

## **Call for abstracts for the 2020 ISNS Conference in Athens (June 10-14, 2020)**

### **The Divine and the Natural World: Animals, Place, Time, and the Environment in the Platonic Tradition**

Crystal Addey <[crystal.addey@ucc.ie](mailto:crystal.addey@ucc.ie)>, Marilynn Lawrence <[pronoia12@gmail.com](mailto:pronoia12@gmail.com)>, and Rob Berchman <[berchmanrob@earthlink.net](mailto:berchmanrob@earthlink.net)>

Humanity is facing an extraordinary climate emergency and environmental crisis: global warming continues to worsen and, according to well-respected scientists, we may well be currently facing disastrous climate ‘tipping’ points (see especially Lenton et. al 2019). The air in many cities, and waters (oceans, rivers), are polluted and toxic, and deforestation continues and even increases. Our planet’s wildlife and animals are in crisis, as species are becoming extinct at an alarming rate. Does ancient philosophy, and specifically the Platonic tradition, have anything to offer us in the face of this crisis? For our conference in Athens - the city that has often been considered to be the ‘place’ of philosophy *par excellence* - we welcome abstracts that explore this question from diverse perspectives – including (but not limited to) ethics, political philosophy, ontology, ancient religions, theology and cosmology. How did Platonist philosophers, from Plato through to Proclus and beyond, conceive of and think through the relationship between the divine (gods, goddesses, *daimones*, angels, heroes), stars, humans, animals, rivers, trees, plants and the land or earth itself? What kind of worldviews did they inhabit and conceptualise in relation to these beings and entities? How and in what ways were the ontological, ethical, and epistemological status of gods, stars, humans, animals and plants conceived? How was the relationship between the divine and the natural world framed by these philosophers, what reflections did they offer on the nature of landscape and place - and human relations with them, and how did the ways of life encouraged, instigated and exemplified by them frame and affect these relationships? Is it possible to characterise their philosophies and worldviews as ‘ecocentric’ or ‘anthropocentric’? What influences and impacts have their philosophical conceptions of the natural world had on later periods and on current times? To what extent was the Platonist philosopher rooted in place, landscape and the natural world? How did she or he relate to stars, animals, trees and plants, alongside relations with the divine and the daimonic? And do these philosophical conceptions and worldviews have any possible relevance or implications for how we might now relate to nature and move through our current environmental crises?

### **Proclus and Causes: problems in epistemology, ethics, and metaphysics**

Sara Ahbel-Rappe <[rappe@umich.edu](mailto:rappe@umich.edu)>

In this panel, we will address complications arising from Proclus’ commentaries and treatises concerning topics in ethics, epistemology, and metaphysics. Proclus’ system is built on a complex matrix of premises and a bold application of principles to specific contexts. The theory that the cause is greater than the effect and that the Good is a cause of all are themselves premises that receive dialectical challenges from Damascius. Proclus’ epistemology also presents potential problems that arise from the place of the soul vis à vis the intellect and the meaning of reversion to the cause. Finally, Proclus’ theorizing on providence and nature suggest methods of evaluating moral responsibility with regard to human agency and cosmic dispensation that also raise problems.

Papers that treat any of these issues are welcome. You may also include comparative material, as for example, looking at Proclus alongside other theoretical systems, later or earlier philosophers, or even other traditions.

### **Plotinus' Rational Approach to Artistic Beauty and its Impact on Twentieth Century Art and Science.**

Aphrodite Alexandrakis <aalexandrakis@barry.edu>

Plotinus discusses the rational, conscious, human activity that consists of the φανταστικον and the διανοητικον (innate knowledge). I.4.10. While διανοια can be independent of imagination, (has its own consciousness), imagination works along with διανοια and the Plotinian διανοητικον and φανταστικον are found in the human intellect's experience.

Interestingly, and on the same lines, Albert Einstein said:

"Imagination is more important than knowledge. Knowledge is limited. Imagination encircles the world." And Picasso added: "Everything you can imagine is real..."

The above influenced both, 20th century artistic works and some scientific theories, especially in Physics. This panel will study the Plotinian theory of imagination, its meaning and influence on certain 20<sup>th</sup> century artists and scientists.

