

Too Many Logoi: The Role of Logoi Within Proclus' System

by

Lucas Paolini

A thesis

presented to the University Of Waterloo

in fulfilment of the

thesis requirement for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

Philosophy

Waterloo, Ontario, Canada, 2023

© Lucas Paolini 2023

Author's Declaration

I hereby declare that I am the sole author of this thesis. This is a true copy of the thesis, including any required final revisions, as accepted by my examiners.

I understand that my thesis may be made electronically available to the public.

Abstract

The purpose of the present study is to understand the role of logoi within Proclus' metaphysical system. Much of the scholarship on Proclus has largely left the topic of logoi to the side, leaving the understanding of the principle ambiguous. The study aims to show that to fully understand Proclus' metaphysical system a better understanding of the logoi and their role within the system needs to be done. By showing how the logoi participate in the realms of Being and Becoming as well as showing their impact on causality and the World Soul, one begins to see the importance the principle has for Proclus' epistemology and ontology. Without the logoi the metaphysical system of Proclus would be incomplete, making the principle integral to understanding Proclus.

Keywords: Proclus, Logoi, epistemology, ontology, World Soul

Acknowledgements

Firstly, I would like to thank my supervisor Professor Jacqueline Feke for keeping me on track and providing me with great feedback throughout the writing process. I feel as if I have become a better writer and thinker thanks to her guidance and support. I would also like to thank Professor Chris Lowry and Professor Doreen Fraser as they provided valuable feedback. I would also like to thank my family for their support and understanding. I would not be where I am today without their love and guidance.

Table of Contents

Title Page.....	i
Author's Declaration.....	ii
Abstract.....	iii
Acknowledgements.....	iv
Chapter One.....	1
Introduction.....	1
Causality of the One.....	1
Intellect.....	13
Chapter Two.....	16
World Soul.....	16
Chapter Three.....	22
Logoi.....	22
Two-Fold Nature of the Logoi.....	43
Conclusion.....	47
Bibliography.....	50

Chapter One

Introduction: Logoi

Proclus (412AD-485AD) in his *Commentary on Timaeus* discusses the creation of the physical cosmos as it relates to the philosopher's broader Neoplatonic metaphysical system. The concept of logoi or rational forming principles is an ambiguous idea used by Proclus. The philosopher uses the concept without much clarification as to the function and purpose of the logoi themselves and the exact way that they are supposed to be interpreted in his broader metaphysical system. How the logoi function within both the causal structure of reality and how they relate and pertain to the World Soul are the areas in which the least amount of inquiry has been made. Are they strictly the forming principles that create the physical cosmos? or do they allow the World Soul itself to have different kinds of knowledge that coincide with the circles of the Same and Different? These are some of the few questions that highlight the ambiguity of the concepts. Through combining different views of the logoi themselves I will try to show that the logoi have a dual nature. The logoi are integral to both the ontological causal chain of reality and the epistemology of the World Soul and individual soul. The two-fold nature of the logoi is due to their participation in the realms of Being and Becoming, which make the logoi an important aspect of Proclus' system.

Causality of the One

To understand Proclus' system in its full scope and how the individual logoi participate within the system, the causal structure of reality first needs to be elucidated in greater detail. A list of key concepts will be given that are necessary to understand the structure of reality that

Proclus puts forward. Some of the key concepts such as transcendence and immanence will show the nature and function of the multiple types of causes that Proclus uses. The concept of the first principle of the causal chain and its identification as both the One and the Good indicate the start and finishing point of Proclus' system. The procession from the first principle highlights the way in which the unity of the One emanates into multiplicity from the Intellect, which acts as another step within the creation of the cosmos. Cosmos meaning the entire created reality that proceeds from the One. The logoi themselves will then be discussed and the place in which they appear within the system. Such an analysis and elucidation of the causal structure will form a picture of the ontological structure of reality according to Proclus. The logoi will then have a clear place within such a structure, and can then be further analysed within its proper position.

The One is the most important concept within Proclus' system as it stresses a complete unity of reality. It is then from this principle that all else follows, engendering the unity of all else that comes after it. Proclus states about the One, "For (the First) is that which ultimately brings all things into being - (and now) he calls it the most sovereign principle, because it is what sets in motion even the causes themselves" (*Commentary II* 368.19-21). Proclus places the principle of the One as the most "sovereign principle" due to the procession of unity and its role as the starting point of the causal chain within his system. The rest of the causes and hypostases (underlying causal realities) are reliant upon the One as a starting principle, due to the unity it imparts on them allowing each step within the causal chain to have a stand alone effect on the lower hypostasis which they in turn engender.

It is from the metaphysical principle of the One in which Proclus unfolds his causal procession from the intelligible or the realm of Being into the realm of Becoming and the corporeal. The two realms of Being and Becoming as essential to a Platonist doctrine of reality

and play a decisive role in Proclus' system as well. Proclus states when discussing the use of Being and Becoming in the *Timaeus* that "By indivisible Being he means that which is intellectual and participates in eternity with respect to the entirety itself. But by the divisible he means that which is in the realm of bodies, inseparable from extension, and which has been allotted an existence that is entirely temporal" (*Commentary* III 147.20-25). Being is the realm which participates in eternity and is completely intellectual and is the home of the Forms. The Forms themselves act as the paradigmatic cause for structures and objects found in the physical cosmos; paradigmatic in the sense that such Forms impart an image to physical objects which then become present within the physical cosmos. The realm of Becoming is described as that which is divided into bodies, is extended and participates in time and change. From this juxtaposition of the two different levels of reality the role of the One's causal influence is to bridge these two opposing poles together. Due to the One itself being the transcendent cause of both due to each being identified as a unity, the One permits the two sides of Being and Becoming to be part of the same causal chain. It is the role of the logoi, which then permit the casual chain to be effective and allows the transmission of the intelligible to the corporeal to be permitted, which we will get into more detail shortly.

The One then has priority over the many or the multiplicity that is found within the physical cosmos, since the plurality of the participated ones, that being the participated Forms which causally descend into the physical cosmos and create its structure, is completely reliant and causally necessitated by the One itself. From this initial distinction and explanatory value of the One comes a hierarchical order of unparticipated and participated unities. Each subsequent unity is seen as a unparticipated and participated one itself, involved in the hierarchical procession of the structure of reality. The unparticipated unities are equivalent to a specific Form

that is in the realm of Being. The participated unities are the particular objects which partake of the unparticipated Form in the realm of Becoming. Each stage in the procession of the hierarchical order involves a subordinate effect proceeded by a superordinate cause, creating the structure it then carries out from the One itself.

An integral principle to the structure of the causation is the so called 'Proclean rule'. The rule states that only the causation of the highest and most fundamental cause reaches all the way down to subordinate causes and effects. Since causation itself is transferred due to the causal power of each principle or hypostasis, the lower causes have a causal power that is proportionally less and affects less than the higher ones. An example of this is the lowest cause being matter, which shares in nothing but unity and is directly caused by the One. Lloyd P. Gerson states in his paper that reality can be thought of as "a "diamond, rather than a pyramid, with the simplest entities at the top and bottom, and the greatest complexity in the middle" (Gerson 54). The image of the diamond allows for a good visual in understanding the ontological relation between the realms of Being and Becoming and from both a bottom up perspective which is the emergence of matter and the physical substrate and a top-down perspective which identifies the constraints put on matter to render it intelligible. With the unifying principle of the One having causal effects all the way down due to each ontological level being understood as a unity; the meeting of the two principles is the emergence of the most amount of multiplicity, representing the physical corporeal realm.

Proclus uses two concepts to represent the nature of the first principle; that being the One and the Good. Each represents the same principle that is the cause and sustainer of the cosmos but in different ways, which bring forth different aspects of the principle itself. Much of what is said about this principle is thematizing the unspeakable. Gerd van Reil in his paper "The One,

the Henads, and the Principles” goes on to explain how the One and the Good are functional names which reveal the “articulation of our concepts rather than that of reality we use them to speak about” (Van Reil 75). The terms that Proclus uses, according to Van Reil, used strictly as conceptual placeholders for which we cannot know anything about. Proclus, however, uses both the One and the Good to discern real functions of the first principle itself not just as placeholders for our lack of understanding. The name of the Good describes of the first principle by a means of analogy, as whatever engenders Being and existence is inherently Good as it provides understanding. For example Proclus states that “the Good...rules as king in the noetic realm, just as the sun does inn the visible realm” (*Commentary II*. 228.5-7). Just as the sun provides light and allows objects to be seen and understood, so does the Good provide understanding for intelligible entities such as the Forms in the realm of Being.

The One on the other hand applies to the first principle as a mode of negation. An important aspect of the One is the ineffable characteristics of its essence, which does not permit the One to be defined in any positive sense. The notion of the One as a negation is a recognition by the Neoplatonists and Proclus that the utter transcendence of the principle leads to an ineffability of its nature. To be determined as an absolute unity the requirement is the negation of all multiplicity if it is to be whole, hence it cannot have a positive determination. So, the One in this sense is a negative term. To identify the One as a negative term, however, does not mean that it is not indicative of the function of the principle itself. For Proclus the One is both cause and ineffable unit, which the term is meant to indicate. Both functions of the concepts are used to place a conceptual understanding around the principle that identifies its function and its procession. The term procession is used by Proclus to identify the causal significance and activity of the first principle as it creates the cosmos.

Paradoxes occur within the logic of Proclus' system, however, due to the distinction of the first principle being both one and many, a unity and a multiplicity. Questions arise such as how can a unitary first principle create the multiplicity of the physical universe. The One as a metaphysical principle is a necessary condition for the many since it is completely reliant upon oneness for unity and wholeness. Without such a principle the cosmos and the intelligible world itself would be unintelligible, completely lacking in any means of identification and unity. The principle of the One must also by necessity remain 'one' and not be 'many' in any way. Hence the One becomes separate from whatever else becomes one through participation of the One itself. The manifold of the many remains an effect of the necessary cause of the One; manifold indicating the multiple parts that make up the corporeal world. The One itself remains within its transcendent station as a cause for all else that participates in oneness, which we shall see, is everything within the cosmos, in both the intelligible and corporeal world.

