

M. J. EDWARDS

GNOSTIC EROS AND ORPHIC THEMES

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 88 (1991) 25–40

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

GNOSTIC EROS AND ORPHIC THEMES

Eros in ancient literature is not manifested only in that which we should call erotic¹. In Hesiod he is the parent of the world and all its creatures, the first to spring from chaos; Orphic poets give other names to a being of similar origin with the same progenitive virtue; for the Platonists Eros is the daemonic nature, half-divine, half-mortal, who lacks his good but seeks it in the intellectual plenitude of the forms². Classicists might nevertheless be surprised to find that his presence is also pervasive in the writings of the Gnostics, men whose thought was not perhaps so alien to the culture of their Greek contemporaries as to the interests of those by whom that culture has been studied in modern times.

The following study is the first one known to me which considers the three great branches of Gnostic literature, the Naassene, the Sethian and the earliest texts relating to Sophia. It confines itself to these because they are united, and distinguished from other relics of early Christian heterodoxy, by the ancient application of the word "Gnostic" to their authors³. If they are united by a dogma as well as a name, we may express this as the principle that cosmogony is the psychology of the macrocosm: the present world is thought to be the dungeon of a fallen mind that yearns to be retrieved. The final section addresses itself to those who, in comparing certain Gnostic texts with Orphic remains, have noticed as a corollary the importance to the Gnostics of the cosmogonic Eros, but have not, in my view, escaped from false hypotheses of influence and the superfluous ingenuity that results from taking too little of the evidence into account.

I. The Bisexual Anthropos of the Naassenes

According to the definition approved by many moderns, to be a Gnostic was to be a dualist, to believe that the world was brought into existence by a fall from the realm of spirit into matter, and that these two kingdoms, the hylic and the pneumatic, remain as irredeemably opposed as dark and light. This is only partly true of the first sect which is known to have desired the appellation: Hippolytus, who prefers to call them Naassenes,

¹For studies of Love in antiquity see A. Lesky, *Vom Eros der Hellenen* (Göttingen 1976); A. Nygren, *Agape and Eros*, Part I, Vols I-II (London 1937).

²Hesiod, *Theogony* 120-2; Orpheus and Plato are cited in detail in the course of this essay. On Platonic Love see L. Robin, *La Théorie Platonicienne de l'Amour* (Paris 1933 and 1964) 101-189.

³See, for the definition of "Gnostic", R. P. Casey, *The Study of Gnosticism*, *JTS* 36 (1935) 45-60; the definitions of the Messina Colloquium in U. Bianchi (ed.) *The Origins of Gnosticism* (Leiden 1967) xxvi-xxvii; and my comments in *Gnostics and Valentinians in the Church Fathers*, *JTS* 40 (1989) 26-47.

reports that the bifurcation of an original "blessed substance" was supposed to have engendered both the lower world of darkness and the higher one of light. In the upper region dwells the Saviour, in the lower dwells his image: each may be styled the Primal Man, the Anthropos, and each projects his seed in the complementary domain⁴.

This theology is explained at length in the Naassene Sermon, which occupies chapters 5-9 in the fifth book of Hippolytus' *Refutation of all Heresies*. Chapter 10 consists largely of a psalm describing the labours of the soul and its redemption through the advent of the Saviour. The fragment of a homily ascribed to Monoimus (Hippolytus, *Refutatio* V.12-15) would appear to be of a piece with both effusions; the accuracy and candour of Hippolytus in reporting them is verified by certain writings found at Nag Hammadi, and we therefore have no reason for mistrusting his report.

The structure of the Sermon is determined by a hymn to Attis (V.9.8-9), whose authenticity has not been doubted, though its date remains obscure⁵. The titles of this deity, which are culled from many provinces with verbose elucidation, form the torso of the Naassene Sermon, which occasionally sprouts a surplus limb. These, consisting chiefly of quotations from both Testaments, have been disparaged as interpolations; but it is no more fair to speak of interpolation in such a liturgy than in the Greek Anthology, for the homily will have grown with the expansion of its audience, and the list of names was one that any neophyte could have had the means and motive to enlarge⁶. Nor, unless we knew its intended audience, would we have the right to ask that every subject which the commentator treats should have its complement in the poem: he might be, if not the author of the hymn, at least a bold contemporary, who interpolated texts from the Old Testament in order to win the Jews.

The hymn which supplies the text for the Naassene sermon is addressed to Attis, but celebrates him under a variety of aspects and appellations, each of which is apposite to some stage in the history of his procession from and reversion to himself:

1. While Attis is the son of the fertile Amygdalus, his own generative faculty is destroyed by emasculation. The author of this wound is a feminine principle styled "the Mother of the Gods", who is evidently the Rhea of the hymn (V.7.13). Other female goddesses, like Venus and Selene, are moved to copulate with mortal men by the lure of pleasure (V.7.11-

⁴On Monoimus see G. Salmon, *The Cross-References in the Philosophumena*, *Hermathena* 5 (1885) 389-402; on the Naassene Psalm see M. Marcovich, *The Naassene Psalm in Hippolytus*, in B. Layton (ed.) *The Rediscovery of Gnosticism*, Vol II (Leiden 1981) 770-9. On the sources of Hippolytus see E. De Faye, *Gnostiques et Gnosticisme* (Paris 1925) 425 ff and H. Staehelin, *Die Gnostischen Quellen Hippolyts* (Leipzig 1890).

⁵U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Lesefrüchte*, *Hermes* 37 (1902) 329-332 (= *Kleine Schriften*, Vol IV, Berlin 1962, 165-8) dates the hymn to the reign of Hadrian.

⁶Against R. Reitzenstein on the Naassene Sermon in his *Poimandres* (Leiden 1904) 81-102 see J. M. Creed, *The Heavenly Man*, *JTS* 26 (1924-5) 118; also authors mentioned in n. 4.

12); but the Mother of the Gods intervenes to separate Attis from the world and thus enable him to ascend to the blessed realm in which there is no distinction of the sexes, but only a new, hermaphrodite creation (V.7.15).

2. The originating principles of all things are called Man and the Son of Man (V.6.4). The names Great Man and Perfect Man are also used (V.7.7 etc), at times to denote an archetypal being of whom the earthly man is a feeble copy, held captive by the powers who rule the elements from which he is lately sprung (V.7.30 etc.). Adam himself, however - for this is the word which signifies "man" in the hymn (cf. V.6.5) - is also worthy on earth of the designation Perfect Man. He is the primal man from above, whose deliverance from earth by the resurrection will entail his transformation from a man into a god.