### **Neoplatonism in the late Middle Ages: from Eckhart to Cusanus**

Oscar Federico Bauchwitz <bauchwitz1930@gmail.com> and Claudia D'Amico <claufabidamico@gmail.com>

This panel will explore examples of Christian Neoplatonists of in this period and consider the originality (or lack thereof) of their use of such sources as Augustine, Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite, John Scotus Eriugena, Albert the Great, the Arabic *Liber de causis*, and the direct reception of the Proclus' work in Latin version.

Although the panel focuses on Eckhart and Cusanus, we also welcome related papers about other authors who flourished between the beginning of the fourteenth and the first half of the fifteenth century, that is, the time immediately preceding the full translation of Plotinus' work. Topics may be related to metaphysics, epistemology, mysticism, ethics or aesthetics.

### **Prophecy, Divination, and Foreknowledge in Neoplatonism: the God(esse)s of Providence**

Dylan Burns <dylanburns93@yahoo.com> and Danielle Layne <layne@gonzaga.edu>

Ritual cultures and practices concerned with prophecy, divination, and revelatory activity posed a variety of problems and opportunities for ancient Mediterranean philosophers. What is the status of prophetic knowledge? Which entities are at work in prophecy and divination – gods, daimones, humans, or some combination thereof? What is the relationship of the philosopher to the established divinatory institutions, shrines, or cults, whether Greek, Roman, or Christian? If a deity prophesies something, to what extent can humans be responsible parties in the prophesied event? Notions of divine knowledge tends to presuppose the divine, and so questions of prophecy and divination tend to be bound up with the existence and character of gods and goddesses. This panel calls for papers that explore how Platonizing thinkers considered, theorized, and named the divine actors at work in prophecy and divination, particularly as regards the relationship between female divinities in Neoplatonism, foreknowledge, and fate, as well as the question of the providential character of deities in divinatory contexts.

## Neoplatonic Aesthetics

Jean-Michel Charrue <jmcharrue@free.fr>

What is Aesthetics? Is there a Neoplatonic Aesthetics? If there is one, it will be the great Aesthetics that goes from Plotinus to Marsilio Ficino, through history. But are there one or more Neoplatonic Aesthetics?

Neoplatonism is rich in different contributions from its authors, such as Porphyry, Proclus, etc. and beyond, from its various sources, so that it may be interesting to confront the richness of everyone's views.

Topics that one may consider might include but are not limited to:

-If Aesthetics is the science of Beauty, is there an Aesthetics of the sensible, spiritual, or divine world? Can we speak about one Neoplatonic Aesthetics expressed in the various Neoplatonists (such as Plotinus, Porphyry, Proclus, Ps-Dionysius, Boethius, Ficino).

-Is Beauty more in the things and beings or more in our souls?

-How can we link Music and Poetics to that Neoplatonic Aesthetics?

## Marsilio Ficino as a Commentator

Anna Corrias <a.corrias@utoronto.ca> and Stephen Gersh <Stephen.E.Gersh.1@nd.edu>

This panel will explore Marsilio Ficino's role as a commentator, both in itself and in relation to the other roles – especially that of translator and philosopher in his own right– which establish Ficino's intellectual identity. We invite contributions on the following topics: Ficino's choices of sources (Plato, Plotinus, Iamblichus, Dionysius the Areopagite etc.); the gestation of Ficino's commentaries (for example, through an analysis of Ficino's reading practices, scholia in Ficino's manuscripts, and the explicit or implicit presence of an author in works which precede the publication of the commentary on that author); Ficino's methods of commentary (long, short, interpolated, paraphrased translation, etc.); the doctrinal filiation between Ficino's own philosophical positions and those of his sources; the relations between Ficino's translations and his commentaries.

