

ABSTRACT

THE ORPHIC MYTH IN THE *PSEUDO-CLEMENTINES*

By

David Vasquez

May 2015

The Orphic myth in the *Pseudo-Clementines* has attracted the attention of scholars attempting to decipher the evolution of the myth. Between the two versions of the *Pseudo-Clementines*, the *Klementia* (also known as the *Homilies*) and the *Recognition*, the majority of scholars have determined that the *Homilies* preserve the oldest version of the myth and reflect the *Basic Writer*'s presentation. The predominant problem with this assertion is that it neglects to address the lack of a detailed comparative analysis of both texts.

The textual method used in this study will involve a comparison of parallel sections of the *Homilies* and the *Recognition*. The aim is to identify the more redacted version as the secondary text and the common material as reflective of the outline of the *Basic Writer*. Moreover, those findings will be compared to other versions of the myth. This analysis will demonstrate that, in the Orphic material, the *Recognition* preserves the older version of the *Pseudo-Clementines* and also reflects the original presentation by the *Basic Writer*.

THE ORPHIC MYTH IN THE *PSEUDO-CLEMENTINES*

Presented to the Department of Religious Studies
California State University, Long Beach

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts in Religious Studies

Committee Members:

F. Stanley Jones, Ph.D. (Chair)
David Tabb Stewart, Ph.D.
Jeffrey Broughton, Ph.D.

College Designee:

Amy Bippus, Ph.D.

By David Vasquez

B.A., 2011, University of California, Fullerton

May 2015

UMI Number: 1587928

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI 1587928

Published by ProQuest LLC (2015). Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Au

Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This work is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code



ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower
Parkway
P.O. Box 1346

Copyright 2015

David Vasquez

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to give special acknowledgement to the chair of my thesis committee, Dr. F. Stanley Jones, for his support and guidance in this endeavor. I would also like to acknowledge Dr. David Tabb Stewart and Dr. Jeffery Broughton for their guidance throughout the Religious Studies program and for exposing me to new insights into the nature and significance of religion.

I would also like to thank my parents, Pedro and Francisca Vasquez. Even after their departure from this life, I can still feel their love, support, and encouragement. To my siblings, Peter, Carlos, and Tania Vasquez, for their support and wisdom throughout my academic venture. To my wife, Tanja Vasquez, and my daughter, Wilhelmina Vasquez, for their support and love and their patience when my studies kept me up through the night. To my sister-in-law, Mavvy Vasquez, I am greatly thankful for her proofing and editing of this thesis.

I would also like to thank my friends and colleagues Tyler Alt and Joe Benson for their encouragement and enthusiasm for this study. To Kareem J. Khaled for his passionate support over the years and proofreading of this paper. Friends do not always gild the lily for us, but in their critiques, they encourage us to strive for greater heights.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iii
LIST OF TABLES.....	vi
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	viii
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Orphism.....	4
2. BACKGROUND.....	11
Review of Modern Research.....	11
Lobeck.....	11
Eugen.....	12
Gruppe.....	12
Nöldeke.....	13
Heintze to Strecker.....	13
Quispel and Côté.....	15
Bernabé.....	18
Post-Bernabé.....	20
Jourdan.....	21
3. THE ORPHIC MYTH IN THE <i>PSEUDO-CLEMENTINES</i>	27
Overview.....	27
Preliminary Note.....	29
The <i>Pseudo-Clementines</i>	30
The <i>Homilies</i>	31
The <i>Recognition</i>	32
Appion in the <i>Homilies</i> and the <i>Recognition</i>	34
The Orphic Myth.....	39
Preface to the Myth.....	39

CHAPTER	Page
Provenance of the Universe	42
The Cosmic Egg.....	47
The Emergence of Phanes.....	54
The First Gods and their Allegories.....	56
The Titans	60
Analysis of the Parallels.....	62
 4. THE <i>BASIC WRITER</i>	 69
The Cosmogony	70
Chaos.....	70
The Egg.....	73
Consequences from the Egg.....	74
The Theogony	78
The Titans	78
Kronos and Rhea.....	80
Aides/Pluto.....	81
Neptune/Poseidon	83
Zeus/Jupiter.....	84
Analysis of the <i>Basic Writer</i>	87
Redaction of the <i>Homilies</i>	89
 5. OTHER VERSIONS.....	 92
Early Church Fathers	93
Athenagoras	93
Epiphanius.....	97
Non-Christian Accounts.....	100
Aristophanes	100
The <i>Derveni Papyrus</i>	100
 6. CONCLUSION.....	 103
 APPENDICES	 107
A. GREEK AND LATIN TEXTS OF CHAPTER 3 PARALLELS	108
B. GREEK AND LATIN TEXTS OF CHAPTER 4 PARALLELS	119
 BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	 130

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	Page
1. Preface to the Myth.....	40
2. Provenance of the Universe.....	42
3. The Cosmic Egg.....	47
4. The Emergence of Phanes.....	54
5. The First Gods and their Allegories.....	56
6. The Titans.....	60
7. Chaos.....	70
8. The Egg.....	73
9. Consequences from the Egg.....	74
10. The Titans.....	78
11. Kronos and Rhea.....	80
12. Aides/Pluto.....	81
13. Neptune/Poseidon.....	83
14. Zeus/Jupiter.....	84
15. Preface to the Myth: Greek and Latin Texts.....	109
16. Provenance of the Universe: Greek and Latin Texts.....	110
17. The Cosmic Egg: Greek and Latin Texts.....	111
18. The Emergence of Phanes: Greek and Latin Texts.....	114

TABLE	Page
19. The First Gods and their Allegories: Greek and Latin Texts.....	115
20. The Titans: Greek and Latin Texts	118
21. Chaos: Greek and Latin Texts.....	120
22. The Egg: Greek and Latin Texts.....	122
23. Consequences from the Egg: Greek and Latin Texts.....	123
24. The Titans: Greek and Latin Texts	125
25. Kronos and Rhea: Greek and Latin Texts.....	126
26. Aides/Pluto: Greek and Latin Texts.....	127
27. Neptune/Poseidon: Greek and Latin Texts	128
28. Zeus/Jupiter: Greek and Latin Texts.....	129

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

<i>H</i>	Greek <i>Homilies</i>
<i>R</i>	Latin/Syriac <i>Recognition</i>
<i>B</i>	<i>Basic Writer</i>
<i>PsCl</i>	<i>Pseudo-Clementines</i>
(O)	Original version of the Orphic myth
(A)	First version of the <i>Rhapsodies</i> with Platonic influence
(A')	The <i>Rhapsodies</i> preserved by Damascius
(B)	Stoic version of the Orphic myth known by Hieronymos and Hellanikos
compar.	Comparative
acc.	Accusative
plur.	Plural

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The study of Orphism is an old endeavor that goes back centuries. Traditionally, such study included the historicity of Orpheus, ritual practices as a mystery religion, and the Orphic cosmogony (the creation of the cosmos) and theogony (creation and genealogy of the gods). The earliest accounts to show knowledge of Orpheus are in the poems of Pindar and in the *Argonautica Orphica*. Examples of the ritual practices of the Orphics can be found in the *Republic*, where Plato writes that

καθ' ἃς θηπολοῦσιν, πείθοντες οὐ μόνον ιδιώτας ἀλλὰ καὶ πόλεις, ὡς ἄρα λύσεις τε καὶ καθαρμοὶ ἀδικημάτων διὰ θυσιῶν καὶ παιδιᾶς ἡδονῶν εἰσι μὲν ἔτι ζῶσιν, εἰσὶ δὲ καὶ τελευτήσασιν, ἃς δὴ τελετὰς καλοῦσιν, αἱ τῶν ἐκεῖ κακῶν ἀπολύουσιν σιν, ἃς δὴ τελετὰς καλοῦσιν, αἱ τῶν ἐκεῖ κακῶν ἀπολύουσιν ἡμᾶς, μὴ θύσαντας δὲ δεινὰ περιμένει.¹

they use in their ritual, and make not only ordinary men but states believe that there really are remissions of sins and purifications for deeds of injustice, by means of sacrifice and pleasant sport for the living, and that there are also special rites for the defunct, which they call functions, that deliver us from evils in that other world, while terrible things await those who have neglected to sacrifice.²

¹ Plato, *Republic* 364e4-365a1.

² Plato, *The Collected Dialogues of Plato: Including The Letters*, ed. by Edith Hamilton and Huntington Cairns, trans. by Lane Cooper et al. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961), 612.

Prior to the first century C.E., source materials for the Orphic cosmogony and theogony were fragmented and limited.³ Nevertheless, Miguel Herrero de Jáuregui in *Orphism and Christianity in Late Antiquity*, suggests that “the Demiurge in Plato’s *Timaeus* seems to have been distantly inspired by these creator gods of the Orphic cosmogonies and of Pherecydes.”⁴ Even though these ancient sources are not extant in Orphic material, over the years they have provided scholars with information to help elucidate the study of Orphism.

After the death of Plato, other philosophical systems arose, such as Epicureanism and Stoicism, whose theories were in direct competition with the philosophy of Plato and with each other. Instead of a god that is outside the material world who creates the cosmos as Plato suggests, the Stoics and Epicureans brought the divine entity into the material world. The Epicureans held the belief that the cosmos formed in the material world through the interactions of atoms:

Soon the greater atoms pressing downwards, by dint of weight forced upwards the smaller and lighter atoms, the fiery ones topmost and with the greatest impetus to form the ether, and afterwards those which form the air.⁵

³ Scholars often use the Orphic cosmogony and the Orphic theogony interchangeably when they should be viewed as two separate entities. For the sake of simplicity, the combined narrative of the Orphic cosmogony and theogony will be called the Orphic myth.

⁴ Miguel Herrero de Jáuregui, *Orphism and Christianity in Late Antiquity* (Berlin: Walter De Gruyter, 2010), 302.

⁵ Eduard Zeller, *The Stoics, Epicureans, and Sceptics*, trans. Oswald J. Reichel (New York: Russell and Russell, 1962), 448.

Alternatively, the Stoics maintained that “the cosmos is a living being and that its origin was a birth exactly like the birth of living things.”⁶ Despite the differences in the mechanics of generation, both systems shared the belief that the four fundamental elements (fire, water, earth, and air) and their qualities (hot, cold, moist, and dry) were paramount components to the generation of the cosmos.

After Plato and through the end of the apostolic age the Early Church Fathers, who developed a theology of Christianity, transmitted the Orphic myth. Several of these church fathers, including Athenagoras and Epiphanius, preserved the Orphic myth in their polemics against the opposing Greek philosophers and their traditions. The *Pseudo-Clementines* [*PsCl*], preserved in the *Klementia* (often called the *Homilies* [*H*]) and the *Recognition* [*R*], retain one of the more interesting versions of the Orphic myth, which is the central text of this study. Two hundred years later, the Neo-Platonist Damascius writes *ΑΠΟΡΙΑΙ ΚΑΙ ΛΥΣΕΙΣ ΠΕΡΙ ΤΩΝ ΠΡΩΤΩΝ ΑΡΧΩΝ*,⁷ in which he outlines three famous versions of Orphic myths with no reference to Christian sources.

Most recently, a large work called *The Derveni Papyrus* was discovered in the early 1960s during road construction in modern day Thessaloniki. This fourth century B.C.E. papyrus roll provides insight into religious practices and beliefs, such as ritual rites and sacred myths of the Orphics. Ancient gold and bone tablets have also been found; they were intended to be taken with an individual to the afterlife. The theory surrounding these artifacts is that Orphics used them to remember passwords and

⁶ David E. Hahm, *The Origins of Stoic Cosmology* (Columbus: Ohio University Press, 1977), 47.

⁷ Damascius, *Problems and Solutions Concerning First Principles*, trans. Sara Ahbel-Rappe (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010).

passages that were believed to have been written by Orpheus after his descent into the underworld.

Orphism

Modern Orphic studies began in the eighteenth century with Dietrich Tiedemann (1748-1803) and Thomas Taylor (1758-1835). Taylor's view on the historicity of the Orphic tradition was more positive than Tiedemann's. Taylor regarded Orpheus as the first theologian of the Greeks and the first to introduce the mysteries to the Greeks. Taylor also suggested that Orpheus may have been the son of King Oeagrus of Thrace. Tiedemann viewed Orpheus as a figure to whom writings were attributed so as to give more authority to their contents. Though Tiedemann believed that Orpheus was an historical figure, he believed that the writings under the name of Orpheus were created by others. Stian Torjussen adds, in *Metamorphoses of Myth*, that:

Both Taylor and Tiedemann, despite their different opinions on Orpheus, agreed that most of the Orphic material was written in the sixth century and that the author, or rather editor, of some of these texts could be identified as Onomakritos of Athens.⁸

In spite of the differences Tiedemann and Taylor had regarding the historicity of Orpheus and his legacy, these two scholars laid the foundation for modern Orphic studies with their relentless efforts towards a “complete understanding of Orphic theology.”⁹ The relevance of their work linking Orphism with philosophy became strikingly apparent in the mid-twentieth century. Later scholars were better equipped to assess the

⁸ Stian Sundell Torjussen, *Metamorphoses of Myth: A Study of the “Orphic” Gold Tablets and the Derveni Papyrus* (Germany: VDM Verlag, 2010), 9.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 14.

discoveries of gold and bone tablets that bore inscriptions containing Orphic teachings, as well as papyri containing the Orphic cosmogony and theogony.

The myth concerning Orpheus alleges that after Orpheus's mother (or lover) was taken by Hades to the underworld, Orpheus descended in order to bring her back to the world of the living. Upon his return, Orpheus recorded what he saw and experienced in a text called the *Hieros Logos*.¹⁰ In this text, Orpheus wrote instructions to guide the soul on the safest path through the underworld. Along the journey, the soul would encounter figures, such as Persephone, who would require a specific password in order to grant the soul safe passage through the underworld.

Other important aspects of Orphism are its cosmogony and theogony. The Orphic cosmogony is preserved in the works of several Neo-Platonic philosophers, such as Proclus and, perhaps the most famous, Damascius. In Damascius's *ΑΠΟΡΙΑΙ ΚΑΙ ΑΥΣΕΙΣ ΠΕΡΙ ΤΩΝ ΠΡΩΤΩΝ ΑΡΧΩΝ*, there are three Orphic myths that are partially preserved. The first version, the *Rhapsodies*, was the most popular of the three versions. In *The Orphic Poems*, Martin L. West states that “[w]hat Damascius refers to as ‘these current Orphic Rhapsodies’ may safely be identified with the *Hieroi Logoi in 24 Rhapsodies*, listed in the *Suda* among Orpheus’ works.”¹¹ Alberto Bernabé, in *Hieros logos: Poesía órfica sobre los dioses, el alma y el más allá*, suggests that the *Rhapsodies*

son el resultado de una prologada tradición de reelaboraciones y reescrituras, en consonancia con la larga

¹⁰ Martin L. West, *The Orphic Poems* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983), 69.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 227.

extensión temporal y la naturaleza no dogmática del movimiento órfico.¹²

are the result of a prolonged tradition of reworking and rewriting, consistent with the long temporal duration and the non-dogmatic nature of the Orphic movement.¹³

As the most popular version among the Neo-Platonists, the *Rhapsodies* were in constant flux, dependent on changing philosophical systems. The other two and lesser known versions are attributed to Hieronymus/Hellanicus and the Peripatetic Eudemos. The author of the former is not known, hence two names are attached to it, while the latter is said to have been transmitted by a student of Aristotle. The existence of these three versions illustrates that the Orphic myth was not a monolithic work.

The cosmogony of the Orphics illustrates the creation of the universe. However, the theogony, the creation of the gods, is seen instead to extend from the creation of the universe. It was said that, “[t]he theologians put Time (Chronos) in the place of the unique principle of wholes, whereas aether and chaos are the two principles.”¹⁴ From these two principles were created Gaea (Earth) and Tartarus (the Depths). Gaea produced three offspring, who were named Pontus, Ouranos (the Heavens), and Actaeus. Ouranos eventually revolted against Chaos to become the ruler of all that existed. After some time, Gaea mated with her son, Ouranos, to produce a long line of Titans, which included Chronos, who craved the seat of power. Chronos planned on revolting against Ouranos, just as Ouranos had revolted against Chaos. While Chronos was planning his revolt, he

¹² Alberto Bernabé, *Hieros logos: Poesía orfica sobre los dioses, el alma y el mas alla* (Madrid: Ediciones Akal, 2003), 22.

¹³ Translated by Author.

¹⁴ Damascius, *Problems and Solutions Concerning First Principles*, 415.

mated with his sister Rhea to produce a new line of gods, known as the Olympians. Among the Olympians was a son named Zeus (god of thunder), who possessed great power; Gaea hid him, fearing that Chronos would kill him. When Chronos finally revolted, he cut off the genitals of Ouranos to ingest the seat of power as represented by the phallus. However, Zeus was able to swallow the phallus of Ouranos before Chronos could do so. After Zeus had ascended the throne, he proceeded to banish the Titans to Tartarus.

While Zeus possessed the seat of power, he mated with Persephone. She gave birth to the infant Dionysus, who was pronounced the heir to Zeus's throne. In a fit of rage, the Titans lured Dionysus away from Olympus with Apollo's golden rattle. When Dionysus followed the Titans, they captured him, dismembered him, and ate the remains. In Proclus's *Commentary on Plato's Timaeus*, Proclus quotes Orpheus, who refers to "[t]he ill-planning Titans, with over-violent hearts."¹⁵ Enraged and overcome with grief over the loss of his son, Zeus struck down the Titans with a thunderbolt and turned them into ashes. From those ashes, Zeus created man, which would enable his son to be reincarnated one day.

The devouring of the infant Dionysus represents the Titanic sin and is the reason suicide was condemned by the Orphics. If a member of the sect took his or her own life, it recreated the murder of Dionysus, and the deceased person would be punished in the

¹⁵ Proclus, *Commentary on Plato's Timaeus Volume 1*, trans. and ed. Harold Tarrant (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 275.

afterlife for committing that sin. The Orphics developed ritual practices of purification in an effort to wash the Titanic¹⁶ portion of their soul away.¹⁷

Ritual observances were the next main components of the Orphic religion. To become an Orphic, one had to be initiated into the group, and in some cases, the participant would have to live an ascetic life. Miguel Herrero de Jáuregui, in *Orphism and Christianity in Late Antiquity*, summarizes the ascetic life as

[t]he ascetic prescription believed to constitute the orphikos bios—that is to say, to refrain from shedding blood, eating certain foods, wearing certain cloths, and perhaps from sexual intercourse along with a commitment to just behavior.¹⁸

By living the ascetic life, the initiates believed they could better purify their souls from the Titanic stain and thus enjoy a better afterlife.

During ritual practices, the initiates carried amulets or tablets. The tablets were a form of book containing “essential guidelines on what was to be done and said at various acts of the ritual.”¹⁹ The books used during ritual practices were often written on papyrus, but when the initiate died, gold leaves and tablets were sometimes buried with the body, since gold lasted much longer than papyrus. If the initiate was not able to afford a gold tablet or leaf, then the papyrus text would be burned with the body rather than buried so that the text could follow the soul of the deceased to the afterlife. As part

¹⁶ Meaning that part of the soul contained Titan traits because Zeus made Man from mud and the ashes from the Titans after he struck them down.

¹⁷ Alberto Bernabé, *Instructions for the Netherworld: The Orphic Gold Tablets* (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 188.

¹⁸ Jáuregui, *Orphism and Christianity in Late Antiquity*, 19.

¹⁹ Bernabé, *Instructions for the Netherworld*, 235.

of their ritual practices, the Orphics reenacted the funeral ceremony to prepare for their journey to the underworld. Initiates would lie on the funeral pyre before rising to recite from either their tablets or memory. If they could not remember the phrases or passwords, their tablets would guide them.

The Orphic practice of remembering the original sin and purifying the body were based on their most important categorical belief system: eschatology. Orphics believed that the soul was partially immortal (i.e., a combination of god and Titan). After the body dies, the soul is released and travels through the underworld to the location reserved for pure souls. When the soul begins its journey, it has to find its way to the river Styx and meet with Charon, the ferryman of the souls. Once the initiates embark on the ferry with Charon, they speak a password that signifies their purification, or else the soul will remain with the ferryman for an unspecified unspecified amount of time.

Presuming that the initiates remember or are able to read the passwords from their tablets or papyri, they disembark and follow the prescribed directions. One wrong turn and the soul will be lost and have to wander the underworld for some time. Once again, presuming that the initiate keeps to the correct path, the soul's journey is almost complete, and "all that is missing is for Persephone to authorize it to join with other pure souls in a special, reserved place."²⁰ As soon as the soul encounters her, it must show that it is pure and free of the Titanic stain. At this point, there are three possible things that can happen. If the wrong password is spoken, the soul will be banished to Tartarus to be purified for an unspecified period of time, and then be reincarnated for a ten thousand year cycle until it is fully purified. If the correct password cannot be

²⁰ Ibid., 115.

remembered, then the soul may drink from the fountain of memory in hopes of recollecting the password. Once the correct password, “I am the son of Earth and starry Heaven,”²¹ is spoken, Persephone will admit the soul into the location reserved for pure souls.

²¹ Ibid., 187.

CHAPTER 2
BACKGROUND

Review of Modern Research

To continue examining the scholarship of the Orphic material in the *Pseudo-Clementines* the following history of research will be focused on scholars who only dealt with the *Pseudo-Clementines* and the Orphic myth.

Lobeck

Modern research of the Orphic myth in the *Pseudo-Clementines* first appears in the work of a German classical scholar Christian Augustus Lobeck. In 1829, Lobeck published *Aglaophamus*, in which the *Pseudo-Clementines* were used as a witness to the Orphic myth. Lobeck's chapter entitled "Theogonia," attempts to give a history of mythology, which includes some Christian witnesses to Orphic mythology.²² In Lobeck's use of the *Pseudo-Clementines*, he utilized only the *Homilies*²³ as part of the myth and makes no reference to the *Recognition*. The reason for this omission is not clear, but it can be assumed that Lobeck was not aware of the *Recognition*.

²² Christian Augustus Lobeck, *Aglaophamus: Sive de Theologiae Mysticae Graecorum Causis* (Berlin: Regimonth Prussorum Sumtibus Fratrum Borntreger, 1829) 478.

²³ "De ovo copiosius loquitur Apio in Clement. Homil VI, 4." Ibid., 475.

Eugen

In 1885, over five decades after Lobeck published *Aglaophamus*, Abel Eugen published *Orphica*. In this text, Eugen, like Lobeck, uses the *Pseudo-Clementines* as a witness to the Orphic myth, but Eugen goes farther in his appropriation. First, Eugen uses both the *Homilies* and the *Recognition* as witnesses to the Orphic myth rather than omitting the *Homilies* as Lobeck did.²⁴ Second, Eugen uses the *Homilies* to describe particular aspects of the Orphic myth, such as “De ovo copiosius loquitur Apio in Clement.”²⁵ In chapter 7 of *Orphica*, entitled “ΘΕΟΓΟΝΙΑ (Θεολογια),” Eugen presents the Orphic myth through categories, and he places the *Homilies* and the *Recognition* under “Hellanici et Hieronymi Theogonia.” By so categorizing the *Homilies* and the *Recognition*, Eugen allows the *Pseudo-Clementines* to be included with other important witnesses to the Orphic myth, such as Damascius’s *ΑΠΟΡΙΑΙ ΚΑΙ ΑΥΣΕΙΣ ΠΕΡΙ ΤΩΝ ΠΡΩΤΩΝ ΑΡΧΩΝ*.

Gruppe

As the nineteenth century progressed, the *Pseudo-Clementines* attracted the attention of more scholars such as German mythographer Otto Gruppe, who continued the work of Lobeck and Eugen. Gruppe’s major work *Die Griechischen Culte und Mythen, in Ihren Beziehungen zu Den Orientalischen Religionen*, published in 1887, cites Phanes in the *Homilies*.²⁶ Gruppe maintained that between the two versions of the

²⁴ Abel Eugen, *Orphica* (Leipzig: Sumptus Fecit G. Freytag, 1885), 160-161.

²⁵ Lobeck, *Aglaophamus*, 475.

²⁶ Otto Gruppe, *Die Griechischen Culte und Mythen in Ihren Beziehungen zu den Orientalischen Religionen* (Leipzig: Druck und Verlag von B.G. Teubner, 1887), 647.

Pseudo-Clementines, the *Homilies* are more primitive than the *Recognition*. Gruppe's research became major point of contention among scholars, who continued to argue over the primacy of the *Homilies* and the *Recognition*. Nevertheless, Gruppe's conclusion came to be the prevailing view among scholars over time.

Nöldeke

In 1889, one of the greatest oriental scholars, Theodor Nöldeke, published an article entitled "Bar Choni über Homer, Hesiod und Orpheus." In this article, Nöldeke attempted to translate the Orphic myth of the *Pseudo-Clementines* from Theodor bar Choni's Syriac text. Nöldeke realized that the bar Choni text was unclear,²⁷ so he enlisted the assistance of fellow scholars to provide him with alternate codices for a better sense of the translation. Ultimately, Nöldeke used J. B. Cotelier's Latin version as a guide, since the bar Choni text proved to have too many corruptions.

Heintze to Strecker

In 1914, Werner Heintze published *Der Klemensroman und Seine Griechische Quellen*, in which he echoes Gruppe's conjecture that the *Homilies* preserve the oldest version of the Orphic myth. Heintze not only asserts the primacy of the *Homilies*, but he is also "the first to maintain that both versions depended upon the same source, a Jewish apology different from the *Grundschrift*."²⁸ As the *Pseudo-Clementines* raised more

²⁷ Zwar gelangte ich nach und nach zu einem gewissen Verständniss einiger Stellen, erkannte z. B., dass die Orphische Lehre vom Weltei (𐤀𐤃𐤁𐤁 statt 𐤀𐤃𐤁𐤁 der Codices) vorgetragen wird, aber vieles blieb mir ganz dunkel. Theodor Nöldeke, "Bar Choni über Homer, Hesiod, und Orpheus," ZDMG, no. 53 (1899): 501.

²⁸ L. Roig Lanzillotta, "Orphic Cosmogonies in the Pseudo-Clementines? Textual Relationship, Character and Sources of Homilies 6.3-13 and Recognitions 10.17-19.30," in *The Pseudo-Clementines*, ed. Jan N. Bremmer (Leuven: Peeters, 2010), 130.

interest among scholars, the various topics and ideas imbedded within the text were given more attention. Since the Orphic myth was one of these topics, scholars began to include the *Pseudo-Clementines* as a source that preserved a version of the Orphic myth.

However, which version of the Orphic myth the *Pseudo-Clementines* actually preserved became another point of contention among scholars.

In 1922, German Classical philologist Otto Kern published *Orphicorum Fragmenta*, in which he had collected and compiled all the Orphic material known to him. One of the chapters in this book, “Pars Posterior Fragmenta Orphicorum,”²⁹ contains the fragments of the Orphic cosmogony that include the versions of Hieronymi et Hellanici Theogonia, IEPOI ΛΟΓΟΙ EN PAΨΩΔΙΑΙΑΣ ΚΑ, and the two versions of the *Pseudo-Clementines*. As Eugen did before him, Kern continued to include the *Pseudo-Clementines* among the most important witnesses to the Orphic myth, but he does not follow Gruppe in commenting on which version is oldest. Kern restricts himself to the two versions and refrains from conjecture.³⁰

The late 1950s began to see a slight shift in opinion with the publication of *Das Judenthum in den Pseudoklementinen* by Georg Strecker. Although the established opinion was that the *Homilies* version of the *Pseudo-Clementines* was the oldest version, this did not stop Strecker from positing the converse. Strecker maintained that the role of the grammarian Appion was a complete fiction that had been developed

²⁹ Otto Kern, *Orphicorum Fragmenta* (Berolini: Weidmannos, 1872), 135.

