

Proclus'  
*On the Hieratic Art*  
*according to the Greeks*

*Critical Edition with  
Translation and Commentary*

ELENI PACHOUMI

BRILL

Proclus' On the Hieratic Art according to the Greeks

# Studies in Platonism, Neoplatonism, and the Platonic Tradition

*Edited by*

Robert M. Berchman (*Foro di Studi Avanzati Gaetano Massa, Roma*)

John F. Finamore (*University of Iowa*)

*Editorial Board*

John Dillon (*Trinity College, Dublin*) – Gary Gurtler (*Boston College*)

Jean-Marc Narbonne (*Laval University, Canada*)

VOLUME 33

The titles published in this series are listed at [brill.com/spnp](http://brill.com/spnp)

# Proclus' *On the Hieratic Art* *according to the Greeks*

*Critical Edition with Translation and Commentary*

*By*

Eleni Pachoumi



BRILL

LEIDEN | BOSTON

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Pachoumi, Eleni, 1975- author. | Proclus, approximately 410–485. On the hieratic art according to the Greeks. 2024. | Proclus, approximately 410–485. On the hieratic art according to the Greeks. English. 2024.

Title: Proclus' On the hieratic art according to the Greeks : critical edition with translation and commentary / Eleni Pachoumi.

Other titles: Studies in Platonism, Neoplatonism, and the Platonic tradition ; 33.

Description: Boston : Brill, 2024. | Series: Studies in Platonism, Neoplatonism, and the Platonic tradition, 1871-188X ; 33 | Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2024011907 (print) | LCCN 2024011908 (ebook) | ISBN 9789004697546 (hardback) | ISBN 9789004697553 (ebook)

Subjects: LCSH: Proclus, approximately 410–485. On the hieratic art according to the Greeks. | Greece—Religion.

Classification: LCC B701.053 P33 2024 (print) | LCC B701.053 (ebook) | DDC 292.08—dc23/eng/20240402

LC record available at <https://lccn.loc.gov/2024011907>

LC ebook record available at <https://lccn.loc.gov/2024011908>

Typeface for the Latin, Greek, and Cyrillic scripts: “Brill”. See and download: [brill.com/brill-typeface](http://brill.com/brill-typeface).

ISSN 1871-188X

ISBN 978-90-04-69754-6 (hardback)

ISBN 978-90-04-69755-3 (e-book)

DOI 10.1163/9789004697553

Copyright 2024 by Eleni Pachoumi. Published by Koninklijke Brill bv, Leiden, The Netherlands. Koninklijke Brill bv incorporates the imprints Brill, Brill Nijhoff, Brill Schöningh, Brill Fink, Brill mentis, Brill Wageningen Academic, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Böhlau and V&R unipress. Koninklijke Brill bv reserves the right to protect this publication against unauthorized use. Requests for re-use and/or translations must be addressed to Koninklijke Brill bv via [brill.com](http://brill.com) or [copyright.com](http://copyright.com).

This book is printed on acid-free paper and produced in a sustainable manner.

*To my parents,  
George and Agoroula Pachoumi*

••



# Contents

Preface ix

Abbreviations xi

## Introduction 1

- 1 Proclus' Life and on the Orphic and Chaldaean Theologies 1
- 2 Proclus' Works 6
  - 2.1 *Proclus' Complete Works* 6
  - 2.2 *Proclus' Lost Works or Preserved in Fragments on Theological Tradition, Orphic Theology and Theurgy* 7
- 3 Proclus' *On the Hieratic Art according to the Greeks* and his Lost Works 8
- 4 Manuscripts 11
  - 4.1 *ms Vallicellianus F 20, Fols. 138<sup>r</sup>–140<sup>v</sup>* 11
    - 4.1.1 Contents of Part 1 of *ms Vallicellianus F 20, Fols. 1–172* 12
    - 4.1.2 The Dating of *ms Vallicellianus F 20, Fols. 138<sup>r</sup>–140<sup>v</sup>* from Watermarks and other Sources 13
    - 4.1.3 Ficino's Life and Works 15
  - 4.2 *ms Laurentianus Plut. 10.32, Fols. 119<sup>r</sup>–121<sup>v</sup>* 17
    - 4.2.1 Contents of *ms Laurentianus Plut. 10.32, Fols. 1<sup>r</sup>–174<sup>v</sup>* 17
    - 4.2.2 The Dating of *ms Laurentianus Plut. 10.32, Fols. 119<sup>r</sup>–121<sup>v</sup>* from Watermarks and other Sources 19
    - 4.2.3 Petrus Candidus' Life and Works 19
  - 4.3 *Comparison between ms V, Fols. 1–144<sup>r</sup> and ms L, Fols. 1<sup>r</sup>–124<sup>r</sup>* 20
  - 4.4 Ficino's Edited Translations of *Proclus' de Sacrificio et Magia* 20
- 5 Text, Transmission, Modern Studies 22
- 6 The Title Πρόκλου Περὶ τῆς καθ' Ἑλληνας ἱερατικῆς τέχνης, “Proclus' *On the Hieratic Art according to the Greeks*” 23
- 7 Book Description 26

Critical Apparatus 28

Text and Translation 29

**Commentary** 38

1. Hieratic Art-Theurgy, *Teletai* and Invocations, Sympathy, Heliotropes and Luminaries 38
2. The Stages of the Hieratic/Theurgic Art 61
3. The Lotus, the Sun, and the Stones 90
4. Lions and Cocks, *Systaseis* and Symbols 98
5. Mixing, One and Many, Helios, Statues and *Synthêmata* 108
6. Direct Revelations/Epiphanies of the Gods, Purification Rituals and the *Empyrean* Power 122
7. *Energeia*, “Activity” 135

**Appendix: MS Vallicellianus F 20** 139**Bibliography** 146**Index of Greek Words** 177**Index of Ancient Sources** 187**Index of Names and Subjects** 197

## Preface

The book is a critical edition of the text with an English translation and commentary on Proclus' treatise *On the Hieratic Art according to the Greeks*. This treatise is a very important fragmentary work on theurgy. The *Hieratic* Art is the *Theurgic* Art, theurgy, the theurgic union with the divine. Proclus describes the theurgic union, putting an emphasis on a conceptual blending of ritual actions (*teletai*, e.g. the role of statues, incense, *synthémata*, symbols, purifications, invocations and epiphanies) and concepts (e.g. union of many powers, 'one and many' sympathy, natural sympathies, attraction, mixing and division).

The study offers a systematic investigation and presentation of Proclus' *On the Hieratic Art according to the Greeks* in a single monograph. It examines the characteristics of the hieratic-theurgic union and its important stages with references to the ritualistic role of *synthémata*, symbols, statues and fire. It also discusses philosophical issues that theurgy is engaged with, such as: the notion of mixing based on the concept of unity and diversity and the relationship between one and many; and the various aspects of the powers of nature and the role of the natural sympathies in the relationship between individual entities and the divine.

The Introduction contains sections on Proclus' life and on the Orphic and Chaldaean theologies, Proclus' works, a detailed description of the parts of the ancient manuscripts that include Proclus' *On the Hieratic Art according to the Greeks*, text description and transmission, and a book description. There follows a Critical Edition of the Greek text with Translation and Commentary. The Appendix is a description of the *ms Vallicellianus F 20*.

Thanks are due to North-West University for the research fellowship from 2014 to the end of 2017, and to the University of Oxford for the visiting fellowships during the years 2015–2020 and 2022–2023. On a personal note, I would like to thank Robert Parker who acted as my mentor in Oxford. Many thanks are also due to Neil McLynn. I would like to thank Mark Edwards who has read and commented on the whole book, and for his mentorship over the years. I am grateful to Nigel Wilson for his comments and kind advice on the manuscripts. I would like to thank Dominic O'Meara for our discussions. Thanks are due to the librarians of the Biblioteca Vallicelliana in Rome, the Biblioteca Laurenziana in Florence and the Bodleian Library in Oxford. I would also like to thank the editors John Finamore and Robert Berchman of Brill series *Studies in Platonism, Neoplatonism and the Platonic Tradition* for their wonderful collaboration.

I am deeply thankful to John Dillon for reading the whole book and for his valuable comments. I am most grateful for all his insight and wisdom.

Finally, I would like to thank my parents, George and Agoroula Pachoumi for all their love and support.

*Eleni Pachoumi*

Oxford, October 2023

# Abbreviations

## 1 Abbreviations of Proclus' Works used in this Study

*Hier.Ar.* Pachoumi, Eleni. *Πρόκλου Περὶ τῆς καθ' Ἑλληνας ἱερατικῆς τέχνης. Proclus' On the Hieratic Art according to the Greeks*: Critical Edition with Translation and Commentary, 2024.

*In R.* Kroll, Guilelmus. (ed.). *Procli Diadochi in Platonis Rem Publicam Commentarii*. Vols. I–II. Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. Leipzig: Teubner, 1899–1901. (Reprint Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1965).

*In Ti.* Diehl, Ernestus. (ed.). *Procli Diadochi in Platonis Timaeum Commentaria*. Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. Leipzig: Teubner, 1903–1906. (Reprint Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1965).

*In Prm.* Cousin, Victor. (ed.). *Procli philosophi Platonici opera inedita pt. III: Procli commentarius in Platonis Parmenidem*. Paris: Durand, 1864.

Steel, Carlos. (ed.). *Procli in Platonis Parmenidem Commentaria*. Tomus I, libros I–III continens, recognoverunt brevique adnotatione critica instruxerunt C. Steel, C. Macé, P. d'Hoine. Oxford Classical Texts. Oxford: Clarendon, 2007.

Steel, Carlos. (ed.). *Procli in Platonis Parmenidem Commentaria*. Tomus II, libros IV–V continens, recognoverunt brevique adnotatione critica instruxerunt C. Steel, A. Gribomont, P. d'Hoine. Oxford Classical Texts. Oxford: Clarendon, 2009.

Steel, Carlos. (ed.). *Procli in Platonis Parmenidem Commentaria*. Tomus III, Libros VI–VII et indices continens, textum graecum recognoverunt brevique adnotatione critica instruxerunt L. Van Campe et C. Steel, ultimam partem ex latino in graecum vertit C. Steel. Oxford Classical Texts. Oxford: Clarendon, 2009.

*In Alc. I* Westerink, Leendert Gerrit. (ed.). *Proclus Diadochus. Commentary on the First Alcibiades of Plato*. Amsterdam: North-Holland, 1954.

*In Cra.* Segonds, Alain-Philippe. (ed. / transl.). *Proclus: Sur le premier Alcibiade de Platon*. Vols. I–II. Collection des universités de France. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1985–1986.

*Inst.* Pasquali, Georgius. (ed.). *Proclus Diadochus in Platonis Cratylum Commentaria*. Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. Leipzig: Teubner, 1908. (Reprint Stuttgart: Teubner, 1994).

Dodds, Eric Robertson. (ed. / transl.). *The Elements of Theology*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1933 (1st ed.; 1963 2nd ed.).

*Inst.Phys.* Ritzenfeld, Albertus. (ed. / transl.). *Procli Diadochi Lycii Institutio Physica*. Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. Leipzig: Teubner, 1912.

*Plat.Theol.* Saffrey, Henri-Dominique and Leendert Gerrit Westerink (eds. / transl.). *Proclus: Théologie Platonicienne*. Vols. I–VI. Collection des universités de France. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1968–1997. (Vol. I: 1968; Vol. II: 1974; Vol. III: 1978; Vol. IV: 1981; Vol. V: 1987; Vol. VI: 1997).

*In Euc.* Friedlein, Godofredus. (ed.). *Procli Diadochi in Primum Euclidis Elementorum Librum Commentarii*. Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. Leipzig: Teubner, 1873. (Reprint Hildesheim: Olms, 1967).

*Hyp.* Manitius, Carolus. (ed. / transl.). *Procli Diadochi hypotyposis astronomi carum positionum*. Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. Leipzig: Teubner, 1909. (Reprint Stuttgart: Teubner 1974).

*H.* Vogt, Ernestus. (ed.). *Procli Hymni accedunt Hymnorum Fragmenta; Epigrammata, Scholia, Fontium et Locorum Similium Apparatus, Indices*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1957.

*De Mal.* Boese, Helmut. (ed.). “*Incipit Liber Eiusdem Procli De Malorum Subsist entia*.” Pages 172–265 in *Procli Diadochi Tria Opuscula (De providentia, libertate, malo)*. Latine Guilelmo de Moerbeka vertente et graece ex Isaaci Sebastocratoris aliorumque scriptis collecta. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1960. Opsomer, Jan and Carlos Steel. (transl.). *Proclus On the Existence of Evils*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 2003.

*Dec. Dub.* Boese, Helmut. (ed.). “*De Decem Dubitationibus Circa Providentiam*.” Pages 3–108 in *Procli Diadochi Tria Opuscula (De providentia, libertate, malo)*. Latine Guilelmo de Moerbeka vertente et graece ex Isaaci Sebastocratoris aliorumque scriptis collecta. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1960. Opsomer, Jan and Carlos Steel. (transl.). *Proclus: Ten Problems Concerning Providence*. Ancient Commentators on Aristotle. London: Bloomsbury, 2012.

*Prov.* Boese, Helmut. (ed.). “*De Providentia et Fato eo quod in nobis ad Theodorum Mechanicum*.” Pages 109–171 in *Procli Diadochi Tria Opuscula (De providentia, libertate, malo)*. Latine Guilelmo de Moerbeka vertente et graece ex Isaaci Sebastocratoris aliorumque scriptis collecta. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1960. Steel, Carlos. (transl.). *Proclus on Providence*. London: Bloomsbury, 2007.

*Phil. Chald.* Pitra, Joannes B. “*Excerpta Chaldaica Vaticana*.” Pages 192–195 in Vol. 5 of *Analecta Sacra et Classica*. Edited by Joannes B. Pitra (ed.) Rome and Paris: Cuggiani and Roter et Chernowitz, 1888. (repr. Farnborough: Gregg Press, 1967). Later included as “*Extraits du Commentaire de Pro*

clus sur la Philosophie Chaldaïque (*Πρόκλου ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς χαλδαϊκῆς φιλοσοφίας*). Pages 206–212 in *Oracles Chaldaïques: Avec un choix de commentaires anciens. Texte établi et traduit*. Edited by Édouard des Places. Collection Budé. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1971.

## 2 Abbreviations of the Orphica and the Chaldean Oracles

*Orac. Chald.* Places, Édouard des. (ed.). *Oracles Chaldaïques: Avec un choix de commentaires anciens. Texte établi et traduit*. Collection Budé. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1971.

Kroll, Guilelmus. *De Oraculis Chaldaicis*. Bratislava: Koebner, 1894. (1st ed.; repr. Hildesheim: G. Olms, 1962).

Majercik, Ruth. (transl.). *The Chaldean Oracles: Text, Translation and Commentary*. Studies in Greek and Roman Religion 5. Leiden: Brill, 1989.

*Orph. Fr.* Kern, Otto. *Orphicorum Fragmenta*. 3rd repr. Zurich: Weidmann, 1972. (1st ed. Berlin: Weidmann, 1922).

*OF Bern.* Bernabé, Alberto. (ed.). *Poetae Epici Graeci: Testimonia et Fragmenta*. Pars II. Fasc. 1: *Orphicorum et Orphicis simillium testimonia et fragmenta. Poetae Epici Graeci. Bibliotheca Teubneriana*. München and Leipzig: K.G. Saur, 2004.

## 3 Other Abbreviations

*ANRW* Haase, Wolfgang and Hildegard Temporini. (eds.). *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1979–1984.

*CHPLA* Gerson, Lloyd P. (ed.). *The Cambridge History of Philosophy in Late Antiquity*. Vols. I–II. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

*CT* *Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets in the British Museum*. London: Trustees of the British Museum, 1896–.

*DK* Diels, Hermann. *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*. Ed. Walther Kranz. Vols. I–III. 6th ed. Berlin: Weidmann, 1951–1952.

*DPhA* Goulet, Richard. (éd.). *Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques*. Vols. I–VII. Paris: CNRS Éditions, 1989–2018.

*EPRO* *Études Préliminaires aux Religions Orientales dans l'Empire Romain*

*KP* Ziegler, Konrat and Walther Sontheimer. (eds.). *Der Kleine Pauly: Lexikon der Antike auf der Grundlage von Pauly's Real-Encyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*. Stuttgart: Alfred Druckenmüller Verlag, 1964–1975.

*LSJ* Liddell, Henry George, Robert Scott and Henry Stuart Jones. (eds.). *A Greek-English Lexicon with revised Supplement*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.

*NP* Cancik, Hubert, Helmuth Schneider and Manfred Landfester. (eds.). *Der Neue Pauly: Enzyklopädie der Antike. Das klassische Altertum und seine Rezeptionsgeschichte*. Stuttgart: J.B. Metzler, 1996–2012.

*OCD* Hornblower, Simon and Antony Spawforth. (eds.). *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.

*PDM* *Papyri Demoticae Magicae*. In Hans D. Betz. (ed.). *The Greek Magical Papyri in Translation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986.

*PG* *Patrologiae cursus completus. Series graeca*. Accurante Jacques-Paul Migne. Paris: Migne, 1.1857–166.1866

*PGM* Preisendanz, Karl and Albert Henrichs. (eds.). *Papyri Graecae Magicae in Papyri Graecae Magicae*. Vols. I–II. 2nd revised ed. Stuttgart: Teubner, 1973–1974.

*PLRE* Arnold H.M. Jones, John R. Martindale and John Morris. (eds.). *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*. Vols. I–III. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971–1992.

*RAC* Theodor Klauser, Ernst Dassmann and Georg Schöllgen. (eds.). *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*. Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1950–2013.

*RE* Pauly, August, Georg Wissowa, Wilhelm Kroll, Kurt Witte, Karl Mittelhaus and Konrat Ziegler. (eds.). *Pauly's Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaften*. Stuttgart: J.B. Metzler, 1894–1980.

Roscher Roscher, Wilhelm H. (ed.). *Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie*. Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1909–1915.

Souda Adler, Ada Sara. (ed.). *Suidae Lexicon*. Vols. I–V. Leipzig: Teubner, 1928–1938.

TH The Sumerian Temple Hymns, see TCS 3

TCS 3 Sjöberg, Åke W., Eugen Bergmann and Gene B. Gragg. *The Collection of the Sumerian Temple Hymns and The Kesh Temple Hymn*. Texts from Cuneiform Sources 3 (TCS 3). Locust Valley, New York: J.J. Augustin, 1969. Individual lines are cited as TH followed by line number.

# Introduction

## 1 Proclus' Life and on the Orphic and Chaldaean Theologies

According to Marinus of Neapolis' eulogy *Proclus or On Happiness*,<sup>1</sup> Proclus (412–485 CE) was born in Constantinople/Byzantium of a rich Lycian family from Xanthos and returned to Xanthos shortly afterwards, where he began his education (Marin. *Vit. Procl.* 6). He continued his education in Alexandria, studying rhetoric in order to pursue a career as a lawyer, like his father. In Alexandria he stayed with the sophist Leonas and studied with the grammarian Orion, who was descended from a priestly caste in Egypt (8). After a short visit to Constantinople at around 430, Proclus decided that he wanted to study philosophy rather than law. Returning to Alexandria, he studied Aristotle with the philosopher Olympiodorus and mathematics with Hero (9).

In 430–431, when he was 18 years old, Proclus went in Athens to study in the Platonic Academy (Marin. *Vit. Procl.* 10). He stayed with Plutarch and studied Plato's *Phaedo* and Aristotle's *De anima* under Plutarch's guidance for two years (12). After Plutarch's death in 432, Proclus moved in with Syrianus, the successor of the Platonic Academy. Proclus studied the entire works of Aristotle and the science of theology with Syrianus, who also "directed him to the mystagogy of Plato" (13.318–323). Syrianus also introduced him to the *Orphic Theology* and the *Chaldaean Oracles*. After Syrianus' death (around 437), Proclus succeeded to the headship of the Platonic Academy in Athens for almost fifty years until his death in 485.<sup>2</sup>

Marinus in *Proclus* points out that Proclus had a good understanding of "the whole theology of both Greeks and the barbarians" (πᾶσαν μὲν θεολογίαν Ἑλληνικήν τε καὶ βαρβαρικήν Marin. *Vit. Procl.* 22.538–540).<sup>3</sup> Marinus also refers to the virtues that marked Proclus' life, "while he was still a student with the philosopher Syrianus" (ἔτι συσχολάζων τῷ φιλοσόφῳ Συριανῷ 26.609–610) and was going through the older treatises; and that "he ascended rapidly to the highest of the virtues in relation to the human soul, which the divinely inspired Iamblichus in an excellent way called theurgic" (ἐπὶ τὰς ἀκροτάτας τῶν ἀρετῶν, ὡς πρὸς ἀνθρωπίνην ψυχήν, ἀνέδραμεν, ἀς ὁ ἐνθους Ἰάμβλιχος ὑπερφυῶς θεουργικὰς ἀπεκάλεσεν 26.624–626).<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Masullo (1985).

<sup>2</sup> The emperor Justinian ended the funding and closed the Academy in 529 CE. The last scholarch of the Academy was Damascius (458–540 CE).

<sup>3</sup> All translations from the Greek are my own.

<sup>4</sup> See also Marin. *Vit. Procl.* 28.672: ἀρετὴν ἔτι μείζονα καὶ τελεωτέραν ἐπορίσατο τὴν θεουργικήν.

Regarding the Orphic and Chaldaean theology (τῆς δὲ Ὀρφικῆς καὶ Χαλδαϊκῆς θεολογίας *Marin. Vit. Procl.* 26.611),<sup>5</sup> he was influenced by his teacher. While at the Academy in Athens, Syrianus asked his disciples Proclus and the Syrian philosopher Domninus to expound “either the works of Orpheus or the *Chaldaean Oracles*” (ἢ τοι τὰ Ὀρφέως ἢ τὰ λόγια 26.615–616), and Domninus chose the works of Orpheus, while Proclus the *Chaldaean Oracles*. The *Chaldaean Oracles* is preserved today as a compilation of fragments consisting of quotes and comments by Neoplatonist philosophers from the third to the sixth centuries CE of a lost original collection of hexametrical verses, which allegedly was composed or compiled by Julian the Chaldaean, or his son Julian the Theurgist in the second century CE. Most of the fragments of the *Chaldaean Oracles* are Proclus’ quotations and comments.<sup>6</sup>

Proclus worked on the *Chaldaean Oracles* project, “bringing together the interpretations, *exegeses* of the previous philosophers” (καὶ τὰς τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ φιλοσόφων ἐξηγήσεις συνελών *Marin. Vit. Procl.* 26.626–627). Also “he collated the other Chaldaean treatises and the greatest commentaries with the god-given *Chaldaean Oracles*” (τάς τε ὅλας Χαλδαϊκὰς ὑποθέσεις καὶ τὰ μέγιστα τῶν ὑπομνημάτων εἰς τὰ θεοπαράδοτα λόγια κατεβάλετο 26.626–630). This task took Proclus five years to get completed (26.630), following Syrianus’ advices, “so he received the first instructions, as there has been said, from his teacher, and along with him [Syrianus], carefully studied the voluminous commentaries of Porphyry and Iamblichus on the *Chaldaean Oracles*, as well as the *Chaldaean Oracles* themselves and other Chaldaean treatises and commentaries ...” (λαβών δὲ οὖν, ὡς εἴρηται, παρὰ τοῦ καθηγεμόνος τὰς ἀφορμὰς καὶ μετ’ ἔκεινον τοῖς τε εἰς Ὀρφέα αὐτοῦ ὑπομνήμασιν ἐπιμελῶς ἐντυγχάνων καὶ τοῖς Πορφυρίου καὶ Ἰαμβλίχου μυρίοις ὅσοις εἰς τὰ λόγια καὶ τὰ σύστοιχα τῶν Χαλδαίων συγγράμματα ...

---

Furthermore, the whole account is structured on the Neoplatonic scale of virtues; see discussion in Saffrey and Seconds (2002) intro. IX–C, esp. LXIX–XCVIII.

5 Proclus in his *Commentary on Plato’s Timaeus* claims that “among all nations those being distinguished on wisdom are particularly concerned with prayers” (ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς ἔθνεσιν οἱ σοφικοὶ διενεγκόντες περὶ εὐχάς ἐσπούδασαν), the Brahmins among the Indians, the Magoi among the Persians, “and among the Greeks the best of the theologians, who established both *teletai* [initiatory rites] and mysteries; and the Chaldaeans worshipped the divine too, and having also named virtue itself of the gods as a goddess, honoured it [virtue], ensuring that they did not neglect the holy cult through [their] virtue.” (Ἐλλήνων δὲ οἱ θεολογικώτατοι, οἱ καὶ τελετὰς κατεστήσαντο καὶ μυστήρια· Χαλδαῖοι δὲ καὶ τὸ ὅλο θεῖον ἐθεράπευσαν καὶ αὐτὴν τὴν ἀρετὴν τῶν θεῶν εἰπόντες ἐσέφθησαν, παλλοῦ δέοντες διὰ τὴν ἀρετὴν ὑπερφρονεῖν τῆς ιερᾶς θρησκείας: *Procl. In Ti.* 1.208.19–22).

6 More than half of the fragments of the *Chaldaean Oracles* collection (about 115 out of 226) are Proclus’ quotations and comments; Des Places (1971). See also Lewy (1978) 72; and Majercik (1989).

26.620–624). Proclus characteristically used to say that if he could choose of all the ancient books which he could have kept, these would have been only the *Chaldaean Oracles* and *Timaeus* (τὰ λόγια καὶ τὸν Τίμαιον 38.916–917).

Marinus in *Proclus* also reports Proclus' experience of Hecate's self-revelations after performing certain Chaldaean purification rituals, “But before these, the philosopher after being purified in due order by the Chaldaean purifications, invoked flame-like revelations for direct vision of Hecate, as he himself has recorded in one of his own treatises.” (Πρὸ δὲ τούτων ἐν τάξει ὁ φιλόσοφος τοῖς Χαλδαῖοῖς καθαρομοῖς καθαιρόμενος, φάσμασι μὲν Ἐκατικοῖς<sup>7</sup> φωτοειδέσιν αὐτοπτουμένοις ὥμιλησεν, ὡς καὶ αὐτός που μέμνηται ἐν ίδιῳ συγγράμματι. 28.683–686). Porphyry also in *De Philosophia ex Oraculis* refers to the *synthémata* (συνθήματα) of Hecate's revelations and the “fiery images” (πυρόεσσιν εἰδώλοις) of her revelations.<sup>8</sup>

Proclus himself, according to Marinus' *Proclus*, at the beginning of his forty-second year had uttered in a loud voice about fire and the immortality of his soul: “My soul has come breathing the spirit of fire,/ And writhing in fire having thrown the mind to the aether,/ It rises up and clamours the rich in stars orbits of the immortal [soul]”<sup>9</sup> (Ψυχὴ μοι πνείουσα πυρὸς μένος εἰλήλουθεν, Καὶ νόν ἀμπετάσασα πρὸς αἰθέρα πυρσοέλικτος/ Ὁρνυται, ἀθανάτης δὲ βρέμει πολυτειρέα κύκλα 28.696–698).<sup>10</sup>

Proclus “had been using the Chaldaean (magico-theurgic) *systaseis*, ‘[invocations for] conjunctions’ (συστάσεις) and *entychiae*, ‘meetings/prayers’ (ἐντυχίαις) and divine and ineffable magic wheels (στροφάλοις)” (Marin. *Vit. Procl.* 28.676–679); Marinus also informs us about Proclus' source of knowledge of the theurgic rites and the transmission process of esoteric knowledge, “he had learned the invocations and the rest of their usage from Plutarch's daughter Asclepigeneia, who was a philosopher and mystic (430–485 AD). For the

7 Procl. *In Cra.* 179.105.26–27: ... εἴτε Ἐκατικὴ προσαγορευομένη θεότης, ὡς οἱ θεουργοί φασιν, ... (frg 201).

8 Porph. *De Phil. Or.* 11.151.165–173: “Ἐν χρηστήριον ἔτι παραθείς, ὅπερ αὐτὴ ἡ Ἐκάτη πεποίηται, καταπαύσω τὸν περὶ ταύτης λόγον.” Ήδ’ ἐγώ είμι κόρη πολυφάσματος, οὐρανόφοιτος, /ταυρῶπις, τρικάρηνος, ἀπτηνής, χρυσοβέλεμνος, /Φοιβή ἀπειρ〈ολεγής〉, φαεσίμβροτος, Εἰλείθυια, /τριστοῖχου φύσεως συνθήματα τρισσά φέρουσα: /αἱ〈θέρα〉 μὲν πυρόεσσιν ἐειδομένη εἰδώλοις, /ἡέρα δ’ ἀργεννοῖσι τροχάτασιν ἀμφικάθημαι. /γα〈ιαν〉 ἐμῶν σκυλάκων δνοφερῷ γέ〈νει〉 ἡνιοχε〈ύω〉.

9 See also Procl. *In R.* 11. 220.7–15: καίτοι γε οίδα καὶ αὐτὸς ὅτι καὶ τοῖς μέσον τῶν ἐπτά τὸν ἥλιον είπομσιν ἀστρονόμοις οὐ πάνυ δι’ ἀναρκαίων τοῦτο δέδεικται λημμάτων ὅπως δὲ δῶλας ἐπεγείρησαν, εἴπομεν ἐν 〈τοῖς εἰς Τίμαιον〉 [p. 257 f. sqq.] ικανῶς: ἀλλὰ 〈τῶν παρὰ Χαλδαίοις θεουργῶν〉 ἀκούσας, ὡς ἄρα ὁ 〈θεὸς ἐμεσεμβόλησεν τὸν ἥλιον ἐν τοῖς ἐπτά καὶ ἀνεκρέμασεν ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ τὰς ἔξ ἄλλας ζώνας,〉 καὶ τῶν 〈θεῶν〉 αὐτῶν, ὅτι τὸ ἥλιακὸν πῦρ 〈κραδίης τόπῳ ἐστήριξεν〉 ...

10 Masullo (1985) 85; Boissonade (1814) 23.

*orgia/rituals and the whole *Theurgic Agôgê*, which was transmitted to her by the great Nestorius through her father, were preserved by her only.”* (καὶ τὰς ἐκφωνήσεις καὶ τὴν ἄλλην χρῆσιν αὐτῶν μεμαθήκει παρὰ Ἀσκληπιγενείας τῆς Πλουτάρχου θυγατρός. παρ’ αὐτῇ γὰρ καὶ μόνη ἐσώζετο ἀπὸ Νεστορίου τοῦ μεγάλου ὄργια καὶ ἡ σύμπασα θεουργικὴ ἀγωγὴ διὰ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῇ παραδοθεῖσα Marin. *Vit. Procl.* 28.679–683). Here Marinus informs us not only about Proclus’ source of knowledge of the theurgic rites and the whole *Theurgic Agôgê*, but also about the process of transmission of esoteric knowledge from Plutarch to his daughter Asclepigeniea.

Regarding the transmission of knowledge from father to daughter, in the prologue of the first book called *Kyranis* of the medico-magical text of the *Kyranides* (first compiled in IV CE), there is a similar example of knowledge transmission. It is reported that the book was compiled from two other books, one of which was written “by Harpokration from Alexandria to his own daughter” (καὶ ἐκ τοῦ Ἀρποκρατίωνος τοῦ Ἀλεξανδρέως πρὸς τὴν οἰκείαν θυγατέραν *Kyran.* 4–5); and “Therapeutic book from Syria, Harpokration has written to his own daughter the following:” (Βίβλος ἀπὸ Συρίας θεραπευτική, τῇ οἰκείᾳ θυγατρὶ Ἀρποκρατίων γέγραφε τάδε: *Kyran.* 30–31).<sup>11</sup>

Moreover, Asclepigeniea’s grandfather, Nestorius was an *Eleusinian hierophant*.<sup>12</sup> Burkert commenting Proclus’ knowledge of the sacred and his relationship to Asclepigeniea, points out that, although “Eleusis had been destroyed some fifteen years before he was born, and pagan sacrifice was forbidden by law in his time,” “what he writes about *mysteries* should be taken seriously as containing authentic tradition.”<sup>13</sup>

Marinus refers to a familiar practice that used to take place in the philosophic school in Athens of “reading himself the works of Orpheus in Proclus’ presence, and hearing in Proclus’ exegeses not only the interpretations of Iamblichus and Syrianus [on these works], but also at the same time many more and more akin to theology.” (Αναγινώσκων δὲ ἐγώ ποτε παρ’ αὐτῷ τὰ ὄρφέως καὶ

<sup>11</sup> On the transmission of the tradition within the family: Betz (2003) 96–97, nn. 42, 44. Dieterich (1891) 160–163. Festugi  re (1944) Vol. I: 332–336. On the transmission of esoteric knowledge from father to daughter in Egyptian culture and its continuation in Greco-Egyptian and hermetic traditions: Betz (2003) 96–97, nn. 42, 44. Borghouts (1982) 39, n. 123. Klasens (1952) 15, 76. On the Egyptian temples in Late Antiquity see, Frankfurter (2004) 159–164; Bagnall (1993); Fowden (1993); Frankfurter (1998); Dunand and Zivie-Coché (2002). Kaimakis (1976) 14, 15. On the transmission of the tradition *within the family*: Betz (2003) 96–97, nn. 42, 44. Dieterich (1891) 160–163. Festugi  re (1944) Vol. I: 332–336.

<sup>12</sup> On the Eleusinian mysteries see Burkert (1983) 248–297, Riedweg (1987) 1–69, Clinton (2003) 50–78, Parker (2005) 342–360.

<sup>13</sup> Burkert (1987) 113–114; Cole (1980) 223–238; see also Procl. *In R. II.108.17–32.*

οὐ μόνον τὰ παρὰ τῷ Ἰαμβλίχῳ καὶ Συριανῷ ἀκούων ἐν ταῖς ἐξηγήσεσιν, ἀλλὰ πλειό τε ἄμα καὶ προσφύστερα τῇ θεολογίᾳ Marin. *Vit. Procl.* 27.656–659); Marinus also mentions that he had tried to persuade Proclus to “write marginal notes of his opinions on his teacher’s [Syrianus’] books” (παραγράφειν αὐτὸν τὰ ἀρέσκοντα τοῖς τοῦ διδασκάλου βιβλίοις 27.664–665); and “when Proclus wrote notes in the margins of the commentaries, we collated them all into a single” (καὶ παραγράψαντος τοῖς μετώποις τῶν ὑπομνημάτων, ἔσχομεν συναγωγὴν εἰς ταῦτὸν ἀπάντων 27.665–668). As a result, “there were [written] comments and notes on many lines of Orpheus by him [Proclus], even if he did not in fact do this on the whole divine myth, or all the *Rhapsodies* (of the *Rhapsodic Theogony*)” (καὶ ἐγένετο εἰς Ὁρφέα αὐτοῦ σχόλια καὶ ὑπομνήματα στίχων οὐκ ὀλίγων, εἰ καὶ μὴ εἰς πάσαν τὴν θεομυθίαν ἡ πάσας τὰς ῥαψῳδίας ἐξεγένετο αὐτῷ τοῦτο ποιῆσαι. 27.668–670). The *Rhapsodic Theogony*, also known as the canonical Orphic theogony, was the most influential theogony of the Imperial period,<sup>14</sup> and the one most frequently referred to, quoted and commented by the Neoplatonist philosophers and, especially, by Proclus and Damascius. Brisson in his study on Proclus and the *Orphica* points out that in Proclus’ works there are 248 references to the *Orphica*.<sup>15</sup> The second most important source of the Orphic fragments after Proclus is Damascius, who provides 56 references to the *Orphica*.

Proclus, finally, in his *Platonic Theology* writes about Plato, Greek theology and their agreement with the Orphic and Pythagorean writings: “Then, it must be shown that each of the doctrines is in agreement with the first principles of Plato and with the mystic traditions of the theologians; for the whole theology of the Greeks is the offspring of the mystagogy of Orpheus; Pythagoras first had learned from Aglaophamos the initiation rites of the gods, Plato then received from the Pythagorean and Orphic writings the complete science that concerns them.” (Δεῖ δὲ ἔκαστα τῶν δογμάτων ταῖς Πλατωνικαῖς ἀρχαῖς ἀποφαίνειν σύμφωνα καὶ ταῖς τῶν θεολόγων μυστικαῖς παραδόσεσιν<sup>16</sup> ἀπασα γάρ ἡ παρ’ Ἑλλησι θεολογία τῆς Ὁρφικῆς<sup>17</sup> ἐστὶ μυσταγωγίας ἔκγονος, πρώτου μὲν Πυθαγόρου<sup>18</sup> παρὰ Ἀγλαοφήμου τὰ περὶ θεῶν ὄργια διδαχθέντος, δευτέρου δὲ Πλάτωνος ὑποδεξαμένου

<sup>14</sup> E.g.: Rufin. *Recognit.* 10, 30 (346, 17 Rehm) = O F Bern. 669 VII.

<sup>15</sup> Brisson (1995) 43–103.

<sup>16</sup> See also the reference to the books of the theologians and the theurgists in Procl. *In Ti. III.132.1–2*: ὃν αἱ βιβλοὶ πλήρεις εἰσὶ τῶν θεολόγων καὶ τῶν θεουργῶν.

<sup>17</sup> Procl. *In Prm.* 647.9–13: ἡ δὲ τῶν Ὁρφικῶν τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς οὖσα θεολογίας ιδία, Κρόνον καὶ Δία καὶ Οὐρανὸν καὶ Νύκτα καὶ Κύκλωπας καὶ Ἐκατόγχειρας ἐπιφημίζουσα ταῖς ἀκροτάταις τῶν πάντων ἀρχαῖς.

<sup>18</sup> Procl. *In Prm.* 647.1–4: ... καθάπερ ἐκείνων ἡ μὲν ἐξαίρετός ἐστι τῶν Πυθαγορείων, ὡς ὁ Φιλόλαος δηλοῖ, τοῖς ἀριθμοῖς τὰς τῶν θεῶν ὑπάρξεις καὶ προόδους ἀφηγησάμενος:

τὴν παντελήν περὶ τούτων ἐπιστήμην ἐκ τε τῶν Πυθαγορείων καὶ τῶν Ὀρφικῶν γραμμάτων. *Procl. Plat.Theol.* 1.25.24–26.4).<sup>19</sup>

## 2 Proclus' Works

### 2.1 Proclus' Complete Works

Proclus' complete surviving works include among others commentaries on Plato's *Timaeus*, *Alcibiades* I, *Parmenides*, *Cratylus* and *Republic*. His commentaries on Plato's *Timaeus*, *Alcibiades* I and *Parmenides* are running prose commentaries. Marinus in *Proclus* mentions that Proclus finished his *Commentary on Plato's Timaeus* by the age of twenty-eight (Marin. *Vit. Procl.* 13.329–330). His *Commentary on Plato's Alcibiades* I may have been one of his early works.<sup>20</sup> Unlike the above commentaries, his *Commentary on Plato's Cratylus* is a collection of excerpts, which could derive either from Proclus' lectures or from the lecture notes of a student.<sup>21</sup> His *Commentary on Plato's Parmenides* must have been composed at a later stage of his life, since it refers to his *Timaeus Commentary*.<sup>22</sup> His *Commentary on Plato's Republic* is a collection of seventeen essays written at different times and addressing various issues of *Plato's Republic*.<sup>23</sup>

Proclus also wrote an astronomical work, *Exposition of Astronomical Hypotheses* (*Hypotypōsis Astronomicarum Positionum*). His systematic manuals, *Elements of Physics* (*Στοιχεώσις Φυσική*) and *Elements of Theology* (*Στοιχεώσις Θεολογική*), may have been early works, although the last one was probably revised

<sup>19</sup> Similarly, Iamblichus in *De Vita Pythagorica* asserts that Pythagoras' 'composite' (σύνθετον) philosophy has influences from Orphic, Egyptian, Chaldaean and mystic doctrines and rituals; Iamb. *VP* 28.151.9–13. Damascius in *Philosophos Historia* points out the Egyptian influence on Pythagorean philosophy: Αἰγύπτιοι δὲ ταῦτά εἰσιν οἱ πρῶτοι φιλοσοφοῦντες ἀπὸ γάρ τῶν Αἰγυπτίων ἔκαστα τούτων οἱ Πυθαγόρειοι ἔξηνεγκαν εἰς τοὺς Ἑλληνας. (Dam. *Phil. Hist.* 4a.15–17 / Dam. *Vit. Isid. Fr.* 3.17–19). Damascius elsewhere praises the Egyptian and Chaldaean higher wisdom, "which exceeds the philosophical common understanding" (πρὸς δὲ τὴν Ὀρφικήν τε καὶ Χαλδαϊκήν τὴν ὑψηλοτέρων σοφίαν, καὶ τὸν κοινὸν φιλοσοφίας νοῦν ὑπεραίρουσσαν) Dam. *Phil. Hist.* 85.5–7 / Dam. *Vit. Isid. Fr.* 126.4–6.

<sup>20</sup> Westerink (1954) vii–x; O'Neil (1965) vii–viii.

<sup>21</sup> Pasquali (1908) v–vii; Duvick and Tarrant (2007) vii–viii, 1–7.

<sup>22</sup> Morrow and Dillon (1987) xxxiv–xxxviii.

<sup>23</sup> Kroll (1899) v–vii; (1901) iii–ix; Sheppard (1980) 16 ff. According to the Souda lexicon, the *Εἰς τὴν πολιτείαν Πλάτωνος βιβλία δ'* is ascribed both to Proclus and Syrianus (Souda Lexicon on Proclus, p. 210 and Souda Lexicon on Syrianus, p. 478). Adler (1928–1938) Vol. IV. See also discussion on Syrianus in *DPhA* (2016) vi: 678–707. Also, Baltzly, Finamore, Miles (2018) intro. 1–33.

at later stages of his life.<sup>24</sup> His *Commentary on the First Book of Euclid's Elements* (*In Primum Euclidis Elementorum Librum Commentarii*) has probably been written in the year after his exile in Lydia (his exile in Lydia is mentioned in Marin. *Vit. Procl.* 15.382). The *Tria Opuscula* is a collection of three monographs on providence, fate and the origin of evil: *Ten Doubts Concerning Providence* (*De Decem Dubitationibus circa Providentiam*), *On Providence and Fate* (*De Providentia et Fato eo quod in nobis ad Theodorum Mechanicum*), and *On the Existence of Evils* (*De Malorum Subsistentia*), which probably have been written at different times.<sup>25</sup> The *Platonic Theology* is considered to be one of his last works, which cites his commentaries on *Plato's Timaeus* and *Parmenides*.<sup>26</sup> It has also been saved a collection of seven theological Hymns<sup>27</sup> (and two Epigrams) composed by Proclus.

## 2.2 Proclus' Lost Works or Preserved in Fragments on Theological Tradition, Orphic Theology and Theurgy

The Souda lexicon attributes two treatises, *On Orphic Theology* (*Εἰς τὴν Ὀρφέως Θεολογίαν*) and *On the Harmony of Orpheus, Pythagoras and Plato with the Oracles 10 Books* (*Συμφωνίαν Ὀρφέως, Πυθαγόρου, Πλάτωνος περὶ τὰ Λόγια βιβλία ί'*)<sup>28</sup> to the works of both Syrianus and Proclus.<sup>29</sup> That double attribution could mean that Proclus might have added comments to these treatises of Syrianus. Proclus has been very much influenced by his teacher Syrianus, working with him for about six years.<sup>30</sup>

Regarding the *Orphic Theology*, as examined in the first section, Marinus in *Proclus* mentions that he had tried to make Proclus “write marginal notes (*παραγράφειν*) of what pleased him in his teacher's [Syrianus'] books” (Marin. *Vit. Procl.* 27.664–665); and “when he [Proclus] wrote notes in the margins of the commentaries, we collated them all into a single volume” (*καὶ παραγράψαντος τοῖς μετώποις τῶν ὑπομνημάτων, ἔσχομεν συναγωγὴν εἰς ταύτὸν ἀπάν-*

24 Dodds (1933) xiv–xviii; Ritzenfeld (1912) v–viii; Boese (1958) 5 ff.

25 Boese (1960) ix–xxxii.

26 Saffrey and Westerink (1968) cl–clx.

27 Berg (2001).

28 See also Praechter (1926) 253.

29 Souda Lexicon on Syrianus, pp. 478–479: *Εἰς τὴν Ὀρφέως Θεολογίαν βιβλία δύο, Συμφωνίαν Ὀρφέως, Πυθαγόρου, Πλάτωνος περὶ τὰ λόγια βιβλία δέκα.* Souda Lexicon on Proclus, p. 210: *Εἰς τὴν Ὀρφέως Θεολογίαν, Συμφωνίαν Ὀρφέως, Πυθαγόρου, Πλάτωνος περὶ τὰ λόγια βιβλία ί'.* See also discussion on Syrianus in *DPhA* (2016) VI: 678–707, and on Proclus in *DPhA* (2012) Vb: 1546–1674.

30 Dodds (1933) xiv: “Of the Orphic Theology and the Harmony of Orpheus, Pythagoras and Plato (both now lost) Proclus seems to have been editor rather than author.”

των 27.665–668). Consequently, “there were [written] comments and notes on many lines of Orpheus by Proclus (καὶ ἐγένετο εἰς Ὁρφέα αὐτοῦ σχόλια καὶ ὑπομήματα στίχων οὐκ δλίγων), even if he did not do this on the whole divine myth, or all the *Rhapsodies* [of the *Rhapsodic Theogony*]” (27.668–670).

Similarly, the Souda lexicon attributes the works *A Commentary on the whole of Homer in seven books* (*Εἰς Ὁμηρον ὅλον ὑπόμνημα ἐν βιβλίοις ἐπτά*) and *On the Gods of Homer* (*Περὶ τῶν παρ’ Ὁμήρῳ θεῶν*) to both Proclus and Syrianus.<sup>31</sup> The double attribution of these works to Proclus and Syrianus probably has a similar explanation, which is that Proclus may have added comments to Syrianus’ works.<sup>32</sup>

The Souda lexicon also ascribes to Proclus a fragmentary *Commentary on Hesiod’s Works and Days*.<sup>33</sup> Another fragmentary work of Proclus, *On the Chaldaean Philosophy* is a collection of five excerpts.<sup>34</sup>

### 3 Proclus’ *On the Hieratic Art according to the Greeks* and His Lost Works

The fragmentary work of Proclus’ *On the Hieratic Art according to the Greeks*<sup>35</sup> could be part of Proclus’ lost work *Peri Agôgês, Περὶ ἀγωγῆς β'*, *On the Evoking Procedure* [of deities/spirits by means of theurgy], completed in two volumes, which is mentioned in the Souda lexicon,<sup>36</sup> or even part of another lost work of Proclus, *On Mythical Symbols*, *Περὶ τῶν μυθικῶν συμβόλων*. Proclus refers to the title *Περὶ τῶν μυθικῶν συμβόλων* in his *Commentary on Plato’s Republic* (Ἄλλὰ τῶν μὲν μύθων τὰς αἰτίας καὶ ἐν τοῖς Περὶ τῶν μυθικῶν συμβόλων ἐξειργάσμεθα. τούτων δὲ ἡμῖν τέλος ἔχόντων ἐπ’ αὐτὸν ἥδη τὸν Πλατωνικὸν μῦθον χωρεῖν ἀναγκαῖον Procl. In R. II.108.30–109.3).<sup>37</sup>

Ficino translated the Greek text of Proclus’ *On the Hieratic Art* into Latin, giving it the title *Opus Procli de Sacrificio et Magia*, and published it in

<sup>31</sup> Souda Lexicon on Syrianus, p. 478: *Εἰς Ὁμηρον ὅλον ὑπόμνημα ἐν βιβλίοις ἐπτά ... [Εἰς τὰ Πρόκλουν] Περὶ τῶν παρ’ Ὁμήρῳ θεῶν*. Souda Lexicon on Proclus, p. 210: *Υπόμνημα εἰς ὅλον τὸν Ὁμηρον ... Περὶ τῶν παρ’ Ὁμήρῳ θεῶν*. Praechter excludes the marginal note [*Εἰς τὰ Πρόκλουν*] from the Souda’ text. Praechter (1926) 253–264.

<sup>32</sup> On *A Commentary on the whole of Homer in seven books* and *On the Gods of Homer* (*Περὶ τῶν παρ’ Ὁμήρῳ θεῶν*) in relation to Proclus’ references to Syrianus in the 6th essay of his *Commentary on Plato’s Republic* see discussion by Sheppard (1980) 46 ff.

<sup>33</sup> Marzillo (2010).

<sup>34</sup> Pitra (1967) 192–195; Des Places (1971) 206–212; Majercik (1989).

<sup>35</sup> On the title see discussion in Intro.: Sect. VI.

<sup>36</sup> Souda Lexicon on Proclus, p. 210: ... *Περὶ ἀγωγῆς β'* ...

<sup>37</sup> Kroll (1899) Vol. I and (1901) Vol. II.

1497.<sup>38</sup> Kroll reedited the Latin translation and retranslated the Latin text into Greek in his *Analecta Graeca* in 1901,<sup>39</sup> in which he notes that the excerpt of Proclus' *On Sacrifices* (*περὶ θυσιῶν*) possibly derives from his books *Peri Agôgês* or *On Mythical Symbols*: "Sequitur fol. h 7 'Opus Procli de sacrificio' tres comprehens paginas (des. fol. h 8 v), quod in indice appellatur 'de sacrificio et magia'. Quod quamquam graece quod sciam nusquam extat, tamen non dubito, quin Ficinus in codice aliquo invenerit excerptum Πρόκλου περὶ θυσιῶν, desumptum fortasse ex eius libris περὶ ἀγωγῆς vel περὶ μυθικῶν συμβόλων."<sup>40</sup> At the same time Kroll edited Proclus' *Commentary on Plato's Republic, the first volume* in 1899 and the second one in 1901.

Bidez (1928) states about the possible relation of Proclus' *On the Hieratic Art* to his lost books *Peri Agôgês* or *On Mythical Symbols*: "Ficin ayant fait que ces quelques pages de Proclus étaient intitulées *Περὶ θυσιῶν*, Kroll les avait données pour extraites du traité du même auteur *Περὶ ἀγωγῆς* ou *Περὶ τῶν μυθικῶν συμβόλων* dont nous ne connaissons que le titre."<sup>41</sup> Dodds (1933) also, following Kroll, notes that this work of Proclus belongs to "A group of lost works on religious symbolism (*Περὶ τῶν μυθικῶν συμβόλων*), on theurgy (*περὶ ἀγωγῆς*), against the Christians, on Hecate and on the myth of Cybele. These are represented for us only by the fragment *περὶ τῆς καθ' Ἑλληνας ιερατικῆς τέχνης* (de sacrificio et magia)."<sup>42</sup>

<sup>38</sup> According to the title and Index of Ficino's 1497 edition: Ficinus, Marsilius. (ed. and transl.). *Index eorum quae hoc in libro habentur. Iamblichus de Mysteriis Aegyptiorum, Chaldaeorum, Assyriorum. Proclus in Platonicum Alcibiadem de anima, atq(ue) daemonie. Proclus de Sacrificio et Magia. Porphyrius de divinis atq(ue) daemonibus. Synesius Platonicus de somniis. Psellus de daemonibus. Expositio Priscian et Marsili in Theophrastu(m) De sensu, phantasia et intellectu. Alcinoi Platonici philosophi Liber de doctri(n)a Platonis. Speusippi Platonis discipuli Liber de Platonis difinitionibus. Pythagorae philosophi Aurea verba. Symbola Pithagorae philosophi. Xenocratis philosophi platonici Liber de morte. Marsilius Ficini liber de voluptate.* (Venice, 1497).

<sup>39</sup> Kroll (1901).

<sup>40</sup> Kroll (1901) 6. See also "similiter etiam ex commentariis ad oracula frustula quaedam in codice Vatic. 1026 servata sunt (ed. A. Jahn. Halis 1891. Pitra anal. V 2. 192). Quod cum Ficinus admodum fideliter interpretatus sit, rursus in Graecam linguam verti, cum in non nullis saltem Procli verba recuperari posse et non sine utilitate recuperari existimarem. Ficini additamenta cancellis inclusi." Kroll (1901) 6; Jahn (1891); Bidez (1928) 137–151. On cod. Vatic. 1026 see comment by Pitra (1888) Vol. v: 192–195 at 192, n. 2: "Ex cod. Vatic. 1026, f. 281 v. Post nota Pselli scholia de Chaldaeorum oraculis, accedunt Procli fragmenta, quae videntur ex iisdem oraculis excerpta, vel libero exposita commentario. Quae quum Holstenius, ut inedita, praecedentibus libellis addidit, in promptu nobis fuit eadem viri docti legere vestigia. In codice Vaticano haec fragmenta inscribuntur: Πρόκλου ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς Χαλδαϊκῆς φιλοσοφίας."

<sup>41</sup> Bidez (1928) Vol. vi: 137–151, at 141.

<sup>42</sup> Dodds (1933) xiv.

Regarding the ancient reference to these works, Proclus in his *Commentary on Plato's Republic* refers to “all the hieratic (systematic) treatises” (ταῖς ἱερατικαῖς ἀπάσαις πραγματείαις Procl. *In R.* 1.110.22–23).<sup>43</sup> In *De Providentia* Proclus also mentions “the whole hieratic treatise” (τὴν ἱερατικὴν πραγματείαν ἀπασαν Procl. *Prov.* 38.2).<sup>44</sup> However, the term *πραγματεία/-αι* in both cases may have a double meaning describing also the hieratic practices/rituals.<sup>45</sup>

Marinus in *Proclus* 28 reports, “For the *orgia* [rituals] and the whole *theurgic agôgê* (ἡ σύμπασα θεουργικὴ ἀγωγή), which was transmitted to her [Asclepiogeneia] by the great Nestorius through her father [Plutarch], were preserved by her only.” (παρ' αὐτῇ γάρ καὶ μόνη ἐσώζετο ἀπὸ Νεστορίου τοῦ μεγάλου ὄργια καὶ ἡ σύμπασα θεουργικὴ ἀγωγὴ διὰ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῇ παραδόθεισα 28.679–683). Here ἡ σύμπασα θεουργικὴ ἀγωγή may also allude to Proclus’ lost work *Peri Agôgês* completed in two volumes, but it must initially refer to the “whole evoking process of theurgy” and the process of transmission of esoteric knowledge from Plutarch to his daughter Asclepiogeneia. Marinus also mentions Proclus’ Chaldaean purification rituals and his invocations of Hecate’s fiery epiphanies that “he himself has recorded in one of his own treatises.” (ώς καὶ αὐτός που μέμνηται ἐν ιδίῳ συγγράμματι. Marin. *Vit. Procl.* 28.683–686). Here, ἐν ιδίῳ συγγράμματι may refer to θεουργικῇ ἀγωγῇ.<sup>46</sup>

The epithet σύμπασα may also allude, as mentioned above, to all (two) volumes of *Peri Agôgês*. In *Proclus* 27 Marinus uses the same adjective πάσας τὰς ῥαψῳδίας, “all the *Rhapsodies*” [of the *Rhapsodic Theogony*], when he refers to the written comments and notes on many lines (σχόλια καὶ ὑπομνήματα στίχων) of Orpheus by Proclus (27.668–670). The epithet θεουργικὴν is used elsewhere in *Proclus* 28 for ἀρετήν, “theurgic virtue” (ἀρετὴν ἔτι μείζονα καὶ τελεωτέραν ἐπορίσατο τὴν θεουργικὴν 28.672). Similarly, Marinus describes the theurgic virtue as

43 Procl. *In R.* 1.110.21–26: εἰ δὲ οὖν καὶ ταῦτα τις εἰς τὴν Ὁμήρου διάνοιαν ἀναπέμπειν ἔθέλοι, πάντως οὐκ ἀπορήσει λόγων συμφώνων μὲν ταῖς ἱερατικαῖς ἀπάσαις πραγματείαις, συμφώνων δὲ ταῖς τελεταῖς καὶ τοῖς μυστηρίοις καὶ ταῖς τῶν θεῶν ἐπιφανείαις, ὃς ὅναρ τε καὶ ὑπάρ γινομένας ἀνωθεν ἡ τῶν ἀνθρώπων φήμη παρεδέξατο.

44 Isaac (1979).

45 See also Baltzly, Finamore, Miles (2018) 223, n. 175.

46 Praechter also (1926) relates Proclus’ lost work *Peri Agôgês* with Marinus’ reference to Proclus’ experience of Hecate’s epiphanies after performing certain Chaldaean purification rituals, and to his reference to “θεουργικὴ ἀγωγή” in Marinus’ *Proclus* 28: “Die Schrift Περὶ ἀγωγῆς wird das ιδίον σύγγραμμα sein, in welchem nach Marinus 28 Proklos über die von ihm vorgenommenen Χαλδαῖκοι καθαρμοί und die selbstgeschauten lichtartigen Hekategesichte berichtete, wahrscheinlich im Zusammenhange mit der von Marinus wenige Zeilen vorher erwähnten θεουργικὴ ἀγωγή.” Praechter (1926) 253–264, at 259, n. 4. See also Lewy (1978) 71, n. 15.

“[to] the highest of the virtues in relation to the human soul” (ἐπὶ τὰς ἀκροτάτας τῶν ἀρετῶν, ὡς πρὸς ἀνθρωπίνην ψυχήν 26.624–625).

The term ἀγωγή is used by Iamblichus in *De Mysteriis* in a theurgical context meaning “the procedure of evoking the spirits/gods” (e.g. Iamb. *Myst.* III.6.113.1–2: ἀφανῶς ποιούμενοι τὰς ἀγωγὰς τῶν πνευμάτων; III.14.134.8: τρόποι τῆς τοῦ φωτὸς ἀγωγῆς; v.26.240.9: τῆς ἱερατικῆς ἀγωγῆς; also on “the procedure of evoking gods,” II.10.92.7: τῇ θεαγωγίᾳ; VI.1.5: αἱ θεαγωγίαι). In his *Commentary on Plato’s Republic*, Proclus refers to “... the hieratic/theurgic mode of the *agôge* [/evoking procedure], accomplished by sacrifices, divine names and prayers” (... <ό> ἱερατικὸς τρόπος τῆς ἀγωγῆς, διὰ θυσιῶν, δὶ’ ὀνομάτων θείων, δὶ’ εὐχῶν συμπεπληρωμένος Procl. *In R.* II.66.13–15). The term ἀγωγή in the Greek magical papyri describes “the spell/procedure of evoking/leading a spirit(/-s) or daimon(/-s) of the dead or a deity(/-ies).” The term is mainly used in the Greek magical papyri in an erotic context and is commonly translated as “erotic spell that leads.” But it actually describes “the procedure of evoking mostly a spirit of the dead in order to lead, or bring” a person [eros-victim] by means of a spell and/or a ritual to be spoken or practiced by the user of the spell to the victim of his/her erotic passion.

#### 4 Manuscripts

The Greek text of Πρόκλου *Περὶ τῆς καθ’ Ἑλληνας ἱερατικῆς τέχνης* is preserved in the ms Vallicellianus F 20, fols. 138<sup>r</sup>–140<sup>v</sup> (= V, 138<sup>r</sup>–140<sup>v</sup>) and the ms Laurentianus Plut. 10.32, fols. 119<sup>r</sup>–121<sup>v</sup> (= L, 119<sup>r</sup>–121<sup>v</sup>).<sup>47</sup> The ms Laurentianus Plut. 10.32, fols. 119<sup>r</sup>–121<sup>v</sup> is a copy of V, 138<sup>r</sup>–140<sup>v</sup>.<sup>48</sup> The codices for the Latin text are: ms Laurentianus Plut. 82.15, fols. 126<sup>v</sup>–128<sup>v</sup>; and ms Laurentianus Strozz. 97, fols. 147<sup>v</sup>–151<sup>v</sup>.<sup>49</sup>

##### 4.1 ms Vallicellianus F 20, Fols. 138<sup>r</sup>–140<sup>v</sup>

The author examined the manuscript by autopsy and in photographs.<sup>50</sup> The ms Vallicellianus F 20 was owned and annotated by Marsilio Ficino (Martini 1902, Sicherl 1957, Kristeller 1937, 1967 and 1986).<sup>51</sup>

<sup>47</sup> Sicherl (1957) 22–27, 36, 184–188, 119–220; see also Copenhaver (1988) 97, nn. 36, 40.

<sup>48</sup> Sicherl (1957) 79–83.

<sup>49</sup> Copenhaver (1988) 85 and 97, n. 40.

<sup>50</sup> For a detailed description of ms Vallicellianus F 20 see Appendix 1.

<sup>51</sup> Martini in *Catalogo di manoscritti greci esistenti nelle biblioteche italiane* (1902) 147–148.

Sicherl (1957) 22–37. Kristeller (1937) Vol. I: xlvii, Lxix, Cxxxv. Kristeller in *Iter Italicum* (1967) Vol. II: 132–133. Kristeller (1986) 15–196, at 116–117.

The ms Vallicellianus F 20 is one of the oldest manuscripts of the Biblioteca Vallicelliana. The library was established in 1565 by the priest and Saint Filippo Neri—born in Florence in 1515 and died in Rome in 1595—and it is located in the building of the Oratory of Saint Filippo Neri, which was erected between 1637 and 1650. The codex belonged to the Portuguese humanist and writer Aquiles Estaço (1524–1581) who lived in Rome as a secretary of the Pope since 1555. When Aquiles Estaço died in 1581, he donated the ms VF 20 and his whole book and manuscript collection comprising 1700 printed volumes and 300 manuscripts to Filippo Neri and the Congregation of Oratory (founded by Filippo Neri in 1575).<sup>52</sup> Then Filippo Neri must have included it in the collections of the Biblioteca Vallicelliana.

The ms Vallicellianus F 20 was restored in the monastery at the Badia di Grottaferrata in 1960. It is a composite manuscript in three parts: A) Part 1: Folios i–172; B) Part 2: Folios 173–318v; C) Part 3: Folios 319v–357v. [height 210 (204) × width 140 (135)/150 mm.].

#### 4.1.1 Contents of Part 1 of ms Vallicellianus F 20, Fols. i–172

1. Fols. 1–136v: Tit.: no title (*Iamblichus De Mysteriis*). Scholion: Inc.: Ἰστέον ... Inc.: ἴστορήσαντα. Inc.: Ἀβάμωνος διδασκάλου. Des.: ἀπορημάτων λύσεις.<sup>53</sup> Fol. 137: blank
2. Fols. 138r–140v include: Tit.: *Πρόκλου Περὶ τῆς καθ' Ἑλληνας ἱερατικῆς τέχνης*. Inc.: Ὁσπερ οἱ ἐρωτικοί. Des.: καὶ θείαις ἐχρήσαντο δυνάμεσι.<sup>54</sup>

Fols. 138r–144r include a Greek text written by a single scribe identified as Marsilio Ficino (1433–1499)<sup>55</sup> with Latin marginal notes also by Ficino.<sup>56</sup> Kristeller (1986) points out: “The Iamblichus text has Latin notes in the hand of

<sup>52</sup> Finocchiaro (2011) 138; see also the Index of the Manuscripts in Vallicelliana: Finocchiaro (2011) 185–186.

<sup>53</sup> Fols. 1–136v include a Greek text written by a single scribe identified as Ioannis Skoutariotis, with Latin marginal notes based on Ficino's translation and written by Ficino and Luca Fabiani Martini (1902) 147–148. See also Saffrey and Stefani (2018).

<sup>54</sup> Bidez (1928) 137–151.

<sup>55</sup> Gamillscheg, Harlfinger and Hunger in *Repertorium der griechischen Kopisten, 800–1600*. Facsim. 30 cm. Band II.2A (1989); and Band II.3A (1997) 165.

<sup>56</sup> ms Riccardianus 76 was annotated and owned by Ficino. See for example the marginal notes in ms Riccardianus 76, Fols. 116–129. Kristeller (1937) includes ms Riccardianus 76 in the copies possessed or transcribed by Ficino, “*Codices a Ficino possessi seu transcripti*”: Kristeller (1937) Vol. I: liv. Later, Kristeller (1986) also includes it in the “Census of manuscripts containing original works and letters of Marsilio Ficino or copied, annotated or owned by him.”: Kristeller (1986) 15–196, at 97–98.

Ficino and Luca Fabiani. The Proclus text is preserved only in this manuscript. The manuscript is the source of Ficino's translations of both Iamblichus and Proclus.<sup>57</sup>

Fols. 141–144 are excerpts from Eusebius' *Praeparatio Evangelica*:<sup>58</sup>

3. Fol. 141<sup>r–v</sup>: Tit.: *Porphyrii testus (sic) quod anima non sit actus corporis, sed quod immortalis*. Inc.: αὐτίκα λόγον ἴσχυρόν. Des.: ψυχρὸν δὲ καθ' ἑαυτό. (= Eusebius *Praeparatio Evangelica* XI 28.1–5 and XV 11.1–2).
4. Fol. 142<sup>r–v</sup>: Tit.: *Numenius De Secunda Causa*. Inc.: τὸν μέλλοντα δὲ. Des.: πρεσβύτερος καὶ θειότερος. (= Eusebius *Praeparatio Evangelica* XI 18.1–3, 6–9, 22–23).
5. Fols. 142<sup>v</sup>–143<sup>r</sup>: Tit.: *Amelius De Johannis Theologia*. Inc.: καὶ οὗτος ἄρα. Des.: τὸν ἀνθρωπὸν καταχθῆναι. (= Eusebius *Praeparatio Evangelica* XI 19.1).
6. Fol. 143<sup>r–v</sup>: *Numenius Pythagoreus de Ente*. Inc.: φέρ' οὖν ὅση. Des.: προσαναγκάζεσθαι. (= Eusebius *Praeparatio Evangelica* XI 10.1–7).
7. Fols. 144<sup>r</sup>: Tit.: *Philon De Secunda Causa*. Inc.: εὐπρεπές γάρ τοῖς. Des.: πρωτογόνον αὐτοῦ λόγον. (= Eusebius *Praeparatio Evangelica* XI 15.1–2).

Fols. 144<sup>r</sup>–172<sup>r</sup>: Latin Text written by another single (unidentified) scribe.

8. Fols. 144<sup>r</sup>–148<sup>r</sup>: Tit.: *Porphyrius de occasionibus sive causis ad intelligibiliā nos ducentibus*. Interprete Marsilio Ficino. (= Marsillii Ficini *Opera*. Basileae, 1561, II 1929–1932).
- Fol. 148: blank
9. Fols. 149–161<sup>v</sup>: Tit.: *Ex Porphyrio de abstinentia animalium*. Interprete Marsilio Ficino. (= Marsillii Ficini *Opera*. Basileae, 1561, II 1932–1939).
10. Fols. 162–171<sup>r</sup>: Tit.: *Ex Michaeli Psello de demonibus* (excerpts) (= Marsillii Ficini *Opera*. Basileae, 1561, II 1939–1945).
11. Fols. 171<sup>r</sup>–172<sup>r</sup>: Tit.: *Hactenus Psellus. Deinceps ex Tomistis*. Inc.: Quanta sit potestas daemonum super naturalia. Des.: (Fol. 172<sup>r</sup>): tu de his lege Tommam contra gentiles de operibus magicis.

#### 4.1.2 The Dating of MS Vallicellianus F 20, Fols. 138<sup>r</sup>–140<sup>v</sup> from Watermarks and other Sources

The watermarks of VF 20, Fols. 138<sup>r</sup>–140<sup>v</sup> of Πρόκλου Περὶ τῆς καθ' Ἑλληνας ἱερατικῆς τέχνης are:

57 Kristeller (1986) 15–196, at 116–117.

58 Monfasani in "Marsilio Ficino and Eusebius of Caesarea's *Praeparatio Evangelica*" (2009) 3–13.

Fol. 137 (: blank), 138, 139, 140 (: not very clear): hat (upper part):

The watermark is similar to Briquet<sup>59</sup> n. 3373 (Florence, Italian paper, 1474–1483); similar also to Briquet n. 3370 (Florence, Italian paper, 1465–1467);<sup>60</sup> also to Briquet n. 3373 (Palermo, Italian paper, 1473).

It is similar also to Piccard<sup>61</sup> n. 31958 (Monteoliveto, StA Mantova, Italian paper, 1462); similar also to Piccard n. 31960 (Rome, StA Mantova, 1461); also to Piccard n. 31961 (Monteoliveto, StA Mantova, Italian paper, 1469); also to Piccard n. 31962 (Firenze, StA Mantova, Italian paper, 1459–1460).

Some important dates of Ficino's life should be taken into account, when dating the codex. For example, Ficino learned Greek late. He first studied Plato in Latin translations. His first book, the *Platonic Institutions* (1456, now lost) relied on Latin authors and translations of the Platonic dialogues. In 1462 Ficino produced his first Latin translation of Greek texts including the first dialogues of Plato, the *Hymns of Orpheus*, and Zoroaster's sayings. In 1463 he produced a Latin translation of the *Hermetic Texts*. After that he had been translating Plato's dialogues until 1469. From 1484 to 1492 he had been translating and commenting Plotinus, Porphyry and Proclus. In 1489 he wrote his work *The Three Books of Life*. Ficino's *Letters* were published in 1495. His commentaries of Plato and his translations and commentaries of Dionysius were published in 1496. In 1497 his translation of Iamblichus and of Proclus' *On the Hieratic Art* was published. Ficino died in 1499.

So, Proclus' *On the Hieratic Art according to the Greeks* V F 20, 138<sup>r</sup>–140<sup>v</sup> was written/copied by Ficino between the 1460s—when Ficino produced his first Latin translation of Greek texts in 1462—and 1488–1489—when Ficino translated into Latin Proclus' *On the Hieratic Art* V, 138<sup>r</sup>–140<sup>v</sup> and probably wrote the marginal (some/most of them) notes of Proclus' *On the Hieratic Art*.

The date that the marginal notes were written does not necessarily have to be the same as the V, Fols. 138<sup>r</sup>–140<sup>v</sup> were written/copied. Ficino made Latin marginal notes in the manuscript related to his work *The Book of Life*, or *The Three Books of Life* (*Liber de Vita* or *De Vita Triplici*) (especially Book 3), which was written in 1489. Consequently, the marginal (some/most of them) notes in Proclus' *On the Hieratic Art* must be written probably shortly before and during 1489 (perhaps around 1488–1489). Kristeller (1937) also asserts that

59 Briquet (1907).

60 Sicherl (1957) 23. Clarke, Dillon and Hershbell follow Sicherl; Clarke, Dillon and Hershbell (2003) xiii.

61 Piccard (1961–1997).

Ficino translated into Latin *De Sacrificio et Magia* in 1488–1489 (Ficino *Opera*, pp. 1928–1929).<sup>62</sup>

#### 4.1.3 Ficino's Life and Works

Cosimo de' Medici was interested in Plato and in establishing the Platonic Academy in Florence since 1439, when Gemistos Plethon (1355/1360–1452/1454) and Ioannis Argyropoulos (1415–1487) arrived in Florence with the Greek Emperor and Patriarch to discuss a possible union between the Greek and Roman Churches.

Ficino (1433–1499) learned Greek at a later stage of his life. He first studied Plato in Latin translations. His first book, the *Platonic Institutions* (1456, now lost) relied on Latin authors and translations of the Platonic dialogues. When Cosimo read it, he advised Ficino to start learning Greek before publishing anything else (*Letters* 10, 12). In his *Letter* 7 on “Divine Frenzy” written the following year (1457) Ficino refers to Plato's *Phaedrus*, probably relying on Leonardo Bruni's translation of this Platonic dialogue (1424).<sup>63</sup> However, Ficino writes in his *Letter* 86 to Lorenzo de' Medici, who became the ruler of Florence in 1469, that he had been discussing philosophy with Cosimo for more than twelve years.<sup>64</sup> Ficino was the mentor to Lorenzo de' Medici, who was the grandson of Cosimo de' Medici. So, he must have been engaged and discussed philosophy with Cosimo, who died in 1464, since 1452.

In 1462 Ficino produced his first Latin translation of Greek texts including the first dialogues of Plato, the *Hymns* of Orpheus, and Zoroaster's sayings. In his *Letter* 25 (dated on 9 June 1492), Ficino refers to the *Orphic Hymns*: “I had translated word for word just for myself in my youth.” The *Orphic Hymns* were published in a printed edition in Italy in 1500.<sup>65</sup>

In 1463 Cosimo gave Ficino a villa at Careggi to accommodate the Academy.<sup>66</sup> (The activities of the Academy were reduced after the death of Lorenzo de' Medici in 1492 and the expulsion of the Medici family from Florence in 1494. Ficino himself retired to the country). In 1463 he finished the Latin translation of the *Hermetic Texts*. After that he translated Plato's dialogues until 1469. In 1468 he suffered from melancholy and his friend Giovanni Cavalcanti

62 Kristeller (1937) vol. I: cxxxiv–cxxxv; Allen (2014) 358. Megna identified Ficino's exemplar as the Vatican library's Palatinus codex gr. 63; Megna (2004) 313–362. Kristeller (1937) cxxxiv–cxxxv. Megna (2004) 313–362. Allen (2014) 353–379.

63 Kristeller et al. (1975) Vol. I: 14, 176.

64 Kristeller et al. (1975) Vol. I.

65 Kristeller et al. (2015) Vol. X: 75.

66 For the date 1463 see Kristeller et al. (1975) Vol. I: xxvii. For the date 1462 see Kristeller (1943) 16.

advised him to write a dialogue about love (this is his commentary on Plato's *Symposium*, *De Amore*).<sup>67</sup> In 1469 Ficino finished the commentaries on Plato's *Symposium* and *Philebus*. From 1470–1475 Ficino was writing his major work, the *Platonic Theology* (18 books). In 1473 he became a priest and started writing the Christian Religion. In 1487 he became a canon of Florence Cathedral.

From 1484–1492 he was translating and commenting Plotinus, Porphyry and Proclus. In 1489 he wrote his work *The Three Books of Life*. In his *Letter 29* (dated on 3 August 1492), Ficino mentions that Janus Lascaris selected and brought books from Greece, including commentaries of Proclus on six books of Plato's *Republic*, "Janus Lascaris made two journeys to Greece for Lorenzo in search for manuscripts in monastic and other libraries, one in autumn 1490 in Thessaloniki, Macedonia and Mount Athos, the second from spring to 1491 to the summer 1492, reaching Constantinople before returning via Mount Athos again and Crete. He returned in 1492 with 200 manuscripts".<sup>68</sup>

Corsi in the *Life of Marsilio Ficino* xi mentions, "Being then fifty-one years old (1484), he undertook the translation of Plotinus ... In the next five years he presented the whole of Plotinus in Latin and produced annotated commentaries on each of the fifty-four books".<sup>69</sup> In the *Life of Marsilio Ficino* xii Corsi continues saying, "After these works, he translated Synesius' *On Dreams*, Psellus' *On Daemons*, Iamblichus' *On the Eleusinian [Mysteries] of the Egyptians*, Priscian of Lydia *On Theophrastus Concerning the Soul* ... At the same time, he translated Porphyry's *On Fasting and Means for Reaching the Divine*, also much from Hermias *On Phaedrus*, from Iamblichus *On the Pythagorean School* and from Theon of Smyrna *On Mathematics*. He also translated Alcinous's *Summary of Plato*, together with the *Definitions* of Speusippus, the *Sayings* of Pythagoras, and Xenocrates' *On Consolation*, as well as the extracts from Athenagoras' *On Resurrection*. Furthermore, he translated from Greek into Latin several works of Proclus, namely, *On Alcibiades*, *On the Republic* and *On Priesthood*. He was then in his fifty-eighth year (1491)."<sup>70</sup>

In his *Letter 30* also on *De Daemonibus*, Ficino mentions: "While I was translating the commentary of Proclus the Platonist on Plato's Alcibiades from Greek to Latin not word for word but according to the meaning ..." Ficino translated an extract from Proclus' Alcibiades commentary in 1488.<sup>71</sup> Ficino's *Letters* were published in 1495. His commentaries on Plato and his translations and

67 Corsi *Life of Marcilio Ficino* viii; *Letter 3*.

68 Kristeller et al. (2015) Vol. x: 79.

69 Kristeller et al. (1981) Vol. iii: 141.

70 Kristeller et al. (1981) Vol. iii: 142, 151.

71 Kristeller et al. 2015 (Vol. x) 82.

commentaries on Dionysius were published in 1496. Also, his translation of Iamblichus and of Proclus' *On the Hieratic Art* was published in 1497.

#### 4.2 *ms Laurentianus Plut. 10.32, Fols. 119<sup>r</sup>–121<sup>v</sup>*

The author examined the manuscript by autopsy and in photographs. The *ms Laurentianus Plut. 10.32* is in the Laurenziana library, Florence; and it was copied by Petrus Candidus (15/16th c.).<sup>72</sup> It is a copy (ἀπόγραφον) of *ms Vallicellianus F 20*, Fols. 138<sup>r</sup>–140<sup>v</sup>.<sup>73</sup>

The emendations, variations or similarities in the Greek text of Proclus' *On the Hieratic Art* between *ms Vallicellianus F 20*, Fols. 138<sup>r</sup>–140<sup>v</sup> and *ms Laurentianus Plut. 10.32*, Fols. 119<sup>r</sup>–121<sup>v</sup> are:

- Procl. *Hier.Ar.* 1.11 συγκλινεῖται codd. VL
- 2.5 ἐφελκύσαντο codd. VL
- 2.10 νοείσθω cod. V νοείσθη cod. L
- 3.6 συναπτύσσοντα codd. VL
- 3.9 ἐνπνέοντας cod. V ἐμπνέοντας corr. cod. L
- 3.10 ἡλιτὶμ cod. V ἡλιτὶμ cod. L
- 3.13 ἀφιέντα cod. V ἀφιόντι cod. L
- 3.14 σεληνίτιν codd. VL
- 3.15 ἡλιοσέλληνον codd. VL
- 4.15 ὅφθησαν codd. VL
- 4.17 τι τῶν ἡλικῶν codd. VL
- 4.18 γενέσεως codd. VL
- 5.4 ἰδιότιτας cod. V ἰδιότητας corr. cod. L
- 5.16 ἐπηγήγαγεν cod. V ἐπανήγαγεν corr. cod. L
- 6.2 ἀπόχρη codd. VL
- 7.4 ἐνεργίας codd. VL; but 7.9 ἐνεργείας codd. VL

##### 4.2.1 Contents of *ms Laurentianus Plut. 10.32, Fols. 1<sup>r</sup>–174<sup>v</sup>*

*ms Laurentianus Plut. 10.32* was copied by Petrus Candidus (1455/1460–1513).

##### 1. Fols. 1<sup>r</sup>–118<sup>v</sup>: Tit.: no title (*Iamblichus De Mysteriis*)

Scholion: Ἰστέον—ἰστορήσαντα. Inc.: Ἀβάμωνος διδασκάλου. Des.: ἀπορημάτων λύσεις.

<sup>72</sup> Sicherl (1957) 22–27, 79–83, 220; Copenhaver (1988) 84, 103.

<sup>73</sup> Kristeller (1986) writes: “Iamblichus and Proclus are copied from Vallicellianus F 20, the Proclus probably for Ficino.” Kristeller (1986) 15–196, at 85.

Fols: 118<sup>r</sup>–121<sup>r</sup> (and 124<sup>r</sup>, 146<sup>r</sup> and 172<sup>r</sup>) have wrong numbering written on the top right:

Existing foliation (: wrong folio numbering)	Reconstructed foliation (: correct folio numbering)
118 <sup>r</sup>	119 <sup>r</sup>
119 <sup>r</sup>	120 <sup>r</sup>
120 <sup>r</sup>	121 <sup>r</sup>
121 <sup>r</sup>	122 <sup>r</sup>
124 <sup>r</sup>	125 <sup>r</sup>
146 <sup>r</sup>	147 <sup>r</sup>
172 <sup>r</sup>	173 <sup>r</sup>

However, the above folios are indicated with the existing foliation and not with the reconstructed one.

2. Fol. 118<sup>r</sup>: Tit.: *Amelius de Johannis theologia*. Inc.: καὶ οὗτος ἄρα. Des.: τὸν ἄνθρωπον καταχθῆναι. (= Eusebius *Praeparatio Evangelica* XI 19.1).
3. Fols. 118<sup>r</sup>–v: Tit.: *Numenius Pythagoreus de Ente*. Inc.: φέρ' οὖν ὅση. Des.: προσαναγκάζεσθαι. (= Eusebius *Praeparatio Evangelica* XI 10.1–7).
4. Fol. 119<sup>r</sup>: Tit.: *Philon de secunda causa*. Inc.: εὐπρεπὲς γὰρ τοῖς. Des.: πρωτόγονον αὐτοῦ λόγον. (= Eusebius *Praeparatio Evangelica* XI 15.1–2).
5. Fols. 119<sup>r</sup>–121<sup>v</sup>: *Πρόκλου Περὶ τῆς καθ' Ἑλληνας ἱερατικῆς τέχνης*. Inc.: "Οσπερ οἱ ἐρωτικοὶ. Des.: καὶ θείαις ἔχρήσαντο δυνάμεσι.
6. Fols. 121<sup>v</sup>–122<sup>v</sup>: Tit.: *Porphyrii testus (sic) quod anima non sit actus corporis, sed quod immortalis*. Inc.: αὐτίκα λόγον ἴσχυρόν. Des.: ψυχρὸν ὃν καθ' ἔαυτό. (= Eusebius *Praeparatio Evangelica* XI 28.1–5 and XV 11.1–2).
7. Fols. 123<sup>v</sup>–124<sup>r</sup>: Tit.: *Numenius de secunda causa*. Inc.: τὸν μέλλοντα δέ. Des.: πρεσβύτερος καὶ θειότερος. (= Eusebius *Praeparatio Evangelica* XI 18.1–3, 6–9, 22–23).
- Fol. 124<sup>v</sup>: Blank
8. Fol. 124<sup>r</sup>–145<sup>v</sup>: Tit.: Ἀθηναγόρου ἀθηναίου φιλοσόφου χριστανοῦ περὶ ἀναστάσεως τῶν νεκρῶν.
9. Fol. 145<sup>v</sup>–172<sup>v</sup>: Tit.: Ἰουστίνου φιλοσόφου καὶ μάρτυρος λόγος παραινετικὸς πρὸς Ἑλληνας. = Migne PG 6, 242–311.
- Fol. 174<sup>r</sup>–v: Blank

#### 4.2.2 The Dating of ms Laurentianus Plut. 10.32, Fols. 119<sup>r</sup>–121<sup>v</sup> from Watermarks and other Sources

The watermarks of L (Plut. 10.32), Fols. 119<sup>r</sup>–121<sup>v</sup> of Πρόκλου *Περὶ τῆς καθ' Ἑλληνας ἱερατικῆς τέχνης* are: Fols. 3<sup>v</sup>, 169<sup>v</sup>: the watermark of two pointed arrows and a star (upper part): The watermark is similar to Briquet n. 6298 (Pistoie, Italian paper, 1511); and Briquet n. 6298 (Florence, Italian paper, 1511–1519). These watermarks are dated before Petrus Candidus' death (1513).<sup>74</sup> Petrus Candidus was skilled in Greek, staying in Crete for about five years (around 1491–1496).

#### 4.2.3 Petrus Candidus' Life and Works

Petrus Candidus (1455/1460 ca–1513), monk Pietro from Portici (Pietro da Portici), a monk of Santa Maria degli Angeli of Florence, known as Pietro Candido from the colour of his monastic dress.<sup>75</sup> He should not to be confused with Pietro Candido Decembrio (in Latin Petrus Candidus Decembrius) (1399–1477).<sup>76</sup> Petrus Candidus was born in Portico in Romagna in the first decades of the second half of the 15th century (1455–1460 ca). He was ordained a monk in the hermitage of Camaldoli in Casentino (Arezzo) in 1481; the following year, 1482, he was appointed Chancellor of the general of the Order of Florence Pietro Delfino.

He was trained in Greek language and the correction of Greek texts. In order to improve his knowledge of the Greek language, he obtained permission from Delfino to travel to Crete, where he remained for five years (around 1491–1496), in order to become a skilled scholar in Greek language and an expert in rhetoric and philosophy. He returned to Italy with a precious collection of Greek books and codices which became part of his rich personal library collection.

In 1498 his personal library collection passed to the monastery of the Angels in Florence, where it remained after his death. Between 1500 and 1506 he was a prior of Castrocaro; in 1507 he stayed for a short period in Bologna and he also spent some time in Rome. In the second half of 1508 he became the director of the abbey of S. Stefano Cintorio in Pisa. He died in 1513 in the monastery of the Angels in Florence. He printed the *Souda Lexicon* in Milan (1499) and published a Greek-Latin lexicon from the library of Fulvio Orsini and two other lexicons, one from the monastery of the Angels in Florence and other from the

<sup>74</sup> Sicherl (1957) and Copenhaver (1988) support that ms L Plut. 10.31 was copied after 1461. Sicherl (1957) 22–27, 79–83, 220; Copenhaver (1988) 84, 103.

<sup>75</sup> See the entry on *Candido, Pietro* in *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*, vol. 17: 785–786. <http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/pietro-candido>.

<sup>76</sup> See also Sicherl (1957) 81–82.

hermitage of Camaldoli. However, his most famous work was the Giuntina edition of Lucretius (*Lucretii Cari De rerum natura libri vi*, Florentiae, 1512). He was in contact with famous humanists of his time, such as Carteromaco, with whom he prepared the Aldine edition of Demosthenes; he collaborated with Marullo, publishing amendments to Lucretius; he was a friend to Poliziano; he also collaborated with Aldo Manuzio.

#### 4.3 *Comparison between ms V, Fols. i–144<sup>r</sup> and ms L, Fols. 1<sup>r</sup>–124<sup>r</sup>*

The comparison between the contents of ms V, folios v 138<sup>r</sup>–144<sup>r</sup> (of Part 1: Fols. i–172) and ms L, folios 119<sup>r</sup>–124<sup>r</sup> show that their contents are the same, but in a different order.

Another very important point is that mss V, 141–144 and L, 119<sup>r</sup>–124<sup>r</sup> use a collection of extracts from Eusebius' *Praeparatio Evangelica*.

Eusebius' fourth (310s and 329s AD) century work of *Praeparatio Evangelica* was one of the bestsellers of the Renaissance, and it was translated into Latin by the Greek philosopher and humanist George of Trebizond (Georgios Trapezountios, 1395–1486) in Rome in 1448 for Pope Nicholas v.<sup>77</sup> It was in fact the first book to be printed by the press of Nicholas Jenson in Venice in 1470.<sup>78</sup> Eusebius' *Praeparatio Evangelica* was also very influential for the Italian Renaissance philosopher Giovani Pico della Mirandola's (1463–1494) oration *A Speech by Giovani Pico della Mirandola, Price of Concord* (composed in 1486).

Eusebius used in *Praeparatio Evangelica* a methodology of extensive quotations either from the writings of the ancient pagan philosophers or from authors who quoted them. The technique of collecting extracts in the form of short separate essays (from Eusebius' *Praeparatio Evangelica*) followed in ms V, Fols. 141–144 and ms L, 119<sup>r</sup>–124<sup>r</sup> may suggest that *Πρόκλου Περὶ τῆς καθ' Ἑλληνας ἱερατικῆς τέχνης* is similarly an extract with the title *Proclus' On the Hieratic Art according to the Greeks*, deriving from a bigger treatise of Proclus. It could possibly be part of his lost two volume treatise *Περὶ ἀγωγῆς* or even his work on *Περὶ μνησικῶν συμβόλων*.

#### 4.4 *Ficino's Edited Translations of Proclus' de Sacrificio et Magia*

In 1497 Ficino's translation of Iamblichus, Proclus and other authors was published in Venice. This edition contains:<sup>79</sup>

77 Monfasani (1984) 721–722 and (2009) 3–13. See also Wilson (1992).

78 Lowry (1991).

79 Venice 1497 edition and Index: Ficinus, Marsilius (ed. and transl.). *Index eorum quae hoc in libro habentur. Iamblichus de Mysteriis Aegyptiorum, Chaldaeorum, Assyriorum. Proclus in Platonicum Alcibiadem de Anima, atq(ue) Daemonie. Proclus de Sacrificio et Magia. Porphyrius de Divinis atq(ue) Daemonibus. Synesius Platonicus de Somniis. Psellus de Dae-*

Index eorum quae hoc in libro habentur.

1. *Iamblichus de Mysteriis Aegyptiorum, Chaldaeorum, Assyriorum.*
2. *Proclus in Platonicum Alcibiadem de Anima, atq(ue) Daemone.*
3. *Proclus de Sacrificio et Magia.*
4. *Porphyrius de Divinis atq(ue) Daemonibus.*
5. *Synesius Platonicus de Somniis.*
6. *Psellus de Daemonibus.<sup>80</sup>*
7. *Expositio Prisciani et Marsili in Theophrastu(m) De Sensu, Phantasia et Intellectu.*
8. *Alcinoi Platonici Philosophi Liber de doctri(n)a Platonis.*
9. *Speusippi Platonis Discipuli Liber de Platonis Difinitionibus.*
10. *Pythagorae Philosophi Aurea Verba.*
11. *Symbola Pithagorae Philosophi.*
12. *Xenocratis Philosophi Platonici Liber de Morte.*
13. *Marsili Ficini Liber de Voluptate.*

The reedition of this volume in 1516 (Venice) also contains the following additional translations:<sup>81</sup>

14. *Mercurii Trismegisti Pimander.*
15. *Eiusdem Asclepius.*
16. *Marsili Ficini De Triplici Vita Libri II.*
17. *Eiusdem Liber de Voluptate.*

---

*monibus. Expositio Prisciani et Marsili in Theophrastu(m) De Sensu, Phantasia et Intellectu. Alcinoi Platonici Philosophi Liber de doctri(n)a Platonis. Speusippi Platonis Discipuli Liber de Platonis Difinitionibus. Pythagorae Philosophi Aurea Verba. Symbola Pithagorae Philosophi. Xenocratis Philosophi Platonici Liber de Morte. Marsili Ficini Liber de Voluptate.*  
Venetiis: In aedibus Aldi, Mense Septembri, M. IIID 1497.

<sup>80</sup> See Gautier (1980) 127–128.

<sup>81</sup> Venice 1516 edition and Index: Ficinus, Marsilius (ed. and transl.). *Index eorum quae hoc in libro habentur. Iamblichus de Mysteriis Aegyptiorum, Chaldaeorum, Assyriorum. Proclus in Platonicum Alcibiadem de Anima, atq(ue) Daemone. Proclus de Sacrificio et Magia. Porphyrius de Divinis atq(ue) Daemonibus. Synesius Platonicus de Somniis. Psellus de Daemonibus. Expositio Prisciani et Marsili in Theophrastu(m) De Sensu, Phantasia et Intellectu. Alcinoi Platonici Philosophi Liber de doctri(n)a Platonis. Speusippi Platonis Discipuli Liber de Platonis Difinitionibus. Pythagorae Philosophi Aurea Verba. Symbola Pithagorae Philosophi. Xenocratis Philosophi Platonici Liber de Morte. Mercurii Trismegisti Pimander. Eiusdem Asclepius. Marsili Ficini De Triplici Vita Libri II. Eiusdem Liber de Voluptate. Eiusdem de Sole et Lumine Libri II. Apologia eiusdem in Librum suum de Lumine. Eiusdem Libellus de Magis. Quod Necessaria sit Securitas et Tranquillitas Animi. Praeclarissimarum Sententiarum huius Operis breuis Annotatio.* (Venice, 1516).

18. *Eiusdem de Sole et Lumine Libri II.*
19. *Apologia eiusdem in Librum suum de Lumine.*
20. *Eiusdem Libellus de Magis.*
21. *Quod Necessaria sit Securitas et Tranquillitas Animi.*
22. *Praeclarissimarum Sententiarum huius Operis breuis Annotatio.*

In the 2nd volume of Ficino's *Opera* (1576), Proclus' *de Sacrificio et Magia* is included:

...

7. *Iamblichus de Mysteriis Aegyptiorum, Chaldaeorum, Assyriorum.*
8. *Proclus in Alcibiadem Platonicum de Anima, atq(ue) Daemone.*
9. *Proclus de Sacrificio et Magia.*
10. *Porphyrius de Occasionibus ...*
11. *Porphyrius de Animi ascensu et descensu.*
12. *Psellus de Daemonibus.<sup>82</sup>*
13. *Alcinous de Doctrina Platonis.*
14. *Speusippus de Definitionibus Platonis.*
15. *Xenocratis de Morte Liber.*
16. *Pythagorae Philosophi Aurea Verba.*

Accesserunt et alia plurima ...