3. The statues of the Perfect Man are covenanted equally to Hermes, who is also called the Logos (V.7.29 etc.) and (to judge by the Hymn) Sophia⁷; his phallus, erect and hugely exaggerated, is said to have "an impulsive power from the parts below to those above" (V.7.29). As the Logos Hermes is the author of all things made, and at the same time takes his place among them as a stone idol; his wand is the sign of his function as the escort of the souls to a higher region (V.7.3 1), the soul which he himself regenerates by springing Adam from his rock (V.7.35).

4. In statues of Osiris the masculine member "looks down and is crowned with all its own fruits of things that are made" (V.7.27). As the consort of Isis, Osiris is the ineffable and formless one who imparts the regular harmony of the planetary spheres to the matter of the world (V.7.22-5). Since he is said to be identical with water (V.7.23), it is no surprise that he is the fecund author of the rainfall (V.7.26); at the same time this emission is compared to that of light (V.7.28).

We therefore find a doctrine in which the generated being is identical with the cause of his generation, a doctrine in which the same being is perpetually casting seed above him and beneath him, a doctrine in which the source of all fertility is an emasculated god. This bifurcated entity is the "original blessed substance" or ἀσχημοσυνή, which in the upper world is the "Firstborn Mind" and in the lower its "outpoured chaos" (V.10.2): it is worshipped under the image of a serpent and of the sacred river Jordan, which, when smitten by Joshua, parted to form two courses, one below and one above (V.7.41).

⁷The hymn runs thus: σὲ καλοῦσι μὲν Ἀσσύριοι τριπόθητον Ἄδωνιν, ὅλη δ' Αἴγυπτος Ὅσιριν, ἐπουράνιον μηνὸς κέρασ, Ἑλληνες Σοφίαν, Σαμοθράκες Ἀδαμνα σεβάσμιον. This is the MS reading at Refutatio V.9.8 (p. 99.15-17 Wendland), without the alteration to Ἑλληνὶς σοφία, which is supported not only by Wendland but by Marcovich and other modern editors: see E. Heitsch, *Die griechischen Dichterfragmente der römischen Kaiserzeit* (Göttingen 1961) Nr. XLIV, pp. 156-7; and T. Wolberg, *Griechische religiöse Gedichte der ersten nachchristlichen Jahrhunderte* (Meisenheim 1971) pp. 6-9. Wolberg remarks (pp. 69-70) that Sophia is not attested elsewhere as a title of Attis, but it is certainly a title of the demiurgic power in Gnostic writings, and it is not said elsewhere that the Greeks called Attis the horn of the moon. On Osiris as a lunar deity see Plutarch, *De Isidie et Osiride* 367 c.

Since he is responsible both for natural generation and for the yearning which induces natural creatures to return to their originating Good, Primal Man would serve as a symbol of Love both in the world and in the soul. Any theologian of the period - and not the Orphics only - would see that he was confirmed in the possession of this character by his fusion of the two sexes and also (as will be shown) by his capacity for assuming a host of forms.

Epiphanies of Love in pagan literature are apt to escape the innocent beholder because of the variety of his natures. In the proem to the longest and most elegant of the Greek novels, he is depicted as a herdsman (Achilles Tatius, *Clitophon and Leucippe*, 1); and Longus, who visits imaginary pastures for his tale of *Daphnis and Chloe*, describes a number of visions in which the deity at first remains concealed⁸. The poet Philetas speaks of a dream in which the young, winged archer proclaims himself a divinity even older than Cronus (*Daphnis and Chloe* II.5); this conceit is a marriage of two speeches from the *Symposium* of Plato, in which one speaker (195 a 8) extols Love as the youngest, and another (178 b) as the oldest, of the gods. A third (181 c-e) distinguishes two, of which one is the son and helper of the vulgar Aphrodite, the other of the Uranian: the elder Love is the author of all creation, as Hesiod (*Theogony* 116 ff) was not the last to say.

In Christian works, and works that aspired to be Christian, such polymorphic entities are legion. An instantaneous progress through the ages is typical of certain Gnostic mediators, who, like the Hermes of the Greek philosophers, are authors of conception in two senses, revealing cosmic mysteries through the same intellectual energy that brought them into being. Such, perhaps, in origin, was the angel who speaks to Hermas in the *Shepherd*⁹; such, in the apocryphal *Acts of Peter* is Christ himself¹⁰. The source of revelation in the Apocryphon of John assumes consecutively the shapes of a young man, an old man and a servant¹¹, which the Logos was believed to have worn in his sojourn with humanity¹²:

Straightway, while I was contemplating these things, behold the heavens opened, and the whole creation which is under heaven shone, and the world was shaken. And I was afraid, and behold I saw in the light a youth who stood by me. While I looked at him, he became like an old man. And he changed his form again, becoming like a servant. There was not a plurality before me, but there was a likeness with multiple forms in the light, and the forms appeared through each other, and the likeness had three forms (AJ II.1, 1.31-2.8).

⁸See further H. H. O. Chalk, *Eros and the Lesbian pastorals of Longus*, JHS 80 (1960) 32-51.

⁹*Pastor*, Visio 5: at 5.3 the angel calls himself a shepherd, and at 5.4 undergoes a change of form. Cf. Reitzenstein (1904) 11-13.

¹⁰*Acts of Peter* 21. Cf. John 20.14-15 and 21.4; cf. Luke 24.16 and the Transfiguration at Mark 9.2 par.

¹¹On the passage of Christ through all the ages see Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses* III.22.4. On Christ as servant see *Philippians* 2.5-12 etc. Cf. also *Isaiah* 53.2, where the servant is said to have no form.

¹²Translation and numeration follow J. M. Robinson (ed.) *the Nag Hammadi Library in English* (Leiden 1984).

The first Hermeticum, written in a circle which respected, if it did not revere, the traditions of Judaism¹³, is often called by the name of the versatile angel who gives instruction to the seer:

Τοῦτο εἰπὼν [sc. ὁ Ποιμάνδρης] ἠλλάγετο τῇ ιδέᾳ, καὶ εὐθέως πάντα μοι ἤνοικτο ῥοπή, καὶ ὁρῶ θεάν ἀόριστον, φῶς δὲ πάντα γεγεννημένα ... καὶ ἠράσθην ἰδῶν (Hermetica I.4).

