

# Macrocosm/Microcosm in Doric Thought 3<sup>rd</sup> Revision

By W. Lindsay Wheeler

July 13, 2011

[wheelerplatsis@hotmail.com](mailto:wheelerplatsis@hotmail.com)

## HISTORY OF ARTICLE

This article was uploaded to [FreeLibrary.com](http://FreeLibrary.com) on July 13, 2011 in two parts. Sometime around Thanksgiving 2013, the article was deleted from FreeLibrary.com.

## INTRODUCTION

This article is about a very important metaphysical concept, macrocosm/microcosm and its appearance in Doric thought which in turn influenced Socrates and Plato. But since this concept has been gainsaid and negated in recent articles and distorted by some ancient thinkers it will be necessary to conduct reconstructive surgery to restore it to its pristine condition. Hopefully, this paper will illustrate how metaphysics is done with the use of the Mind's eye, in the reading of reality that was part and parcel of the Greek mind but also in understanding the ancient Greeks themselves and their culture especially in the creation of the classical republican form of government. This account will discuss what macrocosm/microcosm is, its part in the Cosmos and hence its centrality in the Natural Law and in philosophy (wisdom). Second, it will prove the concept thru another natural law principle, righteousness. Third, point out it's provenance in Doric thought. In a corollary, it points to what the impact macrocosm/microcosm has on the true meaning "to be a lover of wisdom" and its importance in the concept of theosis. More than a research/academic article, this paper is also an exposition in which it will attempt to demonstrate the use and the mechanics of this principle by using a saying of Homer and the tripartite paradigm of the family.

## BODY

What the opinion of the day is and what reality is, are worlds apart and this time it is not just figurative but also literal as well. In recent times, this concept has been discarded as nonsense. George Boas (1973) in his article, "Macrocosm and Microcosm", begins his article by saying that this concept is a "pathetic fallacy" and concludes with this:

"But to all intents and purposes it is obsolete except as a figure of speech, sometimes meaning no more than any small independent group of people, a lodge or church or school."

As current as 2010, this internet encyclopædia article intimates the same thing:

"Despite a surge of interest in the microcosm during the early modern period, reflected in a wide range of disciplines, the theory did not lead to new discoveries and it was gradually relegated to the margins of science and philosophy along with the "occult" disciplines that maintained an affinity to it." (Net a)

And concludes by saying:

"[...] the idea of the microcosm as a synonym for humanity [has] become untenable among mainstream thinkers by the eighteenth century, [...]"

*The Oxford Companion to Philosophy* concurs with Boas as saying "They are not justified by argument, but they may have heuristic value" and *The Encyclopædia of Philosophy* concludes its article on this topic by alluding to it as a "scientific dead end".

Needless to say, this concept has been shoved to the junk science, pop psychology, weird fringe of the intellectual world. Macrocosm/microcosm is fundamental to ancient thought and its disappearance from common knowledge would lead modern people to misunderstand classical antiquity. This is why Chilton Williamson (2009) laments:

"The notion of a republic is a product of classical political thinking, which is now virtually dead in the Western world, and never appeared elsewhere. Not only has the classical political tradition become virtually extinct, the ability to think in classical terms seems to have been lost as well."

It is impossible to understand the true republics of the Dorians, their creation and maintenance without understanding the principle of macrocosm/microcosm. This principle is central to understanding the conception of the tripartite republican form of government. Since this concept has been so thoroughly

deconstructed and people so secularized, it is necessary to reconstruct this idea to its most pristine form and to validate its use and continuity. Macrocosm/microcosm is a very real image despite modern science and secular materialist skeptics to the contrary.

**"As above, so below".**

This saying attributed to the *Corpus Hermeticum* bespeaks to the essence of macrocosm/microcosm. It encapsulates it in its totality. Moreover, the formation of this saying in a laconic way probably points to its Doric origin. This principle, "As above, so below", is pulled from the Natural Order by observation and hence it is part of the Natural Law. It is what Nature teaches. The Greeks see the totality of reality (Hamilton, 185) but this reality is divided into spheres or different levels. What they observed is that paradigms, patterns, laws and principles reappear again and again in each of the different levels of reality.

The word "cosmos" entails order. When most people hear the word "order" what comes to mind is "hierarchy" which is certainly meet and right. But there is another form that order takes, and that is "repetition". There is a replication of principles and laws in all the spheres of the cosmos and this is a major marker and indication of the Logos which is inherent in the ordered universe. And this replication is part and parcel of harmony, another major component of the cosmos, or "ordered beauty". The central modality of macrocosm/microcosm is that things repeat, "As above, so below".

To best illustrate this principle and its idea is to find where it first appears in the canon of regular Western literature. A demonstration of the use of the macrocosm/microcosm principle can be found in one of the most famous and widely read texts of Western culture, that of Plato's *Republic*. The principle of macrocosm/microcosm is one of the very first lessons at the beginning of this book that many have overlooked, yet it forms the fundamental structure for the whole discussion. It is found at §368f. Plato's *Republic* is a discussion of *dikaïos* (righteousness). Now, some of his interlocutors are going to have difficulty in apprehending the idea of righteousness. Socrates proposes this idea:

"Seeing then, I said, that we are no great wits, I think that we had better adopt a method which I may illustrate thus; suppose that a short-sighted person had been asked by someone to read small letters from a distance; and it occurred to someone else that they might be found in another place which was larger and in which the letters were the same and he could read the larger letters first, and then proceed to the lesser-this would have been thought a rare piece of good fortune."

This "method" that Socrates is pointing out is the principle of macrocosm/microcosm. That since a paradigm or principle exists in one sphere, it might be more easily seen if one looks at the larger sphere where this paradigm or principle occurs in a grand scale. (Plato, *Philebus*, 30b)

In Socrates own words then,

"Then in the larger the quantity of justice (*dikaosini*) is likely to be larger and more easily discernible. I propose therefore that we enquire into the nature of justice and injustice, first as they appear in the State, and secondly in the individual, proceeding from the greater to the lesser and comparing them."

It is a given to Socrates that at the level of the individual there is justice but justice also appears at the state/society level as well. When it is hard to see something in the little, it could be easier to see them in the greater. By looking at justice in the state, one can then easily transport the methodology of justice into the sphere of the individual and understand how justice then fits the individual.

In this excerpt, as you can plainly see, the principle of macrocosm/microcosm is not overt! It is implied. It is a vehicle for illustration---not the principle itself. This is the first lesson of this concept; macrocosm/microcosm is the backdrop to another principle of the Natural Law, that of righteousness. It lays underground in the exposition.

**Microcosm/microcosm is the skeleton on which the flesh of the other Natural Law principles hang on.**

The principle of *dikaos* is explained using microcosm/macrocosm. To the microcosm of the individual, Socrates, an Ionian, juxtaposes the structure of the Doric republics of Crete and Lacedæmonia. (Morgenstern, cited in Müller, 1839: II, 193) Why?