## 5 Text, Transmission, Modern Studies

As mentioned above, the Greek text of Proclus' *On the Hieratic Art according to the Greeks* was translated in Latin by Ficino and published in 1497 with the title *Opus Procli de Sacrificio et Magia*.<sup>83</sup> The *de Sacrificio et Magia* since then thought to be the Latin translation of the 'lost' Greek original text. The Latin translation was reedited by Kroll in his *Analecta Graeca* in 1901, who also attempted to retranslate the Latin text into Greek.<sup>84</sup> Thomas Taylor translated the Latin *de sacrificio et magia* into English.<sup>85</sup>

<sup>82</sup> See Gautier (1980) 127–128.

<sup>83</sup> For the contents of the 1497 Venice edition see Intro.: Sect. IV.4 and n. 75 above.

<sup>84</sup> Kroll (1901). Kristeller (1986) also notes: "The Greek text of *De Sacrificio et Magia* was long believed lost, and Kroll retranslated Ficino's Latin version into Greek (1901). The Greek text was rediscovered by Bidez in V F 20 and L 10.32, both of them used by Ficino." Kristeller (1986) 15–196, at 144.

<sup>85</sup> It is included in: Raine and Mills (1969) 194–197.

The original Greek text preserved in ms Vallicellianus F 20, fols. 138<sup>r</sup>–140<sup>v</sup> was discovered and edited by Bidez in 1928 in Appendices of volume six on *Michel Psellus of Catalogue des Manuscrits Alchimiques Grecs* (pp. 137–151).<sup>86</sup> Festugiére included a French translation of the text in the first volume on *L'Astrologie et les Sciences Occultes* of *La Révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste* in 1944.<sup>87</sup> Brian Copenhaver also has a translation in English in the appendix of his chapter “Hermes Trismegistus, Proclus and the Question of a Philosophy of Magic in the Renaissance” (1988).<sup>88</sup>

6        **The Title Πρόκλου Περὶ τῆς καθ' Ἑλληνας ἱερατικῆς τέχνης, “Proclus’ On the Hieratic Art according to the Greeks”**

Bidez (1928a) notes a close connection of Proclus’ *On the Hieratic Art* with various passages of Psellus’ comments on the *Chaldaean Oracles*,<sup>89</sup> and he further proposes that the title was not written by Proclus, but it was later added by the compiler of the extract, Michael Psellus (a “fidèle écho de Proclus,” as described by Bidez): “Le titre de notre inédit parle d'une liturgie hellénique (καθ' Ἑλληνας). Mais ce titre n'est assurément pas de Proclus: il ne remonte pas plus haut que le compilateur à qui nous devons notre extrait.”<sup>90</sup>

Bidez (1936) also asserts about the extract, its title and its relation to Psellus, “Vraisemblablement, cet opuscule n'est qu'un centon d'extraits tirés—par Psellus sans doute—d'une œuvre de Proclus, sous le nom duquel le morceau fut laissé”;<sup>91</sup> and “Si le titre *Περὶ τῆς ἱερατικῆς τέχνης*—donné par notre manuscrit

86 Bidez (1928) Vol. vi: 137–151. See also Bidez (1936) 85–100.

87 Festugiére (1944) Vol. I: 134–136.

88 Copenhaver (1988) 79–110.

89 “Quoi qu'il en soit, nous constatons qu'il provient d'un ouvrage adressé, comme une sorte d'épître, à un correspondant. D'autre part, comme on le verra bientôt, notre inédit Περὶ τῆς καθ' Ἑλληνας ἱερατικῆς τέχνης se rattache, parfois de fort près, aux nombreux passages où Psellus—fidèle écho de Proclus—caractérise ‘l'art hiératique’ ou ‘la science télétique’ des théurge chaldéens.” Bidez (1928a) Vol. vi: 137–151, at 141–142.

90 Bidez (1928a) Vol. vi: 137–151, at 142.

91 Also: “Composé de la même manière qu'une ‘psychogonie’ empruntée par le polygraphe byzantin au commentaire du même néoplatonicien sur le *Timée*, notre centon est fort intelligemment conçu. On y trouve une série de phrases choisies dans l'exposé de Proclus afin d'en dégager certains traits caractéristiques.” Bidez (1936) 85–100, at 86. Lewy (1978) notes that the treatise περὶ τῆς καθ' Ἑλληνας ἱερατικῆς τέχνης “is, as Bidez, Melanges Cumont, 86, suggests, an excerpt made by Psellus from another part of Proclus' commentary on the Chaldaean Oracles.” Lewy (1978) 477.

au morceau de Proclus—ne provient pas de l'auteur, ce titre répond en tous cas au contenu de l'extract.”<sup>92</sup>

Lewy (1978) refers to the two volumes of Proclus' *Περὶ ἀγωγῆς* and notes that “There is no evidence that Psellus knew this work of Proclus.”<sup>93</sup> However, Psellus' question ‘διὰ τί, γάρ φησιν ὁ Πρόκλος, ὁ λέων τὸν ἀλεκτρυόνα ὑπέσταλται;’ (*Theologica I, Opusculum* 51.38 Gautier 1989) shows that Psellus must have been aware of Proclus' fragmentary treatise *On the Hieratic Art* and its reference to the lion and cock: ὑποστέλλεται γάρ ὁ λέων, φασί, τὸν ἀλεκτρυόνα, “for, they say, the lion shrinks back before the cock.” (Procl. *Hier.Ar.* 4.9).<sup>94</sup>

Nevertheless, Bidez does not provide any evidence for his supposition that the title was added later by Michael Psellus who, according to Bidez, compiled the extract from the works of Proclus. Also, Psellus' work “*Exegesis of the Chaldaean Oracles*” on its own does not justify Bidez's suggestion. Moreover, the authorship of *De Operatione Daemonum* (*/De Daemonibus*)<sup>95</sup> and *Quaenam sunt Graecorum opinions de daemonibus* (“Περὶ Δαιμόνων Δοξάζουσιν Ἑλληνες”)<sup>96</sup>—passages of which may allude to Iamblichus and Proclus—by Psellus

<sup>92</sup> Also: “C'est bien de la science et de l'art hiératique que Proclus traite dans cette élucubration, le mot *ἱερατικός*, qui proprement veut dire ‘sacerdotal’! Prenant ici une signification particulière à cause des fonctions d'initiateur que la théurgie attribue au prêtre. Quant à la détermination *καθ'* Ἑλληνας—et non *κατὰ τοὺς Χαλδαίους*—due manifestement à quelque lecteur byzantin, elle répond au caractère foncièrement païen de la doctrine de Proclus.” Bidez (1936): 85–100, at 89.

<sup>93</sup> Lewy (1978) 71, n. 15: “According to Suidas (Souda), 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 Souda: cf. *Excursus x* as well as ch. v, n. 109. Concerning the ἀγωγὴ Ἐκάτης of the Theurgists see ch. i, n. 152. Procl. *In Tī. 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>94</sup> See discussion on Psellus in Comm.: Sect. 4.5–6, 9, 12, 17–18 on *Λέοντες καὶ ἀλεκτρυόνες*, “lions and cocks.”

<sup>95</sup> Boissonade (1838) 1–36; PG 122, 819–874; Bidez (1928b) vi: 119–131; Gautier (1980) 133–194.

<sup>96</sup> The treatise was first published with the title *Quaenam sunt Graecorum opinions de daemonibus* (“Περὶ Δαιμόνων Δοξάζουσιν Ἑλληνες” pp. 36–43) included in Boissonade's edition *Michael Psellus' De Operatione Daemonum* (Boissonade 1838, 36–43). Later Bidez published “La Démonologie de Psellus et le Traité De operatione daemonum” (1928b, 119–131, esp. 128–129) included in volume vi on *Michel Psellus of Catalogue des Manuscrits alchimiques Grecs*; Bidez (1928b) Vol. vi: 128–129. However, the authorship of the *De Operatione Daemonum* (*/De Daemonibus*) and *Quaenam sunt Graecorum opinions de daemonibus*—passages of which may allude to Iamblichus and Proclus—by Psellus has been questioned by modern authors, suggesting possible authorship by Nicholas of Methone. Gautier (1980) 105–194 and (1988) 85–107.

lus has been questioned by modern scholars.<sup>97</sup> Gautier in his articles, “Le de daemonibus du Pseudo-Psellos” (1980) and “Pseudo-Psellos: Graecorum opiniones de daemonibus” (1988) very persuasively argues that the above treatises were not written by Psellus, focusing on codicological arguments and other important issues of content.<sup>98</sup> Duffy and O’Meara also did not include them in their edition of *Michaelis Pselli Philosophica Minora* vol. II (O’Meara 1989) in the belief that they were not written by Psellus, referring to Gautier’s article (1980).<sup>99</sup>

Furthermore, as argued in previous sections,<sup>100</sup> the Greek text of Πρόκλου Περὶ τῆς καθ’ Ἑλληνας ἱερατικῆς τέχνης is preserved in the codex Vallicellianus F 20, folios 138<sup>r</sup>–140<sup>v</sup>, included in the folios 138<sup>r</sup>–144<sup>r</sup>, which are a compilation of Greek texts selected and copied by Ficino with Latin marginal notes also by Ficino. Accordingly, the folios V 141–144 are all excerpts from Eusebius’ *Praeparatio Evangelica*.<sup>101</sup>

Fol. V 141<sup>r–v</sup>: Tit.: *Porphyrii testus (sic) quod anima non sit actus corporis, sed quod immortalis.* (= Eus. PE XI.28.1–5 and XV.11.1–2);  
 Fol. V 142<sup>r–v</sup>: Tit.: *Numenius De Secunda Causa.* (= Eus. PE XI.18.1–3, 6–9, 22–23);  
 Fols. V 142<sup>v</sup>–143<sup>r</sup>: Tit.: *Amelius De Johannis Theologia.* (= Eus. PE XI.19.1);  
 Fol. V 143<sup>r–v</sup>: *Numenius Pythagoreus de Ente.* (= Eus. PE XI.10.1–7);  
 Fols. V 144<sup>r</sup>: Tit.: *Philon De Secunda Causa.* (= Eus. PE XI.15.1–2).

Thus, in the compilation of Greek texts included in the folios V 138<sup>r</sup>–144<sup>r</sup>, the folios V 141–144 are all excerpts from Eusebius’ *Praeparatio Evangelica*. However, the folios V 138<sup>r</sup>–140<sup>v</sup> are not of course an excerpt from Eusebius’ *Praeparatio Evangelica*.

So, the technique of collecting extracts in the form of short separate essays (from Eusebius’ *Praeparatio Evangelica*) followed in ms V, Fols. 141<sup>r</sup>–144<sup>r</sup> (and ms L, Fols. 119<sup>r</sup>–124<sup>r</sup> which is a copy of V) may suggest that the Πρόκλου Περὶ τῆς καθ’ Ἑλληνας ἱερατικῆς τέχνης is similarly an extract with the title *Proclus’ On the*

97 Gautier (1980) 105–194 and (1988) 85–107. Greenfield (1988) 155–156 and n. 486; O’Meara (1989) Vol. II: vii and n. 3 on Gautier’s article (1980). Also, O’Meara (2014) 165–181. See discussion in Comm.: Sect. 1.2.b and n. 22; and Comm.: Sect. 2.2–3 and n. 80 below.

98 On (Pseudo-)Psellus’ *De Daemonibus* and possible authorship by Nicholas of Methone see Gautier (1980) 105–194 and (1988) 85–107.

99 Gautier (1980) 105–194 and (1988) 85–107. O’Meara (1989) Vol. II: vii and n. 3 on Gautier’s article (1980). Also, O’Meara (2014) 165–181.

100 See Intro.: Sect. IV.1.a–d above.

101 On Ficino and Eusebius’ *Praeparatio Evangelica* see Monfasani (2009) 3–13.

*Hieratic Art according to the Greeks*, deriving from a larger treatise of Proclus. It could be part of his lost two volume treatise *Περὶ ἀγωγῆς*, or even his work *Περὶ μνησικῶν συμβόλων*. But there still remains an unanswered question: Did Ficino himself compile the extract, which derives from a larger treatise of Proclus that we have lost since Ficino's time? Or did Ficino only give a title to an excerpt that has already been compiled by another author (e.g. Psellus)? For there is obviously a difference between giving a title to an excerpt that has already been compiled by another author, and compiling an excerpt of one's own. Thus, the phrase *καθ' Ἑλληνας* from the title might have been a later addition by Ficino, or someone between him and Proclus, or even, though less probable, by Proclus to specify and highlight that they were dealing with theurgy, neither 'according to the Chaldaeans', nor 'according to the Egyptians', but 'according to the Greeks'.

Nevertheless, many lines in *Proclus' On the Hieratic Art according to the Greeks* are clarified by the numerous similar references, expressions, repetitions or even quotations in other works of Proclus.<sup>102</sup> The methodology of comparing similar passages in detail in all the works of Proclus has been followed in this commentary. Hence, that comparison process itself has been illuminating the extract of *Proclus' On the Hieratic Art*, and proving that it could be by itself a self-contained and concentrated treatise.

## 7 Book Description

The Introduction includes sections on Proclus' life and on the Orphic and Chaldaean Theologies; Proclus' complete works; Proclus' lost works or those preserved in fragments on theological tradition, Orphic theology and theurgy; *Proclus' On the Hieratic Art according to the Greeks and his lost works*, *Περὶ Ἀγωγῆς* and *Περὶ Μνησικῶν Συμβόλων*; a detailed description, dates and comparison of the Ancient Manuscripts: *ms Vallicellianus F 20, Fols. 138r–140v* and *ms Laurentianus Plut. 10.32, Fols. 119r–121v*; text description, transmission and modern studies; and a book description. There follows a list of Abbreviations of Proclus' works used in this study, Abbreviations of the works of Orpheus and the *Chaldean Oracles*, a list of other Abbreviations, and a Critical Apparatus.

<sup>102</sup> For example, compare: Procl. *Hier.Ar.* 6.1: "Ἐστι δὲ δτε καὶ μία πόα καὶ λιθος εῖς ἀρκεῖ πρὸς τὸ ἔργον with Procl. *In Ti.* 1.111.10–12 ὅπου καὶ μέχρι πόας καὶ λιθων ἡ τῶν θεῶν τῶν ἐφόρων ἰδιότης καθήκει, καὶ ἔστι λιθος καὶ πόα τῆς Ἡλιακῆς ἐξηρτημέναι δυνάμεως, εἴτε ἡλιοτρόπιον εἴτε ἄλλως ὀπωσοῦν καλεῖν ἐθέλοις; Also, Procl. *In Ti.* 1.124.16–29 = The exact passage is quoted in Procl. *In R.* 1.124.17–30 etc.

There follows a Critical Edition of the Greek text with Translation and Commentary.

The Appendix is a description of the whole contents of the *ms Vallicellianus F 20*.

The study offers a systematic investigation and presentation of Proclus' *On the Hieratic Art according to the Greeks*, examining the characteristics and the four important stages of the hieratic-theurgic union, and comparing them with other references in philosophical and magico-religious texts (e.g. the extracts from Proclus' *Chaldaean Philosophy*, Plotinus' *Enneads*, Iamblichus' *De Mysteriis*, the fragments of the *Chaldaean Oracles* and the Greek magical papyri). The first stage, "the preparatory heating," according to Proclus' treatise, is based on "sympathy"; the second, "the approach and the good positioning" on "the use of the materials of the hieratic art at the due time and in the familiar procedure"; the third, "the transmission of the fire" on "the presence of the divine light"; and the fourth, "the kindling/lightning" on "the divinisation of mortals" and "the illumination of things enmattered."

It discusses philosophical issues that theurgy is engaged with, such as: the notion of mixing based on the concept of unity and diversity and the relationship between one and many; the various aspects of the powers of nature, and the role of the natural sympathies in the relationship between individual entities and the divine. It also examines the function of initiatory rites (*tele-tai*) in theurgy, such as the role of *synthêmata*, symbols, statues, purifications, invocations and epiphanies. It illustrates the above issues with examples from philosophy, mysteries and magic, paying particular attention to the interactions between philosophy, mysteries and magic regarding the hieratic-theurgic unions. Particularly, the philosophical and medical notion of mixing based on the relationship between one and many is illustrated by the example of the various attributes of the god Helios in different entities, as emphasised in Proclus' *On the Hieratic Art*, Iamblichus' *De Mysteriis* and the Greek magical papyri. The focus is also put on the role of sympathy in the various stages of the theurgic union. Plotinus' parallel references to the sympathetic powers of Eros inside different entities is also analysed. Finally, attention is paid to the importance of *synthêmata*, symbols and statues in the theurgic union.

# Critical Apparatus

V, L the signs (sigla) of the mss identified.

V MS Vallicellianus F 20

L MS Laurentianus Plut. 10.32

MS(s). (= manuscript/-s) = cod(d). = *codex* (/codices)

V<sup>mg.</sup> = schol. in mg. = scholium in margin (= scholium written in the margin of the manuscript V)

mg. = *margo* (= margin)

schol(l). = scholium (/scholia)

V<sup>s.l.</sup> = schol. s.l. (= scholium written above the line of the manuscript V)

s.l. = *supra lineam* (= above the line)

add. = *addidit* (= added)

an, anne ...? (= perhaps)

cf. = *confer* (= compare)

corr. = *correctio* (= correction)

del. = *delevit* (= deleted) / *delevi* (= I have deleted)

emend. = *emendavit* (= emended)

fr. = *fragmentum* (= fragment)

recte (= rightly)

sim. = *similia* (= similar words)

sup. = *supra* (= above, superior)

suppl. = *supplevit* (= completed)

vel (= or)

vel sim. = *vel simile* (/ *uel similia/-es*) (= or some similar word/-s; or some similar conjecture/-s)

vd. = *vide* (= see)

*Text and Translation*

••

## Πρόκλου

Περὶ τῆς καθ' Ἑλληνας ἱερατικῆς τέχνης

1   “Οσπερ οἱ ἐρωτικοὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἐν αἰσθήσει καλῶν ὁδῷ προιόντες  
 ἐπ' αὐτὴν καταντῶσι τὴν μίαν τῶν καλῶν πάντων καὶ νοητῶν ἀρχήν,  
 5   οὕτως καὶ οἱ ἱερατικοὶ ἀπὸ τῆς ἐν τοῖς φαινομένοις ἀπασι συμπα-  
 θείας πρός τε ἄλληλα καὶ πρὸς τὰς ἀφανεῖς δυνάμεις, πάντα ἐν πάσι  
 κατανοήσαντες, τὴν ἐπιστήμην τὴν ἱερατικὴν συνεστήσαντο, θαυ-  
 μάσαντες τῷ βλέπειν ἐν τε τοῖς πρώτοις τὰ ἔσχατα καὶ ἐν τοῖς  
 10   ἔσχατοις τὰ πρώτιστα, ἐν οὐρανῷ μὲν τὰ χθόνια κατ' αἰτίαν καὶ  
 οὐρανίως, ἐν τε γῇ τὰ οὐράνια γηῖνως. “Η πόθεν ἡλιοτρόπια μὲν  
 ἡλίω, σεληνοτρόπια δὲ σελήνη συγκινεῖται συμπεριπολοῦντα ἐς  
 δύναμιν τοῖς τοῦ κόσμου φωστήρισιν; Εὔχεται γάρ πάντα κατὰ τὴν  
 15   οἰκείαν τάξιν καὶ ὑμεῖ τοὺς ἡγεμόνας τῶν σειρῶν ὅλων ἡ νοερῶς ἡ  
 λογικῶς ἡ φυσικῶς ἡ αἰσθητῶς ἐπεὶ καὶ τὸ ἡλιοτρόπιον ὡς ἔστιν  
 εὖλυτον, τούτῳ κινεῖται καί, εἰ δή τις αὐτοῦ κατὰ τὴν περιστροφὴν  
 ἀκούειν τὸν ἀέρα πλήσσοντος οἶός τε ἦν, ὅμινον ἀν τινα διὰ τοῦ  
 20   ἥχου τούτου συνήσθετο τῷ Βασιλεῖ προσάγοντος, δὸν δύναται  
 φυτὸν ὑμεῖν.

2   Ἐν μὲν οὖν τῇ γῇ χθονίως ἔστιν ἡλίους καὶ σελήνας ὄραν, ἐν  
 οὐρανῷ δὲ οὐρανίως τά τε φυτὰ πάντα καὶ λίθους καὶ ζῷα, ζῶντα  
 νοερῶς. “Α δὴ κατιδόντες οἱ πάλαι σοφοί, τὰ μὲν ἄλλοις, τὰ δὲ  
 5   ἄλλοις προσάγοντες τῶν οὐρανίων, ἐπήγοντο θείας δυνάμεις εἰς τὸν  
 θητὸν τόπον καὶ διὰ τῆς ὁμοιότητος ἐφειλκύσαντο· ἵκανή γάρ ἡ  
 ὁμοιότης συνάπτειν τὰ ὄντα ἄλληλοις· ἐπεὶ καί, εἴ τις θρυαλλίδα  
 προθερμήνας ὑπόσχοι τῷ λυχναίῳ φωτὶ μὴ πόρρω τοῦ πυρός,  
 10   ἴδοι ἀν αὐτὴν ἐξαπτομένην μὴ ψαύουσαν τοῦ πυρός, καὶ τὴν ἐξαψιν  
 ἄνωθεν τοῦ κατωτέρῳ γινομένην. Ἀναλόγως οὖν ἡ μὲν προθέρμαν-  
 σις νοείσθω σοι τῇ συμπαθείᾳ τῶν τῆς πρὸς ἐκείνα, ἡ δὲ προσα-  
 γωγὴ καὶ ἐν καλῷ θέσις τῇ τῆς ἱερατικῆς τέχνης κατά τε καιρὸν τὸν

1: 2-9 *Eadem dixit Porphyrius in propositionibus. Vide Mercurium et Plotinum et Iamblichum et Alchindum et tua scripta V<sup>mg</sup>.* 8 τῷ βλέπειν cf. Procl. *In Alc.* 1.120.1-2, 6 τὸ ‘οἶμαί σε θαυμάζειν’, τὸ ‘εὖ οἶδι’ ὅτι θαυμάζεις, τῷ ‘οἶμαι’ 11 συγκινεῖται corr. Bid. συγχλινεῖται V cf. κινεῖται 1.15 συγκινεῖται 5.1 cf. Procl. *In R.* 11.161.21, 26-27 συγκινούμενα, συμπεριπολεῖν

2: 5 ἐφειλκύσαντο corr. Bid. ἐφειλκύσαντο V 6 sup. θρυαλλίδα *herbam ex qua papyri lucernarum et ipse papyrus* Vs.l. 8 sup. ἐξαπτομένην *accensam* Vs.l. sup. ψαύουσαν *tangentem* Vs.l.

*Proclus**On the Hieratic Art according to the Greeks*

1 Just as lovers proceed methodically from the beautiful things perceived through the senses and attain the one principle of all good and intelligible things, in the same way the leaders of the hieratic art [proceeding] from the *sympathy* [which exists] in all apparent things to one another and to the invisible powers, having understood that all things are included in all things, established the hieratic science, because they were amazed to see the last in the first, and the first in the last; in heaven the earthly in a causal and heavenly manner; and in the earth heavenly things in an earthly manner. Otherwise, how do the *heliotropes* move together with the sun, and the *selenotropes* with the moon, going around as far as possible with the [heavenly] luminaries [i.e. sun and the moon] of the cosmos? Hence all things pray according to their own order, and recite hymns to the leaders of all the chains either intellectually, or logically, or naturally, or sensibly. For indeed the *heliotrope* is also moving toward that to which it easily opens and, if anyone was able to hear it striking the air during its turning around, he would have been aware of it presenting to the king through this sound the hymn that a plant can sing.

2 Thus, in the earth it is possible to see suns and moons terrestrially, and in the heaven [it is possible to see] celestially all the plants and stones and animals being present intellectually. So, the ancient wise men by understanding these well, attributing some of the heavenly things to one set of objects and some to another, brought divine powers into the region of mortals, and they attracted them through resemblance. For resemblance is able to join together the beings between each other; for if someone first heats up a wick and then puts it under the light of a lamp not far from the fire, he/she will see that the wick is inflamed, although it does not touch the fire, and that the lighting proceeds from above to the lower. Thus, you should understand the preparatory warming to be analogous to the *sympathy* of things here to things there, the approach

πρέποντα καὶ τρόπον τὸν οἰκεῖον προσχρήσει τῶν ὑλῶν, ἡ δὲ τοῦ πυρὸς διάδοσις τῇ παρουσίᾳ τοῦ θείου φωτὸς εἰς τὸ δυνάμενον μετέχειν, ἡ δὲ ἔξαψις τῇ θειώσει τῶν θνητῶν καὶ τῇ περιλάμψει τῶν 15 ἐνύλων, ἀ δὴ κινεῖται πρὸς τὸ ἄνω λοιπὸν κατὰ τὸ μετασχεθὲν ὑπ’ αὐτῶν σπέρμα θεῖον, ὥσπερ τὸ τῆς ἔξαφθείσης θρυαλλίδος φῶς.

3 Καὶ ὁ λωτὸς δὲ παρίστησι τὴν συμπάθειαν, μεμυκῶς μὲν πρὸ τῶν ἡλιακῶν αὐγῶν, διαπτυσσόμενος δέ πως ἡρέμα τοῦ ἡλίου πρῶτον φανέντος, καὶ ὅσον ὑψοῦται τὸ φῶς, ἔξαπλούμενος, καὶ αὐθὶς συναγόμενος, ἐπὶ δύσιν ίόντος. Τί δὴ οὖν διαφέρει τοὺς ἀνθρώπους αἴροντας ἡ τιθέντας γένυς ἡ τὰ χεῖλη ὑμνεῖν τὸν ἡλιον, ἡ τὸν λωτὸν 5 τὰ φύλλα συμπτύσσοντα καὶ ἀναπλοῦντα; Γίγνεται γάρ ἀντὶ τῶν γενύων ταῦτα τῷ λωτῷ, καὶ ὁ ὑμνος φυσικός. Καὶ τί δεῖ λέγειν περὶ φυτῶν οὓς ὑπάρχει ζωῆς ἔχνος τι γεννητικῆς; Ἀλλὰ καὶ λίθους ἔστιν 10 ίδειν ταῖς τῶν φωστήρων ἀπορροίαις ἐμπνέοντας, ὡς τὸν μὲν ἡλίτην ταῖς χρυσοειδέσιν ἀκτῖσιν ὄρῳ μεν τὰς ἡλιακὰς ἀκτῖνας μιμούμενον, τὸν δὲ Βήλου προσαγορευόμενον ὀφθαλμὸν καὶ σχῆμα παραπλήσιον ἔχοντα κόραις ὀφθαλμῶν καὶ ἐκ μέσης τῆς ἐν αὐτῷ κόρης στιλπνὸν ἀφίέντα φῶς, ὃν φασιν ἡλίου χρῆναι καλεῖν ὀφθαλμόν, τὸν δὲ σεληνίτην τύπῳ τε καὶ κινήσει σὺν τῇ σελήνῃ τρεπόμενον, τὸν δὲ ἡλιοσέληνον τῆς συνόδου τῶν φωστήρων τούτων οἷον 15 ἄγαλμα ταῖς κατ’ οὐρανὸν συνόδοις τε καὶ διαστάσεσιν ἀφομοιωθέν.

4 Οὕτω μεστὰ πάντα θεῶν, τὰ μὲν ἐν γῇ τῶν οὐρανίων, τὰ δὲ ἐν οὐρανῷ τῶν ὑπὲρ τὸν οὐρανόν, καὶ πρόεισιν ἐκάστη πληθυομένη σειρὰ μέχρι τῶν ἐσχάτων· τὰ γάρ ἐν ἐνὶ πρὸ τῶν πάντων, ταῦτα ἐν πάσιν ἔξεφάνη, ἐν οὓς καὶ ψυχῶν συστάσεις ἄλλων ὑπ’ ἄλλοις 5 ταττομένων θεοῖς, ἔπειτα ζώων ἡλιακῶν εἰ τύχοι πλήθος, οἷον λέον-

3: 1 *Sic si apponis pedi cerebralia, trahit vim a cerebro; si cordalia a corde si epatica ab epate etc. Similiter si natura propria in homine deficiat, trahes vim ab hac stella vel illa appropinquando huic quae conveniat cum stella, maxime stella vigente/ingente.* V<sup>mg</sup> 5 τιθέντας γένυς cf. E. Supp. 1153 παρὰ γένυν τιθέντα σοί, Psel. *Theol. Opusc. I.26.19* γένυς τε καὶ χεῖλη 6 συμπτύσσοντα corr. Bid. συναπτύσσοντα V 9 ἐμπνέοντας corr. L ἐνπνέοντας V *Ego vidi lapillum rotundum et punctis quasi stellis insignitum qui aceto perfusus movebatur primo in rectum ali(quatenus), mox in girum obrerabat, quem credo firmamento esse accommodatum, maxime aceto perfusum. Oportet enim ibi quod natura incohavit arte compleri. Quid quod magnes convenit cum ursa et polo et illuc convertit ferrum, quod appetat in instrumento nautarum id polum explorandum? Unde imago ursae impressa magneti [...] suspensa collo cum ferreo monili trah(eret) vim illius ad nos tangendo carnem?* V<sup>mg</sup>. 10 ἡλίτην corr. Bid. ἡλίτη V et sup. ἡλίτη add. μ. V<sup>s.l.</sup> 14 σεληνίτην corr. Bid. σεληνίτιν V 15 ἡλιοσέληνον corr. Bid. ἡλιοσέληνον V

[attraction] and the good positioning [to be analogous] to the use of the materials of the hieratic art at the proper time and in the right way, the transmission of the fire [to be analogous] to the presence of the divine light to that which is able to receive it, the lighting [to be analogous] to the divinisation of mortals and the illumination of things enmattered, which are subsequently moved to the higher place according to the divine seed in which they participate, just as it is with the light of the kindled wick.

3 The lotus also shows that there is *sympathy*, being closed before the sun's rays, and being unfolded slowly, as the sun first arises; and as long as the light is raised up, being spread out, and being contracted back, when the sun sets. So, how does it differ when people open or close mouths and lips to hymn the sun, from when the lotus folds and unfolds its petals? For the lotus has these [petals] instead of the mouth, and its hymn is a natural one. But why should we talk about plants, which have some trace of generative life? But really, it is possible to see the stones breathing in under the influences of the luminaries, as we see the sunstone with its golden rays imitating the sun rays; and the stone named *Belos'* eye which also resembles in form the pupil of the eye and emits from the centre of its pupil a glittering light, which, they say, should be called sun's eye; and the moonstone changing in form and motion along with the moon; and the sun-moonstone as a kind of image of the conjunction of these luminaries, portraying the conjunctions and separations in heaven.

4 Thus, all things are full of gods, these on earth are full of heavenly gods, and these in heaven are full of supercelestial gods; and each chain proceeds being increased in number to the end of the line; for those which are in 'one before all,' these have been revealed in all, in which there are conjunctions (*systaseis*) of souls set in order under one god or another. Thereafter, it may be a multitude of

τες καὶ ἀλεκτρυόνες, μετέχοντες καὶ αὐτοὶ τοῦ θείου κατὰ τὴν  
έκαυτῶν τάξιν. Καὶ τὸ θαυμαστόν, ὅπως ἐν τούτοις τὰ ἐλάττονα  
δύναμει τε καὶ μεγέθει τοῖς κατ' ἄμφω χρείττοσίν ἐστι φοβερά·  
ὑποστέλλεται γάρ ὁ λέων, φασί, τὸν ἀλεκτρυόνα. Τὸ δὲ αἴτιον ἀπὸ<sup>10</sup>  
μὲν τῆς αἰσθήσεως οὐκ ἔστι λαβεῖν, ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς νοερᾶς ἐπιβλέψεως  
καὶ τῆς ἐν τοῖς αἰτίοις διαφορᾶς. Ἐνεργεστέρα γοῦν ἐστιν ἡ τῶν  
ἡλιακῶν συμβόλων εἰς τὸν ἀλεκτρυόνα παρουσίᾳ· δηλοὶ δὲ τῶν  
ἡλιακῶν περιόδων συναισθανόμενος καὶ ἄδων ὑμνον τῷ φωστήρι  
προσιόντι τε καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ λοιπὰ κέντρα τρεπομένῳ· διὸ καὶ ἄγγελοί<sup>15</sup>  
τινες ἡλιακοὶ ὥφθησαν τοιαύτας ἔχοντες μορφάς, καὶ ὅντες ἀμόρ-  
φωτοι, φαίνονται τοῖς ἐν μορφῇ κατεχομένοις ἡμῖν μεμορφωμένοι.  
"Ηδη δέ τινα τῶν ἡλιακῶν δαιμόνων λεοντοπρόσωπον φαινόμενον,  
ἀλεκτρυόνος δειχθέντος, ἀφανή γενέσθαι φασὶν ὑποστελλόμενον τὰ<sup>20</sup>  
τῶν κρειττόνων συνθήματα· ἐπεὶ καὶ θείων ἀνδρῶν εἰκόνας ὅρων-  
τες πολλοὶ ἀνεστάλησαν ὑπ' αὐταῖς τι τῶν μιαρῶν ἐνεργεῖν.

5 Ἀπλῶς δὲ τὰ μὲν ταῖς περιόδοις τοῦ φωστήρος συγκινεῖται, ὡς  
τὰ εἰρημένα φυτά, τὰ δὲ τὸ σχῆμα μικεῖται τῶν ἀκτίνων, ὥσπερ ὁ  
φοῖνιξ, τὰ δὲ τὴν ἐμπύριον οὐσίαν, ὥσπερ ἡ δάφνη, τὰ δὲ ἄλλο τι.  
"Ιδοις ὅν οὖν τὰς συνεσπειραμένας ἰδιότητας ἐν ἡλίῳ μεριζομένας  
ἐν τοῖς μετέχουσιν ἀγγέλοις, δαιμόσι, ψυχαῖς, ζῷοις, φυτοῖς, λίθοις.  
"Οθεν οἱ τῆς ἱερατικῆς ἡγεμόνες ἀπὸ τῶν ἐν ὁφθαλμοῖς κειμένων τὴν  
τῶν ἀνωτέρω δυνάμεων θεραπείαν εύρήκασι, τὰ μὲν μίξαντες, τὰ δὲ  
οἰκείως ἀναιρούμενοι· ἡ δὲ μίξις διὰ τὸ βλέπειν τῶν ἀμίκτων ἔκα-<sup>10</sup>  
στόν τινα ἔχον ἰδιότητα τοῦ θεοῦ, οὐ μὴν ἔξαρκοῦν πρὸς τὴν ἐκείνου  
πρόκλησιν· διὸ τῇ μίξει τῶν πολλῶν ἐνίζουσι τὰς προειρημένας  
ἀπορροίας καὶ ἔξομοιοῦσι τὸ ἐκ πάντων ἐν γενόμενον πρὸς ἐκείνο  
τὸ πρὸ τῶν πάντων ὅλον· καὶ ἀγάλματα πολλάκις κατασκευάζουσι  
σύμμικτα καὶ θυμιάματα, φυράσαντες εἰς ἐν τὰ μερισθέντα συνθή-<sup>15</sup>  
ματα καὶ ποιήσαντες τέχνην ὁποῖον κατ' οὐσίαν τὸ θεῖον περιληπτικὸν  
καθ' ἔνωσιν τῶν πλειόνων δυνάμεων, ὃν ὁ μὲν μερισμὸς ἡμύδρω-  
σεν ἐκάστην, ἡ δὲ μίξις ἐπανήγαγεν εἰς τὴν τοῦ παραδείγματος  
ἰδέαν.

4: 13 συναισθανόμενος corr. Bid. συναισθόμενος V 15 ὥφθησαν corr. Bid. ὥφθησαν V 17 τινα τῶν  
ἡλιακῶν corr. Bid. τι τῶν ἡλιακῶν V 18 sup. γενέσεως corr. -θαι Vs.l.

5: 3 sup. φοῖνιξ *palma dactilus* Vs.l. 4 ἰδιότητας corr. L ἰδιότιτας V 11 sup. ἔξομοιοῦσι corr. οἱ Vs.l.  
ἔξομοιοῦσι corr. L 16 ἐπανήγαγεν corr. L ἐπηγήγαγεν V

solar animals, such as lions and cocks, which themselves also participate in the divine according to their own order. And the remarkable thing is how the lesser in might and size among these animals are regarded with fear by the stronger in both aspects [might and size]; for, they say, the lion shrinks back before the cock. The cause for this cannot be understood by the visible appearance, but by the intellectual vision and the difference within the causes. Hence, the presence of solar symbols is more effective in the cock; and he shows this by perceiving the solar orbits and singing a hymn to the luminary, while it approaches and is directed to the other celestial centres; therefore, some solar angels have appeared in vision having such forms, and although they are formless, they appear having been formed to us who are bound in form. Actually, they say that, when a cock has been shown forth to one of the solar daemons revealed as lion-faced, he [the solar daemon] becomes invisible, shrinking back before the *synthémata* of the higher [beings]; even as many have been restrained from committing a defiled action, when they saw the images of divine men.

5 Generally, some, as for example the aforementioned plants, move in accordance to the orbits of the luminary; others, just as the palm, imitate the shape of its rays; and others [imitate] the empyrean substance, just as the laurel; and others [imitate] something else. Thus, you could see the particular characteristics that are coiled up in Helios [the Sun] to be distributed to those who participate in his nature, [as to] angels, daemons, souls, animals, plants, stones. Whence from what is laid down in front of their eyes the leaders of the hieratic art found how to serve the higher powers, by mixing some together and by taking others up in the appropriate way; and the mixing takes place, because they see that each one of the unmixed entities has a property of the god, but without being sufficient on its own to call that [god] forth; so, by mixing together many [powers], they unify the aforementioned effluences and assimilate that which is one from all, to that whole which is before all; and they often produce combinatory statues and incenses, having mixed into one [mixture] the distributed *synthémata* and making the divine, as it were, comprehensible in its essence by art through the union with many powers, the dividing of which on the one hand made each one [power] indistinct, while the mixing on the other hand raised it up to the form of its archetype.

6 "Εστι δὲ ὅτε καὶ μία πόα καὶ λίθος εἰς ἀρκεῖ πρὸς τὸ ἔργον· ἀπόχρη γάρ πρὸς μὲν αὐτοφάνειαν τὸ κνέωρον, πρὸς δὲ φυλακὴν δάφνη, ράμνος, σκύλλα, κουράλιον, ἀδάμας καὶ ἵασπις, πρὸς δὲ πρόγνωσιν ἡ τοῦ ἀσπάλακος καρδία, πρὸς δὲ καθάρσεις τὸ θεῖον καὶ τὸ θαλάττιον ὕδωρ. Διὰ μὲν οὖν τῆς συμπαθείας προσήγοντο, διὰ δὲ τῆς ἀντιπαθείας ἀπήλαυνον, καθαίροντες εἰ τύχοι θείω καὶ ἀσφάλτῳ καὶ περιρραίνοντες θαλάττη· καθαίρει γάρ τὸ μὲν θεῖον διὰ τὸ δριμὺ τῆς ὀσμῆς, ἡ δὲ θάλαττα διὰ τὸ μετέχειν ἐμπυρίου δυνάμεως.

7 Καὶ ἐν ταῖς τελεταῖς δὲ καὶ ταῖς ἄλλαις περὶ τοὺς θεοὺς θεραπείαις ζῷά τε προσήκοντα εξελέγοντο καὶ ἔτερ' ἄττα. Ἀπὸ δὴ τούτων καὶ τῶν τοιούτων ὄρμηθέντες, τὰς δαιμονίους δυνάμεις ἔγνωσαν, ὡς προσεχεῖς εἰσιν οὐσίαι τῆς ἐν τῇ φύσει καὶ τοῖς σώμασιν ἐνεργείας, 5 καὶ ἐπηγάγοντο δὲ αὐτῶν τούτων εἰς συνουσίαν· ἀπὸ δὲ τούτων ἐπ' αὐτὰς ἥδη τὰς τῶν θεῶν ἀνέδραμον ποιήσεις, τὰ μὲν ἀπ' αὐτῶν διδασκόμενοι, τὰ δὲ καὶ αὐτοὶ κινούμενοι παρ' ἑαυτῶν εὐστόχως εἰς τὴν τῶν οἰκείων συμβόλων ἐπίνοιαν· καὶ οὕτω λοιπόν, τὴν φύσιν 10 καὶ τὰς φυσικὰς ἐνεργείας κάτω καταλιπόντες, ταῖς πρωτουργοῖς καὶ θείαις ἔχρήσαντο δυνάμεσι.

6: 2 ἀπόχρη corr. Bid. ἀπόκρη V ad κνέωρον *forsan carduus* V<sup>mg</sup>. 3 ad ράμνος *raccinum id est genus virgulli spinosum quo facta est corona Christi* V<sup>mg</sup> sup. σκύλλα *cepa squilla* V<sup>s.l.</sup>. 4 sup. ἀσπάλακος *talpe* V<sup>s.l.</sup>. 6–7 sup. θείω et ἀσφάλτῳ *sulphure et bitumine* V<sup>s.l.</sup> ad περιρραίνοντες *cumspargentes* V<sup>mg</sup>.

7: 4 ἐνεργείας corr. Bid. ἐνεργίας V cf. 9 ἐνεργείας recte V

6 But there are times when one plant or a stone suffices for the ritual act. For flax-leaved daphne is sufficient for direct revelation of the divine; for protection, [there suffices] laurel, box-thorn, squill, coral, diamond, or jasper; for foreknowledge, the heart of a mole; and for purifications, sulphur and sea water. So, through *sympathy* they used to attract them, and through opposition [*antipathy*] they were driving them away, maybe purifying with sulphur and bitumen, and cleansing with sea water; for sulphur purifies by the sharpness of its scent, and sea water because of its participation in the empyrean power.

7 Also, in the initiation rituals and other services related to the gods they used to pick out the appropriate animals and others of that sort. Beginning with these and suchlike things, they understood that the daemonic powers are substances closely connected to the natural and bodily activities, and they brought themselves into union through these very powers. And from these they already returned to the actual works of the gods, learning some from them [the gods] themselves, and as for other things, being moved by themselves accurately towards the discovery of the appropriate symbols. Hence, leaving behind nature and natural activities, they used the primary and divine powers.

# Commentary

## 1. Hieratic Art-Theurgy, *Teletai* and Invocations, Sympathy, Heliotropes and Luminaries

1.2, 5, 7 (cf. also 2.11 and 5.6). Ή Ιερατική Τέχνη, “The Hieratic Art” / Ή Ιερατική Ἐπιστήμη, “The Hieratic Science”. Οἱ Ιερατικοί, “The Hieratics” / Οἱ τῆς Ιερατικῆς Ἡγεμόνες, “The Leaders of the Hieratic Art”<sup>1</sup>

### 1.2.a. The Term Hieratic

Proclus' references to the hieratic art/science and the hieratic leaders in his *On Hieratic Art* can be illuminated by the parallel references in his other works, mainly in his commentaries on *Plato's Republic* and *Timaeus*, but also in his commentaries on *Plato's Parmenides* and *Cratylus*.

In his *Commentary on Plato's Republic*, Proclus includes the “hieratic science” (ιερατικὴν ἐπιστήμην) among the “divine prophetic” (μαντικὴν τὴν θείαν) and “medical” (ἰατρικὴν) sciences (Procl. *In R.* II.118.9–11).<sup>2</sup> Proclus also uses the term hieratic for the treatises, “all the hieratic (systematic) treatises” (ταῖς ιερατικαῖς ἀπάσαις πραγματείαις Procl. *In R.* I.110.22–23).<sup>3</sup> In *De Providentia* Proclus refers to “the whole hieratic treatise” (τὴν ιερατικὴν πραγματείαν ἀπασαν Procl. *Prov.* 38.2).<sup>4</sup> However, πραγματεία (-αι) in both cases may have a double meaning describing also the hieratic operation-s /practise-s /ritual-s.

Olympiodorus in his *Commentary on Plato's Alcibiades*, refers to the Egyptian<sup>5</sup> origins of hieratic art and the hieratic way of life.<sup>6</sup> In his *Commentary*

1 All translations from the Greek are my own.

2 See Procl. *In R.* II.118.8–15.

3 Procl. *In R.* I.110.21–26: εἰ δ' οὖν καὶ ταῦτα τις εἰς τὴν Ὁμήρου διάνοιαν ἀναπέμπειν ἐθέλοι, πάντως οὐκ ἀπορήσει λόγων συμφώνων μὲν ταῖς ιερατικαῖς ἀπάσαις πραγματείαις, συμφώνων δὲ ταῖς τελεταῖς καὶ τοῖς μυστηρίοις καὶ ταῖς τῶν θεῶν ἐπιφανείαις, ὃς ὅναρ τε καὶ ὑπάρ γινομένας ἀναθεν ἡ τῶν ἀνθρώπων φήμη παρεδέξατο.

4 Isaac (1979).

5 On the Egyptian temples in Late Antiquity see, Frankfurter (2004) 159–164. Bagnall (1993). Fowden (1993). Frankfurter (1998). Dunand and Zivie-Coché (2002).

6 Olymp. *In Alc.* 2.134–135: Ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι καὶ εἰς Αἴγυπτον ἀπῆλθεν πρὸς τοὺς ἐκεῖ ιερατικοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ ἔμαθεν παρ' αὐτῶν τὴν ιερατικήν. Olymp. *In Alc.* 21.11–14: οὕτω γάρ καὶ νῦν ὁρῶμεν ἐν τῇ συνηθείᾳ τοὺς ιερατικῶς ζῶντας εὐώδους ὀσφραινομένους ἄφω καὶ λέγοντας ἀγγέλου παρουσίαν εἶναι, ἀτε ἐλλάμψεως καὶ αὐτοῖς γινομένης περὶ τὰ ὀσφραντικά ὅργανα. On the Egyptian Isis and Osiris and hieratic myths, as well as Helios, the moon and all stars see Eus. *PE* II.4.2.1–6: ἑώρα γάρ τοὺς τὸν ἥλιον δημιουργὸν φαμένους καὶ τὰ περὶ τὸν "Οστιριν καὶ τὴν Ἰστιν καὶ πάντας τοὺς ιερατικοὺς μύθους ἦ εἰς τοὺς ἀστέρας καὶ τὰς τούτων φάνσεις καὶ κρύψεις καὶ ἐπιτολάς ἐλιττομένους ἦ

on Plato's *Timaeus* Proclus writes that "the Athenians have been helped by the Egyptians through their hieratic treatises," (καὶ Ἀθηναῖοι παρ' Αἰγυπτίων διὰ τῶν ἱερατικῶν λόγων· Procl. *In Ti.* 1.192.12–13).<sup>7</sup> Proclus also mentions that according to "the story of the Egyptians" (ὁ λόγος ὁ τῶν Αἰγυπτίων Procl. *In Ti.* 1.124.20), "their hieratic class that has got a memory of ancient actions (ἔργων) keeps an image of the permanent divine order that preserves the Whole and guards all within the divine memory" (τὸ ἱερατικὸν γένος τὸ μεμνημένον τῶν παλαιῶν εἰκόνα φέρει τάξεως θείας συνεκτικῆς τῶν ὅλων καὶ μονίμου καὶ τῇ θείᾳ μνήμῃ τὰ πάντα φρουρούσης Procl. *In Ti.* 1.124.24–27).<sup>8</sup>

Regarding the hieratic class, Proclus writes that there are "three classes there, the guardian, the auxiliary and the serving—for the triad belongs closely to the creative monad—while here there are double that number, the *hieratic*, the military, the manufacturing, the agricultural, the pastoral and the hunting." (ἐκεῖ μὲν γάρ τρία γένη, τὸ φυλακικὸν τὸ ἐπικουρητικὸν τὸ θητικόν—οἰκεία γάρ ή τριάς τῇ μονάδι τῇ δημιουργικῇ—ἐνταῦθα δὲ διπλάσια τούτων, τὸ ἱερατικὸν τὸ μάχιμον τὸ δημιουργικὸν τὸ γεωργικὸν τὸ νομευτικὸν τὸ θηρατικόν· Procl. *In Ti.* 1.150.25–28). Among these classes, "the *hieratic* is inferior to the guardian class, which reaches up to the primal cause, just as [Plato] himself in the *Statesman* subordinated the priests to the statesman and did not give them any political power" (τὸ τε γάρ ἱερατικὸν γένος ὑφεῖται τοῦ φυλακικοῦ τοῦ μέχρι τῆς πρωτίστης αἰτίας ἀνίόντος, ὥσπερ καὶ αὐτὸς ἐν τῷ Πολιτικῷ [290 D E] τοὺς ἱερέας ὑπέταξε τῷ πολιτικῷ καὶ οὐ μετέδωκεν αὐτοῖς τῆς πολιτικῆς δυνάμεως· Procl. *In Ti.* 1.151.20–24); and "considering the hieratic and military classes as one dyad" (μίαν μὲν δυάδα θεμένους τὸ ἱερατικὸν καὶ μάχιμον Procl. *In Ti.* 1.153.29–30). Also, "for the *hieratic* is present among the elevating gods" (ἔστι γάρ καὶ τὸ ἱερατικὸν ἐν τοῖς θεοῖς τοῖς ἀναγωγοῖς Procl. *In Ti.* 1.154.1).

Damascius asserts that "hieratic [art] and philosophy are not ruled by the same principles" (ἱερατικὴ καὶ φιλοσοφία οὐκ ἀπὸ τῶν αὐτῶν ἀρχονται ἀρχῶν),<sup>9</sup>

εἰς τάς τῆς σελήνης αὐξήσεις καὶ μειώσεις ἡ εἰς τὴν τοῦ ἥλιου πορείαν ἡ τὸ γε νυκτερινὸν ἡμισφαίριον ἡ τὸ ἡμερινὸν ἡ τὸν γε ποταμόν, καὶ ὅλως πάντα εἰς τὰ φυσικὰ καὶ οὐδὲν εἰς ἀσωμάτους καὶ ζώσας οὐσίας ἐρμηνεύοντας.

7 Also "the Egyptians have been benefited by the Athenians through their acts of war," Αἰγύπτιοι τε γάρ εἰ πεπόνθασιν ὑπὸ Ἀθηναίων διὰ τῶν πολεμικῶν ἔργων (Procl. *In Ti.* 1.192.10–12).

8 Diehl (1903–1906). On the exposition through dialectical names (ἥ διὰ τῶν διαλεκτικῶν ὄνομάτων αὐτῶν ἐφερμηνεύσις Procl. *In Prm.* 647.1–2), and the hieratic style and its Assyrian influences (e.g. the *Chaldaean Oracles*) on it see Procl. *In Prm.* 647.4–7: ἡ δὲ τῶν ἱερατικῶν ὄνόματα τῶν θεῶν κατὰ τὴν ἑαυτῶν μυστικὴν ἐμμηνείαν ἐκδεδωκότων, οἷα τὰ τοῖς Ἀστυρίοις ὑμημένα, Ζώναι καὶ Ἀζώνοι, καὶ Πηγαὶ καὶ Ἀμειλικτοὶ καὶ Συνοχεῖς, δι' ὧν ἐκεῖνοι τάς τάξεις ἐρμηνεύουσι τῶν θεῶν Steel (2007, 2009). See Dillon and Morrow (1992) 39, n. 33.

9 For parallels between the *hieratic* (art) and *philosophy* and the Egyptian 'twofold' initiation in the *Book of Amduat* and the *Book of Gates* see Wentle (1982), Lesko (1977).

“philosophy on the one hand descends from the cause of all things to the sediment of the beings through all the intermediate classes, the divine, and the higher ones after the gods, and those that appear on the so-called third level” (ἀλλ’ ἡ μὲν φιλοσοφία ἀπὸ τῆς μιᾶς τῶν πάντων αἰτίας, εἰς τὴν ὑποστάθμην τῶν ὄντων καθήκουσα διὰ μέσων τῶν ὅλων γενῶν, θείων τε καὶ τῶν μετὰ θεοὺς κρειττόνων καὶ ἐν τρίτῳ, φασί, βῆματι φαινομένων). While, as stated by Damascius, “Regarding *hieratic* on the other hand, *which is the worship of gods* (ἥ ἐστι θεῶν θεραπεία), it is ruled by the causes that embrace the cosmos and it is engaged with these things, namely *the immortality of the soul*, and according to the same philosophical speculations with the Egyptians” (τὴν δὲ ιερατικήν, ᥩ ἐστι θεῶν θεραπεία, ἐντεῦθέν ποθεν ἀπὸ τῶν περικοσμίων αἰτιῶν ἀρχεσθαι καὶ περὶ ταῦτα πραγματεύεσθαι, ψυχῶν περὶ ἀθανασίας, ὅτι κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ καὶ Αἰγυπτίοις φιλοσοφεῖται Dam. *Phil. Hist.* 4a.1–17).<sup>10</sup> In his *Commentary on Plato’s Phaedo*, Damascius includes “Iamblichus, Syrianus and Proclus and all the hieratics (οἱ ιερατικοὶ πάντες) among those who prefer the hieratic [art] (τὴν ιερατικήν)” (Dam. *In Phd.* 1.172.1–3).<sup>11</sup>

### 1.2.b. *The Hieratic Art-Theurgy: Definition*

Proclus uses the terms hieratic art or science, hieratics, or hieratic leaders as synonyms to theurgy and theurgists in his treatise *On the Hieratic Art*, although he does not explicitly use the terms θεουργία or θεουργοί at all in this treatise. It is noteworthy to point out that the examination of all the references to hieratic art/science, hieratics, theurgy and theurgists in all the works of Proclus has shown that, whenever Proclus uses the term hieratic(-s), he does not use the term theurgy(-ist) in the same passage, with only one exception in his *Commentary on Plato’s Republic*, in which he refers to both “the whole hieratic [art]” and “the ritual acts of the theurgists” (τὴν ιερατικήν ὅλην … καὶ τὰ ἔργα τῶν θεουργῶν Procl. *In R.* 1.37.11–12).

However, his definition of hieratic art/science and the hieratics, as it shall be examined in section five, is a definition of theurgy, which is similar to his definition in his other works and to that of Iamblichus.<sup>12</sup> The *Hieratic Art* is the *Theurgic Art*, theurgy, the art of the theurgic union with the divine. Proclus

<sup>10</sup> Dam. *Phil. Hist.* 4a.1–17, Athanassiadi (1999) 78–79; Dam. *Vit. Isid. Fr.* 3.1–19, Zintzen (1967) 5. Also, Krulak (2017a) 454–481.

<sup>11</sup> For hieratics and philosophers see Dam. *In Phd.* 1.172.1–3: “Οτι οἱ μὲν τὴν φιλοσοφίαν προτιμῶσιν, ὡς Πορφύριος καὶ Πλωτῖνος καὶ ὄλοι πολλοὶ φιλόσοφοι· οἱ δὲ τὴν ιερατικήν, ὡς Ιάμβλιχος καὶ Συριανός καὶ Πρόκλος καὶ οἱ ιερατικοὶ πάντες. See also Olymp. *In Phd.* 123.4. Also, Lewy (1978) 464.

<sup>12</sup> See Comm.: Sect. 5 below.

describes the theurgic union, putting an emphasis on a conceptual blending of ritual actions (e.g. the role of statues, incense, symbols and *synthêmata*, invocations and epiphanies) and concepts (e.g. sympathy, union with many powers, division and mixing): “and they often produce combinatory statues and incenses, having mixed into one [mixture] the distributed *synthêmata* and making the divine, as it were, comprehensible in its essence by art through the union with many powers, the dividing of which on the one hand made each one [power] indistinct, while the mixing on the other hand raised it up to the form of its archetype.” (καὶ ἀγάλματα πολλάκις κατασκευάζουσι σύμμικτα καὶ θυμιάματα, φυράσαντες εἰς ἓν τὰ μερισθέντα συνθήματα καὶ ποιήσαντες τέχνη ὁποίον κατ’ οὐσίαν τὸ θεῖον περιληπτικὸν καθ’ ἔνωσιν τῶν πλειόνων δυνάμεων, ὃν ὁ μὲν μερισμὸς ἡμύδρωσεν ἔκαστην, ἡ δὲ μῖξις ἐπανήγαγεν εἰς τὴν τοῦ παραδείγματος ἰδέαν. Procl. *Hier.Ar.* 5.12–17).

Similarly, Iamblichus in *De Mysteriis* II asserts that the theurgic union is established by secret acts and unspeakable symbols. In the question: “for what then would hinder the theoretical philosophers from establishing the theurgic union with the gods?” (ἐπεὶ τί ἔκώλυε τοὺς θεωρητικῶς φιλοσοφοῦντας ἔχειν τὴν θεουργικὴν ἔνωσιν πρὸς τοὺς θεούς;) Iamblichus replies: “the accomplishment of ritual acts not to be spoken and which are executed divinely beyond all conception and the power of unspeakable symbols conceived only by the gods establish the theurgic union” (ἡ τῶν ἔργων τῶν ἀρρήτων καὶ ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν νόησιν θεοπρεπῶς ἐνεργούμενων τελεσιουργία ἡ τε τῶν νοούμενων τοῖς θεοῖς μόνον συμβόλων ἀφθέγκτων δύναμις ἐντίθησι τὴν θεουργικὴν ἔνωσιν; Iamb. *Myst.* II.11.96.13–97.2).<sup>13</sup>

Proclus in his *Platonic Theology* describes the “theurgic power” (τῆς θεουργικῆς δυνάμεως) as “higher than all human wisdom and science, since it combines the blessings of divination and the purifying powers of the *telestic* [initiatory] rite, and without exception all the operations of divine possession” (ἡ κρείττων ἐστὶν ἀπάσης ἀνθρωπίνης σωφροσύνης καὶ ἐπιστήμης, συλλαβοῦσα τά τε τῆς μαντικῆς ἀγαθὰ καὶ τὰς τῆς τελεσιουργικῆς καθαρτικάς δυνάμεις καὶ πάντα ἀπλῶς τὰ τῆς ἐνθέου κατακωχῆς ἐνεργήματα. Procl. *Plat.Theol.* I.113.6–10).<sup>14</sup>

<sup>13</sup> Also, Iamb. *Myst.* IX.1, 5, 9. On the distinction between the Plotinian mystical union and the union with the divine in magic and theurgy see Dodds (1951) 286, 302; see also Dodds (1928) 141 ff. For Plotinus the divine union with the god in philosophy is accomplished by the contemplation of god and beauty; Plot. *Enn.* I.6.9.33–35: Γενέσθω δὴ πρῶτον θεοειδῆς πᾶς καὶ καλὸς πᾶς, εἰ μέλλει θεάσασθαι θεόν τε καὶ καλόν; also Plot. *Enn.* VI.7.34. On theurgy see Shaw (1995) and (1999); on theurgy and Christianity in Dionysius the Areopagite see E.H. I.1; PG 3: 372a: Ἰησοῦς, ... καὶ θεουργίας ἀρχὴ καὶ οὐσία; see Shaw (1999) 573–599; Pavlos (2019) 161–180.

<sup>14</sup> On the hieratic *teletai* see Comm.: Sect. 1.2.c; on the *telestic* art see Comm.: Sect. 5.12.a and b; on the purification rituals see Comm.: Sect. 6.6–8.a, b, c and d below.

Proclus also refers to “the intellectual science of the divine” (ἡ νοερὰ τῶν θείων ἐπιστήμη Procl. *Plat.Theol.* 1.124.26) as revealing “the hidden essence of gods” (τὴν ἀποκεκρυμμένην οὐσίαν τῶν θεῶν 1.125.1–2), using a simile which defines theurgy: “(and just as) *theurgy* through some symbols invokes the bounteous goodness of the gods in order to obtain the illumination of the artificial statues” (καὶ ὥσπερ ἡ θεουργία διὰ δή τινων συμβόλων εἰς τὴν τῶν τεχνητῶν ἀγαλμάτων ἔλλαμψιν προκαλεῖται τὴν τῶν θεῶν ἀφθονον ἀγαθότητα Procl. *Plat.Theol.* 1.124.23–25).

Proclus in his *Chaldaean Philosophy* (Πρόκλου ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς χαλδαϊκῆς φιλοσοφίας, “Extraits du Commentaire de Proclus sur la Philosophie Chaldaïque”) asserts: “for the soul is composed by sacred words and divine symbols; ... and we are images of intellectual essences and statues of unknown *synthémata* ... in that way the soul participates in all the *synthémata*, with which it is united with the god” (συνέστηκε γάρ ἡ ψυχὴ ἀπὸ τῶν ιερῶν λόγων καὶ τῶν θείων συμβόλων ... καὶ ἐσμέν εἰκόνες μὲν τῶν νοερῶν οὐσιῶν, ἀγάλματα [τὰ] δὲ τῶν ἀγνώστων συνθημάτων. ... οὕτω καὶ πάντων μὲν μετέχει τῶν συνθημάτων, δι’ ὃν συνάπτεται τῷ θεῷ, Procl. *Phil. Chald.* Fr. 5.211.4–11).<sup>15</sup>

Furthermore, in *Alcibiades* 1 Proclus writes that getting united with the divine in theurgy (έαυτοὺς τῷ θεῷ συνάπτειν) is accomplished through the triad [faith, truth and love] that oversees everything, “for everything is governed and exists in these three,” says the oracle, and for this reason the gods advise the theurgists to unite themselves to the god through this triad.” (πάντα γάρ ἐν τρισὶ τοῖσδε; φησὶ τὸ λόγιον, ‘κυβερνάται τε καὶ ἔστι’ καὶ διὰ τοῦτο καὶ τοῖς θεουργοῖς οἱ θεοὶ παρακελεύονται διὰ τῆς τριάδος ταύτης έαυτοὺς τῷ θεῷ συνάπτειν. Procl. *In Alc.* 1.52.13–53.2).

The ritualistic role of the theurgist is emphasized by Proclus in his *Commentary on Plato's Cratylus* as following, “For this reason the *theurgist* too, who is the leader of this ritual, starts with the purifications and the lustral besprinklings; let he himself as a *priest* among the first governing the rituals of fire, be sprinkled with a frosty wave of the deep-voiced brine” (διὸ καὶ ὁ θεουργὸς ὁ τῆς τελετῆς τούτου προκαθηγούμενος ἀπὸ τῶν καθάρσεων ἀρχεται καὶ τῶν περιπράσσεων αὐτὸς δὲ ἐν πρώτοις ἱερεὺς πυρὸς ἔργα κυβερνῶν κύματι ῥαινέσθω παγερῷ βαρυηχέος ἄλμης Procl. *In Cra.* 176.101.3–7).<sup>16</sup>

15 Des Places (1971) 211. See also *Fr.* 1.20617–24: ‘Υμνωδὸς δὲ ἀποτελεῖται τῶν θείων ἡ ψυχή, κατὰ τὸ λόγιον, τὰ συνθήματα τοῦ Πατρὸς τὰ ἀρρητα προβάλλομένη καὶ προσφέρουσα αὐτὰ τῷ Πατρί, ἀ ἐνέθετο ὁ Πατὴρ εἰς αὐτὴν ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ παρόδῳ τῆς οὐσίας. Τοιούτοι γάρ οἱ νοεροὶ καὶ ἀφανεῖς ὕμνοι τῆς ἀναγομένης ψυχῆς, ἀνακινοῦντες τὴν μνήμην τῶν ἀρμονικῶν λόγων οἱ φέρουσιν ἀπορρήτους εἰκόνας τῶν θείων ἐν αὐτῇ δυνάμεων. See Pitra (1888) Vol. V: 192–195; and Des Places (1971) 206–212.

16 Pasquali (1908) 101. Also, Αὐτὸς δὲ ἐν πρώτοις ἱερεὺς πυρὸς ἔργα κυβερνῶν κύματι ῥαινέ-

Regarding the role of rituals in the hieratic art, Proclus in his *Commentary on Plato's Republic*, discussing the “obscenity” of Homer's myths (Procl. *In R.* 1.76.17–79.18) and in an attempt to draw parallels between the leaders of the hieratic art and the myth-makers, writes about the establishment of the mystery rituals of laughter and lamentation for the classes of daemons in the hieratic art,<sup>17</sup> “At this point the leaders of the hieratic rites, having observed these things, ordered that [the rituals of] laughter and lamentation should get performed in defined periods, establishing rituals for these classes [of daemons] and allotting to them their fair share of the general ritualistic worship of the divine.” (ἀ δὴ καὶ οἱ τῶν ἱερῶν θεσμῶν ἡγεμόνες κατανοήσαντες περιόδοις ὡρισμέναις ἔταξαν γέλωτά τε καὶ θρήνους ἐπιτελεῖσθαι, τοῖς τοιούτοις γένεσιν ἀφοσιούμενοι καὶ τῆς ὅλης περὶ τὸ θεῖον ἀγιστείας τὴν προσήκουσαν μοῖραν ἀποκληρώσαντες. Procl. *In R.* 1.78.14–18).

Furthermore, Proclus attempts to interpret the myths from the theurgists' point of view and experiences, highlighting the use of mystery language and rituals both in myths and theurgy. He describes, for example, the “manifested experiences” (τοῖς φαινομένοις παθήμασιν) established for the class of the gods' attendants, referring to the practitioners of theurgy and their epiphanic experiences [the divine epiphanies/manifestations].<sup>18</sup> “So, just as the hieratic art, distributing, as it ought, the whole of religious rites to the gods and the gods' attendants, so that none of those who eternally follow the gods may be

σθω παγερῷ βαρυνχέος ὄλμης = *Orac. Chald. Fr.* 133; *Des Places* (1971) 99. See also the reference to the *Chaldaean theurgists* in Procl. *In R.* 11.220.11: τῶν παρὰ Χαλδαίοις θεουργῶν.

<sup>17</sup> See discussion on solar daemons in Comm.: Sect. 4.18–19 below.

<sup>18</sup> Regarding the “manifested experiences” (τοῖς φαινομένοις παθήμασιν), Aristotle also states that the initiates should be *liable to experiences* (παθεῖν); Arist. *Fr.* 15 (ed. Rose = Synesius *Dio* 10): καθάπερ Ἀριστοτέλης ἀξιοί τοὺς τελουμένους οὐ μαθεῖν τί δεῖν, ὅλλα παθεῖν καὶ διατεθῆναι, δηλονότι γενομένους ἐπιτηδείους. On the mystical allusions of the “manifested experiences” see also the vision of the soul and the references to the mystical initiation in Pl. *Phdr.* 250bc: κάλλος δὲ τότε ἦν ίδειν λαμπρόν, ὅτε σὺν εὐδαίμονι χορῷ μακαρίαν ὅψιν τε καὶ θέαν, ἐπόμενοι μετὰ μὲν Διὸς ἡμεῖς, ἄλλοι δὲ μετ' ὄλλου θεῶν, εἰδόν τε καὶ ἐτελοῦντο τῶν τελετῶν ἦν θέμις λέγειν μακαριωτάτην, ἦν ὡργιάζομεν δόλοκληροι μὲν αὐτοὶ ὄντες καὶ ἀπαθεῖς κακῶν ὅσα ἡμᾶς ἐν ὑστέρῳ χρόνῳ ὑπέμενεν, δόλοκληρα δὲ καὶ ἀπλᾶ καὶ ἀτρεμῆ καὶ εὐδαίμονα φάσματα μυούμενοι τε καὶ ἐποπτεύοντες ἐν αὐγῇ καθαρῷ, καθαροὶ ὄντες καὶ ἀσήμαντοι τούτου δὲ νῦν δῆ σώμα περιφέροντες ὄνομάζομεν, ὀστρέουν τρόπον δεδεσμευμένοι. See also Comm.: Sect. 1.2.c on the *hieratic teletai*, epiphanies and direct revelations of the Gods below; also 2.13.b on the “Transmission of Fire” and fire and fiery apparitions in the Chaldaean Oracles and Proclus; and 6.2.b on Αὐτοφάνεια / Αὐτόματος Ἐπιφάνεια below.

left [out] without a share of the appropriate ritual, approaches on the one hand the gods with the holiest initiations and mystical symbols, while on the other hand it calls forth the gifts of the other class [of the gods' attendants] by means of [their] manifested experiences<sup>19</sup> through some ineffable sympathy," (ώσπερ οὖν ἡ τῶν Ἱερῶν τέχνη κατανείμασα δεόντως τὴν σύμπασαν θρησκείαν τοῖς θεοῖς καὶ τοῖς τῶν θεῶν ὀποδοῖς, ἵνα μηδὲν ἄμοιρον τῆς ἐπιβαλλούσης θεραπείας ἀπολείπηται τῶν ἀιδίως ἐπομένων τοῖς θεοῖς, τοὺς μὲν ταῖς ἀγιωτάταις τελεταῖς καὶ τοῖς μυστικοῖς συμβόλοις προσάγεται, τῶν δὲ τοῖς φαινομένοις παθήμασιν προκαλεῖται τὰς δόσεις διὰ δῆ τινος ἀρρήτου συμπαθείας, Procl. *In R.* 1.78.18–24).

Damascius asserts that *hieratic* (τὴν δὲ Ἱερατικήν) is *the worship of gods* (έστι θεῶν θεραπεία), engaged with *the immortality of the soul* (ψυχῶν περὶ ἀθανασίας) and in accordance with the same philosophical speculations with the Egyptians (ὅτι κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ καὶ Αἴγυπτίοις φιλοσοφεῖται) (Dam. *Phil. Hist.* 4a.1–17).<sup>20</sup> For Damascius the hieratic union “would be *mingling with the divine*, or rather *the perfect union*, the ascent of our souls back to god, as they return and assemble themselves from the multiple division” (καὶ τοῦτ' ἀν εἴη θεοκρασία, μᾶλλον δὲ ἔνωσις παντελής, ἐπάνοδος τῶν ἡμετέρων ψυχῶν πρὸς τὸ θεῖον ἐπιστρεφομένων καὶ συναθροιζομένων ἀπὸ τοῦ πολλοῦ μερισμοῦ ... Dam. *Phil. Hist.* 4b.1–3).<sup>21</sup>

Psellus in his *Encomium in Matrem* states that he understands what sort of art is the hieratic (Ἱερατικήν δὲ τέχνην οἶδα μὲν ἥτις ἔστιν Psel. *Enc. Matr.* 1785), and the role of stones and plants and unspoken [secret/sacred] powers (λίθοις δὲ καὶ πόαις δυνάμεις μὲν ἀρρήτους 1786); however, he actually “laughs at the statues fallen from Zeus” (καὶ καταγελῶ τῶν ‘διοπετῶν ἀγαλμάτων’ 1769); and he “rails furiously at the propitiation and purification rituals, the characters, the names, the so-called god-possessed actions, the ethereal one that holds together, the one belonging to the empyrean, the source that holds a lion, the First Father, the Second Father, the Iungges, the guides of the universe, Hecate, the festivals of Hecate, the one that has undergirded, the rambling even as to names” (διαλοιδοροῦμαι ταῖς ἔξεμενίσεσι, ταῖς καθάρσεσι, τοῖς χαρακτῆρσι, τοῖς ὄνόμασι, ταῖς λεγομέναις θεοφορήτοις κινήσεσι, τῷ αἰθερίῳ συνοχεῖ, τῷ ἐμπυρίῳ, τῇ λεοντούχῳ πηγῇ, τῷ πρώτῳ πατρί, τῷ δευτέρῳ, ταῖς Ἰύγξι, τοῖς κοσμαγοῖς, τῇ Ἐκάτῃ, τοῖς Ἐκατησίοις, τῷ ὑπεζωκότι, τοῖς λήροις καὶ μέχρις ὄνόματος. 1792–1797). In addition, Psellus refers to further characteristics of the hieratic /theurgic art, confirming his knowledge “about the notions of aion and time and nature and the theory of the one, and about perception and the mixing and union of the

<sup>19</sup> It is translated as “shows of passion” by Lamberton (2012); and Baltzly, Finamore and Miles (2018) 188 and n. 65.

<sup>20</sup> Dam. *Vit. Isid. Fr.* 3.1–19, Zintzen (1967).

<sup>21</sup> Dam. *Vit. Isid. Fr.* 5.1–3, Zintzen (1967).

opposites" (αἰώνος δὲ πέρι καὶ χρόνου καὶ φύσεως καὶ θεωρίας καὶ τοῦ ἐνός, αἰσθήσεώς τε καὶ μνήμης καὶ τῆς τῶν ἐναντίων μίξεώς τε καὶ κράσεως, 1797–1799).<sup>22</sup>

Furthermore, Psellus in his "Interpretation/Exegesis of the *Chaldaean Oracles*," explaining the *Orac. Chald. Fr. 110*,<sup>23</sup> "by uniting ritual act with sacred word" ('ἱερῷ λόγῳ ἔργον ἐνώσας' 110.3), states, "However this sacred word is unable to lead to the highest ascending and receiving of the divine. Hence, the sacred word leads this one to the god through illuminations from there [divine world], the Chaldaean on the other hand [leads to the god] through the *telestic* science. Thus, the *telestic* [ritualistic] science is that which accomplishes the soul through the power of the materials here [the material world]."<sup>24</sup> (ἀλλ' οὐτος ὁ Ἱερὸς λόγος ἀδυνατεῖ ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ πρὸς τὴν ὑψηλοτέραν ἀναγωγὴν καὶ πρὸς τὴν τοῦ θείου παράληψιν. καὶ ὁ μὲν τῆς εὐσεβείας λόγος χειραγωγεῖ τούτον πρὸς θεὸν διὰ τῶν ἐκεῖθεν ἐλλάμψεων, ὁ δὲ Χαλδαῖος διὰ τῆς τελεστικῆς ἐπιστήμης. τελεστικὴ δὲ ἐπιστήμη ἔστιν ἡ οἷον τελοῦσα τὴν ψυχὴν διὰ τῆς τῶν ἐνταῦθ' ὑλῶν δυνάμεως. *Opusc.* 38. pp. 131.24–132.5 / PG 122. 1129 D 12, 1132 A 9).<sup>24</sup>

Similarly, in magical literature the theurgic union is justified by the magician's knowledge of the forms, the symbols and the secret names of the god invoked. For example in "The erotic binding spell of Astrapsoukos" (PGM VIII.1–63) addressed to Hermes the theurgic union is justified by the magician's knowledge of the god Hermes, his signs and symbols: (the magician knows) "the names for you [Hermes] in heaven"; "I know also your forms," οἶδά σου καὶ τὰς μορφάς, "I know (οἶδά σου) also your wood" and "I know (οἶδά σου) also your barbarian names" (PGM VIII.6–15 and 20–21).<sup>25</sup>

**1.2.c. Hieratic Teletai, Epiphanies and Direct Revelations of the Gods**  
 Proclus discusses "all the hieratic treatises" (ταῖς Ἱερατικαῖς ἀπάσαις πραγματείαις) in relation to "the *teletai* [initiatory rites] and mysteries and the epiphanies of the gods" (ταῖς τελεταῖς καὶ τοῖς μυστηρίοις καὶ ταῖς τῶν θεῶν ἐπιφανείαις Procl. *In R. I.110.22–24*).

<sup>22</sup> On Psellus (1017–1096) and the Hellenic philosophy and Proclus in Byzantium see, Wilson (1983) 156–166; Duffy (2002) 139–156; Ierodiakonou (2002); Gersh (2014) 1–29, at 27–28; Trizio (2014) 182–215; O'Meara (2014) 165–181, at 177; Lauritzen (2020): 69–80. On (Pseudo-)Psellus' *De Operatione Daemonum* (*/De Daemonibus*) and *Quaenam sunt Graecorum opinions de daemonibus* see Gautier (1980) 105–194 and (1988) 85–107. O'Meara (1989) Vol. II: vii and n. 3. And O'Meara (2014) 165–181. Also see Kristeller (1943) 15 (on Plethon Gemistos), 26 (on Ficino, Proclus, Psellos and Nicholas of Methone); also, Kaske and Clark (1989).

<sup>23</sup> Des Places (1971); Lewy (1978); Majercik (1989). See also Kroll (1894).

<sup>24</sup> O'Meara (1989) 131–132.

<sup>25</sup> E.g. also PGM III.612–631 and VII.478–490. See Pachoumi (2018).

Proclus writing about the “unchanging divine” (ἀμετάβλητον τὸ θεῖον Procl. *In R. 1.36.30*) refers to the whole hieratic art and the actions of the theurgists, and “the direct revelations [visions] of gods” (αἱ αὐτοφάνειαι τῶν θεῶν Procl. *In R. 1.37.9*),<sup>26</sup> who “sometimes are revealed as luminous visions without form and sometimes as having taken a form; for if we were not believing in these [visions], we would overthrow the whole hieratic [art] and the ritual acts of the theurgists, and without these, [we would overthrow] the direct epiphanies of the gods, when sometimes they reveal themselves in other forms” (φαινομένων τότε μὲν ἀτυπώτων φώτων, τότε δὲ τετυπωμένων· μὴ γὰρ προσέμενοι ταῦτα τὴν ἱερατικὴν ὅλην ἀνατρέπομεν καὶ τὰ ἔργα τῶν θεουργῶν, καὶ ἀνευ τούτων τὰς αὐτομάτους ἐπιφανείας τῶν θεῶν ἐν σχήμασιν ἀλλοτε ἀλλοις φανταζομένων *I.37.9–14*). It is noteworthy that this is the only case in Proclus’ works that both the *hieratic* and *theurgists* appear in the same passage.

Elsewhere, Proclus refers to the role of hieratic rites (τῶν ἱερατικῶν ἔργων Procl. *In R. 1.83.17*) and hieratic precepts (τοῖς ἱερατικοῖς θεσμοῖς Procl. *In R. 1.83.28*), the mythical symbols (ἀπὸ τῶν μυθικῶν συμβόλων Procl. *In R. 1.83.9*) and the myths of the Greek theologians (οἱ τοιοίδε μῆθοι τῶν παρ’ Ἑλλησιν θεολόγων Procl. *In R. 1.83.27–28*)<sup>27</sup> and asserts that “indeed the gods are pleased, listening to such symbols” (καὶ γὰρ οἱ θεοὶ τῶν τοιῶνδε συμβόλων ἀκούοντες χαίρουσιν Procl. *In R. 1.83.17–18*), and that “mysteries and *teletai* [initiatory rites] are effective in these, and they make the initiates see complete, stable and simple visions” (καὶ τὰ μυστήρια καὶ αἱ τελεταὶ [καὶ] τὸ δραστήριον ἐν τούτοις ἔχουσιν καὶ δόλοκληρα καὶ ἀτρεμῆ καὶ ἀπλὰ θεάματα διὰ τούτων προξενοῦσιν τοῖς μύσταις καθορᾶν Procl. *In R. 1.83.22–25*).<sup>28</sup>

<sup>26</sup> Ον αὐτοφάνειαι see also Procl. *In R. 11.154.1–3*; καὶ αὖται ποτὲ μὲν αὐτοφανῶς ιδούσαι τὰς ἐν τῷ παντὶ τούτῳ κόσμῳ τάξεις αὐτῶν διαγγέλλουσιν κατὰ τὴν ἐν τῷ παντὶ προϋπάρχουσαν ἱερατικὴν. Also, Procl. *In R. 11.344.27–345.1*: καὶ πρότερον εἴπομεν καὶ μαρτυροῦσαν ἔχομεν τὴν ἱερατικὴν παραδοῦσαν καὶ αὐτοπτικὴν κλήσιν τῆς μεγίστης θεοῦ ταύτης καὶ διδάξασαν πῶς ὄφθείσῃ προσιέναι <δεῖ>.

<sup>27</sup> On the Homeric myths in Procl. *In R. 1.79.12–23*; καὶ τοὺς μὲν φιλοσοφωτέρους τίθεσθαι, τοὺς δὲ τοῖς ἱερατικοῖς θεσμοῖς προσήκοντας, καὶ τοὺς μὲν νέοις ἀκούειν πρέποντας, τοὺς δὲ τοῖς διὰ πάσης ὡς εἰπεῖν τῆς ἀλλῆς παιδείας ὄρθως ἥγμένοις καὶ εἰς τὴν τῶν τοιῶνδε μύθων ἀκρόασιν ὥσπερ ὅργανόν τι μυστικὸν ιδρύσαι τὸν τῆς ψυχῆς νοῦν ἐφιεμένοις. ἀλλ’ ὁ μὲν Σωκράτης καὶ ταῦτα ἴνκανως ἐδείκνυται τοῖς συνορᾶν δυναμένοις, καὶ ὅτι τῆς Ὁμήρου μυθοποίας ὡς μῆτε παιδευτικῆς μήτε τοῖς τῶν νέων ἀπλάστοις καὶ ἀβάτοις ἥθεσιν συναρμοζομένης ἐπιλαμβάνεται, καὶ ὡς τὸ ἀπόρρητον αὐτῆς καὶ κρύφιον ἀγαθὸν μυστικῆς τινος δεῖται καὶ ἐνθεαστικῆς νοήσεως.

<sup>28</sup> Also, Procl. *In R. 1.83.26–32*: μὴ τοίνυν λέγωμεν ὡς οὐ παιδευτικοὶ πρὸς ἀρετὴν εἰσιν οἱ τοιοίδε μῆθοι τῶν παρ’ Ἑλλησιν θεολόγων, ἀλλ’ ὡς οὐχὶ τοῖς ἱερατικοῖς θεσμοῖς συμφωνότατοι δεικνύωμεν, μηδὲ ὡς ἀνομοίως μιμοῦνται τὰ θεῖα διὰ τῶν ἀπεμφαινόντων συμβόλων, ἀλλ’ ὡς οὐχὶ συμπάθειαν ἡμῖν ἀρρηγτον προπαρασκευάζουσιν εἰς τὴν μετουσίαν τῶν θεῶν.

Regarding *teletai* [initiatory rites], Proclus explains, “the *teletai* show that the myths affect many; indeed, these *teletai*, using the myths in order to enclose the truth about gods, are the reason of sympathy to the souls concerning the rites in a way unknown to us but also divine;” (“Οτι δε και εις τους πολλους δρωσιν οι μυθοι, δηλούσιν αι τελεται. και γαρ ανται χρώμεναι τοις μύθοις, ινα την περι θεων ἀλήθειαν ἀρρητον κατακλείωσιν, συμπαθείας εισιν αίτιαι ταῖς ψυχαῖς περὶ τὰ δρώμενα τρόπον ἄγνωστον ἡμῖν και θεῖον. Procl. *In R.* 11.108.17–21).<sup>29</sup> Olympiodorus in his *Commentary on Plato's Phaedo*—also quoted in *Orph. Fr.* 235—emphasises the bacchic aspect of *telete*, τελετὴ γάρ ἐστιν ἡ τῶν ἀρετῶν βαχχεία, “for initiation is the bacchic frenzy [orgy] of the virtues” (*Olymp. In Phd.* 1.8.7.2–3) integrating it with Plato's saying, “and he [Plato] says 'many are the bearers of Dionysus' banner, but few inspired by him'” (και φησιν 'πολλοὶ μὲν ναρθηκοφόροι, παῦροι δέ τε Βάκχοι' 1.8.7.3–4).<sup>30</sup>

Damascius in his *Commentary on Plato's Phaedo* states that “the *teletai* [initiatory rites] are twofold, those here [below] which are a kind of preparation [for the mysteries], and those in the hereafter; and I think those [in the hereafter] are twofold as well, those about the pneumatic tunic, as the initiatory rites here [below] about the shell-like body, and those about the luminous [vehicle].” (διτταὶ δέ αι τελεται, αι μὲν ἐνθάδε, προπαρασκευαί τινες ούσαι, αι δέ ἐκεῖ διτται δέ οἵμαι και ανται, αι μὲν περὶ τὸν πνευματικὸν χιτῶνα, ως αι ἐνθάδε περὶ τὸν ὄστρεῖνον, αι δέ περὶ τὸν αὐγοειδῆ. Dam. *In Phd.* 1.168.5–7). Damascius also points out “that the aim of the *teletai* [initiatory rites] is to lift the souls up in that accomplishment from where they made their first descent from the very beginning, in which Dionysus also set them under, being seated on his related father's throne, which is there for the whole life of Zeus. Thus, it must be so that the initiated 'lives among the gods' in accordance with the intention of the accomplishing gods” (“Οτι σκοπὸς τῶν τελετῶν ἐστιν εις τέλος ἀναγαγεῖν τὰς ψυχὰς ἐκεῖνο ἀφ' οὐ

29 See also Procl. *In R.* 11.108.21–32: ως τοὺς μὲν τῶν τελουμένων καταπλήττεσθαι δειμάτων θείων πλήρεις γιγνομένους, τοὺς δὲ συνδιατίθεσθαι τοῖς ιεροῖς συμβόλοις και ἔαυτῶν ἐκστάντας ὅλους ἐνιδρύσθαι τοῖς θεοῖς και ἐνθεάζειν· πάντως που και τῷ ἐπομένων αὐτοῖς κρειττόνων ἡμῶν γενῶν διὰ τὴν πρὸς τὰ τοιαῦτα συνθήματα φιλίαν ἀνεγειρόντων ἡμᾶς εἰς τὴν πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς δι' αὐτῶν συμπαθείαν. η πῶς μετ' ἐκείνων μὲν πᾶς δέ περὶ γῆν τόπος μεστὸς ἡν παντοίων ἀγαθῶν, ὃν θεοὶ προξενοῦσιν ἀνθρώποις, ἄνευ δέ ἐκείνων ἀπνοια πάντα και ἄμοιρα τῆς τῶν θεῶν ἐστιν ἐπιλάμψεως; Άλλα τῶν μὲν μύθων τὰς αἰτίας και ἐν τοῖς Περὶ τῶν μυθικῶν συμβόλων ἐξειργάσμεθα.

30 Olymp. *In Phd.* 1.8.7.1–9: Διὸ και παρφθεὶ ἔπος Ὀρφικὸν [Fr. 235] τὸ λέγον ὅτι 'ὅστις δ' ἡμῶν ἀτέλεστος, ὥσπερ ἐν βορβόρῳ κείσται ἐν 'Αιδου', τελετὴ γάρ ἐστιν ἡ τῶν ἀρετῶν βαχχεία· και φησιν 'πολλοὶ μὲν ναρθηκοφόροι, παῦροι δέ τε Βάκχοι', ναρθηκοφόρους ού μην Βάκχους τοὺς πολιτικοὺς καλῶν, ναρθηκοφόρους δέ και Βάκχους τοὺς καθαρτικούς. και γάρ ἐνδούμεθα μέν τῇ Ὂλῃ ως Τιτᾶνες διὰ τὸν πολὺν μερισμόν—πολὺ γάρ τὸ ἐμόν και σόν—ἀνεγειρόμεθα δέ ως Βάκχοι· διὸ και περὶ τὸν θάνατον μαντικώτεροι γινόμεθα, και ἔφορος δέ τοῦ θανάτου ὁ Διόνυσος, διότι και πάσης βαχχείας. See also *Orph. Fr.* 235; Kern (1972) 248.

τὴν πρώτην ἐποιήσαντο κάθοδον ὡς ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, ἐν ᾧ καὶ ὁ Διόνυσος αὐτὰς ὑπέστησεν ἰδρυμένος ἐν τῷ θρόνῳ τοῦ οἰκείου πατρός, ὃ ἐστιν ἐν τῇ ὅλῃ ζωῇ τῇ Διίῳ. ἀναγκαίως ἄρα ὁ τετελεσμένος 'οἰκεῖ μετὰ θεῶν', κατὰ τὸν σκοπὸν τῶν τελούντων θεῶν. Dam. *In Phd. I.168.1–5*).<sup>31</sup>

#### 1.2.d. Hieratic Invocations, Words and Treatises, and the Separation of the Soul from the Body

In his *Commentary on Plato's Republic*, Proclus refers to "the hieratic mode of invocations, accomplished through sacrifices, divine names and prayers" (<ὅ> ἱερατικὸς τρόπος τῆς ἀγωγῆς, διὰ θυσιῶν, δι' ὀνομάτων θείων, δι' εὐχῶν συμπεπληρωμένος Procl. *In R. II.66.13–15*).<sup>32</sup> Proclus also points out the aim of the hieratic words, "for the hieratic words/teachings accomplish this, separating the souls from the bodies" (καὶ γάρ οἱ ἱερατικοὶ λόγοι τοῦτο δρῶσιν, χωρίζοντες ἀπὸ τῶν σωμάτων τὰς ψυχάς Procl. *In R. II.119.5–6*); "producing to the souls the activity that is freed from bodies and the release of the natural bonds" (ταῖς δὲ ψυχαῖς τὴν ἀπόλυτον τῶν σωμάτων προξενοῦντες ἐνέργειαν καὶ τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν φυσικῶν δεσμῶν II.119.7–9); Proclus then emphasises the theurgists' ability, "for if that is possible to the hieratics, namely to keep the bodies unchangeable, when the souls are separated" (εἰ γάρ καὶ τοῖς ἱερατικοῖς τοῦτο δυνατόν, φυλάττειν ἀτρεπτα τὰ σώματα χωρίζομένων τῶν ψυχῶν II.119.13–14).

Moreover, Proclus explains that these hieratic/theurgic doctrines about the separation of the soul from the body before death—"to be able to take out the soul from the body and again to get it back and make it alive that which it had left" (τὸ τὴν ψυχὴν ἔξιέναι τε δύνασθαι τοῦ σώματος καὶ αὐθις εἰσιέναι καὶ ἔμπνουν ποιεῖν ὅπερ ἀπελελοίπει Procl. *In R. II.123.9–11*)—were published by the theurgists who lived at the time of the emperor Marcus Aurelius (121–180 AD), "and as many (doctrines) were put out by the theurgists at the time of the emperor Marcus provide manifest assurance of the teaching" (καὶ ὅσα τοῖς ἐπὶ Μάρκου θεουργοῖς ἐκδέδοται πίστιν ἐναργῆ πορίζει τοῦ λόγου Procl. *In R. II.123.12–13*).<sup>33</sup> The

31 Damascius says that there are three degrees of ascent through initiation, as there is though philosophy; Dam. *In Phd. I.168.7–16*: τρεῖς γάρ οἱ βαθμοὶ τῆς ἀνόδου τῆς τελεστικῆς, ὡς καὶ τῆς φιλοσόφου· τρισχιλιοστῷ γάρ ἔτει οἱ φιλόσοφοι ἀνάγονται, ὡς ἐν Φαιδρῷ εἴρηται [249a3–5], βίος γάρ τέλειος καὶ περιοδικὸς ἡ χιλιάς. ὃ ἄρα 'ἀτέλεστος' ἀτε πορρωτάτω μένων τοῦ οἰκείου τέλους 'ἐν βορβόρῳ κεῖται' καὶ ἐνταῦθα καὶ πλέον ἐκεῖ, ἐν γάρ τῇ τρυγὶ τῆς γενέσεως, αὐτῷ τῷ Ταρτάρῳ. καὶ δῆλον ὅτι τὰ ἄκρα δύο λόγοις παρείληφεν, πολὺ δὲ καὶ τὸ ἐν μέσῳ πλάτος. ἀνάλογον δέ μοι σκόπει καὶ τάς διὰ φιλοσοφίας ἀνόδους, εἰ καὶ μὴ ἀκριβή μηδὲ κατὰ τὴν ἀπόρρητον ἔνωσιν ποιοῦνται τὴν συναφήν. εἰ δὲ μετιών τις φιλοσοφίαν μαλακώτερον οὐ καρποῦται τὸ τέλος αὐτῆς, δῆλον ὡς καὶ τελεστικῇ ἐνδιατρίβων ἴδιωτικῶς οὐκ ἀμήσει τὸν καρπὸν αὐτῆς οὐδὲ οὐτος.

