

УДК 130.2

## Δράκων Greek Mythology

Andrei N. Kudrin\*

*Khabarovsk State Institute of Culture  
112 Krasnorechenskaia Str., Khabarovsk, 680045, Russia*

Received 09.02.2016, received in revised form 17.04.2016, accepted 18.05.2016

*The article discusses the phenomenological hermeneutics of one of the darkest and mysterious characters of the early Greek mythology named Δράκων. The study is based on the four most ancient myths that we know from Homer and Apollodorus of Athens, describing the battles between Δράκων and different heroes: Apollo, Hermes, Cadmus and Jason. The author chose phenomenology as the method of his investigation following Aristotle's thesis: "It is through wonder that men now begin and originally began to philosophize (the myth-lover is in a sense a philosopher, since myths are composed of wonders); [but] wondering in the first place at obvious (τὰ προχέιρα) perplexities, and then by gradual progression raising the questions about the greater matters too (τὰ προϊόντες)". The myth therefore transmitting the archaic thought narrates εἶδεναι τὰ προχέιρα, "seeing what is open in front of me". The hermeneutic of this vision besides phenomenology needs the ontology of understanding that author finds in fundamental works of S. Kierkegaard, W. Dilthey and M. Heidegger.*

*Keywords: δράκων, Τυφάων, Πύθων, Άργος, Μαρα.*

*DOI: 10.17516/1997-1370-2016-9-6-1307-1319.*

*Research area: philosophy.*

From the depths of Greek antiquity, we have inherited a wonderful myth about the fight of the man with the dragon. And this myth has rooted so deeply in the man that it had been repeating until the beginning of the Christian era. Its deep rooting in the man is due to its attachment to the man. The attachment of the man to the myth speaks for the fact that the battle that was described was the question of human existence. It was not existence in the sense of life and death, but of fundamental being of the man. That is why it is essentially important to us to understand this myth. But how should we approach it?

The creature called Dragon is first mentioned by Homer and Hesiod. Taking into account that neither Homer, nor Hesiod called the Dragon a snake like the authors of the later periods, and in Homer's works the reference to the snake can be only concluded basing on the feminine gender of its name (Hymn. III. 300-306), it is obvious that the myth is so ancient that even for Homer and Hesiod the name of Dragon contained only an echo of something more terrifying than the snake they mention.

The Dragon received its name from the word δέρκομαι, "to see". δράκων is a participle formed from this verb, therefore, δράκων is

“sharp-sighted”. Among all other creatures on earth, only snakes have unblinking eyes, which correspondingly gave the name ὄφις to the snake from ὄψις meaning “an eye”. There is no doubt, this unblinking eye of the snake make the man feel startle and confusion but it has nothing to do with fear and horror. But δράκων makes the man feel horror. Let us recall on Gorgons, ποικίλον κάρα δρακόντων φόβαιπιν λίθινον θάνατον φέρων, “the head with terrible eyes decorated with dragons brining stone death” (Pind. Pyth. 10.47). In the works of Apollodorus δράκων is the child of Ἄρης, *Ares, the rage*; it is accompanied by Φόβος, *fear* and Δείμος, *terror*. Hesiod places between the eyes of the dragon on the shield of Hercules, Ares’s sister and companion δεινὴ Ἐρίς, *terrifying Eris*” (Asp. 148), rage as well. When the man meets the snake, if there is some fear, it is not due to its unblinking eyes but due to the way it moves. Unless, of course, the man had seen the eyes of a terribly giant snake. What can be this *raging eye* that makes the man feel so terrified?

Horror is the word that gives us a clue. Horror is the mood of the peak shrillness of anxiety accompanying the apathy experience, where ὄβρις is waiting for the man awakening him to the existence or recoiling him from the latter. As soon as such awakening accompanies the man throughout the history of his existence, he should inevitably experience coming into the gaze of this raging eye all over again in one form or another. This falling of the men into the effect of the raging eye should we find not only in the ancient myth, but in the stories of the authors that are not so distant to us. One of such stories we hear from Fyodor Dostoevsky, in his invaluable work “Crime and Punishment”, namely, in the description of the state of Rodion Romanovich Raskolnikov who had reached the edge of despair:

*“A strange period began for Raskolnikov: it was as though a fog had fallen upon him and wrapped him in a dreary solitude from which there was no escape. Recalling that period long after, he believed that his mind had been clouded at times, and that it had continued so, with intervals, till the final catastrophe. He was convinced that he had been mistaken about many things at that time, for instance as to the date of certain events. Anyway, when he tried later on to piece his recollections together, he learnt a great deal about himself from what other people told him. He had mixed up incidents and had explained events as due to circumstances which existed only in his imagination. At times he was a prey to agonies of morbid uneasiness, amounting sometimes to panic. But he remembered, too, moments, hours, perhaps whole days, of complete apathy, which came upon him as a reaction from his previous terror and might be compared with the abnormal insensibility, sometimes seen in the dying. [...] He felt very miserable. If it had been possible to escape to some solitude, he would have thought himself lucky, even if he had to spend his whole life there. But although he had almost always been by himself of late, he had never been able to feel alone. Sometimes he walked out of the town on to the high road, once he had even reached a little wood, but the lonelier the place was, the more he seemed to be aware of an uneasy presence near him. It did not frighten him, but greatly annoyed him, so that he made haste to return to the town, to mingle with the crowd, to enter restaurants and taverns, to walk in busy thoroughfares. There he felt easier and even more solitary.”<sup>1</sup>*

Dostoevsky can be hardly suspected of the flight of fantasy, he knew and understood the man too well. Therefore, these lines that he wrote should be read carefully. First of all, we should be interested in the words: “*but the lonelier the place was, the more he seemed to be aware of an uneasy*

*presence near him*". Whose could be that presence in *the most lonely* place, if not the *presence* itself? But why does Ralkolnikov suddenly experience it in such a way? The answer is in the lines: "*his mind had been clouded*", Dostoevsky says. What does the *dullness of the consciousness* mean? What is *consciousness* in general? Dostoevsky's contemporary, Vladimir Dahl, explains this word as follows: "consciousness is a state of the one realizing that ...". 'осознающий' [realizing] according to Dahl, is "*having checked the truth, to accept and understand it*". Consequently, 'сознание' [consciousness] is "believing the truth", "accepting the truth" and "understanding the truth".

