

## Chapter I

# *The Mythic Model: On the One and the Zero*

“All things arise from One.”

—Anonymous

Suppose for a moment that the preceding statement were true, that Zero didn't exist and that the starting point of all things were One. How, then, would you arrive at the number Two? (If you say by simply adding two Ones together, you are forgetting that there is only one One; therefore, the operation that you are suggesting is not possible in this scheme. Try again.) Sooner or later you would realize that the only way for One to become Two is by division, that is, by One splitting itself in half. What are the ramifications of this

act? If One divides itself into Two, then where is the One? Which of the halves of the One is the original One? Both? Neither? Is there a One any longer, or has that One become just one more . . .

Consider further the nature of Two. Two, thus created (by division), contains within it the potentiality of both the same and the different: the same, in that all of it is composed of the One, though technically it loses its quality of Oneness, totality, and unity, once the other is born. Though the other is a copy exactly like the original One, by its mere existence, it cannot be the same as the original One, so in its own act of separation, One simultaneously creates the different, and the One disappears.

A logical consequence of this procedure would create a numerical system, and through *it*, worlds would be created. The names in these worlds, the descriptions of the things in these worlds, the appropriation of forms in these worlds would all be subject to and the result of this simple act of One becoming Many, yet few of us who'd spend our lives counting, naming, reproducing all these things in all these worlds, would probably ever ask the questions, "What would make One want to be Many?", "How does the Many arise from One?", and finally, "Is there a path back to that original unity of the beginning?"

If a cosmological system were to begin with such a unity as One, of which everything is a refracted part, there would be a natural affinity among all the parts, and each part would thus be seen as an individual piece in the larger scheme of things, though each dismembered piece would contain all of the same essentials as the One, save its unity. Once this necessary link were established between the parts and the whole, then the possibility would exist for transformation, communion, and finally, immersion among the parts, and theoretically, at least, even a return to the whole, the unity.

Imagine the consequences of a world thus created. Everything manifest would of necessity be a copy of that which exists within the One, though the One would be much more than each of the elements thus manifested. Since each part would be a copy, then the One would of necessity be the only original. Thus it follows that the original never manifests; that what is seen would only be merely a copy of the original, because it possesses all the parts *but not the whole* or the unity of the original. This means, then, that true reality would exist only in the realm of the unmanifest, that is, in the One. Conversely, illusion would be that which is *seen* in the world of manifested forms, as seemingly independent, disparate entities.

How, then, could any part of the whole experience its origins while still remaining only a part of the whole? And if it were possible to make this journey into wholeness, what would be left of the part? What would have to be sacrificed to achieve this unity? And what would be gained?

“The mysteries of being,” evident in these questions, instigated the lifelong quests and the traveled paths of the great mystics of humanity, from Pythagoras to Buddha, to the Christ; and their searches for the link to that original unity marked for the rest of us a continuous lifeline back to the source from which all of life arises. This book provides the map of their journeys, through the study of myth as the universal epistemological foundation of all human experience and the human faculty of imagination that creates myth. Though each traveler forged his or her own path through the landscapes of the soul to this destination of unity, the human faculty of imagination provided the necessary vehicle for each of them in their individual travels. Through the practice and exercises of imagining, they each verified, albeit via independent paths, that the possibility exists for the part to experience the One; without imagining, however, not even the possibility exists.

## *The Problem with One*

That all things arise from the One was a tenet universally acknowledged among early cultures,<sup>1</sup> though the One was envisioned in many ways. For the Greeks, the One was Chaos, the realm of undifferentiated possibility from which all things are born and to which all things return. Later, that force was personified in the goddess Hestia, whose divine fire provided enlightenment, though her fire itself could not be seen. The ancient Hindus embodied this essential unity as Asat, the realm of nonexistence as the following passage describes:

Then there was neither existence nor non-  
existence:  
Neither the world nor the sky that lies  
beyond it;  
What was covered? And where? And who  
gave it protection?  
Was there water, deep and unfathomable?  
Neither was there death nor immortality,  
Nor any sign of night or day.  
The One breathed without air by self-impulse;  
Other than that was nothing whatsoever.<sup>2</sup>