The Doric city states were all constructed on the basis of righteousness. (Wheeler, 2007b) With the idea of reverse engineering in mind, it is necessary to discover why did the Dorians base their polities on the principle of righteousness?

Here, the principle of righteousness and a discovery of it then is applied to the validation and truth of macrocosm/microcosm. The secret of this is that the principle of righteousness appears over and over again in nature and this is how the principle of macrocosm/microcosm developed. Again, by looking at the principle of righteousness and by seeing how many times it is repeated, gave rise to the idea of macrocosm/microcosm. By looking at righteousness (or for that matter any other natural law), one discovers the law of macrocosm/microcosm; Xenophon writes:

"Yet again, the earth willingly teaches righteousness to those who can learn;" (*Oeconomicus*, v, 12)

*Dikaios* (righteousness) is the dictum that all things are constructed to do one thing. And as the earth willingly teaches righteousness---it also willingly teaches macrocosm/microcosm. For instance, Xenophon points out to the dissection of the body and the exploration of the meaning of the organs inside an animal body---each organ is dedicated to one function; i.e. they all have a single dedicated telos. Commonsense, which is the apprehension of self-evident principles (Maritain, 85), points to other cases of righteousness appearing in the body; eg. the five senses are each based in their own separate organ. This is just one sphere of reality; now, if it appears there---does it appear elsewhere? Let's go to another sphere in the cosmos, the insect world. Do not all insects have a singular job? The science fiction writer Robert A. Heinlein observes this as well and complains about it:

"A human being should be able to change a diaper, plan an invasion, butcher a hog, conn a ship, design a building, write a sonnet, balance accounts, build a wall, set a bone, comfort the dying, take orders, give orders, cooperate, act alone, solve equations, analyze a new problem, pitch manure, program a computer, cook a tasty meal, fight efficiently, die gallantly. **Specialization is for insects.**" (Tigerhawk) (emphasis added)

What is he complaining about? *Dikaios*. (Specialization is *dikaios*.) *Dikaios* is exhibited by the insects.

Karl Marx (1845) complains about *dikaios* (which he calls "the division of labor"):

"The division of labour is at this stage still very elementary and is confined to a further extension of the natural division of labour existing in the family."

Marx finds it in the family but more specifically he finds it in the sex act:

"With these there develops the division of labour, which was originally nothing but the division of labour in the sexual act,..."

He is most certainly right. Only females bear children. Women and men do not both bear children; only one gender does. Nature dictates righteousness.

From several different sources from across the spectrum, ones even hostile to the Dorians and their philosophy is the recognition of righteousness in many spheres; Xenophon writes of righteousness observed in the organs that make up the cosm of the animal body; Robert Heinlein derides the righteousness in the cosm of the insect world; Karl Marx, founder of political communism, deconstructs the righteousness found in the cosm of the family unit. At every level of reality, from the Christian Godhead, to the lowliest subatomic particle, righteousness is observed in every sphere. But there is an even more substantial consideration that happens in the real world, the cosm of human activity.

Socrates was always observing tradesmen at their labors. (Xenophon, *Memorabilia*, I, ii, 37) He would sit and watch for hours and ask questions about their work. Prof. Werner Jaeger writes:

"Socrates found that human nature, which is the part of the world best known to us, was the firmest basis for his analysis of reality and his clue to understanding it." (II, pg 32)

That is to say human beings are not separate from reality or above nature; we live inside nature and therefore nature works on us as much as we work on nature. One thing noticeable about any craftsman was their tools. For a leather worker, he would have one tool to accomplish each task he needed to perform; in the cutting of leather, the making of holes, the sewing it together required a specifically formed tool to do each job. One doesn't sew the leather together using a leather punch. A wood worker or a stone mason would have a number of different chisels to accomplish certain tasks. This is what

Socrates was learning by observing the *vanavsos* (*banausos* {'*vanavsos*' is the transliteration of the Greek word into English}).

Even today in our modern scientific world, in our most advanced technological areas, for instance medicine, each tool a surgeon uses in the operating room is specific, specialized, in order to do its job. This is *dikaios*. In its most basic functions of human activity of the creation of goods and/or services, the principle of righteousness abounds. Man's work is made efficient and successful because of it. Most tradesmen/service people/practitioners do NOT recognize what they are doing; they are not even sentient of what they are doing metaphysically. Working in reality, necessity and commonsense dictates righteousness in the tools they create. *Dikaios* exists in every workshop/construction site. It is everywhere, in every plane of existence, in nature and in the human world. In the system of macrocosm/microcosm, at every level of nature, righteousness is mirrored in one after another, but it goes to an even deeper intensity: reality was created this way and humans who work in reality subconsciously recreate *dikaios* in their tools because of the demands of reality. Reality works because it is designed around righteousness. This is the first pristine modus operandi of macrocosm/microcosm; things repeat.

What does Nature teach? The multiplication of the appearances of the principle of righteousness everywhere proves the existence of the principle of Macrocosm/microcosm. This system is very real. It exists. It operates. Each one of the natural laws, from righteousness, Doric syncretism (i.e. the combinatorial system), the tripartite paradigm, to hierarchy, harmony, the golden mean etc. (and even the mathematical number, the golden ratio 1:6 {Huntley, Doczi}) are all repeated in the realms of nature and human activity.

And this gets to the heart of what philosophy is. Philosophy which is a Doric thing ("that every institution can only flourish in the soil in which it is first planted" {Müller, II, 99}) is about humility before the Logos, having a wonder about it and then, because one is in love with it---imitates it, copies it in his own life. Heinlein sneers at the concept of righteousness and in his book *Starship Troopers*, they are killing, what else, insects! On the other hand, the Doric Greeks saw this in nature, accepted it, and lived it. Why? Because what built the cosmos is far more intelligent than man can ever be. This is the meaning of "philosophy", being a lover of wisdom. And furthermore, the Doric Greek mentality was their obedience and love of God

"We are not in the world in order to give laws, but [...] in order to obey the commands of the gods." (Plutarch)

The principle of righteousness is like a command in nature that all things must obey. The Doric Greeks, in their conception of their government, incorporated the teachings of righteousness. This is why Socrates uses their state to "illustrate" the workings of *dikaiois* in order to explain the working of *dikaiois* for the individual in *The Republic*. The principle of macrocosm/microcosm is not overt but is hidden underneath the rest of the laws of nature. It is a very real and fundamental part of reality. It is not only a principle of the Natural Law but it is its system as well. The principle/system of Macrocosm/microcosm is then part and parcel of Doric thought and becomes the basis of action. To the Doric Greeks, then, if all things practice righteousness, then it only makes (common)sense that they should as well. And this is why their state exhibited righteousness, "As below, so above". As they saw 'below' in nature, they applied it 'above' in their state.