## A Text Worthy of Plotinus

Kevin Corrigan <kcorrigan@emory.edu> and Suzanne Stern-Gillet

<suzannesterngillet@gmail.com>

One of the great scholarly achievements of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century was the first reliable Greek edition of Plotinus' *Enneads* prepared by P. Henry and H-R. Schwyzler, *Plotini Opera, editio major*, 3 vols. (Brussels, Paris, and Leiden, 1951-1973), followed by the appearance of the *editio minor*, 3 vols. (Oxford, 1964-1983). In their thirty years of intense collaborative work, the two men also benefited from epistolary exchanges with major scholars, among whom Dodds, Trouillard, Armstrong and Igal. Their edition, which is to be seen as an advance on the editorial work of Harder-Beutler-Theiler and Cilento, formed the basis of translations first into Dutch (Ferwerda), English (Armstrong), Spanish (Igal), and later into Modern Greek, Chinese, Japanese, Russian, Hebrew, Portuguese etc. The years from 1952 to ca 1989, therefore, were not only the most exciting period for Plotinian scholarship since the emergence of Ficino's translation and commentary in 1492, but they also laid the basis for the detailed exegetical and philosophical study of the *Enneads* that has emerged over the last thirty years.

Since the correspondence has only surfaced recently and is therefore not yet in the public domain, we would like to invite participants of this ISNS meeting to get a preview of our book soon to appear from the University of Leuven Press (edited by Suzanne Stern-Gillet and Kevin

Corrigan)—*A Text Worthy of Plotinus: The Correspondence of Armstrong, Henry, Schwyzer, Dodds, Igal and Trouillard*. The participants in this large editorial project will introduce the correspondence itself, as well as Henry's memoirs, and sketch the potential contribution that these newly discovered documents can make to the study of Plotinus' philosophy at the present time. The topics broached will include the codicological researches of Henry, the distinctive methodology of Henry and Schwyzer, the detailed editorial suggestions made by Igal, and Armstrong's role as the main recipient of the letters and the influence they had on his translation. Anyone interested in participating in this panel discussion about elements of this project or the broader context in which it is situated is welcome.

### **Platonism and Christian Thought in Late Antiquity and Byzantium: Rivals, alliances, or merely a continuum?**

Vladimir Cvetkovic <vlad.cvetkovic@gmail.com> and Panagiotis G. Pavlos  
<panagiotis.pavlos@ifikk.uio.no>

In Plato's *Timaeus* man's capacity for receiving is substantial for advancing in the knowledge of the cosmos and the first principles. In the Gospel of St. John, human receptivity is proclaimed as the paramount virtue that allows the Logos to transform human beings into sons of God. Yet, the discussion on similarities, differences, and the multifaceted, complex relation, between Platonism and Christianity remains most challenging; has Platonism bequeathed Christian thought with anything more than its language and philosophical tools, anything new to the Christian ecclesiastical experience and teaching? Is there any influence of Christianity on Platonism, and, if yes, of what sort? Are there any grounds to speak about a genuine unification of, or even a continuum between, the two movements? Is there such a thing as Christian Platonism at all?

The aim of this panel is to dive—systematically, historically and with a view to modern relevant debates—into fundamental notions and accounts central to the Platonic and the Christian tradition, such as: *autexousion*, consubstantiality, essence (*ousia*), hierarchy, *hypostasis* (substance), logos, person, freedom and necessity, time and eternity; shedding new light on aspects of anthropology, Christology, cosmology, metaphysics, and trinitarian theology. Special attention, not exclusive though, will be paid to Plotinus, the Cappadocians, Proclus, Dionysius the Areopagite, Philoponus and Maximus the Confessor. The panel is open to papers that expand the above research questions and focus on transmissions, receptions, rejections, appropriations, transformations, continuities, discontinuities, bifurcations and novelties occurred in Platonism and Christian Thought during their development and encounter in Late Antique and early Byzantine times.

### **Soul, Intellect, and Afterlife**

John F. Finamore <john-finamore@uiowa.edu> and Ilaria Ramelli <i.l.e.ramelli@durham.ac.uk>  
Plato described the nature and function of the human soul in his dialogues. Later Platonists adopted and adapted his doctrines. This panel explores the ways that Platonists conceived the human soul as an Intelligible being housed in an earthly body, how they articulated the means of its salvation, and the manner in which they imagined its afterlife once freed from the body. Possible topics include (but are not limited to) the relationship between soul and body, the ascent ritual and salvation of the soul, the soul's union with Intellect, the function of intermediary divinities in the soul's salvation.

