

Studia graeco-arabica

9



2019

Editorial Board

Mohammad Ali Amir Moezzi, École Pratique des Hautes Études, Paris
Carmela Baffioni, Istituto Universitario Orientale, Napoli
Sebastian Brock, Oriental Institute, Oxford
Charles Burnett, The Warburg Institute, London
Hans Daiber, Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität Frankfurt a. M.
Cristina D'Ancona, Università di Pisa
Thérèse-Anne Druart, The Catholic University of America, Washington
Gerhard Endress, Ruhr-Universität Bochum
Richard Goulet, Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Paris
Steven Harvey, Bar-Ilan University, Jerusalem
Henri Hugonnard-Roche, École Pratique des Hautes Études, Paris
Remke Kruk, Universiteit Leiden
Concetta Luna, Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa
Alain-Philippe Segonds (†)
Richard C. Taylor, Marquette University, Milwaukee (WI)

Staff

Elisa Coda, Cristina D'Ancona, Giulia Guidara, Issam Marjani, Cecilia Martini Bonadeo

Submissions

Submissions are invited in every area of the studies on the transmission of philosophical and scientific texts from Classical Antiquity to the Middle Ages, Renaissance, and early modern times. Papers in English, French, German, Italian, and Spanish are published. Prospect authors are invited to check the *Guidelines* on the website of the journal, and to address their proposals to the Editor in chief.

Peer Review Criteria

Studia graeco-arabica follows a double-blind peer review process. Authors should avoid putting their names in headers or footers or refer to themselves in the body or notes of the article; the title and abstract alone should appear on the first page of the submitted article. All submitted articles are read by the editorial staff. Manuscripts judged to be of potential interest to our readership are sent for formal review to at least one reviewer. *Studia graeco-arabica* does not release referees' identities to authors or to other reviewers. The journal is committed to rapid editorial decisions.

Subscription orders

Information on subscription rates for the print edition of Volume 9 (2019), claims and customer service: redazione@pacinieditore.it

Web site: <http://learningroads.cfs.unipi.it/sga>

Service Provider: Università di Pisa, ICT - Servizi di Rete Ateneo

ISSN 2281-2687

ISSN 2239-012X (Online)

Registration at the law court of Pisa, 18/12, November 23, 2012.

Editor in chief Cristina D'Ancona (cristina.dancona@unipi.it)

Mailing address: Dipartimento di Civiltà e Forme del Sapere, via Pasquale Paoli 15, 56126 Pisa, Italia.

Italian Scientific Journals Ranking: A (ANVUR, Classe A)

Indexing and Abstracting: ERIH PLUS (SCH ESF); Index Islamicus (Brill Bibliographies); Scopus (Elsevier)



© Copyright 2019 by Industrie Grafiche Pacini Editore, Pisa.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the Publisher. The Publisher remains at the disposal of the rightholders, and is ready to make up for unintentional omissions. *Studia graeco-arabica* cannot be held responsible for the scientific opinions of the authors publishing in it.

Cover

Māshad, Kitābhāna-i Āsitān-i Quds-i Raḍawī 300, f. 1v
Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, *grec* 1853, f. 186v

D.D. Butorac - D.A. Layne (Eds.), *Proclus and his Legacy*, W. de Gruyter, Berlin - Boston 2017 (Millennium Studien zu Kultur und Geschichte des ersten Jahrtausends n. Chr., 65), x + 456 pp.

This volume comprises 27 short essays on Proclus issued from a conference held in 2012 at Fatih University, Istanbul, to celebrate the 1600th anniversary of Proclus' birth in Constantinople. The rationale for the three parts is provided in the Introduction by J. Dillon and the two editors D. Butorac and D.A. Layne (pp. 1-13): life and thought (Part I), reception in Byzantine and Christian authors (Part II), reception in the Arabic tradition and early modernity (Part III). The Latin reception is conspicuous by its absence and is not mentioned in the Introduction.

Part I (pp. 14-158) is entitled "Proclus in Context: Background, Relevance and System" and opens with an essay by S. Gersh, "Proclus in the History of Philosophy: Construction and Deconstruction" (pp. 17-31). "Beginning in late antiquity and continuing in the Middle Ages, we see a variety of responses to Proclus' work. These range between the outright critique of his doctrine that tends to predominate in the Byzantine East – where the tradition of seeing Proclus as the epitome of a 'Hellenism' that was contrasted with Christianity began quite early – and the assimilation of Proclus' ideas in the Latin west in a more positive manner" (p. 18). Gersh detects three main features in the diffusion of Proclus' writings: (i) the reading of his works in conjunction with those of Syrianus and Damascius; (ii) the concealment of Proclus' doctrines in the writings of the Ps.-Dionysius, and (iii) the exploitation of his ideas in the context of the late-Antique commentaries on Aristotle. An outline of the consequences of the loss of some works and of the pseudepigraphical paraphrase of others (the well-known *Liber de Causis*) complete the picture.

