



CHAPTER 10

THE MONISM OF DARKNESS AND THE DUALISM OF LIMIT AND INDETERMINACY

1. Greek philosophical dualism sprang from an experience of cosmological (structural) and cosmogonic (causal) polarity between the Luminous Form and the Indeterminacy of Darkness, between astounding Beauty and awe-inspiring Power, between archetypal, well-ordered Harmony and reckless, productive Fertility. Such a polarity found expression in religion, poetry and popular belief as the copulation of the antithetical Male and Female, in philosophy as the opposition, but also conjugation, of Limit and Indeterminacy¹.

Underneath the experience of polarity a deeper experience lay hidden which originally engendered and nurtured dualism and which, later, when polarity came to relative independence, was developed to such a degree that it finally altered the entire articulation of Dualism by digesting it according to its own proper modalities. That was the experience of aboriginal Darkness as the terrible and almighty Womb of all-that-is.

The primaeval Darkness and the infinite Silence of first origins, the theocosmic Abyss of Chaos and the unblest and awful all-generating Night were in the beginning felt and conceived as the foundation and the root of existence, as the causal and temporal beginning of everything, as the Great Mother of the world's subsistence. This conception while actively experienced led to the religious and theoretical formation of the Monism of Darkness, that is to say to the sole recognition of a single, primaeval, dark Principle.

There is agreement between the empirical bipolarity of the world's constitution and the monistic belief in one principle: Light proceeds from Darkness, order is consolidated from disorder, the formless is formed following internal procedures, the harmony of the limit is taken over by prolific Indeterminacy, the Beauty of the Bloom springs from, feeds on, develops and perfects itself due to the infernal power of the roots which dictates that it shall be the seed of a new root, a new growth and a new bloom. The mighty Mother-Son archetype combines the monism of Darkness with the natural bipolarity of being. Bipolarity derives from Unipolarity. Before the copulation of the masculine and the feminine comes the parturition of the masculine from the feminine. Birth precedes sexual congress in the ontological succession of reality. The relationship of husband and wife is derivative from, hence shallower than, that of mother and son. The articulation of the monism of darkness explains the origin and nature of Archaic dualism.

Dualism sublimates the dependent pole of the cosmic conjugative, complementary and cofunctional opposition and elevates it to the level of an independent principle; what is more, dualism makes out of it the first principle par excellence. During the development of dualism the primacy of Limit is stressed more and more with the necessary consequence that the principle of Indeterminacy is gradually degraded (both hypostatically and valuationally)². When this tendency reaches its final consequence and it appears that an overall reversion is doomed to happen which will substitute a Monism of Light for the primaeval Monism of Darkness; when Limitlessness is pushed to the lowest level of ontological hierarchy, is transformed into the underlying matter of the physical world and is thought of as ultimately deriving from the unique limit-imposing first principle; precisely then, at that very historical moment, fecund Darkness reintroduces itself, above the First Principle this time, as the paternal depth of the Chaldaean Oracles, the ineffable abysses of the Gnostics, or as the Nothing of Athenian Neoplatonism that is beyond being, supra-essential and more powerful than even the One.

2. That Greek Dualism sprang from the spirit of a Monism of Darkness is shown also from the fact that in early Pythagoreanism it is the second principle that is truly dynamic. It is of primal importance

for a correct understanding of the Archaic Greek experience that movement and mobility proceed from the principle of Limitlessness, not that of Limit, and belong to that which receives order, to the receiving, passive and determinable thing, not to that which imposes order, namely the drastic, active and determining thing. The meaning of such recognition becomes profounder once we notice that the soul, because it is a principle of mobility, pertains to the series of Infinity and Indeterminacy, of formlessness, shapelessness and indefiniteness, of that which is without *εἶδος* and without *ἰδέα*. (Some observations on the subject are to be found below in Chapter 12, p. 181 and nn. 105-108.) The divergence from Middle-Eastern Semitic belief, especially the Biblical one, is striking. We find there that God's Spirit, a function of the first principle, moves, activates and creates the orderly world from an inert and chaotic matter (second principle). Thus in Genesis I, 2: an indeterminate earth pre-exists in the wet darkness of the abyss over which the spirit of God was wandering: *ἡ δὲ γῆ ἦν ἀόρατος καὶ ἀκατασκεύαστος, καὶ σκότος ἐπάνω τῆς ἀβύσσου· καὶ πνεῦμα Θεοῦ ἐπεφέρετο ἐπάνω τοῦ ὕδατος*. The Hebrew word which the Septuagint translates as *ἐπεφέρετο* literally means 'to flutter, fly, hover, wing, be suspended, move to and fro'³: it denotes a rushing, tremulous, throbbing, pulsating, quivering, nervous, continuous motion, which is here in the present case the stirring agitation and blowing of a dynamic principle over the static inertness of chaotic abyss. This motion deriving from the principle of life effects the fertilization of inert darkness and thus inaugurates the demiurgic process. That is why the first manifestation of creation is Light.

The Old Testament experience (which is contained in the the so-called Hieratic Codex to which the beginning of the book of Genesis also belongs) is reflected in Phoenician mythology. The Cosmogony of Sanchouniathon (in the version of Philo of Byblos) postulates two first principles: (i) blow of dark wind, swing of infernal breath and (ii) darkness of turbid liquidity and chaotic moisture. Both principles existed from eternity. Logico-mythical thought realizes the inexplicability and unaccountability of one single principle within eternity: what can happen in eternity so that anything starts to be, so that any ontological reality originates? How does it come about that the flow of time begins in eternity? And why then rather than earlier or later? How can moments (durationless presents, *νῦν*) be discerned

in themselves and from one another in eternity? There is no difference there between one point and another; everything is fused in one eternal present. According to Phoenician theology, the beginning comes to be, the infinity of indeterminacy is broken by the imposition of limit, term and boundary as soon as the spiritual principle, the blow of wind as the first principle of primaeva dualism, desires its own beginning, desires that it have an origin although it has none. Such longing of the Spirit is hypostatized as Eros or Desire⁴. The ontological realization of this desire cannot be anything other than the combination of the first principle with the second, since nothing else exists either in eternity or even in the newly-constituted Time. Strictly speaking, the conjugation is not a union of the Spirit per se with Chaos (that is to say, it is not a coition of the two supreme principles with one another); such union has no sufficient reason to happen earlier rather than later, hence no sufficient reason to happen in general or at all. The combination and conjugation is between Desire (i.e. of the Eros that the first principle hypostasizes once it comes to desire beginning and origin, or identity and definition) and Chaos, or rather between the Spirit-in-Desire (or the Desiring Spirit, or the Spirit's Desire) and Chaos. Logico-mythical thought lies beyond such conceptual discriminations as those expressed in the triple disjunction above. In the theology of Sidon, however, one can find, according to Eudemus' account, essential reverberations of the problematic lying underneath. The discrimination explains also the fact that the Spirit per se knows nothing about the outcome of its own longing for beginning and origin and circumscription. The outcome is the creation of the world. The union that stirs the process of the world's formation is a union of the Spirit qua Desire with Darkness. From this copulation comes the semen of all creation (*Μώτ*), which is the primal mud, the origination and coming to be of all that exists, a fecund moist rottenness which is produced from the coition of the two principles as in sexual congress the genital liquids of the partners create the foetus of existence⁵. The seminal slime which is the origin and source of all-that-is develops into a world-creating Egg. - Thus we can fully interpret and appreciate a very difficult passage from Philo which has come down to us in Eusebius *Praeparatio Evangelica* I, 10, 1-2 (FGrH 790 F2): τὴν τῶν ὄλων ἀρχὴν ὑποτίθεται (sc. ὁ Σαγχο-υιάθων) ἀέρα ζοφώδη καὶ πνευματώδη ἢ πνοὴν ἀέρος ζοφώδους καὶ

χάος θολερὸν ἐρεβῶδες· ταῦτα δὲ εἶναι ἄπειρα καὶ διὰ πολὺν αἰῶνα μὴ ἔχειν πέρασ. ὅτε δέ, φησιν, ἠράσθη τὸ πνεῦμα τῶν ἰδίων ἀρχῶν, καὶ ἐγένετο σύγκρασις, ἣ πλοκὴ ἐκείνη ἐκλήθη Πόθος· αὕτη δὲ ἀρχὴ κτίσεως ἀπάντων· αὐτὸ δὲ (sc. τὸ Πνεῦμα = Πνοή) οὐκ ἐγίνωσκε τὴν αὐτοῦ⁶ κτίσιν. καὶ ἐκ τῆς αὐτοῦ συμπλοκῆς, τοῦ Πνεύματος, ἐγένετο Μῶτ. τοῦτό τινές φασιν ἰλύν, οἱ δὲ ὕδατώδους μίξεως σῆψιν. καὶ ἐκ ταύτης ἐγένετο πᾶσα σπορὰ κτίσεως καὶ γένεσις τῶν ὄλων... καὶ ἀνεπλάσθη (sc. Μῶτ) ὁμοίως ᾧ οὐ σχήματι. etc.

The theology of Sidon, according to the account preserved by the Peripatetic Eudemus, exhibits striking similarities. There are three first principles: Time, Desire and Mist. The mixture of the latter two gives birth to Breeze and Air from the copulation of which Ὠτος or Μῶτος is begotten. (Eudemus' account is preserved in Damascius, *De primis principiis* 125c (I p. 323.1 sqq. Ruelle).⁷ The Mist corresponds to the dark and misty Chaos of Sanchouniathon. The Breeze and the Air together correspond to the dark and windy air or (=) to the Breath of dark air. The difference lies in the partial reversion of the sequence: air's breath is the offspring of the first copulation, not one of the member's thereof. (The presence of Time in the first position of the first principles deserves separate analysis which would entail an examination of the major issue of the Zurvanistic Theology of Persia.)⁸

The third account of Phoenician mythology of first principles that has been preserved (it is the account of Mochus, translated into Greek by Laetus in the Hellenistic period, cf. FGrH 784) also exhibits characteristic similarities. Two first principles are postulated, Aether and Air, from which Oulomos is given birth. Oulomos' self-fertilization begets first the opener Chousoros and then the world-creating Egg. Prior to Oulomos the Winds are also taken to exist, but Damascius does not specify the precise sequence (in all likelihood because that would affect the smoothness of assimilations, of which he is so fond, between the described cosmogonies and his own system of the derivation of reality from first principles). Nevertheless, Aether, Air and Wind signify the pneumatic (spiritual and blowing) first principle that has been recognized above, whereas Oulomos is the Greek version of the Semitic Im = infinite (cf. e.g. *Die Schoepfungsmeythen* ed. M. Eliade, p. 182). Chousoros the opener is attested as Kothar-wa-Chassis

in Ugarit texts and means the Powerful One, the Opener, cf. *Die Schoepfungsmythen, loc. cit.* (One may compare him to Chrosor in the Philonian transcription of Sachouniathon, Eusebius, *Praeparatio Evangelica* I, 10, 11, where he is identified with Hephaestus, the Powerful Craftsman and Skilled Technician; evidently he expresses the mechanical, technical model of the world's creation, the artisanship type of creation, since it is precisely Chousoros who opens the cosmic egg and forms the Sky and the Earth.)

The Hellenicus-and-Hieronimus version of Orphic Cosmogony, "the Orphic cosmogony according to Hellenicus and Hieronymus", (Kern, *Orphicorum Fragmenta* Fr. 54) presents interesting similarities with the attested Phoenician models. (It is noteworthy that Hellenicus composed a "Phoenician Archaeology", Josephus, *Jewish Archaeology* I, 94 and Kern *op. cit.* p. 130).⁹

3. The blowing of Spirit as the moving, vital, active principle and the darkness of abyss as the necessary complementary opposite pole¹⁰, as the necessary condition for the creation of something other than the first principle, are in different formulations (with the probable influence from Hellenistic, especially Stoic, terms and concepts) the first principles also of some Gnostic systems of dualistic structure like those of the Nicholaites, Ophites and Sethianoï. The former is purely dualistic (Epiphanius, *Contra Haereseon* XXV, 5, 80 A-C, vol. II pp. 35-6 Dindorf; Philastrius, *Haer.* 33; Tertullianus, *Adversus Haereseon* 1; cf. Bousset, *Hauptprobleme der Gnosis* p. 103). Darkness (*σκότος* and *βυθός* and *ʿδωρ*) pre-exists as second principle; the first principle is pneuma which effects a primary and archetypal determination, a primaeva discrimination within Chaos, maybe the primary earth (according to the testimony of Philastrius), or rather the Sky according to the cosmogony of Genesis, or even the separation of an upper Depth and lower Water, the effect of which was that the spirit came to occupy the upper region. Chaos which was in no way fond of any discrimination became afraid of, and was reluctant to submit to, the possible consequences of such separation: there was serious threat of further and still further determinacy and limitedness and boundary-creation¹¹. Chaos became therefore enraged and furious at the process of separation, and finally raised itself towards the blowing spirit of the upper region, came into contact with it and gave birth to the cosmic

Womb, the source of all creation. (The Womb, in its turn, conceived in lusty yearnings with the Spirit and brought forth the series of Aeons -when Light was also created- the last of whom, the Ugly Aeon begot with her gods, demons, angels and the seven heavenly spirits of the planets): ... λέγοντες ὅτι σκότος ἦν καὶ βυθὸς καὶ ὕδωρ, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ἀνὰ μέσον τούτων διορισμὸν ἐποιήσατο αὐτῶν, τὸ δὲ σκότος ἦν χαλεπαίνόν τε καὶ ἐγκοτοῦν τῷ πνεύματι, ὅπερ σκότος ἀναδραμὸν περιεπλάκη τῷ πνεύματι. Καὶ ἐγέννησε, φασί, τινα μήτραν καλουμένην, ἣτις γεννηθεῖσα ἐνεκίσσησεν ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ πνεύματι. Ἐκ δὲ τῆς μήτρας προεβλήθησάν τινες τέσσαρες αἰῶνες etc. (Eriphanius *loc. cit.*).

The later and more sophisticated system of the Ophites suitably corresponds to all this. The first principle splits into three distinct hypostases, of which the third is the blowing power (pneuma) that affects the elements below, namely Water, Darkness, Abyss and Chaos (Irenaeus, *Elenchus et Eversio falso cognominatae gnoseos*, I, 28, 1 I, pp.226-7 Harvey). The Father (the first hypostasis of the first principle called Man) and the Son (the intelligence (ἔννοια) of the first hypostasis = the second hypostasis of the first principle called Second Man) fall in love with the Spirit (which is female and the third hypostasis of the first principle). The Spirit begets the Third Man and the Second Son, that is Christ, who is snatched up with the Mother of Living Beings (the Holy Spirit). At the same time, because of the overflowing stream of light coming from the first two hypostases which cannot be absorbed wholesale by the female Spirit although it is fertilized precisely thereby, liquid light outflows from the Spirit (as a second, somewhat defective birth) that is called Euonymos (=the one with the good name) and Prounikos and Wisdom and Bisexual. It is Euonymos that becoming heavy sinks into the abyss of dark waters, moves that unmoved liquid blackness, obtains a material body and while moving upwards again to its natural seat forms first of all the Sky that becomes the foundation of the creation of the world: et descendentem (sc. Euonymum) simpliciter in aquas, cum essent immobiles, et movisse quoque eas, petulanter agentem usque ad abyssos (*ibid.* p. 228). For the details of the composition of the World after the stabilization of the first Sky by Euonymos (= the hermaphrodite Prounikos) called also Ialdabaoth (= the Jewish God) one can see the following paragraphs in Irenaeus' account and

compare them to Epiphanius *op. cit.* A, XXVII, 3-4. The model in its fundamental outlines is identical with the Nicolaitic system, although the former is more elaborate and complex than the latter. The basic difference is that in the system of the Ophites the first principle does not mix directly with the other principle, but unites through its descendants with it and as a result of the insufficiency and defectiveness thereof (which is here the relative inability of the female Spirit to receive the fullness of the masculine hypostases of the first principle). Epiphanius makes the defectiveness perfectly clear (*loc. cit.* §3 p. 264 Dindorf): *τοῦτον δὲ (sc. Ἰαλδαβαώθ = the last Sky) προβεβλήσθαι κατὰ ἀδράνειαν καὶ ἄγνοιαν τῆς ἰδίας μητρός, τουτέστι τῆς ἄνω Προυνίκου, ταύτην γὰρ φασὶ τὴν Προϋνικὸν κατεληλυθέναι εἰς τὰ ὕδατα καὶ μιχθῆναι αὐτοῖς* etc. The Holy Spirit, we learn, is Herself the Upper Prounikos. In the order of the First Principle itself, in its third hypostasis, a certain ontological defect is inherent.

In the Sethianic System —Hippolytus provides very good information on the cosmogony of the system (*Elenchus* etc. E, 19-21), whereas Epiphanius focuses on the Sethianic interpretation of the Bible (*Panarion adversus Hereseon* A, 29, 1-10)— we find yet another way of articulating the original fundamental experience of dualism, a version that moves one step further in the direction of inequality between the two first principles. The relatively low position and downgraded power of the third hypostasis of the first principle (i.e. the spirit) according to the Ophitic system are made to form here a separate essence, a third principle that stands between the other two, between Light and Darkness. Darkness is terrible Water below. *Τὸ φῶς πέφυκε καθάπερ ἀκτὶς ἡλίου ἄνωθεν ἐλλάμπειν εἰς τὸ ὑποκείμενον σκότος, ἀνάπαλιν δὲ ἡ τοῦ Πνεύματος εὐωδία μέσσην ἔχουσα τάξιν ἐκτείνεται καὶ φέρεται πανταχῆ, ὡς ἐπὶ τῶν ἐν πυρὶ θυμιαμάτων τὴν εὐωδίαν πανταχῆ ἐπεγνώκαμεν.* (Hippolytus *loc. cit.* 19, §4). Therefore, light (as radiance) and spirit (as fragrance) are thrown and sown on the terrible water and the ensuing mixture produces the totality of the world both as an integrated whole and as separate species and individual things. Darkness needs light if it is to preserve the identity of its apprehension and consciousness as the pupil of the eye which in itself is wet and dark is illumined from the incandescence of an internal light that actually provides it with the capacity to see. It follows that darkness seeks with all possible means to

retain within itself the radiance of light and the consecutive fragrance of the spirit. Light, by contrast, and the spirit long to return qualitatively and chorologically to the purity of their essence uncontaminated by darkness. *Τὸ δὲ σκότος ἀσύνητον οὐκ ἔστιν, ἀλλὰ φρόνιμον παντελῶς, καὶ οἶδεν ὅτι, ἂν ἀπαρῆθῃ τὸ φῶς ἀπὸ τοῦ σκότους, μένει τὸ σκότος ἔρημον, ἀφανές, ἀλαμπές, ἀδύναμον, ἄπρακτον, ἀσθενές. διὸ πάσῃ φρονήσει καὶ συνέσει βιάζεται κατέχειν εἰς ἑαυτὸ τὴν λαμπηδόνα καὶ τὸν σπινθῆρα τοῦ φωτὸς μετὰ τῆς τοῦ πνεύματος εὐωδίας. καὶ τούτων ἔστιν ἰδεῖν τῆς φύσεως εἰκόνα κατὰ πρόσωπον ἀνθρώπου, κόρην ὀφθαλμοῦ, σκοτεινὴν ἐκ τῶν ὑποκειμένων ὑδάτων, πεφωτισμένην πνεύματι. ὡς οὖν ἀντιποιεῖται τὸ σκότος τῆς λαμπηδόνας, ἵνα ἔχη <τὸν> σπινθῆρα δουλεύοντα καὶ βλέπη, οὕτως ἀντιποιεῖται < τὸ σκότος τοῦ φωτὸς καὶ τῆς τοῦ πνεύματος εὐωδίας· ἐφίεται δὲ > [supplevi e.g.] τὸ φῶς καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς δυνάμεως τῆς ἑαυτῶν· καὶ σπεύδουσιν ἄραι καὶ ἀνακομίσασθαι πρὸς ἑαυτὰ τὰς μεμιγμένας αὐτῶν δυνάμεις εἰς τὸ ὑποκείμενον ὕδωρ σκοτεινὸν καὶ φοβερόν (§§ 6-7).*

When they are separate and in themselves the three principles and their infinite powers stand still (like the Empedoclean elements during the thorough dominion of Hate). Their approachment and co-presence, however, because of the co-existing differences, causes action and re-action, movement and activity and finally results in a permanent effect produced by the confluence of opposite powers, as the collision of two bodies that move against one another leaves a permanent mark (which is, so to speak, the stamp of their particular crashing according to the character of the given clashing objects), especially on the more passive among them: *ἐπειδὴν μένωσι κατ' αὐτάς* (sc. αἱ δυνάμεις τῶν τριῶν ἀρχῶν), *ἡσυχάζουσι πᾶσαι· ἐὰν δὲ πλησιάσῃ δύναμις δυνάμει, ἢ ἀνομοιότης τῆς παραθέσεως ἐργάζεται κίνησιν τινα καὶ ἐνέργειαν ἀπὸ τῆς κινήσεως μεμορφωμένην κατὰ τὴν συνδρομὴν τῆς παραθέσεως τῶν συνελθουσῶν δυνάμεων. γίνεται γὰρ τῶν δυνάμεων ἡ συνδρομὴ οἰοεῖ τις τύπος σφραγίδος κατὰ συνδρομὴν ἀπὸ πληγῆς παραπλησίως πρὸς τὸν ἐκτυποῦντα τὰς ἀναφερομένας οὐσίας etc.* (§§ 8-10). The great concurrence of the principles wholly creates the Great Seal, namely the World as a gigantic Womb literally in the form of an animal womb. The Great Concurrence of the principles is necessarily followed by the conflation of their corresponding powers which creates the variety of species of

natural existence within the World. In this manner, one finds both radiance of light and fragrance of spirit thrown and remaining diffuse inside the physical Universe.