The One itself is opposed to a manifold, and hence should not be identified as a manifold itself. The One then, has two meanings of being both partless and not a manifold. It is from these two definitions of the ambiguity and paradoxical function of the One itself that arises a third definition: that of a manifold that is itself a whole and a distinction between a one that is solely unitary and a one that is at the same time many. Such a One can then be many since it is a connecting principle that brings together the opposite poles of both one and many. The third definition then coagulates the paradoxical extremes into a unity and hence a One. The logic used here to analyze the semantic distinction of the One and its essence as a principle, which has paradoxical attributes, is also used in lower levels of reality, which will be brought up in later chapters.

Such an abstract principle as the One is better understood as a manifold and characterization of the system as a whole; with the One running through each subsequent emanation simultaneously accounting for the diverse multiplicity of objects, species and entities that make up the corporeal world. Whenever we find a manifold, we then find the One in it as well. A manifold itself is both one and not one, due to its identification of a unity but itself being made of constituent parts that then make up the whole. For example, a flower such as a rose is a unified whole which allows it to be classified as a rose. It also has constituent parts which make up this whole, such as the stem, rose petals and the colors such as red and green. The unity of the rose itself is due to the unity given to it by the One, which allows such a manifold of parts to be understood as a unity. It is one manifold but itself is not a partless one, meaning its unity has constituent parts which make it a whole. It is the identification of an entity as itself a whole that allows it to participate in the One. Due to the One itself representing unity and identity of an entity, that being a transcendent cause of a material and corporeal object itself.

The problem of polarity is solved by the combining nature of the one and many within the principle of the One itself. The problem of polarity being the simultaneous appearance of the cosmos being both one and many. By emphasizing the intermediary nature of the One itself it allows polar opposites to coalesce into the same causal chain. For example, the properties of the immanent and of the transcendent are different and can be seen on polar ends of an axis they are not completely independent of each other, working on their own accord. Transcendence here being the immaterial cause of corporeality through the unparticipated Forms. Immanence being the individual appearance of the physical objects which are instantiated into corporeality. The superior of the two being the immaterial transcendent cause of the Form. The inferior being the immanent instantiation of the particular object. The contraries then work together under a

dynamic that necessitates the inferior member to the superior. Proclus avoids a strict dualist approach by placing an intermediary between the two polar opposites allowing the one and the many; the transcendent and the immanent to be a part of the same causal chain, making the immanent reliant on the transcendent and the many reliant upon the One. Gerson goes on to state that the two extremes are "not the same logical extreme...instead the lower extreme is an extreme intermediate form—if 'one' is comparable to 'white', then 'many' is 'dark grey', rather than black" (Gerson 52). Gerson stresses the ability for the system to contain what would appear to be opposites into a unitary causal chain which allows such opposites to be under the same principle. The opposites are then not disunited and representing a discontinuous relationship but rather a relationship mediated by an intermediary entity which allows the extremes to be reliant upon each other and represent one metaphysical whole rather than different ontological categories of reality all together that are separate and non-interacting with each other.

The One as a characterization is ineffable but its job as a principle is its causal unity. Such a principle escapes any determination since it repeats itself, handing down unity to the posterior causes and hypostasis that come after. In one sense it is not a cause since it has no relation to other things and is completely transcendent. Although the principle of causality is obscure due to its transcendent nature. Van Reil states that "the only fruitful way to call it a cause is to look at it from below, as that on which all things depend for their (unitary) existence" (Van Reil 77). Van Reil here is speaking of tracking the transcendent causal influence of the One from a human perspective. From the individual perspective of the human soul can the procession of the One be identified and understood. By tracking the transcendent causes of the cosmos the individual can identify the One as the utterly transcendent. The implications of this perspective will be elucidated in greater detail in subsequent chapters. The main point to be understood here

is notion of the One as a transcendent principle since its effects originate in a top-down manner, starting from a place that is beyond the corporeal realm and causing the unity found within it.

The order of negations that ultimately lead to the One and the first transcendent principle also reveals the order of procession. The procession and emanation are terms which indicate the causal chain which starts at the One and ends with corporeality. The order of negations is not a random set of characteristics, but an indication of the characteristics that lead closer to the the One itself. Since the One is the transcendent first principle all characteristics must be negated due to its transcendence above all other ontological levels but simultaneously through this negation they are confirmed. The negation itself reveals the hierarchy and affirmation of characteristics that lead to the One in a bottom-up sense. A top-down conception indicates the ontological and causal procession. Van Reil states that later a characteristic is denied “the better or more worthy its position in the order of things, and the final negation bring us closest to the first.” (79). The final negation of the ontological hierarchy is unity itself, which is why the first principle is considered the be the One. From the negations, the characteristic of the first principle is revealed creating a positive characteristic which can be identified with the first principle itself.

Now more attention will be placed on the first principle as characterized by the Good. The conceptualization of the first principle as the ‘Good’ relies on analogy rather than negation. The difference of the two conceptualizations is the kinship expressed in the analogy between the cause and effect of the first principle. The kinship is due to the lower effect having a desire to become like their transcendent cause. The starting point of the relationship is every being desire to acquire or get close to the good and from this a notion of the Good as an absolute principle arises and hence the cause of all things as the Good. Proclus states that “For, just as the Good is the cause of everything that exists, so too does the generation of the cosmos proceed from this

the most primary principles” (*Commentary* II 368.19-21). Proclus uses the Term the Good in an equivalent sense as the One. The analogy still relies on the transcendence of the principle as pointed out in the negative term of the One. Due to the kinship of the effect to the higher cause can only be recognized by transcendence and therefore negation. The cause is then over and against the effect. It is in the sense that the cause of the Good is over and against all that comes after it that it is the cause of everything that exists. It is the co-occurrence of transcendence and kinship that underlies any causal relationship, indicating the teleological aspect of the philosophers thought. Every entity within the cosmos strives towards the Good through their very existence in the realm of becoming.

For Proclus the Good has a teleological function which acts as the final cause of the cosmos. The Good acts as the first cause in terms of final causality with everything that comes after it reverting to its original state. Proclus strongly identifies this first principle with Aristotle’s unmoved mover as the final cause of the cosmos itself. An activity is then characterized not by the producer but by the produced, allowing the first principle to be completely unmoved and transcendent even though its effects are the necessary constituents of the cosmos itself. Without the first principle or unmoved mover the rest of the cosmos would not exist but the principle as it operates remains unmoved and transcendent of its effects. The efficient nature of the One is explained by Van Reil as “the metaphor of the superabundance of the principle by which it produces without any voluntary act. The final cause, in its completeness, perfection, and fullness, that is, in its Goodness, is, as it were, overflowing.” (81) Goodness is then always productive if it is not productive it cannot be Good. The image of “overflowing” provides a good visual for better understanding of how the Goodness of the first principle affects the subsidiary causes which it provides Being and existence to. It is due to the

overflowing of the Good and its abundance that the principle begets the lower causes. The overflowing then stops at the corporeal realm with its power being extinguished and the full multiplicity of the cosmos expended.

The overflowing of the Good is due to the power which it inherently has. Power in the sense that it necessitates action of the lower hypostasis. Gerson goes on to state that “Platonists assume that a perfectly good first principle has an unlimited abundance of power that necessitates production of further principles” (53). Such an “abundance of power” that pertains within the Good allows the causal chain of influence to then emanate or proceed from this unlimited source of and creative principle. The spreading constitutes this effect on the subordinate principles that emerge from the causal first; the Good. Each of the principles that are produced by the Good then becomes a producer itself, producing lower things in its turn. The lower principles receive a measure of the productive power of its cause, it is from this transference of powers which allows the causal chain to continue. The procession of principles then produce something completely different from what the superordinate principle is identified and qualified as. Although its subordinate principle does emanate from it, it is of something different from what the superlative cause is identified as. From a gradual procession does the difference emerge not an immediate opposite effect from the original cause. The levels of producers are ever less the same and continually different. Each correspond to a universal and particular order of emanation respectively.

The Good is then the name which is given to the cause that gives its gifts to lower reality. Every level of reality and every stop on the causal chain is an unfolding of something that was present in the higher reality in a hidden way. The reality that is unfolded in the subsequent cause was compressed within its superordinate principle and becomes decompressed as the procession

of reality unfolds itself. The compressing and decompressing of the causal influences give a good image of the action that each hypostases undergoes. It is from such compression and decompression that the hidden effects of the subordinate cause reveal themselves. It is the transition from one hypostasis of reality into another and making the prior levels hidden attributes manifest and present that constitutes the chain of causality up until the physical world. It is a transition from hidden multiplicity to genuine distinction that takes place. The one-many describe the logical relations between the different parts of the system. The logical relations then get elaborated into an ontology that describes the rules of causation.

That of vertical procession indicates the hierarchy of hypostases: One-Intellect-Soul. There are also many other combinations and triads that Proclus discusses within his metaphysical system. The vertical aspects of each follow from a ground up perspective, starting from the human perspective and hierarchy of properties. Gerson states that, “according to which the passively moved is inferior to the actively moving, and the actively moving to the unmoved, and the unmoved to the unitary” (Gerson 53); it is from this bottom-up perspective that Proclus discerns the ontological order but the hierarchy then emanates from the top-down in the opposite direction from which it was first discerned, which establishes the true order of the hierarchy, emanating from the Good downwards. Vertical procession is what guarantees the procession of the lower causes, which act as the participable elements of being which emanate from the Good. The causes of the vertical hierarchy differ from their lower ordered effects “like an image whose essence only resembles its paradigm cause” (Gerson 53). The difference of the two realms of the intelligible and the Becoming are indicated by the difference in likeness of image and paradigm. The lower the effects the further away the move from the realm of Being the Forms until they are manifest in the tangible realm of Becoming.

