

CAMBRIDGE  
UNIVERSITY PRESS



---

Ab ovo: Orpheus, Sanchuniathon, and the Origins of the Ionian World Model

Author(s): M. L. West

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *The Classical Quarterly*, New Series, Vol. 44, No. 2 (1994), pp. 289-307

Published by: [Cambridge University Press](#) on behalf of [The Classical Association](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/639634>

Accessed: 24/05/2012 18:18

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Cambridge University Press and The Classical Association are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Classical Quarterly*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

## A B O V O

## ORPHEUS, SANCHUNIATHON, AND THE ORIGINS OF THE IONIAN WORLD MODEL

It is well known that sometime before 700 B.C. the Greeks took over from the Near East a complex theogonic myth about the succession of rulers in heaven, involving the motifs of the castration of Sky and a swallowing and regurgitation by his successor, and that this story forms the framework of Hesiod's *Theogony*. It is less well known that at a later epoch, sometime before the middle of the sixth century B.C., a quite different and no less striking oriental myth about the beginning of things was introduced to Greece: the myth of the god Unaging Time, who created the materials for the world from his own seed, and of the cosmic egg out of which the heaven and the earth were formed. I have discussed this myth and its variants elsewhere.<sup>1</sup> My purpose in re-examining it here is firstly to clarify various details of the Phoenician versions of the cosmogony as reported in Greek sources, secondly to obtain a sharper picture of its original form, and thirdly to argue that the world model of the early Ionian philosophers, which to some extent set the pattern for subsequent Greek cosmology, owed more to the myth than has generally been appreciated.

I will begin by briefly enumerating its manifestations in Greek mythical and poetic cosmogony. It makes a partial appearance in Pherecydes of Syros, who has Chronos as one of his three pre-existing deities, and moreover a Chronos who creates cosmic elements out of his seed.<sup>2</sup> But its classic statement was in the earliest of the theogonies attributed to Orpheus, composed in the late sixth or early fifth century.<sup>3</sup> According to this account, the world began with a sort of watery abyss, possibly represented by the names Oceanus and Tethys, and with a coupling of Unaging Time (*Χρόνος ἀγήραος*) and Ananke, represented as winged, half-serpent figures. Chronos generated Aither and a huge, bottomless Chasm (Chaos), overlaid with gloomy darkness and Night:

*Αἰθέρα μὲν Χρόνος οὗτος (αὐτὸς?) ἀγήραος ἀφθιτόμητις  
γείνατο καὶ μέγα Χάσμα πελώριον ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα...  
οὐδέ τι πείραρ ὑπήν, οὐ πυθμὴν, οὐδέ τις ἔδρα.*

(Orph. fr. 66a/b Kern.) He also fashioned a shining egg, the progeny of Aither and Chaos:

*ἔπειτα δ' ἔτευξε μέγας Χρόνος Αἰθέρι δίωι  
ᾧεον ἀργυφεον.*

(Fr. 70.) In it, enclosed in a bright cloak (of cloud?) the radiant hermaphrodite Phanes, alias Protogonos and Eros, developed. The serpent Time squeezed the egg

<sup>1</sup> *Early Greek Philosophy and the Orient* [hereafter cited as *EGPO*], Oxford, 1971, 28–36; *The Orphic Poems* [hereafter *OP*], Oxford, 1983, 103–5, 198–201.

<sup>2</sup> DK 7 A 8, B 1; *EGPO* 11–13; H. S. Schibli, *Pherekydes of Syros*, Oxford, 1990, 27–38.

<sup>3</sup> For the contents and dating of this poem, and details of the evidence on which the above summary is based, see *OP*, chapter 3 and pp. 182–226.

until it broke. Thereupon the Aither and the misty Chasm were split, and the world was filled with Phanes' brilliance:

*Χάσμα δ' ὑπὲριον καὶ νήνεμος ἑρράγη Αἰθήρ  
ὀρρυμένοιο Φάνητος.*

(Fr. 72.) Phanes copulated with himself and gave birth to various gods.

Echoes of this 'Orphic' cosmogony are to be found in the theogony ascribed to Epimenides, in which two 'Titans' (i.e. half-serpent figures?) produced an egg, and more gods came from it,<sup>4</sup> and especially in the parodic cosmogony of Aristophanes' *Birds* (693–702).<sup>5</sup> But it was never taken up in general poetic tradition. In Hellenistic times and later it remains confined to the Orphic and Mithraic sphere.<sup>6</sup>

This Time–Egg cosmogony appears suddenly in sixth-century Greece and connects with nothing that has gone before. Its foreign provenance is proved conclusively by the parallel Phoenician, Iranian, and Indian myths, all of which seem to have gone into circulation at roughly the same period, around the middle of the first millennium B.C. It developed in the first place from Egyptian antecedents, perhaps on Phoenician soil. At any rate Phoenicia is likely to be closest to the source from which the story came to Greece, and it is on the Phoenician versions that I shall now focus.

#### *Eudemus' 'Sidonian' version*

The first of them we owe to the Peripatetic Eudemus of Rhodes, who included it in a survey of the theogonic doctrines of earlier thinkers, both Greek and barbarian. Eudemus' discussion is paraphrased, and amplified with Neoplatonic interpretations of the theogonies, by Damascius.<sup>7</sup> Shorn of the interpretations, which are of no use to us, the paraphrase runs:

*Σιδώνιοι δὲ κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν συγγραφέα (sc. Eudemus) πρὸ πάντων Χρόνον ὑποτίθενται καὶ Πόθον καὶ Ὁμίχλην· Πόθου δὲ καὶ Ὁμίχλης μιγέντων... Ἀέρα γενέσθαι καὶ Αὔραν... πάλιν δὲ ἐκ τούτων ἀμφοῖν ὠόν γεννηθήναι.*

The Sidonians, according to the same writer (sc. Eudemus), posit Time as existing before everything else, and Desire, and Nebula. And from the union of Desire and Nebula... came Aer and Aura... and again from these two an egg was produced.

This is obviously very much abbreviated, but so far as it goes it is clear. In the initial state of the world there exist three entities: Time, Desire, and Nebula. From the interaction of the two latter, expressed apparently in terms of sexual union, come Aer and Aura. These two in turn produce an egg.<sup>8</sup> This cannot have been the end of the story; from the egg, we may assume, other cosmic entities came, or it developed into our heaven and earth.

The thought behind this cosmogonic myth is that the world begins from a material principle of murky and indistinct nature (Nebula), which is acted upon by a dynamic principle identified as Desire or Longing. The presence of Time is also important. No particular action is attributed to him, at any rate in the summary account, but the idea

<sup>4</sup> DK 3 B 5; *OP* 47f., 112, 201f.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. *OP* 111f.

<sup>6</sup> See *OP* 252–5.

<sup>7</sup> Eudemus fr. 150 Wehrli; Damascius, *Περὶ τῶν πρώτων ἀρχῶν* iii. 162ff. W.–C. (L. G. Westerink and J. Combès, *Damascius. Traité des premiers principes*, Paris, 1986–91).

<sup>8</sup> ὠόν is Gruppe's certain correction of the *vox nihili* ὠτον. For a full justification of the emendation see the note of Westerink–Combès, *op. cit.* 238.

must be that the developments described took place in the course of time, over a long period. As a result of the activity of Desire, Nebula gives way to Aer and Aura, which we may perhaps understand as Still Air and Wind – again a passive or negative and an active or positive principle. Here it is the feminine noun that corresponds to the dynamic element; but this was not necessarily the case in the Phoenician original. The interaction of Air and Wind leads – again in the course of time – to the formation of the cosmic egg.

From what sort of source did Eudemus receive this cosmogony? There is no reason to think that any Greek before him had recorded it, or that he himself could read Phoenician. Most likely he had it from an oral source. In Rhodes he may have had many opportunities to speak with Phoenicians from passing ships. He attributed the cosmogony to ‘Sidonians’. This may indicate a specifically Sidonian source; but in Hebrew ‘Sidonian’ is the ordinary term for ‘Phoenician’, and we should perhaps allow for the possibility that a similar usage was current among some east Mediterranean Greeks.

And what was Eudemus’ informant’s source? Surely not his own fancy, but some current doctrine, perhaps enshrined in a literary work, whether in prose or verse. In the case of the Babylonian theogony which Damascius reports two paragraphs earlier, likewise from Eudemus, we can identify the underlying source as a version of the classic poem *Enūma eliš*. We shall see that Eudemus’ Phoenician cosmogony, while not identical with the others that are attested, shares significant features with them. They will help us to get a clearer idea of the Phoenician original from which he indirectly drew.

#### *Moch’s version*

Damascius knows of another Phoenician cosmogony, and he appends it to that recorded by Eudemus:

*ὡς δὲ ἔξωθεν Εὐδήμου τὴν Φοινίκων εὐρίσκομεν κατὰ Μωχον μυθολογίαν, Αἰθήρ ἦν τὸ πρῶτον καὶ Ἄηρ, αἱ δύο αὐταὶ ἀρχαί, ἐξ ὧν γεννᾶται Οὐλωμος... ἐξ οὗ ἑαυτῷ συνελθόντος γεννηθῆναι φασιν Χουσωρον ἀνοιγέα πρῶτον, εἶτα αἰόν... λέγεται γὰρ ἐξ αὐτοῦ βαγέντος εἰς δύο γενέσθαι οὐρανὸς καὶ γῆ τῶν διχοτομημάτων ἑκάτερον.*

But as we find outside Eudemus in the Phoenician mythology according to Mochos, there was Aither first of all and Aer, these two first principles, from whom Oulomos was generated... From him, after he had intercourse with himself, they say Chousoros the Opener was generated first, then an egg... For it is said that when it broke in two, heaven and earth appeared from the halves.