32 See also Lamb. *Myst. v.26.240.9*: τῆς ἱερατικῆς ἀγωγῆς.

33 Procl. *In R. II.123.8–13*; on Proclus' references to the theurgists during the reign of the

reference here to the theurgists must be to Julian the Chaldaean and his son Julian the Theurgist<sup>34</sup> who, according to Proclus, “accomplish through some *telete* [initiatory rite] the same thing in regard to the initiated” (καὶ γὰρ ἐκεῖνοι διὰ δὴ τινος τελετῆς τὸ αὐτὸ δρῶσιν εἰς τὸν τελούμενον. Procl. *In R. II.123.13–14*).<sup>35</sup>

**1.3–5. The Erotic-Theurgic Simile: “Ωσπερ οἱ ἐρωτικοί ... οὕτως καὶ οἱ ιερατικοί**

The erotic-hieratic simile alludes to a similar theurgic-erotic simile used in one of the early works of Proclus, his *Commentary on Plato's Alcibiades I*, “It could also be said that Socrates approaches visible beauty as an image of intelligible beauty; for he is a worshipper of the whole series of beauty, and just as those who are experts in theurgy respect the visible images of the gods, so the perfect lover pursues also the image of divine beauty that has proceeded to the lowest levels, just as having been dependent on that. Hence, he approaches him [Alcibiades], because he holds the position of an image, for it is said that we approach images.” (λέγοιτο δ' ἂν ὅτι καὶ οἷον ἀγάλματι τοῦ νοητοῦ κάλλους πρόσεισιν δὲ Σωκράτης τῷ ἐμφανεῖ κάλλει θεραπευτής γάρ ἐστι πάσης τῆς τοῦ κάλλους σειρᾶς, καὶ ὥσπερ οἱ περὶ θεουργίαν δεινοὶ καὶ τάς φαινομένας εἰκόνας τῶν θεῶν σέβουσιν, οὕτω δὴ καὶ ὁ τελέως ἐρωτικός καὶ τὸ προελθὸν ἐν ἐσχάτοις ἔνδαλμα τοῦ θείου κάλλους ὡς ἐξηρτημένον ἐκείνου μέτεισι. πρόσεισιν οὖν αὐτῷ διότι τὴν ἀγάλματος ἐπέχει τάξιν, καὶ γὰρ τοῖς ἀγάλμασι προσιέναι λεγόμεθα. Procl. *In Alc. I.92.8–15*).

Similarly, in Proclus' *Commentary on Plato's Republic* 6.1.7 with the title ‘What is the judgement of the goddesses [Athena, Hera and Aphrodite] in the myth of the poet and what differences between ways of life does it allegorically convey?’ (Procl. *In R. I.108.3–109.7*), Paris' choice of Aphrodite is interpreted as a choice of kinds of life, pointing out that the life governed by desire belongs to Aphrodite, and “so then the one who is perfectly erotic and cares for Aph-

emperor Marcus Aurelius see also Procl. *In Cra. 122.72.8–15*: “Οτι πολλοὶ καὶ θεοὶ καὶ δαίμονες ἐκφῆναι τὴν τῶν θεῶν φύσιν ἀξιώσαντες καὶ τὰ προσήκοντα αὐτοῖς ὀνόματα παρέδοσαν· οὕτω καὶ τοῖς ἐπὶ Μάρκου γενομένοις θεουργοῖς οἱ θεοὶ καὶ νοητὰς καὶ νοεράς τάξεις ἐκφαίνοντες, ὀνόματα τῶν θείων διακόσμων ἐξαγγελτικά τῆς ιδιότητος αὐτῶν παραδεδώκασιν, οἵς καλούντες ἐκείνοι τοὺς θεοὺς ἐν ταῖς προσηκούσαις θεραπείαις τῆς παρ' αὐτῶν εὐηκοῖας ἐτύγχανον.

34 See Intro.: Sect. 1 and n. 5 on Proclus' life and Orphic and Chaldaean theologies.

35 Procl. *In R. II.123.13–16*: καὶ γὰρ ἐκεῖνοι διὰ δὴ τινος τελετῆς τὸ αὐτὸ δρῶσιν εἰς τὸν τελούμενον καὶ ἔστι πᾶν τὸ τοιοῦτον οὐκ ἀνθρώπινον, ἀλλὰ δαιμόνιον τὸ μηχάνημα καὶ θείον. On separation of the theurgists' soul from the body and the theurgic union see also Iamb. *Myst. I.12.41.9–16*: Διὰ τῆς τοιαύτης οὖν βουλήσεως ἀφθόνως οἱ θεοὶ τὸ φῶς ἐπιλάμπουσιν εύμενεῖς ὄντες καὶ ἔλεω τοῖς θεουργοῖς, τάς τε ψυχάς αὐτῶν εἰς ἐαυτοὺς ἀνακαλούμενοι καὶ τὴν ἔνωσιν αὐταῖς τὴν πρὸς ἐαυτοὺς χορηγούμεντες, ἐθίζοντές τε αὐτάς καὶ ἔτι ἐν σώματι οὕσας ἀφίστασθαι τῶν σωμάτων, ἐπὶ δὲ τὴν ἀίδιον καὶ νοητὴν αὐτῶν ἀρχὴν περιάγεσθαι.

rodite is led upwards to the divine beauty itself, looking down upon the things which are beautiful in sense-perception.” (ό γάρ δὴ τελέως ἐρωτικὸς καὶ Ἀφροδίτη μέλων ἐπ’ αὐτὸ τὸ θεῖον κάλλος ἀνάγεται τῶν ἐν αἰσθήσει καλῶν ὑπερορῶν Procl. *In R.* 1.109.1–3).

However, the idea of comparison between philosopher and lover goes back to Plato's *Symposium* and the simile between philosopher and lover. The initiation to philosophy is presented as an initiation to eros, and so eros as a way leading to philosophy. Eros first seizes the body and then the soul. The lover understands ἔξαίφνης (Pl. *Smp.* 210e.4) that the idea of beautiful determines his/her erotic behaviour. “For whoever has been educated up to this point in erotics, observing continuously and rightly the beautiful things, going to the perfect end of erotics, shall *suddenly* behold something wonderfully beautiful in its nature;<sup>36</sup> that thing itself, Socrates, for which all the previous hard work was done; first something that is always being and neither becoming, nor perishing, nor increasing, nor passing away; and secondly, not beautiful on the one hand and ugly on the other, nor at one time so, and at another time not; neither with respect to the beautiful nor the ugly; nor here beautiful and there ugly, as being beautiful to some and ugly to others;” (δός γὰρ ὅν μέχρι ἐνταῦθα πρὸς τὰ ἐρωτικὰ παιδαγωγηθῆ, θεώμενος ἐφεξῆς τε καὶ ὄρθως τὰ καλά, πρὸς τέλος ἥδη ἴων τῶν ἐρωτικῶν ἔξαίφνης κατόψεται τι θαυμαστὸν τὴν φύσιν καλόν, τοῦτο ἐκεῖνο, ὡς Σώκρατες, οὐδὲ δὴ ἔνεκεν καὶ οἱ ἐμπροσθεν πάντες πόνοι ἡσαν, πρῶτον μὲν ἀεὶ ὅν καὶ οὔτε γιγνόμενον οὔτε ἀπολλύμενον, οὔτε αὐξανόμενον οὔτε φθίνον, ἐπειτα οὐ τῇ μὲν καλόν, τῇ δὲ αἰσχρόν, οὐδὲ τοτὲ μέν, τοτὲ δὲ οὐ, οὐδὲ πρὸς μὲν τὸ καλόν, πρὸς δὲ τὸ αἰσχρόν, οὐδὲ ἔνθα μὲν καλόν, ἔνθα δὲ αἰσχρόν, ὡς τισὶ μὲν ὅν καλόν, τισὶ δὲ αἰσχρόν. Pl. *Smp.* 210e.2–211a5).

Hermias in his *Scholia on Plato's Phaedrus*, refers to “the erotic art,” as described the *Symposium* (τὴν ἐρωτικὴν τέχνην Herm. *In Phdr.* 21.10),<sup>37</sup> and asserts that “the elevation of all to the One and the Good is achieved through the beautiful and wise, that is to say through the erotic [art] and philosophy” (πάντων δὲ ἡ ἀναγωγὴ ἐπὶ τὸ ἐν καὶ τάγαθὸν γίνεται διὰ τοῦ καλοῦ καὶ τοῦ σοφοῦ, τουτέστι δὲ ἐρωτικῆς καὶ φιλοσοφίας Herm. *In Phdr.* 42.29–31). Elsewhere, Hermias mentions “the erotic enthusiasm, *mania*” as one of the four divisions [i.e. prophetic, musical and *telestic*] of the divine enthusiasm, *mania* (καὶ διελῶν αὐτὴν τὴν μανίαν εἰς τέσσαρα μέρη, μαντικήν, τελεστικήν, ποιητικήν, ἐρωτικήν Herm. *In Phdr.* 4.27–29),<sup>38</sup> describing it as the most divine among the four (θειοτέρα ἡ ἐρωτική 174.18).

36 Cf. the Homeric erotic union between Zeus and Hera and the reference to nature and beauty in Hom. *Il.*14.292–351, esp. 346–351.

37 Couvreur (1901); Lucarini and Moreschini (2012).

38 Also repeated: Herm. *In Phdr.* 173.9–10: Καὶ διείλε ταύτην τὴν μανίαν εἰς τέσσαρα· εἰς μαντικήν

Hermias also uses another simile between the worshiper and the erotic, saying that, “for just as the religious and discreet man falls down and worships the images/statues, as if they have a resemblance to the divine, so does the lover seeing that the beauty here has a resemblance to the divine beauty, worships it as the image/statue” (“Ωσπερ γάρ τὰ ἀγάλματα τῶν θεῶν ὁ εὐσεβὴς καὶ σώφρων ἀνὴρ προσκυνεῖ, ὡς ὁμοιότητά τινα ἔχοντα πρὸς τὰ θεῖα, οὕτως καὶ ὁ ἐρωτικὸς τὸ ἐνταῦθα κάλλος ὁρῶν ὡς ὁμοιότητα ἔχον πρὸς τὸ θεῖον κάλλος, σέβεται ὡς ἀγαλμα Herm. *In Phdr.* 180.28–31).

**1.5–6 (cf. also 2.9–10 and 6.5–6). Συμπάθεια, *Sympathy***

Proclus in the simile between lovers and the hieratic experts mentions the role of the sympathetic invisible powers inside different entities in the hieratic art/science.<sup>39</sup> He also associates *sympathy* with the first stage of “the preparatory warming” in his description of the four important stages in hieratic/theurgic union: first, “the preparatory heating” (ἡ μὲν προθέρμανσις) based on “sympathy” (Procl. *Hier.Ar.* 2.9–16, esp. 9–10).

The simile between lovers and theurgists refers to sympathetic powers inside different entities and alludes to a similar simile in Plotinus' *Ennead* IV to the birth of “power of the erotic art by magic” (ἀλλκὴ ἐρωτικῆς διὰ γοητείας τέχνης Plot. *Enn.* IV.4.40.10–11).<sup>40</sup> Plotinus explains eros' connecting and sympathetic power inside different entities that contain it as: “indeed by sympathy and by the fact that there is by nature a concord of the things alike and opposition of the different things, and by the diversity of the many powers that contribute to

---

καὶ μουσικὴν καὶ τελεστικὴν καὶ ἐρωτικὴν ...; also 173.16–19: μέλλων περὶ τῆς τετάρτης μανίας εἰπεῖν περὶ ἡς καὶ ὁ πάς αὐτῷ λόγος, πρὶν εἰπεῖν περὶ αὐτῆς εἰπὼν περὶ ἀθανασίας ψυχῆς, περὶ ιδέας αὐτῆς, περὶ τῶν βίων, περὶ καθόδου καὶ ἀνόδου καὶ πάντων τῶν ἀνωτέρω ὀλίγον εἰρημένων, οὕτως λέγει περὶ τῆς ἐρωτικῆς μανίας πόσα ἀγαθὰ παρέχει.

39 On the hieratic art and the sympathy in all apparent things to the ἀφανεῖς δυνάμεις, “invisible powers,” and the theurgy imitating τὰς ἀφανεῖς περιόδους τῶν ψυχῶν, “the invisible revolutions of souls” see also Procl. *Plat.Theol.* v.30.3–6: “Ο δὴ καὶ ἡ θεουργία μιμουμένη τὰς ἀφανεῖς περιόδους τῶν ψυχῶν, τὰς πρὸς τὸν δευτέρους θεούς τελετὰς προϋποτίθησι ταῖς ὑψηλοτέραις καὶ διὰ τούτων ἡμάς ἐπ’ αὐτὴν διαβαίνειν ποιεῖ τὴν νοητὴν περιωπήν. On Ammonius' division of the powers of the soul into gnostic and appetitive in *In Aristotelis De Interpretatione Commentarius*, see Ammon. *In Int.* 5.1–16.

40 Note also Plotinus' idealising definition of magic: καὶ ἡ ἀληθινὴ μαγεία ἡ ἐν τῷ παντὶ φιλία καὶ τὸ νεῖκος αὐτοῦ, “and the true magic is the love and the strife again in the all” (Plot. *Enn.* IV.40.6–7); and its allusions to the Pre-Socratic Empedocles' concept of “Love,” Φιλότητι, and “enmity of Strife,” Νείκεος ἔχθει. Emp. DK Fr. 17.16–17; Diels and Kranz (1951); Kirk, Raven and Schofield (1983) 287ff; see also Guthrie (1978) 152ff. On ‘Love’ and ‘Strife’ see also Iamb. *Myst.* IV.9: “Ἐτι δὲ ἡ τῶν πολλῶν σύνοδος εἰς ἐν τὸν παντὸς ζῷον ... οἷον ἡ φιλία τοῦ παντὸς καὶ ὁ ἔρως καὶ τὸ νεῖκος, κατ’ ἐνέργειαν μὲν ὅντα ἐν τῷ παντί.

the one living being" (ἢ τῇ συμπαθείᾳ, καὶ τῷ πεφυκέναι συμφωνίαν εἶναι ὁμοίων καὶ ἐναντίωσιν ἀνομοίων, καὶ τῇ τῶν δυνάμεων τῶν πολλῶν ποικιλίᾳ εἰς ἐν ζῷον συντελούντων Plot. *Enn.* IV.4.40.1–4).<sup>41</sup>

Plotinus in this passage of *Ennead* IV justifies these powers (δυνάμεις) and their uses by the magicians in erotic magic: "and the true magic is the love and the strife again in the all. ... For, because men love by nature and the things that cause loving attract each other,<sup>42</sup> it has arisen by the power of the erotic art by means of magic, of those [magicians] who add [apply] by means of contacts to different people different substances which bring them together and which have eros inside them; and they [magicians] join one soul to the other, as if they were fastening to each other plants which are separate. They also use figures which have powers in them, and working themselves into certain figures, they silently bring powers upon themselves, being within the one [all] and towards the one." (... καὶ ἡ ἀληθινὴ μαγεία ἡ ἐν τῷ παντὶ φιλίᾳ καὶ τὸ νεῖκος αὖ. ... Καὶ γάρ, ὅτι ἔραν πεφύκασι καὶ τὰ ἔραν ποιοῦντα ἔλκει πρὸς ἄλληλα, ἀλλῇ ἐρωτικῆς διὰ γοντείας τέχνης γεγένηται, προστιθέντων ἐπαφαῖς φύσεις ἄλλας ἄλλοις συναγωγοὺς<sup>43</sup> καὶ ἐγκείμενον ἔχοντας ἔρωτα· καὶ συνάπτουσι δὲ ἄλλην ψυχὴν ἄλλη, ὥσπερ ἐν φυτά διεστηκότα ἔξαψάμενοι πρὸς ἄλληλα. Καὶ τοῖς σχήμασι δὲ προσχρώνται δυνάμεις ἔχουσι, καὶ αὐτοὺς σχηματίζοντες ὡδὶ ἐπάγουσιν ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ἀψιφητὶ δυνάμεις ἐν ἐνὶ ὅντες εἰς ἐν. Plot. *Enn.* IV.4.40.4–17).<sup>44</sup>

That erotic "bringing together" of the magic art is also a union of souls, since the magicians, according to Plotinus, "join one soul to another," συνάπτουσι δὲ ἄλλην ψυχὴν ἄλλη (Plot. *Enn.* IV.4.40.13). Plotinus' reference to συναγω-

41 See also Procl. *Hier.Ar.* 7.2–5: Ἀπὸ δὴ τούτων καὶ τῶν τοιούτων ὁρμηθέντες, τὰς δαιμονίους δυνάμεις ἔγωσαν, ὡς προστεχεῖς είσιν οὐσίαι τῆς ἐν τῇ φύσει καὶ τοῖς σώμασιν ἐνεργείας, καὶ ἐπιγγάγοντο δι’ αὐτῶν τούτων εἰς συνουσίαν. On the (theurgic) prayers in magic and the role of theurgy see also: Plot. *Enn.* IV.4.26.1–4: Γίνονται δὲ εὐχῶν γνωσίες κατὰ οἰον σύναψιν καὶ κατὰ τοιάνδε σχέσιν ἐναρμοζόμενων, καὶ αἱ ποιήσεις οὕτως· καὶ ἐν ταῖς μάγων τέχναις εἰς τὸ συναφές πάντα ταῦτα δὲ δυνάμεσιν ἐπομέναις συμπαθῶς; also, particularly on prayers to the Sun and other stars: Plot. *Enn.* IV.4.30.1–16, esp. 3–4: ... καὶ εὐχῶν δὴ κλύοντας ἔφαμεν, ἀς πρὸς ἥλιον ποιούμεθα καὶ δὴ καὶ πρὸς ἄστρα ἄλλοι τινὲς ἄνθρωποι ...; and *Enn.* IV.4.41.1–15: Οἱ δὲ ἥλιος ἡ ἄλλο ἄστρον οὐκ ἐπάει. Καὶ γίνεται τὸ κατὰ τὴν εὐχὴν συμπαθοῦς μέρους μέρει γενομένου; Henry and Schwyzer (1959) II.

42 See also Procl. *Hier.Ar.* 6.1–2: διὰ μὲν οὖν τῆς συμπαθείας προστήγοντο, διὰ δὲ τῆς ἀντιπαθείας ἀπήλαυνον.

43 See Iamb. *Myst.* IV.12.195.12; Pl. *Smp.* 191d1–3; Plot. *Enn.* VI.9.9.24–25.

44 On συνάπτειν either through the erotic *mania*, or the divine philosophy, or even the theurgic power see Procl. *Plat.Theol.* 1.113.4–10: Σύζεται δὲ πάντα διὰ τούτων καὶ συνάπτεται τοῖς πρωτουργοῖς αἵτιαις, τὰ μέν διὰ τῆς ἐρωτικῆς μανίας, τὰ δὲ διὰ τῆς θείας φιλοσοφίας, τὰ δὲ διὰ τῆς θεουργικῆς δυνάμεως, ἡ κρείττων ἐστιν ἀπάσης ἀνθρωπίνης σωφροσύνης καὶ ἐπιστήμης, συλλαβοῦσα τά τε τῆς μαντικῆς ἀγαθά καὶ τὰς τῆς τελεσιουργικῆς καθαρτικάς δυνάμεις καὶ πάντα ἀπλῶς τὰ τῆς ἐνθέου κατακωχῆς ἐνεργήματα.

γούς, “bringing together” also used by Iamblichus (*συναγωγὸν ὅλον*, Iamb. *Myst.* IV.12.195.12) alludes to Plato’s description of Eros in the *Symposium* as ἔμφυτος in human beings and *συναγωγεύς* with their original nature.<sup>45</sup> Iamblichus also uses the term *συναγωγόν* to describe the first degree of theurgic prayer (Iamb. *Myst.* v.26.10).

Proclus in his *Chaldaean Philosophy* (*Πρόκλου ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς χαλδαϊκῆς φιλοσοφίας*, “Extraits du Commentaire de Proclus sur la Philosophie Chaldaïque”) refers to the role of sympathy using a simile of the eye “becoming like the sun” (*γενόμενος ἥλιοιειδής*), when looking at the sun (Procl. *Phil. Chald. Fr.* 4.209.25–29).<sup>46</sup>

Similarly, Plutarch associates love with the eyes, emphasising the eyes’ ability to affect change to the other eyes and inflict eros (Plu. *Quaest. Conv.* 681.B–D).<sup>47</sup> Furthermore, the transmission and ‘lighting up’ of love through the eyes of the lovers is compared with fire (Plu. *Quaest. Conv.* 681.C.1–6).<sup>48</sup>

45 Pl. *Smp.* 191d1–3: ἔστι δὴ οὖν ἐκ τόσου ὁ ἔρως ἔμφυτος ἀλλήλων τοῖς ἀνθρώποις καὶ τῆς ἀρχαίας φύσεως *συναγωγεύς*. Plotinus “On the Good, or the One” refers to eros as σύμφυτος with psyche (καὶ ὁ ἔρως ὁ τῆς ψυχῆς ὁ σύμφυτος, Plot. *Enn.* vi.9.9.24–25). On eros and psyche see also Plot. *Enn.* III.5.4.

46 Procl. *Phil. Chald. Fr.* 4.209.25–29: Ως γάρ νοοειδεῖς γιγνόμενοι τῷ νῷ πρόσιμεν, οὕτως ἔνοειδεῖς πρός τὴν ἔνωσιν ἀνατρέχομεν, ἐπ’ ἄκρω τῷ οἰκείῳ στάντες νῷ ἐπεὶ καὶ ὀφθαλμὸς οὐκ ἄλλως δρᾷ τὸν ἥλιον ἡ γενόμενος ἥλιοιειδής, ἀλλ’ οὐ τῷ ἐκ πυρὸς φωτί: ὡς καὶ δῆλον ὅτι τὸ νοεῖν ἔκεινο μὴ νοεῖν ἔστιν. *Des Places* (1971) 206–212; Pitra (1888) Vol. v: 192–195. Note also the idea of the ‘easily-moved’ eye that becomes like what it sees in Pseudo-Aristotle *Problemata*; Pseud.-Arist. *Probl.* 887a.24–27: ἦ ή μὲν ὀφθαλμία, ὅτι εὐκινητότατον ὁ ὀφθαλμός, καὶ μάλιστα ὅμοιοῦται τῷ ὀρωμένῳ τῶν ἄλλων, οἷον κινεῖται ἀπὸ κινουμένου ὥστε καὶ ἀντιβλέπων τεταραγμένῳ ταράττεται μάλιστα;

47 E.g. Plu. *Quaest. Conv.* 681.A.10–681.B.1–3: καὶ τῶν ἐρωτικῶν, ἀ δὴ μέγιστα καὶ σφοδρότατα παθήματα τῆς ψυχῆς ἔστιν, ἀρχήν ἡ ὄψις ἐνδιδόσιν, ὥστε ρέν καὶ λείβεσθαι τὸν ἐρωτικόν, ὅταν ἐμβλέπῃ τοῖς καλοῖς, οἷον ἐνχέσμενον εἰς αὐτούς. Also, 681.B.5–9: αἱ γάρ ἀντιβλέψεις τῶν ἐν ὥρᾳ καὶ τὸ διὰ τῶν ὄμμάτων ἐκπίπτον, εἰτ’ ἄρα φῶς εἴτε ρέμα, τοὺς ἐρῶντας ἐκτήκει καὶ ἀπόλλυσι μεθ’ ἥδονής ἀλγηδόνι μεμιγμένης, ἥν αὐτοὶ γλυκύπικρον ὄνομάζουσιν. And 681.D.5–6: οὕτω δύναμιν ἔχει ὀξεῖαν ἡ ὄψις ἐνδοῦναι καὶ προσβαλεῖν ἐτέρῳ πάθους ἀρχήν. See also pseud-Arist. *Probl.* 887a.24–27 on the previous footnote. Moreover, the association of love and the eyes is also common outside of a philosophical context, for instance in the ancient novels; e.g. Heliod. *Aeth.* 1.2.3.6–8: Ὁφθαλμοὺς δὲ ἐκείνους οἱ μὲν πόνοι κατέσπων, ἡ δὲ ὄψις τῆς κόρης ἐφ’ ἐαυτὴν ἀνεῖλκε καὶ τούτῳ ὅραν αὐτοὺς ἡνάγκαζεν, ὅτι ἐκείνην ἔώρων; 1.2.8.1–9.5, II.25.2.6–8, IV.1.2.1–8, IV.7.7.4–8: οὐχ ὁρᾶς ὡς κυλοιδιὰ μὲν τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς καὶ τὸ βλέμμα διέρριπται καὶ τὸ πρόσωπον ὡχριδή, σπλάγχνον οὐκ αἰτιωμένη, τὴν διάνοιαν δὲ ἀλύει καὶ τὸ ἐπελθὸν ἀναφθέγγεται καὶ ἀπροφαστικὸν ἀγρυπνίαν ὑφίσταται καὶ τὸν ὅγκον ἀθρόον καθῆρηται; VI.4.1.2–4, etc.

48 Plu. *Quaest. Conv.* 681.C.1–6: ποιάτη γάρ γίνεται διάδοσις καὶ ἀνάφλεξις ἀπὸ τῆς ὄψεως, ὥστε παντελῶς ἀπειράτους ἔρωτος ἡγεῖσθαι τοὺς τὸν Μηδικὸν νάρθιν θαυμάζοντας ἐκ διαστήματος ὑπὸ τοῦ πυρὸς ἀναφλεγόμενον αἱ γάρ τῶν καλῶν ὄψεις, κανὸν πάνυ πόρρωθεν ἀντιβλέπωσι, πῦρ ἐν ταῖς τῶν ἐρωτικῶν ψυχαῖς ἀνάπτουσιν.

Hermias in his *Scholia on Plato's Phaedrus*, discussing the erotic art/science asserts, "And regarding the erotic eye, that is to say the soul of the beloved one; then someone becomes fully erotic, when he returns to himself; and this happens through the eyes" (Τὸ δὲ ἐρωτικὸν ὅμμα, τουτέστι τὴν τοῦ ἐρωμένου ψυχήν· τότε δὲ κυρίως γίνεται τις ἐρωτικός, ὅταν εἰς ἑαυτὸν ἐπιστρέψῃ· τοῦτο δὲ ἔσται διὰ τῶν ὅμμάτων *In Phdr.* 196.23–25). Also, "and that happens through *sympathy*; that is to say eye to eye is joined together somehow through the air. Just as in the mirror; the familiar example of the erotic science is the eye, since 'to love' (*erân*) is achieved through seeing (*horân*), and the illuminations of soul are reflected through the eyes. Thus, just as the lover is elevated up there seen as a mirror through the eye of the beloved, so does the beloved one through the eye of the lover" (συμβαίνει δὲ διὰ τὴν συμπάθειαν· ἥγουν διὰ τοῦ ἀέρος συνάπτεται πῶς ἡ ὀφθαλμία.—"Οσπερ δὲ ἐν κατόπτρῳ τὸ οἰκεῖον παράδειγμα τῆς ἐρωτικῆς ἐπιστήμης ὀφθαλμός ἐστιν, ἐπειδὴ καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ὄράν τοῦτο γίνεται τὸ ἐράν, καὶ αἱ ἐλλάμψεις τῆς ψυχῆς διὰ τῶν ὅμμάτων ἐμφαίνονται. Οσπερ οὖν διὰ τοῦ ὅμματος τοῦ ἐρωμένου ὁ ἐραστῆς ἀνάγεται ἐκεῖ ἐνοπτριζόμενος, οὕτω καὶ ὁ ἐρώμενος διὰ τοῦ ὅμματος τοῦ ἐρώντος 202.3–9).

In the prologue of the first book called *Kyranis* of the medico-magical text of the *Kyranides* (first compiled in 4 CE), there is a reference to the natural powers of *sympathy* and *antipathy*: Βίβλος αὕτη Κυρανοῦ <καὶ> Ἐρμεία ἐπικλητὴ "τὰ τρία", ἐξ ἀμφοτέρων βίβλος φυσικῶν δυνάμεων συμπαθεῖῶν καὶ ἀντιπαθεῖῶν, συνταχθεῖσα {ἐκ δύο βίβλων} (*Kyran.* 1–3).<sup>49</sup>

#### 1.10. Ἡλιοτρόπια, *Heliotropes*, "Sunflowers"

Proclus in his *Commentary on Plato's Timaeus*, when explaining the role of planetary gods as leaders of the souls, outspreading their power as far as plants and stones, refers to the example of *heliotrope* and its dependence on the power of Helios, "and what is there to be amazed at, when the *individual nature of the guardian gods* has reached down even as far as plant and stone, and there is a plant and stone *dependent on the power of Helios*, whether you would like to call them *heliotrope* or in any other way whatever?" (καὶ τί θαυμαστόν, ὅπου καὶ μέχρι πόσας καὶ λίθων ἡ τῶν θεῶν τῶν ἐφόρων ἴδιότης καθήκει, καὶ ἔστι λίθος καὶ πόσα τῆς Ἡλιακῆς ἐξηρτημέναι δυνάμεως, εἴτε ἥλιοτρόπιον εἴτε ἄλλως ὁπωσοῦν καλεῖν ἐθέλοις; Procl. *In Tl.* 1.111.10–13).

Olympiodorus in his *Commentary on Plato's Alcibiades*, discussing the hieratic mode of life (τοὺς ἱερατικῶς ζῶντας), refers to the connection between cele-

49 Kaimakis (1976) 14.

tials and humans, providing the examples of “the *heliotropes* and the moon-stones” (τὰ ἡλιοτρόπια φυτὰ καὶ οἱ σεληνῖται λίθοι) (*Olymp. In Alc.* 18.11–18).<sup>50</sup>

### 1.11. συγκινεῖται

Both codices (codd. V L) read συγκλινεῖται; Bidez corrects it to συγκινεῖται. The verb συγκλινεῖται is not wrong: (fut.) “will lean/incline to the sun”; cf. *PGM* IV 1718: κλίνει γάρ καὶ ἄγει ψυχήν; IV.2069: ἄγει δὲ καὶ κατακλίνει; IV.2435–2438: <Ἄγωγή·> σκευὴ ἐπιθύματος σεληνιακοῦ ἄγουσα ἀσχέτους καὶ ἀνουσιάστους μονογ- μέρους, κατακλίνει γενναίως; IV.2618–2620: <Διαβολὴ πρὸς Σελήνην> ποιούσα πρὸς πάντα καὶ πρὸς πάσαν πρᾶξιν: ἄγει γάρ μονώρους, ὀνειροπομπεῖ, κατακλίνει ...; also Procl. *In Cra.* 107.57.14–16: οὐ γάρ ἐς ὅλην πῦρ ἐπέκεινα τὸ πρώτον ἐήν δύναμιν κατα- κλίνει, φησὶ τὸ λόγιον (or chald p 13),<sup>51</sup> and *Plat.Theol.* v.145.12: Οὐ γάρ εἰς ὅλην ἐήν δύναμιν κατακλίνει, φησὶ τις θεῶν.

However, συγκινεῖται is more precise to the meaning: cf. Procl. *Hier.Ar.* 1.15: κινεῖται in the same section; and *Hier.Ar.* 4.1: συγκινεῖται.<sup>52</sup> Also, συγκινεῖται συμ- περιπολοῦντα is in accordance to the use of συγκινούμενα and συμπεριπολεῖν in relation to the sun and the moon in Proclus’ *Commentary on Plato’s Republic* (Procl. *In R.* II.161.18–27).<sup>53</sup>

### 1.12 (cf. also 4.13 and 5.1). Φωστήρες, “Heavenly Lights /Luminaries”

Proclus in his *Commentary on Plato’s Republic* refers to “the two luminaries,” the sun and the moon (ἀπὸ τῶν δύο φωστήρων *In R.* II.43.25). Furthermore, in his *Exposition of Astronomical Hypotheses (Hypotyposis Astronomicarum Positionum)*, Proclus reports that the Greek astronomer and mathematician Hipparchus of Nicaea (c. 190–120 BCE) has constructed an optical instrument (διὰ διόπτρας) in certain shape and dimension “through which he watches accur-

<sup>50</sup> *Olymp. In Alc.* 18.11–18: ὅτι γάρ συνήπται τοῖς τῶν οὐρανίων εἰδεσιν τὰ ἡμέτερα εἰδῆ, δῆλον ἐκ τοῦ συναύξεσθαι αὐτὰ καὶ συμμειούσθαι τοῖς οὐρανίοις, καὶ γάρ καὶ οἱ χυμοὶ πρὸς τὴν σελήνην καὶ αὐξοῦνται καὶ μειοῦνται καὶ αἱ τρίχες, διὸ τοὺς ἱερατικῶς ζώντας ἐστιν ίδειν μὴ ἀποκειρομένους αὐξοῦσθε τῆς σελήνης δῆλοι δὲ καὶ τὸ σεληνιακὸν πάθος, ἔτι δὲ καὶ τὰ ἡλιοτρόπια φυτὰ καὶ οἱ σεληνῖται λίθοι συναύξοντες καὶ συμμειούμενοι πρὸς τὴν σελήνην ὄμοιως δὲ καὶ τὰ δστρεά, καὶ σχεδὸν ἄπαντα, διὸ καλῶς εἴρηται.

<sup>51</sup> Pasquali (1908) 57.

<sup>52</sup> See also Procl. *Inst.* 209.10 συγκινεῖται.

<sup>53</sup> Procl. *In R.* II.161.18–27: καὶ οὐδὲν θαυμαστὸν ψυχᾶς <καὶ> ὄχήματα ψυχῶν συγγενὴ τοῖς οὐρανίοις τοῦτο δρᾶν, ὅπου καὶ τῶν ἐν γῇ κατερριζωμένων ἐστιν ὄρδαν τὰ μὲν ἡλίῳ συγκινούμενα, τὰ δὲ σελήνῃ συντρέχοντα ...80... ἐκείνοις δῆλον. ὅτι <γάρ> διὰ τῆς κατὰ τὴν φύσιν οἰκειότητος [ἐνέσπαρ]ται τὰ μὲν εἰς ἡλιον, τὰ δὲ εἰς σελήνην, ὡς ὁ Τίμαιος [41a ss.] ἐδίδαξεν, ἐστιν τὰ μὲν ἡλιακὰ ὄχήματα, τὰ δὲ σεληναῖα. καὶ εἰ τοῦτο ἀληθές, οὐδὲν θαυμαστὸν τὰ μὲν ἡλίῳ τὰ δὲ σελήνῃ συμπεριπολεῖν, εἰ μὴ ἄτακτα φέροιτο.

ately the magnitude of the diameters of the luminaries" (δι' ὧν διοπτεύει τὰ μεγέθη τῶν ἐν τοῖς φωστήρσι διαμέτρων Procl. *Hyp.* IV.72.120.15–18).<sup>54</sup>

In his *Commentary on Plato's Timaeus* Proclus, interpreting the meaning of the planets, describes the Moon as a monad and "the cause of every generation and destruction" (μονάς μὲν ἡ σελήνη, πάσης αἰτία γενέσεως καὶ φθορᾶς Procl. *In Ti.* III.69.9) and "the source of nature to the mortals, being the self-revealing image of the creative nature" (σελήνη μὲν αἰτία τοῖς θνητοῖς τῆς φύσεως, τὸ αὐτοπτὸν ἄγαλμα οὖσα τῆς πηγαίας φύσεως *In Ti.* III.69.15–16). Below the Moon there are the elements of generation, which constitute a triad (τριάς δὲ τὰ ἐν γενέσει στοιχεῖα τὰ ὑπ' αὐτήν *In Ti.* III.69.9); and among these there are the ones who proceed at an equal rate (μέσοι δὲ τούτων οἱ ισόδρομοι *In Ti.* III.69.10–11), naming the Sun, Venus and Mercury.<sup>55</sup> This triadic relationship between the Sun, Venus and Mercury is due to the solar and collaborative character (ἥλιακούς ὄντας καὶ συνδημιουργούντας) of Venus and Mercury (*In Ti.* III.65.22–26).<sup>56</sup> The Sun also is interpreted as "the one revealing the truth" (καὶ ὁ μὲν ἥλιος τῆς ἀληθείας ἐκφαντικός *In Ti.* III.69.11) and "the creator of all sense-perceptions, since it is the reason of seeing and being seen" (ἥλιος δὲ δημιουργὸς τῶν αἰσθήσεων πασῶν, διότι καὶ τοῦ ὄραν καὶ τοῦ ὄρᾶσθαι αἴτιος *In Ti.* III.69.16–18).

Proclus also discussing the myth of Phaethon, the son of Helios, and Helios' chariot (from Pl. *Ti.* 22c3–7)<sup>57</sup> presents the planets as gods and leaders of the souls, arguing that the divine andemonic souls (αἱ θεῖαι τε καὶ δαιμόνιαι ψυχαί) were placed under secondary leaders (ὑπὸ ἡγεμόνας δευτέρους), "some were under the divinity of Earth, others under the divinity of Helios, others under the divinity of Zeus and others under the leadership of Ares" (αἱ μὲν ὑπὸ τὴν θεότητα τῆς Γῆς, αἱ δὲ ὑπὸ Σελήνην, αἱ δὲ ὑπὸ "Ηλιον, αἱ δὲ ὑπὸ τὴν Διός, αἱ δὲ ὑπὸ τὴν Ἀρεος ἡγεμονίαν. Procl. *In Ti.* I.110.27–30). Proclus also associates the individual existence of the souls with the *planetary divinities* who act as their leaders, "for this,

54 Manitius (1909).

55 On the ισόδρομοι the Sun, Venus and Mercury see Procl. *In Ti.* II.264.28–30, III.63.31–32; and Procl. *Hyp.* I.25 and V.62. This arrangement of planets goes back to Pl. *Ti.* 38d1–4: σελήνη μὲν εἰς τὸν περὶ γῆν πρῶτον, ἥλιον δὲ εἰς τὸν δεύτερον ὑπέρ γῆς, ἐωσφόρον δὲ καὶ τὸν Ἱερὸν Ἐρμοῦ λεγόμενον εἰς [τὸν] τάχει μὲν ισόδρομον ἥλιῳ κύκλῳ ιόντας, τὴν δὲ ἐναντίαν εἰληχότας αὐτῷ δύναμιν:

56 Procl. *In Ti.* III.65.22–26: ὑπέρ δὲ ἥλιον Ἀφροδίτην καὶ Ἐρμῆν, ἥλιακούς ὄντας καὶ συνδημιουργούντας αὐτῷ καὶ πρὸς τὴν τελεστοιουργίαν τῶν ὅλων αὐτῷ συντελούντας· διὸ καὶ ισόδρομοι τυγχάνονται ὅντες ἥλιῳ καὶ περὶ αὐτόν εἰσιν ὡς συγκοινωνούντες αὐτῷ τῆς ποιήσεως ...

57 Pl. *Ti.* 22c3–7: ὡς ποτε Φαέθων Ἡλίου παῖς τὸ τοῦ πατρὸς ἄρμα ζεύξας διὰ τὸ μὴ δυνατός εἶναι κατὰ τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς ὁδὸν ἐλαύνειν τά τ' ἐπὶ γῆς συνέκαυσεν καὶ αὐτὸς κεραυνωθεὶς διεφθάρη, τοῦτο μάθου μὲν σχῆμα ἔχον λέγεται ...

souls also, when they are sown round their associated stars, receive a particular existence from their leaders themselves, so that each one is not just a soul, but such a kind, as for example Areic, Jovian, or Lunar.” (διὰ τοῦτο καὶ αἱ ψυχαὶ σπειρόμεναι περὶ τὰ σύννομα ἀστρα δέχονται τινα καὶ παρ’ αὐτῶν τῶν ἡγεμόνων ἰδιότητα ζωῆς, ὡστε μὴ μόνον εἶναι ψυχήν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοιάνδε ψυχὴν ἐκάστην, οἷον Ἀρεῖκὴν ἢ Δίιον ἢ Σεληνιακήν. Procl. *In Ti.* I.111.2–7).

Eusebius (c. 260/265–339/340 CE) in his *Praeparatio Evangelica* (PE III.6.2.1–4.1), discussing the theology and its relation to the allegorical physiology (ἐν τῇ τῶν ἀλληγορουμένων φυσιολογίᾳ) of the Egyptian and Greek gods, refers to the assimilation of Greek and Egyptian deities to the heavenly luminaries (τῶν ἐπουρανίων φωστήρων), as for example, of Apollon, Horus and Osiris with the Sun, and Isis or Artemis with the Moon; and concludes, “hence, they thought they should worship the Sun and the Moon and the stars and the other parts of the cosmos as gods” (τὸν ἥλιον ἄρα καὶ τὴν σελήνην καὶ τοὺς ἀστέρας καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τοῦ κόσμου μέρη ὡς θεούς προσκυνητέον. Eus. PE III.6.3.2–4.1).<sup>58</sup> That is an interesting passage from Eusebius, because, although he discusses the assimilation of Greek and Egyptian deities to the heavenly luminaries, he attempts to reduce all ‘pagan’ religion (Greek and Egyptian) to the merely physical. Eusebius also writes that “Plato said that the celestial luminaries have been named god and gods from θέειν, which means to run” (ό δὲ Πλάτων θεὸν καὶ θεούς παρὰ τὸ θέειν, δπερ ἐστὶ τρέχειν, τοὺς ἐν οὐρανῷ φωστήρας ἐπικεκλήσθαι φησι. Eus. PE XI.6.20.7–9).<sup>59</sup>

Furthermore, Porphyry in his treatise *On Statues* associates dress codes at the Eleusinian mysteries with the two luminaries, the sun and the moon, reporting that the torch-bearer was dressed up as Helios, and the one at the altar as Selene, “In the Eleusinian mysteries also the hierophant is dressed up according to the image of the Creator, the torch-bearer (*dadouchos*) according

58 Also, according to the Hebrew theology, Eus. PE VII.9.2.1–5: ἄρχεται τοιγαροῦν ἀπὸ θεοῦ κατὰ τὰ πάτρια τῆς τῶν προγόνων Ἐβραίων θεολογίας, οὐχ ἥπερ Αἰγυπτίοις φίλον ἦν, ἀλλ’ οὐδὲ Φοίνιξιν ἢ τοῖς λοιποῖς ἔθνεσι παραπλήσιώς εἰς πλήθος καταβάλλουσι τὴν σεβάσμιον προστηρούσι θεούς τε ὀρωμένους μὲν τοὺς κατ’ οὐρανὸν φωστήρας νομίζουσιν. And, according to Origen, Eus. PE VI.11.1: Περὶ τοῦ εἰς σημεῖα γεγονέναι τοὺς φωστήρας, οὐκ ἄλλους ἥλιον καὶ σελήνης καὶ τῶν ἀστρων τυγχάνοντας ...

59 Eus. PE III.2.4.1–5.2.5: ὅμολογει γοῦν διαρρήδην ἐν Κρατύλῳ μηδὲν πλέον τῶν ὄρωμένων τοῦ κόσμου μερῶν τοὺς πρώτους τῶν περὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα ἀνθρώπων ἐγνωκέναι, μόνους δὲ θεούς εἶναι τοὺς ἐν οὐρανῷ φωστήρας καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν φαινομένων νομίσται. Eus. PE III.6.4.1–5.1: καὶ ταύτη τοιγαροῦν ἡ γενναία τῶν Ἑλλήνων φιλοσοφία ὡςπερ διὰ μηχανῆς πέφηνε εἰς ὑψός μὲν ἀνάγουσα τὴν ἐπαγγελιαν τοῦ λόγου, κάτω δὲ περιστρέφουσα ἀμφὶ τὴν αἰσθητὴν καὶ φαινομένην τοῦ θεοῦ δημιουργίαν τὴν τῶν σοφῶν διάνοιαν καὶ πλέον οὐδὲν ἀλλ’ ἥ πυρ καὶ τὴν θερμήν οὐσίαν τά τε μέρη τοῦ κόσμου διὰ τῶν οὐρανίων φωστήρων, ἔστω δὲ καὶ τὴν ὑγράν καὶ τὴν ξηράν καὶ τὴν σύγκρασιν τῶν σωμάτων θειάζουσα.

to the image of the sun [Helios] and the one at the altar according to the image of the moon [Selene], and the attendant [herald] at the sacrifice according to the image of Hermes.” (Ἐν δὲ τοῖς κατ’ Ἐλευσίνα μυστηρίοις ὁ μὲν ἱεροφάντης εἰς εἰκόνα τοῦ δημιουργοῦ ἐνσκευάζεται, δαχδούχος δὲ εἰς τὴν ἥλιον, καὶ ὁ μὲν ἐπὶ βωμῷ εἰς τὴν σελήνης, ὁ δὲ ἱεροχήρυξ Ἐρμοῦ. Porph. *On Stat.* 10.4–7).<sup>60</sup>

1.13–14. *“Η νοερῶς ἢ λογικῶς ἢ φυσικῶς ἢ αἰσθητῶς, Either intellectually, or logically, or naturally, or sensibly”*

Proclus in his *Commentary on Plato’s Republic* writes about the different ways [intellectual, logical and sensitive] that angels, daimons and souls are listening to gods and intellectual things, “but this is manifest, as we said, from the hieratic art among us; and there should be added that in other way the angels are listening to gods, in other the daimons, and in other the souls of mortals; the angels are listening to intellectual things intellectually (νοερῶς), the daimones logically (λογικῶς), and the souls sensitively (αἰσθητικῶς), and each of them according to the limits of their liability, accepting the knowledge and the activity (*energeia*) of the gods proceeding towards themselves.” (ἀλλὰ τοῦτο μὲν φανερόν, ὅπερ εἴτομεν, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς παρ’ ἡμῖν ἱερατικῆς: καὶ προσθετέον ὡς ἄλλον μὲν τρόπον ἄγγελοι θεῶν ἐπήκοοι γίγνονται, δαιμονες δὲ ἄλλον, ψυχαὶ δὲ ἀνθρώπων ἄλλον· οἵ μὲν νοερῶς τῶν νοερῶν, οἱ δὲ λογικῶς, οἱ δὲ καὶ αἰσθητικῶς, ἔκαστοι δὲ κατὰ τὰ μέτρα τῆς ἑαυτῶν ἐπιτηδειότητος ὑποδεχόμενοι τὴν τῶν θεῶν γνῶσιν καὶ ἐνέργειαν εἰς ἑαυτούς προϊοῦσσαν. Procl. *In R.* II.243.16–22).

In his *Commentary on Plato’s Parmenides* Proclus, discussing “the whole chain of ideas” (πᾶσαν τὴν τῶν ἰδεῶν σειράν Procl. *In Prm.* 969.10–11), describes the primal Forms as intelligible, the secondary as intelligible in an intellectual mode, the fourth ones as the accomplishers of all intellectual and supracosmic, and the fifth ones as intellectual: “for the primal Forms are the *intelligible ones* (τὰ νοητά), and the secondary Forms are intelligible, but in an *intellectual mode* (ἐν νοεροῖς), the third Forms are cohesive of all things, and fourth Forms are those which accomplish all *intellectual* (τῶν νοερῶν) and supracosmic, and after these are the *intellectual forms* (τὰ νοερά), which have this characteristic in its proper form; the assimilative Forms are in the sixth rank, through which all the secondaries are assimilated to the *intellectual forms* (τοῖς νοεροῖς εἰδεστιν); and in the seventh rank, the superior and supracelestial Forms, which have a *unifying power* (συναγωγὸν δύναμιν) of the divided Forms in the cosmos; and in the last rank, the cosmic Forms;” (πρώτιστα γάρ ἔστιν εἰδὴ τὰ νοητά, δεύτερα δὲ τὰ νοητὰ μὲν, ἀλλ’ ὡς ἐν νοεροῖς, τρίτα δὲ τὰ συνεκτικὰ τῶν ὅλων, τέταρτα δὲ τὰ τελε-

60 Bidez (1913) 22 in Appendices; Smith and Wasserstein (1993).

σιουργὰ πάντων τῶν νοερῶν καὶ ὑπερκοσμίων, ἐπὶ δὲ τούτοις τὰ νοερὰ καὶ ταύτην ἔχοντα τὴν ἴδιότητα καθ' αὐτήν ἔκτην δὲ ἔλαχε τάξιν τὰ ἀφομοιωτικὰ δὶ' ὧν πάντα τὰ δεύτερα τοῖς νοεροῖς εἰδεσιν ἔξομοιοῦται, ἐβδόμην δὲ τὰ ἀπόλυτα καὶ ὑπερουράνια συναγωγὸν δύναμιν ἔχοντα τῶν περὶ τὸν κόσμον διηρημένων εἰδῶν, ἐσχάτην δὲ τὰ ἐγκόσμια· Procl. *In Prm.* 969.16–26).<sup>61</sup>

*Marginal Notes by Ficino (Marginalia Ficini) of ms V  
(Vallicellianus) F 20, Fol. 138r (lines 2–9)*

As examined in the Introduction, the fol. 138<sup>r</sup>–144<sup>r</sup> of the Greek text of Πρόκλου Περὶ τῆς καθ' Ἑλληνας ἴερατικῆς τέχνης are written by a single scribe identified as Marsilio Ficino (1433–1499) with Latin marginal notes also by Ficino.<sup>62</sup> The date that the marginal notes were written does not necessarily have to be the same as that on which the ms V 138<sup>r</sup>–140<sup>v</sup> were copied. Ficino made Latin marginal notes in the manuscript related to his work *The Book of Life* (especially Book III “On Obtaining Life from the Heavens”), which was written in 1489. Consequently, the marginal notes in Proclus’ *On the Hieratic Art according to the Greeks* must be written probably shortly before and during 1489 (perhaps around 1488–1489).<sup>63</sup>

In the margins of ms V, fol. 138<sup>r</sup> (lines 2–9), there is the following marginal note written by Ficino:

*Eadem dixit Porphyrius in propositionibus. Vide Mercurium et Plotinum et Iamblichum et Alchindum et tua scripta.*

Porphyry said the same thing in his *Sententiae [ad intelligibilia ducentes]*. See Mercurius [Hermes Trismegistus], Plotinus, Iamblichus, Alchindus [Al-Kindi], and your own writings.

Ficino in the above marginal note points out that Proclus’ lines are related to the works of Porphyry, Mercurius, Plotinus, Iamblichus and Alchindus (Al-Kindi). All these authors are mentioned in Ficino’s *The Book of Life*, or The

61 On nature’s creation of “icons of forms that are immaterial and intelligible” see reference in Procl. *In R. I.77.13–17*: κατιδόντες γάρ οἱ τῆς μυθοποίας πατέρες, ὅτι καὶ ἡ φύσις εἰκόνας δημιουργοῦσα τῶν ἀνθλωπῶν καὶ νοητῶν εἰδῶν καὶ τόνδε τὸν κόσμον ποικιλλουσα τοῖς τούτων μημήμασιν τὰ μὲν ἀμέριστα μεριστῶς ἀπεικονίζεται, τὰ δὲ αἰώνια διὰ τῶν κατὰ χρόνον προισόντων, τὰ δὲ νοητὰ διὰ τῶν αἰσθητῶν.

62 ms Riccardianus 76 was annotated and owned by Ficino. See for example the marginal notes in ms Riccardianus 76, Fols. 116–129. Kristeller (1937) Vol. 1: liv. Also, Kristeller (1986) 15–196, at 97–98.

63 See Intro.: Sect. 4 above.

*Three Books of Life (Liber de Vita or De Vita Triplici)*.<sup>64</sup> Mercurius is Hermes Trismegistus who is mentioned along with Pythagoras and Plato in Ficino's *De Vita Triplici* Book 1 (*Fic. De Vit. I.10.50–51*).<sup>65</sup> Alchindus [Al-Kindi] is referred to Ficino's *De Vita Triplici* Book III "On Obtaining Life from the Heavens," chapter XXI on the power of words and songs (*Fic. De Vit. III.21.15*).<sup>66</sup> Alchindus was an Arab philosopher, astronomer, physician, mathematician from Baghdad (died around 850 or 873), who wrote among many works *The Theory of the Magic Art* or *On Stellar Rays* (found in a Latin version), and translated the works of Aristotle and other Greek philosophers into Arabic.<sup>67</sup>

Certain passages from Ficino's *De Vita Triplici* book 3 show influences from Proclus' *On the Hieratic Art*, such as Ficino's discussion on the powers of all the celestials and the sun in *De Vita Triplici* Book III.6.47–49, on images in III.13.26–32, on the sun, lions and cocks, and plants and gems in III.14.11–14, on lions and cocks in III.14.27–29, on moonstone in III.15.4–6 and the sun-moonstone in III.15.10–12.<sup>68</sup>

The following passage, for example, from Ficino's *De Vita Triplici* Book III.6.47–49 illustrates influences from Proclus' *On the Hieratic Art*:

*In Sole certe omnes coelestium esse virtutes, non solum Iamblichus Iulianusque, sed omnes affirmant. Et Proculus ait ad Solis aspectum omnes omnium coelestium virtutes congregari in unum atque colligi.*

That all the powers of the heavens are assuredly in the Sun, not only Iamblichus and Julian but all men affirm. And Proclus says that all the powers of all the celestials are gathered and collected into one in the presence of the visible Sun. (Kaske and Clark 1989, 266–267).

64 Kaske and Clark (1989); and Boer (1980).

65 *Fic. De Vit. I.10.50–51: Mercurius, Pythagoras, Plato iubent dissonantem animum vel maerentem cithara cantuque tam constanti quam concinno componere simul atque erigere*, "Hermes Trismegistus, Pythagoras and Plato tell us to calm and cheer the dissonant and the sorrowful mind with constant and harmonious lyre and song." Kaske and Clark (1989) 134–135.

66 Copenhaver (1988) 88–90. Kaske and Clark (2002) 45–55. Robichaud (2017) 44–87. On Ficino's marginal annotation to Alchindus (Al-Kindi) in Ficino's manuscript of Synesius see Toussaint (2000) 19–31, at 22, n. 16. Also, Gentile and Gilly (1999) 95–98; Weill-Parot (2002a) 647–708; Weill-Parot, (2002b) 74, 84, 88.

67 Thorndike (1929) 642–648.

68 On magic and Ficino's *De Vita Triplici* book 3 see Kaske and Clark (1989) 45–55 and 426–460, esp. 441–443 on lotus and stones. Boer (1980) 181, also 137 and 96. Copenhaver (1988) 79–110.

Also, Ficino's *De Vita Triplici* Book III.14.11–14:

*Sub stella Solari, id est Sirio, Solem primo, deinde daemonas quoque Phoebeos, quos aliquando sub leonum vel gallorum forma hominibus occurrisse testis est Proculus, homines subinde persimiles bestiasque Solares, Phoebeas inde plantas, metalla similiter et lapillos et vaporem aeremque ferventem.*

Under the Solar star, that is Sirius, they set the Sun first of all, and then Phoebean daemons, which sometimes have encountered people under the form of lions or cocks, as Proclus testifies, then similar men and Solar beasts, Phoebean plants then, similarly metals and gems and vapour and hot air. (Kaske and Clark 1989, 310–311).

Ficino's *De Vita Triplici* Book III.14.27–29:

*Eadem ratione inquit Proculus Apollineum daemonem, qui nonnunquam apparuit sub figura leonis, statim obiecto gallo disparuisse. Maxime vero in his animalibus cor est Solare.*

For the same reason, says Proclus, the Apollonian daemon who often appeared under the shape of a lion disappeared as soon as a cock was put in his way. In these animals, the heart is especially Solar. (Kaske and Clark 1989, 310–311).

## 2. The Stages of the Hieratic/Theurgic Art

### 2.1–3. *Xθονίως, “terrestrially,” οὐρανίως, “celestially,” and νοερῶς, “intellectually”*

Regarding the presence of suns and moons in the earth terrestrially, and of all the plants, stones and animals in the heaven celestially in lines 2.1–3, Proclus in his *Commentary on Plato's Timaeus* states, “for there is also heaven in earth and earth in heaven, but in the former case the heaven is present terrestrially, while in the latter the earth is present celestially. For Orpheus called the moon a celestial earth,<sup>69</sup> and one should not be surprised at these, and how there could be a heaven on earth;” ... (εστι γὰρ καὶ ἐν γῇ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἐν οὐρανῷ γῆ, καὶ

69 *Orph. Fr. 93; Kern (1972) 162.*

ἐνταῦθα μὲν ὁ οὐρανὸς χθονίως, ἐκεῖ δὲ οὐρανίως ἡ γῆ καὶ γὰρ οὐρανίαν [καὶ] <γῆν> τὴν σελήνην Ὄρφεὺς [frg. 81] προσηγόρευσε, καὶ οὐ δεῖ πρὸς ταῦτα θαυμάζειν, καὶ πῶς ὁ οὐρανὸς ἐν γῇ. Procl. *Ti.* III.172.18–23).

Proclus then gives Iamblichus' interpretation on earth and heaven, writing, "I know indeed that the divine Iamblichus also understands 'earth' as that which embraces all that is permanent and fixed according to the substance and activity (*energeia*) of the encosmic gods, to the eternal rotation, and to which encompasses the higher powers and the universal life-principles; while [he understands] 'heaven' as the creative activity (*energeia*)<sup>70</sup> that proceeds from the Demiurge as being entire, perfect and full of its own power and as being initiated by the Demiurge, as the boundary for itself and for the Universe" (οἶδά γε μήν, ὅτι καὶ ὁ θεῖος Ἰάμβλιχος γῆν μὲν ἀκούει τὴν τὸ μόνιμον πᾶν καὶ σταθερὸν κατά τε οὐσίαν τῶν ἐγκοσμίων θεῶν καὶ κατ' ἐνέργειαν καὶ κατὰ τὴν ἀίδιον περιφορὰν καὶ δυνάμεις κρείττονας καὶ ζωάς δλας περιέχουσαν, οὐρανὸν δὲ τὴν προϊούσαν ἀπὸ τοῦ δημιουργοῦ δημιουργικὴν ἐνέργειαν ὅλην καὶ τελείαν καὶ πλήρη τῆς οἰκείας δυνάμεως καὶ περὶ τὸν δημιουργὸν ὑπάρχουσαν, ὡς ὅρον ἔαυτῆς οὖσαν καὶ τῶν ὅλων. Procl. *Ti.* III.173.16–24).<sup>71</sup>

Proclus also explains the intellectual presence of all the plants and stones and animals in the heaven, mentioning the *intellective order* of the forms reflected in the whole cosmos with its two extremes, Earth and Heaven, "Just as this whole cosmos, being extensive and varied, since it reflects the *intellective order* of the forms, has these two extremes within itself, Earth and Heaven, the latter playing the role of the father by destiny, and the former the role of the mother" ("Οσπερ ὁ σύμπας οὐτοσὶ κόσμος πολὺς καὶ ποικίλος ὡν, ἄτε δὴ τὴν νοερὰν τάξιν τῶν εἰδῶν ἀπεικονισάμενος, ἔχει δύο ταύτας <τὰς> ἀκρότητας ἐν ἔαυτῷ, γῆν καὶ οὐρανόν, τὸν μὲν ἐν πατρὸς ὅντα μοίρα, τὴν δὲ ἐν μητρός ... Procl. *Ti.* III. 171.21–24).

2.2–3 (cf. also 5.4–5). *Φυτὰ πάντα καὶ λίθους καὶ ζῶα, "All the plants and stones and animals"*

Iamblichus in *De Mysteriis* VII, discussing "the manifold powers" (τῶν πολυτρόπων δυνάμεων), "the various forms and transformations" (τὰς δὲ διαμείψεις

<sup>70</sup> See also the passage on *energeia* of the god in the *Corpus Hermeticum* xi "A discourse of Nous to Hermes," in which it is stated that the mixture of the opposites becomes light by the activity (*energeia*) of the god: "the friendship and mixture of opposites and dissimilar elements has become light, which is illuminated over all by the activity (*energeia*) of the god, the begetter of everything good and ruler of every order and leader of the seven worlds" (ἡ γὰρ φιλία καὶ ἡ σύγκρασις τῶν ἐναντίων καὶ τῶν ἀνομοίων φῶς γέγονε, καταλαμπόμενον ὑπὸ τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ ἐνεργείας παντὸς ἀγαθοῦ γεννήτορος καὶ πάσης τάξεως ἄρχοντος καὶ ἡγεμόνος τῶν ἐπτὰ κόσμων *Corp. Herm.* xi.7).

<sup>71</sup> Iamb. *Fr.75*; Dillon (1973) 188–189.

τῆς μορφῆς καὶ τοὺς μετασχηματισμούς) of the one god Helios (Iamb. *Myst.* VII.3.253.12–254.2),<sup>72</sup> asserts that: “the theurgic art ... many times combines stones, plants, animals, aromatic substances (herbs) and other such things (that are) holy and perfect and godlike” (ἡ θεουργικὴ τέχνη ... συμπλέκει πολλάκις λίθους βοτάνας ζῶα ἀρώματα ἄλλα τοιαῦτα ἱερὰ καὶ τέλεια καὶ θεοειδῆ). Iamb. *Myst.* v.23.233.9–12).

Similar references and instructions for the use of plants, birds, fish and stones for magico-theurgical practices are illustrated in Book 1, called *Kyranis* of the medico-magical text of the *Kyranides* (first compiled in 4<sup>th</sup> CE), which displays Syrian and Babylonian influences.<sup>73</sup> At the beginning of each chapter of *Kyranis* the names of a plant, a bird, a fish and a stone are listed.<sup>74</sup> All these names start with the same letter as that of the chapter, and in some cases they can even be homonymous. For example, in chapter Gamma, there is γλυκισίδη βοτάνη, “peony [herb],” γλαῦκος πτηνόν, “owl [bird],” γνάθιος λίθος, “gnathios [stone]” and γλαῦκος ἰχθύς, “glaucus [fish].” Likewise, in chapter Kappa there is κιναίδιος βοτάνη, “kinaidios/cinaedus [herb],” κιναίδιος πτηνόν, δ καλεῖται ἵνγξ “cinaedus [bird], which is called Lynx,” κιναίδιος λίθος ... δς καλεῖται ὄψιανός, “cinaedus [stone] ... which is called obsidian” and κιναίδιος ἰχθύς, “cinaedus [fish].” This cinaedus stone is the property of Kronus (ἐστι δὲ Κρόνου).<sup>75</sup>

The four represents the four elements of nature.<sup>76</sup> The combination of the power of these natural elements evokes the sympathetic forces of the universe and can be used for magico-theurgical practices. At the end of each chapter of *Kyranis* there are instructions for medico-magico-theurgical remedies and for making magic amulets/gems, depending each time on the various combinations of some, or all of the four elements. Proclus and Iamblichus would have worked with similar correspondences to the ones in the *Kyranis*.

72 Iamb. *Myst.* VII.3.253.12–254.2: διὰ τοῦ πλήθους τῶν δοθέντων τὸν ἔνα θεὸν ἐμφαίνειν, καὶ διὰ τῶν πολυτρόπων δυνάμεων τὴν μίαν αὐτοῦ παριστάναι δύναμιν· διὸ καὶ φησιν αὐτὸν ἔνα εἶναι καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν, τὰς δὲ διαμειψεῖς τῆς μορφῆς καὶ τοὺς μετασχηματισμούς ἐν τοῖς δεχομένοις ὑποτίθεται.

73 E.g. *Kyran.* pp. 14–15: Αὕτη ἡ βίβλος Συριακοῖς ἐγκεχαραγμένη γράμμασιν ἐν στήλῃ σιδηρῷ ἐν <λίμνῃ τῆς Συρίας κατεχώσθη ... Βίβλος ἀπὸ Συρίας θεραπευτική ... δόδιοπορίας μοι τίνος γενομένης περὶ τὴν Βαβυλωνίαν χώρων, πόλις ἐστιν τις ἐκεῖστι Σελεύκεια καλουμένη. Kaimakis (1976) 14–15. On Babylonian influences in *Kyranides* see Wellmann (1934) 5, n. 17; Alpers (1984) 13–88; Weidner (1967) 30.

74 Kaimakis (1976). On magical amulets and the alphabet in the first book of the *Kyranides* see Waegeman (1987).

75 Kaimakis (1976) 63.

76 In *PGM* III.494–611 Helios is addressed as κοίρανε (κύραννε MS., emended by Preisendanz, III.551) and associated with the four elements as the god “who created all: abyss, earth, fire, water, air” (III.554–555). Preisendanz (1973) Vol. I: 54–55.

At the end of chapter Kappa of *Kyranis*, for example, there are instructions for making a magic gem, according to which “Further, you should engrave on an obsidian stone a man castrated, having his genitals lying at his feet, his hands turned downward, and he himself looking down towards his genitals. Back again behind him, Aphrodite [should be engraved], having her back to his back, and making her turn her face and look at him.” (“Ετι δὲ τὸν ὄψιαν δὲν λιθον γλύψον ἄνθρωπον ἀπόκοπον, ἔχοντα παρὰ τοὺς πόδας τὰ αἰδοῖα κείμενα, τὰς δὲ χειρας κάτω ἐσταλμένας, αὐτὸν δὲ κάτω βλέποντα τοῖς αἰδοίοις· ὅπίσω δὲ πρὸς νῶτον Ἀφροδίτην, νῶτα πρὸς νῶτον ἔχουσαν, αὐτὴν δὲ ἔαυτὴν στρέφουσαν τὴν ὄψιν καὶ βλέπουσαν αὐτόν. *Kyran.* p. 65).<sup>77</sup> This engraved gem should be placed at the centre “of the great goddess Aphrodite’s first *kestos Himas*, which transforms the nature [/sex] of humans and all animals, and similarly the opinions [minds] especially of male humans, in order that the one who fastens it on him or wears it becomes softened and effeminate.” (Τῆς οὖν μεγάλης θεᾶς τῆς Ἀφροδίτης ὁ πρῶτος κεστὸς ὁ δεινότατος καὶ μεταλλάσσων τὰς φύσεις τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ πάντων ζώων, ὁμοίως καὶ τὰς γνώμας ἀρρενικῶν, μάλιστα δὲ ἀνθρώπων ὥστε μαλθακίζεσθαι καὶ ἀπογυναικοῦσθαι τὸν ἀψάμενον ἥ φορέσαντα. *Kyran.* p. 64).<sup>78</sup>

In *Theologica* 1 (Gautier 1989), Psellus asserts in *Opusculum* 72, “thus God exists in plants and stones and unreasoning animals and in symbolical [phantasmal] natures and souls, in concepts and unions and units;” (εστιν οὖν καὶ ἐν φυτοῖς καὶ ἐν λίθοις καὶ ἐν ἀλόγοις ζωαῖς καὶ ἐν εἰδωλικαῖς φύσεσι καὶ ἐν ψυχαῖς, ἐν τε νοήσεσι καὶ ἐνώσεσι καὶ ἐνάσιν *Psel. Theol. Opusc.* 1.72.72–73).<sup>79</sup>

Similarly, in (Pseudo-)Psellus’ disputed treatise *Quaenam sunt Graecorum opinions de daemonibus* (“Περὶ Δαιμόνων Δοξάζουσιν Ἑλληνες”)<sup>80</sup> it is stated in a passage probably influenced by Proclus’ text, “It seems that magic is a thing [property] with many powers for Greeks. And they say that it is the highest part of the hieratic [theurgic] science ... such a power that traces out the substance, nature and power and quality of each birth under the moon, that is to

77 Kaimakis (1976) 65. Also, on a gem in the Civic Museum of Bologna depicting Kronos holding a sword-sickle in his left hand and his genitalia in his right, and its similarities with Kronos depiction in *Kyranides* see Mastrocinque (2011) chpt. 1. Also, Kotansky (1980) 29–32.

78 Kaimakis (1976) 64.

79 Gautier (1989) 283.

80 Boissonade (1838) 36–43, esp. 40–41; PG 122, 875–882, esp. 880b; Bidez (1928b) Vol. vi: 119–131, esp. 128–129. However, the authorship of the *De Operatione Daemonum* (/*De Daemonibus*) and *Quaenam sunt Graecorum opinions de daemonibus* by Psellus has been questioned by modern authors: Gautier (1980) 105–194 and (1988) 85–107. O’Meara (1989) Vol. ii: vii and n. 3, and (2014) 165–181. Greenfield (1988) 149–150 and n. 486. See Intro.: Sect. vi and nn. 95–99; also, Comm.: Sect. 1.2.b and n. 22 above.

say, of elements and their parts, all kinds of animals and plants and fruits deriving from them, stones, herbs, and to put it simply, the substance and power of everything, henceforth, it works about her own things.” (Η δέ γε μαγεία πολυδύναμόν τι χρήμα τοῖς “Ελλησιν ἔδοξε. Μερίδα γοῦν εἶναι ταύτην φασὶν ἐσχάτην τῆς ἱερατικῆς ἐπιστήμης … ἀνιχνεύουσα γὰρ ἡ τοιαύτη δύναμις τῶν ὑπὸ τὴν σελήνην γενέσεων ἐκάστης οὐσίαν καὶ φύσιν καὶ δύναμιν καὶ ποιότητα, λέγω δὲ στοιχείων καὶ τῶν τούτων μερῶν, ζώων παντοδαπῶν, φυτῶν καὶ τῶν ἐντεῦθεν καρπῶν, λίθων, βοτανῶν, καὶ ἀπλῶς εἰπεῖν, παντὸς πράγματος ὑπόστασίν τε καὶ δύναμιν, ἐντεῦθεν ἄρα τὰ ἔαυτῆς ἐνεργάζεται. Boissonade 1838, 40 = 128.23–129.5; Bidez 1928b, vi: 128–129 = PG 122, 88ob; Gautier 1988, 101–103).

### 2.5–6. Ἡ ὁμοιότης, “Resemblance”

Proclus in his *Elements of Theology* points out that “resemblance binds together all things, just as unlikeness separates one from another and distinguishes them” (συνδεῖ δὲ πάντα ἡ ὁμοιότης, ὡσπερ διακρίνει ἡ ἀνομοιότης καὶ δίστησιν. Procl. *Inst.* 32.6–7).<sup>81</sup> Similarly, in Procl. *In Ti.* II.78.13–15 “for resemblance is uniting, but unlikeness is able to divide” (ἡ μὲν γὰρ ὁμοιότης ἐνοποιός ἐστιν, ἡ δὲ ἀνομοιότης διαιρετική).

Furthermore, in his *Commentary on Plato's Timaeus*, Proclus presents resemblance as a condition of knowledge, “for every higher knowledge is accomplished through resemblance of the one who perceives towards the object of knowledge, and resemblance is fulfilled according to the communion to one form” (πᾶσα γὰρ γνῶσις δι' ὁμοιότητος ἐπιτελεῖται τοῦ γιγνώσκοντος πρὸς τὸ γνωστόν, ἡ δὲ ὁμοιότης καθ' ἐνὸς εἴδους ἐπιτελεῖται κοινωνίᾳν. Procl. *In Ti.* II.298.27–29). Also, in Plotinus each one's knowledge is fulfilled *through resemblance* (τῆς γνώσεως ἐκάστων δι' ὁμοιότητος γιγνομένης Plot. *Enn.* I.8.1.8).

### 2.9–16. The Four Stages of the Hieratic /Theurgic Union

Proclus' *On the Hieratic Art* describes hieratic/theurgy as an art combining Neoplatonic notions of mystic divine union with magic ideas of divine identification and Chaldaean influences (e.g. the role of fire in the theurgic union); and analyses the stages of the hieratic/theurgic union.

Proclus provides the example of the kindling of the wick (θρυαλλίδα) to explain the four stages of the theurgic union with the divine and especially the final ones (Procl. *Hier.Ar.* 2.5–9). These four important stages in the theurgic union of the individual with the divine are: First, “the preparatory warming” (ἡ μὲν προθέρμανσις) based on “sympathy” (τῇ συμπαθείᾳ). Second, “the approach

81 Dodds (1933) 36.

and the good positioning” (ἥ δὲ προσαγωγὴ καὶ ἐν καλῷ θέσις) based on “the use of the materials of the hieratic art at the proper time and in the right way” (κατά τε καιρὸν τὸν πρέποντα καὶ τρόπον τὸν οἰκεῖον προσχρήσει τῶν ὑλῶν).<sup>82</sup> Third, “the transmission of the fire” (ἥ δὲ τοῦ πυρὸς διάδοσις) based on “the presence of the divine light” (τῇ παρουσίᾳ τοῦ θείου φωτός). Fourth, “the lighting/ kindling” (ἥ δὲ ἔξαψις) based on “the divinisation of mortals” (τῇ θειώσει τῶν θηντῶν) and “the illumination of things enmattered” (τῇ περιλάμψει τῶν ἐνύλων).

Iamblichus refers to the theurgic prayers (τὸ τῶν εὐχῶν) as an important part of the sacrifices, because through the prayers the whole process of sacrifice is reinforced and accomplished, and a common contribution is made to the cult. The prayers also contribute to “the indissoluble hieratic community with the gods” (τὴν κοινωνίαν ἀδιάλυτον ... τὴν ἱερατικὴν πρὸς τοὺς θεούς). These prayers may precede the sacrifices, or may come in the middle of the theurgic operation, or even they may “bring the sacrifices into completion” (τὸ τέλος τῶν θυσιῶν ἀποπληροῖ) (Iamb. *Myst.* v.26.237.9–12 and 238.11 and 239.5–6).

The first stage/degree of the theurgic prayer, as stated by Iamblichus, is “the one which brings together [attracts]” (τὸ συναγωγόν), the second is “the conjunctive one” (τὸ συνδετικόν), and the third one is “the ineffable union” (ἥ ἄρρητος ἔνωσις), which is associated with fire and described as “the perfect accomplishment of [the soul through] the fire.” (Iamb. *Myst.* v.26.237.12–238.5). Iamblichus relates the fire in theurgy with the direct vision of divinity, “wherefore they show to the theurgists the fire for the direct vision of divinity” (διόπερ δὴ καὶ τὸ αὐτοπτικὸν πῦρ τοῖς θεουργοῖς ἐπιδείκνυσιν. Iamb. *Myst.* II.10.93.1–2).

According to Iamblichus’ *De Mysteriis* V, “So, I say that the first stage/degree of prayer is the one which brings together [attracts], which leads to contact and acquaintance with the divine; the second [stage] is the conjunctive, producing a community of [union with] one mind, calling forth contributions sent down by the gods before the request and having accomplished all ritual acts before their conceiving; and the most perfect [stage] is marked as the ineffable union, which establishes all authority in the gods and provides that the soul rests perfectly in them. In these three levels/stages in which all divine things are measured out, the prayer establishing our friendship with the gods, provides the triple hieratic benefit from the gods, the first leading to illumination, the second to the common achievement, and the third to the perfect accomplishment of [the soul through] the fire.” (Φημὶ δὴ οὖν ὡς τὸ μὲν πρῶτον τῆς εὐχῆς εἰδός ἔστι συναγωγόν, συναφῆς τε τῆς πρὸς τὸ θεῖον καὶ γνωρίσεως ἔξηγούμενον τὸ

<sup>82</sup> On the importance of practicing magic rituals in the right place and time see Pachoumi (2013) 46–69, at 49–50.

δ' ἐπὶ τούτῳ κοινωνίας ὄμονογητικῆς συνδετικόν, δόσεις τε προκαλούμενον τὰς ἐκ θεῶν καταπεμπομένας πρὸ τοῦ λόγου, καὶ πρὸ τοῦ νοήσαι τὰ ὄλα ἔργα ἐπιτελούσας· τὸ δὲ τελεώτατον αὐτῆς ἡ ἄρρητος ἔνωσις ἐπισφραγίζεται, τὸ πᾶν κῦρος ἐνιδρύουσα τοῖς θεοῖς, καὶ τελέως ἐν αὐτοῖς κεῖσθαι τὴν ψυχὴν ἡμῶν παρέχουσα. Ἐν τρισὶ δὲ τούτοις ὅροις, ἐν οἷς τὰ θεῖα πάντα μετρεῖται, τὴν πρὸς θεούς ἡμῶν φιλίαν συναρμόσασα καὶ τὸ ἀπὸ τῶν θεῶν ἱερατικὸν ὄφελος τριπλοῦν ἐνδίδωσι, τὸ μὲν εἰς ἐπίλαμψιν τεῖνον, τὸ δὲ εἰς κοινὴν ἀπεργασίαν, τὸ δὲ εἰς τὴν τελείαν ἀποπλήρωσιν ἀπὸ τοῦ πυρός· *Iamb. Myst. v.26.237.12–238.5.*

Similarly, Proclus in his *Commentary on Plato's Timaeus*, refers to the five stages/degrees of prayer (Procl. *In Ti. I.211.8–28*): first there is the “knowledge of all the divine ranks” (ἡ γνῶσις τῶν θείων τάξεων πασῶν I.211.9–10);<sup>83</sup> second “the familiarization [attraction] in relation to our resemblance to divine regarding complete purity, chastity, education and order” (ἡ οἰκείωσις κατὰ τὴν πρὸς τὸ θεῖον ὄμοιώσιν ἡμῶν τῆς συμπάσης καθαρότητος, ἀγνείας, παιδείας, τάξεως I.211.14–15);<sup>84</sup> third there is “the touching [connection], through which we touch the divine substance with the uppermost part of our soul and we incline towards it” (ἡ συναφή, καθ' ἥν ἐφαπτόμεθα τῆς θείας οὐσίας τῷ ἀκροτάτῳ τῆς ψυχῆς καὶ συνεύομεν πρὸς αὐτήν. I.211.18–19); fourth “the approaching” (ἡ ἐμπέλασις), “—for the oracle (*Orac. Chald. Fr. 121*) calls it thus; ‘for the mortal who approached the fire will receive the light from the gods’—” (—οὕτως γὰρ αὐτὴν καλεῖ τὸ λόγιον· ‘τῷ πυρὶ γὰρ βροτὸς ἐμπελάσας θεόθεν φάος ἔξει’—I.211.20–22),<sup>85</sup> and fifth there is “the unification establishing the unity of the soul in the unity itself of the gods, and causing a unified activity of us and the gods, according to which we do not belong to ourselves but to gods, staying in the divine light and being embraced by it round about” (ἡ ἔνωσις) (αὐτῷ τῷ ἐνὶ τῶν θεῶν τὸ ἐν τῆς ψυχῆς ἐνιδρύουσα καὶ μίαν ἐνέργειαν ἡμῶν τε ποιοῦσα καὶ τῶν θεῶν, καθ' ἥν οὐδὲ ἑαυτῶν ἐσμεν, ἀλλὰ τῶν θεῶν, ἐν τῷ θείῳ φωτὶ μένοντες καὶ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ κύκλῳ περιεχόμενοι. I.211.24–28).

### 2.9–10. *Η Προθέρμανσις, “The Preparatory Warming”*

Proclus associates the first stage of the “preparatory warming” (ἡ μὲν προθέρμανσις) with sympathy (τῇ συμπαθείᾳ) (Procl. *Hier.Ar. 2.9–10*). In the beginning

83 Procl. *In Ti. I.211.8–13*: Ἡγένεται δὲ τῆς τελείας καὶ ὄντως οὖσης εὐχῆς πρώτον ἡ γνῶσις τῶν θείων τάξεων πασῶν, αἵς πρόσειστον δὲ εὐχόμενος· οὐ γὰρ ὅν οἰκείως προσέλθοι μὴ τὰς ιδιότητας αὐτῶν ἐγνωκώς. διὸ καὶ τὸ λόγιον τὴν πυριθαλπή ἔννοιαν πρωτίστην ἔχειν τάξιν ἐν τῇ ιερῷ θρησκείᾳ παρεκελεύστο.

84 Also, on οἰκείωσις see Procl. *In Ti. I.211.15–17*: δι' ἡς τὰ ἡμέτερα προσάγομεν τοῖς θεοῖς, ἔλκοντες τὴν ἀπ' αὐτῶν εὐμένειαν καὶ τὰς ψυχάς ἡμῶν ὑποκατακλίνοντες αὐτοῖς.

85 Also, on ἐμπέλασις see Procl. *In Ti. I.211.23–24*: μείζω τὴν κοινωνίαν ἡμῶν παρεχομένη καὶ τρανεστέρων τὴν μετουσίαν τοῦ τῶν θεῶν φωτός.

of his treatise, as examined in section one, Proclus emphasises the role of sympathy in the hieratic art/science: “Just as lovers proceed methodically from the beautiful things perceived through the senses, arrive at the one principle of all good and conceivable things, in the same way the leaders of the hieratic art [proceeding] from the sympathy (*συμπαθείας*) [which exists] in all apparent things to one another and [to] the invisible powers, having understood that all things are included in all things, established the hieratic art ...” (Procl. *Hier.Ar.* 1.3–7).<sup>86</sup>

Proclus’ simile between the erotic and the hieratic people and the sympathetic powers inside different entities seems to be influenced by Plotinus’ description of the birth of “power of the erotic art by magic” (*ἀλκή ἐρωτικῆς διὰ γοητείας τέχνης* Plot. *Enn.* IV.4.40.10–11) based on sympathetic power inside different things, the natural concord and opposition and the variety of many powers contributing to the living one: “indeed, by sympathy (*τῇ συμπαθείᾳ*) and by the fact that there is by nature a concord of the things alike and opposition of the different things (*συμφωνίαν εἶναι ὁμοίων καὶ ἐναντίωσιν ἀνομοίων*), and by the diversity of the many powers (*τῶν δυνάμεων τῶν πολλῶν*) that contribute to the one living being.” (Plot. *Enn.* IV.4.40.1–4).<sup>87</sup>

Plotinus’ reference to *συναγωγός*, “bringing together” also used by Iamblichus (*συναγωγὸν ὅλον*, Iamb. *Myst.* IV.12.195.12) alludes to Plato’s description of Eros in the *Symposium* as *ἔμφυτος* in human beings and *συναγωγεύς* with their original nature.

**2.10–12. *The Concepts of “Approach/Attraction,” the Right Place and Time (“the good positioning” and “the proper time”), and “the Use of Materials”***

The second stage of Proclus’ theurgic union involves “the approach/attraction and the right placing” (*ἥ δὲ προσαγωγὴ καὶ ἐν καλῷ θέσις*) based on “the use of the materials of the hieratic art at the proper time and in the right way/procedure” (*κατά τε καιρὸν τὸν πρέποντα καὶ τρόπον τὸν οἰκεῖον προσχρήσει τῶν ὑλῶν*).

**2.10–11. *Προσαγωγή, “Approach /Attraction”***

Iamblichus similarly applies the term, *τὸ συναγωγόν*, “the one which brings together [attracts]” for the first degree/stage of the theurgic prayer (Iamb. *Myst.* V.26.10). Both *προσαγωγή* and *συναγωγόν* are the nouns of *προσάγω* and *συνάγω*,

86 On the concept of *sympathy* in Proclus and the Neoplatonists see discussion in Comm.: Sect. 1.5–6 on *sympathy* above.

87 Also, Plot. *Enn.* IV.4.40.6–17; see Comm.: Sect. 1.5–6 on *sympathy* above. See also Procl. *Hier.Ar.* 7.2–5.

which are compounds of ἄγω. The term ἄγωγή is used by Iamblichus in *De Mysteriis* in a theurgical context, meaning “the procedure of evoking the spirits” (Iamb. *Myst.* III.6.113.1–2).<sup>88</sup>

Ἄγωγή is used in the Greek magical papyri *PGM* (*Papyri Graecae Magicae*) to describe the “spell that leads.” The term most often applies to the erotic spells, referring precisely to “the procedure of evoking mostly a spirit of the dead in order to lead, or bring” a person [the eros-victim] by means of a spell and/or a ritual to be spoken or practiced by the user of the spell to the victim of his/her erotic passion. However, ἄγωγή is not restricted to erotic spells, either in the Greek magical papyri, or elsewhere. For example, in the spells entitled as “Ἄγωγή Πίτυος βασιλέως ἐπὶ παντὸς σκύφου” (*PGM* IV.1928–2005) and “Πίτυος ἄγωγή” (*PGM* IV.2006–2125) it is used for a “spell that leads” a spirit(/-s) or daimon(/-s) of the dead from the underworld—even though in the second Pitys’ spell there are traces of erotic formularies.

Proclus in his *Commentary on Plato’s Republic* characteristically refers to “the hieratic [theurgic] mode of the *agôge* [evoking procedure], accomplished through sacrifices, divine names and prayers” (⟨ὅ⟩ ἱερατικὸς τρόπος τῆς ἄγωγῆς, διὰ θυσιῶν, δι’ ὀνομάτων θείων, δι’ εὐχῶν συμπεπληρωμένος Procl. *In R.* II.66.13–15).<sup>89</sup>

In his *Platonic Theology* Proclus claims about ἀναγωγή, “ascent /elevation,” “Thus, the way itself of ascent (τῆς ἀναγωγῆς) is also available to us and for this reason the more trustworthy way of theurgic elevation” (Ο αὐτὸς ἄρα τρόπος τῆς ἀναγωγῆς καὶ παρ’ ἡμῖν ἐστι, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο πιστότερος ὁ τῆς θεουργικῆς ἀνόδου τρόπος. Procl. *Plat.Theol.* IV.29.3–5).<sup>90</sup>

Regarding now the connection between theurgic unification and the unifying action of the One, Proclus in his *Elements of Theology* comments on τὸ ἐν συναγωγόν, which is a different sense—albeit ultimately related—of συναγωγόν: “then if the one is uniting and holding all beings together, each one

88 Iamb. *Myst.* III.6.10–11: Οἱ δὲ ἄνευ τῶν μακαρίων τούτων θεαμάτων ἀφανῶς ποιούμενοι τὰς ἄγωγὰς τῶν πνευμάτων ... See also Iamb. *Myst.* III.14.134.8: τρόποι τῆς τοῦ φωτὸς ἄγωγῆς, “ways for evoking/conducting the light”; and v.26.240.9: τῆς ἱερατικῆς ἄγωγῆς, “of the hieratic /theurgic evocation.”

89 Procl. *In Ti.* III.20.22–28: ἀλλ’ οὐχ οἱ θεουργοὶ ταῦτα φαίεν ἄν, οἵ γε καὶ θεὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι φασι καὶ ἄγωγὴν αὐτοῦ παρέδοσαν ἡμῖν, δι’ ἡς εἰς αὐτοφάνειαν κινεῖν αὐτὸν δυνατόν, καὶ ὑμοῦνσι πρεσβύτερον καὶ νέωτερον καὶ κυκλοέλικτον <τοῦτον> τὸν θεὸν καὶ αἰώνιον, οὐ μόνον ὡς αἰώνιος εἰκόνα, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὡς αὐτὸν αἰώνιως προειληφότα καὶ νοοῦντα τὸν σύμπαντα τῶν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ κινουμένων ἀπάντων ἀριθμόν ...

90 Οἱ ἀναγωγῆς as “ascent/elevation” in Procl. *In R.* see Procl. *In R.* I.81.5–6: ἀλλὰ τῷ τε Σωκράτει πειθούμενος καὶ τῇ τάξει τῆς ἐπὶ τῷ θεῖον ἀναγωγῆς ...

is accomplished by its own presence; hence in that way unification is good for all.” (καὶ εἰ τὸ ἐν συναγωγόν ἐστι καὶ συνεκτικὸν τῶν ὄντων, ἔκαστον τελειοῖ κατὰ τὴν ἔαυτοῦ παρουσίαν. καὶ ἀγαθὸν ἄρα ταύτη ἐστὶ τὸ ἡγῶσθαι πάσιν. Procl. *Inst.13.9*).

Proclus in his *Commentary on Plato's Parmenides* presents the συναγωγόν as one of the causes of resemblance on the higher level, “therefore, the causes of resemblance are three, one on the lower level, as a foundation, another on the higher level, *bringing together/uniting* the perfecting forces and the things to be perfected, and another in the middle of these two, binding the extremities together.” (ῶστε τρία τὰ αἴτια τοῦ ὁμοιοῦσθαι, τὸ μὲν κάτωθεν ὡς ὑποκείμενον, τὸ δὲ ἄνωθεν ὡς συναγωγὸν τῶν τελειούντων καὶ τελειουμένων, τὸ δὲ ἐν μέσῳ τούτων ὡς συνδετικὸν τῶν ἄκρων. Procl. *In Prm. 918.20–24*).

Proclus also discussing “the whole chain of ideas” (πάσαν τὴν τῶν ἰδεῶν σειρὰν *In Prm. 969.10–11*) and “that which is above Form” (ὑπὲρ εἰδος 969.13), states about the Forms in the seventh rank, “the superior and supracelestial Forms, which have a *unifying power* (συναγωγὸν δύναμιν) of the divided Forms in the cosmos;” (ἐβδόμην δὲ τὰ ἀπόλυτα καὶ ὑπερουράνια συναγωγὸν δύναμιν ἔχοντα τῶν περὶ τὸν κόσμον διηρημένων εἰδῶν, ... Procl. *In Prm. 969.16–26*).

Furthermore, Proclus in his *Commentary on Plato's Timaeus*, discussing the fourth stage/degree of prayer, refers to the notion of “approaching,” using another term with similar meaning, that of ἐμπέλασις, and quoting the *Orac. Chald. Fr. 121*, in which the aorist participle ἐμπελάσας is used, “Besides these things there is the approaching—for the oracle calls it thus; ‘for the mortal who has approached the fire will possess light from the gods’—” (ἐπὶ δὲ ταύταις ἡ ἐμπέλασις—οὕτως γάρ αὐτὴν καλεῖ τὸ λόγιον· ‘τῷ πυρὶ γάρ βροτὸς ἐμπελάσας θεόθεν φάος ἔξει’—Procl. *In Ti. 1.211.19–22*). Proclus further explains the notion of ἐμπέλασις in the quoted *Orac. Chald. Fr. 121*, “offering us a greater communion (with the gods) and a more transparent participation in the light of the gods.” (μείζω τὴν κοινωνίαν ἡμῖν παρεχομένη καὶ τρανεστέραν τὴν μετουσίαν τοῦ τῶν θεῶν φωτός. Procl. *In Ti. 1.211.23–24*).

## 2.11–12. *The Right Place and Time: Ἐν καλῷ θέσις, “the good positioning” and κατά τε καιρὸν τὸν πρέποντα, “at the proper time”*

The right place and hour are important for the theurgic and magical operations in general, and this reference to the importance of “the good positioning” [pure place/-s] and “the proper time” (Procl. *Hier.Ar. 2.11–12*) in the hieratic/theurgic art may be the only passage in Proclus, in which it is clearly and directly expressed. Porphyry also in *Vita Plotini* describes the theurgic operation in which an Egyptian priest conjured up Plotinus' personal daimon (οἰκεῖος δαίμων) for “direct vision” (αὐτοψίαν) in the temple of Isis (ἐν τῷ Ἰσίῳ),

“for the Egyptian priest said that that was the only pure place that he found in Rome;”<sup>91</sup> (μόνον γάρ ἐκεῖνον τὸν τόπον καθαρὸν φῆσαι εὔρεῖν ἐν τῇ Ἀιγύπτιον. Porph. *V. Plot.* 10.19–22). The operation also involved a sacrifice, the strangling of birds that were held for protection [as protective *synthêmata*] by a friend that was present (Porph. *V. Plot.* 10.25–28).<sup>92</sup>

The specification of the place, day and hour is important in the magical spells and rituals. The magician invokes the deity to be revealed in a specific day, hour and place;<sup>93</sup> and practices the rituals in certain, usually purified, places.<sup>94</sup> For example, in the magico-theurgic spell “*Systasis* [connection] with your own daimon” (Σύστασις ἴδιου δαίμονος, *PGM* VII.505–528), “the daimon of this place,” the *genius loci*, (δαῖμον τοῦ τόπου τούτου), “the present hour” (ἐνεστῶσα ὥρα), “the present day” (ἐνεστῶσα ἡμέρα), and “every day” (πᾶσα ἡμέρα) are invoked (VII.506–507).

In the untitled spell *PGM* III.1–164, the “daimon of the place” is invoked (III.34). In the erotic spell *PGM* IV.1390–1495 also the dead unlucky heroes and heroines are called up, “these of this place, of this day and of this hour” (IV.1420–1423). In another spell there is even a reference to “(on) the land of the whole cosmic place,” κατὰ γαῖαν τόπου διοικοῦ (VII.837–838).

In the instructions for the spells that restrain included in the spell “Divine assistance from three Homeric verses” (*PGM* IV.2145–2240) there is stated “and you will bury the seashell in the tomb of someone who died untimely, when the moon is in opposition to the sun” (καὶ καταχώσεις εἰς ἀώρου μνήμα σελήνης οὕσης διαμέτρου ἡλίου. IV.2220–2221). Here the practitioner is instructed to perform the ritual at the right astrological time, “when the moon is opposite to the sun,” at the full moon.

