Tiziana Suarez-Nani, Tamar Tsopurashvili (eds). Héritages platoniciens et aristotéliciens dans l'Orient et l'Occident (IIe-XVIe siècles), Actes du colloque de Tbilissi, juin 2019, édité par Scrinium Friburgense, Veröffentlichungen des Mediävistischen Instituts der Universität Freiburg Schweiz, Bd. 54, Reichert Verlag Wiesbaden, 2021, S. 268

This trilingual volume brings together materials from the international conference *Neoplatonism and Aristotelianism in Eastern and Western Christianity* held in 2019 at Ilia State University in Tbilisi, Georgia, and organized by the Savle Tsereteli Institute of Philosophy. Each paper has its own particular way of engaging with the traces that Platonism and Aristotelianism left on intellectual developments, stretching from late antiquity to the Middle Ages, and spreading to both Western and Eastern Christian traditions. It is noteworthy that the Eastern Christian tradition is portrayed not only through the Byzantine thinkers of the Greek language, but also through the Georgian line of philosophical and literary development, exemplified, among others, through Ioane Petritsi's heritage, that, both in its theoretical content and in its philological practice, adheres to the Greek tradition and is nourished mainly by Neoplatonist elements (especially Proclos). The collection groups the papers into five thematic sections that follow one another chronologically: Patristics, [Greek] Neoplatonism, Ioane Petritsi, Latin XIV-XIII centuries, and Renaissance.

The first section, dedicated to the reception of ancient philosophy in patristics, opens with **Franz Mali**'s paper, *La gnose valentinienne à travers le prisme de l'héritage platonicien dans l'‹Elenchos› du Pseudo-Hippolyte* [*Valentinian Gnosis through the Prism of the Platonic Heritage in Pseudo-Hippolytus'* Elenchos], which focuses on the 3rd-century Greek text attributed by some scholars to Origen and by most to Pseudo-Hippolytus, entitled *Refutation of All the Heresies*, but which is also known as *Elenchos*. The paper provides a detailed analysis of the history and structure of the text, which is only partially preserved, and focuses on its treatment of Valentinian Gnosis. *Elenchos,* which

aims to refute various heresies, uses a specific polemical method, which consists of accusing the heretics of plagiarism of Greek philosophy, and demonstrating the succession of heretics among them. With regard to the Valentinian doctrine, the author of *Elenchos* identifies its sources to be Plato and Pythagoras, specifically Plato's conception of the immortality of the soul, which he claims to be borrowed from Pythagoras. The paper then carefully examines two quotations that the author of *Elenchos* attributes to Plato, identifies them, points out the errors, inaccuracies and modifications in the way they are employed, and demonstrates that the author did not work with Plato's text. He proposes several hypotheses of the mediated provenance of these quotations.

Lenka Karfíková, in her paper *Imagination and Memory in Augustine's Correspondence with Nebridius*, explores the part of the correspondence between Augustine and his philosopher friend Nebridius where, at the latter's suggestion, they discuss questions of imagination and memory. According to Augustine, memory is filled not only with images of perceived objects, but also with intelligible content, the source of which is, in part, observation. For Nebridius, on the contrary, not only are intelligible forms innate, but even mental images are decoupled from sense perception. The paper argues that in the face of Nebridius' radical Neoplatonic position, Augustine is led to develop his argument in a direction opposite to that of Plotinus. The magisterial line of demarcation between the positions of Augustine and Nebridius is exposed, with careful consideration of the specificities in the Latin and Greek uses of terminology and through the identification of theoretical sources from Plato, Plotinus, Aristotle, and the Stoics. Germane to the topic of discussion, the paper also summarizes Augustine's conception of eternity, the torment of the soul, and his teaching on grace.

Alexey Morozov, *Les dialogues de Platon et le ‹De Resurrectione› de Méthode d'Olympe* [*Plato's dialogues and the* De Resurrectione *of Methodius of Olympus*]. Methodius of Olympus is a 3rd-century author who has been historically marginalized and little studied until now. The paper analyzes his dialogue, entitled *De resurrectione*, the original Greek version of which is preserved only in fragmentary form, while its entirety is available in an Old Slavic translation dating from the 10th century. The dialogue is directed against Origen's doctrine, according to which, after the resurrection, Man will receive a spiritual body, but not a carnal one. A comparative analysis of the dialogue with the Platonic dialogues, focusing on the functions of the characters, on the methods of conducting the discussion, and on the identification of a shared terminology or textual references and their modifications, allows the author of

the paper to identify Plato's "Protagoras" as the reference model for Methodius' dialogue. It is thus a dialogue formally inspired by Plato, but which attempts to form a doctrine opposed to the Platonic anthropology, as it has been refracted in Origen. Christianity in its non-Origenian version is therefore presented as the true fulfillment of Plato's theoretical intentions.