But in assigning to each of these entities its metaphysical status, Damascius expresses hesitation. Perhaps, he says, the functions he has assigned to Oulomos and Chousoros, namely τὸ ἄκρον τοῦ νοητοῦ and ἡ νοητὴ δύναμις, should be assigned to certain winds:

*εἰ μὴ ἄρα μετὰ τὰς δύο ἀρχὰς τὸ μὲν ἄκρον ἐστὶν Ἄνεμος ὁ εἷς, τὸ δὲ μέσον οἱ δύο ἄνεμοι Λίψ τε καὶ Νότος· ποιούσι γὰρ πῶς καὶ τούτους πρὸ τοῦ Οὐλωμου.*

Unless it is that after the two first principles the *akron* is Wind as a single entity and the *meson* consists of the two winds Lips and Notos; for they seem to put these too before Oulomos.

The Phoenician writer Moch(os) of Sidon is mentioned by several other Greek authors.<sup>9</sup> According to their own preoccupations, they categorize him variously as an

<sup>9</sup> The testimonia are collected by Jacoby as *FGrHist* 784.

antiquarian historian (Josephus, F 3), a philosopher (Diogenes Laertius, F 2), or a 'physicist prophet' (*φυσιολόγος προφήτης*, Iamblichus, F 5). He was reputed to have lived before the Trojan War (Strabo, F 6, from Posidonius). Iamblichus (l.c.) has Pythagoras sailing to Sidon and there meeting Mochos' descendants 'and the other Phoenician hierophants'. Tatian (T 1) names Theodotus, Hypsicrates, and Mochos as three Phoenician writers whose works were translated into Greek by 'Laitos, the man who made a detailed study of the lives of the philosophers' (*Λαίτος ὁ καὶ τοὺς βίου τῶν φιλοσόφων ἐπ' ἀκριβῆς πραγματευσάμενος*). Of Laitos too there are other mentions. Plutarch attests his interest in physics (784 F 7–8). But he also wrote *Φοινικικά* (F 1b), a romantic history in which Menelaus' visit to Phoenicia was bound up with Solomon's wedding to the daughter of Hiram king of Tyre. Laitos may have been of Phoenician stock himself. It has been assumed too readily that his name is the Roman Laetus.<sup>10</sup> It just might be a Greek name, *Λαίτος*, corresponding to Homer's Boeotian hero *Λήϊτος*, but no historical bearer of this name seems to be attested. I suspect that it represents Aramaic \*lā'it = Balbus, *Ψελλός*. As for Mochos' name, it is presumably Phoenician, though its meaning is not clear.<sup>11</sup>

The cosmogony reported from Moch contains two genuine Phoenician names that Laitos left untranslated and the copyist of the primary manuscript of Damascius left unaccented: *Οὐλωμος* and *Χουσωρος*. *Οὐλωμος* is \**ʿūlōm*, the expected Phoenician form corresponding to Hebrew *ʿōlām* 'remote time'. Here again is a personified Time; this must be the name that Eudemus' informant rendered as *Χρόνος*. As for *Χουσωρος*, he also appears in Sanchuniathon–Philo, in the form *Χουσωρ*, and there he is identified with Hephaestus (*FGrHist* 790 F 2, p. 808. 22). He is in fact the old god Kōṯaru, who appears in the Ugaritic epics as the divine craftsman *kṯr whss* 'Kothar-and-Hasis'; proto-Semitic and Ugaritic *ṯ* became *š* in Phoenician, and the vowels suffered the same shift as in *ʿōlām* > *ʿūlōm*. Semitic *k* and *š* normally appear as *χ* and *σ* in Greek transcriptions. Chousoros' title *ἀνοιγέυς* does not mean merely that he is to open the egg: it must represent Phoenician *pth*, and signifies an equation with the Egyptian Ptah.<sup>12</sup> The form *ἀνοιγέυς* (for *ἀνοίκτης*) is not found elsewhere, and seems designed for the function of a divine title. It might be better written with a capital, *Ἀνοιγέα*.

Moch's cosmogony may be interpreted as follows. It begins with two principles that are named even before Time and said to generate Time: Aither and Aer. In choosing these two terms, Laitos probably intended to express a distinction between (active, fiery) upper air and (passive, damp) lower air. I cannot suggest what Semitic words

<sup>10</sup> Westerink–Combès 238, 'un certain *Λαίτος* (Laetus), donc de l'époque romain'. But we know he was earlier than Posidonius.

<sup>11</sup> According to W. Gesenius, *Scripturae Linguaeque Phoeniciae Monumenta quotquot supersunt*, Lipsiae 1837, 431, it is a form of *malk* 'king' resulting from a sound-change /al/ > /ō/. More recent scholars, however, seem to limit this change to late Punic; see S. Segert, *A Grammar of Phoenician and Punic*, Munich, 1976, 67f. W. F. Albright, *Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan*, London, 1968, 194 n. 39, relates the name to that of Māki of Gad (Numbers 13.15) and the name Mky on a Punic inscription.

<sup>12</sup> W. F. Albright, op. cit. 193–6; J. Ebach, *Weltentstehung und Kulturentwicklung bei Philo von Byblos* (Beitr. z. Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament, 6. Folge, Heft 8) Stuttgart, 1979, 66, 434 n. 9; cf. S. Morenz in S. Morenz (ed.), *Aus Antike und Orient* (Festschr. W. Schubart), 1950, 81f. Ptah appears in connection with a cosmic egg in an inscription from the temple of Chon at Thebes of Graeco-Roman date (Morenz, l.c.) and in an Egyptian cosmogony related by Porphyry (*De cultu simulacrorum* fr. 10 Bidez) ap. Eus. *PE* 3.11.46: τὸν δὲ θεὸν τοῦτον (Κνήφ) ἐκ τοῦ στόματος προίεσθαι ὠὶόν φασι, ἐξ οὗ γεννάσθαι θεὸν ὃν αὐτοὶ προσαγορεύουσι Φθᾶ, οἱ δὲ Ἕλληνες Ἡφαιστον· ἐρμηνεύειν δὲ τὸ ὠὶὸν τὸν κόσμον.

they may represent.<sup>13</sup> We may see an analogy with God's separation of Light (ὄρ) and Darkness (ἠδῶσεκ) in Genesis 1.4, though if Moch had used the corresponding Phoenician words, we should have expected Laitos to render them by φῶς and σκοτός. As in Genesis the separation of Light and Darkness, named by God as Day and Night, initiates the counting of days, so Moch represents Time as being born from Aither and Aer.<sup>14</sup> It is not clear to us (as it was not clear to Damascius) how the winds fit in. They too apparently exist before Time. Perhaps they were responsible for effecting the separation between Aither and Aer.

The following developments have no counterpart in the biblical narrative. Time has intercourse with himself, and gives birth to the divine craftsman Khushor-Ptah and the cosmic egg which will be divided to form heaven and earth. The motif of the self-fructifying Time is paralleled in Pherecydes, the Orphic theogony, and the *Atharvaveda*; the detail of how it was done (ἐαυτῶι συνελθόντος) corresponds exactly to the Zoroastrian cosmogony as it is described in the Armenian sources.<sup>15</sup>

Khushor-Ptah doubtless has a demiurgic function. As 'Opener' he will open the egg and fashion its two halves into heaven and earth. That will not have been the end of his labours. Once again we think of Genesis.

#### *Thoth's version*

The third Phoenician cosmogony is the one recorded in Greek by Philo of Byblos (*FGrHist* 790). Philo's *Phoenician History*, a work in eight or nine books, was translated, or rather adapted, from a native work by one Sanchuniathon of Beirut. It was claimed that Sanchuniathon lived before the Trojan War, and that he gathered his information from various sources, 'studiously collecting and writing up all the ancient tradition from the histories current in the various cities and from the temple inscriptions' (φιλαληθῶς πᾶσαν τὴν παλαιὰν ἱστορίαν ἐκ τῶν κατὰ πόλιν ὑπομνημάτων καὶ τῶν ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς ἀναγραφῶν συναγαγὼν καὶ συγγράψας).<sup>16</sup> There is a reference to his finding in temples books written in a difficult script:

ὁ δὲ συμβαλὼν τοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν ἀδύτων εὐρεθεῖσιν ἀποκρύφους, Ἀμμουνέων γράμμασι συγκεκμηένους, ἃ δὴ οὐκ ἦν πᾶσι γνώριμα, τὴν μάθησιν ἀπάντων αὐτὸς ἤσκησε.

And lighting upon the out-of-the-way works found in the adyta, written in Ammounean characters, which were not familiar to everyone, he worked everything out for himself.<sup>17</sup>

Being curious to discover how the world began, he sought out the works of Taautos, whom the Egyptians call Thouth (Θωύθ), the Alexandrians Thoth (Θῶθ), and the

<sup>13</sup> *ἀήρ* occurs in the Septuagint only in the phrase ἐν νεφέλαις ἀέρος or ἀέρων at 2 Sam. 22.12 = Ps. 17(18).12, where it renders Hebrew *s'ḥāqīm*, a word normally translated by *νέφη*, *νεφέλαι*, or *οὐρανός*. *αἰθήρ* is not found in the Septuagint at all, though Symmachus often uses it to translate *śāhāq*. Nor does the concept of 'air' seem to be found in the Hebrew Bible. What is translated in English versions as 'birds of the air' is actually 'birds of heaven', and similarly with 'the way of an eagle in the air' at Prov. 30.19 ('in heaven'). At Job 41.16, 'One is so near to another that no air can come between them', the Hebrew actually has 'wind' (*rūḥ*, LXX πνεῦμα). Pausanias 7.23.7f. records an encounter with a philosophic Sidonian who identified Asclepius (Eshmun) with *ἀήρ*.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Democritus DK 68 A 72/Epicur. fr. 294 Us. χρόνος ἐστὶν ἡμεροειδὲς καὶ νυκτοειδὲς φάντασμα.

<sup>15</sup> See *EGPO* 30. We do not know whether the Orphic theogony was so explicit about Chronos, but it did describe Phanes as copulating with himself.

<sup>16</sup> Porphyry ap. Eus. *PE* 1.9.21 (*FGrHist* 790 F 1 p. 804.7), presumably paraphrasing Philo.

<sup>17</sup> Philo F 1 p. 805.8ff.

