

# PLOTINUS

DOMINIC J. O'MEARA

(*Université de Fribourg*)

<i>Fortuna.</i>	55
Bibliography.	60
I. <i>Enneades</i> .	67
Translations.	
1. Gaius Marius Victorinus.	
2. Marsilius Ficinus.	
Commentary.	
a. Marsilius Ficinus.	
b. Doubtful commentary.	
1. Paulus Scalichius (Book III).	

## FORTUNA\*

Plotinus was born in A.D. 204/205, probably in Egypt, and died in Campania (Italy) in 270. In 231/232 he began to study philosophy in Alexandria, changing teachers until he found Ammonius Saccas with whom he studied for eleven years. In 243 he joined Gordian III's military expedition against the Persians. After the emperor's murder in 244, Plotinus left the expedition, fleeing to Antioch. He then went to Rome. He began teaching philosophy in Rome to a circle of friends and pupils (he occupied no formal teaching post). Ten years later he began writing treatises based on his lectures and, by the time

Porphyry joined the circle (263), he had written twenty-one. Twenty-four more were completed when Porphyry left for Sicily (268). Plotinus fell ill and retired to the farm of a friend, Zethos, six miles from Minturnae (modern Minturno) in Campania, where he died in 270, having completed the remaining treatises.

Plotinus had close ties with the Roman senatorial class and with the Emperor Gallienus and his wife, but his project to found a city (Platopolis, to be governed, it seems, according to Plato's political ideas) in Campania was not realized. Among his pupils were Porphyry, Amelius, Castricius Firmus, Eustochius, Paulinus, Zoticus, Zethos, and Serapion. His treatises had a very restricted circulation among his friends. Eustochius prepared an edition of Plotinus' treatises, which was replaced by the edition Porphyry published in 301–305, following Plotinus' instructions. Porphyry took some liberties

\* I am much indebted to the generous assistance of R. Imbach, D. O'Brien, A. M. Wolters, and most especially of P. O. Kristeller and F. E. Cranz, who suggested detailed improvements in every aspect of the work. The remaining deficiencies are mine.

in his edition: he broke up some of the treatises to reach the numerologically desirable number of fifty-four (six times nine); he then rearranged the treatises into six subject groups of nine treatises each ("Enneads") dealing (in epagogic order) with morals (*ENN.* I), natural philosophy (*ENN.* II, III), soul (*ENN.* IV), Intellect (*ENN.* V), and the One (*ENN.* VI). The text of the treatises in Porphyry's edition is reliable. Porphyry also gave titles to the individual treatises and prefaced the edition with his invaluable *Vita Plotini*, the sole reliable source for Plotinus' biography.

### GREEK NEOPLATONIC

Although the various Neoplatonic schools that flourished in Syria, Alexandria, and Athens between the third and sixth centuries embodied different tendencies which led to disagreement with some of Plotinus' ideas, and although they derived inspiration from other philosophers besides Plotinus, there is little doubt but that they owe to him their philosophical foundation. Much of their achievement consists in working out in various ways the implications of Plotinus' philosophy. Besides his edition and *Vita* of Plotinus, Porphyry published an introductory philosophical manual (the 'Αφορμαῖ, or *Sentences*) composed largely of paraphrases and excerpts from Plotinus. He also published commentaries, headings, and summaries for Plotinus' works (see p. 57 below). Another pupil of Plotinus, Amelius, produced 100 books (now lost) of "scholia" based on Plotinus' lectures, which he may have brought with him to Syria, where Iamblichus later organized an influential Neoplatonic School. Longinus, an Athenian Platonist who was a contemporary but not a member of Plotinus' circle, received some of Plotinus' treatises and requested more. Later in Athens Proclus wrote a commentary on the *Enneads*, of which some excerpts only survive. Many members of the Neoplatonic schools of late antiquity used and quoted the *Enneads*: Iamblichus, Dexippus, Sallustius, Hermias of Alexandria, Syrianus, Proclus, Marinus, Damascius, Simplicius, Priscianus Lydus, Olympiodorus, John Philoponus, David, and Elias. In some cases, however, the quotations derive, not directly from the *Enneads*, but indirectly, from Porphyry's (or, for the later authors, Proclus') works. It has been argued that some quotations for which no exact

source can be found in the *Enneads* may reflect Plotinus' oral teaching as preserved perhaps in Amelius' scholia or in reports in Porphyry.

### PATRISTIC AND PAGAN LATIN

Plotinus' philosophy exerted wide influence on patristic authors. To list only those who quote him by name in their works one might mention, among the Greek authors, Eusebius, Cyril of Alexandria, Theodoret of Cyrus, and Aeneas of Gaza. The *Enneads* were also known to, and used by, Basil of Caesarea (the authenticity of the *De spiritu sancto* in which some Plotinian extracts are found is, however, in dispute), Gregory Nazianzen, Gregory of Nyssa, and Synesius of Cyrene. In the Latin West the *Enneads* became available in a partial or complete Latin translation by Marius Victorinus, a rhetor in Rome, who converted to Christianity (see below, p. 67). Although Victorinus made little use of Plotinus in his theological writings, his translation of the *Enneads* was of great importance to St. Augustine, who names and quotes Plotinus in some of his major works. A spiritual mentor of St. Augustine, St. Ambrose incorporated in his sermons (without acknowledgment) large extracts from the *Enneads*, which he either took from Victorinus' translation, or translated himself directly from the Greek, or found already excerpted in a Greek patristic source. Plotinus was also read by Latin authors of the time who were (or appear to have been) pagan. Macrobius names and quotes Plotinus at length, translating him from the Greek. Servius and Ammianus Marcellinus also seem to have read Plotinus.

### BYZANTINE

Plotinus could be found by the Byzantines in their various dictionaries, Hesychius, the *Suda* (in which extracts derived indirectly from the *Enneads* are also found). In the sixth century John of Scythopolis made use of the *Enneads* in his comments on Pseudo-Dionysius. A little later Theophylactus Simocattus composed a laudatory letter dedicated to Plotinus. Interest in Plotinus was greatly stimulated in the eleventh century by the polymath Michael Psellos who sought to rescue him, along with the later Neoplatonists, from neglect. Psellos made extensive

use of the *Enneads* in his own works and also excerpted Proclus' commentary on the *Enneads*. The interest in Plotinus carried over into the twelfth and thirteenth centuries: the earlier manuscripts of the *Enneads* were copied in this period, by which time, also, a florilegium of Plotinian texts (represented in several manuscripts) had been compiled. Plotinus was known to Theodore Metochites and Nicephorus Choumnos; the latter composed an *Antitheticum adversus Plotinum*. Plotinus is cited and a considerable number of extracts from the *Enneads* are found in the works of Nicephorus Gregoras. Sometime later a Byzantine scholar inserted excerpts from the *Enneads* in the text of John Lydus' *De mensibus*. Plotinus was known to Pletho, whose opponent, George (Gennadius) Scholarios, wrote a work *On Human Happiness, Harmonizing Aristotle and Plotinus*, and who appears to have corrected a Plotinus manuscript. Bessarion's interest in Plotinus no doubt is derived from Pletho and can be seen not only in his references to Plotinus in his works but also in the Plotinus manuscripts which he acquired and annotated in the 1450s and 1460s.

#### SYRIAC, ARABIC, AND JEWISH

Plotinus is little known by name in medieval Islam, and, when he is referred to by name, little reliable information is given about him. By contrast, his writings, specifically paraphrases of parts of *Enneads* IV–VI, were attributed to a variety of authors and were well known and influential in medieval Islamic and Jewish intellectual history. These paraphrases—conveniently available in an English translation by G. Lewis in Henry and Schwyzer's *Plotini opera*, II (1959)—can be grouped as follows.

(i) The *Theology of Aristotle* purports to include exegesis by Porphyry, to have been translated into Arabic by Ibn Nā'imah of Emesa, and to have been revised (or edited) by Al-Kindī. A “long” and a “vulgate” recension of the *Theology* survive, but the relation between the two recensions has not yet been clearly established. It seems that in some respects the long version includes materials added later; the vulgate recension seems to be an incomplete version of an earlier Arabic paraphrase of Plotinus. Nor has it been made clear how the attribution to Aristotle came about. The *Theology* includes an introduc-

tion, list of chapter headings (for *Ennead* IV.4), and some explanatory paraphrase of *Enneads* IV–VI. It has been argued that the *Theology* includes Porphyry's otherwise lost comments on and summaries of the *Enneads*. Some scholars find signs that the *Theology* was translated from a Syriac original about which nothing as yet is known.

(ii) The *Letter of Divine Science* falsely attributed to Al-Fārābī includes paraphrases of parts of *Ennead* V and is very close in terminology and style to the *Theology*, which suggests that it was produced by the same translator, derived possibly from the same Arabic and ultimately Greek original.

(iii) Various materials attributed to Aš-Šayḥ Al-Yūnānī (“The Greek old man [or sage]”) have been found to be paraphrases of *Enneads* IV–VI and to parallel in part the *Theology*, indicating a common source. The “old man” may be Porphyry. The *Theology* in particular had a long and influential history in Islam. After Al-Kindī it was known to Al-Fārābī, the Ihwān as-Šafā (the Brethren of Purity), Ibn ‘Arabī, Avicenna (who wrote comments on it and was aware that its Aristotelian authorship was suspect), and many others. The *Theology* was also read by medieval Jewish writers. Fragments of the “long” recension survive in Arabic texts written in Hebrew characters. The *Theology* was known (possibly indirectly) to Ibn Gabirol and Ibn Ezra. It appears, however, not to have been translated into Hebrew before the sixteenth century. The variety of Islamic authors who quote “the Greek old man” indicates to some degree the extent to which these Plotinian materials were also known.

#### WESTERN MEDIEVAL

Marius Victorinus' Latin translation of the *Enneads* seems not to have survived into the early medieval period, and there is no evidence that the *Enneads* were read in the West between the end of late antiquity and the time when Ficius prepared his new translation. Attempts to document a reading of the *Enneads* in medieval authors such as John Scottus Eriugena and William of Saint-Thierry have not been convincing: the “Plotinian” passages in these authors can be shown to derive from the substantial amount of Neoplatonic philosophy which reached the

medieval West through the works of St. Augustine, St. Ambrose, Macrobius, Boethius, Pseudo-Dionysius, Maximus the Confessor, and Gregory of Nyssa. If Western medieval readers did not have access to the *Enneads*, they were nevertheless made aware of Plotinus' identity and importance by St. Augustine in particular, and they also read passages from the *Enneads* quoted in Augustine and Macrobius. Among such readers one might list Albert the Great, St. Bonaventure, St. Thomas Aquinas, William of Auvergne, Vincent of Beauvais, and Meister Eckhart. Some Plotinus could be read (but not recognized for what it was) in Ambrose's sermons and in the commentaries on Pseudo-Dionysius by John of Scythopolis, which were translated into Latin by Anastasius Bibliothecarius in the ninth century. One medieval writer, Hugh Etherian, seems to have read Plotinus in Greek in Constantinople ca. 1166–82, quoting him very imprecisely in his *De sancto et immortali Deo* (PL 202, 233C, and 339B). There is no evidence that the Arabic *Theology of Aristotle* (which contains Plotinian texts) was available in Latin in the West before the sixteenth century (see below).

