

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

XI, XII, XIII

CONTRIBUTORS

ELAINE H. PAGELS - JAMES M. ROBINSON

JOHN D. TURNER - ORVAL S. WINTERMUTE

ANTOINETTE CLARK WIRE - FREDERIK WISSE

VOLUME EDITOR

CHARLES W. HEDRICK



E.J. BRILL

LEIDEN · NEW YORK · KØBENHAVN · KÖLN

1990

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

XXVIII

GENERAL EDITOR OF THE COPTIC GNOSTIC LIBRARY

JAMES M. ROBINSON



INTRODUCTION TO CODEX XI

Bibliography: Kasser, "La variété subdialectale lycopolitaine"; Krause, "Zum koptischen Handschriftenfund," 111-13; Krause-Labib, "Gnostische und hermetische Schriften," 10-12; *Facsimile Edition: Codices XI, XII, XIII*, pp. ix-xiii; pl. 1-82; Robinson, "Codicology."

I. PHYSICAL DESCRIPTION AND RECONSTRUCTION

Codex XI was part of one of the groups of codices acquired by the antiquities dealer Phocion J. Tano during 1946-48. It was put in safekeeping at the Department of Antiquities in 1949, transferred to the Coptic Museum on 9 June 1952, declared national property by court action in 1956, and given the inventory number 10547 in 1959. It had been numbered IV by Jean Doresse and Togo Mina in 1949, VI by Henri-Charles Puech in 1950, VIII by Doresse in 1958 and XI by Martin Krause in 1962 and James M. Robinson in 1968 (Robinson, "Introduction," and *Facsimile Edition: Codices XI, XII, XIII*, pp. VI-VII). In May and June 1961 it was conserved in 80 plexiglass containers by Victor Girgis in consultation with Pahor Labib and Martin Krause. It was photographed in part by R. Herzog for Krause at that time and again by photographers of the Center of Documentation for UNESCO in 1965. Under the supervision of the Technical Sub-Committee of the International Committee for the Nag Hammadi Codices of the Arab Republic of Egypt and UNESCO, fragments were placed and photographs made at its four work sessions during 1970-72 and at the work sessions funded by the Smithsonian Institution through the sponsorship of the American Research Center in Egypt in 1974-75.

Codex XI is one of the most poorly preserved among the Nag Hammadi Codices. Except for three leaves (59/60, 61/62, 63/64), which are reconstructed from two to four fragments apiece, no relatively complete leaves survive. In most cases, only the lower fourth to three-fourths survive intact, which means that the page numeration to be expected at the top of the pages is lacking, except for one fragment from a first hand having page numbers 19-20 at the center of the top margin. The pages written in a second hand

bear no evidence of numeration in this position. The numeration by the second hand, not now extant, is assumed to have been at the outside top corner, since the same scribe wrote Codex VII and put the numeration in this position in that codex. Several leaves are represented only by fragments whose exact position is sometimes difficult to identify with certainty. The maximum surviving dimensions of the leaves are 28.2 cm. in height, and 14.5 cm. in width (pp. 61/62).

Codex XI consists of two scribal hands; a first scribe, who wrote in Subachmimic (1-44), also penned the second hand of Codex I (4:43,25-50,18 *Treat. Res.*); a second scribe, who wrote in Sahidic (45-72), also penned Codex VII (Krause, "Zum koptischen Handschriftenfund," 111). This division of Codex XI into two scribal hands allowed an initial sorting of pages and fragments into the two parts of the codex. As early as 1949, transparent tape had been applied to hold together the two conjugate leaves of a given sheet. Because the tape remained until 1974, even though the sheets had been cut in two at the spine, the following leaves from the first half of the codex could be correlated with their conjugate leaves in the second half to reconstruct most of the sheets in the codex (listed here in terms of the side with horizontal fibers): 8 + 63, 10 + 61, 12 + 59, 14 + 57, 20 + 53, 22 + 51, 24 + 49, 26 + 47, and 32 + 41. The proper correlation of the intervening sheets can then be established with relative probability on the basis of horizontal fibers across the two conjugate leaves of the sheet and the congruence of the leaves' contour with that of the preceding and succeeding leaves: 18 + 55, 28 + 45, 30 + 43, 34 + 39, and 36 + 37. Pages 56 and 57 were separated by a stub, now lost. This makes it possible to identify the codex as consisting of a single quire with its center at 36-37.

When in 1961 the individual leaves were conserved at the Coptic Museum between plexiglass panes in the sequence in which they were found, these containers were numbered seriatim. Thus a relative sequence was preserved. The plexiglass numeration can be correlated to the original pagination as follows: plexiglass containers 1-18, 21-64 contained pages 7-68. The plexiglass container numbered 19-20 was used for fragments of hand one, perhaps in recognition that the page numbers 19-20 survived on a fragment. The front flyleaf A-B and pages 1-6, 69-72 were too fragmentary

to have been kept in order or put in distinct plexiglass containers. Hence they had to be reassembled in order to complete the reconstruction of the codex.

The following summary of the codex reconstruction includes only physical considerations, which can be recognized by consultation with the *Facsimile Edition: XI, XII, XIII*; "inner" or "inside" refers to proximity to the spine of the codex. Support for the reconstruction is provided by the transcription and translation; even when fragments are too distant for continuity of text to be established, the content of the fragment fits well the context in the tractate.

Two fragments of the front flyleaf are initially identifiable from the absence of writing on the recto; the color and the texture of the vertical fibers also match. The larger fragment (actually consisting of two fragments that join) is, on its verso, covered with ink blots which migrated from a large fragment with a bottom margin, which thus is identified as leaf 1/2; this identification also indicates the position of the larger fragment of the flyleaf. A smaller fragment of the flyleaf has on its verso a few letters of the title of the first tractate, "The Interpretation of Knowledge" (cf. a similar phenomenon in Codex III); its position higher on the leaf is determined by the congruence of its inner edges with the upper fragment of leaf 1/2.

The location of the fragments comprising leaves 3/4, 5/6 and 7/8 can be determined by working backwards from leaf 9/10, the lower half of which is fairly well preserved, thus serving to position the fragments of the preceding leaves when superimposed on it.

The inner margin of 9/10 and of the large fragment of 7/8 (actually two fragments that join) are congruent. With regard to the small fragment of 7/8, its edges as well as those of the corresponding fragment on 9/10 are generally congruent with the corresponding edges on 13/14; its color, texture and vertical fibers match those of the lower part of 7/8.

The three fragments of 5/6 are placed by approximate congruence with 9/10 and the continuity of color, texture and fibers among themselves. The bottom corners of the lower inside fragments on 5/6 and 7/8 are congruent, as are portions along their inner edges. The lower inside fragment of 5/6 actually consists of two fragments that join.

The large outside fragment of 3/4 (including a small thin fragment that joins its lower inner side) can be placed in precise congruence with that of 5/6. The upper inside fragment of 3/4 (published in the *addenda et corrigenda* in *Facsimile Edition: Introduction*) is placed by the approximate congruency of its upper contour with that of the upper outside contour of the upper fragment of 5/6 and by the congruency of a portion of its outer center edge with the inner edge of the upper enclosed hole in the upper fragment of 1/2.

The outer edge of the upper inside portion of the upper fragment of 1/2 (consisting of two fragments that join) is approximately congruent with the outer edge of the upper outside portion of the upper fragment of 5/6. The lower fragment of 1/2 and of the front flyleaf are congruent with the upper inner fragment of 3/4 at all but its outer edge, thus completing the reconstruction of the leaves between the front flyleaf and the first relatively complete leaf 9/10.

The sequence of the leaves 3/4, 5/6, and 7/8 is confirmed by the continuity of color, texture, and horizontal fibers with the respective conjugate leaves in the second half of the codex: 68/67, 66/65, and 64/63. The restoration of 69/70 and 71/72 is based in part upon the congruence of their fragments with 67/68 and with each other, in part upon continuity of color, texture, and horizontal fibers with 1/2 and the front flyleaf A/B respectively.

Once the leaves comprising the codex have been thus determined and the sequence of leaves that join into sheets reconstructed, continuity of horizontal fibers from one sheet to the next make it possible even to reconstruct to some extent the rolls from which the sheets were cut. Apparently the stationer cut from left to right two rolls whose horizontal fibers faced up, stacking each sheet successively on the others as he progressed, then he rotated the stack of sheets 180°, since the *kolleseis* present the unusual situation of the right *kollema* overlapping the left *kollema*. The end of the first roll was not long enough to produce a complete sheet. But such a piece could still be used if it extended through the center, where the quire was to be folded, far enough to provide the inner margin of the conjugate leaf. Such a stub, extant in the cases of Codices VII and VIII, may be conjectured to have lain between 55/56 and 57/58. For they joined to 17/18 and 13/14 respectively, thus leaving for 15/16 no surviving conjugate. Since a stain on 56 matches

one on 57, a full leaf could not have intervened. Furthermore the loss of an uninscribed stub is more probable than the loss of an inscribed leaf. After being cut and hypothetically rotated by 180°, the first roll can be reconstructed from left to right as follows, with leaves designated in terms of the codex pagination on the horizontal side; a hyphen (–) connects the two conjugate leaves of a sheet and a slash (/) connects two adjoining sheets, replaced by a question mark (?) when fiber continuity is not ascertainable: 71–front fly-leaf B?69–2?67–4/65–6?63–8/61–10/59–12/57–14/stub (protruding between 56 and 57, now lost)–16.

The second roll, after being cut and hypothetically rotated back 180°, can be reconstructed from left to right as follows: 55–18/53–20/51–22?49–24/47–26/45–28/43–30/41–32?39–34/37–36.

The leaves from 9/10 to 67/68 are sufficiently intact, at least toward the bottom, that their relative sequence had been conserved and thus their original pagination could be determined. However, numerous fragments have been added to them, in connection with the preparation of this edition and under the auspices of the Technical Subcommittee of the International Committee for the Nag Hammadi Codices.

There remain thirty-one unidentified inscribed fragments of hand one: from pl. 79–80 of the *Facsimile Edition: XI, XII, XIII* numbers 1, 8–10, 14–16/21, 19, 23, 25–26, 28–29 and 31–35; to these have been added thirteen inscribed fragments as numbers 36–48 (see *Facsimile Edition: Introduction*, 127–28). There are seven unidentified inscribed fragments of hand two, numbered 1–4, 7–9, reproduced on pl. 81–82 of the *Facsimile Edition: XI, XII, XIII*. Fragment 5 is uninscribed. The larger of these fragments are transcribed at the conclusion of Codex XI below: fragments 1, 8–10, 15–16/21, 19, 23, 25–26, 28, 31 of hand one and 1, 2, and 4 of hand two. Fragments 1 and 4 of hand two may belong to 69/70 or 71/72; fragment 2 of hand two may belong to 55/56.

II. THE SCRIBAL HANDS

One scribe (hand one), writing in Subachmimic, copied the first two tractates on XI,1–44; he also penned *Treat. Res. I,4:43,25–50,18*. Another scribe (hand two) copied the last two tractates on

XI,45-72; he also was the scribe of Codex VII (Krause, "Zum koptischen Handschriftenfund," 111). Codices I, VII, and XI must have been produced roughly contemporaneously and perhaps in geographical proximity to one another. From inscribed cartonnage in the cover of Codex VII a *terminus a quo* of around 350 C.E. and a location in the region of Nag Hammadi in Upper Egypt have been established (cf. the *Facsimile Edition: Introduction*). For a description of the leather cover of Codex XI see the Preface to the *Facsimile Edition: XI, XII, XIII*, p. ix and pl. 1-4.

A. Hand One

The script of hand one is a formal mixed hand of a sloping kind (see E. G. Turner, *Greek Manuscripts*, 26 and pl. 49). It averages 19 to 25 letters per line, though the fluctuation becomes less pronounced toward the end of tractate two; at the end of a line ε, α, c, and λ are often elongated, but no real effort is made by the scribe to produce a regular right margin. The scribe averages about 38 lines per page. This count has been established by comparison with the only complete pages that survive (59-64), which are from the second hand. The figure is calculated by comparing the average line density of the two scribes in a proportionate ratio for each page, since some are more dense than others, and some pages have one or two more lines than others. Thus, the line numeration of the transcription for the fragmentary pages is at best a careful estimate of the line count of the original pages.

The left margins are quite straight and even, with a slight tendency to slant towards the left as one goes down the page; the right margins are uneven, with some lines extending as many as five letters beyond the end of other lines.

Punctuation is rare, and when it occurs, it is only the raised dot, which sometimes marks a sense unit, and sometimes indicates the end of a closed syllable. One may also find a diaeresis at 5,16. To mark the end of a tractate, hand one completes the last line with a diplo obelismene (>—); in the left margin a coronis (∟) occurs with a series of chevrons above and below in the margin (see the bottom of pp. 21 and 39). In the liturgical supplements to tractate two, both of these paragraphing devices are used (see the bottom of pp. 41 and 44, and perhaps at 43,20), though a simple linear para-

graphus may at times have sufficed (this may have been the case after 40,29), or even no decoration (cf. the bottom of 43). These brief units following the second tractate (i.e., 40–44) have not been numbered as separate tractates in previous scholarship, and hence are not so classified in this edition; they are called supplements, in view of some affinity in point of view with tractate two, but a precise assessment of their degree of autonomy or dependence awaits further study. The only title that occurs in Codex XI (21,35) has horizontal lines above and below it.

The most striking feature of hand one is the use of the form † for Ψ. The supralinear stroke is, for the most part, used fairly consistently. When it occurs over a single letter it is rather well-centered, not running off to the right of the letter; one should note the unusual and inconsistent stroking of the third masculine singular pronoun $\bar{\eta}$. Strokes bridging two letters to form a closed syllable are carefully formed and extend from the left edge of the left letter to the right edge of the second, e.g., \overline{MN} , \overline{ZN} , $\overline{\alpha\varphi\overline{P}}$ (construct of $\overline{\epsilon\overline{I\overline{P\overline{E}}}}$), $\overline{\tau\overline{H\overline{P\overline{Q}}}}$, etc. Strokes bridging three letters appear to be hastily formed, but in the main extend from the center of the first letter to the center of the third, (though one finds $\overline{\omega\overline{P\overline{\pi\overline{N\overline{\epsilon\overline{I\overline{\omega\overline{\tau}}}}}}}}$, $\overline{\overline{IHC}}$, $\overline{\overline{IHC}}$, etc.). Unlike hand two, the first hand employs no serifs on letters for purposes of syllable demarcation.

The scribe usually makes corrections by a combination of dots above and below the letter to be emended (cf. 19,24); occasionally he employs only supralinear dots (cf. 12,28); rarely does he simply cross out a mistaken letter (cf. 4,28) or make an erasure (cf. 33,34). In each case, corrections appear to be those of the scribe himself. Infrequently one also observes the scribe inserting omitted letters by writing them directly above the line at the point they were intended to occupy. For further examples of corrections see the footnotes to the text.

Three times the scribe left one-third to one-half of a given line blank (6,30; 14,27; 19,15). Since the papyrus at these points seems to be in good condition, and no sense-unit is demarcated thereby, these blanks remain unexplained.

B. *Hand Two*

The script of hand two is a formal round majuscule, more rounded than the biblical majuscule. It averages 18 to 20 letters per

line, with rarely a variation of more than three letters. The lines are usually denser at the top of the page than at the bottom; the line count for each page is calculated on the basis of pp. 59–64. There are usually 37 to 39 lines per page. The left margin is straight and vertical, and the right margin is far more regular than that of hand one; at the end of the line ϵ and λ are sometimes elongated.

Punctuation is consistently the raised dot, to delineate sense units (at the clause level). The supralinear stroke is a curved arch over one letter; over two letters it extends from the center of the first to the center of the second; over three letters, it is a straight line extending from the center of the first to the center of the third. A supralinear stroke occurs over $\bar{2}$, mostly in compounds of the preposition $\bar{2}$ - and in the Greek $\bar{2}\text{I}\text{N}\lambda$. The stroke occurs in $\bar{2}\text{O}\gamma\delta$ when at the end of the line (57,13; 67,23). A serif at the right end of the horizontal bar of τ ($\bar{\tau}$) indicates a closed syllable ending in τ ; its major occurrence is in the morphemes $\epsilon\bar{\tau}$, $\lambda\bar{\tau}$ and $\text{M}\bar{\text{N}}\bar{\tau}$.

The only correction that is clearly apparent is made by means of a stroke through and a dot beneath the first letter, and a dot over the next incorrect letter (54,14).

The scribe utilizes the following decoration: A coronis (r) is at 49,38–39. On 69,14–21 each of the concluding lines of *Allogenes* and the titles of both tractates are surrounded with a reversed dipole obelismene ($\text{—}\langle$) to the left and to the right more than one dipole followed by a dipole obelismene ($\rangle\rangle\text{—}$); the titles are surrounded above and below by short obeli with serifs at their ends.

In NHC XI,4 (*Hypsiphron*) the diaeresis rather than the $\bar{2}$ marks the *spiritus asper* in $\bar{\Psi}\Psi\text{I}\Phi\text{P}\text{R}\text{O}\text{N}\text{H}$.

III. LANGUAGE

The language of Codex XI consists of three separate dialectal types. XI,1 and 2, produced by the same scribal hand, are written in a subdialect of Subachmimic which seems to be typical of the region around Lycopolis. XI,3, produced by the second scribal hand in the codex, is written in a Sahidic dialect which betrays many features of a syntax typical of Bohairic. XI,4, written also by hand two, exhibits a standard Sahidic dialect, but is too brief and frag-

mentary to enable any survey of its linguistic features. In the following description, one may consult the Coptic index for the location of words whose references are not cited.

A. *The Language of XI,1 and 2*

The following analysis will confine itself to major features and peculiarities only. Comparison indicates that the linguistic features of XI,1 and 2 are so similar that one may assume that they were translated from the Greek by the same translator, and can therefore be treated both together as a single linguistic product.

1. Dialect

The dialect of these two treatises is a highly neutralized Upper Egyptian dialect for which the name "Lycopolitan" has been proposed; it is very close to the dialect of the Subachmimic *Gospel of John* edited by H. Thompson, the Heidelberg *Acts of Paul* edited by C. Schmidt, and the first three tractates of the Jung Codex (NHC I,1-3). Assuming that the orthography of XI,1 and 2 is a reliable guide to the phonology of their dialect, the following inventory of the lexical stock of these treatises, with the Sahidic equivalent indicated in parentheses, will illustrate the distinctiveness of this dialect.

Word-initial (ε)Ι for ε: εΙΩΠΕ- (εΩΧΕ-); word-final atonic syllable, ΚΕΚΕΙ (ΚΑΚΕ), ΛΑΒΙ (ΛΙΒΕ), ΝΑΒ(Ε)Ι (ΝΟΒΕ), ΠΠΕΕΙ (ΠΠΕ), ΧΑCΙ (ΧΟCΕ).

Word-final ΟΥ for ω after spirants: ̄ΒCΟΥ, ̄ΓCΟΥ (̄ΒCω), ΧΟΥ (Χω).

Word-final ΕΥ for αγ: ΠΜΕΥ (ΠΜΑγ), ΜΕΕΥ (ΜΑΑγ, "mother"), CΝΕΥ (CΝΑγ).

Word-final atonic syllable: ΚΩΕ (Κω) and after 'aleph, 'ayin and semi-consonants: ΛΑγΕ (ΛΑΑγ), ΜΑΑΒΕ (ΜΑΑΒ), CΑγΝΕ (CΟΟγ̄N̄), ΟΥΑΕΙΕ (ΟΥΟΙ), ΟΥΑΕΙΝΕ (ΟΥΟΕΙΝ), ΧΕΚΑCΕ (ΧΕΚΑΑC).

Doubling of vowels: CΩΩΝΤ (CΩΝΤ), CΑΑΝΤ (CΑΝΤ), ΩΩΝ̄ (ΩΝ̄), ̄ΖΕΕΙ (̄ΖΑΙ), ΧΑΑΝΤ (ΧΑΝΤ).

Assimilation of vowels: ΒΕΒΕ (ΒΕΕΒΕ), ΕΤΒΗΤ (ΕΤΒΗΗΤ), ΜΕγΕ (ΜΕΕγΕ), CΕΠΕ (CΕΕΠΕ).

Word-final ΕΙ(Ε) after a vowel: ΟΕΙ (Ο, "be"), ΜΑΕΙΕ (ΜΕ,

“love”), **САΕΙΕ** (СА, “beauty”), **ΖΑΕΙΕ** (ΖΕ, “fall”), **ΓΡΑΦΑΥΕΙΕ** (ΓΡΑΦΟΥΕ, *γραφαί*).

ΑΥ for **ΟΥΥ**: in open syllable: **ΕΑΥ** (ΕΟΥΥ), **ΚΑΥΕ** (ΚΟΥΕ), **ΤΗΝΑΥ** (ΤΗΝΟΥΥ), **ΖΑΥ** (ΖΟΥΥ, “evil”); in closed syllable: **ΜΑΥΤ** (ΜΟΥΥΤ).

Other typical Subachmimic-like forms include: **ΑΒΑΛ** (ΕΒΟΛ), **ΕΜΑΖΤΕ** (ΑΜΑΖΤΕ), **ΑΡΑ-** (ΕΡΟ-), **ΑΝΗΖΕ** (ΕΝΕΖ), **ΜΗΕ** (ΜΕ, “truth”), **ἸΜΕ** (ΕΙΜΕ), **ΜΑΖΕ** (ΜΟΥΨΕ), **ΝΕΥ** (ΝΑΥ, “see”), **ΠΟΥ-** (ΠΕΥ-, possessive adjective), **ΤΕΕΙ-** (ΤΑΑ-, “give”), **ΤΕΚΟ** (ΤΑΚΟ), **ΤΕΖΟ** (ΤΑΖΟ), and **ΟΥΡΙΤΕ** (ΟΥΡΗΤΕ).

2. Orthography

The orthography of XI,₁ and 2 is very consistent. Irregularities include: (a) itacism, mainly in **ΕΙΩΤ/ΙΩΤ** and in the juncture of the relative particle **ΕΤ** with infinitives beginning with **ΕΙ**, e.g., **ΝΕΤΡΕ** in 9,32 and **ΕΤΡΕ** in 19,30; (b) occasional departure from the internal juncture of **Ε + ΟΥ** to form **ΕΥ** (**ΕΥΝΤΕΟΥ-** in 21,27; **ΝΕΟΥΝΤΕΥ** in 22,35; cf. **ΤΕΥΟ** in 19,30) and of **Α + ΟΥ** to form **ΑΥ** (**ΜΑΟΥ**, “water” in 4,31); and (c) inconsistent internal juncture of **Τ + Ζ** to form **Θ** and of **Π + Ζ** to form **Φ**.

