

Research Article

Carlos A. Segovia*

Rethinking Dionysus and Apollo: Redrawing Today's Philosophical Chessboard

<https://doi.org/10.1515/oppil-2022-0209>

received March 8, 2022; accepted April 25, 2022

Abstract: This essay pursues Gilbert Durand's plea for a new anthropological spirit that would overcome the bureaucracy-or-madness dichotomy which has since Nietzsche left its imprint upon contemporary thought, forcing it to choose between an "Apollonian" ontology established upon some kind of first principle and a "Dionysian" ontology consisting in the erasure of any founding norm. It does so by reclaiming Dionysus and Apollo's original twin-ness and dual affirmation in dialogue with contemporary anthropological theory, especially Roy Wagner's thesis on the interplay of "elicitation" and "containment" in sociocultural life. What would happen then, I ask, if we were to reimagine today's philosophical game – which after Heidegger Deleuze, and Derrida turns variously and increasingly around subtraction – otherwise: as a chiastic board on which Apollo would cut Dionysus's continuum, which Dionysus would in turn restore despite Apollo's cuts, and on which the obliteration of any of the two gods would entail the inevitable dismemberment of the other? Accordingly, I offer a full reassessment of Dionysus's and Apollo's complementary roles in ancient-Greek culture in discussion not only with Nietzsche's Dionysian philosophy but also with Ihab Hassan's postmodern critique of Orpheus. All of it less with the purpose of putting forward a new metaphysics than with the intent of restating the translucent-ness that keeps together reality and thought against any claim that they are either transparent or opaque to one another.

Keywords: Apollo, Dionysus, Nietzsche, post-metaphysics, Roy Wagner

1 Introduction

Putting forward *new* metaphysics (or speculative depictions of reality *in toto*)¹ appears to be the tacit consensus in the contemporary philosophical scene² – even if any truly new metaphysics must, we are reminded, assume a paradoxical status. For, whatever its idiosyncrasy and lest it seem anachronistic, any

¹ Cf. Harman's definition of metaphysics as an inquiry into "the structure of reality as such" (*Object-Oriented Ontology*, 14) and hence as "a theory of everything" (as the subtitle to that particular book suggests in turn) and Hilan Bensusan's parallel definition of it as "a general account of everything at once" (*Indexicalism*, 18).

² "The world is due for a resurgence of original speculative metaphysics. ... Like an emergent recording company, what we seek are traces of a new metaphysical "sound" from any nation of the world," reads, for instance, the brochure of an acclaimed book series in philosophy. "Scene," indeed, may well then be the best term for what was once a field of agonistic interlocution presided by what Hegel called the patience of the concept. In this sense, Deleuze was probably right in that while philosophy has had numberless rivals throughout its history, the "most shameful moment" is that in which "marketing, design, and advertising ... seize[e] hold of the word concept itself and sa[y]: 'This is our concern ...'" (Deleuze and Guattari, *What Is Philosophy*, 10). "Philosophy," Deleuze went on to say, "has not remained unaffected by the general movement that [has] replaced Critique with sales promotion" (*ibid.*, 10).

* Corresponding author: Carlos A. Segovia, Division of Humanities and Social Sciences, Saint Louis University, Madrid Campus, 28003 Madrid, Spain, e-mail: segoviamail@icloud.com

new metaphysics is expected to be post-metaphysical, or to confine itself to exploring the fragmentary furniture of what, in the lack of any sure correlation between what things are and how we take them to be,³ must be assumed as a scrappy un-world.⁴

Instead of venturing yet a new kind of metaphysics, however, I am willing to pursue here – within the limits of my possibilities – Kant's *critical* project, which resonates variously, *inter alios*, in Heidegger,⁵ Wittgenstein,⁶ and Deleuze.⁷ Such project, it could be argued, consists in inquiring how is it that thought is actually possible against any *maximalist* pretension that would make such inquiry superfluous (as though reality would simply speak to us) and against the *minimalist* claim that thought is arbitrary and thus flawed (as if the aspects of reality that it cannot grasp were more fundamental than those translucent to it). Yet, it also consists in examining how is it that thought and reality mirror, albeit asymmetrically, one another.⁸ Now, I should like to pursue that project in strict *post-metaphysical* terms, taking in this case the term “metaphysics” to denote, with Heidegger, the reduction of being to *actualitas* and the subsequent “positioning” (*Ge-stell*) of everything that is as a “standing reserve” (*Bestand*) of things characterised by their “assured availability” (*Sicherstellung*) and thus susceptible of being appropriated, scientifically analysed, technologically manipulated, commercially exchanged, and collectively and/or individually consumed and replaced at will.⁹

My purpose, moreover, is to do so in dialogue, on the one hand, with contemporary *ethnographic theory* and, more specifically, with Roy Wagner's thesis on the interplay of “elicitation” (Barok: *gala*) and “containment” (Barok: *kolume*) among the Usen Barok of Papua New Guinea¹⁰ and the role of such categories in sociocultural life at large;¹¹ but also in conversation, on the other hand, with the core premise of Schelling's

³ See further Bryant, “Correlationism.”

⁴ Which stands, in turn, as a marker of our modern condition. Notice in this sense that Baudelaire (in *The Painter of Modern Life and Other Essays*, 13) was the first to vindicate the term “modernity” in connection to (the experience of) “the ephemeral, the fugitive, the contingent.” Compare with it the “warning” with which Timothy Morton and Dominic Boyer's new book opens: “think small ... what follows is an exercise in flimsy and chaotic thinking. You are bound to be disappointed. No, seriously. Don't get your hopes up. Especially if you are looking for something like a “theory of the hyposubject.” Good luck finding it in this heap. A lot of what is happening here frankly doesn't make very much sense. Yes, we know we ought to be ashamed of ourselves. But it all comes from a sincere spirit of trying to help. Which, for beings like us, means becoming less” (Morton and Boyer, *Hyposubjects*, 13). On the idea of “unworld,” see Gevorkyan and Segovia, “Post-Heideggerian Drifts.” See also Gevorkyan and Segovia, “An Anthropological and Meta-philosophical Critique of Hilan Bensusan's *Indexicalism*,” which briefly examines what may be labelled as the “subtractive” logic of today's thought, and Segovia and Gevorkyan, “From Worlds of Possibles to Possible Worlds,” which analyses its roots at some length. I shall return later to it. Suffice it to say for now that the term “subtractive” is in Hallward's, *Out of This World*, where he applies it to Deleuze's philosophy (81–2).

⁵ See not only Heidegger, *Kant and the Problem of Metaphysics*, but also Heidegger, *Phenomenological Interpretation of Kant's Critique of Pure Reason*.

⁶ On which see now Hanna, “Wittgenstein and Kantianism.”

⁷ See, in addition to Deleuze, *Kant's Critical Philosophy*; Smith, “Deleuze, Kant and the Transcendental Field.”

⁸ I elaborate on it from a different angle in Segovia, “εἰδος\utupē,” where I further contend that Kant (in his First Critique) deemed excessive the scholastic pretension to fully know what things are (and, inversely, empiricism too weak in its scepticism thereof) and made the point (in his Third Critique) that the laws of modern science do not compromise reality's freedom either – for which reason, he is not the “correlationist” that today's speculative realists pretend he is (see e.g. Meillassoux, *After Finitude*, 5; Brassier, *Nihil Unbound*, 49–94).

⁹ On which see Heidegger, *The End of Philosophy*, as well as the critique of modern science in Heidegger, “The Age of the World Picture” (in *Off the Beaten Track*, 57–85). See also Heidegger's parallel critique of modern technology in *Bremen and Freiburg Lectures* (1–73) and afterwards in *The Question Concerning Technology and Other Essays* (3–49). Compare too the brief but telling references to modern economy in Heidegger, *Contributions to Philosophy* (218), *Mindfulness* (59), *The Question of Being* (73), the transcript of the, *Zollikon Seminars* (160), and the likewise eloquent allusions to calculation, utility, manageability, and regulation, but also to machination and lived experience, in Heidegger, *Contributions to Philosophy* (98, 101–6). At will: for the “will to power” represents, in Heidegger's reading of Nietzsche, the fulfillment of metaphysics.

¹⁰ On which see Wagner, *Asiwinarong*; Wagner, *An Anthropology of the Subject*, 31–47.

¹¹ On which see in turn Wagner, *The Invention of Culture*, but also Wagner, *Symbols That Stand for Themselves* and his posthumously published work, *The Logic of Invention*.

philosophy of mythology – that is, with the idea that conceptual figures are figures of pure thought¹² – by positing Dionysus (roughly: event) and Apollo (form)¹³ as two possible conceptual personae matching such notions. Hence, in this essay, I propose to play with Dionysus and Apollo in a manner closer to Lévi-Strauss's interpretation of the conceptual characters of “Coyote” and “Lynx” among the Salish-speaking peoples of America's Northwest Coast,¹⁴ or to Tim Ingold's recent take on “exposure” and “attunement” in human education,¹⁵ than to Nietzsche's own “Dionysian philosophy.”¹⁶ I do so in the wake of Gilbert Durand's untimely dream¹⁷ of a “new anthropological spirit” that would (at last) *overcome* the “bureaucracy”-or-“madness” dichotomy which has (since Nietzsche) left its imprint upon contemporary thought, as evinced by the latter's endorsement of anarchism or negativity (read: underdetermination) against totalitarianism (overdetermination).¹⁸ And, in this sense, it may not be exaggerated at all to affirm that reintroducing Dionysus and Apollo *qua* conceptual personae, or rather as a single Janus-faced conceptual persona in today's philosophical game, amounts to *disrupt* it under the effect of a “thought-event”¹⁹ that hints at the Otherwise.

It might be helpful, however, to begin by looking at the role played by Dionysus and Apollo in ancient-Greek culture, which Nietzsche reworked to build his own synthesis of both gods.

2 Dionysus

Nietzsche's interpretation of Dionysus is indebted to Schopenhauer's reinterpretation of Buddhism²⁰ as much as to the portrayal of the god in Euripides's *Bacchae*.²¹ The deceiving illusions of individuated life, grants Nietzsche, lead to sorrow, and sorrow can only be overcome by dissolving oneself into the eternal, impersonal life that breaths inside us and that pushes us in no matter what directions, all of which one must therefore affirm. Yet, at the same time, as an artiste,²² one cannot renounce to create self-affirming masquerades, and as long as one assumes them as what they are, everything is fine, for one must just not lose sight of the fact that something more powerful and incontrollable beats under these: an impersonal “will”

¹² See Schelling, *Sämtliche Werke*, 11: 255–572, but cf. too Schelling's description of “mythology” as a sort of πρώτη “Poesie” (241) of which philosophy would differ on account of its greater conceptual “freedom” (255–76). Schelling worked unflaggingly in his philosophy of mythology from 1815 to shortly before his death in 1854. The project is somehow prefigured in *Die Weltalter* (of which the versions from 1811 and 1813 are reproduced in Schelling, *Die Weltalter Fragmente*, whereas the version of 1815 can be read in vol. 8 of Schelling's *Sämtliche Werke*). Yet, from 1837 onwards, he devotes himself almost exclusively to it in his lessons of Munich and Berlin. The voluminous result of such work is a philosophy of mythology proper (vol. 12 of Schelling's *Sämtliche Werke*, pp. 133–674), preceded by a philosophy of monotheism (vol. 12, pp. 1–132) and followed by a philosophy of revelation (vol. 13, p. 356) and two introductions: one historical–critical (vol. 11, pp. 1–252) and the other one philosophical (vol. 11, pp. 253–590) – in total more than 1,600 pages of which only 252 (corresponding to Schelling's historical introduction to the study of mythology) have been so far translated into English (see Schelling, *Historical-critical Introduction to the Philosophy of Mythology*).

¹³ I am drawing here on Diano, *Forma ed Evento*; yet, I will later complicate this rough preliminary description.

¹⁴ In *The Story of Lynx*.

¹⁵ Ingold, *The Life of Lines*, 113–58.

¹⁶ Which can be found in *The Dionysian Vision of the World* (1870) prior to the publication of *The Birth of Tragedy* (1872). The expression “Dionysian philosophy” is Löwith's in Nietzsche's *Philosophy of the Eternal Recurrence of the Same* (48).

¹⁷ In Durand, *Sciences de l'homme et tradition*.

¹⁸ On behalf of post-metaphysical de-construction, object-oriented un-relatedness, fulfilled nihilism, etc.