Both aspects of the first principle and their designations of the One and the Good indicate different aspects of nature of the first principle itself. Rather than treating each identification as merely conceptual tokens for a lack of understanding, I believe each notion brings forth real attributes of the principle itself. The One indicates the first principle's ability to maintain the unity of the cosmos by imparting its unity on to the lower causes which rely on it. The reason why the cosmos can be considered a unity is then due to the first principle itself and indicates a real characteristic of the principle. The Good works both the teleological final cause and its abundance and power provides the rest of the subsidiary causes with existence in the realm of Being. The power of the Good provides the cosmos with a stable existence and permits the multiplicity of the cosmos to exist cohesively. Each notion of the first principle provides a different aspect that Proclus deems as real not just a conceptual filler for an ineffability or a lack of understanding.

Intellect

Another key aspect of Proclus' causality is the role of the demiurge or Intellect. For Proclus the demiurge is an immobile cause, an Intellect, the Intellect thinking itself and the object of desire for all beings. Throughout Proclus' commentary he uses demiurge and Intellect as equivalent terms. For conciseness I will be using Intellect when discussing the principle. The Intellect acts as the efficient cause of the universe and is the second cause in the triad of One-Intellect-Soul. Intellect is then the cause of beings due to their intelligible paradigms found within the Intellect itself. The directed thinking of the Intellect then contemplates the Forms which progresses the causal chain from the One. From the contemplation of the Intellect upon itself the chain of procession and recession undergo its causal network. Proclus states that "(Intellect) is the cause of their unity and essence and existence, as well as furnishing existence

and providence to the beings that have to come to exist” (*Commentary II* 319.19-21). The Intellect is then the active principle which emanates first from the One, taking the paradigmatic structures found within the One itself and providing them with existence and Being. It is different from the One due to the first principle being utterly transcendent of all other causes and containing the whole cosmos within itself. The Intellect is the second cause within the procession and gives Being to all that was inherent within the One.

Since the nature of each effect essentially being hidden in the superordinate cause itself provides a connection in which the Intellect has causal knowledge of everything that comes after it. Proclus states “For if we were to view the essential nature of the Demiurge and the entirety of his powers from this level is necessary to observe (a) the entire nature of these beings here engendered by him, all the visible regions of the cosmos and the invisible physical powers in it, which have caused the sympathy and antipathy between regions to exist” (*Commentary II* 301.5-8). The Intellect itself is the engendering cause which allows the procession of the One to take place. This is to say that the Intellect encompasses the causes of all living beings, which would be the Forms. Intellect is marked by multiplicity and can therefore not be the first cause of the cosmos since the first cause requires unity. Intellect must then be subordinate to a higher principle since it contemplates the multiplicity of Forms and is the first instance of the division between subject and object of thought.

The Intellect, by contemplating the Forms in its own intellectual nature create the living image from the contemplation of the paradigm. Proclus states that “the Intellect is a plenitude of Forms, its images will be lower manifestations of these Forms” (*Commentary II* 302.6). Each lower cause is an image of the higher principle, which continues all the way down into the corporeal realm. Each lower cause resembles the higher in a lesser manner and with less

perfection, until it reaches the corporeal world which is the final stop on the causal chain. Pieter d’Hoine in his paper “Platonic Forms and the Triad of Being, Life and Intellect” goes on to state about the production of the images of the Forms “on lower levels is to be understood in terms of procession of the lower from the higher” (d’Hoine 107); the participation of the lower levels of reality provides determination and hence perfection in their participants. The procession and participation of the Forms are essentially two sides of the same process and resemble the double activity of the Intellect itself which engenders them by its own contemplation. When speaking of the participation of the Forms which then engender multiplicity hence making them present in the corporeal world, the main purpose of the double activity is to make the Forms both transcendent and immanent.

The concept of logoi then emerges within Proclus’ system when discussing the descent of the Forms from the Intellect to the corporeal world. Much of what is said about the nature of the logoi themselves and how they relate to the Forms is ambiguous within the *Commentary*. To get a better understanding of the concept itself and the various interpretations of its characteristics the next section will dive into multiple views taken by scholars on the topic.

The main points to take away from this section is the nature of the Intellect and its role within the metaphysical system of Proclus. The principle of Intellect acts as the first active cause and is the second cause within the ontological chain, appearing directly after the One. It is from the Intellect that the Forms get their existence and being, which then act as paradigmatic causes for the hypostasis which appear after the Intellect as subsidiary causes themselves. All of this takes place within the eternal realm of Being. The Forms are still universal, and the causal chain has yet to enter temporality and the realm of Becoming. It is the descent of the Forms into temporality that the concept of logoi appears, which will be discussed in the next chapter.

Chapter Two

World Soul

The World Soul and its role within the ontology of Proclus plays an integral part in understanding the role of the logoi and how they function. The World Soul itself is the concept that permits the causal structure of reality to be connected from the Intelligible to the corporeal. Due to the important part it plays in the connection of the two realms of Being and Becoming it is important to understand how the World Soul functions. From a better understanding of the World Soul a better analysis and understanding can then be made of the epistemological considerations of the logoi themselves and the role they play within the World Soul and the larger metaphysical system as a whole. The focus of this section will be how the World Soul manages to combine the contradictory natures of the realms of Being and Becoming to instantiate the physical universe. Key concepts and notions will be analyzed which will clarify the function and role of the World Soul within Proclus' system and within his *Commentary on the Timaeus*.

Proclus in his *Commentary on the Timaeus* discusses the intermediate nature of the World-Soul and its role within his larger metaphysical system. Intermediate indicates the position it holds in between the realms of Being and Becoming, being a part of both of the distinct levels of reality. Proclus states "The Demiurge made the soul to be a intermediate between the indivisible Being and that which is in relation to bodies, but by also saying that it is an intermediate between that which is always the same and that which comes to be" (*Commentary* III 148.6-8). That which is the same is identified with the realm of Being which is the home of the Intellect, "that which comes to be" on the other hand is that of the realm of

Becoming. It is the dual nature of the World Soul which makes it so important to the system of Proclus. Due to its dual nature the World Soul allows the One to emanate into corporeality as it acts as the subsidiary cause which permits the One to unfold its multiplicity into the corporeal world. The World Soul being the last hypostasis in the triad of One-Intellect-Soul indicates the transitional stage from unity into multiplicity, with the World Soul acting as the entity which permits the realm of Being to descend into the realm of Becoming. The World Soul then fills the role of the cause of diversity and multiplicity within the cosmos. The One's ultimate transcendence beyond all being and change make it impossible to be the direct cause of a living cosmos which encapsulates all of those predicates. The World Soul fills this ontological gap being the entity that is between both realms.

The World Soul fills the discrepancy by being the intermediary between the two realms of Being and Becoming. The entity which accounts for motion in the corporeal world would be the World Soul due to the transference of the intelligible Forms into matter. Proclus states "So that is everything which lives is moved, that which lives through itself is moved and that which always lives is always moved, in accordance with Life, but not in accordance with Intellect. Hence the soul is always moved and yet not always. For it is Intellect potentially, but life actually" (Tim III 335.17-23). The dual aspect of the World Soul is clearly shown with both aspects of Intellect and Life being the potentiality and actuality of the World Soul itself. Intellect is potential in the sense that it is not active but still present. The Form of Life is actual in the sense that it is the effects that proceed from the World Soul to make the cosmos itself a living thing.

The World Soul's dual nature can also be stated as both immanent and transcendent. Immanent in the sense that it would descend into nature, which would create the multiplicity of

the sensible world; transcendent in the sense that it would be hyper cosmic, meaning that a part of the World Soul would not descend into nature but would be a part of the world of Intellect and Form. The dual nature represents the ontological realities of Being and Becoming. Being, represents the intelligible world which is outside of time; Becoming, represents the world of physical change. These two aspects construe the dual nature of the World Soul and enable it to be the guardian and cause of the entire physical cosmos. Proclus states “We do not position the commanding faculty of the soul in the center (for the commanding faculty transcends the universe). Instead, we find there is a certain power of the soul that is guardian over the whole order...” (*Commentary II* 107.14-19). The commanding faculty of the soul then indicates the transcendent cause of the cosmos; the part of the soul that is still in touch with Intellect. The immanence of the World Soul is indicated by its connection and engendering of the corporeal world; the World Soul’ structure, order and multiplicity being the effect of the transcendental and paradigmatic cause of the Forms within the realm of Being.

The World-Soul indicates a transition from eternity into time. The difference between the Intellect and the World Soul is that the Intellect is eternal and unmoving while the World Soul is motion in the realm of time. The Intellect cannot be the immediate cause of the temporal motion seen in the cosmos for Proclus. What the Intellect does for the cosmos is provide the Forms and paradigm’s for its creation. The World Soul has an interwoven nature which permits it to use the structures found within Intellect to project them onto the corporeal world. Proclus goes on to state of the World Soul:

“For to be *interwoven* (pertains) to what is in one way similar, but in another way dissimilar; while *covering over* simultaneously indicates by its inseparability the intellectual (character) of the envelopment which surely belongs to the universe in a secondary way; for through this

envelopment the universe imitates intellect, having first become an image of Intellect”

(*Commentary* III 285.9-12)

The World Soul is the entity which permits the paradoxical realms of Being and Becoming to coalesce into one causal chain. The envelopment by the World Soul over the universe is what permits the cosmos to have a structure which imitates that of Intellect. The World Soul is then the entity that actualizes the parameters set out by the Intellect within the unmoving and eternal realm of Being. Motion and change are brought about by the World Soul, creating the temporal world in which the procession of Being into Becoming is unfolded.

