

Studia graeco-arabica

11/1

2021

Editorial Board

Mohammad Ali Amir Moezzi, École Pratique des Hautes Études, Paris
Carmela Baffioni, Istituto Universitario Orientale, Napoli

Sebastian Brock, Oriental Institute, Oxford

Charles Burnett, The Warburg Institute, London

Hans Daiber, Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität Frankfurt a. M.

Cristina D'Ancona, Università di Pisa

Thérèse-Anne Druart, The Catholic University of America, Washington

Gerhard Endress, Ruhr-Universität Bochum

Richard Goulet, Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Paris

Steven Harvey, Bar-Ilan University, Jerusalem

Henri Hugonnard-Roche, École Pratique des Hautes Études, Paris

Remke Kruk, Universiteit Leiden

Concetta Luna, Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa

Alain-Philippe Segonds (†)

Richard C. Taylor, Marquette University, Milwaukee (WI)

Staff

Elisa Coda (Executive Editor), Cristina D'Ancona, Maria Fasciano, Issam Marjani, Cecilia Martini Bonadeo

Submissions

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

Peer Review Criteria

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

Subscription orders

Information on subscription rates for the print edition of Volume 11/1 and 11/2 (2021), claims and customer service: press@unipi.it.

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

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

ISSN 2281-2687 / ISSN 2239-012X (Online)

ISBN 978-88-3339-614-9 / ISBN 978-88-3339-615-6 (Online)

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

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

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

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

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

© Copyright 2021 by Pisa University Press Polo editoriale - Centro per l'innovazione e la diffusione della cultura

Università di Pisa

Piazza Torricelli 4 - 56126 Pisa

P. IVA 00286820501 · Codice Fiscale 80003670504

Tel. +39 050 2212056 · Fax +39 050 2212945

E-mail press@unipi.it · PEC cidic@pec.unipi.it

www.pisauniversitypress.it

Studia graeco-arabica. Vol. 1 (2011)- . - Pisa : Pacini editore, 2011- . - Annuale. Dal 2021: Pisa : Pisa university press.

180.05 (23.)

1. Filosofia araba - Periodici 2. Filosofia greca - Periodici

CIP a cura del Sistema bibliotecario dell'Università di Pisa

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

Cover

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



Father Henri Dominique Saffrey O.P. (1921-2021) in his cell at the Couvent Saint-Jacques. Paris, June 1999. On the wall a picture of Leendert Gerrit Westerink.

Henri Dominique Saffrey: Philology and History of Neoplatonism

Concetta Luna*

Abstract

This article presents the intellectual activity of Father Henri Dominique Saffrey O.P. (1921-2021), describing the work of a great philologist and historian of Neoplatonism. In particular, it deals with the critical editions (Proclus, Marinus, Iamblichus) that Father Saffrey produced in close collaboration with L.G. Westerink and A.-Ph. Segonds, which are an essential reference for any scholar of late ancient thought.

The only person who could have actually written about Henri Dominique Saffrey, retracing his intellectual and scientific activity, was Alain Segonds. Father Saffrey and Alain Segonds worked together for over forty years. They met once a week, every week, in Father Saffrey's cell at the Couvent d'Étiolles, then at the Couvent Saint-Jacques, 20 rue des Tanneries, in the 13th arrondissement of Paris. Finally, when Alain Segonds passed away on May 2, 2011, he left a void that will never be filled. Therefore, if here I attempt to write about Father Saffrey in Segonds's place it is simply to honour their long and fruitful collaboration.

Describing Father Saffrey's scientific production is not an easy task: his multifarious interests, novelty, and excellence of his achievements in a broad range of fields make him both a complex scholar and a multifaceted mind.¹ Nevertheless, I believe that two main categories can be used to describe his work: (I) Neoplatonism, and (II) History of texts. Saffrey's interest in Neoplatonism produced, on the one hand, editions of texts, and on the other, doctrinal studies. These two aspects are closely linked to one another in Saffrey's production, because he always thought of philology as an instrument — the privileged one for understanding texts — for drawing the lines of conceptual developments and the history of ideas. It is therefore particularly difficult to distinguish sharply between his philological work and doctrinal studies. This is the reason why I will mention each critical edition by Saffrey together with those studies closely linked to it, and a separate paragraph will be devoted to more general studies. The exceptional breadth of Saffrey's rich scientific output allows me to cite only a few of his articles.²

* A slightly different version of this article was originally published as C. Luna, "Henri Dominique Saffrey: Philologie et Histoire du Néoplatonisme", *Accademia* 9 (2019), pp. 9-27.

¹ In what follows I will refer to these three collections of articles: H.D. Saffrey, *Recherches sur le néoplatonisme après Plotin*, Vrin, Paris 1990 (Histoire des doctrines de l'Antiquité classique, 14) [= Saffrey, *Recherches*]; Id., *Le néoplatonisme après Plotin*, Vrin, Paris 2000 (Histoire des doctrines de l'Antiquité classique, 24) [= Saffrey, *Néoplatonisme*]; Id., *L'héritage des Anciens au Moyen Âge et à la Renaissance*, Vrin, Paris 2002 (Histoire des doctrines de l'Antiquité classique, 28) [= Saffrey, *Héritage*].

² Due to a lack of competence, I will not deal with iconographic and bibliographic studies, the most important

First of all, it is useful to recall some biographical data as the background for Father Saffrey's intellectual activity. He was born in Paris on 10 April 1921. He entered the Dominican Order in 1944 at the Couvent d'Études du Saulchoir in Étioilles (Yvelines), made his preliminary profession in 1945 and his final profession in 1948. In 1952, Saffrey graduated in Scholastic Philosophy becoming Lecturer in Theology. In 1957 he obtained a PhD in Scholastic Philosophy (Le Saulchoir). Moreover, from 1948 to 1969, he attended the courses of Father André-Jean Festugière at the École Pratique des Hautes Études, where he befriended Alain Segonds. From 1953 to 1955, following the suggestion of Father Festugière, Saffrey moved to the University of Oxford to complete his studies under the guidance of Eric Robertson Dodds. In 1961 he defended a thesis on Book II of the *Platonic Theology* of Proclus and received a DPhil in Philosophy at the University of Oxford. This thesis would become the foundation for the edition of Proclus's *Platonic Theology*, a work carried out in collaboration with Leendert Gerrit Westerink who, with Alain Segonds, was part and parcel of Father Saffrey's intellectual life and research activity.

I. Neoplatonism

I.1. Neoplatonism in Medieval Tradition: the Edition of Thomas Aquinas's *Super Librum de causis*

Father Saffrey's first major work was a critical edition of Saint Thomas's *Commentary on the Liber de causis*. This is the thesis Saffrey wrote under the supervision of Father Hyacinthe Dondaine when he graduated as a Lecturer in Theology. His choice of taking into consideration the commentary on the *Liber de causis* traces back to Father Marie-Dominique Chenu's idea of studying not only Thomas's Aristotelianism, but also his Platonism. It was published in 1954 in Fribourg.³

Published by Pierre Mandonnet in the *Opuscula*, Thomas's commentary had never been studied.⁴ The introduction contains a section devoted to historical and doctrinal aspects (pp. xv-xxxix), which is divided into four parts: 1. The *Liber de causis* in the Middle Ages; 2. An outline of a doctrinal interpretation; 3. The commentary of Saint Thomas: literary questions; 4. Saint Thomas's *divisio textus*, and a second part on the manuscript tradition (pp. xl-lxiii). Then comes a section devoted to the critical edition divided into the following parts: 1. Manuscripts (list and brief description of the fifty witnesses of the text); 2. Editions; 3. The medieval university tradition; 4. The independent tradition; 5. *Exemplar* or *exemplaria*?; 6. The apograph (i.e. the copy of the autograph which is the common source of all the manuscript tradition); 7. The method followed in (his own) edition.

of which are collected in H.D. Saffrey, *Humanisme et imagerie aux XV^e et XVI^e siècles. Études iconologiques et bibliographiques*, Vrin, Paris 2003 (De Pétrarque à Descartes, LXXII).

³ Sancti Thomae de Aquino *Super Librum de causis expositio*, ed. H.D. Saffrey O.P., Société philosophique, Fribourg - Éditions E. Nauwelaerts, Louvain 1954 (Textus philosophici Friburgenses, 4/5) – repr. Vrin, Paris 2002 (Textes philosophiques du Moyen Âge, XXI). In his own copy of the 1954 edition, Father Saffrey annotated the following corrections: p. 22.6 *loco* “secundum auctorem istius libri quod intelligentiae essent” *lege* “auctorem istius libri <sensisse> quod intelligentiae essent”; p. 38.21 *loco* “de animae huiusmodi” *lege* “de anima huiusmodi”; p. 52.10 *loco* “extentione” *lege* “extensione”; p. 70.1 *loco* “cognitae” *lege* “cognitas”; p. 70.7-8 *loco* “estimatio” *lege* “aestimatio”; p. 100, *De causis*, col. a, li. 5, *loco* “quia” *lege* “quoniam”; p. 102.18 *loco* “quoniam” *lege* “quoniam”; p. 108, *De causis*, col. b, li. 7 *ab imo*, *loco* “iterem” *lege* “iterum”; p. 110.6 *loco* “extat” *lege* “exstat”.

⁴ Sancti Thomae Aquinatis *Opuscula omnia*, ed. P. Mandonnet, Lethielleux, Paris 1927, t. I, pp. 193-311.