3. Phonology

The Greek postpositives **γάρ**, **δέ**, and **μέν** are mostly nasalized, **ἸΜΕΝ** always, while **ἸΓΑΡ** and **ἸΔΕ** predominate over **ΓΑΡ** and **ΔΕ**. The *spiritus asper* on Graeco-Coptic words is mostly rendered by **Ζ** (cf. **ΖΙΚΩΝ** alongside **ΕΘΝΟС** 21,30), although once by **Ψ** in **ΧΙΕΡΙΧΩ** (i.e., **ΤΨΙΕΡΙΧΩ** for *ἡ Ἰεριχώ*; cf. also **Χ** for Greek *chi* in **ΧΕΙΡΟΓΡΑΦΟΝ** apparently for *χειρόγραφον* in 14,21 [although it may represent **ΤΨΙΕΡΟΓΡΑΦΟΝ** erroneously for *ἱερόγραφον*]). Bilabials appear to have had a slight fricative quality either before another consonant or in word-final position, as in **ΩΡϞ** (for **ΩΡΒ**, 23,25); **ΖΩϞ** (for **ΖΩВ**, 1,33; 11,33; 18,18; and 35,16); **ΨϞΕΙΕ** (for **ΨΒΕΙΕ**, s.v. **ΩΙΒΕ**, 18,16; 39,38.39); **ΖϞΟΥ** (for **ΖΒСОУ**, 11,38); **ΩΧϞ** (for **ΩΧВ**, 16,20); and even in **ΖΩΤϞ** (for **ΖΩΤΠ**, 17,30; 18,37). *Mutatis mutandis* **Ϟ** also becomes **В**, as in **<С†>ΝΟΥΒΕ** (for **<С†>ΝΟΥϞΕ**, 25,39); **ΟΥΑΑϞ** (for **ΟΥΑΑВ**, 25,36; 40,23.24); **ΒΙΤ-** (for **ϞΙΤ-**, 10,34); and finally **ΟΥΝΤΕϞ** (for **ΟΥΝΤΕϞ(С)Ϟ**, 14,24; 22,35). **Н** is apparently doubled in **ΟἸἸΝΕΙ** (for **ΟἸΝΕΙ**, “descent,” 26,25). **М** is assimilated to **λ** in **ΟΛΑΛΛМ** (for **ΟΛΑМЛМ**,

9,16; 42,41), and **М** to **Н** in $\overline{\omega\pi\tau\psi\epsilon\epsilon}$ (for $\overline{\omega\mu\tau\psi\epsilon\epsilon}$, 23,27; 30,36). In general, the assimilation of \bar{n} to \bar{m} before π is very inconsistent. Finally, χ becomes δ in $\overline{\zeta\delta\zeta\alpha\beta\tau}$ (an unattested qualitative for $\overline{\zeta\chi\zeta\alpha\chi\tau}$, 2,25).

4. Morphology

Among unusual forms one finds the feminine singular *nomen agentis* prefix **РЄС-** (usually **РЄԀ-**; 26,32.33.[34]; 27,30.31.32.32.[36].37) and the unusual plural form of **γραφαί**, **ΓΡΑΦΑΥΕΙΕ** (28,32 for **ΓΡΑΦΑΥΕ**) and of **ψυχαί**, **ΨΥΧΑΥΕΙΕ** (5,[26] for **ΨΥΧΑΥΕ**). A transitive form of **ΛΟ**, "cease," is apparently attested in the form **ΛΟΤ-** ("to stop," 34,12.17.22).

The system of conjugation bases in XI,1 and 2 is as follows: First Present: **ϕ-**, $\bar{\phi}$ - (pret. **ΝΕϕ-**, **ΝΕΡΕ-**; circ. **Εϕ-**, **ΕΡΕ-**; rel. **ΕΤϕ-**). First Future: **ϕΝΑ-**, **ϕΑ-** (pret. **ΝΕϕΑ-**; *irrealis* **ΕΝΕϕΑ-**; rel. **ΕΤΝΑ-**, **ΕΤϕΑ-**). First Perfect: affirmative **Αϕ-**, $\alpha\bar{\phi}$ -, $\alpha\bar{\zeta}\bar{\phi}$ -, **Α-**, **ΑΖΑ-**, **ΖΑ-** (perhaps **ΖΑ-** is the affirmative counterpart to the "not yet" conjugation base; circ. **ΕΑϕ-**; rel. $\bar{n}\bar{\tau}\alpha\bar{\phi}$ -, $\bar{n}\bar{\tau}\alpha$ -, $\bar{n}\bar{\tau}\alpha\bar{\zeta}\bar{\phi}$ -, $\bar{n}\bar{\tau}\alpha\bar{\zeta}\alpha$ -, $\epsilon\bar{\tau}\alpha\bar{\zeta}\bar{\phi}$ -, $\epsilon\bar{\tau}\alpha\bar{\zeta}$ -); negative $\bar{m}\bar{\pi}\bar{\phi}$ -, $\bar{m}\bar{\pi}\epsilon\bar{\phi}$ -. Habitude: affirmative **ϞΑΡΟΥ-**, **ϞΑΡΕ-** (circ. and rel. **ΕϞΑΥ-**, **ΕϞΑΡΟΥ-**, **ΕϞΑΡΕ-**); negative **ΜΑΡΕ-**. Third Future: affirmative (none; the Second Future is used in final clauses); negative $\bar{n}\bar{n}\epsilon\bar{\gamma}$ -. "Not Yet": (circ. **ΕΜΠΑ $\bar{\tau}\bar{\phi}$**). Second Present: **ϕϕ-**, **ϕΡΕ-**. Second Future: **ϕϕΝΑ-**, **ϕϕΑ-**, **ϕΡΕ...ΝΑ-**. Second Perfect: $\bar{n}\bar{\tau}\alpha\bar{\phi}$ -, $\bar{n}\bar{\tau}\alpha\bar{\zeta}\alpha$ -. Second Habitude: apparently none. Temporalis: $\bar{n}\bar{\tau}\alpha\rho\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\phi}$ -, $\bar{n}\bar{\tau}\alpha\rho\bar{\epsilon}$ -. Conditionalis: **ϕϕϞΑΝ-**, **ϕΡΕϞΑ(Ν)-**. "Until": **ϞΑΝΤΕ-**. Causative Infinitive: affirmative $\bar{\tau}\bar{\rho}\bar{\phi}$ -, **ΤΡΕ-**; negative (none). Imperative: affirmative **ΕΡΙ-** (of **ΕΙΡΕ**); causative **ΜΑΡΝ-**; negative $\bar{m}\bar{\pi}\bar{\omega}\bar{\rho}$ **Α-**, $\bar{m}\bar{\pi}\bar{\omega}\bar{\rho}$ -, $\bar{m}\bar{\pi}\bar{\rho}$ -, $\bar{m}\bar{n}$ -.

5. Lexicography

The following items are unattested in Crum's *A Coptic Dictionary*: An apparent feminine collective **ΑΒΗ**, "nets," 6,29, of **ΑΒΩ**, "net." An apparent transitive use of **ΛΟ**, "cease," in the pronominal form **ΛΟΤ-**, 34,12.17.22, perhaps meaning "to stop." The feminine *nomen agentis* prefix **РЄС-** (26,32.33.[34]; 27,30.31.32.32.[36].37) occurs alongside the usual **РЄԀ-**. A possible instance of a noun **Ϟ**, "garden," depending on the state of the text (see note to 36,33-34). The feminine abstract $\overline{\omega\pi\tau\zeta}$, 6,28, perhaps meaning "portion,"

from $\omega\iota$, "measure." The forms $\overline{\omega\psi\epsilon\iota\epsilon}$, "change," 39,38, and $\overline{\alpha\tau\omega\psi\epsilon\iota\epsilon}$, "unchanging," 39,39, of $\overline{\omega\beta\epsilon\iota\omicron}$ ($\omega\beta\epsilon$). The form $\overline{\zeta\epsilon\epsilon\varsigma}$, 14,15, alongside $\overline{\zeta\epsilon}$, "way, manner." The form $\overline{\alpha\zeta\eta\text{-}}$ in $\uparrow\overline{\alpha\zeta\eta\text{-}}$, "to oppose," 14,31, perhaps from $\alpha + \overline{\zeta\eta}$, "to the forepart of," as in $\uparrow\overline{\alpha\zeta\eta\tau\text{-}}$ (NHC I,4:98,25; 119,20), and $\uparrow\overline{\alpha\zeta\eta\tau\text{-}}$ (NHC I,4:93,7; XIII 1^{*}:41^{*},7; cf. also *s.v.* $\overline{\alpha\zeta\tau\eta\text{-}}$, "against"). Finally, there is the qualitative $\overline{\zeta\omicron\zeta\alpha\beta\tau}$, 2,25, "be distressed" of $\overline{\zeta\omicron\chi\zeta\alpha}$.

6. Syntax

In the absence of a systematic analysis, there are still some syntactic features that deserve notice. Infinitives are used as substantives with (cf. 36,16) and without (cf. 36,34) the article. The Conjunctive is used to continue Imperatives, Futures, complementary infinitives, the "Until" conjugation, and after the phrase $\overline{\pi\omega\kappa\epsilon\eta\pi\epsilon}$, "it is not your affair that you should..." (cf. 10,18). Final clauses consist of three general types: usually $\overline{\chi\epsilon\kappa\alpha\varsigma\epsilon}$ with the Second Future; $\overline{\zeta\omega\varsigma}$ with the Causative Infinitive (cf. 30,32-36) and $\overline{\zeta\omega\varsigma\tau\epsilon}$ with the Conjunctive (cf. 38,36-37). Construction involving $\overline{\varsigma\omega\psi\epsilon}$, "it is fitting that...", $\overline{\omicron\gamma\alpha\eta\alpha\eta\gamma\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\eta\eta\pi\epsilon}$, "it is necessary that...", and $\overline{(\omega)\delta\eta\eta\delta\alpha\mu}$, $\overline{\mu\eta\omega\delta\alpha\mu}$ introduce their complements in the form of complementary infinitives, either simple or causative. Real conditions are introduced either with a Conditionalis in the protasis (the apodosis may contain a First Present, First or Second Future, or the Habitude), or by $\overline{\epsilon\iota\omega\psi\eta\epsilon}$ with the First Present in the protasis and any basic tense in the apodosis. $\overline{\epsilon\iota\omega\psi\eta\epsilon}$ is also used in the rhetorical question: $\overline{\mu\eta\epsilon\eta\epsilon\epsilon\iota\omega\psi\eta\epsilon\langle\epsilon\rangle\eta\alpha\phi\eta\eta\omicron\epsilon\iota}$, "would we not recognize..." (i.e., "surely we would recognize...," 26,35).

B. *The Language of XI,3.*

1. Dialectal Affinities.

Just as *Allogenes* bears a striking similarity to *Three Steles of Seth* (VII,5) and to *Zostrianos* (VIII,1) in metaphysical nomenclature and in the depiction of ontological structures, so also the language of these tractates is strikingly similar. While the orthography, phonology and most of the morphology of these three documents is standard Sahidic with some slight traces of Subachmimic

features, their syntax has strong affinities with Bohairic. This suggests that these tractates were translated from Greek near the northern border of the Sahidic dialectal domain. Some form of *Allogenes* and *Zostrianos* probably in Greek dress, was known to Plotinus' circle in Rome in the period 244–265 C.E. (Porph. *Vit. Plot.* 16). The present version of *Allogenes* was written by the same hand as that of Codex VII; dated documents in the cartonnage of that codex yield a *terminus a quo* of circa 350 C.E., which agrees with the date of the uncial hand in which these tractates were written. These observations suggest that these tractates may witness either to (a) an early form of Bohairic whose orthography is much like that of Sahidic, or (b) a Sahidic translation of a Bohairic text, or (c) perhaps a Coptic dialect underlying the later standard expression of these two dialects.

The following brief profile of the language of *Allogenes* will concentrate mostly on its inconsistencies and distinctiveness compared with standard Sahidic.

2. Orthography

The most inconsistent feature of *Allogenes* is itacism, the frequent interchange of $\epsilon\iota$ and ι in such forms as $\epsilon\iota\mu\epsilon$ and $\epsilon\iota\mu\epsilon$ and in constructions involving the first-person singular pronouns. In Graeco-Coptic words such as $\epsilon\nu\epsilon\rho\gamma\epsilon\iota\alpha$, $\pi\epsilon\iota\rho\alpha\zeta\epsilon\iota\nu$ and $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\iota\omega\varsigma$, the spelling with ι is preferred to $\epsilon\iota$. All Graeco-Coptic infinitives in $-\epsilon\iota\nu$ are rendered with final ι except one instance (51,29) of $\epsilon\nu\epsilon\rho\gamma\epsilon\iota$ and all instances of $\nu\omicron\epsilon\iota$. Internal juncture of $\tau + \zeta$ to form θ occurs in $\zeta\alpha\theta\eta$ and $\bar{\nu}\theta\epsilon$; similar juncture of $\pi + \zeta$ to form ϕ is not witnessed. The *spiritus asper* of Graeco-Coptic words (including $\zeta\iota\kappa\omega\nu$ for $\epsilon\iota\kappa\acute{\omega}\nu$) is represented by ζ , although there is some variation in the name $\alpha\rho\mu\eta\lambda\omega\nu$ (54,12; cf. $\zeta\alpha\rho\mu\eta\lambda\omega\nu$, 58,17). Abbreviation occurs twice: $\Gamma\zeta\omicron\omicron\Upsilon\tau$ (45,37) for $\overline{\omega\mu\eta\tau}$ - $\zeta\omicron\omicron\Upsilon\tau$, used elsewhere, and $\overline{\mu\eta\tau}\chi\varsigma$ (58,11) for $\overline{\mu\eta\tau}\chi\rho\eta\varsigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$, "auspiciousness."

3. Phonology

Irregularities are probably due to dialectal influence except for the following: $\omega\mu\epsilon\varsigma$ (53,12) for $\overline{\omega\mu\varsigma}$ ("submerge"); the frequent doubling of the genitive preposition $\bar{\nu}$ - and of the negative preformative $\bar{\nu}$ -... $\lambda\bar{\nu}$ before the singular indefinite article; the erratic

variation of $\bar{n}ne-$ and $ne-$ for the negative Third Future conjugation base; and the variation of $\bar{m}mn-$ ("not be": 53,21; 58,32; 62,10; 63,13,39; 64,27) with $\bar{m}n-$ (47,35; 59,16; 65,35). n is consistently assimilated to m before π . Irregularities caused by (mostly Subachmimic) dialectal influences include: variation between δom (S) and δam (AA²). The singular instances of $o\gamma a\epsilon\tau-$ ("alone, self," 67,36 for A² $o\gamma a\epsilon\epsilon\tau-$), elsewhere $o\gamma a\lambda-$, and of AA² $ma\lambda-$ (ordinal prefix, 48,38), elsewhere $me\lambda-$. The AF qualitative ϵ of $\epsilon i\pi\epsilon$ is almost always used, except for two instances of S, O, 45,38; 47,10. The consistent use of $ne\lambda-$ ("be great") for $na\lambda-$ is also a Subachmimic. Finally, the consistent use of $\epsilon\omega n$ for $a\acute{i}\omega n$ does not seem to be due to dialectal influence.

4. Morphology

Most striking is the system of demonstratives. There is a distinct preference for πn , τn , $n n$ (as in Bohairic), especially in relative substantives, (e.g., $\pi n \epsilon\tau(\epsilon)$), but $\pi\epsilon\tau-$ occurs only in $\pi\epsilon\tau\psi o o\pi$, 49,27,35; 54,32), while $\pi a\acute{i}$, $\tau a\acute{i}$, $n a\acute{i}$ is much less frequent. The semantic distinction, if any, between these forms is not so much the deictic one of distance ("that") versus proximity ("this") as it is an "affective" distinction (e.g., $\pi n \epsilon\tau\psi o o\pi$ "that (awesome) one who is"; cf. Polotsky's review of Till, *Koptische Grammatik*, OLZ 52(1957) cols. 229–30). The same distinction seems to play a role in the preference for the $\pi i-$, $\acute{\tau}-$, $n i-$ form of the definite article (usually prefixed to the names of hypostases) to the forms $\pi\epsilon-$, $\tau\epsilon-$, $n\epsilon-$. The possessive adjective is as in standard Sahidic, except for the Bohairicizing possessive construction $\tau\epsilon\tau\epsilon \tau\omega\varsigma \bar{n}\zeta\psi\pi a\rho\chi i\varsigma$, 46,12, and in the frequent use of the genitive in possessive constructions with $\pi i-$, $\acute{\tau}-$, $n i-$ + noun + $\epsilon\tau\bar{n}\tau a-$. The possessive prefix occurs only once, 60,26, and is elsewhere rendered by $\pi n \bar{n}\tau\epsilon-$. A final form of interest is the BF qualitative $\bar{o}b\bar{v}i\eta o\gamma\acute{\tau}$, 57,23.

Allogenes employs the following system of conjugation bases: First Present: $q-$ (pret. $neq-$, $nepe-$; circ. $eq-$; rel. $\epsilon\tau\epsilon$, $\epsilon\tau-$, $\epsilon\tau q-$). First Future: $qna-$ (pret. $neqna-$; rel. $\epsilon\tau na-$). First Perfect: affirmative $aq-$, $a-$ (circ. $eaq-$; rel. $\epsilon\tau aq-$); negative $\bar{m}peq-$ (circ. $\epsilon mpeq-$). Habitude: affirmative $\psi aq-$ (circ. and rel. $\epsilon\psi aq-$); negative $meq-$, $maq-$, $mepe-$ (circ. $\epsilon meq-$; rel. $\epsilon\tau\epsilon meq-$ [$maq-$]). Third Future: affirmative $eqe-$ (rel. $\epsilon\tau\epsilon qe-$,

48,18); negative $\bar{\eta}\eta\epsilon\zeta-$, $\eta\epsilon\zeta-$. Second Present: $\epsilon\zeta-$ (rel. $\epsilon\tau\epsilon\zeta-$). Second Future: $\epsilon\kappa\alpha-$ (A², 67,38). Second Perfect: no instances. Second Habitue: $\epsilon\omega\alpha\zeta-$ (negatived in 62,13 as $\bar{\eta}\eta\epsilon\omega\alpha\zeta\dots\alpha\eta$). “Not Yet”: (circ. $\epsilon\mu\pi\alpha\tau\zeta-$). Conjunctive: $\bar{\eta}\zeta-$. Future Conjunctive: no instances. Temporalis: $\bar{\eta}\tau\epsilon\tau\epsilon\zeta-$, $\bar{\eta}\tau\alpha\tau\epsilon\zeta-$, $\epsilon\tau\alpha\zeta-$, $\bar{\eta}\tau\alpha\zeta-$ (for $\bar{\eta}\tau\alpha\langle\rho\epsilon\rangle\zeta-$?; see textual note on 45,22–24). “Until”: no instances. Conditionalis: $\epsilon\zeta\omega\alpha\eta-$ (mostly with $\epsilon\omega\omega\pi\epsilon$). Causative Infinitive: no instances. Imperative forms: negative $\bar{\mu}\bar{\pi}\bar{\rho}$, and special forms $\alpha\rho\iota-$ (from $\epsilon\rho\epsilon$), $\epsilon\mu\omicron\gamma$ (68,23 for $\alpha\mu\omicron\gamma$, “come”), $\epsilon\eta\alpha\gamma$ (59,10, unattested from $\eta\alpha\gamma$, “see”), and $\mu\omicron\omega\epsilon\ \eta\alpha\kappa$ (67,24, attested in Crum 544b as $\mu\alpha-\omega\epsilon\ \eta\alpha-$, perhaps here harmonized with $\mu\omicron\omega\omega\epsilon$).

5. Lexicography

Allogenes witnesses to an unattested infinitive $\omega\omega\chi\bar{2}$, $\omega\alpha\chi\bar{2}-$, $\omega\alpha\bar{2}\chi-$, $\alpha\tau\omega\alpha\chi\bar{2}-$ (62,7.26.27; 63,25.26.27; 67,32), whose meaning, “to diminish,” can be established from context. Because of the use of the “affective” article $\pi\iota-$ in $\pi\iota\omicron\gamma\alpha\tau\omicron$ (“crowd,” 50,[2].32), the form listed *s.v.* $\alpha\tau\omicron$ in Crum 19a should be listed *s.v.* $\omicron\gamma\alpha\tau\omicron$, since this text shows that the initial $\omicron\gamma-$ is not the indefinite article or the suffix pronoun of a possessive adjective. *Allogenes* also offers some peculiar locutions: the neologism $\tau\eta\omicron\eta\tau\eta\varsigma$, 49,30.34, as an abstract substantive “mentality” instead of the expected $\eta\mu\omicron\tau\eta\varsigma$; the locutions $\eta\eta\pi\tau\eta\rho\bar{\zeta}$, “the universals,” 59,3; 62,20, also found in *Zostrianos* and in the Bruce Codex; and $\eta\eta\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\ \omicron\gamma\alpha$, *passim*, “the individuals.”

6. Syntax

There are numerous features reminiscent of Bohairic syntax, especially in the combinations of demonstratives with relatives: the possessive forms $\tau\epsilon\tau\epsilon\ \tau\omega\varsigma\ \bar{\eta}2\gamma\pi\alpha\rho\chi\iota\varsigma$, 46,12, and $\pi\eta\ \epsilon\tau\bar{\eta}\tau\alpha\zeta\ \alpha\gamma\omega\ \pi\eta\ \alpha\eta\ \epsilon\tau\bar{\eta}\tau\alpha\zeta$, “his attribute(s) and non-attribute(s),” 63,20–21, and the relative substantive locutions $\pi\eta\ \epsilon\tau-$ and $\pi\alpha\bar{\iota}\ \epsilon\tau-$. The preference for the “affective” form of the article ($\pi\iota-$, $\bar{\eta}$ -, $\eta\iota-$) necessitates frequent use of the genitive preposition plus relative ($\epsilon\tau\bar{\eta}\tau\alpha\zeta-$) to indicate possession (e.g., $\bar{\eta}\eta\epsilon\eta\epsilon\rho\eta\eta\alpha\ \epsilon\tau\bar{\eta}\tau\alpha\kappa$, 54,13, instead of $\tau\epsilon\kappa\epsilon\eta\epsilon\rho\eta\eta\alpha$). Most intriguing are the Coptic translations of technical terms from Greek metaphysics, e.g., $\pi\epsilon\tau\omega\omicron\omicron\pi$ and $\pi\eta\ \epsilon\tau\epsilon\ \pi\alpha\bar{\iota}\ \pi\epsilon$ for $\tau\omicron\ \delta\upsilon$; $\pi\epsilon\tau\omega\omicron\omicron\pi\ \omicron\eta\tau\omega\varsigma$,

ΝΗ ΕΤΨΟΟΠ ΟΝΤΩΣ and ΝΙΟΝΤΩΣ ΕΤΨΟΟΠ for τὸ ὄντως ὄν and τὰ ὄντως ὄντα. Perhaps πωωπε translates τὸ εἶναι, while such terms as οὐσία and ὑπαρξίς were simply taken over from the Greek exemplar. Greek nouns with the genitive $\bar{\nu}$ - are often used for the corresponding Greek adjectives: $\bar{\nu}$ ΝΟΥΣ for $\bar{\nu}$ ΝΟΕΡΟΝ, $\bar{\mu}$ ΠΑΡΘΕΝΟΣ for $\bar{\mu}$ ΠΑΡΘΕΝΙΚΟΣ, etc.; yet one finds also ΦΥΣΙΣ $\bar{\mu}$ ΜΕΡΙΚΟΝ (*sic.* 51,24–25). ΟΥ $\bar{\nu}$ ΒΟΜ, ($\bar{\mu}$) $\bar{\mu}$ Ν $\bar{\nu}$ ΒΟΜ, and $\bar{\delta}$ $\bar{\nu}$ ΒΟΜ take complements with the prepositions ε- or $\bar{\nu}$ - plus the infinitive, and once with the bare infinitive ($\bar{\delta}$ $\bar{\mu}$ ΒΟΜ ΠΙΡΑΖΕ, 59,8). The protasis of conditional clauses is usually εωωπε ερωωαν-, while an affirmative or negative Habitude or even a Second Present introduces the apodosis.