H. Tarrant, "Forgetting Procline Theology: The Alexandrian Story" (pp. 33-44), compares the anonymous *Prolegomena to Plato's Philosophy* with Olympiodorus' commentary on the *Phaedo*: "Olympiodorus' great discovery, perhaps dictated by necessity as the mother of invention, was that everything that was required for Platonist instruction at Alexandria could be translated into Christian terms. The uncompromising pagan systems of theology presented by Proclus and Damascius could be reworked in ways that continued to make sense of their Platonic texts and allowed those texts to go on being used and plausibly explained to Christian audiences" (p. 44).

D.A. Vasilakis, "Platonic Eros, Moral Egoism, and Proclus" (pp. 45-52) deals with the "divine lover's providential attitude" based on *Phdr.* 253 B 3 – C 2, and reflected in Proclus' commentary on the *First Alcibiades*. "According to the strong unitarian Neoplatonic reading of Plato, it is not so surprising that for Proclus the relationship of the divine lover with his beloved, both in the *Symposium* and in the *Phaedrus*, is the exact analogue of the Demiurge's relation to the Receptacle, and that of the philosopher-king to his own 'political receptacle' (...) the analogy between the divine lover and the divine craftsman is made explicit by Proclus himself" (p. 49).

D.A. Layne, "The Platonic Hero" (pp. 53-67), is devoted to this semi-divine and semi-human figure in the Neoplatonic context, i.e. "some kind of elevated particular souls who, as an agent of divine providence, illuminates, in his words and deeds, the god's unceasing *philia* and mediated contact through all levels of reality, both intelligible and sensible, and, as a consequence, they inspire average souls to become like such heroes, i.e. ones who seem to be both human and divine" (p. 53). For this reason "Proclus explicitly identifies Socrates with heroism and further legitimates the activity of praying to heroes so as to enact ascent, contemplation, and, perhaps, even union with the providential will of the gods" (p. 54). Following the lead of Iamblichus, who "insists that daemons and heroes are the necessary intermediaries between incorporeal and corporeal being" (p. 56), Proclus adds that they perform "the deeds that constitute the perfection of the soul and the reversion to the intelligible" (p. 59). The paper ends with a comparison with saints in Christian worship.

The paper by H.S. Lang, “The Status of Body in Proclus” (pp. 69-82) raises the question why the body does not feature among the primary constitutive principles of Proclus’ universe. This is so because “it has no agency. In a hierarchical arrangement of causes and effects from what is most perfect and so most active to what is least active and so incomplete and imperfect, body has no place. Having no potency, body is ‘off the bottom of the chart’: without potency it cannot even be moved or, speaking generally, be an effect. Being nothing but divisibility into parts, body has no relation to any kind of whole. It possesses no basis for participation in a more perfect potency or in a whole whose parts are wholes” (p. 80). It can nevertheless participate in the incorporeal. According to Lang, here at p. 80 as also earlier in the paper (p. 78), “This view, however Aristotelian the language in which it is expressed, recalls Plato”. One should not forget, however, that the foundations of Proclus’ account are in Plotinus, whose doctrines of potency and omnipresence are pivotal for the conception of the body and the incorporeal dealt with in this article. Surprisingly enough, Plotinus is never mentioned, as if Proclus’ interlocutors were only Plato and Aristotle.

A comparison with Plotinus is made by A. Vargas, “Proclus on Time and the Units of Time” (pp. 83-93). “Proclus takes the fact that time measures psychic activity to be his strongest proof (against Plotinus) that time is not a product of soul (*In Tim.* III.22.4-21). The reason for this is that since temporal measures are normative for the duration of beings, determining when they should start their activities and when they should come-to-be, they must exist prior to the changes they measure” (p. 87). From this, Vargas draws the conclusion that for Proclus Time is “the contemplation of all the forms under the aspect of eternity” (p. 88), although acknowledging that he “does not tell us explicitly” (*ibid.*). Vargas also ventures to conclude that “time’s knowledge of all the forms according to perpetuity results in the calculation of the great year and with it the determination of the proper measures of all beings in the world” (*ibid.*).