The fifth part of this section is the most important one. Here Saffrey demonstrates, for the first time in the history of the philology of medieval scholastic texts, the simultaneous existence and the simultaneous use of two *exemplaria*, the second of which depends upon the first. The problem is clearly stated:

Ayant collationné tous les manuscrits sur une section de texte prise au début, c'est-à-dire dans la *pecia I^a*, et sur une autre prise tout à la fin, dans la *pecia VII^a*, j'ai observé que, comme l'on devait s'y attendre, on retrouve chaque fois le même ensemble des manuscrits se rattachant à la tradition indépendante, mais que la famille des manuscrits de tradition universitaire se divisait nettement en deux groupes [...] et que les manuscrits constituant chacun de ces deux groupes n'étaient pas les mêmes dans les deux cas. La question était alors posée de savoir si vraiment tous ces manuscrits dépendaient du même et unique *exemplar* parisien.⁵

Saffrey took into consideration the hypothesis of reworked *peciae*, and found that it was not supported by the textual data, namely the “oscillation” of certain university manuscripts between the two groups; instead, Saffrey offered a ground-breaking solution, that became a cornerstone of the philology of university texts:

Donc l'hypothèse [des *peciae* refaites] est insuffisante. D'où la nécessité d'en présenter une autre. Je n'en vois pas d'autre qui puisse expliquer toute la complexité des faits que celle d'un double *exemplar*, c'est-à-dire de deux *exemplaria*, en usage à Paris simultanément. Confectionnés à dessin avec une division en *peciae* rigoureusement identique, ils étaient loués aux copistes indifféremment selon les disponibilités sans qu'il y ait aucune préférence pour l'un ou l'autre jeu de *peciae*. Alors on comprend sans peine pourquoi chaque manuscrit, selon les *peciae*, présente le texte de l'un ou l'autre des deux groupes, autrement dit, le texte de l'un ou l'autre des deux *exemplaria*.⁶

This discovery is the basis of the idea of editing *pecia* by *pecia*, which was subsequently followed in all editions of the works of Saint Thomas.⁷

A few years after the publication of the critical edition of St. Thomas's commentary, Saffrey in an article on the *Liber de causis* offered a *status quaestionis* of the research and traced back in time, as far as possible, the obscure history of this fundamental text which exerted such a considerable influence on medieval metaphysics.⁸

⁵ Sancti Thomae de Aquino *Super Librum de causis expositio*, pp. LXI-LXII.

⁶ Sancti Thomae de Aquino *Super Librum de causis expositio*, p. LXIV.

⁷ On the philological criteria followed in the editions of Saint Thomas, cf. C. Luna, “L'édition Léonine de Saint Thomas d'Aquin: vers une méthode de critique textuelle et d'ecdotique”, *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 89 (2005), pp. 31-110 (on the edition of the *Super Librum de causis*, cf. *ibid.*, p. 89).

⁸ “L'état actuel des recherches sur le *Liber de causis* comme source de la métaphysique au Moyen Âge”, in *Miscellanea Mediaevalia*, Bd. 2: *Die Metaphysik im Mittelalter. Ihr Ursprung und ihre Bedeutung*, De Gruyter, Berlin 1963, pp. 267-81. Even after his edition of Saint Thomas's commentary, Saffrey pursued other researches on Saint Thomas and the Order of Preachers, as is shown by the following studies: “Une brillante conjecture de saint Albert et la *recensio nova* du *De anima*”, *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 40 (1956), p. 255-63; “Saint Thomas d'Aquin et ses secrétaires. À propos du livre du R. P. A. Dondaine, *Secrétaires de Saint Thomas*”, *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 41 (1957), pp. 49-74 [= Saffrey, *Héritage*, pp. 43-68]; “Saint Thomas d'Aquin et l'héritage des Anciens”, in *VII^e Centenaire de Saint Thomas d'Aquin et restauration de l'église des Jacobins de*

I.2. *The Edition of the Theologia Platonica*

The edition of the *Theologia Platonica* is rooted in the PhD thesis Saffrey defended in 1961 at Oxford, under the supervision of Eric Robertson Dodds, on Book II of the *Theologia Platonica* (critical text, translation, introduction, and commentary). The collaboration between Saffrey and Lendeert Gerrit Westerink started at that time, when working on the edition of the six books of the *Platonic Theology*. A lifelong collaboration that was interrupted only by Westerink's death in 1990.

A masterpiece of late ancient theology and metaphysics, the *Theologia Platonica* had been published only once, in 1618, by Émile Portus: that in-folio volume of xviii + 526 pages, published simultaneously in Hamburg and Frankfurt, contained the *Platonic Theology*, the *Elements of Theology*, and the *Life of Proclus* by Marinus. While many of Proclus's main works had already been edited by modern editors,⁹ the *Platonic Theology*, a sort of “*Summa theologiae*” of Late Antiquity,¹⁰ was still available in Portus's edition only.¹¹

The first volume of the Saffrey-Westerink edition appeared in the Collection des Universités de France in 1968 (with the revision by Pierre Thillet), 350 years after Portus's edition. It is a masterpiece based on the model of the edition of Dodds' *Elements of Theology*, in which philological and philosophical analysis are combined to create an impeccable critical edition, a modern translation accompanied by rigorous notes clarifying all the obscurities of the text. An introduction consisting of 195 pages precedes the Greek text (accompanied by a French translation): it is a foundational study for anyone interested in Neoplatonism. It includes two chapters concerning general aspects: the first one (pp. ix-lxxxix) is devoted to “L'homme et l'œuvre”, and traces Proclus's life, the family

Toulouse, *Bulletin de Littérature ecclésiastique* 1975, pp. 73-90; “Un panégyrique inédit de S. Thomas d'Aquin par Josse Clichtove”, in C.-J. Pinto de Oliveira OP (ed.), *Ordo sapientiae et amoris. Image et message de Saint Thomas d'Aquin à travers les récentes études historiques, herméneutiques et doctrinales. Hommage au Professeur Jean-Pierre Torrell OP à l'occasion de son 65^e anniversaire*, Éditions Universitaires, Fribourg (Suisse) 1993, pp. 539-53 [= Saffrey, *Héritage*, pp. 279-93]; “Fondation du couvent des frères prêcheurs à Paris. L'hospice devient le couvent Saint-Jacques”, *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 101 (2017), pp. 109-23.

⁹ Proclus's *Commentary* on the *Parmenides* (never published in the Renaissance) had been edited twice by Victor Cousin, in 1821-27, and in 1864. On these two editions, cf. Proclus, *Commentaire sur le Parménide de Platon*, ed. C. Luna – A.-Ph. Segonds, t. I/1, *Introduction générale*, Les Belles Lettres, Paris 2007 (Collection des Universités de France), pp. CDXLVII-CDLX; t. III/1, *ibid.*, 2011, pp. x-LXXXII. The other editions of Proclus's works are listed here according to the chronological order of their publication: *In primum Euclidis Elementorum librum commentarii*, ed. G. Friedlein, Teubner, Leipzig 1873 (very poor edition); *In Platonis Rem publicam commentarii*, ed. W. Kroll, 2 vol., *ibid.*, 1899, 1901; *In Platonis Timaeum commentaria*, ed. E. Diehl, 3 vol., *ibid.*, 1903-1906; *In Platonis Cratylum commentaria*, ed. G. Pasquali, *ibid.*, 1908; *Hypotyposis astronomicarum positionum*, ed. C. Manitius, *ibid.*, 1909 (with a German translation); *The Elements of Theology*, ed. E.R. Dodds, Clarendon Press, Oxford 1933 (second revised edition 1963).

¹⁰ Cf. *Theol. Plat.* I, p. CLXV: “cette ‘somme de théologie’ néoplatonicienne”.

¹¹ The importance of the edition of the *Theol. Plat.* has been explained by Alain Segonds very clearly in his *Liminaire* published in the Proceedings of the Colloquium held in Leuven to celebrate the completion of the edition of the *Theol. Plat.*, cf. A.-Ph. Segonds – C. Steel (eds.), *Proclus et la Théologie platonicienne*. Actes du Colloque International de Louvain (13-16 mai 1998), En l'honneur de Henri Dominique Saffrey et Leendert Gerrit Westerink †, Leuven U.P. – Les Belles Lettres, Leuven – Paris 2000 (Ancient and Medieval Philosophy. De Wulf-Mansion Centre, Series I, XXVI), pp. ix-xxvi. The corrections and supplements proposed by both the editors and other scholars after the publication of the six volumes are collected in C. Luna, “*Addenda et corrigenda* à l'édition de la *Théologie platonicienne* de Proclus”, *Studia graeco-arabica* 9 (2019), pp. 15-46.

of Plutarch of Athens, the School of Athens in the 4th century, the place of the *Theol. Plat.* within Proclus's work, the content, the plan, and the method of the *Theol. Plat.*, as well as the history of the exegesis of the hypotheses of Plato's *Parmenides*. The second chapter (pp. xci-clxv), entitled "Les témoins du texte", deals with the manuscript tradition outlining the history of the text and establishing the criteria of the edition. A "Notice", dedicated specifically to Book I, follows these two chapters, divided into two parts: 1. "Analyse de l'argument" (pp. clxix-clxxxviii), a clear and schematic summary of Proclus's argumentation, chapter by chapter; 2. "Nouveauté et importance du Livre I" (pp. clxxxviii-cxcii). This introductory scheme, in which the first chapter offers a historical and doctrinal outline, the second chapter deals with philological aspects, and the third chapter contains the analysis of Proclus's argumentation, would be adopted in all the other five volumes.

