

PHILOSOPHICAL JOURNAL

VOLUME VIII / 2019 / ISSN 2392-0963

Thomas Alexander Szlezák, On Karl Kerényi's Humanistic and Existentialistic Platonism

Karl Kerényi, Platonism

Henry Corbin, Theology of Aristotle

Kevin Corrigan, Syed A.H. Zaidi, On Henry Corbin's *Theology of Aristotle*

Piotr Nowak, I Die, Therefore I Am: *Phaedo* as a Political Dialogue

John Sallis, Socrates's Second Sailing: The Turn to *Logos*

Eva Brann, Courage Nailed Down: Plato's *Laches*

Peter Kalkavage, Poetic Science in Plato's *Timaeus*

Richard Bodéüs, Theological Science and Its Object According to Aristotle

Françoise Dastur, Some Remarks on Heidegger's Reading of Aristotle's *Physics*

Jeff Love, Michael Meng, Heidegger's Silence

Andrzej Serafin, Heidegger on Plato's Originary Good: A Phenomenological Reconstruction

Giorgio Agamben, Aristotle's *De Anima* and the Division of Life

ON HENRY CORBIN'S *THEOLOGY OF ARISTOTLE*

What is the *Theology of Aristotle*? The Arabic *Theology of Aristotle* (*Ūthulūjīyā Aristū*) and other collections (dubbed the *Plotiniana Arabica*) contain extracts from Plotinus's works, originally collected and systematized by Porphyry into six groups of "nines" or "*Enneads*" (see Porphyry, *Life of Plotinus*),¹ and were translated into Arabic by Syriac Christians, part of the Muslim al-Kindī circle (d. 260/873),² in the ninth century.³ The *Theology* played an integral role in the philosophical thought of Muslim and Jewish thinkers such as al-Kindī, al-Fārābī (d. 339/950), Ibn Sīnā [Avicenna] (d. 429/1037), the Brethren of Purity (*Ikhwān al-Ṣafā'*, c. ninth-tenth century), Isaac Israeli (d. 320/932), Natan'el al-Fayyūmī (d. 1165), Ibn Gabirol (d. 1050 or 1070), and Ibn Ezra (d. 1167). How and why this *Plotiniana Arabica* work was wrongly attributed to Aristotle remains unknown, for these collections clearly contain paraphrases of *Enneads* IV-VI (which have been given a partial English translation by G. Lewis in *Plotini Opera*, vol. 2, ed. Paul Henry and H.-R. Schwyzer, 1959). They include the following: (1) The so-called *Theology of Aristotle* itself, in long and short, or vulgate, recensions (whose interconnection is unclear), which comprises a prologue followed by 142 topics that are then addressed in longer passages, each titled "chapters" (*maqāmir*) in Syriac. They are paraphrased interpretations of *Enneads* IV-VI, perhaps belonging to Porphyry's lost commentaries or summaries, which are to be traced either to a Syriac original or to the Christian translator of Plotinus into Arabic from Syriac known as al-Himṣī⁴ or to al-Kindī himself.⁵ (2) There is also another work, titled *The Letter of Divine Science*, which contains a paraphrase of V.3-5 and V.9, attributed wrongly

¹ P. Henry and H.-R. Schwyzer, *Plotini Opera*, vol. 1 (Paris: Desclée De Brouwer, 1951).

² Numbers in parentheses signify the Islamic (AH) and Gregorian (AD) dates.

³ For a study of the translation movement, see P. Adamson, *The Arabic Plotinus* (London: Duckworth, 2002); D. Gutas, *Greek Thought, Arabic Culture* (New York: Routledge, 1998), 23-25; R. Walzer, "Arabic Transmission of Greek Thought to Medieval Europe," *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 29 (1945): 160-83; S. Hossein Nasr, *Islamic Philosophy from Its Origins to the Present* (Albany: SUNY Press, 2006), 31-49; and Nasr, *Three Muslim Sages* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1964), 9-10.

⁴ F. W. Zimmermann, "The Origins of the So-Called *Theology of Aristotle*," in *Pseudo-Aristotle in the Middle Ages: The "Theology" and Other Texts*, ed. J. Kraye, W. F. Ryan, and C.-B. Schmidt (London: Warburg Institute, 1986), 110-240 (131).

⁵ C. D'Ancona, "The Origins of Islamic Philosophy," in *The Cambridge History of Philosophy in Late Antiquity*, ed. L. P. Gerson, vol. 2 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 869-94 (875n2).

to Al Farabī.⁶ (3) Finally, there are various materials attributed to the “the Greek Sage” (*al-Shaykh al-Yūnānī*), paraphrases of *Enneads* IV-VI and, thus, parallel to the *Theology*.⁷

It has been argued that the Arabic tradition perhaps retained traces of Plotinus’s oral teaching preserved by Amelius (Plotinus’s colleague at Rome in the third century CE), that is, an alternative textual transmission to that of Porphyry’s edition with its characteristic Enneadic structure: “... *Le Livre de la Théologie* ... n’est qu’un fragment des notes de cours d’Amélius.”⁸ However, the Enneadic edition of Porphyry is, in fact, the one presupposed by the *Theology of Aristotle* that actually cites Porphyry in the title of the first chapter and that bears traces of the κεφάλαια, ὑπομνήματα, and ἐπιχειρήματα that Porphyry had added to his own edition (*Life of Plotinus*, 26, 28-40, confirmed by Aeneas of Gaza, *Theophrastus*, 45, 4-9 Colonna).⁹ So in the ninth century, in Baghdad, it was possible to read a complete manuscript of the *Enneads*, and either al-Himsī (if there was a Syriac translation of the *Enneads* before an Arabic version) or al-Kindī or both had the entire *Enneads* before their eyes. The *Theology of Aristotle* and related works, then, go back, through the work of al-Kindī and Syriac Christians, to Porphyry’s edition of Plotinus’s *Enneads* IV-VI. We still await a proper edition of the *Theology*, an edition that is currently under preparation by a team directed by Cristina D’Ancona.¹⁰

What is the importance of the *Theology* for Henry Corbin (1903-1978) in this talk written two years before his death? It is first important to note that Corbin had a very thorough knowledge of the *Theology*. He dedicates six pages of the first chapter of his *History of Islamic Philosophy* to the Greek texts that were translated into Arabic and writes that the *Theology* could have been based on “a Syriac version dating from the sixth century, an epoch during which Neoplatonism flourished both among the Nestorians and at the Sasanid court. (To this epoch, too, belongs the body of writings attributed to Dionysius the Areopagite.)”¹¹ Furthermore, he notes that Ibn Sīnā had suspected that this is not a work by Aristotle¹² and that “Suhrawardī ascribes the ‘ecstatic confession’ of the *Enneads* to Plato himself.”¹³ Finally, both Mīr Dāmād (d. 1041-42/1631-32) and Sa’id Qummī (d. 1103/1691) also wrote commentaries on the *Theology*.¹⁴

The implications of these commentaries are far-reaching. The *Theology* communicates the heritage of antiquity in the thoroughly confusing and ambiguous form of Platonism under the name of Aristotle and complicates the Peripatetic transmission of Aristotle, apparently presenting a “Platonic Aristotle” and preventing any unreserved

⁶ Adamson, *The Arabic Plotinus*, 7.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ P. Henry, “Vers la reconstruction de l’enseignement oral de Plotin,” *Bulletin de l’Académie Royale de Belgique, Classe des Lettres* 23 (1937): 310-42 (326); P. Henry, *Études plotiniennes*, in *Les états du texte de Plotin*, vol. 1 (Brussels: Edition Universelle, 1938), xiv.

⁹ For other problems in reaching this conclusion, see K. Corrigan, “Plotinus and Modern Scholarship: From Ficino to the Twenty-First Century,” *Plotinus’ Legacy: The Transformation of Platonism from the Renaissance to the Modern Era*, ed. S. Gersh (Notre Dame, IN: Notre Dame University Press, 2018).

¹⁰ For information on progress, see <http://www.greekintoarabic.eu>.

