

## НАСЛЕДИЕ В.С. СОЛОВЬЕВА: ИССЛЕДОВАНИЯ И ПУБЛИКАЦИИ<sup>1</sup>

### V.S. SOLOVYOV'S HERITAGE: STUDIES AND PUBLICATIONS

УДК 141.131

ББК 87.3(2)522:87.3(0)44-357

#### Paraskevi Zacharia

Radboud University, Phd student of Philosophy at the Faculty of Philosophy, Theology, and Religious Studies, Nijmegen, The Netherlands, e-mail: evizacharia@hotmail.com

### Parallels between Proclean Philosophy and Vladimir Soloviev's *La Sophia* and *Smysl Lyubvi*

*Abstract.* In the work of Vladimir Soloviev (1853–1900), especially during his first philosophical period, the parallels with the tradition of Neoplatonism have been examined by several researchers. However, the role that specific neoplatonic concepts of Proclean philosophy played for Soloviev's philosophical development, should be examined in more details. The method I follow here is a comparative analysis between three works of Proclus (*The of Elements of Theology* [Στοιχείωσις θεολογική], *Commentary on Alcibiades I* [Σχόλια εἰς τὸν Ἀλκιβιάδην], *Commentary on Timaeus* [Σχόλια εἰς Τιμαίον]) and *La Sophia* and *Smysl Lyubvi* written by Vladimir Soloviev. Moreover, I focus on the only source that we have where Soloviev mentions explicitly to the main concepts of Proclean philosophy. The above methods are proposed in order to analyse crucial concepts in Soloviev's philosophy: love, cosmic unity, and World Soul.

*Key words:* cosmic unity, Neoplatonism, Sophia, *epistrophê*, theurgy, World Soul, *theōsis*, mysticism

#### Параскеви Захария

Университет Радбуда, Phd докторант философии на факультете Философии, Теологии и Религиоведения, Неймеген, Нидерланды, e-mail: evizacharia@hotmail.com

### Параллели между философией Прокла и *La Sophia* и «Смысл любви» Владимира Соловьёва

*Аннотация.* Параллели творчества Владимира Соловьёва (1853–1900), особенно в его первый философский период, с традицией неоплатонизма рассматривались рядом исследователей. Однако роль, которую конкретные неоплатонические концепции философии Прокла сыграли для философского развития Соловьёва, должна быть рассмотрена более подробно. С использованием

<sup>1</sup> Публикуются статьи, подготовленные на основе докладов, представленных на Международной научной конференции «Несобранный и неизданный Соловьёв: проблемы публикации и интерпретации наследия Вл.С. Соловьёва», 29–30 сентября 2021 г., Ивановский государственный энергетический университет имени В.И. Ленина, г. Иваново, Россия.

сравнительного анализа работ (Элементы теологии [Στοιχείωσις θεολογική] Прокла, Комментарий к Алквивиаду I [Σχόλια εἰς τὸν Ἀλκβιάδιον], Комментарий к Тимею [Σχόλια εἰς Τιμαίον]) и *La Sophia* и «Смысл Любви» Владимира Соловьева, а также единственного источника, в котором Вл. Соловьев прямо упоминает основные концепции философии Прокла. Рассматриваются важнейшие понятия в философии Соловьева: любовь, космическое единство и Мировая Душа.

*Ключевые слова:* космическое единство, неоплатонизм, софия, эпистрофа, теургия, мировая душа, теосис, мистицизм

**DOI:** 10.17588/2076-9210.2022.2.006-025

### Vladimir Soloviev reading Proclus

The only source of reference to Proclus by Soloviev is the entry dedicated to the Neoplatonic philosopher in the *Brockhaus and Ephron Encyclopedia*<sup>2</sup>. In this entry, Soloviev stresses the quite complex system of Proclus based on triads and their relation to dualities and trinities. He starts with the main ideas of Proclean philosophy: the idea of All that transcends any concept and definition, the three 'initial incarnations' (One/Good, Intellect, World Soul), and the triad of dialectical law (*monē, prohodos, epistrophē*) that perfuses the world development. In this entry, Soloviev pays particular attention to the third of these ideas, *epistrophē*, since it offers him the opportunity to juxtapose it with the Hegelian dialectics. As he says, «Proclus saw in his dialectics only [...] the law that determines the disclosure of all being, without assuming in this dialectical movement the essence of being itself, as Hegel did» [1, c. 415]. Then, Soloviev relates Proclus' triad of the totality of the Intelligible world [*noēton, noēton ama kai noeron, noeron*]<sup>3</sup> to Schelling's scheme of subject, object and subject-object<sup>4</sup>. Soloviev interprets Proclus' triad under the general tendency of ancient philosophy, i.e., the return to the first beginning. In this respect, explains Soloviev, «the third of the triad is not a synthesis of the two preceding ones, but only a one-sided subjective position» [1, c. 416]. Each of these parts of the triad are designated by Proclus to specific dualities: being and existence [*noēton*], life and power [*noēton ama kai noeron*], thinking and knowledge [*noeron*]. All these exist in every real member of the Intelligible world, defining their unity, while the predominance of the one or the other predetermines in turn the definitions of being, life, and knowledge. Moreover, each part of the 'intellect' triad contains theological triads which are divided into three triads<sup>5</sup>.

---

<sup>2</sup> См.: Соловьев В.С. Прокл // Соловьев В.С. Философский словарь Владимира Соловьева. Ростов н/Д: Феникс: Беляев Г.В., 1997. С. 414–418 [1].

<sup>3</sup> См.: Proclus, Περί της κατά Πλάτωνα Θεολογίας [*Platonic Theology*] II, 2.67.28- 2.68.1 [2].

<sup>4</sup> См.: Schelling F.W.J. *On the True Concept of Philosophy of Nature and the Correct Way of Solving its Problems*, trans. Judith Kahl and Daniel Whistler, accessed June 9, 2021, <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/80775296.pdf>. [3].

<sup>5</sup> См.: Соловьев В.С. Прокл. С. 417.

At the end of the article in the *Brockhaus and Ephron Encyclopedia*, Soloviev discusses Proclus' contribution on the topic of 'matter' and its relation to evil<sup>6</sup>. However, it seems that Soloviev underlines the connection between soul and love in Proclus' philosophy, rather than the connection (if any) between evil and matter. As he says, the most remarkable in Proclean mysticism is the higher power of our soul and its ability to directly perceive, with an absolute manner, one thing<sup>7</sup>. This power which leads to the sacred insanity (*mania*), is the heart of Proclean mysticism, which is elaborated with the divine through *pistis* (faith), *kallos* (beauty) and pure love (Eros), principles that Soloviev follows in his work, in particular in *Smysl Lyubvi* [«СМЫСЛ ЛЮБВИ»] (1892–1894).

In particular, Eros is defined by Plato as the birth not only into the body but in the soul as well. The nature of Eros is demonic, which means that it is a power between god and humans, attracted firstly from physical beauty and then from the soul's beauty or generally from everything good and beautiful. This gradual process of the soul, from external to internal beauty, is actually a path for Eros to live in happiness (εὐδαιμονία). The goal of the soul's mystical journey is to see the absolute beauty which is the ultimate source of good and nice things. Therefore, it can be argued that platonic Eros, has the quality of emptiness (it removes everything that alienates the soul) and the characteristic of fullness as it fills the souls with all those conditions in order to rise and reacquire its authentic nature

The above elements of Proclean philosophy that Soloviev highlighted in the *Brockhaus and Ephron Encyclopedia* may be used to understand Soloviev's mysticism. It is quite obvious, in general, his mysticism draws closer to pantheism, where the individual soul is merged into the physical world. In this respect, he appreciates mostly Proclus' mysticism where the divine energy and perfection are descending to the sensible reality, retaining their supremacy over the logical beings.<sup>8</sup> Furthermore, for Soloviev the connection between mysticism and love is inevitable. In *Smysl Lyubvi*, he employs the concept of Sophia in order to underline the eternal union between the souls of individuals and love. Sophia, in this respect, becomes some kind of neoplatonic being which through her desire of returning nourishes the power of love.