The precise mode of the principles' confluence is as follows: the process gets started with the beginning of Tempest, a dreadful, furious, impetuous Wind, a boisterous Blast. The Wind, however, that is here agitating the primaeval Water of Abyss and causes the worldly formations is not the Spirit as a first principle (as with the Nicolaitae), nor as the humid effulgence of the third hypostasis of the First Principle (as with the Ophitae), nor even as the second principle: the vehement and stormy Wind that raises the Water into a pregnant undulation fertilized by the luminous spirit (by the fragrance of a radiant breeze) is the First-Born of the Water, the very first and most powerful son of the Third Principle. Hippolytus is undoubtedly preserving authentic and moving Sethianic imagery of ur-cosmogonic events. Because of the opposition between the two co-present principles, namely between the bright spirit (or life-generating breath) on the one hand, and the awesome water on the other, the Spirit's Breath stirs lust and arousal, hence sexual desire for copulation, to the water, and this longing blows as raging Wind and makes the water swell raising it in this way to a passionate undulation: *γένονεν οὖν ἐκ τοῦ Ὑδατος πρωτόγονος ἀρχὴ Ἄνεμος σφοδρὸς καὶ λάβρος καὶ πάσης γενέσεως αἴτιος. βρασμὸν γάρ τινα ἐμποιῶν τοῖς ὕδασιν ἀπὸ τῶν ὑδάτων διεγείρει κύματα· ἡ δὲ τῶν κυμάτων γένεσις, οἰοῦναι τις οὐσα ὄρμη· συμμείξεως, τὴν φύσιν ἐποίησεν*¹² *ἐγκύμονα γεγονέναι τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἢ τοῦ νοῦ, ὅποταν ὑπὸ τῆς τοῦ Πνεύματος ὄρμης ὀργήσασα ἐπείγηται. ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦτο τὸ ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀνέμου κύμα ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος ἐγερθὲν καὶ ἐγκύμονα ἐργασάμενον τὴν φύσιν γέννημα θηλείας εἰλήφη ἐν ἑαυτῷ, κατέχει τὸ κατεσπαρμένον φῶς ἄνωθεν μετὰ τῆς τοῦ πνεύματος εὐωδίας, τουτέστι νοῦν μεταμορφωμένον ἐν τοῖς διαφόροις εἶδεσιν, ὃ ἐστὶ τέλειος Θεός, ἐξ ἀγεννήτου Φωτὸς ἄνωθεν καὶ Πνεύματος κατενηνεγμένος εἰς ἀνθρωπίνην φύσιν ὡς περ εἰς ναόν, φορᾶ φύσεως καὶ ἀνέμου κινήματι γεννηθεὶς ἐξ ὕδατος, συγκεκραμένος καὶ καταμεμιγμένος τοῖς σώμασιν, οἰοῦναι ἄλλας τῶν γενομένων ὑπάρχων καὶ φῶς τοῦ σκότους, ἀπὸ τῶν σωμάτων σπεύδων λυθῆναι καὶ μὴ δυνάμενος τὴν λύσιν εὐρεῖν καὶ τὴν διέξοδον ἑαυτοῦ.* The Wind of darkness, the Mighty Primogenitus of the Waters is, therefore, the Father below, the

Generator of the Physical Universe and its partial species and beings. He firstly begets as his Son the perfect Intellect, the intellectual Heaven, ultimate Boundary and binding Fastener of the World, the Cosmic Intelligence. The Son is not in essence the same (homoousios) with the Father: the Son is captivated inside the aroused undulation, and this is according to the Sethians the Spirit that is suspended over the Waters in *Genesis* I, 2. Hippolytus' text 19 §§16-17 should be read as follows: *πᾶσα οὖν φροντὶς καὶ ἐπιμέλεια τοῦ Φωτὸς ἄνωθεν* (sc. *τῆς πρώτης ἀρχῆς*) *ἐστὶ, πῶς καὶ τίνα τρόπον ἀπὸ τοῦ θανάτου τοῦ πονηροῦ καὶ σκοτεινοῦ σώματος ἀπολυθείη ὁ Νοῦς ἀπὸ τοῦ Πατρὸς τοῦ κάτωθεν, ὃ ἐστὶν ὁ Ἄνεμος, ἐν βρόμῳ καὶ ταραχῇ ἐπεγείρας κύματα καὶ γεννήσας νοῦν τέλειον Υἱὸν ἑαυτοῦ, οὐκ ὄντα ἴδιον ἑαυτοῦ κατ' οὐσίαν (ἄνωθεν γὰρ ἦν ἀκτὶς ἀπὸ τοῦ τελείου Φωτὸς ἐκείνου) ἐν τῷ σκοτεινῷ καὶ φοβερῷ καὶ πικρῷ καὶ μιαρῷ ὕδατι κεκρατημένον* [sc. *τὸν Νοῦν* —not *κεκρατημένος* which is a wrong 'emendation' of the right manuscript reading], *ὅπερ ἐστὶ πνεῦμα φωτεινὸν ἐπιφερόμενον ἐπάνω τοῦ ὕδατος.*

With the generation of the world a radiance of the First Light and a fragrance of the Spirit are captured therein so that the multiple intermixtures of the principles' powers with the powers of the third principle and substance, namely water, create the entire cosmic phantasmagoria. Moreover, what is at stake here is not only the imposition of a specific type of characterising seal on a material configuration that would concretise a particular thing, but also specifically the confinement in the particular created thing of pure bright spirit, i.e. of intellect, as happens in the world at large as a whole. Not only does bright spirit as radiant fragrance penetrate the remotest edges of the world as it is sown everywhere, it also gets concentrated, in its fully fledged peculiar essentiality, thereby constituting Man, as perfect God (v. 19 §15 supra).

The Intelligence of the World, the heavenly intellects and the human Mind are the light-bearing and light-transferring spirit: they are immortal gods because they possess perfect and absolute Knowledge. The Luminous Spirit that moves over the Waters is also the universal, Cosmic Intellect. This is born from the Wind in the first phase of creation. The formation of the World consists in the creation of the Cosmic Womb against which the particular animal wombs are modelled (19 §11-12). In the second phase, the Wind as (Phallic)

Snake (probably as the Uroboros that surrounds the World, cf. e.g. *Acta Thomae* 32) enters into the Cosmic Womb of Impurity and thus Man is born: the impure and most-suffering (*πολυποίμων*) Womb neither loves nor recognises nor admits inside her any form other than that of the primaeval Serpent. For this reason when the perfect Logos of the Light above wills to descend into the world in order to redeem from the embrace of Darkness the effulgence of its radiance and the spiritual breath that are imprisoned in nature wailing and crying for liberation from the bonds of impurity and disorder, Logos deceives the Womb of Abomination and penetrates her in the form of her beloved reckless and lawless Wind, the Primordial Snake. After the completion of the abominable mysteries of the Womb, Logos is purified together with the entire con-substantial sequence of light and spirit as well as all the intellects (*τὰ ἐν γνώσει πνεύματα τῆς ἀληθείας*) by means of the chalice of upsurging living water, the cosmic semen, the warrant of Salvation (19 §§19-21).¹³

4. The proximity and connection of the analysed systems and theories with one another is manifest. One characteristic feature of Phoenician theologies was the importance attributed to the serpent, as Philo, allegedly following Sanchouniathon, reports in detail (790 FrGrH F4; Eusebius, *Praeparatio Evangelica* I, 10, 45-53). This feature is directly related to the Ophitic Gnosis and Philo himself identifies the origin of Pherecydes' theory on Ophioneus and the Ophionites in Phoenician models (Eusebius *op. cit.* I, 10, 50 = 7 B4 DK). With reference to the philosophical theology of first principles the salient feature of this group of beliefs is a radical or mediated Dualism between an active life-generating principle of motion and a passive principle of reception, between energetic fullness and inert indeterminacy. The first principle is conceived as fertilizing breath, Wind of impulse, Spirit of life; the second as Abyss of Waters, Darkness of Chaos.¹⁴ Philo Judaeus declares the life-generating power of wind's breath that permeates water, *Quaestiones et Solutiones in Genesin* IV, 5: *ultima vero divinorum sortitus est aer, animans creaturas congregatas. Nam si aer non tangat moveatque aquam, emoritur ista; vivifica autem magis comperitur non aliunde nisi aere in eam intermixto.* According to the Babylonian theology, in the beginning there was the Darkness of the Abyss of Water from which

Belus (Bel=Dominus, the Lord) formed the arrangement of the world and the order of existence firstly by means of a primary division of liquid darkness into Earth and Sky (Berosus FGrH 680 F1 §6=Fr. 12 Schnabel p. 254 sqq. Cf. Abydenus FGrH 685 F1). The old Bel of Akad is the Sumerian Enlil, the Breath of existence, developed into the Lord of Weather and especially the Lord of violent atmospheric phenomena, such as storms and tempests.

Initially, dualism postulates the immediate congress of the two first principles for the Creation of the World-Order (cf. the veil of Sacred Marriage in Pherecydes. Cf. below, Chapter 12, n. 50). However, when dualism is combined with a kind of monism, namely a henism that overestimates the importance and ontological status of the first principle vis-à-vis the World, it tends to develop an articulated system of emanations from the first principle and a corresponding hierarchical differentiation of the Fullness of Existence with no reference to, or collaboration with, the Second Principle. It is then difficult to satisfactorily explain the newly introduced multiplicity in the domain of the absolute, and this difficulty leads to the postulation of a second principle different from the Second, albeit analogous therewith. Intertwining with the Second Principle is now the work of the last Aeon (according to Gnostic terminology), that is of the last Emanation from the supreme Principle which is the primary One. This is the structure of the Ophitic system according to Eirenaeus' account. Here the major problem to be accounted for is presented by the departure of the last Hypostasis from the fullness of absolute existence; a defect is necessarily presupposed inside perfection, be it in its remotest boundaries, a want in the lowest edges of fullness. This line of developing dualism ends up with the suspension of the self-subsistence of the Second Principle as radical Other, and is to be found in full bloom in Valentinian Gnosis as well as in Neoplatonism, the concluding form of ancient Greek philosophy.

In Sethianism, according to Hippolytus, another crucial development is established: mobility is (partially rather than altogether) separated from the First Principle (in which there remains a measured, mild motion of breath and spiritual fragrance) and attached to the Second Principle as violent passibility, lustful receptivity and vigorous craving for surrender to the drastic fertilizing activity of the first principle or any of its emanations. The tempestuous fury of the

Wind now belongs to the Second Principle as passion for the conception of luminous spirit. The Wind as principle of motion in the Second Principle is aroused, to be sure, by virtue of the desire for the first principle and its measured mobility, but is, nonetheless, the proximate creative cause of the World's order. The Wind is not, however, an intrinsic factor of the Second Principle *per se*.

5. In contrast to such a view, Greek Dualism in its early phase considered the root of mobility to belong intrinsically to the disorderly that is peculiar to the Unlimited principle (Indeterminacy). This is, for instance, the eternal motion of Anaximander's Unbounded (12 A9 and 12 DK), its essential character that renders it in itself fertile: the basic pairs of opposites that constitute the World are secreted therefrom (cf. below, Chapter 12, n. 41). We meet with a similar problematic, albeit undecisive or rather hospitable to opposite directions, in the Hermoupolitic Cosmogony. The situation that is prior to cosmic creation is expressed by the Ogdoad (the very first deity and group of deities), i.e. four couples of divinities which denote, by means of the polarity between the male and the female, four fundamental aspects of the pre-universe: Nun and Naunet (primordial water), Heh and Hehet (spatial unlimitedness followed by the determinative 'water'), Kek and Keket (Darkness' abyss with the determinative 'night'), Amun and Amaunet (the latent, the Hidden, the unknown); v. e.g. Schwabl, *Weltschoepfung* in PW col. 1501; M. Eliade (ed.) *Die Schoepfungsmymthen* pp. 72-73¹⁵. According to later Egyptian sources, the last couple was substituted by Niu and Nit (the nothing, negation, void). V. Bonnet, *Reallexicon der Aegyptischen Religionsgeschichte*, s.v. Achtheit, p. 5. In this case, the couple Amun-Amaunet was conceived of as the synthetic hypostasis of primordial Ogdoad (a fact that satisfied simultaneously both the religious feeling and the political importance and royal significance of Thebes after the ascent of the local deity to the supreme rank). Furthermore, Amun (who was known as Ammon in the Greek world and was identified with Zeus) was regarded, when identified with Ptah of the Memphitic Theology, as the Procreator of the primordial Ogdoad, but also, in his hypostatic identification with the Sun, as the Son and Semen of the Ogdoad (v. Bonnet *op. cit.* s.v. Amun pp. 34-5). Amun's fundamental attribute consists in hiddenness: he is the god that lies hidden and

unknown in himself and in his substance and is only revealed in his actions and manifestations. So, he is the Wind, the manifestation of the Powerful Invisible that is the Air (v. op. cit. pp. 32-3; 35-6). As Breath, he is the principle and source of life: “Life is his name” declares a sacred text on Schu, the ancient god of Air. Amun is “breath of life for everything”; he is also “he who dwells in all things”, the omnipresent one, “air’s breath that exists everywhere and animates man” (*ibid.*). Eusebius understands the Egyptian Zeus as “the all-permeating spirit” (*Praeparatio Evangelica* III, 2, 6 PG p. 161D).

The primacy of spiritual Air as first Principle of generation, life and animation is emphatically expressed in Hellenism in the first place with Anaximenes. (Anaximenes’ fragment 13 B 3 DK¹⁶ that is erroneously considered to be spurious contains the view that ἐγγύς ἐστιν ὁ ἀήρ τοῦ ἀσωμάτου (‘air is very close to the incorporeal’), which accurately echoes the above-mentioned Egyptian experience: air is the Powerful Hidden. Mobility is intrinsic to air: air is always in motion (A 10). Diogenes of Apollonia systematically developed the idea that ὃν ἄνθρωποι λέγουσιν ἀέρα, τοῦτό ἐστιν ἡ ἀρχή (‘that which men call air is the beginning’) (Simplicius *In Aristotelis Physicorum* p. 153. 17; cf. Euripides fr. 877 Nauck²: αἰθέρ... Ζεὺς ὃς ἀνθρώποισι ὀνομάζεται. Also Ennius *Epicharmus* VI Mueller = Var. 54 sqq. Vahlen² from Varro *De lingua Latina* V, 65: istic est is Jupiter quem dico, quem Graeci vocant aerem, qui ventus est et nubes etc.): καὶ αὐτὸ μὲν τοῦτο (sc. ὁ ἀήρ) καὶ αἰδίων καὶ ἀθάνατον σῶμα, τῶν δὲ τὰ μὲν γίνεται τὰ δὲ ἀπολείπει (Diogenes B 7 DK); ἀλλὰ τοῦτό μοι δηλὸν δοκεῖ εἶναι, ὅτι καὶ μέγα καὶ ἰσχυρὸν καὶ αἰδίων τε καὶ ἀθάνατον καὶ πολλὰ εἶδός ἐστι (sc. ὁ ἀήρ) (B 8 DK). Because air is the most incorporeal of all physical things it was also associated with intellectual activity, after it, as principle of mobility, had been considered to be the basis of psychic activity, and, as breath and breathing, the cause of life (cf. below, Chapter 12, nn. 105-7). Thence departs the long history of Spirit as wind and as breath and as breathing and as intellectual activity (cf. Aristophanes, *Nubes* 225 sqq.; 264; Euripides, *Troades* 884 sqq. The theory must have been very popular in Athens during the last quarter of the fifth century B.C.: The *Clouds* was performed in 423 B.C. and *The Trojan Women* in 415 B.C. Later, in *Fragmenta Adespota* 565 Nauck²:

αὔρα, θεῶν ὄχημα τιμώτατον

it is possible that a reference to the Breeze and the Air of Phoenician theology (the Sidonian in particular according to Eudemus' account) is involved. To the end of the fourth century B.C. belongs also the relevant and characteristic fragment of Philemon, Fr. 95 PC Gr. VII p. 278). The Hippocratic text *Περὶ Φυσῶν* grounds medicine in the cosmology of Air (v. chapter III; cf. *Περὶ Ἱερῆς Νόσου* I, pp. 612-4 Kuehn). The interpretation of Orphic poems contained in the famous Derveni papyrus identifies Zeus with the all-subduing, omnipresent Air, and Orphic fate with the spirit (the breath) of Air and the Wisdom of Zeus¹⁷. According to the Stoics, everything is permeated by Spirit as by a tone (tension) that unifies being, holds it together and sustains it in existence; Spirit is the active factor of the world, the very divinity in its activeness that binds together the Whole Universe and consists each particular thing inside the world (V. A. Pierris, Excursus III: On Spirit and Tension, to: *First principles and the Beginning of World-Formation in Stoicism*, in K. Boudouris (ed.) *Hellenistic Philosophy* vol. II, pp. 170-5). More specifically, the bonds (ἕξεις) that constitute and hold fast the peculiar quality of inanimate things are winds (ἄερες) (cf. SVF II 449). The significance of Wind-Spirit is also obvious in Greek mythology as testified by religious poetry. According to the rhapsodic Orphic epics, the spirit-winds together with cosmogonic Eros are begotten by primaeval Time (Kern OF 37). Conversely, in the Phoenician account of Sanchouniathon we find that the Wind-of-the-Bay or the Wind-of-the-Womb, ὁ Κολπίας ἄνεμος (the basic wind, maybe Zephyr as would suit Phoenicia) and Baan (which Philo interprets as Night, and signifies the primordial Chaos) give birth to Aeon (Cosmogonical Time) and to Primogenitus, *Πρωτόγονος*, the First-Born (FGrH 790F2, 10§7). We are in the origin of things, the beginning of cosmogony. Alcaeus (Fr. 327 Voigt) makes Eros the offspring of Zephyr and Iris. One of the versions mentioned in Antagoras' poem (Powell, *Collectanea Alexandrina*, 120) assumes Eros to be the son of the Winds. The importance of the Winds as life-generating and fertile principles of high ontological rank was not only the product of logico-mythical symbolism but had also a religious cult and ritual basis, especially in Attica. The Tritopatores (or Trotopatreis) were worshipped as the founders of social groups

(families, clans, phratries) or even of an entire city, in many places (cf. F. Jacobi FrGrH IIIb Supplement, *A Commentary on the Ancient Historians of Athens* vol. I, p. 182). The Athenians in particular, sacrificed to the Tritopatores before getting married and prayed to them for children (Phanodemus FGrH 325F6: *Φανόδημος δὲ ἐν ζ' φησὶν ὅτι μόνοι Ἀθηναῖοι θύουσί τε καὶ εὐχονται αὐτοῖς ὑπὲρ γενέσεως παίδων ὅταν γαμεῖν μέλλωσιν*). There existed a relevant and similarly attested ritual of consecration to the primary couple of Heaven and Earth that functioned as a preliminary initiation in every marriage ceremony (OF 112 p. 176). The combination of this cult practice with the aforementioned sacrifice to Tritopatores led, in all likelihood, to the assumption that the Tritopatores were children of Heaven and Earth and, furthermore, to their identification with the Hesiodian Hecatoncheires (Kottos, Briareos and Gyges) (FGrH 352F1). The Winds as the One-Hundred-Handed were beings of many, and indefinite, 'handles'. The Tritopatores were deities of the Winds (Demon FGrH 327F2). (Hesychius combines the three features: s.v. *Τριτοπάτορες· ἀνέμους ἐξ Οὐρανοῦ καὶ Γῆς γενομένους καὶ τῆς γενέσεως ἀρχηγούς· οἱ δὲ τοὺς προπάτορας*. The last explanation apparently refers to the use of the word in a poetic text and in a general sense, although it is probable that those intended as *οἱ δέ* are, even so, in the wrong.) Orphic tradition was in line with Demon: *ἐν δὲ τῷ Ὀρφείῳ φυσικῶ* (OF 318) *ὀνομάζεσθαι τοὺς Τριτοπάτορας Ἀμαλκείδην* (maybe better *Ἀλαλκείδην* with Budimir and Radermacher) *καὶ Πρωτοκλέα καὶ Πρωτοκρέοντα, θυρωροὺς καὶ φύλακας ὄντας τῶν ἀνέμων* (cf. *Scholia in Odys.* κ 2). Porters and guardians or masters (Scholia) of the winds are the main winds regarded as lords of the (other) winds, or winds offsprings of winds. For in Photius' *Lexicon* there is also a second abbreviated explanation s.v. *Τριτοπάτωρ* where the Orphic poems are taken to consider Tritopatores to be *ἀνέμων παῖδας*. This may of course be only an interpretation of *θυρωροὺς καὶ φύλακες τῶν ἀνέμων*. They are then bodyguards, not masters (as the Homeric commentators imply), of the winds. The difference between masters and children is here mythological, not logico-mythical nor truly symbolic. What is of importance is the windy nature of Tritopatores. Their being grafted onto the Hesiodic Theogony by means of their enticing identification with the Hecatoncheires corroborates their role as masters of the

winds: the Hecatoncheires as *φύλακες πιστοὶ Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο* (*Theogonia* 735) watch over the imprisonment of Titans in Tartara (*ibid.* 729 sqq.) standing by the gates of Chaos where primaeval Indeterminacy bursts out in the full intensity of its power under the form of typhonic winds (742). In this model the Tritopatores are limit-imposing Winds that check the storm of Darkness.

The rhapsodic Theogony follows another pattern and exhibits a different structure. At a high level and very 'early' in the ontological succession Eros-Phanes-Protogonos and the Spirits-Winds are born from the very first cause, Time, that stands at the peak of reality's pyramid (OF 37):

αὐτὰρ Ἔρωτα Χρόνος καὶ Πνεύματα πάντ' ἐτέκνωσε.

There is a strong correspondence with the Phoenician Cosmogony of Sanchouniathon, though a reversion of the positions of Time (Aeon, there) and Spirits (Wind, there: FGrH 790 F10A7 mentioned earlier) occurs. The Protogonos of the Phoenician cosmology corresponds to the Orphic Eros. Eros is born as the first hypostasis and becomes indirectly manifest through his radiance (OF 75 and 86). The Spirits will therefore be indeed either the first directly revealed realities and the first perceptible masters of generation; or (in their hidden aspect that makes them invisible in themselves but visible through their effects and results) fathers of the first tangible things. Consequently, the Orphic Tritopatores will be the first Spirits or offspring of Spirits. The latter is more likely to have happened in late (rhapsodic) Orphism.

In early Orphism the position of Time as first cause and origin is occupied by Night. The part of the rhapsodic Aether and Chaos is played by the Ocean who also mediates for the conception of the Egg and the emergence of Phanes-Eros. The mobility of the Ocean would, probably, be accompanied by the mobility of the Spirits, in which case the Tritopatores as sources of Winds would appear, according to the Archaic consciousness, on the ontological level of the Ocean. But then they will be third before Sky and Earth in the ancient Orphic teaching to be restored (Night-Ocean-Phanes-Sky). (The enumeration is always inclusive of both ends). This explains perfectly well the obscure passage of Philochorus (FGrH 328 F182): *Φιλόχορος δὲ τοὺς Τριτο-*

πάτορας πάντων γεγονέναι πρώτους· τὴν μὲν γὰρ Γῆν καὶ τὸν Ἥλιον, φησὶν, ὃν καὶ Ἀπόλλωνα τότε καλεῖν, γονεῖς αὐτῶν ἐπίσταντο οἱ τότε ἄνθρωποι, τοὺς δὲ ἐκ τούτων τρίτους <τριτο>πάτορας (instead of τρίτους πατέρας). Apparently, this is an attempt at an etymological explanation of a word of unknown meaning. Third, counting from the Earth and the Sun (in Sky's place), are the Ocean and Tethys. If the Sun be regarded as a Titan, son of Earth and Sky, then third in ascending order is Phanes; which is possible by virtue of the ontological equation of Eros and Spirits, but unlikely on account of the consubstantiation of both oceanic and aerial confluence that would ensue, and also because the copulation of Sun and Earth is substituted for the marriage of Sky and Earth as fertile coition. Philochorus, no doubt, wanted to combine the cult of Tritopatores with the cult of Apollo Patroos (Bekker, *Anecdota Graeca* p. 291.33; *Sch. in Aristidem* p. 14). The explanation of the name with reference to τρίτος is unsuccessful; cf. Bekker, *Anecdota Graeca* p. 307.16: τριτοπάτορες· οἱ μὲν τοὺς πρώτους ἀρχηγέτας, οἱ δὲ τρίτους ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρός, ὅπερ ἔστι προπάππους. However, this interpretation seems to have been adopted by Aristotle: Pollux *Onomasticon* III, 17: ὁ δὲ πάππου ἢ τήθης πατὴρ πρόπαππος, ὡς Ἴσοκράτης· τάχα δ' ἂν τοῦτον τριτοπάτορα Ἀριστοτέλης καλοῖ (cf. Rose, *Aristoteles Pseudepigraphus* Fr 369 = *Aristotelis Fragmenta* 415). For the etymology of Tritopatores cf. *Τριτογένεια* (cf. Kretschmer, *Glotta* X, 1920, p. 38sq. and XII, 1923, p. 214. For an overview v. O. Gruppe, *Griechische Mythologie und Religionsgeschichte* vol. II p. 1143 n. 1. Hesychius' gloss (s.v. τριτώ· τρόμος, φόβος) is rather promising (cf. s.v. *Τριτογένεια*· ἢ τὸ τρεῖν ἐγγενῶσα τοῖς ἐναντίοις and s.v. *τριτοκούρη*· ἢ πάντα συνετέλεσται τὰ εἰς τοὺς γάμους· τινὲς δὲ γνησία παρθένος). If the root τριτώ means terror, Tritopatores will then be the terrible Fathers (first ancestors), Tritogeneia the terrible daughter and Tritokoure the terrible maiden.

