

of Analysis and Division (§§ 167, 168) which avoids explaining the meaning of the terms altogether. But the total impression produced is such as to silence hasty or fragmentary criticism. These few chapters are undoubtedly a contribution to Platonic study of the very first importance: there is nothing stale or second-hand about them; and they require for their criticism little less than a re-reading of the text of Plato. And while their value is in a great measure independent of Professor Burnet's main hypothesis, they are yet the most convincing testimony to the soundness of that hypothesis that has so far appeared. We doubt if anyone who disagreed with the Introduction to the *Phaedo* will be able to lay down this book without a feeling that Professor Burnet is a good deal nearer to the truth than he formerly believed.

It will be admitted that there is no extant account of Plato which is free from ill-concealed difficulties and contradictions, to which we are only deadened by familiarity. If we look candidly at Professor Burnet's version, making due allowance for very deep-seated prejudice, we shall find—possibly to our surprise—that it is certainly not more difficult or contradictory than the strongest of its rivals. But there is a further deduction to be made. Professor Burnet, for all his twenty years' study (p. 349) of Plato, is a mere tiro at the exposition of his hypothesis compared with the youngest expositor of the other. An army of predecessors has not been at work to strengthen his weak places. He has had to do the work himself, and, brilliantly as he has done it, parts of the defences are bound to be somewhat tentative and provisional. Making due allowance, again, for this fact, we are bound to conclude either that Professor Burnet's personal prowess is incomparably greater than that of his eminent antagonists, or that his position is naturally much stronger than theirs. Which alternative is to be preferred? Much as we respect Professor Burnet, we are inclined to adopt the latter.

J. L. S.

Nemesios von Emesa: Quellenforschungen zum Neuplatonismus und seinen Anfängen bei Poseidonios. Von W. W. JÄGER. Pp. 143. Berlin: Weidmann, 1914.

Nemesios was a Christian Bishop of Emesa in Syria towards the end of the fourth century of our era. He wrote a treatise *περὶ φύσεως ἀνθρώπου*, showing a curious mixture of Pagan and Christian learning, parts of which have come down to us under the name of Gregory of Nyssa. A new edition of this work, we learn from Dr. Jaeger's preface, will shortly be produced by Dr. Burkhard of Vienna. The extracts from Nemesios which were included in the third part of Von Arnim's *Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta* showed plainly that valuable material for the later history of Stoicism and for the relation of Stoicism to other philosophies was to be found in the treatise; and what Dr. Jaeger here attempts is to discover the main sources upon which Nemesios relied, and so to enable us to estimate more precisely the importance of his evidence. He does not deal with the whole work, though he thinks that it would repay a thorough analysis, but with a few chapters which seemed to be particularly instructive. The discussion is regarded, as the sub-title explains, as spade-work preparatory for the historical account of Neo-platonism that will one day be written. 'With equal justification,' says Dr. Jaeger, 'I might have called my work simply "Enquiries concerning Poseidonios."' For Poseidonios is the true founder of Neo-platonism, and recent researches make it increasingly clear that his eclectic system was by far the most powerful influence operating upon the philosophical and theological speculations of the Roman Empire; indeed, considering the length of its duration and the range of its extension, we may doubt whether his sway over the human mind was not more absolute than that of any philosopher before or since. For though Plato and Aristotle were always greater names, Poseidonios was the medium through which they were seen, the accepted interpreter and harmonizer of their doctrines.

The treatise is divided into two parts, the first headed 'Galen's theory of knowledge and the older Neo-platonism,' the second headed 'Poseidonian Metaphysics (*Weltanschauung*) in Nemesios.' Under the first head Dr. Jaeger deals with the six chapters concerning sensation and the senses and the two chapters concerning sense and memory. For the account of the senses the main source is Galen's lost work in fifteen books, *περὶ ἀποδείξεως*, of part of which his surviving *συμφωνία* of Plato and Hippocrates gives us a compressed version. The inference to the lost work is based on a comparison of Nemesios with the relevant passages in the *συμφωνία*. The character of Galen's doctrine, a compound of Platonic and Aristotelian matter with a dash of Epicurus thrown in, agreeing in important details with Plotinus, Basileios, and Philo, points to a neo-platonic source. The account of Memory is partly drawn from Galen, but the greater part is frankly neo-platonic and is probably drawn from Porphyry's *περὶ δυνάμεων ψυχῆς*. Throughout these chapters the doxography is in varying degrees divergent from Aetios, and Dr. Jaeger thinks that Porphyry at any rate got his information from the school of Poseidonios, which, as Diels has pointed out, formed doxographies of its own. Thus, though no direct path to Poseidonios is found in this part of the enquiry, a good many converging probabilities point in his direction.

In the second part Dr. Jaeger directly faces the question whether the metaphysical doctrines of Nemesios show signs of Poseidonian influence. He begins with the theory of the four elements and their interchanges, and shows a community of tendency between Nemesios and writers as far apart as Galen, Basileios, Chalcidius. The signs of wide doxographical learning and of extensive medical reading, the position accorded to the *Timaeus*, the general combination of Platonic and Aristotelian ideas, together with much detailed evidence, point to a neo-platonic source which must be in the last resort Poseidonios himself. This conclusion is corroborated by an investigation of the notion of 'Syndesmos,' i.e. of that rudimentary evolution-theory which refused to admit any *saltus naturae* and attempted to break down the apparent disparities of creation by the discovery of intermediates. The idea may be said perhaps to originate with the *Timaeus* of Plato and was certainly not without influence upon Aristotle. This is the most interesting chapter in the book and deserves careful study. It ends with an account of the position of man and civilization—that ancient field of controversy in which late Greek thought sought to combine all the combatants, Democritus, Epicurus, Academic, Peripatetic, Cynic, Stoic, in a lasting peace. Here too the 'Syndesmos' idea has its application; for man is himself the link between heaven and earth, and here the Microcosmos doctrine of Democritus and Poseidonios joins hands with the Bible story of the Creation. In all this the original synthesis was that of Poseidonios, and his intellectual force was so much greater than that of his followers that his ideas still survived and triumphed four or five hundred years after his death, when his name was almost forgotten.

Such are Dr. Jaeger's contentions. They are expounded with the thoroughness and lucidity which is to be expected from him. A sceptical reader may refuse to be convinced: he will easily find loopholes through which doubt may enter: or he may take refuge in the general criticism that such enquiries lead in the end nowhither. Often, indeed, it does seem regrettable that so much learning and acumen is spent on these source-hunting expeditions; and if anything is quite certain it is that nothing of real philosophic importance can be discovered in this way. So that the philosopher is inclined to join the sceptics. Still the sport is difficult and arduous, and it would be churlish to withhold applause and gratitude to those who face its hardships and cheerfully hope that they are contributing to great results. However, we should be glad to welcome Dr. Jaeger back to Aristotle.