#### FIFTEENTH AND SIXTEENTH CENTURIES

Knowledge of Plotinus in the early Italian Renaissance was much what it was in the Latin medieval period. Petrarch and Lorenzo Valla, for example, were aware of Plotinus through what was reported in Augustine and Macrobius. In the first quarter of the fifteenth century Italian collectors such as Giovanni Aurispa, Francesco Filelfo, Pietro Miani, Leonardo Giustiniani, and Palla Strozzi had acquired Greek manuscripts, including manuscripts of the *Enneads*. Aurispa and Filelfo also taught Greek in Florence in the 1420s and 1430s, and one can assume they at least glanced at their Plotinus manuscripts. Indeed, Filelfo quotes Plotinus (IV.7.12) in his funeral oration for Francesco Sforza (1467).

Although references in the Latin sources (Augustine and Macrobius) would have been enough to stimulate reading of Plotinus in the original, other factors intervened. The presence of Pletho at the Council of Florence (1439) was considered by Marsilius Ficinus as the source of Cosimo de'Medici's interest in Platonism. The continued presence thereafter in Italy of Bessarion

served to maintain this interest in Platonism. When he began to lecture on Aristotle in Florence in 1457, Argyropoulos referred to Plotinus. It is thus possible that Argyropoulos played an important part in drawing attention to Plotinus in Florence. He may have already read a Plotinus manuscript present before 1462 in the library of Palla Strozzi in Padua and at some time before 1471 himself made a copy of the Greek text of Plotinus (Par. gr. 1976).

In 1456 the young Marsilius Ficinus presented his first major philosophical work, the *Institutiones ad Platonicam disciplinam*, to his future patron Cosimo de'Medici and to Cristoforo Landino. This work (which appears not to survive) of Platonic philosophy was drawn exclusively from Latin sources such as Cicero, Macrobius, Boethius, and Augustine. Landino and Cosimo recommended that rather than publishing the work, Ficinus learn Greek so he could draw from the original Greek sources. In 1462 Ficinus was established at Careggi by Cosimo and provided with Greek manuscripts. Two Plotinus manuscripts have been found which exhibit annotations in the hand of Ficinus (Florence, Biblioteca Laurenziana 87.3 and Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale gr. 1816), and he also compiled excerpts from Plotinus in Greek (Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana F 19 sup.) and brief excerpts and summaries in Latin (Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana 92 and Vatican Library, Borg. gr. 22).

Ficinus' first major task was a translation of Plato after which (1484) he began his translation of Plotinus. We can suppose that the very high opinion Ficinus had of Plotinus in 1492 (Plotinus as a *Plato redivivus*) reflects ultimately the importance given to Plotinus in the Latin sources Ficinus used in 1456, and indeed Ficinus had already begun to read Plotinus in the Greek in 1464 as he commented on Plato. In his *Commentary on the Symposium* (1469) he made good use of the *Enneads* and in writing his *Platonic Theology* (1469–74) he showed complete mastery of the *Enneads*. Ficinus' interest in Plotinus in the 1460s and early 1470s is reflected in Landino's *Camaldolese Disputations* in which Plotinus is quoted, in Janus Pannonius' wish (reported in Vespasiano's *Vite*) to translate Plotinus, and in Angelo Poliziano's rendering in 1491 of a passage from *ENN. I.3.4.2–19*. Ficinus attributes to Giovanni Pico della Mirandola the credit

for stimulating him in 1484 to undertake a translation of Plotinus, but, given Ficinus' previous interest in Plotinus and his understanding of the relation between Plato and Plotinus, it is hardly likely that Pico's stimulation was needed. In 1489 Ficinus published his very popular and influential *De vita*, the third book of which was a commentary on *Enn* IV.3.11.

When Ficinus' Latin translation of Plotinus was published with a commentary in 1492, it was widely used by humanists in Italy and elsewhere—Robert Gaguin, Francesco di Giorgio, Francesco Cattani da Diacceto, John Colet, Louis Le Roy, Symphorien Champier, Francesco Piccolomini, Sebastian Fox Morcillo, Tasso, Giordano Bruno, and many others—and a number of manuscript excerpts from it (and the commentary) are known. It was reprinted five times in the sixteenth century, and the commentary was reprinted separately three more times. The version published by Perna at Basel in 1559 was a revision of the Florence, 1492, edition prepared for Perna by Domenico Montesoro of Verona, who consulted a Greek manuscript for the purpose (according to Perna's Preface, fol. 3v and *ad Enn.* IV.3.28, fol. 203v).

In 1519 Plotinus made another (disguised) appearance when the “long” version of the *Theology of Aristotle* was published at Rome from an Arabic manuscript found in Damascus by Francesco Rosi and translated into Latin by Moses Rovas of Cyprus, which translation was revised by Pier Nicola Castellani. This text, entitled *Sapientissimi philosophi Aristotelis Stagiritae Theologia sive Mystica philosophia secundum Aegyptios*, was incorporated into the editions of Aristotle published by A. Jacobus Martin (Lyons, 1578), Joachim Périon (1580), and Claudio Marnius and Johannes Aubrius, “heredes Wecheli” (Frankfort, 1593). A revision and rearrangement of the text was published by Jacques Charpentier, in which he suggested parallels with Platonic and Neoplatonic texts (including Plotinus): *Libri quatuordecim qui Aristotelis esse dicuntur, de secretiore parte divinae sapientiae secundum Aegyptios. Qui si illius sunt, eiusdem metaphysica vere continent, cum Platonicas magna ex parte convenientia* (1571, 1572). Francesco Patrizi da Cherso republished the 1519 text in his *Nova de universis philo-*

*sophia* (Ferrara, 1591) in the belief that the *Theology* was a transcript by Aristotle of oral teaching in “Chaldaean” philosophy delivered by Plato to his intimate pupils. He thus entitled the work *Mystica Aegyptiorum et Chaldaeorum a Platone voce tradita ab Aristotele excepta et conscripta philosophia*, and he noted the parallel between Plotinus, *Enn.* V.1.1.7f. and *Theol.* IV.4. The *Theology*'s “Aristotelian” authorship was treated in general, however, with increasing suspicion by scholars of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries (it was rejected outright by Luther and Pierre de la Ramée, among others) but its origin in Plotinus' *Enneads* was not shown until 1812, by Thomas Taylor.

No vernacular translations of Plotinus seem to have been produced in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. The single commentary that may have originated in the sixteenth century is now missing; it was attributed to the notorious adventurer Paulus Scalichius (1534–75) (see p. 73 000 below) and concerned *Enn.* III.

#### AFTER 1600

Having become well known to humanists throughout Europe in the sixteenth century thanks to Ficinus' prestige and as part of Ficinus' revival of Platonism—a success that persisted in the seventeenth century among the Cambridge Platonists—Plotinus' *Enneads* were less and less well received (as was also true for Ficinus) in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Among the reasons for this rejection were the rise of secular rationalism (Ficinus had assimilated his version of Platonism to Christianity), theological attacks on the Platonizing of the Christian faith, and the criticism and rejection of the Neoplatonic interpretation of Plato. The decline in Plotinus' fortune is reflected, for example, in the authoritative history of philosophy published by Brucker (1742). Plotinus was not, however, unknown: Berkeley read him, and he received favorable mention from Bayle. Toward the end of the eighteenth century in Germany this situation changed greatly. Novalis and Goethe read Plotinus enthusiastically (in Ficinus' translation). By 1805 Schelling had studied with admiration the excerpts his friend Winckelmann had put into German for him. Such was Hegel's view of the developing structure of

the history of philosophy that Plotinus took on an important role as philosopher in that history. Hegel had used Ficinus and Perna's edition (Basel, 1580), the first to offer a text of the *Enneads* in Greek; unfortunately, however, it was based on four inferior Greek manuscripts. Hegel's colleague and admirer Friedrich Creuzer published two works that were close to the interests of German Idealism: a translation of *Enn.* III.8 (1805) and an edition of *Enn.* I.6 (1814). When Creuzer (together with G. H. Moser) published a new complete edition of Plotinus in 1835 (the first since Perna), he was well aware of the timeliness of this venture. Their edition, based on the unreliable and uncritical use of many more manuscripts, was followed by a regular succession of editions and translations by German scholars throughout the century. None of them can lay claim to being "critical"; e.g., the edition by A. Kirchhoff (Leipzig, 1856) used fewer manuscripts and took liberties in "improving" the text, a practice also followed in the edition of H. F. Müller (Berlin, 1878–80), and later by E. Bréhier (Paris, 1924–38) and G. Faggin (Milan, 1947–48). Franz Brentano's attack on Plotinus toward the end of the nineteenth century was connected to his rejection of Hegelian philosophy. In France, an admirer of Hegel, Victor Cousin, helped establish a strong French tradition of interest in Plotinus and Neoplatonism, which was of consequence, for example, for Henri Bergson. In England, too, an increasing influence of German Idealism was associated with interest in Plotinus, in particular by Coleridge, although the ground had already been prepared by Thomas Taylor's earlier efforts to revive Platonism (understood through the Neoplatonists) as an alternative pagan religion. His English paraphrases of Plotinus made the philosopher available to Blake, Wordsworth, and Yeats, among others, and to the adepts of Platonism in America.

The first reliable Greek edition of the *Enneads* based on a careful examination of the manuscripts is that prepared by P. Henry and H.-R. Schwyzer, *Plotini Opera, editio maior*, 3 vols. (Brussels, Paris, and Leiden, 1951–73); *editio minor* (with some changes), 3 vols. (Oxford, 1964–83). On the history of the editions of the Greek text see the pungent remarks of Henry and Schwyzer, *ed. maior*, I, xxv–xxx. A revised version of Henry and Schwyzer's *editio minor* has been published with an English translation

by A. H. Armstrong, *Plotinus*, 7 vols., Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, Mass., and London, 1966–88).

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

This bibliography is selective, especially in Sections I and II, where, because of the comprehensive bibliographies of Blumenthal and of Corrigan and O'Cleirigh (below), only larger works and some recent articles are listed. For older literature see Mariën (below). In Section III, references are given relating specifically to the *Fortuna* of the *Enneads* rather than to a more general *Fortuna* of Plotinian ideas.

H. J. Blumenthal, "Plotinus in the Light of Twenty Years' Scholarship, 1951–71," *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II.36.1 (Berlin, 1987), 528–70; K. Corrigan and P. O'Cleirigh, "The Course of Plotinian Scholarship from 1971 to 1986," *Aufstieg* (same vol.), 571–623; B. Mariën, "Bibliografia critica degli studi plotiniani," in V. Cilento, *Plotino. Enneadi* (Bari, 1949), III, 2; Marouzeau, *L'Année Philologique* (Paris, 1928–); H.-R. Schwyzer, "Plotinos," *PW*, XLI (1951), 471–592, 1276, Suppl. XV (1978), 310–28; W. Totok, *Handbuch der Geschichte der Philosophie*, I: *Alttertum* (Frankfort, 1964), 336–43; Überweg I, 188\*–190\*.

### I. EDITIONS OF PLOTINUS

*Editio princeps: Operum philosophicorum libri LIV nunc primum graece editi* (Basel, 1580). Some modern editions: A. H. Armstrong, *Plotinus* (London and Cambridge, Mass., 1966–88), with English translation; E. Bréhier, *Plotin, Ennéades* (Paris, 1924–38), with French translation; R. Harder, R. Beutler, and W. Theiler, *Plotins Schriften* (Hamburg, 1956–71), with German translation; P. Henry and H.-R. Schwyzer, *Plotini Opera* (Brussels, Paris, and Leiden, 1951–73, *editio maior*; *editio minor*: Oxford, 1964–83).