As in the Apocryphon of John, the heavens open; as in the cosmogony of the Naassenes and the Sethians, sublimity is experienced as light. Poimandres is, like Christ and Attis, the first Anthropos; like Christ and Hermes, a source at once of knowledge and of its objects; like Christ and Eros, a shepherd, at least in Greek interpretations of his name¹⁴. Hermes too is a shepherd among the Naassenes (V.7.28), while Attis is symbolically believed to pasture goats (V.8.34). The man who sees Poimandres is transported by the emotion that Love himself, according to the allegorists, excites by his gratuitous apparition to the soul¹⁵. Eros is, according to one reading of a sentence by Ignatius (Romans 7.2), an appellation of Christ (Origen, in Canticum Canticorum Proem); and it is also the name conferred by a Gnostic text on the Primal Man in his brightest manifestation¹⁶:

Out of the first blood, Eros appeared, being androgynous. His masculine nature is Himeros, because he is fire from light. His feminine nature which is with him is a blood-soul, and is derived from the substance of Pronoia. He is very handsome in his beauty, having more loveliness than all the creatures of Chaos. Then, when all the gods and their angels saw Eros they became enamoured of him (On the Creation of the World 109.1-10).

Chaos is here the matrix of creation, as it is in the Naassene sermon; Eros resembles Primal man in his combination of sexes, and those who see him feel the same desire that is awakened by Poimandres, that other incandescent emanation of the Mind.

Luminous in aspect, by nature androgynous and ithyphallic, at once the author, expositor and initiate of mysteries, Primal Man appears to have borrowed his properties from almost every nation of the Mediterranean world. As Attis, Hermes, Osiris, or under no mythological pseudonym, he is credited with the universal fecundity and the power of transformation that philosophers had come to ascribe to Love. His importance to the Gnostics was that his

¹³See C. H. Dodd, *The Bible and the Greeks* (London 1935).

¹⁴W. B. Scott, *Hermetica*, Vol II (Oxford 1925) 14 ff discusses possible Egyptian origins of the name; but Greek readers certainly understood it to mean "shepherd of men". Cf. the verb ποιμαίνει at *Hermetica* XIII. 19 and the barbarous but significant ποιμεν ἄνδρην at Zosimus, treatise on the Omega 22.

¹⁵This reading of the myth of Eros and Psyche, first attested plainly in Fulgentius (*Mth.* III.7-8) is perhaps anticipated by Plotinus at *Enneads* VI.7.31. The seminal modern treatment of the tale as allegory is found in Merkelbach's *Roman und Mysterium in der Antike* (Berlin 1962); the most recent known to me is E. J. Kenney, *Psyche and her Mysterious Husband* in D. A. Russell (ed.) *Antonine Literature* (Oxford 1990) 175-199.

¹⁶On the importance of Eros in this text see M. Tardieu, *Trois Mythes Gnostiques* (Paris 1974) 114 ff.

attributes allowed him to be taken for a symbol of the Christian redeemer, who was at one time the lover, the beloved and the light of the elect.

II. The Sethians at Phlya

The Sethians were a Gnostic group, who, though their names, the images and many of the dogmas of their system had originated in Jewish heterodoxy¹⁷, appear to have addressed themselves to inquirers in the Church. The characteristic answer of their enemy Hippolytus to all such overtures is to allege that the secret teachings have been drawn from a contaminated source, and he does little to interpret what his scholarship has given him the authority to abuse.

It is therefore not Hippolytus who tells us that the Sethians also made their Demiurge a type of Eros. That is the conclusion which will be drawn from the following text, after the necessary annotation of the readings given by Wendland¹⁸:

ὁ γὰρ περὶ τῆς μήτρας αὐτῶν καὶ τοῦ ὄφρατος λόγος καὶ ὁ ὄμφαλος, ὅπερ ἐστὶν ἀνδρεία, διαρρήδην οὕτως ἐστὶν ἐν τοῖς Βακχικοῖς τοῦ Ὀρφέως. (a) τετέλεσται δὲ ταῦτα καὶ παραδέδοται ἀνθρώποις πρὸ τῆς Κελεοῦ καὶ Τριπτολέμου καὶ Δήμητρος καὶ Κόρης καὶ Διονύσου ἐν Ἐλευσίῃ τελετῆς, ἐν Φλιοῦντι (b) τῆς Ἀττικῆς· πρὸ γὰρ τῶν Ἐλευσινίων μυστηρίων ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ Φλιοῦντι (τῆς) λεγομένης Μεγάλῃς ὄργια. ἔστι δὲ παστᾶς ἐν αὐτῇ. ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς παστᾶδος ἐγγέγραπται μέχρι σήμερον ἢ [τὰ τῶν] πάντων τῶν εἰρημένων λόγων ἰδέα. πόλλα μὲν οὖν ἐστὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς παστᾶδος ἐκείνης ἐγγεγραμμένα. περὶ ὧν Πλούταρχος ποιεῖται λόγους ἐν ταῖς πρὸς Ἐμπεδοκλέα δέκα βίβλοις· ἔστι δὲ τοῖς πλείοσι (c) καὶ πρεσβύτης τις ἐγγεγραμμένος πολὺς πτερωτὸς ἐντεταμένην ἔχων τὴν αἰσχύνην. γυναῖκα ἀποφύγουσαν διώκων κυνοειδῆ. (d) ἐπιγέγραπται δὲ ἐπὶ τοῦ πρεσβύτου· φάος ῥυέντης, (e) ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς γυναικός. † περηφικόλα. (f) ἔοικε δὲ εἶναι κατὰ τὸν Σηθιανῶν λόγον ὁ φάος ῥυέντης τὸ φῶς, τὸ σκοτεινὸν ὕδωρ δὲ † ἢ φικόλα. τὸ δὲ ἐν μέσῳ τούτων διάστημα ἀρμονία πνεύματος μεταξὺ τεταγμένου. (Refutatio V.20.4-8 = Orphica Fr. 243 Kern)

(a) Scholars have searched in vain for any record of Bacchic mysteries of Orpheus; the verb τετέλεσται refutes the view of Linforth that a book and not a ritual is intended by the author¹⁹. Nevertheless, the existence of a book entitled Bacchica is as certain as the Bacchic rites of Orpheus are a fable (Frs 236-44 Kern). The solution least injurious to the authority

¹⁷On Sethian Gnosticism see Layton (1981) and the articles by Layton, B. A. Pearson and J. D. Turner in C. W. Hedrick and R. Hodgson (eds) *Nag Hammadi, Gnosticism and early Christianity* (Peabody, Mass. 1986).

¹⁸The text is that of P. Wendland, *Hippolytus, Werke III* (Leipzig 1916). A reproduction of this appears as Fr. 243 in O. Kern, *Orphicorum Fragmenta* (Berlin 1922), incorporating the critical apparatus.

