

# Varia Procliana

John Whittaker

## I

IN 1939 A. Delatte published in the second volume of his *Anecdota Atheniensia*<sup>1</sup> the *editio princeps* of the *Σύνοψις τῶν φυσικῶν* of the eleventh-century Byzantine Symeon Seth (pp.1ff). The *λόγος πέμπτος* of this treatise (pp.81ff), entitled *Περὶ τῆς πρώτης αἰτίας τῶν ὄντων καὶ τῆς ἀπ' αὐτῆς διηκούσης ἐνταῦθα προνοίας*, is in the main a patchwork of quotations from Neoplatonic sources, not all of which are readily identifiable. Thus, at p.83.20ff D., Symeon writes:

τὴν οὖν τοιαύτην πρόνοιαν καὶ τις τῶν παρ' Ἑλλῆσι σοφῶν ἀνυμνῶν φησι· πάντων παρεκτικὸν ἐκεῖνο τὸ ἐν, πάντων σωτικόν, πάσης οὐσίας ὑπαρξίν ἔχον ἀληθεστέραν καὶ πάσης γνώσεως τρανεστέραν, οὐ μεριζόμενον τοῖς γνωστοῖς οὐδὲ κινούμενον περὶ αὐτά. τούτων γὰρ ἡ ψυχικὴ καὶ νοερά γνώσις ἔχει τὰς ιδιότητας, ἐκεῖνο δὲ τὸ ἐν μένει ἀμετάβατον ἅμα καὶ ἀδιαίρετον καὶ γινώσκει πάντα τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον καὶ οὐκ ἄνθρωπον μόνον καὶ ἥλιον καὶ πᾶν ὄτιοῦν τοιοῦτον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἕκαστον τῶν καθ' ἕκαστα. οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐκφεύγει τὸ ἐν ἐκεῖνο, κἂν τὸ εἶναι λέγῃς κἂν τὸ γινώσκεσθαι· οὕτως ἡ τῆς προνοίας ἐνιαία γνώσις ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ μέρει πάντων ἐστὶ τῶν μεριζομένων γνώσις καὶ τῶν ἀτομωτάτων ἐκάστου καὶ τῶν ὀλικωτάτων.

The *τις τῶν παρ' Ἑλλῆσι σοφῶν* to whom Symeon refers and whom Delatte has not succeeded in identifying is in fact Proclus, from whose *De decem dubitationibus circa providentiam* the sentences quoted by Symeon have been drawn. When in 1939 Delatte published the text of Symeon this work of Proclus was still known, with the exception of a few quotations in the original Greek, only from the Latin version which William of Moerbeke completed at Corinth on the 4th of February, 1280.<sup>2</sup> In the meantime, however, the major portion of the Greek text has been recovered from the similarly entitled treatise (*Περὶ τῶν δέκα πρὸς τὴν πρόνοιαν ἀπορημάτων*) of Symeon's approximate

<sup>1</sup> *Anecdota Atheniensia et alia*, Tome II: *Textes grecs relatifs à l'histoire des sciences* (Liège/Paris 1939).

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Procli Diadochi Tria Opuscula*, ed. H. Boese (Berlin 1960) 108.

contemporary Isaac Sebastocrator and has been published alongside William of Moerbeke's Latin version in H. Boese's magisterial edition.<sup>3</sup>

Symeon's quotation is not a connected passage of Proclus, but consists of (with a few small corruptions) *De decem dub.* 5.15–18 followed by 5.20–23 and 5.30–32 Boese. It is highly remarkable that the very same sentences of Proclus are quoted by Philoponus in his *De aeternitate mundi contra Proclum* on a number of occasions. Thus, at *De aetern.* pp.37.22–38.20 Rabe, Philoponus quotes *De decem dub.* 5.1–8 followed by 5.14–23 and 5.30–33 B.; at *De aetern.* p.91.10–23 R. he quotes *De decem dub.* 5.14–16 followed by 5.20–23 and 5.30–33 B.; at *De aetern.* p.570.1–18 R. he quotes *De decem dub.* 5.14–23 followed by 5.30–33 B.; and at *De aetern.* p.6.17–21 R. he quotes *De decem dub.* 5.30–33 B. So remarkable indeed is this coincidence that one cannot but conclude that Symeon derived his quotation neither directly from Proclus, nor from Isaac Sebastocrator's plagiarism (the text of which varies considerably from that of Symeon and Philoponus), but necessarily from Philoponus' defence of the Christian position against the dead but dangerous Proclus.<sup>4</sup>