The truth is what is really there. If 'быть' means a sustainable state of the one standing in the light of *medlenie* [Russian for 'delaying'] [Kudrin, 2014: 61], 'truth' should call this *sustainability* of the firmly standing one. Let us recall that the word 'бытие' [being] is rooted in *medlenie*. That is why it has formed a unified paradigm of conjugation with the word 'есть' [to be] having forced out some of its word forms, including the form 'истина' [truth].

What do the confidence in the truth, its acceptance and understanding mean?

The Russian word 'убеждать' [to convince] is close in meaning to the word 'убежище' [shelter]. We may assume that the Russian word is rooted from the Greek word ἐπαγωγή < ἐπάγω, 'brining' < 'I bring', the most important tool in rhetorics, which according to Aristotle, is aimed at the art πίστις, what we mainly translate by the word 'убеждение'. Therefore, all πίστεις come from the open display of what I have found and to which I bring the others. Consequently, the Russian word 'убеждение' quite precisely transfers the meaning of the Greek word πίστις, as well as the word πείθω which is close to it.

Therefore, being convinced in the truth means being brought to what is sustainably

delaying in its sustainability in the glimpse. But how to bring to it the one who is mistaken? The answer can be found in the word 'признать' [to accept]. In fact, it is the word from which the Russian word 'сознание' [consciousness] is formed, while there is no such a word as 'сознание' neither in the Old Russian dictionary, nor in the Church Slavonic one. Its appearance in the Russian language is more likely connected with the necessity to translate the German word 'das Bewußtsein' formed from 'wissen', the German equivalent of the verb 'знать' [to know]. What does the verb 'знать' mean? This word has the basis different from the German 'wissen'. It is closer to the Greek word γινώσκω and the Latin word 'cognosco'. They have the same root, and therefore the general initial meaning is also close. Therefore, we should search for the meaning looking at its ancient use. Some archaisms were recorded by V. Dahl. For example, "Он знает кричит, знает спорит", "Он знает ходит", "Знать сокола по полёту", "Издали знать", "Знать, моя участь такая". 'Знай' in "он знает кричит, знает спорит" and "он знает ходит" is used in the imperative mood and in the second person singular. This means when I say "он знает кричит", I talk about the third person crying: "You should know that he is walking, crying and arguing". Such use of 'знай' can have only one meaning, mainly *you should pay attention to this, notice this*. The German 'wissen' initially had the same meaning. The same meaning is met in the Greek γινώσκω: γνῶ χωομένοιο, "*he notices that he was angry*", γινῶσκω ἀπιστούμενος, "*I notice that they do not believe me*" (Veisman, 1991). This meaning has preserved in the Greek γινώσκω better, it reveals itself in the words τὸ γνῶμα [sign], ὁ γνώμων, [superintendent of the sacred olive trees of Athens] and [gnomon]. It is this meaning that enlightens the meaning of the word 'знай' in the sayings "знать сокола по полёту", "издали знать", "знать, моя участь

такая”. But to see not only from far away, but even in front of you an angry person who does not believe you, or in general an arguing and even screaming person, it is not enough to only look. Otherwise, what for did Aeschylus say:

*“the first ones [people] looked without seeing, listened without listening”* (Prom. 447-450).

I can only see clearly when I distinguish what I look at on the general background. For this purpose, the eye should stop on..., fix on in the exact meaning of the Latin word *‘fixi’*, “I have fastened my gaze upon”. What I have fastened my gaze upon, starts to move slowly in my view as something I *have understood* out of the general background. What I have understood is steadily slow, it reveals itself and is open for the eye. Its free viewing is *‘знание при’*, *‘признание’* [acceptation]. The Greek people called the steadily viewing eye able to distinguish what should be understood νοῦς. We translate this word into Russian as *‘ум’* [intellect]. It is hard to say whether this word is etymologically connected with the word μνήμη [memory]. The connection of the Russian words *‘ум’* and *‘память’* can be traced easily: *“ум – умный – мнение – мнить – помнить – память”*, the same as the Greek μνήμη. That is why *‘сознание’* [consciousness] according to Dahl is also “full memory”. Under the full memory Dahl understands not only the memory of the slowed existence, but also the person in it, person’s state in it implementing the completeness of the event, which means “the state of the person capable of understanding his actions” or “understanding of himself” and herewith, what is extremely important, understanding his body. That is why *“at times, finding himself [Raskolnikov] in a solitary and remote part of the town, in some wretched eating-house, sitting alone lost in thought, hardly knowing how he had come there; another time he woke up before daybreak lying on the ground under some bushes*

*and could not at first understand how he had come there”*, Fyodor Mikhailovich writes about his protagonist.