6. In Phoenicia, Judaea and Canaan we find a dualistic cosmogony in which the active principle of mobility is expressed by the Air and the Breath of Air, whereas the Abyss of Waters signifies the receptive and form-acquiring principle of Passivity. In a monistic version the idea of a creative Air-related spiritual first principle takes roots in Greece and develops with the philosophy of Air as it is articulated by

Anaximenes, Diogenes of Apollonia, the philosophical commentator of the Orphic epics in the Derveni papyrus, and a group of thinkers of fifth and fourth century B.C.¹⁸ None of these seems to have adopted the dualistic application of the initial experience since it was considered, after Anaximenes, that all the other elements can be produced by means of rarefaction and condensation from the air whereas at the same time the necessary active mobility of the one first principle was guaranteed by the very windy-spiritual nature of the air. Nothing else needed to be presupposed. The Wind-Spirit initially thus expresses the dynamism of Darkness in Greece, and is the hypostasizing and life-generating movement of the Great Mighty Invisible. Air is the physical basis of the Unlimited: that is why the Anaximenean principle was the successor of the Anaximandrian Unbounded. The Hesiodic Chaos, the great chasm below the roots of the Universe, is marked by an unabated blow of ever-changing storms and hurricanes (*Theogonia* 740-5):

χάσμα μέγ', οὐδέ κε πάντα τελεσφόρον εἰς ἐνιαυτὸν
οὐδας ἴκοιτ', εἰ πρῶτα πυλέων ἔντοσθε γένοιτο.
ἀλλὰ κεν ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα φέροι πρὸ θύελλα θυέλλη
ἀργαλέη· δεινὸν δὲ καὶ ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσι
τοῦτο τέρας· Νυκτὸς δ' ἑρεβεννῆς οἰκία δεινὰ
ἔστηκεν νεφέλης κεκαλυμμένα κνανήσιν.

The nethermost part of the World, namely Tartaros (*Theogony*, 725 sq.), is enclosed and guarded by the Harpiae (daughters of Boreas, the North-Wind) and Thyella (Storm), Pherecydes B5 DK: κείνης δὲ τῆς μοίρας ἔνερθέν ἐστιν ἡ ταρταρή μοῖρα· φυλάσσουσι δ' αὐτὴν θυγατέρες Βορέου Ἀρπυιαί τε καὶ Θύελλα· ἔνθα Ζεὺς ἐκβάλλει θεῶν ὅταν τις ἐξυβρίσῃ. Stoicism included the initial dualism of elements in the cosmology of Creation¹⁹ and applied its basic kernel (mobility of first principle versus receptivity of the second) to the theory of first principles (absolutely active deity versus absolutely passive matter).²⁰ In the Babylonian poem of Creation (*Enuma Elish*) the Winds are the chief weapons of Marduk (god of the atmosphere = Zeus) who is the guarantor and sovereign deity of the New Order after the defeat of the female first principle Tiamat, the primordial Sea (Tablet IV).

On the other hand, one finds in Egypt (especially in Hermoupolitan theology) the coordination of Spiritual Air into pre-cosmic Chaos either as a member of the Ogdoad or as its capital epitomy. The pre-eminence of Amun as begetter of the Ogdoad or his being the Ogdoad's son are typical examples of Egyptian syncretism of different local theologies and of the no less typical Egyptian theocracy, in our case of Amun to (or prior to) Ptah of Memphis or the Heliopolitic Atum and to Re respectively. In Egyptian religion and theology opposite tendencies and determinations co-exist. The Ogdoad seems to signify the role of two poles, of moisture (Nyn-Naunet) and of spiritual wind (Amun-Amaunet) in this order initially. To the basic polarity the contrariety of male and female is superadded and the Ogdoad is completed with the further addition of the other two necessary parameters for Amun's existence (Huh and Hauhet, spatial limitlessness) and for a sufficient characterization of primordial Chaos (Kuk and Kauket, the gloom of darkness). The bipolarity of water and breath is not definitely or unambiguously dualistic since Amun sometimes belongs to the Ogdoad as the male figure in its fourth couple and sometimes transcends it as its genitor. In Hermoupolis, however, the tendency was for both liquidity and airness to be regarded as aspects of precosmic dark Chaos; though in Heliopolitan theology the dualistic tendency assumed the upper hand: by means of self-fertilization the divine creator Atum brings forth the Ennead the first couple of which consists of Schu (Air) and Tefnut (wetness) (v. Bonnet *op. cit.* s. vv.). Here also functions the familiar Egyptian tendency of simultaneous co-projection and accumulation of differing and opposing perspectives: Atum, thought self-begotten, appears from out of the primordial Ocean (Nun), as incomplete, semi-finished and the one to be perfected (v. Bonnet *op. cit.* s.v. Atum p. 71). In a similar manner, in the Ogdoad of Chaos there exists prior to order a dichotomy of masculine and feminine as well as the distinction between a moving-active (air) and a immobile-passive (water) principle.

Viewed from this perspective of unintegrated mutual superimposition of different experiences and outlooks even the Phoenician Dualism loses its sharpness. For Wind and Water, Breath and Abyss equally well characterize precosmic Chaos and primordial Darkness, belonging therefore to the jurisdiction of Indeterminacy

(ἀπειρία).²¹ The fact that in the context of Gnostic systems they represent the first principles of a clearly determined dualism is the outcome of a double development, both of an extrinsic and of intrinsic nature. The former (extrinsic) kind of development is effected by transcription of Greek philosophical theory and the potent influence of Greek Thought. The latter (intrinsic) evolution consists of a major phenomenon which is a generic feature of any theological articulation of religious experience. Hand in hand with the tendency to retain and incorporate any traditional or newly-discovered differentiation goes the tendency to concentrate, condense and assimilate similar or analogous traits, powers and actions. The former leads to gigantic systems of multiple hierarchies and levels under sometimes incompatible and often unclear principles of differentiation (*principia divisionis*); the latter endeavours to organise the multiplicity in the religious field according to functional, focal positions within it, and reduction of analogous divinities into multifarious, polymorphic identities. This process of denser intellectual (re)articulation may easily lead to a distortion of real relationships. The great achievement of Greek thought lies in the unbiased representation of true reality, in the articulation of the field according to the basic emerging lines of being and in the integration of the objects depiction in a single, organic and living whole.

A fundamental religious experience in the major Hellenic space and in the Middle East is the priority of Chaos over Order, of Darkness over Light and of Indeterminacy (*Ἀπειρία*) over Harmony. In Chaos is the hidden seat of the primordial productive potency that sets in motion the evolutionary cosmic process from which gods and nature spring forth in succession, the ontologically presupposing following the presupposed. The overall causality, lawfulness and harmony of this process and of its final product, i.e. the cosmic Ordering, is safeguarded by the involvement in, and contribution to, it of the principles of Order, Light and Limit. These powers are the governing divine principles of order in the present condition of the World (hence they assume first place in ritual and cult), but they are not the *primaeva* realities that stand on the top of the pyramid of ontological presuppositions as absolute, unpresupposed First Principles. In Cosmic History there is also a period or a number of periods when the powers of Abyss and of Light oppose one another;

some of the former ally with the latter in this titanic Fight and War. Light wins; hence it reigns supreme and governs the World, but it also reveres, and stands in awe of, Maternal Darkness²², the preceding but hidden principle. Salient, integrated examples of such an articulation are the Enuma Elish (the Babylonian Epic of Creation) and the Hesiodic Theogony.

This basic structure varies in different places and people. The crucial point of interest is that as we approach the Iranian Zoroastrian world-model, the Struggle of Light and Darkness becomes all the more intense, irreconcilable and in the end absolute as it comprises even the very first principles in its convolution (Enuma Elish). There is then no possibility of harmonious conjugation between the contrary principles. In the Hittitic Epic of Kumarbi (and in the Song of Ullikummi) recurring battles of gods are inscribed in the frame of struggles for domination (as in the successions of kingship in the Hesiodic Theogony), but the beginnings of things are not known²³. The Egyptian great War, by contrast, is a struggle between two chthonic powers both potent but belonging to a more recent phase of the theogonic series: the Osirian Horus and Seth represent the two parties of Darkness, one that allies with Light in the constitution of Cosmic Harmony, and another that opposes it.

7. The primary Greek experience coincided with the general structure described above. Darkness gives birth to Light²⁴ and later when her own aboriginal limitless Indeterminacy (*ἀπειρία*) attains limits through the working of her very offspring, the universal World Order and Cosmic Harmony come into being. Primaeval Abyss' chaotic condition includes not only the principle of mobility par excellence, namely prolific fertility, but also the power of giving birth to offspring characterized by limit and light, which limits and brightens the infinity and darkness of its progenitor. Even in the epic poem of Olympianism, the Iliad, the implicit cosmogony is one of the Monism of Darkness, since it is She who is the very first principle. The Titans are children of Heaven (*Οὐρανίωνες* E 898) and (those that fought with Cronos Ξ 279 against Zeus and his new order) lie in Tartarus (Ξ 279) at the world's extremities where the roots and outer limits, the boundaries, of Earth and Sea exist (Θ 13-16, 478-481). Among the Titans, Cronos and Iapetus are explicitly mentioned as

Zeus' enemies that lie in Tartarus (Θ 479), but in all likelihood their team should also include Hyperion (identified with the Sun, e.g. Θ 480, *Odyssey* α 8), Themis (O 84-95), Rhea (O 187, Ξ 203) and the rest of those mentioned in the well-known catalogue, apart from Ocean and Tethys. These last two are the Father and Mother of Gods, Ξ 201, 301:

Ὠκεανόν τε θεῶν γένεσιν καὶ μητέρα Τηθύιν.²⁵

Cf. Virgilius, *Georgicon* IV, 382:

Oceanumque patrem rerum.

In Ξ 246 the Ocean is presented as the cause and root from which all things come to be:

Ὠκεανοῦ ὅς περ γένεσις πάντεσσι τέτυκται.

Crates made the idea even more explicit by inserting (guided whether by an ancient reading or his own intuitive emendation, we do not know) the following verse (246a):

ἀνδράσιν ἠδὲ θεοῖς, πλείστην <δ'> ἐπὶ γαίαν ἴησιν.

Hence Ocean and Tethys precede Heaven and Earth and we thus find the following succession: Ocean-Heaven-Cronos-Zeus. From the primordial gush and flow of Water (according to Homer the Ocean is a deep-bedded river but this may suit the present situation more as an orderly movement) Heaven and Earth are created by splitting apart those waters of commotion. An example is afforded by the Book of Genesis although the process there follows two stages which should be combined (I, 6-10). The biblical image, moreover, leaves some gaps: the Firmament of the Sky can by no means separate absolutely the waters above the firmament from the waters below it unless it is continued, completed and concluded below by the Earth (it is of course meaningless to assume an unlimitedly large or expanding firmament). In Egypt the idea was generally accepted that at the beginning of cosmogony an Ur-Earth as Hill emerges in the mist of

Watery Abyss. In the Babylonian Epic of Creation (Enuma Elish) the primordial Liquidity of the Sea (Tiamat, Tiwawat or Tamtu which was possibly pronounced like Tethys in Ionia) after her defeat in the struggle against Bel-Marduk (the Babylonian Zeus, heavenly god of atmospheric phenomena) is dissected and her body moulded by the victor into Heaven-Earth and the World (Tablet IV, 218- V, 66).

In the so-called Vatican Mythographers (*Vat. Myth.* I, 204) we find the succession sequence Ophion-Sky-Cronos with the additional note that the philosophers call the Ophion Sky. In the *Commentaria in Arati Phaenomena* 16 is attested the view of some (τινῶν) that the 'preceding generation' (προτέρη γενεή) in Aratus' text refers to τοὺς περὶ Ὀφίωνα καὶ Εὐρυνόμην καὶ Οὐρανόν <καὶ> Κρόνον. The series is the one discussed: Ophion-Ouranos (Heaven)-Cronos.

Ophion or Ophioneus is well known from the logico-mythical system of Pherecydes (where he competes with Cronos = Time for the celestial kingship and rule of the world, but is defeated and falls into Ogenus=Ocean B4 DK. Ophioneus made an attempt but did not succeed in gaining the royal sceptre) and from poetic texts and commentaries. Here however Ophion and Eurynome did possess the kingdom before they were driven away and precipitated to the Ocean by Cronos. Apollonius of Rhodes, *Argonautica* I, 503-6, where the narration is characteristically put into the mouth of the singing Orpheus. Cf. Nonnus, *Dionysiaca* VIII, 158-61 (cf. II, 573-4). In Lycophron's *Alexandra*, Zeus is called ἄναξ τῶν Ὀφίονος θρόνων (v. 1192), and as for Rhea it is said that she gave birth to Zeus in secret, τὴν πρόσθ' ἄνασσαν ἐμβαλοῦσα Ταρτάρῳ (v. 1197), i.e. Eurynome (cf. Tzetzes *Scholía* ad vv. 1191 and 1196). Defeat is here accompanied by precipitation into Tartarus, not by a simple falling into the Ocean. In Aeschylus *Prometheus Bound* 955-9 there is a mention of δισσων τυράννων that have fallen from Olympus prior to the third succession to power, i.e. Zeus kingship. An ancient scholium comments ad loc.: πρώτους τοὺς περὶ Ὀφίονα καὶ Εὐρυνόμην, δεύτερον τοὺς περὶ Κρόνον. Aeschylus uses the idea again in his *Agamemnon* 167-74. Here the first Lord of Olympus and the World is described as ὅστις πάροιθεν ἦν μέγας, παμμάχῳ θράσει βρύων, οὐδὲ λέξεται πρὶν ὦν, something that suits the primordial and once omnipotent but now forgotten Ophion better than Ouranos; the second Master is referred to with ὃς δ' ἔπειτ' ἔφυ, τριακτῆρος οἴχεται

τυχών, certainly meaning Cronos (the scholia ad loc. erroneously speak of the Titans and of Typhon respectively). The scholia ad Aristophanis *Nubes* 247 attest three divine orders: πρώτον μὲν τοὺς κατὰ Ὀφίωνα καὶ Εὐρυνόμην· δεύτερον δὲ τοὺς κατὰ Κρόνον καὶ Ῥέα οὐστίνας Ὅμηρος (I E 898) Οὐρανίωνα· τρίτον δὲ τοὺς Διὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν καταλύσαντας τὴν ἐκείνων οὐς Ὀλυμπίους κλήζομεν. The Oceanic dimension of Ophion is also alluded to by the nature of his wife Eurynome who is a daughter of the Ocean in all accounts (Homeric, *Ilias* Σ 388-9; Hesiodic, *Theogonia* 358; learned, Apollodorus *Bibliotheca* I, 8). Eurynome was venerated and worshipped in the Arcadian Phigaleia under the monstrous form of a semi-maidenly, gorgon-like figure that was a perfect woman down to the buttocks below which her body ended in a fish tail (Pausanias VIII, 41, 4-6).

8. The tradition according to which Cronos expels Ophioneus from the cosmic throne seems to be incompatible with the common legend about the cutting of Ouranos' genitals by Cronos, but is in fact its illuminating complement that solves many interpretative riddles. The cutting of Ouranos' genitals indicates his severance from the Earth whom he previously fully covered being in endless sexual contact with her. This is the meaning of the Hesiodic myth according to which Ouranos did not allow the children conceived by Earth to come out of their maternal womb (*Theogonia* 154-160). The children's imprisonment inside the Cosmic Womb signifies the undifferentiatedness of beings, that they have not attained a definite form and concrete existence of and in their own, but exist only as potential, spermatic differentiations²⁶. The Earth gets outraged and the children, especially Cronos (136-7), hate their father. The Earth fashions a great adamantine sickle and Cronos uses it to perform the impious act, thereby becoming the Cosmic Master in turn .

A combination of this unspeakable story with Ophioneus' kingdom forces upon us the hypothesis that Ophion was sovereign before the differentiation of beings, in the preexisting Chaotic condition when even the Earth and the Sky (and the Ocean) were prefigured but had not as yet been fully distinguished as separate things. In the Babylonian Epic of Creation, Lahmu and Lahamu (water divinities, maybe in particular mud divinities) are born from,

and inside, the two aboriginal Abysses of Water, namely Apsu (male ocean of unsalted water) and Tiamat (Tethys, Sea, female profusion of saltwater), and later Anshar (male “whole heaven”) and Kishar (female profusion “whole earth”) are also born symbolizing the spermatic or potential prefiguration of the as yet non-existent Heaven and Earth. Anu, Sky still-unshaped, follows. Inside Apsu and after his defeat by Ea (the Sumerian Enki, a deity of fresh water (of fountainsprings), of wisdom and (magical) incantations), the great Bel-Marduk is born (*Enuma Elish* Tablet I). With the rending of Tiamat into pieces after two divine battles the World is at last organised in the form of the real Sky and Earth (Tablet IV-V). In Genesis I, 2 prior to creation the earth was invisible and unconstructed, an unarticulated ur-earth that subsisted in the Abyss of Water, as solid matter in the watery slime.

Ophion’s kingship in the tradition that comprises it corresponds therefore to Ouranos’ kingdom in the Hesiodic and received Common Tradition (e.g. Apollodorus *Bibliotheca* s. in.) that is ignorant thereof, but this is an ur-Sky since it has not been fully distinguished from the Earth. This means that in both versions we find ourselves either in primordial Chaos or in a situation somewhat evolved from it but not yet completely formed nor articulated. However, since domination is meaningless in absolute Chaos, the second version is more probable; in which case also Ophion’s kingdom corresponds to Ocean’s sovereignty prior to the existence of Earth. Moreover, we expect in addition a preceding, even more primary hypostatic level.

When Ophion was defeated, Ouranos, Earth and Ocean were separated by Cronos²⁷. The Ocean runs round the horizon thus forming the common limit of Heaven and Earth (v. OF 115); hence the Ocean is in the distinguished Cosmos the remnant of the distinctionless world, it constitutes the condition that comes the closest to the chaotic and undifferentiated. In images, the Ocean is conceived as a gigantic serpent that embraces and holds the world together. (Thus Ovid, *Metamorphoses* I, 30-1 but without the snake imagery: with the discernment of elements according to their appropriate identity, the Ocean

circumfluit umor
ultima possedit solidumque coarctat orbem).

The image of a serpent fits rivers and the Ocean is the very first river, source of rivers and of all unsalted waters and of the sea. Achelous is thus represented, Sophocles, *Trachiniae*, 11-2, Ovid, *Metamorphoses* IX, 62 sqq. (In the red-figured stamnos of British Museum (B471) we see the battle between Hercules and Achelous in which the latter is painted as a snake with human head, arms and hands and a fish tail; *Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum*, Br. Mus. 3, III 1C, Plate 19, 1b). The continuous flowing of rivers resembles the continuous legless movement of serpents. Already in the Homeric cosmic geography the Ocean is a river (*Ilias* Ξ 245-6, Σ 607), a current (ῥόος O 151) with no source, but one that comes back to itself in a full circle (as it is represented in the famous iconography of Achilles' shield at the outer circumference thereof, *Ilias* Σ 606-7:

Ἐν δὲ τίθει (sc. Ἥφαιστος) ποταμοῖο μέγα σθένος Ὠκεανοῖο
ἀντυγα πὰρ πυμάτην σάκεος πύκα ποιητοῖο.

The adjective ἀψόρροος that characterizes the Ocean Σ 399, *Odyssey* υ 65, signifies the coming-back-to-itself of the current that encloses the earth (cf. Eustathius, *In Dionysium Periegetam* 1, GG II 217, 15). Crates rightly insisted on the flowing-riverness of the whole Ocean against some rationalistic tendencies à la Poseidonius which assumed that the Homeric image refers to the oceanic ebb and flow (v. Strabo, *Geographica*, A, 1, 7).

According to the Gnostic text *Pistis-Sophia* 319 sqq. (p. 207 sq. ed. W. Till, *German translation of the Coptic original*), the outer Darkness that envelops the World is a Large Dragon whose tail is in his mouth. He is of course the acclaimed Uroboros whom we also find in the *Magical Papyri* (cf. Preisendanz, *Papyri Graecae Magicae*², VII, 586 sqq. vol. II p. 26 and picture in Table I, 4). Cf. *Pap. Gr. Mag.* IV, 2769-71 vol. I, p. 160: ἑπτὰ ὑδάτων κρατεῖς καὶ γῆς καὶ σκότου ὃν καλέουσιν δράκοντα μέγαν (with Wuensch's emendation καὶ σκότου instead of the meaningless papyrus reading καισκ (ἢ χ)οονον. Dieterich, *Abrahamas* p. 123, presents —building upon Miller— a verse in hexametre: ἔφθ' ὑδάτων κρατεῖς καὶ γαίης ἧδὲ σκότοι).

The Orphic theology according to Hieronymus and Hellanicus (OF 54 from Damascius *De primis principiis* 123 bis, I 317, 15

Ruelle), starts from Water, the slime which is solidified into earth and produces the Primordial Great Winged Dragon with triple face: a human face between that of a bull and a lion. The Dragon is the Ever-Young Time (*Ἀγήραος Χρόνος*) (or Heracles), consort of Ananke or Adrasteia. (In a similar manner begins the Orphic teaching attested by Athenagoras *Πρεσβεία περὶ Χριστιανῶν* 18 = OF 57, except that Time's faces are a lion's, a man's and a dragon's). In the Orphic *Argonautica* (v. 12 sqq. = OF Test. 224) the cosmogonic process is identical: primary Chaos produces, or is expressed as, Necessity and Time, which is in turn manifested as a huge Dragon that begets Aether and Eros=Phanes. Orpheus summarizes as follows what he proposes to sing hymns to:

ἀρχαίου μὲν πρῶτα Χάους ἀμέγαρτον Ἀνάγκην
καὶ Χρόνον²⁸, ὃς ἐλόχευσεν ἀπειρεσίοισιν ὑφ' ὀλοῦσι
Αἰθέρα καὶ διφυῆ περιωπέα κυδρὸν Ἔρωτα
Νυκτὸς ἀειγνήτης πατέρα κλυτόν, ὃν ρα Φάνητα
ὀπλότεροι καλέουσι βροτοί· πρῶτος γὰρ ἐφάνθη.

The summary of a hymn in v. 419 sqq. (=OF 29) from this work refers to the same cosmogony and theology, with the omission of some phases and the addition of others. What is emphasized here with respect to the very first principles and origins is the World's articulation from Chaos with the aboriginal differentiation of the natures of earth, sky (aether) and water and the manifestation of Eros-Phanes-Primogenitus. It goes without saying that the cosmic Egg would also be definitely included in the Orphic theology to which the *Argonautica* bear witness.