### **Cosmic principles in Proclus' *The Elements of Theology* and in Soloviev's *La Sophia***

Attempting a comparative analysis between Proclus' *Elements of Theology* and Soloviev's *La Sophia* (1875–1876) is a challenge with a lot of limitations. The basic

<sup>6</sup> It would be quite interesting to investigate further the degree of influence by Proclus to Soloviev regarding dependence (or not) between 'matter' and 'evil'.

<sup>7</sup> См.: Соловьёв В.С. Прокл. С. 418.

<sup>8</sup> См.: Jugrin, D. Knowing the Ineffable One: The Mystical Philosophy of Proclus // *Philobiblon*. 2017. Vol. 22, No. 2. P. 21–37 [4].

limitation is the difference in the way of writing: the *Elements of Theology* are written in the form of syllogisms, close to the form of mathematical theorems, while *La Sophia* is largely written in the form of a dialogue between the philosopher and his *Sophia*. The intentions behind this way of writing vary: one explanation could be that Proclus chose this way of writing in order to abstain from the Platonic dialogical form, or, taking into consideration that the *Elements of Theology* belong to his early period of writing, he intended to systematize his thoughts without referring to any of his Neoplatonic predecessors or even the great philosophers of the classical age (Plato, Aristotle). Soloviev, however, adopted the dialogical form in *La Sophia*, thus he was closer in this way to Plato, because as he says (or, more precisely, as he lets *Sophia* to say this) «dialectics are the only suitable form for the philosophical science since it express ideally the unity of contraries» [5, p. 14].

However, the common element from which I am starting my analysis is that both treatises represent first systematic attempts to articulate their thoughts. Proclus' theorems in the *Elements of Theology* constitute his own 'theology', as the title reveals, without referring directly to Plato. Soloviev's *La Sophia* is a draft of his preliminary philosophical ideas where for the first time he presents the concept *Sophia* as a part of his mysticism.

Soloviev in *La Sophia* starts with the absolute principle, which is considered to be the sensible expression of love, and then he moves to the presentation of 'multiplicity' of Being or Matter, as the negative definition of Absolute, i.e., the 'other' according to him<sup>9</sup>. Soloviev does not follow a vertical relation between One and Many (with the sense that Many derives from the One, thus it is inferior), but an horizontal one: One ↔ Many. In this way, Soloviev's position seems to differ from the problem of derivation of many by the One, which Plotinus had detected as the main problem of metaphysics<sup>10</sup>.

In line to this problem, Neoplatonists either had to admit that all that is must ultimately reside within the One or else that the One produces whatever else arises as outside of itself. Proclus' metaphysics of eternal being underlines the structures as well as the hierarchies of the intelligible order, based on a transfer of power (*δύναμις*, i.e., the capacity to effectuate reality). In particular, 'power' in Proclus, which should not be confused with the notion of *energeia* (activity), is closer to the effect and its ability to reveal a possibility that was inactive within the higher order<sup>11</sup>.

Soloviev at this point sounds like Proclus when he attributes to the two poles of Being (Spirit and Matter) the notion of *potentia* (the potency of being, which is

---

<sup>9</sup> См.: Soloviev Vladimir. *La Sophia et les autres écrits français*. Edités et présentés par François Rouleau. Lausanne: La Cite- L'Age d'Homme, 1978, 18 [5].

<sup>10</sup> См.: Plotinus, *Enneads* V.1.6.38 [6].

<sup>11</sup> Later Neoplatonists, especially Damascius, seemed to skirt this problem by constituting a metaphysics of non-being, in an attempt to return to the origin, where One is replaced by the Ineffable, i.e., the unconditioned ground of reality, Rappe, S., *Reading Neoplatonism: Non-discursive Thinking in the Texts of Plotinus, Proclus, and Damascius* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 201 [7].

between nothing and the real being). Soloviev does not speak exactly about a transfer of powers between Spirit (positive potentia) and Matter (negative potentia), but he presents *potentia* as a means of realization of Spirit and Matter<sup>12</sup>. While he seems here to adopt a part of Neoplatonic conception about ‘power’, in the analysis of the triad of Being (Being as itself, Being as power of immediate experience, i.e., love, and Logos), he employs *potentia* with Christian terms, implying that this is related to God.

Another Neoplatonic pattern about cosmic process that Soloviev seems to follow in *La Sophia* is that of the relation between the producer and the produced. Proclus in the *Elements of Theology* claims that «every productive cause is superior to that which it produces» (theorem 7) [8, p. 168–171] attributing in this manner an evaluative order between the producer [παράγων] and the produced [παραγόμενον]<sup>13</sup>. Soloviev in *La Sophia* mentions this general principle, by employing the plurality which is produced by unity, while at the end of the cosmic process it is transferred ontologically towards the lower levels, in particular to the creation of the human organism, the most perfect of all organisms<sup>14</sup>.

In *Smysl Lyubvi*, however, this Neoplatonic thought is expressed by the superiority of the human species and by the perpetuation of the human kind. In particular, he claims that the superiority of the human species is not ensured by the possibility of perpetuation, but by a combination of specific individualities. As far as Sophia is concerned in both texts (*La Sophia* and *Smysl Lyubvi*), it seems that he prefers not to integrate her into the relation between the producer and the produced. In *La Sophia*, Sophia has the role of interlocutor with the philosopher (in the dialogues) and that of the concept (in the monologues), while in *Smysl Lyubvi* a kind of her superiority, by enkindling the ‘creation’ of love in humans, is implied by the Russian philosopher<sup>15</sup>. Therefore, the direct relation between the one that produces and the one produced, that Proclus and in general Neoplatonists proclaimed, seems not to be employed by Soloviev in *La Sophia* and *Smysl Lyubvi*.

Another point of convergence between the *Elements of Theology* and *La Sophia* is the connection between the World Soul and knowledge. Although in the *Elements of Theology*, Proclus does not refer to the World Soul, however, he refers extensively to the general attributes (*essence, life, knowledge, vehicles*, theorems 186-197) of each soul (with the sense of the individual soul) and its role as an intermediary between the Intelligible and the corporeal<sup>16</sup>. Focusing on the attribute of ‘knowledge’, Proclus creates a kind of dependant relationship between the possess of knowledge and the reversion of the being to itself (theorem 186). This means that the reversion to itself entails the possess of the knowledge.

<sup>12</sup> Soloviev Vladimir, *La Sophia et les autres écrits français*, 18.

<sup>13</sup> Proclus, *Elements of Theology*, 168–171 [8].

<sup>14</sup> Soloviev Vladimir, *La Sophia et les autres écrits français*, 16, 67.

<sup>15</sup> Radlov, E.L. *Smysl Lyubvi, Sobranie Sochinenii* [Collected Works] Vladimira Sergeevicha Solov'eva, vols. 12. St.Petersburg: 1901–1903; reprint, Bruxelles: Foyer Oriental Chrétien, 1966, VII:46 [9].

<sup>16</sup> Proclus, *Elements of Theology*. P. 448–468.

