ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

ΦΙΛΟΣΟΦΙΑ

ΕΠΕΤΗΡΙΣ ΤΟΥ ΚΕΝΤΡΟΥ ΕΡΕΥΝΗΣ ΤΗΣ ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΗΣ ΦΙΛΟΣΟΦΙΑΣ

ΑΝΑΤΥΠΟΝ

33 ΑΘΗΝΑΙ 2003

ANAXAGOREAN *NOUS* AND ITS ANALOGIES IN ORPHIC COSMOGONY

I. Introduction. The Anaxagorean Thesis on *Nous*. Anaxagoras argues that matter initially consisted of a mixture of invisible materials, infinite in size and number. These materials were the seed of all things; of all the natural things (animals and humans), of the various forces, and of the natural substances that were going to be produced. These sperms were condensed to a united and solid mass, which preexisted i.e. before the formation of the cosmos. Everything that exists today is rooted in that preexisting mass, since, according to Anaxagoras and Parmenid, «nothing is born and nothing is lost». The sperms of this mass, the sperms of all things contain within themselves *the potential* (*ἐν δυνάμει*) of all material substances of the cosmos, because, «everything contains part of everything». Aristotle later named these sperms as homoeomeri (*ὁμοιομερῆ* = similar kinds), implying that they are fundamental, consisting of similar parts. This is the physical unit from which cosmogony started. In a few things, however, Anaxagoras introduces another factor; the mind = *nous*. *Nous* is a significant factor in the cosmologic theory of Anaxagoras. It is something with self-sufficiency and independence, unmixed, thin and pure, omniscient and governing all beings (*ὄντα*). It acts upon everything and provides the moving power. It is responsible for the separation of things in cosmos, their hierarchy and order. But, although it penetrates (gets through) everything, does not coexist with everything, but only in some, especially the beings.

The Anaxagorean notion of *Nous* needs further clarification. Questions which emerge include: a) has *Nous* a spiritual and transcendant meaning or is it a purely mechanistic quality, b) where has *Nous* come from? As a consequence of the materialistic cosmos, or from outside the closed system of material mixture? Taking his exact wording, he states that «all things were initially together, then *Nous* came and ordered them». An observation immediately arises: does Anaxagoras mean the beginning of time? In this case, by some unexplained, but automatic and dogmatic way, it sets an axiom: in the beginning everything was one, a closed system. But what existed outside this system? Or does «outside» mean an unimaginable space exterior to the area where «everything was mixed in infinitive fundamental particles»? Although Nous is brought in as a universal power without any explanation regarding its origin, it may imply either the theistic presence, or a rational explanation emerging from manifestations of matter.

I. 1. *Nous*, Cosmos, Nature and the Big-Bang. At least initially, according to Anaxagoras, matter was an infinitely divisible mixture of all substances, from which cosmos was to be synthesized. Thereafter, *Nous* acted upon this primitive matter as a moving cause and, as matter gained automatically an acceleration and a turbulence was formed, which progressively spread over the cosmic space, other mechanical factors started to get formed gradually, with an effective functioning on its way to the ongoing route of cosmic formation. Eventually, *Nous* plays an indirect role as a cause of movement. If what Anaxagoras meant is that *Nous* has a mechanistic provenance, then this is identified with the modern theory that

life was born in one of the many universes like bubbles formed after the Big-Bang, when the initial compact mass exploded. During the course of time the universe inflated and in one of the formed small universes in cosmic space, environmental conditions of participated matter – such as energy, matter, biochemical reactions, temperatures, pressures, chemical element formation, nuclear and thermonuclear reactions, fusions, etc. – favored nucleosynthesis of the kind we call life (Liritzis, 1977; Barrow, 1994).