Similar in spirit to this theology and resembling the formulation of v. 419 sqq. is the summary of a hymn attributed to Orpheus and quoted in the *Argonautica* of Apollonius of Rhodes A 496 sqq. = OF 29. Earth, Sky and Sea are originally separated from Chaos, but here the Empedoclean Neikos as principle of differentiation is employed whereas in the Orphic Cosmogony Phanes as light-beaming source is also the distinguishing principle that brings to light the hidden mixture of things from their undifferentiated condition in the cosmic womb. V. e.g. Orphic *Argonautica* v. 424-5:

πρεσβύτατόν τε καὶ αὐτοτελή πολύμητιν Ἴρωτα
ὅσα τ' ἔφυσεν ἅπαντα, διέκριθε δ' ἄλλο ἀπ' ἄλλου.

Ophion and Eurynome, the first couple of cosmic domination according to Apollonius' Orphic doctrine, correspond to the Orphic pairing (according to Hieronymus and Hellenicus) of Time-Serpent with Ananke or Adrasteia (Eurynomes extensive sovereignty indicates the inescapable inevitability of Necessity). Ophion and Eurynome represent the mythological formulation of the same reality that Time and Adrasteia=Necessity express in a more logico-mythical fashion. Apollonius' summary divides Orphic theological cosmogony in two parts, a physical (v. 496-502) and a mythical (v. 503-511) part, instead of combining and unifying both of them (especially in the first phases of creation) into a coherent logico-mythical synthesis symbolizing the divine and physical aspects of the World simultaneously. - A connecting bridge between the Cosmogony of the Orphic *Argonautica* (419 sqq.) and that of Apollonius of Rhodes (A 496 sqq.), is offered by the detailed story in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* I, 5 sqq. Chaos comprises all the elements and parts of the World while they are still formless and merge together in an undifferentiated mass from which deus et melior natura distinguish and separate all total and partial beings, thus articulating the system of World-Order, of *Κόσμος*, according to the example of Apollonius' *Argonautica*. This deus that is not mentioned in the synopsis of Orphic doctrines in Apollonius passages (but who should be certainly present in the full version of the summarized Cosmogony although he is replaced in the abbreviation through philosophical influence by the Empedoclean Hate) is the Eros of the Orphic *Argonautica*²⁹.

9. Combining the Homeric geneological succession in the manner explained above with the Orphic cosmogonies starting with Time and the Ophion-mentioning theogonies, we reach the following correspondence:

Homer	Orphism	Ophionic tradition according to Hieronymus and Hellenicus
Ocean (Tethys)	Time (Necessity)	Ophioneus (Eurynome)

The common element of the three archetypes is in that they all express the fertile creative power of Chaotic Indeterminacy, of the terrible Abyss of Water, of primordial Darkness: the symbolism resides in the intrinsically continuous and flowing attribute of the fluid current, of the temporal dimension and of the serpentine progression. The Ocean is truly, according to Proclus interpreting Orphic doctrines, the giver of all motion (*κινήσεως ἀπάσης χορηγός* *Commentaria in Platonis Timaeum* 40e, III 180.8 Diehl). The Chaos of Indefiniteness (*Ἀπειρία*) far from being exploded into self-annihilating multiple mobility assumes one single impulse of cooperative multidynamism: it becomes a current; it flows into coming-to-be and such self-disciplined focusing begets the World and every natural existence within it. This constitutes the flux of *γένεσθαι*. The philosophical notion of becoming as continuous flowing finds in this cosmic-religious experience of a cosmic current its root and subsistence.

The first outcome of the confluence of chaotic fertility generative of a permanent and stable issue is the separation of Heaven from Earth which is the beginning of the present World-Order formation. It is now that the Ocean gains its more specific significance and function as the current that embraces the Earth at the limits of the World precisely where Earth is united to Sky in a continuous re-creation of the archetypal conditions for the fusion of parts in undifferentiated chaos. Time also becomes homogeneous and uniform succession, measure of all movements, instead of indefinite, amorphous duration. Ophioneus is confined to the extremities of the World and beyond, as the first principle of prolific Unlimitedness, the Universe-encompassing uroboros Dragon, divinity of the extra-worldly Indeterminacy (*Ἀπειρία*), of precisely the Indeterminacy which when in part limited produced, at that part, Order out of, and in the midst of, total Disorder. The separation of Sky from Earth presupposes, in the Orphic cosmogonies of the Hieronymus-Hellanicus type, the transformation of Chaos, by means of Time-Ophioneus, into a Cosmic Egg, and leads to the emergence and manifestation of Eros-Phanes as the very first creator of Cosmic Order (*Διακόσμησις*). In all systems, the creation of Sky and Earth is followed by the common mythological succession of Cronos (Titans), Zeus (Olympians) and Dionysus (Dionysian company, *θίασος*).

10. The Chaos that precedes Ophioneus in the Ophionitic Cosmogonies, and Water (Ur-slime) that represents the primordial condition in the Orphic Cosmogony of the Hellanicus-Hieronymus type, are expressed in Homeric theogony by Night as first principle. This is a very important fact since Night was at the top of the succession series for the generation of reality in early Orphic doctrine.

The Peripatetic philosopher Eudemus knew of one only old Orphic Cosmogony which postulated Night as the Principle of things (Fr. 150, p. 69 Wewhrli = OF 28 from Damascius *De primis principiis* 124, I, p. 319 Ruelle): ἡ δὲ παρὰ τῷ Περιπατητικῷ Εὐδήμῳ ἀναγεγραμμένη ὡς τοῦ Ὀρφέως οὐσα θεολογία... ἀπὸ τῆς Νυκτὸς ἐποιήσατο τὴν ἀρχήν. Damascius, opposing Eudemus' interpretation and possibly Aristotle's (*Metaph.* A, 983b27), continues: ἀφ' ἧς (sc. Νυκτὸς) καὶ Ὀμηρος, εἰ καὶ μὴ συνεχῆ πεποιήται τὴν γενεαλογία, ἴστησιν. οὐ γὰρ ἀποδεκτέον Εὐδήμου λέγοντος ὅτι ἀπὸ Ὠκεανοῦ καὶ Τηθύος ἀρχεται (sc. Ὀμηρος) etc. (The correctness of Damascius' position will be shown later. Cf. O. Gruppe, *Die griechische Kulte und Mythen* I p. 618). Aristotle himself must have specifically referred to Orphic doctrines with the phrase οἱ ἐκ Νυκτὸς γεννῶντες (*Metaph.* Λ 1071b27). No other known early Cosmogony began with Night as single principle of all. (The Cosmogonies of Mousaeus, Epimenides, Acousilaus and the one described in Aristophanes' *Birds* are variations of early Orphic cosmogony, but do not postulate Night at the very top of the ontological pyramid, or do not postulate Night alone there). In *Metaphysics* N 1091b4 Aristotle comments on the fact that οἱ ποιηταὶ οἱ ἀρχαῖοι recognized another *Κυρίαρχην* of the World in the present World-Order and different first principles in the ladder of being such as *Νύξ*, *Οὐρανός*, *Χάος* or *Ὠκεανός*. Aristotle refers here to four separate cosmogonic series. The Ocean, according to him (*Metaph.* A 987b27sq.), is the Homeric first principle; Chaos is of course the Hesiodic; the mythological narration of the Epic Cycle begins with Heaven and Earth (Photius, *Bibliotheca* 318b; cf. Apollodorus, *Bibliotheca* I, 1); the Night stands on the top, at the start of cosmogony according to Orphism³⁰.

To the early Orphic Cosmogony Chrysippus also refers, who was fond of assimilating (*συνοικειώσεις*) fundamental conceptions of other philosophical systems as well as poetic formulations of mythological views to his own doctrines. Among poetic mythologies a

position of primary importance is given to the Orphics. Philodemus, *De pietate* 13. 16 sqq. p. 80 Gomerz = VI. 16 sqq. p. 17, A. Henrichs, *Die Kritik der Stoischen Theologie im Pherc. 1428*, Cronache Ercolanensi 4 (1974): ἐν δὲ τῷ δευτέρῳ (sc. book of the treatise Περὶ Θεῶν) τά τε εἰς Ὀρφέα καὶ Μουσαῖον ἀναφερόμενα καὶ τὰ παρ' Ὀμήρῳ καὶ Ἡσιόδῳ καὶ Εὐριπίδῃ καὶ ποιηταῖς ἄλλοις ὡς καὶ Κλεάνθης πειρᾶται συνοικειῶν (sc. Chrysippus) ταῖς δόξαις αὐτῶν (sc. of the Stoics). In the context of such assimilative associations and with reference to Orphic doctrine it is attested that he considered Night to be the very first goddess; op. cit. 14. 18 sqq. p. 81 Gomperz = VII. 18 p. 18 Henrichs: καὶ δὴ κὰν τῷ πρώτῳ (sc. book of Περὶ Φύσεως) τὴν Νύκτα θεάν φησιν εἶναι πρωτίστην.

The Middle Comedy poet Antiphanes (first half of the fourth c. B.C.) exhibits in one of his plays a theogony³¹ like Aristophanes' in the Birds. According to Irenaeus, *Contra Haereses* II, 18,1 II pp. 366-7 Harvey, Antiphanes spoke more truly and acceptably about the first principles than the Gnostic Valentinians: ille enim de Nocte et Silentio Chaos emissum dicit, dehinc de Chao et Nocte Cupidinem, et ex hoc Lumen, dehinc reliquam secundum eum primam deorum genesim; post quos rursus secundam deorum generationem inducit et mundi fabricationem; dehinc de secundis diis narrat hominum plasmationem. From Silence and Night Chaos springs, from Chaos and Night Eros, from Eros Light and the first divine Generation emerge, then the second divine Generation and World-Formation come out, and later Anthropogony occurs, man being fashioned by the second gods. Silence corresponds to the hypostasized Quiescence of Valentinian Gnosis and to 'the god-nurtured (or, rather, the god-nurturing) silence of the Fathers' (θεοθρέμμονα σιγή τῶν Πατέρων) of the Chaldaean Oracles (fr. 16 des Places. The Fathers' silence stands on the same level as paternal depth, πατρικὸς βυθός, fr. 18 des Places. Cf. e.g. Lewy, *Chaldaean Oracles and Theurgy* p. 160, and also Heraclitus, *Homeric Problemata* 65, 3). This presents a dualistic insertion into the Monism of Darkness of the underlying system: Night functions as Male vis-à-vis Silence and as Female with reference to Chaos. In all likelihood Χάος is named after χύσις (pouring forth), as in the Stoic interpretation of Hesiodic Chaos, to denote the flowing stream of the Water of Abyss; hence it fits in the ontological plane of Ocean-Time-Ophioneus, not in the truly presupposed plane of the

Chaos, as absolutely unordered, disorganized Indefiniteness, *Ἀπειρία*. (Reversion of the Hesiodic series Chaos-Night suggests that we are in an Orphic environment). Light (as the brightness of day) is the shining radiance of Phanes = Eros = Protogonus. The first generation of Gods consist of the Titans, the second of the Olympians. To the second belongs the World-Creation with Zeus as Creator, regulator of the final, perfected, harmonious Ordering (in contradistinction to the first elementary creation of Phanes, prefiguring the fully developed cosmic order). The fact that anthropogony is mentioned last in a separate place from the other cosmic processes probably relates to Dionysus' dismemberment by the Titans, their being in turn struck by Zeus' thunderbolt, and the fashioning of human species from their blood. The Orphic basis of this Theogony is therefore undoubtable. (The absence of so important a feature of Orphic cosmogony as the Cosmic Egg is most probably to be accounted for from Irenaeus' selection; in any case, wherever there is Phanes-Protogonus there is also the Egg, presupposed and preexisting).

The Orphic Theogonic poetry that is philosophically commented upon in the famous Derveni papyrus³² contains the common succession Ouranos-Cronos-Zeus with Night on top as Cronos' mother. Three, in all likelihood successive, verses are as follows:

(Κρόνον) ὃς μέγ' ἔρξεεν

XIV, 5

Οὐρανὸν Εὐφρονίδην ὃς πρώτιστος βασίλευσεν·

XIV, 6

ἐκ τοῦ δὴ Κρόνος αὐτίς, ἔπειτα δὲ μητίετα Ζεύς.

XV, 6

There is also Protogonus who was the very first to be manifested in the Aether and was later swallowed, according to the Orphics, by Zeus when he (Zeus) was about to start, according to the preordained decrees, the second and perfect Creation, that is to say the actualized, definite and concrete hypostasis of the things prefigured in the earlier elementary Creation by Protogonus (XIII, 4 sqq. XVI, 3 sqq.). Ouranos was basically born from mother Night alone as a single parent, and that is why he is named after the mother. Sometimes, however, we find in theogonic Cosmogonies the phrase "X (female)

begot Y in Z” (where Z is a locative, in which case the formulation assumes or suggests egg-bearing) which correlates as equivalent to “X and Z (male) gave birth to Y” or even “X gave birth to Y” simply. The second version exhibits a dualistic tendency, the first phrase implies a potential differentiation between theogonic and cosmogonic sequences, while the third insists on a purely matrilinear fatherless birth. Thus in Acousilaus there are attested three seemingly incompatible and contradictory views on Eros and his birth (FGrH 2 F6a-b-c = 9 B1-2-3 DK):

i. According to Plato (*Symp.* 178 a-b): *γονεῖς Ἔρωτος οὐτ’ εἰσὶν οὐτε λέγονται ὑπ’ οὐδενὸς οὐτε ἰδιώτου οὐτε ποιητοῦ*. Such an emphatic formulation excludes any normal birth through copulation of a male with female parent and ensuing conception. Plato in support of his view refers to Hesiod (*Theogony* 116-8) and Parmenides (28 B13 DK where the ruling female Daimon of the World, the Parmenidean Aphrodite

Πρώτιστον μὲν Ἔρωτα μητίσατο πάντων

with no contribution of a male parent. This Great Goddess creates cosmic arrangement by arousing normal sexual attraction and causing intercourse between male and female, B 12 DK:

*πάντα γὰρ <ἦ> στρυγεροῖο τόκου καὶ μίξιος ἄρχει
πέμπουσ’ ἄρσενι θήλυ μιγῆν τό τ’ ἐναντίον αὐτίς
ἄρσεν θηλυτέρω).*

To these two examples Plato adds Acousilaus: *Ἡσιόδω δὲ καὶ Ἀκουσίλεως σύμφησιν μετὰ τὸ Χάος δύο τούτω γενέσθαι, Γῆν τε καὶ Ἔρωτα*. The meaning is the same in all three cases: proper birth presupposes copulation of male with female and conception in the female. So there is no real parenthood in the procreation of Eros according to Hesiod, Acousilaos and Parmenides, however the exact formulation of this fact may vary.

ii. According to Damascius (*De primis principiis* 124, I, 320 Ruelle) drawing on Eudemus (Fr. 150 Wehrli), Acousilaus started with Chaos which was followed by Erebus and Nyx *ἐκ δὲ τούτων μιχθέντων Αἰθέρα γενέσθαι καὶ Ἔρωτα καὶ Μῆτιν... παράγει δὲ ἐπὶ τούτοις ἐκ τῶν αὐτῶν καὶ ἄλλων θεῶν πολὺν ἀριθμὸν*.

iii. Moreover, according to the *Scholia ad Theocritum* XIII 1/2c p. 258, 8 Wendel, Eros in Acousilaus' theology derives from Night and Aether. Such variations in the formulation of parentage do not alter the basic congruence of the underlying accounts.

11. The congress of Erebus and Nyx is a dualistic formulation (under the guise of male-female sexual intercourse) of a projection, procession or emanation from and by Night in Erebus, exactly as in the Aristophanic theogony, *Aves* (414 B.C.) 694-5:

Ἐρέβους δ' ἐν ἀπείροισι κόλποις
τίκτει πρῶτιστον ὑπηνέμιον Νύξ ἢ μελανόπτερος ὄν,
ἔξ οὗ περιτελλομένας ὥρας ἔβλασταν Ἔρωσ ὁ ποθεινός,
στίλβων νῶτον πετύγιον χρυσαῖν, εἰκῶς ἀνεμώκεσι δίναις.

We have here the derivation of Light (golden-winged glittering and brilliance) from Darkness (black-winged Night), the spiritual (breath-like) nature of the creative principle (Eros being like a windy whirl and mighty spin) and the maleless generation of the cosmic egg³³. The locative significance of Erebus' existence is more emphatically stressed in the phantastic genealogy of the birds which Aristophanes later plays with (698 sqq.):

οὗτος (sc. Ἔρωσ) δὲ Χάει πτερόεντι μιγείσ νυχίῳ κατὰ
Τάρταρον εὐρὺν
ἐνεόττευσεν γένος ἡμέτερον καὶ πρῶτον ἀνήγαγεν εἰς φῶς.

(*Πτερόεντι* is employed because of the general ornithological emphasis on feathers and wings in this passage which is uttered by birds. A true theogony would have *ἡερόεντι*, air as dark, thick mist, as in Homer). If we make exception for Tartarus and Chaos which are used only sportively in this humorous Ornithology (and which satirize the over-elaborate duplications and multiplications of similar coordinated principles that we find in cosmogonic and theogonic genealogies), we are left, as the basic scheme of the Aristophanic Cosmogony, with Night (and Erebus), the Egg, Eros and the formation of the fundamental structures and parts of the World that

emerge from the Egg: Earth, Heaven and Ocean. Along with this basic ordering, Tartarus (the terrible Abyss below Hades, which Hades consists of the inner parts of the Earth) and the outermost Chaos of the all-encompassing Limitlessness are also given (cf. below, Chapter 12, n. 44 and p. 178 with notes). Therefore, what remains as model for the Aristophanic Cosmogony coincides with the Orphic doctrines of the Derveni papyrus: Night gives birth by herself to an Egg from which Eros=Phanes=Protogonus springs forth and which is subsequently formed as the World. Heaven (*Οὐρανός*) is the son of Euphrone (*Εὐφρόνη = Νύξ*). Ioannes Lydus (*De mensibus* II, 8, p. 26. 1 Wuensch) draws on ancient Orphism although his formulation is abbreviated and misleading for no evident reason: *καὶ τρεῖς πρῶτα κατ' Ὀρφεία ἐξεβλάστησαν*³⁴ *ἀρχαὶ τῆς γενέσεως, Νύξ καὶ Γῆ καὶ Οὐρανός*. In World-Formation Aether makes its appearance (or, better, is manifested) together with the other basic parts and elements as finely-textured, transparent and translucent air that occupies the upper part of the World, the Heavenly space, and thus forms the physical vehicle of the Brightness that Phanes=Eros diffuses.

We are led therefore to the following distribution of three corresponding formulations:

- (i) Orphic:
from Night, *ἐκ Νυκτός* (egg, cosmic elements and Eros)
- (ii) Aristophanes:
from Night in Erebus, *ἐκ Νυκτὸς ἐν Ἐρέβει* (egg, elements of the World and Eros)
- (iii) Acousilaus:
From Night and Erebus, *ἐκ Νυκτὸς καὶ Ἐρέβους* (elements of the World and Eros)

With the postulation of the Cosmic Egg in Acousilaus the incompatibility between (ii) and (iii) is raised. The Egg is laid in Erebus by Night and from the Egg, when the World is formed in its basic elements and parts, Eros emerges born by Night in the Aether. With no particular difficulty the same narration would be taken as deriving Eros from Night and Erebus or from Night and Aether. A combination of an Acousilean formulation of Orphism with the

Hesiodic derivation of Aether and Day from the couple of Night and Erebus (with the difference that no World-creation ensues from these complex ramifications but moves separately, in Hesiod, following another line of development) leads to the Cosmogony that Carneades used in order to refute mythology. Cicero, *De Natura Deorum* III, 44: from the primary couple of Erebus and Night arise the following deities: the couple of Aether and Day, Eros and the divine company of Deception, Sickness, Old Age, Death, Eris, Toil and Pain, Sleep and Dreams, Fates, Hesperidae and Nemesis, the whole company that according to Hesiod proceeds from Night alone. (Maybe the company of these divinities is “the great number of other gods” that according to Eudemus were born from Night and Erebus in Acousilaus’ system). Sky is born from Aether and Day³⁵, and the usual, commonly recurring succession follows. A similar syncretism with typical duplications of first principles is expressed in the schematic theogony at the beginning of Hyginus, *Fabulae* p. 9-10 Schmidt. From primordial Darkness or Mist (ὄρφνη, caligo) Chaos is born; from Chaos and Darkness Night, Day, Erebus and Aether spring forth. From Erebus and Night the dark Hesiodic deities are born, and from Aether and Day the elementary parts of the World (Earth, Sky, Sea). This model comes closer to the Hesiodic segregation and isolation of Night’s issue from the constitutive arrangement of the Cosmic Nexus of Order. In Acousilaus the Orphic principle of the Monism of Darkness remains essentially intact since the whole processional constitution of reality passes through Night (and Erebus). Nevertheless, the installation of Chaos instead of Darkness (Night) on the very top of the pyramid together with the approximation of the Hesiodic groupings indicated above reveal a startling underestimation of the dark principle. Chaos evolves into either spatial receptacle or homogeneous mixture of everything, losing thus its dynamic, cutting-edge quality³⁶. Unlimitedness (Ἀπειρία) becomes compliant Passivity, ballast at the most and impediment of activity and active agency at the worse. Cosmic Darkness retains, by reason of the fear attached to it, the experience of inexhaustible dynamism and unsurpassable potency but when it progressively becomes mathematicized as a result of the positions and movements of heavenly bodies, that experience becomes weaker and obtuser.

12. A wide range of testimonies focuses on and suggests the existence of one Orphic (Archaic and Classical) cosmogonic tradition the basic features of which are:

(i) Night as the very first principle, and
 (ii) the Cosmic Egg³⁷ which is transformed into the basic elemental parts of the World (Earth-Sky/Aether-Ocean) when Phanes = Protogonus = Eros is manifested as the first creative Cosmic principle that articulates order.

(i) belongs to absolute, multi-potent Limitlessness (*Ἀπειρία*), (ii) to the outcome of the concentration and polarisation of unlimited mobility: the mutual canceling-out of the opposite results of Indeterminacy's chaotic orgasm of powerfulness is suspended; conditions of ordered productivity are introduced and established to the effect that stable and permanent structures and enduring things can now be attained. (ii) therefore corresponds to the third stage of reality's procession. As the second stage one should postulate the confluence of Indefiniteness which alone can actively effect a stable result. What remains for us to determine is the precise form, symbol and image of such focusing and coming-together of Indeterminacy in early Orphism. In Pythagoreanism the solution is to be found in the other pole of Dualism, in the principle of Limit, which polarises the other principle of Infinity and thus establishes the stability of existence³⁸. Orphism insists on the primordial Monism of Darkness: the confluence should, therefore, be an internal determination of Indeterminacy: thus the theories of liquid (circular) Flux and airy Whirl suggest themselves, of the Great Stream and the Cosmic Dinē (*Δίνη*).