As previously highlighted, the manuscript tradition is taken into consideration in Chapter II. In their list of fifty-two manuscripts¹² (pp. xcvi-xcix), Saffrey and Westerink divide the manuscripts into two main groups: (I) manuscripts containing the full text of the *Theol. Plat.*, and (II) manuscripts which contain only parts of it. In turn, the manuscripts in group (II) are divided into four subgroups: (A) manuscripts containing Books I and II; (B) *membra disiecta* of supposedly complete manuscripts; (C) individual books and manuscripts in which the books are sequenced in order I, IV, II, III, V, VI; (D) the "grand fragment"¹³ and isolated fragments. The analysis of the manuscript tradition is based on the complete manuscripts only.¹⁴ Analysis of the manuscripts results in a bipartite *stemma codicum* in which the archetype α is probably the prototype of the transliteration or a copy of this prototype. The archetype α was the model for the two main manuscripts, the MS *Paris. gr.* 1813 (P), dated back to the 13th century, and the MS *Vat. gr.* 237 (V), dated back to the 14th century, two independent copies made in Constantinople. The manuscript V is incomplete: it ends at II 9, p. 59.11. While the descendants of P are very numerous, only two secondary manuscripts descend from V: the MS *Marc. gr.* 193, which contains a little more text than V (it ends at II 10, p. 62.4). This means that when MS *Marc. gr.* 193 was copied, V contained two more folios than now; and the MS *Matritensis graecus* 4744, which contains the same amount of text found in his model. The latter is therefore of no use, whereas the MS *Marc. gr.* 193 testifies to branch V in the short passage II 9-10, pp. 59.11-62.4. This means that, from II 10, p. 62.4, we only have one main witness of the text, the manuscript P. The textual tradition, initially twofold, becomes a tradition with a single witness (*codex unicus*), a difficult critical situation which requires editors to use more conjectures and caution. And it is due to their conjectures, not to their stemmatic position, that Saffrey and Westerink made use of four secondary manuscripts, all dependent on P; these manuscripts belonged to scholars and provide interesting conjectures.¹⁵

¹² A new manuscript, sold at auction in London by Sotheby's on July 8, 1975, is mentioned in vol. III, p. xcvi. This manuscript, copied in the second half of the 16th century in Italy by Andrea Darmarios, could not be located.

¹³ Saffrey and Westerink call "grand fragment" a compilation of texts from *Theol. Plat.* I 11-II 4 and preserved in eight manuscripts. Its critical value is discussed. On this question, cf. Luna, "Addenda et corrigenda" (above, n. 11), pp. 39-44.

¹⁴ Cf. t. I, pp. ci-cii: «Nous n'examinerons ici que les manuscrits contenant le texte complet et les copies accidentellement mutilées, c'est-à-dire les numéros 1 à 28 de la liste précédente» [= groups I, II.A, II.B].

¹⁵ *Neapolitanus ex-Vindob. gr.* 14 (s), direct copy of P, copied for Giles of Viterbo; *Bodleianus Laud. Gr.* 18 (o), belonged to Giovanni Pico della Mirandola; *Monacensis graecus* 547 (n), copy of o, belonged to Bessarion;

The other five books were published regularly: Book II in 1974 (revision by Pierre Thillet), Book III in 1978 (revision by Alain Segonds), Book IV in 1981 (revision by Alain Segonds), book V in 1987 (revision by Alain Segonds), Book VI in 1997 (revision by Alain Segonds). When Book VI came out, Westerink was no longer alive. The preface to this book, signed by Saffrey, opens with a sober and poignant description of the friendship between the two scholars:

Depuis 1961 jusqu'à sa mort subite, le 24 janvier 1990, Leendert Gerrit Westerink et moi avons entretenu une étroite collaboration dans l'étude et la publication de ce long traité de Proclus, la *Théologie platonicienne*. Sa famille et lui-même m'ont ouvert leur maison et leur cœur, si bien que notre collaboration était bientôt devenue une amitié profonde et durable. La mort de cet ami m'a plongé dans le chagrin et me laisse démuné.¹⁶

The edition of the *Theologia Platonica* is not just a masterpiece of textual criticism (even though this would suffice to ensure its fame). The six volumes provide not only the definitive critical text and a perfectly clear, elegant, and rigorous translation, but each one also contains an in-depth study of Proclus's argumentation.

The six introductions, taken together, are a systematic study of Neoplatonic theology. As highlighted earlier, the first volume traces the life of Proclus, the history of the School of Athens, the structure of the divine hierarchy, and more importantly the history of the exegesis of Plato's *Parmenides*. The last theme is of paramount importance: following in the footsteps of E.R. Dodds' famous article, "The *Parmenides* of Plato and the Origin of the Neoplatonic One",¹⁷ Saffrey and Westerink trace the history of the exegesis of the hypotheses of the *Parmenides* on the basis of such a foundational text as Proclus's commentary on the *Parmenides*. The introduction to Book II addresses two problems: on the one hand, the nature of the First Principle and the refutation of the opinion of Origen the Platonist who denied the transcendence of the One, on the other hand, the history of the exegesis of the pseudo-Platonic *Letter II*.¹⁸ The Book III of the *Theol. Plat.* deals with the doctrine of divine henads (chap. 1-6) as well as with intelligible gods (chap. 7-28), and the first chapter of the Introduction by Saffrey and Westerink is a treatise on the theory of the divine henads: Saffrey and Westerink found theological grounding for this doctrine in Syrianus, the master of Proclus at the School of Athens. Book IV of the *Theol. Plat.* is devoted to the intelligible-intellective gods. According to Proclus, these gods, who are an intermediate degree among the transcendent gods between the purely intelligible gods and the intellectual gods,¹⁹ are symbolized by the myth of the *Phaedrus* (246 E 4-248 C 2). Saffrey-Westerink's introduction to Book IV is therefore devoted to the history of the exegesis of this myth: from Cicero to Proclus, via Plotinus, Theodorus of Asine,²⁰ Iamblichus, and Syrianus.

Riccardianus graecus 70 (f), belonged to Ficino; *Paris. gr.* 2018 (g), brother of f, extensively annotated by an unknown 15th century humanist. The manuscripts o n f g descend from a lost manuscript, [z], copied from P.

¹⁶ Cf. *Theol. Plat.* VI, *Préface*, p. vii. See also Saffrey's obituary of L.G. Westerink, *Gnomon* 63 (1991), pp. 76-8.

¹⁷ *Classical Quarterly* 22 (1928), pp. 129-42.

¹⁸ Cf. esp. 312 E 1-4: *περὶ τὸν πάντων βασιλέα πάντ' ἐστὶ καὶ ἐκείνου ἕνεκα πάντα, καὶ ἐκεῖνο αἴτιον ἀπάντων τῶν καλῶν· δεύτερον δὲ περὶ τὰ δεύτερα, καὶ τρίτον περὶ τὰ τρίτα.*

¹⁹ As Saffrey and Westerink explain at p. xxxvi, the intelligible-intellectual gods are an "innovation tardive pour laquelle nous n'avons aucun témoignage certain avant Proclus lui-même".

²⁰ Saffrey devoted two articles to Theodorus of Asine and his exegesis of the *Parmenides*: "Le 'philosophe de

In Book V of the *Theol. Plat.*, the class of purely intellectual gods is discussed. Unlike intelligible gods and intelligible-intellectual gods, purely intellectual gods are said to form a hebdomad (i.e. two triads and a monad) rather than a series of three triads. Saffrey-Westerink's introduction to Book V draws attention to the problem of the hebdomadic structure of the intellectual gods. Book VI of the *Theol. Plat.* deals with the class of hypercosmic gods (*aphomoiotikoi*) and the class of hypercosmic-encosmic gods (*apolytoi*), the cosmic gods however are not mentioned. Hence, in the second chapter of their introduction to Book VI, Saffrey and Westerink raise the question: "La *Théologie platonicienne* est-elle complète?". The answer is: Yes, of course. Proclus had already dealt with the encosmic and sublunary gods in his commentaries on the *Timaeus*, on the *Parmenides*, on the *Alcibiades*, and on the *Cratylus*.²¹

Furthermore, it is important to underline that Saffrey-Westerink's introductions to volumes III to VI analyse respectively the doctrine of the intelligible gods (III), of intelligible-intellectual gods (IV), of the intellectual gods (V), and of the hypercosmic and hypercosmic-encosmic gods (VI) found in Damascius's commentary on the second hypothesis of the *Parmenides*, where Damascius discusses a part of Proclus's own commentary which is now lost.²² When Saffrey and Westerink were working on the edition of the *Theol. Plat.*, Damascius's commentary on the *Parmenides* could only be read in the mediocre edition by Charles-Émile Ruelle (Paris 1889). The critical edition of this commentary by L.G. Westerink, with a French translation and notes by Joseph Combès, appeared only after Westerink's death, thanks to Alain Segonds's reworking of all the material; this new critical edition consists of four volumes dated 1997 (I-II), 2002 (III), and 2003 (IV). Saffrey-Westerink's introductions to *Theol. Plat.* examine and explain Damascius's commentary, which is one of the most difficult and abstruse texts in late ancient philosophy; actually, they were able to use Damascius's commentary to reconstruct the lost part of Proclus's own.