## **Delphic Philosophy**

Michael Griffin <[michael.griffin@ubc.ca](mailto:michael.griffin@ubc.ca)>

Description: This panel invites contributions on the influence of the Delphic Oracle, and the person of the Pythia in particular, on ancient Mediterranean thought, with a focus on the Neoplatonic tradition. Topics may include philosophies of self-cultivation and personal transformation in Neoplatonism, including exegesis of the Delphic maxims (e.g., Proclus, *in Alc.* 1); the possibility of a recognizably "Delphic" influence on political and social policy (and the question whether strands of Delphic "policy" can be detected in the Platonic tradition); the broader intersection between Delphic and Platonic intellectual traditions; and the role of the Pythia as a teacher and woman intellectual in antiquity, represented by biographical reports of her activity as a teacher and collaborator of philosophers like Pythagoras and Plutarch of Chaeronea.

## **Plotinus' Metaphysics**

D.M.Hutchinson <[dmunoz@stolaf.edu](mailto:dmunoz@stolaf.edu)> and Damian Caluori <[dcaluori@ed.ac.uk](mailto:dcaluori@ed.ac.uk)>

Plotinus devotes three treatises to the genera of being, VI.1-3 (42–44) that involve a lengthy examination of the Stoic and Aristotelian genera and a development of his own Platonic theory. Of course, these treatises are not an isolated analysis of the genera of being. They overlap considerably with the discussion of eternity and time in 3.7 (45), sensible substance in 2.6 (17), Ideas of individuals in 5.7 (18), and the ontological status of numbers in 6.6 (34).

This panel welcomes papers on VI.1-3 and traditional metaphysical issues that overlap with VI.1-3, such as substance, causality, time, the genera of being, the composition and persistence of sensibles, Ideas of individuals, and so forth.

## **Neoplatonic thought in a contemporary perspective: metaphysics, morals and the environmental crisis**

Francis Lacroix <[francis.lacroix.2@ulaval.ca](mailto:francis.lacroix.2@ulaval.ca)> and Louis-Étienne Pigeon <[louis-etienne.pigeon@fp.ulaval.ca](mailto:louis-etienne.pigeon@fp.ulaval.ca)>

The environmental crisis is at the core of contemporary issues, as well as it questions the fundamental philosophical assumptions defining them. In regards to this, many environmental philosophers are searching for ways to reverse anthropocentrism, an ethical position considered responsible for the said crisis. But ancient thinkers had given us examples, for already in Plotinus' philosophy we find the basis for a non-anthropocentric conception of the world in which humans and non-humans beings coexist.

Following this, is it possible to refresh Plotinus' neoplatonic philosophy in order to build a better world in the present and for the future? In the line drawn by Pierre Hadot, this panel aims to rethink our way of life from a neoplatonic perspective, considering contemporary issues and more precisely the environmental crisis. In regards to this, Plotinian thought is highly inspiring as it focuses on *phusis* more than it does on humanity proper say. Indeed, the philosopher affirms in his treatise 30 (III 9) that all living beings contemplate, even plants, thus granting an entitled status to every living form and therefore drawing away somehow from the anthropocentric character of classical Greek philosophy.

More recently, the environmental philosopher and founder of *deep ecology*, Arne Naess, rightly criticized modern thought as incapable of grasping the holistic nature of our environment: the biosphere. This would, according to him, largely explain modernity's anthropocentric ethical perspective. Following this diagnostic, it seems justified to explore premodern (or non-modern)

holistic worldviews in order build an updated representation of our world in which human and non-human beings participate in a common and greater good. Plotinus' thought is a fertile avenue for the contemporary thinker who desires to go beyond modernity and searches for a non-anthropocentric worldview.

This panel will focus on two main themes: 1) Can a philosophy of *phusis* help us to rethink nature in a contemporary setting? And 2) How can the ancient conception of virtues help us orient environmental ethics today? The organizers welcome communication propositions that will explore these questions precisely, or broaden the spectrum here defined.

