



CHAPTER 11

THE PHALLIC HELIOS OF THE DERVENI PAPYRUS AND THE ORIGIN OF GREEK SOLAR THEOLOGY

The philosophical commentary on Orphic Theogony in the Derveni papyrus expounds a monistic cosmogony, whose consecutive stages interpret the divine successions. At each phase in the unitary process of World-development nothing new is generated, but there is only some rearrangement of what preexists, which, by receiving a fresh name, appears to the non-philosophical as a novel entity(*). XVI 7-8: ἐν τούτοις σημαίνει ὅτι τὰ ὄντα ὑπῆρχεν αἰεί, τὰ δὲ νῦν ἔόντα ἐκ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων γίνεται. XVII 1-6: Πρότερον ἦν πρὶν ὀνομασθῆναι· ἔπειτα ὀνομάσθη· ἦν γὰρ καὶ πρόσθεν ἔων ἢ τὰ νῦν ἔόντα συσταθῆναι ἀἴρ καὶ ἔσται αἰεί· οὐ γὰρ ἐγένετο ἀλλὰ ἦν... γενέσθαι δὲ ἐνομίσθη ἐπεὶ τ' ὀνομάσθη Ζεὺς, ὡς περὶ πρότερον μὴ ἔων. XVII 9-12: πρὶν μὲν γὰρ κληθῆναι Ζῆνα, ἦν Μοῖρα φρόνησις τοῦ θεοῦ αἰεί τε καὶ διὰ παντός· ἐπεὶ δ' ἐκλήθη Ζεὺς, γενέσθαι αὐτὸν ἐνομίσθη, ὄντα μὲν καὶ πρόσθεν, ὀνομαζόμενον δ' οὐ etc. And very clearly, XXI, 13-4: ἦν μὲν γὰρ καὶ πρόσθεν (sc. τὰ ὄντα), ὀνομάσθη (ἐνομίσθη Janko) δὲ γενέσθαι ἐπεὶ διεκρίθη. ("Things existed before as well [i.e. they existed always, even before they are thought to come into being], but they have been called to become [i.e. they have been named as existing entities, as entities having come into being] when they have been segregated [from the airy mixture of everything]"). Janko's emendation gives a text capitulating on the φύσις-νόμος distinction. Things appeared to come into being, when they were distinguished. *Becoming is really, as will be seen, the segregation from*

the universal mixture of similar homoiomerics into separate substances.

The Ur-Substance is air or what will be more appropriately called so at a later stage of the cosmic formation. In it there are right from the beginning the seeds of all things, *πάντα χρήματα*. XVIII 1-2: *καὶ τᾶλλα πάντα εἶναι ἐν τῷ ἀέρι πνεῦμα ἔόν.* XVII, 6-9: *καὶ ὕστατον ἔφησεν ἔσεσθαι τοῦτον* (sc. τὸν ἀέρα), *ἐπεὶ τ' ὠνομάσθη Ζεὺς καὶ τοῦτο αὐτῷ διατελεῖ ὄνομα ὄν, μέχρι εἰς τὸ αὐτὸ εἶδος τὰ νῦν ἔόντα συνεστάθη* (συσταθῆ Janko followed by Betegh, to no advantage), *ἐν ᾧ περ πρόσθεν ἔόντα ἤωρεῖτο.* (Cf. XXV, 1 sqq.). Things that, in the original cosmological stage, were dispersed through and floating in the air, now, at the present cosmological state, have been consolidated as separate entities still existing in the air. Only now (the primaeval) air is called Zeus. Even in the present state of the World (*τὰ νῦν ἔόντα*), minute particles of resplendent heat and of cold brilliance are interspersed into the air according to the necessary cosmic law: XXV, 7-8: *αἰωρεῖται δ' αὐτῶν ἕκαστα ἐν ἀνάγκῃ, ὡς ἂν μὴ συνίη πρὸς ἄλληλα* etc. The Law is inherent in the primal substance, embedded in the seeds of all things floating in the air. Notice that in the proto-Orphic Epic Poem there was entertained the notion of the soul entering the body from the environment in the process of respiration, being borne upon the winds (Aristotle, *De Anima*, 410b 28-30). The view of the air being full of souls was also held by the Pythagoreans (cf. Diogenes Laertius VIII 32), some of whom identified them with the motes floating in the air (*τὰ ἐν τῷ ἀέρι ξύσματα*) as principles of incessant movement (*De Anima* 404a16). The idea is exactly paralleled by XXV, 3 sqq.: *ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἄλλα νῦν ἐν τῷ ἀέρι ἐκὰς ἀλλήλων αἰωρούμεν'* (particles from which the Sun and the Moon are congregated respectively), *ἀλλὰ τῆς μὲν ἡμέρας ἀδηλ' ἔστιν ὑπὸ τοῦ ἡλίου ἐπικρατούμενα, τῆς δὲ νυκτὸς ἔόντα δηλὰ ἔστιν, ἐπικρατεῖται δὲ διὰ σμικρότητα. Αἰωρεῖται δ' αὐτῶν ἕκαστα ἐν ἀνάγκῃ* etc. The Derveni Commentator universally applies the doctrine which is specifically attested for psychic entities: *it is clear that we have to do with a particle theory without vacuum, i.e. the Empedoclean - Anaxagorean type as against the Atomistic one.* In fact the doctrine is definitely Anaxagorean: there is no reduction of existence to the four *ριζώματα* in various proportions of mixture. Rather, all forms of

being in the obtaining World-*Διακόσμησις* (τὰ νῦν ἔοντα) preexisted floating in the aboriginal Air just as they are now contained and circumscribed, even defined, by it. XVII, 6 sqq.: καὶ ὕστατον ἔφησεν ἔσεσθαι τοῦτον (sc. τὸν ἀέρα), ἐπεὶ τ' ὠνομάσθη Ζεὺς, καὶ τοῦτο αὐτῷ διατελεῖ ὄνομα ὃν μέχρι εἰς τὸ αὐτὸ εἶδος τὰ νῦν ἔοντα συνεστάθη, ἐν ᾧ περ πρόσθεν ἔοντα ἡωρεῖτο. τὰ δὲ ὄντα [δηλοῖ] γενέσθαι τοιαῦτα διὰ τοῦτον, καὶ γενόμενα εἶναι] ἐν τούτῳ π[άντα. ση]μαίνει δ' ἐν τοῖς ἔπεσι το[ῖσδε.]

Ζεὺς κεφαλή, Ζεὺς μέσσα, Διὸς δ' ἐκ πάντα τέτυκται.

All forms of being exist in the air as vital spirit: (XVIII, 1-2): καὶ τὰλλα πάντα εἶναι ἐν τῷ ἀέρι πνεῦμα ἔόν. This spirit is the Orphic Fate; (2-3): τοῦτ' οὖν τὸ πνεῦμα Ὀρφεὺς ὠνόμασεν *Μοῖραν*. It prefigures whatever is bound to subsist in the present World-Order; it constitutes cosmic Necessity, the Orphic *Ἀνάγκη* (VIII, 13; XXV, 7: αἰωρεῖται δ' αὐτῶν ἕκαστα ἐν ἀνάγκῃ). This Fatal Necessity is the Reason of the World, divine intelligence; XVIII, 6 sqq.: Ὀρφεὺς γὰρ τὴν φρόνησιν *Μοῖραν* ἐκάλεσεν· ἐφαίνετο γὰρ αὐτῷ τοῦτο προσφερέστατον εἶναι ἐξ ὧν ἅπαντες ἄνθρωποι ὠνόμασαν. Πρὶν μὲν γὰρ κληθῆναι Ζῆνα, ἦν *Μοῖρα* φρόνησις τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀεὶ τε καὶ διὰ παντός· ἐπεὶ δ' ἐκλήθη Ζεὺς, γενέσθαι αὐτὸν ἐνομίσθη, ὄντα μὲν καὶ πρόσθεν, ὀνομαζόμενον δ' οὐπω. διὰ τοῦτο λέγει Ζεὺς πρῶτος ἐγένετο etc. XIX, 4-7: “*Μοῖραν*” δ' “ἐπικλῶσαι” λέγοντες τοῦ Διὸς τὴν φρόνησιν ἐπικυρῶσαι λέγουσιν τὰ ἔοντα καὶ τὰ γινόμενα καὶ τὰ μέλλοντα, ὅπως χρὴ γενέσθαι τε καὶ εἶναι καὶ παύσασθαι.

Air, Homoiomerics and Intelligence all at once: it is un-Anaxagorean in the virtual identity of Intelligence with the Initial Mixture conceived as the Air principle. This combination points to Archelaean influence (Cf. A4§1; A10 and A5). However, we shall notice that the mind in the Commentary is the Sun, whereas the intelligence itself is the primal air. Furthermore, the Sun is an entity unmixed with all else, satisfying the Anaxagorean condition. The *syncretism* of the Commentator is evident. In any case, all forms of things, all beings existed always, and what is now existing comes from that eternal pool of being; XVI, 7-8: ἐν τούτοις σημαίνει ὅτι τὰ ὄντα ὑπῆρχεν ἀεὶ, τὰ δὲ νῦν ἔοντα ἐκ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων γίνεται. The

process of generation consists in the distinction and separation of what preexisted in a state of mixture; XV, 2: χωρισθέντα διαστήναι δίχ' ἀλλήλων τὰ ἔόντα.

Significantly, the Commentator utilizes a Parmenidean device to cope with the problem of a distinctly defined multiplicity out of an original unity. (Although his primaeval unity does not coincide with the Parmenidean oneness of being). Basically, the tendency is to suppose a *nominalistic* pluralism: things are said to come into being (and thus to exist as separate entities according to the Commentator's cosmogony) when they are given distinct *names*. Analogously, Parmenides declares that the common dualism which he fundamentally combats is nominal; 28DK B8.53:

μορφὰς γὰρ κατέθεντο δύο γνώμας ὀνομάζειν

and similarly B9.1:

αὐτὰρ ἐπειδὴ πάντα φάος καὶ νύξ ὀνόμασται etc.

(It is not accidental that Parmenides also emphasised *Necessity* (Ἀνάγκη) as the supreme cosmic law of existence, both absolute (B8.30) and in the world of appearance (B10.6). This Necessity is identical with the *Fate* (Μοῖρα) of reality (B8.37), and also with divine *Justice* (Δίκη), as in B8.14). However, the Commentator is not committed to the Eleatic difficulties: his theory involves a *real* cosmogonical process.

Thus the process of World-creation is effected through the agency of the *Sun*, and it is in this way that the Commentator interprets the Orphic swallowing of Protogonos by Zeus at the beginning of the actual World-formation. XIII, 4-11: “αἰδοῖον κατέπινεν, ὃς αἰθέρα ἔχθορε πρῶτος”. ὅτι μὲν πᾶσαν τὴν πόησιν περὶ τῶν πραγμάτων αἰνίζεται καθ' ἔπος ἕκαστον ἀνάγκη λέγειν (Αἰνιγμός as the principle of symbolic-allegorical interpretation universally applied to the Orphic text). ἐν τοῖς αἰδοίοις ὄρων τὴν γένεσιν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους νομίζοντας εἶναι, τούτῳ ἐχρήσατο, ἄνευ δὲ τῶν αἰδοίων οὐ γίνεσθαι, αἰδοίῳ εἰκάσας τὸν ἥλιον· ἄνευ γὰρ τοῦ ἡλίου τὰ ὄντα τοιαῦτα οὐχ οἶδόν τε γίνεσθαι etc. The appropriateness or otherwise of the philosophic commentator's acceptance of “αἰδοῖον” in the Orphic

verse as signifying the virile pudendum (as against the general sense of reverend, awesome) is another question. The philosophical point is the postulation of a *solar* Creator. The Sun is made by God in order for the World as we know it to take form; the Sun is the real Creator of the present World-state, of ἡ νῦν διακόσμησις; XXV, 9-12: τὰ νῦν ἑόντα ὁ θεὸς εἰ μὴ ἤθελεν εἶναι, οὐκ ἂν ἐπόησεν Ἡλίον. ἐποίησε δὲ τοιοῦτον καὶ τοσοῦτον γινόμενον οἶος (or rather οἶον¹) ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ λόγου διηγείται. Further, the cosmic Mind is just the Sun under its creative aspect; XVI, 9 sqq.: δηλοῖ αὐτὸν τὸν Νοῦν πάντων ἄξιον εἶναι μόνον ἑόντα ὡσπερὶ μηδὲν τᾶλλα εἶη· οὐ γὰρ οἶόν τε ταῦτα εἶναι τοιαῦτα ὄντα (τὰ ὑπάρχοντα erroneously Janko, conf. 2 and 8; but τὰ ὑπάρχοντα are things in the beginning) ἄνευ τοῦ Νοῦ². This distinction between God as Ur-Principle and Sun as Mind and Creator of the existing Universal order, especially as Creator at one remove from God the divine fountain of existence, as Agent through which the World is formed (δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο), is pregnant with potent significance and far-reaching consequences. But what is important here is to notice that again there obtains a remarkable structural parallelism to Archelaus' doctrine, according to which the aerial divine Mind as Ur-substance is not in itself the creator, a function which he rather allotted to cosmic Warmth; A12: Ἀρχέλαος ἀέρα καὶ νοῦν τὸν θεόν, οὐ μέντοι κοσμοποιόν. A14: Ἀρχέλαος ὑπὸ θερμοῦ καὶ ἐμφυχίας συστήναι τὸν κόσμον. The principle of warmth is in Archelaus also the psychic principle: the world was constituted ὑπὸ θερμοῦ καὶ ἐμφυχίας (i.e. by the fact that the totality of existence is ensouled, contains the psychic principle). Naturally warmth, movement and soul go together. As to the implied doxographical distinction between mind (νοῦς) and soul (ψυχή), it is better to assume at that early stage, and in Archelaus, a distinction between soul-mind on the one hand and intelligence on the other. And so in the Commentator's theory.

The prerequisite for Creation is therefore the emergence of the Sun out of the aboriginal Ur-Substance, out of the airy intelligence (or rather the intelligent air) containing all forms and seeds of being (homoiomeries) in mutual interpenetration, i.e. as tiny particles. (XXI, 2: ὅτι ἐν τῷ ἀέρι κατὰ μικρὰ μεμερισμένα, sc. τὰ ὄντα, etc.). The bright and fiery particles minutely divided and dispersed throughout

the original Air-Mixture are separated from the rest and collected together (most of them) so as to constitute the heliacal substance in the middle of the Universal ladder from Earth to Heaven. XV, 3-4: *χωριζομένου γὰρ τοῦ ἡλίου καὶ ἀπολαμβανομένου ἐν μέσῳ* etc. A portion of the glowing warmth has remained in the World down here, distinct from its all-potent solar congregation, bound in Cosmic Necessity; XXV, 8-9: *αἰωρεῖται δ' αὐτῶν ἕκαστα ἐν ἀνάγκῃ, ὡς ἂν μὴ συνίη πρὸς ἄλληλα· εἰ γὰρ μὴ, συνέλθοι ἂν ἄλεια* (cf. Hesychius s.v. *ἀλείον ὕδωρ· ἀθροιστὸν καὶ συλλεκτόν*) ὅσα τὴν αὐτὴν δύναμιν ἔχει, ἐξ ὧν ὁ ἥλιος συνεστάθη. The natural tendency of things possessing the same essence and potency is to coalesce; intelligent (cf. *φρόνησις*) and fatal (cf. *μοῖρα*) necessity (and, thus, violence of sorts) can only keep them apart.

So long as the fiery essence is intermixed with all other forms of being, it keeps the entire Universe and all its homoiomerics in a perpetual state of agitation (“shaking”), which does not permit the growth of stable formations. All forms of being are divided in minute particles, each tiny bit surrounded by others of all kinds of existence, all immersed in the aerial Ocean (cf. XXIII, 2-3: *τοῖς δὲ ὀρθῶς γινώσκουσι εὐδῆλον ὅτι Ὠκεανός ἐστιν ὁ ἀήρ*. V. Hesychius s. v. *Ὠκεανός; Ὠκεανοῖο πόρον*) full of disunited homoiomerics, of all kinds of existing corpuscles. When heat is to a great extent removed from the World by being concentrated chiefly in a principal part of it (sc. in the Sun), when the fire equally diffused throughout the universal body is mostly condensed at a single place, the rest of being can solidify according to its varied nature, similar congealing with similar and homoiomerics possessing continuous substance. This freezing is a binding which makes the forms of being amenable to the determinations of the divine airy intelligence and its decrees of destiny. Thus specific being is mastered by Air as absolute being. This pliancy of things renders possible the creative intermixture of different forms resulting in the formation of compound entities with complex structure and function. IX, 5-10: *γινώσκων, (sc. Orpheus) οὖν τὸ πῦρ συμμειγμένον τοῖς ἄλλοις ὅτι ταρασσοὶ καὶ κωλύοι τὰ ὄντα συνίστασθαι διὰ τὴν θάλψιν, ἐξήλλαξεν* (sc. the fire, i.e. assumed a change from the Cronian condition to the Jovial one), *ὥστε ἱκανόν ἐστιν ἐξαλλαχθὲν μὴ κωλύειν τὰ ὄντα συμπαγῆναι· ὅσα δ' ἂν ἀφθῆ ἐπικρατεῖται· ἐπικρατηθὲν δὲ μίσγεται τοῖς ἄλλοις*³.