¹⁹ Cf. Deleuze's contention in *What Is Philosophy?*: not only are “conceptual personae” are “philosophical sensibilia” through which “concepts are not only thought but perceived and felt” (131), they are also “thought-events” (70, emphasis original). On the authorship of *What Is Philosophy?* see Dosse, *Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari*, 456.

²⁰ See further Clarke, *Oriental Enlightenment*, 76–9. Cf. Nietzsche's own reference to the “world of the Maya” in *The Dionysian Vision of the World*, 55.

²¹ Nietzsche, *The Dionysian Vision of the World*, 35. On the questionability of Euripides as a reliable source for reconstructing the figure and cult of Dionysus in ancient Greece, see Henrichs, “Greek Maenadism from Olympias to Messalina,” 135.

²² *Artist* rather than the more-usual term *Künstler*, on which see Nietzsche, *The Birth of Tragedy*, 5n4.

(*Wille*) of which any individuated “will” is a partial expression, an absolute “power” (*Macht*) that my own “will to power” (*Wille zur Macht*) reflects, a force that our moral or Apollonian “representations” (*Vorstellungen*) try to tame and to whose affirmation Dionysian intoxication and ecstasy are but the door.²³ Nietzsche inventively mixes here Schopenhauer’s flirt with Buddhism with the irrationalism of what Heinrich Rickert and other Neo-Kantians called nineteenth-century “biologism”²⁴ and supplements both with what he takes to be art’s metaphysical potential.

Yet, Nietzsche’s interpretation of Dionysus is erroneous inasmuch as it is overenthusiastic, and it is overenthusiastic in that it portrays Dionysus as delivering a *substitutive* experience: one that replaces the ordinary, in fact illusory, experience of reality, for a truthful one. The problem with this understanding of Dionysus – which, allow me to stress it once more, Nietzsche first put forward in *The Dionysian Vision of the World* – is that it somehow misses the Greek construal of the god. For despite his claims to revive the “tragic philosophy of the Greeks,” Nietzsche inspired himself in Dionysus’s Roman re-instantiation, whose counter-cultural trimmings²⁵ served him to formulate his criticism of what Philip Rieff has called “the banality of liberal culture.”²⁶ True, Nietzsche later criticises his early “Dionysian vision of the world” and, more specifically, the way he had initially presented it in *The Birth of Tragedy*, which he declares to be a “badly written” book, “clumsy, embarrassing, with a rage for imagery and confused in its imagery” in addition to being too “emotional.”²⁷ Plus he emphasises we simply do *not* have the response to the question: “What is [the] Dionysiac?”²⁸ But he continues to make of Dionysus’s tragic acceptance of “suffering” a *pessimist* counterpart to an “optimism” he finally assumes – by associating it with Epicurus rather than with Plato’s Socrates alone²⁹ – as being something more than a vain masquerade.³⁰

What was the Greek Dionysus like, then? It is neither in Euripides nor in the Dionysia or annual festivals dedicated to the god in Athens, Ionia, and elsewhere,³¹ but in the Eleusinian Mysteries (“one of the apices of Greek life”)³² that one must actually search for the original meaning of Dionysus in light of his Mycenaean precedents, on which B. C. Dietrich’s classic volume on the origins of Greek religion³³ remains fully relevant more than forty years after its publication.³⁴

As it is well known, the mysteries at Eleusis turned around the myth of Demeter and Persephone as it is recounted in the Homeric *Hymn to Demeter*:³⁵ upon discovering that, while gathering flowers, her daughter, Persephone, has been seized by Hades and taken with him to the underworld, Demeter (i.e. the earth viewed through the lens of its fertility) causes a terrible draught seeking with it to coerce Zeus to allow the return of her daughter; Zeus agrees on the condition that she does not taste the food of the underworld; yet tricked by Hades, who gives her a bunch of pomegranate seeds, Persephone eats of what she should

²³ Nietzsche calls such impersonal Will “*Ur-Eine*” or “primordial oneness” (*The Birth of Tragedy*, 18, 26, 30, 36, 104–5), and qualifies its denial as moral “weakness” and as an act of “idolatry,” which means that he takes it to be a kind of supreme God (*The Dionysian Vision of the World*, 42).

²⁴ Bernasconi, “Heidegger, Rickert, Nietzsche, and the Critique of Biologism;” Moore, *Nietzsche, Biology and Metaphor*.

²⁵ On which see Livy’s *History of Rome*, 39.8–18 (Livy, 11: 240–73). Cf. too Porres Caballero, “Maenadic Ecstasy in Greece;” Alonso Fernández, “Maenadic Ecstasy in Rome.”

²⁶ Rieff, *The Triumph of the Therapeutic*, 132.

²⁷ Nietzsche, “An Attempt at Self-Criticism” (1886), in *The Birth of Tragedy and Other Writings*, 3–12, here 5–6.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 6.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 7–8.

³⁰ Cf. too Nietzsche’s positive reference to Athena’s shield in a fragment from May to June 1883: “I will not turn you into stones with snake-haired terror [*schlangenhaarigem Schrecken*]: with my shield of beauty [*Schild, Schönheit*] I protect myself” (Nietzsche, *Nachgelassene Fragmente 1882–1884*, 350, §9 [17]). On the role of Athena in Apollo’s birth, see Deacy, *Athena*, 132. On Apollo and Athena’s protective “reciprocity,” Shapiro, “Athena, Apollo, and the Religious Propaganda of the Athenian Empire,” 101–4; Kennedy, *Athena’s Justice*, 33.

³¹ On which see Taylor-Perry, *The God Who Comes*.

³² Colli, *La Sapienza Greca*, 1: 28. See further Kerényi, *Eleusis*; Mylona, *Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries*; and Cosmopoulos, *Bronze Age Eleusis and the Origins of the Eleusinian Mysteries*.

³³ Dietrich, *The Origins of Greek Religion*.

³⁴ See now also Bernabé, “Dionysos in the Mycenaean World.”

³⁵ On which see Foley, *The Homeric “Hymn to Demeter”*.

have abstained from and is therefore obliged to spend a third of each year (the winter months) in the underworld and permitted to reunite with her mother and to spend with her on earth the remaining part of the year.

A child, though, called Plutus (Πλούτος, “wealth”), is born from Persephone after her abduction³⁶ by Hades (who was also called Pluton [Πλούτων, “wealth-giver”]):

In two representations of the Eleusinian goddesses intended for the general public, two magnificent vase paintings in late Attic style, we see the child; once as a little boy standing with a cornucopia before the enthroned Demeter, and once in the cornucopia being handed to Demeter by a goddess rising out of the earth – as though he had been born down there in the realm to which Kore had been carried away.³⁷

In all probability, writes Dietrich, this child’s birth “formed the nucleus of the Mysteries from their inception.”³⁸

Like Persephone, then, the initiates at Eleusis would symbolically *descend* to the underworld, i.e. to the “invisible” (ἀιδές) domain of Hades (Ἄιδης),³⁹ and subsequently *ascend* from it, but would do so *born anew* like a new-born child – or like Dionysus, one of whose many names was precisely Διμήτωρ (notice the phonetic affinity with Δημήτηρ), i.e. “twice-born” – after having reached a “vision” (έποπτεία in Plato’s and Aristotle’s words)⁴⁰ that opened for them⁴¹ the “joyful knowledge of life’s beginning and end,” as Pindar says.⁴² What kind of *knowledge*? The knowledge that “life” *qua* ζωή is immortal, that new living forms shine forth from the earth when others die and relapse into it and vice versa, and that the impersonal life that flows through our veins will flow through them like the sap runs through the leaves of the vine. In this manner, Eleusis’s newcomers were initiated into the knowledge of the domain of that which lacks any visible “aspect” and recognisable “form,” i.e. into the ἀ-ιδές realm of Hades, wherein, insofar as they do not shine forth into the unconcealed as X, Y, or Z, but remain hidden and mixed in a state of mere possibility (as it corresponds to all things inside the earth’s womb), things lack any distinction or determination and, thereby too, any εἶδος.⁴³ Hence, Heraclitus’s otherwise surprising statement that “Hades and Dionysus are one and the same.”⁴⁴

36 For, obviously, a living being cannot go into the house of the death but violently, *pace* recent attempts on the part of a number of feminist authors to “restore agency” to Persephone by turning her abduction into a “romance” in order to contest, they claim, “the powerlessness of women in patriarchal, Greco-Roman society,” on which see Schiano, “The Rape of Persephone in Children’s Media” (the expressions reproduced in quotation marks are hers).

37 Kerényi, *Eleusis*, 31.

38 Dietrich, *The Origins of Greek Religion*, 18.

39 Cf. Plato’s etymological word play in *Cratylus*, 403a–b.

40 Colli, *La Sapienza Greca*, 3: 106, 108.

41 Possibly by means of the ingestion of an entheogenic substance, but see for discussion Cosmopoulos, *Bronze Age Eleusis and the Origins of the Eleusinian Mysteries*, 19–21.

42 Pindar, fr. 137, quoted in Colli, *La Sapienza Greca*, 1: 92.

43 Segovia, “εἶδος\utupē;” see also Segovia, “On Plato’s Εἶδη, Deleuze’s Simulacra, and Zeno.”

44 Heraclitus, DK B15: “ώντός δὲ Ἀίδης καὶ Διόνυσος.” (Unless otherwise indicated, hereinafter all translations of the Presocratics are my own. For the original Greek fragments, see Kirk et al., *The Presocratic Philosophers*). Heraclitus’s identification is generally interpreted to bring together “life” and “death” as opposites (so Kirk et al., *The Presocratic Philosophers*, 212; Guthrie, *A History of Greek Philosophy*, 1: 476). Kahn (*The Art and Thought of Heraclitus*, 264–65) adds a twist to it: Hades, he suggests, is “the invisible (*a-ides*) figure of Death,” and Heraclitus “recognize[s] [Dionysian] madness ... as a kind of psychic death, a darkness of soul at maximal distance from the light of sound thinking (*sophronein*)”; hence for Heraclitus, he concludes, “what passes for enhanced vitality [under the auspices of Dionysus] is a sheer pursuit of death.” This amounts to a moralising interpretation of Heraclitus’s fragment in question, which reads: “For if it were not to Dionysus that they make processions, and [if it were not because of him that they] sing hymns to the shameful parts (*oīδοια*), they would be performing something shameful (ἀναιδής). But Dionysus, for whom they rave and go mad, and Hades (Ἄιδης), are one and the same.” Despite the moral tones of his interpretation (which is not uncommon; see Wildberg, “Dionysos in the Mirror of Philosophy,” 210–13), Kahn is here on the track of something important. Yet, unlike Lacan (*Seminar VII*, 299), he fails to see the wordplay between Ἀίδης, αἰδοία, and ἀναιδής, which seems to imply not so much that “what passes for enhanced vitality is a sheer pursuit of death,” but that Dionysus\Hades or what does not belong in the domain of light is also that which would otherwise

There are good reasons to suspect that Plutus was *also* Dionysus,⁴⁵ who, furthermore, must be viewed as both the earth's *offspring* and the earth's *consort*.

Like in many other places of the ancient Near East, the sacred union of a Mother Goddess (𐄈𐄃𐄃 [po-ti-ni-ja] in the Linear-B tablets from Pylos)⁴⁶ with a male figure whose birth, life, and death represented the annual birth, growth, and death of nature was a mythical feature not unknown in ancient-Greek culture, where it served the purpose of ensuring both "human fertility and the fruitfulness of the fields."⁴⁷ Its presence can be already found in the archaeological record of Minoan and Mycenaean Greece in the form of male figurines playing either a harp (Apollo's instrument) or a flute (Dionysus's).⁴⁸ Dionysus's main festival in Athens, the Anthesteria, is reminiscent of such union, for in it the god's sacred marriage with the wife of the senior magistrate of the city⁴⁹ was enacted⁵⁰ in what looks like a reversal of the elsewhere habitual formula for such union, which normally followed the pattern: goddess + young monarch.

