

University of Groningen

Orphic Cosmogonies in the Pseudo-Clementines? Textual Relationship, Character and Sources of Homilies 6.3-13 and Recognitions 10.17-19.30

Roig Lanzillotta, Lautaro

Published in:
The Pseudo-Clementines

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:
2010

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Roig Lanzillotta, L. (2010). Orphic Cosmogonies in the Pseudo-Clementines? Textual Relationship, Character and Sources of Homilies 6.3-13 and Recognitions 10.17-19.30. In J. N. Bremmer (Ed.), *The Pseudo-Clementines* (10 ed., pp. 115-141). (Studies on Early Christian Apocrypha; No. 10). Peeters.

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

one's own type of food from that of the sacrificial cuisine, rather than separating normal meals from sacral ones⁶². In the meal of bread and water one concretizes to live holily (*H* 8.13.1), and the meal as a Eucharist is opposed to partaking from sacrificial meals.

In short, the manna represents the ascetic, pure meals of the author, as the realization par excellence of holy life and of serving God. Any form of deviating from this pure meal, either by eating in excess, eating luxuriously, or eating meat, is potentially harmful, and is paramount to worshipping the demons. Whereas the basic opposition is between manna and meat, the author intensifies the contrast with the reference to the giants' cannibalism, as a hyperbolic condemnation of all those who crave for more than the manna.

Reusing the Watcher Myth

The author of *H* 8 has thoroughly transformed the Enochic Watcher myth. We still recognize the overall narrative structure as found in *BW*, and *H* 8.14 on the teachings of the Watchers shares many details with the account of *BW*. Yet, neither the Watchers nor their teachings have any real significance in the author's retelling. Moreover, the author does not import the so-called Enochic paradigm of a supernatural or demoniac origin of evil, but, on the contrary, emphasizes human free will.

Like other early Christian texts, the author has found in the Enochic Watcher myth an explanation for the origin of the demons. But unlike those other texts, the author saw a connection between the demons and the specific detail of the Watcher myth that tells that the giants devoured men and drank blood, and focused on that relation. For the author, the story about the demons, their gigantic origin and their present influence, was essentially a story about the pure and impure consumption of food, and he has rewritten the story from this perspective, whilst summarizing the peripheral details of the original myth in *H* 8.14⁶³.

New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers (Oxford, 2005) 135-63.

⁶² McGowan, *Ascetic Eucharists*, 197-8.

⁶³ Thanks are due to Wout van Bekkum, Nicole Kelley, Hindy Najman, Mladen Popović, Svetla Slaveva-Griffin, and Kevin Vaccarella, who read and commented on this paper.

VII. Orphic Cosmogonies in the *Pseudo-Clementines*? Textual Relationship, Character and Sources of *Homilies* 6.3-13 and *Recognitions* 10.17-19.30

LAUTARO ROIG LANZILLOTTA

The last two decades have seen great advances in our knowledge and understanding of the Orphic world view. Studies by Burkert, West, Brisson, and Bernabé have contributed to enlarging our overall view of the Orphic ideas and to clarifying numerous details¹, and provided us with such new insights that a historian of Greek religion such as Jan Bremmer rightly calls this improvement 'nothing less than spectacular'². To these erudite analyses should be added the publication, in 2004-2007, of what long will be the edition of the *Orphicorum et orphicis similibus testimonia et fragmenta*³. Indeed, the

¹ M.L. West, *The Orphic Poems* (Oxford, 1983); L. Brisson, *Orphée et l'Orphisme dans l'Antiquité gréco-romaine* (London, 1995); A. Bernabé, many studies: 'Consideraciones sobre una teogonía órfica', *Actas del VIII Congreso Español de Estudios Clásicos (Madrid, 23 al 28 de septiembre de 1991)* (Madrid, 1994) 91-100; 'Tendencias recientes en el estudio del orfismo', *Ællu, revista de ciencias de las religiones* 0 (1995) 23-32; 'Orfismo y Pitagorismo', in C. García Gual (ed.), *Historia de la Filosofía Antigua* (Madrid, 1997) 73-88; 'Elementos orientales en el Orfismo', in J.-L. Cunchillos et al. (eds.), *Actas del Congreso 'El Mediterráneo en la Antigüedad: Oriente y Occidente, Sapanu. Publicaciones en Internet II* (1998) [<http://www.labherm.filol.csic.es>]; W. Burkert, *Kleine Schriften III: Mystica, Orphica, Pythagorica*. ed. F. Graf (Göttingen, 2006).

² J.N. Bremmer, *Greek Religion* (Oxford, 1999²) 86.

³ A. Bernabé Pajares, *Poetae epici graeci. Testimonia et fragmenta*, Pars II, fasc. 1-2: *Orphicorum et orphicis similibus testimonia et*

scrupulousness and exhaustiveness of the edition by Alberto Bernabé is a silent but categorical answer to West's probably gratuitous, but certainly disrespectful opinion that scholars of Southern Europe should refrain from producing new textual editions⁴.

Today, therefore, we are much better equipped than we were some years ago to attempt a new approach to the two so-called 'Orphic cosmogonies' included in the *Pseudo-Clementines*. The first of them appears in chapters 3 to 13 of the sixth book of the *Homilies* and is a part of Apion's discourse in his attempt to defend paganism against Clement, his Jewish and anti-pagan discussion partner⁵. The second version of the Orphic cosmogony appears in the *Recognitions*, more precisely, in Clement's speech in chapters 17 to 19 and in chapter 30 of the tenth book. These passages have been dealt with rather extensively on two occasions, but the results of these studies are, in my opinion, unsatisfactory⁶. On the one hand, the influence of the view that these texts are entirely Stoic speculation has dominated the investigation so far⁷; on the other, the Orphic known material was not as rich as it is nowadays, and the lack of parallels impeded a proper textual comparison.

fragmenta (Munich and –Leipzig, 2004-2005); fasc. 3: *Musaeus – Linus – Epimenides – Papyrus Derveni – Indices* (Berlin, 2007). I quote the Orphic fragments (= *OF*) from this splendid edition.

⁴ M.L. West, *Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique Applicable to Greek and Latin Texts* (Stuttgart, 1973) 61.

⁵ For Apion see Bremmer, this volume, Chapter V.3.

⁶ J. van Amersfoort, 'Traces of an Alexandrian Orphic Theogony in the *Pseudo-Clementines*', in R. van den Broek and M.J. Vermaseren (eds), *Studies in Gnosticism and Hellenistic Religions Presented to Gilles Quispel on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday* (Leiden, 1981) 13-30; L. Brisson, 'Orphée et l' Orphisme à l' époque impériale. Temoignages et interprétations philosophiques, de Plutarque à Jamblique', *ANRW* II.36.4 (Berlin and New York, 1990) 2867-2931 [Reprinted in *Orphée et l'Orphisme* IV] at 2902-14.

⁷ See West, *The Orphic Poems*, 182; Brisson, 'Orphée et l' Orphisme', 2904, 2911-12. See also E. Albrile, 'L'uovo de la fenice: aspetti di un sincretismo orfico-gnostico', *Le Muséon* 113 (2000) 55-85 at 65-66. Against this view, see below note 45.

Both sections of the *Pseudo-Clementines* are rather problematic and pose several questions to the investigator. The first concerns the texts themselves, since both versions are far from presenting analogous accounts of the cosmogony in question. As a matter of fact, they include rather diverging stories of what in both cases are declared to be 'Orphic' cosmogonies. Are these accounts compatible with one another? Do both or either of these cosmogonies really include 'Orphic' issues? Or do they simply recall the name of Orpheus in order to endow their narration with authority?

The second question regards the relationship between the *Homilies* and the *Recognitions*. Given the important conceptual and structural differences in both content and form of the accounts, one may rightly wonder whether the texts are nothing more than independent versions of a common source, which they transform according to their own purposes, or whether they are dependent upon each other.