In *La Sophia*, from the beginning of the first dialogue till its end, the above concept is presented by Soloviev with a kind of variation. He speaks of the World Soul's division in the actual world and of its core role in the transition from the cosmic to the historic process (through its internal connections with divine Logos in human consciousness), while he makes it clear that, because the World Soul contains individual souls, man, as a part of World Soul, is an individual soul<sup>17</sup>. The connection between World Soul and 'knowledge', is highlighted by Soloviev with reference to 'desire', which implies the tendency to revert to its origin. In the footnotes to the French text, the editor, Rouleau, has added that Soul in its essence is the desire of unity (Love) in order to produce the real union<sup>18</sup>. If we add to this Soloviev's claim that Sophia is identical with the World Soul, then we may discern that Soloviev attempts to attribute to Sophia a possession of 'knowledge', as the basic stipulation of her revert to her origin. Moreover, since Sophia possesses the attributes of the World Soul, this probably meant that Soloviev added to her the ability to transfer the self-moved attribute to anything she comes across. In this way, the Russian philosopher seems to confirm theorem 20 of the *Elements of Theology*, according to which «for that in which soul is present receives communication in self-movement» [5, p. 194–195].

I think that the above similarity about World Soul and 'knowledge' should be included in the pair of 'desire-reversion' which is not only reaffirmed in the *Elements of Theology* and *La Sophia*, but also is described as a reciprocal relationship by both philosophers: without desire, reversion is impossible, and without desire reversion seems meaningless. At the same time, humans, as imperfect beings cannot be led to this action by themselves, according to Proclus (theorem 77)<sup>19</sup>. Soloviev may have spotted this gap, so he may have employed Sophia as a means of aiding humans to reach the perfect action, i.e., love.

One last point that I would like to highlight is the relationship between the concepts of eternity and time. A considerable part of *Elements of Theology* is dedicated to the concepts of eternity and time, and to the way they differ one from another. Starting with eternity, Proclus distinguishes two types of eternity: the eternal and the temporal (theorems 54 & 55)<sup>20</sup>. The eternal is constant, concentrated in all its existence, and exists as whole. By contrast, the temporal is executed constantly, proliferating in the course of time and consisting of parts whose individuality is defined by their position before and after<sup>21</sup>.

This point of view of Proclus may help us to better apprehend the way Soloviev employs Sophia's role in relation to eternity and time in *La Sophia*. Her function as intermediary between inferior and superior entities may originate from

---

<sup>17</sup> Soloviev, Vladimir, *La Sophia et les autres écrits français*, 70.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid. P. 15–16.

<sup>19</sup> Ibid. P. 286–289.

<sup>20</sup> Ibid. P. 246–251.

<sup>21</sup> Ibid. P. 247–251.

the way she functions in time. Sophia does not exist forever, because if she did, it would automatically mean that she exists in her own right, thus eternally. Therefore, Sophia seems to be somewhere between eternity and time: which means she is created constantly, thus she is temporal and has the ability to interconnect with the inferior, whereas with 'forever' she mimics the eternal nature.

So far we have presented some of the parallels between the *Elements of Theology* and *La Sophia*, concerning the relationships between the cosmic principles. However, there is one aspect where Soloviev's position in *La Sophia* deeply differ from Proclus' presuppositions in the *Elements of Theology*. This is the way the Russian philosopher uses Sophia's providence towards humans. The attribute of providence, for Proclus, is exclusively divine: only god can provide for everything (theorem 120)<sup>22</sup>. However, Soloviev presents Sophia to provide for everything, squaring a divine characteristic par excellence with the function of her that is closer to the concept of soul. This means that Soloviev seems to abolish the Neoplatonic distinctions concerning the spiritual status and he essentially mixes characteristics attributed to the spirit with characteristics attributed to the soul.

### **Parallels between the theory of love by Proclus (*Commentary on Alcibiades I*) and by Soloviev (*Smysl Lyubvi*)**

In this part of my article I examine Neoplatonic and in particular Proclean patterns upon which Soloviev might form his own theory about love. I propose to approach this possible relation between two philosophers from a wider viewpoint and set out my own view based on the texts of *Commentary on Alcibiades I* and *Smysl Lyubvi*. Soloviev's theory of love contains several concepts from several domains and doctrines. For instance, the notion of *androgyny* was taken from Plato and it was sculpted with the christian meaning of *syzygy*. Or, the matter of free will and its relation to love obtained christian meaning in *Smysl Lyubvi*. The limitations by attempting to elucidate a comparison between the greatest Russian philosopher of the XIX century and the best philosopher of Neoplatonic teachings in the Athenian school, are unsurpassed due to the lack of information provided by Soloviev.

One of the many restrictions is that Soloviev involves personhood in the analysis of love and he calls for its confirmation via rational consciousness<sup>23</sup>. This position refrains significantly from the Neoplatonic one. Moreover, Soloviev speaks of eternal life by involving the whole of personality, embracing in this way the christian perception about man as person. As a Christian philosopher, he had to deal with the 'fall of man' and his salvation only through his repentance, which

---

<sup>22</sup> Providence is the action prior to the thought (theorem 120), *ibid.*, 349. For an extensive study of providence in Proclus, see Opsomer, J. and Steel C., *Proclus: Ten Problems Concerning Providence*, Series: Ancient Commentators on Aristotle, ed. Richard Sorabij (London: Bloomsbury, 2012) [10].

<sup>23</sup> Soloviev, Vladimir, *Smysl Lyubvi*, SS VII: 15.

differentiates him from the Neoplatonic (and Proclean) soteriology of soul through the familiarity with gods which is ensured by the practice of theurgy<sup>24</sup>.

To get back to the parallels points between Proclus and Soloviev on the topic of love, I will start with some structural resemblances between two philosophers regarding the topic of love. Proclus by taking the example of Alcibiades on the *Commentary on Alcibiades I*, he relates the arrogant attitude of the young man with a kind of double ignorance: not knowing himself and his misfortune<sup>25</sup>. It could be argued that here it is implied by Proclus the problematic aspect of ego, which Soloviev interpretes it as the rejection and denial of the ultimate value of the 'other'<sup>26</sup>. Both philosophers impute the malfunctioned aspect of ego to the lack of knowledge.

However, it should be clarified here that when we are talking about egoism in ancient thought, and in particular in Neoplatonism, it is more accurate philosophically to speak of the aspect of 'self' rather than of 'ego'<sup>27</sup>. It is quite obvious that Proclus follows in general the teachings of his predecessor Plotinus about the relation between 'self' and individuality. He believed in multiple selves (two, three or an indefinite number) which can be identified with higher or lower ones, for instance it is possible to identify ourselves with the timeless Intellect<sup>28</sup>. Even if we identify with the timeless Intellect, it is still possible to separate and keep our individuality upon our return to Intellect<sup>29</sup>.

Proclus supports this idea in the *Commentary on Alcibiades I* by not rejecting the problematic aspect of 'self'. Instead, he puts it relationally (within the loving relationship) when he says that it is acceptable in front of the corrupted mass, while it should be discarded in front of a great man<sup>30</sup>. Similarly, Soloviev in the second article of *Smysl Lyubvi*, talks about a kind of transferring our 'self' to the 'other's 'self' by acknowledging the importance of the 'other'. Soloviev does not see this loving relationship as the Platonic mirroring, which brings him closer to Proclus who objected to the appeal to mirroring for understanding the essence of soul<sup>31</sup>. However, Soloviev speaks more about a losing of ourselves into the 'other' self which could be connected with the Proclean grades of 'participation' in love.

