

THE COPTIC GNOSTIC LIBRARY

EDITED WITH ENGLISH TRANSLATION, INTRODUCTION AND NOTES

published under the auspices of

THE INSTITUTE FOR ANTIQUITY AND CHRISTIANITY

NAG HAMMADI CODICES

IX AND X

CONTRIBUTORS

BIRGER A. PEARSON - SØREN GIVERSEN

VOLUME EDITOR

BIRGER A. PEARSON



LEIDEN

E. J. BRILL

1981

NAG HAMMADI STUDIES

EDITED BY

MARTIN KRAUSE - JAMES M. ROBINSON
FREDERIK WISSE

IN CONJUNCTION WITH

ALEXANDER BÖHLIG - JEAN DORESSE - SØREN GIVERSEN
HANS JONAS - RODOLPHE KASSER - PAHOR LABIB
GEORGE W. MACRAE - JACQUES-É. MÉNARD
TORGNY SÄVE-SÖDERBERGH
WILLEM CORNELIS VAN UNNIK † - R. McL. WILSON
JAN ZANDEE

XV

GENERAL EDITOR OF THE COPTIC GNOSTIC LIBRARY
JAMES M. ROBINSON



LEIDEN
E. J. BRILL
1981

ASTROLOGICAL SIGNS

Aries	♈	Libra	♎
Taurus	♉	Scorpio	♏
Gemini	♊	Sagittarius	♐
Cancer	♋	Capricorn	♑
Leo	♌	Aquarius	♒
Virgo	♍	Pisces	♓

INTRODUCTION TO CODEX IX

Bibliography: *Facsimile Edition*, pp. vii-xv, pl. 1-78. Doresse, *Secret Books*, pp. 141-143; Puech, "Découverte," p. 10; Krause, "Der koptische Handschriftenfund," pp. 121-124, 128, 130-132; Krause, "Zum koptischen Handschriftenfund," pp. 109-113; Robinson, "Coptic Gnostic Library Today," p. 400; Krause and Labib, *Gnostische und hermetische Schriften*, pp. 7-8, pl. 4, 12; Robinson, "Construction," pp. 172-174, 176-189; Robinson, "Codicology," pp. 17-18, 26, 28-29; Robinson, "Future," pp. 26-27, 43, 48-49, 53, 58-59.

Codex IX is part of a collection of twelve papyrus codices, plus one tractate from a thirteenth, discovered in December of 1945 in a jar buried at the base of the Gebel et-Ṭarif near the village of Hamra Dom in Upper Egypt, about 10 km. northeast of Nag' Hammadi. (On the discovery of the Nag Hammadi Codices see J. M. Robinson's Introduction to *The Nag Hammadi Library*, pp. 21-23.) It is now the property of the Coptic Museum in Old Cairo, and bears the inventory number 10553. It has been numbered VIII by J. Doresse and T. Mina in 1949 ("Nouveaux textes gnostiques," p. 136), X by H.-C. Puech in 1950 ("Les nouveaux écrits gnostiques," p. 108), IV by S. Giversen in 1958 (in an unpublished microfilm dated January 9 of that year) and by B. van Regemorter in 1960 ("La reliure des manuscrits gnostiques"), V by J. Doresse in 1958 (*Les livres secrets*, p. 165), and IX by M. Krause in 1962 ("Der koptische Handschriftenfund," p. 128 *et passim*). Krause's numbering of the Nag Hammadi codices is the official numbering used by the Coptic Museum and in the *Facsimile Edition*, and is therefore adopted in this edition.

I. Codicology

Codex IX was found with its leather cover intact. Photographs of the cover are presented in the *Facsimile Edition*, plates 1-4 (and in Krause and Labib, *Gnostische und hermetische Schriften*, pl. 4). In one of these photographs (pl. 3) the codex is shown open at pp. 30-31, before it was cut out of the cover. A full description of the cover, which was made of sheepskin and goatskin, is provided by J. M. Robinson in his preface to the *Facsimile Edition* (pp. ix-xi). Robinson has shown, in a thorough analysis of all of the extant

leather covers of the Nag Hammadi Library, that Codex IX belongs typologically in a group together with Codices VI and X, and II, to a lesser extent (see "Construction," pp. 184-190). The extant fragments remaining from the cartonnage of the cover are published in *The Facsimile Edition: Cartonnage*.

The codex is very poorly preserved. Significant portions of it are missing altogether or preserved only in fragments. Study of the extant material has ascertained that the codex consisted of a single quire, as is the case with the other codices in the library with the exception of Codex I (but not XIII, as was erroneously stated by Krause, "Der koptische Handschriftenfund," p. 123, n. 1). The inside portion of the codex, from pp. 27-48, is comparatively well preserved. It is therefore easily established that the center of the codex is at pp. 38-39. (When first subjected to critical examination the leather cover still had the inside portion of these pages, in one piece, attached by the original leather thongs. The pages had been individually cut away from the binding prior to their initial conservation in plexiglass. The inside fragment was restored to its original sheet in the final conservation of Codex IX in 1974; see the *Facsimile Edition*, pl. 41. On the final conservation see Emmel, "Final Report," pp. 17-22.) The recto (right hand) pages from the first half of the codex show vertical fibers, the verso (left hand) pages horizontal. In the second half of the codex recto pages show horizontal fibers, the verso pages vertical. The shift in fiber-direction occurs at p. 39. From this it can be deduced that Codex IX was constructed of 19 double sheets (= 38 leaves = 76 pages), placed in a stack with horizontal fibers facing up, and folded to make a single-quire book. Pp. 38 and 39 represent the top sheet of the stack, and 2 and 75 the bottom sheet. It has been ascertained that single-leaf half-sheets were not used in the manufacture of this codex (for the use of half-sheets with stubs in some codices see Robinson, "Codicology" pp. 23-25).

Unlike most of the codices in the library (I, II, III, IV, V, VI, VII, X, XI), there is no evidence of the codex having had front and/or back flyleaves, or any unscribed pages except possibly p. 76 (see below).

The leaves measured up to 26.3 cm. in height (cf. p. 5/6) and from ca. 13.9 cm. in the middle of the codex to 15.2 at the outer pages, the codex having been trimmed in antiquity at the time it was bound. Unfortunately the intact pages were trimmed off at the

top and/or the bottom, presumably at the time they were put into plexiglass in 1961. (In the Giversen microfilm of 1958 the pages are shown prior to trimming; in the *Facsimile Edition* pp. 27-30 are shown before trimming, in photographs taken by J. Doresse). The closed book had a proportion of approximately 5 to 3, height to width.

The number of lines per page varies from 26 (p. 15) to 33 (p. 69). The average is 29. The lines average approximately 18-19 letters in length. There are as few as 13 (27,27; 41,1; 57,5; 58,2?) and as many as 25 (68,10) or 26 (73,5). The lines average somewhat shorter toward the middle part of the codex; this is due to the fact that the individual pages are wider at the outside of the codex than in the middle.

As has already been stated, the codex is only partially preserved. Aside from pp. 27-48, the bulk of what remains consists of fragments of various sizes, badly damaged. (Attempts were made subsequent to the discovery of the library to keep some of the material together by means of liberal applications of transparent tape! Most of this has been removed as part of the final conservation; see Emmel, "Final Report," pp. 17-19.) By the time that Codex IX was subjected to critical scrutiny, the fragments were not in proper order. No substantial attempt to place fragments in their proper position and sequence was made either at the time of the microfilming in 1958 (by S. Giversen, in behalf of the Institute of Egyptology in Copenhagen and the Coptic Museum; Giversen stated in Micro [frame #] 303, "The Papyri in this Codex IV are microfilmed in that order they were found") or at the time that the codex was conserved in plexiglass in 1961 (by Victor Girgis, according to Krause, in Krause and Labib, *Gnostische und hermetische Schriften*, p. 7, n. 36). The work that has been done on this subsequently has been based, at first, on study of photographs, and finally on study of the MS. itself in the Coptic Museum in Old Cairo.

Since so much of the codex is lost and damaged, it is obvious that fragments cannot be placed as in a jig-saw puzzle. Certain criteria have been developed for placement of fragments and for establishing the sequence of pages. These include physical joins, continuity of fiber patterns from one fragment to another, continuity in destruction patterns from one page to another, blotting from one page to a facing page, continuity of text, similarity of textual context, etc. (Fiber continuity can frequently be deter-

mined even with a considerable amount of space between fragments. Fragments are placed longitudinally according to vertical fibers and latitudinally according to horizontal fibers.) Unfortunately a number of fragments have proven to be intractable, and remain in the category of "unidentified." Transcriptions of the largest of these are found in this edition, and all inscribed unidentified fragments known to be from Codex IX are published in the *Facsimile Edition* (plates 75-78; cf. also plates 3-4 in *The Facsimile Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices: Introduction*, forthcoming).

Fortunately the pages of Codex IX were numbered in antiquity, and page numbers are preserved (or partially preserved) for the following pages (brackets indicate missing letters, dots letters only partially preserved): 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 13, 1[4], 15, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, [2]4, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 4[1], 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 55, 5[6], 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 65, 66, 67, 6[8], 73, 74. It has been possible to establish with near certainty the pagination of the entire codex, including the pages or fragments of pages whose page numbers are lost, on the basis of such criteria as continuity of destruction patterns with adjacent identified pages, text continuity from one page to another, and (in one case) ink-blotting from one page to another. Another criterion is the observation of horizontal fiber continuity between conjugate leaves from the two halves of the quire, indicating a single sheet, but this criterion is not absolute, for a lost *kollesis* may have occurred between the two leaves which would disturb the horizontal fiber-continuity (see further on this below). It has been found that the following pages from Codex IX are completely lost, or at least have no positively identifiable fragments: 63-64 and the last two pages, 75-76. P. 51/52 is represented only by a single small fragment. P. 53/54 is similarly represented by a small fragment, blank on the verso side (p. 54); one-half of this fragment is now lost (it is restored in the *Facsimile Edition* on the basis of an old photograph from Giversen's microfilm of 1958).

The establishment of pagination for pp. 7-8 and 9-10 presents a special problem. The small fragment containing page numbers 9 (recto) and 10 (verso) can be placed equally well, on the basis of horizontal fiber continuity (verso side) with the fragments now identified as pp. 7-8. A glance at the *Facsimile Edition* will also show that the continuity of destruction patterns (or "profile") is better from p. 5/6 to (what is now) 9/10 than from p. 5/6 to (what

is now) 7/8. The decisive factor in the current placement was the horizontal fiber continuity noticeable from p. 67 to (what is now) p. 8 to p. 69; it is therefore posited that pp. 7-8 and 69-70 are conjugate leaves, originally constituting a single sheet of papyrus. Unfortunately these pages are so fragmentary that it is not possible to use textual continuity as an absolute criterion. It is to be observed that much of the text in this portion of the codex has been conjecturally restored (see the introduction to IX, 1: *Melchizedek*, and the relevant pages in the text and translation).

With the pagination established we can now raise the question as to the possibility of reconstructing the rolls of papyrus from which our codex was manufactured. It is assumed that, in the making of a codex, sheets were cut from rolls which consisted of several sheets of papyrus glued together. The sheets from which a roll was made are called *kollemata*; the join where two *kollemata* are glued together is called a *kollesis*. (For this terminology and additional discussion see Turner, *Typology*, pp. 43-53; Robinson, "Codicology," p. 19; and "Future," pp. 23-27.) In some cases a codex can be analyzed to show the process by which it was constructed, down to the exact number of *kollemata* used and the exact number and size of rolls. Such an analysis is possible when all of the *kolleseis* are extant, as well as the stubs at the end of a roll. (For examples of such analysis see esp. Wisse, "Nag Hammadi Codex III," and Robinson, "Codicological Analysis.")

In the case of Codex IX such an analysis is necessarily tentative, due to the loss of so much material. Only one *kollesis* is preserved (p. 49/50; what is taken as a *kollesis* on p. 66 in the *Fascimile Edition*, p. xi, is probably a patch). The *kollesis* is formed by the overlap (ca. 2 cm.) of the left edge of the *kollema* of which most of p. 49 is a part over the right edge of the *kollema* of which p. 28 is a part (i.e. right over left). The overlap of right over left violates the expectation that the *kolleseis* will be so made as to allow the scribe to step down in his writing rather than to be obliged to lift his stylus up onto the higher part of the page (see Turner, *Typology*, p. 47; Robinson, "Future," p. 23; Turner calls attention to the fact that sheets were glued in a roll right over left in the case of rolls used by Demotic scribes [Demotic is written right to left]; see "The terms Recto and Verso," p. 19). Such a phenomenon is usually taken to mean that the entire roll has been rotated 180° before cutting (see esp. Robinson, "Future," p. 27). The fact that only

one *kollesis* has been found in the extant material of Codex IX may itself be significant, for it may indicate that the maker of the codex took special care to construct it in such a way that *kolleseis* would not ordinarily occur in the writing space of the pages. (The Manichaean codices, constructed with great care, have no *kolleseis* in them; see Turner, *Typology*, pp. 45-46, 49-50).

The horizontal fiber patterns of Codex IX have been analyzed, with the aid of a light-table, and some conclusions as to the make-up of the codex are possible. Analysis of the fiber patterns indicates horizontal fiber continuity from the left edge of one sheet in the quire to the right edge of the next above. This would indicate that the rolls from which the codex was constructed were cut from right to left, and the sheets stacked in the order in which they were cut.

In attempting to establish the lengths of the *kollemata* used in the manufacture of Codex IX, results were more certain in the case of that part of the codex (i.e. the middle part) in which the most material is preserved. It is evident that *kollemata* of various lengths were used. The longest one consists of pp. (showing horizontal fibers) 36 + 41, 34 + 43, 32 + 45, 30 + 47, 28 + 49 (part), measuring 127.4 cm., or well over a meter. (Such long *kollemata* are practically unknown to papyrologists before the discovery of the Nag Hammadi Codices, but in the Nag Hammadi Codices they are commonplace. See Robinson, "Codicology," p. 31; "Future," pp. 41-43; and now Turner, *Typology*, p. 53.) The shortest ones are the breadth of a single sheet (38 + 39; 18 + 59; 16 + 61). Separate *kollemata* (or separate rolls) are indicated when there is a disruption of horizontal fibers between sheets; at such places *kolleseis* would originally have been present in the roll (except at the end of a roll).

On the theory that the rolls of papyrus from which our codex was constructed were of a size comparable to papyrus rolls used in other codices (for general discussion see Robinson, "Codicology," pp. 19-30), we can assume that Codex IX was constructed of two rolls. A likely hypothesis is that the nine bottom sheets came from a single roll, and the ten top sheets from another roll (cf. *Facsimile Edition*, pp. xi-xiii). P. 75 (lost) would represent the right edge of one roll and p. 18 the left edge; p. 57 would represent the right edge of the other roll, and p. 38 the left edge. As it happens, p. 57 has an extraordinarily narrow column of writing, and may not have

been as wide as the other pages (see pl. 59 in the *Facsimile Edition*, and note the destruction patterns and the location of the right margin of p. 57 in comparison with that of pp. 55 and 59; cf. also Robinson's remarks, p. xiii). While this is what might be expected in the case of the last sheet cut from a roll rather than the first, the apparent anomaly in this case might be accounted for on the theory that the maker of our codex trimmed away damaged or frayed material at the right edge (i.e. p. 57) after he had already cut the first sheet of the second roll. The observation that the roll making up the bottom sheets of the quire yielded 9 sheets while the roll making up the top sheets (the inside of the quire) yielded 10 sheets fits neatly with the data already discussed regarding the width of the pages at the inside (narrower) and the outside (wider) of the completed codex. The maker of the codex would have cut his sheets progressively narrower so as to avoid the waste that inevitably would have occurred with the final trimming if all the sheets had originally been the same size. (On this phenomenon see Robinson, "Codicology," pp. 28-30; "Future," pp. 26, 36.)

The papyrus used in the manufacture of Codex IX was of average quality, surely not as good as that of e.g. Codex X, but better than that of Codex VIII. (The criteria for quality is thinness, regularity of fibers, surface smoothness, and uniformity of color; cf. also Pliny's remarks on the subject, *Hist. Nat.* XIII.24.78). It is possible to demonstrate that the material had already been damaged or had obvious imperfections in some places before the scribe began his writing. Thus at 11,10 the γ in $\epsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\lambda\lambda\beta$ is written in a crack where vertical fibers had begun to flake off. At line 9 in the same vicinity the fibers were still intact at the time of writing, but have subsequently further flaked and disappeared. At the end of 17,7 there is a gap in the horizontal fibers, causing the scribe not to continue the line to the right margin. At 27,27 damaged papyrus caused the scribe to shorten the line. At 33,22-27 there is a crack in the vertical fibers; in lines 22, 24 and 25 the scribe wrote part of a letter in the crack, in the horizontal fibers beneath, and in lines 23, 26 and 27 he avoided the crack by leaving a larger space than usual between letters at the damaged places. At 35,22-28 a similar loss of vertical fiber is found: the scribe wrote in the crack in lines 23, 24, 26, 27, and 28, whereas in lines 22 and 25 he avoided the crack. At 35, 25 this results in a marked space between $\epsilon\beta\omicron$ and λ . At 40,31 a similar crack in the vertical fibers caused the scribe to

leave a space between **ϩ** and **πτυπος**. At 41,1 the papyrus was so thick and uneven that the scribe, possibly in order to spare his stylus, skipped enough spaces for 3 letters—a good 2 cm.—and separated **ϭω** from **μα** in the word **σωμα**. At 42,19-29, substantial losses of vertical fiber had occurred, forcing the scribe to skip the damaged areas. E.g. in line 24 **ντ** is separated from **ε**. Again, in line 29 a different crack was avoided by separating **κα** from **τα** in the prefix of the verb **καταγινώσκειν**; the **ϭ** in the same verb was written right over yet another crack. Similar breakage is evident at 46,16-28; letters are written in cracks in some lines whereas the cracks are avoided at other places. E.g. in line 27 **ν** is separated by at least a whole letter-space from **ρητϩ**. On the same page, at line 16, **ει** is written over an area with thick, rough fibers. On p. 62, in the small fragment extant, vertical fibers were evidently in very bad shape before the papyrus received writing. Notable letter separations occur at line 5, **ν** from **αληθινος**, and at line 6, **ω** from **ϩμο**; in the latter case the superlinear stroke traverses the crack and binds **ω** end **μ** together. The top fragment of p. 66 shows evidence of patching (note in the *Facsimile Edition* the askew direction of the vertical fibers constituting the patch). At 70,20-28 some of the vertical fibers had worked loose and had been folded back so that the scribe had actually written on the underside in some lines—e.g. in lines 24 and 26—while skipping the resultant crack in other places, e.g. dividing **ετμ** from **μαγ** in line 21, **ει** from **ωοοπ** in line 22, and **ντοο** from **γ** in line 29.

The date of manufacture of Codex IX cannot be determined with certainty, and generalizations based on physical features are becoming more and more dangerous (see Robinson, "Future," p. 62). Datable fragments of cartonnage provide a *terminus a quo* (late 3rd century), suggesting a fourth century date for the manufacture of the codex. The physical features of the codex and the quality of the papyrus, conform to what might be expected of a fourth century Coptic manuscript. But to this there must be added the paleographical evidence, to which we now turn.

2. Contents and Paleography

Codex IX consists of three separate tractates: 1: 1,1-27,10; 2: 27,11-29,5; 3: 29,6-end (Doresse, *Secret Books*, pp. 142-143, had counted four). The leaf containing the last two pages (pp. 75-76) is missing; so it is not established where the third tractate ended.

It is possible that it ended on p. 75; fragment 10 is blank on the side showing vertical fibers and could conceivably have come from the missing leaf, p. 75/76. The tractates are separated on pp. 27 and 29 with decorations extending from the left to the right margins. On p. 27 the decoration consists of a line of "herringbone" decoration, i.e. *diple obelismene* (Ϸ) in series, a line of strokes, and another line of "herringbones," and another line of strokes. The last line of tractate 2 (29,5) is filled out with "herringbone" decoration.

The one extant title occurring in Codex IX is found at the top of p. 1, in the top margin (ΜΕΛΛΙϚ[ΕΔΕΚ]). It is decorated with a series of strokes above and below, and with a wedged line —| to the left (presumably matched on the right, but that part of the page is missing). If a title originally was provided for tractate 3 it would have occurred at the end, on one of the missing pages, 75 or 76. Tractate 2 has no title.

Codex IX was written by a single scribe. The hand can be described as a round uncial, with cursive features. It presents a page that is pleasing to the eye, though not as attractive as the hand of Codex VII, and reflects considerable practice on the part of the scribe.

Noteworthy characteristics of the calligraphy include the following: The α is usually made with a single stroke, the left corner rendered with a loop. Similarly the γ is rendered with a single stroke, the lower member represented by a closed loop. The μ is rendered analogously, with a single stroke and the top members looped rather than drawn angularly. The ζ, also rendered with a single stroke, usually has a noticeable serif at the top. The β is usually quite narrow, angular in appearance, and frequently not quite closed at the top. The tale of the ρ extends below the line; the upper part is narrow and angular, and sometimes not quite closed at the top. The ε is somewhat "flattened" in appearance and not completely uniform. Sometimes the top extends further to the right than the bottom, sometimes vice versa; occasionally the middle stroke of the ε is stretched considerably, especially when the letter appears at the right margin of a page. The π is rendered quite unusually, in that the top bar is frequently uneven and obviously not done with a single stroke. It sometimes gives the appearance of having been rendered as though two ρ's were squeezed together to form a single letter. The ρ sometimes extends below the line,

sometimes not. Overall, the letters tend to slant to the left rather than to the right.

“Punctuation” (if that is the proper term; cf. B. Layton’s discussion of the “articulation marks” “·” used in Codex II, “Text and Orthography,” pp. 190-200) is quite irregular in Codex IX. The raised dot · (cf. the Greek colon) is used very frequently, not always with observable meaning. It is often used to mark the end of a sentence or clause, to separate phrases, or even to separate words in a series (e.g. the proper names at 6,4). But its use must be regarded as quite arbitrary. For example, it is not at all clear why **ΝΕΞΟΥΣΙΑ· ΝΝΟΥ[ΤΕ]** (2,9) should have the “colon” (if that is what it is) and **ΝΝΟΥΤΕ ΝΖΟΥ[Τ]** (2,10) should not. Another problem in the use of this mark is that it does not always occur as a *raised* dot. Sometimes it is more or less on the line, e.g. at 30,6 (**ΝΤΟΟΥ·**, contrast line 11, **ΖΙΤΟΥΟΥ·**).

Another punctuation or articulation mark used by our scribe resembles an apostrophe '. This mark appears to serve the same function as the raised dot, but it is only used after the following letters, to mark the end of a word: **β, Δ, λ, μ, ξ, ρ, ς**. Examples are **ΖΩΒ'** (27,1) and **ΕΤΟΥΑΑΒ'** (28,28); **ΔΑΥΕΙΑΔ'** (70,4.25); **ΕΒΟΛ'** (35,7); **ΝΙΜ'** (27,24; 44,15) and **ΟΥΧΩΖΜ'** (39,5); **ΑΤΣΑΡΑΞ'** (27,5); **ΣΩΤΗΡ'** (45,17); **ΕΡΟϳ'** (43,23) and **ΠΖΟϳ'** (47,5). Evidence that the “apostrophe” is equivalent to the “colon” is found e.g. at 44,14-15: **ΟΥΟΝ ΝΙΜ' . . . ΟΥΟΝ ΝΙΜ'**.

Another feature of the hand of Codex IX is the use of a serif, in the form of a backstroke, on certain letters, viz. **ρ, κ, π, and τ**. This device may be an extension of the “apostrophe,” but it is used not only to mark the end of a word but also to mark the end of a syllable. There is considerable consistency in the use of this device (which occurs as well in Codices IV, V, VI, VII [= XI, second hand], and VIII). The serif is attached regularly to final **π** and **τ**; e.g. **ΩΟΡΠ, ΠΙΩΤ** etc., without exception. The same practice is observable with final **κ**, though in this case it is not so regular: e.g. **[ΝΤΟ]Κ ΖΩΩΚ** (5,14), **ΕΥΒΗΚ** (31,30); **ΧΩΚ** (34,2), etc; but see **ΝΑΚ** (6,23).

In addition, the serif occurs regularly with doubled **ρ, κ, π, τ**, as e.g. **ΑΓΓΕΛΟΣ** (2,11), **ΕΚΚΛΗΣΙΑ** (5,19), **ΕΠΠΑΘΟΣ** (5,8), **ΑΤΤΕΚΟ** (30,19).

The serif occurs usually, but not always, to mark certain morphemes, such as the Relative **ετ**, the Privative **ατ**, the abstract

marker **ΜΝ†**, and the 2 sg. suffix **κ**. But compare **ΝΕΤΟΥΛΛΒ** (27,27) and **ΕΤΟΥΛΛΒ** (4,4; 28,28, with the **Τ** and **Ο** written together); **ΕΤΝΑΝΟΥϞ** (27,2) and **ΕΤΝΑΝΟΥϞ** (6,7 with the **Τ** and **Ν** written together); and numerous other examples could be cited.

Finally, whereas one never sees the "apostrophe" written together with a serif, there are examples of the serif followed by a "colon," e.g. **ΜΦΗ†·** (29,9).

The dicolon: is used in tractate **Ι** after **ΖΑΜΗΝ** ("Amen") at 18,7 (at the end of a series of liturgical praises) and at 27,10, the end of the tractate. The end of tractate **Ζ** (29,5) is marked with a dicolon furnished with an extra dot:· .

The only other punctuation in this codex is the diaeresis. It is used to mark consonantal **ι**, as e.g. in **ΠΑΙ, ΤΑΙ, ΝΑΙ, ΖΡΑΙ, ΙΩΖΑΝΝΗΣ** (31,3), etc. It functions as a genuine diaeresis in **ΠΚΕΪΣΙΑΩΡΟΣ** (57,6).

Superlineation in Codex IX is quite complicated. There are several types of superlinear strokes, and the most regular one is the straight stroke over the single **ν**, **μ**, and **ρ** to indicate the half-vowel. The only example of erroneous omission of the superlinear stroke is **ΜΜΟΝ** (41,3). There appears to be some latitude in the use or non-use of the stroke over the plural Definite Article **ν**. When the noun begins with a vowel the stroke is used or not seemingly according to whim; compare e.g. **ΜΝ ΝΕΞΟΥΣΙΑ** (2,10) and **ΜΝ ΝΕΞΟΥΣΙΑ** (32,5). But when the noun begins with a consonant the stroke is regularly used, except when the previous letter is a vowel, e.g. **ΕΝΓΕΝΕΑ** (27,8).

The superlinear stroke is frequently used over two or more consonants when they form a single syllable, as e.g. in the ubiquitous **ΜΝ** and **ΖΝ**. There is sometimes, but not always, a discernible arch in the way this stroke is rendered. Compare e.g. **ΕΧ̄Μ** (30,27) and **ΕΧ̄Μ** (39,23; 44,22). In the transcriptions presented in this edition these variations are not recorded (for reasons of economy in printing); the stroke binding two consonants together will be rendered only over the second: **ΕΧ̄Μ**.

Sometimes a single superlinear stroke will bind three or more letters together, in which case considerable variation is found in practice. Examples (in which variations in the use of the serif are also noticeable) are: **ΤΜΝ†ΨΒΗΡΕ** (1,9), **ΤΜΝ†Α†ΤΟΟΥΝ** (15,5), **ΤΜΝ†ΡΕϞ† ΚΑΡΡΟΣ** (15,6); **ΜΝ†ΡΜΝΖΗ†** (43,15); **ΠΡΜΝΟΥΟΕΙΝ** (6,5); **ΠΡΜΝΟΥΟΕΙΝ** (17,15). In this edition these

words will be standardized and the superlinear stroke will be shown over a single letter, as in **ΤΜΝΤΨΒΗΡΕ**, **ΜΠΤΡΜΝΖΗΤ**, etc.

Superlinear strokes are even used by our scribe to bind the preposition **ΖΝ** to the following word, as e.g. in **ΖΜΠΠΑΗΡΩΜΑ** (28,22) and **ΖΜΠΠΑΡΑΔΙΣΟΣ** (46,2; 47,11). In this edition these words will be rendered **ΖΜ ΠΠΑΗΡΩΜΑ** and **ΖΜ ΠΠΑΡΑΔΙΣΟΣ**. Single strokes are also sometimes used over the Definite Article **Π**, as e.g. **ΠΠΑΘΟΣ** (30,5), **ΠΠΕΤΝΑΝΟΥϞ** (47,9). In combination with **Ν** the feminine Definite Article **Τ** also receives superlineation, e.g. **ΝΤΔΥΝΑΜΙΣ**. The latter will be rendered in this edition **ΝΤΔΥΝΑΜΙΣ**, though it is not clear in such a case whether it was pronounced like *entodynamis* or like *netodynamis*. A similar problem is presented with the Conjunctives, e.g. **ΝΣΧΟΟΣ** (28,6), **ΝϞΒΩΚ** (44,24), etc., rendered in this edition as **ΝΣΧΟΟΣ** and **ΝϞΒΩΚ**.

A superlinear stroke invariably occurs over the syllable **ΖΙ**, as e.g. in **ΖΙΧΜ** (4,9), **ΝΖΙΑΜΕ** (9,25). In this edition the stroke will be shown only over **Ι**: **ΖΙ**. A circumflex stroke appears invariably over the verb **ΕΙ** (*passim*) and over the vocative Interjection **Ω** (e.g. 1,11; 5,14). The circumflex also occurs over the verb **Ω** at 45,16 (but not at 40,4), and over the verb **Θ** at 73,6.

Another kind of stroke is used over the Greek particle **ἦ**: **Η** (41,28.29.31; 42,1 etc.); this is probably a rendition of the Greek *spiritus lenis* ("smooth breathing").

An extended stroke is usually used over *nomina sacra* (cf. the abundant examples on pp. 5-6 and 16-17), and over the *nomen insacrum* **ΣΑΒΛΩΘ** (73,30, but not over **ΣΑΤΑΝΑΣ** at 20,15) **ΑΔΑΜ** also receives the stroke at 9,28 (also 12,7) but not **ΕΥΖΑ** (10,1); neither receives the stroke in the Genesis material beginning on p. 45. There is a trace of a stroke over **ΗΣΑΙΑΣ** at 40,30. The superlinear stroke is used over the "liturgical" acclamation **ΚΟΥΔΑΒ** ("holy are you") in IX,1 (e.g. 16,16 etc.). It is used regularly over abbreviations and page numerals. Page numerals also usually (but not always, *pace* Krause, *Gnostische und hermetische Schriften*, p. 7) have a sublinear stroke. (The following extant page numerals lack the sublinear stroke: 22, 25, 28, 29, 34, 36, 43, 48, 49, 59, 60, 61.)

The following standard abbreviations are used: **ΙϞ**, "Jesus" (6,2.9 *et passim* written out in the opening line 1,2), **ΠΕΧϞ**, "Christ" (1,2; 6,2.9 *et passim*), **ΠΝΑ** "Spirit" (39,26; 42,2; cf. 50,1). **ΣΤΑΥΡΟΣ**, "cross," is abbreviated **ϞϞΟΣ** at 40,25. (Kahle refers to the "unique use of this abbreviation in a Coptic amulet of the fourth

or fifth century; see *Bala'izah*, vol. 1, p. 255, n. 2.) "Jerusalem" is abbreviated $\overline{\Theta\text{IHM}}$ (70,5.8.15.27).

Other marks and decorations are as follows: At the beginning of tractate 3, on p. 29 the *paragraphus cum corone* occurs in the left margin, ornately written as a single unit: ح . Traces of the same decoration occur at the beginning of tractate 2, on p. 27. It may be assumed that the first tractate was similarly adorned at its beginning, though the left margin of the fragment containing the beginning of tractate 1 is not preserved.

At p. 45, between lines 22 and 23, a *paragraphus* occurs, marking a new section of text. (On this ancient device see Schubart, *Das Buch*, p. 77.)

The work of our scribe is remarkably accurate and obviously practiced. Errors do, of course, occur; and some of these he has corrected himself. At 16,28 there is a case of *parablepsis*. The scribe began to write $\Psi\text{A EN}\epsilon\text{Z NEN}\epsilon\text{Z}$ (cf. 16,29) before writing $\text{TBAPBH}\lambda\text{WN}$, which was doubtless in his *exemplar*. He caught himself before he finished the misplaced phrase, wrote $\text{TBAPBH}\lambda\text{WN}$ and over each of the letters he had written in error he placed a dot, indicating that those letters were to be deleted: $\Psi\text{A}\dot{\text{E}}\text{N}\dot{\text{E}}\dot{\text{Z}}\text{N}\dot{\text{E}}$ (cf. the note). At 45,10 in a context wherein the virgin Mary is contrasted with the aged woman Elizabeth, the scribe wrote CZIME ("woman," cf. 45,8) instead of $\text{PAR}\theta\text{ENOC}$ ("virgin"), but then corrected himself. In this case his correction was probably made as part of his proof-reading, i.e. after he had completed the page; for he has crossed out CZIME with a series of diagonal slashes, and written $\text{PAR}\theta\text{ENOC}$ above the line (the correction is made in the scribe's own hand, albeit in smaller letters). The scribe has written over a letter at 3,6 (λ over ϵ) and possibly at 28,26 (π over ρ ?). At 45,18 he has cancelled an extra ϵ with a diagonal slash, and at 73,1 he has cancelled η similarly. At 47,28 he has cancelled a superlinear stroke written in error.

Undetected errors also occur, but in some of these cases the scribe may only be reproducing errors occurring already in his *exemplar*. Manifest misspellings occur at 28,2.12 (dittography); 29,3 (substitution); 47,21 (omission); and possible misspellings occur at 6,2 and 73,4 (substitution) and at 43,18 (metathesis). (See notes to the passages cited for details.) Dittography occurs at 27,27. Superfluous or tautological material has been editorially deleted at 28,14 and at 61,2. Material deemed to have been erroneously

ly omitted has been editorially supplied at 5,1.8.10; 9,2; 27,5; 28,14; 48,16.18; 55,4; 68,3; (and cf. note to 66,28).

Errors of substitution obviously requiring editorial correction are clustered in tractate 2. Manifest confusion of grammatical person, number, and/or gender occurs on page 28 in lines 3, 5, 6, and 20, and on page 29 in line 2 (see notes for details). The fact that such an error is found elsewhere in the whole codex only at 32,6 (in tractate 3) leads us to conclude that the scribe had a very faulty exemplar of tractate 2, and that he should not be held responsible for these mistakes (although we might wish that he had corrected them).

It was long assumed that Codex IX was written by the same scribe as Codices IV, V, VI, and VIII (cf. Doresse, *Secret Books*, pp. 141-145; Krause, "Zum koptischen Handschriftenfund," p. 110; *Gnostische und hermetische Schriften*, pp. 6, 8) but this hasty judgment cannot be sustained. The superficial similarities among them can be ascribed to the influence of a single scribal school (see Emmel, "Final Report," p. 28). According to J. M. Robinson (see "Codicology," p. 18; cf. Emmel, "Final Report," p. 28) M. Manfredi of the Vitelli Papyrological Institute in Florence expressed the view that the hand of Codex IX is separate and distinct from the others. Indeed, that is a view that had already been expressed by H.-C. Puech (see "Découverte," p. 10). I concur with this judgment.

Puech dates Codex IX (X in his numbering system) to the end of the third or the beginning of the fourth century (cf. "Découverte," p. 10). Of the fourth-century hands illustrated in Maria Cramer's *Koptische Paläographie*, that of BM Or. 7594 most resembles the hand of Codex IX (see *Paläographie*, pl. 33), though the hand of Codex IX is somewhat less accomplished. The British Museum manuscript can be dated on the basis of its colophons between A.D. 330 and 350 (see Krause's review of Cramer in *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 23 [1966], p. 286; cf. Robinson, "Coptic Gnostic Library Today," p. 372).

It thus appears that the paleographical evidence, taken together with the codicological evidence discussed above, strongly points to a fourth-century date for Codex IX.

3. *Language*

All three tractates in Codex IX are Coptic translations of Greek originals. (Indeed there is no reason to doubt the general scholarly

consensus that *all* of the Nag Hammadi tractates have been translated from Greek into Coptic; cf. e.g. G. MacRae, "Nag Hammadi," in *IDBSup*, p. 613). The language of all three tractates is Sahidic, but an "impure" variety of the Sahidic dialect which shows considerable contamination or influence from other dialects. (This, too, is a trait which they have in common with all other Sahidic tractates in the Nag Hammadi Library.) In what follows I shall not attempt to present a complete grammar of each of the three tractates. Rather, I shall survey those peculiarities shown in the language of our tractates which represent divergences from standard Sahidic (as represented e.g. by the Sahidic New Testament), and call attention to other special features deserving of notice. Inasmuch as the language of all three tractates is basically the same, I shall treat them together in synoptic fashion. Some attempt will then be made to assess the significance of the dialectical divergences from standard Sahidic found in Codex IX as a whole, and such linguistic divergences as may be noticed from one tractate to another.

Dialectic variations in the phonemics of Codex IX can be grouped as follows:

1. A² vocalizations.

a) **α** for **ο**. Tractate 1: **μαρ** (9,27); **ανζ†** (6,26; 26,12); **ζιαμε** (2,10; 9,25; 12,13); **βαλπ** (27,4; cf. **βαλεπ** 14,13). Tractate 2: **qtau** (28,27). Tractate 3: **ατε** (31,5; 45,13-15); **λαγ** (41,10); **ταντη** (44,14).

b) **ε** for **α**. Tractate 1: **νεειετ** (18,9); **τεκο** (6,22); **τελο** (15,26); **τελο** (16,7); **ζε†ε** (9,22). Tractate 2: **εμντε** (32,25); **εμαzte** (29,12; 44,1); **μμετε** (32,19); **τεκο** (30,19; 31,14; 32,18; 33,10; 37,1-13; 40,27-28; 42,6; 44,25; 49,5); **тсево** (47,1); **ζε†ε** (43,31).

c) **ε** for **ο** Tractate 3: **εγ** (42,1).

d) **ε** for **ω**. Tractate 3: **ογεν** (46,7 A²? Cf. Kasser, *Compléments*, p. 75).

2. Other A² phonological variants. Tractate 1: **тнzo** (4,6). Tractate 3: **μμε** (30,28; 46,12; 47,9); **εво** (33,6); **тоубо** (43,1); **тнzo** (34,25; 37,25; 69,1[?]); **χωβε** (45,15; 74,5); **бвоур** (43,13).

3. Dialectical variants identified as A by Crum, but attested in A² texts according to Kasser, *Compléments*. Tractate 1: **пноуε** (27,10); **бннoу** (6,24; 27,7). Tractate 3: **звнoуε** (31,12; 42,20).

The only dialectical variants from standard Sahidic not heretofore identified as A² are **ⲧⲁⲭⲣⲏⲟϥ**† (A 39,10), **ⲉ** (AFS 45,18), and **ⲧⲟϥⲁⲟⲉⲓⲧ**† (32,8; cf. Kasser, *Compléments*), all in tractate 3. To this should be added a conjectured occurrence of the BS^b variant of S **ⲉⲟⲟϥ**: **ⲱⲟ<ϥ>** (cf. note to 6,2).

From this survey it is easy to see that the predominant non-Sahidic dialectical influence in all three tractates of Codex IX is Subachmimic (A²). This is the case, at least, in respect to the phonology of the language.

The "mixed" character of the Sahidic Coptic of Codex IX might plausibly be explained as a "pre-classical" version of Sahidic; this is a solution that has often been advanced to account for the variations found in the language of the Nag Hammadi Codices. (See e.g. Böhlig-Wisse, *Gospel of the Egyptians*, p. 7, referring especially to "what appear to be Subachmimic intrusions.") But Bentley Layton has recently made the claim—with special reference to *Hyp. Arch.* (II,4)—that the "Sahidic" texts in the Nag Hammadi Library were translated by native speakers of the Subachmimic dialect, attempting to write in Sahidic (see Layton, *Hypostasis of the Archons*, HTR, 67, p. 374; and "Coptic Language," *IDBSup*, p. 177). His argument is based not only on the occurrence of A² phonological variants, but on the influences of the A² dialect in the structure of the language. It will therefore be useful to test Layton's hypothesis by means of a deeper look at the A² influences in the language of Codex IX:

1. Negations using **ⲁⲛ** without **ⲛ** (S: **ⲛ . . . ⲁⲛ**): In tractate 1 negation with **ⲁⲛ** is usually without the **ⲛ**, with one exception (7,4). In tractate 2 the one occurrence of the negative with **ⲁⲛ** has the Sahidic **ⲛ** (28,26). In tractate 3 negation with **ⲛ** predominates; in five cases **ⲛ** is omitted.

2. 3 plural ending **-ⲟϥ** for the Possessive Article (vs. S **-ⲉϥ**): In tractate 1 all occurrences of the Possessive Article have the A² form **-ⲟϥ**. In tractate 2 at 28,20 the MS reading has **ⲛⲟϥ**; there are no other occurrences of the 3 pl. Possessive Article in 2. In tractate 3 the A² forms **ⲛⲟϥ**- **ⲧⲟϥ**- **ⲛⲟϥ**- occur 6 times, to 9 occurrences of the S form (disregarding the occurrences in lacunae).

3. Use of **ⲫ** with Greek verbs. (A² treats Greek verbs as nominal elements requiring the construct form of **ⲉⲓⲣⲉ**, "make, do," to help them function as verbs. S treats Greek verbs as verbs, and therefore does not use the **ⲫ**. See e.g. Böhlig, "Griechische Depo-

nentien," p. 90; cf. Nagel, *Untersuchungen*, p. 167). In all three tractates Greek verbs are ordinarily prefixed with $\bar{\rho}$, with one exception in 1 (14,17) and four exceptions in 3 (34,5.14; 44,9; 73,27).

4. Preposition α for ϵ . The S preposition ϵ is regularly used in all three tractates. In tractate 2 α occurs once (29,5), and in tractate 3 three times (clustered at 30, 3-4).

5. α - Future instead of S $\eta\alpha$ -. The S $\eta\alpha$ - Future occurs regularly in all three tractates. There is one occurrence of the A² form in tractate 2 (28,26) and one in tractate 3 (49,5, perhaps also at 49,3).

6. $\text{OYNT}\epsilon$ - for $\text{OYNT}\alpha$ -. The S form $\text{OYNT}\alpha$ - is regular throughout, but $\text{OYNT}\epsilon$ - occurs once in tractate 3 ($\text{OYNT}\epsilon\Upsilon\text{C}\rho$ 69,9; cf. $\text{OYNT}\eta\epsilon\text{I}$ at 15,8 in tractate 1).

7. Past Temporal $\eta\tau\alpha\rho\epsilon$ - $\eta\tau\alpha\rho(\epsilon)$ - for S $\eta\tau\epsilon\rho\epsilon$ - $\eta\tau\epsilon\rho(\epsilon)$ -. The S form *never* occurs in Codex IX; the A² form is invariably used in all three tractates. In addition, the one extant occurrence of the negative Habitude form is A² $\eta\alpha$ - instead of S $\eta\epsilon$ - (73,4 tractate 3).

8. A² III Future $\epsilon-\alpha$ instead of S $\epsilon-\epsilon$ occurs twice in tractate 3 (45,26; 55,2). See also A² neg. III Future $\epsilon\eta$ - (48,11), $\epsilon\eta\epsilon$ - (47,25).

9. $\epsilon\tau\alpha\zeta$ -, $\eta\tau\alpha\zeta$ -. The peculiar A² First Perfect Relative forms with $\alpha\zeta$ (used when the subject of the Relative is the same as the antecedent) occur in tractate 1 twice ($\epsilon\eta\tau\alpha\zeta\epsilon\text{I}$, 12,3; 16,10) and in tractate 3 at least five times (31,13; 42,6; 43,28.30?; 47,1.4).

One anomalous verbal form, $\epsilon\tau\alpha\varrho$, occurs in tractate 1 at 6,11, translated as a II Perfect (BAF).

The results of this survey would tend to corroborate Layton's theory; i.e. the translators of the tractates in Codex IX attempted to translate into Sahidic, but left numerous traces of the A² dialect which was presumably their native tongue. Evidently the Sahidic dialect was gaining prestige at the expense of the other Upper Egyptian dialects; hence the attempt to write in the Sahidic dialect of the Upper Egyptian monasteries. The A² dialect, interestingly, has been associated especially with "heretical" (e.g. Gnostic and Manichaeic) literature. (Cf. Layton, "Coptic Language," *IDBSup*, pp. 176-177; Nagel, *Untersuchungen*, pp. 212-214).

Though the language of all three tractates in Codex IX is basically similar, there is no need to assume a single translator for all three. There are sufficient differences among them to posit more than one translator. In any case, reasons have already been

advanced (see discussion above, of scribal errors) for thinking that at least one of the tractates, 2, has been considerably corrupted in transmission. Codex IX, therefore, is not the "autograph" translation of the Coptic documents it contains.

Orthographic features deserving of mention include the following: *plene* spelling of **ϑωλεπ** and **ϑαλεπ** in tractate 1, and of **σοβεκ**, **σοβερ**, and **ζαλεϑ** in tractate 3. **ι** for **ει** occurs in tractate 3 (44,17.28); **ει** for **ι** also occurs (69,5; 30,4 etc.). **χ** is used for **κ** in the spelling of the name "Melchizedek," and also in the spelling of the Greek verb **ἄρχεσθαι** (**αρχει** 14,17; on **χ** for **κ** see Kahle, *Bala'izah*, vol. 1, pp. 133-134). Lack of assimilation of **ν** before **π** occurs in tractate 3 at 29,16 (**ΝΠΛΑΝΗ**).

The orthography of Greek words is quite normal for a Coptic text (or, for that matter, a Roman or Byzantine Greek text); e.g. **ι** for **ει** in numerous places. (See the Index of Greek Words for full data). The Greek word **σάρξ** is consistently rendered **σαρξ** both in tractates 1 and 3 (it does not occur in 2; on this spelling see Girgis, "Greek Loan Words," § 57). The word **κοδράντης** (Latin *quadrans*) is rendered **ΚΟΝΔΡΑΝΤΗΣ** (30,17, tractate 3; cf. Girgis, "Greek Loan Words," § 41b). As usual, the Hebrew-origin words "Seraphim" and "Cherubim" are rendered with final **-ΙΝ** instead of **-ΙΜ** (10,4; tr. 1; cf. Girgis, "Greek Loan Words," § 31b). The Greek word **ἠδύνεσθαι** is to be recognized beneath the Coptic rendering **ΖΗΔΑΝΕ** (68,3, tractate 3, a form elsewhere attested; cf. Böhlig "Beiträge," p. 94).

Finally, the original Greek may be seen beneath the surface of the Coptic text in numerous places, especially in tractate 3: e.g. the frozen gen. sg. **γνώσεως** (47,17), and the adverb **πνευματικῶς** (50,2; cf. 49,13). The verb **ϣϣϣ ΠΤΥΠΟΥ** at 45,21-22 is a transparent rendering of **πρωτοτυποῦν** (cf. *PGL* 1203a). The Coptic locutions **ΤΜΝΤΖΑΖ ΝΨΑΧΕ** and **ΖΕΝΨΑΧΕ ΜΜΙΨΕ** (44,8-9; cf. 68,28-29) are obviously renditions of the Greek words **πολυλογία** and **λογομαχία** respectively. The locution **ΨΜΨΕ ΝΕΙΔΑΛΟΝ** (70,1) renders **εἰδωλολατρεία**. In tractate 2 a frozen (Doric) genitive sg. may be seen in the name **ΑΔΑΜΑ** (cf. 27,26).

INTRODUCTION TO IX, 1: MELCHIZEDEK

Bibliography: Doresse, *Secret Books*, pp. 142, 197; Krause and Labib, *Gnostische und hermetische Schriften*, pp. 8, 236; Berliner Arbeitskreis, "Die Bedeutung der Texte von Nag Hammadi," pp. 67-69; Schenke, "Erwägungen zum Rätsel des Hebräerbriefes," p. 436. n. 37; Pearson, "The Figure of Melchizedek"; Pearson, "Anti-Heretical Warnings," pp. 146-150; Koschorke, *Die Polemik der Gnostiker*, pp. 164-165; Pearson, (Introduction), Giversen and Pearson (Translation), *Melchizedek (IX,1)*, in *The Nag Hammadi Library*, pp. 399-403.

This tractate comprises 1,1—27,10 of the codex, approximately 745 lines in all. Unfortunately the ravages of time and modern mis-handling have left it in very fragmentary condition (see codex introduction). The total number of lines completely extant is a scant 19. 467 additional lines are partially preserved. Of these 199 have been completely restored by scholarly conjecture. Thus only about 47% of the text is recoverable, and a major part of the contents of the transcription and translation here presented is, in fact, based upon conjectural reconstruction. From this it is evident that only a very imperfect picture of the contents and meaning of this tractate is possible to attain. It is evident, too, that what does remain of the tractate, even as restored, is susceptible of various interpretations. Therefore this introduction can only be taken as a very tentative statement.

The title of this tractate, *Melchizedek*, is partially preserved on a fragment belonging to the top of p. 1 of the codex: **ΜΕΛΧΙΖ[ΕΔΕΚ]**, clearly marked as a title by means of decorations (cf. codex introduction and *Fascimile Edition*). The title is doubtless meant to identify the putative "author" of the document, i.e. the recipient of the revelation that is presented in the tractate. (For analogies in the Nag Hammadi library cf. e.g. VIII,1: *Zostrianos* and X,1: *Marsanes*). Thus this document cannot be said to be attributed to "the Great Seth" (against Doresse, *Secret Books*, p. 142; the name "Seth" does occur, however, at 5,20).

The name "Melchizedek" occurs in the body of the tractate at 5,15; 12,10; 14,16; 15,9; 19,13; and 26,3. Unfortunately, in all of these cases lacunae occur in the text so that the name "Melchizedek" has been conjecturally restored. Of these occurrences the name is most fully preserved at 12,10 (only two letters missing),

and least preserved at 5,15 (only a trace of a single letter). Of course, it is possible that the name occurred also in portions of the text that are now totally lost.

The same fragment that contains (partially) the title also contains the *incipit*: "Jesus Christ, the Son [of God . . .]. The precise relationship between "Melchizedek" and "Jesus Christ" is exceedingly difficult to define, and we shall have to return to that problem (see below).

Formally this tractate can be defined as an "apocalypse." Indeed the term "apocalypse" (*ἀποκάλυψις*, in the plural form) occurs toward the end of the document (27, 3) where the recipient of the revelation, Melchizedek, is warned by his heavenly informants not to reveal "these revelations" to anyone in the flesh. A similar warning occurs at 14,12-15. These warnings are, of course, traditional features of the genre (cf. e.g. *Ap. John* BG 76,9—77,5; NHC II 31,34—32,6; 2 *Jeu* ch. 43). In other respects, too, this document satisfies the generic requirements of an "apocalypse": it is pseudonymous, attributed to a biblical hero of the past (Melchizedek), and contains purported prophecies of future events given by an angelic informant (Gamaliel; see discussion below), as well as secrets pertaining to the heavenly world, presumably in a visionary experience.

In spite of its poor state of preservation this tractate can be seen to consist of three major parts: 1) a revelation given to Melchizedek by an angelic informant (1,1?—14,15), concluding with a warning not to divulge the secrets to the uninitiated; 2) a section in which Melchizedek undertakes several ritual actions, including baptism, and offers praises to the heavenly world (14,15-18,11?); and 3) additional revelations given to Melchizedek by heavenly informants, concluding with another warning not to divulge the secrets to the uninitiated, and a brief account of the ascension of the informants (18,11?—27,10 end).

1) Unfortunately the first page is so damaged that not much sense can be made of the opening passage. E.g. it is not clear what the syntactic function of the *incipit* is: "Jesus Christ, the Son [of God . . .]." It may be a vocative, in which case Melchizedek is addressing Jesus Christ in prayer (cf. 1,5-11 and notes). In lines 8-11 someone (Melchizedek?) says, ". . . and that I might put on friendship and goodness as a garment, O brother" (the following material is virtually lost). This suggests a cultic scenario, specifi-

cally a priestly investiture, in which case it is resumed later in the tractate, in the second section (see below).

From 1,19 on it appears that someone (Gamaliel, the angelic informant?) is describing, in the future tense, the ministry, death, and resurrection of the Savior (the term "Savior" occurs at 4,5). The latter will reveal the truth (1,19-20) to some, and speak to others in proverbs, parables, and riddles (1,24-2,2). His activity will incur the anger of Death and his fellow world-rulers (2,5-18), and he will face trial and punishment on false charges (3,9-11). But "[on] the [third] day he [will rise from the] dead" (3,9-11). After the resurrection the Savior will speak life-giving words to his disciples (4,4-6), but the hostile spiritual powers will cause false doctrine to be promulgated by pseudo-disciples (4,7—5,11):

"They will say of him (i.e. Jesus Christ) that he is unbegotten though he has been begotten, (that) he does not eat even though he eats, (that) he does not drink even though he drinks, (that) he is uncircumcised though he has been circumcised, (that) he is unfleshy though he has come in flesh, (that) he did not come to suffering <though> he came to suffering, (that) he did not rise from the dead <though> he arose from [the] dead" (5,2-11).

The substance of the demon-inspired false doctrine so vigorously attacked here is the (typically gnostic!) docetic denial of the reality of Jesus' incarnation, suffering, death and bodily resurrection. (For details, see notes. For discussion of this passage see Berliner Arbeitskreis, "Die Bedeutung der Texte von Nag Hammadi," pp. 68-69; Pearson, "Anti-Heretical Warnings," pp. 147-149; Koschorke, *Die Polemik der Gnostiker*, pp. 164-165. See also below, on the "Melchizedekians.")

The passage immediately following (5,11-23) is a crucial one for the interpretation of the tractate as a whole, but it is unfortunately very fragmentary. It appears to deal with the life and activity of the elect, "the congregation (ἐκκλησία) of [the children] of Seth" (5,19-20) consisting of "all the [tribes and] all [the peoples]," i.e. Gentiles (5,11-12), and the priestly activity of "[Melchizedek], Holy One, [High-priest]" (5,14-16). But, as the brackets indicate, much of this is conjecturally restored. Of the name "Melchizedek" here only the trace of a Δ remains, but the initial λ and the final ΡΕΥC of ἀρχιερεύς are at least partially preserved. Melchizedek is identified as the "High-priest" elsewhere in the tractate (15,9-12; possibly 26,2-3); so the restoration of the name here is probable,

but not certain. The high-priestly activity of Melchizedek is evidently part of the "prophecy." Thus we are confronted with an anomalous situation: Melchizedek, the biblical "priest of God Most High" (Gen 14:18), is given a prophecy of his own future priestly activity in the time following the death and resurrection of the Savior! (See below for additional discussion of this problem.)

In this passage, too, there (probably) occurs a self-identification of the mediator of the prophecy, albeit in very fragmentary form. The words, "I am" are restored at 5,17 (ΑΝ[ΟΚ ΠΕ]), and the final three letters (-iēl) of an angelic name follow upon a lacuna at the beginning of line 18 which has room for 5 letters. The two most likely candidates for the identification of this angelic name are "Gabriel" and "Gamaliel." "Gabriel" has the advantage of being a biblical angelic name (Dan 8:16, Luke 1:19,26), but it yields only 4 letters for the lacuna (ΓΑΒΡ). On the other hand, "Gamaliel" is a perfect candidate, not only because it fits the lacuna ([ΓΑΜΑΛ]ΙΗΛ) but because it occurs elsewhere in gnostic literature in somewhat comparable situations. E.g. in *Apoc. Adam* Gamaliel is one of three angels (Abraxas and Sablo are the other two) who come down to rescue the elect from destruction by fire (see V 75,23 and context). In *Gos. Eg.* Gamaliel occurs in the company of three other angels (Gabriel, as well as Samlo and Abraxas; see III, 52,21 and 64,26); they are referred to as "ministers (διάκονος) of the four lights." (In IV 64,15 the name Gamaliel is spelled "Kamaliel.") In *Trim. Prot.* Kamaliel (*sic*) is one of three "servants (ὑπηρέτης) of the great holy luminaries" (XIII 48*,27-29). In the untitled treatise from the Bruce Codex, Gamaliel is one of the "watchers" (φύλαξ) who "became helpers to those who believed in the light-spark" (Cod. Bruc. *Untitled*, ch. 8). The name "Gamaliel" occurs in *Zost.* in a context similar to that of the Bruce Codex passage (VIII 47,2). The name also occurs in *Marsanes* (X 64*,19). Moreover it is evident that the speaker who identifies himself in our tractate at 5,17-18 is not acting alone, for later on he announces that he will be silent (12,1), and then the plural is used in the next line: "for we [are the brethren who] came down from [the] living [...]" (12,2-4). In the second revelation which begins on p. 18 Melchizedek is addressed by more than one personage (cf. the use of the plural esp. at 19,12). These revealers are probably to be identified as "the brethren who belong to the generations of life," who are taken up to heaven at the end of the tractate (27,7-10 end).

Unfortunately these "brethren" are not named, but it is likely that they are angelic co-workers of the angel whom we have identified as Gamaliel. The other gnostic literature mentioned in connection with "Gamaliel" may therefore give us clues as to the names of Gamaliel's co-workers in this tractate. (The name of one of the angels mentioned together with Gamaliel in *Zost.* VIII 47,2-3, Akramas, may occur in our tractate at 17,24; see note.)

The discussion of Melchizedek's future priestly activity in behalf of the elect provides the context for a passage consisting of invocations of the chief inhabitants of the heavenly world (5,24-6,10). This passage, which looks very much like a secondary insertion, opens with what may be a "mystical" name of the supreme God, possibly to be restored as a palindrome. $\alpha\beta\alpha\beta\alpha\ \iota\alpha\iota\alpha\iota\ \alpha\beta\alpha\beta\alpha$, see note to 5,24), and closes with the formula, "through Jesus Christ, the Son of God whom I proclaim" (6,9-10). The other divine beings that can be identified in this fragmentary passage are Barbelo, Doxomedon, Jesus Christ, the four luminaries Armozel, Oroiael, Daveithe, and Eleleth, Pigeradamas, and Mirocheirothetou (on these names see below). The supreme God may also be referred to at 6,14, under the name "Abel Baruch" (cf. 16,19, and note to 6,14).

In the following passage (6,11-7,5) the angelic informant is presumably revealing knowledge to Melchizedek (see esp. 6,15) for the benefit of the elect, now identified as "the race of the High-priest" (6,17). The content of this knowledge seems here to consist of the person and works of the Savior, of whom the "adverse [spirits are] ignorant" (6,19-21), especially his work of presenting a "living [offering]" to "[the All]" (6,25-28). Melchizedek is then told of the inefficacy of animal sacrifice in removing sin: "[For it is not] cattle [that] you will offer up [for sin(s)] of unbelief [and for] the ignorances [and all the] wicked [deeds] which they [will do . . .]" (6,28-7,3). Here, again, it is to be noted that the future priestly activity of *Melchizedek* is treated. The paradigm for Melchizedek's priestly work is the high-priestly work of Jesus Christ, and the influence of the epistle to the Hebrews is very much in evidence (see notes, and further discussion below).

Faith (7,6), baptism (7,27-8,5), and intercessory prayer (8,28) occur in a passage which is riddled with lacunae and therefore incapable of adequate interpretation. It seems clear that Melchizedek is commanded to receive baptism (8,2), the meaning of which is prob-

ably clarified later in the text (cf. 16,12-16). Intercessory prayer (8,28) is also included in the priestly work of Melchizedek, but the transition from page 8 to the top of page 9, with the mention there of "archons" and "angels," is difficult to construe. (For the problem of the position of pp. 7/8 and 9/10 in the codex see the codex introduction). As restored, the crucial passage reads: "pray for the [offspring of the] archons and [all] the angels, together with [the] seed <which> flowed [forth from the Father] of the All" (8,28-9,3). The meaning, presumably, is that the object of Melchizedek's prayers, humanity in general, is a composite of archontic and heavenly origins (man's lower nature derives from the archons, and his heavenly Spirit from God).

This is followed immediately with a brief "theogonic" passage (9,2-10 . . .), evidently intended to account for the origin of the various gods and angels populating the lower world, and which looks like a secondary insertion. Gods, angels, and men, according to this passage, were all engendered from the primal seed "<which> flowed [forth from the Father] of the All." Such an account of origins is remarkably reminiscent of the ancient Egyptian myth of the procreation of the gods by the masturbation of the primal god Atum (cf. *Pyramid Texts*, Utterance 527, Faulkner tr.).

After a missing section, the extant text resumes with a distinction drawn between men and women "bound" to the lower world, and the "true Adam" and "true Eve." This entire section (9,25-10,11) seems to be closely related to a passage in the treatise *On the Origin of the World* (NHC II,5) consisting of an elaborate midrash on the Paradise narrative in Gen 2-3 (see esp. II 116,33-117,28; cf. notes). The "true Adam" and "true Eve" are said to have eaten from the tree of knowledge and thereby to have "trampled [the Cherubim] and the Seraphim [with the flaming sword]" (10,3-5; cf. Gen 3:6-24 and notes to the text).

In a following fragmentary passage reference is apparently made to the gnostic believers who "renounce (ἀποτάσσειν) the archons" (10,28-29). It is probable that such a "renunciation" belongs to a baptismal context (see note to 10,29). The salvation of the elect is discussed in the following passage (11,2-12 . . .), but it is too fragmentary to interpret in any detail.

After a missing section the speaker (Gamaliel?) announces that he will be silent (12,1), but then the text continues with a list of biblical personages, including Adam, [Abel], Enoch, and [Noah]

(12,7-8). "Melchizedek, [the Priest] of God [Most High]" is addressed (12,10-11), but the following material of some 19 lines is all but lost (12,12-end of page). The list of biblical figures mentioned on this page, culminating with Melchizedek, may be intended as a list of those heroes of the past who functioned as priests. (Cf. the list of priests in the Hellenistic-Jewish synagogue prayer quoted in *Const. Ap.* VIII.5.3, which includes Abel, Seth, Enos, Enoch, Noah, and Melchizedek; on this passage see Goodenough, *Light*, pp. 330-331).

The passage that follows (13,1-14,9), and which concludes the first revelation, deals with the final eschatological struggle between the hostile forces of darkness and the elect. Reference is made to "these two who have been chosen" (13,1). They will not be "convicted" (of any wrong-doing, 13,3-4), but they will nevertheless be maltreated or even killed (see note to 13,8-9) by the opposing archontic powers. Who "these two" are cannot be established with certainty, owing to the loss of the preceding context, but they are possibly to be identified as the "two witnesses" of Rev 11:3-11, whom later tradition identified as Enoch and Elijah. (See Bousset, *The Antichrist Legend*, pp. 203-211; Pearson, "The Pierpont Morgan Fragments," pp. 241-243). The final victory of the Savior is prophesied, together with the final destruction of Death (see esp. 14,4-9; cf. 1 Cor 15:26; Heb 2:14).

The angelic informant closes his revelation with a command to Melchizedek to reveal the things that should be revealed but to keep secret the things that are not to be revealed (14,9-15).

2) The second section presents, in the first person, Melchizedek's reaction to the revelation and the cultic actions he undertakes. Melchizedek rejoices and praises God for sending the "angel of light" (Gamaliel?) with the revelation he has just received (14,17-15,4). In his great joy he gives thanks to the Father, with reference to his angelic informant: "When he came [. . . he raised] me up from ignorance and (from) the fructification of death to life. For I have a name; I am Melchizedek, the Priest of [God] Most High; I [know] that it is I who am truly [the image of] the true High-priest [of] God Most High" (15,4-13). If the restoration of the word $\pi\iota\kappa\epsilon$ ("the image" = $\epsilon\iota\kappa\acute{\omega}\nu$) at 15,12 is correct, we have here a clear statement of the relationship between Melchizedek and Jesus Christ: Melchizedek functions on earth as the image, or even "alter-ego," of the heavenly Christ. This idea, based on Heb 7:3,

must be taken up in greater detail (see below for further discussion).

In a subsequent fragmentary passage, Melchizedek refers in his prayer to the sacrificial activity of a figure from the past (Adam?). He then indicates that he has offered animal sacrifices to [Death], and to [angels] and . . . demons (16,2-5; cf. 6,28-29), but is now offering himself and all that belong to him to the Father of the All (16,7-12). This self-sacrifice is tied to the ritual of baptism, which also serves as the context for the bestowal and pronouncement of the name:

“I shall pronounce my name as I receive baptism [now] (and) forever, (as a name) among the living (and) holy [names], and (now) in the [waters], Amen” (16,12-16).

It is probable that this ritual complex—baptism, offering of sacrifice, reception of the name (“Melchizedek”)—is to be understood as a priestly consecration. And in that connection we also recall the “investiture” language of the fragmentary passage on p. 1 mentioned above (1,9-11). These ritual actions fit into a pattern that harks back to ancient Mesopotamian priestly-royal ritual, and which can also be seen to be operative in Jewish texts, most notably *T. Levi* 8, as well as Mandaean ritual (see Widengren, “Heavenly Enthronement,” esp. pp. 552 and 558). The important thing here is that *baptism* is part of the rite of priestly consecration, just as it is in *T. Levi* 8. On the other hand it is surprising that the bread and wine mentioned in connection with Melchizedek in Gen 14:18 (and with Levi in *T. Levi* 8:5) is apparently absent from our text.

The consecration is immediately followed by a series of invocations directed to the inhabitants of the heavenly world (16,16—18,7), the same figures mentioned in a previous section (5,24—6,10) with perhaps some additions (the text is very fragmentary). The invocations all follow the pattern, “Holy are you” (thrice), followed by the name of the divine being addressed, and the formula, “forever and ever, Amen.” The passage bears all the marks of a liturgical prayer intended to be chanted responsively in the context of a worship service. The thrice-repeated formula, “Holy are you,” is doubtless adapted from the Trishagion formula of the *Kedushah* prayer (cf. Isa 6:3) of the ancient Jewish synagogue, used also from early times in Christian worship (cf. e.g. *Const. Ap.* VII.35.3). The formula, “Holy are you,” is found also in Hermetic worship (ἁγίος εἶ, *Corp. Herm.* I.31) in a prayer also taken

up later for use in Christian circles in Egypt (P. Berol. 9794; cf. *Corp. Herm.*, Nock-Festugière ed., vol. 1, p. 18). This formula, too, derives ultimately from Jewish synagogue worship. (Cf. e.g. the third benediction of the weekly *Amidah*, Staerk, *Altjüdische liturgische Gebete*, p. 11.)

In the fragmentary passage that follows, mention is made of "confession," i.e. in the sense of profession of faith (18,10-11); the object of this confession is doubtless Jesus Christ, the last-named figure in the series of invocations (18,6). Those who "confess him" are pronounced "blessed" (18,9).

3) So much of the text is lost at this point in the document that it is not possible to delineate exactly where the second section ends and where the third section takes up. Probably the material from at least 19,1 on consists of a transition to the second revelation, with the mention of personages (in the plural) who address Melchizedek by name: "and they said to me, [. . . , Melchizedek, Priest] of God [Most High]" (19,12-15). Unfortunately what they say to Melchizedek is impossible to determine at this point in the text. On the next page it is possible to reconstruct part of a sentence, "they did not care that [the priesthood] which you perform, [which] is from [. . .]" (20,10-12). The words "counsels of [. . .] Satan" occur shortly thereafter (20,14-15), indicating that a group of religious opponents are here referred to. It is conjectured that the material from 19,12 to 26,7 is all part of a single discourse constituting a second revelation to Melchizedek mediated by heavenly messengers.

More than four pages of material are almost totally lost (from 20,21-24, end of page, with the exception of 3 very small fragments of pp. 21-22 and a single small fragment of pp. 23-24, blank on the recto side). At the beginning of p. 25 someone is addressing an unidentified group, accusing them of perpetrating acts of violence against the speaker. The speaker, unnamed, is certainly capable of identification from the words that follow:

"And [you crucified me] from the third hour [of the Sabbath-eve] until [the ninth hour] (cf. Matt. 27:45 par). And after [these things I arose] from the [dead." (25,4-9.)