Last but not least, there is an important question that concerns the Orphic cosmogony itself. Was the original version of the cosmogony in the *Pseudo-Clementines* a mix of different Orphic traditions or ideas, or can we trace it back to one of the various Orphic cosmogonies that circulated in Late Antiquity?

In an attempt to give a proper answer to at least these three questions, this exposition is divided into three sections. The first part addresses the contents and character of the relevant texts in order to determine whether in either case we are dealing with an 'Orphic' cosmogony at all. The second part provides a textual analysis that may distinguish original issues, that is, issues proceeding from the 'Orphic' source, from additions by the authors of the *Pseudo-Clementines*. The third one attempts to link it with its Orphic model.

1. The 'Orphic' Cosmogonies in the *Pseudo-Clementines*

Of the two known Orphic cosmogonic traditions, namely the cosmogony according to which Night was in the beginning and the so-called cosmogony of the primordial Egg, the cosmogonies included in the *Pseudo-Clementines* clearly belong to the second group. Both versions not only avoid any reference to Night but also pay particular attention to the appearance and development of the primordial Egg and Phanes.

1.1. *The Cosmogony of Homilies 6.3-13*

The version in *H* 6.3-13 has been preserved in Greek and is, perhaps, the more interesting of the two, since it presents a more detailed and lengthier cosmogonical account. We can divide this cosmogony into three sections. The first deals with the primeval period with its chaotic and confused matter (6.3-4); the second section narrates the appearance of order and the production of the capacious Egg out of which Phanes came forth (6.5-6). The third, finally, describes the further generation of various elements of reality and the gods (6.6-10)⁸.

A. Primordial matter before Time is born

After a short introduction, the first part of our text proceeds to describe the primeval state before the appearance of the tangible world. The text is introduced by Apion as the narration describing the primeval Chaos, although the alleged Orphic quotation does not actually mention Chaos but simply the primordial matter out of which, in due time, the world would appear. It is the state in which Time has not yet been born and substance is in want of order:

τῆς τετραγενοῦς ὕλης ἐμφύχου οὐσης καὶ ὄλου ἀπείρου τινὸς βυθοῦ ἀεὶ ῥέοντος καὶ ἀκρίτως φερομένου καὶ μυρίας ἀτελεῖς κράσεις [εἰς] ἄλλοτε ἄλλως ἐπαναχέοντος καὶ διὰ τοῦτο αὐτὰς ἀναλύοντος τῇ ἀταξίᾳ, καὶ κεληνότος ὡς εἰς γένεσιν ζῶου δεθῆναι μὴ δυναμένου⁹.

This matter, of four kinds, and endowed with life, was an entire infinite abyss, so to speak, in eternal stream, borne about without order, and forming every now and then countless but ineffectual combinations (which therefore it dissolved again from want of order); ripe indeed, but not able to be bound so as to generate a living creature¹⁰.

⁸ See Brisson, 'Orphée et l' Orphisme', 2904-07.

⁹ *H* 6.4.1 = *OF* 104.

¹⁰ English translations according to J. Donaldson, in A. Roberts and J. Donaldson (eds), *Ante-Nicene Christian Library*, vol. XVII: *The Clementine Homilies. The Apostolical Constitutions* (Edinburgh, 1890).

Although the original matter seems to have all necessary elements to produce a living being, for it is endowed with life, moves (streams) and is ripe, creation is still impeded by its lack of order. This is provided for in the next portion of text. The disorderly stage of the primeval matter is followed by the appearance of order, which induces a regular movement to matter, thus creating the suitable context for generation:

συνέβη ποτέ, αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἀπείρου πελάγους ὑπὸ ἰδίας φύσεως περιωθουμένου, κινήσει φυσικῇ εὐτάκτως ῥυθῆναι ἀπὸ τοῦ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ αὐτὸ ὡσπερ ἴλιγγα καὶ μίξαι τὰς οὐσίας, καὶ οὕτως ἐξ ἐκάστου τῶν πάντων τὸ νοστιμώτατον, ὅπερ πρὸς γένεσιν ζῶου ἐπιτηδειότατον ἦν, ὡσπερ ἐν χώνῃ κατὰ μέσου ῥυθῆναι τοῦ παντός καὶ ὑπὸ τῆς πάντα φερούσης ἴλιγγος χωρῆσαι εἰς βάθος καὶ τὸ περιεκείμενον πνεῦμα ἐπισπάσασθαι καὶ ὡς εἰς γονιμώτατον συλληφθῆναι ποιεῖν κριτικὴν σύστασιν¹¹.

And once it chanced that this infinite sea, which was thus by its own nature driven about with a natural motion, flowed in an orderly manner from the same to the same (back on itself), like a whirlpool, mixing the substances in such a way that from each there flowed down the middle of the universe (as in the funnel of a mould) precisely that which was most useful and suitable for the generation of a living creature. This was carried down by the all-carrying whirlpool, drew to itself the surrounding spirit, and having been so conceived that it was very fertile, formed a separate substance.

Without explaining how, the text describes the sudden appearance of this regular movement in such a way that it shapes a vortex. Matter no longer moves chaotically but now follows a natural movement in an orderly manner¹². This circular flow consequently forms a kind of funnel through which the most useful things for generation are driven. It is the combination of these elements with the surrounding spirit, which is also absorbed by the funnel, which finally creates a suitable

¹¹ *H* 6.4.2 = *OF* 115.

¹² Time is not mentioned yet, but this movement seems to imply it, for Time is always represented biting its tail, and here matter 'flowed in an orderly manner from the same to the same (back on itself)'.

context for generation. And in fact the separated substance does indeed appear.

We then come to the second part of the cosmogony, which describes the generation of the primordial Egg and the subsequent birth of Phanes:

B. The Cosmic Egg and Phanes' Appearance

ὡσπερ γὰρ ἐν ὑγρῷ φιλεῖ γίνεσθαι πομφόλυξ, οὕτως σφαιροειδὲς πανταχόθεν συνελήφθη κύτος. ἔπειτα αὐτὸ ἐν ἑαυτῷ κηθέν, ὑπὸ τοῦ περιελιφότης θειώδους πνεύματος ἀναφερόμενον, προέκυψεν εἰς φῶς μέγιστόν τι τοῦτο ἀποκύημα, ὡς ἂν ἐκ παντός τοῦ ἀπείρου βυθοῦ ἀποκεκμημένον ἔμψυχον δημιουργημα καὶ τῇ περιφερείᾳ τῷ ὧφ προσεοικὸς καὶ τῷ τάχει τῆς πτήσεως¹³.

For just as a bubble is usually formed in water, so everything round about contributed to the conception of this ball-like globe. Then there came forth to the light, after it had been conceived in itself, and was borne upwards by the divine spirit which surrounded it, perhaps the greatest thing ever born; a piece of workmanship, so to speak, having life in it which had been conceived from that entire infinite abyss, in shape like an egg, and as swift as a bird.

This first section describes how the surrounding spirit, which has been absorbed by the funnel, forms a kind of bubble that, in combination with the matter around it, becomes an egg-like form. But the *pneuma* or spirit is not only *in* the Egg; according to our text, the *pneuma* also surrounds it, and owing to this circumstance, the Egg is driven upwards and finally appears in the light.

The continuation describes how this primeval matter could have produced the totality of the visible world. Although Time had not yet been mentioned, we will see later that it is plausible that it plays an active role both in the appearance of order and the generation of the Egg¹⁴. In point of fact, Time is now

¹³ H 6.4.3 = OF 117.