This “clouded mind” of Raskolnikov sounds in Greek as μαραινόμενος νοῦς. In this Greek expression μαραιν-όμενος, μαραιν-θήμενος we can distinguish old Russian *Мара* [Mara] that is now forgotten and appears only in its derivative forms: *‘мороз’* [frost], *‘смерть’* [death], *‘морока’* [fog], *‘мрак’* [darkness], ..., *‘марево’* [heat haze]. The last word has best preserved the esthetics of Mara. Raskolnikov’s clouded mind is Mara that like *“fog had fallen upon him and wrapped him in a dreary solitude from which there was no escape”*. The dusk of Mara that had fallen like fog, which is absolutely obvious while Rodion Raskolnikov confuses dates of events, is total *‘безразличие’* [insensibility] of the person who overfills the whole space in the spotlight, ψυχή of Raskolnikov. While it is *‘неразличимое’* [undistinguished], it does not motivate him to act due to this *‘безразличие’* [insensibility]. Absence of motivation in the literal meaning of this Latin word (motus) is felt as consternation and heavy apathy that *“might be compared with the abnormal insensibility, sometimes seen in the dying”*. The meaning of the Russian word *‘умираю’* [to die] means to go to *Мара*. Her freezing grip seems to *squeeze* the one being frozen and is felt as longing *“morbid uneasiness”*, which at the peak of its shrillness turns into its correlate, terror, that is why Raskolnikov *“felt very miserable”*. Leonid Lipavskii in his wonderful research of terror notes that *“ancient Greeks knew this feeling well. They called it meeting with Pan, panic terror”* (Lipavskii, 2005: 21). *Πάν*, Πάν in Greek means *‘Всѣ’* [That’s all]. In Russian the word *‘всѣ’* previously sounded as *‘Мірѣ’*, *‘Мырѣ’*, the same as *Мара*.

This *‘Всѣ’* [That’s all] of the complete fog of insensibility contains *desperation*. While it is impossible to distinguish anything, the way out of

it is as well impossible to determine. There could not be any way out due to the completeness of insensibility. Insensibility of the delayed one does not allow to outline the presence of another, that is why it is experienced as *solitude*. The solitary heavily frozen state before complete insensibility of the presence is standing in front of its *raging eye*.

Therefore, “*clouded mind*” is the answer to the question how can the man experience the presence of the raging eye. Standing in the view of this eye should accompany the first glimmer of self-consciousness in the dim darkness of human existence. May be it is this confrontation that is described in the myth about the Dragon. Let us turn to the most ancient story about it. It is the myth of Pythian Apollo.

This myth has come down to us in two versions: of the poet Homer and the historian Apollodorus of Athens. According to Aristotle, “*the difference between a historian and a poet lies not in the presence or absence of a meter, but in the fact that the first one tells about what had already happened, and the other one about what is happening*” (Poet. 1451 b 6-7). Therefore, let us first of all, turn to Apollodorus but also consider Homer’s story, while according to Aristotle, “*poetry is more philosophical and finer than history*”.

“*But Apollo learned the art of prophecy from Pan, the son of Zeus and Υβρις and came to Delphi, where Themis at that time used to deliver oracles; and when the snake Python, which guarded the oracle, would have hindered him from approaching the chasm, he killed it and took over the oracle*” (Apollod. 1.4.1).

Apollodorus calls the guard of the oracle the snake (ὄφις) Python (Πύθων). Homer calls him Dragon Typhaon (Τυφάων):

“*Nearby is the beautiful-flowing spring where the lord, the son of Zeus, killed the she-dragon with his strong bow,*

*a wild monster grown to great size, who did many evils*

*to men on earth—many to the men themselves and many to thin-shanked sheep, since she was a bloody woe.*

*Hera bore terrible cruel Typhaon, a woe to mortals,*

*who was like neither gods nor mortals.”*

(Hymn. III. 300-304).

Both Apollodorus and Homer write about the same, but call it differently. How deep is this difference? What can be at the back of the names Πύθων and Τυφάων? We have the answer already: it is the raging eye of presence. But is it true?

Let us begin with Πύθων. Much more is said about it, mainly “*and when the snake Python, which guarded the oracle, would have hindered him from approaching the chasm*”.

“*Have hindered him from*” is the semantic translation of Apollodorus’s ἐκόλυεν αὐτὸν. The more literary translation of ἐκόλυεν αὐτὸν is “*set him loose*”. “*Setting Apollo loose*” here should be understood as loosening the body parts of Apollo. If we turn to the Bible, loosened not long ago meant paralyzed. In the New Testament in Luke 5, 18 we read: καὶ ἰδοῦ, ἄνδρες φέροντες ἐπὶ κλίνης ἄνθρωπον ὃς ἦν παραλελυμένος, “*some men came carrying a paralyzed man on a mat*”. The Perfect Participle of παραλελυμένος that has come down to us as “*paralyzed*” from παράλυσις, is literary translated as “*loosened from*”. It is loosened from παρά, ‘*νοδλε*’ [near]. This ‘*νοδλε*’ is the freedom to delay the being; being, which either captures the man attracting him or sending him away to something. This message of being that is attracting the man we call “*motivation*” < motus, “*movement*”. The παραλελυμένος man brought to Jesus does not have this movement. But it appeared after Jesus had told him, “*I tell you, get up, take your mat and go home.*” Immediately he stood up in front of them and went home”. We can treat differently the text of the evangelist.

One can doubt the story he had described, if there was not one “but”: we meet something similar to this situation from time to time. The paralyzed man was able to walk. That means that he was paralyzed because he was not attracted by the being that connects us. It had not captured him. He was not connected. On the contrary, he was loosened. May be he was attracted by something, but not what makes us connected. May be this is why we are not able to understand him.