Greeks Hermes, because he knew that Taautos, as the first on earth who devised the art of writing, was the best authority on the earliest events.<sup>18</sup>

These statements come from Philo's preface, in which he strove to impress his Greek readers with the exceptional value and interest of Sanchuniathon's work, the high antiquity of the author, and the rare quality of his sources. References to ancient records discovered in temples and the like are a commonplace of impostors' literature.<sup>19</sup> One can see why some older scholars entertained the deepest suspicions of Philo's good faith, and took his Sanchuniathon for a fiction. It is now generally accepted that there was a genuine Phoenician work behind Philo's, though a much less ancient one than he claimed.<sup>20</sup> His statements about Sanchuniathon's sources are likely to be based on statements in the original. But in the original they may not have had the same air of 'hype' as they have in Philo's preface. For a Phoenician antiquary of the Hellenistic period – a plausible setting for Sanchuniathon – it would have been natural to seek information from town records and from temple libraries. There is nothing extravagant about the claim that he did this. What about the exotic *Ἀμμουνέων γράμματα*? Scholars have come to no definite conclusion on the meaning of *Ἀμμουνέων*,<sup>21</sup> but the most natural supposition is surely that it is the genitive of a masculine plural ethnic *Ἀμμουνεῖς*, and that these are the Ammonites, Hebrew *ʿammōnîm*, with the regular Phoenician change of /ō/ to /ū/ that we have seen before.<sup>22</sup> If so, Sanchuniathon was not claiming to have deciphered some thrillingly esoteric script such as Egyptian hieroglyphs, only an archaic or regional form of Canaanite alphabet, such as he might well have encountered in the course of his researches and, with a little application, successfully read. It is not said that no one could read the script, only that not everyone could. The Ammonite script was a variety of Aramaic, and so closely related to the Phoenician.<sup>23</sup>

What about the cosmogony of Thoth? Obviously this was a pseudepigraphon. But there is no reason to accuse Sanchuniathon of charlatanry. Like the fifth-century redactors of the Hebrew historico-legal cycle (*Genesis to Kings*), he wished to start his history from the beginning of the world, and he turned to an existing cosmogonic narrative, perhaps a poem. It happened to bear the authoritative name of Thoth, much as some Greek poems on the subject bore the name of Orpheus or Musaeus. The attribution of mystic writings to Thoth began in Egypt – not demonstrably before the Ptolemaic period – and from the second or first century B.C. it began to

<sup>18</sup> Philo F 1 p. 804.22ff. Philo's *Τααυτος* probably represents Phoenician *Ṭḥwt* or *Ṭḥwt*, corresponding to the Egyptian *Dḥwtj*.

<sup>19</sup> See W. Speyer, *Bücherfunde in der Glaubenswerbung der Antike* (Hypomnemata 24), Göttingen 1970; id., *Die literarische Fälschung im heidnischen und christlichen Altertum*, Munich, 1971, 67–71.

<sup>20</sup> See, for example, J. Barr, *Bull. of the John Rylands Library* 57, 1974, 17–68; L. Troiani, *L'opera storiografica di Filone da Byblos*, Pisa, 1974; J. Ebach (as in n. 12); A. I. Baumgarten, *The Phoenician History of Philo of Byblos. A Commentary*, Leiden, 1981, 1–6. Sanchuniathon is a genuine Phoenician name (*Šakkūnyāṭōn*, 'Shakkun has given'), but of a type not likely to be earlier than 700 B.C.; cf. P. Nautin, *Revue biblique* 56, 1949, 272; Barr 36; Baumgarten 42–5. The Greek form *Σαγχουνιάθων* shows in the first syllable a sub-phonemic nasalization, for which cf. Z. S. Harris, *A Grammar of the Phoenician Language*, New Haven, 1936, 30.

<sup>21</sup> Opinions are reviewed by Nautin (as in n. 20), 262–5. He himself emends to *Ἀμμωνείων* and transposes the word to join *ἀδύτων*: 'les sanctuaires d' Ammon'. He is followed by Baumgarten (as in n. 20), 79.

<sup>22</sup> There is no reason why we should expect Philo to have known or adopted the Septuagint form, *Ἀμμανίται*.

<sup>23</sup> See for an up-to-date account of it J. Naveh, *Early History of the Alphabet*, 2nd ed., Jerusalem, 1987, 105–11 and 218.

take hold among Greeks, with Hermes representing the Egyptian god.<sup>24</sup> It is not surprising if the same fashion had spread to Phoenicia, where Egyptian influence was always strong. However, we should observe that so far as our evidence goes, an author who cites a work ascribed to Thoth is unlikely to be pre-Hellenistic.<sup>25</sup>

For our knowledge of the cosmogony, as for most of our knowledge of Sanchuniathon, we depend on Eusebius, who quotes lengthy extracts from Philo's work. The relevant passage is *Praep. Evang.* 1.10.1–5 (*FGrHist* 790 F 2, p. 806. 15–807.9). We need to keep in mind the multi-layered nature of the transmission. The text before us is Eusebius. He is quoting from Philo of Byblos. Philo was adapting Sanchuniathon. Sanchuniathon was adapting a cosmogony ascribed to Thoth. It is possible that we have to reckon with even another link in the chain, namely Porphyry, who had made reference to Sanchuniathon in several places and whom Eusebius has constantly in view as his adversary. It may well have been Porphyry's citations that drew Eusebius' attention to Sanchuniathon in the first place. It is not credible that Eusebius should have got all his quotations of Philo from Porphyry; he clearly consulted Philo directly. But Porphyry may perhaps have quoted parts of the same passages from Philo as Eusebius does, and if so, Eusebius may in those places have had one eye on Philo and one eye on Porphyry's quotation of Philo. This hypothesis will perhaps seem at first sight a gratuitous complication, but it may help to solve a problem.

After quoting selected passages from Philo's preface, Eusebius introduces his version of Sanchuniathon's cosmogony thus:

ἐξῆς ἀπάρχεται τῆς τοῦ Σαγχουινιάθωνος ἐρμηνείας, ὡδὲ πως τὴν Φοινικικὴν ἐκτιθέμενος θεολογίαν·

τὴν τῶν ὄλων ἀρχὴν ὑποτίθεται ἀέρα ζοφώδη καὶ πνευματώδη, ἢ πνοὴν ἀέρος ζοφώδους, καὶ χάος θολερὸν ἐρεβώδες· ταῦτα δὲ εἶναι ἀπειρα, καὶ διὰ πολὺν αἰῶνα μὴ ἔχειν πέρασ· ὅτε δέ, φησὶν, ἠράσθη τὸ πνεῦμα τῶν ἰδίων ἀρχῶν, καὶ ἐγένετο σύγκρασις, ἢ πλοκὴ ἐκείνῃ ἐκλήθη Πόθος. αὐτὴ δὲ ἀρχὴ κτίσεως ἀπάντων, αὐτὸ δὲ οὐκ ἐγίνωσκε τὴν αὐτοῦ κτίσιν. καὶ ἐκ τῆς αὐτοῦ συμπλοκῆς τοῦ πνεύματος ἐγένετο Μῶτ. τοῦτό τινές φασιν ἰλὺν, οἱ δὲ ὕδατῶδους μίξεως σῆψιν. καὶ ἐκ ταύτης ἐγένετο πάσα σπορά κτίσεως καὶ γένεσις τῶν ὄλων.

ἦν δὲ τινα ζῶια οὐκ ἔχοντα αἴσθησιν, ἐξ ὧν ἐγένετο ζῶια νοερά· καὶ ἐκλήθη Ζωφὴ σαμίν, τοῦτ' ἔστιν οὐρανοῦ κατοπταί.

καὶ ἀνεπλάσθη ὁμοίως (ὁ Μῶτ Hölischer) ὠιοῦ σχήματι· καὶ ἐξέλαμψε <τοῦ> Μῶτ ἡλίος τε καὶ σελήνη, ἀστέρες τε καὶ ἀστρα μεγάλα.

[Eusebius:] τοιαύτη μὲν αὐτῶν ἡ κοσμογονία, ἀντικρυς ἀθεοότητα εἰσάγουσα· ἴδωμεν δὲ ἐξῆς ὡς καὶ τὴν ζωιογονίαν ὑποστήναι λέγει. φησὶν οὖν·

[Philo:] καὶ τοῦ ἀέρος διανγασάντος διὰ πύρωσιν καὶ τῆς θαλάσσης καὶ τῆς γῆς, ἐγένετο πνεύματα καὶ νέφη καὶ οὐρανίων ὑδάτων μέγισται καταφοραὶ καὶ χύσεις. καὶ ἐπειδὴ διεκρίθη καὶ τοῦ ἰδίου τόπου ἰδιεχωρίσθη διὰ τὴν τοῦ ἡλίου πύρωσιν, καὶ ἅλιν συνήτησε πάντα ἐν ἀκαρεῖ (v.1. ἀέρι) τὰδε τοῖσδε καὶ συνέρραξαν, βρονταὶ τε ἀπετελέσθησαν καὶ ἀστραπαί. καὶ πρὸς τὸν πάταγον τῶν βροντῶν τὰ προγεγραμμένα νοερά ζῶια ἐργηγόρησεν, καὶ πρὸς τὸν ἦχον ἐπτύρη, καὶ ἐκινήθη ἐν τε γῆι καὶ θαλάσσει ἄρρεν καὶ θήλυ.

[Eusebius:] τοιαύτη αὐτοῖς καὶ ἡ ζωιογονία. τούτοις ἐξῆς ὁ αὐτὸς συγγραφεὺς ἐπιφέρει λέγων·

[Philo:] ταῦθ' εὐρέθη ἐν τῇ κοσμογονίᾳ γεγραμμένα Τααῦτου καὶ τοῖς ἐκείνου ὑπομνήμασιν ἕκ τε στοχασμῶν καὶ τεκμηρίων ὧν ἑώρακεν αὐτοῦ ἡ διάνοια καὶ ἡῦρε καὶ ἡμῖν ἐφώτισεν.