¹⁹A. Linforth, *The Arts of Orpheus* (Berkeley 1941) 200-1.

of this passage as a document in the history of religions is that Hippolytus has misconstrued the title of a writing: the reading of the previous words, in which he states the content of the rites, remains obscure²⁰.

(b) The MS readings, Φλοιοῦντι τῆς Ἀττικῆς and Φλοιοῦντι might denote mysteries either at Phlya or at Phlious in Achaea. Since only the first is an Attic deme, and only there were the mysteries said to antedate those of Eleusis, we have reason to follow Tannery in supposing that the greater fame of Phlious tempted someone (whether Hippolytus, the Sethians or a semi-learned scribe) into an error of transcription²¹. I should therefore prefer to follow Tannery and Marcovich against Wendland in writing Φλυῆ τῆς Ἀττικῆς and Φλυῆ²².

(c) Most editors agree that the MS πλείοσι requires correction. Kern's apparatus offers also κείοσι (Maass) and πυλεῶσι (Miller)²³.

(d) Whether the woman is κυνοειδῆ ("dog-faced") or κυανοειδῆ ("coloured blue") is not, perhaps, a question of any moment²⁴. In one case she has the colour of the shades, and in the other the canine physiognomy of Anubis, but in either she bears the insignia of an infernal being charged with the care of souls.

(e) Since φάος makes grammatical sense, and a sense that is in no way inconsistent with what follows, some argument would be required to defend the emendation of Marcovich, who names the lecherous deity an Phanes²⁵. Students of Orphic literature will raise the further objection that he has endowed the god with attributes which he does not possess in any other source. Phanes, newly-sprung from his egg, does not bear any marks of seniority, he is never guilty of lust (though he must engage in sexual unions) and, where he is depicted with a phallus, it projects behind his body, not before (Fr. 80 Kern). Marcovich has also allowed himself a strong presumption concerning the antiquity of the name Phanes²⁶. The written source of Hippolytus (who died c. 235 A. D.) can hardly be later than the second century, and professes to be transcribing words of a very much earlier date. Before the second century we have abundant evidence for the representation of such an Orphic deity,

²⁰P. Tannery, *Orphica*, Fr. 3 Abel, *Revue de Philologie* 24 (1900) 97-98 rebuts the emendation of ἀνδρεία to ἀρμονία; another possibility would be ἄπερ ἐστὶν ἀνδρεία (i. e. the feminine organs are masculine). This would be a fair allusion to the confusion of gender in the pronouns of such documents as the paraphrase of Shem (sic: Nag Hammadi Codices VII.1), and would gratify the scorn of the apologist.

²¹This question is discussed at length by Tannery (1900) 99-100.

²²See M. Marcovich, Phanes, Phicola and the Sethians, *JTS* 25 (1974) 447-451. The text appears on p. 447 and in Marcovich's own edition of Hippolytus, *Refutatio Omnium Haeresium* (Berlin 1986).

²³That is, E. Maass, *Orpheus* (Berlin 1895) 302. See Kern (1922) 254 and Wendland (1916) 122.

²⁴Marcovich (1974) 450 prefers κυνοειδῆ to the emendation of Schneidewin. For Anubis as an infernal god see Plutarch, *De Iside et Osiride* 368 e; he is conflated with Hermes at 375 e.

²⁵Marcovich (1974) 450; cf. Brink in *Mnemosyne* 2 (1853).

²⁶For this question see W. K. C. Guthrie, *Orpheus and Greek Religion* (London 1935) 95-102.

but Phanes is not attested among his numerous appellations²⁷. It seems most reasonable to retain the reading Φάος, which would enable us to recognise in this ithyphallic satyr an heir to the Naassene Primal Man²⁸.

(f) The MS reading περηφικόλα is clearly insupportable, and Marcovich rightly infers, from the occurrence of the name Phicola in the next sentence, that this implausible concatenation of syllables must have formed at least two words²⁹. His reading γεραία Φικόλα cannot be refuted or corroborated: presuming on the acquaintance of the Sethians with some form of Greek theosophy, we might prefer instead to subtract two letters and produce the composite 'Ρέη Φικόλα, a name which serves to adumbrate, by a common etymology, the allegorical properties that the Sethians imposed upon this scene of a woman in flight³⁰.

That the running figure is charged with lust and resembles the Anthropos of the Naassenes is already enough to indicate that he too is a type of Love. This inference can be strengthened by two further observations:

1. An order of priests at Phlya, the Lycomidae, had the custody of their own ritual, which consisted in, or was augmented by, the chanting of an Orphic hymn to Love³¹.

2. Priapus, who was famous in ancient times for his salacity and for little else, is invested in one account with all the predicates of Phicola's pursuer:

τὸ ἄγαλμα τοῦ Πριάπου τοῦ Ὀρου παρ' Αἰγυπτίοις κεκλημένου ἀνθρωποειδὲς ποιοῦσιν ... ἐν δὲ τῇ εὐωνύμφ κρατοῦν τὸ αἰδοῖον αὐτοῦ ἐντεταμένον ... τὰ δὲ πτερὰ τὴν ταχυτήτα τῆς κινήσεως ... (Suda s. v. Priapus).

Since wings are not conventional in his native representations, we may guess that the Greeks applied the name of Priapus to some image antecedently known in Egypt, which resembled him in maintaining a perpetual erection. For a Gnostic author of the second century, closely akin to the Sethians in doctrine as in time, Priapus is the Benevolent One,

²⁷Attestations begin with Athenagoras, Legatio 18, 20, 32 = Frs 57-9 Kern, and possibly with Apion, if the use of the name Appion in the Clementina (Frs. 55-6 Kern) represents an informed and honest use of this Hellenistic apologist for the Gentiles. On this question see the arguments of J. van Amersfoort, *Traces of an Alexandrian Orphic Cosmogony in the Pseudo-Clementines*, in M. J. Vermaseren (ed.) *Studies in Gnosticism and Hellenistic Religions* (Leiden 1981) 13-30. But even if the myth itself is early, many details might have been imported in later recensions of the novels.

²⁸Whether we read ῥυέτης with Marcovich or ῥυέντης with Wendland we are at a loss for parallels; but we need not expect the Greek to be either good or idiomatic. See further Marcovich (1974) 450. To substitute the participle ῥυεῖς (genitive ῥυέντος) is to deviate strongly from the manuscript, which consistently repeats the term ῥυέντης, and, unless Φάος deemed to be without case or gender, will require further emendation of this word to Φάνης and Φάνητος, as proposed by Brink.

