



HOKKAIDO UNIVERSITY

Title	Pico della Mirandora and the Ancient Chaldaean Theology
Author(s)	Ito, H.
Citation	基督教学, 22, 1-29
Issue Date	1987-07-15
Doc URL	https://hdl.handle.net/2115/46460
Type	journal article
File Information	22_1-29.pdf



PICO DELLA MIRANDOLA AND THE ANCIENT CHALDAEAN THEOLOGY

Hiroaki Ito

1 Pico and the Ancient Theology

Giovanni Pico della Mirandola (1463–1494), in the draft of the famous speech on the dignity of man (*Oratio de hominis dignitate*), which was identified and published by Eugenio Garin,¹ firstly argues the dignity and freedom of man, whose nature is indefinite, and nextly praises the moral science, the dialectic, the natural philosophy and the theology, by which man can reach to God.² After these sections, which almost correctly correspond to those of the final-definitive version of *Oratio*, i. e., that published first by his nephew Gian Francesco Pico in the posthumous *Works*,³ the draft, being different from the final-definitive version which goes to the criticism of those who contempt the philosophy, numerates and discusses two things that are useful to study the philosophy.

These, reverend Fathers, are the considerations that have not only inspired but compelled me to the study of philosophy. But I have always thought that two things were especially useful so to follow fully it as to pursue eagerly it. The first thing was to pledge myself to the doctrines of no man, range through all the masters of philosophy, to investigate all books and to come to know all schools. It seems to me that for this work, it was necessary to know not only the Greek and the Latin but also the Hebrew and the Chaldaean, and moreover, the Arabic, at which now I, for the first time, began to sweat under the guide of Mithridates Gulielmo, most experienced teacher of these languages, for all wisdom has flowed from the East to the Greeks and from the Greeks to us. In their way of philosophizing, our Latins have always found it sufficient to stand on the discoveries of foreigners and to perfect the works of others. Certainly, it is necessary to seek the

sacred books and the secret misteries firstly from the Chaldaeans and secondly from the Greeks. The Arabians share the remaining arts and all sorts of philosophies with the Greeks.⁴

On the study of languages of the Hebrew, the Chaldaean and the Arabic, Pico reports in two letters. Firstly, to Andrea Corneo dated from Perugia on the 15th of October in 1486: "...after I did zealously many works by the continuous and indefatigable studies night after night, I learned the Hebrew and the Chaldaean, and now I also apply my mind to conquering the difficulties of the Arabic."⁵ And secondly, to Marsilio Ficino dated from Fratta (on November in 1486?): "After I gave great attention to the Hebrew language, night and day, for a whole month, I entirely devoted myself to the studies of the Arabic and the Chaldaean."⁶ The reason why Pico was eager to learn these languages, as suggested in the draft of *Oratio*, was that the mastering of ancient languages could bring to Pico the most useful method to approach directly the sacred books and the secret mysteries of the ancients. In Pico's chronology of the wisdom, its source was in the East, and all wisdom followed from there to the Greeks and from them to the Latins. And this chronology, as it is well known, is also shared with the members of the Florentine Academy and their successors not only in Italy but also in other European countries. In the fifteenth century in Italy, in addition to Plato and the Neoplatonists or Cicero and other Roman writers, the legendary or semi-legendary sages, i. e., Hermes Trismegistus in the Egypt, Zoroaster in the Chaldea, and Orpheus and Pythagoras in the Greece, were revived as men of the Ancient Wisdom (*prisca sapientia*) or the Ancient Theology (*prisca theologia*), and also, with Pico, the old Judaic tradition, Cabala was acknowledged as the ancient doctrines handed down originally from Moses himself. Their works were supposed very ancient by Renaissance thinkers, but most of which in fact were produced or compiled in the first four centuries of our era.

On the Ancient Theology in the Renaissance, now we have quite a few studies, i. e., those of Kristeller, Garin and Yates on *Hermetica* attributed to Hermes Trismegistus,⁷ of Walker and Buck on *Orphica* attributed to Orpheus,⁸ of Kieszkowski and Dannenfeldt on *Oracula chaldaica* attributed to Zoroaster,⁹ and of Walker and Schmitt on the Ancient Theology in general,¹⁰ etc. And on the Cabala, there are the great contributions of Sholem and Secret¹¹. Speaking of the Ancient Theology in Pico's thought,

in addition to the references in these studies, there are another ones in the books and articles about Pico.¹² In this paper, it is aimed to reconsider the problem of the Ancient Chaldaean Theology in his thought, which does not seem to have been sufficiently examined.

2 Chaldaean Oracles as the Ancient Wisdom

In the final-definitive version of *Oratio*, Pico, using the passages seen in the draft quoted above, answers those who take offence at the great number of his propositions on many philosophers.

What were the gain if only the philosophy of the Latins were investigated, that is, that of Albert, Thomas, Scotus, Aegidius, Francis, and Henry, if the Greek and Arabian philosophers were left out—since all wisdom has flowed from the East to the Greeks and from the Greeks to us? In their way of philosophizing, our Latins have always found it sufficient to stand on the discoveries of foreigners and to perfect the work of others.¹

Pico proposed 900 theses for the public disputation in Rome, in which, in fact, are contained many kinds of ‘conclusions’, not only according to the doctrines of the Latin philosophers and theologians, the Arabians and the Greeks (Peripatetics and Platonists), but also according to the opinions of the Chaldaeans, the ancient doctrines of the Egyptian Hermes Trismegistus and the secret doctrines of the Hebrew Cabalistic sages.² There would have been those who thought that this disputation tended rather to the parade of his talent and the display of his erudition than to the increase of learning, as in the *Oratio* Pico himself spoke of it.³ But, if Pico’s attempt was beyond his power, his intent is fully comprehensible to us, who know the estimation of the Ancient Theology among the Florentine Neoplatonists, whose representative was Marsilio Ficino.

On the beginning of the philosophy among the barbarians and its flowing to the Greek, Diogenes Laertius and Clement of Alexandria had stated.

There are some who say that the study of philosophy had its beginning among the barbarians. They urge that the Persians have had their Magi, the Babylonians or Assyrians their Chaldaeans, and the Indians their Gymnosophists; and among the Celts and Gauls there are the people called Druids or Holy Ones, for which they cite as authorities

the *Magicus* of Aristotle and Sotion in the twenty-third book of his *Succssion of Philosophers*. Also they say that Mochus was a Phoenician, Zamolxis a Thracian, and Atlas a Libyan.⁴

The philosophy, this very useful matter, flourished among the distinguished men of the barbarians. And after it entered into the Greeks, whom had proceeded the Egyptian prophets, the Assyrian Chaldaeans, Gallic Druids, The Bactrian Samanaioi, the Celts who philosophized, the Persian Magians, (...) Indian Gymnasophists and other barbarian philosophers.⁵

The Caldaeans, who are listed in these catalogues of ancient sages and philosophers, are a people of Assyria. In the *Ancient Testments*, they are described as soothsayers of dreams⁶ and Herodotus says that they are priests of God.⁷ In general they are thought to have been the ruling class in Babylonia before the conquest of Persians. They were distinguished for the arts, in particular, the astronomy and astrology and in antiquity the Chaldaean wisdom meant the knowledge of astronomy and astrology.⁸ The works called the *Chaldaean Oracles* are said to be based on divine revelations, and were collected and edited by Julianus at the second half of the 2nd century.⁹ These Oracles present the syncretic amalgam of Platonism, Pythagoreanism, Stoicism and Gnosticism with Persian elements. In their doctrines, the teaching of a sort of theurgy is particularly worth of attention.¹⁰ The *Chaldaean Oracles* were regarded as sacred books by the Neoplatonists and they attached great importance to these books. Porphyry, Iambulicus, Syrianus and Proclus wrote their commentaries (now all were lost) and Proclus is said to have composed the book on the concord between the doctrines of Orpheus, Pythagoras and Plato and the *Chaldaean Oracles*. The Byzantine Platonist, Michael Psellus (11 c.) collected the fragments of the Oracles and wrote their commentary and explanation.¹¹ And the *Caldaeans Oracles* was rivived as the books of ancient theology in the Italian Renaissance thought, and gained their 'authentic' authour, Zoroaster.

3 Justification of the Chaldaean Theology

For Gemistos Plethon, Zoroaster was not legend one who was imagined to be sage, magician, astrologer, theologian or philosopher and to have witten an immense number of works (2,000,000 lines or some 10,000,000 words)¹², but 'the oldest among those, of whom we know through tradition,

who was the interpreter of the divine and most of the other noble things for the Medes and Persians and the majority of the other ancient Asiatic people² and 'the most ancient of all philosophers and law-givers whose names are recorded, except for Menos, the Egyptian law-giver'.³ Plethon tried to introduce a new universal religion which would replace the Christianity and the Islam, being based on the ancient theological and philosophical tradition, which began with Zoroaster and was completed in Plato. Plethon inserts Pythagoras between Zoroaster and Plato and he says that the doctrines of these three are in harmony.

The philosophy of Plato was not original with him but was derived from Zoroaster via the Pythagoreans. For according to a tradition chiefly represented by Plutarch, Pythagoras studied Zoroastrianism during his sojourn in Asia among the Magi, the successors of Zoroaster, and Zoroaster lived 5000 years before the Trojan War. (...) That Plato was a student of Zoroastrianism is demonstrated by the extant Zoroastrian oracles, which agree in every detail with the Platonic system.⁴

'The extant Zoroastrian oracles' (τὰ ἀπὸ Ἰωροάστρου ἔτι καὶ εἰς ἡμᾶς σωζόμενα λόγια), for Plethon, was none other than the *Caldaean Oracles*. He is thought to be the first that related the *Caldaean Oracles* to Zoroaster and he esteemed these Oracles as the sacred books which contained the most ancient wisdom revealed by Zoroaster. Three works of Plethon on the *Caldaean Oracles* have been handed down to us: *Commentary on the Magian texts of Zoroaster*,⁵ *Brief Explanation of the more obscure passages in these texts*,⁶ and *Summary of the doctrines of Zoroaster and Plato*.⁷ In the interpretation of the Oracles, Plethon was much influenced by Psellus (and by Proclus through him), but Plethon also argued them in his own way.⁸

As it is well known, according to the report of Marsilio Ficino, it was Plethon who suggested the foundation of the Platonic Academy of Florence to Cosimo de' Medici,⁹ and Ficino accepted Plethon's idea of the continuity of the ancient theological and philosophical tradition.¹⁰ But Ficino modified it by adding Hermes Trismegistus to the ancient sages. Ficino, in the 12th book of *Platonic Theology*, states that the ancient theologians (prisci thologi) always united the study of philosophy with the religious piety.