Later, this unity was envisioned as the goddess Kali, whose three manifestations as creator, preserver, and destroyer are described in the following:

You are the original of all manifestations; you are  
the birthplace of even us; you know the whole  
world, yet none know you . . . you are both subtle  
and gross, manifested and veiled, formless, yet with  
form . . . Resuming after dissolution your own

form, dark and formless, you alone remain as One ineffable and inconceivable . . . though yourself with beginning . . . you are the beginning of all, creator, protector and destroyer.<sup>3</sup>

To begin with the One seems obvious, yet our culture seems to have obstructed the beautiful simplicity of this worldview. Of course the introduction of Zero into the numerical system appears to be at least part of the problem, since it introduces the possibility of nonexistence as "the absence of" rather than "the fullness of," and this distinction necessarily leads to the converse conclusion that existence, then, is that which can be counted and that nonexistence is that which cannot be counted and, therefore, *does not exist*.<sup>4</sup>

Now suppose that we named One, "God." By the criteria of ancient cultures, that is, those who see One as the origin of things, the name of God, as well as all the attributes of God, would remain the same as if we were to call One "Chaos" or "Asat" or "Hestia" or "Kali." Think for a moment of what would happen to God, though, in a system where Zero is the beginning. God here would not be One; he would merely be one more, if anything at all.

Now imagine that a cosmological system were to be derived from Zero, and not One. How could it possibly be apprehended? Certain precepts would first have to be posited, namely that somewhere, somehow, something *became*. In order to posit this, simultaneously, we must also posit that there was a beginning, namely, a marked moment when something came of nothing. This event then would herald in the conception of historical precedence, namely, of time as we know it. Following this further, since the possibility existed for one thing to randomly occur as arising from nothing into something, the possibility exists for anything to independently occur in this manner. Thus two principles could now be derived from this scheme:

- That each thing is independent unto itself.
- That that which is, is that which manifests.

Imagine now a world based upon these principles. The beginning, middle, and end of things would be determined only by those things themselves. Communal efforts would merely mean the consensus of individual things acting in communion for their common benefit, which, of course, would be the preservation of their individuality. There would be no need of justification for action, nor would there be criteria for action in favor of one manner over another. If things *could* be done, or created, they *would* be. Finally, there would probably be an inexhaustible struggle for stability, immobility, and preservation of things, since all that would constitute existence would be things that are manifest; therefore, the dissolution of the manifested form would constitute its cessation. Then death would mark the end point of the existence of the thing, after which time it would once again become nothing.

The human faculties allow for both of the above interpretations, and therefore embodiments, of the cosmos. Using the faculty of cognition (including systems of logic; inductive, deductive, and transcendental methods, etc.; and the intuitions derived from them), worlds are created by positing the existence of things, in much the same manner as was done when attempting to create a world by beginning with Zero. The imagination, which is only a faculty of creation, works by taking as a given, that the origin of all things is One. No human is free without the capacity to exercise both of these human faculties, yet our faculty of imagination, for whatever reason, has become all but eradicated from the realm of human possibilities, and with it our hope for true freedom. It is time to recall our imaginative capacities, before we are no longer able to do so. It is time to recover myth from the recesses of our dusty souls.

## *How These Two Models Operate*

The simplest description of how these two models operate and are distinguished from one another is discussed by Ernest McClain in the following passage:

There are two different and contradictory (epistemological) models grounding the meaning of sentences, cultures, and whole philosophies. One model takes sight and its criteria as the primary organizer of sensation. On a model of sight a language of substance is born to communicate exactly what the model had previously established: atomic things and events, within a visual space ruled by fixed coordinates of space and time. On the model of sound . . . a language is born for communication which emphasizes perspectives not of the same fixed object, but of a multitude of relations which must appear for any object seemingly to appear.<sup>5</sup>

McClain here is articulating a distinction discovered by Antonio de Nicolas in his work on the early Hindu texts of the Rg Veda. This distinction between aural and visual epistemological models is the foundation of the varying approaches in our previously discussed models (of creation by the One and creation by Zero).