The teachings of Dodds and Festugière were of great importance in the development of Saffrey's own scientific activity, as can be easily inferred from the mentions of the two scholars found in the prefaces of the six volumes of the *Theol. Plat.*²³ E.R. Dodds died on 8 April 1979,

Rhodes' est-il Théodore d'Asinè ? Sur un point obscur de l'histoire de l'exégèse néoplatonicienne du *Parménide*", in E. Lucchesi – H.D. Saffrey (eds.), *Mémorial André-Jean Festugière. Antiquité païenne et chrétienne*, Patrick Cramer Éditeur, Geneva 1984, pp. 65-76 [= Saffrey, *Néoplatonisme*, pp. 101-17]; "Encore Théodore d'Asinè sur le *Parménide*", in L. Jerphagnon – J. Lagrée – D. Delatre (eds.), *Ainsi parlaient les Anciens. In honorem Jean-Paul Dumont*, Presses Universitaires de Lille, Lille 1994, pp. 283-9 [= Saffrey, *Néoplatonisme*, pp. 119-24].

²¹ Cf. *Theol. Plat.* VI, p. XLIV.

²² As it has come down to us, Proclus's *Commentary* on Plato's *Parmenides* ends with the first hypothesis (142 A 8); therefore, it deals only with negations concerning the One. Proclus's commentary on the second hypothesis (142 B 1-155 E 3) is now lost. There, following in the footsteps of Syrianus, Proclus described the entire divine hierarchy, each degree of which being characterized by one of the attributes that the second hypothesis affirms about the One. Since in his own commentary on the *Parmenides*, Damascius follows Proclus's commentary very closely, even if almost always to oppose its tenets, through Damascius's exegesis it is possible to reconstruct the general features of the lost part of Proclus's one.

²³ Book I: "Nous tenons à exprimer notre respectueuse gratitude au Prof. Dodds qui est à l'origine de cette entreprise et l'a toujours encouragée" (p. VIII). In the preface to Book II, Saffrey and Westerink draw the portrait of the two masters, mentioning in particular Dodds's edition of the *Elements of Theology*, as well as the translations of Proclus's commentaries on the *Timaeus* (5 volumes, Paris 1966-68) and on the *Republic* (3 volumes, Paris 1970)

and the preface to Book IV pays tribute to him in a way that is at the same time eloquent and inspiring:

Malheureusement le premier instigateur et inspirateur de notre travail nous a quittés au moment même où il aurait pu commencer à croire que la première édition de cette *Théologie platonicienne*, celle qu'Émile Portus avait achevée en 1618, n'allait plus être "aujourd'hui encore, la seule édition complète".²⁴ E.R. Dodds est mort le 8 avril 1979. Il fut pour l'un de nous le "supervisor" d'une thèse consacrée au livre II de la *Théologie platonicienne*, et pour nous deux ensemble un maître et un modèle par tous ses écrits et singulièrement par son édition incomparable des *Éléments de théologie* de Proclus (Oxford 1933). On nous permettra de déposer sur sa tombe, en hommage à sa chère mémoire, ce livre, prémices des trois derniers de la *Théologie platonicienne*. Lorsque cette entreprise sera achevée, on pourra dire à bon droit que, ἀναγεγεννημένοι οὐκ ἐκ σπορᾶς φθαρτῆς ἀλλὰ ἀφθάρατου,²⁵ nous avons enfin fait produire son fruit à la semence jetée en nous par E.R. Dodds, il y aura bientôt trente années.

Father Festugière passed away on 13 August 1982, three years after Dodds. The two revered masters were no longer there to see the completion of the work they had inspired and supported. Volume V of the *Theol. Plat.* (1987) is dedicated to their memory. The preface to this volume expresses precisely this tradition of studies, the uninterrupted "chain" which, in spite of the pain and notwithstanding the sorrow for the passing of masters and friends, still remains alive, luminous, and powerful:

Voici maintenant le livre V et avant-dernier de la *Théologie*: avec lui la fin de notre travail approche. En même temps, un regret nous saisit: la disparition du Père A.J. Festugière, le 13 août 1982, après celle de E.R. Dodds, nous empêche, hélas, d'accomplir, autrement qu'en esprit, le geste de gratitude par lequel nous aurions voulu présenter à nos maîtres cet ouvrage achevé en hommage de reconnaissance et d'affection. Sous la direction du Père Festugière, à l'École Pratique des Hautes Études, de 1948 à 1969, l'un de nous étudia chaque année un nouveau texte philosophique ou religieux de l'Antiquité tardive, païenne et chrétienne. Cet enseignement, qui était nouveau à cette époque, en nous offrant un modèle du travail à accomplir, insufflait en même temps en nos cœurs le courage d'entreprises analogues: *legendo autem et scribendo vitam procudito*.²⁶ Dans le "chantier Proclus", Festugière a produit les huit volumes de ses traductions des commentaires *Sur le Timée* et *Sur la République*, et aussi ses articles réunis sous le titre *Procliana* dans les *Études de Philosophie grecque*.²⁷ En exergue de sa traduction du commentaire *Sur le Timée*, il avait inscrit le mot

by Father Festugière, and they dedicate the volume to them: "À ces deux savants, qui furent les inspirateurs de cet ouvrage, il nous est agréable de rendre un hommage plein de respect" (p. vii). These two translations by Festugière are mentioned again in the preface to Book III: "Pour ce tome III, nous avons une nouvelle fois largement utilisé les admirables traductions par le Père A. J. Festugière des commentaires sur le *Timée* et la *République*. Une fois pour toutes, nous annonçons que toutes nos citations de ces textes en français viennent des publications du P. Festugière auquel nous rendons un respectueux hommage" (p. vii).

²⁴ E.R. Dodds, *Missing Persons. An Autobiography*, Clarendon Press, Oxford 1977, p. 76.

²⁵ *Epist. Petri I*, 1, 23.

²⁶ Varro, *Sat. Menipp.*, fr. 551.

²⁷ Vrin, Paris 1971, pp. 533-96.

de Valentin Rose pour caractériser Proclus: *der an Virtuosität speculativer Technik nur mit Hegel vergleichbar ist*. Le même mot pourrait s'appliquer à l'œuvre du Père Festugière: chez lui la virtuosité du traducteur était égale à celle de l'interprète. Sans attendre le livre VI et dernier de la *Théologie platonicienne*, nous dédions cette nouvelle édition de la *Théologie* de Proclus à la mémoire de nos illustres devanciers, E.R. Dodds et A.J. Festugière, ἵνα ἀναπαύσονται ἐκ τῶν κόπων αὐτῶν, τὰ γὰρ ἔργα αὐτῶν ἀκολουθεῖ μετ' αὐτῶν.²⁸

While working on the edition, translation, and commentary of the *Theol. Plat.*, Saffrey authored numerous articles; and only the most significant ones can be recalled here. In 1984, in his contribution “La *Théologie platonicienne* de Proclus, fruit de l'exégèse du *Parménide*”,²⁹ Saffrey explains the relationship between the *Theol. Plat.* and the exegesis of the *Parmenides* examined in the preface to Book I. In 1985, within the framework of the Symposium organized in Paris to celebrate the 15th centenary of Proclus's death (485), Saffrey retraced the history of Proclean studies reconstructing the activity of the School of Athens.³⁰ The same year, at the “Colloque de Neuchâtel”, in “La *Théologie platonicienne* de Proclus et l'histoire du néoplatonisme”,³¹ he re-examined the exegesis of the *Parmenides* as the basis of the theology of Proclus as set out in his *Theol. Plat.* One of the most complex and important notions of Neoplatonic philosophy in general, and particularly of the Proclean one, is the notion of δύναμις; Saffrey examined it in an article, published in 1996, discussing the fundamental question of the procession of multiplicity from the One based on the *Theol. Plat.*³²

1.3. The Edition of *Marinus's* Proclus or Concerning Happiness

After the completion of the edition of the *Platonic Theology*, Saffrey devoted himself, together with Alain Segonds, to the edition of the *Proclus or Concerning Happiness*, the funeral eulogy of Proclus by Marinus, his pupil and successor at the School of Athens, known under the false title of *Vita Procli*. As would happen later with Iamblichus's, here, too, the original title of the work was restored. As Saffrey explains in the preface, Marinus's text had been read, translated, and commented on by Festugière during his course at the École Pratique des Hautes Études (V section), in 1962-1963.³³ The edition of the *Proclus or Concerning*

²⁸ *Apoc.* 14, 13.

²⁹ *Revue de théologie et de philosophie* 116 (1984), pp. 1-12 [= Saffrey, *Recherches*, pp. 173-84].

³⁰ “Proclus, diadoque de Platon”, preface to J. Pépin – H.D. Saffrey (eds.), *Proclus lecteur et interprète des Anciens*. Actes du Colloque International du CNRS, Paris (2-4 octobre 1985), CNRS Éditions, Paris 1987, pp. xi-xxviii [= Saffrey, *Recherches*, pp. 141-58].

³¹ In *Proclus et son influence*. Actes du Colloque de Neuchâtel (Juin 1985), Éditions du Grand Midi, Zürich 1987, pp. 29-44 [= Saffrey, *Recherches*, pp. 185-200].