In the beginning, the philosophy of Zoroaster, as Plato gives evidence of it, was none other than the wise piety and the divine reverence.

Hermes Trismegistus, also, starts all discussions by the vows and ceased them in the sacrifice. The philosophy of Orpheus and Aglaophemus, on the whole, turns to the divine praises. Pythagoras began the philosophic studies by singing the sacred hymns every morning. Plato advised to begin with God in each things, not only by the discourse but also by the reflection, and he himself always began with God.¹¹

Proclus had already said that all theologies of the Greeks were born of the mystical doctrine of Orpheus and firstly Pythagoras learned the divine initiations from Aglaophemus and secondly Plato accepted all knowledge of them from the works of Pythagoras and Orpheus,¹² and Ficino also states in the *Notes* on Proclus that there were five authorities of the theology among the Greeks and its theology was handed down from Orpheus to Aglaophemus, from him to Pythagoras, from him to Philolaus, from him to Plato.¹³ Ficino, following Proclus and Plethon, fixed the succession of six great theologians (*sex summi theologi*), i. e., Zoroaster, Hermes Trismegistus, Orpheus, Aglaophemus, Pythagoras and Plato,¹⁴ although the name of Zoroaster is not found and Philolaus is inserted between Pythagoras and Plato in the *Preface* to his translation of the *Corpus Hermeticum*.¹⁵ Ficino argued that the philosophy must be 'pia philosophia' and the religion must be 'docta religio', and pursued the concord of the Christian religion and the Platonic philosophy. In this attempt, he devised a historical perspective on the theological and philosophical tradition by stating that the ancient doctrines of theologians from Zoroaster to Pythagoras, which had been founded on the Hebrews' prophecy and revelation, all flowed in the philosophy of Plato, and the Neoplatonists (Numenius, Philon, Plotinus, Iamblichus and Proclus) could borrow from the teaching of Christ through John, Paul, Hierotheus and Dionysius the Areopagite.¹⁶ Concerning Zoroaster, he occupies the first place in the golden chain made of the ancient theologians as 'the inventor of the ancient theology'¹⁷ and 'one from whom flowed the wisdom of the ancient theologians'¹⁸, and Ficino quotes and interpretes Zoroaster's *Chaldaean Oracles* in his works.¹⁹

For Pico, the existence of the ancient theologians and their wisdom was, as it were, a premise from which he tried to pursue the wider concord of the philosophy and religion than Plethon and Ficino had done. Pico does not insist that all sects of philosophy and the Christianity are in complete agreement but says that each of these partakes in one truth in the way of expression

peculiar to it, keeping on a marked characteristic of it.²⁰ In the *Oratio*, for example, Pico praises the moral science, the dialectic, the natural philosophy and the theology, through which man can reach to God, citing the statements of the ancient fathers (the Apostle Paul, the patriarch Jacob, Job the Just, Moses) and the statements of the ancient theology (the sacred rites of the Greeks, the Delphic precepts, the words of Pythagoras, the records of the Chaldaens).²¹ Pico does not seem to have been particular about the chronology of the ancient theologians. But the ancient and important for him must have been the ancient theology of Hermes Trismegistus, the doctrines of the Chaldaeans and of Pythagoras and the occult mysteries of the Hebrews.²² The doctrines of the Chaldaeans are those of Zoroaster²³ and the occult mysteries of the Hebrews mean the Cabala, i. e., the mystical tradition of 'the true and more occult explanation of the Law' which Moses received from God with the written law in the five books.²⁴ According to Pico, Orpheus, whose theology were followed by Pythagoras as the model on which he fashioned and built his own philosophy, is read among the Greeks in a nearly complete text, while Zoroaster only in part, though, among the Chaldaeans, in a more complete text, and both are believed to be the fathers and authors of the ancient wisdom.²⁵ Therefore, when Pico could obtain the Chaldaean books written in the original language, it was natural that he expressed his joy to Ficino, for the opportunity to read directly the ancient wisdom came to Pico.

I was forcibly taken off from other things and instigated to the Arabic and Chaldaic learning by certain books in both languages, which came to my hands, no accidentally, but doubtless by the disposal of God, in favor of my studies. Here the inscriptions, and you will believe it. The Chaldaic books (if they are books and not rather treasures) are the Oracles of Esra, Zoroaster, and Melchior, Magi; in which those things which are faulty and defective in the Greek, are read perfect and entire. There is also an exposition of the Chaldean Wise-men upon these Oracles, short and knotty, but full of mysteries, there is also a book of the doctrines of the Chaldean theology, and upon it a divine and copious discourse of the Persians, Greeks, and Chaldeans.²⁶

For Pico it did not have to be doubtful that the *Chaldaean Oracles* contained the ancient sacred wisdom of Zoroaster, and therefore, he gave

it much importance and for the public disputation he proposed not only 'conclusiones secundum opinionem Chaldeorum Theologorum' but also 'conclusiones secundum propriam opinionem de intelligentia dictorum Zoroastris et expositorum eius Chaldeorum' with other conclusions according to his own opinion on the Magia, the Cabala, the hymns of Orpheus, etc.²⁷

4 Zoroaster as a Magus

In the passages quoted above from Diogenes Laertius and Clement of Alexandria, with the Chaldaeans, the Gymnasophists, the Druids, etc., the Magian (*Μάγοι*, Magi) were numerated among the barbarians who has began the study of philosophy for the first time.¹ The Magian are those who are classed as wise and learned men among the Persians² and who assemble regularly in a sacred place for practice and consultation.³ According to the expression of Pico, "as Porphyry says, in the Persian tongue *magus* expresses the same idea as interpreter and worshipper of the divine with us."⁴ And Zoroaster has been commonly thought to be a Magian, arch-representative of the Magi,⁵ rather than a sage of the Chaldaeans as Plethon, Ficino and Pico reckoned so. But they also speak of 'the Magians following Zoroaster'⁶ and call Zoroaster 'the first among the Magians.'⁷ The Magic (*μαγεία*, magia), therefore, means the art of Magians, i. e., the art by which men know and worship the divine,⁸ and 'as it were a perfect and most high wisdom'⁹, using again the expression of Pico, and Zoroaster is regarded the authority of this art. And this fact had been authenticated by 'the divine Plato' (Ficino), in *Alcibiades I*.

And when the boy [Persian prince] reaches fourteen years he is taken over by the royal tutors, as they call them there: these are four men chosen as the most highly esteemed among the Persians of mature age, namely, the wisest one, the justest one, the most temperate one, and the bravest one. The first of these teaches him the magian lore of Zoroaster, son of Horomazes; and that is the worship of the gods: he teaches him also what pertains to a king.¹⁰

As Apleius used this passages for his *Apologia* of the Magic,¹¹ Pico also quotes them as the statements which can justify the rightness of Magic as the utter perfection of natural philosophy and the higher and more holy philosophy, which is distinguished from 'γοητεία', one which depends entirely

on the work and authority of demons and the most deceitful of arts.¹² In the Florentine Neoplatonism, as Ficino says, the philosophy of Zoroaster, i. e., the Magic was none other than the sage piety and the divine worship.¹³ According to Pico, Pythagoras, Empedocles, Democritus, and Plato all traveled to study this art, taught it when returned and esteemed it before all others in their mysteries.¹⁴ With Zoroaster Pico refers to another author of the Magic, Zamolxis, whom Abaris the Hyperborean copied, quoting the some lines in Plato's *Charmides*,¹⁵ and numerates those who followed the Magic of Zoroaster and Zamolxis.

In their footsteps Charondas, Damigeron, Apollonius, Osthanes, and Dardanus thereafter persevered. Homer persevered, whom I shall sometime prove, in my *Poetic Theology*, to have concealed this philosophy beneath the wanderings of his Ulysses, just as he has concealed all others. Eudoxus and Hermippus persevered. Almost all who have searched through the Pythagorean and Platonic mysteries have persevered.¹⁶

In this enumeration of Magians, Pico's sources are thought to be Apleius and Pliny. The former says in the *Apology* that "...If you will admitt any small advantage [in the Magic], I will consent to be Carmendas, Damigeron, Mose, Johannes, Apollobex, Dardanus himself, or whoever became famous among the Magians after Zoroaster and Hostanes,"¹⁷ and the latter says in the *Natural History* that "Eudoxus, who wished magic to be acknowledged as the nobelest and most useful of the schools of philosophy, ... Hermippus, a most studious writer about every aspect of magic, and exponent of two milion verses composed by Zoroaster..."¹⁸ In these lists of Magians, there is one defference that Apollobex is replaced by Apollonius in Pico. In the concerned place of the manuscripts of *Apology*, it is written 'Apollo haec',¹⁹ and the editors correct it to Apollobex (Helm) or Apollobeches (Krueger) following the description of Pliny.²⁰ Pico probably would have made a mistake when he copied the name of Magian in the manuscript that was not easy to read, as Ficino had done.²¹ There is a reason for Ficino and Pico to have thought of Apollonius. Apollonius of Tyana was Neo-pythagorean sage of the 1st century who visited the Magians and had the miraculous powers,²² and he was regarded one representative of Magians by Ficino and Pico. Ficino, in fact, reffers to the magical power which Apollonius had, i. e., the power by which Apollonius could see the fact which

happened at a distance.²³

Thus it came to be clear that Zoroaster was not only the first theologian but also the first Magian, and from this fact we can re-interpretate the great chain of the ancient theologians as that of the Magians, both beginning with Zoroaster and ending with Plato, although in the Magians, Zamolxis and Apollonius play an important part.