A question arises, however, as to how such an entity as the World Soul can have such a contradictory nature? John F. Finamore and Emilie Kutash in their paper “Proclus on the Psyche: World Soul and the Individual Soul” ask the question, how can the World Soul possess “stasis and movement, division and unity, be guardian of intellectual limits and impart powers over all four elements, *and* be present and transcendent at the same time?” (Finamore Kutash 128). In other words, the World Soul seems to resemble a paradoxical account of contradictory natures and is ultimately incomprehensible because of the bipolar nature that Proclus awards it. It is the same paradoxical commitment that is found when discussing the One, combining contradictory natures into a unified whole. One way of working through such contradictions is to say that the World Soul is eternal substance but temporal in activity (Finamore Kutash 129). It belongs to the world of Becoming only as it appeals to its actions and powers. The very substance of the World Soul itself is Eternal and unchanging.

Proclus addresses the confusion of this dual nature of the World Soul by stipulating that a complete universe which has Intellect, Soul, and Body must have a middle aspect which functions as a psychic source of power. Such a power provides the universe with a stable essence

and allows the contradictory attributes of the One to be manifested in unity. The power is described by Proclus as a ‘guardian over the whole order’, and ‘the point around which the whole universe dances’ creating stability in what would otherwise be a destructive or incoherent whole (*Commentary* II.14-19). Without the World Soul having the dual nature of Being and Becoming, the cosmos itself would not be an organized whole. The use of the verb “dances” indicates the structured movement of the cosmos as a result of the World Soul’s unity of the intelligible and corporeal. Just as the movement of dance is structured according to steps, so does the corporeal world move according to World Souls parameters which it attains from the Intellect.

Finamore and Kutash describe the relationship of the World Soul to the realms of Being and Becoming as contiguous. The World Soul is then associated with contiguous movement, meaning that its boundaries of the Intelligible and corporeal touch each other. For the World Soul this means that its contiguous relationship consists in its touching or being in contact with both the Intellect and the physical world. The concept provides a justifiable explanation for the World Soul having “contact with two extremes, the totally successive and the totally unified” (Finamore Kutash 128). The harmonization of the different aspects of the World Soul, through the rotations of the Same and Different makes the entity responsible for the movement and change found in the universe; at the same time being responsible for the cosmos coming to be by conforming to reason through the hypostases of Intellect. Proclus goes on to state “But the soul is intermediate, being a dyad and having the two circles – the one oriented toward intellect, the other toward sensible Being.” (*Commentary* III 263. 14-19). The World Soul has the power of self-moving motion which is usually applied to the physical world. Proclus makes clear the reason why an immaterial entity such as the World Soul could have immaterial movement by

invoking a chain of continuity between Being, Intellect and Soul. Intellect provides the parameter structure while Being itself is associated with existence. It is the World Soul which bridges these hypostases together and brings the contributions of both Intellect and Being to the self-sufficient living-being that is the cosmos. By giving it unity, formation and animation, the World Soul then engenders the living cosmos through its logoi.

The point of emphasis that I wish to make clear purposes of this project is the understanding of the World Soul as the intermediary between the realms of Being and Becoming; the Intelligible and corporeal world. How the World Soul exactly engenders the physical objects of the world brings forth epistemological and ontological questions that need further elucidation. The logoi are present within the World Soul as a two-fold entities that are a part of the Intellect and realm of Being, simultaneously being a part of the corporeal world and the realm of Becoming. The relationship between the two different types of logoi remains an ambiguous aspect of Proclus' system. It is still unclear how the universal aspect of logoi in the realm of Being descends into multiplicity and becomes a particular instantiation of the universal; the relationship between the universal and particular logoi is still unclear.

Chapter Three

The Logoi

To better understand the relationship of the logoi as an analysis of the concept given by multiple scholars will help tease out the role of logoi. The two perspectives of analysis that will be elucidated will be the logoi from the perspective of the World Soul and of the individual human soul. By showcasing the different perspectives of the logoi from a top-down (World Soul) and bottom-up (human soul) perspective, the relationship between the two will become clearer. The epistemological importance of the logoi will also be shown for Proclus' system. First, language will be discussed as the starting point of epistemology for Proclus, showcasing the importance of indicating the words themselves as tokens of the essence of the logoi. From the analysis of language and dialectic an argument by analogy will be made to show the analogous structure of the World Soul from the individual soul. A distinct idea will emerge of the function of the logoi as an epistemological entity within Proclus' system, further emphasizing the idea of their necessity for epistemological certainty of the cosmos. From the analysis of the different scholars a better understanding of the two-fold aspect of the logoi can then be made which will help decipher their causal progression from universal to particular logoi.

The five contemporary philosophers that will be discussed are Pieter D'Hoine, Jan Opsomer, Marije Martijn, D. Gregory MacIsaac and Christoph Helmig. Each philosopher brings a unique perspective to the interpretation of the logoi and provides a starting point for my own interpretation which will be discussed later on. Opsomer focuses on the logoi and their function as rational forming principles of the corporeal world and how exactly the function of their causation is to be understood. Martijn focuses on the logoi and their function as an entity in

themselves and how they are uncovered through dialectic from the perspective of the individual soul. MacIsaac focuses on how the logoi acquire their individual essences through the procession of time as apart from eternity. Helmig does a good job at stressing the importance of the logoi as necessary epistemological concepts. All perspectives of the logoi focus on varying aspects but fail to truly address the nature of how such universal principles instantiate the objects which they are the rational forming principles of. In other words, how the logoi descend from the realm of Intellect as unitary entities into the realm of Becoming and multiplicity of the corporeal world.

Marije Martijn in her book *Proclus on Nature* uncovers the function of the logoi by strictly focusing on the theory of language and discourse that Proclus uses to describe reality. The perspective that Martijn takes of the logoi is from the perspective of the human soul not the World Soul. It is from the human perspective that one can know better the role of logoi within the World Soul itself. The use of language permits one to decipher the hierarchy of logoi in the metaphysical system of Proclus. The logoi that constitute the subject or object of the word are also naturally related to the reality they refer to. From the relation between language and logoi the revelatory aspect of discourse can reveal the nature of logoi themselves. It is due to the words themselves that reveal the logoi in which they designate. Language's ability to identify the structure of reality through names causes Martijn to state that "an account would not be able to do that if it were not similar to them" (2010. 221), meaning the words which are used in discourse. Martijn sticks close to the text as Proclus goes on to state that

"For it is necessary that what the thing is in a contracted manner, the account be in a developed manner, so that it reveals the thing, while it is inferior to it in nature. For in this manner also the divine causes of discourse both reveal the essences of the things above them, and are related to them" (*Commentary I* 341.5-6).

Martijn focuses on the “divine causes of discourse” and states that such divine causes are themselves the logoi. Such logoi “mediate, on higher levels of reality, between primary and secondary entity” (Martijn 2010, 221). The primary entity would in this case be the subject itself while the secondary entity would be the discourse that surrounds the discussion of a certain Form. An asymmetrical relationship occurs between the primary and secondary entities, which reveals the essence of the primary entity through a family resemblance. The “family resemblance” is what allows the multiplicity of the Forms within the physical world to be categorized under the same notion. Such accounts are not the “immediate descendants of things, but their grandchildren as it were, as they are produced from our cognitions, which in turn correspond to reality” (Martijn 2010, 222). It is from our cognition, the filter of our perceptual reality, that discourse emerges. Not of the immediate descendants of things but through the filter of our own perception. The multiplicity of the logoi and their instantiations would then be a cognitive filter. I believe that the logoi being treated as simply a cognitive filter is the main issue for Martijn’s exegesis. By treating the logoi as cognitive filters it does not treat them as ontological entities. Instead the logoi are relegated to mental constructs of the human soul not transcendent entities which instantiate the corporeal world.

Verbal accounts turn into mediators in a series, caused by a higher ontological levels which is the subject matter of such verbal accounts. Such accounts can be about any level of reality such as an explicit and discursive account of material reality, divine beings or even the transcendent One. The discourses, however, are always mediated by the “immediate cause of the logoi: our thoughts” (Martijn 2010, 222). Logoi then are directly aligned with our thoughts about reality. Proclus places words as the images of thoughts themselves, due to the fact that they unfold the previously folded or contained world of the Intellect. In a sense, words mimic the

procession of being from the One to the corporeal world. The logoi that language discovers through discursive reasoning or discourse would have a similarity to the very structure of Being itself. The language of discourse brings the undivided intelligible into a divided understanding of multiplicity, creating the very same action that the World Soul accomplishes through its congruent nature and activity.

Just as speech is the image of our very thoughts so the Intellect's logoi, which are the powers and activities processing from the One are images of the nature that is to be instantiated in the world. Martijn goes on to state that "logoi in general are the emanating potencies and activities of their source (and as such images of the remaining activities), that convey the main character of the source to the receiver and transform the receiver accordingly" (2010, 223). The receiver would be the receptacle, which instantiates the logoi that are projected from the World Soul onto the physical cosmos. Martijn continues the analogy of discourse and logoi by showing how just as the logoi of the World Soul has the ability to transform the receiver, so does discourse.

My issue with Martijn's interpretation is that it places the particular instantiations of logoi as a cognitive lens of the human soul. More needs to be done, however, to fully flesh out the concept from this perspective as relegating the logoi to the individuals thoughts about the transcendent logoi does not provide an explanation as to how the multiplicity of corporeal objects each acquire the individual logoi. The uncovering of the transcendent logoi and the importance the logoi have to Proclus' epistemology is well analyzed by Martijn. The importance of their projected instantiations, however, cannot be relegated to cognitive filters because Proclus gives the logoi a two-fold nature, which makes the individual logoi just as real as the

transcendent counterparts. By placing the individual logoi as mental constructs it takes away from their ontological position and treats their multiplicity of corporeal objects as illusory.