³⁰ The sections of H and R are found in fragments 55 and 56. Kern also makes a reference to the Syriac version but does not present the text. “Cf. versionem Syriacam Theodori bar Choni Nestoriani.” Kern, *Orphicorum Fragmenta*, 133.

by the Homilist³¹. His assertion was based upon two factors. The first point was that Appion does not appear at all in the *Recognition*. Second, Simon's situation³² after the last discussion at Tripolis is contradicted by the *Basic Writer [B]*. Thus, Simon's situation at this late point is also an invention by the Homilist.³³

Quispel and Côté

As the Orphic myth of the *Pseudo-Clementines* gained more attention, scholars tried to investigate the possible traditions from which the myth had been derived. Guilles Quispel was a Dutch theologian and professor of early Christianity who maintained that the Orphic myth of the *Pseudo-Clementines* had been derived from a Jewish Alexandrian source. This conjecture was based upon a Gnostic text, the *Apocryphon of John*, with which Quispel tried to show that the creation of Sophia, Yaltabaoth, was the same creature as Phanes. The passage that Quispel points to is found at *Apocryphon of John* 2.1.10-11:

For it has another form. And when she saw (the consequences of) her desire, it changed into a form of a lion-faced serpent. And its eyes were like lightning fires which flash. She cast it away from her, outside that place, that no one of the immortal ones might see it, for she had created it in ignorance. And she surrounded it with a luminous cloud, and she placed a throne in the middle of the cloud that no one might see it except the Holy Spirit

³¹ Georg Strecker, *Das Judenchristentum in den Pseudoklementinen* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1958), 83-84.

³² Prior to Peter's arrival in Tripolis, Simon healed many people in Tripolis and did not wait for Peter before he departed the city.

³³ Strecker, *Das Judenchristentum in den Pseudoklementinen*, 83.

who is called the mother of the living. And she called his name Yaltabaoth.³⁴

According to Quispel, the theogony that is preserved by the *Pseudo-Clementines* is a “missing link between the old Orphic views and the speculations of the Gnostics.”³⁵ Curiously, Quispel asserts that, because the *Pseudo-Clementines* are free of Platonic influences and only “rather tinged with Stoic colours,”³⁶ this points to Alexandria as the location of the origin of the myth. Indeed, Quispel goes even further and contends that the character of Appion in the *Homilies* is the same as Apion, the central figure in Flavius Josephus’s work, *Against Apion*.³⁷ With this connection established, Quispel concludes that Alexandria is the location from whence our theogony derives.

Perpetuating the hypothesis of Gilles Quispel, J. van Amersfoort published an article in 1981 entitled “Traces of an Alexandrian Orphic Theogony in the Pseudo-Clementines.” In this article, van Amersfoort comes to two conclusions. First, the peacock’s egg that is mentioned in the *Homilies*³⁸ proves that the origin for this myth is

³⁴ James M. Robinson, ed., *The Nag Hammadi Library in English* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1977), 104.

³⁵ J. van Amersfoort, “Traces of an Alexandrian Orphic Theogony in The Pseudo-Clementines.” In *Studies in Gnosticism and Hellenistic Religions: Presented to Gilles Quispel on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*, edited by Broek, R. van Den, and M.J. Vermaseren, 13-30 (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1981), 60.

³⁶ Gilles Quispel, *Gnostica, Judaica, Catholica. Collected Essays of Gilles Quispel*, ed. Johannes van Oort (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 55:60.

³⁷ Josephus, *Against Apion*, The Loeb Classical Library, ed. T.E. Page et al., trans. H. St. J. Thackeray (London: William Heinemann LTD, 1926).

³⁸ Alexander Roberts and Sir James Donaldson, eds., *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translations of the Writings of the Fathers Down to A.D. 325*, Vol 8, Prefaces and notes by Cleveland Cox (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2004), 236.

derived from Alexandria, as Quispel conjectured. The evidence to support this assertion can be found in “the fragments of the Alexandrian Gnostic Basilides, which is quoted by his opponent Hippolytus.”³⁹ If this was indeed the case, then we must conclude that it is not right to place this theogony, as Kern does, in his chapter “Hieronymi et Hellanici Theogonia.”⁴⁰

Van Amersfoort’s second conclusion is that the Orphic myth in *Recognition*, book ten, chapters 17 and 30, is secondary to the *Homilies*, since the *Recognition* favors a theogony that is more representative of Hesiod’s version. Furthermore, van Amersfoort suggests that “Heintze was right, when he asserted, that this source was a Jewish apology written in Alexandria against the Alexandrian hater of the Jew’s Apion.”⁴¹ Even though van Amersfoort bases the bulk of his argument on usage of the phrase “peacock egg,” another shift occurred when scholars began to further explore the complexity of the Orphic myth preserved by the *Pseudo-Clementines*.

Over a decade later, Dominique Côté in “Orphic Theogony and the Context of the Clementines” took a different approach in the analysis of the Orphic myth. Côté, unlike many *Pseudo-Clementines* scholars, did not focus on the *Grundschrift*, which some scholars believe to be the original version of the *Pseudo-Clementines*. Instead, Côté suggests that the *Homilies* “attempted in chapters four to six to address the issue of Neoplatonic attack against the Christian truth or, to be more accurate, against the truth

³⁹ Amersfoort, “Traces of an Alexandrian Orphic Theogony in the *Pseudo-Clementines*,” 25.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 30.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 30.

revealed by the Verus Propheta.”⁴² The argument presented by Côté is a variation on John Chapman’s argument, that the characters of Simon and his followers were reflections of Iamblichus and his followers.⁴³ Although Côté does not fully support Chapman’s conjecture, he does maintain that “the Homilies belong first of all to the fourth century and that they intended, in some way, to reply to the Neo-Platonic attack against the Christians.”⁴⁴

Bernabé

While scholars proposed different theories to explain the origin, influences, and primacy between the *Homilies* and the *Recognition*, one scholar took the study a step farther. Alberto Bernabé, in “La teogonia orfica citada en las Pseudoclementina,” delves deeply into the Orphic text of the *Pseudo-Clementines* and draws several conclusions by comparing two aspects of the myth: the cosmic egg and Phanes. A summary of Bernabé’s conclusions is as follows:

1. The myth told in both the *Homilies* and the *Recognition* is the same.
2. The myth told in the *Homilies* tries to harmonize the Orphic text with the theogony of Hesiod and some of the pre-Socratic philosophical idea so as to reconstruct the Orphic myth.
3. The Orphic myth of the *Pseudo-Clementines* is the same as the myth of the *Rhapsodies*.

⁴² Dominique Côté, “Orphic Theogony and the context of the Clementines.” In *Nouvelles intrigues pseudo-clémentines*, ed. Frederic Amsler, 183-188 (Prahins: Editions du Zebre, 2008), 15.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 9.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 9.

Bernabé's position regarding the two versions of the *Pseudo-Clementines* is similar to that of both van Amersfoort and Côté. All three scholars recognize that the myth present in the *Pseudo-Clementines* does not belong under the genre of Hieronymi et Hellanici. Van Amersfoort suggests that the myth in the *Pseudo-Clementines* is a Jewish apology that originated in Alexandria, whereas Côté argues that the myth is in fact a Christian polemic, in which the grammarian Appion played the role of Neoplatonism. Bernabé, on the other hand, shows that the theogony of the *Pseudo-Clementines* is closer to the *Rhapsodies* and even preserves some of the traditions of the pre-Socratics.

In addition to the intuitive analysis of the *Pseudo-Clementines*'s Orphic myth, Bernabé earned his place beside Eugen and Kern with the publication of an Orphic text anthology. The first of the two-volume opus, entitled *Poetarum epicorum graecorum*,⁴⁵ was published in 1987, and volume two, *Poetae epici graeci*,⁴⁶ was published in three parts, beginning in 2004. This valuable resource covers the fragments and testimonies of Orphic poems to the Orphic rites and followers. One of the things that are unique in this opus is that Bernabé places the *Pseudo-Clementines* Orphic myth under the section of “ἸΕΡΟΙ ΛΟΓΟΙ ΕΝ ΠΑΨΩΔΙΑΙΣ ΚΛ” (fr. 90-359). This reclassification gives new importance to the *Pseudo-Clementines*, since Bernabé uses passages from the *Homilies*

⁴⁵ Alberto Bernabé, *Poetarum epicorum graecorum: Testimonia et fragmenta Pars I*, ed. Alberto Bernabé, Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana (Leipzig: BSB B.G. Teubner Verlagsgesellschaft, 1987).

⁴⁶ Alberto Bernabé, *Poetae epici graeci: Testimonia et fragmenta: Pars II, Orphicorum et Orphicis similium testimonia et fragmenta*, ed. Alberto Bernabé, Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana (Leipzig: K.G. Saur Verlag GmbH, 2004).

and the *Recognition* to illustrate and reconstruct the cosmogony and theogony of the Orphic tradition.

Post-Bernabé

In reaction to Bernabé's work, Lautaro Roig Lanzillotta published an article in 2010 called "Orphic Cosmogonies in the Pseudo-Clementines? Textual Relationship, Character and Sources of Homilies 6.3-13 and Recognitions 10.17-19.30." This article uses textual criticism in a manner similar to Bernabé. Lanzillotta ultimately concludes that the *Homilies* are the older version, the *Recognition* is contaminated with Hesiod's influence, the *Homilies* are responsible for the allegorical interpretation, and the *Homilies* share many similarities with the Orphic *Rhapsodies*.⁴⁷ The conclusions that Lanzillotta draws, parallel to Bernabé's theories, is the dominating view in the post-Bernabé era with little variation.

Also in 2010, Miguel Herrero de Jáuregui published *Orphism and Christianity in Late Antiquity*, in which he analyzes the connection between Orphism and Christianity. In chapter 4, "Orphic Theogonies," Jáuregui uses the *Pseudo-Clementines* as a witness to show how Orphic literature generally has been portrayed in Christian writings. Often, according to Jáuregui, Orpheus is portrayed as a theologian, and the theogonic poems associated with him are a means of interpretation.⁴⁸ Since Christian writers use Orpheus in this manner, Jáuregui asserts that the common theme points out the shortcomings of polytheism and its inconsistencies. Unfortunately, Jáuregui does not go into great detail

⁴⁷ Lanzillotta, "Orphic Cosmogonies in the Pseudo-Clementines? Textual Relationship, Character and Sources of Homilies 6.3-13 and Recognitions 10.17-19.30," 141.

⁴⁸ Jáuregui, *Orphism and Christianity in Late*, 167.

on the way in which the *Pseudo-Clementines* deal with the Orphic myth but merely gives a brief summary of the myth and reiterates Bernabé's conclusions.

The following year, the Friends of Herculaneum Society published *Tracing Orpheus* in the Sozomena series. This is a commemorative volume to honor Alberto Bernabé that includes contributions by Miguel Herrero de Jáuregui, Ana Isabel Jiménez San Crióbal, and other scholars of Orphism. Ironically, the *Pseudo-Clementines* are not mentioned as a source for, or even a witness to, the Orphic myth in any of the chapters. After all, Bernabé did list the *Pseudo-Clementines* as having a connection with the *Rhapsodies*, as well as including it in his great opus on the Orphic fragments.

Jourdan

As the study of the Orphic material in the *Pseudo-Clementines* develops, new conjectures concerning the sources and influence of the myth and primacy between the *Homilies* and the *Recognition* continue to emerge. The French scholar Fabienne Jourdan has contributed new insight into the Orphic myth in the *Pseudo-Clementines*. In chapter one, book two, of *Orphée et les Chrétiens: La réception du mythe d'Orphée dans la littérature Chrétienne Grecque des cinq premiers siècles*, published in 2011, Jourdan investigates Orpheus as a polemical figure among the Greek-speaking Christians of the first five centuries C.E. Jourdan breaks the chapter into four sections:

1. Orpheus used in condemnation of polytheism.
2. Orpheus targeted in the fight against heterodoxy.
3. Orpheus emphasized at the expense of paganism.
4. Attack and capture of cultural territory vis-à-vis Orpheus based on Christian literature.

With these four subsections, Jourdan illustrates early Christian views towards the first theologian of the Greeks.

The section titled “1.a Orphée pris dans la condamnation du polytheisme” begins with the early church father Athenagoras and his polemic against the creation myth of the Greeks. Jourdan states that Athenagoras, along with Origen, was one of the first Christian writers to comment on the Orphic myth. She continues on to present the myth found in the *Pseudo-Clementines*, along with the version that appears in the writings of Athenagoras. The myth that is witnessed by Athenagoras and the *Pseudo-Clementines*, according to Jourdan, is the version transmitted by Hieronymos and Hellanikos. Furthermore, she posits that the Hieronymos and Hellanikos version was influenced by Stoic tradition.⁴⁹

After discussing Athenagoras, Jourdan investigates the reception of the Old Testament by *Pseudo-Clementines*'s Orphic myth. Jourdan asserts that three passages from the book of Genesis that are echoed in the myth. These passages are Gen 1:17, “And God made humankind; according to divine image he made it; male and female he made them”; Gen 2:5, “and every herb of the field before it was on the earth and all the grass of the field before it sprang up, for God had not rained on the earth, and there was not a human to cultivate it”; and Gen 1:2, “But the earth was unsightly and unfurnished, and darkness was over the deep, and the Spirit of God moved over the water.”⁵⁰ Lastly, Jourdan addresses Origen and his attacks on the allegorical nature of the Greek myths.

⁴⁹ Fabienne Jourdan, *Orphée et les Chrétiens: La réception du mythe d'Orphée dans la littérature Chrétienne Grecque des cinq premiers siècles* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2011), 2:43.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 47.

In section “1.b Orphée, cible de la lutte contre l’hétérodoxie” Jourdan investigates the heresiologists’s relationship with the Orphic myth. The first heresiologist to be investigated is Hippolytus of Rome and his *Refutation of All Heresies*. Hippolytus uses Orpheus to draw a connection between the mystery religions of the pagans and the Sethians. Jourdan next mentions Epiphanius and the *Panarion*. In this work, Epiphanius uses Orpheus as one who was the founder of evil mysteries and initiations. Moreover, Epiphanius uses Orpheus as the source of three errors of paganism, Valentinianism, and Ptolemism, and compares them with Manichaeism.⁵¹

Section “1.c Orphée mis en valeur au détriment du paganisme” investigates Tatian’s view on Orpheus, including Tatian’s assertion that Orpheus lived in Thrace during the reign of King Acrisius, within the same period as the events of Exodus. Lastly, Jourdan investigates the stories of Orpheus passing Moses’s teachings to Homer as his successor.⁵²

Section “1.d Attaque et prise de distance culturelle vis-à-vis d’Orphée pour fonder la littérature chrétienne” centers on the work of Gregory of Nazianzus. During the time of Gregory, paganism was on the defensive, being attacked from all sides until the rise of Emperor Julian. Gregory, like those before him, challenged the allegorical interpretation of the Greek myths; however, Gregory praised Orpheus as a transmitter of monotheism.⁵³

⁵¹ Ibid., 78.

⁵² Ibid., 90.

⁵³ Ibid., 101.

In addition to the early Christian views, Jourdan offers a genealogy of texts⁵⁴ for the Orphic myth that revolutionizes and challenges the established view that the *Rhapsodies* preserve the oldest form of the Orphic myth. In her proposed genealogy, Jourdan identifies a “version originelle de la theogonie orphique” (O). The original version (O) of the Orphic myth, influenced by Platonic philosophy, rendered a version that Jourdan calls the first version of the *Rhapsodies* (A). Jourdan further suggests that (A) undergoes philosophical and allegorical transformations when it is exposed to two philosophical systems.

The two systems that Jourdan identifies as influencing (A) are Neo-Platonism and Stoicism. The Neo-Platonic version, preserved by Damascius in the fifth century C.E. and designated as (A') by Jourdan, is the most well-known version of the Orphic myth and is largely believed to be the oldest by most scholars. The Stoic version, designated as (B) by Jourdan, is the version attributed to Hieronymos and Hellanikos. Although (A') and (B) may appear to have developed independently, Jourdan suggests that (A') was influenced by (B) as well as by the Stoic commentaries on (A), which she argues would suggest that Stoicism was more influential than Neo-Platonism on (A').

The proposed genealogy allows Jourdan to assert that, contrary to the established beliefs of West, Bernabé, and Lanzillota, the *Rhapsodies* preserved by Damascius is not the oldest version of the Orphic myth. What Jourdan proposes is that the oldest version belongs to a version (O), which reflects a Middle Platonic revision and is best preserved within the text of the *Pseudo-Clementines*:

⁵⁴ Jourdan attempts to link different texts based upon common elements over a course of time.

La théogonie paraphrasée dans le roman est selon nous le fruit d'une réécriture médio-platonicienne d'une version plus ancienne (O) du poème orphique. Il s'agirait d'un ancêtre (A) des *Rhapsodies* telles qu'elles parviennent aux ou sont remaniées par les néo-Platoniciens (A').⁵⁵

The Theogony paraphrased in the novel is in our opinion the result of a Mid-Platonic rewriting an older version (O) of the Orphic poem. This would be an ancestor (A) of the *Rhapsodies* or are reworked by the neo-Platonists (A').⁵⁶

Since Jourdan asserts that the *Pseudo-Clementines* preserve the oldest form of the Orphic myth, then it must be raised above the preserved *Rhapsodies* in prominence as one of the earliest witnesses of the Orphic myth. Even though Jourdan identifies the immense significance of the *Pseudo-Clementines*, she fails to identify the structure of the *Basic Writing* and defaults to the established view that the *Homilies* preserve the original form of the Orphic myth. In fact, Jourdan sees little difference between the texts of the *Homilies* and the *Recognition*.

L'examen de ces hypothèses permet donc de concevoir le commentaire de Nicète comme une réécriture de celui d'Appion sans doute présent dans l'écrit de base (si celui-ci doit vraiment être distingué des Homélie).⁵⁷

The examination of these hypotheses allows the commentary of Nicete to be understood as a rewrite of Appion's, probably present in the basic writing (if it really needs to be distinguished from Homilies).⁵⁸

The history of modern research concerning the Orphic myth in the *Pseudo-Clementines* has illuminated the shifting scholarly viewpoints regarding the myth's

⁵⁵ Jourdan, *Orphée et Les Chrétiens*, 316.

⁵⁶ Translated by Author.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 327.

⁵⁸ Translated by Author.

evolution and interpretation. Since the early days of Lobeck and Nöldeke, scholars have struggled to categorize the Orphic myth of the *Pseudo-Clementines* among the variety of Orphic texts. Over time, study became more focused on the primacy between the *Homilies* and the *Recognition* as scholars began to associate the myth of the *Pseudo-Clementines* with the *Rhapsodies*. As it stands now, although prevailing theories have been shifting regarding the philosophical influences on the *Pseudo-Clementines's* Orphic myth, the *Homilies* continue to be accepted as the original version without sufficient analysis.

CHAPTER 3

THE ORPHIC MYTH IN THE *PSEUDO-CLEMENTINES*

Overview

The determination of whether the *Homilies* or the *Recognition* preserve the more ancient version of the Orphic myth in the *Pseudo-Clementines* has been a contentious issue among scholars. In line with the majority of scholarship, Heintze, Bernabé, and Jourdan have given priority to the *Homilies* as the older version of the Orphic myth. This conjecture is supported by claims of an alleged Alexandrian Jewish apology as a possible source for the narrative in the *Homilies*,⁵⁹ a possible connection of the *Homilies* with the *Rhapsodies* preserved by the Neo-Platonist Damascius,⁶⁰ and the *Recognition*'s simplification of the Orphic material.⁶¹ In addition to these theories, there even exists the ridiculous notion that the *Homilies* are older simply based on the fact that the text survives in Greek.

Even though renowned scholars such as Heintze, Bernabé, and West have contributed volumes to Orphic scholarship, the overall attention given to the Orphic

⁵⁹ Amersfoort, "Traces of an Alexandrian Orphic Theogony in the Pseudo-Clementines," 26.

⁶⁰ Alberto Bernabé, "La teogonia orfica citada en las Pseudoclementina," *Adamantius* 14 (2008): 97-98.

⁶¹ Lanzillotta, "Orphic Cosmogonies in the Pseudo-Clementines? Textual Relationship, Character and Sources of Homilies 6.3-13 and Recognitions 10.17-19.30," 126.

material in the *Pseudo-Clementines* has been less than impressive. Failure to properly isolate the redacted and common material between the *Homilies* and the *Recognition* has perpetuated the perceived authority of the *Homilies* with respect to the Orphic material. In this study, redaction criticism, and a close reading of the texts, will be employed to compare the parallel sections of the Orphic material in the *Homilies* and *Recognition* to carefully identify which version adds to the myth, thus revealing which version contains the oldest material. Similarly, an outline of the *Basic Writing* (hereafter *B*) will be identified by isolating common words or phrases (identified with italics) that match at least one section in the *Homilies* with one section in the *Recognition*.⁶² The end result will show, contrary to the established scholarship that the *Recognition* not only preserves the older version of the Orphic narrative, but also shares a closer relationship with *B*. After an outline of *B* is identified, source criticism will be used by comparing the outline of *B* with other known Orphic narratives in an attempt to verify Jourdan's conjecture that the *Pseudo-Clementine's* version of the Orphic myth is the oldest.

In addition to the text critical methods, the analysis of this study will proceed in the following manner: (1) The Appion disputation with Clement in the *Homilies* will be shown to be a fabrication as Strecker maintained; (2) Comparing the differences in the parallels between the *Homilies* and the *Recognition* will illuminate the redaction undoubtedly inserted by the author of the *Homilies*, known as the Homilist; (3) Comparing the common parallel material between the *Homilies* and the *Recognition* will illuminate the outline of *B*; (4) The outline of *B* has elements in common with the myths

⁶² The method of parallel isolation is attributed to F.S Jones who asserts that this is the best method to reconstruct *B*. F. Stanley Jones, *Pseudoclementia Elchasaiticaque inter Judaeochristiana. Collected Studies*, s. 203 (Walpole: Peters Publishing, 2012), 17.

preserved by the early church fathers and non-Christian sources that will illustrate the antiquity of *B*. Thus, it will be seen that the Orphic myth narrated in *Recognition* is the older of the two versions and reflects the outline of *B*.

Preliminary Note

Before the analysis begins, a few words must be said regarding the texts and translations used in this study. The translations of the *Homilies*⁶³ (hereafter *H*) and the *Recognition*⁶⁴ (hereafter *R*) are taken from the Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson renditions in the *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, volume 8. The Greek and Latin texts of *H* and *R* are taken from the editions of Bernhard Rehm and Georg Strecker *Die Pseudoklementinen I: Homilien*⁶⁵ and *Die Pseudoklementinen II: Rekognitionen in Rufins Übersetzung*.⁶⁶ The passages for the Greek and Latin texts will be designated with an *H* or *R* followed by the book number, chapter, and section (i.e., *H* 6.2.1 signifies *Homilies*, book 6, chapter 2, section 1; likewise for *R*). The tables in chapters 3 and 4 are presented in 3 or 4 columns. From left to right, the first column is Clement's narrative in *R*, the second column is Niceta's narrative in *R*, the third column is "Appion's" narrative in *H*,

⁶³ Roberts and Donaldson, *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, 223.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 77.

⁶⁵ Bernhard Rehm and Georg Strecker, eds., *Die Pseudoklementinen I: Homilien*, 2nd rev. ed. (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1992).

⁶⁶ Bernhard Rehm and Georg Strecker, eds., *Die Pseudoklementinen II: Rekognitionen in Rufins Übersetzung*, Pt. 2, 2nd rev. ed. (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1994).

and the fourth column, when it appears, is Clement's narrative in *H*⁶⁷. All Spanish, French, and German translations have been translated by the author of this thesis.

The *Pseudo-Clementines*

The *Pseudo-Clementines* (hereafter *PsCl*) are “primarily a specific group of pseudonymous compositions that relate a fictitious tale of the life of Clement of Rome and his travels with the Apostle Peter.”⁶⁸ The text of the *PsCl* was originally written in Greek and later translated by the early church father Tyrannius Rufinus into Latin. In a letter to Bishop Gaudentius, Rufinus writes:

puto quod non te lateat, Clementis huius in Graeco eiusdem operis, hoc est Recognitionum, duas editiones haberi et duo corpora esse librorum, in aliquantis quidem diversae, in multis tamen eiusdem narrationis.⁶⁹

you are, I believe well aware that there are two Greek editions of this work of Clement, his Recognitions; that there are two sets of books, which in some few cases differ from each other though the bulk of the narrative is the same.⁷⁰

As Rufinus points out, the two books differ from one another, yet they tell the same story. The two texts of the *PsCl* are preserved in Greek (*H*) and Latin and Syriac (*R*). Originally, *R* was written in Greek, of which only fragments survive, but to date the extant work mainly survives in Latin and Syriac translations⁷¹.

⁶⁷ The same format is followed for the Greek and Latin Texts presented in the Appendices.

⁶⁸ Jones, *Pseudoclementia Elchasaiticaque inter Judaeochristiana*, 8.

⁶⁹ Rehm and Strecker, *Die Pseudoklementinen: Rekognitionen*, 4.

⁷⁰ Roberts and Donaldson, *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, 75.

⁷¹ There is also an Armenian version.

The Homilies

The events leading to the Orphic myth in *H* begin to take shape in *H* 6.1.4, where a certain grammarian, Appion, is introduced. *H* presents the discourse between Appion, Clement, Niceta, and others in Tyre of Phoenicia on the third day after Clement and his brothers arrived in Tyre. The narrative begins with Appion's desire to correct an apparent misunderstanding of the gods from a previous engagement with Clement.

ἀλλ' ἐχρῆν σε, ὦ τέκνον, εἰδέναι ὅτι μὴ τοιαῦτα περὶ θεῶν
φρονῶν ἔγραφον, ἀλλὰ στοργῇ τῇ πρὸς σὲ τὰ ἀληθῆ λέγειν
ἀπεκρυπτόμην, ἅπερ, εἰ νῦν ἐθέλεις, παρ' ἐμοῦ ἄκουσον.⁷²

But, my son, you ought to have known that I was not in earnest when I wrote such things about the gods, but was concealing the truth, from my love to you. That truth, however, if it so please you, you may hear from me now.⁷³

Appion continues by saying that the myths are not to be understood as true and literal. Instead, the myths are supposed to be allegorically interpreted because they possess particular philosophical meaning. Appion first introduces the ancient authorities of the myths (Homer, Hesiod, and Orpheus) as testimony that in the beginning was chaos. Next, he describes the creation of matter and the creation of a cosmic egg, which splits open. Matter then separates from itself, and finally the gods are created. After Appion narrates the myth, Clement gives a brief recap of the myth in response to Appion's accusations that Clement did not understand the narrative he just heard.

⁷² Rehm and Strecker, *Die Pseudoklementinen: Homilien*, 105.

⁷³ Roberts and Donaldson, *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, 262.

