

Les Platonismes de l'Antiquité Tardive

Base de données et répertoire bibliographique sur les liens entre médio- et néoplatonisme, gnosticisme, hermétisme et oracles chaldaïques

— Titre de la fiche —

- ◆ Meijer, p. 18-19, Traité 9, Un, Intellect, supranoétique

— Auteur principal —

Auteur moderne du commentaire et œuvre

- ◆ Meijer, P. A., *Plotinus On the Good or the One (Enneads VI, 9) : An Analytical Commentary, Amsterdam, Gieben, 1992.*

Commentaire

◆ Krämer suggests the possibility of more sources of the Superone-conception which could have inspired Ammonius and (indirectly via Ammonius) Plotinus: Eudorus, Moderatus, Philo, the Valentinians (note 63: Although it is not unreasonable to consider Gnostic sources as important for the development of Plotinus' theory of the position of the supranoetic One and his derivation-system, something in fact suggested by Jonas, (*Gnosis und spätantiker Geist*, II, 161 passim), Krämer (*Geistmetaphysik*, 263) himself ultimately does not convert himself to this view: "Nicht, alsob Plotin etwa von Valentin abhängig wäre". He sees the presence of a preplotinian ontological tradition as an independent source of both Gnosticism and Neoplatonism as well. See on Plotinus and Gnosticism below 332 ff.), and Ammonius' contemporaries like Clemens Alexandrinus, or Origenes, the Christian (note 64: see Krämer, *Geistmetaphysik*, 294, n. 400). The expressions we come across e.g. in Philo and Origenes about the ineffability of the One (note 65: See Krämer, *Geistmetaphysik*, 282, n. 342) and its position beyond its inferiors, however remarkable they may seem, are all to be seen as different ways of presenting the mind-character of the One, sometimes denying mind and sometimes ascribing mind to the One, which Krämer himself observes (note 66: See Krämer, *Geistmetaphysik*, 287, n. 365). (p. 18-19).

Contexte du commentaire

- ◆ Introduction au Traité 9 (VI, 9), chapitre 1, partie « History of the one »

— Mots-clés —

Français

- ◆ Un
- ◆ Intellect
- ◆ supranoétique

— Liens —

- ◆ Plotin/Gnostiques : problématique commune aux deux auteurs.

- ◆ Plotin/Chrétiens : problématique commune aux deux auteurs.

— Auteurs secondaires —

Auteur ancien 1 mis en relation dans le commentaire supra cité

- ◆ Valentiniens (de manière générique), *Aucune oeuvre en particulier*

Datation

- ◆ Entre 1 et 800.
-

Auteur ancien 2 mis en relation dans le commentaire supra cité

- ◆ Moderatus (de manière générique), *Aucune oeuvre en particulier*

Datation

- ◆ Entre 1 et 800.
-

Auteur ancien 3 mis en relation dans le commentaire supra cité

- ◆ Chrétiens (de manière générique), *Aucune oeuvre en particulier*

Datation

- ◆ Entre 1 et 800.
-

Auteur ancien 4 mis en relation dans le commentaire supra cité

- ◆ Origène (de manière générique), *Aucune oeuvre en particulier*

Datation

- ◆ Entre 100 et 300.
-

Auteur ancien 5 mis en relation dans le commentaire supra cité

- ◆ Clément d'Alexandrie (de manière générique), *Aucune oeuvre en particulier*

Datation

- ◆ Entre 100 et 300.
-

Auteur ancien 6 mis en relation dans le commentaire supra cité

- ◆ Philon d'Alexandrie (de manière générique), *Aucune oeuvre en particulier*

Datation

- ◆ Entre -100 et 100.
-

Auteur ancien 7 mis en relation dans le commentaire supra cité

- ◆ Eudorus (de manière générique), *Aucune oeuvre en particulier*

Datation

- ◆ Entre 150 et 250.
-

Auteur ancien 8 mis en relation dans le commentaire supra cité

- ◆ Ammonius Saccas (de manière générique), *Aucune oeuvre en particulier*
-

Datation

- ◆ Entre 150 et 250.
-

Auteur ancien 9 mis en relation dans le commentaire supra cité

- ◆ Plotin, *Traité 9 (VI, 9), Sur le Bien ou l'Un, § 1*
-

Datation

- ◆ Entre 254 et 263.
-

— Rédaction de la fiche —

Rédacteur de la fiche

- ◆ Soares Santoprete, L. G., fiche numéro 113, 04-07-2018 15:24:00.

Comment citer cette fiche

- ◆ Soares Santoprete, L. G., *Meijer, p. 18-19, Traité 9, Un, Intellect, supranoétique, 04-07-2018 15:24:00, fiche numéro 113*, [en ligne]. Paris : CNRS, http://philognose.org/?page_id=300&idfiche=113
-

Imprimer

Les Platonismes de l'Antiquité Tardive

Base de données et répertoire bibliographique sur les liens entre médio- et néoplatonisme, gnosticisme, hermétisme et oracles chaldaïques

— Titre de la fiche —

◆ Meijer P. A., p. 175-176, Traité 9, audace, τόλμα

— Auteur principal —

Auteur moderne du commentaire et œuvre

◆ Meijer, P. A., *Plotinus On the Good or the One (Enneads VI, 9) : An Analytical Commentary, Amsterdam, Gieben, 1992.*