Magdalena Burlacu, *Quelques aspects des notions aristotéliciennes présentes chez Théodore Studite* [*Some aspects of Aristotelian notions as present in Theodore Studite*]. The paper examines Theodore the Studite's recourse to Aristotle's philosophy, in particular to some of the elements of his logic and epistemology, which he employs to argue for his theology of images. Since the latter has not yet been properly studied, the paper attempts to reconstruct Studite's argument on the basis of his *Sermones adversus iconoclastas* and *Epistulae*, focusing on the Aristotelian concepts that serve the Byzantine monk ― positively or negatively ― to ground his iconophile theology. The paper describes the intellectual circumstances in which the reception of Aristotle by Studite was made possible. He is indeed in continuity with the reinterpretation of the Aristotelian *Categories* by John of Damascus, in favor of Christian dogmatism. However, Studite's originality lies in his rejection of the Aristotelian axiom of non-contradiction when it comes to the hypostasis of Christ, capable of carrying contradictory predicates, such as universal and individual, divine and incarnate, etc. Moreover, the paper points out how the Aristotelian notion of memory is introduced into a Christian approach to life, producing the notion of inhabitation. It is shown how these two moves open up the possibility for an iconophile argument.

Greek Neoplatonism is the subject of the second section of the volume.

Nicolas D'Andrès, *Qui sommes-nous ? L'être humain entre vices et vertus dans le traité 52 de Plotin (II 3)* [*Who are we? Human being between vices and virtues in Plotinus' treatise 52 (II 3)*]. The paper argues that, contrary to the way Pophyrius organizes Plotinus' treatises, there is a continuity between treatises 52 and 51, on the one hand, and 52 and 53, on the other. The demonstration is based on the continuous exposition of ethical and anthropological problems, which are spread over the three treatises in a progressive movement. Besides the purely philological interest of this undertaking, it contributes to a reconstruction of late Plotinus' ethical conception. The paper provides a rich description of Plotinus' astrological knowledge, indicates its sources, and analyzes it in light of the Platonic passages on the subject. Plotinus rejects the astrological idea that the stars, defining human actions, are the cause of vice and

moral evil. This metaphysical revision of astrology brings anthropological and ethical issues to the fore with a new force. The paper shows how the transposition of the Platonic dualism of soul and body not only on the human being, but on the constitution of the universe itself, allows Plotinus to develop a vision of the human being able to escape astral determinism.

Ana Kiria, in her paper *The Theory of the Genesis of Nous in Plotinus*, proposes a close reading of the *Enneads* V 4 [7] and V 3 [49] in order to formulate and explain the paradoxical effects of Plotinus' metaphysical construction. She starts by describing Plotinus' tripartite metaphysical conception, with emphasis on his principle of non-multiplicity, which results in a paradoxical emergence of multiplicity from its own negation. The question to be discussed is then the following: how can a principle which, by definition, has nothing, desires nothing and is nothing, give rise to multiplicity? The paper attempts to extract answers to this question from relevant passages in Plotinus' text and to reconstruct the procession of the multiple from the One. It does so in three steps. First, it asks about the nature of the One. Then it discusses how the Intellect is eternally generated from the One. And finally, it explains the nature of the Intellect. In pursuing this task, the paper addresses a series of paradoxical questions derived from this general framework of Plotinus' philosophy.