The Recognition

The events leading up to the first version of the Orphic myth in *R* begin at *R* 10.15.1 with Clement showing his admiration for Peter's disputation in Tripolis against the Gentiles:

valde miratus sum te, qui a patribus Hebraeo ritu et observantiis propriae legis inbutus, Graecae eruditionis studiis in nullo inquinatus es, quomodo tam magnifice et tam inconparabiliter prosecutes sis, ita ut etiam quaedam de historiis deorum quae in theatris decantari solent, contingeres.⁷⁴

I greatly wondered at you, that although you were instructed by your father according to the fashion of the Hebrews and in observances of your own law, and were never polluted by the studies of Greek learning, you argued so magnificently and so incomparably; and that you even touched upon some things concerning the histories of the gods, which are usually declaimed in the theatres.⁷⁵

Even though Peter was not polluted by Greek learning, as Clement says, he still managed skillfully to combat the Gentiles with respect to their gods. Peter's skill earned the admiration of Clement, but Clement feels that Peter needs to be made aware of the "foolish opinions the Gentiles entertain of the gods."⁷⁶ Clement believes that Peter lacks the opinions of the gods as found in the Orphic myth that Clement narrates in *R* 10.17.1. *R* 10.16.1-16.6 continues with a brief interruption by Niceta, who narrates the version of the myth in *R* 10.30.1, and Peter's acknowledgement that it is good for him to learn the

⁷⁴ Rehm and Strecker, *Die Pseudoklementinen: Rekognitionen*, 335.

⁷⁵ Roberts and Donaldson, *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, 196.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 196.

things in which the Gentiles err. After Peter gives his permission, Clement continues his exposition of the Orphic myth.

R 10.28.1-28.5 concludes with Clement's exposition saying that he does not understand how anyone could venerate the gods, especially Jupiter, knowing that the gods are murderers and adulterers. Peter's response to Clement is that he will teach Clement why the Gentiles worship and venerate the gods and the wickedness of Jupiter. In *R* 10.29.1, Niceta interjects and tells Peter that the Gentiles have certain arguments "by which they support those things which seem to be blameworthy and disgraceful."⁷⁷ This passage leads to *R* 10.30.1, in which Niceta begins his exposition of the Orphic myth.

The Orphic myth introduced in *R* 10.30.1 has a different structure than *R* 10.17.1.

R 10.30.1 begins with Niceta saying,

Omnis sermo apud Graecos, qui de antiquitatis origine
conscribitur, cum alios multos, tum duos praecipuos
auctores habet, Orfeum et Hesiodum.⁷⁸

All the literature among the Greeks that is written on the
subject of the origin of antiquity, is based upon many
authorities, but especially two, Orpheus and Hesiod.⁷⁹

Unlike Clement's exposition in *R* 10.17.1, Niceta goes straight into the myth and gives an impartial account when introducing those Greeks who are considered authorities.⁸⁰

⁷⁷ Roberts and Donaldson, *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, 200.

⁷⁸ Rehm and Strecker, *Die Pseudoklementinen: Rekognitionen*, 346.

⁷⁹ Roberts and Donaldson, *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, 201.

⁸⁰Niceta hoc modo coepit: Omnis sermo apud Graecos, qui de antiquitatis origine
conscribitur..., Niceta started with this: All stories in the Greek writings, which he wrote
about the ancient origin. Rehm and Strecker, *Die Pseudoklementinen: Rekognitionen*,
346.

Although *R* 10.29.1 is not filled with condemning language, Niceta does say that the more intelligent among the Greeks have particular defenses, such as the myths, to color over absurdities.⁸¹ Calling some of the Greeks intelligent suggests that total contempt for Greek culture is not present.

Lautaro Roig Lanzillotta in “Orphic Cosmogonies” asserts that:

[f]rom 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.⁸²

Lanzillotta is correct in identifying the deriding intention of Clement’s remarks, but the contention that one has moved into a Christian dominated world lacks sufficient evidence. Rather than a Christian dominated world, *R* 10.17.1 contains an anti-Hellenistic Jewish Christianity, which seeks to expose the fallacies of Greek myths. Clement’s combative tone in the exposition is in the spirit of Peter’s disputation with Gentiles in Tripolis. Furthermore, if *R* 10.17.1 was meant to be a polemic, it would seem unusual that Clement would say that there are “The wise men, then, who are among the Gentiles.”⁸³

Appion in the *Homilies* and the *Recognition*

“Die Apiondisputationen,” or the Appion disputations, have been a point of controversy among scholars since the time of Heintze. One reason for the controversy is that *H* presents information regarding Appion and his background that is not paralleled in

⁸¹ The absurdities refer to various acts of the gods, such as the affairs of Zeus.

⁸² Lanzillotta, “Orphic Cosmogonies in the Pseudo-Clementines? Textual Relationship, Character and Sources of Homilies 6.3-13 and Recognitions 10.17-19.30,” 124.

⁸³ Roberts and Donaldson, *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, 197.

R. Strecker postulates the fabrication of Appion by the Homilist in *Judenchristentum in Pseudoklementinen*, in which he said:

Völlig evident aber wird die Vermutung, der Homilist habe die Apiondisputation komponiert, durch eine Untersuchung der Gestalt Apions in den Homilien: Ohne vorher genannt zu sein, erscheint Apion in H IV 6,2 als Begleiter Simons, gemeinsam mit den Gefährten Anubion und Athenodor.⁸⁴

The assumption that the Homilist has composed the Apiondisputation becomes completely evident by examining the shape Apion takes in the Homilies: Without being mentioned before, Apion appears in H IV 6,2 as a companion of Simon, together with the companions Anubion and Athenodor.⁸⁵

Prior to Strecker, Rehm, in “Zur Entstehung der Pseudoclementinischen Schriften,” observed that R 10.53-73 has no counterpart in H.⁸⁶ In addition, F. S. Jones summarizes that “Rufinus added to his translation of the Recognition the ending of the novel (R 10.52.2-65.5) from an edition of the *Klementia*, while R 10.65.a-72 is evidently a composition by someone else.”⁸⁷

As stated previously, H 4.6.2 contains information about Appion that is not found in R or any other sections in H, such as that Appion is a grammarian from Alexandria.⁸⁸ Moreover, in H 4.7.2 Appion tells his friends that Clement “has been seduced by a certain

⁸⁴ Strecker, *Das Judenchristentum in den Pseudoklementinen*, 83.

⁸⁵ Translated by Author.

⁸⁶ “R 10, 65 Mitte bis 72 hat in H keine Entsprechung: also kann R 10, 52-72 nicht aus H 20,11-23 stammen.” Bernhard Rehm, “Zur Entstehung der pseudoclementinischen Schriften,” ZNW no. 37 (1938): 82.

⁸⁷ Jones, *Pseudoclementia Elchasaiticaque inter Judaeochristiana*, 12.

⁸⁸ See J.N Bremmer, “Apion and Anoubion,” In *The Pseudo-Clementines*, ed. Jan N. Bremmer, (Leuven: Peeters, 2010), 72-91.

barbarian called Peter to speak and act after the manner of the Jews.”⁸⁹ Thus, it appears that the character of Appion, who is only found in *H*, may have been adapted from book II of Josephus’s *Against Apion*.⁹⁰

In book II of *Against Apion*, Josephus presents the following information on Appion:

Τίνα τοίνυν ἐστὶ τὰ δεινὰ καὶ σκέτλια τῶν ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ
κατοικούντων Ἰουδαίων, ἃ κατηγορήκεν αὐτῶν,
ἴδωμεν. ‘ἐλθόντες,’ φησὶν, ‘ἀπὸ Συρίας ὤκησαν πρὸς
ἀλίμενον θάλασσαν γειτνιάσαντες ταῖς τῶν κυμάτων
ἐκβολαῖς.’ οὐκοῦν τόπος εἰ λαιδορίαν ἔχει, τὴν οὐ πατρίδα
μὲν λεγομένην δὲ αὐτοῦ λαιδορεῖ τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρειαν.⁹¹

Let us investigate the grave and shocking charges which he has brought against the Jewish residents in Alexandria. ‘They came,’ he says, ‘from Syria and settled by a sea without a harbour, close beside the spot where the waves break on the beach.’ Well, if fault is to be found with the locality, he is stigmatizing, I do not say his native place, but what he professes to be his native place, Alexandria.⁹²

Based on Josephus, it is not difficult to understand why some scholars speculate on an Alexandrian source for the Appion disputations. The possibility of Appion being from Alexandria strengthens Quispel and Amersfoort’s Alexandrian roots for the Orphic myth. In fact, Heintze’s postulation for a Jewish apologetic source is also reinforced by Appion’s Jewish connection:

⁸⁹ Roberts and Donaldson, *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, 253.

⁹⁰ To distinguish the character between the *PsCl* and Josephus, Appion will be used for the *PsCl* and Apion will be used for Josephus.

⁹¹ Josephus, *The Life Against Apion*, Edited by Page, T.E., E. Capps, W.H.D. Rouse, L.A. Post, and E.H. Warmington, Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray, The Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1926), 1:304.

⁹² *Ibid.*, 305.

die Person des Apion, der sogar in den bewußt christlichen Homilien seiner historischen Stellung wegen als Erzfeind der Juden erscheint. In der Tat hat er nie etwas mit dem Christentum zu tun gehabt⁹³

the person of Apion, who appears even in the Christian homilies aware of his historical position as a nemesis for the Jews. In fact, he has never had anything to do with Christianity⁹⁴

H 4.6.1 through the Orphic myth is the only place where the character of Appion can be found. Since no parallels of Appion are found in other versions, then it is possible to conclude that the discussion of Appion on the Orphic myth was a fabrication of the Homilist. The disruption of the story-line (e.g., Clement as having learned of Judaism in Rome) and the unexpected and subtle appearance of Appion in *H* 4.6.1 render this conclusion possible.

Furthermore, by the fourth century C.E., evidence to support the fabrication of Appion may be found in *The Ecclesiastical History* by Eusebius of Caesarea. In book 3, Eusebius makes a brief reference to the alleged work of Clement:

ιστέον δ' ὡς καὶ δευτέρα τις εἶναι λέγεται τοῦ Κλήμεντος ἐπιστολή, οὐ μὴν ἔθ' ὁμοίως τῇ προτέρα καὶ ταύτην Κλήμεντος ἐπιστολή, οὐ μὴν ἔθ' ὁμοίως τῇ προτέρα καὶ ταύτην γνώριμον ἐπιστάμεθα, ὅτι μηδὲ τοὺς ἀρχαίους αὐτῇ κεκρημένους ἴσμεν. ἤδη δὲ καὶ ἕτερα πολυεπῆ καὶ μακρὰ συγγράμματα ὡς τοῦ αὐτοῦ χθὲς καὶ πρόην τινὲς προήγαγον, Πέτρου δὴ καὶ Ἀπίωνος διαλόγους περιέχοντα· ὧν οὐδ' ὄλως μνήμη τις παρὰ τοῖς παλαιοῖς φέρεται, οὐδὲ γὰρ καθαρὸν τῆς ἀποστολικῆς ὀρθοδοξίας ἀποσφύζει τὸν χαρακτῆρα.⁹⁵

⁹³ Werner Heintze, *Der Klemensroman und Seine Griechischen Quellen* (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1914), 50.

⁹⁴ Translated by Author.

⁹⁵ Eusebius of Caesarea, *Histoire Ecclesiastique*, ed. by Gustave Bardy, Sources Chretiennes 31 (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1952), 3.38.4.

It must not be overlooked that there is a second epistle said to be from Clement's pen, but I have no reason to suppose that it was well known like the first one, since I am not aware that the early fathers made any use of it. A year or two ago other long and wordy treatises were put forward as Clement's work. They contain alleged dialogues with Peter and Apion, but there is no mention whatever of them by early writers, nor do they preserve in its purity the stamp of apostolic orthodoxy.⁹⁶

It is clear that Eusebius is speaking about *H*, since *R* does not have any dialogue that involves Appion. From the beginning of the passage, Eusebius doubts the authenticity of the work rumored to be written by Clement. In fact, it is possible that Eusebius knows of a different version, possibly *R*, since Eusebius specifically writes about the alleged dialogues of Appion and a treatise that was put forth in his recent past. Unfortunately, Eusebius does not specifically name any work, but it is also possible that he knew of a writing from Clement that did not contain a dialogue with Peter and Appion.

With all the information at hand, two conclusions can be made regarding Appion. First, since Appion only appears in *H*, having been fabricated by the Homilist, it explains, as Strecker initially postulated, why Appion suddenly appears in *R* 10.52.2-52.3. In fact, Clement himself, in the preface of *R*, tells Bishop Gaudentius that one of the versions is missing the ending.⁹⁷ Second, when one compares the Apion attested by Josephus to the Appion in *H*, it appears likely that *H* was inspired by Josephus's antagonist. Now that the

⁹⁶ Eusebius of Caesarea, *Histoire Ecclesiastique*, 3.38.4.

⁹⁷ Roberts and Donaldson, *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, 75.

introductory details have been addressed, I will proceed to the analysis of the parallel material.

The Orphic Myth

The Orphic myth found in *H* and *R* is composed of two different stages of creation: a cosmogony and a theogony, which can be further divided into six sections:

1. Preface to the myth.
2. Provenance of the Universe.
3. The Cosmic Egg.
4. The emergence of Phanes.
5. The first gods and their allegories.
6. The Titans.

By dividing the myth into these six parts and comparing the differences in the parallels, one can gain a clearer understanding of the redactions in the narratives.

Preface to the Myth⁹⁸

R's introductions to the myth begin at *R* 10.17.1 with Clement and *R* 10.30.1 with Niceta, and *H*'s introduction to the myth begins at *H* 6.2.1 with Appion. *H* gives another version of the myth in *H* 6.11.1-12.4, but this version is Clement's summary of Appion's discourse with some added information on allegory and how Clement heard the stories from others. In fact, *H* 6.11.1-12.4 has been largely ignored by scholars, but it will be included in this analysis.

The introductions are as follows:

⁹⁸ See Appendix A for Greek and Latin parallels of Table 1.

TABLE 1. Preface to the Myth⁹⁹

<p><i>R</i> 10.17.2 (10.17.2) The wise men, then, who are among the Gentiles</p>	<p><i>R</i> 10.30.1-30.2 (10.30.1) All the literature among the Greeks which is written on the subject of the origin of antiquity, is based upon many authorities, but especially two, Orpheus and Hesiod. (10.30.2) Now their writings are divided into two parts, in respect to their meaning, —that is, the literal and the allegorical; and the vulgar crowd has flocked to the literal, but all the eloquence of the philosophers and learned men is expended in admiration of the allegorical.</p>	<p><i>H</i> 6.2.12 (6.2.12) But, my son, as I said, such stories have a particular and philosophical meaning, which can be allegorically set forth in such a way that you yourself would listen with wonder.</p>	<p><i>H</i> 6.11.2-11.3 (6.11.2) Do not suppose that I do not understand what you say. I understand it thoroughly; and that the more that this is not the first time I have heard it. (6.11.3) And that you may know that I am not ignorant of these things, I shall epitomize what you have said, and supply in their order, as I have heard them from others, the allegorical interpretations of those stories you have omitted.</p>
--	--	--	--

Upon initial inspection, *H* and *R* in translation treat the interpretation of the myths in different ways. *H* revolves around the idea of allegory when Appion claims the myth to be a wondrous thing. When Appion begins his narrative in *H* 6.2.12, he intends to impress upon Clement the technique of allegory and the way in which it demonstrates philosophical ideas such that Clement himself would be left in wonder. But *H* 6.17.1 illustrates that Clement has already been exposed to these myths and does not seem

⁹⁹ Roberts and Donaldson, *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, 192-265.

impressed. In fact, Clement blames the wise men for leading people astray with their myths.

πλὴν θαυμάζω πᾶς ταῦτα σαφῶς καὶ εὐσεβῶς καὶ
ὠφελίμως ἀκαλύπτω τῇ εὐθείᾳ δηλοῦσθαι δυνάμενα οἱ
πλαγίοις ἀποκρύψαντες αἰνίγμασιν καὶ μύθοις αὐτὰ προκα-
λύψαντες κακοῖς ὑπὸ σοῦ ἔμφορονες καὶ σοφοὶ εἶναι
λέγονται, οἵτινες ὡσπερ ὑπὸ κακοῦ προαχθέντες δαίμονος
σχεδὸν τοὺς πάντας ἐνήδρευσαν ἀνθρώπους.¹⁰⁰

Now, since these things can be clearly, profitably, and without prejudice to piety, set forth in a open and straightforward manner, I wonder you call those men sensible and wise who concealed them under crooked riddles, and overlaid them with filthy stories, and thus, as if impelled by an evil spirit, deceived almost all men.¹⁰¹

R's sentiments towards the myths are not as passionate as those found in *H*.

Clement, in *R* 10.17.2, is very brief in his introduction and says that there are those “who are wise among the Gentiles” but does not mention who they are. It can only be assumed that Clement is speaking about philosophers or influential men such as sages.¹⁰² Niceta’s exposition in *R* 10.30.1-30.2 elaborates on Clements’s brief introduction. Instead of naming those wise men among the Gentiles, Niceta substitutes the word “authorities” for the wise men, who are Orpheus and Hesiod.

In addition to naming these two authorities, Niceta, in *R* 10.30.2, says there are two ways to interpret the writings of Orpheus and Hesiod. The first manner of interpretation is the literal, and the other is the allegorical. Niceta asserts that the

¹⁰⁰ Rehm and Strecker, *Die Pseudoklementinen: Homilien*, 112.

¹⁰¹ Roberts and Donaldson, *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, 265.

¹⁰² *R* 10.17 .2 says “aiunt ergo qui sapientiores sunt inter gentiles...” Clement calls these men sapientiores (compar., acc., plur.), which means the wiser men. Rehm and Strecker, *Die Pseudoklementinen: Rekognitionen*, 336.

eloquence of philosophers and the learned men are attracted to the allegorical. Between the two forms of interpretation, the allegorical method is preferred, since both *H* and *R* proceed in the allegorical manner, but it is only Niceta who begins by naming the two authorities.

Provenance of the Universe¹⁰³

After the preface, the provenance of the Universe, in which all things come from chaos, emerges.

TABLE 2. Provenance of the Universe¹⁰⁴

<i>R</i> 10.17.2	<i>R</i> 10.30.3	<i>H</i> 6.3.1-3.4
(10.17.2) first of all things was chaos.	(10.30.3) 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.	(6.3.1) There was once a time when nothing existed but chaos and a confused mixture of orderless elements, which were as yet simply heaped together. This nature testifies, and great men have been of opinion that it was so. (6.3.2) Of these great men I shall bring forward to you him who excelled them all in wisdom, Homer, where he says, with a reference to the original confused mass, ‘But may you all become water and earth;’ implying that from these all things had their origin, and that all things return to their first state, which is chaos, when the watery and earthy

¹⁰³ See Appendix A for Greek and Latin parallels of Table 2.

¹⁰⁴ Roberts and Donaldson, *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, 192-265.

TABLE 2. Continued

R 10.17.2	R 10.30.3	H 6.3.1-3.4
		<p>substances are separated. And Hesiod in the THEOGONY says, (6.3.3) ‘Assuredly chaos was the very first to come into being.’ Now, by ‘come into being,’ he evidently means that chaos came into being, as having a beginning. (6.3.4) And Orpheus likens chaos to an egg, in which was the confused mixture of the primordial elements. This chaos, which Orpheus calls an egg, is taken for granted by Hesiod, having a beginning, produced from infinite matter, and originated in the following way.</p>

Between the three passages describing the provenance of the Universe, R 10.17.2 gives the least amount of details. In fact, R 10.17.2 is similar to what is found in Hesiod’s *Theogony*. In line 116 of the *Theogony*, Hesiod writes:

ἦτοι μὲν πρότιστα Χάος γένητ’¹⁰⁵

First came Chaos¹⁰⁶

Like Hesiod, Clement says that chaos was first of all things with no additional information regarding of what chaos is comprised.

¹⁰⁵ Hesiod, *Theogony* 116.

¹⁰⁶ Hesiod, *The Works and Days, Theogony, The Shield of Herakles*, trans. Richmond Lattimore (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1959), 130.

In *R* 10.30.3, Niceta begins with a cosmogony attributed to Orpheus in which chaos is the first to exist. To give an idea of what chaos was not, Niceta describes it as being unbounded, unproduced, neither darkness nor light, neither moist nor dry, neither hot nor cold. After the description, Niceta says that chaos was a mixture of all things and it did not take any specific shape or form because everything was mixing together. Interestingly, the description given by Niceta draws on Stoic cosmology.

However, the use of Stoic cosmology by Niceta also separates the cosmogony of Orpheus from the cosmogony of the Stoics. According to Niceta, Orpheus maintained that chaos was always a uniform mass. Unlike Orpheus, the Stoics had a much more elaborate view concerning the creation of the universe. The Stoics maintained that

the cosmos is one, limited, spherical body, situated in an infinite expanse of void. It consists of four elements: earth, water, air, and fire, arranged in concentric spheres around the center of the cosmos.¹⁰⁷

Additionally, these elements represent “the intermediary phase through which the primordial fiery substance is converted into the universe.”¹⁰⁸ Since Niceta says that, according to Orpheus, chaos was bereft of shape, form, and limit, the cosmogony of Orpheus is to be understood as separate from the Stoic version of how the universe originated, which included the elements.

To shift attention now from *R* to *H*, the longest exposition of the three versions is found here. From the previous section, Niceta asserts that there are two authorities among the Greeks, but Appion, in *H* 6.3.1-3.4, asserts there are three; Homer, Hesiod,

¹⁰⁷ Hahn, *The Origins of Stoic Cosmology*, 91.

¹⁰⁸ Josiah B. Gould, *The Philosophy of Chrysippus* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1970), 119.

and Orpheus, who are the greatest among men at expounding myths. Before getting into the details of each of the three authorities, Appion maintains that chaos and a confused mixture of elements were the first to exist. To legitimize his assertion, Appion uses Homer as his first authoritative witness. Appion quotes Homer, “may you all become water and earth,” as a way to connect chaos and the mixture of elements. Since all things originate from water and earth, as Homer says, Appion attempts to bridge his original statement with Homer’s cosmogony. Since all things return to their original states (water and earth), they are in essence chaos, since the elements are separated from a confused mass.

In “La teogonia orfica citada en las Pseudoclementia,” Bernabé acknowledges Appion’s use of Homer as a literary bridge but views Appion’s application of Homer as arbitrary. Bernabé asserts that Appion includes Homer as one who believed chaos was the first to exist and quotes the Iliad to elucidate the ideas together:

De modo que parece claro que Apión, al identificar el Caos con la mezcla indistinta, intenta conciliar fuentes diversas. La idea se confirma, primero, porque intenta introducir *velis nolis* también a Homero entre quienes postulan el caos originario (Hom. 6.3.2), para lo cual interpreta alegórica y muy forzosamente un verso de la *Iliada*.¹⁰⁹

So it seems clear that Apion, to identify the Chaos with indiscriminate mixture, tried to reconcile different sources. The idea is confirmed, first, because he intends to *forcibly* introduce Homer among those who state chaos was first (Hom. 6.3.2), by which they forcibly allegorically interpret a verse of the Iliad.¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁹ Bernabé, “La teogonia orfica citada en las Pseudoclementina,” 83.

¹¹⁰ Translated by Author.

Following the Homeric exposition, Appion transitions to Hesiod as the next witness to chaos as the first “thing” to come into being. Quoting the *Theogony* of Hesiod, Appion says that “assuredly chaos was the very first to come into being.” Appion further argues that chaos had a beginning, implying that it was not eternal. Unlike with the Homeric passage, Appion does not use Hesiod to address the existence of chaos but rather attempts to show the existence of chaos and the confused mixture of the elements as the beginning of all things.

The last of the authorities to be introduced by Appion is Orpheus. In his brief account, Appion asserts that Orpheus calls chaos “an egg.” Within this egg, there is a confused mixture of the primordial elements. Appion points out that Hesiod takes the egg for granted, meaning that Hesiod does not make any reference to an egg in his *Theogony*. Lastly, Orpheus asserts that the egg is produced from infinite matter.

The integration of Homer, Hesiod, and Orpheus in *H* 6.3.1-3.4 is Appion’s attempt to substantiate the claim that the first to exist was chaos, as well as a confused mixture of orderless elements. Appion first employs Homer, who was considered as “a sage with revealed knowledge of the fate of souls and of the structure of reality,”¹¹¹ and who connected earth and water to chaos. Next, Appion introduced Hesiod, the great author of the genealogies of the gods, as a way to bridge his view of chaos and Orpheus’s view of chaos. Lastly, Orpheus, the first theologian, likened chaos to an egg that encapsulated a confused mixture of primordial elements. Thus, Appion inductively shows that chaos and the confused mixture were the first to exist.

¹¹¹ Robert Lamberton, *Homer the Theologian*, ed. Peter Brown (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986), 1.

The Cosmic Egg¹¹²

After the provenance of the universe, the myth proceeds to the generation of the cosmic egg.

TABLE 3. The Cosmic Egg¹¹³

<i>R</i> 10.17.2	<i>R</i> 10.30.4	<i>H</i> 6.4.1-5.3	<i>H</i> 6.12.1
(10.17.2) this, 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	(10.30.4) yet that at length, as it were after the manner of a huge egg	(6.4.1) 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 creature. And once it chanced (6.4.2) that this infinite sea, which was thus by its own nature driven about with a natural motion, flowed in an orderly manner from the	(6.12.1) I shall not at present speak particularly of that living egg, which was conceived by a happy combination out of infinite matter

¹¹² See Appendix A for Greek and Latin parallels of Table 3.

¹¹³ Roberts and Donaldson, *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, 192-265.

TABLE 3. Continued

<i>R</i> 10.17.2	<i>R</i> 10.30.4	<i>H</i> 6.4.1-5.3	<i>H</i> 6.12.1
		<p>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 a 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.</p> <p>(6.4.3) 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</p>	

TABLE 3. Continued

<i>R</i> 10.17.2	<i>R</i> 10.30.4	<i>H</i> 6.4.1-5.3	<i>H</i> 6.12.1
		<p>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.</p> <p>(6.5.1) Now you must think of Kronos as time (CHRONOS), and Rhea as the flowing (RHEON) of the watery substance. 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),</p> <p>(6.5.2) which at first was full of 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.</p> <p>(6.5.3) 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</p>	

TABLE 3. Continued

<i>R</i> 10.17.2	<i>R</i> 10.30.4	<i>H</i> 6.4.1-5.3 egg, conceived out of infinite matter, when set in motion by the underlying and ever-flowing matter, produces many different forms.	<i>H</i> 6.12.1
------------------	------------------	--	-----------------

In *R* 10.17.2 Clement says that, after an unknown period of time, the chaotic state became ordered and took the shape of an egg. However, he does suggest that time was needed for chaos to coagulate and convert itself into some form. In *R* 10.30.4, Niceta does not suggest why chaos formed into an egg but that it formed nonetheless.

Unlike Clement and Niceta, Appion, in *H* 6.4.1-5.3, provides an elaborate explanation for the creation of the cosmic egg. His exposition begins with a commentary on the four principal kinds of matter.¹¹⁴ Next, Appion refers to the chaotic state and the confused mixture of matter that occurred prior to the creation of the egg and cannot support any living thing. After the disorder, the infinite sea (matter) begins to overcome the disorder and attain order. Lastly, since the matter that is present is in a chaotic state, it does not have a chance to bind to itself and thus to take a shape.

At this point, the cosmic egg parallels between *H* and *R* begin to diverge. Prior to the end of the narrative, Appion goes into copious detail on the manner in which the egg developed. Moreover, Appion incorporates Stoic cosmological ideas in his narrative. Matter is called “the four kinds,” referring to the four elements, and the mixing of these elements is what generates life. In fact, from the point of divergence in the parallels to

¹¹⁴ Referring to the elements Earth, Water, Fire, and Air.

the end of his discourse, Appion shifts to a combination of Stoic cosmological and allegorical interpretations.