In the advent of modern science and the advance of materialism, it seems that this idea is no longer needed, been deconstructed and/or has been nullified;

"The old hypothesis of the macrocosm and microcosm was no longer possible to those who had studied and understood the works of Copernicus and Vesalius. Men no longer studied macrocosm and microcosm as such, but they became physicists or physiologists." (Singer, 1928: 110)

Nothing can be further from the truth. Modern science with its invention of technological devices such as the microscope has opened new realms of reality shut off from ancient peoples. Quite to the contrary, modern science has expanded the breadth of macrocosm/microcosm. To illustrate this it would be necessary to use a proverb from Homer.

The phrase, "The rule of one is best", is a laconization of this verse in Homer "there is no good in having many rulers; let only one ruler be, one king". (Interlinear, II, v204) This laconization is sometimes referred to as "Aristotle's principle" (Goodman, 170) and was probably coined that way by some translator of Aristotle somewhere in history.

This idea is also pulled from Nature and is a principle of the Natural Law. In Homer's day and to his time, this paradigm is easily observed in human institutions and society (on one level); it is seen in the family structure (on another level); and viewed in the animal world. Amongst all the herd animals that man has domesticated and even in wild animals, one is the rule; such as in chickens, cows, horses, wolves; a dominant male or couple rules. Even on the plane of the insect world, the ancients would have observed that there is one (head) in a bee hive. This saying of Homer is easily perceived in the Natural Order.

(It is interesting to note in Greek mythology that “many-headed” beings were the symbols of evil and malignancy, for instance: Medusa with her hair of many snake heads; Hydra; Cerberus; Typhon; the Nemean Lion; Chimera etc. All these multi-headed creatures, were beings of horror.)

Pierre Gassendi (1592-1655), a French priest and thinker, used this very same paradigm from Homer to make a point in his treatise:

“Furthermore, he argued, empirical evidence shows that the rule of one is best: The home has one master, the army one general, the universe one ruler. Gassendi consistently compared the state to the home. " (Sarasohn, 157)

Notice he is using macrocosm/microcosm. Living in a scientific age where science and technology have increased our level of awareness of reality, the microscope and the telescope have expanded man's view into other levels of reality. What does Nature teach? Ask yourself these questions:

At the atomic level of reality, is Homer right---How many nucleuses in an atom? One.

How about at the cellular level, how many nucleuses in a cell? One.

In a higher organic life form such as an animal or human being, how many brains does an organism have? One.

In a family, how many fathers are there? One.

How many generals in an army? One.

How many bishops in a diocese? One.

How many plant managers in a factory? One.

How many police chiefs in a city? One.

How many CEO's in a corporation? One.

In Christendom, how many kings in society? One.

How many stars in our solar system? One.

And then how many gods are there in heaven? What does Nature teach? And does not Christian revelation confirm what nature teaches? As the microcosm goes, so does the macrocosm and vice-versa. (Then it is easy to see why Socrates, Plato, Anaxagoras and Aristotle et. al. were all natural monotheists. {Cocker, 139-40, 182; Maritain, 25, 27, 29, 43, 49; Ehrlich, 19-20, 98-99, 103}) At each level of reality, "The rule of one is best" appears. The principle is repeated over and over and over again. Modern science does not nullify the principle/system of macrocosm/microcosm; it has expanded it.

If the Doric Greeks invented and developed philosophy which is a love of wisdom, then the principle/system of macrocosm/microcosm should make an appearance in their thought and in their actions.

Someone, somewhere, referred to Plato as an ancient tape recorder; in this day and age, the apt metaphor should be a video recorder. The German classicist Werner Jaeger points out that the followers of Socrates invented a new medium of literature, halfway between poetry and prose. (Jaeger, II, 18f). Enthralled and bedazzled by Socrates and his teachings, and the way he taught, Plato captured a "truly lifelike" character of Socrates in his totality; his environment, his meetings with people and the content of their discourse. Though in later dialogues he changes the format to better present his advancement of Socratic thought, in his last dialogue, Plato reverts to his old self and becomes again a video camera at the beginning of his work, *The Laws*.

Not only does Plato lay out a conversation between him and the Doric Greeks but also shows in what way Doric philosophy was passed to Socrates and himself. The discussion of the book takes place on Crete which had a religious sanctuary, among others, to Zeus, the major god of the Hellenes. The participants in this treatise are an Athenian, a Cretan and a Spartan and on their way to the shrine they talk about the foundation of a new city. Here, it can be presupposed that many Athenians traveled to Crete to pay their respects to the deity and would have struck up conversation with the locals. Plato's *Republic* is based on the Doric republics and so Socrates, by using their form of peculiar government, had to know the philosophy undergirding them and was taught such by his encounters with Doric Greeks, such as the one Plato starts his *Laws* with.

There can be no doubt that there were many such interactions in Athens by Spartan and Cretan ambassadors and at religious shrines throughout the Hellenic world.

The beginning of the book opens with Plato asking the Cretan about the institution of their laws. Clinias the Cretan offers one of their most salient principles of Doric wisdom and that is "Life is War". He begins to point out that there is "continuous lifelong warfare against all cities whatsoever". (625e) This is commonsense; any observation anywhere can testify to that condition. Clinias progresses with the argument and points out another thing: this condition of "Life is War" exists in other fields as well! To wit:

"Humanity is in a condition of public war of every man against every man..." (Between individual and individual which is the next level down from cities to:)

"...and private war of each man with himself". (626d) (to the microcosmic level).

Observe the transcendental thinking of the Dorians; this metaphysical take. They observe reality and what can be easily seen is cities and their behaviors. They are constantly warring with their neighbors. This observation then lends itself to look farther down in the field; it happens between individual men. The most fundamental aspect of their wisdom is formulated in the macrocosm/microcosm system.

But what is most striking, way before the Christian religion (nor is this idea in the Old Testament {Hebrew thought}), is this view of "Life as War" observed, noticed, recognized as happening WITHIN a man! Clinias repeats himself with clarity:

"...that every one of us is in a state of internal warfare with himself".

The Dorians are quite aware of the internal struggle that happens sight unseen, "As above, so below" in the interior life of the private man. The principle "Life is War" is repeated over and over and over again. And without the aid of a microscope or telescope, through the principle of macrocosm/microcosm, know what is going on in the unseen world below us and above us and within us. This is a sign of a very metaphysical people that can see with their mind's eye, not with their physical eyes; to recognize something going on in the microcosm that is going on in the larger world. Furthermore, the macrocosm/microcosm is in its most pristine primordial sense; that things repeat in all the spheres.