5 'Language' of the Chaldaean Theology

The Oracles are originally the answers which the Gods deliver to the priests or priestesses who questioned about the future, and these are spoken in the way peculiar to the Gods, i. e., in the words which sometimes seem to be enigmatic for the mortals. According to Pico, Zoroaster, the author of the *Chaldaean Oracles*, also spoke in the enigmatic way (enigmatice)¹, and other ancient theologians did so. In the *Oratio* Pico says concerning the conclusions on Orpheus.

But as was the practice of the ancient theologians, even so did Orpheus protect the mysteries of his dogmas with the coverings of fables, and conceal them with a poetic veil, so that whoever should read his hymns would suppose there was nothing beneath them beyond idle tales and perfectly unadulterated trifles. I have wished to say this so that it might be known what a task it was for me, how difficult it was to draw out the hidden meaning of the secrets of philosophy from the intentional tangles of riddles and from the obscurity of fables, especially since I have been aided, in a matter so serious, so abstruse, and so little known, by no toil, no application on the part of other interpreters.²

For Pico the books of the ancient theologians were written in the mysterious languages,³ and their doctrines were, in themselves, the mysteries. It was well-known practice of the ancient sages, Pico says, either simply not to write on religious subjects or to write of them under some other guise. For this reason these subjects are called mysteries, because the things which are not secret are not mysteries (*nec mysteria quae non occulta*).⁴ If Moses seems an unpolished popularizer rather than a philosopher or theologian or master of great wisdom, it is because he did not wish to make public the occult mysteries, the secrets of the supreme Godhead hidden beneath the shell of the Law and under a clumsy show of words, and to

keep hidden from the people the things to be shared by the initiate was not the part of human deliberation but of divine command.⁵ This custom, the ancient philosophers most reverently observed it. Pythagoras, who did not entrust anything to writing except a very few things which, when dying, he left to his daughter Dama, became a master of silence, and the Pythagoreans following him kept this law religiously and the Platonists sore by it.⁶ In Iamblichus there can be found an occult philosophy and the mysteries of the East and Plotinus speaks divinely of things divine and, with learned obliquity of speech, far more than humanly of human things.⁷ And Plato himself had shared with this custom.

Plato himself concealed his doctrines beneath coverings of allegory, veils of myth, mathematical images, and unintelligible signs of fugitive meaning. As he himself says in his *Letters*, no one can fully understand his religious beliefs from anything he has written, and he has indeed proved this to the incredulous.⁸

It is natural that Pico's conviction that the doctrines of the ancient theologians are concealed under the mystic veils of words brought him to interpretate the mysterious words and to show their true meanings. And such an interpretation that Pico tried to take, perhaps it only, would have made possible his insistence that the opinions of several sects seemed to say the different things but they agreed with each other about the meaning and his presentation of "the conclusions according his own opinion" at the public disputation. To give an example of Pico's way of interpretation, in the 10th of "the Cabalistic Conclusions, according to the own opinion, which confirm in the highest degree the Christian Religion from the very bases of the Hebrew sages", it is stated that "that which is said HKMH, among the Cabalists, is without doubt that which is called Pallas by Orpheus, the maternal mind by Zoroaster, the son of God by Hermes, the wisdom by Pythagoras, the intelligent sphere by Parmenides,"⁹ And in this sense, the parts of the *Oratio*, where the dignity and usefulness of the moral science, the dialectic, the natural philosophy and the theology are expounded through citing the statements of the ancient fathers and the ancient theologians,¹⁰ would have been fit for the introductory speech of the disputation.

6 Pico's Thought and the Chaldaean Theology (1)

The subject of the first part of *Oratio*, as it is widely accepted, is a praise of the dignity of man. It begins with the sayings of Abdala the Saracen: "There is nothing to be seen more wonderful than man" and of Hermes Trismegistus: "A great miracle, Asclepius, is man." Pico says that, having weighted the reason for these maxims, he is not content with the many grounds for the excellence of human nature reported by many men: man is the interval between fixed eternity and fleeting time, the bond of the world, on David's testimony but little lower than the angels, etc. Pico wish to explain the rank which man acquired in the universal chain of Being and because of which man is envied not only by brutes but even by the stars and by minds beyond this world.¹

In the sayings of God to Adam, which would be most famous of the passages on the idea of man in the Renaissance thought, Pico's opinion is clearly presented. According to those, man was not given neither a fixed abode nor a form that is his alone nor any function peculiar to himself, to the end that according to his longing and his judgement he may have and possess what abode, what form, and what functions he himself shall desire. Being different from other creatures of which natures are limited and constrained within the bounds of laws prescribed by God, man selects and decides his own nature by his freedom of choice. Thus man has the power of degenerate into the lower forms of life, which are brutish and also the power, out of his soul's judgement, to reborn into the higher forms, which are divine.²

By such a view that man's nature is indefinite and he creates himself with the free will, Pico is thought to have added a new element in the discussions on man's excellence and dignity in the Italian Renaissance.³ After these passages, Pico goes to confirm his thesis by the citation of sayings of several sages, which is based on his another view mentioned above, i. e., the concord among the philosophical and theological doctrines of all sects.

It is man who Asclepius of Athens, arguing from his mutability of character and from his self-transforming nature, on just grounds says was symbolized by Proteus in the mysteries. Hence those metamorphoses renowned among the Hebrews and the Pythagoreans. For the occult theology of the Hebrews sometimes transforms the holy Enoch

into an angel of divinity whom they call 'Mal' akh Adonay Shebaoth', and sometimes transforms others into other divinities. The Pythagoreans degrade impious men into brutes and, if one is to believe Empedocles, even into plants.⁴

The doctrine of the transmigration of human soul is seen in Orpheus, Pythagoras, Empedocles, etc.,⁵ and Pico uses this for showing that the man has all natures of other creatures within himself, in other words, man is 'microcosmos.'⁶ Figurally speaking, the plant, beast, heavenly being and angel live within man, and man is able to become anyone whichever he wishes. In this context, the quotation from the *Chaldaean Oracles* is found in the *Heptaplus*.

Now Moses shifts to those whose function is to desire, the seats of anger and wantonness, or lust. These he represents by the beasts and the irrational sort of living things, since they are common to us and the beasts and, what is worse, often drive us to brutish life. Hence comes that saying of the Chaldeans: "The beasts of the earth dwell in your body." And in Plato's *Republic* we learn that we have various kinds of brutes dwelling within us, so that it is not hard, if it is properly understood, to believe the paradox of the Pythagoreans that wicked men turn into brutes.⁷

Pico's quotation: "Vas tuum inhabitant bestiae terrae" is transmitted in Psellus' Commentary: "Σὸν ἀγγεῖλον θῆρες χθονὸς οἰκῆσουσιν", and he comments "the vessel" (ἀγγεῖλον) means the human body and "the beast of the earth" (θῆρες χθονὸς) the demons, which keep their substances from the passions within man.⁸ Ficino also quotes this Oracle in the 17th book of *Platonic Theology*, but there he interpretes that among the souls which live as same as the beasts do, ones which dwell in the souls more purified live among the gods and the impure souls live among the herd of beasts.⁹ This interpretation is different from that of Psellus, and is similar to that of Pico.

We cannot conclude that this Caldaean Oracle had a great influence upon Pico's formation of the concept of man, for the idea of the transmigration of soul is widely found in other thinkers and Pico must have thought also of the sayings of them. But the saying of the ancient theologian Zoroaster would have become a good evidence for him. Pico, in the *Oratio*, states that in the sacred writings of Moses and the Christians, man is de-

scribed sometimes by the name of all flesh, sometimes by that of every creature, because man himself molds, fashions, and changes himself into the form of all flesh and into the character of every creature. And he ends the opening part of the *Oratio*, where the dignity and excellence of the human nature are discussed, with the quotation from the saying of the Chaldaean theology.

For this reason the Persian Evanthes, in describing the Chaldaean theology, writes that man has no semblance that is inborn and his very own but many that are external and foreign to him; whence this saying of the Chaldaeans: "Hanorish tharah sharinas", that is, "Man is a being of varied, manifold, and inconstant nature."¹⁰

7 Pico's Thought and the Chaldaean Theology (2)

As we mentioned above, Pico's interest to the Magic is remarkable. Pico esteemed the true Magic of Zamolxis and Zoroaster and did not hesitate to say that "No science offers greater assurance of Christ's divinity than Magic and the Cabala."¹ According to Pico, the Magian, as Plotinus demonstrates, is the servant of nature and not a contriver.² This Magic, abounding in the loftiest mysteries, embraces the deepest contemplation of the most secret things, and at last the knowledge of all nature. It, in calling forth into the light as if from their hiding-places the powers scattered and sown in the world by the loving-kindness of God, does not so much work wonders as diligently serve a wonder-working nature.³ This type of Magic, which can be thought to use the 'sympathy' of things within the world, was widely accepted in the Renaissance, and it is this Magic that Pico distinguished sharply from the other unnatural and harmful Magic of demons and called "Natural Magic" (*magia naturalis*) which was divine and salutary.