Martijn in another paper entitled “Proclus on the Order of Philosophy of Nature” continues discussing the logoi from the human perspective and fleshes out her argument on the role of logoi. In this paper Martijn places significance on the concept of doxa, meaning opinion, within Proclus’ system. Doxa is a crucial starting point for the understanding of nature which then leads to epistemological truth. Martijn goes on to state that “*doxa* is the faculty that is on a parallel level to that of the proximate cause of everything generated, I.e. Nature, in the ontological hierarchy” (Martijn 2011, 218). The corporeal world then has the reason-principles or logoi within it allowing to have the power of creation of the sensible world through such principles. It is from the principles themselves that the natural world can mold and hold together the objects of sense and perception. Since the human soul is acquainted with the characteristics of the corporeal world by its ability to discern the correct properties, form and function of the things within nature, it can be said that the individual soul then has these reason-principles within itself. It is the function of doxa to immediately perceive these common qualities and to collect these different attributes into a cohesive whole, which is the role of opinion for the cognition of the individual. This would be the starting point of intellection in which one can get closer to the logoi themselves as they are properly situated within the realm of Being. The corporeal world itself then possesses these creative rational-principles (logoi) of the objects that it generates, which the faculty of judgement within the individual has a “prior conception of the principles of those generated objects, but in a cognitive sense.” (Martijn 2011, 218). It is the relegation of the perception of generated objects of the logoi in a “cognitive sense” where I think Martijn goes astray. By placing the generated world only in the eyes of the human soul it can be easily be

relegated to a subjective perception. The objects of perception would not have any objective reality as they would be constructs of the human soul.

The logoi themselves, which doxa or the faculty of opinion comprehend are the innate rational principles which permit one to ascend from belief to knowledge; from the realm of Becoming to that of Being. Such innate rational principles thereby enable one to “identify immanent universals (logoi) in sense impressions, which are projections of transcendent universals, by comparing them with its own logoi” (Martijn 2011, 219). It is from this identification with the universals to the individual particular logoi themselves that the individual soul has an understanding of sense perception. I will stress again that the particular entities and their multiplicity, however, are not further discussed by Martijn as to what ontological category they would belong to. The essence of the objects are then known because of the logoi present in the realm of Being; the individual needs to adjust and comprehend the true nature of the world that they are placed in front of. The different logoi are then apparent as the universal logoi are the only means to knowledge. The logoi that are within the individual soul and are uncovered through doxa are of opinion and true belief but do not enter into the category of episteme and knowledge. The logoi of the particular objects are mental conceptions rather than objective ontological entities.

Pieter d’Hoine discusses the logoi as the participated aspects of the Forms as they descend into corporeality. Transcendence is dictated by the Forms within the Intellect itself as it and the immanence are the form principles of logoi. The difference is between the intelligible Forms themselves and the formal constituents that make up the physical structure. D’Hoine goes on to state that it is “a means to save the Forms transcendence while at the same time accounting for the fact that it gives rise to a number of participants on a lower level” (108). The Form then

remains itself but has its image within the participated logoi through sensible particulars, which impose its likeness. The formalization of the theory of Forms used by Proclus establishes a division of the unparticipated and the participated. One must distinguish the subject of participation, the participated property and its “eternal, transcendent warrant, the unparticipated Form” (d’Hoine 108). The relation between the sensible particulars and the Forms is due to matter being associated with the participant and the participated term the enmattered form, which resembles a hylomorphism. The hylomorphic form, however, is just an image of the intelligible model. The enmattered form is then governed by the transcendent Form which imparts rational forming principles or logoi that cause its unity and structure allowing the object itself to be intelligible. The logoi and their transcendent counterpart are responsible for the common and unchanging character.

Such logoi are present within the World Soul and constitute its transitory stage from a unparticipated, indivisible unity to a participated Form in the sensible realm of multiplicity. The subsequent stages of the two extremes of Forms and particulars is then mediated by the logoi as the Forms come directly from the Intellect to the rational forming principles in the bodies. Each of the hypostases “starting from the intelligible Intellect is a plenitude of Forms, in which the entire amount of the forms is present in an appropriate way” (d’Hoine 109). From the descent away from the intellect the Forms are subject to further multiplicity until they reach the sensible realm. The power of the Form which originates in the Intellect becomes exhausted once it engages in the material world. The procession of Forms from the intellect to the sensible cosmos does not create new essences “but continues the progressive differentiation of reality in another way, namely by translating the indivisible unity of each Form into forms participated by a number of temporally successive, corporeally extended particulars” (d’Hoine 109). The logoi for

d'Hoine act as the next step in the causal chain which the Intellect projects on to the sensible world. It is the logoi themselves which act as the principles which give the sensible object their structure. More ambiguity, I believe, arises with this interpretation, however, since the multiplicity of such logoi is unclear. Such as whether each physical object has its own logoi which is imparted to it from the transcendental Form or whether the logoi are the transcendental cause but on a lower ontological level. If the logoi are just another transcendental cause, then it is still unclear how the multiplicity of objects could partake in one single logoi and the concept itself becomes obsolete due to it having the same function as the Form itself.

The function of the World Soul plays a crucial part in the transference of Intelligible Form to rational forming principle or logoi. The World-Soul is then the level within the causal chain that mediates between that of the Intelligible and that of corporeal world. It does this by means of the reason-principles, which then generates the production of natural beings. The World Soul then receives the Forms from the immovable Intellect and places them in the realm of motion in which they gain their particularity. The psychic forms from which are found within the World Soul can be said to be stable being "but that their activity involves motion" (d'Hoine 110). The psychic forms are then transposed on to nature which acts as the irrational principle that is internal to natural beings as such. Corporeality is then inseparable from its products as it inspires beings from within. The reason principles act as the "immediate causes of the ultimate processions of the Forms, the enmattered forms" (d'Hoine 110). The Forms then act as the paradigmatic causes in which the images of the corporeal world construct themselves, each to their Form and in accordance with their own rank. It is this resemblance to the paradigmatic causes that the sensible world is then shaped. The Form can be seen as the paradigmatic cause which is then continually in accordance with nature. The same issue arises, however, even with

the introduction of the World Soul for d'Hoine due to the problem of the difference between the logoi and Forms. It is still unclear how the World Soul would be able to multiply the logoi and allow them to instantiate instances of the Forms and explain the multiplicity found in corporeality.

Jan Opsomer in his paper "The Natural World" discusses the rational forming principles and their overall utility, importance and status within the metaphysical system of Proclus. Firstly, Opsomer states that Proclus is committed to the idea that all true causes are incorporeal and that the qualities within objects belong to the formal aspect of compounds. As such, the formal principles (logoi) that give shape and structure to the world and all its parts are causally contained within the Intellect and enter the cosmos through the World Soul and Nature. Such logoi are "immanent in nature and steer all biological and generally all natural processes" (Opsomer 159). The use of the verb "steer" gives the impression that the logoi act as a kind of guide for the natural processes within the cosmos. Their progression and change through time is then guided by these logoi and relies on their status as rational forming principles to maintain their own order and procession through the realm of Becoming. These logoi then become more diversified as they descend, as Opsomer states that "once they are present in the body they produce the form that is constitutive of, and immanent to, the hylomorphic compound" (159). The term hylomorphic compound is a strictly Aristotelean notion but Opsomer uses it here as evidence of the logoi descending into enmattered and diversified existence.

Opsomer goes on to elucidate how Proclus interprets the the concept of the receptacle and the role it plays in instantiating Forms in matter. Opsomer states that enmattered forms and qualities should be interpreted as being separate. Both are to be regarded as incorporeal and immaterial as they are both divided in the multiplicity of the world body. This can only be true,

however, if qualities and enmattered forms divide themselves in the multiplicity of bodies. Proclus later becomes more specific in his *Commentary* stating three types of entities that become divided, one of the three being the “rational forming principles” that divide themselves over “qualityless body” (*Commentary* 139.19-20). Proclus also calls these same forming principles forms that divide themselves over the masses of bodies as well.

The logoi then find their final construction in the geometrical atomism proposed in the *Timaeus*. The same way that the Intellect creates the elements by imposing geometrical shape onto the receptacle is similar to how the logoi penetrate the substrate of matter as well. From these geometric shapes arise the macroscopic qualities of the objects and materials that they create. It is due to an immaterial principle that instantiates itself in the receptacle that causes the qualities of physical reality to become existent in the multiplicity of the corporeal world. For Opsomer, this would be analogous if not an example of how the logoi function within the World Soul. As geometrical/mathematical principles that cause the qualitative diversity of the corporeal world through their instantiation in the receptacle. In turn, creating the multiplicity of the corporeal world.

Opsomer has a similar conception of the logoi that d’Hoine does in that both propose the logoi to be guides of the structures of the physical world. Opsomer takes the interpretation further, however, and proposes the logoi to be the geometrical shapes which make up the corporeal world found in Plato’s *Timaeus*. The World Soul is also projecting the Forms on to the material substrate that creates the corporeal world. The interpretation does provide an explanation for how the World Soul can interact with both the Intelligible and corporeal worlds, but it still fails to explain the multiplicity of the logoi which emerge from the Forms themselves. How each

Form would create such multiplicity is not stated, just how such Forms are projected on to the corporeal world is given an explanation.