The three first hypostatic stages of Cosmogony that we found as primordial successive situations in the process of World-Ordering are succinctly described by Apion in his analysis of Orphic theology (Clement of Rome, *Homilies* VI, 4 = OF 55). He starts from an absolute con-fusion of hylozoic chaotic substance, an indefinite depth of matter that is found in a continuous orgasm of barren mobility inexhaustibly consuming itself in spasms of mutually annihilating activities, a self-conflicting dynamism of overflowing energy that is spent in internal oppositions endlessly producing imperfect minglings that do not come to fruition but are aborted because of the intrinsic

disorder of their distemperament (First Phase). At some point, the disorderly tendencies and impulses happen to converge, to move together and be directed towards the same end thereby causing a periodic circular motion, a co-flowing Whirl, a Vortex. This Vortex is the first order of Indefiniteness, the first limit of Limitlessness, since the disorderly, chaotic flux assumes repeatability (periodicity) as the first determination of its indeterminate mobility (Second Phase). The Vortex creates a funnel-like spinning in the middle of chaotic material indeterminacy (*ἀπειρία*), which, when led to a critical consistence, attracts diffused spirit, or rather (to avoid the Stoic formulation) secretes in the first place the best composition of spiritual matter like an airy breath in the middle of fluid whirling (as the whirling of a liquid creates air-vacuum in its centre). Such a conception of most fertile matter constitutes the bearing of the cosmic Egg in the womb of (maternal) Limitlessness (Third Phase)³⁹. Later Phanes is born and the Egg is turned into the present World according to an orderly and methodical process (Clement of Rome, *op. cit.* VI, 5-12)⁴⁰.

Apion's *ἑλιγξ* (Vortex) resembles Aristophanes' *ἀνεμώδη δίνη* (windy whirl) (*Aves*, 697), but does not correspond to it because the latter refers to Eros whereas the former to the first limitation of Indeterminacy, the confluence of mobility in the aforementioned second stage of Cosmogony. Aristophanes meant a specific doctrine as it is shown by the parody of Dinos which substitutes Zeus as the greatest god in the Socratic lecture-room of the *Clouds* (373-4, 796, 1417-9). The divinities that Socrates constitutes, summons and invokes are the Air, Aether and the *Clouds*, 263-4:

*ὦ δέσποτ' ἄναξ, ἀμέτρητ' Ἄήρ, ὃς ἔχεις τὴν γῆν μετέωρον,
λαμπρὸς τ' Αἰθήρ, σεμναί τε θεαὶ Νεφέλαι βροντησικέραυνοι.*

The reference is to the atmospheric and celestial nature and to meteoric phenomena. Dinos is that turning round and circular movement that sets the creative process into motion and exists now as cosmic revolution⁴¹. This is also Empedocles' whirl and vortex, *δίνη* and *στροφάλιγξ* (B 35.4 DK; cf. B 115.11 DK where aether's whirls represent heavenly orbits). And this whirl, by dissolving the absolute mixture of all roots in the *Σφαῖρος*, separates them and collocates

them into distinct homogeneous masses under the auspices of Hate, thus bringing similar things together just as the Whirl of Atomic Philosophers (Democritus B 164 DK. Cf. A 128, B 167 DK. Cf. A 67, A1 Λ44 DK. Leucippus A 1 Λ31 DK. *Δίνησις ἢ οὐράνιος περιφορά*, Democritus A 89 DK. Whirl is the Natural Necessity that produces and sustains the World, A 83. A1 Λ45. A 69 from Aristotle's *Physics* B 196a24: *τὴν δίνην καὶ τὴν κίνησιν τὴν διακρίνασαν καὶ καταστήσασαν εἰς ταύτην τὴν τάξιν τὸ πᾶν*. Cf. A 68. Cf. Leucippus A 24 Λ90 DK). The Whirl was also used by Anaxagoras so that he may explain the beginning of World-Creation (A 57 DK). When the Intellect decided to separate the species and to create order out of the pre-existing co-existence of all things in the homoeomerics of the primaevial condition (*ἦν ὁμοῦ πάντα χρήματα*), *κίνησιν αὐταῖς ἐνεποίησεν* (A 45 ad fin.), it caused, that is to say, a spinning motion, the Vortex (*τὸν Δῖνον*). Here too, spinning around distinguishes and separates things. The eternal movement of Anaximander's Unbounded (*Ἄπειρον*) also causes the secretion of the fundamental opposites and in this way effects the beginning of cosmic creation. We should regard this movement too as circular motion, as spinning around and whirling. According to Apion, the Vortex distinguishes through secretion from the general chaotic intermixture of everything the most suitable (most fertile, best) elements and brings them together and fuses them to the effect of Egg's conception in Indeterminacy's womb. Two opposite activities (separative and compositive) are thus combined. As for the whirl's cause, according to the Atomists there is none; the vortex is the most general cause of all transformations and cosmic arrangements and we cannot find a cause of the first cause. The Atomists were accused of turning the greatest result into an automatic product of fortune while they were at the same time insisting on the need for the discovery of a particular physical and necessary cause for every specific phenomenon. Empedocles confers the status of physical efficient cause to, in effect, Hate, *Νεῖκος*. Anaxagoras was arraigned that though he theoretically postulated Intelligence as first cause, he nonetheless practically assumed a physical explanatory force for the Word-Order, his Whirl. The causality of the intellectual cause must be primarily final or eidetic (form-bestowing), and efficient only in the sense that it confers form

and purpose (end) to the product. In Apion's Orphic doctrines *iligx'* (*Ἰλιγξ*) *raison d' être* is the necessity of the second stage in the triadic law of proceeding from Indeterminacy (*Ἀπειρία*) to a stable result: we saw that the first order is periodic motion the archetype of which is rotation, ones coming-back to oneself.

13. Between Indeterminacy (*Ἀπειρία*) and Being there must be Limit as the intrinsic self-regulation of Indeterminacy (the opposite of the Neoplatonic Triadology where the Limit stands on the top of the hierarchy, has its empowerment as Indeterminacy in the second place, and finally produces the synthesis of being). Between Night and Egg (World, Eros) early Orphism needed a focusing of mobility, a confluence and a flowing-back. With primordial Chaos being conceived of as Abyss of Water, such a function is taken by the Ocean. In this way, the emphatic position of aquatic nature at the beginning of coming-into-being according to the Orphic systems of the Hellanicus and Hieronymus type as described by Athenagoras (OF 57-8) and Apion (OF 55-6) is accounted for. Moreover, the divine and cosmic genealogies presupposed by Homer are in this perspective better explained.

Plato (*Cratylus*, 402b) relates the continual alteration of the World, the Heraclitean flux of natural being as becoming to the names of streams that the divine progenitors Cronos (=Time) and Rhea bear, to the Homeric belief that Ocean and Tethys are the parents of the gods (with which he makes Hesiod agree)⁴², and last but not least to Orpheus as the poet of two verses that support the same claim, namely that the origin of gods is to be found in stream-like principles (OF 15):

*Ὠκεανὸς πρῶτος καλῖρρος ἦρξε γάμοιο,
ὃς ῥα κασιγνήτην ὁμομήτορα τῆθὲν ὄπυιεν.*

Here too, all subsequent gods (or at least the common main branches of succession) must derive from the couple that was the first to be married. Hence the interpretation according to which the Ocean was the first only among his brothers or only within a limited section of gods however large, to get married, is inadequate. The first marriage

and sexual intercourse of male and female with a view to giving birth to legitimate offspring is the one meant in this context (*πρώτος... ἡρξεν γάμοιο*). With this view a later, post-classical Orphic view, attested by Proclus who draws on the so-called Rhapsodic Cosmogony (*on the Sacred Doctrines in 24 Rhapsodies*), is contrasted according to which the first marriage consists in the union of Earth with Sky, in which case the very first bride is the Earth (OF 112). This mythological version found also a ritual and cultic foundation in the religious observances of Athens where weddings were consecrated to, and initiated in the name of, the first married couple, that of Earth and the Sky (*ibid.*). No doubt this tallied with the prevailing religious feeling about intercourse. But early Orphism moved by bold logicomythical conceptions concerning the cosmogonic priority of the aquatic element was grounded in a deep experience that combined liquidity with coming-into-being (conception and birth), found parallels in similar cosmological views that were widespread in the Middle East, and set the Ocean at the beginning of the World-Arrangement, just as the first philosophical articulation of the Monism of Darkness with Thales acknowledged Water as the sole principle and basis of things. The first distinct partition of existence into male and female happens naturally when the masculine limiting confluence assumes form in the womb of feminine Indeterminacy. Conjugal union of the two poles first arises with the product (the third stage of the Triadology that postulates Indeterminacy (*Ἀπειρία*) as first principle), hence the first Marriage literally takes place only after the basic separation of Sky (Male) from Earth (Female). The relation of Indeterminacy to Limit is the relation of Mother to Son according to the Monism of Darkness; the Mother-Son archetype (the New God as the Son of his Mother) gains its potency here. These logicomythical conceptions must have been expressed in purely mythical terms as absence of marriage for the Ocean as co-flowing and second principle. The second (male) principle is determined by his son-mother relationship to the first principle (female) and by his father-son relation to the third principle (where one also finds his incestuous relation to the first for the production of the third). The first marriage conjugation is to be found in the first dismemberment of the third principle, in the cutting asunder of the previously inseparable coition

of the two poles of existence. The pressure of Dualism, however, is such that the bipolarity of the offspring is projected back onto the monistic conception of the first principles. Thus we have Apsu and Tiamat of the Babylonian Theogony, or Nun and Naunet of the Hermopolitan Egyptian Cosmogony, which are polarities of the primordial abyss of Water. So too in Homer and in early Orphism the Ocean is married to his sister Tethys even though he stands on a higher ontological level than that of the truly first marriage between Heaven and Earth⁴³. To this effect an additional role was also played by the idea that the Ocean is the primordial creative river that can still be understood surviving in the present Order of things, namely in the created World; hence the Ocean is, from this viewpoint, a product of World-Creation (more specifically, the product of the first phase when Sky and Earth were crystallized as two opposing cosmic poles); at one and the same time he is the Father and the Son of Heaven and Earth, according to the mythical mode of saying things.

The primal position of Ocean and Tethys in the Homeric world-vision can be deduced also from the exact phrasing of their relationship in the distich quoted above. The incestuous relationship constituting the first marriage⁴⁴ is between a brother and a sister from the same mother (*ὁμομήτορες*). The word *ὁμομήτωρ* in the second verse refers to *κασίγνητη* which in itself basically indicates coming from the same mother. Coon and Iphidamas are *κασίγνητοι* (*Ilias* Λ 250), but their kinship is specifically and exactly defined as *κασίγνητοι καὶ ὄπατροι* (*ὁμόπατροι* Λ 257), i.e. brothers having the same father. What is meant thereby is that they are brothers not only from the same mother but from the same father as well. In the Orphic verse the fact that Ocean and Tethys are siblings from the same mother is stressed because they have no father, their common mother presumably being none other than the Night (whose status is highest in Homer too).

The early Orphic cosmogonic succession is therefore as follows:

Night - Ocean - Phanes - Heaven - Cronos - Zeus - Zagreus,⁴⁵

whereas the corresponding Homeric succession is:

Night - Ocean - Heaven - Cronos - Zeus.

Orphism added to primordial cosmogony the two most salient features that henceforth characterize it: the cosmic Egg with Protogonus and the dismemberment of Dionysus (Phanes and Zagreus).

A summary of the primary and original Orphic Genealogy of Eros, and in this way of the three first members of the above series (Eros as first creative principle antedates the World as an articulated whole), can be found in the invocation of Eros ascribed to Antagoras (or Crantor) from Diogenes Laertius IV, 26-7 = Powell, *Collectanea Alexandrina* 120:

ἦ σε θεῶν τὸν πρῶτον ἀειγενέων, Ἔρος, εἴπω
τῶν ὄσσοις Ἐρεβός τε πάλαι βασιλεία τε παῖδας
γείνατο Νύξ πελάγεσσιν ὑπ' εὐρέος Ὠκεανοῖο.

The Night gives birth to Eros by the Ocean (H in the Ocean H with the Ocean). (In the sequel, by the influence of creative Eros the limitlessness of darkness gets shaped into Heaven, Earth and the things contained therein, that is into articulate World H Ocean (and Tethys) begets Heaven and Earth once the productive cosmic process has been set to motion). The pre-existence of the Ocean is fundamental. The mention of Erebus side by side with Night as conjugal principle may indicate an elaboration on the Orphic system by Acousilaus. But in Acousilaus the Ocean is not present prior to the emergence of Eros (9 B 1 DK. Cf. B 21 DK).

The precedence of Ocean over the Sky instead of the Hesiodic and common tradition that makes the Ocean a Titan (be it with a peculiar position and function) is testified also by elements that suggest, albeit confusingly, such a priority. According to one genealogy, Heaven was considered to be the son of Acmon⁴⁶. According to some mythographers, Acmon was the Ocean seen from the viewpoint of untiringness, ceaselessness, restlessness, ἀκάματος, ἀκάμας. This adjective usually characterizes rivers as in Ilias Π 176 where Spercheius is so described. Hence Heaven was Ocean's son (*Etymologicum Magnum* s.v. Ἄκμων 49, 50). Theodoretus (*Ἑλληνικῶν θεραπευτικῆ παθημάτων* II, 28) gives paradoxically as Hesiodic the following succession: Chaos - Ocean and Tethys - Sky and Earth - Cronos, Rhea and the rest of the Titans - Zeus and the Olympians and Pluto. If in

Chaos' stead we put the corresponding Night, we have exactly the Homeric sequence, a most ancient cosmogonic succession.

14. Syncretism and fusion between the Homeric-Orphic and the Hesiodic common tradition is reflected in the idea that the Ocean of mythology is one and the same with the Sky, that the current of liquid flowing coincides with the revolving Sky: both are *δινήμεντες*, primordial confluences, aboriginal periodic movements that limit the chaotic indeterminacy of Darkness. There is to this effect an etymology of 'Ocean' that derives the name from the fast movement of the heavens (the Worlds revolution). *Etymologicum Magnum* 821. 18 s.v. Ὠκεανός· ... παρὰ τὸ ὠκέως ἀνύπτειν ὁ Οὐρανὸς νενόμισται. Tethys correspondingly was taken to be the Earth (Hesychius s.vv. Θέτις and Τηθύς. *Scholía ad Homeri Iliadem* Ξ 201. Suda s.v. Τηθύς. *Etymologicum Magnum* 756. 37 s.v. Τηθύς. The correspondence and equivalence was here mediated by moisture as all-nurturing as in the case of Mother-Earth). Hesychius explains s.v. Ὠκεανός· ἀήρ, <αἰ>θήρ etc. (or perhaps simply: Ὠκεανός· αἰθήρ instead of the manuscript error Ὠκεανός· ἀήρ θήρ (sic)). The phrase ὠκεανοῖο πόρος (cf. Hesiod, *Theogony* 292. Aeschylus, *Prometheus Vincitus*, 532) was interpreted by some to mean ἀήρ, Hesychius s.v. Ὠκεανοῖο πόρον· τὸν ἀέρα, εἰς ὃν αἱ ψυχαὶ τῶν τελευτώντων ἀποχωροῦσι. The air of the atmosphere is the passage which the souls of the dying traverse. But this is just a speculative interpretation of the poetic term and of the souls of the dead crossing into Ocean (*Odyssey*, ω 11-14) based on the (Orphic and Pythagorean) theory according to which the souls as breaths are inhaled from, and exhaled to, the air. (cf. below Chapter 12, notes in pp.317 sqq.). The interpretation that the Ocean is the air can be found already in the Derveni papyrus (Col. XXIII. 3) where an Orphic verse referring to Ὠκεανὸν εὐρὺν ρέοντα is commented upon⁴⁷.

In *Timaeus* 40e-41a Plato narrates the successions of the 'invisible gods' (*ἀφανεῖς θεοί*), deities that is which are not celestial, planetic and astral. (He has already spoken of the manifest, visible gods at 40d). About the invisible gods (who manifest themselves καθ' ὅσον ἂν ἐτέλωσιν 41a) we must be confident in, and put our trust into, the divinely transmitted stories, in the myths of the descendants and

children of gods who narrate their own lineage (40d-e). The term children and progeny of gods (*παῖδες καὶ ἔκγονοι*) includes also Orpheus, non-exclusively. The related succession is as follows: Earth and Heaven-Ocean and Tethys-Phorcys, Cronos, Rhea and those that are with them, Zeus, Hera and all their siblings, other divinities, descendants of theirs. The Earth is characterized as *πρώτην καὶ πρεσβυτάτην θεῶν ὅσοι ἐντὸς οὐρανοῦ γέγονασιν* (40c). The major peculiarity of the system is that it makes Cronos and the Titans grandchildren of Earth and Sky; it upgrades the Ocean and Tethys to parents of the other Titans (though according to the Hesiodic and common tradition they were siblings), but regards them as children of Heaven and Earth. Another divergence from Hesiod lies in the Phorcys genealogy: though not a Titan in Hesiod (*Theogony*, 133 sqq.) he counts among the Titans here. In Rhapsodic Orphic Theology too he is a Titan (OF 114)⁴⁸, as also in a passage of the *Vatican Mythographer* I, 204 cited above (it mentions precisely the three names of the Timaeus: Cronos, Rhea, Phorcys). In erudite poets the Homeric view prevails over the common Hesiodic tradition. Euphorion (Fr. 94 Powell, *Collectanea Alexandrina* p. 47) calls Eumenides *θυγατριδαί Φόρκυος*. Usually the Erinyes are placed on a very high level on the genealogical ladder, descending from Night, Earth or any other of the highest principles. According to the Orphic Rhapsodic Theology they are daughters of Pluto (Hades) and Persephone (OF 197; *Orphic Hymn to Eumenides* 70, 1-3; *Orphic Hymn to Erinyes* 69, 8; *Orphic Hymn to Persephone* 29, 6), therefore granddaughters of Phorcys in the extensive sense (his daughters or his brother's children), since Phorcys is a Titan, Cronos' brother. Euphorion faithfully follows Orphic doctrine. In all other respects, the series coincide, and the peculiar presence of Phorcys makes the parallelism necessary:

Timaeus 40e-41a: Earth, Sky - Ocean, Tethys - Cronos, Rhea, Phorcys
 Vat. Myth. I, 204: Ophion - Sky - Cronos, Rhea, Phorcys

Because of the correspondence between Ophion and Ocean the scheme is evidently the same, the only difference being the reversal in the order of the first two terms. The Vatican Mythographer preserves

the ancient Orphic order, while Plato interprets the supposed Homeric genealogy by approximating it to the Hesiodic. He accepts the Hesiodic pre-eminence of Sky and Earth but separates the couple of Ocean and Tethys from the other (according to Hesiod) Titans following the Homeric precept (Ὠκεανὸς θεῶν γένεσις, πάντεσσι γένεσις, καὶ Μήτηρ Τηθύς). The fact that in Homer Cronos and the Titans are called Οὐρανίωνες should be explained as referring to descent from a grandfather, not to fatherhood. We have in the *Timaeus* therefore, a blend of the Homeric, Hesiodic and Orphic lines of succession which in all likelihood has been facilitated by a text influenced by Orphism (hence Phorcys' Titanic position). Because of that Plato was able to ascribe the source of this theogony in general terms to the self-genealogised descendants, ἐγγόνους of gods. In Homer Phorcys is a Lord of the sea (*Odyssey*, α 72: Φόρκυος θυγάτηρ ἄλδος ἀτρυγέτοιο μέδοντος), the old one of the sea, ὁ «παλαιὸς τῆς θαλάσσης» (ν 96, 345: Φόρκυος δέ τις ἐστι λιμῆν ἄλιου γέροντος). His sovereign jurisdiction over the sea seemed to some Alexandrian grammarians to be incompatible with Poseidon's proper authority⁴⁹. But Phorcys is γέρων, the ancient sovereign figure, a pre-Olympian deity⁵⁰. It remains controversial whether he should be included with the Titans (as in the Orphic tradition) or related to a separate line of descent (as in Hesiod).

15. The pressure for differentiating Ocean from the Titans (so that he may assume a higher ontological base) was also felt in that kind of Orphism that accepted the Hesiodic view which equated him with the Titans, namely in the Sacred Doctrines in ΚΔ' Rhapsodies. Here Ocean is included among the seven male Titans (and Tethys among the corresponding female ones), OF 114. But he is the only one from among them that does not participate in the impious act against the father Sky that Cronos, persuaded by their common mother Earth, conceives and executes with the help of his brothers; Ocean stays aloof at home, instead, enraged with his mother and furious against his brothers. OF 135:

ἐνθ' αὖτ' Ὠκεανὸς μὲν ἐνὶ μεγάροισι ἔμμενεν
 ὀρμαίνων ποτέρωσσε νόον τράποι, ἢ πατέρα δὴν
 γυκνώσῃ τε βίης καὶ ἀτάσθαλα λωβήσαιτο

σὺν Κρόνῳ ἦδ' ἄλλοισι ἀδελφοῖς, οἳ πεπόθοντο
 μητρὶ φίλῃ, ἣ τοὺς γε λιπῶν μένοι ἔνδον ἔκηλος.
 πολλὰ δὲ πορφύρων μένεν ἤμενος ἐν μεγάροις,
 σκυζόμενος ἢ μητρὶ, κασιγνήτοισι δὲ μάλλον.⁵¹

Proclus who preserves the fragment (*Comment. in Timaeum* 40e, III, 185. 30 sqq. Diehl) goes on to interpret the passage using two opposite tendencies that counteract and balance one another: on the one hand, the Ocean stands firm in his attachment to father Sky while Cronos and the other Titans become estranged and turn against him; on the other hand, Cronos reigns over Heavenly Olympus (its highest and most extreme part, that is), while Ocean rules middle Heaven which lies on Olympus' base where marvelous streams (*θεσπέσια ρεῖθρα*) encircle and bind fast the Earth as her embracing and bounding 'horizon' (*ὀρίζων*) (OF 115, including Proclus, *Comment. in Timaeum* III, 178. 16 Diehl). Proclus speaks of a Heaven that has fallen from Olympus (i.e. the Summit, the upper pole of the Sky) and been placed at the earthly horizon, OF 117: *καίτοι γε ὅτι ὁ Κρόνος ὑπέρτερός ἐστι τοῦ Ὠκεανοῦ δεδήλωκεν ὁ θεολόγος (sc. Ὀρφεύς) πάλιν λέγων τὸν μὲν Κρόνον αὐτὸν καταλαμβάνειν τὸν Οὐράνιον Ὀλυμπον καὶ ἐκεῖ θρονισθέντα βασιλεύειν τῶν Τιτάνων, τὸν δὲ Ὠκεανὸν τὴν λήξιν ἅπασαν τὴν μέσην· ναίειν γὰρ αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς θεσπεσίοις ρείθροις τοῖς μετὰ τὸν Ὀλυμπον καὶ τὸν ἐκεῖ περιέπειν Οὐρανόν, ἀλλ' οὐ τὸν ἀκρότατον, ὡς δὲ φησιν ὁ μῦθος, τὸν ἐκπεσόντα τοῦ Ὀλύμπου καὶ ἐκεῖ τεταγμένον.* As it is, the passage assumes that Heaven (or a heaven) has fallen from Olympus and been located at the earthly horizon, while another Sky (the Sky par excellence) remains in place. It is not likely that the reference is to Heaven's torn genitals because the genitals fell into the sea, not into Ocean. The sequence of meaning fails after the word *μῦθος* and a lacuna is plausibly detectable, in which case Proclus might have referred to Ophioneus mythology and the passage should be complemented somehow in this way: *ὡς δὲ φησιν ὁ μῦθος, <Ὀφίωνα> τὸν ἐκπεσόντα τοῦ Ὀλύμπου καὶ ἐκεῖ τεταγμένον.* The basic point, however, is, as Proclus later explains, that because the couple of Ocean and Tethys has stayed (remained stationed in immanence, *μονή*) with their parents Sky and Earth, they may be regarded as giving birth together with their parents to Cronos and the rest of the Titans (*ibid.*): *τούτων δ' οὖν οὕτως ἐχόντων ὁ*

Ὠκεανὸς καὶ ἡ Τηθύς καθ' ὅσον μένουσι καὶ ἦνωνται πρὸς τὸν Οὐρανὸν συμπάραγουσιν αὐτῷ τὴν τῶν προϊόντων βασιλείαν, Κρόνου τε καὶ Πέας, καὶ καθ' ὅσον ἐνὶ ἰδρυνται τῇ μονίμῳ δυνάμει τῆς μητρὸς (sc. τῆς Γῆς), κατὰ τοσοῦτον τὸν Φόρκυν μετ' αὐτῆς· αὕτη γὰρ αὐτὸν παράγει Πόντου φιλότῃτι μιγείσα and there follows the previously explained endeavour to show that Phorcys whenever assumed to be begotten by Earth and Sea can be said to be generated in a certain sense by Ocean and Tethys too.