Commentaire

◆ Here we meet (for the first time in the Enneads (note 513: 6 [IV, 8], 8, I has the word [τολμήσαι]; but not the special notion, for it means only 'to dare') the famous, the audacity of the mind to remove itself from the One, the active role in the process of emanation, which has as the other side of the coin the abundant and even redundant richness of the One which causes the overflow of what becomes mind. Plausibly it is because of this paradox that Plotinus uses (note 514: The word τόλμα is commented upon by Atkinson, Ennead V, 1, 4, who conveniently summarizes results of others [Baladi, Rist]. See also Armstrong's note ad 10 [V, I], 1 (Transl. V, p. 10) and Bussanich, *The One*, 82 ff. It has Pythagorean roots and has to be connected with the Dyad, but as Atkinson affirms, Plotinus does not actually call it the Dyad, the commencement of plurality. In 9 (VI, 9), 5, 29 Plotinus needs the idea of τόλμα (here τολμήσας) to make plausible that what had the audacity to stand away from the One, cannot, of course, be the One itself. In 10 (V, 1), 1, 4 its meaning is more negative, for there τόλμα is the root of all evil for the soul. In 9 (VI, 9), 5, 29 it concerns the mind and does not display this negative attitude. The mind is just called the most precious thing in Being. Plotinus' readers, following the chronological order, know nothing so far about the audacity of the mind or the soul. With Bussanich (*The One*, 82) I disagree that the statement in 9 (VI, 9), 5, 29 should represent a bolder remark that Plotinus' utterance 'that it would have been better for Intellect not to have desired all things (30 [III, 8, 35-36]'. We must warn against overinterpretation. To ascribe to 9 (VI, 9), 5, 29 pessimistic tones is overinterpretation. In 11 (V, 2), 2, 5-7 τολμηρότατον is the characteristic of the soul which dares to move from the One as far away as possible, which makes it most stupid. I can leave aside here the confrontation with Gnostic τόλμα. I think that Rist (*Monism*, 241) knows too much when writing that the passage 5, 29 "does not mean that it recklessly broke away, but that it has 'faced up' to living apart after its generation – indeed it had no option". Armstrong, *Gnosis*, 117, denies the presence of a paradox: "that the ultimate responsibility for τόλμα lies with the One or the Good itself. And if it originates in the Good, it cannot be bad". The method of explaining away is doing the work for Plotinus, who never suggested anything of the kind. Moreover, even then the paradox remains or is even worse, for in that case the Good is responsible for what in fact is said to be wrong (10 [V, I], I, 4). Plotinus treated the problem of the birth of the mind for the first time in 7 (V, 4), in 10 (V, I), 7 he will return to this issue, in 9 (VI, 9), 5, 29 he touches it only in passing. (p. 175-176).

Contexte du commentaire

- ◆ Commentaire au Traité 9 (VI, 9), § 5, 24-38

Mots-clés

Français

- ◆ audace, audacieux

Grec

- ◆ τόλμα (audace)

Liens

- ◆ Plotin/Gnostiques : présence dans les traités antérieurs à la « tétralogie antignostique » d'arguments antignostiques exposés dans celle-ci.

Auteurs secondaires

Auteur ancien 1 mis en relation dans le commentaire supra cité

- ◆ Plotin, *Traité 30 (III, 8), Sur la contemplation ; Sur la nature, la contemplation et l'Un*, § 8, 35-36

Datation

- ◆ Entre 263 et 268.

Auteur ancien 2 mis en relation dans le commentaire supra cité

- ◆ Plotin, *Traité 10 (V, 1), Sur les trois hypostases qui ont rang de Principes*, § 1

Datation

- ◆ Entre 254 et 263.

Auteur ancien 3 mis en relation dans le commentaire supra cité

- ◆ Plotin, *Traité 6 (IV, 8), Sur la descente de l'âme dans les corps*, § 8, 1

Datation

- ◆ Entre 254 et 263.

Auteur ancien 4 mis en relation dans le commentaire supra cité

- ◆ Plotin, *Traité 9 (VI, 9), Sur le Bien ou l'Un*, § 5, 24-38

Datation

- ◆ Entre 254 et 263.

Passage en langue moderne

- ◆ Now what is prior to what is the most honourable among the beings, if there really must be something prior to the mind, which wishes to be One, but is not One, but is uniform, because in itself the mind is not dispersed, but really together with itself, without dismembering itself through being near after the One, and having somehow dared to stand away from the One – thus that which is prior to it is the marvel of the One, which is not being, for in that case the One would be said of some other thing, for

which in truth there is no appropriate name, but since one must give it a name, one generally said would be appropriate, not as if it were some other thing and next one, being therefore difficult to be known, but better knowable by means of its offspring, being, – and mind leads to being and the nature of it (the One), which is such as to be the source of the best things and a power that create beings, while it abides in itself and is not diminished nor being in what has come to be through it, because it is even before them.

Références complètes de la traduction

♦ Meijer, P. A., Plotinus On the Good or the One (Enneads VI, 9) : An Analytical Commentary, Amsterdam, Gieben, 1992.

Passage en langue originale

♦ Τὸ δὴ πρὸ τοῦ ἐν τοῖς οὔσι τιμιωτάτου, εἴπερ δεῖ τι πρὸ νοῦ εἶναι ἐν μὲν εἶναι βουλομένου, οὐκ ὄντος δὲ ἐν, ἐνοειδοῦς δὲ, ὅτι αὐτῷ μηδὲ ἐσκέδασται ὁ νοῦς, ἀλλὰ σύνεστιν ἑαυτῷ ὄντως οὐ διαρτήσας ἑαυτὸν τῷ πλησίον μετὰ τὸ ἐν εἶναι, ἀποστῆναι δὲ πως τοῦ ἐνὸς τολμήσας – τὸ δὴ πρὸ τούτου θαῦμα τοῦ ἐν, ὃ μὴ ὄν ἐστίν, ἵνα μὴ καὶ ἐνταῦθα κατ' ἄλλου τὸ ἐν, ᾧ ὄνομα μὲν κατὰ ἀλήθειαν οὐδὲν προσῆκον, εἴπερ δὲ δεῖ ὀνομάσαι, κοινῶς ἂν λεχθὲν προσηκόντως ἐν, οὐχ ὡς ἄλλο, εἴτα ἐν, χαλεπὸν μὲν γνωσθῆναι διὰ τοῦτο, γιγνωσκόμενον δὲ μᾶλλον τῷ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ γεννήματι, τῆ οὐσία – καὶ ἄγει εἰς οὐσίαν νοῦς – καὶ αὐτοῦ ἢ φύσις τοιαύτη, ὡς πηγὴν τῶν ἀρίστων εἶναι καὶ δύνάμιν γεννώσαν τὰ ὄντα μένουσαν ἐν ἑαυτῇ καὶ οὐκ ἐλαττουμένην οὐδὲ ἐν τοῖς γινομένοις ὑπ' αὐτῆς οὔσαν.