²⁹Marcovich (1974) 450. His speculation that the name is of Semitic origin is not implausible.

³⁰For Rhea in (e. g.) Orphic literature see Frs 29.506, 31.8 Kern etc. For Rhea ("the flowing one") as material nature see Damascius, *De Principiis* 284 = Fr. 133 Kern.

³¹Pausanias IX.27.2 and IX.30.12 = Frs 304-5 Kern

the Father of Elohim, whose intellect imparts design and harmony to a world that was precipitately engendered by the folly of lesser beings (Hippolytus, Refutatio V.26.32-3)³².

In late antiquity Priapus was the subject of lascivious epigrams, speaks as a knowing, if impotent, preceptor to the elegist (Tibullus I.4), and intervenes maliciously in the Satyricon of Petronius to mar the scatological calculations of the hero. Phicola's pursuer is one of the many playful epiphanies of Love³³.

III. The Demiurge, Sophia and the Anthropos

To judge by the number of copies and the frequency of allusion to its contents, no work of Gnostic literature, between the second century and the fourth, enjoyed a wider circulation than the Apocryphon of John³⁴. The following passage, taken from the longer of the two Coptic texts which survive to represent the Greek original, describe the fall of Sophia. This androgynous figure is the latest of the aeons which were engendered by the Father, and for that reason the most inclined to sin³⁵:

She wanted to bring forth a likeness out of herself, without the consent of the Spirit - he had not approved - and without her consort and without his consideration ... a thing came out of her which was different from her appearance, because she had created it without her consort ...

And when she saw (the consequence of) her desire it had changed into the form of a lion-faced serpent. And its eyes were like lightning fires which flash. And 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 (Nag Hammadi Codices II.1.9.28-10.14).

Ignorant of all beings but his mother, the demiurge surrounds himself with a garrison of angels, and, exulting in the illusion of supremacy, proclaims in the words of the Decalogue that he is the only God (AJ 11.20). His mother meanwhile is weeping with contrition (13.35-14.2), and when the angels fashion the anatomy of Adam, it is she who inspires the lifeless flesh with intellect and life (19.25 ff.). Nonetheless she yields to the adulterous

³²See M. Marcovich, Justin's Baruch: A Showcase of Gnostic Syncretism, in his *Studies in Greco-Roman Religion and Gnosticism* (Leiden 1988) 93-119, esp. 114-7.

³³Cf. M. D'Arcy, *The Mind and Heart of Love* (London 1945), following J. Harrison, *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion* (Cambridge 1903) 644-5.

³⁴An epitome can be found in Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses* I.29, and a Coptic text appears in P. Berol. 8502.2. This was edited by C. Schmidt, *Ein voreirenäisches gnostisches Originalwerk in koptischer Sprache* (Berlin 1896) and W. Till, *Die Gnostischen Schriften des Koptischen Papyrus Berolensis 8502* (Berlin 1954 and 1972). The Nag Hammadi Codices contain two versions of the long recension (II.1, IV.1) and one of the short recension (III.1). See further the edition and commentary by S. Giversen, *Apocryphon Ioannis* (Copenhagen 1964).

³⁵Translation by F. Wisse from J. M. Robinson (ed.) *The Nag Hammadi Library in English* (Leiden 1984).

conspiracy of the archons, who beget through her the "bitter fate" which the Gnostics style "the last of the terrible bonds" (28.12-32).

The procreative role of the Anthropos is now played by Sophia, though her impulses in this case are precipitate and the outcome unforeseen. In the Zostrianus (as in the *Enneads* of Plotinus: II.9.10) she is said to have looked down and given rise to the "reflection of a reflection" in the shifting mass below her: she is said indeed to have produced the darkness itself, while the reflection became a demiurge who set to work upon it in his own fashion (Zostrianus VIII.9.15 ff.)³⁶. Within Sophia herself, we are told, there was "no prior reflection, pure in itself beforehand" (10.10-11). The folly of Sophia (who, unlike her child, is luminous and bisexual³⁷) is thus akin to that of the Anthropos in the *Poimandres*:

ὁ δὲ ἰδὼν τὴν ὁμοίαν αὐτῷ μορφήν ἐν αὐτῇ οὖσαν ἐν τῷ ὕδατι, ἐφίλησε καὶ ἠβουλήθη αὐτοῦ οἰκεῖν. ἅμα δὲ τῇ βουλῇ ἐγένετο ἐνέργεια, καὶ ᾤκησε τὴν ἄλογον μορφήν. ἡ δὲ φύσις λαβοῦσα τὸν ἐρώμενον περιεπλάκη (Hermetica I.14).

In such a manner, Philo tells us, Adam was beguiled by the simple treachery of Eve (*De Opificio Mundi* 152). This, as Diotima says in the *Symposium*, is to partake of the Lesser Mysteries (209 e 5), to misconstrue that yearning for immortality which is at the root of sexual desire. Being only the female principle of a masculofeminine deity, Sophia is incapable of the ascent to the higher vision; when this is attempted, in the Valentinian treatment of her fall, the language of the *Phaedrus* is employed to describe her striving for the supernatural region, her bucking and straining against the leash of reason, and her surrender to the sweetness which, for a soul whose will outruns its capabilities, is at once an invitation and a snare³⁸.

The name Sophia indicates one who is feminine rather than female, and who lacks the power to rein her passions or create with knowledge. Culpable where the Anthropos of the Naassenes was without sin, she lacks the genital organ, since her procreative capacities have not yet been made perfect: her child is an abortion, also effeminate, who fashions the simulacrum of a world³⁹.

³⁶On the Book of Zoroaster, which may have inspired both this work and the Apocryphon of John, see my *How many Zoroasters?* *Arnobius, Adversus Gentes* I.52, *VigChr.* 42 (1988) 282-9.

³⁷See Irenaeus I.29.4 and *AJ* passim. At Irenaeus I.29.3 the emission of Sophia is preceded by that of the luminous and bisexual Anthropos.

³⁸I compare the relevant passages of Irenaeus, *AH* I.2.2 and *Phaedrus* 249-54 in my *Gnostics and Valentinians in the Church Fathers*. *JTS* 40 (1989) 42. The usage of *τόλμα* also carries erotic connotations: see *Achilles Tatius* II.5-6.

³⁹For both characteristics see Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses* I.29 and *Apocryphon of John* passim. *Ialdabaoth* is always accorded the male pronoun, but on his feminine characteristics cf. E. A. Fisher-Mueller, *Yaldabaoth: The Gnostic Female Principle in its Fullness*, *Novum Testamentum* 31 (1989) 79-95. On the feminine principle in Gnostic thought see M. W. Meyer, *Making Mary Male*, *New Testament Studies* 31 (1985) 554-70.