D. Gregory MacIsaac in his paper “Projection and Time in Proclus” discusses the logoi as they relate to time and eternity respectively. MacIsaac focuses on the hypostasis of time and how it is the measure the circular activity of the World Soul. The Intellect which is the bearer of the logoi, gets unrolled through the activity in things in time and primarily through the World Soul. Proclus states that “For as Nous is to the Soul, so is Eternity to Time, and inversely, so that Time is before the Soul, just as Eternity is before Nous. A time should be participated by the Soul, and does not participate in the Soul, just as Nous does not participate in Eternity, but the inverse” (*Commentary* III 27.20-26). Time itself has an intellectual nature which is situated below the Intellect and before the World Soul. MacIsaac states that the essence of the soul itself “is a fullness of logoi which are the soul’s participation in Nous” (96). The very thing by which the soul is to be defined is itself the logoi which it possesses. The World Soul, however, is not immediately conscious of its own internal logoi that it possesses. The World Soul possesses such entities as if they were a heartbeat or like breathing, it is not an explicit content that the World Soul is aware of until deliberate attention is placed upon them. In order to make the World Soul essence aware to itself, the World Soul must do what Proclus calls projection. The World Soul itself is not able to grasp the entire intelligible world at once and therefore needs to draw them forth one at a time. It does this by discursive thinking, which acts as the divided motion of thinking. Through this motion the logoi present themselves through Time in a manner which permits them to be known through their individual essences. Through discursive reasoning it allows the logoi to be measured by the monad to time and constitutes the moving image of eternity that the causal procession creates.

Due to the fact that the *logoi* which constitute the World Soul essence are its participation in the Intellect, the unfolding of the World Soul in the causal procession is simultaneously an unfolding of the Intellect itself. The hypostasis in which the World Soul unfolds from the Intellect is that of the hypostasis of Time itself. From the line of procession, it is then said that the monad of Time itself which is a measure of the World Soul's activity. It is the image of the circle understood metaphorically that represents this thinking which has Time as its center.

Proclus states:

“And so, Time is eternal, and a monad, and a center by its essence and activity which has remained at rest in itself; and at the same time, it is continuous, and is a number, and a circle by its procession and what participates in it. (Time) then is a certain proceeding nous, since it could not bring to perfection the resemblance of encosmic beings to their paradigms unless it itself were first suspended from (these paradigms), but it also proceeds and flows *en masse* towards the things over which it keeps guard” (*Commentary* III 26.30-27.08).

The World Soul then, partakes of time but not as its essence but as its own activity. It is the changing energy or action of the soul that partakes in Time which is the unfolding of its very essence. The essence is filled with the *logoi* of the intelligible world of the Intellect which it participates in atemporally. It is the very activity of the “unrolling and unfolding its own *ousia* (essence) through the projection of the *logoi* which are its *ousia* that the Soul participates in Time” (MacIsaac 97). The procession of Time is the mark of the World Souls essence into corporeality due to the *logoi* themselves being known through the unfolding of the cosmos.

The issue of how the universal *logoi* can be projected on to the corporeal world is directly addressed by MacIsaac as the particular *logoi* get projected on to corporeality through the World Soul. It is the very act of the projection of the *logoi* by the World Soul that creates the

hypostasis of Time. I believe where the analysis fails to be cogent is the possibility of the World Soul projecting such logoi one at a time. If the logoi were projected, one at a time from the realm of Being and Intellect the corporeal world would not be filled with the abundance of multiplicity that it has. The simultaneity of all of the objects within the world would not be possible if one logoi were projected at a time into its existence, which MacIsaac insinuates that the World Soul does. The discursive thoughts of the World Soul can only know the individual logoi one at a time. The cosmos itself would only represent one object which the individual logoi is the rational forming principle of.

Christoph Helmig on his paper “Proclus on Epistemology, Language and Logic” discusses how language itself and the role it plays within a philosophical discourse is a key indicator of how the logoi are used as epistemological principles. Helmig’s interpretation of the logoi is focused on the epistemological considerations of the principles themselves. The logoi are discussed from the perspective of the World Soul, giving a clear picture of the top-down ontological structure of the principle. The logoi are also integral for the human soul to acquire true knowledge and belief about the cosmos, which the use of language and dialectic permit. There is then a strong interconnection between language and its objects, without the connection between the two, knowledge for the individual soul would not be possible. For Proclus knowledge is itself immaterial and unchangeable; to have knowledge is then to have understanding of the Forms not the physical representations that are found in corporeality. Such physical representations are the area of opinion or doxa due to the ever-changing essence of the corporeal world. Knowledge itself is present within the realm of Being and can only be accessed through the Intellect aspect of the soul both individual and World Soul.

Language directly refers to the Platonic Forms and is a kind of ideal language itself. Ideal due to the words representing and indicating the Intelligible realm not the realm of Becoming and corporeality. Helmig points out that Proclus distinguishes “clearly between two aspects and functions of names, I.e teaching and dividing, but ultimately connects them again” (190). The teaching aspect of the name is the ability for the name itself to instruct and reveal the essence of the Form in which it represents. It is revelatory moment when the name of the logoi is given, indicating the essence of the object at hand. The discriminative function is characterized by deciphering the different essences of things themselves and provides the individual soul understanding of the multiplicity of different objects. Just as the logoi itself is the cause of the physical object in corporeality; so, the name is the means of discrimination of the multitude of essences and a revelatory component of the essence of the object itself. Knowledge and understanding are then attained by the names of Forms from which the individual soul can discriminate between them and attain a full understanding of the intelligible realm which is unchangeable.

It is from the names of the logoi themselves which act as causes, that reality can be known. The better understanding of the logoi that one achieves through dialectic and the allows the true names of the Forms to be understood, therefore, understanding the realm of Being and acquiring knowledge. The names are representatives of the unchanging, intelligible entities. Another aspect of language that Proclus establishes is that of convention, different from the naturalist interpretation of language that indicates the Forms and knowledge. Helmig states that the conventional approach to language “according to Proclus...is possible because a name consists of form and matter, and the greater the material element, as it were, the greater the degree of convention” (191). The conventional way of speaking does not directly relate to the

logoi in the realm of Being, which allows for an understanding of the Forms, but indicates the entities found within the realm of Becoming. This conception of language and names themselves are more accurate for names of particulars since the Form of the particular itself is non-existent; only the universal aspect of the within the intelligible realm.

I believe that the negation of the particular entities found within the realm of Becoming by Helmig is not accurate for Proclus' system. The realm of Becoming is a real ontological level for Proclus, as the causality chapter discussed. To state that the entities within the realm of Becoming are non-existent is to deny their ontological level and would treat the realm of becoming itself as non-existent which is not true. Although the realm of Becoming is not home to knowledge as it resides within the realm of Being, it is still the place of opinion and doxa, which Helmig himself brings up. Just because the realm of Becoming is no indicative of the knowledge within the realm of Being does not mean that it is non-existent.

What do the different levels of names mean to the structure of reality if, for the Neoplatonist, names themselves are indicative of the ontological structure of reality and the hierarchy of causes the lead up into the One? Helmig goes on to show that the analogy between words and Forms is warranted by three observations within the Proclean system:

“(1) The Greek word logos means both word and form (reason-principle). (2) As we have seen, names refer primarily to Platonic Forms. In their formal aspect, they can be said to be images of Forms; in the same way, language is an image of psychic concepts (logoi) that are, in turn, images of the transcendent Forms. (3). It can be concluded from Proclus' *Commentary on the Timaeus* that the Neoplatonist suggest linking the universal demiurge to uttering words (logoi)” (Helmig 192).

The creation of the cosmos is then the utterance of the Intellect. Emanating from the One into the psychic reality of the World Soul and finally becoming instantiated within the corporeal world. Proclus goes on to state that “For he himself (the demiurge) begins first with the creation of these (I.e logoi) as well, and he creates them by means of speaking only—for the words of the Father are the demiurgical thoughts and his thoughts are acts of creation. And he leaves the subsequent creation to the many (sc. the younger gods).” (*Commentary* III 222.2-5). Through the uttered words of the Intellect does the creation of the cosmos and the eternal Forms find their way into the corporeal world. The Forms within the Intelligible realm are then drawn out by the Intellect through thought and language causing the production of the formal attributes of the physical world.

The Intellect being the creator of the World Soul places such logoi in the World Soul as concepts that form the material reality in which the cosmos is based. The true logoi are then the utterances of the Intellect in a metaphorical and analogical sense. The true nature of the objects of corporeality are dependent and caused by the names of logoi. The difference between the conventional language of form and matter is that the words do not indicate the transcendent cause of its being but the physical substrate into which it is enmattered. Helmig states that the “essence of the human soul consists of logoi, and these logoi can be considered, in modern terminology, (inner mental) concepts” (192). It is the inner mental concepts that indicate the transcendent logoi in which the particular instantiations are based off of. I will point out again that Helmig places all of the epistemological importance on the transcendent logoi and fails to consider the importance of the logoi found within the realm of Becoming. The two-fold nature of the logoi is not taken seriously as the particular logoi are considered non-existent and hold no epistemological weight.

Helmig focuses on Proclus' theory of knowledge as it is directly related to the individual soul and the recollection it must undertake to retain the logoi that it has within its own soul and hence regain true knowledge and belief about the cosmos. The three steps of the process of recollection are forgetting, articulation, and putting forth. It is from the dialectical process and the importance of understanding true names that the process of recollection comes about. A greater understanding of the cosmos is acquired by the act of dialectic and the understanding of true names that brings about true opinion and knowledge of the Forms. The inner logoi of the individual soul are then brought about through this process and true knowledge is acquired as the same logoi within the World Soul and the individual soul are realigned and set upon their correct rotations of the Same and Different. Helmig states that the logoi themselves as they pertain to the World Soul are "unaffected by the embodiment and remain clear and articulate" (196). It is only the individual soul that has trouble cognizing them due to the inferior state of embodiment that entraps the individual. It is the awareness of the logoi themselves that is brought forth in recollection. The actual logoi remain the same and contain their true knowledge of the cosmos.