This inventory of striking grammatical features peculiar to *Allogenes* could be greatly extended. They deserve full treatment in a separate monograph, primarily because their elucidation is crucial to the understanding of this document with its later Platonic metaphysical terminology.

IV. TITLES AND SUBDIVISIONS

Since the titles of the tractates are discussed in their respective introductions, it is sufficient here only to point out that there are subscript titles for the first (*Interpretation of Knowledge*) and third (*Allogenes*) tractates, a superscript title for the fourth (*Hypsiphron*), and apparently no title for the second (*A Valentinian Exposition*).

As the subscript title of *Allogenes* and the superscript title of *Hypsiphron* follow one another (69,20 and 21), Doresse took the superscript title to *Hypsiphron* as part of the subscript title to *Allogenes*. Since all that is visible is $\bar{\gamma}$ $\bar{\psi}$ ΙΦ[, which could be read $\bar{\gamma}$ $\bar{\psi}$ ΙϚ[ΤΟC], Doresse named *Allogenes* “The Supreme *Allogenes* (*ἀλλογενῆς ὑψιστος*)” see *Secret Books*, 144, 157–58. The appearance of the name “*Allogenes*” in the *explicit* (69,19) just before the title makes it clear that the first line of the title (69,20, “The *Allogenes*”) is the subscript title to the preceding tractate. But “supreme” (*ὑψιστος*) does not occur in the extant parts of the preceding tractate, nor in Porphyry’s list of gnostic apocalypses (*Vit. Plot.* 16). Porphyry included in his list, just after *Allogenes*,

one named Messos. Doresse, noting a reference to Messos (XI, 68,28), assumed both works to be in Codex XI, and hence placed the fragment with the conclusion of *Allogenes* and the commencement of the last tractate somewhere prior to 67/68, rather than in its correct position on the leaf immediately following 67/68, thus bringing the reference to Messos into the last tractate, which he identified as the Apocalypse of Messos. The result is that *Hypsiphron*e was completely overlooked. However, the fact that "Hypsiphron" is the title of the fourth tractate is confirmed by the reappearance of that name in 69,22–72,37 (69,23; 70,22; 72,21), and its absence in the extant parts of 45,1–69,19, as well as by the fact that *Hypsiphron*e, written in standard Sahidic, shows no traces of the very distinctive dialect of *Allogenes*.

The situation is more complex in the case of the second tractate *A Valentinian Exposition*, since there are no extant titles, but only a series of decorations, usually found between tractates, on pp. 39–44 (see section II above). Although the leaves were still in correct sequence, Doresse apparently took the subscript title to XI,1 (21,35) to come after p. 44 at the conclusion of hand one. Once one has recognized its position to be on p. 21, a second tractate by hand one, unrecognized by Doresse, becomes evident. The tractate itself (22,1–39,39) narrates a Valentinian cosmogony, the fall and redemption of Sophia, and the restoration of the psychic seed by separating (as Demiurge) their passions derived from Sophia. The tractate ends with the eschatological vision of the reunification within the Pleroma. It is followed by five untitled supplements, each no more than two pages in length, and separated from one another usually by the diplo obelismene (>—) that elsewhere separates tractates. The tractate *A Valentinian Exposition* and these five supplements may be meaningfully related. One may understand the long exposition of XI,2 as catechism preceding XI,2a–e, which are short liturgical expositions of the Valentinian redemptive sacraments of anointing, baptism and eucharist.

The first tractate (*Interpretation of Knowledge*) not only has an obvious subscript title (21,35); it probably had also a "superscript" title, not written above the *incipit* on p. 1, but rather on the upper part of the verso of the front flyleaf B (as in Codex III), approximately where lines 10 and 11 would have appeared had the verso of the front flyleaf been a fully inscribed page. Since the letters are

very faint, and only five of them are visible, their reconstruction is uncertain. The transcription is as follows:

**[Θ]ΞΡ[ΜΗΝΙΑ]
ΝΤΥ[ΝΩCIC]**

We thus arrive at the following table of contents for Codex XI, the titles of the second tractate and supplements being supplied by the translator:

<i>1</i>	1,1-21,35	The Interpretation of Knowledge
<i>2</i>	22,1-39,39	A Valentinian Exposition
<i>2a</i>	40,1-29	On the Anointing
<i>2b</i>	40,30-41,38	On Baptism A
<i>2c</i>	42,1-43,19	On Baptism B
<i>2d</i>	43,20-38	On the Eucharist A
<i>2e</i>	44,1-44,37	On the Eucharist B
<i>3</i>	45,1-69,20	Allogenes
<i>4</i>	69,21-72,37	Hypsiphron

INTRODUCTION

NHC XI,*I*: THE INTERPRETATION OF KNOWLEDGE, I,1–22,34

Bibliography: Sagnard, *La gnose valentinienne*; Koschorke, *Die Polemik*, 69–71; id., “Eine neugefundene gnostische Gemeindordnung”; Pagels, “Views of Christ’s Passion”; id., *The Gnostic Paul*.

I. LANGUAGE

For a discussion of the dialect of XI, *I*, the reader is referred above to the introduction to Codex XI and Kasser, “La variété subdialectale lycopolitaine.”

II. TITLE AND IDENTIFICATION

Of the two tractates copied by the first scribal hand of Codex XI, only this first tractate bears a title, “The Interpretation (ἑρμηνεία) of Knowledge (γνώσις)”; the full title appears at the end of the tractate (21,35) but is only partially preserved on the back of the front flyleaf. Owing to the fragmentary condition of the first page, one cannot tell whether or not the partially preserved title reflected the *incipit*. The phrase does not recur anywhere else in the extant text. One may surmise that the title denotes the intention of the tractate, namely, to interpret what the Savior’s teachings and his passion mean for the life of the church (as the body of Christ), specifically, for the relationship between its members.

References to a document by this title do not appear in patristic and other ancient literature, nor do there appear to be other documents of identical content. Therefore it must be interpreted on its own merits, with the aid of the numerous parallels it sustains with other literature, in particular, the *Gospel of Truth* and the *Excerpta ex Theodoto*.

III. FORM, STYLE AND STRUCTURE

Codex XI,*I* offers an exegesis of major elements of Christian tradition interpreted according to knowledge (γνώσις). One section

- and context; for $\omega\rho\alpha\rho\eta \bar{\nu}\theta\alpha\pi\tau\iota\sigma\mu\lambda$, cf. 40,38; 41,10-11.21. For the theme of movement from the world into the Pleroma, cf. *Exc. Theod.* 63-65 (esp. with 42.13-16) and *Exc. Theod.* 21.3; 22.1-2; 26.1-2 with 42.16-19.
- 42,18-21 The fragment preserving the right margin should be moved inward 0.2 cm. toward the spine of the codex.
- 42,35 "brought us forth" (apparently "from the world"—41,37) = entering the Pleroma; cf. *Exc. Theod.* 21.3; 26.3; 42.1-3; 61.5; 67.4; 80.2.
- 42,38 Having accepted the invitation to come from the cosmos into the Aeon, the "souls" apparently have come to realize "the things granted to (them) by the first baptism," cf. *Gos. Phil.* II,3:73,1-8; 77,7-15.
- 43,21 "celebrate the Eucharist" as a translation for $\epsilon\upsilon\chi\alpha\rho\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$: cf. Lampe, *Patristic Greek Lexicon*, 579a.
- 43,21-22 As the psychic "first baptism" relates the baptized to the Demiurge, the pneumatic "second baptism" relates him to the Father (Iren. *Haer.* I.21.1-5). This sacrament, called in Valentinian sources the "redemption" ($\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\lambda\upsilon\tau\rho\omega\sigma\iota\varsigma$, Iren. *Haer.* I.13.6; 21.5), is enacted in various ways (Iren. *Haer.* I.21.1); by some it is enacted as a eucharist (Iren. *Haer.* I.13.2; IV.18.4-5).
- 43,31-34 "will": cf. *Gos. Truth* I,3:33,30-32; the elect are told that "you should do the will of your Father, because you are of Him."
- 43,34 "complete": cf. Iren. *Haer.* I.13.6; through the sacrament, the participants become "perfect" ($\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\iota\omicron\iota$), having attained perfection ($\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\acute{\iota}\omega\sigma\iota\varsigma$) in *gnosis* through the pneumatic Aeon, Grace ($\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\varsigma$, cf. Iren. *Haer.* I.13.1-2). In *Gos. Truth* I,3:36,19-20 those who receive the chrism are made "perfect."
- 43,36-38 Cf. Iren. *Haer.* I.21.3 for liturgical parallels.
- 44,19-21 "food" ($\tau\rho\phi\eta$): cf. Iren. *Haer.* IV.18.4-5, where Irenaeus relates that the Valentinians offer eucharistic bread and wine as symbols of the "body" and "blood" of the Word ($\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$; see Massuet on this passage; Harvey reads "through" the Word); cf. *Interp. Know.* XI,1:12,29-38.
- 44,24 The supralinear stroke is visible above $\eta\zeta$ of $\pi\omega\omega\bar{\eta}\zeta$.
- 44,31 "Lord": cf. Iren. *Haer.* IV.18.4-5; the Valentinians acknowledge the Word as their "Lord"; cf. *Exc. Theod.* 77.1 where Christ "is Lord" ($\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\epsilon\iota$) of the pneumatic life.
- 44,32 *Exc. Theod.* 77.1: "baptism is called death and an end to the old life," that is, to the psychic life. The Valentinians consistently deny the reference of this sacramental "death and rebirth" to bodily resurrection, insisting instead on a symbolic interpretation (*Exc. Theod.* 77.2; Iren. *Haer.* IV.18.4-5; V.2.1-2).

INTRODUCTION

NHC XI,3: ALLOGENES, 45,1-69,20

Bibliography: A. *Allogenes*: Doresse, *Secret Books*, 144, 155-59, 250; King, *Allogenes*; id., "The Quiescent Eye"; Puech, "Les nouveaux écrits gnostiques," 126-34; Sieber, "Introduction to Zostrianos," 233-40; Turner, "The Gnostic Threefold Path," 324-51; Williams, *The Immovable Race*, 52-53, 86, 96-97. B. Philosophical Context of *Allogenes*: Armstrong, *Plotinus*; Bréhier, *Plotin: Ennéades*; Dodds, *Proclus: Theology*; Festugière, *La révélation*, 1.309-54, 2.18-53; Hadot, "Etre, Vie, Pensée chez Plotin," 107-41; "Discussion," 142-57; id., "La métaphysique de Porphyre," 127-57; "Discussion," 158-63; id., *Porphyre et Victorinus* 1.102-43; Kroll, "Ein neuplatonischer Parmenideskommentar," 599-627; Puech, "Plotin et les gnostiques," 161-74; "Discussion," 175-90; Robinson, "The Three Steles of Seth and the Gnostics of Plotinus," 132-42; Schmidt, *Codex Brucianus*; id., *Plotins Stellung zum Gnosticismus*. C. General Background: Armstrong, *Cambridge History*; Lewy, *Chaldaean Oracles*; Krämer, *Der Ursprung der Geistmetaphysik*.

I. LANGUAGE

A brief analysis of the language of *Allogenes* is provided above in the Introduction to Codex XI, Section III. The occasional Bohairic features in its Sahidic dialect, found also in *Zostrianos* (VIII,1) and *Three Steles of Seth* (VII,5), suggest that *Allogenes* was translated from Greek in or near the Bohairic dialectal domain perhaps even in Alexandria, around 300 C.E.

II. TITLE

As in most Nag Hammadi tractates, the title of *Allogenes* appears as a subscript (69,20) after the closing lines of the tractate (69,16-19) which are also inset and decorated. Puech and Doresse (see the Introduction to Codex XI, Section IV) read this title as "The Supreme *Allogenes*" by a conflation of the subscript title of *Allogenes* with the opening title of *Hypsiphron*, the following short tractate.

No other gnostic tractate is extant with the name "Allogenes," nor is there another copy of this text. We can assume that a number of texts with this title have been lost, in view of Epi-

phanus' references to "the books called *Allogeneis*" (*Pan.* XL.2.2; XXXIX.5.1; cf. *Allogenes* XI,3:69,18–19) written in the name of Seth's seven sons, themselves called "Strangers" (*Pan.* XL.7.4–5), as is their father Seth (*Pan.* XL.7.2; cf. *Treat. Seth*, VII,2:52,8–10). Epiphanius states that the books of *Allogeneis* were composed by the Archontics and Sethians whom he is refuting (*Pan.* XXXIX.5.1; XL.7.4), but elsewhere he implies that the Archontics have these books from tradition: "They are already using texts called *Allogeneis* too, for there are books identified in this way" (*Pan.* XL.2.2). But *Allogenes* gives no clear sign of membership in a series, or of having been written by or about Seth or his sons. Since Hippolytus and Irenaeus do not mention Seth's sons or any books called "*Allogeneis*," the *Allogenes* traditions may have developed after 200 C. E., or if earlier, they circulated in non-Western quarters such as Syria or Egypt.

Porphyry writes in his biography of Plotinus that Plotinus attacked certain gnostics who "produced revelations by Zoroaster and Zostrianos and Nicotheos and *Allogenes* and Messos and other such people" (*Vit. Plot.* 16). Scholars have therefore been hopeful that the Nag Hammadi tractates *Allogenes* (XI,3) and *Zostrianos* (VIII,1) might shed light on the relation of the gnostics to Plotinus and Neoplatonism (Puech, "Les nouveaux écrits gnostiques," 126–34, and "Plotin et les gnostiques," 161–74; "Discussion," 175–90; Doresse, *Secret Books*, 144, 156–59, 250). There is widespread acceptance that *Allogenes* and *Zostrianos* can be identified as the revelations mentioned by Porphyry (Sieber, "Introduction to *Zostrianos*," 233–40; Bazán, "Gnóstica," 463–78). Since *Allogenes* is addressed to Messos, and *Zostrianos* bears the cryptogram subtitle "Words of Zoroaster," it is possible that Porphyry's phrase cited above could be referring to these two tractates by the pair of legendary names mentioned in each. But Porphyry goes on to speak of separate refutations of the Book of *Zostrianos* and the Book of *Zoroaster*, showing that he is probably referring to separate revelations by each figure named. Whether *Allogenes* is Porphyry's "revelation by *Allogenes*" cannot be determined from the name alone, since Epiphanius speaks of multiple such titles. It is the striking relation between the thought and terminology of *Allogenes* and of the Neoplatonic writers which suggests that this tractate in an earlier Greek form is indeed one of those known to Plotinus in Rome between 244 and 269.

III. FORM AND COMPOSITION

In this text "Allogenes" is the name of the one who receives divine revelations and records them for "my son Messos." Allogenes' search for self-knowledge is not expressed directly in a dialogue with the revealers Youel and the Luminaries of the Aeon of Barbelo, but the search is evident within the revelations which encourage and instruct Allogenes and in Allogenes' intervening reports on his experience to Messos.

The revelations themselves are the core of the text, but its form is the broader one of the revelation discourse in which a revelation is recounted as an edifying discourse for a patron or disciple (Festugière, *La révélation*, 1.309-54). Characteristic of this genre are the speaker's self-introduction, reference to the person addressed, narrative of events including the appearance of a divine being, a record of the divine pronouncements, an account of the speaker's reaction, and closing instructions on the preservation of the document. The first eight lines of *Allogenes* that may have contained the self-introduction, addressee and the appearance of a divine being are largely missing, yet all the characteristics of this genre can be documented elsewhere in the text.

The revelation discourse is complicated by its pseudonymous nature. The fact would be more obvious in this case if the authorship were attributed to James or Thomas or Zoroaster, but Allogenes, meaning "stranger, foreigner," or "one of another race," is a common name in texts of this era for legendary, semi-divine figures. It is used as a title for Seth and for Seth's seven sons (*Pan.* XL.7.2-5), for the Great Invisible Spirit (*Gos. Eg.* IV,2:50,21; *ἀλλογένιος* in *Gos Eg.* III,2:41,6-7), and in the *Second Treatise of the Great Seth* for its nameless descending revealer (*Treat. Seth* VII,2:52,8-10). The generic sense of the name is brought out in the *Three Steles of Seth* where Emmacha Seth (118,28) addresses his father, "Thou art from another race, for thou art not similar" (120,5-6), and then speaking of his own descendants, "they are from other races, for they are not similar" (120,11-13). The divine figure "Allogenes" thus may represent an entire spiritual race, and can be called Seth of the Sethians. The name "Messos" also may have a generic origin as "Middle One" between the divine and lower spheres (Puech, "Les nouveaux écrits gnostiques," 132). By speaking for Allogenes and to Messos, the writer of *Allogenes*

evokes spiritual progenitors and gives divine authority to the tractate. Its archetypal past setting has a similar function. Allogenes is described as instructing Messos to write the book “for the sake of those who will be worthy after you” and to leave it on a mountain protected by a magical invocation (68,16–23). Thus the book is to be traced to its discovery on a mountain, not to its contemporary author, since we can assume the readers’ ready cooperation in this literary fiction.

Although *Allogenes* presents itself as a single revelation discourse of Allogenes to Messos, it can be divided into two parts. In Part I (45,1[?]-58,6) Allogenes recounts to Messos five revelations he has received from Youel: 45,6(?)–49,38; 50,17–52,6(?); 52,13–55,11(?); 55,17–30; 55,33–57,24. After each quotation of Youel, he comments to Messos on what he has learned and his reactions. The last four revelations are introduced with words close to the formula: “Again the All-glorious One, Youel, said.” This indicates that the tractate’s missing introduction probably included a similar formula before the first revelation, and before it an opening address to Messos. Turner (“The Gnostic Threefold Path,” 328–29) takes the first four pages of the tractate to be Part I (45,1–49,38), the Youel revelations as Part II and the remainder as Part III. The male virgin Youel is mentioned a number of times in the *Gospel of the Egyptians* and *Zostrianos* (see name index) and is described once in more detail: “The Hidden One really exists, and with him is located she who belongs to all the glories, Youel, the male-virgin glory, through whom they saw all the all-perfect things (*Zost.* VIII,1:125,11–17). In *Allogenes* Youel is not the ultimate self-revealing divine reality, but her words bring a first awareness of or an entry way into that which is higher than perfect (53,15–22). Her revelations are complex mythological descriptions and invocations of the divine powers, particularly the Aeon of Barbelo.

At the end of Part I (57,27–58,6) Allogenes deliberates with himself for one hundred years concerning the revelations already received. Part II begins when the waiting time is complete and Allogenes sees what he has come to know and is taken out of his garment (of flesh?) to a holy place (58,7–59,4). There the holy powers instruct him through the Luminaries of the Aeon of Barbelo on the steps he must take to receive a “primary revelation of the Unknowable One” (59,4–60,12). An account of his ascent by these steps follows (60,12–37). He then receives the revelation of

the Unknowable (60,37–67,20). This revelation is a negative theology of divine transcendence, lacking the reference to the mythological divine names characteristic of Part I. In the brief closing (67,20–69,19), Allogenes hears that the revelation is sufficient for him. He is instructed on how it is to be preserved and he, in turn, instructs Messos.

The author seems to be combining two kinds of material, myth and philosophy, within the framework of a single revelation discourse. The final ascent and philosophical revelation in Part II is a unified and fluent piece of writing with no evident signs of rough seams binding older traditions. It might, for that reason, be considered the author's own composition. This would suggest a philosophically-inclined writer to whom also could be attributed the philosophical editing of the mythological revelations of Part I. But it is not possible to be certain.

At least three factors indicate that the traditions in Part II may also precede the author. First, unless the widespread *Apocryphon of John* is dependent on *Allogenes* for the extended parallel passage (62,27–63,25=*Ap. John* BG 8502,2:24,9–25,7), Part II contains at least one borrowed section, and perhaps others. Second, the account of the one hundred years reflection and the translation to a holy place at the juncture of Parts I and II, as well as the tractate's closing, must certainly be attributed to the author and do not reflect the peculiar vocabulary or philosophical interest of the revelation of the Unknowable. This further calls into question the thesis that the final ascent and revelation are an original composition of the author. And third, the fact that an ascent narrative is integral to the final revelation suggests that this revelation may have developed out of a community rite of initiation or worship. The three levels of ascent, from Knowledge to Vitality to Existence (59,9–26), reappear in the revelation as the three aspects of the divine (61,32–39). A communal tradition behind this tractate is already indicated by the close parallels between its prayer of praise in 54,6(?)–37 and prayers in the *Three Steles of Seth*, which use the first person freely (123,30–124,21; 126,17–33; cf. Robinson, "The Three Steles of Seth and the Gnostics of Plotinus"). The instruction to Allogenes to write these revelations for "those who will be worthy after you" (68,16–20; cf. 52,18–28) may be a community signature. Although a single step from a mythological community liturgy to this author's philosophical revelation is possible, it is more likely that there was

some intermediate articulation of ascent mysteries in a philosophically-oriented cult or school.

If Part II is seen to have evolved through increasing abstraction in a cultic tradition, the Youel revelations in Part I may be the older myths and prayers now revised and relegated to the task of cosmological introduction before the "primary revelation of the Unknowable One" (59,28-30). The author may be seeking to harmonize old and new by this ordering of materials, perhaps also by philosophical additions to Part I on the privative divine in its tripartite being (47,7-49,38; 53,10-32) and by mythological motifs in the opening of Part II, such as the vision of Barbelo, the translation to a holy place and the Luminaries giving instructions for a journey (58,7-60,12).

