

PROCLUS' ATTITUDE TO THEURGY*

I. INTRODUCTION

Theurgy, the religious magic practised by the later Neoplatonists, has been commonly regarded as the point at which Neoplatonism degenerates into magic, superstition and irrationalism.¹ A superficial glance at the ancient lives of the Neoplatonists, and in particular at Eunapius' *Lives of the Sophists*, reveals a group of people interested in animating statues, favoured with visions of gods and demons, and skilled in rain-making. But when we look more closely at the works of the Neoplatonists themselves, rather than the stories biographers tell about them, we find a considerable diversity of attitudes towards theurgy and a number of attempts to fit theurgy into their philosophical system.

Porphyry is the first Neoplatonist to show any acquaintance with the *Chaldaean Oracles*, the writings upon which theurgy is based as a religion is based on its sacred text,² and theurgy first becomes really important in Neoplatonism with Iamblichus' *De mysteriis*, where it is apparently advocated as a means of achieving union with the gods. Iamblichus marks a significant turning-point in many areas of Neoplatonic thought, and it is still a common view that with his advocacy of theurgy a decline sets in and the rational basis of Plotinian mysticism is abandoned.³ This view finds support in one of the most commonly quoted pieces of ancient evidence about theurgy and Neoplatonism, a passage in Damascius' commentary on the *Phaedo*:⁴ οἱ μὲν τὴν φιλοσοφίαν προτιμῶσιν, ὡς Πορφύριος καὶ Πλωτῖνος καὶ ἄλλοι πολλοὶ φιλόσοφοι· οἱ δὲ τὴν ἱερατικὴν, ὡς Ἰάμβλῑχος καὶ Συριανὸς καὶ Πρόκλος καὶ οἱ ἱερατικοὶ πάντες. 'Some honour philosophy more highly, as do Porphyry and Plotinus and

* This paper expands and, I hope, corrects the views I sketched in *Studies on the 5th and 6th essays of Proclus' Commentary on the Republic* (Hypomnemata 61, Göttingen 1980), pp. 150–5. An earlier version of it was read to the Northern Association for Ancient Philosophy in April 1979. I am grateful for the comments of all those who took part in the discussion on that occasion, particularly Professor A. C. Lloyd and Dr Andrew Smith. I am also very grateful to Professor Lloyd for further discussion in correspondence.

¹ Thus, e.g., E. R. Dodds, *The Greeks and the Irrational* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1951) describes Iamblichus' *De mysteriis* as 'a manifesto of irrationalism' (p. 287) and theurgy itself as 'the refuge of a despairing intelligentsia which already felt *la fascination de l'abîme*' (p. 288); E. Wind, *Pagan Mysteries in the Renaissance*² (London, 1968) describes ancient theurgy as 'bewitching hocus-pocus' and its practitioners as 'solemn triflers' (p. 6).

² In linking theurgy closely with the *Chaldaean Oracles* I follow Dodds, *op. cit.* pp. 283 ff. For a different view see P. Boyancé, 'Théurgie et téléstique néoplatoniciennes', *RHR* 147 (1955), 189–209.

³ This is essentially Dodds' view (cf. n. 1 above), still espoused by, e.g., G. W. Bowersock, *Julian the Apostate* (London, 1978), pp. 28–9 and 86. Similarly Robert Browning, *The Emperor Julian* (London, 1975), p. 55 describes as 'rather old-fashioned' the Neoplatonism of Eusebius of Myndus, who did not hold with theurgy: see further below, p. 214. For the rational basis of Plotinian mysticism, see Dodds, *Pagan and Christian in an Age of Anxiety* (Cambridge, 1965), pp. 86 ff. and R. Arnou, *Le désir de Dieu dans la philosophie de Plotin*² (Rome, 1967), pp. 260 ff.

⁴ This commentary was for a long time ascribed to Olympiodorus, but L. G. Westerink has shown that it is the work of Damascius: see his *Damascius. Lectures on the Philebus, wrongly attributed to Olympiodorus* (Amsterdam, 1959), pp. xv–xx. The passage quoted is from Westerink, *The Greek Commentaries on Plato's Phaedo* (Amsterdam, Oxford, New York, 1977), ii I. §172. 1–3 = W. Norvin, *Olympiodori in Platonis Phaedonem commentaria* (Leipzig, 1913, reprinted Hildesheim, 1968), p. 123. 3–6.

many other philosophers; others honour more highly the hieratic art [i.e. theurgy – *ἱερατικὴ* is one of the names for this] as do Iamblichus and Syrianus and Proclus and all the theurgists [hieratists].⁵ I shall not attempt to deny that Iamblichus, Syrianus and Proclus all gave theurgy an important role to play in the ascent to union with the gods or with the One, but I do deny that a simple substitution of theurgy for mystical experience based on philosophy was all that was involved.

There have been a number of previous attempts to elucidate more clearly the relationship between theurgy, philosophy and mysticism in the later Neoplatonists, particularly in Proclus. Hans Lewy suggested that for Iamblichus and Proclus theurgy and philosophy were alternative methods of reaching the same goal, union with the gods.⁶ One could proceed either by the 'practical' method of theurgic magic or by the methods of Plotinian mysticism. Both methods could be described as 'theurgy', thus creating a certain confusion. Meanwhile L. J. Rosán suggested that in Proclus there was a distinction between a lower and a higher theurgy.⁷ In Rosán's view the lower theurgy employs the unities found in specific material things of the actual world to stimulate the soul towards its own unity, i.e. the importance of ritual theurgy lies in directing the soul towards the *ἐν τῇς ψυχῇς*, the one within itself, which in later Neoplatonism is thought of as the organ of mystical union.⁸ It is left for the higher theurgy to unite the soul with the transcendent One. In the higher theurgy ritual has been abandoned and we are dealing with something purely contemplative. This is really the same distinction as made by Lewy but with the additional suggestion that rather than two parallel ways to union, Proclus envisages ritual theurgy as subordinate to philosophical contemplation. The most recent discussion of this question has been by Andrew Smith.⁹ Smith gives detailed consideration to Iamblichus' view of theurgy and extends his discussion to cover Proclus. Smith too argues for a distinction between a higher and a lower theurgy in both Iamblichus and Proclus, but his distinction is not the same as Rosán's. In his view the lower theurgy is concerned with magical operations in the material world; it is the higher theurgy alone which is concerned with uniting the soul in any way to the divine. He confesses that the role of ritual in what he calls the higher theurgy is not clear but thinks that ritual did have some part to play here. The view that I shall present in this paper grows out of these views of Lewy, Rosán and Smith but differs from all of them. In the course of presenting my own view I shall put forward certain criticisms of Smith in particular.