### II. LIFE, THOUGHT, AND WRITINGS OF PLOTINUS

A. H. Armstrong, *The Architecture of the Intelligible Universe in the Philosophy of Ploti-*

nus (Cambridge, 1940); Armstrong, *Plotinian and Christian Studies* (London, 1979); R. Arnou, *Le désir de Dieu dans la philosophie de Plotin*, 2d ed. (Rome, 1967); Arnou, "La 'Contemplation' chez Plotin," *Dictionnaire de spiritualité*, II (1950), 1729–38; M. Atkinson, *Plotinus: Ennead V.1. A Commentary with Translation* (Oxford, 1983); F. Bazán, *Plotino y la Gnosis* (Buenos Aires, 1981); W. Beierwaltes, *Plotin über Ewigkeit und Zeit* (Frankfort, 1967); Beierwaltes, "Reflexion und Einung. Zur Mystik Plotins," *Grundfragen der Mystik* (Einsiedeln, 1974), 9–36; Beierwaltes, *Denken des Einen* (Frankfort, 1985); J. Bertier, L. Brisson, et al., *Plotin. Traité sur les nombres (Enn. VI 6 [34])* (Paris, 1980); H. J. Blumenthal, *Plotinus' Psychology: His Doctrines of the Embodied Soul* (The Hague, 1971); U. Bonanate, *Orme ed enigmi nella filosofia di Plotino* (Milan, 1985); P. Boot, *Plotinus over Voorzienigheid, Enneade III, 2–3 (47–48)* (Amsterdam, 1984); E. Bréhier, *La philosophie de Plotin* (Paris, 1928); L. Brisson et al., *Porphyre, La vie de Plotin*, I (Paris, 1982); F. Brunner, "Le premier traité de la cinquième Ennéade, 'Des trois hypostases principales,'" *Revue de théologie et de philosophie*, CV (1973), 135–72; H. Buchner, *Plotins Möglichkeitslehre* (Munich, 1970); V. Cilento, *Plotino. Paideia antignostica* (Florence, 1971); Cilento, *Saggi su Plotino* (Milan, 1973); J.-M. Charrue, *Plotin lecteur de Platon* (Paris, 1978); J. N. Deck, *Nature, Contemplation and the One: A Study in the Philosophy of Plotinus* (Toronto, 1967); D. Dembinska-Siury, *Byt i isti-nienie w filozofii Plotyna* (Warsaw, 1979); C. Elsas, *Neuplatonische und gnostische Welt-ablehnung in der Schule Plotins* (Berlin, 1975); R. Ferwerda, *La signification des images et des métaphores dans la pensée de Plotin* (Groningen, 1965); Ferwerda, *Plotinus. Ennéaden* (trans.) (Baarn and Amsterdam, 1984); A. Frenkian, "L'Ennéade IV, 7 de Plotin et l'édition d'Eustochius," *Recherches sur l'Organon*, ed. A. Joja (Bucharest, 1971), 19–29; E. Früchtel, *Weltentwurf und Logos. Zur Metaphysik Plotins* (Frankfort, 1970); M. Gatti, *Plotino e la metafisica della contemplazione* (Milan, 1982); A. Graeser, *Plotinus and the Stoics: A Preliminary Study* (Leiden, 1972); P. Hadot, *Plotin, ou la simplicité du regard*, 2d ed. (Paris, 1973); Hadot, "L'union de l'âme avec l'intellect divin dans l'expérience mystique plotinienne," *Proclus et son influence*, ed. G. Boss and G. Seel (Zürich, 1987), 3–27; Hadot, "Structure et thèmes du Traité 38 (VI, 7) de Plotin," *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II.36.1 (Berlin, 1987), 624–76; Hadot, *Plotin. Traité 38 (VI, 7)* (Paris, 1988); F. P. Hager, *Der Geist und das Eine* (Berne, 1970); W. Helleman-Elgersma, *Soul-Sisters: A Commentary on Ennead IV 3 (27), 1–8 of Plotinus* (Amsterdam, 1980); W. Himmerich, *Eudaimonia: Die Lehre des Plotin von der Selbstverwirklichung des Menschen* (Würzburg, 1959); O. Hoppe, *Die Gene in Plotins Enn. VI, 2* (Göttingen, 1965); G. Huber, *Das Sein und das Absolute* (Basel, 1955); J. Igual, *La Cronología de la Vida de Plotino de Porfirio* (Bilbao, 1972); Igual, *Porfirio, Vida de Plotino; Plotino, Enéadas I–IV* (trans.) (Madrid, 1982–85); D. Isaac, "Illusion de l'au-delà et mort anticipée chez Plotin," *Revue de métaphysique et de morale*, XCI (1986), 389–98; E. de Keyser, *La signification de l'art dans les Ennéades de Plotin* (Louvain, 1955); G. P. Kostaras, *Der Begriff des Lebens bei Plotin* (Hamburg, 1969); P. O. Kristeller, *Der Begriff der Seele in der Ethik des Plotin* (Tübingen, 1929); J. McCumber, "Anamnesis as Memory of Intelligibles in Plotinus," *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie*, LX (1978), 160–67; P. Matter, *Zum Einfluss des platonischen 'Timaios' auf das Denken Plotins* (Winterthur, 1964); J. Moreau, *Plotin ou la gloire de la philosophie antique* (Paris, 1970); *Le Néoplatonisme*, Colloque international du C.N.R.S. (Paris, 1971); G. O'Daly, *Plotinus' Philosophy of the Self* (Shannon, 1973); D. J. O'Meara, *Structures hiérarchiques dans la pensée de Plotin* (Leiden, 1975); O'Meara, "Plotinus on How Soul Acts on Body," in *Platonic Investigations*, ed. D. J. O'Meara (Washington, D.C., 1985), 247–62; M. Isnardi Parente, *Introduzione a Plotino* (Rome, 1984); *Revue internationale de philosophie*, XXIV, 2 (1970) (thirteen articles on Plotinus); *Plotin; Plotino e il Neoplatonismo in Oriente e in Occidente* (see below III, A); P. Prini, *Plotino e la genesi dell'umanesimo interiore* (Rome, 1970); J. M. Rist, *Plotinus: The Road to Reality* (Cambridge, 1967); D. Roloff, *Die Grossschrift III, 8–V, 8–V, 5–II, 9* (Berlin, 1970); C. Rutten, *Les catégories du monde sensible dans les Ennéades de Plotin* (Paris, 1961); B. Salmona, *La libertà in Plotino* (Milan, 1967); M. Santa Cruz de Prunes, *La*

*genèse du monde sensible dans la philosophie de Plotin* (Paris, 1980); H. R. Schlette, *Das Eine und das Andere. Studien zur Problematik des Negativen in der Metaphysik Plotins* (Munich, 1966); H. Schöndorf, *Plotins Umformung der platonischen Lehre vom Schönen* (Bonn, 1974); V. Schubert, *Pronoia und Logos. Die Rechtfertigung der Weltordnung bei Plotin* (Munich and Salzburg, 1968); *The Significance of Neoplatonism*, ed. R. B. Harris (Norfolk, Va., 1976); J. Sleeman and G. Pollet, *Lexicon Plotinianum* (Leiden, 1980); *Les sources de Plotin*, Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique 5 (Vandoeuvres-Geneva, 1960); *The Structure of Being: A Neoplatonic Approach* ed. R. B. Harris (Norfolk, Va., 1982); S. Strange, "Plotinus' Treatise on the Genera of Being" (diss., University of Texas, 1981); T. A. Szlezák, *Platon und Aristoteles in der Nuslehre Plotins* (Basel, 1979); W. Theiler, *Forschungen zum Neuplatonismus* (Berlin, 1966); J. Trouillard, *La purification plotinienne* (Paris, 1955); Trouillard, *La procession plotinienne* (Paris, 1955); G. Verbeke, "Pourquoi 'trois' hypostases principales chez Plotin?" *Recherches d'Islamologie* (Mélanges Anawati et Gardet) (Louvain, 1979), 359–79; A. Wolters, "Plotinus 'On Eros'" (diss. Amsterdam, 1972); K. Wurm, *Substanz und Qualität. Ein Beitrag zur Interpretation der platonischen Traktate VI 1,2 und 3* (Berlin, 1973).

### III. INFLUENCE OF PLOTINUS

#### A. General

A. H. Armstrong, ed., *The Cambridge History of Later Greek and Early Medieval Philosophy* (Cambridge, 1967); W. Beierwaltes, "Plotins Erbe," *Museum Helveticum*, XLV (1988), 75–97; M. N. Bouillet, *Les Ennéades de Plotin* (Paris, 1857–61); H. Dörrie, *Platonica minora* (Munich, 1976); R. Klibansky, *The Continuity of the Platonic Tradition during the Middle Ages* (London, 1939; rpt. Munich, 1981); P. Merlan, *From Platonism to Neoplatonism*, 2d ed. (The Hague, 1960); Merlan, *Monopsychism, Mysticism, Metaconsciousness* (The Hague, 1963); *Le Néoplatonisme*, Colloque international du C.N.R.S. (Paris, 1971); *Die Philosophie des Neuplatonismus*, ed. C. Zintzen (Darmstadt, 1977); *Plotini Opera*, III, ed. P. Henry and H.-R. Schwyzer (Brussels and Leiden, 1973), 420–35 ("Index testium"); *Plotino e il Neoplatonismo*

*in Oriente e in Occidente*, Acc. Naz. dei Lincei An. CCCLXXI–1974, Quaderno no. 198 (Rome, 1974); E. N. Tigerstedt, *The Decline and Fall of the Neoplatonic Interpretation of Plato* (Helsinki, 1974); R. T. Wallis, *Neo-Platonism* (New York, 1972).

#### B. Greek Neoplatonic

W. Beierwaltes, *Denken des Einen. Studien zur neuplatonischen Philosophie und ihrer Wirkungsgeschichte* (Frankfort, 1985); H. J. Blumenthal, "Plotinus in Later Platonism," *Neoplatonism and Early Christian Thought*, ed. H. J. Blumenthal and R. A. Markus (Liverpool, 1981), 212–22; P. Crome, *Symbol und Unzulänglichkeit der Sprache* (Munich, 1970); P. Hadot, "L'harmonie des philosophies de Plotin et d'Aristote selon Porphyre dans le commentaire de Dexippe sur les *Catégories*," *Plotino e il Neoplatonismo in Oriente e in Occidente* (above III, A), 31–47; P. Henry, *Les états du texte de Plotin* (Brussels, 1938); *De Jamblique à Proclus*, Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique 21 (Vandoeuvres-Geneva, 1975); P. Merlan, "Ein Simplicios-Zitat bei Pseudo-Alexandros und ein Plotinos-Zitat bei Simplicios," *Rheinisches Museum*, LXXXIV (1935), 154–60; K. Praechter, "Richtungen und Schulen im Neuplatonismus," *Genethliakon für Carl Robert* (Berlin, 1910), 105–56 = *Kleine Schriften*, ed. H. Dörrie (Hildesheim, 1973), 165–216; H.-R. Schwyzer, "Plotinisches und Unplotinisches in den 'Αφορμαῖ des Porphyrios," *Plotino e il Neoplatonismo in Oriente e in Occidente* (above III, A), 221–52; A. Smith, *Porphyry's Place in the Neoplatonic Tradition* (The Hague, 1974); L. G. Westerink, "Exzerpte aus Proklos' Enneadenkommentar bei Psellos," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, LII (1959), 1–10; Westerink, "Elias und Plotin," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, LVII (1964), 26–32.