---

<sup>24</sup> Proclus, *Commentary on Alcibiades I*, 32.12-17 [11].

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, 102.26-29.

<sup>26</sup> Soloviev, Vladimir, *Smysl Lyubvi*, SS VII:15.

<sup>27</sup> For 'self' and 'ego' in ancient Greek, see Gill, Ch., *The Structured Self in Hellenistic and Roman Thought* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006). P. 344–359 [12].

<sup>28</sup> Stoic Epictetus in *Discourses* (3.24/113-114) and Plutarch in *Moralia and Lives* had already pointed out before Plotinus the concept of 'self', see Roskam, G., "Plutarch on Self and Others," *Ancient Society* 34 (2004): 254-255, accessed June 10, 2021, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/44079853>. [13].

<sup>29</sup> Sorabji, R. *Self: Ancient and Modern Insights about Individuality, Life, and Death* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2006), 36 [14].

<sup>30</sup> Proclus, *Commentary on Alcibiades I*, 62.3-6.

<sup>31</sup> Proclus, *Commentary on Euclid Book I*, 141.2-19 [15].



The ascent of Proclean ‘self’ to the divine reaches to its excess through the process of *mania*,<sup>32</sup> as Soloviev says in Proclus’ entry in the *Brockhaus and Ephron Encyclopedia*<sup>33</sup>. The main stages of this process are pure love (Eros), speculative knowledge of truth (i.e., philosophy) and faith or pious exercises (prayers, sacrifices, and theurgy)<sup>34</sup>. Soloviev ends the article written for Proclus by providing the general definition of ‘theurgy’ as «the active communication with higher demons and gods, with auxiliary means» [1, c. 418], i.e., music and poetry.

From this definition it is not clear enough what kind of active communication with gods was meant here by Soloviev. Some suggested for instance that the theurgists in antiquity operated on gods, or others supported the idea that theurgists had the power to make a man like god by using the action coming from divine. In case of Proclus, we have only two opuscula which deal exclusively with theurgy: a collection of five fragments entitled in the manuscripts as *Πρόκλου ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς χαλδαϊκῆς φιλοσοφίας* (*Chal.Phil*) and one fragment known as *Opus Procli de sacrificio et magia* [*Περὶ τῆς καθ’ Ἑλληνικῆς ἱερατικῆς τέχνης*]<sup>35</sup>. From these works it seems that Proclus understood with the second way the role of theurgists<sup>36</sup>. Moreover, it is quite unclear whether Soloviev had in mind the meaning of theurgy as given by Iamblichus: a mode of fellowship [*φιλία*] with the divine that is independent of philosophical thought, by adding that “what effects theurgic union is the carrying through of reverently accomplished actions which are unspeakable and transcend any intellectual grasp, as well as the power of mute symbols which only the gods understand”<sup>37</sup>.

The above hypothesis of Soloviev’s contingent reference to Iamblichus’ meaning of theurgy is based on the symbol of Sophia both in his poetry and philosophy. If Soloviev employed Sophia as a symbol in order to achieve a union

<sup>32</sup> Before Proclus, Hermias Alexandrinus was the one who in his commentary on Plato’s *Phaedrus*, claimed that there are four kinds of *mania* (madness): poetic, mantic, erotic, and teletic, Manolea, P.-Ch., “Possessed and Inspired: Hermias on Divine Madness,” *The International Journal of the Platonic Tradition* 7, no. 13 (2013):169-176 [16].

<sup>33</sup> См.: Соловьёв В.С. Прокл. С. 418.

<sup>34</sup> Probably Soloviev had read Proclus’ *Platonic Theology* where he says that «there are three things which fill the divine and go through all kinds of higher beings: they are goodness, wisdom, and beauty. There are also again three inferior beings which gather these qualities and extend them to all the divine worlds: they are faith, truth, and love. By them everything is saved and joined together with the primordial causes, some through erotic madness, others through philosophy, and others by theurgic power which is higher than all human soundness of mind and science, embracing the blessings of divination, the purifying powers of the perfect initiation and absolutely all the operations of inspired possession» [2, I.112, 25-113,10].

<sup>35</sup> It has been argued by Anne Sheppard that in Proclean philosophy there are three kinds of theurgy: the white magic (the lowest form), unification of Soul at the level of Nous, and the mystical union with the One (the highest form), Sheppard, A., “Proclus’ Attitude to Theurgy,” *Classical Quarterly* 32 (1982): 211–224 [17].

<sup>36</sup> van den Berg, R. Proclus’ Hymns Series: *Philosophia antiqua* 90 / Edited by J. Mansfeld, D.T. Runia and J.C.M. van Winden. Leiden, 2001, 67, 76 [18].

<sup>37</sup> Iamblichus, *Περὶ Μυστηρίων* [*On the Mysteries*], I.12, II.11 [19].

with gods (or Christian God), then probably he was closer to Iamblichus' than to Proclean meaning of theurgy. If, however, he employed Sophia in order to activate the ties of the neoplatonic *sympatheia* [συμπάθεια] between himself and god, then it seemed that he approached the Proclean theurgy<sup>38</sup>.

In the same vein, it should be examined Soloviev's reference to poetry as means of 'theurgy' in order to understand how poetry could be part of theurgical practice. Proclus used also poetry in order to fit 'theurgy', as activity of eros, into his philosophical system. From the seven hymns that he wrote, two of them are dedicated to the goddess Aphrodite, traditionally connected to eros<sup>39</sup>. In both hymns (*To Aphrodite*, *To Aphrodite of Lycia*) Proclus through the phase of *oikéiōsis* (familiar with divine) prays to Aphrodite Ourania not to be a victim of the wrong kind of love<sup>40</sup>.

In particular, in the hymn *To Aphrodite* [Εἰς Ἀφροδίτην] Proclus presents Aphrodite's activities through three kinds of eros: eros as anagogic force which moves upwards and downwards in the human soul, eros as cosmic force, and eros as procreative source<sup>41</sup>. From these kinds of eros [Ἔρωτες] the first one is more related to the providential and reversive eros as elaborated in the *Commentary on Alcibiades I*. This double movement of eros (from the top to the bottom inspiring lower beings, and from downwards to upwards as a result of the former movement) represents the relation of the lover as a provider for his beloved, and the reversion of the beloved, who strives after superior beauty, to his lover. As for Aphrodite as the World Soul, Proclus keeps a distance by saying that «whether you envelop the great heaven all around, / where, as they say, you are the divine soul of the everlasting cosmos» (verses 15-16) [11, 30.16]. It seems that Proclus here reproduces Plotinus' position about the identification between Aphrodite and the World Soul.

In the other hymn dedicated to Aphrodite, *To Aphrodite of Lycia* (*Εἰς Λυκίην Ἀφροδίτην*), Proclus stresses the importance of symbols, without referring what kind of, in his prayer: «(a statue) with the symbols of the noeric marriage, / of the noeric wedding of the fiery Hephaistos and Aphrodite Ourania;» (verses 5-6) [19, p. 243]. Maybe here Proclus through the invocation to the statue of Aphrodite and the myth of her marriage to Hephaistos, used the theory of theurgy in order to reach the cause of beauty in the material world. Moreover, the adjective of *ἀγλαομήτις* (having shining wisdom) that he attributes to Aphrodite here, I think that it is quite

---

<sup>38</sup> Iamblichus mentions material symbols (animals or plants, stones and aromatic substances), but also symbolic pictures, names, musical compositions, and numbers, *Περί Μυστηρίων* [*On the Mysteries*] II.11, V.23.