This topic resurfaces in the paper by I. Ramelli, “Proclus and *Apokatastasis*” (pp. 95-122). After recalling the Stoic notion of ἀποκατάστασις and its Christian adaptation in terms of soteriologic palingenesis, Ramelli focusses on the difference between the Christian and late-Neoplatonic visions. Both share in a soteriologic feature that is lacking from the original Stoic notion: “In pagan and Christian Neoplatonism (...) *apokatastasis* became the doctrine of the salvation of the soul” (p. 96). However, for Proclus – at variance with the theory of universal *apokatastasis* held by several Christian thinkers of that time – there are “infinite beginnings (ἀρχαί) and infinite ends (τέλη), because infinite are the returns and the apokatastatic cycles in his system” (pp. 107-8). Note that Ramelli (pp. 100-1) is convinced that Origen the Christian and Origen the Platonist, the co-disciple of Plotinus at the school of Ammonius Saccas, were one and the same person, a point which is not met with scholarly consensus, despite appearances that the reader may get from fn. 23.

According to D.D. Butorac, “Proclus’ Aporetic Epistemology” (pp. 123-35), “there is a dominant understanding within scholarship today of the Procline undescended soul, its *dianoia* and its objects (*logoi*) whose understanding of the soul comes mostly from the *Elements of Theology*, and is entirely unproblematic, but here we have been influenced by Iamblichus’ self-interested presentation of his system as radically different from Plotinus” (p. 130). Butorac thinks that if one relies instead on the *Commentary on the Parmenides*, the status of the soul changes significantly: it features here and there as capable of approaching what Butorac labels the “higher *dianoia*” (p. 134), although remaining incapable of that intellectual cognition that Plotinus granted it. “At stake is the character and even the possibility of the highest dialectic or theology and it seems that the Procline soul is not united sufficiently to itself to encounter what is other than it, in particular, the intelligible principles whence it came, which it both must be ineluctably separate from and joined to” (p. 135).

E. Watts, “The Lycians are coming: The Career of Patricius, the father of Proclus” (pp. 137-43) calls attention to Proclus’ familiar background. His “early life may offer some important insights into why, unlike many of his pagan philosophical contemporaries, Proclus largely shunned intellectual and political engagement with the increasingly Christian population around him” (p. 138). Watts outlines the story of Proclus’ family, coming to the conclusion that they “may have been pagan refugees forced to flee the capital when he was quite young. One of Proclus’ great failings as head of the Athenian school was his inability to work effectively with Christian authorities. (...) The fact that Patricius’ career in the capital may have ended abruptly because of a shift in imperial religious policies could not help but influence this attitude. (...) To use modern parlance, the religious intolerance that forced Proclus’ family from the capital when he was a young child may have ultimately radicalized the philosopher” (p. 142).

M. Luz, “Marinus’ Abrahamic Notions of the Soul and the One” (pp. 145-58), explores Marinus of Neapolis’ theological doctrines. Marinus was born as a ‘Samaritan’, and it seems he abandoned the Abrahamic monotheism for the Athenian Neoplatonic faith in many gods, thus suscitating reactions. “The criticism leveled at Marinus was not of official or even Christian origin, but rather from inside the Neoplatonic school of Athens itself. Ostensibly, it reflects discord among Proclus’ pupils with one party favoring the cause of Marinus who succeeded Proclus in 485 CE – and the other favouring Isidorus of Alexandria, who prevailed a few years later” (p. 145). Luz suggests that during his ‘Samaritan’ period Marinus may have been in some way connected with the doctrines of the “semi-philosophical, gnostic Dositheans” (p. 152) – thus named after the legendary teacher of Simon Magus – and suggests that, during his stay in Athens, he engaged in a philosophical position mediating between Aristotle’s and Plotinus’ doctrines about the soul and the Intellect.

Part II (pp. 159-285) is devoted to “Ps.-Dionysius, Byzantium and the Christian Inheritance of Proclus”. In her “Spiritual Motion and the Incarnation in the Divine Names of Dionysius the Areopagite” (pp. 161-73), R. Coughlin examines the way in which the late-Neoplatonic tripartite ‘spiritual motion’ (in a circle, in a straight way, as a spiral) is adopted by the Ps.-Dionysius. The three kinds of ‘motion’ describe, in later Neoplatonism, the remaining of the principle in itself, its procession, and the reversion of the derivative towards its principle. The Ps.-Dionysius adopts this analogy in the new framework represented by the Christological doctrine of the council held in Chalcedon in 451. At variance with the doctrine of the two natures in Christ, truly divine and truly human, the Ps.-Dionysius has often been presented in past scholarship as affiliated to a monophysite position, “which does not preserve, but destroys both the human and divine natures in the Incarnation and creates something wholly new and unlike either of the constituents” (p. 171). According to Coughlin, the adoption of the analogy of the three motions supports the idea that the Ps.-Dionysius’ Christology, instead, is best accounted for against the background of the Chalcedonian doctrine.

