

## **DOCTRINAL TRADITIONS AND CULTURAL HERITAGE IN THE NEWLY DISCOVERED HOMILIES OF ORIGEN ON THE PSALMS**

(CODEX MONACENSIS GRAECUS 314)

**LORENZO PERRONE**

*Abstract.* The 29 Homilies of Origen on the Psalms discovered in 2012 by Marina Molin Pradel in a Munich Codex (Cod. Graec. 314) constitute an unexpected and very important source for retracing the doctrinal traditions and the cultural heritage that support the Alexandrian's biblical interpretation. The article first investigates the presence of Philo, much more discernible than the doctrinal influence of other Alexandrian predecessors such as Clement. Origen occasionally pays homage to Philo and reuses independently his exegeses. Further, as far as the Hellenistic culture of Alexandria is concerned, the Homilies reveal its influence under several aspects, especially with regard to music and astronomy. Scholarly notions concur to elaborate a vision of the cosmos which is now considered by Origen more fundamentally as a source for attaining the knowledge of God next to the witness of the Scriptures. Since the homilies are to be dated in the final period of Origen's activity, we are allowed to see in them a new emphasis, probably dictated by the preacher's concerns regarding the Marcionite criticism of the Old Testament.

CODEX MONACENSIS GRAECUS 314: A UNIQUE OPPORTUNITY FOR A NEW ASSESSMENT OF ORIGEN AND HIS WORK

The collection of 29 Greek homilies of Origen on the Psalms (Codex Monacensis Graecus 314), discovered in Munich two years ago by Marina Molin Pradel, offers a unique opportunity for a new assessment of his work and significance after a century of intensive research on the Alexandrian author.<sup>1</sup> These texts, besides being the largest series of his sermons in the original language,<sup>2</sup> help us to retrace the picture of Origen as a preacher and commentator of the most familiar book of the Hebrew Bible. In fact, no other author has contributed in such an impressive way to developing the interpretation of the Psalms in the ancient Church. If we were already aware of the traces left by Origen in many of the later interpreters, both Greek and Latin (for instance, Eusebius of Caesarea, Didymus the Blind, Hilary of Poitiers, Ambrose or Jerome), despite the fragmentary preservation of his writings, the Munich homilies now reinforce his status as the exegetical authority for the Christian reception of the Psalms.

Leaving aside for the moment a new investigation into the impact of his interpretation in light of the new sermons, I would like to deal briefly with some aspects that concur in redefining the portrait of Origen as a biblical scholar. It was precisely through the explanation of the Scriptures, seen by the Alexandrian as the book of God's revelation to men, that he came to elaborate what we should continue to term properly his 'biblical theology'. Also in the case of the Munich Codex there is no room to speak of a 'philosophical exegesis', of the kind we find, for example, in Philo of Alexandria.<sup>3</sup> Not incidentally, Origen, at the end of the *Homily on Psalm 74*, distances himself from the two professions that we customarily connect with his biographical and scholarly profile: the grammarian and the philosopher. For our preacher, both the grammarian and the philosopher after a while have nothing new to say, since they are condemned either to repeat their teachings or simply to forward a doctrinal tradition without creative

---

<sup>1</sup> On the find of the Munich Codex see Molin Pradel 2012; Perrone 2013; Fürst (2014) cites the unedited homilies in support of his general presentation.

<sup>2</sup> Our evidence was previously limited to the twenty *Homilies on Jeremiah* and the *Homily on the Witch of Endor (1 Sam 28)*.

<sup>3</sup> See e.g. Fürst 2014b. Yet the same author in his general presentation (*supra*, n. 1), in spite of his propensity for a 'philosophical' approach to Origen, cannot avoid himself using 'theology' as the most apt definition for his intellectual endeavor.

development. On the contrary, the master of Scriptures, who first and foremost is the Logos himself, is a teacher “for eternity.”<sup>4</sup> There is no doubt that Origen, when he gave the sermons, had such a model in his mind. As he openly avows in the 2<sup>nd</sup> *Homily on Psalm 15*, he was yearning to receiving his ‘glory’, as a master of Scripture, both from God and from men.<sup>5</sup>

Nonetheless in the 1<sup>st</sup> *Homily on Psalm 77* Origen presents a different appreciation of philosophy. Dealing with verse 2b (Φθέγξομαι προβλήματα ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς, “I will utter problems from of old”), he observes that those who are used to practise philosophy among the Greeks, both teachers and students, exert themselves with topical ‘problems’ (προβλήματα). In the same way those who study the Bible should concern themselves with its ‘problems’, as paradigmatically shown already by its beginning, since the narrative of creation in the book of *Genesis* is full of difficult questions.<sup>6</sup> The similarity between the Bible and philosophy claimed here by Origen with regard to the methodic approach helps us to situate the Munich sermons within their larger doctrinal and cultural horizon. Certainly one of their premises is based on the practice of *quaestiones et responsiones* (or ζητήματα καὶ λύσεις), which on the other hand was not an exclusive to the philosophical schools. In fact, the Alexandrian, acting essentially as a commentator on the Bible, places himself inside the rich stream of the tra-

---

<sup>4</sup> *H74Ps* 6 (f. 161<sup>v</sup>): Ὁ διδάσκαλος καὶ κύριος ἡμῶν τοσαῦτα ἔχει μαθήματα ὡς ἀπαγγέλλειν οὐκ ἐπὶ δέκα ἔτη, ὡς ἀπαγγέλλει γραμματικὸς καὶ οὐκ ἔχει τί διδάξει οὐδὲ ὡς φιλόσοφος ἀπαγγέλλει παραδιδούς καὶ οὐκέτι ἔχει καινότερόν τι εἶπη, ἀλλὰ τοσαῦτά ἐστι τὰ μαθήματα τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὥστε αὐτὸν ἀπαγγέλλειν εἰς ὅλον τὸν αἰῶνα. All the quotations of *HPs* are taken from: *Origenes Werke, Dreizehnter Band: Die neuen Psalmenhomilien*. Eine kritische Edition des *Codex Monacensis Graecus 314*, hrsg. von L. Perrone in Zusammenarbeit mit M. Molin Pradel, E. Prinzivalli und A. Cacciari 2015.

<sup>5</sup> *H15Ps* II,7 (f. 25<sup>v</sup>): Καὶ ὥσπερ τοῦ ἀθλητοῦ ἡ δόξα τὸ γενναῖον αὐτοῦ σῶμά ἐστι, τοῦ ἱατροῦ ἡ δόξα ἡ ἱατρικὴ ἐστι, τοῦ χειροτέχνου ἡ δόξα αἱ χεῖρές εἰσιν, οὕτω τοῦ σοφοῦ ἡ δόξα λέγοντος θεῖα καὶ ἱερά ἡ γλῶσσά ἐστιν, ὡς μὴ ἐτέραν εἶναι τὴν γλῶσσαν τῆς δόξης, ἀλλὰ τὴν αὐτὴν εἶναι δόξαν καὶ γλῶσσαν. Εὐξασθε περὶ ἐμοῦ, εἰ καὶ ἀνάξιός εἰμι, ἵνα ἐκ τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ καὶ ὑμῶν διῶ ὁ θεὸς γλῶσσάν μοι καὶ δόξαν, ὥστε δοξάζεσθαι με παρὰ θεῶν καὶ ἀνθρώπων ἡ γλῶσσά μου.

<sup>6</sup> *H77Ps* I,6 (f. 225<sup>v</sup>): Φθέγξομαι προβλήματα ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς (Ps. 77,2b): ὥσπερ παρὰ τοῖς φιλοσοφοῦσι τὰ Ἑλλήνων ἐστὶ τινὰ προβλήματα, ἃ προτιθέασιν τοῖς μέλλουσι μελετᾶν, ἵνα ἀναπλωσῶν ἐκεῖνοι, ἢ οἱ διδάσκοντες ἢ οἱ πείραν λαμβάνοντες τῶν ἐπιδεικνυμένων ἐκεῖνα τὰ μαθήματα, οὕτως ἐστὶ τινὰ καὶ τῆς γραφῆς προβλήματα. The English translation of the Psalms is taken from Pietersma 2000.

dition of ancient commentaries (philological, philosophical, medical, and so on). This literary heritage of Greco-Roman antiquity was shared first by Hellenistic Judaism and then by early Christianity. Both did so by replacing the 'canon' of classical poets and authoritative philosophers with the Bible. The Munich homilies provide a novel witness for this widespread tradition, starting with the recourse to the philological techniques of textual and literary criticism or with the application of the familiar tools of late antique rhetorics with whom the Alexandrian, as a former grammarian, was well acquainted.<sup>7</sup>

To our modern perception a sermon does not immediately evoke the idea of a substantial investment of philological skills or doctrinal considerations on the part of the preacher, especially when treating a text such as the *Psalms*, which is first and foremost characterized by implications of a moral and spiritual kind. Origen was fully conscious of these aspects, as we can already observe in the nine *Homilies on Psalms 36, 37 and 38* translated by Rufinus into Latin and regarded by him as a 'moral interpretation'.<sup>8</sup> Yet the Alexandrian did not restrict his view of the Psalms to their recognition as a source of inspiration for the life of the faithful. As emphasized both by the amount of the writings he devoted to commenting on the Psalms and by the mass of their quotations dispersed throughout his *œuvre* (the second largest number of quotes after the Gospel of Matthew), they played a major role in the development of his theological thought. For Origen the Psalms, as a main prophetic book from their early use in the New Testament onward, lent themselves to nourish and support the most important doctrines concerning God, man and the world.<sup>9</sup> Consequently also the new homilies mirror the principal themes of his theology.<sup>10</sup> As such they cannot avoid, at least to some degree, a dependence on

---

<sup>7</sup> See Neuschäfer 1987; Martens 2011.

<sup>8</sup> Rufinus, *Praef.* (Prinzivalli 1991, 26, 1-5): *Quoniam tricesimi sexti et tricesimi septimi et tricesimi octavi psalmi expositio tota moralis est.* This corresponds to Origen's remark in *H36Ps I,1* (f. 30r): δι' ὅλων ὁ ψαλμὸς ἠθικός ἐστι. See also *FrPs 118* (Harl 1972, 182, 7): περιέχει γὰρ ὁ ψαλμὸς οὗτος ὅλον τὸν τόπον τὸν ἠθικόν. For the distinction between ethics and theology as well as their reciprocal connection on the path towards perfection, see *H77Ps I,5* (f. 223v).