♦ Henry, P. et Schwyzer, H.-R., Plotini Opera (Editio Minor), t. III (Enn. VI), Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1982

Auteur ancien 5 mis en relation dans le commentaire supra cité

♦ Gnostiques (de manière générique), *Aucune oeuvre en particulier*

Datation

♦ Entre 1 et 800.

Rédaction de la fiche

Rédacteur de la fiche

♦ Soares Santoprete, L. G., fiche numéro 114, 19-06-2018 23:30:47.

Comment citer cette fiche

♦ Soares Santoprete, L. G., Meijer P. A., p. 175-176, *Traité 9, audace, tólma*, 19-06-2018 23:30:47, *fiche numéro 114*, [en ligne]. Paris : CNRS, http://philognose.org/?page_id=300&idfiche=114

Imprimer

Les Platonismes de l'Antiquité Tardive

Base de données et répertoire bibliographique sur les liens entre médio- et néoplatonisme, gnosticisme, hermétisme et oracles chaldaïques

— Titre de la fiche —

- ◆ Meijer, P. A., p. 228, Traité 9, soi, Un, Minos, père, retour

— Auteur principal —

Auteur moderne du commentaire et œuvre

- ◆ Meijer, P. A., *Plotinus On the Good or the One (Enneads VI, 9) : An Analytical Commentary, Amsterdam, Gieben, 1992.*

Commentaire

◆ The connection this passage has with the foregoing perhaps turns on σύνεστιν of line 29 which continues what was said before the Minos-scene, about being together with the SE (= Supreme Entity ; line 23 συνουσία) and the passage could aim to Neoplatonise the thought, as I suggested: the SE is with you. In any case it generalizes Minos' case: the one is with all. Plotinus proceeds with dwelling on the position of people who do not know (οὐκ εἰδῶσι). According to Plotinus people who 'do not know' have no awareness of the presence of the SE, because they, themselves, break away from the SE, or rather, they break away from themselves. One cannot catch what one is fleeing from and having lost oneself one cannot seek some one, likewise a child, when outside itself in an outburst of madness, will not recognize its father (note 656: On the notion of father and child and their relation see, Ferwerda, Images, 78, who has interesting things to say about the return of the child to the father and makes a reference to Gnostics, who were familiar with the scene (l'enfant prodigue). I cannot understand what Ferwerda (ib., 79) means when he says that the image of the father never coincide "avec l'Un suprême", which happens to be the case in our text). However, he, who knows who he is himself, will know his father and his origin (ὀπόθεν). To lose oneself is to lose the only channel to go to the SE (by epistrophè). Here, at the end of ch. 7, we meet with the theme of the descended soul, which dispersing itself in the world of genesis and dedicating itself to worldly affairs, ceases to be aware of its high origin (note 657: See on the soul as originating in the Supreme Entity, 319) and its de facto connection with the Highest Entity. In this state of oblivion the soul is prey to mindlessness (ἐν ἀνοίαις), desires, fears and other evils, as we read in a rather early treatise, 6 (IV, 8), 3, 3 ff. At this point we have lost our 'selves' (αὐτούς). Locating this 'self is really a serious problem in Plotinus' psychology to which has been given a lot of attention by e.g. Blumenthal (note 658: Blumenthal, Psychology, 109 ff.). In any case, one can lose it, as Plotinus points out at the end of ch.7. Unfortunately, Blumenthal does not take this loss of self into consideration nor does O'Daly (note 659: In O'Daly, the Self we do not come across our passage). This form of loss of the self is entirely different from the loss of the self in the union with the SE (see below 310). (p. 228).

Contexte du commentaire

- ◆ Commentaire du Traité 9 (VI, 9), § 7, 23-34

Mots-clés

Français

- ◆ Minos
- ◆ soi
- ◆ Un
- ◆ père
- ◆ retour

Liens

- ◆ Plotin/Gnostiques : lien avec un argument antignostique développé dans un traité plotinien antérieur à la tétralogie.

Auteurs secondaires

Auteur ancien 1 mis en relation dans le commentaire supra cité

- ◆ Gnostiques (de manière générique), *Aucune oeuvre en particulier*

Datation

- ◆ Entre 1 et 800.
-

Auteur ancien 2 mis en relation dans le commentaire supra cité

- ◆ Plotin, *Traité 6 (IV, 8), Sur la descente de l'âme dans les corps, § 3, 3*

Datation

- ◆ Entre 254 et 263.
-

Auteur ancien 3 mis en relation dans le commentaire supra cité

- ◆ Plotin, *Traité 9 (VI, 9), Sur le Bien ou l'Un, § 7, 23-34*

Datation

- ◆ Entre 254 et 263.
-

Passage en langue moderne

◆ It is, perhaps, because of the fact that he has had such a communion that also Minos is called in the story the companion of Zeus, and it was in remembering this that he laid down the laws as images of this communion, being fulfilled by the contact with the God to lay down those laws. Or having held political matters unworthy of him, he wanted to remain always above, what even could happen to one who has seen much. It is outside nothing – he (Plato) says but he is with ali while they do not know him. For they run away outside him, rather outside themselves. They cannot catch whom they have fled from, nor seek for another having lost themselves. Also a child having come outside itself in madness will not recognize his father, but he who has learned to know himself will also know from whence he comes.