It is in the explained cosmogonical sense that the Commentator interprets the Orphic verses (VIII 4-5):

Ζεὺς μὲν ἐπεὶ δὴ πατρὸς ἐοῦ πάρα θέσφατον ἀρχὴν
ἀλκὴν τ' ἐγ χεῖρεσσι ἔλαβεν καὶ δαίμονα κυδρόν,

especially with reference to ἐν χεῖρεσσι ἔλαβεν, took into his hands, held sway over things now stabilized, essentialized, rendered manageable and tractable, capable of entering into harmonious combinations and compositions. Such commingling has nothing to do with the original interfusion of all existence, where every form of being is dilacerated into homoiomeric particles separated from each other by a conglomeration of molecules belonging to all other forms of being. *The initial condition is macroscopically homogeneous and microscopically heterogeneous, while the reverse is the case in principle with appropriate portions of the world-substance in its created state at present.* The point has been made by Aristotle with reference to the Empedoclean application of the Φιλία - Νείκος duality: when Hostility reigns, and each element is separated from the others, precisely then it is brought together to itself; and conversely, with the domination of Friendship the elements coalesce in a perfectly uniform total mixture where each element is separated from itself and diffused through the whole blend. *Metaphysica*, A, 985a21 sqq.: καὶ Ἐμπεδοκλῆς ἐπὶ πλέον μὲν τούτου (sc. Anaxagoras) χρῆται τοῖς αἰτίοις, οὐ μὴν οὔθ' ἰκανῶς, οὔτ' ἐν τούτοις εὐρίσκει τὸ ὁμολογούμενον. πολλαχοῦ γοῦν αὐτῷ ἢ μὲν Φιλία διακρίνει τὸ δὲ Νείκος συγκρίνει. ὅταν μὲν γὰρ εἰς τὰ στοιχεῖα δίστηται τὸ πᾶν ὑπὸ τοῦ Νείκου, τότε τὸ πῦρ εἰς ἓν συγκρίνεται καὶ τῶν ἄλλων στοιχείων ἕκαστον. ὅταν δὲ πάλιν ὑπὸ τῆς Φιλίας συνίωσιν εἰς τὸ ἓν, ἀναγκαῖον ἕξ ἑκάστου τὰ μόρια διακρίνεσθαι πάλιν.

The fire-homoiomery which is collected in the Sun consists of the bright and warm essence. Commenting on the Orphic reference to Πρωτόγονος - Φάνης by the standard expression “ὄς αἰθέρα ἔχθορε πρῶτος” (XIII, 4) the text explains, XIV, 1-2: ἐχθόρη τὸ{ν} λαμπρότατον τε καὶ θερμότατον (rather than λευκότατον as in Merkelbach) χωρισθὲν ἀφ' ἑωυτοῦ (or, better, ἐφ' ἑωυτοῦ; but we miss the preceding context). The verb ἐκθρώσκω, ἐκθορέω or ἐκθόρνημαι, means leap forth, leap out, spring up, but also specifically come out,

fall out of the womb (cf. Homeric Hymn *in Apollinem* 119). From the dark Womb of the Ur-Mixture there is born the Splendour of the World by separation and aggregation of the cosmic bright heat. The rest of the cosmic content is then consolidated (frozen) under the influence of coldness into its diverse forms and kinds, while the creative solar warmth brings things together into harmonious mixtures of organic, differentiated integration. The action of Coldness is implied in the framing and congealment resulting upon the removal of (most of) the heat substance in its dispersed condition from the world body. *Tὸ ψυχρὸν* is explicitly mentioned as existing in a broken context (XXI, 1: οὕτε τὸ ψυχρὸν τῷ ψυχρῷ), where the mixing of beings is further described following their primaeval consolidation.

This is another point of reapproachment with Archelaus. He envisaged two causes of generation and becoming, Heat and Cold (A1 = Diogenes Laertius II 16; A8), the principles of movement and immobility respectively. Their original separation sets the process of World-formation in action; A4§2: εἶναι δ' ἀρχὴν τῆς κινήσεως (sc. cosmic creation) <τὸ ἀποκρίνεσθαι ἀπ' ἀλλήλων τὸ θερμὸν καὶ τὸ ψυχρὸν, καὶ τὸ θερμὸν κινεῖσθαι, τὸ δὲ ψυχρὸν ἡρεμεῖν. The idea of a primaeval secretion of the fundamental antithesis between Warmth and Frigidity from the Ur-substance is Anaximandrian⁴. But Archelaus' doctrine seems to closely parallel the Derveni account in the specific articulation of that idea. Coldness, e.g., accounts for the immobility and congealment of the earth, acting as a consolidating bond on deheated substance. Plutarch, *de Primo Frigido*, XXI, 954F: (earth is the opposite to fire)... ὅθεν οὐ κατὰ χώραν μόνον ἐξ ἔδρας ἀκίνητον οὖσαν αὐτὴν ἀλλὰ κατ' οὐσίαν ἀμετάβλητον, Ἐστίαν, ἅτε δὴ "μένουσαν ἐν θεῶν οἴκῳ" λίγα προσηγόρευσαν οἱ παλαιοί, διὰ τὴν στάσιν καὶ πῆξιν ἧς ἡ ψυχρότης δεσμός ἐστιν, ὡς Ἀρχέλαος ὁ φυσικὸς εἶπεν, οὐδενὸς χαλῶντος αὐτὴν οὐδὲ μαλάττοντος, ἅτε θερομένην καὶ ἀλεινομένην <ἀμετάβλητον> (Diels) οὖσαν. The quotation refers to Plato, *Phaedrus*, 247A: μένει γὰρ Ἐστία ἐν θεῶν οἴκῳ μόνη. - In his edition of Plutarch λίγα is Bernardakis' proposal for the nonsensical manuscript reading κλίτα. He correctly referred to Clemens Alexandrinus, *Stromateis*, V, 45, 2-3 (p. 672 P), where the Pythagorean Androcydes' symbolical explanation of the magical Ἐφέσια γράμματα is reported (Androcydes Fr. 2 in Häk *De acusmatis sive symbolis Pythagoricis*,

1894): *Λίξ τέ ἐστιν ἡ γῆ κατὰ ἀρχαίαν ἐπωνυμίαν*. The meaning of *λίξ* is given by Hesychius s.v. as: *πλάγιος. καὶ λίθος πλατύς*. The former sense (“slanted”) relates to *λίγξ* there. The second is exactly appropriate: broad stone or rock. We are reminded that according to Anaximander the Earth was like a stone column (drum): *λίθω κίου τὴν γῆν προσφερῆ* (B5; cf. A25; A12 §3). The Plutarchean point is thus clarified: the Earth was called *λίξ* (stone) by the ancients, because of its immobility and solidity, *διὰ τὴν στάσιν καὶ πῆξιν*. Archelaus ascribed these properties, the “frozen” character of earth, to the binding force of Coldness which has inherently grasped it: nothing can loosen or mollify the earth, as is shown by the fact that it remains unchangeable even when warmed up or even heated intensively⁵.

As Plutarch emphasizes in the context preceding the passage quoted above (*de primo frigido*, XXI), frigidity essentially entails freezing, consolidation and solidifying: *ψυχροῦ τὸ πηγνύειν* (954A). The Derveni Commentary similarly characterizes the effect on beings of coldness as *συνίστασθαι* (IX, 6), *συμπαγῆναι* (IX, 8), *πήξας* (XV, 4), *συσταθῆναι* (XVII, 2), *συνεστάθη* (XVII, 8), *κατασυνεστάθη* (XXI, 3)⁶. Conversely, fire entails mobility. When it is dispersed throughout the air at the initial state of World-formation, at the beginning of things and the starting point of creation, it shakes all forms of being and prevents their distinct consolidation; IX, 5-7: *τὸ πῦρ ἀναμειγμένον τοῖς ἄλλοις ὅτι ταραύσσοι καὶ κωλύοι τὰ ὄντα συνίστασθαι διὰ τὴν θάλψιν*. When Fire is mostly collected in one main place constituting the Sun, great source of heat and light, it brings beings into collision; (XIV, 4: *διὰ τὸν Ἥλιον κρούεσθαι πρὸς ἄλληλα* (sc. *τὰ ὄντα*)). The collision of homogeneous mixtures of homoiomerics causes disruption of homogeneity, and the beginning of arrangements on the principle not of undifferentiated fusion, but of distinguishable similarity. Thus beings are collocated separately according to distinct forms; XV, 1-2: *κρούειν αὐτὰ πρὸς ἄλληλα καὶ ποίησιν τὸ [πρῶτ]ον χωρισθέντα διαστῆναι δίχ’ ἀλλήλων τὰ ἔοντα*. XV, 8-10: *τὰ ὄντα κρούων πρὸς ἄλληλα διαστήσας ἐποίει τὴν νῦν μετὰστασιν*. In fact the Commentator proposes to derive the etymology of *Κρόνος* from this characteristic effect of the Sun on the Earthly realm: that Earth bore Saturn to the Sun is allegorised as signifying the smiting effect (in itself, and as the cause of clashes and collisions) of solar action (*κρούειν*). XIV, 2 sqq.: *τοῦτον οὖν τὸν Κρό-*

νον γενέσθαι φησὶν ἐκ τοῦ Ἡλίου τῇ Γῆ, ὅτι αἰτίαν ἔσχε διὰ τὸν Ἡλίον κρούεσθαι πρὸς ἄλληλα (sc. τὰ ὄντα). Similarly, that Cronos committed the (in)famously monstrous atrocity against Ouranos means that cosmic Mind struck things, putting them in general collision, thus overturning the previous peculiar state of thoroughly unhomogeneous homogeneity, the initial condition of total blending. XIV, 5 sqq.: διὰ τοῦτο λέγει: “ὄς μέγ’ ἔρεξεν”. τό δ’ ἐπὶ τούτῳ: “Οὐρανὸν Εὐφρονίδην (in place of Οὐρανὸς Εὐφρονίδης), ὃς πρῶτιστος βασιλευσεν”, κρούοντα τὸν Νοῦν πρὸς ἄλληλα Κρόνον ὀνομάσας μέγα ρέξει φησὶ τὸν Οὐρανόν· ἀφαιρεθῆναι γὰρ τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτόν. Unaccountably, Ouranos appears now for the first time in the Orphic poem: he would have been shaped together with Earth from the cosmic Egg at the emergence of Protogonos-Phanes. The Commentator, rather, interprets it as the upper solid boundary of the World, congealed together with Earth which forms the lower limit, when Sun was constituted at the middle of the aerial space at the cosmogonical initia. XV, 3-5: χωριζομένου γὰρ τοῦ ἡλίου καὶ ἀπολαμβανομένου ἐν μέσῳ πῆξας ἴσχει (sc. ὁ Ἡλιος, or rather Zeus - Air) καὶ τᾶνωθε τοῦ Ἡλίου (sc. Heavens) καὶ τὰ κάτωθεν (sc. Earth). The Commentator considers Sun as the real, active principle in the mythical copulation between Heaven and Earth which produced the Titans, and Cronos principal among them, as offspring. Thus Sun substitutes Heaven in that aboriginal cosmogonical event.

The phallic character of Helios in the Commentary is not an isolated symbol. In the Orphic poem in front of him the philosopher found the notion of semen ejaculated from some Principle as the decisive creative moment in World-formation. *Θορνή* (XXI, 1; 6) cannot but mean the same with *θορός*, *θορή*, i.e. *γονή*, male seed (from *θόρνυμαι*, *θρώσκω*). The Principle whose ejaculation gives birth to all variety of well-ordered being in the created World must have been Protogonos - Phanes. His demiurgic semen was precisely the awesome rain that Phanes poured down, OF 84: ὄμβρον ἀθέσφατον καταχεῦναι τὸν Φάνητα⁷. This rain is ἀθέσφατος, unutterable, portentous, aweful. Early Pythagoreanism similarly adopted the idea of seed-secretion to account for the beginning of things (v. *infra* Chapter 12, , esp. pp. 179 sqq.). Pherecydes has already utilized the notion (7A8 DK; cf. A65 p. 45.21; B7), which stems from Anaximander's construal of World-origination as secretion of the

fertile seed of the fundamental opposition Warm-Cold: ἐκ τοῦ αἰδίου γόνιμον θερμοῦ τε καὶ ψυχροῦ κατὰ τὴν γένεσιν τοῦδε τοῦ Κόσμου ἀποκριθῆναι, 12A10 p. 83.34. Primaeval religious experience of creation as sexual action (according to the organic understanding of the World) - cf. Ch. 12, *infra*, *passim* - was formulated in Theogonies (like the Hesiodic), some of which and preeminently the Orphic, proved more apt to instigate logicomythical or logical articulations and more susceptible to naturalistic interpretations (“hylozoism” and allegorism).

The Derveni Commentator interpreted the Phanic-Heliacal semen (θορνῆ) of the Orphic poem physically by reverting to the broader, non-specialized meaning of the verbal root: spring, rush, dart. The Sun, once constituted by the collocated fiery homoiomery collected in one body from its dispersed state, causes intense movement in the remaining, finely divided and mutually distributed particles of all other forms of being which float in the universal Air, that is, what it will be and be known as once the other homoiomerics are similarly collocated in various degrees of distinct homogeneity. This vigorous movement, and the resulting continual collisions, effect the coacervation of homoiomerics in stable, distinct forms of being, with definite preponderating homoiomeric character. It is not that we have mere pure collections of (only) identical (in essential form) substances, like the World-state during the absolute dominion of *Νεῖκος* in the Empedoclean system. But the clashing movement generates formations marked by durable preponderances in the necessary mixtures. This happens because in the grip of the violent agitation exercised by the heat of the Sun, *similar tends to be attached to similar*⁸. The Commentator’s position is well explained in XXII, 1 sqq.: θορνῆ δὲ λέγων (sc. Orpheus) δηλοῖ ὅτι ἐν τῷ ἀέρι κατὰ μικρὰ μεμερισμένα ἐκινεῖτο καὶ ἐθόρνυτο, θορνύμενα δὲ κατασυνεστάθη πρὸς ἀλλήλα. μέχρι δὲ τούτου ἐθόρνυτο, μέχρι ἕκαστον ἦλθεν εἰς τὸ σύνηθες. This σύν-ηθες (of the same habit) is the οἰκείον (proper, familiar, one’s own, conformable in nature) and ὅμοιον (similar). But there is also mixture of other forms (homoiomerics) in these resulting constitutions, yet of forms subordinated to the prevalent character. XIX, 1-2: ἐν ἕκαστον κέκληται ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐπικρατοῦντος.

Solar action ensures the consolidation of things, each with a dominant essentiality. It brings this about by causing incessant

movement in the particles of being, which thus tend to reallocate themselves, similar with similar, instead of being minutely diffused all in all; the reallocation consequent upon the continual clashing effected by solar action, causes the particles of being to create segregated homogeneities by disrupting the original universal homogeneity of the total blending in the Ur-substance. Beings thus become dominated in assuming definite identities (are mastered by Air and the Sun),⁹ and therefore can suffer creative mixture, i.e. combination of predominant with subordinate characters, and can therefore become proper things. In column IX (Fire, when dispersed, hinders the formation of things, but, if removed from the initial total blending, allows beings to be consolidated) 9-10 we read: ὅσα δ' ἂν ἀφθῆ ἐπικρατεῖται, ἐπικρατηθὲν δὲ μίσγεται τοῖς ἄλλοις. Whatever is kindled (is set on fire) is rendered malleable (is dominated) and thus capable of loosing its intransigent individual identity of substantiality and of entering into syntheses and mixtures with other (homoiomeric) characters of substantiality. The doctrine is nicely indicated by an interpretative theocracy and physiocracy; XXI, 5 sqq. (following the passage quoted above): Ἀφροδίτη Οὐρανία καὶ Ζεὺς καὶ Ἀφροδισιάζειν καὶ Θόρνησθαι (ἀφρ. καὶ θόρν. deleted by Merkelbach, wrongly; the author goes on to explain the reason of these various names of the same reality) καὶ Πειθῶ καὶ Ἀρμονία τῷ αὐτῷ θεῷ ὄνομα κείται. ἀνὴρ γυναικὶ μισγόμενος ἀφροδισιάζειν <καὶ θόρνησθαι> λέγεται κατὰ φάτιν. τῶν γὰρ νῦν ἐόντων μιχθέντων ἀλλήλοις Ἀφροδίτη ὠνομάσθη. Πειθῶ δ' ὅτι εἶξεν τὰ ἐόντα ἀλλήλοισιν. εἴκειν δὲ καὶ πείθειν τὸ αὐτό. Ἀρμονία δὲ ὅτι πολλὰ συνήρμοσε τῶν ἐόντων ἐκάστω. ἦν μὲν γὰρ καὶ πρ[ό]σθεν, ὠνομάσθη δὲ γενέσθαι ἐπεὶ διεκρίθη· τὸ δὲ διεκρίθηναι δηλοῖ ὅτ[ι] τ[ὰς] μεί]ξεις ἐδίωκε [καὶ ἐκ]ράτει, ὥστε διεκρίθησαν -. Things (in their essential homoiomeric characters) existed in the original, absolute, universal homogeneity of homogeneous dispersion. When they were separated (διακρίθηναι) from that Ur-Substance, they manifested their essentiality, and in this sense they came into being. The same reality is further called Γῆ and Μήτηρ and Δημήτηρ and Ρέα and Ἥρα and Ἔστια and Δηῶ, according to its various aspects or phases (XXII). This all-inclusive reality, Mother of all distinct World-parts, is the cosmic Νοῦς; XXVI, 1-2: ὅτι Μήτηρ ὁ Νοῦς ἐστὶν τῶν ἄλλων. As it is identical with Zeus (and Hera), it is the Air (cf. XVII, 2-6), *universal Dominator*; XIX, 1-4: [] ἐν

ἕκαστον κέκληται ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐπικρατοῦντος, Ζεὺς πάντα (i.e. the All) κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν λόγον ἐκλήθη· πάντα γὰρ ὁ ἀήρ ἐπικρατεῖ τοσοῦτον ὅσον βούλεται. In the created World order each thing is constituted and called by its dominant character in the mixture in which it consists. Similarly, the Universal All is called Zeus and vice versa, because Air (= Zeus) dominates everything and all. The Commentator presupposes the crucial Orphic fragment OF 21a, at least two verses of which he actually cites in our extant shreds: v. 2 in XVII.12; and v.7 in XIX.10; cf. XVIII.12 for v.1. (To this fragment, preserved in the Peripatetic *De Mundo* 7, 401a25 sqq., Plato, *Leges*, IV, 715e - to which the Scholiast *ad. loc.* p. 379 Hermann explicitly testifies - and, before him, Aeschylus, *Ἡλιάδες*, Fr. 70 Radt seem to allude).