There can be no doubt that the speaker here is Jesus Christ, and he is addressing his executioners. His executioners, unspecified at this point, are probably not Jewish priests or Roman soldiers; they are probably the super-terrestrial archons and angels (cf. 1

Cor. 2:8), figures who have been mentioned previously in the tractate (cf. 2,5-20; 10,7-29; 13,9-15; etc).

It is most unfortunate that the text breaks off in the middle of the page, for when we turn next to p. 26, we read this remarkable statement: “[...] greeted [me . . .] They said to me, ‘Be [strong, O Melchizedek,] great [High-priest] of God [Most High, for the archons], who [are] your [enemies], made war; you have [prevailed] over them, and] they did not prevail over you, [and you] endured, and [you] destroyed your enemies’” (26,1-9).

The text again breaks off in the middle of the page, and, after a crucial gap, we find ourselves at the end of the tractate, on p. 27. Reference is made to “sacrifices” and “fasting” (27,1-3), and then a final command is given, and the informants ascend to heaven:

“These revelations do not reveal to anyone in the flesh, since they are incorporeal, unless it is revealed to you (i.e. unless express command is given by revelation).’ When the brethren who belong to the generations of life had said these things, they were taken up to (the regions) above all the heavens. Amen.” (27,3-10 end.)

It is imperative that we consider the problem posed by the material on pages 25 and 26, material which can only be taken as part of “these revelations” referred to at the end of the tractate (27,3). On p. 25 *Jesus Christ* (who else can it be?) is speaking to his angelic opponents, referring to his death and his subsequent resurrection. On p. 26 *Melchizedek* ([ΜΕΛΧΙΣΕ]ΔΕΚ) is greeted by a heavenly throng and congratulated upon his victory over his enemies. We are drawn to the conclusion that, in the revelation which the priest Melchizedek has received, he has seen that he himself will have a redemptive role to play as the suffering, dying, resurrected and triumphant Savior, Jesus Christ!

If this hypothesis as to the identification of Melchizedek with Jesus Christ is tenable, then the two revelations contained in this tractate are to be understood as progressive revelations. The first deals, principally, with the life, sufferings, death, resurrection, and ultimate victory of Jesus Christ. In addition, the struggles of the elect community against the archon-inspired opponents are prominently featured. All of this is construed as “prophecy” of the future. There is also a hint in this revelation, as we have seen

(see 5.11-17, and comments above), that Melchizedek himself has a future priestly role to play. The second revelation also deals with the suffering, death, resurrection, and ultimate victory of Jesus Christ, but from what we read on p. 26 it seems that the victory of Jesus Christ is the victory of Melchizedek, and that, in fact, they are one and the same. The extant materials strongly suggests that in the second revelation Melchizedek has been transported into the future, so to speak, in a visionary experience, and sees that the role of Savior-High-priest is *his own* future role. To put it another way, our tractate presents to us *two* Melchizedeks: an ancient priest from biblical history, the ostensible recipient of the revelations, and an eschatological redeemer figure, one who is not only "made like (ἀφωμοιωμένος) the Son of God" (Heb 7:3), but who is actually *assimilated* to "Jesus Christ the Son of God" (1,2). (See below, on the use of Heb in *Melch.*)

Curious as such a doctrine may appear, it is not without parallel in comparable materials from Jewish apocalyptic literature, notably the "Enoch" literature.

In the "Similitudes" of 1 (Ethiopic) *Enoch* (chs. 37-71) overlapping and parallel revelations are given to Enoch, the son of Jared (cf. Gen. 5:18-24), who recounts his visionary experiences in the first person. These revelations deal with the coming judgment of the wicked and the salvation of the righteous, and with the enthronement of the glorious "Son of Man" (see esp. chs. 46-49). Finally the spirit of Enoch ascends into the heavens, and an angel greets him with the words, "You are the Son of Man who is born unto righteousness" (1 *Enoch* 71:14; the changes that R. H. Charles makes in the text in his translation of 1 *Enoch* 71:14-17, emending the pronouns from 2 sg. to 3 sg., are quite unwarranted, and without any support in the Ethiopic MSS.). Thus the antediluvian patriarch, Enoch, is given a revelation which portrays the future redemptive role of the Son of Man, and which ultimately equates Enoch himself with that figure! I see a similar situation in *Melch.*, wherein Melchizedek is identified as the future saviour, Jesus Christ.

A similar phenomenon occurs in a Coptic Enoch apocryphon now extant only in a few fragments. In this text Enoch is given a vision of his own role in the Judgment as the "scribe of righteousness." (See Pearson, "The Pierpont Morgan Fragments," esp. pp. 235-236, 272-273.)

Moreover there is precedent in the Enoch literature for the the notion of two Melchizedeks, or rather a single Melchizedek in two (or more) historical manifestations. In the long recension of 2 (Slavonic) *Enoch* there is a remarkable passage which deals with the figure of Melchizedek. (In A. Vaillant's edition this passage comprises chs. 21-23; in the English translation and commentary by W. Morfill and R. H. Charles the passage is printed as an appendix, not considered an essential part of the text of 2 *Enoch*.) In this passage a child is born miraculously to Noah's recently-deceased sister-in-law, and the child, marked on his chest with a priestly seal, speaks and praises God. The boy is named "Melchizedek" by Noah and his brother Nir, whose wife had been thus miraculously and posthumously delivered. In a night vision Nir is told about the impending flood, and he is also informed that the archangel Michael will bring Melchizedek to heaven. Melchizedek will be the chief of the priests among the people and in the end of days will be revealed yet another time as the chief priest. Thus Melchizedek, in this text, has three different manifestations: miraculously born before the Flood, serving in the post-diluvian age as a great priest, and functioning as a priest in the end-time, i.e. in a *messianic* capacity. (On this text see I. Gruenwald, "The Messianic Image of Melchizedek," pp. 90-92.) That this tradition arose in early Jewish circles is most probable (so Gruenwald; cf. also Delcor, "Melchizedek," pp. 127-130; for a contrary view see Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, pp. 114-115), though there are also in some manuscripts of 2 *Enoch* secondary Christian additions (isolated by Vaillant in his edition as the work of a reviser).

These texts from the Jewish Enoch literature, therefore, provide support for the interpretation advanced above, that in *Melch.* the figure of Melchizedek appears in a double role: as ancient priest and recipient of heavenly revelations of the eschatological future, and as eschatological savior-priest identified with Jesus Christ.

It should be pointed out that the identification, Melchizedek = the Son of God (= Jesus Christ), is known to have been made in some early Christian groups, especially in Egypt. According to Thomas of Marga, "when the heresy of the Melchizedekians broke out at Scete in the land of Egypt through the contemptible monks who said that Melchizedek was the son of God, although there were doctors and famous bishops in those days, yet Theophi-

lus, Bishop of Alexandria, allowed the blessed Macarius, a monk, to make refutation of this error: and that holy man actually did so, and made manifest the foolishness of their opinions" (*Book of Governors*, ed. Budge, vol. 2, pp. 94-95, quoted in Evelyn-White, *The Monasteries of the Wadi 'n Natrun*, vol. 2, p. 116). In the *Apophthegmata Patrum* there is a story about an old visionary who believed Melchizedek to be the Son of God, and who was ultimately corrected in his views by Archbishop Cyril of Alexandria (*Apophth. Patr.*, PG 65,160; Coptic ed. Chaine, ch. 176; the Syriac version of the story attributes the correction of the old man's views to Archbishop Theophilus, Budge, *Paradise*, vol. 1, p. 273). This accords with Epiphanius' report that there are those "even in the true church" who regard Melchizedek as the Son of God (*Haer.* 55.7.3; for other examples see esp. Stork, *Die sogenannten Melchisedekianer*, pp. 53-68).

We are now in a position to present a summary analysis of the phenomenology of the figure of Melchizedek in our tractate:

- 1) Melchizedek is an ancient "Priest of God Most High";
- 2) Melchizedek is an eschatological "High-priest";
- 3) Melchizedek is an eschatological "holy warrior."

1) Melchizedek is an ancient "Priest of God Most High." Melchizedek, the recipient of the heavenly revelations in our tractate, is addressed with that title at least twice (12,10-11; 19,14; cf. 15,9-10) by the heavenly revealer(s). This title, of course, comes straight out of the LXX text of Gen 14:18b (ἱερεὺς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου; Heb. מֶלֶךְ לְאֵל עֵלְיוֹן). In his capacity as a priest Melchizedek offers animal sacrifices, which, however, are considered to be offered not to God but to the archons (16,2-5, cf. 6,28-29). This detail is, of course, absent from the story in Genesis.

There is no trace in our document of any reference to Melchizedek as "king of Salem" (Gen 14:18a), or as a "king" of any sort. In addition, there does not seem to be any influence from Ps 110:4, which is so prominent in the Melchizedek speculations of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

2) Melchizedek is an eschatological "High-priest." The title "High-priest" occurs several times in our tractate, in contexts which depict Melchizedek's role in the future (from the standpoint of the putative time of the delivery of the revelation; the present, from the standpoint of the community for which the tractate was written). At 15,9-13 the two terms "priest" (ΠΟΥΗΝΒ = ἱερεὺς)

and "high-priest" (ἀρχιερεύς) occur together. Melchizedek refers to himself as "[the image of] the true High-priest [of] God Most High" (cf. comments above). In this latter capacity he receives a baptism which seems to serve as an "ordination" or "consecration" rite (16,12-16), and offers up spiritual sacrifices as opposed to the animal sacrifices of his previous priesthood (16,2-12). The sacrifices proper to his role as "High-priest" include a sacrifice of himself, and of those who belong to him (16,7-9), to the Father of All. Those who belong to him are doubtless the elect, the "race of the High-priest" (6,17). As High-priest he has an intercessory role (8,28), and his priesthood (ἱερωσύνη, cf. 20,11) mediates to the elect "perfect hope" and "life" (5,16-17; cf. Heb. 7:16, 19). The series of liturgical invocations beginning at 16,16, which should be taken as reflective of the worship life of the community for which the tractate is written, are presented as part of a priestly prayer of Melchizedek. Indeed one may go so far as to suggest that the specific cultic *Sitz im Leben* for this prayer is the sacrament of Baptism, with which the High-priest Melchizedek is intimately associated in our tractate.

One question that should be discussed here is the source of the designation "High-priest" for Melchizedek, since the term ἀρχιερεύς is not used of him in the OT. The most plausible answer to this question, at least *prima facie*, is to look to the Epistle to the Hebrews in the NT as the source for this designation (cf. Heb 5:10, 6:20). In Heb, of course, it is Christ, not Melchizedek, who is designated as ἀρχιερεύς. We have seen that Melchizedek is designated as the "image" of the High-priest, i.e. of Christ, and this corresponds very well to the general picture in Heb of the relationship between Melchizedek and Christ; i.e. Melchizedek "resembles the Son of God" (ἀφωμοιωμένος τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ θεοῦ). But in our tractate Melchizedek himself is also designated as "High-priest" (5,15; 26,3). It is possible that this designation for Melchizedek is based on Jewish sources. While Philo and Josephus do not use the term ἀρχιερεύς for Melchizedek (Philo calls him ὁ μέγας ἱερεύς, a functional equivalent; see *Abr.* 235), the Jewish prayer in *Const. Ap.* VIII.12.32 uses the term; and some of the Targums also call Melchizedek "High-priest" (for details see Le Déaut, "Le titre de *summus sacerdos*"). Thus the term "High-priest" used of Melchizedek in our tractate can be conjectured to derive directly from Jewish traditions and speculations on the figure of Melchizedek.

3) Melchizedek is an eschatological "holy warrior." Indeed he is such specifically in his role as "High-priest." This is clear from 26,2-9, where Melchizedek is addressed as "great [High-priest] of God [Most High]," is exhorted with the "holy war" slogan, "Be strong" (cf. e.g. IQM xvii 4,9), and is congratulated for his endurance and for destroying his enemies (cf. Ps 110:1-2). These enemies, as we have seen, are none other than the hostile archons and angels. Thus Melchizedek is represented as doing battle in an eschatological war against the archontic-demonic forces of wickedness. And he does so as a *priestly* figure.

For the sources for such ideas we are again driven back to Jewish apocalyptic literature. In the *Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs* we find that the messianic priest is expected to do battle against the demonic forces led by Beliar (*T. Dan* 5:10; *T. Levi* 18:12). And now we have in fragments from the Dead Sea Scrolls the specific teaching that Melchizedek is expected to come as a heavenly redeemer figure to exact vengeance from the hand of Belial and his fellow-spirits, and that he will do this specifically as a *priestly* figure (11QMelch). It is with considerable justification that the suggestion has been made that Melchizedek in these Qumran fragments is to be identified with the archangel Michael (see van der Woude, "Melchizedek als himmlische Erlösergestalt," pp. 269-372; the identification of Michael with Melchizedek is made also in certain Jewish midrashim, as Lueken already pointed out in his monograph, *Der Erzengel Michael*, p. 31).

Now it is precisely in his role as heavenly holy-warrior that Melchizedek seems, in our tractate, to be identified with Jesus Christ. For the "warrior" function is indisputably attributed also to "Jesus Christ, the Son of God." Especially of interest, in this connection, is the use of the term "Commander-in-chief" (ἀρχιστρατηγός) as a title for Jesus Christ (18,5). This is a well-known epithet of the archangel Michael, the chief of the heavenly hosts of God and the protagonist for Israel in Jewish angelology (cf. *Dan* 8:11 LXX; 2 *Enoch* 22:6; 33:10; *Test. Abr.* rec. A, 1 *et passim*; 3 *Apoc. Bar.* 11:4; etc.). It is possible that this epithet for Jesus derives from a primitive Jewish-Christian angelic Christology (cf. *Herm. Sim.* 8.3.3; 9.12.7-8, where Jesus Christ, the "Son of God," seems clearly to be equated with the archangel Michael!). But it is more probable that the epithet ἀρχιστρατηγός for Jesus Christ is meant to support the identification in our trac-

tate of Jesus Christ with Melchizedek, on the one hand, and the role of Melchizedek as the eschatological warrior comparable to the archangel Michael, on the other (as in 11QMelch).

Furthermore the career of the "Savior" (cf. 4,5 and esp. 14,4) is clearly depicted in the first revelation of our tractate as culminating in warfare with the archontic powers and in the final destruction of their chief, Death (13,9—14,9). In this regard we can compare the confrontation in *Test. Abr.* between the ἀρχιστρατηγός Michael and Death (the latter figure is usually called "Samael" in the Talmudic literature; cf. Pearson, "Jewish Haggadic Traditions," p. 467). Now in the second revelation a comparison of p. 25 with p. 26 suggests, as we have seen, that the eschatological struggle of Melchizedek includes the crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus. In this we have a theme that is common in early Christian theological interpretation of the death and resurrection of Jesus, i.e. as an eschatological victory over the forces of wickedness (cf. e.g. Col 2:15).

Thus the depiction of Melchizedek as a "holy warrior" figure, derived from Jewish apocalyptic speculations, is overlaid with an equation of the eschatological struggle with the crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus, and an identification of Melchizedek with "Jesus Christ, the Son of God."

From this it can be seen that a religious-historical analysis of our tractate is a complicated matter. The Jewish apocalyptic elements are very prominent, indeed basic. But the tractate is clearly a *Christian* text, and in fact contains a rigorously "orthodox," or at least anti-docetic, christology (see above). It might be suggested that *Melch.* is a Jewish-Christian product containing an originally pre-Christian Melchizedek speculation overlaid with Christian christological re-interpretation.

It can hardly be doubted that the source of this Christological re-interpretation is the Epistle to the Hebrews. (This judgment represents a revision of an earlier appraisal of the matter; cf. Pearson, "The Figure of Melchizedek," p. 207, n. 29). The key text from Heb is 7:3 (which seems to be the starting point for all early Christian speculations about Melchizedek; see Horton, *The Melchizedek Tradition*, pp. 111, 152), specifically the phrase ἀφωμοιωμένος δὲ τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ θεοῦ. The interpretation found in *Melch.* is, in fact, very close to the original meaning of the passage in Heb: the eternal Son of God is the priestly *type*, and Melchizedek is

the *antitype* (see Horton, *The Melchizedek Tradition*, pp. 161-164). Our tractate goes further, however, in positing an ultimate identity between the Savior, Jesus Christ, and the eschatological High-priest, Melchizedek. The Manichaean doctrine of Mani's heavenly "twin" would provide an analogy (cf. Henrichs-Koenen, "Mani-Codex," esp. pp. 161-189); indeed such a doctrine may have been explicit in the opening passage of *Melch.* (cf. 1,2 and 11), though the loss of so much of the text deprives us of certainty on this point.

In addition, other passages from Heb seem to be reflected in *Melch.*, though I have not found any explicit quotations. (*Melch.* also utilizes other NT texts, especially the gospels and the Pauline epistles; for references see the notes to the text and translation.) The following table provides a summary of the evidence; obviously some of the suggested allusions to, or influences from, Heb are more certain than others:

Hebrews	<i>Melchizedek</i>
1:4	15,8
1:13	26,8-9
2:11-13	6,24; 5,19; 16,8
2:14	14,8-9
3:1	18,9-10
3:12	7,1; 16,13
5:10	5,15
6:6	25,5
6:11	5,16
6:20	5,15
7:3	1,2; 15,12
7:16	5,17
7:19	5,16
7:24	20,10-11
7:26	27,9-10
7:27	6,24-26; 6,29-7,1
9:7	7,2
9:12-13	6,28
9:23-26	6,24-26
10:13	26,8-9
12:2	26,7-8

There are also clear evidences of specifically gnostic mythologoumena in our tractate. Indeed it has been suggested that *Melch.*

is a product of the *Sethian* gnostic sect (Doresse, *Secret Books*, p. 197; Berliner Arbeitskreis, "Die Bedeutung der Texte von Nag Hammadi," p. 67-68; Schenke, "Das sethianische System," p. 166; and "Gnostic Sethianism"). The specifically gnostic elements are restricted mainly to the section beginning approximately at 8,28, which contains within it a theogonic myth with strong Egyptian coloration (see above) and a midrash on the paradise story of Gen 2-3, and the "liturgical" passages containing praises of the inhabitants of the gnostic heavenly world (5,24—6,10; 16,16—18,7). It is the last-named sections which suggest a "Sethian" coloration, because of the names that occur there, names familiar from other Sethian-gnostic literature. (For an attempt to define the constituent elements of "Sethian" Gnosticism see Schenke, "Das sethianische System" and "Gnostic Sethianism"; Schenke classifies as "Sethian" the following documents: *Ap. John* + par. in Iren. *Haer.* I.29, *Hyp. Arch.*, *Gos. Eg.*, *Apoc. Adam*, *Steles Seth*, *Zost.*, *Melch.*, *Norea*, *Marsanes*, *Trim. Prot.* and Cod. Bruc. *Untitled.*)

Barbelo (5,27; 16,26) is familiar from Irenaeus' account of the (Sethian) "Barbelo-Gnostics" (*Haer.* I.29). She is the "Mother" of the primal gnostic triad of Father, Mother, and Son (cf. Schenke, "Das sethianische System," p. 166), and her name, of uncertain etymology, occurs in many other Sethian gnostic documents (e.g. *Ap. John*, *Gos. Eg.*, *Steles Seth*, *Zost.*, *Marsanes*, *Allogenes*, *Trim. Prot.*). Doxomedon, called "splendid Doxomedon" in one place (6,1 αἰθροψ; cf. 16,30), also appears elsewhere in gnostic literature (*Gos. Eg.*, *Zost.*), sometimes as "Domedon Doxomedon" (see esp. *Gos. Eg.* III 41,14 *et passim*). The name "Doxomedon" probably means "lord of glory" (cf. Böhlig, "Der jüdische and judenchristliche Hintergrund," p. 114; Böhlig interprets "Domedon" as "lord of the house," and compares it to the Jewish figure "Domiel"). The four luminaries (6,3-5; 17,9-19) occur in many other texts (e.g. Iren. *Haer.* I.20, *Ap. John*, *Gos. Eg.*, *Hyp. Arch.*, *Zost.*, *Trim. Prot.*, *Norea*, and Cod. Bruc. *Untitled*), and their occurrence is sometimes taken as a sign of "Sethian" influence (Schenke, "Das sethianische System"; but they occur also even in non-gnostic texts, as e.g. in the Coptic magical texts edited by Kropp). Perhaps the same could be said for the figure of Gamaliel, the putative mediator of the revelations to Melchizedek in our text (see discussion above, and the enumeration of texts in which Gamaliel occurs).

Pigeradamas, the "Man of Light" (6,5-6; ΠΙΓΕΡΑΔΑΜΑΣ is

probably to be taken as a vocative, and the nominative case of the name would thus be ΠΙΓΕΡΑΔΑΜΑCΑC, but the spelling with such a reduplicated ending is probably a mistake, and the name should probably be spelled ΠΙΓΕΡΑΔΑΜΑC), is the gnostic Primal Man. As such he occurs in one version of *Ap. John* (II 8,34-35 ΠΙΓΕΡΑ/ΑΔΑΜΑΝ). In *Steles Seth* Pigeradamas (VII 118,26 *et passim* ΠΙΓΕΡΑΔΑΜΑ, a vocative form) is one of the names given to the third person of the gnostic triad; the name occurs also in *Zost.* The etymology is uncertain. Böhlig divides the name ΠΙ-ΓΕΡΑ-ΑΔΑΜΑΝ (referring to the form of the name occurring in II,1: *Ap. John*; he probably did not then know of the other occurrences), and remarks cryptically, "den Charakter des Uradam hebt cod II durch die Bezeichnung als ΠΙ-ΓΕΡΑ-ΑΔΑΜΑΝ ausdrücklich hervor" ("Der jüdische und judenchristliche Hintergrund," p. 114, n. 1). Böhlig evidently understands the element ΓΕΡ(Α) to be derived from the Greek adjective γέρων, "old." But perhaps one should see this element as derived instead from Hebrew נָ, "stranger," in the gnostic sense of "alien" (ἀλλογενής). Schenke suggests that ΠΙ-ΓΕΡ-ΑΔΑΜΑC = ὁ ἱερ (ός) Ἀδαμαc, "the holy Adam," and offers for comparison ΑΔΑΜΑΝ ΕΤΟΥΑΑΒ in II,5: *Orig. World* 108,23 (see "Das sethianische System," p. 170). Giversen's suggestion (in *Apocryphon Johannis*, pp. 186-187), ΠΙ-ΓΕ-ΡΑ(Ν)-ΑΔΑΜΑΝ, "the name indeed (γέ) is Adamas," is probably the least convincing possibility. All of the suggestions advanced are based upon the supposition that the name Pigeradamas is a *Coptic* construction, since they take the initial part of the name, Π- or ΠΙ-, as a Coptic definite article. This I find to be a weakness in the proposed etymologies, but I have no better solution to offer. Klijn proposes an Aramaic etymology, ܩܘܕܐ, which would mean that Pigeradamas is the "corporeal" Adam (see *Seth*, p. 105, n. 137), but this makes no sense at all as a designation for a heavenly being (cf. also Mandaean *adam pagria*, and Rudolph, *Theogonie*, pp. 248-258).

Mirocheirothetou, the "good god of the beneficent worlds," (6,7-8; 17,27-18,2) occurs nowhere else to my knowledge (but cf. "Mirothea" in *Gos. Eg.*, *Zost.*, and *Trim. Prot.*, and "Mirotheos" in *Steles Seth*). The form of the name here is probably (anomalously) genitive case; so the name seems to be a combination of the Greek words, μοῖρα "destiny," χεῖρ "hand," and τίθημι "put, place." The designation then would mean something like, "the one who

allots, or directs, destiny." The further description, "good god of the beneficent worlds" could be an apotropaic euphemism, but the place of this deity among the other heavenly beings praised in the liturgy would then be very strange. Thus it is better to see in this figure an equivalent to "Mirotheos" in *Steles Seth*.

As has been intimated already, those sections of our text which can be labelled as definitely "gnostic" in the technical sense appear to be secondary accretions. This would also hold for the one mention of Seth; the "congregation of [the children] of Seth" (5,19-20) should probably be taken as a secondary identification of the elect, otherwise identified as the "race of the High-priest" (6,17), those that belong to Melchizedek (cf. 16,8). Therefore, rather than seeing *Melch.* as an example of "eine vollständig christianisierte sethianische Gnosis" (cf. Berliner Arbeitskreis, "Die Bedeutung der Texte von Nag Hammadi," p. 67), it might be better appraised as a gnosticized Jewish-Christian apocalypse.

Melch. is the only tractate in the entire Coptic Gnostic Library in which the figure of Melchizedek appears. To be sure, Melchizedek does appear in other gnostic literature. (For discussion of this material see esp. Horton, *The Melchizedek Tradition*, pp. 131-151; cf. Pearson, "The Figure of Melchizedek." Horton does not treat *Melch.* in his book.) In a gnostic parchment fragment from Deir El-Bala'izah (No. 52 in Kahle, *Bala'izah*) the apostle John asks the Savior to explain about Melchizedek, who is said to be "without father and without mother" (Heb 7:3). In *Pist. Soph.* Melchizedek is the great "Receiver (παράλημπτης) of the Light," who despoils the archons of their light and leads souls into the "Treasury of the Light." In *2 Jeu*, "Zorokothora Melchizedek" is the heavenly bearer of the water of baptism. In at least two of these gnostic sources (and perhaps also the Bala'izah fragment) Melchizedek is a heavenly redeemer figure, as he is also in *Melch.* His role in baptism in *2 Jeu* is especially of interest, in comparison to our tractate (on this see Pearson, "The Figure of Melchizedek," pp. 202-204).

Is it possible to place *Melch.* in a specific historical context? In considering this question we must take into account the "Melchizedekian" sect described by Epiphanius.

Epiphanius (*Haer.* 55) gives a rather full account of a group of sectarians who, he says, call themselves "Melchizedekians." This sect may be a branch of an older sect founded by one Theodotus (55.1.1; on Theodotus cf. Hipp. *Ref.* VII.36; Ps.-Tert. *Haer.* 24).

“They glorify the Melchizekek who is spoken of in the scriptures, and think that he is a great power of some kind. In their error they also say that he dwells in ineffable regions above, and that he is not only some sort of power but also superior to Christ” (55.1.2, my translation). Epiphanius goes on to say that they “deceive themselves by creating for themselves spurious books” (55.1.5). They are described as offerings sacrifices to God through Melchizedek and claiming that life is mediated through him by means of his priesthood (55.8.1-2). Epiphanius also accuses them of denying Christ in their affirmation of his conception by Mary. In other words, by their assertion of the true humanity of Christ they are in effect denying that he is “ever with the Father as divine Logos” (55.9.2).

Now virtually all of these assertions, except for the express subordination of Jesus Christ to Melchizedek, can be paralleled in *Melch.* (and even the subordination doctrine may simply reflect a misunderstanding on Epiphanius’ part). It is a pseudonymous book, glorifying the priesthood (cf. *ἱερωσύνη* in *Haer.*, 55.8.1 and in *Melch.* at 20,10-11) of Melchizedek and holding up an antidocetic affirmation of the true humanity of Jesus Christ. There is, in short, enough evidence to suggest that our tractate emerged from a “Melchizedekian” sect very much like the group described by Epiphanius. The specifically gnostic features of our tractate, however, are not accounted for by Epiphanius’ description, and it is therefore probable that the group reflected in *Melch.* has fallen under the influence of one or more other religious groups in which “Sethian” gnostic ideas prevailed (but whose influence certainly did not extend to their christology). Thus the group for whom this tractate—or at least its final redaction—was written can refer to themselves equally well as “the congregation of the children of Seth” (5,19-20) or as the “race of the High-priest” (6,17, i.e. Melchizedek). (For further discussion of these questions see Pearson, “The Figure of Melchizedek,” pp. 207-208; “Anti-Heretical Warnings,” 149-150.)

All indications point to Egypt as the country where *Melch.* was written, for, as we have seen, Egypt is the place where speculations on the figure of Melchizedek were especially rife (cf. Epiph. *Haer.* 55.9.18, *μάλιστα δὲ ἐν τῇ τῶν Αἰγύπτων χόρῳ*). In addition the Egyptian coloration of the brief theogony beginning at 9,2 supports a

NAG HAMMADI CODEX IX,I

theory of Egyptian origin for the document (or at least its final redaction).

As to the date of *Melch.*, late second or early third century would be a good guess. Speculation as to authorship is totally fruitless.

—| ΜΕΛΧΙΙΖΕΚ

- 2 ΙΗΣΟΥΣ ΠΕΧΣ ΠΩΗ[ΡΕ ΠΠΝΟΥ]
 [ΤΕ .].[....] ΕΒΟΛ Ζ[Ν
 (1 line missing)
- ΤΕ [.] ΝΑΙΩΝ ΕΙΝ[ΑΧΩ]
 6 ΠΝΑΙΦΝ ΤΗΡΟΥ ΑΥ[Ω] Ζ[Ν
 ΠΟΥΑ ΠΟΥΑ ΠΝΑΙΦ[Ν ΕΙ]Ν[ΑΧΕ]
 8 [Τ]ΦΥΣΙΣ ΠΠΑΙΩΝ [ΟΥ]ΑΨ
 ΠΕ· ΑΥΩ ΤΜΝΤΨ[Β]ΗΡΕ ΜΝ [ΤΜΝΤ]
 10 ΧΡΗΣΤΟΣ ΕΙΝΑΤΑ[Α]Υ ΖΙΩ[ΩΤ]
 ΠΨΤΗΝ· Ω ΠΣΟΝ .[.]Π[
 12 [± 9]..[
 (2 lines missing)
- [± 8]ΜΕ[
 16 [± 8]Ω Ν[
 [.]... ΜΝ ..[
 18 [.].Χ[.]ΑΦ ..[
 [. . ΕΒΟΛ] Π[ΤΟ]ΥΖΑΗ [. .]ΝΕ[
 20 [.] ΑΥΩ ΦΝΑ[ΘΩΛ]ΕΠ [Ε]
 [ΒΟΛ ΝΑΥ] ΠΤΜΕ· .[.]ΜΦ[
 22 [± 9]..[
 (1 line missing)
- 24 [± 7] Ζ[Ν] Α[
 [. . . . ΠΑ]ΡΦΟΙΜ[ΙΑ . . .].[

1,1 The name "Melchizedek" occurs also at 5,15; 12,10; 14,16; 15,9; 19,13; and 26,3. The decoration —| was probably matched by |— at the end of the name. For the use of Χ for X cf. Kahle, *Bala'izah* I, 133-134.

1,2 The name 'Ιησοῦς is abbreviated ΙC elsewhere in the codex. For the title, "Son of God," cf. 6,9-10. It is possible that "Jesus Christ, Son of God," should be read as a vocative, with Melchizedek as the speaker. Heb 7:3 may be in the background; cf. tractate introduction on the use of Heb in *Melch*. Cf. also the following note.

1,5-11 The verb forms (II Fut.) may indicate that this section is to be read as a prayer. On the "aeons" cf. 5,23ff. On the other hand,

MELCHIZEDEK

- 2 Jesus Christ, the Son [of God]
 [] from [
 (1 line missing)
- [] the aeons (αἰών) that I [might tell]
 6 all of the aeons (αἰών), and in (the case of)
 each one of the aeons (αἰών) [that I might tell]
 8 [the] nature (φύσις) of the aeon (αἰών), what
 it is, and that I might put on
 friendship and goodness (-χρηστός)
 as a garment, O brother [
 12 []
 (2 lines missing)
- []
 16 [] and [
 []
 18 [] their end [
 [] And he will [reveal]
 20 [to them] the truth [
 22 []
 (1 line missing)
- 24 [] in [
 [] proverb(s) (παροιμία)

-
- the speaker may be the revealer angel Gamaliel, addressing Melchizedek. Cf. 5,18 and note.
- 1,9-10 **ΤΜΝΤΨΡΗΤΟC**: Perhaps "Messiahship."
 1,11 **ΠCΟΝ**: Jesus Christ, addressed by Melchizedek? Cf. *Pist. Soph.* ch. 61, where the Spirit, Jesus' heavenly double, refers to the earthly Jesus as "my brother" (**ΠΑCΟΝ**). Cf. also the "brethren" mentioned at 27,7 and 12,3.
- 1,18-19 Perhaps **ΘΩ/Λ(Ε)ΓΓ ΕΒΟ]Λ**, "reveal." Cf. 1,20.
 1,20 The reference is probably to the Savior's teaching.
 1,21 **ΝΑΥ**: Cf. 4,5. But possibly **ΝΑΚ**, "to you"; cf. 6,23.
 1,25 Cf. John 16:25.

26 [± 11] . [.] . [.]
 (±2 lines missing)

[B]

[... Νω]ορπ̄ 2Ν 2ΕΝΠΑΡΑΒΟΛ[Η]

2 [ΜΝ 2ΕΝΑΙ]ΝΙΓΜΑ [
 (1 line missing)

4 [.....] ΝΡ[± 7 Τ]αψ[Ε]
 [Ο]ειψ ΗΜΟΟΥ ΠΜΟΥ ΝΑΨΤ[ΟΡ]
 6 [Τ]Ρ ΑΨΩ ΦΝΑΘΩΝΤ̄· ΟΥ ΜΟΝΟ[Ν]
 [Ν]ΤΟΘ [Ο]ΥΑΑΦ· ΑΛΛΑ ΝΕΦΚΕ[ΨΒΗΡ]
 8 [Ν]ΚΟCΜ[Ο]ΚΡΑΤΩΡ· ΝΑΡΧΩΝ [ΜΝ]
 [Ν]ΑΡΧΗ ΜΝ ΝΕΞΟΥCΙΑ· ΝΝΟΥ[ΤΕ]
 10 [Ν]2ΙΑΜ[Ε] ΜΝ ΝΝΟΥΤΕ Ν2ΟΥ[Τ]
 [Μ]Ν Ν[ΑΡΧ]ΑΓΓΕΛΟC ΑΨΩ Ν[
 (3 lines missing)

[± 7]. ΑΨ[
 16 [..... Τ]ΗΡΟΥ[
 [ΝΚΟC]ΜΟΚΡΑΤ[Ω]Ρ [
 18 [.. Τ]ΗΡΟΥ ΑΨΩ Ν[
 [... ΤΗ]ΡΟΥ ΑΨΩ Ν[
 20 [Τ]ΗΡΟΥ CΕΝΑΧΟΡ[C ΕΤΒΗ]
 [Η]Τ̄· ΑΨΩ ΕΤΒΕ [
 22 [.....] ΑΨΩ [
 (2 lines missing)

2,1 Cf. *Exc. Theod.* 66, παραβολικῶς καὶ ἡνιγμένως; *Iren. Haer.* III.5.1.
 Cf. also *Pist. Soph.*, ch. 6.

2,5 "Death" in this text is functionally equivalent to the Jewish "angel of death," Samael. He seems to be a separate figure from Satan; cf. 20,15. For the personification of Death as an angelic figure see esp. *T. Abr.*, *passim*, esp. Rec. A, 16, where Death shivers and trembles before the Most High. The personification of Death is suggested in the NT in such passages as Rom 5:15 and 1 Cor 15:26. For the angel of death (= Samael) as a "world-ruler" (חַמְוִיָּה) in Jewish aggadah see *Midr. Lev. Rab.* 18,3; cf. Krauss, *Griechische Lehnwörter*, חַמְוִיָּה. The struggle between Jesus and Death is described in grotesque detail in *The*

- 26 [
 (± 2 lines missing)
 [2]
 [at first] in parables (παραβολή)
 2 [and riddles (αἴνιγμα) [
 (1 line missing)
 4 [] proclaim
 them, Death will [tremble]
 6 and be angry, not only (οὐ μόνον)
 he himself, but (ἀλλά) also his [fellow]
 8 world-rulers (κοσμοκράτωρ), and archons (ἄρχων) [and]
 the principalities (ἀρχή) and the authorities (ἐξουσία), the
 10 female gods and the male gods
 together with the [arch-] angels (ἀρχάγγελος). And [
 (3 lines missing)
 [
 16 [] all of them [
 [the] world-rulers (κοσμοκράτωρ) [
 18 [] all of them, and all the
 [], and all the [
 20 They will say [] concerning]
 him, and concerning [
 22 [] and [
 (2 lines missing)

-
- 2,8-11 *Book of the Resurrection* (ed. Budge, *Coptic Apocrypha*).
 For such lists in the NT see 1 Cor 15:24; Col 1:16; 2:10,15;
 Eph 1:21; 3:10; but here these beings have become thoroughly
 demonized.
- 2,10 Male and female gods are listed as such in Graeco-Egyptian
 magical literature, e.g. in the Demotic Papyrus of London and
 Leiden (ed. Griffith-Thompson), col. vi.
- 2,20-3,9 The charges against the Savior are inspired by the demonic-
 archontic powers.
- 2,20 Perhaps **ϸΕΝΛΧΟΦ[ϸ ΤΗΡΟΥ**, "They will all say."
 2,22 No trace of the **Ω** remains on the MS., but it is attested in an
 early photograph.

[...] ϙΕΝΑΕ[± 8 ΜΥC]
 26 [Τ]ΗΡΙΟΝ· ΕΤΖΗ[Π
 [.]ΕΝΕ.[
 (±2 lines missing)

Γ

[± 16]ΕΠ
 2 [± 16]..[
 [± 10]ΛΟΝ Ε[Β]ΟΛ Ζ[Ν]
 4 [± 8]ΠΤΗΡΩ· C[Ε]ΝΑ[
 [± 8]ΠΑΙ ΕΡΕΝΔΙΚΟ
 6 [ΛΟΓΟΣ Τ]ΟΜCΩ ΖΝ ΟΥΑCΑ[Ι]
 [CΕΝΑ]ΜΟΥΤΕ ΕΡΟϙ ΧΕ ΠΡΩ
 8 [ΜΕ ΝΑ]ϙΕΒΗC ΜΠΑΡΑΝΟΜ[Ο]C
 [ΝΑΚΑΘ]ΑΡΤΟΝ· ΑΥΩ [ΖΜ] ΠΜΕΖ
 10 [ΨΟΜΝΤ] [Ν]ΖΦΟΥ ϙ[ΝΑΤΩΩΝ]
 [ΕΒΟΛ ΖΝ ΝΕΤ]ΜΟΟΥ[Τ
 12 [± 11]ΛΟ[
 (±16 lines missing)

Δ

ΝΡΜ[
 2 ΜΝ[
 ΜΟΟ[Υ.]Ν[± 10 ΜΜΑ]
 4 ΘΗΤΗC ΕΤΟΥΑ[ΑΒ· ΑΥΩ ϙΝΑΒΩ]
 ΛΕΠ [Ε]ΒΟΛ ΝΑΥ [ΜΠΛΟΓΟC]
 6 ΕΤΤΝΖΟ ΜΠΠ[ΤΗ]Ρ[Ω ΝΒΙ]
 ΠCΩΤΗΡ ΑΥΨΑΧΕ [ΔΕ ΖΑΖ Ν]
 8 ΨΑΧΕ· ΝΒΙ ΝΕΤΖΝ [ΜΠΗΥΕ]
 ΜΝ ΝΕΤΖΙΧΗ ΠΚΑ[Ζ ΜΝ ΝΕΤ]
 10 ΖΑΠΕ[C]ΗΤ ΜΠΚΑΖ [
 ..[....]ΟΟΥ Μ[Ν

- 3.1-9 A strip of (vertical) fibers is lost from the MS. at the right margin, resulting in the loss of entire letters at lines 2,3,4,6,8.
 3.3 Perhaps CΚΑΝΔΑ]ΛΟΝ, "scandal."
 3.5 Perhaps ΕΤΒΕ] ΠΑΙ, "because of this."
 3.6 Corr. end of line: λ over ε.

[] they will [
 26 hidden [mystery(s) (μυστήριον)
 [
 (± 2 lines missing)

3

[
 2 [
 [] out of
 4 [] the All. They will
 [] this, the [lawyers (δικολόγος)]
 6 will [bury] him quickly.
 [They will] call him,
 8 'impious (ἀσεβής) man, lawless (παράνομος)
 [(and) impure (ἀκάθαρτον)']. And [on] the
 10 [third] day he [will rise]
 [from the] dead [
 12 [
 (± 16 lines missing)

4
 [
 2 and [
 [
 4 [holy disciples (μαθητῆς). And]
 the Savior (σωτήρ) [will reveal] to them [the word
 (λόγος)]
 6 that gives life to the [All.]
 [But (δέ)] those in the heavens spoke [many]
 8 words, together with
 those on the earth [and those]
 10 under the earth. [
 [

3,9-11 Cf. 25,8-9.

4,5-6 The reference here is probably to the Savior's post-resurrection (esoteric) instruction.

4,8-10 Cf. Phil 2:10; Rev 5:3; Exod 20:4; Ign. *Tr.* 9.1; *PGM* IV. 3042-3043; V. 165-167.

- 12 [.....]ΟΥ[
 [....] ΝΑΥ [
 14 [.....]ΜΕ[
 (± 16 lines missing)

—
 Ε

- [ΕΤ]ΝΑΨΩΠΕ ΖΝ ΠΕΦΡΑΝ· <ΑΥΩ>
 2 [Ο]Ν ΣΕΝΑΧΟΟΣ ΕΡΡΟΦ ΞΕ ΟΥΑΤ
 [Χ]ΠΟΦ ΠΕ ΕΛΥΧΠΟΦ ΕΦΟΥΩΜ
 4 [Α]Ν ΕΨΧΕ ΕΦΟΥΩΜ [Ε]ΓΩ ΑΝ
 ΕΨΧΕ ΕΦΩ· ΟΥΑΤΣΒΒΗΤῆ
 6 ΠΕ ΕΑΦΣΒΒΗΤῆ· ΟΥΑΤΣΑΡΑΞ
 ΠΕ ΕΑΦΨΩΠΕ ΖΝ ΣΑΡΑΞ· ΜΠῆ
 8 ΕΙ ΕΠΠΑΘΟΣ <Ε>ΑΦΕΙ ΕΠΠΑΘΟΣ·
 ΜΠῆΤΩΩΝ ΕΒΟΛ ΖΝ ΝΕΤΜΟ
 10 ΟΥΤ <Ε>ΑΦΤΩΩΝ ΕΒΟΛ ΖΝ [ΝΕΤ]
 ΜΟ[Ο]ΥΤ· [ΣΕΝ]ΑΨΑΞΕ [ΔΕ ΠΤΜΕ]
 12 Η[ΘΙ] ΜΦ[ΥΛΗ] ΤΗΡΟΥ [ΜΝ ΠΛΑ]
 [ΟΣ Τ]ΗΡΟΥ ΕΥΧΙ ΕΒΟ[Λ ΝΖΗΤΚ]
 14 [ΝΤΟ]Κ ΖΩΩΚ Ω [ΜΕΛΧΙΣΕ]
 Α[ΕΚ] ΠΕΤ[Ο]ΥΑΑΒ [Π]Α[ΡΧΙΕ]

-
- 5,1-11 On this passage see Berliner Arbeitskreis, "Die Bedeutung der Texte von Nag Hammadi," 68-69; Pearson, "Anti-Heretical Warnings," 147-149; Koschorke, *Die Polemik der Gnostiker*, 164-165; and tractate introduction.
- 5,1 Cf. Matt 7:22; Ign. *Eph.* 7.1.
- 5,2-3 ΑΤΧΠΟΦ = ἀγέννητος. Cf. Ign. *Eph.* 7.2: γεννητός και ἀγέννητος. Cf. Cerinthus' doctrine, Iren. *Haer.* 1.26.1; Carpocrates, Epiph. *Haer.* 27.2.2 (denial of Jesus' divine birth); Saturninus, Iren. *Haer.* 1.24.2; *et al.*
- 5,3-5 For Valentinus' peculiar doctrine of Jesus' eating and drinking see fr. 3, Clem. Alex. *Strom.* III.59.3; cf. Clement's own view, which is similar, *Strom.* VI.71.2. Cf. Matt 11:19; Luke 7:34.
- 5,5-6 Cf. Tert. *Carn. Chr.* 5, against Marcion's denial of Jesus' humanity, including his circumcision.
- 5,6 ΑΤΣΑΡΑΞ = ἄσαρκος. Cf. Epiph. *Haer.* 42.11.15; Hipp. *Ref.* VII.38. The Greek word σάρξ is consistently spelled ΣΑΡΑΞ throughout the codex, and this form is used also in other codices,

12 []
 [] to them [
 14 []
 (± 16 lines missing)

5

[which] will happen in his name.

2 [Furthermore], they will say of him that he is
 unbegotten though he has been begotten, (that) he does
 4 not eat even though he eats, (that) he does not drink
 even though he drinks, (that) he is uncircumcised
 6 though he has been circumcised, (that) he is unfleshly
 (-σάρξ)
 though he has come in flesh (σάρξ), (that) he did not
 8 come to suffering (πάθος), <though> he came to suf-
 fering (πάθος),
 (that) he did not rise from the dead
 10 <though> he arose from [the]
 dead. [But (δέ)] all the [tribes (φυλή) and]
 12 all [the peoples (λάός)] will speak [the truth],
 who are receiving from [you]
 14 yourself, O [Melchizedek],
 Holy One, [High-priest (ἀρχιερεύς)],

e.g. V, VI, and VIII, as well as some NT MSS.; cf. *The Coptic Version of the New Testament*, Rom 13:14 (Horner's apparatus). It is not to be confused with late Greek σάρξ; cf. LSJ 1583b.

- 5,7 Cf. 1 John 4:2; 2 John 7.
 5,8 Cf. the Christological predication ἀπαθής, Ign. *Eph.* 7.2; etc. The denial of Christ's suffering is a common gnostic theme.
 5,9-11 Cf. e.g. Cerinthus' denial of the resurrection of Christ, according to Epiph. *Haer.* 28.6.6.
 5,11-12 "tribes and . . . peoples": Cf. Acts 5:9. The true congregation (cf. 5,19-20) is made up of Gentiles.
 5,13 Cf. 11,1.
 5,14-15 For the restoration of the name "Melchizedek" here cf. esp. 12,10-11 and 15,9-12.
 5,15 δ ἄγιος, a Messianic title; cf. Mark 1:24; Luke 1:35; 4:34; John 6:39; Acts 3:14; Rev 3:7. For ἀρχιερεύς of Melchizedek, see esp. *Const. Ap.* VIII.12.23 (a Jewish source), and δ μέγας ἱερεύς in Philo *Abr.* 235; cf. also κατὰ τὴν τάξιν μελχισέδεκ ἀρχιερεύς, Heb 5:10; 6:20. For discussion see tractate introduction.

- 16 ρεϋϙ [N]ϕελπιϙ ετ'αη[κ MN]
 ΝΤᾶ[ΙΟ M]ΠΩΝῆ· ἀν[οκ πε]
 18 [ΓΑΜΑΛ]ΙΗΛ ΝΤΑΥΤῆΝΟ[ΟΥΤ']
 ε[....]Π ΝΤΕΚΚΛΗϑΙΑ Ν[N]
 20 ΩΗ[ΡΕ] ΝCΗΘ· ΕΥΝΤΠΕ Ἡ
 ΖΕΝ[Ω]Ο [N]ΩΟ ΛΥ[Ω ΖΕΝΤΒΑ]
 22 ΝΤΒᾶ [NNA]ΙΩΝ· .[
 ΖΑ[.... Ο]ΥϑΙΑ ΝΝᾶΙ[ΩΝ]
 24 [Α]Βᾶ[....]ΑΙΑΙ ἈΒᾶΒᾶ Πᾶ[
 [.....]Ιϑ ἩΝΟΥΤΕ ΝΝ·[
 26 [.....]. Κ[...ϕ]ΥϑΙϑ [
 [ΤΜΑΔΥ] ἩΝΑΙΩΝ [ΤΒ]ᾶΡΒ[ΗΛΩΝ]
 28 [Π]ΩΡ[Π] ἩΜΙϑΕ Ν[ΝΑ]Ι[ΩΝ]

Ξ

- ἈΙΘΟΥ ΔΟΞΟΜΕΔΩΝ ΔΡΜ[
 2 ΠᾶΝΙΩΟ<Υ> ἩΙϑ ΠΕΧϑ· Ναρ[χι]

-
- 5,16 Cf. Heb 6:11; 7:19.
 5,17 Cf. Heb 7:16.
 5,18 For "Gamaliel," cf. *Apoc. Adam* V 75,23; *Gos. Eg.* III 52,21; 64,26; IV 64,15; 76,17; *Trim. Prot.* XIII 48*,27; *Marsanes* X 64*,19; *Zost.* VIII 47,2; *Cod. Bruc. Untitled*, ch. 8. See tractate introduction for discussion.
 5,19 Perhaps ε[δωλε]Π, "to reveal," but one would then expect the usual ΕΒΟΛ. Cf. 15,3. 'Εκδησία: Cf. Heb 2:12.
 5,20 Seth (Gen 4:25-5:8) is the "father of the living and immovable race" in "Sethian" Gnosticism, as in *Steles Seth* VII 118,12-13. Cf. e.g. *Ap. John* II 13,21, "seed of Seth"; *Gos. Eg.* III 65,19-20; IV 77,18, "the sons of the great Seth." On Seth in Gnosticism see Pearson, "The Figure of Seth."
 5,20-22 Cf. Rev 5:11; Dan 7:10; *1 Enoch* 14:22; 40:1; 60:1; 71:8. See also *Orig. World* II 105,20-29.
 5,23 Cf. 1,5-9.
 5,24 This is probably an "ineffable" name of the supreme God. A possible reading may be a palindrome: [Α]Βᾶ[Βᾶ ΙΑΙ]ᾶΙᾶ [ἈΒᾶΒᾶ]. Similar palindromes occur in the magical papyri; see e.g. αω αιαι-ιαια ιαω, *PGM* IV. 1069. Here the mystical name may be based on the divine name "Yao" (יהוה, יא-) and the Hebrew/Aramaic word אב, "father." Cf. note to 6,14. Cf. also *Pist. Soph.*, ch. 142.

- 16 the perfect hope (ἐλπεις) [and]
the [gifts of] life. [I am]
18 [Gamaliel] who was [sent]
to [] the congregation (ἐκκλησία) of [the]
20 [children] of Seth, who are above
[thousands of] thousands and [myriads]
22 of myriads [of the] aeons (αἰών) [
[] essence (οὐσία) of the [aeons (αἰών)]
24 [α]βα[] αιαι αβαβα. O
divine [] of the [
26 [] nature (φύσις)
[O Mother] of the aeons (αἰών), [Barbelo,]
28 [O first-] born of the aeons (αἰών)],

6

- splendid (αἰθοψ) Doxomedon, Dom̄ [
2 O glorious one, Jesus Christ,

-
- 5,24-25 Perhaps ΠΑ[Υ/ΤΟΓΕΝ]ΗΦ ΝΝΟΥΤΕ, "the divine Autogenes."
Cf. e.g. *Norea* IX 28,6.
- 5,25 Or perhaps ΦΥC]ΙΦ ΝΝΟΥΤΕ, "divine nature(s)."
- 5,27 MS. now lacks any trace of the name "Barbelo," but early
photographs record the three letters plus superlin. stroke, sub-
sequently flaked off. Barbelo is "Mother of all the aeons" in the
Bruce Codex; see Cod. Bruc. *Untitled*, ch. 2; cf. "womb of the
All," *Ap. John* II 5,5. For discussion see tractate introduction;
cf. also 16,26. In Valentinian speculation the "first Ogdoad" is
the "Mother of all the aeons"; see *Iren. Haer.* I.8.5.
- 5,28 Cf. 16,29.
- 6,1 αἰθοψ, "splendid," is taken as a *nomen sacrum* in the MS., as
indicated by the superlin. stroke. On Doxomedon see tractate
introduction. There is not enough room to restore "Domedon" at
the end of the line, as in *Gos. Eg.* III 41,14; IV 51,3. Perhaps
ΔΟΜ[ΙΗΛ], "Domiel"; cf. Scholem, *Jewish Gnosticism*, 33, and
Böhlig, "Der jüdische und juden-christliche Hintergrund," 114.
- 6,2 ΠΑΝ|ΩΦ<Υ> : This reading is far from certain, owing to the
condition of the MS. at this point. The MS. appears to read
ΠΑΝ|Ω.Ϛ, and the reading adopted here presupposes that the
scribe erroneously wrote Ϛ for Υ. The word ΩΟΥ is a dialectical
variant (B, S^b) of ΕΟΥ, "glory." The word is thus taken to be
equivalent to ΠΑ ΝΙΕΟΥ, lit. "the one of the(se) glories,"
hence "glorious one."

ΣΤΡΑΤ[ΗΓΟ]Σ ΝΗΦΩΣΤΗΡ Ν[ΒΟΜ]
 4 ΑΡΜΟΖΗΛ· ΟΡΩΪΑΗΛ· ΔΑΥ[ΕΙΘΕ]
ΗΪΗΛ[ΗΘ·] ΑΥΩ ΠΡΜΗΟΥΟΕΙΝ
 6 ΝΑΤΜΟΥ ΝΑΙΩΝ ΠΙΓΕΡΑΔΑΜΑ[Σ]Α·
ΑΥΩ ΠΝΟΥΤΕ ΕΤΝΑΝΟΥΩ ΝΝ
 8 ΚΟΣΜΟΣ ΕΤΡ ΨΑΥ ΜΙΡΩΧΕΙΡΟ
ΘΕΤΟΥ ΕΒΟΛ ΖΙΤΝ ΙΣ ΠΕΧΣ ΠΩΗ
 10 ΡΕ ΗΠΝΟΥΤΕ ΠΑΙ ΑΝΟΚ ΕΪΤΑ
Ψ[Ε] ΘΕΙΩ ΗΜΟΩ ΚΑΤΑ Θ[Ε] ΕΤΑΩ
 12 [ΒΜ Π]ΨΙΝΕ ΝΘ[Ι ΠΕ]ΤΨΟ[Ο]Π ΝΑΜΕ·
[ΖΝ ΝΕ]ΤΨΟΟΠ [. . .] Π.[
 14 [. . . . Ψ]ΟΟΠ ΑΝ ΑΒΕΑ ΒΟΡΦ[ΥΧ·]
[ΧΕ ΕΥΕΪ Ν]ΑΚ ΜΠΣΟΟΥΝ [ΝΤΜ]Ε
 16 [. . . .]Ψ[. .]ΜΑ ΧΕ ΟΥΕΒ[ΟΛ] ΗΕ
[ΖΜ ΠΓ]ΕΝΟΣ ΜΠΑΡΧ[Ι]ΕΡ[Ε]ΥΣ
 18 [ΕΤΝΤ]ΠΕ ΝΖΕΝΨ[Ο ΝΨ]Ο ΜΝ
[ΖΕΝΤΒΑ] ΝΤΒΑ ΝΝΑΙΩ[Ν· Σ]Ε[Ο] Ν

- 6,2-3 ἀρχιστρατηγός is a common epithet of the archangel Michael; for discussion see tractate introduction.
- 6,3-5 The four luminaries are well-known from other gnostic documents. See esp. *Ap. John*: ΑΡΜΟΖΗΛ, III 11,24; II 8,5; 9,2; IV 12,10; also called ΖΑΡΜΟΖΗΛ, III 13,3; BG 33,8; 35,9; and “Armogenes,” *Iren. Haer.* I.29.2. ΟΡΩΪΑΗΛ, cf. ΟΡΟΪΑΗΛ, III 13,19; IV 28,1; ΩΡΙΑΗΛ, IV 12,15; ΩΡΙΗΛ, II 8,9; ΩΡΟΙΑΗΛ, III 12,4; BG 33,13; 36,1; ΩΡΩΪΗΛ, II 9,14; cf. “Raguel” in *Iren. Haer.* I.29.2. ΔΑΥΕΙΘΕ, III 14,1; BG 33,18; 36,7; ΔΑΥΕΙΘΑΙ, II 8,13; 9,16; IV 12,21; cf. “David” in *Iren. Haer.* I.29.2. ΗΛΗΛΗΘ, II 8,18; 9,23; III 14,7; IV 13,1; BG 34,2; 36,13; “Eleleth” in *Iren. Haer.* I.29.2. These four occur later in the text on p. 17, but only the name ΩΡΙΑΗΛ is extant, at 17,12. For discussion see tractate introduction. Cf. also note to 28,27-28.
- 6,6 ΠΙΓΕΡΑΔΑΜΑΣΑ: The form of the ending is probably to be taken as a vocative; the nominative form would then be —ΑΣΑΣ. This reduplicated ending is probably a mistake, however. For Pigeradamas cf. *Ap. John* II 8,34-35, ΠΙΓΕΡΑΔΑΜΑΝ; *Steles Seth* VII 118,26, ΠΙΓΕΡΑΔΑΜΑ (voc. form); *Zost.* VIII 6,23, ΠΙΓΕΡΑΔΑΜΑΣ. See also note to 17,4. For discussion see tractate introduction.
- 6,8-9 ΜΙΡΩΧΕΙΡΟΘΕΤΟΥ: The form is probably a genitive. This

- O chief commanders (ἀρχιστρατηγός) of the luminaries
 (φωστήρ), you [powers]
- 4 Armozel, Oroiael, Daveithe,
 Eleleth, and you man-of-light,
- 6 immortal Aeon (αἰών) Pigeradamasas,
 and you good god of the
- 8 beneficent worlds (κόσμος), Mirocheirothetou,
 through Jesus Christ, the Son
- 10 of God whom I proclaim.
 Inasmuch as (κατά) there has [visited]
- 12 [the One who] truly exists
 [among those who] exist [
- 14 [do(es)] not [exist], Abel Baruch ———
 [that] you (sg.) [might be given] the knowledge [of the
 truth]
- 16 [] that he is [from]
 [the] race (γένος) of the High-priest (ἀρχιερεύς)
- 18 [which is] above [thousands of thousands] and
 [myriads] of myriads of the aeons (αἰών). The

figure is probably equivalent to "Mirotheos" in *Steles Seth VII* 119,12; 120,15. See tractate introduction.

6,12-14

ΠΕΤΨΟΟΠ . . . ΨΟΟΠ ΔΝ: This passage, and its parallel at 16,18-19, probably contain a formula used of the supreme God similar to the following passage in Cod. Bruc. *Untitled*, ch. 7, attributed to the gnostic prophet Phosilampes: "Those things which verily and truly exist and those which do not truly exist are for his sake. This is he for whose sake are those that truly exist which are secret, and those that do not truly exist which are manifest."

6,14

"Abel Baruch": Cf. 16,19. H.-M. Schenke (in a forthcoming study kindly sent to me in draft) rightly takes these names to refer not to the familiar biblical figures (cf. Gen 4:2, Jer 32:12) but to God, as epithets: "Father, God, Blessed" (אב + אל + ברוך). For the form Βορούχ instead of Βαρούχ see Jer 50:6 LXX. Cf. also the angel names "Abaël" and "Baruch," Müller, *Die Engellehre*, pp. 296, 289, 302; and Kropp, *Zaubertexte*, vol. 1, pp. 29 and 62.

6,16

The reference is probably to Jesus Christ; cf. 6,9-10.

6,17

The reference is probably to the "race of Seth"; cf. 5,20 and note. Melchizedek would be an important representative of this "high-priestly race"; cf. 5,14-15 and 15,7-13. Cf. tractate introduction.

6,18-19

Cf. 5,20-22 and note.

20 [ατ]σοογν εροφ νβι μ[π̄να] ν
 [α]ντικειμενον μ̄ν προγ
 22 [τ]εκο· ογ μονον αῑει εβω
 [λεπ] εβ[ολ] νακ ν[τ]αλληθεια
 24 [ετ̄ν̄ζρ]αῑ ζ̄ν [ν̄σν]ηογ αφοτ
 [π̄]εῑζογν ογ̄ααγ [επ̄προ]ςφο
 26 [ρα] ετᾱν̄ζ̄ μ̄ν νεκ̄χῑ[ο·] ᾱφ[τα]
 [λο]ογ ε̄ζρᾱῑ μ̄προ[ςφορα μ̄]
 28 [π]τηρ̄ϕ· ζ̄ε̄ν̄τ̄β̄ν[οογε γαρ αν]
 [νετ]κ̄ν̄ᾱταλοογ ε̄ζρ[αῑ ζα νο]

[Σ]

βε μ̄μ̄ν̄τᾱτ̄νᾱζ̄τ[ε αγω ζα]
 2 [μ̄]μ̄ν̄τᾱτ̄σοογν· μ̄[ν̄ ζβηγε τη]
 [ρογ] ε̄θοογ ετογ[ναααγ
 4 [.. αγω ν̄σ[ε]πωζ [αν ε̄ζρᾱῑ]
 [επι]ωτ̄ μ̄π̄τη[ρ]ϕ [̄
 6 [...] ν̄τ̄π̄ῑσ̄τ̄[ῑσ
 [...].[..]νε.[
 8 [...]ιν[
 [.]ζ· τ̄ωσ τ[
 10 [.....]ε̄χ[

(± 14 lines missing)

[.....]ο̄σ̄μ[
 26 [.....]μ̄ο̄σ̄ .[
 [.....] ε̄χῑ β[απ̄τῑσ̄μα
 28 [... μ̄ο]γ̄εῑοογε κ[

6,19-22 Cf. 14,4-9; 15,24-25; 26,9. On the archontic ignorance cf. 1 Cor 2:8.

6,22 The translation presupposes ΟΥ ΜΟΝΟΝ <ΠΑΙ ΑΛΛΑ>; cf. 67,30. Cf. also 5,17-20.

6,24 The superlin. stroke on the second Ν is visible. For Ν̄σ̄ν̄η̄ο̄γ cf. 27,7. But cf. also Heb 2:11-12.

6,24-26 Cf. 16,7-8; and Heb 7:27; 9:23-26; Rom 12:1. Ps. 110:3 may also be in the background.

- 20 adverse (ἀντικείμενον) [spirits (πνεῦμα) are]
ignorant of him and (of) their (own)
22 destruction. Not only (οὐ μόνον) (that, but) I have come
to
[reveal] to you [the] truth (ἀλήθεια)
24 [which is] within the [brethren.] He included
himself [in the] living
26 [offering (προσφορά)] together with your [offspring.] He
[offered] them up as a [sacrifice (προσφορά) to]
28 [the] All. [For (γάρ) it is not] cattle
[that] you will offer up [for sin(s)]

[7]

- of unbelief [and for]
2 the ignorances [and all the] wicked
[deeds] which they [will do].
4 And they do [not] reach
[the] Father of the All [
6 [] the faith (πίστις) [
[
8 [
[] thus (τός) [
10 [

(± 14 lines missing)

- [
26 [] to receive [baptism (βάπτισμα)
28 [] waters [

-
- 6,28 For ΖΕΝΤΕΝΟΟΥΕ cf. 16,2. Heb 9: 12-13 is in the background.
See tractate introduction.
6,29-7,1 ΖΑ ΝΟΒΕ: Cf. Heb 7:27. ΜΗΤΑΤΝΑΖΤΕ: Cf. Heb 3:12.
7,2 ΜΗΝΤΑΤΤΟΟΥΝ = ἀγνώματα. Cf. Heb 9:7.
7,8 Perhaps [ΟΥΟΕ]ΙΝ, "light."
7,9 The Ζ is now lost from the MS.; it is attested in an early photo-
graph.
7,25 Perhaps Κ]ΟСМ[ОС, "world."
7,26 Perhaps ΚΟС]ΜΟС, "world."

[H]

[ΜΟΥΕΙΟΟΥ]Ε ΓΑΡ ΕΤΖΙΠCΑΝ[ΤΠΕ]
 2 [.....Ε]ΤΧΙ ΒΑΠΤΙCΜΑ [
 [± 8]Ε· ΑΛΛΑ ΧΙ ΒΑ[ΠΤΙC]
 4 [ΜΑ ΠΗ ΕΤ]ΖΝ Μ[Μ]ΟΟΥ ΕΤ[
 [± 9] ΕΦΝΗΟΥ Ε[
 6 [± 9] ΟC ΠΝΜ.[
 [± 7 ΝΟ]Θ Π[
 8 [± ΙΙ]..[
 [..... ΒΑΠΤΙC]ΜΑ ΕΥ.[
 10 [± ΙΟ Ε]ΧΝ [

(± 14 lines missing)

[± ΙΟ]ΑΙΤ.[
 26 [± ΙΟ]ΖΙΤΦ[ΟΤ-
 [± ΙΟ]ΝΤΕ Π[
 28 [.....]Ε· ΩΛΗΛ ΖΑ[ΠΧΠΟ ΠΝ]

Θ

[ΑΡ]ΧΩΝ ΜΝ ΝΑΓΓΕΛ[ΟC ΤΗΡΟ]Υ ΜΝ
 2 [Π]CΠΕΡΜΑ <ΕΝΤ> ΑΦΖΕ†Ε [ΕΒΟΛ ΖΜ]
 [ΠΙΩ]Τ ΜΠΤΗΡ῀· Τ[
 4 [.]Α ΤΗΡ῀ ΕΒΟΛ [Ζ]Ν .[
 [ΑΥ]ΧΠΟ ΠΝΝ[ΟΥΤΕ ΜΝ ΝΑΓ]
 6 [ΓΕ]ΛΟC ΜΝ ΠΡΩΜ[Ε
 [Ε]ΒΟΛ ΖΜ ΠCΠ[ΕΡΜΑ ΜΦΥCΙC]
 8 ΤΗΡΟΥ ΝΕ[Τ]ΖΝ [ΜΠΗΥΕ ΜΝ]

-
- 8,5 Perhaps ΝΗΟΥ Ε[ΖΡΑΙ, "coming down."
 8,6 Perhaps ΠΝΜΠ[ΗΟΥΕ, "of the heavens"; cf. 13,13.
 8,7 The top stroke of Θ is extended, indicating that Θ is a final letter.
 8,9 The letter trace after ΕΥ is now lost from the MS. It is attested
 in an early photograph.
 8,10 A superlin. stroke is visible three spaces after Ε]ΧΝ.
 8,25 Perhaps Τ]ΑΙ ΤΕ [ΘΕ, "thus."
 8,28-9,3 The restorations are far from certain, for the passage is difficult
 to construe. ΧΠΟ ΠΝΑΡΧΩΝ: Cf. 10,10. Perhaps the reference
 here, if the restoration is correct, is to humanity in general,
 viewed as the product of *both* heavenly and archontic powers.
 Melchizedek's role as a priest involves intercessory prayer.

[8]

For (γάρ) [the waters] which are above

2 [] that receive baptism (βάπτισμα)

[] But (ἀλλά) receive [that baptism
(βάπτισμα)]

4 [which is] with the waters which [

[] while he is coming [

6 [] ... [

[] great

8 [

[] baptism (βάπτισμα)] as they [

10 [] upon [

(± 14 lines missing)

[

26 [] by [

[] of the [

28 [] pray for the [offspring of the]

9

archons (ἀρχων) and [all] the angels (ἄγγελος), together
with

2 [the] seed (σπέρμα) <which> flowed [forth from]

[the Father] of the All [

4 [the] entire [] from [

[There were] engendered the [gods and the angels
(ἄγγελος)]

6 and the men [

out of the [seed (σπέρμα),] all of [the]

8 [natures (φύσις)], those in [the heavens and]

9,1 The restoration of this line presupposes a greater space between fragments than shown in the *Facsimile Edition*. Cf. codex introduction.

9,2 MS. has a small **Ϟ** written above the line, between **π** and **ϵ**.

9,3 "The Father of the All" is the highest God; cf. 14,27; 16,9.17.

9,3-4 Perhaps **СПЕР/[М]Λ ΤΗΡϞ**, "the entire seed."

9,4 The letter-trace after **Ϟ** is now lost from the MS. but is attested in an early photograph.

9,5-10 Cf. 2,7-11 and 4,8-10, and notes thereto.

9,6 Perhaps **ΜϞ ΝΔΔΙΜΩΝ**], "and the demons"; cf. 16,5.

9,7-8 **ΜΦΥΣΙΣ ΤΗΡΟΥ**: Cf. 13,8-9.

9,8 Or **ΝΕ[Τ]ϞϞ [ΝϞΠΗΥΕ]**; cf. 13,13.