The human demiurge in Plato's dialogues is a man who brings to birth inferior children (Rep. 603 b): he impresses on matter the copy of an original which his mind has not conceived in its perfect form. The things of matter are apprehended only by bastard reasoning (Timaeus 52 b), and to be devoted to them is to follow bastard pleasures (Rep. 587 b). Two kinds of love are distinguished in the Symposium: if a soul inspired by the Uranian Aphrodite seeks a "begetting in the beautiful" (Symposium 206 c), the offspring of the Pandemic Aphrodite will be entirely devoid of beauty, being conceived without any knowledge or suspicion of the ideal (cf. Xenophon, Symposium VIII.9-10).

The demiurge of the Nag Hammadi documents lacks a father, and, at least in the Zostrianus, his mother is seduced by matter into bringing forth. He is a parody of the Anthropos, aspiring to make what he cannot beget, and producing, not an original, but a shadowy and insubstantial copy. While Eros and the Anthropos can endow themselves with many forms of beauty, the Demiurge, like his artefacts, has none.

IV. Orphic and Gnostic

In feature as in function, the protogonic god of Orphic poetry evinces some resemblance to the demiurgic or procreative agents whom we meet in Gnostic records. Luminous and bisexual like the Anthropos or Sophia, winged and ithyphallic like the old man of the Sethians, theriomorphic in aspect like Sophia's abortive progeny, is he not the parent of them all? In answering this question we must look in each case, not for traits which Gnostic and Orphic systems share with a multitude of others, nor even for valid indices of intermittent borrowing, transmission or imitation, but for proof that Orphic thought has exercised a ruling influence on the history of a dogma or the substance of a text.

1. The Gnostic figure of Love who appears in a tract from Nag Hammadi has been compared with the Orphic Phanes⁴⁰, and it is easy to show that Gnostic sects were acquainted with Orphic lore. Orphic poetry speaks of the emergence of a demiurge from a neutral stuff, or Chaos; Gnostics revere a single "blessed substance" which, being formless, can convert itself at once into nether Chaos and supernal mind⁴¹. The Gnostic belief that the human race is divided into three classes - the carnal, the psychic and the heavenly - and that they themselves are the third class, is comparable to the Orphic tenet that, while all men are the brood of earth and heaven, the initiate is the child of heaven alone⁴². For the commentators on Orphic poems at least, the masculine genitalia became an important symbol

⁴⁰G. Quispel, *The Origins of the Demiurge in the Apocryphon of John* in R. Mcl. Wilson (ed.) *Nag Hammadi and Gnosis* (Leiden 1978) 1-33.

⁴¹For Chaos see Frs 1, 24, 28, 29, 54 etc. and the conclusion of Quispel (1978).

⁴²See Frs. 29 and 63.1 Kern and Hippolytus, *Refutatio* V.6.6-7. A threefold division (rather than twofold, as in the Orphics) is suggested by Plato at Republic 414 e and Symposium 190 b: in the latter, the three classes (only one of which is androgynous) are apportioned respectively to the sun, the moon and the earth.

in the early classical period; and, just as the Gnostic Anthropos is a man of light, the Derveni commentator treats Uranus, one of the offspring of Protogonos, as a symbol of the aether irradiated by the sun⁴³.

Yet the teaching of the Naassenes need acknowledge no single origin. In the Classical period, when images of Hermes guarded every door in Athens, philosophers met the scandal of the phallus by explaining it as a symbol of the generative faculty both in nature and in the mind⁴⁴. Osiris was in Egypt always the author of fertility; and, though neither of these was androgynous by custom, that attribute was easily transferred from the Phrygian Attis, whose cult was known in Greece from archaic times, and whose castration was interpreted by philosophers as signifying the mind's restraint of its seminal capacities when they had yoked themselves unequally with the world of sense and change⁴⁵.

2. What of the Gnostic Priapus at Phlya? Even if the name Phanes is an anachronism before the second century, Protogonos is as old as Orphic poetry, and one of the earliest parodists of that genre, Aristophanes, can already speak of the demiurge as Eros, investing him and his kin with a superfluity of wings (Birds 696 - Fr. 1 Kern)⁴⁶. Priapus is also a designation of Phanes in an Orphic hymn⁴⁷. The exiguous length and quality of the song of the Lycomidae may be a proof that it was ancient; the ascription of it to Orpheus might be taken to imply its Orphic provenance, or at least an early casting of it in the Orphic style.

Tannery observed, at the turn of the century, that the extant Orphic poems supplied no cognates for the womb or the navel, both of which have a central place in Sethian allegory⁴⁸; but this is only to say that the exposition known to Hippolytus owed something to authority and something to invention, and is no proof that the Orphic source was invented or misread.

For all that, whatever grist the Orphics brought to the Sethian mill, they were not the ones to set it working: they found in an Orphic text a new manifesto of the creed that they had already learned from the Naassenes, and may not have discovered anything in these texts (the name of Phanes, for example) that they had any need to learn. In one respect, this sect, which quotes the Orphics, stands further from the heart of their philosophy than the Naassenes, who do not. The light illuminates a retreating darkness in their reading of the portico at Phlya; in the Paraphrase of Seth the darkness storms the upper regions (VII. 1.2 ff); but in no case do we hear that the radiant deity has issued from the darkness, or that a

⁴³See Derveni Papyrus IX.4 = *6 in the version printed ZPE 47 (1982) *1-*12. I have argued in my forthcoming Notes on the Derveni Commentator in ZPE that the application of the word in the Commentary, though tendentious, is not inept.

⁴⁴Cornutus, *Theologia Graeca* c.16, p. 23.16-22 Lang; Plotinus, *Enneads* III.6,19.

⁴⁵See Julian, *Hymn to the Mother of the Gods*; Sallustius, *De Mundo et Divis* 4.

⁴⁶For the egg cf. n. 61 and Hellanicus/Hieronymus at Fr. 54 Kern.

⁴⁷Orphic Hymns V.9, where the addressee is initially styled Protogonos. This composition in its present form is likely to be of later date than the second century.

⁴⁸Tannery (1900) 101-2.

single essence penetrates the realm above and the wilderness below. It is Love who acts and matter that resists him: the Sethians opposed them as the Platonists of the time opposed the wicked soul to the intellect of God.