The latter, having more searchingly examined into the harmony of the universe, which the Greeks with greater significance call *συμπάθεια*, and having clearly perceived the reciprocal affinity of natures, and applying to each single thing the suitable and peculiar inducements (which are called the *ἰγγεσι* of the magicians) brings forth into the open the miracles concealed in the recesses of the world, in the depths of nature, and in the storehouses and mysteries of God, just as if she herself were their maker; and, as the farmer weds his elms to vines,

even so does the *magus* wed earth the heaven, that is, he weds lower things to the endowments and powers of higher things.⁴

The origin of the doctrine of 'sympathy' is found in the Milesians, the Pythagoreans and the Platonists, and the Stoics think that just as man's soul permeates into his body, the god as 'logos' permeates into the whole universe. The universe is thought to be an unity and organism, in which the 'sympathy' exists and unites all things within the universe.⁵ As Cicero reports, "the system's coherence and persistence is due to nature's forces and not to divine power; she does possess that concord (the Greek term is *sympatheia*) of which you spoke, but the greater this is as a spontaneous growth, the less possible is it to suppose that it was created by divine reason."⁶ Ficino also takes up this doctrine and says in the *Commentary* of Plato's *Symposium* that "the parts of this world, like the parts of a single animal, all hanging from one author, are joined to each other by the mutuality of one nature."⁷ Just as in our bodies all parts require something from each other, help each other and all suffer when one of them suffers, so in the same way the parts of huge animal, i. e., all bodies of the world, joined together, exchange natures with each other and are mutually exchanged.⁸ The Magian, acknowledging this mutuality of one natura (*unius nature communitio*), attracts one thing to another and in this sense the Magic is assistant of nature rather than art. This attraction had been expressed "the inducements" (*illicebrae*), i. e., "*ἰγγρες*" of the Magians in the passages of Pico. Ficino also speaks of them in his astrological and medical work, *De vita triplici*.

There is nothing so deformed in the whole living world that it has no soul, no gift of soul contained in it. The congruities of these forms, therefore, to the reasons of the soul of the world, are what Zoroaster called the divine lures (*divinas illices*), and Synesius agreed, calling them magic charms (*magicas illicebras*).⁹

Synerius of Cyrene, contemporary of Augustine, also believed in the occult sympathies between natural objects and thought that the wise man, having known the magic sympathy which united all parts of universe, can not only predict the future, but also, to a great extent, control it.

And does not this explain the spells of the magi? For things, besides

being signs of each other, have magic power over each other. The wise man, then, is he who knows the relationships of the parts of the universe. For he draws one object under his control by means of another object, holding what is at hand as a pledge for what is far away, and working through sounds and material substances and forms.¹⁰

Do the 'spells of the magi' (μάγων ἰωγγεσ) of which Synenius speaks here are just the 'illecebrae' which Ficino said? And do the saying of Synenius agree with Pico's former expression: 'illecebrae quae magorum ἰωγγεσ'? The word 'illecebrae' is used as the magical attraction or inducement in Apleius,¹¹ while the ἰωγγεσ meant originally a wryneck, but it was employed as instrument of magic (in particular, erotic magic) in the Greece, became to mean the spell of charms in general, and sometimes indicated the magician herself.¹² Apollonius of Tyana, whom Ficino and Pico numerated among the Magians, also employs it in the sense of magical enchantments.¹³ And in the *Chaldaen Oracles*, the ἰωγγεσ are described as noetic entities which are thought by Father and which think themselves, as they are moved by the ineffable Will.¹⁴ Psellus says in the *Commentary* of the *Chaldaean Oracles* that the ἰωγγεσ are the powers which were made of three triads after Father's abyss and Father thinks them according to Father's intelligence which puts in itself their cause in the unity.¹⁵ The ἰωγγεσ were also thought magical names sent forth by the supreme Father to the sphere and regarded as the transmitter of messages from Father. According to Lewy, "as the Iynges are regarded as localized in the spheres, the conjuration of thier ineffable name by the theurgist presupposes his knowing to which particular sphere they descend when invoked."¹⁶ This side of meanings which the ἰωγγεσ had, Plethon seems to have emphasized it in the *Brief Explanation* of the *Chaldaean Oracles*.

They call 'spells' the intellects linked to him and the separated Forms, which they also call the 'inflexible upholders of the world'. They call spells because of the erotic attachment of things in this world to themselves which the name of the ἰωγγεσ (spell) indicates.¹⁷

It seems to me that as the 'illecebrae of Synesius' was the ἰωγγεσ, so the 'divine lures (divinas illices)' of Zoroaster, of which Ficino spoke, meant the same ἰωγγεσ. And Pico accepted the tradition of this interpretation of ἰωγγεσ, which started from the Greek Magicians via Zoroaster and ended

with Plethon and Ficino, and when Pico mentioned the *ἑπτάπλοος* of Magians, he must have been remembered that this term was found in the *Chaldaean Oracles*, the sacred books of Zoroaster, great theologian and first Magian.¹⁸

NOTES

1

¹ E. Garin, *Notizie intorno a Giovanni Pico*, «Rivista di storia della filosofia», IV, 1949, pp. 210–212; *La prima redazione dell' «oratio de hominis dignitate»*, in his *La cultura filosofica del Rinascimento italiano*, Firenze, 1961, pp. 231–240. The manuscript of this draft exists in the Florentine National Library (*Fondo Palatino 885*). In this *Fondo Palatino 885*, the concerned text starts on fol. 143 r and ends with fol. 153 v, according to the recent numeration, but it can be noticed that the folios are partly out of order (Cf. L. Gentile, *I codici Palatini della R. Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale di Firenze*, vol. 2, Roma, 1899, p. 394; P. O. Kristeller, *Giovanni Pico della Mirandola and His Sources*, in *L'opera e il pensiero di Giovanni Pico della Mirandola nella storia dell'umanesimo*, Convegno internazionale (Mirandola: 15–18 settembre 1963), 2 vols., Firenze, 1965, vol. 1, p. 113).

On the difference between the draft and the final-definitive version of *Oratio*, and on their relation to the two versions which are suggested in Pico's letter to Gerolamo Benivieni dated from Fratta on the 12th of November in 1486 (ed. L. Dorez, *Letteres inédites de Jean Pic de la Mirandole, 1482–1492*, «Giornale storico della letteratura italiana», XXV, 1895, p. 358), see my article: *Note on Some Versions of Giovanni Pico's Oratio*, «Hokkaido Tetsugakkai Kaihou (Transactions of the Philosophical Association of Hokkaido)», Sapporo (Japan), XXXIV, 1987, pp. 1–11.

² *Fondo Palatino 885*, fol. 143^r, l. 1–fol. 146^r, l. 14; *La prima redazione*, ed. Garin, pp. 233–238.

³ *Commentationes Ioannis Pici Mirandulae...*, Diligenter impressit Benedictus Hectoris Bononiensis, Bononiae, Anno salutis MCCCCLXXXVI, die vero XX Martii. Cf. Hain, n. 12992; Panzer, vol. 1, p. 232; BMC, vol. 4, p. 843; IGI, n. 7731; Goff, P-632; E. Valenziani, *Les incunables de Pic de la Mirandole: Contribution à une bibliographie*, in H. Bédarida (ed.), *Pensée humaniste et tradition chrétienne au XV^e et XV^e siècle*, Paris, 1950, p. 334.

In this paper, I consult E. Garin's critical edition (G. Pico della Mirandola, *De hominis dignitate, Heptaplus, De ente et uno e scritti vari*, Edizione nazionale dei Classici del Pensiero italiano I, Firenze, 1942) and use E. L. Forbes' translation based on Garin's edition (*Oration on the Dignity of Man*, in E. Cassirer, P. O. Kristeller, J. H. Randall, Jr. (eds.), *The Renaissance Philosophy of Man*, Chicago-London, 1948, pp. 223–254). The sections of the draft mentioned cor-

respond to pp. 102–130 of Garin’s edition (tr. Forbes, pp. 223–237).

⁴ “Haec sunt, Patres colendissimi, quae me ad philosophiae studium non animarunt adeo sed compulerunt. Quam quidem ut tam plene consequerer quam prosequer ardentem, duo in primis conducere semper existimavi; primum id fuit, in nullius verba iuratus, sed se per omnes philosophiae magistros fundere, omnes scedas excutere, omnes familias agnoscere. Vidi ad hoc munus necessariam esse non graecae modo et latinae, sed hebraicae quoque atque chaldaicae et, cui nunc primum sub Mithridate Gulielmo harum linguarum preceptore peritissimo insudare coepi, arabicae linguae cognitionem. Ferme enim omnis sapientia a barbaris ad grecos, a grecis ad nos manavit. Ita nostrates semper in philosophandi ratione peregrinis inventis stare, et aliena excoluisse sibi duxerunt satis; sacras omnino litteras et mysteria secretiora ab hebreis primum atque chaldeis, tum a grecis petere necessarium. Reliquas artes et omnifariam philosophiam cum grecis arabes partiuntur,” (*Fondo Platino* 885, fol. 146^r, l. 15–fol. 146^v, l. 12; *La prima redazione*, ed. Garin, pp. 238–239).

In this part, the passages: “primum id fuit... omnes familias agnoscere” are also seen in the final-definitive version of *Oratio*, but in another context, i. e., in the lines on the answer to those who are offended by the numerous multitude of things proposed by Pico (ed. Garin, pp. 138, 140; tr. Forbes, p. 242) and the passages: “Ferme enim omnis... sibi duxerunt satis” are seen in the final-definitive version in the lines on the reasons that Pico wished to bring before the public the opinions not of a single alone but rather of every school” (ed. Garin, p. 142; tr. Forbes, p. 244). Other passages cannot be found in the final-definitive version.

⁵ Joannes Picus Mirandulanus, *Opera omnia*, Basileae, 1572 [rpt. Torino, 1971], p. 378.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 367. The name of Flavius Mithridates is also seen in the same letter to Ficino (*Ibid.*, p. 368) and in the letter to an unknown friend dated from Fratta on the 10th of November in 1486 (*Ibid.*, pp. 384–386).

