. 5, Berlin 1930, col. 66-68.
12. Cäsarea Mazaka, *ibid.*, col. 68.
13. Cäsarea Philippi, *ibid.*, col. 68-70.
14. Cassianus Longinus, *ibid.*, col. 82-83.
15. Celsus, *ibid.*, col. 101-103.
16. Coponius, *ibid.*, col. 654.
17. Cumanus, Ventidius, *ibid.*, col. 716-717.
18. Cyprus, *ibid.*, col 720-721.
19. Cyrillus aus Alexandrien, *ibid.*, col. 721.
20. Demetrius, *ibid.*, col. 930.
21. Demetrius I. Soter, *ibid.*, col. 930-931.
22. Demetrius II. Nikator, *ibid.*, col. 931-932.
23. Demetrius III. Eukairos, *ibid.*, col. 932.
24. Doris, *ibid.*, col. 1196-1197.
25. Drusilla, *ibid.*, t. 6, Berlin 1930, col. 82.
26. Essäer, *ibid.*, col. 795-798.
27. Gnosis, *ibid.*, t. 7, Berlin 1931, col. 453-459.
28. Hellenismus, *ibid.*, col. 1141-1149.
29. Johannes, *ibid.*, t. 9, Berlin 1932, col. 245-246.
30. Johannes Chrysostomos, *ibid.*, col. 246-248.
31. Johannes der Täufer, *ibid.*, col. 249-251.
32. Josef aus Arimathia, *ibid.*, col. 327.
33. Jüdisch-Griechisch, *ibid.*, col. 551-555.
34. Justinus Martyr, *ibid.*, col. 620-621.
35. Neue Philontexte in der Überarbeitung des Ambrosius, mit einem Anhang : Neu gefundene Philonfragmente, dans les *Sitzungsberichte der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse* Berlin 1932, p. 28-84.



36. Hekataios von Abdera *περι 'Ιουδαίων*, dans *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 31 (1932) 117-132. Traduit en hébreu dans *'Olamot nifgashim* (cf. *infra* n° 64), Jérusalem 5720/1960, p. 44-59.
37. Ein Rechtsstreit um den Boden Palästinas im Altertum, dans *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums*, 77 (1933) 84-99 et 172-180.  
Traduit en hébreu dans *'Olamot nifgashim* (cf. *infra* n° 64), Jérusalem 5720/1960, p. 60-78.
38. Kyrenaika, dans *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, t. 10, Berlin 1934, col. 535-536.
39. Lampon und Isidoros, *ibid.*, col. 574-575.
40. Lukuas, *ibid.*, col. 1184.
41. Philon von Alexandrien : von den Machterweisen Gottes. Eine zeitgenössische Darstellung der Judenverfolgungen unter dem Kaiser Caligula, coll. « Bücherei des Schocken Verlags », 35, Berlin 1935, 85 p.
42. The Pseudo-Philonic *De Jona*. Part I : The Armenian Text with a critical introduction, coll. « Studies and Documents » (ed. by Kirsopp Lake and Silva Lake), 7, London 1936. Introduction : p. 1-24 ; texte arménien : p. 1-49. Seul le t. 1 a paru. La seconde partie, qui devait fournir le commentaire du texte, annoncée comme étant sous presse par M. Schwabe dans sa postface à H. Lewy, *Philo. Philosophical Writings*, p. 111 et par M. M. Plessner n° 62, n'a pas été publiée.
43. The Date and Purpose of Moses of Chorene's History, dans *Byzantion*, 11 (1936) 81-96.
44. An additional Note on the Date of Moses of Chorene, dans *Byzantion*, 11 (1936), 593-596.
45. Josephus the Physician. A Mediaeval Legend of the Destruction of Jerusalem, dans *Journal of the Warburg Institute*, 1 (1937) 221-242. Traduit en hébreu dans *'Olamot nifgashim* (cf. *infra* n° 64), Jérusalem 5720/1960, p. 266-293.
46. Imaginary Journeys from Palestine to France, dans *Journal of the Warburg Institute*, 1 (1937) 251-253.
47. Aethiopier und Juden in der antiken Literatur, dans *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums*, 81 (1937) 65-71. Traduit en hébreu dans *'Olamot nifgashim* (cf. *infra* n° 64), Jérusalem 5720/1960, p. 204-208.
48. Philon : Über des Zusammenleben um der Allgemeinbildung willen (*περι της προς τα προπαιδευματα συνόδου* = de congressu quaerendae eruditionis causa), « Die Werke Philos von Alexandria » (hrsg. von I. Heinemann und M. Adler), Bd. 6, Breslau 1938, p. 1-49.
49. Aristotle and the Jewish Sage according to Clearchus of Soli, dans *The Harvard Theological Review*, 31 (1938) 205-235.

- Traduit en hébreu dans 'Olamot nifgashim (cf. *infra* n° 64), Jérusalem 5720/1960, p. 15-43.
50. Iulianus Kesar ubinian habayit (= l'Empereur Julien et la reconstruction du Temple), dans *Zion*, 6 (5701/1941) 1-32.  
Repris dans 'Olamot nifgashim (cf. *infra* n° 64), Jérusalem 5720/1960, p. 221-254.
51. Seridei mishpatim ushemot yewanyim besefer Hekhaloth Rabbati (= Survivances de phrases et de mots grecs dans le Livre Hekhaloth Rabbati), dans *Tarbiz*, 12 (5701/1941), 163-167. Repris dans 'Olamot nifgashim (cf. *infra* n° 64), Jérusalem 5720/1960, p. 259-265.
52. Divrei Cicero 'al hayehudim bineum hasanegoria 'al Flaccum (= Cicéron sur les Juifs dans son plaidoyer *Pro Flacco*), dans *Zion*, 7 (5702/1942), 109-134.  
Repris en fascicule séparé sous le titre : Hayehudim le'or hasifrut haromit. Shnei mehqarim bedivrei Cicero weTacitus 'al hayehudim (= les Juifs dans la littérature latine. Deux études sur les écrits de Cicéron et de Tacite relatifs aux Juifs), Jérusalem 5703/1943.  
Repris également dans 'Olamot nifgashim (cf. *infra* n° 64), Jérusalem 5720/1960, p. 79-114.  
Reproduit enfin dans l'ouvrage édité par Menahem STERN, *Yehudim weyahadut be'einei ha'olam hahelenisti* (= les Juifs et le judaïsme aux yeux du monde hellénistique), Jérusalem 5734/1974, p. 83-108.
53. Divrei Tacitus 'al qadmoniot hayehudim umidoteihem (= Tacite sur l'histoire ancienne des Juifs et leurs coutumes), dans *Zion*, 8 (5703/1943) 1-32 et 61-84.  
Repris en fascicule séparé sous le titre : Hayehudim le'or hasifrut haromit. Shnei mehqarim bedivrei Cicero weTacitus 'al hayehudim (= les Juifs dans la littérature latine. Deux études sur les écrits de Cicéron et de Tacite relatifs aux Juifs), Jérusalem 5703/1943.  
Repris également dans 'Olamot nifgashim (cf. *infra* n° 64), Jérusalem 5720/1960, p. 115-196.  
Reproduit enfin dans l'ouvrage édité par Menahem STERN, *Yehudim weyahadut be'einei ha'olam hahelenisti* (= les Juifs et le judaïsme aux yeux du monde hellénistique), Jérusalem 5734/1974, p. 109-162.
54. 'Al goralan shel kelei haqodesh aharei Hurban habayit hashen<sup>i</sup> (= le sort des objets de culte après la destruction du Second Temple), dans *Qedem* 2 (5705/1945), 123-125.  
Repris dans 'Olamot nifgashim (cf. *infra* n° 64), Jérusalem 5720/1960, p. 255-258.
55. Lezikhro shel Paul Kraus (= à la mémoire de Paul Kraus). Allocution prononcée en hébreu le 17 janvier 1945 à l'Université hébraïque de Jérusalem et publiée dans *Moznayim*, 20 (5705/1945) 119-132. Cette allocution a été traduite en français par S. Pinès et publiée sous le titre : *A la mémoire de Paul Kraus*, dans *La Revue du Caire*, 8<sup>e</sup> année, n° 85, décembre 1945 ; dans la série complète, t. 15 (novembre 1945-avril 1946) 132-138.
56. Derakhim hadashot beheqer hahellenism hayehudi (= nouvelles voies de recherche dans le domaine de l'hellénisme juif), dans *Zion*, 10 (5705/1945) 197-204.  
Repris dans 'Olamot nifgashim (cf. *infra* n° 64), Jérusalem 5720/1960, p. 209-220.
57. Virgilius, Aeneis. Perakim niyharim, tirgem Yosef J. Libès, 'im mavo ubeiurim me'et Yoḥanan Lewy (= l'Énéide de Virgile. Extraits

- traduits par J. Libès avec une introduction et des notes de Hans Lewy), Jérusalem 5706/1946.  
Introduction, p. 7-18 ; notes : p. 105-109.
58. Philo. Philosophical Writings. Selections edited by Hans Lewy, coll. « Philosophia Judaica » edited by Hugo Bergmann), Oxford, East and West Library, 1946, 112 p.  
Cet ouvrage contient une note de M. Schwabe sur la vie et les travaux de Hans Lewy, p. 110-112.  
cr : Revue des Études Juives 9 (1948-1949) 129  
Réimprimé dans l'ouvrage collectif : *Three Jewish Philosophers. Philo, edited by Hans Lewy ; Saadya Gaon, edited by Alexander Altman ; Jehuda Halevy, edited by Isaak Heinemann*, New York, Meridian and Jewish Publication Society of America, 1960.  
Traduit en hébreu par Jehoshua Amir, Jérusalem, Magnes Press, 5725/1965, 102 p. ; note de M. Schwabe, p. 99-102
59. A Dream on Mandulis, dans *Annales du Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte*, 44 (1946) 227-234.
60. A Latin Hymn to the Creator ascribed to Plato, dans *The Harvard Theological Review*, 39 (1946) 243-258.
61. Tequfat habayit hasheni le'or hasifrut hayewanit weharomit (= l'époque du second Temple à la lumière de la littérature gréco-latine). Conférence prononcée par Hans Lewy à la « Société Hébraïque pour la Connaissance de la Terre d'Israël et de ses Antiquités », et publiée dans : *Sefer Yohanan Lewy. Mehqarim beHelenismus yehudi* (= Mélanges Hans Lewy. Recherches sur l'hellénisme juif), Jérusalem 5709/1949, éd. par M. Schwabe et J. Gutman, p. 1-12. Reproduit dans 'Olamot nifgashim (cf. infra n° 64), Jérusalem 5720/1960, p. 3-14.
62. 'Aniyei Yisrael beromiti ha'atiqa (= les Juifs pauvres dans la Rome antique). Article écrit pour le *Sefer Dinaburg* (= Benzion Dinur), édité par Y. Baer, J. Gutman et M. Schwabe à Jérusalem en 1949. Repris dans 'Olamot nifgashim (cf. infra n° 64), Jérusalem 5720/1960) p. 197-203.
63. Chaldaean Oracles and Theurgy. Mysticism, Magic and Platonism in the Later Roman Empire. Publications de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale, coll. « Recherches d'archéologie, de philologie et d'histoire », t. 13, Le Caire, Imprimerie de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale, 1956, in-8°, xxvii-512 p.  
cr : The Harvard Theological Review  
54 (1961) 263-273 E. R. Dodds  
Recherches de Science Religieuse  
52 (1964) 469-470 É. des Places
64. 'Olamot nifgashim. Mehqarim 'al ma'amadah shel hayahadut ba'olam hayewani-romi (= Rencontre de deux mondes. Recherches sur la situation du judaïsme dans le monde gréco-romain), Jérusalem 5720/1960, 293 p. Réimpression, Jérusalem 5729/1969.  
Recueil de treize articles de Hans Lewy, publiés par l'Institut Bialik, à savoir les numéros suivants de la présente bibliographie : 36. 37. 45. 47. 49. 50. 51. 52. 53. 54. 56. 61. 62.
- Un ouvrage et deux articles de Lewy, annoncés comme étant à paraître par M.M. Plessner en 1949, n'ont pas été publiés : *The Pseudo-Philonic De Jona. Part II* (= Plessner n° 62) ; *Two Hymns of Mesomedes : The Hymn to Physis and the Hymn to Isis* (= Plessner n° 64) ; *Mount Gerizim and Simon Magus* (= Plessner n° 65).



## Les Oracles chaldaïques 1891-2011

### *Les cercles d'Archimède*

L'initiateur des études actuelles sur les Oracles chaldaïques (OC) est un antiquisant suisse de grand talent, Albert Jahn (Douanne/Twann 9.10.1811 – Berne/Bern 23.8.1900), bien oublié aujourd'hui<sup>1</sup>. On lui doit d'abord le retour à l'usage ancien d'appeler ces oracles *chaldaïques*, et non plus, comme le faisaient les éditeurs de la Renaissance, *Oracles de Zoroastre*<sup>2</sup>. Le second mérite de Jahn a été d'interpréter l'épithète de *chaldaïques*, non dans un sens ethnique

---

1. Le nom et les travaux de Jahn ne sont pas mentionnés dans les exposés généraux sur les OC dus à des Places 1984 et, dépendant de cette documentation, Brisson 2004b-2005. Des Places 1984 (texte rédigé en 1974, d'où le millésime symbolique couvrant « un siècle de recherches ») fait commencer l'histoire de la recherche en 1874, et trouve, pour l'occasion, à signaler les publications de C. N. Sathas et J.-B. Pitra. Mais ces éminents spécialistes des manuscrits grecs n'ont à aucun moment présenté un quelconque point de vue sur les OC à partir des inédits byzantins qu'ils découvraient et publiaient. La situation de Jahn est différente. Il procède à une édition critique d'un texte pré-byzantin (Proclus résumé par Psellus), le commente abondamment et tente une reconstitution partielle des fragments. Cette reconstitution limitée sera au point de départ de celle, globale, de Kroll, trois ans plus tard. L'histoire de la recherche moderne et contemporaine commence donc avec Jahn en 1891.

2. Autrement dit Pléthon (né ca. 1355-1360, mort en 1452) et Patrizi (1529-1597), ainsi que, tributaires de leurs mises en ordre des fragments, les commentateurs des XVII<sup>e</sup> et XVIII<sup>e</sup> s. Pour l'attribution à Zoroastre et la signification de cette autorité, voir les analyses de Tambrun 1995, 37-45, Stausberg 1998, 2000 et 2001, et le ch. II « Le retour de Zoroastre » dans Tambrun 2006, 53-94. Sur la pluralité des figures de Zoroastre dans l'antiquité : J. Kellens, « Zoroastre dans l'histoire ou dans le mythe ? », *Journal Asiatique*, 289 (2001), 171-184.

ou géographique en référence à la Perse ou à la Babylonie<sup>3</sup>, mais comme synonyme de « théosophes », autrement dit sages païens monothéistes. Un troisième point de l'originalité des recherches de Jahn a consisté à aborder l'étude des OC par le biais de leurs citateurs pré-byzantins, en l'occurrence par le principal d'entre eux, Proclus. Le savant suisse est, en effet, le premier à avoir procédé à une édition critique, à partir des trois manuscrits existants, des extraits par Psellus du commentaire de Proclus sur la philosophie chaldaique (Jahn 1891)<sup>4</sup>. Les annotations qu'il a composées sur ces Extraits sont toujours utiles à consulter. Toutefois, l'apport ultime de Jahn, et, bien malgré lui, décisif, à l'histoire de la recherche sur les OC aura été de susciter une émulation, en amenant un jeune et brillant philologue allemand, Wilhelm Kroll (1869-1939), à procéder au rassemblement de tous les fragments connus et à adopter pour cette mise en ordre le plan d'un manuel imaginaire de philosophie néopla-

---

3. Ainsi chez Patrizi et Pic de la Mirandole (voir là-dessus les remarques pertinentes de Jahn 1900, 170), mais aussi chez la plupart des auteurs modernes et contemporains. À titre d'exemple, Cumont 1949, 361 (= 2009, 416): « L'épithète de *chaldaique* indique que (cette révélation) prétendait exprimer la sagesse présumée de l'ancien clergé babylonien, et l'importance qu'elle accordait au culte du Feu, qui caractérise le mazdéisme, semblerait indiquer pareillement une origine iranienne, réelle ou fictive. » Ce genre de points de vue est tributaire d'une conception générale de l'histoire des religions dominée par le pan-iranisme ou le pan-babylonisme. Jahn 1900, 170 qualifie déjà de *creduli* ceux qui s'imaginent que les OC proviennent réellement de la Chaldée et qu'ils y aient été inspirés par les dieux; à ses yeux, la monographie de Kroll 1894 est à ranger parmi les *creduli*, continuateurs de Patrizi et de Pic de la Mirandole (172). Effectivement, Kroll rattache le prétendu « culte du feu » dans les OC à la religion des Perses, c'est-à-dire au mazdéisme (Kroll 1894, 68; 1917b, 152). Jahn 1900, 170 déclare avoir consulté deux orientalistes spécialistes des littératures « chaldéennes » archaïques (perse/moyen-perse, akkadien et syriaque), qui ont été totalement négatifs sur la présence d'oracles analogues dans les domaines étudiés par eux. J'ignore qui sont ces orientalistes consultés. L'un d'eux aurait pu être le syriacisant Rubens Duval (1839-1911). Il connaissait les textes grecs de l'Antiquité tardive et était en relation avec les professeurs parisiens que fréquentait Jahn.

4. Des trois témoins manuscrits des *Eclogae* de Proclus sur lesquelles se base l'édition de Jahn, le texte du *Vaticanus graecus 1026* avait été déjà publié par J.-B. Pitra, *Analecta sacra et classica*, V/2, Paris et Rome, 1888, 192-196. Jahn, qui n'a pas connu cette publication, indique qu'il a profité d'une copie du manuscrit due à August Mau (1840-1909), alors membre du Deutsches Archäologisches Institut de Rome et bibliothécaire du même Institut (Jahn 1891, p. X). Kroll 1892, 100 ayant mis en avant cette aide à Jahn reçue de Mau, Jahn ne manqua de répliquer en faisant remarquer que Kroll 1894 avait bénéficié pareillement et abondamment de l'aide de ses collègues allemands de Rome et d'Allemagne pour la collation des manuscrits du Vatican (*adiutus subsidiis criticis Romae collectis*, Jahn 1900, 172), cf. Kroll 1894, 3 n. 1 (aides de E. Patzig, J. Tschiedel, R. Wünsch), également 2 n. 1 (aide de J. L. Heiberg), 72 n. 1 et 3, et p. 73 (aide de R. Wünsch).

tonicienne (Kroll 1894). Cette monographie, admirable de pertinence et de concision, sert de base, aujourd'hui encore, à toute recherche.

Kroll a 25 ans lorsqu'il la publie en tant qu'Habilitationschrift, ce qui lui vaudra d'être nommé Privatdozent à l'université de Breslau (1894-1898). Durant ces années de Breslau, il travaille à l'édition du commentaire de Proclus à la *République* de Platon (2 vol., Teubner, 1899-1901). À la suite de quoi, il succède à Eduard Norden comme professeur ordinaire à Greifswald (1899-1906), puis il ira à Münster (1906-1913), où il prend la succession de Georg Wissowa comme éditeur scientifique de la *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*<sup>5</sup>. Sa carrière universitaire s'achèvera là où elle a commencé (Breslau, 1913-1935)<sup>6</sup>. La formation de Kroll est un concentré de ce que la philologie allemande produit de meilleur, et elle a pour cadre l'institution la plus brillante de ce temps pour l'étude de la philologie classique comme science auxiliaire de l'histoire : l'université de Breslau où Mommsen, déjà célèbre, avait enseigné<sup>7</sup>. Après ses études de philologie (1887), Kroll passera deux semestres à Berlin, où il travaillera sous la direction de Hermann Diels et Carl Robert, puis il sera promu à Breslau en 1891 avec une dissertation inaugurale sur les citations grecques et latines chez Symmaque<sup>8</sup>. C'est l'année, souvenons-nous, où Jahn publie son édition des extraits de Proclus. Kroll a 21 ans. Il rendra compte du travail de Jahn non sans une certaine condescendance (Kroll 1892a). D'abord, remarque-t-il, la reconstitution des fragments chaldaïques n'est pas toujours heureuse (*nicht*

---

5. Le nom de Kroll apparaît pour la première fois, coordonné au nom de Georg Wissowa, sur la page de couverture du volume 7, *Dreizehnter Halbband*, Stuttgart, Metzler, 1910. Au volume suivant (*Vierzehnter Halbband*, Stuttgart, Metzler, 1912), l'unique éditeur mentionné est Kroll. Georg Wissowa n'y figure plus que comme fondateur. Sur cette prise de direction et son contexte scientifique, voir Udo W. Scholz, «Die Breslauer klassische Philologie und die Realenzyklopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft», *Jahrbuch der Schlesischen Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität zu Breslau*, 42-44 (2003), 311-326.