IV. CONTENT

The main issue at stake in interpreting *Allogenes* is the origin of its unusual combination of gnostic motifs and philosophical triadic monism. Did this philosophy develop within a gnostic community as greater philosophical sophistication forced it toward new affirmations, possibly resulting in some influence on Plotinus and Porphyry? Or is the Neoplatonism a conceptual veneer, adopted without roots in gnostic mythology? The answer must lie somewhere between these alternatives. The new sophistication must have been triggered by some kind of active philosophical interchange, although the dominant motivation continues to be religious and the forms of speech remain those of initiation and revelation. In order to avoid an oversimplified interpretation of the text as the "natural" development of Gnosticism or as a superficial Neoplatonism, we will look first strictly at the affirmations of the text and only then consider major gnostic and philosophical parallels and their significance for its interpretation.

At the apex of *Allogenes* is the revelation of the Unknowable One, the vision of the Invisible. It is inaccurate to define this one as high god in a pantheon, although the Unknowable One can be called the Unknowable God (61,14-16) and receive worship (54,6-37). Nor should it be defined as first principle of cosmic explanation, although it is said to account for all reality by existing in all parts or containing all (47,11-21; 66,25-38). Its direct predication

is strictly privative (unfathomably unfathomable 65,25–26), hyperbolic (superior to [all] superiors 63,19), negative (not existing 63,9–10,17–18) and paradoxical (non-being existence 62,23–24), that is, lacking in either religious or philosophical function. The two names associated most closely with this unnameable (47,19) Unknowable One are Invisible Spirit and Triple Powered One. The two often seem to be synonymous, as in the phrase “the invisible spiritual (πνεῦμα) Triple Powered One” (51,8–9). Yet, whereas the Invisible Spirit remains undifferentiated, the Triple Powered One is said to be the “traverser of the boundlessness of the Invisible Spirit” (49,8–10) and is differentiated into three aspects: 1) Existence (ὑπαρξίς) or Being (οὐσία) or That-Which-Is (πετωοοπ=τὸ ὄν), 2) Life (ὠνζ=ζωή) or Vitality (ΜΝΤΩΝΖ) and 3) Knowledge (ΜΝΤΕΙΜΕ) or Mentality (ΝΟΗΤΗΣ[νοήτης]) or Blessedness (ΜΝΤ-ΜΑΚΑΡΙΟΣ [-μακάριος]) (49,26–38; 59,9–26; 60,14–37). The reader is assured that this is not a generation taking place beyond the Triple Powered One nor a separation within it but a way of describing its eternal and integrated reality (49,21–38).

The relationship of Barbelo to the above triad is unclear in the text. As the “first Thought,” (53,27–28) she “knows [that] she knows that One” (45,29–30), and is apparently the “undivided incorporeal [eternal] knowledge outside of the Triple Powered One (51,8–14) by which the One “knows itself” (49,20–21). As well as reflecting the Triple Powered One to itself, Barbelo also functions as a kind of three-runged ladder for those who would know her—as the Hidden One, Protophanes and Autogenes. It is said that Barbelo becomes “Kalyptos [who] acted in those whom she knows” (45,31–33), or elsewhere that she is “endowed with the types and forms of those who truly exist, the image of the Kalyptos” (51,12–17). Kalyptos (Hidden One) is then endowed with the “intellectual Word” under the image of the male Protophanes (First Appearing One) who works to realize skills and natural abilities (51,17–25). Protophanes is then given the image of the divine Autogenes (Self Born One) who works in each one individually to rectify failures (51,25–32). There are hints of a fourth emanation of Barbelo, the divine Triple Male or Perfect Youth (51,32–38), but more often these names are associated with Protophanes (45,36–38; 58,12–26).

These successive images in *Allogenes* Part I are not shaped into a clear triad or made equivalent to the Existence, Vitality and Knowledge of the Triple Powered One which dominate *Allogenes*

Part II (cf. the equivalency in *Zost.* VIII,1:15,2-12). The Triple Powered One does appear as a triad once in Part I in order to affirm the interdependence of Existence, Vitality and Knowledge in the One (49,26-38). But it is the multiple mythological images which are told and retold, apparently because they offer access to that Triple Powered One for individuals and evoke a step by step process by which individuals can join in the Triple Powered One. First Autogenes "saw them [all] existing individually as [they] are" (46,9-17), then Protophanes becomes "[the] procession [of those who are] together" (46,22-30), and finally Kalyptos has the "forms of those who truly exist" (51,12-17). These may represent three different levels of the human ascent.

The revelations of Part II, given to Allogenes through the Luminaries of the Aeon of Barbelo, focus on the Triple Power of Existence, Vitality and Knowledge. It is both the divine reality to be revealed and the means of access to that reality. The instructions Allogenes receives as Part II opens (59,9-60,12) indicate that, because of the Youel revelations in Part I, he already stands on the level of Knowledge or Blessedness and is expected to withdraw up to the level of Vitality and then to that of Existence in order to receive a "primary revelation of the Unknowable One." This suggests that the writer sees the mythological process in Part I as having taken place within the Knowledge aspect of the Triple Powered One, thus integrating the two parts of the tractate. The positive function of self-knowledge in the Aeon of Barbelo for the ultimate revelation of the Unknowable is thus confirmed. Yet by the same move the religious experiences of divinization and ecstasy involved in Part I (52,7-12; 53,32-54,37) are relegated to a preparatory stage in the more philosophical final revelation. And the rich confusion of mythological divine images in Part I is subsumed as primitive self-revelation of what turns out to be the one known as unknowable.

The initial Knowledge level of the Triple Powered One is characterized by possession of the forms of whatever truly exists, by blessedness, goodness, and becoming divine (52,10-33). It is at once self-knowledge and knowledge of the Triple Power of the Unknowable One (59,9-16; 60,14-18). Although Allogenes is afraid that he is not fit to know this, he is told that a great power that is fit to know has been put on him (50,15-36; 57,32-39). The second level of the Triple Power, Life or Vitality, is an "eternal, intellectual,

undivided motion that pertains to all the formless powers, (which is) unlimited by limitation" (60,24–28). When *Allogenes* withdraws upward and enters this Vitality he finds it difficult to stand firmly and withdraws further to Existence which stands firmly and is at rest (60,19–37). Here he is filled with the primary revelation of the Unknowable One, the knowledge of which is complete ignorance (61,17–19). The Coptic pronouns which here refer to the Unknowable One should be translated in the neuter rather than the masculine in light of its extreme privative characterization of the divine. The text of this revelation has no missing lines for four pages and needs no paraphrase.

V. GNOSTIC CONTEXT

At least three groups of gnostic texts share significant features with *Allogenes*. Until the dating of these materials is better established, the sequence of development remains open to question.

A. One group of gnostic texts with connection to *Allogenes* are the Hermetic initiation discourses, particularly *Corp. Herm.* I, XIII, and NHC VI,6. *Allogenes* shares neither their dialogue form nor their eight or nine level cosmology. The common element lies in their understanding of the divine revealer as instructor, preparing the initiate to undertake an ascent upwards by successive stages of withdrawal (see Festugière, *Personal Religion*, 53–67, 122–39). The Hermetic texts explain this withdrawal as a movement toward self-knowledge: "The one that reflects on oneself withdraws into oneself. . . . Let the self-aware person come to recognize him(her)self" (*Corp. Herm.* I,21; cf. NHC VI,6:60,27–61,1). This is at once participation in and a kind of identification with the divine: "This is the good end for all who have acquired knowledge, to be made divine" (*Corp. Herm.* I,26). In *Allogenes* the Youel revelations climax in a similar experience: "[I] saw the light that [surrounded] me and the Good that was in me and I became divine (NHC XI,3:52,10–13). Then follows a further ascent: "O *Allogenes*, behold your Blessedness how it silently abides, by which you know your proper self, and, seeking yourself, withdraw" (58,12–59,16). The ultimate goal is to withdraw beyond Knowledge to the levels of Life and Existence through a revelation of the

Unknowable One who is “united with the ignorance that sees it” (64,13–14). This paradoxical expression of transcendence and the simplicity of the triadic One in *Allogenes* are not paralleled in Hermetic Gnosticism, but the pattern of ascent in divine self-knowledge is so close as to suggest a literary or even communal conversation between the traditions.

B. *Allogenes* also has some close affinities with a second group of texts sharing its Barbeloite Gnosticism, texts such as the *Apocryphon of John* (BG 8502,2; NHC II,1; III,1; IV,1), Iren. *Haer.* I.29,1–4, *Trimorphic Protennoia* (XIII,1), and to a lesser extent also with *Eugnostos* (III,3; V,1), *Sophia of Jesus Christ* (BG 8502,3; NHC III,4) and *Gospel of the Egyptians* (III,2; IV,2). The Apocalypse of *Allogenes* quoted in the 8th Century by Theodore bar Konai also seems to come from this tradition (Puech, “Apocalypse d’Allogène,” 935–62).

The main outlines of Barbeloite Gnosticism in its relation to *Allogenes* can best be seen in the *Apocryphon of John* which shares with *Allogenes* a full page of negative theology in an almost literal parallel (BG 8502,2:24,9–25,7; NHC XI,3:62,27–63,25). In the *Apocryphon of John*, as in *Allogenes*, it is the privative divine, so described, who is then said to know its own image or thought, called Barbelo, the one “with the three powers.” She in turn is granted Foreknowledge, Incorruptibility and Eternal Life (BG 8502,2:27,1–29,8), in a possible parallel to a triad within Barbelo in *Allogenes*—Kalyptos, Protophanes, and Autogenes (NHC XI,3:45,26–46,11; 51,12–32). In the *Apocryphon of John* these three given to Barbelo are also said to form a pentad with Barbelo and the divine thought, paralleling the shifting expressions of “many in one” found also in *Allogenes* (BG 8502,2:29,8–18; NHC XI,3:58,12–26).

In the next scene in the *Apocryphon of John* Barbelo is shown as the middle figure in a triad. Barbelo turns to the Father of the unbegotten Father and gives birth to a first-born Son, Christ, through whose Mind and Word the perfect human being comes to be. Then follows the generation of deficiency through Sophia. The purpose of this cosmology in the *Apocryphon of John* seems to be, as in *Allogenes*, double. On the one hand, it seeks to teach how that which is visible in myriad external forms is essentially a spiritual unity (“I am [the Father], I am the Mother, I [am the] Son,” BG 8502,2:21,5–22,2). Second, it gives the knowledge necessary for the human being to experience this unity. In *Allogenes* this knowledge

takes the form of a preparation and an ascent ritual. In the *Apocryphon of John* it is an account of the process by which deficiency entered into the cosmic scene and how it was divinely contained.

The absence of this Sophia theodicy and of all Christian terminology in *Allogenes* is its most crucial point of distinction from Barbeloite Gnosticism and suggests one of three ways in which *Allogenes* may be related to this tradition. It is probably too simple to suggest that either *Allogenes* or the *Apocryphon of John* represents the most primitive Barbeloite Gnosticism, as if the Sophia fall and its reversal in Christ were a late elaboration from the feminine aspect in a transcendent monism (cf. H.-M. Schenke, "Nag-Hamadi Studien III," 360), or as if transcendent monism were a late demythologizing of fall and redemption myths. More likely the *Apocryphon of John* and *Allogenes* take separate roads from a common heritage of the transcendent Aeon of Barbelo. The *Apocryphon of John* multiplies aeonic buffer zones between the divine and human through a fall of Sophia tradition, integrating some Christian elements into its divine solution. *Allogenes*, in conversation with Hermetic and Platonic thought, evokes the unity of all experience through ascent in the triadic Unknowable One.

C. The third gnostic text group includes *Allogenes* itself as well as *Zostrianos* (VIII,1), the *Three Steles of Seth* (VII,5), *Marsanes* (X) and the Untitled Text of the Bruce Codex (Schmidt, *Codex Brucianus*; Baynes, *Coptic Gnostic Treatise* and Schmidt-MacDermot, *Bruce Codex*). On this text group see Turner's discussion, "The Gnostic Threefold Path," 324-51. *Marsanes* is so badly preserved that it is little help in reconstructing this tradition. Yet its progression through thirteen seals from the cosmic and material to the privative Triple Powered and Silent One (2,12-4,23) clearly indicates its affinity. The Untitled Text of the Bruce Codex is closer to the *Apocryphon of John* than to *Allogenes* in its elaborate multiplication of levels of reality and its biblical allusions, but it is classified in this group because its focus of interest is not on the origin of deficiency through Sophia but on the Unknowable One who possesses the whole without being possessed (Untitled Text of the Bruce Codex: Schmidt, *Codex Brucianus*, 56,12-61,36; Schmidt-MacDermot, *Bruce Codex*, 270,2-277,8; cf. *Allogenes* XI, 3:66,25-32). Also the Triple Powered One appears here as do many other figurations of divine names parallel to *Allogenes*.

There is external evidence of this text group in Porphyry's state-

ment that Plotinus knew revelations by “Zostrianos and Nicotheos and Allogenes” (*Vit. Plot.* 16). In the Untitled Text of the Bruce Codex a prophecy or revelation of Nikotheos is quoted as an authority: “Nikotheos spoke concerning him; he saw that he was that one. He said: ‘The Father exists, surpassing every perfection. He has revealed the invisible, triple-powered, perfect one’” (Untitled Text in the Bruce Codex: Schmidt, *Codex Brucianus*, 12,24–13,1; Schmidt-MacDermot, *Bruce Codex*, 235,17–21). This short segment suggests a Nicotheos document similar to *Allogenes*. The Untitled Text of the Bruce Codex may then be a later, more elaborate Christianized cosmology within the same tradition, indicating that at least in some instances the praise of transcendent being precedes the complex cosmologies for which Gnosticism is known.

Zostrianos is another document in this group with a title that appears on Porphyry’s list. It is even closer to *Allogenes* than the Untitled Text in the Bruce Codex; it lacks Christian names and allusions and shares an ascent through different heavenly levels reminiscent of the earlier, more mythological parts of *Allogenes*. There are signs of dualism in the introductory framework of *Zostrianos* which describe the human plight as somatic darkness, desire and mental bondage under the cosmocrator (NHC VIII,1:1,10–21). But this picture is immediately eclipsed by a search for the father of all things who is in thought, perception, species, race, part and whole, possession and possessed, corporality and incorporality, essence and matter (2,10–20). The remainder of this 132-page, poorly-preserved tractate reads like a baroque variation on Part I of *Allogenes* in the form of long baptismal ascent revelations (13,7–22,1), ecstatic prayers (51,21–52,25; 118,15–22; 127,1–7) and instructions on heavenly realities by Ephesch, Youel and others. The cultic language points toward a communal setting for the development or preservation of this monistic Gnosticism.

Sharing in this liturgical interest is the document closest to *Allogenes*, the *Three Steles of Seth*. It is a non-Christian revelation to Dositheos from Seth consisting of Seth’s three prayers of praise—to the father Geradama(s), to Barbelo, and to the One—each successive prayer representing a higher ascent in worship. These prayers are called “three steles” in line with the closing instruction to inscribe them on steles. In this way the author impresses their antiquity and power upon the reader. In the first prayer Seth tells

the praises of his Father Geradama(s) who belongs to the divine race and is head of the human race (120,1-15), also called the good, the mind, the word of the divine command (119,1.15-16; 120,27-28). The second prayer praises Barbelo who enables life, multiplying power eternally so that all exist, and simultaneously uniting all multiplicity in herself (122,8-20; 123,3-4.11-14.30-31). The final prayer addresses the One to whom all divine names apply and yet who is beyond any name: "For Thou art the existence of them all. Thou art the life of them all. Thou art the mind of them all. [For] Thou [art the One in whom they all] rejoice." (125,28-33). Here, in one final prayer of praise, most of the divine appellations found in *Allogenes*, including the triad of Existence, Life, and Mind, are affirmed.

The *Three Steles of Seth* demonstrates without doubt that we have in this text group a religious tradition, whether an individual mysticism or a communal cult is not fully clear, although the first-person plural implies the latter (NHC VII,5:123,30-124,21; 126,17-34). The purpose of this worship is not to escape from physical bondage through myths of divine deficiency and its containment. This worship seeks to overcome disintegration of experience, to order chaos, by the progressive self-revelation of an unencompassable reality which encompasses and constitutes all mind, life and existence. The development of this idea in texts concerning Barbelo and Seth suggests that its three-in-one unity is a preservation or revival of the Father/Source, Mother/Thought, Son/Word triad of Barbelo Gnosticism, with Seth representing the primeval human belonging to that "other race."

VI. PHILOSOPHICAL CONTEXT

One point of undeniable contact between gnostic thought and Platonic philosophy is Porphyry's statement that Plotinus' gnostic opponents "produced revelations by Zoroaster and Zostrianos and Nicotheos and Allogenes and Messos and other people of the kind" (*Vit. Plot.* 16). But is there sufficient evidence to prove that Porphyry was referring here to *Allogenes* (NHC XI,3; addressed to Messos) and to the text group just described including *Zostrianos* (also called "the words of Zoroaster," NHC VIII,1:132,9), as well as to the revelation of Nicotheos quoted in the Untitled Text of the Bruce Codex, and even possibly also the *Three Steles of Seth*?

Carl Schmidt made the two basic studies in Plotinus' relation to Gnosticism when he published the Bruce Codex (*Codex Brucianus*, 598-663; id. *Plotins Stellung zum Gnosticismus*). Proposing an identification of the Nicotheos quotation with the text in Porphyry's list of revelations, Schmidt suggested that a Sethian gnostic group originating in Syria developed into a school in Egypt under Prodicus (Clem. Alex., *Strom.* III.4.30). It produced such texts as the Untitled text of the Bruce Codex and was represented by Aquilinus and Adelphius in Rome (Porph. *Vit. Plot.* 16) as a school rivaling Plotinus' own. Because Schmidt assumed an irreconcilable conflict between Plotinus and the gnostics he was puzzled at the mildness of Plotinus' attack on them (*Codex Brucianus*, 619), and in 1900 (*Plotins Stellung zum Gnosticismus*, 18-19) he reversed his earlier identification of this Aquilinus with a known author of the same name because he felt a gnostic could not have written the extant Neoplatonic text.

Research since Schmidt has begun to discover positive connections between Gnosticism and Plotinus. In 1907 W. Bousset suggested that Plotinus' opponents held views closer to Hermetic philosophy than to Christian Gnosticism (*Hauptprobleme der Gnosis* 186-94). E. Bréhier proposed an "oriental" element in Plotinus' own thought (*The Philosophy of Plotinus*, 106-31), and H. Jonas suggested that Plotinus was a philosophical gnostic (*Gnosis*, 2.1, 171-75), but neither one tested his thesis on specific gnostic and philosophical texts. In 1961 J. Zandee proposed in a textual study that both the gnostics and Plotinus saw reality as an eternal, universal organism, but the gnostics combined this view with the account of a fallen demiurge who created a defective humanity and introduced irreconcilable evil into the universe (*The Terminology of Plotinus*). Zandee's conclusions reflect the fact that, when he wrote, the group of gnostic texts closest to *Allogenes* were not available, with the exception of the Untitled Text of the Bruce Codex. They present a type of Gnosticism in which can be found only the most peripheral trace of dualism. The relative affinity of the *Allogenes* text group to Neoplatonic thought cannot, of course, in itself demonstrate that these are the texts Porphyry lists as known to Plotinus. Yet their affinity strengthens this hypothesis rising from the fact that these texts have the specific names mentioned by Porphyry and cohere well with each other in style, content and terminology.

A second text with obvious importance for this issue is Plotinus' argument against the gnostics in *Enn.* II.9. Is it conceivable that Plotinus is attacking monistic gnostics who wrote or preserved the *Allogenes* text group? Plotinus' familiarity with dualistic elements in Gnosticism is clear from his ridicule of the Sophia myth. Why, he asks, would they want to ascend to the archetype of such a reality (*Enn.* II.9.5–11)? But because Plotinus chooses to accentuate the foolishness of these doctrines, it is hard to determine whether they were central to his opponents or peripheral in their texts. Plotinus' writing against the gnostics does seem to have the heat of a family feud or school rivalry, rather than the detachment accorded to the remote fanatic. It is significant that his tractate against the gnostics concludes a series of four constructive lectures summarizing his triadic monism (in chronological order they are: *Enn.* III.8; V.8; V.5; II.9; see Harder, "Eine neue Schrift Plotins," 303–13). Apparently Plotinus' students were being attracted to certain gnostic teachers (*Enn.* II.9.10) and he responded by showing that his own monistic vision excelled theirs. The concluding lecture, which does play up gnostic absurdities, is itself interrupted because of a professed interest not to offend any of his long-standing gnostic friends (*Enn.* II.9.10). And there are a number of features present in the *Allogenes* text group that are attacked by Plotinus. He is suspicious of the cultic elements, particularly what he calls "incantations" (*Allogenes* XI,3:53,37–54,37; *Three Steles of Seth*, passim) and "magical hissings" (*Allogenes* XI,3:53,36–37; *Zost.* VIII,1:127, 1–5; *Marsanes* X:31,22–32,4). He ridicules their invention of new jargon including *παροίκησις* (transmigration), *ἀντίτυποι* (anti-types) and *μετάνοια* (repentance) (*Enn.* II.9.6; the only known gnostic occurrences of this triad are in *Zost.* VIII,1:8,10–18; 12,9–22; and in the Untitled text of the Bruce Codex, 51,7–10; Schmidt-MacDermot, *Bruce Codex*, 263,20–22). He is offended at the arrogance of people who think themselves superior to the powers and heavenly bodies (*Enn.* II.9.5 and 9; *Allogenes* XI,3:50,24–33; 52, 15–28). Above all, he will not tolerate their attributing to private revelations all their true doctrines which are clearly derived from Plato (*Enn.* II.9.6). This final question of the authority upon which one speaks—whether of Plato or of revelation—is probably a greater gulf between these opponents than the dualism they both reject.

Literal parallels between *Allogenes* and Neoplatonic texts cannot

be documented before the fifth century when Proclus wrote his *Elements of Theology*. Compare the following parallel, which in less exact form extends somewhat further:

Procl. <i>Theol.</i> 103	<i>Allogenes</i> XI,3:49,28–36
For in Being (ὄν) there is Life (ζωή) and Mind (νοῦς)	For (γάρ) then (τότε) That-Which-Is constantly possesses its Vitality and Mentality (νοήτης),
and in Life (ζωή) Being (εἶναι) and Mentality (νοεῖν)	and Vitality possesses Being (-οὐσία) and Mentality.
and in Mind (νοῦς) Being (εἶναι) and Living (ζῆν).	Mentality (νοήτης) possesses Life and That-Which-Is.

There has been serious discussion among scholars of Neoplatonism about the origin of this being-life-mind triad which is central to Proclus' theology (Procl. *Theol.* 101–3; *Theol. Plat.* IV.1–3; Dodds, *Proclus: Theology*, 252–54; Hadot, “Être, Vie, Pensée chez Plotin,” 107–41; “Discussion,” 142–57). The above parallel promises that gnostic texts such as *Allogenes* will be quickly taken up within this study.