But the Anaxagorean Nous set an order. Human Nous, as we know it, has a limited capacity and short life-time. Anaxagorean *Nous* has a greater range of influence. It moves the cosmic matter. Thus, if a mechanistic view is examined, this *Nous,* once formed from intra-matter processes, implies a new natural force, not yet discovered. Could it be the unified force (UF) eagerly searched for by modern scientists, which existed before or immediately after the Big-Bang? From this initial force the four forces were born (= symmetry breaking); i.e. gravity, electromagnetic, weak and nuclear. Although it requires further proof, this UF not only existed prior to the explosion, but must partially exist among our present universal World. Simplicius reinforces this saying that *Nous* exists always, that it definitely exists today there where all others are, in covering mass and in all things which united and separated (ὁ δὲ νοῦς, ὃς ἀεί ἐστι, τὸ κάρτα καὶ νῦν ἐστιν ἵνα καὶ τὰ ἄλλα πάντα, ἐν τῶι πολλῶι περιέχοντι καὶ ἐν τοῖς προσκριθεῖσι καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀποκεκριμένοις, *Phys.,* 157, 5). Anaxagoras though, does not mention the cause of the panspermia, but makes a certain statement of their properties. He avoids describing the cause of matter's origin. Orphics instead, describe this prior 'something' as having the shape of an egg. An egg, which exploded, etc.

Taking Anaxagoras' view of nous participating to set an order to cosmos, and our course of thought, we may forward the idea that UF is identified with Nous. Moreover, Anaxagoras does accept the infinite division of matter (Simpl., *Phys.,* 27, 2, τὰς μὲν ὑλικὰς ἀρχὰς ἀπείρους ποιεῖν) which opposes the smallest (non-divisible) Democritean atom. He says that the material principles are infinite, and that everything contains part of the whole. Anaxagoras considers an infinite small and infinite large, i.e. everything (cosmos) without upper or lower definable limits (Theophrastus). However, the Nous is one. Here, the striking contrast of the one and the multiple emerges, leading to the known notion «One is everything» (ἕν τὸ πᾶν).

Aristotle (*Metaph.,* A 8, 989a 30-b16), however seems to have pinpointed this contrast between the one and the undetermined (= infinite), prior to getting shape and becoming a kind, saying (ἐκ δὴ τούτων συμβαίνει λέγειν οὕτω τὰς ἀρχὰς τό τε ἕν - τοῦτο γὰρ ἁπλοῦν καὶ ἀμιγές- καὶ θάτερον οἷον τίθεμεν τὸ ἀόριστον πρὶν ὁρισθῆναι καὶ μετασχεῖν εἴδους τινός). Regarding the relation of *Nous,* time, motion and the Big-Bang, Anaxagoras supports the modern concept of the creation of the universe by saying that *Nous* controls all revolving motion, a revolution that initially started from a tiny point, but now takes place in a larger region and in the future it will take place in even larger space, with increasing separation during the motion and the precession. This is the theory of the inflationary universe, i.e. the expansion of the universe. However, that *Nous* set up for first time the motion brings about once more the idea of outer intervention or the concept of self-creation. But, because Anaxagoras mentions that both genesis (synthesis, compound) and disintegration (decay, separation) derive from the same initial matter, it is reasonable to consider a closed system, whereas any change (variation) is based upon the fundamental, but different, homeomeris. It is this initial stage about which Anaxagoras, or the available fragments about Anaxagoras, is not informative enough (Diels & Kranz, 1964).

I. 2. The Initial State and Time. In addition, Anaxagoras says that initially everything was in a potential motionless state, then Nous, the creator of cosmos, put motion to all of them. But the reason for motion, according to Aristotle's interpretation (Simpl., 1123, 21), was the

wish of the cosmofacturer *Nous* (βουληθεὶς ὁ κοσμοποιὸς νοῦς...), to resolute the infinite past time in kinds (= the homoeomerie) which existed prior to the onset of time («...τὸν ἄπειρον πρὸ τοῦ χρόνον βουληθεὶς ὁ κοσμοποιὸς νοῦς διακρῖναι τὰ εἴδη, ἅπερ ὁμοιομερείας καλεῖ, κίνησιν αὐταῖς ἐνεποίησεν) That is, the Nous, in order to divide (and define) the past infinite time into different kinds (= species), puts into motion the homeomerie. And, elsewhere, «...which inhere many shapes» (Aristotle, *Phys.*, Γ 5, 205 b 1). This implies infinite principles (*ibid.*, A 4, 187 a 26).