<sup>9</sup> Though the author addresses only the evidence of *Prin*, eloquently proves the constitutive value of the Psalms for the essentials of Origen's theology (McGuckin 2011).

<sup>10</sup> I have tried to prove it in some contributions: Perrone 2014a; 2015b; "Et l'homme tout entier devient dieu" ... (forthcoming).

preceding doctrinal traditions or more generally the influence of a cultural heritage exploited by the preacher on behalf of his arguments.

#### DOCTRINAL TRADITIONS: PHILO OF ALEXANDRIA

Origen is a unique genius, but he does not stand alone in the doctrinal landscape of early Christianity. On occasion he is even willing to recognize that he has predecessors upon whom he can build. However, unless he explicitly states it or at least voices some recognizable hints, we do not easily find out more precisely the sources on which he might depend.<sup>11</sup> Therefore we do not always get a clear picture of the theological traditions that contributed to shaping his thought, although we generally admit his debt to his predecessors in Jewish and Christian Alexandria (obviously including also his Gnostic adversaries). That notwithstanding, only the case of Philo can be illustrated in detail; it is difficult to do the same with Clement, in spite of the evident affinities existing between the two Christian teachers of Alexandria.<sup>12</sup> The Munich homilies support the same impression, while adding further evidence to Origen's well-known acquaintance with Philo.<sup>13</sup>

As in most other cases Origen does not mention the Jewish author by name, but he is honest enough not only to let the reader identify him easily but also to accompany the quotation with an appreciative judgment.<sup>14</sup> For example, in the *Homily on Psalm 75* Origen refers to Philo with one of his typical formulations pointing to both aspects:<sup>15</sup> "Another before me observed, and he observed well" (Ἐτερος πρό ἐμοῦ ἐτήρησε, καὶ καλῶς

---

<sup>11</sup> I have discussed this problem in connection with Origen's practice of quotation (Perro-ne 2011).

<sup>12</sup> For this impression see Van den Hoek 1992. Origen never mentions his 'predecessor' in the *Didaskaleion*, according to Eusebius' reconstruction of its *diadochai*, whereas he remembers Pantaenus and Heraclas.

<sup>13</sup> On Origen's use of Philo, cf. Runia 1993, 156-83; Van den Hoek 2000; 2003.

<sup>14</sup> The only mentions of Philo by name are in CC IV,51; VI,21, and CMt XV,3.

<sup>15</sup> For similar introductory sentences, see e.g. CMt X,22 (30,5-6): Ἐτήρησε μὲν οὖν τις τῶν πρό ἐμῶν τὴν ἀναγεγραμμένην ἐν Γενέσει τοῦ Φαραῶ γενέθλιον; XIV,2 (277,30-278,1): Ἦδη δὲ καὶ ἄλλης διηγήσεως ἀψώμεθα, ἣν ἔλεγε τις τῶν πρό ἡμῶν; XVII,17 (635,16-18): Τῶν μὲν πρό ἡμῶν ποιήσας τις βιβλία νόμων ἱερῶν ἀλληγορίας; CC V,55 (58,24-25): Τοῖς δυναμένοις ἀκούειν προφητικοῦ βουλήματος πείσομεν ὅτι καὶ τῶν πρό ἡμῶν τις ταῦτα ἀνήγαγεν εἰς τὸν περὶ ψυχῆς λόγον.

ἐτήρησεν).<sup>16</sup> The passage clearly echoes Philo's distinction between the term ἀναβάτης ('one who mounts' a horse) and ἵππεύς ('horseman') in the *Allegorical Interpretation*, if not also in *On Husbandry*, inasmuch as Origen elaborates on it similarly with regard to the lack of control over passion and desire.<sup>17</sup> Thus the 'one who mounts' a horse is connected in both authors with the Egyptians in the Exodus narrative, symbolically viewed as those who lose their reins over the body and are caused to fall because of their passional movements. Origen, while appropriating the Platonizing allegory of Philo, clarifies it philosophically by opposing the body with its 'appetencies' (ὀρέξεις) to the 'science' (ἐπιστήμη) governing rational behavior. In the wake of his predecessor he also reformulates the argument biblically, since he opposes the Egyptians to the model of Elijah as the true 'horseman' in light of 2 Kings (4 Kingdoms LXX) 2,12.<sup>18</sup> The homiletic context with its didascalical necessities does not allow room for a wider weav-

<sup>16</sup> H75Ps 5 (ff. 167<sup>v</sup>-168<sup>r</sup>): Ἐτερος πρὸ ἐμοῦ ἐτήρησε, καὶ καλῶς ἐτήρησεν, ὅτι οὐ ταῦτό ἐστιν "ἐπιβαίνειν ἵππου" καὶ "ἵππεά εἶναι", καὶ "ἀναβάτην εἶναι" καὶ "ἵππεά εἶναι". Ὁ μὲν οὖν Αἰγύπτιος οὐκ ὦν ἵππεύς ἀλλὰ ἀναβάτης, ἵππον καὶ ἀναβάτην ἔρριψε εἰς θάλασσαν (Ex 15,21): οὐ μετ' ἐπιστήμης ἐπιβαίνων τοῦ ἵππου, διὰ τοῦτο πεσεῖται. Ὁ δὲ ἐπιστημόνως ἐπιβεβηκῶς τῷ σώματι καὶ ἄρχων τῶν ἡδονῶν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἄγων ὅπου βούλεται τὸ σῶμα καὶ τὰς ἡνίας αὐτοῦ κρατῶν τῶν ὀρέξεων, ἵνα μὴ φέρηται εἰς τὰς ὀρέξεις τὰς σαρκολακὰς, οὗτος οὐκ ἔστιν ἀναβάτης ὡς ὁ Αἰγύπτιος, ἀλλ' ἔστιν ἵππεύς ὡς ὁ Ἡλίας.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. Philo, *Leg.* II,103-04: Ζητητέον δέ, τίνας ἕνεκα ὁ μὲν Ἰακώβ φησιν, ὅτι πεσεῖται ὁ ἵππεύς εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω (Gn. 49,17), Μωσῆς δὲ ἄδει, ὅτι ἵππος καὶ ἀναβάτης κατεποντώθησαν (cf. Ex 15,21). Λεκτέον οὖν ὅτι ὁ μὲν καταποντούμενος ὁ Αἰγύπτιος ἐστὶ τρόπος, ὃς κὰν φεύγη, ὑπὸ τὸ ὕδωρ τουτέστιν ὑπὸ τὴν φορὰν τῶν παθῶν φεύγει, ὁ δὲ πίπτων ἵππεύς εἰς τὰ ὀπίσθια οὐκ ἔστι τῶν φιλοπαθῶν: τεκμήριον δέ, ὅτι οὗτος μὲν ἔστιν ἵππεύς, ἐκεῖνος δὲ ἀναβάτης: ἵππέως μὲν οὖν ἔργον δαμάζειν τὸν ἵππον καὶ ἀφηνιάζοντα ἐπιστομιζειν, ἀναβάτου δὲ φέρεσθαι ἢ ἂν τὸ ζῶον ἄγη; *Agr.* 68-69: ὁ μὲν τοῖνυν ἄνευ τέχνης ἵππικῆς ἐπιβεβηκῶς λέγεται μὲν εἰκότως ἀναβάτης, ἐκδέδωκε δὲ ἑαυτὸν ἀλόγῳ καὶ σκισητικῷ θρόμβῳ, ὡσθ' ὅπῃ ἂν ἐκεῖνο χωρῆ ἐκείσε πάντως ἀναγκαῖον φέρεσθαι καὶ μὴ προιδόμενον χάσμα γῆς ἢ βαθύν τινα βόθρον ὑπὸ τῆς ἐν τῷ δρόμῳ ῥύμης κατακρημισθῆναι [συνηνέχθη] καὶ συγκαταποθῆναι τὸν φερόμενον. ὁ δ' ἵππεύς πάλιν, ὅταν ἀνέρχεσθαι μέλλῃ, χαλινὸν ἐντίθησι κάπειτ' ἐφαλλόμενος τῆς περιουχενίου χαίτης ἐνείληπται καὶ φέρεσθαι δοκῶν αὐτός, εἰ δεῖ τάληθές εἰπεῖν, ἄγει τὸ κομίζον τρόπον κυβερνήτου; 73-74: ἀναβάτης δὲ καὶ ἡνίοχος εἰς ὀνοῦς: ἀλλ' ἡνίκα μὲν μετὰ φρονήσεως ἄνεισιν, ἡνίοχος, ὅποτε δὲ μετ' ἀφροσύνης, ἀναβάτης.

<sup>18</sup> Origen usually presents Elijah as the symbol of prophecy (e.g. CC VI,68), or as a 'man of God', eventually together with Moses (e.g. *Clo* II,30,183; CC VIII,28).

ing of the Philonian motif, as we perceive also shortly before this passage with the allegorical interpretation of the 'horse' as the 'body'.<sup>19</sup> However, we should note the very rare word that negatively qualifies the 'appetencies': they are said to be σαρκοδακάς, that is "the biting" or "eating of the flesh." This adjective is attested only once in an Orphic fragment transmitted by Sextus Empiricus<sup>20</sup> so that such rarity itself provides a clue to the preacher's distinctively high level of discourse.

The 2<sup>nd</sup> Homily on Psalm 76 introduces a similar reference to Philo: "One before me criticized Jothor, and he criticized him well, who said: 'Now I know that the Lord is great above all gods'."<sup>21</sup> Origen is surely referring to a passage in *On Drunkenness*, where Philo reproaches Jothor for the fact that he does not know God in the proper sense since he dares to compare him with other deities.<sup>22</sup> Once more Origen simplifies the allegorical explanation given by Philo, for whom Jothor is the symbol of an 'empty presumption' conforming to the majority opinion. On the other hand, he expands the biblical setting on account of the verse on which he is commenting: Ps. 76,14b-15a (τίς θεός μέγας ὡς ὁ θεός ἡμῶν; σὺ εἶ ὁ θεός ἡμῶν ὁ ποιῶν θαυμάσια, "What god is as great as our God? You are the God who works wonders"). He therefore shifts from the words of Jothor to the passages in which the Scripture speaks positively of men as 'gods' (Ps. 81,6 being the main text-proof). Consequently Origen draws the attention of his audience to the theme of 'deification', one of the recurrent issues emerging from the new homilies.