Références complètes de la traduction

- ◆ Meijer, P. A., *Plotinus On the Good or the One (Enneads VI, 9) : An Analytical Commentary*, Amsterdam, Gieben, 1992.

Passage en langue originale

♦ οἷαν ἴσως καὶ Μίνως ποιούμενος ὀριστῆς τοῦ Διὸς ἐφημίσθη εἶναι, ἧς μεμνημένος εἰδῶλα αὐτῆς τοὺς νόμους ἐτίθει τῆ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπαφῆ εἰς νόμων πληρούμενος θέσιν. Ἡ καὶ τὰ πολιτικὰ οὐκ ἄξια αὐτοῦ νομίσας ἀεὶ ἐθέλει μένειν ἄνω, ὅπερ καὶ τῷ πολὺ ἰδόντι γένοιτο ἂν πάθημα. Οὐδενός φησὶν ἐστὶν ἕξω, ἀλλὰ πᾶσι σύνεστιν οὐκ εἰδόσι. Φεύγουσι γὰρ αὐτοὶ αὐτοῦ ἕξω, μᾶλλον δὲ αὐτῶν ἕξω. Οὐ δύναται οὖν ἐλεῖν ὃν πεφεύγασιν, οὐδ' αὐτοὺς ἀπολωλεκότες ἄλλον ζητεῖν, οὐδέ γε παῖς αὐτοῦ ἕξω ἐν μανίᾳ γεγεννημένος εἰδήσει τὸν πατέρα· ὁ δὲ μαθὼν ἑαυτὸν εἰδήσει καὶ ὀπόθεν.

♦ Henry, P. et Schwyzer, H.-R., *Plotini Opera (Editio Minor)*, t. III (Enn. VI), Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1982

Rédaction de la fiche

Rédacteur de la fiche

♦ Soares Santoprete, L. G., fiche numéro 115, 19-06-2018 23:39:50.

Comment citer cette fiche

♦ Soares Santoprete, L. G., *Meijer, P. A., p. 228, Traité 9, soi, Un, Minos, père, retour, 19-06-2018 23:39:50, fiche numéro 115, [en ligne]. Paris : CNRS, http://philognose.org/?page_id=300&idfiche=115*

Imprimer

Les Platonismes de l'Antiquité Tardive

Base de données et répertoire bibliographique sur les liens entre médio- et néoplatonisme, gnosticisme, hermétisme et oracles chaldaïques

— Titre de la fiche —

◆ Meijer, p. 294-296, Traité 9, mysticisme

— Auteur principal —

Auteur moderne du commentaire et œuvre

◆ Meijer, P. A., *Plotinus On the Good or the One (Enneads VI, 9) : An Analytical Commentary, Amsterdam, Gieben, 1992.*

Commentaire

◆ 9 (VI, 9) provides a large, substantial and a chronologically quite early (only 1 [1, 6] and 6 [IV, 8] precede) contribution to the description of Plotinus' great spiritual adventure: the union with the One/SE (...) His philosophy proves to work, and it proves its veracity, if, indeed, one can follow the path to the ultimate Entity and attain to it. The entire way before this union is philosophically elaborated, the experience has nothing to do – as Dodds rightly puts it (note 831: Dodds, Tradition, 7) – with breathing exercises, navel-brooding, or hypnotic repetition of syllables nor, may I add, with voices, visionary visions and gymnastics or ascetism. Stress has been laid on the fact that for Plotinus it is a natural event, not a supernatural grace as in Christian mysticism (note 832: Dodds, Tradition, 7, Tradition 7 and Rist, Road, 225, Zintzen, Mystik, 85, Armstrong, Salvation, 27 ff, see also Bussanich, The One, 144). Plotinus has written several times more or less elaborately about his experience with the Supreme Entity or depicted the union in a more general way (1 [I, 6], 9; 6 (IV, 8), I; 9 [VI, 9], 4 and ch. 7-11; 32 [V, 5], 7, 30 ff. and ch.8 ff; 38 [VI, 7], 34-37; 49 [V, 3], 17, 15 ff.). The question keeps coming up what precisely the mystical element in this union with the Supreme Entity may assumed to be and, more generally, what, if anything, 'mysticism' is supposed to entail. The word stems from the Greek verb μύειν which as such does occur in Plotinus but only once, 9 (VI, 9), 11, 2, meaning 'initiate into mysteries' (see LP s.v.). The cognate word μυστικῶς, too, emerges only once, 26 (III, 6), 19, 26 and also as to do with initiation into mysteries. We have already spent some words about the basic difference between mystery and mysticism so there is no need to repeat this here (note 833: See above note 779). What modern preconception or definition one starts from that will determine one's approach to Plotinus' mysticism or – just like a pair of glasses, that are not the right ones - will corrupt or distort one's perspective. Hadot (note 834: Hadot, Les niveaux, 243) adopted a definition of mysticism (union with a God, not only the God) that enabled him to proclaim that even the union of the soul with mind is a form of mysticism. For convenience's sake I shall call this noetic mysticism. Hadot makes a good point when he distinguishes this form of noetic mysticism. According to Hadot if one fails to appreciate this form of mysticism one will make a grave mistake, that many interpreters are guilty of (note 835: Hadot, Les niveaux, 245). Although Hadot's observations are by no means pointless, and, indeed, this lower union has many features of Plotinian mysticism (note 836: Hadot, Les niveaux 244, 245. On p. 257 Hadot points to soul's being drunken and full of nectar of the soul when it becomes one with intelligible God, something that is also said of the union with the One, see below

