

will receive rest from the Good One." Both texts are not Gnostic.

⁴⁶ Cf. J. Behm, δεινόν, in *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum N.T.*, II (Stuttgart 1935) 33–35.

⁴⁷ Cf. E. Stauffer, γαμέω, in *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum N.T.*, I (Stuttgart 1933) 651–655.

⁴⁸ See now the translation by W. C. Robinson, Jr., in *The Nag Hammadi Library in English* (see note 1), 180–187.

⁴⁹ Cf. Drijvers, *Bardaisan of Edessa* (see note 22), 155, and *Idem*, Bardaisan of Edessa and the Hermetica, 205.

⁵⁰ I followed the translation in E. Hennecke-W. Schneemelcher, *New Testament Apocrypha*, II (London 1965) 446.

⁵¹ See note 49. Bardaisan does not distinguish between the rational and the spiritual soul; his emphasis on the role of Fate and also his cosmology do not seem to be compatible with the views of the *Authentikos Logos*.

⁵² Cf. H. Chadwick, *The Sentences of Sextus. A Contribution to the History of Early Christian Ethics*, Texts and Studies, New Series, V (Cambridge 1959) 138–162, and the notes to the text, 84–94. The relationship between the *Sentences of Sextus*, the *Pythagorean Sentences* and *Ad Marcellam* completely escaped the last editor and commentator of Porphyry's letter, W. Pötscher, *Porphyrios. Pros Markellan* (Leiden 1969).

⁵³ Proclus, *In Tim.*, I, 77, 22–24 Diehl (= Frg. 37 Des Places = Test. 49 Leemans): Πορφύριος, ὃν καὶ θαυμάσιον ἂν τις εἰ ἕτερα λέγει τῆς Νουμηνίου παραδόσεως. Even if this remark has to be attributed to Iamblichus, who was ill-disposed towards Porphyry, it reveals that the latter owed very much to the Apamean philosopher; cf. Waszink, *Porphyrios und Numenius* (see note 8), 35–36.

⁵⁴ Jerome, *Epist.* 133,3 (CSEL 56, 246–247); cf. Chadwick, *o.c.*, 117–137.

⁵⁵ Chadwick, *o.c.*, 138–140, 159–162, and the notes to the text, 163–181.

⁵⁶ Peel and Zandee (see note 36), 351, translate 94,25–29 as follows: "When you had entered into a bodily birth, you were begotten. You have come into being inside the bridal chamber, and you have been illuminated in mind." The opposition between earthly birth and heavenly origin makes "by the Nous" as translation of *h̄m p̄nous* preferable above "in mind" (moreover, if the latter was meant one would expect to read "in your mind").

⁵⁷ The *Sentences* are dated by Chadwick, *o.c.*, 159–160, "round about A.D. 180–210", and the *Teachings* by Peel and Zandee, *o.c.*, 347, "in the late second or early third century".

⁵⁸ Cf. H. A. Wolfson, *Philo. Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity and Islam*, I (Cambridge, Mass. 1948) 376–377.

⁵⁹ Philo, *De somniis*, I, 147 (Cohn-Wendland III, 236).

⁶⁰ Hippolytus, *Refut.*, 6,34,3 and 6 (Wendland 163). The views exposed in this passage represent a later stage of western Valentinianism; cf. W. Foerster, *Von Valentin zu Herakleon*, Beihefte zur ZNW, 7 (Giessen 1928) 57–58, 100, and F.-M.-M. Sagnard, *La Gnose Valentinienne et le témoignage de Saint Irénée*, Etudes de Philosophie Médiévale, 36 (Paris 1947) 234–237.

⁶¹ Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.*, I, 14,1–2 (Harvey I, 131–132); cf. Sagnard, *o.c.*, 431.

⁶² Cf. Chadwick, *o.c.*, 138, concerning the *Sentences*: "But it is a striking fact that even where the Christian inspiration is most obvious the vocabulary and form are carefully touched up so as to bring it more into line with the style of the pagan maxims, mainly of Pythagorean origin. On the one hand, in content there is a Christianisation of pagan maxims; on the other hand, in form there is also a 'paganisation' of Christian maxims." The same can be said of the *Authentikos Logos*. See also Chadwick's remarks on the apologetic method of Origen, *o.c.*, 160.