¹⁴ See next note.

mentioned in connection with the production of the Egg, probably as the course of time over which this process took place¹⁵:

χρόνῳ φερομένη ἢ ὕλη ἅπασα ὡσπερ ὠν τὸν πάντα περιέχοντα σφαιροειδῆ ἀπεικίησεν οὐρανόν· ὅπερ κατ' ἀρχὰς τοῦ γονίμου μυελοῦ πλήρες ἦν ὡς ἂν στοιχεῖα καὶ χρώματα παντοδαπὰ ἔκτεκεῖν δυνάμενον, καὶ ὁμῶς παντοδαπὴν ἐκ μιᾶς οὐσίας τε καὶ χρώματος ἑνὸς ἔφερε τὴν φαντασίαν. ὡσπερ γὰρ ἐν τῷ τοῦ ταῶ γεννήματι ἐν μὲν τοῦ ὠοῦ χρῶμα δοκεῖ, δυνάμει δὲ μυρία ἔχει ἐν ἑαυτῷ τοῦ μέλλοντος τελεσφορεῖσθαι χρώματα, οὕτως καὶ τὸ ἐξ ἀπείρου ὕλης ἀποκηθὲν ἔμψυχον ὠν ἐκ τῆς ὑποκειμένης καὶ αἰεὶ ῥεούσης ὕλης κινούμενον παντοδαπὰς ἐκφαίνει τροπὰς. ἔνδοθεν γὰρ τῆς περιφερείας ζῶν τι ἀρρενόθηλυ εἰδοποιεῖται προνοία τοῦ ἐνότος ἐν αὐτῷ θείου πνεύματος¹⁶.

For the whole body of matter was borne about for some Time, before it brought forth, like an egg, the sphere-like, all-embracing heaven (Ouranos), which at first was full of productive marrow, so that it was able to produce out of itself elements and colours of all sorts, while from the one substance and the one colour it produced all kinds of forms. For as a peacock's egg seems to have only one colour, while potentially it has in it all the colours of the animal that is to be, so this living egg, conceived out of infinite matter, when set in motion by the underlying and ever-flowing matter, produces many different forms. For within the circumference a certain living creature, which is both male and female, is formed by the skill of the indwelling divine spirit.

The egg-like sphere out of which reality will come forth is compared to the egg of a peacock, which is only one colour although it potentially contains all the colours of the future animal¹⁷. Thus the all-embracing heaven includes in its

¹⁵ Similarly, M.L. West, 'Ab ovo. Orpheus, Sanchuniathon, and the Origins of the Ionian World Model', *CQ* 44 (1994) 289-307 at 290-91, in explaining the role of time in the cosmogony preserved by Eudemus.

¹⁶ H 6.5.1 = OF 120 and 121 (III).

¹⁷ On the echo of this notion in Basilides, see Hippolytus, *Refutatio* 7.21.5; also G. Quispel, 'The Demiurge in the Apocryphon of John',

productive marrow the primordial elements that will form the world. In addition, the indwelling spirit, the *pneuma*, forms a living creature, which is both male and female.

Immediately hereafter, a short parenthesis by the author breaks the continuity of the generation process. In fact, it seems as if at the mention of the being inside the Egg the author felt impelled to present its description and name even before it had come out of it:

ὄν Φάνητα Ὀρφεὺς καλεῖ, ὅτι αὐτοῦ φανέντος τὸ πᾶν ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἔλαμψεν, τῷ φέγγει τοῦ διαπρεπεστάτου τῶν στοιχείων πυρὸς ἐν τῷ ὑγρῷ τελεσφορομένου. καὶ οὐκ ἄπιστον, ὅτι καὶ ἐπὶ λαμπυρίδων δείγματος ἕνεκα ἢ φύσις ἡμῖν ὁρᾶν ὑγρὸν φῶς ἔδωρήσατο¹⁸.

This Orpheus calls Phanes, because when it appeared the universe shone forth from it, with the lustre of that most glorious of the elements, fire, perfected in moisture. Nor is this incredible, since in glowworms nature gives us to see a moist light.

After the short comment, the process continues. If the first appearance of order had resulted in possible generation, the birth of Phanes not only maintains the order that ruled before him, but also brings coherency to the globe:

τὸ μὲν οὖν πρωτοσύστατον ὦν ὑποθερμανθὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ ἔσωθεν ζῶου ῥήγνυται, ἔπειτα δὲ μορφωθὲν προέρχεται ὁποῖόν τι καὶ Ὀρφεὺς λέγει κρανίου σχισθέντος πολυχανδέος ὡοῦ καὶ οὕτω μεγάλη δυνάμει αὐτοῦ τοῦ προεληλυθότος φανέντος, τὸ μὲν κύτος τὴν ἀρμονίαν λαμβάνει καὶ τὴν διακόσμησιν ἴσχει, αὐτὸς δὲ ὥσπερ ἐπ' ἀκρωρείας οὐρανοῦ προκαθέζεται καὶ ἐν ἀπορρήτοις τὸν ἄπειρον περιλάμπων αἰῶνα¹⁹.

This egg, then, which was the first substance, growing somewhat hot, was broken by the living creature within, and then there took shape and came forth

in *Nag Hammadi and Gnosis* (Leiden, 1978) 1-33.

¹⁸ H 6.5.4 = OF 127(II).

¹⁹ H 6.6.1 = OF 121 (III) + 171.

something; such as Orpheus also speaks of, where he says, 'when the capacious egg was broken'. And so by the mighty power of that which appeared and came forth, the globe attained coherency, and maintained order, while it itself took its seat, as it were, on the summit of heaven, there in ineffable mystery diffusing light through endless ages.

Due to the increase in its internal temperature, probably owing to the being inside it, the Egg breaks, Phanes appears and its radiance takes its place on the summit of heaven. But at this stage it is not only the superior part of the world that is given form. The following step describes the formation of the inferior part, so to speak, the foundation upon which everything will further develop. As in the very beginning, weight plays a role, since due to its own gravity, the productive matter that remained inside the Egg sinks and is deposited, as dregs, on the bottom. In this way Hades appears:

ἢ δὲ τοῦ κύτους ἔνδοθεν γόνιμος ὑπολειφθεῖσα ὕλη, ὡς ἐν πολλῷ τῷ χρόνῳ τύποκειμένης ἕως φυσικῆς ὑποζέουσα ἢ θερμότης† τὰς πάντων διέκριεν οὐσίας. τὸ μὲν γὰρ κατώτερον αὐτῆς πρῶτον ὥσπερ ὑποστάθμη ὑπὸ τοῦ βάρους εἰς τὰ κάτω ὑποκεχώρηκεν, ὁ δὲ διὰ τὴν ὀλκότητα καὶ διὰ τὸ ἐμβριθὲς καὶ πολὺ τῆς ὑποκειμένης οὐσίας πλήθος Πλούτωνα προσηγόρευσαν, ἄδου τε καὶ νεκρῶν βασιλέα εἶναι ἀποφηνάμενοι²⁰.

But the productive matter left inside the globe, † ... † separated the substances of all things. For first its lower part, just like the dregs, sank downwards of its own weight; and this they called Pluto from its gravity, and weight, and great quantity (Polu) of underlying matter, styling it the king of Hades and the dead.

With this section we close the second part of the cosmogony and proceed to the third, where the further development of reality and new gods takes place. The following section already describes the generation of the remaining gods. From now on, allegory, even though occasionally present in the previous

²⁰ H 6.6.3 = OF 203.

sections, becomes an increasingly important factor:

C. Further Generation of Reality:

ταύτην μὲν οὖν τὴν πρώτην καὶ πολλήν, ἑνπαράν καὶ τραχεῖαν οὐσίαν ὑπὸ Κρόνου, τοῦ χρόνου, καταποθῆναι λέγουσιν φυσικῶς διὰ τὴν κάτω ὑπονόστησιν αὐτῆς. μετὰ δὲ τὴν πρώτην ὑποστάθμην τὸ συρρὺν ὕδωρ καὶ πρώτη ἐπιπολάσαν ὑποστάσει Ποσειδῶνα προσηγόρευσαν. τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν τρίτον τὸ καθαρώτατον καὶ κορυφαιότατον ἄτε διαυγὲς ὃν πῦρ Ζήνα ὠνόμασαν διὰ τὴν ἐν αὐτῷ ζέουσαν φύσιν²¹.