#### C. Patristic and Pagan Latin

C. Andresen, *Bibliographia Augustiniana* (Darmstadt, 1973), 53–57; R. Arnou, "Platonisme des Pères," *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, XII (1935), 2258–2392; D. L. Balás, *Μετουσίᾳ θεοῦ: Man's Participation in God's Perfections according to Saint Gregory of Nyssa* (Rome, 1966); P. Canivet, *Histoire d'une entreprise apologétique au V<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Paris, 1959); H. F. Cherniss, *The Platonism of Gregory of*

Nyssa, University of California Publications in Classical Philology, XI, 1 (Berkeley, 1930); P. Courcelle, *Les lettres grecques en Occident de Macrobre à Cassiodore*, 2d ed. (Paris, 1948); Courcelle, *Recherches sur les "Confessions" de saint Augustin*, 2d ed. (Paris, 1968); Courcelle, "Plotin et saint Ambroise," *Revue de philologie*, XXIV (1950), 29–56; Courcelle, "Nouveaux aspects du Platonisme chez saint Ambroise," *Revue des études latines*, XXXIV (1956), 221–26; Courcelle, "Grégoire de Nysse lecteur de Porphyre," *Revue des études grecques*, LXXX (1967), 402–406; J. Daniélou, "Grégoire de Nysse et Plotin," Assoc. G. Budé, *Congrès de Tours et Poitiers. Actes* (Paris, 1954), 259–62; Daniélou, "Plotin et Grégoire de Nysse sur le mal," *Plotino e il Neoplatonismo in Oriente e in Occidente* (above III, A), 485–92; Daniélou, *L'être et le temps chez Grégoire de Nysse* (Leiden, 1970); F. De Capitani, "Platone, Plotino, Porfirio e sant'Agostino sull'immortalità dell'anima intesa come vita," *Rivista di filosofia neo-scolastica*, LXXVI (1984), 230–44; H. Dehnhard, *Das Problem der Abhängigkeit des Basilus von Plotin* (Berlin, 1964); *Écriture et culture philosophique dans la pensée de Grégoire de Nysse*, ed. M. Harl (Leiden, 1971); J. Flamant, *Macrobre et le Néo-platonisme latin à la fin du IV<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Leiden, 1977); S. Gersh, *Middle Platonism and Neoplatonism: The Latin Tradition*, 2 vols. (Notre Dame, 1986); *Gregor von Nyssa und die Philosophie*, ed. H. Dörrie, M. Altenburger, and U. Schramm (Leiden, 1976); J. Guitton, *Le temps et l'éternité chez Plotin et saint Augustin*, 3d ed. (Paris, 1959); P. Hadot, "Platon et Plotin dans trois sermons de saint Ambroise," *Revue des études latines*, XXXIV (1956), 202–20; Hadot, *Marius Victorinus* (Paris, 1971), 201–10; P. Henry, *Plotin et l'Occident* (Louvain, 1934); Henry, *Recherches sur la Préparation Evangélique d'Eusèbe et l'édition perdue des œuvres de Plotin publiée par Eustochius* (Paris, 1935); A. Jahn, *Basilus magnus plotinizans* (Berne, 1838); C. Lacombrade, *Synésios de Cyrène* (Paris, 1951); E. S. Ludovici, "La presenza di Plotino nel In Iohannis Evangelium di S. Agostino," *Contributi dell'Istituto di filosofia* (Pubbl. dell'Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore), I (1969), 1–34; G. Madec, *Saint Ambroise et la philosophie* (Paris, 1974), 61–71; W. Malley, *Hellenism and Christianity: The Conflict between Hellenic and*

*Christian Wisdom in the Contra Galileos of Julian the Apostate and the Contra Julianum of Saint Cyril of Alexandria* (Rome, 1978); E. P. Meijering, *God Being History: Studies in Patristic Philosophy* (Amsterdam, 1975); C. Moreschini, "Il Platonismo cristiano di Gregorio Nazianzeno," *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa*, Cl. Lett. e filos., 3d ser., IV (1974), 1347–92; M. Ninci, *Aporia ed entusiasmo. Il mondo materiale e i filosofi secondo Teodoreto e la tradizione patristica greca* (Rome, 1977); R. J. O'Connell, *St. Augustine's Early Theory of Man, A.D. 386–391* (Cambridge, Mass., 1968); G. O'Daly, "Memory in Plotinus and Two Early Texts of St. Augustine," *Studia patristica*, XIV, Texte und Untersuchungen 117 (Berlin, 1976), 461–69; *Oeuvres de saint Augustin*, XIII: *Les Confessions*, ed. M. Skutella, introd. and notes A. Solignac (Brussels, 1962), 110–11; J. O'Meara, "Plotinus and Augustine: Exegesis of *Contra Academicos* II, 5," *Revue internationale de philosophie*, XXIV, 2 (1970), 321–37; O'Meara, "The Neoplatonism of Saint Augustine," *Neoplatonism and Christian Thought*, ed. D. J. O'Meara (Albany, N. Y., 1981), 34–41; J. Pépin, "Ex Platonicorum persona," *Etudes sur les lectures philosophiques de s. Augustin* (Amsterdam, 1977); J. M. Rist, "Basil's 'Neoplatonism': Its Background and Nature," in *Basil of Caesarea*, ed. P. J. Fedwick (Toronto, 1981), I, 137–220; O. du Roy, *L'intelligence de la foi en la Trinité selon saint Augustin* (Paris, 1966), 61–72; A. Solignac, "Nouveaux parallèles entre saint Ambroise et Plotin," *Archives de philosophie*, XIX (1956), 148–56; Solignac, "Reminiscences platoniciennes et porphyriennes dans le début du 'De Ordine' de saint Augustin," *Archives de philosophie*, XX (1957), 446–65; Solignac, "Marius Victorinus," *Dictionnaire de spiritualité*, X (1978), 615–23; L. Taormina, "Sant'Ambrogio e Plotino," in *Miscellanea di studi di letteratura cristiana antica*, IV (Catania, 1953), 41–85; W. Theiler, *Forschungen zum Neuplatonismus* (Berlin, 1966); M. Wacht, *Aeneas von Gaza als Apologet* (Bonn, 1969).

#### D. Byzantine

M. V. Anastos, "Pletho's Calendar and Liturgy," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, IV (1948), 289–99; W. Beierwaltes and R. Kannicht, "Plotin-Testimonia bei Johannes von Skytho-

polis," *Hermes*, XCVI (1968), 247–51; W. Beierwaltes, "Johannes von Skythopolis und Plotin," *Studia patristica*, XI, Texte und Untersuchungen 108 (Berlin, 1972), 3–7; H.-V. Beyer, "Nikephoros Gregoras als Theologe und sein erstes Auftreten gegen die Hesychisten," *Jahrbuch der österreichischen byzantinischen Gesellschaft*, XX (1971), 171–88; Beyer, *Nikephoros Gregoras, Antirrheta*, I (Vienna, 1976); Nicephorus Choumnos, *Antitheticum aduersus Plotinum in Plotini Opera omnia*, ed. G. H. Moser and F. Creuzer (Oxford, 1835), 1416–30; R. Guillard, *Essai sur Nicéphore Grégoras* (Paris, 1926); P. Henry, *Les manuscrits des Ennéades* (Brussels, 1948); H. Hunger, *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner*, I (Munich, 1978), 11–61; F. Masai, *Pléthon et le platonisme de Mistra* (Paris, 1956); L. Mohler, *Kardinal Bessarion als Theologe, Humanist und Staatsmann* (Paderborn, 1923); *Oeuvres complètes de Gennade Scholarios*, ed. L. Petit, X. Siderides, and M. Jugie, VIII (Paris, 1936), 499–502; M. Sicherl, "Platonismus und Textüberlieferung," *Jahrbuch der österreichischen byzantinischen Gesellschaft*, XV (1966), 201–29; Theophylactus Simocattus, *Epistola de Plotino in Plotini Opera omnia*, ed. G. Moser and F. Creuzer (Oxford, 1835), cxxxviii–cxxxix; J. Verpeaux, *Nicéphore Choumnos* (Paris, 1959), 141–43; J. Whittaker, "Varia Procliiana," *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies*, XIV (1973), 427.

#### E. Syriac, Arabic, and Jewish

A. Altmann and S. Stern, *Isaac Israeli: A Neoplatonic Philosopher of the Early Tenth Century* (Oxford, 1958); G. Anawati, "Le Néoplatonisme dans la pensée musulmane: Etat actuel des recherches," *Plotino e il Neoplatonismo in Oriente e in Occidente* (above III, A), 339–405; A. Badawi, *Aristu 'ind al-'Arab* (Cairo, 1947); Badawi, *Aflutin 'ind al-'Arab* (Cairo, 1955); Badawi, *La transmission de la philosophie grecque au monde arabe* (Paris, 1968), 46–59; A. Baumstark, "Zur Vorgeschichte der arabischen 'Theologie des Aristoteles,'" *Oriens Christianus*, II (1902), 187–91; A. Borisov, "Arabsky original latinskoi versii tak nazuivaemoi 'Theologii Aristotely,'" *Zapski Kollegii Vostokovedov*, V (1930), 83–98; F. Dieterici, *Die sogenannte Theologie des Aristoteles aus arabischen Handschriften zum ersten Mal herausgegeben* (Leipzig, 1882; rpt. Hildes-

heim, 1969); Dieterici, *Die sogenannte Theologie des Aristoteles aus dem Arabischen ueberetzt und mit Anmerkungen versehen* (Leipzig, 1883; rpt. Hildesheim, 1969); J. Endres, *Proclus Arabus* (Beirut, 1973), 68–71; P. Fenton, "The Arabic and Hebrew Versions of the *Theology of Aristotle*," in *Pseudo-Aristotle in the Middle Ages*, ed. J. Kraye et al. (London, 1986), 241–64; R. M. Frank, "The Neoplatonism of Gahm ibn Ṣafwān," *Le Muséon*, LXXVIII (1965), 395–424; F. Gabrieli, "Plotino e Porfirio in un eresiografo musulmano," *Parola del passato*, I (1946), 338–44; L. Gardet, "Avicenne commentateur de Plotin," *Etudes de philosophie et de mystique comparée* (Paris, 1972), 135–46; P. Henry and H.-R. Schwyzer, eds., *Plotini Opera*, II (Paris and Brussels, 1959), xxvi–xxxvi; P. Kraus, "Un fragment prétendu de la recension d'Eustochius des oeuvres de Plotin," *Revue de l'histoire des religions*, CXIII (1936), 207–18; Kraus, "Plotin chez les Arabes. Remarques sur un nouveau fragment de la paraphrase arabe des Ennéades," *Bulletin de l'Institut d'Egypte*, XXIII (1940–41), 268–95; W. Kutsch, "Ein arabisches Bruchstück aus Porphyrios (?) Περὶ Ψυχῆς, und die Frage des Verfassers der 'Theologie des Aristoteles,'" *Mélanges de l'Université Saint Joseph*, XXXI, 4 (1954), 265–86; B. Mariën, "De zogenaamde Theologie van Aristoteles en de Araabse Plotinos-Traditie," *Tijdschrift voor philosophie*, X (1948), 125–46; Mariën, "Etudes plotiniennes," *Revue philosophique de Louvain*, XLVII (1949), 386–400; A. Mrozek, "Elementy Arystotelizmu w tzw. 'Teologii Arystotelesa,'" *Studia mediewistyczne*, VIII (1967), 77–181; S. Pinès, "La longue recension de la Théologie d'Aristote dans ses rapports avec la doctrine ismaïélienne," *Revue des études islamiques*, XXII (1954), 7–20; Pinès, "Les textes arabes dits Plotiniens et le courant 'porphyrien' dans le Néoplatonisme grec," *Le Néoplatonisme* (above III, A), 303–13; F. Rosenthal, "Aš-Šayh al-Yūnānī and the Arabic Plotinus Source," *Orientalia*, XXI (1952), 461–92, XXII (1953), 370–400, XXIV (1955), 42–66; Rosenthal, "Plotinus in Islam: The Power of Anonymity," *Plotino e il Neoplatonismo in Oriente e in Occidente* (above III, A), 437–46; J. Schlanger, *La philosophie de Salomon ibn Gabirol* (Leiden, 1968); H.-R. Schwyzer, "Die pseudoaristotelische Theologie und die Plotin-Ausgabe des Porphyrios," *Rhei-*