Apollodorus describes this more precise: ἐκ-ώλυνεν. Nevertheless, Apollo is the “light” enlightening the darkness. His name is difficult to analyze in terms of etymology, it is more likely rooted in some pre-Greek lost language, that is why the Greek always called him delicately Φοῖβος, which means “Bright” < “Bringing light”. For the person to enlighten the darkness means to see clearly. For the person who does not understand his body, light and vision is the same! Apollo symbolizes both. To see clearly should be understood as to see the slow being in the light. What it has come from is the fog of absolute insensibility, Mara. Mara as absolute insensibility is appearing and disappearing being, either here or there. This is what it is: Mara looks at the man. She is δράκων, ‘зрак’ [eye, vision] of the presence of absolute insensibility of the presence, being. Such vision of absolute insensibility is, in fact, plane and blind.<sup>2</sup> Its absolute insensibility is ‘*нумань*’ [a mess]. The root of this Russian word can be traced in the name of seeing eye in Apollodorus’s myth, Πύθων. Vladimir Dahl interprets ‘*нумань*’ as ‘*everything that is unconnected*’. Nevertheless, this *absence of connection* is at the same time *chaotic connection*. That is why the Russian word ‘*нумать*’ [to mess up] forms ‘*нык*’, and that is why it is “*everything that is unconnected, unclear and difficult to understand*”. Moreover, some dialects of the Russian language contain the word ‘*нυμερза*’ in the meaning of the snow storm. In Greek it is called θυμός. This word

is often translated as ‘spirit’, ‘soul’, ‘desire’, though it is formed from θύω, which means ‘to smoke’, ‘to rage’. Russian dialects use the word ‘*kura*’ for ‘snow storm’, ‘storm’ (Trubachev, 1987). Therefore, we can assume that θυμός is ‘*нυμερза*’, even though in Russian the best equivalent is ‘*дума*’ [thought]. Πύθων, strictly speaking, is ‘*нуманная дума*’ [a messy thought], which is heaving in the being, which seems to be hidden in the depths of its vortex. May be it is this chasm (τὸ χάσμα) of the heaving vortex that Πύθων did not let Apollo look into.

It is worth noting that ‘*нумань*’, ‘*нумать*’ and ‘*нумы*’: “пучащая *нумань* опутывает” [heaving mess is enmeshing], i.e. freezes! Not only ‘*пучить*’ and ‘*пыхнуть*’ are rooted in the Russian word ‘*нумать*’, but also ‘*пыхать*’ [to smoke]. The latter is similar to the Greek τύφος, which means ‘*smoke*’. In the Russian language it is closer in meaning to the word ‘*чад*’ [a reek], from which the derivative ‘*чадо*’ [a child] is formed, i.e. what has come into the world. Homer’s name Τυφᾶων, similar to τύφος is formed from τύφω, ‘*чадить*’ [to smoke]. Therefore, Τυφᾶων in Homer’s myth is ‘*Чадаиуи*’, ‘*Чадило*’, i.e. *the same dim darkness of insensibility of being, messy thoughts* (Πύθων), Mara – τὴν δὲ σκότος ὄσσε κάλυψε (Hymn. III. 370), “*the darkness that covered Apollo’s eyes*”, μένος ὄξεος Ἡελίοιο (Hymn. III. 374), “*the rage of inhospitable Helios*”. It is noteworthy that Homer twice calls blind Τυφᾶων a Ἡελίοιο, *Helios*, the sun; but “*inhospitable*” sun. This strange “*inhospitality*” of the sun that occurs from nowhere in the text of the myth is *unfriendliness* of Τυφᾶων. His unfriendliness is in ἠλέκτωρ Ὑπερίων (Hymn. III. 369), “*bright glaring arrogance*”. Twice Homer calls Τυφᾶων δεινόν τ’ ἀργαλέον, “*terrible and burdensome*”. ‘*Burdensome*’ suits here, but, ἀργαλέος offered by dictionaries in the meaning “*difficult*”, “*sore*” is quite a complicated word. P. Chantraine tries to refer it to ἄλγος, which means ‘*pain*’, ‘*suffering*’.

He may be right, though his attempt is not very persuasive. It is more likely that ἀργαλέον refers to ἀργός and λέων, 'bright' and 'lion', or ἀργός and λεῖος, 'bright' and 'smooth, even'. 'White-haired lion' suits Τυφαῶν semantically. It should be noted that in Homer's myth Gaia gave birth to Τυφαῶν from Hera:

*"She once received from golden-throned Hera,  
and then raised up,  
terrible cruel Typhaon, a woe to mortals"*

(Hymn. III. 340-353);

and she "brought and gave this evil one to another evil one" to Hera, and she "received him" and "raised him up" (Hymn. III. 300-304).

Let us recall that Hera, Ἥρα, the name of which bear Anaksimenes ἡ ἀήρ, grammatically agreed with it, is similar to *Juno* in Latin. Her name formed from *jungo*, which means 'connect', 'join', 'intertwine', bears the same, what *Mara* calls: *the insensibility of unsteady dusk of shimmering mist, which envelops the horizon, gradually receding, and departing, filling the presence with thickening present, absorbing it again.*

Carried by Hera from the Earth and raised up by her, growing Τυφαῶν is either a smoking orifice of a volcano, which reminds of messy hair of a white-haired lion, or a smooth, even, bright eye of presence. Its smoothness is 'нолог', 'плогив' of absolute insensibility. Its brightness (ἀργός) is more like white hair, the word from which *argentum*, silver, is formed; the colour of silver is light ash-grey, white, *unsteady dusk of shimmering mist of absolute insensibility*. It is right time to recall on the research of Lipavskii that we have mentioned above: "Tropical sadness is expressed in hysteria typical for southern peoples: in the access of the dance or gasping running, when the man is running without stops with a knife in his hand, - *he seems to long for cutting the continuity of the world*", which lies in front of him as a bed of absolute insensibility.