Next he begins on his exposition of Sanchuniathon, setting out the Phoenician theology more or less like this:

As the beginning of all things he posits dark, windy air, or a wind of dark air, and turbid, gloomy *chaos*; these were unbounded, and for long ages found no terminus. But when (he says) the wind fell in love with its own beginnings and a blending took place, that entanglement was

<sup>24</sup> See G. Fowden, *The Egyptian Hermes*, Cambridge, 1986, especially pp. 1–11 and 57–68.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. Baumgarten (as in n. 20), 74.

called Desire. This was the beginning of the foundation of everything, yet it did not recognize its own foundation. And from its self-entanglement – the wind’s – came Mot. Some say this was mud, some say the ooze from a watery mixture. And from this came the whole seed of creation and the genesis of all things.

And there were certain living things that were without perception, from which came others with perception, and they were called *Zophe shamin*, that is, Watchers of the Sky.

And it was formed like the shape of an egg. And there shone out <from> Mot sun and moon, stars and ‘great stars’.

[Eusebius] Such is their cosmogony, which is a plain resort to atheism. Next let us see what he tells us of the basis of their zoogony. This is what he says:

[Philo] And when the air became distinct as a result of heating, and the sea and the earth, there arose winds and cloud and huge precipitations of the celestial waters. And when it divided out and became separated from its own location through being heated by the sun, and then everything met and collided together again in an instant [v.1. in the air], thunder and lightning were produced. And at the claps of thunder the afore-mentioned percipient creatures woke up, and they trembled at the noise, and male and female were stirred on land and sea.

[Eusebius] Such is their zoogony. Following that the same writer adds:

[Philo] This account was found written in the cosmogony of Thoth and in his *hypomnemata*, based on conjectures and indications which his intellect saw and found out and made clear to us.

Eusebius distinguishes the cosmogony from the zoogony, but they are clearly integral parts of a single account, and I shall use ‘the cosmogony’ to cover the two together. Philo’s statement that Sanchuniathon had got this from a different source from the rest of his work seems to be confirmed by a stylistic feature noted by E. Renan:<sup>26</sup> the constant use of *καί* to introduce sentences in these fragments and not in the rest. Others have suggested that the underlying text, the cosmogony of ‘Thoth’, was a poem, arguing from apparent cases of *parallelismus membrorum*, the characteristic feature of Semitic poetry.<sup>27</sup> This may well be right. However, not all the repetitions in Eusebius’ text are to be explained in this way.

Right at the beginning we have the doublet *ἄερα ζοφώδη καὶ πνευματώδη ἢ πνοὴν ἄερος ζοφώδους*, ‘dark windy air, or a wind of dark air’. What is the origin of these alternative phrasings? As the lexical elements are the same in both, they can hardly reflect poetic parallelism in ‘Thoth’. They cannot be merely scribal variants, one of which has been incorporated from the margin. Nor is it plausible to account for them (as I once thought) as Philo’s conscientious efforts to render the nuance of Sanchuniathon’s original. No ancient translator recorded in this way his hesitations between alternative phrasings, and in any case, in view of the fixed order of construct noun and genitive in the Semitic languages, there can have been no ambiguity as to whether ‘wind’ qualified ‘dark air’ or vice versa. Philo, then, can only have written one phrase where we read two. The duplication must be due to Eusebius, and the reason for it will be that he had two versions of Philo’s text in front of him. In the light of what has been said above, we can reasonably conjecture that these were an actual copy of Philo’s *Phoinikika* and a quotation from Philo in Porphyry. If it is asked why he did not simply dismiss Porphyry’s variant version as inaccurate, the answer might be that he thought that Porphyry’s version, being taken from an older copy of Philo, might be more correct than his own copy. In fact its divergent phrasing

<sup>26</sup> *Mémoires de l’Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* 23(2), 1868, 255.

<sup>27</sup> C. Clemen, *Die phönikische Religion nach Philon von Byblos (Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft* 42.3, 1939) 39; U. Hölscher, *Hermes* 81, 1953, 394f. = H.-G. Gadamer (ed.), *Um die Begriffswelt der Vorsokratiker* (Wege der Forschung, 9) Darmstadt, 1968, 139f. (with a tentative layout of the text to reflect the original verses); Baumgarten (as in n. 20), 98–100.

was probably due to Porphyry's habit of introducing minor verbal alterations into his quotations.<sup>28</sup>

Apart from the doublet phrase, is the sentence Philo verbatim, or Eusebius' paraphrase, becoming a verbatim quotation only at ὅτε δέ (φησὶν) ἠράσθη? Is the subject of ὑποτίθεται and φησὶν Philo or Sanchuniathon? I think it is Philo verbatim from the start. Philo has just come to the end of his preface, and now begins his presentation of the contents of Sanchuniathon's work, paraphrasing in the first sentence and then modulating to direct quotation. This is strongly indicated by the fact that the opening sentence, much more than what follows, is full of the language of Greek (Stoic) cosmology: τὴν τῶν ὄλων ἀρχὴν, ἀέρα ζοφώδη, χάος θολερὸν, ἀπειρα/μὴ ἔχειν πέρασ.<sup>29</sup> It is evidently a philosophical interpretation of Sanchuniathon's description of the initial state of the world, not a literal translation, and as such it must be put to Philo's account; Eusebius would not have undertaken such an operation.

Sanchuniathon may have begun like Genesis: 'In the beginning...'; that would invite the Greek paraphrase τὴν τῶν ὄλων ἀρχὴν ὑποτίθεται.... The Genesis account also suggests other equivalences. The 'windy dark air' or 'wind of dark air' may plausibly be resolved into the darkness and wind of Genesis 1:2 (ἡδῶεκ, rī'ḥ), especially as the wind appears on its own in the next sentence (τὸ πνεῦμα).<sup>30</sup> What about the χάος θολερὸν ἐρεβώδες? We should understand χάος in the sense in which the Stoics interpreted this Hesiodic term: as the primeval water.<sup>31</sup> θολερός is an adjective applicable above all to water. Ἐρεβος, according to the same Stoic school of interpretation, was the dark air that arose from the primeval water.<sup>32</sup> What Philo was seeking to express in his Stoicizing phraseology, then, was the idea of a dark, turbid watery mass. This corresponds exactly to the t'hôm ('the deep') of Genesis, upon which the darkness lay. What Sanchuniathon wrote at the start of his cosmogony, therefore, was something like 'In the beginning (there was no earth and no heaven, but) darkness and wind enveloped the deep.'

These entities, says Philo, were ἀπειρα and for long ages they found no terminus. A plausible Hebrew equivalent of διὰ πολλὴν αἰῶνα would be mē'ōlām, and it is tempting to speculate that in the Phoenician text the word ʿālōm played a role, perhaps as an abstract entity as in the two other Phoenician cosmogonies that we have considered.

Philo now applies himself to a closer rendering of Sanchuniathon's original (though we should not expect to find from now on a literal translation free from paraphrastic

<sup>28</sup> Cf. H.-R. Schwyzer, *Chairemon*, Leipzig, 1932, 100–106; W. Pötscher, *Theophrastos Περὶ Εὐσεβείας*, Leiden, 1964, 5–13.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. Ebach (as in n. 12), 78. The first phrase is commonplace in the doxographers. The second reflects Chrysippus' teaching that the air is intrinsically dark but lit up by the sun: Plut. *De Sto. repugn.* 1053f. τὸν ἀέρα φύσει ζοφερὸν εἶναι λέγει; Jo. Diac. in Hes. *Th.* 123 (p. 306 Flach) ἐκ Χάους δέ τὸ Ἐρεβος καὶ ἡ Νύξ γεννᾶται, δηλαδὴ ὁ ἀπὸ τοῦ τῆς διακοσμήσεως ὑγροῦ ζοφώδους καὶ σκοτεινῆς ἀήρ; Anon. Exeg. in Hes. *Th.* 116 (p. 376 Fl.) ὁ ἀήρ φύσει ὦν ζοφερός ὑπὸ ἡλίου φωτίζεται. ἐπεὶ δὲ ὁ μὲν κατὰ μέσον οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς ἀήρ κἄν ζοφώδης ἐστὶν κτλ.

<sup>30</sup> What appears in the Authorized Version as 'the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters' would be more accurately rendered 'the wind of God flapped against the waters'. God will have been absent from Sanchuniathon's account.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. *SVF* i. 29.8–23, ii. 143.44, sch. Hes. *Th.* 115, 116c, 117a, 123, Ach. Tat. *Isag. in Arat.* p. 31, 28 Maass, etc.; F. Wehrli, *Zur Geschichte der allegorischen Deutung Homers im Altertum*, Diss. Basel, 1928, 25.

<sup>32</sup> Sch. Hes. *Th.* 123 (p. 27.14ff. Di Gregorio); cf. Jo. Diac. quoted above, n. 29.

expansion). *ἤρασθη τὸ πνεῦμα τῶν ἰδίων ἀρχῶν*: this at once looks un-Greek. The wind conceived a yearning for its own starting-point; as we might say, it began to chase its own tail. In other words it developed into a whirlwind.<sup>33</sup> This *πλοκή* or *συμπλοκή* of the wind resulted in a *σύγκρασις*, which was the beginning of all creation.

The wind's self-embrace was called Pothos, Desire: we have already encountered this power in Eudemus' Phoenician cosmogony, and it suits what we have just been told about the cause of the whirlwind. Then we read that from the wind's *συμπλοκή* came *Μώτ*. The mysterious name is followed by the sentence *τοῦτό τινές φασιν ἰλύν, οἱ δὲ ὕδατώδους μίξεως σήψιν*, 'some say this is mud, some say the ooze from a watery mixture'. Some explanation of 'Mot' is certainly in place; but this sentence, I submit, is not. It makes no sense that the circling wind should turn into mud or slime; nor is the following narrative intelligible after such a transformation; nor does the word yield such a meaning in terms of any plausible Semitic etymology. And since Philo is the first and only Greek translator of Sanchuniathon, how can he refer to competing interpretations of the Phoenician word? The sentence seems to refer to a subsequent stage of the cosmogony, when the primal waters have started to solidify.<sup>34</sup> It probably does not belong in Philo's text at all; Eusebius perhaps imported it from Porphyry. At any rate it is out of place where it stands now, and should be removed. We shall see presently how its intrusion can be accounted for.