<sup>39</sup> It is quite likely that Proclus refers to these hymns in particular to Aphrodite Ourania. Close to his house in Agora, there was a sanctuary of Aphrodite Ourania, van den Berg, *Proclus' Hymns*, 191.

<sup>40</sup> Proclus in the *Commentary on Timaeus* (I 211, 8-212, 1) divides divine prayer into five successive phases: knowledge [γνώσις], familiar with the divine [*oikéiōsis*], becoming like the divine [ὁμοίωσις], contact [συναφή], and approaching [ἐμπέλασις] [20].

<sup>41</sup> All these kinds of eros are participated in by humans, van den Berg, *Proclus' Hymns*, 193,196.

indicative of his intentions to connect philosophical wisdom with love. As he says in the *Commentary on Alcibiades I* the intellect in the soul is a product of the divine *Mêtis* [Μῆτις] which together with *aporia*, the main condition of philosophy, produces love (*eros*) to search for perfect knowledge<sup>42</sup>.

Comparing Aphrodite as a divine symbol of love in Proclus' hymns with Soloviev's symbol of Sophia in his poetry, I think that Soloviev tried to apply in some extent a part of the neoplatonic theory behind theurgy in his verses. Poetry for Soloviev was the vehicle through which the whole meaning of the universe (externally as beauty of nature, internally as love) is revealed in poetic soul. Based on the themes of 'beauty of nature' and 'love', he is not talking about Sophia, so there is not a kind of *sophiology* here. Instead, he is talking about the ways that Sophia is embodied in the union with the divine world. His invocations to her and to the cosmic elements, especially in the so called 'sophianic circle' of his poems, might be interpreted as means of achieving or better to say of invoking the neoplatonic *sympatheia* [συμπάθεια], which was the basic stipulation of one of the phases of theurgy<sup>43</sup>. We cannot say with certainty, however, if Soloviev saw Sophia in his poetry as the prime cause of the likeness of god as Proclus did in his hymns<sup>44</sup>.

Moving to theurgy in philosophy of both philosophers, I start with *Commentary on Alcibiades I*, where Proclus seems to achieve with 'theurgy' the union between intellectual contemplation and the hieratic art. In particular, his 'theurgy' seems to stand somewhere in the middle: between the rational basis of Plotinian mysticism and Iamblichus' purely magic aspect (more practical method or lower 'theurgy') of 'theurgy'<sup>45</sup>. In this respect, contemplative wisdom guides to an ascent to the God of philosophers, while hieratic art is a process of realization of the direct connection with the gods of the traditional pantheon. This unifying function of 'theurgy' is reflected on the same erotic process that human souls and those of lower divinities do follow. In particular, lower divinities use theurgy while provide for the imperfect souls, while the human souls are reflected from the good providence of gods<sup>46</sup>. Yet, 'theurgy' as activity of the third part of the triad (faith-truth-love) is expressed as invocation to gods when theurgists want to reach them<sup>47</sup>.

<sup>42</sup> Proclus, *Commentary on Alcibiades I*, 236.

<sup>43</sup> Proclus says about *sympatheia*: "According to fate mortal beings are also connected with eternal beings and are set in rotation together with them, and all are in mutual sympathy", Steel, *Proclus: On Providence*, 47. Proclus used theurgical hymns and ritual, based on *sympatheia* to attract the leader-gods in order to be elevated towards the Nous, Layne, A. Danielle, "Philosophical Prayer in Proclus's *Commentary on Plato's Timaeus*," *The Review of Metaphysics* 67, no. 2 (2013): 349 [21].

<sup>44</sup> van den Berg, *Proclus' Hymns*, 85.

<sup>45</sup> Sheppard, "Proclus' Attitude to Theurgy," 212.

<sup>46</sup> Proclus, *Commentary on Alcibiades I*, 32.18-21.

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*, 51.1

This third part was employed by Soloviev in *Smysl Lyubvi* when he speaks, implicitly though, of the theurgic task of love (third article)<sup>48</sup>. Here Soloviev speaks of the realization of sexual love in the realm of personal and social life. In the former, the aim is the creation of a new and complete human being, while in the latter the creation of a new humanity based on Godhuman process (*bogochelovechestvo*) is prevailed<sup>49</sup>. Taking into consideration that on the one hand Neoplatonic theurgy offered to symbols a mysterious and even dark dimension, and on the other hand offered a kind of godlikeness, it seems that Soloviev followed in some extent this way of thinking when he elaborated his theory on sexual love.

Regarding personal life, Soloviev believes that marriage represents the free union of the male and female principle, overcoming their specific differences<sup>50</sup>. In this process, individuals discover each other through love, which leads to their union and to the constitution of their new personhood. So, it seems that the sacrament of marriage executes a kind of *ergon* [ἔργον] for Soloviev. I think that here he christianizes the neoplatonic theurgy in order to show that people can guide their personal lives to a higher purpose, keeping their personhood.

In social life, the theurgic task of love is incarnated into Divine Humanity as he shows in the last article of *Smysl Lyubvi*. Soloviev conceives theurgy here as a process of humanity's transfiguration into divinity, participating in All-Unity (*vseedinstvo*). The result of this transfiguration is the creation of Divine Humanity (*bogochelovechestvo*), which resembles the Eastern Orthodox notion of *theōsis* (deification). Here the first part of the Proclean triad of mysticism (faith-truth-love) is translated into a religious experience where each individual understands the absolute through himself, the others and the relationship with them<sup>51</sup>. The theurgic task of sexual love role in this social process, which ultimately becomes universal, is to unify our identities and to give intellectual and moral meaning to the human life<sup>52</sup>.

### **World Soul in Proclus' *Commentary on Timaeus* and in Soloviev's *La Sophia* and *Smysl Lyubvi***

In general, Proclus derives the structure of the World Soul from the *Timaeus* account (*Timaeus* 34b-37c): «The Creator makes the World Soul as an image

---

<sup>48</sup> Regarding 'theurgy' Soloviev in his work *Dukhovnyye osnovy zhizni* [*Spiritual Foundations of Life*] referred to both terms: "The new religion is an active theurgy, in other words a collective act of the Divine and Humanity toward the regeneration of the latter from the material or corporeal into the spiritual and divine." *Dukhovnyye osnovy zhizni* SS III: 377. In his early work *Filosofskiye nachala tsel'nogo znaniya* (1877) [*Philosophical Principles of Integral Knowledge*], Soloviev spoke of *svobodnaia teurgii* (free theurgy), where the artistic creation becomes a theurgic act, *Filosofskiye nachala tsel'nogo znaniya* SS I: 286.

<sup>49</sup> Soloviev, Vladimir, *Smysl Lyubvi*, SS VII: 24.

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*, 22.

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid.* P. 49.

<sup>52</sup> *Ibid.* P. 50.

[εἰκόνα] of all the divine orders, in the same way as he makes the sensible world an image of the intelligible. Firstly, he gives subsistence to the whole existence [οὐσία] of the soul and subsequently divides it into numbers [ἀριθμούς] binds it with harmonies [ἁρμονίες], and puts it into order with figures [σχήματα], I mean, the rectilinear and the circular. Then, he divides it into one circle and seven circles...the monad subsists according to the circle of sameness [ταυτότης], but the the divided part according to the circle of otherness [ἐτερότης]» [20, 34b–37c]. The ‘harmony’ as Proclus says, is the harmonic blending of ‘Sameness’ and ‘Difference’, which in the Platonic Timaeus (35c–36c) it was expanded into a complicated exposition of the Greek diatonic musical scale, a quite obvious sign of Pythagorean influence.