*nisches Museum*, XC (1941), 216–36; S. Stern, “Ibn Ḥasdāy’s Neoplatonist: A Neoplatonic Treatise and Its Influence on Isaac Israeli and the Longer Version of the Theology of Aristotle,” *Oriens*, XIII (1960), 58–120; P. Thillet, “Une page de Plotin (Enn. IV, 3 [27] 20, 1–39) et son commentaire dans la Pseudo-Théologie d’Aristote,” *Revue des études grecques*, LXXXI (1968), x–xii (summary); Thillet, “Indices porphyriens dans la Théologie d’Aristote,” *Le Néoplatonisme* (above III, A), 293–302; G. Vajda, “Les notes d’Avicenne sur la ‘Théologie d’Aristote’,” *Revue thomiste*, LI (1951), 346–406; F. Zimmermann, “The Origins of the So-called *Theology of Aristotle*,” *Pseudo-Aristotle in the Middle Ages*, 110–240.

#### F. Western Medieval

M. V. Anastos, “Some Aspects of Byzantine Influence on Latin Thought in the Twelfth Century,” in *Twelfth-Century Europe and the Foundations of Modern Society*, ed. M. Clagett, G. Post, and R. Reynolds, 2d ed. (Madison, Wisc., 1966), 137–49; A. H. Armstrong, *Aristotle, Plotinus and St. Thomas* (Oxford, 1946); M. Cappuyns, *Jean Scot Erigène* (1933; rpt. Brussels, 1969), 216 n. 2; J.-M. Dechanet, “Guillaume et Plotin,” *Revue du moyen âge latin*, II (1946), 241–60; Dechanet, *Guillaume de Saint Thierry* (Paris, 1978), 117–46; H. F. Dondaine, *Le corpus dionysien de l’Université de Paris au XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Rome, 1953), 35–66; R. J. Henle, *Saint Thomas and Platonism* (The Hague, 1956); P. Henry, *Plotin et l’Occident* (Louvain, 1934), 246–50; E. Jeauneau, “Macrobe, source du platonisme chartrain,” *Studi medievali*, 3d ser., I (1960), 3–24; H. van Lieshout, *La théorie plotinienne de la vertu. Essai sur la genèse d’un article de la Somme théologique de saint Thomas* (Fribourg, 1926), 128–98; G. Madec, “A propos des sources de Guillaume de Saint-Thierry,” *Revue des études augustiniennes*, XXIV (1978), 302–309; *Platonismus in der Philosophie des Mittelalters*, ed. W. Beierwaltes (Darmstadt, 1969); M. Techert, “Le plotinisme dans le système de Jean Scot Erigène,” *Revue néo-scolastique de philosophie*, XXVIII (1927), 28–68.

#### G. Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries

M. J. B. Allen, *The Platonism of Marsilio Ficino* (Berkeley, 1984); W. Beierwaltes, *Marsilio Ficinos Theorie des Schönen im Kontext*

*des Platonismus* (Heidelberg, 1980); P. G. Bietenholz, *Der italienische Humanismus und die Blütezeit des Buchdrucks in Basel* (Basel and Stuttgart, 1959); V. Cilento, “Glosse di Egidio da Viterbo alla traduzione ficiiana delle Enneadi in un incunabulo del 1492,” *Studi di bibliografia e di storia in onore di Tammaro De Marinis*, I (Verona, 1964), 281–96; B. P. Copenhaver, “Renaissance Magic and Neoplatonic Philosophy: ‘Ennead’ 4.3–5 in Ficino’s ‘De vita coelitus comparanda’,” *Marsilio Ficino e il ritorno di Platone, studi e documenti*, ed. G. C. Garfagnini (Florence, 1986), 351–69; E. Denissoff, *Maxime le grec et l’Occident* (Paris and Louvain, 1943); J. Festugière, *La philosophie de l’amour de Marsile Ficin et son influence sur la littérature française au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Paris, 1941); E. Garin, *Rinascite e rivoluzioni* (Bari, 1975), 91–129; P. Hadot, “‘L’amour magicien’. Aux origines de la notion de ‘magia naturalis’: Platon, Plotin, Marsile Ficin,” *Revue philosophique*, CLXXII (1982), 283–92; J. Hankins, *Plato in the Italian Renaissance*, 2 vols. (Leiden, 1990); Hankins, “Cosimo de’ Medici and the ‘Platonic Academy’,” *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, LIII (1990), 144–62; Hankins, “The Myth of the Platonic Academy in Florence,” *Renaissance Quarterly*, XLIV (1991), 429–76; J. Huszti, “Tendenze platonizzanti alla corte di Mattia Corvino,” *Giornale critico della filosofia italiana*, XI (1930), 1–37; S. Jayne, *John Colet and Marsilio Ficino* (Oxford, 1963); F. Joukovsky, “Jean de Neufville lecteur de Plotin,” *Bibliothèque d’humanisme et Renaissance*, XLI (1979), 111–14; Joukovsky, “Plotin dans les éditions et les commentaires de Porphyre, Jamblique et Proclus à la Renaissance,” *Bibliothèque d’humanisme et Renaissance*, XLII (1980), 387–400; Joukovsky, “Plotin et la Renaissance. Les références aux Ennéades dans quelques éditions de Platon et des Pères de l’Église,” *Etudes seiziéristes offertes à . . . V. L. Saulnier* (Geneva, 1980), 19–32; Joukovsky, *Le regard intérieur. Thèmes plotiniens chez quelques écrivains de la Renaissance française* (Paris, 1982); A. Ingegno, “Il primo Bruno e l’influenza di Marsilio Ficino,” *Rivista critica di storia della filosofia*, XXIII (1968), 149–70; P. Kibre, *The Library of Pico della Mirandola* (New York, 1936); R. Klibansky, E. Panofsky, and F. Saxl, *Saturn and Melancholy* (London, 1964); J. Kraye, “The Pseudo-

do-Aristotelian *Theology* in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century Europe," *Pseudo-Aristotle in the Middle Ages*, ed. J. Kraye et al. (London, 1986), 265–86; P. O. Kristeller, *Supplementum Ficinianum. Marsilius Ficinus florentini philosophi platonici opuscula inedita et dispersa*, 2 vols. (Florence, 1937); Kristeller, *The Philosophy of Marsilio Ficino* (New York, 1943; Italian version, Florence, 1953 and reprint, with additions, 1988); Kristeller, *Studies in Renaissance Thought and Letters* (Rome, 1956); Kristeller, "Some Original Letters and Autograph Manuscripts of Marsilio Ficino," in *Studi di bibliografia e di storia in onore di Tammaro De Marinis*, III (Verona, 1964), 5–33; Kristeller, "Giovanni Pico della Mirandola and His Sources," *L'opera e il pensiero di Giovanni Pico della Mirandola*, I (Florence, 1965), 35–133; Kristeller, "Marsilio Ficino as a Beginning Student of Plato," *Scriptorium*, XX (1966), 41–54; Kristeller, "Marsilio Ficino and His Work after Five Hundred Years," *Marsilio Ficino e il ritorno di Platone, studi e documenti*, ed. G. C. Garfagnini (Florence, 1986), 15–196 (printed separately, with additional bibliography, 1987); E. P. Mahoney, "Neoplatonism, the Greek Commentators and Renaissance Aristotelianism," in *Neoplatonism and Christian Thought*, ed. D. J. O'Meara (Albany, N.Y., 1981), 169–77; R. Marcel, *Marsile Ficin (1433–1499)* (Paris, 1958); *Marsilio Ficino e il ritorno di Platone: mostra di manoscritti*, ed. S. Gentile et al. (Florence, 1984); K. Müllner, *Reden und Briefe italienischer Humanisten* (Vienna, 1899), 3–56 ("Praefationes Iohannis Argyropuli, dum Florentiae doceret philosophiam"); L. Perini, "Note sulla famiglia di Pietro Perna e sul suo apprendistato tipografico," in *Magia, astrologia e religione nel Rinascimento* (Warsaw, 1974), 163–209; N. A. Robb, *Neoplatonism of the Italian Renaissance* (London, 1935); A. Rotondò, *Studi e ricerche di storia ereticale italiana del Cinquecento*, I (Turin, 1974), 343–47 (Perna); R. Sabbadini, *Le scoperte dei codici latini e greci ne' secoli XIV e XV*, 2d ed. (Florence, 1967); Sabbadini, *Carteggio di Giovanni Aurispa* (Rome, 1931); M. Schiavone, *Problemi filosofici in Marsilio Ficino* (Milan, 1957); M. Sicherl, "Neuentdeckte Handschriften von Marsilio Ficino und Johannes Reuchlin," *Scriptorium*, XVI (1962), 50–61; A. della Torre, *Storia dell'Accademia Platonica di Firenze* (Florence,

1902); D. P. Walker, *Spiritual and Demonic Magic from Ficino to Campanella* (London, 1958); O. Walzel, "Aristotelisches und Plotinisches bei J. C. Scaliger und Giordano Bruno," *Zeitschrift für Ästhetik und allgemeine Kunswissenschaft*, XII (1917), 439–59; M. Welti, "Le grand animateur de la Renaissance tardive à Bâle: Pierre Perna, éditeur, imprimeur et libraire," *L'humanisme allemand (1480–1540)* (Paris, 1979), 131–39; A. M. Wolters, "The First Draft of Ficino's Translation of Plotinus," *Marsilio Ficino e il ritorno di Platone, studi e documenti*, ed. G. C. Garfagnini (Florence, 1986), 305–29; Wolters, "Poliziano as Translator of Plotinus," *Renaissance Quarterly*, XL (1987), 452–64.