Its presence has obscured the fact that in the sentences about Pothos and Mot another doublet is to be recognized.

*ὅτε δὲ ἤρασθη τὸ πνεῦμα τῶν ἰδίων ἀρχῶν,  
καὶ ἐγένετο σύγκρασις, ἡ πλοκή ἐκείνη  
ἐκλήθη Πόθος.*

*αὕτη δὲ ἀρχὴ κτίσεως ἀπάντων, αὐτὸ δὲ οὐκ  
ἐγίνωσκε τὴν αὐτοῦ κτίσιν.*

*καὶ ἐκ τῆς αὐτοῦ συμπλοκῆς τοῦ πνεύματος  
ἐγένετο Μώτ. {τοῦτό τινές φασιν ἰλύν, οἱ δὲ  
ὕδατώδους μίξεως σήψιν.}*

*καὶ ἐκ ταύτης ἐγένετο πάσα σπορά κτίσεως  
καὶ γένεσις τῶν ὄλων.*

Just as *αὕτη* in the left-hand column refers back to *ἡ πλοκή*, so *ἐκ ταύτης* in the right-hand column refers back to *τῆς συμπλοκῆς*: this makes it still clearer that the sentence *τοῦτο—σήψιν* is intrusive.

Now, what is the relation between the parallel phrases *ἐκλήθη Πόθος* and *ἐγένετο Μώτ*? One might expect *ἐκλήθη* to be combined with the foreign word, and this then to be interpreted, as below we find *καὶ ἐκλήθη Ζωφὴ σαμίν, τοῦτ' ἔστιν οὐρανοῦ κατόπται*, and after the cosmogony at p. 807.24 *Βεελασαμην καλοῦντες, ὃ ἔστι παρὰ Φοίνιξι κύριος οὐρανοῦ*. If the left-hand column represents Eusebius' transcription of Philo, and the right-hand column Porphyry's paraphrase which Eusebius has conflated with it, Philo's original may have been *ἐκλήθη Μώτ, τοῦτ' ἔστι Πόθος*.

In fact it is very plausible that *Μώτ* should have been the Phoenician word corresponding to *Πόθος*. Scholars have tended to accept Otto Eissfeldt's suggestion

<sup>33</sup> F. Løkkegaard, *Studia Theologica* 8, 1954, 55, 'The wind fell in love with its own beginning, that is, made a tornado.' For a circle as a return to an *ἀρχή* cf. Heraclitus 22 B 103 *ξυὸν ἀρχὴ καὶ πέρασ ἐπὶ κύκλου περιφερείας*. Alcmeon of Croton said that men perish *ὅτι οὐ δύνανται τὴν ἀρχὴν τῷ τέλει προσάψαι*, that is, achieve perpetual cyclical motion like the heavenly bodies (24 B 2, cf. A 12). Sanchuniathon may have used the word *rūš* or *rešit*.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. above, n. 29; sch. A.R. 1.496–8b *καὶ Ζήνων δὲ (SVF i. 29.17) τὸ παρ' Ἡσιόδω Χάος ὕδωρ εἶναι φησιν, οὐ συνιζάνοντος ἰλύν γενέσθαι*; Diod. 1.7.1 (separation of elements from the original mixture) *τὸ δὲ ἰλυώδες καὶ θολερὸν μετὰ τῆς τῶν ὑγρῶν συγκρίσεως ἐπὶ ταῦτο καταστήναι διὰ τὸ βάρος*; *OP* 183.

that *Πόθος* represents the Phoenician counterpart of the Hebrew *rûḥ*, which from its basic meaning of ‘wind, breath’ came to be used also of ‘spirit, disposition, inner impulse, seat of emotion’, etc.<sup>35</sup> But we have already assumed this word to lie behind the *πνοή* or *πνεῦμα* above. And it is impossible to believe that *rûḥ* (or whatever the Phoenician form of the word was) would have been translated into Greek – both by Eudemus’ informant and by Philo – as ‘Desire’ and not as ‘Wind’. What was the Phoenician for ‘desire’? We do not know; but a guess based on Hebrew, which had a very similar vocabulary, will be the best guess we can make. The standard Hebrew verb for ‘desire’ is *ʾāwāh*. Deverbative abstracts are often formed with the prefixes *m-* or *t-*. The usual noun in Hebrew is *taʾāwāh*; the feminine ending *-āh* represents older *-at*, which was preserved in Phoenician. A parallel formation with the *m-* prefix would have been equally correct and it is possible that in Phoenician such a form prevailed: *\*maʾw(a)t*.<sup>36</sup> Aleph was weak in Phoenician and tended to disappear in pronunciation – *\*mawt* – and *aw* contracted into *ō*: *Mōt*. The only slight difficulty in so accounting for Philo’s *Mōt* is that Semitic tau (*t*) is normally represented by *θ* in Greek, as for example later in Philo’s narrative where a different *Mōt*, the god of death, appears as *Μούθ*. But there are exceptions to the general rule: p. 809.23 *Βαίτυλον*, 810.24 *et al.* *Ἀστάρτη*, 812.12 *Βααλτίδι*, 13 *et al.* *Βηρυτόν* (contra 809.15 *Βηρούθ*), 814.13 *Ἀνωβρέτ*, and perhaps *Τάαντος*.<sup>37</sup>

We now have a whirlwind named Desire moulding the boundless deep, but we have as yet no heaven or earth. It is disconcerting, therefore, suddenly to be told that ‘there were certain living things devoid of perception, from which came others with perception, named Watchers of the Sky.’ This sentence seems to be another that is out of place. Eusebius’ transition shortly afterwards, ‘Such then is their cosmogony... next let us see how he (Philo) describes their zoogony’, makes it as clear as we could wish that he has *not* just told us about the generation of living things. And once the sentence is removed, the following one immediately makes much better sense. It was not the living creatures that were moulded in the form of an egg, but the whirling wind-driven cosmos that contained in it the seeds of all creation. Uvo Hölscher’s emendation of *ὁμοίως* to *ὁ Μώτ* would make this explicit, though the transmitted word is defensible.<sup>38</sup> *Mot* appears again in the next sentence, anarthrous in the manuscripts, but that could only yield the (non)sense ‘And *Mot* shone out, the sun and moon, the stars and “great stars”.’ The meaning required is surely that the heavenly lights shone out *from* *Mot*, and for this we need *ἐξέλαμψεν* (ἐκ τοῦ) *Mōt*<sup>39</sup> or simply *ἐξέλαμψε* (τοῦ) *Mōt*.

In passing from cosmogony to zoogony, Eusebius evidently omits some details of the world’s evolution, though the development of living creatures is so bound up with cosmogonic processes that he has to continue with some further account of the latter. The cosmic scrambled egg, after bursting out in lights, had separated into air, sea, and

<sup>35</sup> *Forschungen und Fortschritte* 16, 1940, 1f. = *Kl. Schr.* ii. 259. I acquiesced in *EGPO* 29. Ebach (as in n. 12), 39, objects on the first of the grounds given above.

<sup>36</sup> An *m-*form actually occurs in Hebrew, with a different suffix, in the *maʾāwayyē rāšāʿ* of Ps. 140.9 (poetic *hapax*).

<sup>37</sup> Cf. n. 18; Barr (as in n. 20), 47 n. 2.

<sup>38</sup> Hölscher as cited in n. 27, arguing ‘*Ὅμοίως* ὠιοῦ σχήματι halte ich für falsch, σχήματι braucht kein “gleichwie”.’ But the dative would look bare without a preposition such as *ἐν*; and a search of the TLG disc (version ‘D’) produced two parallels for *ὁμοίως*: schol. Dion. Per. 158 *καὶ περιφερὲι τόξου σχήματι ὁμοίων ἂν ἰδοῖς τὸν Πόντον*, and Justin Martyr, *Dial. cum Tryphone* 40 *τὸ γὰρ ὀπώμενον πρόβατον σχηματιζόμενον ὁμοίως τῷ σχήματι τοῦ σταυροῦ ὀπᾶται*.

<sup>39</sup> H. Ewald, *Gött. Abh.* 5, 1851, 37. Barr’s suggestion (as in n. 20, 23 n. 2) that *Mōt* here is a corruption of something corresponding to the Hebrew *mʿōrōt* ‘heavenly lights’ is ingenious, but unnecessarily far-fetched.

earth. But the sun's heat caused evaporation and dislocations of the air, which resulted in a lot of wild weather. Once more we seem to be faced with a doublet in Eusebius' account:

καὶ τοῦ ἀέρος διαυγάσαντος διὰ πύρωσιν καὶ τῆς θαλάσσης καὶ τῆς γῆς, ἐγένετο πνεύματα καταφοραὶ καὶ χύσεις. καὶ ἐπειδὴ διεκρίθη καὶ τοῦ ἰδίου τόπου ἰδιεχωρίσθη διὰ τὴν τοῦ ἡλίου πύρωσιν, καὶ πάλιν συνήτησε πάντα ἐν ἀκαρεῖ τὰδε τοῖσδε καὶ συνέρραξαν, βρονταί τε ἀπετέλεσθησαν καὶ ἀστραπαί.

καὶ πρὸς τὸν πάταγον τῶν βροντῶν τὰ προγεγραμμένα νοερὰ ζῶια ἐγρηγόρησεν, καὶ πρὸς τὸν ἦχον ἐπτύρη, καὶ ἐκινήθη ἐν τε γῆι καὶ θαλάσσει ἄρρην καὶ θῆλυ.

The thunder and lightning jolted the living things into a higher state of consciousness: they 'woke up', and were terrified, and 'male and female were stirred in land and sea'. It is not altogether clear whether this signifies the differentiation of the sexes (as in Genesis 1.27, 'male and female created he them') or – what ἐκινήθη more naturally suggests – their arousal to coitus. Perhaps it was both at once. Whatever exactly it means, we gather that terrestrial and marine fauna now exist, sexually differentiated, fully sentient, and ready to reproduce themselves by the sexual method from now on. Although Eusebius (Philo) says that it was 'the aforesaid percipient creatures' that 'woke up' at the stimulus of the thunder and lightning, it seems reasonable to suppose that their 'waking up' was in fact synonymous with their transition from non-percipient to percipient beings. The first mention of their becoming sentient was an anticipation of the thunderstorm narrative, and Philo failed to understand this.