Therefore, Dionysus *cannot* exactly be seen as an Olympian god, as he is intimately linked to the earth, while the Olympians represented a stage in the earth's history that was no longer that of Gaia, in whose womb everything remained mixed and potential. Zeus's victory over Gaia and Uranus's children the Titans – or, put differently, his victory over the all-too-basic qualities⁵¹ of a not-yet-fully-consistent and not-yet-fully-conscious, chthonic proto-world – paved the way for a new phase in the process that goes from Chaos to Cosmos,⁵² a phase that, while being part of Gaia's own reality and history,⁵³ inaugurated something outside Gaia's womb. Conversely, Dionysus leads back to the earth, wherein everything belongs in the last instance, i.e. wherein all life begins and ends. Indeed, as Walter Otto famously argued, Dionysus was not part of the Olympian cohort that intervenes in the human affairs. This can be easily deduced from his absence from the core of the Homeric epic. But it is also perceptible, among other things, in the way in which he was pictorially represented, e.g. in the Attic vases, in one of which (the so-called François Vase) he is portrayed frontally, with wide-open eyes, looking at the viewer, unlike the other gods. The encounter with Dionysos is different from the encounter with these in that while these may or may not approach you, he, alone, is ineludible,⁵⁴ which is why he is also depicted wearing a mask,⁵⁵ not so much to underline his distance as to highlight his irresistible otherness and his disquieting proximity.⁵⁶

provoke shame in it and thus cannot be assumed inasmuch as it constitutes its opposite. Cf. Plato's parallel qualification (in *Laws*, 815b–d) of the Dionysian dances as being οὐ πολιτικὸν ("non-political").

⁴⁵ As their shared tauromorphic features attest, on which Dietrich, *The Origins of Greek Religion*, 172–3.

⁴⁶ Ibid., 167.

⁴⁷ Ibid., 11–2. Cf. e.g. the myths of Ishtar and Tammuz, Isis and Osiris, and those of Aphrodite and Adonis and Cybele and Attis, which were Greek transpositions of Phoenician and Phrygian myths.

⁴⁸ Ibid., 12.

⁴⁹ Literally, by the wife of the "king ruler" (ἄρχων βασιλεὺς) of Athens, and thus, symbolically, by the queen of the city, given that the ἄρχων βασιλεὺς was no other than the remnant of the pre-classical monarch.

⁵⁰ Dietrich, *The Origins of Greek Religion*, 12. Reversal, though, is common in mythical thought. Cf. Lévi-Strauss's "canonical formula of myth" (in *Structural Anthropology*, 206–31): $F_x(a):F_y(b) \simeq F_x(b):F_{x-1}(y)$, and its simplified version as offered in Scubla (*Lire Lévi-Strauss*, 167–9): $F_x(a):F_y(b)::F_x(b):F_y(a)$.

⁵¹ Including e.g. time (Cronus) and movement (Rhea).

⁵² I am drawing here on Guattari's concept of "chaosmosis" in *Schizoanalytic Cartographies* and Guattari, *Chaosmosis*.

⁵³ Pace Haraway (*Staying with the Trouble*, 51–7, 180–1n38, 186n58) who, following Gimbutas (*The Living Goddess*), tends to picture the Olympians as being alien to Gaia (a sort of Indo-European intrusion in a pre-Indo-European milieu characterised by a fully earth-bound spirituality exclusively centred on the figure of an Earth-Goddess). In rigour, the only gods that are alien to Gaia in Greek mythology are those that precede Gaia's auto-poiesis, i.e., Chaos's own children: Night and Darkness, who, in turn, gave birth to other likewise obscure figures like Death, Sleep, Misery, Mockery, Discord, Oblivion, Deceit, Sorrow, and Destiny, which thus haunt not only the present world but also any possible world, and against whom any world-shaping gods (Zeus and the other Olympians included) are powerless.

⁵⁴ Otto, *Dionysus*, 90.

⁵⁵ Ibid., 88.

⁵⁶ Ibid., 90–1.

Yet, the picture drawn so far remains incomplete. Dionysus was not only in Greece the god that led one back to the earth's womb:⁵⁷ he also symbolised life's *emerging* power. Thus, the branches and foliage of a vine⁵⁸ cover his mask, climbing to it from his feet.⁵⁹ This not only explains the widespread worship of Dionysus as a "tree,"⁶⁰ but also the frenzy that marked the union with the god in the festivals dedicated to him, a frenzy that, allowing Dionysus's devotees to come out of themselves, epitomised their union with all the living. Károly Kerényi's disclaimer apropos the association of the vine with Dionysus remains in this respect perfectly valid: "any account of the Dionysian religion must put the main accent not on intoxication but on the ... powerful, vegetative element which ultimately engulfed even the ancient theaters, as at Cumae."⁶¹ It is in Rome – as it may be expected from a society in which law was more appreciated than knowledge and the commanding moral will to enforce and live up to the law was preferred to the intellectual passion to decipher life's enigmas – that Dionysus acquired – as the necessary counter-figure to such preference – his famous intoxicating traits.⁶² True, Dionysus erased all boundaries between mortals, animals, and gods, and thereby too any social privileges and gender divisions. He was, one might say, the trickster who "acts as if privileges, exceptions, or abnormalities could become the rule,"⁶³ which is why he is associated with the hare, whose ambiguity is a well-known mythological *topos* elsewhere.⁶⁴ But none of this aims at subverting the social-political order of ancient-Greek life, an order that, in consequence, cannot be viewed as undesirable, let alone as illusory. Dionysus is the reminder that nothing can pretend to stand above the earth whenever a conflict between the earth's law, so to speak, and that of the polis arises. Thus, for example, Antigone's defence, against Creon, of her brother's right to be buried, since, in their quality as mortals, in the moment of their death, i.e. when they go back to dissolve into the earth, all mortals must be treated respectfully by those who shared their lives with them, regardless of whether they were viewed as political enemies of the city in their lifetime. In this manner, earthbound mercy towards the other, whoever the other may be, is requested in *correspondence* with the mercy that the earth shows to everyone through Dionysus.⁶⁵ Plus this explains, too, Dionysus's inspiring-presence in the tragedies performed during his festivals: whereas Apollo presides over the scene where the action takes place, and Athena presides over the audience that attends the play, Dionysus exerts his influence upon the choir, which gives voice to a solemn but faceless type of wisdom that, more often than not, seems to emanate from the bowels of the earth.

The fact that Dionysus fostered the *integration*⁶⁶ of life's indestructible and all-inclusive perspective into the everyday lives of the ancient Greeks – so as to remind them, on the one hand, that something impersonal in them would survive them independently of whether they themselves had achieved the excellence needed to be remembered and become immortal; and, on the other hand, that all the living are worthy of similar respect – proves Nietzsche's mistake about the identity of the god, who was decidedly anything but a rebellious one. Against the frequent Nietzschean-oriented misinterpretation of Dionysus that makes of him the god of "dissonant dynamics, ... noise ..., intoxication, self-abandon, oblivion, and revelry,"⁶⁷ Cornelia Isler-Kerényi adroitly recovers, through a careful examination of the extant

⁵⁷ Which is the reason for which he was worshiped in the winter season, i.e., when life (seemingly) withdraws from the earth's surface.

⁵⁸ Dionysus's plant. Thus, the identity of two of Dionysus's animals: those that nibble on it, i.e., the goat and the donkey. In turn, the leopard symbolises Dionysus's untamed (or savage) nature.

⁵⁹ Otto, *Dionysus*, 86.

⁶⁰ Ibid., 86–7.

⁶¹ Kerényi, *Dionysus*, xxv.

⁶² Cf. Colli's reference in *La Sapienza Greca* (1: 17–8) to the procurement of "knowledge" as the "goal" of the Greek cult of Dionysus.

⁶³ Lévi-Straus, *The Story of Lynx*, 49.

⁶⁴ See Lévi-Strauss, *Myth and Meaning*, 3.

⁶⁵ Cf. the notion of "a life" in Deleuze's posthumously published essay "Immanence: A Life" (Deleuze, *Pure Immanence*, 25–34).

⁶⁶ Cf. Bremmer's definition of the Dionysian cult as "integrative" in "Greek Maenadism Reconsidered," 286.

⁶⁷ Mellamphy and Biswas Mellamphy, "Nietzsche and Networks, Nietzschean Networks," 11–2.

iconography, the originally integrative aspect of the Greek Dionysus, and emphasises the god's role in "ritualising transitions that could potentially be traumatic for the individual and risky for the community,"⁶⁸ like individual rites of passage (birth, maturity, marriage, etc.): "It is at these moments," she writes, "that Dionysos, the god of metamorphosis, must have been active, as guarantor both of a happy transition from one phase to another and of the temporary but unavoidable sojourn in the intermediate phase."⁶⁹ This gentle dimension of Dionysus affects moreover, she goes on to say, the production and the consumption of the substance with which the god is most habitually associated, as well as the material in which it was put. Coming from a plant (the vine) that grows only in the rural area, i.e. neither in the city nor in the forest, but in between both, and that demands considerable care in order to grow properly and to bear fruit,

wine itself reveals other meanings beyond being an intoxicating drink which favours ritual reversion to the wild state.⁷⁰ It is also a symbol and at the same time a means of civilised interaction in that it makes one happy only if consumed in the correct manner and in the right amount. And finally, it is a way of being moved transitorily to a level above daily life: to see and also reveal reality beyond appearances. The pottery of the symposium also belongs to this dignity of wine: a dignity that explains its often very high *techne*, out of proportion to the material value of clay and so successful in the market. Ultimately wine is a metaphor of the gradual and troubled make-up of the real world: like the whole cosmos, and like the citizen who has attained his *akmè*, it is the result of a long process. To produce grapes the vine must be cultivated and then cut, the grapes themselves must be trodden and closed into vats so that they can be transformed into wine: these preparations of the drink must have made it suitable for its ritual role in individual metamorphoses.⁷¹

In one thing, however, Nietzsche was right: Dionysus symbolised in Greece, as I have remarked, life's *emerging* force. Interestingly, Schelling – who Nietzsche never quotes but whose Berlin lessons on the philosophy of mythology, in which Dionysus figures prominently, Nietzsche's admired mentor, colleague, and friend Jacob Burckhardt had attended in the 1840s⁷² – had drawn, some thirty years before Nietzsche, important philosophical implications from it. First, Schelling speaks of a fundamental ontological "process"⁷³ through which a "primordial being" acquires its different expressions and modalities and defines such process as the "primordial event"⁷⁴ accounted for in Greek mythology. Secondly, he takes the figures of Hades, Poseidon, and Zeus to represent that process's three successive moments, which he identifies with (1) the pure possibility of being, which lacks determination (= Hades); (2) its overflowing self-determination or self-affirmation, which lacks form and intelligence (= Poseidon); and (3) its fully achieved and fully conscious determination, which contains the two previous moments and brings all things' morphogenesis to fulfillment (= Zeus).⁷⁵ Thirdly, Schelling labels such moments the three "pure causes" of (all)

⁶⁸ Isler-Kerényi, *Dionysos in Archaic Greece*, 215.

⁶⁹ Ibid., 214–5.

⁷⁰ "Wild," of course, can mean different things. A wild, untamed leopard is one of Dionysus's animals, but animals are never wild in the sense the adjective wild is applied to humans when they lose control and behave brutally. Artemis (an Olympian goddess, and sister of Apollo) is the protectress of the earth's wildness, i.e., of φύσις's ultimate reluctance to human appropriation. Cf. Heraclitus's (who put his own words under Artemis's protection, on which see Heidegger, *Heraclitus*, 12–6) frag. DK B123 "φύσις κρύπτεσθαι φίλετ."

⁷¹ Isler-Kerényi, *Dionysos in Archaic Greece*, 233.

⁷² Krell, *The Tragic Absolute*, 394–5.

⁷³ Schelling, *Sämtliche Werke*, 12: 160.

⁷⁴ Ibid., 12: 153.

⁷⁵ Ibid., 12: 577–86, 625, 634, 663–4, 667. The young Schelling had already differentiated between (i) being's ground (−A) and being's existence (+A) as constituting the dynamic totality of all which is, and (ii) being's *Ungrund* (|A|) as their only-negatively-approachable, yet necessarily-common, substratum (see further Duque, *Historia de la Filosofía Moderna*, 306–10). Later, Schelling distinguishes between "−A" or the pure power to be (=pure or absolute "Subject") which thus lacks being until anything is affirmed of it (*Sämtliche Werke*, 11: 282–94, 331, 335–6, 565, 570); "+A" or pure being (= pure or absolute "Object") which, being every predicate only what it is, lacks, conversely, the power to be anything different from what it actually is (ibid., 11: 282–94, 331, 335–6, 565, 570); "±A" which results from merging "−A" and "+A" (ibid., 11: 282–94, 331, 335–6, 565, 570) and thus overcomes their mutual negation (*Einleitung in die Philosophie*, 98); and "A⁰," which stands in turn for the A behind "−A," "+A," and "±A" alike, i.e., for their *Quod* or real "referent" without which all the other modalities would only be logical (i.e., thinkable), but not ontological (real), principles (ibid., 11: 365–7, 560–1, 565, 570) – thus, too, his conceptualisation of A⁰ as *Ursein* or "primordial being" (in *Einleitung in die Philosophie*, 98). "Absolute" is another possible name for it – but one that

being(s).⁷⁶ Lastly, he identifies Dionysus with moment no. 2 (hence with Poseidon)⁷⁷ but also, more broadly, with the whole process,⁷⁸ which, accordingly, he calls “the triple Dionysus”⁷⁹ and “Dionysus in an absolute sense.”⁸⁰ Therefore – one may deduce after Schelling – when Heraclitus talks about that which “never submerges” (τὸ μὴ δῦνόν)⁸¹ and compares it to an “ever living fire” (πῦρ ἀείζων) present in all things,⁸² and, similarly,⁸³ when Parmenides talks about that which is “continuous” (συνεχές), “steadfast” (ἀτρεμές), “whole” (οὐλόν), and “complete” (τέλειον),⁸⁴ they both, despite their different approaches to the principle of being, elaborate on an idea of which Dionysus can be said to be the *conceptual persona*.