Nino Doborjginidze, *Der Einfluss des Ammonios auf die altgeorgische philologische Praxis* [*The influence of Ammonios on ancient Georgian philological practice*]. The paper provides a systematic overview of the practical and theoretical problems that generations of Georgian translators and writers of the 9th-12th centuries faced and reflected upon in their work, which was carried out as part of the formation of Georgian as a liturgical, scientific and literary language. Georgian philological practice evolved in late antiquity and the Middle Ages under Greek and Byzantine influence, since the efforts explicitly aimed at increasing the semantic, stylistic, conceptual and expressive potentialities of the language were carried out in the context of translating sacred and then philosophical texts into Georgian. Apart from providing an overview of the historical circumstances in which philological, rhetorical and philosophical practice in Georgian developed, the paper focuses more specifically on philological technique, taking as a basis for analysis the metatexts of Ephrem Mtsire accompanying his translation of the Psalms, and finds that the hierarchical structure of levels (historical, allegorical and anagogical), through which a text reveals its meaning, according to him, reproduces the principles of Ammonius' system of textual interpretation. Finally, as an illustration of one of the concepts of Ammonius' system, namely that of 'utility', the paper proposes a number of metaphorical series employed by Ephrem Mtsire.

The third section of the volume includes papers that focus on Ioane Petritsi, a 12th-century Georgian philosopher and translator.

Magda Mtchedlidze, *La compréhension du terme ὕφεσις dans les commentaires du XIIe siècle sur la philosophie de Proclus : Ioané Petritsi et Nicolas de Méthone [Meaning of the term ὕφεσις in the 12th-century commentaries on Proclus' philosophy: Ioane Petritsi and Nicholas of Methone]*. The paper offers a very detailed and comprehensive analysis of the use of the Greek term *hyphesis* as a means for problematizing the relationship between Neoplatonic and Orthodox Christian thought in the commentaries on Proclus, produced by Ioane Petritsi, on the one hand, and Nicholas the Bishop of Methoneon, on the other. This Neoplatonic term, which appears for the first time in Philo and indicates the relaxation of tensions, takes the meaning of downgrading in Porphyry within the framework of emanatory theory, and assumes a theological value in the Cappadocian Fathers. However, when applied to the Trinity, the term becomes controversial from the point of view of Orthodox Christianity, because it involves a relationship of subordination and inequality between the hypostases. The paper shows that in the face of Proclus' *Elements of Theology*, his Orthodox commentators adopt different attitudes. Where Nicolas of Methone expresses a clear criticism and judges the model of Proclus to be inadmissible for Orthodox doctrine of the Trinity, Petritsi tries to find an explanatory strategy for putting the intratrinitarian relations out of reach of *hyphesis*.

Tamar Khubulava, *'Die Liebe zum Einen' in Ioane Petrizis Kommentar zur ‚Elementatio Theologica' des Proklos ['Love of the One' in Ioane Petritsi's Commentary on the ‹Elementatio Theologica› of Proclus]*. Ioane Petritsi translated Proclus' *Elements of Theology* into Georgian and complemented it with commentaries. The paper explores the argumentative progression of Petritsi's commentaries in order to establish the function that the 'love of the One' is occupying therein. In so doing, the paper mobilizes numerous quotations in ancient Georgian, and links the relevant terms to their Greek correspondences. The concept of 'love of the One' is analyzed within the overall theoretical framework, in which all that is derived from the One returns to it. Embodied soul, as caused by the One, tends toward the One as toward its own cause. This ascent of the embodied soul towards its own cause is understood as self-reminiscence and self-cognition of the soul. However, thought, as something of secondary order, produced by the One and, as such, alien to the nature of the transcendent cause present in the soul — despite its transcendental nature — as its cause, cannot carry the function of initiating or motivating upward movement. Thought being incapable of this task, it is love that fulfills this function.

Lela Alexidze, *Petritsi and Plethon on the Differences of Aristotle from Plato*. The paper compares Ioane Petritsi's commentary on Proclus' *Elements of Theology* with Georgios Gemistos Plethon's treatise on the differences between Aristotle and Plato, and it highlights the ways in which these Platonic and Neoplatonic thinkers viewed the relationship between Plato and Aristotle. Although the distance between these two authors extends across more than three centuries, they both share a profound familiarity with the Greek language and the Byzantine philosophical tradition. Moreover, both were greeted with misunderstanding by their respective audiences, Petritsi for his radically pro-Proclus position, and Plethon for his Platonic, and therefore pagan, orientation. Through a detailed analysis of the two authors, the paper concludes that the difference in their attitude towards Platonism and Aristotle is partly due to the difference in their respective objectives: Petritsi's intention was to introduce to the Georgian public the philosophy of Proclus, whom he considered to be the representative of true philosophy and theology, while Plethon tried to build a new metaphysical and practical theory as a foundation for reforms in the context of historical turbulence. In doing so, he was driven to draw on the ancient Greek pantheon and to rely on a specific modification of Plato's philosophy. As for Aristotle, the paper points out that a distinctly Aristotelian tendency in Plethon's intellectual milieu might have led the latter to be less sober in his interpretation.