Eudemos (Simpl., Phys., 1185, 9, p.79) criticizes Anaxagoras on the theme of Nous appearing from nowhere. Anaxagoras does not explain the non-existing motion prior to its start, or when it will stop, if it ever will stop. How is it possible for this state of lacking (στέρησις) to precede the natural tendency of motion (κατοχή, ἀντικειμένη ἕξις)? If quietness is the lacking of motion, quietness cannot exist prior to motion. We think there is no reason to ask for quietness before the motion, as quietness of the infinitum contains a potential power, which is expressed as kinetic energy at a later stage. In the steady state, a phenomenological picture of absolute peace emerges. However, this state still holds due to the existence of strong cognitive forces, which are part of one Unified Force. This recalls the theoretical model of an extremely condensed matter, a focused, highly condensed curved space in a tiny «point». Thereafter, the Big-Bang occurred, splitting the one UF into four forces, with motion as a consequence (Barrow, 1994; cf. Stokes, 1971). Thus, this seems a reasonable follow up of another notion of Anaxagoras; that the world was born once (i.e. one big-bang?) from the initial mixture of infinitum homeomeris, and since then Nous administers and controls it (Simpl., *Phys.*, 154, 29). Our observation is strengthened by reference to Simplicius (*Phys.*, 154, 29, *ibid.*, 1121, 21, 64), who claims that cosmos was created from the very beginning of time, and that, at this time, motion started. That is, all beings were at rest before time, while motion was set from the *Nous*, and cosmos was created (Ἀναξαγόρας τε καὶ Ἀρχέλαος καὶ Μητρόδωρος ὁ Χῖος. οὗτοι δὲ καὶ τὴν κίνησιν ἄρξασθαί φασιν· ἠρεμούντων γὰρ τὸν πρὸ τοῦ χρόνον τῶν ὄντων κίνησιν ἐγγενέσθαι φασὶν ὑπὸ τοῦ νοῦ, ὑφ' ἧς γεγονέναι τὸν κόσμον....)[1].

Regarding time and prognosis, Anaxagoras mentions the arrow of time when he says that we must familiarize (ἐξοικειώνεσθαι) ourselves in advance with all things, i.e. confront things which have not yet occurred as if have had occurred. This familarizing in advance (a priori), according to Posidonius, implies pre-plastering and pre-copying something within us, namely what is going to take place. This ability entails to the physical problem of the arrow of time; that is, the future, past and present, interrelated without any necessary succession, according to a mechanism of becoming familiar (ἐξοικειοῦσθαι). To get to know an event, which does not belong to the present, requires some special process, which, however, is not described (Liritzis, 2001).

I. 3. Mechanistic Versus Theistic Approach. Some ancient writers (Aetius, Euripides) attribute to Anaxagoras's Nous a theistic nature (Diels, 1958; Diels & Kranz, 1964). In particular, Aetius (I 7, 5) interpretes Anaxagorean Nous, as the Nous of God, who puts all in

---

1. This is an important notion, because it involves the beginning of time. Perhaps, misrecording of the word time as χρόνου, instead of χρόνον, produced the translation as 'past time' (χρόνου). In replacing χρόνου, by χρόνον we may translate, «...all things were together in a state of quiteness, then nous the creator of the world, intending to resolve the infinitum past time into different kinds before this quiteness stage, which Anaxagoras named homeomerie, put these into motion». That is, there was infinite time before Nous sets in the motion.

order and who created everything [A. called God a νοῦς κοσμοποιός (7, 15) (= mind cosmofacturer)]. A relevant notion is met in Euripides (fr. 1018) «ὁ νοῦς γὰρ ἡμῶν ἐστιν ἐν ἑκάστω θεός» [Anaxagoras *treats nous as an automaton god (ἀπὸ μηχανής θεός)* (Aristotle, Metaph., A 4, 985 a 18)]. In fact Anaxagoras says that initially all bodies were in a *motionless, steady state, i.e. in a potential state,* and that the intervention of the divine Nous implies a *kinetic state.* This potential state is the *quietness of infinitum,* which, Anaxagoras insists, supports itself since it resides within itself as nothing else contains it. All things were together, but everything is created from everything existing, although not at once, but according to an order. During this process he introduces the separation and unification (Simpl., 460. 4; *Phys.,* 154, 29; Aristotle, *Phys.,* Γ, 4. 203 a 19).