6. Sur cette carrière qui commence et finit à Breslau, lire Wolfhart Unte, «Wilhelm Kroll (1869-1939), Professor der Klassischen Philologie an der Universität zu Breslau», *Jahrbuch der Schlesischen Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität zu Breslau*, 45-46 (2005), 253-278.

7. Breslau (all.), en latin *Vratislavia/Wratislavia*, était alors la capitale de la province prusse de Silésie (1740-1918). Elle sera rattachée à la Pologne en 1945 (nom actuel : Wrocław). Theodor Mommsen (1817-1903) est professeur de droit romain à Breslau de 1854 à 1858 ; les trois premiers livres de son *Histoire romaine* seront écrits là. Sur les intérêts de Mommsen à cette époque, voir ma Préface à l'édition française d'A. von Harnack, *Mission et expansion du christianisme aux trois premiers siècles*, Paris, Cerf, 2004, p. XIII-XXII.

8. *De Q. Aurelii Symmachi studiis Graecis et Latinis*, Dissertatio inauguralis philologica, Vratislavia, Köbner, 1891, 44 p.

*durchweg glücklich*). Ajouter à cela, dit-il, une descente quelque peu pénible (*etwas sauer*) dans les profondeurs de la spéculation néoplatonicienne. Kroll termine son compte rendu par un bon mot de la comédie latine: *Sapienti sat*<sup>9</sup>!

Ce bon mot, *in cauda venenum*, est une flèche assassine, pour dire que le livre n'a pas grand intérêt et qu'il faut le refaire, tâche dont va se charger le recenseur lui-même sur une base manuscrite élargie à l'ensemble des témoins de Psellus, le citateur byzantin de Proclus et des Oracles, et par une descente, cette fois maîtrisée et allègre, dans les profondeurs du néoplatonisme. Grâce à l'appui de Mommsen et d'Usener, Kroll se rendra, l'année même de la publication de l'opuscule de Jahn, à Turin, Venise et Rome pour y explorer les fonds de manuscrits qui lui permettront d'écrire son *De oraculis Chaldaicis*<sup>10</sup>. La thèse d'habilitation paraîtra en 1894 avec (hasard d'imprimeur!) le même nombre de pages que le *De doctrina oraculorum Chaldaicorum* de Jahn (78 p.).

Cette parution va constituer pour Jahn la fin pathétique d'une vie faite d'échecs successifs, familiaux et professionnels<sup>11</sup>. Marié quatre fois et quatre fois veuf, il connut aussi la perte de plusieurs de ses enfants. Après des études de théologie et de philologie à Berne (1831-1834), d'archéologie à Heidelberg et Munich (1835-1837), il est remercié de son poste d'enseignant

9. Littéralement: «C'est assez pour le sage», ce dernier étant le recenseur et son lecteur complice. L'expression est tirée du proverbe latin commun à Plaute, *Persa*, IV 7, 19 (729) et Térence, *Phormio*, III 3, 8 (541): *Dictum sapienti sat est*, que je paraphrase ainsi: Ce qui a été dit est bien suffisant pour que le sage comprenne (sous-entendu: que l'ouvrage ne vaut pas grand-chose et qu'il faut le refaire). Inutile d'en dire davantage!

10. Un des grands résultats de cette recherche des témoins des OC aura été aussi un nouveau déchiffrement, avec l'aide d'Usener, du palimpseste de Turin portant le commentaire anonyme sur le *Parménide* de Platon (Kroll 1892). Kroll et Usener auront été probablement les derniers lecteurs de ce manuscrit insigne, puisqu'il va disparaître dans l'incendie de la bibliothèque de Turin en 1904. Usener meurt le 21 octobre 1905; sur sa personnalité et son œuvre scientifique, voir A. Dieterich, *Kleine Schriften*, Leipzig, Teubner, 1911, 354-362, et surtout G. Arrighetti (ed.), *Aspetti di Hermann Usener, filologo della religione*, Pisa, 1982.

11. Je me réfère ici à la biographie scientifique de Jahn écrite par Hans-Georg Bandi, «Albert Jahn. Ein hervorragender Förderer der Bernischen Altertumsforschung im 19. Jahrhundert», in *Festgabe Hans von Greyerz*, Bern, Lang, 1967, 147-172. Cette remarquable biographie est consacrée essentiellement à l'apport de Jahn à l'histoire ancienne de la Suisse et aux problèmes de la topographie historique du canton de Berne. Bandi, non compétent dans les domaines de la théologie et de la philosophie, a fait appel pour en rendre compte à Olof Gigon; mais la note de ce dernier sur ces sujets est malheureusement lacunaire et superficielle (p. 148, n. 3). Bandi souligne bien le caractère «tragique» de la vie de Jahn (p. 151). Les annotations autobiographiques de Jahn dans ses ultimes publications portant sur les OC et écrites en latin lui ont été inaccessibles.



par incapacité de faire observer la discipline parmi ses élèves<sup>12</sup>. Il occupera à l'occasion divers emplois subalternes au Département fédéral de l'Intérieur et aux Archives fédérales. C'est un non-universitaire, qui partage son temps entre deux passions, l'étude des antiquités suisses du canton de Berne et celle des textes philosophiques et théologiques de Byzance<sup>13</sup>. Se croyait-il dans ces disciplines érudites à l'abri des mauvais coups du sort? Les dernières lignes qu'il a écrites avant sa mort vont le donner à penser.

Dans la Préface de son étude de 1900 sur la reconstitution de fragments chaldaïques, il fait état d'abord des raisons du retard de cette publication: un autre ouvrage à achever<sup>14</sup>, et surtout la perte de la vue: *et deinde ingruens offuscatio meorum prope nonagenarii oculorum*. À la suite de quoi, il écrit ceci: *Interim<sup>15</sup> accidit, quod vir eruditus, fautor meus et amicus<sup>16</sup>, mihi praedixerat: sibi haud mirum fore, si post editas a me Eclogas e Proclo iam alii quoque Oracula Chaldaica sibi tractanda sumpturi sint. Scilicet Guil. Krollius, quum antea purus putus Latinus ex disciplina Mommseni inque Symmacho<sup>17</sup> defixus fuisset, postmodum Useneri discipulus factus, repente ad Oracula Chaldaica transiit et dissertationem de illis supra commemoratam a 1894 edidit, quamvis haec ipsa Oracula opus facticium (germanice: ein Machwerk<sup>18</sup>), ut*

12. Bandi, «Albert Jahn», p. 149.

13. Bibliographie archéologique et philologique de Jahn dans Bandi, p. 168-172. Ses deux ouvrages les plus connus concernent les antiquités celtes du canton de Berne (*Die keltischen Alterthümer der Schweiz, zumal des Kantons Bern, in Absicht auf Kunst und ästhetisches Interesse*, Bern, 1860) et l'histoire des Burgondes (*Die Geschichte der Burgundionen und Burgundiens bis zum Ende der I. Dynastie*, 2 vol., Halle, 1874). Parmi ses nombreux ouvrages sur le néoplatonisme, je signale ses études sur les citations de Plotin chez Basile et Méthode: *S. Basilii Magni plotiniani, supplementum editionis Plotini Creuzerianae*, Bern, 1838; *S. Methodii platoniani*, Halle, 1865.

14. A. Jahn, *Anecdota Graeca theologica, cum prolegomenis Gennadii episcopi Spolitani*, Leipzig, 1893.

15. C'est-à-dire après Jahn 1891 sur la Philosophie chaldaïque de Proclus.

16. À mon avis, il s'agit de Charles-Émile Ruelle (1833-1912), dont l'édition de Damascius (*Dubitaciones et solutiones de primis principiis, in Platonis Parmenidem, I-II*) avait été publiée à Paris en 1889 (réimpression Bruxelles, Culture et civilisation, 1964). C'est à ce même Ruelle que Jahn avait dédié ses *Eclogae e Proclo de philosophia Chaldaica* de 1891: *Viro doctissimo humanissimo Carolo Aemilio Ruello fautori post Boissonadium Alexandrum Darembergium optimo, grati testimonium animi offert editor*. Ruelle était Administrateur de la Bibliothèque Sainte-Geneviève (Paris). Wilhelm Kroll (*RE*, IV, Stuttgart, 1901, col. 2041) qualifie de *unzulänglich* (insuffisante) l'édition de Damascius par Ruelle et renvoie aux *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen* 1892, 111-112, et au *Philologus*, 53, 424.

17. Q. Aurelius Symmachus (IV<sup>e</sup> s. ap. J.-C.), auquel Kroll a consacré sa dissertation inaugurale (*supra* n. 8).

18. Traduction allemande littérale du latin *facticium*. Je n'ai vu nulle part chez Kroll 1891, 1894 et 1895 que le philologue allemand ait utilisé l'un ou l'autre terme pour

*eorum auctorem poetastrum, ignominiose nuncupet. Sed ego illa dissertatione uti, etiamsi per oculos meos licuisset, tamen noluissem, ut ne circulos meos alius inventis turbarem*<sup>19</sup>. Cette dernière métaphore «troubler mes cercles» est tirée de la tradition classique sur la mort d'Archimède<sup>20</sup>. Elle permet à Jahn de construire une allégorie de sa propre fin : il meurt à Berne le 23 août 1900, après avoir préfacé sa reconstitution chaldaïque et l'avoir envoyée pour publication (Jahn 1900). En s'identifiant à Archimède de Syracuse, il désignait en quelque sorte son assassin scientifique : Kroll, un *purus putus Latinus*, le soldat Romain passé à l'hellénisme. Le savant de 89 ans, vivant dans les cercles de l'illusion de

---

désigner les OC. Ce que Jahn vise ici, ce ne sont pas les OC vus par Kroll, mais le compte rendu de Kroll 1892 sur le travail de Jahn 1891. Mon collègue Peter von Moos m'a écrit à propos de *Machwerk*, qu'il s'agit d'un «idiotisme plutôt vulgaire du jargon académique, voire une insulte, pour désigner un livre "bon à mettre au cabinet", comme dirait le Misanthrope. Le sens est clairement opposé à une œuvre de génie née d'une inspiration et organiquement composée : c'est une fabrication artificielle, un patchwork sans valeur, une construction de bric-à-brac, avec une nuance morale négative, une imposture. Si on veut dénigrer à fond un ouvrage, on l'appelle ainsi. Le grand dictionnaire de Gerhard Wahrig donne cette définition : "(abwertend) schlechte Arbeit, minderwertiges Erzeugnis, Pfuschwerk, Schund"».

19. Jahn 1900, 173, que je traduis ainsi : «Sur ces entrefaites, arriva ce qu'un homme érudit, mon soutien et ami, m'avait prédit : il n'y aurait certes rien d'étonnant à ce que désormais d'autres décident de s'occuper aussi des OC. En effet, Wilhelm Kroll, auparavant latiniste pur et dur de l'École de Mommsen et spécialiste de Symmaque, devenu par la suite disciple d'Usener, passa tout à coup aux OC et publia à leur sujet la dissertation signalée ci-dessus [Kroll 1894], bien qu'il déclare de façon ignominieuse que ces mêmes Oracles sont une œuvre factice (en allemand : un *Machwerk*), tout comme leur auteur un mauvais poète. Mais moi, même si mes yeux me l'avaient permis, je n'aurais de toute façon pas voulu utiliser cette dissertation, afin de ne pas troubler mes cercles par les inventions d'un autre.»

20. Cette source a été identifiée par mon collègue et ami, Peter von Moos (19.8.2010), que je remercie vivement. Aucune notice d'écrivains gréco-latins ne transmet littéralement l'expression réutilisée par Jahn *ad usum personale*, voir Tite-Live XXV 31, 9-10; Plutarque, *Vies. Marcellus*, XVIII 8; Valère Maxime VIII 7, 7. Ce dernier fournit la version la plus développée des circonstances de la mort du savant. D'après Valère, Archimède avait l'esprit concentré sur des figures géométriques (*formas*) qu'il dessinait sur le sol (*in terram*). Plusieurs soldats de l'armée romaine (qui assiégeait Syracuse, 212 av. n. è.) firent alors irruption chez lui pour piller. Mais, comme les soldats avaient ordre d'épargner Archimède et de le ramener au général Romain, l'un d'eux lui demanda qui il était. Celui-ci absorbé dans ses raisonnements répondit : *Noli, obsecro, istum disturbare* («Garde-toi, je t'en prie, de le [*istum*] détruire»). Devant ce refus d'obtempérer et de déclarer son identité, le soldat tue le savant, de sorte qu'Archimède, «éborgné, mêla les lignes de son art à son propre sang» (*obtruncatus sanguino suo artis suae lineamenta confudit*). Le pronom *istum* dans la phrase prêtée à Archimède désigne l'homme (*hominem*), assimilé à son art.

soi, victime d'un jeune homme. Que représente culturellement un Suisse de Twann pour un Prussien de Breslau ? *Sapienti sat!*

### *Les aires d'étude*

La méthodologie de la recherche sur les OC à la fin du XIX<sup>e</sup> s., telle qu'elle est mise en œuvre par Jahn et Kroll, reste d'actualité car il n'est d'autre façon d'étudier une littérature fragmentaire que l'examen de la tradition textuelle, d'un côté, et l'analyse des contextes citateurs, de l'autre<sup>21</sup>. La première méthode relève de la philologie, la seconde de l'herméneutique. L'apport particulier de Kroll – au-delà de la question de l'établissement de la totalité des fragments – a été de situer les OC dans le cadre de l'idée de Mommsen, selon laquelle le mélange des peuples et de leurs religions à partir de l'époque hellénistique s'était traduit en philosophie par la fusion des Écoles et la nécessité de classer. Au II<sup>e</sup> s. de notre ère, les OC sont un bassin collecteur du renouvellement de la religiosité par un mélange de stoïcisme, de platonisme, d'Aristote, de pythagorisme, d'hermétisme et de religions orientales : culte du feu venu du monde iranien mazdéen, vénération d'Hécate propre à l'Asie mineure, religion solaire qui serait l'apport de la Syrie. Kroll donne à cet effort vers le syncrétisme, dont les OC sont tributaires, le nom de «gnose païenne<sup>22</sup>». Or, si l'interprétation des fragments par les contextes citateurs s'est développée de façon si intense depuis, du fait d'une plus grande accessibilité aux œuvres des néoplatoniciens<sup>23</sup>, en revanche la perspective de Kroll 1894, selon laquelle l'élément proprement «mystique transcendant» des OC serait à chercher du

---

21. L'organisation matérielle de ces Oracles en vers reste à ce jour inconnue. S'agissait-il d'un poème continu, comme on le pense souvent, ou bien plutôt d'un recueil d'hymnes disposés selon un schéma annulaire en imitation de l'ordre du monde, à la façon des Hymnes orphiques étudiés par M.-C. Fayant (édition à paraître, Belles Lettres) ?

22. Kroll 1894, 70 : «Altero saeculo si conditum est carmen, necesse est illa aetate inveniri quae similem habeant naturam. Hic primo loco afferenda sunt systemata gnostica, quibus tam similia sunt oracula, ut gnosin ethnicam eis contineri dicas»; même opinion soutenue dans Kroll 1895, 639 et Kroll 1917b, 151-153.

23. Aujourd'hui presque toutes éditées et traduites. L'accélération de la recherche sur les OC dans la période intermédiaire entre Kroll 1894 et Lewy 1956 est due principalement à Bousset, Bidez, Wilamowitz, Nock, Dodds, Festugière, et Theiler; dans la période récente, c'est-à-dire postérieure au Lewy 1956, elle est due à deux facteurs : les travaux de Pierre Hadot sur Porphyre (1960-1971), et les facilités d'accessibilité et de consultation qu'offrent l'édition usuelle des fragments numérotés (des Places 1971, suivi par Majercik 1989) et l'indexation systématique du Lewy (Tardieu 1978). Jésuite macrobiote, le P. des Places (1900-2000) traversa un siècle de platonisme en fournissant, en marge de son édition, un bouquet de quatorze contributions particulières (peu lues). Ce sont pour la plupart des compléments à la notice d'introduction à l'édition de 1971, et donc fort utiles.

côté d'une «gnose orientalisante», n'a pas conduit à renouveler les perspectives mais à répéter des thèmes conventionnels à l'histoire des religions à la fin du XIX<sup>e</sup> siècle. Lewy les a répertoriés dans le ch. VII des *Chaldaean Oracles and Theurgy*, sans s'y intéresser davantage. L'idée de Kroll ne manquait pourtant pas de pertinence. La «gnose païenne», selon lui ferment des OC, avait pour fondement doctrinal les liens qu'il percevait à juste titre entre Numénius, la littérature juive et les gnostiques<sup>24</sup>, de sorte que les OC se trouvèrent inscrits par lui dans une sorte de triptyque interprétatif qui se lisait de gauche à droite, selon la diachronie: Numénius – OC – Jamblique et les néoplatoniciens postérieurs<sup>25</sup>.

L'originalité de Hans Lewy a consisté à lire le triptyque en sens inverse, à partir du volet de droite, celui des citateurs et interprètes néoplatoniciens des oracles (ch. II-VI). Cette méthode a eu pour conséquence d'élargir considérablement les aires d'étude. Préoccupé de savoir ce que ces oracles étaient devenus, comment ils avaient été compris et à quoi ils avaient servi, Lewy étendit l'analyse des doctrines vers le domaine des pratiques et prolongea ainsi la métaphysique en direction de la théurgie. En devenant une sorte de fixateur ou de catalyseur de la diversité des croyances et des rites, le platonisme selon Lewy se substituait, de fait, à la gnose orientalisante selon Kroll. Fief de philologues au départ, les Oracles se présentent chez Lewy en champ pour comparatistes. Le panneau central du triptyque, au sommet duquel est installée

---

24. Kroll 1894, 70 n. 2: «Haud inutile duco adnotare philosophorum Numenium quantum constat Iudaeorum libros cognitos habuisse.» Suivent un certain nombre de références à des parallèles (*similitudines*) gnostiques indiquées par Kroll. J'ai complété ces indices dans Tardieu 1980b.

25. La place de Numénius en position prioritaire est restée longtemps une préoccupation de la recherche après Kroll, voir là-dessus des Places 1974, 355-356, où est utilisée l'image du triptyque. Dodds 1960, 11 parlera, de son côté, de chaînon manquant: «It has always seemed a little odd that the *Oracles*, composed under Marcus Aurelius, should have remained unknown until Porphyry discovered them, perhaps more than a century later. If I am right, the missing link will be Numenius, whose strong influence on Porphyry is attested by Proclus; Plotinus will have ignored the *Oracles*, recognising them for the theosophical rubbish that they are. And I see no chronological difficulty in supposing that Numenius was writing in the time of Marcus (161-180) or even a little later.» Krämer 1967, 27-28. 66-68 est dans la lignée de Dodds: son exposé de la métaphysique des OC est construit dans le cadre du système de Numénius. Festugière 1953, 52-59: points de contact entre OC et Numénius, fr. 3. 5. 7. 8. 22. 37. 44. 51. 53. 96. 115; Festugière 1954, 132-140: la *via negationis* commune aux OC et à Numénius ne vient pas d'Orient [thèse de Norden], mais de Platon, commentaire des fr. 1 et 2 dP. Sur les liens OC-Numénius-Porphyre, la lecture de Lewy 1978 amène Dodds 1961, 271, à se montrer plus circonspect: «Some sort of bridge must have linked the two systems; but I find it hard to be quite sure which way the traffic ran. It could even have been a two-way traffic, since so far as our scanty knowledge goes Numenius and Julianus may well have been contemporaries.»

une collection d'oracles propre à la dévotion privée des théurges, s'agrandit de domaines particuliers, jusqu'alors cloisonnés par les disciplines universitaires : littérature oraculaire publique révélée par l'épigraphie des derniers sanctuaires païens en activité (Apollon : Claros, Didymes), pratiques et hymnes dites « magiques » rassemblées par les papyrologues (Eitrem, Preisendanz), œuvres de toutes sortes d'écrivains et de poètes gréco-latins se référant aux autorités de Platon, d'Hermès ou d'Orphée (nouvelles éditions et traductions du corpus hermétique et des commentateurs néoplatoniciens). Lewy a été le premier à percevoir les OC comme l'expression d'une religion harmonieuse, faite de dogmes et de pratiques religieuses, mélange de scolastique et de théurgie, où l'on se plaisait autant à classifier sans cesse les ordres triadiques qu'à entrer en contact avec le divin<sup>26</sup>.