The fourth section of the volume is devoted to Latin authors of the 13th century.

Tiziana Suarez-Nani, *Néoplatonisme et aristotélisme dans la question de l'infinité divine au XIIIe siècle: Alexandre de Halès, Thomas d'Aquin et Henri de Gand* [*Neoplatonism and Aristotelianism on the question of divine infinity in the 13th century: Alexander of Hales, Thomas Aquinas and Henry of Ghent*]. The paper analyzes the role of Neoplatonic and Aristotelian influences on the formation of the non-privative notion of the infinite as divine perfection. The paper follows on from the research carried out on the notion of divine immensity, dominant throughout the 12th century, and replaced in the mid-13th century by the notion of infinity in the context of the fight against the Cathar heresy and the need to support the positive theology made indispensable after the Condemnation of 1241. The paper follows numerous argumentative lines designed to demonstrate the infinite as an intrinsic divine property in the writings of Alexander of Hales, Thomas Aquinas or Henry of Ghent, and highlights the Aristotelian and/or Platonic sources of each of these lines in order to shed light on the strategies of recuperation or even detouring of the arguments found in them.

Fran O'Rourke, *Aquinas' Neoplatonist Aesthetics*. The purpose of this paper is to discuss Aquinas' theory of beauty. To this end, it first addresses Aquinas' ancient sources, Plotinus, St. Augustine, and Pseudo-Dionysius, who, through their originality, provided the preliminaries for his theory. Plotinus proposes the criterion of symmetry in his definition of beauty. However, aiming at transcending sensible beauty, he also introduces unity as a superior principle that allows one to grasp the beauty of intelligible forms. Augustine, frequently quoted by Aquinas, derives his definition of beauty from unity, order and luminosity, and while he does not develop the latter, he relies on the principle of number to establish the first two. As for the Pseudo-Dionysius, he employs the notion of beauty, as well as that of goodness, as positive names for God, who, as infinite, cannot but be causal beauty. Commenting on Dionysius' *On the Divine Names*, and injecting his own unique metaphysical perspicacity into the discussion, Aquinas identifies beauty with the act of existence itself. As a result, Aquinas reinterprets the Aristotelian notion of form, and instead of taking it as the fundamental reason for a definite being, he transforms it into a medium through which the creature reveals itself, but still needs a more fundamental principle for the actualization of its very existence. Ultimately, Aquinas uses this aesthetic conception to explain the reason for creation itself as God's love for his own beauty.

Tamar Tsopurashvili, *Neoplatonic and Aristotelian Sources of Meister Eckhart's Theory of Transcendentals*. On the basis of an analysis of Eckhart's *Opus Tripartitum* and *Expositio sancti Evangelii secundum Iohannem*, the paper opens with the observation that Eckhart projected a harmonization of the divine, natural and moral perspectives, and insisted on the compatibility of philosophy and the first theology. The paper discusses this project from the viewpoint of the theory of transcendentals, as well as that of signification modi, and highlights the ontologization of semantics as its necessary result in Eckhart's theory, insofar as the most general concepts of Being, the One, Truth and the Good are taken as convertibles. Through a detailed exposition of the Eckhartian application of the theory of transcendentals to the divine Trinity, by which Eckhart is led to introduce the Aristotelian principle of identification of the Being and the One, the paper shows the transition he makes towards a henological discourse. Another example of Aristotelian-Platonic convergence discussed in the paper concerns Eckhart's reading of *Peri Hermeneias*, in order to define the relation between name, concept and object. By correlating the name with the concept rather than with the extramental object, Eckhart is led to admit the ontological superiority of intelligible quiddities or divine ideas of creatures.