Rather than looking in the first instance at the passages discussed by Smith, I propose to approach the question from a wider viewpoint and to set out my own view with the texts on which it is based, texts not considered by Smith. I shall then apply this view to some of the passages Smith discusses and hope to show that my view makes

⁵ H. Lewy, *Chaldaean Oracles and Theurgy* (Cairo, 1956; 2nd edn Paris, 1978), pp. 462–3.

⁶ L. J. Rosán, *The Philosophy of Proclus* (New York, 1949), pp. 213 ff.

⁷ On the *ἐν τῇς ψυχῇς* see R. T. Wallis, *Neoplatonism* (London, 1972), p. 153; L. H. Grondijs, *L'âme, le nous et les hénades dans la théologie de Proclus* (Proceedings of the Royal Netherlands Academy N.S. 23. 2, Amsterdam, 1960); W. Beierwaltes, 'Der Begriff des "unum in nobis" bei Proklos', *Miscellanea Medievalia* 2 (Berlin, 1963), 255–66 and *Proklos. Grundzüge seiner Metaphysik* (Frankfurt, 1965), pp. 367–82. Cf. also J. Whittaker's remarks in *De Jamblique à Proclus* (Entretiens Hardt xxi, Vandoeuvres–Geneva, 1974), p. 189.

⁸ A. Smith, *Porphry's Place in the Neoplatonic Tradition* (The Hague, 1974), pp. 111–21. For other discussions see A. J. Festugière, 'Proclus et la religion traditionnelle', *Mélanges Piganiol* 3 (Paris, 1966), pp. 1581–90 and 'Contemplation philosophique et art théurgique chez Proclus', *Studi di storia religiosa della tarda antichità* (Messina, 1968), pp. 7–18, both reprinted in Festugière's *Etudes de philosophie grecque* (Paris, 1971), pp. 575–84 and 585–96 respectively; J. Trouillard, 'Le merveilleux dans la vie et la pensée de Proclus', *RPhilos* 163 (1973), 439–52.

better sense of them than his does. I shall be concerned with Proclus and to some extent with Syrianus, not with Iamblichus. The distinction which Smith draws between higher and lower theurgy applies better to Iamblichus than it does to Proclus, and in dealing with the latter he is rather too ready to assume that his view will be essentially the same as Iamblichus'. Although Proclus and Iamblichus belong to the same current of Neoplatonism they deserve separate treatment, not only because of differences in their thought but also because the types of evidence available for their views are so different. For Iamblichus we have to pick our way between his few surviving works, the principal one of which, the *De mysteriis*, is religious rather than philosophical, and such fragmentary reports of his philosophical views as can be gleaned from his successors. For Proclus we have a wider range of secure evidence, all of it from philosophical work and most of it in one way or another exegesis of Plato.

II. THE EVIDENCE OF HERMIAS

We saw that Damascius lumps together Iamblichus, Syrianus, Proclus and 'all the theurgists' (οἱ ἱερατικοὶ πάντες) in a way which suggests that all the Neoplatonists after Iamblichus were equally committed to theurgy. There is however some evidence that attitudes were more varied than Damascius' comment has often led scholars to suppose. A passage in Eunapius' *Lives of the Sophists* 7. 2 indicates a divergence of views among the pupils of Iamblichus' pupil, Aedesius.⁹ Apparently Eusebius of Myndus disapproved of theurgy while Chrysanthius and Maximus made striking and 'theatrical' use of it: the future emperor Julian was more attracted by the magic of Chrysanthius and Maximus than by the solemn warnings of Eusebius.¹⁰ Similarly the fifth-century Neoplatonist Hermias, in his commentary on the *Phaedrus*, records the opinion of 'certain people' (τινές) that τελεστική, another of the Neoplatonic names for theurgy, was effective only in the area beneath the moon, i.e. only in the natural world.¹¹ It is of course possible that he has Plotinus and Porphyry in mind here, since they thought such efficacy as magic possessed was to be attributed to the force of sympathy within the natural world.¹² It is however equally possible that he is thinking of people like Eusebius of Myndus or even of contemporaries of his own.

Study of Hermias' discussions of theurgy in fact throws very considerable light on attitudes in the fifth-century Neoplatonic school. Hermias was a contemporary of Proclus and, like him, a pupil of Syrianus. It has been established with reasonable certainty that Hermias' commentary on the *Phaedrus* is largely a report of Syrianus' lectures on that dialogue.¹³ This means that we can treat Hermias as evidence for the views of Syrianus. Proclus in his turn took over much of Syrianus' teaching, as he freely acknowledges in many places, and we can to some extent use Hermias' work to

⁹ P. 43. 5 ff. Giangrande.

¹⁰ cf. Dodds, *The Greeks and the Irrational*, p. 288; Smith, op. cit. pp. 143–4; also my *Studies on the 5th and 6th essays of Proclus' Commentary on the Republic*, p. 154.

¹¹ 86. 22 ff. All Hermias references are to page and line of the edition by P. Couvreur, *Hermias Alexandrinus. In Platonis Phaedrum scholia* (Paris, 1901; 2nd edn Hildesheim–New York, 1971).

¹² For Plotinus' view see *Enn.* 4. 4. 40 ff. and *Enn.* 2. 3. Porphyry's attitude is less clear, but the fragments of the *Letter to Anebo* and the *De regressu animae* suggest that fundamentally he agreed with Plotinus; for a recent discussion of Porphyry on theurgy see Smith, op. cit. pp. 122–41. Iamblichus contrasts sympathy within the natural world with the *φιλία* which links the hypercosmic gods to their creation: see *De myst.* 5. 7 and 9–10 and Smith, op. cit. p. 93.

¹³ See K. Praechter's RE article on Hermias (13) and P. A. Bielmeier, *Die neuplatonische Phaidrosinterpretation* (Paderborn, 1930).

illuminate the context within which Proclus was thinking.¹⁴ Hermias' commentary includes an important discussion of the four *μανίαι* of *Phaedrus* 244 ff. The second madness concerned with purifications and rites he calls *τελεστική μανία* and associates with theurgy. He discusses *ἐνθουσιασμός* in connection with the *μανίαι* at some length, and regards the fourth and highest madness, *ἐρωτική μανία*, as the madness which brings about a mystical union between the 'one in the soul' and the highest gods (84. 18 ff.). There is also some discussion of theurgy at other points in his commentary.