Aetius, among others, speaks of the *Nous* of god, a notion, which is not found in other writers who speak of Anaxagoras's philosophy of *Nous.* This is, perhaps, the interpretation of the Anaxagorean *Nous,* and the theistic attribute is their own perception of Anaxagoras. Similarly, Cicero, *de nat.* d. I 11, 26 [DK A 48, 40], repeats that Anaxagoras considered the rational power of an eternal Nous who planned and executed the order (hierarchy) of all things. But Cicero opposes Anaxagoras's views, forwarding the argument that human ability which lacks sensual experience can exist only when the same subject becomes sensual, by the content of a sense. Cicero notes that, if such an eternal *Nous* existed in a concrete living creature, it should have an internal principle of life that justifies this name. Anaxagoras did not like the idea of the *Nous* being surrounded by an external shield. Instead, Anaxagoras considered *Nous* as naked and simple, without any material attachment, which of course seems to surpass our conceptual ability. Cicero, *Acad. Pr.,* II 37, 118 [DK A 49], like Aetius, attributes a divine property to the *Nous,* i.e. provides it with a theistic nature. This same *divine Nous,* puts in an order the chaotic state of the initial infinite matter, but at a *later time (...eas primum confusas postea in ordinem adductas mente divina).* Cicero also sets, here, the first appearance of the divine Nous at a later stage. The qualification of the Nous as a divine being or as the power, is variously reported by commentators. However, we think Anaxagoras must have avoided naming Nous as god. Instead, he is determined to describe the basic elements of nature, their compounds, the type of matter and the laws governing nature, through certain meanings of the invisible homeomerie (ὁμοιομερῆ, Aristotle, *On the heavens,* Γ 3, 302 a 28), the infinite principles, (Aristotle, *Metaph.,* A3 984 a 11), the continuous infinite (Aristotle. *Phys.,* Γ 4 203 a 19), that genesis and disintegration is identical with the decay or the variation of matter (relevant quotations by Aetius, Aristotle, Proclus, Simplicius). Perhaps, Anaxagoras following the Orphic doctrine of the ineffable name of god, avoids an exact spelling and/or definition.

The *Nous* has different properties. Democritus and the Stoics spoke of the unconceivable Cause, implying *Nous,* and explained this cause as due to five factors; *need, destiny (predestination), will, randomness, and opportune moment* (Liritzis, 2001). Anaxagoras did not accept any divine destiny of the humans; instead, according to him, all humans are led by randomness (Aetius, II 4, 6; I 29, 7; Aristide *Vatic. Gr.* 1298). This report is further evidence that Anaxagoras did not attribute to the *Nous* a theistic nature. However, it is interesting to further argue, here, that Anaxagoras did have a rational (mechanistic) rather than theistic approach in the explanation of the universe. Among his theories on various physical phenomena (earthquakes, stars, moon, meteorites etc), he was getting deeply involved with the basics (the main elements) of nature. Thus, when Anaxagoras states that the sun and fire are the same, Socrates advised people to avoid this way of thinking, since one cannot see the sun, but can see the fire. In fact, Anaxagoras implied that both have a common element; in the sun, high temperatures exist due to the burning of hydrogen, thermonuclear reactions and convection of heat out of the corona. The high temperature burning means complete

ionization of atoms, that is an atmosphere of ionized atoms and electrons — what we call plasma. (Cf. this with the four elements in nature, i.e., earth, water, air, fire = plasma).

Another notion quoted by Plutarch (*Sympos.*, VIII 3, 3. 722 A) regarding nature is the solar wind, which Anaxagoras called «tilas» (= *tiny traces and pieces of matter moving always inside light rays),* saying that the wind moves from the sun through oscillatory and wavy motion. This wind, Anaxagoras says, occasionally produces sounds and motion. It is the aurora, which produces such phenomena, mainly in northern latitudes, where the trapped electrons and protons from the solar wind are more intense and the magnetic field less strong than around the equator, and as a result, the ionization of the atmosphere is higher and this causes the creation of colourful moving curtains! Surely, it is not possible to understand Anaxagoras with the limited ability of our senses, something for which Anaxagoras has spoken, as «the weak senses, that do not allow us to know the truth» (Sextus, VII, 90). However, for the rational approach in the investigation of the cause of the universe, Anaxagoras suggests experience, memory, wisdom and sophisticated ability.