⁷ P. O. Kristeller, *Marsilio Ficino e Ludovico Lazzarelli: Contributo alla diffusione delle idee ermetiche nel Rinascimento*, «Annali della R. Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa. Lettere, Storia e Filosofia», Ser. II, VII, 1938, pp. 237–262 [in Idem, *Studies in Renaissance Thought and Letters*, Roma, 1956, pp. 221–247]; E. Garin, *Nota sull’ermetismo*, in *Testi umanistici sull’ermetismo*, «Archivio di Filosofia», Roma, 1955, pp. 7–20 [in Idem, *La cultura filosofica del Rinascimento*, pp. 143–154]; Idem, *Magia ed astrologia nella cultura del Rinascimento*, in Idem, *Medioevo e Rinascimento: Studi e ricerche*, Roma-Bari, 1954, pp. 141–157; Idem, *Ermetismo e antica teologia*, «Rivista critica di storia della filosofia», XXVIII, 1973, pp. 331–334; Idem, *Postille sull’ermetismo nel Rinascimento*, «Rinascimento», Ser. II, XVI, 1976, pp. 245–249; Idem, *Lo zodiaco della vita: La polemica sull’astrologia dal Trecento al Quattrocento*, 2a ed., Roma-Bari, 1982, pp. 61–92;

Idem, *Il ritorno dei filosofi antichi*, Napoli, 1983, pp. 61-78; F. A. Yates, *Giordano Bruno and the Hermetic Tradition*, Chicago-London, 1964; Idem, *the Hermetic Tradition in Renaissance Science*, in C. S. Singleton (ed.), *Art, Science and History in the Renaissance*, Baltimore, 1968, pp. 255-274. Cf. also K. H. Dannenfeldt, *Hermetica Philosophica*, in P. O. Kristeller (ed.), *Catalogus Translationum et Commentariorum*, vol. 1, Washington, 1960, pp. 137-151; C. Vasoli, *L'Influence de la tradition hermétique et cabalistique*, in R. R. Bolgar (ed.), *Classical Influences on Western Thought A. D. 1650-1870*, Cambridge, 1979, pp. 61-75; R. Marcel, *La fortune d'Hèrmes Trismégiste à la Renaissance*, in *L'Humanisme français au début de la Renaissance*, Paris, 1973, pp. 137-154; A. Grafton, *Protestant Versus Prophet: Isaac Casaubon on Hermes Trismegistus*, «Journal of the Warburg and the Courtauld Institutes», XLVI, 1983, pp. 78-93.

⁸ D. P. Walker, *Orpheus the Theologian and Renaissance Platonist*, «Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes», XVI, 1953, pp. 100-120; Idem, *Le chant orphique de Marsile Ficin*, in *Musique et Poésie au XVI^e Siècle*, Paris, 1954, pp. 17-33; A. Buck, *Der Orpheus-Mythos in der italienischen Renaissance*, Krefeld, 1961. Cf. also E. Wind, *Pagan Mysteries in the Renaissance*, riv. ed., New York, 1958; J. Warden, *Orpheus and Ficino*, in Idem (ed.) *Orpheus: The Metamorphoses of a Myth*, Toronto-Buffalo-London, 1982, pp. 85-110.

⁹ B. Kieszkowski, *Il platonismo di Rinascimento italiano e la dottrina degli oracoli caldaici*, «Giornale critico della filosofia italiana», XV, 1934, pp. 189-198; Idem, *Studi sul platonismo del Rinascimento in Italia*, Firenze, 1936, pp. 113-127; K. H. Dannenfeldt, *The Pseudo-Zoroastrian Oracles in the Renaissance*, «Studies in the Renaissance», IV, 1957, pp. 7-30. Cf. also Idem, *Oracula Chaldaica*, in Kristeller (ed.), *Catalogus Translationum et Commentariorum*, vol. 1, pp. 157-164.

¹⁰ D. P. Walker, *The Prisca Theologia in France*, «Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes», XVII, 1954, pp. 204-259; Idem *The Ancient Theology: Studies in Christian Platonism from the Fifteenth to the Eighteenth Century*, London, 1972; Ch. B. Schmitt, *Perennial Philosophy from Agostino Steuco to Leibniz*, «Journal of the History of Ideas», XXVI, 1966, pp. 505-532; Idem, *Prisca theologia e Philosophia perennis: Due temi del Rinascimento italiano e la loro fortuna*, in G. S. Tarugi (ed.), *Il pensiero italiano del Rinascimento e il tempo nostro*, Firenze, 1970, pp. 211-236; Cf. also G. di Napoli, *Il concetto di «Philosophia perennis» di Agostino Steuco nel quadro nella tematica rinascimentale*, in *Filosofia e cultura in Umbria tra Medioevo e Rinascimento*, Atti del quarto convegno di studi umbri (Gubbio 22-26 maggio 1966), Perugia, 1967, pp. 459-489 [in Idem, *Studi sul Rinascimento*, Napoli, 1973, pp. 245-277]; Ch. Trinkaus, *In Our Image and Likeness: Humanity and Divinity in Italian Humanist Thought*, 2 vols., London-Chicago, 1970, pp. 683-760.

¹¹ G. Scholem, *Zur Geschichte der Anfäng der christlichen Kabbala*, in

Essays presented to Leo Baeck, London, 1954, pp. 158-193; F. Secret, *L'astrologie et les kabbalistes chrétiens à la Renaissance*, «La Tour Saint-Jacque», IV, 1956, 45-56; Idem, *L'interpretazione della Kabbala nel Rinascimento*, «Convivium», XXIV, 1956, pp. 511-514; Idem, *Les debut du kabbalisme chrétien en Espagne et son histoire à la Renaissance*, «Sefard», XVII, 1957, pp. 36-48; Idem, *Les Kabbalistes chrétiens de la Renaissance*, Paris, 1964; Idem, *Le Zohar chez les Kabbalistes chrétiens de la Renaissance*, Paris-La Haye, 1965. Cf. also J. L. Blau, *The Christian Interpretation of the Cabala in the Renaissance*, New York, 1944.

¹² P. Kibre, *The Library of Pico della Mirandola*, New York, 1936; E. Garin, *Giovanni Pico della Mirandola. Vita e dottrina*, Firenze, 1937; Idem, *Giovanni Pico della Mirandola*, Parma, 1963 [in Idem, *Ritratti di umanisti*, Firenze, 1967, pp. 185-218]; Idem, *Le interpretazioni del pensiero di Giovanni Pico*, in *L'opera e il pensiero di Giovanni Pico*, vol. 1, pp. 3-31; E. Anguine, *Giovanni Pico della Mirandola. Sincretismo religioso-filosofico*, Bari, 1937; E. Monnerjahn, *Giovanni Pico della Mirandola. Ein Beitrag zur philosophischen Theologie des italienischen Humanismus*, Wiesbaden, 1960; P. O. Kristeller, *Eight Philosophers of the Italian Renaissance*, Stanford, 1964, pp. 54-70; Idem, *Giovanni Pico della Mirandola and his Sources*, in *L'opera e il pensiero di Giovanni Pico*, vol. 1, pp. 35-133; G. di Napoli, *Giovanni Pico della Mirandola e la problematica dottrinale del suo tempo*, Roma, 1965; H. de Lubac, *Pic de la Mirandole: Études et discussion*, Paris, 1974; W. G. Craven, *Giovanni Pico della Mirandola, Symbol of his Age: Modern Interpretations of a Renaissance Philosopher*, Genève, 1981; F. Secret, *Pico della Mirandola e gli inizi della cabala cristiana*, «Convivium», XXV, 1957, pp. 31-47; B. Kieszkowski, *Les rapports entre Elie del Midigo et Pic de la Mirandole (d'après le ms. lat. 6508 de la Bibliothèque Nationale)*, «Rinascimento», Ser. II, IV, 1964, pp. 41-91; F. A. Yates, *Giovanni Pico della Mirandola and Magic*, in *L'opera e il pensiero di Giovanni Pico*, vol. 1, pp. 159-196; G. dell'Acqua-L. Münster, *I rapporti di Giovanni Pico della Mirandola con alcuni filosofi ebrei*, in *L'opera e il pensiero di Giovanni Pico*, vol. 2, pp. 149-168; F. Secret, *Nouvelles précisions sur Flavius Mithridates maître de Pic de la Mirandole et traducteur de commentaires de Kabbale*, in *L'opera e il pensiero di Giovanni Pico*, vol. 2, p. 169-187; E. Wind, *Porus Consilii Filius (Notes on the Orphic «Counsels of Night»)*, in *L'opera e il pensiero di Giovanni Pico*, vol. 2, pp. 197-203 [in Idem, *Pagan Mysteries in the Renaissance*, pp. 276-281]; R. W. Meyer, *Pico della Mirandola und der Orient*, «Asiatische Studien», XVIII/XIX, 1965, pp. 308-336; C. Wirzubski, *Giovanni Pico's Companion to Kabbalistic Symbolism*, in *Studies in Mysticism and Religion presented to G. Sholem*, Jerusalem, 1967, pp. 357-362; H. Greiv, *Die christliche Kabbala des G. Pico della Mirandola*, «Archiv für Kulturgeschichte», LVII, 1975, pp. 141-161.

¹ *Oratio*, ed. Garin, p. 142 (tr. Forbes, p. 244).

² *Conclusiones DCCCC publice disputandae*, Impressum Romae opera Venerabilis viri Eucharii Silber alias Franck, Anno ab incarnatione Domini MCCCCLXXXVI die septima Decembris. Cf. Hain, 12999; B. M. C., vol. IV, p. 197; Panzer, vol. 11, p. 489; Valenziani, *op. cit.*, p. 335. The recent critical edition is B. Kieszkowski's (*Conclusiones sive Theses DCCCC. Romae anno 1486 publice disputandae sed non admissae*, Genève, 1973). But cf. Jose V. de Pina Martin's correction of this edition (*Jean Pic de la Mirandole. Un portrait inconnu de l'humaniste. Une édition très rare des ses Conclusiones*, Paris, 1976, pp. 43-82).

³ ed. Garin, pp. 132, 134; tr. Forbes, p. 239.

⁴ *Vitae philosophorum*, I, prol. (tr. by R. D. Hicks, London-Cambridge, Mass., 1938, vol. 1, p. 3). Cf. also Strabo, *Geographia*, XVI, 2, 39.

⁵ *Stromata*, I, 15, P.G., VIII, col. 778 A-B.

⁶ Cf. *Dan.*, 2, 1-12.

⁷ Cf. *Historiae*, I, 181.