It still remains to be clarified how the insensate creatures came into being in the first place, and where the sentence that introduces them belongs. As to the latter question, the answer must be that it belongs somewhere after the appearance of the lights of heaven and before the interaction of elements that produced storms: in other words, somewhere in the passage of Philo that Eusebius omitted in passing from cosmogony to zoogony. When he reached the awakening of the insensate creatures, he realized that he had passed over the prior mention of them, and that he needed to restore it. He wrote it in his margin, probably meaning it to go before καὶ τοῦ ἀέρος διαυγάσαντος, and it was then inserted in the wrong place.

We are now in a position to account for the other intrusive sentence a couple of lines earlier: τοὔτο τινές φασιν ἰλύν, οἱ δὲ ὑδατώδους μίξεως σῆψιν. This belonged together with the first appearance of the living things, and was part of the same marginal insertion by Eusebius. The passage that he had passed over must have described the transformation of the original turbid waters, or a part of them, into mud or slime. It was in this slime that the primitive life-forms appeared by spontaneous generation, as was believed to happen visibly in the mud left by the inundations of the Nile.<sup>40</sup> We find a very similar account in the cosmogony presented by Diodorus (1.7.1–6).<sup>41</sup> According to this, the world was originally a single mixture. When its constituent parts separated themselves out, the fiery elements rose high, with the result that the sun and the other luminaries became caught up in the circular

<sup>40</sup> Diod. 1.10.1–3; cf. Troiani (as in n. 20), 84f.; Ebach (as in n. 12), 43f., 74, 76.

<sup>41</sup> Compared by O. Eissfeldt in *Éléments orientaux dans la religion grecque ancienne* (Colloque de Strasbourg, 22–24 mai 1958) Paris, 1960, 3, 7ff., who followed the now discredited theory that Diodorus' cosmogony was taken from Democritus. It is now regarded as Hellenistic-eclectic; see W. Spoerri, *Späthellenistische Berichte über Welt, Kultur und Götter*, Basel, 1959, 1–38, 114–17, 126–9, et al. Cf. Baumgarten (as in n. 20), 107. It does, however, contain some traditional motifs that go back to Anaximander and Anaxagoras, both of whom held that life first developed in the moist element as it was dried out by the sun; see below. p. 306.

current, while the muddy and turbid elements, with the moisture contained in them, settled down under their own weight into one mass (τὸ δὲ ἰλυώδες καὶ θολερὸν μετὰ τῆς τῶν ὑγρῶν συγκρίσεως ἐπὶ ταῦτὸ καταστήναι διὰ τὸ βάρος). The force of rotation separated this liquid mass further into sea and a soft, muddy earth, which, warmed by the sun, produced bubbles such as we see even now in marshy areas; from these emerged living creatures of all kinds, birds, animals, and fishes. But in time the earth dried out so much that it could no longer generate fauna in this way, and since then life has been perpetuated by sexual reproduction.

The name that Sanchuniathon gave to the creatures is transmitted as ζωφασημιν (cod. A, the oldest and best manuscript of Eusebius) or ζοφασημίν. We should undoubtedly accept Gesenius' correction to Ζωφησαμίν,<sup>42</sup> or rather Ζωφῆ σαμίν *divisim*, since Philo knew that these were two Semitic words, *šōpē šamīn*, meaning, as he says, 'Watchers of the Sky'. The form in which he gives them is Aramaic rather than Phoenician; the Phoenician would have been \*šūrē šamēm, \*Ζουφῆ σαμήμ. Together with p. 807.24 Βεελασαμην (instead of \*Βα(α)λασαμήμ) and one or two other forms, this has prompted the theory that the original translated by Philo was actually in Aramaic.<sup>43</sup> But he gives other names in genuinely Phoenician forms, for example (p. 808.8) Σαμημουμος with the right form for 'heaven'. We should bear in mind that Philo himself will have been an Aramaic-speaker (Phoenician being by his time more or less dead except for the Punic of the West), and that in reading the text of Sanchuniathon, which lacked vowel signs, he might well have read it in places as if it was Aramaic. On coming upon *b<sup>c</sup>l šmm*, for instance, he would have recognized it immediately as the title familiar to him as *be<sup>c</sup>el šamīn*, and it was natural enough that he should transliterate it as Βεελασαμίν or -μήν.

One further feature of Sanchuniathon's narrative deserves attention. We read that the involution of the primal wind 'was called' Pothos, or rather Mot, and again that the living creatures, whether before or after their electrification, 'were called' Watchers of the Sky. By whom were these names bestowed, and what is the significance of the naming event? Has Philo eliminated some divine creator figure parallel to the God of Genesis, who 'called the light Day, and the darkness he called Night', and 'called the firmament Heaven'?

We need not suppose so. We probably have before us an example of the Semitic concept that naming something is equivalent to bringing it into being. There need be no reference to a specific namer. The idea is expressed in the Akkadian verb *nabū* 'to name', hence 'appoint, set up'. 'All creatures that have names' means 'all that exist'. The Creation Epic *Enūma eliš* begins

When above the heavens had not been named,  
and below, the earth was not called by its name

– that is, before they existed.<sup>44</sup>

To recapitulate the results of the preceding discussion, here is a 'purified' version of Philo's account of Sanchuniathon's cosmogony, with Eusebian doublets eliminated and the displaced sentences returned to their proper position. Beside it I give an

<sup>42</sup> Gesenius (as in n. 11), 390.

<sup>43</sup> Grimme, *RE* 1A 2243, whom I followed in *Hesiod. Theogony*, Oxford, 1966, 26. Barr (as in n. 20), 44 n. 1, reproves us.

<sup>44</sup> We see something similar in Greek in the Derveni papyrus: xvii [olim xiii] 4 γενέσθαι δὲ ἐνομίσθη ἐπειτ' ἠνομάσθη Ζεὺς, ὡς περὶ πρότερον μὴ ἔων. xviii [xiv] 9 πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ κληθῆναι Ζῆνα, ἦμ Μοῖρα φρόνησις τοῦ θεοῦ αἰεὶ τε καὶ διὰ παντός· ἐπεὶ δ' ἐκλήθη Ζεὺς, γενέσθαι αὐτὸν δ[οκοῦσι], and xix [xv] 1–3, xxi [xvii] 10ff., with the impersonal passives ἐκλήθη and ἠνομάσθη throughout.

English paraphrase in which the Greek philosophical colouring attributable to Philo is toned down to give a more authentic idea of the possible idiom and poetic form of the Phoenician original.

τὴν τῶν ὀλων ἀρχὴν ὑποτίθεται ἀέρα ζοφώδη  
καὶ πνευματώδη καὶ χάος θολερὸν ἐρεβώδες·  
ταῦτα δὲ εἶναι ἀπειρα, καὶ διὰ πολὺν αἰῶνα  
μὴ ἔχειν πέρας. ὅτε δέ, φησὶν, ἠράσθη τὸ  
πνεῦμα τῶν ἰδίων ἀρχῶν, καὶ ἐγένετο  
σύγκρασις, ἢ πλοκὴ ἐκείνη ἐκλήθη Μῶτ,  
τοῦτ' ἐστι Πόθος.

αὕτη δὲ ἀρχὴ κτίσεως ἀπάντων, αὐτὸ δὲ οὐκ  
ἐγίνωσκε τὴν αὐτοῦ κτίσιν· καὶ ἀνεπλάσθη  
ὁμοίως αἰοῦ σχήματι.

καὶ ἐξέλαμψε <τοῦ> Μῶτ ἠλιός τε καὶ  
σελήνη, ἀστéρες τε καὶ ἄστρα μεγάλα.

.....

{τοῦτό τινες φασιν ἰλύν, οἱ δὲ ὕδατώδους  
μίξεως σήφιν.}... ἦν δέ τινα ζῶια οὐκ ἔχοντα  
αἴσθησιν, ἐξ ὧν ἐγένετο ζῶια νοερά· καὶ  
ἐκλήθη Ζωφὴ σαμίν, τοῦτ' ἐστὶν οὐρανοῦ  
κατόπτται.

.....

καὶ τοῦ ἀέρος διαυγασάντος διὰ πύρωσιν καὶ  
τῆς θαλάσσης καὶ τῆς γῆς, ἐγένετο πνεύματα  
καὶ νέφη καὶ οὐρανίων ὑδάτων μέγιστα  
καταφοραὶ καὶ χύσεις. καὶ πάλιν συνήντησε  
πάντα ἐν ἀκαρεὶ τάδε τοῖσδε καὶ συνέρραξαν,  
βρονταὶ τε ἀπετελέσθησαν καὶ ἀστραπαί· καὶ  
πρὸς τὸν πάταγον τῶν βροντῶν τὰ  
προγεγραμμένα νοερά ζῶια ἐγρηγόρησεν, καὶ  
πρὸς τὸν ἦχον ἐπτύρη, καὶ ἐκινήθη ἐν τε γῆ  
καὶ θαλάσσει ἄρρεν καὶ θήλυ.

In the beginning there was no earth and no  
heaven, but darkness and wind enveloped the  
deep: they extended every way without end,  
from remotest time (*min cūlōm*).

But when the wind conceived love of its own  
'head', those things began to be mixed  
together; and the name of that involvement was  
Desire.

This was the source of creation for all things,  
but its own creation it knew not; and it was  
formed like the shape of an egg.

And out of that Desire the sun and moon  
shone forth, the stars and the 'great stars'.

(Separation of heaven and earth.)

(Creatures born from the mud.)

And they were blind creatures and without  
sense; but from them were born creatures with  
eyes to see and ears that they might hear. And  
their name was called Watchers of the Sky.

.....

And after the air became clear, the sun heated  
the sea and the earth, so that winds and storm-  
clouds arose, and the waters of heaven were  
poured forth: the clouds dashed together, one  
with another, and thunders and lightnings  
broke forth from their chambers.