91 See also Porph. *V. Plot.* 10.25–28.

92 Porph. *V. Plot.* 10.25–28: Μήτε δὲ ἐρέσθαι τι ἐκγενέσθαι μήτε ἐπιπλέον ιδεῖν παρόντα τοῦ συνθεωρούντος φίλου τὰς ὅρνεις, ἃς κατεῖχε φυλακῆς ἔνεκα, πνίξαντος εἴτε διὰ φθόνον εἴτε καὶ διὰ φόβον τινά. “It was not allowed to ask a question or to see the direct vision any longer, for the friend who was a fellow-observer strangled the birds, which he was holding for protection either out of jealousy or indeed out of some fear.” The strangling of birds must have been part of the ritual, although Porphyry uses a conventional formula of motivations (Porph. *V. Plot.* 10. 27–28: εἴτε διὰ φθόνον εἴτε καὶ διὰ φόβον τινά), which is repeated in chapter 12 (Porph. *V. Plot.* 12.11–12: φθονούντες ἢ νεμεσῶντες ἢ δι’ ἄλλην μοχθηρὰν αἰτίαν) and reveals his lack of explanation. On the strangling of birds for protection as part of the ritual see Eitrem (1942) 62 ff.; Dodds (1951) 289–291; Betz (1981) 161–162; Brisson (1992) 471–472; Edwards (2000) 20, n. 111 and 23, n. 128.

93 E.g. *PGM* III.37–38, 77–78, IV.544–545, 686–687, 1699–1700, V.194–195; VII.155–167 called “Days and Hours for divination”; for the role of astronomy in Egyptian rituals see Morenz (1973) 7–9.

94 E.g. *PGM* II.148, IV.1926, VII.844 and XIII.6 ff.

In the introductory letter of Thessalos of Tralles' astrological work *De Virtutibus Herbarum* (dated to the first or second century CE) god said to king Necepso that he failed to obtain a prophecy from the gods about what he wanted to learn, because he did not know the correct “times and places,” τοὺς δὲ καιρούς καὶ τοὺς τόπους, he should pick the plants.<sup>95</sup>

Iamblichus in *De Mysteriis* VIII discusses the Hermaic and Egyptian influences on the celestial planets and deities, zodiac and astrology, noticing that the Egyptian priest and philosopher Chaeremon and other such authorities have dealt with the Hermetic treatises and doctrines,<sup>96</sup> “for they were translated from the Egyptian tongue by men not unexperienced in philosophy” (μεταγέγραπται γάρ ἀπὸ τῆς αἰγυπτίας γλώττης ὑπ’ ἀνδρῶν φιλοσοφίας οὐκ ἀπειρωτέος ἔχοντων Iamb. *Myst.* VIII.4.265.12–266.1); “and these who teach about the planets, the zodiac and the decans and horoscopes and the so-called mighty ones and the leaders show forth the particular divisions of the principles” (ὅσοι τε τοὺς πλανήτας καὶ τὸν ζωδιακὸν τούς τε δεκανούς καὶ ὥροσκόπους καὶ τοὺς λεγομένους κραταιούς καὶ ἡγεμόνας παραδιδόσι, τὰς μεριστὰς τῶν ἀρχῶν διανομὰς ἀναφαίνουσιν. Iamb. *Myst.* VIII.4.266.1–5).<sup>97</sup> “Also, what is included in the almanac astrological calendars comprises a very small part of the Hermaic constitution; and the doctrines on the risings and settings of the stars, or the waxings and wanings of the moon hold the lowest level in the Egyptian [explanation of the] causes of things.” (Τά τε ἐν τοῖς σαλμεσχινιακοῖς μέρος τι βραχύτατον περιέχει τῶν ἔρμαϊκῶν διατάξεων καὶ τὰ περὶ ἀστέρων ἡ φάσεων ἡ κρύψεων ἡ σελήνης αὐξήσεων ἡ μειώσεων ἐν τοῖς ἐσχάτοις εἶχε τὴν παρ’ Αἰγυπτίοις αἰτιολογίαν. Iamb. *Myst.* VIII.4.266.5–8).<sup>98</sup>

95 Thess. Tral. *Virt. Herb.* 27; see also Zos. Alch. *Com. Ω.* 3.

96 Iamb. *Myst.* VIII.4.265.10–12: τὰ μὲν γάρ φερόμενα ὡς Ἐρμοῦ ἔρμαϊκὰς περιέχει δόξας, εἰ καὶ τῇ τῶν φιλοσόφων γλώττῃ πολλάκις χρήτανται.

97 On divine planets in Iamblichus see also Iamb. *Myst.* 1.17, 18, 19. On astrology as divination in Iamblichus see Shaw (2007a) 89–102.

98 On the role of time and the ὥροσκόποι see also Procl. *In R.* 11.56.15–57.2: δεῖ τοίνυν τοὺς τῶν γάμων κυρίους τὸν καιρὸν αὐτῶν θηράν κατὰ μὲν τὴν ἀπλανή διά τε τῶν ὥροσκόπων καὶ τῶν τούτοις παρανατελλόντων ἀστέρων τε καὶ δεκανῶν—καὶ γάρ μοιραὶ ὥροσκοπούσαι τὴν δῆλην ἔχουσι τῆς γενέσεως δύναμιν, ὡς τὰς μὲν ἵερατικὰς ποιεῖν, τὰς δὲ σύνεγγυς αὐτῶν ἐπιρρήτου ζωῆς γεννήσεις (καὶ ταῦτα ἐν ταῖς Χαλδαιϊκαῖς σφαιραῖς [καὶ αὐτοῖς καὶ Αἰγυπτίοι] καὶ Αἰγυπτίαις), ἀφ’ ὃν καὶ κρίνουσιν οἱ παλαιοί, τίς δέ βίος ἔσται τῶν εἰς τὴν γένεσιν παριουσῶν ψυχῶν ἐκείνων ὥροσκοπουσῶν, ὥσπερ τὸ τοῦ βίου ποιὸν ἐκ τῶν σχημάτων καὶ τῶν παρανατολῶν καὶ τῆς τῶν ἀστέρων ιδιότητος τῶν πρόσων τὴν ὥροσκοπούσαν μοιραν συσχηματιζόμενων· καὶ αἱ τῶν παρανατελλόντων δυνάμεις παμπόλλην παρέχονται δύναμιν εἰς τε εὐγονίαν καὶ δυσγονίαν also on time see Procl. *In R.* 11.66.1–8: Τοιαύτην δὲ θεῖος ἐκείνος ἀγωγὴν παραδέδωκεν ἐνιαυτοκράτορος λήψεως ὄνοματος· ἦν δέ τοις καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς σπορίμους ὥρας μετηγάγομεν ὡς χρήσιμον τοῖς γεννήσεως ἐπιμεληταῖς ἐσομένοις, ἵνα μὴ μόνον παρατηρῶσιν τὴν εὐκαιρίαν τοῦ παντὸς κατὰ τὰς συνέρξεις καὶ οὕτως ἐνεργὸν ποιῶσι τὸν γεωμετρικὸν ἀριθμόν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸν ἵερατικὸν τρόπον παρέχωσι τοῖς καιροῖς, οὓς ἐκλέγονται, τὸ δραστήριον.

The notion of 'pure place' was important in the mystic initiation rituals and their similarities to the Platonic doctrine of the post-mortem condition of the soul (ψυχή).

For example, in Plato's *Phaedo* Socrates in his discussion with Cebes and Simmias refers to the pure region of Hades that the soul departs to after death, "So, will the soul, the invisible part, which has departed to this kind of region, the noble and *pure* and invisible one, to Hades indeed, to the good and wise god, if god willing my soul must immediately be going—will the soul, being of this kind and nature, when leaving the body, at once be dispersed and destroyed as many men say?" (Ἡ δὲ ψυχὴ ἄρα, τὸ ἀιδές, τὸ εἰς τοιοῦτον τόπον ἔτερον οἰχόμενον γενναῖον καὶ καθαρὸν καὶ ἀιδή, εἰς Ἀιδουνώς ἀληθῶς, παρὰ τὸν ἀγαθὸν καὶ φρόνιμον θεόν, οἵ, ἀνθεός θέλη, αὐτίκα καὶ τῇ ἐμῇ ψυχῇ ἵτεον, αὕτη δὲ δὴ ἡμῖν ἡ τοιαύτη καὶ οὕτω πεφυκυῖα ἀπαλλαττομένη τοῦ σώματος εὐθὺς διαπεφύσηται καὶ ἀπόλωλεν, ὡς φασιν οἱ πολλοὶ ἀνθρωποι; Pl. *Phd.* 80.d.5–80.e.1).<sup>99</sup>

Moreover, "Those who seem to have lived a particularly pious life are freed and released from the region of the earth as from a prison, having arrived upwards at a *pure place* and living on earth." (οἵ δὲ δὴ ἀνδρῶν δόξωσι διαφερόντως πρὸς τὸ ὄστια βίωναι, οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ τῶνδε μὲν τῶν τόπων τῶν ἐν τῇ γῇ ἐλευθερούμενοι τε καὶ ἀπαλλαττόμενοι ὥσπερ δεσμωτηρίων, ἀνω δὲ εἰς τὴν καθαρὰν οἰκησιν ἀφικνούμενοι καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς οἰκιζόμενοι. Pl. *Phd.* 114.b.6–c.2). Then there follows a reference to those purified by philosophy, "and those who have purified themselves satisfactorily by philosophy live altogether in the future without a body, and they arrive at even more beautiful dwelling places ..." (τούτων δὲ αὐτῶν οἱ φιλοσοφίᾳ ικανῶς καθηράμενοι ἄνευ τε σωμάτων ζῶσι τὸ παράπαν εἰς τὸν ἔπειτα χρόνον, καὶ εἰς οἰκήσις ἔτι τούτων καλλίους ἀφικνούμνται ... Pl. *Phd.* 114.c.1–5).

Similarly, Plutarch in a passage quoted in Stobaeus' *Anthology* (Plut. *Fr.* 178.1–21 = Stobaeus *Anthology* IV.52.49) relates the notion of purity of men and places with the final stages of the initiation to the mysteries, "first there are wanderings [illusions], and wearisome runnings around, and fearful and endless travellings through darkness, then before the very accomplishment there is every kind of suffering, shuddering and trembling, and sweat and terror; but after that a marvelous light appears, and *pure places* and meadows come next, having voices and dances and the solemnities of sacred utterances and holy visions; in which places the one who has been already perfect and initiated and free, walking around free and wearing a crown, celebrates religious rites (*orgiazei*),

99 Also, Pl. *Phd.* 80e.2–81a.2: ἐὰν μὲν καθαρὰ ἀπαλλάττηται, μηδὲν τοῦ σώματος συνεφέλκουσα, ἄτε οὐδέν κοινωνούσα αὐτῷ ἐν τῷ βίῳ ἐκούσα εἶναι, ἀλλὰ φεύγουσα αὐτό καὶ συνηθροισμένη αὐτῇ εἰς ἑαυτήν, ἄτε μελετώσα ἀεὶ τοῦτο—τὸ δὲ οὐδέν ἄλλο ἐστίν ἡ ὄρθως φιλοσοφούσα καὶ τῷ ὅντι τεθνάναι μελετώσα ῥάσίως· ἡ οὐ τοῦτ' ἀν εἴη μελέτη θανάτου;

and joins with pious and pure people" (πλάναι τὰ πρώτα καὶ περιδρομαὶ κοπώδεις καὶ διὰ σκότους τινὲς ὑποπτοὶ πορεῖαι καὶ ἀτέλεστοι εἴτα πρὸ τοῦ τέλους αὐτοῦ τὰ δεινὰ πάντα, φρίκη καὶ τρόμος καὶ ἰδρώς καὶ θάμβος· ἐκ δὲ τούτου φῶς τι θαυμάσιον ἀπήντησεν καὶ τόποι καθαροὶ καὶ λειμῶνες ἐδέξαντο, φωνὰς καὶ χορείας καὶ σεμνότητας ἀκουσμάτων ἱερῶν καὶ φασμάτων ἀγίων ἔχοντες· ἐν αἷς ὁ παντελῆς ἥδη καὶ μεμυημένος ἐλεύθερος γεγονὼς καὶ ἀφετος περιιών ἐστεφανωμένος ὀργιάζει καὶ σύνεστιν ὁσίοις καὶ καθαροῖς ἀνδράσι).<sup>100</sup>

### 2.12. *Πρόσχρησις τῶν ύλῶν, "The use of materials"; and the Concepts and Ritual Actions of Mixing and the Union of Powers*

The "use of materials" (προσχρήσει τῶν ύλῶν Procl. *Hier.Ar.* 2.12) in the second stage of Proclus' theurgic union is based on the concept of mixing and the union of powers, as well as on the concept of one and many, as examined above: e.g. "Thus, in the earth it is possible to see *suns and moons* terrestrially, and in the heaven celestially *all the plants and stones and animals* living intellectually. So, the ancient wise men by understanding these well, attaching (προσάγοντες) some of the heavenly things to the one set of objects and some to another, they brought divine powers into the region of mortals, and they attracted them through resemblance." (Procl. *Hier.Ar.* 2.1–5).<sup>101</sup>

The ritual actions also involve the use of *agalmata* (statues), incenses, *synthémata* and symbols, and the concept of mixing: "so, by mixing (τῇ μίξῃ) together many things [powers], they unify the aforementioned effluences and assimilate that which is one from all, to that whole which is before all; and they often produce combinatory *statues* and *incenses*, having mixed into one [mixture] the distributed *synthémata* and making the divine, as it were, comprehensible in its essence by art *through the union with many powers* (καθ' ἔνωσιν

100 Plut. *Fr.* 178.1–21 = Stobaeus *Anthology* IV.52.49 (V. p. 1089 H.): ἐν ταύτῳ. 'Οὕτω κατὰ τὴν εἰς τὸ ὅλον μεταβολὴν καὶ μετακόσμησιν ὀλωλέναι τὴν ψυχὴν λέγομεν ἐκεῖ γενομένην· ἐνταῦθα δ' ἀγνοεῖ, πλὴν ὅταν ἐν τῷ τελευτάνῳ ἥδη γένηται· τότε δὲ πάσχει πάθος οἷον οἱ τελεταῖς μεγάλαις κατοργιαζόμενοι. Διὸ καὶ τὸ ρήμα τῷ ρήματι καὶ τὸ ἔργον τῷ ἔργῳ τοῦ τελευτῶν καὶ τελεσθῶι προσέοικε. πλάναι τὰ πρώτα καὶ περιδρομαὶ κοπώδεις καὶ διὰ σκότους τινὲς ὑποπτοὶ πορεῖαι καὶ ἀτέλεστοι, εἴτα πρὸ τοῦ τέλους αὐτοῦ τὰ δεινὰ πάντα, φρίκη καὶ τρόμος καὶ ἰδρώς καὶ θάμβος· ἐκ δὲ τούτου φῶς τι θαυμάσιον ἀπήντησεν καὶ τόποι καθαροὶ καὶ λειμῶνες ἐδέξαντο, φωνὰς καὶ χορείας καὶ σεμνότητας ἀκουσμάτων ἱερῶν καὶ φασμάτων ἀγίων ἔχοντες· ἐν αἷς ὁ παντελῆς ἥδη καὶ μεμυημένος ἐλεύθερος γεγονὼς καὶ ἀφετος περιιών ἐστεφανωμένος ὀργιάζει καὶ σύνεστιν ὁσίοις καὶ καθαροῖς ἀνδράσι, τὸν ἀμύνητον ἐνταῦθα τῶν ζώντων <καὶ> ἀκάθαρτον ἐφορῶν ὅχλον ἐν βορβόρῳ πολλῷ καὶ ὁμίχλῃ πατούμενον ὑπὸ ἑαυτοῦ καὶ συνελαυνόμενον, φόβῳ δὲ θανάτου τοῖς κακοῖς ἀπιστίᾳ τῶν ἐκεῖ ἀγαθῶν ἐμμένοντα. ἐπει τό γε παρὰ φύσιν τὴν πρὸς τὸ σῶμα τῇ ψυχῇ συμπλοκήν είναι καὶ σύνερξιν ἐκεῖθεν ἀν συνίδοις.'

101 On Procl. *Hier.Ar.* 2.1–5 see discussion in Comm.: Sect. 2.2–3 on plants, stones and animals above.

τῶν πλειόνων δυνάμεων), the dividing of which on the one hand made each one [power] indistinct, while the mixing on the other hand (ή δὲ μῖξις) raised it up to the form of its archetype.” (Procl. *Hier.Ar.* 5.10–17).<sup>102</sup>

Iamblichus in *De Mysteriis* VII writes that ή θεουργική τέχνη ... συμπλέκει πολλάκις λίθους βοτάνας ζῷα ἀρώματα ἄλλα τοιαῦτα ιερὰ καὶ τέλεια καὶ θεοειδῆ. “the theurgic art ... many times joins together [combines] *stones, plants, animals, aromatic substances* [/herbs] and other such things [that are] holy and perfect and godlike” (Iamb. *Myst.* v.23.233.9–12).<sup>103</sup>

Iamblichus also explains the concept of manifold powers and transformations of the one by providing the example of the one god Helios: “for this reason the symbolic teaching wishes to indicate the one god [τὸν ἔνα θεὸν] *through the multitude of offerings* (διὰ τοῦ πλήθους τῶν δοθέντων), and to represent his one power *through the manifold powers* (διὰ τῶν πολυτρόπων δυνάμεων); wherefore it [the symbolic teaching] indicates that he [Helios] is one and the same (αὐτὸν ἔνα εἶναι καὶ τὸν αὐτόν), but assigns the changes of form and of configuration to the recipients. Therefore it [the symbolic teaching] indicates that he [Helios] is changed according to the Zodiac and every hour, just as these are variegated/changeable around the god according to his many receptions.” (Iamb. *Myst.* VII.3.253.12–254.2).

### 2.13.a. Πυρὸς διάδοσις, “The Transmission of Fire”

The third stage of the theurgic union is “the transmission of the fire” (ή δὲ τοῦ πυρὸς διάδοσις) based on “the presence of the divine light” (τῇ παρουσίᾳ τοῦ θείου φωτός). And the fourth stage involves “the lighting/kindling” (ή δὲ ἔξαψις) based on “the divinisation of mortals” (τῇ θειώσει τῶν θνητῶν) and “the illumination of things enmattered” (τῇ περιλάμψει τῶν ἐνύλων).

Proclus in his *Chaldaean Philosophy* (Πρόκλου ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς χαλδαιϊκῆς φιλοσοφίας, *Extraits du Commentaire de Proclus sur la Philosophie Chaldaïque*) extracts

<sup>102</sup> See also Procl. *Hier.Ar.* 7.1–10. On Procl. *Hier.Ar.* 5.10–17 see discussion in Comm.: Sect. 5 below. See also Pachoumi (2018) 23–37.

<sup>103</sup> Iamb. *Myst.* VII.3.12–16: διὰ τοῦ πλήθους τῶν δοθέντων τὸν ἔνα θεὸν ἐμφαίνειν, καὶ διὰ τῶν πολυτρόπων δυνάμεων τὴν μίαν αὐτοῦ παριστάναι δύναμιν διὸ καὶ φησιν αὐτὸν ἔνα εἶναι καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν, τὰς δὲ διαμείψεις τῆς μορφῆς καὶ τοὺς μετασχηματισμοὺς ἐν τοῖς δεχομένοις ὑποτίθεται. Note also a similar reference by (Pseudo-)Psellus’ *Quaenam sunt Graecorum opinions de daemonibus* (4.75–5.82), Gautier (1988) 85–107 (Boissonade 1838, 40): Ή δέ γε μαγεία πολυδύναμόν τι χρήμα τοῖς “Ἐλλησιν ἔδοξε. Μερίδα γοῦν εἶναι ταύτην φασὶν ἐσχάτην τῆς ιερατικῆς ἐπιστήμης ... ἀνιχνεύουσα γάρ ή τοιαύτη δύναμις τῶν ὑπὸ τὴν σελήνην γενέσεων ἐκάστης οὐσίαν καὶ φύσιν καὶ δύναμιν καὶ ποιότητα, λέγω δὲ στοιχείων καὶ τῶν τούτων μερῶν, ζῶν παντοδαπῶν, φυτῶν καὶ τῶν ἐντεῦθεν καρπῶν, λίθων, βοτανῶν, καὶ ἀπλῶς εἰπεῖν, παντὸς πράγματος ὑπόστασίν τε καὶ δύναμιν, ἐντεῦθεν ἄρα τὰ ἔαυτῆς ἐνεργάζεται. Gautier (1988) 103.

1 and 2 refers to the Chaldaean notion of immaterial divine fire and its connection to the divine union of the soul:<sup>104</sup>

How does the class of angels lead the soul upwards? By making the soul shining by fire, it is said, that means illuminating it all around and making it [the soul] to be full of immaculate fire, which gives it undeviating order and power, through which it is not rushed forth into the material disorder, but it is united with the divine light; ... The highest point of [the various stages of] the ascent is participation in the divine fruits and *self-illuminating fulfilment of the fire*, which is the vision [image] of god, since it sets the soul under the eyes of the Father. The soul is made to sing hymns to divine beings, according to the Oracle, setting forth the ineffable *synthémata* of the Father and offering these [*synthémata*] to the Father, those which the Father has put into it [the soul] in its first passage [appearance] into substance. For such are the intellectual and invisible hymns of the ascending soul, stirring up the memory of harmonic verbal formulas [formative forces], which carry ineffable images of divine powers which are in it [the soul].<sup>105</sup>

ἡ δὲ τῶν ἀγγέλων μερὶς πῶς ἀνάγει ψυχήν; φέγγουσα, φησί, πυρὶ τὴν ψυχήν, τοῦτ' ἔστι περιλάμπουσα αὐτὴν πανταχόθεν, καὶ πλήρη ποιοῦσα τοῦ ἀχράντου πυρὸς ὃ ἐνδίδωσιν αὐτῇ τάξιν ἀκλιτον καὶ δύναμιν δι' ἣν οὐκ ἐκροιζεῖται εἰς τὴν ὑλικὴν ἀταξίαν ἀλλὰ συνάπτεται τῷ φωτὶ τῶν θείων: ... Τέλος δὲ τῶν ἀνόδων ἡ μετουσία τῶν θείων καρπῶν καὶ ἡ αὐτοφαγή τοῦ πυρὸς ἀποπλήρωσις, ἥτις ἔστιν ἡ θεοῦ ὅψις, ὡς ὑπὸ ὅμμασιν αὐτὴν τιθεῖσα τοῦ Πατρός. Υμνῷδὸς δὲ ἀποτελεῖται τῶν θείων ἡ ψυχή, κατὰ τὸ λόγιον, τὰ συνθήματα τοῦ Πατρὸς τὰ ἄρρητα προβαλλομένη καὶ προσφέρουσα αὐτὰ τῷ Πατρί, ἡ ἐνέθετο δι' Πατήρ τοις αὐτὴν ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ παρόδῳ τῆς οὐσίας. Τοιούτοι γάρ οἱ νοεροὶ καὶ ἀφανεῖς ὅμοι τῆς ἀναγομένης ψυχῆς, ἀνακινοῦντες τὴν μνήμην τῶν ἀρμονικῶν λόγων οἱ φέρου-

<sup>104</sup> Des Places (1971) 206–212; Pitra (1888) Vol. v: 192–195. On the theurgic union and the concept of fire in Proclus see Pachoumi (2022) 251–268.

<sup>105</sup> On the theurgic *enthusiasmos* of the soul and statues see Hermias *In Phdr.* 87.4–32: Πῶς μὲν οὖν ἡ ψυχὴ ἐνθουσιᾷ, εἰρηται. Πῶς δὲ καὶ ἀγάλμα λέγεται ἐνθουσιάν; "Ἡ αὐτὸ μὲν οὐκ ἐνεργεῖ περὶ τὸ θεῖον, δι' γε ἀψυχὸν ἐστιν, ἀλλὰ τὴν ὅλην ἡ τελεστικὴ διακαθήρασα καὶ τινας χαρακτῆρας καὶ σύμβολα περιθεῖται τῷ ἀγάλματι πρῶτον μὲν ἔμψυχον αὐτὸ διὰ τούτων ἐποίησε καὶ <οἶν τε> ζωὴν τινα ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου καταδέξασθαι, ἔπειτα μετὰ τούτο ἔλλαμφθῆναι παρὰ τοῦ θείου αὐτὸ παρεσκεύαστεν: ... τὸ δὲ ἀγάλμα ως ἀν πάθῃ οὕτω μένει ἔλλαμπόμενον, διὸ καὶ ἡ ἀνεπιτηδειότης αὐτοῦ εἰς στέρησιν παντελῆ χωρεῖ, ἐάν μὴ πάλιν ἐκ νέας ὑπὸ τοῦ τελεστοῦ τελεσθῆ καὶ ἔμψυχωθῇ. "Οτι μὲν οὖν περὶ τὸ ἐν τῆς ψυχῆς γίνεται ὁ κυρίως ἐνθουσιασμὸς καὶ ὅτι ἐπίπνοια καὶ ἔλλαμψίς ἔστι τῶν θεῶν, ίκανῶς εἰρηται; also, Herm. *In Phdr.* 88.1–34.

σιν ἀπορρήτους εἰκόνας τῶν θείων ἐν αὐτῇ δυνάμεων. Procl. *Phil. Chald. Fr.* 1.206.6–11 and 206.17–208.2.<sup>106</sup>

In Proclus' *Chaldaean Philosophy* extract 2, lines 207.22–208.4, also known as Proclus' *Hymn to the God or the Fire-song*:<sup>107</sup> “so, let us dedicate to God this hymn; let us leave behind the flowing substance; let us come to our true aim, *the assimilation with Him* (τὴν εἰς αὐτὸν ἔξομοίωσιν); let us come to know/understand the Master, *let us love the Father*; let us get persuaded by Him who calls us; let us run towards the heat, fleeing from the cold; *let us become fire, let us walk through the fire*; we have a free way for ascending; The Father guide us, unfolding ways of fire ...”<sup>108</sup> (“Υμνον οὖν τῷ θεῷ τοῦτον ἀναθῶμεν· καταλίπωμεν τὴν φέουσαν οὐσίαν· ἔλθωμεν ἐπὶ τὸν ἀληθῆ σκοπόν, τὴν εἰς αὐτὸν ἔξομοίωσιν· γνω-ρίσωμεν τὸν δεσπότην, ἀγαπήσωμεν<sup>109</sup> τὸν Πατέρα· καλοῦντι πεισθῶμεν· τῷ θερμῷ

106 Des Places (1971) 206–207.

107 Lewy (1978) 114–115, *Excursus IX*. See also Proclus' *Hymn* 4. 1–7, “Υμνος κοινὸς εἰς θεούς; also, *Hymn* 1.1, *Eἰς Ἡλιον. On Proclus' Hymns* 1–7, Vogt 1957; and Berg (2001).

108 Plot. *Enn.* IV.4.41.11–15; οἶνον εἰ πῦρ τις ἐκ πυρὸς λαβὼν ἔβλαψεν ἄλλον ὁ μηχανησάμενος τὴν ἔλθειν τὴν ἄλλην ἐκεῖνος ποιεῖν τῷ δεδωκέναι γοῦν τι οἶνον μετατιθέντι ἐξ ἄλλου εἰς ἄλλο· καὶ τὸ ἔληνυθός δέ, εἰ μή οἶος τε ἐγένετο δέξασθαι εἰς δόν μετηνέχθη. Also, Iamb. *Myst.* II.10.44: Εἰ γάρ τὰ ἀποπίπτοντα ἔργα τῆς αὐτοφανοῦς δείξεως τοιαῦτά ἔστιν οὐαὶ σὺ λέγεις ἀλαζονικὰ καὶ ψευδῆ, τὰ τῶν ἀληθινῶν ἀθλητῶν περὶ τὸ πῦρ γνήσια τέ ἔστι καὶ ἀληθινά.

109 This is the only case in Proclus that ἀγαπᾶ is used in relation to the Father. It could be redolent of Christian usage, where ἀγάπη is preferred to eros and thus the verb ἀγαπᾶ acquires an intensity that is lacking in pre-Christian pagan usage. On the use of the verb ἀγαπᾶ in relation to ἔρως (“love”) in Proclus see Procl. *In Alc.* I.65.20–66.1: τῷ μὲν οὖν ἀμεθέκτῳ τὸν ἔρωτα τὸν ἐν θεοῖς ἀνάλογον ληπτέον and 66.9–12, καὶ μοι δοκεῖ καὶ ὁ Πλάτων εὐρών παρ’ Ὁρφεῖ τὸν αὐτὸν τοῦτον θεόν καὶ ἔρωτα καὶ δαιμόνα μέγαν ἀποκαλούμενον ἀγαπῆσαι καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπὶ τοῦ ἔρωτος τὸν τοιούτον ὕμνον (“Plato loved himself such a praise of love”). Also, Procl. *In Alc.* I.133.14–16: Ἐγὼ γάρ, δὲ Ἀλκιβιάδη, εἰ μὲν σε ἔωραν ἀντὶ νῦν δὴ διῆλθον ἀγαπῶντα καὶ οἴμενον δεῖν ἐν τούτοις καταβιῶνται, πάλαι ἀντὶ ἀπηλλάγμην τοῦ ἔρωτος, ὡς γε δὴ ἐμαυτὸν πειθῶ. 104 E. Also, Procl. *Cra.* 70.5–6: (ὁ Πλάτων) ἐνταῦθα δέ καὶ πανταχοῦ τὸ ἔνθουν αὐτῶν ἀγαπᾷ καὶ ἀσπάζεται (“Plato loves and welcomes the inspiration of these (poets).” In Proclus' *Commentary on Plato's Timaeus*, the phrase ἀγαπᾶμεν ἀντὶ ἐμφρόνως γινώσκοντες is used in a passage containing an attack on the Christians, Procl. *In Tl.* I.369.20–370.2: οὐχὶ καὶ ὁ ἐπιτυχῶν εἴπειν *ὅν* τι περὶ θεοῦ καὶ τῆς τελικῆς αἰτίας; τί δέ; οὐ καθ’ ἐκάστην ἡμέραν πολλῶν ἔστιν ἀκούειν λεγοντῶν· ὁ θεὸς ἀγαθός; ἀλλὰ τὸ θεός δονούματι ἔστι χωρὶς ἀρετῆς, ὡς φησι Πλωτίνος [enn. 1, 2, 1 s], καὶ οὐ κατὰ φρόνσιν, ἀλλὰ κατ’ ἐπιτυχίαν λέγεται παρὰ τῶν πολλῶν. τί δέ; οὐχὶ καὶ δαιμονες γινώσκουσι τὴν ἀγαθότητα τοῦ πατρὸς οἱ περὶ αὐτὸν χορεύοντες, καὶ ὅγγελοι δημιουργικοὶ προπομπεύοντες τῆς πατρικῆς ποιήσεως, καὶ θεοὶ παραδεχόμενοι τάς ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐνὸς αἰτίου δημιουργικάς δυνάμεις; ἀλλὰ θεοὶ μὲν ἐνοειδῶς, ὅγγελοι δὲ νοερῶς, δαιμονες δὲ ἀχράντως καὶ αἰδίως καὶ συγγενῶς τοῖς πρὸ αὐτῶν· ἡμεῖς δὲ ἀγαπᾶμεν ἀντὶ ἐμφρόνως γινώσκοντες, μέσοι πως ὅντες τῶν τε θειοτέρων καὶ τῶν πολλῶν, τῶν τε νοερῶν καὶ τῶν ἀνοήτων. On “God is good ... every day” and the lines 369.19–25 Runia and Share comments: “I suspect that these remarks (369.19–25) constitute another of the veiled attacks on the Christians identified in Saffrey (1975)”; Runia and Share (2008) Vol. II: 232 n. 117.

προσδράμωμεν, τὸ ψυχρὸν ἐκφυγόντες· πῦρ γενώμεθα, διὰ πυρὸς ὁδεύσωμεν. "Ἐχομεν εὐλυτον ὁδὸν εἰς ἀνέλευσιν· Πατὴρ ὁδηγεῖ, πυρὸς ὁδοὺς ἀναπτύξας ... Procl. *Phil. Chald. Fr. 2.207.22–208.4*).<sup>110</sup>

Marinus also mentions that Proclus at the beginning of his forty-second year had said: "My soul has come breathing the spirit of fire,/ And writhing in fire having thrown the mind to the aether,/ It rises up and clamours the star-rich orbits of the immortal [soul]"<sup>111</sup> (Ψυχή μοι πνείουσα πυρὸς μένος εἰλήλουθεν, / Καὶ νόον ἀμπετάσασα πρὸς αἰθέρα πυρσοέλικτος / "Ορνυται, ἀθανάτης δὲ βρέμει πολυτειρέα κύκλα, Marin. *Vit. Procl.* 28.696–698).<sup>112</sup>

Regarding the concept of assimilation with the divine (c.f. ἔξομοιωσις in Procl. *Phil. Chald. Fr. 2*), in the final stages of the theurgic union of the magico-theurgic "Erotic binding spell of Astrapsoukos" (PGM VIII.1–63), the magician's secret knowledge of the god Hermes reaches the level of assimilation with the divine at the end of the invocation, when the magician asserts: "for you are I and I am you, your name is mine and mine is yours," σὺ γὰρ ἐγὼ καὶ ἐγὼ σύ, τὸ σὸν ὄνομα ἐμὸν καὶ τὸ ἐμὸν σόν (VIII.36–37), and then again: "I know you, Hermes, and you me. I am you and you are I," οἶδα σε, Ἐρμῆ, καὶ σὺ ἐμέ. ἐγὼ εἰμι σὺ καὶ σὺ ἐγώ (VIII.49–50).<sup>113</sup> That formula reflects influences from the Egyptian identification with the divine. For example, the Eighteenth

<sup>110</sup> Des Places (1971) 207–208.

<sup>111</sup> See also Procl. *In R. II.220.7–15*: καίτοι γε οἶδα καὶ αὐτὸς ὅτι καὶ τοῖς μέσον τῶν ἐπτὰ τὸν ἥλιον εἰπούσιν ἀστρονόμοις οὐ πάνυ δι' ἀναγκαίων τοῦτο δέδεικται λημμάτων· ὅπως δὲ ὅλως ἐπεχειρησαν, εἴπομεν ἐν τοῖς εἰς Τίμαιον [p. 257 f. sqq.] ἵνανῶς· ἀλλὰ τῶν παρὰ Χαλδαίοις θεουργῶν ἀκούσας, ὡς ἄρα διθεός ἐμετεμβόλησεν τὸν ἥλιον ἐν τοῖς ἐπτά καὶ ἀνεκρέμασεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ τὰς ἔξι ἅλλας ζώνας, καὶ τῶν θεῶν αὐτῶν, ὅτι τὸ ἥλιακόν πῦρ κραδίης τόπῳ ἐστήριξεν ...

<sup>112</sup> Masullo (1985) 85; Boissonade (1814) 23.

<sup>113</sup> The reciprocal knowledge of the individual and the god and its mystical associations is paralleled with Pentheus and Dionysus in Euripides' *Bacchae*, when Dionysus says to Pentheus: "you don't know what your life is, nor what you are doing, nor who you are," οὐκ οἶσθι· δι τι ζῆσ, οὐδὲ δι δράξ, οὐδὲ δι στις εἰ (E. *Ba.* 506), or to Cadmus at the end of the tragedy: "you understood us too late. When you should have, you did not know" (οὐδὲ διέμαθεν ήμάς, δτε δὲ χρῆν, οὐκ ηδετε), and Cadmus realises: "we have understood these things" (ἐγνώκαμεν ταῦτα E. *Ba.* 1345–1346). On knowledge see also the "Gospel of Thomas 11.2.91" of the *Nag Hammadi Library*. Also, in the "[Σύστασις πρ]ὸς Ἡλιον" (PGM III.494–611) the magician associates Helios with the 'womb of knowledge': "We understood, O womb of all Knowledge, we understood, O womb pregnant through the father's begetting, we understood, O eternal permanence of the pregnant father" (ἐγνωρίσαμεν, μήτρα πάστης γνώσεως, ἐγνωρίσαμεν, ὡς μήτρα κυνηφόρε ἐν πατρὸς φυτείᾳ, ἐγνωρίσαμεν, ὡς πατρὸς κυνηφορούμντος αἰώνιος διαμονή III.603–606). Note also the association of the wombs with the world-forming ideas in the *Chaldaean Oracles* (Orac. *Chald. Fr. 36* / Procl. *Cra.* 107.58.14–15). Knowledge is also associated with the Womb in the "Interpretation of Knowledge xi.1.3" of the *Nag Hammadi Library*.

Dynasty noble Paheri at el-Kab writes in his tomb: "I know the god who is in (my) mankind, since I perceive him".<sup>114</sup>

Furthermore, in the "Erotic binding spell of Astrapsoukos" (VIII.1–63) the theurgic union and identification between the magician and the god is justified further: "for you are I and I am you, your name is mine and mine is yours; for I am your image (ἐγώ γάρ εἰμι τὸ εἰδωλόν σου)" (VIII.36–38).<sup>115</sup> The magician's concept of himself as the εἰδωλον of Hermes alludes to Dionysiac mystical ideas and the mirror image of the "souls of men" (ἀνθρώπων δὲ ψυχαί) who see their "images," εἰδωλα "as if in the mirror of Dionysus," οἵον Διονύσου ἐν κατόπτρῳ, as expressed by Plotinus (Plot. *Enn.* IV.3.12).<sup>116</sup> Furthermore, regarding the mirror and the Athenaic souls, Proclus includes "the construction of the mirror" (ἡ γάρ τοῦ ἐσόπτρου κατασκευή) among Hephaestus' symbols of sensible

<sup>114</sup> Sethe (1907) 119/15. In the earliest religious literature of Egypt, the Pyramid Texts, deities who would assist the king's ascent to heaven were threatened by priests and practitioners. For example, in the 'slanderous' formula of the Pyramid Text spell 539 "It is she who said ... She, οὐ, said, not I," a technique of "ritual blame shifting," as described by Ritner, the ritualist is careful to shift any blame by employing the principle of divine identification. Faulkner (1969) 208; Ritner (1995) 3333–3379, esp. 3368–3373. Also, in *PGM* XIII.734–1077: "you may enter my *nous* and my *phrenes* for all the time of my life and you may accomplish for me all the wishes of my soul," εἰσέλθοις τὸν ἐμὸν νοῦν καὶ τάς ἐμάς φρένας εἰς τὸν ἀπαντά χρόνον τῆς ζωῆς μου καὶ ποιήσαις μοι πάντα τὰ θελήματα τῆς ψυχῆς μου (XIII.791–794), "for you are I and I am you," σὺ γάρ εἴ ἐγώ καὶ ἐγώ σύ (XIII.795). See also similar identifications in the *Corpus Hermeticum* V, "A discourse of Hermes to his son Tat" II: σὺ γάρ εἴ ὁ [ε]ἰναι ὁ, σὺ εἴ ὁ ἀν ποιῶ, σὺ εἴ ὁ ἀν λέγω, "for you are whatsoever I am, you are whatsoever I do, you are whatsoever I say." *Corp. Herm.* V.11. Also, in *Nag Hammadi* Library, "Gospel of Thomas" II.2. 108"; In *Cologne Mani Codex* 24.11–16: ἐπέγνων μὲν αὐτὸν καὶ συνῆκα ὅτι ἐκεῖνος ἐγώ εἰμι ἐξ οὐδεικριθην. ἐπεμαρτύρησα δὲ ὅτι ἐγώ ἔκει[το]νος αὐτός εἰμι ἀκλί[νητο]ς οὐπάρχων ... "I recognized him and I understood that I am he, whom I was separated from. I testified that I myself am he and that I am unshaken"; Henrichs and Koenen (1975) 27 and 80, n. 59 and Henrichs (1979) 340.

<sup>115</sup> See also *Genesis* 1:24; *Corp. Herm. Excerpt.* VIII A Discourse of Hermes to His Son (3); also *Corp. Herm. Excerpt.* XV From the teachings of Hermes to Ammon (2–7); see Betz (1981) 166–167; also *Corp. Herm.* V.6; also *Act. Joan.* 95:16 ff.; see also "The Prayer of Deliverance" (I.195–222) at I.211–212. Also, Paul's second Letter to the Corinthians (2 Cor 4:4).

<sup>116</sup> On the souls of men who see their εἰδωλα as if in the mirror of Dionysus see Plot. *Enn.* IV.3.12.1–5: Ἀνθρώπων δὲ ψυχαὶ εἰδωλα αὐτῶν ἰδούσαι οἵον Διονύσου ἐν κατόπτρῳ ἄνωθεν ὄρμυθεῖσαι, οὐκ ἀποτιμθεῖσαι οὐδὲ αὐταῖς τῆς ἑαυτῶν ἀρχῆς τε καὶ νοῦ. Οὐ γάρ μετὰ τοῦ νοῦ ἥλθον, ἀλλ ἐφθασαν μὲν μέχρι γῆς, κάρα δὲ αὐταῖς ἐστήρικται οὐπεράνω τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. See also Nonn. D. 6.169–206; *Orph. Fr.* 209; Kern (1972) 227; Vernant (1990) 468 ff. See also Procl. *Inst.* 185 and 195. Also, Hom. *Il.* 4.443. See also the reference to the εἰδωλον of Heracles (ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἡρακλέους τὸ εἰδωλον) and the separation of the soul from its εἰδωλον in Plot. *Enn.* I.1.12.31–39: Χωρίζειν δὲ ἔσικεν ὁ ποιητὴς τοῦτο ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἡρακλέους τὸ εἰδωλον αὐτοῦ διδούς ἐν "Αἰδου, αὐτὸν δὲ ἐν θεοῖς εἶναι ὑπ' ἀμφοτέρων τῶν λόγων κατεχόμενος, καὶ ὅτι ἐν θεοῖς καὶ ὅτι ἐν "Αἰδου" ἐμέρισε δ' οὖν. Τόχα δ' ὃν οὖτα πιθανὸς ὁ λόγος εἴη· ὅτι δή πρακτικὴν ἀρετὴν ἔχων Ἡρακλῆς καὶ ἀξιωθεῖς διὰ καλοκἀγαθίαν θεός εἶναι, ὅτι πρακτικός, ἀλλ ὁ θεωρητικός ἦν, ἵνα ἀν ὅλος ἦν ἐκεῖ, ἄνω τέ ἐστι καὶ ἔστι τι αὐτοῦ καὶ κάτω.

productivity (Procl. *Ti.* I.142.26–28),<sup>117</sup> and ascribes to Hephaestus the receipt of “the vehicles” (τὰ ὄχήματα) of the Athenaic souls (αἱ δὲ Ἀθηναῖκαι ψυχαῖ),<sup>118</sup> which “are housed in bodies created by the principles of Hephaestus and earth” (εἰσοικίζονται ἐν σώμασιν ἐκ τῶν Ἡφαίστου λόγων καὶ τῆς γῆς ὑποστᾶσι Procl. *Ti.* I.144.12–18).

### 2.13.b. “The Transmission of Fire”: Fire and Fiery Apparitions in the Chaldaean Oracles and Proclus

The Chaldaean concept of primordial divine fire and light and its association with the soul in the theurgic union is illustrated in various fragments of the *Chaldaean Oracles*. The following fragments illustrate the concept of fire and its association with the soul: “making the soul shining with fire” (τὴν ψυχὴν φέγγουσα πυρί, the *Orac. Chald. Fr. 122.1* / Procl. *Phil.Chald.* 1.206.7),<sup>119</sup> “because the soul, being a shining fire by the power of the father, remains immortal and master of life and it possesses the fulness of many wombs of the cosmos” (“Οττι ψυχή, πῦρ δυνάμει πατρὸς οὖσα φαεινόν, ἀθάνατός τε μένει καὶ ζωῆς δεσπότις ἐστὶν καὶ ἵσχει <κόσμου> πολλῶν πληρώματα κόλπων, *Fr. 96.1–3* / Psel. PG 122.1141c 7–9), “all have been generated from one fire” (εἰσὶν πάντα ἐνὸς πυρὸς ἐκγεγάωτα, *Fr. 10.1* / Psel. PG 122.1145a 4), and “for the mortal who has approached the fire will hold the light from the god” (τῷ πυρὶ γάρ βρότος ἐμπελάσας θεόθεν φάος ἔξει, *Fr. 121.1* / Procl. *In Ti.* I.211.21).<sup>120</sup>

<sup>117</sup> Procl. *Ti.* I.142.26–28: “for the construction of the mirror, smith’s work, lameness, and all such things are symbols of his [Hephaestus’] productivity in the sensible realm.” (ἥ γάρ τοῦ ἐσόπτερου κατασκευὴ καὶ ἡ χαλκεία καὶ ἡ χωλεία καὶ πάντα τὰ τοιαῦτα σύμβολα τῆς περὶ τὸ αἰσθητὸν αὐτὸν ποιήσεως ἐστι).

<sup>118</sup> ‘Souls in the procession, or under the influence of Athena’; souls of this divine procession are also mentioned in Procl. *In R.* I.108.3–109.7, a passage in which Paris is appointed judge of the goddesses Athena, Hera and Aphrodite, interpreted as a choice of three different kinds of life; Procl. *In R.* I.108.22–25: ὃ μὲν γάρ ὄντως ἐρωτικός νοῦν καὶ φρόνησιν προστησάμενος καὶ μετά τούτων τό τε ἀληθινὸν κάλλος καὶ τὸ φαινόμενον θεωρῶν οὐχ ἥσσον ἐστιν Ἀθηναῖκός ἡ Ἀφροδίσιακός·

<sup>119</sup> Des Places (1971); Lewy (1978); Majercik (1989). See also Kroll (1894). Also Pitra (1888) 192.14–15.

<sup>120</sup> *Orac. Chald. Fr. 2.1–4; Fr. 3.1–2*: ... ὁ πατὴρ ἡρπασσεν ἔαυτόν, οὐδὲ ἐν ἐῇ δυνάμει νοερῷ κλείσας ἴδιον πῦρ; *Fr. 5.1–4*: ... οὐ γάρ ἐς ὅλην πῦρ ἐπέκεινα τὸ πρῶτον ἐν δύναμιν κατακλείει: ἔργοις ἀλλὰ νόῳ· νοῦ γάρ νόος ἐστὶν ὁ κόσμου τεχνίτης πυρίου; *Fr. 6.1–2*: ὡς γάρ ὑπεζωκώς τίς ύμὴν νοερὸς διακρίνει, πῦρ πρῶτον καὶ πῦρ ἔτερον σπεύδοντα μιγῆναι. *Fr. 32.1–4; Fr. 33.1–2; Fr. 34.1–4*: ον πυρὸς ἄνθος; *Fr. 35.1–4*: ον πυρὸς ἄνθος; *Fr. 36.1–2; Fr. 37.1–16*: ον πυρὸς ἄνθος; *Fr. 38.1; Fr. 39.1–5; Fr. 42.1–3*: ον πυρὸς ἄνθος; *Fr. 47.1; 51.1–3; 58.1; 60.1–2; 65.1–2; 66.1; 67.1; 68.1–3; 73.1–3; 76.1–3; 81.1; 85.1; 126.1; 128.1–2; 133.1–2; 48.1–3; 130.1–4*; and *Fr. 223.1–5*: Τοὺς μὲν ἀπορρήτοις ἐρήμων ἵνγξιν ἀπ’ αἴθρης ῥήθισίως ἀέκοντας ἐπὶ χθόνα τήνδε κατήγεις, τοὺς δὲ μέσους μεσάτοισιν ἐπεμβεβαῖτας ἀήταις νόσφι πυρὸς θείοι πανομφέας ὥσπερ ὀνείρους εἰσκρίνεις μερόπεστιν, ἀεί κέα δαιμονας ἔρδων.

In *Fragment 146 of the Chaldaean Oracles*, also included in Proclus' *Commentary on Plato's Republic*, the theurgist when invoking the deity has fiery apparitions similar to a rich light, or the image of a child riding a horse, or a horse itself:

[for it is said] after having invoked these, you will either see a fire similar to a child, stretching by leaps over the swelling of air; or you will see a formless fire from which a voice is sent forth; or you will see an abundant light rushing like a spiral around the field; but you may even see a horse more lightening than light, or even a child riding upon the quick back of a horse, [a child] *fiery or covered with gold or again naked*, or even shooting and standing on the back [of a horse].

... ταῦτ' (γάρ φησιν) ἐπιφωνήσας ἡ παιδὶ κατόψῃ πῦρ ἵκελον σκιρτηδὸν ἐπ' ἡέρος οἰδμα τιταῖνον· ἡ καὶ πῦρ ἀτύπωτον, ὅθεν φωνὴν προθέουσαν· ἡ φῶς πλούσιον ἀμφὶ γύνην ροιζαῖον ἐλιχθέν· ἀλλὰ καὶ ἵππον ἰδεῖν φωτὸς πλέον ἀστράπτοντα ἡ καὶ παιδία θοοῖς νώτοις ἐποχούμενον ἵππου, ἔμπυρον ἡ χρυσῷ πεπυκασμένον ἡ πάλι γυμνόν, ἡ καὶ τοξεύοντα καὶ ἐστηῶτ' ἐπὶ νώτοις. *Orac. Chald. Fr. 146.2–8/ Procl. In R. 1.111.2–12.*<sup>121</sup>

Proclus in his *Commentary on Plato's Republic*, which actually precedes the above mentioned passage, refers to all the hieratic treatises (*ταῖς ιερατικαῖς ἀπάσαις πραγματείαις*) and *teletai* [initiatory rites] and the mysteries and the epiphanies of the gods (*ταῖς τελεταῖς καὶ τοῖς μυστηρίοις καὶ ταῖς τῶν θεῶν ἐπιφανείαις*), stating that, “For in all these, the gods set forth many forms of themselves, and they appear to change into many shapes; sometimes there appears their formless light, sometimes [there appears] to have been shaped into a human form, and other times having advanced a different form. The god-given mystical doctrine hands down these [teachings] too.” (ἐν ἀπασὶ γάρ τούτοις οἱ θεοὶ πολλὰς μὲν ἔαυτῶν προτείνουσι μορφάς, πολλὰ δὲ σχήματα ἔξαλλάττοντες φαίνονται· καὶ τότε μὲν ἀτύπωτον αὐτῶν προβέβληται φῶς, τότε δὲ εἰς ἀνθρώπου μορφὴν ἐσχηματισμένον, τότε δὲ εἰς ἀλλοῖον τύπον προεληλυθός. καὶ ταῦτα καὶ ἡ θεοπαράδοτος μυσταγωγία παραδίδωσιν Procl. *In R. 1.110.21–111.2*).

Fiery apparitions are generally associated with divine revelations and epiphanies in magic literature. For example, in the “Lunar spell of Klaudianus and ritual of heaven and the Bear constellation over lunar offerings” (*PGM VII.862–918*), the epiphany of the goddess Selene is associated with a fiery vision of the goddess. The magician summons “Mistress Selene the Egyptian” (*VII.871*)

<sup>121</sup> See also Lewy (1978) 240 and n. 52; and Baltzly, Finamore and Miles (2018) 224, n. 179.

to send her “sacred angel or assistant” (ἱερὸν ἄγγελον ἢ πάρεδρον, VII.883) to become the magician’s assistant. The moment of Selene’s epiphany in which the goddess is magically efficient is associated with an allusion to the visual image of a physical phenomenon, that of fire: “but when you see the goddess becoming fiery red (πυρράν), know that she is, already, attracting (ἄγει ἡδη)” (VII.889–890).<sup>122</sup>

In *Fr. 146* of the *Chaldaean Oracles* (/Procl. *In R. I.111.2–12*) the visions of fire and light or boys, or archers and horses are associated with the epiphanies of Hecate.<sup>123</sup> Boys, or archers are invoked as *biaiothanatoi* or *aoroi*—the spirits of the dead who suffered a violent death, or died before their time—in the Greek magical papyri and the theurgical rites to assist the magicians/theurgists in their rituals.<sup>124</sup> Furthermore, Hecate is associated with horse images in the Greek magical papyri, as revealed in her epithets as “horse-faced goddess” (ἰπποπόσωπε θεά, *PGM* IV.2549), “half-mare half-bitch” (ἰπποκύων, *PGM* IV.2614) and “earth mare” (ἰππόχθων, *PGM* IV.2755). Generally, horse images are used in magic rituals, such as “earth mare” (ἰππόχθων, *PGM* III.548–549 in the *maskelli maskello* formula; also, in same formula in IV.3177, IX.10, XII.291–292, XXXVI.344, LXXVIII.10, XIXA.10–11).<sup>125</sup>

Marinus in *Proclus* reports Proclus’ experience of Hecate’s self-revelations after performing certain Chaldaean purification rituals, “But before these, the philosopher after being purified in due order by the Chaldaean purifications, invoked flame-like [fiery] revelations for direct revelation [vision] of Hecate, as he himself has recorded in one of his own treatises.” (Πρὸ δὲ τούτων ἐν τάξει ὁ φιλόσοφος τοῖς Χαλδαϊκοῖς καθαρμοῖς καθαιρόμενος, φάσμασι μὲν Ἐκατικοῖς φωτοειδέστιν αὐτοπτουμένοις ὡμίλησεν, ὡς καὶ αὐτός που μέμνηται ἐν ἴδιῳ συγγράμματι. *Marin. Vit. Procl.* 28.683–686).

Porphyry also in *De philosophia ex oraculis* refers to the *synthēmata* (συνθήματα) and the fiery images (πυρόεσσιν εἰδώλοις) of Hecate’s revelations.<sup>126</sup>

<sup>122</sup> On the association of angels and fire, as from where they emerged, see the Jewish Book of Mysteries *Sepher Ha-Razim*; Morgan (1983) 21. On divine epiphanies and their signs see Pachoumi (2011a) 155–165.

<sup>123</sup> On *Fr. 146* see also discussion by Lewy (1978) 240–241; and Majercik (1989) 195–196.

<sup>124</sup> On *aoroi* and *biaiothanatoi* see Pachoumi (2017) 41, 119–121.

<sup>125</sup> Also, “driver of horses” (Ιπποκελεφοκλωψ, XII.300), “stallion” (ἴππου ἄρσενος, IV.65), “horses” (ἴππους, IV.472, 822, 2140), “horse” (ἴππος, VII.781), “hippopotamus” (ἴπποπό[τα] μον, III.524 and XIII.309, 318), and “horses” ([ἴπ]ποι, XX.18–19).

<sup>126</sup> Porph. *De Phil. Or. II.151.165–173*: “Ἐν χρηστήριον ἔτι παραθείς, δπερ αὐτὴ ἡ Ἐκάτη πεποίηται, καταπαύσω τὸν περὶ ταύτης λόγον: “Ηδ’ ἐγώ εἰμι κόρη πολυφάσματος, οὐρανόφοιτος, /ταυρῶπις, τρικάρηνος, ἀπηνῆς, χρυσοβέλεμνος, /Φοίβη ἀπειρ〈ολεχής〉, φαεσίμβροτος, Εἰλείθυια, /τριστοῖχου φύσεως συνθήματα τριστά φέρουσα: /αι〈θέρα〉 μὲν πυρόεσσιν ἐειδομένη εἰδώλοις, /ήέρα δ’ ἀργεννοῖσι τροχάσματιν ἀμφικάθημαι: /γα〈ιν〉 ἔμῶν σκυλάκων δνοφερῷ γέ〈νει〉 ἡνιοχε〈ύω〉.

In addition to the Chaldaean rituals of fire, Eusebius in his *Praeparatio Evangelica* also offers an Egyptian aspect of worshiping fire, reporting his contemporary Egyptian cult of ‘water and fire’ in the worship of Sarapis (Ὥς που ἔτι καὶ νῦν ἐν τῇ ἀνοίξει τοῦ ἀγίου Σαράπιδος ἡ θεραπεία διὰ πυρὸς καὶ ὄδατος γίνεται, Eus. PE III.4.9.3–4).<sup>127</sup>

### 2.13.c. “The Transmission of Fire”: Fire and the Immortalisation Ritual in Proclus

Proclus in his *Commentary on Plato’s Republic* points out that according to his teacher Syrianus the fire ritual and the libations that the Achilles offered at Patroclus’ funeral imitated the *immortalisation ritual of the soul by the theurgist*, “Then if it is necessary even to remember the most secret of the contemplations by our teacher [Syrianus], it must be said that the whole ritual about that fire of Achilles *imitates the immortalisation ritual (apathanatismos) of the soul by the theurgist*, elevating the soul of Patroclus into the supreme life.” (εἰ δὲ δεῖ καὶ τῶν ἀπορρητότερον ὑπὸ τοῦ καθηγεμόνος ἡμῶν<sup>128</sup> τεθεωρημένων κανὸν τούτοις ποιήσασθαι μνήμην, ρήτεον ὅτι πάσα ή περὶ τὴν πυρὰν ἔκεινην τοῦ Ἀχιλλέως πραγματεία μικεῖται τὸν παρὰ τοῖς θεουργοῖς τῆς ψυχῆς ἀπαθανατισμὸν εἰς τὴν χωριστὴν ζωὴν ἀνάγουσα τὴν τοῦ Πατρόκλου ψυχήν. Procl. *In R.* I.152.7–12).<sup>129</sup>

Proclus then describes the manifestation of the vehicle and the return of the divine soul to its own sphere, “Thus, standing before the fire, he [Achilles] summons the winds, Boreas and Zephyrus, (*Il.* 23.194–195), so that the manifested vehicle (τὸ φαίνομενον ὅχημα)<sup>130</sup> might acquire the appropriate care (θεραπείας)

127 Eus. PE III.4.9.1–6 and 10.1: τῶν θεῶν παρέσχεν ἔθρήσκευσαν. ὄδωρ δὲ καὶ πῦρ σέβονται, τὰ καλλιστα τῶν στοιχείων, ὡς ταῦτα αἰτιώτατα τῆς σωτηρίας ἡμῶν, καὶ ταῦτα δεικνύντες ἐν τοῖς ιεροῖς, ὡς που ἔτι καὶ νῦν ἐν τῇ ἀνοίξει τοῦ ἀγίου Σαράπιδος ἡ θεραπεία διὰ πυρὸς καὶ ὄδατος γίνεται, λείβοντος τοῦ ὄμνῳδού τὸ ὄδωρ καὶ τὸ πῦρ φαίνοντος, ὀπηγίκα ἐστὼς ἐπὶ τοῦ οὐδοῦ τῇ πατριώ τῶν Αἰγυπτίων φωνῇ ἐγείρει τὸν θέον.

128 Procl. *In R.* I.152.7: ὑπὸ τοῦ καθηγεμόνος ἡμῶν: this is a common reference to Proclus’ teacher Syrianus; for other references to Syrianus as καθηγεμών in Procl. *In R.* see e.g. I.115.27–29: προσκείσθω δὲ καὶ ἡ τοῦ καθηγεμόνος ἡμῶν ἐπιβολή, τῆς τε Ὁμηρικῆς διανοίας στοχαζομένη καὶ τῆς τῶν πραγμάτων ἀληθείας; I.133.5–7: ὁ μὲν οὖν ἡμέτερος καθηγεμών προιηγουμένη καταβαλλόμενος πραγματείαν εἰς τούτον ἀπαντά τὸν μύθον ἐνθεαστικώτατα τὴν ἀπόρρητον αὐτοῦ θεωρίαν ἐξέφρηνεν; I.153.2–3; καὶ ὅλως πολλὰ τῆς ὑπονοίας ταύτης λάβοι τις ἄν τεκμήρια τοῖς τοῦ καθηγεμόνος ἡμῶν ἐντυχών; I.205.21–22: ταῦτα, ὡς φίλοι ἐταῖροι, μνήμη κεχαρίσθω τῆς τοῦ καθηγεμόνος ἡμῶν συνουσίας.

129 On *apathanatismos* see Lewy (1978) 184–211, Sheppard (1980) 76–77, Liefferinge (2000b) 99–119, Finamore (2004) 123–137, Majercik (1989) 38ff., Pachoumi (2017) 60, 77, 82, 94.

130 On ὅχημα of the soul and the purification ritual see *Orac. Chald. Fr.* 120: ψυχῆς λεπτὸν ὅχημα, “delicate vehicle of the soul”; also *Fr.* 119 and *Fr.* 129: Σώζετε καὶ τὸ πικρᾶς ὄλης περιβλημα

through their manifest movement, and the more divine than this [vehicle] might invisibly be purified and return to its own sphere (λῆξιν<sup>131</sup>), drawn up by the aerial and lunar and solar rays;<sup>132</sup> and, as one of the gods says, it is said that during the whole night he [Achilles] was pouring libations on fire."<sup>133</sup> (διὸ καὶ στὰς πρὸ τῆς πυρᾶς ἐπικαλεῖσθαι λέγεται τοὺς ἀνέμους, Βορρᾶν καὶ Ζέφυρον [Il. Ψ 194], ἵνα καὶ τὸ φαινόμενον ὄχημα διὰ τῆς ἐμφανοῦς αὐτῶν κινήσεως τύχῃ τῆς πρεπούσης θεραπείας, καὶ τὸ τούτου θειότερον ἀφανῶς καθαρθῆ καὶ εἰς τὴν οἰκείαν ἀποκαταστῇ λῆξιν, ὑπὸ τῶν ἀερίων καὶ τῶν σεληναίων καὶ τῶν ἡλιακῶν αὐγῶν ἀνελκόμενον, ὃς πού φησίν τις τῶν θεῶν, καὶ πάννυχος ἐπισπένδειν παραδέδοται τῇ πυρᾷ Procl. *In R. I.152.12–19*).

Proclus also analyses the symbolisms of the manifestation of the vehicle, the golden crater, the libation offerings and the fire, “when the poet all but

---

βρότειον, “Save also the mortal covering of the bitter matter”; and *Fr. 158*: Οὐδὲ τὸ τῆς ὅλης σκύβαλον κρημνῷ καταλείψεις, ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰδώλῳ μερὶς εἰς τόπον ἀμφιφάοντα. “You will not leave behind the dung of matter on a cliff, but there is also a place for the image in a region visible in light all round.” On mortal and immortal elements of the soul see Procl. *Ti. III.234.32–235.9*: τρίτοι δὲ ἀδὲ εἰσιν οἱ πάσταν φθορὰν ἀνελόντες ἀπὸ τε τοῦ ὄχήματος καὶ τῆς ἀλογίας καὶ εἰς ταύτον ὅγοντες τὴν τε τοῦ ὄχήματος διαμονὴν καὶ τὴν τοῦ ἀλόγου καὶ τὸ θνητὸν ἐπ’ αὐτοῦ τὸ σωματοειδές καὶ περὶ τὴν ὥλην ἐπτομένον καὶ ἐπικελούμενον τῶν θνητῶν ἔξηγούμενοι, ὃς Ἰάμβλιχος οἴεται καὶ ὅσιοι τούτῳ συνάφειν ἀξιούσι, καὶ οὐχ ἀπλῶς ἀπὸ τῶν σωμάτων τῶν θείων αὐτῷ διδόντες τὴν ὑπόστασιν, ἵνα δὴ γενόμενον ἐκ κινουμένων αἰτίων καὶ μεταβλητὸν ἥ κατὰ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ φύσιν, ἀλλ’ ἀπὸ τῶν θεῶν αὐτῶν τῶν κόσμου κατευθυνόντων καὶ πάντα διαιωνίως ποιούντων. On τὸ φαινόμενον ὄχημα and the disputed phrase τὸ τούτου θειότερον ἀφανῶς καθαρθῆ see also discussion in Lewy (1978) 184–185, Sheppard (1980) 76–77, and Baltzly, Finamore and Miles (2018) 266, n. 290. Also, Dodds (1933) 319–320. On Achilles’ ritual activities and the theurgical practises see also Miles (2022) 877–888.

131 On λῆξις as the “assigned sphere” see *LsJ*, e.g. *Jul. Or. 6.8.9–10*: Ἐγώ δὲ ὑπὲρ τῶν θεῶν καὶ τῶν εἰς θείαν λῆξιν πορευθέντων εὐφημεῖν ἐθέλων πείθομαι ..., *Lib. Or. 12.36*: τούτῳ γάρ δὴ τιμᾷ τὴν τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς λῆξιν ...

132 See also similar invocation to “Ether, Sun, pneuma of the moon, leaders of the air /winds” (Procl. *In Ti. III.61.16*) and “streams of the air /winds” (III.61.19) in the Chaldaean fragment *Orac. Chald. Fr. 61* of a hymn/invocation quoted in Procl. *In Ti. III.61.12–25*: αἰθέριός τε δρόμος καὶ μήνης ἀπλετος ὄρμῃ, φησίν, ἡερίοι τε ροσί. καὶ πάλιν· αἰθήρ ἥλιε πνεύμα σελήνης ἡέρος ἀγοι. καὶ ἐν ἀλλοις· ἡλιακῶν τε κύκλων καὶ μηναίων καναχισμῶν κόλπων τ’ ἡερίων. καὶ ἔξης· αἰθρίς μέρος ἡελίου τε καὶ μήνης ὄχετῶν ἡδὲ ἡέρος. καὶ ἀλλοχοῦ· καὶ πλατύς ἀήρ μηναίος τε δρόμος καὶ αἴτιος ἡελίοι.

133 On the theurgical ascending of the separated soul see *Orac. Chald. Fr. 110*: “Διζεο *καὶ* ψυχῆς ὄχετόν, θεῖν ἐν τινι τάξει σώματι θητεύσασ’ *〈*ὑπέβη καὶ πῶς*〉* ἐπὶ τάξιν αὐθις ἀναστήσεις, ἵερῷ λόγῳ ἔργον ἐνώσας.” In relation to the assistance of the angels and role of the fire in the soul’s ascending see *Orac. Chald. Fr. 122*: ἡ δὲ τῶν ἀγγέλων μερὶς πῶς ἀνάγει ψυχήν; “τὴν ψυχὴν φέγγουσα πυρί ...”, “how does the class of angels make the soul to ascend? by making the soul shining with fire” and *Orac. Chald. Fr. 123*: ... πνεύματι θερμῷ κονφίζουσα ... “lightening [the soul] with warm pneuma”; on hymns and prayers for the ascending of the soul see *Orac. Chald. Fr. 131* and 140.

proclaims to us that Achilles' ritual was about the soul of his friend and not only about the manifested vehicle (*ochéma*), and that all [the rituals] have been undertaken symbolically by him [Achilles]. The golden crater<sup>134</sup> is also a symbol of the spring of the souls, and the libation is the symbol of influence from there conducting a better life for the divided soul, and the fire is the symbol of the immaculate purity<sup>135</sup> which can lead away from the bodies to the unseen." (μονονουχὶ κηρύττοντος ἡμῖν τοῦ ποιητοῦ, καὶ ὅτι περὶ τὴν τοῦ φίλου ψυχὴν ἡ πραγματεία τοῦ Ἀχιλλέως ἦν, ἀλλ' οὐ περὶ τὸ φαινόμενον μόνον, καὶ ὅτι πάντα συμβολικῶς αὐτῷ παρεῖληπται, καὶ ὁ χρυσοῦς κρατήρ τῆς πηγῆς τῶν ψυχῶν, καὶ ἡ σπονδὴ τῆς ἐκεῖθεν ἀπορροίας κρείττονα ζωὴν ἐποχετευούσης τῇ μερικῇ ψυχῇ, καὶ ἡ πυρὰ τῆς ἀχράντου καθαρότητος τῆς εἰς τὸ ἀφανές περιάγειν ἀπὸ τῶν σωμάτων δυναμένης. Procl. *In R. I.152.23–153.2*).

Proclus in his *Commentary on Plato's Timaeus* mentions that the Athenaic souls receive "their vehicles" (τὰ ὄχήματα) by Hephaestus, "But the Athenaic souls actually, according to this activity of Hephaestus, receive their vehicles from him, and are housed in bodies created by the principles of Hephaestus and earth, principles that have received Athenaic *synthémata*. For this is the initiator god who gives bodies their pre-natural perfection, imposing on different bodies different symbols of the divine." (αἱ δὲ Ἀθηναϊκαὶ ψυχαὶ μάλιστα κατὰ ταύτην τοῦ Ἡφαίστου τὴν ἐνέργειαν δέχονται τὰ ὄχήματα παρ' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰσοικίζονται ἐν σώμασιν ἐκ τῶν Ἡφαίστου λόγων καὶ τῆς γῆς ὑποστάσιν, τῶν λόγων Ἀθηναϊκὰ συνθήματα λαβόντων οὗτος γάρ ἐστιν ὁ πρὸ τῆς φύσεως τελεστὴς τῶν σωμάτων ἄλλοις ἄλλα σύμβολα τῶν θείων ἐπιτιθείς. Procl. *Ti. I.144.12–18*).

Proclus also quoting the *Chaldaean Oracle* 130<sup>136</sup> writes about strong fires coming down from the father and nourishing the soul, "Thus, wherefore also the souls by perceiving the works of the father, 'flee the ruthless wing of allotted fate,' as the oracle says; 'and remain in god, drawing on the strong fires coming down from the father; from these [fires], the soul harvests the soul-nourished flower of the fiery fruits as they are descending.'" (διὸ καὶ νοήσασαι τὰ ἔργα τοῦ πατρὸς μοίρης τείμαρμένης<sup>137</sup> τὸ πτερὸν φεύγουσιν ἀναιδές, ὡς φησι τὸ λόγιον [Orac.

134 Hom. *Il.23.218–221*: ὃ δὲ πάννυχος ὡκὺς Ἀγιλλεὺς χρυσέου ἐκ κρητῆρος, ἐλών δέπας ἀμφικύπελλον οἶνον ἀφυσσόμενος χαμάδις χέε, δεῦνε δὲ γαῖαν, ψυχὴν κικλήσκων Πατροκλῆος δειλοῖο. See also Procl. *In R. I.152.20–21*.

135 On purity and the purification ritual see Comm.: Sect. 6.6–8.a on purification rituals below.  
 136 Des Places (1971).

137 τείμαρμένης Kroll (1906) II: 266; τείμαρμένης *Orac. Chald. Fr. 54* Kroll (1894) 54, c.f. esp. n. 1 on είμαρτὸν; cod. είμαρτὸν πτερὸν ἐκφεύγουσιν; but είμαρτῆς *Orac. Chald. Fr. 130* Des Places (1971) 98, which reads better for metrical reasons.

*Chald. Fr. 54]*: ἐν δὲ θεῷ κείνται πυρσοὺς ἔλκουσαι ὀκμαίους ἐκ πατρόθεν κατιόντας, ἀφ' ὧν ψυχὴ κατιόντων ἐμπυρίων δρέπεται καρπῶν ψυχοτρόφον ἀνθος. Procl. *Ti. III.266.18–23/ Orac. Chald. Fr. 130. 1–6*<sup>138</sup>).

The emperor Julian also in his fifth Oration “On the Mother of Gods” mentions the Chaldaean ascent of the soul through its initiation to the theurgic mystery related to the seven-rayed god, “If I was to engage in the secret mystery in which the Chaldaean was initiated in bacchic frenzy concerning the seven-rayed god, causing the ascent of the souls though his agency [the Chaldaean’s], I should say unknown things, unknown especially to the mob, but known to the blessed theurgists.” (Εἰ δὲ καὶ τῆς ἀρρήτου μυσταγωγίας ὀψιάμην, ἦν δὲ Χαλδαῖος περὶ τὸν ἐπτάκτινα θεὸν ἐβάκχευσεν ἀνάγων δι’ αὐτοῦ τὰς ψυχάς, ἄγνωστα ἐρῶ, καὶ μάλα γε ἄγνωστα τῷ συρφετῷ, θεουργοῖς δὲ τοῖς μακαρίοις γνώριμα· διόπερ αὐτὰ σιωπήσω ταῦν. *Jul. Or. 5.12.28–33*).

Proclus in his *Commentary on Plato’s Republic* refers to the hieratic words,<sup>139</sup> which aim at separating the soul from the body in the theurgic ritual of the ascent of the soul, “for the hieratic words/teachings accomplish this, separating the souls from the bodies, ... producing to the souls the absolute activity of the bodies and the release of the natural bonds” (καὶ γὰρ οἱ ἱερατικοὶ λόγοι τοῦτο δρῶσιν, χωρίζοντες ἀπὸ τῶν σωμάτων τὰς ψυχάς, ... ταῖς δὲ ψυχαῖς τὴν ἀπόλυτον τῶν σωμάτων προξενοῦντες ἐνέργειαν καὶ τὴν ἀφεσιν τῶν φυσικῶν δεσμῶν Procl. *In R. II.119.5–9*).<sup>140</sup>

Moreover, Plato earlier in *Phaedo* presents the separation of the soul from the bonds of the body as part of the purification ritual, “Is this not purification consequently, exactly as was said in our discourse some time ago, namely, to separate the soul from the body as far as possible and to accustom it to assemble and gather itself together out of every part of the body, and to dwell by itself as much as possible both now and hereafter, released, just as from the bonds of the body?” (Κάθαρσις δὲ εἶναι ἀρά οὐ τοῦτο συμβαίνει, ὅπερ πάλαι ἐν τῷ λόγῳ λέγεται, τὸ χωρίζειν ὅτι μάλιστα ἀπὸ τοῦ σώματος τὴν ψυχὴν καὶ ἔθισαι αὐτὴν καθ’ αὐτὴν παντοχόθεν ἐκ τοῦ σώματος συναγείρεσθαι τε καὶ ἀθροίζεσθαι, καὶ οἰκεῖν κατὰ τὸ

138 Des Places (1971) 98; Majercik (1989) 98.

139 See also Procl. *In R. II.66.13–14*: “the hieratic way of invocations,” *〈ὅ〉 ἱερατικὸς τρόπος τῆς ἀγωγῆς*.

140 Regarding the ascent of the soul and the role of the vehicle see also Procl. *In R. II.154.17–26*: καὶ γάρ οἱ τῆδε τελεστικοὶ τάξεώς εἰσι τοιαύτης· θέει ἄγγελος ἐν δυνάμει ζῶν, φησὶν τὸ λόγιον, δῆστις ἔστιν ὡς ἀληθῶς ἱερατικός· γίνεται οὖν ἐπόπτης μὲν τῶν ἀφανῶν, ἄγγελος δὲ τοῖς ἐμφανέσιν ὁ αὐτός διόπερ αὐτὸν οἱ δικασταὶ κελεύουσιν ὄραν τὰ ἐν τῷ τόπῳ πάντα καὶ ἀκούειν, τόπον μὲν δῆπου τοῦ μύθου λέγοντος τὸν παρὰ τοῖς δικασταῖς ἐντεῦθεν γάρ ὡς ἐκ περιωπῆς ὅλον τὸν κόσμον καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῷ καθοράν, τὰ μὲν ἀσώματα τοῖς ἀσωμάτοις ὅμμασιν τῆς ψυχῆς, τὰ δὲ σωματικὰ τοῖς τοῦ αὐγοειδοῦς ὄχηματος.

δυνατὸν καὶ ἐν τῷ νῦν παρόντι καὶ ἐν τῷ ἔπειτα μόνην καθ' αὐτήν, ἐκλυομένην ὥσπερ [έκ] δεσμῶν ἐκ τοῦ σώματος; Pl. *Phd.* 67c.5–67d.2).

**2.13.d. “The Transmission of Fire”: Fire and the Immortalisation Ritual in Magic Rituals and the Chaldaean Oracles**

In the invocation (*PGM* IV.485–537) which contains an immortalisation ritual (*apathanatismos*) and is part of the so-called “Mithras Liturgy” (*PGM* IV.475–829, IV CE)—c.f. ἀθανασίαν ἀξιῶ IV.477, ὁ ἀπαθανατισμὸς οὗτος IV.748—the magician prays to the origin (*γένεσις* and ἀρχή)<sup>141</sup> and to the four elements (*πνεύμα*, πῦρ, ὕδωρ and οὐσία γεώδης, IV.485–494), with fire, πῦρ described as “the sacred fire” (τὸ ἱερὸν πῦρ, IV.512) and “fire, given by god to my mixture of the mixtures in me” (πῦρ, τὸ εἰς ἐμὴν κράσιν τῶν ἐν ἐμοὶ κράσεων θεοδώρητον, IV.490–491).<sup>142</sup> The aim of the immortalisation ritual is: “in order that I may oversee the *immortal principle* (τὴν ἀθάνατον ἀρχήν) with the immortal spirit ... with the immortal water ... with the firmest air ... in order that I may be born again in thought ... and the sacred spirit may breathe in me ... in order that I may marvel at the *sacred fire* (τὸ ἱερὸν πῦρ) ... in order that I may gaze upon the unfathomable, frightful water of the dawn ... and the life-giving and encompassing ether may hear me” (ἴνα ... ἐποπτεύσω τὴν ἀθάνατον ἀρχὴν τῷ ἀθανάτῳ πνεύματι ... τῷ ἀθανάτῳ ὕδατι ... τῷ στερεωτάτῳ ἀέρι ... ἴνα νοήματι μεταγενε<ν>ηθῶ ... καὶ πνεύσῃ ἐν ἐμοὶ τὸ ἱερὸν πνεύμα ... ἴνα θαυμάσω τὸ ἱερὸν πῦρ ... ἴνα θεάσωμαι τὸ ἀβύσσον τῆς ἀνατολῆς φρικτὸν ὕδωρ<sup>143</sup> ... καὶ ἀκούσῃ μου ὁ ζωγόνος καὶ περικεχυμένος αἰθήρ, IV.502–515).<sup>144</sup>

In the “Mithras Liturgy” (*PGM* IV.474–829) also the initiated magician tutors his fellow initiate about the elevation of his soul and the moment his soul is in the air and the divine order of the heaven is revealed, “Draw in breath from the rays, drawing up three times as much as you can, and you will see yourself

<sup>141</sup> *PGM* IV.485 ff.: [Γ]ένεσις πρώτη τῆς ἐμῆς γενέσεως ... ἀρχὴ τῆς ἐμῆς ἀρχῆς<ς> πρώτη.

<sup>142</sup> Betz supports the notion that the reference to the four elements here implies influences from the Pre-Socratics and, particularly, Empedocles, and from Stoic cosmology. On the four elements and *κράσις* see the discussion in Betz (2003) 105 and 107–108. Also, Dieterich (1891) 57–60 and 83 ff.; Dieterich (1966) 55, 58 ff., 78 ff.; Merkelbach and Totti (1992) Vol. III: 234; Kingsley (1996) 374–375.

<sup>143</sup> The reference to φρικτὸν ὕδωρ, “frightful water” may allude to the phrase of the Orphic gold tablets ψυχρὸν ὕδωρ, “frigid water”, as for example: ψυχρὸν ὕδορ (*l. -ωρ*) (12) in the Orphic gold tablet from Hipponion (400 BCE), ψυχρὸν ὕδωρ (9) in the Orphic gold tablet from Petelia (4th c. BCE), [ψυχρὸν ὕδωρ] (14) in the Orphic gold tablet from Entella (3rd c. BCE); and ψυχρὸν ὕδωρ (5) in the Orphic gold tablet from Pharsalos (350–300 BCE). Graf and Johnston (2007).

<sup>144</sup> Betz following Dieterich argues for Stoic influences on the “Mithras Liturgy” (IV.475–829). Betz (2003) 89–90, 114 ff., 118; Dieterich (1966).

being lifted up and ascending in regard to the height, so that you seem to be in the middle of the air. You will hear of neither a man, nor any other living thing, nor will you see anything of mortals on earth in that hour, but you will see all immortal things. For you will see the divine position [setting] of that day and hour, the presiding [planetary] gods ascending to heaven, and others descending. Now the course of the visible gods will appear through the disk, my father, god; and similarly, the so-called pipe, the origin of the ministering wind. For you will see it hanging from the sun's disk like a pipe." (Ἔλκε ἀπὸ τῶν ἀκτίνων πνεῦμα γ' ἀνασπῶν, ὃ δύνα[σ]αι, καὶ ὅψη σεαυτὸν ἀνακουφίζόμενον [κ]αὶ ὑπερβαίνοντα εἰς ὑψος, ὡστε σε δοκεῖ[ν μ]έσον τοῦ ἀέρος εἶναι. οὐδενὸς δὲ ἀκούσει [ο]ὗτε ἀνθρώπου οὕτε ζώου ἄλλο[ου], οὐδὲ ὅψη οὐδέν τῶν ἐπὶ γῆς θητῶν ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ, πάντα δὲ ὅψη ἀθάνατα· ὅψη γάρ ἐκείνης τῆς ἡμέρας καὶ τῆς ὥρας θείαν θέσιν, τοὺς πολεύοντας ἀναβαίνοντας εἰς οὐρανὸν θεούς, ἄλλους δὲ καταβαίνοντας. ἡ δὲ πορεία τῶν ὄρωμένων θεῶν διὰ τοῦ δίσκου, πατρός μου, θεοῦ, φανήσεται, ὄμοίως δὲ καὶ δὲ καλούμενος αὐλός, ἡ ἀρχὴ τοῦ λειτουργούμντος ἀνέμου· ὅψη γάρ ἀπὸ τοῦ δίσκου ὡς αὐλὸν κρεμάμενον.

*PGM IV.538–551).*

At that moment the fellow initiate is instructed in the following words, “and do you put immediately your right finger on your mouth and say: ‘silence, silence, silence, symbol of living, incorruptible god; silence, guard me ...’” (‘σιγή, σιγή, σιγή, σύμβολον θεοῦ ζῶντος ἀφθάρτου· φύλαξόν με, σιγὴ νεχθειρ θανμελου’ *PGM IV.558–561*).<sup>145</sup>

Thus, the concepts of “sacred fire,” “immortal principle” and “principle of fire” in the “Mithras Liturgy” (*PGM IV.475–829*) reflect Chaldaean influences. In regard to the concept of fire, the cosmos in the Chaldaean system is divided into three world-circles, “the empyrean, the ethereal and the hylic” (<πυρίη γ' ἡδ' αἰθερίη καὶ ὑλώδης>, *Orac. Chald. Fr. 76.3 / Dam. In Prm. II.59.23–25, 88.3–5*).<sup>146</sup> The “paternal Nous,” Νοῦς πατρός in the doctrine of the *Chaldaean Oracles* created the “many-formed ideas” (παμμόρφους ιδέας, *Fr. 37.1–2 / Procl. In Prm. 800.20–801.5*), or the “primordial ideas” (ἀρχεγόνους ιδέας, *Fr. 37.15 / Procl. In Prm. 800.20–801.5*). These primordial ideas, identified with the triadic principles,<sup>147</sup> were separated into “other noetic” ideas (εἰς ἄλλας νοεράς)<sup>148</sup> after

<sup>145</sup> On silence as the symbol of the god see Betz (2003) 147–148; on secrecy in the Greek magical papyri see Betz (1995) 153–175.

<sup>146</sup> *Orac. Chald. Fr. 76.1–3 / Dam. In Prm. II.59.23–25, 88.3–5*: Πολλαὶ μέν δὴ αἱδεῖς ἐπεμβαίνουσι φαεινοῖς κόσμοις ἐνθρώπουσαι· ἐν αἵς ἀκρότητες ἔασιν τρεῖς· <πυρίη γ' ἡδ' αἰθερίη καὶ ὑλώδης>; on the three worlds see also Lewy (1978) 137–157 and n. 270.

<sup>147</sup> See *Orac. Chald. Fr. 40.1 / Dam. In Prm. II.200.23–24*: ἀρχάς, αἱ πατρὸς ἔργα ...; and *Orac. Chald. Fr. 49.3 / Procl. In Tl. III.14.3–10*: πάσαις πνηγαῖς τε καὶ ἀρχαῖς.

<sup>148</sup> See also ἔννοιαι νοεράι, “noetic thoughts” (*Orac. Chald. Fr. 37.13 / Procl. In Prm. 800.20–801.5*).

having been divided “by noetic fire” (*νοερῷ πυρί*, *Fr.* 37.4–5 / Procl. *In Prm.* 800.20–801.5).<sup>149</sup> Elsewhere in the *Chaldaean Oracles* there is a similar reference to the “fiery nous” (*πύριον νοῦν*, *Fr.* 128.1 / Psel. PG 122.114ob1–2), the “flower of fire” (*πυρὸς ἄνθος*, *Fr.* 37.14 / Procl. *In Prm.* 800.20–801.5).<sup>150</sup>

Moreover, the concept of ἀρχή, addressed in the “Mithras Liturgy” (*PGM* IV.475–829), is also attested in the *Chaldaean Oracles* as “of the paternal principle” (*πατρικῆς ἀρχῆς*, *Orac. Chald. Fr.* 13.1 / Psel. PG 122.1145d7), “from Zeus’ principle” (*ἐκ Διὸς ἀρχῆς*, *Fr.* 215.3 / Lyd. *De Mens.* IV.101, 141.2–11), “principal source” (*κρηνῆς ἀρχή*, *Fr.* 74.1 / Dam. *In Prm.* II.206.11), or “the three-winged principle” (as *τὴν τρίπτερον ἀρχήν*, *Fr.* 168.1 / Procl. *In Crat.* 96.18–19). This three-winged principle evidently refers to the triadic Monad of the Chaldaean system (*Μοναδά γάρ σε τριούχον ιδών ἐσεβάσσατο κόσμος*, *Fr.* 26.1 / Lyd. *De Mens.* II.6, 23.12), according to which, “for the Triad shines in every world, which the Monad rules.” Παντὶ γάρ ἐν κόσμῳ λάμπει τριάς, ἥς μονὰς ἀρχει (*Fr.* 27.1 / Dam. *De Pr.* I.87.3, II.87.14).<sup>151</sup>

Πῦρ (fire) and ἀρχή (principle) are also important in the hymn “To Helios” (*PGM* IV.939–948) included in the “*Systasis*-prayer that produces direct vision (of the divinity invoked)” (“Αὔτοπτος σύστασις” *PGM* IV.930–1114, IV CE). In this hymn, Helios is invoked as φύσι καὶ πυρὸς ἀρχή, “nature and principle of fire” (IV.939).<sup>152</sup> In a fragment of the *Chaldaean Oracles* fire is also associated to the sun as “fire of the sun,” τὸ ἥλιακὸν πῦρ (*Fr.* 58 / Procl. *In R.* II.220.14–15).

Furthermore, fire is associated to Helios in another spell, *PGM* IV.959–973, also included in the “*Systasis*-prayer that produces direct vision [of the divinity invoked]” (*PGM* IV.930–1114). Helios here is described as πυριφεγγή, “fire-

149 For comments on *Fr.* 37 see Lewy (1978) 109–117.

150 Also, in *Orac. Chald. Fr.* 34.2, *Fr.* 35.3, *Fr.* 42.3. Also, the “flower of nous” (*νόου ἄνθος*, *Fr.* 49.2 / Procl. *In Tl.* III.14.3–10). The second Nous is described as the “artificer of the fiery world,” ὁ κόσμου τεχνίτης πυρίου; *Orac. Chald. Fr.* 5.1–4: οὐ γάρ ἐς ὅλην πῦρ ἐπέκεινα τὸ πρῶτον ἐήν δύναμιν κατακλείει ἔργοις ἀλλὰ νόῳ· νοῦ γάρ νόος ἐστίν ὁ κόσμου τεχνίτης πυρίου.

151 See also *Orac. Chald. Fr.* 73.1–3 / Dam. *In Prm.* II.217.8–10: Ἐν τούτοις ἱερὸς πρῶτος δρόμος, ἐν δ’ ἄρα μέσσω ἡέριος, τρίτος ἄλλος ὃς ἐν πυρὶ τὴν χθόνα θάλπει. Ἀρχαῖς γάρ τρισὶ ταῖσδε λάβροις δουλεύει ἄπαντα; *Des Places* (1971). See also discussion on the ideas in Lewy (1978) 105–117 and n. 164.

152 The papyrus actually reads φύσι καὶ πυρὸς ἀρχή. Herwerden (1888) retains φύσι καὶ πυρὸς ἀρχή of the papyrus. But, Dieterich (1891) emends it to φυσικαὶ πυρὸς ἀρχαῖ, “die Zauberzeichen des Feuers,” having ἀρχαῖ in plural and taking φυσικαὶ as an adjective, thus giving a later interpretation to it as meaning magical. Preisendanz (1928) I: 104–105; Preisendanz (1973) vol. I: 104–105. Herwerden (1888) 316–347, at 322–323. Dieterich, (1891) 51, n. 2 and 97, n. 1. I have argued that the poetic invocation to φύσι καὶ πυρὸς ἀρχή (IV.939) of the papyrus should not be emended to φυσικαὶ πυρὸς ἀρχαῖ, as Dieterich suggests and as Preisendanz adopts in his edition. Pachoumi (2014).

blazing" and ἀόρατον φωτὸς γεννήτορα, "invisible begetter of light" (IV.960).<sup>153</sup> The adjective πυριφεγγής is also used in the *Orphica* as an adjective to Helios (e.g. πυριφεγγέος Ἡελίοι, *Orph. A.* 214).<sup>154</sup> It is also used by Proclus in his *Commentary on Plato's Timaeus* (e.g. σῶμα δέ οἱ πυριφεγγές ἀπείριτον ἀστυφέλικτον ... Procl. *In Ti.* II.45.7), and in feminine plural in Proclus' *Hymn* "To Aphrodite" (e.g. πυριφεγγέας αὐλάς, 2.6).

Fire's assimilation to Helios is established by the ritual of "light bringing" (φωταγωγία, IV.955) included in the spell "Systasis-prayer that produces direct vision," which involves the instilling of the god as part of the ritual of "filling with divine spirit," ἐνπνευμάτωσις of the lamp. Helios, the fire-blazing, invisible, begetter of light is invoked to, "rouse your daemon and enter into this fire and fill it (the daemon) with divine spirit" (διέγειρόν σου τὸν δαιμόνα καὶ εἴσελθε ἐν τῷ πυρὶ τούτῳ καὶ ἐνπνευμάτωσον αὐτὸν θείου πνεύματος, IV.964–966).<sup>155</sup> The divine spirit of Helios may also reflect influences from Zoroastrian religion, since according to Zarathustra, God, Ahura Mazda, and his Holy Spirit, Spenta Mainyu, are one factor of the Zoroastrian Heptad.<sup>156</sup> Fire was also an important element in the Zoroastrian cults.<sup>157</sup> The ritual of fire in the ritual of *phōtagōgia*, "light bringing," may also allude to the Zoroastrian fire-cult.<sup>158</sup>

### 3. The Lotus, the Sun, and the Stones

#### 3.1. Ὁ Λωτός, "The Lotus," and ὁ Ἡλιος, "the Sun"

The Greek magical papyri illustrate the association between the lotus and the Egyptian young Sun god Harpocrates. For example, in the "Spell to bring the

<sup>153</sup> In the spell IV.587–616 included in the "Mithras Liturgy" (IV.475–829) Aion is invoked and described with many πυρι- composite epithets, e.g. πυρίπολε, πυρίπνοε, πυριχαρῆ, πυρισώματε, πυρισπόρε, πυριχλόνε, πυριδῖνα, πυρισχησίφως (IV.591–602); see also IV.520–522: τὸν ἀθάνατον Αἰῶνα καὶ δεσπότην τῶν πυρίνων διαδημάτων. Similarly, Marinus in *Proclus* uses the epithets πυρισμαράγου (for θιασείης), Marin. *Vit. Procl.* 28.693 (also in Theoc. *Syrinx* 8); and πυροσέλικτος, Marin. *Vit. Procl.* 28.697.

<sup>154</sup> Abel (1885). In relation to Helios see Nonn. *D.* 38.85–86: καὶ πάλιν ἀντέλλων πυριφεγγέος ὑψόθι δίφρου/Ἡελίος ζοφέσσαν ἀπηκόντιζεν ὄμιχλην. See also *Hymn. Orph.* 52.9: πυριφεγγές; and *Orph. L.* 173: πυριφεγγέος ἀμβρότου αἴγλης.

<sup>155</sup> On ἐνπνευμάτωσις see Pachoumi (2017) 20, n. 57, 45 with n. 65, 58, 84 with 110, 128 with n. 336. Also, cf. Pachoumi (2011b) 729–740, at 736, n. 25.

<sup>156</sup> Cf. Boyce (1984) 12–15, 37, 40.

<sup>157</sup> Boyce (1984) 10, 48–50, 61–63; and Boyce (1979) 3–6, 12.