¹¹ H. Corbin, *History of Islamic Philosophy*, trans. Liadain Sherrad (New York: Kegan Paul International, 1993), 18.

¹² Ibid., 18; D. Gutas, *Avicenna and the Aristotelian Tradition* (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 145.

¹³ Corbin, *History of Islamic Philosophy*, 18.

¹⁴ Ibid.

demarcation lines between Platonic and Aristotelian thought. It thus transmits Greek learning in a way that will often be questioned in the subsequent tradition. But its influence is far-reaching, for it does not stop in the Middle Ages, with Islamic, Jewish, and Christian adaptations of this heritage, as is commonly thought even today. It moves through Suhrawardī's (d. 587/1191) ontological cosmology of light. Suhrawardī's school of Illuminationism (*Ishrāq*) was based on four primary sources: Sufi works as based on the works of al-Ghazālī (d. 504/1111) and Maṣṣūr al-Hallāj (d. 310/922); Muslim Peripatetic philosophy (*al-Mashshā'īyyūn*); Hermeticism, Pythagoreanism, and Platonism as transmitted by the Sabians of Ḥarrān and the *Theology*; and, finally, the religious and philosophical thought of the Zoroastrians,¹⁵ which was transmitted through Ferdowsī's *Epic Book of Kings (Shahnameh)*.¹⁶ Suhrawardī once asked Plotinus in a dream if the real philosophers were al-Fārābī or Ibn Sīnā or both.¹⁷ Plotinus responded, "Not a degree in a thousand. Rather, the Sufis Bayāzīd Baṣṭāmī [d. 261/874] and Tustarī [d. 283/896] are the real philosophers."¹⁸ For Suhrawardī, Plotinus's response to his question was not surprising in the slightest. Although he began with Peripatetic premises, Suhrawardī's philosophical thought was radically different from that of his predecessors. Not only did he break away from Aristotelian hylomorphism, instead seeing everything outside of God (as the Light above lights [*Nūr al-anwār*]) as a composite of light and darkness, but he also saw the journey back to pure light as a road paved by the Sufis. Furthermore, Plotinus's declaration of Plato's superiority over all other philosophers and his vigorous defense of him confirmed his conversion from affiliation to his Muslim predecessors to the theoretical thought of the ancient Persians and Greeks. Finally, the author's declaration of the ecstatic Sufis as the true inheritors of Platonic thought cemented his belief in the practice of the Sufis. In the famous instance noted by Corbin, Suhrawardī cites the famous ecstatic passage from Plotinus, *Ennead* IV.8 [6] 1, 1-11 ("Often have I woken up to myself out of the body and entered into myself ... seeing a beauty of great wonder and trusting that then above all I belonged to the greater part"). This passage is paraphrased prominently in the *Theology of Aristotle*,¹⁹ and Suhrawardī puts the accent on its Platonic heritage – or, as Corbin characterizes this, "a sort of Platonic and Zoroastrian Neoplatonist thought" for the Islamic-Iranian world.

Later still, this heritage is of major importance for Mīr Dāmād (d. /1631-32), the foremost figure (together with his student Mullā Ṣadrā [d. 1050/1640]) of the intellectual and cultural rebirth of Iran under the Safavid dynasty, the founder of the School of Isfahan, the Third Teacher (*al-mu'allim al-thālith*) after Aristotle and al-Fārābī. He was known as the "Master of the Learned" (Sayyid al-afāḍil), becoming an integral part of Islamic philosophy, and, as Corbin rightly notes, his thought is still alive in Iran today.²⁰

¹⁵ Nasr, *Three Muslim Sages*, 60-61.

¹⁶ H. Corbin, *En Islam Iranien*, vol. 2 (Paris: Gallimard, 1971-72), 212-14.

¹⁷ J. Walbridge, *The Leaven of the Ancients* (Albany: SUNY Press, 2000), 224.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁹ For translation, see Lewis in Henry and Schwyzer, *Plotini Opera II*, 225, lines 1-26.

²⁰ For an examination of the state of Islamic philosophy today, see S. Hossein Nasr, *Islamic Philosophy from Its Origins to the Present: Philosophy in the Land of Prophecy* (Albany: SUNY Press, 2006), 235-73. It is important to note that various figures, living both in and out of Iran, currently represent these philosophical strands. For example, Gholāmreza Aavani (b. 1943), who is known as the "Wayfarer of Wisdom" (*Sālik-e-Ḥikmat*), is

Mīr Dāmād's pen name was Ishrāq, another reference to Suhrawardi's Illuminationist philosophy and to his substantial adherence to Platonic and Neoplatonic thought. What is an ecstatic confession in Suhrawardi is, in Corbin's view, colored by a profound sadness in Mīr Dāmād – something that shows the diversity of reception. Here it is not clear to us exactly what Corbin had in mind.

In the final part of his talk, Corbin picks out several influences from the *Theology* that lead to several claims that will seem extraordinary if not absurd to most modern readers. First, there is the claim that there is an interworld ('*alām al-mithāl/khayal* or *mundus imaginalis*) of the imagination between the sensible and the intelligible worlds in the thought of Ibn 'Arabī. In his *Spiritual Body and Celestial Earth*, Corbin summarizes his views on this inter-earth as “the land of nowhere” (*na-koja-abād*) or “the eighth climate.”²¹ This is the land where dreams and miracles exist, where images exist in their actual reality, and the place of the celestial mountain *Qaf*.²² Second, the claim that in the inter-world there is an intimate theophany represented by the biblical and Qur'anic paradox that no one will see the face of God and live (Exodus 33:20; Qur'an 55:26), on the one hand, and yet that the prophet sees his god in the most beautiful form (according to the famous *hadīth al-ru'yā*) – a paradox that, in Corbin's view, entails that the death of the human being makes him responsible for the death of his god in that theophany and that human prayer and divine prayer are two sides of a single coin.

What does Corbin appear to mean by these two claims? On the first count, Corbin claims that the *Theology* posits behind the terrestrial world a celestial inter-world, a *mundus imaginalis*, in which heaven, earth, sea, animals, and human beings are celestial. This real world of the imagination – far from mere fantasy, a world freed from matter but not from extension – is situated between the terrestrial and the intelligible worlds. It is, for Corbin, the source of mystical, eschatological, and prophetic visionary insight, as well as heavenly and infernal visions, and a crucial feature transmitted by the *Theology of Aristotle* to Islamic-Persian thought. This inter-world, in Corbin's estimation, has been entirely lost in the West, and so Corbin devoted two of his most important books to recovering it, both the one he notes here, about the thought of Ibn 'Arabī, *L'imagination créatrice dans le soufisme d'Ibn Arabi*, and *Terre celeste et corps de resurrection: de l'Iran mazdéen à l'Iran Shi'ite*.²³

What does Corbin mean, and to which texts in the *Theology* does he refer? Unfortunately, he gives no references (besides Ennead IV.8.1), but perhaps we could point

a leading exponent of the school of Ibn 'Arabī, Rūmī, and Mullā Ṣadrā. Gholām-hossein Ebrāhīmī Dīnānī (b. 1934), known as the “Wayfarer of Thought” (*Sālik-e-Fikrat*), represents the school of Avicenna, Suhrawardi, and Ḥafīz. Seyyed Moṣṭafā Moḥaqiq Dāmād (b. 1945) represents the school of Mullā Ṣadrā but is best known for his work on interfaith dialogue. Living abroad, Seyyed Hossein Nasr (b. 1933) represents the schools of Avicenna, Suhrawardi, Ibn 'Arabī, and Mullā Ṣadrā. In his *History of Philosophy without Any Gaps*, Peter Adamson dedicates an episode on Islamic philosophy in the modern world to the relevance of such figures; see <https://historyofphilosophy.net/after-sadra>.

²¹ Corbin, *Spiritual Body and Celestial Earth*, 85.

²² Ibid.