In both of the cases we have examined, Origen not only points to Philo as his predecessor but also stresses the positive value of the track provided by Philo for his own interpretation. Interestingly, his use of Philo proves to

<sup>19</sup> H75Ps 6 (ff. 167<sup>r-v</sup>): Τροπικῶς πολλαχοῦ τῆς γραφῆς ὁ ἵππος τὸ σῶμα λέγεται, οἶον ψευδῆς ἵππος εἰς σωτηρίαν (Ps. 32,17a).

<sup>20</sup> See above n. 16: ἵνα μὴ φέρονται εἰς τὰς ὀρέξεις τὰς σαρκοδακάς (the manuscript has the reading σαρκιδακάς). As for the Orphic fragment, cf. Sext. Emp. *Math.* II,31,7 and, in a slightly different form, IX,15,4: ἦν γὰρ χρόνος, ὡς φησιν ὁ Ορφεύς, ἠνίκα φῶτες ἀπ' ἀλλήλων βίον εἶχον/σαρκοδακή, κρείττων δὲ τὸν ἦττονα φῶτ' ἐδάϊζεν.

<sup>21</sup> H76Ps II,4 (f. 190<sup>r</sup>): ἐμέμψατό τις τῶν πρὸ ἡμῶν, καὶ καλῶς γε ἐμέμψατο, τὸν Ἰοθὸρ εἰπόντα ὅτι νῦν ἔγνω ὅτι μέγας κύριος παρὰ πάντας τοὺς θεοὺς (Ex 18,11), ὅτι καὶ ἔδοξε τι λέγειν περὶ θεοῦ συγκρίνων αὐτὸν εἰδώλοισι, οὐ νοήσας ἄλλους θεοὺς ἢ ταῦτα.

<sup>22</sup> Philo, *Ebr.* 45 (178,28-29): Θεοῖς οὖν τοῖς ψευδωνύμοις οὐκ ἂν τις τὸν ἀληθῆ θεὸν συγκρίνειν ὑπέμενε, εἴπερ ἀψευδῶς ἐγίνωσκεν αὐτόν. See also *ibid.*, 41-44.

be at once faithful and creative. We can observe this again in other passages alluding to the Jewish author, though Origen no longer endorses his Alexandrian antecedent or even hints generically at Philo by simply mentioning some interpreters that preceded. In the *Homily on Psalm 74* he presumably goes back to Philo's ζήτημα on Ps. 74,9a-b in the treatise *On the Unchangeableness of God* (Ποτήριον ἐν χειρὶ κυρίου οἶνον ἀκράτου πλήρης κεράσματος, καὶ ἐκκλινεν ἐκ τούτου εἰς τούτο, "in the Lord's hand there is a cup of pure wine, full of a mixture; he tipped it from side to side").<sup>23</sup> However, the verse is exploited for various explanations: Origen applies it to the sinners, whose 'cup' is filled in varying measure with evil and good, as long as they have also done virtuous deeds,<sup>24</sup> whereas Philo refers it to the privilege of the 'Powers' (δυνάμεις) over men since they participate in God without any mixture.<sup>25</sup> In other words, Origen here shares the problem with Philo but not his answer.

Another point of contact with the Jewish teacher figures in the 7<sup>th</sup> *Homily on Psalm 77*, where Origen deals with the narrative of the plagues in Egypt. In his comment on Ps. 77,45a (ἐξαπέστειλεν εἰς αὐτοὺς κυνόμυιαν καὶ κατέφαγεν αὐτούς, "He sent among them the dog-fly, and it devoured them") he compares the order of the plagues in the Psalm which differs from that appearing in Exodus and in Ps. 104. Apparently he is referring to Philo when he afterwards mentions the explanation proposed by 'others', for whom the dog-fly, a 'shameless' insect, refers to the excee-

<sup>23</sup> H74Ps 5 (f. 160<sup>v</sup>): Ἐζήτησέ τις τῶν πρὸ ἐμοῦ· εἰ κεράσματος, πῶς ἀκράτου; εἰ δὲ ἀκράτου, πῶς κεράσματος;

<sup>24</sup> H74Ps 5 (f. 160<sup>v</sup>): Ὅσοι οὖν ἁμαρτωλοὶ εἰσιν, ἐπεὶ ποτε καὶ χρηστὸν πεποιθήκασι, πίνουσιν οὐχ ἅπλως ἄκρατον ἀλλὰ ἄκρατον κέρασμα· οἱ δὲ πλείονα τὰ κρείττονα ποιήσαντες, ἐὰν πίνωσι τὸ ποτήριον τῆς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν, πίνουσιν οὐκ ἄκρατον τὸ κέρασμα, ἀλλ' εἰ δεῖ οὕτως ὀνομάσαι, εὐκρατον ἢ ὀλιγόκρατον κέρασμα.

<sup>25</sup> Philo, *Deus* 76-77: Πρεσβύτερος γὰρ δίκης ὁ ἔλεος παρ' αὐτῷ ἔστιν ἅτε τὸν κολάσεως ἄξιον οὐ μετὰ τὴν δίκην, ἀλλὰ πρὸ δίκης εἰδοῖται. Διὰ τοῦτο ἐν ἑτέροις εἴρηται ποτήριον ἐν χειρὶ κυρίου, οἶνον ἀκράτου πλήρης κεράσματος (Ps. 74,9a-b)· καίτοι τὸ γε κεκραμένον οὐκ ἄκρατον. Ἀλλ' ἔχει λόγον ταῦτα φυσικώτατον καὶ τοῖς προειρημένοις ἀκόλουθον· ὁ γὰρ θεὸς ταῖς δυνάμεσι πρὸς μὲν ἑαυτὸν ἀκράτους χρηταί, κεκραμέναις δὲ πρὸς γένεσιν· τὰς γὰρ ἀμιγείς θνητὴν ἀμήχανον φύσιν κωφεῖται. With regard to Philo's view of the δυνάμεις, see Termini 2000.



ding ‘shamelessness’ of the Egyptians.<sup>26</sup> Actually Philo elaborates more thoroughly on the motif of ‘shamelessness’,<sup>27</sup> when he comments that the dog-fly is a plague inflicted directly by God: actually, when God deals with human affairs he does not need anybody as his intermediary.<sup>28</sup> Origen instead asks himself about the source of Wis 16,9 (“For them the bitings of grasshoppers and flies killed”) and finds it in the passage of Ps. 77,45a.<sup>29</sup> This connection then offers him a key for his own interpretation of the ‘dog-fly’: God can use a worthless insect to carry out his punishments, avoiding wild and more cruel animals because he wants to leave room for conversion and penance. In this way the perspective of the divine pedagogy of salvation in the book of *Wisdom* impregnates the Origenian interpretation of the Psalm passage. As a matter of fact, Philo shares the same motif by alluding to Wis 11,17-19, though he does not quote this passage *in extenso* as does Origen, who also refers to Wis 12,26. In the end the Jewish and the Christian interpreter converge in the essentials of their explanation. Yet Origen once more uses the Philonian materials although he inserts them into a different setting.

---

<sup>26</sup> *H77Ps* VII,3 (f. 290r): Ἄλλοι δὲ οὕτως διηγῆσαντο· ἐπεὶ πάνυ ἀναιδῆς ἦν τὸ πεμφθὲν ζῷον τοῖς Αἰγυπτίοις, δύο ἀναιδῆ ζῶα συλλαβῶν ἔδειξε τῷ ὀνόματι, ἵνα παραστήσῃ τὴν ὑπερβάλλουσαν ἀναίδειαν αὐτῶν.

<sup>27</sup> See Philo, *Mos.* I,130: Ἡ γενομένη διὰ ζῶου τῶν ἐν τῇ φύσει πάντων θρασυτάτου, κυνομυίας, ἦν ἐτύμως ἐκάλεσαν οἱ θετικοὶ τῶν ὀνομάτων - σοφοὶ γὰρ ἦσαν - ἐκ τῶν ἀναιδεσάτων ζῶων συνθέντες τοῦνομα, μυίας καὶ κυνός. Origen exploits the Philonian distinction regarding the identity of those who initiate the plagues (Aaron, Moses and God himself) in *HEX* IV,3-4.

<sup>28</sup> Philo, *Mos.* I,109: Ἵσως ἂν τις ἐπιζητήσῃ, διὰ τί τοῖς οὕτω ἀφανέσι καὶ ἡμελημένοις ζῷοις ἐτιμωρεῖτο τὴν χώραν παρῆς ἄρκτους καὶ λέοντας καὶ παρδάλεις καὶ τὰ ἄλλα γένη τῶν ἀτιθάσων θηρίων, ἃ σαρκῶν ἀνθρωπείων ἄπτεται, καὶ εἰ μὴ ταῦτα, τὰς γοῦν Αἰγυπτίων ἀσπίδας, ὧν τὰ δῆγματα πέφυκεν ἀνυπερθέτως ἀναιρεῖν. Εἰ δ’ ὄντως ἀγνοεῖ, μαθέτω· πρῶτον μὲν ὅτι τοὺς οἰκήτορας τῆς χώρας ὁ θεὸς νουθετησάι μᾶλλον ἐβούλετο ἢ διαφθεῖραι· βουληθεὶς γὰρ ἀφανίζῃν εἰς ἅπαν οὐκ ἂν ζῷοις ἐχρήτο πρὸς τὰς ἐπιθέσεις ὥσπερ συνεργοῖς, ἀλλὰ τοῖς θεηλάτοις κακοῖς, λιμῷ τε καὶ λοιμῷ.

<sup>29</sup> *H77Ps* VII,3 (ff. 288v-289r): Αναγινώσκων τὴν ἐπιγεγραμμένην *Σολομώντος Σοφίαν*, ἐφίστημι πόθεν ἐλήφθη τῷ γράψαντι τὸ βιβλίον ἐκεῖνο· τοὺς μὲν ἀκρίδων καὶ μυῶν ἀπέκτεινεν δῆγματα (Wis 16,9). Καὶ ἐζητοῦν εἰ ἐκεῖ πρῶτον εἴρηται· θεοῦ δὲ διδόντος τηρεῖν καὶ προσέχειν τῇ ἀναγνώσει, εὗρον ὅτι ἐντεῦθεν ἐλήφθη.