The model of creation by the One is the aural model.<sup>6</sup> This model produces mythology, geometry, alchemy, polytheism, music, mysticism, and enlightenment through revelation. The model of creation by Zero is the literary model. It is responsible for theology, algebra, biology, monotheism, visual art, asceticism, and knowledge through the appropriation of data. Humanity needs both models. Our modern culture has focused on the skills necessary to produce only the latter

model. A simple journey through history reveals that this struggle between these two worldviews is not new.

### *Historical Glimpses*

While our modern emphasis on the literary (Zero) model is a direct result of the scientific revolution brought about in the end of the sixteenth century,<sup>7</sup> prior to that time, traces of this epistemological worldview appeared as lapses in the overall development of many cultures. I should like briefly to discuss some occasions of these lapses in particular: in ancient Egypt, during the Armana period; and in Greece, through the philosophical works of Aristotle.

The Armana period of Egyptian culture was marked by the reign of the heretic king Akhenaten (1372–55). Akhenaten,<sup>8</sup> who was formerly named Amenhotep IV, instituted perhaps the greatest religious revolution in ancient times by declaring the supremacy of the god Aten (solar disc) to the exclusion of all the other gods, especially the deity Amen (the hidden one). Prior to the reign of Akhenaten, Egyptian religion, though diverse in its iconographical expression, tended toward viewing the universe on the model of the One:

Ancient Egyptian speculation about the origin and nature of the universe . . . strongly tended towards explaining the apparent plurality of the cosmos in terms of an underlying unity. One system, . . . 'Heliopolitan,' opted for Atum, . . . the one; . . . the Memphite system exalted 'Heart' as the primal element; . . . Hermopolis described the primal element as the infinite . . . completely hidden.<sup>9</sup>

Akhenaten's god, however, was not like these deities. Where the others boasted of their god as being the "*One from*



which all things come," Akhenaten's Aten was known as the "unique creator of all things."<sup>10</sup> While the other deities were given epithets such as the "hidden one," Aten was the "visible one" (the physical sun in the sky). Aten had no myths, no anthropomorphic artistic rendering, few epithets. In fact, Aten was an exclusive deity, as is evidenced by Akhenaten's orders to deface temples of other deities, to all but eliminate temple acts and offerings to other deities, to discard mythology, and to remove the importance of the eschatological literature.

Finally, and most importantly for our discussion, Akhenaten's reign is marked by a change in the hieroglyphic style and artistic style.<sup>11</sup> Words tended to be written phonetically, rather than pictographically, and the artistic rendering of the sun disk was effectively static: the god of the sun did not change his shape, he did not manifest in any other way than the manner in which he appears in the sky; in short, he represented stability, permanence, and unyielding omnipotence. This shift is a major divergence from the cultural norm of ancient Egypt.

And if one thinks that this mind-set of a unique, creator god was eradicated with the destruction of Akhenaten's reign, one ought to read the writings of St. Augustine, who seems to have taken up Akhenaten's view in interpreting his own Christian God:

What did God make before he made heaven and earth? . . . I say that our God is the Creator of every creature: and if by the name 'heaven and earth' every creature is understood; I boldly say, that before God made heaven and earth, he did not make anything.<sup>12</sup>

God here is clearly depicted through the "Zero model" worldview. As an entity outside of creation, unlike the One, he remains detached and separate from his orphaned creations. There is no link among his creations except for the fact

that they were all created by him, albeit independently of each other. In other words, each created being has affinity only to its creator, of which the creation is *not* a part. And God, in this model, is merely the artificer of forms that are created in space/time, and then later in time, he is the destroyer of those forms that he created.

What seems to have contributed to this strange shift from the One model to the Zero model in the field of religious enquiry is the human technological shift from the ear to the eye as the primary organizer of sensation, as the following examples shall show.

Ancient Greek thought from the time of Homer to the time of Plato was grounded on the model of the One, though as in Egyptian culture, there were many varied representations of this belief: Hesiod named it "Chaos," the Ionians applied various elemental appellations to it, Empedocles and Pythagoras simply referred to it as "the One," and Plato *named this force* "God."<sup>13</sup> Implicit in these renderings is the notion that the realm of the One is the source of all things, yet *it*, strictly speaking, has no form.