There is general agreement that the extensive Platonist school exegesis of Plato, *Soph.* 248e, including the occasional use of this triad without fixed order by Plotinus (*Enn.* I.6.7; III.6.6; VI.6.8 and 18), is not itself sufficient explanation for the fixed and interdependent triad seen in Proclus. The question arises, could the three-in-three triad have first been developed in this form by the gnostics of the *Allogenes* text group? Porphyry is widely held to have introduced the triad to Neoplatonic dogma, but it does not appear in Porphyry's extant writings and is attributed to him in ancient times only by Proclus himself. Willy Theiler (*Porphyrios und Augustin*, 4) attributes the triad to Porphyry on the basis of Augustine's (*De Civ.* X.23) reference to Platonists who teach an obscure intermediate spirit between father and son (*de regressu animae* reconstructed by Bidez, *Vie de Porphyre*, 36*–37*). Theiler operates here with a working hypothesis that every Neoplatonic

doctrine found in both Augustine and in a later Neoplatonist, if not derived from Plotinus, comes from Porphyry. Using the same principle, P. Hadot attributes the fourth-century Parmenides Commentary, which displays this triad, to Porphyry, although Theiler and Kroll consider it to be non-Porphyrian (Hadot, "La métaphysique de Porphyre," 127-57; "Discussion," 158-63; id., *Porphyre et Victorinus*, 1.102-43; Dodds, *Proclus: Theology*, 220). This Parmenides Commentary may be read as evidence of the difficult process by which this triad was integrated into Neoplatonism before Proclus, due to Plotinus' adamant rejection of all qualifications of the One. Eventually, Existence, Life, and Thought were accepted as three aspects of the divine Intellect, the second level of Plotinus' One-Intellect-Soul triad, with Existence also in a peculiar independent association to the One (XIV, 16-26 in Kroll, "Ein neuplatonischer Parmenideskommentar," 599-627; cf. Hadot, "Commentaire sur le Parménide," 410-38). In any case the presence of the triad in *Allogenes* XI,3:49,26-38 and *Zost.* VIII,1:15,2-12 (as well as *Steles Seth* VII,5:125,28-33) brings into question the necessity of attributing the triad to Porphyry in order to account for its appearance in later Neoplatonic thought. And Porphyry's known anti-Gnosticism does not make him a likely candidate for borrowing a triad known to be prominent in a group of gnostic texts he mentions (*Vit. Plot.* 16). Nor does it make sense to assume that the Neoplatonists got this triad from the Chaldean Oracles, an eclectic text of Platonic cosmology, angelology and fire theurgy whose extant fragments attest no such triad (Theiler, *Die chaldaeischen Orakel*, 5).

Another Neoplatonic concept with an uncertain origin appears in *Allogenes* and its text group: the word *ὑπαρξίς* (existence) used to refer to the highest divine reality and the first term in the Existence-Life-Thought triad. Again, it is not so used by Plotinus, it is so used by Proclus, and, in order to explain its introduction into Neoplatonism between these two figures, it is attributed to Porphyry by proposing that he is the author of the anonymous Parmenides commentary which speaks of Existence at the head of the divine triad.

A third parallel between *Allogenes* and the Platonic tradition is more general, the pattern of threefold ascent. The ascent pattern in *Allogenes*, also found in the first gnostic text group discussed above, the Hermetic tractates, is a progressive withdrawal by a path of

privation into knowledge of the One that cannot be named. Turner's recent study on "The Gnostic Threefold Path" notes that this ascent does not characterize the texts in our second gnostic text group, including the *Apocryphon of John*. In these texts the bondage to evil is such that salvation can only take place by a threefold descent of the divine, a pattern that seems to derive from Jewish Wisdom and Apocalyptic literature (Turner, 325-28; 346-50). In contrast, he sees the threefold ascent in *Allogenes* and other texts in the third text group to be derived from the Platonic tradition, specifically from Neopythagorean speculation on the One beyond the dyad, and from middle Platonic exegesis of Plato's *Timaeus* 39E in terms of three levels of divine intelligence (Turner, 337).

No one can contest the presence in Platonism of various tripartite divisions of divine reality and particularly the view of knowledge of the divine as a kind of self-knowledge. But it may, nevertheless, not be accurate to say that the pattern of ascent in *Allogenes* derives from Platonism. From Plato's threefold vision of beauty mediated through the prophetess Diotima (*Symp.* 210a-12a) through Plutarch's contrast of Isis' many-colored robes to Osiris' robe which is the color of light and the mystic image of truth (*De Is. et Os.* 382cde), the stimulation to conceive philosophy as ascent seems to have come into Greek thought from oriental mythical sources. Therefore an oriental and mythical tradition such as Gnosticism may well not get its ascent triad initially from Platonism, though its formulation is doubtless shaped in time by philosophical debates with Platonists. Ascent is integral to the gnostic world view. Cosmology as the history of an imprisonment, and divine descent as a fissure in the prison wall, both point toward the need to escape, whether or not it is articulated in detail. In the third text group including *Allogenes* we seem to have an escape-oriented religious-sect-turned-school. The "hell-fire" sermons are gone and meditations on self-knowledge have taken their place. But the ascent out of hell is still worked out in the Aeon of Barbelo. And, as Turner himself suggests (338-39), the higher reaches of the ascent into the Triple Power of Being, Vitality and Mentality may be projected out of Barbelo's own traditional three powers to form a pathway to ultimate reunion with the Unknowable One.

The question remains concerning the relation to the Neoplatonists of the three elements in *Allogenes* noted above—the Existence-Life-Thought triad, the *ὑπαρξίς* (Existence) term as head of

a divine triad, and the religious threefold ascent. Each is a different expression of what can only be recognized as the core of Neoplatonic thought by the time of Proclus. Their presence in the *Allogenes* text group must be taken as proof that it was written under heavy Neoplatonic influence, unless there is sufficient reason to say that the gnostic texts are themselves the seed-bed of these particular ideas. Because the Nag Hammadi library was buried in the mid-fourth century C.E. (Robinson, "Introduction," 4), *Allogenes* cannot be dependent on the very close parallel cited in the fifth-century Proclus. Allowing time for Coptic translation and the collecting of the library, the latest feasible date for *Allogenes*' original composition is at the end of the third century C.E. At that time there is no Neoplatonic attestation of the triad headed by the term "Existence" unless we accept the literary hypothesis which attributes the Parmenides Commentary to Porphyry in order to explain where Proclus got the new ideas. And there is no sign at all of the triple-modulated triad that appears in *Allogenes* and Proclus. The simplest thesis is that these particular elements are gnostic contributions to Neoplatonism.

The most telling evidence of the gnostic origin of the ascending triad headed by the Existence term is its presence in a group of gnostic texts with common characteristics bearing the titles named by Porphyry as revelations available to Plotinus. Porphyry himself, if he was consistent in his anti-gnostic crusade, may have rejected the Existence term and this triad. But the gnostic texts could have remained on hand for increasingly receptive fourth-century Neoplatonists. This would locate *Allogenes* at latest by the mid-third century C.E. in Rome where Plotinus was writing against the gnostics, possibly already in Alexandria at the time of Plotinus' studies with Ammonius from 232-243 C.E. Plotinus' own sharp rejection of any division in the One shows that he held his own against multiplication in debate with gnostics. But his greater focus on divine emanation and human ascent than in previous Platonists may be witness to the gnostics' persuasive powers. An Alexandrian origin of *Allogenes* would allow for whatever influence this text had on Platonists including Plotinus, the reverse influence in the demythologizing of gnostic thought in a Platonic direction, as well as the subsequent Bohairicized (upper Egyptian) Sahidic translation that we read.

[MĒ]

(Lines 1-5 lacking)

- 6 [12±]εγε $\bar{n}\kappa[\lambda]$
 [τα ο]γα $\bar{n}\tau\epsilon[\lambda\iota\omicron\varsigma \alpha]\gamma\omega \epsilon\gamma\kappa\eta$
 8 [21 ο]γμα τηροϋ [εγ2]οτπ [ε]πι
 [νοϋ]ς πιρεφаре2 $\bar{n}[\tau\alpha]\epsilon\iota\tau\alpha\alpha\phi$
 10 [$\bar{n}\tau$]αφταμοκ· αγ[ω] †βομ ετ
 [ω]οπ $\bar{n}2\eta\tau\kappa \tau\epsilon \bar{n}\tau\alpha\varsigma\pi\omicron[r\psi\varsigma]$
 12 [$\bar{n}\psi\alpha$]χε οϋμνησε $\bar{n}\varsigma\omicron\pi$
 [πιεβ]ολ 2 \bar{m} πιωμνητβομ· π[η]
 14 [$\bar{n}\tau\epsilon \eta\eta$] τηροϋ ετ[ω]οοπ ο[η]
 [τως] $\bar{m}\bar{n}$ πιατ† [ω]! εροϋ πι
 16 [οϋο]ειν ψα εν[ε2 \bar{n}]†γνω
 [ςις ε]τασοϋψ[$\bar{n}2$] εβολ· πι
 18 [αλο]γ $\bar{n}2\omicron\omicron\gamma\tau$ [\bar{n}]παρθενος
 [πωορπ] $\bar{n}\eta\epsilon\omega\eta\eta$ πιεβολ 2 \bar{n}
 20 [οϋεω]η $\bar{n}\omicron\gamma\omega\tau$ $\bar{n}\psi\mu\eta\tau$
 [βομ πι]ωμνητβομ ετψ[ο]
 22 [οπ οητω]ς· χε εταγ2ο[r]
 [κq αγπορ]ψ<q> εβολ· αγψ
 24 [εταγπορ]ψq αφρτε[λι]ος·
 [αγ]ψ αφχι[β]ομ εβολ [$\bar{n}2\eta$]
 26 [του τ]ηροϋ· εφειμ[ε εροϋ]
 [$\bar{m}\bar{n}$ πια]2ορα[τον] ηπ[$\bar{n}\alpha$]
 28 [$\bar{n}\tau\epsilon\lambda\iota\omicron\varsigma$] αγψ αφψ[ωπε]
 [2 \bar{n} ογ]εων· εσειμ[ε ερος]
 30 [χε ε]σειμε επη ε[$\bar{t}\bar{m}$]μαγ
 [αγ]ψ ασψωπε $\bar{n}\kappa\alpha\lambda\gamma[\eta]\tau\omicron\varsigma$
 32 [ετα]ς† ενεργι 2 \bar{n} ηη ετς
 [ςο]οϋη $\bar{n}\mu\omicron\omicron\gamma$ · οϋπρω
 34 [το]φανης πε $\bar{n}\tau\epsilon\lambda\iota\omicron\varsigma \bar{n}$
 [$\bar{n}\alpha$]τναγ εροϋ $\bar{n}\eta\omicron\gamma\varsigma$
 36 [$\bar{n}2$]αρμηδων· ες† βομ
 [δε] $\bar{n}\eta\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha$ ογα· ογ̄ 2ο
 38 [οϋ]† τε εσο δε κατα ογα

[45]

(Lines 1-5 lacking)

- 6 [] since they are
 [perfect (τέλειος) individuals (-κατά) and dwell]
 8 all [together, joined with] the
 [mind (νοῦς)], the guardian [which I provided],
 10 [who] taught you (sg.). [And] it is [the power that]
 [exists] within you that often [extended itself]
 12 [as word]
 from the Triple Powered One, [that One]
 14 [of] all [those] who [truly (ὄντως)] exist
 with the [Immeasurable One], the
 16 eternal [Light of] the Knowledge (γνώσις)
 that appeared, the
 18 male virginal (παρθένος) [Youth],
 [the first] of the Aeons from
 20 [a] unique triple-[powered Aeon],
 [the] Triple Powered One who
 22 [truly (ὄντως) exists], for when [he was stilled],
 <he> [was extended] and
 24 [when he was extended], he became [complete (τέλειος)]
 [and] he received [power] from
 26 all of [them]. He knows [himself]
 [and the perfect (τέλειος)] Invisible (ἀόρατον) [Spirit (πνεῦμα)].
 28 And he [came to be]
 [in an] Aeon who knows
 30 [that] she knows That One.
 [And] she became Kalyptos
 32 [who] acted (ἐνεργεῖν) in those whom she
 knows.
 34 He is a perfect (τέλειος)
 invisible, noetic (νοῦς)
 36 Protophanes-Harmedon. [And (δέ)] empowering
 the individuals (-κατά), she is a Triple (ᾱ) Male.
 38 And (δέ) being individually (-κατά)

[M5]

(Lines 1-5 lacking)

- 6 εγκα[τα ογα μεν ευζῑ ου]
μα δε [χε εκ]ο̄¹ ουζ[υπαρ]
- 8 ζις̄ ν̄τ[ε νᾱι] αγω εκν[αυ]
ενη τη[ρ]ογ <εγωοοπ> οντωσ ο[ν]
- 10 οῡν̄τα[ς] ¹μ̄μαγ̄ μπιαγ[τογε]
[ν]ηс̄ ν̄νουτε· ετασε[ιμε]
- 12 ετετε τωс̄ ν̄ζυπα[ρζις]
αγω ν̄ταρεсаζερατ[ε̄ ас̄ν̄]
- 14 πᾱῑ εαφ̄ναγ̄ ενη τη[ηροу] εῡ]
ωοοπ̄ [κ]ατα ογα ν̄θ[ε ετ̄α]
- 16 ωοφ[π̄ μ̄]μοс̄· αγω ε[ταυ]
ωωп[ε εν]τοφ̄ πε· ε[γνα]
- 18 ναγ̄ επι[ω]μ̄ν̄τ̄ζοογ[τ̄ ν̄]
νουτε· †βομ̄ ετ̄χ[οσε ε]
- 20 π̄νουτε· тен[νοια τε]
ν̄τε νᾱῑ τηροӯ ετ̄ω[οοп̄]
- 22 [ζ̄]̄¹ ουμᾱ εφω̄λ[νμοωτοу]
[εφ]μογ̄ωτ̄¹ μ̄[πιπρωτοφα]
- 24 ηс̄ ν̄ноб̄ ν̄ζοο[γτ̄
[.]̄[...н]ογс̄· †ψ[ο]̄¹[π̄¹ ν̄]
- 26 [ζ̄ιη̄ ν̄]τε νᾱῑ εωωп[ε εφ]
[ωλ]η̄ναγ̄ ерос̄ [εφ̄ναγ̄]
- 28 [он̄ ен̄ιο]η̄τ̄[ω]с̄ [ετ̄ωοοп̄]
[ε†]ωορ̄π̄ ν̄ζ̄ιη̄ Δ[ε̄ ν̄η̄ ет̄]
- 30 ζ̄ῑ [οу]μᾱ· πη̄ δε ета[φ̄ναγ̄]
ен̄[α]̄ῑ аφ̄ναγ̄ еп̄икаλ[γ̄птос̄]
- 32 εωωπε δε εφω̄λ̄η̄[αγ̄ ε]
πογᾱ ν̄τε н̄καλγ̄пт̄[οс̄ εφ]
- 34 ναγ̄ επῑεων̄ ν̄βαρ̄βαλ̄ω̄ [πι]
χπο̄ δε ν̄нат̄μ̄ис̄ε̄ ν̄τ̄[ε̄ πη̄]
- 36 εωωπε ер̄ω̄ανογᾱ η̄[αγ̄]
εροφ̄ χε̄ πωс̄ εωαφ̄ω[ν̄ζ̄]

- [46]
 (Lines 1–5 lacking)
- 6 [individual (-κατά) on the one hand (μὲν), they are together]
 on the other hand (δέ), [since she] is an existence (ὑπαρξίς)
- 8 of [theirs], and she [sees]
 them all [also] truly (ὄντως) <existing>.
- 10 [She] contains the
 divine Autogenes. When she [knew]
- 12 her [Existence (ὑπαρξίς)]
 and when she stood, [she brought]
- 14 This One (masc.) since he saw them [all]
 existing individually (-κατά) as [he]
- 16 is. And [when they]
 become (as) he (is), [they shall]
- 18 see the divine Triple Male,
 the power that is [higher than]
- 20 God. [He is] the [Thought (ἔννοια)]
 of all these who [exist]
- 22 together. If he [ponders them],
 [he] ponders [the]
- 24 great male [
 [] noetic (νοῦς) [Protophanes], the [procession]
- 26 [of] these. When [he]
 sees it, [he sees]
- 28 [also those who truly (ὄντως) exist]
 and (δέ) [the] procession [of those who are]
- 30 together. And (δέ) when he [has seen]
 [these], he has seen [Kalyptos].
- 32 And (δέ) if he [sees]
 one of the hidden ones (καλυπτός), [he]
- 34 sees the Aeon of Barbalo. And (δέ) as for [the]
 unbegotten offspring of [That One],
- 36 if one [sees]
 how (πῶς) he [lives]

[MZ]

(Lines 1-4 lacking)

- [7± ακω^τμ] [ετβε τ]
 6 περ[ι]ου^ς [ια μπ]ου^α πο^α
 μμο^ου^γ ρ^η ο[υτα]χρο· ετβε
 8 πι^ωμ^ντ^βο^μ [δε] η^αρ^ορ[α]το[μ]
 η^πη^α σω^τμ· [ψ]οο[π] εο^υ[α]
 10 πε η^ατ^ηα^υ ερ[ο^υ ε^υ]ο η^αα[τ]
 τα^ρο^υ η^αυ τη^ρο^υ εο^υη^α
 12 τα^υ η^αη τη^ρο^υ ρ^αι η^αη^ατ[α]
 [ε^υ]ωοο^π γαρ τη^ρο^υ ετβ[η]
 14 [η^ατ^α· ε]υ^τελι^ον πε α^υω ε
 [η^ε]α^υ ετε^λιο^ς· α[υ]ψ ε^υμα
 16 κ^αριο^ς πε· εο^υ[α π]ε η^ογο
 ει^ψ η^ιμ· α^υψ [ε^υ]ωοο^π η^α
 18 [ρ^ητ^ο]υ τη^ρο^υ· ε^υα^τψα^{χε}
 [μ^μ]ο^υ [π]ε η^αα^τ† ρ^αη ερ^ο
 20 [εο^υα] η^ε ε^υωοο^π εβ^ολ ρ^η
 [τ^οο^το]υ τη^ρο^υ· η^α ετ^ε [ε]
 22 [ψωπε ερ^ωα]η^ου^α ρ^ηο^ε[ι μ]
 [μ^ου με^υο^υ]ε^ψ λα^αυ ε^υ
 24 [ωοο^π ρ^ατ]ε^υε^ρη η^ατ[ε] η^α
 [ετε ο^υη^α]υ η^αο^υρ[υ]η^αρ
 26 [ξ^ις· η^ατα^υ] γαρ η^ε τ^η[η^αη]
 [η^ατα^υτα^υοο^υ τη^ρ]ο^υ εβ^ολ
 28 [η^αρ^ητ^ς· ε^υωο^ρη^α πε ρ^αθη η^α
 [τ^μη^ατ^ε]λι^ος η^ε[υ^ωο^ρη^α πε]
 30 [ρ^αθη η^α]μ^ητ^ηο^υτ[ε η^ιμ·]
 α[υ^ω] ε^υωο^ρη^α πε ρ^α[θη η^α]
 32 η^αη[τ^η]μ^ακ^αριο^ς η^ιμ[·] ε^υ
 σα^ρη^ε η^ασα β^ομ η^ιμ· α^υω
 34 ο^υο^υς^{ια} <πε> ε^υμ^ητ^ατο^υς^{ια}
 πε ε^υη^ου^{τε} πε ε^μη^α η^α
 36 τ^ηο^υτε ρ^ηα^υ· η^α ετε·
 η^ιρ^ου^ε ο^υω^τβ η^ατε τε^υ
 38 η^αη^ατ^ηο^υβ η^αη †η^αη^ατ^ςα^{ει}<ε>·

[M̄H]

(Lines 1-5 lacking)

- 6 [β]αμ[·] ογα[τβαμ αν] τ[ε] νταγ]
 εχι νογω¹ν[ζ¹ ε]βολ ντ[ε] να¹τ
- 8 εσωπε [εγω]ανει εγμα·
 επιαν [ογμ]ντατβαμ τε ν̄
- 10 τε νικ[ατα ο]γα εταζε πτηρ^q
 ετκ[η ζ]μ¹ [π]μα ετχοσε ετε
- 12 λιος· εσαγχι δε εβολ ζ̄ιτο
 οτς̄ νογωορπ̄ νενν[ο]ια·
- 14 [ν̄]θε μησωπε αν· αλ[λα ρω]
 εφ^t μ[π]σωπε μν̄ [π]η [ετ]
- 16 ζηπ ντ[ε] ογπαρξικ· εφς[αζ]
 νε ν̄σφ[ι] ν̄ζωβ νιμ· χε πη
- 18 ντοφ [τε]φσωπε εφωαν
 ρνοει μμοφ· παί δε πε [ογα]
- 20 εφκη εζραί νογλα[ειβε ν̄σω]
 [π]ε μν̄ ογπηγη· αγω [ογζγ]
- 22 [λ]η ν̄νατ²ζγλη [μν̄ ογνηπε]
¹νατηπε [μν̄ ογειδος ν̄ατ]
- 24 ειδος[·] μν̄ ογμ[ορφη ν̄ατ]
 μο[ρ]φη· μν̄ ο[γατβαμ μν̄]
- 26 ογ[β]αμ[· μ]ν̄ ο[γογσια ν̄ατ]
 ογ[ς]η[α μν̄ ογκινησις]
- 28 [ν̄ατκιμ· μν̄ ογενεργια]
 [ν̄ατεν]εργια α[λλα εφε]
- 30 [νογρε]φςαζνε ¹ν̄[τε ζ̄νςαζ]
 ν̄[ε μ]ν̄¹ ογ¹μν̄¹τνογτ[ε ν̄]τε
- 32 τ¹μν̄¹τνογτε αλ[λ]α [ε]σω
 πε εφωανχι εσαγχι εβολ
- 34 ζ̄ν τωορπ̄ μ̄μν̄τ̄ωνζ̄· μν̄
 ογενεργια ν̄ατ̄πωρ̄χ̄·
- 36 ογζγποστασις ν̄τε τωο
 ρπ̄ ν̄τε πογα ετ̄ωοοπ
- 38 οντωσ· ογμαζς̄ντε δε

[48]

(Lines 1–5 lacking)