### **Theandrites: Byzantine Philosophy and Christian Platonism**

Frederick Lauritzen <[frederick.lauritzen@new.oxon.org](mailto:frederick.lauritzen@new.oxon.org)> and Sarah Klitenic Wear <[swear@franciscan.edu](mailto:swear@franciscan.edu)>

This panel focuses on the reception of Platonism in the Christian philosophy of the Byzantine era (4<sup>th</sup>-15<sup>th</sup> centuries), an era marking the creation of a unique dialogue between Hellenic Platonism and the theology of the Church Fathers and Byzantine Christians. The panel is open to all issues relating to Byzantine Platonism. This includes: Christians in the Greek-speaking East and their relationship to the Latin tradition in the West, as well as the Christian Platonism found in contemporary church fathers, the Greek-speaking Christians in late antique Gaza, Athens, and Alexandria; the philosophical theology of Pseudo-Dionysius, Maximus, and John Damascene; the later reception of Platonic theories on the soul, time, and eternity, and metaphysics, as well as ritual among Greek Christians and Hellenes. We welcome papers that trace Platonic ideas, terminology, and methodology as they move throughout the Eastern Roman Empire and the Byzantine Orthodox world.

### **Non-Anachronistic Neoplatonic Readings of Plato”**

D. Gregory MacIsaac <[gregory.macisaac@carleton.ca](mailto:gregory.macisaac@carleton.ca)>

This panel seeks to establish accurate readings of the Platonic dialogues by making use of the particular hermeneutical strengths of Neoplatonic scholars. To a great extent, Neoplatonism is a commentary tradition whose aim is to present the genuine thought of Plato. While often guilty of wild anachronism in attributing its own metaphysical positions to Plato, the practice itself of finding their own doctrines in the dialogues forced Neoplatonists to become very sophisticated readers, with an attention to Plato's own words rarely matched by contemporary readers. This puts scholars of Neoplatonism in the advantageous position of benefitting from the close observations of the texts made by Neoplatonists, while also being able to detect and avoid their anachronisms in our own readings of Plato. Because Neoplatonic scholars are familiar with the later tradition, they are well-placed to avoid 'solving' problems in Platonic dialogues by naïvely attributing to him positions that only became thinkable with Aristotle, the Stoics, or Middle or Neoplatonists, to say nothing of the mis-characterisations that come from using Cartesian dualism or contemporary symbolic logic as one's touchstones of interpretation.

Contributors are invited to submit paper proposals that would fall roughly into one of two groups:

A) Neoplatonic Interpretive Content: Readings of the dialogues by ancient Neoplatonists that are plausible, i.e. non-anachronistic, but are not commonly found in contemporary scholarship on Plato.

B) Neoplatonic Interpretive Principles: New readings of the dialogues that consciously avoid anachronism and that make use of those Neoplatonic interpretive principles that can plausibly be

attributed to Plato, e.g. reading each dialogue as a whole argument, close attention to language and dramatic elements, an awareness that Plato's work is in conversation with other thinkers and with his culture, and perhaps the assumption of Unitarianism.

### **Neoplatonism in Comparative Light: Individuality and how it expands through Ascent**

Deepa Majumdar <dmajumda@pnw.edu>

In this panel we welcome papers that compare conceptions of individuality in Neoplatonism with those in other traditions, whether western or not. We address issues such as whether soul, self or mind best describe the individual. We explore other questions as well. What is the role of the ego? Is it the ultimate locus of individuality? Or is it something to flee from in our quest for self-actualization? Is soul a bearer of the self? How do we characterize transformations in the individual – especially the expansion of the self, through empathy, from literally the individual ego – to the collective consciousness and more? What is the role of the First Principle in this expansion? How do we characterize more mundane transformations – through the rounds of reincarnation?

### **The Plato-Homer Question in Antiquity: Philosophers and Scholars**

Christina-Panagiota Manolea <[christinamanolea@hotmail.gr](mailto:christinamanolea@hotmail.gr)> and François Renaud