10 ΝΕΤΖΙΧΗ ΠΚΑΖ ΜΝ [ΝΕΤΖΑ]
 ΠΕΦΗΤ Η[ΠΚ]ΑΖ [.]·Α[
 (5 lines missing)
 16 ΝΤ[
 ΑΝ[
 18 Η[
 (1 line missing)
 20 ΠΝΘ[
 ΕΖΡΑΓ[
 22 Φ[...] Ν[
 (1 line missing)
 24 [.....]·[.]·[.] †ΜΑ[
 [...]ΦΥCIC ΝΝΖΙΑΜΕ [
 26 [.....]Ε ΖΝ ΝΕΤΖΝ Τ[
 [...]· ΑΥΜΑΡ[ΟΥ] ΖΝ Ζ·[
 28 [ΠΑΓ ΔΕ] ΔΔΑΜ ΝΑΛΗΘΕΙ[ΝΟC ΑΝ]

̅

ΠΕ Ο[ΥΔΕ] ΕΥΖΑ ΝΑΛΗΘΕΙΝ[Η Χ]Ε
 2 ΝΤ[ΑΡΟΥΟΥΩ]Μ ΕΒΟΛ ΖΜ ΠΩΗ[Ν Ν]
 [ΤΓΝΩCIC Α]ΥΡΚΑΤΑΠΑΤΕΙ [ΝΝ]
 4 [ΧΕΡΟΥΒΕΙ]Ν ΜΝ ΝCΑΡΑΦΕΙ[Ν]
 [ΜΝ ΤCΗΦΕ ΝΚ]ΨΖΤ ΑΥΡΚΑ[

-
- 9,25 ΖΙΑΜΕ: AA³ form here and at 12,13; cf. 10,26, where the S form occurs. Cf. also 9,27 and 15,24 for a similar variation.
 9,26 A trace of what may be a superlin. stroke occurs after Τ.
 9,27 Cf. 15,24 and note. The "bound" Adam is not the "true" Adam; see 9,28-10,1 and note.
 9,28-10,1 For "true Adam" and "true Eve" cf. *Orig. World* II 117,11 ("true Man") and 117,2 ("true Eve"). For the eschatological "true Man" see also *Hyp. Arch.* II 96,33.
 10,1-29 The transcription presupposes that the lines are wider than shown in the *Facsimile Edition*. Cf. note to 9,1 and codex introduction.
 10,1 The Ο in ΟΥΔΕ is now lost from the MS., but it is partially attested in an early photograph.
 10,2-3 Cf. Gen 3:6.

those upon the earth and [those]
 10 under [the earth

(5 lines missing)

16 . . . [
 . . .
 18 [

(1 line missing)

20 the [
 . . . [
 22 [

(1 line missing)

24 [
 [] nature (φύσις) of the females [
 26 [] among those that are in the [
 [] they were bound with [
 28 [But (δέ) this] is [not] (the) true (ἀληθινός) Adam

10

[nor (οὐδέ)] (the) true (ἀληθινή) Eve. [For]
 2 [when they ate] of the tree [of]
 [knowledge (γνώσις)] they trampled (καταπατεῖν) [the]
 4 [Cherubim] and the Seraphim
 [with the flaming sword]. They [

10,3 **ΑΥΡΚΑΤΑΠΑΤΕΙ**: "Trampling" upon evil spirits is given to the elect in the eschaton, according to *T. Sim.* 6:6; *T. Levi* 18:12; cf. Ps. 91:13; Luke 10:19-20; Rom 16:20. Cf. also *Hyp. Arch.* II 97,6-7: **ΣΕΝΑΡΚΑΤΑΠΑΤΕΙ ΜΗΜΟΥ ΝΝΕΞΟΥΣΙΑ**, "they will trample Death (and) the Authorities."

10,4-5 Cf. Gen 3:24. The removal of "the threatening sword against Adam" is an eschatological hope in Jewish apocalyptic; see *T. Levi* 18:10. For "Cherubim and Seraphim" in a gnostic context, as here, cf. *Treat. Seth* VII 54,34. On the "flaming sword," cf. the Simonian *Megale Apophasis*, Hipp. Ref. VI 17.5-6, in a complicated allegory.

10,5-11 The key to understanding this passage may perhaps be found in *Orig. World* II 117,2-28.

6 [± 9]ΕΤΝ ΑΔΑΜ [
 [..... ΝΚΟΣ]ΜΟΚΡΑΤΩΡ Μ[Ν]
 8 [± 12]ΜΟΥ ΕΒΟΛ
 [± 7 Μ]ΝΝCΑ ΤΡΕΥΧΠΟ
 10 [± 7]ΧΠΟ Ν[Τ]Ε ΝΑΡΧΩΝ ΜΝ
 [ΝΟΥΚΟΣ]ΜΙΚ[Ο]Ν [ΝΑ]Τ ΕΥΗΠ Ε

(5 lines missing)

[± 18] ΑΛ
 18 [ΑΛ ± 15] ΕΥΟ
 [± 19] Α

(1 line missing)

21 [± 18] Ν

(3 lines missing)

[.... ΟΥΟ]ΕΙΝ [
 26 [.. Α]ΥΩ ΝΖΙΟΜΕ ΜΝ ΝΖΦ[ΟΥΤ]
 [ΝΕ]ΤΨΟΟΠ ΝΜ.[
 28 [..Ζ]ΩΠ ΕΦΥCΙC ΝΙΜ [ΑΥΩ CΕΝΑ]
 [ΡΑΠ]ΟΥΑ[C]CΕ ΝΝΑΡΧΩ[Ν ΝΒΙ ΝΗ]

[12]

[Ε]ΤΧΙ ΝΤΟΟΤΩ ΝΝΕ[
 2 [CΕ]Ρ ΜΠΨΑ ΓΑΡ Ν[
 [ΑΤ]ΜΟΥ ΜΝ ΖΕΝΝ[ΟΒ Ν
 4 [...] ΜΝ ΖΕΝΝ[ΟΒ
 [ΜΝ ΖΕ]ΝΝΟΒ Ν[
 6 [....] ΝΨΗΡΕ Ν[Ν]Ρ[ΩΜΕ
 [..Μ]Α[ΘΗ]ΤΗC [
 8 [.... ΖΙ]ΚΩ[Ν] ΑΥΩ[
 [± 9 Ε]ΒΟΛ ΖΗ ΠΟΥ

10,5-7

Perhaps read: ΑΥΡΚΑ[ΤΕΧΕ / ΔΕ ΝΤCΖΙΜΕ] ΕΤΝ ΑΔΑΜ
 [ΝΒΙ / ΝΑΡΧΩΝ, "and the archons seized the woman which
 was Adam s . . ." Cf. *Orig. World II* 117,3.

10,21

Ν perhaps written over another letter.

10,26

Cf. 9,25 and note.

10,28

Cf. 5,12.

10,29

"Renunciation" of evil powers belongs to a baptismal context;

- 6 [] which was Adam's []
 [the] world-rulers (κοσμοκράτωρ) and
 8 [] them out
 [] after they had brought forth
 10 [] offspring of the archons (ἄρχων) and
 [their worldly things (κοσμικόν)], these belonging to
 (5 lines missing)
- [] but (ἀλλά)
 18 [] they are
 []
 (1 line missing)
- 21 []
 (3 lines missing)
- [light
 26 And the females and the [males,]
 those who exist with []
 28 [hidden] from every nature (φύσις), [and they will]
 [renounce (ἀποτάσσειν)] the archons (ἄρχων), [that is,
 those]
- [11]
- [who] receive from him the []
 2 For (γάρ) [they] are worthy of []
 [immortal,] and [great
 4 [] and [great
 [and] great []
 6 [] sons of [men
 [disciples (μαθητής)
 8 [image (εἰκόν)] and []
 [] from the [light]

see e.g. *Exc. Theod.* 77.1, and for "orthodox" usage Hipp. *Trad. ap.* 21.

11,1 Perhaps **ΝΝΞ[CFPAGIC]**, "the seals" (of baptism).

11,6 **Ν** has flaked off.

11,8 **ΞΙΚΩΝ**: a possible reference to Adam as "image" of God. Cf. Gen 1:26-27; 5:1. **Ν** has flaked off. Vertical fibers after **ΛΥΩ** are also flaked off.

10 [ΟΕΙΝ ± 7]Ϝ ΕΤΟΥ[Α]ΑΒ
 [± 13 Ϝ]ΑΡ Ϝ[Ι]Ν Ν
 12 [ΨΟΡΠ ± 10]ΟΥϜΠΕΡ
 (± 16 lines missing)

[1B]

[± 7] †ΝΑΚΑΡΩΕΙ ΔΕ
 2 [± 8]Ε· ΑΝΟΝ ΓΑΡ Ν[Ε]
 [ΝΣΗΥ ΕΝΤΑ]ΖΕΙ ΕΠΙΤΝ ΕΒ[ΟΛ]
 4 [± 8]ΟΝϜ· ΣΕΝΑΔΩ
 [± 9 Ε]ϞΝ ΝΑΠΟ[
 6 [± 10]·ΟΥ ΝΝΑ[
 [± 7]Π ΝΤΕ ΑΔΑΜ
 8 [..... ΑΒΕ]Λ ΕΝΩΧ Ν[ΩΕ
 [± 9]ΧΕΙ[
 10 [..]Κ ΜΕΛΧΙϜΕΔ[ΕΚ ΠΟΥΗΗΒ]
 ΝΠΝΟΥΤΕ [ΕΤΧΟΣΕ
 12 ΝΕΝΤΑΥΝ[
 ΝΖΙΑΜΕ Ν[
 14 ΜΝΤΑΤ.[
 Μ[.] Ν[
 (± 15 lines missing)

[1Γ]

ΠΕΙΣΝΑΥ ΕΝΤΑΥΣΟΤΠΟ[Υ]
 2 [ΖΝ] ΚΑΙΡΟΣ ΝΙΜ ΑΝ· ΟΥΔΕ

- 11,10 The Υ is written over a flaked area, indicating that the papyrus was already somewhat damaged when it came into the scribe's hands.
- 11,11 I has flaked off.
- 11,12 $\mu\alpha$ in $\sigma\pi\epsilon\rho\mu\alpha$, "seed," doubtless occurred on the next line.
- 12,1 The speaker is probably the angelic revealer identified at 5,17-18.
- 12,4 Or perhaps $\omicron\Upsilon\omicron\text{N}\text{Z}$, "manifest." $\sigma\epsilon\text{n}\alpha\delta\omega$: "they will remain"? Or perhaps $\sigma\epsilon\text{n}\alpha\delta\omega/[\lambda\pi]$, "they will reveal."
- 12,5 Perhaps $\text{n}\alpha\pi\omicron[\sigma/\tau\omicron\lambda\omicron\sigma$, "the apostles"; or $\text{n}\alpha\pi\omicron[\kappa\alpha/\lambda\psi\iota\sigma$, "the revelations." In the latter case $\epsilon\chi\text{N}$ should be translated, "concerning."
- 12,8 Traces of the superlin. stroke on $\overline{\lambda\beta\epsilon\lambda}$ are visible. Here, in contrast to 6,14 and 16,19, the name "Abel" probably refers to the biblical personage. Cf. tractate introduction for discussion of this and the other names in this passage.

10 [] which is holy.
 For (γάρ) [] from the
 12 [beginning [] a seed (σπέρμα)
 (± 16 lines missing)

[12]
 [] But (δέ) I will be silent
 2 [] for (γάρ) we [are]
 [the brethren who] came down from
 4 [the] living []. They will . . .
 [] upon the [
 6 [
 [] of Adam
 8 [Abel], Enoch, [Noah
 [
 10 [] you, Melchizedek, [the Priest]
 of God [Most High
 12 those who [
 women [
 14 [
 [
 (± 15 lines missing)

13

these two who have been chosen will
 2 [at] no time (καίρως) nor (οὐδέ)

-
- 12,9 Perhaps ΜΕΛΙΧΕΙ, "Melchi," one of the traditional names given to Melchizedek's father. See e.g. Ps.-Athanasius, *Historia de Melchisedech*, PG 28,525-526.
- 12,9-10 Perhaps Ν/ΤΟΙΚ, "you."
- 12,10-11 Gen 14:18b LXX, ἱερεὺς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου.
- 12,12 Perhaps ΝΕΝΤΑΥΗ[ΤΟΝ ΗΜΟΟΥ, "those who have rested," or ΝΕΝΤΑΥΗ[ΠΩΛ, "those who have become worthy."
- 12,13 Cf. 9,25; 10,26.
- 13,1 The identity of "these two" is difficult to establish. Perhaps they are the two witnesses of Rev 11:3-11, on which see Bousset, *The Antichrist Legend*, 203-211; Pearson, "The Pierpont Morgan Fragments," 241-243. For discussion see tractate introduction.

- [2N TO]ΠΟC NIM AN EYNAΧΠ[Ι]
 4 [OΟΥ] ΖΟΤΑΝ ΕΥΨΑΝΧΠΟ[ΟΥ]
 [2ΙΤΝ] ΝΧΑΧΕ 2ΙΤΝ ΝΨΒΕΕΡ
 6 [ΟΥΔΕ 2Ι]ΤΝ ΝΨΗΜΟ ΜΝ ΝΕΤ[Ε]
 [ΝΟΥ]ΟΥ ΝΕ ΝΤΟΟΤΟΥ ΝΝΑCΕ
 8 [ΒΗC] ΜΝ ΝΕΥCΕΒΗC· CΕΝ[Α]
 [± 7]Υ ΝΒΙ ΝΦΥCΙC Τ[Η]
 10 [ΡΟΥ ΝΑΝ]Τ[Ι]ΚΕΙΜΕΝΗ· ΕΙΤΕ
 [ΝΕΤΟΥ]ΟΝΖ [Ε]ΒΟΛ ΜΝ ΝΕΤΕ
 12 [ΝCΕΟΥΟΝΖ Ε]Β[Ο]Λ ΑΝ· ΜΝ ΝΕ[Τ]
 [ΨΟΟ]Π [2]Ν ΝΜΠΗΥΕ ΜΝ Ν[Ε]Τ
 14 [2ΙΧΜ] ΠΚΑ2 [Μ]Ν ΝΕΤ'2ΑΠ[Ε]
 [CΗΤ] ΝΠΚΑ[2] CΕΝΑΡ ΠΟΛ[ΕΜ]
 16 [ΟC ..]Π[. .].. ΟΥΟΝ ΝΙΜ· [CΕ]
 [ΨΟΟ]Π ΓΑΡ ΕΙΤΕ 2Μ Π[
 18 [± 8]ΑΒ ΜΝ Μ·[
 [± 9]ΜΕ [Ν]ΤΕ[
 20 [± 8]ΑΝΑ[
 [..... ΝΑ]ΨΩΟΥ [
 22 [± 8 2]Ν ΟΥ[
 [± 8 Ε]ΡΟΟΥ [
 24 [± 8] ΝΜΟC [.]·[.]·[
 [± 8]Α ΝΑΙ ΔΕ 2Μ Π[
 26 [.. ΟΥΟΝ] ΝΙΜ CΕΝΑΠ[
 [....]ΟΥ· ΝΑΙ CΕΝ[Α
 28 [... 2]Ν CΗΨΕ ΝΙΜ' [

14

- 2ΕΝΨΩΝΕ· ΝΑΙ ΜΕΝ 2Ν 2[ΕΝ]
 2 κ[Ε]CΜΟΤ' CΕΝΑΟΤΠΟΥ [ΑΨΩ]
 [ΝC]ΕΡΚΟΛΑΖΕ ΝΜΟΟΥ [ΝΑΙ]
 4 [ΜΕ]Ν ΠCΩΤΗΡ ΝΑΡΙΤΟΥ [ΕΒΟΛ]

13,3-4

Or possibly ΕΥΝΑΧΗ/[ΑΛΥ], "be stricken."

13,4

The first O in ΧΠΟΟΥ is now broken off from the MS. but is attested in an early photograph. ΝΧΑΧΕ: Cf. ΧΙΧ[ΕΕΥ, 26,9.

13,8-9

Perhaps CΕΝ[Α/ΜΟΟΥΤΟ]Υ, "they will kill them," or CΕΝ[Α/ΧΡΟ ΕΡΟΟΥ]Υ, "they will vanquish them."

13,9-10

Cf. 6,20-21; 15,25. Cf. also ὁ ἀντικείμενος in 2 Thess 2:4, and the "Antichrist" tradition.

[in] any place (τόπος) be convicted,
 4 whenever (ὅταν) they have been begotten,
 [by] their enemies, by their friends,
 6 [nor (οὐδέ)] by strangers nor their
 [own] kin, (nor) by the [impious (ἀσεβής)]
 8 nor the pious (εὐσεβής).
 [All of] the adverse (ἀντικειμένη) natures (φύσις) will
 10 [] them, whether (εἴτε)
 [those that] are manifest, or those that
 12 [are] not [manifest], together with those
 [that dwell] in the heavens and those that are
 14 [upon] the earth and those that are under
 the earth. They will make [war (πόλεμος)]
 16 [] every one.
 For (γάρ) [] whether (εἴτε) in the [
 18 [] and [
 [
 20 [
 [] many
 22 [] in a [
 [] them [
 24 [] . . . [
 [] And (δέ) these in the [
 26 every [one] will [
 [] These will [
 28 [] with every blow [

14

weaknesses. These (+ μέν) will be
 2 confined in other forms [and]
 [will] be punished (κολάζειν). [These]
 4 [(+ μέν)] the Savior (σωτήρ) will take [away]

13,12 † has flaked off.

13,12-15 Cf. 4,8-10; 9,8-10.

13,15 Cf. Rev 11:7; Dan 7:21.

13,18 Perhaps ΟΥΑ]ΑΒ, "holy."

13,19 Superlin. stroke visible.

13,24 Perhaps ΧΩ] ΠΜΟC [Χ]Ε, "saying (said)."

14,4 N is now broken off from the MS. but is attested in an early photograph.

[N]CEϢ TΠE NOYON NIM Z[I TN]
 6 NTAΠPO MN NΨAXE [MEN AN]
 [E]BOL ΔE ZITOOTOY NNH[
 8 [.] C ETOYNAAY NA[Γ· QNAϢ]
 KATAAYE HΠMOY[· NAI MEN]
 10 ENTAYOYEZ CAZ[NE EPOT]
 OY NAI EBOL[Π]OY E[BOL]
 12 BOΛΠOY E[BOL NTAZE· PAI]
 ΔE ETZHHT HΠPBALLE[ΠQ EBOL]
 14 [N]AAAY· EIMH[TI] HCEB[ΩLEΠ]
 [EB]OL NAK· AYΩ HTE[YN OY]
 16 [AEI]TΩWN AN[OK] MEX[ΧICE]
 [ΔEK AYΩ AITAPXEI N[
 18 [... Π]NOYTE E[
 [....]ETPA[O]YH[OY]
 20 [± 8]NAP[
 [± 7]EQϢ ZΦ[B
 22 [.... E]TONZ[
 [AEIXOOC]C XE T[
 24 [..... AYΩ T[
 [..]. EZPAI HΠP[
 26 [AYΩ T]NAXO AN XIN [TEN OY]
 [NΨA EN E]Z Ω ΠIΩT HΠ[THPQ]
 28 [EBOL] XE AKNA N[A]I· AY[Ω]

I E

[AKT H NEY PAIT] ELOS NOY[O] EIN
 2 [± 8] EB[O]L ZN NEKAI[ΩN]

-
- 14,7 Part of M has flaked off.
 14,8-9 "The last enemy to be destroyed is Death," 1 Cor 15:26; cf. Heb 2:14. Cf. also 2,5 and note.
 14,9-15 With this exhortation to Melchizedek, given by his angelic informant, the first revelation is concluded. Such a warning to guard the revelation sometimes occurs at the beginning of a revelatory document or discourse, as e.g. in *Ap. Jas.* I 1,20-25, or even in the middle, as in *The Book of the Resurrection*, (ed. Budge, *Coptic Apocrypha*), p. 17 (Coptic) and 193 (ET). Such exhortations are proper to the genre; cf. tractate introduction.
 14,16 Cf. 15,9.

[and] they will overcome everything, [not with]
 6 their mouths and words [(+ μὲν)]
 but (δέ) by means of the [
 8 which will be done for [them. He will]
 destroy (καταλύειν) Death. [These things (+ μὲν)]
 10 which I was commanded
 to reveal, these things
 12 reveal [as I (have done)].
 But (δέ) [that] which is hidden, do not reveal
 14 [to] anyone, unless (εἰ μήτι) [it is revealed]
 to you (to do so)." And [immediately]
 16 [I] arose, [I, Melchizedek],
 and I began (ἄρχεσθαι) to [
 18 [] God [
 [] that I should [rejoice
 20 [] will [
 [] while he [is acting
 22 [] living [
 [I said], "I [
 24 [] and I [
 [] the [
 26 [and I] will not cease, from [now on]
 [for ever,] O Father of the [All],
 28 [because] you have had pity on me, and

15

[you have sent the] angel (ἄγγελος) of light
 2 [] from your [aeons (αἰών)]

-
- 14,17 For χ in ἀρχεσθαι cf. note to 1,1. Perhaps $\Pi[\text{C}\text{M}\text{O}\text{Y}$, "to praise," or something similar.
 14,18 Perhaps $\text{E}\text{I}\text{T}\text{X}\text{O}\text{C}\text{E}$, "Most High"; cf. 12,11; 15,10.13; 19,14; 26,4.
 14,20 Perhaps $\text{I}\text{N}\text{A}\text{P}$, "will" (+ verb); a lacuna occurs where the superlin. stroke would be.
 14,25 The letter-trace before $\text{E}\text{Z}\text{P}\text{A}\text{I}$ does not appear to be an O , as in $\text{T}\text{A}\text{L}\text{I}\text{O}\text{ E}\text{Z}\text{P}\text{A}\text{I}$, "offer up." Perhaps $\text{H}\text{I}\text{P}\text{P}[\text{O}\text{C}\text{F}\text{O}\text{R}\text{A}]$; cf. 6,27; 16,7.
 14,27 Cf. 16,9.14.
 15,1 Cf. 5,18.
 15,2 Perhaps read $\text{I}\text{G}\text{A}\text{M}\text{A}\text{L}\text{I}\text{H}\text{L}$, "Gamaliel"; cf. 5,18.

[..... ε]δωλπ̄ εβ[ολ
 4 [± 8]παί Ν[τ]ἀρεφ̄ε̄ [α]φ
 [τρευχ̄α]σ̄τ̄ εβολ 2̄Ν τμ̄ν̄τατ̄
 6 [σο]ογν̄ αγω τμ̄ν̄τρεφ̄τ̄ καρ
 [πο]ς̄ Μ̄π̄μ̄[ο]γ̄· επ̄ων̄2̄· ογ
 8 Ν̄τ̄ν̄ει γαρ̄ Μ̄μαγ̄ Ν̄ογ̄ραν
 ἀνο̄ξ̄ [μελ̄χ]εισεδεκ̄ πογ
 10 η̄ν̄β̄ η̄π̄[νογ̄τε] ετ̄χοσε̄· †
 [ειμ̄]ε̄ χε̄ ἀ[λ]η̄φ̄ω̄ς̄ ἀνοκ̄ πε
 12 [π̄ινε̄ Μ̄]παρχιερεγ̄ς̄ Μ̄με
 [Μ̄π̄ν̄]ογ̄τε ετ̄χοσε̄· αγω
 14 [...]τ̄ᾱ[...]π̄κοσμο̄ς̄ [ογ]
 [πραγ̄μ̄]ᾱ γαρ̄ ψ̄η̄μ̄ ἀν̄ πε̄ [χε]
 16 [.....] Ν̄β̄ῑ π̄νογ̄τε̄ η̄ν̄[
 ᾱ.[.....]π̄ᾱ[.] εφ̄β̄ .[
 18 αγω̄ [....] νᾱγ̄τ̄ε̄λο̄ς̄ ε[τ̄ω]ο̄
 οπ̄̄ 2̄[ῑχ̄η̄ π̄]κα2̄ 2̄[
 20 η̄[.....]γε̄ ογ̄[
 η̄[.....] αγω̄.[
 22 πε̄ π̄ω[ω]τ̄ Ν̄τ̄[
 εν̄ταπ̄[μ̄]ογ̄ ρ̄π̄λανᾱ η̄μο̄γ̄
 24 Ν̄ταρε̄[γ̄μο]γ̄ ᾱγ̄μορ̄[ο]γ̄
 [Ν̄]η̄φ̄ῡγ̄ς̄ῑς̄ ετ̄ρ̄πα[αν]ᾱ [Μ̄]
 26 [μοογ̄] ετ̄ῑ ἀ̄γ̄τελο̄ ε2̄ρᾱ[ῑ Ν̄]

[15]

2ε̄ν̄π̄ροσφορ̄[α

-
- 15,2-3 Perhaps ΝΕΚΑΙ[ΩΝ/ΕΤ̄ΧΗΚ], “your perfect aeons”; cf. *Ap. John* BG 27,14-15. Cf. also 5,22-23.
- 15,3 Perhaps [ΧΕ ΕΤΡΕΦ]δωλπ̄, “that he (Gamaliel) might reveal.”
- 15,8 Cf. 16,13. Cf. also Phil 2:9; Heb 1:4.
- 15,9-10 Cf. 12,10-11 and note.
- 15,12 Melchizedek is the “image” of the heavenly High-priest, Jesus Christ. Cf. Heb 7:3.
- 15,14 Perhaps one should read something like the following: [ΤΜΝ]τ̄ᾱ [πε̄ Μ̄]π̄κοσμο̄ς̄ <τ̄ωγ̄ τε>, “the primacy of the world is his.” Cf. *Ap. John* BG 26,9-10, where God is said to be the “Head” (ταπε̄) of all the aeons.
- 15,17 After πα, either a superlin. stroke or a diaeresis is visible; perhaps πα[ῑ] εφ̄β̄.

- [to] reveal [
- 4 [] when he came [he]
[raised] me up from ignorance
- 6 and (from) the fructification (-καρπός)
of death to life. For (γάρ)
- 8 I have a name;
I am Melchizedek, the Priest
- 10 of [God] Most High; I
[know] that it is I who am truly (ἀληθῶς)
- 12 [the image of] the true High-priest (ἀρχιερεύς)
[of] God Most High, and
- 14 [] the world (κόσμος). For (γάρ) it
is not [a] small [thing (πρᾶγμα) that]
- 16 God [] with [
[] while he [
18 And [the angels (ἄγγελος) that]
[dwell upon the] earth [
20 [
[
- 22 is the [sacrifice] of [
whom Death deceived (πλανᾶν).
- 24 When he [died] he bound them
with the natures (φύσεις) which are [leading them astray
(πλανᾶν)].
- 26 Yet (ἔτι) he offered up
- 16
sacrifices (προσφορά) [
[

15,18 Perhaps [ΝΑΡΧΑΪΓ]ΕΛΟΣ; cf. 2,11.

15,19 Cf. 4,9; 9,9; 13,14.

15,22 ΨΩΤ: Lit. "thing cut," hence "sacrifice."

15,23 Perhaps a reference to Adam. Cf. Rom 7:11, an allusion to Gen 3:13.

15,24-25 Cf. 9,27, and note to 10,3. Cf. the "spirits of deceit" τὰ πνεύματα τῆς πλάνης, trodden under foot in the eschaton, *T. Sim.* 6:6, and the binding of Beliar, *T. Levi* 18:12; cf. also the imprisonment of the "hosts of heaven" (= planets), Isa 24:21-22, and the binding of the planets, 1 Enoch 31. According to the *Book of the Resurrection* fol. 3b (Coptic), p. 184 (ET), cf. p. 216, Satan and his ministers were bound in chains and fetters at the death of Jesus.

15,26-16,1 Cf. 6,26-28.

- 2 ΤΕ ΠΤΒΝΟΟΥ[Ε
[Α]ΕΙΤΑΑΥ ΠΠΜΟΥ
4 [Μ]Ν [ΝΑΓΓΕ]ΛΟΣ ΜΝ Ν[
[...].[. ΝΔ]ΑΙΜΩ[Ν ΖΕΝ]
6 ΠΡΟΣΦΟΡΑ ΕΥΟΝΖ Ν[
ΛΕΙΤΕΛΟΕΙ ΕΖΡΑΙ ΝΑΚ ΠΠ[ΡΟΣ]
8 ΦΟΡΑ ΜΝ ΝΕΤΕ Ν[Ο]ΥΕΙ ΝΕ [Ν]
ΤΟΚ ΟΥΑΑΚ ΠΙΩΤ ΠΠΤΗΡΩ ΜΝ
10 ΝΕΤΚΟΥΑΨΟΥ Ε[Ν]ΤΑΖΕ[Ι] ΕΒΟΛ
ΝΖΗΤΚ ΕΤΟΥΑΑ[Β ΕΤΟ]ΝΖ ΑΥΩ <ΚΑΤΑ>
12 ΝΝΟΜΟΣ ΝΤΕ[ΛΕΙΟΣ] †ΝΑΧΕ
[Π]ΑΡΑΝ ΕΕΙΧΙ ΒΑΠΤ[ΙC]ΜΑ [ΤΕ]
14 ΝΟΥ ΠΨΑ ΕΝΕΖ ΖΝ ΠΡ[ΑΝ ΕΤΟ]
ΝΖ ΕΤΟΥΑΑΒ· ΑΥΩ ΖΝ Ν[ΜΟΥ]
16 [ΕΙ]ΡΟΥΕ ΖΑΜΗ[Ν· ΚΟ]Υ[ΑΑΒ]
[ΚΟ]ΥΑΑΒ ΚΟΥΑΑΒ Φ ΠΙ[ΩΤ]
18 [ΠΠΤΗΡΩ] ΕΤΨΟΟΠ ΝΑΜ[Ε
[...]ΨΟΟΠ [Α]Ν ΑΒ[ΕΛ ΒΟΡ]ΟΥ[Χ]
20 [... Ψ]Α ΕΝΕΖ [ΝΕ]ΝΕΖ [ΖΑΜ]ΗΝ·
[ΚΟ]ΥΑΑΒ [ΚΟ]ΥΑΑ[Β ΚΟ]ΥΑΑΒ
22 [± 8]Π ΖΑΤ[
[± 7]ΑΞ Ψ[Α ΕΝΕΖ ΝΕ]ΝΕΖ
24 [ΖΑΜΗΝ· ΤΕ]ΟΥΑΑΒ[· ΤΕΟ]ΥΑΑΒ

-
- 16,2 Cf. 6,28.
16,3-5 Animal sacrifice belongs to the realm of Death and the demons.
16,6-9 Cf. 6,24-28 and note to 6,24-26.
16,8 "Those that are mine" are the "race of the High-priest," 6,17.
Cf. also Heb 2:11-13.
16,10 Another possible translation is "those whom you love, who . . ." The circumflex stroke on ΕΙ is completely visible.
16,12-16 A ritual context related to priestly consecration is probably in the background here. See tractate introduction for discussion.
16,12 Cf. Jas 1:25; Ps 19:7-9.
16,13 ΠΑΡΑΝ: cf. 15,8 and note; cf. also Heb 3:12. ΕΕΙΧΙ ΒΑΠΤΙCΜΑ cf. 7,27; 8,2,9.
16,15-16 ΝΗΟΥΕΙΟΟΥΕ: cf. 7,28.
16,16 Perhaps a full stop (dicolon:) occurred after ΖΑΜΗΝ; cf. 18,7; 27,10.
16,16-18,7 The invocations, "Holy are you" (thrice), addressed to the

- 2 cattle [
I gave them to [Death
4 [and the angels (ἄγγελος)] and the [
[] demons (δαίμων) [
6 living sacrifices (προσφορά) [
I have offered up myself to you as a
8 sacrifice (προσφορά), together with those that are mine, to
you yourself, (O) Father of the All, and
10 those whom you love, who have come forth
from you who are holy (and) [living]. And <according
to>
12 the [perfect (τέλειος)] laws (νόμος) I shall pronounce
my name as I receive baptism (βάπτισμα) [now]
14 (and) for ever, (as a name) among the living (and)
holy [names], and (now) in the
16 [waters], Amen (ἀμήν). [Holy are you,]
Holy are [you], Holy are you, O [Father]
18 [of the All,] who truly exist [
[] do(es) not exist, [Abel Baruch]
20 [] for ever and ever, [Amen (ἀμήν)].
Holy are [you, Holy are you,] Holy are [you]
22 [] before [
[] for ever and] ever,
24 [Amen (ἀμήν)]. Holy are [you,] Holy are [you,]

inhabitants of the heavenly world, are probably adapted from the Trishagion in Isa 6:3, ascribed to the companies of angels in later Jewish literature and liturgy (the *Kedushah*). See e.g. *1 Enoch* 39:12; *2 Enoch* 21:1. A liturgical context is probably reflected here. For similar use of the ἄγιος formula in Hermetic literature see *Corp. Herm.* I.31. Cf. also ΝΤΚ ΟΥΤΕΛΙΟΣ, "you are perfect" (thrice), *Steles Seth* VII 121, 14-15. For the formula ΚΟΥΑΑΒ (twice) see *Pist. Soph.*, ch. 143. For further discussion see tractate introduction.

- 16,17-18 ΠΙΩΤ ΠΠΤΗΡΨ: Cf. 16,9; 14,27.
16,18-19 Cf. 6,12-14 and note.
16,19 ΛΘΕΛ ΒΟΡΟΥΧ: Cf. 6,14 and note.
16,22 Perhaps something like ΨΟΟ]Π ΖΑΤ[ΕΖΗ, "exists before . . ."
16,23 For a proper name ending in -ΑΖ see ΖΑΡΑΖΑΖ, *Pist. Soph.*, ch. 140. In the Books of Jeu (*passim*) there are almost sixty mystical names ending in -ΑΖ, from ΗΑΠΑCΑΖΑΖ in *1 Jeu* (ch. 7) to ΩΕΖΗΑΖ in *a Jeu* (ch. 52).

26 [ΤΕΟΥΑΑΒ ΤΜ]ΑΑΥ [ΝΝ]ΑΙΩΝ
[[ΨΑ ΕΝΕΖ ΝΕ]] ΤΒΑ[Ρ]ΒΗΛΩΝ
[Ψ]Α ΕΝΕΖ ΝΕΝΕ[Ζ· ΖΑ]ΜΗΝ·
 28 [ΚΟ]Υ[ΑΑΒ] ΚΟΥΑΑΒ ΚΟΥΑΑΒ
[ΠΨΡ]Π ΠΜΙΣΕ ΠΝΑΙΩΝ [ΔΟ]
 30 ΞΟ]ΜΕΔΩΝ· ΠΕ[...].Χ.[

[12]

[..... ΨΑ ΕΝΕΖ ΝΕΝΕΖ ΖΑΜΗΝ·
 2 [ΚΟΥΑΑΒ· ΚΟΥΑΑΒ·] ΚΟΥΑΑΒ
 [± 15]...
 4 [± 14]ΜΑΝ
[ΨΑ ΕΝΕΖ ΝΕΝΕΖ ΖΑΜΗΝ·
 6 [ΚΟΥΑΑΒ· ΚΟΥΑΑ]Β ΚΟΥΑΑΒ
 [± 14]C
 8 [± 11 ΨΟΡ]Π ΝΑΙΩΝ
[ΖΑΡΜΟΖΗΛ· ΨΑ Ε]ΝΕΖ ΝΕΝΕΖ
 10 [ΖΑΜΗΝ· ΚΟΥΑ]ΑΒ ΚΟΥΑΑΒ
[ΚΟΥΑΑΒ· ΠCΤ]ΡΑΤΗΓΟC ΦΩC
 12 [ΤΗΡ ΠΝΑΙΩΝ] ΨΡΙΑΗΛ ΝΨΑ
[ΕΝΕΖ ΝΕΝΕΖ Ζ]ΑΜΗΝ· ΚΟΥ[ΑΑΒ]
 14 [ΚΟΥΑΑΒ ΚΟΥΑΑΒ Π]CΤΡΑ[ΤΗ]
[ΓΟC ΠΝΑΙΩΝ] ΠΡΗΠΟΥΟ
 16 [ΕΙΝ ΔΑΥΕΙΘΕ] ΝΨΑ ΕΝΕΖ
[ΝΕΝΕΖ ΖΑΜ]ΗΝ· ΚΟΥΑΑΒ
 18 [ΚΟΥΑΑΒ ΚΟΥΑ]ΑΒ ΠΑΡΧ[ΙCΤΡ]Α
[ΤΗΓΟC ΗΛΗΛΗΘ] .[.]·† Ν[...].
 20 [± 9 Ν]ΑΙΩΝ ...].
 [± 10]ΝΟ[

16,25-26 Cf. 5,26 and note.

16,26 ΨΑ ΕΝΕΖ ΝΕ was deleted in the MS. with a dot over each letter; the dots are visible over the last four letters, and in the lacuna over the first four. The mistake was due to an incipient haplography: ΤΒΑΡΒΗΛΩΝ was about to be omitted.

16,29-30 Cf. 5,28-6,1 and note to 6,1.

17,4 Perhaps ΠΙΓΕΡΑΔΑ]ΜΑΝ, "Pigeradaman." Cf. 6,6 and note, esp. *Stiles Seth* VII 118,26. Cf. also note to 17,24.

17,7 This line is 4-6 spaces shorter than most of the other lines, due

- [Holy are you, Mother of the] aeons(s) (αἰών),
 26 Barbelo,
 for ever and ever, [Amen (ἀμήν)].
 28 [Holy are you,] Holy are you, Holy are you,
 [First-] born of the aeons (αἰών),
 30 Doxomedon. [

17

- [for ever] and ever, Amen (ἀμήν).
 2 [Holy are you, Holy are you,] Holy are you.
 [
 4 [
 [for ever and ever], Amen (ἀμήν).
 6 [Holy are you, Holy are you,] Holy are you.
 [
 8 [first] aeon (αἰών),
 [Harmozel, for] ever and ever,
 10 [Amen. (ἀμήν). Holy are you], Holy are you,
 [Holy are you,] commander (στρατηγός), luminary
 (φωστήρ)
 12 [of the aeons (αἰών)], Oriael, for
 [ever and ever], Amen (ἀμήν). Holy are you,
 14 [Holy are you, Holy are you,] commander (στρατηγός)
 [of the aeons (αἰών)], man-of-light,
 16 [Daveithe], for ever
 [and ever, Amen (ἀμήν)]. Holy are you,
 18 [Holy are you, Holy are you, commander-in-chief
 (ἀρχιστρατηγός)
 [Eleleth,
 20 [the] aeons (αἰών) [
 [

-
- to damaged papyrus at this point. Perhaps read **[ΠΑΡΧΙΣΤΡΑ-
 ΤΗΓΟΣ]**, "commander-in-chief." Cf. 6,2-3 and note.
 17,9 Perhaps **ΑΡΜΟΖΗΛ**, as at 6,4, but there is room for the 2. Cf.
 note to 6,3-5.
 17,12 Cf. 6,4.
 17,15-16 Cf. 6,4-5.
 17,18-19 Cf. 6,2-3 and note.
 17,20-21 **Ν]ΑΙΩ[Ν** on line 20 and line 21 are now lost. This material is
 attested in an early photograph. A superlin. stroke is visible at
 the end of line 20.
 17,21 Perhaps **ΝΟ[ΥΤΕ**, "god(s)."

(1 line missing)

[± 10] ΝΝΑΡ[
 24 [± 10] ΜΑΝ [ΨΑ]
 [ΕΝΕΖ ΝΕΝΕΖ] ΖΑΜ[ΗΝ·]
 26 [ΚΟΥΑΑΒ ΚΟΥ]ΑΑΒ ΚΟ[ΥΑΑΒ]
 [ΠΝΟΥΤΕ ΕΤΝ]ΑΝΟΥϞ [Ν]
ΙΗ
 ΝΚΡΟСМОС Ε[ΤΡ ΨΑΥ
 2 ΜΕΙΡΟΧΕΙ[ΡΟΘΕΤΟΥ ΨΑ]
 ΕΝΕΖ ΝΕΝΕΖ[Ζ ΖΑΜΗΝ·]
 4 ΚΟ[ΥΑΑΒ ΚΟΥΑΑΒ ΚΟΥΑΑΒ]
 ΠΑΡΧΙϞ[ΤΡΑΤΗΓΟС ΗΠΤΗ]
 6 ΡϞ ΙϞ ΠΕϞϞ [ΨΑ ΕΝΕΖ ΝΕΝΕΖ]
 ΖΑΜΗΝ: Ϟ[
 8 ΤΕΙΑ ΜΗ[
 ΝΕΕΙΕ[Τ ± 8 ΖΟΜΟ]
 10 ΛΟΓΙΑ· Ϟ[ΥΩ ΡΖΟΜΟ]
 ΛΟΓΕΙ ΗΜ[Ο]Ϟ [
 12 ΟΥ ΝΤΕΥΝΟ[Υ
 ΒΕ СΨΩΠΕ Η[
 14 ΠΕ ΝΖΡΤΕ Μ[Ν
 ΝΖΡ[Τ]Ε ΜΗ[
 16 Ψ[Τ]ΟΡΤΡ .[
 ΕϞΚΩΤΕ ΕΡΟ[ΟΥ
 18 ΖΗ ΠΤΟΠΟС Ε[ΤΕΥΝΤΑϞ ΝΟΥ]
 ΝΟΒ ΝΚΑΚΕ [ΗΜΑΥ ΝΖΗΤϞ]
 20 Ϟ[Υ]Ω ΖΑΖ Ν[
 ΟΥΩΝΖ Ε[ΒΟΛ
 22 Ε[ΤΗ]ΜΑΥ .[
 [ΟΥΩΝΖ] ΕΒΟ[Λ

17,22 The three-fold ΚΟΥΑΑΒ, "holy are you," probably occurred on this lost line.

17,24 Perhaps read ΑΚΡΑ]ΜΑΝ, "Akramas." Cf. *Gos. Eg.* III 65,7; *Zost.* VIII 47,3 and 126,9; *Cod. Bruc. Untitled*, ch. 8.

17,27 The superlin. stroke on Ν is visible.

17,27-18,2 Cf. 6,7-9 and note; the scribe omitted the superlin. stroke on the name.

18,5-6 Cf. 6,2-3 and note; 17,18-19.

18,7-8 Perhaps ΗΠΡΟΦΗ]/ΤΕΙΑ ΜΗ [ΝΑΠΟΚΑΛΥΨΙС, "prophecies and revelations."

(1 line missing)

- [
 24 [for]
 [ever and ever,] Amen.
 26 [Holy are you,] Holy are [you], Holy are you,
 good [god of]
 18
 the [beneficent] worlds (κόσμος), [
 2 Mirocheirothetou, [for]
 ever and ever, [Amen (ἀμήν)].
 4 [Holy are] you, [Holy are you, Holy are you,]
 Commander-in-chief (ἀρχιστρατηγός) [of the]
 6 All, Jesus Christ, [for ever and ever,]
 Amen (ἀμήν). [
 8 . . . and [
 Blessed [
 10 confession (ὁμολογία) [And
 confess (ὁμολογεῖν) him [
 12 now [
 then it becomes [
 14 fear [and
 fear and [
 16 disturb [
 surrounding [them
 18 in the place (τόπος) [which has a]
 great darkness [in it]
 20 [and] many [
 appear [
 22 there [
 [appear

18,9-10 ὁμολογία: cf. Heb 3:1.

18,10-11 Cf. Rom 10:9.

18,12 **ΝΤΕΥΝΟΥ**: Cf. 14,15.

18,14 The superlin. stroke on **MN** is completely visible.

18,16 Or perhaps "disturbance."

18,22-23 **Υ** on line 22 and line 23 are now lost. This material is attested in an early photograph.

18,23 **ΟΥΩΝΖ ΕΒΟΛ**: Cf. 18,21.

(1 line missing)

[....]ο.[
 26 [...].εζτ[
 [.....]ογ[
 28 [.....]εζ[

ιε

[± 12]ε· αγω
 2 [± 11 ε]γβολε ϩ
 [± 12] τ[η]ρ[ϗ] μϩ
 4 [± 11] ϩμαγ ϩ
 [± 13]ε· αγω
 6 [± 11].ο ϩεε ϩ
 [± 11]γ ϩμοογ
 8 [± 10].·.[
 [± 10].·.[..].[...].κ
 10 [± 7 ζ]ενταραχη [α]γϑ
 [± 9]πε νογψαχε
 12 [± 7 α]γω πεχαγ ναί
 [χε μελ]χις[εα]φε
 14 [πογνηβ] ϩπνογτε [ετχο]
 [σε αγω]αχε ζωρ[.....]ε
 16 [.... νο]γταπρ[ο] ·.[
 [.....] ζϩ πτηρϗ α[.].[
 18 [± 7]γϩ[. α]γω π.[
 [± 11] νεκ[.·.]ε
 20 [± 11].·.[...].κ
 (3 lines missing)
 24 [± 11 ϩ]π[α]αηα
 [± 12]ααϩφ[
 26 [± 15]·.[
 (± 2 lines missing)

κ

μϩ νεαπ[

18,26 Perhaps]τεζτ[ωζ. "confused."
 19,13-15 Cf. 12,10-11 and note; 15,9-10.
 19,16 Cf. 14,6.

(1 line missing)

26 []
 []
 28 []
 []

19

[] And
 2 [] they were clothed with
 [] all and
 4 [] there
 [] and
 6 [] just as
 [] them
 8 []
 []
 10 [] disturbances (ταραχή). They gave
 [] their words
 12 [] and they said to me,
 [] Melchizedek,
 14 [Priest] of God [Most High
 [] they] spoke as though (ὡς) [
 16 [] their] mouths [
 [] in the All [
 18 [] and [
 [] your [
 20 []

(3 lines missing)

24 [] lead astray (πλανᾶν)
 [] he [
 26 []

(± 2 lines missing)

20

with his [

19,24 Perhaps **ΜΦΥΣΙΣ ΕΤΡ]Π[ΛΑΝΑ**, "the natures which lead astray"; cf. 15,24.

20,1 Perhaps **ΝΕΦΗ[ΡΟΦΟΡΑ**, "his offerings."

- 2 ΟΥΩΨ̄ Μ[Ν
ΠΙΣΤΙ[С] Μ[Ν
4 ΝΕΨΛΗΛ· ΑΥ[Ω
ΝΟΟΥΕ· ΑΥ[Ω
6 ΗΝΕΤΕ ΝΟΥ[ϥ ΝΕ
ΝΨΟΡΠ̄ ΕΝ[
8 ΑϚ·[.].[.].Κ Δ[Ε
ΡΟ[
10 ΗΠΟ[Υ]ΡΟΟΥΨ ΧΕ [ΘΙΕΡΩ]
СΥΝΗ ΕΤ̄ΚΕΙΡ[Ε ΗΜΟΣ Ε]
12 ΤΕ [Ο]ΥΕΒΟΛ ΖΗ [
[.]ΚΕ[.]ΝΑ.[
14 [ΖΝ ΝСΥ]ΜΒΟΥΛΙΑ Η[
[...]САТАНАС Ε[
16 Ν[Η... Ε]ΒΟΛ· ΘΥ[СΙΑ
[...] ΝΕΨСΒΟ[ΟΥΕ
18 [.]Ϛ ΕΝΕΚΜΟ.[
[.]ΟΥΤ[
20 Η[Π]ΕΙΔΙΩ[Ν
Η[

(3 lines missing)

- [ΕΤ̄]ΨΟΟΠ̄ Ζ[Ν
26 [...]Ρ̄ΠΛ[ΑΝΑ
(± 2 lines missing)

ΚΔ

- | | | | |
|---|---|------|----------------------|
| | [| ± 12 |] ΑΥΩ ΖΕΝ |
| 2 | [| ± 11 |]ΙΝ· Α[Υ]Ω [|
| | [| ± 11 |]ΑΝΑ[.]ΟΥ[|
| 4 | [| ± 10 | Α]ϚΤΑΑΥ Ε[|
| | [| ± 12 | Α]ΥΩ [|
| 6 | [| ± 9 | ΑΥ]Ω Π̄ Ϛ[|
| | | | (± 22 lines missing) |

20,3 Cf. 7,6.

20,4 Cf. 8,28.

20,4-5 Perhaps ΗΤΒ]/ΝΟΟΥΕ, "cattle"; cf. 6,28; 16,2. Or possibly ΟΥ]/ΝΟΟΥΕ, "hours."

20,10-11 λερωσώνη; cf. Heb 7:24.

20,17 I.e. Satan's? Cf. line 15.

20,20 Cf. 1 Cor 2:6-8; 2 Cor 4:4.

- 2 worship [and
 faith (πίστις) [and
 4 his prayers. And [
 . . . And [
 6 those that [are his
 first [
 8 [(+ δε)
 [
 10 They did not care that [the]
 [priesthood (ἱερωσύνη)] which you perform, [which]
 12 is from [
 [
 14 [in the] counsels (συμβουλίᾳ) of [
 [] Satan [
 16 [] . . . the sacrifice (θυσία)
 [] his doctrines
 18 [] your [
 [
 20 of this aeon (αἰών) [
 [
 (3 lines missing)
 [which] exist(s) [in
 26 [] lead(s) [astray (πλανᾶν)
 (± 2 lines missing)

21

- [] and some
 2 [] and
 [] . . .
 4 [] he gave them to [
 [] and [
 6 [] and] thirteen [
 (± 22 lines missing)

20,25 The superlin. stroke is now lost from the MS.; it is attested in an early photograph.

20,26 Cf. 15,24; 19,24.

21,2 Perhaps ΟΥΟΕ]ΙΝ, "light."

21,3 Perhaps ΕΤΡΠΑΛ]ΑΝΑ; cf. 19,24; 15,24.

21,6 13̄ = 13: This is the only occurrence of a numeral in the codex, except for pagination numerals. For possible contexts for the number "thirteen" see note to *Marsanes* X 2,12-13.

KB

- ΝΟΥΧΕ ΜΜ[ΟQ
 2 [Χ]ΕΚΑ[ΑC] ΕΚ[
 [.....]Ρ[
 4 [Χ]Ε ΝΤΕΥΝΟΥ [
 [ΕΒΟ]Λ Ζ[ΙΤQ[ΟΤQ̄
 6 [ΖΑΠΕ]ΦΗΤ Π[
 (± 22 lines missing)

KA

- [Γ]ΑΡ ΕΒΟΛ . [
 2 [Ε]ΤΗ ΠCΑΝ[ΤΠΕ
 (± 26 lines missing)

KE

- [± 8]ΜΗΟΕΙ· ΑΥΩ
 2 [± 8]ΤΕΤΗΡΩΖΤ̄
 [± 9]ΑΤΕΤΗΝΟΧΤ̄
 4 [± 9]ΠΤΩΜΑ· ΑΥΩ
 [ΑΤΕΤΗΑΨΤ̄] ΧΙΝ ΝΧΠ̄ ΨΟ[Μ]
 6 [ΤΕ ΗΤΕ ΠΠΡΟ]CΑΒΒΑ[Τ]ΟΝ ΨΑ
 [ΠΝΑΥ ΝΧΠ̄ ΨΙΤ]Ε· ΑΥ[Ω Μ]ΗΝ
 8 [CΑ ΝΑΙ ΛΕΙΤΩ]ΩΝ ΕΒΟΛ ΖΗ ΝΕΤ̄
 [ΜΟΟΥΤ̄]ΜΑ ΕΙ ΕΒ[ΟΛ Ζ]Η
 10 [..... ΕΖΟ]ΥΝ ΕΡΟῙ .[.]ΤΕ
 [± 10]ΑΝΑΒΑΛ Ν[ΑΥ

-
- 22,1 Or "throw him . . ." Cf. 25,3.
 22,5 The second superlin. stroke is visible, though the letters ΟΤQ̄ are in the lacuna.
 23 The fragment is uninscribed on recto.
 24,2 Cf. 27,9.
 25,1-14 The speaker is evidently Jesus Christ, victoriously addressing his (demonic-archontic) executioners. See tractate introduction for discussion.
 25,2 Cf. Matt 26:67; Mark 14:65; Luke 22:63.
 25,3 Perhaps [ΖΗ ΠΚΑΛΛΑΜΟC], "with the reed"; cf. Matt 27:30; Mark 15:19. ΑΤΕΤΗΝΟΧΤ̄: Cf. 22,1.

22

throw [it

2 [in order that] you might [
[4 [for] immediately [
[by means of6 [on the ground]. The [
(± 22 lines missing)

[2]4

for (γάφ) [
2 [which is above

(± 26 lines missing)

25

[] me. And
2 [] you (pl.) struck me,
[] you threw me,
4 [] corpse (πτῶμα). And
[you crucified me] from the third hour
6 [of the Sabbath-eve (προσάββατον)] until
[the ninth hour.] And after
8 [these things I arose] from the
[dead.] came out of
10 [] into me. [
[] my eyes [saw

25,5 **ΕΙΨΕ** = σταυροῦν, "crucify" as well as "hang." Cf. Heb 6:6. Cf. also 1 Cor 2:8 for the real agents of the crucifixion. "From the third hour": cf. Mark 15:25.

25,6 προσάββατον = Friday, "the day before the sabbath"; cf. Mark 15:42.

25,6-7 "Until the ninth hour": Cf. Matt 27:45; Mark 15:33; Luke 23:44. Cf. 3,9-11; and Matt 28:7; etc.

25,8-9 Perhaps **ΑΠΑΣΩΜΑ ΕΙ ΕΒ[ΟΛ 2]Η/[ΠΗΖΑΛΥ ΕΞΟ]ΥΝ ΕΡΟΪ**, "my body came out of the tomb into me," referring to the reuniting of Jesus' body and soul after the resurrection. A similar concept is found in *The Book of the Resurrection*.

12 [± 7 ΜΠΟΥ]ΒΝ ΛΑΑ[Υ
 [± 11]ΕΖΡ[ΑΙ
 14 [± 11 Μ]ΜΟΕ[Ι
 (± 14 lines missing)

ΚΣ

ΑΣΠΑΖΕ ΜΜ[ΟΕΙ ΠΕ]
 2 ΧΑΥ ΝΑΙ ΧΕ ΒΜ[ΒΟΜ Ω ΜΕΛΧΙ]
 [C]ΕΔΕΚ ΠΝΟΒ [ΝΑΡΧΙΕΡΕΥC]
 4 ΗΤΕ ΠΝΟΥΤΕ [ΕΤΧΟCΕ ΧΕ ΝΑΡ]
 ΧΩΝ ΕΤΕ ΝΕΚ[ΧΑΧΕ ΝΕ ΑΥΡ ΠΟ]
 6 ΛΕΜΟC ΑΚΧ[ΡΟ ΕΡΟΟΥ ΑΥΩ]
 ΜΠΟ[Υ]ΧΡΟ ΕΡΟ[Κ ΑΥΩ ΑΚΡ]
 8 ΖΥΠ[Ο]ΜΙΝΕ ΑΥ[Ω ΑΚΡΚΑΤΑ]
 ΛΥΕ ΠΝΕΚΧΙΧ[ΕΕΥ
 10 ΤΕ[. . .]Λ ΠΝΟΥ[
 ΝΑ[Μ]ΤΟΝ ΖΝ ΛΑΑ[Υ
 12 [. . Ε]ΤΑΝΖ ΕΤΟΥΑ[ΑΒ
 [ΝΕΤ]Χ[Ι]CΕ ΖΗΤΩ Ζ[Ν
 14 [. . CΑ]ΡΑΧ· [·
 [. . . .]ΧΟΥ [·
 (± 13 lines missing)

ΚΖ

[Ζ]Ν ΜΠΡΟCΦΟΡΑ· ΕΦΡ ΖΩΒ' ΕΠ
 2 [Π]ΕΤΝΑΝΟΥC ΕΦΡΗΝCΤΕΥΕ
 [Ζ]Ν ΠΗΝCΤΙΑ· ΝΕΕΙΑΠΟΚΑΛΥ
 4 ΨΙC ΜΠΡΒΑΛΠΟΥ ΕΒΟΛ ΠΛΑΑΥ
 ΕΦΖΝ ΤCΑΡΑΧ ΕΥ<Ο Ν> ΑΤCΑΡΑΧ'
 6 ΕΥΤΜΒΩΛΠ ΕΒΟΛ ΝΑΚ· Ν

- 25,12 A possible reference to the women at the tomb; cf. Luke 24:3.
 26,1 The prefix ΑΥ- probably occurred on the last line of p. 25: "They greeted me." The reference is probably to heavenly beings.
 26,2 ΒΜΒΟΜ: a "holy war" slogan; cf. IQM xvii 4,9; cf. Deut 31:6,7; Josh 1:6,7; etc.
 26,2-4 Cf. 15,12-13.
 26,5-6 The eschatological battle is here referred to; cf. e.g. Rev 19:19. The opponents are all the hostile powers referred to earlier in the tractate; cf. 2,5-11; 4,7-10; 10,5-11.29; 13,9-15; 15,18-25; 16,3-5; 25,1-5.
 26,7-8 ΑΚΡΖΥΠΟΜΙΝΕ: Cf. Heb 12:2.

12 [they did not] find anyone
 []
 14 [] me [
 (± 14 lines missing)

26

greeted (ἀσπάζεσθαι) [me
 2 They said to me, 'Be [strong, O Melchizedek,]
 great [High-priest (ἀρχιερέως)]
 4 of God [Most High, for the archons (ἀρχων)],
 who [are] your [enemies],
 6 made war (πόλεμος); you have [prevailed over them, and]
 they did not prevail over you, [and you]
 8 endured ὑπομένειν), and [you]
 destroyed (καταλύειν) your enemies [
 10 [] of their [
 will rest, in any [
 12 which is living (and) holy [
 [those that] exalted themselves against him in [
 14 flesh (σάρξ).
 [

(± 13 lines missing)

27

[with] the offerings (προσφορά), working on that
 2 which is good, fasting (νηστεύειν)
 with fasts (νηστεία). These revelations (ἀποκάλυψις)
 4 do not reveal to anyone
 in the flesh (σάρξ), since they are incorporeal (-σάρξ),
 6 unless it is revealed to you (to do so)."

26,8-9 Cf. Ps 110:1-2; 1 Cor 15:24-25; Heb 1:13; 10:13.

26,12 Cf. 16,11.

26,13 The superlin. stroke on 2 N is visible.

27,1-3 A ritual context is reflected here. Cf. Epiph. *Haer.* 55.8.1-2 for offerings (προσφορά) to God through Melchizedek. It is possible that these "offerings" include baptism, as in 2 *Jeu.* chs. 45-46. For discussion see Pearson, "The Figure of Melchizedek," and tractate introduction.

27,3-6 This exhortation concludes the second revelation to Melchizedek. Cf. 14,9-15 and note.

ΤΑΡΟΥΧΕ ΝΑΪ ΝΒΙ ΝCΝΗΟΥ
 8 ΕΤΗΠ ΕΝΓΕΝΕΑ ΜΠΩΝΖ ΑΥ
 ΧΑΣΤΟΥ ΕΠCΑΝΤΠΕ Ν
 10 ΕΠΗΦΥΕ ΤΗΡΟΥ [ΖΑ]ΜΗΝ:

27.7

ΝCΝΗΟΥ: These "brethren" are Melchizedek's angelic informants; cf. 5,17-22; 12,2-4; 19,12; and tractate introduction.

When the brethren who belong to the
 8 generations (γενεά) of life had said these things, they
 were taken up to (the regions) above
 10 all the heavens. Amen (ἀμήν).

27,8 **ΝΓΕΝΕΑ ΠΠΩΝΩ**: Cf. the Mandaean term, *šurbta dhiia*,
 "generation of life"; see Rudolph, "Coptica-Mandaica," 196.
 27,9-10 Cf. Eph 4:10; Heb 7:26.

INTRODUCTION TO IX, 2: THE THOUGHT OF NOREA

Bibliography: Doresse, *Secret Books*, pp. 143, 197; Krause and Labib, *Gnostische und hermetische Schriften*, p. 8; Berliner Arbeitskreis, "Die Bedeutung der Texte von Nag Hammadi," pp. 69-70; Pearson, "The Figure of Norea," pp. 143, 151-152; Pearson (Introduction), Giversen and Pearson (Translation), *The Thought of Norea* (IX,2), in *The Nag Hammadi Library*, pp. 404-405; Roberge, *Norea* (see p. XXIX).

This tractate comprises 27,11—29,5 of the codex, a total of only 52 lines. Since it is marked off from the preceding and following tractates by scribal decorations, there is no doubt that it constitutes a composition distinct from the others (against Puech, "Découverte d'une bibliothèque gnostique," p. 10), a fact which is also confirmed by the subject matter of the tractate as compared with that of the other two tractates in the codex. (Moreover there are other tractates in the Nag Hammadi Library as short or shorter, such as I,1.) Despite its brevity *Norea* appears to be a self-contained unit rather than a fragment from another document.

The tractate is untitled; the title by which it is identified in this edition is taken from the body of the text. The phrase, "the thought of Norea" occurs at 29,3 in the last sentence of the tractate. The Berliner Arbeitskreis für koptisch-gnostische Schriften has suggested a different title: "Ode über Norea" (cf. Berliner Arbeitskreis, "Die Bedeutung der Texte von Nag Hammadi," p. 69). The title adopted here has the advantage that it relates directly to the contents of the tractate, and is also analogous to the way in which titles are formulated in some of the other Nag Hammadi documents. Cf. e.g. *The Concept of our Great Power* (ΠΝΟΗΜΑ ΠΤΝΝΟΘ ΝΘΟΜ, VI,4: 48,14-15; cf. 36,2). This tractate cannot be identified with the book *Noria* mentioned by Epiphanius (*Haer.* 26.1.3; cf. *Orig. World* II 102,10.25).

Although *Norea* has been referred to as an "epistle" (Doresse, *Secret Books*, p. 143) there is nothing "epistolary" about it. It resembles much more a hymn or a psalm, for it has certain poetic, or quasi-poetic features: *parallelismus membrorum*, repetitiveness, and in general, a "rhapsodic" flavor. There is therefore some justification in referring to *Norea* as an "ode," comparable in form and flavor to the *Odes of Solomon* (cf. Berliner Arbeitskreis, "Die Be-

deutung der Texte von Nag Hammadi," p. 70). Nevertheless it would be difficult to divide the document into strophes, or to delineate definitively a poetic structure throughout (possibly because of the corrupt state of the text). Thus it is better to refer to the style of *Norea* as "hymnic prose," and the form of the document as a "prose hymn."

The text of *Norea* is obviously corrupt at a number of places, and recourse to textual emendation has therefore been taken. Manifest errors in number and gender in verb forms and pronouns have produced considerable confusion of the *dramatis personae* in the text of the MS., especially from 28,3 on. Emendations have seemed required on p. 28 at lines 3, 5, 6, 12 (a misspelling), 14 and 20, and on p. 29 at line 2 (see notes to the transcription and translation). It is probable that these mistakes were present in the Vorlage from which the scribe of Codex IX copied, and may indeed have been introduced into the text during the process of translation from Greek into Coptic. (On the language of *Norea* and the habits of the scribe of Codex IX, see the codex introduction.)

An analysis of this short tractate reveals the following elements: 1) an invocation of the Father of the All and his heavenly companions: 27,11-20; 2) *Norea's* cry and her deliverance: 27,21-28,12; 3) *Norea's* activity within the Pleroma: 28,12-23; and 4) the future salvation of *Norea* and her spiritual progeny: 28,24-29,5.

1) The first three figures invoked appear to constitute the basic gnostic triad of Father, Mother, and Son: "Father of the All, [Ennoia] of the Light, Nous [dwelling] in the heights. . ." (27,11-13). It is unclear whether the other elements of the invocation are thought of as gnostic "aeons" (the term does not occur) or are simply hypostatizations poetically created *ad hoc* to signify aspects of the heavenly Pleroma. The Father is again invoked at the end of the passage: "[incomprehensible] Father" (27,20).

2) The invocation is expressly attributed to *Norea*: "It is *Norea* who [cries out] to them" (27,21-22). The redemption of *Norea* is described as a restoration to her "place" (τόπος) = the Pleroma, and union with the Godhead (Father, Mother, and Son, described this time in different terminology; see below).

3) *Norea's* activity within the pleroma consists of "speaking with words of [Life]" (28,13-14), dwelling in the presence of the Exalted One (= the Father), and giving him glory. *Norea's* salvation is thus described in terms of complete eschatological fulfilment.

4) But then, in the last section of the tractate, Norea's salvation is seen as not yet accomplished. "There will be days when she will [behold] the Pleroma, and she will not be in deficiency" (28,24-26). To assist her in her salvation, she has the "four holy helpers who intercede on her behalf with the Father of the All" (28,27-30). These four "helpers" are doubtless to be identified as the "luminaries" frequently found in other gnostic texts of a "Sethian" type: (H)armozel, Oroiael, Daveithe, and Eleleth (cf. *Melch.* IX 6,3-5 and note). The (future) salvation of Norea is clearly seen to be identified with, and a symbol of, the salvation of all the Gnostics, i.e. "all of the Adams that possess the thought of Norea" (29,1-3), within whom there dwells the heavenly "Adamas" himself (see 28,30—29,1). In this formulation one can see reflected the gnostic doctrine of the "image (εἰκὼν) of God" (cf. Gen 1:26-27). The "thought (νόησις) of Norea, who speaks concerning the two names which create a single name" (29,3-5) is probably a reference to the knowledge requisite for salvation. This knowledge, or "thought," is appropriated by means of "mind" (νοῦς, see 28,4.12.19). The "two names" are probably "Adamas" and "Norea"; the "single name" is "Adamas." Thus salvation is essentially seen to consist ultimately of integration, or rather re-integration, into the Godhead. "Adamas," in this document, is none other than the primal Father himself (cf. 27,25-26; 28,29-30).

This tractate is closely related to *The Hypostasis of the Archons* (NHC II,4). In *Hyp. Arch.* Norea is represented as "crying out" for "help," for deliverance from the power of the hostile archons:

"She cried out (ααα)ψκκακ with a loud voice to the Holy One, the God of the All, 'Help (βοηθεῖν) me against the archons of unrighteousness and save me now from their hands'" (II 92,33-93,2).

The "great angel" Eleleth is then sent down to rescue her and to instruct her in the saving knowledge. Eleleth is expressly identified as one of "the four luminaries (φωστῆρ) that stand in the presence of the Great Invisible Spirit" (II 93,20-22).

Norea's plea for help in *Hyp. Arch.* seems to be expanded upon in *Norea*, with the opening invocation, and is expressly referred to in 27,21-22: "It is Norea who [cries out] (εταψ[κκακ) to them." Furthermore the "help" (βοηθεῖν) that comes from the four luminaries in the person of Eleleth in *Hyp. Arch.* is evidently referred to in *Norea* at 28,27-30: "she has the four holy helpers (βοηθῶς) who intercede on her behalf with the Father of the All."

On the other hand, very little technical terminology is shared between *Norea* and *Hyp. Arch.* except for the terms "Father of the All" (ΠΙΩΤ ΠΑΤΗΡΩ, 27,1; 28,30; cf. II 88,11; 96,21; 97,15) and "world" (κόσμος, 28,17; cf. II 86,24; 93,24; 96,17), but even in the latter case the term is used differently in the two tractates. Therefore it cannot be concluded with certainty that *Norea* is dependent upon *Hyp. Arch.* Perhaps, instead, *Norea* is dependent upon one of the sources of *Hyp. Arch.* (On the literary analysis of *Hyp. Arch.* see Bullard, *The Hypostasis of the Archons*, p. 115).

Norea's cry for help and her deliverance is also very similar to the story of Pistis Sophia, told by Jesus to his disciples in the *Pistis Sophia*, chs. 29-81. Pistis Sophia is in grief because she finds herself outside of her rightful place, the "thirteenth aeon," tormented by the wicked archons. She cries out to the Light of lights for deliverance from the wicked powers (ch. 32). Jesus is sent to help her (ch. 52), and he in turn sends two light-powers to save her (chs. 58, 60). Pistis Sophia then offers up hymns of praise to the Light, and is ultimately brought into the world of light, the thirteenth aeon (ch. 81).