T. Lankila, “A Crypto-pagan Reading of the Figure of Hierotheus and the ‘Dormition’ Passage in the *Corpus Areopagiticum*” (pp. 175-82), discusses the “amalgam of Neoplatonism and Christianity in the *CDA*” (*Corpus Dionysiacum Areopagiticum*) in order to answer the question “why is there this play of duplicate pseudonyms, Dionysius and Hierotheus?” (p. 178). Lankila suggests that the model of this relationship is that of Proclus to his teacher Syrianus. Proclus’ veneration evidences his “belief that divine providence causes some special souls, such as Pythagoras, Plato, Plotinus or Syrianus, to descend to the world of becoming in order to enlighten people regarding divine phenomena. (...) Comparing Procline *proemia* and corresponding passages referring to the works of a fictitious master of theology in the *CDA*, we observe the same elements of eulogy, gratitude, reception of divine light, talk about divine hierarchies, and references to the words of still higher authority (Plato for Proclus, Paul for the *CDA*). Both authors rhetorically posture themselves as transmitters of their master’s teaching in a way proportionate to their own capacities” (p. 179). Now, even though one may agree

that “Hierotheus is for the author what Syrianus is for Proclus”, this is not enough to come to the conclusion, aired in the paper, that the entire pseudo-Dionysian corpus was created to conceal and preserve for the future the Neoplatonic doctrines in a disguised form.

The paper by B. Schomakers, “An Unknown *Elements of Theology*? On Proclus as the model for the Hierotheos in the Dionysian Corpus” (pp. 183-97), deals with the same topic but arrives at different conclusions: for Schomakers ‘Hierotheos’ stands for Proclus himself rather than for Syrianus. The paper challenges the idea that the corpus is a forgery “composed with the explicit intent to dupe readers into believing it was actually written by the historical Dionysius” mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles as the Athenian who converted after Paul’s speech. Rather, it is Schomakers’ conviction that the author of the Dionysian corpus wanted to have the Neoplatonic sources he borrowed from to be recognised as such by his readers. Instead of wishing to persuade them that the work was by the historical Dionysius, the author “may have crafted a complex historical-philosophical-theological novel, in which a 5th century theologian chooses the 1st century convert Dionysius as his main character, opting therein for a first-person singular perspective” (p. 184). Ideas and even passages taken from Proclus’ *Elements of Theology* are ascribed to Hierotheus. One may readily agree with Schomakers that “behind the veil of Hierotheos, Dionysius achieves, with respect to Proclus, a certain metaphysical metamorphosis which implies a different perspective” (p. 193). Less persuasive is the proposal to read the corpus as a theologico-philosophical novel: no reason is provided for interpreting it in this way, except for the argument quoted above, i.e. that the true origin of its doctrines was easy to detect. Not so easy in reality, one may observe, if the forgery of a work issued from the Apostolic age was successful for so many centuries.

With the paper by E.S. Mainoldi, “The Transfiguration of Proclus’ Legacy: Pseudo-Dionysius and the Late Neoplatonic School of Athens” (pp. 199-217), we remain on the same ground but are guided in a different direction. First Mainoldi outlines the two main positions of contemporary scholarship on the pseudo-Dionysian corpus: the ‘crypto-pagan’ (see above) that at times indicates Damascius as the author of the corpus, and the ‘Origenist’, that envisages behind the Ps.-Dionysius an author connected with the Monophysite milieu of late-Antique Palestine. Against this background, Mainoldi sets for himself the task to demonstrate that the Ps.-Dionysius was engaged in a well-conscious reinterpretation of Neoplatonism. He “was very likely aware of Procline philosophical foundation of polytheism, so he felt the need to contrast it by a new philosophical perspective, built upon the causal uniqueness of the First Principle (...). Accepting the antinomy of a principle completely transcendent and at the same time revealing itself in theophanies, Ps.-Dionysius bypasses the multiplication of the first principles and also avoids the distributing of affirmative and negative features of the One principle, as well as its causal power, to several secondary principles, as it has been concluded by the two diadochs” Proclus and Damascius (p. 207). The philosophical/metaphysical doctrine consistently held throughout the *CDA* shows that the ‘crypto-pagan’ hypothesis is untenable. Rather, the Ps.-Dionysius entertains a continuous “critical dialogue with the late Neoplatonic philosophy” (p. 214) All in all, “Damascius’ triadic doctrine is targeted in this polemic” (p. 217).