Knowledge, therefore, was seen as a result of training to re-create and thereby establish the continuity of an *act* similar to that act performed by the One. That is, the means of obtaining knowledge was through the experience of action. The evidence of the relative worth of the experience was apparent in the manifested form.<sup>14</sup> All of this was changed by Aristotle due to two of his philosophical allegations.

The first shift has to do with Aristotle's introduction of and preoccupation with substance, which led him to the fatal conclusion that *being was substance*.<sup>15</sup> Following this, it is not difficult to see how his next query established a necessary link to this one that completed his philosophical quest. That is, that knowledge, then, became equated with explanation about substances. Thus, what Aristotle amputated from philosophical speculation, namely, the experiential source of knowledge through acts of the *doer*, was replaced with a system of cate-

gorization and classification of things through the criteria of logic. *Knowledge* then was reduced to *knowing about*.<sup>16</sup>

It must be noted, in all fairness, that Aristotle himself was not rejecting the earlier oral worldview by his philosophical methodology; in fact, he acknowledged the necessity of both. It is the later philosophical thinkers who applied *this method to the exclusion of others*, who are responsible for the present state of affairs. Perhaps the clearest example of such a thinker is René Descartes,<sup>17</sup> whose first *Discourse on Optics* heralds the dawning of the visual (Zero) model, with its emphasis on sight as the primary sense, and his introduction of the mathematical model (with emphasis on measure and order) as the universal determinant of knowledge.

Each of the above examples from history points to the origins of certain elements in the embodiment of the Zero model: the preference for stability and permanence over mobility and change; the emphasis on things that are seen as the source of knowledge and not on the acts performed to create them; and finally, the belief in nonexistence as the source to which all things return. Taken as a whole, these glimpses from history reveal humanity's attempts to superimpose their own wills onto the larger scheme of the cosmos, in an effort to control or perhaps disguise the underlying truth that all things arise from the One, including themselves.

### *The One Made Myth versus Zero Made Theory*

The model of the One takes for granted the necessity of the fourfold acts of *maia*, *mythos*, *mimesis*, and *logos*; in fact, the earliest myth cycle evident in almost all cultures, that of the triple goddess, outlines how the goddess in her four aspects and three forms fashions the model of all creation. The goddess, through the pattern of the lunar cycle, forms cosmos and then dissolves it back to Chaos, in an everflowing cycle of life, death, and rebirth. In this myth system, what we modern

interpreters might term a “creator deity” is made only in the second phase of the cycle and is given a form only in the mimetic third phase of the cycle. And in the fourth phase of her cycle, this deity is sacrificed back to maia, his original mother.

Reinterpreting this cycle from a Zero perspective, namely, from one that focuses on forms, things, objects, and not the power of creation, it is easy to see how this mimetic “creation of forms” phase could be misread or overemphasized to reduce all of creation to the forms created, thereby raising the status of the mimetic creator deity (demiurge) to sole, omnipotent, omniscient (male) deity. This is what occurs when a logos theory of interpretation is superimposed on creation myths. In effect, what occurs is that, as we stated in the Introduction, the mimetic act serves as the origin of logos; therefore, the creative act of maia disappears altogether (since the focus in this phase is on cataloging the mimetic forms in order to derive theories), and what is left is a theory about how some creative demiurge “out there” (separate and distinct from ourselves and his creations) made forms out of nothing! This theory is easily verified, through a total (mis)interpretation of the original mythos, and this serves as the origin of the theory of creation—entirely abstracted from the mimetic phase and totally devoid of individual human experience.

So that the reader may see, at a glance, how these two models operate, I present the original triple-goddess myth cycle to clarify both the role of maia, the mother as creator; and the role of logos, the absent father as the surrogate usurper of the same role. The models of the One and the Zero will then become starkly evident.

### *Revisioning the Triple Goddess*

The mysteries of maia are embodied in the myths of the goddess, manifested in her three forms. As the triple aspects of virgin, mother, crone, she is the universal archetype for the

creation, preservation, and dissolution of worlds. She is the metamorphosing lunar sphere; she is the yonic triangle; she is the One in Three, the perfect "form" of transformation, the original Trinity.