Not only is Dionysus intimately linked to the birth of philosophy, though: his twin- or “half-brother”⁸⁵ Apollo is as well.

3 Apollo

Dionysus and Apollo shared the Sanctuary of Delphi, which is located on a ridge of the Parnassus mountains overlooking the Valley of Phocis and the surrounding hills, near the town of Crissa north of the Gulf of Corinth in today’s region of Sterea or Central Greece. Dionysus was worshiped there in the winter, whereas Apollo returned to Delphi every spring. Whatever the apparently chthonic origins of the shrine, which might have been first dedicated to Gaia,⁸⁶ Apollo’s presence in Delphi is attested in the eighth century BCE.⁸⁷ As for Dionysus, his connection to Delphi may be even older.⁸⁸ Be that as it may, a Delphic vase of c. 400 BCE depicts the two gods “holding out their hands to one another,”⁸⁹ and in a fourth-century Delphic relief “the Proxenos of the Dionysian cortege raises a rhyton, a Dionysian drinking vessel, and pours its content into a cinnamon-colored phial, a familiar accoutrement of the cult of Apollo.”⁹⁰ Plus there is also

comprises all the aforementioned moments. Note that Schelling enumerates the Absolute’s modalities as per Aristotle’s distinction between the ὑποκείμενον, i.e., the “subject” of which something is said, and the κατηγορίες or “predicates” that inform of what that something is, and the being the two components of any “proposition” or λόγος ἀποφαντικός. Ultimately, however, Schelling draws on Kant’s differentiation in the Third Critique between “pure freedom” (“reason”) and “pure necessity” (“nature”) as the two fundamental modes of being, as well as on Hölderlin’s conviction that their apparent opposition must be overcome, as otherwise the Absolute would split in two (Krell, *The Tragic Absolute*, 34–5).

⁷⁶ Schelling, *Sämtliche Werke*, 12: 634.

⁷⁷ Ibid., 12: 581, 627, 664. On Poseidon, who, as Schelling writes, “received as his dowry the grey sea, which is the deepest layer of the earth’s surface” (ibid., 12: 585), and Dionysus (in connection to the myth of Glaucus, whose horses, which are Poseidon’s animals, are driven into a sort of Dionysian *frenzy* after eating a special grass at *Potniai* in Boeotia), see Hard, *The Routledge Handbook of Greek Mythology*, 432. Notice too the morphological and thus phonetic resemblance of Poseidon’s epithet: πότε (on which see Burkert, *Greek Religion*, 187) with that of the earth goddess in the Linear-B tablets from Pylos (πο-τι-νι-ja). It should also be recalled here that if Ποσειδῶν is the Homeric name of the god, in Aeolic it is Ποτειδάων, and in Doric Ποτειδάν, Ποτειδάων, and Ποτειδᾶς.

⁷⁸ Schelling, *Sämtliche Werke*, 12: 634, 642. A process of which, born directly from Zeus’s forehead, Athena consequently represents the self-consciousness (ibid., 12: 665).

⁷⁹ Ibid., 12: 634.

⁸⁰ Ibid., 12: 642. Cf. Nietzsche’s “Ur-Eine” as mentioned in n24 above.

⁸¹ Heraclitus, DK B16.

⁸² Heraclitus, DK B30.

⁸³ See Severino, *Dike*, 34–41; Martínez Marzoa, *Historia de la Filosofía Antigua*, 35–52; Segovia, “Fire in Three Images, from Heraclitus to the Anthropocene.”

⁸⁴ Parmenides, DK B8.

⁸⁵ Otto, *The Homeric Gods*, 78.

⁸⁶ Dietrich, *The Origins of Greek Religion*, 155–6, 308–9; Larson, *Ancient Greek Cults*, 93; and Graf, *Apollo*, 47.

⁸⁷ Dillon, *Omens and Oracles*, 353.

⁸⁸ Otto, *Dionysus*, 203.

⁸⁹ Ibid.

⁹⁰ Detienne, *Dionysos at Large*, 11.

Plutarch's testimony that the *two* gods were actually *one*: a single god with two names, with Dionysus's symbolising nature's becoming and Apollo's symbolising being.⁹¹

There is a crucial difference between them, though. While Dionysus retains his wisdom by keeping it enclosed within himself, so that whoever attempts to obtain it must fuse with him by means of an ecstatic experience, Apollo, instead, delivers his in such a way that it can be rendered into the oracular words of his priests and priestesses (at Delphi, Didyma, and elsewhere) and seers like Teiresias and Calchas.⁹² Can one say, then, that Apollo allows an easier access to that which Dionysus demands at a higher price? Not really. For Dionysus shares his wisdom without any restrictions with those who partake in it by means of their ecstatic experience. Instead, Apollo only speaks through signs or "signifies," in the sense that he merely "indicates" (σημαίνειν), as Heraclitus says.⁹³ Apollo, in short, is the archer-god whose wisdom remains at a distance.

It could be argued, therefore, that Apollo's epigean distance contrasts with Dionysus's hypogean immanence. Furthermore, it is this distance that philosophy initially revolved around. Thus, Plutarch, who was himself a philosopher and a priest of Apollo, portrays the latter as a god lover of "reasoning" (διαλεκτική) and of truth *qua* "disclosure" (ἀλήθεια) and thereby too as the god of philosophy.⁹⁴ First, because the words of his priestesses, priests, and seers demand to be interpreted, not simply believed in,⁹⁵ which is both Apollo's challenge and the game that philosophy consists in.⁹⁶ Secondly, because the words thus proffered by the god's speakers echo that which philosophy aimed at reaching from the very start. To find it out what that something is it is important to recall once more that Apollo's priestesses, priests, and seers are those who speak for the god.⁹⁷ Apollo himself does not: Apollo sees. But what does he see, what can be said to be Apollo's vision, which is later turned into words and without which no oracle would be possible in the first place? Homer provides us with a clue to this when he introduces Calchas as someone who could "see" (ός ήδη) "what is, what will be, and what had been" (τά τ' έόντα τά τ' έσσομενα πρό τ' έόντα).⁹⁸ Similarly, the oneness of that which "was," which "is," and which "will be" is what philosophy originally aimed at elucidating. Accordingly, Parmenides affirms of "what is" (ώς έστιν),⁹⁹ whose "disclosure" philosophy pursues,¹⁰⁰ that "it is not born" (ἀγένητον) and "imperishable" (ἀνώλεθρον);¹⁰¹ hence, he adds, it can neither be said that "it has been" (ούδε ποτ' ήν) or that "it will be" (ούδ' εσται)¹⁰² as it is "one" (έν) "now" (νῦν έστιν)¹⁰³ "altogether" (όμοιν πᾶν).¹⁰⁴ On his part, Heraclitus affirms of "the never-submerging before which one cannot hide" (τὸ μὴ δῦνόν ποτε πῶς δῆν τις λάθοι),¹⁰⁵ that "it was, it is, and will be an ever-living fire" (πῦρ ἀείζων) whose "gleaming" (κόσμος) all things display.¹⁰⁶

⁹¹ Plutarch, *Moralia*, 388e–89b, 392e–3d.

⁹² Colli, *La Sapienza Greca*, 1: 23–4.

⁹³ Heraclitus, DK B93: "οἱ ἄναξ οὐ τὸ μαντεῖόν ἔστι τὸ ἐν Δελφοῖς οὔτε λέγει οὔτε κρύπτει ἀλλὰ σημαίνει" ("the lord of the oracle which is found in Delphi neither speaks nor hides [his meaning], but gives signs.")

⁹⁴ Plutarch, *Ethics*, 386d–7c.

⁹⁵ Thus, for instance, the famous oracle delivered to Croesus, king of Lydia, on his planned military campaign against Persia, which Croesus erroneously took as a favourable omen (Dillon, *Omens and Oracles*, 33–5, 375).

⁹⁶ Colli, *La Sapienza Greca*, 1: 27, 37–8. Heraclitus's enigmatic style is perhaps the best example of it we have. Yet, something similar can be said about Anaximander's saying and of the words of the goddess in Parmenides's poem.

⁹⁷ In this sense, Plutarch (*Ethics*, 404d–e) compares the Pythia to the moon reflecting the light of the sun.

⁹⁸ Homer, *Iliad*, 1.69–70 (my translation). Plutarch says something similar: "The god ... is a prophet, and the prophetic art concerns the future that is to result from things present and past" (*Ethics*, 387b). Apollo's oracle bears witness to this, as well. Thus, for example, among the Delphic oracles catalogued by Fontenrose, those requested by the Spartans in the early seventh century, on the one hand (*The Delphic Oracle*, 271), and by the Athenians in 421, on the other hand (*ibid.*, 247), involve the reciprocal articulation of past, present, and future.

⁹⁹ Parmenides DK B8, 2.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, B1.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, B8, 3.

¹⁰² *Ibid.*, B8, 4.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, B8, 5.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, B8, 11.

¹⁰⁵ Heraclitus, DK B16.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, B30. On the translation of κόσμος as "gleaming," see Heidegger, *Heraclitus*, 123–4, as well as Segovia, "Fire in Three Images, from Heraclitus to the Anthropocene."

In a nutshell, Apollo's eye is also the eye of philosophy: an eye that procures the thought-vision (the “thinking,” *νοεῖν*) of that which “is” (i.e. of “being,” *εἶναι*), as Parmenides has it,¹⁰⁷ and that “gathers” it as its *λόγος* (*logos*), in Heraclitus's words.¹⁰⁸ Unlike Zeus (whose light is what makes things spring up in the first place), Artemis (who protects that light from being corrupted by human ambition), and Athena (whose light supplies the clear vision of how things stand in the course of an action), Apollo is the *light* that measures all things (which explains his fundamental role in the tragedy, where he presides over the scene while Dionysus does over the chorus) and he whose *lyre* the poets hold to sing the *κλέος* (“glory”) of all things.¹⁰⁹ For whereas all things, whose being Apollo thus illuminates, shine forth for a while and then recede into concealment,¹¹⁰ those who compete for *κλέος* and struggle to remain present in the domain of the unconcealed often tend to do so by not letting others rise up to their own ambitioned position, as Agamemnon's behaviour in the opening song of the *Iliad* makes patent. Yet, from Homer to Euripides and from Anaximander to Plato, ancient-Greek culture provided the corrective, if not the remedy, to it in the form of a reminder that Heraclitus enunciates as follows: “excess (*ὕβρις*) needs to be put out more than a house on fire.”¹¹¹ Hence, the two Delphic imperatives in which all Greek citizens were educated: *Γνῶθι σεαυτόν* (“Know yourself”) and *Μηδέν ἄγαν* (“Nothing in excess”), as well as Apollo's attitude on the west pediment of Zeus's temple at Olympia, where he stands at the centre of a scene likely depicting the mythological battle between the Centaurs and the Lapiths:¹¹² Apollo rises soberly over the contenders and extends his right arm horizontally, as if urging them to put an end to their violent fight. The god's gesture is authoritative, yet serene at the same time, as also is the expression of his face.¹¹³ In sum, Apollo rises above all mortals, awakens their *αἰδώς*, and thereby induces them to have mutual esteem, so that, in spite of their legitimate struggle to achieve everlasting fame, they may put down any *ἀδικία* among them. Should they, nonetheless, try to overstep their mortal limits, Apollo's arrows bring if needed an end to their *ὕβρις*, as it happens with Diomedes and Patroclus in the *Iliad*.