CULTURAL HERITAGE: THE *POLYMATHEIA* OF ALEXANDRIA

There are further points of contact between the new homilies and Philo, but in part they have to do with their shared cultural heritage. So we should now, albeit once again quickly, review some aspects of the intellectual patrimony that comes to light in the Munich Codex. As hinted earlier, our sermons might be exploited for lexical investigation, inasmuch as we detect therein an interesting group of *hapax legomena* together with other words rarely used.<sup>30</sup> On the whole, the texts convey several traces of the πολυμάθεια fostered by Alexandrian Hellenism. For instance, when Origen explains the plague of the ‘frogs’ in the 7<sup>th</sup> Homily on Psalm 77 (Ps. 77,45b), leaning upon a precedent interpreter he applies zoological (and perhaps also medical) notions to trace the difference between the ‘frog’ (βάτραχος) and the ‘toad’ (φρῦνος). It is not possible to establish the source from which the Alexandrian derived such a distinction, but his assessment explicitly relies on its zoological evidence (ἡ ἱστορία ἢ περὶ τοῦ ζώου τοῦτο παραδίδωσιν). Origen read therein about the toad being an animal that becomes poisonous when living outside its aquatic environment and as such dangerous, like snakes.<sup>31</sup> We may notice affinities with a textbook of Alexandrian medicine – Philumenos’ work on poisonous animals and the remedies against them (*Περί ἰοβόλων ζώων καὶ τῶν*

<sup>30</sup> As for the *hapax legomena*, the list includes the following items: ἀντινύμφιος (H67Ps II,7 [f. 113<sup>v</sup>]); ἀρθητή (H67Ps II,3 [f. 102<sup>r</sup>]); ἐβωνισμός (H76Ps II,1 [f. 184<sup>v</sup>]); ἐννηξίς (H77Ps VII,3 [f. 290<sup>v</sup>]); ἐπιστεφανώματα (H73Ps III,7 [f. 148<sup>v</sup>]); ἡμιμήνιος (H80Ps I,6 [f. 339<sup>r</sup>]); ὀλιγόκρατον (H74Ps 5 [f. 160<sup>v</sup>]); ὀραματιστήριον (H73Ps I,6 [f. 122<sup>r</sup>]); περατιστί (H80Ps I,6 [f. 340<sup>v</sup>]); πονήρευσις (H73Ps I,7 [f. 125<sup>r</sup>]); συνιουδαίειν (H77Ps IX,1 [f. 317<sup>r</sup>]); τρισυτεῖν (H15Ps I,3 [f. 14<sup>v</sup>]); φωναλειπτική (H67Ps II,2 [f. 99<sup>v</sup>]). As for the unusual expressions, Origen shares for instance with Sextus Empiricus the term κενοπάθεια, “unreal sensation”, in H77Ps VIII,4 (f. 306<sup>v</sup>), confirming by the way his use of the verb κενοπαθέω (three times), a word also present in Sextus Empiricus (four times). For further expressions, see supra n. 20.

<sup>31</sup> H77Ps VII,7 (f. 290<sup>v</sup>): Ἐλεγε δέ τις τοῦτον τὸν βάτραχον τὸν καλούμενον εἶναι φρῦνον. Ἡ γὰρ ἱστορία ἢ περὶ τοῦ ζώου τοῦτο παραδίδωσιν, ὅτι ἀποχερσωθεὶς βάτραχος καὶ ἐξ ὕδατος γενόμενος γίνεται δηλητήριον φάρμακον, ὥστε αὐτὸν ἐνδάκνοντα τὸ παραπλήσιον ποιῆσαι ἐχίδνη καὶ ἀσπίδι καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ζώοις, ἅπερ ἰοβόλα ἐστίν. Στερηθὲν γὰρ τὸ ζῶον τῆς ὑγρᾶς ζωῆς καὶ τῆς ἐννήξεως τῆς ἐν τῷ ὕδατι, ἰὸν ἀπὸ τῶν τροφῶν συνάγει καὶ ποιεῖ παραπλήσιον τῷ ἐκείνων τῇ δυνάμει τὸν ἰὸν βάτραχος ὅθεν ἀσπίδων καὶ τῶν ἰοβόλων τροφή ἐστὶν βάτραχος, καὶ λαμβάνει τὸν ἰὸν τὰ ζῶα καὶ ἐκ τῆς τοιαύτης τροφῆς.

βοηθημάτων)<sup>32</sup> –, or even catch some echoes of a similar topic dealt with by Origen's colleague and friend Julius Africanus in his *Kestoi*.<sup>33</sup>

From another vantage point we discern evidence of historical reading, though we cannot exclude a more personal and immediate familiarity with the subject. Actually Origen often resorts to agonistic (as well as theatrical) metaphors, so that it does not come totally as a surprise when in the 4<sup>th</sup> *Homily on Psalm 77* he evokes “the so called ‘Great Games’ (Μεγάλα γυμνικά),” apparently a unique designation of the Olympic or Panhellenic games. His mention is far from being stereotypical, because he sketches a lively description of the training of the athletes and the control of their diet in preparation for the games, undertaken by inspectors sent by the organizers (or referees) of the games.<sup>34</sup> In this passage we find also the technical term for such organizers starting with Herodotus' *Histories*: the Ἑλληνοδίκαι.<sup>35</sup>

A more pervasive cultural impact is the presence of music, which is also as an expected response to the biblical book that is most of all connected

<sup>32</sup> Cf. Philum. 36,1-3 (39,1-12): Ὁ δὲ Θεόδωρος ἐν τῷ ος' αὐτοῦ συγγράμματι περὶ φρύνου τῆς τε ιδέας καὶ τῆς φύσεως ἡμῖν ἐξηγούμενος οὕτως λέγει· ὁ φρύνος βατράχου εἶδος εἶναι μοι δοκεῖ, ὑδρόβιον δὲ τὸ ζῶον καὶ «ἐκ» τῆς λιμνοβίου φύσεως μεταβληκὸς ἐπὶ τὸ χερσόβιον. Φρύνος δὲ προσαγορεύεται ἐμφερῶς τῷ χερσὺδρῳ, δυσαλθὴ δὲ τὴν κάκωσιν παρέχει τοῖς ἐντυγχάνουσιν· ἔστι γὰρ τὸ ζῶον ἐπιμέγεθες, ὡς μηδὲν ἀποδεῖν βραχείας χελώνης, τραχύνεται τε τὰ νῶτα καὶ πολὺ ἐπὶ τῆ τοῦ πνεύματος ἐμπλήσει διοιδεῖ. Τολμηρότερον δὲ ἀμύνεται πρὸς τὸ ἀντικρυς καὶ τοῖς πηδήμασιν «τὸ μεταξὺ» συναίρει διάστημα, σπανίως δὲ δῆγμασιν χρῆται. Ἄσθμα «δὲ» πέφυκεν ἰώδες ἐμποιεῖν σφόδρα, ὡς κὰν μόνον προσθίγη τῷ ἄσθματι, βλάπτειν τοὺς πλησίον γινομένουσ.

<sup>33</sup> See Julius Africanus, *Kestoi* 33: Ἀφρικανοῦ· πρὸς τὸ μὴ ἀδικεῖσθαι κτήνη ὑπὸ φρύνου νύκτωρ ἢ ἐν ζοφερῷ τόπῳ ἐμφωλεύοντος προσφυσώμενα. Ὁ φρύνος προσφυσᾶν εἴωθεν τοῖς κτήνεσι χαλεπώτατα, ἢν που ἐν ἵπποστασίῳ νύκτωρ λάθη ἢ ἐν ζοφώδει τόπῳ, καὶ νόσοι παρακολουθοῦσιν ἐκ τούτου λοιμικαὶ τοῖς ζῴοις καὶ οἰδήματα δυσίατα, ὡς ἀργεῖν πᾶσαν ἐπικουρίαν πρὸς τὸ δεινόν. Χρῆ οὖν πρὸς τὸ μηδέποτε αὐτὸν τοιοῦτον δράσαι πῦρ ἐν τοῖς ἵπποστασίοις διαρκές ὑβάπτειν· τοῦτι γὰρ τὸ ζῶον ὡς ἔλεγχον αὐτοῦ φοβεῖται τὸ πῦρ.

<sup>34</sup> *H77Ps* IV,4 (f. 251v): Ἡ οὐχ ὀρᾶς τί ἱστορεῖται περὶ τῶν ἀγῶνων τούτων τῶν ὀνομαζομένων Μεγάλων Γυμνικῶν; Οἷς, πάρεσι πεμπόμενοι ὑπὸ τῶν Ἑλληνοδικῶν οἱ ἐπιτηροῦντες τὸν ἀθλητὴν πῶς ἐσθίει· καὶ ὥσπερ τοῖς γυμνασίοις παρατυγχάνουσι, καὶ ἐπιτηροῦσιν εἰ κατὰ νόμον γίνεται καὶ κατὰ λόγον τὰ γυμνάσια.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. *Hdt. Hist.* V,22: Πρὸς δὲ καὶ οἱ ἐν Ὀλυμπίῃ διέποντες ἀγῶνα Ἑλληνοδίκαι οὕτω ἔγνωσαν εἶναι. The most usual form of this term is Ἑλλανοδίκαι.

with the practice of singing and playing. In his *Letter to Gregory* Origen counts music among the *artes liberales* that for the Greeks were propaedeutic to the study of philosophy, whereas for him all these disciplines should be put at the service of biblical interpretation.<sup>36</sup> His Alexandrian predecessors Philo and Clement had already manifested the extent to which they were interested in music. They, in fact, worked out elaborate patterns addressing the music of the *kosmos*, also that of the Church as the corporate body of Christ or, with an additional allegory, that of the individual and his body. Origen in his turn would make use of these models, though proving again his autonomy with regard to such premises. If occasionally he seems to play down his own expertise in music, as in the *1<sup>st</sup> Homily on Psalm 80*,<sup>37</sup> he does so only to open the way for an allegorical interpretation of the passage on which he is commenting. Elsewhere he introduces the performance of both instrumental and vocal music in some details, as in the *2<sup>nd</sup> Homily on Psalm 67*. Here the preacher, as he interprets verse 5a-b (ἄσατε τῷ θεῷ, ψάλατε τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ, “Sing to God, make music to his name”), exhibits a lexical creativity: namely, he shapes a new word for the training of the voice – φωναλειπτική –, and illustrates its meaning by associating it with the better-known term φωνασκή, “for exercising the voice” (τέχνης φωνασκήs καὶ φωναλειπτικήs).<sup>38</sup>

<sup>36</sup> *EpGr* 1: Διὰ τοῦτ' ἂν ηὐξάμην παραλαβεῖν σε καὶ φιλοσοφίας Ἑλλήνων τὰ οἰοῖνεῖς χριστιανισμὸν δυνάμενα γενέσθαι ἐγκύκλια μαθήματα ἢ προπαιδεύματα, καὶ τὰ ἀπὸ γεωμετρίας καὶ ἀστρονομίας χρήσιμα ἐσόμενα εἰς τὴν τῶν ἱερῶν γραφῶν διήγησιν· ἴν', ὅπερ φασὶ φιλοσόφων παῖδες περὶ γεωμετρίας καὶ μουσικῆς, γραμματικῆς τε καὶ ἠητορικῆς καὶ ἀστρονομίας, ὡς συνερίθων φιλοσοφία, τοῦθ' ἡμεῖς εἴπωμεν καὶ περὶ αὐτῆς φιλοσοφίας πρὸς χριστιανισμὸν.