#### H. After 1600

N. Baladi, "Plotin et l'immatérialisme de Berkeley, témoignage de la *Siris*," in *Plotino e il Neoplatonismo* (above, III, A.), 597–602; H. Baumgartner, "Die Bestimmung des Absoluten. Ein Strukturvergleich der Reflexionsformen bei J. G. Fichte und Plotin," *Zeitschrift für philosophische Forschung*, XXXIV (1980), 321–42; W. Beierwaltes, *Platonismus und Idealismus* (Frankfort, 1972); Beierwaltes, *Identität und Differenz* (Frankfort, 1980); E. Cassirer, *The Platonic Renaissance in England* (Austin, Tex., 1953); Cassirer, *The Philosophy of the Enlightenment* (Princeton, 1951); G. Guffey, *Traherne and the Seventeenth-Century English Platonists* (London, 1969) (bibliography); P. Hadot, "L'apport du néoplatonisme à la philosophie de la nature en Occident," *Eranos-Jahrbuch*, XXXVII (1968), 91–132; K. Harrington, "Paul Elmer More and Neoplatonism," in *The Significance of Neoplatonism*, ed. R. B. Harris (Norfolk, Va., 1976), 333–53; F. Koch, *Goethe und Plotin* (Leipzig, 1925); P. O. Kristeller, "The European Significance of Florentine Platonism," in *Medieval and Renaissance Studies*, III, ed. J. Headley (Chapel Hill, 1968), 206–29; S. MacKenna, *Journals and Letters*, ed. E. R. Dodds (London, 1936); H. Mähl, "Novalis und Plotin," *Jahrbuch des Freien Deutschen Hochstifts 1963* (Tübingen, 1963), 139–250; E. Manasse, "Platonism since the Enlightenment," in *Dictionary of the History of Ideas*, III, 515–25; B. Mariën (above, p. 60), 582–99; R. Mossé-Bastide, *Bergson et Plotin* (Paris, 1956); G. Orsini, *Coleridge and German Idealism* (Carbondale, Ill.,

1969); C. Patrides, *The Cambridge Platonists* (Cambridge, 1969); E. N. Tigerstedt (above III, A); K. Raine and G. Mills Harper, *Thomas Taylor the Platonist* (Princeton, 1969); K. Raine, "Thomas Taylor et le mouvement romantique anglais," *Le Néoplatonisme* (above, III, A), 475–83; J. Roberts, *From Puritanism to Platonism in Seventeenth-Century England* (The Hague, 1968); B. Salmona, *Giorgio Hegel e Antonio Rosmini interpreti di Plotino* (Genoa, 1973); X. Tillette, "Vision plotinienne et intuition schellingienne: deux modèles de mystique intellectuelle," *Gregorianum*, LX (1979), 703–24; F. Uehlein, *Kosmos und Subjektivität. Lord Shaftesbury's Philosophical Regimen* (Freiburg and Munich, 1976).

## I. ENNEADES

### TRANSLATIONS

#### I. Gaius Marius Victorinus

The first known Latin translation of Plotinus was produced by Marius Victorinus less than a century after Plotinus' death. It is certainly to be regretted that this translation has not survived, for it would shed much light on St. Augustine's knowledge of Plotinus and on the influence Plotinus had both on him and on the other Latin writers of the period. Little is known about Victorinus' translation: we do not know when he made it, whether it was a complete translation of the *Enneads* (assuming Victorinus used Porphyry's edition of Plotinus, since he is otherwise much indebted to Porphyry), a partial translation, or merely a series of excerpts with commentary by Porphyry. What little evidence has been found (see above, Bibliography III, C) may be summarized as follows.

The existence of Victorinus' translation is known from the combination of two texts in Augustine. In the *Confessions* (VIII,2,3), speaking of events leading to his conversion (in 386), Augustine reports that he told Simplicianus: ". . . legisse me quosdam libros Platonicorum, quos Victorinus . . . in latinam linguam transtulisset." In the *De beata vita* (I,4), written in 386, he refers to his reading of Plotinus ("lectis autem Plotini paucissimis libris"). There is little doubt that the "libri Platonicorum" translated by Victorinus included Plotinus, but it is not clear

whether these "libri" contained a complete or a partial translation of Plotinus and whether they also included works by Porphyry, another of the "Platonici" read and used both by Victorinus and Augustine.

Victorinus' own extant works provide little information of use in determining the extent of his translation. Only one short quotation from Plotinus (*Enn. V.2.1–2*) has been found in his works (*Adv. Ar.*, IV.22), together with a few possible allusions. More evidence can be found in Augustine. Brief excerpts from *Enn. IV.2* have been discovered in the *De immortalitate animae* (387), from *Enn. I.6* and *V.1* in the *Confessions* (ca. 400), from *Enn. V.1* again in the *De consensu evangelistarum* (400), from *V.3* in the *De trinitate* (400–416), from *Enn. V.5* in the *De Genesi ad litteram* (400–415), and from *Enn. I.6* and *V.1* in the *Tractatus in Johannem* (414–16/17). (Many other, but not indubitable, excerpts and allusions have been found.) This list suggests that Victorinus' translation included not only short popular treatises (*Enn. I.6*; *V.1*) but also some longer, less accessible works (*Enn. V.3*; *V.5*) and must therefore have been quite extensive, possibly even complete. By the time he wrote the *De civ. dei* (413–26), Augustine knew enough Greek to read Plotinus in the original. The treatises he now refers to and quotes (*Enn. I.6*; III.2–3; *V.1*; *V.6*) include those he had used earlier, but it is not possible to determine whether he still used Victorinus' translation at this stage or read Plotinus in Greek. Augustine, in his last days as recorded in Possidius' *Vita Augustini* 28, consoled himself with these words of Plotinus (*Enn. I.4.7*): "There would be no virtue left in him if he thought that wood and stones, and . . . the death of mortals were important" (tr. Armstrong).

Many excerpts from Plotinus (*Enn. I.1*; *I.2*; *I.6*; *I.7*; *I.8*; *III.5*; *IV.8*) have been found in St. Ambrose (*De Isaac*, *De bono mortis*, *De Jacob*, *De fuga*), but it cannot be established at present whether Ambrose used Victorinus' translation, or read Plotinus in the original, or found the Plotinian excerpts already incorporated in a Greek patristic source of the sort on which he often depended. It has been argued (from a few cases) that the translation of Greek philosophical terms in the Ambrosian excerpts differs from that in Victorinus' extant works. Yet there are similarities between the excerpts from *Enn. I.6* in Ambrose and in Augustine. These have been explained by

supposing simply that both Ambrose and Augustine used Victorinus' translation, or, less simply, that Ambrose influenced Augustine in his reading of Victorinus' translation of Plotinus.

#### *Biography:*

Gaius Marius Victorinus (Afer) was born in North Africa toward the end of the third century and died, probably in Rome, not long after 363. He held the professorship of rhetoric at Rome during the reign of Constantius (353–361) and attained such influence and fame that a statue of him was erected in Trajan's forum in 354. He converted late in life to Christianity (ca. 355–357) and resigned his position in 362 following Julian's edict against Christian teachers.

In addition to the "libri Platonicorum" Victorinus made translations of works in logic by Aristotle and Porphyry; he composed grammatical, rhetorical and logical treatises and commentaries; and, at the end of his life, he wrote theological works which included polemic directed against Arianism and commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul.

#### *Bibliography:*

B. Altaner and A. Stuiber, *Patrologie*, 8th ed. (Freiburg, 1978), 368–69; P. Wessner, PW XIV, 1840–48; E. Benz, *Marius Victorinus* (Stuttgart, 1932), 1–38, P. Hadot, *Marius Victorinus* (Paris, 1971); A. Solignac, "Marius Victorinus," in *Dictionnaire de spiritualité*, XX (1978), 615–23; A. Travis, "Marius Victorinus: A Biographical Note," *Harvard Theological Review*, XXXVI (1943), 83–90.

#### 2. Marsilius Ficinus

The documents and circumstances relating to Ficinus' translation have been thoroughly presented and discussed by P. O. Kristeller (see *Supplementum Ficinianum*, I, clvii–clix; R. Marcel, *Marsile Ficin* [Paris, 1958], 466ff., reviews the evidence and disagrees on some points). It will suffice here to recall the main facts. In his Preface dedicated to Lorenzo de' Medici reprinted below, Ficinus refers to the Byzantine Platonist Pletho as having inspired in Lorenzo's grandfather Cosimo, on the occasion of the Council of Florence (1438), an interest in Platonic philosophy and a desire to found an "Academy". He claims that he was selected as a boy by Cosimo and educated with this end in

view (but see *Fortuna* above) and that Greek manuscripts not only of Plato but also of Plotinus were made available to him. He tells us that on finishing his translation of Plato (printed in 1484) he was stimulated to undertake the translation of Plotinus by Giovanni Pico della Mirandola, who had recently arrived in Florence (1484). Ficinus viewed Pico's encouragement as divinely inspired and as expressing the wishes of Cosimo. Pico, however, had been reading Ficinus' *Theologia Platonica* in 1483 (see Marcel, 471) in which Plotinus is quoted, and, in any case, Ficinus' own interest in Plotinus was by now long-standing; Plotinus was central to his interpretation of Platonic philosophy (see *Fortuna* above). Ficinus' correspondence reflects the uneven progress of the translation, which was completed according to Ficinus in 1486. (A. M. Wolters, "The First Draft of Ficino's Translation of Plotinus," *Bibliography* above, III, G, argues that the manuscript in the Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale [see below] is a first draft completed in 1486 that Ficinus subsequently revised.) The printing of the translation with Ficinus' commentary was completed in May 1492, one month after Lorenzo's death.

The translation follows Porphyry's enneadic ordering of Plotinus' treatises as represented in the manuscripts. It is based on the Greek text given in Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale gr. 1816, which contains marginalia in Ficinus' hand and was copied (for Ficinus?) by John Skutariotes in August 1460 from Florence, Biblioteca Laurenziana 87.3, a codex which probably belonged to Niccolò Niccoli and was part of the library set up by Cosimo de' Medici in the monastery of San Marco and which may also have been consulted by Ficinus (see Henry, *Les manuscrits* (*Bibliography* above, III, D), 30–35, 47–62; Marcel, 253). Judgments concerning Ficinus' translation have been very favorable (see J. Festugière, *La philosophie de l'amour de Marsile Ficin et son influence sur la littérature française au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle* [Paris, 1941], 149–52). It continued to be found clear and useful and was reprinted (with corrections) as late as the nineteenth century (in F. Creuzer and G. H. Moser, *Plotini Opera omnia* [Oxford, 1835]; *Plotini Enneades* [Paris, 1855]), apparently removing the need for another complete translation until this century.