Accordingly, if Dionysus leads back to the earth, which is both the source and the destiny of all the living, if he shows that they all partake in a single indestructible life and cares for them by reminding them of their pre-individual unity and earthbound-ness, Apollo gathers them in their shining forth from the earth into unhidden-ness, inspires them to acknowledge their limits, and cares for them by impeding their mutual injustice, so that each can exercise its right to be. For this reason too Apollo stands as a political god; in fact, Apollo's name derives very possibly from that of the Dorian assembly, the *ἀπέλλα* (“boundless” in the sense of “lacking” [*ἀ-*] any delimiting “stones” [-*πέλλα*] around it),¹¹⁴ in allusion to the *empty* space at the heart of the Spartan polis where the assembly gathered – a symbol of political freedom and justice against any attempt to submit the political to particular interests. Now, all this means that Dionysos and Apollo function as twin gods, as per Lévi-Strauss characterisation of the mythological twins in Amerindian thought:

It is clear that Lynx and Coyote in North America, and Maire and Opossum in South America, fill complementary but opposite functions. The first separates the positive and negative aspects of reality and puts them in separate categories. The other acts in the opposite direction: it joins the bad and the good. The demiurge has changed animate and inanimate creatures from what they were in mythical times into what they will be thenceforth. The trickster keeps imitating the creatures as they were in mythical times and as they cannot remain afterward. He acts as if privileges, exceptions, or

¹⁰⁷ Parmenides, DK B3.

¹⁰⁸ Heraclitus, DK B1, B2, B50.

¹⁰⁹ Diano, *Forma ed Evento*, 60.

¹¹⁰ No other is the content of Anaximander's saying, with which philosophy begins: “ἔξ ὥν δὲ ἡ γένεσις ἔστι τοῖς οὖσι, καὶ τὴν φθορὰν εἰς ταῦτα γίνεσθαι κατὰ τὸ χρεών· διδόναι γὰρ αὐτὰ δίκιν καὶ τίσιν ἀλληλοις τῆς ἀδικίας κατὰ τὴν τοῦ χρόνου τάξιν” (“[t]he things that are perish into the things from which they come to be, according to necessity, for they pay penalty and retribution to each other for their injustice in accordance with the ordering of time, in Richard McKirahan and Patricia Curd's translation [Curd, *A Presocratics Reader*, 17]).

¹¹¹ Heraclitus, DK B43: “ὕβριν χρὴ σβεννύναι μᾶλλον ἢ πυρκαϊήν.”

¹¹² See further Spivey, *Greek Sculpture*, 114.

¹¹³ See the images and the analysis in Barringer, “The Temple of Zeus at Olympia, Heroes, and Athletes,” 213, 217–8, 232–6.

¹¹⁴ Burkert, “Apollai und Apollon.”

abnormalities could become the rule, while the demiurge's job is to put an end to singularities and to establish rules that will be universally applicable to all members of each species and category.¹¹⁶

But it also means, *pace* Lévi-Strauss, that one need not just look into the myth of Prometheus and Epimetheus as it is told by Plato in the *Protagoras* to find in the Old World a motif that, for some reason, found in the New World (and elsewhere!)¹¹⁷ a more favourable ground on which to grow.¹¹⁸

Therefore, identifying Apollo, as Nietzsche does, with the god of appearances (be they artistically creative or deceiving, necessary or spurious) is highly questionable. Whereas Dionysus's task is to enforce life's oneness and continuity regardless of the spatial and temporal discreteness of all living forms, Apollo's is to prevent these from clinging to their being in a manner that they could deprive others from their equal right to shine forth. In other words, *ζωή* and *βίοι* stand in reciprocal presupposition, and so Dionysus and Apollo protect life's rhythm in two different, albeit complementary, ways.

4 Today's philosophical chessboard and the otherwise

I have written elsewhere on what I have labelled the *Ulysses syndrome* of post-Nietzschean thought.¹¹⁹ “Man of many tricks” (ἀνήρ πολύτροπος),¹²⁰ Ulysses/Odysseus¹²¹ is unable “to sing and accompany himself with [Apollo's] lyre”:¹²² when he hears the mermaids singing the *κλέος* of the heroes, he asks his men to tie him up to the mast of his boat, so as not to fall under the spell; and when he hears of his own *κλέος*, he cries, “because in his world forms are merely aspects of the event, fame an illusion, and pain the only true reality ... [which] cannot be sung but narrated.”¹²³ One recognises here some traits distinctive of contemporary thought, such as the preference for the event over being¹²⁴ and for narrative over poetry (save when poetry is turned existentially introspective, like in Baudelaire)¹²⁵ and knowledge (other than negative),¹²⁶ as also the refusal to acknowledge the *κλέος* of things (as still sung by Hölderlin)¹²⁷ under the pretext that the

¹¹⁶ Lévi-Strauss, *The Story of Lynx*, 49. See further Lévi-Strauss, *The Raw and the Cooked*, 50, as regards the social implications of this dual mythical structure.

¹¹⁷ See the works of Roy Wagner cited in nn11 and 12 above.

¹¹⁸ “The Old World favors extreme solutions in response to the problem of twoness: its twins are either antithetical or identical. The New World prefers intermediate forms that were known as well by the ancient Greeks and Romans: the way Plato tells it ([in the] *Protagoras* ...), the myth of Prometheus and Epimetheus could have been Brazilian! However, it does appear that in the mythology of the Old World this formula yielded, so to speak, a small return, while in the mythology of the New World it constitutes a sort of seminal cell” (Lévi-Strauss, *The Story of Lynx*, 227); “Even though the Indo-Europeans held an archaic notion of twoness that was close to that of the Amerindians, they gradually discarded it. In contrast to the Indians and as Dumézil would have said, ‘they did not draw an explanation of the world from it’” (*ibid.*, 231). The reference to Dumézil is to *Heur et malheur du guerrier*, 188. On PIE mythological twoness, see now Mallory and Adams, *The Oxford Introduction to Proto-Indo-European and the Proto-Indo-European World*, 435.

¹¹⁹ Segovia and Gevorkyan, “From Worlds of Possibles to Possible Worlds.”

¹²⁰ Homer, *Odyssey*, 1.1 (my translation).

¹²¹ Ulysses is Odysseus's Roman name. See my remarks above on the Roman Dionysus and its transgressive qualities.

¹²² Diano, *Forma ed Evento*, 59 (my translation).

¹²³ *Ibid.*, 60 (my translation).

¹²⁴ As thematised, e.g., in Deleuze's transformation of being into becoming (from *The Logic of Sense* onwards) and Badiou's contraposition of being and event (in *Being and Event*).

¹²⁵ Who was the first to vindicate the term “modernity” in connection to the experience of “the ephemeral, the fugitive, the contingent” (Baudelaire, *The Painter of Modern Life and Other Essays*, 13). Notice in this sense Derrida's ongoing interest in literature, which, as Tenev remarks, “seems to have been indeed a privileged object of study for Derrida, who insistently demonstrated how the singularity of the literary work escapes the conceptual schemes one uses to grasp it” (“Jacques Derrida”).

¹²⁶ Deconstructive, subtractive, etc., on which more below.

¹²⁷ For whom the “first-fruits are not for mortals” but “belong to the gods” (cited in Heidegger, *Elucidations of Hölderlin's Poetry*, 55) and “what remains is founded by the poets” (*ibid.*, 58). It is tempting to read the subtle contrast that Hölderlin further makes between “speaking to god” and “offering the first fruits to the gods” as indicative of the difference between Christianity,

experience of anything is painful at best and, at worst, meaningless.¹²⁸ Now, even if Odysseus is not equivalent to Dionysus, the fact is that Nietzsche's plea for “‘ecstasy’ ... under the aegis of Dionysus as *ho lysios* – the ‘liberator’ – who undoes boundaries,”¹²⁹ not only involves “suffering”¹³⁰ but runs parallel to the invitation to explore anew the “seas”¹³¹ (re-)opened by the “death of [a] God”¹³² identified, in turn, with the A and the Ω of everything.¹³³ And from this neo-Odyssean image to that of Joyce's *Ulysses*, there is, as Sam Slote suggests, a more-or-less-straightforward line;¹³⁴ although it is true that Odysseus's original landscape, like that of Nietzsche before his final crisis (i.e. prior to his falling into Dionysus's “maelstrom”),¹³⁵ was that of an untraced sea explored by someone capable of orientating himself on it, which he manages to do by experimentally re-conducting to their being the many appearances he comes across – hence a landscape different from that of Joyce's *Ulysses*, whose characters are unable to orientate themselves in the overdetermined space of a modern city.¹³⁶ I thus take a disoriented Ulysses willingly tied to the mast of his boat to be the epitome of our late modern condition, to which two consecutive world wars, the globalisation of social misery, and an unprecedented ecological crisis have contributed their own grains of sand. As a result, philosophy, or what is left of it, has ended up by lashing itself to the mast of absolute contingency, or to the “*omnipotence of chaos*.”¹³⁷

Heidegger has, to be sure, played a crucial role in this. For he intimates that early-Greek φύσις paved the way for the summoning of everything into the “assured availability” (*Sicherstellung*) characteristic of the modern “enframing” (*Ge-stell*)¹³⁸ or “positioning” (*θέσις*) of reality,¹³⁹ in a manner similar to how Deleuze contends that identity and representation conscript being's flow.¹⁴⁰ Hence, Heidegger's demand to go “above ... φύσις ... [so as to] ground the *domain of the open* as such,”¹⁴¹ which he thinks in “abyssal” terms.¹⁴² True, Heidegger proves ambiguous concerning this point. For if, on the one hand, he writes: “‘Being’ has *since* the early days of the Greek world *up* to the latest days of our century meant being present,”¹⁴³ on the other hand, he acknowledges that if the *Ge-stell* comes from the “letting-lie-before” (*Vorliegenlassen*) experienced by the ancient Greeks as a result from their “letting-come-forth” (*Her-vorankommen-lassens*) of everything into presence, “[w]hat stands through θέσις essences otherwise than what is brought forth here by φύσις.”¹⁴⁴ Yet, overall, Heidegger's surmise on the continuity between φύσις and θέσις has seemingly won the day and influenced the view that the undetermined (“*beyng*”) must be

with its emphasis on an inner relation with a god to whom no sacrifice (in the original sense of the term, as Girard saw very well in *Violence and the Sacred*) is made, since it is him who sacrifices his own son for humankind, and the post-Christian “remembrance” or “rethinking” (*Andenken*, which is also the title of Hölderlin's poem in question here) of the nature of the Olympian gods, which, as I have written above apropos Zeus, Apollo, and Artemis, name first and foremost the measured brightness of everything that is.

¹²⁸ Cf. e.g. Critchley, *Very Little... Almost Nothing*; Brassier, *Nihil Unbound*; and Woodward, “Vigour Mortis.”

¹²⁹ Ulfers, “Introduction,” 6.

¹³⁰ Ibid., 6–8.

¹³¹ Nietzsche, *The Gay Science*, 3, 161, 163, 172, 199, 234, 243, 258.

¹³² Ibid., 109, 120, 199.

¹³³ Cf. Derrida's rejection of ἀρχή and τέλος in *Writing and Difference* (352), Deleuze's claim for a “game without rules” in *The Logic of Sense* (58–65); Deleuze, *The Fold* (69), and Meilllassoux's defence of chaos and chance (after Mallarmé, on which see nonetheless Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition*, 69, 283; *The Logic of Sense*, 63) in *The Number and the Siren*; cf. too in this sense Badiou, Deleuze, 78; Badiou, *Briefings of Existence*, 122–4, 168.

¹³⁴ Slote, *Joyce's Nietzschean Ethics*.

¹³⁵ Cf. Nietzsche, *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*, 124.

¹³⁶ See further Cosgrove, *James Joyce's Negations*. It would be tempting to describe those two seas as “smooth” and “striated” spaces, respectively (cf. Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, 474–500).

¹³⁷ Meilllassoux, *After Finitude*, 71 (emphasis original). Cf. Mackay, *The Medium of Contingency*.

¹³⁸ Heidegger, *Off the Beaten Track*, 54.

¹³⁹ Heidegger, *Bremen and Freiburg Lectures*, 60–1.

¹⁴⁰ Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition*, 28–69, 168–221, 262–304.

¹⁴¹ Heidegger, *Überlegungen II–VI*, 241 (emphasis original, my translation).

¹⁴² Heidegger, *The Event*, 195–6.

¹⁴³ Heidegger, *The Question of Being*, 63 (emphasis added).