A definite and coherent philosophical system of Ionian physiology underlies the Derveni interpretations. Its cosmogonical steps observe the following sequence.

1) In the beginning there is an Archelaeon *Σφαῖρος*, a completely homogeneous intermixture of all homoiomerics, all forms of being, minutely divided and dispersed as tiny particles throughout the blend. Equally distributed in this Ur-substance are the eminently active molecules of fire; thus a perpetual, general shaking obtains which secures permanent absolute homogeneity by equalizing accidental, momentary anomalies of particle-concentration.

2) Homoiomerics of all kinds of being float in the Air of this Ur-Mixture, like a Blowing and Wind (spirit, *πνεῦμα*). The (apparent) character of that original All-One was airy. Yet the aerial particles did not yet constitute Air (as we know it in the present World-state), since they were not already collocated at such a sufficient quantity as to establish an identity of substance capable of dominating the other being-forms in the mixture. But in that stage of all things together and none distinguishable there was implicit the reason of the articulation in the present obtaining, developed World-Order, and this reason, which resided in the aerial substance, composed the Cosmic Intelligence (*φρόνησις τοῦ θεοῦ*).

3) Fire-substance is collected, from its scattered state, principally in a single entity, the Sun. World-formation begins, and is effected through this demiurgic Protogonos.

4) The Sun-Fire causes intense mobility and a state of continual collision to the other particles. As a result, they tend to coacervate, similar with similar. Air in particular emerges as a distinct vast substance of universal sway. Under this rule beings are mixed with essential character defined by the dominant homoiomery: stable formations (i.e. things) come into existence. The Cosmic Harmony is established.

These cosmogonical stages express, according to the Commentator, the truth of the Orphic divine genealogies.

Thus (1) answers to aboriginal Night (cf. XI, 1-4 and X), the first hypostasis of the early Orphic Theogony, construed as Chaos, i.e. characterless equal mixture of all things together. Night in the original Orphic Poem was *πανομφεύουσα*, all-divining authoress of ominous Word, and *τροφός*, universal nurse (X, 9 and 11). In Rhapsodic Orphic Theogony, Night was called *θεῶν τροφὸς ἀμβροσίη* (OF 106, from Proclus). Merkelbach nicely constructs a hexametre which may well have belonged to original Orphism:

ἦστο πανομφεύουσα θεῶν τροφὸς ἀμβροσίη Νύξ.

For *πανομφεύουσα*, the Commentator easily allegorises universal teacher (of truth); X, 1-10.

A physical interpretation of Night's nursing function is given by the Commentator immediately afterwards; X, 12-13: *τροφ[ὸν δὲ φήσας αὐ]τὴν αἰνί[ζει]ται ὅτι [ἄ]σσα / ὁ ἥλι[ος] θερμαίνων δι[α]λύει (or better ἀν]αλύει) ταῦτα ἢ νύξ ψύ[χουσα / συ[ν]ίστησιν (or συ[μ]πήγνυσιν)... The solvative action of the heat is countered by the coagulating and condensative function of nocturnal coldness, *which confirms things in their concrete identity under their prevailing character*: it feeds their particular essentiality. Such is Night's operation in the evolved cosmic order. For coldness belongs to Night when Fire has been separated from the homogeneous mass of "all things together" by being concentrated on particular spots (and esp. in the Sun), instead of existing in the original state of total dispersion throughout that togetherness. In the initial state of things, the All-Substance was equally warm and cold in all its parts. Coldness is not necessarily implicated into the aboriginal Night. That primaeval, undifferentiated Totality was *Night*, though tepid and indifferent.*

(Just as the original All-One was air, even though it included in homogenous blending all else as well. It was Night and Air because in the present segregated world-state, might and air sustain everything in the last resort).

The precedence of Night over Light is explained in XI, 1-4: [τ]ῆς Νυκτός. ἐξ ἀδύτοι]ο δ' αὐτήν [λέγει] χρῆσαι γνώμην ποιού[με]νος ἄδυτον ε[ἶ]ναι τὸ βάθος τῆς Νυκτός· οὐ γ[ὰρ] δύνει ὤ[σ]περ τὸ φῶς, ἀλλὰ νιν ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ μέ[νο]ν ἀγῆ κατα[λ]αμβάνει. The Orphic passage had Night proclaim a mighty oracle to Zeus (cf. XI.10 οἶ and XI.1 and 3), from the unenterable innermost sanctuary (of existence): ἐξ ἀδύτοιο. The Commentator etymologizes ἄδυτον from δύο, δύνω, to set, and interprets this unsettling parameter of Night as her depth, the profundity of darkness. It is the light that is kindled and extinguished, the Sun and all natural luminaries of heaven that rise and set; Darkness and Night are never kindled nor extinguished, they never rise nor set, but are always there the same in the same place, the underlying root and principle of being, whether illumined by the splendour of light or unenlightened by it.

The Commentator's etymology of ἄδυτον is coupled by his bold equation of the two senses of χρῆσαι (χράω, deliver oracular pronouncements and χράω / κίχρημι, furnish with a thing or the use of a thing, cf. χρῆσις, χρήσιμος); XI, 5-9: χρῆσαι δὲ καὶ ἀρκέσαι ταὐτὸ [δύ]ναται / σκέψασθαι δὲ χρῆ ἐφ' ᾧ κέτα[ι τὸ] ἀρκέσαι / καὶ τὸ χρῆσαι. / χρᾶν τόνδε τὸν θεὸν νομίζον[τες ἔρ]χονται / [π]ευσό-μενοι ἄσσα ποῶσι. So to issue oracles is to provide with, to be strong enough in usefulness, to suffice, to make good and satisfy (χρῆσαι = ἀρκέσαι)¹⁰. And this is why people come to learn about their actions, thinking that this God pronounces oracular responses, i.e. *avails* (χρᾶν)¹¹. This "God" must be Apollo. Is a statue of Apollo to be implied in the room or place of discourse, or is the disquisition being held in an Apollonian Temple or at Delphi (where the seat of divinity belonged to Night before it was seized by Apollo)?

Night emerges as the all-powerful Succourer (χρᾶν), the great Nourisher (τροφός), the master Teacher (πανομφεύουσα) of existence in this World order. *She also is the Unapproachable (ἄδυτον) absolute presupposition of Existence.*

Further, condition (2) in the cosmogonical process represents Fate (Μοῖρα) and Necessity (Ἀνάγκη, Ἀδράστεια). Cf. Orphic

Argonautica, 13: Ἀρχαίου μὲν πρῶτα Χάους ἀμέγαρτον Ἀνάγκην (although the sequel does not correspond to the proto-Orphic structure). This Cosmic Necessity is the uninflexible lawfulness governing all evolution out of the aboriginal Chaos, Chaos' conjugal, steely Rule. In Rhapsodic Orphic Theogony Ἀδράστεια sits in front of Night's cave (OF 105):

παλάμησι δὲ χάλκεα ρόπτρα
δῶκεν Ἀδρηστεία.

The sounding of the cymbals notifies to all existence Night's decrees (*ibid.*). Cf. OF 152. The distinction between Ἀδράστεια, Ἀνάγκη and Εἰμαρμένη - OF 162 - is clearly late. In Derveni Orphism they are identical, as is also divine Intelligence (Φρόνησις) and, consequently, Providence (Πρόνοια). (Cf. *supra*). The full Stoic apparatus is already at work.

Night and Necessity, Chaos and Intelligence, Air and Spirit are the double aspect of the aboriginal reality. What exists initially at the absolute beginning of things is the total and thorough Mixture of everything with everything, a Mixture so perfect that every part of it, however small, contains particles of all homoiomeric natures, of all existing characters of being. All things (natures) are broken down in minute corpuscles and completely interfused. The nature which in the end of the cosmogonical development will appear distinctly as Air may be considered as providing the ontological framework of the original Mixture (that which in a sense keeps it together), while all else will then be taken as existing in it, in the form of a wind blowing, or breath in the air, that is in its spiritual existence. This Air and Spirit is then the Fate and the Intelligence of Existence, preexisting before all evolution of reality and predetermining it.

The Sun in stage (3) interprets Protogonos - Phanes. It is the splendour of Light emerging out of the dark Womb of Night. Probably the consequent solidification, through freezing, of Earth and Heaven at the lower and upper extremities of the Universe, once the heat particles have been assembled at its focal center (cf. XV, 3-5), was a commentary on the formation of the primal pair Heaven-Earth out of the Cosmic Egg laid by Night¹², as in the Aristophanic parody, *Aves*, 695 sqq.:

τίκτει πρώτιστον ὑπηγέμιον Νύξ ἢ μελανόπτερος ὤον,
 ἔξ οὐ περιτελλομένας ὥραις ἔβλασεν Ἔρωσ ὁ ποθεινός,
 στίλβων νῶτον πτερύγιον χρυσαῖν, εἰκὼς ἀνεμῶκεσι δῖναις.

This Orphic Eros is, of course, the Phanes-Protogonos. This is the Light of the World.

With the fixation of Heaven and Earth, the first structure of a differentiated reality is established. In fact the Commentator has probably etymologised *Οὐρανός* so as to highlight such a fixation: *οὐρίζων* (= *ὀρίζων*) *νοῦς*, Intelligence defining and fixative, maintaining also the physical interpretation as horizon. (For *Ἰκεανός* as horizon, v. OF 115; for Ocean as occupying the place of lower Heaven, v. OF 117. For *Οὐρανός* as protective guardianship of the World, from *οὐρεῖν* v. OF 113). Tsantsanoglou's tentative construal of XIV, 11-14 is persuasive as regards the sense required: *ἕκαστ]ον*. (with Merkelbach, better than Tsantsanoglou's *τῶν ἐόντων*. The preceding sentence runs thus: *Κρόνον δὲ ὠνόμασεν ἀπὸ τοῦ / ἔ[ρ]γου αὐτὸν καὶ τὰλλα κατὰ [τὸν αὐτὸν λ]όγον / ἕκαστ]ον*.) *τῶν γὰρ ἀπάντ[ων οὐπω κρουομέ]νων / [ὁ Νοῦς] ὡς ὀρ[ί]ζων φύσιν [τὴν ἐπωνυμίαν ἔσχε]ν / [Οὐρανός]. ἀφαιρ[εῖ]σθαι δ' αὐ[τόν] φησι τὴν βασιλ[είαν] / [κρουο]μένων τ[ῶν] ἐ[ό]ντ[ων]*. So the Commentator postulates a naming of things according to their essential function (*ἀπὸ τοῦ ἔργου*) - a principle of natural etymology in the Cratylean sense. *Κρόνος* is then *Κρούων νοῦς* and *Οὐρανός* is *Οὐρίζων νοῦς*. *Κρόνος*, further, arrogates the cosmic kingship to himself, overthrowing *Οὐρανός* in the sense that the universal collision of natures represented by *Κρόνος* annuls the first fixation of the World established and sustained by the emergence and action of *Οὐρανός*. It is relevant to notice in this connection the Hesiodic account (*Theogony*, 154-160) that Heaven engaged the Earth in a perpetual coition without allowing (free space between them for) the coming forth of the offspring of this monstrous copulation, such offspring being instead imprisoned within the maternal womb. Saturn perpetrates the enormity, castrates Heaven and thus separates him from Earth: the place for the intervening air is thus brought into existence.

Finally, in step (4) the (principle of the) persistent clashing of being-particles in the Intelligence-Mixture (*Φρόνησις* - *Μοῖρα* -

πνεῦμα) effected by the agency of the Sun once constituted, provides the etymology and explanation of *Κρόνος* (i.e. *κρούων νοῦς, κρούοντα τὸν νοῦν πρὸς ἄλληλα*, XIV, 7). *Κρόνος* is intelligence-as-principle-of-a-general-collusion-of-things-to-one-another. Thus it is both identical to cosmic intelligence and distinct from it; it preexists as intelligence (the spiritual breath (*πνεῦμα ἐόν* XVIII, 2) full of all kinds of being-particles, a true *πανσπερμία εἰδῶν* in airy form) and yet as representative of the universal clashing (considered as a distinct moment in the onto-logical evolution, i.e. articulation, of reality) can be said to come into being. First there exists Intelligence as Ur-Substance, and more strictly as an aspect of the Ur-Substance. Then there is fixed and fixative Intelligence as *Οὐρανός*, generated at the primal formation of the Sun. And thirdly, there is born *Κρόνος*, the “striking” Intelligence, or rather mind (as was distinguished above) cancelling the heavenly stability and causing the preliminary, necessary upheaval with a view towards the establishment of a New World Order.

This new World order is the realm of Zeus. For the universal colliding movement generates (or rather separates in distinct body) the enormity of Air as the universal Dominator, i.e. *Ζεὺς βασιλεύς, Ζεὺς δ’ ἀρχὸς πάντων* etc. (XIX, 10 sqq.). And in this sense is Zeus born from Cronos, and divine Phronesis precedes the God himself (XVIII, 9 sqq.: *πρὶν μὲν γὰρ κληθῆναι Ζῆνα, ἣν Μοῖρα φρόνησις τοῦ θεοῦ αἰεὶ τε καὶ διὰ παντός· ἐπεὶ δ’ ἐκλήθη Ζεὺς, γενέσθαι αὐτὸν ἐνομίσθη, ὄντα μὲν καὶ πρόσθεν, ὀνομαζόμενον δ’ οὕτω*). In fact divine Phronesis “precedes” divine Mind, and this the God, *the cosmogonical series being logically expressed by the sequence: intelligence, mind, godhead*. There is neither real change in identity, nor alteration in mere nomenclature; World phases and cosmic aspects are named in the sequence as and when they manifest themselves, although they are eternally existing.

Οὐρανός proceeds from Night: *Οὐρανὸς Εὐφρονίδης* (XIV, 6). Cronos, and the other Titans, are children of *Οὐρανός* and *Γῆ*, in the common theogonies. But the Commentator emphasises that the Orphic poem ascribed in effect the generation of Cronos to Helios; XIV 2-3: *τοῦτον οὖν τὸν Κρόνον γενέσθαι φησὶν* (sc. Orpheus) *ἐκ τοῦ Ἥλιου τῆ Γῆ* etc. The Helios of the Commentator is the Protogonos-Phanes of the Orphic poem. The *ἄμβρος ἀθέσφατος*

from Phanes (OF 84, cf. *supra*) expresses his all-potent semen, creative of the entire divine order; OF85 (v. esp. Damascius *De primis principiis* 111 (I 286, 15 Ruelle): *εἰ δὲ ὁ παρ' Ὀρφεί πρωτόγονος θεὸς ὁ πάντων σπέρμα φέρων τῶν θεῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ ὤου πρῶτος ἐξέθορε*¹³ *καὶ ἀνέδραμε* etc.). In this sense the real procreative power in the first divine genealogies is Heliacal-Phanetic, even though the series consists of the succession *Οὐρανὸς* (XIV, 6) - *Κρόνος* - *Ζεὺς* (XV, 6). There is thus Orphic justification for the Commentator's solar emphasis, given the equivalence Protogonos - Phanes = Helios.

Such solar emphasis was not a rarity in classical times. After defining malehood and femineity as that which begets offspring in somebody else and in itself respectively (*de generatione Animalium* 716a13), Aristotle illustrates the definition by cosmogonical conceptions regarding Nature at large: Earth was regularly the great Mother (v. Ch. 12 *infra*, n. 6a), while Heaven or Sun or some other similar celestial power played the role of Universal Father; 716a15: *διὸ καὶ ἐν τῷ ὄλῳ τὴν τῆς Γῆς φύσιν ὡς θῆλυ καὶ μητέρα νομίζουσιν, Οὐρανὸν δὲ καὶ Ἥλιον ἢ τι τῶν ἄλλων τῶν τοιούτων ὡς γεννώντας καὶ πατέρας προσαγορεύουσιν*. Acknowledgement of the crucial importance of the Sun and of its annual (apparent) movement in the ecliptic for the realisation of natural processes and becoming in general on Earth, was readily forthcoming. Aristotle, *Physica*, 194b13: *ἄνθρωπος γὰρ ἄνθρωπον γεννᾷ καὶ ἥλιος*. *Metaphysica*, 1071a13: *ἀνθρώπου αἴτιον τά τε στοιχεῖα, πῦρ καὶ γῆ ὡς ὕλη καὶ τὸ ἴδιον εἶδος, καὶ ἔτι τι ἄλλο ἕξω οἶον ὁ πατήρ, καὶ παρὰ ταῦτα ὁ Ἥλιος καὶ ὁ λοξὸς κύκλος* (the zodiacal belt). And generally, *De Generatione et Corruptione*, 336a31: *διὸ καὶ οὐχ ἡ πρώτη φορὰ* (the diurnal movement of the Sun) *αἰτία ἐστὶ γενέσεως καὶ φθορᾶς, ἀλλ' ἡ κατὰ τὸν λοξὸν κύκλον* (sc. the solar movement along the ecliptic).