In his commentary on Timaeus, Proclus follows in general, the neoplatonic view of World Soul, as an intermediate between Intellect and Nature. He describes it as the «guardian over the whole order» and «the point around which the whole universe dances» [20, II 107. 14–19]. In this respect, World Soul having its own kinds of Forms (the ‘projected reason principles’), has the ability to provide motion, multiplicity in the body of the world, actualize it, control it and infuse to it the form derived from Intellect<sup>53</sup>. By being a part of Intellect, Soul (and World Soul) maintains continuity, which does not prohibit it from dividing itself and moving in time and space<sup>54</sup>.

These attributes of the World Soul could be useful in order to discuss the matter of immortality of the soul and in particular its limitations when it is ready for the union with the One. The human soul, the lowest in the hierarchy of the rational souls, does not have the ability to assimilate with the higher levels of reality due to its limited contact with the Intellect<sup>55</sup>. However, the World Soul provides continuity within discontinuities by combining stasis and movement, while with its own activities between the intelligible and the physical world it can infuse to the physical world all that it is sharing with Intellect. In this way, it could be possible to cause to the human soul the desire to contact with its higher hypostases. With the assistance of ‘theurgy’, the Neoplatonic World Soul obtains soteriological orientation within Proclean philosophy, but it seems to be limited. This limitation maybe derived from the fact that for Neoplatonists, and in particular for Proclus, the potential salvation of soul was not possible for everyone. One reason could be that the route to salvation turned out to be the philosophic life, a continuous effort of the mind to return to the One, i.e., a spiritual purification of demonic souls. With Iamblichus, this limitation becomes even more difficult to be exceeded since he stresses that the key to the whole process always lies in the gods. The humans are unable to extort any effect from the higher beings<sup>56</sup>.

<sup>53</sup> Proclus, *Commentary on Timaeus*, III 335.17–23.

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*, III 3.1.

<sup>55</sup> Finamore, F. J. and Kutash, E. *Proclus on the Psychê* // Edited by Pieter d’Hoine and Marije Martijn *All from One: A Guide to Proclus*. Oxford, 2017. P. 128 [22].

<sup>56</sup> Iamblichus, *Περὶ Μυστηρίων* [*On the Mysteries*] III, 9.

Furthermore, Proclus' understanding of World Soul, as intermediate, is based on the principles between whole and parts or the unified whole and the divided plurality. As we have already seen in the *Elements of Theology*, the relation between whole and parts is defined through the trifold relationship of: a) the whole prior to the parts, b) the whole consisting from the parts, and c) the wholeness in each part. Under these principles Proclus interpretes the relationship of the World Soul with numbers, by reading numbers corresponding to the psychic principles as images of divine causes<sup>57</sup>. In particular, he applies the three main principles of his philosophy in order to show the relationship between number and causes. Thus, the three cycles of procession, remaining and reversion correspond respectively to number two, number one, and number three. This triad of numbers corresponds in turn to the triad of the three kinds of wholeness: that prior to the parts, that of the parts, and that in the parts.

The main ingredients of the cosmic process in general and of the World Soul in particular, are the qualities of Being, Sameness, and Difference. Here Proclus' contribution on the platonic dialogue is to speak of 'intermediates' of these three fundamental cosmic principles. As he explains, the 'difference' and the 'sameness' are not equated to the divisible and to the indivisible kinds of Being respectively<sup>58</sup>. And this makes sense since the core of the neoplatonic doctrine is that 'all things are in all.' So, Proclus places the Demiurge to combine the indivisible kind of Sameness to the divisible kind in order to form a third kind, an intermediate one. The same applies to the Difference. In this way, the first stage of the cosmic process (or the Demiurgic activity) ends with the creation of three kinds of ingredients for the World Soul, including three intermediate gradations of Being, Sameness, and Difference<sup>59</sup>.

The above qualities of the World Soul in the *Commentary on Timaeus* could be used, in some extent, in order to understand how Soloviev integrate them in his notion of World Soul. However, the main challenge of seeking the meaning of the World Soul in Soloviev's philosophy is that it is not clear where in his work he identifies it with his concept of Sophia. As a mystic, it seems that he preferred not to reveal Sophia every time that he was referring to the World Soul. Starting with this limitation, I expose here Soloviev's references to the World Soul in his work, while I will try to bring forward some resemblances between the Proclean approach of the World Soul in the *Commentary on Timaeus* and Soloviev's *La Sophia* and *Smysl Lyubvi*.

---

<sup>57</sup> Proclus, *Commentary on Timaeus*, 214.31-215.2.

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 155.20-156.8.

<sup>59</sup> Depending on the predominance of each of them, the quality of the encosmic soul is different. For instance, if Being predominates, then this fact makes a soul divine. If Sameness predominates, then the soul is demonic, and if Difference predominates then the soul is human. This differentiation is subordinated to mathematical principles. So, Proclus, following here Plato, he says that all encosmic souls must have the same ratios, starting with the initial unit 384 for World Soul, *ibid.*, III 255.30-256.21.

In the entry of the 'World Soul' Soloviev refers explicitly to the meaning of the World Soul as elaborated in *Timaeus*: «living in all phenomena as a subordinate principle, perceiving and realizing in the sensory field and in the temporal process the highest ideal unity, forever in the absolute beginning» [1, c. 282]. From this direct reference to Plato, and then to Neoplatonists and to the history of the World Soul in philosophy (Church Fathers, Renaissance, Goethe, Schelling), it is quite possible that he had an excellent knowledge of the World Soul as a cosmological and metaphysical principle. However, he does not analyse further the ancient view of the World Soul. Instead, he prefers to focus on Hartmann's view of the World Soul as the unconscious world creativity, by providing his own argumentation and at the end by rejecting the World Soul as the unconditionally independent and unique essence of everything<sup>60</sup>. This view was unacceptable for Soloviev because it was against the character of the world process: «assuming the world soul as the only source, such a process would be a constant product of something unconditionally new or a continuous creation from nothing, that is, a pure miracle» [1, c. 283].

Apart from the entry of the 'World Soul', Soloviev refers to the World Soul in the *Brockhaus and Ephron Encyclopedia* in several entries, such as 'Hermes Trismegistus', 'Plato', 'potency' 'matter', 'life', 'mysticism', and 'providence'. These entries could be indicative of Soloviev's intentions to connect some functions of the World Soul with specific philosophical/mystical traditions. This does not mean, however, that the concept of the World Soul is limited to these notions in Soloviev's philosophy. Thus, from *Hermetic* writings, may derive the connection of the World Soul with the order of gods, from Plato's *Timaeus* World Soul's intermediate role, while from the notion of 'life' World Soul may reproduce the Proclean concept of the wholeness within parts and vice versa. In the same vein, he sees the potency and act within the World Soul, while when he speaks of the World Soul with mystical terms, then he sees it as a means of communication between the human spirit and the divine. His approach of the World Soul as God's executive power while exercising providence, might be considered as the most theological interpretation of the World Soul given by Soloviev.

Since I have showed the dimensions of the World Soul in the relative entries in the *Brockhaus and Ephron Encyclopedia*, I will proceed with the possible correlations between the World Soul in *La Sophia* and *Smysl Lyubvi*, and in the *Commentary on Timaeus*. In *Smysl Lyubvi* it is quite uncertain if Soloviev implies somewhere in the text the role of the World Soul in the realization of the All-Unity through sexual love. I think that in *Smysl Lyubvi* Soloviev's intention is to praise the role of human soul rather than of World Soul in the creation of ideal humanity. This creates an antithesis with his intentions in *La Sophia*, *Chteniya o bogochelovechestve* and *La Russie et l'église universelle*, where world soul was considered as nature independent from the whole. However, there is a passage in *Smysl Lyubvi* where

<sup>60</sup> См.: Соловьёв В.С. Мировая душа. С. 285.