³² “Fonction divine de la ΔΥΝΑΜΙΣ dans la théologie proclienne”, in F. Romano – R.L. Cardullo (eds.), *Dunamis nel Neoplatonismo*. Atti del II Colloquio Internazionale del Centro di Ricerca sul Neoplatonismo, La Nuova Italia, Firenze 1996 (Symbolon, 16), pp. 107-20 [= Saffrey, *Néoplatonisme*, pp. 159-68].

³³ “Ce fut une véritable initiation” (p. vii). Saffrey gives a startling description of Father Festugière's classes at the École Pratique des Hautes Études in “Le Père André-Jean Festugière, O.P. (1898-1982). Portrait”, in Lucchesi-Saffrey (eds.), *Mémorial André-Jean Festugière* (above, n. 20), pp. vii-xv, esp. p. viii [= Saffrey, *Recherches*, pp. 297-305, esp. p. 298]. On Festugière's work, see also H.D. Saffrey, “Le Père André-Jean Festugière. Une histoire littéraire et doctrinale du besoin d'être avec Dieu dans le monde romain”, *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 92 (2008), pp. 591-600.

Happiness, published in 2001, is an admirable complement to that of the *Theologia Platonica*, and supersedes all previous editions. The introduction consists of three chapters, the first of which is devoted to the life and works of Marinus, the second to Marinus' oration, that is, to the rhetorical structure and the Neoplatonic classification of virtues, which provides the framework for the whole work, the third to the witnesses of the text.

The *Proclus or Concerning Happiness* is transmitted by eighteen manuscripts, ten of which contain the complete text, seven are incomplete, and one is inaccessible.³⁴ The manuscript tradition is bipartite, like that of the *Theol. Plat.*: the two primary witnesses are the MS *Paris. Coisl.* 249 (10th cent. = C) and the *Laur. Plut.* 86, 3 (12th cent. = L). All other manuscripts descend directly or indirectly from C or L.³⁵ The text preserved by L is generally better than that preserved by C. The manuscript L had a twin brother, now lost, the *Toxitanus*, used in the *editio princeps* (Zurich 1559, by Conrad Gesner).³⁶ The *Toxitanus* is incomplete, therefore the *princeps* stops at the beginning of §22. The *editio princeps* allows us to reconstruct the lost model of L and of the *Toxitanus* and to correct sporadically (by conjecture of the *editio princeps* itself) the erroneous lesson of the archetype. At a variance with the *Theol. Plat.*, Marinus's text is also attested in indirect tradition, although it is meagre and consists of eleven passages transmitted by the *Souda*. While the *Theol. Plat.* had only been published once (by Portus in 1618) and had therefore been neglected by scholars, Marinus's *Proclus* had ten editions, the best of which being that of Jean-François Boissonade (Leipzig 1814) based on C, L, and three secondary manuscripts, while the latest in chronological order, published in 1985 by Rita Masullo, is based upon all the manuscript tradition, which is however poorly utilised. In this sense, the Saffrey-Segonds edition, presenting a rich set of notes (pp. 49-183) and an appendix on the horoscope of Proclus (pp. 185-201), must be considered the definitive one.

I.4. The Edition of Porphyry's Letter to the Egyptian Anebo, and of Iamblichus's Reply to Porphyry's Letter to Anebo

Having completed the dossier on the School of Athens, Father Saffrey and Alain Segonds turned to Iamblichus's *De Mysteriis* (which, in the new Saffrey-Segonds edition, is entitled *Reply to Porphyry*). The genesis of the edition of Iamblichus's work (2013) is explained in the "Avant-propos", signed by Saffrey, after the sudden death of Alain Segonds. The tone is, as always, lucid and objective, yet passionate. As was the case of the edition of Marinus's *Proclus*, Festugière's teaching inspired their work:

En 1966, j'ai été prié par l'Association Guillaume Budé de faire la révision de l'édition du *De mysteriis* par le Père des Places. En fait, je reçus le volume entièrement composé et prêt pour l'impression. À ce moment-là, j'avais une connaissance superficielle de Jamblique en général et du *De mysteriis* en particulier. [...] Je lus le texte grec et proposai quelques

³⁴ That is the MS Cheltenham, Thirlestaine House, Phillipps 8276, whose actual location is unknown.

³⁵ See the *Stemma codicum* at p. CXLIV.

³⁶ The name "*Toxitanus*" comes from the poet and adventurer Michael Toxites (Schütz). He found a manuscript including Marcus Aurelius's *Meditations* and Marinus's *Proclus* in the library of the prince-electors Otto Henry and gave it to Conrad Gesner.

conjectures³⁷ auxquelles vinrent s'ajouter celles de mon ami Westerink³⁸ qui se trouvait alors à Paris. Ensuite, au fur et à mesure qu'Alain Segonds et moi utilisons ce travail dans nos recherches sur le Néoplatonisme, nous en découvrons les imperfections, et la nécessité s'imposait à nous d'en donner une nouvelle édition. [...] Alain Segonds et moi avons tiré grand profit des notes inédites composées par le Père Festugière pour deux conférences dont nous avons été les auditeurs à l'École Pratique des Hautes Études, les 16 et 30 mai 1968, ainsi que de son exemplaire de l'édition du Père des Places, dont les marges sont remplies de corrections et de conjectures.³⁹

Since Iamblichus's treatise was the response to Porphyry's *Letter to the Egyptian Anebo*, Saffrey and Segonds edited the *Letter to Anebo* first (2012), and then the *Reply to Porphyry* (2013).⁴⁰ Unfortunately, Porphyry's treatise is lost to us, and only a hundred fragments have survived. They are preserved in the following six main sources: (1) the quotations by Iamblichus in his *Reply*; (2) the literal quotations preserved in Eusebius of Caesarea's *Preparation of the Gospel*; (3) the quotations preserved in Theodoret of Cyrillus's *Cure of the Greek Maladies* (*Graecarum affectionum curatio*), which depends on Eusebius; (4) the quotations found in Cyril of Alexandria's *Contra Iulianum*; (5) a chapter of the *Hypomnesticon* by Joseph of Tiberiade, that Saffrey studied in 2001;⁴¹ (6) the important quotation preserved in Book X of Saint Augustine's *De Civitate Dei* published by Saffrey and Segonds in 2009.⁴² Unlike all previous editions, in which Porphyry's *Letter* has been tentatively reconstructed as a continuous Greek text,⁴³ the illusion of reconstructing a continuous text of Porphyry's *Letter* was abandoned in the Saffrey-Segonds edition.⁴⁴

³⁷ See the critical apparatus of the edition by des Places *ad* 65.17 (p. 77), 66.11 (p. 77), 67.10 (p. 78), 76.15 (p. 83), 96.4 (p. 95), 107.9 (p. 102), 246.8 (p. 186), 255.3-4 (p. 192). In the Saffrey-Segonds edition, the first three conjectures are attributed to Saffrey (cf. pp. 49.17, 50.3, 50.8), while the conjectures *ad* 76.15 (p. 83), 96.4 (p. 95), 107.9 (p. 102), 246.8 (p. 186) are attributed to the editors (cf. pp. 57.20, 72.17, 80.21, 183.6) and the conjecture *ad* 255.3 (p. 192) is rightly neither taken nor mentioned in the critical apparatus.

³⁸ See the critical apparatus of the edition by des Places *ad* 8.7 (p. 42), 109.3 (p. 103), 153.6-7 (p. 130), 158.12 (p. 133), 186.3 (p. 149), 186.9 (p. 150), 190.7 (p. 152), 218.8 (p. 169) (*bis*), 224.4 (p. 172), 264.14 (p. 197), 274.3 (p. 203), 281.9-10 (p. 207) = ed. Saffrey-Segonds *ad* pp. 6.5, 82.1, 115.4, 119.8, 139.7, 139.15, 142.15-16, 163.1 (*bis*), 167.3-4, 196.7-8, 202.21, 208.11. To Westerink's conjectures taken by des Places, Saffrey and Segonds add four conjectures (pp. 86.8, 134.11, 151.25 and 174.19).

³⁹ Cf. the critical apparatus of the Saffrey-Segonds edition *ad* pp. 4.16-17, 10.26, 20.13, 38.8.

⁴⁰ Porphyre, *Lettre à Anébon l'Égyptien*, ed. H.D. Saffrey – A.-Ph. Segonds †, Les Belles Lettres, Paris 2012 (CUF); Jamblique, *Réponse à Porphyre (De mysteriis)*, ed. H.D. Saffrey – A.-Ph. Segonds † avec la collaboration de A. Lecerf, Les Belles Lettres, Paris 2013 (CUF).

⁴¹ H.D. Saffrey, "Porphyre dans la *Patrologie* de Migne. Sur la divination", in S. Matton (ed.), *Documents oubliés sur l'alchimie, la kabbale et Guillaume Postel offerts, à l'occasion de son 90^e anniversaire, à François Secret par ses élèves et amis*, Droz, Genève 2001, pp. 39-48 [= Saffrey, *Néoplatonisme*, pp. 27-36].

⁴² A. Segonds – H.D. Saffrey O. P., "Le témoignage de Saint Augustin dans la reconstitution de la *Lettre à Anébon l'Égyptien* par Porphyre", *Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions & Belles-Lettres*, de Boccard, Paris 2009, pp. 163-94.