It is in the course of this discussion of the four *maniai* that Hermias reports the view of those who think that theurgy does not operate beyond the moon. He reports this as a view with which he disagrees, but the reason for his disagreement is interesting. He argues that these people are wrong because there are souls which dwell above the moon, i.e. he seems in this passage to be regarding theurgy as operating within the realm of souls. This would mean that it operates over a wider sphere than that of sympathy within the natural world, but it would not necessarily mean that theurgy extended over the whole realm of Neoplatonic metaphysics, for in that metaphysics above the level of Soul there are two further hypostases, the level of Mind and the level of the One.

Hermias' further discussion of the four *maniai* supports the idea that he thinks the power of theurgy does not extend beyond a certain point. In 89. 1 ff. he explains that each *mania* unifies the soul at one particular level: progression through the four of them is a gradual progression towards mystical union. Here he places *ποιητική μανία*, poetic inspiration, lowest, as drawing the discordant parts of the soul together at its own level (89. 20–2); theurgy, telestic madness, comes second and is said to unify the soul at the level of Mind, making it intellectually active (*νοερώς ἐνεργεῖν*) (89. 22–31); prophetic madness then brings the soul to the level of the one within itself (89. 31–3); finally *ἐρωτική μανία* joins (*συνάπτει*) the 'one in the soul' to the gods and to intelligible beauty (90. 1–2). This passage implies that of the four *maniai* only *ἐρωτική μανία* could be regarded as bringing about a mystical experience of the Plotinian kind.¹⁵ Theurgy is simply an aid along the way, at a lower level. The same point, about the ranking of the four *maniai*, is made again at 90. 16 ff. Hermias describes this

¹⁴ I do not mean to suggest that Proclus invariably agrees with Syrianus or that his views will always coincide exactly with those presented by Hermias. On the intellectual relationships between Proclus, Syrianus and Hermias see E. R. Dodds, *Proclus. The Elements of Theology*² (Oxford, 1963), pp. xxiii–xxv; E. Zeller, *Die Philosophie der Griechen*³ (Leipzig, 1903), iii. 2, pp. 818 ff., esp. p. 833 and pp. 890–92; and my *Studies on the 5th and 6th essays of Proclus' Commentary on the Republic* ch. 2, esp. pp. 39–42 and 92–103.

¹⁵ It may be doubted whether even Hermias' *ἐρωτική μανία* brings about an experience which is really 'of the Plotinian kind'. 'Joining to the gods and to intelligible beauty' suggests only participation in the intelligible order and in the divine henads, not a Plotinian union with the One itself. Cf. 86. 5 and 87. 20, where Hermias refers to 'gods' in the plural. Hermias accepts the view of Iamblichus that the *skopos* of the *Phaedrus* is *τὸ παντοδαπὸν καλόν* and argues against those who say the dialogue is *περὶ τὰ γαθοῦ* (see 8. 30–9. 10 and 11. 8–12. 5); it would therefore be inconsistent for him to interpret *ἐρωτική μανία* as full union with the One. Proclus himself seems to vacillate between talking only of participation in the First Hypostasis (e.g. *In Alc.* 247) and saying explicitly that the flower of our soul can be joined to the One (e.g. *De phil. chald.* fr. 4; *In Parm.* 1046. 4–13 Cousin). The change from Plotinus' One to a First Hypostasis which includes the divine henads and can be represented by them may help to explain the apparent lack of consistency here. I use the term 'mystical union' in this paper rather loosely to cover any kind of experience of the First Hypostasis, leaving unresolved the question of just how far into the First Hypostasis Syrianus, Hermias or Proclus thought that one could go. I am grateful to Professor A. C. Lloyd for sharpening my awareness of this problem and for drawing my attention to relevant texts.

ordering as corresponding to the ordering of the *maniai* ἔνδον ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ψυχῇ, 'within the soul itself' (91. 16–17; cf. 89. 1–6). He goes on to describe the eternal effects of the *maniai*, τὰς ἐκτὸς αὐτῶν εἰς τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐνεργείας καὶ ἃ ἀποτελοῦσιν ἕξω περὶ ἡμᾶς, 'their external effects on man and what they do to us on the outside' (91. 17–18). This time he describes telestic madness as having a purifying and healing effect on body and soul alike (91. 22–6). This brings it close to the *mania* of *Phaedrus* 244e, which employs purifications and rites, and does not tell us very much about Hermias' view of the effects of theurgy. At this point he is trying to show us how his interpretation is in line with Plato rather than to give us information about actual Neoplatonic rituals.

Towards the end of Hermias' discussion of the *maniai* there is a further passage about theurgy. One of the indications that Hermias' work is based on notes of Syrianus' lectures is the occasional passages where a discussion between the master and ὁ ἐταῖρος Πρόκλος is recorded, and one of these occurs in 92. 6 ff. There we find that Proclus asked Syrianus a couple of questions. The second of these concerned the relationship of τελεστική μανία to μαντική and ἐρωτική μανία:

πὼς δέ, φησί, τὴν τελεστικὴν αἰεὶ προτάττοντες πασῶν τῶν παρ' ἡμῖν ἐπιτηδεύσεων, καὶ αὐτῆς <τῆς> φιλοσοφίας τῆς ἀνθρωπικῆς ὑπερτέραν αὐτὴν λέγοντες, νῦν καὶ μαντικῆς καὶ ἐρωτικῆς ποιούμεν καταδεεστέραν;

'How can it be, he said, that although we are always ranking telestic above all our other practices and saying that it is superior to human philosophy itself, we are now making it less powerful than prophetic and erotic madness?' (92. 10–13).

Syrianus' reply to Proclus' question, as reported by Hermias, is not easy to follow, perhaps just because Syrianus was aware of an uncomfortable contradiction between his interpretation of the *Phaedrus* and the high esteem in which he and his followers were accustomed to hold theurgy *in some sense of that word*. His reply (92. 13–27) seems to consist of two rather different suggestions. First he says that theurgy is placed first 'in the affairs of human life' (ἐν τοῖς τοῦ ἀνθρωπίνου βίου πράγμασιν) but not 'in the affairs of the soul taken by itself' (ἐν τοῖς τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτῆς καθ' αὐτήν). This would fit in with the role of τελεστική μανία as expounded by Hermias in the preceding passage and would suggest a distinction between ritual theurgy as employed in human life, where it was of the highest importance, and ritual theurgy in the ascent towards the divine, where it was no more than a stage along the way. But Proclus was a persistent student and was not satisfied with this answer. I take it that a further objection by Proclus follows in the words,

Ἄλλὰ διὰ τί μὴ ὡς ἔνδον ἔχει, οὕτω καὶ ἕξω; καὶ γὰρ ἐλέγομεν εἶναι ἀναλογίαν τοῖς ἔνδον πρὸς τὰ ἕξω.