Beusichem, Markt 17–19

HYSTERIA AND THE GNOSTIC MYTHS OF CREATION

BY

PAULA FREDRIKSEN

Suffering, ignorance, evil – these are the leitmotifs of Gnostic cosmogonies, which draw on episodes in the Old Testament and on the dualism implicit in Middle Platonism. The presence of a Greek loan word in the Coptic texts from Nag Hammadi which deal with the Creation may indicate a third, if minor, source for these themes. This clue word is ὑστέρημα, "deficiency".

ὑστέρημα is not a classical word. It occurs in late works that would have been familiar to the Gnostics: the LXX, Luke, Paul, and the Hermetic corpus.¹ The word also turns up in two Nag Hammadi tractates, and in two of the heresiologists' reports on Gnostic beliefs. All four sources use it to conjoin the ideas of deficiency and femaleness:

1) The *Letter of Eugnostos* (CG V.3), describing the unfolding of the Pleroma, states "... and in this way appeared the defect [ὑστέρημα] of femaleness" (85.8). According to the *Gospel of the Egyptians* (CG III.2), Metanoia will serve as the matrix for the seed of Seth "... so that, through her, the ὑστέρημα may be filled up" (59.19).

2) Both Irenaeus and Hippolytus use ὑστέρημα when describing the beliefs of their Gnostic opponents, and again the idea of "defect" or "deficiency" is linked to a reference to a female. For example, Irenaeus, discussing the abortive passion of Sophia, says:

οἱ τὸν ποιητὴν οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς μόνον Θεὸν παντοκράτορα, ὑπερὸν ἄλλος Θεὸς οὐκ ἔστιν, ἐξ ὑστερήματος, καὶ αὐτοῦ ἐξ ἄλλου ὑστερήματος γεγονότος, προβεβλήσθαι λέγοντες. ὥστε κατ' αὐτοὺς αὐτὸν προβολὴν τρίτου ὑστερήματος.

"They say that the maker of heaven and earth, the one God Almighty above whom there is no other God, was brought forth from a defect, who had in turn been born of another defect, and so according to them he is the product [or emanation] of the third defect." (*Adv. Haer.* I, 16,3)

τὴν δωδεκάδα δὲ, περὶ ἣν καὶ τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ πάθους τοῦ ὑστερήματος γεγονέναι, ἐξ οὗ πάθους τὰ βλεπόμενα κατεσκευάσθαι θέλουσιν, ἐπισήμως καὶ φανερώς πανταχῇ κείσθαι λέγουσιν.

"They claim that the duodekad, in connection with which the mystery of the passion of the defect occurred, and from which passion (they maintain) the visible world has been made, is clearly and manifestly to be found everywhere." (*Adv. Haer.* I.18,4)

3) A related word, ὑστέρα ("womb"),² also appears in the heresiologists' discussions of the Gnostics. Epiphanius reports a group who believe that Darkness and Spirit came together to engender ὑστέρα who, impregnated by this same Spirit, produced aeons. One of these aeons then had intercourse with ὑστέρα, from which union issued gods, angels, demons, and the Seven Spirits – in brief, the lower Pleroma (*Panarion* 25.5,1–3). Irenaeus speaks of the Cainites who "advocate the abolition of the works of ὑστέρα."³ Moreover, they call this ὑστέρα the creator of heaven and earth" (*Adv. Haer.* I.31,2). Hippolytus in his discussion of the *Megale Apophasis* (*Refutatio* VI.14,7f.) relates an elaborate gynecological metaphor: the Garden is the ὑστέρα; Eden is the placenta; the river coming out of Eden to water the Garden is a navel; this river splits into four sources, two of which are veins and two arteries. Elsewhere (*Ref.* V.19,11) he speaks of the Sethians' belief that Light and Spirit are imprisoned in the unclean and hurtful ὑστέρα of disorder.