3. The strongest claims for a borrowing from the Orphics have been made with regard to the iconography of the Gnostic Demiurge as he appears in the Apocryphon of John⁴⁹. There is certainly proof of kinship between this Demiurge and Phanes in their functions and their possession of bestial properties; but kinship may be explained by a common ancestor, and the Demiurge is a composite of many forms, not all of which were Greek.

There is, in fact, no scarcity of passages in Greek literature, not Orphic, which tell of a birth without the impregnation of a womb:

ὅμοια δὲ τούτοις καὶ περὶ τῆς Ἥρας ἄδουσιν, ἄνευ τῆς πρὸς τὸν ἄνδρα ὁμιλίας ὑπηνέμιον αὐτὴν παῖδα γεννῆσαι τὸν Ἥφαιστον, οὐ μάλα εὐτυχῆ τοῦτον, ἀλλὰ βάνουσον καὶ χαλκέα καὶ πυρίτην κτλ. (Lucian, *De Sacrificiis* 6).

Hera's motive, we learn elsewhere, was to emulate the birth of Athena from the head of Zeus⁵⁰. Lucian, following Homer, ascribes the lameness of Hephaestus to his having been thrown from heaven to earth by Zeus; but in the Homeric hymn to Apollo, Hera says:

αὐτὰρ ὅ γ' ἠπεδανὸς γέγονεν μετὰ πᾶσι θεοῖσι
παῖς ἐμὸς Ἥφαιστος, ῥικνὸς πόδας, ὄν τέκον αὐτὴ ...
ρίψ' ἀνὰ χερσὶν ἐλοῦσα καὶ ἔμβαλον εὐρέϊ πόντῳ·

(316-7; possible lacuna).

Hera's parturition is unassisted and competitive, the child unsightly, the consequent revulsion and ejection a further cause of his deformity. The neglect of Hephaistos in studies of Gnostic origins is all the more surprising since he evinces such a likeness to the Demiurge in origins and nature that he must have done some service as a model. These profitable corollaries he owes, not to the Orphics or the Egyptians, but to the cardinal traditions of Greek thought.

Not the least important is his function, for as the smith of the gods he holds a place of honour among Greek craftsmen, and would thus incur the force of the dishonourable allusions to the craftsman in such prophecies as Isaiah's (44.12 ff, 46.6 ff etc.), which are frequently adduced in Gnostic writings. The manufacture of idols is the greatest insult to God and the most insidious temptation to his people; it is the King of Babylon, the home of idols, who falsely proclaims "I am and there is none beside" (Isaiah 47.8, 47.10; cf. Exodus 3.14, 20.2).

⁴⁹Quispel (1978) *passim*.

⁵⁰Cf. Hesiod, *Theogony* 927-9 with the commentary of M. L. West (Oxford 1964) *ad loc*. I am indebted to Isabelle Clark for helping to draw my attention to this analogy.

Once fashioned anew by allegory, Hephaestus might be taken for the Demiurge in disguise. Homeric song relates that he sprang a trap for his consort Aphrodite as she lay in the arms of her warlike paramour (Odyssey VIII.266-366); the allegorists detected in those fetters a symbol of Fate, which holds in a Empedoclean harmony the two dynamic forces of the cosmos (Heraclitus, Homeric Allegories 69.7-11). Fate and chains are the staple of Gnostic imagery, since those who professed a loathing for the universe described themselves as prisoners of necessity, and the Demiurge as a universal tyrant who detains the human soul in bonds of flesh.

The demiurge is a fiery god, and fire is the principal instrument of Hephaestus⁵¹, so that he himself was often held to personify its nature. Writing in the first century, Cornutus makes him a rarefied variety of that element, with his seat in that upper region where the Demiurge was believed to have pitched his throne (Theologia Graeca c. 19 p. 33.12-14 Lang). A greater measure of learning is affected when the Clementine Homilies state that Ptah, whom the Greeks know as Hephaestus, embodies the Egyptian name of fire (IX.6). Porphyry makes Hephaestus, not a material being, but one who owes his nourishment to matter (De Statuis p. 14.8-10 Bidez; cf. Cornutus, c. 19 p. 33.18-22 Lang), holding the middle place between earth and heaven, just as the Gnostic allots an intermediate place between matter and spirit to the soul.

Hephaestus has his role, though a minor one, in Orphic literature: he is the forger of that mirror which distracted Dionysos while the Titans plotted to rend him limb from limb (Fr. 209 Kern). A Platonist, to whom the sensible universe was a mirror of Dionysus (Plotinus Enneads, IV.3) would understand that the World-Soul, being dismembered by its fall into this mirror, lived a fragmentary existence in the souls of individuals⁵². Seduced like the Anthropos of the Hermetica, the soul becomes the prisoner of the world.

What of the physiognomy of the Demiurge, which he did not take from Hephaestus? He has been compared with Ptah⁵³, with Aion⁵⁴ and with the figure of Cerberus who accompanies Serapis⁵⁵. All three are Egyptian types, and Egypt is the Source of all our manuscripts of the Apocryphon of John. The proximity of Christian, Jew and Greek in

⁵¹The image of fire in the Apocryphon of John and Paraphrase of Shem is too frequent to require or allow citation.

⁵²See for full discussion A. H. Armstrong, Platonic Mirrors, *Eranos Jahrbuch* 55 (1988) 147-81.

⁵³See Quispel (1978) 13-15 and R. Pettazzoni, *Studies in the History of Religion* (Leiden 1954) 182-94. Tardieu (1974) 215-78 is devoted to an "Egyptian bestiary". The fullest discussion of the lion in Gnostic iconography is H. M. Jackson, *The Lion became Man* (Atlanta 1985).

⁵⁴On Aion see Pettazzoni (1954) 171-9: Aion-(Chronos)Kronos in Egypt, and A. J. Festugiere, *Les cinq sceaux de l'Aion alexandrin*, *Revue de l'Égyptologie* 8 (1951) 63-70. Quispel (1978) argues justly that the figure of Aion may be of great antiquity even in Greece (cf. Orpheus, Pherecydes), but the Orphic representation of Chronos (Fr. 54) is not identical with that of the Gnostic Ialdabaoth.

⁵⁵On the Cerberus of Serapis see Macrobius, *Saturnalia* I.20.13 and Pettazzoni (1954) 164-70. Pettazzoni argues that Cerberus is a symbol of divisible time, but in his discussion of the origins of Mithras (180-192) he assumes too readily that the functions of deities who appear together must be identical.