⁸ At the times of Cicero, the 'Chaldaeans' came to be used as astrologers. Cf. *De divinatione*, I, 2: "And in that same nation the Chaldaeans—a name which they derived not from their art but their race—have, it is thought, by means of long-continued observation of the constellations, perfected a science which enables them to fortell what any man's lot will be and for what fate he was born." (tr. by W. A. Falconer, Cambridge, Mass.-London, 1927, p. 225.) Cf. also Idem, *Tusculanae Disputationes*, I, 95; Gellius, *Noctes atticae*, I, 7, XIV, 2; Lucretius, *De rerum natura*, V, 727.

⁹ On the *Chaldaean Oracles*, cf. in particular, W. Kroll (ed.), *De oraculis Chaldaicis*, Breslau, 1894 [rpt. Hildesheim, 1962]; É. des Places (ed.), *Oracles chaldaïques avec un choix de commentaires anciens*, Paris, 1971; H. Lewy, *Chaldaean Oracles and Theurgy: Mysticism, Magic and Platonism in the Later Roman Empire*, Cairo, 1956 [new ed. by M. Tardieu, Paris, 1978].

¹⁰ Cf. Lewy, *op. cit.*, pp. 254-257, 462-466; E. R. Dodds, *The Greek and the Irrational*, Berkly, 1951, pp. 283-311.

¹¹ Ἐξηγήσεις τῶν χαλδαϊκῶν ῥητῶν (P. G., CXXII, coll. 1124 A-1149 B; ed. Des Place, pp. 162-185.); Ἰστορῶσις κεφαλαϊώδης τῶν παρὰ Χαλδαίους ἀρχαίων δογμάτων (ed. Kroll, pp. 73-76; ed. Des Place, pp. 198-201.); Ἐκθεσις κεφαλαϊώδης καὶ σύντομος τῶν παρὰ Χαλδαίους δογμάτων (P. G., CXXII, coll. 1149C-1153B; ed. Des Place, pp. 189-191.) Cf. Lewy, *op. cit.*, pp. 473-485.

¹ On Zoroaster, cf. in particular, J. Bidez and F. Cumont, *Les Mages Hel-*

lénisés. *Zoroastre, Ostanès et Hytaspé d'après la tradition grecque*, 2 vols., Paris 1938 [rpt. Paris, 1973].

² *Νόμων συγγράφῃ*, I, ed. C. Alexandre, in Pleton, *Traite des Lois*, Paris 1958 [rpt. Amsterdam, 1966; Paris, 1982], p. 30.

³ *Πρὸς τὰς ὑπὲρ Ἀριστοτέλους Γεωργίου τοῦ Σχολαρίου ἀντιλήψεις*, P. G., CLX, col. 984A [ed. Alexandre, *op. cit.*, Appendice VI, p. 297; Bidez-Cumont, *op. cit.*, vol. 2, p. 259]. Cf. *Νόμων συγγράφῃ*, III, ed. C. Alexandre, p. 252.

⁴ *Πρὸς τὰς ὑπὲρ Ἀριστοτέλους Γεωργίου τοῦ Σχολαρίου ἀντιλήψεις*, P. G., CLX, col. 984 A-B [ed. Alexandre, *op. cit.*, Appendice VI, p. 297; Bidez-Cumont, *op. cit.*, vol. 2, p. 259]. I use M. V. Anatos' translation cited in his article (*Pletho's Calendar and Liturgy*, «Dumbarton Oaks Papers», IV, 1948, p. 281).

⁵ *Μαγικὰ λόγια τῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ Ζωροάστρου Μάγων ἐξηγηθέντα*, ed. J. Opsopoeus, *Oracula magica Zoroastris cum scholiis Plethonis et Pselli nunc primum editi*, Paris, 1599, pp. 16-51; extracts in Alexandre (ed.), *op. cit.* Appendice II, pp. 274-281.

⁶ *Βραχέειά τις διασάφησης τῶν ἐν τοῖς λογίοις τοῦτοις ἀσάφεστέρως λεγομένων*, ed. Kieszkowski, in *Studi sul platonismo del Rinascimento in Italia*, pp. 161-162.

⁷ *Ζωροαστρέϊων τε καὶ Πλατωνικῶν δογμάτων συγκεφάλαιωσις* P. G., CLX, coll. 973-974; ed. Alexandre, *op. cit.*, pp. 262-269.

⁸ On Zoroaster and the *Chaldean Oracles* in Plethon, cf. Bidez-Cumont, *op. cit.*, vol. 1, pp. 158-163, vol. 2, pp. 251-263; Anatos, *op. cit.*, pp. 270-303; F. Masai, *Plethon et le platonisme de Mistra*, Paris, 1956, 130-143; C. M. Woodhouse, *George Gemistos Plethon: The Last of the Hellenes*, Oxford, 1986, pp. 48-61.

⁹ Cf. the *Preface* to Ficino's translation of Plotinus, in Ficinus, *Opera omnia*, 2 vols., Basileae, 1576 [rpt. Torino, 1959], p. 1537.

¹⁰ On Ficino's relation to Plethon, cf. P. O. Kristeller, *The Scholastic Background of Marsilio Ficino*, «Traditio», II, 1944, p. 259 [In Idem, *Studies in Renaissance Thought and Letters*, p. 36]; Idem, *The Philosophy of Marsilio Ficino*, tr. by V. Conant, New York, 1943 [rpt. Gloucester, Mass., 1964], p. 15; idem, *Platonismo bizantino e fiorentino e la controversia su Platone e Aristotele*, in A. Pertusi (ed.), *Venezia e l'Oriente fra Tardo Medioevo e Rinascimento*, Firenze, 1966, pp. 113-115; Idem, *Byzantine and Western Platonism in the Fifteenth Century*, in Idem, *Renaissance Concept of Man and Other Essays*, New York, 1972, pp. 105-108 [in Idem, ed. by M. Mooney, *Renaissance Thought and Its Sources*, New York, 1979, pp. 161-163]; E. Garin, *Per la storia della cultura filosofica del Rinascimento*, «Rivista critica della filosofia», XII, 1957, pp. 6-12; A. Keller, *Two Byzantine Scholars and Their Reception in Italy*, «Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes», XX, 1957, pp. 363-370; Woodhouse, *op. cit.*, pp. 372-374.

¹¹ *Theologia platonica de immortalitate animorum*, XII, 1, ed. R. Marcel,

vol. 2, Paris, p. 1970, pp. 157-158.

¹² *Theologia platonica*, I, 5, ed. H. D. Saffrey and L. G. Westerink, vol. 1, Paris, 1968, pp. 25-26.

¹³ ed. H. D. Saffrey, in Idem, *Notes platoniciennes de Marsile Ficin dans un manuscrit de Proclus (Cod. Riccardianus 70)*, «Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance», XXI, 1959, p. 168.

¹⁴ Cf. *Theologia platonica*, VI, 1, ed. Marcel, vol. 1, Paris, 1964, p.224; XVII, 1, ed. Idem, vol. 3, Paris, 1970, p. 148; *Commentaria in Philebum Platonis de summo bono*, XVII and XXVI, ed. M. J. B. Allen, Berkeley-Los Angeles-London, 1975, p. 181 and p. 247; *Epistulae*, Lib. I, *Opera omnia*, p. 634; *Ibid.*, Lib. VIII, p. 871.

¹⁵ Cf. *Argumentum in librum Mercurii Trismegisti, Opera omnia*, p. 1836. R. Marcel regards this lacking of Zoroaster as important, and he attributes Ficino's later insertion of Zoroaster into the ancient theologians to the influence from Proclus rather than to the knowledge of Plethon's doctrine (Cf. *Marsile Ficino (1433-1499)*, Paris, 1958, pp. 603-612). I, however, would accept Kristeller's explication that when the translation of *Corpus Hermeticum* was published (1463), Ficino had not yet known the existence of the Oracle (this opinion is reported by Dannenfeldt, *The Pseudo-Zoroastrian Oracles in the Renaissance*, p. 13, note 34). Cf. also, I. Klustein, *Marsile Ficino et «les Oracles chaldaïques»*, in G. C. Garfagnini (ed.), *Marsilio Ficino e il ritorno di Platone: Studi e documenti*, 2 vols., Firenze, 1986, p. 331. note 2. And on the founder of the ancient theology, in the *Preface* of the translation of Plotinus it is said that the holy philosophy was born at the same time both among the Persians with Zoroaster and among the Egyptians with Hermes Trismegistus. But Ficino is seemd to generally agree with the priority of Zoroaster (Cf. notes 17 and 18 below).

¹⁶ Cf. *De religione christiana*, XXII, *Opera omnia*, p. 25. On Ficino's idea of the theological and philosophical concord, cf. Kristeller, *The Philosophy of Marsilio Ficino*, pp. 23-29; Idem, *Il pensiero filosofico di Marsilio Ficino*, Firenze, 1953, pp. 13-2; Idem, *Renaissance Concept of Man*, in Idem, *Renaissance Thought and Its Sources*, pp. 204-205; Schmitt, *Perennial Philosophy from Agostino Steuco to Leibniz*, pp. 507-511; Idem, *Prisca theologia e philosophia perennis: due temi del Rinascimento italiano e la loro fortuna*, pp. 217-219; Trinkaus, *op. cit.*, pp. 734-753; F. Purnell, Jr., *The Theme of Philosophic Concord and the Source of Ficino's Platonism*, in *Marsilio Ficino e il ritorno di Platone: Studi e documenti*, pp. 397-415.

¹⁷ *Theologia platonica*, XVI, 4, ed. Marcel, vol. 3, p. 173.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, IV, 2, ed. Marcel, vol. 1, p. 166.

¹⁹ E. g. in the *Platonic Theology*, there are found 17 citations from the

Chaldaean Oracles.