Soloviev seems to involve mystically the notion of the World Soul and in particular its neoplatonic interpretation, when he defines sexual love. He says that this kind of love relies on the homogeneity of nature and on the general difference in the form of the two interconnected existences<sup>61</sup>.

Maybe here the two ingredients of the World Soul, the 'Sameness' and the 'Difference', and their between relationship which Proclus stressed in the *Commentary on Timaeus*, are implied by Soloviev. If we take into consideration the Platonic meaning of 'Sameness' as unity and continuity, and 'Difference' as division and separation, then maybe sexual love was an example for Soloviev of perfect union between the universality and the distinguished individuality. Besides, this was the main principle of his metaphysics in *La Sophia*: the convergence between the universal and the individual or the understanding of the universality in terms of relativity. The difference is that in *La Sophia* the principles of 'Sameness' and 'Difference' are applied to his cosmogony, which maybe indicates a direct platonic influence, while in *Smysl Lyubvi* the notions of 'Sameness' and 'Difference' could be considered as the quality characteristics of sexual love, whose cosmic force (see *La Sophia*)<sup>62</sup> is disregarded in *Smysl Lyubvi* for the sake of the realization of the God-human process (*bogochelovechestvo*).

Moreover, in *La Sophia* Soloviev attributes to the hypostasis of the Soul a feminine character, which it is identified with Sophia. In particular, However, when he describes her 'fall' in *La Sophia*, it seems like an early identification of Sophia with the World Soul: «in her real or sensual multiplicity is an act, ideality is the same, as well as spirituality is the essence of potency» [5, p. 55–62]. Apart from Sophia's theurgic tasks that they are quite obvious here, his reference to the notion of potency may imply a connection to the World Soul, as we have already seen in the entry of 'potency' in the *Brockhaus and Ephron Encyclopedia*.

In the same work, when he speaks of the historic process that follows the cosmic one, he refers explicitly to the fact that man is inspirited by the World Soul itself, not just by its action (the case of animals) but as a part of it. Here, he follows the neoplatonic categorization of the souls (Soul-World Soul-individual souls) in order to prove that an individual soul has an eternal element of the World Soul. However, he states that the several conceptions of the Soul as elaborated by the ancient philosophies are incomplete. By almost denouncing the conception of the World Soul by the Greco-Roman philosophy, I do not think that he rejects it in total, but it seems more like a criticism on the conception of the World Soul as an idea by the classical world<sup>63</sup>. Maybe this is the reason that makes him to speak of the liberation of human self-consciousness and the gradual spiritualization of man through which the actual historical process of mankind will start<sup>64</sup>.

---

<sup>61</sup> Soloviev, Vladimir, *Smysl Lyubvi*, SS VII: 18-19.

<sup>62</sup> Vladimir Soloviev, *La Sophia et les autres écrits français*, 13.

<sup>63</sup> Ibid. P. 156.

<sup>64</sup> Ibid. P. 70.



### Список литературы

1. Соловьёв В.С. Прокл // Соловьёв В.С. Философский словарь Владимира Соловьёва. Ростов н/Д: Феникс: Беляев Г.В., 1997. С. 414–418.
2. Proclus. Περί της κατά Πλάτωνα Θεολογίας. Αθήνα: Κάκτος, 1999. Т. 10 (690).
3. Schelling F.W.J. On the True Concept of Philosophy of Nature and the Correct Way of Solving its Problems. Translated by Judith Kahl and Daniel Whistler. Available at: <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/80775296.pdf>.
4. Jugrin D. Knowing the Ineffable One: The Mystical Philosophy of Proclus // Philobiblon. 2017. Vol. 22, No. 2. P. 21–37.
5. Soloviev Vladimir. *La Sophia et les autres écrits français*. Edités et présentés par François Rouleau. Lausanne: La Cite- L'Age d'Homme, 1978.
6. Plotinus. Εννεάς Πέμπτη. Αθήνα: Κάκτος, 2000.
7. Rappe S. Reading Neoplatonism: Non-discursive Thinking in the Texts of Plotinus, Proclus, and Damascius. Cambridge, 2000.
8. Proclus. Στοχασίως Θεολογική. Αθήνα: Κάκτος, 2007. Т. 14 (634).
9. Radlov E.L. *Sobranie Sochinenii Vladimira Sergeevicha Solov'eva*. Vol. 12. Saint-Petersburg: 1901–1903; reprint, Bruxelles: Foyer Oriental Chrétien, 1966.
10. Opsomer J., Steel C. Proclus: Ten Problems Concerning Providence, Series: Ancient Commentators on Aristotle / Edited by Richard Sorabij. London, 2012.
11. Proclus. Σχόλια εις τον Άλκιβιάδην. Αθήνα: Κάκτος, 2005. Т. 15 (635).
12. Gill Ch. The Structured Self in Hellenistic and Roman Thought. Oxford, 2006.
13. Roskam G. Plutarch on Self and Others // *Ancient Society*. 2004. Vol. 34. P. 254–255. Available at: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/44079853>.
14. Sorabji R. *Self: Ancient and Modern Insights about Individuality, Life, and Death*. Chicago, 2006.
15. Proclus. Σχόλια εις τον Εὐκλείδη. Αθήνα: Κάκτος, 2008. Т. 32 (652).
16. Manolea P.-Ch. Possessed and Inspired: Hermias on Divine Madness // *The International Journal of the Platonic Tradition*. 2013. Vol. 7, No. 13. P. 156–179.
17. Sheppard A. Proclus' Attitude to Theurgy // *Classical Quarterly*. 1982. Vol. 32. P. 211–224.
18. van den Berg, R. Proclus' Hymns Series: *Philosophia antiqua 90* / Edited by J. Mansfeld, D.T. Runia, J.C.M. van Winden. Leiden, 2001.
19. Iamblichus. Περί μυστηρίων. Αθήνα: Κάκτος, 2005. Т. 5 (790).
20. Proclus. Σχόλια εις τον Τίμαιον. Αθήνα: Κάκτος, 2006. Т. 22–24 (642).
21. Layne A.D. Philosophical Prayer in Proclus's Commentary on Plato's Timaeus // *The Review of Metaphysics*. 2013. Vol. 67, No. 2. P. 345–368.
22. Finamore F.J., Kutash E. Proclus on the Psychê / Edited by Pieter d'Hoine and Marije Martijn All from One: A Guide to Proclus. Oxford, 2017. P. 122–139.

### References

#### (Sources)

#### *Collected Works*

1. Radlov, E.L. *Sobranie Sochinenii Vladimira Sergeevicha Solov'eva v 12 t.* [Collected Works by Vladimir Sergeevich Solovyov in 12 vol.]. Saint-Petersburg, 1901–1903; reprint, Bruxelles: Foyer Oriental Chrétien, 1966.

#### *Individual Works*

2. Belyayev, G.V. *Filosofskiy slovar' Vladimira Solov'eva* [Philosophical Dictionary of Vladimir Soloviev]. Rostov n/D: Izdatel'stvo Feniks, 1997.