<sup>158</sup> Kroll followed by Bidez and Cumont supports the view that the Chaldaean theurgists were influenced by the Zoroastrian fire-cult; see Kroll (1894) 68; Bidez (1930) 75; Bidez

god" ("θεαγωγὸς λόγος" *PGM* IV.985–1035), included in the "Spell that produces direct vision [of the divinity invoked]" (Αὔτοπτος *PGM* IV.930–1114), the magician assimilates Helios with "the greatest god (τὸν μέγιστον θεόν), lord Horus Harpocrates," "god of gods (θεές θεῶν)," whom he invokes.<sup>159</sup> Helios is described as "the one who enlightens everything and illuminates by his own power the whole cosmos" (iv.989–991).<sup>160</sup> In the hymn "To Helios" (*PGM* IV.939–948) Helios is described as "gathering up the clover of the golden bean" (iv.941) and identified with Harpocrates, "the god seated on a lotus, decorated with rays," as he is described at the moment of his expected revelation to the magician (iv.1107–1108).<sup>161</sup> Harpocrates, the Egyptian young Sun god, is often depicted in the magical papyri and in magical amulets of the late Hellenistic and Roman period as a naked child seated on a lotus flower or in a boat, representing the rising sun. The rise of the sun was also represented with the young child Harpocrates seated on the lotus cup.<sup>162</sup>

Porphyry in *Epistula ad Anebonem* describes the two images of the sun, as "the one sitting on the lotus, and sailing in the ships," as discussed above by Iamblichus and illustrated in the magical papyri examples. (λέγουσαι καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ λωτῷ καθήμενον καὶ ἐπὶ πλοίου ναυτιλλόμενον. *Porph. Aneb.* 2.9a.2).

Iamblichus in *De Mysteries* VII, referring to the "intellectual interpretation of the symbols according to the Egyptian thought" (Iamb. *Myst.* VII.2.250.10–11), explains the symbolism of sitting on a lotus: "For sitting on a lotus implies pre-eminence over the mud, without ever touching the mud, and also displays intellectual and empyrean leadership" (Τὸ γάρ ἐπὶ λωτῷ καθέζεσθαι ὑπεροχήν τε ὑπὲρ τὴν ἵλυν αἰνίττεται μὴ ψαύουσαν μηδαμῶς τῆς ἵλυος, καὶ ἡγεμονίαν νοερὰν καὶ ἐμπύριον ἐπιδείκνυται Iamb. *Myst.* VII.2.251.14–252.2).

Furthermore, Iamblichus explicates the parallelism between the sun's power over the cosmos and the symbolism of sailing in a ship: "The one who sails in the ship represents the rule that governs the world. Just as the steersman mounts on the ship, being separate from its rudders, so the sun, separately from the tillers, mounts upon the whole world" ('Ο δ' ἐπὶ πλοίου ναυτιλλόμενος τὴν διακυβερνώσαν τὸν κόσμον ἐπικράτειαν παρίστησιν. "Ωσπερ οὖν ὁ κυβερνήτης χωριστὸς

and Cumont (1938) I: 161. For the plausibility of that supposition and on possible Stoic influences see discussion in Lewy (1978) 429, n. 104 and 430, n. 105.

<sup>159</sup> E.g. *PGM* IV.987–988, 999–1000, 1048–1049.

<sup>160</sup> For this cosmic depiction of Harpocrates in the Greco-Roman period see El-Kachab (1971) 132–145; also Bonner (1950) plates IX–X.

<sup>161</sup> See also *PGM* II.102–103: ἐπὶ λωτῷ καθήμενος καὶ λαμπυρίζων τὴν ὅλην οἰκουμένην.

<sup>162</sup> See also *PGM* II.106–107: ὃς[περ ἔ]χεις ἐν τοῖς πρός βορρᾶ μέρεσι μορφὴν νηπίου παιδὸς ἐπὶ λωτῷ καθημένου. See Plu. *De Is. et Os.* 355B; Bonner (1950) 140–147, plts. IX–X; El-Kachab (1971) 132–145; Betz (1986) 68; cf. also *PDM* XIV.45.

ών τῆς νεώς τῶν πηδαλίων αὐτῆς ἐπιβέβηκεν, οὕτω χωριστῶς ὁ ἥλιος τῶν οἰάκων τοῦ κόσμου παντὸς ἐπιβέβηκεν Iamb. *Myst.* VII.2.252.8–10).<sup>163</sup>

In the spell *PGM* III.98–124, included in *PGM* III.1–164, “the greatest Mithras” (III.100–101) is associated with Helios, addressed as “the holy king, the sailor, who controls the tiller of the great god” (III.102–103 and 81–82). This description must refer to the daily solar sea journey on the boat of the Egyptian sun god Re.<sup>164</sup>

Psellus in *Philosophica Minora* 1 (Duffy 1992) *Opusculum* 16.30 uses a simile of lotus, “just as the lotus during the turning of the sun” (ώσπερ ὁ λωτὸς κατὰ τὴν τοῦ φωστήρος περιστροφήν 16.30),<sup>165</sup> and “just as the plant lotus is a solar one, thus when the sun rises, the lotus opens its petals, and when it sets, it closes” (ώσπερ ὁ λωτὸς τὸ φυτὸν ἥλιαικός ἐστι, ὅθεν ἀνατέλλοντι μὲν τῷ φωστήρι ἔξαπλοι τὰ φύλλα, δύνοντι δὲ συστέλλει, 16.228–230).

### 3.8–16. *The Stones Ἡλίτης, Hélités, “Sunstone,” Σεληνίτης, Selénités, “Moonstone,” and Ἡλιοσέληνος, Hélioselénos “Sun-moonstone”*

Proclus in his *Commentary on Plato’s Timaeus* discusses the dependence of particular stones and plants on the power of Helios, “For whether the god is unmoved, or a demiurge or a life-generator, some reflection of the special character of the one that has obtained it is conveyed to all the souls assigned beneath it. What is there to be amazed at, when the individual nature of the guardian gods has reached down even as far as plant and stone, and there is a plant and stone *dependent on the power of Helios*, whether you would like to call them *heliotrope* or in any other way whatever?” (εἴτε γάρ ἀτρεπτος ὁ θεὸς εἴτε δημιουργὸς εἴτε ζῷογονικός, ἥκει τις ἔμφασις τῆς ἴδιότητος τοῦ λαχόντος ἐπὶ πάσας τὰς ὑποτεταγμένας αὐτῷ ψυχάς. καὶ τί θαυμαστόν, ὅπου καὶ μέχρι πόσας καὶ λίθων ἡ τῶν θεῶν τῶν ἐφόρων ἴδιότης καθήκει, καὶ ἔστι λίθος καὶ πόσα τῆς Ἡλιαικῆς ἔξηρτη μέναι δυνάμεως, εἴτε ἥλιοτρόπιον εἴτε ἄλλως ὁπωσοῦν καλεῖν ἐθέλοις; Procl. *In Ti.* I.111.7–13).

In the *Elements of Theology* Proclus associates souls, animals, plants and stones with purifying deities and powers and explains that the stone shares in purifying power only corporeally, “So I say that if, for example, there is a purify-

<sup>163</sup> On a similar parallelism of Helios see also Porph. *On Stat.* 10.7–10: “Ἡλιον δὲ σημαίνουσι ποτὲ μὲν δι’ ἀνθρώπου ἐπιβεβηκότος πλοίον, τοῦ πλοίου ἐπὶ κροκοδείλου κειμένου. Δηλοὶ δὲ τὸ μὲν πλοῖον τὴν ἐν ὑγρῷ κίνησιν ὁ δὲ κροκόδειλος πότιμον ὕδωρ, ἐνῷ φέρεται ὁ ἥλιος. Ἐσημαίνετο τοίνυν ὁ ἥλιος δι’ ἀέρος ὑγροῦ καὶ γλυκέος τὴν περιπόλησιν ποιεῖσθαι. Bidez (1913) 19 in Appendices.

<sup>164</sup> See Betz (1986) 21.

<sup>165</sup> Duffy (1992) Vol. I: 48.

ing deity, then there will be purification in souls, animals, plants and stones" (... λέγω δὲ οἶον εἴ τις ἔστι θεότης καθαρτική, καὶ ἐν ψυχαῖς ἔστι κάθαρσις καὶ ἐν ζώοις καὶ ἐν φυτοῖς καὶ ἐν λίθοις· Procl. *Inst.* 145.7–9).<sup>166</sup> Also, "The stone participates in the purifying power only corporeally, the plant in an even clearer way, vitally, the animal possesses this form in appetition too, the rational soul, rationally, the intelligence, intellectually, the gods supra-existentially and in unity" (καὶ ὁ μὲν λίθος μετέχει τῆς καθαρτικῆς δυνάμεως σωματικῶς μόνον, τὸ δὲ φυτὸν ἔστι τρανέστερον κατὰ τὴν ζωήν, τὸ δὲ ζῶον ἔχει καὶ κατὰ τὴν ὄρμὴν τὸ εἶδος τοῦτο, ψυχὴ δὲ λογικὴ λογικῶς, νοῦς δὲ νοερῶς, οἱ δὲ θεοὶ ύπερουσίως καὶ ἐνιαίως· Procl. *Inst.* 145.11–15).<sup>167</sup>

Earlier, Plato in *Phaedo* refers to the beauty and purity of stones, "also these precious stones here are [our] loved pieces, such as cornelians and jaspers and emeralds and all of that kind. And there is nothing of that kind and even more beautiful than these stones. The reason is *that there they are pure*, not eaten up or destroyed like these here by decay and brine by those things which have flowed together in here, which bring ugliness and disease upon stones and earth and other animals and plants." (ὦν καὶ τὰ ἐνθάδε λιθίδια εἶναι ταῦτα τὰ ἀγαπώμενα μόρια, σάρδιά τε καὶ ιάσπιδας καὶ σμαράγδους καὶ πάντα τὰ τοιαῦτα· ἔκει δὲ οὐδὲν δτὶ οὐ τοιούτον εἶναι καὶ ἔτι τούτων καλλίω. τὸ δὲ αἴτιον τούτου εἶναι δτὶ ἔκεινοι οἱ λίθοι εἰσὶ καθαροὶ καὶ οὐ κατεδημεσμένοι οὐδὲ διεφθαρμένοι ὥσπερ οἱ ἐνθάδε ύπὸ σηπεδόνος καὶ ἄλμης ύπὸ τῶν δεύτρου συνερρυηκότων, ἀ καὶ λίθοις καὶ γῇ καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ζώοις τε καὶ φυτοῖς αἴσχη τε καὶ νόσους παρέχει. Pl. *Phd* 110.d.7–e.6). Plato's observation here about pure stones cannot, of course, reflect the extent of Proclus' theurgic notion of the purifying power of stones in theurgic rituals.

Psellus in *Philosophica Minora* 1 (Duffy 1992)<sup>168</sup> *Opusculum* 16 uses a simile of the luminaries as images of the cosmos and their secret *synthēmata*, "Just as the sun and the moon and all the stars in heaven are images of the first cosmos and keep secret *synthēmata* of that [cosmos]" ("Ωσπερ ἥλιος καὶ σελήνη καὶ τὰ κατὰ τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀστρα εἰκόνες εἰσὶ τοῦ πρώτου κόσμου καὶ ἔχουσιν ἐκείνου συνθήματα

166 Dodds (1933) 128. On animals which imitate the heavenly form of the moon, such as the Egyptian Apis-bull and the moon-fish, see Procl. *In Prm.* 903.27–31: καὶ πολλὴ τῶν σεληνιακῶν ἥξει σοι ζῶων θεωρία περὶ τὸν Ἀπιν Αἰγύπτιον, καὶ τὸν σεληνίτινον ἰχθύν, καὶ πολλὰ ὄλλα ζῶα τὰ μὲν ὄλλως, τὰ δὲ ὄλλως μιμούμενα τὸ οὐράνιον τῆς σελήνης εἶδος.

167 Dodds (1933) 128. See also Procl. *In R.* 1.183.11–22: ἐφεξῆς ὁ Σωκράτης ἀναδιδάσκει, τῇ λίθῳ χρώμενος ἐναργεστάτῳ παραδείγματι τῆς τελεωτάτης ἐκ τῶν Μουσῶν κατοκωχής, ἣν Ἡρακλείαν οἱ πολλοὶ καλούσιν. τί οὖν αὕτη ἡ λίθος ἀπεργάζεται; οὐ μόνον δή φησιν αὐτοὺς ἄγει πρὸς ἔαυτὴν τοὺς σιδηροῦς δακτυλίους, ὀλλὰ καὶ δύναμιν αὐτοῖς ὀλόδην τῶν ὄμοιών ἐντίθησιν, ὥστε ὄλλους ἄγειν δακτυλίους· καὶ πολλάκις φησὶν ὄρμαθός δακτυλίων ἡ σιδηρίων ἐξ ὄλληλων ἥρτηται· πάσι δὲ ἄφα τούτοις ἀπ' ἐκείνης τῆς λίθου ἡ δύναμις ἔξηρτηται. τίνα μὲν οὖν τρόπον τὰ τοσαῦτα πάθη περὶ τοὺς δακτυλίους συμβαίνει καὶ τίς ἡ τῆς λίθου δύναμις, οὐ πρόκειται λέγειν ἐν τούτοις.

168 Duffy (1992) Vol. 1: 48.

χρύφια, 16.223–224). The other simile used by Psellus is between the solar plant lotus and the moonstone, “just as the plant lotus is solar, whence when the sun rises, the lotus opens its petals, and when it sets, it closes; so the moonstone keeps the *synthémata* of the moon” (ώσπερ ὁ λωτός τὸ φυτὸν ἡλιακός ἐστι, ὅθεν ἀνατέλλοντι μὲν τῷ φωστήρι ἔξαπλοι τὰ φύλλα, δύνοντι δὲ συστέλλει, καὶ ὁ σεληνίτης δὲ λίθος σελήνης ἔχει συνθήματα *Opusc.* 16.228–231).

Psellus in his *Encomium in Matrem*, discussing the characteristics of the hieratic art (Ιερατικὴν δὲ τέχνην οἶδα μὲν ἡτις ἐστίν *Psel. Enc. Matr.* 1785), points out the role of stones and plants and unspoken [secret-sacred] powers (λίθοις δὲ καὶ πόαις δυνάμεις μὲν ἀρρήτους 1786). In *Philosophica Minora* I (Duffy 1992)<sup>169</sup> *Opusculum* 34 Psellus refers to the “powers of stones” (τῶν παρὰ τοῖς λίθοις δυνάμεων 34.105) and the “power and energy of each stone” (ἡ ἔκάστου τῶν λίθων δύναμις καὶ ἐνέργεια: *Opusc.* 34.109–110).

Moreover, in *Philosophica Minora* II (O’Meara 1989)<sup>170</sup> *Opusculum* 38 Psellus writes about the Chaldaean rituals of purification and ascension of the soul and the use of materials, such as stones and plants, and magic spells: “The Chaldaean also says no otherwise that we are elevated towards God, by empowering the vehicle of the soul through rituals that use materials; for he thinks that the soul is purified by stones, plants and spells, in order to run easily toward ascension” (ό δὲ Χαλδαῖος οὐκ ἄλλως φησὶν ἡμᾶς ἀνάγεσθαι πρὸς θεόν, εἰ μὴ δυναμώσομεν τὸ τῆς ψυχῆς ὅχημα διὰ τῶν ὑλικῶν τελετῶν· οἴεται γὰρ καθαίρεσθαι τὴν ψυχὴν λίθοις καὶ πόαις καὶ ἐπωδαῖς, ὡς εὔτροχον εἶναι πρὸς τὴν ἀνάβασιν. *Phil. Opusc.* II.38.10–14).

The following passages from Ficino’s *De Vita Triplici* book 3 on the moonstone, selenite and the sun-moonstone show influences from Proclus’ *On the Hieratic Art* 1.10–12:

Ficino’s *De Vita Triplici* Book III.15.4–6:

*Multo vero potentiores in serie Lunae lapillos narrat Proculus: primum quidem selinitim, qui non modo figura Lunam imitetur, sed et motu, circumeatque cum Luna.*

But Proclus recounts that in their series *the gems* of the Moon are much more powerful. The first of these is selenite, which imitates the Moon not only in shape but even in motion, for it turns with the Moon. (Kaske and Clark 1989, 314–315).

<sup>169</sup> Duffy (1992) Vol. I: 119.

<sup>170</sup> O’Meara (1989) Vol. II: 132.

Ficino's *De Vita Triplici* Book III.15.10–12:

*Alterum vero recenset lapillum helioselinon cognomento, qui Solis Lunaeque coniunctae Soli naturaliter habet imaginem.*

But he lists another *gem*, helioselinon by name, which has on it by nature the image of the Sun and Moon in conjunction. (Kaske and Clark 1989, 314–315).

*Marginal Notes by Ficino (Marginalia Ficini) of ms V  
(Vallicellianus) F 20, Fol. 138<sup>v</sup>*

In the margins of the bottom of ms V F 20, fol. 138<sup>v</sup>, there is the following marginal note written by Ficino:

*Sic si apponis pedi cerebralia, trahit vim a cerebro; si cordalia a corde si epatica ab epate etc. Similiter si natura propria in homine deficiat, trahes vim ab hac stella vel illa appropinquando huic qua conveniat cum stella, maxime stella ingente.*

Thus, if you apply cerebral objects to the foot, it draws/attracts power only from the brain; if [you apply] cardiac objects, [it draws power] from the heart; if hepatic objects, from the liver etc. Similarly, if a specific nature is deficient in a person, you draw/attract power from this star or another by bringing close to it that which fits the star, especially a star with enormous influence.

Ficino here accepts the theory of attraction between the heavenly (e.g. sun, moon and the stars) and earthly entities (e.g. plants, stones, animals etc.), as explored by Proclus, and uses an organic and medical analogy to explain it.

Marginal Notes by Ficino (*Marginalia Ficini*) of ms V (Vallicellianus) F 20, Fol. 139<sup>r</sup>

In the margins of ms V F 20, fol. 139<sup>r</sup> (lines 11–23 and the bottom of the folio), there is another marginal note written by Ficino:

*Ego vidi lapillum rotundum et punctis quasi stellis insignitum qui aceto perfusus movebatur primo in rectum ali(quatenus), mox in girum oberrabat, quem credo firmamento esse accommodatum, maxime aceto perfusum. Oportet enim ibi quod natura incohavit arte compleri. Quid quod magnes convenit cum ursa et polo et illuc convertit ferrum, quod apparel in instrumento nautarum id polum explorandum? Unde imago ursae impressa*

*magneti [...] suspensa collo cum ferreo monili trah(eret) vim illius ad nos tangendo carnem?*

I have seen a round stone marked with starlike dots, which, when soaked in vinegar, first moved in a straight line for a while, and soon wandered off in circle, which I believe was accommodated to the firmament, especially having been soaked in vinegar. For here it is necessary that art should complete that which nature has begun. Why does the magnet fit the Bear and the Pole? And why does it incline iron towards them, as in the sailors' instrument it appears to seek out the pole? Whence does an image of the Bear impressed on a magnet [...] hung about the neck on an iron necklace, draw/attract power from it [the constellation] to us, while touching the flesh?

Certain passages from Ficino's *De Vita Triplici* book 3 show influences from Proclus' *On the Hieratic Art*, such as Ficino's discussion on the powers of all the celestials and the sun, on images, on the sun, plants and gems, on lions and cocks, and on sunstone, moonstone and the sun-moonstone.<sup>171</sup> The following passages from Ficino's *De Vita Triplici* book 3 illustrate such influences from Proclus' *On the Hieratic Art* to Ficino's treatise:

Ficino's *De Vita Triplici* Book III.6.47–49:

*In Sole certe omnes coelestium esse virtutes, non solum Iamblichus Iulianusque, sed omnes affirmant. Et Proclus ait ad Solis aspectum omnes omnium coelestium virtutes congregari in unum atque colligi.*

That all the powers of the heavens are assuredly in the Sun, not only Iamblichus and Julian but all authorities affirm. And Proclus says that all the powers of all the celestials are gathered and collected into one in the presence of the visible Sun. (Kaske and Clark 1989, 266–267).

Ficino's *De Vita Triplici* Book III.13.26–32:

*Porphyrius quoque in epistola ad Anebonem imagines efficaces esse testatur, additque certis quibusdam vaporibus qui a propriis suffumigationibus*

<sup>171</sup> On magic and Ficino's *De Vita Triplici* book 3 see Kaske and Clark (1989) 45–55 and 426–460, esp. 441–443 on lotus and stones. Boer (1980) 181, also 137 and 96. Copenhaver (1988) 79–110.

*exhalabant, aerios daemonas insinuari statim consuevisse. Iamblichus in materiis quae naturaliter superis consentaneae sint et opportune riteque collectae undique conflataeque fuerint, vires effectusque non solum coelestes, sed etiam daemonicos et divinos suscipi posse confirmat. Idem omnino Proclus atque Synesius.*

Porphyry also in his *Letter to Anebo* testifies that images are efficacious; and he adds that by certain vapours arising from fumigations proper to them, aerial daemons would instantly be insinuated into them. Iamblichus confirms that in materials which are naturally akin to the things above and have been both collected from their various places and compounded at the right time in the proper manner, you can receive forces and effect which are not only celestial, but even daemonic and divine. Proclus and Synesius absolutely agree. (Kaske and Clark 1989, 306–307).

Ficino's *De Vita Triplici* Book III.14.11–14:

*Sub stella Solari, id est Sirio, Solem primo, deinde daemonas quoque Phoebeos, quos aliquando sub leonum vel gallorum forma hominibus occurrisse testis est Proculus, homines subinde persimiles bestiasque Solares, Phoebeas inde plantas, metalla similiter et lapillos et vaporem aeremque ferventem.*

Under the Solar star, that is Sirius, they set the Sun first of all, and then Phoebean daemons, which sometimes have encountered people under the form of lions or cocks, as Proclus testifies, then similar men and Solar beasts, Phoebean plants then, similarly metals and gems and vapour and hot air. (Kaske and Clark 1989, 310–311).

Ficino's *De Vita Triplici* Book III.14.27–29:

*Eadem ratione inquit Proculus Apollineum daemonem, qui nonnunquam apparuit sub figura leonis, statim obiecto gallo disparuisse. Maxime vero in his animalibus cor est Solare.*

For the same reason, says Proclus, the Apollonian daemon who often appeared under the shape of a lion disappeared as soon as a cock was put in his way. In these animals, the heart is especially Solar. (Kaske and Clark 1989, 310–311).

Ficino's *De Vita Triplici* Book III.15.4–6:

*Multo vero potentiores in serie Lunae lapillos narrat Proculus: primum quidem selinitim, qui non modo figura Lunam imitetur, sed et motu, circumeatque cum Luna.*

But Proclus recounts that in their series the Moon gems are much more powerful. The first of these is selenite, which imitates the Moon not only in shape but even in motion, for it turns with the Moon. (Kaske and Clark 1989, 314–315).

Ficino's *De Vita Triplici* Book III.15.10–12:

*Alterum vero recenset lapillum helioselinon cognomento, qui Solis Lunaeque coniunctae Soli naturaliter habet imaginem.*

But he lists another gem, *helioselinon* by name, which has on it by nature the image of the Sun and Moon in conjunction. (Kaske and Clark 1989, 314–315).

#### 4. Lions and Cocks, *Systaseis* and Symbols

##### 4.4. Σύστασις/-εις, *Systasis/-eis*, “Conjunction-s / Connection-s”

Marinus in *Proclus* reports that Proclus “had been using the Chaldaean [magico-theurgic] *systaseis*, [invocations for] conjunctions,’ and *entychiai*,<sup>172</sup> ‘meetings / prayers,’ and divine and unspeakable magic wheels” (ταῖς γὰρ τῶν Χαλδαίων συστάσεσι καὶ ἐντυχίαις καὶ τοῖς θείοις καὶ ἀφθέγκτοις στροφάλοις ἐκέχρητο Marin. *Vit. Procl.* 28.676–679). Proclus “had learned the invocations and the rest of the practice [i.e. of theurgy] from Plutarch’s daughter Asclepigenia, who was a philosopher and mystic (430–485 AD).” (καὶ τὰς ἐκφωνήσεις καὶ τὴν ἄλλην

<sup>172</sup> Compare the use and meaning of ἐντυχία in the spell *PGM* XII.1–343. The term is used in XII.1–343 in the sense of “prayer” or “petition” (XII.135: ἐπερεῖς τὴν ἐντυχίαν ταύτην, also in XII.695 and IV.1930); Preisendanz (1974) II: 93 translates it as “Gebet,” and Betz (1986) 175 as “petition”. But ἐντυχία can also mean “meeting.” This double connotation of ἐντυχία as “prayer” and “meeting” alludes to a similar double meaning of the term σύστασις as “connection” or “meeting” (e.g. IV.930–931: σύστασις, ἥν πρῶτον λέγεις πρὸς ἀνατολὴν ἡλίου and I.57: λέγει τὴν πρώτην σύστασιν). Hence ἐντυχία could possibly be used as an alternative term for σύστασις in this spell. On ἐντυχία see also in P. Duk. inv. 729.28: ἐντυχίας πρὸς (Ἡλιον). Jordan (2006) 159–173, at 161, 163, 171.

χρήσιν αὐτῶν μεμαθήκει παρὰ Ἀσκληπιγενείας τῆς Πλουτάρχου θυγατρός. Marin. *Vit. Procl.* 28.679–681).<sup>173</sup>

In his *Commentary on Plato's Timaeus* Proclus claims about the role of *systasis* in the unification of the cosmos, when discussing "bond" (δεσμός) "as an image of divine unification and the mutual sharing of powers" (ώς εἰκόνα ... τῆς ἐνώσεως τῆς θείας ... καὶ τῆς κοινωνίας τῶν δυνάμεων Procl. *In Ti.* II.13.19–21), "but if something happens, besides what already has happened, this thing that happens will be the bond between them; for this would be the thing that brings them together (*synagogon*) into the *systasis* [conjunction] with the one." (εἰ δέ τι προσγέγονε, παρὰ τὰ ἡδη ὅντα γέγονε τοῦτο προσγενόμενον αὐτῶν δεσμός· τοῦτο γάρ ἦν καὶ τὸ συναγωγόν αὐτῶν εἰς ἐνὸς σύστασιν Procl. *In Ti.* II.15.10–12).<sup>174</sup> "However, the bond is spoken of in a threefold manner; one kind is the *pre-existing* (προϋπάρχων) bond; another is the *immanent* (ἐνυπάρχων) bond; and the third bond is *intermediate* between these (ἐν μέσῳ τούτων)" Procl. *In Ti.* II.15.12–17).<sup>175</sup>

Σύστασις is a term applied in theurgy.<sup>176</sup> Lewy in his *Chaldaean Oracles and Theurgy* translates this as "conjunction."<sup>177</sup> The term σύστασις applies to the

<sup>173</sup> On knowledge transmission from father to daughter see *Kyran.* 4–5: καὶ ἐκ τοῦ Ἀρποκρατίωνος τοῦ Ἀλέξανδρέως πρὸς τὴν οἰκείαν θυγατέραν; and 30–31: (Βίβλος ἀπὸ Συρίας θεραπευτική, τῇ οἰκείᾳ θυγατρὶ Ἀρποκρατίων γέγραφε τάδε); Kaimakis (1976) 14, 15. See Intro.: Sect. 1 above.

<sup>174</sup> See also Eusebius on *systasis*: Eus. *PE* VII.22.56.3–7: εἰ γάρ ἀπλή τις ἐτύγχανεν ἡ ὥλη καὶ μονοειδῆς, σύνθετος δὲ ὁ κόσμος καὶ ἐκ διαφόρων οὐσιῶν τε καὶ κράσεων τὴν σύστασιν ἔχει, (ἀδύνατον τοῦτον ἐξ ὥλης γεγονέναι λέγειν τῷ τὰ σύνθετα μὴ οἶνον τε ἐξ ἐνὸς ἀπλοῦ τὴν σύστασιν ἔχειν), τὸ γάρ σύνθετον ἀπλῶν τινῶν μᾶξην μηνύει. Eus. *PE* VII.22.58.2–3: εἰ γάρ σύνθετος ἡ ὥλη, τὰ δὲ σύνθετα ἐξ ἀπλῶν τὴν σύστασιν ἔχει, ἥν ποτε καιρὸς ὅτε ὥλη οὐκ ἦν, τουτέστι πρὶν τὰ ἀπλᾶ συνελθεῖν. Eus. *PE* VII.22.23.4: δοκεῖ σοι τὴν οὐσίαν σωματικήν τινα σύστασιν είναι; Eus. *PE* VII.22.24.1–2: Ἡ δὲ σωματική σύστασις αὐτὴ ἐφ' ἑαυτῆς ὑπάρχει οὐ δεσμένη τινός, οὐ γενομένου τὸ εἶναι λήψεται; Eusebius on magic: Eus. *PE* VI.4. Eusebius on *systasis* and magic: Eus. *PE* V.14.

<sup>175</sup> Procl. *In Ti.* II.15.10–17: ἀλλὰ ὁ δεσμὸς λέγεται τριχῶς· ἀλλος μὲν γάρ δεσμὸς <δ> ἐν τῇ αἰτίᾳ τῶν συνελθόντων προϋπάρχων, ἀλλος δὲ ὁ ἐν αὐτοῖς τοῖς δεδεμένοις ἐνυπάρχων ὄμβοτοιχος αὐτοῖς καὶ συμφόνης, τρίτος δὲ ἀλλος ἐν μέσῳ τούτων, προϊὼν μὲν ἀπὸ τῆς αἰτίας, ἐν δὲ τοῖς συνδεομένοις ἐμφαινόμενος.

<sup>176</sup> E.g. Iamb. *Myst.* III.14.132.6; and III.14.133.14; Porph. *Aneb.* 13.2.1–5; Marin. *Vit. Procl.* 28; on theurgy and magic see Dodds (1951) 291ff. and Lewy (1978) 461–466; on theurgy and philosophy see Iamb. *Myst.* II.11.96.11ff. and IX.1; see also Dickie (2001) 208ff.

<sup>177</sup> Lewy comments: "The term [i.e. σύστασις] derives from the current vocabulary of the magical science and applies to the 'conjunction' of a magician with a god or with one of his ministering spirits, called the 'assistant [sic] demon' (δαιμόνων πάρεδρος), who aids the theurgist by granting him the superhuman powers required for the accomplishment of the magical act" and "The papyri frequently mention magical practices destined to bring about 'conjunction' (σύστασις) with a ministering spirit"; Lewy (1978) 228–229 and n. 3. The term applies to gods and the paredros in the *PGM* spells (e.g. 1.58). However, Lewy's definition of σύστασις fails to refer to the notion of the personal daimon in relation to sys-

theurgic ritual and/or prayer for establishing a “connection” between a man and the divine. In the Greek magical papyri, this “connection” is established between a man and a god, or the personal daimon, or even a divine “assistant,” πάρεδρος.<sup>178</sup> Betz also translates this term as “meeting.”<sup>179</sup> Although the interpretation of *systasis* as “meeting” should not be rejected, the translation of the term as “conjunction” or “connection” seems to be etymologically precise<sup>180</sup> and fits in with the theurgical use of the term.

In the magico-theurgic spell “*Systasis* with your own daimon” (“Σύστασις ἰδίου δαιμονος” *PGM* VII.505–528), the magician greets Tyche, the *genius loci*, the Hour, Day, the abstract “encompassing” and Helios, followed by an invocation to the god (vii.508–521), in which the Egyptian influences of the cosmic portrayal of Helios predominate. Here, the magico-theurgic ritual of σύστασις is based on the notion of the symbolic connection of two entities (the individual and the personal daimon), which is established gradually through a series of transitional astrologically correct ‘connections,’ or ‘meetings’: e.g. the individual and: a) the *genius loci*, b) the deities of Hour and Day, c) the abstract “encompassing” and d) the great cosmic god Helios.<sup>181</sup>

---

tasis. In the spell VII.505–528, for example, the term is used for the connection with the personal daimon, which should not be confused with the concept of the divine assistant, paredros; See Pachoumi (2017) Chpt. 2. On *systasis* see also Johnston (1997) 165–194.

<sup>178</sup> See also LSJ; e.g. *PGM* II.43: συσταθῆς αὐτῷ; II.73: συνίστα δὲ σεαυτὸν τῷ θεῷ οὕτως; III.197: ἡ σύστασις τῆς πράξεως ἥδε πρὸς “Ἥλιον γιν[ομένη]; III.438–439: πάσα σύστασις τῆς ιερᾶς συνθέσεως; III.494: [Σύστασις πρὸς] δὲ “Ἥλιον; III.695: αὐτῶν σύστασις[ιν τῇ]ν τοῦ θεοῦ; III.698–699: ὅταν οὖν συσταθῆς τῷ θεῷ; IV.168–169: πρῶτα μὲν συσταθεῖς πρὸς τὸν “Ἥλιον τρόπῳ τούτῳ; IV.209: σημεῖον ἔσται τῆς συστάσεως τόδε; IV.215–216: συνεστάθην σου τῇ ιερῷ μορφῇ; IV.220–221: ισοθέουν φύσεως κυριεύσας τῆς διὰ ταύτης τῆς συστάσεως (see below, pp. 101ff.); IV.261: σύστασις τῆς πράξεως; IV.778–779: ἡ δὲ τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ σύστασις ἔστιν ἥδε; IV.930–931: σύστασις, ἣν πρῶτον λέγεις πρὸς ἀνατολήν ήλίου; Va.1–2: “Ἥλιε ... Ζαγουήλ, ἔχε με συνιστάμενον; VI.1: <Γίνεται ἡ μὲν σύστασις αὐτοῦ πρὸς “Ἥλιον β’; VI.39: ὁμοίως καὶ πρὸς Σελήνην ἔστιν αὐτοῦ σύστασις ἥδε; and XIII.29: συνιστάνου; XIII.38: τῇ καθολικῇ συστάσει; XIII.346: ἔχει δὲ σύστασιν; XIII.378–379: ἐπικαλούν τὸν τῆς ὥρας καὶ τὸν τῆς ἡμέρας θεόν, ἵνα ἔξ αὐτῶν συσταθῆσι; XIII.611: σύστησόν με; XIII.927–931: διὸ συνίσταμαι σοι διὰ τοῦ μεγάλου ἀρχιστρατηγοῦ Μιχαήλ ... διὸ συνίσταμαι. In relation to πάρεδρος 1.57: λέγεται τὴν πρώτην σύστασιν and 1.179–180: ἀξέριον πνεύμα συσταθὲν κραταιῷ παρέδρῳ; note also the use of προσύστασις in III.587–588: τὴν προσύστασιν.

<sup>179</sup> Betz (1981) 160–161. The same translation is followed by Martin in Betz’s *The Greek Magical Papyri in Translation*. Betz (1986) 131; but in the Glossary Betz uses a broader definition characterising it as a technical term for: “a rite, or a prayer to establish association between a god and a person” (here he provides the example of *PGM* VII.505 ff.), “a meeting ... to receive a revelation,” “a blessing,” “a union.” Betz (1986) 339.

<sup>180</sup> From the verb συνίστημι; see LSJ.

<sup>181</sup> See Pachoumi (2013): 46–69.

The concept of connection (*systasis*) with the god's form is also illustrated in the bowl divination spell (*PGM* IV.154–285), in which the magician refers to his union with the god Typhon as, “I was connected [/united] with your holy form” (*συνεστάθην σου τῇ ἱερᾷ μορφῇ* IV.215–216) and later, “having taken possession of a nature equal to god” (*ἰσοθέου φύσεως κυριεύσας*) “by this connection” (*διὰ ταύτης τῆς συστάσεως* IV.220–221). A similar idea of union with the god in a mystic ritual context may also be implied in the disputed phrase of Euripides' *Bacchae*: “for when the god enters into the body mighty [mightily], he makes the maddened speak the future” (*ὅταν γάρ ὁ θεός ἐς τὸ σῶμα’ ἔλθῃ πολύς, λέγειν τὸ μέλλον τοὺς μεμηγότας ποιεῖ* 300–301).<sup>182</sup>

Similarly, Iamblichus in *De Mysteriis* III, examining *θεοφορία*, “divine possession” and divination, asserts: “for neither the work of being possessed is human, nor does the whole [activity] base its power on human parts and actions; but these are otherwise subordinate, and the god uses them as instruments; the whole activity of divination is accomplished by him [the god], and he acts by himself without being mixed, detached from the others, without the soul or anything or the body being moved.” (*οὕτε γάρ ἀνθρώπινον ἐστι τὸ τῆς θεοφορίας ἔργον, οὔτε ἀνθρωπίνοις μορίοις ἡ ἐνεργήμασι τὸ πᾶν ἔχει κύρος: ἀλλὰ ταῦτα μὲν ἄλλως ὑπόκειται, καὶ χρήται αὐτοῖς ὁ θεός ὡς ὀργάνοις: τὸ δὲ πᾶν ἔργον τῆς μαντείας διὶ αὐτοῦ πληροῖ, καὶ ἀμιγῶς ἀπὸ τῶν ἄλλων ἀφειμένος οὕτε ψυχῆς κινούμενης οὐδὲ ὄτιοῦν οὕτε σώματος ἐνεργεῖ καθ’ αὐτόν.* Iamb. *Myst.* III.7.115.2–7).

The ritual of *systasis*, connection with Helios is also illustrated in the spell “[Σύστασις πρὸς Ἡλίον]” (*PGM* III.494–611); this spell together with two other spells may be parts, as Dillon rightly observes,<sup>183</sup> of a broader “*Systasis* with Helios” spell (III.494–731). The two other spells are the untitled spell concerning your own shadow (*PGM* III.612–632) that precedes it, and the third spell (*PGM* III.633–731) with a Coptic section at the end that follows it. The ritual of *systasis* is mentioned both in the first (e.g. *τὴν προσύστασιν*, III.587–588) and the third spell (e.g. *αἰτῶν σύστασιν τῇ ν τοῦ θεοῦ*, III.695 and *ὅταν οὖν συσταθῆται τῷ θεῷ*, III.698–699). Furthermore, the “signs and symbols,” *τὰ σημεῖα καὶ*

<sup>182</sup> For Plutarch ‘the god’ in this case is used metonymically for the wine: ὡς οἶνος ἀναθυμι-αθεῖς ἔτερα πολλὰ κινήματα καὶ λόγους ἀποκειμένους καὶ λανθάνοντας ἀποκαλύπτει· τό γάρ βασιχεύσιμον καὶ μανιώδες μαντικήν πολλήν ἔχει· κατ’ Εὐριπίδην (*Plu. Def. Orac.* 40.432E); also in *Anth. Pal.* VII.105.3: Διόνυσος ὅτι ἄν πολὺς ἐς δέμας ἔλθῃ. In this case the author agrees with Dodds' comment: “I do not think that l. 300 means merely ‘when a man has drunk a great deal of wine’ though Plutarch perhaps understood it so,” and he would further add that the phrase also alludes to the idea of divine possession or mystic union of the prophet with the god, in order to deliver a prophecy; Dodds (1960) 109.

<sup>183</sup> Betz (1986) 34.

τὰ παράσημα, are mentioned in the first and second spell.<sup>184</sup> In the third spell there is also a reference to the “symbols” (σύμβολα III.701).

In the spell *PGM* XIII.1–343 “A sacred book named Monad, or the Eighth Book of Moses about the holy name,” which is the first of the three different versions of the “Eighth Book of Moses” included in XIII.1–734, the magician according to the ritual of “the universal *systasis/connection*” (τῇ καθολικῇ συστάσει XIII.38) is instructed: “get connected earlier” (πρότερον συνιστάνου) “with the gods who beget the hours” (τοῖς ὠρογενέσιν θεοῖς XIII.29–31), and “you will be initiated to (by) them” (τελεσθήσῃ δὲ αὐτοῖς XIII.31–32). The magician should also chant “the spell of the gods who beget the hours” (τὸν λόγον τῶν ὠρογενῶν), and invoke their compulsive spell and the names of “the gods set over the week” (τοὺς ἐφεβδοματικοὺς τεταγμένους).<sup>185</sup> As a result, “you [the magician] will have been initiated to [by] them” (καὶ ἔσῃ <τε>τελεσμένος αὐτοῖς XIII.35–37). Therefore, the *systasis* is presented in this case as a mystic ritual and the magician an initiate to the gods who beget the hours.

The second version *PGM* XIII.343–645 included in *PGM* XIII.1–734 with the title “The holy, hidden book of Moses called Eighth or Holy” also refers to the ritual *systasis* (e.g. σύστασιν, XIII.346), according to which the magician should “invoke the god of the hour and the day, so that you may be connected through them” (ἐπικαλοῦ τὸν τῆς ὥρας καὶ τὸν τῆς ἡμέρας θεόν, ἵνα ἔξ αὐτῶν συσταθῆσ XIII.378–379).<sup>186</sup> The language alludes to the mysteries. In addition, the ritual

<sup>184</sup> E.g. Part A, *PGM* III.494–611: ὅτι οἱδά σου τὰ σημεῖα καὶ τὰ π]αράσ[ημα (III.499–500) and εἰρηκά σου τὰ σ[ημ]εῖα καὶ τὰ παράσημα (III.536). Part B, *PGM* III.612–631: ὅτι οἱδά σου τὰ ἄγ[ια] ὀνόμ[ατα καὶ] τὰ σημεῖα καὶ τὰ παράσημα (III.623–625) and εἰρηκά σου τὰ ἄγια ὀνόμ[ατα καὶ] τὰ [σημεῖα σου] καὶ τὰ παράσημα (III.627–628). Also the reference to “the spell above,” τὸν λόγον τὸν ἐπάνω (III.626), as Preisendanz and Dillon note. Preisendanz (1973) Vol. 1: 59; Betz (1986) 34.

<sup>185</sup> See also *PGM* XIII.53–58: ὃν πρόλεγε τοὺς ὠρογενεῖς σὺν τῇ στήλῃ καὶ τοὺς ἡμερεσίους <καὶ> τοὺς ἐφεβδοματικοὺς τεταγγ<μ>ένους ... εἰ μὴ τὸν κύριον τῆς ἡμέρας προείπης καὶ τῆς ὥρας πυκνότερον; repeated in *PGM* XIII.118–120, XIII.378–381 and XIII.424–429.

<sup>186</sup> On the deification of Time by the theurgist in Proclus see Procl. *In Ti.* III.43.10–12: ἀλλ’ οὐχ οἵ γε θεουργοὶ ταῦτα πεπόνθασιν· οὐ γάρ θέμις αὐτοῖς· ἀλλὰ τὸν χρόνον αὐτὸν ὑμήκαστιν ὡς θεόν ...; also Procl. *In Ti.* III.80.12–21: καὶ μήποτε καὶ ὁ θεουργός [ορ chald 46] ἐλικοειδῆ τὸν χρόνον ὑμήσας ὡς νέον ἄμα καὶ πρεσβύτην καὶ εἰς τοῦτο ἀπέβλεπε τὸ μάλιστα διὰ τῆς τῶν πλανήτων κινήσεως τῆς καθ’ ἔλικα γιγνομένης ἡμῖν ἐμφανῆ γίγνεσθαι τὰ μέτρα τῶν χρονικῶν παντοίων περιόδων, καὶ οὐ μόνον εἰς τὸ πάσαν αὐτὸν κίνησιν ἀριθμεῖν εὐθεῖαν καὶ κυκλικήν, ὃν ἡ ἔλιξ ἐστὶν ἐνοειδῶς περιληπτική, καὶ συνάδοι ἄν καὶ ταύτη τῷ Πλάτωνι, διὰ τῆς τῶν πλανήτων κινήσεως οἰόμενος καὶ αὐτὸς γνωρίζεσθαι τὰς χρονικὰς περιόδους. Similarly, in Procl. *In Ti.* III.40.19–24: τούτοις δὲ οὐ μόνον, ὁ καὶ πρότερον ἐπίμεν [pp. 20, 22 ss], Πλάτων, ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ θεουργοὶ συνάθεοσι, θεόν ἐγκόσμιον τὸν χρόνον ὑμοῦντες, <ώς> αἰώνιον, ἀπέραντον, νέον καὶ πρεσβύτην, ἐλικοειδῆ, πρὸς τούτοις ὡς ἔχοντα τὴν οὐσίαν ἐν αἰώνι καὶ μένοντα ἀεὶ τὸν αὐτὸν καὶ ὡς ἀπειρο-δύναμον.

of *systasis* is described as a mystical initiation of the magician with the personified and deified hours and days (e.g. τέλεσόν με ... σύστησόν με ΧΙΙΙ.610–611).<sup>187</sup> In the “[Σύστασις πρ]ὸς Ἡλίον” (*PGM* III.494–611) also the twelve different animal “forms,” “images” and magical names of Helios correspond to the twelve hours of the day respectively (III.501–536).

**4.5–6, 9, 12, 17–18. Λέοντες καὶ Ἀλεκτρυόνες, “Lions” and “Cocks”**

The reference to the ‘solar animals’ and particularly to lions and cocks could be an influence from Iamblichus. In his *De vita Pythagorica*, Iamblichus discusses Pythagoras’ concept of divine being as defined by number, and reports that Pythagoras “achieved through these same numbers an admirable prediction and worship of gods according the numbers, as it was most closely related to them” (ἐποιείτο δὲ διὰ τῶν αὐτῶν ἀριθμῶν καὶ θαυμαστὴν πρόγνωσιν καὶ θεραπείαν τῶν θεῶν κατὰ τοὺς ἀριθμοὺς ὅτι μάλιστα συγγενεστάτην. Iamb. *VP* 28.147.5–7).<sup>188</sup> Iamblichus reports as an illustration of Pythagoras’ theory on numbers his reaction to Abaris the Hyperborean—a legendary healer and priest of Apollo—who used to make predictions, sacrificing birds, “for they think that bird entrails are accurate for examination” (τὰ γὰρ τῶν τοιούτων σπλάγχνα ἀκριβῆ πρὸς διάσκεψιν ἡγούνται Iamb. *VP* 28.147.12–13).<sup>189</sup> Hence, “Pythagoras [who] wished not to diminish his zeal for truth, but to provide him a more reliable method without bloodshed, especially as he believed that the cock was sacred to Helios” (βούλομενος δὲ Πυθαγόρας μὴ ἀφαιρεῖν μὲν αὐτοῦ τὴν εἰς τάληθες σπουδήν, παρασχεῖν δὲ διὰ τινος ἀσφαλεστέρου καὶ χωρὶς αἴματος καὶ σφαγῆς, ἀλλως τε καὶ ὅτι ιερὸν ἡγεῖτο εἶναι τὸν ἀλεκτρυόνα ἡλίῳ Iamb. *VP* 28.147.13–16).<sup>190</sup>

Iamblichus also in *Protrepticus* advises that “you should rear a cock, but you should not sacrifice it; for it is dedicated to the moon and the sun” (Ἀλεκτρυόνα τρέφε μὲν μὴ θῦε δέ· μήνη γάρ καὶ ἡλίῳ καθιέρωται. Iamb. *Protr.* 107.18–19).<sup>191</sup>

187 Also see *PGM* XIII.927–931: διὸ συνίσταμαι σοι διὰ τοῦ μεγάλου ἀρχιστρατηγοῦ Μιχαήλ ... διὸ συνίσταμαι.

188 Deubner (1975) 83.

189 Deubner (1975) 83. Iamblichus in *Vita Pythagorica* writes that Abaris is said to have purified Sparta and Knossos from plagues (Iamb. *VP* 92–93). Abaris and Pythagoras also appear at the court of the Sicilian tyrant Phalaris, discussing about the divine (Iamb. *VP* 215–221). The Souda Lexicon attributes to Abaris a volume of *Scythian Oracles* among his other books (6).

190 Deubner (1975) 83.

191 The same advice is also repeated in Iamb. *Protr.* 116.11–16: Τὸ δὲ ἀλεκτρυόνα τρέφε μέν, μὴ θῦε δέ· μήνη γάρ καὶ ἡλίῳ καθιέρωται συμβούλεύει ἡμῖν ὑποτρέφειν καὶ σωματοποιεῖν καὶ μὴ παρορᾶν ἀπολλύμενα καὶ διαφθειρόμενα τὰ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ἐνώσεως καὶ ἀληγλουχίας συμπαθείας τε καὶ συμπνοίας μεγάλα τεκμήρια. Pistelli (1888).

4.18–19: Ἄφανή γενέσθαι φασὶν ὑποστελλόμενον τὰ τῶν κρειττόνων συνθήματα

The solar lion-faced daemons' transformation into invisible beings and their shrinking back before the *synthémata* of the higher beings may allude to some form of ritual performed in theurgy. Proclus, for example, in his *Commentary on Plato's Republic*, discussing Homer's myths (Procl. *In R.* 1.76.17–79.18) and drawing parallels between the leaders of the hieratic art and the myth-makers (e.g. Homer and Hesiod), points out that the leaders of the hieratic rites established the rituals of "laughter and lamentation" (γέλωτά τε καὶ θρήνους 1.78.15–16) for the classes of daemons in the hieratic art (Procl. *In R.* 1.78.14–18).<sup>192</sup>

Psellus' question in *Theologica* 1 (Gautier 1989) *Theol. Opusc.* 1.51.38, διὰ τί, γάρ φησιν ὁ Πρόκλος, ὁ λέων τὸν ἀλεκτρυόνα ὑπέσταλται; alludes to the phrase and discussion of Proclus' *On the Hieratic Art according to the Greeks*, ὑποστέλλεται γάρ ὁ λέων, φασί, τὸν ἀλεκτρυόνα, "for, they say, the lion shrinks back before the cock." (Procl. *Hier.Ar.* 4.9); and it shows that Psellus must have been aware of Proclus' fragmentary treatise.

Psellus' explanation is similar to that of Proclus,<sup>193</sup> "then he adds that the *synthémata* are more powerful in him [the cock] than in the lion, for the cock is solar, but the lion belongs to the moon" (εἴτα ἐπάγει, ὅτι κρείττονα ἐν ἐκείνῳ τὰ συνθήματα ἡ ἐν τῷ λέοντι, ὁ μὲν γάρ ήλιακός ἐστιν, ὁ δὲ σεληνιακός. *Theol. Opusc.* 1.51.38–40).<sup>194</sup> Furthermore, in *Philosophica Minora* 1 (Duffy 1992)<sup>195</sup> *Opusculum* 16, Psellus repeats that notion, "the lion is under the series of the moon, while the cock is under the series of the sun" (ὁ μὲν λέων ὑπὸ τὴν σειρὰν τῆς σελήνης ἐστίν, ὁ δέ γε ἀλεκτρυών ὑπὸ τὴν ήλιακὴν τάξιν. *Phil. Opusc.* 1.16.232–233). Likewise, "whenever the lion-faced daemons often appeared and saw a cock, they cowered beneath" (καὶ δαιμονες δὲ λεοντοπρόσωποι πολλάκις φανέντες, ἀλεκτρυόνα ιδόντες ὑπέπτηξαν. *Phil. Opusc.* 1.16.239–240).<sup>196</sup>

#### 4.12.a (cf. also 7.8). Σύμβολα, "Symbols"

Proclus in his *Commentary on Plato's Cratylus* describes the process of reciting the symbols of the gods and highlights the ritualistic role of the theurgist, "such are the so-called *symbols* of gods; being uniform in the superior class,

192 See also Comm.: Sect. 1.2.b on the definition of the *hieratic art-theurgy* above.

193 Procl. *Hier.Ar.* 4.11–12: Ἐνεργεστέρα γοῦν ἐστιν ἡ τῶν ήλιακῶν συμβόλων εἰς τὸν ἀλεκτρυόνα παρουσία.

194 Also, Psel. *Theol. Opusc.* 1.51.40–42: ἀλλὰ καὶ δαιμονες, φησί, μετασχηματισθέντες εἰς λέοντα καὶ ἐν μέσαις νυξὶ φανέντες, ἐπειδὴ ἀλεκτρυόνος ἄδοντος ἥκουσαν, ἥφανίσθησαν.

195 Duffy (1992) Vol. I: 54.

196 Also, Psel. *Phil. Opusc.* 1.16.236–239: δέδοικεν τούτον ὁ λέων ιδών, ὅτι οὖτος μὲν τῆς σεληνιακῆς ἐστι τάξις, ἐκεῖνος δὲ τῆς ήλιακῆς, καὶ ὡς τοῦ ἐλάττονος φωστήρος ζῶν τὸ τοῦ μείζονος πέφρικε.

but multiformed in the inferior; theurgy also, imitating these [symbols], recites them through pronounced but inarticulate expressions.” (... τοιαῦτα δ’ ἔστιν τὰ καλούμενα σύμβολα τῶν θεῶν· μονοειδῆ μὲν ἐν τοῖς ὑψηλοτέροις ὅντα διακόσμοις, πολυειδῆ δ’ ἐν τοῖς καταδεεστέροις· ἀ καὶ ἡ θεουργία μιμουμένη δι’ ἐκφωνήσεων μέν, ἀδιαρθρώτων δέ, αὐτὰ προφέρεται Procl. *In Cra.* 71.31.24–28).<sup>197</sup> Also, “... so for this reason the theurgist, who is the leader of this ritual, starts with the purifications and the lustral besprinklings.” (... διὸ καὶ ὁ θεουργὸς ὁ τῆς τελετῆς τούτου προκαθηγούμενος ἀπὸ τῶν καθάρσεων ἀρχεται καὶ τῶν περιρράνσεων Procl. *In Cra.* 176.101.3–5).<sup>198</sup>

In his *Commentary on Plato’s Timaeus* Proclus also discusses the divine names handed down to the theurgists—probably referring to Julian the Chaldaean and his son Julian the Theurgist who composed or compiled the *Chaldaean Oracles*<sup>199</sup>—noticing, “for this reason the divine cosmic names have been transmitted to the theurgists as well, some termed unutterable, but others uttered by them, the former expressing the invisible powers within it, the latter expressing the visible elements from which they have been completed.” (διὸ καὶ τοῖς θεουργοῖς ὀνόματα θεῖα κοσμικὰ παραδέδοται, τὰ μὲν ἄρρητα καλούμενα, τὰ δὲ ἥρητὰ παρ’ αὐτοῖς, τὰ μὲν τῶν ἀφανῶν ἐν αὐτῷ δύναμεων ὅντα, τὰ δὲ τῶν ἐμφανῶν στοιχείων, ἐξ ὧν συμπεπλήρωται. Procl. *In. Ti.* 1.274.16–20). Proclus also in his *Commentary on Plato’s Republic* mentions “... the hieratic/theurgic mode of the *agôge* [evoking procedure], accomplished by sacrifices, divine names and prayers,” ... ⟨ὅ⟩ ιερατικὸς τρόπος τῆς ἀγωγῆς, διὰ θυσιῶν, δι’ ὀνομάτων θείων, δι’ εὐχῶν συμπεπληρωμένος (Procl. *In R.* 11.66.13–15).

Similarly in the mystic rites, according to Proclus, the initiates “are disposed to the sacred symbols and, standing all of them outside themselves, are established in the gods and are possessed by them.” (τοὺς δὲ συνδιατίθεσθαι τοῖς ιεροῖς συμβόλοις καὶ ἔαυτῶν ἐκστάντας ὅλους ἐνιδρύσθαι τοῖς θεοῖς καὶ ἐνθεάζειν Procl. *In R.* 11.108.22–24).<sup>200</sup>

197 Pasquali (1908) 31.

198 Pasquali (1908) 101.

199 See Intro.: Sect. I above.

200 Procl. *In R.* 11.108.17–30: “Οτι δὲ καὶ εἰς τοὺς πολλοὺς δρῶσιν οἱ μῦθοι, δηλοῦσιν αἱ τελεταί. καὶ γάρ αὐταις χρώμεναι τοῖς μύθοις, ἵνα τὴν περὶ θεῶν ἀλήθειαν ἔρρητον κατακλείωσιν, συμπαθείας εἰσὶν αἵτιαι ταῖς ψυχαῖς περὶ τὰ δρώμενα τρόπον ἀγνωστὸν ἡμῖν καὶ θεῖον· ὡς τοὺς μὲν τῶν τελούμένων καταπλήττεσθαι δειμάτων θείων πλήρεις γιγνομένους, τοὺς δὲ συνδιατίθεσθαι τοῖς ιεροῖς συμβόλοις καὶ ἔαυτῶν ἐκστάντας ὅλους ἐνιδρύσθαι τοῖς θεοῖς καὶ ἐνθεάζειν πάντως που καὶ τῶν ἐπομένων αὐτοῖς κρειττόνων ἡμῶν γενῶν διὰ τὴν πρὸς τὰ τοιαῦτα συνθήματα φιλίαν ἀνεγειρόντων ἡμᾶς εἰς τὴν πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς δι’ αὐτῶν συμπάθειαν. ἡ πῶς μετ’ ἐκείνων μὲν πᾶς ὁ περὶ γῆν τόπος μεστός ἦν παντοίων ἀγαθῶν, ὃν θεοὶ προξενοῦσιν ἀνθρώποις, ἀνευ δὲ ἐκείνων ἄπνοια πάντα καὶ ὄμοια τῆς τῶν θεῶν ἔστιν ἐπιλάμψεως;

Proclus in his *Platonic Theology* highlights the use of symbols in theurgy for the illumination of the statues, stating, “and just as *theurgy* through some symbols invokes the bounteous goodness of the gods in order to obtain the illumination of the artificial statues” (καὶ ὥσπερ ἡ θεουργία διὰ δή τινων συμβόλων εἰς τὴν τῶν τεχνητῶν ἀγαλμάτων ἔλλαμψιν προκαλεῖται τὴν τῶν θεῶν ἀφθονον ἀγάθοτητα Procl. *Plat.Theol.* 1.124.23–25).

Furthermore, in his *Chaldaean Philosophy* (Πρόκλου ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς χαλδαϊκῆς φιλοσοφίας, *Extraits du Commentaire de Proclus sur la Philosophie Chaldaïque*) extract 5, Proclus asserts, “for the soul is composed by sacred words and divine symbols; ... and we are images of intellectual essences and *statues* of unknown *synthémata* ... in that way the soul participates in *synthémata*, through which it is united with the god” (συνέστηκε γάρ ἡ ψυχὴ ἀπὸ τῶν ἱερῶν λόγων καὶ τῶν θείων συμβόλων· ... καὶ ἐσμὲν εἰκόνες μὲν τῶν νοερῶν οὐσιῶν, ἀγάλματα [τὰ] δὲ τῶν ἀγνώστων συνθημάτων. ... οὕτω καὶ πάντων μὲν μετέχει τῶν συνθημάτων, δι’ ὃν συνάπτεται τῷ θεῷ, Procl. *Phil. Chald. Fr.* 5.211.4–212.2).<sup>201</sup>

Iamblichus in *De Mysteriis* VII, referring to the “intellectual interpretation of the symbols according to the Egyptian thought” (Iamb. *Myst.* VII.2.250.10–11), explicates the symbolism of sailing in a ship: “The one who sails in the ship represents the rule that governs the world. Just as the steersman mounts on the ship, being separate from its rudders, so the sun, separately from the tillers, mounts upon the whole world” (Ο δὲ ἐπὶ πλοίου ναυτιλλόμενος τὴν διακυβερνῶσαν τὸν κόσμον ἐπικράτειαν παρίστησιν. “Ωσπερ οὖν ὁ κυβερνήτης χωριστὸς ὃν τῆς νεώς τῶν πηδαλίων αὐτῆς ἐπιβέβηκεν, οὕτω χωριστῶς ὁ ἥλιος τῶν οἰάκων τοῦ κόσμου παντὸς ἐπιβέβηκεν Iamb. *Myst.* VII.2.252.8–10).

Iamblichus also in *De Mysteriis* II emphasises the role of secret acts and unspeakable symbols in the theurgic union: “the accomplishment of ritual acts not to be spoken and which are executed divinely beyond all conception and the power of unspeakable *symbols* conceived only by the gods establish the theurgic union,” ἡ τῶν ἔργων τῶν ἀρρήτων καὶ ὑπέρ πάστων νόησιν θεοπρεπῶς ἐνεργουμένων τελεσιουργία ἡ τε τῶν νοούμενων τοῖς θεοῖς μόνον συμβόλων ἀφθέγκτων δύναμις ἐντίθησι τὴν θεουργικὴν ἔνωσιν (Iamb. *Myst.* II.11.96.13–97.2).<sup>202</sup>

<sup>201</sup> See also *Fr.* 1.17–24: ‘Γέμνωδός δὲ ἀποτελεῖται τῶν θείων ἡ ψυχή, κατὰ τὸ λόγιον, τὰ συνθήματα τοῦ Πατρὸς τὰ ὅρητα προβαλλομένη καὶ προσφέρουσα αὐτὰ τῷ Πατρί, ἀ ἐνέθετο ὁ Πατήτος εἰς αὐτὴν ἐπὶ τῇ πρώτῃ παρόδῳ τῆς οὐσίας. Τοιοῦτοι γάρ οἱ νοεροὶ καὶ ἀφανεῖς ὄμνοι τῆς ἀναγομένης ψυχῆς, ἀνοκινοῦντες τὴν μνήμην τῶν ἀρμονικῶν λόγων οἱ φέρουσιν ἀπορρήτους εἰκόνας τῶν θείων ἐν αὐτῇ δυνάμεων. See Pitra (1888) Vol. v: 192–195; and Des Places (1971) 206–212.

<sup>202</sup> Also, Iamb. *Myst.* IX.1, 5, 9. On the distinction between the Plotinian mystical union and the union with the divine in magic and theurgy see Dodds (1928) 141ff., and (1951) 286, 302; Armstrong (1955); Shaw (1995); Rappe (2000); Mazur (2003) and (2004). For Plotinus the divine union with the god in philosophy is accomplished by the contemplation of god

#### 4.12.b. *Symbols in Magic*

Similarly in magic in three spells that are probably parts, as Dillon rightly observes, of a broader “*Systasis* with Helios” spell (*PGM* III.494–731)<sup>203</sup>—the “*Systasis* to Helios” ([Σύστασις πρ]ὸς “*Ηλιον* *PGM* III.494–611), the untitled spell concerning your own shadow (*PGM* III.612–631), and *PGM* III.633–731—the magician mentions the “signs and *symbols*” (τὰ σημεῖα καὶ τὰ παράσημα) of Helios in order to get connected with him: Part A: III.494–611: ὅτι οἶδά σου τὰ σημεῖα καὶ τὰ παράσημα (III.499–500) and εἴρηκά σου τὰ σ[ημ]εῖα καὶ τὰ παράσημα (III.536). Part B: III.612–631: ὅτι οἶδά σου τὰ ἄγ[ια] ὄνόμ[ατα καὶ] τὰ σημεῖα καὶ τὰ παράσημα (III.623–625) and εἴρηκά σου τὰ ἄγια ὄνόμ[ατα καὶ] τὰ [σημεῖα σου] καὶ τὰ παράσημα (III.627–628). Part C: III.633–731: the “*symbols*,” σύμβολα (III.701).

The spell called “This is the (consecration) ritual for all purposes. Spell to Helios” (“Ἐστιν δὲ ἡ κατὰ πάντων τελετὴ ἥδε. Πρὸς “*Ηλιον λόγος*” *PGM* IV.1596–1715) aims at consecrating a phylactery, stone, or a ring by reciting to Helios a spell with ritual *symbols*, which apply to the various stages of its preparation. The portrait of Helios is based on the synthesis of natural, divine and cosmic powers, which at the same time are necessary for the consecration of the phylactery. The spell lists the twelve different animal forms and magical names of Helios, which correspond to the twelve hours of the day. The twelve animal forms and creative powers of Helios are associated with the twelve stages of consecration of the phylactery. For example, “in the first hour you (Helios) have the form of a cat, your name (is) *PHARAKOUNETH*. Give glory and favour to this phylactery, this stone and to NN,” δὸς δόξαν καὶ χάριν τῷ φυλακτηρίῳ τούτῳ, τῷ λίθῳ τούτῳ καὶ τῷ δεῖνα (IV.1647–1650).<sup>204</sup>

In the “Erotic binding spell of Astrapsoukos” (*PGM* VIII.1–63), in which the union is justified by the emphasis of the magician’s knowledge of the god, his forms, signs and *symbols* throughout the invocation.<sup>205</sup> The magician defines himself as one who knows “the names for you [Hermes] in heaven”; “I know also your forms,” οἶδά σου καὶ τὰς μορφάς, “I know (οἶδά σου) also your wood” and “I know (οἶδά σου) also your barbarian names” (VIII.6–15 and 20–21).<sup>206</sup> Then the

and beauty; Plot. *ENN.* I.6.9.33–35: Γενέσθω δὴ πρῶτον θεοειδῆς πᾶς καὶ καλὸς πᾶς, εἰ μέλλει θεάσασθαι θεόν τε καὶ καλόν; also Plot. *ENN.* VI.7.34.

203 Betz (1986) 34; see also Preisendanz (1973) Vol. I: 59.

204 See the discussion on possible influence of the Egyptian *dodekaoros* in III.494–611; see Boll (1903) 295–346; see Comm.: Sect. 5.4–12, 15.b on the concepts of “mixing” and “one” and “many” in the Helios examples from magic above.

205 The knowledge of the signs and symbols of the adjured god is a common characteristic of the invocation spell to the personal daimon (also III.612–631 and VII.478–490). See VII.478–479 and III.624–627, 629–630.

206 There are interesting parallels at Rev 3:1, Καὶ τῷ ἀγγέλῳ τῆς ἐν Σάρδεσιν ἐκκλησίας γράψον

magician, personally, refers to Hermes saying: “I know you (οἶδά σε), Hermes, who you are and where you come from and which your city is; Hermoupolis,” “come to me (έλθε μοι), lord Hermes, many-named,<sup>207</sup> who knows (εἰδώς) the things hidden beneath heaven and earth” (viii.13–15).<sup>208</sup>

## 5. Mixing, One and Many, Helios, Statues and *Synthêmata*

### 5.4–12, 15 (cf. also 2.1–3).a. *The Concepts of Μῖξις, “Mixing,” Many Powers, and “One” and “Many” in the Helios Example from Philosophy: Angels, Daemons, Souls, Animals, Plants and Stones Participating in Helios’ Nature*

The Helios examples from Neoplatonic philosophy illustrate the notion of mixing based on the concept of unity and diversity and the relationship between one and many. Proclus’ *On the Hieratic Art according to the Greeks* refers to the various attributes of Helios in different entities, such as angels, daemons, souls, animals, plants, stones (5.4–5).

This concept of one and many is explored by the theurgists, “the leaders of the hieratic art,” οἱ τῆς ἱερατικῆς ἡγεμόνες (5.6), by using “the procedure of mixing the many,” διὸ τῇ μίξει τῶν πολλῶν (5.10; also μίξαντες and μῖξις, 5.7, 8), in order to establish unity with the one, “through the process of union with many powers,” καθ’ ἔνωσιν τῶν πλειόνων δυνάμεων (5.15).<sup>209</sup> Proclus in his *Commentary on Plato’s Timaeus* similarly refers to the division of the World Soul into universal genera and “the *mixture* (σύγχρασις) from all [universals] towards the implied [universal] creation, which exists in a holistic mode,” ἡ ἐκ τῶν ὅλων σύγχρασις πρὸς τὴν ὑποκειμένην δημιουργίαν δύικὴν ὑπάρχουσαν (Procl. *In Ti.* II. 268.1–3).<sup>210</sup>

Τάδε λέγει ο ἔχων τὰ ἐπτὰ πνεύματα τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τοὺς ἐπτὰ ἀστέρας· Οἶδά σου τὰ ἔργα, ὅτι ὅνομα ἔχεις ὅτι ζῆς, καὶ νεκρὸς εἶ. Also, Rev 3:8, Οἶδά σου τὰ ἔργα—ἰδού δέδωκα ἐνώπιόν σου θύραν ἡνεῳγμένην, ἵν σύδεις δύναται κλείσαι αὐτήν—ὅτι μικρὰν ἔχεις δύναμιν, καὶ ἐτήρησάς μου τὸν λόγον, καὶ οὐκ ἡρήσω τὸ ὄνομά μου.

<sup>207</sup> On “many-named,” πολυώνυμος see Pachoumi (201b) 155–165, at 161.

<sup>208</sup> The reference is, actually, to Hermes-Thoth. Hermes in Greek religion is the interpreter of the divine associated with the founding of civilisation; Burkert (1996) 157–159. The Egyptian god Thoth is similarly associated with sacred writings, wisdom and knowledge of magic and medicine; Morenz (1992) 270; Wiedemann (2003) 225ff. Due to their common characteristics, Hermes and Thoth were systematically identified with each other in the Hellenistic and Roman period; Dunand and Zivie-Coché (2002) 140–147.

<sup>209</sup> Procl. *Hier.Ar.* 5.4–17.

<sup>210</sup> Procl. *In Ti.* II.297.15; also Procl. *In Prm.* 777.5–9: Ἡ δὲ σύγχρασις τῶν εἰδῶν ἐμφαίνει τὴν κοινωνίαν αὐτῶν τὴν ἀδιάζευκτον καὶ τὴν ἔνωσιν τὴν ἀσύλον, ἵσως δὲ καὶ τὴν πηγαίαν αὐτῶν καὶ

Iamblichus in *De Mysteriis* VII discusses the manifold powers, τῶν πολυτρόπων δυνάμεων, the various forms and transformations, τὰς δὲ διαμείψεις τῆς μορφῆς καὶ τοὺς μετασχηματισμοὺς of the one god Helios (Iamb. *Myst.* VII.3.12–16),<sup>211</sup> claiming about theurgic art that: “the theurgic art ... many times combines stones, plants, animals, aromatic substances [herbs] and other such things [that are] holy and perfect and godlike” (ἡ θεουργικὴ τέχνη ... συμπλέκει πολλάκις λίθους βοτάνας ζῷα ἀρώματα ἄλλα τοιαῦτα ἱερὰ καὶ τέλεια καὶ θεοειδῆ). Iamb. *Myst.* v.23.233.9–12).<sup>212</sup>

In the third Helios example Iamblichus in *De Mysteriis* VII, attempting “to interpret the mode of the Egyptian theology” (Iamb. *Myst.* VII.1.249.10–11), explains the notion of the manifold powers and transformations of the one god Helios: “for this reason the symbolic teaching wishes to indicate the one god through the multitude of offerings, and to represent his one power through the manifold powers; wherefore it [the symbolic teaching] indicates that he [Helios] is one and the same, but assigns the changes of form and of configuration to the [his] recipients. Therefore it [the symbolic teaching] indicates that he [Helios] is changed according to the Zodiac and every hour, just as these are changeable around the god according to his many receptions.” (διὰ τοῦτο βούλεται μὲν ἡ συμβολικὴ διδαχὴ διὰ τοῦ πλήθους τῶν δοθέντων τὸν ἔνα θεὸν ἐμφαίνειν, καὶ διὰ τῶν πολυτρόπων δυνάμεων τὴν μίαν αὐτοῦ παριστάναι δύναμιν. διὸ καὶ φησιν αὐτὸν ἔνα εἶναι καὶ τὸν αὐτόν, τὰς δὲ διαμείψεις τῆς μορφῆς καὶ τοὺς μετασχηματισμοὺς ἐν τοῖς δεχομένοις ὑποτίθεται. Διόπερ κατὰ ζῷδιον καὶ καθ' ὥραν μεταβάλλεσθαι αὐτόν φησιν, ὡς ἐκείνων διαποικιλλομένων περὶ τὸν θεὸν κατὰ τὰς πολλὰς αὐτοῦ ὑποδοχάς). Iamb. *Myst.* VII.3.253.12–254.2).<sup>213</sup>

Furthermore, according to the Egyptian religion, humans, animals, plants and inanimate objects can all be associated with the divine power and considered attributes of a deity. An example is the Egyptian depiction of gods in

---

πρωτουργὸν ἐνδείκνυται φύσιν; Procl. *In Prm.* 723.29, 1051.22–23; Procl. *Hier.Ar.* 5.10–12: διὸ τῇ μίξει τῶν πολλῶν ἐνίζουσι τὰς προειρημένας ἀπορροίας καὶ ἔξομοιοῦσι τὸ ἐκ πάντων ἐν γενόμενον πρὸς ἐκεῖνο τὸ πρὸ τῶν πάντων ὅλον.

211 Iamb. *Myst.* VII.3.12–16: διὰ τοῦ πλήθους τῶν δοθέντων τὸν ἔνα θεὸν ἐμφαίνειν, καὶ διὰ τῶν πολυτρόπων δυνάμεων τὴν μίαν αὐτοῦ παριστάναι δύναμιν διὸ καὶ φησιν αὐτὸν ἔνα εἶναι καὶ τὸν αὐτόν, τὰς δὲ διαμείψεις τῆς μορφῆς καὶ τοὺς μετασχηματισμούς ἐν τοῖς δεχομένοις ὑποτίθεται.

212 Note also a similar reference by (Pseudo-)Psellus’ *Quaenam sunt Graecorum opinions de daemonibus*, Gautier (1988) 85–107 (Boissonade 1838, 40): Η δέ γε μαγεία πολυδύναμον τι χρήμα τοῖς “Ελλησιν ἔδοξε. Μερίδα γοῦν εἶναι ταύτην φασὶν ἐσχάτην τῆς ἱερατικῆς ἐπιστήμης ... ἀνιχνεύουσα γὰρ ἡ τοιαύτη δύναμις τῶν ὑπὸ τὴν σελήνην γενέσεων ἐκάστης οὐσίαν καὶ φύσιν καὶ δύναμιν καὶ ποιότητα, λέγω δὲ στοιχείων καὶ τῶν τούτων μερῶν, ζῶων παντοδαπῶν, φυτῶν καὶ τῶν ἐντεῦθεν καρπῶν, λίθων, βοτανῶν, καὶ ἀπλῶς εἰπεῖν, παντὸς πράγματος ὑπόστασίν τε καὶ δύναμιν, ἐντεῦθεν ἄρα τὰ ἔαυτῆς ἐνεργάζεται.

213 See also discussion in Comm.: Sect. 2.12 above.

animal form or in human form with animal heads. Regarding the concept of divine power and its association with cultic visual images of humans, animals and objects, Morenz observes that, “we proceed from ‘power’ as primary cause, which can elevate to the rank of deity man and animal, even plant and object, so that neither animal nor plant, still less inorganic matter, ever ceases to be God *in potentia*.<sup>214</sup>

The various attributes, powers, forms and transformations of the one god Helios, as described by Proclus and Iamblichus, seem remotely parallel to Plotinus’ doctrine of the “generically” (τῷ γένει) and “manifold” One which “at the same time” is “also many” (ἐν ἀμα καὶ πολλά) and that “anything manifold (ποικίλον) has the many in one” (Plot. *Enn.* vi.2.2.2 ff.). Plotinus also discussing the *genera* (γένη) identified with *principles* (ἀρχάς), in *Ennead* vi says: ἀρά τὰ μὲν γένη, ἔκαστον μετὰ τῶν ὑπ’ αὐτά, ὁμοῦ μιγνύντες ἀλλήλοις τὰ πάντα, τὸ ὅλον ἀποτελούμεν καὶ σύγκρασιν ποιοῦμεν ἀπάντων; “so, by mixing the *genera*, all of them together with each other, each with those under these, do we accomplish *the whole* and make *a mixture of everything*?“ (Plot. *Enn.* vi.2.2.20–22).<sup>215</sup>

#### 5.4–12, 15 (cf. also 2.1–3).b. *The Concepts of Μῖξις, “Mixing,” and “One” and “Many,” in the Helios Examples from Magic*

The examples and references to Helios from the magico-theurgic ritual-prayers of systasis further demonstrate influences and interactions with the magical papyri on the notions of mixing and one and many. In the magico-theurgic systasis spell with your personal daimon, “Σύστασις ἰδίου δαίμονος” (*PGM* VII.505–528), which aims at connecting the individual with his personal daimon, Helios is assimilated with abstract deified concepts and addressed as: σὺ εἶ ὁ ἔχων ἐν σεαυτῷ τὴν τῆς κοσμικῆς φύσεως σύγκρασιν, “you are the one who have in yourself the mixture of the cosmic nature” (vii.511).<sup>216</sup>

In the other magico-theurgic systasis spell to Helios, “[Σύστασις πρ]ὸς Ἡλίον” (*PGM* III.494–611), Helios is presented as the creator of the four elements, “who created all: abyss, earth, fire, water, air” (III.554–555). In the formula *PGM* III.499–536, included in the above systasis spell (also in *PGM* IV.1596–1715),

<sup>214</sup> Morenz (1992) 20, 17–18, 19–21, 139–142; Hornung (1982); Stroumsa (1981) 412–435; Quack (2006) 175–190. Also see Pachoumi (2011a) 39–49, at 40, n. 6.

<sup>215</sup> Cf. Plot. *Enn.* vi.3.25.9 ff.: Εἰ δὲ σύγκρασίν τινα καὶ μίξιν σημαίνουσι καὶ κράστιν καὶ εἰς ἐξ ἐνὸς σύστασιν τὴν κατὰ τὸ συνίστασθαι γινομένην, οὐ κατὰ τὸ συνεστάναι; Plot. *Enn.* III.3.4.49; Porph. *V. Plot.* 31.50.23–51.3; τὴν δὲ πασῶν ἀμα σύγκρασιν καὶ συμφωνίαν καὶ ὥστανει σύνδεσμον, ἥσπερ ὡς ἀιδίου τε καὶ ἀγενήτου μέρος ἔκάστη καὶ ἀπόρροια, Μνημοσύνην ὡνόμαζεν. Des Places and Segonds (1982) 50–51; Iamb. *Comm. Math.* p. 29.1; Iamb. *Theol. Ar.* v.18. See Pachoumi (2013) 46–69, at 51.

<sup>216</sup> On the systasis in VII.505–528 see Pachoumi (2013) 46–69, at 47–55.

Helios is identified with twelve different animal “forms” and magical names, which correspond to the twelve hours of the day, and are associated with the production of a different tree, stone and bird (III.501–536): “in the first hour you [Helios] have the form (μορφήν) and image (τύπον) of a child monkey; you produce a silver fir tree, an *aphanos* stone, a ... bird ..., your name (is) *PHROUER*,<sup>217</sup> in the second hour you have the form of a unicorn, you produce a *perseia* tree, a pottery stone, a *halouchakon* bird, on land an *ichneumon*, your name (is) *BAZ-ETOPHOTH*” (III.501–506). The Hour or Hours are personified and deified in the Greek magical papyri. For example, in *PGM* XIII.1–343 “A sacred book called Monad or Eighth Book of Moses about the holy name” the magician according to the *systasis* ritual should be connected *τοῖς ὠρογενέσιν θεοῖς*, “with the gods who beget the hours” (XIII.29–31) and *ἐπικαλοῦ τὸν τῆς ὥρας καὶ τὸν τῆς ἡμέρας θεόν*, ἵνα ἐξ αὐτῶν συσταθῆς, “invoke the god of the hour and the day, so that you may be connected through them” (XIII.378–379).<sup>218</sup> Proclus mentions the Chaldaean invocations to “the divine names of day and night,” ὄνόματά τε θεῖα νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας (Procl. *In Ti.* III.89.18), and to the personified “goddesses of Time, god Month,” τὰς “Ὥρας θεάς καὶ τὸν Μῆνα θεόν (Procl. *In Ti.* III.32.16–17).<sup>219</sup>

The twelvefold division of Helios’ forms and names and its correspondence to the twelve hours of the day allude to the sun cult and the ritual of hours in the Egyptian religion, and more specifically to the hymns of Hours of the day in the cult of Ra.<sup>220</sup> That association also finds parallels in the zodiac signs and their associated animals in the Egyptian dodekaoros.<sup>221</sup>

Furthermore, in the beginning and the end of the formula *PGM* III.499–536 the magician emphasises to Helios his personal knowledge of Helios’ signs, symbols and forms: οἶδά σου τὰ σημεῖα καὶ τὰ π]αράσ[ημα καί μ]ορφάς “I know your signs and symbols and forms” (III.499–500); and εἴρηκά σου τὰ σ[ημ]εῖα

<sup>217</sup> I.e. Pre the great, see Ritner in Betz (1986) 31, n. 97.

<sup>218</sup> Similarly, in the *systasis* spell VII.505–528 the magician greets “the present hour,” “the present day,” and “every day” (VII.506–507). Similarly, in the *defixio* from Carthage there is an invocation to “the god of this day,” “the god who has the power of this hour.” Audollent (1904) 325 ff.; also see Kotansky (1994) 118–120. See Pachoumi (2013) 46–69, at 49–50.

<sup>219</sup> Procl. *In Ti.* III.89.17–19: ὄνόματά τε θεῖα νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας ἐκδιδούσα καὶ μηνὸς καὶ ἐνιαυτοῦ συστατικά καὶ κλήσεις καὶ αὐτοφανείας; also Procl. *In Ti.* III.32.16–21: δεύτερον δὲ κοινῆς οὐσίης ἐννοίας εἶναι τὰς “Ὥρας θεάς καὶ τὸν Μῆνα θεόν, ὃν καὶ ἱερὰ παρειλήφαμεν, καὶ Ἡμέραν καὶ Νύκτα θεᾶς εἶναι φαμεν, ὃν καὶ κλήσεις ἔχομεν ἐκδεδομένας παρ’ αὐτῶν τῶν θεῶν, πολλῷ μᾶλλον ἀνάγκη τὸν χρόνον αὐτὸν εἶναι θεόν καὶ μηνὸς καὶ ὥρων καὶ νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας ὅντα περιληπτικόν. For the invocation of the gods of time in the Chaldaean theurgical rituals see Psel. *Daim.* c.7; Lewy (1978) 229–230, esp. n. 9.

<sup>220</sup> See Quirke (2001) 54–58.

<sup>221</sup> On the dodekaoros see Boll (1903) 295–346.

καὶ τὰ παράσημα, “I have told your signs and symbols” (III.536).<sup>222</sup> These various forms of Helios represent different attributes of the god. Proclus, as we have seen, *On the Hieratic Art*, discussing the association of one and many in the natural cosmos, refers to the various attributes of Helios in different entities (Procl. *Hier.Ar.* 5.4–17). Iamblichus also in *De Mysteriis* used the example of the manifold powers, forms and transformations of the one god Helios, referring to the practices of the hieratic-theurgic art and attempting “to interpret the mode of the Egyptian theology” (Iamb. *Myst.* VII.1.249.10–11 and VII.3.253.12–254.2).

The mixing of the four elements for hieratic-theurgic purposes also alludes to the medico-magical text of the *Kyranides*.<sup>223</sup> In the beginning of each chapter of Book 1, called *Kyranis*, of the *Kyranides* the names of a plant, a bird, a fish and a stone are recorded, which all start with the same letter as that of the chapter.<sup>224</sup> The various combinations of some, or all of the four elements, which represent the four elements of nature, can be used for hieratic-theurgic practices, medico-magico-theurgic remedies and for making magic amulets-gems.<sup>225</sup>

### 5.12 (cf. also 3.16). Ἀγάλματα, “Statues”

#### 5.12.a. Statues of Gods as Receptacles of Divine Illuminations in Theurgy and the Teleistic Art

Proclus in his *Platonic Theology* explains the role of statues and symbols in theurgy, “(and just as) *theurgy* through some symbols invokes the bounteous goodness of the gods in order to obtain the illumination of the artificial statues” (καὶ ὥσπερ ἡ θεουργία διὰ δή τινων συμβόλων εἰς τὴν τῶν τεχνητῶν ἀγαλμάτων ἔλλαμψιν προκαλεῖται τὴν τῶν θεῶν ἀφθονον ἀγαθότητα Procl. *Plat.Theol.* I.124.23–25).

Proclus also discusses the personification and divinisation of Day and Night, and Month and Year through invocations and by means of statues and sacrifices, “just as the sacred tradition worships both the latter invisible [numbers] and the causes of these [the visible ones], by naming Night and Day divine [as gods], as well as by delivering connecting [rituals] to Month and Year and *supplications and invocations* for direct revelation [vision of the god invoked]; as if these things are not considered to be summed up on one’s fingers,”<sup>226</sup> but

<sup>222</sup> On the signs and symbols in theurgy see Pachoumi (2013) 46–69, at 60–64.

<sup>223</sup> Helios is addressed κοίρανε (III.551): emended by Preisendanz; κύραννε MS; Preisendanz (1973) I: 54–55.

<sup>224</sup> Kaimakis (1976).

<sup>225</sup> See discussion in Comm.: Sect. 2.2–3 on plants, stones and animals above.

<sup>226</sup> See also Procl. *In Ti.* III.41.5: καὶ δεῖ μὴ ἐπὶ δακτύλων πάντα μόνον σκοπεῖν, ...; and

rather as among the things that have divine subsistence, which the sacred laws commanded to worship and honour by means of statues and sacrifices.” (ώσπερ δὴ καὶ τοὺς ἀφανεῖς ἐκείνους καὶ τούτων αἰτίους ἡ ἱερὰ φήμη θεραπεύει, ὀνόματά τε θεῖα νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας ἐκδίδομσα καὶ μηνὸς καὶ ἐνιαυτοῦ συστατικὰ καὶ κλήσεις καὶ αὐτοφανείας, ὡς οὐκ ἐπὶ δακτύλων θεωρουμένων, ἀλλ’ ἐν ὑπάρξει θείαις, ἃς καὶ θρησκεύειν καὶ τιμᾶν ἀγάλμασί τε καὶ θυσίαις οἱ τῶν ἱερῶν παρεκελεύσαντο θεσμοί, ... Procl. *In Ti.* III.89.16–22).<sup>227</sup>

In his *Commentary on the First Book of Euclid's Elements* there is pointed out theurgy's function as forming and appropriating the shapes of gods by means of their statues. Proclus refers to the “perfect and unitary and unknown and unutterable shapes of gods being mounted on the intelligible figures” (τὰ τέλεια καὶ ἐνοεῖδη καὶ ἄγνωστα καὶ ἀφραστα σχήματα τῶν θεῶν, ἐποχούμενα<sup>228</sup> μὲν τοῖς νοεροῖς σχήμασι), “the properties of which the theurgic art also represents in its statues of the gods, and it clothes them in the most varied figures.” (ῶν καὶ ἡ θεουργία τὰς ἰδιότητας ἀποτυπουμένη τοῖς τῶν θεῶν ἀγάλμασιν ἀλλα ἀλλοις περιβάλλει σχήματα. Procl. *In Euc.* 138.5–12).<sup>229</sup>

Proclus in his *Commentary on Plato's Cratylus* writes about the soul's assimilation to the superior divine beings as well to the posterior beings, and the reflection of that process to the statues, “Moreover, by the same power the soul can assimilate itself to its superiors, gods, angels and daemons; but through the same power it assimilates even the posterior beings (*ta deутera*) from itself to itself and, further, to those superior to itself. Wherefore, it creates images/statues of both gods and daemons;” (καὶ πάλιν κατὰ τὴν αὐτὴν δύναμιν ἡ ψυχὴ δύναται ἑαυτὴν ἐξομοιοῦν τοῖς κρείττονι ἑαυτῆς θεοῖς ἀγγέλοις δαίμοσιν ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ δεύτερα ἀφ' ἑαυτῆς ἐξομοιοῖ πρὸς ἑαυτὴν διὰ τῆς αὐτῆς δυνάμεως, καὶ ἔτι πρὸς τὰ κρείττω ἑαυτῆς, διὸ θεῶν τε ἀγάλματα καὶ δαιμόνων δημιουργεῖ. Procl. *In Cra.* 19.51.4–8).

Procl. *In R.* I.16.3–8: Τὸν <τέλειον ἀριθμὸν> οὐ μόνον χρὴ νοεῖν ἐπὶ δακτύλων τι]θέντας (οὐτος γ[άρ ἐστιν] ἀριθμητὸν μᾶλλον ἡ ἀριθμὸς καὶ τελειούμενος καὶ οὐδέποτε τέλειος, ἀεὶ γιγνόμενος), ἀλλὰ τὴν αἰτίαν τούτου νοερὰν μὲν οὖσαν, περιέχουσαν δὲ τὸν πεπερασμένον ὄρον τῆς τοῦ κόσμου πάσης περιόδου.

227 Also, Procl. *In R.* II.133.15–20: εἰ δὲ καὶ προσεχώς εἰς τὴν σεληνιακὴν ἀνήρτηται σφαῖραν, ἐν ἥ της γενέσεως αἰτίαι πάστες καὶ, ὡς φησίν τις ἱερὸς λόγος, τὸ αὐτοπτὸν ἀγάλμα τῆς φύσεως προσλάμπει, δῆλον δήπουθεν, ὅτι καὶ ταύτῃ λειμῶν εἰκότας ὀνομάζεται, δεξάμενος ἐκεῖθεν πρώτος τὰς προόδους τῶν τὴν γένεσιν συγκροτούντων πνευμάτων.

228 On ἐποχούμενον referring to σχῆμα, the vehicle of the soul, see also Procl. *In Euc.* 90.11–14: ἄλλοι δὲ ἀπορητότεροι λόγοι καὶ τὸν δημιουργὸν ἐφεστάναι τῷ κόσμῳ λέγουσιν τοῖς πόλοις ἐποχούμενον καὶ δι' ἔρωτος θείου τὸ πάντα ἐπιστρέφοντα πρὸς ἑαυτόν. Friedlein (1873) 90. Procl. *Inst.* 205. Also, Dodds (1933) Appendix II, pp. 313–323. See also discussion in Comm.: Sect. 2.13 on the “Transmission of Fire” and n. 124.

229 Friedlein (1873) 138.

Regarding the *telestic* art [the art of mystic initiatory rites] and the role of statues of gods as receptacles of divine illuminations, Proclus claims, “thus, just as the *telestic* art<sup>230</sup> through some symbols and secret *synthémata* conforms the statues in this way to the gods, and makes these statues suitable for the reception of divine illuminations, so too the legislative art by the same power of assimilation substitutes names as statues of their objects, representing through such echoes the nature of real beings; and having substituted them it handed them on to men for use.” (καὶ ὥσπερ ἡ τελεστικὴ διὰ δή τινων συμβόλων καὶ ἀπορρήτων συνθημάτων τὰ τῆδε ἀγάλματα τοῖς θεοῖς ἀπεικάζει καὶ ἐπιτήδεια ποιεῖ πρὸς ὑποδοχὴν τῶν θείων ἐλλάμψεων, οὕτω δὲ καὶ ἡ νομοθετικὴ κατὰ τὴν αὐτὴν ἀφομοιωτικὴν δύναμιν ἀγάλματα τῶν πραγμάτων ὑφίστησι τὰ ὄνόματα διὰ τοίων καὶ τοίων ἥχων ἀπεικονιζόμενη τὴν τῶν ὄντων φύσιν, καὶ ὑποστήσασα παρέδωκεν εἰς χρῆσιν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις. Procl. *In Cra.* 51.19.12–19).<sup>231</sup>

Furthermore, in his *Commentary on Plato's Timaeus* Proclus uses a similar simile of the *telestic* art [of mystic initiatory rites] and the role of statues and symbols to explain the role of images/statues of the intelligible in the cosmos, “But just as in regard to the sacred statues (*agalmata*) established by the *telestic* art some of them are visible, while others have been hidden away inside as *symbols* of the presence of the gods, which are known to the initiates only, in the same way the cosmos, as sacred image/statue (*agalma*) of the intelligible and initiated by the Father, has some as visible tokens (*gnôrismata*) of its own divinity, while others as invisible *synthémata* of its participation in Being, which it received from the Father who initiated it, so that because of him it would be eternally rooted in Being.” (ἀλλ' ὥσπερ τῶν ὑπὸ τῆς τελεστικῆς ἰδρυμένων ἀγάλματων τὰ μέν ἔστιν ἐμφανῆ, τὰ δὲ ἔνδον ἀποκέρυπται σύμβολα τῆς τῶν θεῶν παρουσίας, ἀ καὶ μόνοις ἔστι γνώριμα τοῖς τελεσταῖς, τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον ὁ κόσμος ἀγαλμα ὡν τοῦ νοητοῦ καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς τελεσθεὶς τὰ μὲν ἔχει φανερὰ τῆς ἑαυτοῦ θειότητος γνωρίσματα, τὰ δὲ ἀφανῆ συνθήματα τῆς τοῦ ὄντος μετοχῆς, ἀ παρὰ τοῦ τελέσαντος αὐτὸν ἐδέξατο πατρός, ἵνα δὴ δι' αὐτὸν ἐρριζωμένος ἥ διαιωνίως ἐν τῷ ὄντι. Procl. *In Ti.* 1.273.10–18).