16. The fact that Proclus does not simply indulge in common Neoplatonic assimilations (conpropriations, *συννοικειώσεις*) but there is, conversely, a certain ancient tendency to heighten Ocean's ontological level above the Titanic one of Hesiodic Theogony towards the aboriginal eminence of Homeric Theology is demonstrated also by the Eleusinian tradition about a marriage of Ocean and Earth. According to the epics ascribed to Musaeus (Pausanias doubts as to whether or not they are genuine works composed by the old initiate, I, 14, 2; he recognises as indubitably authentic work of Musaeus only the Hymn to Demeter that the Lycomidae used in their sacred ceremonies, I, 22, 7; IV, 1, 5), Triptolemus of the Mysteries is son of Ocean and Earth (Musaeus 2 B 10 DK). The Hymn to the Muses that is quoted in the proemium of the Hesiodic Theogony (v. 11-12) begins with the gods of the Olympian New Order and gradually ascends to older divinities reaching its climax in (v. 20): *Γαίαν τ' Ὠκεανὸν τε μέγαν καὶ Νύκτα μέλαιναν*. The Sky is absent and Ocean is either Earth's consort or a member of the Homeric precisely sequence of first principles: Night - Ocean - (Heaven) Earth. Ocean's role in the Eleusinian mysteries is implicitly shown also from the fact that Daeira, an important mystic deity, was considered to be Ocean's daughter according to Pherecydes of Athens (FGrH 3F45: sister of Styx) and also from the myth narrated in Orphic contexts that Persephone's abduction took place *ἐκ τῶν περὶ τὸν Ὠκεανὸν τόπων*, OF 43.

Alexander of Aphrodisias comments on the Aristotelian saying that some theologians of the Academy (Speusippus in particular) openly declared in the production of reality an evolutionary process from the least to the most perfect, following in this view ancient poets. Alexander explains that Aristotle intimates Orpheus, according to

whom the present optimal cosmic state under the reign of Zeus is the latest effect of processes and successions from previous, more elementary and less integrated conditions and corresponding sovereignties. He mentions as an Orphic series of succession (*Commentaria ad Aristotelis Metaphysicam* N 1091b4 (821. 13 Hayduck)): καὶ ἐπεὶ πρῶτον μὲν κατ' Ὀρφέα τὸ Χάος γέγονεν, εἶθ' ὁ Ὠκεανός, τρίτον Νύξ, τέταρτον ὁ Οὐρανός, εἶτ' ἀθανάτων βασιλεὺς θεῶν Ζεὺς (OF 107). He regards this series as coinciding with the canonic sequence of Rhapsodic Orphic Theogony which he schematizes thus (*ibid.*): πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ “βασιλευσεν περικλυτὸς Ἑρικεπαῖος” (OF 108) φησὶν ἢ ποιήσις, μεθ' ὃν Νύξ “σκηπτρον ἔχουσ' ἐν χερσὶν ἀριπρεπὲς Ἑρικεπαίου” (OF 102), μεθ' ἣν Οὐρανός, “ὃς πρῶτος βασιλευσε θεῶν μετὰ μητέρα Νύκτα.” (OF 111). The basic sequence Ericepaeus - Night - Sky - Cronos - Zeus - Dionysus is for the Rhapsodic Sacred Doctrines securely determined. In Alexander's series the following problems arise:

(i) Between Sky and Zeus, Cronos is missing. His presence is indispensable for any mythology; hence we should interpose: τέταρτον ὁ Οὐρανός, <πέμπτον ὁ Κρόνος καὶ οἱ Τιτᾶνες,> εἶτ' ἀθανάτων βασιλεὺς θεῶν ὁ Ζεὺς.

(ii) Dionysus is not mentioned after Zeus because his Sacred Passion (his dismemberment by the Titans) contradicts the linear, continuous, progressive evolution to more developed phases in the sequence of cosmic articulation (which is precisely the thesis that Alexander here analyses).

(iii) Zeus now assumes the sixth place in the sequence, although in Orphic doctrines he expressly occupies the fifth (OF 107 p. 171): ἀθανάτων βασιλῆα θεῶν πέμπτον σε γενέσθαι. But as Syrianus explains, *Commentaria in Aristotelis Metaphysicam* N 1091b4 (182. 18 Kroll): τὸ δὲ Χάος ὑπὲρ τὴν τοῦ βασιλεύοντός ἐστι σχέσιν. Hence Chaos' dominion is not counted in the succession of sovereignties, as not belonging to the series of articulate lordships. Proclus enumerates the successive stages of cosmic sovereignty (*Commentaria in Platonis Timaeum* III, 168. 20 Diehl): Phanes (Ericepaeus) - Night - Sky - Cronos - Zeus - Dionysus.

(iv) The essential difficulty: how to correlate Ocean with the Primogenitus Phanes-Ericepaeus when in the Sacred Doctrines the Ocean is a Titan (belonging to Cronos level)? If this were the reason

because of which Cronos is absent from his position in the sequence, then there is an inexplicable confusion in Alexander's scheme. A fusion of two distinct Orphic traditions (the older archaic-classical and the hellenistic-Rhapsodic) properly interpreted suffices to clarify the problem.

Order	-1	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Old Orphism	-	Night	Ocean	(Egg) Phanes	Heaven	Cronos	Zeus	Dionysus
Rhapsodic Orphism	Time	Aether Chaos	(Egg) Phanes	Night	Heaven	Cronos	Zeus	Dionysus
Alexander of Aphrodisias	-	Chaos	Ocean	Night	Heaven	<Cronos>	Zeus	<Dionysus>

(numbers indicate sequence of kingdom and generation)

Members 3-6 are all common. To position 2 Alexander assigns the Night of the Sacred Doctrines. As to 0 and 1 he follows the Archaic sequence with the difference that having used the Night in her Rhapsodic position and function he substitutes, for the first principle Nyx of early Orphic doctrine, Chaos as the ontological equivalent which in fact partially (but extrinsically as remarked above) overlaps with the level of first principle (of beginning) in the Rhapsodic Theogony. From this mixture another paradox can be best explained, namely that in an Orphic schema of the progression and production of reality Phanes (and the accompanying Egg) may be absent. Phanes and Egg being assigned to different stages of cosmic procession in the two Orphic patterns, Alexander's source, conflating both, omitted incompetently the most characteristic Orphic feature (Cosmic Ovum and Primogenitus) from either position in the sequence, adopting for each the other occupant in the two series, i.e. Ocean from ancient Orphism for place 1 and Night from Rhapsodic Orphism for place 2.

17. Poetic awareness preserved in the purest form the original Orphic idea and experience that the Night as very first cosmogonic principle expresses the abyssmal Darkness of aboriginal Chaos. On the

day of Julius Ceasar's death, of universal significance and import for the destiny of all mankind, the Sun is hidden by a dark mist, and the impious epoch is afraid lest it be covered and submerged by eternal Night. Virgil, *Georgicon* I, 446-8:

Ille etiam (sc. Sol) extincto miseratus Caesare Romam,
cum caput obscura nitidum ferrugine textit,
impiaque aeternam timuerunt saecula noctem.

Lucanus elaborates and expatiates on the idea in his oratoricoepical manner: he figuratively paints the terrifyingly imminent reversion to primordial Chaos. Titanic Winds raise the water of Ocean and Sea up to Heaven, thus flooding the whole Earth. The universal Typhonic arousal of confusion starts appropriately with the Ocean and spreads to the Sea and all the partial segments thereof (*Bellum Civile* V, 597-620). Having confounded the earth, the cosmic storm of wind and water would have dissolved even the Sky in its fury had it not been prevented through a dam of dense clouds by Zeus (620-626):

623 cum mare convolvit gentes, cum litora Tethys
noluit ulla pati caelo contenta teneri
tum quoque tanta maris moles crevisset in astra
ni superum rector pressisset nubibus undas.

Light is extinguished and the very consistency, composition and articulation of the Universe tremble: Nature is horrified before the coming of Chaos since it now seems that the bond of elements is being loosened and primordial Night is coming back intermingling Hades' Shadows with Olympian deities into the aboriginal confusion of everything:

630 lux etiam metuenda perit, nec fulgura currunt
clara, sed obscurum nimbosus dissilit aer.
tum superum convexa tremunt atque arduus axis
intonuit motaque poli compage laborant.
extimuit natura chaos; rupisse videntur
concordes elementa moras rursusque redire
nox manes mixture deis.

The Scholiast rightly interprets: Nox; confusionem rerum dicit noctem, mixtura luci tenebras, inferos coelo.

Recession to primordial Chaos when Time reaches its end is similarly described in the same work, I, 72-80:

sic, cum compage soluta
 saecula tota mundi suprema coegerit hora,
 antiquum repetent iterum Chaos omnia, mixtis
 sidera sideribus concurrent, ignea pontum
 Plaustra⁵² petent, tellus extendere litera nolet
 excutietque fretum, fratri contraria Phoebe
 ibit et obliquum bigas agitare per orbem
 indignata diem poscet sibi, totaque discors
 machina divolsi turbabit foedera mundi.

Chaos strives to achieve restitution of primordial confusion:

VI, 696: Chaos, innumeros avidum confundere mundos.

Opposite Typhonic winds and a Titanic turbulence of the Aquatic element in Ocean and Sea constitute the character of the imminent fusion of sea and sky, the Old One of Confusion being ever new and the Last of the Future, primordial Chaos. Seneca, *Agamemnon* 490-511.

506 Mundum revelli sedibus totum suis,
 ipsosque rupto crederes coelo deos
 decidere, et atrum rebus induci chaos.

Cf. *Thyestes* 829-834 Peiper et Richter. Things originate in Chaos and come back to Chaos (v. *Octavia* 402; *Hercules Oeteus* 1138). Chaos is of the eternal Night (*Hercules Furens* 614; *Medea* 9). At the bottom of the Universe lie the Palaces of Hades; below it yawns the bottomless abyss of Chaos ready to swallow the World when weariness overcomes it at the end of Time, the orbiting (universal revolution) that retains the cosmic elements and parts in separation fails and matter becomes heavy, drives back things into the original indiscriminate confusion, as in the Empedoclean collapse of the World into the *Σφαῖρος*. Valerius Flaccus, *Argonauticon* I, 827 sqq.:

Cardine sub nostro rebusque abscissa supernis
 Tartarei sedet aula patris, non illa ruenti
 ccessura polo, victam si volvere molem

< *** >

ingenti jacet ore Chaos, quod pondere fessam
 materiem lapsunq̄ue queat consumere mundum.⁵³

The Cosmology about the Basis of the World comes close to the Hesiodic *Theogony*, 720 sqq., especially 736-745. At the World's lowest part lies Tartarus, and whence in its nethermost place the sources and roots of Heaven, Earth, Sea and Tartarus surrounded by the Great Gap are ramified - there lies primordial Chaos, ingenti ore Chaos.

This aboriginal Chaos is the principle of Darkness, pre-eternal all-generating Night into which at the end of Time everything sinks, including the gods themselves, Plinius Junior, *Epistulae* VI, 20 Λ15: multi ad deos manus tollere, plures nusquam iam deos ulles aeternamque illam et novissimam Noctem mundo interpretabantur⁵⁴.

18. The Monism of Darkness and the development of its articulation to a fully fledged and systematic Weltanschauung was the foundation upon and the framework within which the Dualism of Limit and Unlimitedness originated and was informed. In Classical times the order of Harmony attempted to transgress the natural boundaries of its jurisdiction and committed a Hybris for which the offended Erinyes of Darkness took revenge. The history of the Greek Dualistic Movement can be adequately interpreted when it is inscribed in the experiential and intellectual structures of an articulated Monism of Darkness. Conversely, the integration of the monistic System was achieved with full respect for the force and validity of the polarity of being, which Dualism violently transforms into Double Authority, Dyarchy. In Archaic times, especially in the most prolific sixth century B.C., we can accurately trace the transition from the Ionian philosophical expression of the Monism of Darkness to the Italic (of Ionian origin but Western development) Dualistic position (Pythagoreans). The Parmenidean contribution and legacy ultimately consist in the achievement of purified Logos (Pure Reason), not in the direct support of any specific ontological analysis and

structure of being notwithstanding Parmenides' definitive influence on the formation of the theory of Ideas. The transition from the Archaic Logicomythical conception of reality to its Classical Logical representation corresponds to, and conforms with, the contemporary augmentation of Limit's dominion beyond the immutable boundaries of the ordinances of lawless Night. The first principle conceived as abyss of Water (Thales), as Unboundedness agitated by eternal mobility (Anaximander), and as Air breathing large, endlessly spirited and always blowing (Anaximenes) are philosophical formulations and conceptual projections of the dark and chaotic pre-eternal Depth. Early Pythagoreanism set against, and conjugated with, female Limitlessness (*Ἀπειρία*) her Son whom it finally positioned and venerated above her as consort and co-governor. In the Classical era, the Abyss of Indeterminacy loses much of its ontological power and becomes underestimated in value. Limitlessness dynamism, having become other than and alienated from Indeterminacy itself, seeks a new vehicle: thus arises a tendency to hypostasize a third principle of active creativity⁵⁵. Mature Classicism provided two solutions: the mathematical Pythagoreanism of the Ancient Academy and Aristotelian teleology. Hellenistic reaction manifested itself positively with the bold synthesis of Monism and Dualism in Stoicism on the one hand, and the Epicurean continuation of the ancient atomistic application of Eleatic Pythagoreanism on the other. When, in the centuries of the Great Turn, the Limit seems to usurp the inappropriate horrible throne of the Very First Principle, pushing thus Unlimitedness to the lower threshold of existence as its farthest declension, there emerges again unmanifest, far above Limit, the primordial Night, inviolable in its inescapable supreme jurisdiction. In his first act of lawlessness, Light takes maternal Darkness as his wife; he in his last finally rejects her as his very last lowest offspring. Nevertheless, what he encompasses and what he rules over, is only a limited portion taken from boundless and independent Unlimitedness. Unlimitedness herself stands always on top, undiminishable and undebilitate, universal fertile Mother and inexhaustible Nurse of all things, progenitor of Limit and hypostasis of its activities, sole root and power of his Transgression (Hybris) against her, as well as of the ensuing inflexible Retribution (Nemesis), very first Cause above all relationships, references and co-ordinations, most

ancient Darkness beyond any beginning and any ordering, unspeakable, lawless, law-imposing Night.

NOTES

1. V. (i) Chapter 12, *infra*; (ii) A.L. Pierris, *First Principles and the Beginning of World-Formation in Stoicism* in K. Boudouris (ed.) *Hellenistic Philosophy*, vol. II, 1994, pp. 149-176 [First Principles]; (iii) Id. *Hellenistic Philosophy: Continuity and Reaction in an Oecumenical Age* in K. Boudouris (ed.) *Hellenistic Philosophy* vol. I, 1993, pp. 133-135 (especially Excursus I: *On the Hybris of Limitation and Order* and Excursus II: *Immanence, Dualism and Theodicy*).
2. For an analysis of related procedures see the articles cited in the previous note.
3. Cf. O. Kaiser, *Die Mythische Bedeutung des Meeres in Aegypten, Ugarit und Israel*, 1962, pp. 116, 169.
4. The idea that the primary impetus towards world-formation is due to Eros (who is identical with, or conceived by, the Demiurge) has deep religious roots and a long philosophical history and articulation. Pherecydes 7 B 3 DK: εἰς Ἔρωτα μεταβεβλήσθαι τὸν Δία μέλλοντα δημιουργεῖν, ὅτι δὴ τὸν Κόσμον ἐκ τῶν ἐναντίων συνιστὰς εἰς ὁμολογίαν καὶ φιλίαν ἤγαγε καὶ ταυτότητα πᾶσιν ἐνέσπειρε καὶ ἔνωσιν τὴν δι' ὄλων διήκουσαν. Cf. *infra*, Chapter 12, p. 175 and nn. 55-56. In the elaborate and brilliant cosmogonic myth that Dion Chrysostomus narrates (*Oratio* XXX, 55), the first principle, primary beginning and sole eternal God and endless Being: ὅτε κάλλιστος γίνεται ... εὐθύς ἐπόθησε τὸν ἐξ ἀρχῆς βίον, ἔρωτα δὲ λαβών ... ὤρμησεν ἐπὶ τὸ γεννᾶν καὶ διανέμειν ἕκαστα καὶ δημιουργεῖν τὸν ὄντα νῦν Κόσμον ... ἀστράψας δὲ ὄλος οὐκ ἄτακτον οὐδὲ ρυπαρὰν ἀστραπήν ... ἀλλὰ καθαρὰν καὶ ἀμιγῆ παντὸς σκοτεινοῦ (- Φάνης) μετέβαλε ραδίως ἅμα τῇ νοήσει. μνησθεῖς δὲ Ἀφροδίτης etc. In Parmenides the creator is Aphrodite, 28 B 12. 4-6 DK:

ἐν δὲ μέσῳ τούτων Δαίμων ἢ πάντα κυβερνᾷ·
πάντα γὰρ < ἦ > συγερῶϊ τόκου καὶ μίξιος ἄρχει
πέμπουσ' ἄρσενι θῆλυ μιγῆν τό τ' ἐναντίον
αὐτίς ἄρσεν θηλυτέρῳ

with Eros as her first offspring (B 13):

πρώτιστον μὲν Ἔρωτα θεῶν μητίσατο πάντων.

Eros is the moving force in Hesiod's Theogony and the third among the primary principles after Chaos and the first stable form which is the Earth (with Tartarus located in Earth's innermost nook, deepest bottom and root) 116-122. In Orphic Tradition, Eros=Phanes=Protogonus is the first creator. The Primogenitus is Primocreator.

5. For an etymological clarification of the Semitic Mot v. A.B. Cook, *Zeus II*, p. 1038. The suggested interpretations include: Arabic madda=matter, substance (Ewald); water (Baudissin, Maspero); moch, mud, slime (Bunsen); <to>mot Phoenician tehomot = female depth, abyss; mak=rotteness (Mclean). No matter how tentative these interpretations and how hypothetical the assumed connections are they tend significantly to corroborate the correctness of Philo's view.
6. Eissfeld's emendation (*αὐτοῦ*) is often accepted. However, *αὐτό* cannot refer to anything other than *Πνεῦμα*; if *πλοκή* or *πόθος* were meant the pronoun used would have been masculine or feminine. Moreover, if the sense were that the Spirit did not know its own creation (the coming-into-being of itself), as the suggested emendation would want it, then we can in a way respond to the objection that is based on the fact that Spirit as first principle must be eternal, precisely by invoking a necessary breach as it were in its continuity of everlastingness when the World's existence is going to start; but even this is not altogether correct, since it is not the Spirit per se but Spirit's Longing (*Πόθος*) that determines the beginning of Time and History. What is more, and more important, it is unlikely that the Spirit remained ignorant or unaware of its own beginning since it was the Spirit that longed for its own beginning and actually realized it precisely by its very desire. If the Spirit is ignorant of anything, it is ignorant of the result of its beginning, of the product of its realized desire not to remain infinite but to acquire a beginning as a physical being. Manuscripts have *αὐτοῦ* and *αὐτήν*.
7. It is extremely characteristic that Damascius gives the series of offspring in the order Air-Breeze, and it is clear why: the principle of mobility occupies, in all limit-friendly theories, a secondary position vis-à-vis the principle of definiteness and unchangeableness. He writes: *Ἄερα γενέσθαι καὶ Αὔραν, Ἄερα μὲν <τὸ> ἄκρατον τοῦ νοεροῦ παραδηλοῦντες, Αὔραν δὲ τὸ ἐξ αὐτοῦ κινούμενον τοῦ νοητοῦ ζωτικὸν προτύπωμα*. The terminology is Neoplatonic; the experience and frame of mind primevally Greek.
8. The Orphic theogony according to the *Sacred Doctrines in ΚΑ΄ Rhapsodies* is directly related to this type of Cosmogony. The supreme principle is Time. The primordial situation is characterized by *σκοτόεσσα ὁμίχλη* (OF 67) and *ἄζηχῆς σκότος* (OF 66. p. 148). Aether (OF 66 etc.)

corresponds to the Sidonians' Air, and Eros=Phanes to Longing. The articulation may vary, but the basic elements are sufficiently identical.

9. For an analysis of some aspects of the topic see Chapter 9.
10. The salient feature here is availability and readiness-to-assume-shape-and-form, hence passivity, irrespective of how much productivity, even chaotic productivity and moreover power of resistance be also present.
11. Maybe the main element in Erebus' fury was that the Spirit initially pervaded throughout undifferentiated Abyss whereas after the separation of Up and Down it withdrew to the Upper region, in which case the Spirit's separation from the Abyss (as first principle of every separation) angered abyssmal Darkness. A comparison with Ophitic doctrines (where the first principle is distinguished into three separate hypostases) according to which the first principle is hidden in the upper Depth, the Bythos above, while the elements Water, Darkness, Abyss and Chaos exist on the lower level below and the third hypostasis of the first principle, i.e. Spirit, hovers proximately over them, may corroborate the suggested interpretation.
12. The apparent lacuna has been emended in different ways by various scholars: *ὄρμη <μήτρας> ἐγκύμων γέγονεν* Bernays; *ὄρμη ἐγκύμων ἀρχή ἐστι τοῦ <γεγονέναι τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἢ τὸν νοῦν* Cruice; *ὄρμη <αἰτία τῆ μήτρα ἐστὶ τοῦ > ἐγκύμονα γεγονέναι* Wendland. These suggestions fluctuate from being insufficient to being irrelevant. The word *φύσις* must be present here because of the following clause; if not *φύσις* then water (*τὰ ὕδατα*) must be present; *ὄρμη* is in a way an impulse for copulation (cf. *συνεπλάκη* which is used in an analogous context in the system of the Nicolaites, above). The suggested addition even if not verbally correct satisfies the intended meaning.
13. Theodoretus (*Historia Fabularis Haereseon* I, 14) considers the Sethians to be identical with the Ophites. And indeed, in the analysis of the Sethianic System made by Hippolytus the significance of the Serpent is emphatic as is in all likelihood the special importance of Man, evident in anthropogony. Irenaeus describes the Ophitic system starting with a general statement: *Alii autem rursus portentuosam loquuntur* etc.; at the end of the chapter, however, he epigrammatically recounts some variations of the basic scheme he has already explained mentioning as traits of Ophitic doctrine the Cainians, the (apocryphal) Gospel according to Judas, Cosmic Uterus (Hystera) and Carpocrates. Hippolytus at the beginning of his fifth book mentions the Naassenes (*ὄνομα ἐβραϊδος φωνῆς*, he explains, *σημαίνον Ὀφίτες*) who called themselves Gnostics, *Γνωστικοί* simpliciter, *φάσκο- ντες μόνον τὰ βάθη γινώσκουσιν*. The account he offers comprises the First and the Second Man as well as the triple distinction between intellectual (or

angelic), psychic and earthly man (in all probability corresponding to the distinction of the three Ophitic principles, lightspiritdarkness), and then devotes himself to an extended analysis of all Mysteries through emphatically erotic and venereal interpretations. It seems that Hippolytus offers with the help of Ophitic texts the theoretical foundation of practices and rituals that Irenaeus mentions refusing to go into what he calls their unspeakable details. The Fathers of the Church agree that the sect in question was particularly multifarious with various subdivisions and that it was regarded as the Gnostic persuasion par excellence. The abominable Aeon and the Uterus of Nicolaites correspond to the Wind of Darkness = primogenitus Serpent and the Uterus of the Sethians. Undoubtedly, the Ophitic, Nicolaitic and Sethian doctrines analysed above are related subgroups of this generic tendency.