I. 4. Anaxagoras on Soul and Nous. Aetius (IV 3, 2) speaks of Anaxagoras's thesis on the Nous, that Anaxagoras and Pythagoras both speak of *Nous* as «...coming from outside...» (...θύραθεν εἰσκρίνεσθαι τὸν νοῦν). There is no clear report on the connection of soul and Nous. In several points Anaxagoras considers Nous as the cause for anything good and right, and identifies elsewhere *Nous* with the soul, as it resides in all living beings. It seems that Anaxagoras distinguishes the two, though they are treated as one nature. Aristotle (Περὶ ζῴων μορ. Δ 10, 687 a 7), Aetius (V 20, 3), and Psellos (101a. *Διὸ. Παντοδ.*, 15), discuss how Anaxagoras considered the two. In fact, when Anaxagoras says that there exists in everything a part of everything, but in a few things Nous exists as well, he implies living beings. One could interpret this as penetration of Nous into everything, but being more compressed in a few, more like a universal brain, parts of which reflect its globality, but with limited abilities. This is limited knowledge, because Nous knows everything of the infinite, but limited homeomerie. Knowledge provides the barriers and the edges (Simpl., *de cael.*, 608, 23).

II. Orphic Analogies. On the existence and the properties of Nous, some Orphic fragments present some analogies to Anaxagorean rational approach. Although, in Orphic fragments the theistic attitude predominates, the copiers and commentators may have altered the initial orphic thesis, according to their own thesis (West, 1983). Otherwise, the transition from the Mycenean Age to the archaic and early classical age, essentially corresponds to the transition from myth and the personified pantheon to a more rational (scientific) approach, the cause of cosmos and natural phenomena. Although in Orphic fragments the theistic attitude predominates, some statements regarding properties of natural laws may be the interpretation of the theistic, mostly symbolic, nature on theogony and cosmogony of the original Orphic philosophy, in general.

II. 1. Orphics on *Nous*. Concerning the *Nous,* the Orphics refer to the *divine logos,* the *one* governor Zeus (Jupiter), vaguely or clearly as the Nous, as the indestructible aether, (Macrobius, *Saturnalia,* I, 18 I, 23, I, 17, Proclus, *in Tim.*, B, 49, 19 and Justine the martyr, *Λόγος παραινετικὸς πρὸς Ἕλληνας*, 15, 8 : εἷς ἐστ' αὐτογενής, ἑνός ἔκγονα πάντα τέκυκται = «one he is, self-born and all have been created as creatures of one», Kern, 245, 8*).* Elsewhere, *Nous* is identified as; fatherly *Nous,* self-born (*πατρικός νάος αὐτογένεθλος...*, Proclus, *in Tim.*, Γ 155, 43), with the fire being attributed to it as the cause of attraction and harmony (the universal law of attraction of celestial bodies. In other places the Orphics consider all Olympian gods and anything they represent as one, supported also by

Anaxagoras (Ioannes Diakonos, *Ἀλληγορίαι εἰς τὴν Θεογονίαν τοῦ Ἡσιόδου*, 305, 2: Ζεὺς δέ τε πάντων ἐστὶ θεός, πάντων τε κεραστής, πνεύμασι συρίζων, φωνῆσιν τ' ἠερομίκτοις = «the god of all is zeus, fermenter of all, whistling with the spirits and windy voices, ...» ὅτι ὁ Ζεὺς καὶ Αἰθὴρ λέγεται... = «that Zeus is called ether, as well... From the one all were born», Justine, *ibid.*, 15, I).

From the above we may identify Zeus = Aether = *Nous,* and Zeus the «fermenter» of all (Papathanassiou, 1977). The creator identified as the Nous in Orphics, is fed by *adrasteia* (= the law), accompanies the *Need* (motion), and gives birth to the *Eimarmeni,* predestination, recognised as the kairos = opportune moment. (Proclus, *Plat. Theol.,* 16, *in Tim.,* E 323, 24). These are the characteristic properties of the order or of the Nous, and three out of the five elements of the Anaxagorean theory on the properties of the unconceived cause, i.e. the Nous (Liritzis, 1997). In another interpretation to the creating cause is identified with Phanes (or Hirikepaeos), who was keeping everything together in the shaft belly (the orphic egg) with the aid of his chaotic power. Phanes was made within Zeus' belly (egg = closed universe). A preexisting creative cause (the creative power of light) which, nevertheless, pumps his power from the power of Zeus (the whole closed system, without any intervention). This is the dynamic state of the universe before it was set in motion by Phanes (Proclus, *in Tim.,* B, 34). This transmits the idea that nous derives from within the Anaxagorean initial closed system. On the other hand, it makes one think of Hesiod's Theogony, where Phanes (light) came out of the broken egg (Brouchard, 1926; Barnes, 1982).