Probably the most important feature of *Norea* is the figure of *Norea* (spelled ΝΩΡΕΑ at 27,21 and ΝΟΡΕΑ at 29,3) and the way in which she is presented. This figure occurs in a wide range of gnostic literature, with considerable variation in the spelling of the name: *Norea*, *Orea*, *Noraia*, *Oraia*, *Horaia*, *Nora*, *Noria*, *Nuraita*, and *Nhuraita*. She is represented in the literature as the daughter of Adam and Eve, as the wife-sister of Seth, or as the wife of Noah or Shem. She is sometimes portrayed as seducing the archons, or as the intended victim of rape by the archons. Comparative analysis of the gnostic texts in which this figure occurs, together with certain Jewish legends concerning the biblical Na'amah (cf. Gen 4:22), shows that *Norea* is a gnostic derivative of the figure of Na'amah (Heb. נַעֲמָה = "pleasing, lovely,") and that the original spelling of the name "*Norea*" must be "*Hōraia*" (Gr. Ὠραία = "pleasing, lovely" = Heb. נַעֲמָה). The gnostic heroine is thus created out of a Jewish anti-heroine, a "naughty girl" in Jewish legend. (For complete discussion, with documentation, see Pearson, "The Figure of *Norea*.")

In *Norea* the figure of *Norea* is presented and interpreted in much the same way that she is in *Hyp. Arch.* (see above discussion of the overlapping relationship between the two tractates). To

be sure, many of the details concerning the adventures of Norea in *Hyp. Arch.* are absent from *Norea*, but one suspects that her story is implied in our tractate, and that its audience was expected to be familiar with it. However, in *Norea* her symbolic importance has been, if anything, escalated, in that she seems in this document to assume the full symbolic significance of the gnostic figure of Sophia. Thus, in our document there is reflected a full-blown myth of Norea, as well as a full-blown myth of Sophia, and the two are fused into one. (Cf. the Simonian figure of "Helen," who is similarly a representation of the gnostic Sophia.)

Moreover there are some very strong similarities between the career of Norea and that of Sophia in the Valentinian gnostic mythology. (Of course these similarities also pertain in the case of Pistis Sophia discussed above.) For example, Norea's restoration to her "place" (27,23; cf. also the express mention of the "Pleroma" at 28,22-25) is strongly reminiscent of the Valentinian myth of the restoration of Sophia to the Pleroma. Indeed the curious juxtaposition of a "realized" salvation for Norea (28,12-23) with an immediately-following promise of "future" salvation (28,24-29,5) is fully understandable on the basis of the Valentinian differentiation between a "higher" Sophia and a "lower" Sophia, viz. "Achamoth," the former enjoying an initial restoration to the Pleroma and the latter being restored only at the end (cf. Iren *Haer.* I.2.5-6 and I.7.1.). Thus Norea, like Sophia, is a symbol of the fall and redemption of the gnostic soul and, as such, functions as a "saved savior."

From what has already been said there can hardly be any doubt the *Norea* is a "gnostic" document in the full, technical sense of the word. There are no evident signs of Jewish or Christian influence on the surface. The Jewish elements are basic to the formation of certain of the mythologoumena found in the document (e.g. the origin of the figure of Norea), but are certainly not to be seen as directly influencing the tractate *per se*. Whether or not any "Christian" elements are to be found in *Norea* depends entirely upon the question of the occurrence of specifically *Valentinian* (and therefore "Christian gnostic") elements, but there is no evidence at all of a direct Christian influence upon the tractate.

It is with some justification that *Norea* has been classified as a "Sethian" document (see Berliner Arbeitskreis, "Die Bedeutung der Texte von Nag Hammadi," p. 69). H.-M. Schenke has delineated the salient features of the Sethian "system" (see "Das sethianische

System" and "Gnostic Sethianism"; he classifies as "Sethian" the following gnostic documents: *Ap. John* + *Iren. Haer* I.29; *Hyp. Arch.*, *Gos. Eg.*, *Apoc. Adam*, *Steles Seth*, *Zost.*, *Norea*, *Marsanes*, *Allogenes*, *Trim. Prot.*, and *Cod. Bruc. Untitled*). These features include the following: 1) a triad of deities consisting of Father, Mother, and Son, and 2) the four luminaries (φωστῆρες) subordinate to the Son in the divine triad. 3) The figure of Seth and/or his wife/sister Norea are included in the system (for others see his articles, cited above). All three of these features are reflected in *Norea*.

1) The primal divine triad consists of the "Father of the all" (27,11; 28,29), also called "Adamas" (28,30; 27,26), "Father of Nous" (27,25), "Exalted One" (28,15), and "Invisible One" (28,19); "Ennoia of the Light" (27,11), also called "ineffable Epinoia" (28,2); and Nous (27,12), also called "divine Autogenes" (28,6). The first section of the cosmogony in *Ap. John* shows some very definite affinities with this system and the vocabulary with which the individual members of the triad are identified, except that "Nous" in *Ap. John* is a lesser aeon, not identified with Autogenes ("Monogenes" = "Christ," etc.), and "Adamas" is a lesser being, not the Father himself. The second member, "Ennoia," is of course also called "Barbelo" in *Ap. John* and related texts, a name that is absent in *Norea*. It is striking that *Norea* is much more economical in its system, whereas *Ap. John* and other such texts usually develop a number of aeons and lesser beings subordinate to the primal triad (but cf. also *Steles Seth*). And most striking of all is that "Adamas" is the name given to the Father. Thus *Norea* presents to us a simpler and more "primitive"-looking system. (But this "undeveloped" look may be deceptive, not necessarily indicating an early date; see below.)

2) As for the four luminaries, Harmozel, Oroiael, Daveithe, and Eleleth, found in *Ap. John* and related literature, they do not occur in *Norea* by name, but are certainly referred to under the designation, "the four holy helpers" (28,27-28; cf. discussion above).

3) The presence of Norea in our document is not in and of itself evidence for a "Sethian" origin. Although Norea/Orea occurs in *Hyp. Arch.*, and as "Horiaia" in the "Sethian" system described by Epiphanius (*Haer.* 39.5.2), she also occurs in material belonging to many other contexts as well, including Irenaeus' *alii* (cf. *Haer.* I.30.1, called "Sethians" or "Ophites" by Theodoret; Norea is

mentioned at I.30.9), Nicolaitans (Fil. *Her.* 33.3; cf. Epiph. *Haer.* 26.1.6), Mandaeans (e.g. Lidz. *Ginza*, p. 46), and Manichaeans (Hegem. *Arch.* 9). (For full discussion see Pearson, "The Figure of Norea.")

On the other hand, we have already seen reasons for noting some Valentinian influence in our tractate. To what has already been said on this point we can add that the specifically Valentinian terms "Pleroma" (Gr. πλήρωμα, see 28,22-25 *ter*) and "deficiency" (ὤψα = Gr. ὑστέρημα, see 28,26) occur in our text. The third member of the divine triad, the Son, is called "Nous" in *Norea*, and this *may* be taken as further evidence for Valentinian influence (cf. e.g. Iren. *Haer.* I.1.1, where Nous is presented as the offspring of Bythos and Sige), but, on the other hand, this is not unknown in "Sethian" documents as well (see e.g. *Steles Seth VII* 119,1, where the term νοῦς is used as an appellative for Geradamas or Pigeradamas, the "Son" in the gnostic triad). Indeed, the Valentinian usage may itself be based on an earlier Sethian system (see Iren. *Haer.* I.11.1; cf. I.31.3).

In sum, while it is difficult to classify *Norea* strictly according to categories derived from the ecclesiastical heresiologists (cf. on this problem in general, Wisse, "The Nag Hammadi Library and the Heresiologists"), the "Sethian" features delineated above predominate. (But the Yale Congress papers on Sethian Gnosticism reveal that there is no unanimity of scholarly opinion on what constitutes "Sethian" Gnosticism; see *The Rediscovery of Gnosticism*, vol. 2.) What we have in this document is a literary creation reflecting a number of diverse influences; and thus it seems to be a product of intra-gnostic, "inter-denominational" syncretism.

It does not appear possible to posit a definite cultic *Sitz im Leben* for *Norea*. Its date and provenience are also impossible to determine, but the previous discussion might suggest an early third-century date. Speculation on authorship is totally fruitless.

12 **Σ** ΠΙΩΤ̅ ΠΠΤΗΡ̅. ΤΕΝ[ΝΟΙΑ]
 ΠΠΟΥΟΕΙΝ. ΠΝΟΥÇ [ΕΤΟΥ]
 ΗΖ Ζ̅ ΝΕΤ̅ΧΟΣΕ ΕΖ[ΡΑΪ]
 14 ΕΧ̅Ν ΝΕΤ̅Π̅Π̅ΣΑ ΠΠ[ΙΤ̅Ν]
 ΠΟΥΟΕΙΝ ΕΤΟΥΗΖ [Ζ̅Ν]
 16 [Ν]ΕΤ̅ΧΟΣΕ· ΤΣΜΗ Ν[ΤΕ]
 [Τ]ΜΕ ΠΝΟΥÇ ΕΤ̅ΣΟΥ[ΤΩΝ]
 18 [Π]ΛΟΥÇ ΝΑΤ̅Θ̅Μ̅ΩΜ[Ϊ]
 [Α]ΥΩ ΤΣΜΗ ΠΝΑΤ̅Ψ̅Α[ΧΕ]
 20 [Ε]ΡΟΣ ΠΙΩΤ̅ ΝΑΤ̅Τ[ΑΖΟΥ]
 ΝΩΡΕΑ Τ̅ΑΪ ΕΤΑΨ[ΚΑΚ Ε]
 22 ΖΡΑΪ ΕΡΟΥΥ ΑΥÇΩ[Τ̅Μ]
 ΑΥΧΙΤ̅ ΕΖΟΥΝ ΕΠΕÇΤΟ
 24 ΠΟΣ ΠΟΥΟΕΙΨ ΝΙΜ' ΑΥΤΑ
 ΑÇ ΝΑΣ ΠΠΙΩΤ̅ ΠΠΝΟΥÇ
 26 Ν̅ΑΔΑΜ̅Α Μ̅Ν ΤΚΕΣΜ̅Η Ν̅
 ΤΕ {ΝΤΕ} ΝΕΤ̅ΟΥΑΔΒ

ΚΗ

ΧΕΚΑΔΣ ΕCΝΑΗΤΟΝ Μ[ΜΟΣ]
 2 Ζ̅Ν ΤΕΠΙΝΝΟΙΑ ΠΝΑΤ̅Ψ̅ΑΧ[Ε]
 ΕΡΟ<C>· ΧΕΚΑΔΣ Ε<C> ΝΑΡ̅ΚΛ[Η]
 4 ΡΟΝΟΜΙ ΠΠΨΟΡ̅Π̅ ΠΝΟΥÇ
 ΕΤΑ<C> ΧΙΤ̅Ϊ· ΑΥΩ Ν<C> ΜΤΟ[Ν]

- 27,11-20 This passage may be a fragment of a larger prayer attributed to Norea in a source used by the author of this tractate. The first three beings addressed are probably to be identified as the Sethian-gnostic divine triad of Father, Mother, and Son. See tractate introduction.
- 27,16 **CMH**: An alternative translation here and elsewhere in the tractate is "sound." For highly developed speculations on "voice" (ΖΡΟΥΥ, masc.) and "sound" (CMH, fem.) see *Trim. Prot.* XIII 44*, 3 *et passim*.
- 27,20 Or perhaps ΑΤ̅Τ[ΟΥΪ], "unlimited"; cf. *Ap. John* II 3,7.
- 27,21 On the figure of Norea see tractate introduction and Pearson, "The Figure of Norea." ΕΤΑΨΚΑΚ: Cf. *Hyp. Arch.* II 92,33-93,2, and tractate introduction. Cf. also the cry of Pistis Sophia in *Pist. Soph.*, ch. 32 *et passim*.
- 27,22 Possibly ΑΥÇΩ[Τ̅Μ ΕΡΟΣ], "they heard her," but this would create a line one or two spaces longer than expected.

Father of the All, [Ennoia]
 12 of the Light, Nous
 [dwelling] in the heights
 14 above the (regions) below,
 Light dwelling [in]
 16 [the] heights, Voice of
 Truth, upright Nous,
 18 untouchable Logos,
 and [ineffable] Voice,
 20 [incomprehensible] Father!
 It is Norea who [cries out]
 22 to them. They [heard,]
 (and) they received her into her place (τόπος)
 24 forever. They gave
 her the Father of Nous,
 26 Adamas, as well as the voice
 of the Holy Ones,

28

in order that she might rest
 2 in the ineffable Epinoia,
 in order that <she> might inherit (κληρονομεῖν)
 4 the first mind (νοῦς)
 which <she> had received, and that <she> might rest

-
- 27,24-25 Or: "They gave it to her in the Father of Nous . . ."
 27,26 **ΑΔΑΜΑ**: The form should be **ΑΔΑΜΑΣ**, as in 29,1; but cf. also 28,30. "Adamas" here is the supreme God, the perfect "Man"; cf. e.g. *Ap. John* II 14,14-24. The Naassene Gnostics referred to the highest God as "the blessed Man above, Adamas" (τοῦ μακαρίου ἀθρώπου τοῦ ἔνω, τοῦ Ἀδάμαντος), Hipp. *Ref.* V.8.2.
 27,27 {**ΝΤΕ**}: dittography. The papyrus is damaged in the area of the right margin, and the scribe probably wrote nothing after **ΟΥΛΛΒ**. Hence the unusually short line, 13 letters.
 28,3-14 The *dramatis personae* seem to be badly confused in the text as it stands; emendation is therefore necessary.
 28,3 MS. reads **ΕΡΟQ** and **ΕΚΝΔΡ**.
 28,4 "First Mind," πρώτος νοῦς, is a designation for the highest God in second-century Middle-Platonism, e.g. Numenius, fr. 17 (des Places). This may be the meaning here; cf. 27,24-25.
 28,5 MS. reads **ΕΤΑQ**- and **ΝQ**-.

- 6 **ΜΜΟ<C> ΖΜ ΠΑΥΤΟΓΕΝΗΣ**
ΝΝΟΥΤΕ· ΑΥΩ ΝCΧΠΟΣ
- 8 **ΟΥΑΑΣ ΝΘΕ ΖΩΩΩ ΟΝ ΝΤΑ[CF]**
ΚΛΗΡΟΝΟΜΙ ΜΠΛΟΓΟΣ ΕΤ[Ο]
- 10 **ΝΖ ΑΥΩ ΝCΖΩΤΠ̄ ΑΝ[ΑΤ]**
ΤΑΚΟ ΤΗΡΟΥ· ΑΥΩ Ν[CΨΑ]
- 12 **[ΧΕ] ΖΜ ΠΝΟ<Υ> C ΜΠΙΩΤ· ΑΥΦ**
[ΑCΙ] ΕCΨΑΧΕ ΖΝ ΝΨΑΧΕ Μ
- 14 **[ΠΩΝ]Ζ· ΑΥΩ Δ<C>ΒΩ ΜΠΕΜ**
[ΤΟ ΕΒ]ΟΛ ΜΠΕΤΧΟCΕ ΕCΑ[ΜΔ]
- 16 **[ΖΤΕ ΜΠ]ΕΝΤΑΧΧΙΤΩ ΖΑΘΗ [ΜΦΟ]**
[ΟΥ ΝΤ]ΑΠΚΟCΜΟC ΨΩΠΕ
- 18 **[ΟΥ]ΝΤΑC ΜΜΑΥ ΜΠΝΟ[Β Ν]**
[ΝΟ]ΥC ΝΤΕ [Π]ΑΖΟΡΑ[Τ]ΟC Α[ΥΩ]
- 20 **[C† Ε]ΟΟΥ ΜΠ<ΕC> Ε[Ι]ΩΤ Α[ΥΩ]**
[ΕC]ΨΟΟΠ̄ ΝΖΡΑΪ ΖΝ ΝΕΤ. [
- 22 **[. . .]. ΝΖΡΑΪ Ζ[Μ] ΠΠΛΗΡΩΜΑ**
[ΑΥΩ Ν]CΝΑΥ ΑΠΠΛΗΡΩΜΑ·
- 24 **[ΟΥΝ Ζ]ΕΝΖΟΟΥ ΝΑΨΩΠΕ ΝC**
[ΝΑΥ Δ]ΠΠΛΗΡΩΜΑ· ΑΥΩ
- 26 **ΝCΑΨΩΠΕ ΑΝ ΖΜ ΠΨΤΑ·**
ΟΥΝΤΑC ΔΕ ΜΜΑΥ ΜΠΩΤΑΥ
- 28 **ΝΒΟΗΘΟC ΕΤΟΥΑΑΒ' ΕΥΡΠΡΕ**

- 28,6 MS. reads **ΜΜΟΩ**. On Autogenes see tractate introduction.
- 28,8 **ΖΩΩΩ** functions here as a conjunction. See Roberge, *Noréa*, p. 165. (Cf. p. XXIX.)
- 28,11 No trace of the superlin. stroke remains in the MS. over the **Ν**, as might be expected. For the restored construction **ΑΥΩ ΝC-** see the previous line; lit. "and that she might . . ."
- 28,12 No trace of the final **Ω** remains in the MS., but it is attested in an early photograph.
- 28,13 **ΑCΙ**: Inchoative (E)I. See Roberge, *Noréa*, p. 166. (Cf. p. XXIX.)
- 28,14 **Δ<C>ΒΩ**: MS. reads **ΔΒΩ**.
- 28,16-17 **ΖΑΘΗ ΜΦΟΟΥ ΝΤΑ-**: Lit. "before the day that." See Roberge, *Noréa*, p. 166 (cf. p. XXIX). One would expect **ΖΑΘΗ ΜΠΑΤΕ-**.
- 28,18-19 Possession of "mind," **νοῦς**, characterizes the gnostic soul, of which Norea is a symbol. "Mind" characterizes God himself as well. The same notions are found clearly expressed in *Corp. Herm. I (Poimandres)*, and derive from Middle Platonism. Cf. note to 28,4.
- 28,20 The glorification and praise of God characterizes the activity of the divine beings and ascended souls in the highest heavens in

- 6 in the divine Autogenes,
and that she (too) might generate
8 herself, just as [she] also has
inherited (κληρονομεῖν) the [living] Logos,
10 and that she might be joined to
all of the Imperishable Ones, and [speak]
12 with the mind (νοῦς) of the Father. And
[she began] to speak with words of
14 [Life], and <she> remained in the
[presence] of the Exalted One, [possessing]
16 [that] which she had received before
the world (κόσμος) came into being.
18 [She has] the [great]
[mind (νοῦς)] of the Invisible One (ἀόρατος), [and]
20 [she gives] glory to <her> Father, [and]
[she] dwells within those who [
22 [] within the Pleroma (πλήρωμα),
[and] she beholds the Pleroma (πλήρωμα).
24 There will be days when she will
[behold] the Pleroma (πλήρωμα), and
26 she will not be in deficiency,
for (δέ) she has the four
28 holy helpers (βοηθός) who intercede (πρεσβεύειν)

gnostic and Hermetic literature and religion. See e.g. *Ap. John* BG 27,15-16; 28,10-11; etc. and *Corp. Herm.* I. 26. Π<ΕC> ΕΙΩΤ: MS. reads ΠΟΥ-, "your" (2 sg. fem.) or "their" (A³).

28,21 Or: "among . . ."

28,22 The superlin. stroke over M is visible.

28,26 ΠΩΤΑ: Π appears to be written over ΓC in the MS. The word ΩΤΑ renders the (Valentinian) gnostic technical term ὑστέρημα. For discussion of the terminology see the tractate introduction.

28,27-28 The "four holy helpers" are the four luminaries of "Sethian" or "Barbelo-Gnostic" speculation. Cf. *Melch* IX 6,3-5 and note. In *Hyp. Arch.* the "great angel" Eleleth, one of the four luminaries, comes down to Norea in answer to her cry for help (βοηθεῖν); see *Hyp. Arch.* II 92,33-93,13. In *Pist. Soph.* there are "five helpers," ch. 1 *et passim*. But also in the same document it is Jesus who is sent to save the hapless Pistis Sophia, see *Pist. Soph.*, ch. 52 *et passim*. He, in turn, sends two "light-powers"; ch. 58 and 60. Analogies to the "four holy helpers" in Mandaean texts are the "four men, the sons of salvation," or the "four Uthras, sons of light," on which see Rudolph, *Theogonie*, p. 128, and "Coptica-Mandaica," p. 199.

30 **ϸϸΕΥΕ ΖΑΡΟϸ ΖΑΤϹ ΠΙΩΤϹ Ϲ**
Π[Τ]ΗΡϹ· ΛΔΔΑΜΑ ΠΑΙ ΠΕ

ΚΘ

ΕΤϹΠϸΑΝΖΟΥΝ ϹΝΔΔΑΜΑϸ
 2 **ΤΗΡΟΥ· ΕΥΝΤΑ<Υ> ϹΜΑΥ Ϲ**
ΤΝΟΗϸΙϸ ϹΝΟΡΕΑ· ΕϸΩΑΧΕ
 4 **ΕΤΒΕ ΠΡΑΝ ϸΝΑΥ ΕΥϹ ΖΩΒ**
ΛΟΥΡΑΝ ϹΟΥΩΤ· >>>>>—————

28,29 **ΖΑΤϹ** = εμπροσθεν.

28,30 **ΛΔΔΑΜΑ**: cf. note to 27,26. But here we might be able to see the Greek (Doric) genitive case-ending preserved.

28,30-29,2 As "mind," νοϹ, God dwells within all members of (gnostic) mankind. Cf. note to 28,18-19. This passage also probably reflects gnostic speculation on the "image of God" in Gen 1:26-27.

29,2 MS. reads **ΕΥΝΤΑϹ**.

29,3 **ΝΟΡΕΑ** is a mis-spelling; the correct form, with **Ω**, occurs at 27,21. On Norea see the tractate introduction and Pearson, "The Thought of Norea." The phrase, "the thought of Norea,"

on her behalf with the Father of
 30 the All, Adamas, the one

who is within all of the Adams
 2 that possess the
 thought (νόησις) of Norea, who speaks
 4 concerning the two names which create
 a single name.

-
- probably stands for gnostic knowledge. ΕCΨΑΞΕ may refer also to "thought," "that speaks . . ."
- 29,4 The "two names" may be "Adamas" and "Norea," or perhaps "Adamas" (= God) and "Adam" (= generic mankind).
- 29,5 The "single name" is "Adamas" = God. Cf. the "one single name" (of the Father) discussed in *Gos. Phil.* II 54,5. In gnostic speculation the mystical name of God is "Man," Ἄνθρωπος or "Adam(as)"; cf. 27,26 and note, and Schenke, *Der Gott "Mensch" in der Gnosis*. On the two becoming one cf. *Gos. Thom.* 106.

75 ↑ :]ΠΟΥΝ[
]ΤΒΑΡ[ΒΗΛΩΝ
]ΝΖ[

75 → :]ΟΟΥΤ[
]ΟΝ Χ[
].ΝΛ[
]Ρ ς[

82 ↑ :]...[
]..[

82 → :]ΡΗΡΑ[Ω
]ΥΝ[

83 ↑ :].Β.[
]ΝΤ .[

83 → :].ΙΩ[
]ΕΥ.[

86 ↑ :].[.].[
].ΖΝ.Χ[
]...[

86 → :].[.].[
]..[

Fr. 75↑ Top margin preserved. This fragment probably belongs in the vicinity of p. 17, as indicated by the name "Barbelo" (cf. *Melch.* IX 16,26), and because it was first photographed with fragments of pp. 17 and 21. It does not fit the top of p. 17, however.

75↑,2 "Barbelo."

75↑,3 Perhaps ΠΩ]ΝΖ, "the life."

Fr. 75→ Top margin visible.

75→,1 Perhaps Ζ]ΟΟΥΤ, "male."

Fr. 82↑ No margins visible.

Fr. 82→ No margins visible.

82→,1 "gentle."

Fr. 83↑ No margins visible.

Fr. 83→ No margins visible.

Fr. 86↑ No margins visible.

Fr. 86→ No margins visible.

INTRODUCTION TO CODEX X

Bibliography: Facsimile Edition, pp. xv-xxiii, pl. 81-144. Doresse, *Secret Books*, pp. 140-141, 145; Krause, "Der koptische Handschriftenfund," pp. 107-113; Robinson, "Coptic Gnostic Library Today," p. 400; Krause and Labib, *Gnostische und hermetische Schriften*, pp. 9-10, pl. 5, 13; Robinson, "Construction," pp. 172, 174, 176-183, 185-189; Robinson, "Codicology," pp. 15, 17-18, 27-28; Robinson, "Future," pp. 26-27, 42-43, 47-49, 53-54, 58-59; Emmel, "Final Report," pp. 16, 21.

Codex X is part of a collection of twelve papyrus codices, plus one tractate from a thirteenth, discovered in December of 1945 in a jar buried at the base of the Gebel et-Ṭarif near the village of Hamra Dom in Upper Egypt, about 10 km. northeast of Nag' Ḥammadi. (On the discovery of the Nag Hammadi Codices see J. M. Robinson's Introduction to *The Nag Hammadi Library*, pp. 21-23). It is now the property of the Coptic Museum in Old Cairo, and bears the inventory number 10551. It has been numbered X by J. Doresse and T. Mina in 1949 ("Nouveaux textes gnostiques," p. 137), XII by H.-C. Puech in 1950 ("Les nouveaux écrits gnostiques," p. 109) and by J. Doresse in 1958 (*Les livres secrets*, p. 167), and X by M. Krause in 1962 ("Der koptische Handschriftenfund," p. 128 *et passim*). Krause's numbering of the Nag Hammadi codices is the official numbering used by the Coptic Museum and in the *Facsimile Edition*, and is therefore adopted in this edition.

1. *Codicology*

Codex X was found with its leather cover intact. Photographs of the cover are presented in the *Facsimile Edition*, plates 81-86 (and in Krause and Labib, *Gnostische und hermetische Schriften*, pl. 5). In three of these photographs (pl. 83-85) the codex is shown open at pp. 26*-27*, 28*-29*, and 30*-31*. A full description of the leather cover, which was made of sheep leather, is provided by J. M. Robinson in his Preface to the *Facsimile Edition* (p. xvii). Robinson has shown, in a thorough analysis of all of the extant leather covers of the Nag Hammadi Library, that Codex X belongs typologically in a group together with Codices VI and IX, and to a lesser extent II (see "Construction," pp. 184-190). Such cartonnage as may have been removed from the binding of Codex X has been lost (cf. Emmel, "Final Report," p. 21).

Codex X is preserved only in part, and the extant portion consists mainly of fragments. More than half of the codex is lost. Thus this codex, along with Codex XII, represents that part of the Nag Hammadi Library which has suffered the most damage and loss. Unlike Codex XII, the fragments of Codex X have not been susceptible of identification with any previously known literature. Thus it is not possible to ascertain even the extent of the codex: how many pages it originally contained, or even how many tractates, though on grounds of content it is presumed that it contained only one tractate, whose title occurs on the last inscribed page of the codex, p. 68* (see the tractate introduction).

In *Secret Books* (p. 145) J. Doresse says of Codex X (= XII in his numbering system): "20 pages [= leaves], with their binding in sahidic dialect, marked by akhmimic influence." Subsequently, ("Les Reliures," p. 45), Doresse is even less specific, remarking simply that the codex is too damaged to say how many pages it contained.

Krause reports of Codex X that it came to the Cairo Museum (along with other codices in the library) in 1952 (cf. also Doresse, *Secret Books*, p. 124) and that the papyrus leaves, contained in a leather cover, were broken and disordered (Krause and Labib, *Gnostische und hermetische Schriften*, p. 9). Krause reports that the remains of the codex were placed between 34 plexiglass panes. He thus silently corrects an earlier statement which referred to 36 plexiglass panes ("Der koptische Handschriftenfund," p. 128).

No attempt had apparently been made, at the time of the initial conservation in plexiglass, to put the pages and fragments of Codex X into order. The work that was done on this subsequently was carried out, from 1968 on, on the basis of photographs of the plexiglass containers. This work has been refined and corrected by examination of the original MS. on periodic work sessions in the Coptic Museum in Cairo, from 1970 to 1977.

At the time that I joined the Coptic Project of the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity of Claremont in 1968 and was assigned Codex X as part of my contribution to the Project, I was given access to 36 photographs (taken in 1966 under UNESCO auspices), showing the 36 panes of plexiglass referred to by Krause in his earlier article (see above). Upon study of these photographs it immediately became evident that plexiglass nos. 35-36 contained fragments that did not belong to Codex X at all. This judgment

was made on the basis of the hand as shown by the writing preserved on the fragments, and also the dialect (Sahidic, rather than the Subakhmimic of Codex X; cf. below). The suggestion was then made that the fragments in question belong to Codex VIII; sometime later some of these fragments were positively identified as belonging to Codex VIII.

The question as to why plexiglass 35-36 were attributed to Codex X at all was later answered. At an advanced stage of the work of the Coptic Project of the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity J. Doresse kindly offered to the Institute some photographs of the Nag Hammadi codices that he had taken in 1948, including three photographs of Codex X in an opened state, showing pp. 26*-27*, 28*-29*, 30*-31* (see *Facsimile Edition*, plates 83-85). In the photograph showing p. 31* (pl. 85), there is clearly visible, protruding from under p. 31* at the top, one of the fragments that had appeared in plexiglass 36, a fragment that has been subsequently identified as part of the bottom of Codex VIII, p. 10, preserving parts of the last four lines. (An unidentified fragment from Codex VIII is also visible; see *Facsimile Edition*; p. xix.) These photographs of Codex X, dating from 1948, show that the contents of that codex had been considerably disturbed before the photography. Sometime after the manuscripts were discovered, but *before* Doresse had had a chance to study them, the contents of Codices X and VIII—and probably the others as well (cf. *Secret Books*, p. 117)—had become thoroughly disordered, with the result that not only was Codex X itself in hopeless disarray, but fragments from Codex VIII had been arbitrarily stuffed into the cover containing Codex X. At the time of the initial conservation in 1960 the material was conserved in plexiglass panes in the sequence in which it was found in the leather cover (see Krause, *Gnostische und hermetische Schriften*, p. 9; cf. *Facsimile Edition*, p. xix). Final conservation was completed in 1977 (see *Facsimile Edition*, p. xix; cf. Emmel, "Final Report," pp. 17-22).

Enough of Codex X has been preserved and pieced together to suggest with confidence that it consisted of a single quire. Recto pages from the first half of the quire consistently display vertical fibers, and recto pages from the last half of the quire horizontal fibers. The sequence of some of the pages has been ascertained, and fragments have been assigned to other pages somewhat arbitrarily (though not-without criteria, see below), with the result that an

educated guess as to the original extent of the codex is possible. It appears that Codex X was originally constructed of a *minimum* of 18 sheets of four pages each, placed in such a way that all vertical fibers faced downward and horizontal fibers upward, and folded to make a book. The bottom sheet became the uninscribed front and back flyleaves (the back flyleaf is partially preserved, cf. pl. 141-142 of the *Facsimile Edition*). The other sheets constituted the written part of the book. There is enough material surviving from the beginning, the middle, and the end of the codex to arrive at an absolute minimum of 68 inscribed pages for the codex, though the codex was probably larger (see below). 56 pages, or fragments thereof, are extant. Pagination, after p. 10, is uncertain; asterisks (*) are used to indicate those pages whose numeration is postulated, not certain (though absolute sequence has been determined for some of these pages; see below). According to the minimum pagination adopted here, the center pages of the codex are 34* and 35*.

The leaves measure up to 26.0 cm. in height, and from ca. 11.4 cm. in width in the middle portion of the codex (p. 39*/40*) to 12.2 cm. at the outer pages (p. 3/4). The closed book thus had a proportion of roughly 2 to 1, height to width. Codex X is the narrowest of all of the codices in the Nag Hammadi Library (cf. Robinson's table, "Construction," p. 185).

The number of lines per page varies from 28 (pp. 1, 25*, 26*, 27*, 28*, 35*, 36*, 37*, 38*) to 30 (pp. 30*, 39*?, 41*, 42*); the average is 29. The lines average 15-16 letters in length. There are as few as 11 (40*,6), and as many as 21 (5,2). The lines average somewhat shorter toward the middle part of the codex; this is due to the fact that the individual pages are wider at the outside of the codex than in the middle.

Page numerals 3, 4, and 5 are extant, and occur in the middle of the top margin of their respective pages. Unfortunately our scribe stopped numbering the pages after p. 5, a fact which has made the task of reconstructing the codex all the more difficult. It should also be noted that the work of placing fragments and reconstructing the codex has been done over a considerable period of time, and has been a "trial and error" process. Thus what has been said of Codex X in preliminary articles on the Nag Hammadi library and the Coptic Project of the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity has been subject to revision and refinement as the work progressed.

Since so much of the codex is lost and damaged, it is obvious that

fragments could not be placed as in a jig-saw puzzle. Certain criteria were developed for placement of fragments and for establishing, in so far as is possible, the sequence of the pages. These criteria include physical joins, continuity of fibers from one fragment to another, continuity in destruction patterns from one page to another, ink blotting from one page to a facing page, and continuity of text. Another criterion, quite crucial for the reconstruction of this codex, is the observation of horizontal fiber continuity between conjugate leaves from the two halves of the quire, indicating a single sheet. (Fiber continuity can frequently be determined even with a considerable amount of space between fragments. Fragments are placed longitudinally according to vertical fibers and latitudinally according to horizontal fibers.)

Unfortunately a number of fragments have proven to be incapable of placement, and remain in the category of "unidentified." Transcriptions of the largest of these are found in this edition, and all inscribed fragments from Codex X are published in the *Facsimile Edition* (plates 143-144; cf. also plates 3-4 in *The Facsimile Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices: Introduction*, forthcoming).

The sequence of pp. 1-10 has been established with certainty, on the basis of text continuity and destruction patterns (page numbering ceases at p. 5). In addition, the sequence of pp. 25*-42* has also been established with certainty, on the basis of the criteria discussed above. The uninscribed back flyleaf (C) shows ink-blotting from p. 68*. The observation that there is horizontal fiber continuity between pp. 2 and 67*, between pp. 6 and 63*, and between pp. 8 and 61*, provided additional material for reconstructing the end of the codex. Placement of the material between p. 10 and p. 25* in the first half of the codex, and between p. 42* and 61* in the second half, is admittedly somewhat arbitrary, but criteria such as fiber continuity and destruction patterns ("profile") have been employed. Much more material is probably lost than is posited in the present pagination. All of the fragments determined to represent separate leaves or folios have been accommodated into a *mimimal* quire of 72 pages (68 inscribed), 36 folios, 18 sheets.

The following table shows how the folios relate to one another from one half of the codex to the other, in the order they lie in the codex opened at the center of the quire. Lost folios are shown in brackets. Horizontal fiber continuity from the first half of the quire to the second is indicated with the sign ==. Disruption of

horizontal fiber continuity is shown as follows: $=/$; in this case a *kollesis* is presumed to have existed (though no *kolleseis* have been preserved from Codex X). Where one of the conjugate leaves is shown in brackets as lost, fiber continuity, or lack thereof, is not shown.

first half of quire		second half of quire
33*/34*	===	35*/36*
31*/32*	===	37*/38*
29*/30*	===	39*/40*
27*/28*	===	41*/42*
25*/26*	= / =	43*/44*
[23*/24*]		45*/46*
21*/22*		[47*/48*]
19*/20*		[49*/50*]
17*/18*		[51*/52*]
15*/16*		[53*/54*]
13*/14*	===	55*/56*
[11/12]		57*/58*
9/10		[59*/60*]
7/8	===	61*/62*
5/6	===	63*/64*
3/4	= / =	65*/66*
1/2	===	67*/68*
[A/B]		C/D

(Note: P. 43*/44* is placed where it is because of "profile" similarity to p. 41*/42*; cf. *Facsimile Edition*, p. xxi.)

There is enough evidence preserved, in addition, to establish the extent of some of the *kollemata* in the papyrus rolls from which the sheets making up Codex X were cut. It is assumed that, in the construction of a codex, sheets were cut from rolls consisting of several sheets of papyrus glued together. The sheets from which a roll was made are called *kollemata*; the join where two *kollemata* are glued together is called a *kollesis*. (For this terminology and additional discussion see Turner, *Typology*, pp. 43-53; Robinson, "Codicology," p. 19; and "Future," pp. 23-27; cf. also the introduction to Codex IX.) In the case of Codex X too much material is lost to determine the exact number and size of the rolls from which it was constructed (for examples of complete analyses of other codices along these lines see e.g. Wisse, "Nag Hammadi Codex III," and Robinson, "Codicological Analysis"). Moreover not a single *kollesis* is preserved from Codex X (nor from XIII; see Robinson,

"Future," p. 42). However, direction of horizontal fiber continuity has been established, and some *kollemata* have been delineated.

Analysis of the horizontal fiber patterns in Codex X indicates horizontal fiber continuity from the left edge of one sheet in the quire to the right edge of the next above. This means that the rolls from which the codex was constructed were probably cut from right to left, and the sheets stacked in the order in which they were cut. The longest *kollema* identified in Codex X is the one beginning at the center of the quire (the left edge of a roll): pp. (showing horizontal fibers) 34* + 35*, 32* + 37*, 30* + 39*, 28* + 41*, 26* + 43* (part). Extant material in this *kollema* measures over 95 cm.; so we have a *kollema* of almost a meter in length, and perhaps a little more if we take into account lost material from outside margins. (Such long *kollemata* are practically unknown to papyrologists before the discovery of the Nag Hammadi Codices, but in the Nag Hammadi Codices they are commonplace. See Robinson, "Codicology," p. 31; "Future," pp. 41-43; and now Turner, *Typology*, p. 53.) Other *kollemata* wider than a single sheet (i.e. 2 folios) have been delineated with varying degrees of certainty as follows (pages shown in brackets are missing pages): 43*, [24*] + 45*; 20* + [49*], 18* + [51*], 16*; 10 + [59*], 8 + 61*, 6 + 63* 4 + 65 (part); and 65*, 2 + 67*, [B] + C. Obviously the identification of material coming from a single *kollema* was also an important factor in the final pagination of the codex.

It has already been stressed that the pagination of Codex X is the *minimum* pagination needed to take into account all of the extant fragments, i.e. all fragments that were seen necessarily to represent separate leaves or folios. In fact, it is probable that Codex X was quite a bit larger than is reflected by the extant material. A reasonable hypothesis is that two rolls of papyrus were utilized in the construction of Codex X (cf. Robinson, "Codicology," p. 28; *Facsimile Edition*, p. xxi). The other Nag Hammadi Codices that are made up of two rolls are V, VI, IX, and XI (cf. Robinson, "Codicology," p. 28). Codex V has 94 pages, VI had 80, IX had 76, and XI has 74. Codices VI, IX, and X belong typologically together (see Robinson, "Construction," pp. 184-190). Using Codex IX as a conservative example, Codex X might be expected to have been made up of two rolls of 9 and 10 sheets respectively (see the introduction to Codex IX), and therefore to have contained at least 76 pages, 72 of them inscribed. But it should also be pointed

out that a standard roll of papyrus can be expected to yield a greater number of sheets the narrower they are cut. In fact Codex X is the narrowest of all of the Nag Hammadi Codices; the next narrowest is Codex V (see Robinson's chart, "Construction," p. 185). Hence one might reasonably conjecture a pattern similar to that of Codex V, in which the roll used at the outside of the quire yielded 10½ sheets, and that used at the middle of the quire yielded 13, for a total of 94 pages in all (cf. Robinson, "Future," p. 53; *Facsimile Edition*, p. xix). Unfortunately we shall probably never know how much has been lost from Codex X.

The papyrus used in Codex X was obviously of very good quality when it first received writing, much better than Codex IX (cf. the introduction to Codex IX). I have found no instances of the scribe having to avoid cracks or damaged areas in the papyrus as he wrote. P. 3 shows a narrow break in the vertical fibers extending the length of the page, but the scribe wrote over it. At lines 11 and 12, the crack is wide enough so that part of the fourth letter of line 11 (M) and line 12 (N) occurs in the crack on the horizontal fiber beneath. Similar phenomena occur on p. 21*, lines 13-26, p. 25*, lines 3-4, and p. 38*, lines 2, 19-22. But in general it can be stated that the scribe had at his disposal a very high-quality papyrus upon which to write.

The fact that no *kolleseis* have been found in the extant material of Codex X may be an indicator of high-quality work in the manufacture of the codex. The stationer may have taken special care to construct it in such a way as to ensure that *kolleseis* would not occur in the writing space of the pages; the *kolleseis* may even have been trimmed away. (The Manichaean codices, also constructed with great care, have no *kolleseis* in them; see Turner, *Typology*, pp. 45-46, 49-50.)

2. *Paleography*

Codex X was inscribed by a single scribe. The hand can be described generally as a somewhat primitive version of the "Biblical Majuscule" type discussed by E. G. Turner (*Greek Manuscripts*, pp. 25-26; otherwise known as "Biblical Uncial," cf. e.g. C. H. Roberts, *Greek Literary Hands*, pp. 16, 24). The letters are majuscules, roughly bilinear (i.e. written between an upper and lower line notionally present to the scribe, cf. Turner, *Greek Manuscripts*, p. 3). As in the standard "Biblical Majuscule" style, γ and ρ extend

below the lower line, Φ and Ψ above and below the lines. In addition the Coptic letters ω and ϱ extend below the line, the letter σ above, and τ above and below. The hand is vertical, not slanted either to right or left. The letters are written rather large with bold and deliberate strokes. In general the appearance of the hand is pleasing to the eye.

Noteworthy characteristics of the lettering are as follows: the α tends to be squared off at the top rather than extending upward, unlike the standard "Biblical Majuscule" style in this respect; the λ frequently shows the same characteristic. Also deviating from the "Biblical Majuscule" style is the mode of executing the ϵ and c : ϵ is executed with three strokes, the top cap and the middle stroke rendered separately; similarly in the case of c : frequently the top portion is rendered with a separate stroke.

The use of punctuation in Codex X is very sparing. The raised dot ("colon") is used rather frequently, not only to mark the end of a sentence, but also to divide clauses and even phrases. But its use is irregular; and it is sometimes difficult to make any proper sense of it at all, e.g. at 5,4: $\cdot\alpha\gamma\omega\ \cdot\ \eta\alpha\iota\omega\nu\cdot\ \eta\nu\omicron\upsilon\tau\epsilon$.

The only other punctuation used is the *trema* or diaeresis. It is used only over the letter ι , and only in the word $\rho\eta\iota$: e.g. $\eta\rho\eta\iota$ (8,3), $\alpha\rho\eta\iota$ (8,23), $\omega\alpha\rho\eta\iota$ (31*,7).

The use of the superlinear stroke in Codex X is quite regular, though it is used less frequently, and with fewer variations, than in Codex IX. It is regularly omitted over $\omicron\upsilon\nu$ and $\omicron\upsilon\nu\tau\epsilon$ (but see $\epsilon\gamma\eta\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, 8,17 and $\epsilon\gamma\eta\tau\eta\tau\eta\nu$, 10,22). It is frequently omitted in other words where it would be expected, though it is not clear whether these omissions should be regarded as errors or as dialecticisms: e.g. $\omega\alpha\rho\pi$ (2,16; cf. $\omega\alpha\rho\pi$ 4,19); $\rho\prime\nu$ (30*,24); $\varsigma\alpha\omega\varrho$ (31*,11; cf. $\varsigma\alpha\omega\varrho$ 31*,8; $\eta\kappa\pi\omega\rho\chi$ (37*,4; cf. $\eta\kappa\rho\tau\omicron\lambda\mu\alpha$, 27*,22). There is latitude in the use or non-use of the stroke over the plural Definite Article η . When the noun begins with a vowel the stroke is used or not seemingly according to whim: e.g. $\eta\alpha\rho\gamma\epsilon\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ (25*,2; 27*,14; 32*,4), but $\eta\alpha\iota\omega\nu$ (5,4). The stroke is regularly used when the noun begins with a consonant.

The stroke over a single letter is placed directly over the letter, sometimes extending to the left or (less frequently) to the right. Over ρ it frequently extends beyond the letter on either side, with flourishes: e.g. $\overline{\rho}\ \omicron\upsilon\gamma\alpha\epsilon\iota\nu$ (10,7).

The superlinear stroke is sometimes used to bind two or more

consonants together, and there is some variation in the way in which the stroke is rendered: e.g. $\overline{\tau\mu\alpha\zeta\mu\bar{\nu}\bar{\nu}\bar{\tau}\omega\bar{\alpha}\bar{m}\bar{n}\bar{\tau}}$ (2,12); $\overline{\bar{\nu}\omega\bar{\alpha}\bar{m}\bar{n}\bar{\tau}}$ (3,4); $\overline{\omega\bar{\alpha}\bar{\rho}\bar{\pi}}$ (7,7). On $\bar{m}\bar{n}$ and $\bar{\zeta}\bar{n}$ the stroke usually extends to the right of the letter preceding the vocalized \bar{n} . In the transcription provided in this edition variations in the rendition of the superlinear stroke are not represented (for reasons of economy in printing); the stroke will appear over a single letter, e.g. $\tau\mu\alpha\zeta\bar{m}\bar{n}\bar{\nu}\bar{\tau}\omega\bar{\alpha}\bar{m}\bar{n}\bar{\tau}$.

The superlinear stroke occurs twice over the sg. Definite Article (6,5 and 61*,2). There are no strokes or other marks used over vowel morphemes or phonemes. The one abbreviation found in Codex X, of $\overline{\pi\bar{n}\bar{\alpha}}$ ("Spirit"), receives an extended superlinear stroke: $\overline{\pi\bar{n}\bar{\alpha}}$ (4,17 *et passim*). The superlinear stroke is not used to mark *nomina sacra*. The only extant examples would be $\overline{\bar{\nu}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\rho}\bar{\nu}\bar{\eta}\bar{\lambda}\omega}$ (8,28; cf. 43*,21) and $\overline{\bar{\gamma}\bar{\alpha}\bar{m}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\lambda}\bar{i}\bar{\eta}\bar{\lambda}}$ (64*,19). Superlinear strokes occur over the Greek vowels $\bar{\alpha}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\eta}\bar{i}\bar{o}\bar{\upsilon}\bar{\omega}$ at 26*,4, but the use of superlineation in the section of text dealing with vowels and consonants (from p. 25*; cf. tractate introduction) is quite inconsistent: see e.g. 28*,4: $\overline{\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\epsilon}\cdot\text{III}\bar{o}\bar{o}\bar{o}\bar{\gamma}\bar{\gamma}\bar{\gamma}\bar{\omega}\bar{\omega}\bar{\omega}}$; 31*,23-27: $\overline{\bar{\nu}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\gamma}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\lambda}[\bar{\lambda}]\bar{\zeta}[\bar{\lambda}\bar{\theta}\bar{\alpha}]\bar{\nu}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\gamma}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\lambda}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\zeta}[\bar{\epsilon}]\bar{\theta}\bar{\epsilon}}$ etc. Finally, superlinear strokes occur over the three extant page numerals found in the middle of the top margin of pp. 3, 4, and 5 respectively.

Decoration occurs at the end of Codex X on p. 68* with the tractate title. The title, $[\bar{M}]\bar{\alpha}\bar{\rho}\bar{\varsigma}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\nu}\bar{\eta}\bar{\varsigma}$, is decorated with super- and sublinear strokes, and in the left margin a rudimentary *paragraphus cum corone* occurs: $\overline{\tau}$. A possible trace of a *paragraphus*, a straight line in the left margin, occurs at 55*,17; the initial letter in that line, ϵ , is written larger than usual. This was probably a device meant to set off a new section of text.

Scribal errors abound in Codex X, many of them caught by the scribe himself, others escaping his notice. The scribe used a number of devices in correcting errors. At 6,22 writing the word $\bar{\alpha}\bar{\rho}\bar{\nu}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\nu}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\rho}\bar{\rho}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{i}$ he wrote $\bar{\gamma}$ after $\bar{\rho}$; he then crossed out the $\bar{\gamma}$ with two diagonal slashes, marked it with three superlinear dots, and wrote the rest of the word. At 19*,20 writing the word $\bar{o}\bar{\upsilon}\bar{\gamma}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\tau}\bar{\tau}\bar{\eta}\bar{\nu}\bar{\epsilon}$ he wrote \bar{o} after $\bar{o}\bar{\upsilon}$; he then crossed out the \bar{o} and wrote $\bar{\epsilon}$ above. In this case the mistake was probably corrected after the entire line, or perhaps the entire page, had been written. At 34*,22 writing $\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\rho}\bar{\omega}\bar{o}\bar{o}\bar{\pi}$ he wrote $\bar{\zeta}$ instead of $\bar{\omega}$; he subsequently crossed out $\bar{\zeta}$ with a single slash and wrote $\bar{\omega}$ above. At 38*,26 writing $\bar{\pi}\bar{\zeta}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\epsilon}$ he wrote

πμαζ; he then crossed out μαζ with two slashes and wrote ζαε above. At 40*,13 writing ΠΠΑΤΚΡΔΟΚΙΜΑΖΕ he wrote the wrong suffix ς after τ, then cancelled it with a diagonal slash and wrote κ above. In one case, at 9,4, the scribe wrote ἀρετῆ and subsequently wrote ς (3 sg. fem. suffix) above the η (3 sg. masc. suffix) without cancelling it.

The scribe has written in omitted letters above the line in several places: 4,20; 15*,3; 16*,14; 17*,20; 19*,20 (in addition to the correction already noted); and 30*,24. And in one case a whole word is added in this way: 'ΝΤΕΣΜΗ' at 25*,13. There are numerous cases where the scribe has written over one or more letters: 1,13.18; 3,21; 6,11; 7,1; 8,8.19.23; 9,8; 14*,22; 26*,25; 28*,16; 30*,2.8.24.28; 33*,6; 34*,29; 36*,22 (probably erroneously!); 41*,15; 42*,5; 68*,3. (For details see the notes.)

In the case of the errors left undetected by the scribe it is, of course, possible that he was simply reproducing mistakes already present in his exemplar (unless he is also the translator of the Codex). Manifest misspellings occur at 9,7 (omission); 27,13 (substitution, perhaps a dialecticism); 32*,20 (omission). An extra superlinear stroke occurs at 8,20: ΝΜας. A complicated case of dittography occurs at 30*,12-13: {ϲΡΖΥΠΟΤΑϲϲΕ ΑΥΩ} ϲΡΖΥΠΟΤΑϲϲΕ, but the latter should probably be emended to <ϲε> ΡΖΥΠΟΤΑϲϲΕ (3 pl. instead of 3 sg. masc. subject). Superfluous material has been editorially deleted also at 8,20; 28*,23; and 30*,12. Material deemed to have been erroneously omitted has been editorially supplied at 4,28; 5,1.19.23; 6,3.9 (perhaps a dialecticism); 7,17; 8,2; 9,21; 10,4; 25*,14; 27*,13; 30*,3.8; 31*,9; 32*,12; 33*,19; 34*,23; 40*,14; 41*,6; 64*,3; and 67*,17. Apparent errors of substitution requiring emendation occur at 5,22.23; 25*,23; 29*,12; 34*,2.3; and perhaps 8,20.22. (For details see the notes.)

It has been assumed that Codex X was written by the same hand as that of the greater portion of Codex I. Thus Doresse assigns Codex X (XII in his numbering system) and the first hand of I (XIII in his numbering system) to "writing 8" (*Secret books*, pp. 141-145). Krause, too, states that the first scribe of codex I also wrote Codex X ("Der koptische Handschriftenfund," p. III, qualifying the statement with the adverb "wohl"; cf. *Gnostische und hermetische Schriften*, p. 9, qualified by "vielleicht"). This judgment is unquestionably wrong, and has been abandoned in

more recent discussions (cf. e.g. Robinson, "Codicology," pp. 17-18; cf. also Emmel, "Final Report," p. 27).

The similarities between the first hand of Codex I and that of Codex X are superficial. Study of the two hands turns up a number of important differences in the execution of certain letters. E.g. **α** in Codex X is more square in shape, and is squared off at the top; in I **α** is more angular, and not squared off at the top. **Δ** in X is more upright; in I it is slanted more to the left. **ε** in X is executed regularly with three distinct movements, the top portion formed with a separate stroke; **ε** in I is usually written as a standard uncial. **κ** in X has both of its top members even on the upper line; in I it has its diagonal stroke regularly lower. **ϙ** in X has its top part rendered as a separate stroke; in I **ϙ** is more rounded. **τ** in X frequently has extra ink at either or both ends of the horizontal member; in I this is not the case. **γ** in both codices is basically the same shape, majuscule; but in I it is frequently extraordinarily large. The body of **ϕ** in X is diamond-shaped and broad; in I it is more round and not as wide. **Ϛ** in both codices extends above the line, but in I the top part is slanted more steeply upward. The superlinear stroke in I is not as uniform as in X, and is not written as far above the line as in X. The scribe of I uses the "apostrophe" and the circumflex stroke; both features are absent from X. Line fillers and slash marks to separate passages are employed in I (e.g. both occur at 13,25), not in X. I has elaborate decoration between tractates 2 and 3 and between 3 and 4, quite unlike the modest decoration occurring at the end of Codex X. In general, the hand of Codex X is more regularly bilinear than that of I. The letters are more uniform, written more deliberately, and with broader and heavier strokes.

In summary, it must be concluded that the hand of Codex X cannot be identified with that of any other codex in the Nag Hammadi Library. It is quite similar (except in superlineation) to the hand of the "Gnostic Treatise" (on parchment) from Deir el-Bala'izah in Upper Egypt (Text no. 52 in Kahle, *Bala'izah*, vol. 1, pp. 473-477, see plate I,1). This hand is referred to as "square uncials of the fourth century" by P. Kahle (*Bala'izah*, vol. 1, p. 473).

On paleographical grounds a fourth-century date can be posited for Codex X. (A fourth-century date has consistently been maintained from the beginning; see Doresse, *Secret Books*, p. 141; and Krause, *Gnostische und hermetische Schriften*, p. 9.) There is nothing in the codicological evidence, discussed above, that would count against a fourth-century date.

3. Language

The single tractate in Codex X, *Marsanes*, is a Coptic translation of a Greek original. (There is no reason to doubt the general scholarly consensus that all of the Nag Hammadi tractates have been translated from Greek into Coptic; cf. e.g. MacRae, "Nag Hammadi," in *IDBSup*, p. 613). The dialect of Codex X is Subachmimic (A²), a dialect found, with individual variations, in two other of the Nag Hammadi Codices. (The other A² tractates in the Nag Hammadi Library are *Pr. Paul* I,1; *Ap. Jas.* I,2; *Gos. Truth* I,3; *Treat. Res.* I,4; *Tri. Trac.* I,5; *Interp. Know.* XI,1; and *Val. Exp.* XI,2). A glance at the Index of Coptic Words will enable the reader to perceive the basic differences in vocalization between A² words and S words, for all entries are listed under the S forms found in Crum's *Coptic Dictionary*. In general terms, the language of Codex X resembles especially that of *Gos. Truth* (I,3) and the other texts in the Jung Codex *except* I,5, which has a sub-dialect all its own.

The A² dialect never achieved standardization, and therefore shows many variations. It is possible to group the various sub-dialects of A², according to vocalization patterns as found in the various texts and groups of texts written in A². R. Kasser has prepared a preliminary unpublished analysis of the various A² sub-groups represented by the Nag Hammadi A² documents, the A² *Acts of Paul*, the A² Gospel of John, and the Manichaean texts (*Psalms*, *Kephalaia*, and *Homilies*), and presents in this study a thorough comparative analysis of the A² vocabulary of the tractates in Codices X and XI. This study will be published in C. Hedrick, ed., *Nag Hammadi Codices XI, XII, and XIII*.

In what follows I shall not attempt to present a complete grammar of Codex X. Rather I shall survey those features shown in the language of Codex X which show divergences from what might be expected of a A² document, and call attention to other special problems in the language of Codex X deserving of mention.

As has already been indicated, the A² dialect varies greatly from text to text; so what appears to be a non-A² intrusion in a particular text may turn out, with further evidence available, to be well within the bounds of the dialect. Nevertheless, on the basis of our present evidence, there are some interesting divergences in the phonology of Codex X from what would be expected in a A² text. There is one case of what appears to be a Fayumic (F) vocalization: NEI for A² NAE (67*,20). The other divergences from A²

are Sahidicisms: **ΜΜΑΤΕ** (56*,17 α for ε), **ΜΜΑΥ** (17*,15 α for ε), **CON** (7,11 ο for α), **ΧΙΟΟΡ** (33*,4 loss of final ε), **ΤΝΤΝ** (6,11; A² is **ΤΝΤΝΕ** or **ΤΑΝΤΝ**, which occurs at 5,8). The last two cases are examples of a general tendency observable in the vocalizations in Codex X, viz. dropping of final ε: e.g. **ΖΑΕΕΥ** (10,18) and **ΝΤΩΤΝ** (10,20), both of which can also be taken as Sahidicisms, though they are attested in other A² texts (according to Nagel, *Untersuchungen*, pp. 123, 87). Another case of the loss of final ε is a hitherto unattested form: **ΑΙ ΕΥ** (41*,16 for A² **ΑΙ ΕΥΕ**, S **ΑΙΑΙ**). Other apparent Sahidicisms are **ΚΗ†** (65*,19 A² usually **ΚΑΑΤ†**) and **ΤΝΤΩΝ†** (5,12; 32*,14; the usual A² form **ΤΝΤΑΝΤ†** probably occurs at 28,25).

The Sahidicisms in Codex X go beyond merely the occurrence of a few S vocalizations. E.g. at 1,13, the Sahidic **Ν** is found prefixed to a negated verb (cf. S **Ν . . . ΑΝ**): **ΕΝCΕΖΑCΙ ΕΝ** (cf. *Gos. Truth* I 26,20; 37,32). At 9,21 the S form **ΑΝ-** is used for the First Perfect 1 plural instead of the usual **ΑΖΝ-** (otherwise regular in our text). At 14*,16 the S form of the Definite Article (used with certain nouns expressing time) occurs: **ΝΕΑΙΩΝ** instead of **ΝΑΙΩΝ**. The loss of **Ϝ** before the Greek verb at 30*,7 (cf. 10,25; 66*,3) may be a Sahidicism, or simply a mistake. It is also possible that the use of the Active form of the Greek verb **ὑποτάσσεσθαι** (e.g. 29*,22 **ΖΥΠΟΤΑCCE**) should be regarded as a Sahidicism. (The Greek verbal ending **-εσθαι**, for Middle and Passive voice, is not normally used in Sahidic; see Böhlig, "Griechische Deponentien.") It therefore appears that the language of Codex X has undergone considerable Sahidic influence.

There are other peculiarities in the language of Codex X that cannot be traced to dialectical interference. **CΩΤΕ** is used for **CΩΤ** at 27*,21 (cf. *Gos. Truth* I 38,2). The word **ΧΙΜ** at 40*,18 is either a new word, or a hitherto unattested variant of **ΧΙΝ** (it is translated as the latter).

Some noteworthy features of the orthography of Codex X include the following: dissimilation of **ΜΠ**, resulting in **ΝΠ** (4,22-23 [*bis*]; 6,25); use of **Ψ** for **ΠC** (**ΑΨ** 42*,17; 63*,18; **ΖΑΨ** 10,13; 17*,16); possible syncopation at 27*,20 (or else a mistake: **ΠΟΥ<ΟΥ> Ω ΨΕ**); double **Ν** before the Indefinite Article (27*,18; 28*,12; 30*,15-16; 33*,20 40*,1); possible elision of **Τ** before **Δ** at 32*,12 (or else a mistake: **<Τ> ΔΥΑC**; cf. **ΤΔΥΑC** 32*,16); doubling of consonants, such as **ΖΑΤΤΖΤ** (7,1 hitherto unattested) and **ΨΑΜΝΤΤΕ** (7,17.27 also unattested).

Probably the most noticeable feature in the orthography of Codex X is its remarkable internal inconsistency. Full evidence is found in the Index of Coptic Words, but some noteworthy examples are **ⲃⲁⲗⲃⲧ**† (19*,21, etc.) and **ⲃⲁⲗⲕⲧ**† (26*,23); **ϣⲃⲃⲉⲓⲁⲉⲓⲧ**† (6,29; 28*,23) and **ϣⲃⲃⲉⲓⲁⲉⲓⲧ**† (25*,23; 30*,12, a mistake?); and the feminine form of the word for "three": **ϣⲁⲙⲛⲧⲧⲉ** (7,17. 27); **ϣⲁⲙⲛⲧⲉ** (4,16; 7,23); **ϣⲁⲙⲧⲉ** (6,19 etc.).

Orthography of Greek words is such as one might expect in a Coptic text, or, for that matter, in a Roman or Byzantine Greek text. Thus **ⲓ** for **ⲉⲓ** is frequent, though not consistent (see Index of Greek Words). Aspiration is added to **ἀόρατος** (**ⲁⲗⲟⲣⲁⲧⲟⲥ**, frequent in Coptic texts of all dialects). In contrast to the other A² texts in the Nag Hammadi Library (except I,5) **δέ** is not nasalized as **ⲛⲁⲉ**. The Greek word **ὄλον** is rendered without aspiration in all cases, **ⲟⲓⲟⲛ** (29*,17; 30*,22; 34*,19). The aspiration in **ἴνα** is rendered with **ϣ**: **ϣⲓⲛⲁ** (8,22; 41*,15; this is regular in A² texts).

Attention has already been drawn to the orthographic inconsistencies in the Codex, and other peculiarities of the language which serve to add to the difficulty of reading the text. But the greatest difficulties in the language of Codex X have to do with morphology and syntax.

An especially difficult problem in the morphology of Codex X is presented in the hitherto unattested form **ⲁⲧⲟϥ**. The instances are: **ⲧϣⲁⲣⲏ ⲛⲁⲧⲟϥⲭⲡⲁⲥ** "the first Unbegotten" (4,19); **ⲛⲁⲧⲟϥⲭⲡⲁϥ** "the unbegotten ones" (6,24); and **ⲡⲁⲧⲟϥⲭⲡⲁϥ**, "the One unbegotten . . ." (7,18). The translations demanded by the contexts in these passages presuppose that the anomalous form **ⲁⲧⲟϥ** is a variant of, or somehow related to, the privative adjective **ⲁⲧ**. Normal uses of the privative **ⲁⲧ**, also with the word **ⲭⲡⲟ**, occur as well: **ⲛⲉⲧⲟⲉⲓ ⲛⲁⲧⲭⲡⲁϥ**, "those who are unbegotten" (5,3-4); cf. **ⲡⲉⲧⲉ Ⲏⲡⲟϥⲭⲡⲁϥ** "the Unbegotten One" (6,3). What, then, is **ⲁⲧⲟϥ**?

Early in the study of Codex X I came to the view that this anomalous form may be an archaizing "negative Relative" construction, taking the cue from the observation made orally to me by A. Böhlig that the privative **ⲁⲧ** is itself derived from the Middle-Egyptian negative Relative 'iwty (cf. W. Westendorf, *Koptisches Handwörterbuch*, p. 13; cf. A. Gardiner, *Egyptian Grammar*, p. 152). Could it be that **ⲁⲧⲟϥ** should be regarded as a newly-discovered negative Relative with suffix **-ⲟϥ**, on the analogy of **ⲉⲧⲟϥ**? **ⲡⲁⲧⲟϥⲭⲡⲁϥ**

would thus mean, literally: "the one *which not they* beget him." In normal Coptic one could render the positive form as ΠΕΤΟΥΧΠΟ ΠΜΑϢ. A normal negative construction yielding the meaning of "unbegotten" (ἀγέννητος) would be ΠΕΤΕ ΠΠΟΥΧΠΑϢ (Perfect), a form which also occurs in the text (6,3). It is possible that the addition of an impersonal plural ending -ΟΥ to ΑΤ- was felt to carry more adequately the passive meaning of "unbegotten." (ΑΤΧΠΟ, on the other hand, would mean "not begetting.")

But from what is known of Coptic grammar (and not everything is known!), the suffix -ΟΥ *cannot* be attached to ΑΤ-. Thus Wolf-Peter Funk, in consultation with Peter Nagel, has proposed that we should understand ΑΤΟΥ- as an Achmimicisms, involving the Causative Infinitive form ΤΡΟΥ-, Α ΤΟΥ- plus ΑΤ-, with the loss of a Τ: ΑΤΟΥΧΠΑϢ <ΑΤ-ΤΟΥ-ΧΠΑϢ (see Funk's recently published paper, "'Blind' oder 'Unsichtbar': Zur Bedeutungsstruktur der verbaler negativer Adjektiv im Koptischen," in *Menschenbild in Gnosis und Manichäismus* [Halle-Wittenberg, 1979], pp. 62-63). This solution, at least, works within the theoretical limits of Coptic grammar as currently understood. But I have not found any examples of such a form as ΑΤΤΡΟΥ-, nor is there any particular reason to look for an "Achmimicisms" in Codex X. Thus Funk's solution must remain tentative at best. (I have been informed, through my student Diana Fulbright, that H.-J. Polotsky has no other solution to offer, but feels the difficulty of Funk's solution. B. Layton is also dubious of Funk's explanation, and suggests that we may have an entirely new form to deal with in ΑΤΟΥ-.)

Another difficult form is found at 55*,17: ΕΤΑ21[ΚΑ]ΡΩ[ΕΙ, translated "(after) I was silent." It looks like a hybrid combination of First Perfect Α2- with BA II Perfect ΕΤΑ-, possibly with a Past Temporal (*Temporalis*) meaning, as in Bohairic (see note to 55*,17). In any case, this form, whatever it is, looks very strange to me.

Another possible morphological difficulty is present at 5,8: ΠΤΑΝΤΝ. It is translated "the likenesses," but the preposition Α following may indicate that the form should have been ΕΥΤΑΝΤΝ, "they resemble." The text seems to be corrupt at that point.

Syntactic problems, even to the extent of apparent violations of grammatical rules, are also found in the language of Codex X, contributing to the overall impression received in reading the text that it has suffered considerable corruption in transmission. At 2,25 it appears that ΑΥΩ is made to function as ΜΝ. At 7,22 either

something is lost from the text or **№ᖁ** (which is ordinarily used to introduce a post-verbal subject) is being pressed into service as an equivalent of **ετε πει πει**. A similar problem may occur at 8,11 (see note). At 7,6 it appears that **κεοϣεε πει** is used in the sense of **οϣᖁ κεοϣεε**, "there is another . . .".

It was stated at the beginning that Codex X, like all the tractates of the Nag Hammadi Library, was translated from Greek. The difficulties found in the text overall may partially be attributable to a translator's misunderstanding of a difficult Greek text. (The most obvious case of such a phenomenon in the Nag Hammadi Library is the Coptic version of the short passage from Plato, VI,5: *Plato Rep.*, rendering in a hopelessly fractured translation *Republic* 588B-589B). Our translator may also have had a deficient knowledge of Coptic grammar!

There are some passages in the text of Codex X which are obvious cases of "translation Coptic," or in which the Greek text is rendered without adequate translation, and others which can only be understood with recourse to a hypothetical Greek original. For example, the section of *Marsanes* beginning on p. 25*, dealing with speculation on the significance of the Greek alphabet, is full of Coptic locutions attempting to render technical terms of Greek grammar (see notes for details). Similarly, at 30*,16-18 there is a section of text which renders technical terms from Greek musicology (technical terms whose Coptic translation obfuscate rather than clarify their meanings; see notes). Isolated cases of Coptic locutions obviously rendering Greek terms are: **κωε ἀπιτᖁ** = *κατατιθέναι* (2,13-14); **βαλζητ** = *ἀπλοῦς* (5,7); **πετε ἡποϣπαϣ** = *ἀγέννητος* (6,3; cf. also **πατοϣπαϣ** discussed above); **ζαζ ἡσματ** = *πολύμορφος* (25*,6). The Greek terms *αἰσθητὸς κόσμος* and *νοητὸς κόσμος* are assumed bodily into the text without the use of the connector **ᖁ** (5,18-19.24-25; 34*,20; 41*,2-3; 5,22; 41*,5-6; cf. 4,6-7). There is one possible case of **αϣω** rendering a Greek adversative *καί* (2,24). And a frozen genitive plural is found at 22*,26. Other evidences of "translation Coptic" are noticeable throughout the text.

In sum, the language of Codex X is quite complicated in a variety of ways, and it must finally be admitted that others will very likely come to a much better understanding of it than I have been able to thus far.

INTRODUCTION TO X,₁: MARSANES

Bibliography: Doresse, *Secret Books*, p. 197; Berliner Arbeitskreis, "Die Bedeutung der Texte von Nag Hammadi," pp. 72-73; Böhlig, "Die griechische Schule," pp. 16-17; Robinson, "The Three Steles of Seth," p. 139; Pearson (Introduction and Translation), *Marsanes* (X,₁), in *The Nag Hammadi Library*, pp. 417-426; Pearson, "The Tractate Marsanes."