S. Klitenic Wear, “Pseudo-Dionysius and Proclus on *Parmenides* 137 D: On Parts and Wholes” (pp. 219-31), argues that the Trinitarian theology of the Divine Names is inspired by the commentary that Proclus devotes to *Parm.*, 137 D 4-8. Here Plato establishes that the ‘one’ cannot have parts; hence, in *Parm.*, 137 C 5 – D 3, the conclusion is drawn that the ‘one’ cannot have beginning, middle, or end, a conclusion that Proclus adapts to the One as a transcendent principle. There is, however, in Proclus’ system another ‘one’ that has indeed beginning, middle, and end: the One-Being. All this resurfaces, adapted to the new context, in Ps.-Dionysius’ Trinitarian theology. For Klitenic Wear, “the Dionysian understanding of the relationship between the Trinity and the

One seems to be articulated best, not by Proclus' description of the One and its parts, but rather by 'Porphyry's' theory of the One as the Father of the noetic triad" (p. 229), a theory attested by Proclus himself in his commentary on *Parm.* 137 D – provided that one is ready to identify with Porphyry the anonymous doctrine there criticised by Proclus. Past scholarship has advanced the hypothesis that Proclus referred instead to Iamblichus, but Klitenic Wear does not discuss the question.¹

The Byzantine scholar Michael Psellos (d. ca. 1081) forms the core of the paper by F. Lauritzen, "The Renaissance of Proclus in the Eleventh Century" (pp. 233-9). First Lauritzen outlines Psellos' approach against the background of the other philosophical texts and scholars before him (the so-called *Anonymus Heiberg*) and after him (Psellos' disciple John Italos), coming to the conclusion that "the only element which is truly innovative in Psellos' interestes was his fascination and frequent discussion of Proclus. (...) In five years (1042-1047) he devoted himself specifically to the study of Proclus and it was a solitary undertaking since he says that no one knew anything of philosophy either in the city or abroad" (p. 236). Then an important point is raised: at variance with the *Anonymus Heiberg*, but also with John Italos, Psellos does not consider logic as the main part of philosophy. On the contrary, for him Proclus is an omnipresent source on every topic, especially on theological questions. A useful table of the Procline works that feature in Psellos' *Philosophica* and *Theologica* shows that he was acquainted with the entire corpus, with few exceptions. "Psellos indeed quotes all of the surviving works of Proclus and even refers to texts which are yet unidentified. (...) This abundance of Procline texts and thought in Psellos does not appear in any other author of the eleventh century" (p. 238).

L. Gigineishvili, "Proclus as a Biblical Exegete: Bible and its Platonic Interpretation in Ioane Petritsi's Commentaries" (pp. 241-8) deals with the project to promote "a unity of faith and philosophy, of biblical and philosophical wisdoms" (p. 241) that animated the activity of the 12th century Georgian monk and theologian Ioane Petritsi. Gigineishvili outlines the latter's work against the backdrop of what he labels the "Hellenophilic trend" of previous scholars "like Arsen Ikaltoeli (d. ca. 1127) or Ephrem Mtsire (d. 1101)" who "were engaged in titanic effort for creation of a Georgian philosophical terminology – especially while translating the Porphyrian elaboration of Aristotelian logic as given in John Damascene's *Font of Knowledge*" (p. 241). Going further than his predecessors, Petritsi set for himself the task to "identify Platonic truth in the biblical text" (p. 242), and to this end he made extensive use of Proclus. The *Elements of Theology*, that Petritsi translated and commented upon, provided tools for interpreting the Bible. This attitude "was found to be dangerous by the official church authorities – doubly blind by ignorance and unawareness of this ignorance – who started persecuting the philosopher, both in Byzantium and Georgia, for which Petritsi bitterly laments in his Epilogue", where he complains that, were it not for the envy and perfidy of his enemies, he "would have shown the Georgian language as being of equal capacities to those of the Greek language and would have Aristotelized", which means, explains Gigineishvili, "philosophize like Aristotle" (p. 248).