⁴³ The first to have tried such a reconstruction is Thomas Gale in his *editio princeps* of Iamblichus (Oxford 1678); his reconstruction is reproduced in the edition by Gustav Parthey, Berlin 1857, pp. xxix-xlv. On the previous editions of the *Letter to the Egyptian Anebo*, cf. ed. Saffrey-Segonds, pp. cx-cxi.

⁴⁴ Cf. ed. Saffrey-Segonds, p. xcix: "Croire que l'on peut retrouver le texte grec de la *Lettre à Anébon* dans toute sa longueur, nous paraît totalement illusoire"; p. cix: "Depuis Thomas Gale en 1678, tous nos prédécesseurs ont tenté de reconstituer la *Lettre à Anébon* par un texte continu, texte grec et traduction latine, en inventant

From this point of view, the Saffrey-Segonds edition is the first critical edition of Porphyry's *Letter*, because it implements, in a rigorous way, one of the most important tasks of philology: to establish how far the work of reconstitution of a text can be pushed and, conversely, where one is at risk of inventing texts that never actually existed. Instead of "inventing" a continuous lost text, the Saffrey-Segonds edition brings together all the known fragments of Porphyry's *Letter* (numbered from 1 to 100), each of which is accompanied by a translation and a commentary "qui essaie d'interpréter le fragment dans le mouvement continu de la pensée de Porphyre".⁴⁵

The edition of the fragments of Porphyry's *Letter* was the indispensable premise for editing Iamblichus's *Reply to Porphyry's Letter*. While the textual tradition of the *Theol. Plat.* had never been studied before and the only edition was Portus's *princeps* of 1618, ever since Marsilio Ficino the textual tradition of Iamblichus's *Reply* had been the subject of an uninterrupted reflection. The foundational study on the manuscript tradition was published by Martin Sicherl in 1957. Sicherl recognizes the two hyparchetypes of the tradition in the MS. *Vallicellianus* F 20 (= V), annotated by Ficino, and in the MS. *Marc. gr.* 244 (= M), annotated by Bessarion.⁴⁶ Ficino studied the text, indeed; he annotated it extensively in the *Vallicellianus* F 20.⁴⁷ He gave to Iamblichus's *Reply* the title of *De mysteriis Aegyptiorum, Chaldaeorum, Assyriorum*, and under this title Aldus Manutius published Ficino's paraphrase in 1497 in Venice, along with other Neoplatonic writings.⁴⁸ The *princeps* edition by Thomas Gale was published in Oxford in 1678; it is based on two secondary manuscripts, the *Leidensis Vossianus graecus* Q 22, which belongs to the family of M, and the *Basiliensis Bibl. Univ.* F. II. 1b, which belongs

des chevilles entre les fragments au mieux du sens général. [...] Nous croyons totalement illusoire cette manière de procéder».

⁴⁵ Cf. ed. Saffrey-Segonds, p. cix.

⁴⁶ M. Sicherl, *Die Handschriften, Ausgaben und Übersetzungen von Iamblichos De Mysteriis. Eine kritisch-historische Studie*, Akademie-Verlag, Berlin 1957 (Texte und Untersuchungen, 62. Band = V. Reihe, Bd. 7). Cf. esp. p. 18: "Die Codices integri bilden zwei Klassen. Die der ersten Klasse sind alle unmittelbar oder über Zwischenglieder aus Vallicell. F 20 (= V) geflossen, die der zweiten Klasse auf die gleiche Weise aus Marc. gr. 244 (= M). V und M, beide um die Mitte des 15. Jh. aus dem heute verlorenen Archetypus abgeschrieben und älteste vollständig erhaltene Textzeugen, stellen somit, um einen von P. Maas geprägten Terminus zu gebrauchen, die Hyparchetypen der beiden Klassen dar". *Stemma codicum* at p. 206. On the manuscript tradition of Iamblichus's *Reply* two contributions by A.R. Sodano should be mentioned: "La tradizione manoscritta del trattato *De Mysteriis* di Giamblico", *Giornale italiano di filologia* 5 (1952), pp. 1-18; "Il codice torinese e due nuovi manoscritti del *De Mysteriis* di Giamblico", *Rendiconti della Accademia di archeologia, lettere e belle arti* (Società Nazionale di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti, Napoli), N. S., 30 (1955), pp. 159-92.

⁴⁷ Ficino's reworking of Iamblichus's *Reply* (reordering of the text which was unintelligible because of the inversion of two sections and translation-paraphrase) has been analysed by Father Saffrey and Alain Segonds in the article: "Ficino sur le *De mysteriis* de Jamblique", *Humanistica* 1-2 (2006), pp. 117-24. This study constitutes the *prolegomena* to the critical edition of the autograph of Ficino's paraphrase: *Marsile Ficino sur Jamblique. Édition des notes au De Mysteriis dans le ms. Vallicellianus F 20*, éd. H.D. Saffrey avec la coll. de M. Stefani, Société Marsile Ficino - San Marco Litotipo, Lucca 2018 (Cahiers Accademia, 10). The editors distinguish the different hands that have annotated the *Vallicellianus* F 20: Ficino (Roman characters), Giovanni Pico della Mirandola (underlined text), Luca Fabiani, secretary of Ficino (italics), unidentified hands (in normal characters and between square brackets). Aldine variants are registered in the critical apparatus.

⁴⁸ Facsimile edition with introduction of S. Toussaint, Les Éditions du Miraval, Enghien-les-Bains 2006.

to the family of V.⁴⁹ A new edition by Gustav Parthey was published in Berlin in 1857.⁵⁰ Parthey did not have access to the two main manuscripts M and V, but used the *Laur. Plut.* 10, 32 and the *Vindob. phil. gr.* 264 (family of V) and the *Gothanus chartaceus* A 150 (family of M). In 1966, the edition by Édouard des Places was published. It is strongly criticized by Saffrey and Segonds:

Un travail hâtif et superficiel a été accompli par le Père des Places en 1966 par la collation rapide des deux manuscrits principaux sélectionnés par Sicherl et l'accumulation de tous les défauts — titre fallacieux, division scolastique en livres et chapitres, annotation insuffisante et traduction souvent obscure — de toutes les éditions qui précédaient.⁵¹

The question of the title is discussed at length by Saffrey and Segonds (pp. ix-xxi). They explain the reason for the title chosen by Ficino which prevailed to such an extent that des Places replaced it in Greek.⁵² The reason of Ficino's title is the search for the *Platonica Mysteria*, which Ficino himself pursued his entire life. With Iamblichus, the *Platonica Mysteria* are confirmed by the mysteries of the Egyptians, Chaldeans (i.e. the *Chaldean Oracles*) and Assyrians:

Quoi qu'il en soit, aujourd'hui le monde moderne connaît ce livre sous le titre inventé par Ficin *De mysteriis*, que nous nous proposons d'abandonner pour revenir au titre authentique de *Réponse à Porphyre*. [...] Pour Ficin, l'écrit de Jamblique pouvait donc s'intituler *De mysteriis Ægyptiorum, Chaldaeorum, Assyriorum*, ce qui signifie "Au sujet des divinités et de la religion des Égyptiens, des Chaldéens, des Syriens", signification qui est outrageusement trahie lorsque l'on traduit ce titre "Les mystères d'Égypte".⁵³

In addition to the question of the title, there is the question of the division of the text:

Malheureusement un titre nouveau n'était pas la seule innovation que l'âge moderne devait apporter au texte de Jamblique car, en 1556, le premier traducteur de notre texte, le religieux ermite de S. Augustin, Nicolas Scutelli, a cru bon de le diviser en segments et

⁴⁹ ΙΑΜΒΛΙΧΟΥ ΧΑΛΚΙΔΕΩΣ ΤΗΣ ΚΟΙΛΗΣ ΣΥΡΙΑΣ ΠΕΡΙ ΜΥΣΤΗΡΙΩΝ ΛΟΓΟΣ. *IAMBlichI CHALCIDENSIS EX COELE-SYRIA DE MYSTERIIS LIBER*. Praemittitur *Epistola Porphyrii ad Anebonem Ægyptium*, eodem argumento. Thomas Gale Anglus Græce nunc primum edidit, latine vertit, et Notas adjecit, Oxonii, E Theatro Sheldoniano, Anno Dom. M.DC.LXXVIII. On Gale's edition, cf. Sicherl, *Die Handschriften* (above, n. 46), pp. 195-8.

⁵⁰ Jamblichus *De Mysteriis liber*, ad fidem codicum manu scriptorum recognovit Gustavus Parthey, Berolini, Prostat in Libraria Friderici Nicolai, 1857. On Parthey's edition, cf. Sicherl, *Die Handschriften* (above, n. 46), pp. 198-200.

⁵¹ Ed. Saffrey-Segonds, p. xci.

⁵² Des Places (1966) recognizes that the true title of the work is Ἀβάμμωνος διδασκάλου πρὸς τὴν Πορφυρίου πρὸς Ἀνεβὼ ἐπιστολὴν ἀπόκρισις καὶ τῶν ἐν αὐτῇ ἀπορημάτων λύσεις, but he adds <Περὶ τῶν αἰγυπτίων μυστηρίων>. Already Gale in the *editio princeps* wrote Περὶ μυστηρίων λόγος.