Appion begins by comparing the egg to a ball-like bubble formed by its surroundings, like a bubble in water. Second, the bubble comes forth to the light, and it is born upwards by a divine spirit. Lastly, the divine spirit bears the globe, which resembles an egg, and a life begins to manifest within it. After the introduction of the divine spirit, Appion goes into an allegorical interpretation of the elements.

The allegorical discourse proceeds on how Kronos and Rhea should be interpreted. Kronos must be thought of as time, and Rhea should be thought of as water. When elucidating how Kronos and Rhea ought to be understood, Appion asserts that the flowing watery substance Rhea (matter) was born for some time and later manifested as a sphere, like an egg, which represented the all embracing heavens. Within the egg, there are all sorts of elements and colors, but in actuality there was only one element and color that produced all the forms. Appion likens the egg to a peacock's egg because as a peacock's egg has externally one color, but internally possesses the potential for all colors. So Rhea's egg also holds the potential for all forms. Lastly, within the egg, the elements were brought together by the divine spirit to produce a creature that was both male and female in form.

After the long exposition by Appion, Clement, in *H* 6.12.1, gives a brief summary of Appion's account, starting with the egg, but Clement's summary is akin to both versions given in *R*. Between the accounts of *R* and *H*, *H* 6.4.1-5.3 gives a more elaborate description of the formation of the cosmic egg. Appion's elaborations are especially visible halfway through his narrative. The second half of the account is a

retelling of the egg's manifestation, heavily allegorized and accompanied by the comparison with the peacock's egg.

The peacock's egg has attracted the attention of scholars regarding determination of its place in *H*. Van Amersfoort argues that the imagery of the egg originated in Alexandria because it appeared in the writings of the Gnostic, Basilides, and “[s]ince Basilides lived in Alexandria, the image of the peacock's egg must belong to the cosmological imagery of the Orphics in Alexandria.”¹¹⁵ Quispel, prior to van Amersfoort, did not need the peacock's egg to postulate an Egyptian source for the egg, for he says, “I do not see why this myth could not have been borrowed by the Mycenaean from the Egyptians through the intermediary of the Phoenicians.”¹¹⁶

In addition to the Alexandrian origin, a pre-Hellenistic parallel to the egg can be found in the mock cosmogony of Aristophanes's *Birds*.¹¹⁷

Χάος ἦν καὶ Νύξ Ἐρεβός τε μέλαν πρῶτον καὶ Τάρταρος
εὐρύς, γῆ δ' οὐδ' ἀήρ οὐδ' οὐρανός ἦν· Ἐρέβους δ' ἐν
ἀπείροσι κόλποις τίκτει πρότιστον ὑπνέμιον Νύξ ἢ
μελανόπτερος ὄόν, ἐξ οἷ περιτελλομέναις ὥραις ἔβλασταν
Ἔρωσ ὁ ποθινός, στίλβων νῶτον πτερύγοιν χρυσαῖν, εἰκῶς
ἀνεμώκεσι δίναις.¹¹⁸

There was Chaos at first, and Darkness, and Night, and
Tartarus vasty and dismal; But the Earth was not there, nor
the Sky, nor the Air, till at length in the bosom abysmal of
Darkness an egg, from the whirlwind conceived, was laid
by the sable-plumed Night. And out of that egg, as the

¹¹⁵ Amersfoort, “Traces of an Alexandrian Orphic Theogony in the *Pseudo-Clementines*,” 25.

¹¹⁶ Quispel, *Gnostica, Judaica, Catholica*, 56.

¹¹⁷ West, *The Orphic Poems*, 51.

¹¹⁸ Aristophanes, *Birds* 693-697.

Seasons revolved, sprang Love, the entrancing, the bright,
Love brilliant and bold with his pinions of gold, like a
whirlwind, refulgent and sparkling!¹¹⁹

Upon close inspection, Aristophanes's version has more in common with *R* than *H*. Appion begins his explanation with a discussion on matter and its movement, then transitions into an allegorical interpretation of the egg. *R*, in both versions, has the egg generating over the course of time, similarly to Aristophanes's version of the egg being laid at length by darkness.

In addition to Aristophanes's satire, "sometime before the middle of the sixth century B.C.E., a quite different and no less striking oriental myth about the beginning of things was introduced to Greece: the myth of the god Unaging Time, who created the materials for the world from his own seed, and of the cosmic egg out of which the heaven and earth were formed."¹²⁰ The story of the cosmic egg that, according to West, was introduced to the early Milesian, Anaximander, can be traced to accounts found in Phoenician cosmogonies. Among the various similarities, one of the motifs shared between the Greek and Phoenician versions is that the cosmic egg was produced from the seed (τό σπέρμα) of Time.¹²¹ This shared motif would be continued by the successors of Anaximander, such as Anaxagoras, Leucippus, and Epicurus.¹²²

¹¹⁹ Aristophanes, *Birds*, ed. by Page, T.E., E. Capps, and W.H.D. Rouse, trans. Benjamin Bickley Rogers, The Loeb Classical Library (London: William Heinemann Ltd, 1926), 2:199.

¹²⁰ Martin L. West, "Ab ovo: Orpheus, Sanchuniathon, and the Origins of the Ionian World Model," *The Classical Quarterly*, n.s., 44, no. 2 (1994): 289.

¹²¹ Martin L. West, *Early Greek Philosophy and the Orient* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971), 84.

¹²² West, "Ab ovo," 307.

The Emergence of Phanes¹²³

Once the egg manifested, a creature germinated and resided within the egg. This creature, which broke through the egg and brought forth the light, was called Phanes.

TABLE 4. The Emergence of Phanes¹²⁴

<i>R</i> 10.17.2-17.4	<i>R</i> 10.30.4-30.5	<i>H</i> 6.5.4-6.1	<i>H</i> 6.12.1
(10.17.2) there was cherished and vivified a certain animal (10.17.3) and that afterwards, that huge globe being broken, there came forth a certain kind of man of double sex, which they call masculo-feminine. (10.30.4) This they called Phanetas, from appearing, because when it appeared, they say, then also light shone forth.	(10.30.4) 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; (10.30.5) and that this is the principle of all things	(6.5.4) For within the circumference a certain living creature, which is both male and female, is formed by the skill of the indwelling divine spirit. This Orpheus calls Phanes, because when it appeared (PHANEIS) the universe shone forth from it, With the luster of that most glorious of the elements, fire, perfected in moisture. (6.5.5) Nor is this incredible, since in glowworms nature gives us to see a moist light. (6.6.1) This egg, then, which was the first substance, growing somewhat hot, was broken by	(6.12.1) when it was broken, the masculo-feminine Phanes leaped forth, as some say.

¹²³ See Appendix A for Greek and Latin parallels of Table 4.

¹²⁴ Roberts and Donaldson, *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, 192-265.

TABLE 4. Continued

<i>R</i> 10.17.2-17.4	<i>R</i> 10.30.4-30.5	<i>H</i> 6.5.4-6.1	<i>H</i> 6.12.1
		the living creature within, and then there took shape and came forth something; such as Orpheus also speaks of, where he says, ‘when the capacious egg was broken,’ etc.	

After the speech about the egg, in *R* 10.17.2-17.4, Clement says the creature within the egg broke through the globe. The creature that comes forth is a person with both sexes, who is called masculo-feminine. Once the creature broke through the egg, light shone forth, and they called the creature Phantasia. In *R* 10.30.4, Niceta tells us about the double form creature being created within the egg and taking a long period of time to be molded. The creature, called masculo-feminine, was the mixture of all the substances that resided within the egg.

In *H* 6.5.4-6.1, Appion asserts that the living creature is formed by the indwelling divine spirit. Appion references Orpheus and credits him when he says that the universe shone forth from the creature when it appeared. Appion allegorically interprets Phanes’s shining to the luster of fire that is perfected in moisture. The section concludes with a recap of the myth, ending with another reference to Orpheus, who says that the capacious egg was broken.

Phanes has long been a symbol for the Orphic tradition, and his presence in the *PsCl* is no exception. This section of the cosmogony deals with the creation of the Orphic Phanes and the generation of the material universe. Once the egg is ripe with life,

the creature residing within breaks free, causing light to be brought forth and the material world to come into being.

The First Gods and their Allegories¹²⁵

As the light permeates through what was once chaos, the residual elements that are left over from the birth of Phanes form the material world.

TABLE 5. The First Gods and their Allegories¹²⁶

<i>R</i> 10.17.4	<i>R</i> 10.32.1-32.6	<i>H</i> 6.6.2-7.5	<i>H</i> 6.12.2-12.4
(10.17.4) And from this, they say that there were produced substance, prudence, motion, and coition, and from these the heavens and the earth were made	(10.32.1) She therefore (Rhea, or nature), it is said, produced, as it were, a certain bubble which had been collecting for a long time; and it being gradually collected from the spirit which was in the waters, (10.32.2) swelled, and being for some time driven over the surface of matter, from which it had come forth as from a womb, and being hardened by the rigor of cold, and always increasing by additions of ice, at length was broken off and sunk into the deep, and drawn by its own weight,	(6.6.2) And so by the mighty power of that which appeared (PHANEIS) 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. (6.6.3) But the productive matter left inside the globe, separated the substance of all things. (6.6.4) For first its lower part, just like the dregs, sank downwards of its own weight; and	(6.12.2) I say little about all that, up to the point when this broken globe attained coherency, there being left in it some of its marrow-like matter; and I shall briefly run over the description of what took place in it by the agency of this matter, with all that followed. (6.12.3) From Kronos and Rhea were born, as you say—that is, by time and matter—first Pluto, who represents the sediment which settled down; and then Poseidon, the liquid substance in the middle, which floated over the

¹²⁵ See Appendix A for Greek and Latin parallels of Table 5.

¹²⁶ Roberts and Donaldson, *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, 192-265.

TABLE 5. Continued

<i>R</i> 10.17.4	<i>R</i> 10.32.1-32.6	<i>H</i> 6.6.2-7.5	<i>H</i> 6.12.2-12.4
	<p>went down to the infernal regions; and because it became invisible it was called Aides, and is also named Orcus or Pluto.</p> <p>(10.32.3) And since it was sunk from the top to the bottom, it gave place to the moist element to flow together; and the grosser part, which is the earth; was laid bare by the retirement of the waters.</p> <p>(10.32.4) They say, therefore, that this freedom of the water, which was formerly restrained by the presence of the bubble, was called Neptune</p> <p>(10.32.5) after the bubble attained the lowest place. After this, when the cold element had been sucked down to the lower regions by the concretion of the icy bubble, and the dry and the moist element had been separated, there being now no hindrance, the warm element rushed by its force and lightness to the</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>(6.7.1) 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.</p> <p>(6.7.2) And the water which flowed together after this first sediment, and floated on the surface of the first substance, they called Poseidon.</p> <p>(6.7.3) And then what remained, the purest and noblest of all, for it was translucent fire, they called Zeus, from its glowing (ZEOUSA) nature.</p> <p>(6.7.4) Now since fire ascends, this was not swallowed, and made to descend by time or Kronos; but, as I said, the fiery substance, since it has life in it,</p>	<p>heavier body below; (6.12.4) and the third child—that is, Zeus—is the æther, and is highest of all. It was not devoured; but as it is a fiery power, and naturally ascends, it flew up as with a bound to the very highest æther.</p>

TABLE 5. Continued

R 10.17.4	R 10.32.1-32.6	H 6.6.2-7.5	H 6.12.2-12.4
	upper regions of the air, being borne up by wind and storm. (10.32.6) This storm, therefore, which in Greek is called <i>καταγίς</i> , they called <i>ÆGIS</i> —that is, a she-goat; and the fire which ascended to the upper regions they called Jupiter; wherefore they say that he ascended to Olympus riding on a she-goat.	and naturally ascends, flew right up into the air, which form its purity is very intelligent. (6.7.5) 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	

After the light shone, Clement states that the universe began to take shape and produce substance, prudence, motion, and coition. From these four qualities, heaven and earth were formed. Niceta, in R 10.32.1-32.6, approached the generation of the material world differently than Clement. Niceta postulates that Rhea, also known as nature, produced a bubble for some time, and after the bubble had been created, a spirit from the waters took the bubble from the water being passed over the surface of matter.¹²⁷

As the bubble passed over matter, ice was built upon it through the cold and eventually broke due to the weight. The icy piece that sank to the lower world¹²⁸ was called Aides and, as it sunk from top to bottom, gave way to the moist element, which

¹²⁷ Quae ex spiritu qui in aquis erat, paulatim collecta intumuit et aliquanto tempore circumacta per superficiem materiae. Rehm and Strecker, *Die Pseudoklementinen: Rekognitionen*, 347.

¹²⁸ In infernum. Rehm and Strecker, *Die Pseudoklementinen: Rekognitionen*, 348.

caused water and earth to separate. The water that was once bounded by the bubble was called Neptune after the icy pieces sank. As the cold element was sucked down with the icy pieces, the warm element was brought up by the spirit and a storm. The storm, referred to as AEGIS, is the she-goat that was ridden by fire, called Jupiter, to the upper region, called Olympus.

Now, in *H* 6.6.2-7.5, the power (PHANEIS) that manifested in the globe brought order and coherency to the elements within the globe. Once order was established, the power took its place at the summit of heaven. The heavier part of the matter left in the globe sank down, by its weight, and was called Pluto. Allegorically, Appion suggests that the sinking of matter is a representation of Kronos devouring matter. Once the matter settled, the waters flowed together and remained on the surface, which was called Poseidon. The last element to subsist, after the dregs and water, was the translucent fire, which was called Zeus. The fire ascended, avoiding being swallowed by Kronos, and flew into the air. Due to the heat, the fire drew up the strong and divine spirit (Metis) that remained in the underlying moisture.

Clement's summary in *H* 6.12.2-12.4 follows in similar fashion to Niceta's narrative in *R* 10.32.1-32.6. After the generation of Phanes, there remained the fractured egg with a productive marrow-like matter. To illustrate the events that followed from the marrow, Clement asserts that matter has agency and thusly accounts for the events that follow. First, Kronos (Time) and Rhea (matter) produce Pluto, the sediment that settled down. Next, Poseidon, the liquid substance in the middle, came to be. The third was Zeus, the aether that ascends to the heavens and is not devoured by Kronos.

After Clement recounts the myth, he provides an allegorical explanation. First, he says the bonds of Kronos represent the unification of heaven and earth, and the mutilation of Kronos represents the separation of the elements from each other. Moreover, with the binding and mutilation of Kronos, he can no longer produce any offspring.

The Titans¹²⁹

After the beginning of the universe, the creation of the cosmic egg, the birth of Phanes, and the allegorical interpretation of the Olympians, the Titans and the theogony are the only portion of the myth left to examine. In *R*, the genealogy of the Titans is found in *R* 10.17.4-17.6 and *R* 10.31.1-31.5. In *H*, the genealogy is only found in *H* 6.2.2.

TABLE 6. The Titans¹³⁰

<i>R</i> 10.17.4-17.6	<i>R</i> 10.31.1-31.5	<i>H</i> 6.2.2
(10.17.4) From the heaven they say that six males were produced, whom they call Titans; (10.17.5) 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, Crius, Hyperion, Iapetus, Chronos, who amongst us is called Saturn. (10.17.6) In like manner, the names of the females who sprang from the earth are these:	(10.31.1) But to this Hesiod adds, that after chaos the heaven and earth were made immediately, from which he says that those eleven were produced (and sometimes also he speaks of them as twelve) of whom he makes six males and five females. And these are the names that he gives to the males: (10.31.2) Oceanus, Coeus, Crius, Hyperion, Iapetus, Chronos, who is called Saturn. Also the names of the females are: Theia, Rhea, Themis, Mnemosyne,	(6.2.2) For it is not really true that from Ouranos and his mother Ge were born twelve children, as the myth counts them: six sons, Okeanos, Koios, Krios. Hyperion, Japetos, Kronos; and six daughters, Thea, Themis, Mnemosyne, Demeter, Tethys, and Rhea.

¹²⁹ See Appendix A for Greek and Latin parallels of Table 6.

¹³⁰ Roberts and Donaldson, *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, 192-265.

TABLE 6. Continued

<i>R</i> 10.17.4-17.6	<i>R</i> 10.31.1-31.5	<i>H</i> 6.2.2
Theia, Rhea, Themis, Mnemosyne, Tethys, Hebe.	Tethys. And these names they thus interpret allegorically. (10.31.3) They say that the number is eleven or twelve: that the first is nature itself, which also they would have to be called Rhea, from Flowing; (10.31.4) and they say that the other ten are her accidents, which also they call qualities; yet they add a twelfth, namely Chronos, who with us is called Saturn, and him they take to be time. (10.31.5) Therefore they assert that Saturn and Rhea are time and matter; and these, when they are mixed with moisture and dryness, heat and cold, produce all things.	

The narrative in *R* 10.17.4 is short but begins with six males and six females produced from heaven and earth. Clement lists all the males and females but does not provide more detail concerning their generation. Later in *R* 10.31.1, Niceta also introduces the Titans but quotes Hesiod, saying that after chaos, heaven and earth were made. Out of heaven and earth, six males were made, but there is a question about the females. Sometimes, according to Hesiod, there are five females instead of six.

After going through the list of the Titans, Niceta says that they must be interpreted allegorically. He begins with describing Rhea as the flowing, and the remaining Titans are the qualities. Next, Niceta speaks of Chronos, who is also called

Saturn, as being time and Rhea as matter. Finally, the two are mixed with the four qualities moist, dry, hot, and cold from which all things can be produced.

Lastly, in *H* 6.2.2, Appion states that it is not true that from Ouranos and his mother Ge twelve children were produced, but he lists the twelve children anyway. Like Clement's exposition in *R* 10.17.4-17.6, there is no mention as to whom the genealogies are attributed.

Analysis of the Parallels

In analyzing the six sections of the myth, the differences between *H* and *R* come into focus. In the preface to the myths, it is said that myths are to be allegorically interpreted. Even though *H* and *R* agree on the allegorical interpretation, *R* adds that there are two ways to interpret the writings of Orpheus and Hesiod: literally and allegorically. Both *H* 6.2.12 and *H* 6.11.2-11.3 do not speak of the ancient authorities until later in Appion's exposition in the provenance of the universe.

The provenance of the Universe begins the major textual divergence between *H* and *R*. *R* begins with Clement's lucid statement regarding chaos being the first to exist. In Niceta's exposition, Orpheus explains that chaos was the first to exist then makes some additions to his account. Although the description of chaos is Stoic in nature and employs words such as moist, dry, hot, and cold, there is no allegorical interpretation made. In contrast to *R*, Appion, in *H* 6.3.1-3.4, goes on a lengthy commentary about the creation of the cosmos.

The first ancient authority to be discussed is Homer, whom Appion says is above all in wisdom and furthermore substantiates that everything came from water and earth. Appion then alludes to Hesiod and his *Theogony* to reinforce his contention that chaos

was the first thing to come into being. Lastly, Orpheus is used to explain the cosmogony through his description of the cosmic egg. In addition to the ancient authorities, Appion employs Stoic language and imagery as a means of allegorizing the myth. Appion's method is an attempt to substantiate his assertion that "nothing existed but chaos and a confused mixture of orderless elements."¹³¹ In fact, Bernabé concludes that not only is there a harmonization that exists between the Orphic myth and Hesiod in the *PsCl*; there is also a harmonizing amongst pre-Socratic philosophers.

Clemente, Apión, y Nicetas intentan armonizar el texto de Orfeo con el de Hesíodo e incluso con el de algunos filósofos presocráticos, de los que toman lenguaje y fraseología, lo que dificulta no poco la reconstrucción de la teogonía de Orfeo.¹³²

Clement, Appion, and Niceta attempt to harmonize the Orphic text with Hesiod and include some pre-Socratic philosophers, with those who use language and phraseology, with little difficulty to reconstruct the theogony of Orpheus.¹³³

After the provenance of the universe, the myth proceeds to the cosmic egg. In this part, *R* 10.17.2, *R* 10.30.4, and *H* 6.12.1 all keep the section brief in detail, but Appion makes heavy use of Stoic language and imagery. First, he says that matter is of four kinds and is endowed with life. Next, there is a mixing of the substance in a whirlpool, which brings order to the substance. Lastly, the substance is surrounded by a spirit, which then brings forth light. After this Stoic interjection, Appion delves into the allegory of Chronos, Rhea, and Ouranos.

¹³¹ Roberts and Donaldson, *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, 263.

¹³² Bernabé, "La teogonia orfica citada en las Pseudoclementina," 97.

¹³³ Translated by Author.

The next section deals with the emergence of Phanes from the egg. All four sections attest to the emergence of Phanes, but again Appion weaves in Stoic imagery. After the double sexed Phanes appears, Appion quickly shifts the discussion to the allegory of the fire element. Lastly, the myth is repeated by Appion and gives credit for the broken egg to Orpheus.

The last two sections after the emergence of Phanes cover the further creation of the material world and the Titans. The further generation of the material world is attested to in all sections of *H* and *R* in roughly the same manner, except *R* Latinizes the names and *H* keeps the Greek names. Both *H* and *R* explain the three sections of the material world, which are water, the depths, and the heavens. Out of the four narratives, Niceta's exposition in *R* 10.32.1-32.6, and Appion's account in *H* 6.6.2-7.5, follow a similar chronology.

The last section deals with the offspring of heaven and earth. The first appearance of this section in *R* is found in Clement's exposition in *R* 10.17.4-17.6. After the creation of substance, prudence, motion, and coition, heaven and earth come together and produce their offspring. The next mention of the Titans in *R* is in Niceta's exposition in *R* 10.31.1-31.5, which is also where Niceta uses the name Hesiod. In *H*, there is only one mention of the Titans in *H* 6.2.2. Appion asserts that the wisest of the ancients hid knowledge from the unworthy, and he uses the offspring of heaven and earth as an illustration of the tales that are not to be understood as truth.

It is clear that *H* and *R* are using the genealogy preserved in Hesiod's *Theogony*. In fact, both Niceta and Appion cite Hesiod directly in their discourses, but only Niceta references Hesiod in connection with the Titans. Even though Appion's account does not

mention Hesiod in these parallels, it is clear that they both follow lines 131 through 138 of the *Theogony*:

ἦδὲ καὶ ἀτρύγετον πέλαγος τέκεν οἴδατι θυῖον, Πόντον,
ἄτερ φιλότητος ἐφιμέρου· αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα Οὐρανῶ εὐνηθεῖσα
τέκ' Ὠκεανὸν βαθυδίνην Κοῖόν τε Κρεῖόν θ' Ὑπερίονά τ'
Ἴαπετόν τε Θεῖαν τε Ῥεῖαν τε Θέμιν τε Μνημοσύνην τε
Φοίβην τε χρυσοστέφανον Τηθύν τ' ἐρατεινὴν. τοὺς δὲ
μέθ' ὀπλότατος γένετο Κρόνος ἀγκυλομήτης, δεινότατος
παίδων, θαλερὸν δ' ἤχθηρε τοκῆα.¹³⁴

Without any sweet act of love she produced the barren sea, Pontos, seething in his fury of waves, and after this she lay with Ouranos, and bore him deep-swirling Okeanos the ocean-stream; and Koios, Krios, Hyperion, Iapetos, and Theia too and Rheia, and Themis, and Mynemosyne, Phoibe of the wreath of gold, and Tethys the lovely. After these her youngest-born was devious-devising Kronos, most terrible of her children; and he hated his strong father.¹³⁵

According to Hesiod, six males and six females are created. The only one excluded from the list is the youngest, Kronos, who, according to Hesiod, was born after the five males and six females.

Between the version of *H* and *R*, *R* 10.17.4-17.6 represents the closest similarity to Hesiod. The only variant in Clement's exposition is that Tethys and Hebe are switched in order. The next account is Niceta's in *R* 10.31.1-31.5, but he leaves out Hebe and says "the number is eleven or twelve."¹³⁶ The version with the greatest discrepancies is Appion's account in *H* 6.2.2. Despite Appion saying there are twelve children from the union, he places Rhea last and replaces Hebe with Demeter.

¹³⁴ Hesiod, *Theogony* 131-138.

¹³⁵ Hesiod, *The Works and Days, Theogony, The Shield of Herakles*, 131.

¹³⁶ Roberts and Donaldson, *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, 200.

Now that the six parallel sections of *H* and *R* have been compared, it becomes easier to distinguish the redacted material in the myth. From the start of the narratives, it is clear that the preferred method of the Greeks is to interpret their myths allegorically. This is made especially clear when the narratives in both *H* and *R* launch into the cosmogony. Niceta and Clement, in both *H* and *R*, say that chaos was the first to exist, but Appion is not satisfied with such a simple account. Appion instead undertakes an effort to show that chaos and a confused mixture existed in the beginning. He even introduces Homer as an authoritative witness to substantiate his claim.

In the discourse concerning the egg, Appion inundates his narrative with Stoic cosmology and allegorical accounts of the elements to show that an egg was created from chaos as well as the confused mixture. Eventually, Appion likens the egg to a peacock's egg to further illustrate his attempt at an elemental cosmology. In contrast to *H*, the accounts of Niceta and Clement in *R* slowly incorporate the allegorical and Stoic cosmology into their narratives without going into copious detail. The same approach is observed in the account of the appearance of Phanes.

The next two sections in the parallels are the generation of the sons of Ouranos and Ge and the emergence of the Titans and the Titanides. Unlike the previous sections, the last two narratives do not engage in lengthy discourse, and both *H* and *R*'s narratives align. Appion's account in *H* does continue with Stoic cosmology on the further generation of the gods, but Niceta's exposition also incorporates the cosmology. The discourses on the Titans and Titanides, compared to the previous five accounts, have the most material in common. This is due to both *H* and *R*'s use of the *Theogony* of Hesiod.

Based on the material presented, a few conclusions can be drawn. First, upon investigating Orphic myth as presented by *H* and *R*, one senses that Appion's account in *H* is largely redacted. The addition of Homer and the copious amount of Stoic cosmology in the first three parallel sections are not attested to in *R*. In fact, Lanzillotta accused *R* of reducing the myth to the bare minimum and voiding all subtleties.¹³⁷ It is obvious that Lanzillotta is not able to see that the simple narrative in *R* is the basis for Appion's additions. In addition, Lanzillotta ignores that *H* displays a habit of enhancing stories throughout the novel,¹³⁸ such as with the background of Justa.

The sections on Justa's background are found in both *H* and *R*, but both sections give conflicting information. A brief overview of the sections will illustrate the nature of the Homilist's additions. In *R* 7.31.1, Niceta says that he and his brother were sold to a widowed honorable woman named Justa. She raised Niceta and Clement to be educated in Greek literature, art, and philosophy. The purpose for their education was to allow them to refute the philosophical teachings of the Greeks and not be defeated by them. Conversely, *H* provides more than one section on Justa's background, yet those three sections contain different information: *H* 2.19.1 state that Justa is a Syro-Pheonician and by race a Canaanite, *H* 3.73.4 and *H* 4.1.2 say that Justa is a Canaanite only, and *H* 13.7.7 goes on to state that Justa is a proselyte of the Jews. Since *R* only attests to Justa caring for the two brothers and educating them and *H* cannot decide on her background, it can

¹³⁷ Lanzillotta, "Orphic Cosmogonies in the Pseudo-Clementines? Textual Relationship, Character and Sources of Homilies 6.3-13 and Recognitions 10.17-19.30," 126.