John Dudley, *Neoplatonism confronted by Aristotelianism in Western Christianity*. In broad strokes, and with erudition, the paper describes the turning point in the course of the Christian tradition occasioned by the adoption of Aristotelian views on a number of questions at the expense of the classical Neoplatonic approaches in force until the 13th century. The paper first describes the standard Neoplatonic paradigm, which derived from Plotinus and, more importantly, Philo, and was based on the overarching idea of the subordinate relationship of reason to the higher principle of faith. In its second part, the paper outlines the Neoplatonic formulations for a number of theoretical problems regarding political authority, nature, natural law, ethics, slavery and private property, which were disrupted by the adoption of Aristotelianism. Indeed, with the strengthening of the role of reason, the respective spheres loosened their dependence on the transcendental principle, which led to their theoretical and practical autonomy. The thesis of the paper is that the lasting results of the Christian decline, triggered by the marginalization of Neoplatonic attitudes by Aristotelianism in the Christian tradition, have led to the secularizing and technologizing trends that shape our contemporary condition.

The fifth and last section of the book is devoted to the Renaissance.

Filip Karfík, *'Amor universalis'. Marsilio Ficino, Dionysius Areopagite, Proclus*. The theory of love expounded by Ficino in his *Commentary on Plato's Symposium on Love* is articulated in the paper as a twofold definition of love. It is shown how Ficino's multiple explanation of love derives from the superimposition of a complex ontological structure of the universe, comprising superior, inferior and equal things, with its cosmogony. In Ficino's theory of creation, love is initiated by God in the creature, allowing the latter to be in a relationship with him. Love, presented as part of the cosmogonic process, acquires a circular structure and is defined as the desire for beauty. On the other hand, love, as part of God himself, gives rise to his second definition as desire to propagate his own perfection. The paper also explains how the mediating power of love is articulated between the three types of things in terms of triple causality, enveloping and maintaining the universe. An important part of the paper is devoted to finding the elements that Ficino borrows from the *On the Divine Names* of Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite and, even more profoundly, from Proclus' *Commentary on Plato's Alcibiades*.

Maka Lashkhia, *Interpretation of Neoplatonic Philosophy by Marsilio Ficino*. This paper also deals with the question of love in the philosophy of Mar-

silio Ficino. This time, love is compared structurally and functionally to the soul. Both aim at a unification of otherwise disjointed elements and are ultimately capable of ensuring the connectivity of the universe as a whole. This similarity is explained in the paper by the integration of Platonic and Christian views in Ficino, who spent a great deal of time commenting on Plato's dialogues, especially the *Symposium*. The soul provides the binding power to the hierarchically organized universe that extends from God to Matter and contains the intermediate levels of the souls of the angels, the rational soul, and the qualitativeness. The soul reaches out to God, and once the path is completed, it faces the divine infinity, which is perceptible as love, for God loves his creation and the creation loves its creator. Both mind and love ensure the unity of the universe. Love is ultimately the rotation around oneself, for, in love, one discovers that the one one loves is oneself. A similar structure applies to the attainment of wisdom. The soul unites with its own ideas and perfects itself. It is able to perceive God in objects, so that it can love objects in God. The structural convergence of soul and love leads to an ultimate state in which, through the love of God, one begins to love oneself in God.

Olivier Ribordy, *Platon und Aristoteles als Modelle neuer philosophischer Ansätze über das Unendliche. Patrizis 'Nova de universis philosophia' und die metaphysischen Überlegungen des Francisco Suárez* [*Plato and Aristotle as models of new philosophical approaches to the infinite. Patrizi's 'Nova de universis philosophia' and the metaphysical reflections of Francisco Suárez*]. The paper examines the question of infinity as posed by Francisco Suárez in his metaphysical system on the one hand, and by Francesco Patrizi in his philosophical and mathematical reflections, on the other, and describes how the difference in their respective handling of the Aristotelian and Platonic elements contributes to the essential difference in their understanding of this concept. According to Suarez, the distinction between the infinite and the finite expresses the radical opposition between God and finite things, whereby a quantitative continuity between the two is excluded. Francesco Patrizi, on the other hand, conceptualizes the finite and the infinite as non-contradictory properties of space considered as the first principle of the universe. Space is thus both finite and infinite, which can be fully grasped without having to exit the quantitative perspective. Later, this ambiguity will be solved by Descartes, who proposes a new articulation of the concept of the infinity which contrasts with the concept of the indefinite.