Selon la jolie formule de Jahn, les OC ont été « comme une sorte de pépinière de philosophie néoplatonicienne<sup>27</sup> ». L'étude pour elle-même de ce riche terreau, révélé par les *Chaldaean Oracles and Theurgy*, s'est poursuivie jusqu'à aujourd'hui, non sans risques de redites ou de sur-observation, alors que persistent des portions ou composantes peu explorées ne relevant pas du néoplatonisme. L'une de ces dernières est certainement la littérature oraculaire. Bien qu'il se soit enhardi jusqu'à identifier comme chaldaïques des oracles issus des collections théosophiques (ch. I), Lewy avait bien vu qu'il y avait de ce côté-là d'autres thématiques à mettre en place, ne serait-ce que pour comprendre le cas Porphyre et la situation de *La Philosophie à tirer des oracles*. Les oracles théologiques manifestent la vitalité de la religiosité païenne au III<sup>e</sup> siècle<sup>28</sup>. Il en est de même pour maints traités de métaphysique transmis

---

26. Il est difficile de savoir si cette religion « chaldaïque » correspond à l'état du platonisme préplotinien (ainsi Hadot 1987, 29), gnostique ou néoplatonicien.

27. Jahn 1900, 170 : *quasi quoddam seminarium philosophiae platonicae recentioris*.

28. État de la question dans Aude Busine 2005, 154-224 ; historique de l'hypothèse chaldaïque des oracles d'Apollon, 200-224. L'oracle de Claros à trois témoins (*Théosophie*, Lactance, inscription d'Oinoanda), réalisé par Livrea 1998 et plus récemment par Chuvin 2009b, est un bon exemple d'une formulation renouvelée du divin sans qu'on puisse la définir par une étiquette particulière d'école philosophique. On peut en dire autant de l'oracle latin anonyme sur le sacrifice anagogique, exhumé par Stéphane Toulouse d'œuvres augustinienes et sur lequel il a fourni une étude fouillée (Toulouse 2001) : *Non hi qui pecudum pertractant corque iecurque, / Sed quorum emundat prudens praecordia virtus, / Excludens positam subter labem uitiorum, / Remigio poterunt caelum penetrare secundo, / Aethera nec uacuum laetis transcurrere pennis* ; « Ce ne sont pas ceux qui sondent avec attention le cœur et le foie des bêtes, / Mais ceux dont la vertu de prudence purifie les entrailles, / Fermant l'accès à la souillure sous-jacente des vices, / Qui ont pu pénétrer dans le ciel, d'un heureux battement d'ailes, / Et traverser dans le vol joyeux l'éther qui n'est pas vide » (texte et traduction de Toulouse 2001, 170). Ce type d'oracle théologique est bien dans la préoccupation des antiquisants platoniciens amateurs d'OC et faisant flèche de tout bois (ainsi Lydus, *De mensibus*, IV

par les Pères de l'Église sous étiquette gnostique ou conservés en copte dans les Nag Hammadi Codices, sortes de conservatoire ou de laboratoire philosophiques. Ainsi l'exposé de théologie négative identique chez un pro-nicéen (Marius Victorinus) et dans un traité gnostique (*Zostrianos*)<sup>29</sup>. On voit là en action les résistances des modes traditionnels d'argumenter aussi bien que les invariants pour se mettre au goût du jour. Cette documentation nouvelle permet d'ouvrir le chantier des matériaux, tant métaphoriques que conceptuels, considérés jusque-là comme spécifiques du chaldéisme ou du néoplatonisme naissant, alors qu'ils sont seulement des remplois (gnostiques, chaldéiques, patristiques, ou néoplatoniciens) de la religiosité commune<sup>30</sup>. L'élargissement des aires d'étude se juge aussi à l'exploration des auteurs latins, chrétiens et païens, parmi lesquels un témoignage surprenant chez Ammien Marcellin<sup>31</sup>. Kroll avait cru pouvoir négliger le Pseudo-Denys, Pléthon, les savants grecs émigrés en Italie à la Renaissance: c'est aujourd'hui un secteur innovant de la recherche.

---

24, ed. R. Wünsch, citant à l'appui Isaïe 1, 11-14).

29. Tardieu 1996; discussions: Hadot 1996; A. Guillaumont, *CRAI*, 141, 1997, 880-882; B. A. Pearson, *Religious Studies Review*, 24, January 1998, 104; U.-K. Plisch, *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung*, 93 (1998), 632-634; M. van Esbroeck, *Oriens christianus*, 82 (1998), 274-275; Ph. Luisier, *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, 64 (1998), 211-213; H.-M. Schenke, *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum*, 41 (1998), 252-256; Brisson 1999; M. Veronese, *Vetera Christianorum*, 36 (1999), 148-149; J.-D. Dubois, *Apocrypha*, 11 (2000), 317-318; Abramowski 2005; Turner 2006; Abramowski 2006.

30. Tardieu 1973, 1980b et 1996. La religiosité des OC n'est pas spécifique d'un courant particularisable comme platonicien, médioplatonicien, néoplatonicien. Ces étiquettes classificatoires sont peu utiles. En outre, la méthode de salut dans les OC est comme chez les philosophes et les gnostiques une *voegà ðvoria* opposée aux sacrifices traditionnels et à la divination. Pareillement, la subordination du démiurge au dieu suprême n'est pas spécifique d'un courant particulier, elle est commune à toute la religiosité (gnostiques, OC, Numénius, néoplatonisme).

31. Ainsi Clerc 1989 voit avec pertinence dans les formules de la notice d'Ammien Marcellin à l'année 363 (*Res gestae*, XXIII 6, 25) relative à la Chaldée (*Chaldaeorum regio*) – «terre nourricière de la philosophie ancienne, ainsi que le rappellent ceux en qui a resplendi la véritable Foi pour parler au nom des dieux (trad. pers.)» (*altrix philosophiae veteris, ut memorant ipsi apud quos ueridica uaticinandi fides elucet*) –, non pas une profession de foi à l'astrologie babylonienne (ainsi chez J. Fontaine, *Ammien. Histoire*, t. 4, *Commentaire*, Paris, Les Belles Lettres, 1977, p. 77), mais un hommage à la théurgie et aux philosophes commentateurs des Oracles chaldéiques, autrement dit Jamblique et Julien. «La Foi fondatrice de Vérité (c'est-à-dire opposée à la foi crédule des chrétiens) pour parler au nom des dieux (rendre des oracles, prophétiser)»: la formulation évoque la théorie chaldéique Foi-Vérité-[-Amour], mais peut renvoyer aussi à l'Abraham païen des néoplatoniciens.

### ***Prestige de la philosophie barbare***

Aux yeux des néoplatoniciens, les OC constituaient le sommet de l'enseignement et de la philosophie. Comment s'explique un tel prestige? Franz Cumont mettait en avant deux raisons: la présence d'«une forme honorable de la magie, une sorcellerie clarifiée», autrement dit la théurgie. Ensuite, l'ensemble de la théologie des OC offrirait, selon Cumont, «une similitude frappante avec le système philosophique de Plotin», et d'ajouter: «C'est certainement cette analogie qui leur a valu le prestige incroyable dont ils jouirent chez les néoplatoniciens<sup>32</sup>.» La première raison est concevable, la seconde pose le problème de la connaissance des Oracles par Plotin, généralement rejetée<sup>33</sup>. H.-D. Saffrey, à son tour, avance trois raisons de l'accueil des OC chez les néoplatoniciens. Ceux-ci auraient été séduits par la doctrine de Platon présentée par ces Oracles, ensuite leur contenu philosophique était gagé sur une révélation oraculaire, enfin les philosophes post-plotiniens ressentaient le besoin pour l'âme humaine de recourir à une aide surnaturelle, la théurgie, pour aller à Dieu<sup>34</sup>. Ces motivations sont bien réelles mais je les formulerai autrement.

Pour les néoplatoniciens, les OC constituaient d'abord *un livre religieux*, apportant, en partie en référence aux explications du *Timée*, les éléments essentiels d'un récit sacré sur l'origine du monde et sa fin, et fournissant par là une solution au sort des âmes et de soi-même après la mort en assurant le salut, ou purification, dès ce bas-monde par la théurgie. La métaphore de Livre saint ou de Bible, qui a été appliquée aux OC par les chercheurs modernes et contemporains depuis Kroll et Jahn, est donc pleinement justifiée<sup>35</sup>. Ensuite, aux yeux des philosophes grecs, le prestige de ce livre religieux venait essentiellement de ce qu'il se présentait comme un monument de leur propre culture, c'est-à-dire en vers et sous la forme reconnaissable de ce que tous les gens cultivés connaissaient par cœur et que l'on se récitait depuis l'enfance, *une poésie homérique*, un recueil composé des mêmes hexamètres que ceux d'Homère et dans le langage immédiatement identifiable comme homérique,

---

32. Cumont 1949, 362-365 = 2009, 418-420.

33. Voir *infra* Réception et fragments, s. v. Plotin.

34. Saffrey 1984, 52-56 = 1990, 162-166.

35. En dépit de Culdaut 2002, qui achoppe sur l'usage métaphorique du mot «Bible». Kroll 1899, 2045: «das heilige Buch einer religiösen Genossenschaft»; Jahn 1900, 170: «quare ab illis (= les néoplatoniciens) tanquam sacra testimonia, haud aliter ac dicta Scripturae Sacrae a Patribus Ecclesiae, certatim invocantur»; Cumont 1906, 115: «la Bible des théurges platoniciens»; 294 n. 87: «en quelque sorte la Bible des derniers néo-platoniciens»; Bidez 1913, 88 n. 2: «comme la Bible d'une secte qui dut avoir beaucoup d'adhérents».

autrement dit avec beaucoup de créations lexicales<sup>36</sup>. Enfin, la méthode de salut proposée dans ce recueil oraculaire est *une voie universelle* spécifique de la philosophie barbare, c'est-à-dire de ce qu'il y a de plus ancien et de plus respectable, aux fondements mêmes de la philosophie grecque<sup>37</sup>. Les oracles relevant de la philosophie barbare ne sont pas attachés, en effet, à des sanctuaires publics, multiples et parfois localisables (ceux-ci ne sont pas exclus de la réflexion de Porphyre dans la *Philosophie à tirer des oracles*), ils relèvent seulement de la religion privée, qui s'occupe de disposer les images divines à l'intérieur du sanctuaire unique de soi-même, temple sans murs ni clergé ni sacrifices. D'où la désignation du recueil comme «chaldaïque», c'est-à-dire, ainsi que l'avait bien compris Jahn, sans acception ethnique, ni babylonienne, ni perse, ni syrienne, mais répondant à une conception moniste de l'univers et théologiquement monothéiste ou abrahamite<sup>38</sup>: le poème chaldaïque se posait ainsi en courant rival du christianisme et en réplique scripturaire aux Écritures chrétiennes.

L'image du sacré dans les OC n'est guère aisée à restituer car elle nous est parvenue à l'état fragmentaire et brouillée par la réception néoplatonicienne. La recherche récente (H. Seng, L. Saudelli, A. Lecerf) a le mérite d'attirer l'attention sur ce morcellement d'image. Cette troisième édition des *Chaldaean Oracles and Theurgy*, entreprise à la demande répétée de l'Institut d'Études augustiniennes, a pour but de contribuer à l'effort de cette recherche actuelle. La forme que j'ai adoptée dans les divers inventaires devait être nécessairement

36. Ces mots nouveaux et obscurs contribuaient à auréoler par une sorte de magie le prestige des OC. Sur l'usage des vers homériques dans les papyrus magiques, voir l'étude de Derek Collins, «The Magic of Homeric Verses», *Classical Philology*, 103 (2008), 211-236; pour l'utilisation prophylactique de vers d'Homère en codicologie: Zago 2010, 137 n. 1 et p. 245-247.

37. Ainsi, les «théologiens» grecs, Orphée, Linos, Musée, sont dits avoir été à l'école des «théologiens» phéniciens et égyptiens; Homère, les Sept Sages et Pythagore doivent leur formation aux Mages, Prophètes et Brahmanes; Démocrite a converti en éthique les *λόγοι* des Babyloniens; Platon fut l'interprète de la philosophie égyptienne. L'incorporéité de Dieu et le monothéisme sont des avancées dues à la philosophie barbare (Théophraste ap. Porphyre, *De abstinentia*, II 26, 3; Numénius, fr. 1b des Places).

38. L'abrahamisme comme fait culturel païen fait partie de l'*inductio Chaldaeorum* de la «voie universelle», par rapport à laquelle Porphyre prend ses distances dans le *De regressu animae* (fr. 12 Bidez = 302F Smith). Dans le même sens, voir le témoignage relevé par Clerc 1989 concernant Ammien Marcellin. Sur la *via universalis*, Castelletti 2006, 78-79 (les OC dans la recherche d'une voie universelle du salut). Une réflexion nouvelle sur la philosophie barbare est le réexamen du fr. 160 dans la perspective du débat historique sur la réincarnation des âmes humaines dans des corps d'animaux (Castelletti 2006, 306-308). Ne pourrait-on pas lire le *De Styge* comme un commentaire du fr. chaldaïque 51?



condensée, afin de ne pas alourdir l'ouvrage<sup>39</sup>. Mes remerciements vont à l'Institut d'Études augustiniennes ; à son directeur général, M. Vincent Zarini ; au directeur de la Collection des Études augustiniennes, M. Frédéric Chapot, qui m'a aidé dans la collecte de la bibliographie et la mise au point finale ; à la bibliothécaire de l'Institut, Mme Claudine Croyère, et aux personnels de cette bibliothèque ; à M. Philippe Hoffmann, qui a obtenu une subvention de l'École Pratique des Hautes Études pour faciliter la publication ; à Mlle Marjorie Dumaire (CNRS) ; à Mme Florence Terrasse-Riou (Fondation Hugot) ; à H. Seng (Francfort), P. von Moos (Heidelberg), M. Zago (Padoue), qui m'ont apporté leur concours généreux.

### *Réception et fragments*

Éditions critiques annotées. 1894 Kroll, grec, apparat, ordre scolastique des fragments, appréciation non systématique des contextes citateurs, éd. de l'Ἰστορίαις de Psellus en appendice, concordance Tardieu 1978,681-691 ; 1971 des Places, grec/français, apparat, ordre de Kroll et numérotation des fragments, dix commentateurs anciens fournis en appendice, édités et traduits, dont depuis sont réédités : l'Ἐξήγησις de Psellus, n°1,162-186 = O'Meara 1989,n°38,126-146 ; l'Ἐκθεσις chaldaïque, n°2,189-191 = n°39,146-148 ; l'Ἐκθεσις assyrienne, n°3,194-195 = n°41,151-152 ; l'Ἰστορίαις, n°4,198-201 = n°40,148-151 ; y ajouter l'extrait de Psellus, *Aux disciples insouciantes*, édité, traduit et commenté par Tardieu 1980a ; 1989 Majercik, grec/anglais, numérotation des Places 1971, introduction et notes originales, ni apparat ni commentateurs anciens. D'un intérêt médiocre (choix de fragments et/ou de commentateurs anciens) : Tonelli 1990, García Bazán 1991, Lanzi 2001.

Réception néoplatonicienne et patristique, Seng 2009b,15-23.130-174, Toulouse 2011 ; raisons de l'assimilation des OC par les néoplatoniciens : Saffrey 1969 1984 ; retour au contexte citeur : Hadot 1978,715-716 ; **Albinus** : des Places 1984,2305-6 ; **Numénius** : Festugière 1953,52-59, 1954,132-140, Dodds 1960c,10-11, 1961,270-272, Waszink 1966, Krämer 1967,27-28.66-68, des Places 1973, Hadot 1978,707-709, des Places 1984,2306-8, Brisson

---

39. Il ne m'était pas possible de rédiger d'amples notices à la façon des répertoires bibliographiques de : Nicoletta Scotti Muth, *Proclo negli ultimi quarant'anni*, Milano, Vita e Pensiero, 1993 ; Giuseppe Girgenti, *Porfirio negli ultimi cinquant'anni*, Milano, Vita e Pensiero, 1994 ; Richard Dufour, *Plotinus. A Bibliography 1950-2000*, Leiden, Brill, 2002, avec compléments sur <http://rdufour.free.fr/BibPlotin>. Je ne pouvais, non plus, envisager des résumés sur le modèle de ce que j'avais fait pour les *Études manichéennes. Bibliographie critique 1977-1986*, Téhéran-Paris, Institut français de recherche en Iran, 1988, 159 p. Je me suis donc inspiré plutôt de la forme adoptée pour le « Dossier bibliographique » figurant dans les appendices de l'édition française du *Marcion* de Harnack (Paris, Cerf, 2003, 2005<sup>2</sup>, p. 488-561), en proposant cinq sections : réception et fragments, les contextes, les interprétations, la chronologie 1891-1978 et le répertoire alphabétique 1979-2011.

1999, Linguiti 2003, Athanassiadi 2006,84-89; [Anonyme], *In Parmenidem*: Kroll 1892b, Hadot 1961 1966 1968,II90-93, Saffrey 1988,4-6, Linguiti 1995, Bechtle 1999, Corrigan 2000, Turner 2000, Majercik 2001,266n5 (histoire de l'interprétation), Abramowski 2005, Bechtle 2006, Turner 2006,41-47; **Plotin**: Dodds 1947, Hadot 1978,709-711 («selon toute vraisemblance, Plotin n'a pas connu les OC ou a refusé de s'y intéresser»), Abramowski 1983b, Dillon 1992 (Plotin lecteur direct), Majercik 1998b («That Plotinus, Amelius, or the shadowy Antoninus were familiar with the CO does not seem likely»), discussion: Finamore 1998, Soares 2006; **Amélius**: Brisson 1987,811-812, Majercik 1998b, Abramowski 2005; **Porphyre** (rapports supposés entre *Philosophie à tirer des oracles*, *De regressu animae*, et *Commentaire sur les Oracles chaldaïques?*): Bidez 1913,88-97, O'Meara 1959-1969, Hadot 1960 1961 1962 1966 1968 1978,711-714, Theiler 1966, Waszink 1966, Saffrey 1981a, Abramowski 1983, des Places 1984,2308-11, Smith 1987,731-737 (sur O'Meara 1959 1969 et Hadot 1960), Beatrice 1988, Saffrey 1988, Edwards 1990, Majercik 1992, Smith 1993,319-350 (apparat OC au *De regressu*), Tardieu 1996, Majercik 1998b, Van Liefferinge 1999, Guerra 2000, Simmons 2001, Toulouse 2001, Zambon 2002, Busine 2004, Chase 2004, Rodríguez Moreno 2005, Abramowski 2005, Castelletti 2006, Seng 2006b, Wintjes 2010; **Jamblique**: Dodds 1947, des Places 1964a-b, Cremer 1969, des Places 1984,2311-3, Finamore 1985, Shaw 1985 1988 1993 1995 1996 1998 2003, Nasemann 1991, Van Liefferinge 1999, Lanzi 2005b, Bergemann 2010, Athanassiadi 2011; **Julien** empereur: Bidez 1930, Penati 1983, Bouffartigue 1992,306-309.345-348, Van Liefferinge 1999, Broze-Van Liefferinge 2009, Lecerf 2011; **Arnobé**: Bousset 1915, des Places 1972,27-29, 1984,2313-4, Seng 2009b,151-162; **Lactance**: Wlosok 1960; **Marius Victorinus**: Hadot 1960, Hadot 1962 1968 1971, des Places 1972,29-31, Abramowski 1983, des Places 1984,2314-6, Majercik 1992, Tardieu 1996, Tommasi 1996, Abramowski 2005 2006; **Sosipatra**: Lanzi 2004; **Ammien Marcellin**: Clerc 1989; **Grégoire de Nazianze**: Majercik 1998a; **Augustin**: Theiler 1942, O'Meara 1959-1969, Hadot 1960, des Places 1972,31-36, Toulouse 2001, Seng 2009b,163-167; **Favonius Eulogius**: Tommasi 2011; **Synesius**: Theiler 1942, des Places 1972,36-41, 1984,2316-8, Susanetti 1992, Seng 1996; **Macrobe**: Seng 2006b; **Martianus Capella**: des Places 1984,2318-9, Hadot (I.) 2005,326-329.391-410, Guillaumin 2008, Seng 2009b,171-174, Tommasi 2010; **Syrianus**: Moreschini 2011; **Proclus**: Westerink 1942, Saffrey 1981a-b (Hymne IV, "aux dieux des OC", *sed contra* Van den Berg 2001), Saffrey-Westerink 1978,xxvi-xxxvi (*Parménide*), 1981, des Places 1984,2321-22, Masullo 1987, Gautier 1988,92-94, Romano 1989,xxiv-xxv (table des OC dans l'*In Cratylum*), Moutsopoulos 1990, des Places 1994 (*Comm. au Premier Alcibiade*), Athanassiadi 1999, Van Liefferinge 1999, Brisson 2000a (*Théologie platonicienne*), Majercik 2001, Van den Berg 2001 (*Hymnes*), Toulouse 2001, Gritti 2003, Brisson 2004a-b, Seng 2005 (*Hymnes*); Gillon 2011; Hoffmann 2011; **Hiéroclès**: Hadot (I.) 1978,68-73 (*Sur la Providence*, livre IV), des Places 1984,2319-20; **Pseudo-Denys**: des Places 1977 1981a-b 1984,2322-3, Perczel 2000, Arthur 2006 (*idem* 2008); **Procope de Gaza**:

Westerink 1942, Seng 2009b,136-141; **Damascius**: Westerink 1977, des Places 1984,2324-5, Athanassiadi 1999; **Énée de Gaza**: Hadot (I.) 1978,80; **Simplicius**: Bidez 1903, Nock 1934,382n98, Festugière 1948, Hadot (I.) 1978-1987, Hoffmann 1987.