But this is not the full extent of Symeon's indebtedness to Proclus, *De decem dub.* At p.87.9ff D. Symeon writes:

ὥσπερ γὰρ ἐν τῷ κέντρῳ πᾶς ὁ κύκλος κεντρικῶς, εἴπερ αἰτία τὸ κέντρον αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐν τῇ μονάδι πᾶς ἀριθμὸς μοναδικῶς, οὕτως ἐν τῷ τῆς προνοίας ἐνί, ἐνιαίως τὰ πάντα. καὶ εἰ εἶχε γινῶσιν τὸ κέντρον τοῦ κύκλου, κεντρικὴν ἂν εἶχε ταύτην καὶ οὐκ ἂν ἐμέριζεν αὐτὴν τοῖς τοῦ κύκλου μέρεσι.

In the light of the above finds it is not difficult to recognize in these lines a corrupted version of Proclus, *De decem dub.* 5.24–30 B., i.e. precisely the words which intervene between two of the passages which Symeon, following Philoponus, has previously combined into a

<sup>3</sup> *op.cit.* 3ff. The Greek text of Isaac's treatise has been edited by J. Dornseiff, Isaak Sebastokrator, *Zehn Aporien über die Vorsehung* (Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie 19 [Meisenheim am Glan 1966]).

<sup>4</sup> It may well be more than a coincidence that in quoting *De decem dub.* 5.22 B. both Symeon (*Σύνοψις* p.84.9 D.) and Philoponus at *De aetern.* p.38.13 R. read not *ὅτι* but *ὅτιοῦν*. Philoponus has *ὅτι* at *De aetern.* p.91.16 and 570.11 R., whilst Isaac Sebastocrator omits (unless the scribe of *Vaticanus gr.* 1773 is at fault) the relevant portion of the text; cf. p.14.13 Dornseiff. On the circumstances surrounding the publication of Philoponus, *De aetern.* cf. H. D. Saffrey, "Le chrétien Jean Philopon et la survivance de l'école d'Alexandrie," *REG* 67 (1954) 396ff; more generally on the background of the conflict cf. M. Wacht, *Aeneas von Gaza als Apologet: seine Kosmologie im Verhältnis zum Platonismus* (Bonn 1969).

single quotation. Since it can hardly be doubted that this previous quotation from Proclus has been transmitted to Symeon through the medium of Philoponus, it would seem more than probable that Symeon has borrowed also this latter quotation from the same source, in spite of the fact that the pertinent passage does not occur in Rabe's edition of Philoponus, *De aeternitate*. It must be recalled that the text of the *De aeternitate* has been preserved only in the ninth-century *Marcianus gr.* 236, which in the course of its history has suffered the loss of its first two quaternions and of an undetermined number of folios at its close.<sup>5</sup> We can therefore conclude with fair probability that somewhere in these missing leaves Philoponus had quoted Proclus, *De decem dub.* 5.24–30 B.

A further Neoplatonic quotation of Symeon's which Delatte has failed to identify is at *Σύνοψις* p.88.2–13 D. Apart from variations so slight that it is frequently difficult to know whether they are Symeon's adaptation or genuine variant readings, this passage coincides with Plotinus, *Enn.* 5.5.3, 8–21 Henry–Schwyzer.