<[francois.renaud@umoncton.ca](mailto:francois.renaud@umoncton.ca)>

Plato's famous and infamous criticism of Homer constitutes the climax of a long series of attacks on the first and greatest Greek poet Homer (Xenophanes, Heraclitus, etc.). It triggers in turn an even longer series of responses attempting to reconcile the two great authors or, in some cases, to perpetuate and justify further "the old quarrel between philosophy and poetry" (*Rep.* 607b-c). The so-called Plato-Homer problem is roughly twofold, with numberless ramifications and sub-issues: Why does Plato repeatedly attack and even exile the greatest cultural authority of the Greek world? And why does he do so while showing intimate familiarity with his two epic poems (he quotes Homer more often than any other poet or prose writer) and even incorporating many features of Homeric poetry in his dialogues? The panel welcomes a wide range of approaches: not only direct responses to the Plato-Homer controversy on the part of Platonically minded writers, but also interpretations and testimonies on Homer and/or Plato, from philosophers, poets and scholars who do not necessarily respond to the Plato-Homer question directly, but nonetheless shed light on it. Possible topics comprise: reconciliation through allegory (the dominant trend), non-allegoric reconciliation, disapproval of various sorts, "neutral" literary criticism with pertinent implications, etc., on myth, the divine, mimesis, inspiration, soul, ethics, etc. We welcome original treatments on major interpreters (Heraclitus the grammarian, Pseudo-Plutarch, Porphyry, Proclus, etc.), but especially lesser-known or somewhat lesser researched figures, including grammarians and rhetoricians, as well as neglected aspects of major texts, from the time of Plato to the 6<sup>th</sup> century AD.

### **Plato's Reception in Modern (Historiography of) Philosophy (from the 18<sup>th</sup> century until now)**

Tomasz Mróz <[tmroz1@gmail.com](mailto:tmroz1@gmail.com)>

The aim of this panel is to explore philosophical assumptions and/or ideological positions of the authors who devoted significant parts of their production to Plato; we would like to discuss their personal or ideological motivations, constraints, conditions and results achieved by them.

Simply, to address the question of who, where, why, and to what purpose they took their time to investigate Plato's dialogues during the last three centuries.

Research on historiography of philosophy frequently reveals philosophical essence that is, deliberately or not, hidden under the robe of historical narrative. It is often difficult, if at all possible, to draw the line between historical presentations, interpretations or deliberations in which Plato served only as a mirror to reflect the modern author's own views. Past historical research on authenticity or chronology of the dialogues, or on greater significance of some dialogues over the others frequently served philosophical or ideological purposes and revealed the philosophical or political position of the historian, of the philosopher who addressed the problem of discussing Plato's philosophy.

West European and American interpretations and renderings of Plato constitute a natural resource for such deliberations, but prospective participants who research less obvious philosophical traditions, less frequently presented in English (non-European, East or Central European thought) are especially encouraged to submit their proposals. The above description does not, certainly, exhaust the list of problems resulting from investigating of numerous works and chapters on Plato in the given period.

### **Nature and Soul in the Greek Neoplatonic Tradition**

Melina G. Mouzala <[mmouzala@upatras.gr](mailto:mmouzala@upatras.gr)> and Elias Tempelis <[chrisdar@otenet.gr](mailto:chrisdar@otenet.gr)>

Nature and soul are two key-themes which have been intensively examined in the context of the Greek Neo-Platonic philosophy. Issues that deal with both the soul and nature separately and the relationship that links them or the differences that define their limits when they function in parallel are welcome in this panel.

It would be helpful and useful to have a discussion on the following topics (without the list being exhaustive):

- What is the essence or the nature of the soul and how is it conceived of in relation to the body (considered in a broad sense, i.e. regarding any ensouled being) with which it coexists?
- What is the position of the individual soul in cosmos, and what is its relation to the senses and the sensible things surrounding it?
- What is the relation of the cosmic soul/soul of the universe to nature and matter?
- What is nature as a principle (archē) and what is its relation to soul? How is this relationship understood in the Greek Neo-Platonic philosophy?
- Neoplatonic interpretations of the Platonic and Aristotelian approaches to nature and soul, as well as their interrelations.

### **The Neoplatonists on method, style and epistemic advancement**

Pauliina Remes <[pauliina.remes@filosofi.uu.se](mailto:pauliina.remes@filosofi.uu.se)>

Neoplatonists are famous for reflecting upon the interpretative principles they use in commenting their predecessors, and for sophisticated theories of knowledge and intellection. What we find less of are explicit statements, not to mention treatises, that would explicate the methodology used and the way in which it serves the purpose of knowledge-acquisition and philosophical advancement. In Plotinus, the treatise on dialectic (I.3) is among the shortest ones, and the reader is left wondering both how dialectic operates as well as whether the suggested method is put to practice in his other treatises. Both Plotinus and other Neoplatonists do, however, make passing comments on their methodology in the act of philosophising, as part of their writings even when the main focus would be on some other thematic.