In the heliocentric philosophical and theological developments there was presupposed firm and clear awareness of the heightened solar significance in the formation and running of the World, especially as manifested in the seasonal year. A eulogy on the Sun, with recension of its vital and multifarious beneficial actions and essential virtues is given by Plinius, *Naturalis Historia*, II, 4(6) §§12-13. Cf. the elaborate analyses in Macrobius, Comm. In *Somnium Scipionis*, I, 20, 1-8. The basic idea is expressed already in Xenophanes; 21A 42:

Ξενοφάνης τὸν μὲν ἥλιον χρήσιμον εἶναι πρὸς τὴν τοῦ κόσμου καὶ τὴν τῶν ἐν αὐτῷ ζώων γένεσίν τε καὶ διοίκησιν, τὴν δὲ σελήνην παρέλκειν. The recognition of the cardinal heliacal influence is in fact accompanied here by a rejection of the lunar role in the cosmic processes, or at least of the importance of Moon's action, contrary to widely popular views, evidently very ancient, such as those represented in the *Aegyptiaca* of Hecataeus from Abdera, upholding the preeminence of the divine pair, Sun - Moon. (B7 = Diodorus I, 11, 1; 5-6; cf. 12, 3. Cf. Macrobius, *op. cit.* I, 19, 23). Anaxagoras called the Earth mother of plants and the Sun their father; Peripatetic *de plantis*, 817a23: *estque principium cibi plantarum a terra et principium generationis fructuum a sole. et ideo Anaxagoras dixit quod earum frigus est ab aere* (the Greek re-translation has: *ὅτι ἡ ὑγρότης τούτων ἐστὶν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς*, which is more apt in the context) *et ideo dicit lechogeon* (I propose *λεχώγαιον* following Diels' suggestion *λεχώιον γῆν*; cf. Callimachus Hymnus in Jovem, 14, *Ρείης λεχώιον* for the place where Rhea bore her child and Zeus was born; here *λεχώγαιον* would mean earth as perennially pregnant and in childbirth, with all that grows out of, and on, her) *quod terra mater est plantarum et sol pater.* The second Pythagorean principle is here represented by Earth in a way that leaves no place for the Moon: for instead of the usual double polarity Heaven-Earth and Sun-Moon we have just one: Sun-Earth. This squares with the religious construal of Moon as chthonic (Selene-Hecate).

The crucial importance of the Sun for the life of the entire Universe was also highlighted by the Pythagorean view of it as the heart of the cosmic-all, the principal and leading factor in the world (*ἡγεμονικώτατον* - sc. *κύκλον εἶναι τὸν τοῦ ἡλίου - καὶ οἶον καρδίαν τοῦ παντός*, Theo Smyrnaeus, p. 138.17-8 Hiller). V. *op.cit.* p. 187.14-7: *...ἵνα τοῦ κόσμου, ὡς κόσμου καὶ ζώου, τῆς ἐμφυχίας ἢ τύπος οὗτος* (sc. the position of the Sun in the planetary order of distance), *ὡσανεὶ καρδίας τοῦ παντός ὄντος τοῦ ἡλίου πολυθέρμου διὰ τὴν κίνησιν καὶ τὸ μέγεθος καὶ τὴν συνοδίαν τῶν περὶ αὐτόν* (sc. *πλανήτων*). Cf. p. 188.3-7¹⁴.

The adequate appreciation of the solar influence in the constitution and working of the World was enhanced by the all-powerful symbolism of the Light borne by, or (out) of, Darkness, a

peculiarly Orphic experience. The combination of these two moments provides the source of Greek heliacal theology. The logicomythical, religiophilosophical and philosophical systems (of mixed theology or physiology) that were orphically oriented or influenced, were (consequently) prone to capitalize on the heliacal interpretation of the Protogonos doctrine. Already in Pherecydes' Zeus, when about to begin World-creation proper, is transformed into Eros (7B3). This answers so closely Zeus' swallowing of Phanes at the start of the cosmogonical process (cf. e.g. OF 82 and IX, 4 of the Derveni papyrus), that, given the identity of cosmic Eros with Phanes (cf. OF 83 and 85), it must entail an Orphic connexion in Pherecydes. Thus Joannes Lydus' statement that Zeus was identical with Helios in the Pherecydean system (7A9 = *de mensibus* IV, 3) reflects the basic fact that God is transformed into, or assumes the attributes of, or is identified with, the Sun in order to form the World. This complex idea is expressed in the often maintained aspectual identity of Zeus with Helios. Ζεύς Ἥλιος is attested from Amorgos in the 6th century in a rock inscription (IG XII (7) 87; v. Gaertringen unwarrantedly declines to accept the identity here). The Empedoclean recension of the four ριζώματα in 31B6 refers to fire by Ζεύς ἀργής, the radiant Zeus, the aetherial brilliance. The difficult Orphic poem in a Sicilian golden leaf (OF 47 = FV, 1B21) involves the invocation to πανόπτῃς Ζεύς (v. 2; cf. OF 170); πανόπτῃς, all-seeing, is the standard epithet of the Sun: in fact the same very poem combines in v. 10: Ζεῦ Ὀλύμπιε καὶ πανόπτα Ἄλιε. Sun is fire (v. 3, Ἥλιε πῦρ), and twice Fate is referred to, once as all-inventive, all-devising, she who sees through everything (παμμήστωρ), which suggests a reflection of the equivalence θεοῦ φρόνησις = Μοῖρα in the Derveni Commentary¹⁵.

Zeus swallows Phanes in early Orphism, assimilates the latter's essence to himself and assumes his powers plenipotentially; this virtual identification through absorption of two distinct hypostases effects functional identity: the Protogonos' spermatic nature (OF 84; symbolized also by his hermaphroditism, cf. OF 80-1) constitutes Zeus' creative faculty. First, the cosmic structure is articulated within Zeus (OF 167, from the rhapsodic cosmogony, which in this reproduces archaic Orphism: v. *Derveni papyrus*, col. XVI.3-5; cf. M.L. West, *The Orphic Poems*, 1983, pp. 88 sqq.). And then, world-

creation proper follows (OF 168.31-32). A conflation of the two stages, or rather moments, of creation surfaces in the Stoicizing, pantheistic construal of Zeus so impregnated as the cosmic whole itself (OF 168.1-30).

The Derveni Commentator provides physical interpretation of the entities and processes involved, under preservation of the structural scheme. Fundamentally, the *panspermatic* nature of Phanes is dropped; it is the Air that involves all seeds of being out of which the present World-formation is shaped, but this creation can only happen through the agency of the Protogonos - Helios: such efficient causality is thus ascribed to the Sun-cosmic *membrum virile* in III, 4 sqq.; and correspondingly a mechanistic interpretation (in the Atomistic manner¹⁶) is given for the Phanetic semen - *θορνή*.

The functional theocracy of Zeus - Helios is an evident mark of physiologized Orphic influence. It was mediated by the equivalence Phanes - *Ἥλιος*, which was not restricted to abstruse allegorical speculations, but is widespread enough to occur in poetry as well. Sophocles, Fr. 1017 Nauck²:

Ἥλι, οἰκτίροις ἐμέ,
 <ὄν> οἱ σοφοὶ λέγουσι γεννητὴν θεῶν
 καὶ πατέρα πάντων.¹⁷

Cf. *Oedipus Tyrannus* 660:

οὐ τὸν πάντων θεῶν θεὸν πρόμον
 Ἄλιον.

Probably the aspectual identity was not interpretative alone, or implicative (the first-born Light of the World, *πρωτόγονον Φάος*, being expressed by the splendour of the shining solar disc), but was further postulated by the underlying common experience vividly manifested in identical images. So OF 78:

χρυσείαις πτερύγεσσι φορέυμενος ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα (sc. Phanes).

OF 1 (Aristophanic *Aves*):

ἔβλασταν Ἐρωσ ὁ ποθεινός,
στίλβων νῶτον πτερύγων χρυσαῖν.

OF 62:

Ἥελιε, χρυσέαισιν ἀειρόμενε πτερύγεσσιν.

(cf. OF 54).

There is a detail which tends to confirm the Orphic affiliation of Archelaus. When the Protogonos - Phanes emerges out of Night¹⁸, what is seen is not he himself but his radiance illuminating the aetherial depths, OF 86 (and cf. OF 2). Only Night has a direct vision of him. The experience presupposed is probably not that of the primacy of the day-light over, and its independence from, the rays of the Sun (as is mythologically expressed in Hesiod by the marked precedence of the generation of Day over that of the Sun and Moon, *Theogony* 124 and 371-4 respectively), but rather that of the dawn before the actual rising of the solar disc above the Horizon. In any case, the Orphic view was taken up and articulated philosophically in the Empedoclean doctrine of the Sun as a spectral image of the fiery hemisphere, this latter being invisible from the earth's surface. Fire, when at the beginning of world-formation was secreted from the initial state of homogeneity, was accumulated in one cosmic hemisphere, leaving air intermingled with a little fiery essence to occupy the other. The reflection of the igneous hemisphere on the earth is projected onto the sky of the aerial hemisphere as the (phenomenal) Sun; 31A30 DK I p. 288. 26-30; A56 DK; B44 DK. The greater impetus of the fire collected in one hemisphere, to which the air in the other succumbed and yielded, caused both the cosmic rotation (A30 DK I p. 288.27-8) and the inclination of the polar axis (A58 DK)¹⁹.

Archelaus preserves the same basis of an indirect vision of the source of light, but articulates it differently. Before the declension of the World-Axis the Sun was invisible from the Earth, since the terrestrial surface has a concave form with a depression in the middle and high mountains all round. A4 §4: ἐπικλιθῆναι δὲ τὸν οὐρανὸν φησι καὶ οὕτως τὸν ἥλιον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ποιῆσαι φῶς καὶ τὸν τε ἀέρα

ποιῆσαι διαφανῆ καὶ τὴν γῆν ξηράν. λίμνην γὰρ εἶναι τὸ πρῶτον, ἅτε κύκλω μὲν οὖσαν ὑψηλήν, μέσον δὲ κοίλην. σημεῖον δὲ φέρει τῆς κοιλότητος, ὅτι ὁ Ἥλιος οὐχ ἅμα ἀνατέλλει τε καὶ δύεται πᾶσιν, ὅπερ ἔδει συμβαίνειν, εἴπερ ἦν ὁμαλή. The expression τὸν ἥλιον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ποιῆσαι φῶς means principally direct illumination by the solar rays, and does not preclude the possibility of a dim light diffused in the upper hemisphere when the Sun approached the horizon of the concave Earth before the cosmic declension, just as it happens now at dawn. So that when the Sun was generated, it could only be the object of indirect vision from the surface of the earth that was to be inhabited. This all fits well with the *Derveni papyrus* interpretative method which consists in construing theogonical successions as stages in physical cosmic creation. The identification of the original Sun with Protogonos is presupposed throughout.

The functional identity of Zeus-Helios in their creative aspect is consistent with their hypostatic diversity. Scythinos from Teos (4th century B.C.) conceives of the World-order as cosmic harmony played upon the World-lyre by Apollo, son of Zeus, using as plectrum the sunlight, the solar rays. Scythinos²⁰ sings of the lyre (22C 3.1 DK):

ἦν ἀρμόζεται
Ζηνὸς εὐειδῆς Ἀπόλλων πᾶσαν, ἀρχὴν καὶ τέλος
συλλαβῶν, ἔχει δὲ λαμπρὸν πλῆκτρον Ἥλιου φάος.

The sunlight and solar rays as *plectrum* in the universal Lyre squares well with the Sun causing the collision of beings that generates the World. The solar light striking (*πλήττειν*) the cosmic constituents in Scythinos answers exactly to Helios causing them to be struck one against another (*κρούεσθαι πρὸς ἄλληλα*) (Col. XIV) in the *Derveni Papyrus*²¹. This construal connects Apollon's musical function with the Sun as universal moderator of cosmic harmony. Solar rays are also archetypally seen as arrows of the God. *The Apollonian symbols, thus, the bow and the lyre, fit well into a heliacal setting, given a developed solar religion and theology.* Consequently, it emerges that the utilization of just these symbols in the formulation of the central Heraclitean doctrine (22B51 DK) is of primal significance. The rays of the god strike or smite (*πλήττειν, κρούειν, also παίειν*), vivify or kill, send illness or heal it. (Apollo's medicinal

faculty is therefore brought into the same nexus). *Παίων* et sim. may well be related to this striking and smiting activity of the solar god (Macrobius, *Saturnalia*, I, 17, 17; *Scholia in Aristophanes Plutus*, 636). The Apollo ἀφῆτωρ of *Ilias* I, 404-5 (*pace* Zenodotus) had been connected in antiquity to Apollo the Archer (*Sch. b*² Erbse; cf. Scholia d) ὁ ἀφειὲς τὰ βέλη (Et. M. s.v. ἀφῆτωρ 177.27S.) and identified with the Sun (*op.cit.* 177.28): Apollo's arrows are the solar rays. The Derveni Commentator kept well within this underlying experience in interpreting the Orphic cosmogony.

That Apollo is son of Zeus, who, in the Orphic theogonies, stems from Helios - Protogonos - Phanes - Eros, only superficially seem to preclude the functional identity Apollo - Helios, or to cast shade on the force and character of the underlying connections. According to the Derveni Commentary, for instance, Zeus as Air exists both before and after the emergence of the Sun - Protogonos out of Night. But it is only after its occupation of a vast extent as a continuous or quasi-continuous body (as a result of the separation of the fire particles and their collocation in the Sun) that Air becomes the universal Dominator; in this sense only then does Air become Zeus, the ruler King of the World. And similarly the Sun before and after the jovial new cosmic order is both identical and different: it is the same collection basically of bright, warm particles of fire, the difference lying in that he is the absolute Lord of the World previous to the current cosmic articulation (*ἡ νῦν διακόσμησις*), while he is part of Zeus' governance afterwards. This is why the World is so to speak re-created by Zeus following his swallowing of the first organizing principle, Phanes. Apparent tensions of the type indicated above can be readily resolved in such way.

It is in a similar way that Cleanthes' doctrine is best understood as well. Zeus is the World-whole, the universal substance permeated by the divine spirit, the totality of being bound together by the cosmic *τόνος* in one entity under all its various forms. (Cf. SVF I 536)²². Deities are named according to different phases or aspects or powers of this single existence, the World. (Thus e.g. Hercules is the invincible cosmic *τόνος* which maintains being in one coherent whole differentiated in accordance with the modes of relaxation and intensification distinctive to that tension, cf. I 514). Fiery is the vital force, psychic and mental, which governs each being (cf. I 513). The

Sun, as the principal cosmic fire, is the authoritative, commanding part of the World, the *ἡγεμονικὸν τοῦ Κόσμου* (I 449). This universal Dominator is part of the entire World (of Zeus in his all-inclusive existence) in the present cosmic order, but coincides with Zeus in the state of total conflagration, *ἐκπύρωσις*, from which World-creation begins (cf. I 510-512 and I 536). *The analogy in this respect with the Derveni theory is remarkable.* Decisive confirmation of all this is found in Cleanthes' famous *Hymn to Zeus* (I. 537). Zeus is the supreme God (*κύδιστ' ἀθανάτων*), He of the many Names (*πολυώνυμε*), eternally all-powerful (*παγκρατὲς αἰεί*, v. 1), leader of Nature (*φύσεως ἀρχηγέ*), Governor of the Universe with his Law = Reason, (*νόμου μέτα πάντα κυβερνῶν*, v. 2). He is the Divine Spirit, the permeator universitatis (I, 533), to which the entire World "voluntarily" yields, is subdued and dominated, vv. 3-4:

σοὶ δὴ πᾶς ὄδε Κόσμος, ἐλισσόμενος περὶ γαίαν,
πείθεται, ἧ̄ κεν ἄγης, καὶ ἐκὼν ὑπὸ σείῳ κρατεῖται.

This domination is effected through the Ministry of the Sun, by whose radiant striking all Nature's works are effected and consummated, and the common reason of the World is directed in its entrance and presence everywhere as fiery light, vv. 5-9:

τοῖον ἔχεις ὑποεργὸν ἀνικῆτοῖς ὑπὸ χερσίν
ἀμφήκη, πυρόεντα, ἀειζώνοντα κεραυνόν·
τοῦ γὰρ ὑπὸ πληγῆς φύσεως πάντ' ἔργα < τελεῖται·
ὦ σὺ κατευθύνεις κοινὸν λόγον, ὃς διὰ πάντων
φοιτᾷ, μιγνύμενος μεγάλοις μικροῖς τε φάεσσι.

That Zeus holds in his hands the solar lightning thunderbolt neatly answers and interprets the proto-Orphic image, as reported in the Derveni papyrus VIII 4-5:

Ζεὺς μὲν ἐπεὶ δὴ πατὴρ ἐοῦ πάρα θέσφατον ἀρχὴν
ἄλκην τ' ἐν χείρεσσιν ἔλαβεν καὶ δαίμονα κυδρόν.

This *ἀλκή*, strength or force of Zeus, is symbolised by his lightning thunderbolt. As Heraclitus put it: *τὰ δὲ πάντα οἰακίζει κεραυνός* (22

B 64). More specifically, vital warmth, proceeding from the Sun, sustains, according to him, the life of all living beings (Hisdosus Scholasticus in 22B67a; the testimony comes from another era, but fits congenially with what is known about Heracleitean doctrines).

There is also the notion of solar rays hitting the cosmic substance and thus forming determinate beings as they strike the harmonious World-order (cf. the *κρούειν, πλήττειν, πλήκτρον* of the Derveni commentary and Skythinos as noted above). The Sun is the supreme royal Minister in the service of highest Godhead, and it is to the solar agency that this Godhead owes his position, v. 10:

ϕ̄ (sc. the previously mentioned living, fiery lighthing, i.e.
Helical radiance) *σὺ τόσος γεγαώς ὕπατος βασιλεὺς διὰ
παντός.*

The Sun is precisely the creative aspect of Divinity, hypostatically distinct from its progenitor, yet δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο.

