

# CADMO

Revista do Instituto Oriental  
Faculdade de Letras de Lisboa

1



EDICÖES  
COSMOS

二 一 三 四 五 六 七 八 九 十 十一 十二 十三 十四 十五 十六 十七 十八 十九 二十 二十一 二十二 二十三 二十四 二十五 二十六 二十七 二十八 二十九 三十 三十一 三十二 三十三 三十四 三十五 三十六 三十七 三十八 三十九 四十 四十一 四十二 四十三 四十四 四十五 四十六 四十七 四十八 四十九 五十 五十一 五十二 五十三 五十四 五十五 五十六 五十七 五十八 五十九 六十 六十一 六十二 六十三 六十四 六十五 六十六 六十七 六十八 六十九 七十 七十一 七十二 七十三 七十四 七十五 七十六 七十七 七十八 七十九 八十 八十一 八十二 八十三 八十四 八十五 八十六 八十七 八十八 八十九 九十 九十一 九十二 九十三 九十四 九十五 九十六 九十七 九十八 九十九 一百

# HERMOPOLITAN TRADITIONS IN PHILO BYBLIUS' PHOENICIAN HISTORY

Por JOSÉ NUNES CARREIRA

*Professor da Faculdade de Letras  
da Universidade de Lisboa (Instituto Oriental)*

## Resumo

A investigação das últimas décadas tem visto a *História Fenícia* de Filon de Biblos/Sanchuniaton quer à luz das presumíveis fontes quer no contexto cultural da época helenística em que a suposta versão grega nasceu. Não ignorando a pertinência da última perspectiva, procura-se a «última fonte» da cosmogonia de Filon não em Ugarit nem em Babilónia, mas no Egito faraónico, concretamente nas doutrinas de Hermópolis (Ogdóade, vento cósmico, colina primordial, ovo primordial, Thot revelador das concepções cosmogónicas).

## Zusammenfassung

Im Gegensatz zu den Hauptrichtungen der Forschung in den letzten Jahrzehnten sucht der vorliegende Aufsatz, die Quelle der Kosmogonie des Philo von Byblos/Sanchuniaton näher zu bestimmen. Auf den Spuren von S. Morenz wird dabei der Einfluss des pharaonischen Ägypten besonders hervorgehoben. Auf die Weltentstehungslehre von Hermopolis weisen namentlich die Anspielungen an die Achtheit, die Auffassungen von «windbefruchtetem» Welt- bzw. Ur-Ei und Urhügel, nicht zuletzt die mehrmalige Erwähnung des dortigen Ortsgottes Thot hin.

(Página deixada propositadamente em branco)

Obscure and enigmatic as they may look, the fragments of the  $\nu\pi\omicron\iota\nu\text{L}\text{K}\iota\text{K}\iota\text{j}$   $\iota\omicron\text{Topia}$  (in Eusebius' *Praeparatio evangélica* 9,20-10,55) have been frequently studied in the past four centuries. The fragments are of interest to scholars of related scientific areas — Biblical, Classical and Near Eastern Studies. This fact points to one chief difficulty concerning Philo Byblius' writings. His work has been understood in quite different ways according to the different scholars' peculiar scientific areas.

In the last two decades Near Eastern explanations have been compared to those based on the reality of the Graeco-Roman world in which Philo lived. This new «key» does not, however, exclude the problem of the sources. Indeed, Hellenistic Byblos could not have ignored fundamental religious and cultural experiences, which had lasted there for centuries. This paper aims at placing Philo's cosmogony in the context of the religious and cultural traditions which pharaonic Egypt had set down from the dawn of history.

After the emphasis laid on Ugaritic backgrounds rising from the discoveries at Ras Shamra (O. Eissfeldt) and after the appeal of some late Babylonism (P. Walcot) it seems reasonable to highlight Egypt's heritage. The primaeva egg, the cosmic wind and especially the many quotations referring to the local god Thot help us to consider Hermopolis as the ultimate source of Philo's cosmogony. Hence, the present ordering of the material becomes quite understandable and does not necessarily appear as a result from Philo's Euhemerism. In Hermopolis a cosmogony without «gods» was perfectly at home.