²³ H. Corbin, *L'imagination créatrice dans le soufisme d'Ibn 'Arabi* (Paris: Flammarion, 1958); Corbin, *Creative Imagination in the Sufism of Ibn 'Arabi* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1969, with preface by H. Bloom, 1997); Corbin, *Spiritual Body and Celestial Earth: From Mazdean Iran to Shi'ite Iran*, trans. Nancy Pearson (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1989).

to such texts as *Ennead* IV.3.18 (not reproduced in Lewis's translation), where Plotinus observes cryptically that, although the souls "there" do not use discursive reasoning and speech, they "would know by understanding what passes from one another ... for ... there all their body is pure, and each is like an eye, and nothing is hidden or feigned, but before one speaks to another that other has seen and understood" (18, 18-22). And there are other passages, such as the apparently intermediate "true heaven, the true light, and the true earth" in the myth at the end of Plato's *Phaedo* (109e-110a), that made an impression upon Plotinus in *Ennead* V.8.4 and also upon Sethian Gnostics in *Zostrianos* (*Zost.* 47.27-48.29; cf. also 55.13-25).²⁴

However, the central difference between modern usage and Ibn 'Arabī is that, while we tend to make imagination and its images into unreal fantasies, an image for Ibn 'Arabī and Corbin is not to be reduced to external things or simply to nothing but rather uploaded, as it were, into its broader significance – not on the discursive level but as a manifestation of the divine imagination or theophanic compassion, which wants to reveal itself to us as an individual theopathy *in* our experience. In other words, the creative imagination is not a modern tag for some nebulous faculty but a real experience of the divine yearning in us that stands between sense experience and understanding. This noetic value of the imagination means that there is "more" in our images than we can unpack and this "more" has to be lived on its own terms as part of the divine yearning to reveal Itself to each of us in our experience, however differently, indeed uniquely, it is experienced in each individual. Corbin often quotes the famous hadith: "I was a hidden Treasure, I yearned [loved] to be known. That is why I produced creatures, in order to be known in them" (see, for example, *Alone with the Alone*, 184).

If this seems completely outside the range of modern consciousness, Corbin's second claim will seem just as, if not even more, absurd – namely, his claim about the death of God and the bi-unity (a term Corbin uses in his other works) of divine-human prayer. We take Corbin's claim about the death of God in the light of Ibn 'Arabī's views: first, that in death we wake up into ourselves and into God; and, second, that since, in the creative imagination, God's theophanic imagination entrusts Itself into our care, we have a responsibility for the Divine Being so entrusted in Its vulnerability, a responsibility not to annihilate or reject God. It is in this sense, we think, that Corbin intends the listener/reader to understand the citation from the mystic Angelus Silesius (1624-1677), as he also does in *Alone with the Alone*, where he cites Silesius to emphasize the radical mystical interrelation between God and man – an interdependence, in fact, that is also reflected, according to Corbin, in Ibn 'Arabī's practice of prayer. Here, for Ibn 'Arabī, the mystic prototype of prayer consists in Abraham "offering the mystic repast to the Angels under the oak of Mamre," where the faithful one has "a divine service which consists in feeding his lord of love on his own being and on all creation."²⁵ Ibn 'Arabī describes prayer as "theophanic," "a dialogue between two beings," "a means of existing and of *causing* to exist," and "the process of creative creation."²⁶ For Ibn 'Arabī, as for Corbin, prayer

²⁴ For the broader Platonic antecedents of this Zostrinian conception, see *Phaedo* 109a9-112a4, *Phaedrus* 247 ff.

²⁵ H. Corbin, *Alone with the Alone* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1997), 247.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 267.

is an active and continuous exchange between God and the human being, where the act of creation occurs in the process of conversation. Prayer, therefore, is less a request for something than “it is the expression of a mode of being, a means of existing and of *causing to exist*, that is, a means of causing the God who reveals Himself to appear, of ‘seeing’ Him, not to be sure in His essence, but in the form which precisely He reveals by revealing Himself by and to that form.”²⁷ Corbin puts this in slightly different terms here, but the sense is similar: “Man is a fighting partner of his god who fights with him for whom he fights, and each has need of the other’s service. This is the magnificent sense of prayer – a prayer of god and a prayer of man.”

If we think of all this in terms of common binaries in philosophical-theological language (uncreated-created, Creator-creature, hypostatic union of two natures, etc.), then it will certainly seem absurd. In Corbin’s view, we cannot reduce the creative theophanic-theopathic imagination to such schemas, for the pathos of Divine Love in our love is more immediate, more intimate, and more personal than such structures can ever allow.²⁸

What does any of this have to do with Aristotle – or even with Plotinus? On the surface, not much. In fact, Corbin’s talk will seem alien to most readers of Aristotle in the contemporary world. In his closing paragraphs, Corbin himself is fully aware of this. On the one hand, how can we separate Plotinus from his subsequent Neoplatonic “destiny,” he asks? On the other hand, Suhrawardi himself seems so close to Proclus but we cannot easily demonstrate a link. Yet again, we cannot forget, Corbin insists, how Proclus “restores” theogony and a Hellenistic religious sensibility to Plotinus or how Plotinus goes right to the heart of Abrahamic thought. In Corbin’s own time, this penetration of “Plotinus” into Jewish, Islamic, or Christian thought seemed “like a dream” and, despite all the scholarship since his death 40 years ago, it still seems difficult. Nonetheless, if Porphyry is correct in his view that “Aristotle’s *Metaphysics* is concentrated” in Plotinus’s writings (*Life of Plotinus*, chap. 14), then until Porphyry’s seminal insight from over 1700 years ago is understood more fully, the connection between Aristotle, Plotinus, and the subsequent remarkable history of “Neoplatonic” thought, across the range of the Abrahamic religions, will continue to remain, unfortunately, “like a dream.”

²⁷ Ibid., 248.

²⁸ For a detailed study of the nature of Divine Love in the Islamic tradition, see W. C. Chittick, *Divine Love* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2003).

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

GIORGIO AGAMBEN (1942) completed studies in Law and Philosophy with a doctoral thesis on the political thought of Simone Weil and participated in Martin Heidegger's Le Thor seminars on Hegel and Heraclitus as a postdoctoral scholar. He has taught at various universities, including the Universities of Macerata and Verona, Università IUAV di Venezia, and the European Graduate School in Saas-Fee. He was Director of Programmes at Collège Internationale de Paris. He has been a Visiting Professor at various universities in the United States of America and was a Distinguished Professor at The New School University in New York. He is known mostly for the *Homo Sacer* series, the first integral edition of which appeared recently at Quodlibet (*Homo Sacer. Edizione integrale*, Quodlibet 2018). His books have been translated and commented upon all over the world.

RICHARD BODÉÛS (1948) is a retired Professor of Greek Philosophy at Université de Montréal and a member of Société royale du Canada. He has published numerous books on Aristotle, including *The Political Dimensions of Aristotle's Ethics* (1993) and *Aristotle and the Theology of the Living Immortals* (2000). He is the author of the French translations of *On the Soul* and *Nicomachean Ethics*.

EVA BRANN (1929) received her doctorate from Yale University in 1956. She has been a tutor at St. John's College in Annapolis from 1957 to the present and dean from 1990 to 1997. Her books include *Feeling Our Feelings* (2008), *Un-Willing* (2014), and *Pursuits of Happiness* (2020), and translations, with her colleagues Peter Kalkavage and Eric Salem, of these Platonic dialogues: *Phaedo*, *Sophist*, *Statesman*, *Symposium*.

KEVIN CORRIGAN (1948) is Samuel Candler Dobbs Professor of Interdisciplinary Humanities in the Department of Middle Eastern and South Asian Studies at Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia. His recent works include *Evagrius and Gregory: Mind, Soul and Body in the 4th Century* (Ashgate Press, UK, 2009); *Religion and Philosophy in the Platonic and Neoplatonic Traditions: From Antiquity to the Early Medieval Period (Pagan, Jewish, Christian, Islamic, and Comparative Eastern Perspectives)*, edited with John D. Turner and Peter Wakefield (Akademia Verlag, 2012); *Gnosticism, Platonism and the Late Ancient World: Essays in Honour of John D. Turner*, edited with Tuomas Rasimus, in collaboration with Dylan Burns, Lance Jenott, and Zeke Mazur (*Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies*. Leiden: Brill, 2012); and *Reason, Faith and Otherness in Neoplatonic and Early Christian Thought* (Farnham: Ashgate Press, 2013).