When, then, they say that this primordial substance, although most filthy and rough, was devoured by Kronos, that is, time, this is to be understood in a physical sense, as meaning that it sank downwards. And the water which flowed together after this first sediment, and floated on the surface of the first substance, they called Poseidon. And then what remained, the purest and noblest of all, for it was translucent fire, they called Zeus, from its glowing (Zeousa) nature.

As will now be clear, as the narration advances the degree of allegorization gradually increases. Even though the text goes on to describe the appearance of other gods, such as Athena, Hera, Artemis and Dionysus, for our present purposes it will suffice to close with the description of how Metis is drawn up by Zeus:

ἀνωφερὲς γὰρ ὃν τὸ πῦρ πρὸς μὲν τὰ κάτω ὑπὸ χρόνου, τοῦ Κρόνου, οὐ κατεπόθη, ἀλλ', ὡς ἔφην, ἡ πυρώδης οὐσία ζωτική τε καὶ ἀνωφερῆς οὐσα εἰς αὐτὸν ἀνέπτη τὸν ἀέρα, ὃς καὶ φρονιμώτατος ἐστί διὰ τὴν καθαρότητα. τῇ οὖν ἰδίᾳ θερμότητι ὁ Ζεὺς, τουτέστιν ἡ ζέουσα οὐσία, τὸ καταλειφθὲν ἐν τῷ ὑποκειμένῳ ὑγρῷ τὸ ισχυρότατον καὶ θεῖον ἀνιμάται πνεῦμα, ὅπερ Μῆτιν ἐκάλεσαν. κατὰ κορυφῆς δὲ αὐτοῦ ἐλθὼν τοῦ αἰθέρος καὶ συνποθὲν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, ὥσπερ ὑγρὸν θερμῷ μίγνεν²².

Now since fire ascends, this was not swallowed, and made to descend by time

²¹ H 6.7.1 = OF 203, 8-6 + 204, 2-3 + 207, 2-3.

²² H 6.7.4 = OF 204, 4-5 + 240 (X).

or Kronos; but, as I said, the fiery substance, since it has life in it, and naturally ascends, flew right up into the air, which from its purity is very intelligent. By his own proper heat, then, Zeus –that is, the glowing substance – draws up what is left in the underlying moisture, to wit, that very strong and divine spirit which they called Metis. And this, when it had reached the summit of the aether, was devoured by it (moisture being mixed with heat, so to say);

Apion closes his intervention by stating that all these stories should be understood allegorically and provides some examples, which are afterwards further developed by Clement's epitome of his words²³. Let us now take a look at the version included in the *Recognitions*.

1.2. The Cosmogony in R 10.17-19 and 10.30

Rufinus's Latin translation of the lost Greek original includes a rather different and poor version of the Orphic cosmogony. To begin with, the cosmogonical account is no more part of Apion's discourse to Clement, but is described by Clement himself in the presence of Peter, Faustus, Nicetas and Aquila. At the same time, the tone of its introduction points to the revisionary character of the text:

*Cupio de origine eorum ridicula te coram exponere, ut neque te lateat vanae superstitionis commentum et auditores qui adsistunt erroris sui proba cognoscant*²⁴.

I desire to set forth in your presence the ridiculous legends concerning their origin, both that you may not be unacquainted with the falsehood of this vain superstition, and that the hearers who are present may know the disgraceful character of their error.

From the very beginning one realises that one now moves in a Christian dominated world. The introduction is clear as to the deriding intention of the section. This account consists of two major

²³ See Apion's closing words in H 6.10; As for Clement's epitome of Apion's exposition, see H 6.11-25 at 12-13.

²⁴ R 10.17.1

parts. In the first, Clement makes his exposition; in the second, Nicetas allegedly epitomizes but actually produces a rather different version of the cosmogony.

After his introductory words, Clement proceeds to describe the process of generation, which may also, as in the previous case, be divided into three stages: the origin from chaos, the development of the Egg and the generation of the gods. In spite of preserving the same order of elements, the single stages, when compared with the *Homilies*, present conspicuous differences. The most important is perhaps that the account is reduced to a minimum. Avoiding all subtleties, the text simply asserts that everything began from chaos.

A. The Origins from Chaos:

*Aiunt ergo qui sapientiores sunt inter gentiles, primo omnium Chaos fuisse*²⁵.

The wise men, then, who are among the Gentiles, say that first of all things was chaos;

This passing reference to Chaos is all that is left of the beginning²⁶. The omissions, however, concern not only the description of the eddy of primordial matter. As we will see, they also affect the generation of the Egg, which in this version is formed by the progressive solidification of matter, and the further generation of the divinities, which presents a rather schematic structure:

B. The Cosmic Egg and Phanes' Appearance

*Hoc per multum tempus exteriores sui solidans partes, fines sibi et fundum quandam fecisse tamquam in ovi inmanis modum formamque collectum, intra quod multo nihilominus tempore, quasi intra ovi testam, folum vivificatumque esse animal quoddam; disruptoque post haec inmani illo globo processisse speciem quandam hominis duplicis formae, quam illi masculofeminam vocant. Hunc etiam Phaneta[m] numinarunt ab apparendo, quia cum apparuisset, inquit, tunc etiam lux effulsit*²⁷.

²⁵ R 10.17.2 = OF 104 (III).

²⁶ On 'Chaos' as first principle in *Recognitions*, see below note 40.

²⁷ R 10.17.2-4 = OF 114 (XI) + 121 (VIII) + 127 (III).

That this (*scil.* chaos), through a long time solidifying its outer parts, made bounds to itself and a sort of foundation, being gathered, as it were, into the manner and form of a huge egg, within which, in the course of a long time, as within the shell of the egg, there was cherished and vivified a certain animal; and that afterwards, that huge globe being broken, there came forth a certain kind of man of double sex, which they call masculino-feminine. This they called Phanetas, from appearing, because when it appeared, they say, then also light shone forth.

It is clear that the process of formation is rather different than in the *Homilies*. The basic elements of the account remain – that is, the long time, the Egg, and Phanes – but the processes have changed considerably. In the first place, the Egg is the result of a process of solidification, an aspect which in the previous version did not play any relevant role: the outer parts begin to solidify so as to form a foundation that after a while becomes an egg. Therein a living creature appears, a being of double sex, but the text does not explain why or how this happens.

C. Further Generation of Reality

*Et ex hoc dicunt progenitam esse substantiam, prudentiam, motum, coitum: ex his factum Coelum et Terram. Ex caelo sex progenitos mares, quos et Titanas appellant; similiter et de terra sex feminas, quas Titanidas vocitarunt. Et sunt nomina eorum quidem qui ex caelo orti sunt haec: Oceanus, Coeus, Crios, Yperion, Iapetos, Cronos, qui apud nos Saturnus nominatur. Similiter et earum quae ex terra ortae sunt nomina sunt haec: Thia, Rea, Themis, Mnemosyne, Tethys, Hebe*²⁸.

And from this, they say that there were produced substance, prudence, motion, and coition, and from these the heavens and the earth were made. From the heaven they say that six males were produced, whom they call Titans; and in like manner, from the earth six females, whom they called Titanides. And these are the names of the males who sprang from the heaven: Oceanus, Coeus, Crios, Hyperion, Iapetus, Chronos, who amongst us is called Saturn. In like manner, the names of the females who sprang from the earth are these: Theia, Rhea, Themis, Mnemosyne, Tethys, Hebe.

²⁸ R 10.17.4 OF 139 (IV) + 149 (VIII) + 179 (X).

After substance, prudence, motion and coition, heaven and earth appear, from which are born six male and six female Titans, respectively²⁹. From Saturn and Rhea, finally, Neptune, Orcus and Jupiter come forth. The Hesiodic character of this cosmogony, or rather, theogony seems evident³⁰.