¹⁴⁴ Heidegger, *Bremen and Freiburg Lectures*, 60–1 (emphasis original).

privileged over the determined (“being”),¹⁴⁵ which admittedly reverses Aristotle’s axiom that “being is preferable to non being.”¹⁴⁶

Deleuze has had his share in it too. For, by claiming that the singularity of what is *precludes* its representation inasmuch as everything is inherently multiple, and hence ever-differing in respect to what can no longer be properly called itself,¹⁴⁷ he has influentially reversed Plato’s premise that there are no things without their corresponding *εἶδος*¹⁴⁸ (whence Deleuze’s commitment to nonsense, as well).¹⁴⁹ In short, Deleuze is responsible for having promoted “difference” *qua* something rebellious and unassimilable to the doxological spotlight – in the two senses of the term *δόξα* – of today’s philosophical conversation, which is but another way of privileging underdetermination (here in terms of unpredictability) over determination; and he is responsible for it despite having made of a single *δύναμις* the substance of being’s transitory configurations,¹⁵⁰ which supplies ontology a material anchor that is lacking in Heidegger.

But perhaps there has been no other stronger dismissal of being’s positiveness than that of Derrida, who – reversing Heidegger like Marx did with Hegel – makes of a being’s “trace”¹⁵¹ that which must be thought against the intolerable menace of its presence.¹⁵² “Only *pure absence* – not the absence of this or that, but the absence of everything in which all presence is announced – can *inspire*, in other words, can *work*, and then make one *work*” writes Derrida.¹⁵³ Language understood not so much as ontologically disclosive – which is how philosophy originally conceived it¹⁵⁴ – but as something irretrievably elusive of its referent provides Derrida the model.¹⁵⁵ Yet, it is Levinas, with his view of textuality as that which bears on it the voice of an absent Other, and of that Other as an instance that cannot be appropriated and that incites my responsibility towards it, on whom Derrida relies in the last instance.¹⁵⁶ In other words, Levinas’s substitution of ontology by ethics¹⁵⁷ is equally at play in Derrida – and, via Levinas, Rosenzweig’s prejudice that one and the same trend of thought leads from the Presocratics to Hegel, from Jonia to Jena.¹⁵⁸ Thus, Derrida’s perceived need to move beyond ontology altogether, which echoes Levinas’s embrace of an “infinite” contraposed to any “totality”; for, on both Levinas’s and Derrida’s interpretation, being\determination irredeemably implies “closure”¹⁵⁹ and “violence.”¹⁶⁰

¹⁴⁵ Notice, though, that, in Heidegger’s Bremen lectures, the *Geviert*, rather than “*being*,” stands as the *antithesis* to the *Ge-stell*. Whether it is “*being*” or the *Geviert*, then, that may lead us out of the latter remains undecided for Heidegger, since, in his latest writings, he elaborates indistinctly on both concepts. One thing seems to be clear, anyway: whereas Heidegger’s *Geviert* is inspired in Hölderlin, as Mattéi stresses (Mattéi, *Heidegger et Hölderlin*), and, via Hölderlin, in Heraclitus, Heidegger’s “*being*” is, in turn, inspired in Eckhart (Moore, *Eckhart, Heidegger, and the Imperative of Release*) and, via Eckhart, in the abyssal theology of Christian gnosticism (Altizer, *Godhead and the Nothing*, 112). See in this respect, for a new interpretation of Heidegger’s *Geviert* (in dialogue too with contemporary anthropology), Gevorkyan and Segovia, “Earth and World(s),” which, drawing *inter alia* on Harman’s contention that Heidegger’s *Geviert* epitomises Heidegger’s dialectics of “veiling and unveiling, absence and presence, concealing and unconcealing, sheltering and clearing” (Harman, “Dwelling in the Fourfold,” 295; cf. Harman, *The Quadruple Object*, 175), pushes further – I now realise – Mitchell’s allegation (based on Heidegger’s *The Question of Being*, 82–3) that the *Geviert* is but the positive “face” of Heidegger’s “*being*” (Mitchell, *The Fourfold*, 315).

¹⁴⁶ Aristotle, *Generation of Animals*, 731b30–1.

¹⁴⁷ Deleuze and Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus*, 362.

¹⁴⁸ Segovia, “*εἶδος\utupē;*” Segovia, “On Plato’s *Εἶδος*, Deleuze’s *Simulacra*, and Zeno.”

¹⁴⁹ Particularly in *The Logic of Sense*, 66–73.

¹⁵⁰ Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition*, 35–42; Deleuze, *Spinoza*, 91–2, 97–104.

¹⁵¹ Derrida, *Of Grammatology*, 61.

¹⁵² Derrida, *Writing and Difference*, 354.

¹⁵³ Ibid., 7 (emphasis original).

¹⁵⁴ Segovia, “*εἶδος\utupē.*”

¹⁵⁵ Cf. Derrida, *Writing and Difference*, 4: “Th[e] state of being haunted ... is perhaps the general mode of the presence or absence of the thing itself in pure language.”

¹⁵⁶ Ibid., 97–192.

¹⁵⁷ On which see e.g. Levinas, *Otherwise than Being*.

¹⁵⁸ Rosenzweig, *The Star of Redemption*, 18.

¹⁵⁹ Cf. Levinas, *Totality and Infinity*; Derrida, *Writing and Difference*, 292–316.

¹⁶⁰ Derrida, *Writing and Difference*, 97–192. As though ontology did not present ethical concerns right from the start, on which see Heidegger’s reading of Anaximander’s saying in *Off the Beaten Track*, 242–81.

And here we are – lashed in one way or another to the mast of indeterminacy and negativity. In one way or another, therefore, today's philosophical game revolves around what Ihab Hassan famously hallowed as a new cultural paradigm ("post-modernist," "post-humanist," etc.)¹⁶¹ characterised by the restatement of freedom and uncertainty. Negativity – or, what amounts to the same, *subtraction* – is thus its main ingredient. Therefore, if the history of Western metaphysics can be depicted as a series of more-or-less totalitarian deductions from a first principle (be it God, Man, the State, Class Struggle, etc.), its postmodern *limes* can be said to abound in anarchic subtractions that make patent the strict negative of any alleged principle (God's death, the non-human, the unresolved possibilities of aesthetic playfulness in the absence of any compelling political imperative, etc.). For deductive or demonstrative logics have failed to procure what they aimed at providing, namely, a stable ground on which to build a world that has proven, more often than not, one or another kind of prison; whereas the counter-demonstrative illuminative logics offered by spiritualities of various kinds generally prove (perhaps with the exception of Buddhism)¹⁶² adamant to dissolve life into the intractable (or else display a predisposition to be engulfed in one or another kind of deductive apparatus of their own). The *intractable*: that, in the end, is what it is all about; the intractable taken to its uttermost extreme, so that even the surface on which the trace of our shipwreck might be located vanishes at the beating of a siren's tail.¹⁶³

Hence, if philosophy was, it could be argued, born and shaped by the Mediterranean light, it is its originally *cum* distinctive co-implication as formulated by Parmenides (i.e. the mutual *mirroring* of being and thought) that is being questioned today on behalf of something like a global-nordic mist. And just like Plato fancied in the *Sophist* a Stranger who taught that being is ineluctably affected by Sameness and Otherness, contemporary philosophy is only able to fancy reality, as it were, as a different kind of stranger: a Stranger barely perceptible because of being surrounded by fog, submerged in the mist, about whose being, consequently, nothing can be surmised, let alone known, and before whom one can only ask oneself *endlessly*, for otherwise the game would be over: "how do I (or what can no longer be called "I," anyway) relate to it (if it is an "it" after all)?" And as essential and courageous as initiatives to find out minimal provisional answers to such question may be in a time in which many seem only willing to listen to the question itself in their self-absorbed minds just for the pleasure of hearing it, one wonders whether this is the only game philosophy is entitled to play today.

Yet, for another game to be possible, Dionysus's anarchic tyranny (for he is the god of the yet-undetermined possible), and with it Nietzsche's legacy, may have to be put into question once and for all. Not, though, on behalf of Apollo's own tyranny (the tyranny of crystallised form). Actually, Apollo is not truly himself without Dionysus, nor is Dionysus truly himself without Apollo. What would happen, then, if we reimagine the philosophical game on the *chiastic* board of dual thinking, on which Apollo cuts Dionysus's continuum, which Dionysus restores despite Apollo's cuts? For were it not for Apollo, nothing definite would begin; and were it not for Dionysus, things would not be in position to begin otherwise. Chaos/Cosmos, Earth/World, Limitlessness/Limitation, Possibility/Compossibility, Emergence/Shape, Becoming/Being, Transformation/Stability, Allowance/Care are among Dionysus's and Apollo's many names – or, if you wish, among the many *markers* of their twin-ness. Their list goes back to the Pythagoreans,¹⁶⁴ whose mistake was to moralise it. But it can be found too in Hassan's *The Dismemberment of Orpheus*,¹⁶⁵ where the myth of Orpheus is symptomatically recalled to warn the reader about the fatal consequences of forgetting Dionysus: Orpheus did in his willingness to serve Apollo alone and was, as a result, dismembered by Thracian Maenads. Hassan, however, overlooks that Dionysus was *also* torn to pieces by the Titans,¹⁶⁶

¹⁶¹ Hassan, "Prometheus as Performer;" Hassan, "The Culture of Postmodernism."

¹⁶² Boon et al., *Nothing: Three Inquiries in Buddhism*.

¹⁶³ Meillassoux, *The Number and the Siren*, 17.

¹⁶⁴ Kirk and Raven, *The Presocratic Philosophers*, 238.

¹⁶⁵ Shortened: "Hierarchy/Anarchy; Mastery-Logos/Exhaustion-Silence; Creation-Totalization/Decreation-Deconstruction; Presence/Absence; Centering/Dispersal; Selection/Combination; Root-Depth/Rhizome-Surface; Type/Mutant, Origin-Cause/Difference-Difference-Trace; Determinacy/Indeterminacy" (Hassan, *The Dismemberment of Orpheus*, 268).

¹⁶⁶ Detienne, *Dionysos Slain*.

that nothing durable comes out of Dionysus even if he is and sustains everything – nothing durable and nothing habitable.¹⁶⁷

Yet, the twin-ness of the two gods should be clear by now to all of us, since Marcel Detienne inaugurated the twenty-first century by re-stressing it (*contra Nietzsche*).¹⁶⁸ It is, however, Roy Wagner, who has, I think, done more to re-stress their reciprocal presupposition by affirming, first, in that if “power over something” is not only the ability to master it, but also the ability to “negate” or “destroy” it or replace it by something else; by contending, secondly, that “social power ... cannot [then] be merely a function of the social order itself,” that is to say, “[i]t cannot, despite Durkheim’s assertions to the contrary,”¹⁶⁹ amount to society’s representation of itself, or to society’s mirror;¹⁷⁰ and by concluding, therefore, that it cannot be exclusively “represented as ‘order’ or establishment,” for “[i]t may ... be [either] elicited or contained,”¹⁷¹ and when it is elicited, it overflows any possible container. In other words, its elicitation must be acknowledged to be broader than its containment – which means, too, that Dionysus is broader than Apollo. Still, what sense would it make to be in position to elicit such force without *simultaneously* being in position to contain it? Wagner again:

Imagine a tree whose top foliage cuts the shape of a human face against the sky,” say the Tolai people of East New Britain, in Papua New Guinea, “and fix the shape of that face in your mind, so that it appears as a real face, and not just a profile. When you have finished, go back to the tree, and visualize it as a free-standing object without reference to the face. When you have both images firmly fixed in your mind, just hold them in suspension and keep shifting your attention from one to the other: tree/face, face/tree, tree/face, and so on.

That is what we call a *tabapot*. Man is a *tabapot*. For you see the human being is encased within the boundaries of their own body, but they want what is outside of their own body. But when they get what is outside of their own body, they want to be encased back in the body again.¹⁷²

Not only does Dionysus and Apollo’s twin-ness supply the meta-model model of social life (and cultural) life (as per its dialectics of convention and innovation)¹⁷³ but also that of human behaviour in its likewise chiastic rhythm. And the same *mutatis mutandis* may be applied to the dissymmetric relation existing between what Merleau-Ponty called the world’s “flesh”¹⁷⁴ and its symbolic representation, i.e. between reality and thought.¹⁷⁵ For neither is reality transparent to us nor are those of its facets that we cannot grasp more relevant and significant than those we can read into; in fact, translucent-ness, rather than transparency or opaqueness,¹⁷⁶ results from the always-already infinitesimal combination of knowledge and ignorance, presence and absence, *phenomenon* and *noumenon* which frames our relation to the world.

