

Mithraism, the Chaldaean oracles and Platonism become fused in Late Antiquity. Though Plato, Speusippus and Xenocrates made ample reference to the gods, Iamblichus and the Emperor Julian promulgated the particular adaptations that became the “spiritual commonwealth” of late antiquity. Syrianus, Proclus teacher, wrote on the harmony in the doctrines of Orpheus, Pythagoras and Plato with the Chaldaean Oracles. For Proclus there is a facile intertranslatability between god and concept throughout his theologized metaphysics. The subject of the *Commentary on Timaeus* is the physical world, the realm furthest away from transcendental theology. Still, Proclus makes constant reference to Orphic, Chaldaean/Mithraic deities. In particular the so called lesser pantheon or sublunary deities are named. In this work Proclus is presenting complex ontological and scientific problems and at the same time referring to a plethora of Chaldaean and Mithraic gods. What is their function? Sarah Iles Johnston discusses the “growing interest in mediating deities and principles “in Late Antiquity.” As the gods increasingly were portrayed as transcendent and detached from the world of men, the need for intervening principles or entities increased. Oppositions such as “divided” and “indivisible” or “time “and eternity” require mediation .For Proclus the gods posses the quality of ‘self sufficiency’ and ‘make up’ the difference between the immobility of the ‘transcendent’ realities and the mobility of the physical world by enacting principles in the world of space and time. Hecate, for example, conforms to the doctrine of the Platonists as to the place of the Cosmic Soul. The demiurge is equated with Zeus as the efficient cause.. Younger gods such as Ocean, Tethys, Phorcys, Rhea and Saturn play roles in generation as well. It is the “lesser pantheon” that rules over the physical world. Despite Proclus’ entheistic discourse, Proclus still resolves issues as a metaphysician.. There are many instances in the *Commentary on Timaeus* where he is critical of his theological predecessors. Proclus adopts a very definitive position that the first cause is one. In *Commentary on Timaeus* the naming of the gods does not take away from this essentially monotheistic metaphysics. This paper will examine this seeming contradiction. In his *Commentary on Cratylus*, Proclus believes that names refer especially to metaphysical entities as they represent to us a kind of portrait-like image of these entities. In the case of divine names Van den Berg, points out “Since names resemble these metaphysical divine beings, Proclus, like many other Neoplatonist considers them as statues (*agalмата*) in sound of the gods (*Crat* 51:19, 12-17). Proclus has four modes (*tropoi*) of theological exposition: the entheistic, symbolic, iconic and dialectic. Naming the gods that are involved in generation then, is comparable to the “iconic” and symbolic discourses with which Proclus discusses issues concerned with the

physical world.