\*\*\*

Some doubts concerning Philo Byblius' *Phoenician History* (rather

an account of Phoenician myths and legends than history in the strict sense of the word) have been quite satisfactorily cleared away: Sanchuniathon's real existence (1). Philo's Semitic *Vorlage* (2), beliefs and concerns of the age (first and second centuries A.D.) (3). Claims for an ancient origin of the Phoenician *Vorlage* are not to be taken seriously. To make of Sanchuniathon a contemporary with the war the Greeks fought against Troy can no longer be accepted even when taking into account expressions like «in the Trojan times», «in the time of Semiramis... before the Trojan war or from those times» (4). It is true that O. Eissfeldt makes a serious effort to establish such a chronology with the support of the Ugaritic sources (5). Nevertheless, reliable evidence does not help him much, since the Trojan war has been considered the oldest Hellenic cultural boundary. The fact of making of someone its contemporary does not mean anything, except a strong claim for an ancient source: «older than the oldest Greek tradition» (6), «before all known deeds, plunging in the roots and the times of myth» (7).

In other words, a spread of knowledge concerning the ancient Near East has been enabling scholars to understand Philo's Phoenician heritage, though such an enthusiasm has often led to a certain amount of excess (8). The Near Eastern trend of interpretation of Philo's work should now be balanced against the author's Graeco-Roman context.

Even if one can «demonstrate that the 'Phoenician History' is a most typical specimen of Hellenistic historiography» and clearly believes that it «provides valuable additional evidence for reconstructing the world of the Hellenistic Orient» (9), the question still remains as far as the sources are concerned. In fact, Philo attaches a great deal of importance to the alleged antiquity of his material. It should further be underlined, though, that Philo's cosmogony finds in Her-mopolis its ultimate source.

## I.

According to James Barr (10), whose opinion does not necessarily coincide with the author's, the *Phoenician History* may be divided into three parts as far as its contents are concerned, namely, a cosmogony, a technogony, as J. Barr rightly calls it, and a theogony. Pious or scholarly prepared Bible readers of the first chapter of the *Genesis* might strongly react against such a division, which also strikes us as rather odd, when compared with the Babylonian story of the creation, *Enuma elië*.

0. Eissfeldt explained the apparent anomaly in terms of Philo's Euhemerism. He suggests the cosmogony could possibly have narrated the origin of the gods. Like the other beings, they emerge from the primeval slime. Philo, not his sources, would then be responsible for the provisional suppression of the gods. According to Philo's Euhemeristic theory, the «gods», or at least most of them, did not come into existence before man. Hence, theogony comes next to technogony. (n)

The solution to this problem should, nevertheless, be envisaged rather in terms of history of the traditions. A logical hypothesis points out that parallel accounts and sources of influence should not be restricted to Mesopotamia and Ugarit. It can be proved that Philo/Sanchuniathon let the traditions speak for themselves. (12)

Besides, cosmogony and theogony are originally different traditions in Egypt, rooted in different geographical places. The theological speculation in Hermopolis conceives the birth of the world as *origin*, that is, a kind of scientific theory with no reference to gods (13). The same is found in Philo's cosmogony. Bearing in mind that Eusebius carefully distinguishes the *Vorlage* (10,1: φησίν, 10,3: φησιν ον, 10,5: λέγωί') from his commentaries, let us take a closer look at the text.

## II.

The opening section of the cosmogony reads more like a paraphrase than like a quotation or a commentary:

(10) Ἦν τῶν ὀλων ἀρχὴν ἰποτίθεται ἀερα ζοφῶδῆ καὶ πνευματώδῃ ἠπνοῇ ἀερος ζοφῶδου καὶ χάσε δοχερον βρββωδβε' ταῦτα ὄβ εἶναι ἀπαρα καὶ δια ποχυν αἰῶνα μὴ εἶναι περας.