A bit later, still in the Byzantine empire, the Bishop of Methone Nicholas engages in systematic criticism of Proclus' metaphysics. This is the topic of the paper by J.M. Robinson, "Dionysius Against Proclus: the Apophatic Critique in Nicholas of Methone's *Refutation of the Elements of Theology*" (pp. 249-69). The aim of the Bishop is "to neutralize a preceived danger in the *Elements of Theology*. As Nicholas explains in his prologue, he has set out to write this work because some of his contemporaries find Proclus fascinating, and even prefer the intricacies of Proclus' doctrine to the truths of the Christian faith" (p. 250). In order to make evident that Proclus' metaphysics and the Christian doctrine are incompatible

¹ See now the dossier in *Proclus. Commentaire sur le Parménide de Platon. Tome VI. Livre VI*, par C. Luna - A.-Ph. Segonds (†), Les Belles Lettres, Paris 2017 (CUF), *Notes complémentaires*, pp. 363-4

with each other, Nicholas points to polytheism and emanation as to the two pillars of Proclus' system. He opposes Procline metaphysics in the name of Dionysian apophaticism: Proclus speaks of the First Principle as if it were known by us, whereas it is transcendent and unknowable. "Nicholas' own use of apophatic theology against Proclus presupposes the absence of a genuine apophaticism in Proclus himself, and indeed Nicholas dismisses Proclus' apophatic claims in § 123 on the grounds that Proclus actually does assign names ('One' and 'Good') to the divine substance. Nicholas thus makes the case that his theology is more apophatic than that of Proclus" (p. 264). The affinity he recognises between Proclus and Dionysius is explained in terms that reverse the real relationship between the two: Dionysius has revealed truths on God that Proclus did not completely understand, or also deliberately deviated from.

E. Tempelis and Ch. Terezis, "The Presence of Proclus in George Pachymeres' Paraphrase of Ps.-Dionysius' *De Divinis Nominibus*" (pp. 271-85) alternates an outline of Proclus' ideas on the topics of "Identity and Otherness", "Similarity and Dissimilarity", "Rest and Motion", and of their reception in George Pachymeres' (1242-1310). They conclude that "through the theological utilization of Proclus' ontological doctrines, he proves that part of, or rather, one way of existence of the triadic god can be the object of knowledge by means of evidential reasoning. These are the divine energies, which he sees in their philosophical dimensions in the Platonic ontological categories and their Neoplatonic interpretation. By means of these categories he describes the theonymies as perceived by Christianity" (p. 285). The reader unfamiliar with Pachymeres and his context would have been helped by more punctual explanations, in particular on the issue of the relationship he posits between the First Principle and its derivatives: at p. 284 the authors speak of "Christian monism", and while the context suggests that they intend the uniqueness of the cause of the universe, not the uniqueness of its *being*, more details of Pachymeres' broad metaphysical ideas would have been welcome.

Part III (pp. 287-414) is devoted to the reception of Proclus' works and ideas in the Arabic-speaking world and in the early modern age.

T. Riggs, "On the Absence of the Henads in the *Liber de causis*: Some Consequences for Procline Subjectivity" (pp. 289-309) deals with the famous Arabic reworking of the *Elements of Theology*, quite strangely labelled "the Arabic version of the Latin *Liber de causis*" (p. 289). Riggs thinks that "the Gods (Henads) in Proclus' philosophy are primal individuals and thus are the source of the individuality of all inferior beings" (*ibid.*). Once taking this for granted, the question might be asked what happens if, as in the Arabic reworking, the Henads disappear in favour of the unique First Principle that – as shown in the abundant scholarship on the *De Causis* – is endowed with their features (chiefly providence). It is Riggs' conviction that "if the Henads are the ultimate principles of individuation in Proclus' metaphysics, their absence would result in a loss of the conceptual means to ensure individuation, at least for incorporeal beings, unless replaced by some other principle or principles. It is my contention that the Arabic *Liber* does not, in fact, offer a viable principle of individuation for incorporeal beings" (pp. 298-90). Riggs acknowledges (pp. 290 and 294) that this alleged function of Proclus' Henads does not feature in the *Elements of Theology*, i.e. the source of the *Liber de causis*; however, for him the lack of "a formal principle of individuation" (p. 307) is problematic: the 'Adaptor' of the *Liber de causis* as well as its readers are "unable to account for the individuality of the human souls" (p. 309), that in Riggs' interpretation was needed for their creedal assumptions.