'But why are external things not the same as internal things? For we did say that there was an analogy between internal and external things' (92. 15–16). In answer to this Syrianus tries a rather different tack. His second answer runs as follows:

*Ἡ ἔστι μὲν ὅπῃ ἔχει τὴν πρὸς τὰ ἔνδον ἀναλογίαν, ἔστι δὲ ὅπῃ οὐκ ἔχει. Προτάττεται μὲν γὰρ πασῶν τῶν ἄλλων ἢ τελεστικῇ, ὅτι δὴ καὶ τὰς ἄλλας πάσας συλλαβοῦσα ἔχει (καὶ γὰρ θεολογίαν καὶ φιλοσοφίαν σύμπασαν καὶ ἐρωτικὴν μέντοι· δεῖ γὰρ αὐτὴν σφόδρα ἐρωτικῶς ἐξῆφθαι αὐτῶν, ἵνα καὶ κατορθωθῇ), τὴν μέντοι ἐρωτικὴν τὴν ἕξω μόνην καθ' αὐτὴν ἀποδιαλαβόντες οὕτω θεωροῦμεν, καὶ ταύτη φαίνεται ἡμῖν καταδεεστέρα τῆς τελεστικῆς. Τῆς τελεστικῆς οὖν ἐὰν ἀποδιαλάβῃς τὰς ἄλλας, πολὺ αὐτὰς καταδεεστέρας αὐτῆς ὄψει.

'In some respects there is an analogy with internal things but in other respects there is not. For telestic madness is ranked above all the others inasmuch as it gathers all the others together and possesses them (that is, theology and all philosophy and indeed

erotic madness; for it must have taken hold of them with the full force of erotic in order actually to go right). But if we separate off external erotic madness alone by itself, we look at it in this way [i.e. from an external point of view] and from this point of view it seems to us less powerful than telestic [i.e. external telestic]. So if you separate off the others from telestic, you will see that they are far less powerful than it' (92. 16–24).

After pointing out that analogies do not have to apply in absolutely all respects, Syrianus here distinguishes in a new way between the roles of theurgy externally and internally. He now says that there is a sense in which theurgy gathers all the other *maniai* together (τὰς ἄλλας πάσας συλλαβοῦσα)¹⁶ but this is really a sense in which all the *maniai* need each other: theurgy must have taken hold of the others ἐρωτικῶς. Externally ('in the affairs of human life') it remains the case that ἐρωτικὴ μανία is weaker than theurgy. This is a different distinction from that between 'external' and 'internal' theurgy made by Hermias earlier, for in the earlier passages (89. 1–90. 2 and 90. 16 ff.) 'internal' theurgy is inferior to ἐρωτικὴ μανία and unifies the soul at the level of Mind only, making it intellectually active. The new 'internal' theurgy is superior to any one *mania* taken on its own as it involves all the *maniai* together. In introducing this notion Syrianus is moving towards the concept of a theurgy which does have the full power to bring about mystical union. This theurgy is not only a matter of ritual – if indeed it involves ritual at all – for the other *maniai*, which do not involve ritual, are bound up with it. If my interpretation of this passage is correct, then Syrianus' two answers to Proclus' objections, taken together, seem to imply not two but three levels of theurgy: first, a theurgy which concerns itself with 'the affairs of human life'; secondly, a theurgy which makes the soul intellectually active; and finally, a theurgy which involves all the other *maniai* as well, which really does bring about mystical union. It is this third kind of theurgy which is apparently meant when theurgy is praised extravagantly as superior to all other practices and activities, even to 'human philosophy'. Which of these theurgies involves ritual? The first two probably do, though it is not clearly explained just what the rituals of the second type are – purificatory rites perhaps?¹⁷ The third theurgy sounds like a new idea altogether and there is no obvious place for rituals in it.

At 96. 2–8 Hermias refers again to the distinction between 'internal' and 'external' theurgy, reverting here to the distinction in his main discussion, rather than picking up the new distinctions made by Syrianus in reply to Proclus' questions. This time he says,

ἡ ἐνδον τελεστική τελείαν ἡμῖν ἐποίει τὴν ψυχὴν καὶ ὁλόκληρον, ὥστε κατὰ πάσας τὰς δυνάμεις αὐτὴν ἐνεργεῖν.

'Internal theurgy made our soul perfect and complete, so that it acted according to all its powers.' This is another reference to the ability of theurgy to make the soul intellectually active (notice ἐνεργεῖν); mystical union is not implied here. External theurgy in this passage is clearly theurgy which facilitates the affairs of human life:

ἢ'... οὕτω δὲ καὶ ἡ ἕξω τελεστική, ἀπαλλάττουσα ἡμῶν τὴν ψυχὴν καὶ τὸ σῶμα καὶ τὰ ἐκτὸς τῶν ἐνοχλοῦντων δυσχερῶν εὐροῖαν ἡμῖν καὶ εὐδαιμονίαν παρασκευάζει κατὰ τὸν βίον.

'so that... in this way too external theurgy, freeing our soul and body and external possessions from troubling difficulties, furnishes us with a smooth and happy passage

¹⁶ This use of συλλαβοῦσα echoes Plato, *Grg.* 456a. Cf. also Iamblichus, *De myst.* 4. 2, p. 183. 7 Parthey.

¹⁷ cf. 97. 23–5, discussed below, p. 218.

through life.' On the other hand 97. 23–5 suggests again the new, third sense of theurgy as accomplishing mystical union. In this passage Hermias tries to account for Plato's mention in *Phaedrus* 244e of both purifications (καθαρμοί) and rites (τελεταί):

καλῶς δὲ προέταξε τοὺς καθαρμοὺς τῶν τελετῶν· οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἀπαλλάττουσιν ἡμᾶς τῶν ἀλλοτρίων, αἱ δὲ τελεταί λοιπὸν ἐνιδρύουσι καὶ θεοῖς.