In his *Commentary on Plato's Timaeus* Proclus writes that Plato portrays the *demiurge* among the foremost of the initiates (*telestai*) (κατὰ τοὺς ἄκρους τῶν τελεστῶν) as statue-maker of the cosmos (ἀγαλματοποιὸν τοῦ κόσμου Procl. *In Ti.* III.6.9–10), while earlier Plato had established him as “the author of divine names and one who reveals the divine characters, through which he initiated

<sup>230</sup> See also Procl. *In Ti.* III.155.18–22: ἔτι δὲ κάκεινο ἄτοπον, τὸ τῆν μὲν τελεστικὴν καὶ χρηστήρια καὶ ἀγάλματα θεῶν ἰδρυσθαι ἐπὶ γῆς καὶ διά τινων συμβόλων ἐπιτήδεια ποιεῖν τὰ ἔκ μερικῆς ὅλης γενόμενα καὶ φθαρτῆς εἰς τὸ μετέχειν θεοῦ καὶ κινεῖσθαι παρ' αὐτοῦ καὶ προλέγειν τὸ μέλον, ...

<sup>231</sup> Pasquali (1908) 19.

[consecrated] the soul [of the universe].” (όνομάτων ποιητὴν θείων καὶ χαρακτήρων θείων ἐκφαντικόν, δι’ ὧν τὴν ψυχὴν ἐτέλεσε Procl. *In Ti.* III.6.11–12). “For these are what the true initiates to the Mysteries do, producing statues [of gods] through characters and names that have the power to bring them to life, and making them living and moving.” (ταῦτα γὰρ καὶ οἱ τῷ ὄντι τελεσταὶ δρῶσι, διὰ χαρακτήρων καὶ ὄνομάτων ζωτικῶν τελοῦντες τὰ ἀγάλματα καὶ ζῶντα καὶ κινούμενα ἀποτελοῦντες. Procl. *In Ti.* III.6.12–15).

Then, Proclus illustrates the relationship between the demiurge, father of all, and his creatures, referring to the relationship between *agalma* and *agallesthai*, “Just as knowing himself, he knows the cosmos, so too in being amazed at his own creative power, he makes his creature admirable and a truthful image (*agalma*) of the eternal gods; for in a sense, it has been said that the [term] image (*agalma*) derives from the fact that the god is delighted (*agallesthai*) in it.” (καὶ ὥσπερ ἔαυτὸν γιγνώσκων οἶδε τὸν κόσμον, οὕτω τὴν δημιουργικὴν ἔαυτοῦ θευμάτων δύναμιν ἀγαστὸν ποιεῖ τὸ δημιούργημα καὶ ἀληθινὸν ἄγαλμα τῶν ἀιδίων θεῶν.<sup>232</sup> καὶ γάρ πως τὸ ἄγαλμα παρὰ τὸ ἀγάλλεσθαι τὸν θεὸν ἐπ’ αὐτῷ λέλεκται. Procl. *In Ti.* III.6.23–25).<sup>233</sup>

Furthermore, in his *Commentary on Plato's Cratylus* Proclus expresses an intriguing notion of the intellect as *agalma* [image] of Dionysus, “The intellect in us is Dionysian and truly an image of Dionysus.” (“Οτι δὲ ἐν ἡμῖν νοῦς Διονύσιος ἐστιν καὶ ἄγαλμα ὄντως τοῦ Διονύσου. Procl. *In Cra.* 77.133.24–25). However, Proclus points out the truthful association of the intellect with the concept of Dionysus itself rather than his *agalma*, stating that anyone who offends against it [the intellect], this person clearly sins against Dionysus himself, even more than those who offend “against the external *agalmata* [images] of the god” (εἰς τὰ ἔκτος τοῦ θεοῦ ἀγάλματα 78.133.1), since the intellect is more than other things related to the god.<sup>234</sup> Thus, as examined in this section, the production of *agal-*

<sup>232</sup> The phrase ἄγαλμα τῶν ἀιδίων is quoted and discussed in Procl. *In R.* II.212.20–213.2: Εἰ δὴ ταῦτα διηρθρωμένως νοήσαιμεν, ἔξομεν καὶ τὰ τούτων ἀπορρητότερα νοεῖν, ἐπειδὴ κατὰ τὸν Τίμαιον [p. 37c] ἄγαλμα τῶν ἀιδίων ἐστὶν θεῶν ὅδε ὁ κόσμος, τελεστὴν μὲν εἶναι τοῦ ἀγάλματος τούτου τὸν δημιουργόν, ὃς ἔπινευσεν εἰς αὐτὸν ζῷην ἀμύχανον ὅσην καὶ ἐποίησεν ἄγαλμα ἔνουν χρηματίζον διὰ τῆς αὐτοῦ κινήσεως τοῖς ὅραν δυναμένοις καὶ διὰ τῶν ἐν οὐρανῷ σημείων τὰ ἐσόμενα λέγον· τῷ δὲ τῆς ψυχῆς χαρακτῆρι καὶ ταῖς περιφοροῖς, αἵς ὄντα ἀπορρητά ἔθηκεν, περιέλαβεν αὐτὸν καὶ συνέδησεν φιλακτήρια δὲ αὐτῷ περιῆψεν καὶ ἐν μέσοις ἡδρασεν τοῖς κόλποις τοὺς εἰρημένους νόσους, οἷον αὐτῶν, εἰ βούλει, τῶν ἴνγρων συνθήματα τῶν ἀτόμων καὶ ἐνοιειδῶν.

<sup>233</sup> See also Procl. *In Ti.* III.68.32–69.4: ταῦτα δὲ καὶ ὡς ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἀιδίων θεῶν τύφισταμένων πάντων εἰρηται τῷ ἰδρύσαντο, μεθ’ ὧν ὁ δημιουργὸς ἔκαστα ἀπεργάζεται καὶ τὸν δλον κόσμον ἄγαλμα ποιῶν καὶ τὰ τῶν μερικῶν θεῶν ἀγάλματα ἐν αὐτῷ ἰδρυόμενος.

<sup>234</sup> The passage Procl. *In Cra.* 77.133.24–25 continues as follows, Procl. *In Cra.* 77.133.25–78.3: ὅστις οὖν εἰς αὐτὸν πλημμελῆ καὶ τὴν ἀμερή αὐτοῦ φύσιν διασπᾶται τούς πολυσχιδόνες ψεύδους, οὗτος δηλονότι εἰς αὐτὸν τὸν Διόνυσον ἀμαρτάνει, καὶ μᾶλλον τῶν εἰς τὰ ἔκτος τοῦ θεοῦ

*mata* keeps the theurgist in a creative cosmic process, which is an intrinsic feature of the cosmos.

5.12.b. The Animation of Statues in Theurgy, *Telestic Art and Magic* Porphyry in his *Adversus Christianos*<sup>235</sup> refers to the belief that gods live in the statues (ώς ἐν τοῖς ἀγάλμασιν ἔνδον οἰκεῖν νομίζειν τοὺς θεούς Porph. *Chr. Fr.* 77.1–2).<sup>236</sup> Furthermore, Porphyry in *De Philosophia ex Oraculis* 1.129–130 Cap.11—a passage also quoted by Eusebius in his *Praeparatio Evangelica* v.11.1.1–6—discusses the shape of statues (τό τε σχῆμα τῶν ἀγαλμάτων) and the right time and place of the sacrifices.<sup>237</sup>

Plotinus earlier in *Ennead* IV refers to the practice of the ancient wise men of animating statues through rituals, probably alluding to the Egyptian practice. These rituals were used by theurgists in Late Antiquity. In the magical papyri also there are frequent mentions of the magic ritual of ἐνπνευμάτωσις, “filling with divine spirit,” of statues, as will be discussed at the end of the section below.<sup>238</sup> Thus, Plotinus writes about statues, “It seems to me that among the wise men of old those who wanted the gods to be present to them, having built temples and *statues*, looking to the nature of all [the universe], had in mind that the nature of the soul is in general easy to attract; but the easiest

ἀγάλματα πλημμελούντων, ὅσον δὲ νοῦς μᾶλλον τῶν ἄλλων συγγενῆς ἐστι τῷ θεῷ. Pasquali (1908) 77–78. Also, on the definition of man truthfully identified with the concept of Socrates rather than his statue (ἀνδριάς) see Ammon. In *Int.* 21.10–33, esp. 18–21: καὶ γὰρ λέγειν εἰώθαμεν ἀληθῶς μὲν ἄνθρωπον εἶναι τὸν Σωκράτηγ, φευδῶς δὲ τὸν ἀνδριάντα τοῦ Σωκράτους, οὐδὲν ἔτερον διά τούτου σημαίνοντες ἡ ὅτι τῆς μὲν τοῦ Σωκράτους ἐννοίας δὲ τοῦ ἄνθρωπου λόγος ἀληθῶς κατηγορεῖται, τοῦ δὲ ἀνδριάντος οὐκέτι; see also Duvick and Tarrant (2007) 122.

235 Harnack (1916).

236 Porph. *Chr. Fr.* 77.1–5: Εἰ δὲ καὶ τις τῶν Ἑλλήνων οὕτω κοῦφος τὴν γνώμην, ὡς ἐν τοῖς ἀγάλμασιν ἔνδον οἰκεῖν τοὺς θεούς, πολλῷ καθαρώτερον εἶχε τὴν ἐννοιαν τοῦ πιστεύοντος ὅτι εἰς τὴν γαστέρα Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου εἰσέδυν τὸ θεῖον, ἔμβρυον τε ἐγένετο καὶ τεχθὲν ἐσπαργανώθη, μεστὸν αἵματος χορίου καὶ χολῆς καὶ τῶν ἔτι πολλῷ τούτων ἀτοπωτέρων.

237 Porph. *De Phil. Or.* 1.129–130 Cap.11 = Eus. *PE* v.11.1.1–6: Οὐ μόνον δὲ τὴν πολιτείαν αὐτῶν αὐτοὶ μεμηνύκασιν καὶ τὰ ἄλλα τὰ εἰρημένα, ἀλλὰ καὶ τίσι χαίρουσι καὶ κρατοῦνται ὑπηρόψευσαν, καὶ μὴν καὶ τίσι ἀναγκάζονται τίνα τε δεῖ θύειν καὶ ἐκ ποίας ἡμέρας ἐκτρέπεσθαι τό τε σχῆμα τῶν ἀγαλμάτων ποταπὸν δεῖ ποιεῖν αὐτοὶ τε ποίοις σχῆμασιν φαίνονται ἐν τε ποίοις διατρίβουσιν τόποις· καὶ δλῶς ἐν οὐδένι ἐστιν δὲ μὴ παρ’ αὐτῶν μαθόντες ἄνθρωποι οὕτως αὐτοὺς ἐτίμησαν. See also Eus. *PE* v.12.1.1–2: “Οτι δὲ καὶ τὰ ἀγάλματα αὐτοὶ ὑπέθεντο πῶς χρὴ ποιεῖν καὶ ἐκ ποίας ὥλης, δηλώσει τὰ τῆς Ἐκάτης ἔχοντα τούτον τὸν τρόπον” On Porphyry see Wolff (1856) 129; Smith and Wasserstein (1993); on Eusebius see Mras (1954) Vol. I: 232; Sirinelli and Places des (1974); Places des (1982), (1983) and (1987); Places, des and Schroeder (1991). See also Hopfner (1974) 211. On Porphyry see also Berchman (2005); and on the Fragments of Porphyry in Eusebius see Magny (2014).

238 See examples at the end of Comm.: Sect. 5.12.b below.

way of all to receive it would be, if one were to craft something *sympathetic*, which was able to receive some share of it. And that is *sympathetic* which is in any way imitative of it, like a mirror able to capture some image of it.” (Καὶ μοι δοκοῦσιν οἱ πάλαι σοφοί, ὅσοι ἐβούληθησαν θεοὺς αὐτοῖς παρεῖναι ἱερὰ καὶ ἀγάλματα ποιησάμενοι, εἰς τὴν τοῦ παντὸς φύσιν ἀπιδόντες, ἐν νῷ λαβεῖν ὡς πανταχοῦ μὲν εὐάγωγον ψυχῆς φύσις, δέξασθαι γε μὴν ῥάστον ἄν εἴη ἀπάντων, εἴ τις προσπαθές τι τεκτήναιτο ὑποδέξασθαι δυνάμενον μοῖράν τινα αὐτῆς. Προσπαθές δὲ τὸ ὄπωσον μιμηθέν, ὥσπερ κάτοπτρον ἀρπάσαι εἰδός τι δυνάμενον. Plot. *Enn.* IV.3.11.1–8).

Hermias in his *Commentary on Plato's Phaedrus* writes about the theurgic *enthusiasmos*, and how the 'divine possession' and animation of statues is achieved through the *telestic* art, emphasising the role of purification rituals, characters and symbols. He also describes the processes of consecration and illumination<sup>239</sup> of the statues. Accordingly: "It has been discussed how the soul is possessed by god. But how is the statue said to be possessed by god? Indeed, it does not operate by itself in regard to the divine, which is inanimate; but the *telestic* art having purified the material thoroughly and having bestowed some characters and symbols on the statue, first animated it through these, and enabled it to receive life from the cosmos; then along with this it contrived that it would be illuminated by the divine; therefore, the statue always gives oracular responses, until the conformable ones are able to accept; for the statue, until it would get consecrated, stays in order, until it would become in any way unfit to the gods' illumination; ... hence the statue stays illuminated as long as it gets affected; thus, its unfitness leaves room for complete deprivation, if it is not again anew consecrated and animated by the initiated."<sup>240</sup> (Πῶς μὲν οὖν ἡ ψυχὴ ἐνθουσιᾷ, εἴρηται. Πῶς δὲ καὶ ἀγάλμα λέγεται ἐνθουσιάν; "Ἡ αὐτὸ μὲν οὐκ ἐνεργεῖ περὶ τὸ θεῖον, ὅ γε ἀψυχόν ἐστιν, ἀλλὰ τὴν ὕλην ἡ τελεστικὴ διακαθήρασα καὶ τινας χαρακτῆρας καὶ σύμβολα περιθεῖσα τῷ ἀγάλματι πρώτον μὲν ἐμψυχον αὐτὸ διὰ τούτων ἐποίησε καὶ οἶόν τε ζωήν τινα ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου καταδέξασθαι, ἐπειτα μετὰ τούτο ἐλλαμφθῆναι παρὰ τοῦ θείου αὐτὸ παρεσκεύασεν· ὅπερ ἀγάλμα ἀεὶ χρηματίζει ἔως δύνανται δέχεσθαι οἱ ἐπιτήδειοι· τὸ μὲν γάρ ἀγάλμα ώς ἄν τελεσθῇ μένει ἐφεξῆς ἔως ἄν πάντη ἀνεπιτήδειον γένηται πρὸς τὴν θεῶν ἐλλαμψιν· ... τὸ δὲ ἀγάλμα ώς ἄν πάθη οὕτω μένει ἐλλαμπόμενον, διὸ καὶ ἡ ἀνεπιτήδειότης αὐτοῦ εἰς στέρησιν παντελῆ χωρεῖ, ἔὰν μὴ πάλιν ἐκ νέας ὑπὸ τοῦ τελεστοῦ τελεσθῇ καὶ ἐμψυχωθῇ. Herm. *In Phdr.* 87.4–18).<sup>241</sup>

<sup>239</sup> On the statues's illumination see also Procl. *In Cra.* 5.19.12–15: καὶ ὥσπερ ἡ τελεστικὴ διὰ δῆ τινων συμβόλων καὶ ἀπορρήτων συνθημάτων τὰ τῆδε ἀγάλματα τοῖς θεοῖς ἀπεικάζει καὶ ἐπιτήδεια ποιεῖ πρὸς ὑποδοχήν τῶν θείων ἐλλάμψεων ...

<sup>240</sup> See examples at the end of Comm.: Sect. 5.12.b below.

<sup>241</sup> Couvreur (1901); Lucarini and Moreschini (2012). See also Dam. *Vit. Isid. Fr.* 174.1–8 (Souda

The examples from the Greek magical papyri are related to the use of statues and the ritual of ἐνπνευμάτωσις, “filling with divine spirit,” which is mentioned, frequently, in the magical papyri. The process is based on the general belief that in Greek, Egyptian and Mesopotamian religions gods are residing in their statues.<sup>242</sup> According to the process of *enpneumatōsis*, they prepared hollow figures of the gods, and placed inside them the magical spell, in order for the figure to be filled with the spirit of the god.<sup>243</sup>

In the ritual of Eros’ consecration (*PGM XII.15 ff.*) included in the spell “Eros as an assistant” (*PGM XII.14–95*) the magician is instructed to take seven living animals, two of which should be nestlings and, “holding them in your hand, you will choke them, at the same time offering them to Eros, until each animal has been choked and its spirit has gone into him [the cult statue of Eros]” (xii.32–34). In the same spell, the magician is instructed, “place another chicklet on the altar; while practising the ritual eat the chicklet by yourself and let no one else be present” (xii.36–37). Just as the offering of the animals and chicklets functions as a way of instilling their spirit into the statue of Eros, eating the chicklet in this manner helps to instil its spirit into the magician.

In the “Sword of Dardanos” (*PGM IV.1716–1870*) the magician is also instructed to inscribe the magical formula on a golden leaf and “give the leaf to a partridge to swallow down and then kill it” (iv.1811–1823). Thereafter, he should pick up the slain bird and wear it around his neck as a way of preserving the potency of the magical formula. In the “Holy book of Hermes Trismegistus addressed to Asclepius” in the *Hermetica*, Trismegistus refers to “living statues filled with sense and spirit” (*Herm. Asclep. III.24a*). Furthermore, as is asserted in the same work, this invention of making gods out of material substance is ascribed to the Egyptians, “who invoked the souls of daimons or angels and implanted them by means of holy and sacred rites” (*Herm. Asclep. III.37.23–25*). The concept of eating living creatures as a way of acquiring their spirit and power is made dramatically explicit in the spells of the *Egyptian Pyramid Texts* (*Eg. Pyr. T. 273–274*), “The king is one who eats men and lives on the gods ... The king eats their magic, swallows their spirits ... He has seized the hearts of the

II 579, 7; II 52, 23 s. vv. Ἡραΐσκος et διαγνώμων): ὁ μὲν δὴ Ἡραΐσκος αὐτοφυῆς ἐγένετο διαγνώμων τῶν τε ζώντων καὶ τῶν μὴ ζώντων ἱερῶν ἀγαλμάτων. εὐθὺς γάρ ἐμβλέπων ἐτιτρώσκετο τὴν καρδίαν ὑπὸ τοῦ θειασμοῦ καὶ ἀνεπήδα τό τε σῶμα καὶ τὴν ψυχήν, ὃσπερ ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ κατάσχετος, εἰ δὲ μὴ κινοῦτο τοιοῦτον, ἄψυχον ἦν ἐκεῖνο τὸ ἀγαλμα καὶ ἄμοιρον θείας ἐπιτνοίας. οὕτω διέγνω τὸ ἄρρητον ἀγαλμα τοῦ Αἰώνος ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ κατεχόμενον, δὲ Ἀλεξανδρεῖς ἐπίμησαν, “Οστριν ὅντα καὶ Ἀδωνιν ὅμοιν κατὰ μυστικὴν ὡς ἀληθῶς φάναι θεοχρασίαν. Zintzen (1967) 147–148.

242 Burkert (1996) 84 ff. and Schnapp (1994) 40–44.

243 See e.g. *PGM III.282–409*, 296 ff.; *IV.964–966*, 2359–2372; also v.381–385; on this practice see Poulsen (1945) 178–195.

gods ... The king feeds on the lungs of the wise and is satisfied with living on hearts and their magic.”<sup>244</sup>

5.13–14 (cf. also 4.19). *Συνθήματα, Synthémata*

5.13–14.a. Instilled *Synthémata* as a Way of Returning to Themselves or to the Gods, and as a Way of Uniting the Soul with the Divine

Proclus in his *Commentary on Plato's Timaeus* discusses the Ἡλιακά and Σεληνιακά *synthémata*: “for Nature being dependent from above and from the gods themselves, and being distributed through the ranks of the gods, she also instils in the bodies the *synthémata* of their affinity to the gods; in one case solar *synthémata*, in another lunar, in others those of other gods, and she causes also these things to return to the gods, some to the gods in general, others to specific gods, bringing her works to completion, according to the various characteristics of the gods.” (ἄνωθεν γὰρ καὶ ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἐξηρτημένη τῶν θεῶν ἡ φύσις καὶ διανενεμημένη περὶ τὰς τῶν θεῶν τάξεις ἐντίθησι καὶ τοῖς σώμασι τῆς πρὸς θεοὺς αὐτῶν οἰκειότητος συνθήματα, τοῖς μὲν Ἡλιακά, τοῖς δὲ Σεληνιακά, τοῖς δὲ ἄλλους τινὸς θεῶν, καὶ ἐπιστρέφει καὶ ταῦτα πρὸς θεούς, τὰ μὲν ὡς πρὸς θεοὺς ἀπλῶς, τὰ δὲ ὡς πρὸς τούσδε τοὺς θεούς, τελεώσασα τὰ ἐαυτῆς γεννήματα κατ' ἄλλην καὶ ἄλλην ιδιότητα θεῶν. Procl. *In Ti.* 1.210.19–30).<sup>245</sup>

In his *Commentary on Plato's Cratylus* Proclus relates *synthémata* to the notion of return, “thus, just as Nature, the demiurgic Monad and the Father himself who transcends all things sowed *synthémata* of their own identity in beings subsequent to them, and through these *synthémata* they make *everything return to themselves*, so too all the gods instil in the entities produced from themselves *symbols* of their causality, and through these they establish all creatures in themselves. Therefore, the *synthémata* of the existence of the higher beings which are sown into subsequent ones are unspeakable and unknowable, and their active and movable force surpasses all intellection.” (ῶσπερ οὖν ἡ φύσις καὶ ἡ μονὰς ἡ δημιουργικὴ καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ πάντων ἐξηρημένος πατήρ ἐνέσπειραν τοῖς δευτέροις τῆς οἰκείας ιδιότητος συνθήματα, καὶ δι' ἐκείνων ἐπιστρέφουσι πάντα πρὸς ἐαυτούς, οὕτως δὲ καὶ πάντες οἱ θεοὶ τοῖς ἀφ' ἐαυτῶν παραγομένοις ἐνδιδόσαι τῆς σφετέρας αἰτίας σύμβολα, καὶ διὰ τούτων ἐδράζουσι πάντα ἐν ἐαυτοῖς. τὰ μὲν οὖν τῆς ὑπάρξεως τῶν ὑπερτέρων ἐνσπειρόμενα τοῖς δευτέροις συνθήματα ἄρρητά ἔστιν καὶ ἄγνωστα, καὶ τὸ δραστήριον αὐτῶν καὶ κινητικὸν ὑπεραίρει πάσαν νόησιν. Procl. *In Cra.* 71.30.29–31.8).<sup>246</sup>

244 Faulkner (1969); on the Egyptian ritual of swallowing see Ritner (1993) chpt. 3.

245 On Proclus on *synthémata* and ἐπιστροφή see Dodds (1933) 222–223.

246 Pasquali (1908) 30–31. See also on *synthémata* and the notion of return in Procl. *In Ti.*

In his *Chaldaean Philosophy*, extract 5, Proclus asserts that *synthêmata* unite the soul with the divine, “in that way the soul participates in *synthêmata*, through which it is united with the god” (οὕτω καὶ πάντων μὲν μετέχει τῶν συνθημάτων, δι’ ὧν συνάπτεται τῷ θεῷ, Procl. *Phil. Chald. Fr. 5.212.1–2*).<sup>247</sup>

Proclus, discussing the role of symbols and *synthêmata* in the hieratic rites (τῶν ἱερατικῶν ἔργων Procl. *In R. 1.83.17*) and hieratic precepts (τοῖς ἱερατικοῖς θεσμοῖς 1.83.28) in his *Commentary on Plato’s Republic*, relates them to the experience of the initiated in the mystery rites, “indeed the gods are pleased, listening to such symbols, and they are readily prevailed upon those who invoke them and show forth the distinctive nature of (the gods) themselves through those familiar to them and very well-known *synthêmata*; mysteries and *teletai* [initiatory rites] have their efficacy in these [*synthêmata*], and they make the initiates see complete, stable and simple visions” (καὶ γάρ οἱ θεοὶ τῶν τοιωνδε συμβόλων ἀκούοντες χαίρουσιν καὶ τοῖς καλοῦσιν ἐτοίμως πείθονται καὶ τὴν ἔαυτῶν ἰδιότητα προφαίνουσιν διὰ τούτων ὡς οἰκείων αὐτοῖς καὶ μάλιστα γνωρίμων συνθημάτων καὶ τὰ μυστήρια καὶ αἱ τελεταὶ [καὶ] τὸ δραστήριον ἐν τούτοις ἔχουσιν καὶ δλόκληρα καὶ ἀτρεμή καὶ ἀπλά θεάματα διὰ τούτων προξενοῦσιν τοῖς μύσταις καθορᾶν ... Procl. *In R. 1.83.17–25*).

Furthermore, in his *Commentary on Plato’s Timaeus* the Dionysiac aspects of *synthêmata* are discussed. Proclus refers to the Dionysiac activity of the Demiurge and the role of “the number seven, since the theologians say that Dionysus was divided into seven parts” (ἡ ἐβδομάς, ἐπεὶ καὶ τὸν Διόνυσον οἱ θεολόγοι μεριζόμενον εἰς ἑπτὰ μερισθῆναι λέγουσιν. *In Ti. II.197.24–26*); and points out that “this number comes to the soul from higher causes” (ήκει μὲν οὖν τῇ ψυχῇ καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ὑπερτέρων αἰτίων οὗτος ὁ ἀριθμός), “in order that it may have its division into seven parts as a *synthēma* of the Dionysiac series and of the legendary tearing apart” (ἴνα τὸν μὲν εἰς ἑπτὰ μοίρας μερισμὸν ἔχη σύνθημα τῆς Διονυσιακῆς σειρᾶς καὶ τοῦ μυθευομένου σπαραγμοῦ Procl. *In Ti. II.198.2–7*).<sup>248</sup> That notion of

I.273.18–24: τὸ μὲν οὖν οὐρανὸς καὶ τὸ κόσμος ὄνομα τῶν ἐμφανῶν ἔστιν ἐν αὐτῷ δυνάμεων σημαντικά, τὸ μὲν καθὸ πρόσεισιν ἐκεῖθεν, τὸ δὲ τῆς ἐπιστροφῆς δεῖ δὲ εἶναι καὶ τῆς μενούσης αὐτοῦ δυνάμεως ὄνομα θεῖον τὸν συνθήματος ὃν τὸν δημιουργικὸν σύμβολον, καθὸ καὶ ἀνεκφοίτητός ἔστι τοῦ δόντος, ἀρρητὸν δὲν καὶ ἀφθεγγτὸν καὶ αὐτοῖς γνώριμον τοῖς θεοῖς.

247 Des Places (1971) 212. Procl. *In R. 1.84.26–31*: καὶ ἡ μὲν δι’ εἰκόνων μέθοδος τοῖς γνησίως φιλοσοφοῦσιν προσήκει, ἡ δὲ δι’ ἀπορρήτων συνθημάτων τῆς θείας οὐσίας ἔνδειξις τοῖς τῆς μυστικωτέρας ἡγεμόσιν τελεστιουργίας, ἀφ’ ἣς δὴ καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ Πλάτων πολλὰ τῶν οἰκείων δογμάτων ἀξιοῖ πιστότερα καὶ ἐναργέστερα δεικνύειναι.

248 See also Procl. *In Ti. II.198.7–14*: (καὶ γάρ ἔδει νοῦ μετέχουσαν αὐτὴν Διονυσιακοῦ καί, ὡς Ὁρφεύς [frg. 207. 203] φησιν, ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς φέρουσαν τὸν θεὸν διηρήσθαι κατ’ ἐκεῖνον), τὴν δὲ ἐν ταύταις ταῖς μοίραις ἀρμονίαν ἔχη τῆς Ἀπολλωνιακῆς τάξεως σύμβολον καὶ γάρ ἐν ἐκείνοις ὁ συνάγων καὶ ἐνίζων τὰ μερισθέντα τοῦ Διονύσου μέλη κατὰ τὴν βούλησιν τοῦ πατρὸς οὗτος

the Dionysiac dismemberment as a *synthēma* is also repeated in Procl. *In R. I.175.2–3*: “for dismemberment is one of the Dionysiac *synthēmata*” (καὶ γὰρ ὁ σπαραγμὸς τῶν Διονυσιακῶν ἐν ἐστιν συνθημάτων).

### 5.13–14.b. The Mentality, Suitability, Visibility, Form and Shape of the *Synthēmata*

Proclus deals with issues of visibility, form and shape of the *synthēmata* and their relation to the concept of powers, “for the visible things are the *synthēmata* of the invisible powers, the ones seen in extended shape of the shapeless powers.” (συνθήματα γὰρ τὰ ἐμφανῆ τῶν ἀφανῶν ἐστιν δυνάμεων, τῶν ἀμορφῶν τὰ ἐν μορφαῖς ὄρωμενα διασταταῖς. Procl. *In R. II.242.24–26*).

Furthermore, in the *Platonic Theology* Proclus points out that Plato said that the divinity (τὴν θεότητα) is “colourless, shapeless and tasteless” (Ἀχρόματον γὰρ αὐτὴν καὶ ἀσχημάτιστον καὶ ἀναφῆ Procl. *Plat.Theol. IV.35.13–14*).<sup>249</sup> Proclus then explains that the gods belong to the intellectual order, and they are known through mental *synthēmata*, “thus, I say that also this order, being the highest of the intellectual gods, is unknowable and incomprehensible according to its own character, and it is perceived through intelligible *synthēmata*.” (Λέγω τοίνυν ὅτι καὶ ἡ τάξις αὕτη, τῶν νοερῶν οὐσα θεῶν ἀκρότης, ἄγνωστός ἐστι καὶ ἀφραστος κατὰ τὴν ἑαυτῆς ἰδιότητα καὶ διὰ συνθημάτων γιγνώσκεται νοητῶν. Procl. *Plat.Theol. IV.35.17–20*).

Proclus also in his *Commentary on Plato's Cratylus* discusses the role of symbols and *synthēmata* in the *telestic* art, “thus, just as the *telestic* art through some symbols and secret *synthēmata* conforms the statues (*agalmata*) down here to the gods, and makes these statues suitable (ἐπιτήδεια) for the reception of divine illuminations, so too the legislative art by the same power of assimilation produces names as statues of their objects, representing through such echoes the nature of real beings; and having produced them it handed them on to men for use.” (καὶ ὡσπερ ἡ τελεστικὴ διὰ δῆ τινων συμβόλων καὶ ἀπορρήτων συνθημάτων τὰ τῇδε ἀγάλματα τοῖς θεοῖς ἀπεικάζει καὶ ἐπιτήδεια ποιεῖ πρὸς ὑποδοχὴν τῶν θείων

ἐστιν ὁ θεός. On Dionysiac *synthēmata* see also Procl. *In R. I.85.2–12*: ... τό τε ἐν ἀπορρήτοις λεγόμενον, ὡς ἐν τινι φρουρῷ ἐσμεν οἱ ἄνθρωποι, σιγῇ τῇ πρεπούσῃ σέβων, καὶ τὰς τελετὰς μαρτυρόμενος τῶν διαφόρων λήξεων τῆς ψυχῆς κεκαθαρέντης τε καὶ ἀκαθάρτου εἰς Ἀιδου ἀπιούσης, καὶ τάς τε σχίσεις αὐλ καὶ τάς τριάδους ἀπὸ τῶν δσίων καὶ τῶν πατρίων θεσμῶν τεκμαιρόμενος, ἀ δῆ τῆς συμβολικῆς ἀπαντα θεωρίας ἐστὶ μεστά, καὶ τῶν παρὰ τοῖς ποιηταῖς θρυλουσμένων ἀνόδων τε καὶ καθόδων, τῶν τε Διονυσιακῶν συνθημάτων καὶ τῶν Τίτανικῶν ἀμαρτημάτων λεγομένων, καὶ τῶν ἐν Ἀιδου τριάδων καὶ τῆς πλάνης καὶ τῶν τοιούτων ἀπάντων.

249 Also, in the *Corpus Hermeticum V*, “A discourse of Hermes to his son Tat,” god is described as ὁ ἀφανῆς and ὁ φανερώτατος, and ὁ ἀσώματος, ὁ πολυσώματος, μᾶλλον δὲ παντοσώματος (*Corp. Herm. V.10*).

έλλαμψεων, οὕτω δὲ καὶ ἡ νομοθετικὴ κατὰ τὴν αὐτὴν ἀφομοιωτικὴν δύναμιν ἀγάλματα τῶν πραγμάτων ὑφίστησι τὰ ὄνόματα διὰ τοίων καὶ τοίων ἥχων ἀπεικονίζομένη τὴν τῶν ὄντων φύσιν, καὶ ὑποστήσασα παρέδωκεν εἰς χρῆσιν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις. Procl. *In Cra. 51.19.12–19*).<sup>250</sup>

## 6. Direct Revelations/Epiphanies of the Gods, Purification Rituals and the *Empyrean* Power

### 6.2.a. Αὐτοφάνεια/Αὐτόματος Ἐπιφάνεια, “Direct Revelation/Epiphany of the God/-s”

Marinus in *Proclus* reports Proclus' experience of Hecate's self-revelations after performing certain Chaldaean purification rituals, “But before these, the philosopher after being purified in due order by the Chaldaean purifications, invoked flame-like [fiery] *revelations for direct vision* of Hecate, as he himself has recorded in one of his own treatises.” (Πρὸ δὲ τούτων ἐν τάξει ὁ φιλόσοφος τοῖς Χαλδαϊκοῖς καθαρμοῖς καθαιρόμενος, φάσμασι μὲν Ἐκατικοῖς φωτοειδέσιν αὐτοπτουμένοις ὡμιλησεν, ὡς καὶ αὐτός που μέμνηται ἐν ἴδιᾳ συγγράμματι. Marin. *Vit. Procl.* 28.683–686). Porphyry also in *De Philosophia ex Oraculis* refers to the *synthēmata* (συνθήματα) of Hecate's revelations and the fiery images (πυρόεσσιν εἰδώλοις) of her revelations (Porph. *De Phil. Or.* II.151.165–173).<sup>251</sup>

In his *Commentary on Plato's Timaeus* Proclus also describes the theurgic “connecting rituals, calls and invocations for direct revelations (visions) of the gods” (συστατικὰ καὶ κλήσεις καὶ αὐτοφανείας Procl. *In Ti. III.89.19*) according to the sacred tradition (ἡ ιερὰ φήμη) of the theurgists,<sup>252</sup> “Just as the sacred tradition worships both the latter invisible [numbers] and the causes of these [the visible ones], by naming Night and Day divine [as gods], as well as by delivering connecting [rituals] to Month and Year and *supplications and invocations for direct revelation* [/vision of the god invoked]; ...” (ῷσπερ δὴ καὶ τοὺς ἀφανεῖς ἐκείνους καὶ τούτων αἰτίους ἡ ιερὰ φήμη θεραπεύει, ὄνόματά τε θεῖα νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας ἐκδιδούσα καὶ μηνὸς καὶ ἐνιαυτοῦ συστατικὰ καὶ κλήσεις καὶ αὐτοφανείας, ... Procl. *In Ti. III.89.16–19*).

<sup>250</sup> Pasquali (1908) 19.

<sup>251</sup> Porph. *De Phil. Or.* II.151.165–173: “Ἐν χρηστήριον ἔτι παραθείς, ὅπερ αὐτὴ ἡ Ἐκάτη πεποίηται, καταπαύσω τὸν περὶ ταύτης λόγον. Ἡδὲ ἐγώ εἰμι κόρη πολυφάσματος, οὐρανόφοιτος, /ταυρῶπις, τρικάρηνος, ἀπηνῆς, χρυσοβέλεμνος, /Φοίβη ἀπειρ〈ολεχής〉, φαεσίμβροτος, Εἰλείθυια, /τριστοίχου φύσεως συνθήματα τριστά φέρουσα: /αἰ〈θέρα〉 μὲν πυρόεσσιν ἐειδομένη εἰδώλοις, /ήρα δὲ ἀργεννοῖσι τροχάσματιν ἀμφικάθημαι: /γαλαῖαν ἐμῶν σκυλάκων δνοφερῷ γέ〈νει〉 ἡνιοχε〈ύω〉.

<sup>252</sup> On ιερὰ φήμη as a term used by the Neoplatonists when referring to the *Chaldaean Oracles* see Lewy (1978) 445.

Regarding the experiences of the initiates and their “suitability” (έπιτηδειότης) to receive epiphanies, it is stated: Arist. *Fr.* 15 (ed. Rose = Synesius *Dio* 10): “just as Aristotle esteems that the initiates (τοὺς τελουμένους) should not learn (οὐ μαθεῖν) anything, but *be liable to experiences* (παθεῖν) and be in such a condition, so that they have become suitable (έπιτηδείους) *⟨for the revelation⟩*” (καθάπερ Ἀριστοτέλης ἀξιοὶ τοὺς τελουμένους οὐ μαθεῖν τί δεῖν, ἀλλὰ παθεῖν καὶ διατεθῆναι, δηλονότι γενομένους ἐπιτηδείους’).<sup>253</sup>

Concerning the *PGM* examples of αὐτοφάνεια, in the “Spell to bring the god” (“θεαγωγός λόγος” IV.985–1035), included in the “Spell that produces direct vision [of the divinity invoked]” (Αὔτοπτος IV.930–1114), the magician assimilates Helios with “the greatest god (τὸν μέγιστον θεόν), lord Horus Harpocrates,” “god of gods (θεὸς θεῶν),” whom he invokes (IV.987–988, 999–1000, 1048–1049). Helios is described as “the one who enlightens everything and illuminates by his own power the whole cosmos” (IV.989–991).<sup>254</sup>

Another “Prayer that produces direct vision (of the divinity invoked)” (Αὔτοπτος σύστασις, IV.930–1114) includes a hymn “To Helios” (IV.939–948), in which Helios is invoked. In another spell, IV.959–973, also included in the “Spell that produces direct vision” (IV.930–1114), Helios is also invoked addressed as “the living god,” τὸν θεὸν τὸν ζῶντα (IV.959). In the “Spell for direct vision” (VII.319–334) Osiris’ revelation to the magician in order to prophesy is described through ritualistic language, which emphasises Osiris’ cosmic establishment and is allusive to the mysteries.<sup>255</sup>

### 6.2.b. *Αὐτοφάνεια/Αὐτόματος Ἐπιφάνεια: Shape and Form*

In his *Commentary on Plato’s Republic* Proclus discusses the shapes and forms of the theurgic “direct revelation of the gods” (αἱ αὐτοφάνειαι τῶν θεῶν Procl. *In R.* I.37.9),<sup>256</sup> who “sometimes are revealed as luminous visions without form and sometimes as having taken a form; for if we were not believing in these [visions], we would overthrow the *whole* hieratic [art] and the *ritual acts of the*

253 See Burkert (1987) 69, 89–90; Bremmer (2014) 13–14.

254 For this cosmic depiction of Harpocrates in the Greco-Roman period see El-Kachab (1971) 132–145; also Bonner (1950) plates IX–X.

255 E.g. VII.326 and 329: ἀνοίγε τὸν [ναὸν, τὸν ἐπὶ γῆς ἰδρυμένον] κόσμον, καὶ δέξαι τὸν “Οσιριν and ἀνοιξόν μου τὰ ὁτα, ἵνα μοι χρηματίσῃς; see also the spell “Hermes’ Ring” (v.213–303): ἐπαφήσω ἀνοιξιν ἐφ’ ὑμάς (v.285); also Plu. *Quaest. Conv.* 738.C.3: τῇ τῶν χειλῶν ἀνοίξει.

256 Οἱ αὐτοφάνειαι see also Procl. *In R.* II.154.1–3: καὶ σῦνται ποτέ μὲν αὐτοφανῶς ιδούσαι τάς ἐν τῷ παντὶ τούτῳ κόσμῳ τάξεις αὐτῶν διαγγέλλουσιν κατά τὴν ἐν τῷ παντὶ προϋπάρχουσαν ιερατικήν. Procl. *In R.* II.344.27–345.1: καὶ πρότερον εἴπομεν καὶ μαρτυροῦσαν ἔχομεν τὴν ιερατικήν παραδούσαν καὶ αὐτοπτικὴν κλήσιν τῆς μεγίστης θεού ταύτης καὶ διδάξασαν πῶς ὀφθείση προσιέναι <δεῖ>.

*theurgists*, and without these, [we would overthrow] the direct epiphanies of the gods, which sometimes manifest themselves in one form, sometimes in another" (φαινομένων τότε μὲν ἀτυπώτων φώτων, τότε δὲ τετυπωμένων· μὴ γάρ προσέμενοι ταῦτα τὴν ἱερατικὴν δλην ἀνατρέπομεν καὶ τὰ ἔργα τῶν θεουργῶν, καὶ ἄνευ τούτων τὰς αὐτομάτους ἐπιφανείας τῶν θεῶν ἐν σχήμασιν ἄλλοτε ἄλλοις φαντα-ζομένων Procl. *In R.* 1.37.9–14).

Furthermore, Proclus discussing all the hieratic treatises (ταῖς ἱερατικαῖς ἀπάσαις πραγματείαις) and *teletai* [initiatory rites] and mysteries and the epiphanies of the gods (ταῖς τελεταῖς καὶ τοῖς μυστηρίοις καὶ ταῖς τῶν θεῶν ἐπιφανείαις), writes about the manifold forms and transformation of shapes of gods in the theurgic epiphanies (ταῖς τῶν θεῶν ἐπιφανείαις), "for in all these, the gods set forth many forms of themselves, and they appear to change into many shapes; sometimes their light appears formless, sometimes (it appears) having been shaped into a human form, and other times having advanced a different form. The god-given mystical doctrine hands down these (teachings) too." (ἐν ἄπασι γάρ τούτοις οἱ θεοὶ πολλὰς μὲν ἔαυτῶν προτείνουσι μορφάς, πολλὰ δὲ σχήματα ἔξαλλάττοντες φαίνονται· καὶ τότε μὲν ἀτύπωτον αὐτῶν προβέβληται φῶς, τότε δὲ εἰς ἀνθρώπου μορφὴν ἐσχηματισμένον, τότε δὲ εἰς ἄλλοιον τύπον προεληλυθός. καὶ ταῦτα καὶ ἡ θεοπαράδοτος μυσταγωγία παραδίδωσιν· Procl. *In R.* 1.110.21–111.2).

Moreover, in his *Commentary on Plato's Republic* Proclus reports, "long ago when the theurgists taught us that the direct revelations of the gods without form were necessarily endowed with form and those of the gods without figures were necessarily endowed with figures." (πάλαι καὶ τῶν θεουργῶν ἡμᾶς διδαξάντων, ὅτι τὰς αὐτοφανείας τῶν θεῶν μεμορφωμένας τῶν ἀμορφώτων καὶ ἐσχηματισμένας τῶν ἀσχηματίστων ἀνάγκη γίνεσθαι Procl. *In R.* 11.241.22–24).

Proclus also describes the theurgic apparition(-s) as "the flame-like, the immaculate, the timelessly present, the vital, anything of that kind, and the dimensionally one of those who participate, the one that has been formed and shaped; when gods also said these to the theurgists" (τὸ φωτοειδὲς τὸ ἄχραντον τὸ ἀχρόνως παρὸν τὸ ζωτικόν, πᾶν εἴ τι τοιοῦτον, τῶν δὲ μετεχόντων τὸ διαστατὸν τὸ μεμορφωμένον τὸ ἐσχηματισμένον· ταῦτα καὶ τῶν θεῶν εἰπόντων πρὸς τοὺς θεουργούς· Procl. *In R.* 11.242.5–9).<sup>257</sup>

For Proclus, when the soul descends from the immaterial into the en-mattered domain, it becomes passive, liable to experiences and emotions (Procl. *In Tl.* 111.330.8–331.2). Proclus explains that these emotional souls of the embodied state are also formative "... since souls have become emotional (παθητικαῖς) instead of impassive and inclined to give shape (μορφωτικαῖς)

257 Procl. *In R.* 11.242.15–16: εἰ οὖν τοῖς θεουργοῖς τοῦτον αὐτοπτεῖται τὸν τρόπον τὰ θεῖα.

instead of having no shape, it is sensible to say that teaching through this kind of myths is the proper way of teaching them" (... γενομέναις ἀπαθέσι παθητικαῖς, ἀμορφῶτοις μορφωτικαῖς, πρέπων ἐστὶν τρόπος διδασκαλίας εἰκότως ὁ διὰ τῶν τοι-  
ῶνδε μύθων) (Procl. *In R.* II.107.21–23).

Similarly, the symbols and *synthémata* in the *telestic* art [theurgy] make the statues suitable to receive divine illuminations, as Proclus explains in his *Commentary on Plato's Cratylus*, "thus, just as the *telestic* art through some symbols and secret *synthémata* conforms the statues in this way to the gods, and makes these statues suitable (ἐπιτήδεια) for the reception of divine illuminations ..." (καὶ ὡσπερ ἡ τελεστικὴ διὰ δή τινων συμβόλων καὶ ἀπορρήτων συνθημάτων τὰ τῆδε ἀγάλματα τοῖς θεοῖς ἀπεικάζει καὶ ἐπιτήδεια ποιεῖ πρὸς ὑποδοχὴν τῶν θείων ἐλλάμ-  
ψεων ... Procl. *In Cra.* 51.19.12–15).<sup>258</sup>

#### 6.4–8.a. Καθάρσεις /Καθαρμοί, "Purification Rituals"

Proclus in his *Platonic Theology* asserts that the theurgic power (τῆς θεουργικῆς δυνάμεως) combines the purifying powers of the *telestic* [initiatory] rite (τὰς τῆς τελεσιουργικῆς καθαρτικὰς δυνάμεις) with the operations of divination and divine possession (Procl. *Plat.Theol.* I.113.6–10).

In his *Commentary on Plato's Cratylus* Proclus also points out that "purification is a characteristic not only of medicine but also of divination" (ἢ τὸ τὴν καθαρσὶν μὴ μόνον ἐπὶ τῆς ἱατρικῆς ὄρâν ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς μαντικῆς Procl. *In Cra.* 176.100.11–12), "and, as Timaeus says (22c), gods purify the universe either with fire or water, acts which the seers also imitate; and for these reasons the theurgic rites instruct that they should purify first the summoners and the receptors according to these ways. ... For Apollo is everywhere the one who unites the many and brings them together to one, and he uniformly anticipated all the ways of purification, cleansing the whole heaven and creation and all encosmic lives, and separating individual souls from the thickening of matter. So for this reason the *theurgist*, who is the leader of this rite, starts with the purifications and the lustral besprinklings; let he himself as a *priest* among the first governing the rituals of fire, be sprinkled with a frosty wave of the deep-voiced brine, as the Chaldaean oracle<sup>259</sup> says about him." (καὶ γάρ, ὡς φησι Τίμαιος (p 22c), καὶ τὸ πᾶν οἱ θεοὶ καθαίρουσιν ἢ πυρὶ ἢ ὕδατι, ἢ καὶ οἱ μάντεις μιμοῦνται, καὶ διὰ ταῦτα καὶ αἱ θεουργίαι τοὺς μὲν κλήτορας καὶ τοὺς δοχέας τούτοις τοῖς τρόποις προκαθαίρειν παρακελεύονται, καὶ οὐ τοῖς μάντεσι μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς τελεσταῖς οἱ καθαρμοὶ πρὸ τῶν τελετῶν παραλαμβάνονται, πᾶν τὸ ἀλλότριον τῆς προκειμένης τελετῆς ἀποσκευ-

<sup>258</sup> Pasquali (1908) 19.

<sup>259</sup> *Orac. Chald. Fr.* 133; Majercik (1989).

αζόμενοι. ..., καὶ πάντας τοὺς τρόπους τῆς καθάρσεως ἑνοειδῶς προεὶληφεν, ὅλον τε τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γένεσιν καὶ τὰς ζωὰς ἀπάσας καθαίρων τὰς ἐγκοσμίους καὶ τὰς μερικὰς ψυχὰς ἀπὸ τῶν παχυσμάτων χωρίζων τῆς ὕλης. διὸ καὶ ὁ θεουργὸς ὁ τῆς τελετῆς τούτου προκαθηγούμενος ἀπὸ τῶν καθάρσεων ἀρχεται καὶ τῶν περιρράνσεων· αὐτὸς δ' ἐν πρώτοις ἵερεὺς πυρὸς ἔργα κυβερνῶν κύματι ῥαινέσθω παγερῷ βαρυηχέος ἄλμης ὡς φησι τὸ λόγιον (or chald p 55) περὶ αὐτοῦ. Procl. *In Cra.* 176.100.19–101.8.<sup>260</sup>

Marinus in his *Proclus* mentions that Proclus used to practice Orphic and Chaldaean purification rituals from the prime to the end of his life, “... at night and also during the day he used apotropaic (rituals), sprinklings with lustral water and other purifications, sometimes Orphic, other times Chaldaean, going down to the sea without fear every month, and sometimes ‘twice’ or ‘thrice’ in the same month;” (... νύκτωρ τε καὶ μεθ’ ἡμέραν ἀποτροπαῖς καὶ περιρραντηρίος καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις καθαρμοῖς χρώμενος, ὅτε μὲν Ὁρφικοῖς ὅτε δὲ Χαλδαϊκοῖς, ἐπὶ θάλαττάν τε ἀόκνως ἐκάστου μηνὸς κατιών, ἔσθ’ ὅτε δὲ ‘δίς’ ἢ ‘καὶ τρίς’ τοῦ αὐτοῦ· Marin. *Vit. Procl.* 18.455–459).

Marinus also particularly refers to certain Chaldaean purification rituals associated with Hecate’s epiphanies, which Proclus used to practice, “But before these, the philosopher, *after being purified in due order by the Chaldaean purifications*, invoked flame-like [/*fiery*] revelations for direct vision of Hecate, as he himself has recorded in one of his own treatises.” (Πρὸ δὲ τούτων ἐν τάξει ὁ φιλόσοφος τοῖς Χαλδαϊκοῖς καθαρμοῖς καθαιρόμενος, φάσμασι μὲν Ἐκατικοῖς φωτειδέσιν αὐτοπτούμενοις ὡμίλησεν, ὡς καὶ αὐτός που μέμνηται ἐν ἴδιῳ συγγράμματι. Marin. *Vit. Procl.* 28.683–686).

Proclus in his *Commentary on Plato’s Alcibiades I* refers to the purification rituals, using a simile between theurgic rituals and philosophical accomplishment, “Thus, just as in the [theurgic] rituals there precede cleansings and sprinklings with lustral water and purifications, which are practice for secret rites and participation in the divine, so also I think the philosophical procedure purifies beforehand and prepares those who are on the way to it for the self-knowledge and the self-revealing contemplation [/*vision*] of our essence.” (὾σπερ οὖν ἐν ταῖς τελεταῖς καθάρσεις ἡγοῦνται καὶ περιρραντήρια καὶ ἀγνισμοί, ἀ τῶν ἐν ἀπορρήτοις δρωμένων καὶ τῆς τοῦ θείου μετουσίας γυμνάσματά εἰσιν, οὕτω μοι δοκεῖ καὶ ἡ φιλόσοφος τελεσιουργία προκαθαίρειν καὶ προπαρασκευάζειν εἰς τὴν ἑαυτῶν γνῶσιν καὶ τὴν αὐτοφανῆ τῆς οὐσίας ἡμῶν θεωρίαν τοὺς ἐπ’ αὐτὴν στελλομένους. Procl. *In Alc.* 1.9.2–7).

Furthermore, Proclus in his *Commentary on Plato's Timaeus* discusses the divine purifications, referring to the act of "gods purifying the earth with water" ("Οταν δὲ αὖ οἱ θεοὶ τὴν γῆν ὕδασι καθαίροντες Procl. *In Ti.* 1.118.14), and explaining it as follows, "for the one type of purification is made through water and the other through fire, and everywhere there is purity to the seconds coming from the firsts" (καὶ γὰρ καθαρμὸς ὁ μὲν γίνεται δι' ὕδατος, ὁ δὲ διὰ πυρός, πανταχοῦ δὲ ἡ καθαρότης τοῖς δευτέροις ἀπὸ τῶν πρώτων 1.118.21–23).

Proclus also relates these purifications with the ones on a universal scale, "And if there are certain purifications in the universe too, there are certainly those who stand before these purifications, acting as purifiers in the universe before the partial purifiers ... And the priest having understood this has also called the destructions by water or fire according to the hieratic way purifications, but not destructions, as he would have said if he was explaining it only from natural principles." (εἰ δὲ δὴ καθαρμοί τινές εἰσι καὶ ἐν τοῖς ὅλοις, εἰσὶ δήποτον καὶ τῶν καθαρμῶν προστάται τούτων πρὸ τῶν μερικῶν καθαρτῆρες εἰς τὰ ὅλα δρῶντες, ... ὁ δὴ καὶ ὁ ἱερεὺς εἰδὼς τὰς δι' ὕδατος καὶ πυρὸς φθορὰς ὀνόματι κέκληκεν ἱερατικῷ καθαρμούς, ἀλλ' οὐ φθοράς, ως ἀν εἶπε φυσιολογῶν μόνον. Procl. *In Ti.* 1.118.30–119.6).

#### 6.6–8.b. *Καθάρσεις /Καθαρμοί: Plato on Purification Rituals*

In Plato's *Cratylus* Socrates states about purification and the cleansing rituals, "first, the purification and the cleansing rituals both in medicine and divination, the fumigations with medical drugs and divination and the bathings and lustral besprinklings [included] in these [rituals], all these could have the same effect, namely to purify a person in body and soul" (πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ ἡ κάθαρσις καὶ οἱ καθαρμοὶ καὶ κατὰ τὴν ἰατρικὴν καὶ κατὰ τὴν μαντικὴν καὶ αἱ τοῖς ἰατρικοῖς φαρμάκοις καὶ αἱ τοῖς μαντικοῖς περιθειώσεις τε καὶ τὰ λουτρὰ τὰ ἐν τοῖς τοιούτοις καὶ αἱ περιρράνσεις, πάντα ἐν τι ταῦτα δύναται ἄν, καθαρὸν παρέχειν τὸν ἄνθρωπον καὶ κατὰ τὸ σῶμα καὶ κατὰ τὴν ψυχήν Pl. *Cra.* 405.a.7–b.4). Furthermore, "the *telestic* rites, Socrates says in Plato's *Phaedrus* (244d–e), can purify, releasing from the present bad things through the worship of the divine" (φησὶν ὁ ἐν Φαιδρῷ Σωκράτης, ἡ τελεστικὴ δύναται καθαίρειν λύουσα τῶν παρόντων κακῶν διὰ τῆς περὶ τὸ θεῖον λατρείας. Procl. *In Cra.* 93. 46.21–23).<sup>261</sup>

Socrates in Plato's *Phaedrus* also describes the mystic initiation rites of the pure souls, alluding to images and visual experiences of the initiated to the Eleusinian mysteries, "... but beauty was bright to see at the time when the souls, together with the blessed chorus—with us following Zeus, while others followed other gods—saw that blessed appearance and vision and were prac-

261 Pasquali (1908) 46.

tising the *rite*,<sup>262</sup> which according to the custom is the most blessed of all; this rite which we celebrated being ourselves perfect and without experience of the troubles that awaited us in after time, being initiated and viewing as *epoptai*<sup>263</sup> perfect, and simple, and unshakeable and blissful apparitions<sup>264</sup> *in pure light because we were pure ourselves* and unmarked by this thing which we are carrying around now and we call a body, bound to it like an oyster in its shell." (... καλλος δε τότ' ήν ιδεῖν λαμπρόν, ὅτε σὺν εὐδαίμονι χορῷ μακαρίαν ὄψιν τε καὶ θέαν, ἐπόμενοι μετὰ μὲν Διὸς ἡμεῖς, ἄλλοι δὲ μετ' ἄλλου θεῶν, εἰδόν τε καὶ ἐτελοῦντο τῶν τελετῶν ἥν θέμις λέγειν μακαριωτάτην, ἥν ὡργιάζομεν ὀλόκληροι μὲν αὐτοὶ ὅντες καὶ ἀπαθεῖς κακῶν ὅσα ἡμᾶς ἐν ὑστέρῳ χρόνῳ ὑπέμενεν, ὀλόκληρα δὲ καὶ ἀπλᾶ καὶ ἀτρεμῇ καὶ εὐδαίμονα φάσματα μυούμενοί τε καὶ ἐποπτεύοντες ἐν αὐγῇ καθαρῷ, καθαροὶ ὄντες καὶ ἀσήμαντοι τούτου ὃ νῦν δὴ σώμα περιφέροντες ὄνομάζομεν, ὀστρέου τρόπον δεδεσμευμένοι. Pl. *Phdr.* 250.b.5–c.6).

Plato also in *Phaedrus* associates madness with purification rites, saying that madness [*mania*] found relief from trouble and hardship, "... taking refuge in prayers to the gods and in worship, and, as a result, being engaged in *mystic rites and purifications* ..." (... καταφυγούμσα πρὸς θεῶν εὐχάς τε καὶ λατρείας, ὅθεν δὴ καθαρμῶν τε καὶ τελετῶν τυχοῦμσα ἔξαντη ... Pl. *Phdr.* 244 e.2–4).<sup>265</sup>

In *Phaedo* Plato relates purification with the separation of the soul from the body, "Is this, then, not purification, exactly as was said in our discourse some time ago, namely, to separate the soul from the body as far as possible and to accustom it to assemble and gather itself together out of every part of the body, and to dwell by itself as much as possible both now and then, released, just as from the bonds of the body?" (Κάθαρσις δὲ εἶναι ἀρα οὐ τοῦτο συμβαίνει, ὅπερ πάλαι ἐν τῷ λόγῳ λέγεται, τὸ χωρίζειν ὅτι μάλιστα ἀπὸ τοῦ σώματος τὴν ψυχὴν καὶ ἐθίσαι αὐτὴν καθ' αὐτὴν πανταχόθεν ἐκ τοῦ σώματος συναγείρεσθαι τε καὶ ἀθροίζε-

262 On the secret Eleusinian rites and the laments of Kore and Demeter included in these rites Proclus says: Procl. *In R. 1.125.20–22*: ἐπεὶ καὶ Κόρης καὶ Δήμητρος καὶ αὐτῆς τῆς μεγίστης θεᾶς ἱερούς τινας ἐν ἀπορρήτοις θρήνους αἱ τελεταὶ παραδεδώκασιν. See also Isocr. *Paneg.* 28. 4–12: Δήμητρος γάρ ἀφικομένης εἰς τὴν χώραν, ὅτε ἐπλανήθη τῆς Κόρης ἀρπασθείσης, καὶ πρὸς τοὺς προγόνους ἡμῶν εὐμενῶς διατεθείσης ἐκ τῶν εὐεργεσιῶν, ἃς οὐχ οἶλόν τ' ἄλλοις ἢ τοῖς μεμυημένοις ἀκούειν, καὶ δούστης δωρεάς διττάς, αἵπερ μέγισται τυγχάνουσιν οὖσαι, τούς τε καρπούς, οἱ τοῦ μὴ θηριωδῶς ζῆν ἡμᾶς αἴτιοι γεγόνασιν, καὶ τὴν τελετὴν, ἥς οἱ μετασχόντες περὶ τῆς τοῦ βίου τελευτῆς καὶ τοῦ σύμπαντος αἰώνος ἡδίους τάξ ἐλπίδας ἔχουσιν; and Christian sources: Greg. *Naz. Or.* 39.4; Clem. Alex. *Protr.* 2.12.2; Lact. *Inst. Dh.* 18.7.

263 *Epoptai*: the highest grade of initiation at the Eleusinian mysteries; *L.S.J.*

264 On the apparitions /visual experiences of the initiated to the Eleusinian mysteries see Burkert (1983) 265–293, Riedweg (1987) 30–69, Clinton (2003) 50–78, Parker (2005) 342–360.

265 Plato *Phd.* 69c; cf. Plu. *De Rect. Rat. Aud.* 2.47A: hence in pl., as title of poem by Empedocles, Ath. *Deipn.* 14.620d.

σθαι, καὶ οἰκεῖν κατὰ τὸ δυνατὸν καὶ ἐν τῷ νῦν παρόντι καὶ ἐν τῷ ἔπειτα μόνην καθ' αὐτήν, ἐκλυομένην ὥσπερ [ἐκ] δεσμῶν ἐκ τοῦ σώματος; Pl. *Phd.* 67c.5–67d.2).

Plato also refers to a certain way of life that should lead to knowledge, and says that “we should not be infected with the nature of the body, but we should *purify ourselves* from it until the god himself sets us free; ... for it is not righteous to the *impure to touch/attain the pure*.” (μηδὲ ἀναπιμπλώμεθα τῆς τούτου φύσεως, ἀλλὰ καθαρεύωμεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, ἔως ὃ θεός αὐτὸς ἀπολύσῃ ἡμᾶς· ... μὴ καθαρῷ γάρ καθαροῦ ἐφάπτεσθαι μὴ οὐ θεμιτὸν ἥ. Pl. *Phd.* 67.a.2–b.2).

Furthermore, Plato turns the discussion to precious stones (λιθίδια), such as cornelians, jaspers, emeralds, describing them as “the loved pieces” (τὰ ἀγαπώμενα μόρια), and all stones as “even more beautiful” (καὶ ἔτι τούτων καλλίω). And “the reason is that there they are pure” (τὸ δ' αἴτιον τούτου εἶναι ὅτι ἐκεῖνοι οἱ λίθοι εἰσὶ καθαροί Pl. *Phd* 110.d.7–e.3). Regarding the ‘purity’ and purifying power of stones in theurgical rituals, Proclus in the *Elements of Theology* asserts that, “So I say that if, for example, there is a purifying deity, then there will be purification in souls, animals and stones” (... λέγω δὲ οἶον εἴ τις ἔστι θεότης καθαρική, καὶ ἐν ψυχαῖς ἔστι καθαρσίς καὶ ἐν ζώοις καὶ ἐν φυτοῖς καὶ ἐν λίθοις· Procl. *Inst.* 145.7–10). Proclus also clarifies that the purifying power of stones is only corporeal, “the stone participates in purifying power only corporeally” (καὶ ὁ μὲν λίθος μετέχει τῆς καθαρικῆς δυνάμεως σωματικῶς μόνον Procl. *Inst.* 145.11–12).<sup>266</sup>

### 6.6–8.c. Καθάρσεις /Καθαρμόι: Water Purification Rituals in Egyptian Religion

According to Porphyry's treatise *De Abstinentia* iv.7, Chaeremon, the Egyptian priest [sacred scribe] and Stoic philosopher of the first century CE, reports about the priests during the period of their priestly office, “Thrice a day they used to wash themselves in cold water, when they got up, before the midday meal and before they went to bed. If they happen to have an emission of semen during sleep, they immediately used to purify the body by washing.” (τρὶς δὲ τῆς ἡμέρας ἀπελούντο ψυχρῷ, ἀπό τε κοίτης καὶ πρὸ ἀρίστου καὶ πρὸ ὑπνου. εἰ δέ ποτε συμβαίη καὶ ὄνειρώττειν, παραχρῆμα ἀπεκάθαιρον λουτρῷ τὸ σῶμα. *Abst.* 4.7.32–35).<sup>267</sup> Chaeremon's report recorded by Porphyry about the importance of purification rituals practiced by the Egyptian priests may suggest possible influences from the Egyptian practice into theurgy. However, the Christian theologian and philosopher Augustine (354–430 CE) in *The City of God, De Civitate Dei* x.9, discussing Porphyry's view on the role of purification in the theurgic

<sup>266</sup> See also Procl. *In R.* 1.183.11–22.

<sup>267</sup> Horst (1987); Patillon, Segonds and Brisson (1995).

*teletai*, writes that for Porphyry the theurgic purification rituals are useful not for the intellectual part, but only for the spiritual part of the soul, which is related to “the images of material things” and “visions of the gods.”<sup>268</sup>

Purification rituals were an essential part of the religiosity of the Egyptian priests. In the temple of Edfu in Upper Egypt there is a reference to the purification rituals that the Egyptian priests had undertaken before entering the temple: “Door-keepers, great Gods, masters of the flame, with long rays, who open the door-wings of heaven and illuminate the two countries, Guardians [...] Upper and Lower Egypt, who stand and sit at the right and at the left, Kings of Upper and lower Egypt of the south and the north, Venerable ones of the gods! I have come to you, great gods, *after Horus has purified me, after Thot has perfumed me with incense*. Make way for me so that I can pass! I have come on the way of the god, I have entered praised and have emerged loved, there are no male and female adversaries on my path ... I do not diminish the offering bread, I do not do painful things. I have not made any dirt. *Horus is my purity*. My hands are Horus, my arms are Thot, I have brought the Udjat-eye to his master, I have put Maat in her place. I am a prophet; it is the king who has sent me to see the god. A king’s offering, *I am pure*.” (Edfou III 83, 2–11).<sup>269</sup>

The purification rituals that the Egyptian priests practiced involve the use of water, as they are well documented in temple reliefs.<sup>270</sup> Water in these

<sup>268</sup> Aug. *De Civ. Dei* x.9: “Even Porphyry promises a kind of *purification* of the soul by means of *theurgy*, though he does so reluctantly, ... at another, he seems to yield to the advocates of magic and claims that it is useful for the purification of a part of the soul—not, of course, the *intellectual part* which conceives the truth of intelligible realities that have no sensible images, but the *spiritual part* which perceives the images of material things. He [Porphyry] explains that by means of certain *theurgic consecrations*, which are called *teletai* [initiatory rites] or *mysteries*, this *spiritual part* becomes suitably prepared for the friendship of spirits and angels and fit for *visions of the gods*. Nevertheless, he is disposed to confess that these theurgic mysteries do not operate any purification in the intellectual soul which would prepare it to behold its God and to perceive the realities that truly exist—an admission, surely, that helps us to understand the kind of gods involved in theurgic consecrations, and the value of a vision in which true realities remain unseen.” Transl. Walsh and Monahan (1952). Furthermore, Augustine points out that according to Porphyry theurgy is associated with envious powers, and he refers to a story about a certain Chaldaean, which has been reported by Porphyry: “A good man in Chaldaea complains his great efforts to purify his soul were frustrated because *an expert in theurgy* who was envious of his purity *had bound and conjured the powers by magical prayers* not to grant his request—with the result that what one bound the other could not loose.” (Aug. *De Civ. Dei* x.9). Transl. Walsh and Monahan (1952).

<sup>269</sup> Alliot (1949–1954) 144–145.

<sup>270</sup> E.g. the reliefs of the ‘Red Chapel of Hatshepsut’ (/ ‘La Chapelle Rouge’) from the Eighteenth Dynasty; see Burgos and Larché (2006) 212 and 216.

rituals was a symbol of life and all things emerged from it.<sup>271</sup> An initiated priest reveals about the various stages of the ‘induction ritual’ in the temple, such as presentation before the god, purification and beholding the deity: “I was presented before the god, being an excellent young man, while I was introduced into the horizon of heaven ... I was emerged from Nun (the primordial waters), and I was purified of what ill had been in me; I removed my clothing and ointments, as Horus and Seth were purified. I advanced before the god in the holy of holies, filled with fear before his power.” (Cairo Catalogue général 42230).<sup>272</sup>

Herodotus in *Histories* 11.37 describes the water purification rituals of the Egyptian priests as follows: “They wash themselves in cold water twice a day and twice every night;” (Λοῦνται δὲ δίς τε τῆς ἡμέρης ἐκάστης ψυχρῷ καὶ δίς ἐκάστης νυκτός ... Hdt. 11.37.14–16).<sup>273</sup>

Apuleius (c. 124–170 AD) in *Metamorphoses* Book XI describes the water purification rituals that Lucius underwent in his initiation into the mysteries of Isis at Rome, according to which Lucius was purified by the high-priest in “the nearest public baths” and “sprinkled” “with holy water.” At the final stage of his initiation Lucius experienced a divine epiphany, “Then he [the high-priest] ordered all uninitiated to depart, invested me in a new linen garment and led me by the hand into the inner recesses of the sanctuary itself. ... I approached the very gates of death and set one foot on Persephone’s threshold, yet was permitted to return, rapt through all the elements. At midnight I saw the sun shining as if it were noon; I entered the presence of the gods of the Underworld and the gods of the Upper-world, stood near and worshipped them.” (Apul. *Met.* xi.20–23).<sup>274</sup>

<sup>271</sup> On the symbolism of the water purification rituals of the priests see Sauneron (2000) 36–42; On priests and temples in Ptolemaic Egypt see Otto (1905–1908).

<sup>272</sup> Transl. Jansen-Winkel (1985).

<sup>273</sup> Hdt. 11.37.1–17: Θεοσεβέες δὲ περισσώς ἐόντες μάλιστα πάντων ἀνθρώπων νόμοισι τοιοισίδε χρέωνται. Ἐκ χαλκέων ποτηρίων πίνουσι, διασμῶντες ἀνά πάσαν ἡμέρην, οὐκ ὁ μέν, ὁ δὲ οὐ, ἀλλὰ πάντες. Εἴματα δὲ λίνεα φορέουσι αἱεὶ νεόπλυτα, ἐπιτηδεύοντες τοῦτο μάλιστα. Τά τε αἰδοῖα περιτάμνονται καθαρειότητος εἴνεκεν, προτιμῶντες καθαροὶ εἰναι ἢ εὐπρεπέστεροι. Οἱ δὲ ἱέες ξυροῦνται πᾶν τὸ σῶμα διά τρίτης ἡμέρης, ἵνα μήτε φθειρ μήτε ὀλλο μυσαρὸν μηδὲν ἐγγίνηται σφι θεραπεύουσι τοὺς θεούς. Εσθῆτα δὲ φορέουσι οἱ ἱέες λινέην μούνην καὶ ὑποδήματα βύβλινα, ἄλλην δέ σφι ἐσθῆτα οὐκ ἔξεστι λαβεῖν οὐδὲ ὑποδήματα ἄλλα. Λοῦνται δὲ δίς τε τῆς ἡμέρης ἐκάστης ψυχρῷ καὶ δίς ἐκάστης νυκτός, ἄλλας τε θρησκήιας ἐπιτελέουσι μυρίας ὡς εἰπεῖν λόγῳ. Πάσχουσι δὲ καὶ ἀγαθά οὐκ ὀλίγα: See Lloyd (1994) 164–171.

<sup>274</sup> Transl. Graves (1951) 279–280.

#### 6.6–8.d. Καθάρσεις /Καθαρμοί: Water Purification Rituals in Sumerian Religion

Purification rituals with sacred water are also attested in Sumerian texts, such as hymns to gods, the Gudea cylinders which deal with the myth of the “Building of Ningirsu’s Temple,” incantations, or economic texts. One major god associated with water purification rituals is Enki,<sup>275</sup> the Sumerian god of water, wisdom and magic, later known as Ea or Ae in Akkadian religion. Another deity associated with the consecration of the water is the Mesopotamian goddess Ningirima, who is addressed in a Sumerian temple hymn as “mistress of shining sacred water” (TCS 3, TH 19, line 237).<sup>276</sup> “Apollo’s purifying power” (ἡ καθαρτικὴ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος δύναμις Procl. *In Cra.* 176.100.12–13) is discussed in a passage in Proclus’ *Commentary on Plato’s Cratylus*, in which Apollo is described as “the one who unites the many and brings them together to one” (πανταχοῦ γάρ ἐνωτικός ἐστιν τοῦ πλήθους ὁ Ἀπόλλων καὶ συναγωγὸς εἰς ἔν 176.100.27–28), “cleaning the whole heaven and creation and all encosmic lives” (δλον τε τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γένεσιν καὶ τὰς ζωὰς ἀπάσας καθαίρων τὰς ἐγκοσμίους 176.101.1–2). These purifying activities of the gods are imitated, according to Proclus, by seers and theurgists (176.100. 20 and 101.3–8).

In the Sumerian tale of “Inanna’s Descent to the Netherworld,” Inanna goes to the Underworld to conquer the realm of her sister, Ereshkigal. She asks her servant to call upon Enki to help her, when she dies. According to Inanna’s words: “Father Enki, lord of great wisdom, he knows the herb of life, he knows the potion [literally: water] of life. He will bring me back to life.” (ETCSL 1.4.1.65–67).<sup>277</sup>

Enki advises his son Asalluhi to practice a water purification ritual to purify the town from the pollution caused by an incantation priest: “Take seven šaharratu-vessels brought from a large kiln *at the mouths of the two rivers draw water*. Tamarisk, soapwort(?), young date palm, šalālu-reed, ‘horned’ alkali, salt which washes/opens the mouths of the gods, cedar, cypress, supālu-juniper, box-wood, aromatics, burāšu-juniper, terebinth(?), white cedar, red [...], cedar-oil, pure oil, excellent oil, oil of a nikiptu plant, white syrup brought from its mountain/country of origin, pure cow-fat, cow fat produced in a pure stall, gold, silver, sāriru-gold, rock-crystal, serpentine, ɻulālu-stone, carnelian, (and) lapis lazuli throw into the holy-water-basin. *Set in place the pure holy-water-basin of Eridu*, perform the rites of the Apsû, recite your propitious incantation, *make that water fully perfect by the craft of the ăšipu/exorcist, purify (it) by your pure*

<sup>275</sup> Kramer and Maier (1989) 2.

<sup>276</sup> Sjöberg, Bergmann and Gragg (1969).

<sup>277</sup> Black et al. (1998–2006).

*incantation.* Take a bucket, a dipper with a ring handle, pour that water into it. The holy-water-basin which purifies the temple of the gods, *the holy-water-basin* which cleanses the temple of the gods, *the holy-water-basin* which makes bright the temple of the gods, *the holy-water-basin* which washes the mouth of the gods, *the holy-water-basin* which purifies the city, *the holy-water-basin* which cleanses the city, *the holy-water-basin* which makes the city shine, take it and make it pass through the city, make it pass through the city-square, make it pass through street and alley, make it pass through the city ... Shout ..., 'Let the city (?) become pure, let [...] become bright, let [...] become pure, let [...] become bright.' The [...] of the gods [...] may it be pure, [...] may it be clean, [...] may it be bright." (CT XVII. 31–65).<sup>278</sup>

Regarding the reference to the sacred-pure place to collect water, "Take seven šaharratu-vessels brought from a large kiln at the mouths of the two rivers draw water." (CT XVII. 31–32), as examined above, there are more topographical details provided in a spell against *Utukki lemnuti*-daemons: "In Eredu the mulberry on a *pure place* has grown; its light of fresh lazurite above Abzu over-stretched, a place of the basis of it is the Underground world! In the dark house, in a wood rejecting a shadow under which any person will not enter, inside Utu and Amaushumgalanna, *between mouths of two rivers* Kahegal', Igihegal, Lahama from Eredu have made the following spell ..." (CT XVI. 46, 183–202).<sup>279</sup>

#### 6.8. Ἐμπύριος Δύναμις, "Empyrean Power"

Proclus points out that a natural element, sea water purifies because of its participation in the "empyrean power." (Procl. *Hier.Ar.* 6.7–8). In Proclus' *Commentary on Plato's Cratylus* 'fire and water' are associated with the purifying activities of the gods in the universe and the purifications and the lustral besprinklings practiced by the theurgists, "as Timaeus says (22c), gods purify the universe either with fire or water (ἢ πυρὶ ἢ ὕδατι), acts which the seers also imitate;" (Procl. *In Cra.* 176.100.19–20); and "above all, let the priest himself, governing the rituals of fire, be sprinkled with a frosty wave of the deep-voiced brine, as the Chaldaean oracle<sup>280</sup> says about him" (Procl. *In Cra.* 176.101.6–7).<sup>281</sup>

278 Walker and Dick (2001) 224. On temple purifications with lustral water see Bottéro (2001) 161.

279 Lambert (2000) 75–77. On Enki's ejaculation in the waters of Tigris note the following passage from the so-called story of "Enki and the World Order": "After he looked away, after Father Enki looked at the Euphrates, he stood ready like a rampant wild bull, he raises his penis and ejaculates, he filled the Tigris with flowing water." (ETCSL 1.1.3. 250–254) Black et al (1998–2006); Kramer and Maier (1989) 38–56.

280 *Orac. Chald. Fr.* 133; Majercik (1989).

281 See also Comm.: Sect. 6.4–8.a on the purification rituals above.

The “power of fire” has been identified with the divine in Porphyry. For example, *On Statues* Porphyry says that “the power of fire has been called Dionysus” (ἥ πυρὸς δύναμις Διόνυσος κέχληται Porph. *On Stat.* 8.19–20).<sup>282</sup> And in the *De Antro Nympharum* he refers to the symbols of Dionysus, namely clay kraters and amphoras, and explains that “for these [symbols] are dear to the gift of the god of the vine, since its fruit is ripened by the fire of heaven” (ταῦτα γὰρ φίλα τῇ παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ δωρεὰ τῆς ἀμπέλου, ἐπεὶ ἀπὸ πυρὸς οὐρανίου πεπαίνεται ταύτης ὁ καρπός. Porph. *Ant.* 13.8–9). Elsewhere *On Statues* Porphyry associates the “power of fire” with Hephaestus, “Then they addressed the power of fire as Hephaestus and they have made his statue in human shape” (Τοῦ δ' αὖ πυρὸς τὴν δύναμιν προσειπόντες Ἡφαίστον, ἀνθρωποειδές μὲν αὐτοῦ τὸ ἄγαλμα πεποιήκασι. Porph. *On Stat.* 8.5–6).<sup>283</sup>

*Marginal Notes by Ficino (Marginalia Ficini) of ms V (Vallicellianus) F 20, Fol. 140<sup>v</sup> (lines 3 and 6–8)*

6.2 ad κνέωρον *forsan carduuus* V<sup>mg</sup>.

Similarly, in Ficino’s translation of Proclus’ *De Sacrificio et Magia* (1497) it is written:

*cnebison id est carduuus*

6.3 ad ῥάμνος *raccinum id est genus virgulli spinosum quo facta est corona Christi* V<sup>mg</sup>.

Similarly, in Ficino’s translation of Proclus’ *De Sacrificio et Magia* (1497) it is written:

*raccinum id est genus virgulli spinosum*

*Scholium written above the line of ms VF 20, Fol. 140<sup>v</sup> (line 10)*

6.6–7 sup. θείω et ἀσφάλτω *sulphure et bitumine* V<sup>s.l.</sup>

<sup>282</sup> Bidez (1913) 13 in Appendices.

<sup>283</sup> Bidez (1913) 12 in Appendices. See Procl. *In Ti.* 1.147.6–9: ὁ δέ γε φιλόσοφος Πορφύριος ταῦτα ἔξηγούμενος τὸν μὲν Ἡφαίστον τὸν μὲν Ἡφαίστον τεχνικὸν ὑποτίθεται νοῦν, γῆν δὲ τὴν σεληνιακὴν σφαῖραν ταύτην γάρ αἰθερίαν γῆν καλεῖσθαι παρ' Αἰγυπτίοις.

The following scholium is written above the line (*supra lineam*) of the manuscript V F 20, Fol. 140<sup>v</sup> (line 10)

Similarly, in Ficino's translation of Proclus' *De Sacrificio et Magia* (1497) it is written:

*asphalto id est bitumine*

### 7. *Energeia*, “Activity”

#### 7.4, 9. *Ἐνέργεια, Energeia, “Activity”*

In Proclus' *On the Hieratic Art according to the Greeks* it is stated that the theurgists in the initiation rituals understood that “the daemonic powers” (τὰς δαιμονίους δυνάμεις) are substances closely associated to “the natural and bodily activities” (τῆς ἐν τῇ φύσει καὶ τοῖς σώμασιν ἐνέργειας) and “they brought themselves into union through these very powers.” (Procl. *Hier.Ar.* 7.3–5). Then, they left behind these natural activities (τὰς φυσικὰς ἐνέργειας), and used “the primary and divine powers” (ταῖς πρωτουργοῖς καὶ θείαις ἐχρήσαντο δυνάμεσι Procl. *Hier.Ar.* 7.8–10).

Regarding the natural *activity*, Proclus in his *Platonic Theology* states that “the activity (*energeia*) of nature is twofold,<sup>284</sup> the one which stays inside itself, according to which it keeps together itself and the reason-principles inside it; and the one that derives from it, through which the bodies also are filled full of these natural powers (τῶν φυσικῶν τούτων δυνάμεων), which are moved by the nature and act to one another and are affected by one another naturally.” (... διττὴ μὲν ἐστιν ἐνέργεια τῆς φύσεως, ἡ τε ἐν αὐτῇ μένουσα, καλ' ἦν ἔαυτὴν συνέχει καὶ τοὺς ἐν αὐτῇ λόγους, καὶ ἡ ἀπ' αὐτῆς, δι' ἦν καὶ τὰ σώματα πεπλήρωται τῶν φυσικῶν τούτων δυνάμεων, αἱ κινούμεναι παρὰ τῆς φύσεως εἰς ἀλλήλας δρῶσι καὶ πάσχουσιν ὑπ' ἀλλήλων φυσικῶς. Procl. *Plat.Theol.* v.64.15–20).<sup>285</sup>

284 On the “twofold are the activities (*energeiai*) and powers (*dunameis*) of gods” see Procl. *Plat.Theol.* v.64.3–9: Διτταὶ τῶν θεῶν εἰσὶν ἐνέργειαι καὶ δυνάμεις. Αἱ μὲν οὖν ἐν αὐτοῖς μένουσι καὶ περὶ αὐτοὺς ἐνεργοῦσι καὶ τέλος ἔχουσι τὴν μίαν καὶ ἡνωμένην πρὸς τὴν οὐσίαν ὑπόστασιν αἱ δὲ ἀπ' αὐτῶν προιοῦσαι καὶ περὶ τὰ δεύτερα τὴν δραστήριον ἐπιδεικνύμεναι δύναμιν, αἱ καὶ τῷ πλήθει τῶν ὑποδεχομένων καὶ τῇ τῆς οὐσίας ιδιότητι συνυπάρχουσι. On the *energeia* of gods see Comm.: Sect. 2.1–3; also 2.9–16 and 1.13–14.

285 The word *ἐνέργεια* is rarely used in the New Testament, but the term δύναμις is mostly used to describe the human participation in the divine dynamic. In Paul's epistle to the Ephesians there is a rare example of the “activity of the god's power,” in which both terms are used. Eph 3:6–7: εἶναι τὰ ἔννη συγχληρονόμα καὶ σύστωμα καὶ συμμέτοχα τῆς ἐπαγγελίας ἐν

In relation to the bodily *activity*, Proclus in his *Commentary on Plato's Republic* writes that in the theurgic ritual of the ascent of the soul the hieratic words (οἱ Ἱερατικοὶ λόγοι) focus on separating the souls from the bodies, “by producing to the souls the activity (*energeia*) freed from bodies and the release of the natural bonds” (ταῖς δὲ ψυχαῖς τὴν ἀπόλυτον τῶν σωμάτων προξενοῦντες ἐνέργειαν καὶ τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν φυσικῶν δεσμῶν Procl. *In R. II.119.5–9*).

In the *Elements of Theology*, also, Proclus, discussing the characteristics of activity (*energeia*) and its relation to existence (οὐσία) and the body (σῶμα), states, “Everything that is capable of returning to itself has an existence (ousia) separable from the body. For if it were inseparable from whatsoever body, it could not have any activity (*energeia*) separable from the body; for it is impossible that, if the existence is inseparable from bodies, the activity (*energeia*) should be separable from the existence: if so, the activity would be superior to the existence, if the latter needed a body, while the former was self-sufficient, being dependent not on bodies but on itself. Therefore, if anything is inseparable in its existence, it is in the same way or even more inseparable in its *activity*. But if so, it cannot return to itself; for that which returns to itself, being other than body, has an activity separate from the body and not conducted through the body or with the body, if neither the activity itself nor that to which it is directed requires the body. Thus, that which returns to itself is entirely separable from bodies.” (Πάντα τὸ πρὸς ἔαυτὸν ἐπιστρεπτικὸν χωριστὴν οὐσίαν ἔχει παντὸς σώματος. εἰ γάρ ἀχώριστον εἴη σώματος οὐτινοσούν, οὐχ ἔξει τινὰ ἐνέργειαν σώματος χωριστὴν. ἀδύνατον γάρ, ἀχώριστου τῆς οὐσίας σωμάτων οὖσης, τὴν ἀπὸ τῆς οὐσίας ἐνέργειαν εἶναι χωριστὴν: ἔσται γάρ οὕτως ἡ ἐνέργεια τῆς οὐσίας κρείττων, εἴπερ ἡ μὲν ἐπιδεής ἔστι σωμάτων, ἡ δὲ αὐτάρκης, ἔαυτῆς οὖσα καὶ οὐ σωμάτων. εἰ οὖν τι κατ’ οὐσίαν ἔστιν ἀχώριστον, καὶ κατ’ ἐνέργειαν ὅμοιώς ἡ καὶ ἔτι μᾶλλον ἀχώριστον. εἰ δὲ τοῦτο, οὐκ ἐπιστρέφει πρὸς ἔαυτόν. τὸ γάρ πρὸς ἔαυτὸν ἐπιστρέφον, ἄλλο ὃν σώματος, ἐνέργειαν ἔχει χωριζόμενη σώματος καὶ οὐ διὰ σώματος οὐδὲ μετὰ σώματος, εἴπερ ἡ τε ἐνέργεια καὶ τὸ πρὸς ὃ ἡ ἐνέργεια οὐδὲν δεῖται τοῦ σώματος. χωριστὸν ἄρα πάντη σωμάτων ἔστι τὸ πρὸς ἔαυτὸν ἐπιστρέφον. Procl. *Inst. 16.7–20*).<sup>286</sup>

Iamblichus in *De Mysteriis* discusses the notion of practicing the *human activity* in common with the god and the human participation in god's powers,

Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, οὐ ἐγενήθην διάκονος κατὰ τὴν δωρεὰν τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ τῆς δοθείσης μοι κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τῆς δινάμεως αὐτοῦ. See also (Pseudo-)Psellus' *Περὶ Ἐνέργειας Δαιμόνων* (*De Operatione Daemonum* / *De Daemonibus*) and *Quaenam sunt Graecorum opinions de daemonibus*; Gautier (1980) 105–194 and (1988) 85–107.

286 Dodds (1933) 18. On *energeia* and *epistrophe* in Proclus' *Institutio Theologica* see Dodds (1933) 193–194 and 222–223.

distinguishing at the same time the notions of participation, communion and union, “For either god holds us, or we are wholly possessed by god, or we practice our *activity* in common with him; and sometimes we participate in the god’s *lowest power* (*dunamis*), sometimes in his *intermediate* [*dunamis*], and other times in his *primary power* (*dunamis*); and sometimes there is a simple participation, sometimes a communion, and other times even a union from these inspirations [/divine possessions].” (“H γάρ ὁ θεός ἡμᾶς ἔχει, ἢ ἡμεῖς ὅλοι τοῦ θεοῦ γιγνόμεθα, ἢ κοινὴν ποιούμεθα πρὸς αὐτὸν τὴν ἐνέργειαν· καὶ ποτὲ μὲν τῆς ἐσχάτης δυνάμεως τοῦ θεοῦ μετέχομεν, ποτὲ δ’ αὖτῆς μέσης, ἐνίοτε δὲ τῆς πρώτης· καὶ ποτὲ μὲν μετουσίᾳ ψιλὴ γίγνεται, ποτὲ δὲ καὶ κοινωνία, ἐνίοτε δὲ καὶ ἐνωσίς τούτων τῶν ἐνθουσιάσεων” Iamb. *Myst.* III.5.III.7–12).



## APPENDIX

# MS Vallicellianus F 20

### Contents:

#### Fols. II–III: index

Fol. iv: blank

1. Fols. 1–136<sup>v</sup>: Tit.: no title (Iamblichus *De Mysteriis*). Scholion: Inc.: Ἰστέον ... Inc.: Ἰστορήσαντα. Inc.: Ἀβάμωνος διδασκάλου. Des.: ἀπορημάτων λύσεις.

Fols. 1–136<sup>v</sup> contain a Greek text written by a single scribe identified as Ioannis Skoutariōtis, with Latin marginal notes based on Ficino's translation and written by Ficino and Luca Fabiani.<sup>1</sup>

Fol. 137: blank

2. Fols. 138<sup>r</sup>–140<sup>v</sup> include: Tit.: *Πρόκλου Περὶ τῆς καθ' Ἑλληνας ἱερατικῆς τέχνης*. Inc.: "Ωσπερ οἱ ἐρωτικοί. Des.: καὶ θείαις ἐχρήσαντο δυνάμεσι."<sup>2</sup>

Fols. 138<sup>r</sup>–144<sup>r</sup> include a Greek text written by a single scribe identified as Marsilio Ficino (1433–1499)<sup>3</sup> with Latin marginal notes also by Ficino.<sup>4</sup> Kristeller (1986) points out: "The Iamblichus text has Latin notes in the hand of Ficino and Luca Fabiani. The Proclus text is preserved only in this manuscript. The manuscript is the source of Ficino's translations of both Iamblichus and Proclus."<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Martini (1902) 147–148. See also Saffrey and Stefani (2018).

<sup>2</sup> Bidez (1928) 137–151.

<sup>3</sup> Gamillscheg, Harlfinger and Hunger in *Repertorium der griechischen Kopisten, 800–1600*. Fac-sims. 30 cm. Band III.2A (1989); and Band III.3A (1997) 165.

<sup>4</sup> MS Riccardianus 76 was annotated and owned by Ficino. See for example the marginal notes in MS Riccardianus 76, Fols. 116–129. Kristeller (1937) includes MS Riccardianus 76 in the copies possessed or transcribed by Ficino, "Codices a Ficino possessi seu transcripti": Kristeller (1937) Vol. I: liv. Later, Kristeller (1986) also includes it in the "Census of manuscripts containing original works and letters of Marsilio Ficino or copied, annotated or owned by him": Kristeller (1986) 15–196, at 97–98.

<sup>5</sup> Kristeller (1986) 15–196, at 116–117.

Fols. 141–144 are excerpts from Eusebius' *Praeparatio Evangelica*:<sup>6</sup>

3. Fol. 141<sup>r–v</sup>: Tit.: *Porphyrii testus (sic) quod anima non sit actus corporis, sed quod immortalis*. Inc.: αὐτίκα λόγον ἴσχυρόν. Des.: ψυχρὸν δὲν καθ' ἑαυτό. (= Eusebius *Praeparatio Evangelica* XI 28.1–5 and XV 11.1–2).
4. Fol. 142<sup>r–v</sup>: Tit.: *Numenius De Secunda Causa*. Inc.: τὸν μέλλοντα δέ. Des.: πρεσβύτερος καὶ θειότερος. (= Eusebius *Praeparatio Evangelica* XI 18.1–3, 6–9, 22–23).
5. Fols. 142<sup>v</sup>–143<sup>r</sup>: Tit.: *Amelius De Johannis Theologia*. Inc.: καὶ οὗτος ἄρα. Des.: τὸν ἀνθρώπον καταχθῆναι. (= Eusebius *Praeparatio Evangelica* XI 19.1).
6. Fol. 143<sup>r–v</sup>: *Numenius Pythagoreus de Ente*. Inc.: φέρ' οὖν ὅση. Des.: προσαναγκάζεσθαι. (= Eusebius *Praeparatio Evangelica* XI 10.1–7).
7. Fols. 144<sup>r</sup>: Tit.: *Philon De Secunda Causa*. Inc.: εὐπρεπές γάρ τοῖς. Des.: πρωτογόνον αὐτοῦ λόγον. (= Eusebius *Praeparatio Evangelica* XI 15.1–2).

Fols. 144<sup>r</sup>–172<sup>r</sup>: Latin Text written by another single (unidentified) scribe.

8. Fols. 144<sup>r</sup>–148<sup>r</sup>: Tit.: *Porphyrius de occasionibus sive causis ad intelligibilia nos ducentibus*. Interprete Marsilio Ficino. (= Marsillii Ficini *Opera*. Basileae, 1561, II 1929–1932).

Fol. 148: blank

9. Fols. 149–161<sup>v</sup>: Tit.: *Ex Porphyrio de abstinentia animalium*. Interprete Marsilio Ficino.  
(= Marsillii Ficini *Opera*. Basileae, 1561, II 1932–1939).
10. Fols. 162–171<sup>r</sup>: Tit.: *Ex Michaeli Psello de demonibus* (excerpts)  
(= Marsillii Ficini *Opera*. Basileae, 1561, II 1939–1945).
11. Fols. 171<sup>r</sup>–172<sup>r</sup>: Tit.: *Hactenus Psellus. Deinceps ex Tomistis*. Inc.: Quanta sit potestas daemonum super naturalia. Des.: (Fol. 172<sup>r</sup>): tu de his lege Tommam contra gentiles de operibus magicis.