This is all that can be found in the first part of the cosmogony. The second section, however, adds some interesting elements. The epitome by Nicetas in *R* 10.30 is rather similar, although it does present some differences. In the first place, the physicist character is more prominent than in the previous part and is probably due to Nicetas himself, since Chaos, for example, is described as being neither moist nor dry, neither hot nor cold, a type of definition that sounds pre-Socratic³¹:

*Orfeus igitur est, qui dicit primo fuisse chaos sempiternum, immensum, ingenitum, ex quo omnia facta sunt; hoc sane ipsum chaos non tenebras dixit esse, non lucem, non umidum, non aridum, non calidum, non frigidum, sed omnia simul mixta, et semper unum fuisse informe*³²;

It is Orpheus, then, who says that at first there was chaos, eternal, unbounded, unproduced, and that from it all things were made. He says that this chaos was neither darkness nor light, neither moist nor dry, neither hot nor cold, but that it was all things mixed together, and was always one unformed mass.

Another interesting aspect is that the main focus moves from the exterior to the interior of the Egg; that is, the interest is no longer the Egg itself and the solidifying process that produced it, but the creature within it, which after a long period of time comes into being from the mixture of opposites – once again pre-Socratic terminology:

²⁹ On the issue Hesiod, *Theog.* 132-38. See also J.N. Bremmer, *Greek Religion and Culture, the Bible and the Ancient Near East* (Leiden, 2008) 73-88.

³⁰ See below note 40.

³¹ See Anaxagoras B 4, B 12 D-K; Anaximander, 12 A 10 D-K. On the basis of the similarity between this exposition and Ovid, *Met.* 1.5, A. Bernabé, *Textos órficos y filosofía presocrática* (Madrid, 2004) 45, considers that our text may very well reliably reflect the tenor of its source.

³² *R* 10.30.3 = *OF* 104 (II).

*Aliquando tamen quasi ad ovi inmanis modum per immensa tempora effectam peperisse ac protulisse ex se duplicem quandam speciem, quam illi mascofeminam vocant, ex contraria admixtione huiusmodi diversitatis speciem concretam*³³;

... yet that at length, as it were after the manner of a huge egg, it brought forth and produced from itself a certain double form, which had been wrought through immense periods of time, and which they call masculo-feminine, a form concrete from the contrary admixture of such diversity;

Finally, there is also the emphasis laid on Phanes as 'creator' of the world, who enacts the separation of the elements and in this way creates the tangible world:

*Et hoc esse principium omnium, quod primum ex materia puriore processerit quodque procedens discretionem quattuor elementorum dederit et ex duobus quae prima sunt elementis fecerit caelum, ex aliis autem terram; ex quibus iam omnia participatione sui invicem nasci dicit et gigni*³⁴.

and that this (scil. Phanes) is the principle of all things, which came of pure matter, and which, coming forth, effected a separation of the four elements, and made heaven of the two elements which are first, *fire and air*, and earth of the others, *earth and water*; and of these he says that all things now are born and produced by a mutual participation of them.

Nothing of the kind appears either in the *Homilies* or in the first part of the cosmogony of *Recognitions*.

1.3. Relationship between the Accounts in *Homilies* and *Recognitions*

The relationship between these texts has not always been dealt with properly. On the one hand, in spite of the important differences between both accounts, the texts are sometimes said to preserve more or less the same elements³⁵. On the other, notwithstanding the clearly

³³ *R* 10.30.4 = *OF* 121 (VII).

³⁴ *R* 10.30.5 = *OF* 127 (IV) + 149 (VI).

³⁵ In his summary of the contents of this cosmogony, Quispel, 'The Demiurge', 18-19, actually conflates both versions in order to produce a single account. This tendency can also be seen in Brisson, 'Orphée et l'Orphisme', 2910-12, who, after giving the priority to the

secondary character of the *Recognitions*' version, it is sometimes affirmed that Rufinus' version retains the most primitive of both accounts. As far as the differences between the texts are concerned, the matter hardly needs more elaboration, but the question regarding the priority of one or the other version perhaps deserves some attention.

Werner Heintze, at the beginning of the twentieth century, was the first to maintain that both versions depended upon the same source, a Jewish apology different from the *Grundschrift*³⁶, and that the *Homilies* preserved the tenor of this source more faithfully than the *Recognitions*. In the 1950s, however, Georg Strecker argued against Heintze's hypothesis; in his view, the *Recognitions*, and not the *Homilies*, is the version that preserves the original more faithfully. As he considers that there is no such Jewish apology, he maintains that both versions rely exclusively on the Pseudo-Clementines source and that the dialogue between Apion and Clement is a forgery by the author of the *Homilies*³⁷.

Nowadays, however, we are better prepared to examine and evaluate these two versions. The publication of new testimonies and new editions of already known material have provided enough parallels for the account in the *Homilies* to disprove the opinion that it is a forgery. Taking this material into account, a simple textual comparison between both versions clearly shows that the *Homilies* preserve the most original account. Not only the different *misè-en-scène* and the revisionary tone of its introductory words point to the secondary character of the *Recognitions*³⁸; its epitomizing style, the

Homilies' version, nevertheless proceeds to review the cosmogonic account conflating both versions as well. The same view, in Albrile, 'L'uovo de la fenice' 65-66, who surprisingly affirms that 'Anche le *Recognitiones*, il grande romanzo pseudoclementino della cristianità antica, riproducono sostanzialmente, con poche varianti, la stessa cosmogonia'.

³⁶ W. Heintze, *Der Klemensroman und seine griechischen Quellen* (Leipzig, 1914) 14-23 at 22.

³⁷ G. Strecker, *Das Judenchristentum in den Pseudoklementinen* (Berlin, 1958, 1981²) 79-87 at 83.

³⁸ See above § 1.2.

innovations without parallel in other versions³⁹, the Hesiodic contamination⁴⁰, the clear shift from cosmogony to theogony and the higher degree of rationalization and allegorizing all point in the same direction as well⁴¹.

In what follows, we shall thus focus on the Orphic cosmogony of the *Homilies*, which in our view preserves the most genuine account.

2. The 'Orphic' and 'less Orphic' issues in the so-called 'Orphic' cosmogony of the *Homilies*

During the last century scholars tended to doubt the authenticity of the Orphic cosmogony included in the *Homilies*. Due to the physicist tone of the cosmogony, many scholars have, if not suspected it, at least surmised that the exposition presented a clear Stoic influence. Thus, for example, Brisson, even suggests Zeno of Citium as the possible origin for our cosmogony⁴², although in this he seems to be following West, for he considers that the cosmogony of the *Homilies*

³⁹ See, for example, the process of solidification through which the Egg is produced according to *R* 17.2-4; or the reference to Chaos (see next note) as the first principle.

⁴⁰ See, for example, *Recognitions*' view that Chaos was in the beginning. Rather than 'Orphic', this might be called Hesiodic, see *Theogony* 116 and Van Amersfoort, 'Alexandrian Theogony', 28-29, who thinks that the author of *Recognitions* has simply added the birth of Phanes to the theogony of Hesiod. Cf., however, *ibid.* note 53 ad fin.

⁴¹ Van Amersfoort, 'Alexandrian Theogony', 29-30; Brisson, 'Orphée et l'Orphisme', 2910.

⁴² Note, however, that in doing this he actually bases this interpretation in *Recognitions*' account, because he refers to the process of solidification of Zeno's fragment (SVF I, 104). The same tendency in West, *Orphic Poems*, 186 note 21, where he seems to imply that both Apion and Rufinus, that is, *Homilies* and *Recognitions*, posit Chaos in the beginning. See also below note 45. This is, however, only true for the latter text, since *Homilies* clearly differentiates the Orphic and Hesiodic cosmogony by emphasising the equivalence, in both accounts, between the Orphic Egg and Hesiodic Chaos.

derives from the Orphic cosmogony of Hieronymus and Hellanicus, and West described this version as 'a Hellenistic, Stoicizing adaptation of the Protogonos cosmogony'⁴³. Turcan and Albrile offer similar views⁴⁴. Today, however, things are not so certain, and Bernabé, in his edition of the Orphic fragments, has carefully pointed out that 'incertum utrum Apio et Rufinus (vel fons eorum) verterit ποιητικώτερα ὀνόματα in philosophica, an ipse poeta aliquas opiniones a physicis mutuatus sit' – it is uncertain whether Apion, Rufinus, or their source changed the poetic style into a philosophical one, or whether the author of the original cosmogony was already used to this mode of expression⁴⁵.