- 6 [power. *It is not impossible for them*
to receive a [revelation of] these things
- 8 if [they] come together.
Since (ἐπειδή) it is impossible for
- 10 the [individuals (-κατά)] to comprehend the Universal One
[situated in the] place that is higher than perfect (τέλειος),
- 12 they (+δέ) apprehend by means of
a First [Thought (ἔννοια)]—
- 14 (it is) not as Being (alone), [but (ἀλλά)]
it is along with the
- 16 latency of Existence (ὑπαρξίς) that he confers Being. He
[provides]
- everything for [himself] since it is
- 18 he who shall come to be when he
intelligizes (νοεῖν) himself. And (δέ) he is [One]
- 20 who subsists as a [cause]
and source (πηγή) [of Being] and [an]
- 22 immaterial (-ύλη) [material (ύλη) and an]
innumerable [number and a formless (-εἶδος)]
- 24 form (εἶδος) and a [shapeless (-μορφή)]
shape (μορφή) and [a powerlessness and]
- 26 [a power and an insubstantial (-οὐσία)]
[substance (οὐσία) and a motionless motion (κίνησις)]
- 28 [and an inactive (-ἐνέργεια)]
[activity (ἐνέργεια). Yet (ἀλλά) he is]
- 30 [a] provider of [provisions]
[and] a divinity [of]
- 32 divinity—but (ἀλλά) whenever
they apprehend, they participate
- 34 the first Vitality and
an undivided activity (ἐνέργεια),
- 36 an hypostasis (ὑπόστασις) of the First One
from the One who truly (ὄντως) exists.
- 38 And (δέ) a second

[MΘ]

2 ἡ ἐνεργία ἐ[
 [. . .] δε πε πε[
 [.] οὐτ[
 4 [
 [.] . . . [. ο] γῆτ[αφ ᾤ
 6 οὐμνῆμαξ[αριος] μῆ οὐμ[ῆτ]
 αγαθος· χε [εψω]πε εψω[αν]
 8 ῤνοει ᾤμοφ ᾤ[πιρε]φχιοφ
 ᾤτμῆτ'ατῆαρ[ηχς] ᾤτε πα
 10 ζορατον ᾤπῆ[α ετκ]ῆ ᾤζρα[ί]
 ᾤζητῆ εσκωτῆ ᾤμοφ ερ[οφ]
 12 [ζ]ῆνα χε εσεειμε χε οὐ πε
 [πῆ ε]τῆζραῖ ᾤζητῆ· ἀγω χε
 14 [ε]φ[ω]ροφ ᾤαψ ᾤζε· ἀγω ᾤ[ε]
 [ρ]επαῖ ψωπε ᾤοφφχαῖ ᾤ
 16 [ο]γον ᾤμ· εφωροφ ᾤοφ
 λαειβε ᾤνιοντωσ ετψο
 18 οπ· εβολ γαρ ζῆτῆ παῖ ασβω
 ψτ εβολ ᾤβι τεφγνωσικ·
 20 χε ᾤτοφ ετσοοφν χε οὐ
 πε· εμπенаῖ δε ᾤ λααφ εβ[ολ]
 22 [ᾤς]ανβολ ᾤνεγερῆφ· οὐ[τε]
 φφβам· οὐτε οὐταξικ· οὐ
 24 [τ]ε οφεαφ· οὐτε οφεων·
 [ᾤ]τοοφ γαρ τηροφ ζεψα
 26 [ε]νεζ νε· τμῆτῶνζ ᾤῆ
 τμῆτῆιμε· ᾤῆ πετψο
 28 οπ ᾤτοφ πε· τοτε γαρ πῆ
 ετε παῖ πε οὐῆταφ ᾤτεφ
 30 ᾤῆτῶνζ εφμῆῆ· ᾤῆ τῆο
 ῆτῆσ ἀγω {πωνζ· εοῆ
 32 τε} τμῆτῶνζ οὐῆτεσ ᾤ
 {τμῆτ'α}τοῦσῆα ᾤῆ τμῆτ'
 34 ειμε· ῆῆῆτῆσ εῆῆ
 τασ ᾤπωνζ ᾤῆ πετψο
 36 οπ· ἀγω πψοῆτ' οφα
 νε· εῆε ᾤψοῆτ' κατα
 38 ποφα ποφα· ἀνοκ δε ᾤ
 ταρισωτῆ εναῖ παψῆρε

[49]

activity (ἐνέργεια) [
 2 [] however (δέ), is the [
 [
 4 [
 [*He is endowed with*]
 6 [blessedness (-μακάριος)] and
 goodness (-ἀγαθός) because [when] he is
 8 recognized (νοεῖν) [as the] traverser
 of the boundlessness of the Invisible (ἀόρατον)
 10 Spirit (πνεῦμα) [that subsists]
 in him, it (i.e., the boundlessness) turns him (i.e., the traverser)
 to [it] (i.e., the Invisible Spirit)
 12 [in] order that (ἵνα) it might know what is
 within him and
 14 how he exists. And
 he was becoming salvation for
 16 every one by being a
 cause for those who truly (ὄντως) exist,
 18 for (γάρ) through him
 his knowledge (γνώσις) endured,
 20 since he is the one who knows what
 he is. But (δέ) they brought forth nothing
 22 beyond themselves, neither (οὔτε)
 power nor (οὔτε) rank (τάξις) nor (οὔτε)
 24 glory nor (οὔτε) aeon,
 for (γάρ) they are all
 26 eternal. He is Vitality and
 Mentality and That-Which-Is.
 28 For (γάρ) then (τότε) That-
 Which-Is constantly possesses its
 30 Vitality and Mentality (νοήτης),
 and {Life has}
 32 Vitality possesses
 {non-}Being (-οὐσία) and
 34 Mentality. Mentality (νοήτης) possesses
 Life and That-Which-Is.
 36 And the three are one,
 although individually (-κατά) they are three.”
 38 Now (δέ) after
 I heard these things, my son

[NΔ]

(Lines 1-5 lacking)

- 6 ζΗ[...].[.....N]ΑΚ [NΟΥ]
 ΕΙΔΟΣ [M'N] ΟΥΩN Ζ ΕΒΟΛ [M]
- 8 ΠΙΩΟΜΤ [NΒΟΜ N]ΝΑΤΝΑΥ
 ΕΡΟQ ΜΠ[NΔ] Ε[CΚΗ N]CΑΒΟΛ [M']
- 10 ΜΟQ NΒΙ ΟΥΓΝΩ[CIC N]ΑΤΗ[Ω]
 ΨΕ NΑΤCΩΜΑ [N]Ψ[Α Ε]ΝΕΖ
- 12 ΚΑΤΑ ΘΕ ΕΤΖN N[Ι]ΕΩΝ ΤΗΡ[ΟΥ]
 [Ε]ΨΟΟΠ NΒΙ ΠΙΕΩΝ NΒΑΡΒ[Η]
- 14 [Λ]Ω· ΕΥNΤΑQ ΟΝ NΝΙΤΥΠΟC
 MN ΝΙΕΙΔΟC NΤΕ ΝΙΟΝΤΩC
- 16 ΕΤΨΟΟΠ· †ΖΙΚΩΝ NΤΕ
 ΠΙΚΑΛΥΠΤΟC· ΕΥNΤΑQ ΔΕ
- 18 ΜΠΙΩΑΧΕ NΝΟΕΡΟΝ NΤΕ
 ΝΑΙ ΕQΤΩΝ ΖΑ ΠΙΠΡΩΤΟΦΑ
- 20 ΝΗC NΖΟΟΥΤ NΝΟΥC ΚΑΤΑ
 ΟΥΖΙΚΩΝ· ΕQΡΕΝΕΡΓΙ ΔΕ
- 22 ΖN ΝΙΚΑΤΑ ΟΥΔ· ΕΙΤΕ ΖN ΟΥ
 ΤΕΧΝΗ· ΕΙΤΕ ΖN ΟΥΕΠΙCΤΗ
- 24 [M]Η· ΕΙΤΕ ΖN ΟΥΦΥCΙC M
 ΜΕΡΙΚΟΝ· ΕΥNΤΑQ ΜΠΙ
- 26 ΑΥΤΟΓΕΝΗC NΝΟΥΤΕ ΚΑ
 ΤΑ ΟΥΖΙΚΩΝ· ΕQΕΙΜΕ ΔΕ
- 28 ΕΠΟΥΑ ΠΟΥΑ NΤΕ ΝΑΙ· ΕQ
 ΡΕΝΕΡΓΕΙ ΚΑΤΑ ΜΕΡΟC ΑΥΩ
- 30 ΚΑΤΑ ΟΥΑ ΕQΟΥΗΖ ΕQΤΑΖΟ
 NΝΙΝΟΒΕ ΕΡΑΤΟΥ ΝΙΕΒΟΛ
- 32 ΖN †ΦΥCΙC· ΟΥNΤΑQ M
 ΠΙΩΟΜΤ NΖΟΟΥΤ NΝΟΥ
- 34 ΤΕ ΕΥΟΥΧΑΙ NΤΕΥ ΤΗ
 ΡΟΥ MN ΠΙΑΖΟΡΑΤΟΝ ΜΠΝΑ
- 36 ΟΥΩΑΧΕ ΠΕ ΕΒΟΛ ΖN ΟΥΨΟ
 ΧΝΕ <NΤΟQ> ΠΕ ΠΙΑΛΟΥ NΤΕΛΙΟC
- 38 ΑΥΩ ΤΕΙΖΥΠΟCΤΑCΙC ΟΥΑ

[51]

- (Lines 1-5 lacking)
- 6 [to] you [a]
form (εἶδος) [and a revelation of]
- 8 the invisible spiritual (πνεῦμα) Triple Powered One
outside of which [dwells]
- 10 an undivided
incorporeal (-σῶμα) [eternal] knowledge (γνώσις).
- 12 As (κατά) with all the Aeons,
the Aeon of Barbelo exists,
14 also endowed with the types (τύπος)
and forms (εἶδος) of those who truly (δυνως)
16 exist, the image (εἰκὼν) of
Kalyptos. And (δέ) endowed
18 with the intellectual (νοερόν) Word of
these, he bears the
20 noetic (νοῦς) male Protophanes like (κατά)
an image (εἰκὼν), and (δέ) he acts (ἐνεργεῖν)
22 within the individuals (-κατά) either (εἴτε) with
craft (τεχνή) or (εἴτε) with skill (ἐπιστήμη)
24 or (εἴτε) with partial (μερικόν) instinct (φύσις).
He is endowed with the
26 divine Autogenes like (κατά)
an image (εἰκὼν), and (δέ) he knows
28 each one of these. He
acts (ἐνεργεῖν) separately (κατὰ μέρος) and
30 individually (-κατά), continuing to rectify
the failures
32 from nature (φύσις). He is endowed with
the divine Triple Male
34 as salvation for them all
(and) in cooperation with the Invisible (ἀόρατον) Spirit
(πνεῦμα).
- 36 He is a word from a counsel,
<he> is the perfect (τέλειος) Youth.
38 And this hypostasis (ὑπόστασις) is a

[NB]

(Lines 1-5 lacking)

- 6 [...] [10±]α[с]
 [P6]αβζη[τ n̄bi ταψγ]χη· αγω
 8 [α]ειP̄ εβ[ολ αειωτ]οP̄τρ̄ εμα
 τε· αγ[ω αε]ικoτ̄τ̄ εροει
 10 ογα[ατ̄ α]ειναγ̄ επιογο
 ein̄ ε[τ̄κω]τε εροει mn̄ πι
 12 αγαθον̄ ετ̄νητ̄ αειP̄νογ̄
 τε· αγω ασ̄χω2 εροī on̄ n̄[bi]
 14 τανιεοογ̄ τηρογ̄ īoyn̄h̄
 ασ̄† βοm̄ ναī· πεχας̄ χε ε
 16 πιαν̄ ατεκσβω ασ̄P̄τελιος
 mn̄ πιαγαθον̄ ετ̄νητ̄κ
 18 ακειμε εροq̄· σωτ̄m̄ ετβε
 πιωm̄n̄τ̄βοm̄· n̄h̄ ετε κνα
 20 [2]αρε2 εροογ̄ 2n̄ ογνοb̄ n̄
 ciγn̄ mn̄ ογνοb̄ m̄m̄ȳc̄τηP̄[i]
 22 on̄ χε ναī μευχooγ̄ n̄oγ̄
 on̄ nim̄ εβολ̄ εnh̄ ετ̄m̄πψα
 24 n̄h̄ ετε ογ̄n̄βοm̄ m̄mooȳ
 εσωτ̄m̄· οȳτε m̄πετεψ
 26 ψε αν̄ πε εχοογ̄ ε2ραī εγ̄
 γενεᾱ n̄naτ̄σβω ετβε πι
 28 τηP̄q̄ ετ̄χοσε ετελιος·
 οȳn̄τακ̄ δε m̄μαγ̄ <n̄nai> ετβε
 30 πιωom̄τ̄ n̄βοm̄· πh̄ ετ̄ψo
 οπ̄ 2n̄ οȳm̄n̄τ̄μακαριος
 32 mn̄ οȳm̄n̄τ̄αγαθος· πh̄
 ετε n̄λοειβε εναī τηρογ̄·
 34 εσωοop̄ 2ραī n̄2ητ̄q̄ n̄bi
 οȳm̄n̄τ̄νοb̄ εναψωc̄
 36 εψωοop̄ εογᾱ πε 2n̄ ογ̄

[52]
 (Lines 1–5 lacking)

6 [

[my soul (ψυχή) went slack] and

8 I fled [and was] very disturbed.
 And [I] turned to myself

10 [and] saw the light
 that [surrounded] me and the

12 Good (ἀγαθόν) that was in me and I became divine.
 And the all-glorious One, Youel,

14 anointed me again
 and she gave power to me. She said: “Since (ἐπειδή)

16 your instruction has become complete (τέλειος)
 and you have known the Good (ἀγαθόν) that is within you,

18 hear concerning
 the Triple Powered One those things that you will

20 guard in great
 silence (σιγή) and great mystery (μυστήριον),

22 because they are not spoken to
 anyone except those who are worthy,

24 those who are able
 to hear; nor (οὔτε) is it fitting

26 to speak to an
 uninstructed generation (γενεά) concerning

28 the Universal One that is higher than perfect (τέλειος).
 But (δέ) you have <these> because of

30 the Triple Powered One, the One who exists
 in blessedness (-μακάριος)

32 and goodness (-ἀγαθός), the One
 who is responsible for all these.

34 There exists within him
 much greatness.

36 Inasmuch as he is One in a

[NG]

(Lines 1-4 lacking)

ωφ[

- 6 $\bar{\eta}\tau\epsilon$ †ω[ορπ̄ $\bar{\eta}\epsilon\bar{\nu}\bar{\nu}\bar{o}\iota\alpha$ πη ε]
 ΘΕ ΔΝ ΕΒ[ΟΛ $\bar{\zeta}\bar{\eta}$ ΝΗ ΕΤΨΟΟΠ]
 8 $\bar{\zeta}\bar{\rho}\alpha\iota$ $\bar{\zeta}\bar{\eta}$ ΟΥΤΑΖΟ [Μ̄Ν ΟΥΓΝΩ]
 CIC Μ̄Ν ΟΥΕΠΙ[CΤΗ]Μ[Η ΑΥΩ]
 10 ΑΦΚΙΜ $\bar{\zeta}\bar{\eta}$ ΟΥ Μ̄[Ν]Τ' ΑΤΚΙΜ
 [̄]ΘΙ ΠΗ ΕΤΜΜΑΥ $\bar{\zeta}\bar{\rho}\alpha\iota$ $\bar{\zeta}\bar{\eta}$ ΠΕΤ'
 12 [Ρ]̄ΖΜΜΕ' $\bar{\zeta}\bar{\eta}$ ΝΑ ΧΕ ΝΕΦΩΜΕC
 ΕΖΟΥΝ ΕΠΙΑΤ̄ΝΑΡΗΧ̄ ΕΒΟΛ
 14 $\bar{\zeta}\bar{\eta}\tau\circ\circ\tau\bar{c}$ $\bar{\eta}\kappa\epsilon\epsilon\bar{\nu}\epsilon\rho\gamma\iota\alpha$ $\bar{\eta}\tau\epsilon$
 †ΜΝΤ̄ΕΙΜΕ' ΑΥΩ ΑΦΒΩΚ
 16 ΕΖΟΥΝ ΕΡΟΦ ΟΥΑΑΦ' ΑΦΟΥ
 ΩΝ̄ ΕΒΟΛ ΕΦΕ $\bar{\eta}$ † ΤΟΥ ΝΙΜ'
 18 ΠΙΤΗΡ̄Φ ΕΤ'ΧΟCΕ ΕΤΕΛΙΟC'
 ΕΦΕ $\bar{\eta}$ ΨΟΡ̄Π ΜΕΝ ΕΤΓΝΩ
 20 CIC $\bar{\eta}$ †ΖΕ ΕΒΟΛ $\bar{\zeta}\bar{\eta}\tau\circ\circ\tau$ ΔΝ
 ΕΠΙΔΗ Μ̄Μ̄Ν̄ΒΟΜ ΕΠΙΤΕΖΟ
 22 $\bar{\eta}\tau\epsilon\lambda\iota\circ\varsigma$ ΕΥΕΙΜΕ ΕΡΟΦ $\bar{\eta}$
 †ΖΕ ΔΕ ΠΑΪ' ΕΤΒΕ ΠΙΜΕΖ
 24 ΨΟΜ̄Τ̄ $\bar{\eta}\kappa\alpha\rho\omega\phi$ $\bar{\eta}\tau\epsilon$ †ΜΝΤ̄
 ΕΙΜΕ' Μ̄Ν †ΜΕΖC̄ΝΤΕ $\bar{\eta}\epsilon$
 26 ΝΕΡΓΙΑ $\bar{\eta}$ ΑΤ̄ΠΩΡ̄Χ̄ ΕΤΑCΟΥ
 ΩΝ̄ ΕΒΟΛ $\bar{\zeta}\bar{\eta}$ †ΨΟΡ̄Π $\bar{\eta}\epsilon\bar{\nu}$
 28 ΝΟΙΑ ΕΤΕ ΠΙΕΩΝ ΠΕ $\bar{\eta}$ ΒΑΡ
 ΒΗΛΩ' Μ̄Ν ΠΙΑΤ̄ΠΩΨ $\bar{\eta}$
 30 ΝΙΝΕ $\bar{\eta}$ ΠΩΨ' Μ̄Ν ΠΙΨΜΝΤ̄
 ΒΟΜ' Μ̄Ν †ΖΥΠΑΡΞΙC $\bar{\eta}\bar{\eta}$ Α
 32 ΤΟΥCΙΑ<·> <ΑΥΩ> †ΒΟΜ{·} ΑCΟΥ
 ΩΝ̄ ΕΒΟΛ' ΕΒΟΛ $\bar{\zeta}\bar{\eta}\tau\bar{\eta}$ ΟΥΕ
 34 ΝΕΡΓΙΑ ΕCΖΟΡ̄Κ̄ $\bar{\eta}\bar{\mu}\circ\varsigma$
 ΑΥΩ ΕCΚΩ $\bar{\eta}$ ΡΩC ΕΑC†
 36 $\bar{\eta}$ ΟΥΖΡΟΟΥ $\bar{\eta}$ †ΖΕ ΧΕ ΖΖΑ
 ΖΖΑ ΖΖΑ' $\bar{\eta}\tau\epsilon\rho\epsilon\varsigma\varsigma\omega\tau\bar{\mu}$
 38 ΔΕ Ε†ΒΟΜ' ΑΥΩ ΑCΜΟΥΖ

[53]

(Lines 1–4 lacking)

[
6 of the [*First Thought* (*ἔννοια*), which]
does not fall away [*from those who dwell*]
8 in comprehension [*and knowledge* (*γνώσις*)]
and [*understanding* (*ἐπιστήμη*). And]
10 That One moved motionlessly
in that which
12 governs, lest (*ἵνα*) he sink
into the boundless by means of
14 another activity (*ἐνέργεια*) of
Mentality. And he entered
16 into himself and he appeared,
being all-encompassing,
18 the Universal One that is higher than perfect (*τέλειος*).
Indeed (*μὲν*) it is not through me
20 that he is to such a degree anterior to knowledge (*γνώσις*).
Whereas (*ἐπειδή*) there is no possibility for complete (*τέλειος*)
22 comprehension, he is (nevertheless) known.
And (*δέ*) this is so because of the
24 third silence of
Mentality and the second
26 undivided activity (*ἐνέργεια*) which appeared
in the First Thought (*ἔννοια*),
28 that is, the Aeon of Barbelo,
together with the Indivisible One of
30 the divisible likenesses and the Triple
Powered One and the nonsubstantial (*-οὐσία*) Existence
(*ὑπαρξις*).”
32 <And> the power
appeared by means of an activity (*ἐνέργεια*)
34 that is at rest
and silent, although it uttered
36 a sound thus: ZZA
ZZA ZZA. But (*δέ*) when she heard
38 the power and she was filled

[NΔ]

(Lines 1-4 lacking)

6 [15±] .ΝΕ
 [13±] ΔΕ ΝΤΚ
 8 [11±] ΥC· COΛMIC·
 [8±] Κ]ΑΤΑ ΤΜΝΤΩΝΩ
 [ΕΤ]ΝΤ[ΑΚ ΜΝ] ΤΨΟΡΠ ΝΕΝΕΡ
 10 [Γ]Ι[Α] ΤΗ ΕΤ[Ε] ΕΒΟΛ ΜΜΟΣ ΤΕ
 ΤΜΝΤΝΟΥΤΕ· ΝΤΚ ΟΥΝΟΘ
 12 ΑΡΜΗΔΩΝ[·] ΝΤΚ ΟΥΤΕΛΙΟ[С]
 ΕΠΙΦΑΝΕΥ· ΚΑΤΑ ΔΕ ΤΕΝ[Ε]Ρ
 14 ΓΙΑ [ΔΕ] ΕΤΝΤΑΚ· ΤΒΟΜ ΜΜΕΖ
 CНΤΕ ΜΝ ΤΜΝΤΕΙΜΕ· ΤΗ Ε
 16 ΤΕ ΕΒΟΛ ΜΜΟ<C> ΤΕ ΤΜΝΤΜΑ
 ΚΑΡΙΟΣ· ΑΥΤΟΗΡ· ΒΗΡΙΘΕΥ·
 18 ΗΡΙΓΕΝΑΩΡ· ΩΡΙΜΕΝΙΕ· ΑΡΑ
 ΜΕΝ· ΑΛΦΛΕΓΕC· ΗΛΗΛΙΟΥΦΕΥ·
 20 [Λ]ΑΛΑΜΕΥ· ΙΕΘΕΥ· ΝΟΗΘΕΥ[·]
 ΝΤΚ ΟΥΝΟΘ ΠΗ ΕΤΕΙΜΕ ΕΡΟ[Κ]
 22 ΟΙΜΕ ΕΠΤΗΡ[·] ΝΤΚ ΟΥΑ Ν
 ΤΚ ΟΥΑ ΠΗ ΕΤΝΑΝΟΥC ΑΦΡΗ
 24 ΔΩΝ· ΝΤΟΚ ΠΕ ΠΕΩΝ ΝΤΕ
 ΝΕΩΝ ΠΗ ΕΨΟΟΠ ΝΟΥΟ
 26 ΕΙΨ ΝΙΜ· ΤΟΤΕ ΑCСΜΟΥ Ε
 ΠΙΟΥΑ ΤΗΡ[·] ΕCΧΩ ΜΜΟΣ
 28 ΧΕ ΑΛΑΜΕΥ· ΝΟ[ΗΘ]ΕΥ· CΗ
 ΝΑΩΝ· ΑCΙΝΕ[Υ· Ω]ΡΙΦΑΝΙΕ
 30 ΜΕΛΛΕΦΑΝΕΥ[·] ΕΛΕΜΑΩΝΙ·
 CΜΟΥΝ· ΟΠΤΑΩΝ· ΠΗ ΕΤ
 32 ΨΟΟΠ· ΝΤΟΚ ΠΕ ΠΕΨΟ
 ΟΠ ΠΙΕΩΝ ΝΤΕ ΝΕΩΝ· ΠΙ
 34 ΑΤΧΠΟ ΕΤΧΟCΕ ΕΝΙΑΤΧΠΟ
 ΙΑΤΟΜΕΝΕ· ΝΤΟΚ ΟΥΑΑΚ
 36 ΕΤΑΥΧΠΟ ΝΑΚ ΝΝΙΑΤΜΙ
 CΕ ΤΗΡΟΥ· ΠΙΑΤΤΡΑΝ Ε

- [54]
 (Lines 1–4 lacking)
 [
 6 [] thou art
 [] Solmis!
 8 [] according to (κατά) the Vitality,
 [that is thine, and] the first activity (ἐνέργεια)
 10 which derives from
 divinity: Thou art great,
 12 Armedon! Thou art perfect (τέλειος),
 Epiphaneu(s)! And (δέ) according to (κατά) that activity
 (ἐνέργεια)
 14 of thine, the second power
 and the Mentality
 16 which derives from blessedness (-μακάριος):
 Autoer, Beritheu(s),
 18 Erigenaor, Orimenei(os), Aramen,
 Alphleges, Elelioupheu(s),
 20 Lalameu(s), Yetheu(s), Noetheu(s)!
 Thou art great! He who knows [thee]
 22 knows the Universal One! Thou art One, Thou
 art One, He who is good, Aphredon!
 24 Thou art the Aeon of
 Aeons, He who is perpetually!”
 26 Then (τότε) she praised
 the Universal One, saying:
 28 “Lalameu(s), Noetheu(s), Senaon,
 Asine[υ(s), O]riphani(os),:
 30 Mellephaneu(s), Elemaoni,
 Smoun, Optaon, He Who
 32 Is! Thou art He Who Is,
 the Aeon of Aeons, the
 34 Unbegotten, who art higher than the unbegotten (ones),
 Yatomen(os), thou alone
 36 for whom all the unborn ones were begotten,
 the Unnameable One!