<sup>37</sup> *H80Ps* I,4 (ff. 334<sup>v</sup>-335<sup>r</sup>): Τί δὲ δυνάμεθα ἀνθρώποι μηδέποτε ἐκ παιδῶν μεμαθηκότες μήτε κιθαρίζειν μήτε ψάλλειν ἐν ψαλτηρίῳ, τούτῳ τῷ ὄργάνῳ ψάλλειν οὕτως, ὡς οἱ ἐκ παιδῶν ταῦτα μεμαθηκότες, ἵνα ἐτοιμάσωμεν ψαλτήριον τερπνὸν καὶ κιθάρας, ἐπεὶ τοῦτο λέγει κατ' αὐτοὺς ὁ λόγος· λάβετε ψαλμὸν (Ps. 80,3a).

<sup>38</sup> *H67Ps* II,2 (f. 99<sup>v</sup>): Ζητῶ οὖν εἰ τοῦτο προσέταξεν ὁ τῶν ὄλων θεὸς ἢ ὁ Χριστὸς ἢ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, ἵνα μηδὲν ἄλλο νοηταὶ κατὰ τὸ ἄσατε τῷ θεῷ ἢ ἐκκλις τῆς φωνῆς, ἦν ἡμῶν μᾶλλον δύνανται ποιεῖν οἱ μουσικοὶ καὶ ὅσοι μεμελετήκασιν ἀσκεῖν αὐτῶν τὴν φωνὴν καὶ μεγαλύνειν καὶ μεγεθύνειν διὰ τινος τέχνης φωνασκήs καὶ φωναλειπτικήs. Unless we should emendate the manuscript, there seems to be a further *hapax* in connection with the voice; it is the term ἀρθητή in *H67Ps* II,3 (ff. 101<sup>v</sup>-102<sup>r</sup>): Καὶ ἐπὶ μὲν γὰρ τῆς ἀρθητῆς φωνῆς βλέπω διαφορὰν τοῦ λέγειν μὴ ἄδοντα καὶ τοῦ ἄδειν μὴ περὶ λέγοντα.

As for the τέχνη itself, the art of playing, in the 4<sup>th</sup> Homily on Psalm 76 Origen acknowledges the seductive power of music, which distracts man from enjoying the beauty of the world created by God or, to use the eloquent image employed by the preacher, from appreciating the ‘manifold symposion’ prepared by Him for mankind.<sup>39</sup> Contrary to that, thanks to the relaxation provided by music, man is led to superstition. Indeed, God has endowed the creation with its own musical ‘art’ – the thunder (βροντή) –, which should awaken man from his spiritual sleep and arouse him to worship the Creator.<sup>40</sup> However, the Logos further exploited the resources of music, since he admitted the necessity for man to have some recreation, instead of keeping his mind in perpetual tension.<sup>41</sup> Consequently, according to the 2<sup>nd</sup> Homily on Psalm 67, he endowed the Scriptures with all the different genres that correspond spiritually to mundane music, including equivalents for erotic and wedding songs.<sup>42</sup>

A good player should know how to touch the strings of his ‘harp’ (ψαλτήριον) and our preacher lists their names even more meticulously

<sup>39</sup> H76Ps IV,1 (ff. 204<sup>v</sup>-205<sup>v</sup>): Πεποίηκε γὰρ οἰονεῖ αὐτόθεν καὶ αὐτόματα γευστὰ χωρὶς ἀνθρωπίνης τέχνης, ἵνα πάλιν ἢ αἰσθησις τούτοις προσβάλλουσα ζητήση τοῦδε μὲν τοῦ φυτοῦ τὴν αὐτόθεν γλυκύτητα, τοῦδε δὲ τὴν στρυφνότητα, τοῦδε δὲ τὴν τοιάνδε ποιότητα καὶ ζητήσασα ἢ φύσις ἢ ἀνθρωπίνη θαυμάση τὸν εἰς ποικίλον καὶ τοιοῦτον συμπόσιον εἰσαγαγόντα ἡμᾶς.

<sup>40</sup> H76Ps IV,1 (ff. 204<sup>v</sup>-205<sup>v</sup>): Βροντὴν εἰργάσατο, ἵνα διὰ τῆς βροντῆς κοιμωμένην ἐγείρῃ καὶ διῶπνισή τὴν ψυχὴν, ὥστε ζητησαὶ τίς ὁ τὰς βροντὰς ποιήσας καὶ ὁ τὰς τηλικαύτας ἐργαζόμενος ἐν τῷ παντὶ φωνάς. Ἡμεῖς δὲ οἱ τάλανες καταλιπόντες βλέπειν τὸν κόσμον καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῷ, μᾶλλον περὶ τὰς τέχνας τὰς ἀνθρωπίνας καταγιγόμεθα, ὅσα αἱ τέχναι πρὸς ἀπάτην ποιούσι, ταῦτα ἦριον βλέποντες τοῦ κόσμου.

<sup>41</sup> H67Ps II,2 (f. 100<sup>r</sup>): Ἵσμεν δὴ ὅτι πάντες ἀνθρώποι καὶ ἀνέσεως δεόμεθα καὶ οὐκ οἶόν τέ ἐστὶν αἰεὶ τετάσθαι τὸ ἡγεμονικὸν ἡμῶν οὐδ’ ἂν πάνυ σπουδαῖοι γενώμεθα.

<sup>42</sup> H67Ps II,2 (ff. 100<sup>r</sup>-v): Ἡμᾶς δὲ ἠθέλησεν ὁ λόγος περισπάσαι καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν τῶν πιστευόντων ἀπὸ τῶν ἐθνικῶν ᾠδῶν ἐπὶ τὰς κρείττονας κατὰ θεόν, ἵνα τῇ παραθέσει τῶν δοκούντων μὲν ὁμογενῶν κρειττόνων δὲ ἀποστήσῃ τὴν ψυχὴν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐπιθυμίας ἐκείνων. Καὶ φησὶν ὁ λόγος· ἄδειν θέλεις καὶ χρῆσθαι ὑποθέσει τοῦ ἄσματος ἐρωτικῆ· Μάθε ὅτι ἔστι τις ἀληθῶς καὶ θεῖος οὐράνιος ἔρως καθὸ γέγραπται τὸ ἄσμα τῶν ἁσμάτων. Ἀλλὰ ἄδειν θέλεις ἐπιθαλαμίους ᾠδάς· Μάθε τὸν θεῖον γάμον τοῦ κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον υἱοῦ τοῦ βασιλέως εἰς ὃν ἐκλήθης· νόησον τὸν νυμφίον, σύνες τὴν νύμφην, καὶ ἄσσον οὐκ ἄσμα ἀλλὰ ἐξαιρέτως, ὡς ἅγια τῶν ἁγίων ἔστι τινὰ, οὕτως ἄδε τὸ ἄσμα τῶν ἁσμάτων. Ἀλλὰ βούλει θρηγεῖν καὶ ἐθνικός ὢν εἶχες ᾠδὰς ἐπιτηδείους καὶ θρήνους· Μάνθανε ὅτι καὶ νῦν σοι ἔστι τις μακαρισμὸς κλαιόντων.

than did Philo and Clement of Alexandria.<sup>43</sup> David is an example of a good player or, rather, he is regarded as such inasmuch as he is the ‘type’ (τύπος) of Christ, the ‘new David’, who shaped the Church as his ‘instrument with many chords’.<sup>44</sup> Yet the supreme performer of music for our homilies is “the artist God” (ὁ τεχνίτης θεός); he makes men, especially the prophets, his instruments as we hear in the beautiful prologue to the 2<sup>nd</sup> *Homily on Psalm 80*.<sup>45</sup> God seeks for himself the most harmonious instruments among those who have prepared themselves to play “the celestial music” – seemingly a unique formulation for more common expressions, such as ‘the music of God’ or ‘divine music’. Origen does not elaborate on the notion of “celestial music,” apart from regarding man, and more specifically his body, as a “spiritual harp” (πνευματικὸν ψαλτήριον); Clement applies a similar concept both to the universe as macrocosm and to man as microcosm, through which the Logos sings his song to God.<sup>46</sup>

<sup>43</sup> *H67Ps* II,4 (f. 105r): Ὁ τεχνίτης ἐν τῷ ψάλλειν οὐ συγκεχυμένως κρούει τὰς χορδὰς, ἀλλ’ οἶδε τοὺς καιροὺς καὶ τοὺς τόπους, καὶ πότε μὲν κρούση τὴν ὑπάτην, τὴν παρῦπάτην, ὅτε δὲ τὴν νήτην, πότε κρούη τὴν ἀνωτέρω, καὶ πότε δὲ δῶ τὸν φθόγγον κατωτέρω. For similar passages in his predecessors, see Philo, *Leg.* III,121: Ὁ μουσικὸς λέγει τῷ πρώτῳ εἰσαγομένῳ δεικνὺς τὸ ἐναρμόνιον ὅτι χρῶμά ἐστιν, ἢ τὸ χρωματικὸν ὅτι διατονικόν, ἢ τὴν ὑπάτην ὅτι μέση; Clem. Al. *Str.* I,13,57,5: Ἦδη δὲ καὶ ἡ ὑπάτη ἐναντία τῇ νεάτῃ οὖσα, ἀλλ’ ἄμφω γε ἄρμονία μία.