Every ancient culture revered the goddess in her triple manifestations. In India, she was Kali-Ma; the Druids called her "Diana triformis"; in ancient Etruria, she was "Uni" (a cognate of *Yoni*); in Egypt she was called "Isis." Every aspect of the divine feminine as creator, preserver, and destroyer of forms was made present to the members of these cultures through the sacred mystery practices, and these practices have been preserved for us through the mythic tradition. The difficulty, of course, is in our lack of expertise in "reading" the myths within this context of maia, as the source of creation.

### *The Four and the Three*

There are four phases of the triple-goddess myth cycle. These phases correspond cosmically to the acts of maia, mythos, mimesis, and logos; naturally, to the phases of the moon; and biologically, to the rhythm of woman. What is of vital importance is that these myths, while appearing to mark a path of degeneration, actually recall a cyclical process of creation, preservation, and dissolution. Therefore, the seemingly destructive phase of logos, in this model, is in actuality a mythic description of the return back to the original unity of the One.

#### *Phase One: Chaos, Golden Age, New Moon, Maia*

The new moon is that phase in the lunar cycle where there is no manifested form of the moon visible. This lack of definite form places the empirical moon in the realm of potentiality. Since it does not contain any particular form (which

would be subject to dissolution), it is, at this stage in the cycle, in the state of Chaos, of “undifferentiated possibility.” Because the gravitational force of the moon, during this phase, is operating in conjunction with that of the sun (as it relates to earth), this phase corresponds to the mythic Golden Age, the cosmic season of eternal spring.

The goddess in this phase is usually described in terms of her powers of action rather than by physical description. Here she is revered as that most sacred, nameless power: maia.

### *Phase Two: The Virgin, the Androgyne, Mythos*

The second phase of the goddess myth corresponds to the lunar cycle with the appearance of the crescent moon, the “horns of Diana,” the first manifested form of the moon. In this phase the goddess is the virgin, created by the “breaking open” of the One. Here the gravitational forces of sun and moon begin to struggle against each other in their relationship to the earth; hence, the emergence of the opposites: positive/negative, male/female, darkness/light. As the first “image” of the One, the virgin is the manifested shadow of the perfect one: she is the realm of potentiality *in fluid form*, of mythos. As the moon moves toward its half phase, the virgin and her opposite male “twin” (as in the case of Artemis and Apollo) represent the mythic division of the One and, simultaneously, the dissolution of the original unity, now that manifestation has taken place. Each aspect of the duality screams out its individuation. They are two equal aspects vying against one another for permanence of form. In the cosmic cycle, this aspect represents the mythic time when the world becomes divided into two seasons, winter and summer. For the first time, vegetation must die to be reborn.

Myths recounting the virgin aspect of the triple goddess depict her as the androgynous youth Artemis, who rivals her brother Apollo in skill with the quiver and bow, who roams

about in the forests protecting the hunted and hunter alike. Sometimes the virgin is the warrior goddess Athena, born armed with a warrior's garb, whose sole concerns are to offer strategic counsel in warfare and promote logical wisdom among the populace. These goddesses do not concern themselves with issues of creation; they are stagnant vestiges of the awakening of the I. The virgin aspect is the One realizing her own reflection and, being mesmerized by her power to create such a beautiful form, seeking to preserve it at all costs.

### *Phase Three: Full Moon, Mother/Lover, Mimesis*

The sexual union of the opposites yields the "mirror image" of the One; namely, a mimetic re-creation of a manifested form that embodies the qualities of the One, *except that it is manifest* and is thereby subject to decay and dissolution. This is geometrically imagined by the circle of the full moon. The full moon represents the fecundation of the virgin through the infusion of the male, who at the moment of conception loses his own identity and "dies," that is, loses his form. Likewise, in this act the virgin sacrifices her individuation; however, not by killing herself, but merely by removing her shadow and allowing the male to return to her. Thus, for transformational creation to occur, the male must die through dismemberment; the female must re-create him through love. This phase only comes about when the virgin turns away from the mirror of I and sees that all she lacks, to return to the unity of the beginning, is her distance from her twin. The male, to effectuate this phase, recognizes the temporality of his form and realizes that only in his own dismemberment shall there be a hope for his own immortality, and thereby assents to the act. Unless this occurs, the progeny of these two opposites yields more stagnant, forms created as shadows, not of the original One, but merely as shadows of the *forms* of their parents.