«He (Philo) posits at the beginning of all things dark and windy mist, or a blast of dark mist, and a turbid, watery chaos, dark as Erebos. These things were boundless, and throughout a long period of time had no bound.»

Barr's «first instinct» leads him to realize the existence of concepts which are «Greek rather than Semitic». «Dark and windy aer (mist), desire, limit, boundary, intelligence — all these are typical concepts of the Greek cosmology, and some of them, such as limit, are paralleled poorly, or not at all, on the Semitic side (14).

He does not accept Albright's «far-reaching theory», «speculative» construction, and «precarious» attempts to connect Philo's cosmogony

with the Hermopolitan myth <sup>(15)</sup>. A.I. Baumgarten acknowledges a direct dependence on Hermopolis <sup>(16)</sup>. At the same time with the support of Ugaritic parallel accounts <sup>(17)</sup> he insists on considering that the «ultimate source» of Philo's cosmogony is Phoenician <sup>(18)</sup>.

Albright points in the right direction. As for Baumgarten, he would better realize the few Semitic parallel accounts to Philo's cosmogony and look at Hermopolis and its Ogdoad as the ultimate source of the Hellenistic work. The watery chaos would best be understood not as demythologized El <sup>(19)</sup>, but as the first element of the Hermopolitan Ogdoad (Nun/Naunet). Dark and windy *αηρ* as «the beginning of all things» is conveniently equated with Amun/Amaunet in the last place of the cosmogonic system of Hermopolis.

There are good reasons for taking the latest cosmogonic element (*αηρ*) of the Hermopolitan Ogdoad as a starting point. Indeed, the primeval wind is a very important link in the cosmogonic evolution. It brings life to the dark and dead abyss. Almost surreptitiously, the «dark and windy *αηρ*» becomes a universal creating god. «Amun very early became lord of the universe, as was the case with Atum in Heliopolis before him, and still before, in the period of the little states, with Geb, the god of the Earth» <sup>(20)</sup>. This preeminence was confirmed and radicalized in the New Kingdom, as Amun became «king of the gods» and «head of the Enead», in Thebes. No wonder that Philo/Sanchuniathon emphasizes the status of the wind (Amun) when ascribing him the first place in the cosmogonic system.

Xaos *θαλβρον* *epe/3udes* is the Greek equivalent of Nun, the ancient Egyptian word for the primeval abyss, the starting element of the Ogdoad in Hermopolis (Nun/Naunet). *'αηρ* and *λαος* are, therefore, basic cosmogonic elements in Philo/Sanchuniathon as well as in Hermopolis.

Primeval darkness (Kuk/Kauket) has been degraded to adjectival attribute to *αηρ* — *αερα... ζοφώδβ, πνοήν αερος ζοφώδονβ* — and to *χάοε* — *λαος θαλβρορ βριβώδβε*.

The boundlessness of space (Huh/Hauhet) remains to be considered. Its presence is once again well attested by an essential attribute of the primeval chaos: *ταύτα θε εΤναι απβιρα και δια πολυν αιώννα μη ιχβιν πβραε* — «These things were boundless, and throughout a long period of time had no bound.»

There we have the substance of the Hermopolitan Ogdoad: Nun/Naunet, the primeval abyss, translated as *χαος*; Huh/Hauhet, boundless, conveyed by its attributes *απαρα / μη εχειν πβραε*; Kuk/Kauket, darkness, linked to the primeval windy mist — *ζοφώδη... ξοφώδουε* — and primeval abyss — *QoXepov, 'ερεβώδβε]* Amun/Amaunet as *αηρ / πνοη*.

The emphasis on the qualities of the primeval substance shows some kind of scientific concern.

One can hardly come to a conclusion on whether the definition of origin as *αρχή* comes from Philo or from Eusebius, who would be expected to write *εν αρχή*, according to his Greek Bible (Gen i 1).