Réception byzantine et médiévale, Seng 2009b,24-29; citateurs et commentateurs du Moyen Âge et de la Renaissance. **Lydus**: des Places 1984,2325-7; Jean Scot **Érigène**: Jeuneau 1987; **Oracles de Zoroastre**: Dannenfeldt 1960, Klutstein 1992, Stausberg 1998; **Psellos**: Westerink 1942, des Places 1966, Marcovich 1975, Tardieu 1980a 1980c-1987, des Places 1983 1984,2327-30, 1988, O'Meara 1989, Lanzi 2001, Athanassiadi 2002, Seng 2009b,39-44, Delli 2011, Moreschini 2011; **Pseudo-Psellos**, *De daemonibus (ex-De operatione daemonum)*: Gautier 1980; *Opiniones de daemonibus*: Gautier 1988; **Elisha**: Wust 1989; **Pléthon**: Bidez-Cumont 1938,I158-163,II251-262, Theiler 1942, Tardieu 1980c, des Places 1984,2331, Tardieu 1987, Tambrun 1992 1995, Tardieu 1995, Tambrun 1999, Stausberg 2000, Tambrun 2001, Athanassiadi 2002, Tambrun 2006, Tambrun 2011; **Prisca theologia**: Gentile 1986, Mucillo 1996; **Ficin**: Mucillo 1986, Klutstein 1986, des Places 1984,331, Klutstein 1987, Gentile 1990, Toussaint 1994, Tambrun 1999, Magnard 2001, Tambrun 2001-2006,241-259; **Steuco di Gubbio**: Moreschini 2009,145-154; **Mazzoni**: Moreschini 2009,154-155; **Patrizi**: Jahn 1900, Mucillo 1986, Stausberg 1998,I318-323 2001, Moreschini 2009,155-169; **Pic de la Mirandole**: des Places 1984,2331-2.

Réception moderne, Jahn 1900,169-173, Seng 2009a-b,30-31; xvii<sup>e</sup>-xviii<sup>e</sup> s.: Stausberg 2001; Tambrun 2011; xix<sup>e</sup>-xx<sup>e</sup> s.: Susanetti 2010.

Fragments, concordance entre Kroll 1894, Theiler 1942-1953, Lewy 1956, Hadot 1960 1966 1968 1971, des Places 1971: Tardieu 1978,679-691; études et réexamens: 1 Cremer 1969,45, Saffrey-Westerink 1974,113, Hadot 1978,718-719, des Places 1981a 1983 1994, Tardieu 1996,87, Majercik 2001,269, Linguisti 2003, Seng 2010; 1,4 Theiler 1942,11.17, Saffrey 1981a222-223, Saffrey-Westerink 1987,201.210; 1,10 Hadot 1968,I325n1; 1-2 Festugière 1954,132-140; 2 Theiler 1942,12; 3 Bousset 1915,143n1, Theiler 1942,5-6, Saffrey-Westerink 1978,xxxv, Abramowski 1981, des Places 1983 1988, Tardieu 1996,100-101; 3-4: Saffrey-Westerink 1987,178, Majercik 2001,266-272; 4 Theiler 1942,5,12, Hadot 1966,134-139, des Places 1994, Saffrey-Westerink 1997,145, Majercik 2001,279-282; 5 Theiler 1942,12, Orbe 1966,92-95, Majercik 2001,288-289, Seng 2000; 6 Hadot 1971,227, des Places 1983, Saffrey-Westerink 1987,xv-xvi; 7 Bousset 1915,142-143, Bidez 1903, Theiler 1942,6, Festugière 1948 (ignore Bidez 1903), Dodds 1960c, Hadot 1978,707-709, Brock 1983,218.240, Smith 1993,431F. 432F13-14, Linguisti 2003; 8 Jahn 1900,176-178, Bousset 1915,143, Hadot 1960b,709, des Places 1983, Saffrey-Westerink 1987,164,189-190, Linguisti 2003; 10 Theiler 1942,18-19,33-34; 11 Theiler 1942,7-8, des Places 1994, Majercik 2001,275-277; 12 Jahn 1900,174-176; 14 des Places 1988; 15 des Places 1983; 16 Theiler 1942,10, Saffrey-Westerink 1974,124, des Places 1983 1994; 17 des Places 1983, Saffrey-Westerink 1987,165; 18 Theiler 1942,10-11, des Places 1981a 1983 (+ fr. 19-22),

Saffrey-Westerink 1997,ix-xiv; **21** Theiler 1942,18-19, Tardieu 1996,101; **22** Jahn 1900,179-182, Bidez 1902; **23** des Places 1983; **22-23** Saffrey-Westerink 1997,162-163; **26** Vogt 1957,33-34 (non chaldaïque, vers d'un hymne de Proclus au *Hapax epekeina*), des Places 1983; **27** Jahn 1900,178-179, Theiler 1942,7-8, Hadot 1968,I261n1, Cremer 1969,104, Tardieu 1973,562-564, Saffrey-Westerink 1978,xxxv, Smith 1993,429F, Majercik 2001,271-277; **28** Theiler 1942,7-8; **29** Theiler 1942,28, Zago 2010a,158n45; **28-30** Tardieu 1996,91.97; **30** Jahn 1900,186-187; **31** Jahn 1900,183-184; **32** Theiler 1942,30-31, Tardieu 1996,87; **33** Bousset 1915,142-143, Brisson 1987,811-2, Seng 2000; **34** Jahn 1900,187-192, Theiler 1942,28; **35** Cremer 1969,45, des Places 1983, Seng 2009b,57-61; **37** Theiler 1942,21.25, Cremer 1969,45, des Places 1983, Saffrey 1987,xxii-xxvii; **38** Cremer 1969,116; **39** Hadot 1966,159, des Places 1983 1994; **42** des Places 1994, Majercik 1998a; **43** Saffrey-Westerink 1968,133-134; **44** Theiler 1942,9.30, Hadot 1962,437, Moraux 1967, Saffrey 1969, Tardieu 1975, des Places 1994; **45** des Places 1994; **46** Nilsson 1974, Tardieu 1980b,215-216, des Places 1983 1994, Hoffmann 2000 2010; **48** des Places 1994; **49** des Places 1994, Saffrey-Westerink 1997,122.133; **50** Theiler 1942,5-6.12-13, Hadot 1960,236, 1966,139-141, Majercik 2001,291-294; Guillaumin 2008,177-180; **51** Theiler 1942,22, Tardieu 1980b,204-209, des Places 1983, Saffrey-Westerink 1987,193, Seng 2006b,119-121, Hoffmann 2011; **53** Bousset 1915,142, Theiler 1942,7, Cremer 1969,116; **56** Theiler 1942,5.13.21; **57** Theiler 1942,22, Saffrey-Westerink 1987,195, 1997,xxvii; **58** des Places 1983; **60** Theiler 1942,24; **61** Tardieu 1980b,197-198, Seng 2006b,125-126; **65** Saffrey-Westerink 1981,130, 1987,169.202; **66** Theiler 1942,33-34; **67** Tardieu 1980b,205-209, des Places 1983; **72** Saffrey-Westerink 1987,208; **73** Jahn 1900,184-186, Cremer 1969,39; **76** des Places 1994; **78** des Places 1981a 1994; **84** Saffrey-Westerink 1981,162, des Places 1983, Majercik 2001,283-284; **86** des Places 1983; **87** des Places 1994; **90** des Places 1983; **92** Theiler 1942,30; **94** Theiler 1942,29; **97** Seng 2006a, Zago 2010a,186n161; **98** des Places 1983; **99** Saffrey-Westerink 1987,196; **102** Theiler 1942,33, Cremer 1969,124; **102-103**: des Places 1979,368; **104** Krämer 1967,260-261, Hadot (I.) 1978,105n111; **104-105** Theiler 1942,37, Westerink 1977,II193, Tardieu 1979, des Places 1983 1988; **107** Saffrey-Westerink 1981,158, 1987,209, Toulouse 2001, Hadot (I.) 2005,328-329, Tanaseanu-Döbler 2010, Tardieu 2011; **108** Cremer 1969,44, Gautier 1980,142-143, Broze-Van Liefferinge 2009,54n29; **109** Theiler 1942,32; **110** Theiler 1942,32, Tardieu 1980b,200-202, des Places 1983 1988; **112** des Places 1981a 1988 1994, Van Riel 2008,cxviii1; **113** Theiler 1942,32; **114** Saffrey-Westerink 1987,193; **115-116** Theiler 1942,35, Wlosok 1960,145-146, des Places 1981a 1983 1994, Seng 2006a; **117** des Places 1994,288; **117-118** Camplani 2002,122-123; **120** Hadot (I.) 1978,99, des Places 1983; **121** des Places 1983; **125** Seng 2009b,179-180; **126** des Places 1994; **128** Theiler 1942,37, Hadot 1968,I343n11, Seng 2006a; **129** Seng 2006a-b; **130** Cremer 1969,47-49, Saffrey-Westerink 1974,113; **131** Theiler 1942,34, Festugière 1953,132-135; **132** Theiler 1942,10; **134** Saffrey 1969; **135** Saffrey 1969, des Places 1994, Seng 2006a; **138** Finamore 2002; **145** Hadot

1968,I379.407; **146** Cremer 1969,45, Johnston 1992; **147** Cremer 1969,47, Tardieu 2010; **148** Cremer 1969,48; **149** Tardieu 2010; **150** Guillaumin 2008,173-174, Zago 2010b; **152** Hadot 1968,II75n4, Tardieu 1996,98, Linguiti 2003; **153** Kroll 1899, Cumont 1906,292n73, Cremer 1969, 124, Stroumsa 1980, Saffrey-Westerink 1981,155, des Places 1983; **154** Theiler 1942,21, des Places 1994; **155** Hadot 1978,710, Saffrey-Westerink 1997,166; Tardieu 1979; **157-158** Seng 2006a 2010b; **158** Hadot 1968,I343n11; **159** West 1968 *sed contra* Marcovich 1975; **160** Castelletti 2006,306-308; **161** des Places 1994; **163** Theiler 1942,30, Tardieu 1996,73-74, Saudelli 2011; **164** Finamore 1998; **165** Seng 2010b, Tardieu 2011; **166** Finamore 1998; **169** Hadot 1960,214-215; **171** Theiler 1942,32; **175** Löhr 2009,414-415, Seng 2010b; **176** Saffrey-Segonds 2001,110n5; **179** Jahn 1900,179; **182** Jahn 1900,182-183; **187** Saffrey-Westerink 1987,167; **189** Theiler 1942,25; **190** des Places 1979 1994; **194** Theiler 1942,35, Seyrig 1959; **196** des Places 1994; **210** des Places 1983; **211** Zago 2010a,215; **213** Toulouse 2001; **214** Tardieu 1996,66-67, Linguiti 2003; **216** des Places 1994; **217** Toulouse 2001; **219** Smith 1993,347F19-23; **220** Zago 2010a,178n108; **221** Smith 1993,347F28-29; **223** Smith 1993,347F31-35; **224** Smith 1993,317F4.9.

Fragments, nouveaux: Hadot 1960b,885 (*et ista discernis*), Saffrey 1969 (fr. 44, 134, 135), Tardieu 1978,520-521, Saffrey-Westerink 1981,162 (fr. 84), Saffrey-Westerink 1981,119-120 et Westerink-Combès 1989,261 (penser être pensé, *voeiv voeivodai*); Athanassiadi 2006,40-41 (Isis démiurge).

Modes de citation et dénominations. «Ceux qui rapportent ces traditions» (An., *In Parm.* IX 10): Hadot 1961 (désigne le recueil des OC, *sed contra* Theiler dans Hadot 1966,160-161, les commentateurs néoplatoniciens = Porphyre?), Hadot 1996a (réexamen critique); transfert en prose: Bechtle 2006; intitulés: Hadot 1978,706-707, Athanassiadi 2006,38, Tanaseanu-Döbler 2010; pacte secret des Chaldéens: Gautier 1988; «la religion» (*ἀριστεία*): Nock 1934,382n98.

Histoire de la recherche: Jahn 1891,v-xii, Kroll 1892a, Jahn 1900,169-174, Dodds 1961=1978, Hadot 1978, Tardieu 1978,515-519.539-550.673-678.725-729, 1980b, des Places 1984,2303-5, Toulouse 2001,222-223; exposés généraux: Kroll 1899, Cumont 1949,361-366 = 2009,416-422, Nilsson 1974, des Places 1974,355-357, des Places 1984, Majercik 1989, Brisson 2004b 2005 (redites de Brisson 2000a), Athanassiadi 2009,25-27, Seng 2009b,11-14; principes critiques: Schenke 1995; sources et bibliographie: Seng 2009b,185-214; discussion critique sur Lewy 1956-1978, ch. I: O'Meara 1959, Hadot 1960, Dodds 1961; ch. VII: Stroumsa 1980; excursus I: Hadot 1960; corrections à Lewy 1956: Hadot 1960,227n76 (à 28n105), Tardieu 1978,523-539.

### *Les contextes*

Attributions/datations. Les *Iuliani*, père/fils, chaldéen/théurge, auteurs ou premiers exégètes?: Kroll 1916 1917a, Dodds 1947, Hadot 1978,703-706, Potter 1991, Majercik 2001,286n90, Lanzi 2005a; théosophes: Jahn 1900,170; magiciens d'origine syrienne?: Saffrey 1981a,224-225; prêtres du temple de

Bel-Hadad, Apamée de Syrie (“the Apamean Connection”)?: Athanassiadi 1999 2005 2006 2009 2010; réponses faites par l’âme de Platon à Julien fils [le Théurge] pris comme médium?: Saffrey 1981a-c *sed contra* Hadot 1987; pseudépigraphie?: Cazalais 2005,275-279; théurge “père des dieux”: Saffrey-Segonds 2001,xcv, Chase 2004.

Culture grecque. Diffusion en Égypte: Chuvin 1988; histoire politique et culturelle: Chuvin 2009; Homère (utilisation d’): Masullo 1987, Johnston 1992; Platon, *Lettre II*: Brisson 1999; *Phédon*: Toulouse 2011; *Timée*: Brisson 2003 2004b, Turner 2006; *Parménide*: Dodds 1928, Turner 2006; débats païens/chrétiens: Chuvin 1988, Simmons 2001, Sfameni Gasparro 2006; liens avec les *Rhapsodies orphiques*: Brisson 2004a; sacrifices, polémiques de l’hermétisme et de la philosophie contre les sacrifices et la divination: Hadot 1960,225-226, des Places 1964b, Montero 1999, Toulouse 2001, Camplani-Zambon 2002, Tommasi 2007,188-190, Van den Kerchove 2010 2011; accord des énoncés poétiques et hymniques sur Dieu, traditions gnostiques, manichéennes, oraculaires: Tardieu 1988; néoplatoniciennes: Saffrey-Westerink 1968,138, Saffrey 1992, Brisson 2004b; théosophiques: Tardieu 1989, Pricoco 1989, Graf 2010.

Doctrines communes. Âme, tableau comparatif: Festugière 1940,128-129, dénominations (épanchement, flot, λιβάς; source, πηγῆ): Hadot 1987, âmes humaines, classe particulière d’êtres: Finamore 2002, âmes mercenaires: Tardieu 1980b,201-202, chant des âmes: Festugière 1953,132-135, descente de l’âme, ivresse, oubli, esclavage, liens: Hadot 1968,1181-183, Geudtner 1971, Seng 2006b, retour (*inductio/ἀναγωγή*), élévation, sotériologie: Bousset 1901, Theiler 1942,33-34, Hadot 1960b,1074, des Places 1964b, Geudtner 1971,64-77, Cremer 1969, Tardieu 1980b,202-204, Schenke 1995, Toulouse 2001, Albrile 2002, structure et composition de l’âme: Bidez 1913,88-97, Hadot 1962,436-437, 1968,1178-187.340-344, véhicule de l’âme et corps pneumatique: Hadot (I.) 1978, 98-106, Majercik 1992, Di Pasquale Barbanti 1998, Zambon 2005, Scarpi 2009,467-468; vêtements: Cumont 1906,282n69; démonologie: Bousset 1915, Cremer 1969,68-86, Geudtner 1971,56-63, des Places 1983 (télétares), Gautier 1988, Montero 1999, Rodríguez Moreno 2005, Sfameni Gasparro 2006; duplication des noms: Zago 2010a,150-151; immortalité astrale: Selzer 2006, Zago 2010a; logos puissance divine: Löhr 2009.414-415; matière fluente: Tardieu 1980b,218-219, Declava Caizzi 1988, Isnardi Parente 1990, formatrice et peintre: Dubois 2010, informe: Tardieu 1980b,206-207, résidu-lie-reflet: Theiler 1942,27, des Places 1973, Tardieu 1980b,225-228; métaphysique, tableau comparatif: Brisson 2004b,24; monothéisme païen: Tommasi 2007, Sfameni Gasparro 2010; soleil centre: Tardieu 1980b,199-200; subordination du démiurge au Dieu suprême: Hadot 1966, Beatrice 2009; transmigration des âmes humaines en anges: Finamore 2002 (non chaldaïque).

Gnostiques: Tardieu 1973 (*Trois Stèles de Seth*), Tardieu 1975, Hadot 1978,720, Tardieu 1980b (Valentiniens), Turner 1980, Abramowski 1983b (*Zostrien, Anonyme de Bruce*), 2005 2006, des Places 1983, Turner 1991, Majercik

1992, Tardieu 1996 (*Zostrien*), Tommasi 1996 2002, Brisson 1999, Guerra 2000, Roberge 2006 (*Paraphrase de Sem*), Turner 2006, Dubois 2010.

Magie. Apparitions/théophanies: Dodds 1947, Cremer 1969,42-53, Toussaint 1994, Gillon 2011; incubation: Bergemann 2010; instruments et objets: Dodds 1947, Majercik 1989,29-30; iynx/iynges: Eitrem 1942, Geudtner 1971,42-47, Chuvin 1988, Saffrey-Segonds 2001,156n16, Brisson 2004b,19-20, Perea Yébenes 2005; liens entre papyrus grecs magiques et OC: Eitrem 1942, Zago 2010a; ligatures: Majercik 1989,27-29; liturgie de Mithra (*Mithrasliturgie*), voir Recette d'immortalité; miracle de la pluie: Saffrey 1981a,213-214, Lanzi 2005a,154-155 (confond Zosime l'alchimiste avec Zosime l'historien!), Seng 2009b,142-150; noms barbares, en assistance (*παροδρεία*): Gautier 1980,lignes 561-566, Tardieu 1980b,220-224, Zago 2010b; photagogie: Cremer 1969, Bergemann 2010; recette d'immortalité (*ex-Mithrasliturgie*): Edmonds 2001 (confusionniste), Zago 2010a (nouvelle édition, liens avec OC); rites sacrificiels "chaldéens", matières purifiantes et opérateurs: Gautier 1988,104-107; silence: Saffrey-Westerink 1981,134; symboles (signes, marques), *συνδήματα*: Dodds 1947, Theiler 1942,36, des Places 1964b, Geudtner 1971,48-50, Saffrey-Westerink 1974,114, Gautier 1980,142-143, Shaw 1995,162-228, Saffrey-Westerink 1997,151, Linguiti 2003; transes: Dodds 1947.

Mythologie. Comparatisme: Johnston 1992, Rodríguez Moreno 2005; dieux démiurges: Beatrice 2009,357-364; Aïôn: Nock 1934,382-383, Theiler 1942,19-20, Saffrey-Westerink 1987,210, Casadio 1999, Lanzi 2006 (redites de Lanzi 2005c); Arès-Hermès-Aphrodite: Tommasi 1996; Attis: Lecerf 2011; Dioscures: Johnston 1992; Éros: Theiler 1964, Geudtner 1971,34-41, des Places 1983,324-325, Shaw 1995,118-126, Hadot (I.) 2005,323 (Éros/Hymenaeus), Lanzi 2006; Hadad/Adados: Saffrey 1981a,224, Athanassiadi 2006,39-40; Hadès: Lanzi 2006; Hécate: Theiler 1942,25-27, Hadot 1968,1265.275-277.396n2, 1971,226-227, Tardieu 1980b,208-209.215-218, Saffrey-Westerink 1987,168, 1997,153, Johnston 1990, Turner 1991, Majercik 2001,286-296, Simmons 2001, Brisson 2003, Fauth 2006, Athanassiadi 2009,26-27, Soares 2010; Heptaktis: Theiler 1942, 35, Seyrig 1959, des Places 1979 (ignore Seyrig 1959); Hermès Logios: Pernot 2002; Isis: Athanassiadi 2006; Kronos: Saffrey-Westerink 1987,xiii-xxiii; Lethe: Theiler 1942,32; Pariokeiseis, Antitupoi, Metanoiai: Abramowski 1983b; Phanes (Metis): Theiler 1942,16; Zeus/Zen: Hadot (I.) 1978,112-113.