The second step within the triad of recollection is articulation and comes into play when the logoi themselves become clearer to the individual within their cognition. The awareness and apprehension of the logoi, once they have become clear to the individual are then primed for articulation and remembrance. Once the logoi have been properly uncovered from forgetfulness and placed within the awareness and apprehension of the individual, hence making them clear and articulate, it is then ready to be put forth by the individual. The putting forth is the bringing of the psychic logoi "to one's attention, whereby they come to rest before the soul as objects of knowledge and do not remain hidden within it as bedrock principles of our (cognitive) lives we are only dimly and tacitly aware of" (Helmig 197). The recognition of these principles within the

soul is what constitutes true knowledge of the cosmos and permits the individual to ascend into the intelligible realm of the Forms where true understanding of such principles are permitted. The uncovering of true knowledge is due to the relation between the individual soul and the World Soul. By analogy Helmig infers that the logoi that are used by the World Soul to create everything that comes after it are the true principles that the individual soul ascends to. Hence the World Soul through the logoi has constant true knowledge of the images in which it projects onto the imagination of the cosmos. The logoi are at the basis of the cognitive processes of the individual soul and allow it to function in accordance with the objects of the perceptible and internal worlds. Hence the individual soul, even if the logoi has not been uncovered and remains forgotten to the individual, is completely reliant upon the principles for perception, cognition and even true opinion.

It is the underlying reality of the logoi within the realm of Becoming, which is overlooked by Helmig and can be elaborated on further. Helmig only treats the transcendental logoi as real but fails to recognize the importance of the particular instantiations of logoi, as stated earlier. The particular logoi, however, are part of the realm of Becoming and are therefore just as real, although they may not hold true knowledge. For example, Proclus states “We must maintain that sense-perception is entirely non-rational. In general, every sense perceives the affection of the animal which stems from the sense object. Thus, for instance, if an apple is presented to us, the sense of sight perceives that it is red because of the affection of the eye, the sense of smell perceives that it is fragrant because of the affection of the nose, (and likewise) the sense of taste perceives that it is sweet, and the sense of touch that it is smooth. But what is it that says what is it that says what is presented to us is an apple? For it is not any of the partial sense-perceptions, since each of these perceives only one of the features of this thing, not

the whole, nor is it the *common perception*, since this only distinguishes the differences of the affections, but it does not know that there is a whole that has such a being. It is plain, therefore, that there is a certain potency superior to the senses, which knows the whole before the parts and which contemplates its form in an indivisible manner, the Form, which holds together all these properties/attributes. This faculty Plato has termed *doxa* and the object of sense, therefore, object of *doxa*.” (*Commentary I 249.12-27*)

Even at the basic level of sense perception the Forms guide our experience. It is the Form itself that gathers the multitude of senses of a particular object, in this case an apple, and allows for basic understanding of the object as a whole to be recognized by the individual. Not just a multitude of parts but a whole and unity in itself. The object as a whole is then grasped by means of its Form. *Doxa* is then the faculty of the mind that achieves this, which is not knowledge but opinion of a certain object. The *logoi* are then the unknown cause of the unity of perception for the individual and are what allow the individual to acquire true belief about the world. The *logoi* act as the Forms on the level of the individual soul from which were originally attained by the World-Soul itself. Proclus further states that “*Doxa* puts forth the reason principles of the sensible from itself and knows their being” (*Commentary I 251.6-7*). The very recognition of the existence of a particular whole is reliant upon *doxa* and the underlying *logoi* that allows the soul to perceive thing as an existent entity.

Proclus again states:

“By embracing the reason principles of the generated objects, opinion takes up the rank of cause in relation to them. This is the reason, it seems to me, that he (Plato) was not satisfied with the term sense-perceptible for designating the generated, but also added that it was an object of *doxa*, since sense-perception knows the properties of perceptible through being acted upon by them,

but opinion also knows their being, for it possesses their reason-principles beforehand”
(*Commentary I 292.26-293.4*).

The logoi themselves are then not empirical entities but are what permit empirical reality to be understood. In a sense the logoi are a priori contents that allow the empirical world to be understood. Since the logoi are the causes of sensible reality then they would have to be prior to the sensible themselves not posterior in any way. This way what doxa grasps as the essences of sensible objects would be the beginning of the ascension to true knowledge of the sensible objects in the aspect of their Forms within the Intelligible realm. The first step of knowledge is to recognize the object as a whole and unity despite all the other attributes which pertain to it. The knowledge of logoi themselves allows the individual to attain true knowledge and belief and be in line and true rotation with the World Soul itself, from which the logoi were originated from. Helmig stresses the importance of the transcendental logoi within the World Soul as the place of true knowledge. By doing so, Helmig treats the logoi of the realm of Becoming as non-existent but the concept of doxa proves that the logoi within the realm of Becoming are still apart of the causal chain, as they are necessary for the individual soul to reach knowledge.

Helmig goes on to state the importance of the World Soul as the entity pertain to the logoi. True knowledge is first formulated by the World Soul, since the utterances of the logoi are emanated through the World Soul from the Intellect. The circles of the Same and Different then play this role of establishing both true belief and knowledge based on the Intellects logoi principles in which it harbors and projects onto the imagination, then creating the corporeal world and from the physical substrate of matter. The Intellect then equips the World Soul with the principles of the first things themselves (logoi) and as such projects them onto the corporeal world which then creates their particular existence through the hylomorphic causes of matter and

form. The human soul then knows these logoi due to the soul itself being akin to the logoi and being in conformity with the principles in which it chooses to understand. This is due to the fact that “the innate content of the soul consists in *logoi*. They constitute the essence of the soul and are contained in it as in a vessel” (Helmig 195). The individual soul has the logoi contained within itself, making the ascent to true knowledge one of introspection and contemplation.

The logoi themselves are a part of the ontological hierarchy of Forms; the most important of this hierarchy being the transcendent Forms, Helmig states that “the logoi in the soul, and the logoi or forms in things/forms in matter” (195). Each level of the hierarchy starting from the transcendent Intellect and works its way down to World Soul and then the corporeal world are each connected and not independent of each other. Each logoi while being connected to its higher up ontological cause also contains within it all that came before and all that is to come after. Each stage of reality then mirrors reality as a whole and each contains within it its specificity but also a universal principle that allows the whole to be found within the part as stated in the causality chapter. Helmig goes on to state that “we find suggestion that the structure of the cosmos is mirrored somehow in the human soul (relation of microcosm and macrocosm)” (195). The relation between microcosm and macrocosm also holds true for the epistemological inferences of the World Soul and individual Soul. Through analogy then, one infer the functions of the World Soul through one’s own philosophical endeavor. What constitutes true knowledge is then the true logoi of both the World Soul and individual soul. Each containing the same logoi but on a different ontological level on which each operates.

The World Soul can then be seen to pre-embrace all sensible things in the manner of a cause. The possession of logoi by the soul are the causes of material things in which the World Soul possesses immaterially. The Intelligible nature of the causes themselves are due to them

originating in the Intellect in which the World Soul has access. Such intelligible principles are also possessed as images in which it can project onto the imagination and form the object within matter. Or the individual soul, knowing its own logoi, Helmig states that “the soul obtains true knowledge of reality, knowledge according to causes” (196). The acquisition of the logoi within the soul and the acquisition of true knowledge because of the understanding of the logoi is because of the place these logoi have within the World Soul. The World Soul then produces everything that comes after it due to the reason-forming principles or logoi that it acquires from the intelligible realm due to the Intellect. The very same logoi are found within the human soul, which allows the soul to attain knowledge through recollection of these principles which are innate within it. When such souls are embodied, however, they forget about such reason-principles within and are in a state of ignorance when it comes to knowledge and true opinion.

Helmig’s interpretation of the logoi focuses on the logoi as epistemological entities which are necessary for true knowledge. I believe more could be done to fully flesh out the interpretation is to highlight the different aspects of the logoi and its function in the metaphysical system, such as its role as a guide for the corporeal world. Helmig only discusses the role of logoi as they pertain to the realm of being and treats the descended logoi within the realm of Becoming as non-existent. As I attempted to show, Proclus’ view does not align with those sentiments and the logoi should be treated as entities which are real within both realms of Proclus’ ontology. The next section will attempt to fill in these gaps and bring together a coherent interpretation of the logoi that indicates its ontological and epistemological function.

Two-Fold Nature of the Logoi

The upcoming section will discuss an interpretation of the logoi that is built upon Helmig's, and Ospomer’s in the last section. Helmig does a good job stressing the importance of

the logoi as necessary entities for Proclus' epistemology. The logoi are the principles which allow the human soul to acquire knowledge of the Forms in the realm of Being. Opsomer highlights the role of logoi as they descend into the corporeal world from the World Soul. Helmig has good insights into the epistemological aspects of the logoi as they pertain to epistemology and the human soul. Opsomer, on the other hand, focuses more on the ontological aspect of the logoi as they descend from the World Soul along the causal chain. It is from the analogy of human soul and World Soul that the logoi function in the two-fold way of being both a part of the Intellect and the corporeal world. By looking at the entity from a top-down and bottom-up perspective the logoi are better understood as the fundamental principles for Proclus epistemology and ontology. By combining the views of these scholars the shortcomings of each view, as stated in the previous section, dissolve and a concise view of the logoi emerge that allow them to have an important role in the realms of Being and Becoming. My interpretation will be to incorporate the different perspectives of each scholar and showcase the two-fold nature of the logoi.

Proclus emphasizes that the logoi have a two-fold nature and are a part of the realms of Being and Becoming simultaneously. The logoi themselves have a particular nature and a universal nature. The universal nature residing within the realm of Being. The particular nature residing within the realm of Becoming. Proclus states of the World Soul that "it has two-fold rational-forming principles (logoi) - some intellectual and others organizational, and while some are planted facing the things that are, others are in contact with the sensible" (*Commentary III* 263. 14-19). The logoi themselves are the entities which partake of both realms of Being and Becoming. The logoi which are intellectual and facing the things that are a part of the realm of Being. The logoi which are organizational and in contact with the sensible are a part of the realm

of Becoming. It is this distinction that I wish to add to by using the ideas of Helmig for the logoi associated with the realm of Being. The logoi associated with the realm of Becoming are adequately discussed by Opsomer. It is from these two perspectives, that of Being and Becoming that the logoi should be understood.