Hurtful disorderly wombs and deficiencies of femaleness appear in another context in the Hellenistic world – in Greek medical science. The womb is called ὑστέρα, explains Galen, because it comes last (ὕστατη) of all the parts of the female body.⁴ Soranus suggests that the ὑστέρα is so named because it yields up its products afterwards (ὕστερον), or because, broadly speaking, it lies after (ὕστερος) all the entrails.⁵ The ὑστέρα's place is in the lower body, and both Galen and Soranus, as well as Aretaeus and Hippocrates, see it as the seat and cause of a disease peculiar to women, ὑστερική πνίξις, hysterical suffocation.⁶

This respiratory difficulty is caused by the womb's "drying out", usually because of a lack of sexual intercourse through which moisture could be obtained either by the male sperm entering the womb or by the release of "female sperm" in orgasm.⁷ Aretaeus and the Hippocratic tradition hold that the womb, as it dries out, becomes lighter and so rises, wandering to the upper regions of the body and thereby causing suffocation, as well as grogginess, loss of sensibility, and sleep.⁸

This medical description of the female anatomy and the "wandering

womb" has both verbal and narrative echoes in the Gnostic cosmogonic myths. The suffering of the womb deficient in moisture nicely parallels Sophia's πάθος τοῦ ὑστερήματος which results in the coming into being of ὑστέρημα the realm of deficiency, mentioned by Irenaeus in I.18,4 (cited above). The Sophia-figure of the Cainites, according to Epiphanius (*Pan.* 38.1) and Irenaeus (I.31,2) is called ὑστέρα, which term itself can refer to the disorderly realm of this world (Hippolytus, *Ref.* V.19,11). A less direct connection might also be drawn here. The *Origin of the World* (CG II.5) describes the matter which appears in Chaos as like "after-birth" (99.19) – περισσόν in the text, but a synonym for ὕστερον.

Schematically, then, we have:

Sophia/ὑστέρα	womb/ὑστέρα
↓	↓
affected by the suffering of deficiency πάθος τοῦ ὑστ. as she wanders	suffering from a deficiency of moisture and so wandering
↓	↓
producing matter like afterbirth ὕστερον which characterizes the realm of deficiency ὑστέρημα	causing ὑστερική πνίξις which results in suffocation, grogginess and sleep.

Thus it would appear that Jonas' description of the myth of Sophia as "wandering in the void... laboring her passion into matter"⁹ is particularly apt. Just as the womb works havoc when, dry because of lack of intercourse, it wanders to the higher parts of the body,¹⁰ so Sophia literally causes chaos when, in one version of the myth, she forsakes the male half of her syzygy and wanders from her proper place to seek the Father above. Grogginess, sleep, pain and disorder result both for the hysterical woman and for the dweller in the lower realm.

The cosmogonic ὑστέρα–Sophia myth, in other words, can be appreciated in terms of this elaborate, highly condensed gynecological pun.¹¹ The pun was lost in the translation of the Gnostic texts from Greek to Coptic; but, as I hope I have shown, it can be reconstructed from the Greek loan words in the Coptic Gnostic documents and from the heresiologists' reports.

NOTES

¹ LXX, Ps. 33(34).10; Lk 21.4; II Cor. 8.4, 11.9 (ὕστερηθείς); I Thess. 4.10; *Herm.* 13.1

² see H. Frisk, *Griechisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch* (Heidelberg 1970) Bd. II: ὀστέρα and ὀστέριν.

³ cf. *The Dialogue of the Saviour*, CG III.5, "destroying the works of femaleness" (144.17); and Clement's report of the Greek *Gospel of the Egyptians* (not identical with the gospel of the same name found at Nag Hammadi), "For they say that the Savior himself said, 'I am come to undo the works of the Female'" *Strom.* III. 63.

⁴ *Opera Omnia* (Kühn 1830) XIX.362: ταύτη καὶ ἡ ὀστέρα ὀνομάζεται, ὅτι ὀστέρη τῶν ἀπάντων μερῶν ἐστὶ.