[NE]

(Lines 1-9 lacking)

- 1 [ροϞ
- 10 [12±]·[
[6± MNṬ]ϞΙΜΕ Α
- 12 [ΝΟΚ ΔΕ ΝΤΑΡΙ]Ϟ[Ω]ΤṢ ΕΝΑΪ ΔΕΙ
[ΝΑΥ ΕΝΕΟΟΥ] ΝΝΙΚΑΤΑ ΟΥΑ
- 14 [ΝΤΕΛΙΟΣ ΑΥ]Ψ ΝΙΠΑΝΤΕΛΙΟΣ
[ΝΗ ΕΤΨΟΟΠ ΖΙ]ΟΥΜΑ· ΜΝ ΝΙ
- 16 [ΠΑΝΤΕΛΙΟΣ Ε]ΤΖΑΘΗ ΝΝΙΤΕ
[ΛΙΟΣ· ΠΑΛΙΝ] ΟΝ ΠΕΧΑΣ ΝΑΪ
- 18 [ΝΒΙ ΤΑΝΝΟΒ] ΝΕΟΟΥ ΙΟΥΗΛ·
[ΧΕ ΠΑΛΛΟΓΕ]ΝΗΣ ΖΝ ΟΥΕΙ
- 20 [ΜΕ ΝΑΤ ΕΙΜΕ] ΕΚΕΙΜΕ· ΧΕ ΠΙ
[ΨΟΜΤ ΝΒΟ]Μ ΨΟΟΠ ΖΑ
- 22 [ΘΗ ΝΝΙΕΟΟΥ] ΝΣΕΨΟΟΠ ΑΝ
[ΜΝ ΝΕΤΨΟ]ΟΠ ΝΣΕΨΟΟΠ
- 24 [ΑΝ ΖΙ ΟΥΜΑ] ΜΝ ΝΗ ΕΤΨΟΟΠ
[ΟΥΤΕ ΝΗ ΕΤΨ]ΟΟΠ ΟΝΤΩΣ
- 26 [ΑΛΛΑ ΝΑΪ ΤΗΡ]ΟΥ ΕΨΟΟΠ
[ΝΟΥΜΝΤΝΟΥ]ΤΕ ΜΝ ΟΥΜΝΤ
- 28 [ΜΑΚΑΡΙΟΣ ΜΝ] ΟΥΖΥΠΑΡΞΙΣ·
[ΑΥΩ ΝΟΥΜΝΤ]ΑΤΟΥΣΙΑ ΜΝ
- 30 [ΟΥΖΥΠΑΡΞΙΣ] ΝΑΤΨΩΠΕ·
[ΑΥΩ ΤΟΤΕ Α]Ε[Ι]ΤΩΒΖ ΧΕ ΕΡΕ
- 32 [ΠΟΥΩΝΖ ΕΒ]ΟΛ ΨΩΠΕ ΝΑΪ
[ΑΥΩ ΤΟΤΕ ΠΕ]ΧΑΣ ΝΑΪ ΝΒΙ
- 34 [ΤΑΝΙΕΟΟΥ] ΤΗΡΟΥ ΙΟΥΗΛ
[ΧΕ Ω ΠΑΛΛΟΓ]ΕΝΗΣ ΜΕΝ
- 36 [ΤΟΙ ΠΙΩΜΝ]ΤΖΟΟΥΤ ΕΥ
[ΛΑΑΥ ΠΕ ΝΣ]Α ΟΥΟΥΣΙΑ·
- 38 [ΕΝΕΥΑΤΟΥ]ϞΙΑ ΔΕ ΠΕ ΠΙ

[55]

- (Lines 1-9 lacking)
- 10 [[] knowledge.”
- 12 [Now (δέ) after I] heard these things, I
[saw the glories of the perfect (τέλειος)] individuals
- 14 [and] the all-perfect ones (παντέλειος)
[who exist] together, and the
- 16 [all-perfect ones (παντέλειος) who] are before the perfect ones
(τέλειος).
[Again (πάλιν) the greatly] glorious One,
- 18 Youel, said to me:
[“O Allogenes], in an
- 20 [unknowing knowledge] you know that the
[Triple Powered One] exists before
- 22 [the glories]. They do not exist
[among those who exist]. They do not exist
- 24 [together] with those who exist
[nor (οὔτε) (with) those who] truly (ὄντως) exist.
- 26 [Rather (ἀλλά) all these] exist
[as divinity] and [blessedness (-μακάριος)]
- 28 [and] existence (ὑπαρξίς),
[and as] nonsubstantiality (-οὐσία) and
- 30 non-being [existence (ὑπαρξίς)].”
[And then (τότε) I] prayed that
- 32 [the revelation] might occur to me.
[And then (τότε)]
- 34 [the] all-[glorious One], Youel, said to me:
[“O (ὦ) Allogenes], of course (μέντοι)
- 36 [the Triple] Male
[is something beyond] substance (οὐσία).
- 38 Yet (δέ) [were he insubstantial (-οὐσία)],

[N5]

(Lines 1-7 lacking)

- 8 [ε]
- [B]ολ[
- 10 NH ετψο[ο]π [ζN ουςγστα]
 CIC MN †[r]ε[NEA NTE NH]
- 12 ετψοοπ ο[ΝΤΩC· ΕΥΨΟ]
 ΟΠ NBI NIAYT[ΟΓΕΝΗC Ε]
- 14 ΖΡΑΙ ΕΠΙΨ[ΜΝΤ'ΖΟΟΥΤ· Ε]
 ΨΩΠΕ ΕΚΨΑ[ΝΨΙΝΕ ζN ΟΥ]
- 16 ΨΙΝΕ ΕCΧΗ[Κ ΕΒΟΛ· ΤΟΤΕ]
 ΕΚΕΕΙΜΕ ΕΠ[ΙΑΓΛΘΟΝ ΕΤN]
- 18 ΖΗΤΚ· ΤΟΤΕ Ε[ΚΕΕΙΜΕ ΕΡΟΚ]
 ΖΩΨΚ· ΠΗ ΕΤ[ΨΟΟΠ ΕΒΟΛ ζM]
- 20 ΠΝΟΥΤΕ ΕΤΡ[ΨΟΡΠ NΨΟΟΠ]
 ΟΝΤΩC· MN N[CA ΨΕ ΔΕ N]
- 22 ΡΟΜΠΕ ΕCΕ[ΨΩΠΕ ΝΑΚ N]
 ΒΙ ΟΥΒΩΛΠ ΕΒ[ΟΛ NTE ΠΗ Ε]
- 24 ΒΟΛ ΖΙΤΟΟΤQ [NCΑΛΛΑΜΕΞ]
 MN CΕ<λ>ΜΕΝ· M[N ΔΡ· Η ΝΙ]
- 26 ΦΩCΤΗΡ NT[Ε ΠΙΕΩΝ NΒΑΡ]
 ΒΗΛΩ· ΑΓΩ Π[ΙΠΑΡΑ ΠΕΤ]
- 28 ΨΨΕ ΕΡΟΚ N[ΕΚΕΙΜΕ ΕΡΟQ]
 NΨΟΡΠ ΧΕ N[ΕΚ† ΟCΕ MΠΕΚ]
- 30 ΓΕΝΟC ΕΨ[ΩΠΕ ΔΕ N†ΖΕ]
 ΤΟΤΕ ΕΨΩΠ[Ε ΕΚΨΑΝΧΙ]
- 32 NΟΥΕΝΝΟ[ΙΑ NTE ΠΗ· ΤΟΤΕ]
 ΕΨΑΥΧΩΚ [MMOK ΕΒΟΛ ζM]
- 34 ΠΨΑΧΕ ΕΖ[ΡΑΙ ΕΠΧΩΚ ΕΒΟΛ·]
 ΑΓΩ ΤΟΤΕ [ΨΑΚΨΩΠΕ NΝΟΥ]
- 36 ΤΕ· ΑΓΩ Ψ[ΑΚΡ ΤΕΛΙΟC· ΕΚΧΙ]
 ΜΕΝ NΜΟQ[Υ

- [56]
 (Lines 1-7 lacking)
- 8 []
 []
- 10 those who exist [in association (σύστασις)]
 with the [generation (γενεά) of those]
 12 who [truly (ὄντως)] exist.
 [The self-begotten ones (αὐτογένεις) exist]
 14 with the [Triple Male].
 If you [seek with a]
 16 [perfect] seeking, [then (τότε)]
 you shall know the [Good (ἀγαθόν) that is]
 18 in you; then (τότε) [you will know yourself]
 as well, (as) one who [derives from]
 20 the God who truly (ὄντως) [pre-exists].
 [For (γάρ)] after [a hundred]
 22 years there shall [come to you]
 a revelation [of That One]
 24 by means of [Salamex]
 and Se<l>men [and Ar.e, the]
 26 Luminaries (φωστήρ) [of the Aeon of] Barbelo.
 And [that beyond (παρά) what]
 28 is fitting for you, [you shall not know]
 at first, so as not [to forfeit your]
 30 kind (γένος). [And (δέ) if so],
 then (τότε) when [you receive]
 32 a conception (ἐννοια) [of That One, then (τότε)]
 [you] are filled [with]
 34 the word [to completion].
 Then (τότε) [you become divine]
 36 and [you become perfect (τέλειος). You receive]
 (+μέν) them [

[N̄Z]

(Lines 1-4 lacking)

- [. . .] πωιν[ε
 6 [.] †ζγπαρξ[ις
 [ε]ωωπε εσωα[ναμαρτε ν̄ου]
 8 [λ]ααγ εσαγαμα[ρτε ν̄μος εβολ]
 [ζι]τ̄μ̄ πη ετ̄μμαγ· [μ̄ν] εβολ [ζι]
 10 τ̄οοτ̄q̄ μ̄πη ετογταρο μ̄μοq̄
 [ε]τε παϊ πε· αγω τοτε εσαq̄
 12 ωωπε ενεαq̄ ν̄ρογο ν̄βι πη
 [ε]†τερο αγω ετειμε ν̄ρογδ̄·
 14 ε[π]η ετογταρο μ̄μοq̄ αγω
 ετογειμε εροq̄· εσωπε
 16 δε εq̄ωανεῑ ερραϊ ετεq̄φγ
 cis ψαq̄θ̄ββιο· νιφγcis γαρ
 18 ν̄νατcωμα μ̄πογρ̄ωβηρ ε
 λααγ μ̄μ̄ντ̄νοβ̄· εγ̄ηταγ
 20 ν̄τεϊδομ̄ εγ̄ζ̄ν̄ τοποc nim̄·
 αγω ενσεζ̄ν̄ λααγ ν̄τοποc
 22 αν̄· ενεαγ̄ εμ̄ντ̄νοβ̄ nim̄·
 αγω σεθ̄ββινογ̄† εμ̄ντ̄κογ̄
 24 ει nim̄· ναϊ δε ν̄ταcχοογ̄ ν̄
 βι τανιεοογ̄ τηρογ̄ ιογ̄ηλ̄·
 26 ασπ̄ωρ̄x̄ εβολ μ̄μοϊ ασκα
 α†· ανοκ δε μ̄πικα τοο†
 28 εβολ ζ̄ν̄ νιψαχε εταϊcωτ̄μ̄
 εροογ̄· δεισοβτε μ̄μοϊ ν̄
 30 ζητογ̄· αγω νεϊωox̄νε μ̄
 μοει πε ζ̄ν̄ †ψε ν̄ρομπε·
 32 ανοκ δε νεϊτεληη μ̄μοϊ ε
 ματε ειωοοπ̄ ζ̄ν̄ ογ̄νοβ̄
 34 ν̄ογ̄οειν μ̄ν̄ ογ̄ζ̄ιη μ̄μα
 καριοc· x̄ε νη μεν εταει
 36 μ̄πψα ν̄ναγ̄ εροογ̄· αγω
 ον νη εταειμ̄πψα ν̄cω
 38 τ̄μ̄ εροογ̄· νη ετεψωε
 ν̄τε νινοβ̄ ν̄βομ̄ ογααγ

[57]

(Lines 1-4 lacking)
 [] the seeking [
 6 [] the Existence (ὑπαρξίς) [
 if it [apprehends]
 8 anything, [it] is [apprehended by]
 that one and by
 10 the very one who is comprehended.
 And then (τότε) he
 12 becomes greater
 who comprehends and knows than
 14 he who is comprehended and
 known. But (δέ) if
 16 he descends to his nature (φύσις),
 he is less, for (γάρ) the
 18 incorporeal (-σῶμα) natures (φύσις) have not associated with
 any magnitude; having
 20 this power, they are everywhere (τόπος)
 and they are nowhere (τόπος),
 22 since they are greater than every magnitude,
 and less than every exiguity.”
 24 Now (δέ) after
 the all-glorious One, Youel, said these things,
 26 she separated from me and left
 me. But (δέ) I did not despair
 28 of the words that I heard.
 I prepared myself
 30 therein and I deliberated
 with myself for a hundred years.
 32 And (δέ) I rejoiced exceedingly
 since I was in a great
 34 light and a blessed (μακάριος) path
 because those (+μέν) whom I was
 36 worthy to see as well
 as those whom I was worthy to hear
 38 (are) those whom it is fitting
 that the great powers alone

[NH]

(Lines 1-4 Lacking)

- [13[±]]. εν.[
 6 [10[±]]β ντε πνο[γ]
 [τε εταϋζνα]ν εζογν νβι [πι]
 8 [α]ϋ[ει]ν[ε] να^ι ννογμντμακ[α]
 10 ριος ντε τζεल्पικ νψα ενε[ζ]
 εσμεζ εβολ ζν ογμντ^χ
 12 αйнаγ επιαγαθος ναγτογε
 νηс ννογτε μν πисωτ[ηρ]
 14 ετε παί πε πιωμντ^{ζο}[ογ]τ
 ντελιος νναλογ^{μν} τμντ
 16 αγαθος ντε παί: πιπρωτο
 φανηс νζαρμηδων ντελι
 18 οс ννογс μν τμντμακα
 ριος ντε πικαλυπτος: μν τ
 20 ψορπ ναρχη ντε τμντμα
 καριος: πιεων νβαρβηλω
 22 εσμεζ εβολ ζν ογμντ^{νογ}
 τε μν τψορπ ναρχη ντε
 24 πιαταρχη: πιωμντ^{βομ} να
 ζορατον μπνα: πιτηρϋ ετ
 26 χοσε ετελιος: εταγτορπ<τ>
 εβολ ζιτοοτϋ μπιογοειν
 28 νψα ενεζ: εβολ ζιτοοτϋ
 μπιεναγμα εττοε ζιω
 30 ωτ: αγω αγχιτ εζραι εχн
 ογτοπος εφογααβ: πη ε
 32 τε μμν^{βομ} ντεεине ν
 ταϋ ογων^ζ εβολ ζμ πκοс
 34 μοс: τοτε εβολ ζιτ^н ογ
 νοб μμντ^{μακα}ριος αι
 36 ναγ ενη τηρογ εταει
 сωτ^м εροογ αγω δει
 38 сμογ εροογ τηρογ αι

[58]

(Lines 1-4 lacking)

[

6 [] of [God].

[When the]

8 [completion of] the one hundred years [drew nigh],
[it brought] me a blessedness (*μακάριος*)10 of the eternal hope (*ἐλπίς*)
full of auspiciousness (*-χρηστός*).12 I saw: the good (*ἀγαθός*) divine Autogenes;
and the Savior (*σωτήρ*)14 who is the
youthful, perfect (*τέλειος*) Triple Male Child; and his16 goodness (*-ἀγαθός*), the
noetic (*νοῦς*) perfect (*τέλειος*) Protophanes-Harmedon;18 and the blessedness (*-μακάριος*)
of the Kalyptos; and the20 primary origin (*ἀρχή*) of the blessedness (*-μακάριος*),
the Aeon of Barbelo22 full of divinity;
and the primary origin (*ἀρχή*) of24 the one without origin (*-ἀρχή*), the
spiritual (*πνεῦμα*), invisible (*ἀόρατον*) Triple Powered One,
the Universal One that26 is higher than perfect (*τέλειος*). When <I> was taken
by the28 eternal Light out of
the garment (*ἔνδυμα*) that was upon30 me, and taken up to
a holy place (*τόπος*) whose32 likeness cannot be
revealed in the world (*κόσμος*),34 then (*τότε*) by means of a
great blessedness (*-μακάριος*) I36 saw all those about whom I had
heard. And I

38 praised all of them and I

[NΘ]

- [αζερ]ατ̄ ζ̄ιχ̄ν ταρνωσις· α[ι]
 2 [κωτ]ε ερουν ετ̄ρνωσις [ν̄]
 [τε] ν̄ιπτηρ̄ϛ̄· πιεων ν̄βαρβ[η]
 4 [λω]· αγω αειναυ ερενβομ ε[γ]
 [αα]β̄ εβολ ζ̄ιτοροτου ν̄νιφω[ς]
 6 [τη]ρ̄ ν̄τε τ̄βαρβ[ηλ]ω ν̄ροογ[τ̄]
 'ν̄'παρθενος εγ[χω] μμο[ς ναί]
 8 [χ]ε τ̄ναδ̄μ̄βομ πιραζε τα[τ̄] ε[τ̄]
 ψωπε ζ̄μ̄ πκοσμοσ· παλλ̄ο
 10 [r]ενησ εναυ ετ̄μ̄ντ̄μακαρι
 ρ̄σ ετ̄ν̄τακ ν̄θε ετ̄ψοοπ
 12 ζ̄ν̄ ουσιγη· τη ετεκειμε ε
 ροκ ν̄ζητ̄ς καταροκ· αγω αρι
 14 αναχωρι εχ̄ν̄ τ̄μ̄ντ̄ων̄ζ̄
 εκκωτε ν̄σωκ· τη ετεκνα
 16 ναυ εροσ εκκιμ· αγω εμ̄ν̄
 βαμ ν̄γαζερατ̄κ· μ̄π̄ρ̄ρ̄ζοτε
 18 λααγ· αλλα εψωπε εκψαν
 ουωψ εαζερατ̄κ· αριαναχω
 20 ρι εχ̄ν̄ τ̄ζ̄υπαρ̄ξις· αγω εκε
 ζε εροσ εσαζερατ̄ς αγω εκ
 22 ζορ̄κ̄ μ̄μοσ κατα πινε μ̄πη
 ετ̄ζορ̄κ̄ μ̄μοσ̄ οντωσ·
 24 αγω εσαμαζτε ν̄ναί τηρογ
 ζ̄ν̄ ουκαρωσ̄ μ̄ν̄ ουμ̄ντ̄α
 26 तेнерγια· αγω εκψαν̄χῑ ν̄
 ουων̄ζ̄ εβολ ν̄τε παί· εβολ
 28 ζ̄ιτοοτ̄ϛ̄̄ ν̄ουψορ̄π̄̄ ν̄ου
 ων̄ζ̄ εβολ ν̄τε πιατ̄σογω
 30 ν̄ϛ̄· πη ετε εψωπε εκ
 ψανειμε εροϛ̄· αριατ̄ει
 32 με εροϛ̄· αγω εκψαν̄ϛ̄
 ζοτε μ̄πιμα ετ̄μ̄μαγ̄ αρι
 34 αναχωρι επαρογ̄ ετ̄βε̄ νι
 ενεργια· αγω εκψαν̄ϛ̄
 36 τελιος μ̄πιτοποσ̄ ετ̄μ̄
 μαγ̄ ζροκ̄ μ̄μοκ̄· αγω
 38 κατα πιτυποσ̄ ετ̄ψοοπ
 ν̄ζητ̄κ̄· ειμε̄ ον̄ ν̄τ̄ζε

[59]