### III.

The following paragraph belongs to the Hellenistic historian from Byblos:

(10,1) «6re δβ» φησίν «ήράσθη το πνβύμα των ιδίων αρχών, και έγευετο *ανγκρααις*, η πΧοκή βκβίνη βκΧήθη ΙΙ6005αντη δι αρχή κτίσβωε απάντων *abro* δβ ουκ εγίνωσκβ την αυτοϋ κτισιν. και βκ τηε *abron* συμπΧοκή του π ντι) ματ ος κγευετο Μ ώτ. τουτό nves φασιν Ιλύν, οι δβ Ιδατώδουε μίξβωε σήθιν. και βκ ταύτηβ εγευετο πάσα σπορά κτίσβωβ τών βΧων.

«And when the wind loved its own primary elements and a mixture resulted, that plexus was called Pothos (Desire). This (plexus) is the source of the creation of all things. But he (Pothos) did not know his own creation. And from his connection (with the wind) Mot was born. Some say that (Mot) is slime, others the putrefaction of a watery mixture. And from this (putrefaction) was born every seed of creation and (the) origin of all (things).»

The contribution of modern scientific definitions has proved irrelevant to reconcile «creation» (*κτλολς*) with «origin» (*αρχή*) and this one with Pothos' constituent «principles» (*άρχαί*). In a narrative on the emergence of the world intuition wins over rationality. The adequate language being that of symbols, apparent inconsistencies become understandable. More important is the fact that with *οτβ δβ* a new section formally and really begins.

Philo/Sanchuniathon leaves the pre-cosmogonic stage, takes to his own formulations, and enters the convulsion of the world's birth pangs. Form and function of the windy mist before and after the 6re δβ cannot be compared. In the earliest origins the *αήρ ζοφώδηε* was passive, nearly negative and empty like the abyss, in the manner of «an awesome wind sweeping over the water» (Gen i 2). But it now turns to itself, loves itself and becomes the active «principle» of «origin» and «creation of all things». The *αήρ* became *πνβύμα*. Once again the Her-mopolitan system is involved, for *πνβύμα* is the Greek equivalent of Amun. Conversely, Amun/Amaunet represents «die Urkraft als Hauch» <sup>(21)</sup> and as god of the air enjoys some kind of predominance



within the Ogdoad. One is tempted to look for an Egyptologist as the best commentator of Philo's cosmogony:

«Denn die Luft ist nicht toter Stoff, sie tragt die Krafte des Lebens in sich; nur wer sie atmet besitzt es. Das ist eine schlichte Erfahrung. 'Leben is sein Name' hatte darum bereits ein Text der Herakleopoli-tenzeit von Schu, dem alten Luftgott, verkiindet. Das gleiche gilt nun von Amun. Er ist nicht nur Herr der Luft und des Windes; er ist auch 'Hauch des Lebens fCir alles'.» (22)

As a result from Pothis' self love and excitement «Mot was born» — not the Ugaritic Death, which Philo rightly transliterates *Μούθ*, but the primeval hillock under a strange name: «Some say that (Mot) is slime, others the putrefaction of a watery mixture.» This applies to ancient Egypt and specifically to Hermopolis: a primeval watery mist (*ixhrp/Amun*) turns successively into a blast of dark mist (*πνοή*), a wind (*πνβύμα*), a hillock (*Μώτ/τΧΟs*).

The traditions of the primeval island (another version of the primeval hillock) (23) and of the primeval egg (24) were also developed at Hermopolis. Both are to be found in Philo's cosmogony. Finally, there is even reference to sensible/intellectual creatures named *Zophasemin*, an aramaic word rightly translated by Philo as «observers of the heavens». These egg-shaped beings look indeed rather strange:

(10,2) και άνβπλάσθη ομοίωε ωωϋ σχήματι. και βεβλαμεξψβ Μώτ, ηλώε γε και σβλήνη &arepes γε και αστρα μεγάληα».

«(The *Zophasemin*) were formed like the shape of an egg. And Mot blazed as sun and moon, as stars and great luminous bodies.»

By now it should be made clear that we are neither facing Aristotelian logics nor dealing with everyday experience.