317. 31 [V, 8] chapters 10 and 11 describe a union with the divine Intellect which indeed resembles a mystical union, cf. 30 [III, 8], 11, 30 ff.) and is clothed in similar terms, his claim does not seem very productive in regard to the union with the One as the union of soul and mind is only preliminary to it and displays features of its own. It is only a pre-stage, be it the final one before the great union. Moreover, Hadot deprives us of the happening of 6 (IV, 8), 1, by proclaiming that is the union of the soul and the intellect (so noetic mysticism) that is depicted by Plotinus instead of his union with the SE (note 837: There are several reasons against Hadot's position concerning 6 [IV, 8], 1. It seems unlikely that Plotinus would have described the union of his soul with the divine Intellect as having taken place often (πολλάκις). It is far more plausible that by 'often' he indicated the highest form of mystical union, be it that it is not yet the One he believed to be joint soul with (see above 34). It is perhaps decisive that in the Life of Plotinus Porphyrius uses the same formula to denote the union with the highest. Compare Plotinus : ὑπὲρ πᾶν τὸ ἄλλο νοητὸν ἑμαυτὸν ἰδρύσας with Porphyrius Vita 23, ἐκείνος ὁ θεὸς, ὁ μήτε μορφήν μήτε τινα ἰδέαν ἔχων, ὑπὲρ δὲ νοῦν καὶ πᾶν τὸ νοητὸν ἰδρυμένους). Rist (note 838: Rist, Road, 214) sides with Zaehner's approach (note 839: Zaehner, *Mysticism, sacred and profane*, Oxford 1957) to mysticism by partly adopting his fourfold classification of mystical systems. Basing his arguments on Indian, Muslim and Christian mysticism, Zaehner claims to have developed a rather objective approach by recognizing four basic mystical positions which are assumed to embrace the field of mystical experience in general. Rist borrowed two positions (note 840: Zaehner firstly distinguishes a panenhenic position: the individual soul is merged into nature, secondly a position which aims at the complete isolation of the soul from nature by ascetism. These forms have nothing to do with Plotinus.) from Zaehner's system as coordinates for determining the Plotinian mystical experience. Zaehner himself did not try to let his system embrace Neoplatonian mysticism. Fortunately, he did not wish or in any case did not undertake this task, because his one and only remark on Neoplatonian mysticism is completely off the mark (note 841: Zaehner, *Mysticism*, 167 holds that the mind in Neoplatonism is the "second aspect of the Deity", not differentiating between the Neoplatonists and Philo, who are irresponsibly heaped together). (p. 294-296).

Contexte du commentaire

- ♦ Commentaire partie « Mystical Union : Problems » du Traité 9 (VI, 9), § 1

Mots-clés

Français

- ♦ mysticisme

Liens

- ♦ Plotin/Chrétiens : appartenance au même milieu socioculturel

Auteurs secondaires

Auteur ancien 1 mis en relation dans le commentaire supra cité

- ♦ Plotin, *Traité 30 (III, 8), Sur la contemplation ; Sur la nature, la contemplation et l'Un*, § 11, 30

Datation

- ♦ Entre 263 et 268.

Auteur ancien 2 mis en relation dans le commentaire supra cité

- ◆ Plotin, *Traité 26 (III, 6), Sur l'impassibilité des incorporels*, § 19, 26

Datation

- ◆ Entre 263 et 268.
-

Auteur ancien 3 mis en relation dans le commentaire supra cité

- ◆ Plotin, *Traité 6 (IV, 8), Sur la descente de l'âme dans les corps*, § 1

Datation

- ◆ Entre 254 et 263.
-

Auteur ancien 4 mis en relation dans le commentaire supra cité

- ◆ Plotin, *Traité 1 (I, 6), Sur le Beau*, § 9

Datation

- ◆ Entre 254 et 263.
-

Auteur ancien 5 mis en relation dans le commentaire supra cité

- ◆ Plotin, *Traité 9 (VI, 9), Sur le Bien ou l'Un*

Datation

- ◆ Entre 254 et 263.
-

Auteur ancien 6 mis en relation dans le commentaire supra cité

- ◆ Plotin, *Traité 30 (III, 8), Sur la contemplation ; Sur la nature, la contemplation et l'Un*, § 11, 30

Datation

- ◆ Entre 263 et 268.
-

Auteur ancien 7 mis en relation dans le commentaire supra cité

- ◆ Plotin, *Traité 26 (III, 6), Sur l'impassibilité des incorporels*, § 19, 26

Datation

- ◆ Entre 263 et 268.
-

Auteur ancien 8 mis en relation dans le commentaire supra cité

- ◆ Plotin, *Traité 6 (IV, 8), Sur la descente de l'âme dans les corps*, § 1

Datation

- ◆ Entre 254 et 263.
-

Auteur ancien 9 mis en relation dans le commentaire supra cité

- ◆ Plotin, *Traité 1 (I, 6), Sur le Beau*, § 9

Datation

- ◆ Entre 254 et 263.
-

Auteur ancien 10 mis en relation dans le commentaire supra cité

- ◆ Plotin, *Traité 9 (VI, 9), Sur le Bien ou l'Un*

Datation

- ◆ Entre 254 et 263.
-

Auteur ancien 11 mis en relation dans le commentaire supra cité

- ◆ Chrétiens (de manière générique), *Aucune oeuvre en particulier*

Datation

- ◆ Entre 1 et 800.
-

Auteur ancien 12 mis en relation dans le commentaire supra cité

- ◆ Porphyre, *La Vie de Plotin*

Datation

- ◆ Entre 200 et 300.
-

— Rédaction de la fiche —

Rédacteur de la fiche

- ◆ Soares Santoprete, L. G., fiche numéro 116, 20-06-2018 01:19:45.