What was the first in the meaning of Τυφαῶν: the clouds of the volcano's smoke or misty *Mara*? It is difficult to assert, but what does not cause any doubts is: Homer tells about the second one, since Apollo ἐρεχθομένη κατὰ χῶρον (Hymn. III. 357), *"tore it into pieces on the spot"* and καθ' ὕλην πυκνὰ μάλ' ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα ἐλίσσετο (Hymn. III. 360), *"writhed continually this way and that amid the wood"*. Let us recall once again that Apollo is Light. And his weapon is a bow. His arrows are the rays of light coming through the mist of darkness. Before he came to Delphi, according to Apollodorus, he had learned the art of prediction (τὴν μαντικὴν) from Zeus and Ὑβρις. Is in understanding of the ancient Greek Zeus is φρήν, a moving *diaphragm* dividing the presence into presence and absence, uncovered and hidden (Kudrin, 2009, 50), if Ὑβρις is "Nonsense" and "Storm" evolving in the misty darkness of being, than Apollo is the "Light" in this misty, messy darkness that he tears apart and which he had left there, in the wood, to rot (Hymn. III. 363), says Homer. In Greek 'to rot' is πῦθεσθαι. Some researchers think that Apollodorus's name Πύθων is formed from this word. Indeed, we find its base in the close Latin words *puteo*, 'to smell rotten', *pus*, 'gleet', *puter*, 'flabby', 'dim'. It is interesting that *puto*, 'to think', 'to clean', *putus*, 'clean', *puteus*, 'a pit', 'a mine'. These meaning of *puto*, *putus*, *puteus* in comparison with *puter*, 'flabby', 'dim', again bring us back to the thoughts of similarity of Πύθων and θυμός as a messy thought.

And what does this word mean to us? Sometimes instead of 'думать' [to think] we use 'мыслить'. But these two words are not the same. They are different in their daily use: in 'мыслить' and 'мысль' [a thought] we mean clarity and accuracy, which cannot be said about the word 'думать'. We do not say 'мыслить' about 'мысль'. But we say 'думать думу', in order to encounter or make up something. The

word 'думать' is closer in meaning to 'гадать' [to guess]. It is no coincidence that in Russian there is a proverb "не думал, не гадал" [who would have foretold it]. The initial meaning of the word 'гадать' is best preserved in the superstition: "to get to know something unknown, the future or the past, in particular". May be this getting to know (μαντεύομαι) the future out of the past (μνεία) since then was what Πυθία, *Pythia*, was doing, which Apollo speaks for. His prediction (μαντική), 'гадание', is nothing else but clearing a messy thought up. This word is referred to the Russian name for Πύθων, 'Γαδ' [a reptile]. Since Apollo is the light coming through the darkness, the thought that he is clearing up is 'выведывание' [finding out]. In Greek 'выведывать' is πυνθάνομαι; its basis is πυθ-. This πυθ- can be read not only in Πύθων, but also in πυθμέν, 'a root', 'a bottom', 'a basis'. This bottom is the bottom of *putei*, 'the pit' where everything is rooted and where everything comes from! It is where Apollo looks (όρέι) through the eye of Pythia, that is why he is an *oracle*.

Nevertheless, Apollodorus says that Apollo, having guessed the Reptile, Πύθων, had taken the prediction of Themis that was already there. Apollodorus says differently; regarding Apollo he says μαντεύομενος, and regarding Themis χρησμοφδοούσης. χρησμοφδοούσης is φδοούσης, 'singing' ωδή, 'a song' of what χρή, 'should' be done, and not what will happen to you. Themis, Θέμις, cannot act differently, while together with Zeus she is 'Устанавливающая' [setting] (Θέμις < τίθημι, 'to suppose', 'to set') Μοῖρ'υ, 'freedom' and Δίκη, 'steady being': appearance, pastime and waning. Aeschylus tells us that before Themis in Delphi there was a cult of Gaia (Eum. 1-20). Up to now there is όμφαλός, her 'navel'. But is it a navel? In όμφαλός we can clearly hear φαλλός. May be, όμ- in όμφαλός is - όμός, 'the same', 'equal'. ό- could have transferred into ό-, like it happened with copulativum, where

ά- turned into ά-. Then όμφαλός is "the same" φαλλός» or "equal"-φαλλός», i.e. 'the small hill of Venus'. It is indeed interesting why a hill is called a navel, when a navel is normally a hole? If όμφαλός is "a small hill of Venus" of Gaia, nearby there should be γεννύσα μήτρα, "birth giving metra", while the cult of Gaia is the cult of fertility. Fertility is coming out from the hidden to the presence. This is similar to what we have read in Πύθων, a messy thought, that is heaving like a bud ready to give birth to a sprout coming from the darkness to the light. According to Homer, she has turned into fertile soil. Thus, the cult of birth giving Gaia that used to be in Delphi had transformed into the cult of enlightenment of Apollo preserving the same understanding of presence.

Now let us return to the interesting phrase of Aristotle, that "poetry is more philosophical and more important than history". It is more philosophical and more important because "poetry is finer and more philosophical than history; for poetry expresses the universal, and history only the particular", says Aristotle. The myth that we have studied while it is recorded both by the poet and the historian has both these features. This means that Apollodorus, telling the history of the gods smoothly transforming the history of people, in fact, presents the history of the man that in the beginning does not understand himself and then clearly distinguishes himself among others. Therefore, both of them in the myth about Apollo say (λέγειν) οἷα ἂν γένοιτο καὶ τὰ δυνατὰ κατὰ τὸ εἰκὸς ἢ τὸ ἀναγκαῖον (Arist. Poet. 1451 a 36), "as like what happened and what can happen either due to analogy, or due to necessity". While, "by a "general truth" I mean the sort of thing that a certain type of man will do or say either probably or necessarily. That is what poetry aims at in giving names to the characters. A "particular fact" is what Alcibiades did or what was done to him", says Aristotle (Arist. Poet. 1451 b 8-10).

This “*sort of thing that a certain type of man will do or say either probably or necessarily*” contains *imitation* (μίμησις) of *someone*, something that happened before, or of *anybody* who found himself in the same situation. Therefore, only what had happened before is possible; it will happen to everybody following (συμβαίνει) him in his life. Surprisingly, but according to Aristotle, only *what is necessary is possible!* That is why poetry is more important than history. It tells about inevitable things that concern everybody unlike history, which only confirms this by saying names. Let us remember those who followed Apollo.