FRANÇOISE DASTUR (1942) taught philosophy in the University of Paris I from 1969 to 1995, in the University of Paris XII from 1995 to 1999, and in the University of Nice-Sophia Antipolis from 1999 to 2003. She taught also as visiting professor in the Universities of Mannheim, Rio de Janeiro, Caracas, Warwick, Essex, De Paul (Chicago), Boston College, and Northwestern University (Evanston). As annual lecturer, she gave lectures in 2011 in ten different universities in India. She was, as honorary Professor of Philosophy, attached to the Husserl Archives of Paris (ENS Ulm), a research unit affiliated with the French National Center for Research (CNRS) until June 2017. She was one of the founding members in 1993 and the president until 2003 of the École Française de Daseinsanalyse, of which she is now honorary president. She has published many articles in French, English, and German on Husserl, Heidegger, Merleau-Ponty, Ricoeur, Derrida, Levinas, and others, and is the author of several books in French from which five have been translated into English: *Heidegger and the Question of Time* (1998); *Telling Time, Sketch of a Phenomenological Chronology* (2000); *Death, An Essay on Finitude* (1996); *How Are We to Confront Death? An Introduction to Philosophy* (2012); and *Questions of Phenomenology, Language, Alterity, Temporality, Finitude* (2017). Her last publications in French include *Daseinsanalyse. Phénoménologie et psychiatrie* (with Philippe Cabestan; 2011); *Hölderlin, le retournement natal* (2013); *Penser ce qui advient, Dialogue avec Philippe Cabestan* (2015); *Déconstruction et phénoménologie. Derrida en débat avec Husserl et*

Heidegger (2016); *Chair et langage, Essais sur Merleau-Ponty* (2016); *Leçons sur la Genèse de la pensée dialectique, Schelling, Hölderlin, Hegel* (2016); and *Figures du néant et de la négation entre Orient et Occident* (2018).

DIEGO DE BRASI (1982) is currently Assistant Professor of Classical Philology / Greek at the University of Marburg and specializes in Ancient Philosophy. His scholarship focuses on ancient biology (especially during the Roman Empire), Plato's political thought and the poetics of philosophical dialogue, Philo of Alexandria, late antique Christian anthropology, and the interpretation of Platonic dialogues by modern and contemporary philosophers. He is the author of *L'immagine di Sparta nei dialoghi platonici: il giudizio di un filosofo su una (presunta) pólis modello* (Sankt Augustin 2013) and has edited with Sabine Föllinger *Anthropologie in Antike und Gegenwart: Biologische und philosophische Entwürfe vom Menschen* (Freiburg i. B. 2015). He is the editor, together with Marko J. Fuchs, of *Sophistes: Plato's Dialogue and Heidegger's Lectures in Marburg (1924-25)* (Newcastle upon Tyne 2016).

FRANCISCO J. GONZALEZ (1963) is Professor of Philosophy at the University of Ottawa. His publications include *Dialectic and Dialogue: Plato's Practice of Philosophical Inquiry* (Northwestern, 1998) and *Plato and Heidegger: A Question of Dialogue* (Penn State, 2009), in addition to numerous articles in journals and collections in the areas of Ancient and Contemporary Continental philosophy. He has also edited *The Third Way: New Directions in Platonic Studies* (Rowman and Littlefield, 1995) and co-edited *Plato and Myth: Studies on the Use and Status of Platonic Myths* (Brill, 2012). Currently he is working on Heidegger's reading of Aristotle as well as on Aristotle's metaphysics and biology.

BURT HOPKINS (1954) is an American philosopher. He is an Associate Member of the Université de Lille, Permanent Faculty member of the Summer School of Phenomenology and Phenomenological Philosophy, Università Ca' Foscari Venezia, former Professor and Chair of Philosophy at Seattle University, and Permanent Secretary of the Husserl Circle. He has been Visiting Professor at the University of Nanjing, China, Visiting Professor at École des hautes études en sciences sociales (EHESS) and the Centre Alexandre Koyré, Senior Fellow at The Sidney M. Edelstein Center for the History and Philosophy of Science, Technology and Medicine at The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, and most recently Researcher at The Institute of Philosophy, Czech Academy of Sciences. His main research interest is the philosophical foundation of the transformation of knowledge that began in the sixteenth century with the philosophical advent of modernity. He has written three books, most recently *The Origin of the Logic of Symbolic Mathematics: Jacob Klein and Edmund Husserl* (2011) and *The Philosophy of Husserl* (2010), and edited two others. He has published over sixty articles and given over 100 lectures on contemporary European philosophy (especially the phenomenology of Edmund Husserl, Martin Heidegger, and Jacob Klein), Plato, early modern philosophy, and philosophy and depth psychology. He is founding co-editor of *The New Yearbook for Phenomenology and Phenomenological Philosophy*. Hopkins's current research continues the tradition of transcendental phenomenology and is focused on the critique of symbolic reason.

PETER KALKAVAGE (1951) was born in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. He received his doctorate in philosophy at Penn State University and has been on the faculty of St. John's College in Annapolis since 1977. He has translated Plato's *Timaeus* and co-translated the *Sophist, Phaedo, Statesman, and Symposium* with Eva Brann and Eric Salem. He is the author of *The Logic of Desire: An Introduction to Hegel's Phenomenology of Spirit* for Paul Dry Books and has written essays on Plato, Hegel, Dante, Bach, Mozart, Schopenhauer, and Wagner.

JOSHUA D. KERR (1984) is currently a doctoral candidate at the University of Oregon. He studies ancient Greek philosophy and nineteenth- and twentieth-century continental philosophy.

JEFF LOVE (1962) is Research Professor of German and Russian at Clemson University. He is the author of *The Black Circle: A Life of Alexander Kojève* (Columbia University Press, 2018), *Tolstoy: A Guide for the Perplexed* (Continuum, 2008), and *The Overcoming of History in War and Peace* (Brill-Rodopi, 2004). He has also published a translation of Alexandre Kojève's *Atheism* (Columbia University Press, 2018), an annotated translation (with Johannes Schmidt) of F. W. J. Schelling's *Philosophical Investigations into the Essence of Human Freedom* (State University of New York Press, 2006), a co-edited volume, *Nietzsche and Dostoevsky: Philosophy, Morality, Tragedy* (Northwestern University Press, 2016), and an edited volume, *Heidegger in Russia and Eastern Europe* (Rowman & Littlefield International, 2017).

MICHAEL MENG (1978) is Associate Professor of History at Clemson University. He is the author of *Shattered Spaces: Encountering Jewish Ruins in Postwar Germany and Poland* (Harvard University Press, 2011) and co-editor of *Jewish Space in Contemporary Poland* (Indiana University Press, 2015) and co-editor of *Modern Germany in Transatlantic Perspective* (Berghahn Books, 2017), among other publications on modern European intellectual and cultural history.

PIOTR NOWAK (1966) is Professor of Philosophy at Białystok University in Poland. He translated works of such writers as Hannah Arendt, W. H. Auden, Leo Strauss, Alexander Kojève, Allan Bloom, Boris Pasternak, Vasily Rozanov, Andrei Bely, Pavel Florensky, Jacob Taubes, and Semyon Frank. He is the deputy editor-in-chief of the philosophical quarterly *Kronos* (in Polish), and the annual *Kronos. Philosophical Journal* (in English). He is also a Member of the Board of the Count August Cieszkowski Foundation. He is the author of the following monographs: *Ontology of Success: An Essay on the Philosophy of Alexandre Kojève* (Gdańsk 2006), *The Prince's Signature: Reflections on Strength and Weakness* (Warsaw 2013), *The Ancients and Shakespeare on Time: Some Remarks on the War of Generations* (Amsterdam–New York 2014; in English), *Troglodyte Breeding: Comments on Higher Education and the Mental Culture of Contemporary Man* (Warsaw 2014), *I Die Therefore I Am* (Warsaw 2016), *The Box with Pandora Within* (Warsaw 2016). His most recent book is *Violence and Words. Political Philosophy of Hannah Arendt* (Warsaw 2018), for which he was awarded the 2019 Daedalus' Wings Literary Prize founded by the National Library of Poland.