The Orphics attribute to Phanes (= eros, light) four elements (four eyes) (Hermias, *εἰς Φαῖδρ.*, 1, 5: τετράς δ' ὁ φάνης, ὡς Ὀρφεὺς φησί...), probably corresponding to the four rivers, in turn, corresponding to the underground elements and centers in two oppositions: Pyriphlegethon = fire, east; Kokytos = earth, west, Acheron = air, south, and Oceanus = water, north, meaning by this, the four elements of nature and the four directions of the horizon; also, to the four zodiacs of Taurus (bull), Snake, Ram and Leo. Though Hesiod describes it as a two-bodied god, perhaps implying the two opposite forces in nature, or the philotes and neikos of Empedocles (Liritzis, 1997). Apparently, the Orphics discriminate *Nous* from matter, for which Anaxagoras later was very clear «all things were initially together, then Nous came and ordered them», Proclus, *In Tim.,* B 49, 23; «...so it is Nous and the head of Zeus, concerning his body, flamed as it is, infinite, immovable...».

II. 2. Orphics on Nature. Certain statements on motion and star movements conform precisely with Anaxagoras's views and modern astrophysics and astronomy. Thus, in several cases, as in Proclus, in Orphic Hymns to Uranus, Nature and the Stars. Here are references to the infinite, which eternally revolves a circle, i.e the precessional motion[2]. It is the apparent precession of the stars around the earth, due to the earth's precession around its axis. The same circular precessional picture is in the Hymn to the Stars (VII, 3-4) («ἀστέρες οὐράνιοι, νυκτὸς φίλα τέκνα μελαίνης, ἐγκυκλίοις δίνῃσι περιθρόνιοι κυκλέοντες...»), and to the Hymn to Nature (X, 21-23, from PRSLA, 1981 and *Procli hymni*).

---

2. Cf. relevant fragments: Proclus, *Ὑπόμνημα εἰς τὸ πρῶτον τοῦ Εὐκλείδου*, B 43) Orphics speaks of the infinite which eternally precesses a circle (Τὸ δ' ἀπειρέσιον κατὰ κύκλον ἀτρύτως ἐφορεῖτο). A similar notion to Anaxagoras who says that the Nous set everything to a precessional motion. This precessional motion is also met in the Orphic hymn to Uranus (*ουρανέ παγγενέτωρ...πρεσβυγένεθλ', ἀρχή πάντων, πάντων τε τελευτή, κοσμοκράτωρ σφαιρηδόν ἑλισσόμενος περί γαίαν...*).

The idea of everything being in precession (from such little things, as solar systems, to such great ones as the revolving galaxies and more...), as helix or revolution, is quoted in several points by Orphic fragments (e.g. Proclus, *Ὑπόμνημα εἰς τὸ Πρῶτον τοῦ Εὐκλείδου*, B 43; Macrobius, *Saturnalia* I, 23 I, 17-71, a, Kern). Orphics also maintain that everything is one, though each being separate from the other, and, that one should include everything around the ineffable aether. This notion reminds of Anaxagoras's view of homeomerie, and his Nous (= ether) deriving (according to our interpretation) from within the initial potential state of everything.

II. 3. Orphics on Soul and Nous Orphics distinguish between soul and *Nous* (οὐδέ τις αὐτὸν εἰσοράαι ψυχῶν θνητῶν, νώ δ' εἰσοράαται, «but none of the mortal souls can see him, because he can only be seen by the nous...», Eusebius, *Εὐαγγελική Προπαρασκευή*, ΙΓ 12, 10-15, Kern, 247, 11-12) though Eusebius seems to have included and twisted orphic quotations implying the coming of Christ. Further, Orphics call Ippa, the soul of everything (= universe, world), which, in an extremely obscure picture, relates it with Dionysus and Zeus (Proclus, *in Tim.*, B 124, 25-199, Kern 211).