One of them is Cadmus. His story is as follows: sent by his father to find his missing sister Europa, he came to Delphi to find out something about her. The God told him that he should not worry about Europa and follow a special cow, with a half moon on her flank, which would meet him, and to build a town on the spot where she should lie down exhausted. After receiving the prediction of the oracle, Cadmus followed the cow when he met her. The cow guided him to Boeotia, where he founded the city of Thebes (Apollod. 3.1.1; 3.4.1). Cadmus “*wishing to sacrifice the cow to Athena, sent some of his companions to draw water from the spring of Ares. But a dragon, which some said was the offspring of Ares, guarded the spring and destroyed most of those that were sent. In his indignation Cadmus killed the dragon, and by the advice of Athena sowed its teeth. When they were sown there rose from the ground armed men whom they called Sparti*” (Apollod. 3.4.1).

Another one is Jason, who was questing the Golden Fleece:

*“For it lay within a thicket near the ravenous jaws of a dragon which, in length and breadth, exceeded a fifty-oared ship”* (Pin. Pyth. 4. 244, 252).

The “*thicket*” in which the Fleece lay is λόχμη in Pindar’s myth. This word refers to the

word λέγω in the meaning “to lay”. This means that it would be better to translate λόχμη as ‘*lair*’. This meaning suits well the meaning of the lines: “*For it lay within a lair near the ravenous jaws*”. But in Pindar’s text δράκοντος δ’ εἶχετο λαβροτατῶν γενύων, “*the ravenous jaws of a dragon*” is taken into commas. May be it was taken in commas later, may be not. If not, then the sentence in Pindar’s text gets another meaning. Mainly, it should be interpreted λόχμη. λέγω, to which it refers, which has a long history of meanings. Its initial meaning “to lay” transforms into “to collect” what is being laid. Therefore, “to collect”, λόχμη receives the meaning “a thicket, a bush” as vegetation in one place. What if δράκοντος λαβροταταί γένυας “*the ravenous jaws of a dragon*”, following λόχμη and λόχμη itself is an *impenetrable thicket*. This impossibility to see the present is its insensibility. Let us recall on the man’s feeling in impenetrable woods described by Ivan Turgenev: “*You go, and go, but this eternal forest does not end and your heart starts to ache a little, and you want to go as quickly as possible to the open space, the light, you want to breathe deeply ...*”. “*Your heart starts to ache a little*” is continuous sadness. Leonid Lipavskii writes: “Oh, this special *sadness* of southern countries, where nature is too strong and the life remarkably shameless, so the man gets lost in it and ready to cry with despair!”. What does it mean that “*life is shameless*”? And what does sadness have to do with it? Aristotle gives us the answer.

“Shame (αἰσχύνη, αἰδῶ) is a kind of anxiety (λύπη τις) or worry (ταραχή) in relation to disgrace phenomenon (τὰ εἰς ἀδοξίαν φαινόμενα)”, he says (Rhet. 1383 b 14). λύπη is “*sadness*”, “*worry*”, “*the blues*”; ταραχή refers to ταρασσῶ, “to trouble”, “to excite”, “to shock”. Therefore, shame is “*sadness that worries*” in the precise meaning of the word “*anxiety*”, i.e. causing the state of oscillation. What causes this oscillation? Dreams, while “in relation to *imagination* (φαντασία)

disgrace is *shame*”, says Aristotle. “φαντασία is impossible without φαντάσμα”, he writes in his other work (Peri Mnēmōn. 450 a). φαντάσμα is what we νοεῖν: “it accompanies while enduring it is ἐν τῷ νοεῖν” (Peri Mnēmōn. 450 a). νοεῖν is the action of νοῦς, “steadily standing gaze”, which penetrates through τὸ αἶσθημα inspired (ἀίω) by Mara to the absent, outlining it near τὸ αἶσθημα. This visible τὸ αἶσθημα is φαντάσμα. To see it clearly is φαντασία. But also there are animals that live φαντασία (Meth. 980 b 26), which we reject in intellect. Why? Because in the basis of φαντασία is μνήμη, which is Μνημοσύνη, “the one that aims at (μνάεται) the one that has become present in the presence from the closed nature and fuses with it” (Kudrin, 2009). These τὸ αἶσθημα and φαντάσμα fused together initiate oscillation, vibrating in the gaze, showing one part or another. This fusion is the dream that worries and in the waves of which there is mist of insensibility. Therefore, shame is anxiety, which is not determined by something specific, but *some* (λύπη τις), as Aristotle says about it.

Nevertheless, shame is always “displayed” (Rhet. 1384 a 35), which is confirmed by the proverb: τὸ ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς εἶναι αἰδῶ. Shame is always felt *before* somebody, in the eyes of who you did the action. Therefore, to a greater extent, he continues, we are ashamed of those in the eyes of which we are constantly present (ἀεὶ παρεσομένου), first of all. Secondly, we are ashamed only of what amazes us (θαυμάζει). And we are mostly amazed by those, who have an inquisitive mind (φροντίζουσι δ’ ὡς ἀληθεύων τὸ φρονίμων), and such people are senior and educated, that is why we are ashamed in front of them. This is not surprising: they can bring scandal upon us (ἀδοξέειν); and people listen to them. That is why in αἰδῶ its is not ‘shame’ that comes first, but ‘respect’. And vice versa, in front of those who admire me, I am proud and I neglect their opinion. This pride (ὑβρις)

and neglecting lies impudence (ἀναΐδεια). But if shame is sadness felt due to insensibility in front of the proud eye (let us recall on ἠλέκτωρ Ὑπερίων, “bright glaring arrogance” of Τυφάων in Homer’s text), why cannot this eye be the insensibility of the presence of the rainforest, which of cause, the depths of which are even more impenetrable than the depths of Polesie, which cause sadness. May be this is its shamelessness? This sadness, despair and frustration is caused by the continuous space of the impenetrable woods, when “in the full day, when light, smells and warmth are at utmost, the thick rays stand like horns” forming “the continuous world without gaps, without pores, without heterogeneity” (Lipavskii, 2005: 22). Insensibility of the present causes human frustration. He is literally lost, because he cannot find his way. How can you find your way somewhere, where you can distinguish nothing? The sadness arising in the man makes him almost frozen. Absence of the way out of insensibility causes despair. May be this is the feeling that Jason and Cadmus felt when they found themselves in the totally alien landscape. “Oh, this special sadness of southern countries!”, writes Lipavskii, “may be this is what they pay double salary for to those sent to serve in the colonies, but this does not help, they quickly lose their will to live, they sink and die” (Lipavskii, 2005: 22). The sadness of southern countries is more typical for the person who is alien there. Alien!