This is the mimetic phase where the reunion of the opposites yields a new, creative element of changeable, material form. In this age the children of the cosmic "opposites" begin to war with one another, fighting for possession of the forms. There is also born in this act, however, the heroes: male children born out of the fusion of immortal and mortal (that is, children born from the dismemberment of the male element: the forms made of the reflected light of the sun and the maia power of the female). These are the children who effectuate the transformation of the cycle back to its original unity.

The strongest mythical references to this third phase usually involve the abduction of the triple goddess in her virgin aspect by the god of death, or a dying hero who is brought back to life by his female consort, who is usually depicted as the bride of death or goddess of the underworld. Here all the references to death and dismemberment and then resurrection become evident. The most famous myths of these types are those of Hades and Persephone and Isis and Osiris. In both cases, the male/female dualities are siblings/lovers who restore the continuity of creation through their mimetic acts of dismemberment and re-creation.

The other aspect of this phase occurs after the goddess gives birth to her child, usually a son, who is made in the "image" of her (absent) lover, the sun. Variations on the myths of the goddess in this phase occasionally have her mating with this son/lover. These myths refer to the same act as above, except "the mother" here refers to the goddess as the original *manifested* One; therefore, the male counterpart in the act of creation would be considered her son, not her twin. Since the aspect of the full moon is the exact opposite of the new moon, this inversion to son/mother replaces the duality of opposites of the second phase. In this phase, however, the absent partner is the masculine paternal force, while in the second phase the absent partner is the feminine One. This is the portion of the triple-goddess myth that becomes most troublesome: Does the full moon then symbolize the *hieros gamos* (the re-



turn of the two halves back to the unity of the beginning), or does it represent the birth of the child of the cosmic pair (sun and moon); and is it therefore an exaltation of the sun, the son of the sun on earth?

In the maia model, the full moon represents *both* the *hieros gamos* and the birth of the son, for both are necessary components for the goddess cycle to continue. At the full moon phase, the male and the female elements of the opposites are both sacrificed back to the One, maia (thus the “circle” of immortality), in order to re-create—in this case the son. When, however, the epistemological paradigm shifts from the One to the Zero model, the full moon represents *only* the son: the “image” that is similar to but not like his father, the physical form of the sun. Thus the son rules over the sub-lunar, mortal realm as his father rules over the celestial one.

From this moment on, then, the son begins his journey of sacrifice, which is described in our discussion of the next phase. How this sacrifice is interpreted and to whom he is sacrificed, however, depend upon the model, once again. In the Zero model, which focuses on the form of the son, the son is sacrificed back to his father, the original light. In the One model, the son is sacrificed to his original mother, maia.

### *Phase Four: Crone, Iron Age, Waning Moon, Logos*

This final phase of the triple-goddess myth cycle is perhaps the most misunderstood and has done the most damage to the modern psyche. From exotic images of flesh-eating hags devouring corpses of young (male) children to myths of mothers crying helplessly as their sons are being taken away to die, the iconographic and mythic depictions of this final phase of the lunar/goddess cycle has been popularly dubbed the “doomsday” aspect. As the moon slowly begins its return back

to the new phase, one observes that its image begins to deteriorate from the ripe fullness of the glowing orb, to the half moon, to the crescent, and then finally back to formlessness. This seemingly degenerative portion of the lunar cycle is in reality simply a return of the moon back to the position of regeneration, back to the new-moon phase. It is not the ultimate dissolution of the moon herself; rather, it is the dissolution of the old cycle and, simultaneously, the culmination of the new cycle.

Interpreting this cycle from the Zero perspective, however, this fourth phase is truly destructive, and the goddess is truly the evil, devouring hag, the threat to her son, since the son's life (his stagnant form) has to be sacrificed to atone for her cycle of birth and death. Of course, by the model of the One, both are sacrificed back to maia, their common source.