JOHN SALLIS (1938) is Frederick J. Adelman Professor of Philosophy at Boston College. He obtained his Ph.D. from Tulane University with a dissertation on Heidegger (*The Concept of World: A Study in the Phenomenological Ontology of Martin Heidegger*, 1964). He has published more than twenty books in such areas as ancient philosophy, German Idealism, philosophy of art, and recent continental philosophy. His *Collected Writings* are currently being published by Indiana University Press. Professor Sallis has been Visiting Professor at Freiburg University, Tübingen University, Bergen University (Norway), and Wuhan University (China). He holds an honorary doctorate from Freiburg University and has been the recipient of the Alexander von Humboldt Stiftung Research Prize. He has lectured throughout the world, and his works have been translated into more than a dozen languages.

ANDRZEJ SERAFIN (1980) is Assistant Professor of Philosophy at the Institute of Philosophy and Sociology of the Pedagogical University in Cracow. He is the editor of the philosophical quarterly *Kronos* (in Polish) and the annual *Kronos. Philosophical Journal* (in English). He translated Plato (*Symposium, Epinomis*), Jacob Taubes (*Occidental Eschatology*), and Rilke (*Letters on Cézanne, Letters to Merline and her son Balthus*) into Polish. He obtained his PhD with the thesis *The Concept of Truth in Heidegger's Interpretation of Aristotle* (2016). He is the founder and organizer of the Platonic Academy, a summer school of Platonism held each year in Lanckorona since 2017.

MARK SHIFFMAN (1968) is Associate Professor in the Department of Humanities at Villanova University. His publications include a translation of Aristotle's *De Anima* (Focus, 2010) and scholarly articles on Plato, Aristotle, and Plutarch.

MAREK ŚLAWIŃSKI (1987) holds an MA in law and BA in philosophy. He is a PhD Candidate at the Jagiellonian University in Cracow. In his thesis, he adopts Roman Ingarden's conception of responsibility as a framework to develop and explain the notion of criminal liability used in legal sciences. His main areas of interest include the notion of moral agency in ancient Greek philosophy, as well as Plato's thought and its contemporary reception.

CLAUDE VISHNU SPAAK (1980) was recruited as a philosophy teacher after he received an Agrégation de philosophie in 2007. He received a PhD from Sorbonne University in 2014. He is currently Assistant Professor at Sorbonne University Abu Dhabi, serving as the Head of the Department of Philosophy and Sociology. He specializes in the field of phenomenology, especially in Heideggerian studies and in the field of cosmological phenomenology. C. V. Spaak has several academic affiliations: he is an associate member of the Husserl Archives of Paris, full member of Centro de Filosofia at the University of Lisbon, and a scientific collaborator of Europé, centre de philosophie pratique at Université Catholique de Louvain. C. V. Spaak is the author of three monographs (including one as co-author) and co-editor of four collected works published either as books or as thematic releases in philosophical journals. He has published about 15 peer-reviewed articles and 15 book chapters.

THOMAS ALEXANDER SZLEZÁK (1940) studied Philosophy, Classics, and History in the 1960s, was Privatdozent of Classics at the University of Zürich, later Full Professor at the University of Würzburg (1983-1990) and at the University of Tübingen (1990-2006). More than 100 of his numerous publications were translated into 17 European and non-European languages.

ANTONI SZWED (1955) is a Professor at the Pedagogical University in Cracow. He has published books on Kant, Hegel, and Kierkegaard, as well as translations of Kierkegaard's works into Polish (*The Concept of Anxiety, Practice in Christianity, Works of Love, On Christianity*). His main area of interest is the relation between faith and reason. His recent research focuses on the interplay between philosophy and religion in early modern England.

PETER LAMBORN WILSON (1945) a.k.a. Hakim Bey has published (as author, co-translator, editor, etc.) over sixty books and countless articles, among them *Traditional Modes of Contemplation & Action* (1977), *Angels* (1980), *Henry Corbin and the Hermeneutics of Light* (1981), *The Universe: A Mirror of Itself* (1992), *Sacred Drift: Essays on the Margins of Islam* (1993), *Introduction to the Sufi Path* (1995), and *The New Nihilism* (2018). His works have been translated into Dutch, German, Swedish, French, Italian, Spanish, Portuguese, Gallego, Arabic, Slovenian, Bengali, Hungarian, Québécois, Japanese, Czech, Turkish, and Polish. He lives in the Hudson Valley. He was born in another century.

JAKUB WOLAK (1995) is a PhD candidate at the Institute of Philosophy and Sociology of the Polish Academy of Sciences. He studied Philosophy and Classical Philology at the University of Warsaw, at the Jagiellonian University of Cracow, and at the University of Tübingen, where he received a scholarship from GFPS e.V.

CORDELL D. K. YEE (1955) has been on the faculty of St. John's College, Annapolis, Maryland, since 1989. There, he, as do all the faculty of St. John's, teaches across an integrated program of study in which students examine fundamental works of the Western tradition in science, mathematics, music, literature, and philosophy. In a similar way, Yee has ranged widely in his scholarly work. After focusing on modern literature in English, he has gone on to publish on the cultural contexts of cartography, on the Chinese script, and on translation. Among his publications are *The Word according to James Joyce: Reconstructing Representation* (1997), *Reading within the Lines: Henri Michaux and the Chinese Art of Writing* (2009), and (co-author) *Challenges in a World-Wide History of Cartography* (2001).

SYED A.H. ZAIDI (1990) is a PhD candidate in Islamic philosophy at Emory University's Islamic Civilizations Program, Atlanta, GA. He has published several book reviews in the *Journal of Iranian Studies*, the *Journal of Islamic and Muslim Studies*, and a chapter in *A Guide to Sufi Literature*. His doctoral focus is on the philosophical thought of the Brethren of Purity (Ikhwān al-Safā'), Ibn Sīnā, and Mīr Dāmād. He obtained an MA (2016) in Islamic Studies from George Washington University, Washington, DC, and a BA (2012) in International Relations from Hobart and William Smith Colleges, Geneva, NY. His dissertation work will focus on the influence of Hermetic and Neoplatonic thought upon the works of the Brethren of Purity.

Kevin Corrigan and Syed A. H. Zaidi

ON HENRY CORBIN'S *THEOLOGY OF ARISTOTLE*

This commentary focuses on Corbin's understanding of the *Theology of Aristotle* and shows how it was used in the works of major Muslim philosophers. In his short piece, Corbin argues on the basis of the *Theology* that there is an inter-earth known as the "the land of nowhere," (*na-koja-abād*), "the eighth climate," or the *mundus imaginalis*, where dreams and miracles exist, where the Qur'ānic celestial mountain *Qāf* is situated, and where prayers become reality. This article shows how the "eighth climate" is a world found in the ontological and cosmological religious philosophies of Plotinus and Proclus and outlines the important role it plays in the *Theology*. It then goes on to show how Ibn 'Arabī, Suhrawardī, and Mīr Dāmād employed the *mundus imaginalis* in their cosmological doctrines. For Corbin the *mundus imaginalis* was an important cornerstone in Greek philosophy that influenced all of medieval Abrahamic thought, a cornerstone now lost in an age of analytic philosophy.

Thomas Alexander Szelezák

ON KARL KERÉNYI'S HUMANISTIC AND EXISTENTIALISTIC PLATONISM

This article tries to give a critical comment on the short essay by Karl Kerényi on Plato from 1940. Kerényi proves to be, on the one hand, a typical representative of the European intellectual world of the first half of the twentieth century, insofar as he does not realize fully the meaning of Plato's criticism of writing at the end of the *Phaedrus*. On the other hand, he saw important things that tend to be overlooked in our days. He treats the *Seventh Letter* rightly as authentic and does not believe, as even today many Platonists do, that *σύγγραμμα* means "treatise": Plato is not criticizing a specific literary form of writing but writing as such. Most valuable is Kerényi's interpretation of Plato's metaphysical approach. Plato's goal is not to recommend a new religion. He points to something that lies at the roots of religion, philosophy, art, and all spiritual longing. Therefore, Plato's Ideas of Truth, Beauty, and the Good are in the first place contents of personal existentialist experience, apt to transform your individual life.