Comment citer cette fiche

- ◆ Soares Santoprete, L. G., *Meijer*, p. 294-296, *Traité 9, mysticisme*, 20-06-2018 01:19:45, *fiche numéro 116*, [en ligne]. Paris : CNRS, http://philognose.org/?page_id=300&idfiche=116

Imprimer

Les Platonismes de l'Antiquité Tardive

Base de données et répertoire bibliographique sur les liens entre médio- et néoplatonisme, gnosticisme, hermétisme et oracles chaldaïques

— Titre de la fiche —

- ◆ Meijer, P. A., p. 313-314, Traité 9, retour, Principe Suprême, Dieu, union

— Auteur principal —

Auteur moderne du commentaire et œuvre

- ◆ Meijer, P. A., *Plotinus On the Good or the One (Enneads VI, 9) : An Analytical Commentary, Amsterdam, Gieben, 1992.*

Commentaire

◆ The union with the Supreme Entity is not the privilege of a single mystic, e.g. Plotinus. Porphyrius experienced it as well. We know that the Supergod is the centre of centres and, as Rist points out, to join in the chorus and to turn to the Supreme Entity in 9 (VI, 9), 8 means the end of the journey. To be sure, Rist rightly introduces the problem of multiple union with the Supreme Entity. In *Against the Gnostics* (33 [II, 9], 9). Plotinus explicitly defends the 'divinisation' of more mystics against the thesis of the real gnostic's elevation above his fellowmen and even above the Gods (note 888: This remarkable arrogance is sometimes found in the Stoa, Sen., *Epistula* 53, 11 ff, see Merki, *Angleichung*, 17). In the eyes of Plotinus the latter position is sheer blasphemy, which as such is enough to disqualify the gnostic mystic and deprives him of becoming a God in so far as it is granted to the human soul to become a God (33 [II, 9], 9, 50) (note 889: Then the man of real dignity must ascend in due measure, with an absence of boorish arrogance, going so far as our nature is able to go, and consider that there is room for others with God, and not set himself alone next after God; this is like flying in our dreams and will deprive him even of becoming God as far as it is granted to a human soul (33 [II, 9], 9, 46 ff.). See also 33 (II, 9), 10, 79: "and he does not attribute the ability to himself alone.). Plotinus is fully prepared to answer the question of the 'multiple divinisation'. So the multiple union with the One as a problem must have been a problem not far from his mind. Rist launches the passage on the dance as proof for his assumption that the soul is only filled with God, but not identical with Him: "The members of the chorus are blended together when they sing, but it would be absurd to say that they had no individual differences of any kind. If they were not individuals, they could not form a collective unity (note 890: Rist, *Road*, 227). According to Rist this passage suggests that the individual soul is preserved in the 'blending'. (p. 313-314).

Contexte du commentaire

- ◆ Commentaire au Traité 9 (VI, 9), § 3

— Mots-clés —

Français

- ◆ Principe Suprême

- ◆ union
- ◆ Dieu
- ◆ retour

— Liens —

- ◆ Plotin/Gnostiques : présence dans les traités antérieurs à la « tétralogie antignostique » d'arguments antignostiques exposés dans celle-ci.
- ◆ Plotin/Gnostiques : lien avec un argument antignostique développé dans le Traité 33 (II, 9).

— Auteurs secondaires —

Auteur ancien 1 mis en relation dans le commentaire supra cité

- ◆ Gnostiques (de manière générique), *Aucune oeuvre en particulier*

Datation

- ◆ Entre 1 et 800.

Auteur ancien 2 mis en relation dans le commentaire supra cité

- ◆ Sénèque, *Épîtres*, 53, 11 et ss.

Datation

- ◆ Entre -4 et 65.

Auteur ancien 3 mis en relation dans le commentaire supra cité

- ◆ Porphyre (de manière générique), *Aucune oeuvre en particulier*

Datation

- ◆ Entre 200 et 300.

Auteur ancien 4 mis en relation dans le commentaire supra cité

- ◆ Plotin, *Traité 33 (II, 9), Contre les gnostiques ; Contre ceux qui disent que le démiurge du monde est mauvais et que le monde est mauvais*, § 9, 46 ; § 9, 50 ; § 10, 79

Datation

- ◆ Entre 263 et 268.

Auteur ancien 5 mis en relation dans le commentaire supra cité

- ◆ Plotin, *Traité 9 (VI, 9), Sur le Bien ou l'Un*

Datation

- ◆ Entre 254 et 263.

— Rédaction de la fiche —

Rédacteur de la fiche

- ◆ Soares Santoprete, L. G., fiche numéro 117, 20-06-2018 00:11:32.

Comment citer cette fiche

- ◆ Soares Santoprete, L. G., *Meijer, P. A., p. 313-314, Traité 9, retour, Principe Suprême, Dieu, union*, 20-06-2018 00:11:32, fiche numéro 117, [en ligne]. Paris : CNRS, http://philognose.org/?page_id=300&idfiche=117

Imprimer

Les Platonismes de l'Antiquité Tardive

Base de données et répertoire bibliographique sur les liens entre médio- et néoplatonisme, gnosticisme, hermétisme et oracles chaldaïques

— Titre de la fiche —

◆ Meijer, p. 322-323, Traité 9, éros, grâce, union, âme, attente, ascension

— Auteur principal —

Auteur moderne du commentaire et œuvre

◆ Meijer, P. A., *Plotinus On the Good or the One (Enneads VI, 9) : An Analytical Commentary, Amsterdam, Gieben, 1992.*