14. In the Phoenician theologies according to Sanchouniathon and Mochus the liquid nature of the second principle is not explicitly mentioned. However, Sanchouniathons Chaos is characterized as filthy and dark, whereas the issue of the first copulation (named Mot) is described as slime or rottenness of aquatic mixture. The Spirit in intercourse with filthy wetness produces the first mudlike consistence, from which substance all determined and delineated forms of existence, natural things, will crystallize into being by means of condensation. Ulomos-Unlimitedness of Phoenician cosmogony according to Mochus, must also be liquid, the Abyss of Waters, especially since by self-fertilization it engenders ChousorusAnoegus (Ἀνοιγεύς = Opener) and the cosmic Egg (FGrH 784 F4). Fertility was ascribed to the liquid element as in Thales. It is worth noting that the Stoics interpreted Hesiodic Chaos as the wetness that existed prior to the world's formation, v. *Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta* I, No. 103-105. II No. 437-564. Cf. II 436. 565. In I 104 the cosmogonic theory of Zeno (who came from Cition of Cyprus πολίσματος Ἑλληνικοῦ Φοίνικας ἐποίκου ἐσχηκότος, Diogenes Laertius VII, 1) is presented in mud-terminology: *Καὶ Ζήνων τὸ παρ' Ἡσιόδου Χάος ὕδωρ εἶναι φησιν, οὐ συνιζάνοντος ἰλὸν γενέσθαι, ἧς πηγνυμένης ἢ γῆ στερεμνιούται* etc. The role of slime is central in the Phoenician cosmogony according to Sanchouniathon and in the Orphic cosmogony according to Hieronymus and Hellanicus. Otos of the Sidonian theology according to Eudemus is identical with Mot of Sanchouniathon's Cosmogony. The Mist of this Cosmogony (and the corresponding unlimited Chaos and foggy Erebus of Orphic theology according to Hieronymus and Hellanicus) are meant to express liquidity in its airy form, that is to say the wetness of air or simply moist air.
15. Classical Egyptian iconography represents the Ogdoad as frog-headed (male members) and snake-headed (female members). This is a reference to

- primordial watery slime from which spang forth the aboriginal Hill, the Sun as child on a lotus in the cosmogonic beginning of things.
16. The formulation is of course of later origin.
 17. Col. XIII-XV in Merkelbach's anonymous edition, *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 47, 1982 with separate page-numbering at the end of the volume. The scandal concerning the already forty years' delay for a proper editio princeps of this most important papyrus has reached air's limits. The want has been recently satisfied in part by R. Janko's splendid work; v. his edition of the Papyrus, *The Derveni Papyrus: an Interim Text in Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, Band 141, 2002, pp. 1-62. (Cf. supplementarily F. Jourdan, *Le Papyrus de Derveni*, 2003, with translation based on Janko's text and notes). The cited passage is in Col. XVII-XIX Janko.
 18. This is easily deduced from the repeated comic derision of the view (v. supra) and also from the Hippocratic foundation of medicine upon this view in the *Περὶ Φυσῶν* treatise.
 19. Air is assimilated to fire because both are active elements while earth is assimilated to water since both are passive (SVF II 418). Heraclitus who allegorizes Homer calls the former spiritual and the latter material elements, *Homeric Problems*, 22 §13; cf. 15, 3. The former because they are tenses hold themselves together and provide the latter with a cohesive tension by permeating, and being mixed with, and in, them (II 444 and 473 p. 155, 32-36). The air is the cohesive cause both of physical being (II 449) and of its own quality (e.g. II 440 p. 145. 9). Air as divine breath and spirit is to be found mixed in water and in all elements right from the very beginning of coming-into-being, of Cosmogony proper (II 721). Spirit is basically moving air (II 471, p. 152. 34). V. Excursus III: *On Spirit and Tension in "First Principles"*, esp. pp. 173-4. It is there explained how dispersing elements can be cohesive causes.
 20. Cf. Excursus I: *Matter, Body, Incorporeals and Concepts* and Excursus IV: *Principles, Ur-Element and Elements in "First Principles"*.
 21. According to Sanchouniathon the first principle is a breath (spirit) of gloomy air. The Stoics consider the air to be intrinsically dark and they invoke the Homeric testimony to corroborate this view. V. II 429. 430. 56. 569 p. 178.8. Cf. Heraclitus, *Homeric Problemata* 23, 9-11.
 22. Even Homeric Zeus is afraid of displeasing the Night and feels awe before her. *Ilias* Ε 258-61 (Zeus wants to punish Sleep who narrates):

καὶ κέ μ' αἴσιον ἀπ' αἰθέρος ἔμβαλε πόντω,
εἰ μὴ Νύξ, δμήτειρα θεῶν ἐσάωσε καὶ ἀνδρῶν
τὴν ἰκόμην φεύγων, ὃ δ' ἐπαύσατο χοῶμενός περ·
ἄζετο γάρ, μὴ Νυκτὶ θοῆ ἀποθύμια ἔρδοι.

23. The first god in the succession series of the Epic of Kumarbi is Alalu (II) who signifies in all likelihood the cosmic watery flow (cf. Schwabl s.v. *Weltschoepfung* in PW col. 1486-7), the Ocean. Alalus' identification with the Sumerian En-lil (as in Meriggi, *I Miti di Kumarpi II Kronos Currico*, Athenaeum N.S. XXXI, 1953, p. 148) is erroneous (cf. e.g. Schwabl *op. cit.* col. 1493) The second god in Kumarbis Epic is Anu, the god of the Sky (III). The third is Kumarbi (IV-V), the Hettitic El=Cronos (Schwabl, *op. cit.* col. 1490. 23 sqq.). Kumarbi swallows Anus' genitals (V), like Cronos who severs Sky's genitals. The sovereign of the present World-Order follows, the god of weather and atmospheric phenomena (V), Zeus. The sequence is therefore as follows: Ocean, Sky, Cronos, Zeus precisely as the Homeric series. The philosophical commentator of the Orphic epic in the Derveni papyrus makes Zeus swallow the sexual organ that was the first manifestation in aether = the Sun. The organ belongs to the Sky (Col. IX Merkelbach = Col. XIII Janko), and is cut by Cronos (Col. X 5-9 M. = Col. XIV 5-9 J).
24. Days light has the preceding night as mother, Aeschylus, *Agamemnon* 279:

τῆς νῦν τεκούσης φῶς τόδ' Εὐφρόνης λέγω.

(Euphrone is the Night in a euphemistic, apotropaic and supplicatory way of speaking). *Ibid.* 264-5:

εὐάγγελος μὲν, ὥσπερ ἡ παροιμία,
"Ἐως γένοιτο μητρὸς Εὐφρόνης πάρα.

("Ἐως = 'Ἡώς). In Sophocles, *Trachiniae* 94-6, the Night, dying and putting her clothes off (ἐναριζομένη), gives birth to the Sun who full of flames is put to sleep by her in the evening:

ὄν αἰόλα Νῆξ ἐναριζομένα
τίκτει κατευνάζει τε φλογιζόμενον
"Ἄλιον etc.

According to a Slovakian song the Sun declares: "my mother begets me anew as a beautiful boy every morning and buries me every evening as a feeble old man" (Usener, *Kleine Schriften* iv. 387 sq.). The tragic poet Theodectes who was fond of propounding enigmas (cf. Hermippus apud Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae*, X 451 E sqq.) presents the relation of Day and Night as that between two sisters who alternate in continually giving birth to each other; Fr. 4 Nauck 2nd. ed. p. 802:

εἰσι κασίγνηται δισσαί, ὧν ἡ μία τίκτει
τὴν ἑτέραν, αὐτὴ δὲ τεκοῦσ' ὑπὸ τῆσδε τεκνοῦται.

This is of course playful. The deeper experience perceives the Day to be born by the Night, not vice versa; Hesiod, *Theogony* 124-5:

Νυκτὸς δ' αὐτ' Αἰθήρ τε καὶ Ἡμέρη ἐξεγένοντο,
οὓς τέκε κυσαμένη, Ἐρέβει φιλότῃτι μυγεῖσα.

Eustathius (*Scholia ad Homeric Iliadem* A, 9 p. 22. 30 sqq.) in similar manner interprets the fact that Apollo is the son of Leto: *τουτέστι Νυκτός*, referring to Euripides *Orestes* 213 (ὦ πότνια Λήθη τῶν κακῶν, ὡς εἰ σοφή). The starting point of the ancient Greek and Orthodox day-and-night unit was the evening, the Sun setting.

25. Tethys may derive etymologically from *τήθη*, the father's or mother's mother (Pollux III, 17). She is the maternal ancestor, the Old One, the Ancient of Years (Cf. Eustathius, *Scholia ad Iliadem*. p. 971.44).
26. Hesiod has already made Heaven and (open) Sea come from the Earth through wind-births with no male semen and the Sea is engendered *ἄτερ φιλότῃτος ἐφ' ἡμέρου*, without sexual coition (v. 126-132). He has also explained the manifestation of Night and Day (123-5). This allows him to speak mythically of the Sky as coming in the evening to have sexual intercourse with the Earth (176-8), but the symbolism of continual copulation as birthless conception is not thereby cancelled.
27. The fact that in Pherecydes when Ophioneus is defeated he is cast into the Ocean as if the situation after the battle of gods (*θεομαχία*) were cosmologically identical with the previous one is a mythopoetic element with no symbolic significance. Pherecydes speaks, at any rate, in the manner of 'mixed theology' (as this kind of speculative thinking is aptly called by Aristotle), of a typical anthropomorphic Homeric battle: *Φερεκύδην... μυθοποιεῖν στρατείαν στρατεία παραταττομένην καὶ τῆς μὲν ἡγεμόνα Κρόνον ἀποδιδόναι, τῆς ἑτέρας δ' Ὀφίωνεα, προκλήσεις τε καὶ ἀμίλλας αὐτῶν ἰστορεῖν, συνθήκας τε αὐτοῖς γίνεσθαι, ἵν' ὀπίτεροι αὐτῶν εἰς τὸν Ὠκεανὸν ἐμπέσωσι, τούτους μὲν εἶναι νενικημένους τοὺς δ' ἐξώσαντες καὶ νικήσαντες τούτους ἔχειν τὸν Οὐρανόν*. Pherecydes does not include in his system the kingdom of Ophioneus but only the revolt against Cronos, the previous Lord of the World (Chronus, Time). What is common with the Orphic narration in Apollonius *Argonautica* (I, 506) is the casting into the Ocean. It means that in the new order of things Ophioneus abides by the Ocean which flows round the Earth.

28. The manuscripts have *Κρόνον* but Zoegas' emendation is obvious. When Cronos is put in the supreme position (as in Pherecydes) then his name hints at Time. When, by contrast, the Titan of Mythology is also present, then Chronus at the beginning of the sequence is not Cronos. The Orphic teachings in all variations certainly comprised the myths about Cronos. Cf. Orphic *Argonautica* v. 426.
29. Ovid presents this theory of first principles and aboriginal beginnings also as a symbolic interpretation of the double-faced god Janus. *Fasti* I 103 sqq.: the god is speaking:

Me Chaos antiqui, nam sum res prisca, vocabant.
 Aspice, quam longi temporis acta canam.
 Lucidus hic aer, et quae tria corpora restant,
 ignis, aquae, tellus, unus acervus erant.
 Ut semel haec rerum secessit lite suarum
 inque novas abiit massa soluta domos,
 altum flamma petit; proprior locus aera cepit:
 sederunt medio terra fretumque solo.
 Tunc ego, qui fueram globus (= Empedocles' Sphairos) et sine
 imagine moles,
 in faciem redii dignaque membra deo.

...

117 Quicquid ubique vides, caelum, mare, nubila, terras,
 omnia sunt nostra clausa patentque manu.
 Me penes est unum vasti custodia mundi,
 et ius vertendi cardinis omne meum est.

Here the transition from the formlessness of primaeval Indeterminacy (*Ἀπειρία*) to the present World-Order is an internal development that accords with the Monism of Darkness. In the *Metamorphoses*, on the other hand, the creative deus et melior natura seem to come from the outside, but the subject is not clarified. A Neopythagorean Dualistic Conception of first principles may be implied, though my interpretation in the text above, with Phanes as offspring of Darkness, is more plausible. The third principle mentioned in the *Timaeus* (the Demiurge) constitutes a symbolic scheme that ultimately is reducible to the orthodox classic Pythagorean Dualism.

30. In a fragment from Euripides *Hypsipyle* (409 B.C.) the early Orphic doctrine seems to be resonant; Fr. 57 (p. 59 Arnim) = OF 2. (The interpretation of Cataudella, Sulla "*Teogonia*" di Antifane e sui frammenti del "*Piritoo*" di Euripide, Athenaeum 10 (1932), p. 263-4 is erroneous):

<ὦ>πότνια θεῶν
 <φάος ἄσκοπον <...>
 <αἰθέρι πρωτόγονος? ν? ...>
 <... Ἐρως ὅτε Νύξ? ...>
 <...>δὴ τότε...
 ...γένεο...

The Night may be the Mistress of Gods, the Great Lady (πότνια θεῶν) from whom there is born in aether the first born Protogonus = Eros = Phanes = φάος ἄσκοπον. Ἄσκοπον means also 'invisible' (cf. Sophocles, *Oedipus Coloneus* 1682), but it more commonly means 'unspeakable', unformulable, unnarratable, 'inconceivable' (cf. Sophocles, 1864), 'unintelligible' (id. *Ajax* 21), 'paradoxical' (id. *Electra* 1315). In Parmenides 28 B 7. 4 DK ἄσκοπον ὄμμα is the eye that lacks direction, orientation and goal. In our case, ἄσκοπον φάος is the diffuse, mysterious, inexplicable light, the light that does not emanate from a visible source or a determinate focus, the dark radiance that comes with the manifestation of the first born Phanes. Cf. *Orphic Hymns* 6 (OF 87):

Πρωτόγονον καλέω διφυῆ, μέγαν αἰθερόπλαγκτον
 ὦογενῆ, χρυσέαισιν ἀγαλλόμενον πτερύγεσσιν.
 ...
 ὄσσων ὃς σκοτοέσσιν ἀπημαύρωσας ὀμίχλην
 πάντη δινηθεῖς πτερύγων ριπαῖς κατὰ κόσμον
 λαμπρὸν ἄγων φάος ἄγνόν, ἀφ' οὗ σε Φάνητα κικλήσκω
 ἦδὲ Πρίηπον ἄνακτα καὶ Ἀνταύγην ἐλίκωπον.

The ἄσκοπον φάος of the Euripidean fragment is similarly repeated in the Orphic poetry of the *Sacred Doctrines in ΚΔ' Rhapsodies*, OF 86:

Πρωτόγονόν γε μὲν οὔτις ἐσέδρακεν ὀφθαλμοῖσιν
 εἰ μὴ Νύξ ἱερὴ μούνη· τοὶ δ' ἄλλοι ἅπαντες
 θαύμαζον καθορῶντες ἐν αἰθέρι φέγγος ἄελπτον
 (ἄληπτον Gesner; ἄληκτον Schneider)
 τοῖον ἀπέστιλβε χροὸς ἀθανάτοιο Φάνητος.

The light without visible source is the Day regarded as independent of (and ontologically preceding in the derivation ladder of reality) the Sun.

31. The title of the comedy could be *Θεογονία*, or more plausibly the attested *Ἀφροδίτης Γοναί*, or else the elsewhere reported *Ἀνθρωπογονία*, or even *Ὀρφεύς*.

32. Fate reserved for the papyrus inappropriate vicissitudes at the hands of later descendants. Columns refer to Merkelbach's edition. The numbers of Janko's new Interim Text are added.
33. Scholia *ad loc.*: ὑπηνέμια καλεῖται τὰ δίχα συνουσίας καὶ μίξεως. Photius, *Lexicon* s.v. ὑπηνέμια: τὰ δίχα σπέρματος ἄρρενος. Hesychius s.v. ὑπηνέμια ὡς: τὰ δίχα τοῦ ὀχευθῆναι γεννώμενα. Cf. Lucian, *De sacrific.* 6: ὅμοια δὲ τούτοις καὶ περὶ τῆς Ἥρας ἄδουσιν, ἄνευ τῆς πρὸς τὸν ἄνδρα ὀμιλίας ὑπηνέμιον αὐτὴν παῖδα γεννῆσαι τὸν Ἥφαιστον. Plato (the comic playwright) or (maybe again) Aristophanes used the word in this sense (*Scholia on Aristophanes*, Nubes 659 = Plato, *Daedalus* fr. 1 Meineke II, 619. Athenaeus IX 374E. Photius s.v. ὑπηνέμια. Aristophanes, *Daedalus* Fr. VI No. 187 Blaydes = 237 Dindorf = Fr. 194 PCGr. vol. III 2 p. 118). Aristotle, *De generatione animalium* Γ, 749a34: συνίσταται μὲν οὖν κυήματα τοῖς ὄρνισι καὶ αὐτόματα, ἃ καλοῦσιν ὑπηνέμια καὶ ζεφύριά τινες. The fertilizing power of the wind's breath (spirit) is suggested by both appellations. Cf. Aristotle, *De animalibus historiae* Z, 560a6: ζεφύρια δὲ καλεῖται τὰ ὑπηνέμια ὑπὸ τινων, ὅτι ὑπὸ τὴν ἑαρινὴν ὥραν φαίνονται δεχόμενοι τὰ πνεύματα αἱ ὄρνιθες. As mentioned above, the wind *Κολπίας* (which must be the Phoenician Zephyr) fertilizes Baan (Chaos) according to the Phoenician doctrines of Sanchouniathon, and in this way the first generation of Aeon and of Protogonus is engendered (FGrH 790F10 Λ7). The bearing of eggs called ὑπηνέμια (wind-eggs) does not depend on remnants of a previous copulation according to normal oviparous generation. Aristotle, *op. cit.* Z, 559b20: οἱ δὲ λέγοντες ὅτι ὑπολείμματά ἐστι τὰ ὑπηνέμια τῶν ἔμπροσθεν ἐξ ὀχέας γινόμενων, οὐκ ἀληθῆ λέγουσιν. ὠπται γὰρ ἱκανῶς ἤδη ἀνόχευτοι νεοττίδες ἀλεκτορίδων καὶ χηνῶν τίκτουσαι ὑπηνέμια. As was to be expected, the ὑπηνέμια are barren. Plinius, *Naturalis Historia* X §166, 60 (80): quidam et vento putant ea (sc. the barren eggs) generari, qua de causa etiam zephyria appellant. Aristotle, *op. cit.* E, 539a31: ἐξ ὧν γίνεται ὡσπερ ἐν τοῖς ὄρνισι τὰ ὑπηνέμια. Τὰ μὲν οὖν ὄρνιθων ἄγονα πάντα ἐστὶ ταῦτα (μέχρι γὰρ τοῦ ὤου γέννησιν δύναται ἢ φύσις αὐτῶν ἐπιτελεῖν), ἐὰν μὴ τις αὐτοῖς συμβῆ τρόπος ἄλλος τῆς κοινωνίας πρὸς τοὺς ἄρρενας (cf. Z, 561a1: ἐξ ὧν οὐ γίνεται νεοττὸς οὐθείς, ἀλλ' ὑπηνέμια πάντα τὰ τοιαῦτα). The 'other way of intercourse with the male partner' is the fertilizing copulation that occurs after the conception of the egg (and before the formation of the white part) cf. e.g. Z, 560a9 sqq. Cf. Plinius *op. cit.* X §169, 58 (79). X §166, 60 (80). In the case of primordial Darkness, of pre-eternal Night, the Egg, albeit ὑπηνέμιον, is unsurpassably potent and extremely prolific.
34. The same word as in the Aristophanic Cosmogony, ἐκβλαστάνω. Literally,

- the Night did not spring forth unless in the sense in which Chaos was born (ἐγένετο) in Hesiod.
35. From Aether alone according to the *Titanomachy* of the Epic Cycle, Fr. 1 and 2 Bernabé.
36. In this way, the overfull and overflowing, all-potent Chaos of the Monism of Darkness turns into an inactive, inert and impotent agglomeration of undifferentiated matter. Dynamic Chaos engenders by itself its own generative impetus when its indeterminate mobility converges producing the mighty flow of the primordial cosmic current (thus starting the world revolution). The idle, inert Chaos of unmovable stillness, by contrast, needs an external moving breath, a primal God standing outside the World according to the analysed Semitic standpoint. The prototype of this attitude, apart from the beginning of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, is crucially described in Heraclitus' *Homeric Problems* 65 §2-6: παλαιοὶ γὰρ ἦσαν ποτε χρόνοι καθ' οὓς ἀτύπωτον ἢ ὑπόλιμνον (sc. sank in the abyss of waters as in Genesis) ἦν, οὐδέπω κεκρμένους χαρακτηῆρσιν εἰς τέλειον ἦκουσα μορφῆς· οὔτε γὰρ γῆ τῶν ὄλων ἐστία κέντρον ἐπεπῆγει βέβαιον οὔτ' οὐρανὸς περὶ τὴν αἰδίων φορὰν ἰδρυμένος ἐκυκλείτο, πάντα δ' ἦν ἀνήλιος ἡρεμία καὶ κατηφοῦσα σιγή, καὶ πλέον οὐδὲν ἦν ἢ] κεχυμένης ὕλης, ἄμορφος γὰρ ἀργία, πρὶν ἢ δημιουργὸς ἀπάντων καὶ κοσμοτόκος ἀρχὴ σωτήριον ἐλκύσασα τῷ βίῳ τύπον τὸν κόσμον ἀπέδωκε τῷ κόσμῳ· διεξέυγην τὸν μὲν οὐρανὸν γῆς, ἐχώριζε δὲ τὴν ἡπειρον θαλάττης, τέτταρα δὲ στοιχεῖα, τῶν ὄλων ρίζα καὶ γένηνα, ἐν τάξει τὴν ἰδίαν μορφὴν ἐκομίζετο· τούτων δὲ προμηθῶς κίρναμένων ὁ θεὸς <...> μηδεμιάς οὔσης διακρίσεως περὶ τὴν ἄμορφον ὕλην. (In the lacuna we expect something like <τὸν κόσμον συναπετέλει διακρίνων ἕκαστα > or anything similar).
37. The doctrine of a first Egg at the beginning of cosmic development is of primal importance for Orphism. Oviparous generation as the way in which the World comes to be is the basic thesis. Cf. Plutarch, *Quaestionum Convivialium* II, 2 p. 636d: αἰείσω ξυνετοῖσι τὸν ὄρφικὸν καὶ ἱερὸν λόγον ὃς οὐκ ὄρνιθος μόνον τὸ ᾧδὸν ἀποφαίνει πρῆσβύτερον, ἀλλὰ καὶ συλλαβῶν ἄπασαν αὐτῷ τὴν ἀπάντων ὁμοῦ πρῆσβυγένειαν ἀνατίθησι.
38. The precise articulation of the idea is presented below, Chapter 12, esp. pp. 178-182 with corresponding notes.
39. ... Ὀρφεὺς ᾧδὸν λέγει γενητόν, ἐξ ἀπείρου τῆς ὕλης προβεβλημένον, γεγονὸς δὲ οὕτω· τῆς τετραγενοῦς ὕλης ἐμφύχου οὔσης καὶ ὄλου ἀπείρου τινὸς βυθοῦ αἰὲ ρέοντος καὶ ἀκρίτως φερομένου καὶ μυρίας ἀτελεῖς κρᾶσεις [εἰς] ἄλλοτε ἄλλως ἐπαναχέοντος καὶ διὰ τοῦτο αὐτὰς ἀναλύοντος τῇ ἀταξίᾳ, καὶ κεχηγνότητος ὡς εἰς γένεσιν ζῶου δεθῆναι μὴ δυναμένου [1st