As was to be expected, many of the aspects in this cosmogony have been suspected of being later additions. To begin with, there is the motif of the vortex or whirlpool (ἄλγξ) that follows the spontaneous appearance of order in the primeval mixture of chaotic matter. The motif of the δίνη or 'vortex', however, is a well-established issue in early Ionian cosmology and its influence can be traced in Anaximander and Anaximenes, Empedocles, Anaxagoras, Leucippus and Democritus⁴⁶. West has even tried to trace it back to Thales, who might have used it to explain the movement of the cosmos⁴⁷. Its appearance in an Orphic cosmogony is not only plausible but highly probable, witness the frequent contacts between

⁴³ West, *Orphic Poems*, 182, 183; cf., however, Bernabé, *PEG* II/1, 80, 'quod mihi valde incertum videtur' and *Actas del VIII Congreso Español de Estudios Clásicos* II (Madrid, 1994) 91ff.

⁴⁴ R. Turcan, 'L'oeuf orphique et les quatre elements (Martianus Capella, *De Nuptiis* II, 140)', *Rev. d'Hist. Rel.* 159-160 (1961) 13-23, at 18-19 tends to deal with both accounts as if they were approximately the same; Albrile, 'L'uovo della Fenice', 64-66.

⁴⁵ Bernabé, *PEG* II/1, 113. See also, against a Stoic influence, Bernabé, 'Consideraciones sobre una teogonía órfica', 94-95, 100 and *Textos órficos*, 37 and note 45.

⁴⁶ Empedocles B 35,21 D-K; Anaxagoras A 12,8 D-K; 88,2-4; Leucippus A 1 D-K; Democritus B 5 D-K and A 1, 69, 83 and 89 D-K.

⁴⁷ M.L. West, 'Three Presocratic Cosmologies', *CQ* 13 (1963) 154-76 at 172-76.

Orphic ideas and Pre-Socratic philosophy⁴⁸.

Even the motif of the primordial Egg itself also used to be considered a later invention⁴⁹, and, as a matter of fact, the Egg is not attested in any older Orphic text⁵⁰. However, there are so many indirect testimonies that Bremmer has rightly pointed out that 'its early Orphic existence can hardly (...) be doubted'⁵¹. Indeed, the Egg appears not only in the theogony of the Pseudo-Epimenides (DK 3B 5 = 6b Fowler)⁵², in which two Titans produce an egg from which come other divinities⁵³, but also in Aristophanes' parody of an Orphic cosmogony in the famous 'ornithogony' of *Birds* (685-703 at 697)⁵⁴, in his *Gerytades* (fr. 170 Kassel-Austin)⁵⁵, and was probably referred to in Euripides' *Hypsipyle*⁵⁶. In point of fact, not only Kern, who puts

⁴⁸ On the relationship between Orphism and Pre-Socratic philosophy, see Bernabé, *PEG* II/1, 113 app. ad 104; Idem, *Textos órficos*, passim.

⁴⁹ L. Moulinier, *Orphée et l'Orphisme à l'époque classique* (Paris 1955) 94ff.

⁵⁰ J. Mansfeld, *Studies in Later Greek Philosophy and Gnosticism* (London, 1989) Chapter XIV, 267, 291.

⁵¹ Bremmer, *Greek Religion and Culture*, 15.

⁵² See, however, A. Bernabé, 'Una Cosmogonía cómica: Aristófanes, *Aves* 685ss.', in J.A. López Férez (ed.), *De Homero a Libanio* (Madrid, 1995) 195-211 at 206 note 24, who thinks we might already have here Orphic influence. J.P. Vernant, *Les origines de la pensée grecque* (Paris, 1962) 90ff, already pointed to the similarities between this conception and Anaximander's 'fiery sphere' (B 10 D-K) including in its interior some kind of germ (τὸ γόνυμιον); see also G.S. Kirk, J.E. Raven and M. Schofield, *The Presocratic Philosophers* (Cambridge, 1983²) 131f; Bernabé, *Textos órficos*, 31.

⁵³ See West, *Orphic Poems*, 47-48, 112, 201-02.

⁵⁴ On the issue, see West, *Orphic Poems*, 252-55; Bernabé, 'Cosmogonía cómica'. On 'Ornithogony', see Schwabl, 'Weltschöpfung', *RE* Suppl. IX (1962) 1472.

⁵⁵ A.C. Cassio, 'L'uovo orfico e il Geritade di Aristofane (164 K)', *Rivista di Filologia e d'Insegnamento Classico* 106 (1978) 28-31.

⁵⁶ Euripides, *Hyps.* 1103ff Kannicht (111,20 Cockle) seems to preserve the same tradition, since it mentions Night, Eros and Protogonos. See also the new fragment established by G. Colli, *La*

the verses of Aristophanes' *Birds* as fr. number 1 in his edition, but also Bernabé considers the motif as belonging to the most primitive Orphic cosmogony or cosmogonies⁵⁷.

The egg-motif appears in numerous mythologies around the world⁵⁸, but its appearance in an Orphic context has been connected with parallels in Phoenician, Iranian and Indian myths⁵⁹ that suddenly appear around the middle of the first millennium BC, the origin of which seems to be in Egypt⁶⁰ (*infra*).

Another element under suspicion is the role of *pneuma*. As we have seen above, the *Homilies* mention this *pneuma* on three occasions, in 6.4.2, 6.4.3 and 6.5.4. In the first the vortex absorbs the surrounding *pneuma*, as a result of which the Egg is generated; in the latter two passages it is mentioned in connection with the generation of Phanes. According to some scholars, this aspect is due to the influence of Genesis when it says (1.2) that 'the spirit of God was hovering over the waters'⁶¹. According to others, however, the important role played by the *pneuma* in this passage should be searched for in the context of the Stoa⁶².

Nowadays, however, we know that this can hardly be the case. The wind played an important role not only in the Orphic cosmogony transmitted by Eudemus (fr. 150 Wehrli), Aristotle's disciple, but also

sapienza greca I, (Milan, 1990) 118-19, fr. 4 [A 1] b (= Ibycus, fr. 285 Page/Davies), where the poet mentions a 'silver egg'.

⁵⁷ Bernabé, 'Elementos Orientales', § III and 'Cosmogonía cómica', 210.

⁵⁸ M.P. Nilsson, *Geschichte der griechischen Religion* I (Munich, 1967³) 648; for the symbolism of the egg in Gallic religion, F. Le Roux, 'L'ovum anguinum et l'oursin fossile', in J. Bibauw (ed.), *Hommages à Marcel Renard* II (Brussels 1969) 415-25; West, *Orphic Poems*, 103ff; in general, Albrile, 'L'uovo della Fenice', *passim*.

⁵⁹ F. Lukas, 'Das Ei als kosmogonische Vorstellung', *Zeitschrift des Vereins für Volkskunde* 4 (1894) 227-43.

⁶⁰ West, *Orphic Poems*, 106 and 'Ab ovo', 290; Bernabé, 'Elementos orientales' § III ad fin.; Bremmer, *Greek Religion and Culture*, 13.

⁶¹ Brisson, 'Orphée et l'Orphisme', 2911; Van Amersfoort, 'Alexandrian Theogony', 26.

⁶² Turcan, 'L'oeuf', 19.

in the Phoenician cosmogonies attributed to Moch of Sidon by Laetus (*FGrHist* 784 F 4) and to Sanchuniaton by Philo of Byblos. In all these examples the wind is the fertilizing or active principle that generates the primordial Egg⁶³, more or less the function it also has in the *Pseudo-Clementines*. We should not forget, moreover, that in *De anima* (410 b27-411a2) Aristotle records as Orphic the view according to which 'the soul, borne by the winds, enters from the universe into animals when they breathe' (*OF* 421)⁶⁴.