Both of Plato's major treatises, *The Republic* and *The Laws*, start by discussing some principle of the Natural Law and in both instances, they illustrate two different principles by using one standard, the principle/system of macrocosm/microcosm! Macrocosm/microcosm is central to Doric thought. Even though *The Laws* is the last of Plato's works, the history he records is chronologically earlier than any of his dialogues. Not only was Socrates familiar with Doric wisdom before he actually started his mission in Athens, but that the Dorians were the home of Greek philosophy for many centuries before Socrates was born and were the source for Socratic philosophy. (Wheeler, 2007a)

The Athenian then asks, "Then, suppose we invert the argument..." This is central to understanding the method Socrates uses in *The Republic* to demonstrate what righteousness is for the individual. The macrocosm/microcosm can also be inverted. As one progresses upwards to the highest levels, one can also reverse and find the same thing repeated to the lowest levels.

As the macrocosm/microcosm is central to reality, it is also central in Doric thought. What was repeated in nature, they repeated. Moreover, since Socrates and Plato are both philodorians and familiar with Doric philosophy, they use it as well as the basis for their teachings.

There is another place where one can see macrocosm/microcosm at play in Doric thought. In Plutarch's biography of *Lycurgus*, he reports of an exchange between an inquisitor asking Lycurgus why he didn't set up a democracy in Sparta. Lycurgus replies,

"Begin, friend, and set it up in your family". (Plutarch's Lives, pg 65)

Here in this simplest form is the macrocosm/microcosm principle at work! It can be seriously doubted that in the depths of history, in the 10th, 9th, or 8th centuries B.C., or whenever Lycurgus lived, that there was even a concept of democracy at that time, but what cannot be doubted though, is that the family, and the form of the family (by using reverse engineering), provided the basis of their creation and maintenance of their tripartite classical republics.

In this quick retort, whom ever created it, went quickly to the microcosm of the family because the family and its structure was the basis of their state. Immediately one comprehends that no, democracy cannot work in a family. If it doesn't work in a family, according to the macrocosm/microcosm principle--it cannot work in the state as well. In the defense of their setup of their state, it is the microcosm of the family that makes the point.

Not only is there this microcosm/macrocosm being used, but also the seed form of the Socratic elenchus is exhibited. Socrates uses three principles in his elenchus to get at the truth; the principle of identity, the principle of non-contradiction, and the principle of consistency. (Wheeler, 2008a) The principle of identity is based on the Natural Law principle of righteousness, (As things in reality are constructed to do one thing, so words, constructions of man, in order to fit reality, must follow the dictates of righteousness and so a word must identify solely with one object); the principle of non-contradiction is from Parmenides and is a form of logic; but where did the principle of consistency come from; where Socrates asks, "And I will begin with courage, and once more ask what is that common quality, which is the same in all these cases, and which is called courage?" (Plato, *Laches*, 191d) This principle of consistency is a corollary to the principle/system of macrocosm/microcosm; repetition signifies consistency. At each level of reality, the same thing goes. Democracy doesn't work in the family and so it doesn't work in the state as well.

This is the basis of the scientific spirit. The inquisitor poses a hypothesis "Why didn't you create a democracy". What happens is that the responder puts it to the test; he places it in the cosm of the family to 'test' whether that man's opinion is right or not, i.e. "Try it in your family". The opinion of the man is tested by using the principle of macrocosm/microcosm. Here is the scientific method of hypothesis, test, conclusion, all wrapped up in a metaphysical repartee. The Socratic elenchus was not a form of criticism but a way of testing what one says is true or not. This saying, of some very early provenance than Plutarch, shows that this testing of thought was part of Lacedæmonian culture.

There is a further teaching embedded in this simple reply as well. Earlier in this paper, Homer's Rule of One was utilized and shown that it occurs in the animal kingdom, and in various human institutions such

as the family and an army. Both of these institutions are ruled by One but these institutions are also composed of three parts; a pattern emerges; a Three in One. (This is probably how Pythagoras {as well as the Dorians} thought of number as being the basis of reality.) The family is one but is composed of three different parties; an adult male, the father; an adult female, the mother; and children. There are three different classes of humans in a family; a tripartite paradigm shows itself. As one studies the Doric republics, one can't help but notice their tripartite form as well. (Wheeler, 2007b) It consisted of Dorians/Perioci/Helots and the Dorians, themselves, were further divided into three major castes; royalty, aristocracy and the *homonoï*; a tripartite paradigm embedded within a greater tripartite paradigm. This was recognized by Dicaearchus of Messana when he titled his study of the Spartan politia, *The Tripoliticus*. The paradigm of the tripartite form of the family was used in classical political science by Aristotle and Arius Didymus of Stobaeus. (Politics I, §ii,21; I, §v, 1-2, Boring et. al., 530) Both Aristotle and Arius noticed that the family structure mirrors the classical caste system of the *respublica Lacedaemoniorum* where the father is like the king, the mother is like the aristocracy and the children mirror the citizens. The tripartite form found in the family of father, mother, children is mirrored/repeated in a high organic caste society of the Dorians, royalty, aristocracy and *homonoï* (the commons).

Can this also be expanded to succeeding levels of reality? What does Nature teach? This is how the macrocosm/microcosm system works:

At the nuclear level, how many parts are there? Three: proton, neutron, electron; the tripartite paradigm.

At the cellular level, how many major sections are there? Three: nucleus, mitochondria (and other specialized microbodies {these bodies are a type of aristocracy}), cytoplasm; again the tripartite paradigm repeats itself.

At the organism level, how many general sections are there? Three: brain, the spinal cord (a type of aristocratical system) and body; the body includes the flesh, organs, skeleton, a tripartite paradigm within a tripartite paradigm.

The Family is three; father, mother, children.

As was pointed out, Socrates considered "human nature, [...] was the firmest basis for his analysis of reality and his clue to understanding it". If one looks at human institutions one finds the tripartite paradigm repeated over and over again.

In race, especially in the European (Dumezil), which is family writ large, there is royalty, aristocracy, commons; the tripartite paradigm. The tripartite form of the race was also a set up for their military organization, where the king was the war lord and the aristocracy was the war captains commanding the common soldiery. In modern times, this tripartite pattern has been replicated. In modern militaries there is the officer corps, the non-commissioned officers (NCOs) and the regular enlisted.

In factories there is the plant manager, foremen (which are a type of aristocracy), the factory workers. A tripartite paradigm.

In the medical field, there is the doctor, nurses (which are a type of aristocracy), and the patients. A tripartite paradigm.

In the corporations, there is the CEO, a white collar work force and the blue collar work force. A tripartite paradigm.

In all the institutions that man creates, he replicates this tripartite pattern.

And as the microcosm is three, so the macrocosm of life is three. Living organisms are divided into three categories: plants, animals, humans. By inverting this principle, Plato, with his mind's eye, can see something unseen and see that the soul is divided into three parts corresponding to the three levels of life; the plant soul having nutritive and generative powers, the animal soul having the powers of the plant plus the power of movement and the human soul having the power of the plant and animal plus one more power, the power of reasoning.