Commentaire

◆ In 38 [VI, 7], 22, 18, 19 Plotinus goes so far as to ascribe to the SE the arousal of eros, the desire for the SE in the soul which without this stimulating activity would only be indolent and inert. The moment the warmth, as it were, radiating from the SE descends to it, it awakens and is elevated "by whom give eros to it" (22, 18, 19 αἰρομένη ὑπὸ τοῦ δόντος (sc. the Good) τὸν ἔρωτα). The activity of the SE is described in ch. 38 [VI, 7], 23, 1 ff. quite impressively : the SE drags the soul towards it and calls back the erring and wandering soul to come to rest with it. One can hear Christian undertones, cf. Harder (III b, 500) who quotes Augustine, Confessiones, 1, 1 : "πρὸς Αὐτὸν(ν) ἀναπαύσαιτο (inquietum est cor nostrum, donec) requiescat in te". What is said here, seems tantamount to and is hardly to be distinguished from the Christian type of grace Dodds and others deny Plotinus. To furnish this 'grace' there is no need for the SE to turn into the direction of the blessed. I can understand why Rist (note 915 : Rist, Road, 225) would reject Aubin's (note 916 : Aubin, Image, 376) claim that the Supreme Entity is forced to turn to the seeker, since the Supreme Entity cannot be located in a place because it is everywhere (and nowhere). This is the atypical character of the SE, which in fact is nothing other than its omnipresence. The SE does not need such a turn, because it is present to the blessed, to aid the mystic in his becoming prepared. Reviewing the issue one might claim that the slight ambiguity mentioned in the opening of this paragraph is undeniable. Since the SE has a great part to play in the realisation of the union, one could wonder why the elected soul has wait for its appearance. This ambiguity could be mitigated, if not eliminated, one were to regard the suddenness of his appearance as a feature deliberately introduced to bring out the majestic character of the SE, coming as to an audience (an image recurring in the Enneads) or coming as a God in the theophany. Both elements of this word are present in the Enneads. Plotinus emphasises in 32 [V, 5], 8, 2, 3 the φαίνεσθαι or not φαίνεσθαι of the SE and in the [V, 3], 17, 30 he compares the parousia of the SE to a real theophany of another God : "You only know the God (not the SE) is present when he enlightens" the house he was invited to visit". So the solemn and majestic character of the appearance of the SE is expressed by the waiting of the soul till the SE condescends to appear. This is well expressed in the passage on the waiting for the sun who, incidentally, is regarded as a God by Plotinus. The encounter is grace : not only the contribution to the preparedness of the mystic is a form of grace but also the ultimate revelation is grace on the part of the SE. All the same, the mystic must go a well defined way in the ascent, viz. via the prescribed stages. That is the 'natural' side

of the matter : using the ladder of hierarchical structures in the personal ascent. So I can understand why some scholars (Dodds [note 917 : Dodds, Tradition, 7]) speak about a natural event, apparently in opposition to the Christian use of the term 'grace', where it is taken to mean that all inspiration and activity comes from the Godhead to the rather passive, or even unwilling blessed (cf. Saint Paul's conversion on the road to Damascus). However, this is only part of the matter, for the grace and activity of the SE have to play their part too. In any case I would deny that Zintzen's remark : "Nicht wird die Vereinigung erreicht durch ein Herabneigen des Höheren zum Niedrigen. Nicht ist sie ein Gnadenakt" (note 918 : Zintzen, Mystic, 85), is justified. We should immediately add that this does not mean that the Plotinian notion of grace is the same as the Christian view takes it to be. As to the term 'supernatural', a term often used in connection with grace, the supernatural belongs mainly to the SE, and one might conclude that in fact this activity on the part of the SE is hardly in tune with its essence of total rest and quiet as a non-active Entity. As to the mystic, I think, there is nothing supernatural about him, for it seems part of the nature of the soul to go all the way to the SE. So in the end it is grace that leads to the unification, but not a supernatural grace like in Christianity. (p. 322-323)

Contexte du commentaire

- ◆ Commentaire au Traité 9 (VI, 9), § 3

— Mots-clés —

Français

- ◆ grâce
- ◆ union
- ◆ âme
- ◆ attente
- ◆ ascension

Grec

- ◆ éros (amour)

— Liens —

- ◆ Plotin/Chrétiens : problématique commune aux deux auteurs.

— Auteurs secondaires —

Auteur ancien 1 mis en relation dans le commentaire supra cité

- ◆ Augustin, *Confessions* , 1, 1

Datation

- ◆ Entre 248 et 248.

Auteur ancien 2 mis en relation dans le commentaire supra cité

- ◆ Plotin, *Traité 32 (V, 5), Sur l'Intellect, que les intelligibles ne sont pas hors de l'Intellect et sur le Bien ; Que les intelligibles ne sont pas hors de l'Intellect, et sur le Bien, § 8, 2-3*

Datation

- ◆ Entre 263 et 268.

Auteur ancien 3 mis en relation dans le commentaire supra cité

- ◆ Plotin, *Traité 38 (VI, 7), Comment la multiplicité des idées s'est établie et sur le Bien*, § 22, 18-19 ; § 23, 1

Datation

- ◆ Entre 263 et 268.
-

Auteur ancien 4 mis en relation dans le commentaire supra cité

- ◆ Plotin, *Traité 9 (VI, 9), Sur le Bien ou l'Un*

Datation

- ◆ Entre 254 et 263.
-

— Rédaction de la fiche —

Rédacteur de la fiche

- ◆ Soares Santoprete, L. G., fiche numéro 192, 28-08-2018 12:33:56.