Orphics imply a creator, father of gods and humans, who embedded Nous within soul and soul within the body (matter). Paternal Nous and soul coexist. It appears here that a universal power moves Nous - it is not the Anaxagorean Nous, which is a self-created force from within the initial mixture, that sets an order to the initially mixed things (homaeomerie).This is an essential different approach between Anaxagoras and Orphic philosophy of creation of the universe. At any rate, in all Orphic surviving texts (hymns, fragments, inedited fragments, Proclus' hymns, Kallimachus' hymns, the newly discovered Orphic tablets and the Derveni papyrus) the particular reference is made to i) symbolism in the Olympean pantheon, (theogony, cosmogny), ii) mythology (personification, symbolism), and iii) Observational astronomy. The names in (i) or (ii) are interrelated to intrinsic properties of nature's forces[3]. The idea that everything was together (Anaxagoras), is found earlier in Orphics, as the sky (Uranus) and earth was one; later, their separation gave birth to everything and brought everything to light (Ioannis Tzetzis, *Περὶ διαφορᾶς ποιητῶν*, 116). This may be misrecorded, since, elsewhere, Uranus and Gaia are supposed to have emerged from Phanes (Hermias, *εἰς Φαῖδρ.*, 7, Kern, 109).

II. 4. Orphics on time. God Kronus is identified with Time (Chronos in Greek), «who eats his children», «producer of eternity, expressed with various words... you who consume everything and the same you again increase, you who has unbroken connections to the infinite world...genesis and reduction of nature...» (see, *Κρόνου Θυμίαμα, Orphic Hymns,* XIII). These very important notions can be interpreted according to modern theories of time, that is, i) the triple property of time, and that the future becomes past via the present; ii) the relative entity of time qualifies all movements and physical phenomena with various time intervals; iii) the contraction and expansion of time at high velocities (approaching or higher than the speed of light) in conjunction and participation of space. About Kronos, Orphics speak of his reign in the silver race era and considers that his hair is always black. That his hair never gets white may imply that Kronus (= Chronus = Time), is never subjected to the linear evolution or flux of

---

3. E.g. Aegaeus, the symbol of the divine conscience which leads the evolution of the soul, Agathodaemon, symbol of holy life and potency emerging from within the soul. It is the good divinity that Greeks honoured by drinking a cup of pure wine at the end of each symposium. The wine cup represented the divine life and truth needed by everyone who participates in all properties. Also, Kronos=Χρονος in Greek = time, Phanes=light=eros=attraction= four elements of nature.

natural phenomenological parameters we define as time, but remains unaltered, an eternal present, within which appears the triple property of time, past, present and future. Time is intimately connected to birth (genesis) (Proclus, *in Parm.,* 13). This transmits to the «relative time» entity, a multifaced parameter of space which appears prominent during the completion of a morphogenetic process. Nevertheless, such a process in becoming (γίγνεσθαι) is elsewhere named Kairos (= opportune moment). Thus, the opportune moment is intimately associated with time and space. In Anaxagoras's, views time appeared from the moment everything was set in an order by Nous, that is, the birth of order and consequently the appearance of the Nous, is connected with the beginning of time. The allegorical meaning of many sentences is met with the interpretation made by commentators (e..g. Olympiodorus, *εἰς Πλατ. Φαίδ.*, 22: «the alive and dead result one from the other.....the same fathers and sons at homes are....»).

II. 5. Orphics and Order. According to the Orphics the divine logos sets the order of everything («...from high up everything appears in order...», Eusebius, *Εὐαγγ. Προπ.*, ΙΓ 12, 39); «... yours is the order of stars...», Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.,* E, XIV, 6-7; «...that is after the swelling of Phanes the shapes of everything appear from inside...», Proclus, *In Tim.,* B, 34, 4-5, 95, 49, which imply the notion of order). Further, Orphics claim that all were born in Zeus' belly, i.e the universe is identified with Zeus' belly, which was set in order by his Nous; that is, Nous and primeval matter resided in Zeus (cf. above, Orphics and Nous.). Order is attributed to the daemon (deity, divine logos, nous?) who restored it from the coalition of opposites - a night and a day, allegory of darkness and light (Ioannes Tzetzis, *Χιλιάδες*, ΙΒ 150), while in another fragment the set of order appears not immediately after the appearance of the creator (we attribute this to Nous), but in a later stage. In fact, according to Proclus, *Plat. Theol.,* VI, 8, Orpheus said that, the order of the universe started, while the daemon reigned followed by justice (Dike). This later stage is acknowledged by Anaxagoras: «... later on Nous came and ordered them». Order is mentioned In several other instances of Orphic fragments and Orphic Hymns, as the status quo set by cosmogonic principles, or as implying the universal laws of gravity among the stars and planets, the change of seasons, etc.