And at the crashing of the thunders the  
Watchers of the Sky were awakened, and they  
trembled mightily at the noise of them; and  
they were stirred in their loins on the land and  
in the sea, both male and female.

### Comparison of the three Phoenician accounts

The differences between the three Phoenician accounts are considerable. We cannot treat them simply as variants of a single account. On the other hand, they have some features in common, such that we can speak of a Phoenician tradition from which each of them springs. They all begin with an initial state of the universe characterized by formlessness; they all refer at an early stage to time, either as a divine entity in its own right or as a dimension of the initial state; they all posit wind at or near the beginning of things; and they all introduce an egg (or egg-shaped formation) as the intermediate stage between the initial state and the present structure of earth and heaven. There are obvious differences in the way in which the initial state is conceived, and in the order in which things appear, though it is possible that some of the differences are more apparent than real, and due to the inconsistency of the Greek translators and excerptors. Here is a synoptic comparison:

	Eudemus	Moch	Sanchuniathon
First stage	Χρόνος, Πόθος, Ἄμιχλη	Αἰθήρ, Ἀήρ. Winds	Windy dark, turbid waters (for aeons)
Next	Ἀήρ, Αὔρα	Οὐλωμος (= Χρόνος)	Πόθος
Next	Egg	Χουσωρος + Egg	Egg-shaped form
Next	(Heaven, earth)	Heaven, earth	(Heaven, earth)

We have considered the likely or possible Phoenician equivalents for some of the Greek terms (*Χρόνος, Πόθος; άνεμοι, πνεύμα; ἀήρ ζοφώδης καὶ πνευματώδης; χάος θολερὸν ἐρεβώδες*); we have noted that for others (*Αἰθήρ, Ἀήρ*) equivalents are hard to divine. The two that we have not yet looked at from this point of view are Eudemus' Ὀμίχλη and Ἀύρα.

*Ἀύρα* is obviously some sort of wind, and there is no reason why she should not correspond to the same word as Sanchuniathon's πνεύμα, that is, most likely, *ruḥ*.<sup>45</sup> Eudemus' informant no doubt chose a feminine word, rather than *άνεμος* or πνεύμα, because he needed a male and female pair to produce the egg.<sup>46</sup>

Ὀμίχλη, which I rendered above as 'Nebula', is more difficult. In the Septuagint it is used in a rather inconsistent way, translating several different Hebrew words which in other passages are rendered by other Greek words, namely:

*hōšek* (Isa. 29.18) 'darkness', elsewhere *σκότος*.  
*ʿēpāh* (Amos 4.13) 'darkness', elsewhere *σκότος*.  
*ʿārāpel* (Joel 2.2, Zeph. 1.15, Job 38.9) 'heavy cloud, murk, foggy dew', elsewhere *γνόφος* (once *σκότος*).  
*kʾrōr* (Job 38.29, Ps. 147.16) 'hoar-frost', elsewhere *πάγος*.

The third of these seems the most suitable. In Ezekiel 34.12 'the day of *ʿānān* (cloud) and *ʿārāpel*' is one when the sheep become scattered and the shepherd has to search for them. If there existed a similar word in Phoenician, that was perhaps the one that Eudemus' informant rendered as Ὀμίχλη.

A further respect in which the three cosmogonies differ is in the balance between mythical and philosophical language. Moch appears the most mythical: here the Time-god was described in fully personalized terms, as a bisexual figure who had intercourse with himself, and the cosmic egg had the divine craftsman Khushor-Ptah standing by to bisect it. In Eudemus there is still a genealogical framework, with Poθος and Omichle, and again Aer and Aura, coupling as if sexually; but the story is somewhat demythologized. Chronos seems a mere abstraction. There is an egg, but no mention of a god to open it. We may say that Eudemus would naturally have tended to suppress the more mythical elements. But he did not do so in the case of the Babylonian cosmogony that he reported in the same context. As for Sanchuniathon, his account is more philosophical still, even allowing for Philo's tendency to accommodate it to Stoic theory. Time's role as a divine agent is obscured. The autoeroticism motif is transferred to the wind, and comes across as little more than a metaphor. Its rotatory frenzy produces not 'an egg' but a formation 'resembling the shape of an egg'. The attempt is made to explain everything in mechanistic terms.

Of the three Phoenician accounts, then, whatever their relative chronology, it is Moch who seems best to reflect the traditional prototype that underlies them all.

#### *Greek and Phoenician cosmogonies compared*

This traditional prototype must go back at least to the sixth century B.C. in view of the Greek evidence, which we must finally bring back into focus. Comparison of the Greek with the Phoenician versions should enable us to identify features that go back to the common original. At the same time we must keep an eye on the Iranian and

<sup>45</sup> In the Septuagint *αὔρα* occurs in three places (1 Kings 19.12, Job 4.16, Ps. 106(107).29), always translating Hebrew *dʾmāmāh* 'whisper'.

<sup>46</sup> In Hebrew *ruḥ* is usually feminine (and so in Gen. 1.2).

Indian forms of the myth: any motifs that they share with the Greek, even if not attested in the Phoenician, must presumably be attributed to the Near Eastern archetype.

The following motifs are shared by Greek and Phoenician versions, though they do not always appear in the same sequence or combination.

1. A primeval watery abyss (Orpheus, Sanchuniathon).
2. Primeval darkness (Orpheus, Epimenides, Aristophanes, Sanchuniathon). The Orphic account used the phrase *κατὰ σκοτόεσσαν ὀμίχλην* (fr. 67, cf. 54), which recalls the 'Ὀμίχλη of Eudemus' Phoenicians.
3. The role played by wind (Eudemus, Moch, Sanchuniathon) is hinted at in Aristophanes (*Av.* 695 *ὑπηνέμιον ὠϊόν*; 696 *ἀνεμώκεσι δίναις* actually suggests the whirlwind, cf. below).
4. Absence of *πέρας* or *πεῖραρ* (Orph. fr. 66b, Aristophanes ('*Ερέβους δ' ἐν ἀπείροσι κόλποις*), Sanchuniathon).
5. The presence of the personified Time (Pherecydes, Orpheus, Eudemus, Moch). In Orpheus he has the epithet 'unaging' (*ἀγήραος*), which is paralleled in the Iranian and Indian versions.
6. Procreation by Time (Pherecydes, Orpheus, Moch; also Iranian and Indian).
7. Appearance of the bright Aither (Orpheus; already before Time in Moch).
8. The production of an egg (Orpheus, Epimenides, Aristophanes, Eudemus, Moch; in Sanchuniathon an egg-shaped formation).
9. The personified Desire of the Phoenician accounts (Eudemus, Sanchuniathon), while not paralleled in Greek under the name *Πόθος*, can hardly be dissociated entirely from the *Ἔρως* (= Phanes) who appears out of the egg in Orpheus and Aristophanes and plays a demiurgic role. Eros had, of course, appeared at a very early stage in theogonies since Hesiod, but with no such explicit function. In Orpheus he is bisexual and copulates with himself; this is what the Time-god does in Moch and the Iranian myth, and the motif has evidently been transferred to Phanes-Eros from Chronos. In Pherecydes, we hear, the pre-existent deity *Zas*, *μέλλων δημιουργεῖν*, transformed himself into Eros. Aristophanes' Eros recalls Sanchuniathon's *Pothos* in two ways, apart from the fact that he is actually called *Ἔρως ὁ ποθεινός*: he is *εἰκῶς ἀνεμώκεσι δίναις*, like a swiftly circling wind, and he *ξυνέμειξεν ἅπαντα*, which resulted in the separation of heaven, earth, and Ocean, just as, when Sanchuniathon's wind became a whirlwind and the name Desire was bestowed, *ἐγένετο σύγκρασις*, and this led to the separation of earth, sea, and air.
10. In his role as demiurge, Phanes-Eros has a counterpart in Moch's *Khushor-Ptah*, who presumably not only opens the egg but fashions its two halves into heaven and earth, and perhaps performs not only other creative acts. But a closer parallel is the Indian *Prajāpati*, the firstborn son of Time, the creator of heaven and earth, who has the same radiant quality as Phanes and who, in some accounts, is born from an egg. This must be the primary version, whereas the Phoenician version in which the demiurge works on the egg from outside, like the Iranian version in which Ohrmazd fashions the celestial egg out of light, represents an accommodation to older, simpler native mythology where a capable god (*Khushor*, *Ohrmazd*) made heaven and earth, and that was all there was to it.<sup>47</sup>

If we try to construct an archetypal account that will explain the occurrence of these features in the Greek and Phoenician sources, we can get quite a long way by

<sup>47</sup> Cf. *OP* 104f.

simply adding them together in sequence; but certain points remain ambiguous. The basic story will look like this:

In the beginning there was no heaven and no earth,<sup>48</sup> but a limitless watery abyss, cloaked in murky darkness. This existed for long aeons. Eventually Unaging Time, who was both male and female, made love to himself and generated an egg. Out of the egg came a radiant creator god, who made heaven and earth from it.

The principal ambiguous points concern the role of wind, the status of Desire, and the place of Aither. Was wind present from the beginning, as in Sanchuniathon and Genesis? What is the relationship between the wind's act of self-love in Sanchuniathon and Time's in Pherecydes, Moch, etc.? Is it by setting up a whirlwind that Time engenders the egg? This would help to harmonize Sanchuniathon's egg-shaped Desire-whirlwind with the Orphic–Aristophanic whirlwind-like Eros who appears from the egg and 'mixes everything together'. At what point does Aither (which we may understand as the Bright Sky, or Daylight) come into being? For Moch it is one of the two pre-existent entities; in the Orphic theogony it is engendered, together with the bottomless blackness of Chaos, by Chronos, who uses it in forming the egg. The latter seems to be paralleled in one version of the Zoroastrian cosmogony, if it is rightly understood to say that Time brought forth Light and Darkness.<sup>49</sup>

### *Myth into philosophy*

This highly individual cosmogony, which, as we have seen, was reflected in a number of Greek mythical narratives from Pherecydes and the first Orphic theogony on, also exercised a powerful influence on the philosophical tradition that began with the Milesians.