*Prefatory Letter:*

*Prooemium Marsilii Ficini Florentini in Plotinum ad magnanimum Laurentium Medicem patriae servatorem* (ed. of Florence, 1492. [Inc.]: (fol. aii') Magnus Cosmus Senatus consulto patriae pater, quo tempore concilium inter Graecos atque Latinos sub Eugenio pontifice Florentiae tractabatur, philosophum graecum nomine Gemistum, cognomine Plethonem, quasi Platonem alterum, de mysteriis platonicis disputantem frequenter audivit. E cuius ore ferventi sic afflatus est protinus, sic animatus, ut inde Academiam quandam alta mente conceperit, hanc opportuno primum tempore paritus. Deinde dum conceptum tantum Magnus ille Medices quodammodo parturiret, me electissimi medici sui Ficini filium, adhuc puerum, tanto operi destinavit, ad hoc ipsum educavit indies. Operam praeterea dedit, ut omnes non solum Platonis, sed etiam Plotini libros graecos habrem. Post haec autem anno millesimo quadragesimo sexagesimo tertio, quo ego trigesimum agebam aetatis annum, mihi Mercurium primo Termaximum, mox Platonem mandavit interpretandum. Mercurium paucis mensibus eo vivente peregi, Platonem tunc etiam sum aggressus. Etsi Plotinum quoque desiderabat, nullum tamen de hoc interpretando fecit verbum, ne graviore me pondere semel premere videretur. Tanta erat viri tanti erga suos clementia, in omnes tanta modestia. Itaque nec ego quidem quasi nec vates<sup>1</sup> aggredi Plotinum aliquando cogitavi. Verum interea Cosmus, quod vivens olim in terra reticuit, tandem expressit, vel potius impressit ex alto. Quo enim tempore Platonem Latinis dedi legendum, heroicus ille Cosmi animus heroicam Iohannis Pici Mirandulae mentem nescio quomodo instigavit, ut Florentiam, et ipse quasi nesciens quomodo, perveniret. Hic sane quo anno Platonem aggressus fueram natus, deinde quo die et ferme qua hora Platonem edidi Florentiam veniens, me statim post primam salutationem de Platone rogat. Huic equidem Plato noster, inquam, hodie liminibus nostris est egressus. Tunc ille et hoc ipso vehementer

1. "Vates" is also the reading given by the dedication copy, ms. Florence, Biblioteca Laurenziana 82.10 (see below, *Manuscripts*). The sentence might be construed as follows: "And thus neither did I, not being so to speak a prophet, think to approach Plotinus."

congratulatus est et mox nescio quibus verbis, ac ille nescit quibus, ad Plotinum interpretandum me non adduxit quidem, sed potius concitavit. Divinitus profecto videtur effectum, ut dum Plato quasi renasceretur, natus Picus heros sub Saturno suo Aquarium possidente, sub quo et ego similiter anno prius trigesimo natus fueram, ac perveniens Florentiam quo die Plato noster est editus, antiquum illud de Plotino herois Cosmi votum mihi prorsus occultum, sed sibi caelitus inspiratum, idem et mihi mirabiliter inspiraverit. Quoniam vero nunc circa philosophandi officium divinam attigimus providentiam, operae pretium fore videtur, ut eam paulo latius prosequamur. Non est profecto putandum acuta et quodammodo philosophica hominum ingenia unquam alia quadam esca praeterquam philosophica ad perfectam religionem allici posse paulatim atque perduci. Acuta enim ingenia plerumque soli se rationi committunt, cumque a religioso quodam philosopho hanc accipiunt, religionem subito communem libenter admittunt. Qua quidem imbuti ad meliorem religionis speciem sub genere comprehensam facilius traducuntur. Itaque non absque divina providentia volente videlicet omnes pro singulorum ingenio ad se mirabiliter revocare, factum est ut pia quaedam philosophia quondam et apud Persas sub Zoroastre, et apud Aegyptios sub Mercurio nasceretur, utrobique sibimet consona, nutritur deinde apud Thraces sub Orpheo atque Aglaophemo, adolesceret quoque mox sub Pythagora apud Graecos et Italos, tandem vero a divo Platone consummaretur Athenis. Vetus autem theologorum mos erat divina mysteria cum mathematicis numeris et figuris, tum poetis figuris obtegere, ne temere cuilibet communia forent. Plotinus tandem his theologiam velaminibus enudavit, primusque et solus ut Porphyrius Proculusque testantur, arcana veterum divinitus penetravit. Sed ob incredibilem cum verborum brevitatem, tum sententiarum copiam sensusque profunditatem non translatione tantum linguae, sed commentariis indiget. Nos ergo in theologis superioribus apud<sup>2</sup> Platonem atque

2. Professor Kristeller suggests reading "ante" for "apud." But "apud" is also found in the dedication copy (above, n. 1), and the sentence might be construed as follows: "Therefore we, in translating and explaining the older theologians, have worked with Plato and Plotinus, so that. . . ."

Plotinum traducendis et explanandis elaboravimus, ut hac theologia in lucem prodeunte, et poetae desinant gesta mysteriaque pietatis impie fabulis suis annumerare, et Peripatetici quamplurimi, id est philosophi paene omnes, admonentur, non esse de religione saltem communianquam de anilibus fabulis sentiendum. Totus enim ferme terrarum orbis a Peripateticis occupatus in duas plurimum sectas divisus est, Alexandrinam et Averroicam. Illi quidem intellectum nostrum esse mortalem existimant, hi vero unicum esse contendunt: utriusque religionem omnem funditus aequae tollunt, praesertim quia divinam circa homines providentiam negare videntur, et utrobique a suo etiam Aristotele defecisse. Cuius mentem hodie pauci praeter sublimem Picum complatonicum nostrum ea pietate qua Theophrastus olim et Themistius, Porphyrius, Simplicius, Avicenna, et nuper Plethon interpretantur. Si quis autem putet tam divulgatam impietatem tamque acribus munitam ingeniis sola quadam simplici praedicatione fidei apud homines posse deleri, is a vero longius aberrare palam re ipsa procul dubio convincetur: maiore admodum hic opus est potestate. Id autem est vel divinis miraculis ubique patentibus, vel saltem philosophica quadam religione philosophis eam libentius audituris quandoque persuasura. Placet autem divinae providentiae his saeculis ipsum religionis suae genus auctoritate rationeque philosophica confirmare, quoad statuto quadam tempore verissimam religionis speciem, ut olim quandoque fecit, manifestis per omnes gentes confirmet miraculis. Divina igitur providentia ducti divinum Platонem et magnum Plotinum interpretati sumus. Platонem quidem ipsum misimus ad te iamdiu, ut apud eum aliquando revivisceret, in quo revixit Cosmus, atque renatus adolevit ad votum et feliciter floret adultus. Plotinum vero nunc et si iure missuri sumus, non tam mittimus quidem quam spectamus ad tuas aedes ultro et alacriter properantem, tanquam ab ipso Platоне, velut ferrum a lapide quadam Herculeo raptum, ut penes te, magnanime Laurenti, unice litteratorum patronе, una cum Platоне suo felicissime vivat. Audi ergo feliciter Plotinum de omnibus philosophiae mysteriis apud te cum Platоне loquentem. Sed antequam hunc auscultes, Porphyrius pius eius discipulus tibi auscultandus erit, vitam, mores, gesta magistri et brevissime simul et verissime narrans. Cuius historiam Angelus Politianus noster,

alumnus tuus, acerrimo vir iudicio, tam orationem quam philosophicam esse censem, propterea tibi admodum placitura. Denique non solum audi feliciter, sed etiam felicissime vive. Et quantum nos amas, dilectissime Laurenti, tantum precor nostrum ama Valorem, Philippum inquam egregium virum et platonicae sapientiae studiosum et te ardenter amantem.

*Plotini vita composita a Porphyrio discipulo suo traducta vero a Marsilio Ficino Florentino.* [Inc.]: (fol. aiii<sup>r</sup>) Plotinus delicias et inanem gloriam vitamque contemnebat, obiit angina, apparuit draco. Plotinus philosophus nostro saeculo singularis pudore quodam affici videbatur quod anima eius in corpore esset . . . / . . . [Expl.]: (fol. bi<sup>r</sup>) Et si quid usquam in dictionibus erratum fuerit emendare conabimur ac si quid aliud nos moueat, opus ipsum significare potest.

*Exhortatio Marsili Ficini Florentini ad auditores in lectionem Plotini et similiter ad legentes.* [Inc.]: (fol. bii<sup>r</sup>) Principio vos omnes admoneo, qui divinum audituri Plotinum huc acceditis, ut Platонem ipsum sub Plotini persona loquentem vos audituros existimetis. Sive enim Plato quandam in Plotino revixit, quod facile nobis Pythagorici dabunt, sive Daemon idem Platонem quidem prius afflavit, deinde vero Plotinum, quod Platонici nulli negabunt, omnino aspirator idem os platonicum afflat atque plotinum. Sed in Platone quidem afflando spiritum effundit uberiorem, in Plotino autem flatum angustiorem, ac ne augustiorem dixerim, saltem non minus augustum, nonnunquam ferme profundiorem. Idem itaque numen per os utrumque humano generi divina fundit oracula, utrobique sagacissimo quadam interprete digna, qui ibi quidem in evolvendis figuramentorum incumbat involucris, hic vero tum in exprimendis secretissimis ubique sensibus, tum in explanandis verbis quam brevissimis diligentius elaboret. Mementote praeterea vos haudquaquam vel sensu comite vel humana ratione duce, sed mente quadam sublimiore excelsam Plotini mentem penetraturos. Profecto (ut platonice loquar) caeteros homines rationales animos appellamus, Plotinum vero non animum sed intellectum. Sic omnes eum philosophi suo saeculo praesertim Platонici nominabant. Atque utinam in mysteriis huius interpretandis adminiculum Porphyrii aut Eustochii aut Proculi, qui Plotini libros disposerunt atque exposuerunt, nobis adesset. Spero tamen id, quod admodum felicius est, divinum

auxilium in traducendis explicandisque divinis Plotini libris Marsilio Ficino non defuturum. Sed iam caelestibus hinc auspiciis et nos ad transfrendum primum Plotini librum et argumento breviter exponendum, reliquosque deinceps feliciter accedamus. Et vos Platonem ipsum exclamare sic erga Plotinum existimetis: Hic est filius meus dilectus, in quo mihi undique placebo: ipsum audite. [The last sentence, from Matt. 3:17 and Luke 9:35, caused scandal, it seems, since it was replaced in the edition of Basel, 1580 by the Homeric verse (*Od.* X.495) οὗτος πέπνυται, τοὶ δ' ὡς σκιαὶ αἴσσονται. Iste sapit solus, volunt reliqui sicut umbrae.]

*Enneades*. [Inc.]: (fol. bvii<sup>r</sup>) Plotini Liber primus quid animal quid homo a Marsilio Ficino Florentino translatus. . . . (I.1.1) Voluptates et dolores, timores item atque audaciae, cupiditates et fugae atque cruciatus, cuiusnam sunt? Nunquid ipsius animae tantum? An animae potius utentis corpore? An tertii cuiusdam ex utrisque compositi? Dupliciter autem et hoc accipi potest. . . . / . . . [Expl.]: (fol. UUx<sup>r</sup>) (VI.9.11) Haec igitur est deorum et hominum divinorum feliciumque vita humanas omnino negligens voluptates fugaque solius ad solum. Finis.

*Consolatory letter*. [Inc.]: (fol. UUx<sup>r</sup>) Marsilius Ficinus magnanimo Petro Medici s. Cum Idibus Novembribus in agro Caregio una cum magno Laurentio Medice deambularem multaque Platonis mysteria ultro citroque interpretaremur, decidi forte inter loquendum e sapientia in fortunam coepique hanc acrius incusare . . . / . . . [Expl.]: (fol. UUx<sup>r</sup>) Plotinus denique manibus nunc tuis apprehensus seniorem interea Platonem piis humeris substinebit teque duce producit in lucem.