Instead, we are trying to read a narrative which has to do with the outburst of the world and life, far beyond time and space. Therefore, symbol and fancy come to our mind as suitable approaches.

Although the origin of celestial bodies other than the sun did not concern the Egyptians of Hermopolis, they did speculate on the emergence of life. According to a theory, in Hermopolis the cosmic primeval egg stood as the origin of life. By the time of the Pyramid Texts (Pyr 1271), if not earlier, this theory appears in connection to Hermopolis. Later sources explain the emergence of the sun, in Hermopolis, springing from the two halves of the same egg. «Since the cosmogonies of Hermopolis and Philo are so closed to each other, it seems reasonable to make Mot one of the subjects of *ανβπλάσθη*, part of the '*Lichte*', or egg from which the heavenly luminaries are born.» (25)

The sudden connection of Mot and the sun also implies an Egyp-

tian background. The emergence of the sun would as well be conceived as the star appearing at the top of a primeval lotus flower. Re is «the great lotus that comes from the Nun», the god that «emerged from the lotus in the high hillock, that enlightens the land with his two eyes» (26). «It may, therefore, be stated that our text links impressively the emergence of life to the origin of the firm substance and, if the coinage of the word is allowed, sets a biogony near the cosmogony.» (27)»

This coinage is allowed... and somehow anticipated in more than a thousand years by Eusebius. Indeed, the church historian from Caesarea names a section of the cosmogony «zoogony» — *ἰδᾶ/iev ὁὲ ἐξίης, (x)0 Kal TTFv faioyovian 'VKOOTŷvca |eye| (10,3).*

The Egyptian notion of a primeval fire island, a Hermopolitan version of the primeval hillock, could also be taken as the ultimate source of the cosmic thunderstorm (air bursting into light, the burning of land and sea):

(10.4) «*Kal TO V à epos ôiavy áoavTos, ôià 7r vpwoiv Kal rfs da|áarjs Kal rrtis γρs 'ey évero wvevfiara Kal vé(prj Kal obpavíwv bòárwv jleyiorai Kara<popal Kal x^oeis.*

«And when the air burst into light, on account of the burning of both land and sea, there aroused winds and clouds and great down-pourings of the waters of heaven and floods.»

Re appeared on the fire island «in the beginning, as the earth was surrounded by Nun.» (28)

Philo/Sanchuniathon himself clearly states the «ultimate source» of his cosmogony:

(10.5) «**Taiü0'** r!)pésr) ev rr!1 Koo!xoyoviat yeypáfi/ieva **Taavrov** Kal rols eKeivov bironvrfiacnv **Ék re** oroxaonüv Kal **reKnrlpi03v, us** 'eupaKev avrov r; **biavoia** Kal **rvpe** Kal **γup etpúnoev.**»

«These are the things which were found written in the cosmogony of Taautos and his commentaries from both conjectures and proofs which his intellect saw, and found, and revealed to us.»

Taautos is a Greek adaptation of the Hermopolitan chief god's Egyptian name (Thot). To the Greeks, Thot stood equivalent to their god Hermes. Accordingly, the city was called Hermopolis, after Hermes. The five out of the seven instances (9,24; 10,5.14.30.38.43.46-63) in which clearly the name Taautos occurs in *Phoenician History* openly relate to Egypt : Thoyt of the Egyptians and Thot of the Alexandrians, «whom the Greeks translate as Hermes» (9,24;

10,14.43), from Misor/Egypt (10,14); the whole Egypt was given to whim by Kronos (10,38). In the name of Tautos does the cosmogony open (9,24) and close (10,5). And this should be considered a real tribute of respect to its ultimate source. Tautos was probably bound to a Semitic form like *Tw't* and can obviously be recognized as a Greek equivalent to the Egyptian Thot (<sup>29</sup>).

רז \* \*

Albright and Baumgarten are most probably quite correct when supposing that the above mentioned cosmogony relies on the many similarities detected between the cosmogony and the traditions of Hermopolis, the Egyptian city where Thot was worshiped. My purpose is to add further evidence to Albright's fundamental intuition (<sup>30</sup>).