This symbolism was naturally enhanced (given Apollo's sonship in relation to Zeus) by the theocracy Apollo - Helios, which is emphatically present in Cleanthes (I, 540-2) and was characteristically operative in Orphism, OF 172 (Proclus): *πρῶτον δὲ τοῦτο κατανοήσωμεν, ὅπως καὶ αὐτὸς (sc. Plato) ὡσπερ Ὀρφεὺς τὸν Ἥλιον εἰς ταῦτόν πως ἄγει τῶ Ἀπόλλωνι καὶ ὡς τὴν κοινωνίαν πρεσβεύει τούτων τῶν θεῶν. ἐκείνος μὲν (sc. Ὀρφεύς) γὰρ διαρρήδην λέγει καὶ διὰ πάσης, ὡς εἰπεῖν, τῆς ποιήσεως.* The Orphic identity of a solar Apollo is, happily, testified very early by Aeschylus in his lost tragedy *Bassarae or Bassarides*, the second play of his Lyncurgen tetralogy; v. Stefan Radt, *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, vol. 3, 1985, pp. 138-9²³. The basic account in the Eratosthenic *Catasterismi* represents a precis of the play as a whole²⁴. Orpheus, having been initiated into *the Mysteries of chthonicity* (of life and death) through his descent to Hades in search of Eurydice, reoriented his principal devotion from Dionysus (whom he had until then worshipped primarily to his own acclaim) to Helios, whom he now ranked greatest among Gods and identified with Apollo: *διὰ δὲ τὴν γυναικα εἰς Ἄιδου καταβάς (sc. Orpheus) καὶ ἰδὼν τὰ ἐκεῖ οἶα ἦν, τὸν μὲν Διόνυσον οὐκέτι ἐτίμα, ὑφ' οὗ ἦν δεδοξασμένος, τὸν δὲ Ἥλιον μέγιστον τῶν θεῶν ἐνόμισεν, ὃν καὶ Ἀπόλλωνα προσηγόρευεν etc.,*

Eratosthenes, *Catesterismorum Reliquiae*, p. 29.3-11 Olivieri = p. 140.4-8 Robert (the phrases *διὰ δὲ ... οἷα ἦν* and *ὕφ' οὗ ἦν δεδοξασμένος* are found in the text R of the *Epitome* (v. Olivieri), confirmed by the *Scholia ad Germanicum* BP and Hyginus, *Astronomicum*, II, 7, v. pp. 140-1 Robert). In view of the Thracian origin and context of the Orpheus²⁵, it is significant that Sophocles testifies to the precedence of solar worship among the Thracians; *Tereus* Fr. 523 Nauck²: *Ἥλιε, φιλίπποις Θρηξὶ πρέσβιστον σέβας* (*σέβας* with Bothe, in place of the manuscript reading *σέλας*). Tereus was himself a Thracian (cf. e.g. Thucydides II, 29). Preeminence of solar worship is also testified for the Paeones; Maximus Tyrius IX, 8: *Παίονες σέβουσι μὲν Ἥλιον, ἄγαλμα δὲ Ἥλιου Παιονικὸν δίσκος βραχὺς ὑπὲρ μακροῦ ξύλου*. In high classical times the Paeones inhabited especially the area of the middle and upper Strymon and western Rhodope; their land included the sources of the modern Iskur = ancient Skios (cf. Herodotus IV, 49, 1; V, 1, 2; 13, 2), whose sources were in Mount Scombrus = modern Rila (Thucydides, II, 96). In Paeonia was also located Lake Kerkinitis = ancient Prusias, Herodotus V, 17, 2. The country lay to the northwest of Mount Pangaios, VII, 113, 1, and extended to the west of the Strymon down to the Axios river and even beyond it in a thin wedge (Thucydides II, 99). The close proximity of Pangeaon to Paeonia is thus amply confirmed.

Pangeaon was, according to the Aeschylean testimony, the place of high solar worship on the part of Orpheus. The name of the first play of the Lycurgen tetralogy was *Edonoi*, belonging to a people originally inhabiting the low country between the Axios and the Strymon (Thucydides, II, 99). In fact the people initially dwelling in Pieria (north of Olympus) were pushed out of their land by the conquering and expanding Macedonians, and moved to the coastal area east of the Strymon, i.e. to the Pangeaon lowlands (Thucydides II, 99; Herodotus VII, 112). Leibethra, where the remains of Orpheus were buried by the Muses (already according to the Aeschylean account) was located in Pieria near Dion (cf. e.g. Pausanias I, 30, 7; Livy XLIV, 5, 12; the Leibethrion in Boeotia - Pausanias IX, 34 §4; Strabo IX p. 410; v. esp. X p. 471 - is evidently a transposition from the Olympian Leibethra, reflecting the Thracian presence from earliest times in southeast Greece). Of a Leibethra by Pangaion speaks Himerius (XLVI, 18-9 Colonna) alone: it is, most likely, simply an

erroneous inference from the Eratosthenic account of Aeschylus' *Bassares*, conflating two valid traditions (that Orpheus' passion took place on Pangaion and that his tomb existed at Leibethra near Dion) into one faulty result. On the other hand, it is just possible that a place of burial had been acclaimed for Orpheus in the area of his death; this would be the less widely known, perhaps even obscure, Pangaeon Leibethra.

Once the solar dimension of early Orphism is well confirmed, we can draw in further illustrations of its influence in the high classical spirit. The heliacal identity of Apollo is recognised in Euripides *Phaethon*, Fr. 781.11-3 Nauck²:

ὦ καλλιφεγγές Ἥλι', ὡς μ' ἀπώλεσας
καὶ τόνδ'· Ἀπόλλων δ' ἐν βροτοῖς ὀρθῶς καλῆ,
ὅστις τὰ σιγῶντ' ὀνόματ' οἶδε δαυμόνων.

Playing on the insistent etymological connection Ἀπόλλων - ἀπόλλυμι (cf. e.g. *Scholia in Euripides, Orestes*, 1389; Macrobius, *Saturnalia*, I, 17, 10), Apollo is here considered as the mystic - symbolic name of the Sun. Solar precedence over all godhead is affirmed in Sophocles, *Oedipus Rex*, 660-1:

οὐ τὸν πάντων θεῶν θεὸν πρόμον
Ἄλιον.

And, similarly, the Sun is invoked as progenitor of Gods and father of all according to wise men in Sophocles, Fr. 1017 N² (without cause relegated to the dubious category by Nauck following Bernhardt v. loc.cit.). Cf. Fr. 672. In Fr. 870 Apollo as Phoebus is identified with the Sun; cf. Aeschylus, *Prometheus Vincit*, 22.

It turns out that the testimony of Heraclitus (the scholar) is trustworthy, and reflects genuine early Orphic traditions; *Homeric Problemata*, 6, 6, p. 7 Buffinre: "Ὅτι μὲν τοίνυν ὁ αὐτὸς Ἀπόλλων Ἥλιος, καὶ θεὸς εἰς δυσὶν ὀνόμασι κοσμεῖται, σαφὲς ἡμῖν ἔκ τε τῶν μυστικῶν λόγων, οὓς αἱ ἀπόρρητοι τελεταὶ θεολογοῦσι, καὶ τὸ δημῶδες ἄνω καὶ κάτω θρυλούμενον· "ὁ Ἥλιος Ἀπόλλων, ὁ δὲ γε Ἀπόλλων Ἥλιος". The mystic accounts, and esp. the unspeakable rites (ἀπόρρητοι τελεταί), standardly refer to Orphism, which

expressed the preeminently Greek “theology” (θεολογοῦσι). The argument for this Orphic identity²⁶ was elaborated, among others, by Apollodorus, evidently in his great work *Περὶ θεῶν*; *op.cit.* 7, 1: ἡκρίβωται δ’ ἡ περὶ τούτων ἀπόδειξις καὶ Ἀπολλοδώρῳ, περὶ πᾶσαν ἱστορίαν ἀνδρὶ δεινῷ. The doctrine, of Orphic emphasis, was also the common stock of popular belief²⁷.

There is, thus, a well-documented *Orphic emphasis on solar worship*, reflecting (and partly identifying with) the preeminence of the Orphic Phanes, the Apparent One, the First Born (*Πρωτόγονος*) of existence. The underlying experience is of the Light of the World (τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου, John 5; 10), borne from the aboriginal Darkness, of the Daylight borne of the Night - a generation which turns the undifferentiated chaos of primeval abyss into the orderly structures of well-formed, identifiable being. The nexus of basic logicomycological thinking constituting this solar theology is well-captured by Alexander in his prose hymn to Apollo Smintheus (*Rhetores Graeci*, IX p. 321 Walz): ὦ Σμίνθιε Ἄπολλον²⁸, τίνα χρὴ <σε> προσεῖπεν πρότερον; ἥλιον τὸν τοῦ φωτὸς ταμίαν καὶ πηγὴν τῆς οὐρανοῦ ταύτης αἴγλης; ἢ νοῦν, ὡς ὁ τῶν θεολογούντων λόγος, διήκοντα μὲν διὰ τῶν οὐρανόων, ἰόντα δὲ δι’ αἰθέρος ἐπὶ τὰ τῆδε; (for the idea cf., beyond its Stoic dressing, the Empedoclean view noted above) ἢ πρότερον αὐτὸν τὸν ὄλων δημιουργὸν ἢ [πρότερον] δευτερεύουσαν αὐτοῦ δύναμιν; δι’ ὃν σελήνη μὲν κέκτηται σέλας, γῆ δὲ τοὺς ἰδίους ἠγάπησεν ὄρους, θάλαττα δὲ οὐχ ὑπερβαίνει τοὺς ἰδίους μυχοὺς. Φασὶ γὰρ τοῦ χάους κατειληφότος τὰ σύμπαντα καὶ πάντων συγκεχυμένων καὶ φερομένων τὴν ἄτακτον ἐκείνην καὶ ἀμυγῆ φοράν, σὲ ἐκ τῶν οὐρανόων ἀψίδων ἐκλάμψαντα σκεδάσαι μὲν τὸ χάος ἐκεῖνο, ἀπολέσαι δὲ τὸν ζόφον, τάξιν δ’ ἐπιθεῖναι τοῖς ἅπασιν. ἀλλὰ ταῦτα μὲν σοφῶν παισὶ φιλοσοφεῖν παραλείπω (cf. *op.cit.*, p. 329 sq.). *The antithesis between light and darkness, celestial and terrestrial, olympic and chthonic, was construed in logicomycological lore as generation of the former from the latter.* Such mysteric experience was crystallized in Orphism through gorgeous imagery and ponderous articulation, both pregnant with meaning. In such a context the typically earthy animal, the rat (esp. the field rat) was associated with the solar god, as symbolic of his origin. Origination

further turned into a relationship of (aspectual) identity between parent and offspring, in the double-faced Apollo - Dionysus.

NOTES

- (*) References to the Derveni papyrus are made to the fullest edition so far, R. Janko, *The Derveni Papyrus: an Interim Text*, *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, Band 141, 2002, pp. 1-62. The numeration of the columns is the same with that in the provisional translation of the Papyrus by André Laks and Glenn W. Most in A. Laks - G.W. Most (eds.), *Studies on the Derveni Papyrus*, 1997, pp. 9-22. Column numeration in Merkelbach's proekdosis (in *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, 47, 1982, separate numeration after p. 300) is four numbers lower. A text (based on Janko's), French translation and extended annotation has been published by Fabienne Jourdan, *Le Papyrus de Derveni*, 2003. A booklength study of the Papyrus including edition and translation has been given by Gabor Betegh, *The Derveni Papyrus*, 2004. Tsantsanoglou (with Parassoglou and Kouremenos) finally produced an edition of the papyrus with introduction, commentary and a set of photographs. The work is hastily done, uncritical and misleading. Dirk Obbink and Apostolos Pierris have recently undertaken a new full study of the text, with the use of multispectral imaging; our edition is scheduled to appear about the end of 2007.
1. But uncouth (judged by classical style criteria) constructions seem to occur spontaneously in the text. In any case the beginning of the Orphic poem consisted of a hymn to Helios.
 2. The idea that *Noûs* is equivalent to the totality of being is expressed in terminology applying to the value and price of things (*ἄξιος*). This is a significant parallelism to the Heracleitean monetary formulation and illustration of the universal principle of existence B90 DK: *πυρός τε ἀνταμοιβή* (exchange) *τὰ πάντα, φησὶν ὁ Ἡράκλειτος, καὶ πῦρ ἀπάντων, ὄκωσπερ χρυσοῦ χρήματα καὶ χρημάτων χρυσός*. Here it is the Sun (-*Noûs*) which is money for everything.
 3. In this context *ἐξαλλάσσεισθαι* means not utterly change, be transformed, but withdraw or remove (to oneself from something else), similarly to Thucydides V, 71: *ἐξαλλάττειν ἀεὶ τῶν ἐναντίων τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γύμνωσιν*. Cf. *ἀπαλλάττειν* and *ἐξαπαλλάττειν*, Thucydides IV, 28. Cf. Euripides, *Iphigeneia in Tauris*, 135).

4. V. esp. A10 DK (I p. 83.33 sqq.): *φησὶ δὲ τὸ ἐκ τοῦ αἰδίου γόνιμον θερμοῦ τε καὶ ψυχροῦ κατὰ τὴν γένεσιν τοῦδε τοῦ κόσμου ἀποκριθῆναι καὶ τινα ἐκ τούτου φλογὸς σφαίραν περιφυῆναι τῷ περὶ τὴν γῆν ἀέρι ὡς τῷ δένδρω φλοιόν· ἥστινος ἀπορραγείσης καὶ εἰς τινὰς ἀποκλεισθείσης κύκλους ὑποστῆναι τὸν ἥλιον καὶ τὴν σελήνην καὶ τοὺς ἀστέρας.* All the basic (at least) contraries are similarly secreted (*ἐκκρίνεσθαι*) from the indeterminate Infinite (A9, A16).
5. For the Ephesian Letters v. also Hesychius s.v.; Anaxilas Fr. 18.7 *Poetae Comici Graeci*, II, p. 285; Aelius Dionysius ε, 79 (cf. Apostolius, XI, 29, *Paroemiographi Graeci*, II p. 523.1) and Pausanias *Atticista* ε, 85 in H. Erbse, *Untersuchungen zu den Attizistischen Lexica*, p. 120.25 and p. 183.3; Plutarch, *Quaestionum Convivialium*, VII, 5, 4 (706D-E). The Letters formed six words mentioned by Androcydes (and Hesychius): ΑΣΚΙ, ΚΑΤΑΣΚΙ, ΛΙΞ, ΤΕΤΡΑΞ, ΔΑΜΝΑΜΕΝΕΥΣ, ΑΙΣΙΑ. They were worn on the feet, the girdle and the crown of Artemis in Ephesus (Pausanias). The Magians ordained their salutary recitation for those possessed by daemons (Plutarch). The words were averters of evil in general, pregnant with cosmic meaning, *φωναὶ φυσικὸν ἐμπεριέχουσα<i>i> νοῦν ἀλεξίκακον* (Pausanias; cf. *Suda* s.v. Ἀφρικανὸς ὁ Σέξτος; esp. Menander, *Παίδιον*, 2, Meineke). They also secured victory to those pronouncing them at critical junctures (Aelius Dionysius; and Apostolius VIII, 17 [*Paroemiographi Graeci*, II p. 429.15]). The magical force of the words is emphasized by Photius *Lexicon* s.v.: *φωναὶ ἀντιπάθειαν τινα φυσικὴν ἔχουσαι*. At face value the words were devoid of meaning (Macarius IV, 23 [Par. Gr. II p. 169.5]; Diogenianus in note ad II *Par. Gr.* p. 430). Some attributed the invention of the Ephesian Letters to the Idaean Dactyls, thus confirming their mystic origin (Clemens, *Stromateis* I, 73, 1 p. 360 P). The Idaean Dactyls were sorcerers (*γόητες*), according to an ancient construal reported in the Epic Poem *Phoronis*, one of whom was precisely called *Δαμναμενεύς* (v. *Phoronis*, Fr. 2, *Fragmenta Epicorum Graecorum*, ed. Bernabé, I p. 118).

There is an analogy between incantations of the nature of the Ephesian Letters as interpreted in the ancient testimonies and Orphic poetry according to the Derveni Commentator.

In Col. VII, the latter sets out to describe concisely the essential character of original Orphism. The poetry is in hymnic form, it is a glorification (*δοξολογία* in the later sense) of divine entities: VII, 2: ὕμνον [ὕγ]ιῆ καὶ θεμ[ι]τὰ λέγο[ντα]. (And cf. XXII, 11: ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἐν τοῖς ὕμνοις εἰ[ρη]μένον). The contents are sound and religiously permissible (to be spoken), ὕγιῆ and θεμιτά - obviously, the point to be understood is that

this is so, despite glaring appearances to the contrary. (Allegory is now in full sway, correcting also the illicit mythological pictures concerning divine existence). A justification is then required, and ἡνίξε]το γὰρ [τῆ]ι ποήσει will do nicely (which is much to be preferred over the *ἱερουργεῖ]το* adopted by Tsantsanoglou, *The First Columns of the Derveni Papyrus*, pp. 95, 119 in A. Laks - G.W. Most (edd.) *Studies on the Derveni Papyrus*, 1997. The available space between λέγο]ντα and ἡνίξε]το then can be aptly filled with ἔπη, as Tsantsanoglou suggests). In fact the text runs smoothly thus: ἡνίξε]το γὰρ [τῆ]ι ποήσει, καὶ εἰπεῖν οὐχ οἶόν τ[ε τὴν τῶν ὀνομάτων φύ]σιν καίτοι ρηθέντα· ἔστι δὲ ξ[ένη τις ἡ] πόσις [κ]αὶ ἀνθρώ[ποις] αἰνίγμ[α]τῶδης. What is said in the sacred hymn is sound and religiously sanctioned because it is spoken as a riddle, not to be understood at its face value. Thus even though spoken (καίτοι ρηθέντα, sc. τὰ ἔπη from above, or τὰ ὀνόματα), it is not possible to explain the natural potency (φύσιν), the full significance, of the words involved (φύσιν again to be preferred to Tsantsanoglou's λύσιν, with A. Laks and G.W. Most, *op.cit.* p. 12, who suggest full force as a rendering of φύσιν. Λύσις ὀνομάτων is, at least, harsh, as against λύσις ἀπορίας, προβλημάτων and the like, which, besides, are not early locutions). *Even though spoken, the sacred sayings are therefore unspoken.* The poetry is unfamiliar and riddlesome for men (but clear to superior beings, the κρείττονα γένη). Not that Orpheus is indulging in controversial puzzles regarding the meaning of words (ἐριστὰ αἰνίγματα); he only indicates through riddles great things (μεγάλα), difficult to be appropriately conceived. The great things are, as the actual Commentary proves in the end, fundamental facts of Nature, in effect a piece of Ionizing Physiology, basic cosmogonical and cosmological structures. This comes close to the φωναὶ φυσικὸν ἐμπεριέχουσαι νοῦν (expressions involving cosmic meaning), the characterization employed in relationship to the Ephesian Letters.