## II

Florence, *Biblioteca Nazionale* II.x.145 (*Magliabechianus* 32)<sup>6</sup> contains a series of extracts of Proclus, *In Rempublicam*, made, probably about the beginning of the seventeenth century, from *Vaticanus gr.* 2197.<sup>7</sup> Since the *Vaticanus* is in a much damaged state and has deteriorated considerably during the past 300 years, the Florentine extracts are not without value for the reconstitution of the text of Proclus.<sup>8</sup> It was

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Rabe's *Praefatio* p. iii. We owe the survival of the Greek text of Proclus' *Ἐπιχειρήματα περὶ ἀδιότητος τοῦ κόσμου* solely to the fact that Philoponus quotes *in toto* the text of each *ἐπιχείρημα* before he attempts to refute it. Since the opening of the *De aetern.* is missing, so also is the Greek text of Proclus' first *ἐπιχείρημα*. The text of Proclus has, however, now been recovered in Arabic translation; cf. J. van Ess, "Jüngere orientalistische Literatur zur neuplatonischen Überlieferung," in *Parusia: Festgabe für J. Hirschberger*, ed. K. Flasch (Frankfurt 1965) 346f.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. A. Olivieri, "Indicis codicum graecorum Magliabechianorum supplementum," *StItal* 5 (1897) 403f.

<sup>7</sup> The *Vaticanus* and *Laurentianus* 80.9, which together once formed a single volume, are (apart from apographs) our sole witness to the text of Procl. *In Remp.* In marked contrast to the *Vaticanus*, the Laurentian portion of the original codex is in an excellent state of preservation. It was brought to Florence, probably from Crete, by Janus Lascaris in the spring of 1492; cf. my "Parisinus gr. 1962 and the writings of Albinus" (forthcoming in *Phoenix*).

<sup>8</sup> Of similar significance for the recovery of the text of Proclus is the XVII-century *Barberinianus gr.* 65, which is in fact a copy of *Vaticanus gr.* 2197 made by L. Holstenius; cf. V.

suggested by A. Olivieri,<sup>9</sup> and the suggestion was repeated as established fact by W. Kroll,<sup>10</sup> that the extracts in the *Magliabechianus* might have been written by Alexander More (1616–1670), the learned but hot-blooded antagonist of John Milton, presumably during More's visit to Italy in 1655.<sup>11</sup> In fact More not only visited Florence during his stay in Italy but whilst there actually examined the *Vaticanus* in the Salviati library, of which at that time it formed a part.<sup>12</sup> The importance of the ms impressed itself upon More's attention, and he did indeed copy from it a number of extracts, some of which at least he published in his *Ad quaedam loca Novi Foederis notae*<sup>13</sup> together with some adverse comments on the dismal state of the Salviati library, in which he describes the ms as "male conservatus."<sup>14</sup> He has published these extracts, he tells us (p.102f), "cum in una tantum reperiantur Bibliotheca, in qua cum blattis luctantur & tineis."

---

Capocci, *Codices Barberiniani graeci, Tomus I Codices 1–163* (Vatican 1958) 67ff. It was from the *Barberinianus* and not from *Vaticanus gr.* 2197 (since the latter's whereabouts could not at the time be traced) that the *editio princeps* of this portion of Procl. *In Remp.* was made by R. Schoell (*Anecdota varia Graeca et Latina* II [Berlin 1886]). Short extracts from the *Vaticanus* had been previously published by Alexander More (as we shall see) and A. Mai (cf. Schoell, *op.cit.* 8 n.2). On the edition published from *Vaticanus gr.* 2197 by J. B. Pitra (*Analecta sacra et classica spicilegio Solesmensi parata* V [Paris/Rome 1888]) cf. R. Reitzenstein, *Supplementa ad Procli commentarios in Platonis De Republica libros nuper vulgatos*, Breslauer philologische Abhandlungen IV.3 (Breslau 1889) 1ff. Pitra, *op.cit.* pt. II p. xv, describes how he rediscovered *Vaticanus gr.* 2197, which had been kept hidden by Cardinal Mai. The text of two missing leaves of the *Vaticanus* survives in *Parisinus gr.* 1838, *Chigianus gr.* R.viii.58, and *Scorialensis* T.iii.2, and was first edited by E. Diehl in his "Subsidia Procliana," *RhM* 54 (1899) 196ff. Capocci (*loc.cit.*) argues that a part of *Barberinianus gr.* 65 was not (as Pitra and others following him have supposed) copied by Leo Allatius.

<sup>9</sup> *loc.cit.* (*supra* n.6).

<sup>10</sup> *Procli In Rempublicam* II (Leipzig 1901) p. viii.