III. Conclusion-Discussion. All above comments, and several more, on Nous, order, time and nature, present us with a clearer picture: Anaxagoras follows Orphic philosophy of nature through his own personal analysis and definition of some basic natural laws, while moving towards a mechanistic view of the creation of everything. Evidently, some early philosophical views on nature, time, order, motion, attributed to the Orphics and the Anaxagoras, correspond to contemporary physical and astrophysical theories. Although earlier attempts have proved the validity of such an interpretation (Papathanasiou, 1978; Liritzis, 1997), further insight and detailed consideration is much needed. Our effort to syncretism between Anaxagoras and Orphic views on Nous, especially in correlating such correspondences with time, order, the opportune moment (= kairos), and space in general, as reported by various ancient writers, certainly require further research. In some instances particular attention should be paid to details of the syntax and grammar of available copied fragments. In our attempt to compare and comment on the ancient fragments and texts, one should be cautious in unreservedly accepting the exact wording of the surviving and multicopied fragments attributed to Orphics, especially the so called inedited fragments, which are notes of later writers, but also the rest of the fragments as well. What is attributed to Orphics may be the keyword of a fragment. The phrasing or rephrasing could well be the work of the later recording and copying of the philoshophers.

Ioannis LIRITZIS
(Rhodes)

References

Anaxagoras

Texts on Anaxagoras were based on Diels & Kranz collective work, in comparison with a special Publication Series of Ancient Hellenic Literature, *The Greeks,* by Kaktos, No 817, (2000). This Series is based upon the editions of Oxford Classical Texts and BSB B.G Teubner Verlagsgesellschaft, as well as, on Loeb Classical library, Cambridge; Les Belles Lettres; Tusculum Bucherei, Munchen; I poeti greci trad. da Ettore Romagnoli, Bologna; Pubblicazioni dell'Istituto Universitario di Magistero di Catania; Les auteurs grecs expliqués d' après une méthode nouvelle par deux traductions françaises, Paris.

Barnes, J. (1982), *The Presocratic Philosophers,* 2 volumes, revised edition, London.

Barrow, J.D. (1994), *The Origin of the Universe,* Basic Books, London.

Brochard, V. (1926), *Études de philosophie ancienne et de philosophie moderne,* Paris.

Diels, H. (1958), *Doxographi Graeci,* Berolini.

Diels, H. and Kranz, W. (1964), *Die fragmente der Vorsokratiker.* Zurich-Berlin.

Kirk G.S, Raven J.E and Schofield M (1990), *The Presocratic Philosophers* translated by D.Kourtovik, publ. By MIET (Educational Foundation of National Bank), Athens.

Liritzis, I. (1997), *Orphic Cosmogony: Early Beliefs and Contemporary Considerations,* In Delphic Idea, Ancient Greek Logos and Contemporary World, Proceedings, Publ. by the Academy of Delphic Sudies, No 3, pp. 63-77.

Liritzis, I. (2003), *Time and Oracle* (in preparation).

Papathanasiou, M. (1977), *Κοσμολογικαὶ καὶ κοσμογονικαὶ ἀντιλήψεις τῶν Ἑλλήνων στὴν 2η χιλιετία π.Χ.*. (Cosmogonic and Cosmologic Views of Greeks during the 2nd millenium B.C., Ph.D. Athens University, in Greek).

Stokes, M.C. (1971), *One and Many in Presocratic Philosophy.* Washington D.C..

Orphics

Orphic Texts. Publ. Pyrinos Kosmos (1999). Contents: *Argonautics - Lithics - Hymns -Anecdot fragmenta- Proclus hymns- Iro and Leandros - Kallimachus hymns - New Orphic texts: tablets of Ipponios, of Petilias, from Crete, of Timpone Grande, of Companio, Derveni papyrus, of Kaikilia Sekoundina.* The complete contents are based on the books: *Orphica, Procli Hymni, Musaei Carmen de Hero et Leandro, Callimachi hymni et Epigrammata'', Leipsing, 1829;* and Kern, O., *Orphicorum Fragmenta,* Berlin, 1963[2].

The Hymns of Orpheus (1981), transl. by Thomas Taylor, Philosophical Research Society, Los Angeles.

West, M. (1983), *The Orphic Poems,* Oxford University Press, New York.