According to the most plausible reconstruction of Codex X, this fragmentary codex contains a single tractate whose title, *Marsanes*, occurs on the last page at the end of the tractate. The surviving material from Codex X has been assigned a minimum pagination of 68* inscribed pages, comprising pages from the first part of the codex, the middle part, and the last part. (On the use of the asterisk [*] to indicate uncertainty of pagination see the codex introduction.) From this minimum number of pages, 14 are lost (pp. 11-12, 23*-24*, 47*-54*, and 59*-60*), and many of the remaining pages consist only of small fragments. Moreover it is likely, on the basis of codicological analysis and comparison with other codices, that Codex X originally contained *at least 72* inscribed pages (see codex introduction for discussion). This would mean that the tractate *Marsanes* originally comprised at least 2072 lines (the average number of lines per page is 29), and may in fact have been considerably longer. In this respect, as in others, *Marsanes* shows features in common with *Zostrianos* (VIII:1).

The number of lines completely preserved from Codex X is a scant 117. 1004 additional lines are partially preserved (including lines with as little as a trace of a single letter). Of these, 447 have been completely restored by scholarly conjecture. Given a conservative estimate of 2072 lines originally, the total number of complete lines remaining, whether extant or restored, is 564, some 27%, or less, of the total content of the tractate. Taking into account the partial lines left, one can estimate that at least 59%, and probably much more, of the tractate is totally lost. From this it is evident that only a very imperfect picture of the contents and meaning of *Marsanes* is possible to attain. Therefore this introduction must be regarded as, at best, a tentative and imprecise statement.

The best-preserved pages occur at the beginning (1-10) and the

middle (25*-42*) of the codex. One can therefore get a better picture of the contents of these sections than of the other parts of the tractate. Since so many pages are missing from the last half of the codex one must also entertain the possibility that there may have been more than one tractate in Codex X. (The Berliner Arbeitskreis arrived at an estimate of 3 tractates, "Die Bedeutung der Texte von Nag Hammadi," pp. 72-73; for additional discussion see the codex introduction). However, the material preserved in the first part of the codex is entirely consistent with what we might expect to be associated with the gnostic prophet Marsanes, whose name comprises the title partially preserved at the end of the codex (see below). Furthermore, one can find considerable stylistic consistency in all extant portions of the codex, as well as consistency of vocabulary, suggesting that the codex did, in fact, contain but a single tractate.

The title is partially preserved on one of the fragments of p. 68*. Seven letters are preserved in whole or part, set off by sub- and superlinear strokes. Another fragment preserves the margin, with *paraglyphus cum corone* serving as additional decoration. The final four letters of the title are quite clear: **ΑΝΗC**. The tail of a **Ρ** is also clear, and traces of two other letters are preserved: **. Ρ. ΑΝΗC**. The title is obviously a proper name, as can be seen from the ending, "-anes." The two faint letter traces can be restored as **α** and **c**. There is room for an additional letter in the lacuna, or at most two: **ΙΑΡCΑΝΗC**. The one proper name known from extant sources that fits is "Marsanes." Thus the title has been restored accordingly: **[Μ]ΙΑΡCΑΝΗC**.

Who is Marsanes? In the untitled tractate of the Bruce Codex, there is an extended discussion of the heavenly entourage of the highest God and the triple-powered Monogenes, in which an interesting parenthetical comment occurs (see Cod. Bruc. *Untitled*, ch. 7). It is stated that it is impossible to speak of divine things with a "tongue of flesh," but there are certain great ones (**ΖΕΝΝΟΘ**) who excel in their ability to speak the word of revelation, and who thus make it possible for others to learn about him (i.e., the triple-powered Monogenes). The following passage is part of this parenthetical comment:

"The powers (**δύναμις**) of all the great aeons (**αιών**) worshipped the power (**δύναμις**) which is in Marsanes (**ΜΑΡCΑΝΗC**). They said 'Who is this who has seen these things in his very presence, that

on his account he (i.e. Monogenes) appeared in this way! Nicotheus (ΝΙΚΟΘΕΟΣ) (also) spoke of him (i.e. Monogenes) and saw him, that he is that One. He said, 'The Father who surpasses every perfect being (τέλειος) is, and has revealed the invisible (ἀόρατος) perfect (τέλειος) Triple-Power (τριδύναμις).' Each of the perfect (τέλειος) men saw him and spoke of him, giving him glory, each according to (κατά) his own manner." (My translation.)

Marsanes and Nicotheus, therefore, are referred to as "great ones" and "perfect men" who have seen heavenly verities and have revealed them to men. Nicotheus, in fact, is quoted, indicating that the author of the tractate in the Bruce Codex was dependent upon a document attributed to Nicotheus, an "apocalypse of Nicotheus" (cf. Schmidt, *Gnostische Schriften*, pp. 601-602). Marsanes must also have been one of that author's sources. Is it too much to suggest that he had read our tractate? As we shall see, the subject matter of *Marsanes* is closely related to that of the untitled tractate of the Bruce Codex.

Moreover, Epiphanius, in his account of the "Archontics," mentions among the prophets honored by those Gnostics "a certain Martiades and Marsianos, who had been snatched up into the heavens and had come down after three days" (μαρτιάδην τινά και μαρσιανόν, ἀρπαγέντας εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς και διὰ ἡμερῶν τριῶν καταβεβηκότας, *Haer.* 40.7.6). It is virtually certain that "Marsanes" and "Marsianos" are one and the same (so Schmidt, *Gnostische Schriften*, p. 602; cf. Baynes, *Coptic Gnostic Treatise*, p. 85, n. 5; Puech, "Plotin et les gnostiques," p. 90; Elsas, *Neuplatonische und gnostische Weltablehnung*, p. 36).

Thus, in gnostic tradition, Marsanes (Marsianos) is a gnostic prophet who is credited with a heavenly journey (Epiphanius) and with visions of great and wonderful things, thus receiving the homage of heavenly beings (Cod. Bruc. *Untitled*). Such information accords perfectly well with the experience claimed by the putative author of our tractate, who refers to himself and his visionary experiences in the first person in various places in the document (see e.g. 6,18; 7,1; 14*,15-18; 16*,3; 18*,16; 55*,17; 64*,2; 66*,17; etc.). Either he is himself named "Marsanes" and is writing in his own name, or the author of our tractate is writing in the name of a well-known prophet, purporting to report his revelations and visionary experiences. The product is an apocalypse which, in turn, is used by other Gnostics including, possibly, the author of the untitled tractate in the Bruce Codex.

It should be remarked that Jean Doresse, in an early article ("Trois livres gnostiques," p. 138) mentions a "canon" of writings belonging to the "Gnostics" (or "Sethians," "Archontics") known to Epiphanius in the fourth century on the basis of his personal investigations (Doresse cites Epiph. *Haer.* 26.2,8,12,13; 39.5; 40.2,7). This "canon" included seven books attributed to Seth, seven others called *Allogenes*, the *Books of Ialdabaoth*, a *Great Symphony* and a *Small Symphony*, an *Ascension of Isaiah*, an *Apocalypse of Adam*, the *Gospel of Eve*, an *Apocalypse of Abraham*, a book attributed to Moses, a book on the *Generation of Mary*, a *Gospel of Philip*, the *Interrogations of Mary*, a *Gospel of Perfection*, and, finally, the works of the prophets Marsianes (*sic*) and Martiades. At the end of his article—presumably written before he knew of any other codices in the Nag Hammadi library besides I and III (cf. *Secret Books*, pp. 116-119)—Doresse remarks on the importance of the manuscript (i.e., Codex III) containing *Ap. John*, *Gos. Eg.*, *Eugnostos*, and *Soph. Jes. Chr.* (he does not discuss the fifth tractate, *Dial. Sav.*). He then makes the following "prophetic" remark:

"Bien des espoirs sont actuellement permis, et l'on ne serait peut-être étonnés qu'un instant si quelque nouveau hasard ramenait au jour, hors d'une jarre ensevelie depuis quinze siècles, d'autres volumes cachés par les gnostiques d'Égypte, qu'il s'agisse d'une *Apocalypse d'Adam*, ou d'un traité du prophète Marsianès, ou — qui sait —, d'écrits plus hermétiques encore" (*ibid.*, p. 160).

Doresse mentions Marsanes (sometimes spelling the name "Marsianes") again in *Secret Books* (cf. pp. 46, 82, 86, 109, 114) and remarks that the revelations of Marsanes and Martiades are still lacking, but one might hope that they may some day be found (pp. 159, 252). (He does not repeat, and is probably tacitly withdrawing, the suggestion that he made in his article in the *Crum Festschrift*: that Marsanes and Martiades are alternative names for Zostrianos and Zoroaster; see "Les apocalypses," p. 262.) It is now clear that Doresse had good grounds for hope! Though he did not realize it, the tractate he refers to in his book as tractate no. 44 (*Secret Books*, p. 197) is that hoped-for revelation of Marsanes.

The name "Marsanes" is probably of Syrian origin, as Schmidt had suggested many years ago (see Schmidt, *Gnostische Schriften*, p. 602). The alternate form "Marsianos" should be construed as a variant Graecization of the original Syriac name. Schmidt did not attempt to provide an etymology of the name, but it might be

suggested that the first part of it (*mar*) is the Aramaic/Syriac word for "master."

Another suggestion has recently been offered by C. Elsas, who locates the name "Marsanes" in the Elchasaite tradition. Elsas calls attention to the name of one of Elchasai's sisters, "Marthana" (μαρθάνα, cf. Epiph. *Haer.* 19.2.12; 53.1.5), and derives the three names, "Marthana," "Marsanes," and "Marsianos," from the same Aramaic phrase: *mar^edha (a)na* (= "I am rebellious"). These names, according to Elsas, reflect the revolutionary zeal of the Elchasaite sect (see Elsas, *Neuplatonische und gnostische Welttablehnung*, pp. 36-37). I do not find this suggestion convincing, though Elsas is correct in locating the origin of the name in a Syrian milieu. In that connection it should be remembered that Epiphanius located the "Archontic" Gnostics in Palestine, and it is among these Gnostics that he found the tradition pertaining to the prophet Marsianos (= Marsanes; see *Haer.* 40.1.1; 40.7.6). (On the Sethian-Archontic provenience of *Marsanes* see discussion below.) The name "Marsanes" may, of course, be a fictitious or assumed name, on the order of "Barcabbas" and other such names of gnostic prophets (so Schmidt, *Gnostische Schriften*, p. 602). (Cf. also the name of the Chaldaean magus, "Mithrobarzanes" [μιθροβαρζάνης] in Luc. *Nec.* 6. There is no connection between Marsanes and the "Markianos" [μαρκιανός] mentioned in Eus. *Hist. Eccl.* VI.12 *contra* Elsas, p. 36, n. 116, following Doresse, "Les apocalypses," p. 256.)

As has already been indicated, *Marsanes* is an example of the genre, "apocalypse." However, it is not an apocalypse of the Jewish or Christian type, in which the history of the end-times is of primary concern (but see e.g. 10.18). Yet it does share with the Jewish and Christian apocalypses an emphasis on the revelation of "mysteries" or "secrets" "hidden" to all except an elite group. And, like the Jewish and Christian apocalypses, it contains an account of visions and a heavenly journey. (On these features of the Jewish and Christian apocalypses see P. Vielhauer's comments on "apocalyptic" in Hennecke-Schneemelcher, *New Testament Apocrypha*, vol. 2, pp. 582-600). Porphyry (*Vit. Plot.* 16) refers to certain "heretics who had abandoned the ancient (i.e., Platonic) philosophy (αἱρετικοὶ δὲ ἐκ τῆς παλαιᾶς φιλοσοφίας ἀνηγμένοι)," and who produced "apocalypses" (ἀποκαλύψεις) of Zoroaster, Zostrianus, Nicotheus, Allogenes, Messus, "and others of this sort" (καὶ ἄλλων τοιούτων). H.-C. Puech, discussing this statement, refers to the kind of "apocalypses"

that Porphyry mentions as "un écrit d'un genre bien déterminé," and defines the genre as a revelation disclosed to a visionary, or a small group of privileged adepts, of sublime mysteries which are to be transmitted only to initiates ("Plotin et les Gnostiques," p. 87). This description fits our document perfectly. And, as we shall see, there is good reason to believe that Marsanes should be included in Porphyry's reference to "others of this sort," whom the "heretics" credited with "apocalypses."

Marsanes contains, in addition to the usual "revelation" and "vision" language, passages of a paraenetical character. Such paraenesis is, in fact, typical of the genre, "apocalypse." (See Vielhauer's remarks in Hennecke-Schneemelcher, *New Testament Apocrypha*, vol. 2, p. 587). In the paraenetical sections the plural "you" and "we" are used, indicating that the document was written for a specific group or sect. This group is already in possession of gnosis. Thus there is no need for the author of our document to recount in full detail the gnostic myth; it is sufficient only to allude to the salvation of Sophia, for example (4,2)), or to the masculinization of the Virgin Barbelo (9,1-2), without going into detail. Indeed, in the section dealing with the thirteen "seals" (2,14-4,23) the author repeatedly states that his readers have already been informed on these matters. Thus, what our document provides that is new to the intended audience is an account of additional revelatory experiences, and additional information on matters of concern to the author and his group.

The paraenesis is sometimes included as part of the revelational material proper, as e.g. in the section on the thirteen "seals," wherein the author exhorts his community to keep themselves from the "passion" that is part of bodily existence in the "sense-perceptible world" (αἰσθητὸς κόσμος; see 2,19-26). Sometimes the paraenesis is inserted as blocks which interrupt the flow of the discourse, as e.g. in the short injunction to "bear fruit" and to become detached from the things of this world, at 26*,12-17, or the long injunction against sin at 39*,18-41*,7.

The content of *Marsanes* can be described in general terms as an account of visionary experiences involving a revelation of the levels of being and their natures, of the descent and ascent of a savior (though the term "savior" does not occur), and of the possibility of ascent for those who achieve gnosis. More specificity can be attained in the case of the first part of the tractate (pp. 1-10), and of its

middle section (pp. 25*-42*). From the remaining fragments of the first and last pages one gets the impression that the document is introduced and concluded with an encouraging statement on the rewards of gnosis.

After an exordium on the benefits of knowing the Father (1,1-2,?), there is an interesting (though very fragmentary) passage dealing with thirteen "seals," in which each seal corresponds to a different level or aspect of being, from the lowest to the highest (2,12-4,23). Thus the first three seals deal with the "worldly" (κοσμικός) and "material" (ύλικός) levels, characterized by corporeal existence. The fourth and fifth, apparently, relate in some way to "conversion" (μετάνοια, 3,15), the sixth to "partial" "self-begotten" (αύτογέννητος) and "incorporeal" (άσώματον) entities, the seventh to the "self-begotten" (αύτογενής) power, the eighth to the first-appearing "mind" (νοῦς) and the "intelligible world" (κόσμος νοητός), the ninth to a power whose description is lost in a lacuna, the tenth to the virgin Barbelo, the eleventh and twelfth to the "Invisible One who possesses three powers" and the "Spirit" who is without "being" (οὐσία). Finally, the thirteenth seal relates to the unknown "Silent One," doubtless a reference to the supreme God. These seals are mentioned in such a way as to suggest that the basic mythological referents are known to the readers, by previous revelation. The mythological allusions are intelligible by comparison with other Sethian-gnostic documents, esp. *Ap. John, Gos. Eg., Zost.*, and *Allogenes* (on the "Sethian" character of *Marsanes* see below).

The following passage (4,24-5,26) begins with an identification-formula, "I am he who has [understood] that which truly exists . . .," and is probably to be taken as a statement of the gnostic prophet Marsanes himself. Marsanes refers to the knowledge he has gained by means of a meditational ascent (see esp. 5,17-22), knowledge of the "intelligible world" in all of its aspects. Remarkably, this knowledge also includes the insight that "in every respect the sense-perceptible world is [worthy] of being saved entirely" (5,24-26); from this statement we can see that the radical dualism characteristic of Gnosticism is being attenuated in a monistic direction (see below).

Next, the descent and ascent of a savior figure, "the Self-begotten One" (αύτογενής), is referred to; he is said to have "saved a multitude" (6,15-16). The saving activity of the Self-begotten One is paradigmatic of the saving work of Marsanes himself, for Marsanes also functions as a kind of "savior" (see below).

In a series of questions Marsanes presses his enquiry, which itself seems to function as an intellectual ascent, to the "kingdom of the Three-Powered One" (6,18-19) and beyond, to the realm of the supreme Silent One (7,8) who manifests himself in a divine being referred to as the "Three-Powered One," whom Marsanes and his community bless and praise, together with the denizens of the heavenly world (8,1-12; see notes to the text).

Further search leads Marsanes to the male virgin Barbelo, whose "division" (i.e. feminization) from her primal masculine state is reversed by her masculinization, "becoming male," and her "withdrawal" from duality (8,13-9,28). This is treated as a paradigm for the salvific and contemplative experience of gnostic humanity: "We all have withdrawn to ourselves. We have [become] silent, [and] when we come to know [him, that is,] the Three-Powered, [we] bowed down . . . (and) blessed him . . ." (9,21-27).

The ascent of a savior figure, designated here the "invisible Spirit" (9,28: 10,19), is then treated, and it is clear that his ascent is paradigmatic of the ascent of those who attain knowledge (9,28-10,29+). In this passage the gnostic prophet Marsanes addresses those "[who dwell in these] places," i.e. in this lower world, and invites them to stake their claim to the heavenly world and the "great crown" which is their reward: "It is necessary [for you to know] those that are higher than these, and tell them to the powers. For you will become [elect] with the elect ones [in the last] times . . . Run with him (i.e. the "Invisible Spirit") [up above], since you have [the] great crown . . ." (10,13-23).

Unfortunately the subsequent material is broken with lacunae, and the extant pages following are so fragmentary that little can be determined regarding their content. At least two pages (11-12) are totally lost. On p. 13* the discussion focuses upon the supreme God, "the One who is, who is silent, the One who is from the beginning, [who] does [not] have being (οὐσῶν)" (13*,17-19). P. 14* apparently relates some ecstatic experiences of Marsanes: "I [was dwelling] among the aeons . . . I have come to be among those that were not [begotten] . . ." (14*,15-18). On p. 18* Marsanes seems to claim that he has seen and known the Father (18*,16-17).

The middle section of the tractate contains a very interesting discussion involving the letters of the alphabet and their combinations. The letters and letter-combinations are related, on the one hand, to the various "shapes" (σχημα) of the soul, and on the other,

to the task of "calling upon" or "naming" the "gods and the angels."

It is not possible to state where this discussion begins in the tractate, or what kind of transition is made from the earlier section to this one. One can surmise that this section contains information that is deemed important for the "ascent" of the gnostic adepts. The occurrence of the verb *ὀνομάζειν* and the noun *ὀνομασία* at 19*, 18-19 may indicate that this discussion has already begun on that page. On pp. 21* and 22* there occur such terms as *ζώδιον* ("signs of the Zodiac"), *ψυχή* ("soul[s]"), *σχῆμα* ("shape"), terms characteristic of the discussion found in the better-preserved pages from p. 25* on. (Pp. 23*-24* are altogether missing.)

On p. 25* we find certain "powers" or "angels" described as theriomorphic and polymorphous, and it is clear that the "signs of the Zodiac" are here being discussed (25*, 1-8). Various kinds of "sound" (*σμη*, "voice") are associated with their "names" (8-14). This passage reflects a considerable knowledge of Graeco-Roman astrological speculation, according to which the signs of the Zodiac are classified variously as "human" shaped or "animal" shaped, and assimilated to the consonants of the alphabet, classified as "voiced," "semi-voiced," and "voiceless" (see Bouché-Leclercq, *L'astrologie grecque*, pp. 149-150; Dornseiff, *Das Alphabet*, pp. 83-89; and notes to the text). Such speculations are known to have been utilized by the gnostic "magician" Marcus, a Valentinian of Asiatic, or possibly Syrian, origin (Iren. *Haer.* 1.13-21; on Marcus see esp. Leisegang, *Die Gnosis*, pp. 326-349, and Dornseiff, *Das Alphabet*, pp. 126-133).

The discussion then moves to the various "shapes" (*σχῆμα*) of the soul, "spherical" (*σφαιρικόν*) shapes associated with various combinations of the seven vowels (25*, 1-26*, 12), all of which is to be understood as reflecting current speculations on the Psychogonia in Plato's *Timaeus* (35A-36D; see notes for details). A paraenesis then follows (26*, 12-17), in which Marsanes' audience is exhorted to exercise self-control, "receive [the] imperishable seed," and "bear fruit."

One of the interesting features of this tractate is its quasi-learned discussion of those aspects of Greek grammar having to do with the letters of the alphabet and their combinations. These discussions show considerable familiarity with the technical work of the Greek grammatists, notably Dionysius Thrax (2nd cent. B.C.) and his

later commentators, and tell us something of the educational background of our gnostic author. (Cf. Böhlig, "Die griechische Schule," pp. 16-17; for details see the notes.) Of course, the technical knowledge reflected here is completely ancillary to the religious concerns of the author and his intended audience. Similar use is made of the Greek alphabet by the gnostic "magician" Marcus, mentioned above.

This technical discussion apparently begins at 26*,18 (though it is anticipated earlier in the tractate, e.g. at 22*,24-25 and 26*,6-7). Vowels, diphthongs, semi-vowels, and consonants are given preliminary classification, and various groups are regarded as "superior" to others. The value judgments presented here are not *ad hoc*, but reflect the speculations of the ancient grammarians (see notes for details). The letters of the alphabet, in their various combinations, are said to constitute the "nomenclature (*ὀνομασία*) of the [gods] and the angels" (27*,13-14).

This discussion is interrupted by another brief paraenesis (27*,21-23: "Do not keep on [sinning,] and do not dare to make use of sin"), after which it resumes, with additional instruction on the various "shapes" of the soul (cf. 25*,1-26*,12) related to various combinations of vowels (27*,23-30*,2). In this discussion all eleven of the Greek diphthongs are listed (28*,6-8; cf. notes), and the technical distinction between the five prefixed (*προτακτικά*) vowels and the two post-positive (*ὕποτακτικά*) vowels used in the formation of diphthongs is observed (28*,28-29*,1; cf. notes).

The various classifications of the consonants are treated next (30*,3-31*,11), followed by discussion of various combinations of vowels and consonants. Examples are given which are obviously taken from actual school exercises in antiquity (see esp. 31*,22-29; cf. notes). The purpose of the knowledge of these details concerning the alphabet is stated at 32*,3-5: "in order that you might [collect] them, and be separated from the angels." It is obvious that the various letters of the alphabet are here understood to have their counterparts in the angelic world; in order for the adept to ascend beyond the spheres of the angels he or she has to know their secrets. This knowledge may also include the ability to chant the various combinations of vowels and syllables during the ascent. Similar doctrines were held by other Gnostics in antiquity, especially the Marcosians (Iren. *Haer.* I.13-21; see above, and for details see the notes).

But our tractate would not be complete were it only to deal with the letters of the alphabet; it is also necessary to know the essentials of the numbers, a subject dear to ancient Pythagoreans and Platonists. So at 32*,5 there begins a discussion of arithmology, treating the various numbers from the monad and the dyad to the dodecad (33*,4 +). In this section one can see the influence of Pythagorean tradition, and parallels to similar speculations found in Philo of Alexandria and in Macrobius are of special interest (see notes for details).

Unfortunately the material becomes more fragmentary at that point. At 33*,18-21 one can see traces of a discussion concerning the various punctuation marks used in Greek grammar. At 34*,19-23 there is reference to "the temple [which measures] seven hundred [cubits]" existing "within [the] sense-perceptible world." The ancient Stoics regarded the entire visible universe as a temple, and this idea, documented especially in Philo of Alexandria and in Cicero's account of the "Dream of Scipio," is probably reflected here in our text (see notes for details).

An especially enigmatic section occurs at 35*,1-6, where "the [forms of the] wax images" and "emerald likeness" are mentioned, in connection with the "generation of the names." It is known that waxen images and emerald stones were among the devices used by ancient magicians, and it is possible that our text is referring here to the ritual use of these items by the gnostic community for which it was written. The "generation of the names" may also belong to a magico-ritual context. The "Chaldaean" theurgists used in their rituals a magical top, called the "Iynx, " by which they "bound" the spheres, each of which corresponded to one of the vowels of the alphabet (see Lewy, *Chaldaean Oracles*, pp. 249-252). It is not inconceivable that magical devices were used by our Gnostics in conjuring up the "names" of the gods and the angels. (See below for further discussion of the ritual references in *Marsanes*.)

At 36*,28-37*,2 the following sentence occurs: "If one knows him, he will [call] upon him." Perhaps God the Father is meant here, or another divine being. In the following context, fragmentary as it is, letters of the alphabet and their various combinations are again mentioned, and their actual utterance ("they were pronounced openly"—39*,1-2), for the apparent purpose of "naming (*ὀνομάζειν*) the angels" (39*,5).

At this point in the text a lengthy paraenetical passage occurs

(39*,18-41*,16?), containing warnings against "cast(ing) aspersions [on] the mysteries" (39*,23-24) and the commission of sin. The readers are urged to "bear fruit" (39*,21-22; cf. 26*,15), and to "examine" (δοκιμάζειν) certain people to see who is "worthy" to receive revelation (40*, 21-22; cf. 40*,13-14). Warnings of judgment against sinners are also included here (40*,5-9; 40*22-24?), and promises of "reward" (40*,2-3) for the worthy.

The next section (41*,18-42*,30+), also very fragmentary, discusses the number of souls, disembodied and embodied, in relation to the number of angels. A pronouncement of blessedness is apparently given to one who is engaged in cosmic meditation, "gazing at the two (sun and moon) or . . . at the seven planets or at the twelve signs of the Zodiac, or at the thirty [-six] Decans" (42*,1-6). The meaning of this passage seems to be that meditation on the heavens leads to knowledge of God, a notion documented in late Platonic texts, but surprising for a gnostic document (see notes for details).

Pages 43*-46* are too fragmentary to make any sense of at all. "Divine Barbelo" is apparently named at 43*,21; revelation (44*,4) and salvation (44*,23) are referred to; and a "voice" and some "names" are mentioned (46*,20-21). There is a substantial loss of material at this point (at least eight pages, 47*-54*), and such material as is left in the codex thereafter is in exceedingly fragmentary condition. (Pp. 59*-60* are totally lost.) On p. 55* Marsanes is apparently recounting a visionary experience (cf. 57*,22; 63*,4-6; 63*,19-22; 64*,2-5), and there is reference to a baptism of some sort (55*,20; cf. 66*,1-5). Marsanes' visionary experience includes reference to certain heavenly personages who "[spoke] like the angels" (63*,3-4). One of these is mentioned by name, Gamaliel (64*,19), an angelic figure known from other Sethian-gnostic sources (see below).

The tractate closes the way it begins, with encouragement to "those who will know [him]" (68*,17; cf. 68*,1), referring most likely to knowledge of God the Father (cf. 1,11-25).

There can be no doubt that *Marsanes* is to be classified as a "gnostic" document, in the full technical sense of that word. To be sure, we have already noted certain "monistic" tendencies in the tractate, indicating an attenuation of the radical dualism characteristic of Gnosticism. But this must be seen as part and parcel of the evolution and development of ancient Gnosticism as a whole. *Marsanes*,

indeed, is one of a number of Nag Hammadi tractates which fit into the developmental scheme first delineated by Hans Jonas, indicated in the subtitle of the second volume of his major opus, *Gnosis und spätantiker Geist*: "Von der Mythologie zur mystischen Philosophie" (more on this below; cf. Pearson, "The Tractate Marsanes," p. 384).

Marsanes has rightly been classified among those Coptic gnostic documents which reflect a "Sethian" gnostic system (see Schenke, "Gnostic Sethianism," and cf. Pearson, "Jewish Elements in Gnosticism," p. 152). The following tractates are included in this category: *Ap. John* (NHC II,1; III,1; IV,1; BG 2; cf. Iren. *Haer.* I.29); *Hyp. Arch.* (NHC II,4); *Gos. Eg.* (NHC III,2; IV,2); *Apoc. Adam* (NHC V,5); *Steles Seth* (NHC VII,5); *Zost.* (NHC VIII,1); *Melch.* (NHC IX,1); *Norea* (NHC IX,2); *Marsanes* (NHC X,1); *Allogenes* (NHC XI,3); *Trim. Prot.* (NHC XIII, 1); and Cod. Bruc. *Untitled*. In broad terms the Sethian-gnostic "system" includes the following elements: the figure of Seth, son of Adam, who functions both as a heavenly being and as a savior, and whose spiritual descendants constitute the gnostic elect; a primordial divine triad of Father, Mother, and Son; four "luminaries" (φωστῆρες: Harmozel, Oroiael, Daveithe, and Eleleth), and other angelic beings subordinate to them; and an apocalyptic schematization of history (see Schenke, "Das sethianische System"). The Sethian system also includes a Sophia ("Wisdom") figure, but she occurs in numerous other gnostic systems as well.

Although, as has been noted, *Marsanes* does not go into detail regarding the essentials of the gnostic myth—prior knowledge of these matters is assumed—it is not difficult to find specific features in *Marsanes* which relate, in general, to the Sethian system and to which parallels in other Sethian texts can be found. To be sure, the underlying "system" is highly developed in this tractate, with considerable proliferation of the posited levels of being; but even this is a feature which *Marsanes* has in common with certain other Sethian texts, especially *Allogenes* and *Zostrianos*. Thus, whereas in *Ap. John* the original divine triad of Father, Mother, and Son can more easily be seen (FATHER = Monad = Invisible Spirit, etc.— II 2,25-4,26; MOTHER = Barbelo = Ennoia, etc.— II 4,26-6,10; SON = Monogenes = Mind = Autogenes = Christ, etc.— II 6,10-7,30), in *Marsanes*, as in *Allogenes* and *Zostrianos*, there are interposed several additional levels of divine being (and non-being!).

The "system" of *Marsanes*, whose closest parallel is that of *Allogenes*, can best be determined from the first ten pages of the tractate, especially the passage dealing with the thirteen "seals" (2,12-4,23; see above, and notes to the text). The highest God, although he can be called "Father" (1,23), is essentially unknowable and transcendent, characterized best by "silence" (see 4,20-22; cf. esp. *Allogenes* XI 60,28-61,22). Between him and Barbelo (the "Mother" in the original Sethian triad, there is interposed another divine entity, whose relation to the supreme God is expressed in the designation "Invisible Spirit" (4,15-17; cf. *Ap. John* II 2,33, where this is a designation for the supreme Father himself), and whose relation to lower levels of being is expressed in the phrase, "who possesses three powers" (4,15-16; cf. 6,19 and note), something that is said of Barbelo in *Ap. John* (see esp. BG 27,19-28,2). The counterpart in *Allogenes* to the "Three-Powered One" is called "the Triple-Power" (ΠΙΩΜΝΤΒΟΜ, XI 45,13 *et passim*; cf. note to 6,19). Beneath Barbelo (4,11; 8,28; cf. 43*,21) in the chain of divine being is a figure whose name is lost in a lacuna (4,8; a figure called "Kalyptos" or "Hidden One" would fit in here, according to the scheme found both in *Allogenes* and in *Zostrianos*; see e.g. *Allogenes* XI 45,31 etc. and *Zost.* VIII 13,3; 18,10 etc.), "mind" (νοῦς, 4,3) and the "self-begotten" (αὐτογενής, 3,26) power, whose equivalent in *Allogenes* has the same name, "Autogenes" (XI 45,11; cf. *Ap. John* II 7,11-30). In *Marsanes* this figure, "the Self-begotten One," assumes a saving role in a descent to the lower world (5,17-6,16), and his role may be understood as paradigmatic of *Marsanes'* own role as savior-prophet (cf. 8,18-20; 9,19-21). The tractate *Marsanes* seems here to have truncated the original Sethian system, wherein salvation is mediated through Seth (cf. *Ap. John* II 8,28-9,24 where it is by the "will of Autogenes" that the perfect Man Pigeradamas and his son Seth are emanated).

Thus one problem in identifying *Marsanes* as a "Sethian" document is posed: i.e. the lack of any reference, at least in the extant material, to the figure of Seth. This may be due to the loss of material in which the name "Seth" may be presumed to have occurred. Or, what is equally plausible, we should think in terms of the underlying system of the tractate, and the features it displays in common with other tractates identified as "Sethian." The tractate with which it has most in common, *Allogenes* (XI,3), bears the name of an epithet of Seth, "Allogenes" (for discussion see Pearson, "The

Figure of Seth," p. 486); in that tractate the gnostic author assumes the saving-revealing role of Seth, as a kind of "incarnation" of Seth the Savior. "Zostrianos" assumes a similar role in the tractate that bears his name (see Pearson, "The Figure of Seth," p. 497), and it is not out of the question that "Marsanes" is assuming the same role in our tractate, even though the extant material does not contain the name of Seth. In any case, as a prophet-revealer Marsanes is certainly to be regarded as a gnostic "savior" (see Schmithals, *Apostle*, pp. 114-197). It appears to be a constitutive feature of Sethian gnosticism that Seth the heavenly Savior can manifest himself in a variety of earthly figures, such as Jesus Christ, "Allogenes," "Zostrianos," or in this case, "Marsanes" (cf. Pearson, "The Figure of Seth," pp. 496-500). Moreover it must not be forgotten that it was precisely in a Sethian ("Archontic" = Sethian) group that Marsanes was revered as a prophet (Epiph. *Haer.* 40.7.6; cf. discussion above).

An additional mythological detail which relates our tractate to other Sethian-gnostic documents is the occurrence in it of the angelic personage, Gamaliel (64*, 19). Gamaliel is mentioned in the following tractates, in addition to *Marsanes*, all of which fall into the "Sethian" category: *Apoc. Adam*; *Gos. Eg.*; *Melch., Trim. Prot., Zost.*, and *Cod. Bruc. Untitled* (cf. note to *Melch.* IX 5, 18 and discussion in the introduction to IX, 1). Gamaliel is one of several angels subordinate to the four luminaries (φωστῆρες, mentioned above), and is related especially to Harmozel, the first luminary (*Gos. Eg.* III 52, 21-22). He is one of the four "receivers" (παράληπτωρ) of the race of Seth (= the gnostic elect), whose function is to receive the souls of the elect into eternal life (*Gos. Eg.* III 64, 22-65, 1), thus serving as "helpers (βοηθός) to those who believed in the light-spark" (*Cod. Bruc. Untitled*, ch. 8). It is precisely the role of "receiving" (παραλαμβάνειν) the souls of the elect that is doubtless attributed to the "angels" (necessarily including Gamaliel) mentioned at 65*, 1-3 (see note).

One of the features of Sethianism noted above is the apocalyptic schematization of history. While this feature is more marked in some Sethian tractates than in others (esp. in *Apoc. Adam* and *Gos. Eg.*, with their schema of the three-fold judgment of flood, fire, and end-time), it is not entirely absent from *Marsanes*, wherein one does see an eschatological thrust. E.g. at 10, 18 there is a reference to "the last times," and the context (though fragmentary)

treats of the eschatological rewards of the elect. Similarly at 40*,1-9 eschatological rewards and punishments are referred to (cf. also 40*,22-24).

Of the texts falling into the "Sethian" category, some are Christian, and the earliest of them (at least typologically) show a very strong Jewish coloration (see Pearson, "Jewish Elements in Gnosticism"). *Marsanes*, on the other hand, shows positively no Christian elements or influence, and such items of Jewish origin that may be found in it are certainly to be reckoned to the pre-history of the document. (The few biblical parallels cited in the notes are not to be attributed to direct use of the Bible by the author; such "parallels" as there are should be understood phenomenologically, not necessarily genetically.) In this respect, as in others, *Marsanes* is closely related to such tractates as *Allogenes* (XI,3), *Steles Seth* (VII,5), and to a large extent, *Zost.* (VIII,1). Indeed, what holds these documents together, in addition to their "Sethian" coloration, is their philosophical, specifically Platonist, tendency. If anything, *Marsanes* probably shows the strongest and most consistent Platonist coloration of the Sethian documents just mentioned (as is well known, Valentinian Gnosticism is also heavily influenced by Platonic philosophy, but I must omit reference to the Valentinian texts here), to the extent that it might plausibly be suggested that *Marsanes* reflects a considerable degree of discussion between Gnostics and Platonist philosophers, such as we know took place in Rome in the days of Plotinus (Porphyr. *Vit. Plot.* 16; Plot. *Enn.* II.9; cf. Pearson, "The Tractate Marsanes"). What follows is necessarily only a bare outline of the facts; this subject obviously deserves a far more detailed discussion.

One of the basic doctrines of Middle Platonism is the distinction between the "intelligible world" ($\kappa\acute{o}\sigma\mu\omicron\varsigma\ \nu\omicron\eta\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$) and the "sense-perceptible world" ($\kappa\acute{o}\sigma\mu\omicron\varsigma\ \alpha\iota\sigma\theta\eta\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$). The Middle Platonists used the term $\kappa\acute{o}\sigma\mu\omicron\varsigma\ \nu\omicron\eta\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ to designate the totality of Plato's intelligible "Ideas" (this terminology is first attested in Philo of Alexandria, but is probably not original with him; see Baltes, *Timaios Lokros*, p. 105; and cf. Dillon, *Middle Platonists*, pp. 158-159). This doctrine and its terminology are part and parcel of the thought-world of *Marsanes* (see 4,6-7; 5,18-19.22.24-25; 34*,20; 41*,2-6). In *Marsanes*, as in Platonic philosophy in general, the "intelligible" realm is the realm of true being.

In *Marsanes* one also encounters a level of divine reality clearly

regarded as above and beyond "being." The expression for this level is "non-being" (**ΑΤΟΥΓΙΑ** = *ἀνούσιος*; see 5,14 and cf. 4,15-18; 6,3-5; 7,13-15.17-19; 13,16-19). The same expression occurs in other gnostic documents, Sethian (*Allogenes*, *Zost.*, *Steles Seth*, Cod. Bruc. *Untitled*) and Valentinian (see e.g. Hipp. *Ref.* VI.42). Though the term may well be a gnostic coinage it is based on an idea found already in Plato, that "the Good is not being" (*οὐκ οὐσίτας ὄντος τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ*), but is "beyond being" *ἐπέκεινα τῆς οὐσίας*, *Resp.* VI 509B; on this passage and its influence in the history of Platonism see Whittaker, "ΕΠΕΚΕΙΝΑ ΝΟΥ ΚΑΙ ΟΥΣΙΑΣ"). Plotinus refers to his First Principle, "the One," as "beyond being" (*ἐπέκεινα οὐσίας*) and "non-being" (*μη οὐσία*; *Enn.* I.7.1; V.6.6; V.4.2; VI.7.40,42). Thus *Marsanes* is following an established philosophical, i.e. Platonist, tradition in the use of the language of "non-being" to express the notion of transcendence. (For additional references and discussion see Pearson, "The Tractate Marsanes," pp. 381-384.)

An important feature of Neo-Platonic philosophy is its tendency to organize reality into triads, and even triads within triads. Plotinus, as is well known, organized his whole philosophy around three first principles (*ἀρχαί*), "the One" (*τὸ ἓν*), "Mind" (*νοῦς*), and "Soul" (*ψυχή*); he criticized the Gnostics for positing more than three (see esp. *Enn.* II.9.1-3). The multiplication of triads is found in such later Platonist writers as Proclus (see esp. his *Theology*, and Dodds' admirable commentary thereon) and others. Now *Marsanes'* system, as has already been seen, is developed out of the Sethian triad of unknown Father (= the transcendent, "non-being" realm), Mother (Barbelo, symbolizing the intelligible realm), and Son (the Unbegotten One), whose salutary work brings the lower world into relation with the divine. But as we have also seen, there are more than three levels of reality posited, the most important of which is that of the "Three-Powered One" (**ΠΑ ΤΩΑΜΤΕ ΝΘΑΜ**; see 6,19 and note), a being who seems to mediate between the unknown supreme God and the intelligible realm of Barbelo, itself probably understood as triadic. (For an interesting analogy see fr. 27 of the *Chaldaean Oracles* [ed. des Places]: *παντὶ γὰρ ἐν κόσμῳ λάμπει τριάς, ἧς μονὰς ἄρχει*. Damascius [De Princ. 43] interprets this oracle to mean that the one transcendent Father is prior to the Triad [*ὁ εἷς πατήρ ὁ πρὸ τῆς τριάδος*].) The Coptic term **ΠΑ ΤΩΑΜΤΕ ΝΘΑΜ** (the same figure occurs in *Allogenes* under the name **ΠΙΩΜΗΤΒΟΜ**, "the Triple Power," XI 45,13 *et passim*) is

transparently based on the Greek adjective *τριδύναμος* (a term which occurs untranslated in Cod. Bruc. *Untitled* and in other gnostic texts; cf. note to 6,19). This term, used mythologically in gnostic sources, is a technical term in the language of late Platonism, and is used both of the human soul (e.g. Hierocles) and of God (Marius Victorinus). The usage in Marius Victorinus is of key importance; I cite *Adv. Arium* IV.21: “*τριδύναμος* est deus, id est tres potentias habens, esse, vivere, intellegere” (“God is triple-powerful, that is he has three powers: Existence, Life, and Intelligence”). Victorinus, a Christian theologian, relates “Existence” to the Father, “Life” to the Son, and “Intelligence” to the Holy Spirit (cf. Hadot, in Marius Victorinus, *Traité théologique sur la Trinité*, ed. P. Henry, vol. 1 [SC 68], p. 82). More importantly, this passage in Marius Victorinus, with its triad of “Existence, Life, and Intelligence,” has been shown to be among those portions of Victorinus’ writings that are based on Porphyry’s lost commentary on Plato’s *Parmenides* (see Hadot, *Porphyre et Victorinus*, esp. vol. 1, pp. 293-294 and vol. 2, p. 48). Now although the triad, “Existence, Life, and Intelligence,” does not occur as such in *Marsanes*, it does occur in the closely-related tractate *Allogenes*, precisely as a designation for the “Triple-Power”: “He is Vitality ($\omega\nu\eta$ = ζωή) and Mentality ($\tau\mu\eta\tau\epsilon\iota\mu\epsilon$ = νόησις) and That Which Is ($\pi\eta\ \epsilon\tau\epsilon\ \pi\alpha\iota\ \pi\epsilon$ = τὸ ὄν or ὑπαρξίς, XI 49,26-28). The same triad, or variations thereof, occurs in *Steles Seth* and in *Zost.*, and an analogous triad occurs also in *Marsanes* itself, at 9,16-18 (γνώσις, ὑπόστασις, ἐνέργεια; see note to 9,16-18; for discussion of the Neo-Platonic triad in relation to *Steles Seth*, *Zost.*, and *Allogenes* see Robinson, “The Three Steles of Seth,” esp. pp. 133-141; cf. also Tardieu, “Les trois stèles de Seth,” esp. pp. 559-564). Thus we have in *Marsanes*, and in the tractates related to it, with their use of the “Triple-Power” terminology and their speculation on intellectual triads, a very strong affinity with the Platonist schools of late antiquity, notably the school of Plotinus himself (whose pupil Porphyry was). It is probable that the very term *τριδύναμος*, used by later Platonists, was originally derived from the language of the Gnostics. (This may also be true of the triad of “Existence, Life, and Intelligence”; cf. Robinson’s remarks in “The Three Steles of Seth,” p. 141.) We can easily see here evidence of a considerable interaction of Platonist scholars and Gnostics.

In its treatment of the nature and destiny of the human soul,

Marsanes can be seen as essentially a Platonist work, and thoroughly conversant with late-ancient speculation on Plato's dialogues, especially the *Timaeus*. The "spherical shape" of the soul is mentioned several times in the tractate (see 26*,1; 28*,1.14); this notion is based on speculation on the Psychogonia in the *Timaeus* (35A-36D; see note to 26*,1). On p. 25* there is an enigmatic and fragmentary passage which seems to reflect Numenius' special teaching on the descent of the soul into the world of generation (see Macrobius *In Somn.* I.10-12, based essentially on Numenius, according to Dodds, "Numenius and Ammonius," p. 8, and de Ley, *Macrobius and Numenius*). The well-known Platonist doctrine that embodiment dulls the intellect (Plat. *Phaed.* 79C, 72E; cf. Macrobius *In Somn.* I.12.7-11; Plot. *Enn.* II.9.6) is taught at 41*,17-19. On the same page the following context discusses disembodied souls and their abode, in a way reminiscent of Plato's "Myth of Er" (*Resp.* X 614A-621D) and later Platonists' speculations thereon (cf. e.g. Macrobius *In Somn.* I.11-12).

In general, the vocabulary of *Marsanes* is full of technical terms derived from Platonic philosophy. Some examples include the use of the term "incorporeal" (ἀσώματον) as an attribute of the intelligible (νοητόν) realm (see 3,8-9 and note, 3,20; 5,13.21; 36*,20); "simple" (ἀπλοῦς) as a divine attribute (see 5,8-9 and note), "activity" (ἐνέργεια) to express the way in which a higher level of reality relates to lower levels (see 7,16.23; 9,18; cf. note to 7,2-19), "sameness" τ'αυτότης and "difference" (ἐτερότης) as qualities built into the world (see 4,27-28 and note); and "division" (μερισμός) as a property of lower levels of being (see 2,25 and note). And there is a possible allusion to the famous passage in Plato's *Timaeus* 41D on the "mixing bowl" of soul at 5,9-11 (cf. note).

In his important treatise "Against the Gnostics" Plotinus criticizes certain Gnostics known to him and members of his school for adding to the store of knowledge derived from Plato certain additional categories not attested in genuine Platonic tradition, such as "exiles" (παροικήσεις), "impressions" (ἀντιτυποι), and "repentings" (μετάνοιαι). The last-named term, μετάνοια, occurs in *Marsanes* at 3,15 (cf. note, with references also to *Zost.* and *Cod. Bruc. Untitled*). Interestingly enough, some of the doctrines condemned by Plotinus are absent from *Marsanes*, notably those doctrines which are most characteristic of the radical dualism of early Gnosticism, i.e. the myth of the fall of Sophia and the doc-

trine of the evil creator (cf. *Enn.* II.9.4-5 and 10-11; there is a possible allusion to the "salvation of Sophia" at 4,2 but no trace of the wicked or foolish demiurge). Moreover one can see in *Marsanes* a definite movement away from the dualism characteristic of early Gnosticism, in the direction of a more monistic understanding of reality. In my view this movement is itself traceable to the influence of late-ancient Platonism, and is probably to be attributed to the "give-and-take" that may be expected to result from actual discussions between Gnostics and Platonist scholars. Examples in *Marsanes* of what might be taken to be concessions to Platonic monism are the remarkable passage on p. 5, conceding the "salvation" of the sense-perceptible world (traceable to Plat. *Tim.* 41A-42A and later discussions thereon; see 5,24-26 and note), and the positive valuation given to cosmic contemplation on p. 42* (traceable to Plat. *Tim.* 90A-D; see 42*,1-7 and notes) of the sort actually recommended by Plotinus (see e.g. *Enn.* II.9.16 and III. 8.11; the latter belongs to the four tractates, nos. 30-33, originally composed as a single work by Plotinus to counter aberrant, including gnostic, doctrines). In short, it seems that the author of *Marsanes* is "bending over backwards" to make his teaching as palatable as possible to Platonist readers!

Nevertheless *Marsanes* is and remains a *gnostic religious* document, not primarily a Platonist philosophical one. We have already adumbrated its "Sethian" features; there remains only to attempt to recover something of its original setting. This involves the following question: Is *Marsanes* addressed to members of a "school" or to members of a religious congregation? Though the answer to this question is by no means unambiguous—e.g. the material on the alphabet discussed above, reflecting the influence of grammatical training received in ancient schools, and of course the massive influence of Platonic philosophy just discussed—there are discernible allusions in the text of the tractate to certain religious rituals presumably practised by its readership.

It must be acknowledged that the study of Sethian-gnostic ritual is still in its infancy. H.-M. Schenke has taken some impressive steps forward in his article, "Gnostic Sethianism," wherein he discusses two prominent rituals, a baptism (for which he posits *Gos. Eg.* as an initiation text) and a "cultic ascension" ritual (for which *Steles Seth* is an aetiology). In *Marsanes* there are a number of passages which can be taken to allude to a baptismal ritual.

A baptismal "washing" is clearly referred to at 66*,1 (cf. a possible reference to "living water" at 65*,22; cf. 55*,20 and see notes), and in the same context the terms "seal" (σφραγίς) and "sealing" (σφραγιζέειν) occur. The use of the "seal" terminology at 2,12-13 and following, and at 34*,28, may also imply a baptismal context, though one could equally well posit an "ascension" ritual for the material beginning at 2,12-13, with a "sealing" ceremony connected to each of the various levels of the ascent. "Baptism" in this context, therefore, would be part of the larger ritual of "cultic ascent," as seems to be indicated in *Zostrianos* (see *Zost.* VIII 5,14-7,22 *et passim*).

An "ascent" ritual (cf. the analogous ἀναγωγή ritual of the "Chaldaeans," on which see Lewy, *Chaldaean Oracles*, pp. 177-226), posited for *Marsanes'* community, might include the following elements, in addition to those just mentioned: hymns or acclamations of praise (for which *Steles Seth* provides the best analogy: see esp. 8,4-12), alternated with sacred silences (cf. 8,14-25), and invocations of the "names" of gods and angels, symbolized by the chanting of *voces mysticae* (see 19*,18-20; 28*,12-13,17-22; 30*,16-18; 36*,28-37*,2; 38*,16-17; and notes to these passages).

Other possible rituals alluded to in the text of *Marsanes* include items properly classified as "magic." At 36*,1-6 there is a very interesting but enigmatic passage alluding to the use of waxen images and emerald stones, presumably in a ritual context (see discussion above). The closest parallels to this are found in the magical papyri and in the Chaldaean "Oracles" (cf. notes to this passage). Now while it is well-known that the later Neo-Platonists, from the time of Iamblichus on, were powerfully influenced by the theurgical art of the "Chaldaeans," even the pre-Plotinian philosopher Numenius apparently engaged in such arts, especially the fabrication of magical images (ἰδρυσίς; cf. fr. 1 [des Places] and Dodds, "Numenius and Ammonius," p. 10). It is therefore not surprising to find this sort of thing reflected in a gnostic text. (A less likely magic ritual, that of "conjunction," may be alluded to at 2,14-16; see note.)

The overall impression received from a study of *Marsanes* is that ritual action was part and parcel of the *gnosis* experienced by the community to whom it was addressed. The "mysteries" referred to in the text would therefore have included not only secret doctrines but secret practices (see 39*,24 and note; cf. 68*,11). These "mysteries" were not to be contemned (see the warning at

39*,23-25). Those who were to be admitted to them were subject to an initiatory "testing" (δοκιμάζειν; see 40*,13-14 and note) and preliminary instruction (cf. 40*,14-19 and note).

In conclusion, it has long been assumed that the Gnostics combated by Plotinus in Rome in the early third century belonged to the same basic "family" of Gnosticism as the Sethians and "Archontics" encountered by Epiphanius in the fourth century (*Haer.* 39 and 40; cf. Puech, "Plotin et les gnostiques," pp. 83-84; cf. 110-111; and Schmidt, *Gnostische Schriften*, pp. 602-664; the "Archontics" are obviously a branch of Sethian Gnosticism; cf. Puech, "Archontiker," *RAC* I, 635). In our tractate from Codex X we now have the "Apocalypse of Marsanes" posited by Schmidt and others on the basis of the references in Epiphanius and the Bruce Codex (cf. discussion above). It is also possible that this document should be included in the "others" mentioned by Porphyry (*Vit. Plot.* 16; cf. discussion above). The name "Marsanes" probably reflects a Syrian background for its author, though not necessarily for the document's own provenience; it would be foolhardy, therefore, to assign *Marsanes* to any specific locality in the Roman world. It is possible that *Marsanes* was known to the author of the anonymous untitled tractate in the Bruce Codex, which Schmidt dated at the end of the second century (cf. *Gnostische Schriften*, p. 664); *Marsanes* would therefore have to be somewhat earlier. More conservatively, *Marsanes* might be dated to the early third century, or roughly the time of Plotinus and Porphyry. Perhaps more could be said if the document were more completely preserved.

The translation that follows is, in many places, overly literal and "wooden," but the fragmentary state of the MS. and the corrupt state of the text has militated against the production of a more readable translation. Future attempts will perhaps rectify this obvious deficiency.

[A]

(9 lines missing)

10 [.]ΙΚΦ[
 ΜΝ ΟΥΒ[Ε]Κ[Ε] ΑΥCAY[NE AY
 12 ΟΝΤΩ ΖΝ ΟΥΖΗΤ ΕΦΤ[Ο]ΥΒΗΥ
 ΕΝCΕΖΑCΙ ΕΝ ΝΤΟΦ[Τ]Ω
 14 ΝΖΜΠΕΘ[Α]Υ· ΝΕΝΤΑ[Υ]ΧΙ
 ΤΗΝΕ CΕΝΑ† ΝΕΥ Μ[Π]ΟΥ
 16 ΒΕΚΕ ΕΦCΑΤΠ ΕΤΒ[Ε] ΟΥ
 ΖΥΠΟΜΟΝΗ ΑΥΩ ς[Ν]Α
 18 ΡΑΝΕΧΕ ΖΗΤΟΥ Ν[ΜΠΕ]
 ΘΑΥ· ΜΝΤΡΕΛΛΑΥ[Ε ΔΕ Ν]
 20 ΖΗΤΝ ΡΛΥΠΕΙCΘΑ[Ι ΑΥ]Ω
 ΜΝΤΡΕΦΜΕΕΥ[Ε ΖΜ Π]ΕΦ
 22 ΖΗΤ ΧΕ ΦΡΑΠ[...].[
 ΝΒΙ ΠΝΑΒ ΝΕ[Ι]ΩΤ Φ[ΒΩ]
 24 ΩΤ ΓΑΡ ΑΧΜ ΠΤΗΡΩ [ΑΥΩ]
 ΩΦΙ ΜΠΟΥΡΑΥΩ ΤΗ[ΡΟΥ]
 26 ΑΥΩ Α[ΦΟ]ΥΩΝΖ Ν[Α]Υ
 ΑΒΑΛ [Μ]ΠΕΦΚΕΛ[
 28 ΕΝ[. .] ΝΕΤΧΩ.[

[B]

(9 lines missing)

10 [± Ι3]..[
 Ν[...]ΝΤΑ[...]Υ ΝΨΑΡ[Π]
 12 ΤΜ[Α]ΖΜΝΤΨΑΜΝΤ ΔΕ Ν
 CΦΡΑΓΙC ΑΖΙΚΩΕ ΜΜΑϚ

- 1,10 Probably a Greek adjective, perhaps ΚΟC/[Μ]ΙΚΟ[Ϛ,
 "worldly"; cf. 2,18.
 1,12 "him": God. Cf. 68*,17.
 1,13 Corr. Δ over Ν in ΖΑCΙ.
 1,14-15 "Those who have received you": The gnostic prophet (Marsa-
 nes) seems here to be encouraging his followers in their mis-
 sionary activity. Cf. Matt 10:40 par.
 1,16 "reward": Cf. 40*,2-5.
 1,18 Corr. Χ over Δ in ΔΝΕΧΕ.
 1,20-21 Lit. "and let him not think . . ."
 1,22 A Greek word with the prefix ἀπο- was in the text here.
 1,23 "The great Father" refers to the supreme God. Cf. "the great
 Forefather (προπάτωρ)," *Pist. Soph.*, ch. 14.
 1,24 ΠΤΗΡΩ: "The All" is a technical reference to the totality of
 heavenly beings; cf. esp. *Gos. Truth* I 18,29-19,10.

[1]

(9 lines missing)

10 [and a [reward]. They [came to know;] they
 12 found him with a pure heart,
 (and) they are not afflicted by him
 14 with evils. Those who have received
 you (pl.) will be given their
 16 choice reward for
 endurance (ὑπομονή), and he will
 18 ward off (ἀνέχειν) [the]
 evils from them. [But (δέ)] let none
 20 of us be distressed (λυπεῖσθαι) [and]
 think [in] his
 22 heart that the great
 Father [
 24 For (γάρ) he looks upon the All [and]
 takes care of them all.
 26 And [he] has shown to them
 his [
 28 . . . Those that [

[2]

(9 lines missing)

10 [
 [] at first.
 12 But (δέ) as for the thirteenth
 seal (σφραγίς), I have established it,

1,27

Perhaps περικελευγίς, "his command."

1,28

Probably not ἄω ἤ[μας, "say," for the form ἄωγ is used elsewhere in this tractate; cf. 34*, 18.

2, 12-4, 23

On this passage see the tractate introduction.

2, 12-13

"the thirteenth seal": The various "seals" referred to in what follows are possibly to be understood as magical names associated with angelic inhabitants of the various realms. Cf. Scholem, *Jewish Gnosticism*, pp. 32-33. In the Books of Jeu such seals are shown as diagrams in the MS., and are also treated in connection with a ritual of "sealing" (σφραγιζειν); see e.g. 1 *Jeu*, chs. 38-41, and 2 *Jeu*, chs. 44-52. Cf. also *Pist. Soph.*, chs. 25, 86, etc., and esp. 138. In *Marsanes*, as in the Books of Jeu, the "seals" may also be associated with a (baptismal) ritual; cf. 66*, 1-5. Cf. also the "five seals" in *Trim. Prot.* XIII 49, 27-32. The "thirteenth seal" probably

14 α[ΠΙ]ΤΗ ΜΗ [Π]ΤΑΨ ΝΤ[Ε]
 Γ[Ν]ΨCIC ΜΗ ΠΤΑΧΡΟ ΝΤ[Α]
 16 Ν[ΑΠ]ΑΥCIC· ΤΨΑΡΠ ΜΕ[Ν]
 Μ[Ν Τ]ΜΑΖCΗΤΕ ΜΗ ΤΜΑ[Ζ]
 18 [ΨΑΜ]ΤΕ ΕΥΨΟΟΠ ΝΗΚΟC
 [ΜΙΚΟ]C ΜΗ ΝΖΥΛΙΚΟC· ΑΖΙ
 20 Τ[ΑΜ]Ε ΤΗΝΕ ΑΡΑΥ ΑΤΡΕΤΗ
 Α.[... Ν]ΕΤΗCΩΜΑ· ΑΥΩ
 22 [ΟΥ]Δ[ΥΝΑ]ΜΙC ΝΑΙCΘΗΤΗ
 [C]ΝΑΖ.[.] ΝΝΕΤΑΜΤΑΝ Μ
 24 [ΜΑ]Υ ΑΥΩ ΝCΕΡΤΗΡΙ ΜΜΑΥ
 [ΑΠ]ΠΑΘΟC· ΑΥΩ ΠΜΕΡΙCΜΟC
 26 [ΜΠ]ΤΩΜΕ· ΤΜ[Α]ΖΥΤΟΕ ΔΕ
 [ΜΗ Τ]ΜΑΖΤΕ Ε[Τ]Η ΠCΑΖΡΕ
 28 [ΝΕΕΙ] ΑΤΕΤΗC[Ο]ΥΩΝΟΥ
 [.....]Φ.[..ΝΝΟ]ΥΤΕ

F

2 γΨΟΟΠ ΜΗΝCΑ Π[
 ΑΥΩ ΤΦ[Υ]CIC ΝΗ.[

corresponds to the highest heavenly realm, which in *Pist. Soph.* is called the "thirteenth aeon" (*passim*). Cf. "the world of the Thirteen" referred to by Zosimus of Panopolis, according to Scott, *Hermetica*, vol. 4, p. 143. In *Pist. Soph.* the exiled Pistis Sophia must undergo thirteen "repentances" (μετάνοια) before being restored to the thirteenth aeon, chs. 30-60. Contrast *Gos. Eg.* III 63,18-64,4; *Zost.* VIII 4,25-28; etc.; where the "thirteen aeons" are regarded as part of the lower world.

2,13-14
 2,14-16

ΚΩΕ ΑΠΙΤΗ = κατατιθέσθαι.

When the Gnostic attains to the highest level of reality, the level of the "thirteenth," he has achieved the very extremity of *gnosis*, and is assured of the eschatological "rest." The experience treated here probably involves contemplation and meditation. On contemplation and its benefits in Gnosticism and in Platonism see e.g. Zandee, *Terminology*, pp. 33-38. An alternative way of understanding the expression ΠΤΑΨ ΝΤΕΡΝΩCIC is to take ΤΑΨ as a translation of a technical term, "Conjunction" (σύστασις), referring to a magical ritual whereby an adept gains supernatural power. In the "Chaldaean" system of theurgy, "conjunction" is achieved through certain rites and invocations of inarticulate magical names—such as seem to be referred to extensively later in this tractate

- 14 together with [the] summit of
 knowledge (γνώσις) and the certainty
 16 of rest (ἀνάπαυσις). The first (+ μὲν)
 [and the] second and the
 18 [third] are the worldly (κοσμικός)
 and the material (ὕλικός). I have
 20 [informed] you concerning these, that you should
 [] your bodies (σῶμα). And
 22 [a] sense-perceptible (αἰσθητή) [power (δύναμις)]
 will [] those who will rest,
 24 and they will be kept (τηρεῖν)
 [from] passion (πάθος) and division (μερισμός)
 26 [of the] union. The fourth (+ δέ)
 [and the] fifth which are above,
 28 [these] you have come to know
 [] divine]

3

- He exists after the [
 2 and the nature (φύσις) of the [

-
- (esp. pp. 19*-39*). On the Chaldaean "Conjunction" see Lewy, *Chaldaean Oracles*, pp. 228-238. For a well-known example in Graeco-Egyptian magic see *PGM IV.778-798*.
- 2,16-26 The first stage of ascent involves *askesis*.
- 2,18-19 κοσμικός and ὑλικός appear to be used synonymously here. This is a specifically gnostic use of κοσμικός, without parallel in the Platonic tradition. Cf. 18*,21-22.
- 2,19-20 The author is building on prior instruction. Cf. also 2,28; 3,4-8.
- 2,21 Perhaps ἀρ[ΗΖ ΛΝ]ετησῶμα, "guard your bodies."
- 2,23 Perhaps [C]ηαζψ[Ν], "will impose upon," in which case λψω in line 24 should be understood adversatively, presupposing an adversative καί in the Greek original.
- 2,24 Or: "but they will be kept . . ." Cf. the preceding note.
- 2,25 μερισμός: "Division" is the property of lower levels of being, according to gnostic and Platonic categories. See e.g. Zandee, *Terminology*, pp. 23-24. Cf. also note to 3,20-22.
- 2,26 ΤΩΜΕ: This probably refers to the union of the earthly self with its heavenly counterpart.
- 2,29 The superlin. stroke is visible. Perhaps "the gods" instead of "divine."
- 3,2 Perhaps τφ[γ]ςις ηηφ[γτε], "the divine nature."

4 ΕΤΕ ΠΕΕΙ [Π]Ε ΠΕΤΠΑ[
 ΕΙ ΠΨΑΜΝΤ ΑΥΩ ΑΖ[ΙΤΑ]
 ΜΕ ΤΗΝΕ ΑΝ[. . .]Ω[
 6 ΖΗ ΠΨΑΜΝ[Τ
 ΖΙΤΝ ΠΕΕΙCΝ[ΕΥ ΑΖΙΤΑ]
 8 ΜΕ ΤΗΝΕ ΑΡ[ΑΔ ΧΕ ΟΥΑ]
 ΤCΩΜΑ ΠΕ [
 10 [. .]Ε[
 ΑΥΩ ΜΝΝC[Α
 12 [.]ΟΥ ΝΖΗΤ[
 ΝΙΜ ΕΤ[
 14 ΝΕΤΝ[. . .] Τ[ΜΑΖ†Ε]
 ΔΕ Ε[ΤΒΕ Τ]ΜΕΤΑΝ[ΟΙΑ Ν]
 16 ΝΕΤΨΟΟΠ ΝΖΗΤ ΑΥΩ
 ΕΤΒΕ ΝΕΤΟΥΗΖ ΜΠΜΑ
 18 ΕΤΗΜΕΥ ΤΜΑΖCΟΕ
 ΔΕ ΕΤΒΕ ΝΑΥΤΟΓΕΝ[ΝΗΤ]ΟC
 20 ΕΤΒΕ ΤΟΥCΙΑ ΝΑCΩΜΑ
 ΤΟΝ ΕΤΨΟΟΠ ΚΑΤΑ ΜΕ
 22 ΡΟC· ΜΝ ΝΕΤΨΟ[ΟΠ] ΖΗ
 ΤΜΗΕ ΠΠΤΗΡΪ Α[. .].
 24 ΑΟΥΕΠΙCΤΗΜΗ Μ[Ν ΟΥ]
 ΩΡΧ· ΑΥΩ ΤΜΑΖCΑ[ΨΦΕ]

-
- 3,5 Perhaps ΑΝ[ΕΕΙ, "of these (things)."
 3,8-9 ΑΤCΩΜΑ = ἀσώματος; cf. 3,20-21. "Incorporeal" is equivalent
 to "intelligible" (νοητός) in Platonic thought; see e.g. Numenius
 fr. 7 (des Places ed.), of "being" (τὸ ὄν).
 3,15 μετάνοια: "Conversion" is apparently to be understood as the
 first step in the return of the gnostic soul to its place of origin.
 μετάνοια and παροικησις (variously translated as "exile" and
 "transmigration") are gnostic technical terms which occur
 together in *Zost.* (VIII 5,24-27 *et passim*) and in *Cod. Bruc.*
Untitled (ch. 20). Plotinus criticized the Gnostics known to him
 for their use of these terms; *Enn.* II.9.6. For discussion see
 esp. Puech, "Plotin et les Gnostiques," pp. 108-109.
 3,16 The reference is to those Gnostics associated with the prophet-
 savior Marsanes. Cf. 8,2. For discussion see tractate intro-
 duction.
 3,17 ΝΕΤΟΥΗΖ: Perhaps the Greek word παροικεῖν is in the back-
 ground here. Cf. note to 3,15.

that is, the one who [
 4 [] three. And [I have]
 [informed] you of [
 6 in the three [
 by these [two. I have]
 8 [informed] you concerning [it, that it]
 is incorporeal (-σῶμα) [
 10 [
 and after [
 12 within [
 every [] which [
 14 your []. The [fifth,]
 (+ δέ) [concerning the] conversion (μετάνοια) [of]
 16 those that are within me, and
 concerning those who dwell in that place.
 18 But (δέ) the sixth,
 concerning the self-begotten ones (αὐτογέννητος),
 20 concerning the incorporeal (ἄσώματον) being (οὐσία)
 which exists partially (κατὰ μέρος),
 22 together with those who exist in
 the truth of the All [
 24 for understanding (ἐπιστήμη) and
 assurance. And the [seventh,]

3,19 This line is unusually long, 19 letters. αὐτογέννητος: This term is used of the supreme God both in gnostic and non-gnostic sources. See e.g. Cod. Bruc. *Untitled*, ch. 1; Ps.-Clem. *Hom.* 16.16. But in the Peratic gnostic system it is used of the second principle (of three); the first principle is ἀγέννητον and the second is αὐτογέννητον.

3,20-21 ἄσώματον: Cf. note to 3,8-9.

3,20-22 That "incorporeal being" should have only "partial" (κατὰ μέρος) existence is a surprising doctrine, but the author is attempting to express in Platonic categories the gnostic myth of the scattered particles of divinity in the world. In Platonism the soul participates both in "indivisible being" (ἀμερίστος οὐσία) and "divisible being" (μερίστη οὐσία); see e.g. Plat. *Tim.* 35A; Plot. *Enn.* VI.2.5. Cf. also note to 2,25.

3,21 Corr. Ω over 2.