<sup>11</sup> For a brief account of More cf. *Dictionary of National Biography* 13, p.858.

<sup>12</sup> The ms passed subsequently into the possession of the Colonna family in Rome, and was among the 93 Greek mss of the Bibliotheca Columnensis which were acquired by the Vatican in July 1821 (*Vaticani gr.* 2161–2253); cf. G. Mercati, *Opere Minori* IV (*Studi e Testi* 79, Vatican 1937) 201.

<sup>13</sup> I have used the edition of this work published in Paris in 1668. An earlier edition, inaccessible to me, was published in London in 1661 (cf. *BM Catalogue* 164, col. 3). The extracts from Procl. *In Remp.* are on pp.99–103, 130f and 142 of the Paris edition.

<sup>14</sup> *op.cit.* (*supra* n.13) 99. Also Lucas Holstenius in his *Iudicium de libris optimis ac maximam partem ineditis bibliothecae Mediceae* (1640) laments at length the wretched fate of the ms in the Salviati library. Holstenius writes *inter alia* (I quote from Schoell, *op.cit.* [*supra* n.8] 6f.): "Sed ut simiae prolem prae nimio affectu suffocant, ita invidi illi et maligni librorum custodes, dum thesaurum nimium abscondunt, eundem et sibi et publico perdidierunt. Nam quaterniones illi ita carie, marcere et putredine corrupti sunt, ut membranae divelli

Olivieri's suggestion that the *Magliabechianus* might be from More's hand seems intrinsically improbable, since More is hardly likely to have left behind in Florence the extracts which he had been at pains to make from the Salviati manuscript. However, the only way of proving or disproving the contention of Olivieri and Kroll would be to put the *Magliabechianus* alongside a Greek text known with certainty to have been written by More. We are fortunate in that just such a document is still in existence.

Amongst the friends whom More made during his stay in Florence was Francesco Redi da Arezzo (1626–1698),<sup>15</sup> More's subsequent correspondence with whom is preserved in Florence amongst the *Rediani* at the Laurenziana.<sup>16</sup> This correspondence includes an undated letter in Greek (*Redianus* 203, fol.253)<sup>17</sup> headed 'Αλεξανδῆρ ὁ Μῶρος Φραγκίσκῳ τῷ 'Ρεδίῳ. That this is the original letter in More's own hand may be seen from a comparison of the Greek script with that of quotations in Greek in letters signed by More.<sup>18</sup> But the writing is strikingly different from that of the *Magliabechianus*, so different indeed that it is inconceivable that the two documents could have been written by the same hand. The *Magliabechianus* is written in a graceful professional script, comparable to (but not identical with) that of L. Holstenius. The letter, on the other hand, may have been written by a scholar, but Greek did not flow with absolute ease and fluidity from his pen. Though thoroughly legible, the script is frequently non-cursive to such a degree that not only are letters unconnected but also the individual components of the letters are written in separate strokes. A far cry indeed from the studied calligraphy of the *Magliabechianus*!

---

nequeant, in quibus vix detrita literarum vestigia apparent." However, without denying the philistine carelessness of those responsible for the library, one is inclined to conclude that More and Holstenius have, out of concern for the precious manuscript, exaggerated the responsibility of the Salviati for the deterioration of *Vaticanus gr.* 2197, which is in fact in a noticeably worse state than other Salviati mss. The history of *Vaticanus gr.* 2197 awaits clarification.

<sup>15</sup> On Redi see M. E. Cosenza, *Biographical and Bibliographical Dictionary of the Italian Humanists and of the World of Classical Scholarship in Italy 1300–1800* IV (Boston 1962) 3012ff.

<sup>16</sup> *Laur. Redianus* 203, fol. 233 recto—260 verso.

<sup>17</sup> There are in fact 4 leaves numbered 253, of which the first and third contain the Greek text whilst the second and fourth are blank. The letter is mentioned briefly as item no.67 in E. Rostagno, "Indicis codicum graecorum Bybliothecae Laurentianae supplementum," *StItal* 6 (1898) 158.

<sup>18</sup> Cf., e.g., *Redianus* 203, fol.255 recto.