Comment citer cette fiche

- ◆ Soares Santoprete, L. G., *Meijer*, p. 322-323, *Traité 9, éros, grâce, union, âme, attente, ascension*, 28-08-2018 12:33:56, *fiche numéro 192*, [en ligne]. Paris : CNRS, http://philognose.org/?page_id=300&idfiche=192
-

Imprimer

Les Platonismes de l'Antiquité Tardive

Base de données et répertoire bibliographique sur les liens entre médio- et néoplatonisme, gnosticisme, hermétisme et oracles chaldaïques

— Titre de la fiche —

- ◆ Meijer, p. 332-333, Traité 9, unification, ascension, union

— Auteur principal —

Auteur moderne du commentaire et œuvre

- ◆ Meijer, P. A., *Plotinus On the Good or the One (Enneads VI, 9) : An Analytical Commentary, Amsterdam, Gieben, 1992.*

Commentaire

◆ Apart from Albinus and Numenius Gnosticism may also have had a maior influence upon Plotinus. Numenius himself is commonly agreed to have been very close to Gnosticism (note 964 : Puech, Plotin et les Gnostiques, 178). Because of doctrinal similarities in regard to unification with God there is a possibility that Plotinus' hausted from Gnostic sources. Jonas (note 965 : Jonas, Gnostic Religion, 165 ff.) indicates several striking congruencies. In the Poimandres death is followed by ascent and one's going to the Father, entering the Godhead and becoming God (this is the good end of those who have attained gnosis: to become God [note 966 : Poimandres I, 26 : καὶ δυνάμεις γενόμενοι ἐν θεῷ γίνονται, τοῦτο ἐστὶ τὸ ἀγαθὸν τέλος τοῖς γνώσιν ἐσχηκόσι, θεωθῆναι. Jonas, Gnostic Religion, 153. Cf. also Festugière, Révélation, III, 130]). According to Mani the ultimate stage is man's becoming a God again (note 967 : Jonas, Gnostic Religion, 222). To the mind of Jonas (note 968 : Jonas, Gnostic Religion, 60, 61) (ib., 60, 61) "Plotinus draws the full mystical conclusions from the (gnostic) metaphysics of 'Unity versus Plurality'". Indeed, Plotinus was acquainted with (Valentinian) Gnostics (note 969 : Puech, Plotin et les Gnostiques, 178). Moreover the (Sethian or Valentinian) Gnostics Plotinus himself so heavily attacked in 33 [II, 9] (see above under the heading multiple union) adhered to a doctrine according to which they themselves were even more God than the celestial bodies (which were Gods in the eyes of Plotinus). Unfortunately, however, any borrowing or influence from Gnostics must remain uncertain, because of the fact that if there were connections as regards the notion of unification, it is almost impossible to decide who was influenced by whom, for chronological it is equally possible that Gnostics have drawn from Plotinus an perhaps other Neoplatonici or at least from earlier Platonists or the other way round. Valentinus (who lived during the first half of the second century, and stayed at Rome perhaps from 138 - 158 or 166) himself may be regarded as a Platonist or at least as Platonizing (note 970 : Stead, In search of Valetinus, 75 ff. shows how difficult the matter of Valentinus Platonism is). It could be that ideas about unification were alive in preplotinian Platonism (e. g. the same source that Philo used). Considering the issue of the multiple union in 33 [II, 9] I would not be surprised if Plotinus had in fact been influenced by Gnosticism, be in that ascent in earlier Gnosticism seems to be confined to the situation after death. Be this at it may, in the end Plotinus himself was left with the great task to establish the union with his new Supreme Entity (already during lifetime) within the new framework of philosophy. One has the impression that at minimum this was left to be his own initiative and his own invention, perhaps supported

by his own experience of emptying the mind. This in fact led to the design of a new procedure of attaining his God, a procedure we have portrayed in this Part. (p. 332-333)

Contexte du commentaire

- ◆ Commentaire au Traité 9 (VI, 9), § 4

— Mots-clés —

Français

- ◆ unification
- ◆ ascension
- ◆ union

— Liens —

- ◆ Plotin/Gnostiques : appartenance au même milieu socioculturel.
- ◆ Plotin/Gnostiques : problématique commune aux deux auteurs.

— Auteurs secondaires —

Auteur ancien 1 mis en relation dans le commentaire supra cité

- ◆ Alcinoos, *Aucune oeuvre en particulier*

Auteur ancien 2 mis en relation dans le commentaire supra cité

- ◆ Hermétiques, *Poimandrès (CH I)*

Auteur ancien 3 mis en relation dans le commentaire supra cité

- ◆ Philon d'Alexandrie (de manière générique), *Aucune oeuvre en particulier*

Datation

- ◆ Entre -100 et 100.

Auteur ancien 4 mis en relation dans le commentaire supra cité

- ◆ Mani (de manière générique), *Aucune oeuvre en particulier*

Auteur ancien 5 mis en relation dans le commentaire supra cité

- ◆ Platoniciens, *Aucune oeuvre en particulier.*

Auteur ancien 6 mis en relation dans le commentaire supra cité

- ◆ Valentiniens (de manière générique), *Aucune oeuvre en particulier*

Datation

- ◆ Entre 1 et 800.

Auteur ancien 7 mis en relation dans le commentaire supra cité

- ◆ Séthiens (de manière générique), *Aucune oeuvre en particulier*

Datation

- ◆ Entre 1 et 800.
-

Auteur ancien 8 mis en relation dans le commentaire supra cité

- ◆ Numénius (de manière générique), *Aucune oeuvre en particulier*

Datation

- ◆ Entre 100 et 200.
-

Auteur ancien 9 mis en relation dans le commentaire supra cité

- ◆ Gnostiques (de manière générique), *Aucune oeuvre en particulier*

Datation

- ◆ Entre 1 et 800.
-

Auteur ancien 10 mis en relation dans le commentaire supra cité

- ◆ Plotin, *Traité 9 (VI, 9), Sur le Bien ou l'Un*

Datation

- ◆ Entre 254 et 263.
-

— Rédaction de la fiche —

Rédacteur de la fiche

- ◆ Soares Santoprete, L. G., fiche numéro 193, 28-08-2018 16:57:21.

Comment citer cette fiche

- ◆ Soares Santoprete, L. G., *Meijer, p. 332-333, Traité 9, unification, ascension, union, 28-08-2018 16:57:21, fiche numéro 193, [en ligne]. Paris : CNRS, http://philognose.org/?page_id=300&idfiche=193*

Imprimer