¹³⁸ F.S. Jones suggests that *H* displays patterns of elaborations to the story. Jones, *Pseudoclementia Elchasaiticaque inter Judaeochristiana*, 37.

be concluded that *H* enhances the information regarding Justa. Further evidence of *H*'s redactionist tendencies is outlined by Kareem J. Khaled in his Master's thesis, entitled

The Reception of the Gospel of Mark in the Pseudo-Clementines, which says:

the Homilist has a facetious nature and often employs levity, sarcasm, and whit [*sic*] to express a point and quite often takes liberties with the texts which he quotes, adding and subtracting information at will. At times, his writing is burlesque; he adds gratuitously to many of the vignettes which are found in the gospels, apocryphal literature, and the Old Testament¹³⁹

Second, as asserted by Strecker, the character of Appion is a fabrication of *H*.

The fact that Rufinus admits to omissions in his version of *R*, his borrowing from the *H* solidifies that there are no parallels of the character in *R*. Eusebius also casts doubts on what he calls the "alleged dialogues" with Peter and Appion. In fact, the Appion in *H* is likely to be an adaptation of Josephus's protagonist in *Against Apion*. Thus, with the redacted material presented by *H*, it seems clear that *H* elaborates on the more original form of the Orphic myth that is preserved by *R*.¹⁴⁰

¹³⁹ Kareem J. Khaled, "The Reception of the Gospel of Mark in the Pseudo-Clementines" (Master's thesis, California State University Long Beach, 2014), 83.

¹⁴⁰ Lanzillotta claims that "taking this material into account, a simple textual comparison between both versions clearly shows that the Homilies preserve the most original account." Lanzillotta, "Orphic Cosmogonies in the Pseudo-Clementines? Textual Relationship, Character and Sources of Homilies 6.3-13 and Recognitions 10.17-19.30," 130. Now that the comparisons have been done, it should be clear, even to Lanzillotta, that *R* preserves the more original version.

CHAPTER 4

THE *BASIC WRITER*

The identification of potential Orphic material in *B* has not been vigorously pursued, and in some cases, it has even been avoided by scholars. Dominique Côté, who is joined in this opinion by Annette Yoshiko Reed, asserts that *H* and *R*, being products of the fourth century, should be viewed in terms of their own place in time.¹⁴¹ Therefore, there is no need, according to Côté, to uncover *B* because *H* and *R* impact later generations with no influence prior to being penned. The problems with Côté's assertion are that *H* and *R* are redacted versions of an earlier source and they share too many parallels. Since *H* and *R* have been redacted, it follows that they not only reflect the *Zeitgeist* of the fourth century, but also are influenced by the *Zeitgeist* of the third century, which is when *B* is believed to have been written.

Upon close inspection of *H* and *R*, it can be seen that each tells the same basic story. In fact, Alberto Bernabé asserts that:

La diferencia entre la versión que nos da Apión y la que de Nicetas no se debe, pues, en mi opinión, a que manejen diferentes versiones, sino a que ejercen de forma diferente la equiparación con Hesíodo.¹⁴²

The difference between the version that Apion gives us and that of Niceta was not, therefore, in my opinion, to manage

¹⁴¹ Côté, "Orphic Theogony and the Context of the Clementines," 7.

¹⁴² Bernabé, "La teogonia orfica citada en las Pseudoclementina," 84.

different versions, but they exert a different shape matching with Hesiod.¹⁴³

Since Bernabé suggests that both *H* and *R* are different not because they are using different versions of the Theogony, but because each is trying to resolve the connection with Hesiod in different ways, further illustrates that *H* and *R* stem from an earlier text. With that said, I will now move onto the possible version of the Orphic myth in *B*.

The Cosmogony

Chaos¹⁴⁴

The first parallel material, found in *R* 10.17.2, *R* 10.30.3-30.4, *H* 6.3.1-3.4, and *H* 6.12.1, deals with chaos and its development.

TABLE 7. Chaos¹⁴⁵

<i>R</i> 10.17.2	<i>R</i> 10.30.3-30.4	<i>H</i> 6.3.1-3.4	<i>H</i> 6.12.1
(10.17.2) <i>first</i> of all things was <i>chaos</i> ; that this, through a long <i>time</i> 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 <i>egg</i>	(10.30.3) <i>first</i> there was <i>chaos</i> , eternal, unbounded, unproduced, and that from it all things were made. He says that this <i>chaos</i> was neither darkness nor light, neither moist nor dry, neither hot nor cold, but that it was all things <i>mixed</i> together, and was always one unformed mass;	(6.3.1) There was once a <i>time</i> when nothing existed but <i>chaos</i> and a confused <i>mixture</i> of orderless elements, which were as yet simply heaped together. This nature testifies, and great men have been of opinion that it was so. (6.3.2) Of these great men I shall bring forward to	(6.12.1) I shall not at present speak particularly of that living <i>egg</i> , which was conceived by a happy combination out of infinite matter

¹⁴³ Translated by Author.

¹⁴⁴ See Appendix B for Greek and Latin parallels of Table 7.

¹⁴⁵ Roberts and Donaldson, *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, 192-265.

TABLE 7. Continued

<i>R</i> 10.17.2	<i>R</i> 10.30.3-30.4 (10.30.4) yet that at length, as it were after the manner of a huge <i>egg</i>	<i>H</i> 6.3.1-3.4 you him who excelled them all in wisdom, Homer, where he says, with a reference to the original confused mass, ‘But may you all become water and earth;’ implying that from these all things had their origin, and that all things return to their first state, which is <i>chaos</i> , when the watery and earthy substances are separated. And Hesiod in the Theogony says, (6.3.3) ‘Assuredly <i>chaos</i> was the very <i>first</i> to come into being,’ Now, by ‘come into being,’ he evidently means that chaos came into being, as having a beginning, and did not always exist, without beginning. (6.3.4) And Orpheus likens chaos to an <i>egg</i> , in which was the confused <i>mixture</i> of the primordial elements.	<i>H</i> 6.12.1
------------------	---	---	-----------------

In this first parallel section between *H* and *R*, the underlying narrative can be identified when the redacted material is stripped away. For example, in *R* 10.17.2, chaos

is described as solidifying its outer parts to form a foundation that later takes the shape of an egg. *R* 10.30.3-30.4, on the other hand, gives a more detailed account of chaos, saying that it is not one thing in particular but a mixture of all things. Niceta's description regarding those things that have been mixed together are not the elements (water, earth, fire, air) as one would suspect, but instead he uses the qualities (moist, dry, hot, cold) to describe the things being mixed.

Although both sections in *R* give slightly different accounts concerning chaos, *H* conveys a more elaborate description. In *H* 6.3.1-3.4, Appion asserts that chaos and a confused mixture of elements existed at the same time. Homer is introduced as an authoritative witness to the confused mixture, and Appion focuses on two specific elements (earth and water) as the source from which all things emerge. Next, the narrative is repeated with less detail and uses Hesiod as the authoritative figure. Lastly, Appion credits Orpheus with likening chaos, a confused mixture of elements, to an egg.

H 6.12.1, unlike the other three sections, does not mention chaos. The only parallel material in *H* 6.12.1 is the living egg. As the redacted materials are identified, the underlying narrative begins to emerge. Since three of the four sections discuss chaos, the mixture of elements,¹⁴⁶ and the egg, then these features must have been part of *B*. Thus, first there was chaos, then through the mixture of elements, an egg was created.

¹⁴⁶ *R* uses the qualities moist, dry, hot, and cold to discuss what chaos was not. This may have been an error by *B* that was carried over by *R*.

The Egg¹⁴⁷

After an egg forms from the chaotic state, something begins to germinate within the egg.

TABLE 8. The Egg¹⁴⁸

<i>R</i> 10.17.2-17.3	<i>R</i> 10.30.4	<i>H</i> 6.5.1 & <i>H</i> 6.5.4	<i>H</i> 6.12.1
(10.17.2) in the course of a long <i>time</i> , as within the shell of the egg, there was cherished and vivified a certain animal; (10.17.3) and that afterwards, that huge globe being <i>broken</i> , there came forth a certain kind of man of double sex, which they call <i>masculo-feminine</i> .	(10.30.4) and produced from itself a certain double form, which had been wrought through immense periods of <i>time</i> , and which they call <i>masculo-feminine</i> , a form concrete from the contrary admixture of such diversity;	(6.5.1) For the whole body of matter was borne about for some <i>TIME</i> (6.5.4) For within the circumference a certain living creature, which is both <i>male</i> and <i>female</i> , is formed by the skill of the indwelling divine spirit.	(6.12.1) and from which, when it was <i>broken</i> , the <i>masculo-feminine</i>

The description of what germinates within the egg varies between the narratives of *H* and *R*. In *R* 10.17.2-17.3, Clement asserts that for a long time a cherished and vivified animal is created within a globe. After being broken, a person with double sex, called masculo-feminine, emerges from the globe. In *R* 10.30.4-30.5, Niceta gives a little more information, postulating that the double form was wrought for an immense period of time. The double form, or masculo-feminine, was the ultimate form from the admixture of things.

¹⁴⁷ See Appendix B for Greek and Latin parallels of Table 8.

¹⁴⁸ Roberts and Donaldson, *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, 192-265.

Appion asserts that matter was borne for some Time and that within the matter, a living creature, both male and female, resides. *H* 6.12.1 only adds that the masculine-feminine creature resides in the broken egg. In the last section of Niceta's and Appion's accounts, Stoic influences surface with the admixture of the elements and the divine spirit. For the Stoics, both the elements and the divine spirit play central roles in their cosmology.

The redacted material encountered in this section is significant, but not as pervasive as the previous parallel section. Nevertheless, the redacted material masks the underlying narrative. Once the redacted material is removed, it is evident that within a span of time, the egg begins to take shape and a creature begins to form with features of an intersexed being.¹⁴⁹ Thus, another piece of *B* has been uncovered.

Consequences from the Egg¹⁵⁰

The next section brings forth the creature within the egg, as well as the consequences from its emergence.

TABLE 9. Consequences from the Egg¹⁵¹

<i>R</i> 10.17.4	<i>R</i> 10.30.5	<i>H</i> 6.5.4-6.2	<i>H</i> 6.12.1
(10.17.4) This they called <i>Phanetas</i> , from appearing, because when it	(10.30.5) and that this is the principle of all things, which came of pure matter,	(6.5.4) This <i>Orpheus</i> calls <i>Phanes</i> , because when it appeared	(6.12.1) <i>Phanes</i> leaped forth, as some say.

¹⁴⁹ Rehm uses ἀρρενόθηλος in both *H* 6.5.4 and *H* 6.12.1. All four sections attest to the creature being androgynous. Rehm and Strecker, *Die Pseudoklementinen: Homilien*, 108-110.

¹⁵⁰ See Appendix B for Greek and Latin parallels of Table 9.

¹⁵¹ Roberts and Donaldson, *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, 192-265.

TABLE 9. Continued

R 10.17.4	R 10.30.5	H 6.5.4-6.2	H 6.12.1
<p>appeared, they say, then also light <i>shone</i> forth. And from this, they say that there were produced <i>substance</i>, prudence, motion, and coition, and from these the heavens and the earth were made.</p>	<p>and which, coming forth, effected a separation of the four elements, and made heaven of the two <i>elements</i> which are first, <i>fire</i> and air, and earth of the others, earth and water;¹⁵² and of these he says that all things now are born and produced by a mutual participation of them. So far <i>Orpheus</i>.</p>	<p>(PHANEIS) the universe <i>shone</i> forth from it, with the luster of that most glorious of the <i>elements, fire</i>, perfected in moisture. (6.5.5) Nor is this incredible, since in glowworms nature gives us to see a moist light. (6.6.1) This egg, then, which was the first <i>substance</i>, growing somewhat hot, was broken by the living creature within, and then there took shape and came forth something; such as <i>Orpheus</i> also speaks of, where he says, ‘when the capacious egg was broken,’ etc. (6.6.2) And so by the mighty power of that which appeared (PHANEIS) and came forth, the globe attained coherency, and maintained order, while it itself took its seat, as it were,</p>	

¹⁵² The Latin for the underline section is “et ex duobus quae prima sunt elementis fecerit caelum, ex aliis autem terram.” A more accurate translation is “and made heaven of the first two *elements* and earth of the others.” Rehm and Strecker, *Die Pseudoklementinen: Rekognitionen*, 344-345.

TABLE 9. Continued

<i>R</i> 10.17.4	<i>R</i> 10.30.5	<i>H</i> 6.5.4-6.2 on the summit of heaven, there in ineffable mystery diffusing light through endless ages.	<i>H</i> 6.12.1
------------------	------------------	--	-----------------

This passage concerning what emerges from the egg is pivotal since a comparison of *H* and *R* reveals which of the two versions is the oldest. Here, the expositions of Clement and Appion share the closest related material, in that the creature within the egg was called Phanes because when it, appeared light shone forth. However, after the light shone forth, the two texts diverge. Clement’s section in *R* 10.17.4 progresses with the production of substance, prudence, motion, and coition, which in turn create the heavens and earth.

In *H*, after the appearance of Phanes, Appion extends the narrative by articulating that fire appearing and giving off light, perfected in moisture, is not extraordinary. Appion maintains that the same thing is done by glowworms in nature. Next, Appion shifts back to the egg, which was the first substance, and says that it grew hot and was broken by the living creature. Appion then again evokes Orpheus and repeats himself, saying that the egg was broken, Phanes appeared, order was achieved, and he ascended to the summit of heaven, diffusing light.

Unlike the two previous narratives, there is something different present in Niceta’s version. What sets Niceta apart is that his narrative launches into a Stoic cosmological account of what happens after the egg is broken. In this narrative, Niceta never uses the name Phanes, but instead uses “the principle of all things” to describe the

same idea. This principle is further described using the four elements and their interactions with each other. From their mutual interactions, according to Orpheus, all things are born and produced.

Although this section is credited to Orpheus, it is more likely an inserted attribution rather than a genuine citation. In fact, the allegorical interpretations are briefly removed from this section, and Niceta uses Stoic ideas to describe what happens after the egg opens. According to the Stoics, the four elements are at the center of creation. Fire, in particular, when mixed with moisture, is the element that carries the seed of creation. Knowing this, it is no surprise to see Fire present in both *H* and *R*.

Upon close inspection, it becomes clear why this passage is so important. First, the two sections in *R* display different recountings of the narrative. On the one hand, Clement's version is straightforward with the appearance of Phanes, light shining, and matter being created, which produces heaven and earth. On the other hand, Niceta's narrative is heavily philosophical, making use of Stoic physics. Though there are differences in the two versions of *R*, both differences are combined in Appion's version in *H*.

Comparing the narratives of Appion and Clement, it has been shown that both versions are similar up to the light shining forth. However, Appion proceeds to discuss the element Fire with a brief polemic that argues that Fire perfected in moisture is not as incredible as glowworms, who also give off light in moisture. Appion then returns to the egg but states that it grows hot and eventually the egg is broken by the living creature within. Even though Appion does not continue the discussion of the elements, he still exhibits Stoic ideas with the mention of heat and the living creature in the egg. In a

similar fashion as Niceta, Appion also credits Orpheus for his insight and continues on with another version of what happens to the egg after it is broken. At the end of this passage, Appion's narrative closes with coherency and order being maintained, which aligns with the production of substance, prudence, motion, and coition at the end of Clement's narrative.

Assessing what has been investigated, a few conclusions can be drawn from this section. First, *B* appears to contain elements of Stoic cosmology, as these ideas are present in both *R* and *H*. Second, *H* pieces the expositions of Clement and Niceta together to produce the narrative of Appion. Even though *H* tries to make Appion's narrative appear consistent, the piecing together of *B*, the repetition in the text, and the brief interjection of the glowworms give away the fact that *H* is dependent on the version preserved in *R*.

The Theogony

The Titans¹⁵³

With the completion of the cosmos, the myth transitions from the cosmogony to the theogony.

TABLE 10. The Titans¹⁵⁴

<i>R</i> 10.17.5-17.6	<i>R</i> 10.31.1-31.2	<i>H</i> 6.2.2
(10.17.5) From the <i>heaven</i> they say that <i>six</i> males were produced, whom they call Titans; and in like manner, from the <i>earth</i> <i>six</i> females,	(10.31.1) the <i>heaven</i> and the <i>earth</i> were made immediately, from which he says that those eleven were produced (and sometimes	(6.2.2) For it is not really true that from <i>Ouranos</i> and his mother <i>Ge</i> were born twelve children, as the myth counts them: <i>six</i> sons,

¹⁵³ See Appendix B for Greek and Latin parallels of Table 10.

¹⁵⁴ Roberts and Donaldson, *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, 192-265.

TABLE 10. Continued

<i>R</i> 10.17.5-17.6	<i>R</i> 10.31.1-31.2	<i>H</i> 6.2.2
whom they called Titanides. And these are the names of the males who sprang from the heaven: <i>Oceanus</i> , <i>Coeus</i> , <i>Crios</i> , <i>Hyperion</i> , <i>Iapetus</i> , <i>Chronos</i> , who amongst us is called Saturn. (10.17.6) In like manner, the names of the females who sprang from the earth are these: <i>Theia</i> , <i>Rhea</i> , <i>Themis</i> , <i>Mnemosyne</i> , <i>Tethys</i> , Hebe.	also he speaks of them as twelve) of whom he makes six males and five females. (10.31.2) And these are the names that he gives to the males: <i>Oceanus</i> , <i>Coeus</i> , <i>Crius</i> , <i>Hyperion</i> , <i>Iapetus</i> , <i>Chronos</i> , who is also called Saturn. Also the names of the females are: <i>Theia</i> , <i>Rhea</i> , <i>Themis</i> . <i>Mnemosyne</i> . <i>Tethys</i> .	<i>Okeanos</i> , <i>Koios</i> , <i>Krios</i> , <i>Hyperion</i> , <i>Japetos</i> , <i>Kronos</i> ; and six daughters, <i>Thea</i> , <i>Themis</i> , <i>Mnemosyne</i> , Demeter, <i>Tethys</i> , and <i>Rhea</i> .

The theogony begins with heaven and earth producing offspring, twelve in total. However, *R* 10.31.1-31.2 deviates from this number, saying that there are eleven but that he (Hesiod) sometimes speaks of eleven or twelve. The deviation in number is present with the females, as Niceta only mentions five. Clement and Appion, on the other hand, attest to six females, but they differ in the listing. Clement lists Hebe as the sixth; Appion substitutes Demeter and shifts Rhea to the end of the list. Regardless of why Niceta only lists five females, it is likely that there were originally six females in *B*, since Clement and Appion both attest to six females.

Additionally, Niceta says that the listing of the Titans and the Titanides derive from Hesiod's theogony. In lines 131-138 of the Theogony,¹⁵⁵ Hesiod contends that there are six males (*Oceanus*, *Coeus*, *Crios*, *Hyperion*, *Iapetus*, and *Chronos*) and six females (*Theia*, *Rhea*, *Themis*, *Mnemosyne*, *Phoebe*, and *Tethys*) who are born to *Ouranos* and *Ge*. When compared to the sections of *H* and *R*, Clement's exposition in *R*

¹⁵⁵ Hesiod, *The Works and Days*, *Theogony*, *The Shield of Herakles*, 131.

10.17.4-17.6 follows Hesiod the closest. The only difference between the two versions is that Clement transposes Tethys and Phoebe and changes Phoebe to Hebe as discussed in the previous chapter.

Kronos and Rhea¹⁵⁶

After the Titans are born from heaven and earth, Kronos and Rhea take over creation.

TABLE 11. Kronos and Rhea¹⁵⁷

<i>R</i> 10.18.3-18.4	<i>R</i> 10.31.5	<i>H</i> 6.5.1	<i>H</i> 6.12.3
(10.18.3) From their intercourse they assert that innumerable <i>others sprang</i> . (10.18.4) But of these six males, the one who is called <i>Saturn</i> received in marriage <i>Rhea</i>	(10.31.5) Therefore they assert that <i>Saturn</i> and <i>Rhea</i> are <i>time</i> and <i>matter</i> ; and these, when they are mixed with moisture and dryness, heat, and cold, <i>produce all things</i> .	(6.5.1) Now you must think of <i>Kronos</i> as <i>time</i> (CHRONOS) and <i>Rhea</i> as the flowing (RHEON) of the watery substance.	(6.12.3) For from <i>Kronos</i> and <i>Rhea</i> were born, as you say—that is, by <i>time</i> and <i>matter</i>

At this stage of the theogony, Chronos and Rhea have assumed the power of creation. From their union, where Chronos represents time and Rhea represents matter, all things are produced, but there is a slight difference between Niceta's and Appion's expositions. Niceta describes matter in terms of the qualities (moisture, dryness, heat, and cold), while Appion focuses on relating Rhea to the element water. Based on these minor differences, it seems that Appion is more concerned with highlighting Rhea's

¹⁵⁶ See Appendix B for Greek and Latin parallels of Table 11.

¹⁵⁷ Roberts and Donaldson, *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, 192-265.

connection to the moist while Niceta continues the general mixture of the elemental qualities.

Aides/Pluto¹⁵⁸

The union between Kronos and Rhea brought forth the birth of three sons, each of whom is associated with a level of the material world. The first of the three is Aides, also called Pluto, who is the first to be described.

TABLE 12. Aides/Pluto¹⁵⁹

R 10.18.5	R 10.32.2-32.3	H 6.6.4-7.1	H 6.12.3
(10.18.5) First, then, there is born to him a son <i>called Aides</i> , who amongst us is called <i>Orcus</i> ; and him, for the reason we have just stated, he took and <i>devoured</i>	(10.32.2) and drawn by its <i>own weight</i> , went <i>down</i> to the infernal regions; and because it became invisible it was <i>called Aides</i> , and is also <i>named Orcus</i> or <i>Pluto</i> . (10.32.3) And since it was <i>sunk</i> from the <i>top to the bottom</i> , it gave place to <i>the moist elements to flow together</i> ; and the grosser part, which is the earth, was laid bare by the retirement of the waters	(6.6.4) For first its lower part, just like dregs, sank <i>downwards</i> of its <i>own weight</i> ; and this they <i>called Pluto</i> from its gravity, and <i>weight</i> , and great quantity (POLU) of underlying matter, styling it the king of Hades and the dead. (6.7.1) When, then, they say that this primordial substance, although most filthy and rough, was <i>devoured</i> by Kronos, that is, time, this is to be understood in a physical sense, as meaning that it <i>sank downwards</i>	(6.12.3) first <i>Pluto</i> , who represents the sediment which settled <i>down</i>

¹⁵⁸ See Appendix B for Greek and Latin parallels of Table 12.

¹⁵⁹ Roberts and Donaldson, *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, 192-265.

The first son, Aides/Pluto, has his place among the depths of the material world, and it is by his own weight that he sinks from the upper to the lower regions. At this point in the narrative of Aides/Pluto, *H* and *R* begin to diverge. In *R*, Clement's exposition concludes the Aides narrative by saying that Chronos most likely devoured Aides. Niceta's exposition adds a little more to the story by saying that the sinking of Aides leads to the moist elements coming together and leaving parts of the earth to be exposed.

Appion's narrative utilizes allegory to correlate the sinking of Pluto with being swallowed by Kronos. Alternatively, in Clement's summary of Appion's discourse, Pluto settles down with no mention of being swallowed by Kronos. The only account of Kronos devouring Pluto is found in *H* 6.6.4-7.1, which includes an allegorical interpretation, and Clement's version in *R* 10.32.2-32.3, which does not include the allegory. Moreover, the narratives of Appion and Niceta align at the start of the passage until Appion breaks off and speaks of Hades as the primordial substance.

Based on this information, it is reasonable to assume that, once again, *H* reflects the narrative of both Niceta and Clement. First, *H* begins the narrative by aligning with Niceta. Next, *H* calls Hades the primordial substance and adds an allegorical interpretation of Kronos devouring him. Finally, *H* closes with the waters flowing back together as Pluto sinks, just as Niceta outlines in his narrative. It is clear that *H* is dependent on *B* as preserved in *R* and pieces together the accounts of Niceta and Clement in *B*. Thus, Aides is the first born in the material world and sinks to the lower regions as if swallowed by Kronos.

Neptune/Poseidon¹⁶⁰

After the birth and swallowing of Aides/Pluto, the next son from the union was Poseidon.

TABLE 13. Neptune/Poseidon¹⁶¹

<i>R</i> 10.19.3	<i>R</i> 10.32.4-32.5	<i>H</i> 6.7.2	<i>H</i> 6.12.3
(10.19.3) The second, being above him—he whom they call <i>Neptune</i> —is thrust forth upon the <i>waters</i>	(10.32.4) They say therefore, that this freedom of the <i>waters</i> , which was formerly restrained by the presence of the bubble, was called <i>Neptune</i> (10.32.5) after the bubble attained the lowest place. After this, when the cold element had been sucked down to the lower regions by the concretion of the icy bubble	(6.7.2) And the <i>water</i> which flowed together after this first sediment, and floated on the surface of the first substance, they called <i>Poseidon</i>	(6.12.3) and then <i>Poseidon</i> the liquid substance in the middle, which floated over the heavier body below

The narrative of the second son, Neptune/Poseidon, has the greatest discrepancies thus far. Both *H* and *R* agree that the second son was named Neptune/Poseidon, but Appion surprisingly ends the narrative with no further commentary or allegorical explanation. This is also true of Clement’s summary of Appion’s narrative. The only exception is that the water, in Clement’s summary of Appion, is in the middle, rather than the water coming together after the descent of the first son.

¹⁶⁰ See Appendix B for Greek and Latin parallels of Table 13.

¹⁶¹ Roberts and Donaldson, *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, 192-265.

Zeus/Jupiter¹⁶²

Now that the depths (Aides/Pluto) and water (Neptune/Poseidon) came into being and settled into their respective regions, the last of the sons, Zeus/Jupiter (Fire), ascends to his natural place in the heavens.

TABLE 14. Zeus/Jupiter¹⁶³

R 10.19.4	R 10.32.5-32.6	H 6.7.3-7.5	H 6.12.4
(10.19.4) <i>The third</i> , who survived by the artifice of his mother Rhea, she put upon a she-goat and sent into <i>heaven</i> .	(10.32.5) and the dry and the moist element had been separated, there being now no hindrance, <i>the warm element</i> rushed by its force and lightness to the upper regions of <i>the air</i> , being born up by wind and storm. (10.32.6) This storm, therefore, which in Greek is called <i>καταγίς</i> , they called <i>ÆGIS</i> —that is, a she-goat; and the <i>fire</i> which <i>ascended</i> to the upper regions they called <i>Jupiter</i> ; wherefore they say that he ascended to Olympus riding on a she-goat. ¹⁶⁴	(6.7.3) what remained, the purest and noblest of all, for it was translucent <i>fire</i> , they called <i>Zeus</i> , from its glowing (ZEOUSA) nature. (6.7.4) Now since <i>fire ascends</i> , this was not swallowed, and made to descend by time or Kronos; but as I said, the fiery substance, since it has life in it, and naturally ascends, flew right up into <i>the air</i> , which from its purity is very intelligent. (6.7.5) By his own proper heat, then, <i>Zeus</i> —that is, the glowing	(6.12.4) and <i>the third</i> child—that is <i>Zeus</i> —is the <i>æther</i> , and is highest of all. It was not devoured; but as it is a fiery power, and naturally <i>ascends</i> , it flew up as with a bound to the very highest <i>æther</i> .

¹⁶² See Appendix B for Greek and Latin parallels of Table 14.