Now, on a philosophical chessboard on which, apparently, only one game is recurrently being played – that of their mutual contraposition – can Dionysus and Apollo’s *dual affirmation* be viewed as anything but an invitation to redraw that board so as to allow on it the game of the Otherwise?¹⁷⁷

Conflict of interest: Author states no conflict of interest.

¹⁶⁷ Hassan acknowledges that dichotomies “remain insecure, equivocal” (*The Dismemberment of Orpheus*, 269) but believes late modern culture ought to hang on the Dionysian features in the list.

¹⁶⁸ Detienne, “Forgetting Delphi between Apollo and Dionysus.”

¹⁶⁹ In Durkheim, *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life*, 418–8.

¹⁷⁰ Wagner, *Asiwinarong*, xiv.

¹⁷¹ Ibid.

¹⁷² Wagner, *The Logic of Invention*, 1.

¹⁷³ See the references given on n11 above.

¹⁷⁴ Dillon, *Merleau-Ponty’s Ontology*, 105.

¹⁷⁵ On which see Wagner, *The Logic of Invention*, 19–58.

¹⁷⁶ That is, the transparency of “correlationism” and the opaqueness of the “Great Outdoors,” on which see Meillassoux, *After Finitude*.

¹⁷⁷ My forthcoming coauthored (with Sofya Segovia) monograph, *Dionysus and Apollo after Nihilism*, aims at further exploring this question in an attempt to redesign contemporary theory through the reciprocal affirmation of event and form, earth and world. The present essay reproduces some of its contents, extracted from chapters 1, 2, 3, and 8.

References

Alonso Fernández, Zoa. "Maenadic Ecstasy in Rome: Fact or Fiction?" In: *Redefining Dionysos*, edited by Alberto Bernabé, Miguel Herrero de Jáuregui, Ana Isabel Jiménez San Cristóbal, and Raquel Martín Hernández, 185–99. Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, 2013.

Altizer, Thomas J. J. *Godhead and the Nothing*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2003.

Aristotle. *Generation of Animals*, translated by A. L. Peck. London and Cambridge, MA: Heinemann and Harvard University Press, 1943.

Badiou, Alain. *Deleuze: The Clamor of Being*, translated by Louise Burchill. Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press, 2000.

Badiou, Alain. *Being and Event*, translated by Oliver Feltham. London and New York: Continuum, 2005.

Badiou, Alain. *Briefings on Existence: A Short Treatise on Transitory Ontology*, translated by Norman Madarasz. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2006.

Barringer, Judith M. "The Temple of Zeus at Olympia, Heroes, and Athletes." *Hesperia* 74 (2005), 211–41.

Baudelaire, Charles. *The Painter of Modern Life and Other Essays*, translated by Jonathan Mayne. London: Phaidon Press, 1964.

Bernabé, Alberto. "Dionysos in the Mycenaean World." In: *Redefining Dionysos*, edited by Alberto Bernabé, Miguel Herrero de Jáuregui, Ana Isabel Jiménez San Cristóbal, Raquel Martín Hernández, 23–37. Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, 2013.

Bernasconi, Robert. "Heidegger, Rickert, Nietzsche, and the Critique of Biologism." In: *Heidegger and Nietzsche*, edited by Babette Babich, Alfred Denker and Holger Zaborowski, 159–80. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2012.

Boon, Marcus, Eric Cazdyn, and Timothy Morton. *Nothing: Three Inquiries in Buddhism*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2015.

Brassier, Ray. *Nihil Unbound: Enlightenment and Extinction*. London and New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2007.

Bremmer, Jan. "Greek Maenadism Reconsidered." *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 55 (1984), 267–86.

Bryant, Levi. "Correlationism." In: *The Meillasoux Dictionary*, edited by Petter Gratton and Paul J. Ennis, 46–8. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2015.

Burkert, Walter. "Apellai und Apollon." *Rheinisches Museum* 118 (1975), 1–21.

Burkert, Walter. *Greek Religion: Archaic and Classical*, translated by John Raffan. Oxford and Malden, MA: Blackwell, 1985.

Clarke, J. J. *Oriental Enlightenment: The Encounter Between Asian and Western Thought*. London and New York: Routledge, 1997.

Colli, Giorgio. *La Sapienza Greca*. 3 vols. Milan: Adelphi, 1977–1993.

Cosgrove, Brian. *James Joyce's Negations: Irony, Indeterminacy and Nihilism in "Ulysses" and Other Writings*. Dublin: University College Dublin Press, 2007.

Cosmopoulos, Michael B. *Bronze Age Eleusis and the Origins of the Eleusinian Mysteries*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2015.

Critchley, Simon. *Very Little... Almost Nothing: Death, Philosophy, Literature*. Second edition. London and New York: Routledge, 2004.

Curd, Patricia (ed.). *A Presocratics Reader: Selected Fragments and Testimonia*, translated by Richard D. McKirahan and Patricia Curd. Second edition. Indianapolis and Cambridge: Hackett, 2011.

Deacy, Susan. *Athena*. London and New York: Routledge, 2008.

Deleuze, Gilles. *Kant's Critical Philosophy: The Doctrine of the Faculties*, translated by Hugh Tomlinson and Barbara Habberjam. London: The Athlone Press, 1985.

Deleuze, Gilles. *Spinoza: Practical Philosophy*, translated by Robert Hurley. San Francisco: City Lights, 1988.

Deleuze, Gilles. *The Logic of Sense*, edited by Constantin V. Boundas, translated by Mark Lester and Charles Stivale. London: The Athlone Press, 1990.

Deleuze, Gilles. *The Fold: Leibniz and the Baroque*, translated by Tom Conley. London: The Athlone Press, 1993.

Deleuze, Gilles. *Difference and Repetition*, translated by Paul Patton. London and New York: The Athlone Press and Columbia University Press, 1994.

Deleuze, Gilles. *Pure Immanence: Essays on a Life*, translated by Anne Boyman with an Introduction by John Rajchman. New York: Zone Books, 2001.

Deleuze, Gilles, and Félix Guattari. *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, translated by Robert Hurley, Mark Seem, and Helen R. Lane, Preface by Michel Foucault. London and New York: Continuum, 1983.

Deleuze, Gilles, and Félix Guattari. *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, translated by Brian Massumi. London and New York: Continuum, 1987.

Deleuze, Gilles, and Félix Guattari. *What Is Philosophy?*, translated by Hugh Tomlinson and Graham Burchell. New York and Chichester, UK: Columbia University Press, 1994.

Derrida, Jacques. *Of Grammatology*, translated by Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. Corrected edition. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997.

Derrida, Jacques. *Writing and Difference*, translated by Alan Bass. Second edition. London and New York: Routledge, 2001.

Detienne, Marcel. *Dionysos Slain*, translated by Mireille Muellner and Leonard Muellner. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1979.

Detienne, Marcel. *Dionysos at Large*, translated by Arthur Goldhammer. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 1989.

Detienne, Marcel. "Forgetting Delphi between Apollo and Dionysus." *Classical Philology* 96:2 (2001), 147–58.

Diano, Carlo. *Forma ed Evento. Principi per una Interpretazione del Mondo Greco*. Prefazione di Remo Bodei. Venice: Marsilio, 1993.

Dietrich, B. C. *The Origins of Greek Religion*. Berlin and New York: De Gruyter, 1974.

Dillon, M. C. *Merleau-Ponty's Ontology*. Second edition. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1997.

Dillon, Matthew. *Omen and Oracles: Divination in Ancient Greece*. London and New York: Routledge, 2017.

Dosse, François. *Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari: Intersecting Lives*, translated by Deborah Glassman. New York: Columbia University Press, 2010.

Dumézil, Georges. *Heur et Malheur du Guerrier. Aspects Mythiques de la Fonction Guerrière Chez les Indo-Européens*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1969.

Duque, Félix. *Historia de la Filosofía Moderna. La era de la Crítica*. Madrid: Akal, 1998.

Durand, Gilbert. *Sciences de L'homme et Tradition. Le Nouvel Esprit Anthropologique*. Paris: Tête de feuille-Sirac, 1975.

Durkheim, Émile. *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life*, translated by Karen E. Fields. New York and London: The Free Press, 1995.

Foley, Helene P. *The Homeric "Hymn to Demeter": Translation, Commentary, and Interpretative Essays*. Princeton, NJ and London: Princeton University Press, 1994.

Gevorkyan, Sofya and Carlos A. Segovia. "Post-Heideggerian Drifts: From Object-Oriented-Ontology Worldlessness to Post-nihilist Worldings." *Das Questões: Filosofia, Tradução, Arte (special issue: Heidegger, Levinas, Derrida e o Nihilismo)*, edited by Hilan Bensusan, vol. 9.1, 3–18, 2020. <https://periodicos.unb.br/index.php/dasquestoes/article/view/31212>.

Gevorkyan, Sofya and Carlos A. Segovia. "Earth and World(s): From Heidegger's Fourfold to Contemporary Anthropology." *Open Philosophy* 4 (2021), 58–82. <https://www.degruyter.com/document/doi/10.1515/oppil-2020-0152/html>.

Gevorkyan, Sofya and Carlos A. Segovia. "An Anthropological and Meta-philosophical Critique of Hilan Bensusan's Indexicalism." *Cosmos and History: The Journal of Natural and Social Philosophy (special issue: Indexicalism)*, edited by Arran Garre and Hilan Bensusan, vol. 17.2, 26–44, 2021. <https://cosmosandhistory.org/index.php/journal/article/view/970>.

Gimbutas, Marija. *The Living Goddess*, edited by Miriam Robbins Dexter. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press, 1999.

Girard, René. *Violence and the Sacred*, translated by Patrick Gregory. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1977.

Graf, Fritz. *Apollo*. London and New York: Routledge, 2009.

Guattari, Félix. *Chaosmosis: An Ethico-Aesthetic Paradigm*, translated by Paul Bains and Julian Pefanis. Sidney: Power Publications, 1995.

Guattari, Félix. *Schizoanalytic Cartographies*, translated by Andrew Goffey. London and New York: Bloomsbury, 2013.

Guthrie, W. K. C. *A History of Greek Philosophy*. 6 vols. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1962–1985.

Hallward, Peter. *Out of this World: Deleuze and the Philosophy of Creation*. London and New York: Verso, 2006.

Hanna, Robert. "Wittgenstein and Kantianism." In: *A Companion to Wittgenstein*, edited by Hans-Johann Glock and John Hyman, 682–98. Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell, 2017.

Haraway, Donna J. *Staying with the Trouble: Making Kin in the Chthulucene*. Durham, NC and London: Duke University Press, 2016.

Hard, Robin. *The Routledge Handbook of Greek Mythology, based on H. J. Rose's Handbook of Greek Mythology*. London and New York: Routledge, 2004.

Harman, Graham. "Dwelling with the Fourfold." *Space and Culture* 12:3 (2009), 292–302.

Harman, Graham. *The Quadruple Object*. Winchester and Washington: Zero Books, 2011.

Harman, Graham. *Object-Oriented Ontology: A New Theory of Everything*. London: Pelican, 2018.

Hassan, Ihab. *The Dismemberment of Orpheus: Toward a Post-modern Literature*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1971.

Hassan, Ihab. "Prometheus as Performer: Toward a Post-Humanist Culture?" *The Georgia Review* 31:4 (1977), 830–50.

Hassan, Ihab. "The Culture of Postmodernism." *Theory, Culture & Society* 2:3 (1985), 119–31.

Heidegger, Martin. *The Question of Being*, translated by William Klubak and Jean T. Wilde. New York: Twayne, 1958.

Heidegger, Martin. *Kant and the Problem of Metaphysics*, translated by Richard Taft. 5th, enlarged ed. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1997.

Heidegger, Martin. *Phenomenological Interpretation of Kant's Critique of Pure Reason*, translated by Parvis Emad and Kenneth Maly. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1997.

Heidegger, Martin. *Elucidations of Hölderlin's Poetry*, translated by Keith Hoeller. Amherst, MA: Humanity Books, 2000.

Heidegger, Martin. *Zollikon Seminars: Protocols – Conversations – Letters*, edited by Medard Boss, translated by Franz Mayr and Richard Askay. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 2001.

Heidegger, Martin. *Off the Beaten Track*, translated by Julian Young and Kenneth Haynes. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Heidegger, Martin. *The End of Philosophy*, translated by Joan Stambaugh. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 2003.