And if macrocosm/microcosm principle is true, then this tripartite reality would also be taught by divine revelation. As the proverb goes, "As above, so below", the spiritual/divine realm should match the physical realm (which is a teaching of Pythagoras, i.e. "Truth about nature and divine truth, were one and the same thing" {Ferguson, 103}); there should be a confluence of what nature teaches and the divine revelation of Christianity. (Cocker, 51) Christianity reveals that God is one but three persons. In

the Godhead, there is a tripartite paradigm; Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; the Trinity. Not only is there a tripartite paradigm in the godhead, there is also a tripartite paradigm in regards to the Church itself. (Lukyx, who was constantly citing Dumezil) That in the movement of the Holy Spirit in the formation of its institution, created a class of offices, that of bishop, priest and deacon which is a form of aristocracy that is placed between the founder, Jesus Christ, and his believers. The church itself exhibits a tripartite form. Christ is the monarch, the clergy is the aristocracy and the laity is the commons. Again, it can be shrunk to the diocese, the bishop is a type of monarch, with the priest and deacon as a type of aristocracy and the laity is the commons. Even in the ranks of the clergy is this tripartite reality evident, there is the rank of bishop, the priestly office, and the deaconate. It is a tripartite paradigm within a tripartite paradigm within another tripartite paradigm headed by their tripartite godhead. In the revealed religion of Christianity, the religion of the West, it mirrors the Natural law. Is it a coincidence that revealed religion matches what the natural law teaches?

Macrocosm/microcosm is how reality works. As the family is tripartite, so is the state tripartite. As that anecdote from Plutarch from Lycurgus shows, the setup of the Doric republics are a mirror of the family unit. As the family is, so shall the state. And just like parents rear children in a family, it is the duty of the state to rear citizens as well and this is why one sees the emphasis on public education of citizens to a general uniform idea in the Doric republics.

## CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the articles about macrocosm/microcosm on the internet point to a bunch of people as the originator of this idea. Wikipedia states: "It may have begun with Democritus in the 5th century [BC] or with Pythagoras...". On the other hand, this idea is found in nature and the Doric Greeks, readers of nature, pulled it from there and hence passed it on to others.

Nature teaches the principle of macrocosm/microcosm. This is not obsolete; it is alive and well, encircling us, ever present. Modern science has not nullified it. It is a metaphysical concept that requires transcendence, the mind's eye, to see and use it. Reality is based on reason and reason implies order and one facet of this order is "As above, so below". Used in the Platonic texts, it is underground, implied; it is the background upon which the other laws of nature are exhibited. Just as the earth willingly teaches righteousness, so it also graciously teaches macrocosm/microcosm. If one is incognizant of this principle, one really doesn't know what reality is all about.

How the Doric Greeks conceived of their republics was by seeing with the mind's eye a tripartite pattern in the family and replicating that in their form of government. Microcosm/macrocosm is integral to Doric thought as it is to the Laws of Nature.

Macrocosm/microcosm is not a system of analogy. It, itself, is not an analogy. It is the system within nature, things repeat. This is the first pristine meaning of the theory. In later years, the principle has grown and adapted to other uses (and in a secondary sense, can be used as an analogy). Plato and other philosophers/sophists have certainly taken liberty and applied it to other novel ways for instance that there is a "world soul" since man has a soul himself. Even though this is a bastardization of the original meaning, the invalidation of this particular case does not nullify the principle generally.

Second, this principle shows the confluence between the Natural Law and Divine Revelation. With the principle of "Rule of one is best" and the tripartite paradigm, one can see how natural theology and natural monotheism arose amongst the Greek philosophers of the theophilis side (as opposed to the Greek materialist sophists) and segued into Christianity. Nature itself is a reflection of the trinitarianness of the Christian Godhead.

On this point, Socrates uses the tripartite Spartan republic to showcase how righteousness worked in the tripartite soul of the individual. From there Plato expanded that to a tripartite godhead of a nous, demiurge and world soul which encompassed The Good and all perfection. Plato believed, even as a natural monotheist, a triad of gods (Droge, 310) Numenius, a second century Platonist, codified this doctrine of "three gods" and claimed it was a Pythagorean teaching, (since Plato's Academy in its purest form came from Pythagoras); that there was "a philosophical need for a trio of roles in the creation and sustenance of the universe". (Ferguson, 191) From thence, Prof. Jerry Ehrlich points out that Plato's work formed the culture of the Hellenistic Age that gave birth to Christianity. Concept precedes knowledge (Socrates) and Plato's general intuition from the laws of nature prepared the ground for the reception of Christianity.

Third, there is another ramification of this principle, that of theosis. Theosis is a Greek term that means "to become like god". (In Plato, it is *omeosis theo* {Cocker, 503}) This idea is heavily used in Greek Orthodox theology but this idea is not of Christianity, it is Platonic (Ehrlich, 77) and hence Doric. That the divine life was a concept of the Greeks, is shown by Diogenes Laertius when he preserved an epitaph inscribed upon Plato's tomb which ends with this, "...because he discerned the divine life". (Ehrlich, 100) If Plato discerned the divine life, it was because he got that idea from the Doric Cretans and Lacedaemonians. Christianity, in the book of Genesis, reveals that man is made in the image of God. Man is a mirror of God. God is the Macrocosm and man is the microcosm. If that is the case, according to the dictates of the natural law of macrocosm/microcosm, then man must imitate God as much as possible.

"Having attained this insight, the microcosm realizes that just as the universe employs reason to govern the planets, it too should employ reason to govern its emotions. In this way the microcosm overcomes its inner discord and prepares its soul for a return to the heavens from which it came." (Netb)

This can be seen in the paideia of the Doric Greeks. They lived this divine life. They endeavored to be good, to live truth, that their citizens were educated to live a virtuous and ethical life. They imitated their god Apollo in that they practiced and encouraged an intellectual culture. The symbols of Apollo were a lyre and a bow which "symbolized the order of nature. The bow was 'strife', the lyre harmonia" (Ferguson, 90) and this duality of strife and harmony can be fully seen in Doric culture; their warrior culture and the singing that attended everything they did.

"With the iron stern and sharp  
Comes the playing on the harp".  
(Plutarch, Lycurgus)

Just as their god Apollo was, so were they; the bow and the lyre were united in Sparta. Furthermore, the creation of the gerousia, the senate, as the seat of reason to guide the body politic is a great talisman of their replication of the divine image. Theosis, or the divine life is the signature characteristic of their philosophic state. (Plutarch, Lycurgus) Theosis is a concomitant of macrocosm/microcosm.