¹⁶³ Roberts and Donaldson, *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, 192-265.

TABLE 14. Continued

R 10.19.4	R 10.32.5-32.6	H 6.7.3-7.5	H 6.12.4
		substance—draws up what is left in the underlying moisture, to wit, that very strong and divine spirit which they call Metis.	

The last of the three sons to ascend is Zeus/Jupiter. As in the other sections, there are similarities and differences here between the text of *H* and *R*. Niceta, in *R* 10.32.5-32.6, begins by asserting that the dry element (Fire) separated from the moist element and rushed up into the air, where it was born up by the wind. This final stage was the pinnacle of creation, according to Stoic cosmology, “as the Stoics identified the generative factor in the semen with soul, heat, and pneuma.”¹⁶⁵ Clement succinctly closes the narrative with an allegorical interpretation of Jupiter riding on a she-goat (wind) and ascending to Olympus.

In *H* 6.7.3-7.5, Appion also recounts the narrative of Zeus, but he begins his exposition with fire already having been separated from the other elements. Appion adds the Fire is called Zeus because of its glowing nature. From this point, Appion deviates from the story to assert that Fire was not swallowed by Chronos (time). Instead, the fiery substance ascended into the air and draws up from the remaining moisture the divine spirit called Metis.

¹⁶⁴ The Latin *spiritu* is not translated to reflect Stoic cosmology. To fit the context, *spiritu* should be translated as Spirit. Rehm and Strecker, *Die Pseudoklementinen: Rekognitionen*, 348.

¹⁶⁵ Hahn, *The Origins of Stoic Cosmology*, 75.

The last section of this pericope, in which Appion interjects the commentary of Kronos not swallowing the Fire, raises more questions about the authenticity of such a passage. Appion spoke of moisture at the end of his passage, yet did not speak of the separation of heat and moisture as Niceta does in *R* 10.32.5-32.6. Moreover, the divine spirit that is drawn from the moisture does not appear in any other parallel material with *R*. Even in the expositions of Clement in *R* 10.19.4 and *H* 6.12.4, there is no mention of a divine spirit being drawn up from moisture, but there is a mention by Niceta in *R* 10.32.5 of the warm element (Fire) being born up by the wind. Thus, Zeus is the last of the three sons born and who is like Fire and ascends to the heavens, being drawn by the spirit.

In addition to the seven parallels discussed in this chapter, there are other parallels between *H* and *R* that were not discussed due to the complexity of the narratives. In the previous chapter, under the section “Preface to the Myth,” it was shown that that both *H* and *R* agree on how the myths ought to be interpreted. Even though the differences between the sections were the main objective, both *H* and *R* agree on the allegorical method of interpretation.

Second, the genealogy of the gods does not arise in similar locations between the narratives of *H* and *R*. In *H* 6.2.2, the sons and daughters of Ouranos and Ge are listed by Appion, but he does not say where he obtained the information. Yet, in *H* 6.3.2, Appion mentions Hesiod by name when describing that first there was chaos. Similarly, *R* 10.17.5 also lists the children of heaven and earth but does not mention the author of the genealogy. *R* 10.31.1, on the other hand, indicates the genealogy comes from Hesiod, and the genealogy in *H* 6.3.2 and *R* 10.17.5 are similar to what Hesiod writes in his

Theogony. Thus, the genealogy used in the both *H* and *R* derives from Hesiod's genealogy.

The last significant parallel not previously listed is the bubble that is present during the theogony. In *H*, the bubble is mentioned in the cosmogony, in *H* 6.4.1-5.3, with the creation of the Cosmic Egg. The illusion derives from a bubble being formed in water, which attracted a spirit. Appion alludes that the egg, which is like a peacock's egg that has the potential all colors, had the potential to create many forms since it was conceived from infinite matter. In *R*, the bubble is presented in *R* 10.32.1-32.6 as Niceta described the creation of the first gods. First, Rhea collected water into the form of a bubble over a period of time, which contained a spirit. After the bubble formed, it broke into fragments, and like the separation of the elements, the gods took residency in their own regions. From the narratives of Appion and Niceta, the bubble appeared in the theogony portion of *B* after Rhea (matter) and Kronos (time). The bubble, having been formed from water and time, became infused with a spirit. Then, like the separation of the four elements, the bubble broke, and from the fragments, the lower, middle, and upper regions were created.

Analysis of the *Basic Writer*

Based upon what has been textually analyzed, the parallel material can be organized into an outline representative of the Orphic myth in *B*:

1. Allegory is the method of interpretation.
2. First there was chaos.
3. From the mixture of the elements and after some time, an egg was formed.
4. Time allowed a masculo-feminine creature to form.

5. Orpheus says that Phanes came forth and shone light as the substantial element, Fire.
6. Then, as Hesiod says, Heaven and Earth produce six males (Oceanus, Coeus, Crios, Hyperion, Iapetus, and Chronos) and six females (Theia, Rhea, Themis, Mnemosyne, Tethys, and Hebe).
7. Kronos (Time) and Rhea (Matter) form a union to bring forth the material world.
8. A bubble was created by water and time.
9. The bubble breaks and the gods take their places.
10. Aides was the first son born in the material world and sinks to the bottom as if being swallowed by Kronos.
11. Watery Neptune is the next to be born and settles on the surface.
12. Finally, Zeus is the last to be born and is like fire and ascends to heaven, being drawn by the spirit.

Even though the outline is a basic form of *B*, the order in which events occurred is also representative of *B*. The only part of the outline that varies is the appearance of the Titans and Titanides. In *H* 6.2.2, Appion immediately begins his narrative by criticizing those who are unworthy and who follow the myths, “[f]or it is not really true that from Ouranos and his mother Ge were born twelve children.”¹⁶⁶ Appion in no part connects the genealogy of the Titans and Titanides with Hesiod, nor does he mention from where the myth derives.

¹⁶⁶ Roberts and Donaldson, *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, 262.

Clement and Niceta, in *R* 10.17.4-17.6 and *R* 10.30.3-31.2, both incorporate the Titans and Titanides after the creation of Phanes. In Clement's narrative, the Titans and Titanides are produced by heaven and earth after substance, prudence, motion, and coition are made following the creation of Phanes. Niceta, after the discourse on the Stoic cosmogony and the "principle of all things", uses Hesiod's genealogy of the Titans and Titanides as a bridge into the theogony. Since the use of the Titanic genealogy by *R* better fits the story and is not used as a polemical point as with Appion, then it follows that the events occurred in *B* in the same order.

Redaction of the *Homilies*

Since *H* contains the majority of the textual additions, much of the material that is found in *H* that is not paralleled in *R* has been left out in order to identify *B*. The additions omitted from the six parallel sections of *H* are listed with the same headings as outlined in *B*. The only additional heading added is the second account of chaos.

1. Chaos.
 - a. Homer used as an authority to attest to earth and water as the first substances.
 - b. Orpheus used as an authority to attest that the egg was a mixture of the elements.
2. Chaos repeated.
 - a. The four elements are born without order.
 - b. Chaotic state is not able to generate life.
 - c. By its own nature, order was created in the manner of a whirlpool, which mixed everything together.
 - d. The funneling motion was perfect for generating a living creature.

- e. A light from within came forth and was born upwards by the divine spirit.
 - f. What was conceived was the greatest thing ever born from the infinite abyss, in the shape of an egg and as swift as a bird.
3. Making of the egg.
 - a. The indwelling divine spirit helped form the creature in the egg.
 4. Phanes emerges.
 - a. The egg grew hot, the creature inside broke the egg, the creature took form and came forth.
 - c. By the power of the creature, the globe became coherent and orderly.
 - d. The creature took its place on the summit of heaven.
 5. The Titans are created.
 6. Kronos and Rhea are born.
 - a. Rheon of the watery substance was born for some Time.
 7. Pluto/Aides is born and sinks to the depths
 - a. The underlying matter is called Hades.
 - b. This primordial substance was filthy and rough.
 - c. Time is understood in the physical sense.
 8. Neptune/Poseidon is born and settles in the middle.
 - a. Water flowed to the surface over the first substance.
 9. Jupiter/Zeus.
 - a. The purest and noblest of all remained.
 - b. Zeus is not swallowed by Kronos.
 - c. Fiery substance has life and naturally ascends.

d. Its purity is very intelligent.

e. Glowing substance draws moisture to it, which is the strong and divine spirit called Metis.

It is evident that *H* creates a large amount of material. In particular, the beginning of the myth has the largest amount of the supplemental material. *H* begins with incorporating renowned figures from antiquity to illustrate the point that in the beginning there existed chaos and a confused mixture. Then Appion repeats the story, but in the second rendition, he uses Stoic cosmology to describe the cosmogony at great length.

After the chaos sections, *H* adds the generation of the egg. Even though the previous section had copious amounts of Stoic cosmology, the making of the egg continues to display Stoic ideology. In fact, the remaining five sections of the Orphic cosmogony progressively incorporate Stoic cosmological descriptions. The aggressive redaction at the beginning of Appion's discourse shows the secondary nature of *H*, since the Stoic cosmology is already present throughout the discourse in *B*.

CHAPTER 5

OTHER VERSIONS

Modern scholarship has tried to understand the nature of the Orphic myth present in the *PsCl*. Conclusive identification of the origin and tradition from which the myth derives has, even to this day, eluded scholars. Although some academics, such as Quispel and Amersfoort, postulate an Alexandrian polemical text as a source, the majority of scholars rely on the work of the Neo-Platonist Damascius for comparative analysis of the Orphic myth.

As stated earlier, Damascius and *B* are separated by more than two hundred years (*B* being earlier). Therefore, it is not prudent to rely on Damascius as the primary source for the Orphic myth in the *PsCl*. In addition to the methodological objection, Gábor Betegh adds that this method of investigation is an “unwarranted assumption that the different versions of the Orphic theogony are basically homogeneous, so that what is lacking from one, we can reconstruct on the basis of the others.”¹⁶⁷ Despite those objections, scholars continue to insist on citing Damascius as an authoritative source, as well as a means of definitive reconstruction.

An alternative approach to relying on Damascius’s accounts is to compare *B*’s version, as outlined above, with other known forms and to allow the text to confirm its own features. For example, several of the early church fathers discuss the fallacies of the

¹⁶⁷ Gábor Betegh, *The Derveni Papyrus: Cosmology, Theology and Interpretation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 131.

Greeks's stories of creation and philosophies. As part of a polemical technique, some of the church fathers emphasized the fallacies of ancient figures in Greek tradition such as Orpheus, Homer, and Hesiod, as they were believed to have developed the ancient creation myths. Since several of the early church fathers comment on the myths, it may be possible to find connections and parallels between the texts by comparing what their polemics contain to the outline of *B*.

Early Church Fathers

Athenagoras

The early church father Athenagoras, who lived from 133 C.E. to 190 C.E., was thought to have been an Athenian philosopher and, like others before him, was a Christian convert. Athenagoras's major work, *A Plea for the Christians*, was written to the Emperors Marcus Aurelius Antoninus and Lucius Aurelius Commodus. The aim of the plea was to defend against accusations of Atheism, Thyestean feasts, and Oedipodean intercourse within the Christian community. Athenagoras appeals to the Emperors's philosophic nature and asserts that Christians worship their god as others in the Empire worship their gods. Despite this similarity, Christians are not given equal rights and must endure harassment and persecution throughout the empire.

Part of the persuasive tactic that Athenagoras employs is to illustrate the superiority of Christian doctrine versus the absurdities of the polytheist. Among the absurdities discussed are the myths of the ancient Greeks, whom Athenagoras names as:

Ὅρφέα καὶ Ὅμηρον καὶ Ἡσίοδον εἶναι τοὺς καὶ γένη καὶ
ὀνόματα δόντας τοῖς ὑπ' αὐτῶν λεγομένοις θεοῖς.¹⁶⁸

¹⁶⁸ Athenagoras, *Legation and de Resurrectione*, ed. and trans. William R. Schoedel (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972), 34.

Orpheus, and Homer, and Hesiod who gave genealogies and names to those they called gods.¹⁶⁹

These three individuals, Athenagoras asserts, are the central authorities concerning the ancient Greek myths. Orpheus was the first theologian, Homer created the great epics, and Hesiod had the great theogony. A comparison of this information to *B* confirms that Orpheus and Hesiod were used as ancient authorities for the Greeks. *B* only names Orpheus in the text, but it is clear that he makes use of Hesiod's genealogy without naming Hesiod explicitly.

Athenagoras presents the Orphic cosmogony and theogony in two different narratives. The first narrative focuses on Oceanus as the beginning of all things.

Ὅμηρου μὲν [γὰρ] λέγοντος Ὠκεανόν τε, θεῶν γένεσιν, καὶ μητέρα Τηθύν, Ὀρφέως δέ, ὃς καὶ τὰ ὀνόματα αὐτῶν πρῶτος ἐξηῦρεν καὶ τὰς γενέσεις διεξῆλθεν καὶ ὅσα ἐκάστοις πέπρακται εἶπεν καὶ πεπίστευται παρ' αὐτοῖς ἀληθέστερον θεολογεῖν, ᾧ καὶ Ὅμηρος τὰ πολλὰ καὶ περὶ θεῶν μάλιστα ἔπεται, καὶ αὐτοῦ τὴν πρώτην γένεσιν αὐτῶν ἐξ ὕδατος συνιστάντος Ὠκεανός, ὅσπερ γένεσις πάντεσσι τέτυκται. ἦν γὰρ ὕδωρ ἀρχὴ κατ' αὐτὸν τοῖς ὅλοις, ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ ὕδατος ἰλὺς κατέστη, ἐκ δὲ ἐκατέρων ἐγεννήθη ζῶον δράκων προσπεφυκυῖαν ἔχων κεφαλὴν λέοντος, διὰ μέσου δὲ αὐτῶν θεοῦ πρόσωπον, ὄνομα Ἡρακλῆς καὶ Χρόνος. οὗτος ὁ Ἡρακλῆς ἐγέννησεν ὑπερμέγεθες ὦόν, ὃ συμπληρούμενον ὑπὸ βίας τοῦ γεγεννηκότος ἐκ παρατριβῆς εἰς δύο ἐρράγη. τὸ μὲν οὖν κατὰ κορυφὴν αὐτοῦ Οὐρανὸς εἶναι ἐτελέσθη, τὸ δὲ κάτω ἐνεχθὲν Γῆ· προῆλθε δὲ καὶ θεὸς ἴγῃ δισώματος. Οὐρανὸς δὲ Γῆ· μιχθεὶς γεννᾷ θηλείας μὲν Κλωθῶ, Λάχεσιν, Ἄτροπον, ἄνδρας δὲ Ἐκατόγχειρας Κόττον, Γύγην, Βριάρεων καὶ Κύκλωπας, Βρόντην καὶ Στερόπην καὶ Ἄργην· οὓς καὶ δήσας κατεταρτάρωσεν, ἐκπεσεῖσθαι αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τῶν παίδων τῆς ἀρχῆς μαθόν. διὸ καὶ ὀργισθεῖσα ἡ Γῆ τοὺς Τιτᾶνας ἐγέννησεν· Κούρους δ' Οὐρανίωνα·ς ἐγείνατο

¹⁶⁹ Ibid., 35.

πότνια Γαῖα, οὗς δὴ καὶ Τιτῆνας ἐπὶ κλησὶν καλέουσιν,
οὔνεκα τισάσθην μέγαν Οὐρανὸν ἀστερόεντα.¹⁷⁰

Homer speaks of ‘Ocean, the origin of the gods, and Tethys their mother.’ Orpheus (who was the first to invent their names, to describe their births, and to recount the deeds of each, who is generally believed by them to treat of the gods with great accuracy, and who for the most part is followed even by Homer, especially in his treatment of the gods) affirms their ultimate origin from water—‘Ocean, in whom is to be found the origin of all.’ For according to him water was the beginning of everything. From water came slime. From both an animal was born—a serpent with the head of a lion attached, and between them the face of a god. Its name was Heracles and Chronos. This Heracles generated a huge egg which, when filled by the power of him who generated it, broke into two through friction. The upper part of it was fashioned into Heaven; the part which descended became Earth; a sort of two-bodied god came forth. Heaven in union with Earth begot female offspring—Clotho, Gyges, Briareus—and the Round-eyes—Brontes, Steropes, and Arges. Heaven bound and cast them into Tartarus when he learned that he would be deprived of his rule by his offspring. Consequently Earth in her anger brought forth the Titans: ‘Our mistress the Earth brought forth children of Heaven to whom men also give the name of ‘Titans’ because they ‘took vengeance’ on the starry expanse of Heaven.’¹⁷¹

Athenagoras asserts that Homer was a witness that all things came from water (Ὠκεανόν), but it was Orpheus who was credited for the myth. From water, as Orpheus states, mud was formed that gave rise to an animal-like dragon, which had three heads, the middle head being called Heracles and Kronos. Heracles generated an egg, which became full, and split into two parts as a result of the commotion inside the egg. Of the two halves of the egg, the upper portion became Heaven and the lower portion became

¹⁷⁰ Ibid., 36.

¹⁷¹ Ibid., 37.

Earth. As the two halves separated, both Heaven and Earth took material forms and produced offspring. These offspring were later cast into Tartarus by Ouranos because he discovered a plot against him had been devised by these offspring. Gaia then gave birth to the Titans, who took revenge on Ouranos.

In the second narrative, Athenagoras gives further detail about what manifested from Heracles's egg. In the previous narrative, Heaven and Earth were the only two mentioned as emerging from the egg, but now a different god makes an appearance.

Ὅρφεύς· ἂν δὲ Φάνης ἄλλην γενεὴν τεκνώσατο δεινὴν
νηδύος ἐξ ἱερῆς, προσιδεῖν φοβερῶπὸν Ἐχιδναν, ἧς χαῖται
μὲν ἀπὸ κρατὸς καλὸν τε πρόσωπον ἦν ἐσιδεῖν, τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ
μέρη φοβεροῖο δράκοντος ἀχένος ἐξ ἄκρου—ἢ αὐτὸν τὸν
Φάνητα δέξαιτο, θεὸν ὄντα πρωτόγονον (οὗτος γὰρ ἐστὶν ὁ
ἐκ τοῦ ᾧοῦ προχυθείς), ἢ σῶμα ἢ σχῆμα ἔχειν δράκοντος ἢ
καταποθῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ Διός, ὅπως ὁ Ζεὺς ἀχώρητος γένοιτο;
εἰ γὰρ μηδὲν διενενηνόχασιν τῶν φαυλοτάτων θηρίων
(δῆλον γὰρ ὅτι ὑποδιαλλάσσειν δεῖ τῶν γῆινων καὶ τῶν ἀπὸ
τῆς ὕλης ἀποκρῖνομένων τὸ θεῖον), οὐκ εἰσὶν θεοί. τί δὲ καὶ
πρόσιμεν αὐτοῖς, ὧν κτηνῶν μὲν δίκην ἔχει ἢ γένεσις, αὐτοὶ
δὲ θηριόμορφοι καὶ δυσειδεῖς¹⁷²

Thus Orpheus: ‘Phanes brought forth yet another fearful child from his sacred belly: the Viper, terrible to look upon. Hair indeed streamed from its head, and beautiful to see was its face; but what remained below its neck were the parts of a fearful serpent.’ Or could he allow that this very Phanes, the first-born of the gods (for he was the one who emerged from the egg), had the body or form of a serpent or was devoured by Zeus so that Zeus could become infinite? For if their gods differ in no way from the vilest beasts (for it is clear that the divine must differ somewhat from earthly things and things derived from matter!), they are not gods. Why indeed do we reverently draw near to them who are born like dumb beasts and who themselves look like animals and are ugly in form?¹⁷³

¹⁷² Ibid., 42.

¹⁷³ Ibid., 43.

In this account, Athenagoras focuses on the first god to be produced, Phanes, and the creature that he births. Phanes is produced from the egg that separated into Heaven and Earth and is born with the body of a dragon. Athenagoras does not comment any further about the body of Phanes, but he does say that his body brings forth a creature from the sacred womb. This creature is fierce, looks like a serpent, and from the neck downward takes the form of a dragon.

Comparing the account given by Athenagoras with the outline of *B*, three parallels can be identified. First, both narratives evoke the authority of Orpheus to substantiate the account of the myth. Hesiod is not mentioned specifically by name, but it is obvious that his genealogy is used in both narratives. The second parallel is the creation of an egg. In both narratives given by Athenagoras, an egg is produced that is also found in *B*. The last parallel material involves the birth of the Titans by Ge and Ouranos.

Epiphanius

Epiphanius, who is dated after *B* and contemporary with the versions of *H* and *R*, was a heresiologist who lived from 320 C.E. to 403 C.E. In *Adversus Haereses*, Epiphanius systematically identifies groups he deems to be heretical and addresses their heretical natures. One of the groups that Epiphanius addressed was the Epicureans, focusing specifically on their philosophy concerning the origin of the universe.

In this cosmogonical version, Epiphanius focuses on Epicurus and his theory of atoms. Included in this cosmogonical account, Epiphanius incorporates material that is reminiscent of *B*.

Ἐπίκουρος δὲ καθεξῆς μετὰ τούτους ἀπρονοησίαν τῶ
κόσμῳ εἰσηγήσατο· ἐξ ἀτόμων δὲ συνεστάναι τὰ πάντα ἢ δ'
αὖ πάλιν εἰς ἄτομα χωρεῖν καὶ ἐξ αὐτοματισμοῦ εἶναι τὰ
ὅλα καὶ τὸν κόσμον ὑφεστάναι, ἀεὶ γεννώσης τῆς φύσεως

ἡδ' αὖ πάλιν δαπανωμένης καὶ ἐξ αὐτῆς πάλιν ἐπιγινωμένης, μηδέποτε δὲ ληγούσης, ἀφ' ἑαυτῆς φυομένης καὶ εἰς ἑαυτὴν συντριβομένης. εἶναι δὲ ἐξ ὑπαρχῆς ὧσ' οὐδὲν δίκην τὸ σύμπαν, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα δρακοντοειδῶς περὶ τὸ ὦδον ὡς στέφανον ἢ ὡς ζώνην περισφίγγειν τότε τὴν φύσιν. θελήσαν δὲ βιασμῶ τινὶ καιρῶ περισσοτέρως σφίγγειν τὴν πᾶσαν ὕλην εἴτ' οὖν φύσιν τῶν πάντων οὕτως διχάσαι μὲν τὰ ὄντα εἰς τὰ δύο ἡμισφαίρια καὶ λοιπὸν ἐκ τούτου τὰ ἄτομα διακεκρίσθαι. τὰ μὲν γὰρ κοῦφα καὶ λεπτότερα τῆς πάσης φύσεως ἐπιπολάσαι ἄνω τουτέστιν φῶς καὶ αἰθέρα καὶ τὸ λεπτότατον τοῦ πνεύματος, τὰ δὲ βαρύτερα καὶ σκυβαλώδη κάτω νενευκέναι, τουτέστι γῆν (ὅπερ ἐστὶ τὸ ξηρόν) καὶ τὴν ὑγρὰν τῶν ὑδάτων οὐσίαν. τὰ δὲ ὅλα ἀφ' ἑαυτῶν κινεῖσθαι καὶ δι' ἑαυτῶν ἐν τῇ περιδιδήσει τοῦ πόλου καὶ τῶν ἄστρον ὡς ἀπὸ τοῦ δρακοντοειδοῦς ἔτι τὰ πάντα ἐλαύνεσθαι πνεύματος. Καὶ ἀπὸ μέρους μὲν περὶ τούτων ἔφημεν· τῷ δὲ αὐτῷ τρόπῳ τὰς τέσσαρας ταύτας αἰρέσεις ἀνατρεπτέον· διὰ τὴν συντομίαν τῆς ἀναγνώσεως.

Next after them, Epicurus introduced the world to the doctrine that there is no providence. He said that all things arise from atoms and revert back to atoms. All things, even the world, exist by chance, since nature is constantly generating, being used up again, and once more renewed out of itself—but it never ceases to be, since it arises out of itself and is worn down into itself. Originally the entire universe was like an egg and the spirit was then coiled snakewise round the egg, and bound nature tightly like a wreath or girdle. At one time it wanted to squeeze the entire matter, or nature, of all things more forcibly, and so divided all that existed into the two hemispheres and then, as the result of this, the atoms were separated. For the light, finer parts of all nature—light, ether and the finest parts of the spirit—floated up on top. But the parts which were heaviest and like dregs have sunk downwards. This means earth—that is, anything dry—and the moist substance of the waters. The whole moves of itself and by its own momentum with the revolution of the pole and stars, as though all things were still being driven by the snakelike spirit. I have spoken of these things if only in part, and in the same way these four sects ought to be refuted. <But this has been foregone> for the sake of shortness in reading.¹⁷⁴

¹⁷⁴ Frank Williams, *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis: Book I (Sects 1-46)* (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 25.

This passage is divided into two major parts. The first portion is the attack on Epicurus and his theory of atoms, and the second is a cosmogony that asserts the universe is like an egg. Although Epiphanius does not indicate which myth he is narrating, it is reminiscent of the Orphic tradition.

The second half of the narrative can be divided into three sections. First, there is an egg, with the spirit wrapped around it like a snake. Second, the egg is broken into two parts, which allows matter to separate; the lighter elements go up, and the heavier elements go down. Lastly, after the separation, there is still motion as if influenced by the spirit.

At the end of the passage, Epiphanius is not too clear as to whether this was a brief summary of a longer treatise or if he was being intentionally succinct, only incorporating its mention for the purpose of refuting the myth. No matter what the purpose, Epiphanius knew of a cosmogony that may have been attributed to Orpheus. It can only be conjectured that the myth had Orphic and Epicurean influences.

Comparison of the text of Epiphanius with *B* shows that there are three parallel sections. The first parallel is the introduction of the egg. In Epiphanius's narrative, it is the shape of the universe, and in *B*, the egg is formed from the mixture of elements. The second parallel section is found when Epiphanius narrates that the lighter elements floated upwards. In *B*, Zeus, who is like fire, ascends to heaven. Even though this passage appears in a different order in *B*, it nevertheless shares common material. The last parallel material in Epiphanius is found when the heaviest elements sink downwards. In *B*, this happens to Aides: he sinks down as if being swallowed by Kronos.

Non-Christian Accounts

Aristophanes

In addition to the Orphic myths found in the writings of early church fathers, there are other, more ancient, versions that also contain elements of an Orphic myth. In line 693 of Aristophanes's *Birds*, written around the early fourth century B.C.E., was used as an example of the manner in which the egg was formed. In both *B* and *Birds*, the egg was generated in relation to time. Even though the parallel between Aristophanes and *B* is limited, there is no doubt that a connection exists.

The Derveni Papyrus

Originating in about the mid fifth century C.E., as discussed in the introduction, the *Derveni Papyrus* was unearthed in Thessaloniki in the 1960s. The *Derveni Papyrus* contains a complex commentary on an apparent Orphic myth that is still under investigation by scholars. One reason for the complexity of the *Derveni Papyrus* is that the text is fragmentary. Another reason is that it is a commentary on an Orphic myth. The unknown author interjects allegorical interpretations throughout the text, which makes it difficult to parse out the myth from the commentary.

Regardless of the complexity, scholars such as Betegh continue to forage through the Derveni commentary. In the *Derveni Papyrus*, Betegh analyzes the columns of the *Derveni Papyrus*, and in chapter three, he outlines the structure of the narrative. The summary of the narrative is as follows:

1. The poet warns the profane to not listen, then begins the narrative.
2. Zeus ascends to power according to a divine decree.
3. Night as the source of the prophecy for the ascension of Zeus.