Oracles. Oracles d'Apollon (Claros, Didymes, rapports avec les OC): Kroll 1916, Robert 1971, Brock 1983, Pricoco 1989, Montero-Perea 2000, Simmons 2001, Busine 2005 (ch. III "Discours théologiques en contextes",154-224); oracle d'Apollon commun à *Théosophie de Tübingen* (§ 13-14), Lactance, *Institutions divines* (I 7, 1) et inscription de la porte d'Oinoanda: Robert 1971, Gallavotti 1977 (suit Lewy 21-22, origine chaldaïque), Hall 1978, Pricoco 1987 (contre Gallavotti 1977, non chaldaïque), Pricoco 1991 (thèmes orphiques et judaïsants), Livrea 1998 (chaldaïque), Chuvin 2009 (non chaldaïque, compléments épigraphiques, iconographiques); autorité de révélation: Athanassiadi

1992, Bergemann 2010; mode d'exposition philosophique: Hadot 1987; oracle théologique (typologie): Pricoco 1989; *Théosophie de Tübingen*: Brock 1983, des Places 1984,2300-3, Pricoco 1987, Saffrey 1988, Tardieu 1989, Beatrice 2001, Toulouse 2001, Graf 2010.

Orientalisme. Apothéoses, chevaux: Johnston 1992, Perea Yébenes 2008, Zago 2010a; chaldéens/chaldaïques: Jahn 1900,170, Athanassiadi 2006,38-43, Broze-Busine-Inowlocki 2006; détermination des éléments "non grecs": Kroll 1917b, Cumont 1949,361-365 = 2009,416-420; Nouveau Testament: Abramowski 1981; philosophie barbare: Hadot 1960,238-240; rapports avec Apamée de Syrie et le temple de Bel-Hadad: Athanassiadi 1999 2005 2006,58-61 («à la fois le *Sitz-im-Leben* des OC et le laboratoire où se prépare le platonisme régénéré»); sotériologie "orientaliste": des Places 1979; syriaque (littérature): Tardieu 1980b,223-225, Brock 1983.

### *Les interprétations*

Appréciations générales: Kroll 1895,639 («ein Document heidnischer Gnosis»); Kroll 1899 («Christliches scheint zu fehlen, jedoch bietet die beste Analogie zu unserem Gedicht die christliche Gnosis»); Hadot 1960,211n24 («un véritable système philosophique proche de celui de Numénius»); Brisson 2004b,23 («un outil [des Écoles néoplatoniciennes] pour résister, sur un plan textuel et rituel, au christianisme triomphant qui allait bientôt les faire disparaître»); Seng 2009b,11 («eine religiös-philosophische Dichtung, die ... in vielem Numenius nahe steht»).

Doctrines et concepts spécifiques. Anges et dieux: Hadot 1968,I390-398, Saffrey-Westerink 1981,170; anthropologie: Majercik 1989,19-21, Seng 2006a; assimilation de la nature au destin: Tardieu 1980b; cosmologie: Hadot 1968,I180-182, Tardieu 1980b, Majercik 1989,16-19, Seng 2006b-2009b; eschatologie: Festugière 1953,132-135, Simmons 2001; existant caché: Hadot 1960b,716, Abramowski 1983a; existence comme idée d'être et principe premier: Majercik 2001,278-285; extériorité de la connaissance par rapport à l'objet connu: Hadot 1960b,872, Saffrey-Westerink 1978,119.145; figure du ciel et hiérarchies célestes (ἄζωνοι-ζωναῖοι): Seng 2009b,81-127; hypostases: Hadot 1966, Waszink 1964,20n1, 1966, Abramowski 1983b, Majercik 2001,282; idées, intelligibles, intellectuels, νοητόν-νοερόν: Theiler 1942,4-5.8.24-25, Hadot 1968,I99-100.200-201.262-269, Gigli Piccardi 1986, Seng 2009b,72-73, Soares 2010; identification du Premier dieu (Père) et de l'existence: Hadot 1966; indivisibilité de l'intelligible: Theiler 1942,11-12; liens entre triade intelligible et cosmologie: Hoffmann 1987,217-220; matière, engendrée/inengendrée: Theiler 1966, Hadot (I.) 1978,80-81, Seng 2006b, reliquat: Tardieu 1980b; ordre caché des *noeroi*: Majercik 2001,267-268; paraphrases néoplatonisantes: Breton 1978 1980; puissance démiurgique, paternelle: Theiler 1942,6-7; sympathies et antipathies: Tardieu 1980b; théologie positive: Majercik 1989,5-16, négative: Festugière 1954,132-140, des Places 1977, Lilla 1988,203-207, Tommasi 2002, Linguisti 2003; un comme être pur: Hadot 1968,I283-297; vie: Hadot 1968,I379-390; volonté paternelle: Theiler 1942,14.



Exégèse. Autorité et place des OC dans le cursus des études philosophiques chez les néoplatoniciens: Saffrey-Segonds 2001,181, Hoffmann 2007, Athanassiadi 2009; concepts originaux et réélabores postérieures: Linguiti 2003; collection progressive: Cazalais 2005,281-284; didascalie maître/disciple: Camplani 2002,122-123; liens astrologie-métaphysique (notion de *κοσμηγός*): Seng 2009b,39-74; liens mythologiques (7 pères ou sources): Majercik 2001,295-296; méthode d'exposition théologique non cachée (*ἀπαρακάλυπτος*): Hadot 1987; méthodes de commentaire: Brisson 2000b; méthodologie des combinaisons exégétiques néoplatoniciennes: Majercik 2001; prise de position contre la réincarnation des âmes humaines dans des corps d'animaux: Castelletti 2006,306-308.

Lexicologie chaldaïque. Répertoires, grec: Jahn 1899, des Places 1971,227-239, Tardieu 1978,589-671, Seng 2009b,181-183; latin: Huh-Pià 2011. — Grec: *ἀγγεῖον* Zambon 2005,313; *ἀμφιπρόσωπος*, *ἀμφίστομος*, *ἀμφιφαής* Theiler 1942,25, Hadot 1962,436, 1978,711, Dillon 1992, Majercik 2001,293, Seng 2010, Soares 2010; *ἄνδρος* des Places 1981a, Guérard 1987, Jeuneau 1987, Perczel 2000,505-510; *ἅπαξ ἐπέκεινα/δὶς ἐπέκεινα* Majercik 2001, Seng 2011; *ἀπάξειν ἑαυτὸν* Abramowski 1981; *βάδος/βυδός* Theiler 1942,10-11, Hadot 1960b,1069, des Places 1981a, Saffrey-Westerink 1987,195; *διαπόρδιοι* des Places 1981a; *ἐμπύριος* = *νοερός* Theiler 1942,22-23.33-34; *ἐπινάειν* Tardieu 1979; *ἐργάτις/operatrix* Hadot 1960b,862, Saffrey-Westerink 1978,145; *ἔργον* Charles 1993; *ἐργοτεχνίτης* Seng 2000; *θεουργός* Stroumsa 1980; *κέντρον* Saffrey-Westerink 1978,112, 1981,132, 1987,168.171, 1997,149, Majercik 2001,291; *κόλπος* Theiler 1942,26-27; *κουφίζειν* Van Riel 2008. cxviii1; *κόσμος πύριος* Seng 2000; *μισοφαής* Gautier 1980,lignes 253.291.540; *μνούρις/μνίζουρις* Tardieu 2010; *νοῦ νόος* Seng 2000; *ὄχημα* Bidez 1913,88-97, Hadot (I.) 1978,104-106, Zambon 2005, Bergemann 2010; *ὀπισθοβαρής* Kroll 1899, Hadot 1978,710, Majercik 1998b; *παράδεισος* Tardieu 2011; *πηγαίους κρατήρας* Majercik 1998a 2001,287; *προένοια* Hadot 1968,II71n2; *πῦρ* Cremer 1969, Zago 2010a,139.151; *ροῖζος* des Places 1964a,458-459, 1964b, 1981a, Bergemann 2010; *ροῖζημα* Hadot 1968,I402n2, Majercik 2001,295n136; *σειρα* Theiler 1942,27, Cremer 1969,15; *σκύβαλον* Hadot 1968,I403n1; *σπινθήρ* Hadot 1968,I183-184; *στοιχεῖα* Hadot 1968,I404n4; *τεχνίτης* Brisson 1987,811, Majercik 1998b; *τόπος* Hoffmann 2011; *τριγλῶγος* Majercik 1992, 2001,275, Tommasi 1996; *τρυξ* Theiler 1942,27; *φάος* Cremer 1969, Hoffmann 2011; *φάσματα* Gillon 2011. — Latin: *Ad-Ad/Unum-Unum* Saffrey 1981a,221-224, Tardieu 1996,104-105, Majercik 2001,287-291; *bipotens, gemini luminis* Hadot 1960b,802-803, Hadot 1962,436; *caritas-veritas-fides* Hadot (I.) 2005,326-328; *faex* Theiler 1942,27, Hadot 1960b,1003; *fons a se perfecta* Hadot 1960b,753; *geminæ mentes* Bousset 1915,141-142; *in semet ipsum conversum* Hadot 1960b,724; *linea animæ* Hadot 1960b,1038, Hadot 1968,I441; *mater* Hadot 1960b,882; *summitates et flores* Hadot 1960b,884; *simplicitate comuniens* Tardieu 1996,100-101, Abramowski 2005,540-541, *tripotens* Abramowski 1983a, Majercik 1992, Tardieu 1996,93-98, Hadot 1996a, Tommasi 1996, Abramowski 2005; *universalis atque fontana anima* Hadot 1960b,987.

Métaphores. Abeilles-idées: Gigli Piccardi 1986; abîmes éthérés: Saffrey-Westerink 1974,105-106; canaux: Geudtner 1971,5-56, Saffrey-Westerink 1978,117.149; fleur de l'intellect/de l'âme/du feu: Theiler 1942,29, des Places 1977, Saffrey-Westerink 1981,186, Guérard 1987, Jeaneau 1987, Perczel 2000,505-510, Linguisti 2003; fleuve des idées: Hadot 1960b,988.1047; musique: Festugière 1953, Moutsopoulos 1990; œil: Festugière 1954,218-220; or: Guerra 2000, Zago 2010a,162n65; sein: Saffrey-Westerink 1987,168; troupeau: des Places 1964b.

Religion. Autorité divine et révélation comme garants de la philosophie de Platon, religion complète: Hadot 1987; culte spirituel: Saffrey-Westerink 1987,209; livre sacré/Bible des néoplatoniciens: Kroll 1899, Jahn 1900, Cumont 1906,115.294n87, Bidez 1913,88n2; préfiguration du Coran: Athanassiadi 2006,48-70; inadéquation du terme Bible: Culdaut 2002; recueil canonique, normatif: Brisson 2004b; réticences porphyriennes: Hadot 1960 1961,427-428; prière: des Places 1964b, Saffrey 1981b, Brisson 2000b, Cazalais 2005,284-288; saintes femmes: Lanzi 2004; statues: Majercik 1989,26-27.

Théurgie. Définition, écoles, formes, techniques,: Bidez 1913,88-97, 1930,73-81, Eitrem 1942, Dodds 1947, Boyancé 1955, Zintzen 1965, Saffrey-Westerink 1968, Cremer 1969, Hadot 1978,717-720, Saffrey 1981c 1984, Shaw 1985 1988 1993 1995 1996 1998 2003, Clerc 1989, Nasemann 1991, Pearson 1992, Athanassiadi 1993 2009 2011, Johnston 1997, Van Liefferinge 1999 (23-126 Jamblique, 127-175 OC, 176-211 Porphyre, 213-243 Julien, 243-280 Proclus), Simmons 2001, Perea Yébenes 2005, Lanzi 2005b, Bergemann 2010; liens démiurgiques: Broze-Van Liefferinge 2009,204-231; nombres dans rituels: Saffrey-Westerink 1981,184; réticences: Hadot (I.) 1978,71n8; transmission familiale: Eitrem 1942; vertus théurgiques: Saffrey-Segonds 2001,xci-xcii; vision directe et époptie: Gautier 1980.

Triades. Non chaldaïques: Cumont 1906,262n77, Abramowski 1983b (Paroikeseis-Antitupoi-Metanoiiai), Tardieu 1973 (στάσις-κίνησις-γένεσις); Turner 1980 (Kalyptos-Protophanes-Autogenes), Abramowski 1983a 2006. — Chaldaïques/néoplatoniciennes, distorsions exégétiques: Majercik 2001; énoncés: ἄζωνοι-ζωναῖοι-κόσμοι: Theiler 1942,29-30, Seng 2009b; amour-vérité/espérance-foi (ἔρω-ἀλήθεια/ἐλπίς-πίστις): des Places 1964b,182-183, Saffrey-Westerink 1968,109-113.133, Cremer 1969,59-60.139-143, Nilsson 1974 (sens théurgique), Tardieu 1980b,215-216, des Places 1994, Hoffmann 2000, Hadot (I.) 2005,326-328, Hoffmann 2010; ἄπαξ ἐπέκεινα-Hécate-dès ἐπέκεινα: Theiler 1942,5-6. 20, Hadot 1968,I262-267.272-278, Tardieu 1980b,215-218, Majercik 2001,286-291, Seng 2011; être-vie-pensée, existence-vie-intellect, ὑπαρξις-ζωή-νοῦς, père-puissance-démiurge/intellect: Theiler 1942, 4-5.18-19, Hadot 1960b,868-869, 1960d, 1968,I95-99.112-113.260-272.306-310.325-326, Tardieu 1973 1980b, Turner 1980, Abramowski 1983a, Edwards 1990, Majercik 1992, Tardieu 1996, Tommasi 1996, Majercik 2001,266-278, Turner 2006,47-49; *exsistentia-vita-beatitudo/intellectualitas*: Hadot 1960b,852, Majercik 1992, Abramowski 2005 2006; intellect-notion-amour, *mens-notitia-amor*: Hadot 1962,436-437; Kronos-Rhêa/Hécate-Zeus:

Theiler 1942, 4-5.12-13, Hadot 1968, 1262-267.272-278, Majercik 2001, 289-296, Seng 2011 ; procession-conversion-station/permanence, προόδου-ἐπιστροφῆ-μωνή, *progressio-regressus-status*: Theiler 1942, 14-15, des Places 1964b ; trois feux : Tardieu 1980b, 213-214 ; un-intellect-âme : Theiler 1942, 8 ; un plotinien et théologie triadique : Simmons 2001, 200.

### Chronologie 1891-1978

**1891** A. JAHN, *Eclogae e Proclo de philosophia Chaldaica sive de doctrina oraculorum Chaldaicorum*, Halle, Pfeffer ; **1892** a W. KROLL, « Rezension über A. Jahn, *Eclogae e Proclo* », *Neue Philologische Rundschau*, 7, 100-101 ; b « Ein neuplatonischer Parmenidescommentar in einem Turiner Palimpsest », *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*, 47, 599-627 ; **1894** *De oraculis Chaldaicis*, Breslau, Koebner (Breslauer philologische Abhandlungen VII.1), 78, réimpr. Hildesheim, Olms, 1962 ; **1895** « Die chaldäischen Orakel », *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*, 50, 636-640, repris dans Kroll 1894 réimpr. 1962, 79-83 ; **1899** A. JAHN, « Glossarium sive vocabularium ad oracula Chaldaica », *Revue de Philologie*, 23, 193-225 ; W. KROLL, « Χαλδαϊκὰ λόγια », in G. Wissowa (ed.), *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, III. Bd., Stuttgart, Metzlerscher Verlag, 2045 ; **1900** A. JAHN, « Specimen commentarii critici et exegetici ex fontibus hausti ad Oracula Chaldaica », *Revue de Philologie*, 24, 169-192 ; **1901** W. BOUSSET, « Die Himmelsreise der Seele », *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, 4, 136-169.229-273 ; **1902** J. BIDEZ, « Ad oracula Chaldaica, v. 7-8 = p. 18, 3 Kroll », *Revue de Philologie*, 26, 180-181 ; **1903** « Un faux dieu des Oracles chaldaiques », *Revue de Philologie*, 27, 79-81 ; **1906** Fr. CUMONT, *Les religions orientales dans le paganisme romain*. Conférences faites au Collège de France en 1905, Paris, Leroux, <sup>2</sup>1909, <sup>3</sup>1929, <sup>4</sup>1963 (pagination de renvoi), <sup>5</sup>2006 (Torino, Aragno) ; **1907** U. VON WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORF, « Die Hymnen des Proklos und Synesios », *Sitzungsberichte des Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 272-295, repris dans Id., *Kleine Schriften*, Berlin, 1941, 163-191 ; **1913** J. BIDEZ, *Vie de Porphyre*, Gand, réimpr. Hildesheim, Olms, 1964 ; **1915** W. BOUSSET, « Zur Dämonologie der spätere Antike », *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, 18, 134-172 ; **1916** W. KROLL, « Die Zeit des Cornelius Labeo », *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*, 71, 309-357 ; **1917** a « Iulianus 9 », in W. Kroll (ed.), *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, X. Bd., 15-17 ; b « Die religionsgeschichtliche Bedeutung des Poseidonios », *Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum*, 39, 145-157 ; **1919** J. BIDEZ, « La liturgie des mystères chez les néo-platoniciens », *Académie royale de Belgique. Bulletin de la Classe des Lettres et des Sciences morales et politiques*, 415-430 ; **1927** K. PRAECHTER, « Zur theoretischen Begründung der Theurgie im Neuplatonismus », *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, 25, 209-213 ; **1928** a J. BIDEZ, « Note sur les mystères néo-platoniciens », *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire*, 7, 1477-1481 ; b *Catalogue des manuscrits alchimiques grecs VI. Michel Psellus. Épître sur la Chrysopée. Opuscules et extraits sur l'alchimie, la météorologie et la démonologie. En appendice, Proclus sur l'art hiératique, Psellus choix de dissertations inédites*, Bruxelles, Lamertin, 159-166 ; E. R. DODDS, « The Parmenides of Plato and the Origin of the Neoplatonic