'He has done well in placing purifications before rites; for purifications free us from things which do not belong to our true selves, and rites then set us actually among the gods.'¹⁸

The theurgy concerned with the affairs of human life is effectively white magic, what Smith has picked out as lower theurgy concerned only with magical operations in the material world. It is mentioned again by Hermias in 99. 9–20 and 165. 9 ff. In these passages Hermias follows up Plato's distinction between two kinds of prophecy and two kinds of poetry, the inspired and the merely skilled (τεχνική), to make a parallel distinction between two kinds of τελεστική. The merely skilled τελεστική is described in a way which suggests white magic, and Hermias remarks that there is a lot of it about:

ἀνθρωπικὴ καὶ τεχνικὴ τελεστική, οἷα χρῶνται καὶ οἱ ἱερεῖς περὶ τὰς θεραπέας τῶν ἀγαλμάτων νόμῳ πόλεως καὶ κατὰ τὰ οἰκεία πάτρια· καὶ αἱ ἐπωδαὶ δὲ καὶ αἱ διὰ βοτάνων ἢ λίθων θεραπέαι εἴησαν ἀν τῆς τεχνικῆς τελεστικῆς. Ἡ οὖν ὡς σαφὲς παρήκε· πολὺ γὰρ τοῦτο ἐν ταῖς πόλεσιν, ἢ ὡς μηδὲν μέγα ἀνύουσαν, ἢ εἰ καὶ ἀνύει κατὰ τὸν ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἐνθουσιασμόν ἀνύει.

'human and merely skilled telestic, such as priests also use in the cults of statues by the law of the city and according to their native customs; and incantations and cults involving plants and stones would belong to merely skilled telestic. So either he [Plato] passed it over as obvious; for there is a lot of this in the cities; or he passed it over as not achieving anything much, or even if it does achieve anything, it does so because of the original inspiration [i.e. because of inspired telestic]' (99. 14–19). Similarly in the passage on p. 165:

τὸν τεχνικὸν τοῦτον καὶ ἱερατικόν, ὃς διὰ θυσιῶν καὶ εὐχῶν ἐπικουρίαν τινὰ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις πορίζει.

'this [life] which is merely skilled and hieratic, which brings a certain help to men by means of sacrifices and prayers' (165. 14–15). Inspired telestic here covers Hermias' original internal theurgy, and perhaps also the theurgy which brings about mystical union. Hermias discusses it no further in detail.

III. THE EVIDENCE OF PROCLUS' OWN WORKS

I turn now to Proclus' own references to theurgy. I cannot hope to cover all of them but I shall discuss some of the most striking. I begin with an important passage from the *Platonic Theology* 1. 25.¹⁹ Here Proclus says that there are three characteristics which permeate the divine realm, goodness, wisdom and beauty. Correspondingly there are three characteristics which draw together the entities filled with the first three qualities, and these are faith (πίστις), truth (ἀλήθεια) and love (ἔρως). The triad

¹⁸ Couvreur's comma before καὶ cannot be right; for the phrase ἐνιδρύειν τοῖς θεοῖς cf. Iamblichus, *De myst.* 5. 26, p. 238. 5 Parthey; Proclus, *In Tim.* i. 211. 8 Diehl; Hermias, 156. 18; etc. Hermias uses the word τελεταί here because Plato uses it; it is not enough in itself to prove that the third level of theurgy involved ritual.

¹⁹ pp. 112. 25–113. 10 Saffrey–Westerkink.

πίστις, ἀλήθεια, ἔρως is a frequent one in Proclus and has been considerably discussed.²⁰ In this passage there is a precise correspondence between the two groups of three: faith gives contact with divine goodness; wisdom contact with divine truth; and love (as in Plato's *Symposium* and *Phaedrus*) gives contact with divine beauty. Proclus goes on:

Σώζεται δὲ πάντα διὰ τούτων καὶ συνάπτεται ταῖς πρωτουργοῖς αἰτίαις, τὰ μὲν διὰ τῆς ἐρωτικῆς μανίας, τὰ δὲ διὰ τῆς θείας φιλοσοφίας, τὰ δὲ διὰ τῆς θεουργικῆς δυνάμεως, ἡ κρείττων ἐστὶν ἀπάσης ἀνθρωπίνης σωφροσύνης καὶ ἐπιστήμης, συλλαβοῦσα τὰ τε τῆς μαντικῆς ἀγαθὰ καὶ τὰς τῆς τελεσιουργικῆς καθαρτικὰς δυνάμεις καὶ πάντα ἀπλῶς τὰ τῆς ἐνθέου κατακωχῆς ἐνεργήματα.

'Everything is saved by these means and joined to the original causes, some things through erotic madness, others through divine philosophy, others again through theurgic power, which is greater than all human temperance and knowledge, gathering together the benefits of prophecy and the purifying forces of effective ritual and absolutely all the activities of divine inspiration.' This sounds like an unequivocal promoting of theurgy to the highest possible role, and it is so taken by Saffrey and Westerink, who in their note on this passage make the comment, 'Affirmation catégorique de la supériorité de la théurgie sur la connaissance rationnelle.' Smith accordingly makes this passage the starting-point for his discussion of Proclus' attitude to theurgy, and eventually concludes that Proclus is here talking about 'higher theurgy'; he takes the reference to ἐνεργήματα as indicating that rites may be involved even in 'higher theurgy'.²¹ What Smith has apparently not seen, and Saffrey and Westerink may have seen but have failed to draw attention to, is the link between this passage of Proclus and Plato's *Phaedrus*. Chs. 22–5 of Book I of the *PT* are as a whole concerned with divine attributes drawn from the *Phaedrus*, and Proclus' description of theurgy as συλλαβοῦσα τὰ τε τῆς μαντικῆς ἀγαθὰ καὶ τὰς τῆς τελεσιουργικῆς καθαρτικὰς δυνάμεις καὶ πάντα ἀπλῶς τὰ τῆς ἐνθέου κατακωχῆς ἐνεργήματα recalls the four inspired *maniai* of *Phaedrus* 244 ff. τὰ τῆς μαντικῆς ἀγαθὰ echoes Plato's talk of prophetic madness, and τὰς τῆς τελεσιουργικῆς καθαρτικὰς δυνάμεις picks up his talk of the madness which employs purifications and rites (*καθαρμῶν τε καὶ τελετῶν τυχοῦσα*). The mention of ἐνεργήματα is thus nothing to do with theurgic rites. It is simply a reference to the activities of divine inspiration as described by Plato. The reference earlier in the passage to ἐρωτικὴ μανία is of course another reference to *Phaedrus* 244 ff. Proclus lists here three ways of ascending to the divine which are to be correlated with the three sets of divine attributes mentioned immediately before. ἐρωτικὴ μανία makes possible the ascent through ἔρως to divine beauty; θεία φιλοσοφία makes possible the ascent through ἀλήθεια to divine wisdom; and θεουργικὴ δύναμις makes possible the ascent through πίστις to divine goodness.²²