4. Another divine prophecy from Zeus's father and an act of swallowing.
5. Description of what was swallowed and a description of the line of ascension.
6. Zeus engulfs all beings and is the only one left. He is praised as being the king of all, and he is the creator of a second stage of gods.
7. Further exploits of Zeus's incestuous relationship with his mother.

There are two difficulties, Betegh asserts, with the structure of the narrative. First, the ascension verses appear to be inserted between the verses that mention swallowing. Betegh explains that "the poet interrupts the chronological sequence of events at the point where he considers that the description of an antecedent event or events is important for understanding of the present stage of the story."¹⁷⁵ The second issue is that the narrative begins mid-story when Zeus gains power, but this feature seems to be related to the previous issue. Thus, Betegh asserts that if his outline holds, then "this composition indeed marks an important difference from other known theogonic narratives."¹⁷⁶

Comparison of the outline of the Derveni text to the outline of *B* reveals that there are two features they share. The first, the ascension of Zeus, is present in both outlines, although *B* does not describe Zeus forcefully usurping the throne from his father. Rather, Zeus ascends to heaven riding the she-goat. Under the Stoic allegory, the ascension of Zeus on the wind suggests that he will assume power. The second similar feature in both texts is the line of succession, which begins with chaos, then the appearance of Phanes, then heaven (Ouranos), then Kronos, and finally the ascension of Zeus into heaven.

¹⁷⁵ Betegh, *The Derveni Papyrus*, 131.

¹⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 131.

Now that the outline of *B* has been compared to the various texts, a few broad observations can be made. First, the use of ancient authorities to substantiate the myth is displayed by all the versions investigated. Even in cases in which an ancient author is not mentioned, such as in the second half of Epiphanius's myth, it is reasonable to assume that Orpheus is incorporated.¹⁷⁷ Second, the egg motif, which is present in *B*, also appears in Athenagoras and Epiphanius and in Aristophanes's play. Lastly, the ascension of Zeus, represented as fire and light, is present in Epiphanius, *B*, and the *Derveni Papyrus*.

From these observations, it can be confirmed that *B* has parallels in its narrative with the early church fathers, as well as with the ancient versions, but parallels cannot always be found between the versions of the church fathers and the ancient versions. For example, Aristophanes's play does not discuss the ascension of Zeus, nor does Epiphanius discuss the Titanic genealogy. There is no question that *B* represents aspects of all the versions investigated. Recalling Jourdan's assertion that the *PsCl* preserves the oldest form of the Orphic myth, one would expect that elements of *B*, the original form of the *PsCl*, would be present in other versions. Thus, it can be confirmed that *B* is, in fact, the oldest version, just as Jourdan claims.

¹⁷⁷ Although it is not discussed in the section on *The Derveni Papyrus*, the Derveni commentator evokes Orpheus throughout the entire commentary. Gábor Betegh, *The Derveni Papyrus: Cosmology, Theology and Interpretation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

My study of the Orphic myth in the *PsCl* sought to prove the thesis that the Orphic myth narrated in *R* is the more ancient of the two versions of the *PsCl* and reflects the outline of *B*. The study began by outlining the history of research that has specifically dealt with the Orphic myth in the *PsCl*. It was observed that much of scholarly opinion had been dominated by the early assumptions of Heintze that between *H* and *R*, *H* represents the oldest version. Later, Strecker challenged Heintze's assumption and proposed that *R* represented the oldest version. Even though Strecker revealed a smoking gun, namely the fabrication of Appion by *H*, and the Apion of Josephus likely inspired the Appion in *H*, scholars continued on the premise that *H* was the oldest version.

After the history of research was presented, the study shifted to an in-depth analysis of the two versions that preserve the *PsCl*. The method employed in the analysis was a side-by-side comparison of parallel sections found in *H* and *R*. The objective was to identify which of the two versions possess the most redacted material. As the investigation progressed, it became clear that *H* possesses the greatest amount of redacted material. First, in the parallel sections analyzed, *H* exaggerates the narrative by adding copious detail that is not present in *R*. In fact, exaggeration is a characteristic of *H*, as

can be observed in other parts of the *PsCl*, such as the account of Justa.¹⁷⁸ Second, the character of Appion is only found in *H*, which indicates that he was a fabrication of *H*. Based upon this evidence, *H* shows secondary composition.

The next step in the analysis was to decipher a possible version of *B*'s theogony and cosmogony from the identified parallel sections. The text critical method of this analysis involved the identification of words and phrases that are common to both *H* and *R*. The reasoning behind this method was that if *B* was used by both authors, then the material shared between both versions would invariably illuminate the original version. As I employed this method and isolated the parallel material, an outline of *B* emerged. The outline displayed a narrative of a cosmogony and theogony that appeared to be Orphic in nature, incorporating the *Theogony* of Hesiod and the genealogy of the Titans; narrating the birth of Hades, Neptune, and Zeus; and mentioning the ascension of Zeus. The additional material in *H* was also outlined to further demonstrate that *H*'s version of the Orphic myth was secondary to *R*'s.

After the outline of *B* was constructed, the next step in the investigation was to compare *B* with other versions of the Orphic myth. By comparing *B* with other versions and identifying parallels in themes and context, it was possible to confirm Jourdan's conjecture that the Orphic myth in the *PsCl* preserves the oldest known version of the Orphic myth (O). According to Jourdan, *B*'s version predates and is more primitive than the *Rhapsodies* preserved by Damascius, as well as the other two lesser known versions, the Hieronymus/Hellanicus and the Eudemian.

¹⁷⁸ Information regarding Justa's background is found in *R* 7.31.1, *H* 2.19.1, *H* 3.73.4, *H* 4.1.2, and *H* 13.7.7.

The comparisons involved the polemical writings of Athenagoras and Epiphanius, as well as Aristophanes's play *Birds* and the *Derveni Papyrus*. When the comparisons were made, I concluded that *B* shows common material with all the versions compared. The other versions do not display the same characteristics as *B*, since Aristophanes's play did not possess the ascension of Zeus nor did Epiphanius contain any portion of the Titanic genealogy, which appears to be a characteristic of Orphism. Based on this analysis, if *B* in fact preserves the oldest known form of the Orphic myth, then these results indicate that the *PsCl* are highly undervalued in Orphic studies.

Objections concerning the method used in this study may arise because the Stoic elements in the myth have been largely ignored. Some may argue that Stoicism should have played a larger role in *B*. The problem with this objection is that the Stoic allegorization is a large part of *H*'s redaction. Although there are Stoic influences present in *B*, those influences are minimal, not to mention that *H* is aggressive in its allegorical application. Questions may also be raised concerning the superiority of *B* over the established version of the *Rhapsodies*. Jourdan outlines a detailed argument in the Annexe 3 of *Orphée et Les Chrétiens*, which addresses this objection.¹⁷⁹ The conclusions drawn from the analysis show that *B* possesses parallels with all the compared versions. Thus, it is confirmed that *B* preserves the oldest version of the Orphic myth, as Jourdan claims.

The study of Orphism has a long and complicated history. The ritualistic aspect of Orphism is typically given consideration before the myth. Regardless of the ritual component's popularity, the Orphic myth has captivated many scholars, especially with

¹⁷⁹ Jourdan, *Orphée et Les Chrétiens*, 316.

the discovery of new texts and artifacts that shed light on previously unknown aspects of Orphism. Yet without the necessity of discovering new papyri, a reexamination of the *PsCl* has allowed me to show that *R* preserves an older version of the Orphic myth over *H*. This conclusion was achieved by a detailed examination of the differences between parallel pericopes of the Orphic myth in *H* and *R*. Likewise, a close investigation of the similarities between *H* and *R* have facilitated the presentation of an outline of the Orphic myth in *B*. The combination of my reconstruction of *B*'s outline with Jourdan's conjecture that the *PsCl* contains a version of the Orphic myth older than the *Rhapsodies* shows that the *PsCl* is a jewel that has been mishandled by conventional scholarship.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

GREEK AND LATIN TEXTS OF CHAPTER 3 PARALLELS

The following tables are the Greek and Latin texts that correspond to the chapter three parallels. All texts were taken from *Die Pseudoklementinen I: Homilien* and *Die Pseudoklementinen II: Rekognitionenin*.

TABLE 15. Preface to the Myth: Greek¹⁸⁰ and Latin¹⁸¹ Texts

<i>R</i> 10.17.2 (10.17.2) aiunt ergo qui sapientiores sunt inter gentiles	<i>R</i> 10.30.1-30.2 (10.30.1) Omnis sermo apud Graecos, qui de antiquitatis origine conscribitur, cum alios multos tum duos praecipuos auctores habet, Orfeum et Hesiodum. (10.30.2) horum ergo scripta in duas partes intellegentiae dividuntur, id est, secundum litteram et secundum allegoriam.	<i>H</i> 6.2.12 (6.2.12) ἀλλά (ὡς ἔφην) ὃ τέκνον, ἔχει τινὰ λόγον τὰ τοιαῦτα οἰκεῖον καὶ φιλόσοφον, ἀλληγορίᾳ φρασθῆναι δυνάμενον, ὥστε σε ἀκούσαντα θαυμάσαι.	<i>H</i> 6.11.2-11.3 (6.11.2) Εἰ μὴ παρακολουθεῖς οἷς λέγω, τί καὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν διαλέγομαι; κἀγὼ ἀπεκρινά- μην· Μὴ με ὑπολάμβανε ἀναισθήτως ἔχειν τῶν ὑπὸ σοῦ λεγομένων· πάν- νυ γὰρ αὐτὰ συνήμι, ἅτε δὴ οὐ πρῶτον αὐτῶν ἀκηκόως. (6.11.3) ἵνα δὲ γινῶς ὅτι οὐκ ἀγνοῶ τὰ ὑπὸ σοῦ λεγόμενα, τὰ μὲν σοὶ ῥηθέντα ἐπιτεμοῦμαι, τῶν δὲ παραλειφθέντων σοὶ κατὰ ἀκολουθίαν, ὡς παρ' ἑτέρων ἤκουσα, ἀποπληρώ- σω τὰς ἀλληγορίας
--	---	--	---

¹⁸⁰ Rehm and Strecker, *Die Pseudoklementinen: Homilien*, 103-111.

¹⁸¹ Rehm and Strecker, *Die Pseudoklementinen: Rekognitionenin*, 336-348.

TABLE 16. The Provenance of the Universe: Greek¹⁸² and Latin¹⁸³ Texts

<i>R</i> 10.17.2	<i>R</i> 10.30.3	<i>H</i> 6.3.1-3.4
(10.17.2) primo omnium chaos fuisse	(10.30.3) Orfeus igitur est, qui dicit primo fuisse chaos sempiternum, immensum, igenitum, ex quo omnia facta sunt; hoc sane ipsum chaos non tenebras dixit esse, no lucem, non umidum, non aridum, non calidum, non frigidum, sed omnia simul mixta, et semper unum fuisse informe.	(6.3.1) Ἦν ποτε ὅτε οὐδὲν <ἦν> πλὴν χάος καὶ στοιχείων ἀτάκτων ἔτι συνηφορημένων μίξις ἀδιάκριτος, τοῦτο καὶ τῆς φύσεως ὁμολογούσης καὶ τῶν μεγάλων ἀνδρῶν οὕτως ἔχειν νενοηκότων. (6.3.2) καὶ μάρτυρα τῶν μεγάλων ἐν σοφίᾳ τὸν μέγιστον Ὅμηρον αὐτὸν σοὶ παρέξομαι, εἰπόντα περὶ τῆς ἀνέκαθεν συγχύσεως· »Ἀλλὰ ὑμεῖς μὲν πάντες ὕδωρ καὶ γαῖα γένοισθε«, ὡς ἐκεῖθεν ἀπάντων τὴν γένεσιν ἐσχηκότων καὶ μετὰ ἀνάλυσιν τῆς ὑγρᾶς καὶ γηίνης οὐσίας εἰς τὴν πρώτην πάλιν ἀποκαθισταμένων φύσιν, ὃ ἔστιν χάος. Ἡσίοδος δὲ ἐν τῇ θεογονίᾳ λέγει· (6.3.3) »Ἦτοι μὲν πρότιστα χάος ἐγένετο«. τὸ δὲ »ἐγένετο« δῆλον ὅτι γεγενῆσθαι ὡς γενητὰ σημαίνει, οὐ τὸ ἀεὶ εἶναι ὡς ἀγένητα. (6.3.4) καὶ Ὀρφεὺς δὲ τὸ χάος ὡς παρεικάζει, ἐν ᾧ τῶν πρώτων στοιχείων ἦν ἡ σύγχυσις. τοῦτο Ἡσίοδος χάος ὑποτίθεται, ὅπερ Ὀρφεὺς ὠδὸν λέγει γενητόν, ἐξ ἀπείρου τῆς ὕλης προβεβλημένον, γεγονὸς δὲ οὕτω.

¹⁸² Rehm and Strecker, *Die Pseudoklementinen: Homilien*, 103-111.

¹⁸³ Rehm and Strecker, *Die Pseudoklementinen: Rekognitionen*, 336-348.

TABLE 17. The Cosmic Egg: Greek¹⁸⁴ and Latin¹⁸⁵ Texts

R 10.17.2	R 10.30.4	H 6.4.1-5.3	H 6.12.1
hoc per multum tempus exteriors sui solidans partes, fines sibi et fundum quondam fecisse tamquam in ovi inmanis modum formamque collectum, intra quod multo nihilominus tempore, quasi intra ovi testam	aliquando tamen quasi ad ovi inmanis modum	τῆς τετραγενοῦς ὑλης ἐμψύχου οὔσης καὶ ὅλου ἀπείρου τινὸς βυθοῦ ἀεὶ ρέοντος καὶ ἀκρίτως φερομένου καὶ μυρίας ἀτελεῖς κράσεις [εἰς] ἄλλοτε ἄλλως ἐπαναχέοντος καὶ διὰ τοῦτο αὐτὰς ἀναλύοντος τῇ ἀταξίᾳ, καὶ κεκηνότος ὡς εἰς γένεσιν ζώου δεθῆναι μὴ δυ- ναμένου, συνέβη ποτέ, (6.4.2) αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἀπείρου πελάγους ὑπὸ ἰδίας φύσεως περιωθουμένου, κινήσει φυσικῇ εὐτάκτως ῥυῆναι ἀπὸ τοῦ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ αὐτὸ ὥσπερ ἴλιγγα καὶ μῖξαι τὰς οὐσίας, καὶ οὕτως ἐξ ἐκάστου τῶν πάντων τὸ νοστιμώτατον, ὅπερ πρὸς γένεσιν ζώου ἐπιτηδειότατον ἦν, ὥσπερ ἐν χώνῃ κατὰ μέσου ῥυῆναι τοῦ παντὸς καὶ ὑπὸ τῆς πάντα φερούσης	(6.12.1) Ποίησον οὕτως ὡς λέγεις. κἀγὼ ἀπεκρινάμην· Παρίημι νῦν ἐπ’ ἀκριβὲς λέγειν τὸ ἐκ τῆς ἀπείρου ὑλης κατὰ ἐπιτυχίαν κράσεως ἀποκυθηθὲν ἔμψυχον ὦόν.

¹⁸⁴ Rehm and Strecker, *Die Pseudoklementinen: Homilien*, 103-111.

¹⁸⁵ Rehm and Strecker, *Die Pseudoklementinen: Rekognitionen*, 336-348.

TABLE 17. Continued

R 10.17.2	R 10.30.4	H 6.4.1-5.3	H 6.12.1
		<p>ἕλιγγος χωρῆσαι εἰς βάθος καὶ τὸ περικείμενον πνεῦμα ἐπισπά- σασθαι καὶ ὡς εἰς γονιμώτατον συλληφθὲν ποιεῖν κριτικὴν σύστασιν. (6.4.3) ὥσπερ γὰρ ἐν ὑγρῷ φιλεῖ γίνεσθαι πομφόλυξ, οὕτως σφαιροειδὲς πανταχόθεν συνελήφθη κύτος. ἔπειτα αὐτὸ ἐν ἑαυτῷ κυθὲν, ὑπὸ τοῦ περιειληφότος θειώδους πνεύματος ἀναφερόμενον, προέκυψεν εἰς φῶς μέγιστόν τι τοῦτο ἀποκύημα, ὡς ἂν ἐκ παντὸς τοῦ ἀπείρου βυθοῦ ἀποκεκυημένον ἔμψυχον δημιούργημα καὶ τῆ περιφερεία τῷ ὠῷ προσεικὸς καὶ τῷ τάχει τῆς πτήσεως. (6.5.1) Κρόνον οὖν τὸν χρόνον μοι νόει, τὴν δὲ Ἴρεαν τὸ ῥέον τῆς ὑγρᾶς οὐσίας, ὅτι χρόνον φερομένη ἢ ἕλη ἅπασα ὥσπερ ὦδὸν τὸν πάντα περιέχοντα σφαιροειδῆ ἀπεκύησεν οὐρανόν· (6.5.2) ὅπερ κατ' ἀρχὰς τοῦ γονίμου</p>	

TABLE 17. Continued

<i>R</i> 10.17.2	<i>R</i> 10.30.4	<i>H</i> 6.4.1-5.3	<i>H</i> 6.12.1
		<p> μυελοῦ πλήρες ἦν ὡς ἂν στοιχεῖα καὶ χρώματα παν- τοδαπὰ ἐκτεκεῖν δυνάμενον, καὶ ὁμῶς παντοδαπὴν ἐκ μιᾶς οὐσίας τε καὶ χρώματος ἐνὸς ἔφερε τὴν φαντασίαν. (6.5.3) ὥσπερ γὰρ ἐν τῷ τοῦ ταὼ γεννήματι ἐν μὲν τοῦ ὡοῦ χρῶμα δοκεῖ, δυνάμει δὲ μυρία ἔχει ἐν ἑαυτῷ τοῦ μέλλοντος τελεσφορεῖσθαι χρώματα, οὕτως καὶ τὸ ἐξ ἀπείρου ὕλης ἀποκυθὲν ἔμψυχον ὠὸν ἐκ τῆς ὑποκειμένης καὶ ἀεὶ ῥεούσης ὕλης κινούμενον παντοδαπὰς ἐκφαίνει τροπὰς. </p>	

TABLE 18. The Emergence of Phanes: Greek¹⁸⁶ and Latin¹⁸⁷ Texts

R 10.17.2-17.4	R 10.30.4-30.5	H 6.5.4-6.1	H 6.12.1
(10.17.2) <i>fotum vivificatumque esse animal quoddam; (10.30.3) disruptoque post haec inmani illo globo processisse speciem quandam hominis duplicis formae, quam illi masculofeminam vocant.</i> (10.30.4) <i>hunc etiam Faneta[m] nominarunt ab apparendo, quia cum apparuisset, inquit, tunc etiam lux effulsit.</i>	(10.30.4) <i>effectam peperisse ac protulisse ex se duplicem quondam speciem, quam illi masculofeminam vocant, ex contraria admixtione huiusmodi diversitatis speciem concretam</i> (10.30.5) <i>et hoc esse principium omnium.</i>	(6.5.4) <i>ἐνδοθεν γὰρ τῆς περιφερείας ζῶόν τι ἀρρενόθηλυ εἰδοποιεῖται προνοία τοῦ ἐνότος ἐν αὐτῷ θείου πνεύματος, ὃν Φάνητα Ὀρφεὺς καλεῖ, ὅτι αὐτοῦ φανέντος τὸ πᾶν ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἔλαμψεν, τῷ φέγγει τοῦ διαπρεπεστάτου τῶν στοιχείων πυρὸς ἐν τῷ ὑγρῷ τελεσφορουμένου.</i> (6.5.5) <i>καὶ οὐκ ἄπιστον, ὅτι καὶ ἐπὶ λαμπυρίδων δείγματος ἔνεκα ἢ φύσις ἡμῖν ὄραν ὑγρὸν φῶς ἐδωρήσατο.</i> (6.6.1) <i>τὸ μὲν οὖν πρωτοσύστατον ὦδὸν ὑποθερμανθέν ὑπὸ τοῦ ἔσωθεν ζῶου ῥήγνυται, ἔπειτα δὲ μορφωθέν προέρχεται ὁποῖόν τι καὶ Ὀρφεὺς λέγει »κρανίου σχισθέντος πολυχανδέος ὡοῦ«.</i>	(6.12.1) <i>οὗ ῥαγέντος κατὰ τινὰς ἀρρενόθηλυς ἐξέθορεν Φάνης.</i>

¹⁸⁶ Rehm and Strecker, *Die Pseudoklementinen: Homilien*, 103-111.

¹⁸⁷ Rehm and Strecker, *Die Pseudoklementinen: Rekognitionen*, 336-348.

TABLE 19. The First Gods and their Allegories: Greek¹⁸⁸ and Latin¹⁸⁹ Texts

R 10.17.4	R 10.32.1-32.6	H 6.6.2-7.5	H 6.12.2-12.4
(10.17.4) ex hoc dicunt progenitam esse substantiam, prudentiam, motum, coitum: ex his factum caelum et terram	(10.32.1) haec ergo, inquit, primo omnium tempore multo concretam genuit quandam quasi bullam, quae ex spiritu qui in aquis erat, paulatim collecta (10.32.2) intumuit et aliquanto tempore circumacta per superficiem materiae, ex qua quasi ex vulva processerat, rigore frigoris obdurata et glacialibus augmentis semper increscens, abrupta tandem demergitur in profundum ac pondere ipso pertracta in infernum descendit, et quia invisibilis facta est, Aides appellata est, qui et Orcus vel Pluto nominatur (10.32.3) cumque de superioribus mergeretur in inferna, locum confluendi umido praebuit elemento, et pars crassior,	(6.6.2) καὶ οὕτω μεγάλη δυνάμει αὐτοῦ τοῦ προεληλυθότος φανέντος, τὸ μὲν κύτος τὴν ἁρμονίαν λαμβάνει καὶ τὴν διακόσμησιν ἴσχει, αὐτὸς δὲ ὥσπερ ἐπ' ἀκρωρείας οὐρανοῦ προκαθέζεται καὶ ἐν ἀπορρήτοις τὸν ἄπειρον περιλάμπων αἰῶνα. (6.6.3) ἡ δὲ τοῦ κύτους ἔνδοθεν γόνιμος ὑπολειφθεῖσα ὕλη, ὡς ἐν πολλῶ τῶ χρόνῳ ὑποκειμένης ἕως φυσικῆς ὑποξέουσα ἢ θερμότης† τὰς πάντων διέκρινεν οὐσίας. (6.6.4) τὸ μὲν γὰρ κατώτερον αὐτῆς πρῶτον ὥσπερ ὑποστάθμη ὑπὸ τοῦ βάρους εἰς τὰ κάτω ὑποκεχώρηκεν, ὃ διὰ τὴν ὀλκότητα καὶ διὰ τὸ ἐμβριθὲς καὶ πολὺ τῆς ὑποκειμένης οὐσίας πλῆθος Πλούτωνα προσηγόρευσαν, ἄδου τε καὶ νεκρῶν βασιλέα εἶναι	(6.12.2) καὶ πάντ' ἐκεῖνα ἐπιτέμνομαι, μέχρις οὗ τὸ ῥαγὲν κύτος τὴν ἁρμονίαν ἔλαβεν, ὑπολειφθείσης αὐτοῦ μυελώδους ὕλης, καὶ τὸν λόγον τῶν ὑπ' αὐτῆς ἔνδοθεν γενομένων ἐπὶ κεφαλαίων μετὰ τῶν ἀκολουθῶν ἐπιτρέχω. (6.12.3) ἐγεννήθη γὰρ (ὡς λέγεις) ἐκ Κρόνου καὶ Ρέας (ὑπὸ τε χρόνου καὶ ὕλης) τὰ μὲν πρῶτα Πλούτων, ὡς ἢ κάτω παραχωρήσασα ὑποστάθμη— δεύτερα δὲ Ποσειδῶν, ὃς ἢ μέση ἐστὶν ὑγρὰ οὐσία ἐπιπολάσασα τῇ κάτω ὀλκοτάτῃ φύσει— (6.12.4) ἡ δὲ τρίτη ἀνωτάτῃ τε καὶ αἰθῆρ οὐσα, ὅσπερ ἐστὶν Ζεὺς, ἥτις οὐ κατεπόθη, ἀλλὰ θερμὴ οὐσα ἰσχύς καὶ ἀνωφερῆ ἔχουσα τὴν φύσιν ὥσπερ ὑπὸ τινος ῥιπῆς εἰς τὸν ἄνω

¹⁸⁸ Rehm and Strecker, *Die Pseudoklementinen: Homilien*, 103-111.

¹⁸⁹ Rehm and Strecker, *Die Pseudoklementinen: Rekognitionen*, 336-348.

TABLE 19. Continued

R 10.17.4	R 10.32.1-32.6	H 6.6.2-7.5	H 6.12.2-12.4
	<p>quae est terra, aquis cedentibus patefacta est. (10.32.4) hanc ergo aquarum libertatem, quae prius bulla obtegente premebatur, postquam illa inferni sortita est locum, Neptunum esse appellatam. (10.32.5) post hoc cum elementum frigidum per concretionem glacialis bullae ad inferiora fuisset absor<p>tum et aridum fuisset umidumque discretum, nullo iam inpediente, elementum calidum ignis utpote vigore et levitate ad superior convolavit aeris spiritu et procella subvectum. (10.32.6) hanc ergo procellam, quae cat<a>egis Graece appellatur, aega[m], id est capram dixerunt, et ignem qui ad superna conscendit, Iovem; et ideo eum capra subvectum conscendisse Olympum dicunt.</p>	<p>ἀποφηνάμενοι. (6.7.1) ταύτην μὲν οὖν τὴν πρώτην καὶ πολλήν, ῥυπαρὰν καὶ τραχεῖαν οὐσίαν ὑπὸ Κρόνου, τοῦ χρόνου, καταποθῆναι λέγουσιν φυσικῶς διὰ τὴν κάτω ὑπονόστησιν αὐτῆς. (6.7.2) μετὰ δὲ τὴν πρώτην ὑποστάθμην τὸ συρρῦν ὕδωρ καὶ πρώτη ἐπιτολάσαν ὑποστάσει Ποσειδῶνα προσηγόρευσαν. (6.7.3) τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν τρίτον τὸ καθαρώτατον καὶ κορυφαιότατον ἅτε διαυγὲς ὄν πῦρ Ζῆνα ὠνόμασαν διὰ τὴν ἐν αὐτῶ ζέουσαν φύσιν· (6.7.4) ἀνωφερὲς γὰρ ὄν τὸ πῦρ πρὸς μὲν τὰ κάτω ὑπὸ χρόνου, τοῦ Κρόνου, οὐ κατεπόθη, ἀλλ' (ὡς ἔφην) ἢ πυρώδης οὐσία ζωτικὴ τε καὶ ἀνωφερῆς οὖσα εἰς αὐτὸν ἀνέπτη τὸν ἀέρα, ὃς καὶ φρονιμώτατός ἐστι</p>	<p>ἡγεμονικώτατον ἀνέπτη αἰθέρα.</p>

TABLE 19. Continued

<i>R</i> 10.17.4	<i>R</i> 10.32.1-32.6	<i>H</i> 6.6.2-7.5 διὰ τὴν καθαρότητα. (6.7.5) τῇ οὖν ἰδίᾳ θερμότητι ὁ Ζεὺς (τουτέστιν ἡ ζέουσα οὐσία) τὸ καταλειφθὲν ἐν τῷ ὑποκειμένῳ ὑγρῷ τὸ ἰσχνότατον καὶ θεῖον ἀνιμάται πνεῦμα, ὅπερ Μῆτιν ἐκάλεσαν.	<i>H</i> 6.12.2-12.4
------------------	-----------------------	--	----------------------

TABLE 20. The Titans: Greek¹⁹⁰ and Latin¹⁹¹ Texts

<i>R</i> 10.17.4-17.6	<i>R</i> 10.31.1-31.5	<i>H</i> 6.2.2
<p>(10.17.4) ex caelo sex progenitos mares, quos et Titanas appellant; (10.17.5) similiter et de terra sex feminas, quas Titanidas vocitarunt. et sunt nomina eorum quidem qui ex caelo orti sunt haec: Oceanus, Coeus, Crius, Yperion, Iapetos, Cronos, qui apud nos Saturnus nominator. (10.17.6) similiter et earum quae ex terra ortae sunt nomina sunt haec: Thia, Rea, Themis, Mnemosyne, Tethys, Hebe.</p>	<p>(10.31.1) subiungit autem his et Hesiodus, post chaos statim caelum dicens factum esse et terram, ex quibus ait progenitos illos undecim, quos interdum et duodecim dicit, ex quibus sex mares, quinque feminas ponit; nomina autem dat maribus: (10.31.2) Oceanus, Coeus, Crius, Yperion, Iapetus, Cronus, qui et Saturnus; item feminis: Thia, Rea, Themis, Mnemosyne, Thetys, quae nomina per allegoriam hoc modo interpretantur: (10.31.3) numerum quidem undecim vel duodecim ipsam dicunt primam naturam, quam et Ream a fluendo dictam volunt; (10.31.4) reliquos autem decem accidentia eius dicunt quas et qualitates appellant; duodecimum tamen addunt et Cronum quem apud nos Saturnum dicunt; hunc pro tempore accipiunt. (10.31.5) Saturnum ergo et Ream tempus ponunt et materiam, quae ubi cum umido et arido et calido et frigido tempore fuerit admixta, omnia generat.</p>	<p>(6.2.2) οὔτε γὰρ ἀπ’ Οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ Γῆς γεγόνασιν παῖδες δώδεκα, ὡς ὁ μῦθος καταριθμεῖ· ἄρρενες μὲν Ὡκεανός, Κοῖος, Κρῖος, Ὑπερίων, Ἰαπετός, Κρόνος· θήλειαι δὲ Θεία, Θέμις, Μνημοσύνη, Δημήτηρ, Τηθύς, Ῥέα.</p>

¹⁹⁰ Rehm and Strecker, *Die Pseudoklementinen: Homilien*, 103-111.