As shown by the title "Ibn al-Ṭayyib's *Istithmār* on Proclus' *Commentary on the Pythagorean Golden Verses*" (pp. 311-21), Th. Zampaki thinks that this Arabic text is a genuine Proclean work. It is not the case that she ignores the 1987 paper in which L.G. Westerink – the co-editor with H.D. Saffrey of Proclus' *Platonic Theology* – challenged this attribution; but, surprisingly enough, throughout the entire article this commentary is referred to as if it were a work by Proclus. It may be useful to recapitulate Westerink's point. Remarking that, despite the general Neoplatonic attitude,

any idea or terminology typical of Proclus is lacking from this commentary (not cited among Proclus' writings in the ancient sources), Westerink pointed to Proclus of Laodicea, to whom, instead, a commentary on the *Golden Verses* is attributed in the relevant entry of the *Suda*.² One may think that Zampaki credits Proclus with the commentary because the authorship of Proclus of Lycia has been established by some scholar in studies subsequent to Westerink's paper. This is not the case, quite the contrary: the work is listed among the "Ouvrages faussement attribués" by C. Luna - A.-Ph. Segonds (†),³ who comment "Il n'y a, en tout cas, dans le texte rien de spécifiquement proclien qui pourrait appuyer l'attribution à Proclus le diadoque". G. Endress,⁴ sides with Westerink and adds further elements that can explain the confusion between the two homonyms in the Arabic tradition. Neither entry is mentioned in this paper.

Both M. Chase and E. Giannakis offer a presentation of some of Proclus' arguments on the eternity of the cosmos as they feature in the heresiographer al-Šahrastānī (d. 1153). M. Chase, "Al-Šahrastānī on Proclus" (pp. 323-33) deals with the *Book of Religions and Philosophical Sects*, which contains summaries of eight of Proclus' arguments. It is Chase's conviction that the final part of this summary does not contain Proclus' ideas: "At the end of his presentation, however, Šahrastānī appends a final section that appears to derive from a different source. (...) Scholars have explained Šahrastānī's last paragraph in a variety of ways: some have claimed, erroneously, that it is a quote from Proclus; others, closer to the mark, that it has been cobbled together from elements of Proclus' twelfth and sixteenth arguments against the world's eternity" (pp. 323 and 325). On the basis of similarities between the argument that al-Šahrastānī attributes to Proclus and a passage in Augustine, Chase comes to the conclusion that the remote antecedent of both Proclus and Augustine is Porphyry.

E. Giannakis, "Proclus' Arguments on the Eternity of the World in al-Shahrastānī's Works" (pp. 335-51), concentrates on another treatise by al-Šahrastānī, the *K. Nihāya l-iqdām fi 'ilm al-kalām* (rendered, p. 336, as *Summa philosophiae*, lit. *Book of the Utmost Proficiency in Theology*). In this work a summary of Proclus' arguments is presented, that reflects the list provided in the *Book of Religions and Philosophical Sects*. The summary of the first argument contains the Avicennian formula *wāğib al-wuğūd bi-dātihī*, and this raises doubts about the direct acquaintance of al-Šahrastānī's with Proclus: he may quote from Avicenna. On the other hand, nothing prevents him from quoting directly from the *Eighteen Arguments*, because this work was translated into Arabic. It is well known that, although attested in Greek only as part and parcel of Philoponus' own *De Aeternitate mundi*, in Arabic the first eight or nine of these arguments exist as an independent work, in two translations: eight arguments in the earlier translation, and nine in the later one, made by Iṣḥāq ibn Ḥunayn. Giannakis' analysis of the available data suggests that "al-Shahrastānī may have had in front of him some treatise of Ibn Sīnā in which arguments from Philoponus' *Refutation of Proclus* were cited in order to be disproved and criticized" (pp. 350-51). Giannakis sides with G. Endress,⁵ who pointed to the Arabic version (lost to us) of Philoponus' *De Aeternitate mundi*, rather to the *Eighteen Arguments* themselves, as to the source of al-Šahrastānī.

G. Steiris, "Proclus as a Source for Giovanni Pico della Mirandola's Arguments Concerning *emanatio* and *creatio ex nihilo*" (pp. 353-63) opens with the claim that "Proclus is undoubtedly the most important source in Pico's most significant work *Conclusiones CM publice disputandae*: almost 100 of the 900 theses and arguments were drawn from Proclus" (p. 353). Steiris points to

² On this 4th or 5th century author see now R. Goulet, "Proclus Procléius (de Laodicée)", in R. Goulet (ed.), *Dictionnaire des Philosophes Antiques* (= *DPhA*), Vb, CNRS-Éditions, Paris 2012, p. 1675.

³ C. Luna - A.-Ph. Segonds (†), "Proclus de Lycie", in Goulet (ed.), *DPhA*, Vb, pp. 1546-657, in part. pp. 1652-3.

⁴ G. Endress, "Proclus de Lycie. Œuvres transmises par la tradition arabe", *ibid.*, pp. 1657-74, part. pp. 1673-4.