Fourth, the family in its tripartite paradigm is the central focus of macrocosm/microcosm and from there radiates most of the natural law. From its very structure, in its natural organic existence, the family is in essence the basis of political science, philosophy and natural theology through the principle/system of macrocosm/microcosm for the Dorians and hence Plato.

Fifth, the principle of macrocosm/microcosm is probably the seed bed for the third leg (the principle of consistency) of the Socratic elenchus.

Sixth, this touches on the meaning of philosophy itself. The term "philosophy" was first used by Pythagoras (Maritain, 27; Fortenbaugh et al., 210). Pythagoras received his training from the Doric Greeks of Crete and Laconia. They probably coined the term; they created the science of philosophy and

Socrates points out that the home of Greek philosophy is Crete and Sparta. Earlier, this paper mentioned Karl Marx who is also labeled a philosopher (by the *Oxford Companion to Philosophy*). But anyone can see that the two are diametrically opposed. How can they both be philosophers; the Doric Greeks who had a feudal system, a caste system and the founder of Marxism that preached egalitarianism, was anti-hierarchical and had a great contempt for the division of labor? Can they both be philosophers or does this break the dictum of Parmenides principle of non-contradiction, integral to logic? What is the meaning of philosophy? Socrates says in the Gorgias:

"...philosophy holds ALWAYS to the same ..." (sec 482, a)

As the principle/system of macrocosm/microcosm is used to illustrate the natural law principles of righteousness and 'life is war' in the Platonic dialogues, it can also be said that it points to the meaning of the term 'philosophy'. If the essence of macrocosm/microcosm is repetition, then it means that the natural law principles are repeated in one's life. As the Macrocosm, i.e. the cosmos, is formed by righteousness and strife, man, the microcosm, must also follow suit. As a part of nature, he must obey the logos. He must also consciously repeat those laws and be obedient to them. The Doric Greeks implemented the principle of righteousness in their government and in their society, they consciously developed a tripartite government form, they reiterated the golden mean in their character and martial art, etc etc; they obeyed and imitated and repeated those principles. Karl Marx (1845) on the other hand, had this to say:

"That the abolition of individual economy (the division of labor) is inseparable from the abolition of the family is self-evident."

Not only does Karl Marx want to end the division of labor (*dikaios* or feudalism) in society, he also wants to abolish the family, a natural organic creation. When the Christian scriptures proclaim that

"How great are thy works, O Lord! in wisdom (sophia) hast thou wrought them all;..." (Psalm 103.24)

Karl Marx is not a lover of the wisdom that built the natural order. A person who deconstructs the natural order is a nihilist (Rose, 75-77) and not a "Lover of wisdom", a philosopher. Karl Marx is a misologos or a misocosmi, a hater of the Logos and hence a hater of sophia, wisdom.

Philosophy literally means to be a "lover of wisdom" for if you love something:

**You mimic what you love.**

The word philosophy is formed from two Greek words "*philos*" and "*sophia*"; Sophia is knowledge, it is passive; on the other hand "*philos*" requires action. "To Love" is about movement; movement towards something. The Dorians of Crete and Laconia loved reality and so they implemented what the natural order taught in their institutions and in their culture. They mimicked what they loved and so they earn the title of philosophers (That "mimicking" or imitation is an important facet of philosophy, Leonard Brandwood lists this word occurring 313 times in Plato's works {Ehrlich, 81}). The magisterial scholar of the Dorians, Prof. Karl Otfried Müller (II, 381) discerned that the Dorians were "delighted more in imitation than in creation or action" and this racial proclivity formed the creation of the science of philosophy. Not just an intellectual pursuit, "to mimic" forms an integral part of philosophy; philosophy is actively lived. "To mimic" forms the first part of this word; "to mimic" is the form of repetition. The Roman lawyer/statesman Cicero, trained in Athens at the Aristotelian school, a philodorian, completely influenced by Dicaearchus of Messana (also a philodorian), brings forward Doric thinking: "man was born **to contemplate the cosmos and to imitate it,...**" (Jonas, cited in Bertonneau) (emphasis added)

"God's formative work holds the ultimate explanation for the existence of order in the visible and invisible universe. The perfection found in appearances is a visible imitation of the rational perfection of the original. As in Pythagorean cosmology, the beauty of the universe with its eternal and unchanging order resides in its pellucid mathematical structure, its hierarchically ordered relations and resonant harmonies. Socrates thus relates the world-order to its geometrical blueprint—a constitutive ordering which mortals ignore at their peril, failing to respect the immanent logic that governs the polis and consequently replacing this by the 'acosmic' forces of greed and injustice." (Sandywell, 52).

By respecting the Logos of the natural order, the Cretans and the Spartans gained eunomia in their societies. This is why Plato and Socrates were adamant about The Law. The Law expresses the will of the Logos. Man has a partiality of this Logos or man's logos/reason is deformed. Man is in a sense "saved" when he attaches his mind to that of the Divine Logos.

Seventh, Gregory Vlastos is a celebrated and distinguished scholar of Plato. Yet, in his most recent work, *Plato's Universe*, which even has a chapter called "The Greeks discover the cosmos", there is no mention of macrocosm/microcosm. Furthermore, he also like A. E. Taylor lampoons the fact that Spartans were even philosophical. (2005, 41)

The opinions of modern men are nowhere near the truth; truth being "a faithful representation of reality". (Makrakis) If one denies the system of macrocosm/microcosm, how can he or anyone have a faithful representation of reality in their minds and thoughts? Do they really know what is going on in the real world? How do classical scholars by the thousands, ignorant of macrocosm/microcosm understand their subject material, comprehend classical antiquity, not to say that of the Doric Greeks, their institutions and practices. How come someone is named a philosopher without being cognizant of the law of macrocosm/microcosm? How does one who hates the natural order, who is a misologos, get the title of "philosopher"? It just goes to show that there is a whole mass of people who really don't know what is going on in reality or for that matter in classical antiquity and for all the lectures on Plato's cave, it seems that most are still stuck watching shadows, deceived and remaining ignorant.

Eighth, it has to be concluded that much of what Socrates did and what Plato taught originated from the Doric Cretans and Spartans who they rubbed shoulders with.

Ninth, the material sciences are just that---materialistic. Reality is a mix; reality also obeys the natural law and so it is a mixture; it is not purely "material" and it is not purely "spiritual". It is a mix of the two. The material sciences do not read or know the natural law. They study only the physical concrete structures with the naked eye and with physical instruments. On the other hand, life is metaphysical and therefore to understand the totality of reality takes a "mind's eye". Material sciences have no impact in this area. They feed information and give data--but can make no judgments about it. Righteousness must be observed in the scientific community. The principle/system of macrocosm/microcosm is the field and property of Philosophy alone (Maritain, 67-76) and it is to true philosophers, not to sophists, ideologues, rhetoricians, lawyers, academics or materialists that this principle is to be left in the hands of. The Natural Law is the purview and domain of philosophers. The material sciences have no say in judgment on the validity or value of the macrocosm/microcosm principle.