Just what does Proclus mean here by θεία φιλοσοφία and θεουργικὴ δύναμις, and what is the ἀνθρωπίνη σωφροσύνη καὶ ἐπιστήμη which is inferior to them? The reference to σωφροσύνη recalls the contrast between μανία and σωφροσύνη in *Phaedrus* 244 ff.²³ Moreover this passage does more than echo the *Phaedrus*. It is also reminiscent of Hermias' commentary on the *Phaedrus*, of precisely that passage of Hermias which distinguished three levels of theurgy (92. 6 ff.). In Hermias when

²⁰ See, e.g., Wallis, op. cit. p. 154; J. M. Rist, *Plotinus. The Road to Reality* (Cambridge, 1967), pp. 231–46; Lewy, op. cit. pp. 144–8.

²¹ Saffrey and Westerink's note, *PT* i, p. 161; Smith, op. cit. pp. 111–21.

²² On the connection of πίστις with theurgy in Proclus, see Rist, op. cit. pp. 241 ff.

²³ See esp. 244d, where *divine* madness is contrasted with *human* σωφροσύνη.

Proclus asks his question he refers to their placing theurgy above ἡ φιλοσοφία ἡ ἀνθρωπική; so here theurgy comes above ἀνθρωπίνῃ σωφροσύνῃ καὶ ἐπιστήμῃ. And, in Hermias, Syrianus explains that there is a sense in which theurgy gathers together all the other *maniai*, τὰς ἄλλας πάσας συλλαβοῦσα. The same word, συλλαβοῦσα, is used by Proclus here in the *PT* and again with reference to a theurgy which ‘gathers together’ the *maniai* of the *Phaedrus*. I suggest therefore that the theurgy in question here in Proclus is the same as the theurgy in question in Hermias, i.e. that it is a theurgy which can bring about mystical union, the highest of the three types implied in the Hermias passage. In other words, ἐρωτικὴ μανία, θεία φιλοσοφία and θεουργικὴ δύναμις here really all mean the same thing. They all refer to mystical union. θεία φιλοσοφία, then, is not ordinary philosophy, not ἀνθρωπίνῃ ἐπιστήμῃ, not ‘connaissance rationnelle’. Theurgy too is not ordinary theurgy here; that is left behind as τὰς τῆς τελεσιουργικῆς καθαρτικὰς δυνάμεις. Saffrey and Westerink are too swift in saying that Proclus here affirms the superiority of theurgy to rational knowledge, for they fail to ask in what sense of theurgy he does so. Smith is on the right track in talking of a ‘higher theurgy’, but he has failed to see how the passage arises out of discussion of the *Phaedrus* and so misunderstands details of it.

One might think from what I have said so far that Proclus’ and Syrianus’ application of the term ‘theurgy’ to mystical union was simply an unjustified abuse of the word. If no theurgic rites are clearly involved, why do they call it theurgy at all? To answer this question, we need to consider the theoretical basis of theurgy more closely. We have already seen that for Plotinus the power of magic was to be explained by the force of sympathy within the natural world.²⁴ In later Neoplatonism the whole metaphysical structure of reality was felt to be bound together in a similar way. In Proclus’ metaphysical system everything in both the natural and the intelligible world belongs both to a particular level of being and to a particular ‘chain’ (σειρά or τάξις) by which it is inherently related to other members of the same ‘chain’ on other levels. Thus, to use an example from the fragment of Proclus’ work *On the Hieratic Art*,²⁵ the heliotrope, on the level of plant life, belongs to the same ‘chain’ as the sun, on the level of the heavenly bodies, and the sun, in its turn, is linked to higher realities in that ‘chain’ such as the god Apollo and ultimately the transcendent Good which is the Neoplatonic One. The sun does not merely stand for the Good by analogy, as in Plato’s *Republic*; it is inherently related to it. The theurgist can thus use stones, animals or plants to affect higher entities to which they correspond. Entities on a lower level are described as σύμβολα or συνθήματα of the corresponding items on a higher level, so that the heliotrope is a σύμβολον of the sun, and the sun in turn a σύμβολον of Apollo and of the One. These σύμβολον-relationships not only make theurgy possible but are also fundamental to the structure of Proclus’ metaphysical system.²⁶

We can see Proclus applying the theory behind theurgy to mystical union in his fragmentary commentary on the *Chaldaean Oracles*.²⁷ In fr. 5 Proclus says that every soul is composed of νοεροὶ λόγοι and θεῖα σύμβολα.²⁸ The νοεροὶ λόγοι come from

²⁴ cf. above p. 214 and n. 12.

²⁵ Published by J. Bidez in *Catalogue des manuscrits alchimiques grecs* (Brussels, 1928), vi. 148–51.

²⁶ cf. C. Zintzen, ‘Die Wertung von Mystik und Magie in der neuplatonischen Philosophie’, *RhM* N.F. 108 (1965), 71–100, esp. 93 ff.; Rist, op. cit. pp. 237 ff.; M. Hirschle, *Sprachphilosophie und Namenmagie im Neuplatonismus* (Meisenheim am Glan, 1979), pp. 12 ff.

²⁷ Ed. A. Jahn (Halle, 1891); also ed. E. des Places as appendix 5 of his edition of the *Chaldaean Oracles* (Paris, 1971), pp. 206–12.