26 ΕΤΒΕ ΤΔΥΝΑΜΙC Η[ΛΥΤΟ]
 ΓΕΝΗC· ΕΤΕ ΠΕ[ΕΙ ΠΕ ΠΜΑΖ]
 28 ΨΑΜΝΤ ΝΤελ[ΕΙΟC
 ΠΝ[. .]. Ν·Υ[

X

[ΤΜΑΖ]ΟΤΟΕ ΕΤΒΕ ΠΟΥΧΕ
 2 [ΕΙ· Μ]Η ΤCΟΦ[Ι]Α· ΤΜΑΖΨΜΟΥ
 [ΝΕ] ΔΕ ΕΤΒΕ ΠΝΟΥC ΕΤΟΕΙ
 4 [Η]ΖΑΥΤ [ΝΤΑ]ΖΟΥΩΝΖ ΑΒΑΛ
 [ΧΙ]Ν Η[ΨΑΡΠ] ΜΗ ΤΟΥCΙΑ Ε
 6 [ΤΕ ΜΗΤΕC C]ΨΜΑ ΜΗ ΠΚΟC
 [ΜΟC ΗΝΟΗ]ΤΟC· ΤΜΑΖΨΙΤΕ
 8 [± 7] ΗΤΑΥΝΑΜΙC
 [ΤΕΕΙ ΗΤΑΖΟ]ΥΨ[Ν]Ζ ΑΒΑ[Λ] Χ[ΙΝ]
 10 [ΗΨΑΡΠ· ΤΜΑΖ]ΜΗΤΕ ΕΤ[ΒΕ]
 [ΒΑΡΒΗΛΩ Τ]ΠΑΡΘΕΝΟC [·
 12 [± 7 Η]ΤΕ ΠΑΙΨ[Ν·]
 [ΤΜΑΖΜΗΤΟΥΗΕ] ΜΗ ΤΜΑ[Ζ]
 14 [ΜΗΤC]ΝΑΥ[C ΕΥ]ΨΕΧΕ ΑΠ

-
- 3,26-28 The "third perfect" "self begotten" power may be taken as equivalent to the divine Autogenes, the "son" in the Sethian-gnostic triad of Father, Mother, and Son. Cf. e.g. *Ap. John* II 7,11-30; and *Norea* IX 28,6 (and see introduction to IX,2). Cf. also 5,27-28.
- 4,2 For the reconstruction of the lacuna see 5,16. One might also be tempted to restore the text of 4,1-2 to read: **ΕΤΒΕ ΠΟΥΧΕ/[ΕΙΤΕ] ΗΤCΟΦΙΑ**, "concerning the salvation of (the gnostic aeon) Sophia"; for the form **ΟΥΧΕΕΙΤΕ** see Kasser, *Compléments*, p. 79.
- 4.3-5 For the appearance of "mind" (νοῦς) in gnostic myth see e.g. *Ap. John* II 6,33-7,4. Cf. also *Zost.* VIII 18,5-6: "the great male invisible perfect Mind, the First-Appearing One . . ." On the masculine nature of the νοῦς, cf. *Testim. Truth* IX 44,2-3 and note. Cf. also 31*,17-18.
- 4.4 The second superlin. stroke is visible.
- 4.5-6 Cf. 3,8-9 and note.
- 4.6-7 **ΠΚΟCΜΟC ΗΝΟΗΤΟC**: The "intelligible world" (νοητός κόσμος) is equivalent to the immaterial world of the "Ideas" in Middle Platonism. Whereas Plato used the term ζῶον νοητόν

- 26 concerning the self-begotten (αὐτογενής) power (δύναμις),
 which [is the]
 28 third [perfect (τέλειος)
 [

4

- fourth, concerning salvation
 2 [and] wisdom (σοφία). And (δέ) the eighth,
 concerning the mind (νοῦς) which is
 4 [male, which] appeared
 [in the beginning,] and (concerning) the being (οὐσία)
 6 [which is incorporeal (-σῶμα)] and the
 [intelligible (νοητός)] world (κόσμος). The ninth,
 8 [] of the power (δύναμις)
 [which] appeared [in the]
 10 [beginning. The] tenth, [concerning]
 [Barbelo, the] virgin (παρθένος) [
 12 [] of the Aeon (αἰών).
 [The eleventh] and [the]
 14 [twelfth] speak of the

("intelligible living being") for the immaterial "pattern" of the material world (cf. *Tim.* 37D), later Platonists used the term κόσμος νοητός, and included in the designation the totality of Plato's intelligible "Ideas." The earliest attestation of the distinction between two "worlds," νοητός and αἰσθητός ("sense-perceptible") is Philo of Alexandria. See e.g. *Op. Mund.* 15-17, 24; cf. Baltes, *Timaios Lokros*, p. 105. Here the Middle-Platonic "intelligible world" has been incorporated into the gnostic system of *Marsanes*. For discussion see tractate introduction.

4,11

ΒΑΡΒΗΛΩ: For the reconstruction, cf. 8,28-29. Barbelo is the "Mother" in the Sethian-gnostic divine triad. See esp. *Ap. John* II 4,36-5,11. Barbelo is sometimes referred to as a "male virgin" in gnostic texts related to *Marsanes*; see e.g. *Steles Seth* VII 121,21. She is also called, simply, "the Virgin Barbelo," *Zost.* VIII 63,7 *et passim*, and is designated "triple-male," *Zost.* VIII 83,10; *Ap. John* II 5,8. Cf. also *Melch.* IX 5,27 and note.

4,12

A trace of the superlin. stroke is visible. **ΠΑΙΩΝ**: Perhaps this refers to the "Aeon of Barbelo"; cf. 8,28 and *Allogenes* XI 46,34 *et passim*; *Zost.* VIII 14,6 *et passim*.

16 [α20]ΡΑΤΟΣ ΠΕΤ[Ε ΟΥ]ΝΤΕΦ
 Ψ[Λ]ΜΗΤΤΕ ΝΔΥΝ[Λ]ΜΙΦ [Μ]
 Μ[Ε]Υ· ΑΥΩ ΠΙΠΝΑ ΕΤΕ ΜΝ
 18 [Τ]ΦΦ ΟΥΣΙΑ ΜΜΕΥ ΕΦΗΠ Α
 ΤΨΑΡΠ ΝΑΤΟΥΧΠΑΣ· ΤΜΑΖ
 20 ΜΝΤΨΑΜΤΕ Ε'Σ' ΨΕΧΕ ΕΤΒΕ
 ΠΕ[Τ]ΚΑΡΑΕΙΤ ΕΜΠΟΥΣΟΥ
 22 Φ[ΩΝ]Ϊ· ΑΥΩ ΤΚΑΤΑΡΧΗ Ν
 [ΠΕΤ]Ε ΝΠΟΥΔΙΑΚΡΙΝΕ Μ
 24 [ΜΑΦ]· ΑΝΑΚ ΓΑΡ ΠΕ ΝΤΑΖΙΪ
 [ΝΟΕΙ] ΜΠΕΤΨΟΟΠ ΜΑΜΗ
 26 [Ε ΕΙ]ΤΕ ΚΑΤΑ ΜΕΡΟΣ ΕΙΤΕ Μ
 [ΠΙΠΤΗ]ΡΪ ΚΑΤΑ ΤΔΙΑΦΟΡΑ
 28 [ΜΝ <Π> ΨΩΨ] ΧΕ ΣΕΨΟΟΠ ΧΙΝ Ν
 [ΨΑΡΠ ΖΜ Π]ΜΑ ΤΗΡ[Ϊ] ΕΤΟΕ[Ι]

Ε

ΝΔΙΩΝΙΟΝ <ΝΒΙ> ΝΕΝΤΑΖΨΩ
 2 ΠΕ ΤΗΡΟΥ· ΕΙΤΕ ΧΩΡΙΣ ΟΥΣΙΑ
 ΕΙΤΕ ΖΝ ΟΥΣΙΑ· ΝΕΤΟΕΙ ΝΑΤ
 4 ΧΠΑΥ· ΑΥΩ ΝΔΙΩΝ· ΝΝΟΥ

-
- 4.15-19 "Invisible" (ἀόρατος), "Spirit" (πνεῦμα), "non-being" (ἀνού-
 σιος), "unbegotten" (ἀγέννητος) are all designations for the
 supreme God in gnostic sources. On the system of *Marsanes*
 see the tractate introduction.
- 4.16 It is not clear how the "three powers" are to be construed here.
 In *Gos. Eg.* "three powers" emanate from the Supreme God:
 Father, Mother, and Son; see *Gos. Eg.* III 41,7-11; cf. III 44,10-
 12. Later on in *Marsanes* the "third power" is referred to; see
 8,18-19; cf. 3,26-27; 9,19-20; 20*,15-16. On the term "three-
 powered" see 6,19 and note.
- 4.19 ΑΤΟΥΧΠΑ=: Cf. 6,24; 7,13-14.18. For discussion of this
 hitherto unattested form see the grammatical section of the
 codex introduction. However the form is to be construed
 grammatically, the meaning is clear: "unbegotten." The
 expected construction, ΑΤΧΠΑ=, occurs at 5,3-4. "The first
 Unbegotten" (fem.) referred to here is difficult to identify;
 perhaps this is an oblique reference to a divine feminine entity
 such as the "First Thought" (ἐννοια) of the Invisible Spirit in
Allogenes XI 64,35-36.
- 4.20-24 Here, as in many other gnostic texts, "silence" and "un-
 knowability" are the most important attributes of the supreme

- Invisible One (ἀόρατος) who possesses
 16 three powers (δύναμις)
 and the Spirit (πνεῦμα) which does not
 18 have being (οὐσία), belonging to
 the first Unbegotten (fem.). The
 20 thirteenth speaks concerning
 [the] Silent One who was not
 22 [known], and the primacy (καταρχή) of
 [the one who] was not distinguished (διακρίνειν).
 24 For (γάρ) I am he who has
 [understood (νοεῖν)] that which truly exists,
 26 [whether (εἴτε)] partially (κατὰ μέρος) or (εἴτε)
 [wholly], according to difference (διαφορά)
 28 [and sameness], that they exist from the
 [beginning in the] entire place which is

5

- eternal (αἰώνιον), <i.e.> all those that have come into
 2 existence whether (εἴτε) without (χωρίς) being (οὐσία)
 or (εἴτε) with being (οὐσία), those who are
 4 unbegotten, and the divine aeons (αἰών)

-
- God. Cf. esp. *Allogenes* XI 60,28-61,22. Cf. tractate introduction for discussion.
- 4,24 "I" here probably refers to Marsanes, the prophet-revealer of the tractate; cf. 2,13.19; 3,4.7.16.
- 4,27-28 "Sameness" (ταυτόν) and "Difference" (θάτερον) are qualities built into the World Soul according to Plato *Tim.* 35A. Cf. Plutarch's commentary on this passage, *De animae procreatione in Timaeo*, esp. 1012d-1013a. In Neo-Platonism the usual terms are ταυτότης and ἑτερότης; cf. e.g. Plot. *Enn.* VI.2.21, where these terms are used to describe Mind (νοῦς). It is assumed that here διαφορά = ἑτερότης and that **ΩΩΩ** = ταυτότης.
- 4,28 There is not enough room in the lacuna for the article; it is assumed that it was erroneously omitted by the scribe.
- 5,2-3 "without being": This phrase implies utter transcendence, in the sense of "beyond being," and reflects a Platonic philosophical background. Cf. 5,14; 6,3-5; 7,13-19; and notes. For discussion see Pearson, "The Tractate Marsanes," and tractate introduction.
- 5,3-4 **ΑΤΧΠΑ** = Cf. note to 4,19.

ΤΕ ΜΝ ΠΑΓΓ[Ε]ΛΟΣ· ΑΥΩ
 6 ΠΨΥΧΗ ΕΥΖῆ ΟΥΜ[ΠΤ]
 ΒΑΛΖΗΤ· ΑΥΩ ΠΖ[ΒCΩ Μ]
 8 ΨΥΧΗ· ΠΤΑΝΤῆ ᾱ[ΝΖΑ]
 ΠΛΟΥΝ· ΑΥΩ ΜΝῆ[CΩC Α]
 10 ΖΟΥΤΑΤΟΥ Μῆ ἡ[ΕΤΕΙΝΕ]
 ΑΡΑΥ· ΕΤΙ ΔΕ [..... ΤΟΥ]
 12 CΙΑ ΤΗΡῚ ἡ[..... ΕΤΤῆ]
 ΤΩΝ ΑΤΟ[ΥCΙΑ ΠΑΤCΩΜΑ]
 14 Μῆ ΤΑΤΟΥ[CΙ]Α· ᾱ[ΟΙΠΟΝ]
 ΔΕ ΑΠΧΩΖῆ ΤΗΡ[Ὶ ΟΥΧΕ]
 16 ΕΙ· Μῆ ΤΜῆΤΑΤΜΟΥ ἡ
 ΤΕΤῆΜΕΥ· ΑΖΙΔΙΑΚΡΙΝΕ·
 18 ΑΥΩ ΑΖΙΠΩΖ ΑΘΑΗ ΜῆΑΙ
 CΘΗΤΟC ΚΟCΜΟC· <ΑΖΙCΑΥΝΕ> ΚΑΤ[Α]
 20 ΜΕΡΟC ἡΠΤΟΠΟC ΤΗΡῚ

-
- 5.7 **ΒΑΛΖΗΤ** may also be translated “simple” (*ἀπλοῦς*). Cf. lines 8-9. The superlin. stroke on **ΖΒCΩ** is visible. “soul garments”: The soul is regularly portrayed as a “garment” (*ἔνδυμα*, **ΖΒCΩ**) in gnostic literature. See e.g. *Gos. Mary* BG 15,8; *Allogenes* XI 58,29; *Auth. Teach.* VI 32,4. Here the term “soul-garment” may refer to something akin to the “vehicle of the soul” (*ἄχημα τῆς ψυχῆς*) in late Platonism, on which see Dodds, *Proclus: Theology*, pp. 313-321. According to Proclus the “vehicle” of the soul descends by the addition of “garments” (*χιτῶνες*) of increasingly material substance; see *Theology*, Prop. 209.
- 5.8 **ΠΤΑΝΤῆ**: The following preposition **ᾱ** may presuppose a verb form, **ΕΥΤΑΝΤῆ**. “likenesses”: Cf. the Neo-Platonic doctrine of the soul as a “likeness” (*εἰκῶν*) of the mind (*νοῦς*), Plot. *Enn.* V.1.3.
- 5.8-9 *ἀπλοῦν*: “Simplicity” is a divine attribute according to Platonic tradition. E.g. Numenius applies the adjective *ἀπλοῦς* to the supreme God (*πρωτὸς θεός*), fr. 11 (des Places ed.) and Prop. 127 of Proclus’ *Theology* reads: “All that is divine is primordially and supremely simple (*ἀπλοῦν*) . . .,” Dodds, pp. 112-113.
- 5.9-11 Perhaps there is an allusion here to the “mixing bowl” (*κρατήρ*) of Plato’s *Timaeus* 41D; cf. 35A.
- 5.13 **ΑΤCΩΜΑ**: Cf. note to 3,8-9.
- 5.14 **ΑΤΟΥCΙΑ** = *ἀνοῦσιος*, a predication of divine transcendence;

- 6 together with the angels (ἄγγελος) and the
 souls (ψυχή) which are without guile
 and the soul-(ψυχή) [garments,]
 8 the likenesses of [the]
 simple (ἁπλοῦν) ones. And [afterwards they]
 10 have been mixed with [those that resemble]
 them. But (δέ) still (ἔτι) [the]
 12 entire being (οὐσία) [which]
 imitates the [incorporeal (-σῶμα) being (οὐσία)]
 14 and the unsubstantial (-οὐσία) (fem.). [Finally (λοιπὸν)]
 (+ δέ) the entire defilement [was saved]
 16 together with the immortality of
 the former (fem.). I have deliberated (διακρίνειν)
 18 and have attained to the boundary of the sense-per-
 ceptible (αἰσθητός)
 world (κόσμος). <I have come to know> part by part
 20 (κατὰ μέρος) the entire place (τόπος)

cf. note to 5,2-3. For the gnostic use of the term ἀνούσιος see
 e.g. Cod. Bruc. *Untitled* ch. 2 *et passim*; Hipp. *Ref.* VI.42 (the
 Valentinian Marcus); Hipp. *Ref.* VII.21 (Basilides). For
ΑΤΟΥΓΙΑ cf. *Allogenes* XI 53,31-32; *Zostrianos* VIII 79,7;
Steles Seth VII 121,27; 124,26; and for **ΜΗΤΑΤΟΥΓΙΑ**
 (= ἀνουσίτης?) *Allogenes* XI 47,34; 49,33; 55,29. For discus-
 sion see Pearson, "The Tractate Marsanes."

- 5,15-16 "The entire defilement" probably refers to the sense-perceptible
 world, whose "salvation" is apparently granted in this tractate.
 Cf. 5,24-26 and note.
- 5,17-26 "Marsanes" is apparently referring to his own experience of
 meditational ascent. The text is corrupt here and the emenda-
 tions are conjectural.
- 5,17 **ΤΕΤῸΜΕΥ**: Lit. "that one." The translation assumes that
 this is a reference back to οὐσία in lines 11-13. διακρίνειν: The
 term translated here "deliberate" also includes the connotation
 of "distinguishing" between the various levels of reality, as the
 following passage indicates. Cf. *Allogenes* XI 50,13 where the
 Coptic word ΠΩΡΞ is used.
- 5,18-19 **ΠΑΙΣΘΗΤΟΣ ΚΟΣΜΟΣ**: The "sense-perceptible world" is
 the world of materiality, viewed in Middle-Platonism as an
 "imitation" (μιμημα) of the "intelligible world." See e.g. Philo
Op. Mund. 25; "heaven" (οὐρανός) is the "boundary" (ἄρος)
 of the sense-perceptible world, *Op. Mund.* 37. Cf. note to 4,6-7.

- ΝΤΟΥΣΙΑ ΝΑΤΣΩΜΑ· ΑΥΩ
 22 ΠΝΟΗΤΟΣ ΚΟΣΜΟΣ Α<ΖΙ>
 ΣΟΥΩΝῆ <ΑΖΙΣΑΥΝΕ> Ζῆ ΠΤΡ<Α>ΡΔΙ
 24 ΑΚΡΙΝΕ· ΧΕ ΠΑΝΤΩΣ ΠΙΔΙ
 ΣΘΗΤΟΣ ΚΟΣΜΟΣ ΚΜ[ΠΨΑ]
 26 ΑΤΡΕΦΟΥΧΕΕΙ [ΤΗ]Ρῆ [ΧΕ]
 ΜΠΙΛΟ ΕΕΙΨΕΧ[Ε ΑΠΑΥ]
 28 ΤΟΥΓΕΝΗΣ· Ψ[
 [...]]ΨΩΠ[Ε

<5>

- ΚΑΤ[Α] ΜΕΡΟΣ ΜΠΜΑ ΤΗΡῆ
 2 ΑΦΙ ΑΠΙΤῆ ΠΑΛΙΝ ΑΦΙ ΑΠΙ
 Τῆ <ΑΒΑΛ> Ζῆ ΠΕΤΕ ΜΠΟΥΧΠΑῆ
 4 ΕΜῆΤΕῆ ΟΥΣΙΑ ΜΜΕΥ Ε
 Τῆ ΠΠΝᾶ [Π]Ε· ΠΕΕΙ ΕΤΩΟ

-
- 5,21-22 Cf. note to 3,8-9.
 5,22 One would expect ΠΝΟΗΤΟΣ ΝΚΟΣΜΟΣ; but cf. also 41*,5.
 Α<ΖΙ>: MS. reads ΑΨ-, "he."
 5,23 MS. reads ΠΤΡΕΦῆ-, "he." In support of the emendation
 cf. 5,17.
 5,24-26 This is a remarkable statement for a gnostic text, and reflects
 an attenuation of the radical dualism of early Gnosticism; for
 discussion see Pearson, "The Tractate Marsanes." That the
 sense-perceptible world is capable of "salvation" is a doctrine
 whose background is to be found in Platonic philosophy, and
 one Platonic theory that the purpose of the soul's descent into
 the material world is "for the perfection of the All" (εις τελειωσιν
 τοῦ παντός). See e.g. Calvisius Taurus, *apud* Stob. I.378,25 ff.
 (Wachsmuth ed.) and cf. Plat. *Tim.* 41A-42A. For discussion
 see e.g. Kübel, *Schuld und Schicksal*, pp. 15-27. The Platonic
 theory in *Tim.* 41A-42A includes reference to the demiurgic
 activity of the lesser gods. In *Marsanes* this salvific demiurgic
 activity is attributed esp. to the "Self-begotten One." See
 5,27-6,16 and notes.
 5,27-6,16 The "salvation" of the lower world is attributed to the descent
 of the "Self-begotten One" from the higher realm of the
 Unbegotten, non-being Spirit.

- of the incorporeal (-σῶμα) being (οὐσία), and
 22 <I> have come to know the intelligible (νοητός) world
 (κόσμος).
 <I have come to know>, when <I> was deliberating
 (διακρίνειν),
 24 that in every respect (πάντως) the sense-perceptible
 (αἰσθητός) world (κόσμος) is [worthy]
 26 of being saved entirely. [For]
 I have not ceased speaking [of the]
 28 Self-begotten (αὐτογενής) One, O [
 [] became [

<6>

- part by part (κατὰ μέρος) the entire place.
 2 He descended; again (πάλιν) he descended
 <from> the Unbegotten One
 4 who does not have being (οὐσία), who
 is the Spirit (πνεῦμα). That one who exists

-
- 5,27-28 "the Self-begotten One": Cf. 3,26-28 and note. For an understanding of the role of this divine personage one should compare what is said of his counterpart ("Autogenes") in *Allogenes* XI 46,11; 51,26; 58,12. But whereas Autogenes in that tractate seems to be included in the "Aeon of Barbelo," in Marsanes he seems to be more intimately related to the "Three-Powered One," as the "third Power"; see 8,18-20 and cf. 3,26-28. Autogenes is credited with a demiurgic role in *Ap. John* II 7,10-8,28 and *Gos. Eg.* III 50,17-25, and with a role in eschatological revelation in *Gos. Eg.* ("by the will of the divine Autogenes," III 68,15-16); these mythological details are part of the assumed background in *Marsanes*. For further discussion see tractate introduction.
- 5,28 The transcription and translation presuppose a vocative address here. Cf. 10,12-13.
- 6,1 Cf. 6,20-23.
- 6,2 The subject is the "self-begotten One"; cf. 5,28.
- 6,3 ΠΕΤΕ ΜΠΟΥΧΠΑΩ = ὁ ἀγέννητος. Cf. notes to 3,19 and 4,15. In *Marsanes* the "unbegotten" level is superior to the "self-begotten."
- 6,4 Cf. notes to 5,2-3 and 5,14.
- 6,5 "the Spirit": cf. 4,17; 9,29; 10,19.

6 [ΟΠ Ζ]ΑΤΟΥΖΗ ΤΗΡΟΥ ΕΦΗΗΖ
 [ΑΧΝ ΠΑ]ΥΤΟΓΕΝΝΗΤΟΣ Ν
 8 [ΝΟΥΤ]Ε· ΠΕΕΙ ΕΥΝΤΕΦ
 [ΟΥΣΙΑ] ΝΜΕΥ ΦΜΟΥΦ<Τ> Ν
 10 [.....] ΑΥΩ ΦΦΟΦΗ Ν
 [..... ΑΥ]Ω ΕΦΤΗΤΗ
 12 [± 8] ΑΥΩ ΑΒΑΛ [[± 10] ΕΥΠΩΡΧ
 14 [.....]ΩΖ[.] ΑΖΙΨΩ[ΠΕ]
 [....]. ΝΖΑΖ ΕΦΒΑΛΠ ΑΒΑ[Λ]
 16 ΧΕ ΑΦΤΟΥΧΕ ΟΥΜΗΨ[Ε]
 ΜΝΝΣΑ ΝΕΕΙ ΔΕ ΤΗΡΟΥ
 18 ΕΙΨΙΝΕ ΝΣΑ ΤΜΗΤΡΟ
 ΝΠΑ ΤΨΑΜΤΕ ΝΒΑΜ ΕΜΝ

-
- 6,5-6 "That One who exists before all of them": This is doubtless a reference to the supreme unknown God. Cf. e.g. *Steles Seth* 124,18-21: ΠΗ ΕΤΡ ΨΡΠ ΝΨΟΟΠ ΟΝΤΩΣ ΕΦΨΟΟΠ ΟΝΤΩΣ· ΕΦΨΟΟΠ ΠΙΨΟΡΠ ΝΨΑ ΕΝΕΖ, "the really Preexistent One really existing, being the first eternal One."
- 6,7-8 "The divine Self-engendered One" is probably to be identified with "the Self-begotten One" mentioned at 5,27-28. αὐτο-γέννητος (also at 3,19) and αὐτογενής (3,26; 5,27-28) are virtually synonymous.
- 6,8-9 In Platonic thought the realm of "being" (τὸ ὄν) is the "intelligible" (νοητός) realm. Cf. note to 3,8-9.
- 6,11 Corr. The second Ν over Α.
- 6,14-15 There may be a reference here to Marsanes' saving-prophetic role. Cf. the role attributed to Zostrianos in *Zost.*; for discussion see tractate introduction.
- 6,15-16 Three interpretations are possible: 1) The clause ΕΦΒΑΛΠ . . . ΟΥΜΗΨΕ may be taken as a scribal gloss, and translated, "he (Marsanes) is showing that he has saved a multitude." 2) The statement refers to the salvific role of the Unbegotten One; cf. 5,24-28 and notes. 3) The verbs are to be emended to Ε<Ι>ΒΑΛΠ and Α<ΖΙ>ΤΟΥΧΕ, and the passage translated, "[I] am showing that [I] have saved a multitude." Cf. note to 6,14-15.
- 6,17-28 Cf. *Allogenes* XI 56,15-58,26; *Zost.* VIII 128,19-25.
- 6,18 "seeking the kingdom": Cf. Matt 6:33.
- 6,19 ΠΑ ΤΨΑΜΤΕ ΝΒΑΜ: Cf. 7,17-18.23-24.27-28; 8,5.11.19-20; 9,8-9.20-21.25; 15*,1-2. According to Coptic grammar the normal literal translation of this phrase is, "the one belonging to (that which belongs to) the three powers," but in *Marsanes*

- 6 before all of them reaches
 [to the divine] Self-engendered One (αὐτογέννητος).
 8 The one having
 [being (οὐσία)] searches
 10 [] and he exists
 [] and] he is like
 12 [] and from
 [] dividing
 14 [] I became
 [] for many, as it is manifest
 16 that he saved a multitude.
 But (δέ) after all of these things
 18 I am seeking the kingdom
 of the Three-Powered One,

it clearly means "the one who possesses three powers." Cf. 4,15-16: ΠΕΤΕ ΟΥΝΤΕQ ΨΑΜΝΤΕ ΠΑΥΝΑΜΙC, "the . . . One who possesses three powers"; also 10,9-11; 14*,23-24. Perhaps one should see behind the Coptic text an ambiguous Greek phrase, such as ὁ τῶν τριῶν δυνάμεων, wherein the genitive case admits of either a "subjective" or "objective" meaning. The phrase used here occurs also in the BG version of *Ap. John*, where it applies to Barbelo: "She became a First Man, that is, the virginal spirit, the triple male, the one with the three powers (ΠΑ ΤΨΟΜΤΕ ΝΘΟΜ), the three names, the three begettings . . ."; BG 27,19-28,2. In *Marsanes* "the Three-Powered One" is a divine entity above Barbelo, but apparently below (or somehow distinct from) the Unknown Supreme God; cf. esp. 15*,1-2. "The Three-Powered One" in *Marsanes* has an exact counterpart in *Allogenes*, under the name ΠΙΨΜΝΤ-ΘΟΜ, "the Triple Power"; XI 45,13 *et passim*. The Greek equivalent τριδύναμος occurs not only in gnostic texts—in the Coptic text of the Bruce and Askew Codices (in both of which the term τριδύναμις also occurs), and in Hippolytus' description of the Peratic gnostic system, *Ref. V.12*—but also in late Platonist writers. Unfortunately there is no agreement in the literature as to how the designation "triple-powered" or "triple-powerful" is used. E.g. it can be used of the supreme God, as in *Steles Seth* 121,31-32; of Barbelo, as in *Steles Seth* 121,32-33 and *Ap. John* II 5,8 (cf. BG 27,21-28,1); of Monogenes = Christ in Cod. Bruc. *Untitled* ch. 4 *et passim*; of Christ in the Peratic system described by Hipp. *Ref. V.12* (τριφυῆς . . . τρισάματος . . . τριδύναμος ἄνθρωπος); of the "self-willed" Authades and other hostile powers in *Pist. Soph.* ch. 29 *et*

20 ΤΕΣ ΖΟΥΕΙΤΕ ΗΜΕΥ· ΑΒΑΛ
 ΤΟΝ ΑΦΟΥΩΝΖ ΑΒΑΛ ΑΥΩ
 22 ΑΦΡΕΝΕΡΓΕΙ· ΑΜΟΥΖ Η
 ΠΜΑ ΤΗΡῬ ΖΝ ΤΕΦΒΑΜ· ΑΥΩ
 24 ΕΨ ΤΕ ΘΕ ΝΑΤΟΥΧΠΑΥ ΑΖΟΥ
 [Ψ]ΩΠΕ ΕΝΠΟΥΧΠΑΥ· ΑΥΩ
 26 [Ε]Ψ ΝΕ [Ν]ΔΙΑΦΟΡΑ ΗΝΑΙ
 [ΩΝ· ΑΥ]Ω ΝΕΤΕ ΗΠΟΥΧΠΑΥ
 28 [ΕΥΨΟΟΠ] ΗΟΥΗΡ· ΑΥΩ ΖΝ ΕΥ
 [ΕΥΨΒΒΕΙΑ]ΕΙΤ ΑΝΟΥΕΡΗΥ

<Σ>

ΗΤΑΡΙΖΑΤΤΖΤ ΣΑ ΝΕΕΙ Α
 2 ΖΙΗΜΕ ΧΕ ΗΤΑΦΡΕΝΕΡΓΙ
 ΑΒΑΛ ΖΗ ΟΥΚΑΡΩΦ· ΦΨΟΟ[Π]
 4 ΧΙΝ ΗΨΑΡΠΗ ΗΝΕΤΨΟΟΠ
 ΜΑΜΗΕ ΕΤΗΠ ΑΠΕΤΨΟ
 6 ΟΠ· ΚΕΟΥΕΕ ΠΕ ΕΦΨΟΟ[Π]
 ΧΙΝ ΗΨΑΡΠΗ ΕΦΗΠ Α[Π]ΕΤῬ
 8 ΕΝΕΡΓΕΙ· ΗΠΕΤΚ[ΑΡΑ]ΕΙΤ
 ΑΥΩ ΠΚΑΡΩΦ Η[
 10 ΗΣΩΦ ΦΡΕΝΕΡΓ[ΕΙ· ΟΥ]

passim; and of various miscellaneous divine entities in all of the tractates of the Bruce and Askew Codices. The Neo-Platonist Hierocles uses the term τριδύναμος of the human soul; *Carm. Aur.* (Mullach, *Fragmenta Philosophorum Graecorum* I), col. 462. Marius Victorinus, probably under the influence of Porphyry, uses the term of God, in a sense which comes very close to the meaning in *Marsanes*: "Τριδύναμος est deus, id est tres potentias habens, esse, vivere, intellegere . . ." *Adv. Arium* IV.21 (cf. "tripotens," I.50). It is possible that the Gnostics borrowed the term from Middle-Platonist sources; or vice versa. For further discussion see tractate introduction.

6,20-29 Questions of a similar nature occur at the beginning of *Zostrianos* at VIII 2,24-3,13. Cf. the philosophical questions attributed to Moses by Philo, *Op. Mund.* 54.

6,20 Perhaps before ΑΒΑΛ one should read: <ΠΑΧΕΕΙ ΧΕ>, "I said."

6,22 Corr. A Υ was written in the MS. between Ῥ and ε in ΑΦΡΕ-ΝΕΡΓΕΙ, then cancelled with three superlinear dots and crossed out with two diagonal strokes. On the ἐνέργεια of the Three-Powered One see 7,2-3 and note.

- 20 which has no beginning. Whence
 did he appear and
 22 act (ἐνεργεῖν) to fill the
 entire place with his power? And
 24 in what way did the unbegotten ones
 come into existence, since they were not begotten? And
 26 what are [the] differences (διαφορά) among the [aeons
 (αἰών)?]
 [And] as for those who are unbegotten,
 28 how many [are they]? And in what respect
 [do they differ] from each other?

<7>

- When I had inquired about these things
 2 I perceived that he had worked (ἐνεργεῖν)
 from silence. He exists
 4 from the beginning among those that
 truly exist, that belong to the One who
 6 exists. There is another, existing
 from the beginning, belonging to the One who
 8 works within (ἐνεργεῖν) the Silent One.
 And the silence [
 10 him works (ἐνεργεῖν),

6,22-23 "to fill the entire place": Cf. Eph 4:10.

6,24 ΝΑΤΟΥΧΠΑΥ = ΝΕΤΕ ΜΠΟΥΧΠΑΥ (6,27) = ΝΕΤΟΕΙ
 ΝΑΤΧΠΑΥ (5,3-4). On ΑΤΟΥΧΠΑ see note to 4,19.

7,1 Corr. ρ over ζ. The form ΖΑΤΤΖΤ, with double τ, is hitherto
 unattested.

7,2-19 The activity (ἐνέργεια) of the Three-Powered One is to be
 understood as rooted in the silence of the unknown, silent
 supreme God; indeed it appears that the Triple-Powered One
 is defined as "the energy of that One" (7,16-17) whose realm
 is silence. Cf. *Allogenes* 53,9-31. According to Plotinus the soul
 (ψυχή) is the "activity" (ἐνέργεια) of the Mind (νοῦς). In similar
 fashion the Triple Powered One is here regarded as the ἐνέργεια
 of the Unknown Supreme God. Plotinus also states that the
 One (his Supreme God) is his own ἐνέργεια (*Enn.* VI.8.12); in
Marsanes the Three-Powered One, as the ἐνέργεια of the
 Supreme God, seems to be seen as a separate hypostasis. For
 further discussion see tractate introduction.

7,6 One would expect ΟΥΝ ΚΕΟΥΕΕ. Perhaps the text should
 be emended accordingly.

CON ΓΑΡ ΠΕ ΠΑ[
 12 ΠΗ ΡΕ[ΝΕΡΓΕΙ ΑΒΑΛ ΖΜ]
 ΠΚΑΡ[ΩΦ ΕΤΗΠ ΑΠΑΤΟΥ]
 14 ΧΠΑΦ ΖΝ [ΝΑ]ΙΩ[Ν ΑΥΩ ΧΙΝ]
 ΝΨΑΡΠ ΜΝΤΕΦ Ο[ΥΣΙΑ]
 16 ΗΜΕΥ· ΤΕΝΕΡΓΕΙΑ ΔΕ Μ
 ΠΗ <ΠΕ> ΠΑ ΤΨΑΜΝΤΕ ΝΔΥΝ[Α]
 18 ΜΙΣ ΠΑΤΟΥΧΠΑΦ ΖΑΤΕ[ΖΗ]
 ΗΠΑΙΩΝ· ΕΜΝΤΕΦ ΟΥ[ΣΙΑ]
 20 ΗΜΕΥ· ΠΧΙΣΕ ΔΕ ΜΠΑ
 ΡΩΦ ΗΠΕΤΚΑΡΑΕΙΤ· ΟΥΝ
 22 ΒΑΜ ΑΝΕΥ ΑΡΑΦ· ΝΒΙ ΠΧΙ
 ΣΕ ΝΤΕΝΕΡΓΕΙΑ ΗΠΑ ΤΨΑ
 24 ΜΝΤΤΕ ΝΒΑΜ· ΑΥΩ ΠΕ
 ΤΨΟΟΠ ΕΤΚΑΡΑΕΙΤ [ΕΤΗ]
 26 ΠΣΑΖΡΕ ΝΤΗ[Ε
 ΑΦΟΥΩΝΖ ΑΒ[ΑΛ ΗΠΑ ΤΨΑ]
 28 ΜΝΤΕ ΝΒ[ΑΜ ΠΨΑΡΠ ΝΤΕ]
 ΛΕΙΟΣ· ΝΤΑ[ΡΕΦ

<Η>

ΑΝΔΥΝΑΜΙΣ ΑΥΤΕΛΗΛ
 2 ΑΖΟΥΧΩΚ ΑΒΑΛ· <ΝΒΙ> ΝΕΤΨΟΟΠ
 ΝΖΡΗΙ ΝΖΗΤ ΜΝ ΠΚΕΣΕΕ
 4 ΠΕ ΤΗΡΦ· ΑΥΩ ΑΖΟΥΣΜΟΥ
 ΤΗΡΟΥ ΑΠ[Α] ΤΨΑΜΤΕ ΝΒΑΜ

-
- 7,11 "brother": This is a very uncertain rendering, for the form is S rather than the expected A³ form **CAN**. See the grammatical discussion in the Codex introduction.
- 7,13-14 **ΠΑΤΟΥΧΠΑΦ**: Cf. 7,18 and note to 4,19.
- 7,15-16 Cf. note to 5,2-3.
- 7,18 Perhaps <ΠΕΤΨΟΟΠ> should be added before **ΖΑΤΕΖΗ**, "the one who exists before . . ." Cf. 6,5-6 and note; 8,9-10.
- 7,22 Either something has been omitted before **ΝΒΙ** or **ΝΒΙ** must be translated (anomalously) in the sense of **ΕΤΕ ΠΕΕΙ ΠΕ**.
- 7,24-29 That the supreme, silent God should "reveal" the Three-Powered One seems to imply a reversal of roles! But cf. the following passage from Cod. Bruc. *Untitled*, ch. 7: "The Father exists, surpassing every perfection. He has revealed the invisible triple-powered, perfect one." For discussion see tractate introduction and Pearson, "The Tractate Marsanes," p. 376. Cf. also *Allogenes* XI 61,19-20, where the Unknown God is

- for (γάρ) the [] is [a] brother.
 12 That one [works (ἐνεργεῖν) from]
 the [silence which belongs to the Un-]
 14 begotten One among [the aeons (αἰών), and from]
 the beginning he does not have [being (οὐσία)].
 16 But (δέ) the energy (ἐνέργεια) of
 that One <is> the Three-Powered (δύναμις) One,
 18 the One unbegotten [before]
 the Aeon (αἰών), not having [being (οὐσία)],
 20 And (δέ) it is possible to behold the supremacy of the
 silence of the Silent One,
 22 < . . . > i.e. the supremacy
 of the energy (ἐνέργεια) of the Three-
 24 Powered. And the One who
 exists, who is silent, [who is]
 26 above the [heaven
 revealed [the Three-]
 28 [Powered, First-]
 Perfect (τέλειος) One. [When he

<8>

- to the powers (δύναμις), they rejoiced.
 2 Those that are within me were perfected
 together with all the
 4 rest. And they all blessed
 the Three-Powered,

-
- 7,28-29 called the "Mediator of the Triple Power."
 8,1 ΠΩΡΠ ΠΤΕΛΕΙΟΣ: Cf. 8,7.
 Or: "the powers rejoiced." In that case the λ in ΔΝΔΥΝΑΜΙC
 is not a preposition but a First Perfect prefix, which is resumed
 in ΔΥΤΕΛΗΛ. The "powers" referred to here are probably
 angelic or divine beings, as in *Corp. Herm.* I.7,26,27,31.
 8,2 Part of the final π is now broken off from the MS., but it is
 completely attested in an early photograph.
 8,2-3 "Those that are within me": This phrase may refer to the inner
 faculties of Marsanes' soul. Cf. e.g., Ps 102 (103):1, πάντα τὰ
 ἐντός μου; and *Corp. Herm.* I.30-31. But it may, by implication,
 refer to the gnostic adherents of the prophet-savior Marsanes.
 Cf. 3,16 and note.
 8,4-12 The offering up of hymns of praise to God is characteristic of
 gnostic and Hermetic piety. Cf. e.g. *Steles Seth* VII,5 (*passim*);
Corp. Herm. I.30-31.

- 6 ΝΟΥΕΕΙ ΟΥΕΕΙ· ΕΤΕ ΠΕΕΙ
 ΠΕ [Π]ΨΑΡΠ̄ ΝΤΕΛΕΙΟΣ· ΕΥ
 8 [CMOY AP]ΑQ 2N ΟΥΤΟΥΒΟ· ΠΜΑ
 [ΤΗΡ῀] ΕΥCΜΟΥ ΑΠΧΑΕΙC Π[Η]
 10 [ΕΤΨΟΟΠ] 2ΑΤΕ2Η ΜΠΤΗΡ῀
 [...] ΠΑ Τ]ΨΑΜΤΕ ΝΒΑΜ· Μ
 12 [± ΙΙ]ΝΟΥΨΜ
 [ΨΕ ± ΙΟ] 2ΩΩΤ
 14 [ΑΥΩ †ΝΑΟΥ]Ψ2 [ΑΝ] 2ΤΟΟΤ
 [ΕΕΙΨΙ]ΝΕ ΧΕ ΠΨϚ Α2ΟΥΚΑ
 16 ΡΩΟΥ· †ΝΑΡ̄ΝΟΕΙ ΝΟΥΔΥ
 ΝΑΜΙC ΕῩΝΤΗΕΙC ΜΜΕ[Υ]
 18 [2N] ΟΥΤΑΕΙΟ· ΤΜΑ2ΨΑΜΤΕ
 [N]ΒΑΜ ΝΤΕ ΠΑ ΤΨΑΜΤΕ Ν
 20 ΒΑΜ· ΕΑCΡ̄ΝΟΕΙ ΜΜΑQ· {ΑΥΩ}
 ΠΑΧΕC ΝΗΕΙ ΧΕ ΚΑΡΩΚ·
 22 ΨΙΝΑ ΧΕ ΝΕΚΜ̄ΜΕ ΝΚΠΩΤ
 ΝΚΕΙ Α2ΡΗΙ ΨΑΡΑΕΙ· ΑΛΛΑ
 24 ΕΡΙΝΟΕΙ ΜΠΕΕΙ ΧΕ ΝΕQΚΑ
 [ΡΑΕ]ΙΤ· ΝΚQΙ ΜΠΝΟΗΜΑ·
 26 [ΤΑΔΥΝΑΜΙC Γ]ΑΡ CΜΗΝ ΑΒΑΛ
 [ΑΡΑΙ ΕCΧΙ Μ]ΑΕΙΤ 2ΗΤ· Α2Ο[ΥΝ]

-
- 8,8 Corr. 2 over 1 (or the first stroke of a N).
 8,9 "The Lord" evidently = "The Three-Powered One."
 8,11 Perhaps [NΒΙ ΠΑ Τ]ΨΑΜΤΕ ΝΒΑΜ, in which case ΝΒΙ was used in the same way as is possibly the case in 7,22 (see note), i.e., as equivalent to ΕΤΕ ΠΕΕΙ ΠΕ. Or perhaps read [ΑΥΩ at the beginning of the line; ΑΥΩ would then be understood as translating an epexegetical καὶ in the Greek original.
 8,12-13 Perhaps 2]N ΟΥΨΜ/ΨΕ, "with worship."
 8,14 For the reconstruction †ΝΑ- cf. 8,16. But perhaps one should read: [ΑΥΩ Α2ΙΟΥ]Ψ2, "and I went on . . ."
 8,15-16 "they had become silent": Silence is an important part of gnostic and hermetic praise and meditation. Cf. e.g. *Disc. 8-9 VI,6 (passim)*, where silence alternates with the singing of hymns.
 8,18-19 The "third power" may be a reference to the Self-begotten One (Autogenes). Cf. 3,26-28; 5,27-28; 9,19-21; and notes.
 8,19 Corr. 2T over M.
 8,20 Perhaps ΜΜα<ΕΙ>, "me." The second superlin. stroke on

- 6 one by one, who
 is [the] First-Perfect (τέλειος) One,
 8 [blessing] him in purity, [every]where
 praising the Lord
 10 [who exists] before the All,
 [the] Three-Powered.
 12 [] their worship
 [] myself,
 14 [and I will still go on]
 [inquiring] how (πῶς) they had
 16 become silent. I will understand (νοεῖν) a
 power (δύναμις) which I hold
 18 in honor. The third
 power of the Three-Powered,
 20 when it (fem.) had perceived (νοεῖν) him,
 said to me, "Be silent
 22 in order that (ἵνα) you might {not} know; run,
 and come before me. But (ἀλλά)
 24 know (νοεῖν) that this One was
 [silent], and obtain understanding (νόημα)."
 26 For (γάρ) [the power (δύναμις)] is attending
 [to me, leading] me into

-
- ΜΜΔϞ is superfluous. ΔΥΩ is superfluous and disturbs the syntax.
- 8,21 Silence is a prerequisite for higher revelation: Cf. e.g. *Allogenes* XI 60,13-18. Cf. also 55*,17ff.
- 8,22 The translation assumes that the negative Third Future form ΝΕΚ- is a mistake for a positive form, ΕΚΛ-. On the other hand the text may be correct as it stands, thus stating that Marsanes *cannot* and *must not* know the supreme God. Cf. *Allogenes* XI 60,8-12.
- 8,23 Corr. Ϙ over λ in ΔΖΡΗΙ.
- 8,23-25 Knowledge of the supreme God is really knowledge of his "silence" and unknowability. Cf. *Allogenes* XI 59,4-67,35.
- 8,26-28 Marsanes is reaching a stage in his contemplative ascent comparable to that of Allogenes in *Allogenes* XI 58,7-59,3. The "Aeon which is Barbelo" (cf. "Aeon of Barbelo," *Allogenes* XI 59,3) is apparently to be understood as a hypostatization of the knowledge—or self-knowledge—of the Unknown Supreme God, or, perhaps, of the Three-Powered One. Cf. 9,3-4 and note.
- 8,26 "the power": Cf. 8,18-19 and note.

28 [ΑΠΑΙΩΝ ΕΤΕ Β]ΑΡΒΗΛΩ ΤΕ
[ΤΠΑΡΘΕΝΟΣ] ΗΖΑΥΤ

<Θ>

ΕΤΒΕ ΠΕΕΙ ΑΣΨΩΠΕ Ν
2 ΖΑΥΤ ΝΒΙ ΤΠΑΡΘΕΝΟΣ
ΧΕ ΑΣΠΩΡΧ ΑΦΑΥΤ ΑΣΩΖΕ
4 ΑΡΕΤ'Ε' ΗΠΕΦΒΑΛ ΝΒΙ ΤΕ
ΓΝΩΣΙΣ ΖΩΣ ΕΣΗΠ ΑΡΑΦ
6 ΤΕΤΨΟΟΠ ΔΕ ΤΕΝΤΑΖΨ[Ι]
ΝΕ ΟΥ<Ν> ΤΕΣ ΗΜΕΥ ΝΘΕ Ε
8 ΟΥΝΤΕΦ ΗΜΕΥ ΝΒΙ ΠΑ [ΤΨΑΜ]
ΤΕ ΝΒΑΜ ΑΣΡΑΝΑΧΦ[ΡΕΙ]
10 ΝΤΟΟΤΟΥ ΝΤΕΦ[ΙΒΑΜ]
ΣΗΤΕ ΕΣΨΟΦΗ [ΗΠΒΑΛ]
12 [Η]ΠΙΝΑΒ ΕΣΝ[± 7 Ε]
ΤΗΠΣΑΖΡΕ Η[
14 ΟΣ ΕΤΚΑΡΑΕΙ[Τ ΕΥΗΤΕΦ]
ΗΜΕΥ ΝΤΕΕ[Ι]ΕΝ[ΤΟΛΗ]
16 [Α]ΤΡΕΦΚΑΡΩΦ ΤΕΦ[Γ]ΗΨ
[Σ]ΙΣ ΜΗ ΤΕΦΖΥΠΟΣΤ[ΑΣ]ΙΣ
18 ΗΗ ΤΕΦΕΝΕΡΓΕΙΑ Η[ΕΕΙ]

- 8,28 Part of the final Ε is now broken off from the MS.; it is more fully attested in an early photograph.
- 8,28-29 "Barbelo the male Virgin": Cf. 4,11 and note.
- 9,1-3 In gnostic thought "becoming male" is a metaphor of salvation, in the sense of reintegration. This idea is widely attested esp. in Valentinian Gnosticism; see e.g. *Exc. Theod.* 21.1-3; 79; Heracleon fr. 5; and the same notion is found in *Gos. Thom.* 114. This idea is derived ultimately from speculation on Gen 1:27 and 2:21-23; cf. *Gos. Phil.* II 70,9-22. In this passage the myth of the emanation of Barbelo from the supreme God "Man" is reflected; cf. esp. *Ap. John* II 4,26-5,11. "Becoming male," and theories of "masculinity" and "femininity" comparable to the gnostic ones, occur in the philosophy of Philo of Alexandria. See e.g. *Quaest. in Ex.* I.8; *Quaest. in Gen.* II.49; for discussion see Baer, *Male and Female*, pp. 45-80.
- 9,3-5 Barbelo is a mythicization of the knowledge of God; cf. *Zost.* VIII 118,10-12; *Steles Seth* VII 123,15-17; *Iren. Haer.* I.29.1; *Ap. John* II 4,26-5,11.
- 9,4 MS. reads ΑΡΕΤΦ, with C written above Φ, which is not cancelled.
- 9,7 Perhaps there is something missing from the text after ΗΜΕΥ, i.e., an object of the verb.

- 28 [the Aeon (αίων) which] is Barbelo,
[the] male [Virgin (παρθένος)].

<9>

For this reason the

- 2 Virgin (παρθένος) became male,
because she had been divided from the male. The
4 Knowledge (γνώσις) stood outside of him,
because (ὡς) it belongs to him.
6 And (δέ) she who exists, she who sought,
possesses (it), just as
8 the Three-Powered One possesses.
She withdrew (ἀναχωρεῖν)
10 from them, from [these] two [powers],
since she exists [outside of]
12 the Great One, as she [
who is above [
14 who is silent, [who has]
this [commandment (ἐντολή)]
16 to be silent. His knowledge (γνώσις)
and his hypostasis (ὑπόστασις)
18 and his activity (ἐνεργεία)

-
- 9,8 Corr. **q** over **c**.
- 9,8-12 Gnostic salvation involves withdrawal into the self; cf. 9,21-22.
Barbelo's experience is paradigmatic, although it is not clear
from this passage exactly what Barbelo is withdrawing *from*.
- 9,11 **ΜΠΒΔΛ**: The reconstruction is based on what is said in 9,4.
But perhaps one should read [**ΝΖΟΥΝ**], "within," if the
context deals with reintegration.
- 9,12 "the Great One": Presumably a reference to the supreme God.
Cf. 1,23 and note.
- 9,15-16 Cf. 8,21.
- 9,16-18 It is possible that the knowledge (γνώσις), hypostasis (ὑπόστα-
σις), and activity (ἐνεργεία) of God are meant to constitute a
triad comparable to the triad of Existence (ὑπαρξίς), Life
(ΩΝΖ = ζωή), and Mind (νοῦς) in *Stiles Seth* VII 125,28-32;
of Existence (ὑπαρξίς), Knowledge (COOYN = γνώσις), and
Life (ΩΝΖ = ζωή) in *Zost.* VIII 15,2-12; or of Existence
(ΠΗ ΕΤΕ ΠΔΙ ΠΕ, etc. = τὸ ὄν), Life (ΩΝΖ = ζωή), and
Mentality (ΤΜΝΤΕΙΜΕ = νόησις) in *Allogenes* XI 49,28-38.
Such triads belong to a Platonic philosophical background.
Cf. e.g. the triad of τὸ ὄν, ζωή, and νοῦς in Proclus *Theology*,
prop. 103; cf. also note to 6,19. For discussion, with further
references, see the tractate introduction.

ΝΕ ΝΤΑΣΧΟΟΥ ΝΘΙ Τ[ΔΥ]
 20 ΝΑΜΙΣ ΝΠΑ ΤΨΑΜΤ[Ε Ν]
 ΒΑΜ· <ΧΕ> ΑΝΑΝ ΤΗΡΝ ΑΝ[ΡΑ]
 22 ΝΑΧΩΡΙ ΝΕΝ· ΑΖΝ[ΨΩ]
 ΠΕ ΕΝΚΑΡΑΕ[ΙΤ ΑΥΩ Ν]
 24 ΤΑΡΝΣΟΥΦΝ[Ψ ΕΤΕ ΠΕΕΙ ΠΕ]
 ΠΑ ΤΨΑΜ[ΤΕ ΝΒΑΜ ΑΖΝ]
 26 ΠΑΖΤΝ ΑΖΝ[..... ΑΖΝ]
 [C]ΜΟΥ ΑΡΑΦ[
 28 ΑΧΩΝ Ν[
 ΑΒΑΛ· Π[..... ΠΕΠΝΑ]

<I>

ΝΑΖΟΡΑΤΟΝ ΑΦΠΩΤ ΑΖΡΗ
 2 Ι ΑΠΕΦΤΟΠΟΣ· ΑΠΜΑ ΤΗΡΨ
 ΒΩΛΠ ΑΒΑΛ· ΑΠΜΑ ΤΗΡΨ ΒΨ[Λ]
 4 ΑΒΑΛ· ΨΑ<ΝΤ> ΦΜΕΕΤΕ ΑΠCΑ[ΖΡΕ]
 ΠΑΛΙΝ ΑΦΙ ΑΒΑΛ ΑΦΤΡΕΠΜ[Α]
 6 [Τ]ΗΡΨ Ρ ΟΥΑΕΙΝ· ΑΥΩ ΑΠΜΑ
 [ΤΗ]ΡΨ Ρ ΟΥΑΕΙΝ· ΑΥΩ ΑΥ† ΝΗ
 8 [ΤΝ Ν]ΠΟΥΩΝ ΝΨΑΜΝΤ Ν
 [ΠΕΠΝΑ] ΝΤΔΥΝΑΜΙC ΝΠΕ
 10 [ΤΕ ΟΥΝΤ]ΕΦ ΝΜΕΥ ΝΤΨΑ
 [ΜΤΕ ΝΒΑΜ· ΟΥ]ΜΑΚΑΡΙΟΝ Π[Ε]
 12 [..... ΠΑ]ΧΕΦ ΧΕ Ω ΝΗ
 [ΕΤΨΟΟΠ ΖΝ Ν]ΕΕΙΜΑ· ΖΑΨ

-
- 9,17 ὑπόστασις: The meaning here is "reality." Cf. H. Koester on ὑπόστασις, *TDNT* VIII, pp. 575-577. Cf. also *Allogenes* XI 48,36.
 9,18 Cf. note to 7,2-19; also *Allogenes* XI 48,35.
 9,19 "the power": Cf. 8,26; 8,18-19 and note.
 9,21-22 ΑΝΡΑΝΑΧΩΡΙ: The S prefix ΑΝ- is used here, instead of Α² ΑΖΝ-, as in 9,22. On "withdrawal" cf. note to 9,8-12 and *Allogenes* XI 59,14.19.36; 60,19.
 9,24 For the restoration cf. 8,6-7.
 9,25-27 Cf. 8,4-12 and note.
 9,29 For the restoration cf. 10,19-20.
 9,29-10,7 This passage, which concludes an account of a visionary experience, portrays the retreat of the Three-Powered Invisible Spirit to his proper transcendent "place," and what remains in view is impenetrable light. Cf. the opening words of a Syriac Valentinian hymn preserved by Epiphanius, *Haer.* 36.6.10: "That Celestial Light came to be in every place . . ."; see Newbold, "A Syriac Valentinian Hymn," p. 4, for text and translation.

- are those things of which the power (δύναμις)
 20 of the Three-Powered spoke, <saying>,
 "We all have
 22 withdrawn (ἀναχωρεῖν) to ourselves. We have [become]
 silent, [and]
 24 when we came to know [him, that is,]
 the Three-Powered, [we]
 26 bowed down; we [; we]
 blessed him [
 28 upon us." []
 . . . [the] invisible (ἀόρατον) [Spirit (πνεῦμα)]

<10>

- ran up
 2 to his place (τόπος). The whole place
 was revealed; the whole place unfolded
 4 <until> he reached the upper region.
 Again (πάλιν) he departed; he caused the
 6 whole place to be illuminated, and the whole
 place was illuminated. And [you] (pl.) have been given
 8 the third part of
 [the spirit (πνεῦμα)] of the power (δύναμις) of the One
 10 [who possesses] the three
 [powers.] Blessed (μακάριον) is
 12 [] He said, "O [you]
 [who dwell in these] places, it is necessary

-
- 10,1-2 ΠΩΤ ΛΖΡΗΙ: This expression, and its equivalent at 10,19.20-21.26-27, probably translates the Greek word ἀναχωρεῖν, used at 9,9.21.
- 10,4 ΨΛ<ΝΤ> ΓΜΕΕΤΕ: The MS. has ΨΛΓΜΕΕΤΕ, which can be read as a Habitual form of the verb: "he (usually or habitually) reaches"; but this makes no sense.
- 10,7-29 This passage constitutes part of an exhortation, whose conclusion occurred in a lost portion of the MS. For discussion see the tractate introduction. Marsanes here addresses his gnostic congregation, as at 1,14-28.
- 10,9 The reconstruction presupposes that the context refers to a life-giving endowment bestowed upon the elect, such as the "power and spirit of life" referred to in *Ap. John* II 26,9-10.
- 10,12-13 For this mode of address cf. *Corp. Herm.* I.28: ὧ ἄνδρες γηγενεῖς. "These places" = "this world"; cf. *Treat. Res.* I 46,9.11; 47,14.26.

- 14 [ΑΤΡΕΚ]Ρ[ΝΟ]ΕΙ ΝΝΕΤΧΑΣΙ
 ΑΝ[Ε]ΕΙ· ΑΥΩ ΝΚΧΟΟΥ ΝΝ
 16 ΔΥ[Ν]ΑΜΙΣ· ΧΕ ΚΝΑΨΩΠ[Ε]
 Ε[ΚΣΑ]ΤΠ ΝΤΕ ΝΕΤΣΑΤΠ
 18 [ΑΝΖ]ΑΞΕΥ ΝΝΕΟΥΑΕΙΨ
 [ΕΦΠ]ΗΤ ΑΠΣΑΖΡΕ ΝΒΙ ΠΕΠΝΑ
 20 ΝΑΖΟΡΑΤΟΝ· ΑΥΩ ΝΤΩΤΝ
 [ΖΩΤ]ΤΗΝΕ ΠΩΤ ΝΗΜΕΦ
 22 [ΑΠΣΑΖΡ]Ε· ΕΥΝΤΗΤΝ Μ
 [ΜΕΥ ΜΠ]ΝΑΒ ΝΚΛΑΜ ΕΤ
 24 [.....] ΖΜ ΠΕΖΟΟΥ ΔΕ
 [± 8]ΝΑΝΕΥΦ
 26 [± 8]ΠΩΤ ΑΠΣΑΖ
 [ΡΕ Α]ΥΩ ΝΑΙΣΘΗ
 28 [ΤΟΣ ΟΥ]ΑΝΖ ΑΒΑ[Λ]
 [± 10] ΑΥΩ ΣΕ

13*

(14 lines missing)

- ΤΝΘΗΣ[ΙC] ΕΦΨ[Ο]ΟΠ ΝΨΑ
 16 ΑΝΗΖΕ ΕΜ[Ν]ΤΕΦ [Ο]ΥCΙΑ Ν
 [Μ]ΕΥ ΝΠ[Ε]ΤΨΟΟΠ ΕΤΚΑ
 18 [ΡΑΕ]ΙΤ ΠΕΤΨΟΟΠ ΧΙΝ ΝΨΑ
 [ΡΠ ΕΤΕ Μ]ΝΤΕ[Φ] ΟΥCΙΑ ΝΜΕ[Υ]
 20 [± 9] ΜΕΡΟΣ Ν[
 [± 7 Α]ΤΠΩΨΕ· ΝΕ[

-
- 10,14-17 The transition to the 2 sg. form of address is anomalous; the text is doubtless corrupt. The 2 pl. form resumes at 10,20.
- 10,14 ΝΕΤΧΑΣΙ: Probably "those (places) that are higher," i.e., the higher spheres of the heavens.
- 10,15-16 "tell them to the powers": This may refer to magical names or formulae given to angelic inhabitants of the astral spheres. Cf. note to 2,12-13; and the "passwords" used in Marcasian Gnosticism according to Iren. *Haer.* I.21.5. Cf. also notes to 19*,18-20.
- 10,17 "elect ones": One of the designations for the gnostic community used in Sethian-gnostic sources. See e.g. *Zost.* VIII 4,17; *Melch.* IX 10,17.
- 10,18 ΝΖΑΞΕΥ: A S form.
- 10,19-22 The "withdrawal" or "ascension" of God from the world is paradigmatic of—indeed, *consists* of—the withdrawal of the gnostic elect from the world. Cf. also 9,8-12.21-22 and notes.

- 14 [for you to know (νοεῖν)] those that are higher
 than these, and tell them to the
 16 powers (δύναμεις). For you (sg.) will become
 [elect] with the elect ones
 18 [in the last] times,
 [as] the invisible (ἀόρατον) Spirit (πνεῦμα)
 20 [runs] up above. And you
 [yourselves], run with him
 22 [up above], since you have
 [the] great crown which
 24 []. But (δέ) on the day
 [] will beckon (νεύειν)
 26 [] run up above
 [] and the sense-perceptible (αἰσθητός)
 28 [] visible
 [] and they

13*

(14 lines missing)

- the perception (νόησις). He is for
 16 ever, not having being (οὐσία),
 in the One who is, who is silent,
 18 the One who is from the beginning,
 [who] does [not] have being (οὐσία)
 20 [] part (μέρος) of [
 [] indivisible. The [

-
- 10,20 The first two letters **Βλ** are now broken off from the MS. but are attested in an early photograph.
- 10,23 "the great crown": Cf. *Zost.* VIII 129,16 and *Cod. Bruc. Untitled* ch. 9.
- 10,25 νεύειν is very uncertain.
- 10,27-28 **ΝΑΙΘΗΤΟΣ**: Apparently a plural form; elsewhere in the tractate it is always singular.
- 11-12 At least two pages are missing from the MS. Pagination in what follows is uncertain, as indicated by the use of the asterisk. See codex and tractate introductions.
- 13*,15 νόησις: Only here in the tractate.
- 13*,15-19 The reference is probably to the supreme God. Cf. 4,20-24; 7,2-29 and notes.
- 13*,17 "the One who is": Cf. *Exod* 3:14 ὁ ὢν, on which see esp. *Philo Som.* I 231-232 and *Poster. C.* 167-169.

- 22 [.....]ΜΕΕΥΕ ΑΒ[ΑΛ] ΝΟΥ[
 [.....].ΜΑΖ.[.....].Ε Π[
 24 [.....]..Β[...ΜΑ]ΖΨ[Ι]
 [ΤΕ ± ΙΟ] ΓΑΡ
 26 [± Ι3] ΟC
 (3 lines missing)
 Ι4*
 (14 lines missing)
- [.]·2.[...]·.[. Ν]ΕΕΙΨ[Ο]Ο[Π]
 16 ΖΝ ΝΕ[Α]ΙΩΝ [ΝΕ]ΕΙ ΝΤΑΖΟ[Υ]
 ΧΠΑΥ ΕΥΚΩ[Ε] ΗΜΑΕΙ ΑΖ[Ι]
 18 ΨΩΠΕ· ΖΝ ΝΕ[Τ]Ε ΗΠΟ[ΥΧΠΑΥ]
 ΑΛΛΑ ΝΕΕΙΨ[Ο]ΟΠ ΖΗ Π[ΝΑΒ]
 20 ΝΑΙΩΝ ΕΕΙ[.]...[
 [.]ΑΦ· ΑΥΩ ΝΕ[
 22 [Τ]ΨΑΜΤΕ ΗΔΥΝΑ[ΜΙC
 ΠΕΤΕ [ΟΥΝΤ]ΕC ΗΜ[ΕΥ Ν]
 24 ΤΨΑ[ΜΤΕ ΝΒ]ΑΜ· Τ[ΨΑΜΤΕ Ν]
 ΔΥ[ΝΑΜΙC
 26 ΜΗ [
- (3 lines missing)
 Ι5*
- [.Π]ΕΤΚΑΡΑΕΙΤ ΜΗ ΠΑ
 2 [ΤΨ]ΑΜΝΤΕ ΝΒΑΜ [
- [. Π]ΕΤ'Ε' ΜΗΤΕC ΠΝΟ[Η ΗΜΕΥ]
 4 [ΑΖ]ΗΨ[Ζ]Ε ΑΡΕΤΗ [
- [.....].Α ΖΗ Π[
- (6 lines missing)
- 12 [± 7].[
- [. Α]ΖΗΕΙ ΑΖΟΥΝ [
- 14 [.] ΗΠΝΟΗ [
- (± 15 lines missing)

- 13*,24 "ninth": Perhaps a reference to the ninth heaven or "world,"
 as e.g. in *Disc.* 8-9 VI 52,5-6: ΤΜΑΖΨΙΤΕ. Cf. 18*,2.
- 14*,15 ΝΕΕΙΨΟΟΠ: The reconstruction is based on 14*,19.
- 14*,18 ΝΕΤΕ ΗΠΟΥΧΠΑΥ: Cf. 6,27.
- 14*,20 A superlin. stroke occurs over the second letter trace after the
 lacana.
- 14*,20-21 Probably either Η/Μ]ΑΦ or Α/Ρ]ΑΦ, "(to) him."
- 14*,22 Corr. Α over Ο in ΨΑΜΤΕ.

- 22 [] consider a [
 []
 24 [ninth]
 [] for (γάρ) [
 26 []
 (3 lines missing)
 14*
 (14 lines missing)
 [] I [was dwelling]
 16 among the aeons (αἰών) which have
 been begotten. As I was permitted, [I] have
 18 come to be among those that were not [begotten].
 But (ἀλλά) I was dwelling in the [great]
 20 Aeon, as I [
 And [
 22 [the] three powers (δύναμις) [
 the One who [possesses]
 24 the [three] powers. The [three]
 [powers (δύναμις)
 26 and [
 (3 lines missing)
 15*
 [the] Silent One and the
 2 Three-Powered One [
 [the] one that does not have breath (πνοή).
 4 We took our stand [
 [] in the [
 (6 lines missing)
 12 []
 we entered [
 14 [] breath (πνοή) [
 (± 15 lines missing)

14*,23-24
 15*,3

Cf. 4,15-16; 10,9-11.

ΠΕΤΕ ΜΝΤΕϚ ΠΝΟΗ ΜΜΕΥ: The reconstruction is based on 16*,1. The meaning, however, is not clear, but perhaps we should understand this expression as analogous to **ΕΤΕ ΜΝΤΕϚ ΟΥCΙΑ ΜΜΕΥ**, "not having being," i.e., *beyond* the realm of "being" and the "breath" of life. Cf. notes to 5,2-3.14.

15*,14

Cf. 15*,3; 16*,1. But perhaps **ΠΝΟΗ[ΤΟΣ (Ν)ΚΟΣΜΟΣ]**. "the intelligible world." Cf. 5,22; 41*,5.

16*

- [ΕΤΕ] ΜΝΤΕϞ ΠΝΘΗ ΜΜ[ΕΥ]
 2 [ΑΥΩ ϞΨ]ΟΟΠ ΖΝ ΟΥΜΝΤ[
 [... ΤΗ]ΡῘ· ΑΥΩ ΑΖΙΝΕΥ
 4 [± 8]ΤῘ ΑΤΝ[Α]Θ Ν
 [± 7] ΑΥϞΟΥ[ΩΩ]Ν[Ῐ]
 (6 lines missing)
 12 [± 7]ΕϞ ΑΡΗΧ[
 [± 11] ΑΥΩ ΑΖ[Ι
 14 [± 11] ΟΥ'Α'ΕΕ[Τ
 (± 15 lines missing)

17*

- [± 11]ΕΝΕΡΓΙ
 2 [...] ΕΤΒΕ ΕΥ [Α]Ν ΓΝΩϞΙ[Ϟ]
 [...]ΑΤϞΑΥΝΕ ΑΥΩ [
 4 [± 7] ϞΡΚΙΝΔΥΝΕ[ΥΕ]
 [.....]ΤΡΕϞΨΩΠΕ
 (1 line missing)
 [± 10]Ε.Ε.[
 8 [± 9]ΥΩ .[
 [± 10] ΕΤΒΕ
 10 [± 9] . ΖΝ [
 [± 11] Μ[
 (3 lines missing)
 [± 7] ΝΗ ΕΤῘΜΑΥ
 16 [..... ΖΑ]Ψ ΔΕ ΑΤΡΕΟΥ
 [± 8] ΜΝΤΕϞ ΕΙΝΕ
 18 [± 9] Ν ΑΠΙΟΥΕΕΙ
 [± 9] Ψ[Ο]ΟΠ ΖΑΤΕ
 20 [ΖΗ ± 8] 'Π'ΜΕΕΥΕ Ε[
 [± 8] ΧΙ]Ν ΝΨΑΡῘ
 22 [± 11] ΠΕΤΕ Μ.
 [± 10] ΗΥ ΑῘ[ΑΑ]

- 16*,3-4 Perhaps ΑΖΙΝΕΥ / [ΑΠΙΩΤ, "I saw the Father." Cf. 18*,14-16 and note.
 16*,5 I.e., the Father? Cf. 18*,16-17; 1,11-12. The superlin. stroke is visible.
 16*,12 Perhaps ΜΝΤ]ΕϞ ΑΡΗΧ[Ϟ, "not having (fem.) an end," i.e., "limitless."