The logoi which are in touch with the sensible are directly related to Opsomer's conception of logoi as organizational entities. It is from the perspective of logoi being projected from the World Soul into corporeal reality that constitutes their participation in the realm of Becoming. One half of the two-fold nature of the logoi is their ontological importance as they are the causes of the multiplicity of objects in the corporeal world. The ontological perspective as the logoi as guide of the physical cosmos, as stated by Opsomer, is indicative of itself as a rational forming principle. The causal procession from the One to the corporeal world is mediated by the World Soul and the logoi, which reside within its essence. The intermediary nature of the World Soul and its coagulation between the Intelligible and corporeal is brought together by the logoi. The logoi are the entities that allows the Forms to become immanent as they "descend" from the transcendent realm of Being into the realm of Becoming through the imagination of the World Soul and projected onto matter and the corporeal world. It is the very act of the World Soul as it projects the logoi on to the receptacle that makes the logoi partake of the realm of Becoming. The logoi in this aspect are strictly organizational as they are the guides of the physical objects in the corporeal world.

The World Soul then has complete knowledge of the cosmos through the logoi. All ontological levels are known to the World Soul through its interaction with the Intellect as it imparts the logoi to the World Soul to then be projected onto matter through the imagination. The Intellects utterances are representative of the logoi themselves imparting their principles to

the World Soul. The projection itself causes the World Soul to be aware of the corporeal world and have complete knowledge of the particulars into which it creates. The World Soul is then not ignorant of the sensible realm but is completely aware of its presence as doxa or opinion and judgement.

Helmig's interpretation of the logoi directly relates to the side of logoi that is a part of the realm of Being. For Helmig the logoi are necessary for Proclus' epistemology. This is due to the logoi being the means by which the human soul ascends to true knowledge. In order to attain true knowledge the human soul has to be acquainted with the logoi that are present within the realm of Being. The realm of Being is unchanging and contains the true Forms within it. It is the logoi as the means by which the human soul attains knowledge that allows them to have a two-fold nature. If they were simply organizational principles of the corporeal world, they would not be the objects of knowledge but simply principles that help the World Soul shape the cosmos. Their necessity for the human soul to acquire knowledge, however, makes their position in the realm of Being just as important.

The logoi's two-fold nature are due to their participation in both realms of Being and Becoming and are integral to the World Soul and the individual soul. The difference is that the logoi of the World Soul render the physical world while the logoi of the individual soul allow the human being to gain knowledge and understanding of the world itself. The logoi as ontological entities are guides for the structure of the material cosmos as discussed by Opsomer. Through their forming principles the material world emerges based upon the specific logoi which gets projected onto matter. The logoi act as guides for the entities that are within the sensible realm. They are also necessary for the individual souls' thoughts which then lead to knowledge and truth through discursive reasoning as shown through Helmig. For the individual, they are mental

entities which when uncovered through dialectic represent the ontological hierarchy of the physical cosmos. The logoi are epistemological entities, in the sense that they represent the true essence and nature of the entities within the cosmos. The logoi within the World Soul are known through time; as time brings forth their particular essences in the corporeal world. They are also the very essence of the World Soul itself as it is the connection to the intelligible realm of Being that allows the logoi to be projected onto the cosmos. From the two perspectives a picture of the logoi emerges that is both ontological and epistemic. It shows the importance the logoi have as guides for the physical structure of the universe as well as epistemic necessities that permit truth and knowledge to be acquired. The two-fold nature of the logoi are due to their roles in the realms of Being and Becoming and their importance for the World Soul and human soul.

Conclusion

From the analysis of Proclus metaphysical system as articulated in the *Commentary on the Timaeus* the logoi hold an ambiguous but important role. The concept of the logoi are directly related to how the World Soul can be a part of both the realm of Being and Becoming simultaneously. It is due to the logoi that the Forms get projected by the World Soul onto the receptacle and create the physical cosmos. They are also the cause of true knowledge and opinion, which the individual soul then uncovers through dialectic. The discussion of the logoi as illustrated by Opsomer, Martijn, MacIsaac and Helmig all explain the concept within the narrow scope of either their causal significance or their importance epistemologically. By combining the outlooks of Helmig and Opsomer, as well as getting a better grasp of Proclus epistemology, one can start to see the outline of the logoi as an integral aspect of the system rather than an ambiguous concept that has not garnered much attention. Without the placement of the concepts within the causal order of procession the Forms would not become enmattered; the World Soul

would not be the intermediate entity in which it is that bridges together the realms of Being and Becoming. The logoi are what permit this action to take place and fulfill the creation of the cosmos in its corporeality. Such is the ontological nature of the logoi being the essence of the World Soul. Without the logoi the World Soul could not project the rational structures onto matter and therefore, could not instantiate the physical cosmos.

Epistemologically, the logoi are what allow the individual as well as the World Soul to gain true opinion and knowledge of the cosmos. The true essence and nature of the physical universe is revealed through the logoi that the World Soul projects. Since the logoi come directly from the Intellect, they are the instantiations and particular causes of the forming principles that make up particular objects. They are also, however, the universal Forms in a gradation lower from the Intellect. Without such principles the individual soul could never recollect the knowledge that is inherent in their own soul through dialectic and philosophy. The logoi are also epistemological necessities in the system of Proclus for these reasons.

By understanding the significance of the logoi as both epistemological and ontological entities, my hope is to draw more attention to the concept for further analysis. I believe to have proven that the concept is not easily understood as having one specific function but requires a viewpoint from multiple angles to be fully understood. The two-fold nature that Proclus ascribes to the principle is correlated to their participation in both realms of Being and Becoming. From the analysis of the causal structure from the One down to the physical cosmos as well as the function of the World Soul, I have showed that the logoi share in this dual nature of Being and Becoming ontological and epistemological necessity for the system of Proclus. It is from this conception of the logoi as having different roles within the realms of Being and Becoming that

further research should be guided. By only emphasizing one role the logoi are diminished within Proclus' system and do not fulfill the two-fold nature that Proclus ascribed to the principles.

Bibliography

Baltzly, Dirk. “Gaia Gets to Know Herself: Proclus on the World’s Self-Perception.” *Phronesis*, vol. 54, no. 3, 2009, pp. 261–85. *DOI.org (Crossref)*,

<https://doi.org/10.1163/156852809X441331>.

D'Hoine, Pieter. “Platonic Forms and the Triad of Being Life, and Intellect” eds. *All from one: A guide to Proclus*. Oxford University Press, 2016. Pg. 98-122.

Gersh, Stephen. “Universals, Wholes, Logoi: Eustratios of Nicaea’s Response to Proclus’

Elements of Theology.” *Reading Proclus and the Book of Causes, Volume 2*, edited by

Dragos Calma, BRILL, 2020, pp. 32–55. *DOI.org (Crossref)*,

https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004440685_004.

Gregory, Andrew. “Mathematics and Cosmology in Plato’s *Timaeus*.” *Apeiron*, vol. 55, no. 3,

July 2022, pp. 359–89. *DOI.org (Crossref)*, <https://doi.org/10.1515/apeiron-2020-0034>.

Gerson, Lloyd P, “Proclus’ System” eds. *All from one: A guide to Proclus*. Oxford University Press, 2016. Pg 45-73.

Helmig, Christoph. “Proclus on Epistemology, Language, and Logic” eds. *All from one: A guide to Proclus*. Oxford University Press, 2016. Pg. 183-107.

Jorgenson, Chad, et al. *Plato’s Timaeus: Proceedings of the Tenth Symposium Platonicum*

Pragense. BRILL, 2021. *DOI.org (Crossref)*, <https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004437081>.

Kobec, Alberto. “Proclus on the Forms of Attributes.” *Mnemosyne*, vol. 70, no. 5, Sept. 2017, pp.

775–807. *DOI.org (Crossref)*, <https://doi.org/10.1163/1568525X-12342095>.

- MacIsaac, D. Gregory. "Sensation and Thought in Theaetetus, Plotinus and Proclus." *The International Journal of the Platonic Tradition*, vol. 8, no. 2, Aug. 2014, pp. 192–230. DOI.org (Crossref), <https://doi.org/10.1163/18725473-12341287>.
- MacIsaac, D. Gregory. "Projection and Time in Proclus". *Medieval Philosophy and the Classical Tradition*. 2002. Pg 83-105.
- Martijn, Marije. "Proclus on the Order of Philosophy of Nature." *Synthese*, vol. 174, no. 2, May 2011, pp. 205–23. DOI.org (Crossref), <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11229-008-9418-3>.
- Martijn, Marije. *Proclus on Nature: Philosophy of Nature and Its Methods in Proclus' Commentary on Plato's Timaeus*. Netherlands, Brill, 2010.
- Opsomer, Jan. "The Natural World" eds. *All from one: A guide to Proclus*. Oxford University Press, 2016. Pg. 139-167.
- Opsomer, Jan. "Proclus vs Plotinus on Matter (De Mal. Subs. 30-7)." *Phronesis*, vol. 46, no. 2, 2001, pp. 154–88. DOI.org (Crossref), <https://doi.org/10.1163/156852801753733268>.
- Proclus, et al. Trans, P., Tarrant, H., Baltzly, D. *Commentary on the Timaeus*. Book I-V. Spain, Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Slaveva-Griffin, Svetla, and Pauliina Remes, eds. *The Routledge Handbook of Neoplatonism*. Routledge, 2014.
- Van Riel, Gerd. "The One, the Henads, and the Principles" eds. *All from one: A guide to Proclus*. Oxford University Press, 2016. Pg. 74-98