Diego De Brasi

KARÓLY KERÉNYI AND THE PLATONIC DIALOGUE

In this paper, I comment on Karóly Kerényi's essay *Platonism*. First, I briefly examine the aspects of Platonism and of Plato's literary style that Kerényi highlights in these essays. Second, I focus on some methodological aspects of his reading of Plato and examine them within the broader context of his dissociation from traditional philology. In particular, I analyze some of the programmatic claims made in his prefaces to the first two editions of *Apollon* and in his *Bericht über die Arbeiten der Jahre 1939-1948*. Then I consider some critical remarks that clearly set both essays at odds with the interpretation of Plato that was dominant in Germany at that time. Further I show the continuities between *Unsterblichkeit und Apollonreligion* and *Platonism*. Finally, I critically assess Kerényi's reading of Plato from the perspective of the contemporary scholarly debate on Plato.

Piotr Nowak

I DIE, THEREFORE I AM: *PHAEDO* AS A POLITICAL DIALOGUE

Phaedo is not a dialogue on death or dying. Neither is it an opinion on immortality in a narrow sense – that is, whether there is life after death or not, whether it hurts to live in Tartarus or not. Rather, *Phaedo's* content is, according to Gadamer, "not immortality at all but rather that which constitutes the actual being of the soul – not in regard to its possible mortality or immortality but to its ever vigilant understanding of itself and reality."

I would like to recommend the *Phaedo* as the second greatest, right after *The Republic*, political treaty of antiquity. It is my strong conviction that its lesson has been written as if in between the parts of the philosopher's soul – the philosopher who is willing to serve the state with his wisdom. I think the best way to reconstruct *Phaedo*'s political drama is to employ the structure of the cave parable borrowed from Book Seven of Plato's *Republic*.

John Sallis

SOCRATES'S SECOND SAILING: THE TURN TO *LOGOS*

This essay focuses on the passage in Plato's *Phaedo* in which Socrates recounts his philosophical development, from the period in which he took up investigations of nature, to that in which he was attracted by – but ultimately disappointed in – the theories of Anaxagoras, to the period in which he finally carried out the turn that proved decisive. This truly Socratic turn he describes as his second sailing, adopting the phrase that was used to describe the practice of taking up the oars when there was no wind to fill the sails. Having failed in his efforts to investigate things directly, he launches the indirect approach, which consists in turning to *lógos*. In this way he goes about his search for the truth of things. The task of the present essay is to interpret the precise sense of this turn to *lógos* and the way in which it opens the way to a discovery of the truth of things. In this interpretation it is shown that it is the manifold nature of *lógos* itself that enables Socrates's philosophical endeavor.

Eva Brann

COURAGE NAILED DOWN: PLATO'S *LACHES*

Socrates's philosophizing is a sort of unperturbed unsettledness, hence "ironic" in the specific sense of "paradoxical." From this perspective, the *Laches*, Socrates's conversation with two generals, gives the answer to the question "What is courage?" in terms applicable to all the canonical virtues, such as justice, temperance, courage, and wisdom. In this understanding, courage is descriptively distinct from and essentially identical to all the virtues. For courage looks like and can be particularly described as endurance, but it is, in its being, wisdom. This wisdom is, however, distinct from that in the canonical list, where it is a sort of know-how, an expertise. This hyper-wisdom is instead one that welds all the particular virtues into a super-virtue, one that is concerned with ends, with finalities. Consequently, in the *Laches*, as in other dialogues, Socrates's refutational logicizing gives way, as a mere preliminary cleansing of the mind, to a mode of clear-eyed self-contradiction that conveys the truth about courage. Although the *Laches* does not explicitly answer the generals' practical question, how to make their sons courageous, the dialogue implies Socrates's recommendation: Think out the question "What is courage?" and the cognitive effort will have an ethical result. For Socrates is convinced that to gain wisdom about courage is to become courageous. He himself embodies this genuine courage which is wisdom.

Burt C. Hopkins

DIVIDING MADNESS AND THE APPEARANCES OF EROS IN THE *PHAEDRUS*

The criteria behind the dialogue's criticism of writing and the argument for the superiority of spoken over written *lógos* is applied to Lysias's and Socrates's speeches on Eros and madness and Phaedrus's and Socrates's critical examination of these speeches. The argument is made that the dialogue's dramatic portrayal of both these speeches and their examination present written word images that conjure up in the soul of the reader Socrates's and Phaedrus's original spoken *lógos*. It follows from this that the criteria for assessing their *lógos* should be what that *lógos* presents with regard to distinguishing good and bad speech, not good and bad writing (which are not investigated in the dialogue). In line with this, the inconsistencies between the divisions of madness and the appearances of Eros in the speeches and their examination in the dialogue point not to a deficiency in Plato's writing but to the original investigation of the community of madness and Eros in Socrates's and Phaedrus's spoken *lógos*. Interpreted thusly, the community in question is established *not* by argument but by its appearance in the *lógos* of the Lover Socrates and his Beloved Phaedrus. This appearance is one in which the reader may share, insofar as the dialogue's written word images serve as reminders to the reader of the knowledge they already possess of Eros's community with madness and its source in the beauty of the face and body parts of their Beloved.

Peter Kalkavage

POETIC SCIENCE IN PLATO'S *TIMAEUS*

In Plato's *Timaeus*, Socrates foregoes his usual questioning and receives an elaborate speech about world order from the scientist-statesman, Timaeus. The "likely story," as Timaeus calls it, is not just a speech about the cosmos but an imitation of the very deed by which the cosmos came to be. This mimetic act celebrates two things: the cosmos as a divinely ordered whole and the productive art or *poíōsis* that went into the making of the whole. The cosmology of Timaeus may therefore be called "poetic science," since it

is not the order as such but the making of order, most beautifully displayed in the mathematical tuning of the scale (for the cosmic soul) and the construction of the regular solids (for the cosmic body), that gives us cognitive access to what the cosmos essentially is or, rather, what it is imagined to be – a thing well made.

But cognition for its own sake is not the goal of poetic science. Timaeus's account connects mathematics and poetic science with the ethical good and practical wisdom. To give likely accounts of the whole is to establish a healthy, because intelligent, bond with the laws of the cosmic regime and to bring our souls into virtuous conformity with that regime. By playfully sharing in the technical modes of divine making, especially when this concerns our ingeniously devised bodily structures, we come to know, in detail, the complexity of our being in light of the whole of becoming. The τέχνη-driven account of the human good in the *Timaeus* in this way invites contrast with the dialectical pursuit of the good in *The Republic*.

Richard Bodéüs

THEOLOGICAL SCIENCE AND ITS OBJECT ACCORDING TO ARISTOTLE

In the first section, I consider (1) Aristotle's use of the adjective "theological," then (2) some potential presuppositions aiming at an explanation of this adjective, and, finally, (3) a project of Platonic origins, which seems to be the main concern of Aristotle's use of this adjective.

In the second section, (4) I attempt to explain how one could find certain elements of "theological" science in Aristotle, and (5) how one could possibly recollect these elements.

In the third section, I take into account (6) the silence that is, on principle, imposed on the second philosophy regarding the noetical soul, and, further, (7) the rigorous distinction that Aristotle poses between the living body and the celestial body, and, finally, (8), the causal union he establishes between the celestial body and the noetical soul, thus sketching a profile of god that differs from human in a twofold manner.

In the fourth section, I explain (9) why the divine body and the divine soul, although separated, remain united in a suitable way, and, further, (10) why the divine good is not separable from the multiplicity of the gods.

In the fifth and last section, I conclude with (11) an attempt to collect the key data that allow for a reconstruction of the profile of the heavenly gods, thus evaluating its significance from the viewpoint of a potential "theological" science. Finally, (12) I compare it with a certain belief that seems independent from it and that is held by the Philosopher, who does not hesitate to assert it.