Orphic Poetry is in this way a Ἱερὸς Λόγος through and through: ἱερ[ολογ]εῖται μὲν οὖν καὶ ἀ[πὸ το]ῦ πρώτου [ἀεὶ] μέχρι οὗ [τελε]υταίου ρήματος (VII, 7-8). Thus it is that Orpheus utters his renowned behest: profane, close the gates on your ears (*ibid.* 8-10). The Commentator, sharing a profound Ionic experience, *discovers in the ultimate truth of reality the very sacredness of existence*: divine and cosmic order coincide, the World of Gods is the fundamental structure of being. His criticism of Heracleitus in Col. IV consists precisely in that the Ephesian does not carry the de-mythologization of the Logos to the very end: ὅσπερ ἕκλε[α μ]υθο]λόγω λέγων [ἔφη] (with Laks and Most, *op.cit.* p. 11 n. 4):

ἥλιος ἔω]του κατὰ φύσιν ἀνθρω[πηίου] εἶρος ποδός [ἔών]
 του[ς οὔρου]ς οὐχ ὑπερβάλλων· εἰ γάρ [τι οὔ]ρους ἐ[ωυτοῦ]
 [ἐ]κ[βή]σεται, Ἐρινύε[ς] νῦν ἐξευρήσου[σι Δίκης] ἐπίκουροι.

Tsantsanoglou *op.cit.* text p. 94, notes pp. 108-9 (following G.M. Parassoglou-K. Tsantsanoglou, *Heraclitus in the Derveni Papyrus*, in A. Brancacci et al. (ed.), *Aristoxenica, Menandrea, Fragmenta Philosophica*, Studi e Testi per il corpus dei papiri filosofici greci e latini 3, 1988, pp. 135-33; and followed by the Translators Laks-Most p. 11 and by Janko) edits εἰ γάρ [τι οὔ]ρους and ποδός [ἔστι], entertaining the preposterous notion that it is the size of the Sun that cannot be transcended, as against the universally confirmed ancient testimony that the limits of the Sun's movement (limits spatial and, therefore, temporal as well) cannot be transgressed. The idea is not only absurd in itself but positively disprovable. For in l. 10 (ὑπερ]βατὸν ποῆι κ[] the Commentator is evidently propounding an argument similar to the one in Col. VIII resting on the use of hyperbaton in syntactical construals. In all probability the argument must be that ἔωυτοῦ κατὰ φύσιν does not relate to ἥλιος or εἶρος and ἔών but has its force carried forward to του[ς οὔρου]ς and οὐχ ὑπερβάλλων correspondingly in the next line; thus the construction will be: ἥλιος, ἀνθρωπηίου εἶρος ποδός ἔών, τοὺς ὄρους κατὰ φύσιν ἔωυτοῦ οὐχ ὑπερβάλλων· etc. So οὔ]ρους has obviously to be the reading in l. 8, and not the naive εὔ]ρους. Even quite apart from the Commentator, ἥλιος ἔωυτοῦ κατὰ φύσιν ... ἔστι is not Greek for "the Sun in itself according to its nature is..." Tsantsanoglou's notion (adopted by D. Sider, *Heraclitus in the Derveni Papyrus*, in Laks and Most *op.cit.* p. 141) that the ὑπερβατόν on line 10 refers to the transgression of the Sun is discreditable. From what Sider, *loc.cit.*, reports, Lebedev is certainly on the right track in taking ὑπερβατόν in the standard grammatico-rhetorical sense, but the point at hand is far more important than the elementary, ordinary and frequent inversion of εἶρος ἀνθρωπείου ποδός.

The point of the Commentator's emphasis on a thoroughly naturalistic allegorism of the Orphic poem without mythological undertones is highlighted in a further comparison with Heraclitus and his attitude to religious rites, observances and practices, especially of chthonic religion (to which the cult of Eumenides belongs), of Mystic religiosity and of vagrant (and vagabond) religiosity (μάγοι, ἀγύρτες, γόητες, night-wanderers etc.). B15 DK is an eminent example of that attitude: εἰ μὴ Διονύσω πομπήν ἐποιοῦντο καὶ ὕμνεον ἄσμα αἰδοίοισιν, ἀναιδέστατα εἴργασται. The λεγόμενα and δρώμενα of Bacchic rites would be shameless behaviour if

not done in honour of Dionysus and in celebration of the Organs of Generation. For the Commentator, the naturalistic allegorising of the ritual cannot stop at Dionysus, or the Furies: one has to go to the Pudenda and the Sun, and then behind them, to the productive force in Nature and to the very end of ontological analysis here, the collection of fiery particles. Of course, Heraclitus did proceed to the natural foundations of the religious sayings and doings: he knew for example, what the many did not fathom, that is the true nature of gods and heroes (cf. B5 DK). But he did not carry his naturalistic interpretation out systematically and in detail. He, like the God in Delphi, often *οὔτε λέγει οὔτε κρύπτει ἀλλὰ σημαίνει*. Herein lies the difference from a thorough reductionist like the Derveni Commentator. And this is the gist of the latter's criticism addressed to the Dark philosopher. The Commentator would also restrict the allegory to sayings and symbolic acts; antinomian immoralism was not part of Orphic ritual anyway. In fact, the tendency was to substitute in preference for heavy handed, gross ritual, simpler, symbolic, sacred performances and the highly articulate Word.

However Orphic ritual did exist, of course, and of a chthonic type, as also the first six apparently identifiable columns of the work prove. They interpret opening, initiative sacred rites addressed to the Furies (*Ἐρινύες* occur in all six columns but the fifth as central subject, while in VI, 8-9 it is explicitly stated that the *Orphic initiates perform in all ritual acts a preliminary sacrifice to the Eumenides in the Magian manner*: *μύσται Ἐὐμένισι προθύουσι κ[ατὰ τὰ] αὐτὰ μάγοις*. The Magian sacrifice is done essentially as a surrogate for punishment due; VI, 4-5: *τὴν θυσ[ία]ν τούτου ἔνεκε[ν] ποιούσ[ιν] οἱ μά[γο]ι, ὡσπερὶ πονὴν ἀποδιδόντες*. The idea is of a ransom paid for the salvation of the soul. *The soteriological Eschatology of Orphism is manifest*. The retribution exacted and substituted is in atonement of an old delict, the primeval transgression that caused the original Fall, Zagreus' monstrous dismemberment; Pindar Fr. 133: *οἷσι δὲ Φερσεφόνα πονὴν παλαιοῦ πένθεος / δέξεται* etc. The mighty Titans, perpetrators of that abomination were thunder-stricken by Zeus; Man originated from their ashes. The event is alluded to in gold Orphic lamellae, e.g. A2, 4-5 Zuntz (the soul is speaking after death in front of Underworld powers):

*πονὴν δ' ἀνταπέεισ' ἔργων ἔνεκ' οὔτι δικαίων·
εἶτε με μοῖρ' ἐδάμασσ' εἴτ' ἀστεροπῆτι κεραυνῶ.*

Empedocles B124 refers to the same lamentable origination of humankind:

ὦ πόποι, ὦ δειλὸν θνητῶν γένος, ὦ δυσάνολβον,
τοίων ἔκ τ' ἐρίδων ἔκ τε στοναχῶν ἐγένεσθε.

From such wretchedness the initiate is declared redeemed: ἄποινος γὰρ ὁ μύστης (K. Tsantsanoglou *op. cit.* p. 114), in a gold leaf from Pherai.

Daemons of the Underworld also are present in the initial columns; III, 6: δαίμονες οἱ κάτωθεν; cf. V, 5. These awesome punitive beings, with the Furies at their head, are considered as terrible Guardians of the Cosmic Order; they have to be appeased (III, 6-9; IV, 4; 9; VI, 1-5; cf. V, 5). The Eumenides are offered the ἄοινοι χόες, water and milk without wine, and also particular kinds of cakes (VI, 5-9); some bird (ὄρνιθειον) is sacrificed (VI, 10-11; II, 7).

So Orphic poetry is thoroughly embedded in religious ritual, even if, uncharacteristically for the ancient experience, the word in this case dominates the act. The similarity to the Persian Magi is striking (as has been correctly observed, e.g. by Tsantsanoglou, *op.cit.* p. 111). Herodotus I, 132 reports that the Persian sacrificial ritual involves necessarily the singing by a Magian of an incantation, which they maintain is really a Theogony: (after the performance of the sacrifice, the roasting of the meat and the preparation of the table - all utterly simple) μάγος ἀνὴρ παρεστῶς ἐπαείδει θεογονίην, οἴην δὴ ἐκεῖνοι λέγουσι εἶναι τὴν ἐπαιδιήν· ἄνευ γὰρ δὴ μάγου οὐ σφι νόμος ἐστὶ θυσίας ποιέεσθαι. Strabo XV, 732-3 concurs, but he does not explain in what the ἐπαιδιή consisted. In fifth century well-established Graeco-Persian contacts, the Magi claimed that their hymns were really concerned with the origin of Gods. (Since a claim is involved, the matter was not obvious, at least to fifth century Greek intellectuals. Some sort of allegorical interpretation is thereby to be assumed). Since their Gods were conceived as cosmic realities (Herodotus and Strabo mention the Celestial Dome as Zeus, the Sun, Moon, Earth, Fire, Water and the Winds - and Heavenly Aphrodite, whose worship according to Herodotus was not indigenous), the theogony was equivalent to cosmogony and cosmological structures. The non-existence of statues, temples, altars was congruous to such non-anthropomorphism of the divinity (Herodotus I, 131). The naturalistic allegorising in the Greek World was bound to gain additional momentum by those contacts. A relevant side effect may be adduced in confirmation of the significance of this communication between the Greek and the Persian worlds. The Magus, while singing the incantations, keeps in his hand a bundle of rods (especially myrtle ones), Strabo, XV, 733 (III p. 256, 16; 275.2 Kramer). The wand is of course a primaeval sign of magical power and a staff of office (the shepherd's crook included). Significantly, it was also an early feature of the Epic reciter, the

ραιφωδός. Highly important is that the Pythagoreans also seem to have assumed this symbol of Magian authority when expounding their half-mythological, half-scientific speculations, as is reported by Eudemus, Fr. 88 Wehrli: *εἰ δέ τις πιστεύσειε τοῖς Πυθαγορείοις, ..., κἀγὼ μυθολογήσω τὸ ραβδίον ἔχων ὑμῖν καθημένοις οὕτω* etc. Eudemus speaks of himself, in mock solemnity, but probably actually imitates Pythagorean practice on the occasion, brandishing his professorial staff as a magic wand.

Both the Commentator of the Papyrus and testimonies regarding the Ephesian Letters connect Orphic lore and the purer Ephesian magic with the Persian Magi and their practices. The Magians recognised in the Ephesian Letters efficiency in curing daemonic possession; Plutarch, *Quaestionum Convivialium* VII, 5, 4, 706D: *ὥσπερ γὰρ οἱ Μάγοι τοὺς δαίμονιζομένους κελεύουσι τὰ Ἐφέσια γράμματα πρὸς αὐτοὺς καταλέγειν καὶ ὀνομάζειν*. Similarly the Derveni Commentator explains (VI, 2-3): *ἐπ[ρωιδῆ δ]ὲ μάγων δύν[α]ται δαίμονας ἐμποδῶν γι[νομένου]ς μεθιστάναι δαίμονες ἐμπο[δῶν εἰσι] ψ[υχῆ]ι τιμω[ροῖ] (rather than ἐχθ[ροῖ]*). The power enclosed in the Ephesian Letters is due to these words signifying profoundly supreme natural realities; according to the Pythagorean Androcydes these were, respectively, Light, Darkness, Earth, Year, Sun, Harmony, corresponding to the series of magic Ephesian words (v. *sub in.*). Significantly, the Sun's mystic name is *Δαμναμενεύς*, the All-Subduing (cf. *δαμάζω*): just as it should be according to the solar theory of the Commentator.

The Orphic ritual started with appropriate offerings to the Furies. The Commentator interprets this as warding off daemonic influences, averting interference by disembodied souls floating as spiritual breath in the air. The aversion consists in paying a surrogate ransom for the aboriginal delict: it is a redemptive salvation.

There followed a proper sacrifice to a God, very probably often to the Sun. And the Orphic Theogony was then recited as in the Magian incantations.

6. In a broader sense it is said also of the heat particles: *ἐξ ὧν ὁ ἥλιος συνεστάθη*, XXI, 9.
7. Damascius, who preserves the fragment, (*De primis principiis* 189, II 65, 14 Ruelle) adds "*ἀπὸ τῆς ἑαυτοῦ* (sc. Phanes') *ἄκρας κορυφῆς*". If this was in fact specified in the Orphic text, it would involve the symbolism of fructifying rain as tears (e.g. Zeus tears = rain, Clemens Alexandrinus, *Stromata* V, 49, 3 = OF 33). The idea occurs in the famous Empedoclean passage where a mixed (in the Aristotelian sense) identification is given of the four basic roots of reality (B6), a paradigmatic case of naturalistic mythology in philosophy. Water as principle of this liquid nature is represented by *Νῆστις* (at the side of Zeus, Hera and Hades), *ἡ δακρύοις*

τέγγει κρούνωμα βρότειον. The ancient interpretations of the passage are divided into two classes, the Theophrastean and the Stoic, according to whether they identify Hera with Air or with the Earth (and correspondingly Aidoneus with Earth or the Air). The former view is represented by the Plutarchean *Epitoma* I, 3 (878A), the latter by Stobaeus, *Eclogae* I, 10, 11b (121W). The Epicureans sided in this with the Peripatetics; v. Philodemus, *de pietate*, 2 p. 63G in A33 (I p. 289.35). Both accounts concur in the seminal acceptance of *Νῆστις*: *νῆστιν δὲ καὶ κρούνωμα βρότειον τὸ σπέρμα καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ* (sc. λέγει) (Cf. Diels, *Doxographi Graeci*, p. 90, n. 3). This understanding fits well with the precise force of the Empedoclean expression: *κρούνωμα βρότειον* is the (fountainhead of the) stream of (human) mortality. Nestis' tears supply the saps to this stream: they constitute the generative semen.

Νῆστις was actually a Sicilian Goddess: Alexis (of the Middle Comedy) had mentioned her (Fr. 323, *Poet. Com. Gr.* II p. 191). It is thus natural that Empedocles included her in the august company of great Panhellenic divinities when establishing the divine aspect of the roots of existence (*ρίζωματα*). As to the sense of the divine name, it is easy to connect it with *νηστεία*, *νηστεύω*, *νήστις* etc. in the ordinary sense of fasting, not eating, abstaining, being hungry, starving (*νη + ἔδω*); cf. *Suda* s.v. *Νῆστις*. (For a characteristic employment of the word in this sense, v. B144: *νηστεῦσαι κακότητος*). One may further correlate the name to the abstentions and fastings characteristic of Cereal cults; the worship of Demeter and Kore was very pronounced in Sicily. And we should rather expect for reasons of symmetry a queen of the Underworld to complement Hades in the four Empedoclean *ρίζωματα*, in the way that Hera is conjugated to Zeus in the superior realm. Demeter (as Earth Goddess) is associated to Poseidon (as Water-God) in Thelpusa and Phigaleia of Arcadia (Pausanias VIII, 25, 5 sqq. and 42, 1, sqq.). In Sicily we find the reverse distribution of characterising predicates, the male divinity (Hades) becoming Lord of Earth and the female (Persephone) Mistress of Liquidity. But fasting represents one aspect of the chthonic Cereal worship. And then why should Empedocles connect such (an aspect of) a divinity with water and the principle of liquidity? A superficial, albeit ingenious, solution is to be found in Hippolytus, *Refutatio Omnium Haeresium*, VII, 29, 5 (p. 211.1 sqq. W), a passage incorporated in A33: *μόνον γὰρ τοῦτο ὄχημα τροφῆς [αἴτιον] γινόμενον πᾶσι τοῖς τρεφομένοις, αὐτὸ καθ' αὐτὸ τρέφειν οὐκ ἰσχύει τὰ τρεφόμενα. εἰ γὰρ ἔτρεφε, φησὶν, οὐκ ἂν ποτε λιμῶ κατελήθη τὰ ζῶα, ὕδατος ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ πλεονάζοντος ἀεί. διὰ τοῦτο Νῆστιν καλεῖ τὸ ὕδωρ, ὅτι τροφῆς αἴτιον γινόμενον τρέφειν οὐκ εὐτονεῖ τὰ τρε-*

φόμενα. That the watery principle is a vehicle for food is (as J. Bollack in his Commentary *ad loc.*, III pp. 174-7, aptly points out) an old discovery: see the last aphorism in the Hippocratic tract *Περὶ τροφῆς* is (LV): ὑγρασίη τροφῆς ὄχημα. The elaboration of the idea is particularly associated with Erasistratus (Plutarch, *Quaest. Conv.* VI, 3, 2, 690A; also, 698D). But it seems extraordinarily artificial and far-fetched to accept such a privative explanation for the reputedly characteristic identification of a Goddess of Fasting with the Principle of Liquidity. All liquid (earthly water, rain, blood) has the capacity to feed. In fact Empedocles (followed by Democritus, Aristoteles and Theophrastus) held that fish are fed by quantities of pure water interfused in the sea; A66 (I, p. 295.20-30). Water is no mere neutral receptacle of different saps and their potencies; its taste (when pure) is without flavour because it contains all kinds of saps fragmented into particles imperceptible by reason of their smallness (A94). We are informed about another forced explanation regarding the Empedoclean *Νῆστις*. Probus, in his extensive commentary on Virgil's *Bucolica* VI, 31 gives the Stoic version of the four *ριζώματα* (pp. 332.25 sqq. Hagen in *Appendix Servii Thiloniani*); in this context Nestis' construal appears in the following way (p. 334.8): *Νῆστις* aquam significat, quae scilicet sincero habitu cuncta confirmet. Nam creditur id eundem habitum, quem acceperit, servare (habitum, in place of the transmitted hominem, in Keils and Thilo's correction, adopted by Diels in *Dox.Gr.* p. 90, who also (*op.cit.* p. 93 n. 1) understands the id (instead of ea sc. aqua) by inter-language attraction to *τοῦτο* sc. ὕδωρ). The sense is that liquidity consists in assuming and preserving whatever shape the liquid is put into; the watery nature is true to the shape received (sincero habitu), in this way confirming without alteration the shape of things which she is in or which are in her. (Bollack, *op.cit.*, p. 181 n. 1, curiously fails to understand this point). Maybe there is an underlying etymology **νη + ἴσταμαι*, that which stays in its (received) shape, with the **νη* epitatic like (in a contrary manner) *νήχυτον ὕδωρ*; cf. *Etymologicum Magnum* s.v. νη. (It could easily be the other way round with the privative **νη*, but the explanation does not equally well suit it). Probus' passage probably stems from Heracleon (v. p. 334.29), the Grammarian (cf. Diels *op.cit.* p. 93 n. 2). Both previous explanations are obvious a posteriori attempts to account for the Empedoclean point. Simplicius must then be right in connecting *Νῆστις* to *νάω, νάμα*, flow. (B96, p. 346.3-5: *νήστιν μὲν διὰ τὸ ὑγρὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ νάειν* and *ρεῖν*). She corresponds to the *Ναϊάδες, Νηίδες* Nymphs, to Zeus *Ναῖος* and *Διώνη Ναΐα* in Dodona; cf. v. Wilamowitz Euripides *Herakles* ad 625 (III p. 139). It is noticeable that in Virgil's

Bucolica, VI, 20 Aegle is the most beautiful of the Naiads, while αἴγλη (brilliance) is attributed to Νῆστις in B 97.2. We have to assume that there was a major Sicilian Goddess of Liquidity, preferably conjugated, under at least one of her aspects, to the Lord of the Underworld in the manner of the Dodonean couple; or, rather that Νῆστις was a divine Epitheton of Persephone, in Acragas preferably, the very home and fief of Persephone (Pindar, *Pythion*. XII, 2 (Acragas) Φερσεφόνας ἔδος).