⁵ *Proclus Arabus. Zwanzig Abschnitte aus der Institutio Theologica in arabischer Übersetzung*, Imprimerie Catholique, Wiesbaden-Beirut 1973, p. 17

Pico's inconsistencies, oscillations and even contradictions on the issue of creation vs emanation, coming to the conclusion that in the mid-1480's, i.e., the date of composition of the *Nine-Hundred Conclusions*, Pico "was rather young and did not grasp in full depth the Procline philosophy" (p. 363).

The Anglican theologian Richard Hooker (d. 1600) forms the focus of the paper by T. Kirby, "Aeternall Lawe: Richard Hooker's Neoplatonic Account of Law and Causality" (pp. 365-74). The eternal Law that coincides with God's nature is prior to and cause of every kind of law: this idea, that governs Hooker's theology and political philosophy, is inspired for Kirby by Proclus. "Hooker anchors his elaborate exposition and defense of the Elizabethian religious settlement in a metaphysical theory of law which itself assumes a Neoplatonic ontology of 'participation' in the Procline tradition" (p. 365). Kirby aptly remarks that this idea may sound like an echo of the omnipresent *Logos*-theology; however, the topics of God as "verie Onenesse, and mere unitie" and of the "indifferentiated unity of the eternal law which simultaneously remains ineffably one with itself", giving rise to all the derivative species of law (p. 368), give a distinctive Procline ring. The outside reader gets the impression that Hooker's acquaintance with Proclus was indirect, because most footnotes in Kirby's paper refer to Thomas Aquinas: hence, one gets the impression that it was Thomas who channelled to Hooker some basic principles of the Neoplatonic ideas of procession and reversion. It is in any case fascinating to read, phrased in Old English, that "all thing in the worlde are saide in some sort to seeke the highest, and to covet more or lesse the participation of God himselfe" (*ibid.*).

Y.T. Langermann, "Proclus Revenant: The (Re-)Integration of Proclus into the Creationism-Eternalism Debate in Joseph Solomon Delmedigo's (1591-1655) *Novelot Hokma*" (pp. 375-89) discusses the position held by Joseph Solomon Delmedigo in the debate between creationism and eternalism. Delmedigo's ideas are analysed by Langermann against the broad background of Proclus' arguments and Philoponus' response to them. Indeed, the ultimate source of the eternalist arguments is Proclus, even though most Jewish authors were unaware of this: "Proclus is not mentioned by name by any medieval Jewish thinker" (p. 375). At variance with them, Joseph Solomon Delmedigo "inserts Proclus directly into the discussion of creation. It is clear from his dates that Yashar [i.e., the acronym of Joseph Solomon Delmedigo] is not a medieval author. Indeed, his science is that of the early modernist, as one would expect from someone who attended Galileo's lectures in Padua" (pp. 375-6). His source was in all likelihood Philoponus, whose *De Aeternitate mundi* was available to him both in Greek, in the 1535 edition by Vittore Trincavelli, and in a couple of Latin translations. Joseph Solomon Delmedigo had both languages, hence he "had relatively direct access to Proclus via Philoponus' refutation" (pp. 378-9). Personally a supporter of perpetual creation with no temporal beginning, in the wake of Ḥasdaï Crescas (d. 1412), Joseph Solomon Delmedigo detects the ultimate source of both al-Ġazālī and Maimonides: Proclus. His direct source, however, is Philoponus: a detailed analysis of four passages allows Langermann to conclude that "Yashar evidently did read Philoponus' refutation of Proclus" (p. 388).

M.-É. Zovko, "Understanding the Geometric Method: Prolegomena to a Study of Procline Influences in Spinoza as Mediated through Abraham Cohen Herrera" (pp. 391-414), advances a "Platonist interpretation of Spinoza's philosophy" (p. 392) based on his acquaintance with the works of the Kabbalist Abraham Cohen Herrera (d. 1635). Not only does Spinoza share with this thinker a general "Neoplatonic vision of reality as hierarchically structured procession of the stages of being" (p. 397), but also the conception of dialectic. "The affinities between Proclus' hypothetical dialectic and Spinoza's geometric method provide ample evidence for a philosophically significant relationship between Spinoza's idea of a geometric method and the Procline understanding of Platonic dialectic, which played a formative role in the works of Abraham Cohen Herrera" (p. 413).

The Bibliography (pp. 415-49) and a general extremely selective index conclude the volume.

Cristina D'Ancona

Finito di stampare nel mese di dicembre 2019
presso le Industrie Grafiche della Pacini Editore S.p.A.
Via A. Gherardesca • 56121 Ospedaletto • Pisa
Tel. 050 313011 • Fax 050 3130300
www.pacineditore.it