#### *Manuscripts:*

(\*) Florence, Biblioteca Laurenziana 82.10 and 82.11: dedication copy dated 1490 (the consolatory letter to Piero de'Medici is dated 1492) includes the translation, commentary, and a dedicatory letter to Lorenzo de'Medici from Filippo Valori (edited in *Suppl. Fic.*, I, 94) at whose expense the manuscript was prepared (Bandini, *Catalogus*, III, 194ff.; *Suppl. Fic.*, I, xii).

(\*) Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, Conventi soppr. E.1.2562: dated 1484; translation only; variant readings recorded in *Suppl. Fic.*, I, 93 (*Suppl. Fic.*, I, xxvi).

(\*) Holkham Hall, Library of the Earl of

Leicester, 448: *Enn.* I–III with commentary; s. XV; copy of 1492 edition (Kristeller, *Studies*, p. 166; *Iter*, IV, 45; S. De Ricci, *A Handlist of Manuscripts in the Library of the Earl of Leicester* [Oxford, 1932], 39; A. Derolez, *The Library of Raphael de Marcatellis* [Ghent, 1979], 236–37).

Missing manuscript in the library of Matthias Corvinus (*Suppl. Fic.*, I, liii).

*Editions* (listed in *Suppl. Fic.*, I, lxvi; D. O'Brien, “Bibliographie analytique des éditions, traductions et commentaires de la Vie de Plotin, 1492–1980,” in L. Brisson et al., *Porphyre, la Vie de Plotin* [Paris, 1982], 151–56):

1492, Florentiae (Florence): Antonius Miscominus. Ficinus' translation and commentary. HC 13121\*; Goff P-815; BMC VI, 640; Graesse V 353; NUC. BL; BN; (DLC; MH).

1540, Salingiacum (Solingen): Ioannes Soter. Reprint of the 1492 edition. (The identification of “Salingiacum” as Solingen is confirmed by H. Finger, Universitätsbibliothek Düsseldorf.) Adams P-1598; NUC. Cambridge, University Library; BN; (CLSU; IMunS).

1559, Basileae (Basel): apud Petrum Pernam. Ficinus' translation and commentary. Some copies include an index. Adams P-1599; NUC (including a listing under 1570 for the NNUT copy under NP 0426038. The NNUT imprint date has been altered by hand from MDLIX to MDLXX, information I owe to D. O'Brien, verified by P. O. Kristeller.) Cambridge, Trinity College; BL; (DCU; ICU; NNUT).

1559, Basileae (Basel): per T. Guerinum [*sic*]. Perna's 1559 edition with a different title page. BN.

1562, Basileae (Basel): per T. Guarinum. Perna's 1559 edition with new title page. Adams P-1600; NUC. BN; Cambridge, University Library; (CLSU).

1580, Basileae (Basel): ad Perneam lecythum. (Gr.-Lat.) Ficinus' Latin translation and commentary, with the Greek text. Adams P-1597; Brunet IV, 727; NUC. Cambridge, Clare College; BL; BN; (DFo; MH).

1615, Basileae (Basel): impensis Ludovici Regis. Contents as in the edition of 1580. Graesse V, 352; NUC. BL; BN; (ViU; MiD).

1835, Oxonii (Oxford): e Typographeo academico. Creuzer and Moser's edition of Ploti-

nus, which includes a corrected version of Ficinus' translation and his commentary. NUC. BN; (CtY; IU).

1855, Parisiis (Paris): Didot. Enlarged reprint of the 1835 edition; it contains only the chapter headings of the first part of the commentary together with the entire second part. NUC. (CU; MH).

1861, London/Cambridge. B. Botfield, *Praefationes et epistolae editionibus principibus auctorum veterum praepositae*. Ficinus' prefatory letter to his translation is reprinted on pages 600–603.

1896, Parisiis (Paris): Didot. Reprint of the edition of 1855. NUC. (CtY; IU).

#### *Biography:*

See CTC I, 139. Add to the *Bibliography*: M.J.B. Allen, *The Platonism of Marsilio Ficino. A Study of His Phaedrus Commentary, Its Sources and Genesis* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1984); Allen, *Icastes: Marsilio Ficino's Interpretation of Plato's Sophist* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1989); *Ficino and Renaissance Neoplatonism*, ed. K. Eisenbichler and O. Z. Pugliese (Toronto, 1986); A. Field, *The Origins of the Platonic Academy of Florence* (Princeton, 1988); *Marsilio Ficino e il ritorno di Platone, studi e documenti*, ed. G. C. Garfagnini, 2 vols. (Florence, 1986); *Marsilio Ficino, Lettere I*, ed. S. Gentile (Florence, 1990); J. Hankins, *Plato in the Italian Renaissance*, I (Leiden, 1990), 267–359; Hankins, “Cosimo de’ Medici and the ‘Platonic Academy’,” *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, LIII (1990), 144–62; Hankins, “The Myth of the Platonic Academy in Florence,” *Renaissance Quarterly*, XLIV (1991), 429–76; P. O. Kristeller, *Marsilio Ficino and His Work after Five Hundred Years* (Florence, 1987).

#### COMMENTARY

##### a. Marsilius Ficinus

Ficinus began composing his commentary upon completion of his translation (1486), on the basis of public lectures he gave on Plotinus (see *Suppl. Fic.*, I, cxxvi–cxxxviii). The first part of the commentary consisted of preliminary introductions and summaries (*argumenta*) for each treatise, each chapter of each treatise also being given a heading indicating briefly its contents. In some cases, depending on Ficinus' in-

terests, the argumentum could be quite extensive, incorporating in the commentary on *Enn.* III.1 material from the earlier unpublished *Disputatio contra iudicium astrologorum* (edited, omitting the material in the Plotinus commentary, by Kristeller, *Suppl. Fic.*, II, 11–76) and giving rise, in connection with the commentary on *Enn.* IV.3.11, to the composition of another work, the “De vita coelitus comparanda ad Matthiam Corvinum Pannoniae regem” (Book III of the very popular *De vita libri tres*, in *Opera omnia* 529–71), completed in 1489, which still appears as part of the Plotinus commentary in Florence, Biblioteca Laurenziana 82.10, and which, as separately published in the *De vita libri tres*, reflects its origin in the context of the commentary on Plotinus (see *Suppl. Fic.*, I, xii, lxxxiv). Various other tasks and events interrupted the progress of the commentary (see *Suppl. Fic.*, I, cxxvi–cxxxviii; Marcel, 476–508) and from *Enn.* IV.3.15 it assumes a shorter form which is announced at the end of the commentary on IV.3.14 (*Opera omnia*, 1738): “Sed non licet ulterius in praesentia digredi, immo neque licet tenorem ab initio librorum exponendorum hactenus continuatum ultra servare. Si enim longa similiter argumenta, immo et commentaria seorsumque ab ipsis Plotini capitibus disposita prosequamur, et confusa contingit interpretatio, et opus excrescit immensum. Satis evagati sumus; satis multa iam diximus. Sat igitur erit deinceps breves quasdam annotationes, ut in Theophrasto fecimus, Plotini capitibus interserere.” From this point Ficinus discontinues composing *argumenta* for each treatise, providing only brief summaries at the head of each chapter of the remaining treatises, although some of these summaries are quite extensive. The commentary was completed in 1490 and was printed both with the editions of the translation (see above) and separately in the *Opera omnia* of Ficinus. The commentary is reprinted in the Oxford, 1835, Creuzer-Moser edition of Plotinus; the Paris, 1855 edition contains the chapter headings (only) of the first part of the commentary and the entire second part of the commentary.

*Argumentum* (ed. of Florence, 1492). [Inc.]: (fol. bii') *Argumentum Marsilii Ficini Florentini in primum librum Plotini platonici. Anima rationalis media est inter formas divinas atque naturales neque inest corpori, sed adest, et vitam ex se*

propagat quae inest corpori, ex qua et corpore fit animal unum compositum. Capitulum primum.

*Commentary.* [Inc.]: (fol. bii<sup>r</sup>) Peropportune primus hic omnium nobis occurrit liber, in quo nos ipsos velut in speculo contempleremur, ne tamquam nimium curiosi aliena prius quam nostra quaeramus. Docebit enim nos, id est hominem verum . . . / . . . [Expl.]: (fol. UUix<sup>r</sup>) Infunde praeterea lumen quo vera passim discernat a falsis, ne usquam vel meditando vel agendo a tua voluntate dissentiat.

*Manuscripts:*

(\*) Florence, Biblioteca Laurenziana 82.10 and 82.11 (see above, *Manuscripts* of Ficinus' translation).

(\*) Holkham Hall 448 (see *Manuscripts*, above).

*Editions* (editions of the *Opera omnia* listed in *Suppl. Fic.*, I):

1492, Florence (see *Editions* of Ficinus' translation, above).

1540, Solingen (see *Editions*, above).

1559, Basel: apud Petrum Pernam (see *Editions*, above).

1559, Basel: per T. Guerinum (*sic*) (see *Editions*, above).

1561, Basileae (Basel): ex officina Henricpetrina. *Opera omnia* of Ficinus, including his commentary on Plotinus. *Suppl. Fic.*, I, lxxi-lxxiii; Adams F-412; NUC. Cambridge, Pembroke College; (CLSU; NNC; NIC; ICU).

1562, Basel (see *Editions*, above).

1576, Basileae (Basel): ex officina Henricpetrina. *Opera omnia* of Ficinus, including his commentary on Plotinus. Kristeller, *Studies*, 137; *Suppl. Fic.*, I, lxxiii; NUC. BL; BN; (MH).

1580, Basel (see *Editions*, above).

1615, Basel (see *Editions*, above).

1641, Parisiis (Paris): apud Guillelmum Pelé.

*Opera omnia* of Ficinus, including his commentary on Plotinus. BL; BN.

1835, Oxford (see *Editions*, above).

1855, Paris (see *Editions*, above).

1896, Paris (see *Editions*, above).

b. Doubtful Commentary

*I. Paulus Scalichius.*

Kristeller, *Iter*, III, 402b gives the following entry for Greifswald, Universitätsbibliothek, ms. Lat. Oct. 11: "Lat. Oct. 11. No new number [referring to the new shelf marks given to many of the Greifswald manuscripts]. Missing. misc. XVI. Pauli Scaphihy (*sic*, perhaps Scalichii) dynastae Huniorum et marchionis Veronae commentaria sive dictata in Plotini Eneadis librum III. 20 fols. Cf. Müller, p. 312." (Müller = H. Müller, "Verzeichniss der lateinischen Handschriften in der Königl. Universitäts-Bibliothek zu Greifswald," *Neuer Anzeiger für Bibliographie und Bibliothekswissenschaft*, Heft 8–9 (1875), 274, who reports essentially the same information and specifies that the "Commentaria sive Dictata" occupied fols. 1–15).

"Pauli Scaphihy" is surely to be identified with "Paulus Scalichius" (Paul Skalich, 1534–75), who was born in Zagreb, studied in Vienna, Bologna, and Rome, and later in his adventurous career claimed descent from the Scala of Verona. Scalichius certainly cited Plotinus in his *Encyclopaediae, seu Orbis disciplinarum tam sacrarum quam prophanarum epistemon* (Basel, 1559), but there is no other evidence presently known, apart from the alleged commentary on *Enn.* III in the missing Greifswald codex, that Scalichius actually commented on Plotinus. For Scalichius' life and writings see G. Krabbel, *Paul Skalich. Ein Lebensbild aus dem 16. Jahrhundert* (Münster i. W., 1915), and also Schottenloher II 20125–30.