<sup>44</sup> *H67Ps* II,3 (ff. 102v-103r): Δαυὶδ δὲ πολλαχοῦ τοῦ σωτήρος ἡμῶν τύπος ἐστί· κάκεινος μὲν ὄργανον ἑαυτῷ εὐτρεπίζει δεκάχορδον ἄῃ· ἐξ ὁπόσων δὴποτε χορδῶν ἔχον τὴν σύστασιν, ὁ δὲ μέγας μουσικὸς Δαυὶδ, ὁ “ικανὸς τῇ χειρὶ” – τοῦτο γὰρ φασιν ἐρμηνεύεσθαι τὸ ὄνομα, ἀπὸ τοῦ “Δαυὶδ” μεταλαμβάνομενον εἰς “ικανὸν χειρὶ” –, περὶ οὗ προφητεύουσιν οἱ προφῆται ἄρξαι τοῦ λαοῦ, ἦλθεν εἰς τὸν βίον καὶ ὄργανον ἑαυτῷ μέγα πολύχορδον κατεσκεύασεν ἐκκλησίαν.

<sup>45</sup> *H80Ps* II,1 (f. 345r): Καὶ ζητεῖ ὁ τεχνίτης θεὸς λύραν μουσικῶς ἤρμωσμένην, κιθάραν καλῶς ἤρμωσμένην, ψαλτήριον ὃν δεῖ τρόπον τὰς χορδὰς ἔχον τετονωμένας· καὶ συγκρίνας ὅπου εὐρίσκει τὰ τοιαῦτα ὁ θεός, δείκνυσι τὴν οὐράνιον μουσικὴν.

<sup>46</sup> Clem. Al. *Strom.* I,5,3-4: κόσμον δὲ τόνδε καὶ διὰ καὶ τὸν σμικρὸν κόσμον, τὸν ἄνθρωπον, ψυχὴν τε καὶ σῶμα αὐτοῦ, ἀγίῳ πνεύματι ἁρμωσάμενος, ψάλλει τῷ θεῷ διὰ τοῦ πολυφώνου ὄργάνου καὶ προσάδει τῷ ὄργάνῳ τῷ ἄνθρωπῳ. As for the ecclesiological implications, see also VI,11,18: εἴη δ’ ἂν τῷ ψαλμῷδῶ κιθάρα ἀλληγορούμενη κατὰ μὲν τὸ πρῶτον σημαίνομενον ὁ κύριος, κατὰ δὲ τὸ δευτέρον οἱ προσεχῶς κρούοντες τὰς ψυχὰς ὑπὸ μουσηγέτῃ τῷ κυρίῳ. Κἂν ὁ σφζόμενος λέγηται λαὸς κιθάρα, κατ’ ἐπίπνοιαν τοῦ λόγου καὶ κατ’ ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ θεοῦ δοξάζων μουσικῶς ἐξακούεται, κρούομενος εἰς πίστιν τῷ λόγῳ. λάβοις δ’ ἂν καὶ ἄλλως μουσικὴν συμφωνίαν τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν νόμου καὶ προφητῶν ὁμοῦ καὶ ἀποστόλων σὺν καὶ τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ

Finally, the perspective of music helps us to approach a contiguous aspect of the cultural heritage mirrored by the Munich homilies in the wake of Alexandrian Hellenism. Origen famously possessed a remarkable knowledge of astronomy, and the new homilies add further elements in support of that knowledge.<sup>47</sup> In the Munich codex astronomy is much more closely connected to cosmology than are the *Homilies on Genesis*. The vision of the cosmos emerges in the 2<sup>nd</sup> *Homily on Psalm 36*, in which we observe the doctrine of two heavens and two earths. The second and superior earth, called ἀντίχθων, that is ‘the opposite’ or ‘counter-earth’,<sup>48</sup> a Pythagoric notion for a superior sky as attested by Aristotle and Clement of Alexandria.<sup>49</sup> Origen relates this ‘counter-earth’ to Jesus’ promise to the meek of a new land in the Sermon of the Mount (Mt 5,5). According to a controversial passage of *Peri archôn*, preserved in a letter of Jerome, he also refers to it by another astronomical notion, by using a term not otherwise attested in Greek: ἀντιζώνη, meaning again the land of the blessed located above the sphere of the fixed stars.<sup>50</sup> Moreover Origen proposes the same cosmological view in the 5<sup>th</sup> *Homily on Psalm 36*, preserved only in Latin. In his commentary on verse 11a (οἱ δὲ πραεῖς κληρονομήσουσι γῆν, “But the meek shall inherit the earth”) Origen goes back once more to his concept of a double ‘earth’: on the one hand, the inhabited world, which is called ‘dry’ (ξηρά); on the other hand, the land under the upper sky, which is above our firmament and thus is called its ‘back’ (*dorsum*).<sup>51</sup> It is a formu-

---

τήν τε ὑποβεβηκυῖαν, τὴν καθ’ ἕκαστον προφήτην κατὰ τὰς μεταπηδήσεις τῶν προσώπων συνφθίαν.

<sup>47</sup> See especially Scott 1991 and Pazzini 2009, 70-89; Dorival 2001; Fürst 2014a, 499.

<sup>48</sup> H36Ps II,4 (ff. 46<sup>v</sup>-47<sup>r</sup>): ἔστιν τις ἄλλη γῆ, ἣ λέγεται παρὰ τισιν ἀντίχθων. Εκείνη ἔστιν ἡ κατὰ τὰς γραφὰς ἀγαθή, ῥέουσα γάλα καὶ μέλι, ἦν ὁ σωτὴρ ἐπαγγέλλεται τοῖς πραεῖσι λέγων μακάριοι οἱ πραεῖς, ὅτι αὐτοὶ κληρονομήσουσι τὴν γῆν (Mt 5,5).

<sup>49</sup> See respectively Arist. *Cael.* 293a and Clement, *Strom.* V,14,139.

<sup>50</sup> Cf. *Prin* II,3,7 and Jerome, *Ep.* 124,5: *Aut certe sphaera illa, quam supra appellauimus ἀπλανῆ, et quidquid illius circulo continetur, dissoluetur in nihilum, illa uero qua ἀντιζώνη ipsa tenetur et cingitur, uocabitur ‘terra bona’, nec non et altera sphaera, quae hanc ipsam terram circumambit uertigine et dicitur caelum, in sanctorum habitaculum seruabitur.*

<sup>51</sup> H36PsL V,4: *Unde ego arbitror quia sicut caeli istius, id est firmamenti, inferius solum arida haec in qua nos habitamus, terra eius dicitur: ita et illius superioris qui principaliter caelum dicitur, inferius solum in quo habitatores illi caelestes conuersantur et, ut ita dicam, dorsum ipsum firmamenti huius, merito, ut dici, terra illius caeli esse dicitur.* On this distinction see also H36Ps II,4 (f. 205<sup>v</sup>): Οἶδε γὰρ ὁ θεὸς διαφορὰν στερεώματος καὶ οὐρανοῦ ἢ οὐρανῶν, καὶ διαφορὰν ξερᾶς καὶ γῆς. Ἐπὶ τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν οὖν σπεύδομεν ἀληθινοῦ οὐρανοῦ,

lation that clearly betrays the influence of Plato's *Phaedrus* with its theme of the flight of the soul through the heavens to reach the celestial vault and get behind it.<sup>52</sup> Yet Origen joins the notion of Plato with the image of the cosmos traced by the Alexandrian astronomer Claudius Ptolemy, who envisaged the whole universe as comprising eight heavenly spheres, but hypothesized an additional one actually coinciding with Origen's ἀντίκλων or ἀντιζώνη.<sup>53</sup>

The cosmological interests of the preacher come to the fore especially in the *Homilies on Psalm 76*. In the third sermon of this group Origen, asking about the 'waters' that 'see God' in verse 17b (εἶδοσάν σε ὕδατα καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν, "The waters saw you, and they were afraid"), surprises us with the extemporary hypothesis that all things might be endowed with a soul (πάντα ἐψύχωνται).<sup>54</sup> This thesis never occurs so explicitly in his other writings, although Origen introduces some hints of it when he exposes the different kinds of movement.<sup>55</sup> Yet here he just evokes the idea, whereas he prefers to refer the passage to the δυνάμεις, the angelic powers invested by God with the care of all the world's elements.<sup>56</sup> Nonetheless, the

---

οὐκ ἐπίκλιν ὄν οὐρανοῦ, τὸ δὲ ἀληθὲς στερέωματος· οὐδὲ ἐπίκλιν γῆς, τὸ δὲ ἀληθὲς οὐσῆς ξεροῦς.

<sup>52</sup> Plato's influence on Origen's cosmology is analyzed by Köckert (2008). In particular, she points to Pl. *Phdr.* 247a-c.

<sup>53</sup> Cf. *Prin* I,7,3 and Köckert 2008, 74: "(Origenes) macht außerdem darauf aufmerksam, daß oberhalb der sogenannten Fixsternsphäre eine weitere Sphäre angenommen wird. Ptolemaeus hatte sie eingeführt, um die Präzession des Frühjahrs- und Herbstpunktes zu erklären. Während diese neunte, äußere Himmelsphäre für ihn wohl mehr den Charakter einer Hypothese zur Erklärung der Bewegung der Fixsternsphäre hatte, wurde sie schon bald – wie hier bei Origenes – als reale Himmelsphäre aufgefaßt."

<sup>54</sup> *H76Ps* III,2 (ff. 195<sup>v</sup>-196<sup>r</sup>): Ἐπέρχεται δὴ μοι λέγειν, ὅτι πάντα ἐψύχωνται καὶ οὐδὲν ἔστιν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ κενὸν ψυχῆς· πάντα δὲ ἐψύχωνται σώμασι διαφοροῖς.

<sup>55</sup> According to Scott 1991, 126: "Origen realizes that rationality can be present in different ways... soul in a lesser sense such as the growth of plants, or the movement of elements (as in fire's upward motion, earthquakes, winds and water currents)." With regard to his doctrine of movement, see especially *Prin* III,1,1 and *Orat.* VI,1.