²⁸ Reading νοεροὶ with Jahn, not ἑεροὶ with des Places.

the intellectual Forms, the *θεία σύμβολα* from the divine henads. It is the *θεία σύμβολα* which can join the soul to the divine. The divine henads, in Proclus' system, are an extension of the supreme hypostasis, the One. It is they which mediate the One's diffusion into the lower hypostases. The implication of this fragment is that Proclus thinks of the 'one in the soul' as a *σύμβολον* of the First Hypostasis and that it is because of this *σύμβολον*-relationship that mystical union is possible. I would suggest that Proclus re-interpreted the Plotinian mystical experience in terms of the theory behind theurgy. To put it another way, mystical union could be described as a lofty kind of theurgy because turning the 'one in the soul' towards the supreme One was thought of as activating a *σύμβολον* in the direction of what it symbolized. There is no clear indication in Proclus that it was external theurgic rites which were used to activate the 'one in the soul' in this way. The supreme theurgy is also a *θεία φιλοσοφία*, and I see no reason why a Plotinian approach to it should not have been considered possible.²⁹

In the *Commentary on the Cratylus*³⁰ Proclus distinguishes between that point of the intelligible gods (*νοητοὶ θεοί*) where the highest god that can be named is situated, and the higher realms of the intelligible which are unknowable and unnamable. Theurgy, he says, reaches only as far as the former; the latter can be attained by the 'flower of the mind' (*ἄνθος τοῦ νοῦ*).³¹ Smith³² takes the distinction here to be between his higher and lower theurgy, but a more appropriate distinction is between the highest of the three levels implied in Hermias and the second of those levels. It is important to remember in this context that in the late Neoplatonic metaphysical system the second hypostasis, Mind, is subdivided into intelligible (*νοητόν*), intelligible-and-intellectual (*νοητόν καὶ νοερόν*) and intellectual (*νοερόν*). Hermias described the second level of theurgy as concerned with intellectual activity (*νοερώς ἐνεργεῖν*). It looks from Proclus' *Commentary on the Cratylus* as though it can in fact reach as far as the point where the intelligible joins the intelligible-and-intellectual. Beyond that point ritual which uses divine names must be abandoned,³³ and the highest type of theurgy is concerned with the highest of the intelligible gods and with the First Hypostasis.³⁴

Similarly in *Platonic Theology* 4. 9,³⁵ in expounding the procession of souls to the realm above the heavens, the *ὑπερουράνιος τόπος* of *Phaedrus* 247c, Proclus distinguishes between the ascent to the lowest of the intelligible powers, which are the summit of the intellectual (*τὰς...νοητὰς δυνάμεις, τὰς τῶν νοερῶν πάντων ἀκρότητας*) on the one hand, and on the other conjunction (*συναφή*) with the first intelligibles (*τὰ πρῶτα νοητά*) and beyond that union with the intelligible and primary

²⁹ cf. also Proclus, *In Tim.* i. 209. 13 ff. Diehl.

³⁰ 32. 18 ff.; 65. 16 ff. Pasquali. Cf. also 47. 14 ff.

³¹ This term from the *Chaldaean Oracles* is one of Proclus' names for the 'one in the soul'. The idea also has Plotinian roots, for in *Enn.* 5. 5. 8. 22-3 and 6. 9. 3. 26-7 Plotinus talks as if there is a special element within *νοῦς* by which we attain mystical union; cf. also 5. 3. 14. 15 and 6. 7. 35. 19-25, and see further J. M. Rist, 'Mysticism and Transcendence in Later Neoplatonism', *Hermes* 92 (1964), 213-25.

³² op. cit. pp. 111-12.

³³ I doubt that *σημαίνουσι* in *In Crat.* 66. 16 means that some kind of ritual is still admitted at the highest level, as Smith, op. cit. p. 116, n. 9 suggests. Proclus is talking there about mythical accounts of the gods by the *θεόλογοι* (his regular term for Homer and Hesiod), not about theurgy; cf. his treatment of Homeric myths in *In Remp.* i. 69. 23 ff. Kroll.

³⁴ cf. n. 15 above. It is not significant that no mention is made in the *In Crat.* passages of going beyond the intelligible gods, since mention of either the divine henads or the One would not be relevant to the context there.

³⁵ Pp. 192. 31-194. 12 Portus.

causes (ἐνωσις πρὸς τὰς νοητὰς καὶ πρωτουργοὺς αἰτίας). The former is said to be what Plato is describing in the *Phaedrus*, the latter is wrapped in ineffable silence. Theurgy and the theurgic rite of 'immortalization' are mentioned in *PT* 4. 9 only to show that the theurgists and Plato hold the same metaphysical views,³⁶ but the passage does confirm that Proclus saw a significant dividing-line between the lowest intelligibles, closely linked to the intellectual, and the higher intelligibles which lead up to the First Hypostasis.

So much for the higher two types of theurgy. One of the few places where Proclus is mainly concerned with the third and lowest type is the fragment *On the Hieratic Art*, where he gives the clearest and simplest statement of the theory on which theurgy is based, and seems to be talking much more about real magical operations than elsewhere. The highest entities specifically referred to there are the sun and the moon, and Proclus is referring primarily to magic within the physical world, involving the lowest of his orders of gods, the θεοὶ ἐγκόσμιοι who belong to the celestial and sublunary realms.

IV. THE EVIDENCE OF MARINUS

Further evidence for Proclus' use of ritual theurgy at its lowest level, the level at which it was no more than white magic, is provided by Marinus' *Life*. By the nature of the work, Marinus' *Life* is full of just the kind of sensational stories which I mentioned at the beginning of this paper. It is based on a twofold scheme, in part straightforwardly chronological and in part following the traditional Neoplatonic classification of the virtues.³⁷ Marinus sets out to show that Proclus possessed all the Neoplatonic virtues, the physical, the ethical, the purificatory, the theoretical and the theurgic. He also mentions an even higher category of virtues, τὰς δὲ ἔτι ἀνωτέρω τούτων... ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπων ἤδη τεταγμένας, 'those which are still higher than these... which are already beyond the capacity of man' (ch. 3). About these, he says, he will be silent. The classification of virtues is hierarchical, and Proclus is shown progressing in virtue as he gets older.

If we are to regard Marinus as evidence for Proclus' attitude to theurgy we must begin by distinguishing between a number of different ways in which sensational religious marvels crop up in the *Life*. First, Marinus constantly brings in divine signs and divine aid for Proclus. When Proclus was ill as a child he was healed by the god *Telesphoros* (ch. 7); Athene appeared to Proclus and turned him towards philosophy (ch. 9); divine signs and portents greeted Proclus' arrival in Athens (chs. 10 and 11); and so on. Particularly striking is Marinus' treatment of Proclus' enforced departure from Athens for a year in ch. 15. Marinus makes it pretty clear that there were political reasons for this: presumably the Christian authorities took action against the pagan

³⁶ Smith, op. cit. p. 116 does not seem to realize this fully. The closing words of the passage, ἀλλὰ ταῦτα μὲν ἐκ τῆς ἐμῆς πρὸς τὰ τοιαῦτα συμπαθείας μεμήκνυται, 'but this has been said at length because of my sympathy for such things', are not, as Smith thinks, 'an apology for his extended treatment of ritual and the theological elaborations concerned with it' but refer to Proclus' enthusiastic exposition of the glorious vision described in the *Phaedrus*. On the theurgic rite and its significance, see Lewy, op. cit. pp. 205–6.