²⁰ Cf. *Oratio*, ed. Garin, p. 140 (tr. Forbes, p. 142). On the theological and philosophical concord in Pico, cf. Garin, *Pico della Mirandola: Vita e dottrina*, pp. 73-89; Kristeller, *Renaissance Concept of Man*, 56-61 [in Idem, *Renaissance Thought and Its Sources*, pp. 205-209]; Schmitt, *Perennial Philosophy from Agostino Steuco to Leibniz*, pp. 511-513; Idem, *Prisca theologia e philosophia perennis: due temi del Rinascimento italiano e la loro fortuna*, pp. 219-220; De Lubac, *Pic de la Mirandole: Études et discussions*, pp. 90-113, 243-260 et passsim; Trinkaus, *op. cit.*, 753-760. Cf. also Craven, *op. cit.*, 89-111.

²¹ *Oratio*, ed. Garin, pp. 112-130 (tr. Forbes, pp. 228-237).

²² Cf. *Ibid.*, ed. Garin, p. 144 (tr. Forbes, p. 245).

²³ Cf. *Ibid.*, ed. Garin, pp. 126, 128 (tr. Forbes, p. 236).

²⁴ *Ibid.*, ed. Garin, p. 80 (tr. Forbes, p. 250).

²⁵ *Ibid.*, ed. Garin, p. 160, 162 (tr. Forbes, p. 253).

²⁶ *Opera omnia*, p. 367. I use Dannenfeldt's translation cited in his article (*The Pseudo-Zoroastrian Oracles in the Renaissance*, p. 15). Cf. A. J. Festugière, *Studia Mirandulana*, «Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Age», VII, 1932, pp. 170-171.

²⁷ Cf. *Conclusiones*, ed. Kieszkowski, pp. 49-50, 77-78.

4

¹ Cf. Notes 2, 4 and 5 above.

² Cf. Cicero, *De divinatione*, I, 46.

³ Cf. *Ibid.*, I, 90. Cf. also, Idem, *De legibus*, II, 26; Idem, *Tusculanae Disputationes*, I, 107; Vitruvius, *De aedificia*, VII, prol., 1.

⁴ *Oratio*, ed. Garin, p. 148 (tr. Forbes, p. 247). Cf. Porphyry, *De abstinetia*, IV, 16; Apuleius, *Apologia*, XXV.

⁵ Cf. Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae philosophorum*, I, 2; Pliny, *Historia naturalis*, XXX, 3; Clemens of Alexandria, *Stromata*, I, 15; Cyrillus, *Adversus Jilianum*, III; Apuleius, *Florida*, XV. Cf. also Bidez et Cumont, *op. cit.*, vol. 2, pp. 34-35.

⁶ Cf. Μαγικά λόγια τῶν τοῦ Ζωροάστρου Μάγων ἐξήγηθῆντα, ed. J. Opsopœus, pp. 25, 38 [ed. Alexandre, pp. 274, 278]; Ficino, *Quinque platonicae sapientiae clave*, XII, ed. Marcel, Appendix to *Theologia platonica*, vol. 3, p. 341.

⁷ Cf. Ficino, *Theologia platonica*, XIII, 2, ed. Marcel, vol. 2, p. 221; *Ibid.*, XVII, 1, vol. 3, p. 148; Pico, *Oratio*, ed. Garin, p. 150 (tr. Forbes, p. 247).

⁸ Cf. Apuleius, *Apologia*, 26.

⁹ *Oratio*, ed. Garin, p. 148 (tr. Forbes, p. 247).

¹⁰ *Alcibiades I*, 121 E-122 A (tr. W. R. M. Lamb, London-Cambridge, Mass., 1955, p. 167).

¹¹ Cf. Apuleius, *Apologia*, 26.

¹² Cf. *Oratio*, ed. Garin, p. 148 (tr. Forbes, pp. 146-147).

¹³ Cf. Ficino, *Theologia platonica*, XII, 1, ed. Marcel, vol. 2, p. 157.

¹⁴ Cf. *Oratio*, ed. Garin, p. 150 (tr. Forbes, p. 247.) Cf. also Pliny, *Historia naturalis*, XXX, 9; Cicero, *Tusculanae disputationes*, IV, 45; Idem, *De finibus*, V, 29. Pico, also in *Heptaplus* states that "All the Greeks who have been considered the most excellent took the Egyptians as teachers: Pythagoras, Plato, Empedocles and Democritus" (Prooemium, ed. Garin, p. 170. tr. D. Carmichael, in Pico della Mirandola, *On the Dignity of Man, On Being and the One and Heptaplus*, Indianapolis-New York-Kansas City, 1965, p. 68). On Democritus, cf. Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae philosophorum*, IX, 34; DK, 68A 16=Aelianus, *Varia historia*, IV, 20; DK, 68 A 40=Hippolytus, *Refutatio Omnium Haeresium*, I, 13; DK, 68 A 2=Suidas; Clemens of Alexandria, *Stromata*, I, 5. On Plato, cf. Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae philosophorum*, III, 6-7; Olympiodrus, *Commentarium in Platonis Alcibiadem*, I, 2; Anonymus, *Prolegomena*, IV. On Pythagoras, cf. Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae philosophorum*, VIII, 2-3; DK, 14, 11=Hippolytus, *Refutatio Omnium Haeresium*, I, 2; DK, 14, 4=Diodrus, XII, 9; Clemens of Alexandria, *Stromata*, I, 15; Plutarch, *De animae procreatione in Timaeo*, 2 [Moralia, 68, 1012E]; Porphyry, *De vita pythagorica*, 12; Iamblichus, *De vita pythagorica*, IV, 19; Apuleius, *Apologia*, 31.

¹⁵ *Oratio*, ed. Garin, p. 150 (tr. Forbes, p. 248) Cf. Plato, *Charmides*, 156 D-157 B; Ficino, *Theologia platonica*, XIII, 1, ed. Marcel, vol. 2, p. 198. On Zamolxis as pupil of Pythagoras, cf. Herodotus, *Historiae*, IV, 94-95; Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae philosophorum*, VIII, 2; Porphyry, *De vita pythagorica*, 14; Iamblichus, *De vita pythagorica*, XXX, 173.

¹⁶ *Oratio*, ed. Garin, p. 150 (tr. Forbes, p. 248).

¹⁷ *Apologia*, 90, ed. R. Helm, 5th ed., Leipzig, 1972, p. 100. Cf. Pliny, *Historia naturalis*, XXX, 5; XXX, 8; XXX, 9; Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae philosophorum*, I, 2; VIII, 16; Porphyry, *De vita pythagorica*, 21; Iamblichus, *De vita pythagorica*, XXIII, 104; Tertullianus, *De anima*, 57; Arnobius, *Disputationes adversus gentes*, 52.

¹⁸ *Historia naturalis*, XXX, 2 (tr. W. H. S. Jornes, vol. 8, London-Cambridge, Mass., 1963, p. 281). Cf. Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae philosophorum*, I, 8. On Ulysses, cf. Pliny, *Historia naturalis*, XXX, 2.

¹⁹ Cf. *Apologia*, ed. cit., p. 100; ed. P. Vallette, 2nd ed., Paris, 1960, p. 107.

²⁰ Cf. *Historia naturalis* XXX, 9.

²¹ Cf. Ficino, *De laudibus medicinae, Opera omnia*, I, p. 758. Cf. also Marcel, *Marsile Ficin*, p. 608.

²² We can know his life and teachings from Philostratus' *Life of Apollonius of Tyana*. On his relation to the Magian and Magic, cf. L. Thorndide, *A History of Magic and Experimental Science*, Vol. 1, New York-London, 1923, pp. 242-267.

²³ *Theologia platonica*, XVIII, 4, ed. Marcel, vol. 3, p. 195. Cf. *Ibid.*, XIII, 4, vol. 2, p. 235; *Commentarium in Convivium Platonis, de amore*, VI, 10, ed. R. Marcel, Paris, 1956, p. 221; *De vita triplici*, III, 3, 8, 21, *Opera omnia*, pp. 535, 541, 562.

Because of the fame of Apollonius as a Magian, Gian Francesco Pico is thought to have dedicated the whole chapter 'Adversus magica Apollonii Tyanaei' in the 7th book (*De subseditiosa praenotatione adversus magiam*) of *De rerum praenotatione (Opera omnia)*, Basileae, 1573 [rpt. Hildesheim, 1969], pp. 667-674). Cf. D. P. Walker, *Spiritual and Demonic Magic from Ficino to Campanella*, London, 1958 [rpt. Nendeln, 1969; London, 1975], 146-148.

5

¹ *Conclusiones secundum propriam opinionem de intelligentia dictorum Zoroastris et expositorum eius Chaldeorum*, 10, ed. Kieszkowski, p. 78. Cf. Ficino, *Theologia platonica*, II, 7, ed. Marcel, vol. 1, p. 92.

² *Oratio*, ed. Garin, p. 162 (tr. Forbes, pp. 253-254).

³ On the languages of mysteries, cf. in particular, Wind, *Pagan Mysteries in the Renaissance*, pp. 1-25.

⁴ *Heptaplus*, Prooemium, ed. Garin, p. 172 (tr. Carmichael, p. 68).

⁵ *Ibid.*; *Oratio*, ed. Garin, p. 156 (tr. Forbes, p. 250).

⁶ *Heptaplus*, Prooemium, ed. Garin, p. 172 (tr. Carmichael, pp. 68-69). Cf. *Oratio*, ed. Garin, p. 156 (tr. Forbes, p. 250); Iamblichus, *De vita pythagorica*, XXVIII, 146.

⁷ *Oratio*, ed. Garin, pp. 140, 142 (tr. Forbes, p. 243).

⁸ *Heptaplus*, Prooemium, ed. Garin, p. 172 (tr. Carmichael, p. 69). Cf. *Oratio*, ed. Garin, p. 156 (tr. Forbes, p. 250); Plato, *Epistula II*, 315 D-E.

⁹ *Conclusiones Cabalistiche, secundum opinionem, ex ipsis Hebreorum sapientum fundamentis Cristianam Religionem maxime confirmantes*, 10, ed. Kieszkowski, p. 84. I follow De Pina Martin's correction (*op. cit.*, p. 79).