In the ancient myths of the ages of the world, this aspect was known as the Iron Age, when sons were not safe from mothers, friends were not safe from friends, and the entire world was on the brink of total disaster, by either a cataclysmic flood or a fire. In short, the "form" of the world cycle was degenerating back into its chaotic state. Of course, the implications in ancient times was that this occurred in order that the world would once again begin anew; however, we, as modern readers with a linear conception of time (as opposed to the cyclical time of the ancients), erroneously see this phase as Armageddon, the final, decisive battle. In actuality, without the dissolution of every existent form, the hope for the return to the perfection of the One is an unattainable goal; hence the destructive phase.

The goddess in this final phase is the crone, the woman beyond the age of childbearing, the mirror of the virgin in her negative (that is, dormant) phase of creativity. She is once again androgynous, as is the virgin; however, she now becomes identified not with the absent feminine creative One, but with the absent *male* consort with whom she had created her son. Thus, this is a cycle of total death and dismember-

ment. The son has to return back to his mother for there to be any hope of regeneration; however, their union is impossible because the soil is no longer fruit bearing. The result is that both the son and the crone must be sacrificed back to the One, the original mother (of which the crone is merely a reflection, as the son is the reflection of the father, the sun). These are the myths of Kali, the devourer of men; of the hunters being dismembered by the goddess in the mountains; of the savior sons being hung upon the crosses of materiality; of the universal floods and universal fires, the cosmic equalizers.

As the last vestiges of the old cycle fade into the black night, and the shades of all manifested forms bewail their unhappy fate of returning to the darkness of the moon, only the worshipers of the triple goddess sit together quietly, in the darkness, confidently awaiting the reemergence of the cosmic mother.

### *Vestiges of the Lunar Cycle*

The use of the lunar paradigm continued and was transformed as various mythic retellings of the original experience of the triple goddess. The vestiges of this original lunar paradigm are evident in virtually every hero myth, as well as in myths of male mortals or demigods who perform sacrifices eternally in the underworld. The Greek myths are replete with such examples; the names of the characters reveal startling clues as to the origins of the themes of their tales. Examples of moon goddesses who are involved with heroes include Alcmena ("power of the moon"), mother of Heracles; Semele (from *Selene*, "moon"), mother of Dionysos; Io ("moon"), mother of Epaphus; Pasiphae ("she who shines for all"), mother of the minotaur ("moon bull"); Europa ("full moon"), mother of King Minos ("belonging to the moon"); Jocasta ("shining moon"), mother and wife of Oedipus; Phoebe ("bright moon"). Then there are the lunar males of

myth: Menander (“moon man”); Endymion (“seduced moon man”); Ixion (“strong moon man”); Menelaus (“moon lord”); Orion (“moon man of the mountain”). There are also numerous references to the moon as maia power (“insight,” wisdom), the most famous of which is personified in the goddess Metis, mother of Athena, whom Zeus swallowed whole when she was pregnant with his child. He reputedly did this because an oracle told him that if Metis gave birth to a son, the son would overpower him, taking over Zeus’s function as lord of the sky and earth (again reflecting the lunar cycle).

It is also interesting that this mythic vestige occurs in many non-Greek sources as well: Almah (“moon woman”), Hebrew; Zemelo (Cybele, “moon incarnation”), Phrygia; Nana (“moon”), mother of the savior Attis, Uruk; Chimalman (mother of the Aztec savior, Quetzalcontl); Hina (“moon”), Polynesia. Even the famous Chaldeans of antiquity reflect this cycle: their name means “moon worshipers.”

In short, the mythic phase of the fourfold path of creation (maia, mythos, mimesis, and logos) is verified in these voluminous retellings of the same maia experience of the lunar cycle.

The mimetic phase of our lunar paradigm is evidenced by the birth of ritual reenactments by the people of this universal lunar cycle, for their purpose of uncovering that “as above, so below”: as the lunar cycle begins, transforms, grows, and dies only to be reborn, so do all things, including ourselves. Thus were the mysteries born, and myths of the earth and water, vegetation, agriculture, and finally eschatology. And with the birth of these rituals came the birth of logos.

In the original lunar paradigm, the logos is the savior son; the “form” created by the opposites (sun and moon) in a re-creation (mimetic expression) of the return to unity (maia). His number is four, because he represents the fourth level of creation (manifestation); the four elements (all of which must