¹⁹¹ Rehm and Strecker, *Die Pseudoklementinen: Rekognitionen*, 336-348.

APPENDIX B

GREEK AND LATIN TEXTS OF CHAPTER 4 PARALLELS

The following tables are the Greek and Latin texts that correspond with the chapter four parallels. All texts were taken from *Die Pseudoklementinen I: Homilien* and *Die Pseudoklementinen II: Rekognitionen*.

TABLE 21. Chaos: Greek¹⁹² and Latin¹⁹³ Texts

R 10.17.2	R 10.30.3-30.4	H 6.3.1-3.4	H 6.12.1
(10.17.2) primo omnium chaos fuisse: hoc per multum tempus exteriors sui solidans partes, fines sibi et fundum quendam fecisse tamquam in ovi inmanis.	(10.30.3) 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; (10.30.4) aliquando tamen quasi ad ovi inmanis modum per inmensa tempora effectam reperisse.	(6.3.1) Ἦν ποτε ὅτε οὐδὲν <ἦν> πλὴν χάος καὶ στοιχείων ἀτάκτων ἔτι συνηφορημένων μίξις ἀδιάκριτος, τοῦτο καὶ τῆς φύσεως ὁμολογούσης καὶ τῶν μεγάλων ἀνδρῶν οὕτως ἔχειν νενοηκότων. (6.3.2) καὶ μάρτυρα τῶν μεγάλων ἐν σοφίᾳ τὸν μέγιστον Ὅμηρον αὐτόν σοι παρέξομαι, εἰπόντα περὶ τῆς ἀνέκαθεν συγχύσεως. »Ἄλλὰ ὑμεῖς μὲν πάντες ὕδωρ καὶ γαῖα γένοισθε«, ὡς ἐκεῖθεν ἀπάντων τὴν γένεσιν ἐσχηκότων καὶ μετὰ ἀνάλυσιν τῆς ὑγρᾶς καὶ γήινης οὐσίας εἰς τὴν πρώτην πάλιν ἀποκαθισταμένων φύσιν, ὃ ἐστὶν χάος. Ἡσίοδος δὲ ἐν τῇ	(6.12.1) Παρήμι νῦν ἐπ' ἀκριβὲς λέγειν τὸ ἐκ τῆς ἀπείρου ὕλης κατὰ ἐπιτυχίαν κράσεως ἀποκυθηθὲν ἔμψυχον ὄν

¹⁹² Rehm and Strecker, *Die Pseudoklementinen: Homilien*, 103-111.

¹⁹³ Rehm and Strecker, *Die Pseudoklementinen: Rekognitionen*, 336-348.

TABLE 21. Continued

<i>R</i> 10.17.2	<i>R</i> 10.30.3-30.4	<i>H</i> 6.3.1-3.4	<i>H</i> 6.12.1
		<p>θεογονία λέγει· (6.3.3) »Ἦτοι μὲν πρότιστα χάος ἐγένετο«. τὸ δὲ »ἐγένετο« δῆλον ὅτι γεγενῆσθαι ὡς γενητὰ σημαίνει, οὐ τὸ αἰεὶ εἶναι ὡς ἀγένητα. (6.3.4) καὶ Ὀρφεὺς δὲ τὸ χάος ὡφ̃ παρεικάζει, ἐν ᾧ̃ τῶν πρώτων στοιχείων ἦν ἡ σύγχυσις.</p>	

TABLE 22. The Egg: Greek¹⁹⁴ and Latin¹⁹⁵ Texts

<p><i>R</i> 10.17.2-17.3 (10.17.2) intra quod multo nihilominus tempore, quasi intra ovi testam, fotum vivificatumque esse animal quoddam; (10.17.3) disruptoque post haec inmani illo globo processisse speciem quandam hominis duplicis formae, quam illi masculofeminam vocant.</p>	<p><i>R</i> 10.30.4 (10.30.4) ac protulisse ex se duplicem quondam speciem, quam illi masculofeminam vocant, ex contraria admixtione huiusmodi diversitatis speciem concretem;</p>	<p><i>H</i> 6.5.1- & <i>H</i> 6.5.4 (6.5.1) ὅτι χρόνω φερομένη ἢ ὕλη (6.5.4) ἐνδοθεν γὰρ τῆς περιφερείας ζῳόν τι ἀρρενόθηλυ εἰδοποιεῖται προνοία τοῦ ἐνότος ἐν αὐτῷ θείου πνεύματος</p>	<p><i>H</i> 6.12.1 (6.12.1) οὗ ῥαγέντος κατά τινος ἀρρενόθηλως</p>
--	--	---	---

¹⁹⁴ Rehm and Strecker, *Die Pseudoklementinen: Homilien*, 103-111.

¹⁹⁵ Rehm and Strecker, *Die Pseudoklementinen: Rekognitionen*, 336-348.

TABLE 23. Consequences from the Egg: Greek¹⁹⁶ and Latin¹⁹⁷ Texts

R 10.17.4	R 10.30.5	H 6.5.4-6.2	H 6.12.1
(10.17.4) hunc etiam Faneta[m] nominarunt ab apparendo, quia cum apparuisset, inquit, tunc etiam lux effulsit. ex hoc dicunt progenitam esse substantiam, prudentiam, motum, coitum: ex his factum caelum et terram.	(10.30.5) et hoc esse principium omnium. quod primum ex material 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. haec quidem Orfeus.	(6.5.4) ὃν Φάνητα Ὀρφεὺς καλεῖ, ὅτι αὐτοῦ φανέντος τὸ πᾶν ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἔλαμψεν, τῷ φέγγει τοῦ διαπρεπεστάτου τῶν στοιχείων πυρὸς ἐν τῷ ὑγρῷ τελεσφορουμένου. (6.5.5) καὶ οὐκ ἄπιστον, ὅτι καὶ ἐπὶ λαμπυρίδων δείγματος ἔνεκα ἡ φύσις ἡμῖν ὄρᾶν ὑγρὸν φῶς ἐδωρήσατο. (6.6.1) τὸ μὲν οὖν δείγματος ἔνεκα ἡ φύσις ἡμῖν ὄρᾶν ὑγρὸν φῶς ἐδωρήσατο. τὸ μὲν οὖν πρωτοσύστατον ὦδὸν ὑποθερμανθέν ὑπὸ τοῦ ἔσωθεν ζῶου ῥήγνυται, ἔπειτα δὲ μορφωθὲν προέρχεται ὁποῖόν τι καὶ Ὀρφεὺς λέγει »κρανίου σχισθέντος πολυχανδέος ὡοῦ«. (6.6.2) καὶ οὕτω μεγάλη δυνάμει αὐτοῦ τοῦ προεληλυθότος φανέντος, τὸ μὲν κύτος τὴν ἁρμονίαν λαμβάνει καὶ τὴν	(6.12.1) ἐξέθορεν Φάνης.

¹⁹⁶ Rehm and Strecker, *Die Pseudoklementinen: Homilien*, 103-111.

¹⁹⁷ Rehm and Strecker, *Die Pseudoklementinen: Rekognitionen*, 336-348.

TABLE 23. Continued

<i>R</i> 10.17.4	<i>R</i> 10.30.5	<i>H</i> 6.5.4-6.2 διακόσμησιν ἴσχει, αὐτὸς δὲ ὥσπερ ἐπ’ ἀκρωρείας οὐρανοῦ προκαθέζεται καὶ ἐν ἀπορρήτοις τὸν ἄπειρον περιλάμπων αἰῶνα.	<i>H</i> 6.12.1
------------------	------------------	--	-----------------

TABLE 24. The Titans: Greek¹⁹⁸ and Latin¹⁹⁹ Texts

<i>R</i> 10.17.5-17.6	<i>R</i> 10.31.1-31.2	<i>H</i> 6.2.2
<p>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, Crius, Yperion, Iapetos, Cronos, qui apud nos Saturnus nominator. (10.17.6) similiter et earum quae ex terra ortae sunt nomina sunt haec: Thia, Rea, Themis, Mnemosyne, Tethys, Hebe.</p>	<p>(10.31.1) subiungit autem his et Hesiodus, post chaos statim caelum dicens factum esse et terram, ex quibus ait progenitos illos undecim, quos interdum et duodecim dicit, ex quibus sex mares, quinque feminas ponit; (10.31.2) nomina autem dat maribus: Oceanus, Coeus, Crius, Yperion, Iapetus, Cronus, qui et Saturnus; item feminis: Thia, Rea, Themis, Mnemosyne, Thetyus</p>	<p>(6.2.2) οὔτε γὰρ ἀπ’ Οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ Γῆς γεγόνασιν παῖδες δώδεκα, ὡς ὁ μῦθος καταριθμεῖ· ἄρρενες μὲν Ὠκεανός, Κοῖος, Κρῖος, Ὑπερίων, Ἴαπετός, Κρόνος· θήλειαι δὲ Θεία, Θέμις, Μνημοσύνη, Δημήτηρ, Τηθύς, Ῥέα</p>

¹⁹⁸ Rehm and Strecker, *Die Pseudoklementinen: Homilien*, 103-111.

¹⁹⁹ Rehm and Strecker, *Die Pseudoklementinen: Rekognitionen*, 336-348.

TABLE 25. Kronos and Rhea: Greek²⁰⁰ and Latin²⁰¹ Texts

R 10.18.3-18.4	R 10.31.5	H 6.5.1	H 6.12.3
(10.18.3) ex istorum coniunctionibus alios quoque innumeros adserunt progenitos. (10.18.4) sed de illis sex maribus unus, qui dicitur Saturnus, in coniugium acceperat Ream	(10.31.5) Saturnum ergo et Ream tempus ponunt et materiam, quae ubi cum umido et arido et calido et frigido tempore fuerit admixta, omnia generat.	(6.5.1) Κρόνον οὖν τὸν χρόνον μοι νόει, τὴν δὲ Ῥέα τὸ ῥέον τῆς ὑγρᾶς οὐσίας.	(6.12.3) ἐγεννήθη γάρ (ὡς λέγεις) ἐκ Κρόνου καὶ Ῥέας (ὑπὸ τε χρόνου καὶ ὑλης)

²⁰⁰ Rehm and Strecker, *Die Pseudoklementinen: Homilien*, 103-111.

²⁰¹ Rehm and Strecker, *Die Pseudoklementinen: Rekognitionen*, 336-348.

TABLE 26. Aides/Pluto: Greek²⁰² and Latin²⁰³ Texts

R 10.18.5	R 10.32.2-32.3	H 6.6.4-7.1	H 6.12.3
(10.18.5) huic ergo primus nascitur filius, quem Aiden appellarunt, qui apud nos Orcus nominator, quem pro causis quibus supra diximus, adsumptum devorat	(10.32.2) ac pondere ipso pertracta in infernum descendit, et quia invisibilis facta est, Aides appellate est, qui et Orcus vel Pluto nominatur. (10.32.3) cumque de superioribus mergeretur in inferna, locum confluendi umido praebuit elemento, est pars crassior, quae est terra, aquis cedentibus patefacta est.	(6.6.4) τὸ μὲν γὰρ κατώτερον αὐτῆς πρῶτον ὥσπερ ὑποστάθμη ὑπὸ τοῦ βάρους εἰς τὰ κάτω ὑποκεχώρηκεν, ὃ διὰ τὴν ὀλκότητα καὶ διὰ τὸ ἐμβριθὲς καὶ πολὺ τῆς ὑποκειμένης οὐσίας πλῆθος Πλούτωνα προσηγόρευσαν, ἄδου τε καὶ νεκρῶν βασιλέα εἶναι ἀποφηνάμενοι. (6.7.1) ταύτην μὲν οὖν τὴν πρώτην καὶ πολλήν, ῥυπαρὰν καὶ τραχεῖαν οὐσίαν ὑπὸ Κρόνου, τοῦ χρόνου, καταποθῆναι λέγουσιν φυσικῶς διὰ τὴν κάτω ὑπονόστησιν αὐτῆς.	(6.12.3) πρῶτα Πλούτων, ὡς ἡ κάτω παραχωρήσασα ὑποστάθμη

²⁰² Rehm and Strecker, *Die Pseudoklementinen: Homilien*, 103-111.

²⁰³ Rehm and Strecker, *Die Pseudoklementinen: Rekognitionen*, 336-348.

TABLE 27. Neptune/Poseidon: Greek²⁰⁴ and Latin²⁰⁵ Texts

<i>R</i> 10.19.3	<i>R</i> 10.32.4-32.5	<i>H</i> 6.7.2	<i>H</i> 6.12.3
(10.19.3) secundus utpote illo superior super aquas detruditur is quem Neptunum vocant.	(10.32.4) hanc ergo aquarum libertatem, quae prius bulla obtegente premebatur, postquam illa infernī sortita est locum, Neptunum esse appellatam. (10.32.5) post hoc cum elementum frigidum per concretionem glacialis bullae ad inferior fuisset absor<p>tum.	(6.7.2) μετὰ δὲ τὴν πρώτην ὑποστάθμην τὸ συρρυνὲν ὕδωρ καὶ πρώτη ἐπιπολάσαν ὑποστάσει Ποσειδῶνα προσηγόρευσαν.	(6.12.3) δεύτερα δὲ Ποσειδῶν, ὃς ἡ μέση ἐστὶν ὑγρὰ οὐσία ἐπιπολάσασα τῇ κάτω ὀλκοτάτῃ φύσει

²⁰⁴ Rehm and Strecker, *Die Pseudoklementinen: Homilien*, 103-111.

²⁰⁵ Rehm and Strecker, *Die Pseudoklementinen: Rekognitionen*, 336-348.

TABLE 28. Zeus/Jupiter: Greek²⁰⁶ and Latin²⁰⁷ Texts

R 10.19.4	R 10.32.5-32.6	H 6.7.3-7.5	H 6.12.4
(10.19.4) tertius qui arte matris Reae superfuit, ab ipsa caprae superpositus in caelum emissus est.	(10.32.5) et aridum fuisset umidumque discretum, nullo iam impediante, elementum calidum ignis utpote vigore et levitate ad superior convolavit aeris spiritu et procella subvectum. (10.32.6) hanc ergo procellam, quae cat<a>egis Graece appellatur, aega[m], id est capram dixerunt, et ignem qui ad superna conscendit, Iovem; et ideo eum capra subvectum conscendisse Olympum dicunt.	(6.7.3) τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν τρίτον τὸ καθαρώτατον καὶ κορυφαιότατον ἄτε διαυγὲς ὄν πῦρ Ζῆνα ὠνόμασαν διὰ τὴν ἐν αὐτῷ ζέουσαν φύσιν. (6.7.4) ἀνωφερὲς γὰρ ὄν τὸ πῦρ πρὸς μὲν τὰ κάτω ὑπὸ χρόνου, τοῦ Κρόνου, οὐ κατεπόθη, ἀλλ' (ὡς ἔφην) ἡ πυρώδης οὐσία ζωτικὴ τε καὶ ἀνωφερῆς οὐσα εἰς αὐτὸν ἀνέπτη τὸν ἀέρα, ὃς καὶ φρονιμώτατός ἐστι διὰ τὴν καθαρότητα. (6.7.5) 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.	(6.12.4) ἡ δὲ τρίτη ἀνωτάτη τε καὶ αἰθὴρ οὐσα, ὅσπερ ἐστὶν Ζεὺς, ἥτις οὐ κατεπόθη, ἀλλὰ θερμὴ οὐσα ἰσχυρὴ καὶ ἀνωφερῆ ἔχουσα τὴν φύσιν ὡσπερ ὑπὸ τινος ῥιπῆς εἰς τὸν ἀνω ἡγεμονικώτατον ἀνέπτη αἰθέρα.

²⁰⁶ Rehm and Strecker, *Die Pseudoklementinen: Homilien*, 103-111.

²⁰⁷ Rehm and Strecker, *Die Pseudoklementinen: Rekognitionen*, 336-348.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Amersfoort, J. van. "Traces of an Alexandrian Orphic Theogony in the Pseudo-Clementines." In *Studies in Gnosticism and Hellenistic Religions: Presented to Gilles Quispel on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*. Edited by Broek, R. Van Den, and M.J. Vermaseren, 13-30. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1981.
- Athenagoras. *Legation and de Resurrectione*. Translated and edited by William R. Schoedel. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972.
- Aristophanes. *Aristophanis Comoediae*. Translated by F.W. Hall and W.M. Geldart. Oxford: Oxford Clarendon Press, 1967.
- . *Birds*. Edited by Page, T.E., E. Capps, and W.H.D. Rouse. Translated by Benjamin Bickley Rogers. The Loeb Classical Library. Vol. 2. London: William Heinemann Ltd, 1926.
- Barthell, Edward E., Jr. *Gods and Goddesses of Ancient Greece*. Coral Gables: University of Miami Press, 1971.
- Bernabé, Alberto. *Poetarum Epicorum Graecorum: Testimonia et Fragmenta Pars I*, Edited by Alberto Bernabé. Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. Leipzig: BSB B.G. Teubner Verlagsgesellschaft, 1987.
- . *Hieros logos: Poesia orfica sobre los dioses, el alma y el mas alla*. Madrid: Ediciones Akal, 2003.
- . *Poetae epici graeci: testimonia et fragmenta: Pars II, Orphicorum et Orphicis similibus testimonia et fragmenta*. 3 vols. Bibliotheca scriptorium Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. München: K.G. Saur, 2005.
- . *Instructions for the Netherworld: The Orphic Gold Tablets*. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- . "La teogonia orfica citada en las Pseudoclementina." *Adamantius* 14 (2008): 79-99.
- Betegh, Gábor. *The Derveni Papyrus: Cosmology, Theology and Interpretation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Bremmer, Jan N. *The Rise and Fall of the Afterlife*. New York: Routledge, 2002.

- Brenton, Sir Lancelot C.L. *The Septuagint with Apocrypha: Greek and English*. Longdon: Hendrickson, 1986.
- Brown, J. Baldwin. *Stoics and Saints*. Glasgow: James Maclehose and Sons, 1893.
- Côté, Dominique. "Orphic Theogony and the context of the Clementines." In *Nouvelles intrigues pseudo-clémentines*. Edited by Frederic Amsler, 183-188. Prahins: Editions du Zebre, 2008.
- Creuzers, Georg Friedrich. *Symbolik und Mythologie: Der Alten Völker besonders der Griechen*. Leipzig: C.W Leske, 1822.
- Damascius. *Problems and Solutions Concerning First Principles*. Translated from the Greek by Sara Ahbel-Rappe. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Diels, Hermann. *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*. 3 vols. Published by Walther Kranz. Zürich: Weidmann, 1968.
- Dillon, John. *The Middle Platonists: 80 B.C. to A.D. 220*. New York: Cornell University Press, 1977.
- Eugen, Abel. *Orphica*. Leipzig: Sumptus Fecit G. Freytag, 1885.
- Eusebius of Caesarea. *Histoire Ecclesiastique*. Edited by Gustave Bardy. Sources Chretiennes 31. Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1952.
- Gantz, Timothy. *Early Greek Myth: A Guide to Literary and Artistic Sources*. Vol. 1. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993.
- Gould, Josiah B. *The Philosophy of Chrysippus*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1970.
- Grant, Robert M. *Greek Apologists of the Second Century*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1988.
- Gruppe, Otto. *Die Griechischen Culte und Mythen in Ihren Beziehungen zu den Orientalischen Religionen*. Leipzig: Druck und Verlag von B.G. Teubner, 1887.
- Hahn, David E. *The Origins of Stoic Cosmology*. Columbus: Ohio University Press, 1977.
- Heintze, Werner. *Der Klemensroman und Seine Griechischen Quellen*. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1914.
- Hesiod. *The Works and Days, Theogony, The Shield of Herakles*. Translated by Richmond Lattimore. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1959.

- Hunt, H.A.K. *A Physical Interpretation of the Universe; The Doctrines of Zeno the Stoic*. Carlton Victoria: Melbourne University Press, 1976.
- Jáuregui, Miguel Herrero de. *Orphism and Christianity in Late Antiquity*. Berlin: Walter De Gruyter, 2010.
- Jones, F. Stanley. *Pseudoclementia Elchasaiticaque inter Judaeochristiana. Collected Studies*, s. 203. Walpole: Peters Publishing, 2012.
- Josephus. *The Life Against Apion*. Vol. 1. Edited by Page, T.E., E. Capps, W.H.D. Rouse, L.A. Post, and E.H. Warmington, Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1926.
- Jourdan, Fabienne. *Orphée et Les Chrétiens: La réception du mythe d'Orphée dans la littérature Chrétienne Grecque des cinq premiers siècles*. Vol. 2. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2011.
- Kern, Otto. *Orphicorum Fragmenta*. Berolini: Weidmannos, 1872.
- Khaled, Kareem J. "The Reception of the Gospel of Mark in the Pseudo-Clementines." Master's thesis, California State University Long Beach, 2014.
- Lamberton, Robert. *Homer the Theologian*. Edited by Peter Brown. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986.
- Lanzillotta, L. Roig. "Orphic Cosmogonies in the Pseudo-Clementines? Textual Relationship, Character and Sources of Homilies 6.3-13 and Recognitions 10.17-19.30." In *The Pseudo-Clementines*, Edited by Jan N. Bremmer, 115-141. Leuven: Peeters, 2010.
- Linforth, Ivan Mortimer. *The Arts of Orpheus*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1941.
- Lobeck, Christian Augustus. *Aglaophamus: Sive de Theologiae Mysticae Graecorum Causis*. Vol. 1. Berlin: Regimonth Prussorum Sumtibus Fratrum Borntraeger, 1829.
- Luján, Eugenio R. "The Cosmic Egg (OF 64, 79. 114)." In *Tracing Orpheus*. Edited by Barchiesi, Alessandro, Robert Fowler, Dirk Obbink, and Nigel Wilson, 85-91. Vol. 10. Berlin: Walter De Gruyter, 2011.
- Nöldeke, Theodor. "Bar Choni über Homer, Hesiod, und Orpheus." *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, no. 53 (1899): 501-507.

- Plato. *The Collected Dialogues of Plato: Including The Letters*, Edited by Edith Hamilton and Huntington Cairns, Translated by Lane Cooper, F.M. Cornford, W.K.C. Guthrie, R. Hackforth, Michael Joyce, Benjamin Jowett, L.A. Post, W.H.D. Rouse, Paul Shorey, J.B. Skemp, A.E. Taylor, Hugh Tredennick, W.D. Woodhead, and J. Wright. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961.
- Proclus. *Commentary on Plato's Timaeus Volume I*, Translated and edited by Harold Tarrant. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Quispel, Gilles. *Gnostica, Judaica, Catholica. Collected Essays of Gilles Quispel*. Edited by Johannes van Oort. Vol 55. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Rehm, Bernhard. "Zur Entstehung der pseudoclementinischen Schriften." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 37, (1938): 77-184.
- Rehm, Bernhard, and Georg Strecker, eds. *Die Pseudoklementinen I: Homilien*. 2nd rev. ed. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1992.
- , eds. *Die Pseudoklementinen II: Rekognitionen in Rufins Übersetzung*. Pt. 2, 2nd rev. ed. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1994.
- Roberts, Alexander, and Sir James Donaldson, eds. *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translations of the Writings of the Fathers Down to A.D. 325*. 10 vols. Prefaces and notes by Cleveland Coxe. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2004.
- Robinson, James M. editor. *The Nag Hammadi Library in English*, San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1977.
- Roessli, Jean-Michel. "La Cosmo-Théogonie Orphique du Roman Pseudo-Clémentin: note sur ses sources et son utilisation par l'auteur des Homélie et des Reconnaissances." *Les Études Classiques* 76 (2008): 1-12.
- Rollinson, Philip. *Classical Theories of Allegory and Christian Culture*. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1981.
- Ruelle, Car. Aem. *Damascii Successoris: Dubitaiones et Solutiones de Primis Principiis, in Platonis Parmenidem*. Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert, 1966.
- Strecker, Georg. *Das Judenchristentum in den Pseudoklementinen*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1958.
- . *Die Pseudoklementinen III: Konkordanz zu den Pseudoklementinen*. Vol. 1. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1986.

- . *Die Pseudoklementinen III: Konkordanz zu Den Pseudoklementinen*. Vol. 2. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1986.
- Torjussen, Stian Sundell. *Metamorphoses of Myth: A Study of the “Orphic” Gold Tablets and the Derveni Papyrus*. Germany: VDM Verlag, 2010.
- West, Martin L. *Hesiod Theogony*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966.
- . *Early Greek Philosophy and the Orient*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971.
- . *The Orphic Poems*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983.
- . “Ab ovo: Orpheus, Sanchuniathon, and the Origins of the Ionian World Model.” *The Classical Quarterly*, n.s., 44, no. 2 (1994): 289-307.
- Whitman, Jon. *Allegory*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1987.
- Williams, Frank. *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis: Book I (Sects 1-46)*. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Zeller, Eduard. *The Stoics, Epicureans, and Sceptics*, Translated by Oswald J. Reichel. New York: Russell and Russell, 1962.