One», *Classical Quarterly*, 22, 129-142; **1930** *La Vie de l'empereur Julien*, Paris, Belles Lettres; **1934** A. D. NOCK, «A Vision of Mandulis Aion», *The Harvard Theological Review*, 27, repris dans Id., *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World*, Z. Stewart (ed.), I-II, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 356-400; **1936** J. BIDEZ, «Proclus, Περί τῆς ἱερατικῆς τέχνης», *Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire Orientales et Slaves de l'Université libre de Bruxelles*, 4 (Mélanges Franz Cumont), 85-100; **1938** «La découverte à Trèves d'une inscription en vers grecs célébrant le dieu Hermès», *Annales de l'École des hautes études de Gand*, II. *Études d'archéologie grecque*, 13-28, 2 pl.; J. BIDEZ, FR. CUMONT, *Les Mages hellénisés. Zoroastre, Ostanès et Hystaspe d'après la tradition grecque*, I-II, Paris, Belles Lettres; **1940** A.-J. FESTUGIÈRE, «La doctrine des *uri novi* sur l'origine et le sort des âmes d'après Arnobe II. 11-66», in *Mémorial Lagrange*, Paris, Gabalda, 97-132, repris dans Id., *Hermétisme et mystique païenne*, Paris, Aubier, 1967, 261-312; **1942** S. EITREM, «La théurgie chez les néoplatoniciens et les papyrus magiques», *Symbolae Osloenses*, 22, 49-79; W. THEILER, «Die chaldäischen Orakel und die Hymnen des Synesios», *Schriften der Königsberger Gelehrten Gesellschaft*, 18/1, Halle (Saale), repris dans Id., *Forschungen zum Neoplatonismus*, Berlin, de Gruyter, 1966, 252-301 (Quellen und Studien zur Geschichte der Philosophie 10), cr A. Kurfess, *Philologische Woche*, 1944, 6-8; L. G. WESTERINK «Proclus, Procopius, Psellus», *Mnemosyne*, N.S., 3, 275-280, repris dans Id., *Texts and Studies in Neoplatonism and Byzantine Literature. Collected Papers*, Amsterdam, Hakert, 1980, 1-6; **1947** E. R. DODDS, «Theurgy and its Relationship to Neoplatonism», *The Journal of Roman Studies*, 37, 55-69, repris dans Id., *The Greeks and the Irrational*, Berkeley, University of California Press, 1959, 283-311 = trad. fr. Paris, Aubier, 1965, 270-297; **1948** A.-J. FESTUGIÈRE, «Un vers méconnu des Oracles chaldaiques dans Simplicius, *In de Caelo*, II 1, 284a14 (p. 375, 9ss. Heiberg)», *Symbolae Osloenses*, 26, 75-77; **1949** FR. CUMONT, *Lux perpetua*, Paris, Geuthner, réédition par B. Rochette, A. Motte, B. Toune, Torino, Aragno, 2009 (Bibliotheca Cumontiana, Scripta Maiora, II); **1953** A.-J. FESTUGIÈRE, *La Révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste*, III. *Les doctrines de l'âme*, Paris, Gabalda, 52-59.132-135; **1954**, IV. *Le dieu inconnu et la gnose*, Paris, Gabalda, 132-140.218-220; **1955** P. BOYANCÉ, «Théurgie et téléstique néoplatoniciennes», *Revue de l'histoire des religions*, 147, 189-209; **1956** H. LEWY, *Chaldaean Oracles and Theurgy. Mysticism Magic and Platonism in the Later Roman Empire*, Le Caire, Institut français d'archéologie orientale, 1956, xxvii + 512 p. (cr Dodds 1961), 2<sup>e</sup> éd. Tardieu 1978; **1957** E. VOGT, *Procli Hymni*, Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz; **1959** J. J. O'MEARA, *Porphry's Philosophy from Oracles in Augustine*, Paris, Études Augustiniennes, cr H. Dörrie, *Gnomon*, 32, 1960, 320-326; H. SEYRIG, «Antiquités syriennes, n° 69: Deux reliquaires», *Syria*, 36, 43-48, pl. VIII; **1960** K. H. DANNENFELDT, «Oracula chaldaica», in P. O. Kristeller, F. E. Cranz (ed.), *Catalogus Translationum et Commentariorum*, Washington, 157-164; E. R. DODDS, «Numenius and Ammonius», in *Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique V, Les sources de Plotin*, Genève, Fondation Hardt, 3-61; P. HADOT a «Citations de Porphyre chez Augustin», *Revue des études augustiniennes*, 6, 205-244; b *Marius Victorinus. Traités théologiques sur la Trinité*, II. *Commentaire*, Paris,

Cerf (Sources Chrétiennes 69); c «Être, vie, pensée chez Plotin et avant Plotin», in Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique V, *Les sources de Plotin*, Genève, Fondation Hardt, 107-157, repris dans Hadot 1999, 127-181; J.J. O'MEARA, «Comment», *Revue des études augustiniennes*, 6, 245-247; A. WLOSOK, *Laktanz und die philosophische Gnosis*, Heidelberg, Winter; 1961 E.R. DODDS, «New Light on the Chaldaean Oracles», *Harvard Theological Review*, 54, 263-273, repris dans Lewy 1978, 693-701; P. HADOT, «Fragments d'un commentaire de Porphyre sur le *Parménide*», *Revue des études grecques*, 74, 410-438, repris dans Hadot 1999, 281-316; 1962 P. HADOT, «L'image de la Trinité dans l'âme chez Victorinus et chez saint Augustin», in F.L. Cross (ed.), *Studia Patristica VI*, 411-442 (Texte und Untersuchungen 81); 1964 É. DES PLACES a «Les "Mystères d'Égypte" de Jamblique et les "Oracles chaldaïques"», *Oikoumene. Studi paleocristiani*, Catania, 455-460, repris dans des Places 1981c, 355-360; b «Jamblique et les Oracles chaldaïques», *CRAI*, 178-184; W. THEILER, «Antike und christliche Rückkehr zu Gott», in *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* (Ergänzungsband 1), *Mullus. Festschrift Theodor Klauser*, Münster, 352-361; J.H. WASZINK, *Studien zum Timaioskommentar des Calcidius*, I., Leiden, Brill (Philosophia Antiqua 12); 1965 C. ZINTZEN, «Die Wertung von Mystik und Magie in der neuplatonischen Philosophie», *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*, 108, 71-100, repris dans Id., *Athen-Rom-Florenz. Ausgewählte kleine Schriften*, D. Gall, P. Riemer (ed.), Hildesheim, Olms, 2000, 53-76; 1966 P. HADOT, «La métaphysique de Porphyre», in Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique XII, *Porphyre*, Vandœuvres-Genève, 127-163, repris dans Hadot 1999, 317-353; A. ORBE, *Estudios Valentinianos, IV. La Teología del Espíritu Santo*, Roma, Libreria Editrice dell'Università Gregoriana (Analecta Gregoriana 158), 85-87.92-95; É. DES PLACES, «Le renouveau platonicien du XI<sup>e</sup> s.: Michel Psellus et les Oracles chaldaïques», *CRAI*, 313-324; W. THEILER, «Ammonios und Porphyrios», in Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique XII, *Porphyre*, Vandœuvres-Genève, 87-123; J.H. WASZINK, «Porphyrios und Numenios», *ibid.*, 35-83; 1967 H.J. KRÄMER, *Der Ursprung der Geistmetaphysik. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Platonismus zwischen Platon und Plotin*, Amsterdam, Grüner (1<sup>re</sup> éd., 1964); P. MORAUX, «Le Parisinus graecus 1853 (Ms. E) d'Aristote», *Scriptorium*, 21, 17-41; 1968 P. HADOT, *Porphyre et Victorinus*, I-II, Paris, Études Augustiniennes; H.-D. SAFFREY-L. G. WESTERINK, *Proclus. Théologie platonicienne. Livre I*, Paris, Belles Lettres; M. L. WEST, «A Pseudo-Fragment of Heraclitus», *The Classical Review*, 18, 257-258; 1969 F.W. CREMER, *Die chaldäischen Orakel und Jamblich de mysteriis*, Meisenheim, Hain (Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie 26); J.J. O'MEARA, «Porphyry's Philosophy from Oracles in Eusebius's Praeparatio evangelica and Augustine's Dialogues of Cassiciacum», *Recherches augustiniennes*, 6, 103-139; H.-D. SAFFREY, «Nouveaux oracles chaldaïques dans les scholies du *Paris. gr.* 1853», *Revue de Philologie*, 43, 59-72, repris dans Saffrey 1990, 81-94; 1971 O. GEUDTNER, *Die Seelenlehre der chaldäischen Orakel*, Meisenheim, Hain, 1969 (Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie 35), cf H. Savon, *Revue des études anciennes*, 77 (1975, paru 1978), 276-278; P. HADOT, *Marius Victorinus. Recherches sur sa vie et ses œuvres*, Paris, Études Augustiniennes; É. DES

PLACES, *Oracles chaldaïques avec un choix de commentaires anciens*, Paris, Belles Lettres, 2<sup>e</sup> tirage "revu et corrigé", 1989; 3<sup>e</sup> tirage "revu et corrigé par Alain Segonds", 1996; L. ROBERT, «Un oracle gravé à Oinoanda», *CRAI*, 115, 597-619; 1972 É. DES PLACES, «Les Oracles chaldaïques dans la tradition patristique africaine», in F.L. Cross (ed.), *Studia Patristica*, XI/2, 27-41 (Texte und Untersuchungen 108); 1973 É. DES PLACES, «La matière dans le platonisme moyen, surtout chez Numénius et dans les Oracles chaldaïques», *Zetesis*, 215-223, repris dans des Places 1981c, 285-293; M. TARDIEU, «Les Trois Stèles de Seth. Un écrit gnostique retrouvé à Nag Hammadi», *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques*, 57, 545-575; 1974 M. P. NILSSON, *Geschichte der griechischen Religion II. Die hellenistische und römische Zeit* (1950, 21960, 31974), München, Beck, 479-481; É. DES PLACES, «Études récentes (1953-1973) sur le platonisme moyen du II<sup>e</sup> s. de notre ère», *Bulletin de l'Association G. Budé*, 347-358, repris dans des Places 1981c, 273-284; H.-D. SAFFREY-L. G. WESTERINK, *Proclus. Théologie platonicienne. Livre II*, Paris, Belles Lettres; 1975 M. MARCOVICH, «Oraculum Chaldaicum 159 des Places», *American Journal of Philology*, 96, 30; M. TARDIEU, «Ψυχαῖος σπινθήρ. Histoire d'une métaphore dans la tradition platonicienne jusqu'à Eckhart», *Revue des études augustiniennes*, 21, 225-255; 1976 J. GOULLARD, «La religion des philosophes», *Travaux et Mémoires*, 6, 305-324; J. GROSIDIER DE MATONS, «Psellos et le monde de l'irrationnel», *Travaux et Mémoires*, 6, 325-349; 1977 C. GALLAVOTTI, «Un' epigrafe teosofica ad Enoanda nel quadro della teurgia caldaica», *Philologus*, 121, 95-105; É. DES PLACES, «Denys l'Aréopagite et les Oracles chaldaïques», *Freiburger Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie*, 24, 187-190, repris dans des Places 1981c, 383-386; L. G. WESTERINK, *The Greek Commentaries on Plato's Phaedo*, I. Olympiodorus, II. Damascius, Amsterdam, North-Holland Publishing Company; 1978 I. HADOT, *Le problème du néoplatonisme alexandrin. Hiéroclès et Simplicius*, Paris, Études Augustiniennes; P. HADOT, «Bilan et perspectives sur les Oracles chaldaïques», in Tardieu 1978, 703-720, repris dans Hadot 1999, 89-114; A. S. HALL, «The Klarian Oracle at Oenoanda», *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, 32, 263-268; H.-D. SAFFREY-L. G. WESTERINK, *Proclus. Théologie platonicienne. Livre III*, Paris, Belles Lettres; M. TARDIEU, *Nouvelle édition de Lamy 1956*, Paris, Études Augustiniennes, Compléments p. 513-734, cr Stroumsa 1980.

### Répertoire alphabétique 1979-2011

L. ABRAMOWSKI 1981, «Phil. 2,6 und Oracula Chaldaica 3», in Id., *Drei christologische Untersuchungen*, Berlin, de Gruyter, 1-17 (ZNTW Beihefte 45); 1983a, «Marius Victorinus, Porphyrius und die römischen Gnostiker», *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 74, 108-128; 1983b, «Nag Hammadi 8,1 „Zostrianus“, das Anonymum Brucianum, Plotin Enn. 2,9 (33)», in H.-D. Blume, Fr. Mann (ed.), *Platonismus und Christentum. Festschrift für Heinrich Dörrie*, Münster Westfalen, 1-10 (Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum, Ergänzungsband 10); 2005, «Nicänismus und Gnosis im Rom des Bischofs Liberius: Der Fall des Marius Victorinus», *Zeitschrift für Antikes Christentum*, 8, 513-566 (cr de Tardieu 1996); 2006, «„Audi, ut dico“. Literarische

Beobachtungen und chronologische Erwägungen zu Marius Victorinus und den „platonisierenden“ Nag Hammadi-Traktaten», *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, 117, 145-168; E. ALBRILE 2002, «Il segreto della madre lucente: estasi e teurgia nel sincretismo gnostico», *MHNH*, 2, 145-174; R. A. ARTHUR 2006, «Ps-Dionysius' Angelic Hierarchy and the *Chaldaean Oracles*», in F. M. Young, M. J. Edwards, P. Parvis (ed.), *Studia Patristica XLII*, Peeters, Leuven, 23-28; 2008, *Pseudo-Dionysius as Polemicist. The Development and Purpose of the Angelic Hierarchy in Sixth Century Syria*, Aldershot, Ashgate, 53-57; P. ATHANASSIADI 1992, «Philosophers and Oracles: Shifts of Authority in Late Paganism», *Byzantion*, 62, 45-62; 1993, «Dreams, Theurgy, and Freelance Divination: the Testimony of Iamblichus», *Journal of Roman Studies*, 83, 115-130; 1999, «The *Chaldean Oracles*: Theology and Theurgy», in P. Athanassiadi, M. Frede (ed.), *Pagan Monotheism in Late Antiquity*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1999, 149-183; 2002, «Byzantine Commentators on the *Chaldaean Oracles*: Psellos and Plethon», in K. Ierodiakonou (ed.), *Byzantine Philosophy and its Ancient Sources*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 237-251; 2005, «Apamea and the *Chaldaean Oracles*: a Holy City and a Holy Book», in A. Smith (ed), *The Philosopher and Society in Late Antiquity. Essays in Honour of P. Brown*, Swansea, Classical Press of Wales, 117-143; 2006, *La lutte pour l'orthodoxie dans le platonisme tardif de Numénius à Damascius*, Paris, Belles Lettres; 2009, «Polytheistic Cult and Monotheistic Theology in the World of Late Antiquity», in T. Schabert, G. Zarone (ed.), *Gott oder Götter? God or Gods?*, Würzburg, Königshausen & Neumann, 15-31; 2010, «Julian the Theurgist: man or myth?», in Seng-Tardieu 2010; 2011, «Le théurge comme dispensateur universel de la grâce: entre les *Oracles chaldaïques* et Jamblique», in Lecerf-Saudelli 2011;

P. F. BEATRICE 1988, «Un oracle antichrétien chez Arnobe», in *Mémorial J. Gribomont (1920-1986)*, Roma, Augustinianum, 107-129 (*Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum* 27); 2001, *Anonymi monophysitae Theosophia. An Attempt at Reconstruction*, Leiden, Brill (*Supplementum Vigiliae Christianae* 56); 2009, «The Oriental Religions and Porphyry's Universal Way for the Soul's Deliverance», in C. Bonnet, V. Pirenne-Delforge, D. Praet (éd.), *Les religions orientales dans le monde grec et romain: cent ans après Cumont (1906-2006). Bilan historique et historiographique*, Bruxelles et Rome, Institut historique belge de Rome, 343-368; G. BECHTLE 1999, *The Anonymous Commentary on Plato's Parmenides*, Bern, 1999 (*Berner Philosophische Studien*, 22); 2000, «The Question of Being and the Dating of the Anonymous *Parmenides* Commentary», *Ancient Philosophy*, 20, 393-414; 2006, «A Neglected Testimony (fragment?) on the *Chaldaean Oracles*», *Classical Quarterly*, 56, 563-581; J. BOUFFARTIGUE 1992, *L'Empereur Julien et la culture de son temps*, Paris, Études Augustiniennes; S. BRETON 1978, «Téléologie et ontogénie. Variation sur les *Oracles chaldaïques*», *Recherches de science religieuse*, 66, 5-26; 1980, «L'homme et l'âme humaine dans les *Oracles chaldaïques*», *Diotima*, 8, 21-24; L. BRISSON 1987, «Amélius: sa vie, son œuvre, sa doctrine, son style», in W. Haase, H. Temporini (ed.), *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, II/36/2, 793-860; 1999, «The Platonic Background in the *Apocalypse of Zostrianos*: Numenius and *Letter II* attributed to Plato», in

J.J. Cleary (ed.), *Tradition of Platonism. Essays in Honour of J. Dillon*, Aldershot, Ashgate, 173-188; **2000 a**, «La place des Oracles chaldaïques dans la Théologie Platonicienne», in A.-Ph. Segonds, C. Steel (éd.), *Proclus et la Théologie platonicienne*, Leuven, Leuven University Press, 109-162 (*Ancient and Medieval Philosophy* 26); **b**, «Le commentaire comme prière destinée à assurer le salut de l'âme: la place et le rôle des Oracles chaldaïques dans le Commentaire sur le Timée de Platon par Proclus», in M.-O. Goulet-Cazé (éd.), *Le Commentaire entre tradition et innovation*, Paris, Vrin, 329-353; **2003**, «Plato's *Timaeus* and the Chaldaean Oracles», in Gr. J. Reydams-Schils (ed.), *Plato's *Timaeus* as Cultural Icon*, Notre Dame (Indiana), University of Notre Dame, 111-132; **2004 a**, «Kronos. Summit of the Intellective Hebdomad in Proclus' Interpretation of the Chaldean Oracles», in G. Van Riel, C. Macé, L. Van Campe (ed.), *Platonic Ideas and Concept Formation in Ancient and Medieval Thought*, Leuven, Leuven University Press, 191-210 (*Ancient and Medieval Philosophy*, I/32); **b**, «Le recueil des Oracles chaldaïques et sa réception», in E. Norelli (éd.), *Recueils normatifs et canons dans l'Antiquité*, Lausanne, Zèbre, 11-24; **2005**, «Oracles chaldaïques», in R. Goulet (éd.), *Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques*, IV. *De Labeo à Ovidius*, Paris, CNRS Éditions, 784-792; S. BROCK **1983**, «A Syriac Collection of Prophecies of the Pagan Philosophers», *Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica*, 14, 203-246; M. BROZE, A. BUSINE, S. INOWLOCKI **2006**, «Les catalogues de peuples sages. Fonctions et contextes d'utilisation», *Kernos*, 19, 131-144; M. BROZE, C. VAN LIEFFERINGE **2009**, *Jamblique. Les Mystères d'Égypte. Réponse d'Abamon à la Lettre de Porphyre à Anébon*, Bruxelles, Ousia; A. BUSINE **2004**, «Des logia pour la philosophie. À propos du titre de la *Philosophie des Oracles* de Porphyre», *Philosophie antique*, 4, 151-168; **2005**, *Paroles d'Apollon. Pratiques et traditions oraculaires dans l'Antiquité tardive (IV-VI s.)*, Leiden, Brill, 2005 (*Religions in the Graeco-Roman World* 156);

A. CAMPLANI **2002**, «Forme di rapporto maestro/discepolo nei testi magici e alchemici della tarda antichità», in G. Filoramo (ed.), *Maestro e discepolo. Temi e problemi della direzione spirituale tra VI s. a. C. e VII s. d. C.*, Brescia, Morcelliana, 107-126; A. CAMPLANI, M. ZAMBON **2002**, «Il sacrificio come problema in alcune correnti filosofiche di età imperiale», *Annali di storia dell'esegesi*, 19, 59-99; G. CASADIO **1999**, «From Hellenistic *Aion* to Gnostic *Aiones*», in D. Zeller (ed.), *Religion im Wandel der Kosmologien*, Bern, Lang, 175-190; C. CASTELLETTI **2006**, *Porfirio. Sullo Stige*, Milano, Bompiani (Testi a fronte 99); S. CAZELAIS **2005**, «Quelques remarques sur la réception d'un pseudépigraphé: les Oracles chaldaïques», *Laval théologique et philosophique*, 61, 273-289; A. CHARLES **1993**, «La théurgie, nouvelle figure de l'ergon dans la vie philosophique», in H.J. Blumenthal, E. G. Clark (ed.), *The Divine Iamblichus. Philosopher and Man of Gods*, London, Duckworth, 107-115; M. CHASE **2004**, «What does Porphyry mean by  $\delta\epsilon\omega\nu$  πατήρ?», *Dionysius*, 22, 77-94; P. CHUVIN **1988**, «I filosofi e la loro religione nella società di Alessandria nel V secolo», in F. Romano, A. Tiné (ed.), *Questioni Neoplatoniche*, Roma, "L'Erma" di Bretschneider, 45-61; **2009a**, *Chronique des derniers païens*, Paris, Belles Lettres [1990, 21991]; **2009b**, «Réception d'un oracle de Claros en milieu chrétien», in M.-A. Amir



Moezzi, J.-D. Dubois, C. Jullien, F. Jullien (éd.), *Pensée grecque et sagesse d'Orient. Hommage à M. Tardieu*, Turnhout, Brepols, 169-176; J.-B. CLERC 1989, «À propos d'Ammien 23, 6, 25: une prétendue profession de foi en l'astrologie», in M. Piérart, O. Curty (éd.), *Historia testis. Mélanges d'épigraphie, d'histoire ancienne et de philologie offerts à T. Zawadzki*, Fribourg, Éditions Universitaires, 167-174; K. CORRIGAN 2000, «Platonism and Gnosticism. The Anonymous Commentary on the Parmenides: Middle or Neoplatonic?», in J. D. Turner, R. Majercik (ed.), *Gnosticism and Later Platonism. Themes, Figures, and Texts*, Atlanta, 141-177 (SBL Symposium Series 12); F. CULDAUT 2002, «Les Oracles chaldaïques et la notion d'apocryphe», in C. Mimouni (éd.), *Apocryphité: histoire d'un concept transversal aux religions du livre*, Turnhout, Brepols, 45-49 (Bibliothèque de l'École des hautes études. Sciences religieuses 113);