<div align="right">

Elene Ladaria
Ilia State University

</div>

აბსტრაქტი
ABSTRACT

Tiziana Suarez-Nani, Tamar Tsopurashvili (eds). Héritages platoniciens et aristotéliciens dans l'Orient et l'Occident (IIe-XVIe siècles), Actes du colloque de Tbilissi, juin 2019, édité par Scrinium Friburgense, Veröffentlichungen des Mediävistischen Instituts der Universität Freiburg Schweiz, Bd. 54, Reichert Verlag Wiesbaden, 2021, S. 268

პლატონური და არისტოტელური მემკვიდრეობა აღმოსავლეთისა და დასავლეთში (II-XVI საუკუნეები) სამეცნოვანი კრებულია, რომელიც აერთიანებს მასალებს 2019 წელს სავლე წერეთლის ფილოსოფიის ინსტიტუტის მიერ გამართული კონფერენციისა „ნეოპლატონიზმი და არისტოტელიზმში აღმოსავლეთ და დასავლეთ საქრისტიანოში". კრებულში ხუთ თემატურ და ქრონოლოგიურად დალაგებულ ბლოკად წარმოდგენილია სტატიები, რომელთაგან თითოეული ცალკეული ავტორის, ტექსტისა ან პრობლემატიკის საფუძველზე წარმოაჩენს (ნეო) პლატონური ან არისტოტელური ელემენტების ნაკვალევს თუ მათ გადაკვეთას ქრისტიანობის კონტექსტში ახალი თეორიული გამოწვევების საპასუხოდ.

პირველი ნაწილი პატრისტიკის პერიოდს ეთმობა. აქ პლატონისა და ნეოპლატონიზმის რეცეფციაა ნაჩვენები ფსევდო-იპოლიტეს „უარყოფის", ავგუსტინესა და ნებრიდიუსის კორესპონდენციისა და ჯერჯერობით ნაკლებად შესწავლილი ბიზანტიელი ავტორის, მეთოდე ოლიმპელის დიალოგ „მკვდრეთით აღდგომის" მაგალითებზე. ასევე განხილულია არისტოტელური პრინციპების როლი თეოდორე სტუდიელის მიერ იკონოფილური თეოლოგიის ჩამოყალიბებაში. ბერძნული ნეოპლატონიზმისთვის მიძღვნილ მეორე ნაწილში, ერთი მხრივ, ვპოულობთ პლოტინის ეთიკისა და მისივე გონის გენეზისის თეორიის განხილვას, მეორე მხრივ კი, ძველი ქართული ფილოლოგიური პრაქტიკის ჩამოყალიბების ანალიზს, რომელიც კონცენტრირებულია ეფრემ მცირესთან მთარგმნელობით ტექნიკაზე რეფლექსისა და მისი ბერძნული წყაროს დადგენაზე. მესამე ნაწილი სრულად ეთმობა იოანე პეტრიწს. აქ ვპოულობთ გარკვეული ცნებების მისთვის სპეციფიკური გამოყენების ანალიზს, მაგრამ ასევე მის კომპარაციულ გან-

ხილვას პროკლესთან თუ გეორგიოს გემისტოს პლეთონთან ერთად, რაც შესაძლებელს ხდის პეტრიწის ფიგურის როგორც თეორიულ, ისე ისტორიულ კონტექსტუალიზაციას. XIII საუკუნის ლათინი ავტორებისადმი მიძღვნილ მეოთხე ნაწილში ნეოპლატონიზმში და არისტოტელიზმი წარმოჩენილია ალექსანდრე ჰალელის, თომა აკვინელის, ანრი გენტელის, მაისტერ ეკჰარტის მაგალითზე და შეფასებულია ის რადიკალური და შორსმიმავალი ცვლილებები, რომლებიც არისტოტელეს აქტუალიზაციისა და პლატონიზმის მარგინალიზაციის შედეგად დადგა. დაბოლოს, კრებულის მეხუთე ნაწილში პლატონიზმის ან პლატონისა და არისტოტელეს კონკურენტული მოდელების გავლენაზეა საუბარი რენესანსის ეპოქის ისეთ ავტორებზე, როგორიცაა მარსილიო ფიჩინო, ფრანცისკო სუარესი და ფრანჩესკო პატრიცი.

ელენე ლადარია
ილიას სახელმწიფო უნივერსიტეტი