Besides, it makes Baumgarten's presentation still more coherent by supplying pertinent Egyptian material and correcting unfortunate formulations of the «ultimate source» of that cosmogony. Truly, «the four Hermopolitan pairs (of the Ogdoad), taken as a whole, are the precise equivalent of the beginning of Philo's cosmogony» (<sup>31</sup>) and the «reference to works of Tautos Thoth is particularly interesting» as evidence «that the cosmogony is somehow directly dependent on Hermopolis» (<sup>32</sup>). But other conceptions — the primeval egg, the hillock and the fire island — also spring from the city where Thot was worshiped.

Baumgarten holds the «atheism» which Eusebius had already detected as wholly «inexplicable» (<sup>33</sup>). I quite disagree, since the two basic Egyptian conceptions on the emergence of the world, either as creation or as origin, must definitely be kept in mind (<sup>34</sup>). The creation pattern is the only one which implies the existence of active gods. The origin pattern, the one of Hermopolis, «explains» the birth of the world as a quasi natural kind of evolution. The Egyptian ultimate source, not Philo/Sanchuniathon, had already replaced the traditional gods by a close related physical element. No wonder Eusebius had mentioned «atheism». Baumgarten's «demythologizing tendency» becomes rather superfluous.

After all, neither of them has read Philo's cosmogony bearing in mind its Egyptian, Hermopolitan background. The organized world springs from physical shapes: «le modèle de l'Ogdoade postule à l'origine du monde des 'formes' ou êtres physiques» (<sup>35</sup>); the Hermopolitan cosmogony «se caractérise par un effort d'explication de la naissance du monde matériel, à partir des phénomènes physiques» (<sup>36</sup>).

The cosmic principles of the Ogdoad could, of course, be sometimes considered persons. This fact renders the full secularization of physics, both in Egypt and in Hermopolis, rather problematic<sup>(37)</sup>, but the truth is that this cosmogony seems to rely more on physics than on theology and therefore could be paralleled to Greek philosophy<sup>(38)</sup>.

The precise birth date of the Hermopolitan Ogdoad is still matter for discussion<sup>(39)</sup>. Yet, it should certainly be considered prior to Philo and even to Sanchuniathon. The tide of tradition between Egypt and Byblos had flown from the earliest times of history, albeit from pre-history. Byblos had been receiving from Egypt much more than acknowledged wisdom (so says the prince in his dialogue with Wenamun): «Thus learning came from it (Egypt) in order to reach the place where I am (Byblos)»<sup>(40)</sup>. «The need for mastery of Near Eastern and classical studies»<sup>(41)</sup>, necessary as it is, does not provide the whole key to Philo's *Phoenician History*. Egyptology proves to be helpful as well as rewarding.

## NOTES

(1) Author or literary patron of a *Phoenician History*, Sanchuniathon may have lived around the VIIIth — VIth centuries B. C. According to W. F. Albright, «Sanchuniathon was a refugee from Tyre who settled in Berytus at the second quarter of the sixth century B. C.» (*Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan*, London, 1968, p. 195). I cannot accept such a precise dating.

(2) Cf. A. I. BAUMGARTEN, *The Phoenician History of Philo of Byblos. A Commentary*, Leiden, 1981, p. 98; GRIMME, «Sanchuniathon», in *Pauly Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaften*, II Reihe A, 2, Stuttgart, 1920 (Neudruck, 1970), 237-238.

(3) P. R. WILLIAMS, *A Commentary to Philo Byblius' «Phoenician History»*, dissertation University of Southern California, Los Angeles, 1968; J. BARR, «Philo of Byblos and His 'Phoenician History'», *BJRL* 57 (1974) 17-69; L. TROIANI, *L'opera storiografica di Filone da Byblos* (Biblioteca degli studi classici e orientali, 1), Pisa, 1974; R. A. ODEN Jr., «Philo of Byblos and Hellenistic Historiography», *PEQ* 110 (1978), pp. 118-125.