Consequently, it seems obvious that the wind, air or *pneuma* was an important element already in the old Orphic cosmogony⁶⁵, especially since Aristophanes in the above-mentioned 'ornithogony' of *Birds* not only mentions a 'whirlwind' (696, ἀνεμώκεσι δίναις) in the generation of Phanes /Eros, but also a ὑπτηνέμιον ὠίον or 'an egg fertilized by the wind'. Admittedly, the sense of the adjective ὑπτηνέμιον is not undisputed and has received up to four different explanations: a) 'e vento ortum', b) 'ventis verberatum', c) 'a vento fecundatum' and d) 'sua sponte fecundatum (i.e. sine maris fecundantis concursu)'⁶⁶. In spite of Bernabé, who prefers the last meaning, based on the scholium *ad locum* with West, I favour the explanation 'fecundated by the wind' given by Morenz and Schwabl⁶⁷, on the basis of the Egyptian roots *šwh* 'wind' and *šwh.t* 'egg', where both elements were considered masculine and feminine, respectively. If this interpretation is correct, the origin of the motif of the Orphic egg may be found on Egyptian soil, where the myth relates that the God Re, the first of the gods, was born out of an egg⁶⁸.

⁶³ West, 'Ab ovo', *passim*.

⁶⁴ Earlier in the text, however, Aristotle records this idea as Pythagoric, see *De An.* 407b 21; see also, Aristotle, *Phys.* 213b 22 = Pythagoras B 30 D-K. In Presocratic context, this concept of the soul as formed by air (designed either as ἀήρ or as πνεῦμα) is also present in Anaximenes (13 B 2 D-K) and Diogenes of Apollonia (64 B 4-5 D-K).

⁶⁵ On the issue, Bernabé, *Textos órficos*, 75-78.

⁶⁶ Bernabé, *PEG* II/1, 74.

⁶⁷ S. Morenz (ed.), *Aus Antike und Orient. Festschrift Wilhelm Schubart* (Leipzig, 1950) 64-103; Schwabl, 'Welschöpfung', 1473.

⁶⁸ Egyptian influence on early Orphism has now been demonstrated

Phanes is a typically Orphic figure. The version of the *Pseudo-Clementines* is rather sober, for in some Orphic testimonies Phanes is described with (silver) wings and in others even as a god with four heads (ram, bull, lion and snake), four pair of eyes, four horns, golden wings and both sexes⁶⁹. Not only Damascius, the Neoplatonist philosopher of the fifth and sixth centuries, but also Athenagoras echo this description. According to the former, Phanes is 'a double-bodied (= bisexual) god with golden wings on his shoulders, bulls' heads growing upon his flanks, and on his head a monstrous serpent, presenting the appearance of all kinds of animal forms'⁷⁰. According to the latter, 'Phanes himself, being a first-born god (for he it was that was produced from the egg), has the body or shape of a dragon'⁷¹. Of all these elements, our version only preserves the bisexuality and the brightness, which might perhaps also be suspected of being a later Stoic addition. As a matter of fact, however, Phanes / Eros seems already to have had this quality in Aristophanes' parody, where he is called 'sparkling' (697, στίλβων νῶτον πτερύγοιν χρυσαῖν). The soberness of the *Pseudo-Clementines* is noteworthy, since, in spite of the Hellenistic Orphic cosmogonies, Phanes' monstrous aspect is not attested by any ancient testimony, either literary or iconographical⁷². It seems, consequently, that the *Pseudo-Clementines* retains the older iconography of Phanes.

3. The Orphic Cosmogony in the *Pseudo-Clementines* and its Source(s)

Before we attempt to connect this cosmogony to one of the various Orphic cosmogonies that circulated in Late Antiquity, it seems useful to provide an overview of the main groups.

3.1. Overview of the Cosmogonies Attributed to Orpheus

by W. Burkert, *Babylon, Memphis, Persepolis* (Cambridge Mass., 2004) 71-98; Bremmer, *Greek Religion and Culture*, 15 (also on the egg).

⁶⁹ Bernabé, 'Elementos Orientales', § III and note 16-18.

⁷⁰ Damascius, *De principiis* 123 bis, III, 162.5 Westerink.

⁷¹ Athenagoras, *Pro Christ.* 20.4.

⁷² A. Bottini, *La archeologia della salvezza* (Milan, 1992) 82.

It is very difficult to determine how many of the numerous cosmogonies handed down by tradition correspond with clear and distinct Orphic cosmogonies. Damascius in his *De principiis* already distinguished three versions, the so-called 'Rhapsodic' Orphic cosmogony, the cosmogony attributed to Hieronymus and Hellanicus, and the Orphic cosmogony preserved by Eudemus.

However, investigations during the last two centuries have gradually enlarged the number of new Orphic variants. Otto Gruppe, for example, added two other exemplars, namely a cosmogony preserved by Alexander of Aphrodisias (*OF* 367) and another by Clement Romanus, which is none other than our own *Pseudo-Clementines*' account⁷³. The discovery of the Derveni papyrus has added another variant, since it includes a commentary to a previously unknown Orphic cosmogony. West would add two more: the so-called Cyclic Theogony, which has been placed at the beginning of the Epic Cycle, and a Protogonos cosmogony, composed in Ionia around 500 BC. Two other exemplars should be added to this list: the parodic cosmogony by Aristophanes mentioned above and the one mentioned in the *Argonautica* by Apollonius of Rhodes⁷⁴.

Bernabé in his edition of the Orphic fragments distinguishes up to 9 groups of fragments or testimonies, but for our present purposes we can reduce all these allegedly Orphic cosmogonic accounts to five: the Derveni Papyrus, the cosmogony preserved by Eudemus, the source that Aristophanes ridiculed, the Hieronymus and Hellanicus cosmogony, and the so-called Rhapsodic cosmogony. On the basis of

⁷³ O. Gruppe, *Die griechische Culte und Mythen* I (Leipzig, 1887) 641.

⁷⁴ Apoll. Rhod. 1.494-511 = *OF* 67. See, however, Mansfeld's review of L.J. Alderink, *Creation and Salvation in Ancient Orphism*, in Mansfeld, *Studies in Later Greek Philosophy*, Chapter XV, at 437 and Idem, 'Bad World and Demiurge: A 'Gnostic' Motif from Parmenides and Empedocles to Lucretius and Philo', *Ibid.*, Chapter XIV, p. 281 with note 48. On the issue of whether Apollonius is influenced by Orphism or by Empedocles, see Bernabé, *PEG* II/1, 79 app. ad *OF* 67. See also Idem, *Textos órficos*, 33-34: Apollonius is a collage of Orphic motives with elements proceeding from Empedocles. See also the bibliographic references included in his p. 34 note 35.

their similarities and differences we may distinguish, following Bernabé, two main groups, which can be called Night cosmogony and Egg cosmogony⁷⁵.

3.2. *The Orphic Cosmogony of the Pseudo-Clementines and its Source*

As far as the source of our version is concerned, we have in the first place the opinion of Gruppe who, as mentioned above, considered the Pseudo-Clementine account a cosmogonic tradition in its own right⁷⁶. For a long time, however, the predominant view has been that the Pseudo-Clementine cosmogony depends upon the Orphic cosmogony of Hieronymus and Hellanicus. Ever since Kern classed it among the testimonies and fragments of this cosmogony⁷⁷, with the only exception of Van Amersfoort⁷⁸ scholars have uncritically accepted his view. To a certain extent his opinion is understandable. These scholars in general mistrust the beginning of the Homiletic cosmogony, which they normally attribute to Stoic speculation, and in its second section, that is, from Phanes onwards, the accounts of Hieronymus and Hellanicus, on the one hand, and of the Rhapsodies, on the other, are nearly the same.