We must conclude that the useful *Magliabechianus* is not from the hand of Alexander More, and that the identity of its scribe remains to be decided.

### III

W. Kroll published at the close of the second volume of his edition of Proclus, *In Rempublicam*<sup>19</sup> the scholia written in the first hand (or a hand indistinguishable therefrom) in *Laurentianus* 80.9 and *Vaticanus gr.* 2197. However, on fol. 14 verso of the latter ms Kroll has missed an important scholion dealing with the subject of 'astral bodies',<sup>20</sup> which although it appears in Pitra's obsolete edition of the *In Rempublicam*,<sup>21</sup> it may be of value to repeat here. The scholion (ad *In Remp.* 2.166.23–167.2 Kroll, concerning the manner in which souls communicate) reads as follows:

καὶ μᾶλλον εἰκὸς ἦν γίνεσθαι ταῦτα κατὰ τὰ πνευματικὰ ὀχήματα ἢ περ κατὰ τὰ αὐγοειδῆ· ταῦτα γὰρ ἄτε γενητὰ ὄντα καὶ εὐπλαστα καὶ μορφοῦσθαι διαφόρως καὶ κινεῖσθαι κατὰ τὰς φαντασίας τῶν ψυχῶν δυνατὸν ὥστε καὶ τὸν ἀέρα πλήττειν.

Though inspired by Proclus,<sup>22</sup> there is nothing in the content of the scholion to identify the author as necessarily pagan or Christian. In estimating its antiquity it is worth bearing in mind that nowhere in the scholia edited by Kroll is there any indication of specifically Christian influence. Moreover the scholia not only evince a consistently high level of scholarship, but also show familiarity with a wide range of writings no longer extant.

Thus, when at *In Remp.* 1.37.23f K. Proclus writes *Ἐῖρηται μὲν οὖν διὰ πλειόνων ἐν ἄλλοις περὶ τούτων* (i.e., *inter alia* the nature of evil), the scholiast (*Laurentianus* 80.9, fol.22 verso) is able to refer not only to Proclus' *De malorum subsistentia* but also to his lost commentaries on the Speech of Diotima, on the *Theaetetus* and on Plotinus (*In Remp.* 2.371.12ff K.):<sup>23</sup>

<sup>19</sup> *Procli in Rempublicam* II (Leipzig 1901) 369ff.

<sup>20</sup> On which see E. R. Dodds, *Proclus: The Elements of Theology* (Oxford 1933; repr. 1963) 313ff (App. II: "The Astral Body in Neoplatonism").

<sup>21</sup> *op.cit.* (*supra* n.8) II 35 n.1.

<sup>22</sup> On the doctrine of the two ὀχήματα, which can be traced back no further than to Syrianus, cf. Dodds, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.20) 320f.

<sup>23</sup> On these commentaries see R. Beutler, *RE* 23 (1957) 197–98 s.v. PROKLOS 4.

τὸ μὲν ἐν τῷ περὶ τῆς τῶν κακῶν ὑποστάσεως μονοβίβλω·	ᾱ
τὸ δὲ ἐν τοῖς εἰς τὸν λόγον τῆς Διοτίμας.	β
περὶ τῆς τῶν κακῶν ὑποστάσεως εἴρηται ἐν τοῖς εἰς Θεαίτητον, Ἄλλ'	
οὔτε ἀπολέσθαι τὰ κακὰ δυνατόν (Theat. 176A5).	γ
καὶ ἐν τοῖς εἰς τὴν τρίτην ἐννεάδα, πόθεν τὰ κακά.	δ

P. Henry and H.-R. Schwyzer in their edition have assumed that the latter reference is to *Enn.* 1.8 [51] *Περὶ τοῦ τίνα καὶ πόθεν τὰ κακά*.<sup>24</sup> It may well be, however, as Beutler supposes,<sup>25</sup> that the scholiast's reference εἰς τὴν τρίτην ἐννεάδα is not mistaken. We know from another source that Proclus commented upon Plotinus' *Περὶ προνοίας* (*Enn.* 3.2–3 [47–48]),<sup>26</sup> and the question πόθεν τὰ κακά; looms large in any discussion of *πρόνοια* including that of Plotinus.