There are some implications due to this idea as well. Transcendent people see hierarchically and create structured societies and their values as well are laid out hierarchically. Macrocosm/microcosm is a hierarchical structure. Materialist people do not and therefore create leveled societies and there is only one value with no higher or lower values. Democracy, created in Athens, is a sign of the materialistic *vanavsic* (banausos) aspects of the Ionians. The mission of Plato was to train the Athenians who were

materialistically minded to see with the mind's eye, to comprehend the transcendent, to be philo-sophiers, to bring Doric philosophy to bear upon the Athenians. For transcendence is about seeing hierarchically; to seeing the unseen worlds above and below. As there is hierarchy in the physical, it trains those to see the hierarchy in the Chain of Being.

The second implication of this is that not only does microcosm/macrocosm exist in the natural world and in the human sphere, it also exists in human thought as well and there is a real historical event that makes this very visible and concrete.

Prof. Michael Mendle has done a masterful study of 17th century English constitutional history which is about the fluctuations in the technical language of the estates that made up the British government and society. This disturbance was caused by the Scottish Presbyterian movement which endangered the classical republican tripartite form of traditional English rule and this situation became the prelude to the civil war called The Great Revolution. As Protestantism matured, it became increasingly and virulently anti-clerical; meaning that it saw the clergy, bishops, priests, deacons, as a pernicious error and in their purification drive to return to supposedly Christian primitivism uncorrupted by Rome, the clerical office had to be removed from Christianity.

In the course of their rise in England with their teaching of the removal of clergy from the church and the clerical church from politics, they began to contend with the clerical Protestant Anglican Church, the official Church which was of course allied with the government and king. Prof. Mendle in describing what happened next, observes that

"the religious and political causes now had [became] intertwined". (1985, 157)

That is to say, the theology of the Scottish Presbyterians soon became political science; they then sought to remove the British aristocracy and king altogether like how they dispatched the clergy in their churches. In the civil war that followed, they managed to do just that with Charles I losing his head and the disbandment of their bicameral system, (with the upper house being the seat of the aristocracy). The anti-clericalism of fundamental Protestantism morphed into anti-hierarchicalism (they were called the Levellers) which led to the removal of all forms of hierarchy in society. (As a matter of note: the American Revolution was a carryover of this revolution and so it was originally called "The Presbyterian War". {Allen; Wheeler (2008b), ref# 118})

How one thinks in one sphere in his thought, is the same way one thinks in another sphere. "As above, so below". What started out theologically soon ended up in the temporal sphere. The principle of macrocosm/microcosm exists in human thought as well! The same standards, principles, knowledge that one applies to one side of his thought, will be applied to other sides of his thought as well. It goes 'across the board'. This is logical. (In the modern age, ideology has replaced theology and this is how ideology moves by fixing the temporal order to match the demands of ideology.)

Clearly against Boas contention that man as the microcosm of God as a pathetic fallacy, this historical event proves quite the contrary. Divine Revelation specifically elaborates that man is made in the image of God; in that case, the system of macrocosm/microcosm is inherent in the human mind as it is in God's. Prof. Benjamin Cocker writes that

"Now, if humanity has a special end and destination, it must have some instinctive tendencies, some spermatic ideas, some original forces or laws, which determine it towards that end. All development supposes some original elements to be unfolded or developed." (1870, 51)

Nature which proceeds from God exhibits this consistency from one sphere to the next. Like man who thinks "across the board", God does as well and this is why nature exhibits this "across the board" presentation of the same principles and laws. Mark Moffet (2010, 230), a myrmecologist, observes this phenomena as well, "Recent investigations across the sciences and humanities are in fact proving how commonalities among colonies, cities, organisms, and minds run deep, with principles and constraints operating in a similar manner whether we look at a cell, a brain, a body or a superorganism." Macrocosm/microcosm is this.

Macrocosm/microcosm is a very real system that exists in the natural order, the human sphere and in human thought. To not pay attention or respect this law or even be cognizant of it, is just one of the many causes of dysfunctionality in society as it was in Athens at the time of Socrates and Plato not to mention the total erroneous suppositions of Doric/Spartan government, institutions, and culture that have been taught in classical departments in the past centuries and the total farrago and vulgar shape that has become of Western thought and philosophy of the past preceding three centuries.

Macrocosm/microcosm is a system/principle of the Natural Law, a part of the Logos; to be disregarded at one's and society's peril. Knowledge of it is necessary for the comprehension of Doric society, their institutions and their classical republican form of government and for the recapturing of classical European thought.

## ADDENDUM

(1) Archimandrite Boniface Luykx was constantly citing Georges Dumézil and how Indo-European trifunctionality infused Christianity throughout. He also taught that Christianity was acculturated Hellenism.

(2) I have reconstituted the real, original Natural Law. It can be found here:

[http://wikinfo.org/w/index.php/Natural\\_Law\\_by\\_Wheeler](http://wikinfo.org/w/index.php/Natural_Law_by_Wheeler)

(3) Nature teaches righteousness, the dictum that all things are created to do one thing. This repeats throughout the sphere. Just as Macrocosm/Microcosm exists in nature and in the human mind as in “across the board”, so also righteousness exists in the human mind.

Roger Seip, in his book *Train Your Brain For Success*, emphatically states that multitasking is a fallacy. After review of many articles on the subject, it is clear that multitasking slows a person down and actually makes one stupider! (pgs 148-149) As he observes, many people deceive themselves in thinking that they can; they only harm themselves.

Righteousness exists in human thinking. Righteousness goes to all spheres. The Natural Law guides all things thru macrocosm/microcosm. All things repeat.

## **Longer history of article**

This article was sent to three journals. All three rejected this paper. One was not surprising because it really did not fit the bill. The Journal of Ancient Philosophy at Notre Dame, a Catholic University, rejected this article.

At FreeLibrary.com, it was first not accepted. It went some thirty days and no response. Only after contacting someone on staff and he told me he could see no reason why it shouldn't appear, then it was published. After some time, I was not allowed to upload any new articles for they had changed their policy. Next, I was not allowed to comment on the article because I wanted to add new information. Next, all the links in the article were de-linked. Then, they deleted it without notice or reason given. Just, bang—gone.

## REFERENCES

All quotes from Plato's *Republic* are taken from Jowett's translation. All other Platonic quotes/references come from Edith Hamilton and Huntington Cairns' *The Collected Dialogues of Plato*. All quotes of the Bible come from the LXX.

Aristotle, [1932] (1990) *Politics*, trans. by H. Rackham, Loeb Classical Library #264, Harvard University Press; Cambridge, MA.

Allen, Thomas B. (2010) *Tories, Fighting for the King in America's First Civil War*, Harper.