16*

- [who] does not have breath (πνοή),
 2 [and he] exists in a [
 [completely]. And I saw
 4 [] him to the great (fem.)
 [] they knew [him]
 (6 lines missing)
 12 [] limit [
 [] and [I
 14 [] alone
 (± 15 lines missing)

17*

- [] is active (ἐνεργεῖν)
 2 [] why, [again], (does) knowledge (γνώσις)
 [] ignorant, and [
 4 [] he runs the risk (κινδυνεύειν)
 [] that he become
 (1 line missing)
 []
 8 [] and
 [] on account of
 10 [] in [
 []
 (3 lines missing)
 [] Those
 16 [] But (δέ) it is necessary that a
 [] does not have form
 18 [] to this one
 [] exists before
 20 [] the thought
 [] from] the beginning
 22 [] the one that
 [] ...

16*,14

Or "self."

17*,2

Or emend to add the def. art.: <Τ>ΓΝΩΣΙ[Σ].

17*,19-20

Perhaps ΕΤ]Ω[Ο]Π ΖΑΤΕ/[ΖΗ ΜΠΤΗΡΦ, "who exists before the All"; cf. 8,9-10.

17*,20

Perhaps ςΡ] 'Π'ΜΕΕΥΕ, "he remembers."

24 [± I3]ειε[
 [± I4]εcχ[
 26 [± I4].cφ[

(3 lines missing)

I8*

νεει ρ[
 2 νεγ ρ[...] ρϩ ψιτ[ε ... θε]
 [β]ϱομαϑ κκοcμφ[
 4 [ο]γ ρϩ ογροογ ϩ[
 ψα ρνηρε· ε[
 6 [.....].[
 [...]ϩη[
 8 [...]μαα[
 [...]ρογ[
 10 [.....]τβ[

(3 lines missing)

14 .επ[.] ργω .[.... μϩϩ]
 cα ραρ ϩραμ[πε ... ϩ]
 16 ταρινεγ απ[ιωτ ρρικογ]
 ωνϩ ργω ρ[
 18 ραρ ϩ.[
 μερικον [
 20 ψα ρνηρ[ε
 ϩϩγλ[ικoc
 22 [ϩ]κocμ[ικoc
 ηcαρ[ρε
 24 [λ]οιπ[ον
 ϩτο[
 26 [.]

(3 lines missing)

-
- I8*,2 ψιτε: Perhaps = τμαρψιτε, "ninth"; cf. I3*,24 and note.
 I8*,2-3 Cf. 32*,23-24 and note.
 I8*,4 Cf. I0,24.
 I8*,8 Perhaps π]μαα[βεce, "thirty-six"; cf. 42*,6.
 I8*,I4-15 "after many years": Cf. *Allogenes* XI 58,8 "one hundred
 years."
 I8*,I5-17 Cf. I6*,5; I,23; 40*,26.

24 []
 []
 26 []

(3 lines missing)

18*

these []
 2 look(ed) at [] in the nine [] the]
 world (κόσμος) of the hebdomad (ἑβδομάς) []
 4 in a day of []
 for ever []
 6 []
 []
 8 []
 []
 10 []

(3 lines missing)

14 . . . and [] after]
 many [years
 16 when I saw the [Father I came to]
 know him, and []
 18 many []
 partial (μερικόν) []
 20 for ever []
 the material ones (ὕλικός) []
 22 worldly (κόσμικος) []
 above []
 24 in addition (λοιπόν) []
 []
 26 []

(3 lines missing)

-
- 18*,18 The letter trace is not **ρ**; cf. 18*,15 **ΡΑΜΠΕ**.
 18*,19 Cf. 2,25 and note. Or "particular." Cf. Proclus, *Theology*,
 Prop. 108-109.
 18*,21-22 Cf. 2,18-19 and note.
 18*,22 The superlin. stroke is visible.
 18*,24 Perhaps [**Λ**]ΟΙΠ[ΟΝ ΔΕ. Cf. 5,14; 19*,23.

19*

(12 lines missing)

- [± 7].ε εϚ[
 14 [.....]Ε ΟΥΝ.[
 [.... α]ΒΑΛ ΖΝ Ν[
 16 [.... α]ΖΟΥΝ ΑΝ[Ε]ΤΡ[
 [.....]ΗΤΟΥ ΑΖΟΥΝ [
 18 [.....] ΕΡΙΟΝΟΜΑΖΕ
 [ΜΜΑΥ ΑΥ]Ψ ΤΟΥΟΝΟΜ[Α]
 20 [CΙΑ ΕΡΙ Μ]ΗΤΡ'Ε' ΟΥ'Ε'ΕΤ[ΤΗ]
 [ΝΕ ΧΕ ΤΕΤ]ΗΒΑΧΒ ΑΤ[ΟΥ]
 22 [.....] ΜΝ ΤΟΥΖΥΠΟ[C]
 [ΤΑCΙC' ΛΟΙ]ΠΟ[Ν] ΔΕ ΖΦ[ΤΑΝ]
 24 [± 10]. Μ[
 [± 11]..[
 (± 4 lines missing)

20*

(12 lines missing)

- [...].[.]ΑΝ.[
 14 [...] ΕΘΗΠ [
 [.. Τ]ΜΑΖΨΑΜ[ΤΕ ΝΔΥΝΑ]
 16 ΜΙC ΤΜΗΤΑΠ[Ε ΔΕ ΜΜΑ]
 ΚΑΡΙΟC ΑCΧΟΟ[C
 18 ΖΝ ΝΕΕΙ ΜΝ[
 ΝΒΙ ΤΕΤΕ Μ[ΝΤΕC

19*,17

"them": Cf. note to 19*,18.

19*,18

ΕΡΙΟΝΟΜΑΖΕ: The form is Imperative. The object is probably "the angels" or "the gods and the angels." Cf. 39*,5-6; 27*,13-14. "Naming," or "calling upon," the gods and the angels involves not only knowing their names but being able to pronounce their names correctly in chants or incantations. This is clear from what follows in the tractate. The purpose of this exercise is to effect the ascension of the soul past the astral barriers inhabited by these "gods" and "angels." For important parallel material see *Pist. Soph.* chs. 98, 109, 130; and the Books of Jeu chs. 37, 40, 43. In the Jeu texts "seals" (σφραγίς) and ritual "sealing" (σφραγιζειν) are involved. Cf. note to 2,12-13.

19*,19-20

δνομασία: Cf. 27*,13; 30*,8; 31*,4. The word can also be translated "language," but it is here clearly related to the verb

19*

(12 lines missing)

- [] he [
 14 [] . . . [
 [] out of [
 16 [] into those that [
 [] them into [
 18 [] name (ὀνομάζειν)
 [them. And] (as for) their nomenclature (ὀνομασία),
 20 [bear] witness yourselves
 [that you are] inferior to [their]
 22 [] and their [hypostasis (ὑπόστασις).]
 But (δέ) [in addition (λοιπόν), when (ἔταν)]
 24 [
 [

(\pm 4 lines missing)

20*

(12 lines missing)

- [
 14 [] hidden [
 [] the] third
 16 [power (δύναμις)]. The blessed (μακάριος) Authority
 (fem.) [(+ δε)]
 said [
 18 among these and [
 i.e. she who [does not have

ὀνομάζειν, discussed above. For comparable usages of the word in Gnosticism see e.g. *Pist. Soph.* chs. 111, 141; in Hermeticism see e.g. *Disc.* 8-9 VIII 62, 24; 64, 1.3; and in magic see e.g. *PGM XIII.211*, 566.

- 19*, 20 Corr. The first ϵ in ΟΥΞΕΤΤΗΝΕ is written above an Θ , which is crossed out.
 19*, 22-23 ὑπόστασις: The meaning here—in contrast to 9, 17—may be “nature.”
 20*, 15-16 “the third power”: Cf. 8, 18-19 and note to 4, 16.
 20*, 16 Perhaps ΤΜΝΤΑΠΕ translates something like κεφαλις or κεφαλαιωτής. Lack of context prevents a satisfactory elucidation of this passage. Cf. *Ap. John* BG 26, 9-10, where the supreme God is called ΤΑΠΕ ΝΑΙΩΝ ΝΙΜ, “the Head of every aeon.” Cf. Col 1:18.
 20*, 18 Or “among these there is not . . .” Cf. 20*, 20.

20 ΜΝ ΕΛΥ ΓΑΡ [
 [Ο]ΥΔΕ ΠΕΤΕ [
 22 ΚΑΙΓΑΡ ΠΕΤ[Ε
 [Μ]ΜΕΥ ΟΥΠ[
 24 [..] ΓΑΡ [
 [..]..[

(± 4 lines missing)

21*

(± 12 lines missing)

[± 11]ΚΟ[
 14 [± 7]ΜΝ ΝΖΦ[ΔΙΟΝ
 [.....]ΜΝ Ν.[
 16 [± 7]Ο ΜΝ ..[
 [..... Ε]ΤΕ Μ[Ν]ΤΟ[Υ
 18 [± 7].ΧΠΟ Α[
 [.....ΚΥ]ΛΙΣΙΣ Ο[
 20 [± 7]ΨΥΧΗ Δ[Ε ..].
 [.....]... ΜΜΕΥ
 22 [....C]ΩΜΑ ΝΤΕΕΙΜΝ[Τ]
 [.....]ΨΥΧΗ ΝΤΠΕ
 24 [.... Μ]ΠΚΩΤΕ [
 [....]CΧΗΜΑ Ε[
 26 [....].Η ΕΦΘΕΙ Ν[

(± 3 lines missing)

22*

(± 12 lines missing)

[..]ΝΟ[
 14 [..]ΕΥΜΑ[
 [....]ΝΕΤΕ [
 16 [..]ΑΕ ΜΜΕΥ [

21*,13-26 The papyrus is of poor quality here, and damaged, with some (vertical) fibers lost.

21*,14 ΝΖΩΔΙΟΝ: Cf. 39*,28; 42*,5. But perhaps read ΝΖΦ[ΟΝ or ΝΖΦ[ΩΝ, "animals." Cf. 22*,26; 25*,4; and note to 25*,1-4.

21*,16 The letters after ΜΝ appear to be ΙC; but some vertical fibers are lost, and the reading is quite uncertain.

21*,18 Perhaps Ε]ΤΧΠΟ, "who (or which) acquire(s)."

21*,19 κώλιας: This word is used of the orbits of the astral bodies;

- 20 For (γάρ) there is not glory [
 nor even (οὐδέ) the one who [
 22 For indeed (καὶ γάρ) the one who [
 . . . [
 24 For (γάρ) [
 [

(± 4 lines missing)

21*

(± 12 lines missing)

- [
 14 [] and the [signs of the Zodiac (ζώδιον)
 [] and the [
 16 [] and [
 [] which do not have [
 18 [] acquire for [
 [revolution (κύλισις)
 20 [] But (δέ) [the] soul(s) (ψυχή) [
 [] there [
 22 [] body(s) (σῶμα) of this
 [] soul(s) (ψυχή) of heaven [
 24 [] around [
 [] shape (σχῆμα) [
 26 [] which is [
 [

(± 3 lines missing)

22*

(± 12 lines missing)

- [
 14 [] . . . [
 [] those that [
 16 (+ δέ) there [
 [

cf. e.g. Aristot. *Cael.* 290A. Cf. the restored reading at 21*,14 and **ἩΠΚΩΤΕ** in line 24.

21*,20 Either **τ(ε)]ΨΥΧΗ** (sg.) or **Ἡ]ΨΥΧΗ** (pl.).

21*,23 ψυχή: Cf. note to 21*,20.

21*,25 σχῆμα: Cf. note to 25*,22-24.

22*,15 After **ΝΕΤΕ** read either **[ΟΥΝΤΟΥ**, "have," or **[ΜΝΤΟΥ**, "do not have," as indicated by the correlative **ἩΜΕΥ** in line 16.

- [..]αγ· .ετπ[
 18 [..]εγ μπс[
 [.. ñε]ινε τη[ροϋ
 20 [..]ε αραγ· [·
 ñсματ τηρ[ο]γ [·
 22 [сх]ημα ζωστε ат[ροϋ
 [ñс]εψωπε ññ[
 24 [.. οϋ]αξετοϋ м·[
 [.....] мñ ñαα[
 26 [.....] ñζωων [·
 [.....]ειε мñ τ[
 (± 2 lines missing)

25*

- [.....]. ñμεγ· αλλα νοϋ
 2 [α]γναμис ετε ñαγγελο[с]
 ñε εϋοει ñμορφη ñ
 4 εñριον αγω ñζωον·
 ζωεινε ñζητοϋ εϋψο[οп ñ]
 6 [ζαζ] ñсματ· αγ[ω] παρα
 [φγ]çic οϋντοϋ ζñζ[·
 8 [ñμε]γ ανοϋρεñ· ετζ[·
 [.....] се[παρ]̄ αγω [·
 10 [.....]αε[. κ]ατα π[

-
- 22*,17 Possible readings are **çετπ̄-**, "choose," **ζετπ̄-**, "join," or **βετπ̄-**, "overcome"; all are S forms, however, not A¹.
- 22*,18 Perhaps **μπс[ωμα**, "(of) the body." Cf. 21*,22.
- 22*,19 Cf. 25*,13.
- 22*,21 Cf. 25*,6.11.25.
- 22*,22 *σχημα*: Cf. note to 25*,21-24.
- 22*,24-25 Perhaps **мñ [ñ/ψιλον] мñ ñαα[сγ**, "and the inaspirate and the aspirate (consonants)." For ψιλόν and δασύ see 27*,4-5. On the connection between the letters of the alphabet and the signs of the Zodiac see note to 25*,1-4 and tractate introduction.
- 22*,26 Cf. 25*,4 and note. Note the Greek gen. pl. form.
- 23*-24* At least two pages are missing from the MS. See codex and tractate introductions.
- 25*,1-4 The context suggests that the reference here is to the signs of the Zodiac (cf. 21*,14), on the one hand, and the letters of the alphabet, on the other. In Graeco-Roman astrology, the signs

- [] . . . [
- 18 []
- [all the likenesses
- 20 [] them [
- all the forms [
- 22 shape(s) (σχήμα), so that (ὥστε) [they
- [and] become [
- 24 themselves [
- [] and the [
- 26 [] of animals (ζῴων) [
- [] and the [
- (± 2 lines missing)

25*

- [] there. But (ἀλλά) their
- 2 powers (δύναμις), which are the angels (ἄγγελος),
- are in the form (μορφή) of
- 4 beasts (θήριον) and animals (ζῶον).
- Some among them are
- 6 [polymorphous], and contrary to (παρά)
- [nature (φύσις)] they have [
- 8 for their names which [
- [] They are [divided] and [
- 10 [] according to (κατά) the [

of the Zodiac (τὰ ζῳδία) are classified in various ways, e.g. as "human" shaped or "animal" shaped, or assimilated to the letters of the alphabet, as "voiced" (φωνήεντα: Ϛ ϝ π πλ Ϟ), "semi-voiced" (ἡμιφωνα: Ϟ † ϛ), or "voiceless" (ἄφωνα: Ϟ Ϟ Ϟ Ϟ). Cf. Bouché-Leclercq, *L'astrologie grecque*, pp. 149-150. According to the gnostic "magician" Marcus, the letters of the alphabet (and perhaps the signs of the Zodiac) are "angels" and "aeons"; see *Iren. Haer.* I.14.1-2. For discussion see tractate introduction.

- 25*, 3-4 A strip of (vertical) fibers is lost from the MS., resulting in the loss of part of the Υ on line 3 and part of the Θ in $\Theta\eta\rho\iota\omicron\nu$ on line 4. $\mathbf{\Xi\mu\omicron\rho\phi\eta\ N\eta\eta\rho\iota\omicron\nu}$: Cf. Ptol. *Tetr.* II.7 (LCL 80): τὰ θηριώδη (ζῳδία), probably referring to Ϛ, Ϟ and Ϟ (cf. LCL ed., p. 173, n. 5).
- 25*, 6 $\mathbf{\Sigma\alpha\zeta\ N\epsilon\mu\alpha\tau}$ = πολύμορφος. Cf. Ptol. *Tetr.* IV.5 (LCL 183), also of signs of the Zodiac. Perhaps read instead $\mathbf{[\rho\mu]\ N\epsilon\mu\alpha\tau}$ = ἀνθρωπόμορφος; cf. Ptol. *Tetr.* II.7 (LCL 79). The ἀνθρωπόμορφα ζῳδία are π, πλ, Ϟ, and †.

[.. α]γω [...] Ἰσμ[ατ
 12 [...] νεει δε ετψ[ο]φ[π]
 [νει]νε Ἰτεςμνη' κατα πμαρψα
 14 [μ]Ἰ[τ]· αβαλ ρῆ <τ> ουσια [νε]
 [α]γω ετβε νεει· σερ[ω]
 16 ψε Ἰβι νεει τηροϋ
 εαρῆψεχε αραϋ π[εει]
 18 πωρϫ γαρ ψαφψωπ[ε]
 αν Ἰνεειμα· κατα [θε]
 20 Ἰταρῆχοοσ χιν Ἰ[ψα]
 [ρ]ῆ· πλην τψγχη φ[γν]
 22 [τ]εσ ρωωσ αν Ἰμεϋ <ῆ>
 <ρεν> σχημα ε<γ> ψῆβ[εια]
 24 [ει]τ εφωοοπ δε [ρῆ]
 [πι]ςματ Ἰβι πσχημα
 26 [Ἰ]τψγχη τεπταρ[ψω]
 πε ογαεετ· Ἰ[σχη]
 28 μα δε οε[ι Ἰπμαρσνεϋ]

26*

Ἰμεροσ Ἰσφαιρ[ικον]

2 ερεπψαρῆ ογνη ϸσω[φ]

-
- 25*,12-14 The discussion here probably concerns heavenly counterparts of human language and voice. Cf. 31*,15-16.
 25*,13-14 The τ in πμαρψαμῆτ is flaked off from the MS. κατα πμαρψαμῆτ: Scil. σχημα, "shape" or "schema"? Cf. 25*,23.
 25*,15-17 Again "Marsanes" assumes prior instruction on the part of his audience. Cf. 2,19-20.28; 3,4-8; etc.
 25*,16 Though there would be room in a lacuna at the end of the line for up to 3 more letters, the syntax does not admit of additional material here. Perhaps there was a colon: τηροϋ.
 25*,17-18 "this division": Cf. 25*,9. The "division" referred to is probably the soul's "division" from its simple state as an indivisible monad to its status in this world, i.e. its descent into materiality. The classic statement on this is Macrobius *In Somn.* I.12, probably derived from Numenius (cf. Fr. 34, des Places). For discussion see tractate introduction.
 25*,19 "these regions" = this world; cf. 10,12-13 and note.
 25*,22-24 MS. reads [μ]/πσχημα εφψῆβ[εια/ει]τ, "the different shape." In what follows it is evident that more than one "shape" or "schema" is attributed to the human soul; but all

- [and] in [form
 12 [] But (δέ) these that are
 [aspects] of sound according to (κατά) the third
 14 originate from being (ούσία).
 And concerning these, all of
 16 these (remarks) are sufficient,
 since we have(already) spoken about them. For(γάρ) [this]
 18 division takes place
 again in these regions in (κατά) [the manner]
 20 we have mentioned from the [beginning].
 However (πλὴν) the soul (ψυχή), on the
 22 other hand, [has]
 different shape<s> (σχήμα).
 24 The shape (σχήμα) (+ δέ) of the soul (ψυχή) exists [in]
 [this] form,
 26 i.e. (the soul) that came into
 existence of its own accord. The shape (σχήμα)
 28 (+ δέ) is [the second]

26*

- spherical (σφαιρικόν) part (μέρος)
 2 while the first follows [it,]

-
- of these "shapes" are basically the same, i.e. "spherical." Cf. note to 26*,1.
- 25*,24 The C in **CMAT** is now flaked off from the MS.; it is attested in an early photograph.
- 25*,25-27 Perhaps the reference is to the soul which, of its own volition, descends into the world of generation. Cf. Macrobius *In Somn.* I.11.12.
- 25*,26 The superlin. stroke is visible.
- 25*,28 "the second": This reconstruction is far from certain; the entire passage is not altogether clear. Cf. 26*,5.
- 26*,1 μέρος: In contemporary speculation on the Psychogonia in Plato's *Timaeus* (35A-36D) the human soul, as well as the World Soul, is made up of seven parts conceived as circular or spherical. Cf. e.g. Plut. *De an. procr.* 1028B (ἐπὶὰ μέρους); Diog. Laert. III.68. **ΣΦΑΙΡΙΚΟΝ**: That the characteristic shape (σχήμα) of the soul is "spherical" is a common assumption in popular Platonism, based on the Psychogonia of the *Timaeus*. See e.g. Diog. Laert. III.71; Iambl. *In Tim.* fr. 49 (Dillon); Procl. *In Tim.* II.72.14; *Theol. Prop.* 210. The passages in Iambl. and Procl. deal with the soul's immaterial "vehicle" (ὄχημα).

ΕΗΙΟΥ· ΝΤΨΥΧΗ ΝΧΠ[Ο]
 4 ΟΥΑΕΕΤ̄· ΔΕΗΙΟΥΩ
 [Π]ΜΑΖCNEY ΝCΧΗΜΑ·
 6 ΕΗΙΟΥ ΔΒΑΛ ΖΙΤ̄Ν Ν[Δ]
 [ΤC]ΜΗ CΝΤΕ ΠΩΑΡ[Π Ε]
 8 [ΦΟ]ΥΗΖ ΝCΩΟΥ ΠΕ [
 [...]ΟΝ· ΑΥ[Ω Π]ΙΖ[
 10 [...]ΟΥ Π[...]ΕΕΙ[
 [...]Τ̄Ν[...]
 12 [...]Ε ΗΠΟΥΑΕΙΝ ΨΩ[Π]
 [ΔΡ]ΩΤ̄Ν ΝΤΕΤ̄ΝΧΙ Η[ΠΕ]
 14 [C]ΠΕΡΜΑ ΝΑΤΤΕΚΟ [Ν]
 [ΤΕ]Τ̄Ν† ΚΑΡΠΟΣ· ΑΥΩ
 16 [ΝΤΕ]Τ̄[Ν]Τ̄ΜΩΠΕ ΕΡΕ
 [Τ]̄ΝΗΠ ΔΝΕΤΕ ΝΟΥΤ̄Ν
 18 [ΔΔ]ΛΛ ΗΜΕ ΧΕ ΝΕΤ̄ΧΑCΙ
 [CΕ]ΨΟΟΠ Ζ̄Ν ΝΕΤΕ ΟΥΝ
 20 [ΤΟΥ] CΜΗ ΗΜΕΥ· ΑΥΩ ΝΔ
 [ΤC]ΜΗ CΝΤΕ ΕΤΨΟΟΠ
 22 [ΝΝ]ΔΖΡ̄Ν ΝΕΕΙ· ΝΒΡΑ
 [ΧΥ Δ]Ε CΕΒΑΧ̄· ΑΥΩ Ν
 24 [...]ΟΥ CΨΟΟΠ [

26*,3-4

ΕΗΙΟΥ . . . ΔΕΗΙΟΥΩ: The seven vowels were symbolically related to the seven planetary spheres from ancient times; see e.g. Dornseiff, *Das Alphabet*, 32-60. Here it appears that different vowel combinations are symbolically related to the spherical "shapes" of the soul. The underlying assumption is that language and letters are functions of the soul; cf. Aristot. *Int.* 16a. Cf. esp. Theiler, "Sprache des Geistes," 304-311. "The self-begotten soul" seems to be distinguished from the soul "that came into existence of its own accord"; cf. 25*,26-27. The former is symbolically related to the full sequence of vowels; the latter, "the second schema," is signified by the deficient combination ΕΗΙΟΥ.

26*,6

There seems to be something missing before ΔΒΑΛ ΖΙΤ̄Ν.

26*,6-7

ΝΑ ΤCΜΗ CΝΤΕ: Lit. "those of the two voices" = Gk. of δὶφθογγοί. Cf. 28*,5-11, where the various diphthongs are listed.

26*,12

ΩΠ: The Ω is now lost from the MS.; it is attested in an early photograph.

26*,13-14

"the imperishable seed": Cf. *Apoc. Adam V* 76,7: †CΠΟΡΑ

- 4 εημου, the self-begotten soul (ψυχή),
 4 αεημουω.
 [The] second schema (σχημα),
 6 εημου, . . . by those [having]
 two sounds (diphthongs), the first being
 8 placed after them [
 [] and [
 10 [
 [
 12 the light. [Control]
 yourselves, receive [the]
 14 imperishable seed (σπέρμα),
 bear fruit (καρπός), and
 16 do not become
 attached to your possessions.
 18 But (ἀλλά) know that the oxytones
 exist among the vowels
 20 and the
 diphthongs which are
 22 next to them. But (δέ) the [short (βραχύ)]
 are inferior, and the [
 24 [] are [

ΝΑΤΤΑΚΟ, but there the reference is probably to the "seed of Seth." Here the "imperishable seed" is the knowledge imparted by Marsanes.

26*,15 "bear fruit": Though this is a common biblical expression (cf. e.g. Matt 3:8, John 15:8,16) it occurs also in non-biblical materials, as e.g. *Corp. Herm.* XIII.22.

26*,16 The second superlin. stroke is visible.

26*,18 **ΝΕΤΧΑCΙ**: Lit. "those which are high." The translation "oxytones" assumes that a technical term in Greek grammar was used. Cf. note to 30*,1-2.

26*,19-20 **ΝΕΤΕ ΟΥΝΤΟΥ CΜΗ**: Lit. "those which have voice"
 τὰ φωνήεντα, "the vowels."

26*,20-21 **ΝΑ ΤCΜΗ CΝΤΕ**: Cf. note to 26*,6-7.

26*,22-23 **ΝΒΡΑΧΥ**: What is meant are the short vowels, τὰ βραχέα φωνήεντα, i.e., ε and ο. For the terminology see Dionysius Thrax, *Ars Grammatica* 6 in *Grammatici Graeci* I.1 (ed. Uhlig). There are three kinds of vowels: βραχέα ("short"): ε and ο; μακρά ("long"): η and ω; and δίχρονα (dual, either long or short): α, ι, and υ. Cf. 29*,24-28.

[..]. ΖΙΤΟΟΤΟ[Υ]· ΝΕΤ[
 26 [...]Ϝ ΕΥΖΝ ΤΜΗΤΕ [
 [.....].. ΝCΜΗ ΝΤϜ
 28 [ΝΖΗΜΙΦΩΝ]ΟΝ CΕΧΑ

27*

CΙ ΔΝΕΤΕ ΜΝΤΟΥ CΜΗ
 2 ΜΜΕΥ· ΝΕΤΚΗΒ ΔΕ CΕΧ[Α]
 CΙ ΔΝΑ ΤΠΕΩΕ ΝCΜΗ Ε
 4 ΜΑΥΨΒΒΙΕ· ΝΔΔCΥ ΔΕ
 CΕCΑΤΠ ΔΗΨΙΛΟΝ Η[Ε]
 6 ΕΙ ΕΜΝΤΟΥ CΜΗ ΜΜ[ΕΥ]
 ΝΕΤΖΝ ΤΜΗΤΕ ΔΕ ΝΑΨ[ΑΠ]
 8 ΠΟΥΒΛΑΜΛΗ ΕΤΟΥΝ[ΖΗ]
 ΤΨ· CΕΟΕΙ ΝΑΤCΑΥΝ[Ε Ν]
 10 ΝΕΤΝΑΝΟΥΟΥ· CϜ[ΒΛΜ]
 ΛΑΜΝΤ ΔΕ ΔΝΕΤΖ[Ν ΤΜΗ]
 12 ΤΕ ΕΤΒΑΧΒ· ΚΑΤΑ ΕΙ[ΝΕ]
 <CΕΨΟΟΠ> ΝΤΟΝΟΜ<Α> CΙΑ ΝΝ[ΟΥ]

26*,25 The first **Τ** in ΖΙΤΟΟΤΟΥ is written over a diagonal stroke; the scribe probably began to write something else. Most of the final **Τ** is broken off from the MS.; it is better attested in an early photograph.

26*,27-27*,2 Of the consonants, the "semi-vowels" are said to be superior to the voiceless consonants. Cf. Melampous' commentary on Dionysius Thrax *Ars Gram.* 6 (A. Hilgard, ed. *Scholía in Dionysii Thracis Artem Grammaticam*, p. 42): ὅσον ἐλάττωνά ἐστι (scil. τὰ ἡμίφωνα) τῶν φωνηέντων ἐν τῇ ἐκφωνήσει τῶν τελείων φωνῆν ἐχόντων, τοσοῦτον εὐφωνότερά ἐστι τῶν ἄλλων ἐννεα στοιχείων τῶν καλουμένων ἀφώνων. Philo likens the vowels to the mind, the semivowels to the senses, and the consonants to the body: *Quaest. in Gen.* IV.117; cf. *Congr.* 150; *Op. Mund.* 126. Cf. also Marcus' speculation on the letters of the alphabet, esp. *Iren. Haer.* I.14.5. The eight semivowels, according to the ancient grammarians, are ζ, ξ, ψ, λ, μ, ν, ρ, and σ. (This classification differs from that of modern grammarians of the Greek language.)

27*,1-2 **ΝΕΤΕ ΜΝΤΟΥ CΜΗ ΜΜΕΥ**: Lit. "those which do not have voice" = τὰ ἀφωνα. The nine voiceless consonants are β, γ, δ, κ, π, τ, θ, φ, and χ. Their "superiority" is presumably based on the idea that they have twice as much "power" (δύναμις). See *Scholía* (Melampous), p. 45.

27*,2 **ΝΕΤΚΗΒ** = τὰ διπλά σύμφωνα, "the double consonants."

- by them. Those that [
 26 [] since they are intermediate
 [] The sounds of
 28 [the semivowels (ἡμίφωνον)] are

27*

superior to the voiceless (consonants).

- 2 And (δέ) those that are double are superior
 to the semivowels which
 4 do not change. But (δέ) the aspirates (δασύ)
 are better than the inaspirates (ψιλόν) (of)
 6 the voiceless (consonants).
 And (δέ) those that are intermediate will [accept]
 8 their combination in which they are;
 they are ignorant [of]
 10 the things that are good. They (the vowels)
 (+ δέ) are combined with the [intermediates]
 12 which are less. [Form] by (κατά) [form],
 <they constitute> the nomenclature (ὀνομασία) of the
 [gods]

-
- 27*,3 These are ζ, ξ, and ψ, also reckoned as "semivowels."
ΝΑ ΤΠΕΨΕ ΝCΜΗ: Lit. "the ones of the half-voice"
 τὰ ἡμίφωνα. Böhlig reads **ΑΤΠΕΨΕ**, "undivided," interpreting
ΝΑΤΠΕΨΕ ΝCΜΗ as = φωνῆ ἀδιαίρετος, referring to Aristot.
Poet. 1456b; see "Die griechische Schule," p. 17. The context
 requires us to see here a reference to the semivowels.
- 27*,4-7 The nine ἄφωνα σύμφωνα are classified as "aspirate" (δασέα:
 θ, φ, and χ), "inaspirate" (ψιλά: κ, π, and τ), and "intermediate"
 (μέσα: β, δ, and γ). The aspirates are here regarded as "better"
 because they have more πνεῦμα ("breath" or "spirit"). Cf.
Scholía (Melampous), p. 44.
- 27*,9-10 Note that the various letters of the alphabet are virtually
 personified, probably as angels. For a striking parallel, in-
 cluding the notion of these letters' "ignorance," see Iren. *Haer.*
 I.14.1 (Marcus).
- 27*,10 "They" must refer to letters other than the intermediate
 voiceless consonants, for the latter are referred to in the next
 line. For combinations of vowels with the intermediate voiceless
 consonants see 31*,22-32*,3.
- 27*,11 The superlin. stroke on **ΖΝ** is visible.
- 27*,12 "which are less": I.e., inferior to the aspirates; cf. 27*,4-6 and
 note.

14 ΤΕ ΜΝ ΠΑΓΓΕΛΟΣ· Φ[ΥΧΟ]
 ΤΙ ΕΥΤΕΡΤΩΣ ΑΝΟΥΦ[ΡΗΥ]
 16 ΚΑΤΑ ΣΜΑΤ ΝΙΜ· ΑΛ[ΛΑ]
 ΜΟΝΟΝ ΕΟΥΗ[Τ]ΕΥ [Η]
 18 ΜΕΥ ΝΝΟΥΕΡΓΑΣΙΑ [Ε]
 ΝΑΝΟΥΣ· ΜΠΕΣΩΦ[ΠΕ]
 20 ΑΤΡΕΠΟΥ<ΟΥ> ΩΨΕ ΘΨ[ΛΠ]
 ΑΒΑΛ· ΜΝΣΩΤΕ ΔΡ Ν[ΑΒΙ]
 22 ΝΚΡΤΟΛΜΑ ΑΤΡΕΚ[Ρ]
 ΧΡΑΣΘΑΙ ΜΠΝΑΒ[Ι· †]
 24 ΧΟΥ ΔΕ ΝΕΚ Ε[ΤΒΕ ΠΨΑ]
 ΜΝΤ ΝΣ[ΧΗΜΑ
 26 ΝΤΕ ΤΨΥ[ΧΗ· ΠΜΑΖΨΑ]
 ΜΝΤ Ν[ΣΧΗΜΑ ΝΤΨΥΧΗ]
 28 ΨΟΦΠ [

28*

ΟΥΣΦΑΙΡΙΚΟΝ ΠΕ ΕΦΟΥ
 2 ΗΖ ΝΣΩΦ· ΖΙΤΝ ΝΕΤΕ ΟΥΝ
 ΣΜΗ ΜΜΑΥ ΝΖΑΠΛΟΥΝ·
 4 ΞΞΞ· ΙΙΙ ΟΟΟ ΥΥΥ ΩΩΩ
 ΝΑ ΤΣΜΗ ΣΝΤΕ ΝΕΥΨΟ
 6 ΟΠ ΝΖΝΖΔΕΙΝΕ· ΔΙ ΔΥ·
 [Ε]Ι ΕΥ· ΗΥ· ΟΥ· ΩΥ· ΟΙ ΗΙ·
 8 [Υ]Ι ΩΙ· ΔΥΕΙ· ΕΥΗΥ· ΟΙΟΥ
 [ΓΓ]Γ· ΓΓΓ· ΓΓΓ· ΔΙΑΔ
 10 [ΕΙΕΥ]· ΗΥ· ΟΙΟΥ· ΩΥ· ΓΓΓ·
 [ΓΓΓ]· ΔΥΕΙΕΥ· ΟΙΟΥ· ΗΥ·

- 27*,13-14 <ΣΕΨΟΟΠ>: Cf. 30*,8. "They" refers, in general, to combinations of vowels and consonants. Such combinations make up the "nomenclature" of the gods and the angels. ΤΟΝΟΜ<Α>ΣΙΑ: MS. reads ΟΝΟΜΟCΙΑ; it is spelled correctly at 30*,8; 31*,4; and presumably at 19*,19. For the presumed meaning of this terminology and its context see 19*,18-20 and notes; see tractate introduction for discussion.
- 27*,19-21 Perhaps ΜΠΕΣΩΦΠΕ = Greek οὐκ ἐξῆν: "it was not possible" (or "lawful") that <their> will should be revealed."
- 27*,22-24 Note the use of the 2 sg. pronoun here. Cf. 10,14-17 and note. Cf. 29*,7-8.
- 27*,23-26 Here Marsanes takes up his previous discussion of the "shapes" of the soul; cf. 25*,21-26*,9.
- 28*,1 ΣΦΑΙΡΙΚΟΝ: Cf. note to 26*,1.
- 28*,2-3 ΝΕΤΕ ΟΥΝ ΣΜΗ ΜΜΑΥ ΝΖΑΠΛΟΥΝ: Lit. "those which there are simple sounds to them." The "simple" vowels are

- 14 and the angels (ἄγγελος), [not (οὐχ)] because (ὅτι)
they are mixed with each other
16 according to (κατά) every form, but (ἀλλά)
only (μόνον) (because) they have
18 a good function (ἐργασία).
It did not happen
20 that <their> will was revealed.
Do not keep on [sinning,]
22 and do not dare (τολμᾶν) to
make use of (χρᾶσθαι) sin. But (δέ) [I]
24 am speaking to you (sg.) [concerning the]
[three shapes (σχήμα)]
26 of the soul (ψυχή). [The]
third [shape (σχῆμα) of the soul (ψυχή)]
28 is [

28*

- is a spherical (σφαιρικόν) one, put
2 after it, from the
simple (ἄπλοῦν) vowels:
4 εεε, ιιι, οοο, υυυ, ωωω.
The diphthongs were
6 as follows: αι, αυ,
ει, ευ, ηυ, ου, ωυ, οι, ηι
8 υι, ωι. αυει, ευηυ, οιου,
γγγ, γγγ, γγγ, αιαυ
10 [ειευ], ηυ, οιου, ωυ, γγγ
[γγγ], αυειευ, οιου, ηυ,

here distinguished from the diphthongs. It is possible that
CMH here and in line 20 = φωνῆν, "vowel," rather than
φωνή, "sound"; this is supported by the neuter ending on
ΖΑΠΛΟΥΝ. See Böhlig, "Die griechische Schule," p. 17.

28*,4 λλλ and ΗΗΗ appear to be inadvertently omitted; cf. 28*,21-
22 for the entire list.

28*,5 ΝΑ ΤCMH CŃTE: Cf. note to 26*,6-7.

28*,6-8 Although Dionysius Thrax (ch. 6, *Grammatici Graeci*, ed. Uhlig,
p. 10) enumerates only six diphthongs, his commentators
disagree, asserting that there are eleven (*Scholia*, p. 200 [anon.],
331 [Heliodorus]) or even twelve (*Scholia*, p. 40 [Melampous]).
All eleven are enumerated here, ending with ωι; Melampous
adds Ϛ, which could not be distinguished from αι in uncial or
majuscule writing.

28*,8-11 The letter-combinations after ΩΙ are probably secondary
additions, functioning as *voces mysticae*.

12 [N]CΠ ΨΑΜΝΤ ΝΝΟΥΨΥ
 ΧΗ ΝΖΑΥΤ ΠΜΑΖΨΑΜΝΤ
 14 ΝCΧΗΜΑ ΟΥCΦΑΙΡΙΚΟΝ
 [ΠΕ] ΠΜΑΖCΝΕΥ ΝCΧΗ
 16 [Μ]Α ΕΦΟΥΗΖ ΝCΩΦ ΟΥΝ
 [ΤΕ]Ϟ CΜΗ CΝΤΕ· ΤΨΥΧΗ
 18 [Ν]ΖΑΥΤ ΠΕCΜΑΖΨΑΜΝΤ
 [Ν]CΧΗΜΑ· ΖΙΤΝ ΝΕΤΕ ΟΥΝ
 20 [ΤΟΥ C]ΜΗ ΕΤΟΕΙ ΝΖΑΠΛΟΥΝ
 [ΑΑ]Α· ΕΕΕ· ΗΗΗ· ΙΙΙ· ΟΟΟ·
 22 [Υ]ΥΥ· ΩΩΩ· ΩΩΩ· ΩΩΩ
 [ΑΥΩ] ΠΕΕΙCΧΗΜΑ ΨΒΒ{1}
 24 [ΕΙΔΕΙΤ Α]ΠΨΑΡΠ· CΕ
 [ΤΝΤΑΝ]Τ ΔΕ ΑΝΟΥΕ
 26 [ΡΗΥ ΑΥΩ CΕ]ΕΙΡΕ ΝΖΝ
 [CΜΗ ΜΠΡΟΧ]ΕΙΡΟΝ Ν
 28 [ΤΕΕΙΖΕ· ΑΕΗ]ΡΦ· ΑΥΩ Α

29*

ΒΑΛ ΖΙΤΟΥΤΟΥ ΝΝΑ ΤCΜΗ
 2 CΝΤΕ· ΤΕΕΙΖΕ ΑΝ ΠΜΑΖ
 ΦΤΑΥ ΑΥΩ ΠΜΑΖ†ΟΥ·
 4 ΕΤΒΗΤΟΥ ΜΠΟΥΚΑΛΥ Α
 ΒΩΛΠ ΑΒΑΛ ΜΠΜΑ ΤΗ[ΡϞ]
 6 ΑΛΛΑ ΜΟΝΟΝ ΝΕΤΟΥΑ[ΝΖ]
 ΑΒΑΛ ΑΖΟΥΤCΕΒΕ ΤΗΝ[Ε]
 8 ΑΡΑΥ ΑΤΡΕΤΝΡΝΟΕΙ [Μ]

- 28*,12-13 As in the case of the simple vowels enumerated above (28*,4; cf. 28*,21-22) the diphthongs are understood as tripled, presumably for mystical effect. It is possible that these vowel-combinations were meant to be chanted. Cf. the magical papyri, where mystical words are frequently directed to be uttered "three times" (τρῖς); see e.g. *PGM* IV.209, 2957, 3175, 3814, etc.
- 28*,12 "male soul": Cf. 28*,17-18. Perhaps the intellectual part of the soul is meant, i.e., the νοῦς ("mind"); cf. 31*,17-18 and 4,3-4. On "masculinity" in *Marsanes* see note to 9,1-3.
- 28*,14 CΦΑΙΡΙΚΟΝ: Cf. note to 26*,1.
- 28*,15-16 ΠΜΑΖCΝΕΥ ΝCΧΗΜΑ: Cf. 26*,5.
- 28*,16 Corr. Ε over a vertical stroke; the scribe began to write something else.
- 28*,17-22 Cf. 27*,26-28*,4. Note that the set of three Ω's is tripled, perhaps indicating that the entire sequence of vowels is to be

- 12 three times for a male soul (ψυχή).
The third
14 shape (σχῆμα) is spherical (σφαιρικόν).
The second shape (σχῆμα), being
16 put after it, has
two sounds. The male soul's (ψυχή)
18 third shape (σχῆμα)
(consists) of the
20 simple (ἀπλοῦν) vowels:
ααα, εεε, ηηη, ιιι, οοο,
22 υυυ, ωωω, ωωω, ωωω.
[And] this shape (σχῆμα) is different
24 [from] the first, but (δέ)
[they resemble] each other
26 [and they] make some
[ordinary (πρόχειρον) sounds] of
28 [this sort: αεη]οω. And

29*

from these (are made) the diphthongs.

- 2 So also the
fourth and the fifth.
4 With regard to them, they were not allowed to
reveal the whole topic,
6 but (ἀλλά) only (μόνον) those things that are apparent.
You (pl.) were taught
8 about them, that you should perceive (νοεῖν) them

chanted, and the Ω's extended. Cf. *PGM* XIII.630-631:
ἐπικαλοῦμαι σε, κύριε, φδικῶ ὕμνω σου τὸ ἅγιον κρ<ά>τος·
αεηιοωωω. For discussion see tractate introduction.

28*, 23-24 **ΩΒΒΙΕΙΑΕΙΤ**: Space in the lacuna requires restoration of the
extra **ΕΙ**; the same form occurs at 30, 12.

28*, 24 "the first": Cf. 26*, 2-8.

28*, 28-29*, 2 **ΑΕΗΟΩ**: These vowels are called προτακτικά by the gram-
marians because they stand in front of the ὑποτακτικά vowels
ι and υ in order to form diphthongs. See Dionysius Thrax ch. 6
(*Grammatici Graeci* I.1 ed. Uhlig, p. 10) and *Scholía*, p. 38
(Melampous).

29*, 1 Part of the Η is now broken off from the MS.; it is more fully
attested in an early photograph. **ΝΑ ΤCΜΗ CΝΤΕ**: Cf. 26*,
6-7 and note.

29*, 7-8 Here the 2 person pl. is resumed. Cf. 27*, 22-24 and note.

ΜΑΥ ΧΕΚΑΣΕ ΖΩΟΥ Ε[ΥΑ]
 10 ΨΙΝΕ ΝΣΕΒΙΝΕ· ΧΕ [ΝΙΜ]
 ΝΕ ΤΗΡΟΥ· Η ΑΒΑΛ [ΖΙΤΟ]
 12 <Ο>ΤΟΥ ΟΥΑΕΕΤΟΥ ΟΥ[
 Η ΑΒΑΛ ΖΙΤΝ ΝΟΥΕΡ[ΗΥ]
 14 Η ΔΟΥΩΝΖ ΑΒΑΛ ΝΖΝΤ[ΑΩ]
 ΕΛΥΤΑΨΟΥ ΧΙΝ ΝΨΑΡ[Π]
 16 Η ΝΗΜΟΥ ΟΥΑΕΕΤ[ΟΥ· Η]
 ΜΝ ΝΟΥΕΡΗΥ· ΟΙΟΝ [ΕΥ]
 18 ΨΟΟΠ ΜΝ ΝΟΥΕΡΗ[Υ ΖΝ]
 ΟΥΣΜΗ· ΕΙΤΕ ΚΑΤΑ Μ[Ε]
 20 ΡΟΣ ΕΙΤΕ ΚΑΤΑ ΕΙΝ[Ε· ΣΕ]
 ΟΥΑΖ ΣΑΖΝΕ ΗΜΑΥ [Α]
 22 ΡΖΥΠΟΤΑΣΣΕ Η ΠΟΥ[ΜΕ]
 ΡΟΣ ΦΟΕΙ ΝΧΠΟ· ΑΥΨ [ΚΑ]
 24 ΤΑ ΕΙΝΕ· Η ΖΙΤΝ [ΗΜΑ]
 ΚΡΟΝ· Η ΑΒ[ΑΛ ΖΙΤΟΟΤΟΥ]
 26 ΝΝΑ ΠΧ[ΡΟΝΟΣ ΣΝΕΥ· Η]
 ΑΒΑΛ ΖΙΤΝ [ΝΒΡΑΧΥ Ε]
 28 ΤΣΑΒΚ· Π[
 ΝΑ[

30*

Η ΝΕΤΧΑΣΙ Η ΝΕΤΖΝ
 2 ΤΜΗΤΕ Η ΝΕΤΒΑΧΒ
 [Α]ΥΩ <Ν> ΣΥΜΦΩΝΟΝ ΣΕ
 4 ΨΟΟΠ ΜΝ ΝΕΤΕ ΟΥΝ
 [Τ]ΟΥ ΣΜΗ· ΑΥΩ ΚΑΤΑ ΜΕ

29*,9-11 "they": Presumably the various angels identified with the letters of the alphabet. Cf. note to 27*,9-10. "Seeking and finding," especially relating to self-knowledge, is a recurrent theme in gnostic and Hermetic literature. See e.g. *Testim. Truth* IX 69,1-4; *Auth. Teach.* VI 35,15; *Disc.* 8-9 VI 60,10-11; and for Mandaean parallels see Rudolph, "Coptica-Mandaica," p. 199. Cf. also *Gos. Thom.* 2; *Matt.* 7:8.

29*,12

29*,22

MS. reads **CTOY**.

ΡΖΥΠΟΤΑΣΣΕ: It is assumed that this verb has a passive meaning, though its form is active. The entire passage is obscure but it is probable that it involves speculation on the post-positive (and therefore "submissive," *ὑποτακτικά*) vowels and consonants in various combinations. For the terminology see e.g. *Scholia* p. 38 (Melampous on *ὑποτακτικὰ φωνήεντα*) and

- in order that they, too, might
 10 all seek and find [who]
 they are, either (ῥί)
 12 by themselves alone [
 or (ῥί) by each other,
 14 or (ῥί) to reveal [destinies]
 that have been determined from the beginning,
 16 either (ῥί) with reference to themselves alone [or (ῥί)]
 with reference to one another, just as (οἶον) [they]
 18 exist with each other [in]
 sound, whether (εἴτε) partially (κατὰ μέρος)
 20 or (εἴτε) formally (κατά-). [They are]
 commanded [to]
 22 submit (ὑποτάσσειν) or (ῥί) their
 [part (μέρος)] is generated and
 24 formal (κατά-). Either (ῥί) (they are commanded) by [the]
 [long (μακρόν)] (vowels) or (ῥί) [by]
 26 those of [dual time value (χρόνος), or (ῥί)]
 by [the short (βραχύ) (vowels)]
 28 which are small [
 [

30*

- or (ῥί) the oxytones or (ῥί) the
 2 intermediates or (ῥί) the barytones.
 And <the> consonants (σύμφωνον)
 4 exist with the vowels,
 and individually (κατὰ μέρος)

p. 47 (Melampous on ὑποτακτικὰ σύμφωνα).

29*,24-27

Cf. note to 26*,22-23.

29*,26

ΝΑ ΠΧΡΟΝΟΣ CNEY: τὰ δίχρονα φωνήεντα.

29*,27

ΒΡΑΧΥ: Cf. 26*,22-23 and note.

29*,27-29

ΕΤCΑΒΚ: A Coptic gloss on βραχύ.

30*,1-2

Here the discussion has to do with accent or pitch (τόνος).

ΝΕΤΧΑCΙ: Lit. "those that are high," = the oxytone.

ΝΕΤῤῥ ΤΜΗΤΕ: Lit. "those in the middle," = the circum-

flex. **ΝΕΤῬΑΧῆ**: Lit. "those that are low," = the barytone.

In Greek terminology, τόνος ("pitch" or "tone") is classified as

ὁ ὀξύς τόνος, ὁ βαρὺς τόνος, and ὁ περισπώμενος, or ὁ μέσος τόνος.

See *Scholias*, pp. 22-23 (Melampous) and 310 (Heliodorus).

Corr. ὀ over ε.

30*,2

ΝΕΤΕ ΟΥΝΤΟΥ CΜΗ: Cf. note to 26*,19-20.

30*,4-5

- 6 [P]OC CEY[Α]Ζ ΦΑΖΝΕ ΝΕΥ
[Α]ΥΩ CEZYΠOTACE·
- 8 [C]EYOOΠ Π<Τ> ΟΝΟΜΑCΙΑ
[N]H̄ΑΓΓΕΛΟC· ΑΥΩ
- 10 [NC]ΥΜΦΩΝΟΝ CEYΘ
[ΟΠ] Ζ]ΑΡΙ ΖΑΡΑΥ ΟΥΛΕΕΤΟΥ
- 12 [ΑΥ]Ω ΕΥΘΒΒ{Ι}ΕΙΛΕΙΤ {q̄p̄
[ΖΥ]ΠΟΤΑCCE ΑΥΩ} <CE> P̄ZY
- 14 [Π]ΟΤΑCCE ΝΗΝΟΥΤΕ
[Ε]ΘΗΠ· ΑΒΑΛ ΖΙΤΟΟΤ̄q̄ Ν
- 16 [ΝΟ]ΥΩΒΑΑΒΕ ΜΗ ΟΥ
[Μ]H̄ΤΟΥΑΖΕΙΗΤ· ΜΗ ΟΥ
- 18 [Κ]ΑΡΩq̄ ΜΗ ΟΥΖΟΡΜΗ·
[CEP̄]ΚΑΛΕΙ ΝΝΑ ΤΠΕΦΕ Ν
- 20 [CM]H̄· ΝΕΕΙ ΤΗΡΟΥ CEP̄
[ΖΥΠΟ]ΤΑCCE ΗΜΑΥ ΝΝΟΥ
- 22 [CM]H̄ ΝΟΥΩΤ· ΟΙΟΝ ΜΟ
[ΝΟ]Ν ΝΕΤΚΗΒ ΝΑΤΩΙ
- 24 [ΒΕ ΕΥ]YOOΠ 'Ζ'Ν ΝΑ ΤΠΕ
[ΦΕ ΝCM]H̄· ΝΔΑCΥ ΔΕ
- 26 [ΜΗ ΜΨΙΑ]ΦΟΝ ΜΗ ΝΕ
[ΤΖΝ ΤΜΗΤΕ CE]YOOΠ
- 28 [ΝΝΕΤΕ ΜH̄Τ]ΟΥ CΜΗ· ΠΑ
[ΛΙΝ CE]ΒΛH̄ΛΑΜH̄Τ
- 30 [ΜΗ ΝΟΥΕΡΗΥ· ΑΥ]Φ CEΠΑΡΞ

-
- 30*,7 ΖΥΠΟΤΑCCE: Cf. note to 29*,22. Probably in the background here is the notion that certain combinations of vowels and consonants can bring into subjection (ὑποτάσσειν) gods, angels, demons, etc. Cf. e.g. *PGM XIII.744-746*. Similar notions occur in the writings of late Platonism and Pythagoreanism; see e.g. Nicomachus *apud* Janus, *Musici Scriptores Graeci*, pp. 276-277; and see tractate introduction for discussion.
- 30*,8 Corr. π over ζ. ΟΝΟΜΑCΙΑ: See notes to 19*,18-20 and 27*,13-14.
- 30*,13-14 MS. reads q̄P̄ZYΠOTACE. Perhaps here the word should be translated with an active meaning, "to bring into subjection." Cf. 29*,22; 30*,7 and notes.
- 30*,16-18 Technical terms from Greek musicology are being used here,

- 6 they are commanded,
and they submit (ὑποτάσσειν).
- 8 They constitute the nomenclature (ὀνομασία)
[of] the angels (ἄγγελος). And
- 10 [the] consonants (σύμφωνον) are
self-existent,
- 12 [and] as they are changed
<they> submit (ὑποτάσσειν)
- 14 to the hidden
gods by means of
- 16 beat and
pitch and
- 18 silence and impulse (ὄρμη).
[They] summon (καλεῖν) the semivowels,
- 20 all of which
submit (ὑποτάσσειν) to them with
- 22 one [accord]; since (οἷον) it is only (μόνον)
the [unchanging] double (consonants)
- 24 that co-exist with the semivowels.
But (δέ) the aspirates (δασύ)
- 26 [and the inaspirates (ψιλόν)] and the
[intermediates] constitute
- 28 [the voiceless (consonants). Again (πάλιν)]
[they] are combined
- 30 [with each other, and] they are separate

indicating that the adept who understands the mysteries of language also knows how to chant properly, thus bringing the gods and the angels into subjection. **ΩΘΑΛΘΕ** = πληγή (Lat. *ictus*), "beat." **ΜΝΤΟΥΑΖΕΙΤ** (cf. Crum 508b) = *πικρότης* or τὸ πικρόν, "pitch." For references see Janus, *Musici Scriptores Graeci*, Index.

30*,19
30*,19-20
30*,23-25
30*,24
30*,25-28
30*,29

The superlin. stroke on **῔** is visible.

ΝΛ ΤΠΕΨΕ ΝΣΜΗ: Cf. note to 27*,3.

The double consonants ζ, ξ, and ψ are also classified as semivowels. Cf. 26*,27-27*,2 and notes.

Corr. **Ν** in **ΖΝ** over **Μ**. The scribe omitted the superlin. stroke.

Cf. 27*,4-7 and note.

Corr. The second **λ** is written over **ο**.

31*

ΑΝΟΥΕΡΗ[Υ] ΣΕΟΥΕΖ ΣΑΖ
 2 ΝΕ ΔΕ ΠΜΑΥ ΑΥΩ ΣΕΖΥ
 ΠΟΤΑΣΣΕ· ΕΥΨΟΟΠ ΔΕ [Ν]
 4 ΟΝΟΜΑΣΙΑ ΠΑΤΣΑΥΝΕ
 ΣΕΨΩΠΕ ΔΕ ΝΟΥΕΕΙ Η
 6 ΣΝΕΥ Η ΨΑΜΝΤ· Η Ϟ[ΤΑΥ]
 Η †ΟΥ· Η [C]ΑΥ ΨΑΖΡΗΙ [Α]
 8 ΣΑΨϞ ΕΟΥΝΤΟΥ ΣΜΗ [Ν]
 [ΖΑΠ]ΛΟΥΝ <ΜΝ> ΝΕΕΙ ΕΤΕ ΟΥ[ΝΤΟΥ]
 10 [CΜ]Η CΝΤ[Ε] Ν· ΠΜΑ [ΠΠΜΝΤ]
 ΣΑΨϞ Ε[ΤΡCΥ]ΜΦ[ΩΝΙ· ΖΝ]
 12 ΝΨΑΡΠ ΠΡΕΝ ΖΝ[ΖΑΕΙ]
 ΝΕ· ΣΕΒ[ΑΧ]Β· ΑΥΩ Ν[ΕΕΙ]
 14 ΖΩC ΕΜ[Ν]ΤΟΥ ΟΥCΙΑ [Μ]
 [Μ]ΕΥ Η Ε[ΥΟ]ΕΙ ΝΕΙΝΕ [Ν]
 16 [Τ]ΟΥCΙΑ [Η] ΕΥΠΩΡ[Χ Α]
 ΤΦΥCΙC [Μ]ΠΝΟΥC [ΤΗ Ε]
 18 ΤΕ ΘΑΥ[Τ ΤΕ] ΕΤΖΝ ΤΜ[ΗΤΕ]
 ΑΥΩ ΕΚΕ[Ι]ΝΕ ΑΖΟΥΝ [Ν]
 20 ΝΕ†ΝΕ ΠΝΟΥΕΡ[ΗΥ ΜΝ]
 ΝΕΤΕ ΟΥΝΤΟΥ ΣΜΗ [ΜΝ]
 22 ΝΕΤΡCΥΜΦΩΝΙ ΖΝ[ΖΑ]
 ΕΙΝΕ ΜΕΝ· ΒΑΓΑΔ[Α]Ζ[ΑΘΑ]
 24 ΒΕΓΕΔΕΖ[Ε]ΘΕ [ΒΗΓΗΔΗ]
 ΖΗΘΗ· Β[ΙΓΙΔΙΖΙΘΙ· ΒΟΓΟ]

31*,1-4

Cf. 30*,6-9; 27*,9-10.13-14 and notes.

31*,5-9

The simple vowels; cf. 28*,2-3 and note.

31*,9-10

I.e. the diphthongs. Cf. 26*,6-7 and note.

31*,10

Probably ΝΜ, for ΝΠ, "with," or "and."

31*,10-11

ΠΜΝΤCΑΨϞ ΕΤΡCΥΜΦΩΝΙ: Lit. "the seventeen which sound together," i.e. the seventeen σύμφωνα. Cf. 31*,22; 37*,28; 38*,6.19; 39*,7 for the verb συμφωνεῖν used in this way; the noun occurs at 30*,3.10.

31*,14-15

ΜΝΤΟΥ ΟΥCΙΑ ΠΜΕΥ: Cf. note to 5.2-3.

31*,15-16

Cf. 25*,12-14.

31*,17-18

The mind (νοῦς) is masculine by nature. Cf. 4.3-5 and note.

31*,19

Here and at 32*,3-4 the 2 person sg. reappears. Cf. 29*,7-8 and note. This passage has the appearance of a school-master's instruction to a student. Cf. note to 31*,23-27.

31*,20

ΝΕ†ΝΕ ΠΝΟΥΕΡΗΥ: I.e., the same vowels combined with the consonants in order, such as in the examples below.

3I*

from one another. They are
 2 commanded (+ δέ), and they submit (ὑποτάσσειν),
 and (δέ) they constitute an
 4 ignorant nomenclature (ὀνομασία).
 And (δέ) they become one or (ἡ)
 6 two or (ἦ) three or (ῆ) [four]
 or (ῆ) five or (ῆ) six up to
 8 seven having a
 [simple (ἀπλοῦν)] sound, <together with> these which
 [have]
 10 two [sounds], . . . the place [of the]
 [seventeen consonants (συμφωνεῖν). Among]
 12 the first names [some] are
 less. And
 14 since (ὥς) [these] do not have being (οὐσία),
 either (ἡ) [they] are an aspect [of]
 16 being (οὐσία) [or (ἡ)] they are divided [from]
 the nature (φύσις) [of] the mind (νοῦς),
 18 which [is masculine] (and) which is [intermediate.]
 And you (sg.) [put] in
 20 those that resemble each other [with]
 the vowels [and]
 22 the consonants (συμφωνεῖν). Some
 (+ μέν) are: βαγαδαζαθα,
 24 βεγεδεζεθε, [βηγγηδη]
 ζηθη, [βιγιδιζιθι, βογο]

3I*,21

ΝΕΤΕ ΟΥΝΤΟΥ ΣΜΗ: Cf. note to 26*,19-20.

3I*,22

ΝΕΤΡ̄CΥΜΦΩΝΙ: Cf. 3I*,10-11 and note.

3I*,23-27

Such combinations are found in ancient school exercises. See e.g. "Schreibübung des kleinen Apollonius," pap. no. 147 in Wilcken, *Urkunden* I, p. 634; cf. Böhlig, *Die griechische Schule*, pp. 16-17. The first six columns (there are 29 in all) of little Apollonius' writing exercise look like this:

α	βα	γα	δα	ζα	θα
ε	βε	γε	δε	ζε	θε
η	βη	γη	δη	ζη	θη
ι	βι	γι	δι	ζι	θι
ο	βο	γο	δο	ζο	θο
υ	βυ	γυ	δυ	ζυ	θυ
ω	βω	γω	δω	ζω	θω

Dornseiff refers to a magical papyrus which has a similar table. See Dornseiff, *Das Alphabet*, p. 67.

26 ΔΟΞΟΘΘ [ΒΥΓΥΔΥΖΥΘΥ]
 ΒΩΓΩΔΦ[ΖΩΘΩ· ΛΥΩ]
 28 ΠΚΕΣΕ[ΕΠΕ
 ΒΑ[ΒΕΒΗΒΙΒΟΒΥΒΩ·]

32*

ΠΚΕΣΕΠΕ ΔΕ ΕΥΨΟΟΠ
 2 ΖΝ ΟΥΨΒΒΙΕ· ΔΒΕΒΗΒΙ
 [Β]ΟΒ ΧΕΚΑΣΕ ΕΚΝΑΣΑΥ
 4 [Ζ]ΟΥ· ΛΥΩ ΝΚΠΩΡΧ ΔΝ
 [Α]ΠΕΛΟΣ ΛΥΩ ΟΥΝ ΖΝ
 6 [Α]ΠΟΤΕΛΕΣΤΙΚΟΝ ΝΑ
 ΨΩΠΕ ΤΕ[Ζ]ΟΥΕΙΤΕ ΜΕΝ
 8 [Ε]ΤΝΑΝΟΥΣ ΟΥΑΒΑΛ ΖΝ
 [ΠΨ]ΑΜΝΤ ΤΕ· ΣΠ[...]Ε
 10 [...]. Ρ ΧΡΕΙ[Α] ΜΠ.[
 [...]Α[...]ΑΖΤΕ[
 12 [...] ΝΟΥΣΧΗΜΑ· <Τ> ΔΥ
 [ΑΣ] ΔΕ ΜΝ ΤΜΟΝΑΣ ΣΕ
 14 [Τ]ΗΤΩΝ ΕΝ [ΝΛ]ΑΔΥΕ· ΑΛ
 [Λ]Α ΕΥΨΟΟ[Π Ν]ΖΟΥΕΙ
 16 [ΤΕ] ΤΑΥΑΣ [ΜΕ]Ν ΕΣΠ[Α]
 [ΡΧ] ΣΠΑΡΧ [ΑΤ]ΜΟΝΑΣ Α[Υ]

- 31*,29 The superlin. stroke is visible for at least four more letter spaces. For the restoration cf. the second of Apollonius' columns. Cf. also 32*,2-3.
- 32*,2-3 The full sequence would be: ΔΒΕΒΗΒΙΒΟΒΥΒΩΒ.
- 32*,3-4 ΕΚΝΑΣΑΥ[Ν]ΟΥ, "in order that you might know them," would render a better meaning, but the form ΣΑΥΝ is grammatically impossible. Perhaps read ΕΚΝΑΣ<ΟΥΩΝ>ΟΥ.
- 32*,4-5 Knowledge of the letters of the alphabet enables the adept to escape from the lower regions where the angels reside and ascend to God. Cf. Pearson, "The Tractate Marsanes," p. 380, and tractate introduction.
- 32*,6 ΖΝΑΠΟΤΕΛΕΣΤΙΚΟΝ: This word is here taken as equivalent to ἀποτελέσματα, "effects" or "results," (opp. αἰτία, "causes"). Cf. e.g. Proclus *Theology*, prop. 18, 65, 71, 74, 98, 173; also Basilides, Hipp. Ref. VII.24.2. But perhaps a noun is missing, in which case the word, as an adjective, means "productive" or "final."
- 32*,7-9 Perhaps the meaning is that, of the numbers making up the universe, the triad (ΠΨΑΜΝΤ = ἡ τριάς) or "the (number) three" is "the first" (note fem. gender) to qualify as an "effect"

- 26 δοζοθο, [βυγυδυζυθυ,
βωγωδωζωθω. [And]
28 the rest [
βα[βεβηβιβοβυβω.]

32*

- But (δέ) the rest are
2 different: αβεβηβι
βοβ, in order that you (sg.) might [collect]
4 them, and be separated from the
angels (ἄγγελος). And there
6 will be some effects (ἀποτελεστικόν).
The first (fem.) (+ μέν),
8 which is good, is from
[the] triad. It [
10 [] has need (χρεία) of [
[
12 [] their shapes (σχῆμα). <The> dyad (δυάς)
(+ δέ) and the monad (μονάς)
14 do not resemble anything, but (ἀλλά)
they are first to exist.
16 The dyad (δυάς) [(+ μέν)], being divided,
is divided [from the] monad (μονάς), [and]

(1 + 2 = 3); the monad and the dyad would then be understood as “causes.” Cf. 32*,12-18. The whole passage, extending to somewhere on the fragmentary next page, is an affectation of “arithmology,” of the type dear to the Pythagoreans and later Platonists. A key text in Plato gave a profound impulse to this kind of speculation, *Tim.* 53B: The Creator, in bringing the elements out of chaos into order “first shaped them by means of forms and numbers (πρῶτον διεσχηματίσατο εἰδεσί τε καὶ ἀριθμοῖς).” Philo preserves extensive examples of Pythagorean number-speculation; on these see Staehle, *Die Zahlenmystik*. On the relation between arithmology and “alphabet-mysticism” see Dornseiff, *Das Alphabet*, pp. 61-63; Lewy, *Chaldaean Oracles*, pp. 239-240. Of the triad, Philo says e.g. that it is the first of the odd numbers (*Op. Mund.* 13), and the first number to consist of beginning, middle, and end (*Quaest. in Gen.* II.5; cf. III.3); the triad among numbers and the right-angled triangle are “the foundation of the knowledge of all things” (*Quaest. in Gen.* IV.8).