We know very little of Thales' system, and as he left no book, the ancients themselves knew only as much as was mentioned by some early, informed source, possibly Anaximenes.<sup>50</sup> The main datum is that he held all things to have come from water. Commentators have often related this to a background of Near Eastern mythical cosmogony. But there is something else that points to a more specific link with the Phoenician cosmogony that we have been considering. In the fullest statement of Thales' doctrines, derived from Theophrastus, there is reference to water causing earthquakes, circling winds (*πνευμάτων στροφάς* or *συστροφάς*), and movements of airs or of celestial bodies (*ἀέρων* or *ἄστρων κινήσεις*).<sup>51</sup> Thales had to account for the rotatory movement that is a feature of the visible cosmos. Apparently he postulated a cosmic whirlwind that arose from the primeval waters and that carried the heavenly bodies round the sky. Both water and wind participated in the circular flow – the *δίνη* that was to be the dominant model for Thales' successors.<sup>52</sup> Now, we have inferred from Aristophanes that the whirlwind motif had a place in the common source of the Greek and Phoenician traditions, in other words in a sixth-century (if not seventh-century) Phoenician cosmogony. Thales may have made the rotation start in the water, the water then driving the wind, whereas Sanchuniathon's Thoth

<sup>48</sup> Ar. *Av.* 694; cf. *Enūma eliš* I. 1–2 and other Oriental accounts, Hölscher (as in n. 27) 401 = 150.

<sup>49</sup> Damasc. (as in n. 9) iii. 165. 17 W.–C. *Μάγοι δὲ καὶ πᾶν τὸ Ἄριον γένος, ὡς καὶ τοῦτο γράφει ὁ Εὐδήμος, οἱ μὲν Τόπον, οἱ δὲ Χρόνον καλοῦσι τὸ νοητὸν ἅπαν καὶ τὸ ἠνωμένον, ἐξ οὗ διακριθῆναι ἢ θεὸν ἀγαθὸν καὶ δαίμονα κακόν, ἢ φῶς καὶ σκότος πρὸ τούτων, ὡς ἐνίοις λέγειν.* Cf. Aristoxenus fr. 13 Wehrli; *EGPO* 30–2. <sup>50</sup> Cf. *EGPO* 212.

<sup>51</sup> Hipp. *Ref.* 1.1.1–3 (Diels, *Doxographi* 555); *EGPO* 209–13.

<sup>52</sup> *EGPO* 211. I had already observed in 1963 (*CQ* 57, 172–6) that the *δίνη* model should have originated in Thales' water cosmology.

makes it start in the wind. But there is similarity enough to suggest that Thales borrowed the idea from the Phoenician cosmogony. It may as well be recalled that according to Herodotus and others, Thales was himself of Phoenician descent.<sup>53</sup>

When we come to Anaximander, the points of contact are clearer and more numerous.<sup>54</sup> Firstly, his initial state is 'the Boundless', or at any rate 'boundless', *ἄπειρον*. It is eternal, and in constant movement. This was the *ἀρχή* of all things.<sup>55</sup> Anaximander evidently avoided specific terms such as wind, darkness, Chaos, but there remains a formal similarity to the initial state in Sanchuniathon, where these things were *ἄπειρα* and for long ages had no *πέρας*.

Secondly, Anaximander spoke of Time as a divine agent; he laid it down that cosmic imbalances are eventually self-correcting, since all things return to what they came from, 'paying the penalty to each other for their expropriations (*τῆς ἀδικίας*) in accordance with Time's tariff', *κατὰ τὴν τοῦ Χρόνου τάξιν*.<sup>56</sup> The Time-god, as we have seen, was a distinctive element in the Phoenician myth.

Thirdly, Anaximander described the genesis of our world as starting with an event which Theophrastus paraphrased as the separation from the Eternal (*τὸ αἰδίον*) of something generative of heat and cold, *τι γόνιμον θερμοῦ τε καὶ ψυχροῦ*. From this entity, whatever it was, grew a sphere of flame that enclosed the space round the earth, corresponding to our firmament. Pieces of fire split off from it and became the sun, moon, and stars.<sup>57</sup> This reads like a translation into scientific language of a myth that ran: 'Eternal Time ejaculated semen, which developed into an egg, with the hot and light parts gathered on the outside, and the cool, heavier parts towards the middle. From the hot parts on the outside the sun, moon, and stars were made.' This is unmistakably a form of the Phoenician myth. Its demythologization was already largely accomplished in Anaximander, and completed by Theophrastus in rendering account of Anaximander's theory.

Fourthly, Anaximander held that the earth was at first entirely covered by water; it has gradually been evaporating, and the sea that we know is what is left of it at present.<sup>58</sup> Thus he preserved the Semitic myth of the primeval Deep, except that he removed it from the initial state of the universe and made it instead the initial state of our local cosmos.

Fifthly, he held that the action of the sun's heat on the moisture below was responsible for winds, clouds, and rain.<sup>59</sup> This agrees with Sanchuniathon's account. There the meteorology appears as an integral part of the process that leads to the awakening of animal life by thunder and lightning. Anaximander's explanation of thunder and lightning as being caused by wind bursting out of clouds is a little different from Sanchuniathon's (clouds crashing together), and he did not, so far as we know, associate them with the origins of life.

He did, however, exert himself to account for the evolution of living things. He said that they first developed in the water, somehow as a result of its warming and drying

<sup>53</sup> Hdt. 1.170 *Θαλέω, ἀνδρὸς Μιλησίου... τὸ ἀνέκαθεν γένος ἔόντος Φοίνικος*. Cf. D.L. 1.22, who cites Herodotus, Duris (= *FGrHist* 76 F 74), and Democritus (= DK 68 B 115a).

<sup>54</sup> Cf. Hölscher (as in n. 27), 416f. = 173f.; Eissfeldt (as in n. 41), 9ff.

<sup>55</sup> DK 12 A 1, 9–17; more conveniently laid out in C. H. Kahn, *Anaximander and the Origins of Greek Cosmology*, New York and London, 1960, 29 + 32 + 39.

<sup>56</sup> A 9, Kahn 35; cf. *EGPO* 81–3.

<sup>57</sup> A 10, Kahn 57: *φῆσι δέ τι ἐκ τοῦ αἰδίου γόνιμον θερμοῦ τε καὶ ψυχροῦ κατὰ τὴν γένεσιν τοῦδε τοῦ κόσμου ἀποκριθῆναι, καὶ τινα ἐκ τούτου φλογὸς σφαίραν περιφνήναι τῶι περὶ τὴν γῆν ἀέρι, ὡς τῶι δένδρωι φλοῖόν· ἥστινος ἀπορραγείσης καὶ εἰς τινὰς ἀποκλεισθείσης κύκλους ὑποστήναι τὸν ἥλιον καὶ τὴν σελήνην καὶ τοὺς ἀστέρας*. Cf. *EGPO* 83–5, 95.

<sup>58</sup> A 27, Kahn 65f.

<sup>59</sup> A 11.7, 24, Kahn 63.

out by the sun, and that they were enclosed in prickly shells; at a later stage they – and we – came out onto the land and shed their (our) integuments.<sup>60</sup> This account has in common with Sanchuniathon's at least the assumption that the origin of life is something to be treated in a cosmogonic context, and the concept of its development by stages from a lower to a higher form; probably also the idea of its genesis from the action of heat on moisture. In reports of Anaxagoras' biology, which evidently stood in the Anaximandrian tradition, it is stated explicitly that sexual reproduction was a secondary development.<sup>61</sup>

There are many things in Anaximander's system that cannot be derived from the Phoenician Time–Egg cosmogony. His model of the present cosmos seems to show several Babylonian or Iranian features.<sup>62</sup> As he certainly heard and debated with Thales, who apparently knew the Phoenician complex, it is a reasonable guess that it was from Thales that he took that over, while the Babylonian–Iranian elements represent a new ingredient coming from a subsequent source. A welcome consequence of this hypothesis will be that we can substantially fill out our picture of Thales' cosmology by retrojecting into it all those features of Anaximander's system which derive from the Phoenician cosmogony: the boundlessness of the initial state (water for Thales), the divine agent Time, his production of a seed that grew into an oval or spherical cosmos, the conversion of sea into land under the influence of heat, the meteorological and biological theories. The fact that none of this is associated with Thales in the tradition is no obstacle. He left no book in which it could be read; the only parts of his teaching that were remembered as his were those cited at an early date by someone who did write.<sup>63</sup> Much more may have been preserved indirectly through Anaximander.

Much of Anaximander's system, in turn, was carried forward into later ones. Anaximenes, Anaxagoras, Leucippus and his atomist followers, Diogenes of Apollonia, all preserve the basic concept of the cosmos as a globule created and maintained in the infinite surrounding continuum by vortical forces. The more mythical elements of the original story, such as the autoeroticism of Time, disappear; yet *σπέρμα* remains as a cosmological metaphor (Anaxagoras, atomists), and in a curious report about Epicurus' cosmology we still read how the world began in the likeness of an egg, girded by a circling wind, as by a serpent, which in time divided it into the celestial and terrestrial hemispheres, and which even now drives the revolution of the sky and the stars.<sup>64</sup>

Once again we see the truth of Anaxagoras' dictum: *οὐ κεχώρισται ἀλλήλων τὰ ἐν τῷ ἐνὶ κόσμῳ, οὐδὲ ἀποκέκοπται πελέκει.*

All Souls College, Oxford

M. L. WEST

<sup>60</sup> A 10, 11.6, 30, Kahn 68–70.

<sup>61</sup> DK 59 A 1.9 (≈ A 42.12) *ζῶια γίνεσθαι ἐξ ὑγροῦ καὶ θερμοῦ καὶ γεώδους, ὕστερον δὲ ἐξ ἀλλήλων.* Cf. Diodorus cited above, p. 300.

<sup>62</sup> W. Burkert, *Rh. Mus.* 106, 1963, 97–134; *EGPO* 87–93. <sup>63</sup> Cf. above, n. 50.

<sup>64</sup> Epiphanius, *Adv. haer.* 1.8 (Diels, *Doxographi* 589.11–21). There are connections here with the Orphic theogony; see *OP* 202.