Fols. 173–246<sup>r</sup>: Latin Text written by another single (unidentified) scribe

12. Fols. 173<sup>r</sup>–190<sup>r</sup>: Tit.: *Accursius Pistoriensis* (i.e. Bonaccursius de Monte Magno), *de Nobilitate*.

<sup>6</sup> Monfasani in “Marsilio Ficino and Eusebius of Caesarea’s *Praeparatio Evangelica*” (2009) 3–13.

13. Fols. 190<sup>r</sup>–192<sup>v</sup>: Tit.: *Franc de Roma* (i.e. de Fiano?), *ad laudem Ciceronis oratio*.
14. Fols. 193<sup>r</sup>–201<sup>v</sup>: Guarinus, orations and letters (followed by some anon. pieces).
15. Fols. 201<sup>v</sup>–210<sup>v</sup>: Inc.: *Maximum et amplissimum munus* (table says: Guarinus, oration on Carolus Zenus, probably leon. Justinianus).
16. Fols. 211<sup>r</sup>–<sup>v</sup>: *Franc. Philephus, oratio in principio studii* 1430.
17. Fols. 212<sup>r</sup>–213<sup>v</sup>: Tit.: *Franc. Philephus, oratio in principio extraordinarie lectionis Sallustii de bello Jugurtino Flo(rentiae)* 1431.
18. Fols. 213<sup>v</sup>–224<sup>v</sup>: Id., *Oratio de laudibus historiae poetice philosophie atque hasce complectitur eloquentie* (given at Florence).
19. Fols. 224<sup>v</sup>–229<sup>r</sup>: Lucian, *comparatio* (tr. Aurispa).
20. Fols. 229<sup>r</sup>–231<sup>v</sup>: *Franc. De Coppulis Perusinus* (oration held in Florence).
21. Fols. 231<sup>v</sup>–240<sup>r</sup>: Tit.: *Anastasius Burgensis, oration* (then anon. orations in Latin and volg.).
22. Fols. 240<sup>v</sup>–242<sup>v</sup>: *Matth. De Interane* (oration).
23. Fols. 243<sup>r</sup>–246<sup>r</sup>: Tit.: *M. de Ursinis Archiepiscopus Tarentinus* (letter).

Fols. 246<sup>v</sup>–252<sup>v</sup>: blank

Fols. 253<sup>r</sup>–292<sup>r</sup>: Greek Text written by another single (unidentified) scribe

24. Fols. 253<sup>r</sup>–276<sup>v</sup>: no title. Inc.: Ἐδεξάμην σοῦ γεώργιε καὶ ταύτην τὴν μακρὰν ἀδολεσχίαν. Des.: ώς ἀν ἐντεῦθεν εἰδέναι ἔχοιεν ...
25. Fols. 277<sup>r</sup>–292<sup>r</sup>: Tit.: Ἰωάννης τῷ ἀκολάστῳ πριάπῳ τῷ σκαταβλατᾷ, χαῖρειν.

Fols. 293<sup>r</sup>–315<sup>v</sup>: Greek Text written by another single (unidentified) scribe

26. Fols. 293<sup>r</sup>–312<sup>v</sup>: Tit.: συμβουλευτικὸς περὶ ὁμονοίας πρὸς ῥωμαίους καὶ λατίνους, βαρλαὰμ μοναχοῦ.

(Fols. 307<sup>v</sup>–312<sup>v</sup>: Eiusdem πρὸς τὴν σύνοδον περὶ τῆς πρὸς λατίνους ἐνώσεως.)

27. Fols. 313<sup>r</sup>–315<sup>v</sup>: no title, Libanii Fragment.

Fols. 316<sup>r</sup>–319<sup>v</sup>: blank

Fols. 320<sup>r</sup>–355<sup>r</sup>: Latin Text written by another single (unidentified) scribe

28. Fols. 320<sup>r</sup>–355<sup>r</sup>: Tit.: *Opus Jo. Sulpitii iuvenile*. Inc.: Fervidus aestiferi (poem). (Other poems by the same, one addressed to Petr. Riarius card., one to Gryphus. Then anon. poems, perhaps by the same). Des.: Fol. 355.

Fols. 355<sup>v</sup>–356<sup>v</sup>: Blank

29. Fols. 357<sup>r–v</sup>: Greek text, restored folio

Parchment and Paper:

Parchment and paper of good quality; it was restored in the monastery Badia di Grottaferrata in 1960.

MS V F 20 is one of the oldest manuscripts of the Vallicelliana Biblioteca. The library was established in 1565 by the priest and Saint Filippo Neri. The codex belonged to the Portuguese humanist and writer Aquiles Estaço (1524–1581) who lived in Rome as a secretary of the Pope since 1555. When Aquiles Estaço died in 1581, he donated F 20 and his whole book and manuscript collection comprising of 1700 printed volumes and 300 manuscripts to Filippo Neri and the Congregation of Oratory (founded by F. Neri in 1575).<sup>7</sup> Then Filippo Neri must have included it in the collections of the Biblioteca Vallicelliana.

MS V F 20 was owned and annotated by Marsilio Ficino.<sup>8</sup>

Proclus *Hier.Ar.* MS V, 138<sup>r</sup>–140<sup>v</sup>: height 210 × width 150 mm. (Procl. *Hier.Ar.*: Fol. 138 = width 142 mm.; Fol. 139 = width 143 mm.; Fol. 140 = width 142 mm.).

Fols. 138<sup>r</sup>–140<sup>r</sup> = 22–23 lines; Fol. 140<sup>v</sup> = 25 lines.

Fol. 138: the right upper side of the paper is restored (in the margins of lines 2–8).

Fol. 139: the right upper side of the paper is restored (in the margins of line 7).

Fol. 140: the right upper side of the paper is restored (in the margins of lines 4 and 6).

Collation:

It is a composite manuscript in three parts:

- A) Part 1: Folios i–172
- B) Part 2: Folios 173–318<sup>v</sup>
- C) Part 3: Folios 319<sup>v</sup>–357<sup>v</sup>.

[height 210 (204) × width 140 (135)–150 mm.]

<sup>7</sup> Finocchiaro (2011) 138 and 185–186.

<sup>8</sup> Martini in *Catalogo di manoscritti greci esistenti nelle biblioteche italiane* (1902) 147–148. Sicherl (1957) 22–37. Kristeller (1937) Vol. I: xlvii, Lxix, Cxxxv. Kristeller in *Iter Italicum* (1967) Vol. II: 132–133. Kristeller (1986) 15–196, at 116–117.

## Quires:

## Quires of Part 1:

(Fol. 1) I–XIV x 10:

I<sup>10</sup>: Fols. 1–10II<sup>10</sup>: Fols. 11–19; Fol. 14 is double, incl. 14 + 14a (or Fols. 11–14, 14a–19).III<sup>10</sup>: Fols. 20–29IV<sup>10</sup>: Fols. 30–39V<sup>10</sup>: Fols. 40–49VI<sup>10</sup>: Fols. 50–57; Fols. 53 and 56 are double, incl. 53 + 53a, 56 + 56a.VII<sup>10</sup>: Fols. 58–67VIII<sup>10</sup>: Fols. 68–77IX<sup>10</sup>: Fols. 78–87X<sup>10</sup>: Fols. 88–97XI<sup>10</sup>: Fols. 98–107XII<sup>10</sup>: Fols. 108–117XIII<sup>10</sup>: Fols. 118–127XIV<sup>10</sup>: Fols. 128–137 (137<sup>r–v</sup> = blank)

(Fol. 138) XV–XVII x 12:

XV<sup>12</sup>: Fols. 138–149Fols. 138<sup>r</sup>–144<sup>r</sup>: written by a single scribeFols. 144<sup>r</sup>–149<sup>v</sup>: written by another single scribe (148<sup>v</sup> = blank)XVI<sup>12</sup>: Fols. 150–161XVII<sup>12–1</sup>: Fols. 162–173 (172 r = text; 173<sup>v</sup> = blank)

## Quires of Part 2:

(Fol. 173) XVIII–XXV x 10:

XVIII<sup>10</sup>: Fols. 173–182IX<sup>10</sup>: Fols. 183–192XX<sup>10</sup>: Fols. 193–202XXI<sup>10</sup>: Fols. 203–212XXII<sup>10</sup>: Fols. 213–222XXIII<sup>10</sup>: Fols. 223–232XXIV<sup>10</sup>: Fols. 233–242XXV<sup>10</sup>: Fols. 243 (246<sup>v</sup> = blank, 242<sup>r–v</sup> = blank)–252 (248–252 = blank)

(Fol. 253) XXVI–XXX x 8:

XXVI<sup>8</sup>: Fols. 253–260XXVII<sup>8</sup>: Fols. 261–268XXVIII<sup>8</sup>: Fols. 269–276XXIX<sup>8</sup>: Fols. 277–284

xxx<sup>8</sup>: Fols. 285–292 (292<sup>r</sup> = text)

(Fol. 293) XXXI–XXXII x 10:

XXXI<sup>10</sup>: Fols. 293–302

XXXII<sup>10</sup>: Fols. 303–312

(Fol. 313) XXXIII x 6:

XXXIII<sup>6</sup>: Fols. 313–318 (316–318 = blank)

### Quires of Part 3:

(Fol. 319) XXXIV x 10:

XXXIV<sup>10</sup> Fols. 319<sup>r</sup>–328<sup>v</sup> (5 + 5) (319 = blank)

(Fol. 329) XXXV x 16 (10 + 6):

XXXV<sup>20–4</sup>: Fols. 329–344, 332<sup>r–v</sup> = restored; (folios are missing after fol. 334)

(Fol. 345) XXXVI x 13 (6 + 7):

XXXVI<sup>14–1</sup>: Fols. 345–357, 355<sup>v</sup> (= blank), 356<sup>r–v</sup> (= blank), 357<sup>r–v</sup> (= restored); (one folio is missing after fol. 345)

### Watermarks Part 1: Fols. i–172

Fols. 31, 45, 48, 53, 56, 59, 60, 71, 72, 78, 83, 88, 90, 99, 101, 102, 112, 118, 123, 143, 154, 158, 161, 169, 171, 172 (: hat—upper part); and Fols. 34, 38, 44, 46, 52, 65, 67, 73, 74, 75, 82, 87, 94, 98, 103, 104, 106, 116, 127, 128, 136, 144, 148, 149, 150, 153, 157, 163, 164, 166 (: hat—lower part): similar to Briquet<sup>9</sup> 3370 (Florence, Italian paper, 1465–1467).

Fols. 138<sup>r</sup>–140<sup>v</sup> of Πρόκλου Περὶ τῆς καθ' Ἐλληνας ἱερατικῆς τέχνης:

Fol. 137: blank, 138, 139, 140: not very clear (: hat—upper part):

The watermark is similar to Briquet n. 3373 (Florence, Italian paper, 1474–1483); similar also to Briquet n. 3370 (Florence, Italian paper, 1465–1467);<sup>10</sup> also to Briquet n. 3373 (Palerme, Italian paper, 1473).

It is similar also to Piccard<sup>11</sup> n. 31958 (Monteoliveto, StA Mantova, Italian paper, 1462); similar also to Piccard n. 31960 (Rome, StA Mantova, 1461); also to Piccard n. 31961 (Monteolivero, StA Mantova, Italian paper, 1469); also to Piccard n. 31962 (Firenze, StA Mantova, Italian paper, 1459–1460).

<sup>9</sup> Briquet (1907).

<sup>10</sup> Sicherl (1957) 23. Clarke, Dillon and Hershbell follow Sicherl; Clarke, Dillon and Hershbell (2003) xiii.

<sup>11</sup> Piccard (1961–1997).

Watermarks Part 2: Fols. 173<sup>r</sup>–318

Fols. 244, 247 (: hat—upper part); fols. 252 (: hat—lower part): Briquet 3370 (Florence, Italian paper, 1465–1467).

Watermarks Part 3: Fols. 319<sup>v</sup>–357<sup>v</sup>

Fols. 334, 336, 338 (: bird—upper part); fol. 339, 343 (: bird—lower part): similar to Briquet 12202 (Rome, Italian paper, 1479–1480).

# Bibliography

## Proclus' *On the Hieratic Art according to the Greeks*

Bidez, Joseph. "Proclus sur l'art hiératique." Pages 137–151 in *Catalogue des Manuscrits Alchimiques Grecs*. Volume vi: *Michel Psellus*. Edited by Joseph Bidez, Franz Cumont, Armand Delatte, Otto Lagercrantz, Julius Ruska. Union Académique Internationale. Bruxelles: Maurice Lamertin, 1928a.

Bidez, Joseph. "Proclus Περὶ τῆς ἱερατικῆς τέχνης." *Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire Orientales et Slaves* iv. Mélanges Franz Cumont. Bruxelles: Secrétariat de l'Institut, 1936, 85–100.

Copenhaver, Brian. "Hermes Trismegistus, Proclus and the Question of a Philosophy of Magic in the Renaissance." Pages 79–110 in *Hermeticism and the Renaissance*. Edited by Ingrid Merkel and Allen G. Debus. London: Associated University Presses, 1988.

Cousin, Victor. (ed.). *Procli philosophi Platonici opera inedita*. Paris, 1864 (2nd ed.). (1820–1827 1st ed.). (Reprint of the Commentary on Plato's *Parmenides*, Hildesheim: Olms, 1961 and 2002; Reprint of the whole work, Frankfurt am Main: Minerva, 1962).

Faraggiana di Sarzana, C. (transl.). *I manuali, Elementi di fisica, Elementi di teologia; I testi magico-teurgici; Marino di Neapoli, Vita di Proclo; traduzione, prefazione, note e indici*. Milano: Rusconi, 1999. (2nd ed.). (1985 1st ed.).

Festugière, André-Jean. *La Révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste*. Volume i: *L'Astrologie et les Sciences Occultes*. Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, 1944, 134–136. (Reprint Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1989).

Ficinus, Marsilius. (ed. and transl.). *Index eorum quae hoc in libro habentur. Iamblichus de Mysteriis Aegyptiorum, Chaldaeorum, Assyriorum. Proclus in Platonicum Alcibadem de Anima, atq(ue) Daemone. Proclus de Sacrificio et Magia. Porphyrius de Divinis atq(ue) Daemonibus. Synesius Platonicus de Somniis. Psellus de Daemonibus. Expositio Prisciani et Marsili in Theophrastu(m) De Sensu, Phantasia et Intellectu. Alcinoi Platonici Philosophi Liber de doctri(n)a Platonis. Speusippi Platonis Discipuli Liber de Platonis Definitionibus. Pythagorae Philosophi Aurea Verba. Symbola Pithagorae Philosophi. Xenocratis Philosophi Platonici Liber de Morte. Marsilius Ficini Liber de Voluptate*. Venetiis: In aedibus Aldi, Mense Septembri, M. IIID 1497.

Ficinus, Marsilius (ed. and transl.). *Index eorum quae hoc in libro habentur. Iamblichus de Mysteriis Aegyptiorum, Chaldaeorum, Assyriorum. Proclus in Platonicum Alcibadem de Anima, atq(ue) Daemone. Proclus de Sacrificio et Magia. Porphyrius de Divinis atq(ue) Daemonibus. Synesius Platonicus de Somniis. Psellus de Daemonibus. Expositio Prisciani et Marsili in Theophrastu(m) De Sensu, Phantasia et Intellectu. Alcinoi Platonici Philosophi Liber de doctri(n)a Platonis. Speusippi Platonis Discip-*

uli *Liber de Platonis Definitionibus. Pythagorae Philosophi Aurea Verba. Symbola Pithagorae Philosophi. Xenocratis Philosophi Platonici Liber de Morte. Mercurii Trismegisti Pimander. Eiusdem Asclepius. Marsilii Ficini De Triplici Vita Liber II. Eiusdem Liber de Voluptate. Eiusdem de Sole et Lumine Libri II. Apologia eiusdem in Librum suum de Lumine. Eiusdem Libellus de Magis. Quod Necessaria sit Securitas et Tranquillitas Animi. Praeclarissimarum Sententiarum huius Operis breuis Annotatio*. Venetiis: Mense Novembri. In aedibus Aldi, M.D.XVI 1516.

Ficinus, Marsilius. (ed. and transl.). *Iamblichus de Mysteriis Aegyptiorum, Chaldaeorum, Assyriorum. Proclus in Platonicum Alcibiadem de anima, at(que) daemone. Idem de Sacrificio [et] Magia. Porphyrius de divinis atq[ue] daemonib[us]. Psellus de daemonibus. Mercurii Trismegisti Pimander. E[i]usdem Asclepius*. Lugduni: Apud Ioan. Tornaesium, typogr. Regium, M.D. LXXVII.

Ficinus, Marsilius. (ed. and transl.). *Index eorum quae hoc in libro habentur. Iamblichus de Mysteriis Aegyptiorum, Chaldaeorum, Assyriorum. Proclus in Platonicum Alcibiadem de anima, at(que) demone. Proclus de Sacrificio et Magia. Porphyrius de divinis atq[ue] daemonib[us]. Synesius Platonicus de somniis. Psellus de daemonibus*. Venetiis: In aedibus Aldi, et Andreea Soceri, Mense Novembri, M.D. XVI 1516.

Ficinus, Marsilius. (ed. and transl.). *Index eorum quae hoc in libro habentur. Iamblichus de Mysteriis Aegyptiorum, Chaldaeorum, Assyriorum. Proclus in Platonicum Alcibiadem de anima, atq[ue] daemone. Proclus de Sacrificio et Magia. Porphyrius de divinis atq[ue] daemonibus. Synesius Platonicus de somniis. Psellus de daemonibus. Expositio Prisciani et Marsili in Theophrastu[m] De sensu, phantasia et intellectu. Alcinoi Platonici philosophi Liber de doctrina Platonis. Speusippi Platonis discipuli Liber de Platonis definitionibus [sic]. Pythagorae philosophi Aurea verba. Symbola Pithagorae philosophi. Xenocratis philosophi platonici Liber de morte. Marsilii Ficini Liber de voluptate*. Venetiis: In aedibus Aldi, Mense Septembri, M.IIID 1497.

Ficini, Marsilius Florentini, insignis philosophi Platonici, Medici, atque theologi clarissimi. *Opera, et quae hactenus extitere, & quae in lucem nunc primum prodiere omnia, omnium artium & scientiarum, maiorumque facultatum multifaria cognitione referuntissima, in duos tomos digesta, & ab innumeris mendis hac postrema editione castigata, quorum seriem versa pagella reperies. Una cum Gnomologia, hoc est, sententiarum ex iisdem operibus collectarum farragine copiosissima, in calce totius voluminis adiecta*. Tomi 2. Basilea, 1576.

Hopfner, Theodor. *Griechisch-ägyptischer Offenbarungszauber*. Mit einer eingehenden Darstellung des griechischsynkretistischen Daemonenglaubens und der Voraussetzungen und Mittel des Zaubers überhaupt und der magischen Divination im besonderen. Studien zur Palaeographie und Papyruskunde 21.1. Amsterdan: Verlag Adolf M. Hakkert, 1974. (1st ed. Leipzig: H. Haessel, 1921).

Jahn, Albert. *Eclogae e Proclo de philosophia chaldaica: sive de doctrina oraculorum chaldaicorum*. Halis Saxonum: Pfeffer, 1891.

Kalligas, Pavlos. *The Hieratic Art and The Hymns*. Athens: Stigme, 2009.

Kroll, Guilelmus. *Analecta Graeca*. Greifswald: Druck von Julius Abel, 1901.

Pitra, Joannes B. "Excerpta Chaldaica Vaticana." Pages 192–195 in *Analecta Sacra et Classica*. Vol. v. Edited by Joannes B. Pitra. Rome, Paris, 1888. Repr. Farnborough: Gregg Press, 1967. Later included as "Extraits du Commentaire de Proclus sur la Philosophie Chaldaïque" (*Πρόκλου ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς χαλδαϊκῆς φιλοσοφίας*). Pages 206–212 in *Oracles Chaldaïques*. Edited by Édouard S.J. des Places. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1971.

Taylor, Thomas (Engl. transl. of the Latin) "De sacrificio et magia." Pages 194–197 in *Thomas Taylor, the Platonist: Selected Writings*. Edited by Kathleen Raine and George Mills Harper. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969.

### ms VF 20

Briquet, Charles-Moïse. *Les Filigranes. Dictionnaire historique des marques du papier dès leurs apparition vers jusqu'en 1600*. Volumes I–IV. Geneva: A. Jullien, 1907. (1st ed.).

Finocchiaro, Giuseppe. *Vallicelliana segreta e pubblica: Fabiano Giustiniani e l'origine di una biblioteca universal*. Firenze: Olschki, 2011.

Gamillscheg, Ernst, Dieter Harlfinger and Dieter Hunger. (eds.). *Repertorium der griechischen Kopisten, 800–1600*. Facsims. 30 cm. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1981–1997.

Kristeller, Paul Oskar. *Supplementum Ficinianum*. Vols. I–II. Florence: Olschki, 1937.

Kristeller, Paul Oskar. *Iter Italicum*. Volume II, Italy Orvieto to Volterra, Vatican City. Leiden: Brill, 1967: 132–133.

Kristeller, Paul Oskar. "Marsilio Ficino and his Works after Five Hundred Years." In Gian Carlo Garfagnini (ed.). *Marsilio Ficino e Ritorno di Platone Studi e Documenti*. Firenze: Olschki, 1986.

Martini, Emidio. *Catalogo di manoscritti greci esistenti nelle biblioteche italiane*. (Tomus I. 1, Milano, 1893; tomus I. 2, Milano, 1896; tomus II, Milano, 1902).

Megna, Paola. "Per Ficino e Proclo." Pages 313–362 in *Laurentia Laurus: Per Mario Martelli*. Edited by Francesco Bausi and Vincenzo Fera. Messina: Centro interdipartimentale di studi umanistici, 2004.

Monfasani, John. "Marsilio Ficino and Eusebius of Caesarea's Praeparatio Evangelica." *Rinascimento* XLIX (2009): 3–13.

Piccard, Gerhard. *Die Wasserzeichenkartei Piccard im Hauptstaatsarchiv Stuttgart, Findbücher I–XVII*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1961–1997.

Sicherl, Martin. *Die Handschriften, Ausgaben und Übersetzungen von Iamblichos De mysteriis: eine kritisch-historische Studie*. Berlin Akademie-Verlag, 1957: 22–37.

## ms L Plut. 10.32

Bandini, Angelo Maria, Enrico Rostagno, Nicola Festa and Fridolf Kudlien. *Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Mediceae Laurentianae*. Tomoi 1–III. Florence, 1764–1770 (repr. Leipzig, 1961—réimpression de l'original de 1764–1770, avec suppléments).

Bandini, Angelo Maria. *Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Mediceae Laurentianae*. Tomus I. Florence, 1764.

## Proclus' Text Editions

Bidez, Joseph. "Proclus sur l'art hiératique." Pages 137–151 in *Catalogue des Manuscrits alchimiques Grecs*. Volume vi: *Michel Psellus*. Edited by Joseph Bidez, Franz Cumont, Armand Delatte, Otto Lagercrantz and Julius Ruska. Union Académique Internationale. Brussels: Maurice Lamertin, 1928a.

Boese, Helmut. (ed.). *Die mittelalterliche Übersetzung der ΣΤΟΙΧΕΙΩΣΙΣ ΦΥΣΙΚΗ des Proclus. Procli Diadochi Lycii Elementatio Physica*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1960.

Boese, Helmut. (ed.). *Procli Diadochi Tria Opuscula (De providentia, libertate, malo). Latine Guilelmo de Moerbeka vertente et graece ex Isaacii Sebastocratoris aliorumque scriptis collecta*. Quellen und Studien zur Geschichte der Philosophie 1. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1960.

Boissonade, Jean François. (ed.). *Marini Vita Procli*. Lipsiae: A.G. Weigel, 1814.

Cousin, Victor. (ed.). *Procli philosophi Platonici opera inedita*. Paris: Durand, 1864.

Cousin, Victor. (ed.). *Procli philosophi Platonici opera inedita* pt. III: *Procli commentarius in Platonis Parmenidem*. Paris: Durand, 1864.

Diehl, Ernestus. (ed.). *Procli Diadochi in Platonis Timaeum Commentaria*. Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. Leipzig: Teubner, 1903–1906. (Reprint Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1965).

Dodds, Eric Robertson. (ed. / transl.). *The Elements of Theology*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1933 (1st ed.). (1963 2nd ed.).

Duvick, Brian and Harold Tarrant. (transl.). *Proclus: On Plato Cratylus*. Ancient Commentators on Aristotle. London: Duckworth, 2007.

Festugière, André-Jean. (transl.). *Proclus: Commentaire Sur Le Timée*. Vols. I–V. Bibliothèque des textes philosophiques. Paris: Vrin, 1966–1968.

Festugière, André-Jean. (transl.). *Proclus: Commentaire sur la république*. Vols. I–III. Bibliothèque des textes philosophiques. Paris: Vrin, 1970.

Friedlein, Godofredi. (ed.). *Procli Diadochi in Primum Euclidis Elementorum Librum Commentarii*. Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. Leipzig: Teubner, 1873. (Reprint Hildesheim: Olms, 1967).

Gerd, van Riel. *Procli Diadochi, In Platonis Timaeum Commentaria*. Tomoi 1–v. Oxford Classical Texts. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2022.

Isaac, Daniel. (ed. / transl.). *Proclus: Trois études sur la providence*, II. *Providence, fatalité, liberté*. Collection des universités de France. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1979.

Jahn, Albert. *Elogiae e Proclo de philosophia chaldaica: sive de doctrina oraculorum chaldaicorum*. Halis Saxonum: Pfeffer, 1891.

Kroll, Guilelmus. *De Oraculis Chaldaicis*. Bratislava: Koebner, 1894. (1st ed.; repr. Hildesheim: G. Olms, 1962).

Kroll, Guilelmus. (ed.). *Procli Diadochi in Platonis Rem Publicam Commentarii*. Vols. I–II. *Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1899–1901. (Reprint Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1965).

Kroll, Guilelmus. *Analecta Graeca*. Greifswald, 1901.

Lang, Helen S. and Anthony D. Macro. *Proclus: On the Eternity of the World (De Aeternitate Mundi)*. Edited, Translated, and Commented, with an Introduction. Berkeley, University of California Press, 2001.

Lewy, Hans. *Chaldaean Oracles and Theurgy: Mysticism, Magic and Platonism in the Later Roman Empire*. Paris: Études Augustiniennes, 1978.

Linley, Neil. *Proclus' Commentary on the Pythagorean Golden Verses*. Arabic Text and Translation. Arethusa Monographs x. Buffalo, New York: State University of New York at Buffalo, 1884.

Manitius, Carolus. (ed. / transl.). *Procli Diadochi hypotyposis astronomicarum positionum*. *Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1909. (Reprint Stuttgart: Teubner 1974).

Marzillo, Patrizia. *Der Kommentar des Proklos zu Hesiods 'Werken und Tagen'. Edition, Übersetzung und Erläuterung der Fragmente*. *Classica Monacensia* Bd. 33. Tübingen: Narr Verlag, 2010.

Masullo, Rita. (ed. / transl.). *Marino di Neapoli. Vita di Proclo*. Testo critico, introduzione, traduzione e commenario. Speculum, contributi di Filologia Classica, collana diretta da A. Garzya. Napoli: M. D'Auria Editore, 1985.

Morrow, Glenn R. (transl.). *Proclus: Commentary on the First Book of Euclid's Elements*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1970.

Morrow, Glenn R. and John M. Dillon. (transl.). *Proclus' Commentary on Plato's Parmenides*, with introduction and notes by J.M. Dillon. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987.

Opsomer, Jan and Carlos Steel. (transl.). *Proclus On the Existence of Evils*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 2003.

Opsomer, Jan and Carlos Steel. (transl.). *Proclus: Ten Problems Concerning Providence*. Ancient Commentators on Aristotle. London: Bloomsbury, 2012.

Pasquali, Georgius. (ed.). *Proclus Diadochus in Platonis Cratylum Commentaria*. *Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1908. (Reprint Stuttgart: Teubner, 1994).

Pitra, Joannes B. "Excerpta Chaldaica Vaticana." Pages 192–195 in Vol. 5 of *Analecta Sacra et Classica*. Edited by Joannes B. Pitra (ed.) Rome and Paris: Cuggiani and Roter et Chernowitz, 1888. (repr. Farnborough: Gregg Press, 1967). Later included as "Extraits du Commentaire de Proclus sur la Philosophie Chaldaïque" (*Πρόκλου ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς χαλδαϊκῆς φιλοσοφίας*). Pages 206–212 in *Oracles Chaldaïques: Avec un choix de commentaires anciens. Texte établi et traduit*. Edited by Édouard des Places. Collection Budé. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1971.

Places, Édouard des. (ed.). *Jamblique: Les mystères d'Égypte*. 1st ed. Collection Budé. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1966. (repr. 1996 with additional bibliography).

Places, Édouard des. (ed.). *Oracles Chaldaïques: Avec un choix de commentaires anciens. Texte établi et traduit*. Collection Budé. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1971.

Praechter, Karl. "Das Schriftenverzeichnis des Neuplatonikers Syrianos bei Suidas." *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 26 (1926): 253–264.

Raine, Kathleen and George Mills Harper. (ed.). *Thomas Taylor, the Platonist: Selected Writings*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969, 194–197.

Ritzenfeld, Albertus. (ed. / transl.). *Procli Diadochi Lycii Institutio Physica*. Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. Leipzig: Teubner, 1912.

Saffrey, Henri-Dominique and Leendert Gerrit Westerink. (eds. / transl.). *Proclus: Théologie Platonicienne*. Vols. I–VI. Collection des universités de France. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1968–1997. (Vol. I: 1968; Vol. II: 1974; Vol. III: 1978; Vol. IV: 1981; Vol. V: 1987; Vol. VI: 1997).

Saffrey, Henri-Dominique and Alain-Philippe Segonds. (eds. / transl.). *Proclus ou Sur le bonheur*. Avec la collaboration de Concetta Luna. Collection des universités de France. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2002.

Segonds, Alain-Philippe. (ed. / transl.). *Proclus: Sur le premier Alcibiade de Platon*. Vols. I–II. Collection des universités de France. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1985–1986.

Segonds, Alain-Philippe and Luna Concetta. *Proclus. Commentaire sur le "Parménide" de Platon*. Tome VI, Livre VI. Collection des universités de France. Série grecque, 533. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2017.

Sheppard, Anne D.R. *Studies on the 5th and 6th Essays of Proclus' Commentary on the Republic*. Hypomnemata 61. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1980.

Steel, Carlos. *Proclus on Providence*. London: Duckworth, 2007.

Steel, Carlos (ed.). *Procli in Platonis Parmenidem commentaria*. Tomus I, libros I–III continens, recognoverunt brevique adnotatione critica instruxerunt C. Steel, C. Macé, P. d'Hoine. Oxford Classical Texts. Oxford: Clarendon, 2007.

Steel, Carlos. (ed.). *Procli in Platonis Parmenidem commentaria*. Tomus II libros IV–V continens, recognoverunt brevique adnotatione critica instruxerunt C. Steel, A. Grimbomont, P. d'Hoine. Oxford Classical Texts. Oxford: Clarendon, 2009.

Steel, Carlos. (ed.). *Procli in Platonis Parmenidem commentaria*. Tomus III, Libros VI–VII et indices continens, textum graecum recognoverunt brevique adnotatione critica

instruxerunt L. Van Campe et C. Steel, *ultimam partem ex latino in graecum vertit C. Steel*. Oxford Classical Texts. Oxford: Clarendon, 2009.

Vogt, Ernestus. (ed.). *Procli Hymni accedunt Hymnorum Fragmenta; Epigrammata, Scholia, Fontium et Locorum Similium Apparatus, Indices*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1957.

Westerink, Leendert Gerrit. (ed.). *Proclus Diadochus. Commentary on the first Alcibiades of Plato*. Amsterdam: North-Holland, 1954.

### Other Bibliography

Abbate, Michele. *Proclo Commento alla Repubblica di Platone*. (Dissertazioni I, III–V, VII–XII, CIV–XV, XVII). Milano: Bompiani, 2004.

Abbate, Michele. *Proclo Commento al Cratilo di Platone*. Milano: Bompiani, 2017.

Abbate, Michele. *Proclo Teologia Platonica*. Nuova Edizione Riveduta e Ampliata. Prefazione di Werner Beierwaltes. Milano: Bompiani, 2019.

Abel, Eugenius. (ed.). *Orphica*. Leipzig: Sumptus Fecit G. Freytag, 1885.

Addey, Crystal. *Divination and Theurgy in Neoplatonism: Oracles of the Gods*. Farnham: Ashgate, 2014.

Allen, Michael J. "Marsilio Ficino." Pages 353–379 in *Interpreting Proclus From Antiquity to Renaissance*. Edited by Stephen Gersh. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.

Alliot, Maurice. *Le culte d'Horus à Edsou au temps des Ptolémées*. Bibliothèque d'Étude 20. Cairo: Institut français d'archéologie orientale, 1949–1954.

Alpers, Klaus. "Untersuchungen zum griechischen Physiologos und den Kyraniden," *Vestigia Bibliae* 6 (1984): 13–88.

Argyropoulos Ioannis. (ed./transl.). *Aristotle Organon (Porphyrius De Universalibus. Arrestotilis Predicamentorum. Arrestotilis Periarmenearu. Gilbertus Pozritanus De Sex Principiis. Boecu Divisionum. Arrestotilis Pr(i)mus Priorum. Arrestotilis Primus Posteriorum. Arrestotilis Primus Ellenchorum. Arrestotilis Primus-Secundus-Tertius-Quartus-Quintus-Sextus-Septimus-Octavus-Quintus Shopicorum)*. 1479.

Armstrong, Arthur H. "Was Plotinus a Magician?" *Phronesis* 1 (1955/1956): 73–79.

Armstrong, Arthur H. *The Architecture of the Intelligible Universe in the Philosophy of Plotinus: An Analytical and Historical Study*. Amsterdam: A.M. Hakkert, 1967.

Armstrong, Arthur H. (ed.). *Plotinus, Ennead VI.1–5*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1988.

Athanassiadi, Polymnia. *Julian and Hellenism: An Intellectual Biography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981.

Athanassiadi, Polymnia. *Damascius. The Philosophical History. Text with Translation and Notes*. Athens: Apamea, 1999.

Athanassiadi, Polymnia. "Byzantine Commentators in the Chaldaean Oracles: Psellos and Plethon." Pages 237–252 in *Byzantine Philosophy and its Ancient Sources*. Edited by Ierodiakonou, Katerina. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002.

Athanassiadi, Polymnia and Frede, Michael. (eds.). *Pagan Monotheism in Late Antiquity*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999.

Audollent, Auguste. *Defixionum Tabellae*. Paris: Albert Fontemoing, 1904.

Bagnall, Roger S. *Egypt in Late Antiquity*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.

Baltzly, Dirk. "The Virtues and 'becoming like god': Alcinous to Proclus." *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy* 26 (2004): 297–322.

Baltzly, Dirk. (ed./transl.). *Proclus' Commentary on Plato's Timaeus. Vol. 3, Book 3, Part 1: Proclus on the World's Body*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Baltzly, Dirk. (ed./transl.). *Proclus' Commentary on Plato's Timaeus. Vol. 4. Book 3, part 2: Proclus on the world soul*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Baltzly, Dirk. (ed./transl.). *Proclus' Commentary on Plato's Timaeus. Vol. 5, Book 4: Proclus on the Time and the Stars*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013a.

Baltzly, Dirk. "Proclus and Theodore of Asine on Female Philosopher-rulers: Patriarchy, Metempsychosis, and Women in the Neoplatonic Commentary Tradition." *Ancient Philosophy* 33.2 (2013b): 403–424.

Baltzly, Dirk, Harold Tarrant, David T. Runia and Michael John Share. *Proclus' Commentary on Plato's Timaeus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Baltzly, Dirk, John F. Finamore and Graeme Miles. (ed./transl.). *Proclus' Commentary on Plato's Republic. Vol. 1, Essays 1–6*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018.

Baltzly, Dirk, John F. Finamore and Graeme Miles. (ed./transl.). *Proclus' Commentary on Plato's Republic. Vol. II, Essays 7–15*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2022.

Baltzly, Dirk and Michael John Share. *Hermias: On Plato Phaedrus 227A–245E. Ancient Commentaries on Aristotle*. London: Bloomsbury, 2018.

Bandini, Angelo Maria, Enrico Rostagno, Nicola Festa and Fridolf Kudlien. *Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Mediceae Laurentianae*. Tomoi I–III. Florence, 1764–1770 (repr. Leipzig, 1961—réimpression de l'original de 1764–1770, avec suppléments).

Bandini, Angelo Maria, Enrico Rostagno, Nicola Festa and Fridolf Kudlien. *Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Mediceae Laurentianae*. Tomus I. Florence, 1764.

Berchman, Robert M. *Porphyry, Against the Christians*. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

Berg, Robert M. van den. *Proclus' Hymns: Essays, Translations, Commentary*. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

Berg, Robert M. van den. *Proclus' Commentary on the Cratylus in Context: Ancient Theories of Language and Naming*. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

Bernabé, Alberto. (ed.). *Poetae Epici Graeci: Testimonia et Fragmenta*. Pars II. Fasc. 1: *Orphicorum et Orphicis Similium Testimonia et Fragmenta. Bibliotheca Teubneriana*. München and Leipzig: K.G. Saur, 2004.

Bernabé, Alberto. (ed.). *Poetae Epici Graeci. Testimonia et Fragmenta*. Pars II. Fasc. 2: *Orphicorum et Orphicis Similium Testimonia et Fragmenta. Bibliotheca Teubneriana*. München and Leipzig: K.G. Saur, 2005.

Betegh, Gábor. *The Derveni Papyrus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Betz, Hans Dieter. "The Delphic Maxim 'Know Yourself' in the Greek Magical Papyri." *History of Religions* 21 (1981): 156–171.

Betz, Hans Dieter. *The Greek Magical Papyri in Translation*. 1st ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986 (2nd 1992; Paperback 1996).

Betz, Hans Dieter. *The "Mithras Liturgy": Text, Translation and Commentary*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.

Bidez, Joseph. *Vie De Porphyre. Avec Les Fragments Des Traitées Περὶ Ἀγαλμάτων et De Regressu Animaee*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1913.

Bidez, Joseph. "La Démonologie de Psellus et le Traité De operatione daemonum." Pages 95–134 in *Catalogue des Manuscrits alchimiques Grecs*. Volume 6: *Michel Psellus*. Edited by Joseph Bidez, Franz Cumont, Armand Delatte, Otto Lagercrantz and Julius Ruska. Union Académique Internationale. Bruxelles: Maurice Lamertin, 1928b.

Bidez, Joseph. *La vie de l'empereur Julien*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1930.

Bidez, Joseph. "Proclus Περὶ τῆς ἱερατικῆς τέχνης." *Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire Orientales et Slaves* IV. Mélanges Franz Cumont. Bruxelles: Secrétariat de l'Institut, 1936, 85–100.

Bidez, Joseph and Franz Cumont. (eds.). *Imperatoris Caesaris Flavii Claudi Juliani: Epistulae, Leges, Poemata, et Fragmenta Varia*. Paris: Les belles lettres, 1922.

Bidez, Joseph and Franz Cumont. *Les Mages Hellénisés. Zoroastre, Ostanès et Hystaspe d'Après la Tradition Grecque*. Volume 1. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1938.

Black, Jeremy, Graham Cunningham, Jarle Ebeling, Esther Flückiger-Hawker, Eleanor Robson, Jonathan Taylor and Gabor Zólyomi. *The Electronic Text Corpus of Sumerian Literature*. Oxford, 1998–2006. <http://etcsl.orinst.ox.ac.uk/>

Blumenthal, Henry J. and Robert A. Markus. (eds.). *Neoplatonism and Early Christian Thought: Essays in Honour of A.H. Armstrong*. London: Variorum Publications, 1981.

Boer, Charles. *Marsilio Ficino The Book of Life. A Translation of Liber De Vita or De Vita Triplici*. Texas: Spring Publications, 1980.

Boissonade, Jean François. (ed.). *Michael Psellus De Operatione Daemonum. Cum Notis Gaulmini. Accedunt Inedita Opuscula Pselli*. Norimbergae: Apud Fr. Nap. Campe, 1838.

Boll, Franz. *Sphaera: Neue griechische Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Sternbilder*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1903.

Bonner, Campbell. *Studies in Magical Amulets Chiefly Greco-Egyptian*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1950.

Borghouts, Joris F. "Divine Intervention in Ancient Egypt and its Manifestation (bzw)." Pages 1–70 (esp. 39, n. 123) in *Gleanings from Deir el-Medîna*. Edited by Robert J. Demarée and Jac J. Janssen. Leiden: Brill, 1982.

Bos Egbert P. and P.A. Meijer. (eds.). *On Proclus and his Influence in Medieval Philosophy*. *Philosophia Antiqua*: A Series of Studies on Ancient Philosophy. Leiden: Brill, 1992.

Bottéro, Jean. *Religion in Ancient Mesopotamia*. Translated by Teresa L. Fagan. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001.

Boyce, Mary. *Zoroastrians, their Religious Beliefs and Practices*. London, Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1979.

Boyce, Mary. *Textual Sources for the Study of Zoroastrianism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984.

Boys-Stones, George. (ed.). *Platonist Philosophy 80 BC to AD 250: An Introduction and Collection of Sources in Translation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018.

Briquet, Charles-Moïse. *Les Filigranes. Dictionnaire historique des marques du papier dès leurs apparition vers jusqu'en 1600*. Volumes I–IV. Geneva: A. Jullien, 1907 (1st ed.).

Brisson, Luc. (ed.). *La Vie de Plotin*. Volumes I–II. Paris: J. Vrin, 1982, 1992.

Brisson, Luc. "Proclus et l'Orphisme." Pages 43–103 in *Proclus. Lecteur et interprète des Anciens*: Actes du colloque international du CNRS, Paris, 2–4 Octobre 1985. Colloques internationaux du Centre national de la recherche scientifique. Edited by Jean Pépin and Henri-Dominique Saffrey. Paris: Éditions du Centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1987. (Reprinted in Brisson 1995).

Brisson, Luc. "Platon et la magie." Pages 465–475 in *La Vie de Plotin*. Edited by Luc Brisson. Paris: J. Vrin, 1992.

Brisson, Luc. *Porphyre. Sentences, Études d'introduction, texte grec et traduction français, commentaire*. Tome I. Histoire des doctrines de l'antiquité classique XXXIII. Paris: Vrin, 2005.

Brisson, Luc. "Prayer in Neoplatonism and the Chaldaean Oracles. Porphyry, Iamblichus, Proclus." Pages 108–133 in *Platonic Theories of Prayer*. Edited by John M. Dillon and Andrei Timotin. Leiden: Brill, 2016.

Brisson, Luc, Séamus O'Neill and Andrei Timotin. (eds.). *Neoplatonic Demons and Angels*. Series: Studies in Platonism, Neoplatonism, and the Platonic Tradition 20. Leiden: Brill, 2018.

Bremner, Jan. *Initiation into the Mysteries of the Ancient World*. Münchener Vorlesungen zu Antiken Welten I. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2014.

Burgos, Franck and François Larché. *La Chapelle Rouge: Le sanctuaire de barque d'Hatshepsout*. Volume I: Fac-similes et photographies des scènes. Paris: Culturesfrance, 2006.

Burkert, Walter. *Homo Necans. The Anthropology of Ancient Greek Sacrificial Ritual and Myth*. Berkeley / Los Angeles / London: University of California Press, 1983.

Burkert, Walter. *Ancient Mystery Cults*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1987.

Burkert, Walter. *The Orientalizing Revolution: Near Eastern Influence on the Greek Culture in the Early Archaic Age*. Translated by Walter Burkert and Margaret E. Pinder. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1992.

Burkert, Walter. *Greek Religion: Archaic and Classical*. Translated by John Raffan. Oxford: Blackwell, 1996.

Burkert, Walter. *Babylon, Memphis, Persepolis: Eastern Contexts of Greek Culture*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2004.

Bychkov, Oleg V. and Anne Sheppard. *Greek and Roman Aesthetics*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Callanan, Christopher K. "A Rediscovered Text of Porphyry on Mystic Formulae." *The Classical Quarterly* 45.1 (1995): 215–230.

Chadwick, Henry. *Origen: Contra Celsum*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980.

Chlup, Radek. *Proclus. An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

Clark, Dennis C. "Iamblichus' Egyptian neoplatonic Theology in *De Mysteriis*." *The International Journal of the Neoplatonic Tradition* 2 (2008): 164–205.

Clarke, Emma C., John M. Dillon and Jackson P. Hershbell. *Iamblichus' De Mysteriis*. Translated with an Introduction and Notes. Society of Biblical Literature. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

Clinton, Kevin. *The Sacred Officials of the Eleusinian Mysteries*. Transactions of the American Philosophical Society 64.3. (1974).

Clinton, Kevin. "Stages of Initiation in the Eleusinian and Samothracian Mysteries." Pages 50–78 in Greek

Cole, Susan G. "New Evidence for the Mysteries of Dionysus." *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 21 (1980): 223–238.

Constas, Nicholas. *Proclus of Constantinople and the Cult of the Virgin in Late Antiquity: Homilies 1–5, Texts and Translations*. Leiden, Boston: Brill 2003.

Cooper, John M. (ed.). *Plato The Complete Works*. Indianapolis/Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Company, 1997.

Copenhaver, Brian. "Hermes Trismegistus, Proclus and the Question of a Philosophy of Magic in the Renaissance." Pages 79–110 in *Hermeticism and the Renaissance*. Edited by Ingrid Merkel and Allen G. Debus. London: Associated University Presses. 1988.

Corrigan, Kevin. *Reading Plotinus: A Practical Introduction to Neoplatonism*. West Lafayette, Indiana: Purdue University Press, 2005.

Couvreur Paul. *Hermiae Alexandrini in Platonis Phaedrum Scholia*. Paris: É. Bouillon, 1901.

Cumont, Franz V.M. *Afterlife in Roman Paganism*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1922.

Cumont, Franz V.M. *The Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism*. With an Introductory essay by G. Showerman. New York: Dover Publications, 1956.

Curd, Patricia. *The Legacy of Parmenides: Eleatic Monism and Later Presocractic Thought*. Las Vegas: Parmenides Publishing, 2004.

Curd, Patricia. *Anaxagoras of Clazomenae: Fragments and Testimonia. A Text and Translation with Notes and Essays*. Toronto, Buffalo and London: University of Toronto Press, 2007.

Deubner, Ludovicus. (ed.). *Iamblichus De Vita Pythagorica Liber*. Stuttgart: Teubner, 1975.

Dickie, Matthew W. *Magic and Magicians in the Greco-Roman World*. London: Routledge, 2001.

Diels, Hermann. *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*. Edited by Walther Kranz. Vols. I–III. (6th ed.). Berlin: Weidmann, 1951–1952.

Dieterich, Albrecht. *Abraxas: Studien zur Religionsgeschichte des späteren Altertums*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1891.

Dieterich, Albrecht. *Eine Mithrasliturie*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1966. (3rd reprinted ed.).

Dillon, John. (ed.). *Iamblichus Chalcidensis in Platonis Dialogos Commentariorum Fragments*. Leiden: Brill, 1973.

Dillon, John. "Image, Symbol and Analogy: Three Basic Concepts of Neoplatonic Allegorical Exegesis." Pages 247–262 in *The Significance of Neoplatonism*. Edited by R. Baine Harris. Norfolk: Old Dominion University, 1976. Reprinted as 247–258 in *The Golden Chain. Studies in the Development of Platonism and Early Christianity*. Edited by John Dillon. Aldershot: Variorum, 1990.

Dillon, John. *The Golden Chain. Studies in the Development of Platonism and Early Christianity*. Aldershot: Variorum, 1990.

Dillon, John. "Philosophy and Theology in Proclus. Some Remarks on the 'Philosophical' and 'Theological' Modes of Exegesis in Proclus' Platonic Commentaries." Pages 66–76 in *From Augustine to Eriugena: Essays on Neoplatonism and Christianity in Honor of John O'Meara*. Edited by Francis X. Martin and John A. Richmond. Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1991.

Dillon, John. *The Great Tradition. Further Studies in the Development of Platonism and Early Christianity*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 1997.

Dillon, John. *The Heirs of Plato. A Study of the Old Academy (347–274 BC)*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2003.

Dillon, John and John F. Finamore. *Iamblichus De Anima: Text, Translation and Commentary*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2002.

Dillon, John and Lloyd, P. Gerson. (eds.). *Neoplatonic Philosophy. Introductory Readings*. Indianapolis/Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Company, 2004.

Dillon, John and Dominic O'Meara. *Syrianus On Aristotle Metaphysics 13–14*. London, New York: Bloomsbury, 2006.

Dillon, John and Dominic O'Meara. *Syrianus On Aristotle Metaphysics 3–4*. London, New York: Bloomsbury, 2008.

Dillon, John and Sarah Klitenic Wear. (eds.). *Dionysius the Areopagite and the Neoplatonist Tradition*. Despoiling the Hellenes. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007.

Dillon, John and Wolfgang Polleichtner. *Iamblichus of Chalcis: The Letters. Edited with a Translation and Commentary*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009.

Dillon, John, John F. Finamore and Eugene Afonasius. (eds.). *Iamblichus and the Foundations of Late Platonism*. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

Dillon, John, Brendan O'Byrne and Fran O'Rourke. *Studies on Plato, Aristotle and Proclus. Collected Essays on Ancient Philosophy of John J. Cleary*. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

Dodds, Eric Robertson. "The Parmenides of Plato and the Origin of the Neoplatonic One." *Classical Quarterly* 22 (1928): 129–142.

Dodds, Eric Robertson. "Plato and the Irrational." *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 64 (1944): 16–25.

Dodds, Eric Robertson. "Theurgy and Its Relationship to Neoplatonism." *Journal of Roman Studies* 37 (1947): 55–69.

Dodds, Eric Robertson. *The Greeks and the Irrational*. Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press, 1951.

Dodds, Eric Robertson. "Tradition and Personal Achievement in the Philosophy of Plotinus." *Journal of Roman Studies* 49 (1959): 1–7.

Dodds, Eric Robertson. *Euripides' Bacchae*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1960.

Dodds, Eric Robertson. "New Light on the Chaldaean Oracles." *Harvard Theological Review* 54.4 (1961): 263–273.

Dodds, Eric Robertson. *Pagan and Christian in the Age of Anxiety*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965.

Dodds, Eric Robertson. *The Ancient Concept of Progress*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973.

Duffy, John M. "Hellenic Philosophy in Byzantium and the Lonely Mission on Michael Psellos." Pages 139–156 in *Byzantine Philosophy and its Ancient Sources*. Edited by Katerina Ierodiakonou. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002.

Duffy, John M. and Dominic J. O'Meara. (eds.). *Michaelis Pselli Philosophica Minora*. Vols. I–II. Leipzig: Teubner, 1989 and 1992.

Duffy, John M. (ed.). *Michaelis Pselli Philosophica Minora*. Vol. I. Leipzig: Teubner, 1992.

Dunand, Françoise and Christiane Zivie-Coché. *Gods and Men in Egypt (3000 BCE to 395 CE)*. Ithaca, New York and London: Cornell University Press, 2002.

Edwards, Mark J. *Neoplatonic Saints: The Lives of Plotinus and Proclus by their Students*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2000.

Eitrem, Samson. "La Théurgie chez les Neoplatoniciens et dans les papyrus magiques." *Symbolae Osloenses* 22.1 (1942): 49–79.

El-Khachab, Abd el-Mohsen. "Some Gem-Amulets Depicting Harpocrates Seated on a Lotus Flower." *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 57 (1971): 132–145.

Faulkner, Raymond O. *The Ancient Egyptian Pyramid Texts*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969.

Faulkner, Raymond O. *The Book of the Dead*. Vol. 1. New York: Limited Edition Club, 1972.

Faulkner, Raymond O. *The Ancient Egyptian Coffin Texts*. Oxford: Aris & Phillips, 2004.

Faulkner, Raymond O., Ogden Goelet, Eva von Dassow and James Wasserman. *The Egyptian Book of the Dead*. San Francisco: Chronicle Books, 1998.

Festa, Nicolaus. *Iamblichus de communi mathematica scientia liber*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1891 (repr. Stuttgart: Teubner, 1975).

Festugière, André-Jean. *La Révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste*. Volume 1: *L'Astrologie et les Sciences Occultes*, Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, 1944, 134–136. (Reprint Paris: Les Belles Letters, 1989).

Festugière, André-Jean. *Personal Religion among the Greeks*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1954.

Festugière, André-Jean. *Historia Monachorum in Aegypto*. Bruxelles: Société des Bollandistes, 1961.

Festugière, André-Jean. "Contemplation philosophique et art théurgique chez Proclus." Pages 7–18 in *Studi di Storia Religiosa della tarda antichità*. Edited by Ugo Bianchi. Messina: Università di Messina, 1968. Reprinted as Pages 585–596 in *Études de philosophie Grecque*. Edited by André-Jean Festugière. Paris: Vrin, 1971.

Festugière, André-Jean. "Modes de composition des Commentaires de Proclus." Pages 551–571 in *Études de philosophie Grecque*. Edited by André-Jean Festugière. Paris: Vrin, 1971.

Finamore, John F. *Iamblichus and the Theory of the Vehicle of the Soul*. American Classical Studies 14. Chico CA: Scholars Press, 1985.

Finamore, John F. "Iamblichean Dream Theory." Pages 155–166 in *Mediators of the Divine*. Edited by Robert M. Berchman. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998.

Finamore, John F. "Plotinus and Iamblichus on Magic and Theurgy." *Dionysius* 17 (1999): 83–94.

Finamore, John F. "Proclus on Ritual Practice in Neoplatonic Religious Philosophy." Pages 123–137 in *Being or Good? Metamorphoses of Neoplatonism*. Edited by Agnieszka Kijewska. Lublin: Wydawnictwo, 2004.

Finamore, John F. "Iamblichus on the Grades of Virtue." Pages 114–132 in *Iamblichus and the Foundations of Late Platonism*. Edited by Eugene Afonasin, John M. Dillon, and John F. Finamore. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

Finamore, John F., and Sarah I. Johnston. "The Chaldaean Oracles." Pages 161–173 in *The Cambridge History of Philosophy in Late Antiquity*. Vol. 1. Edited by Lloyd Gerson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Finocchiaro, Giuseppe. *Vallicelliana segreta e pubblica: Fabiano Giustiniani e l'origine di una biblioteca universal*. Firenze: Olschki, 2011.

Fowden, Garth. *The Egyptian Hermes*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.

Fowden, Garth. "Late Polytheism." Pages 521–572 in *The Cambridge Ancient History, Second Edition, Volume XII: The Crisis of Empire, A.D. 193–337*. Edited by Alan K. Bowman, Peter Garnsey and Averil Cameron. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Frankfurter, David. *Religion in Roman Egypt: Assimilation and Resistance*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998.

Frankfurter, David. "Egypt: Later Period." Pages 159–164 in *Ancient Religions*. Edited by Sarah. I. Johnston. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2004.

Frankfurter, David. *Christianizing Egypt. Syncretism and Local Worlds in Late Antiquity*. Princeton / Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2018.

Gadra, Thomas A. (ed.). *Geōrgiou tou Pachymerous Ypomnēma eis ton Parmenidēn Platōnōs [anōnymou synecheia tou Ypomnēmatos Proklou]*: Commentary on Plato's Parmenides [anonymous sequel to Proclus' Commentary]. Athēnai: Akadēmia Athēnōn, 1989.

Gaisford, Thomas. *Hēphaistīōnos egcheiridion peri metrōn kai poiēmatōn: Hephaestionis Alexandrini enchiridion*. Lipsiae: Sumptibus C.H.F. Hartmanni, 1832. Oxonii: e Typographo academic, 1855.

Gautier, Paul. "Le daemonibus du Pseudo-Psellos." *Revue des études byzantines* 38 (1980): 105–194.

Gautier, Paul. "Pseudo-Psellos: Graecorum opiniones de daemonibus." *Revue des études byzantines* 46 (1988): 85–107.

Gautier, Paul. (ed.). *Michaelis Pselli Theologica*. Vol. 1. Leipzig: Teubner, 1989.

Geller, Markham J. "Jesus' Theurgic Powers: Parallels in the Talmud and Incantation Bowls." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 28 (1977): 141–155.

Gentile, Sebastiano and Carlos Gilly. *Marsilio Ficino e il ritorno di ermete trismegisto*. Florence: Centro Di, 1999.

Gersh, Stephen. *Kίνησις ἀκίνητος: A Study of Spiritual Motion in the Philosophy of Proclus*. Leiden: Brill, 1973.

Gersh, Stephen. *From Iamblichus to Eriugena*. Leiden: Brill, 1978.

Gersh, Stephen. (ed.). *Interpreting Proclus: From Antiquity to the Renaissance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.

Gersh, Stephen. "One Thousand Years of Proclus. An Introduction to his Reception." Pages 1–29 in *Interpreting Proclus From Antiquity to Renaissance*. Edited by Stephen Gersh. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.

Gersh, Stephen. "George Gemistos Plethon." Pages 216–225 in *Interpreting Proclus From Antiquity to Renaissance*. Edited by Stephen Gersh. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.

Gersh, Stephen. (ed.). *Plotinus Legacy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019.

Gerson, Lloyd P. *God and Greek Philosophy*. London: Routledge, 1990.

Gerson, Lloyd P. (ed.). *Plotinus*. London: Routledge, 1994.

Gerson, Lloyd P. (ed.). *The Cambridge Companion to Plotinus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Gerson, Lloyd P. "Epistrophe eis heauton: History and Meaning." *Documenti e studi sulla tradizione filosofica medievale* 8 (1997): 1–32.

Gerson, Lloyd P. (ed.). *The Cambridge History of Philosophy in Late Antiquity*. Vols. I–II. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Gerson, Lloyd P. (ed.). *Plotinus The Enneads*. Translated by George Boys-Stones, John M. Dillon, Lloyd P. Gerson, R.A.H. King, Andrew Smith, James Wilberding. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018.

Gertz, Sebastian, John Dillon and Donald Russell. (Transl.). *Aeneas of Gaza, Theophrastus, with Zacharias of Mytilene, Ammonius*. Ancient Commentators on Aristotle. London: Bloomsbury Academic, Bristol Classical Press, 2012.

Graf, Fritz D. *Roman Festivals in the Greek East from the Early Empire to the Middle Byzantine Era*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.

Graf, Fritz D. and Sarah I. Johnston. *Ritual Texts for the Afterlife. Orpheus and the Bacchic Gold Tablets*. London: Routledge, 2007.

Graves, Robert. *The Transformations of Lucius, otherwise known as the Golden Ass*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Young, 1951.

Greenfield, Richard P.H. *Traditions of Belief in Late Byzantine Demonology*. Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert, 1988.

Griffin Michael. *Olympiodorus Life of Plato and On Plato First Alcibiades 1–9. Translation*. Ancient Commentators on Aristotle. London: Bloomsbury, 2015.

Guthrie, William Keith C. *A History of Greek Philosophy: The Presocratic Tradition from Parmenides to Democritus*. Vol. II. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978.

Hadot, Pierre. *Porphyre et Victorinus*. Vols. I and II. Paris: Études Augustiniennes, 1968.

Halliwell, Stephen. *The Aesthetics of Mimesis: Ancient Texts and Modern Problems*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002.

Harnack Adolf von. *Porphyrios. Gegen die Christen*. Berlin: Reimer, 1916.

Heath, Malcolm. "Longinus, On Sublimity." *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* Vol. 45 (1999): 43–74.

Helwig, Christoph. "Proclus on Epistemology, Language, and Logic." Pages 183–206 in *All from One: A Guide to Proclus*. Edited by Pieter d'Hoine and Marije Martjin. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.

Helwig, Christoph. "Proklos und die neuplatonische Philosophie in der Vita Procli des Marinus." Pages 293–314 in *Über das Glück: Marinus, Das Leben des Proklos*. Edited by Irmgard Männlein-Robert. Series: Sapere 34. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2019.

Helwig, Christoph. Helwig, Christoph and A.L.C. Vargas. "Ascent of the Soul and Grades of Freedom. Neoplatonic Theurgy between Ritual and Philosophy." Pages 253–266 in *Fate, Providence and Moral Responsibility in Ancient, Medieval and Early Modern*

*Thought. Studies in Honour of Carlos Steel.* Edited by Pieter d'Hoine and Gerd van Riel. Series: Ancient and Medieval Philosophy I. 49. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2014.

Herrero de Jáuregui, Miguel. "Pathein and Mathein in the Descents to Hades." Pages 103–123 in *Round Trip to Hades in the Eastern Mediterranean Tradition: Visits to the Underworld from Antiquity to Byzantium*. Edited by Gunnel Ekroth and Ingela Nilsson. Leiden: Brill, 2018.

Henrichs, Albert, and Ludwig Koenen. "Ein griechischer Mani-Codex." *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 5 (1970): 161–216.

Henrichs, Albert, and Ludwig Koenen. "Der Kölner Mani-Kodex (P. Colon. inv. nr. 4780) ΠΕΡΙ ΤΗΣ ΓΕΝΝΗΣ ΤΟΥ ΣΩΜΑΤΟΣ ΑΥΤΟΥ. Edition der Seiten 1–72." *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 19 (1975): 1–85.

Henrichs, Albert. "The Cologne Mani Codex Reconsidered." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 83 (1979): 339–367.

Henry, Paul and Hans Rudolf Schwyze. (eds.). *Plotini Opera*. Vol. I. Leiden: Brill, 1951.

Henry, Paul and Hans Rudolf Schwyze. (eds.). *Plotini Opera*. Vol II. Leiden: Brill, 1959.

Henry, Paul and Hans Rudolf Schwyze. (eds.). *Plotini Opera*. Vol. III. Leiden: Brill, 1973.

Herwerden, Henricus van. "De carminibus e papyris aegyptiacis erutis et eruendis." *Mnemosyne* 16 (1888): 342.

Hischle, Maurus. *Spachphilosophie und Namenmagie im Neulatonismus*. Mit einem Exkurs zu Demokrit B 142. Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie 96. Meisenheim: Anton Hain Verlag, 1979.

Hoffmann, Joseph R. *Porphyry's Against the Christians. The Literary Remains*. Amherst, New York: Prometheus Books, 1994.

Hoine, Pieter d'and Martjin Marije. (eds.). *All from One: A Guide to Proclus*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.

Hopfner, Theodor. *Griechisch-ägyptischer Offenbarungszauber*. Mit einer eingehenden Darstellung des griechischsynkretistischen Daemonenglaubens und der Voraussetzungen und Mittel des Zaubers überhaupt und der magischen Divination im besonderen. Studien zur Palaeographie und Papyruskunde 21.1. Amsterdan: Verlag Adolf M. Hakkert, 1974. (1st ed. Leipzig: H. Haessel, 1921).

Hornung, Erik. *Conceptions of God in Ancient Egypt: The One and the Many*. Translated by John Baines. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1982.

Horst, Pieter Willem van der. *Chærémon: Egyptian Priest and Stoic Philosopher. The Fragments Collected and Translated with Explanatory Notes*. Études Préliminaires aux Religions Orientales dans l'Empire Romain 101. Leiden: Brill, 1987.

Ierodiakonou, Katerina. (ed.). *Byzantine Philosophy and its Ancient Sources*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002.

Ionides. Alexander C. *Divine arithmetic. The Elements of theology by Proclus*. London, 1917.

Jackson, Robin, Kimon Lycos and Harold Tarrant. *Olympiodorus Commentary on Plato's Gorgias. Translated with Full Notes*. Philosophia Antiqua LXXVIII. Leiden: Brill, 1998.

Jansen-Winkel, Karl. *Ägyptische Biographien der 22. und 23. Dynastie*. Ägypten und Altes Testament 8. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1985.

Johnson, Thomas M. *Proclus' Metaphysical Elements*, Στοιχείωσις θεολογική. Osceola, 1909.

Jordan, David R. "P. Duk. inv. 729, Magical Formulae." *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 46 (2006): 159–173.

Juliette, Day. *Proclus on baptism in Constantinople*. Norwich: SCM, Canterbury Press, 2005.

Kaimakis, Dimitris. *Die Kyraniden*. Beiträge zur Klassischen Philologie 76. Meisenheim: Verlag Anton Hain, 1976.

Kaske Carol V. and John R. Clark. *Marsilio Ficino Three Books on Life*. Binghamton, New York: Center for Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1989.

Kern, Otto. *Orphicorum Fragmenta*. 3rd ed. Zurich: Weidmann, 1972. (1st ed. Berlin: Weidmann, 1922).

Kidd, Ian G. and Ludwig Edelstein. *Posidonius*. Vol. I: *The Fragments*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972.

Kidd, Ian G. and Ludwig Edelstein. *Posidonios*. Vol. II: *The Commentary*. Part 1: *Testimonia and Fragments 1–149*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988a.

Kidd, Ian G. and Ludwig Edelstein. *Posidonios*. Vol. II: *The Commentary*. Part 2: *Fragments 150–293*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988b.

Kidd, Ian G. and Ludwig Edelstein. *Posidonios*. Vol. III: *The Translation of the Fragments*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Kingsley, Peter. *Ancient Philosophy, Mystery and Magic: Empedocles and Pythagorean Tradition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Kirk, Geoffrey S., John E. Raven and Malcolm Schofield. *The Presocratic Philosophers: A History with a Selection of Texts*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Klasens, Adolf. *A Magical Statue Base (Socle Behague) in the Museum of Antiquities at Leiden*. Leiden: Brill, 1952.

Clitenic Wear, Sarah. *The Teaching of Syrianus on Plato's Timaeus and Parmenides*. Leiden: Brill, 2011.

Kotansky, Roy D. "Kronos and a New Magical Inscription Formula on a Gem in the J.P. Getty Museum." *Ancient World* 3 (1980): 29–32.

Kotansky, Roy D. *Greek Magical Amulets*. The Inscribed Gold, Silver, Copper and Bronze Lamellae Part I, Published Texts of Known Provenance. Papyrologica Coloniensia Vol. XXII.1. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1994.

Kramer, Samuel Noah and John Maier. *Myths of Enki, the Crafty God*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.

Kristeller, Paul Oskar. *Supplementum Ficinianum*. Vols. I–II. Florence: Olschki, 1937.

Kristeller, Paul Oskar. *The Philosophy of Marsilio Ficino*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1943.

Kristeller, Paul Oskar. *Iter Italicum*. Volume II, Italy Orvieto to Volterra, Vatican City. Leiden: Brill, 1967.

Kristeller, Paul Oskar. “Marsilio Ficino and his Works after Five Hundred Years.” In Gian Carlo Garfagnini (ed.). *Marsilio Ficino e Ritorno di Platone Studi e Documenti*. Firenze: Olschki, 1986.

Kristeller, Paul Oskar. (pref.) and Members of the School of Economic Science in London (transl.). *The letters of Marcilio Ficino*. Vol. I. London: Shepheard-Walwyn, 1975 (2018 2nd ed.).

Kristeller, Paul Oskar. (pref.) and Members of the School of Economic Science in London (transl.). *The letters of Marcilio Ficino*. Vol. III. London: Shepheard-Walwyn, 1981.

Kristeller, Paul Oskar. (pref.) and Members of the School of Economic Science in London (transl.). *The letters of Marcilio Ficino*. Vol. VII. London: Shepheard-Walwyn, 2003.

Kristeller, Paul Oskar. (pref.) and Members of the School of Economic Science in London (transl.). *The letters of Marcilio Ficino*. Vol. VIII. London: Shepheard-Walwyn, 2009.

Kristeller, Paul Oskar. (pref.) and Members of the School of Economic Science in London (transl.). *The letters of Marcilio Ficino*. Vol. IX. London: Shepheard-Walwyn, 2012.

Kristeller, Paul Oskar. (pref.) and Members of the School of Economic Science in London (transl.). *The letters of Marcilio Ficino*. Vol. X. London: Shepheard-Walwyn, 2015.

Kroll, Guilelmus. *Analecta Graeca*. Greifswald: Druck von Julius Abel, 1901.

Krulak, Todd. “Philosophy, Τερατική, and the Damascian Dichotomy: Pursuing the Bacchic Ideal in the Sixth-Century Academy.” *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 57 (2017a): 454–481.

Krulak, Todd. “Powers and Poieseis: A statue Animation and Divine Manifestation in Proclus Diadochus’ Commentary on the *Timaeus*.” Pages 88–107 in *Divine Powers in Late Antiquity*. Edited by Irene F. Viltanioti and Anna Marmodoro. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017b.

Kutash, Emilie. *Ten Gifts of the Demiurge: Proclus on Plato’s Timaeus*. London: Bristol Classical, 2011.

Laks, André and Glen W. Most. *Studies on the Derveni Papyrus*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.

Laks, André and Glen W. Most. (ed. / transl.). *Early Greek Philosophy*. Vols. I–IX. Loeb Classical Library. Harvard: Harvard University Press, 2016.

Lambert, Wilfred G. “The Apsū.” Pages 75–77 in *Landscapes. Territories, Frontiers and Horizons. Papers Presented to the XLIV Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale, Venezia 7–11 July 1998*. Edited by Lucio Milano et al. Part III. Padova: Sargon, 2000.

Lamberton, Robert. *Proclus the Successor on Poetics and the Homeric Poems: Essays 5 and 6 of his Commentary on the Republic of Plato*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2012.

Lauritzen, Frederick. "A Lifetime with Proclus: Psellos as Reader." *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 113.1 (2020): 69–80.

Lawrence, Marilynn. "Astral Symbolism in Theurgic Rites." Pages 270–294 in *Divination and knowledge in Greco-Roman Antiquity*. Edited by Crystal Addey. London: Routledge, 2021.

Lesko, Leonard, H. *The Ancient Egyptian Book of Two Ways*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977.

Lewy, Hans. *Chaldaean Oracles and Theurgy: Mysticism, Magic and Platonism in the Later Roman Empire*. Paris: Études Augustiniennes, 1978.

Lewy, Yochannan. *Chaldaean Oracles and Theurgy: Mysticism, Magic and Platonism in the Later Roman Empire*. 3rd ed. Paris: Institut des Études augustiniennes, 2011.

Lichtheim, Miriam. "The Song of the Harper." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 4 (1945): 178–212.

Lichtheim, Miriam. *Ancient Egyptian Literature: A Book of Readings*. Vol. I: *The Old and Middle Kingdoms*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1973.

Lichtheim, Miriam. *Ancient Egyptian Literature: A Book of Readings*. Vol. II: *The New Kingdom*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1976.

Lichtheim, Miriam. *Ancient Egyptian Literature: A Book of Readings*. Vol. III: *The Late Period*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1980.

Liefferinge, Carine van. *La théurgie: des Oracles Chaldaïques à Proclus*. Supplement of *Kernos*. Liège: Centre International d'Étude de la Religion Grecque Antique, 1999.

Liefferinge, Carine van. "Magie et Théurgie chez Jamblique." Pages 115–125 in vol. 2 of *La Magie: Actes du Colloque International de Montpellier, 25–27 Mars 1999*. Edited by Alain Moreau and Jean-Claude Turpin. Montpellier: Université Paul-Valéry, 2000a.

Liefferinge, Carine van. "L'immortalisation par le feu dans la littérature grecque: du récit mythique à la pratique rituelle." *Dialogues d'histoire ancienne* 26.2 (2000b): 99–119.

Liefferinge, Carine van. "Homère erre-t-il loin de la science théologique? De la réhabilitation du 'divin' poète par Proclus." *Kernos* 15 (2002): 199–210.

Lloyd, Alan B. *Herodotus Book II. Commentary 1–98*. Leiden, New York: Brill, 1994 (2nd ed.).

Lloyd, Anthony C. "Procession and Division in Proclus." Pages 18–45 in *Soul and the Structure of Being in Late Neoplatonism: Syrianus, Proclus and Simplicius*. Edited by Henry Jacob Blumenthal and Anthony Charles Lloyd. Liverpool: University of Liverpool Press, 1982.

Long, Anthony Arthur and David N. Sedley. *The Hellenistic Philosophers*. Vols. I–II. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Longo, Angela. *Syrianus et la Metaphysique de l'Antiquité Tardive*. Istituto per il Lessico Intellettuale Europeo e Storia delle Idee: Bibliopolis, 2009.

Lowry, Martin. (ed.). *Nicholas Jenson and the Rise of Venetian Publishing in Renaissance Europe*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1991.

Lucarini Carlo M. and Claudio Moreschini. (eds). *Hermias Alexandrinus: in Platonis Phaedrum Scholia*. Berlin / Boston: De Gruyter, 2012.

MacPhail, John A. Jr. *Porphyry's Homeric Questions on the Iliad. Text, Translation, Commentary*. Berlin, New York: De Gruyter, 2011.

Magny, Ariane. *Porphyry in Fragments. Reception of an Anti-Christian Text in Late Antiquity*. Farnham-Burlington: Ashgate, 2014.

Majercik, Ruth. (transl.). *The Chaldean Oracles: Text, Translation and Commentary. Studies in Greek and Roman Religion* 5. Leiden: Brill, 1989.

Mander, Pietro. "Non-corporeal Beings in Iamblichus' Chaldean Doctrine and in Mesopotamia." *Studi e materiali di storia delle religioni* 77.2 (2011): 369–384.

Mariev Sergei. (ed.). *Byzantine Perspectives on Neoplatonism*. Boston / Berlin: Walter De Gruyter, 2017.

Marije, Martijn. *Proclus on Nature: Philosophy of Nature and its Methods in Proclus' Commentary on Plato's Timaeus*. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

Martelli, Matteo and Stefano Valente. "Per una nuova edizione commentata di un lessico alchemico bizantino." *Eikasmos* XXIV (2013): 275–296.

Martini Emidio. *Catalogo di manoscritti greci esistenti nelle biblioteche italiane*. (Tomus I, 1, Milano, 1893; tomus I, 2, Milano, 1896; Tomus II, Milano, 1902).

Mastrocinque, Attilio. 2011. *Kronos, Shiva and Asklepios. Studies in Magical Gems and Religions of the Roman Empire*, Philadelphia, PA: American Philosophical Society.

Masullo, Rita. (ed./transl.). *Marino di Neapoli. Vita di Proclo*. Testo critico, introduzione, traduzione e commentario. Speculum, contributi di Filologia Classica, collana diretta da A. Garzya. Napoli: M. D'Auria Editore, 1985.

Mazur, Zeke. "Unio Magica: Part I: On the Magical Origins of Plotinus's Mysticism." *Dionysius* 21 (2003): 23–52.

Mazur, Zeke. "Unio Magica: Part II: Plotinus, Theurgy and the Question of Ritual." *Dionysius* 22 (2004): 29–56.

Megna, Paola. "Per Ficino e Proclo." Pages 313–362 in *Laurentia Laurus: Per Mario Martelli*. Edited by Francesco Bausi and Vincenzo Fera. Messina: Centro interdipartimentale di studi umanistici, 2004.

Merkelbach, Reinholt and Maria Totti. (eds.). *Abrasax: Ausgewählte Papyri Religiösen und Magischen Inhalts*. Bands 1–4. *Papyrologica Coloniensia* 17.1–4. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1990–1996.

Miles, Graeme. "The Achilles of Proclus." *Classical Quarterly* 72.2 (2022): 877–888.

Mitchell, Stephen, and Peter van Nuffelen (eds.). *One God: Pagan Monotheism in the Roman Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010a.

Mohr, Richard D. *God and Forms in Plato*. Las Vegas: Parmenides Publishing, 2005.

Monfasani, John. *Collectanea Trapezuntiana. Texts, Documents, and Bibliographies of George of Trebizond*. Binghamton, New York: RSA, 1984: 721–722.

Monfasani, John. “Marsilio Ficino and Eusebius of Caesarea’s *Praeparatio Evangelica*.” *Rinascimento* XLIX (2009): 3–13.

Morenz, Siegfried. *Egyptian Religion*. Translated by Ann E. Kepp. London: Methuen, 1973. (repr. 1992).

Morgan, Michael A. *Sepher Ha-Razim: The Book of the Mysteries*. California: Scholars Press, 1983.

Morrow, Glenn R. *A Commentary on the First Book of Euclid’s Elements*. Translated with Introduction and Notes. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1970. (Reprinted 1992, with a new foreword by I. Mueller).

Morrow, Glenn R. and John M. Dillon. (transl.). *Proclus’ commentary on Plato’s Parmenides*, with introduction and notes by J.M. Dillon. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987.

Mras, Karl. (ed.). *Eusebius Die Praeparatio Evangelica*. Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, Band 43.1, 1954; Band 43.2: 1956.

Mras, Karl. (ed.). *Eusebius Die Praeparatio Evangelica. Die Bücher xi bis xv, Register*. Bearbeitete Auflage Herausgegeben von Édouard Des Places. Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte. Band 8.2. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1983.

Nauck, Augustus. *Porphyrii Philosophi Platonici Opuscula Selecta*. Lipsiae: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1963.

Nelstrop, Louise, Kevin Magill and Bradley B. Onishi. (eds.). *Christian Mysticism: An Introduction to Contemporary Theoretical Approaches*. Farnham: Ashgate Publishing, 2009.

O’Meara Dominic J. (ed.). *Michaelis Pselli Philosophica Minora*. Vol. II. Leipzig: Teubner, 1989.

O’Meara Dominic J. *Pythagoras Revived: Mathematics and Philosophy in Late Antiquity*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989.

O’Meara Dominic J. “Psellos’ Commentary on the Chaldaean Oracles and Proclus’ Lost Commentary.” Pages 45–58. in *Platonismus und Esoterik in byzantinischem Mittelalter und italienischer Renaissance*. Edited by Helmut Seng. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 2011.

O’Meara Dominic J. “Michael Psellos.” Pages 165–181 in *Interpreting Proclus From Antiquity to Renaissance*. Edited by Stephen Gersh. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.

O’Neill, William. *Proclus: Alcibiades I*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1964.

Opsomer, Jan. “La Démisurgie Des Jeunes Dieux Selon Proclus.” *Les Études Classiques* 71 (2003): 5–49.

Otto, Walter Gustav A. *Priester und Tempel im hellenistischen Ägypten*. Vols. 1–11. Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1905–1908.

Pachoumi, Eleni. “Divine Epiphanies of Paredroi in the *Greek Magical Papyri*.” *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 51 (2011a): 155–165.

Pachoumi, Eleni. “Resurrection of the Body in the *Greek Magical Papyri*.” *Numen* 58 (2011b): 729–740.

Pachoumi, Eleni. “Eros and Psyche in Erotic Magic.” *Classica et Mediaevalia* 62 (2011c): 39–49.

Pachoumi, Eleni. “A List of Epithets from the *Greek Magical Papyri* That Are Not Recorded in the LSJ and LSJ Supplements.” *Glotta* 87 (2011d): 155–158.

Pachoumi, Eleni. “The Concept of Personal Daimon and the Magico-Theurgic Ritual of Systasis in the Greek Magical Papyri.” *Philologus* 157.1 (2013): 46–69.

Pachoumi, Eleni. “φυσικαὶ πυρὸς ἀρχαὶ” or “φύσις καὶ πυρὸς ἀρχή” in the Hymn “To Helios” (PGM. IV.939–948)? *ZPE (Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik)* 192 (2014): 104–107.

Pachoumi, Eleni. “The Religious and Philosophical Assimilations of Helios in the Greek Magical Papyri.” *GRBS (Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies)* 55.2 (2015): 391–413.

Pachoumi, Eleni. *The Concepts of the Divine in the Greek Magical Papyri*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017.

Pachoumi, Eleni. “Magico-religious and Philosophical Interactions in Proclus’ Theurgic Unions.” Pages 23–37 in *Praying and Contemplating in Late Antiquity. Religious and Philosophical Interactions*. Edited by Eleni Pachoumi and Mark Edwards. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2018.

Pachoumi, Eleni. (ed.). *Conceptualising Divine Unions in the Greek and Near Eastern Worlds*. Ancient Philosophy and Religion. Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2022.

Pachoumi, Eleni. “Proclus’ Theurgic Union, Θεούργια Ἐνωσις, and the Concept of Fire.” Pages 251–268 in *Conceptualising Divine Unions in the Greek and Near Eastern Worlds*. Edited by Eleni Pachoumi. Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2022.

Parker, Robert. *Polytheism and Society at Athens*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Patillon, Michel, Alain Philippe Segonds and Luc Brisson. *Porphyre, De l’abstinence*. Tome 3. Livre 4. Collection des universités de France 368 Serie grecque. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1995.

Patillon, Michel and Luc Brisson. (eds.). *Longin: Fragments, Art rhétorique*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2001.

Pavlos, Panagiotis G. “Theurgy in Dionysius the Areopagite.” Pages 161–180 in *Platonism and Christian Thought in Late Antiquity*. Edited by Panagiotis G. Pavlos, Lars Friedrik Janby, Eyjólfur Kjalar Emilsson and Torstein Theodor Tollefson. London: Routledge, 2019.

Phillips, John. *Order from Disorder: Proclus’ Doctrine of Evil and its Roots in Ancient Platonism*. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

Petersen Anders Klostergaard and George H. van Kooten. (eds.). *Religio-Philosophical Discourses in the Mediterranean World: From Plato through Jesus, to Late Antiquity*. Series: Ancient Philosophy & Religion, Volume: 1. Leiden: Brill, 2017.

Piccard, Gerhard. *Die Wasserzeichenkartei Piccard im Hauptstaatsarchiv Stuttgart, Findbücher I–XVII*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1961–1997.

Pichler, Reinhard. *Allegorese und Ethik bei Proklos. Untersuchungen zum Kommentar zu Platons Politeia*. Klassische Philologie 2. Berlin: Frank and Timme, 2006.

Pistelli, Hermenegildus. (ed.). *Iamblichus Protrepticus*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1888.

Pitra, Joannes B. "Excerpta Chaldaica Vaticana." Pages 192–195 in Vol. 5 of *Analecta Sacra et Classica*. Edited by Joannes B. Pitra (ed.) Rome and Paris: Cuggiani and Roter et Chernowitz, 1888. (repr. Farnborough: Gregg Press, 1967). Later included as "Extraits du Commentaire de Proclus sur la Philosophie Chaldaïque" (*Πρόκλου ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς χαλδαϊκῆς φιλοσοφίας*). Pages 206–212 in *Oracles Chaldaïques: Avec un choix de commentaires anciens. Texte établi et traduit*. Edited by Édouard des Places. Collection Budé. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1971.

Places, Édouard des. (ed.). *Jamblique: Les mystères d'Égypte*. 1st ed. Collection Budé. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1966. (repr. 1996 with additional bibliography).

Places, Édouard des. (ed.). *Oracles Chaldaïques: Avec un choix de commentaires anciens. Texte établi et traduit*. Collection Budé. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1971.

Places, Édouard des. *La préparation évangélique, livre XI*. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1982.

Places, Édouard des. *La préparation évangélique, livres XII–XIII*. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1983.

Places, Édouard des. *La préparation évangélique, livres XIV–XV*. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1987.

Places, Édouard des and Guy Schroeder. *La préparation évangélique, livres VIII–IX–X*. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1991.

Places, Édouard des and Alain-Philippe Segonds. (eds.). *Vie de Pythagore, Lettre à Marcella*. Paris: Société d'édition les belles lettres, 1982.

Praechter, Karl. "Das Schriftenverzeichnis des Neuplatonikers Syrianos bei Suidas." *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 26 (1926): 253–264.

Platt, Verity. *Facing the Gods. Epiphany and Representation in Graeco-Roman Art, Literature and Religion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Podskalsky, Gerhard. "Nikolaos von Methone und die Proklosrenaissance in Byzanz (11.–12. Jh.)." *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 42 (1976): 509–523.

Porter, James L. "Plato and the Platonic Tradition: The Image Beyond the Image." *The Yearbook of Comparative Literature* 56 (2010): 75–103.

Pötscher, Walter. *Porphyrios' Πρὸς Μαρκέλλαν*. Leiden: Brill, 1969.

Poulsen, Frederik. "Talking, Weeping and Bleeding Sculptures." *Acta Archaeologica* 16 (1945): 178–195.

Preisendanz, Karl. (ed.). *Papyri Graecae Magicae. Die Griechischen Zauberpapyri*. Vols. I–II. 1st ed. Leipzig: Teubner, 1928–1931.

Preisendanz, Karl. (ed.). *Papyri Graecae Magicae Die Griechischen Zauberpapyri*. Vols. I–II. Durchgesehen und Herausgegeben von Albert Henrichs. 2nd revised ed. Stuttgart: Teubner, 1973–1974.

Preisendanz, Karl. (ed.). *Papyri Graecae Magicae. Die Griechischen Zauberpapyri*. Vols. I–II. Durchgesehen und Herausgegeben von Albert Henrichs. 3rd ed. München: K.G. Saur, 2001.

Quack, Joachim F. “The so-called Pantheos. On Polymorphic Deities in Late Egyptian Religion.” *Aegyptus et Pannonia* 3 (2006): 175–190.

Quack, Joachim F. “Conceptions of Purity in Egyptian Religion.” Pages 115–158 in *Purity and the Forming of Religious Traditions in the Ancient Mediterranean World and Ancient Judaism. Dynamics in the History of Religion* 3. Edited by Christian Frevel and Christophe Nihan. Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2013.

Quirke, Stephen. *The Cult of Ra. Sun-worship in Ancient Egypt*. London: Thames and Hudson, 2001.

Raine, Kathleen and George Mills Harper. (eds.). *Thomas Taylor, the Platonist: Selected Writings*, 194–197. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969.

Rappe, Sara. *Reading Neoplatonism: Non-discursive Thinking in the Texts of Plotinus, Proclus, and Damascius*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Rappe, Sara. *Damascius' Problems and Solutions Concerning First Principles. Translation with Notes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Redondo, José Manuel. “The Transmission of Fire: Proclus’ Theurgical Prayers.” Pages 164–191 in *Platonic Theories of Prayer*. Edited by John M. Dillon and Andrei Timotin. Leiden: Brill, 2016.

Remes, Paulina. *Neoplatonism*. Stocksfield: Acumen, 2008.

Riedweg, Christoph. *Mysterienterminologie bei Platon, Philon und Clemens von Alexandrien*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1987.

Riginos-Swift, Alice. *Platonica. The Anecdotes Concerning the Life and Writings of Plato*. Leiden: Brill, 1976.

Rist, Martin. “Plotinus and the Daimonion of Socrates.” *Phoenix* 17 (1963): 13–24.

Rist, Martin. *Eros and Psyche: Studies in Plato, Plotinus and Origen*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1964.

Rist, Martin. *Plotinus: The Road to Reality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967.

Ritner, Robert K. *The Mechanics of Ancient Egyptian Magical Practice*. Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 1993.

Robichaud, Denis, J.-J. “Ficino on Force, Magic and Prayers: Neoplatonic and Hermetic Influences in Ficino’s Three Books on Life.” *Renaissance Quarterly* 70 (2017): 44–87.

Rosán, Laurence Jay. *The philosophy of Proclus: the final phase of ancient thought*. Thesis, Columbia University, 1949.

Runia, David T. *Philo of Alexandria and the Timaeus of Plato*. Leiden: Brill, 1986.

Runia, David T. and Michael Share. *Proclus' Commentary on Plato's Timaeus*. Vol. 2, Book 2: *Proclus on the Causes of the Cosmos and its Creation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Runia, David T. and Michael Share. *Proclus. Commentary on Plato's Timaeus*. Vol. 11: Book 2: *Proclus on the Causes of the Cosmos and its Creation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Saffrey, Henri-Dominique and Alain-Philippe Segonds. (eds.). *Jamblique: Réponse à Porphyre (De mysteriis)*. Paris: Collection des universités de France, 2013.

Saffrey, Henri-Dominique and Matteo Stefani. *Marsile Ficin sur Jamblique. Édition des notes au De mysteriis dans le ms. Vallicellianus F 20*. Société Marsile Ficin. Paris, Lucca: Cahiers Accademia, 2018.

Sauneron, Serge. *The Priests of Ancient Egypt*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 2000.

Schnapp, Alain. "Are Images Animated: The Psychology of Statues in Ancient Greece." Pages 40–44 in *The Ancient Mind: Elements of Cognitive Archaeology*. Edited by Colin Renfrew and Ezra B.W. Zubrow. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Schultz, Jana and James Wilberding. (eds.). *Women and the Female in Neoplatonism*. Studies in Platonism, Neoplatonism, and the Platonic Tradition, Vol. 30. Leiden: Brill, 2022.

Scott, Walter. (ed.). *Hermetica*. Edited with English Translation and Notes. Vols. 1–III. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1924–1926.

Scott, Walter (ed.). *Hermetica*. Edited with English Translation and Notes. Vol. IV: *Testimonia*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1936.

Sedley, David. "Plato's Auctoritas and the rebirth of the commentary tradition." Pages 110–129 in *Philosophia Togata II*. Edited by Miriam Griffin and Jonathan Barnes, 1997.

Sedley, David. "The ideal of godlikeness." Pages 309–328 in *Oxford Readings in Plato: Ethics, Politics, Religion and the Soul*. Edited by Gail Fine. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Sedley, David. "The origins of the Stoic god." Pages 41–83 in *Traditions of Theology: Studies in Hellenistic Theology, its Background, and Aftermath*. Edited by Dorothea Frede and André Laks. Leiden: Brill, 2002.

Sethe, Kurt. *Urkunden der 18. Dynastie*. Vol. 1. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1907.

Share, Michael. (transl.). *Philoponus: Against Proclus On the Eternity of the World 1–5*. Ancient Commentators on Aristotle. London: Duckworth, Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 2005.

Share, Michael. (transl.). *Philoponus: Against Proclus On the Eternity of the World 6–8*. Ancient Commentators on Aristotle. London: Duckworth / Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2005.

Share, Michael. (transl.). *Philoponus: Against Proclus On the Eternity of the World 9–11. Ancient Commentators on Aristotle*. London: Duckworth, Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 2010.

Share, Michael and Dirk Baltzly. *Hermias On Plato Phaedrus 227A–245E*. London: Bloomsbury, 2018.

Shaw, Gregory. "The Geometry of Grace: A Pythagorean Approach to Theurgy." Pages 116–137 in *The Divine Iamblichus. Philosopher and Man of Gods*. Edited by Henry J. Blumenthal and Emma G. Clark. London: Bristol Classical Press, 1993.

Shaw, Gregory. *Theurgy and the Soul: The Neoplatonism of Iamblichus*. University Park, Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1995.

Shaw, Gregory. "Eros and Arithmos: Pythagorean Theurgy in Iamblichus and Plotinus." *Ancient Philosophy* 19 (1999a): 121–143.

Shaw, Gregory. "Neoplatonic Theurgy and Dionysius the Areopagite." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 7.4 (1999b): 573–599.

Shaw, Gregory. "Astrology as Divination: Iamblichean Theory and its Contemporary Practice." Pages 89–102 in *Metaphysical Patterns in Platonism: Ancient, Medieval, Renaissance and Modern Times*. Edited by John F. Finamore and Robert M. Berchman. New Orleans: University Press of the South, 2007a.

Shaw, Gregory. "Living Light: Divine Embodiment in Western Philosophy." Pages 59–87 in *Seeing with Different eyes: Essays in Astrology and Divination*. Edited by Patrick Curry and Angela Voss. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2007b.

Sheppard, Anne D.R. *Studies on the 5th and 6th Essays of Proclus' Commentary on the Republic*. Hypomnemata 61. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1980.

Sheppard, Anne D.R. "Proclus' Attitude to theurgy." *Classical Quarterly* 32.1 (1982): 212–224.

Sheppard, Anne D.R. "Literary Theory and Aesthetics." Pages 276–289 in *All from One. A Guide to Proclus*. Edited by Pieter d'Hoine and Marije Martijn. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.

Sicherl, Martin. *Die Handschriften, Ausgaben und Übersetzungen von Iamblichos De mysteriis: eine kritisch-historische Studie*. Berlin Akademie-Verlag, 1957.