Mark Shiffman

HOW THE PRIOR BY NATURE COMES TO LIGHT IN *CATEGORIES* 12

In chapter 12 of the *Categories*, Aristotle initially promises the reader to distinguish four different senses of priority but then reconsiders and adds a fifth, the prior by nature. We might interpret this as a later revision of an original text. This would accord with a modern chronological interpretation like that of Christopher Long, which sees in the *Categories* a preliminary doctrine of οὐσία whose instability requires that Aristotle develop his more mature doctrines of material/formal relations and the priority of ἐνέργεια over δύναμις. Alternatively, with the ancient commentators, we might read the *Categories* as intentionally propaedeutic to metaphysics and the passage in question as composed with a pedagogical intention. Drawing on Heidegger's phenomenological account of the emergence to view of the prior by nature, this article argues that chapter 12 marks a shift in horizon – from a pre-metaphysical account of οὐσία, governed by priority in time, to a metaphysical horizon concerned with causal relations among beings – and that this shift of horizon governs how Aristotle, beginning in chapter 13, revisits topics addressed earlier in the text. Thus the pedagogical reading of ancient commentators is not displaced but rather enhanced by recognizing the instability of the doctrine of οὐσία, on the assumption (supported by this analysis of the text) that Aristotle himself recognizes that instability as one inherent in the natural path of philosophical learning and incorporated it into his unfolding of the text. At the same time, a phenomenological reading of how Aristotle's fourth sense of priority opens the way to this unexpected fifth sense challenges the adequacy of Heidegger's narrative, according to which Plato's doctrine of the priority of the idea of the Good is destined to eventuate in Nietzsche's metaphysical doctrine of will-to-power.

Joshua Kerr

PHYTOLOGY: BETWEEN *PHŪSIS* AND *ZOĒ*

What is the place of the vegetal in Aristotle's account of living things? In contrast to his predecessors, Aristotle begins with the life of plants, insisting upon a vegetal beginning to the inquiry concerning soul. At the same time, vegetal life quickly recedes and vanishes in his account, which remains oriented around the animal. Life in plants thus appears as the origin for a zoological account of life while nevertheless remaining foreign to that account. Although this has led many interpreters to see vegetality as merely a primitive stage of animality, I understand Aristotle's ambivalence concerning plants as the mark of a certain autonomy of plant life vis-à-vis animal life. This is expressed poignantly in his vacillations concerning local motion and desire, which he both affirms and denies of plants. Although related to animals (ζῷα) as a form of life (ζωή), the plant (φυτόν) remains more closely related with nature (φύσις) as the

coming to be and passing away of things. In this way, the plant manifests a germinal form of life that in its hiddenness simultaneously discloses φύσις as a principle of animal life.

Françoise Dastur

SOME REMARKS ON HEIDEGGER'S READING OF ARISTOTLE'S *PHYSICS*: MATTER, FORM, AND PRODUCTION

For Heidegger in 1927, the question was to discover the phenomenal basis and the limits of ancient ontology, a task that led him to the analysis of Aristotle's *Physics*, which he considered as the "foundational book of Western Philosophy." In his 1939-1940 seminar dedicated to Aristotle's conception of φύσις, he undertakes to show that the Aristotelian interpretation of φύσις guides all succeeding interpretation of the being of nature, since he places the question of φύσις on an entirely new level. This new level is the level of production, that is, of the productive behavior of the human being, which implies the application of a form, μορφή, to a preexisting matter, ὕλη. But Aristotle nevertheless succeeds in showing that there is another mode of production than making, that is, growing, which involves the fundamental negative category of στέρησις, privation, which alone allows the understanding of the process of blossoming and fructification. It is therefore on the basis of στέρησις that the essential mobility of φύσις has to be understood, whereas for us modern beings, nature is unilaterally understood on the basis of production, as is shown by the fact that Kant could see in nature a "technique." It is only if we place ourselves in the artistic attitude that we succeed in understanding that what is set forth in the Open through the work of art is the self-secluding process of nature, which, as Heraclitus said, κρύπτεσθαι φιλῆι, since the emerging and rising of all things tends from itself to keep itself secluded.

Francisco J. Gonzalez

GROUNDING THE PRINCIPLE OF NON-CONTRADICTION EXISTENTIALLY: HEIDEGGER ON ARISTOTLE'S *METAPHYSICS* GAMMA IN AN UNPUBLISHED SEMINAR FROM 1928/29

In the winter semester of 1928-1929, Martin Heidegger delivered a seminar titled *The Ontological Principles and the Problem of Categories*. This seminar remains unpublished in any form and has not received any discussion or even acknowledgement in the literature on Heidegger. The seminar is of significant importance, however, and for a number of reasons. First, the one "ontological principle" on which it focuses, that is, the principle of noncontradiction, and whose supposed self-evidence is elsewhere described by Heidegger as "perhaps what is most puzzling in Western philosophy," here receives its most extensive discussion by him. Second, in turning first to Kant's insistence on the purely formal and logical character of the principle, Heidegger pursues a critique of Kant that both anticipates and supplements his later interpretations. Finally, the seminar turns to Aristotle with a detailed reading of *Metaphysics* Γ that also, especially as concerns chapters three and following, is not to be found elsewhere in Heidegger. It is on this reading of Aristotle that I will focus here, while also reproducing the trajectory of the seminar as a whole. It will be shown that Heidegger's reading defends the thesis that the principle of noncontradiction is neither a logical nor an ontological but an *existential* principle, that is, one that characterizes our existence in relation to beings. It will also be shown that Heidegger, while raising at the outset the question of the relation between the principle and a certain conception of time, a relation denied by Kant but presupposed by Aristotle, leaves it unanswered at the seminar's end. Nevertheless, a certain answer can be inferred from what the seminar does say.

Claude Vishnu Spaak

PHENOMENOLOGICAL INTERPRETATIONS OF ARISTOTLE'S *PHYSICS* IN THE WORKS OF HEIDEGGER AND PATOČKA

This work confronts the Heideggerian and Patočkian interpretations of the fundamental concepts of Aristotelian *Physics*. Both interpretations share a point in common: according to Heidegger and Patočka, Aristotle conceives movement as a fundamental ontological determination of Being. Indeed, movement (κίνησις/μεταβολή) is conceived by Aristotle as a process of unconcealment, of coming into presence of entities in the openness of manifest being. Nevertheless, Heidegger and Patočka disagree on the way that one should understand the meaning of this ontological movement at the core of nature (φύσις). This work is dedicated to examining these differences. Our aim is to show, through Heidegger's and Patočka's interpretations of Aristotle, that there are two distinct and by all means opposed conceptions of the meaning and status of phenomenological ontology itself. We conclude both with Heidegger's philosophical idealism (at least in his hermeneutical appropriation of Aristotle) and with Patočka's contrary attempt to build a cosmological realism that challenges to a certain extent the identity between Being and meaning. In the working out of this thesis, a very particular focus is drawn on the concept that concentrates the entire charge of the tension, that is, the concept of matter (ὕλη).

Jeff Love and Michael Meng

HEIDEGGER'S SILENCE

Martin Heidegger is not typically considered an esoteric writer as defined by Leo Strauss. Recent evidence, the hidden writings of the 1930s and the newly published *Black Notebooks*, suggest otherwise. This article argues that Heidegger is a profoundly esoteric writer whose esotericism reaches far beyond that of Strauss. Heidegger's esotericism encompasses two fundamental aspects of his thinking, its efforts to define truth and the human relation to death. Heidegger strives in both cases to orient thinking to a "sigetics" or speaking of silence that shows what is most unsettling and dangerous about his thinking: its refusal to accept any account of origins and ends as authoritative.