But the case is different when we come to scholars who accept the testimony of the *Homilies* as a genuine, if demythologized, narration of an Orphic cosmogony. Brisson, for example, although he denounces the Stoicizing tone and philosophical character of the *Homilies*⁷⁹, never rejects its testimony as a later forgery. Nevertheless he considers the version of the *Homilies* to depend upon Hieronymus and Hellanicus. The same opinion is held by Albrile, in an article published in 2000, who not only thinks that the version of the *Homilies*, although with some variants, belongs to the same tradition,

⁷⁵ See Bernabé, 'Elementos orientales', § III.

⁷⁶ Gruppe, *Griechische Culte*, see above note 73, although he only knew the version in *Recognitions*.

⁷⁷ O. Kern, *Orphicorum Fragmenta* (Berlin, 1922) 130ff, fragments 55 and 56.

⁷⁸ Van Amersfoort, 'Alexandrian Theogony', *passim*.

⁷⁹ Brisson, 'Orphée', 2911.

but also wrongly affirms that it was in the Hieronymus and Hellanicus' version that Phanes was included in the Orphic cosmogony for the first time⁸⁰.

The differences, however, between this cosmogony and the account of the *Homilies* are evident. In the first place, they disagree as to the first principle. Whereas Hieronymus and Hellanicus posit water in the beginning⁸¹, *Homilies* speaks of the primordial matter. True, this primordial matter is said to 'stream' (*H* 6.4.1), but its fluidity does not necessarily imply, as numerous investigators assume, its equation with water. Also, the process that will form the egg is completely different. In Hieronymus and Hellanicus the original water thickens into mud and this generates Time and Necessity, who, in their turn, generate the Egg from which Phanes comes forth⁸². In the *Homilies*, however, the vortex of matter absorbs the surrounding *pneuma*, and the bubble it generates will later on become the Egg. In contrast to the important role the wind/ air or *pneuma* plays in the *Homilies*⁸³, in Hieronymus and Hellanicus it is wholly irrelevant⁸⁴. Another important difference is that in the latter cosmogony order appears before the Egg, since Time already enacts a first organization of space by separating the primordial water and positing Aither above, Chaos in the middle and Hades below. Differently, in the *Homilies* all this takes place after the egg opens and is more or less the result of Phanes' activity. There are still many other differences of detail. Let those I have already mentioned suffice for the time being.

The first to disagree with the predominant view that connected the *Homilies* with Hieronymus and Hellanicus was Van Amersfoort, but his view did not help in establishing the genealogy of the cosmogony of the *Homilies*. As a matter of fact, the main interest of

⁸⁰ Albrile, 'L'Uovo dell Fenice', 65.

⁸¹ See Damascius, *De Princip.* 123bis (III, 160, 17 Westerink) who affirms that according to Hieronymus and Hellanicus in the beginning was water. See also, Athenagoras, *Pro Christ.* 18, 3.

⁸² See Brisson's comparison with Zeno of Citium, above, note 42.

⁸³ See above pp. 28-30, § 2.

⁸⁴ Incidentally, this might also be the reason why authors who endorse this view tend to consider the role of *pneuma* an alien element, see above pp. 134-35.

his study was establishing a yet unknown 'Alexandrian' Orphic cosmogony. In his view, the fact that Basilides used the simile of the peacock's egg, which also appears in the *Homilies*, shows that their common source must have been a cosmogonic account *sui generis* that originated in Alexandria⁸⁵. But his thesis is more a premise than a conclusion of his study and his comparison of the *Homilies* with Hieronymus and Hellanicus and with *Rhapsodies* is incomplete and confusing.

It was Walter Burkert, in an article from 1968, who was the first to suggest that the account of the *Homilies* should be placed among the testimonies of the *Rhapsodies*. He rightly suggested that if we substitute the *pneuma* of the *Homilies* with the *aither* of the *Rhapsodies* we get approximately the same account. As a matter of fact, as we have seen before, the role of the *pneuma* in the *Homilies* is equivalent to that of wind/ air in several other sources and almost certainly played a relevant role in the old Orphic account(s), since it is mentioned in the Aristophanic parody, it appears in numerous pre-Socratic cosmologies and Aristotle attributes to Orphics the view that the soul is borne by the wind. The other stages of the constitution of the world and the gods also seem to coincide: the primordial matter as first principle, the formation of the Egg, and the appearance of Phanes seem to follow the same sequence.

Indeed, in Bernabé's most recent edition of the Orphic fragments, the version of the *Pseudo-Clementines* not only occupies a prominent place among the testimonies of the *Rhapsodies*, but also serves, especially the version from the *Homilies*, to reconstruct the beginning of this Orphic cosmogony and to determine the disposition of numerous fragments proceeding from other sources.

4. Conclusions

It is time now to draw some conclusions. In the first place, from our comparison of the two versions of the Orphic cosmogony included in the *Pseudo-Clementines*, it seems obvious that the version of the *Homilies* is the one that keeps the most genuine account. This version

⁸⁵ Van Amersfoort, 'Alexandrian Theogony', 30; the idea had been already defended by Quispel, 'The Demiurge', 10-23.

not only presents a better structure with numerous parallels in other Orphic cosmogonies, but is also free of the Hesiodic contamination that marks the version of the *Recognitions*. In the second place, the author of the *Homilies* has been frequently accused of allegorizing the text and of changing its poetical and mythological style into a philosophical one⁸⁶. As far as we can judge today, it seems that he was only responsible for the allegoric interpretation, since the philosophical approach to the Orphic cosmogony might have been already present in his source⁸⁷. Finally, this source was in all likelihood the cosmogony known as the *Orphic Rhapsodies* with which the *Homilies* present the most similarities⁸⁸.

⁸⁶ For the opinions on the issue by Brisson, West, Turcan and Albrile, see above § 2 and notes 42 to 44.

⁸⁷ Bernabé, *PEG* II/1, 123.

⁸⁸ I would like to express my warm thanks to Jan Bremmer. He not only inspired many an approach to the subject matter of this paper, but also patiently and confidently waited for its final version. He also revised its various drafts and enriched it with numerous suggestions and improvements.

STUDIES ON EARLY CHRISTIAN APOCRYPHA

Edited by J.N. Bremmer (*editor-in-chief*), I. Czachesz, A. Hilhorst,
M. Pesthy and L. Roig Lanzillotta.

In recent years the so-called apocryphal literature has increasingly drawn the attention of scholars interested in early Christianity, ancient history and the ancient novel. New editions of the most important texts have already appeared or are being prepared. We are therefore pleased to announce a new series, *Studies on Early Christian Apocrypha* (formerly called *Studies on the Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles*). The editors welcome contributions on individual aspects of the main texts, be they proceedings of conferences or monographs.

1. *The Apocryphal Acts of John*, J.N. Bremmer (ed.), Kampen 1996
2. *The Apocryphal Acts of Paul and Thecla*, J.N. Bremmer (ed.), Kampen 1996
3. *The Apocryphal Acts of Peter: Magic, Miracles and Gnosticism*, J.N. Bremmer (ed.), Leuven 1998
4. *The Acts of John: a Two-stage Initiation into Johannine Gnosticism*, P.J. Lalleman, Leuven 1998
5. *The Apocryphal Acts of Andrew*, J.N. Bremmer (ed.), Leuven 2000
6. *The Apocryphal Acts of Thomas*, J.N. Bremmer (ed.), Leuven 2001
7. *The Apocalypse of Peter*, J.N. Bremmer and I. Czachesz (eds.), Leuven 2003
8. *Commission Narratives: A Comparative Study of the Canonical and Apocryphal Acts*, I. Czachesz, Leuven 2007
9. *The Visio Pauli and the Gnostic Apocalypse of Paul*, J.N. Bremmer and I. Czachesz (eds.), Leuven 2007
10. *The Pseudo-Clementines*, J.N. Bremmer (ed.), Leuven 2010
11. *The Ascensio Isaiae*, J.N. Bremmer (ed.), Leuven 2011

The Pseudo-Clementines

JAN N. BREMMER (ed.)