Alexandria yielded many opportunities of acquaintance, which the Gnostics were not reluctant to exhibit. The author of this myth would appear to have been a Jew or Christian living in Alexandria, who had read some of its many books and embraced its Platonism: he brought together the procreative deity of the Gnostics with the demiurge of Greek myth as the exponents of a false Platonic love.

Phanes the Gnostic Demiurge resembles neither more nor less than Ptah, who had no lion's head, or Cerberus, who had three. An Orphic myth recorded in the Hellenistic period - the only one that is relevant and likely to be older than the Apocryphon of John⁵⁶ - offers us an embarrassment of models for the Demiurge, since Phanes has a serpent's head and sprouts bulls from his flanks, while Cronus, one of his ancestors, is crowned with the heads of a lion, a bull and a god (Damascius, *De Principiis* 123 = Fr. 54 Kern). Neither likeness is, however, so perfect as to yield clear proof of influence: for one thing, both Cronus and Protogonos, unlike the Gnostic demiurge, reveal their derivation from Eros by their possession of wings.

The very circumstances which would facilitate direct borrowing from the Orphics would render such a borrowing superfluous. Orphism was only one of many creeds transmuted by the speculative pedantry and fraud of Alexandria⁵⁷, and the notion that Hephaestus was the god whom the Egyptians knew as Ptah is one that does not appear to have needed the mediation of Orphic writings. The *De Mysteriis* of Iamblichus, a work which bears comparison in many points of thought and exegesis with the doctrines of the Gnostics as we know them from Plotinus and Hippolytus⁵⁸, maintains the ancient practice (which can be traced at least to Herodotus) of receiving Egyptian deities under Greek names:

ὁ γὰρ δημιουργικὸς νοῦς ... Ἀμοῦν κατὰ τὴν τῶν Αἰγυπτίων γλῶσσαν λέγεται, συντελῶν δὲ ἀψευδῶς ἕκαστα καὶ τεχνικῶς μετ' ἀληθείας, Φθά - Ἕλληνες δὲ εἰς Ἥφαιστον μεταλαμβάνουσι τὸν Φθά, τῷ τεχνικῷ μόνῳ προσβάλλοντες ... (Iamblichus, *De Mysteriis* VIII 3 p. 263.7-264.2).

The identity of Ptah and Hephaestus is also affirmed by Porphyry, in a work which, like the *De Mysteriis*, made no profession of novelty⁵⁹:

⁵⁶On the likelihood of a Hellenistic date for Hellanicus and Hieronymus see M. L. West, *The Orphic Poems* (Oxford 1983) 176-8.

⁵⁷Many Orphic remains are of Jewish origin. Thus Moses is alluded to under the name ὕλογενής ("born of water") at Fr. 247.36 Kern.

⁵⁸The fullest commentary on the "Egyptian" portions of the *De Mysteriis* remains W. B. Scott, *Hermetica* (Oxford 1925) 28-102. See especially p. 63 on the Ogdoad and pp. 75-7 on the doctrine of two souls. For the latter as a Gnostic tenet see Porphyry, *De Abstinencia* I 40 p. 116.11 ff Nauck and Plotinus *Enneads* II.9.5.16. Iamblichus, whose *De Anima* (p. 375 Wachsmuth) is the only Greek doxography to treat the Gnostics as philosophers, also provides the closest parallels to *Enneads* II.9.6.2, where the word ἀντιτυπία signifies a perverse affection of the soul (cf. *De Mysteriis* III 28 p.167).

⁵⁹Text of J. Bidez, *Vie de Porphyre* (Ghent 1913) Appendix 1.

τὸν δημιουργόν, ὃν Κνήφ οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι προσαγορεύουσιν ... ἐκ τοῦ στόματος προίεσθαι φασιν ὦόν, ἐξ οὗ γεννᾶσθαι Θεόν, ὃν αὐτοὶ προσαγορεύουσι Φθᾶ, οἱ δὲ Ἕλληνες Ἥφαιστον. (Porphyry, *De Statuis* p.*18.10-19 Bidez).

Thus Ptah becomes the guest of another culture through the offices of Hephaestus, not the Orphics. Ptah is one of many Egyptian gods who have been adduced as antecedents of the Alexandrian Aion and the Mithraic image of time⁶⁰, and these in turn resemble the Gnostic Demiurge as closely as any being who appears in the deposit of Orphic literature. That is to say, they too are leontocephalic, and typically have serpents in attendance on their bodies: their statues were a common spectacle in Alexandria, while Phanes travelled only through the mediation of books. And must not the domain of the Gnostic Demiurge be coeval and coterminous with time? This is but another way of stating that the Gnostics owed their Demiurge to everyone and no-one: if we say that he was almost an inevitable development of Jewish and Christian heterodoxy in pagan Alexandria, the conclusion is one that Quispel, who believes that the Orphics derived their myths of Phanes and the egg from the Egyptians, would have little cause to impugn⁶¹.

Undoubtedly the Demiurge of this late Gnosticism has a pedigree. He appears at one point in the Naassene sermon as the fiery Esaldaios, who desires, contrives and perpetuates the detention of human souls (V.7.30-31). This demiurge, however, may be only the carnal element of Hermes, the description of whose attributes is immediately resumed (V.7.32 ff). The human race being threefold, it requires a threefold Saviour, who embraces at once the spiritual, the psychic and the carnal (V.6.6 etc.): no redemption is possible without the participation of the redeemed.

The lower world once sundered from the higher, a carnal or psychic Demiurge can only be an exile from the Kingdom. Being himself the result of a miscarriage by the last and weakest luminary in a chain of propagation, he is incapable of begetting, even upon his own low eminence, and can certainly effect no birth in heaven. In nature he resembles Ptah in Egypt and Hephaestus among the Greeks; the account of his nativity, which he also shares with the latter, has neither Gnostic precedent nor Orphic parallel. In his ophidian body and his lion's head he resembles many deities, of whom Phanes is but one, and, being sterile, lacks not only the generative organ, but the wings which are inseparable from the Orphic god of Love.

New College, Oxford

M. J. Edwards

⁶⁰See Pettazzoni (1954) 182-94.

⁶¹Quispel (1978) 11 ff. A similar conclusion is to be found in the study by S. Morenz, entitled "Ägypten und die altorphanische Kosmogonie" in: S. Morenz (ed.), *Aus Antike und Orient, Festschrift W. Schubart* (Leipzig 1950) 64-111. The "wind-egg" of Aristophanes is plausibly traced to Egyptian sources on pp. 71-102.

60

ZPE 91 (1992) 60

CORRIGENDUM

ZPE 88,1991,26, Z.8: lies, "Refutatio VIII.12-15".