The most ancient myth about the man’s confrontation with the Dragon is the myth of Pythian Apollo. Another very ancient myth is the myth about Argos, Ἄργος, the son of Gaia and Uranus, the brother of Στερόπη and Βρόντης, all three were κυκλόπες, *Cyclops*, which means “round-eyed”. Their round eyes in fact meant one round eye. The name Ἄργος refers to ἀργής, ‘light’, “white-haired”, which we have already discussed in connection with Τυφάων in Homer’s

text. The names of his brothers are formed from στεροπή, 'lightening', 'glitter', 'shine' and βρόντη, 'thunder', βρόμος, 'noise', 'rumble'. Therefore, Στερόπη means the "shine of lightning", and Βρόντης stands for "rumbling thunder". How can be the name of Άργος interpreted as he appeared before both of them? The sequence of their names in Apollodorus's works is confirmed by the sequence of their appearance during the night thunderstorm when between the sky (Οὐράνος) and the dale (Γῆ) in the darkness of the night there appears a glimpse and then in it we see the lightening and here the thunder. Therefore, Άργος is the glimpse, and in the darkness of the night it is the 'Bright Eye'. Though, in the beginning they should have names something else, different from atmospheric glimpse, thunder and lightening, while they had not only *made* (τεῦξάν) and given thunder and lightening to Zeus (Hes. Th. 138-145), but also they had given the trident to Poseidon, which *shakes* everything, and what is even more important, they had given the Cap of Invisibility to Hades, and this is extremely significant moment for understanding, while invisibility of Hades and Hades himself (Αἴδος, 'invisible') appears from the moment of dividing the integral presence into open and hidden. Their names more likely refer to the shocking awakening light of the threat to being. The antiquity of the myth is confirmed by their triplicity, the second intellectual ability of the human. The first one, as we know from Alcmaeon from Croton is *duality*: δύο τὰ πολλὰ τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων (DK 24 A 3, Arist. Met. 986 a 22), "many things are dual for the man". This duality is confirmed by earlier periods of Hesiod's Theogony, which tell about the appearance of the first gods in pairs: Gaia and Uranus, Γει и Урана, Coeus and Crius, Iapetus and Hyperion, Theia and Rhea...; Pythagoreans assumed there were ten coupled principles: even-uneven, left-right, female-male, ...; we can find the confirmation of this in our daily language:

wet-dry, light-darkness, warm-cold, good-bad, ... . Alcmaeon explains the duality that we see here from the point of view of comparison, while ἄνθρωπον γὰρ φησι τῶν ἄλλων διαφέρειν ὅτι μόνον ξυνήσι, τὰ δ' ἄλλα αἰσθάνεται μὲν, οὐ ξυνήσι δε (DK 24 B 1 a), "the man is different among others while he compares, and others only perceive and do not compare". He is right, while it gives the possibility to compare and, therefore, distinguish. Comparison is impossible without the ability to stay focused on something moving the gaze to something else at the same time. Capturing of the first one in one's eye is impossible without focusing your eyes on it. As a result it begins to delay. Moreover, it allows to add it to another one. The opportunity for the second one to be delayed before the first one is its *addition*, if we will understand in *opportunity* what this word literally means, the effort to appear. Focusing of the eye forms a glimpse between delaying and the glimpse itself is formed by duality offering an opportunity to join the third one. That is why after pairs, the Theogony of Hesiod described three gods: Άργος, "Glimpse", Στερόπη, "Glaring" and Βρόντης, "Shock"; Βριάρεώς, "Difficulty" of Γύης, "Glimpse" as Κόττος, "Evil Fate", etc.

Therefore, Άργος is, if we recall on the uncertainty of the landscape shown in the light of the lightening in the night, ὁ πάνθ' ὀρώντων, πανόπτην, as Aeschylus says, (Suppl. 303, 304), "the all seeing raging eye" of presence Δράκων. He was killed by Hermes, who favoured the thieves. Thieves and Apollo, and Cadmus and Jason. Consequently, this is the story for them. They meet Δράκων on their way. They meet him because starting their journey, they sooner or later find themselves in an alien landscape. This happened to Cadmus who was born on the seacoast and traveled to find his sister. This happen to Jason who was also born on the seacoast and traveled by sea in the search for the Golden Fleece. This fate awaited for Perseus, Oedipus,

Odysseus of Greek history, brother Ivanushka and Ivan Tsarevich in Russian fairy tales. The same was awaiting for N.V. Gogol's Khoma and Dr. Startsev of A.P. Chekhov. But that is another story.