³⁷ Edition of Marinus by J. F. Boissonade (Leipzig, 1814; reprinted Amsterdam, 1966; also printed in *Procli opera inedita*, ed. V. Cousin (Paris, 1864), pp. 1–66 and in the Didot edition of Diogenes Laertius, ed. C. G. Cobet (Paris, 1878), pp. 151–70). On Marinus' use of the Neoplatonic classification of the virtues, see O. Schissel von Fleschenberg, *Marinos von Neapolis und die neuplatonischen Tugendgrade* (Texte und Forschungen zur byzantinisch-neugriechischen Philologie 8, Athens, 1928).

community of Platonic philosophers in the Academy.³⁸ At the same time he tries to ascribe the whole episode to divine guidance: Proclus' δαιμόνιον really sent him on this journey to give him an opportunity to study the religious rites of Asia. All these claims of divine guidance belong to the genre in which Marinus is writing. They perhaps also represent the kind of legends which would cluster about a famous man even during his lifetime. They tell us nothing at all about Proclus' own views or behaviour.

Secondly, Marinus bears witness to Proclus' omnivorous piety. He went in for sea-bathing as a form of purification and also performed Orphic and Chaldaean purification rites; he purified himself by the rites of the Great Mother, observed the Egyptian holy days, and in general kept the religious holidays of all peoples and of every nation, celebrating them by vigils and hymns rather than idleness and feasting. Marinus recounts all this in chs. 18 and 19 in connection with Proclus' possession of the καθαρτικά ἀρεταί, the purificatory virtues. These virtues are discussed by Plotinus in *Enn.* 1. 2. 3. It is true that Marinus' account suggests Proclus thought religious ritual far more important in purifying the soul than Plotinus thought it, but this still tells us nothing about his attitude to theurgy as such.³⁹

Theurgy really comes in only with a third group of marvels, under the heading of the theurgic virtues, as one might indeed expect. Marinus reaches these in ch. 28 and associates them with Proclus' πρόνοια, his providence, talking about Proclus almost as if he were a god. All this really means, however, is that Proclus used ritual theurgy to help his fellow human beings. It is at this point that we hear how Proclus by his rain-making saved Athens from a drought, or (in ch. 29) how he cured the child Asclepigeneia by praying to Asclepius. This is theurgy as white magic, theurgy 'in the affairs of human life'. It is admittedly remarkable that Proclus should have been regarded by himself and others as a kind of wizard, but there is no suggestion here that he used theurgic rites to induce mystical experience.

Smith claims that Marinus' reference in ch. 3 to even higher, superhuman virtues, above the theurgic virtues, is evidence for 'higher theurgy' and finds another reference to this in the passage at the beginning of ch. 28 where Marinus says that Proclus helped others by his 'providential' theurgy and was not νοῶν μόνον καὶ ἀνατεινόμενος εἰς τὰ κρείττονα, 'only thinking and stretching out towards superior things'.⁴⁰ But that passage simply refers back to the immediately preceding discussion of the theoretical virtues, in which Marinus gives an account of his teacher's scholarly activities. As for the reference in ch. 3 to higher, superhuman virtues, that is picked up in ch. 26, where the theurgic virtues are described as τὰς ἀκροτάτας τῶν ἀρετῶν, ὡς πρὸς ἀνθρωπίνην ψυχὴν, 'the highest of virtues as far as the human soul is concerned'. By superhuman virtues Marinus will be thinking of something like becoming a god. No scale of types of theurgy is implied in Marinus, and he does not attribute any superhuman virtue to Proclus. All he provides is some evidence that Proclus was prepared to use the lowest type, the 'white magic' type. This evidence is in itself interesting since in Proclus' own works there is so little reference to this type of theurgy. I suspect Proclus himself did not reckon it of much importance.

³⁸ cf. A. Cameron, 'The Last Days of the Academy at Athens', *PCPhS* 195, n.s. 15 (1969), 16-17 and 19.

³⁹ There is in any case a conventional element in this description of Proclus' piety: see E. Wind, *Pagan Mysteries in the Renaissance*² (London, 1968), p. 218.

⁴⁰ Smith, *op. cit.* pp. 113-14.

V. CONCLUSION

My main suggestion in this paper has been that Proclus, following Syrianus, used a classification of theurgy into three types, pure ritual 'white magic', theurgy which uses some kind of ritual and raises the soul to the level of the intellectual and to the lowest point of the intelligible, and finally theurgy which is not really ritual at all but brings about a union of the 'one in the soul' with the higher intelligibles and with the First Hypostasis. This classification makes better sense of the diverse evidence than any of the cruder divisions into only two types of theurgy which have previously been proposed.⁴¹ If it is correct, then various conclusions follow: first, even if Proclus was rather good at rain-making this tells us nothing about his view of the way to salvation in mystical union; second, although Proclus gives ritual theurgy an important part to play in the return of the soul to its origins, ritual theurgy is not operative beyond the lowest of the intelligible gods; third, Proclus still thinks of the final union as a 'Plotinian' mystical experience, not as some magically induced trance.⁴² He describes it as a kind of theurgy because its theoretical basis is of the same kind as the theoretical basis of theurgy: the 'one in the soul' is a *σύμβολον* of the transcendent One. Proclus' belief in theurgy remains from our point of view surprising in so rigorous and rational a thinker, but it is not an extraneous bit of superstition grafted on to his outlook. It makes quite good sense in terms of his metaphysics, and he tries to fit it into specific places in his philosophical system.

University of Durham

ANNE SHEPPARD

⁴¹ There is an interesting parallel between the three types of theurgy I am suggesting and Proclus' explicit division of poetry into three types, itself based on a division of three types of life, at *In Remp.* i. 177. 7 ff. Kroll, discussed in my *Studies on the 5th and 6th essays of Proclus' Commentary on the Republic*, pp. 162–202. I am grateful to Professor A. C. Lloyd for drawing this parallel to my attention.

⁴² By "'Plotinian" mystical experience' here I mean an experience of the First Hypostasis achieved by philosophical contemplation. Cf. n. 15 above.