Andrzej Serafin

HEIDEGGER ON PLATO'S ORIGINARY GOOD: A PHENOMENOLOGICAL RECONSTRUCTION

Heidegger's phenomenology is rooted in Greek metaphysics. According to Heidegger's claim, Aristotle was an earlier and more radical phenomenologist than Husserl, with ἀλήθεια understood as *Unverborgenheit* constituting the core of Greek phenomenology. Already in one of his early remarks, Heidegger claims that ἀγαθόν also underwent a process of deterioration and the original, phenomenological meaning of this concept was lost. Unfortunately, he never systematically developed the concept of originary ἀγαθόν and based his narrative of *Seinsvergessenheit* on the loss and retrieval of the primordial concept of ἀλήθεια. This essay is an attempt to analyze the process of deterioration and to reconstruct the originary concept of ἀγαθόν upon the basis of remarks scattered around the entire corpus of Heidegger's writings, in particular his interpretation of Plato. Heidegger's understanding of the phenomenological method with the three components of reduction, construction, and destruction are the guiding thread for this analysis.

Giorgio Agamben

ARISTOTLE'S *DE ANIMA* AND THE DIVISION OF LIFE

The concept of life is not used by Aristotle in the way we moderns use it, as something concerning biology or science, but rather it is initially a political term, and subsequently it will become a theological term. Furthermore, there is the term "life," for instance in the philosophical tradition and perhaps also in the scientific tradition. In the scientific tradition, it is never defined. We never find a definition of what "life" means, what a ζῶη is. But we find – on the contrary – an operation of division of life. Life is not defined but always divided, and this is from its origin up to now. Life is what cannot be defined and precisely for this reason must ceaselessly be articulated and divided.

One should not underestimate the enormous importance of this Aristotelian strategy of division. It seems an innocuous philosophical operation, but if you now consider the development of Western science and medicine, you will see how this apparently innocuous operation constitutes a fundamental event that enables the construction of the entire edifice of modern medicine and science. Modern surgery was made possible only by material separation through anesthesia of vegetative life from consciousness (the ἀρχή from the other function). Medicine transformed this psychological and logical operation of division into a material operation. We are now able to separate vegetative life completely from mental life, thinking, sensation, and so forth. Out of the Aristotelian division of life into nutritive, sensational, thinking, conscious, there is one – φυτικόν – that will act as the ἀρχή and allow for all modern sciences.

Antoni Szwed

A LONG WAY TO JOHN LOCKE'S CONCEPT OF TOLERATION

In *Letters Concerning Toleration* and in *Two Treatises of Government*, John Locke (1632-1704) elaborated the concept of toleration, which was of great importance for liberal democracy and generally for liberal culture in the world. Locke strongly contributed to the break in a long period of intolerance in English public life until the Glorious Revolution (1688-1689). The intellectual debate concerning the toleration concept, which paved the long way toward the Glorious Revolution, will be the subject of my analysis. I devote particular attention to Samuel Parker (1640-1688), the author of *A Discourse of Ecclesiastical Politie*, who argued for preserving the official religion and the official Church of England. Parker had two objectives. First, the official religion was to reinforce sovereign authority and to contribute to better observation of national law by its subjects. Second, Parker was silently arguing that the monarch's religion is the true one.

Cordell D.K. Yee

TRANSLATION AMONG THE LIBERAL ARTS: ON JOE SACHS'S ARISTOTLE

This is a review of the work of Joe Sachs, an emeritus member of the faculty at St. John's College (Annapolis, Maryland), who has published a septology of translations of Aristotle's works: three theoretical works and four focused on human activities. The review

begins by making a case for translation as an important activity of liberal learning, not only as an application of the arts of the trivium, but also as an undertaking that aims at least in part to foster the examination of unexamined presuppositions. Sachs's work offers plenty of examples to illustrate the former characterization, but that characterization is secondary to my main interest in the latter aim. I try to show how Sachs realizes this aim by considering some of his renderings of key terms and definitions, such as "motion," "being," and "soul." With some of his renditions, Sachs attempts to make etymology visible, and the results, to say the least, are non-standard and non-traditional. As such, they help a reader to break through sedimentation accumulated from a consistency of scholarly practice in the translation of Aristotle – a consistency that obscures important aspects of his thinking, making it seem more static and abstract than it is.

Marek Stawiński

HUSSERL, PLATO, AND THE HISTORICITY OF THE *EIDĒ*

The Philosophy of Husserl by Burt C. Hopkins is a book devised by its author to serve as an introduction to Husserl's phenomenology for beginners. However, its unusual structure combined with high attention to detail and a broad spectrum of topics makes it a very original introduction, if introduction at all. The book begins with an emphasis on the importance of the last stage of Husserl's phenomenology, that is, its turn to history. What immediately follows is the presentation of the "ancient precedent to pure phenomenology," which Hopkins identifies as Plato's and Aristotle's dispute about the εἰδῆ. Everything closes with the refutation of the critique of Husserl's phenomenology raised by Heidegger and Derrida. The presentation of the development of Husserl's phenomenology is thus situated between Plato and Aristotle on the one hand and Heidegger and Derrida on the other. In this review I present the overall structure of the book, arguing that Hopkins's considerations have two main purposes, one explicitly stated and the second implicitly realized. The former is to present and explain Husserl's phenomenology project by reconstructing subsequent phases of its development, while the latter is to apply this thinking to investigate the origin of the ideal meaning of the εἰδῆ. Therefore, Hopkins's book is not only about Husserl's philosophy but is also a practical example of philosophizing done in this manner. I conclude this review by presenting and discussing Hopkins's interpretation of Plato's theory of the εἰδῆ. Despite the role of this fragment in the overall structure of this book, it can be treated as a stand-alone point of interest because of Hopkins's employment of the notion of eidetic numbers in the interpretation of Plato's thought.

Jakub Wolak

GEMMA PLATONICA: ON HEINRICH DÖRRIE'S PHILOLOGICAL PLATONISM

Heinrich Dörrie was a German philologist and a founder of *Der Platonismus in der Antike* (*Platonism in Antiquity*), a monumental eight-volume series, the first volume of which was published posthumously by his wife in 1987. The project was continued by his students and now, after over 30 years, is near completion.

Platonism in Antiquity consists of 300 "building stones" (*Bausteine*) and aims at recollecting and reunifying the reportedly shattered tradition of ancient Platonism by making its textual witnesses available to the contemporary reader. Each building stone pertains to one topic of ancient Platonism and offers a review of crucial quotes from the sources alongside a German translation and commentary. Dörrie approaches the text in both an analytic and a synthetic way, presenting, exposing, and summarizing the preserved material, striving to provide an assimilative read – that is, to make his work understandable to the user "rooted in the spiritual world of the twentieth century." As such, Dörrie's endeavor seems to be of much broader scope and aim than that of a simple archivist.

The paper seeks to reconstruct Dörrie's concept of Platonism and to present controversies it evoked in German-speaking Academia. Of particular interest are (1) the metaphor of Platonism as a crystal with many facets, (2) the accusation of identifying all of ancient Platonism with Middle Platonism, and (3) the hermeneutical principles that rely on a presupposition that there is a continuous yet fragmented Platonic tradition centered around an unwritten esoteric kernel. The paper gives a thorough summary of Dörrie's thirty guiding sentences (*Leitsätze*), which sketch out the concept of Platonism as philosophy and religion in an aphoristic manner and concludes with a reflection on a Platonic understanding of philology.

The philosophical quarterly *Kronos* was established in 2007 by scholars connected with the University of Warsaw and the University of Białystok. Metaphysics, the philosophy of politics, the philosophy of literature and religion, history of psychoanalysis comprise the thematic scope of the journal. The editors of the quarterly strive to familiarize the Polish reader with new translations and commentaries of classic works (Plato, Joachim of Fiore, Nicholas of Cusa, Shakespeare, Schelling, the Schlegel brothers, Heidegger, and many others), as well as the work of contemporary philosophers.

The annual *Kronos Philosophical Journal* (in English) was established in 2012 as a companion edition to the quarterly, to supplement it, yet without repeating the content of the Polish edition. The papers presented in the annual might be of interest to the readers from outside Poland, allowing them to familiarize themselves with the dynamic thought of contemporary Polish authors, as well as entirely new topics, rarely discussed by English-speaking authors. One of the issues published so far contained passages from previously unknown lectures by Leo Strauss on Aristotle; another issue was dedicated to the Russian phenomenologist Gustav Shpet.

ISSN 2392-0963