(4) *btTjp 'KOikoLLTOiToS, kolí Twv Tpuikuv XpSvæv, cós (fOiol, TpeoßvTepos (Praeparatio evangelica, I, 9, 20)*, ó...e7rÍ Ee/upál/¿ews yéyovev, *Tris 'Aaavplæv QocolXíðos, rj íçpo tív 'IXcxkwv rj KaravTov yé tovs xpónovs ytedoa* (I, 9, 21). In all quotations, Greek text according to F. JACOBY, *Die Fragmentse der Griechischen Historiker, III C*, Leiden, 1958, pp. 803-816.

(5) O. EISSFELDT, *Ras Schamra und Sanchunjaton*, Halle, 1939. *Das Chaos in der*

*biblischen und in der phönikischen Kosmogonie*, FF 16 (1940) 1-3. *Taautos und Sanchunjaton*, in SAB, 1952 (among many other studies).

Semiramis, as the Greeks called Sammu-ramat, the legendary wife of the Assyrian king Šamē-Adad V (823-811 B.C.) and mother to his successor Adad-Nirari III (810-783 B. C.) came about four hundred years after the Trojan war and the destruction of Troy Vila (c. 1200 B. C.).

(6) L. TROIANI, o.e., p. 30.

(7) J. EBACH, *Weltenstehung und Kulturentwicklung bei Philo von Byblos*. Ein Beitrag zur Überlieferung der biblischen Urgeschichte im Rahmen des altorientalischen und antiken Schöpfungsglaubens (BWANT 108), Stuttgart/Berlin/Köln/Mainz, 1979, 2, n. 3.

Likewise, Strabo takes Mochos from Sidon as being «older than the Trojan times»

— *Ἐπιτομὴ τῶν Ἐπιτομῶν Ἰουδαίων ἱστορίας* (XVI, 2, 24). In a similar way, the Jews had ascribed to Abraham the beginning of astrology and to Moses that of law and scripture (L. TROIANI, o.e., p. 30).

(8) P. WALCOT thinks that it would be «surely reasonable to conclude that Philo did actually translate from Phoenician into Greek a text like those we know from Ugarit (*Hesiod and the Near East*, Cardiff, 1966, p. 18) and imagines the Greeks would have acquired at al Mina «a knowledge of Enuma Elish or any other work of Babylonian literature» (*ibid.*, p. 121). «Al Mina, therefore, may be the place where Greeks for the first time not only heard of a poem like Enuma Elish, but also learnt to write» (*ibid.*, P. 123).

(9) R. A. ODEN Jr., o.e., 118. According to this writer, the main characteristics of Philo's historiography are: euhemerism, Stoic notions, a narrow nationalistic design, patriotic cultural history, a belligerent and defensive distance with respect claims for the antiquity of the material he used in his history (pp. 119-123).

(10) O.e., p. 22.

(11)0. EISSFELDT, «Religionsdokument und Religionspoesie, Religionstheorie und Religionsgeschichte. Ras Schamra und Sanchunjaton, Philo Byblius und Eusebius von Caesarea», Thbl 17 (1938) pp. 185-197 = ID., *Kleine Schriften*, II, pp. 130-144. J. BARR seems to accept the explanation: «it can be argued with probability...» (o.e., P. 35).

(12) J. EBACH, o.e., pp. 18-19, 38-41, 96-100.

(13) Cf. S. MORENZ, *Ägyptische Religion* (Religionen der Menschheit, 8), Stuttgart, 1977, p. 189.

(14) J. BARR, o.e., p. 46.

(15) *ibid.*, p. 38.

(16) A. I. BAUMGARTEN, o.e., pp. 104, 110, 113, 115-116.

(17) *ibid.*, p. 106: «El, in the Ugaritic epics, lives at the sources of Tehom. El is also the creator god in the Ugaritic epics. He is called *ab adm* — 'Father of Man' and *bny bnwt* — 'the Creator of Creatures'».