18 [ω ς]ηη αθ[υπ]φστασις
 [π]εφταυ Δ[ε αq]χι στοι
 20 [χει]φν· αγ<ω> πμαρτ̄ου
 [αq]χι ηπτωτ· πμαρ
 22 [σα]γ αqχωκ αβαλ· ριτο
 [οτ]ῆ̄ ογαεετῆ̄· πμαρ
 24 [σαωῆ̄ Δ]ε αqχι σαλειε·
 [αγω πμαρ]ψμογν αq
 26 [χι ± 8]ρηγ α
 [± 9 ς]ῆτωτ·
 28 [± 10]τ qτα
 [± 10]ουρ ουο·

33*

αγω πμ[αρ]μητ α[qβαλλπ]
 2 πμα τηρῆ̄ αβαλ· π[μαρ]
 μητογν δε μη πμ[αρ]
 4 μ[ητς]ηαγς αχιοο[ρ
 [·]ηαπ[·] εμ[η]το[γ ... ημ]
 6 [ε]γ qχα[ςι ...]πμ[
 [ς]αωq ε[τε ...]τεq [
 8 [...] ημ[εγ

(1 line missing)

-
- 32*,19-20 **ΠΕΦΤΑΥ**: I.e., "the (number) four," or tetrad. The triad has already been mentioned at 32*,9. On the tetrad in relation to the four elements see e.g. Philo *Op. Mund.* 52; *Vit. Mos.* II.88; etc.
- 32*,20-21 **ΠΜΑΡΤ̄ΟΥ**: Lit. "the fifth" = ἡ πεντάς, "the pentad" or "the (number) five." ΤΩΤ = δμόνοια, "concord" or "harmony." The interval of the fifth is an important aspect of musical harmony. Cf. e.g. Macrobius *In Somn.* I.6.43-44. For Philo the number 5 is predominantly the number of the senses, hence of sense-perception. See e.g. *Op. Mund.* 62; *Vit. Mos.* II.81-82; *Quaest. in Gen.* IV.110; etc.
- 32*,21-23 **ΠΜΑΡΣΑΥ**: Lit. "the sixth" = ἡ ἑξάς, "the hexad," or "the (number) six." According to Philo it is a "perfect" number. See e.g. *Op. Mund.* 13-14, 89; *Leg. All.* I.2-4.
- 32*,23-24 **ΠΜΑΡΣΑΩῆ̄**: Lit. "the seventh" (Gk. ἑβδομος); here = ἡ ἑβδομάς, "the hebdomad," or "the (number) seven." "Beauty" is only one of the manifold attributes of the number 7. See Philo's lengthy discussion, *Op. Mund.* 89-128, esp. 107; cf. *Vit. Mos.* II.209-210. See also Macrobius *In Somn.* I.6.1-82.

- 18 [it] belongs to the hypostasis (ὑπόστασις).
 But (δέ) the tetrad received (the) [elements (στοιχεῖον)],
 20 and the pentad
 received concord, and the
 22 [hexad] was perfected by
 itself. The
 24 [hebdomad (+ δέ)] received beauty,
 [and the] ogdoad
 26 [received] . . .
 [] ready
 28 [] greatly.

33*

- And the [decad revealed]
 2 the whole place.
 But (δέ) the eleven and the
 4 [twelve] have traversed
 [] not having [
 6 it [is higher
 seven [
 8 [

(1 line missing)

-
- 32*,25 ΠΜΑΖΩΜΟΥΝ: Lit. "the eighth" (Gk. ὄγδοος); here = ἡ ὄγδοάς, "the ogdoad," or "the (number) eight."
 32*,27-29 In one of these lines there was undoubtedly a reference to the ennead, the number 9.
 33*,1-2 ΠΜΑΖΜΗΤ: Lit. "the tenth" = ἡ δεκάς, "the decad," or "the (number) ten." The number 10 is tied to "revelation" also in Philo, both scriptural and arithmetical; see esp. *Decal.* 18-31. As the "supremely perfect" number, it contains all other numbers in itself.
 33*,2-3 ΠΜΑΖΜΗΝΤΟΥΗ: Lit. "the eleventh" = ἡ ἑνδεκάς, "the (number) eleven." Philo does not discuss the number 11.
 33*,3-4 ΠΜΑΖΜΗΤCΝΑΥC: Lit. "the twelfth" = ἡ δωδεκάς, "the (number) twelve."
 33*,6 Corr. ϣ over ε; the scribe had begun to write ε but omitted the top of the ε.
 33*,6-7 Perhaps ΠΜ[αζ/ς]αψϣ, "the seventh," or ΠΜ[ητ/ς]αψϣ, "the seventeen." Cf. 31*,10-11.
 33*,7 Either ε[τε ουν]τεϣ, "which has," or ε[τε μη]τεϣ, "which does not have."

10 [.] []
 ΜΕΥ []
 12 ἀβαλ ρ[Ν
 [...]Ν []
 14 [.]ΛΟC []
 [Ρ]ΦΝ Μ []
 16 ΟΤῸ []
 ΦΡΗΤ ᾤ[ε ...]ΑΙΡ[... Ρ]
 18 ΑΡΧΕCΦ[ΑΙ Α]ΡΑΠ[ΟΧΩ]
 ΡΙ<ΖΕ> ΗΜΑΥ· ΑΒΑΛ ρ[ΙΤΟΟ]
 20 ΤῸ ΗΝΟΥΜΑΕΙΝ [ΜΝ]
 ΟΥCΤΙΓΜΗ· ΗΠΕ[Τ†]
 22 ΤΩΝ ΜΝ ΠΕΤΟΕΙ Ἰ[ΧΑ]
 ΧΕ· ΤΕΕΙ [ΤΕ] ΘΕ []
 24 ΗΤΟΥCΙΑ []
 ΒΑΛ ΝΕ []
 26 ΗΝCΤΟ[ΙΧΙΟΝ
 ΔΕ ρΝ Ο[Υ

34*

[ΟΥΑ]Β Η ΚΑΤΑ ΟΥΖΩ
 2 [ΤΠ] ΕΦ' Ψ' ΟΟΠ ΖΑΡΙΖΑΡΑ<Φ>·
 [ΑΥ]Ω Ε<Υ> ΨΟΟΠ ΨΑ ΝΟΥ
 4 [ΕΡΗ]Υ ρΝ ΟΥΧΠΟ Η [ρΝ] ΟΥ
 [ΜΕC]ΤΟΥ ΑΥ]Ω ΚΑΤ[Α
 6 [...]ΧΠ[Ο ...]ΜΗΝΤΕΥ
 [...]·[.....]Ω· ΝΕΦ[Ι
 8 [± ΙΟ]ΕΥ· []
 (2 lines missing)
 [± Ι2]ΜΑ
 12 [± ΙΟ]ΟΥΑΤ
 [± ΙΟ]ΨΟ[.

33*,13-14

Perhaps ΑΓΓ/Ε]ΛΟC, "angel(s)." Cf. 32*,5.

33*,15-16

Perhaps ΑΒΑΛ ρ[ΙΤΟ]/ΟΤῸ, "by means of." Cf. 33*,19-20.

33*,18-19

ΑΠΟΧΩΡΙ<ΖΕ>: Instead of ἀποχωρεῖν, "withdraw," ἀποχωρῖζειν, "separate" is meant, as indicated by the object ΗΜΑΥ.

33*,20-21

The reference here is probably to punctuation marks, στυγμαί. Cf. Dionysius Thrax, ch. 4.

- 10 []
 []
 12 from []
 []
 14 []
 [name(s)]
 16 []
 promise that []
 18 begin (ἀρχῆσθαι) [to separate (ἀποχωρίζειν)]
 them by means of
 20 a mark [and]
 a point (στιγμῆ), the [one which]
 22 [quarrels] from the one which is [an enemy].
 Thus []
 24 of being (οὐσία) []
 . . . []
 26 the letters (στοιχεῖον)
 (+ δέ) in [a holy

34*

- or (ἥ) according to (κατά) a [bond]
 2 existing separately.
 [And] <they> exist with each
 4 [other] in generation or (ἥ) [in]
 [birth. And] according to (κατά) []
 6 [generation] they do not have
 [] these []
 8 []

(2 lines missing)

- []
 12 []
 []

-
- 33*,24-25 Perhaps ΟΥΩΝΖ Δ]/ΒΔΛ ΝΕ[Κ, "reveal to you."
 33*,26 ΝΚΤΟΙΧΙΟΝ: Or "elements"; cf. 32*,19-20.
 34*,2 Corr. ΕΦ'Ψ'ΟΟΠ: Ψ is written above a cancelled Ο.
 ΖΑΡΙΖΑΡΑ<Ϙ> : MS. reads ΖΑΡΙΖΑΡΑΥ. If ΖΑΡΙΖΑΡΑΥ is
 correct the previous word should be emended: Ε<Υ> ΨΟΟΠ,
 "since they exist separately."
 34*,3 MS. reads ΕΦΨΟΟΠ.
 34*,4-5 Cf. 29*,22-24; but the meaning is not clear in either passage!

- 14 [± II] ΤΟΝ[
 [± IO] ΕΛΟΣ .[
 16 [± IO] ΕΥ Μ[
 [.....]Ν[.....].[.]·Ε[
 18 [... Ο]ΥΕΕΙ [.. Ε]ΦΧΟΥ Μ
 [ΠΑΙ]ΝΙΓΜΑ Φ[Ι]ΟΝ ΝΖΡΗ
 20 [Ι ΖΗ Π]ΑΙΣΕΝΤΟΣ ΚΟΣΜΟΣ
 [ΕΦΨ]ΟΟΠ ΝΒΙ ΠΡΠΕΕΙ
 22 [ΕΤΕΙ]ΡΕ ΝСАΨḳ ΝΨΕ Μ
 [ΜΑΖΕ] ΑΥΩ ΟΥΕΙ<Ε> ΡΟ ΕΦ
 24 [.....].[.]·Π· ΝΖΡΗΓ
 [..... ΨΑ Δ]ΝΗΖΕ ΕΥ
 26 [± 9] ΨΑΜΝΤ
 [± 9] ΑΠΓΤΑΥ
 28 [± 7] ϸΦ]ΡΑΓΙϸ Ν
 [± IO] ΝΚΛΟΟΛΕ·

35*

- [ΜΝ Μ]ΜΟΥΕΙΗ· ΜΝ ΝΕΙ
 2 [ΝΕ ΝΝ]ΣΜΑΤ ΜΜΟΥΛΖ
 [ΜΝ] ΖΝΕΙΝΕ ΝСМАРАΔ
 4 [ΙΝΟΣ] ΠΚΕΣΕΕΠΕ ΨΝΑ
 [Τϸ]ΕΒΑ[Κ] ΑΡΑΥ· ΠΕΕΙ ΠΕ
 6 [Π]ΧΠΟ [ΝΝ]ΡΕΝ· ΤΕΤΕ Μ[ΠΟΥ]

34*,15

Perhaps ΑΓΓ]ΕΛΟΣ, "angel(s)." Cf. 33*,13-14 and note.

34*,18

Perhaps [ΕΤΕ Ο]ΥΕΕΙ [ΠΕ, "which is one."

34*,20

ΠΑΙΣΕΝΤΟΣ ΚΟΣΜΟΣ: Cf. 5,18-19 and note.

34*,21

"the temple": The entire visible universe is referred to as God's "temple" in "Scipio's Dream," as reported by Cicero (*Resp.* VI.9-26, esp. 15). On this concept, probably derived from Stoic philosophy, see Macrobius *In Somn.* I.14.2. The same idea is found in Philo *Spec. Leg.* I.66. At *Vit. Mos.* II.82 the same symbolism occurs, but the κόσμος νοητός, "the intelligible world," is designated as the "Holy of Holies." Cf. note to 4,6-7.

34*,22-23

Perhaps "seven hundred cubits" is symbolically related to the seven planetary spheres. This cosmic temple, with its measurements, is analogous to the eschatological temple of Ezek 40-42; cf. Rev. 11:1.

34*,23

ΟΥΕΙ<Ε> ΡΟ: A "river" beside a temple would reflect a typically Egyptian conception. Cf. also the river of water flowing from Ezekiel's eschatological temple, Ezek 47:1-12; cf. Joel 3:18; Rev 22:1. The MS. reading is intelligible as it

- 14 []
 []
 16 []
 []
 18 [] one [] speaking
 [the] riddle (αἰνιγμα). Because (οἶον) within
 20 [the] sense-perceptible (αἰσθητός) world (κόσμος)
 there exists the temple
 22 [which measures] seven hundred
 [cubits], and a river which
 24 [] within
 [] for] ever, they
 26 [] three
 [] to the four
 28 [] seal(s) (σφραγίς)
 [] clouds

35*

- [and the] waters, and the [forms]
 2 [of the] wax images,
 [and] some emerald (σμαράγδινος) likenesses.
 4 For the rest, I will
 [teach you (sg.)] about them. This is
 6 [the] generation of the names. That (fem.) which [was not]

stands: **ΟΥΕΙ ΡΟ**, "one gate." But in support of "river" cf. 35*,1, "waters."

- 34*,24 A superlin. stroke is visible above the last letter in the first lacuna.
 34*,28 σφραγίς: This term may carry a baptismal meaning here. Cf. 66*,1-5; 2,12-13 and note.
 34*,29 Corr. **ΛΕ** over **Μ**.
 35*,1-6 This passage may refer to cultic magical rituals utilizing stones, images, and other objects, such as were practiced by the "Chaldaean" theurgists. On "Chaldaean" magic ritual see Lewy, *Chaldaean Oracles*, pp. 227-257.
 35*,2 For examples of the use of wax images in magic see e.g. *PGM* IV.296-300ff.; 2360-2373; 2380-2383ff.; 2943-2948ff.
 35*,3-4 For the use of emerald stones in magic see e.g. *PGM* V.239-240ff.
 35*,5-6 "This is the generation of the names." Perhaps this statement refers to magical rituals utilized in order to conjure up the names of the gods and the angels. Cf. the Chaldaean "Iynx," a magical top, on which see Lewy, *Chaldaean Oracles*, pp. 249-252.

8 **χπας [.....]. [. χιν η]**
ψαρπ [
 (2 lines missing)
 [.] η[
 12 [.]ϩμ.[
 [.] ψα[
 14 [.]ψο[
 ετβε[
 16 ταζε[
 δε [.....]ψα...[
 18 **σαπ ρω[ε εφ]ατπ ρωσ**
εφψηψ ρωσ εφβ[αχβ·]
 20 **φωοοπ δε ηβι πλ[ογος]**
ηρϩρεψ̄ ογν κε[λο]
 22 **γος δε ψοοπ εφρ[ηη]**
αρογν ατογσι[α
 24 **ρε ητεειμ[ι]ηε [**
χε απε[
 26 **αγω φογ[**
ταιαφορ[α
 28 **μη η[**

36*

ηπτηρ̄ μη ογ[
 2 **ηνογσια ηατπ[ωψε**
αγω ταγνamic ε[
 4 **εγντες ημεγ η[ογ]**
κοινωνια α[π]ογν[αφ]
 6 **[ρ]η ογπραχ μη ο[γ**
[± 9]ιο ειτ[ε
 8 **[± 10]ωμ.[**
 (2 lines missing)
[± 11]ε· [

35*, 18-23 The translation here is very uncertain, and lack of context prevents adequate interpretation.

35*, 18 ατπ: Or "laden."

35*, 19 ψηψ: Or "equalized."

35*, 20 λόγος: Perhaps the divine Logos is meant. Cf. e.g. *Gos. Eg.* III

- generated [from the]
 8 beginning [
 (2 lines missing)
- 12 [
 [
 14 [
 with regard to [
 16 [
 (+ δέ) [
 18 time(s), when (ὥς) [confined,] when (ὥς)
 spread out, when (ὥς) [diminished.]
 20 But (δέ) there exists the gentle [word (λόγος),]
 and (δέ) there exists another
 22 word (λόγος) which [approaches]
 being (οὐσία) [
 24 in this [manner
 . . . [
 26 And he [
 the difference (διαφορά) [
 28 and the [

36*

- the all and a [
 2 the [undivided] beings (οὐσία)
 and the power (δύναμις) [
 4 having [a]
 share (κοινωνία) in [the joy]
 6 separately and [
 [] whether (εἴτε)
 8 [
 (2 lines missing)
 [

49,16-22.

36*,2

ΑΤΠΩΨΕ: Cf. 13*,21.

36*,6

There is room in a lacuna between **ΠΡΑΧ** and **ΜΝ** for an additional letter, or perhaps a colon.

36*,8

Perhaps **С]ΨΜλ**, "body" or "(in)corporeal"; cf. 36*,19-20.

12 [± IO]ΝΤΟΥ[
 [± IO]ε οΥ[
 14 [IO]μα[
 [± IO]Ν ΒΑΜ
 16 [± 7 εϛ]ΨΟΟ[Π]
 [ΖΜ] ΜΑ ΝΙΜ [.....]ΦΜ[
 18 [..] ΗΜΑΥ [ΝΟΥ]ΑΕΙΨ ΝΙΜ
 [εϛ]ΨΟΟΠ ΜΝ ΝCΩΜΑ
 20 [ΤΙ]ΚΟΝ ΜΝ ΝΑΤCΩΜΑ
 [Π]ΞΕΙ ΠΕ ΠΨΕΧΕ ΝΝΖΥ
 22 [ΠΟC]ΤΑCΙC ΑΤΡΕ ΟΥΕΕΙ
 [....] ΝΤΕΕΙΖΕ· ΕΙΨΧΕ
 24 [.....]ΞΑ· ΕΝ ΜΝ ΝΟΥ
 [± 9]ε εϛϞΒΟΗ
 26 [ΘΙ ΝΝΕΤϞΤ]ΑΡΑCCE ΝΜ
 [± 7]ΟΥΑΝΖ ΑΒΑ[Λ]
 28 [± 8 εϛ]εΨΑΟΥ

37*

[ε]ΕΙ CΟΥΩΩΝῆ ḡΝΑ
 2 [Μ]ΟΥΤΕ ΑΡΑϞ· ΟΥΝ ΖΝ
 [Ψ]ΕΧΕ ΔΕ ΨΟΟΠ ΖΑΕΙΝΕ
 4 [ΜΕ]Ν ΕΥΟΕΙ ΝCΝ[ΕΥ· ΖΝ]
 [Κ]ΑΥΕ [Δ]Ε ΕΥΨΟΟ[Π ΖΑΡΙ]
 6 [Ζ]ΑΡΑΥ [.....]ΜΕ[
 ΑΤΟΥ[
 8 [..].[

(2 lines missing)

[.]ΤΟ[
 12 [.]ΕΙΠΑΡ[
 [Α]ΥΩ ΕΥ[
 14 ΞΩC [
 Η ΝΕΤ[

36*,16-17 The reference is probably to the Father. Cf. 1,11-27.

36*,20 ΑΤCΩΜΑ: Cf. 3,8-9 and note.

36*,21-22 "hypostases": Only here in the plural. Perhaps the meaning here is "existent (divine) beings."

36*,22 Corr. The scribe seems (erroneously) to have written O over Δ in -CΤΑCΙC.

- 12 []
 []
 14 []
 [] power
 16 [he] exists
 [in] every place []
 18 [] them always.
 [He] dwells with the corporeal (σωματικόν)
 20 and the incorporeal (-σῶμα) ones.
 This is the word of the hypostases (ὑπόστασις)
 22 that one should
 [] in this way. If
 24 [] with their
 [] helping (βοηθεῖν)
 26 [those who stir up (ταράσσειν)] the
 [] manifest
 28 [] if one

37*

knows him, he will

- 2 [call] upon him.
 But (δέ) there are words, some
 4 of which [(+ μέν)] are [two]
 [but (δέ) others] existing
 6 [separately
 []
 8 []

(2 lines missing)

- []
 12 []
 [and] they []
 14 . . . []
 or (ἢ) those which []

36*,28-37*,2 Knowing God (cf. 1,11-12; 68*,17) implies "calling upon" (ἐπικαλεῖν) him, which, in turn, implies knowledge of his mystical name(s). Cf. Nicom. *apud* Janus, *Musici Scriptores Graeci*, pp. 276-277; PGM XIII.630-631 (quoted in n. to 28*,17-22) *et passim*; *Pist. Soph.* chs. 136, 142; 1 *Jeu* ch. 6 *et passim*; 2 *Jeu* ch. 46 *et passim*.

36*,7 Perhaps ἀτοῦ[CIA], "non-being." Cf. 5,14 and note.

16 ΗΥ [.] [± 8]ΑΒ[
 Η ΚΑΤΑ Ν[ΕΤ]Ε ΟΥ[Ν]ΤΟΥ
 18 ΧΡΟΝΟΣ [ΜΜ]ΕΥ ΑΥΩ [ΝΕ]
 ΕΙ· Η ΕΥΟΥΕΤΟΥ ΑΡ[ΑΥ]
 20 Η ΕΥΖΑΤΡ̄ ΑΝΟΥΕΡΗ[Υ]
 Η ΝΕΥΟΓΑ[Ε]ΕΤΟΥ Η [ΝΑ]
 22 ΤΣΜΗ ΣΝΤΕ· Η ΝΑ Τ[ΣΜΗ]
 ΝΖΑΠΛΟΥΝ· Η Ν[
 24 ΝΙΜ· Η Ν.[
 ΤΟΥ· Η Ν.[± 7 ΨΟ]
 26 ΟΠ ΚΑΤΑ Θ[Ε ΨΟ]
 ΟΠ ΔΕ ΑΒΑ[Λ
 28 ΝΕΤΡ̄[ΣΥΜΦΩΝΙ

38*

ΕΥΨΟΟΠ ΖΑΡΙΖΑΡΑΥ·
 2 ΨΑΝΤΟΥΠΑΡΧΟΥ [ΑΥ]Ω
 ΝΣΕΖΑΤΡΟΥ· ΖΝΖΑΦ[Ι]
 4 [ΝΕ ΔΕ] ΟΥΝ ΒΑΜ ΜΜ[ΕΥ]
 [. . .] ΚΑΤΑ ΝΣ[ΤΟ]ΙΧΙΟ[Ν]
 6 [ΝΝΕ]ΤΡ̄[ΣΥΜΦ]ΩΝΙ· Ε[
 [± 9 Ο]ΥΔΙΑ
 8 [± 11]·[
 (2 lines missing)
 [± 11]· ΔΕ [
 12 [± 10]ΨΩΠΕ [
 [± 10]ΝΟΥÇ[
 14 [± 11]Π ΔΕ [
 [.]ΥΑ[. . . . ΖΑΡΙ]ΖΑΡΑ[Υ]
 16 [.]ΣΑ.[.]Ν[. . Α]ΥΨ ΝΨΑ
 [Μ]ΝΤ [Κ]ΑΤΑ [Ν]ΕΤΕ ΟΥΝ
 18 [ΤΟ]Υ ΣΜΗ· Α[Υ]Ψ ΣΑΠ ΣΝΕΥ
 [ΚΑ]ΤΑ ΝΕΤΡ̄[Σ]ΥΜΦΩΝΙ
 20 [ΑΥ]Ω ΟΥΣΑΠ ΝΟΥΩΤ ΚΑ
 [ΤΑ] ΠΜΑ ΤΗΡ̄· ΑΥΩ ΖΝ
 22 [ΟΥΜ]ΝΤΑΤΣΑΥΝΕ ΚΑΤΑ

37*,21-22 ΝΑ ΤΣΜΗ ΣΝΤΕ: Cf. 26*,6-7 and note.

37*,22-23 ΝΑ ΤΣΜΗ ΝΖΑΠΛΟΥΝ: Cf. 28*,2-3 and note.

37*,28 ΝΕΤΡ̄[ΣΥΜΦΩΝΙ: Cf. 31*,10-11 and note.

16 [
 or (ξ) according to (κατά) [those that] have
 18 duration (χρόνος). And [these]
 either (ξ) are separate from [them]
 20 or (ξ) they are joined to one another,
 or (ξ) with themselves, either (ξ) [the]
 22 diphthongs, or (ξ) the
 simple (ἄτλοῦν) [vowels], or (ξ) every [
 24 or (ξ) [
 or (ξ) [
 26 [exist] just as (κατά) [
 [exist] (+ δέ) . . . [
 28 the [consonants (συμφωνεῖν)

38*

they exist individually
 2 until they are divided
 and doubled. Some
 4 [(+ δέ)] have the power
 [] according to (κατά) the [letters (στοιχεῖον)]
 6 [that are consonants (συμφωνεῖν)
 [
 8 [
 (2 lines missing)
 [] (+ δέ)
 12 [] become
 [] . . .
 14 [] (+ δέ)
 [] by themselves
 16 [] and three (times)
 [for (κατά) the] vowels,
 18 and twice
 [for (κατά)] the consonants (συμφωνεῖν),
 20 [and] once for (κατά)
 the entire place, and with
 22 ignorance for (κατά)

38*,7-8

Perhaps **ΟΥΔΙΑ**/[**ΦΟΡΑ**, "a difference"; cf. 35*,27.

38*,13

Perhaps **ΝΟΥΣ**[**ΙΑ**, "beings"; cf. 36*,2.

38*,16-17

"three (times)": Cf. 28*,12-13 and note.

[NET]ΨΟΟΠ ΖΗ ΠΨΙΒΞ
 24 [± 7 Ν]ΤΑΖΨΩΠ[Ε]
 [± 8]ΟΥ· ΜΗ ΠΜ[Α]
 26 [ΤΗΡῪ . . .] ΜΠ'ΖΑΕ'· ΑΥ
 [Ω] ἩΤΑΥ ΤΗΡῪ[Υ]
 28 [± 7 ΕΥΨ]ΦΩΠ ΜΕΝ

39*

ΕΥΖΗΠ· ΑΛΛΑ ΖΟΥΧΟΟΥ
 2 ΖΗ ΟΥΩΝΖ ΑΒΑΛ· ΟΥΤΕ
 ΗΠΟΥΒΩ ΟΥΨ ΝΟΥΑΝΖΟΥ
 4 ΑΒΑΛ· ΟΥΔΕ ΗΠΟΥΒΩ ΟΥΨ
 ΗΦΟΝΟΜΑΖΕ ΗΝΑΓΓΕ
 6 [Λ]ΦC· ΝΕΤΕ ΟΥΝΤΟΥ CΜΗ
 [Δ]Ε ΗΜΕ[Υ CΕΖΑ]ΤῪ ΑΝΕΤῪ
 8 [CΥ]ΜΦ[ΩΝΙ ΕΙΤ]Ε ΗΠCΑΝ
 ΒΑ[Λ ΕΙΤΕ ΗΠCΑ]ΝΖΟΥΝ·
 10 ΖΙΤ[± 9 ΑΖ]ΟΥ
 ΧΟΟ[C
 12 ΤCΕ[ΒΑΚ
 ΠΑΛΙΝ Ψ[Α ΑΝ]ΗΖΕ Α[ΥΧΙ Η]
 14 ΠΕ ΗῪΤΑΥ [Ν]CΑΠ· ΑΥ[ΜΙ]
 CΕ ΗΜΑΥ [ΝΨ]ΑΜΗΤ Η
 16 CΑΠ ΑΥΩ [Α]ΥΨΩΠΞ
 ΗΜἩΤ[.]ΑΝ[
 18 ΕΤΒΕ ΝΕ[ΕΙ] ΜΕΝ [Α]ΖΝΧ
 ΠΕ ΡΩΨΕ ΨΨΕ ΓΑΡ Α
 20 ΤΡΕΠΟΥΕΕΙ ΠΟΥΕΕΙ ΨΠΕ
 ΒΑΜ ΝΕῪ ΗΤΑῪ Α† ΚΑΡ
 22 ΠΟC· ΑΥΩ [Ν]ΤἩΤΗΨΩΠΞ
 ΨΑ ΑΒΑΛ [Ε]ΗΝΝΟΥΧΕ Η
 24 CΑΑΖ[Ε] Ἡ[CΑ] ΗΜΥCΤΗ[ΡΙ]
 [Ο]Ἡ [.] ἩΕ ΠΝΕ[
 26 [± 7 Γ]ΑΡ ΕΤΟ[ΕΙ

38*,24

The superlin. stroke is visible.

38*,26

Corr. ΖΑΕ written above ΜΑΖ, cancelled.

39*,1

"hidden": Cf. 30*,14-15. The reference here is probably to the personified letters of the alphabet. Cf. note to 27*,9-10.

39*,5-6

Cf. 19*,18-20 and notes.

39*,6-7

ΝΕΤΕ ΟΥΝΤΟΥ CΜΗ ΗΜΑΥ: Cf. note to 26*,19-20.

- [those which] are subject to change
 24 [which] became
 [] together with the [entire]
 26 [place] finally. And
 [] they all
 28 [they] are (+ μέν)

39*

- hidden, but (ἀλλά) they were pronounced
 2 openly. They did not (οὔτε)
 stop without being revealed,
 4 nor (οὐδέ) did they stop without
 naming (ὀνομάζειν) the angels (ἄγγελος).
 6 The vowels
 [(+ δέ) join] the
 8 [consonants (συμφωνεῖν), whether (εἴτε)] without
 [or (εἴτε)] within,
 10 [] they
 said []
 12 [teach you (sg.)
 again (πάλιν) [for ever. They were counted]
 14 four times, (and) they were [engendered]
 three
 16 times, and they became
 []
 18 For these reasons (+ μέν) we have acquired
 sufficiency; for (γάρ) it is fitting that
 20 each one acquire
 power for himself to bear fruit (καρπός),
 22 and that we
 never cast
 24 aspersions [on] the mysteries (μυστήριον)
 [] the []
 26 For (γάρ) [] which [is

39*,7-8 ΝΕΤΡ̄CΥΜΦΩΝΙ: Cf. note to 31*,10-11.

39*,12 ΤCΕΒΔΑΚ: Cf. 35*,5; 31*,19 and note.

39*,14-15 ΛΥΜΙCΕ ΠΜΔΥ: Cf. 34*,4-5.

39*,21-22 "bear fruit": Cf. 26*,15 and note.

39*,24 "the mysteries": Probably referring both to esoteric teaching
 and to secret rituals. Cf. e.g. *Asclepius* IV 65,35-38; *Pist. Soph.*
passim; *1 Jeu passim*.

- [. . . . ΝΗΨ]ΥΧΗ· Ν[
 28 [. Ν]ΖΩΔ[ΙΟΝ
 (2 lines missing)
 40*
- ΝΝΟΥΖΥΠΟCΤΑCΙC Ν
 2 ΒΡΡΕ· ΠΒΕΚΕ ΔΕ ΕΤΟΥ
 ΝΑΚΑΑϞ ΑΖΡΗΪ ΗΠΕΕΙ
 4 ΗΤΕΕΙΜΙΝΕ ΠΕ ΠΟΥΧΕ
 ΕΙ· Η ΠΕΝΑΝΤΙΟΝ ΕϞΝ[Α]
 6 ΨΩΠΕ ΗΜΕΥ ΗΠΕ
 ΤΡ ΝΑΒ[Ι· ΠΕΤΡ] ΝΑΒΙ Ο[ΥΑ]
 8 ΕΕΤϞ Ε[. . . .] ΝΑΨΩ[ΠΕ]
 [ΖΝ] Ϟ[Υ ± 7 ΖΝ] ΟΥ
 10 [± 12] ΗΠΚΕ
 [± 12] ΗΝ[
 12 [. . . .]ΨΕ[. . . ΧΕ]ΚΑCΕ
 [ΖΑ]ΤΕΖΗ ΗΠΑΤ· Κ'ΡΔΟ
 14 ΚΙΜΑΖΕ [ΗΠ]ΕΤΕ <ΕΡΕ> ΟΥΕ
 ΕΙ ΝΑΤΕϞ[ΥΟ] ΗΚΕΟΥ
 16 [Ε]ΕΙ [ΕΤΒΕ ΟΥΔΥ]ΝΑΜΙC ΕC
 ΧΑC[Ι] ΜΗ ΟΥ[Γ]ΗΝΨCΙC·
 18 ΗΘΕΙΟΝ ΜΗ ΟΥΧΙΜ Ε
 ΜΑΥΨΜΙΨΕ ΑΖΗΤϞ·
 20 ΑΛΛΑ ΕΚΑΡΔΟΚΙΜΑΖΕ
 ΧΕ ΕΨ ΠΕ Ϟ[Υ]ΑΞΙΟC ΑΤΡΕϞ
 22 ϞΥΑΝΖΟΥ [Α]ΒΑΛ· ΕΚCΑΥ
 [Ν]Ε ΧΕ CΕ·[.]· Η[.] ΑΠΙ
 24 [ΤΗ] ΨΑ ΠΧ[. . . . Ν]ΕΤΡ
 [Ν]ΑΒΙ· ΕΥ[

- 39*,28 Cf. 21*,14; 42*,5.
 40*,1 ΖΥΠΟCΤΑCΙC: Here the meaning seems to be "condition" or "nature." Cf. 19*,22-23 and note.
 40*,2 "reward": Cf. 1,11.
 40*,5-9 This passage refers to punishments awaiting the sinner. Cf. *Zost.* VIII 131,20-132,5.
 40*,6-7 Cf. 27*,21-23.
 40*,9 The first superlin. stroke is visible.
 40*,13 Corr. Κ written above Ϟ, cancelled.
 40*,13-14 δοκιμάζειν: This word may refer to an initiatory testing procedure. Cf. e.g. Cod. Bruc. *Untitled* ch. 5. It is used in an eschatol-

[the] souls (ψυχή) [
 28 [the] signs of the Zodiac (ζώδιον) [
 (2 lines missing)

40*

a new hypostasis (ὑπόστασις).
 2 And (δέ) the reward which will
 be provided for this one
 4 in this manner is salvation.
 But (ἤ) the opposite (ἐναντίον) will
 6 happen there to the one
 who commits sin. [The one who commits] sin
 8 by himself [] will be
 [in a] in a]
 10 [
 [
 12 [] in order that,
 before you (sg.) examine (δοκιμάζειν)
 14 the one who < . . . >, one
 might [tell] another
 16 [about an] exalted power (δύναμις)
 and a divine (θεῖον) knowledge (γνώσις)
 18 and a might which
 cannot be resisted.
 20 But (ἀλλά) you shall examine (δοκιμάζειν)
 who is worthy (ἄξιος) that he should
 22 reveal them, knowing
 that [those] who commit sin [
 24 down to [
 as they [

ogical context in *Pist. Soph.* chs. 98, 103 *et passim*. There seems to be some loss of material after **ἌΠΕΤΕ**.

- 40*,14-19 A kind of "catechetical instruction" may be envisaged here.
 40*,18 **ΧΙΜ = ΧΙΝ** (Crum. 773b).
 40*,20 Cf. 40*,13-14 and note.
 40*,23-25 Perhaps **СЕН[Λ]ΤἩ[Ο] ΑΠΙ/[ΤἩ] ΨΑ ΠΧ[Η ΝΘΙ Ν]ΕΤΡ/[Ν]ΑΒΙ**, "those who commit sin will be trodden down to the dust." But the letter before **Ν** in line 23 looks more like **Π** than **Τ**. The passage refers to the punishment awaiting sinners. Cf. 40*,5-9 and note.

- 26 [Ϻπι]ωτ τ[
[...]]που[
(2 lines missing)

41*

- πετεψψε· Ϻπρωψψε
2 α† βαμ ϺπαισϷητος κοσ
μοσ ετετϺβωψτ Ϻωει
4 εν πεει Ϻταρχι Ϻπουχε
[ε]ι αβαλ ϺϺ πνοητος κοσ
6 [μο]ς· νεειψε<χε> δε αρηρ αρω
[τη Ϻ]πρ[...].οϺ Ϻογα!
8 [± 9]οϺτε εποϺ
(2 lines missing)
[± 10]Ϻνε[
12 [q]ρνω[ει] Ϻqφι[
[.]εϺ· χ[. π]κεσε[επε]
14 †Ϻ[αψεχε α]ραϺ πχ[ωκ]
αβαλ [.]χε· ψινα
16 [Ϻ]qαιε[Ϻ]ε ετρϺαβ[ι]
[± 9]κα[.] Ϻ[π]οϺ
18 [ρ]Ϻοει Ϻμ[α]Ϻ Ϻβι ϺψϺ
[χ]η ετρϺ σωμα· νετριχϺ
20 πκαρ μϺ νετϺπβχ Ϻ
πσωμα· νε[τρ]Ϻ Ϻπε· να
22 ψωοϺ αν[αγγ]ελοσ· πμα

-
- 40*,26 πιωτ: Cf. 1,23; 18*,16.
41*,2-3 παισϷητος κοσμοσ: Cf. 34*,20; 5,18-19 and note.
41*,3 Here Marsanes reverts to the 2 person pl. Cf. notes to 31*,19 and 29*,7-8.
41*,4-5 πεει Ϻταρχι: Lit. "this one who has received." Marsanes, having himself received salvation, is now engaged in bestowing it upon his followers. Cf. 6,14-16 and notes.
41*,5-6 πνοητος κοσμοσ: Cf. note to 4,6-7. The "intelligible world" is the source and ultimate goal of salvation.
41*,7 The superlin. stroke on Ϻ is visible.
41*,8 Perhaps Ϻ]οϺτε, "god(s)."

26 [the Father
[

(2 lines missing)

41*

that which is fitting. Do not desire
2 to give power to the sense-perceptible (αἰσθητός) world
(κόσμος).

Are you (pl.) not attending to me,
4 who have received salvation
from the intelligible (νοητός) world (κόσμος)?
6 But (δέ) (as for) these <words>—watch yourselves—
do not [] them as a(n)
8 [] . . .

(2 lines missing)

[
12 [he understands (νοεῖν)] and he takes [
[the rest,]
14 I [will speak of] them. The [perfection]
[] in order that (ἵνα)
16 it might [not] increase [] who commit sin
[
18 the embodied (σῶμα) souls (ψυχή) did not understand
(νοεῖν)
them. Those that are upon
20 the earth as well as those outside of
the body (σῶμα), those in heaven, are
22 more than the angels (ἄγγελος). The place

41*,13 Perhaps [N]ΕΥ, "for them."

41*,14-15 "The perfection": Cf. 8,24.

41*,15 Corr. λ over ο in ΨΙΝΑ.

41*,17-19 Embodiment dulls the intellectual powers of the soul: this is a classical Platonic doctrine. See e.g. Macrob. *In Somn.* I.12.7-11; Plat. *Phaed.* 79C, 72E.

41*,19-22 This passage seems to assert that the total number of human souls is greater than that of the angels. Some souls are embodied; others are disembodied. Cf. e.g. Macrob. *In Somn.* I.11-12.

ΝΤΑΖΝ[ΩΕΧΕ] ΑΡΑΦ ΖΝ
 24 ΩΕΧΕ [ΝΙΜ'] ΝΕΕΙ Χ[
 [± 9] ΝΣΙΟΥ [
 26 ΤΟΥ[
 ΧΟΥΜ[Ε
 28 ΕΙΤΕ ΗΔ[Η
 ΑΖΟΥΝ ΑΦ[
 30 ΝΕΕΙΕΤ[Ω

42*

Η ΕΦΘΩΨΤ ΑΖΟΥΝ ΑΠΕ
 2 ΣΝΕΥ Η ΕΦΘΩΨΤ ΑΖΟΥΝ
 ΑΠΣΑΨΩΪ ΗΠΛΑΝΗΤΗΣ
 4 Η ΑΖΟΥΝ ΑΠΜΝΤΣΝΑΥΣ
 ΝΖΩΔΙΟΝ· Η ΑΖΟΥΝ Α
 6 ΠΜΑΑΒ[ΕΣ]Ε ΝΖΩΡΟ
 ΣΚΟΡΟ[Σ]. [

(2 lines missing)

-
- 41*,22-25 Perhaps the reference here is to the sphere of the fixed stars above the planetary spheres, which is the true abode of the soul according to late Platonic doctrine. See e.g. Macrobius. *In Somn.* I.11.10-12.
- 41*,28-29 Perhaps **ΘΩΨΤ**/ΑΖΟΥΝ, "gaze." Cf. 42*,1-2.
- 41*,30 "Blessedness" is here probably attributed to the one who is engaged in cosmic contemplation, as a step towards enlightenment. See 42*,1-7 and notes.
- 42*,1-7 This passage reflects the popular notion in late Platonism that meditation on the heavens leads to the knowledge of God. Man, gifted by the Creator with an erect posture wherewith to gaze easily at the heavens (Plat. *Tim.* 90A-D), should fix his contemplation on the heavens and so achieve enlightenment. See esp. Macrobius. *In Somn.* I.14; Philo *Plant.* 16-27; *Leg. All.* III.100-102; *Vit. Mos.* II.69-70; *Mut. Nom.* 54-56; *Somn.* II.226. The attitude expressed here is in marked contrast to the usual gnostic attitude towards the heavenly bodies, esp. the planets and the Zodiac. Cf. *Ap. John* BG 39,6-12; *Treat. Seth* VII 58,17-21; *1 Apoc. Jas.* V 25,24-26,24; *Exc. Theod.* 69-74; and for the Mandaean material see Rudolph, "Coptica-Mandaica," p. 205.
- 42*,1-2 "the two": i.e., the sun and the moon, frequently distinguished among the seven planets of antiquity. See e.g. Macrobius. *In Somn.* I.14.23: *duo lumina*, "two luminous (planets)," i.e., the sun and the moon.

- which we [talked] about in
 24 [every] discourse, these [
 [] stars [
 26 [
 book(s) [
 28 whether (εἴτε) already (ἤδη) [
 into the [
 30 blessed is [
]

42*

- whether (ἤ) he is gazing at the
 2 two or (ἤ) he is gazing at
 the seven planets (πλανήτης)
 4 or at the twelve
 signs of the Zodiac (ζώδιον) or at
 6 the thirty [-six] Decans (ἑροσκόπος)
 [
]

(2 lines missing)

-
- 42*,2 Corr. Η over €; the scribe started to write € but omitted the top of the €.
- 42*,3 "the seven planets": Here including the sun and the moon. The usual order in late antiquity, from the highest to the lowest, is: Saturn, Jupiter, Mars, the sun, Venus, Mercury, and the moon. See e.g. Macrob. *In Somn.* I.12.13; Ptol. *Tetr.* I.4; cf. Bouché-Leclercq, *L'astrologie grecque*, pp. 107-108. Cf. Philo *Quaest. in Ex.* II.75, where the order of Venus and Mercury is reversed.
- 42*,5 Corr. Ζ over Ο.
- 42*,6-7 "the thirty-six Decans": Although the word ἑροσκόπος usually refers to the sign or degree rising on the ecliptic at the moment of birth (see e.g. Ptol. *Tetr.* I.12 *et passim*), here it refers to the stars governing each ten degrees of the 360° circuit of heaven, i.e., οἱ δεκανοί, "the Decans." On the 36 Decans see e.g. *Corp. Herm. Fragm.* VI, an entire dialogue devoted to the subject. See also Gundel, *Dekane und Dekansternebilder*. For other examples of this usage—οἱ ἑροσκόποι = "the Decans"—see e.g. Brit. Mus. Gr. Pap. XCVIII, ed. Kenyon, p. 128: οἱ λαμπροὶ λς' ἑροσκόποι; *Corp. Herm. Asclepius* 19: "XXXVI, quorum uocabulum est Horoscopi..." Cf. Gundel, *Weltbild und Astrologie*, p. 20; *Dekane und Dekansternebilder*, pp. 27, 344 *et passim*. But sometimes it appears that δεκανοί and ἑροσκόποι are distinguishable; see e.g. Iambli. *Myst.* (ed. des Places) VIII.4: τοὺς τε δεκανοὺς καὶ ἑροσκόπους (citing Chaeremon).

10 [.]ϞΕ Ν[
 [.]ωε ρφ[.....]ετ[
 12 [.]ΜΝΤ[± 7]ΠΟΡ.
 [.]Ν ΝΕ Ν[εει π]ΗΖ ρ
 14 ρΡΗΙ ΔΨ[.....] Μ
 ΜΟ.. [Ν]Δ[.....]ΔΝ
 16 ΤΟ.[...] ΜΠ[.....] ΜΝ
 [Ν]ΔΨ ΕΙΤ[ε ΝΕΤΖΝ ΤΠΕ]
 18 ΕΙΤΕ ΝΕΤΖΙΧΜ ΠΚΑΖ
 ΜΝ ΝΕΤΖΑΠΕCΗΤ ΜΠ[ΚΑΖ]
 20 ΚΑΤΑ ΝΚΟΙΝΩΝΙΑ ΜΝ
 ΜΜΕΡΙCΜΟ[Ϟ] ΝΑΒΑΛ ΖΝ
 22 ΝΕΕΙ ΔΥΩ [Ζ]Ν ΠΚΕCΕ
 ΕΠ[ε] Π[.....] ΜΜΕΡΟC
 24 [ΚΑ]ΤΑ ΓΕΝΟ[Ϟ ΔΥ]Ψ ΚΑΤΑ
 [ΕΙ]ΝΕ ..[
 26 [± 13]].[.]
 [± 10 Ϟ]ΦΝΑΖΥ
 28 [ΠΟΤΑCCE· Ε]ΥΝΤΕC ΒΑ[Μ]
 [ΜΜΕΥ] ΜΠCΑΖΡΕ
 30 [..... CΕΨΟΟ]Π ΖΑΡΙΖΑΡ[ΔΥ]

43*

(3 lines missing)

4 [.]ΕΥ[.].[
 ΜΠΟΥΔΕΙ[
 6 [.] ΝΙΜ[
 (± 12 lines missing)
 [.....].[± 9]Ο[
 20 [Ϟ]ΩΜΑ ΜΜ[.....]ΤΠ.[
 [Ο]ΥΜΑ ΚΩ[..... Β]ΑΡΒ[Η]
 22 [ΛΩ] ΝΝΟΥ[ΤΕ]ΕΠ[

42*,15 The superlin. stroke is visible.

42*,17-19 Cf. *Melch.* IX 4,8-10; 9,8-10; 13,12-15. This three-fold division occurs not only in biblical writings, esp. Phil 2:9-10, but also in the magical papyri. Cf. note to IX 4,8-10.

42*,23 A superlin. stroke is visible in the second lacuna, over the second letter-space.

42*,25 ΕΙΝΕ: Here taken as equivalent to Gk. εἶδος, "species," correlative to γένος, "kind" or "genus," in the previous line.

10 []
 []
 12 [] are []
 [these reach up]
 14 to []
 []
 16 [] and
 [these] numbers, whether (εἴτε) [those in heaven]
 18 or (εἴτε) those upon the earth,
 together with those that are under the [earth,]
 20 according to (κατά) the relationships (κοινωνία) and
 the divisions (μερισμός) among
 22 these, and in the rest
 [] parts (μέρος)
 24 [according to (κατά) kind (γένος) and] according to (κατά)
 [species]
 26 []
 [] they] will [submit (ὑποτάσσειν)]
 28 [since] she has power
 [] above
 30 [] they exist] apart

43*

(3 lines missing)

4 []
 . . . []
 6 every []

(± 12 lines missing)

[]
 20 body(s) (σῶμα) []
 [a] place [] divine Barbelo]
 22 []

-
- 42*,27-28 **ΖΥΠΟΤΑCCE**: Passive meaning (ὑποτάσσεσθαι); cf. note to 29*,22.
 42*,28 "she": Lack of context prevents identification. Perhaps Barbelo; cf. 43*,21-22.
 43*.5 Perhaps ΠΟΥΔΕΙ[Ν, "the light." Other possibilities for ΠΠΟΥ-: "of their" or "they did not."
 43*,21-22 "Barbelo": Cf. 4,11 and note; 8,28-29.

- [.]ΕΤΕ[
 (± 3 lines missing)
 [.]ΗΤΟΣ Α[
 28 .ΙΤΗΨΟΤ[
 (1 line missing)
 44*
 (3 lines missing)
 4 [± 8 Ο]ΥΑ[Ν]ΖΟΥ [Α]
 [ΒΑΛ] ΝΤΕΕΙΜ[Ι]
 6 [ΝΕ ± 8] ΝΤΕΕΙ[
 (± 11 lines missing)
 18 Ψ[
 Ψ[± 9]ΚΜ[.]·[
 20 [Α]ΓΓΕ[ΛΟΣ ΝΝΟ]ΗΤΟΣ· ΕΣΨ[
 ΤΕ Ν[. Ν]ΟΗΤΟΣ [
 22 [.]Π[± 8]ΠΣΑ[ΖΡΕ
 [± 8 ΤΟ]ΥΧΟ Α[
 (± 3 lines missing)
 [± 8] ΜΜΑΥ ΣΦ[
 28 [± 8]·[.]ΕΡΕΠΑ[
 (1 line missing)
 45*
 [.]·[
 2 [.] ΜΜΑΝ[
 [. . .]ΚΟΣΜΟΣ [
 4 [Ο]Σ ΑΥΩ [
 [.]ΙΚΟΣ [
 6 [Κ]ΟΣΜ[ΟΣ
 (± 13 lines missing)
 20 [.]ΕΠ Ν·[
 ΑΖΟΥΕΙ [
 22 [.]ΑΖΕ ΔΦ [

43*,26-27

Perhaps ΔΙΣ/Θ]ΗΤΟΣ, "sense-perceptible."

43*,28

Letters and word-division uncertain. Perhaps a Greek word ending in -μῆτη or -πιτη.

44*,4-5

ΟΥΑΝΖΟΥ ΑΒΑΛ: Cf. 39*,3; 40*,22.

- [
 (± 3 lines missing)
 ... [
 28 ... [
 (1 line missing)
 44*
 (3 lines missing)
 4 [] reveal them [
 [] in this [manner]
 6 [] this [
 (± 11 lines missing)
 18 [
 [
 20 [intelligible (νοητός) angels (ἄγγελος)], as she [
 [] intelligible (νοητός) [
 22 [] above
 [] save(d) from [
 (± 3 lines missing)
 [] them [
 28 [] ... [
 (1 line missing)
 45*
 [
 2 [] ... [
 [] world (κόσμος) [
 4 and [
 ... [
 6 [world (κόσμος)
 (± 13 lines missing)
 20 ... [
 they came [
 22 ... (+ δέ) [

45*,2 Perhaps ἡμᾶν, "us."

45*,4-5 Perhaps ΚΟC/Μ]ΙΚΟC, "worldly"; cf. 2,18; 18*,22; 58*,21.
Or 2Υ/Λ]ΙΚΟC, "material"; cf. 2,19; 18*,21.

45*,6 Or [Κ]ΟCΜ[ΙΚΟC, "worldly."

45*,21-22 Perhaps ΟΝΟ/Μ]ΑΞΕ, "name"; cf. 19*,18; 39*,5.

ΜΝ ΝΕΙ
24 ΝΕΤΟΥΓ
ΝΙ

(± 4 lines missing)

46*

[.....].ΟΥΑΓ
2 [.....].ΟΟΥΝΕΙ
[.....].ΞΕΙ· ΠΑΑΓ
4 [± 9]ΗΥΕ Μ·[
[± 10] ΕΦΟ[ΕΙ Ν
6 [± 9 Ν]ΘΕ ΝΙ
(± 13 lines missing)

20 [± 9]ΠΖΡΑΥ [Ν]
[± 9]ΡΕΝ· Μ[Ν]
22 [± 9]ΑΕΙΤΟΥΓ
[..... ΨΑ ΑΝ]ΗΖΕ Μ[
24 [± 9 Ρ]ΕΝ ΜΕΝ
[± 13]ΚΟC
(± 4 lines missing)

55*

(± 15 lines missing)

16 .[
ΕΤΑΖΙ[ΚΑ]ΡΩ[ΕΙ ΠΑΧΕΙ ΧΕ]
18 ΜΑΤΑΜΑ[ΕΙ
ΞΨ ΤΕ ΤΒΑ[Μ
20 ΝΑΧΩΚΜ [
[ΓΕ]ΝΕΑ ΤΗ[ΡC

-
- 46*, 1 Part of the λ is now broken off from the MS.; it is attested in an early photograph.
- 46*, 2 Word division uncertain. -ΟΟΥ is not a likely ending; -ΑΥ would be expected (A³).
- 46*, 21 The superlin. stroke is visible.
- 46*, 22 Perhaps ΑΕΙΤΟΥΓ[ΧΟ, "I saved" or "I was saved." Cf. 44*, 23; 6, 16.
- 46*, 25-26 Probably ΚΟC/[ΜΟC, "world."
- 47*-54* At least eight pages (probably more) are missing from the MS. See codex introduction.
- 55*, 17 A *paraglyphus* appears to have been used in the left margin;

- and [
 24 those who [
 [
 (± 4 lines missing)
 46*
 [
 2 []...[
 []...[
 4 []...[
 [] is [
 6 [] like [
 (± 13 lines missing)
 20 [] the voice of
 [] name(s) [and]
 22 []...[
 [for] ever [
 24 [name(s)] (+ μέν)
 (± 4 lines missing)
 55*
 (± 15 lines missing)
 16 [(after) I was silent, [I said,]
 18 "Tell [me,
 what is the [power
 20 will wash [
 [entire generation (γενεά)

see *Facsimile Edition*. This, plus an unusually large initial letter (Ε), probably indicated a new section in the text. **ΕΤΑΖΙΚΑΡΩΕΙ**: This strange form is here taken as a "Bohairicizing" form, 2 Perfect = Temporalis; cf. Till, *Dialektgrammatik* § 264: "After I was silent." Cf. *Zost.* VIII 1, 10 *et passim*. Here Marsanes seems to be resuming a conversation with a heavenly informant, probably in a visionary setting. Cf. 63*,3-6.19-22.

55*,20

The N is now broken off from the MS.; it is partially attested in an early photograph. **ΧΩΚΜ**: Cf. 66*,1; probably referring to a baptismal ritual.

- 22 [..]. MN.[
 (± 7 lines missing)
 56*
 (± 15 lines missing)
- 16 [± 16]M
 [± 8]MMATE ΠΝΑ.
 18 [± 8]. ς· Ε[Μ]ΠΨΑ
 [± 8]ΗΡ ΠΕ· ΑΥ[Ω]
 20 [± 7]ΤΗΡΩ ΜΠ[
 [± 7].Α ΖΝ Τ[
 (± 8 lines missing)
 57*
 (± 16 lines missing)

- ΖΗ[
 18 ΓΝ[ΩCIC
 ΡΟ[.]ΑΡ[
 20 ΜΟΥΝ ΑΒ[ΑΛ
 ΜΠΝΑΘ Π[
 22 ΧΕ ΑΖΙΨΩ[ΠΕ
 [..]ΜΑ[
 (± 6 lines missing)
 58*
 (± 16 lines missing)

- [± 16]M
 18 [± 15]. Μ
 [± 11]. Ζ.[.] ΝΝΑ
 20 [± 10]ΚΕΕC ΠΤΑ[
 [± 8]. ΔΕ ΖΝ ΝΚΟ[С]
 22 [ΜΙΚΟC]Ν[.] ΑΒΑΛ [
 [± 14]Π[
 (± 6 lines missing)

- 61*
 [Ε]ΤΖΑΝ[. . . . Ν]ΕΤΝΨΕΕΡΕ ΕΥ
 2 [..]Μ[± 10]ΤΕ ΠΠΟ[
 [.]ΙΨ[± 8]Χ[Ε Κ]ΑΤΑ ΘΕ .

22 [

(± 7 lines missing)

56*

(± 15 lines missing)

16 [

[] greatly, the

18 [] much

[] he is [], and

20 [] all [

[] in the [

(± 8 lines missing)

57*

(± 16 lines missing)

[

18 [knowledge (γνώσις)

[

20 perservere [

the great [

22 for I [became

[

(± 6 lines missing)

58*

(± 16 lines missing)

[

18 [

[] ...

20 [] bone(s) of the

[] (+ δέ) in the [worldly (κοσμικός)]

22 [] ...

[

(± 6 lines missing)

61*

[which is] under [] your daughters

2 [

[] for just as (κατά)

59*-60*

At least 2 pages are missing from the MS. See codex introduction.

- 4 [± 10 τ]ΜΝΤΡ̄ΡΟ Μ[
 [± 11] ΠΕΕΙ ΔΕ ΛΖ[
 6 [± 14]. τϚ τ[
 (± 4 lines missing)
 [± 11] ΝΑΠΟ[
 12 [± 11] ΝΙΜ ΕΥ[
 [± 12] ΥΕ[
 (± 16 lines missing)

62*

- [.] ΧΕ ΖΜ Π[Ε]Τ. . [. . . .] ΑΥΝ[
 2 [.] Τ ΕΝ· Α[ΥΩ ± 9] ΗΕ[
 [.] ΓΑΡ ΠΕ ΕΤΚ. [± 7] Μ[Π]
 4 [ΕΤ] ΝΣΑΥΝΕ ΜΠ[
 [.] ΕΥ ΧΕ ΠΑ. [(± 4 lines missing)
 10 [ΚΑΤΑ] ΜΕΡ[ΟC
 [...] ΤΕ ΨΑ[
 12 [. . . .] ΙC. [[. . . .] . [(± 16 lines missing)

63*

- [± 13]. ΔΕ ΖΝ
 2 [± 10 ΠΚΕC] ΕΕΠΕ
 [Α] ΖΡΗ[Τ . . .] Ε [Π] ΚΑΖ· Α[ΥΩ Λ[Ζ]
 4 [Ο] ΥΨΕΧ[Ε] ΝΘΕ ΝΝΙΑΓΓΕΛΟ[C]
 [.] . ΕΦΟΕΙ ΝΘΕ ΝΝΙ
 6 [ΘΗΡΙΟΝ ΝΑ] ΓΡΙΟC· ΑΥ[Ω] ΠΑΧΕQ
 [± 8] Ν[.] ΑΖΕ Λ
 8 [± 14 Ψ] Λ ΑΝΗ
 [ΖΕ ± 14] ΘΗ
 10 [± 15] ΗΡΙ
 [± 15] Ε[(± 5 lines missing)

61*,4

ΤΜΝΤΡ̄ΡΟ: Cf. 6,18.

61*,6

A superlin. stroke is visible in the lacuna two spaces from the end.

62*,10

ΚΑΤΑ ΜΕΡΟC: Cf. 3,21.

63*,5

Perhaps Ε<Υ> ΟΕΙ, 3 pl. agreeing with ΝΙΑΓΓΕΛΟC.

4 [the] kingdom of [
 [] But (δέ) this one [

6 [

(± 4 lines missing)

[
 12 [] every [
 [

(± 16 lines missing)

62*

[] in the one who [
 2 not. [And
 For (γάρ) it is [] who [
 4 [you (pl.) did not] know the [
 [] for the [

(± 4 lines missing)

10 [partially (κατὰ μέρος)

[
 12 [
 [

(± 16 lines missing)

63*

[] (+ δέ) in
 2 [] remainder
 down [the] earth. And they
 4 [spoke] like the angels (ἄγγελος)
 [] he was like the
 6 wild (ἄγριος) [animals (θηρῶν)]. And he said,
 [

8 [for] ever
 [

10 [
 [

(± 5 lines missing)

63*,6

"he": Gamaliel? Cf. 64*,19-20 and note.

63*,9-10

Perhaps ΘΗ/[ΡΙ]ΟΝ, "animal(s)." Cf. 63*,6.

63*,10-11

Perhaps ΜΥΣΤ[Η]ΡΙ/[Ι]ΟΝ, "mystery." Cf. 39*,24. Or
 Θ[Η]ΡΙ/[Ι]ΟΝ, "animal(s)." Cf. previous note.

[αβ]αλ ρ̄ν α.[
 18 [...]τε ηταψ .[
 [...] αζινεγ [α
 20 εφ..εαρ.[
 αγω πεφ[....]νε ουζρ[αγ
 22 [...] αγφ [...] πεφ..[
 (± 7 lines missing)

64*

ανακ [± 10 ετ]
 2 βε χ[ε] αζι[νε]γ α[νογα]ειν
 τηρου ε<γ>κωτε [μμ]αει εγ[χε]
 4 ρο [ρ̄ν] ουκωζτ̄· α[γω
 ει ρ̄[μ] πογμητε [
 6 μ.[.....].[
 α.[
 8 α[
 τμ[

(± 6 lines missing)

16 [± 7 ηαρ]γελοσ ε[τ
 [± 7 ρ̄]ατογωει· α[γω]
 18 [± 10]πογε[ει
 [...]...η..[.] ηγαμαλι
 20 [ηλ· π]η ετρ̄ιχ[η ηπ]̄ηα ετ[.].
 [.....]α.[...]οσ κ[

(± 8 lines missing)

65*

[± 9] δε ηαργελοσ
 2 [± 8 ε]τ̄ηπαραλαμ
 [βανε ημαγ τη]ρου [
 4 [± 7]· ηη νε[το]γπ.

63*,18

αψ: Cf. 42*,17.

63*,19

Marsanes is recounting a visionary experience. Cf. 16*,3; 18*,2.16; 64*,2; 66*,17.

63*,21

ρ̄ραγ: Cf. 46*,20.

63*,22

Perhaps ηεφρ̄ρ[αγ, "his voice."

64*,5

The superlin. stroke is visible.

64*,19-20

Gamaliel: An angelic being occurring in a number of Sethian gnostic documents; see *Melch.* IX 5,18 and note. Perhaps here,

from [
 18 [] the number [
 [] I saw [
 20 [
 and his [] a [voice
 22 [] and [] his [
 (± 7 lines missing)

64*

I [
 2 because I [saw] all of [the lights]
 around [me, blazing]
 4 [with] fire. [And
 me in their midst [
 6 [
 [
 8 [
 [
 (± 6 lines missing)

16 [] angel(s) [who
 [] beside me. [And]
 18 [] the [one
 [] Gamaliel,
 20 [the one] who is in command of [the spirits (πνεῦμα)]
 which
 [(± 8 lines missing)

65*

[] (+ δέ) the angels (ἄγγελος)
 2 [] which receive (παραλαμβάνειν)
 [all of them
 4 [] with those whom they [

as in *Melch.*, he serves as a revealer figure. Cf. 63*,6 and note.
 Cf. also note to 65*,1-3.

65*,1-3

The reference here is probably to the work of the angels who "receive" (παραλαμβάνειν) the souls of the elect into eternal life; such angels are called "Receivers" (παραλήπτωρ, παραλήπτῆς), and Gamaliel is sometimes included in their number. See *Ap. John* III 33,16-19; BG 66,1-7; *Gos. Eg.* III 64,22-65,1; 66,4-8; *Cod. Bruc. Untitled*, ch. 8; cf. *2 Jeu*, ch. 42.

[. αγ]ω ααχ[ι ϩ]μαει
 6 [± 7]ητ αα[αω]κ ϩ
 [± 14]πα
 8 [± 15]φω
 [± 15]γ
 (1 line missing)
 [± 15]εα
 12 [± 9 νε]ςμελος
 [± 12]ουκο
 14 [± 12]παρο
 [ρατος ± 9]ει
 16 [± 15]ς
 [± 8]κρ[ι]ς[ις ε]ι
 18 [± 8]κης[.]α νηχ
 [± 9]νιμ [ετκ]η
 20 [± 10]τη[.] ϩ
 [± 9 π]ηρ[η] πατ
 22 [μου ± 7]ερανη
 [± 13]πςνευ
 24 [± 11 καρ]ωα
 [± 11 νο]υτε
 (± 4 lines missing)

66*

χακμς αβ[αλ 2ϩ
 2 .ε ϩπν[ουτε
 π[εν]ταγ[ς]φ[ραγιζε ϩμαα]
 4 α2[ου]τςαει[αα 2ϩ τςφρα]
 ρι[ς ϩ]τηε· [
 6 ϩ[
 ε
 8 .[
 α
 10 ς[.].[

65*,21-22 πηγῆ: A baptismal context is to be assumed. Cf. 66*,1; Gos. Eg. III 66,4. Cf. also *Testim. Truth* IX 72,27.

65*,22 Perhaps ΟΥΜΑΥ] ΕΡΑΝῆ, "a living water." Cf. e.g. *Zost.* VIII 5,21.

[and] he [took] me
 6 [he finished
 []
 8 []
 []
 (1 line missing)
 []
 12 [her] members (μέλος)
 [] . . .
 14 [] the [invisible (ἀόρατος)]
 []
 16 []
 [judgment (κρίσις)
 18 [] thrown
 [] every [which is placed]
 20 []
 [fountain (πηγή)] of
 22 [immortality] living
 [] the two
 24 [silent]
 [god(s)
 (± 4 lines missing)

66*

wash it (fem.) from [
 2 [of God
 the one whom they [sealed (σφραγίζειν)]
 4 has been adorned [with the]
 [seal (σφραγίς) of] heaven. [
 6 []
 []
 8 []
 []
 10 []

66*,1

ΣΑΚΜC: Cf. 55*,20. The word can also be translated "baptize."
 Cf. e.g. *Gos. Eg.* III 65,24. "it": Scil. "the soul" (ψυχή)?

66*,3-5

σφραγίζειν, σφραγίς: These are baptismal terms. Cf. 34*,28;
 2,12-13 and note; also e.g. *Gos. Eg.* III 66,3.

12 απεϛ[
 ναβ [ϩ
 του[
 14 ϩ[
 ζ[
 16 τηρ[. . . . ϩ[
 αυ[ω α]ζινε[γ
 18 τ[. . .]εγ· [± 9 α]
 τμ[ο]γϛ[δ
 20 νε[τ]ε π[
 εν ψα[
 22 βω[
 ϩτ[
 24 αϛ[

(± 4 lines missing)

67*

[± 8] εγναψωπε
 2 [± 11] ϩπνογ
 [τε ± 8] ουςζιμε
 4 [± 9] εςζϩ [ο]γστο
 [νοσ ϩτ]ερεϛ[α]πο
 6 [± 10] αϩ[.]εγ
 [± 14] οη
 8 [± 14] εμ
 [± 15] η
 10 [± 14] ε μϩ
 [± 14] πε
 12 [± 11 τ]ηρϛγ
 [± 11]. ϩζωβ
 14 [. . . .] ζϩρψϩ[ε . . .]ς· αυω
 [. . . .] ζϩζια[με μϩ ζ]ϩρω
 16 [με ϩτεε]μιν[ε ϩ]
 [πελ]ααγε <ϩ> νε[τ]ζιαμ π]καζ
 18 [σογ]ψνογ· α[ε . . .]ει
 [. . . .]ε νιμ [. . . .]νογ
 20 [ϩς]ενε! ζα νεει μ[ϩ μ]εσ
 [ζ]ϩηει αε νεει να[† ε]σογ

to his [
 12 great [
 [
 14 [
 [
 16 [
 And I [saw
 18 [
 [unmixed
 20 those who [
 ... [
 22 [
 [
 24 [

(± 4 lines missing)

67*

[] they will become
 2 [] of God
 [] a woman
 4 [] while she is in [travail (στόνος)]
 [] when she gives birth,
 6 []
 []
 8 []
 []
 10 [] with
 []
 12 [] all of [
 [] thing
 14 [] men [] and
 [] women [and men]
 16 [in this manner
 [no one] <of> those [that are upon the] earth
 18 [knew] that [
 [] every [] them,
 20 [and they will] take pity on these, [together with the]
 home-[born], for these will [pay]

22 [...]ΝΟΥΤΕ [.....]ΝΕ
 [...].[.]ΟΤΟ[.....] ΑΒΑΛ
 24 [± 7]ΑΙΩΝ [.....]ΟΝ·
 [± 16]Α
 (± 4 lines missing)

68*

ΜΝ ΝΕΤΑ[
 2 ΝΤΑΥΠ[
 ΠΝ[Ο]ΥΤΕ [
 4 ΧΙ[Ν] ΝΨ[ΑΡΠ
 2Ϟ [Π]ΑΚΑ[
 6 2Ϻ[ΤΕ
 Ε[
 8 ΡΦ[Ν
 ΤΟΥ[
 10 Τ[
 ΝΔΙΑ[± 12 ΜΥ]
 12 ΣΤΗΡ[ΙΟΝ
 ΝΤ.[.....]. 2Ϟ [
 14 [.....Ν]ΟΥΤΕ Α[
 ..[.....]ϺΧΟ.[
 16 ΤΕ.[...Ο]ΥΑΝΖ Α[ΒΑΛ
 Τ[.....]ΝΕΤΑΣΑΥ[ΝΕ ΜΜΑϺ]

2

[Μ]ΑΡϺΑΝΗΣ

68*,1

Perhaps ΝΕΤΑ[ΣΑΥΝΕ ΜΜΑϺ, "those who will know him";
 cf. 68*,17.

68*,3

Corr. Υ over Ρ.

22 [] God [
 [] ...
 24 [] aeon(s) (αἰών) [
 [

(± 4 lines missing)

68*

with those who will [
 2 who have [
 God [
 4 from the [beginning
 in [the
 6 fear [
 [
 8 [name(s)
 [
 10 []
 [
 12 [mysteries (μυστήριον)
 [] in [
 14 [] God [
 [
 16 [] manifest [
 [] those who will know [him.]

18 [M] A R S A N E S

68*,5 Perhaps ἀκαθαῖρος, "unclean."
 68*,11-12 ΜΥΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ: Cf. 39*,24.
 68*,17 Cf. 1,11-12.