In the myths about Jason and Cadmus it is said that after killing Δράκων they “sowed its teeth and when they were sown there rose from the ground armed men” that both of them had to fight. If Δράκων is the Raging Eye of ερο presence, to kill him means to enlighten the absolute insensibility of the misty darkness, then his sowed teeth can only stand for the steady being of presence. Due to its steadiness, this steady being forms what the Greek called κόσμος, where Harmonia rules. She (Αρμονία) then had become Cadmus's wife (Apollod. 3.4.2). His majesty in comparison with Jason is that similar to Apollo he was able to overcome freezing sadness of inhospitable presence and *being angry* (ἀγανακτήσας), according to Apollodorus, began to fight him. This Cadmus's anger we hear

in Lipavskii's description of tropical sadness! ἀγανακτήσας is not only angry, but also ‘excited’! In his *excitement* there is ὕβρις, *foolishness and storm* that awakens him to being. And at the same time, this is his majesty, like the majesty of Ivanushka the Fool in the Russian fairy tales. For Jason it is not the same, it was Medea who helped him not to plunge into sadness, die or run away like Rodion Raskolnikov, showing him the way to the Golden Fleece in the dark night; in the night, finding his way by touch and what is even more remarkable, being led, he had avoided the freezing grasp of the dragon. In fact, he did not confront the dragon, that is why in the end he only got the Fleece and Medea who she lost in short time. Cadmus on the contrary, had appropriated the being hidden by Δράκων and had become its master. In the teeth of killed Δράκων sowed by Cadmus, we clearly see what in early Greek philosophy would sound as Pythagorean ἀριθμοί, τὰ σπέρματα of Anaxagoras and τὰ ἄτομα of Democritus.

<sup>1</sup> Translator's note: Official translation of Fyodor Dostoevsky's “Crime and Punishment” by Constance Garnett.

<sup>2</sup> It is noteworthy that in almost half of Homer's hymn versions instead of Τυφάων there is τυφλόν, which means ‘blind’. [Author's note]

<sup>3</sup> By the way, in Hesiod's Theogony the sequence of their appearance is as follows: Βρόντης, Στερόπη, Ἄρη. [Author's note]

## References

- Aeschylus (1937). *Septem quae supersunt Tragoediae*. Editio altera. Oxonii E Typographeo Clarendoniano, 1937.
- Apollodorus (1921). *The Library*, with an English Translation by Sir James George Frazer, Includes Frazer's notes. F.B.A., F.R.S. in 2 Volumes. Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press; London, William Heinemann Ltd.
- Aristoteles (1989). *Metaphysik*. Text in der Ed. von Wilhelm Christ. Hamburg, Felix Meiner.
- Aristotelis (1959). *De Arte Poetica*. (Oxonii E Typographeo Clarendoniano).
- Aristotelis (1959). *Ars Rhetorica*. Oxonii E Typographeo Clarendoniano.
- Aristotelis (1955). *Parva Naturalia*. Oxonii E Typographeo Clarendoniano.
- Aristotelis (1963). *Categoriae et Liber de Interpretatoine*. Oxonii E Typographeo Clarendoniano.
- Chantraine, P. (1968-1977). *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque. Histoire de mots*. Paris, Klincksieck.
- Dahl, V.I. (2006). *Tolkovy slovar' zhivogo velikorusskogo iazyka [The Explanatory Dictionary of the Living Great Russian Language]*. Moscow.

- Diogenis Laertii (1964). *Vitae philosophorum*. Oxonii E Typographeo Clarendoniano.
- Hésiod (2002). *Théogonie. Les Travaux et les Jours. Le Bouclier*. Paris, Les Belles Lettres.
- Homeri (1912). *Opera*. Tomus V. Oxonii E Typographeo Clarendoniano.
- Kern, O. (1922). *Orphicorum fragmenta*. Berolini.
- Kudrin, A.N. (2003). *K fragmentu parmeinda B3, D.-K.* [To fragment of Parmenides B3, D.-K.]. Novoe videnie kultury mira v XXI veke [New Vision of Culture in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century]. Materialy Mezhdunarodnogo nauchnogo simpoziuma [Proceedings of International Scientific Symposium]. Vladivostok, FESTU, 46-50.
- Kudrin, A.N. (2009). Hesiod's Θεολογία. *Nauchnoe obozrenie*, (5), 40-53.
- Kudrin, A.N. (2014). Anaximander's ΤΟ ΑΠΕΙΡΟΝ. *ESSJ*, 4(1), 56-72.
- Lipavskii, L. (2005). *Issledovanie uzhasa*. [The Horror's Analysis]. Moscow, 446 p.
- Novum Testamentum Graece*. (1956). Editio altera. Oxonii E Typographeo Clarendoniano.
- Pindar, (2001). *Oden*. Herausgegeben von Eugen Dönt. Stuttgart, Philipp Reclam jun.
- Sophoclis, (1923). *Fabulae*. Editio altera. Oxonii E Typographeo Clarendoniano.
- Trubachev, O.N. (1987). *Slavianskii etimologicheskii slovar'* [The Slavonics Etymological Dictionary], (13). Moscow.
- Veisman, A.D. (1991). *Grechesko-russkii slovar'* [The Greek-Russian Dictionary]. Moscow.

## Δράκων греческих мифов

**А.Н. Кудрин**

*Хабаровский государственный институт культуры  
Россия, 680045, Хабаровск, ул. Краснореченская, 112*

---

*Статья представляет собой исследование одного из наиболее тёмных и загадочных существ архаичной греческой мифологии, существа, носящего имя Δράκων. В основу исследования автором положены четыре наиболее древних мифа, дошедшие к нам от Гомера и Аполлодора Афинского, о схватках с Δράκων Аполлона, Гермеса, Кадма и Ясона. Поскольку предметом исследования является выраженная в мифе архаичная мысль, фиксирующая, по утверждению Аристотеля, εἶδεναι, «видение» того, что непосредственно человеку открыто, перед ним, «в просторе его рук (τὰ προχείρα) наличествующего», методом исследования автором выбрана феноменология с опорой на онтологию понимания, восходящую к фундаментальным трудам С. Кьеркегора, В. Дильтея и М. Хайдеггера.*

*Ключевые слова: δράκων, Τυφάων, Πύθων, Άργος, мара.*

*Научная специальность: 09.00.00 – философские науки.*

---