Significantly, we meet in Empedocles the Orphic association between (fructifying) rain, (divine) tears and semen as pertaining to the watery Principle of Liquidity. This elemental water is ὄμβρος in B 21.5; 73; 98; 100.12 and 18.

[In connection with the physical interpretation of the divine names for the four Empedoclean existential roots (ριζώματα), Kingsley's brave endeavour, useful as it is and important in a number of significant ways, leads to an idiosyncratic account, far removed from the philosopher's meaning and its natural context. (P. Kingsley, *Ancient Philosophy, Mystery and Magic - Empedocles and Pythagorean Tradition*, 1995)].

8. Cf. the relevant Democritean doctrine; B164: καὶ γὰρ ζῶα, φησὶν (sc. Democritus), ὁμογενέσι ζώοις συναγελάζεται ὡς περιστεραὶ περιστεραῖς καὶ γέρανοι γεράνοις καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀλόγων ὡσαύτως. <ὡς> δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἀψύχων, καθάπερ ὄραν πάρεστιν ἐπὶ τε τῶν κοσκινευομένων σπερμάτων καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν παρὰ ταῖς κυματωγαῖς ψηφίδων· ὅπου μὲν γὰρ κατὰ τὸν τοῦ κοσκίνου δῖνον διακριτικῶς φακοὶ μετὰ φακῶν τάσσονται καὶ κριθαὶ μετὰ κριθῶν καὶ πυροὶ μετὰ πυρῶν, ὅπου δὲ κατὰ τὴν τοῦ κύματος κίνησιν αἱ μὲν ἐπιμήκεις ψηφίδες εἰς τὸν αὐτὸν τόπον τοῖς ἐπιμηκέσιν ὠθοῦνται, αἱ δὲ περιφερεῖς ταῖς περιφερέσιν ὡς ἂν συναγωγόν τι ἐχούσης τῶν πραγμάτων τῆς ἐν τούτοις ὁμοιότητος. Cf. A128. *Movement has the capacity to cause a gathering together of the distinct similarities in things (of collocating similar with similar in return natura).*
9. For the Air, v. XIX, 3-4: πάντα {ς?} (or πάντων as in Laks and Most *op.cit.*, p. 18 n. 51) γὰρ ὁ ἀήρ ἐπικρατεῖ τοσοῦτον ὅσον βούλεται. For the Sun, v. V, 5-10, supra. Cf. also XII, 8 sqq. (XVI p. 16): τὸ δὲ “αὐτὸς δὲ ἄρα μόνος ἔγεντο”, τοῦτο δὲ λέγων δηλοῖ αὐτὸν τὸν Νοῦν (identical with Κρόνος and thus virtually, in enhanced aspectual identification, with the Sun) πάντων ἄξιον εἶναι μόνον ἔοντα ὡςπερὲι μηδὲν τᾶλλα εἶη. The Sun-Cronos is worth everything, as if everything else were nothing, because he creates them in their specificity, causes their specific existence as formed substances with a dominant character of homogeneity. This is again a conscious *συνουκείωσις* with the Heraclitean maxim (v. supra).
10. The translation in Laks and Most *op. cit.* p. 14 is entirely wrong and completely misses the point: “But proclaiming the Oracle and preventing

harm have the same meaning” etc. Correctly Janko: “ ‘Prophesy’ means the same as ‘suffice’ ”.

11. Associating oracular divination so intimately with divine availing to man (a counterpart to the identification in the commentary of Necessity with Providence) may be a resonance of the general Prodician view that men considered as Gods things that are eminently and powerfully beneficial: Sextus Empiricus, *adv. Math.* IX 18; Cicero *de natura deorum* I, 118; cf. Themistius *Orat.* XXX, 349b and esp. Epiphanius, *adv. Haer.* III, 21. The healthy pragmatism of the ancient Greek mind is everywhere at work.
12. XV, 3-5 is commentary on the verse “Ὀὐρανὸν Ἐὐφρονίδην, ὃς πρῶτιστος βασίλευσεν” (XIV, 6) which immediately precedes (XV, 5) the verse “ἐκ τοῦ δὴ Κρόνος [α]ὔτις, ἔπειτα δὲ μητίετα Ζεὺς (XV, 6). Hence, XI, 3-5 may fittingly be taken to explain the origin of the first couple (and the first copulation) of Heaven and Earth.
13. The word has an incontestable Orphic pedigree. Thus it is emphasised, and seminally allegorized, in the papyrus (Col. XXI, 1-7). V. supra pp. 126-7.
14. The series of planets presupposed in the above account (Theo Smyrnaeus pp. 138.9-143.6; 187.13-188.7) is the so-called Chaldaean one, with the Sun occupying the middle position: Earth (at the centre) - Moon - Mercury - Venus - Sun - Mars - Jupiter - Saturn. But this is the later Pythagorean conception. (Not as late, though, as is usually assumed; cf. e.g. Fr. Cumont, *La Théologie Solaire du Paganisme Romain, in Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, XII, 2e partie, p. 471. For it was utilised by Archimedes, at least; Macrobius, *Comm. in Somnium Scipionis*, I, 19, 2, where the mention of Archimedes is not an error as he is also later associated with the Chaldaean order in connection with his measurements of the planetary distances, II, 3, 13; cf. 14. Archimedes had constructed the famous Planetarium (an elaborate astronomical model of the cosmic globe), which Marcellus carried to Rome after the capture of Syracuse, and deposited it in the Templum Virtutis; Cicero, *De Republ.* I, 21 sq. Archimedes described the structure of the model in his *Περὶ Σφαιροποιίας*). If so, Hipparchus followed Archimedes. In any case, the earlier, standard Greek order put the Sun immediately after the Moon in the increasing order of distance from the centre (v. Plato, *Timaeus*, 38D; cf. *Republic*, 616E sqq.; *Epinomis*, 986A-987C; and so Eratosthenes, in Theo p. 142.7 sqq.). There were originally views that located the Sun on top of the series, followed, in decreasing order, by the Moon, the starry heaven, the planets (Anaximander, the atomist Metrodorus of Chios, the scholar Crates; 12A18 DK). Parmenides proposed the sequence: solid celestial wall (28A 37 DK I p. 224.5, probably identified with the mythological Olympus cf. B11.2-3) - Evening Star = Morning Star - Sun - Fixed Stars = Heaven (28 A

40a). The supremest position for the Sun was adopted by Leucippus with simultaneously lowest place reserved for the Moon, 67A1 §33. The classical orthodoxy would however closely associate Sun and Moon, an idea that was ascribed to Anaxagoras by Eudemus (59A75 ≈ Eudemus Fr. 147 Wehrli). Democritus, however, exhibits the order: fixed stars - planets - Sun - the Light Bringer = the Morning Star - Moon (68A86).

Clearly, a significant revolution has occurred at some point in the ideas about cosmic structure of the universe, pushing the Sun towards the lower end of the celestial hierarchy in terms of distance from the earth. A general breakthrough was due to the Pythagorean doctrine of dualism, propounded as a universal key, the opener of the secrets of existence. Pythagoras was accredited with the fundamental construal of the world as *κόσμος*, an ornament, a well-ordered pattern; 14A21. The idea was ab initio of a constitutive cosmic harmony. The image of the Cosmos as a gigantic lyre on which the harmony was played that sustained the existence of the world, was a natural image for the fundamental dogma. As we shall see, the solar rays were the *πλήκτρον* making the cosmic lyre to sound its universal harmony. The distances from the central point (and corresponding velocities) of the celestial bodies were in the proportions required for the constitution of a wonderful symphony of the spheres (58B35). The close conjunction of Sun and Moon in this cosmic order (which was accredited to Anaxagoras according to Eudemus, as was seen above) was probably a vision of original Pythagoreanism: one of the oral teachings (*ἀκούσματα*), which bear on their face the stamp of olden times, held that the Islands of the Blessed were precisely the two grand celestial luminaries (58C4 §82 DK I p. 464.6). The entire planetary order was established systematically first by the early Pythagoreans, as Eudemus maintained (12A19 = Eudemus Fr. 146 Wehrli; to Anaximander he attributed the initial discovery of the distances and magnitudes of the two chief luminaries, *ibid.*). Aristotle detailed in his work on Pythagorean Doctrine (*Περὶ τῆς Πυθαγορικῶν δόξης* or *Πυθαγορικαὶ δόξαι* or *Περὶ τῶν Πυθαγορείων*) the School's ordering of the numbers in the World as constitutive of the heavenly bodies (58B35 DK I p. 461.10 sqq.; cf. V. Rose, *Aristoteles Pseudepigraphus*, Fr. 187, pp. 206-7). The series run thus (starting from the innermost focal point): central fire, antichthon (the Counter-Earth), Earth, Moon, Sun, the five Planets (in the more ancient order Aphrodite, Mercury, Mars, Juppiter, Saturn), the Starry Heaven (58B 37). Aristotle attributes the view to the Italiot philosophers (which he generally identifies with the Pythagoreans); *de caelo*, 293a20 sqq.; 293b1 sqq. The doxographic tradition ascribes the idea to Philolaus specifically (44A16; 17). But early (= preclassical) Pythagorean doctrine must have posited fire at the central point of the

universe (and not of the Earth, recognizing no subterranean Hades), whence the ordering of infinity started (Cf. Ch. 12, *infra*, pp. 178-9, with notes). The vital, creative force, the organizing, leading principle of the world, is that inner fire at the centre of the Universe (58B37 DK I p. 462.1 sqq.; 44A17 DK I p. 403.31 sqq.). Aristotle criticised that view, also, because it confounds the geometrical central point of a physical body with the central focus of its functional, organic existence; as in an animal, even in man as living being, one thing is his middle geometrical point (say at navel), another his vital centre (his heart); *de caelo*, 293b4-15. Organic centricity and spatial middleness do not necessarily coincide.

15. For the late Orphic Theocracy as reported and developed in Macrobius, v. OF.236-239; 242. Zeus = Helios = Apollo = Dionysus = Phanes = Hades = Serapis. It is significant that all equivalences revolve around solarly as the focal point and basic essence. The treatise on solar theocracy is to be found in Macrobius, *Saturnalia*, I, 17, 1 - 23, 22. On this important text, and its Porphyrian provenance, v. Franz Altheim, *Aus Spätantike und Christentum*, 1951, first part: *Porphyrios Schrift über den Sonnengott* pp. 1-58 and the text in Anhang I, pp. 138-152.
16. The Derveni theory of cosmic elements seems to be more Atomistic than Anaxagorean in its molecular conception of substance as has been expounded above. The multitude of qualitatively distinct forms of being exist as minute particles, either dispersed or coacervated in cogglomerations involving particles of different kinds, constituting things characterised by the form of the dominant group of particles. It can be supposed that the elementary particles possess qualities irreducible to quantitative properties. In this sense the Derveni particles are a cross between Anaxagorean homoimeries (each part of which, however small, contains seeds of all forms with the homoimeric character-seeds prevailing) and Atomistic indivisibles. The Derveni particles would presumably be like the Empedoclean elements before (or of) elements. FV31A43, esp. Diels, *Doxographi Graeci* p. 315.23: 'Ἐμπεδοκλῆς καὶ Ξενοκράτης ἐκ μικροτέρων ὄγκων τὰ στοιχεῖα συγκρίνει, ἅπερ ἐστὶν ἐλάχιστα καὶ οἰονεὶ στοιχεῖα στοιχείων; p. 312.2: 'Ἐμπεδοκλῆς ἔφη πρὸ τῶν τεττάρων στοιχείων θραύσματα ἐλάχιστα, οἰονεὶ στοιχεῖα πρὸ τῶν στοιχείων ὁμοιομερῆ; Galen in *Hippocr. de nat. hom.* XV 49 Kuehn = CMG V 9, 1 p. 27, 24: κάκεινος γὰρ (sc. Empedocles) ἐκ μὲν τῶν αὐτῶν στοιχείων, ὧν καὶ Ἴπποκράτης, γεγενῆσθαι φησὶν ἡμᾶς τε καὶ τὰ ἄλλα σώματα πάντα τὰ περὶ τὴν γῆν, οὐ μὴν κεκραμένων γε δι' ἀλλήλων, ἀλλὰ κατὰ μικρὰ μόρια παρακειμένων τε καὶ ψαύοντων (cf. IV 762: κατὰ μικρὰ μόρια καταθραυόμενων). Some doxographers involved Anaxagoras also in this atomistic conception, 31A44: 'Ἐμπεδοκλῆς, Ἀναξαγόρας, Δημόκριτος,

Ἐπίκουρος καὶ πάντες ὅσοι κατὰ συναθροισμὸν τῶν λεπτομερῶν σωματικῶν κοσμοποιούσι, συγκρίσεις μὲν καὶ διακρίσεις εἰσάγουσι, γενέσεις δὲ καὶ φθορὰς οὐ κυρίως· οὐ γὰρ κατὰ τὸ ποιὸν ἐξ ἀλλοιούσεως, κατὰ δὲ τὸ ποσὸν ἐκ συναθροισμοῦ ταύτας γίνεσθαι. To the standard objection, namely, what makes these particles minimal although space-continuum can be divided ad infinitum, the early answer was either affirmation of indivisibility (according to the inner logic and tendency of Atomism) or undividedness, which Aristotle thinks is implied by Empedocles, 31A43a: εἰ δὲ στήσεται ἢ διάλυσις, ἥτοι ἄτομον ἔσται τὸ σῶμα ἐν ᾧ ἴσταται ἢ διαιρετὸν μὲν, οὐ μέντοι διαιρεθησόμενον οὐδέποτε, καθάπερ Ἐμπεδοκλῆς βούλεται λέγων. (Cf. B159 τὸ σωρευόμενον μέγεθος τῶν στοιχείων). Notice however Aristotle's formulation: βούλεται λέγων. It is the logic of the Empedoclean position that leads there rather than an explicit statement and articulation of the implied view. For the problem of minimal particles and related questions, v. A.L. Pierris, *First Principles and the Beginning of World-Formation in Stoicism*, in K. Boudouris, *Hellenistic Philosophy*, 1994, vol. II p. 149-176, Excursus II *On the Cohesion of Being and on the Existence of Non-Being* esp. pp. 166-170. Add that according to some doxographical interpretations even Heraclitus postulated such tiny motes or scrapings, chips (if indeed the entry is not a misnomer for Heraclides), Diels, *Dox. Gr.* p. 312.6: Ἡράκλειτος πρὸ τοῦ ἐνὸς δοκεῖ τισι ψήγματα (or ψηγάτια τινα ἐλάχιστα καὶ ἀμερῆ) καταλείπειν. That the ascription was upheld by some few scholars only (δοκεῖ τισιν) and the fact that the view was inscribed within a general monistic theory of ultimate reality (πρὸ τοῦ ἐνός), tend to confirm that, in fact, Heraclitus is meant here. In any case the theory was developed by Heraclides Ponticus Frs. 118-121, esp. 121: Ἡρακλείδης θραύσματα (sc. τὰ ἐλάχιστα ὠρίζετο). But his ἀμερῆ (ἄναρμοι ὄγκοι) were not homoiomerics of the things composed out of them (Fr. 120) ed. Fr. Wehrli. The theory of corpuscules with no internal interstices and joints that were, thus, actually and physically indivisible, was taken up and elaborated in the context of Hellenistic medicine by the physician Asclepiades from Bithynia; cf. J.T. Vallance, *The lost Theory of Asclepiades of Bithynia*, 1990, esp. pp. 7-43. It is significant that the Derveni doctrine as circumscribed coincides with Archelaus' view on the matter, A10 (Augustinus): Anaxagorae successit auditor eius Archelaus. etiam ipse de particulis inter se similibus (i.e. ὁμοιομέρειαι) quibus singula quaequae fierent ita putavit constare omnia, ut inesse etiam mentem diceret, quae corpora aeterna, id est illas particulas, coniungendo et dissipando ageret omnia. And more specifically, Sidonius Apollinaris, XV, 94-6:

post hos Archeleos (with Diels, for the transmitted Arcesilas)
 divina mente paratam
 conicit hanc molem, confectam partibus illis
 quas atomos vocat ipse leves (i.e. aerial atoms).