Sirinelli, Jean and Édouard des Places. *Eusèbe de Césarée, La Préparation Évangélique 1. Introduction, Greek text, Translation and Commentary*. Sources Chrétiennes, no. 206. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1974.

Sjöberg Åke W., Eugen Bergmann and Gene B. Gragg. *The Collection of the Sumerian Temple Hymns and The Kesh Temple Hymn*. Texts from Cuneiform Sources 3 (TCS 3). Locust Valley, New York: J.J. Augustin, 1969. Individual lines are cited as TH followed by line number.

Sodano, Angelo R. (ed.). *Porphyrii in Platonis Timaeum Commentariorum Fragmenta*. Naples: Privately printed, 1964.

Sorabji, Richard. *Matter, Space and Motion: Theories in Antiquity and their Sequel*. London: Duckworth, 1988.

Sorabji, Richard. *The Philosophy of the Commentators, 200–600 AD: A Sourcebook*. Vols. I–III. London: Duckworth, 2004.

Smith, Andrew. *Porphyry's Place in the Neoplatonic Tradition. A Study in Post-Plotinian Neoplatonism*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1974.

Smith, Andrew. "Porphyrian Studies since 1913." *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt* II 36.2 (1987): 717–773.

Smith, Andrew. *Philosophy in Late Antiquity*. London: Routledge, 2004.

Smith, Andrew and David Wasserstein. *Porphyrii Philosophi Fragmenta*. Stuttgart/Leipzig: Teuber, 1993.

Spanu, Nicola. *Proclus and the Chaldean Oracles. A Study on Proclean Exegesis with Translation and Commentary of Proclus' Treatise on Chaldean Philosophy*. Abingdon, Oxford: Routledge, 2021.

Stang, Charles M. "From the Chaldean Oracles to the Corpus Dionysiacum: Theurgy between the Third and Sixth Centuries." *Journal for Late Antique Religion and Culture* 5 (2011): 1–13.

Steel, Carlos. *Proclus on Providence*. London: Duckworth, 2007.

Stepień, Tomasz. "The Understanding of Symbols and their Role in the Ascent of the Soul to God in Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite and Nicholas of Cusa." *Roczniki Filozoficzne* LXIII.2 (2015): 85–103.

Stroumsa, Guy G. "Polymorphie divine et transformations d'un mythologème." *Vigiliae Christianae* 35 (1981): 412–435.

Struck, Peter T. *Birth of the Symbol: Ancient Readers at the Limits of their Texts*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004.

Tanaseanu-Döbler Ilinca. *Theurgy in Late Antiquity. The Invention of a Ritual Tradition*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 2013.

Tanaseanu-Döbler Ilinca. "Neo-Platonic Readings of Embodied Presence: Iamblichus and Julian." Pages 338–374 in *Religio-Philosophical Discourses in the Mediterranean World. From Plato, through Jesus, to Late Antiquity*. Edited by Anders Klostergaard Petersen and George van Kooten. Leiden: Brill, 2017.

Tarrant, Harold. *Plato's First Interpreters*. London: Duckworth, 2000.

Tarrant, Harold. (ed./transl.). *Proclus' Commentary on Plato's Timaeus*. Vol. 1, Book 1: *Proclus on the Socratic State and Atlantis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Tarrant, Harold. *From the Old Academy to Later Neo-Platonism. Studies in the History of Platonic Thought*. Surrey: Ashgate, 2011.

Tarrant, Harold. (ed. and transl.). *Proclus' Commentary on Plato's Timaeus*. Vol. 6, Book 5: *Proclus on the Gods of Generation and the Creation of Humans*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017.

Tarrant Harold and Dirk Baltzly. (eds.) *Reading Plato in Antiquity*. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2006.

Tarrant Harold, Danielle A. Layne, Dirk Baltzly and François Renaud. (eds.). *Brill's Companion to the Reception of Plato in Antiquity*. Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2017.

Taylor, Thomas. *Iamblichus' Life of Pythagoras*. London: J.M. Watkins, 1818.

Taylor, Thomas. *The Commentaries of Proclus on the Timaeus of Plato*. Translated by Thomas Taylor together with a concordance to the edition of Diehl and an appendix, *Proclus on the system of Theodorus of Asine* by Stephen Ronan. London: Chthonios Books, 1988.

Taylor, Thomas. *Essays and Fragments of Proclus the Platonic Successor*. The Thomas Taylor Series XVIII. Somerset: Prometheus Trust.

Taylor, Thomas. *Proclus' Elements of Theology*. Frome: Prometheus Trust, 1994.

Taylor, Thomas. *Essays and Fragments of Proclus, the Platonic Successor*. Frome, Somerset: Prometheus Trust, 1999.

Taylor, Thomas. *Proclus' Commentary on the First Book of Euclid's Elements*. Sturminster Newton: The Prometheus Trust, 2006.

Taylor, Thomas. *The Philosophical and Mathematical Commentaries* [electronic resource] of *Proclus*; Surnamed, Plato's Successor, on the First Book of Euclid's Elements. And his life by Marinus. Translated from the Greek with a preliminary dissertation on the Platonic doctrine of ideas by Thomas Taylor. Vols. I-II. London: T. Payne and Son (B. White and Son; L. Davis; J. Robson; T. Cadell; Leigh and Co. G. Nicol; R. Faulder; and T. and J. Egerton), 1788-1789.

Thorndike, Lynn. *A History of Magic and Experimental Science*. Vol. I. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1929.

Toussaint, Stéphane. "Ficino's orphic Magic or Jewish Astrology and Oriental Philosophy?" *Academia, Revue de la Société Marsile Ficin* 2 (2000): 19-31.

Trizio, Michele. "Eleventh to Twelfth century Byzantium." Pages 182-215 in *Interpreting Proclus From Antiquity to Renaissance*. Edited by Stephen Gersh. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.

Trombley, Frank. *Hellenistic Religion and Christianization: c. 370-529*. Religions in the Graeco-Roman world, V. 115. Leiden: Brill, 1995.

Turcan, Robert. *Mithras Platonicus*. Études préliminaires aux religions orientales dans l'Empire romain 47. Leiden: Brill, 1975.

Uždavinys, Algis. (Ed.). *The Golden Chain: An Anthology of Pythagorean and Platonic Philosophy*. Foreword by John F. Finamore. Bloomington, Indiana: World Wisdom, 2005.

Uždavinys, Algis. *Philosophy and Theurgy in Late Antiquity*. San Rafael /California: Sophia Perennis, 2010.

Versnel, Hendrik S. "What did Ancient Man See When He Saw a God? Some Reflections on Greco-Roman Epiphany." Pages 42-55 in *Effigies Dei. Essays on the History of Religions*. Edited by Dirk van der Plas. Leiden: Brill, 1987.

Waegeman, Maryse. *Amulet and Alphabet: Magical Amulets in the First Book of Cyranides*, Amsterdam: J.C. Gieben, 1987.

Walker, Christopher and Michael Dick. *The Induction of the Cult Image in Ancient Mesopotamia. The Mesopotamian Mis-Pi-Ritual*. Helsinki: The Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project, 2001.

Walsh, Gerald G. and Grace Monahan. (transl.). *Saint Augustine The City of God. Books VIII–XVI*. Washington D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1952.

Watts, Edward J. *City and School in Late Antique Athens and Alexandria*. Series: The Transformation of the Classical Heritage 41. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006.

Weidner, Ernst. "Gestirn-Darstellungen auf Babylonischen Tontafeln." Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Phi.-hist. Klasse 254, 1967.

Weill-Parot, Nicolas. *Les 'images astrologiques' au Moyen Âge et à la Renaissance*. Paris: Honoré Champion, 2002a.

Weill-Parot, Nicolas. "Pénombre ficienne: Le renouveau de la théorie de la magie talismanique et ses ambiguïtés." Pages 71–90 in *Marsile Ficin ou Les Mystères platoniciens*. Edited by Stéphane Toussaint. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2002b.

Wellmann, Max. "Marcellus von Side als Arzt und die Koiranides des Hermes Trismegistos." *Philologus Suppl.* xxvii.2. Leipzig: Dieterich, 1934.

Wente, Edward F. "Mysticism in Pharaonic Egypt." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 41.3 (1982): 161–179.

West, Martin L. *The Orphic Poems*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983.

West, Martin L. *The East Face of Helicon: West Asiatic Elements in Greek Poetry and Myth*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999.

Westerink, Leendert Gerrit. (ed.). *Olympiodori In Platonis Alcibiadem Commentaria*. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing, 1956.

Westerink, Leendert Gerrit. (ed.). *Olympiodori In Platonis Gorgiam Commentaria*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1970.

Westerink, Leendert Gerrit and John M. Duffy. (eds.). *Michaelis Pselli Theologica*. Vol. II. München: K.G. Saur, 2002.

Westerink, Leendert Gerrit and O'Neill, William. (ed./transl.). *Proclus' Commentary on the First Alcibiades*. Platonic Texts and Translations Series. Westbury: Prometheus Trust, 2011.

Wiedemann, Alfred. *Religion of the Ancient Egyptians*. Translated by F. Ll. Griffiths. Mineola, New York: Dover Publications, 2003.

Wilberding, James. (transl.). *Philoponus: Against Proclus On the Eternity of the World* 12–18. Ancient Commentators on Aristotle. London: Duckworth / Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2006.

Wilson, Nigel G. *From Byzantium to Italy. Greek Studies in the Italian Renaissance*. London: Duckworth, 1992.

Wolff, Gustavus. *Porphyrii de philosophia ex oraculis haurienda librorum reliquiae*. Berlin: Springer, 1856. (repr. Hildesheim: Olms, 1962, 109–185).

Zintzen, Clemens. *Damascii vitae Isidori reliquiae*. Hildesheim: Olms, 1967.

# Index of Greek Words

ἀγαθίαν 79<sup>n116</sup>  
ἀγαθός, -ή, -όν 77<sup>n109</sup>  
ἀγαθοῦ 62<sup>n70</sup>  
ἀγαθόν 46<sup>n27</sup>, 50, 70, 73  
ἀγαθά 41, 51<sup>n38</sup>, 52<sup>n44</sup>, 132<sup>n273</sup>  
ἀγαθῶν 47<sup>n29</sup>, 74<sup>n100</sup>, 105<sup>n200</sup>  
ἀγαθότης  
ἀγαθότητα 42, 77<sup>n109</sup>, 112  
ἄγγελος 86<sup>n140</sup>  
ἄγγέλου 38<sup>n6</sup>  
ἄγγέλῳ 107<sup>n206</sup>  
ἄγγελον 81  
ἄγγελοι 34, 58, 77<sup>n109</sup>  
ἄγγέλων 76, 84<sup>n133</sup>  
ἄγγέλοις 34, 113  
ἀγένητος, -ον  
ἀγενήτου 110<sup>n215</sup>  
ἄγνωστος 121  
ἄγνωστον 47, 105<sup>n200</sup>  
ἄγνωστα 86, 113, 119  
ἄγνωστων 42, 106  
ἀγωγή 4, 10 with n46, 11, 24<sup>n93</sup>, 55, 69  
ἀγωγῆς 8 with n36, 9, 10<sup>n46</sup>, 11, 20, 24  
with n93, 26, 48 with n31, 69 with n88,  
69 with n88, 86<sup>n139</sup>, 105  
ἀγωγήν 69<sup>n89</sup>, 72<sup>n98</sup>  
ἀγωγάς 11  
ἀδιάλυτος, -ον  
ἀδιάλυτον 66  
ἀδιάρθρωτος, -ον  
ἀδιαρθρώτων 105  
ἀδύνατον 99<sup>n174</sup>, 136  
ἀθάνατος, -ον /-η, -ον 80  
ἀθανάτης 78  
ἀθανάτῳ 87  
ἀθάνατον 87, 90<sup>n153</sup>  
ἀθάνατα 88  
ἀθανασία  
ἀθανασίας 40, 51<sup>n38</sup>  
ἀθανασίαν 87  
αἰθέριος 84<sup>n132</sup>  
αἰθερίη 88 with n146  
αἰθερίω 44  
αἰθερίαν 134<sup>n283</sup>  
αἰσθητικῶς 58  
αἰσθητός, -ή, -όν  
αἰσθητόν 80<sup>n117</sup>  
αἰσθητήν 57<sup>n59</sup>  
αἰσθητῶν 59<sup>n61</sup>  
αἰσθητός 30, 58  
αἴτιος 56  
αἴτιοι 128<sup>n262</sup>  
αἴτιος 113, 122  
αἴτια 56  
αἴτιας 8, 39–40, 47<sup>n29</sup>, 77<sup>n109</sup>, 99<sup>n175</sup>,  
119  
αἴτιᾳ 99<sup>n175</sup>  
αἴτιαν 30, 71<sup>n92</sup>, 113<sup>n226</sup>  
αἴτιαι 113<sup>n227</sup>  
αἴτιῶν 40  
αἴτιαις 52<sup>n44</sup>  
αἴτια  
αἴτιαι 47, 105<sup>n200</sup>  
αἴτιον 34, 93, 129  
αἴτιον 77<sup>n109</sup>  
αἴτια 70  
αἴτιων 84<sup>n130</sup>, 120  
αἴτιοις 34  
αἴτιοιγία  
αἴτιοιγίαν 72  
αἰών  
αἰώνος 45, 69<sup>n89</sup>, 118<sup>n241</sup>, 128<sup>n262</sup>  
αἰώνι 102<sup>n186</sup>  
αἰώνια 90<sup>n153</sup>  
αἰώνιος, -ον /-α, -ον  
αἰώνιον 69<sup>n89</sup>, 102<sup>n186</sup>  
αἰώνια 59<sup>n61</sup>  
αἰώνιώς 69<sup>n89</sup>  
ἀκρότης 121  
ἀκρότητες 88<sup>n146</sup>  
ἀκρότητας 62  
ἀλεκτρύων 104  
ἀλεκτρυόνος 34, 104<sup>n194</sup>  
ἀλεκτρυόνα 24, 34, 103 with n191, 104  
with n193  
ἀλεκτρυόνες 24<sup>n94</sup>, 34, 103  
ἀλληλουχία  
ἀλληλουχίας 103<sup>n191</sup>  
ἀμέθεκτος  
ἀμεθέκτῳ 77<sup>n109</sup>  
ἀμερής, -ές  
ἀμερή 115<sup>n234</sup>

ἀμέριστος, -ον  
ἀμέριστα 61n68  
ἀμετάβλητος, -ον  
ἀμετάβλητον 46  
ἀμιγῶς 101  
ἀναγωγός  
    ἀναγωγῆς 39  
ἀναγωγή 50, 69 with n90  
    ἀναγωγῆς 39, 69 with n90  
    ἀναγωγήν 45  
ἀνάλογος, -ον  
ἀνάλογον 48n31, 77n109  
ἀναλόγως 30  
ἄνθρωπος  
    ἀνθρώπου 81, 88, 92n163, 116n234, 124  
    ἄνθρωπον 13, 18, 64, 116n234, 127, 140  
    ἄνθρωποι 52n41, 73, 116n237, 121n248  
    ἀνθρώποις 47n29, 53n45, 105n200, 114,  
        122  
    ἀνθρώπους 32  
ἀνθρωπειδής, -ές  
    ἀνθρωπειδές 134  
ἄνοδος  
    ἀνόδου 48n31, 51n38, 69  
    ἀνόδους 48n31  
ἀντιπάθεια  
    ἀντιπαθείας 36, 52n42  
    ἀντιπαθεῖν 54  
ἀπαθανατισμός 87  
    ἀπαθανατισμόν 83  
ἀπαθής, -ές  
ἀπαθεῖς 43n18, 128  
ἀπαθέσι 125  
ἀπείρατος, -ον  
    ἀπειράτους 53n48  
ἀπείριτος, -ον  
    ἀπείριτον 90  
ἀπειροδύναμος, -ον  
ἀπειροδύναμον 102n186  
ἀποπληρώω  
    ἀποπλήρωσι 66  
    ἀποπλήρωσιν 67  
ἀριθμός 113n226, 120  
    ἀριθμόν 69n89, 72n98, 112n226  
    ἀριθμοῖς 5n18  
    ἀριθμούς 103  
ἀρχέγονος, -ον  
    ἀρχεγόνους 88

ἀρχή 41n13, 87 with n141, 88, 89 with n152  
    ἀρχῆς 48, 79n116, 87n141, 89  
    ἀρχήν 30, 49n35, 53n47, 87, 89  
    ἀρχαί 89n152  
    ἀρχῶν 39, 72  
    ἀρχαῖς 5 with n17, 88n147, 89n151  
    ἀρχάς 88n147, 110

ἀστήρ  
    ἀστέρων 72 with n98  
    ἀστέρας 38n6, 57, 108n206

ἀστράπτων  
    ἀστράπτοντα 81

ἄστρον 52n41  
    ἄστρα 52n41, 59, 93  
    ἄστρων 57n58

ἀστρονόμος  
    ἀστρονόμοις 3n9, 78n111

ἀτέλεστος 47n30, 48n31  
    ἀτέλεστοι 74 with n100

αὐτόματος, -ον / -η, -ον  
    αὐτόματος 43n18, 122–123  
    αὐτομάτους 46, 124

αὐτοφάνεια 122, 123  
    αὐτοφάνειαν 36, 43n18, 69n89  
    αὐτοφάνειαι 46 with n26, 123 with n256  
    αὐτοφανείας 111n219, 113, 122, 124

ἄχραντος  
    ἄχραντου 76, 85

ἀχώριστος, -ον  
    ἀχωρίστου 136  
    ἀχωρίστον 136

βίβλος 4, 54, 63n73, 99  
    βίβλοι 5n16  
    βίβλων 54

βιβλίον  
    βιβλία 6n23, 7 with n29  
    βιβλίοις 5, 8 with n31

γένεσις 87  
    γενέσεως 17, 34, 48n31, 56, 72n98, 87n141,  
        113n227  
    γένεσιν 43, 72n98, 113n227, 126, 132  
    γενέσεων 65, 75n103, 109n212

γέννημα  
    γεννήματα 119

γέννησις  
    γεννήσεως 72n98  
    γεννήσεις 72n98

γεννητικός, -ή, -όν  
 γεννητικής 32  
 γεννήτωρ  
   γεννήτορος 62n70  
   γεννήτορα 90  
 γένος 39  
 γήγνομαι  
   έγένοντο 79n116  
   γενέσθαι 34, 104  
   γενέσθω 41n13, 107n202  
   γένηται 74n100, 117  
   γενόμενος 53 with n46  
   γενομένου 52n41, 99n174  
   γενομένης 63n73  
   γενόμενον 34, 84n130, 109n210  
   γενομένην 74n100  
   γενόμενα 114n230  
   γενομένοις 49n33  
   γενομέναις 125  
   γενομένους 43n18, 123  
   γεγένηται 52  
 γιγνώσκω  
   γιγνώσκων 115  
   γιγνώσκοντος 65  
   γιγνώσκεται 121  
   έγνωκέναι 57n59  
   έγνωκώς 67n83  
   έγνωσαν 36, 52n41  
 γνωρίζω  
   γνωρίζεσθαι 102n186  
 γνώριμον 120n146  
 γνώριμα 86, 114  
 γνωρίμων 120  
 γνώριστις  
   γνωρίσεως 66  
 γνώρισμα  
   γνωρίσματα 114  
 γνώσις 65, 67 with n83  
   γνώσεως 65  
   γνώσιν 58, 126  
   γνώσεις 52n41  
  
 δαίμων 70, 99n177  
   δαίμονος 71, 100, 110  
   δαίμονα 77n109, 90  
   δαίμον 58  
   δαίμονες 60, 77n109, 104 with n194  
   δαίμόνων 24 with n96, 34, 64, 113, 135n285  
  
 δαίμοσιν 34, 113  
 δαίμονας 80n120  
 δαίμονιας, -α, -ον  
   δαίμονιον 49n35  
   δαίμονίους 36, 52n41, 135  
   δαίμονιαι 59  
 δημιουργία  
   δημιουργίαν 57n59, 108  
 δημιουργικός, -ή, -όν 39, 119  
   δημιουργικού 120n246  
   δημιουργική 39  
   δημιουργικήν 62, 115  
   δημιουργικοί 77n109  
   δημιουργικάς 77n109  
 δημιούργημα 115  
 δημιουργός 56, 92, 115n233  
   δημιουργού 58, 62  
   δημιουργόν 38n6, 62, 113n228, 115n232  
 διαιωνίως 84n130, 114  
 διαβολή 55  
 διαγιγνώσκω  
   διέγνω 118n241  
 διάδοσις 32, 53n48, 66, 75  
 διαιρετική 65  
 διάκοσμος  
   διακόσμων 49n33  
   διακόσμοις 105  
 διακυβερνῶ  
   διακυβερνῶσαν 106  
 διάνοια  
 διανοίας 83n128  
   διάνοιαν 10n43, 38n3, 53n47, 57n59  
 διάστασις  
   διαστάσεσιν 32  
 διαφορά  
   διαφορᾶς 34  
 διάφορος, -ον  
   διαφόρων 99n174, 121n248  
 δύναμαι  
   δυνάμενον 32, 117  
   δυναμένοις 46n27, 115n232  
   δυναμένης 85  
 δύναμις 41, 65, 75n103, 93n167, 94, 106, 109n212, 132–134, 135n285  
   δυνάμεως 26n102, 36, 39, 41, 52n44, 62, 92–93, 113, 120n246, 125, 129, 136n285, 137  
 δύναμει 34, 80 with n120, 86n140  
 δύναμιν 30, 53n47, 55, 56n55, 58–59,

δύναμιν (*cont.*) 63n72, 65, 70, 72n98, 75n103, 76, 80n120, 89n150, 93n167, 108n206, 109 with *nn211* and 212, 113–115, 122, 134, 135n284  
 δυνάμεις 30, 36, 41, 44, 51n39, 52 with *nn41* and 44, 62, 72n98, 77n109, 94, 125, 135 with *n284*  
 δυνάμεων 34, 41, 42n15, 52, 54, 62, 63n72, 68, 75 with *n103*, 77, 94, 99, 105, 106n201, 108, 109 with *n211*, 120n246, 121, 135  
 δυνάμεσι(ν) 12, 18, 36, 52n41, 135, 139  
 δύναμις 94  
 εἰδωλική  
 εἰδωλικοῖς 64  
 εἰδωλον 79 with *n116*  
     εἰδώλῳ 84n130  
     εἰδώλα 79 with *n116*  
     εἰδώλων  
     εἰδώλοις 3 with *n8*, 82 with *n126*, 122 with *n251*  
 ἐκγίγνομαι  
     ἐκγενέσθαι 71n92  
 ἐμπέλαστις 67 with *n85*, 70  
 ἐμπύριος, -ον 133  
     ἐμπύριον 34, 91  
     ἐμπυρίου 36  
     ἐμπυρίων 86  
 ἐμπυρος  
     ἐμπυρον 81  
 ἐμφυτος 53n45  
 ἐνθουσιασμός 76n105  
 ἐνθουσίασις  
     ἐνθουσιάσεων 137  
 ἐνπνευμάτω  
     ἐνπνευμάτωσον 90  
 ἐνπνευμάτωσις 90 with *n155*, 116, 118  
 ἐνωσις 44, 66–67, 137  
     ἐνώσεως 99, 103n191, 141  
     ἐνωσιν 34, 41, 48n31, 49n35, 53n46, 74, 106, 108 with *n210*  
     ἐνώσεσι 64  
 ἔξαψις 32, 66, 75  
     ἔξαψιν 30  
 ἐπάνοδος 44  
 ἐπιγιγνώσκω  
     ἐπέγνων 79n114

ἐπιστήμη 38, 42  
 ἐπιστήμης 41, 45, 52n44, 54, 65, 75n103, 109n212  
 ἐπιστήμην 6, 30, 38  
 ἐπιστρέφω  
     ἐπιστρέψει 119, 136  
     ἐπιστρέψουσι 119  
     ἐπιστρέφοντα 113n228  
     ἐπιστρέφον 136  
     ἐπιστρεφομένων 44  
 ἐπιφάνεια 43n18, 122–123  
     ἐπιφανείας 46, 124  
     ἐπιφανείας 10n43, 38n3, 45–46, 124  
 εὐάγωγον 117  
 εὐδαίμων  
     εὐδαίμονα 43n18, 128  
     εὐδαίμονι 43n18, 128  
 ζωδιακός, -ή, -όν  
 ζωδιακόν 72  
 ζωή  
     ζωῆς 32, 57, 72n98, 79n114, 80  
     ζωῆ 48  
     ζωήν 76n105, 83, 85, 93, 115n232, 117  
     ζωαῖς 64  
     ζωάς 62, 126, 132  
 ζωογονικός 92  
 ζωογόνος 87  
 ζῶον 51 with *n40*, 52, 93, 104n196  
     ζῶα 30, 36, 62–63, 75, 93n166, 109  
     ζῶων 65, 75n103, 93n166, 109n212  
     ζῶοις 93, 129  
 ζῶ (ζώω, ζάω)  
     ζῶσι 73  
     ζῶν 86n140  
     ζῶντος 88  
     ζῶντα 30, 115, 123  
     ζῶσας 38n6  
     ζῶντων 74n100, 118n241  
     ζῶντας 38n6, 54, 55n50  
 ζωτικός, -ή, -όν  
     ζωτικόν 124  
     ζωτικῶν 115  
 ἡγεμονία  
     ἡγεμονίαν 56, 91  
 ἡγεμών  
     ἡγεμόνος 62n70  
     ἡγεμόνες 34, 38, 43, 108  
     ἡγεμόνων 57

ἡγεμόσιν 120n147  
 ἡγεμόνας 30, 56, 72

θάνατος  
 θανάτου 47n30, 73n99, 74n100  
 θάνατον 47n30

θεαγωγία  
 θεαγωγίᾳ 11  
 θεαγωγίαι 11

θεῖον 2n5, 32, 34, 36, 41, 43–44, 46–47,  
 49n35, 50, 76n105, 105n200, 117,  
 120n246

θείου 32, 34, 45, 49, 66–67, 69n90, 75,  
 76n105, 113n228, 116n236, 117, 126–127

θεῖος 62, 72n98  
 θείοις 98

θειότερος 13, 18, 140  
 θειοτέρων 77n109

θειοτέρα 50

θειότερον 84 with n130

θεοειδής, -ές  
 θεοειδής 41n13

θεοκρασία 44  
 θεοκρασίαν 118n241

θεολογία 5  
 θεολογίας 2, 5n17, 57n58  
 θεολογίᾳ 5  
 θεολογίαν 1, 7 with n29

θεολογικώτατος, -η, -ον  
 θεολογικώτατοι 2n5

θεός 3n9, 73, 77n109, 78n111, 79n116, 92, 101,  
 121n248, 129, 137

θεότης 3n7, 93, 129  
 θειότητος 114  
 θεότητα 56, 121

θεουργία 40, 42, 5n139, 105–106, 112–113  
 θεουργίας 41n13  
 θεουργίαν 49  
 θεουργίαι 125

θεουργικός  
 θεουργική 4, 10 with n46, 63, 75, 109  
 θεουργικῆς 41, 52n44, 69, 125  
 θεουργικήν 1n4, 10, 41, 106  
 θεουργικάς 1

θεουργός  
 θεουργοί 40

θεοφορία 101  
 θεοφορίας 101

θρησκεία

θρησκείας 2n5  
 θρησκείᾳ 67n83  
 θρησκείαν 44  
 θρησκηίας 131n273

θρησκεύω  
 ἐθρήσκευσαν 83n127

ἰδέα  
 ἰδέας (τῆς) 51n38  
 ἰδέαν 34, 41  
 ἰδέας (τάς) 88

ἰδιότης 26n102, 54, 92  
 ἰδιότητος 49n33, 72n98, 92, 119  
 ἰδιότητι 135n284  
 ἰδιότητα 34, 57, 59, 119–121  
 ἰδιότητας 17, 34, 67n83, 113

ἱερατικός 11, 24n92, 48, 69, 86nn139 and 140,  
 105  
 ἱερατικόν 72n98  
 ἱερατικοί 30, 38, 40 with n11, 48–49, 86,  
 136  
 ἱερατικῶν 39 with n8  
 ἱερατικοῖς 46 with nn27 and 28, 48, 120  
 ἱερατικούς 38n6

ἱερατική 38–39  
 ἱερατικῆς x, 9, 11–12, 18–20, 23 with nn89  
 and 91, 25, 30, 34, 38, 48n32, 58–59, 65,  
 69n88, 75n103, 108, 109n212, 139, 144

ἱερατικήν 10, 30, 38 with n6, 40 with n11,  
 44, 46n26, 66, 94, 123n256, 124

ἱερατικᾶς 10n43, 38n3, 45, 81, 124  
 ἱερατικάς 72n98

ἱερατικόν 39, 67  
 ἱερατικῷ 127  
 ἱερατικῶν 46, 120

ἱερατικῶς 38n6, 54, 55n50

καθαρμός 127  
 καθαρμοί 10n46, 125, 127, 129, 132  
 καθαρμῶν 127–128  
 καθαρμούς 127  
 καθαρμοῖς 3, 82, 122, 126

καθαρός  
 καθαροῦ 129  
 καθαρῷ 129  
 καθαρόν 71, 73, 127  
 καθαροί 43n18, 74 with n100, 93, 128,  
 131n273  
 καθαροῖς 74 with n100

καθαρότης 127  
 καθαρότητος 67, 85  
 καθαροτης 86, 93, 127–129  
 καθάρσεως 126  
 καθαρσιν 125  
 καθάρσεις 36, 125–127, 129, 132  
 καθάρσεων 42, 126  
 καθάρσεσι 44  
 καθαρτικός  
 καθαρτικούς 47n29  
 καθαρτική 129  
 καθαρτικής 93, 129  
 καθαρτικάς 41, 52n44, 125  
 καθηγεμών 83n128  
 καθηγεμόνος 2, 83 with n128  
 κάθοδος  
 καθόδου 51n38  
 κάθοδον 48  
 καθόδων 121n248  
 κίνησις  
 κινήσεως 84, 102n186, 115n232  
 κινήσει 32  
 κινήσιν 92n163, 102n186  
 κινήσεσι 44  
 κινητικόν 119  
 κοινωνία 137  
 κοινωνίας 67, 99  
 κοινωνίαν 65–66, 67n85, 70, 108n210  
 κόσμος 62, 89, 99n174, 114, 115n232, 120n146  
 κόσμου 30, 57 with n59, 76n105, 80 with  
 n120, 89n150, 92–93, 103n191, 106,  
 113n226, 114, 117  
 κόσμον 59 with n61, 70, 84n130, 86n140,  
 91, 106, 115 with n223, 123n255  
 κόσμοις 88n146  
 κράτις 87n142  
 κράσεως 45  
 κράτιν 87, 110n215  
 κράσεων 87, 99n174  
 κυβερνήτης 91, 106  
 κυβερνώ  
 κυβερνάται 42  
 κυβερνών 42 with n16  
 κυβερνώσαν 91  
 κυκλοέλικτος, -όν  
 κυκλοέλικτον 69n89  
 κύκλος  
 κύκλον 56n55  
 κύριος

κύριον 102n185  
 κυρίους 72n98

λεοντοπόρσωπος, -ον  
 λεοντοπόρσωπον 34  
 λεοντοπόρσωποι 104  
 λεοντούχος, -ον  
 λεοντούχω 44  
 λέων 24, 34, 104 with n196

μέγας  
 μεγάλου 4, 10, 100n178, 103n187  
 μέγαν 77n109  
 μεγάλη  
 μεγάλης 64  
 μεγάλαις 74n100  
 μέγα  
 μεγάλα 103n191  
 μέγιστος  
 μέγιστον 91, 123  
 μέγιστη  
 μεγίστης 46n26, 123n256  
 μέγισται 128n262  
 μέγιστο  
 μέγιστα 2, 53n47  
 μερικός, -ή, -όν  
 μερικής 114n230  
 μερική 85  
 μερικῶν 115n233, 127  
 μερικάς 126  
 μερίς 76, 84n130, 84n133  
 μερίδα 65, 75n103, 109n212  
 μερισμός 34, 41  
 μερισμού 44  
 μερισμόν 47n30, 120  
 μεριστής  
 μεριστάς 72  
 μεριστώς 59n61  
 μέρος 72, 84n132, 110n215  
 μέρους 52n41  
 μέρει 52n41  
 μέρη 50, 57 with n59  
 μερῶν 57n59, 65, 75n103, 109n212  
 μέρεσι 91n162  
 μετουσία 76, 137  
 μετουσίας 126  
 μετουσίαν 46n28, 67n85, 70  
 μετοχή  
 μετοχῆς 114

μῖξις 34, 41, 75, 108, 110  
 μίξεως 45  
 μίξει 34, 74, 108, 109n212  
 μίξιν 99n174, 110n215  
 μοῖρα  
 μοῖρας 62  
 μοῖραν 43, 72n98, 117  
 μοῖραι 72n98  
 μοῖραις 120n248  
 μοῖρας 120  
 μονάς 56, 89, 119  
 μονάδι 39  
 μορφή  
 μορφῆς 63 with *n*72, 75n103, 109 with *n*211  
 μορφῆ 34, 100n178, 101  
 μορφήν 81, 91n162, 111, 124  
 μορφαῖς 121  
 μορφάς 34, 45, 81, 124  
 μορφωτικός, -ή, -όν  
 μορφωτικαῖς 124, 125  
 μυσταγωγία 124  
 μυσταγωγίας 5, 86  
 μυστήριον  
 μυστήρια 2n5, 46, 120  
 μυστηρίοις 10n43, 38n3, 45, 58, 81, 124  
 μύστης  
 μύσταις 120  
 μυστικός, -ή, -όν  
 μυστικῆς 46n27  
 μυστικόν 46n27  
 μυστικήν 39n8, 118n241  
 μυστικαῖς 5  
 μυστικοῖς 44  
 μυστικωτέρα  
 μυστικωτέρας 120n247

νεῦκος 52  
 νοερός  
 νοερῶν 42, 58–59, 77n109, 106, 121  
 νοεροῖς 58–59, 113  
 νοερῶς 30, 58, 61, 77n109, 93  
 νόημα  
 νοήματι 87  
 νόησις  
 νόήσιν 41, 119  
 νοήσεσι 64  
 νοητός, -ή, -όν  
 νοητοῦ 49, 114

νοητήν 49n35, 51n39  
 νοητάς 49n33  
 νοητῶν 30, 59n61, 59n61, 121  
 νοητά 58, 59n61  
 νοῦς 88, 93, 115, 116n234  
 νοῦν 6n19, 46n27, 79n114, 80n118, 89, 134n283  
 νοῦ 79n116, 80n120, 89n150, 120n248

οἰδα 3n9, 44–45, 62, 78 with *n*111, 94, 102n184, 107, 108 with *n*206, 111  
 εἰδώς 108, 127  
 οἰκείως 34, 67n83  
 οἰκείωσις 67 with *n*84  
 οἶνος 101n182  
 οἶνον 85n134  
 οἴνομα 77n109, 78, 108n206, 120n246  
 ὀνόματος 44, 72n98  
 ὀνόματι 127  
 ὀνόματα 39n8, 49n33, 105, 111 with *n*219, 113–114, 115n232, 122  
 ὀνομάτων 11, 48, 69, 105, 115  
 ὀνόμασι 44  
 ούσια 41n13, 87, 136  
 ούσιας 39n6, 42n15, 67, 76, 106n201, 120n247, 126, 135n284, 136  
 ούσιαν 34, 41–42, 57n59, 62, 65, 75n103, 77, 99n174, 102n186, 109n212, 135n284, 136  
 ούσιαι 36, 52n41  
 ὅχημα 83 with *n*130, 84 with *n*130, 94, 113n228  
 ὅχήματος 84n130, 86n140  
 ὅχήματα 55n53, 80, 85

πάθημα  
 παθήματα 53n47  
 παθήμασιν 43 with *n*18, 44  
 παθητική  
 παθητικαῖς 124, 125  
 πάθος 55n50, 74n100  
 πάμμορφος, -ον  
 παμμόρφους 88  
 πᾶς, πᾶσα, πᾶν  
 παντός 51n40, 62n70, 65, 69, 72n98, 75n103, 92, 106, 109n212, 136  
 παντί 46n26, 51n40, 52, 89, 117, 123n256  
 πάντα 30, 32, 39 with *n*6, 41–42, 47n29, 52n44, 55, 59, 62, 65, 67, 74 with *n*100,

πάντα (*cont.*) 79n14, 80 with n17, 84n130, 85, 86n140, 88, 93, 105n200, 110, 112n226, 119, 127

πάντες 40 with n11, 50, 119, 131n273

πάντων 5n17, 30, 32, 34, 40, 42, 50, 51n38, 59, 64, 106–107, 109n110, 115nn232–233, 119–120, 131n273

πάντας 38n6, 126

παντοσώματος 121n149

παράδειγμα 54

παραδείγματος 34, 41

παραδείγματι 93n167

πάρεδρος 99n177, 100 with n178

παρέδρω 100n178

πάρεδρον 81

παρουσία 34, 104n193

παρουσίας 114

παρουσίᾳ 32, 66, 75

παρουσίαν 38n6, 70

πατήρ 42n15, 76, 78, 80n120, 106n201, 119

πατέρα 77

πατέρες 59n61

περὶληπτικός, -ή, -όν

περὶληπτική 102n186

περὶληπτικόν 34, 41

πλήθος 32, 57n58

πλήθους 63n72, 75 with n103, 109 with n211, 132

πλήθει 135n284

πλήρης

πλήρη 62, 76

πλήρεις 5n16, 47n29, 105n200

πνεῦμα 84n32, 87–88, 100n178

πνεύματος 90

πνεύματι 84n133, 87

πνεύματα 108n206

πνευμάτων 11, 69n88, 113n227

πνευματικός

πνευματικόν 47

πολυδύναμος, -ον

πολυδύναμον 109n212

πολυώνυμος 108n207

πρόγνωσις

πρόγνωσιν 36, 103

προθέρμαντις 51, 65, 67

προσαγωγή 66, 68

προσγίγνομαι

προσγενόμενον 99

πρωτουργός

πρωτουργόν 109n210

πρωτουργοῖς 36, 52n44, 135

πύρ 3n9, 53n48, 55, 57n59, 66, 77 with n108, 78n11, 80 with n120, 81, 83n127, 87, 89 with n150

πυρός 3, 30, 32, 42 with n16, 53nn46 and 48, 66–67, 75–76, 77n108, 78, 80 with n120, 83 with n127, 89 with n152, 126–127, 134

πυρί 67, 70, 76, 80, 84n133, 89 with n151, 90, 125, 133

πυρά 85

πυρᾶς 84

πυρᾶ 84

πυράν 83

πυριθαλπής, -ές

πυριθαλπή 67n83

πυρισχησίφως 90n153

πυριφεγγής, -ές 90 with n154

πυριφεγγέος 90 with n154

πυριφεγγή 89

πυριφεγγέας 90

πυρρά

πυρράν 82

συμβολική 109

συμβολικής 121n248

σύμβολον 88, 120nn246 and 248

σύμβολα 76n105, 80n117, 85, 102, 104–105, 107, 114, 117, 119

συμβόλων 8, 9, 20, 26, 34, 36, 42, 46 with n28, 47n29, 104n193, 106, 112, 114 with n230, 117n239, 120–121, 125

συμβόλοις 44, 47n29, 105 with n200

σημεῖον 100n178

σημεῖα 57n58, 101, 102n184, 107, 111

σημείων 115n232

σπλάγχνον

σπλάγχνα 103

σύγκρασις 62n70, 108 with n210

σύγκρασιν 57n59, 110 with n215

συναγωγέύς 53 with n45, 68

συναγωγή

συναγωγήν 5

συναγωγός 132

συναγωγούς 52, 68

συναγωγόν 53, 58, 59, 66, 68–70, 99

συνάπτω  
 συνάπτουσι 55  
 συνάπτειν 30, 42, 55<sup>n</sup>51  
 συνάπτεται 42, 55<sup>n</sup>51, 56, 76  
 συναφή 67  
 συναφῆς 66  
 συναφήν 48<sup>n</sup>31  
 συνδημιουργέω  
 συνδημιουργούντας 56  
 σύνθημα 120  
 συνθήματος 120<sup>n</sup>246  
 συνθήματα 34, 41, 42<sup>n</sup>15, 47<sup>n</sup>29,  
 76, 82<sup>n</sup>126, 93–94, 104, 105<sup>n</sup>200,  
 106<sup>n</sup>201, 114, 115<sup>n</sup>232, 119, 121, 122 with  
 n251  
 συνθημάτων 42, 106, 114, 117<sup>n</sup>239, 121 with  
 n248  
 συνουσία  
 συνουσίας 83<sup>n</sup>128  
 συνουσίαν 36, 52<sup>n</sup>41  
 σύστασις 71, 89, 98 with n172, 99 with nn174  
 and 177, 100 with n178, 101, 103, 107, 110,  
 123  
 συστάσεως 100<sup>n</sup>178, 101  
 συστάσει 100<sup>n</sup>178, 102  
 σύστασιν 98<sup>n</sup>172, 99 with n174, 100 with  
 n178, 102, 110 with n215  
 συστάσεις 3, 32  
 συστάσεσι 98

τάξις 121  
 τάξεως 39, 62<sup>n</sup>70, 67, 86<sup>n</sup>140, 104<sup>n</sup>196,  
 120<sup>n</sup>248  
 τάξει 3, 69<sup>n</sup>90, 82, 84<sup>n</sup>133, 122, 126  
 τάξιν 30, 34, 49, 59, 62, 67<sup>n</sup>83, 76, 84<sup>n</sup>133,  
 104  
 τάξεις 39<sup>n</sup>8, 46<sup>n</sup>26, 119, 123<sup>n</sup>256  
 τάξεων 67 with n83  
 τελεσιουργία 41, 106, 126  
 τελεσιουργίας 120<sup>n</sup>247  
 τελεσιουργίαν 56<sup>n</sup>56  
 τελεσιουργική  
 τελεσιουργικής 41, 52<sup>n</sup>44, 125  
 τελεστής 85  
 τελεστοῦ 76<sup>n</sup>105  
 τελεστήν 115<sup>n</sup>232  
 τελεσταί 115  
 τελεστῶν 114  
 τελεσταῖς 114, 125

τελεστική 45, 76<sup>n</sup>105, 114, 117 with n239, 121,  
 127  
 τελεστικῆς 45, 48<sup>n</sup>31, 114  
 τελεστικῆ 48<sup>n</sup>31  
 τελεστικήν 50, 51<sup>n</sup>38, 114<sup>n</sup>230  
 τελεστικός  
 τελεστικοί 86<sup>n</sup>140  
 τελετή 47 with n30, 107  
 τελετῆς 42, 49 with n35, 105, 125  
 τελετήν 128<sup>n</sup>262  
 τελετῶν 43<sup>n</sup>18, 47, 125, 128  
 τελεταῖς 10<sup>n</sup>43, 36, 44–45, 74<sup>n</sup>100, 124,  
 126

τελέω  
 ἐτέλεσε 115  
 τέλεσον 103  
 τελεσθείς 114  
 τελέσαντος 114  
 τετελεσμένος 48, 102  
 τέχνη 38, 44, 75, 109  
 τέχνης xī, 9, 11–13, 18–20, 23 with nn89  
 and 91, 25, 30, 51–52, 59, 68, 139,  
 144  
 τέχνη 34, 41, 63  
 τέχνην 44, 50, 94  
 τύπος  
 τύπον 111, 124

ῦδωρ 36, 83<sup>n</sup>127, 87 with n143, 92 with  
 n163  
 ὕλη 99<sup>n</sup>174  
 ὕλης 83<sup>n</sup>130, 84<sup>n</sup>130, 99<sup>n</sup>174, 114<sup>n</sup>230,  
 116<sup>n</sup>237, 126  
 ὕλη 47<sup>n</sup>30  
 ὕλην 55, 76<sup>n</sup>105, 80<sup>n</sup>120, 84<sup>n</sup>130, 89<sup>n</sup>150,  
 117

ὑλική  
 ὑλικήν 76, 94  
 ὑπαρξίς  
 ὑπάρξεως 119  
 ὑπάρξεις 5<sup>n</sup>18  
 ὑπάρξεσι 113  
 ὑπόστασις  
 ὑπόστασιν 65, 75<sup>n</sup>103, 84<sup>n</sup>130, 109<sup>n</sup>112,  
 185<sup>n</sup>234

φαινόμενον 34, 80<sup>n</sup>18, 83, 84 with n130,  
 85  
 φαινομένοις 30, 43 with n18, 44

φιλία 51<sup>n</sup>40, 52, 62<sup>n</sup>70  
 φιλίαν 47<sup>n</sup>29, 67, 105<sup>n</sup>200  
 φρήν  
 φρένας 79<sup>n</sup>114  
 φύσις 59<sup>n</sup>61, 117, 119  
 φύσεως 3<sup>n</sup>8, 45, 53<sup>n</sup>45, 56, 82<sup>n</sup>126, 85,  
 100<sup>n</sup>178, 101, 110, 113<sup>n</sup>227, 122<sup>n</sup>251, 129,  
 135  
 φύσιν 36, 49<sup>n</sup>33, 50, 55<sup>n</sup>53, 65, 74<sup>n</sup>100,  
 75<sup>n</sup>103, 84<sup>n</sup>130, 109<sup>n</sup>210 and 212, 114,  
 115<sup>n</sup>234, 117, 122  
 φύσι 89 with n152  
 φυτόν 30, 92, 93, 94  
 φυτά 30, 34, 52, 55 with n50, 62  
 φυτῶν 32, 65, 75<sup>n</sup>103, 109<sup>n</sup>212  
 φυτοῖς 34, 64, 93, 129  
 φῶς 32, 49<sup>n</sup>35, 53<sup>n</sup>47, 62<sup>n</sup>70, 74 with n100,  
 81, 124  
 φωστήρ  
 φωστήρος 34, 92, 104<sup>n</sup>196  
 φωστήρι 34, 92, 94  
 φωστήρες 55  
 φωστήρων 32, 55, 57 with n59  
 φωστήρσι(ν) 30, 56  
 φωστήρας 57 with nn58 and 59  
 φωταγωγία 90

χαρακτήρ  
 χαρακτήρι 115<sup>n</sup>232  
 χαρακτήρων 115  
 χαρακτήρσι 44  
 χαρακτήρας 76<sup>n</sup>105, 117

χθόνιον  
 χθόνια 30  
 χρόνος  
 χρόνου 45  
 χρόνον 59<sup>n</sup>61, 73, 79<sup>n</sup>114, 102<sup>n</sup>186, 111<sup>n</sup>219  
 χωριστός 91, 106  
 χωριστόν 136  
 ψυχή 3, 42 with n15, 73, 76, 78, 80, 86, 93,  
 106 with n201, 113, 117  
 ψυχῆς 42<sup>n</sup>15, 46<sup>n</sup>27, 51<sup>n</sup>38, 53<sup>n</sup>45  
 and 47, 54, 67, 76, 79<sup>n</sup>114, 83 with  
 n130, 84<sup>n</sup>133, 86<sup>n</sup>140, 94, 101, 106<sup>n</sup>201,  
 115<sup>n</sup>232, 117, 121<sup>n</sup>248  
 ψυχῆ 73, 74<sup>n</sup>100, 85, 120  
 ψυχήν 1, 11, 45, 48, 52, 54–55, 57,  
 67, 74<sup>n</sup>100, 76, 80, 83, 84<sup>n</sup>133, 85  
 with n134, 86, 94, 115, 118<sup>n</sup>241, 127,  
 128  
 ψυχαί 56–58, 79 with n116, 85  
 ψυχῶν 32, 40, 44, 48, 51<sup>n</sup>39, 55<sup>n</sup>53,  
 72<sup>n</sup>98, 85  
 ψυχαῖς 34, 47–48, 53<sup>n</sup>48, 64, 86, 93,  
 105<sup>n</sup>200, 129, 136  
 ψυχάς 47–48, 67<sup>n</sup>84, 49<sup>n</sup>35, 55<sup>n</sup>53, 86,  
 92, 126

ώρογενής  
 ὥρογενεῖς 102<sup>n</sup>185  
 ὥρογενῶν 102  
 ὥρογενέσιν 102, 111

# Index of Ancient Sources

<b>Ammonius (Ammon.)</b>		<i>Excerpt viii A Discourse of Hermes to His Son</i>
<i>In Aristotelis De Interpretatione Commentarius (In Int.)</i>		3 79n115
5.1–16	51n39	
<i>Anthologia Palatina (Anth. Pal.)</i>		<i>Excerpt xv From the teachings of Hermes to Ammon</i>
VII.105.3	101n182	3 79n115
<b>Apuleius (Apul.)</b>		<b>Damascius (Dam.)</b>
<i>Metamorphoses (Met.)</i>		<i>Commentary on Plato's Phaedo (In Phd.)</i>
xi.20–23	131	1.168.1–5 47–48
		1.168.5–7 47
		1.168.7–16 48n31
		1.172.1–3 40 with n10
<b>Aristotle (Arist.)</b>		<i>Philosophos Historia (Phil. Hist.)</i>
<i>Fragmenta (Fr.)</i>		4a.1–17 /Vit. Isid. Fr. 3.1–19 39–40 with n10
15	43n18, 123	4a.15–17 /Vit. Isid. Fr. 3.17–19 6n19
		85.5–7 /Vit. Isid. Fr. 126.4–6 6n19
<b>Pseudo-Aristotle (Pseud.-Arist.)</b>		4b.1–3 /Vit. Isid. Fr. 5.1–3 44 with n21
<i>Problemata (Probl.)</i>		
887a.24–27	53n46	
<b>Athenaeus (Ath.)</b>		<i>Egyptian Pyramid Texts (Eg. Pyr. T.)</i>
<i>Deipnosophistae (Deipn.)</i>		Utt. 273–274 118
14.62od	128n265	
<b>Augustine (Aug.)</b>		<b>Empedocles (Emp.)</b>
<i>De Civitate Dei / The City of God (De Civ. Dei)</i>		D K Fr. 17.16–17 30n19
x.9	129–130 with n268	
<b>Clement of Alexandria (Clem. Alex.)</b>		<b>Euripides (Eur.)</b>
<i>Protrepticus (Protr.)</i>		<i>Bacchae (Ba.)</i>
2.12.2	128n262	300–301 101
		506 78n113
<b>Cologne Mani Codex (cmc)</b>		1345–1346 78n113
24.11–16	79n114	
<b>Corpus Hermeticum (Corp. Herm.)</b>		<b>Eusebius of Caesarea (Eus.)</b>
<i>III The Holy Book of Hermes Trismegistus addressed to Asclepius</i>		<i>Praeparatio Evangelica (PE)</i>
24a	118	III.2.4.1–5.2.5 57n59
37.23–25	118	III.4.2.1–6 38n6
v <i>A Discourse of Hermes to His Son Tat</i>		III.4.9.1–6 and 10.1 83n127
11	79n114	III.4.9.3–4 83
10	121n249	III.6.3.2–4.1 57
6	79n115	III.6.4.1–5.1 57n59
xI <i>A Discourse of Nous to Hermes</i>		V.11.1.1–6 116n237
7	62n70	V.12.1.1–2 116n237
		V.14 99n174
		VI.4 99n174

*Praeparatio Evangelica (cont.)*

VI.11.1.1	57n58
VII.9.2.1–5	57n58
VII.22.23.4	99n174
VII.22.24.1–2	99n174
VII.22.56.3–7	99n174
VII.22.58.2–3	99n174
XI.6.20.7–9	57
XI.10.1–7	25
XI.15.1–2	25
XI.18.1–3	25
XI.18.6–9	25
XI.18.22–23	25
XI.19.1	25
XI.28.1–5	25
XV.11.1–2	25

**Gregory of Nazianzus (Greg. Naz.)***Orationes (Or.)*

39.4	128n262
------	---------

**Heliodorus (Heliod.)***Aethiopica (Aeth.)*

I.2.3.6–8	53n47
I.2.8.1–9.5	53n47
II.25.2.6–8	53n47
IV.1.2.1–8	53n47
IV.7.7.4–8	53n47
VI.4.1.2–4	53n47

**Hermias (Herm.)***In Platonis Phaedrum scholia (In Phdr.)*

4.27–29	50
21.10	50
173.9–10	50n38
42.29–31	50
87.4–18	117
88.1–34	76n105
173.9–10	50n38
180.28–31	51

**Herodotus (Hdt.)***Histories (Hist.)*

II.37.1–17	131n273
II.37.14–16	131

**Homer (Hom.)**

<i>Ilias/Iliad (Il.)</i>	
	14.292–351, esp. 346–351
	50n36
	4.443
	23.194–195
	83–84
	23.218–221
	85n134

**Iamblichus (Iamb.)**

<i>Protrepticus (Protr.)</i>	
	107.18–19
	116.11–16

*De Communi Mathematica Scientia (Comm. Math.)*

<i>De Mysteriis (Myst.)</i>	
	1.12.41.9–16
	1.17.18, 19
	1.10.44
	1.10.93.1–2
	1.11.96.11 ff.
	1.11.96.13–97.2
	1.11.5.11.7–12

1.11.6.13.1–2	11, 69
1.11.6.10–11	69n88
1.11.7.11.5.2–7	101
1.11.14.132.6	99n176
1.11.14.133.14	99n176
1.11.14.134.8	69n88
1.11.9	51n40
1.12.195.12	53, 68
1.23.233.9–12	63
1.26.240.9	48n32
1.26.10	53, 68
1.26.237.9–12	66
1.238.11	66
1.239.5–6	66
1.26.237.12–238.5	66–67
1.1.1.249.10–11	109
1.1.2.250.10–11	106
1.1.2.251.10–11	91
1.1.2.252.8–10	92, 106
1.1.3.12–16	109 with n211

VII.3.253.12–254.2	109
VII.5.259.14–260.2	91
VIII.4.265.10–12	72n96
VIII.4.265.12–266.1	72
VIII.4.266.1–5	72
VIII.4.266.5–8	72

<i>De Mysteriis (cont.)</i>		27.665–668	7–8
IX.1	99n176	27.668–670	5, 8
IX.1, 5, 9	106n202	28	24n93
<i>De Vita Pythagorica (VP)</i>		28.672	10
28.147.5–7	103	28.676–679	98
28.151.9–13	6n19	28.679–683	4
<i>Theologumena Arithmeticae/Theological Principles of Arithmetic (Theol. Ar.)</i>		28.683–686	122
V.18	110n215	28.693	90n153
		28.696–698	78
		28.697	90n153
<b>Julian (Jul.)</b>	2, 49, 60, 86, 96,		
	105		
<i>Orationes (Or.)</i>		<b>Nag Hammadi</b>	
5.12.28–33	86	Nag Hammadi Codex (NHC)	
6.8.9–10	84n131	11.2 <i>Gospel of Thomas</i>	
		91	78n113
		108	79n114
<b>Kyranides (Kyran.)</b>		<b>xI.1 The Interpretation of Knowledge</b>	
1–3	54	3	78n113
4–5	4		
14–15	63n73	<b>Nonnus (Nonn.)</b>	
30–31	4	<i>Dionysiaca (D.)</i>	
64	64	6.169–206	79n116
65	64	38.85–86	90n154
<b>Lactantius (Lact.)</b>			
<i>Institutiones Divinae (Inst. Div.)</i>		<b>Olympiodorus (Olymp.)</b>	
18.7	128n262	<i>In Platonis Alcibiadem commentarii (In Alc.)</i>	
		2.134–135	38n6
		18.11–18	54–55 with n50
		21.11–14	38n6
<b>Marinus (Marin.)</b>		<i>In Platonis Phaedonem commentaria (In Phd.)</i>	
<i>Vita Procli / Proclus or On Happiness (Vit. Procl.)</i>		1.8.7.1–9	47n30
6	1	1.8.7.2–3	47
8	1	1.8.7.3–4	47
9	1		
10	1		
12	1		
13.329–330	6		
15.382	7		
18.455–459	126		
22.538–540	1		
26.609–610	1		
26.611	2		
26.615–616	2		
26.624–625	10–11		
26.624–626	1		
26.626–627	2		
6.626–630	2		
27.656–659	5		
27.664–665	5		
		<b>Oracula Chaldaica (Orac. Chald.)</b>	
		<i>Fr. 2.1–4</i>	80n120
		<i>Fr. 3.1–2</i>	80n120
		<i>Fr. 5.1–4</i>	89n150
		<i>Fr. 13.1 / Psel. PG 122.1145d7</i>	
		89	
		<i>Fr. 26.1 / Lyd. De Mens. 11.6, 23.12</i>	
		89	
		<i>Fr. 27.1 / Dam. De Pr. 1.87.3, 11.87.14</i>	
		89	
		<i>Fr. 34.2</i>	89n150
		<i>Fr. 35.3</i>	89n150
		<i>Fr. 36 / Procl. Crat. 107.5.8.14–15</i>	
		78n113	

**Oracula Chaldaica (cont.)**

*Fr. 37.4–5 / Procl. In Prm. 800.20–801.5*  
89

*Fr. 37.13 / Procl. In Prm. 800.20–801.5*  
88n148

*Fr. 37.14 / Procl. In Prm. 800.20–801.5*  
89

*Fr. 37.15 / Procl. In Prm. 800.20–801.5*  
88

*Fr. 40.1 / Dam. In Prm. II.200.23–24*  
88n147

*Fr. 49.2 / Procl. In Tl. III.14.3–10*  
89n150

*Fr. 42.3* 89n150

*Fr. 49.3 / Procl. In Tl. III.14.3–10*  
88n147

*Fr. 54* 85n137, 86

*Fr. 58 / Procl. In R. II.220.14–15*  
89

*Fr. 61 / Procl. In Tl. III.61.12–25*  
84n132

*Fr. 73.1–3 / Dam. In Prm. II.217.8–10*  
89n151

*Fr. 74.1 / Dam. In Prm. II.206.11*  
89

*Fr. 76.1–3 / Dam. In Prm. II.59.23–25, 88.3–5*  
88n146

*Fr. 76.3 / Dam. In Prm. II.59.23–25, 88.3–5*  
88

*Fr. 110* 45, 84n133

*Fr. 120* 83n130

*Fr. 121* 67, 70

*Fr. 122* 84n133

*Fr. 122.1 / Procl. Phil. Chald. 192.14–15*  
80

*Fr. 123* 84n133

*Fr. 130* 85n137

*Fr. 130. 1–6* 86

*Fr. 131* 84n133

*Fr. 133* 42–43n16, 125n259

*Fr. 140* 84n133

*Fr. 146.2–8 / Procl. In R. I.111.2–12*  
81

*Fr. 168.1 / Procl. In Crat. 96.18–19*  
89

*Fr. 215.3 / Lyd. De Mens. IV.101, 141.2–11*  
89

**Orphica**

*Orphica Argonautica (Orph. A.)*  
214 90

*Orphica Fragmenta (Orph. Fr.)*  
93 61n69  
209 79n116  
235 47 with n30

*Orphic Fragments Bernabé (or Bern.)*  
669 VII 5n14

*Orphic Hymns / Hymni Orphici (Hymn. Orph.)*  
52.9 90n154

*Orphica Lithica (Orph. L.)*  
173 90n154

**Papyri Demoticae Magicae (PDM)**  
xiv.1–1227 91n162

**Papyri Graecae Magicae (PGM)**

I.42–195 “Spell of Pnouthis the sacred scribe for acquiring an assistant”  
100n178

II.1–64 Untitled spell for revelation  
100n178

II.65–183 “An alternative method of procedure” 71n94, 91n161, 162, 100n178

III.1–164 Untitled Spell  
71 with n93, 92

III.187–262 Untitled spell for revelation  
100n178

III.282–409 Untitled Spell for foreknowledge  
118n243

III.424–466 “A copy from a holy book (Spell for foreknowledge and memory)” 100n178

III.494–611 “[Systasis to] Helios”  
63n76, 82 with n125, 100n178, 101, 102n184, 103, 107, 110–111

III.612–632 Untitled spell concerning your own shadow 45n25, 101–102n184, 107

III.633–731 Untitled spell for direct vision  
100n178, 101–102, 107

IV.52–85 Untitled spell for revelation  
82n125

IV.154–285 “Nephotes to Psammetichos immortal king of Egypt”  
101

*Papyri Graecae Magicae (cont.)*

IV.471–473 Untitled verses from Homer  
82n125

IV.475–829 “Mithras Liturgy”  
71n93, 82n125,  
87 with n141,  
88, 89, 90n153,  
100n178

IV.930–1114 “*Systasis*-prayer that produces direct vision (of the divinity invoked)”  
89, 90, 91 with n159,  
100n178, 118n243,  
123

IV.1390–1495 “Erotic spell that leads”  
71

IV.1596–1715 “This is the (consecration) ritual for all purposes. Spell to Helios”  
107, 110

IV.1716–1870 “The sword of Dardanos”  
55, 118

IV.1872–1927 Untitled spell  
71n94

IV.1928–2005 “Pitys’ spell that leads over a skull cup”  
69, 98n172

IV.2006–2125 “Pitys’ spell that leads”  
55, 69

IV.2140–2144 “Pitys the Thessalian’s spell for questioning corpses”  
82n125

IV.2145–2240 “Divine assistance from three Homeric verses”  
71

IV.2359–2372 “Magic rite”  
118n243

IV.2373–2440 “Charm for acquiring business”  
55

IV.2441–2621 “Erotic spell that leads”  
55, 82

IV.2708–2784 “Erotic spell that leads”  
82

IV.3172–3208 “Spell for divine dream revelation, involving three reeds”  
82

V.213–303 “Hermes’ ring”  
123 with n255

V.370–446 Untitled spell for revelation  
118n243

Va.1–3 Untitled spell for direct vision  
100n178

VI.1–47 Untitled spell, *Systasis* with Helios  
100n178

VII.319–334 “Charm for direct vision”  
123 with n255

VII.478–490 Untitled spell for dream revelation  
45n25, 111n218

VII.505–528 “*Systasis* with your own demon”  
71, 100n177 and 179,  
110

VII.795–845 “Pythagoras’ request for a dream revelation and Demokritos’ astrological dream interpreter”  
71 with n94, 82n125

VII.155–167 “Days and Hours for divination”  
71n93

VII.862–918 “Lunar spell of Klaudianus and ritual of heaven and the Bear constellation over lunar offerings”  
81–82

VIII.1–63 “The erotic binding spell of Astrapsoukos”  
45, 78, 107

IX.1–14 Untitled spell  
82

XII.14–95 “Eros as an assistant”  
118

XII.270–350 “A little ring for success and favor and victory”  
82 with n125

XIII.1–734 “GOD/GODS; A sacred book called Monad or Eighth Book of Moses about the holy name”  
71n94, 82n125,  
98n172, 100n178,  
102 with n185, 103,  
111

XIII.734–1077 Untitled collection of spells  
79n114, 100n178,  
103n187

XIXa.1–54 Untitled erotic spell that leads  
82

XX.13–19 “The charm of the Thessalian Philinna [for] headache”  
82n125

XXXVI.333–360 “Erotic spell that leads”  
82

LXXVIII.1–14 Untitled erotic spell that leads  
82

<b>Plato (Pl.)</b>		
<i>Cratylus (Cra.)</i>		
405.a.7–b.4	127	
<i>Phaedo (Phd.)</i>		
67.a.2–b.2	129	
67.c.5–67.d.2	87	
80.d.5–80.e.1	73	
80.e.2–81.a.2	73n99	
110.d.7–e.3	129	
110.d.7–e.6	93	
114.b.6–c.2	73	
114.c.1–5	73	
<i>Phaedrus (Phdr.)</i>		
244.e.2–4	128	
250.b.5–c.6	128	
250bc	43n18	
<i>Symposium (Smp.)</i>		
191d1–3	52n43, 53n45	
210.e.2–211a5	50	
210e.4	50	
<i>Timaeus (Ti.)</i>		
22c3–7	56 with n57	
38d1–4	56n55	
<b>Plotinus (Plot.)</b>		
<i>Enneads (Enn.)</i>		
I.1.12.31–39	79n16	
I.6.9.33–35	107n202	
I.8.1.8	65	
III.3.4.49	110n15	
III.5.4	53n45	
IV.3.11.1–8	117	
IV.3.12	79	
IV.3.12.1–5	79n16	
IV.4.26.1–4	52n41	
IV.4.30.1–16 esp. 3–4	52n41	
IV.4.40.1–4	51–52	
IV.4.40.4–17	52	
IV.4.40.6–17	68n87	
IV.40.6–7	51n40	
IV.4.40.10–11	51	
IV.4.40.13	52	
IV.4.41.11–15	77n108	
VI.2.2.2 ff.	110	
VI.2.2.20–22	110	
VI.3.25.9 ff.	110n215	
VI.7.34	107n202	
VI.9.9.24–25	53n45	
<b>Plutarch (Plu.)</b>		
<i>De Defectu Oraculorum (Def. Orac.)</i>		
40.432E	10m182	
<i>De Iside et Osiride (De Is. et Os.)</i>		
355B	9m162	
<i>De recta ratione audiendi (De Rect. Rat. Aud.)</i>		
Plu. 2.47A	128n265	
<i>Quaestiones Convivales (Quaest. Conv.)</i>		
681.A.10–681.B.1–3	53n47	
681.B.5–9	53n47	
681.B–D	53	
681.C.1–6	53 with n48	
681.D.5–6	53n47	
738.C.3	123n255	
<b>Porphyry (Porph.)</b>		
<i>Adversus Christianos (Chr.)</i>		
Fr. 77.1–2	116	
Fr. 77.1–5	116n236	
<i>De Abstinentia (Abst.)</i>		
4.7.32–35	129	
<i>De Antro Nymphaeum (Ant.)</i>		
13.8–9	134	
<i>De Philosophia ex Oraculis (De Phil. Or.)</i>		
I.129–130 Cap.11	116 with n237	
II.151.165–173	122 with n251	
<i>Epistula ad Anebonem (Aneb.)</i>		
2.9a.2	91	
13.2.1–5	99n176	
<i>Περὶ Ἀγαλμάτων / On Statues (On Stat.)</i>		
8.5–6	134	
8.19–20	134	
10.4–7	58	
10.7–10	92n163	
<i>Vita Plotini (V. Plot.)</i>		
10.19–22	71	
10.25–28	71 with n92	
10.27–28	71n92	
12.11–12	71n92	
31.50.23–51.3	110n215	
<b>Proclus (Procl.)</b>		
<i>On the Chaldaean Philosophy ("Extraits du</i>		
<i>Commentaire de Proclus sur la Philosophie Chaldaïque") (Phil. Chald.)</i>		
Fr. 1.206.7 (/ Pitra 192.14–15)		
	80	
<i>Fr. 1.206.6–11</i>	76–77	
<i>Fr. 1.206.17–208.2</i>	76–77	

<i>On the Chaldaean Philosophy (cont.)</i>		185 and 195	79n116
Fr. 2	78	205	113n228
Fr. 2.207.22–208.4	77–78	209.10	55n52
Fr. 4.209.25–29	53 with n46	<i>In Platonis Alcibiadem commentarii (In Alc.)</i>	
Fr. 5.211.4–11	42	1.9.2–7	126
<i>In Primum Euclidis Elementorum Librum</i>		1.52.13–53.2	42
<i>Commentarii (In Euc.)</i>		1.65.20–66.1	77n109
90.11–14	113n228	1.92.8–15	49
138.5–12	113	1.120.1–2, 6	30
<i>On the Hieratic Art according to the Greeks</i>		1.133.14–16	77n109
( <i>Hier.Ar.</i> )		<i>In Platonis Cratylum commentaria (In Cra.)</i>	
1.3–7	68	19.51.4–8	113
1.15	55	51.19.12–15	125
2.1–5	74	51.19.12–19	114
2.5–9	65	71.30.29–31.8	119
2.9–10	67	71.31.24–28	105
2.9–16, esp. 9–10	51	77.133.24–25	115
2.11–12	70	77.133.25–78.3	114n234
2.12	74	93.46.21–23	93n46
4.1	55	107.57.14–16	55
4.9	24	122.72.8–15	49n33
4.11–12	104n193	77.133.24–25	115n234
5.4–17	112	176.101.6–7	133
5.10–12	109n210	176.100.11–12	125
5.10–17	75	176.100.12–13	132
5.12–17	41	176.100.19–20	133
6.1–2	52n42	176.100.19–101.8	126
6.1	26n102	176.101.3–5	105
6.7–8	133	176.101.3–7	42
7.2–5	52n41	179.105.26–27	3n7
7.3–5	135	<i>In Platonis Parmenidem commentarii (In Prm.)</i>	
7.8–10	135	647.1–2	39n8
<i>Hymni (H.)</i>		647.1–4	5n18
<i>Hymn to Aphrodite</i>		647.4–7	39n8
2.6	90	647.9–13	5n7
<i>Hymn to the God or the Fire-song</i>		903.27–31	93n166
4.1–7	77–78 with n107	918.20–24	70
<i>Hypotyposis astronomicarum positionum</i>		969.10–11	58
( <i>Hyp.</i> )		969.16–26	59
1.25 and v.62	56n55	<i>In Platonis Rempublicam commentarii (In R.)</i>	
<i>Institutio Theologica / The Elements of Theology (Inst.)</i>		1.16.3–8	112n226
13.9	70	1.36.3–0	46
16.7–20	136	1.37.9	46, 123
32.6–7	65	1.37.9–14	124
145.7–9	93	1.37.11–12	40
145.7–10	129	1.76.17–79.18	43, 104
145.11–12	129	1.77.13–17	59n61
145.11–15	93	1.78.14–18	43

*In Platonis Rerum publicarum commentarii (cont.)*

I.7.18–24 44  
 I.79.12–23 46n27  
 I.81.5–6 69n90  
 I.83.9 46  
 I.83.17 46, 120  
 I.83.17–18 46  
 I.83.17–25 120  
 I.83.22–25 46  
 I.83.26–32 46n28  
 I.83.27–28 46  
 I.83.28 46  
 I.84.26–31 120n247  
 I.85.2–12 121n248  
 I.108.3–109.7 49  
 I.108.22–25 80n118  
 I.109.1–3 49–50  
 I.110.21–26 10n43  
 I.110.22–23 38  
 I.110.21–111.2 81  
 I.110.21–26 38n3  
 I.110.22–24 45  
 I.111.2–12 81  
 I.115.27–29 83n128  
 I.124.17–30 26n102  
 I.125.20–22 128n262  
 I.152.7 83n128  
 I.152.7–12 83  
 I.152.12–19 84  
 I.152.20–21 85n134  
 I.152.23–153.2 85  
 I.175.2–3 121  
 I.183.11–22 129n266  
 I.183.11–22 93n167  
 II.43.25 55  
 II.56.15–57.2 72n98  
 II.66.1–8 72n98  
 II.66.13–14 86n139  
 II.66.13–15 11  
 II.107.21–23 125  
 II.108.17–21 47  
 II.108.17–30 105n200  
 II.108.17–32 47n13  
 II.108.21–32 47n27  
 II.108.22–24 105  
 II.108.30–109.3 8  
 II.118.8–15 38n2  
 II.118.9–11 38  
 II.119.5–6 48

II.119.5–9 136  
 II.123.9–11 48  
 II.123.12–13 48 with n33  
 II.123.13–14 49  
 II.123.13–16 49n35  
 II.133.15–20 113n227  
 II.154.1–3 123n256  
 II.154.17–26 86n140  
 II.161.18–27 55 with n53  
 II.161.21, 26–27 30  
 II.212.20–213.2 115n232  
 II.220.7–15 78n111  
 II.220.11 43n16  
 II.241.22–24 124  
 II.242.5–9 124  
 II.242.15–16 124n257  
 II.242.24–26 121  
 II.243.16–22 58  
 II.344.27–345.1 123n256

*In Platonis Timaeum commentaria (In Ti.)*

I.110.27–30 56  
 I.111.2–7 56  
 I.111.7–13 92  
 I.111.10–12 26n102  
 I.118.14 127  
 I.118.30–119.6 127  
 I.124.16–29 26n102  
 I.124.20 39  
 I.124.24–27 39  
 I.147.6–9 134  
 I.150.25–28 39  
 I.151.20–24 39  
 I.153.29–30 39  
 I.154.1 39  
 I.192.10–12 39n7  
 I.192.12–13 39  
 I.208.19–22 2n5  
 I.210.19–30 119  
 I.211.8–28 67  
 I.211.8–13 67n83  
 I.211.15–17 67n84  
 I.211.19–22 70  
 I.211.21 80  
 I.211.23–24 67n85, 70  
 I.273.10–18 114  
 I.274.16–20 105  
 I.369.20–370.2 77n109  
 II.13.19–21 99  
 II.15.10–12 99

*In Platonis Timaeum commentaria (cont.)*

II.15.10–17	99n175	I.124.26	42
II.15.12–17	99	IV.29.3–5	69
II.45.7	90	IV.35.13–14	121
II.78.13–15	65	IV.35.17–20	121
II.197.24–26	120	V.30.3–6	51n39
II.198.2–7	120	V.64.3–9	135n284
II.198.7–14	120n248	V.64.15–20	135
II.264.28–30	56n55	V.145.12	55
II.268.1–3	108	<i>De Providentia et Fato eo quod in nobis ad</i> <i>Theodorum Mechanicum (Prov.)</i>	
II.297.15	108n210	38.2	38
II.298.27–29	65	<b>Psellus (Psel.)</b>	
III.6.9–10	114	<i>Encomium in Matrem (Enc. Matr.)</i>	
III.6.11–12	115	1785	44, 94
III.6.12–15	115	<i>Philosophica Opuscula (Phil. Opusc.)</i>	
III.6.23–25	115	<i>(Philosophica Minora I Duffy 1992)</i>	
III.14.3–10	89n150	I.16.232–233	104
III.20.22–28	69n89	I.16.236–239	104n196
III.32.16–17	111	I.16.239–240	104
III.32.16–21	111n219	<i>(Philosophica Minora II O'Meara 1989)</i>	
III.40.19–24	102n186	II.38.10–14	94
III.41.5	112n226	<i>Theologica Opuscula (Theol. Opusc.)</i>	
III.43.10–12	102n186	<i>(Theologica I Gautier 1989)</i>	
III.61.12–25	84n132	I.26.19	32
III.61.16	84n132	I.51.38	104
III.61.19	84n132	I.51.38–40	104
III.63.31–32	56n55	I.51.40–42	104n194
III.65.22–26	56 with n56	I.72.72–73	64
III.68.32–69.4	115n233	<b>(Pseudo-)Psellus (Pseud.-Psel.)</b>	
III.69.9	56	<i>Περὶ Δαιμόνων Δοξάζουσιν Ἑλλῆνες / Quaenam</i>	
III.69.10–11	56	<i>sunt Graecorum opinions de daemonibus</i>	
III.69.11	56	(Boissonade 1838, 36–43; PG 122, 875–882, esp. 88ob; Bidez 1928b vi: 128–129; Gautier 1988, 85–107)	
III.69.15–16	56	24–25, 64, 75n103	
III.69.16–18	56	<i>Περὶ Ἐνεργείας Δαιμόνων / De Operatione Dae-</i>	
III.80.12–21	102n186	<i>monum / De Daemonibus</i>	
III.89.16–19	122	(Boissonade 1838, 1–36; PG 122, 819–874; Bidez 1928b vi: 119–131; Gautier 1980, 133–194)	24–25
III.89.16–22	113		
III.89.17–19	111n219	<b>Theon of Smyrna (Theo Sm.)</b>	
III.89.18	111	<i>Expositio Rerum Mathematicarum ad</i>	
III.89.19	122	<i>Legendum Platonem Utilium (De Util.</i>	
III.131.26	24n93	<i>Math.)</i>	16
III.132.1–2	5n16		
III.155.18–22	114n230		
III.330.8–331.2	124		

*Theologia Platonica (Plat.Theol.)*

I.25.24–26.4	6
I.113.4–10	52n44
I.113.6–10	41, 125
I.124.23–25	112

<b>Thessalos of Tralles (Thess. Tral.)</b>		<b>Revelation (Rev)</b>	
<i>De Virtutibus Herborum (Virt. Herb.)</i>		3:1	107n206
27	72n95	3:8	108n206
<b>Old Testament (Septuagint)</b>		<b>New Testament Apocrypha</b>	
<b>Genesis (LXX Gen)</b>		<b>Acta Joannis (Act. Joan.)</b>	
1:24	79n115	95:16 ff.	79n115
<b>New Testament</b>		<b>Zosimus Alchemista (Zos. Alch.)</b>	
<b>2 Corinthians (2 Cor)</b>		<i>Commentary on the Letter Ω (Com. Ω)</i>	
4:4.	79n115	3	72n95
<b>Ephesians (Eph)</b>			
3:6–7	135–136n285		

# Index of Names and Subjects

Angels 19, 58, 76, 82n122, 84n133, 108, 113, 118, 130n268  
Solar 35

Animals 31, 35, 37, 61–65, 74 with n101, 75, 92, 93 with n166, 95, 97, 103, 108–111, 112n225, 118, 129

Aphrodite 49, 64, 80n18, 90

Apollon 57

Apollonian 61, 97

Archetype 35, 41, 75

Artemis 57

Ascend /-ing 1, 45, 76–77, 84n133, 88

Assimilation /-s 57, 77–78, 90, 113, 114, 121

Assistant /-s 81–82, 100 with n177, 118

Astrapoukos 45, 78–79, 107

Athena 49, 80n118

Athenaic 79–80, 85

Birds 63, 71 with n92, 103

Canon 16

Chaldaean  
Ascent 86  
The Chaldaeans 26, 86, 94, 130n268, 133  
Julian 2, 49, 105  
Invocations 111  
Oracles 1, 2 with n6, 3, 23 with n91, 24, 27, 39n8, 43n18, 45, 80, 82, 84n132, 85, 87–89, 99, 105, 122n252, 125  
Philosophy 8, 27, 42, 53, 75, 77, 106, 120

Purification Rituals 3, 10 with n46, 82, 122, 126

*Systaseis* 3, 98

System 88–89

Theologies 1–2, 26, 49n33

Theurgists 43n16, 90n158

Treatises 2

Wisdom 6n19

Circle /-s 88, 96

Cocks 24n94, 35, 60–61, 96–98, 103

Contemplation 4n13, 83, 106n202, 126

Cosmos 31, 40, 57–58, 62, 70, 80, 88, 91, 93, 99, 112, 114–117, 123

Daemons 16, 35, 43, 61, 97, 104, 108, 113  
Aerial 97  
Lion-faced 104  
Solar 35, 43 n, 17, 104

Dionysus 47, 79 with n116, 115, 120, 134

Divination 41, 71n93, 72n97, 101, 125, 127

Dreams 88

Essence /-s 35, 41–42, 74, 106, 126

Eternal 62, 115

*Energeia /-ai* 58, 62 with n70, 135 with n284, 136 with n286

*Enpneumatōsis* 118

Enthusiasm /-os  
Erotic 50  
Theurgic 76n105, 117

Epiphany /-ies 10 with n46, 27, 41, 43 with n18, 45, 46, 81, 82 with n122, 122, 123, 124, 126, 131

Eros 27, 50–53 with n45, 68, 77n109, 118

Faith 42

Fate 7, 85

Fire 3, 31, 42–43, 53, 63n76, 65–67, 70, 76 with n104, 77–78, 80–81, 82 with n122, 83, 84 with n133, 85, 87–89, 90 with n158, 110, 125, 127, 133–134  
Transmission of 27, 33, 66, 75, 80, 83, 87

Father 4 with n11, 10, 44, 47, 62, 76, 77 with n109, 80, 88, 114–115, 119, 132, 133n279

Force /-s 63, 70, 76, 97, 119

Form /-s 33, 35, 41, 45–46, 58, 59n61, 61–62, 65, 70, 75, 81, 93 with n166, 97, 101, 103, 104, 107, 109, 110–112, 121, 123–124

Formless 35, 81, 124

God /-s 2n5, 5, 11, 27, 33, 35, 37, 39, 40, 41 with n13, 42, 43 with n18, 44–47, 49, 54, 56, 57–58, 62 with n70, 63 with n76, 64, 66–67, 70, 72–73, 75–76, 77 with n109, 78–81, 84–87, 88 with n145, 90–94, 99n177, 100 with n179, 101 with n182, 102–105, 106 with n202, 107 with n205, 108n208, 109–110, 111 with nn218 and 219, 112–120, 121 with n249, 122–129, 130 with n268, 131–134, 135n284 and 285, 136–137

Goddess /-es 2n5, 49, 64, 80n118, 81–82, 111, 132

Gnostic 51n39

Heaven 31, 33, 45, 61–62, 74, 78n114, 81, 87, 88, 93, 107–108, 125, 130–132, 134

Heavenly 31, 33, 55, 57, 74, 93n166, 95

Hecate 3, 9, 10 with n46, 24n93, 44, 82, 122, 126

Helios 27, 35, 38n6, 54, 56–58, 63, 75, 89, 90 with n154, 91, 92 with n163, 100–101, 103, 107–123

Hera 49, 50n36, 80n118

Hermes 45, 58, 62n70, 78, 79 with n114, 107, 108 with n208, 121n249, 123n255

Hermes Trismegistus 23, 59, 60 with n65, 118

Hieratic

- Hieratics 40, 48, 68
- Art (/ Science) 8–9, 11, 14, 17, 20, 22–24, 26–27, 31, 33, 35, 38, 40, 43–44, 46, 51, 58–61, 64–66, 68, 70, 94, 96, 104, 108, 112, 123, 135
- Class 39
- Mode of invocations 11, 48
- Mode of life 54
- Myths 38n6
- Rites /Practices 10, 38, 43, 46, 104, 112, 120
- Teletai* 45, 46, 123
- Treatise /-s 10, 38–39, 45, 81, 123
- Words /Teachings /Doctrines 48, 86, 136

Horoscopes 72

Hymn /-s 31, 33, 35, 76

- of the Chaldaean Fragments 84nn132 and 133
- in Magic 89, 91, 123
- Orphic* 15, 90n154
- Proclus' 7, 77 with n107, 90
- Sumerian temple 132

Idea /-s 65, 79

- Chain of 58
- Many-formed 88
- Noetic 88
- Primordial 88

Illumination /-s 27, 33, 42, 45, 54, 66, 75, 106, 112, 114, 117, 125

Immaculate

- Apparitions 124
- Fire 76
- Purity 85

Image /-s 3, 33, 35, 39, 42, 49, 51, 56–58, 60, 76, 79, 81–82, 84n130, 91, 93, 95–99, 103, 106, 110–111, 113–115, 117, 122, 127, 130 with n268

Immanent 99

Incenses 35, 41, 74, 130

Initiations / Initiation rituals / Rites 5, 37, 43n18, 44, 47, 48n31, 73, 86, 103, 127, 131, 135

- to Philosophy 50

Intellect 115

Intellectual 35, 42, 58, 62, 76, 91, 106, 121, 130 with n268

Isis 38n6, 57, 70, 131

Knowledge 3–4, 10, 45, 58, 65, 67, 78, 107–108, 111, 126, 129

Light 27, 31, 33, 62n70, 66–67, 69n88, 70, 73, 75–76, 80–82, 84n130, 90, 124, 128, 133

Lions 35, 60–61, 96–98, 103

Lotus 33, 60n68, 90–92, 94

Madness 128

Magic 3, 23, 27, 41n13, 51 with n40, 52 with n41, 60 with n68, 63–65, 66n82, 81–82, 87, 94, 96n171, 98, 99n174, 107, 110, 112, 116, 118–119, 130n268, 132

Material /-s 27, 33, 45, 66, 68, 74, 76, 94, 97, 117–118, 124, 130 with n268

Medicine 108n208, 125, 127

Mind 3, 60n65, 66

Mirror 54, 79 with n117, 117

- of Dionysus 79 with n116

Mithras Liturgy 87–89, 90n153

Mixing 27, 35, 41, 44, 74–75, 108, 110, 112

Mixture /-s 35, 41, 62n70, 74, 87, 108, 110

Monad 39, 56, 89, 102, 111, 119

Moon 31, 33, 38n6, 55–58, 61, 64, 71–72, 74, 84n132, 93 with n166, 94–95, 98, 103–104

Moonstone 33, 55, 60, 92, 94, 96

Mysteries 2n5, 4, 27, 45–47, 73, 81, 102, 114–115, 120, 123–124, 130n268

Eleusinian 4n11, 16, 57, 127

of Isis 131

Myth /-s 9, 43, 47, 49, 125, 132

    Divine 5

    Hieratic 38n6

    Homer's 43, 46n27, 104

    of Phaethon 56

    of the Greek Theologians 46

Name /-s 11, 39n8, 44–45, 48, 63, 69, 78–79, 95, 98, 102–103, 105, 107, 111–112, 114–115, 121

Nature 27, 35, 37, 44, 50 with n36, 51–54, 56, 59n61, 63–64, 68, 73, 89, 92, 95–96, 98, 101, 108, 110, 112, 114, 116, 119–121, 129, 135

Nous 62n70, 79n114

    Fiery 89

    Flower of 89n150

    Paternal 88

One and Many 27, 74, 108, 110, 112

Oracle 42, 76

Orphic 5, 6n19, 7, 15, 26, 87n143, 126

Orphica 5, 90

Osiris 38n6, 57, 123

*Phantasia* 9n38, 21 with nn79 and 81

Philosophy 27, 39, 40 with n13, 45n22, 48n31, 50, 52n44, 72–73, 99n176, 108

    Proclus' *Chaldaean* 8, 27, 42, 53, 75, 77, 106, 120

Plants 31, 33, 35, 44, 52, 54, 60–65, 72, 74–75, 92–97, 108–109

*Pneuma* 84nn132 and 133

Power /-s 27, 31, 35, 37, 39, 41, 44–45, 51–52, 54, 58, 60, 62–65, 68, 70, 74–76, 80, 91–96, 98–99, 101, 105–110, 112–115, 118, 121–123, 125, 129, 130n268, 131–137

Prayer /-s 2n5, 3, 11, 48, 52n41, 53, 66–70, 84n133, 89–90, 98, 100, 105, 123, 128, 130n268

Priest /-s 12, 16, 39, 42, 70–72, 78n114, 103, 125, 127, 129–130, 131 with n271, 132–133, 142

Prophecy 72, 101n182

Purification Rituals /Purifications 3, 10 with n46, 27, 37, 41n14, 42, 44, 82, 83n130, 86, 93–94, 105, 117, 122, 125–129, 130 with n268, 131–133

Purity 67, 73, 85, 93, 127, 129, 130 with n268

Religion 16, 57, 90, 108n208, 109, 111, 118, 129, 132

Return 44, 83, 84, 119 with n246, 131, 136

Ritual /-s 3–4, 10, 11, 37–38, 40, 41–46, 66, 69, 71 with n92, 73, 74, 79, 81–83, 85, 86–87, 90, 93–94, 100–102, 104–107, 110–112, 116–118, 122–123, 125–127, 129–133, 135–136

Sacrifice /-s 4, 9, 11, 48, 58, 66, 69, 71, 103, 105, 112–113, 116

Secrecy 88n145

Selene 57–58, 81, 82

*Selenotropes* 31

Shape /-s 35, 55, 61, 81, 94, 97–98, 113, 116, 121, 123–125, 134

Shapeless 121

Silence 88 with n145

Soul /-s 1, 3, 11, 16, 33, 35, 42, 43n18, 45, 47, 50, 51n39, 52, 54, 56–58, 64, 66–67, 73, 78 with n113, 79 with nn14 and n16, 80 with n118, 83 with n130, 84n130, 87, 92–93, 101, 106, 108, 113n228, 115–120, 124–125, 127–129, 130 with n268

Ascent of the 44, 76, 84n133, 85–86, 94, 136

Assimilation of the 113

Athenaic 79, 80, 85

*Enthusiasmos* of the 76n105

Illumination of the 54

Immortal / Immortality / Immortalisation

    Ritual of the 3, 40, 44, 78, 83

Separation of the 48, 49n35, 86, 136

Unity of the 67

Sphere 83, 84 with n131

Spirit /-s 3, 8, 11, 69, 78, 82, 87, 90, 99n177, 116, 118, 130n268

Star /-s 3, 19, 38n6, 42, 52n41, 57, 61, 72, 78, 93, 95–97

Statue /-s 27, 35, 41–42, 44, 51, 57, 74, 76n105, 106, 108, 112–116, 117 with n239, 118, 121, 125, 134

Stone /-s 31, 33, 35, 37, 44, 54, 60n68, 61–65, 74–75, 90, 92–96, 107–109, 111–112, 129, 132

Sun 31, 33, 52n41, 53, 55, 56 with *n*55, 57–58, 60–61, 71, 74, 84n132, 88–98, 103–104, 106, 111, 131

Sunflower /-s 54

Sunstone 33, 92, 96

Sun-moonstone 33, 60, 92, 94, 96

Sympathy 27, 31, 33, 37–38, 41, 44, 47, 51 with *n*39, 53–54, 65, 67–68

*Synthémata* 3, 27, 35, 41–42, 71, 74, 76, 82, 85, 93–94, 104, 106, 108, 114, 119 with *n*245 and 246, 120, 121 with *n*148, 122, 125

Symbol /-s 9n38, 21 with *n*79 and 81, 27, 37, 41–42, 45, 46, 74, 79 with *n*117, 85, 88 with *n*145, 91, 98, 101–102, 104, 105–106, 107 with *n*205, 111–112, 114, 117, 119–121, 125, 131, 134

Divine 42, 106

Mystical 44

*Mythical* 8–9

Sacred 105

Solar 35

*Systasis* /-eis 3, 33, 71, 89–90, 98, 99 with *n*74, 100 with *n*77, 101–103, 107, 110, 111 with *n*218

Substance /-s 35, 37, 52, 62–65, 67, 76–77, 109, 118, 135

Temple /-s 4n11, 70, 116, 130, 131 with *n*271, 132, 133 with *n*278

Theogony 5, 8, 10

Theology 1, 4–5, 26, 57

Chaldaean 2

Egyptian 109, 112

Hebrew 57n58

*Orphic* 1–2, 7 with *n*30

*Platonic* 5, 7, 16, 41, 69, 106, 112, 121, 125, 135

*Elements of* 6, 65, 69, 92, 129, 136

Theurgy 7–10, 26, 27, 38, 40, 41n13, 42–43, 49, 51n39, 52n41, 65–66, 98, 99 with *n*76, 104–105, 106 with *n*202, 112–113, 116, 125, 129, 130n268

Transformation /-s 62, 75, 104, 109–110, 112, 124

Triad 29, 42, 56, 89

Tradic 56

Monad 89

Principles 88

Union

Erotic 50n36

Hieratic / Theurgic with the Divine 27, 40–41, 45, 49n35, 51, 65, 68, 75, 78–80, 101, 106–107

Ineffable 66

With / Through Many Powers 35, 37, 41, 44, 74, 108, 135, 137

Of the Soul /-s 52, 76

Vehicle /-s 80, 83 with *n*30, 84–85, 86n140, 94, 113n228

Virtue /-s 1, 2nn4 and 5, 47

theurgic 10, 11

Vision 35, 43n18, 46, 73, 76, 120, 127, 130 with *n*268

Direct 3, 46, 66, 70, 71n92, 82, 89–91, 112, 122–123, 126

Fiery 81–82

Intellectual 35

Luminous 46, 123

Self-revealing 126

Wine 101n182

Womb /-s 80

Zeus 44, 47, 50n36, 56, 89, 127

Zodiac 72, 75, 109, 111

The book is a critical edition of the text with an English translation and commentary of Proclus' *On the Hieratic Art according to the Greeks*. The Hieratic Art is the Theurgic Art, theurgy, the theurgic union with the divine. Proclus describes the theurgic union, putting an emphasis on a conceptual blending of ritual actions (teletai, e.g. the role of statues, incenses, synthêmata, symbols, purifications, invocations and epiphanies) and philosophical concepts (e.g. union of many powers, 'one and many', sympathy, natural sympathies, attraction, mixing and division).

**Eleni Pachoumi** is currently an academic visiting fellow at Oxford University. She has published the monograph *The Concepts of the Divine in the Greek Magical Papyri* (Mohr Siebeck, 2017), co-edited the volume *Praying and Contemplating in Late Antiquity: Religious and Philosophical Interactions* (Mohr Siebeck, 2018), and edited the volume *Conceptualising Divine Unions in the Ancient Greek and Near Eastern Worlds* (Brill, 2022).

ISBN 978-90-04-69754-6



BRILL.COM/SPNP

ISSN 1871-188X