⁵³ Cf. ed. Saffrey-Segonds, pp. xiv and xviii. *Les Mystères d'Égypte* is precisely the title of the edition of des Places. See also *Les Mystères d'Égypte. Réponse d'Abamon à la Lettre de Porphyre à Anébon*, Traduction et commentaire de M. Broze – C. Van Liefferinge, Éditions Ousia, Bruxelles 2009 (note the contamination of the titles).

chapitres à la manière d'un traité scolastique. Ces "segments" deviendront des "sections" dans les éditions de Gale et de Parthey et des "livres" dans l'édition du Père des Places. Cette division n'a aucune raison d'être et doit être, elle aussi, complètement abandonnée⁵⁴.

The Saffrey-Segonds edition is therefore, and above all, a delicate and decisive archaeological achievement which attempts to remove any subsequent encrustation and restore the work to its original splendour.

The groundwork for the edition of Iamblichus's *Reply* was prepared through a large number of articles which all aim to understand the purpose of the work, its true nature, and its original structure beyond the division imposed by the previous editors.⁵⁵

1.5. Other Doctrinal Essays

The aforementioned studies are closely linked to the editorial work because they aim to clarify, analyse, and understand the edited texts. As previously mentioned, this list merely provides a selection of the vast literary production of Father Saffrey. To give an idea of the breadth of subjects he addressed I may mention a few articles which have made a mark on the field of Neoplatonic studies.

An unparalleled knowledge of Proclus's work enabled Saffrey to draw an immense picture of Late Antiquity as a whole, one where the themes of theology as a science,⁵⁶ of mystical

⁵⁴ Cf. ed. Saffrey-Segonds, pp. xviii-xix.

⁵⁵ H.D. Saffrey, "Abamon, pseudonyme de Jamblique", in O.B. Palmer – R. Hamerton-Kelly (eds.), *Philomathes. Studies and Essays in the Humanities in memory of Philip Merlan*, M. Nijhoff, The Hague 1971, pp. 227-39 [= Saffrey, *Recherches*, pp. 95-107]; Id., "Plan des livres I et II du *De mysteriis* de Jamblique", in *Zetesis. Bijdragen op het gebied van de klassieke filologie, filosofie, byzantinistiek, patrologie en theologie door collega's en vrienden aangeboden aan Prof. Dr. Emile de Strijcker naar aanleiding van zijn vijftenzestigste verjaardag*, De Nederlandsche Boekhandel, Antwerpen-Utrecht 1973, pp. 281-95 [= Saffrey, *Recherches*, pp. 109-23]; Id., "Relecture de Jamblique, *De mysteriis*, VIII, chap. 1-5", in S. Gersh – Ch. Kannengiesser (eds.), *Platonism in Late Antiquity. Homage to Père Édouard des Places*, University of Notre Dame Press, Notre Dame (Ind.) 1992, pp. 157-71 [= Saffrey, *Néoplatonisme*, pp. 65-76]; Id., "Les livres IV à VII du *De Mysteriis* de Jamblique relus avec la Lettre de Porphyre à Anébon", in H.J. Blumenthal – E.G. Clark (eds.), *The Divine Iamblichus, Philosopher and Man of Gods*, Bristol Classical Press, London 1993, pp. 144-58 [= Saffrey, *Néoplatonisme*, pp. 49-64]; Id., "Réflexions sur la pseudonymie Abammôn-Jamblique", in J.J. Cleary (ed.), *Traditions of Platonism. Essays in Honour of John Dillon*, Ashgate, Aldershot 1999, pp. 307-18 [= Saffrey, *Néoplatonisme*, pp. 39-48]; Id., "Analyse de la Réponse de Jamblique à Porphyre, connue sous le titre: *De mysteriis*", *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 84 (2000), pp. 489-511 [= Saffrey, *Néoplatonisme*, pp. 77-99]. The weight and the real meaning of the controversy between Porphyry and Iamblichus, namely the hard struggle waged by Porphyry against the subordination of philosophy to theurgy, are masterfully analysed by Saffrey in "Pourquoi Porphyre a-t-il édité Plotin? Réponse provisoire", in L. Brisson et al. (eds.), *Porphyre. La Vie de Plotin*, vol. II, Vrin, Paris 1992 (*Histoire des doctrines de l'Antiquité classique*, 16), pp. 31-64 [= Saffrey, *Néoplatonisme*, pp. 3-26].

⁵⁶ H.D. Saffrey, "Les débuts de la théologie comme science (III^e-VI^e siècle)", *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 80 (1996), pp. 201-20 [= Saffrey, *Néoplatonisme*, pp. 219-38] (this article is dedicated "À la mémoire de E.R. Dodds et de M.-D. Chenu").

knowledge and spirituality,⁵⁷ of theurgy,⁵⁸ and of the relationship with Christians⁵⁹ are always discussed through a careful analysis of the texts. The very close link between theology and spirituality in Proclus is highlighted by Father Saffrey in two articles devoted to the hymns of Proclus, published respectively in 1981 and 1984.⁶⁰ Particular attention is always given to Athenian Neoplatonism: before editing Marinus's *Proclus*, Saffrey wrote two fundamental articles devoted to the School of Athens and, in particular, to Syrianus, the master of Proclus, who played a decisive role in the elaboration of Proclus's own metaphysics and theology.⁶¹

An essential point of Proclus's *Nachleben*, namely the relationship with Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite, was the subject of three studies that Saffrey published respectively in 1966, 1979, and 1998. These articles are linked by their titles and show that the similarity of doctrines and even expressions between Pseudo-Dionysius and Proclus had been detected with accuracy as early as the 6th century.⁶²

⁵⁷ H.D. Saffrey, "Théologie et anthropologie d'après quelques préfaces de Proclus", in F. Bossier et al. (eds.), *Images of Man in Ancient and Medieval Thought. Studia Gerardo Verbeke ab amicis et collegis dicata*, Leuven U.P., Leuven 1976, pp. 199-212 [= Saffrey, *Recherches*, pp. 159-72]; Id., "Quelques aspects de la spiritualité des philosophes néoplatoniciens. De Jamblique à Proclus et Damascius", *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 68 (1984), pp. 169-82 [= Saffrey, *Recherches*, pp. 213-26].

⁵⁸ H.D. Saffrey, "La théurgie comme pénétration d'éléments extra-rationnels dans la philosophie grecque tardive", in *Wissenschaftliche und außerwissenschaftliche Rationalität. Referate und Texte des 4. Internationalen Humanistischen Symposiums 1978*, Athena, Athens 1981, pp. 153-69 [= Saffrey, *Recherches*, pp. 33-49]; Id., "La théurgie comme phénomène culturel chez les néoplatoniciens (IV^e-V^e siècles)", *KOINONIA* 8/2 (1984), pp. 161-71 [= Saffrey, *Recherches*, pp. 51-61]; Id., "ΣΗΜΕΙΟΝ/SIGNUM dans la littérature néoplatonicienne et la théurgie", in M.L. Bianchi (ed.), *Signum*. IX Colloquio Internazionale, Roma, 8-10 gennaio 1998, Leo S. Olschki, Firenze 1999, pp. 23-38 [= Saffrey, *Néoplatonisme*, pp. 127-41].

⁵⁹ H.D. Saffrey, "Allusions antichrétiennes chez Proclus, le diadoque platonicien", *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 59 (1975), pp. 553-63 [= Saffrey, *Recherches*, pp. 201-11]; Id., "Le thème du malheur des temps chez les derniers philosophes néoplatoniciens", in *ΣΟΦΙΗΣ ΜΑΙΗΤΟΡΕΣ*. "Chercheurs de sagesse". *Hommage à Jean Pépin*, Institut d'Études Augustiniennes, Paris 1992 (Collection des Études Augustiniennes. Série Antiquité, 131), pp. 421-31 [= Saffrey, *Néoplatonisme*, pp. 207-17].

⁶⁰ H.D. Saffrey, "L'hymne IV de Proclus, prière aux dieux des *Oracles Chaldaïques*", in *Néoplatonisme. Mélanges offerts à Jean Trouillard*, École Normale Supérieure, Fontenay-aux-Roses 1981 (Les cahiers de Fontenay, 19-20-21-22), pp. 297-312 [= Saffrey, *Néoplatonisme*, pp. 193-206]; Id., "La dévotion de Proclus au Soleil", in *Philosophies non chrétiennes et christianisme*, Éditions de l'Université de Bruxelles, Bruxelles 1984 (Annales de l'Institut de Philosophie et de sciences morales, Université libre de Bruxelles), pp. 73-86 [= Saffrey, *Néoplatonisme*, pp. 179-91].

⁶¹ H.D. Saffrey, "Comment Syrianus, le maître de l'École néoplatonicienne d'Athènes, considérait-il Aristote?", in J. Wiesner (ed.), *Aristoteles Werk und Wirkung Paul Moraux gewidmet, Zweiter Band*, De Gruyter, Berlin-New York 1987, pp. 205-14 [= Saffrey, *Recherches*, pp. 131-40]; Id., "Accorder entre elles les traditions théologiques: une caractéristique du néoplatonisme athénien", in E.P. Bos – P.A. Meijer (eds.), *On Proclus and his Influence in Medieval Philosophy*, Brill, Leiden-New York-Köln 1992 (*Philosophia Antiqua*, 53), pp. 35-50 [= Saffrey, *Néoplatonisme*, pp. 143-58].