3. Iamblichus. Περί μυστηρίων [On the Mysteries]. Αθήνα: Κάκτος, 2005, vol. 5(790).
4. Proclus. Περί της κατά Πλάτωνα Θεολογίας [Platonic Theology]. Αθήνα: Κάκτος, 1999, vol. 10(690).
5. Proclus. Στοιχείωσις Θεολογική [Elements of Theology]. Αθήνα: Κάκτος, 2007, vol. 14(634).
6. Proclus. Σχόλια εἰς τον Ἀλκιβιάδην [Commentary on Alcibiades I]. Αθήνα: Κάκτος, 2005, vol. 15(635).
7. Proclus. Σχόλια εἰς τον Εὐκλείδη [Commentary on Euclid Book I]. Αθήνα: Κάκτος, 2008, vol. 32(652).
8. Proclus. Σχόλια εἰς τον Τίμαιον [Commentary on Timaeus]. Αθήνα: Κάκτος, 2006, vol. 22–24(642).
9. Plotinus. Εννεάς Πέμπτη [Enneads]. Αθήνα: Κάκτος, 2000.
10. Soloviev, V.S. La Sophia et les autres écrits français, edités et présentés par François Rouleau. Lausanne: La Cite- L'Age d'Homme, 1978.

#### (Articles from Scientific Journals)

11. Jugrin, D. Knowing the Ineffable One: The Mystical Philosophy of Proclus, in *Philobiblon*, 2017, vol. 22, no. 2, pp. 21–37.
12. Layne, A.D. Philosophical Prayer in Proclus's Commentary on Plato's Timaeus, in *The Review of Metaphysics*, 2013, vol. 67, no. 2, pp. 345–368.
13. Manolea, P.-Ch. Possessed and Inspired: Hermias on Divine Madness, in *The International Journal of the Platonic Tradition*, 2013, vol. 7, no. 13, pp. 156–179.
14. Sheppard, A. Proclus' Attitude to Theurgy, in *Classical Quarterly*, 1982, vol. 32, pp. 211–224.

#### (Articles from Proceedings and Collections of Research Papers)

15. Finamore, F.J., Kutash, E. Proclus on the Psychê, in Pieter d'Hoine and Marije Martijn All from One: A Guide to Proclus. Oxford, 2017, pp. 122–139.

#### (Monographs)

16. Gill, Ch. The Structured Self in Hellenistic and Roman Thought. Oxford, 2006.
17. Opsomer, J. and Steel, C. Proclus: Ten Problems Concerning Providence. Series: Ancient Commentators on Aristotle. London, 2012.
18. Rappe, S. Reading Neoplatonism: Non-discursive Thinking in the Texts of Plotinus, Proclus, and Damascius. Cambridge, 2000.
19. Sorabji, R. Self: Ancient and Modern Insights about Individuality, Life, and Death. Chicago, 2006.
20. van den Berg, R. Proclus' Hymns, Series: Philosophia antiqua 90. Leiden, 2001.

#### (Electronic Sources)

21. Roskam, G. Plutarch on Self and Others, in *Ancient Society*, 2004, vol. 34, pp. 254–255. Available at: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/44079853>.
22. Schelling, F.W.J. On the True Concept of Philosophy of Nature and the Correct Way of Solving its Problems. Translated by Judith Kahl and Daniel Whistler. Available at: <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/80775296.pdf>.

## Реферат

Параллели с традицией неоплатонизма, имеющиеся в раннем творчестве В.С. Соловьева, уже рассматривались некоторыми исследователями. Однако роль, которую конкретные неоплатонические концепции философии Прокла сыграли для философского развития В.С. Соловьева, должна быть рассмотрена более подробно. В нашей работе представлен сравнительный анализ трех работ Прокла («Элементы теологии» [Στοιχείωσις θεολογική], «Комментарий к Алкивиаду» I [Σχόλια εἰς τὸν Ἀλκιβιάδην], «Комментарий к Тимею» [Σχόλια εἰς Τιμαίον]) и сочинений В.С. Соловьева *La Sophia* и «Смысл любви», а также его статьи «Прокл», написанной для «Энциклопедического словаря» Ф.А. Брокгауза, И.А. Ефрона. В сопоставлении с учением Прокла в статье проанализированы важнейшие понятия философии Соловьева: *любовь*, *космическое единство* и *Мировая душа*.

Первая часть нашего исследования посвящена анализу единственного сочинения В.С. Соловьева, где он прямо ссылается на философию Прокла, – это упомянутая выше статья «Прокл». В.С. Соловьев не находился под прямым влиянием Прокла. Однако нам удалось обнаружить некоторые параллели в характеристике мыслителями феномена мистицизма. В целом совершенно очевидно, что мистицизм Соловьева ближе к пантеизму, где индивидуальная душа сливается с физическим миром. В этом отношении он больше всего ценит мистику Прокла, где божественная энергия и совершенство нисходят в разумную реальность, сохраняя свое превосходство над логическими существами.

Во второй части статьи мы рассматриваем космические принципы в «Элементах теологии» Прокла и в *La Sophia* Соловьева. Наше исследование сосредоточено на понятии *потенции*, которое Соловьев, как и Прокл, приписывает двум полюсам бытия (Духу и Материи), а также на отношениях между производящим и производимым. В.С. Соловьев в сочинении «София» упоминает этот общий принцип, характеризуя *множественность*, порождаемую *единством*. Рассматривая завершение космического процесса, Соловьев переносит этот принцип и на более низкие уровни, в частности, на создание человеческого организма, самого совершенного из всех организмов. Еще одна точка соприкосновения между «Элементами теологии» Прокла и *La Sophia* Соловьева – понимание связи между Мировой Душой и знанием, которую следует включить в пару желание–обращение. Эта связь описывается обоими философами как взаимная связь: без желания обращение невозможно и является бессмысленным.

Третья часть статьи посвящена возможным параллелям между теорией любви в «Комментарии к Алкивиаду» I Прокла и в «Смысле любви» Соловьева. Наш анализ сосредоточен на двух моментах – *проблематическом аспекте эго* и *теургической задаче любви*. В конце этой части сопоставляется

божественный символ любви (*Афродита*) в гимнах Прокла с символом *Софии* в поэзии Соловьева. В стихотворениях В.С. Соловьева мы обнаруживаем влияние неоплатонической теории теургии. Поэзия для философа была средством, с помощью которого в поэтической душе раскрывается весь смысл мироздания (внешне – как красота природы, внутренне – как любовь). В стихотворениях, посвященных темам *красоты природы* и *любви*, Соловьев воспевает воплощение *Софии* в божественном мире.

В последней части статьи сопоставляется учение о *Мировой Душе* Прокла, изложенное в «Комментарии к Тимею», с учением о *Мировой Душе* Соловьева, представленным в его сочинениях *La Sophia* и «Смысл любви». Основными составляющими *Мировой Души* являются, согласно Платону, качества Бытия, Подобия и Различия. Прокла дополняет эти платоновские фундаментальные космические принципы «промежуточными звеньями». Прокл утверждает, что «Различие» и «Подобие» не приравняются к делимым и неделимым видам бытия соответственно. И это имеет смысл, поскольку суть неоплатонической доктрины в том, что «*все во всем*» (*hén kai pân*). Возможно, две составляющие *Мировой Души*, «Подобие» и «Различие», и их взаимосвязь, которую Прокл подчеркивал в «Комментарии к Тимею», подразумеваются Соловьевым. Если принять во внимание платоновское понимание «Подобия» как единства и непрерывности, а «Различия» – как разделения и обособления, то, возможно, половая любовь была для Соловьева примером совершенного союза между всеобщностью и отличительной индивидуальностью. Кроме того, это был основной принцип его метафизики в сочинении *La Sophia*: сближение универсального и индивидуального или понимание универсальности в терминах относительности.