PHASE], *συνέβη ποτέ, αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἀπείρου πελάγους ὑπὸ ἰδίας φύσεως περιωθουμένου κινήσει φυσικῇ ἐκτάκτως ρυῆναι ἀπὸ τοῦ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ αὐτὸ ὥσπερ ἴλιγγα [2nd PHASE] καὶ μίξαι τὰς οὐσίας καὶ οὕτως ἐξ ἐκάστου τῶν πάντων τὸ νοστιμώτατον, ὅπερ πρὸς γένεσιν ζῶου ἐπιτηδειότατον ἦν, ὥσπερ ἐν χώνη κατὰ μέσον ρυῆναι τοῦ παντὸς καὶ ὑπὸ τῆς πάντα φερούσης ἴλιγγος χωρῆσαι εἰς βάθος καὶ τὸ περικείμενον πνεῦμα ἐπισπάσασθαι, καὶ ὡς εἰς γονιμώτατον συλληφθέν ποιεῖν κριτικὴν σύστασιν. Ὡσπερ γὰρ ἐν ὑγρῷ φιλεῖ γίνεσθαι πομφόλυξ, οὕτως σφαιροειδῆς πανταχόθεν συνειλήθη κύτος. Ἐπειτα αὐτὸ ἐν ἑαυτῷ κληθέν ὑπὸ τοῦ παρειληφότος θειώδους πνεύματος ἀναφερόμενον προέκυψε εἰς φῶς μέγιστόν τι τοῦτο ἀποκύημα, ὡς ἂν ἐκ παντὸς τοῦ ἀπείρου βυθοῦ ἀποκεκυημένον ἔμφυχον δημιουργήμα, καὶ τῇ περιφερείᾳ τῶν ῥῶν προσεικόσ, καὶ τῷ τάχει τῆς πτήσεως [3rd PHASE]. Cf. below, Chapter 12, p. 182.*

40. Breath (spirit) in a liquid corresponds to the idea of semen in the seed (*σπέρμα ἐν τῇ γονῇ*) according to Stoic precosmogony. Cf. SVF I 102 p. 28. 25, etc. Cf. II 721.
41. The Sky is *δινῆεις* (Quintus Smyrnaeus, *Methomeric* V, 10). The *δινῆεις Ἀκμονίδης* of Callimachus (Fr. 498 Pfeiffer) is Ouranos, son of Acamas (v. infra). Cf. Hesychius s.v. *δεινήεντα*; and Sky's *περιδίνησις* according to Anaxagoras (59 A 1 DK). The *δίνη* is the whirl of the cosmic revolution, Universes Vortex.
42. Usually (e.g. OF 15) this is taken to refer to *Theogony* 337 sqq. where, however, only the abundant offspring of Ocean and Tethys as conceived by Hesiod is enumerated. But in the Platonic argumentation of the Cratylean passage all the gods that come from the divine couple that is being etymologized (or at least the main branches of their genealogical tree) must be born from the said couple, as in the two previous examples. Hence, some etymological interpretation of the Hesiodic Chaos according to the later Stoic paradigm (from *χέομαι, χεῖσθαι*) must be presupposed here so that liquid nature be signified.
43. The problem does not of course arise in the common and Hesiodic version where Ocean and Tethys are the very first and idiosyncratic, to be sure, Titans, but siblings of Cronos and the other Titans, hence children of Sky and Earth.
44. The first marriage must necessarily be incestuous, be it between Mother and Son or between Brother and Sister.
45. Eros = Phanes = Protogonus emerges (is hatched) from the Cosmic Egg, and this egg being cut and then shaped so as to form the world, constitutes Heaven, Earth and the whole Universe. Zagreus is the Orphic Dionysus

- who is dismembered by the Titans. Zagreus belongs to the sixth and final generation of Orphism already in its early form (Plato, *Philebus* 66c): ἔκτῃ δ' ἐν γενεῇ καταπαύσατε οἶμον ἀοιδῆς (OF 14). Aboriginal Chaos counts neither as generation (since it has no beginning and birth) nor as kingdom (since it is inarticulate).
46. Etymologicum Magnum s.v. Ἄκμων. Callimachus, Fr. 498 Pfeiffer. Scholia ad Callimachum fr. 110. 65-6, p. 118 Pfeiffer. *Συναγωγὴ λέξεων χρησίμων* s.v. *Ἀκμονίδης* (where Charon is also called Acmonides). Bekker, *Anecdota Graeca* I p. 367. 12. Hesychius s.v. *Ἀκμονίδης*. Photius *Λέξεων συναγωγὴ* s.v. *Ἀκμονίδης* I p. 84 No. 774 Theodoridis. Eustathius, *Scholia ad Iliadem* p. 1154. 25. Antimachus Fr. 44 Wyss. Simmias, *Πτέρυγες* 1 (= *Anthologia Palatina* XV 24. 1). Cornutus, *Ἐπιδρομὴ τῶν κατὰ τὴν ἑλληνικὴν θεολογίαν παραδεδομένων* 1, p. 2. 6 Lang. Probably the view was first to be found in the *Τιτανομαχία* of the Epic Cycle Fr. 2 Bernabè (*Anecdota Oxoniensia* I, 75. 11 Cramer) with Aether as Acmon, that is untiring, at the beginning of things. (Cf. Callimachus, *Hymn. in Dianam* 146: Ἡρακλῆς Τιρύνθιος ἄκμων). A verse ascribed to Hesiod (Fr. 389 Merkelbach and West) posits Earth as Acmon's mother and Acmon as Sky's father. It is uncertain whether Alcan identified Acmon with the Sky (cf. also Hesychius s.v. Ἄκμων. Eustathius 1154. 24: Ἀκμονίδαι οἱ Οὐρανίδαι) or considered the latter to be the former's son (Fr. 111 Bergk=61 Davies).
47. Alcman's Cosmogony may be related to the following equation: πόρος Ὠκεανοῦ ≈ Ὠκεανός ≈ Ἀήρ. From primordial Chaos there sprang (a) a force ordering and determining everything, (b) πρέσγυς (= πρεσβύτης, old man) Πόρος and (c) Τέκμωρ. Τέκμαρ and τέκμωρ (or πείραρ) in Homeric and ancient usage signify limit, boundary, term, end, consummation, solution. Cf. e.g. Hesiod Fr. 273 (from *Melampodia*) Merkelbach and West, which is found in identical form in Musaeus fragments (2 B 7 DK): δειλῶν τε καὶ ἐσθλῶν τέκμαρ ἐναργές (dividing line). In cosmogonic contexts τέκμωρ is the limit that demarcates the World from the massive Indeterminacy that surrounds it. Πόρος is therefore what stands in between the limits, the passage, the channel, as in πόρος Ἴονιος (Pindar, *Nemean.* IV, 53); πέλαγος Αἰγαίου πόρου (Euripides, *Helena* 130). Such a cosmic channel is the region of the air. We saw that the beginning of World-formation takes place, according to Apion's Orphic cosmogony, in a way similar to the production of a bubble or vesicle inside a whirling liquid. This might in fact be the Scholiast's interpretation of Alcman's Poros. The interpretation, however, is late. Alcman's Poros is in truth the first steadfast basis within the Abyss of

Waters, in the pre-eternal Chaos of Indeterminacy (analogous to the crossing, ford (πόρος) of a river), maybe earth itself as it emerges and assumes form from the waters (by condensation of the slime of primordial liquidity). Finally, the plastic, formative principle is called Θέτις (She who sets and determines), equivalent in all likelihood with Αἶσα (the fate (μοῖρα, lot, part) and portion of destiny belonging to each thing). Alcman's cosmogony is preserved in a scholium on a poem of his (possibly a maiden-song), 5 Fr. 2 col. iii Davies:

(v. 3) ... ἐκ δὲ τῷ π[ρέσγυς Πόρος τέκμωρ
 (v. 7) ὡς γὰρ ἤρξατο ἡ ὕλη κατασκευ[ασθῆναι
 ἐγένετο πόρος τις οἰονεὶ ἀρχή· λ[έγει
 οὖν ὁ Ἀλκμᾶν τὴν ὕλην πάν[των τετα-
 ραγμένην καὶ ἀπόητον· εἶτα [γενέ-
 σθαι τινὰ φησιν τὸν κατασκευά[ζοντα
 πάντα, εἶτα γενέσθαι [πό]ρον, τοῦ [δὲ πό-
 ρου παρελθόντος ἐπακολουθῆ[σαι] τέ-
 κμωρ· καὶ ἔστιν ὁ μὲν πόρος οἶον ἀρχή, τὸ δὲ τέ-
 κμωρ οἰονεὶ τέλος, τῆς Θέτιδος γενο-
 μένης ἀρχῆ καὶ τέ[λο]ς ταῦ]τα πάντων ἐ-
 γένε[τ]λο, καὶ τὰ μὲν πάντα [ὁμο]ίαν ἔχει
 τὴν φύσιν τῇ τοῦ χαλκοῦ ὕλη, ἡ δὲ
 Θέτις τ[ῆ] τοῦ τεχνίτου, ὁ δὲ πόρος καὶ τὸ τέ-
 κμωρ τῇ ἀρχῇ καὶ τῷ τέλει, πρέσγ[υς
 δὲ ἀντὶ τοῦ πρεσβύτης.

Cf. Fr. 1. 13-4:

τέκμωρ (στ Πείραρ) Αἶσα πάντων
 καὶ Πόρος] γεραιτάτοι
 σιῶν]

complemented by Blass; but Poros is of course mentioned in the passage since the Scholiast *ad loc.* (p. 31 Davies) observes: ὅτι τὸν Πόρον εἴρηκε τὸν αὐτὸν τῷ ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἡσιόδου μεμυθολογημένῳ Χάει. Poros, however, corresponds not to Chaos but rather to Hesiod's Earth, and in any case to a passage/channel crossing, ford inside Chaos. The Chaos is reflected rather on the πάντα of the Scholiast above, which he interprets as matter. This sounds like a prefiguration of the Anaxagorean πάντα ὁμοῦ πράγματα. So that we have in the beginning the chaotic mass of indefiniteness (ἀπειρία,

χάος) i.e. the πάντα, which is unformed (ἀποίητος) and in a state of absolute convulsion (τεταραγμένη). As soon as the ordering principle (Θέτις, the Stabiliser, the Seter, One who sets and posits, τίθημι) emerges, a firm base and way (πόρος) of definition within the chaos - πάντα is established and reality is articulated by the realization of boundaries (τέκμωρ). So Chaos and Πόρος cannot correspond cosmogonically in variant derivations of reality. But the Scholiast above may have considered Chaos to be the Yawning Gap within Indeterminacy, the Space available for the existence of determinate things, Air itself (for the proto-logicomylthical frame of mind the vacuum has physical existence, space is the air).

48. Proclus (*Commentaria ad Timaeum* 40e III, 186 Diehl = OF 117) combines the two traditions in Neoplatonic fashion. Tethys to the extent that she is Earth by participation (since she progresses from earth) brings Phorcys into being; the Ocean to the extent that he is Sea by causality (since he is the source of sea) brings Phorcys into being. Hence Phorcys is born both by the couple of Earth and Sea in essence and by the couple of Tethys and Ocean, by participation in his primary mother (Earth) of his secondary mother, and by causality of his primary father (Sea) to his secondary father. But even in this way no full accord is achieved: the Sea is not produced by the Ocean in Hesiod, but is ontologically superior to him (*Theogony* 131-2). The idea of the Ocean as source of all rivers, seas, fountains and wells is Homeric (*Ilias* Φ 195-199. Cf. Proclus in OF 116). And this fits well with the supreme position of the Ocean in the early Orphic system.
49. A tricky solution has been proposed which associates ἀλὸς ἀτρυγέτιο μέδοντος with the following ἐν σπέσσι γλαφυροῖσι and punctuates the passage as follows, α 71-3:

Θόωσα δέ μιν τέκε νύμφη
 Φόρκυος θυγάτηρ, ἀλὸς ἀτρυγέτιο μέδοντος
 ἐν σπέσσι γλαφυροῖσι Ποσειδάωνι μιγείσα.

The suggested meaning is therefore this: Phorcys' daughter who copulated with Poseidon in the caves of the marine king, that is of Poseidon (Scholia ad *Odysseam* α 72: Μέδοντος ἐν σπέσσι, ἦτοι τοῦ Ποσειδῶνος. ἦτοι ὄντινα ἔτεκεν ἐν σπέσσι τοῦ μέδοντος τῆς ἀλὸς τῆς ἀτρυγέτου ἦτοι τοῦ Ποσειδῶνος ... ἢ συναπτέον, μέδοντος ἐν σπέσσι, ὥστε καὶ ἐν σπηλαίοις τοῦ Ποσειδῶνος γεννηθῆναι τὸν Κύκλωπα). But the endeavour is impossible; both because the syntax is rough, hard, unsuitable and cold (she copulated with Poseidon in the caves of the sea's king who is Poseidon); and because, as the scholia ad *Od.* ν, 96 observe, Phorcys is truly a sea god

(ἄλιος γέρων): it has been clearly shown that θαλάσσιος θεὸς ὁ Φόρκυς. Κακῶς ὁ Ἀριστοφάνης ἔγραφεν ἐκεῖ (sc. in *a*, 72) “Φόρκυος θυγάτηρ, ἀλλὸς ἀτρυγέτιο μέδοντος”. ἀντὶ γὰρ τοῦ “μέδοντι” (to be thus emended instead of the transmitted μέδοντος), φησὶν ἴν’ ἢ ἐπὶ τοῦ Ποσειδάωνος, καὶ συνάπτεται τῷ ἐξῆς. Aristophanes therefore, more articulately, considered μέδοντος to stand in place of μέδοντι once two different syntactic constructions merged together: (i) *μιγείσα Ποσειδάωνι ἐν σπέσσι γλαφυροῖσι μέδοντος ἀλλὸς ἀτρυγέτιο* and (ii) *μιγείσα Ποσειδάωνι μέδοντι ἀλλὸς ἀτρυγέτιο ἐν σπέσσι γλαφυροῖσι*. In the former case the word μέδοντος refers to the master of the caves, whereas in the later case the word μέδοντι refers to Poseidon. A trick as useless as the simplistic preceding one. The scholia ad *a* 72 provide an alternative escape from this underwater rock: (they interpret μέδοντος) *βασιλεύοντος, δηλονότι τοῦ Φόρκυος, συνήθως γὰρ καὶ τοὺς ὑπάρχους βασιλεῖς ἔλεγον*. But Phorcys is not a subordinate commander, a lieutenant of Poseidon: he is ὁ παλαιὸς κράτωρ τοῦ πόντου.

50. His authority was great and was even compared with Cronos’ own. Proclus, *Commentaria in Timaeum* 40e (III 189. 10): *ἐκείνο μὴν γινώσκειν ἄξιον, ὡς οὐ προσῆκεν ἀμφιβολογεῖσθαι περὶ τῆς ἐν αὐτοῖς τάξεως, πότερον ὁ Κρόνος ἐστὶν ὑπέρτερος ἢ ὁ Φόρκυς. ἔνωσις γὰρ αὐτῶν ἐστι καὶ ὁμοιότης* (sc. among all Titans).
51. By contrast, the Night particularly loves and nurtures and cares for Cronos, of all Titans, OF 129:

ἐκ πάντων δὲ Κρόνον Νύξ ἔτρεφεν ἠδ’ ἀτίταλλεν.

According to Rhapsodic Orphism, the Night is procreator of Heaven and Earth (OF 109), but is removed away from the very First Principle, Time, since Aether and Chaos, the Egg and the triple hypostasis of Phanes-Ericepaeus-Metis stand in between. Of course, *σκοτώεσσα ὁμίχλη* (OF 67) and *ἀζήχες σκότος* (OF 66 p. 148) and *σκότος τὸ ἀρχαιότατον* (OF 136) are innate in Chaos. The fact that in the Orphic Rhapsodies Night is distinguished from aboriginal Darkness and is regarded as ontologically posterior proves the syncretism of the Rhapsodic Theogony. Archaic Orphism started with the Night which surely functioned like the Hesiodic Chaos. Hesiod’s Night derives from Chaos but is not organically involved in the main axes of ontological progressions. Night on her own, alone, gave birth with no previous copulation to the dark powers of Fate, Diseases, Old-Age, Death, Revenge, Hostility, Pain, Injustice, Oath. In conjugation with Erebus that sprang from Chaos together with her, she gave birth to Aether and Day. Apparently what lies underneath is the model of the two

hemispheres of the world, the one being bright (full of fire) and the other dark (full of air), as it is articulated by Empedocles A 30 and 56 DK. Night is the airy hemisphere which is periodically illuminated by reflection from the empyreal hemisphere upon the Earth; the reflection is projected as Sun and constitutes Day; periodicity depends on the inclination of the poles and of the axis of cosmic revolution. In Hesiod the pattern is more elementary: Erebus is the Tartarean Darkness below the Earth, from which Night comes and covers the luminous Aether of the upper boundaries of the World. (The Night dwells in Erebus; Euripides, *Orestes* 174-6. Varro regards her as daughter of Erebus (Festus, *de verborum significatione* V, s.v. Erebum where a verse is also quoted: *Erebo creata fuscis crinibus Nox, te invoco*. She is called Nox Erebeis, *Culex* 202. A standing characteristic expression is *Νύξ ἑρεβενή* *Ilias* Θ 488, *Opera et Dies* 17 etc.). The water of Styx springs from the Ocean and flows under the earth passing through Night, that is to say through the lowest Tartarean place, *Theogony* 785 sqq.:

ὕδωρ
 ψυχρόν, ὃ τ' ἐκ πέτρης καταλείβεται ἡλιβάτοιο
 ὑψηλῆς, πολλὸν δὲ ὑπὸ χθονὸς εὐρυοδείης
 ἐξ ἱεροῦ ποταμοῦ ρέει διὰ νύκτα μέλαιναν
 Ὠκεανοῦ κέρας· δεκάτη δ' ἐπὶ μοῖρα δέδασται.

The Orphic Rhapsodies agree with the relatively subdued position of Night in Hesiod's ontological pyramid, but they link her organically with the sole chain of succession that Orphism accepts, as one of its main rings. They regard the Hesiodic Chaos as equivalent to primordial Darkness but they also subordinate it to Time and exempt it from the progressional line of reality. The cosmic Egg is engendered by Chronos = Time in Aether OF 70; cf. supra on birth-in. The First-Born=Phaethon=Phanes (who flew upwards after breaking the Egg to the Aether and the aerial Gap, OF 72) is considered to be the son only of Aether, OF 73-74, cf. 75. Chaos encompasses the World but is not essentially involved in the World's genetic constitution, nor has it any well-defined cosmogonic role, but only a precise cosmological position, cf. Hesiod, *Theogony* 807 sqq. esp. 814.

52. Housman's emendation of the manuscript reading *astra*. The Great Bear does not set (does not sink into the Ocean) in the situation of the present World-Order. Repetent is Rutgers emendation of *repetens*.
53. After v. 829 there is a lacuna in the text's tradition. The famous and controversial codex Carrionis (C), now lost, had the following complement in the margin:

Iuppiter et primae velit omnia reddere massae.

But this is not a particularly convincing addition. As we have analysed above, the revolution of the World distinguishes things, it does not confuse them. That is why the emendation *solvere* has been suggested in v. 829. But the dissolution of some mass or heap (*moles*, *massa*) indicates distinction, not confusion, of parts; and this is how it is used, Ovid, *Fasti* I 106-8. It is the constitution of the World, not its mass, that is dissolved at the end of Time. Cf. e.g. the already cited passage Lucanus, *Bellum Civile* I, 72-4. See also below Silius passage: *compagne soluta*. And Claudianus, *Raptus Prosperinae* I, 115-6: *compagne soluta / fulgidus umbroso miscebitur axis Averno*. Heaven as articulated hypostasis is dissolved in chaotic Tartarus, Virgil, *Aeneis* XII, 204: *coelumque in Tartara solvat*. In similar manner but more articulately Silius Italicus with the use of *compages* (*compago* = make compact, solidify), *Punicorum* XVII, 606-7: *Caelum licet omne soluta / in caput hoc compagne ruat*. Heaven falls when the entire constitution of the World is dissolved. Prudentius, *Cathemerinon* XI, 107-8: *Et scissus axis cardinem / Mundi ruentis solverit*. (The World's axis is broken and the polar seat and cardinal base of its revolution is dissolved). His formulation in *Hamartigenia* 505-6 is looser: *ex elementis / cuncta solubilibus fluxoque creamine constant*: the elements and parts of the World are dissolved as the entire creature is fundamentally fluid and in flux. In the exact use of the idea what is always expressed is the dissolution of an articulated whole or synthesis, of the cosmic ordered system. Seneca, *Epistulae Morales* IX, 16: *Qualis est Jovis, cum resoluta mundo et diis in unum confusis paulisper cessante natura adquiescit sibi cogitationibus suis traditus*. He refers to the Stoic conflagration at the end of Time when Zeus dissolves and reduces everything into himself. This is described in more detail in *De Beneficiis* VI, 22, where the parts of the world are said to be released from the present World-Order and to merge into an indiscriminate mass: *ex tanta varietate solvantur, atque eant in unum omnia*. Manilius (Burman had already compared this passage) uses the same expression (as the suggested *solvere molem* for our Flaccian passage) *Astronomicum* I, 718, in the first explanation of the Milky Way that he offers (namely that it represents the beginning for Sky's split into two halves):

num se diductis conetur solvere moles
 segminibus, raraque labent compagine rimae
 admonitantque novum laxato tegmine lumen.

events concerning himself, while in VI, 16 he details the conditions and circumstances that led to the death of his uncle Plinius who had wanted to satisfy his scientific curiosity in observing the phenomenon and studying its causes at close hand.

55. The problematic of world creation from the viewpoint of advanced Pythagoreanism and in relation to the newly emerged tendency is most clearly exhibited in Plato's *Timaeus*.