⁶² H.D. Saffrey, "Un lien objectif entre le Pseudo-Denys et Proclus", *Studia Patristica* IX, Akademie-Verlag, Berlin 1966 (Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, 94), pp. 98-105 [= Saffrey, *Recherches*, pp. 227-34]; Id., "Nouveaux liens objectifs entre le Pseudo-Denys et Proclus", *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 63 (1979), pp. 3-16 [= Saffrey, *Recherches*, pp. 235-48]; Id., "Le lien le plus objectif entre le Pseudo-Denys et Proclus", in J. Hamesse (ed.), *Roma, magistra mundi. Itineraria culturae mediaevalis. Mélanges offerts au Père L. E. Boyle à l'occasion de son 75^e anniversaire*, Brepols, Turnhout 1998 (Textes et Études du Moyen Âge, 10), pp. 791-810 [= Saffrey, *Néoplatonisme*, pp. 239-52]. As Saffrey explains at the beginning of the third article: "J'appelle 'lien objectif' un rapport entre le Pseudo-Denys et Proclus qui ne dépende ni d'une interprétation doctrinale ni d'une hypothèse sur l'identité de l'auteur du *Corpus dionysien*" (p. 792 [239]).

II. History of Texts

In Father Saffrey's philological production, manuscripts are not only witnesses of variant readings. They have a history of their own, and this reflects the history of the texts and therefore the history of the ideas transmitted by these very texts. Such a view, in which a material object, i.e. the manuscript, plays an essential role in the development of major currents of thought, is the basis of all the aforementioned critical editions. As a matter of fact, the introduction to the first volume of the *Theol. Plat.* contains a section devoted to the history of the text,⁶³ greatly enriched in the introduction to volume V, in which the third chapter studies "Un chaînon méconnu de la tradition proclienne: Georges Pachymère".⁶⁴ The two primary manuscripts of Iamblichus's *Reply to Porphyry* belonged to Ficino and Bessarion respectively, and Ficino's philological activity on Iamblichus's text and his autographical notes preserved in *Vallicellianus* F 20 determined not only the transmission of the text, but also its interpretation to the present day. This interest in the history of texts is at the origin of several studies dealing with a wide range of themes, from Plato to the Renaissance.

Saffrey devoted two articles to the *Parisinus gr.* 1807, Plato's manuscript A, in which he retraced the astonishing journey of this manuscript, from Constantinople to Petrarch's library via Armenia.⁶⁵ Bessarion's autographical notes are discussed in four articles that clearly explain the Cardinal's method of study and annotation.⁶⁶ As for Ficino, in addition to the two studies closely related to the edition of Iamblichus's *Reply to Porphyry*,⁶⁷ we should cite an article on the *Riccardianus* 70, a manuscript of the *Theol. Plat.* annotated by Ficino.⁶⁸

An article devoted to the Latin translation by Pietro Balbi deals with the history of the *Theol. Plat.*⁶⁹ This article was already announced in the first volume of the *Theol. Plat.*; here Saffrey and Westerink reach the conclusion that "pour l'établissement du texte grec de

⁶³ *Theol. Plat.* I, pp. CL-CLX.

⁶⁴ *Theol. Plat.* V, pp. LVIII-LXIX.

⁶⁵ H.D. Saffrey, "Nouvelles observations sur le manuscrit *Parisinus graecus* 1807", in M. Joyal (ed.), *Studies in Plato and the Platonic Tradition. Essays Presented to John Whittaker*, Ashgate, Aldershot 1997, pp. 293-306 + 1 plate [= Saffrey, *Neoplatonisme*, pp. 255-66]; Id., "Retour sur le *Parisinus graecus* 1807, le manuscrit A de Platon", in C. D'Ancona (ed.), *The Libraries of the Neoplatonists. Proceedings of the Meeting of the European Science Foundation Network "Late Antiquity and Arabic Thought"*, Brill, Leiden-Boston 2007 (*Philosophia Antiqua*, 107), pp. 3-28.

⁶⁶ H.D. Saffrey, review of "Plato latinus III", *Deutsche Literaturzeitung* 81, 7/8 (Juli/Aug. 1960), coll. 621-9 (about the *Ambrosianus* B 165 sup., containing Proclus's *In Parm.*); Id., "Recherches sur quelques autographes du cardinal Bessarion et leur caractère autobiographique", in *Mélanges Eugène Tisserant*, vol. III, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Città del Vaticano 1964 (*Studi e Testi*, 233), pp. 263-97 [= Saffrey, *Héritage*, pp. 95-131]; Id., "Notes autographes du cardinal Bessarion dans un manuscrit de Munich", *Byzantion* 35 (1965), pp. 536-63 [= Saffrey, *Héritage*, pp. 132-65]; Id., "Un exercice de latin philosophique, autographe du cardinal Bessarion", in *Miscellanea Marciana di Studi Bessarionei*, Editrice Antenore, Padova 1976 (*Medioevo e Umanesimo*, 24), pp. 371-9 + 1 plate [= Saffrey, *Héritage*, pp. 177-87].

⁶⁷ Cf. *supra*, n. 47.

⁶⁸ H.D. Saffrey, "Notes platoniciennes de Marsile Ficin dans un manuscrit de Proclus (*Cod. Riccardianus* 70)", *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance* 21 (1959), pp. 161-84 [= Saffrey, *Héritage*, pp. 69-94]. The MS. *Riccardianus* 70 (= f in the Saffrey-Westerink edition of the *Theol. Plat.*) descends from the manuscript P.

⁶⁹ "Pietro Balbi et la première traduction latine de la *Théologie platonicienne* de Proclus", in P. Cockshaw – M.-C. Garand – P. Jodogne (eds.), *Miscellanea codicologica F. Masai dicata*, E. Story-Scientia S.P.R.L. Éditions scientifiques, Gand 1979, pp. 425-37 [= Saffrey, *Héritage*, pp. 189-201].

la *Théol. plat.*, la traduction de Balbi, plus littéraire que précise, et témoin d'un original grec voisin de n [= *Monac. gr.* 547], ne saurait être d'aucun secours".⁷⁰

A crucial step in the survival of Neoplatonism was undoubtedly the publication, in 1492, of the Latin translation of Plotinus's *Enneads* by Marsilio Ficino, which marks Plotinus's return to the West after centuries of oblivion. This publication was analysed in a seminal article published in French in 1995 and translated into English one year later.⁷¹

Even in a completely different field, i.e. alchemy, Saffrey's article on *Marcianus gr.* 299 should be mentioned; it is a true masterpiece in which, thanks to his codicological competence and knowledge of the texts, Saffrey was able to reconstruct the original structure of this manuscript, the oldest document on Greek alchemy which has come down to us, except for the two papyri of Leiden and Stockholm.⁷²

To conclude this all too brief overview of Saffrey's studies on the history of texts, it is important to mention the volume published in 2003, edited by Saffrey with Aubrey Diller († 1985) and Leendert G. Westerink († 1990), on the Greek library of Cardinal Domenico Grimani.⁷³ The edition of the documents concerning Grimani's library (among which the most important is the catalogue of the library itself) is preceded by an introduction which traces Grimani's intellectual biography and contains an appendix in which the editors publish about thirty prefaces addressed to Grimani. In his "Avant-propos" (p. 2), Saffrey writes:

Ce livre doit être considéré comme un hommage à l'intrépidité et à la science immense de ces deux grands philologues, Aubrey Diller et L.G. Westerink, et ce n'est pas sans émotion que je fais revivre leur souvenir que la lecture souvent reprise de leurs travaux rend toujours vivant.

Masters and friends disappear: Dodds († 1979), Festugière († 1982), Diller († 1985), Westerink († 1990), Segonds († 2011). But their legacy and memory remain forever, just as the immense joy of having sought the truth side by side: *In dulcedine societatis quaerere veritatem* could be the motto that epitomizes the personality and the scientific work of Henri Dominique Saffrey.⁷⁴

⁷⁰ *Theol. Plat.* I, p. CXXVI.

⁷¹ H.D. Saffrey, "Florence, 1492: réapparaît Plotin", *Freiburger Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie* 42 (1995), pp. 134-51. English version "Florence, 1492: The Reappearance of Plotinus", *Renaissance Quarterly* 49 (1996), pp. 488-508 [= Saffrey, *Néoplatonisme*, pp. 277-93].

⁷² H.D. Saffrey, "Historique et description du manuscrit alchimique de Venise *Marcianus Graecus* 299", in D. Kahn – S. Matton (eds.), *Alchimie: art, histoire et mythes. Actes du I^{er} Colloque international de la Société d'Étude de l'Histoire de l'Alchimie*, S.E.H.A.-Archè, Paris-Milan 1995 (Textes et Travaux de Chrysopœia, I), pp. 1-10 [= Saffrey, *Néoplatonisme*, pp. 267-76].

⁷³ A. Diller – H.D. Saffrey – L.G. Westerink, *Bibliotheca Graeca Manuscripta Cardinalis Domini Grimani (1461-1523)*, Edizioni della Laguna, Venezia 2003 (Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana. Collana di Studi, 1).

⁷⁴ Father Henri Dominique Saffrey passed away on May 20, 2021. His career and his scientific production have been recently described by Ph. Hoffmann, "Henri-Dominique Saffrey (1921-2021). *In memoriam*", *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 104 (2020), pp. 601-31, and L. Brisson, "Henri Paul André Saffrey, 1921-2021", *The International Journal of the Platonic Tradition* 15 (2021), pp. 125-7.