This panel welcomes papers on dialectic and other philosophical methods used by Neoplatonists. The presentations can concentrate on distinctly Neoplatonic methods or the earlier methodologies that the Neoplatonists followed. The focus will be on the role of method and writing style in epistemic advancement. For example: how do methods guide philosophising and make us better at it? Does a method sharpen our concepts? Does it lead from particular to general, and if so, how? Does it create systematicity, and how would that happen? Can philosophical methods help grounding our everyday philosophising in real beings? What are the possibilities, operations, limits, and problems of these methods?

### **Emotions in Early Modern Platonic Philosophy**

Natalia Strok <[natiska@gmail.com](mailto:natiska@gmail.com)> and Valentina Zaffino <[zaffino@pul.it](mailto:zaffino@pul.it)>

Platonism has always been associated with Rationalism. But over the last few decades there have been studies on the relationship between this trend and the emotions and passions present in the human soul. This topic has its difficulty as emotions have been regarded by philosophers with suspicion. Nevertheless, their existence cannot be denied. Do passions have importance for metaphysics? Do they resemble something about reality? What is their importance concerning human understanding and human practical affairs? As organizers we are interested, in particular, in two different manifestations of this: the conception of pain and of enthusiasm. Pain and suffering can have important roles in the unfolding of creation in philosophical thought, such as in Anne Conway's philosophy, because she understands that it spiritualizes the created world and also serves as an important tool for knowledge. In *The Principle of the Most Ancient and Modern Philosophy* (1692) Lady Conway writes that through suffering the world becomes more perfect because: "all pain and torment stimulates the life or spirit existing in everything that suffers" (*Principles* VII, 1 (43)).

Moreover, according to the Cambridge Platonists, in some cases enthusiasm was identified with fanaticism and the social upheaval caused by religion. In particular, this is Henry More's point of view in *Enthusiasmus Triumphatus* (1656; 1679). Therefore, deviant imagination is opposed to reason: while the former pushes someone to agree upon false phenomena which seem deceiving, the latter assesses the truthfulness of logical propositions and natural phenomena. For, according to More, religious enthusiasm is a serious illness that can be cured with three medicines: temperance, humility, and reason. In any case, we must also remember that Shaftesbury, in his *Letter Concerning Enthusiasm* (1708), would later distinguish between enthusiasm and fanaticism.

Additionally, Spinoza's conception of emotions and its relationship to Early Modern Platonism is of interest to our panel. He developed a complex theory of affects that had a huge impact on Modern thought.

In this regard, our aim is to reconstruct the debate about rejecting or not rejecting emotions, considering that the different thesis flourished in the Neoplatonic cultural milieu.

We invite papers on these and other emotions or passions in authors of the Renaissance and Early Modern period.

### **(Re-)Considering Platonic Dubia**

William Wians <[wiansw@merrimack.edu](mailto:wiansw@merrimack.edu)>

Modern scholarship has cast doubt on the authorship of several dialogues included in the Thrasyllan catalogue of Plato's works. This panel seeks proposals for current assessments of arguments for and against these Platonic dubia. Proposals may address the question of

authenticity either collectively or with regard to individual dialogues that have been doubted and defended in recent scholarship: Cleitophon, Theages, Alcibiades I and II, Erastai, Hippias Major, Hipparchus, Minos, Epinomos, and the Letters. Close readings of particular dialogues that draw on both philosophical and “literary” dimensions of Plato’s philosophical technique are particularly encouraged. A study of how one or more of the doubted dialogues is treated by later ancient Platonists would also be of interest, as would a “reception” paper devoted to the 19th-century debate on authenticity (e.g., to the arguments initiated by Schleiermacher or Grote). Both doubters and defenders are welcome to submit proposals. Proposals that respond primarily to some other recent commentator are not likely to be selected.