Bertonneau, Thomas F. (2010) "Gnosticism from a Non-Voegelinian Perspective, Part III (Gnosticism in Modern Scholarship)", *The Brussels Journal*, 2010-06-15. <http://www.brusselsjournal.com/node/4461>  
Retrieved: 6/24/2010.

Boas, George (1973) "Macrocosm and Microcosm", in Wiener, P. P. (ed.) *Dictionary of the History of Ideas*, Studies of Selected Pivotal Ideas, 4 vol., NY: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Boring, M. Eugene (ed); Berger, Klaus; Colpe, Carsten (1995) *Hellenistic Commentary to the New Testament*, Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press.

Cocker, Benjamin Franklin [1870] (2008) *Christianity and Greek Philosophy or, the relation between spontaneous and reflective thought in Greece and the positive teaching of Christ and His Apostles*, NY: Carlton & Lanahan. Project Gutenberg.

Doczi, G., (1981) *The Power of Limits, Proportional Harmonies in Nature, Art, and Architecture*, Boston and London: Shambala Publications, Inc. 1981.

Droge, Arthur J. (1987) "Justin Martyr and the Restoration of Philosophy", *Church History*, Vol. 56, issue 3. Questia Media America, Inc. [www.questia.com](http://www.questia.com)

Ehrlich, Jerry Dell (2001) *Plato's Gift to Christianity, The Gentile Preparation for and the Making of the Christian Faith*, San Diego, CA: Academic Christian Press.

Ferguson, Kitty (2008) *The Music of Pythagoras, How an Ancient Brotherhood Cracked the Code of the Universe and Lit the Path from Antiquity to Outer Space*, NY: Walker Publishing Company, Inc.

Fortenbaugh, William W.; Schütrumpf, Echart (2001) *Dicaearchus of Messana, Text, Translation, and Discussion*, New Brunswick USA: Transaction Publishers.

Goodman, Lenn E. (1998) *Judaism, Human Rights and Human Values*, NY: Oxford University Press. Questia Media America, Inc. [www.questia.com](http://www.questia.com)

Hamilton, Edith [1930] (1993) *The Greek Way*, NY: W. W. Norton and Co., Inc.

Homer *Iliad*, interlinear Iliad <http://www.elopos.net/elpenor/greek-texts/interlinear-iliad.asp?homer=70> Retrieved 01/30/2010. Check Aristotle's *Metaph.* 1076a and *Polit.* 1292a. Check also *Theophrastus Char.* 26.2. (Help from [Elpenor](http://www.elopos.net/elpenor/) website)

Huntley, H. E., (1970) *The Divine Proportion, A Study in Mathematical Beauty*, NY: Dover Publications, Inc.

Jaeger, Werner [1943] (1948) *Paideia: the Ideals of Greek Culture*, trans. by Gilbert Highet, I-III Vol., NY: Oxford University Press.

Luykx, Archimandrite Boniface, Lectures held at Mt. Tabor Monastery, Redwood, California, in the years 1982, 1993

Makrakis, Apostolos (?) *Philosophy: An Orthodox Christian Understanding*.

Maritain, Jacques [1930] (1991) *An Introduction to Philosophy*, Westminster, MD; Christian Classics, Inc.

Marx, Karl, (1845) *The German Ideology*, <http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1845/german-ideology/ch01a.htm> Retrieved 12/30/2009

Mendle, Michael (1985) *Dangerous Positions, Mixed Government, the Estates of the Realm, and the Making of the 'Answer to the xix propositions'*, University, AL: The University of Alabama Press.

Moffet, Mark W. (2010) *Adventures Among Ants, A Global Safari with a Cast of Thousands*, Berkeley, University of California Press.

Müller, Karl Otfried (1839) *The History and Antiquities of the Doric Race*, I-II Vol. London: John Murray. 2<sup>nd</sup> rev. ed.

Net Industries [a] (2010) "Microcosm and Macrocosm - Early Modern Theories And Aftermath", <http://science.jrank.org/pages/10215/Microcosm-Macrocosm-Early-Modern-Theories-Aftermath.html> Retrieved: 1/9/2010.

Net Industries [b] (2010) "Microcosm and Macrocosm - Plato", <http://science.jrank.org/pages/10209/Microcosm-Macrocosm-Plato.html> Retrieved: 1/9/2010.

Plutarch, (n/a) *Lives*, Modern Library

Rose, Br. Seraphim (1994) *Nihilism, The Root of Revolution in the Modern Age*, Forestville, CA: St. Herman of Alaska Brotherhood.

Sarasohn, Lisa T. (1996) *Gassendi's Ethics: Freedom in a Mechanistic Universe*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press. Questia Media America, Inc. [www.questia.com](http://www.questia.com)

Seip, Roger (2012) *Train Your Brain For Success*, Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Singer, Charles (1928) *From Magic to Science: Essays on the Scientific Twilight*, NY: Boni and Liveright. Questia Media America, Inc. [www.questia.com](http://www.questia.com)

Sandywell, Barry (1996) *Presocratic Reflexivity: The Construction of Philosophical Discourse C. 600-450 BC*. NY: Routledge. Questia Media America, Inc. [www.questia.com](http://www.questia.com)

Tigerhawk blog "After line by Robert Heinlein" <http://tigerhawk.blogspot.com/2009/04/after-line-by-robert-heinlein.html> Retrieved: 4/22/2009

Vlastos, Gregory (2005) *Plato's Universe*, Parmenides. Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Wheeler, W. Lindsay (2007)a "Doric Crete and Sparta, the home of Greek Philosophy", SPARTA, Vol. 3 no. 2, pp 13-22. <http://www.sparta.markoulakispublications.org.uk/?id=143>

------(2008)b "Classical Definition of Republic" Wikinfo online internet encyclopædia  
[http://wikinfo.org/w/index.php/Classical\\_definition\\_of\\_republic](http://wikinfo.org/w/index.php/Classical_definition_of_republic)

------(2007)b "The Spartan Republic", SPARTA, at  
<http://www.sparta.markoulakispublications.org.uk/index.php?id=105>

------(2008)a "The Principles of Definition", Wikinfo online internet encyclopædia  
[http://wikinfo.org/w/index.php/Principles\\_of\\_definition](http://wikinfo.org/w/index.php/Principles_of_definition)

Williamson, Chilton (2009) "The Classless Republic", *Chronicles* magazine, May.

Xenophon, [1923] (1992) *Memorabilia, Oeconomicus* trans. E. C. Marchant, Loeb Classical Library #168, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

This paper was originally divided in two parts; Part I was

<http://www.thefreelibrary.com/Macrocosm/Microcosm+in+Doric+Thought+Part+I-a01074347355>

Part II was <http://www.thefreelibrary.com/Macrocosm/Microcosm+in+Doric+Thought+Part+II-a01074347359>