Moreover, like Simplicius, who is apparently able to quote from the work (cf. *In Phys.* p.611.10ff Diels), our scholiast is conversant with the views expressed by Proclus ἐν τοῖς περὶ τόπου<sup>27</sup> (*In Remp.* 2.380.29ff K.= *Vaticanus* gr. 2197, fol.136 *recto*), and like Proclus himself and Olympiodorus he finds it natural to refer, evidently at first hand, to the views expressed in the lost writings of the otherwise unknown Platonist Paterios<sup>28</sup> (*In Remp.* 2.380.24ff K.= *Vaticanus* gr. 2197, fol.126 *recto*). It seems, however, that he did not have access to Proclus' Commentary on the *Phaedrus*,<sup>29</sup> since on fol.169 *verso* of the *Vaticanus* we find the remark (*In Remp.* 2.382.21f K.): ζητητέον σοι τὰ εἰς τὸν Φαῖδρον τοῦ Πλάτωνος Πρόκλου σχόλια. It was the view of Kroll that the scholia were not much younger than the text itself,<sup>30</sup> and in the case of Proclus, *In Timaeum* it seems more than likely that some of the scholia go

<sup>24</sup> *Plotini opera*, edd. P. Henry and H.-R. Schwyzer, I (Paris 1951) p.121.

<sup>25</sup> *op.cit.* (*supra* n.23) 198.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. *Cat.Cod.Astr.* V 1, p.189.28 (ὁ δὲ γε θεῖος Πρόκλος ὑπομνηματίζων τὰ Περὶ προνοίας Πλωτίνου), to which Henry and Schwyzer (*op.cit.* [*supra* n.24] 267) and Beutler (*loc.cit.*) draw attention.

<sup>27</sup> On which see Beutler, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.23) 201.

<sup>28</sup> On Paterios see Beutler, *RE* 18 (1949) 2562f, and A. J. Festugière, *Proclus: Commentaire sur la République III* (Paris 1970) 78 n.3. It is particularly interesting that Paterios appears not only in the text of the Olympiodorian *In Phaed.* (pp.85.1, 104.21, and 113.5 and 12 Norvin) but also twice in the scholia thereto in *Marcianus* gr. 196 (cf. pp.104 and 124 Norvin). See further Beutler, "Zu Paterios," *Hermes* 78 (1943) 106ff.

<sup>29</sup> On which see Beutler, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.23) 196.

<sup>30</sup> *op.cit.* (*supra* n.19) II iii: "A Proclo enim ipso ut opinor editae [sc. commentationes ad Platonis rem publicam pertinentes] in coetu Platonico adservatae et paulo post scholiis nonnullis doctissimis instructae sunt."

back to Simplicius.<sup>31</sup> There is good reason to suppose that the scholia in the first hand in *Laurentianus* 80.9 and *Vaticanus* gr. 2197 are no less ancient.

A further omission from Kroll's edition of the scholia in the first hand in these two mss is the result of Kroll's inadvertent insertion of the scholion in question into the body of the text. On fol.87 *recto* of the *Vaticanus* the scribe has written in the margin (*In Remp.* 2.265.16f K.) *καφηνίζει τοῦτο ἐξηγούμενος τὸ πρῶτος δὲ ὁ λαχὼν πρῶτος αἰρείσθω βίον* (*Rep.* 617E2). Kroll is clearly in error in inserting these words into the text. They constitute a scholion upon the adjacent text (*In Remp.* 2.265.4ff K.), and the subject of *καφηνίζει* is Proclus.<sup>32</sup>

MEMORIAL UNIVERSITY OF NEWFOUNDLAND  
and UNIVERSITETET I BERGEN  
April, 1973

<sup>31</sup> Cf. *Proclus: Théologie Platonicienne*, edd. H. D. Saffrey and L. G. Westerink, I (Paris 1968) pp. clii f.

<sup>32</sup> Festugière, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.28) 224, manages to translate Kroll's version of the text by supposing that *προφήτης* be understood as the subject of *καφηνίζει*.

For the support of my research I am indebted to the Canada Council.