F. DECLEVA CAIZZI 1988, «La "materia scorrevole". Sulle tracce di un dibattito perduto», in J. Barnes, M. Mignucci (ed.), *Matter and Metaphysics*, Napoli, Bibliopolis, 427-470; E. DELLI 2011, «Psellos et les Oracles chaldaïques», in Lecerf-Saudelli 2011; J. DILLON 1992, «Plotinus and the Chaldaean Oracles», in S. Gersh, C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *Platonism in Late Antiquity*, Notre Dame, University of Notre Dame Press, 131-140 (Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity 8), repris dans Id., *The Great Tradition. Further Studies in the Development of Platonism and Early Christianity*, Aldershot, Ashgate, 1997, n° XV; J.-D. DUBOIS 2010, «La forme de la matière selon la démiurgie valentinienne et les Oracles chaldaïques», in Seng-Tardieu 2010;

R. EDMONDS 2001, «Did the Mithraists Inhale? A Technique for Theurgic Ascent in the Mithras Liturgy, the Chaldaean Oracles, and some Mithraic Frescoes», *The Ancient World*, 32, 10-22; M. J. EDWARDS 1990, «Porphyry and the Intelligible Triad», *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 110, 14-25;

W. FAUTH 2006, *Hekate Polymorphos. Wesensvarianten einer antiken Gottheit. Zwischen frühgriechischer Theogonie und spätantikem Synkretismus*, Hamburg, Kovac (Schriftenreihe altsprachliche Forschungsergebnisse 4); J. F. FINAMORE 1985, *Iamblichus and the Theory of the Vehicle of the Soul*, Chico, Scholars Press (American Classical Studies 14); 1998, «Plotinus, Psellos, and the Chaldean Oracles: a Reply to Majercik», *The Ancient World*, 29, 107-110; 2002, «"In Angelic Space": Chaldaean Oracles fr. 138 and Iamblichus», in M. Barbanti, G. R. Giardina, P. Manganaro (ed.), *Ἐνωσις καὶ φιλία. Unione e amicizia: Omaggio a F. Romano*, Catania, CUECM, 425-432;

F. GARCÍA BAZÁN 1991, *Oráculos Caldeos, con una selección de testimonios de Proclo, Pselo y M. Itálico, Numenio de Apamea, Fragmentos y testimonios*, Madrid, Gredos; P. GAUTIER 1980, «Le De daemonibus du Pseudo-Psellos», *Revue des études Byzantines*, 38, 105-194; 1988, «Pseudo-Psellos: Graecorum opiniones de daemonibus», *Revue des études Byzantines*, 46, 85-107; S. GENTILE 1986, «Giano Lascaris, Germain de Ganay et la "prisca teologia" in Francia», *Rinascimento. Rivista dell'Istituto Nazionale di studi sul Rinascimento*, Ser. II, 26, 51-76; 1990, «Sulle prime traduzioni dal greco di Marsilio Ficino», *Rinascimento. Rivista dell'Istituto Nazionale di studi sul Rinascimento*, Ser. II, 30, 57-104; D. GIGLI PICCARDI 1986, «Sul fr. 37 degli Oracoli Caldaici», *Prometheus*, 12, 267-281;

F. GILLON 2011, «Les apparitions divines dans les Oracles chaldaiques et selon Proclus», in Lecerf-Saudelli 2011; F. GRAF 2010, «Apollinische Divination und theologische Spekulation. Zu den Orakeln der Tübinger Theosophie», in Seng-Tardieu 2010; E. GRITTI 2003, «La “scienza teologica” di Proclo: *πραγματειῶν παιδίαν παίζειν* (Platone, Parmenide 137b2)», in M. Bonazzi, F. Trabattoni (ed.), *Platone e la tradizione platonica. Studi di filosofia antica*, Milano, Cisalpino, 265-299 (Quaderni di Acme 58); C. GUÉRARD 1987, «L'hyparxis de l'âme et la fleur de l'intellect dans la mystagogie de Proclus», in J. Pépin, H.-D. Saffrey (éd.), *Proclus. Lecteur et interprète des Anciens*, Paris, Éditions du CNRS, 335-348; C. GUERRA 2000, «Porfirio editore di Plotino e la “paideia antignostica”, *Patavium*, 15, 111-137; J.-B. GUILLAUMIN 2008, «Néoplatonisme et encyclopédisme dans l'œuvre de Martianus Capella», *Revue des études latines*, 86, 167-190;

I. HADOT 1987, *Simplicius. Sa vie, son œuvre, sa survie*, I. Hadot (ed.), Berlin, De Gruyter; 2005, *Arts libéraux et philosophie dans la pensée antique. Contribution à l'histoire de l'éducation et de la culture dans l'Antiquité*, Paris, Vrin, 578 p. (1<sup>re</sup> éd., Paris, Études Augustiniennes, 1984); P. HADOT 1987, «Théologie, exégèse, révélation, écriture dans la philosophie grecque», in M. Tardieu (éd.), *Les Règles de l'interprétation*, Paris, Cerf, 13-34, repris dans: Hadot 1998, 27-58; 1996 a, «Remarques additionnelles», in Tardieu 1996, 113-114; b, «Porphyre et Victorinus. Questions et hypothèses», in Tardieu 1996, 115-125; 1998, *Études de philosophie ancienne*, Paris, Belles Lettres; 1999, *Plotin, Porphyre. Études néoplatoniciennes*, Paris, Belles Lettres; Ph. HOFFMANN 1987, «Sur quelques aspects de la polémique de Simplicius contre Jean Philopon: de l'invective à la réaffirmation de la transcendance du ciel», in Hadot (I.) 1987, 183-221; 2000, «La triade chaldaique *ἔρως, ἀλήθεια, πίστις*: de Proclus à Simplicius», in A. Ph. Segonds, C. Steel (éd.), *Proclus et la Théologie platonicienne*, Leuven, University Press, 459-489; 2007, «Le canon de lecture des dialogues dans les écoles néoplatoniciennes de l'Antiquité tardive», *Internet (gral.unipi)*, 1-22; 2010, «Le dossier de la triade (tétrade?) chaldaique Erôs-Alêtheia-Pistis», in Seng-Tardieu 2010; 2011, «Φῶς et τόπος: le fr. 51 des Places = p. 28 Kroll des *Oracles chaldaiques* et la doctrine du “lieu” selon Proclus», in Lecerf-Saudelli 2011; M.-J. HUH-J. PIA 2011, «L'usage du vocabulaire chaldaique chez les néoplatoniciens latins», in Lecerf-Saudelli 2011;

M. ISNARDI PARENTE 1990, «*ὕλη θευστή*», *La Parola del Passato*, 45, 277-284;

É. JEAUNEAU 1987, «Jean Scot et la métaphysique du feu» (inédit), in Id., *Études érigéniennes*, Paris, Études Augustiniennes, 299-319; S.I. JOHNSTON 1990, *Hekate Soteira. A Study of Hecate's Roles in the Chaldean Oracles and Related Literature*, Atlanta, Scholars Press (American Classical Studies 21); 1992, «Riders in the Sky: Cavalier Gods and Theurgic Salvation in the Second Century A. D.», *Classical Philology*, 87, 303-321; 1997, «Rising to the Occasion. Theurgic Ascent in its Cultural Milieu», in P. Schäfer, H. Kippenberg (ed.), *Envisioning Magic*, Leiden, Brill, 165-195 (Studies in the History of Religions 75); 2004a, «Working Overtime in the Afterlife; or, No Rest for the Virtuous», in R. S. Boustan, A. Y. Reed (ed.), *Heavenly Realms and Earthly Realities in Late*

*Antique Religions*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 85-100; **2004b**, «Fiat lux, fiat ritus: Divine Light and the Late Antique Defence of Ritual», in M. T. Kapstein (ed.), *The Presence of Light. Divine Radiance and Religious Experience*, Chicago, Chicago University Press, 5-24;

I. KLUTSTEIN **1986**, «Marsile Ficini et les Oracles chaldaïques», in G. C. Garfagnini (ed.), *Marsilio Ficino e il ritorno di Platone. Studi e documenti*, I-II, Firenze, Olschki, 331-338; **1987**, *Marsilio Ficino et la théologie ancienne: Oracles chaldaïques, Hymnes orphiques, Hymnes de Proclus*, Firenze, Olschki (Quaderni di Rinascimento 5); **1992**, «Oracula Chaldaica. Addenda et corrigenda», in V. Brown, P. O. Kristeller (ed.), *Catalogus Translationum et Commentariorum. Mediaeval and Renaissance Latin Translations and Commentaries*, t. VII, Washington, Catholic University of America Press, 326-328;

S. LANZI **2001**, *Michele Psello. Oracoli caldaici. Con appendici su Proclo e Michele Italo*, Milano, Mimesis; **2004**, «Sospittra, la teurga: una "holy woman" iniziata ai misteri caldaici», *Studi e Materiali di Storia delle Religioni*, 70, 275-294; **2005a**, «La questione dei Giuliani e gli Oracoli caldaici: alcuni problemi storico-religiosi», *Mythos*, 12, 145-169; **2005b**, «La teurgia soteriologica degli Oracoli caldaici», *Simmetria*, 7, 57-67; **2005c**, «Oracula Chaldaica. Alcune osservazioni storico-religiose», *Studi sull'Oriente Cristiano*, 9, 29-46; **2006**, «Aion, Eros e Hades nei frammenti caldaici», *Kervan*, 3, 35-49; A. LECERF **2011**, «Le mythe d'Attis chez Julien au regard des Oracles chaldaïques», in Lecerf-Saudelli 2011; A. LECERF-L. SAUDELLI **2011**, *Oracles chaldaïques: fragments et philosophie*, Heidelberg, Winter (Bibliotheca Chaldaica); S. LILLA, «La teologia negativa dal pensiero greco classico a quello patristico e bizantino», *Helikon*, 28, 203-279; A. LINGUITI **1995**, *Commentarium in Platonis «Parmenidem»*. *Corpus dei papiri filosofici greci e latini (CPF). Testi e lessico nei papiri di cultura greca et latina. Parte III: Commentari*, Firenze, Olschki, 63-202.601-612; **2003**, «Motivi di teologia negativa negli Oracoli caldaici», in F. Calabi (ed.), *Arrhetos Theos. L'ineffabilità del Primo Principio nel Medioplatonismo*, Genova, Edizioni ETS, 103-117; E. LIVREA **1998**, «Sull'iscrizione teosofica di Enoanda», *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, 122, 90-96; W. LÖHR **2009**, «Logos», *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*, 23, 327-435; G. LUCK **1989**, «Theurgy and Form of Worship in Neoplatonism», in J. Neusner et alii (ed.), *Religion, Science, and Magic. In Concert and in Conflict*, New York, 195-225;

P. MAGNARD **2001**, *Marsile Ficini. Les platonismes à la Renaissance*, Paris, Vrin; R. MAJERIC **1989**, *The Chaldean Oracles. Text, Translation, and Commentary*, Leiden, Brill (Studies in Greek and Roman Religion 5); **1992**, «The Existence-Life-Intellect Triad in Gnosticism and Neoplatonism», *Classical Quarterly*, 42, 475-488; **1998 a**, «A Reminiscence of the Chaldaean Oracles at Gregory of Nazianzus, Or 29, 2», *Vigiliae Christianae*, 52, 286-292; **b**, «The Chaldean Oracles and the School of Plotinus», *Ancient World*, 29, 91-105; **2001**, «Chaldaean Triads in Neoplatonic Exegesis: Some Reconsideration», *Classical Quarterly*, 51, 265-296; R. MASULLO **1987**, «Ascendenze omeriche e caldaiche negli Inni di Proclo», *Vichiana*, 16, 151-168, doublon dans *Annali della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia dell'Università di Napoli*, N.S. 18, 1987-1988, 321-

338; S. MONTERO 1999, «Porfirio e il sacrificio divinatorio», *Les écrivains du III<sup>e</sup> s. et l'Etrusca disciplina, Caesarodunum*, Suppl. 66 (*La divination dans le monde étrusco-italique*, vol. VIII), 81-93; S. MONTERO, S. PEREA 2000, «La misteriosa inscripción hispana a Zeus, Serapis y Iao: su relación con la magia y con la teología oracular del Apolo de Klaros», in G. Paci (ed.), *Epigraphai. Miscellanea epigrafica in onore di L. Gasperini*, Tivoli, Tipigraf, II, 711-736; C. MORESCHINI 2009, «Gli Oracula Chaldaïca nel Rinascimento italiano: alcuni osservazioni», *Koinonia*, 33, 143-169; 2011, «Les Oracles chaldaïques de Syrianus à Psellos», in Lecerf-Saudelli 2011; E. MOUTSOPOULOS 1990, «Musique et musicalité dans les Oracles chaldaïques», *Kernos*, 3, 281-293; M. MUCCILLO 1986, «Marsilio Ficino e Francesco Patrizi da Cherso», in G. C. Garfagnini (ed.), *Marsilio Ficino e il ritorno di Platone. Studi e Documenti*, 2 vol., Firenze, Olschki, 615-679 (Studi e Testi 15); 1996, *Platonismo, Ermetismo e "Prisca Teologia". Ricerche di storiografia filosofica rinascimentale*, Firenze, Olschki;

B. NASEMANN 1991, *Theurgie und Philosophie in Jamblichs De Mysteriis*, Stuttgart, Teubner;

D. J. O'MEARA 1989, *Psellos. Philosophica Minora II. Opuscula psychologica, theologica, daemonologica*, Leipzig, Teubner;

B. A. PEARSON 1992, «Theurgic Tendencies in Gnosticism and Iamblichus' Conception of Theurgy», in R. T. Wallis, J. Bremen (ed.), *Neoplatonism and Gnosticism*, Albany, State University of New York Press, 253-276 (Studies in Neoplatonism, Ancient and Modern 6); A. PENATI, 1983, «L'influenza del sistema caldaico sul pensiero teologico dell'imperatore Giuliano», *Rivista di filosofia neoscolastica*, 75, 543-562; I. PERCZEL 2000, «Pseudo-Dionysius and the Platonic Theology. A Preliminary Study», in A. Ph. Segonds, C. Steel (éd.), *Proclus et la Théologie platonicienne*, Leuven, University Press, 491-532; S. PEREA YÉBENES 2008, «Compra de un caballo (PSI VI, 729). El caballo militar, mucho mas que un animal», *Aquila Legionis. Cuadernos de estudios sobre el Ejército Romano*, 10, 65-80; 2005, «Un capítulo de la teúrgia antigua: los oráculos de Hécate y la cuestión de las "estatuas parlantes"», *MHNH*, 5, 189-240; L. PERNOT 2002, «L'empreinte d'Hermès Logios. Une citation d'Aelius Aristide chez Julien et chez Damascius», *Rendiconti dell'Accademia di archeologia lettere e belle arti*, 71, 171-207; É. DES PLACES 1979, «Éléments de sotériologie orientale dans le platonisme à la fin de l'Antiquité» (Colloque de Rome, 1979), repris dans des Places 1981c, 361-371; 1981 a, «Les Oracles chaldaïques et Denys l'Aréopagite», in S. Breton (éd.), *Néoplatonisme. Mélanges offerts à J. Tronillard*, Fontenay-aux-Roses, École Normale Supérieure, 291-295 (Cahiers de Fontenay 19-22); b, «Le Pseudo-Denys l'Aréopagite, ses précurseurs et sa postérité», *Dialogues d'histoire ancienne*, 7, 323-332; c, *Études platoniciennes 1929-1979*, Leiden, Brill (EPRO 90); 1983, «Notes sur quelques Oracles chaldaïques», in C. Froidefond (éd.), *Mélanges É. Delebecque*, Aix-en-Provence, Publications de l'Université de Provence, 319-329; 1984, «Les Oracles chaldaïques», *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, II/17/4, 2299-2335; 1988, «Quelques progrès récents des études sur Michel Psellus en relation surtout avec les "Oracles chaldaïques"», *Orpheus*, 9, 344-348; 1994,

«Les Oracles chaldaïques dans le commentaire de Proclus sur le *Premier Alcibiade* de Platon», in G. Sfameni Gasparro (ed.), *Ἀγαθή ἑλπίς. Studi storico-religiosi in onore di U. Bianchi*, Roma, "L'Erma" di Bretschneider, 285-290 (Storia delle Religioni 11); D. POTTER 1991, «Review of Majercik, Ruth: The Chaldaean Oracles (1989)», *The Journal of Roman Studies*, 81, 225-227; S. PRICOCO 1987, «Un oracolo di Apollo su Dio», *Rivista di storia e letteratura religiosa*, 23, 4-36; 1989, «L'oracolo teologico», in A. Garzya (ed.), *Metodologie della ricerca sulla tarda antichità*, Napoli, D'Auria, 267-285; 1991, «Tre frammenti oracolari di Apollo (Lact. inst. 1.7.9-10)», *Studi tardoantichi*, 8, 337-354 (*Polyanthema. Studi di letteratura cristiana antica offerti a Salvatore Costanza*, 2);

M. ROBERGE 2006, «La dynamis dans les Oracles chaldaïques et la *Paraphrase de Sem* (NHC VII, 1)», in L. Painchaud, P.-H. Poirier (éd.), *Actes du colloque "L'Évangile selon Thomas et les textes de Nag Hammadi"*, Québec, Peeters, 473-516 (Bibliothèque copte de Nag Hammadi Études 9); I. RODRÍGUEZ MORENO 2005, «Influencias de los Oráculos caldeos en Porfirio de Tiro», in A. Alvar Ezquerro, J.F. González Castro (ed.), *Actas del XI congreso español de estudios clásicos (2003)*, I, Madrid, Ed. Clásicas, 385-395;

H.-D. SAFFREY 1981 a, «Les néoplatoniciens et les Oracles chaldaïques», *Revue des études Augustiniennes*, 27, 209-225, repris dans Saffrey 1990, 63-79; b, «L'Hymne IV de Proclus. Prière aux dieux des Oracles chaldaïques», in S. Breton (éd.), *Néoplatonisme. Mélanges offerts à Jean Trouillard*, Fontenay-aux-Roses, ENS, 297-312 (Cahiers de Fontenay 19-22), repris dans Saffrey 1990, 193-206; c, «La théurgie comme pénétration d'éléments extra-rationnels dans la philosophie grecque tardive», repris dans Saffrey 1990, 33-49; 1984, «La théurgie comme phénomène culturel chez les néoplatoniciens (IV<sup>e</sup>-V<sup>e</sup> s.)», *Koinonia*, 8, 161-171, repris dans Saffrey 1990, 51-61; 1987, «Proclus, diadoque de Platon», in J. Pépin, H.-D. Saffrey (éd.), *Proclus, lecteur et interprète des Anciens*, Paris, CNRS, xi-xxviii, repris dans Saffrey 1990, 141-158; 1988, «Connaissance et inconnissance de Dieu: Porphyre et la Théosophie de Tübingen», in J. Duffy, J. Peradotto (ed.), *Gonimos. Neoplatonic and Byzantine Studies presented to L. G. Westerink*, Buffalo, 3-20, repris dans Saffrey 1990, 11-30; 1990, *Recherches sur le néoplatonisme après Plotin*, Paris, Vrin (Histoire des doctrines de l'Antiquité classique 14); 1992, «Accorder entre elles les traditions théologiques: une caractéristique du néoplatonisme athénien», in E. P. Bos, P. A. Meijer (ed.), *On Proclus and his Influence on Medieval Philosophy*, Leiden, Brill, 35-50 (Philosophia Antiqua 53), repris dans Saffrey 2000, 143-158; 2000, *Le néoplatonisme après Plotin*, Paris, Vrin (Histoire des doctrines de l'Antiquité classique 24); H.-D. SAFFREY, A.-Ph. SEGONDS 2001, *Marinus. Proclus ou sur le bonheur*, Paris, Belles Lettres; H.-D. SAFFREY, L. G. WESTERINK 1981, *Proclus. Théologie platonicienne. Livre IV*, Paris, Belles Lettres; 1987, *Livre V*; 1997, *Livre VI*; L. SAUDELLI 2011, «Oracles chaldaïques, fr. 163», in Lecerf-Sauelli 2011; P. SCARPI 2009, *La Rivelazione segreta di Ermete Trismegisto*, I, Milano, Lorenzo Valla, Mondadori; H.-M. SCHENKE 1995, «Rezension zu R. Majercik, The Chaldaean Oracles (1989)», *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 120, 228-231; B. SELTER 2006, «Astral Immortality in the *Carmina Latina Epigraphica*