(18) *ibid.*, pp. 96, 99, 103, 104. «Several lines of analysis have already suggested that Philo's ultimate source was Near Eastern, specifically Phoenician (104)».

(19) So *ibid.*, p. 107.

- (20) K. SETHE, *Amun und die Achtheit von Hermopolis*, Berlin, 1930, pp. 122-123.
- (21) K. SETHE, o.e., p. 77.
- (22) H. BONNET, «Amun», in ID. (Hrsg.), *Reallexikon der ägyptischen Religionsgeschichte*, Berlin 1971, p. 33. As a god of the moving air *irvevna* is opposed to *ai)p*, S. MORENZ, «Ägypten und die altorphanische Kosmogonie», in ID., *Religion und Geschichte des alten Ägypten*. Gesammelte Aufsätze, Köln/Wien, 1975, p. 475.
- (23) H. KEES, *Der Götterglaube im alten Ägypten*, Leipzig, 1941, p. 310.
- (24) Pyr 1271 and S. MORENZ, *Religion*, p. 187.
- (25) A. I. BAUMGARTEN, o.e., p. 116.
- (26) S. MORENZ, *Religion*, p. 189, with quotation of the sources.
- (27) *Ibidem*.
- (28) H. KEES, o.e., p. 310.
- (29) E. EBACH, o.e., p. 66: «(Es) lässt sich festhalten, dass Taaautos eine besondere, nur bei Philo belegte Namensform des ägyptischen Gottes Thot ist. Die Form *Tótavroo* mag auf *7w't* = Zeichen zurückgehen, zugrunde liegt dann eine gelehrte Etymologie...»
- (30) W. F. ALBRIGHT, *Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan*, London, 1968, p. 196: Philo's cosmogony was «based on a very ancient Hermopolite myth of the beginning, centering around Thot, the patron divinity of Hermopolis».
- (31) A. I. BAUMGARTEN, o.e., p. 110.
- (32) *Ibid.*, p. 131.
- (33) Cf. *ibid.*, p. 121: «Inexplicable is the 'atheism' of the cosmogony (to use Eusebius' term), the absence of the traditional gods, or what I have called demythologizing tendency.»
- (34) Cf. the whole chapter VIII. — «Weltschöpfung und Weltwerdung» — of S. MORENZ, *Religion*, pp. 167-191.
- (35) M. BILOLO, *Les cosmo-théologies philosophiques d'Héliopolis et d'Hermopolis*. Essai de thématization et de systématisation, Kinshasa/Libreville/Munich, 1986, p. 169.
- (36) *Ibid.*, p. 184.
- (37) S. MORENZ, *Religion*, pp. 184-185: «dass die Weltmaterie in mythischer Weise zu Gestalten personifiziert wird... macht uns bewusst, dass selbst in naturwissenschaftlicher Sicht der Mythos die verbindliche Redeweise blieb und eine Säkularisierung der Physik in Ägypten nicht erfolgte.»
- (38) M. BILOLO, o.e., p. 169: «La situation est analogue à celles que les Grecs connaissent plus tard: Empédocle par exemple postule quatre éléments à l'origine du monde: eau, air, feu, terre. Mais chacun un de ses éléments est considéré ailleurs comme l'élément primordial par excellence: eau chez Thalès, *infini* ou *apeiron* chez Anaximandre, air chez Anaximène et feu chez Héraclite, etc.»
- (39) Cf. K. SETHE, o.e., pp. 36, 41, 116, 122; H. BONNET, o.e., pp. 32-33; E. HORNUNG, *Der Eine und die Vielen*, Ägyptische Gottesvorstellungen, Darmstadt, 1973, p. 75.

**(40) *The Report of Wenamun*, trans. by M. LICHTHEIM, *Ancient Egyptian Literature, II: The New Kingdom*, Berkeley/Los Angeles/London, 1976, p. 227 (the whole *Report*, pp. 224-230).**

**(41) So A. I. BAUMGARTEN, o.e., p. 6.**