<sup>56</sup> *H76Ps* III,2 (ff. 196<sup>v</sup>): Ζητώ οὖν, εἰ δυνάμεις τις ἐνδέδεται τὸ σῶμα τὸ <τῆς> θαλάσσης καὶ ἄλλη δύναμις ἐνδέδεται σῶμα ποταμοῦ τοῦ Ἰορδάνου καὶ ἄλλου ποταμοῦ, φέρε' εἰπεῖν τοῦ Γηῶν, ἄλλη δύναμις, καὶ οὕτως ἐπὶ πάντων. Cf. Scott 1991, 128: "Along with positing a lower soul to explain elemental movements, Origen accounts for them by suggesting that they are governed by spiritual powers." For parallel passages see *Hlos* XXIII, 3; CC VIII,31.



recourse to a more traditional explanation does not prevent the preacher from again surprising his audience. Namely, he admits the partial truth of the Greeks when they speak of the Nymphs, though they are mistaken in regarding them as deities.<sup>57</sup>

In the 4<sup>th</sup> *Homily on Psalm 76* the interpretation of verse 19a (φωνή τῆς βροντῆς σου ἐν τῷ τροχῷ, "The sound of your thunder in the wheel") leads Origen to reflect on the movement of the universe in the wake of ancient philosophy and astronomy. To explain the image of the "thunder in the wheel" (Ps. 76, 19a), he takes as an additional proof-text the vision of Ezekiel, since Ez 1,16 speaks of "a wheel in a wheel" (ὡς ἂν τροχός ἐν τροχῷ). Having especially this passage in mind, Origen states that the motion of the universe is circular; more precisely, it is a double motion: from east to west and from west to east. The universe, understood as the sphere comprising the whole cosmos (ἀπλανῆς), moves westward, whereas each one of the so-called seven 'planets' (including the sun and the moon) moves in the opposite direction.<sup>58</sup>

The image of the universe traced by Origen with its eight spheres (the ἀντίχθων not being included this time) – that is the seven spheres of the planets plus the sphere of the fixed stars encircling them – corresponds to the system of Claudius Ptolemy mentioned earlier. On the other hand, the idea of the double movement may go back to Plato's *Timaeus*, echoed among many others also by the Middle-Platonist Celsus in his *True Doctrine*.<sup>59</sup> At all events, it is a view that Origen exposes in various passages of

---

<sup>57</sup> H76Ps III,2 (f. 196<sup>v</sup>): Καὶ τάχα τοιαῦτα φαντασθέντες καὶ οἱ παρ' Ἑλλήσι περιεργότεροι θύουσι τοῖς ποταμοῖς ὡς θεοῖς, οὐ πάντη ἀποπεπτωκότες τῆς ἀληθείας, ἀποπεπτωκότες δὲ ἐκ μέρους. Εἰ μὲν γὰρ ὡς θεοῖς θύουσιν, ἁμαρτάνουσιν· εἰ δὲ φαντάζονται εἶναι τινα δυνάμιν περὶ ἐκεῖνα, οὐχ ἁμαρτάνουσιν. Εἰσὶν γὰρ δυνάμεις, ἃς καλοῦσι νύμφας.

<sup>58</sup> H76Ps IV,2 (f. 207<sup>v</sup>): Ἡ οὖν φορὰ τοῦ παντός κυκλοειδῶς φέρεται, ὡς δῆλον τοῖς τηροῦσι τὰ φαινόμενα. Ἔστι δὲ ἐν τῷ παντὶ διττὴ γενικὴ κίνησις· ἡ μὲν τις ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν ἐπὶ δυσμᾶς, ἡ δὲ ἀπὸ δυσμῶν ἐπὶ ἀνατολᾶς. Καὶ ἔστιν ἡ μὲν ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν ἐπὶ δυσμᾶς ἡ τοῦ παντός, ἡ δὲ ἀπὸ δυσμῶν ἐπὶ ἀνατολᾶς ἐνός ἐκάστου τῶν λεγομένων ἑπτὰ πλανητῶν ἐν οἷς εἰσὶν ἥλιος καὶ σελήνη. Καὶ κατὰ τοῦτο ἂν λέγοιτο ἐν τῷ Ἰεζεκιήλ "τροχός εἶναι ἐν τῷ τροχῷ (Ez 1,16)," τῷ περιέχοντι κατὰ τὴν νοουμένην σφαιρᾶν ἕσωθεν, ἡ τροχός ὁ δεύτερος κατὰ τὴν κίνησιν τῶν πλανωμένων λεγομένων οὕτως παρ' Ἑλλήσι σφαιρῶν.

<sup>59</sup> Cf. Pl. *Ti.* 36c; 38c; 39b; 47b.

the *Contra Celsum*, a work that probably preceded our homilies.<sup>60</sup> What is new is the subsequent meteorological explanation of the ‘thunder’ presented by our sermon. In fact, Origen does not content himself with repeating the idea expressed in the 8<sup>th</sup> *Homily on Jeremiah*, according to which the thunder derives from the clouds clashing against one another.<sup>61</sup> In addition, he relates the meteorological phenomenon of thunder to the position of the sun in the Zodiac: when this determines a reaction of συμπάθεια with a star, it gives way to thunder.<sup>62</sup>

This passage, which deserves a more thorough investigation, also evokes a complex of astronomic and atmospheric phenomena that figure several times in the Munich codex. For instance, the 1<sup>st</sup> *Homily on Psalm 80* introduces a precise definition of νεομηνία, “new moon,” with regard to

---

<sup>60</sup> See CC I,23: ὡς οὐδ’ ὑπὸ πολλῶν ψυχῶν συνέχεσθαι ὅλον τὸν οὐρανὸν κινουσῶν· ἀρκεῖ γὰρ μία ἢ φέρουσα ὅλην τὴν ἀπλανή ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν ἐπὶ δυσμᾶς καὶ ἐμπεριλαβοῦσα ἔνδον πάντα, ὧν χρεῖαν ἔχει ὁ κόσμος, τὰ μὴ αὐτοτελεῖ. I,58 evokes the ‘spheres’ under the ἀπλανής: Τὸν ὀφθέντα “ἀστέρα ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ” καινὸν εἶναι νομιζόμεν καὶ μηδενὶ τῶν συνήθων παραπλήσιον, οὔτε τῶν ἐν τῇ ἀπλανεῖ οὔτε τῶν ἐν ταῖς κατωτέρω σφαίραις. For further allusions to the double movement see also CGh = *Phil* 23,6: Νοητέον τοὺς ἀστέρας οὕτω τετάχθαι κινεῖσθαι, ἐναντιοφορούντων τῶν καλουμένων πλανωμένων τοῖς ἀπλανέσιν; and CC VIII,52: Τὸν κόσμον καὶ τὴν ἐν αὐτῷ τεταγμένην οὐρανὸν καὶ τῶν ἐν τῇ ἀπλανεῖ κινήσιν τῶν τε φερομένων ἐναντίως τῇ τοῦ κόσμου κινήσει λεγομένων πλανήτων τάξιν.

<sup>61</sup> *H76Ps* IV,2 (f. 206<sup>v</sup>): ἐπάλληλος γὰρ ἡχός τις γίνεται τῇ φορᾷ τῶν νεφελῶν συγκρουουσῶν πρὸς ἀλλήλας. Cf. *Hler* VIII,4: Λέγουσιν οἱ περὶ ταῦτα δεινοὶ, ὅτι ἡ γένεσις τῶν ἀστραπῶν ἀπὸ τῶν νεφελῶν γίνεται ἀλλήλαις προστριβομένων· ὅπερ γὰρ συμβαίνει περὶ τοὺς πυροβόλους λίθους ἐπὶ γῆς, ἵνα δύο λίθων προσκρουσάντων πῦρ γενηθῇ, τοῦτο γίνεσθαι καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν φασιν. Προσκρουομένων τῶν νεφελῶν κατὰ τοὺς χειμῶνας γίνεται ἡ ἀστραπή, διὸ ὡς ἐπίπαιν ἡ ἀστραπή ἄμα βροντῇ γίνεται, τῆς μὲν βροντῆς ἐμφαινούσης τὸν ἦχον τοῦ συγκρουομένου τῶν νεφελῶν, τῆς δὲ ἀστραπῆς γεννώσης τὸ φῶς. See also Jerome’s translation of the 5<sup>th</sup> *Homily on Jeremiah* (PL 25, 629 B-C) and his *Tr. in Ps.* 96. For B. Neuschäfer (1987, 189) Origen depends upon a Stoic (doxographic?) source. For the views of Stoicism both ancient and new see Speyer 1978, 1140.

<sup>62</sup> *H76Ps* IV,2 (f. 207<sup>v</sup>-208<sup>r</sup>): κατὰ γὰρ τὴν περιφορὰν τοῦ παντός καὶ τὴν κινήσιν τοῦ κόσμου, ὅταν ὁ ἥλιος ἔλθῃ ἐν τοῖσδε τοῖς δωδεκατημορίοις καὶ συμπάθειαν σχῆι πρὸς τινὰ τῶν ἀστέρων καὶ τοὺς οὐρανοὺς, ποιεῖ τὴν βροντὴν αἰεὶ τῇ γῇ. On Origen’s use of δωδεκατημορίον, also in the context of astrology, see Dorival 2011, 299-300. According to Speyer (1978, 1140), “je mehr Macht die Astrologie über die Geister erhielt, desto mehr Einfluß wurde den Planeten eingeräumt. Zeus wurde mit Helios gleichgesetzt und so die Sonne als Ursache der Blitze angenommen (Joh. Lyd. *ost.* 46).”

verse 4 (Σαλπίασατε ἐν νεομηνία σάλπιγγι. Ἐν εὐσήμεν ἡμέρα ἐορτῆς ἡμῶν, “Blow the trumpet at the new moon, on the high day of our feast”).<sup>63</sup> Origen knew also a different translation of Ps. 80, 4b, attested by the other ‘editions’ (ἐκδόσεις) of the Greek Bible: ἐν πανσελήνῳ, “at the full moon.”<sup>64</sup> In addition, one of them had also another rendering: ἐν ἡμιμηνίῳ, presumably for indicating “the day in the middle of the month,” apparently a *harax legomenon*.<sup>65</sup> In both cases – either the new moon or the full moon – the preacher observes the ‘conjunction’ between the moon and the sun, though with different visual effects for the inhabitants of the earth.<sup>66</sup>

#### THE LEGACY OF THE ‘ULTIMATE’ ORIGEN: SCRIPTURE AND COSMOS

The two perspectives that I have tried to outline in the new *Homilies on the Psalms* contribute to a better definition of the legacy of the ‘ultimate’ Origen. On the one hand, they confirm his well-known image as interpreter of the Bible in the wake of the Philonian (and Clementine) tradition; on the other hand, they closely connect the spiritual interpretation pursued by the Alexandrian with a remarkable interest in the created world, supported even more intensively by the heritage of the Hellenic disciplines. In this sense we discern a novel juncture between Scripture and cosmos that is probably dictated by the preacher’s concerns regarding the Gnostic or Marcionite criticisms of the Old Testament.<sup>67</sup> Even if the 2<sup>nd</sup> *Homily on Psalm 77* retrospectively celebrates the triumph of orthodoxy over heresy in the course of his own life, Origen still has to face the challenge of Gnos-

---

<sup>63</sup> *H80Ps* I,6 (f. 338<sup>v</sup>): Τῇ νεομηνία σύνοδος γίνεται σελήνης καὶ ἡλίου καὶ κατὰ τὴν αὐτὴν κάθετον ἡ σελήνη γίνεται καὶ ὁ ἥλιος. For similar notions, see *CMtS* 134, about the presumed ‘eclipse’ of the sun in the narrative of Jesus’ passion: Τότε γὰρ γίνονται ἐκλείψεις ὅτε πλησιάσωσιν ἀλλήλοισι οἱ δύο οὔτοι φωστῆρες. Γίνεται γὰρ ἐκλείψις ἡλίου, συνόδῳ ὑποδραμούσης αὐτὸν σελήνης, οὐ πανσελήνῳ ὅτε διάμετρος ἐστὶ τῆ σελήνη. Cf. the comment by Neuschäfer (Neuschäfer 1987, 182-83).