of the City of Rome: a Comparison between Pagan and Christian Views», *Sacris Erudiri*, 45, 47-106; H. SENG 1996, *Untersuchungen zum Vokabular und zur Metrik in den Hymnen des Synesios*, Frankfurt/Main (Patrologia, 4); 2000, «I frammenti caldaici 33 e 5 des Places», in G. Lanata (ed.), *Il tardoantico alle soglie del duemila. Diritto Religione Società*, Pisa, Edizioni ETS, 99-103; 2005, «Rezension zu R. M. Van den Berg, *Proclus' Hymns*, 2001», *Gnomon*, 77, 9-14; 2006 a, «Der Körper des Theurgen», in *Pagani e cristiani alla ricerca della salvezza (secoli I-III)*, Roma, 849-860 (Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum 96); b, «Seele und Kosmos bei Macrobius», in B. Feichtinger, S. Lake, H. Seng (ed.), *Körper und Seele. Aspekte spätantiker Anthropologie*, München-Leipzig, Saur, 115-141 (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 215); 2009 a, «Übersetzungen der Chaldaeischen Orakel in der Frühen Neuzeit», in W. Kofler, F. Schaffnerath, K. Töchterle (ed.), *Pontes V. Übersetzung als Vermittlerin antiker Literatur*, Innsbruck, 82-98; b, *Κόσμοι, ἄζωοι, ζῶντες. Drei Begriffe chaldaeischer Kosmologie und ihr Fortleben*, Heidelberg, Winter; 2010, «Ἀμφίφανής: Facetten einer chaldaeischen Vokabel», in Seng-Tardieu 2010; 2011, «Ἄπαξ ἐπέξευα et δις ἐπέξευα», in Lecerf-Saudelli 2011; H. SENG, M. TARDIEU 2010, *Die chaldaeischen Orakel: Kontext, Interpretation, Rezeption*, Heidelberg, Winter; G. SFAMENI GASPARRO 2006, «Magia e demonologia nella polemica tra cristiani e pagani (v-vi sec.): La Vita di Severo di Zaccaria Scolastico», *MHNH*, 6, 33-92; 2010, «Gli Oracoli Caldei e l'attuale dibattito sul "monoteismo pagano": sull'uso e l'abuso di una categoria storico-religiosa», in Seng-Tardieu 2010; G. SHAW 1985, «Theurgy: Rituals of Unification in the Neoplatonism of Iamblichus», *Traditio*, 41, 1-28; 1988, «Theurgy as Demiurgy: Iamblichus' Solution to the Problem of Embodiment», *Dionysius*, 12, 37-59; 1993 «The Geometry of Grace: a Pythagorean Approach to Theurgy», in H. J. Blumenthal, E. G. Clark (ed.), *The Divine Iamblichus: Philosopher and Man of Gods*, London, Duckworth, 116-137; 1995, *Theurgy and the Soul. The Neoplatonism of Iamblichus*, The Pennsylvania State University Press; 1996, «After Aporia: Theurgy in Later Platonism», *The Journal of Neoplatonic Studies*, 5, 3-41; 1998, «Divination in the Neoplatonism of Iamblichus», in R. M. Berchman (ed.), *Mediators of the Divine. Horizons of Prophecy, Divination, Dreams, and Theurgy in Mediterranean Antiquity*, Atlanta, Scholars Press, 225-267; 2003, «Containing Exstasy: the Strategies of Iamblichean Soul», *Dionysius*, 21, 53-87; A. SHEPPARD 1982, «Proclus' Attitude to Theurgy», *Classical Quarterly*, N.S. 32 (= 76), 212-224; M. B. SIMMONS 2001, «The Eschatological Aspects of Porphyry's Anti-Christian Polemics in a Chaldaean-Neoplatonic Context», *Classica et Mediaevalia*, 52, 193-215; A. SMITH 1987, «Porphyrian Studies since 1913», in W. Haase (ed.), *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, II/36/2, Berlin, De Gruyter, 717-773; 1993, *Porphyrii philosophi fragmenta*, Stuttgart-Leipzig, Teubner; L. SOARES 2010, «La question des intelligibles chez Plotin Traité 32 et dans les Oracles chaldaïques», in Seng-Tardieu 2010; M. STAUSBERG 1998, *Faszination Zarathustras. Zoroaster und die Europäische Religionsgeschichte der Frühen Neuzeit*, I-II, Berlin, De Gruyter (Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten 42); 2000, «Neo-Zoroastrian Hellenism in 15th Century Byzantine Empire: The Case

of George Gemistos Plethon», in *Third International Congress Proceedings*, Mumbai, Cama Oriental Institute, 81-87; **2001**, «Von den Chaldäischen Orakeln zu den Hundert Pforten und darüber hinaus: Das 17. Jahrhundert als rezeptionsgeschichtliche Epochenschwelle», *Archiv für Religionsgeschichte*, 3, 257-272; G. G. STROUMSA **1980**, «Chaldaean Oracles», *Numen*, 27, 167-172; D. SUSANETTI **1992**, *Sinesio di Cirene. I sogni*, Bari, Adriatica Editrice; **2010**, «Due poeti tra misteri eleusini e oracoli caldaici», in Seng-Tardieu 2010;

B. TAMBRUN **1992**, «Allusions antipalamites dans le *Commentaire* de Pléthon aux Oracles chaldaïques», *Revue des études Augustiniennes*, 38, 168-179; **1995**, *Oracles chaldaïques. Recension de Georges Gémiste Pléthon. Édition critique avec introduction, traduction et commentaire*, Athens, Academy of Athens; **1999**, «Marsile Ficin et le Commentaire de Pléthon sur les Oracles chaldaïques», *Accademia*, 1, 9-48; **2001**, «Ficin, Pléthon et les mages disciples de Zoroastre», in Magnard 2001, 169-180; **2006**, *Pléthon. Le retour de Platon*, Paris, Vrin; **2011**, «Les Oracles chaldaïques entre idéologie et critique (XV<sup>e</sup>-XVII<sup>e</sup> s.)», in Lecerf-Saudelli 2011; I. TANASEANU-DÖBLER **2010**, «Weise oder Scharlatane? Chaldäerbilder in der griechisch-römischen Literatur der Kaiserzeit und die Chaldäischen Orakel», in Seng-Tardieu 2010; M. TARDIEU **1979**, «Compte rendu de Westerink 1977», *Revue des études Byzantines*, 37, 269; **1980 a**, «Un texte négligé de Psellus sur les Oracles chaldaïques», *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 73, 12-15; **b**, «La gnose valentinienne et les Oracles chaldaïques», in B. Layton (ed.), *The Rediscovery of Gnosticism, I. The School of Valentinus*, Leiden, Brill, 194-237 (Studies in the History of Religions 41); **c**, «Pletho arabicus. Identification et contenu du manuscrit arabe d'Istanbul, *Topkapı Serai, Ahmet III 1896*», *Journal Asiatique*, 268, 35-57 (avec J. Nicolet); **1987**, «Pléthon lecteur des Oracles», *MHTIS*, 2, 141-164; **1988**, «La conception de Dieu dans le manichéisme», in R. Van den Broek, T. Baarda, J. Mansfeld (ed.), *Knowledge of God in the Graeco-Roman World*, Leiden, Brill, 262-270 (EPRO 112); **1989**, «Aristocritos», in R. Goulet (éd.), *Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques, I. Abam(m)on à Axiothéa*, Paris, Éditions du CNRS, 389-393; **1995**, «La recension arabe des Μαγικά λόγια», in Tambrun-Krasker 1995, 157-171; **1996**, *Recherches sur la formation de l'Apocalypse de Zostrien et les sources de Marius Victorinus*, Bures-sur-Yvette, GECSO (Res Orientales 9); **2010**, «L'oracle de la pierre mnouziris», in Seng-Tardieu 2010; **2011**, «Le paradis chaldaïque», in Lecerf-Saudelli 2011; C. O. TOMMASI **1996**, «*Tripotens in unalitate spiritus*: Mario Vittorino e la gnosi», *Koinonia*, 20, 53-75; **2002**, «*Viae negationis* della dossologia divina nel medioplatonismo e nello gnosticismo sethiano (con echi in Mario Vittorino)», in Fr. Calabi (ed.), *Arrhetos Theos. L'ineffabilità del primo principion el medio platonismo*, Pisa, Edizioni ETS, 119-154; **2007**, «Tra politeismo, enoteismo e monoteismo: tensioni e collisioni nella cultura latine imperiale», *Orpheus*, 28, 186-220; **2010**, «Conoscenza e diffusione degli Oracoli Caldaici nell'Occidente latino: il *De nuptiis* di Marziano Capella», in Seng-Tardieu 2010; **2011**, «Favonius Eulogius: un témoin méconnu sur la fortune latine des Oracles chaldaïques», in Lecerf-Saudelli 2011; A. TONELLI **1990**, *Oracoli caldaici, con testo greco a fronte*, Milano, Biblioteca Universale Rizzoli (Classici greci e latini), 1995<sup>2</sup>; S. TOULOUSE **2001**, «Que le vrai sacrifice est

celui d'un cœur pur. À propos d'un oracle "porphyrien" (?) dans le *Liber XXI sententiarum* édité parmi les œuvres d'Augustin», *Recherches augustiniennes*, 32, 169-223 ; 2011, «L'exégèse des *Oracles chaldaïques* dans les commentaires néoplatoniciens à Platon», in Lecerf-Saudelli 2011 ; S. TOUSSAINT 1994, «Ficiniana II. Théophanies néoplatoniciennes», *Momus. Studi Umanistici*, 2, 50-69 ; J. TURNER 1980, «The Gnostic Threefold Path to Enlightenment», *Novum Testamentum*, 22, 324-351 ; 1991, «The Figure of Hecate and Dynamic Emanationism in the *Chaldean Oracles*, Sethian Gnosticism and Neoplatonism», *The Second Century Journal*, 7, 221-232 ; 2000, «The Setting of the Platonizing Sethian Treatises in Middle Platonism», in J. D. Turner, R. Majercik (ed.), *Gnosticism and Later Platonism. Themes, Figures, and Texts*, Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 179-224 ; 2006, «The Gnostic Sethians and Middle Platonism: Interpretations of *Timaeus* and *Parmenides*», *Vigiliae Christianae*, 60, 9-64 ;

R. M. VAN DEN BERG 2001, *Proclus' Hymns: Essays, Translations, Commentary*, Leiden ; A. VAN DEN KERCHOVE 2010, «Le mode de révélation dans les *Oracles chaldaïques* et le corpus hermétique», in Seng-Tardieu 2010 ; 2011, «Les sacrifices dans les *Oracles chaldaïques*. Comparaison avec les traités hermétiques», in Lecerf-Saudelli 2011 ; C. VAN LIEFFERINGE 1999, *La Théurgie. Des Oracles chaldaïques à Proclus*, Liège (Kernos, Supplément 9) ; G. VAN RIEL 2008, avec C. Macé et J. Follon, *Damascius. Commentaire sur le Philèbe de Platon*, Paris, Belles Lettres ;

L. G. WESTERINK, J. COMBÈS 1989, *Damascius. Traité des premiers principes, II. De la triade et de l'unifié*, Paris, Belles Lettres ; A. WINTJES 2010, «Die Orakel als Mittel der Offenbarung bei Porphyrios», in Seng-Tardieu 2010 ; E. WUST 1989, «Elisha le Grec. Un médecin et philosophe du début de la période ottomane» (en hébreu), *Pe'anim. Studies in Oriental Jewry*, 41, 49-57 ;

M. ZAGO 2010a, *La Ricetta di immortalità. Testo greco a fronte. Introduzione, traduzione, commento*, Milano, La Vita Felice (Saturnalia 24) ; b, «Non cambiare mai i nomi barbari (Oracoli Caldaici, fr. 150 dP)», in Seng-Tardieu 2010 ; M. ZAMBON 2002, *Porphyre et le moyen-platonisme*, Paris, Vrin, 2002 ; 2005, «Il significato filosofico della dottrina dell'ὄραμα dell'anima», in R. Chiaradonna (ed.), *Studi sull'anima in Plotino*, Napoli, Bibliopolis, 307-335.

*Addendum à Réception et fragments*: H. SENG, «Oracula Chaldaica», in Ch. Walde (ed.), *Die Rezeption der antiken Literatur. Kulturhistorisches Werklexikon* (Der Neue Pauly, Supplemente 7), Stuttgart, Metzler, 2010, col. 549-556.

Joigny, le 29 septembre 2010



# Table des Matières

<b>Avant-propos</b>	
par la direction de l'IFAO, mars 1956 .....	XI-XII
Introduction by Hans Lewy .....	XIII-XX
Postscript by Walter Zander .....	XXI-XXII
Abbreviations .....	XXIII-XXVI
Table of contents .....	XXVII
<b>I. THE EXPOSITION OF THE CHALDAEAN SYSTEM .....</b>	<b>1-441</b>
<b>Chap. I : New Chaldaean Oracles in the Porphyry's work</b>	
« <i>On the Philosophy of the Oracles</i> » .....	3-65
1. The metaphysical Oracles .....	3-38
2. The ritual Oracles .....	38-65
<b>Chap. II : The Chaldaean system of the intelligible world</b>	<b>67-176</b>
1. The literary tradition .....	67-76
2. The Supreme Being .....	76-78
3. Power, Intellect and Will of the Supreme Being .....	78-83
4. Hecate-Psyche, the Cosmic Soul .....	83-98
5. Aion .....	99-105
6. The Ideas .....	105-117
7. The Creation of the World .....	117-120
8. The « Wombs » and the Pneuma of the Cosmic Soul .....	120-122
9. The Firmaments .....	122-126
10. Eros .....	126-129
11. The « Connectives » .....	129-131
12. The Iynges .....	132-137

13. The three Worlds and their Rulers .....	137-157
14. God, the Gods and the Angels .....	157-164
15. The cognition of the noetic beings .....	164-176
Chap. III : Theurgical elevation .....	177-226
1. The Vehicle of the Soul .....	178-184
2. The ascent of the Soul .....	184-200
3. The stations of the Fire .....	201-204
4. The death of the body .....	204-207
5. The phases of the sacramental action .....	207-211
6. The After-Life .....	211-226
Chap. IV : The magical ritual of the Chaldaeans .....	227-257
1. The « Conjunction » .....	228-238
2. Supplications, Binding Spells, Divine Names .....	238-240
3. The Conjuration of Hecate .....	240-246
4. The « self-manifestation » of the gods .....	246-247
5. The consecration of Hecate's statue .....	247-248
6. The magical top .....	249-252
7. The « characters » .....	252-254
8. Technical mantics and Theurgy .....	254-257
Chap. V : Chaldaean demonology .....	259-309
1. The evil demons .....	259-279
2. The god Hades .....	279-293
3. Hades and Hyle .....	293-304
4. The hylic demons .....	304-309
II. THE ORIGIN OF THE CHALDAEAN SYSTEM .....	311-441
Chap. VI : The Platonic elements .....	311-398
1. Introduction .....	311-312
2. The contemporary Platonism .....	312-316
3. The dependence of the Chaldaeans upon the contemporary Platonism (the doctrines of the ideas and of the sequence of the noetic principles) .....	316-326
4. The designations of the Supreme Being ....	327-328
5. The Will of God .....	329-332
6. The Power of God .....	332-335
7. The origin of the Chaldaean doctrine of emanations .....	335-345

8. Eros and the « Connectives » .....	345-353
9. The Cosmic Soul .....	353-366
10. The cognition of the noetic beings .....	366-375
11. Hyle, Hades and the Demons .....	375-394
12. Pythagorean doctrines in the Chaldaean Oracles .....	394-398
Chap. VII : The Oriental elements .....	399-441
1. Preliminary remarks .....	399-401
2. Aion .....	401-409
3. The Solar Theology .....	409-413
4. The journey of the soul through the heavens .....	413-417
5. The three Rulers of the Chaldaean initiation .....	417-425
6. The meaning of the name « Chaldaeans » ...	425-428
7. The synthesis of Oriental beliefs, magic and metaphysics .....	429-441
III. EXCURSUS .....	443-512
I. On the Neoplatonists' mode of quoting the Chaldaean Oracles .....	443-447
II. Porphyry and the Chaldaeans .....	449-456
III. Neologisms and rare words in the Chaldaean Oracles ...	457-459
IV. The meaning and the history of the terms « theurgist » and « theurgy » .....	461-466
V. The caller and the call .....	467-471
VI. Psellus and the Chaldaeans .....	473-479
VII. Proclus' exposition of the Chaldaean system of the noetic entities .....	481-485
VIII. On the designation of the theurgical sacrament of immortality as elevation (ἀναγωγή) .....	487-489
IX. Proclus « Fire-Song » .....	491-493
X. The « Telestic art » of the Chaldaean theurgists .....	495-496
XI. The work of the Neoplatonist Origen « Concerning the demons » .....	497-508
XII. The source of the « Hellenic Theology » quoted by Eusebius .....	509-512

<b>COMPLÉMENTS par Michel Tardieu, E. R. Dodds, Pierre Hadot</b>	<b>513-729</b>
1. Préface (M. T.) .....	515-522
2. Errata (M. T.) .....	523-532
3. Addenda (M. T.) .....	533-550
4. Index locorum (M. T.) .....	551-587
5. Index verborum (M. T.) .....	589-644
A) Index graecus .....	590-639
B) Index latinus .....	640-643
C) Index hebraicus .....	644
6. Index rerum (M. T.) .....	645-671
7. Index des auteurs récents (M. T.) .....	673-678
8. Concordance (M. T.) .....	679-691
9. New Light on the « Chaldaean Oracles » (E. R. D.) .....	693-701
10. Bilan et perspectives sur les <i>Oracles chaldaïques</i> (P. H.) ...	703-720
11. Notice sur Hans Lewy (M. T.) .....	721-723
12. Bibliographie de Hans Lewy (M. T.) .....	725-729
13. Les Oracles chaldaïques 1891-2011 (M. T.) .....	731-766
<b>TABLE DES MATIÈRES</b> .....	<b>767-770</b>





**ACHEVÉ D'IMPRIMER  
EN JANVIER 2011  
SUR LES PRESSES  
DE  
L'IMPRIMERIE F. PAILLART  
À ABBEVILLE**

**DÉPÔT LÉGAL : 1<sup>er</sup> TRIMESTRE 2011**

PUBLICATIONS DE L'INSTITUT  
D'ÉTUDES AUGUSTINIENNES

COLLECTION DES ÉTUDES AUGUSTINIENNES

Liste en fin de volume

BIBLIOTHÈQUE AUGUSTINIENNE (Titres récents)

**Œuvres de saint Augustin**, vol. 50. *Sur la Genèse contre les manichéens, De Genesi contra Manichaeos*. Traduction de P. Monat, introduction par M. Dulaey, M. Scopello, A.-I. Bouton-Touboulic, annotations et notes complémentaires de M. Dulaey ; suivi de *Sur la Genèse au sens littéral, livre inachevé, De Genesi ad litteram imperfectus liber*. Introduction, traduction et notes de P. Monat, 2004, 580 p.

**Œuvres de saint Augustin**, vol. 57/A. *Les Commentaires des Psaumes*, I-XVI. Sous la direction de M. Dulaey, avec I. Bochet, A.-I. Bouton-Touboulic, P.-M. Hombert et É. Rebillard, 2009, 662 p.

**Œuvres de saint Augustin**, vol. 57/B. *Les Commentaires des Psaumes*, XVII-XXV. Sous la direction de M. Dulaey, avec I. Bochet, A.-I. Bouton-Touboulic, P.-M. Hombert et É. Rebillard, 2009, 381 p.

**Œuvres de saint Augustin**, vol. 76. *Homélie sur la première épître de saint Jean*. Texte critique de J. W. Mountain, traduction de J. Lemouzy, introduction et notes de D. Dideberg, 2008, 544 p.

NOUVELLE BIBLIOTHÈQUE AUGUSTINIENNE

**Saint Augustin**, vol. 3, *La Cité de Dieu I*, Livres I-X. Introduction d'Isabelle Bochet. Traduction de G. Combès, revue et corrigée par G. Madec, 1993, 636 p.

**Saint Augustin**, vol. 4/1, *La Cité de Dieu II*, Livres XI-XVIII. Traduction de G. Combès, revue et corrigée par G. Madec, 1994, 547 p.

**Saint Augustin**, vol. 4/2, *La Cité de Dieu II*, Livres XIX-XXII. Traduction de G. Combès, revue et corrigée par G. Madec, 1995, p. 549-965.

**Saint Augustin**, vol. 5, *Sermons sur l'Écriture*, 1-15 A. Traduction d'A. Bouissou, introduction et notes de G. Madec, 1994, 335 p.

**Saint Augustin**, vol. 6, *La vie communautaire*. Traduction annotée des *Sermons* 355-356 par G. Madec, 1996, 63 p.

**Saint Augustin**, vol. 7, *La première catéchèse*. Introduction et traduction de G. Madec, 2001, 127 p.

**Saint Augustin**, vol. 8, *Sermons sur la chute de Rome*. Introduction, traduction et notes de J.-C. Fredouille, 2004, 148 p.

PÉRIODIQUES

*Revue d'études augustiniennes et patristiques* (1955 →) : 2 fasc. par an.

*Recherches augustiniennes et patristiques* (1958 →) : tome 35, 2007.

ISBN : 978-2-85121-243-6

ISSN : 1158-7032

68 €