⁵ *Gynaecia* I. iii.6. For an English translation see *Soranus' Gynecology*, E.T.: O. Temkin (Baltimore 1956).

⁶ Galen, *De locis affectis* VI.ii.39; Soranus, *Gyn.* III.4; Aretaeus *SA* II,xi (E.T.: F. Adams, London 1861); Hippocrates, *Diseases of Women* I.2; I.7 (E.T.: A. Hanson, *Signs*. Winter 1975, 567-584).

For a useful summary and comparison of Greek medical writers' views on hysteria, see Ilya Veith, *Hysteria: The History of a Disease* (Chicago 1965) 9-39. Vern E. Bulloch, *Medieval Medical and Scientific Views of Women*, *Viator* 4 (1963) 485-501, discusses the impact of Greek gynecology on subsequent Christian theology and science.

⁷ Galen, *de loc. aff.* VI

⁸ Soranus and Galen both thought this was nonsense, but no less a figure than Plato held to the theory of the wandering womb, *Timaeus* 91c.

⁹ Hans Jonas, *The Gnostic Religion* (Boston 1958) xiii.

¹⁰ This view of hysteria is more widely attested than in medical and philosophical writings alone. Athenaeus 13.585d puns on the several meanings of ὀστέρα. Rejected Lention, whose lover has just turned his attentions to a newly-arrived courtesan at the banquet, replies to a friend who asks what ails her ὀστέρα με λυπεῖ. "The last [female] comer gives me a pain!" or "My womb hurts me" - playing off the (apparently common) knowledge that lack of sexual intercourse (the result of the arrival of Lention's competitor) causes pain in the uterus.

¹¹ See S. Freud, 'Wit and Its Relation to the Unconscious', *Basic Writings of Sigmund Freud* (Modern Library, New York 1938), 633-762, especially 640 ff., 646 ff., and 655 ff. According to Freud, such condensation and multiple-reference are integral to the structure of dreams and myths as well as puns.

Princeton, University

NOTICE TOUCHANT L'HOMÉLIE XIV DE SÉVÈRE D'ANTIOCHE

PAR

E. LUCCHESI

Avec le fascicule 2 du tome XXXVIII de la *Patrologia Orientalis*,¹ s'achève enfin un grand et important projet: la publication intégrale des 125 *Homélies Cathédrales* de Sévère d'Antioche, disparues, à de rares exceptions près, dans l'original grec, mais restituées dans leur presque totalité grâce à deux versions syriaques différentes, la première et plus complète due à Jacques d'Édesse, la seconde, beaucoup plus partielle, de Paul de Callinice.

Cette édition, commencée par R. Duval et vaillamment et inlassablement poursuivie par le Chanoine M. Brière, puis, après sa mort, par F. Graffin, actuel directeur de la *PO*, avec la collaboration sporadique d'autres syriacisants,² se sera donc échelonnée sur la longue période de soixante-dix ans, puisque le premier fascicule datait de 1906 déjà, et aura ainsi recquis non moins de 17 fascicules, répartis sur 14 volumes de la collection parisienne. Entreprise redoutable, s'il en est, et qui mérite l'approbation et la reconnaissance du monde scientifique.

C'est sur le dernier fascicule, consacré aux *Homélies I à XVII*, que nous voudrions nous arrêter brièvement, et en particulier sur l'*Homélie XIV*.

Nous possédons de cette homélie, une version copte, signalée à deux reprises, et publiée entre-temps par É. Porcher,³ lequel s'était attaché tout particulièrement à définir la place de Sévère d'Antioche dans la littérature copte.⁴

Or, cette traduction semble avoir totalement échappée aux éditeurs du syriaque, qui, du moins, n'en parlent pas. Ces éditeurs avaient pourtant, et à très juste titre, tenu compte auparavant de la recension copte de l'*Homélie I*, qui remédie aux importants hiatus dont souffre ici la version de Jacques d'Édesse. Du copte, ils avaient alors reproduit le texte et la traduction mêmes, sensiblement améliorés, de Porcher.⁵

Celui-ci n'avait pas, et pour cause (le syriaque étant alors inédit!)