<sup>64</sup> Cf. A. Σ. ἠχίσσατε ἐν πάσῃ νεομηνία κερατίνῃ, ἐν πανσελήνῳ ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐορτῆς ὑμῶν (Field, 230).

<sup>65</sup> *H80Ps* I,6 (f. 339<sup>v</sup>): ἐποίησε δὲ τις καὶ ἐν ἡμιμηνίῳ.

<sup>66</sup> *H80Ps* I,6 (ff. 339<sup>v-v</sup>): Καθ’ ἑκατέρας τε σύνοδος γίνεται τῆς σελήνης πρὸς τὸν ἥλιον, καὶ ὅτε λαμπρὰ ἡ σελήνη φαίνεται πεφωτισμένη ὅλη ἀπὸ τοῦ ἡλίου, καὶ τοῖς ἐπὶ γῆς πεφώτισται μὲν γὰρ καὶ ἐν συνόδῳ, ἀλλ’ οὐχ’ ὥστε γνωστὸν εἶναι τὸν φωτισμὸν αὐτῆς – ἐν δὲ τῇ πανσελήνῳ καὶ πεφώτισται καὶ γνωστός ἐστὶν ὁ φωτισμὸς αὐτῆς.

<sup>67</sup> On the heresiological aspects see the article of Le Boulluc 2014, 256-74.

ticism and Marcionism.<sup>68</sup> By opposing especially the second of these heretical doctrines he was apparently led to rethink once again the problems of cosmology that he discussed earlier in the *Commentary on Genesis* and more recently in the *Contra Celsum*. Though the Scriptures remain for Origen the main way to salvation,<sup>69</sup> by contemplating the world and its beauty man is assured another access to the unique God of creation and redemption. As a consequence, despite being still questioned for his allegorism by members of his audience, he now avows that in the event of an apparently untenable passage in the Scriptures he no longer escapes immediately into allegory, as he was wont to do before.<sup>70</sup> In a word, the ‘ultimate’ Origen is perhaps more balanced, though remaining creatively faithful to himself.

*University of Bologna, Italy*

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

Dorival, Gilles. 2011. “Origène, la création du monde et les savoirs antiques.” In *Prolongements et renouvellements de la tradition classique, Un hommage à Didier Pralon, études réunies par Anne Balansard, Gilles Dorival et Mireille Loubet*, 295-307. Aix-en-Provence.

Fürst, Alfons. 2014a. “Origenes.” In *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* XXVI: 460-567.

— 2014b. “Bibel und Kosmos in der Psalmenauslegung des Origenes.” *Adamantius* 20: 130-46.

---

<sup>68</sup> *H77Ps* II,4 (f. 233r): ἐν γὰρ τῇ πρώτῃ ἡμῶν ἡλικίᾳ πάνυ ἤνθουν αἱ αἰρέσεις καὶ ἐδόκουν πολλοὶ εἶναι οἱ ἐν αὐταῖς συναγόμενοι. Ὅσοι γὰρ ἦσαν λίχνοι περὶ τὰ μαθήματα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, μὴ εὐποροῦντες ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ διδασκάλων ἱκανῶν, διὰ λιμὸν μιμούμενοι τοὺς ἐν λιμῷ ἐσθίοντας κρέα ἀνθρώπινα, ἀφιστάμενοι τοῦ ὑγιοῦς λόγου, προσεῖχον λόγοις ὅποιοιδήποτε, καὶ ἦν συγκροτούμενα αὐτῶν τὰ διδασκαλεῖα. Ὅτε δὲ ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπέλαμψε διδασκαλίαν πλείονα, ὁσημέραι αἱ αἰρέσεις κατελύοντο καὶ τὰ δοκοῦντα αὐτῶν ἀπόρητα παραδειγματίζεται καὶ δεῖκνυται βλασφημίαι ὄντα καὶ λόγοι ἀσεβεῖς καὶ ἄθεοι.

<sup>69</sup> *H67Ps* II,4 (f. 106v): ὁδὸς γὰρ ἡ γραφὴ πᾶσα ἢ φέρουσα ἐπὶ τὴν σωτηρίαν.

<sup>70</sup> *H76Ps* III,2 (f. 198r): Αναγινώσκων οὖν ἐζήτουν τί βούλεται ταῦτα καὶ εὐχερῶς μὲν κατέφευγον ἐπὶ τὴν τροπολογίαν βλέπων τὴν ἀπέμφασιν τῆς λέξεως, ὕστερον δὲ ποτε ἐσκόπουν κατ’ ἑμαυτὸν μήποτε ὁμωνύμως τοῖς οικονομουμένοις αἱ οἰκονομοῦσαι δυνάμεις ὀνομάζονται.

Harl, Marguerite, ed. 1972. *La chaîne palestinienne sur le Psaume 118*. Paris: Editions du Cerf.

Köckert, Charlotte. 2008. "Räumliche Vorstellungen im Weltbild des Origenes und ihr Verhältnis zum zeitgenössischen astronomischen Weltbild." In *Die Welt als Bild*, edited by Christoph Marksches and Johannes Zachhuber, 69-79. Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Le Boulluec, Alain. 2014. "La polémique contre les hérésies dans les Homélie sur les Psaumes d'Origène." *Adamantius* 20: 256-74.

Martens, Peter W. 2011. *Origen and Scripture. The Contours of the Exegetical Life*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

McGuckin, John A. 2011. "Origen's Use of the Psalms in the Treatise *On First Principles*." In *Meditations of the Heart: The Psalms in Early Christian Thought and Practice, Essays in Honour of Andrew Louth*, edited by Andreas Andreopoulos, Augustine Casiday and Carol Harrison, 97-118. Turnhout: Brepols Publishers.

Molin Pradel, Marina. 2012. "Novità origeniane dalla Staatsbibliothek di Monaco di Baviera: il Cod. Graec. 314." *Adamantius* 18: 16-40.

Neuschäfer, Bernhard. 1987. *Origenes als Philologe*. Basel: Friedrich Reinhardt Verlag.

*Origenes Werke, Dreizehnter Band: Die neuen Psalmenhomilien*. 2015. Eine kritische Edition des *Codex Monacensis Graecus 314*, hrsg. v. Lorenzo Perrone in Zusammenarbeit mit Marina Molin Pradel, Emanuela Prinzivalli und Antonio Cacciari. Berlin, München, Boston: De Gruyter.

Pazzini, Domenico. 2009. *Lingua e teologia in Origene: Il Commento a Giovanni*. Brescia: Paideia Editrice.

Perrone, Lorenzo. 2011. "Origenes pro domo sua: Self-Quotations and the (Re-) Construction of a Literary oeuvre." In *Origeniana Decima. Origen as Writer*. Papers of the 10<sup>th</sup> International Origen Congress, edited by Sylwia Kaczmarek and Henryk Pietras, 3-38. Leuven-Paris-Walpole (MA): Peeters.

———. 2013. "Rediscovering Origen Today: First Impressions of the New Collection of Homilies on the Psalms in the Codex Monacensis Graecus 314." *Studia Patristica* LVI(4): 103-122.

———. 2014a. "Aspetti dottrinali delle nuove omelie di Origene sui salmi: le tematiche cristologiche a confronto col *Peri archon*." *Teologia y Vida* 55: 209-43.

———. 2014b. "Abstieg und Aufstieg Christi nach Origenes: Zur Auslegung von Psalm 15 in den Homilien von Codex Monacensis Graecus 314." *Theologie und Philosophie* 89: 321-40.

— Forthcoming. “Et l’homme tout entier devient dieu: la déification selon Origène à la lumière des nouvelles homélies sur les Psaumes.” In *Exégèse, révélation et formation des dogmes dans l’Antiquité tardive*, edited by Alain Le Boulluec and Philippe Hoffmann.

Pietersma, Albert, trans. 2000. *A New English Translation of the Septuagint: The Psalms*. New York-Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Prinzivalli, Emanuela, ed. 1991. Origene, *Omèlie sui Salmi, Homiliae in Psalmos XXXVI – XXXVII – XXXVIII*. Firenze.

Runia, David. 1993. *Philo in Early Christian Literature. A Survey*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Scott, Alan. 1991. *Origen and the Life of the Stars. A History of an Idea*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Speyer, Wolfgang. 1978. “Gewitter.” *RAC X*: 1107-72.

Termini, Cristina. 2000. *Le potenze di Dio. Studio su δύναμις in Filone di Alessandria*. Roma: Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum.

Van den Hoek, Annewies. 1992. “Origen and the Intellectual Heritage of Alexandria: Continuity or Disjunction?” In *Origeniana Quinta*, edited by Robert J. Daly, 40-50. Leuven: Uitgeverij Peeters and Leuven University Press.

— 2000. “Philo and Origen: A Descriptive Catalogue of Their Relationship.” *The Studia Philonica Annual 12*: 44-121.

— 2003. “Assessing Philo’s Influence in Christian Alexandria: The Case of Origen.” In *Shem in the Tents of Japhet: Essays on the Encounter of Judaism and Hellenism*, edited by James Kugel, 223-39. Leiden: Brill.