Heidegger, Martin. *Mindfulness*, translated by Parvis Emad and Thomas Kalary. London and New York: Continuum, 2006.

Heidegger, Martin. *Bremen and Freiburg Lectures: Insight Into That Which Is and Basic Principles of Thinking*, translated by Andrew J. Mitchell. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2012.

Heidegger, Martin. *Contributions to Philosophy: Of the Event*, translated by Richard Rojcewicz and Daniela Vallega-Neu. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2012.

Heidegger, Martin. *The Event*, translated by Richard Rojcewicz. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2013.

Heidegger, Martin. *Überlegungen II–VI (Schwarze Hefte 1931–1938)*, edited by Peter Trawny. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 2014.

Heidegger, Martin. *Heraclitus: The Inception of Occidental Thinking, and Logic: Heraclitus' Doctrine of the Logos*, translated by Julia Goesser Assaiante and S. Montgomery Ewegen. London and New York: Bloomsbury, 2018.

Henrichs, Albert. "Greek Maenadism from Olympias to Messalina." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 82 (1978), 121–60.

Homer. *The Odyssey*, translated by A. T. Murray, revised by George E. Dimock. 2 vols. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1919.

Homer. *The Iliad*, translated by A. T. Murray, revised by William F. Wyatt. 2 vols. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1924–1925.

Ingold, Tim. *The Life of Lines*. London and New York: Routledge, 2015.

Isler-Kerényi, Cornelia. *Dionysos in Archaic Greece: An Understanding through Images*. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2007.

Kahn, Charles H. *The Art and Thought of Heraclitus: An Edition of the Fragments with Translation and Commentary*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1979.

Kennedy, Rebecca Futo. *Athena's Justice: Athena, Athens and the Concept of Justice in Greek Tragedy*. New York: Peter Lang, 2009.

Kerényi, Carl. *Dionysos: Archetypal Image of Indestructible Life*, translated by Ralph Manheim. Princeton, NJ and London: Princeton University Press, 1976.

Kerényi, Carl. *Eleusis: Archetypal Image of Mother and Daughter*, translated by Ralph Manheim. Princeton, NJ and London: Princeton University Press, 1967.

Kirk, G. S. and J. E. Raven. *The Presocratic Philosophers: A Critical History with a Selection of Texts*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1957.

Kirk, G. S., J. E. Raven and M. Schofield. *The Presocratic Philosophers: A Critical History with a Selection of Texts*. Second edition. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Krell, David Farrell. *The Tragic Absolute: German Idealism and the Languishing of God*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2005.

Lacan, Jacques. *Seminar VII: The Ethics of Psychoanalysis, 1959–1960*, edited by Jacques-Alain Miller, translated by Dennis Porter. London and New York: Norton & Co., 1992.

Larson, Jennifer. *Ancient Greek Cults: A Guide*. London and New York: Routledge, 2007.

Lévi-Strauss, Claude. *Structural Anthropology*, translated by Claire Jacobson and Brooke Grundfest Schoepf. New York: Basic Books, 1963.

Lévi-Strauss, Claude. *The Raw and the Cooked: Introduction to a Science of Mythology*: 1, translated by John and Doreen Weightman. New York and Evanston, IL: Harper & Row, 1969.

Lévi-Strauss, Claude. *The Story of Lynx*, translated by Catherine Tihanyi. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1995.

Lévi-Strauss, Claude. *Myth and Meaning*. London and New York: Routledge, 2001.

Levinas, Emmanuel. *Totality and Infinity: An Essay on Exteriority*, translated by Alphonso Lingis. Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press, 1969.

Levinas, Emmanuel. *Otherwise than Being, or, Beyond Essence*, translated by Alphonso Lingis. Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press, 1998.

Löwith, Karl. *Nietzsche's Philosophy of the Eternal Recurrence of the Same*, translated by J. Harvey Lomax, Foreword by Bern Magnus. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press, 1997.

Mackay, Robin (ed). *The Medium of Contingency*. London: Urbanomic, 2011; reissued in 2015.

Mallory, J. P. and D. Q. Adams. *The Oxford Introduction to Proto-Indo-European and the Proto-Indo-European World*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Martínez Marzoa, Felipe. *Historia de la Filosofía Antigua*. Madrid: Akal, 1995.

Mattéi, Jean-François. *Heidegger et Hölderlin. Le Quadriparti*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 2001.

Meillassoux, Quentin. *After Finitude: An Essay on the Necessity of Contingency*, translated by Ray Brassier. London and New York: Continuum, 2008.

Meillassoux, Quentin. *The Number and the Siren: A Decipherment of Mallarmé's Coup de dés*, translated by Robin Mackay. London: Urbanomic and Sequence, 2012.

Mellamphy, Dan and Nandita Biswas Mellamphy. "Nietzsche and Networks, Nietzschean Networks: *The Digital Dionysus*." In: *The Digital Dionysus: Nietzsche and the Network-Centric Condition*, edited by Dan Mellamphy and Nandita Biswas Mellamphy, 10–31. New York: Punctum, 2016.

Mitchell, Andrew J. *The Fourfold: Reading the Late Heidegger*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 2015.

Moore, Gregory. *Nietzsche, Biology and Metaphor*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Moore, Ian Alexander. *Eckhart, Heidegger, and the Imperative of Release*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2019.

Morton, Timothy and Dominic Boyer. *Hyposubjects: On Becoming Human*. London: Open Humanities Press, 2021.

Mylonas, George E. *Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries*. Princeton, NJ and London: Princeton University Press and Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1961.

Nietzsche, Friedrich. *The Gay Science, with a Prelude of Rhymes and an Appendix of Songs*, translated, with Commentary, by Walter Kaufmann. New York: Random House, 1974.

Nietzsche, Friedrich. *The Birth of Tragedy and Other Writings*, edited by Raymond Geuss and Ronald Speirs, translated by Ronald Speirs. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Nietzsche, Friedrich. *Nachgelassene Fragmente 1882–1884*, edited by Giorgio Colli and Mazzino Montinari. 2nd ed. Berlin and New York: De Gruyter, 1988.

Nietzsche, Friedrich. *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*, edited by Adrian del Caro and Robert P. Pipin, translated by Adrian del Caro. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Nietzsche, Friedrich. *The Dionysian Vision of the World*, translated by Ira J. Allen with an Introduction by Friedrich Ulfers. Minneapolis: Univocal, 2013.

Otto, Walter F. *Dionysus: Myth and Cult*, translated by with an Introduction by Robert B. Palmer. Bloomington and London: Indiana University Press, 1965.

Otto, Walter F. *The Homeric Gods: The Spiritual Significance of Greek Religion*, translated by Moses Hadas. London: Thames and Hudson, 1979.

Plutarch. *Moralia*, translated by Frank Cole Babbitt et al. 16 vols. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 1936–2004.

Porres Caballero, Silvia. “Maenadic Ecstasy in Greece: Fact or Fiction?” In: *Redefining Dionysos*, edited by Alberto Bernabé, Miguel Herrero de Jáuregui, Ana Isabel Jiménez San Cristóbal, and Raquel Martín Hernández, 159–84. Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, 2013.

Rieff, Philip. *The Triumph of the Therapeutic Uses of Faith after Freud*. New York: Harper and Row, 1966.

Rosenzweig, Franz. *The Star of Redemption*, translated by Barbara E. Galli. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2005.

Schelling, Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph. *Samtliche Werke*. 13 vols. Stuttgart-Augsburg: Cotta, 1856–1861.

Schelling, Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph. *Die Weltalter Fragmente: In der Urfassungen von 1811 und 1813*, edited by Manfred Schröter. Munich: Biederstein and Leibniz, 1946.

Schelling, Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph. *Einleitung in die Philosophie*. Stuttgart: Frommann, 1989.

Schelling, Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph. *Historical-critical Introduction to the Philosophy of Mythology*, translated by Mason Richey Markus Zisselsberger, with a Foreword by Jason M. Wirth. Albany: State University of New York Press Press, 2007.

Schiano, Sierra. “The Rape of Persephone in Children’s Media: Feminist Receptions of Classical Mythology.” *Berkeley Undergraduate Journal of Classics* 6:2 (2018), 1–16.

Scubla, Lucien. *Lire Lévi-Strauss. Le déploiement d’une intuition*. Paris: Odile Jacob, 1998.

Segovia, Carlos A. “Fire in Three Images, from Heraclitus to the Anthropocene.” *Cosmos and History: The Journal of Natural and Social Philosophy (special issue: Civilization in Crisis)*, edited by Arran Gare, vol. 17.3 (2021), 501–21. <https://cosmosandhistory.org/index.php/journal/article/view/957>

Segovia, Carlos A. “εἴδος/utupē – Or Yet Another Take on the Dissymmetric Reciprocity of the Real and the Symbolic.” In: *Interpretation, Representation, Language: Cross-Cultural, Transhistorical and Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, edited by Fionn Bennett. Reims: Éditions et Presses Universitaires de Reims, 2023. Forthcoming.

Segovia, Carlos A. “On Plato’s Εἶδη, Deleuze’s Simulacra, and Zeno.” Submitted in April 2022 to *Epoché: A Journal for the History of Philosophy*. Forthcoming.

Segovia, Carlos A. In Collaboration with Sofya Gevorkyan. “From Worlds of Possibles to Possible Worlds: Dionysos and Apollo after Nihilism.” In: *From World of Possibles to Possible Worlds: On Post-nihilism and Dwelling*, edited by Sofya Gevorkyan and Carlos A. Segovia = RDQ 13.1 (2021), 46–72. <https://periodicos.unb.br/index.php/dasquestoes/article/view/41324>

Segovia, Sofya, and Carlos A. Segovia. *Dionysus and Apollo after Nihilism: Rethinking the Earth/World Divide*. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2023. Forthcoming.

Severino, Emanuele. *Dike*. Milan: Adelphi, 2015.

Shapiro, H. Alan. “Athena, Apollo, and the Religious Propaganda of the Athenian Empire.” In: *Religion and Power in the Ancient-Greek World: Proceedings of the Uppsala Symposium*, edited by Pontus Hellström and Brita Alroth, 101–14. Stockholm: Ubsaliensis S. Academiae, 1993.

Slote, Sam. *Joyce’s Nietzschean Ethics*. London and New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2013.

Smith, Daniel W. “Deleuze, Kant and the Transcendental Field.” In: *At the Edges of Thought: Deleuze and Post-Kantian Philosophy*, edited by Craig Lundy and Daniela Voss, 25–43. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2015.

Spivey, Nigel. *Greek Sculpture*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Taylor-Perry, Rosemarie. *The God Who Comes: Dionysian Mysteries Revisited*. New York: Algora, 2003.

Tenev, Darin. “Jacques Derrida.” *Oxford Bibliographies* (January 15, 2020). <https://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/view/document/obo-9780190221911/obo-9780190221911-0003.xml>.

Titus Livius. *Livy*. 13 vols. Vol. 11, translated by Evan T. Sage. London and Cambridge, MA: William Heinemann and Harvard University Press, 1936.

Ulfers, Friedrich. "Introduction." In: *Friedrich Nietzsche, The Dionysian Vision of the World*, translated by Ira J. Allen, 1–28. Minneapolis: Univocal, 2013.

Wagner, Roy. *Asiwinarong: Ethos, Image, and Social Power Among the Usen Barok of New Ireland*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1986.

Wagner, Roy. *Symbols That Stand for Themselves*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1986.

Wagner, Roy. *An Anthropology of the Subject: Holographic Worldview in New Guinea and Its Meaning and Significance for the World of Anthropology*. Berkeley, California, and London: University of California Press, 2001.

Wagner, Roy. *The Invention of Culture*. With a New Foreword by Tim Ingold. Chicago: HAU Books, 2016.

Wagner, Roy. *The Logic of Invention*. Chicago: HAU Books, 2019.

Wildberg, Christian. "Dionysos in the Mirror of Philosophy: Heraclitus, Plato, Plotinus." In: *A Different God? Dionysos and Ancient Polytheism*, edited by Renate Schlesier, 205–32. Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, 2011.

Woodward, Ashley. "Vigour Mortis: Ray Brassier and the Ends of Nihilism." *Paper Presented in the Seminar Series of the Centre for Research in Post-Kantian European Philosophy at the University of Warwick*, February 17, 2015. Online: https://www.academia.edu/49004184/Vigour_mortis_Ray_Brassier_and_the_Ends_of_Nihilism.