The Archelaean provenance of the Derveni Commentary seems well testified.

17. The fragment is quoted by an anonymous commentary on Aratus (Petavius, *Uranol.* p. 274A); its Sophoclean authorship has been questioned: cf. e.g. Nauck² *loc.cit.* It is more likely Euripidean.
18. This is the case in early Orphism. In the Rhapsodies there is more complication in the First Principles, but the original experience of the first rising of Light out of primordial Darkness is well articulated, OF 65-67; 72-75. V. OF 2 from Euripides' *Hypsipyle* (performed in 409 BC) where, despite the broken and incomplete state of the text, the initial doctrine seems to be clearly indicated;

⟨ὦ⟩ πότνια θεῶν
 ⟨φ>άος ἄσκοπον <...>
 <αἰθ>έρι πρωτόγονο <ς?ν?...>
 <...> Ἐ<ρως ὅτε Ν<ύξ?>...>

There is *Νύξ*, and *Πρωτόγονος* = *Ἐρως* and his radiance (*φάος ἄσκοπον*) in the vast aetherial realm. *Ἄσκοπον φάος* is light mysterious, incomprehensible, diffused, without a recognizable focal point of origin: this is exactly the situation described in the verses OF 86 mentioned above. The precedence of Night over Light is well illustrated in the Derveni text, XI, 1-4: [...] τῆς Νυκτός. ἐξ ἀδύτοιο δ' αὐτὴν λέγει χρῆσαι γνώμην ποιούμενος ἄδυτον εἶναι τὸ βάθος τῆς Νυκτός. οὐ γὰρ δύνει ὡσπερ τὸ φῶς, ἀλλὰ νιν ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ μένον ἀγγὴ καταλαμβάνει. Night and its ineffable abyssal depth is the Ur-reality. Light comes and goes, illuminates by its presence and leaves the fundamental entity in its inherent quality when it departs. That daylight presupposes the darkness of the night from which it is borne is common experience among Greek as among other ancient peoples. Cf. Aeschylus, *Agamemnon*, 279; 264-5; Sophocles, *Trachiniae*, 94-6, and, ultimately, Hesiod, *Theogonia*, 124-5.

19. In this doxography (31A58) the impetus is ascribed to the Sun, but the archetypal Sun (*ἀρχέτυπος Ἥλιος*) is meant, i.e. Fire coacervated into its own hemisphere: πῦρ ὃν ἐν τῷ ἐτέρῳ ἡμισφαιρίῳ τοῦ Κόσμου, πεπληρωκὸς τὸ ἡμισφαῖρον, αἰεὶ κατ' ἀντικρὺ τῇ ἀντανγείᾳ ἑαυτοῦ (= τῷ φαινομένῳ Ἥλιῳ) τεταγμένον (A56).

20. Scythinos' affinity to Heraclitean thought was noticed in antiquity, Hieronymus claimed that he endeavoured to express poetically Heraclitus' theory; 22A1 DK I p.142.32-34 = Fr. 46 Wehrli.
21. The idea of striking the parts of the World as the strings of a lyre in effecting the cosmic harmony is further utilized explicitly by Cornutus, *Theologia Graeca*, XXXII, p. 67.17 sqq. Lang: μουσικὸς δὲ καὶ κιθαριστῆς παρεισθῆκται (sc. Apollo) τῷ κρούειν ἐναρμονίως πᾶν μέρος τοῦ κόσμου καὶ συνῶδον αὐτὸ πᾶσι τοῖς ἄλλοις μέρεσι ποιεῖν, μηδεμιᾶς αὐτῶν ἐκμελείας ἐν τοῖς οἴσι θεωρουμένης, etc. It is revealing that the Scythinian image was employed by Cleanthes, the Stoic who postulated solar hegemony in the formed World; SVF I 502: οὐκ ἀνέγνωσαν δ' οὔτοι Κλεάνθην τὸν φιλόσοφον, ὃς ἄντικρυς πλήκτρον τὸν Ἥλιον καλεῖ· ἐν γὰρ ταῖς ἀνατολαῖς, ἐρείδων τὰς αὐγὰς, οἶον πλήσσων τὸν κόσμον εἰς τὴν ἐναρμόνιον πορείαν τὸ φῶς ἄγει. Solar rays consist of fire transmitted, according to Empedocles, and it is this fire permeating the air which, upon appropriate conditions, striking the resisting air, manifests itself as lightning (31 A63 DK).

It is significant that, according to Anaxagoras, the Sun, by its light rays and thermal radiation, causes the aerial molecules, and everything contained in the air, to move in a jerky, vibratory, leapwising manner (59A 74; κίνησιν τρομώδη καὶ παλμούς εἴχουσαν). This is similar to the jumping agitation in which the corpuscles of things are found as they float in the air, and which mixes them up and, thus, generates the various existents, according to the Derveni Commentator. He, in fact, highlights the point by employing in the description of that irritation a term, *θόρνημι*, *θρόσκω*, signifying both jumping and mating. V. col. XXI 1-10; cf. XVII 8-9. This jerky motion is what constitutes the «striking one with another» (*κρούεσθαι πρὸς ἄλληλα*) of the various particles of varied being, as a result of solar action (XIV.2-4). *The Derveni Commentator belongs no doubt to the School (or rather, circle) of Anaxagoras; he must be, in fact, one of his immediate successors.*

22. There is harmless, systematic ambiguity in Cleanthes' conception of Godhead as is reported in the sources. God is (a) the World, (b) the Spirit permeating the material substance of the World, (c) the Soul and Mind of the World (= the Sun), (d) the celestial Aether, as collection of the quintessential sublimation of fire (vide I 530-4).
23. The tetralogy was probably performed in 484 BC. Then Aeschylus won his first victory (*Marmor Parium*, ep. 50; the chronology of the Marmor is one year too high). It is very likely that this was achieved through the Lycurgeia; vide T69 in Radt, *op.cit.* p. 54: *τούτου* (sc. Aeschylus) *διὰ τῶν Ἡδωνῶν* (i.e. the first play of the tetralogy) *εὐδοκμήσαντος.*

24. When at the end of the narrative in the relative passage the author refers to Aeschylus, the formulation shows that the report in its entirety is meant to be so ascribed: ὄθεν ὁ Διόνυσος ὀργισθεὶς αὐτῷ (sc. Orpheus) ἔπεμψε τὰς Βασσάρας, ὡς φησιν Αἰσχύλος ὁ τῶν τραγωδιῶν ποιητής, etc. Aeschylus dramatised not only the fact of Dionysus' wrath against *Orpheus* and the resulting punishment, but also the reason (ὄθεν) for that wrath and its consequence.
25. Cf. P.-W. R.E. (Ziegler) s.v. Orpheus columns 1228 sqq. for a convincing presentation of the evidence.
26. Heraclitus goes on to allegorise the Homeric picture of Apollo as implying the same solar identity; op.cit. 7, 3 - 8, 5.
27. Crates, also, invoked the identity Sun = Apollo in his exegesis of Homer, *Ilias*, Σ 239-40; v. *Scholia A ad loc.* (IV p. 478 Erbse).
28. Apollo Smintheus was especially worshipped in the Troad. Already in Homer he is invoked by Chryses, the priest of Apollo, *Ilias*, A, 37-39:

κλῦθί μεν, ἀργυρότοξ', ὃς Χρύσην ἀμφιβέβηκας
 Κίλλαν τε ζαθέην, Τενέδοιό τε ἴφι ἀνάσσεις,
 Σμινθεῦ·

V. Strabo, XIII, 604 (two sanctuaries in Tenedos and Chryse; various locations called Sminthia); cf. p. 612; v. p. 618. V. also Pausanias, X 12, 5-6; Ammianus Marcellinus, XXII, 8, 3; Eustathius, *Commentary on Dionysius Periegeta*, 536. The divine epithet came from a dialectal or glossematic expression *σμίνθος* or *σμίνθιος*, denoting mouse or rat; v. Aeschylus, Sisyphus Fr. 227 (where Sisyphus anodos from the Underworld was, in all probability, likened to the emergence from the earth of an ἀρουραῖος *σμίνθος*, a field rat); cf. Callimachus Fr. 177.16 Pfeiffer; Strabo, XIII, 613; Hesychius s.vv. *σμίνθα* and *σμίνθος*. The word was an Aeolic (or particularly Troadic) idiomatic form according to some (Aelianus, *de natura animalium*, XII, 5), including Polemo (fr. XXXI Preller); cf. Clemens, *Protrepticus*, II, 39, 7 = p. 34 Potter. Others claimed a Cretan origin for the appellation; I, 39. *Scholia in Lycophron*, 1303; *Scholia in Clemens, Protrepticus*, II, 39, 7; Servius, *Comm. in Aeneid.* III, 108.

However, the word occurs elsewhere, too, besides the Aeolic Lesbos (a divinity Σμινθεύς with clear Apollonian characteristics, musical and prophetic, IG XII, 2 n. 519). It is encountered persistently in Rhodes, as the name of an important religious festival (Philomnestus, *Περὶ τῶν ἐν Ρόδῳ Σμινθειῶν*, FGrH 527 nn. 1 and 2; Apollonius Sophista, *Lexicon Homericum*, s.v. Σμινθεῦ; IG XII, 1 n. 762.9; 15; 21); of various locations (Strabo, XIII, 605); of a month (Lindos, II, *Inscriptions*, Nos. 181; 182;

671 Blinkeberg; cf. IG XII, 1 Index VI, 5 p. 237 s.v.). Sanctuaries of Apollo Smintheus are testified for Keos in the Cyclades (Strabo, X, 487), as well as in Attica itself (IG II² 4854; cf. Strabo, XIII, 604, where an Attic connection for the Troadic cult is alluded to). The Attic, Cycladic (Paros may also have had a location named after the divine epithet in question, Strabo XIII, 605) and Rhodian spread of Sminthean worship is consistent with the Cretan origin claimed for its Aeolic prevalence in view of related ancient traditions. But nonetheless, a Thracian context is much closer at hand and likelier. The central importance of the Troad and its vicinity in this connection is enhanced if we construe the ancient name of the greater region and its people (*Μυσία*, *Μυσοί*; v. e.g. Strabo, XIII, 613; Photius, Suda s.v. ἔσχατος *Μυσῶν* (i.e. in Aeolis); western Anatolia was divided into Mysia, Lydia and Caria roughly corresponding to the Aeolic, Ionic and Doric coastal area) as related to *μῦς* (and not to the beech (*ὀξύη*), which, according to Xanthus, was called something like *μύση* by the Lydians, FGrH 765 n. 15; cf. Stephanus Byzantius s.v. *Μυσία*; according to Hesychius s.v. *μύσον*, the name was properly Mysian with that signification). The cult is connected permanently or aetiologically, positively or avertedly, with the presence, indeed a plethora, of field rats (Heracleides of Pontus, Fr. 154 Wehrli; the Cretan account has it (Strabo, XIII, 604; Aelianus, *de natura anim.* XII, 5); also the epichoric story (*Scholia A in Homer, Ilias*, A 39 = Polemo, Fr. XXXI, Preller; Aelianus, *loc.cit.*).

Tame mice thronged in the Troadic main sanctuary of the God and fed on public rations; white ones nested under the altar and one was sculpted by the Apollinian tripod; Aelianus, *loc.cit.* (p. 293.18-21 Herscher): *καὶ τρέφονται μὲν ἐν τῷ Σμινθείῳ μῦες τιθασοὶ δημοσίας τροφᾶς λαμβάνοντες, ὑπὸ δὲ τῷ βωμῷ φωλεύουσι λευκοί, καὶ παρὰ τῷ τρίποδι τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος ἕστηκε μῦς*. The God himself was represented as standing upon a rat; Strabo, XIII, 604 (III p. 43.20-3 Kramer): *ἐν δὲ τῇ Χρύσῃ ταύτῃ καὶ τὸ Σμινθέως Ἀπόλλωνός ἐστιν ἱερὸν καὶ τὸ σύμβολον τὸ τὴν ἐτυμότητα τοῦ ὀνόματος σῶζον, ὁ μῦς, ὑπόκειται τῷ ποδὶ τοῦ ξοάνου· Σκόπα δ' ἐστὶν ἔργα τοῦ Παρίου*. V. also Heracleides Ponticus *loc.cit.*, probably referring to the aboriginal cultic image of the God (*ξόανον*) taken as model by Scopas for his major work. Alternatively, the god was depicted treading on a mousehole; Hesychius s.v. *Σμίνθος· μῦς. καὶ ὁ Ἀπόλλων δὲ Σμινθεὺς διὰ τὸ ἐπὶ μυωπίας φασὶ βεβηκέναι*. *Μυωπία* is a mousehole, *σημαίνει δὲ τοὺς τῶν μυῶν χηραμούς*, Photius, *Lexicon*, and Suda s.v. *μυωξία* (probably, *μυωπία* has to be introduced as a separate lemma). Mysia (the mouse-country) and Mysoi (the mouse-people) were cognate to the great Thracian stock; v. Strabo, VII, 295; 303; XII, 542; 572 = III p. 572.13

Kramer (Xanthus the Lydian considered them a sort of half-way house between Phrygians (associated to the Thracians) and Lydians, but this is a rather partisan account; v. Xanthus FGrH 765 n. 15).

Mōs (and the related *ἀσπάλαξ*) is a typically *chthonic animal*, living underground, a creature of earth and darkness. It is natural to conceive of it antithetically to solar radiance. According to an account reported by Oppian, *Cynegeticus*, II, 612-28 (esp. 626-8), Phineus (having been saved from the Harpies by the Boreads) was transformed into a rat by Helios on account of Phineus' victory over Phoebus in mantic power (here Apollo is distinguished from the superior Sun, cf. I, 9). Cf. *Scholía in Apollonius Rhodius* II, 178 for a variant: *πηρωθῆναι δὲ λέγουσι τὸν Φινέα ὑπὸ Ἥλιου ὅτι πολυχρόνιος εἶλετο μάλλον εἶναι ἢ βλέπειν*. Another account of the same enmity is reported by Istros the Callimachean, FGrH 334 n. 67. In *Etymologicon Genuinum*, s.v. *ὀπίξεσθαι*, Apollo stands in the place of Helios. Oppian's report of the metamorphoses is repeated by Timotheus (*Supplementum Aristotelicum*, I, I p. 118); the same in *Cyranides*, p. 54 de Mely-Ruelle. A more forceful story has Phineus disclosing to mankind the mysteries of light (of the Sun), and so being punished by Helios Prometheus-wise. Olympiodorus, *Commentaire sur le livre Sur l' Action de Zosime, et sure les dires d' Hermès et des philosophes*, in Berthelot-Ruelle, *Collection des anciens alchimistes grecs*, 1887-8, t. I p. 101: *ἐν αὐτῷ δὲ (sc. ἐν τῇ ἀρχαῖκῃ βίβλῳ, a Hermetic book) μέμνηται καὶ περὶ τοῦ ἀσπάλακος, ὅτι καὶ αὐτὸς ἄνθρωπος ἦν καὶ ἐγένετο θεοκατάρατος ὡς ἐξειπὼν τὰ τοῦ ἡλίου μυστήρια. Καὶ ἐποίησεν αὐτὸν τυφλόν. Ἀμέλει καὶ ἐὰν φθάσῃ θεωρηθῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ ἡλίου, οὐ δέχεται αὐτὸν ἢ γῆ ἕως ἑσπέρας. Λέγει ὅτι "ὡς καὶ γινώσκων τὴν μορφήν τοῦ ἡλίου ὅποια ἦν". Καὶ ἐξώρισεν αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ μελαίνῃ γῆ ὡς παρανομήσαντα καὶ ἐξειπόντα τὸ μυστήριον τοῖς ἀνθρώποις.*

Apollo Smintheus emerges as the god of sunlight. His solar character is probably testified by the Athenian inscription mentioned supra. IG II² 4854 should be completed thus:

Ἀπόλλωνι Σμιν[θίῳ]
καὶ Ἀρτέμιδι [Σελα]σ[φόρῳ].

(Cf. H. Usener, *Götternamen*, 1948², p. 261 n. 32). *Ἄρτεμις σελασφόρος* is obviously the Moon. Hence the Sminthian Apollo represents most likely the Sun.

The subject of the religious significance of the mouse in Apolline worship is broached, but inadequately pursued, producing artificial results, by H. Grégoire - R. Goossens - M. Mathieu, *Asklēpios, Apollon Smintheus et*

Rudra: Études sur le dieu de la taupe et le dieu au rat dans la Grèce et dans l'Inde, 1949.

It is interesting to note a case of mouse divination among some peoples of the Ivory coast in West Africa. V. L. Homberger, *Where the Mouse is Omniscient: The Mouse Oracle among the Guro*, in John Pemberton III (ed.) *Insight and Artistry in African Divination*, 2000, pp. 157-67. There the Mantic operation is directly and explicitly connected to the chthonic element of the animal. According to one practitioner of this form of divination: mice can hear and understand all sounds of the earth, indeed they live in the earth, and we in turn populate it (*op.cit.* p. 162). The parallel to the circle of ideas implied by Apollo's (the divinatory divinity par excellence) connection to the mice in the worship of Sminthean (and Solar) Apollo, is remarkable.