¹⁰ *Oratio*, ed. Garin, pp. 121-130 (tr. Forbes, pp. 228-237). Cf. note 3, 21 above.

6

¹ *Oratio*, ed. Garin, pp. 102, 104 (tr. Forbes, pp. 223-224).

² *Ibid.*, ed. Garin, pp. 104, 106 (tr. Forbes, pp. 224-225).

³ Cf. Craven's polemic against "the generally accepted interpretation of Pico's anthropology" (*op. cit.*, pp. 21-45).

⁴ *Oratio*, ed. Garin, pp. 106, 108 (tr. Forbes, pp. 225-226).

⁵ On the Egyptians, cf. Herodotus, *Histriae*, II, 123; On Pythagoras, cf. Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae philosophorum*, VIII 4-5; Porphyry, *De vita pythagorica*, 30. On Empedocles, cf. DK, 31 B 117=Diogenes Laertius, VIII, 77; DK, 31 B 127=Aelianus, *Varia historia*, XII, 7, Cf. also *Corpus hermeticum*, X, 7-8;

Asclepius, 12.

⁶ There are the debates about Pico's acceptance of the traditional concept of 'homo=microcosmos'. Cf. Garin, *Giovanni Pico della Mirandola. Vita e dottrina*, p. 27; Idem, *L'umanesimo italiano. Filosofia e vita civile nel Rinascimento*, 2a ed., Roma, 1958, p. 124; Idem, *La «dignitas hominis» e la letteratura patristica*, «Rinascita», I, no. 4, 1938, p. 104; Kristeller, *Eight Philosophers of the Italian Renaissance*, pp. 66-67; Idem, *Renaissance Concept of Man*, p. 16; Monnerjahn, *op. cit.*, pp. 24, 27; Di Naploli, *Giovanni Pico della Mirandola e la problematica dottrinale del suo tempo*, pp. 399-405; Idem, *Contempus mundi e Dignitas hominis nel Rinascimento*, in his *Studi sul Rinascimento*, Napoli, 1973, pp. 60-62; E. Colomer, *Individuo e cosmo in Niccolò Cusano e Giovanni Pico*, in *L'opera e il pensiero di Giovanni Pico*, vol. 2, pp. 85-90; De Lubac, *op. cit.*, pp. 86-87, 167; Craven, *op. cit.*, p. 31. My view on this problem is presented in an article: *Pico della Mirandola ni okeru ningengo honsei no mondai (The problem of 'natura humana' in Pico della Mirandola)*, «Rinrigaku-Nenpou (Annals of Ethics)», Tokyo, XXXVI, 1987, pp. 19-35.

⁷ *Heptaplus*, IV, 5, ed. Garin, p. 280 (tr. Carmichael, p. 123). Cf. Plato, *Respublica*, 588 D.

⁸ *Ἐξήγησις τῶν χαλδαϊκῶν βιβλιῶν*, P. G., CXXII, 1140 A (ed. De Place, pp. 176-177). Cf. De Place, *op. cit.*, pp. 104, 145; Lewy, *op. cit.*, p. 265.

⁹ *Theologia platonica*, XVII, 4, ed. Marcel, vol. 3, p. 173: "Σὺν γὰρ ἀγγεῖον θῆρες χλοὺς αἰκίησουσιν. Id est: Tuum vas bestiae terrae habitant." Here the Greek text differs from that of Plethon, which lacks γὰρ, on the other hand, the later edition gives the same as Ficino's (ed. Johannes Lodoicus Tiletanus, Paris, 1538, rpt. in Kieszkowski, *Studi sul platonismo del Rinascimento in Italia*, p. 157). And the Latin translation contained in *Magica (idest philosophica) dicta magorum ex Zoroaster* existing in the *Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana (Laur. 36, 35)* is different from those of Ficino and Pico: "Tuum enim vas ferae terre habitabunt" (ed. Kieszkowski, in *op. cit.*, p. 159). This translation has been attributed to Ficino but was recently proved that it was not his. Cf. Klustein, *op. cit.*, 331-338; Kristeller, *Marsilio Ficino and His Work after Five Hundred Years*, Appendix III, in *Marsilio Ficino e il ritorno di Platone: Studi e documenti*, p. 86.

¹⁰ *Oratio*, ed. Garin, p. 108 (tr. Forbes, pp. 226-227). The citation from the *Caldaean Oracles* written in the Hebrew language appeared for the first time in the Basel's edition (1557), while in the draft of the *Oratio*, the Egyptian letters are written, which are the transcription from the Hebrew letters, as C. Wirszubski pointed out (Flavius Mithridates, *Sermo de passionem domini*, 'Introduction', Jerusalem, 1963, p. 38). Wirszubski also gives the Latin translation of the passage: "homo est animal naturae variae et vage et mutantis se huc et illuc". I could not find this in the modern collection of *Chaldaean*

Oracles. After all, we would have to think that Pico possessed the text of Oracles more spacious than that we now know, as Dannenfeldt suggests (*The Pseudo-Zoroastrian Oracles in the Renaissance*, p. 16), although we cannot conclude that this passage was contained in the Oracles written in the Chaldaean language, of which Pico reported in a letter to Ficino.

7

¹ *Conclusiones Magice secundum opinionem propriam*, 9, ed. Kieszkowski, p. 79.

² *Oratio*, ed. Garin, p. 152 (tr. Forbes, p. 248). Cf. Plotinus, *Enneades*, IV, 4, 43.

³ *Oratio*, ed. Garin, p. 152 (tr. Forbes, p. 248).

⁴ *Ibid.*, ed. Garin, p. 152 (tr. Forbes, pp. 248-249).

⁵ Cf. e.g. Plato, *Timaeus*, 30 D; Alexander of Aphrodisias, *De Mixtione*, 142; Epictetus, *Disertationes ad Arriano digestae*, I, 14; Philo of Alexandria, *De opificio mundi*, 117; Sextus Empiricus, *Adversus mathematicos*, IX, 78. On the sympathetic theory of the Stoics, cf. in particular, K. Reinhardt, *Kosmos und Sympathie*, München, 1926.

⁶ *De natura deorum*, III, 28 (tr. H. Rackham, London-Cambridge, Mass., 1933, p. 312). Cf. Plinius, *Historia naturalis* XX, 1.

⁷ *Commentarium in Convivium Platonis, de amore*, VI, 10, ed. R. Marcel, Paris, 1956, p. 220 (tr. S. R. Jayne, Columbia, 1944, p. 199). On the Magic in Ficino (and Pico), cf. Walker, *Spiritual and Demonic Magic*, pp. 3-29; Yates, *Giordano Bruno and the Hermetic Tradition*, pp. 62-116, 126-129; Zambelli, *Il problema della magia naturale nel Rinascimento*, «Rivista critica di storia della filosofia», XXVIII (1973), pp. 279-285; Idem, *Platone, Ficino e la magia*, in E. Hora and E. Kessler (eds.), *Studia humanitatis. Ernesto Grassi zum 70*, München, 1973, pp. 121-142; Idem, *Le probleme de la magie naturelle à la Renaissance*, in *Magia, astrologia e religione nel Rinascimento*, Convegno polacco-italiano (Varsavia: 25-27 settembre 1972), Wrocław-Warszawa-Kraków-Gdańsk, 1974, pp. 60-66; G. Zanier, *La medicina astrologica e la sua teoria. Marsilio Ficino e i suoi critici contemporanei*, Roma, 1977; W.-D. Müller-Jahneke, *Von Ficino zu Agrippa: Der Magia-Begriff des Renaissance-Humanismus im Überblick*, in A. Faivre and R. C. Zimmermann (eds.), *Epochen der Naturmystik: Hermetische Tradition im wissenschaftlichen Fortschritt*, Berlin, 1979, pp. 24-51; P. Hadot, *L'«Amor magicien»*. *Aux origines de la notion de «Magia naturalis»*: *Platon, Plotin, Marsile Ficin*, «Revue philosophique de la France et de l'étranger», CLXXII, 1982, pp. 283-292.

⁸ *Commentarium in Convivium Platonis*, VI, 10, p. 220 (tr. pp. 199-200).

⁹ *De vita coelitus comparanda*, 1, *Opera omnia*, p. 531 (tr. Ch. Doer, *The Book of Life*, Irving, Texas, 1980, p. 87).

¹⁰ *Περὶ ἐνυπνίων*, 2 (cited by Thorndike, *op. cit.*, p. 542).

- ¹¹ Cf. *Metamorphoses*, III, 16; *Apologia*, 34; 47.
- ¹² On the ζυγξ of the Greek Magic, cf. in particular, M. Detienne, *Les Jardins d'Adonis*, Paris, 1972, pp. 160-167.
- ¹³ Cf. Philostoratus, *Vita Apollonii*, VI, 10. Cf. also Thorndike, *op. cit.*, pp. 265-267.
- ¹⁴ Cf. Lewy, *op. cit.*, pp. 132-137, 249-252.
- ¹⁵ Ἐξήγησις τῶν χαλδαϊκῶν, ῥητῶν, P. G., CXXII, 1149 A-B (ed. De Place, pp. 185-186).
- ¹⁶ Lewy, *op. cit.*, p. 134.
- ¹⁷ Βραχεῖά τις διασάφησις τῶν ἐν τοῖς λογίοις τούτοις ἀσαφέστερος λεγομένων, ed. Kieszkowski, in *Studi sul platonismo del Rinascimento in Italia*, p. 161. I use Woodhouse's translation in *op. cit.*, p. 53. Cf. Plethon, *Μαγικὰ λόγια τῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ Ζωροάστρου Μάγων ἐξηγηθέντα*, ed. J. Opsopoeus, pp. 46-49; Woodhouse, *op. cit.*, p. 58.
- ¹⁸ On other relations between Pico's thought and the *Chaldaean Oracles*, cf. Dannenfeldt, *The Pseudo-Zoroastrian Oracles in the Renaissance*, pp. 16-17.