[stood] upon my knowledge (*γνώσις*) and [I]
 2 [inclined to] the knowledge (*γνώσις*) [of]
 the Universals, the Aeon of Barbelo.
 4 And I saw [*holy*] powers
 by means of the [*Luminaries* (*φωστήρ*)]
 6 of the virginal (*παρθένος*) male Barbelo
 [telling me]
 8 [that] I would be able to test (*πειράζειν*) what
 happens in the world (*κόσμος*): “O Allogenes,
 10 behold your Blessedness (*-μακάριος*),
 how it silently (*σιγή*) abides,
 12 by which you know
 your proper (*-κατά*) self and,
 14 seeking yourself, withdraw (*ἀναχωρεῖν*) to the Vitality
 that you will
 16 see moving. And although it is
 impossible for you to stand, fear
 18 nothing; but (*ἀλλά*) if you
 wish to stand, withdraw (*ἀναχωρεῖν*)
 20 to the Existence (*ὑπαρξις*), and you will
 find it standing and
 22 at rest after (*κατά*) the likeness of the One
 who is truly (*ὄντως*) at rest
 24 and embraces all these
 silently and
 26 inactively (*-ἐνέργεια*). And when you receive
 a revelation of him by
 28 means of a primary revelation
 of the Unknowable One—
 30 the One whom if you should
 know him, be ignorant
 32 of him—and you become
 afraid in that place,
 34 withdraw (*ἀναχωρεῖν*) to the rear because of the
 activities (*ἐνέργεια*). And when you become
 36 perfect (*τέλειος*) in that place (*τόπος*),
 still yourself. And
 38 in accordance with (*κατά*) the pattern (*τύπος*) that indwells
 you, know likewise

[ἄ]

- [x]ε εϥωοοπ $\bar{n}\dagger z\epsilon$ $\bar{z}\bar{n}$ n[αί τη]
 2 [ρο]γ κατα πείσμοτ· αγ[ω]
 [μπ]ρχωρε εβολ $\bar{n}zοyο$ [zina]
 4 [x]ε εκεδ \bar{m} βομ $\bar{n}αzερατ[k]$
 [ο]γτε $\bar{m}\bar{p}ρογωψ$ ερε \bar{n} [εργι]
 6 [zι]να χε νεκzε εβολ παντ[ωc]
 [zι] πιατενεργια ετ $\bar{z}ραϊ$ $\bar{n}z[h]$
 8 [τκ] $\bar{n}\dagger$ τε η[ατc]ογ $\bar{ω}n\bar{q}$ $\bar{m}\bar{p}ρε[i]$
 [m]ε εροq['] παϊ γαρ ογ $\bar{m}\bar{n}\dagger$ ατ
 10 βομ τε· αλλα εβολ $\bar{z}\bar{i}\bar{t}\bar{n}$ ογ
 εννοια εσε $\bar{n}οyοειν$ εκι \bar{m} [ε]
 12 εροq· αριατ \bar{e} ιμε εροq· ναϊ
 δε νεϊcωτ \bar{m} εροοy εγ \bar{x} ω \bar{m}
 14 μοοy $\bar{n}\bar{b}i$ ηη ετ \bar{m} μαy· νεq
 ψοοπ $\bar{n}\bar{b}i$ οy \bar{z} ροκ $\bar{z}ραϊ$ $\bar{n}z\eta\tau$
 16 $\bar{n}\dagger$ τε οyσιγη· δεϊcωτ \bar{m} ε†
 $\bar{m}\bar{n}\dagger$ μακαριος τη ετα \bar{i} ειμε
 18 εροϊ εβολ $\bar{z}\bar{i}\bar{t}οοτc$ καταρο<ι>
 αγω δεϊ \bar{p} αναχωρι ε $\bar{x}\bar{n}$ † $\bar{m}\bar{n}\dagger$
 20 ω $\bar{n}z$ εϊκωτε $\bar{n}cω<ι>$ · αγω
 δεϊ \bar{p} ωβηp $\bar{n}βωκ$ εzοy \bar{n} εροc
 22 $\bar{n}\bar{m}αc$ · αγω δειαzερατ \bar{n}
 $\bar{z}ραϊ$ $\bar{z}\bar{n}$ οyτα \bar{x} ρο αν· αλλα $\bar{z}\bar{n}$
 24 οy \bar{z} ροκ· αγω αι $\bar{n}αy$ εyκ $\bar{i}m$ ·
 $\bar{n}\psiα$ ενεz $\bar{n}nοερον$ $\bar{n}ατ$
 26 πω $\bar{p}\bar{x}$ · επα \bar{n} ιβομ τηροy πε
 $\bar{n}nατ \bar{e} ιδοc $\bar{n}nατ†$ τοψ
 28 εροq $\bar{z}\bar{n}$ οy† τοψ· αγω ε
 ταειοyωψ εαzερατ $\bar{z}\bar{n}$ οy
 30 τα \bar{x} ρο· δεϊ \bar{p} αναχωρι ε $\bar{x}\bar{n}$
 †z \bar{y} παρ \bar{z} ιc τη εταειδ \bar{o} ntc
 32 εcazερατc· αγω εc \bar{z} οpκ
 $\bar{m}mοc$ κατα οy \bar{z} ικων $\bar{m}\bar{n}$
 34 οyε $\bar{i}nε$ $\bar{n}\dagger$ τε πη ετ $\bar{t}οε$ $\bar{z}\bar{i}ω$
 ωτ· εβολ $\bar{z}\bar{i}\bar{t}\bar{n}$ οyω $\bar{n}z$ εβολ
 36 $\bar{n}\dagger$ τε πιατ \bar{p} ωψ $\bar{m}\bar{n}$ πη ε†
 $\bar{z}οpκ$ $\bar{m}mοq$ · δειμοy \bar{z} εβολ
 38 $\bar{z}\bar{n}$ οyω $\bar{n}z$ εβολ· εβολ $\bar{z}\bar{i}$
 $\bar{t}\bar{n}$ οy $\bar{m}\bar{n}\dagger$ ωοpπ $\bar{n}οyω\bar{n}z$$

[60]
 [that] it is this way in [all such (matters)]
 2 after (κατά) this (very) pattern. And
 [do not] further dissipate, [so that (ίνα)]
 4 you may be able to stand,
 and do not (ούτε) desire to [be active (ἐνεργεῖν)]
 6 lest (ίνα) you fall [in any way (πάντως)]
 from the inactivity (-ἐνέργεια) in
 8 [you] of the Unknowable One. Do not
 [know] him, for (γάρ) it is impossible;
 10 but (ἀλλά) if by means of an
 enlightened thought (ἐννοια) you should know
 12 him, be ignorant of him.”
 Now (δέ) I was listening to these things as
 14 those ones spoke them. There
 was within me a stillness
 16 of silence (σιγή), and I heard the
 Blessedness (-μακάριος)
 18 whereby I knew <my> proper (-κατά) self.
 And I withdrew (ἀναχωρεῖν) to the
 20 Vitality as I sought <myself>, and
 I joined into it,
 22 and I stood,
 not firmly but (ἀλλά)
 24 still. And I saw
 an eternal, intellectual (νοερόν), undivided motion
 26 that pertains to all the
 formless (-εἶδος) powers, (which is) unlimited
 28 by limitation. And when
 I wanted to stand firmly,
 30 I withdrew (ἀναχωρεῖν) to
 the Existence (ὑπαρξίς), which I found
 32 standing and at rest
 like (κατά) an image (εἰκῶν) and
 34 likeness of what is conferred upon
 me by a revelation
 36 of the Indivisible One and the One who
 is at rest. I was filled
 38 with revelation by means
 of a primary revelation

[32]

2 εβολ ἡπιατσογωνῆ· ζ[ωσ]
 3 εἶε ἡνατῆιμε εροφ· αἶει[με]
 4 εροφ αγω λειχι βομ ζραῖ ἡ
 5 [ζ]ἡτῆ· ελειχι ἡογχορο ἡζητ
 6 [ἡ]ψα ενεζ· λεισογων πη ε[τ]
 7 [ψ]οοπ ἡζητ ἡν πιωμτῆβο[μ]
 8 ἡν πιογωνῆ ε[βο]λ ἡτε η[ι]
 9 ἀτσωπ εροφ ε[τῆ]ταφ· α[γω]
 10 εβολ ζῆτῆ οὔμντῆωορπ ἡ[ογ]
 11 ωῆζ εβολ ἡτε πιωορπ ἡατ
 12 [σ]ογωνῆ ναγ τηροφ· πνογ
 13 τε ετῆοσε ετελιος αἶναγ
 14 εροφ ἡν πιωμτῆβομ ετῆο
 15 οπ ἡζητοφ τηροφ· νεῖκω
 16 τε ἡσα πνογτε ἡνατῆαχε
 17 ἡμοφ ἡν πιατσογωνῆ·
 18 παῖ ετε εψωπε ερωανογα
 19 εἶμε εροφ παντωσ ψαφῆατ
 20 εἶμε εροφ· πιμεσιτῆσ ἡτε
 21 πιωμντῆβομ πη ετῆκῆ ζῆ ογ
 22 ζροκ ἡν οὔκαρωφ· αγω εφε
 23 ἡνατσογωνῆ· ναῖ δε εἶτα
 24 χρηγ ἡζητοφ· πεχαγ ναῖ ἡ
 25 βι νῆβομ ἡτε νῆφωστηρ χε
 26 ζω δε εκχωωρε εβολ ἡπια
 27 τενεργια ετῆοοπ ἡζητκ
 28 εβολ ζῆτοοτῆ ἡπικωτε ἡ
 29 τε νιατῆαζοοφ· ἀλλα σωτῆ
 30 ετβηητῆ κατα θε ετε ογῆ
 31 βομ εβολ ζῆτῆ οὔμντῆωο
 32 ρπ ἡογωνῆ εβολ ἡν ογω
 33 ἡζ εβολ· φωοοπ δε ἡνογ
 34 λαγ ἡθε ετεφωοοπ· ἡ χε
 35 φωοοπ αγω εφναψωπε
 36 ἡ εφῆενεργι ἡ εφειμε εφο
 37 ἡζ εμῆταφ ἡνογνογσ·
 38 ογτε ογωνῆ· ογτε ογζγ
 39 παρζις· ογτε πιατῆγπαρ
 40 ζις ζῆ οὔμντῆατῆαζοσ·

[61]

of the Unknowable One. [*As though* (ὥς)]
2 I were ignorant of him, I [*knew*]
him and I received power [*by*]
4 him. Having been permanently strengthened,
I knew the One who
6 exists in me and the Triple Powered One
and the revelation of
8 his uncontainableness. [*And*]
by means of a primary
10 revelation of the First One (who is) unknowable
to them all, the God
12 who is beyond perfection (τέλειος), I saw
him and the Triple Powered One that exists
14 in them all. I was seeking
the ineffable
16 and Unknowable God—
whom if one should
18 know him, he would be absolutely (πάντως)
ignorant of him—the Mediator (μεσιτήης) of
20 the Triple Powered One who subsists in
stillness and silence and is
22 unknowable. And (δέ) when I was confirmed
in these matters,
24 the powers of the Luminaries (φωστήρη) said to me:
“Cease hindering the inactivity (-ἐνέργεια)
26 that exists in you
by seeking
28 incomprehensible matters; rather (ἀλλά) hear
about him insofar (κατά) as it is
30 possible by means of a primary
revelation and a revelation.
32 Now (δέ) he is
something insofar as he exists in that he either (ἢ)
34 exists and will become,
or (ἢ) acts (ἐνεργεῖν) or (ἢ) knows, although he lives
36 without Mind (νοῦς)
or (οὔτε) Life or (οὔτε) Existence (ὑπαρξίς)
38 or (οὔτε) Non-Existence (-ὑπαρξίς),
incomprehensibly.

[38]

- [α]γω εφωοοπ ἡνογλααγ ἡμν
 2 [π]ἡ ετψοοπ ετἡνταφ' οὔτε
 [ε]ἡσεψωχπ ἡμοφ αν κατα
 4 [λ]ααγ ἡσμοτ' ζωσ εφτ ἡφ[γ]
 [λ]ααγ εφχοἡτ' ἡ εφτββφ [ἡ]
 6 [ε]φχι ἡ εφτ' οὔτε εμεγ
 [ψα]χζφ κα[τα] λααγ ἡσμοτ'
 8 [ἡ ε]βολ ζι[τἡ] πεφουωψε ογα
 φφ ἡ εφτ' ἡ εφχι εβολ ζιτο
 10 οτῆ ἡκεογα' οὔτε ἡμἡνταφ
 λααγ ἡογωψε εβολ ἡμοφ
 12 ογααφ' οὔτε εβολ ζιτἡ κε
 ογα' ἡνεψαφει αν εζραϊ ε
 14 ροφ' αλλα οὔτε ἡτοφ ἡφτ
ἡνογλααγ αν εβολ ζιτοοτῆ
 16 ζινα χε νεφωωπε εγψωχζ
ἡμοφ κατα κεσμοτ' ετβε
 18 παϊ οὔτε μαφρχρια ἡνογ
 νογσ οὔτε ογωνζ' οὔτε λα
 20 αγ ρω επτηρῆφ' εφσοτἡ ενι
 πτηρῆφ ζἡ τἡμἡτἡρζαε ετἡνταφ
 22 ἡμἡ τἡμἡτἡτσογωἡσ' ετε
 ταϊ τε τζγπαρχις ἡνατψω
 24 πε' επιδη ογἡνταφ ἡμαγ ἡ
 ογσιγη ἡμἡ ογζροκ' ζινα χε
 26 νεγψαζχφ εβολ ζιτοοτογ
ἡνη ετε μεγψαζχογ' ογ
 28 τε ἡνογμἡτἡνογτε αν πε
 οὔτε ογμἡτἡμακαριος
 30 οὔτε ογμἡτἡτελιος' αλλα
 ογλααγ ἡνταφ πε ἡνατσογ
 32 ωἡφ ἡπἡ αν ετἡνταφ' αλ
 λα εκεογα ἡτοφ πε εφσο
 34 τἡ ετἡμἡτἡμακαριος ἡμἡ
 τἡμἡτἡνογτε ἡμἡ ογμἡτἡ
 36 τελιος' οὔτε γαρ ἡνογ
 τελιος αν πε' αλλα εκεἡ

[62]

- And he is something along with
 2 his proper being.
 He is not (οὐτε) left over in (κατά)
 4 any way, as if (ὥς) he yields
 something that is assayed or (ἦ) purified [or (ἦ)]
 6 [that] receives or (ἦ) gives. And he is not (οὐτε)
 diminished in (κατά) any way,
 8 [whether (ἦ)] by his own desire
 or whether (ἦ) he gives or (ἦ) receives through
 10 another. Neither (οὐτε) does [he] have
 any desire of himself
 12 nor (οὐτε) from another;
 it does not affect him.
 14 Rather (ἀλλά) neither (οὐτε) does he give
 anything by himself
 16 lest (ἵνα) he become diminished
 in (κατά) another respect;
 18 nor (οὐτε) for this reason does he need (-χρεία)
 Mind (νοῦς), or (οὐτε) Life, or (οὐτε)
 20 indeed anything at all. He is superior to the
 Universals in his privation
 22 and unknowability,
 that is, the non-being existence (ὑπαρξίς),
 24 since (ἐπειδή) he is endowed with
 silence (σιγή) and stillness lest (ἵνα)
 26 he be diminished by
 those who are not diminished.
 28 He is neither (οὐτε) divinity
 nor (οὐτε) blessedness (-μακάριος)
 30 nor (οὐτε) perfection (-τέλειος). Rather (ἀλλά)
 it (i.e., this triad) is an unknowable entity of him,
 32 not that which is proper to him; rather (ἀλλά)
 he is another one
 34 superior to the blessedness (-μακάριος) and
 the divinity and
 36 perfection (-τέλειος). For (γάρ) he is not (οὐτε)
 perfect (τέλειος) but (ἀλλά) he is another thing

[αΓ]

2 κα πε εϕσοτπ̄· οϕτε ν̄[νοϕ]
 [α]τ̄ναρνηχ̄ αν πε· οϕτε ν̄[σε]
 † τοϿ εροϕ αν εβολ ζ̄ιτοο[τϕ]
 4 [ν̄κ]εοϕα· αλλα εϕν̄κα εϕϑ
 [τ̄π̄] πε· ν̄νοϕςωμα αν πε [ν̄]
 6 νοϕατςωμα α[ν] πε· ν̄[νοϕ]
 νοβ αν πε ν̄νοϕ[κο]ϕει [αν πε]
 8 ν̄νοϕηπε αν πε ν̄[νοϕ]τα[μιο]
 αν πε· οϕτε ν̄νοϕλααϕ αν
 10 πε εϕϿοοπ̄· παί ετε οϕν̄βομ
 [ν̄]τ̄εοϕα ειμε εροϕ· αλλα εκε
 12 [λα]αϕ ν̄ταϕ πε εϕσοτπ̄· πη ε
 [τ]ε ν̄μν̄βομ ν̄τεοϕα ειμε
 14 [ε]ροϕ· εϕϿορπ̄ ν̄οϕων̄ε ε
 βολ πε ν̄ν̄ οϕγν̄ωςις ν̄ταϕ
 16 εντοϕ οϕααϕ ετ̄ειμε εροϕ·
 επιδ̄η ν̄λααϕ α[ν] πε ν̄τε νη
 18 ετ̄Ͽοοπ̄· αλλα εκεν̄κα πε
 εϕσοτπ̄ ν̄τε νη ετ̄σοτπ̄·
 20 αλλα ν̄θε ν̄πη ετ̄ν̄ταϕ· αϕω
 ν̄πη αν ετ̄ν̄ταϕ· οϕτε εϕχι
 22 αν εβολ ζ̄ν̄ οϕεων· οϕτε
 εϕχι αν εβολ ζ̄ν̄ οϕχρονος·
 24 οϕτε εμεϕχι λααϕ εβολ ζ̄ι
 τ̄ν̄ κεοϕα· οϕτε ενσεϿω
 26 χ̄ε ν̄μοϕ αν· οϕτε εϕϿωχ̄ε
 ν̄λααϕ αν· οϕτε ν̄νοϕατ̄Ͽα
 28 χ̄ε αν πε· παί δε οϕτερο
 ν̄ταϕ οϕααϕ πε· ζως εϕλα
 30 αϕ ν̄τ̄ε πε ν̄νατ̄σοϕων̄ϕ·
 ζως εϕσοτπ̄ ενη ετ̄νανοϕ
 32 οϕ ζ̄ν̄ †ν̄μν̄τ̄ατ̄σοϕων̄ς·
 εϕν̄ταϕ ν̄νοϕν̄τ̄μακα
 34 ριος ν̄ν̄ οϕν̄τ̄τελιος
 ν̄ν̄ οϕκαρϿω <ν̄τ̄μν̄τ>μακαρι
 36 ος αν· οϕτε ν̄τ̄μν̄τ̄ε
 λιος αν· ν̄ν̄ οϕζροκ· αλλα
 38 οϕλααϕ ν̄ταϕ πε εϕϿοοπ̄·
 πη ετε ν̄μν̄βομ ν̄τεοϕα

[63]

that is superior. He is neither (οὐτε)
 2 boundless, nor (οὐτε)
 is he bounded by
 4 another. Rather (ἀλλά) he is something [*superior*].
 He is not corporeal (σῶμα).
 6 He is not incorporeal (-σῶμα).
 He is not great. [*He is not*] small.
 8 He is not a number (i.e., quantity). He is not a [*creature*].
 Nor (οὐτε) is he something
 10 that exists, that
 one can know. But (ἀλλά)
 12 he is something else of himself that is superior, which
 one cannot know.
 14 He is primary revelation
 and knowledge (γνώσις) of himself,
 16 as it is he alone who knows himself.
 Since (ἐπειδή) he is not one of those
 18 that exist but (ἀλλά) is another thing,
 he is superior to (all) superlatives
 20 even (ἀλλά) in comparison to (both) what is (properly) his and
 not his. He neither (οὐτε) participates in
 22 eternity (αἰών) nor (οὐτε)
 does he participate in time (χρόνος).
 24 He does not (οὐτε) receive anything from anything
 else. He is not (οὐτε) diminishable,
 26 nor (οὐτε) does he diminish
 anything, nor (οὐτε) is he undiminishable.
 28 But (δέ) he is
 self-comprehending, as (ὡς) something
 30 so unknowable,
 that (ὡς) he exceeds those who excell
 32 in unknowability.
 He is endowed with blessedness (-μακάριος)
 34 and perfection (-τέλειος)
 and silence—not <the blessedness (-μακάριος)>
 36 nor (οὐτε) the perfection (-τέλειος)—
 and stillness. Rather (ἀλλά)
 38 it (i.e., these attributes) is an entity of him that exists,
 which one cannot

[ΞΔ]

- [ει]με ερωϑ αγω εϑ2ορκ̄ μ̄
 2 [μ]οϑ̄· αλλα ε2ενλααγ̄ νε̄ ν̄
 [τα]ϑ̄ ν̄νατ̄σογ̄ωνοϑ̄ ναγ̄
 4 τηροϑ̄· εϑχοσε δε̄ 2̄ν̄ †μ̄[ντ̄]
 ϑ̄αειε̄ ν̄2ογο̄ ενᾱ^ι τηροϑ̄
 6 [ετν]ανο[γ]οϑ̄· πᾱῑ δε̄ ν̄†2ε̄
 [ογα]†ϑ̄ο[γ]ων̄ϑ̄ πε̄ ναγ̄ τη
 8 ρ̄[ο]γ̄̄ κατᾱ σμοτ̄̄ νιμ̄· αγω
 εβολ̄ 2̄ιτοοτοϑ̄ τηροϑ̄ εϑ
 10 2̄ρᾱῑ ν̄2ητοϑ̄ τηροϑ̄ ν̄†γνω
 σις̄ ογᾱας̄ αν̄ ν̄νατ̄σογ̄ων̄[ς̄]
 12 τη̄ ετ̄ψοοπ̄ καταροϑ̄· αγ[ω]
 εϑ2οτ̄π̄ εβολ̄ 2̄ιτοοτ̄ς̄ ν̄†μ̄[ντ̄]
 14 ατ̄σογ̄ων̄ς̄ ετ̄ναγ̄ ερωϑ̄· η̄ [εω]
 14a <χε̄ ογ̄ν̄ ογᾱ εϑναγ̄ ερωϑ̄>
 χε̄ ν̄αω̄ ν̄2ε̄ ϑε̄ ν̄νατ̄σογ̄ω
 16 ν̄ϑ̄· η̄ εωχ̄ε̄ [ο]γ̄ν̄ ογᾱ εϑναγ̄
 ερωϑ̄ κατᾱ θε̄ ετεϑψοοπ̄ μ̄
 18 μοσ̄ κατᾱ σμοτ̄̄ νιμ̄· η̄ εω
 χε̄ ογ̄ν̄ ογᾱ ναχοοσ̄ ερωϑ̄ χε̄
 20 εϑψοοπ̄ ν̄ογλααγ̄ ν̄θε̄ ν̄ογ
 γνωσις̄· αϑ̄ρ̄ασεβ̄ης̄ ερωϑ̄
 22 εγ̄ν̄ταϑ̄ ν̄ογ2απ̄ χε̄ μ̄πεϑ̄
 σογ̄ων̄ π̄νοϑ̄τε· ν̄νεϑ̄να
 24 χῑ ν̄ογ2απ̄ αν̄ εβολ̄ 2̄ιτοοτ̄ϑ̄
 μ̄π̄η̄ ετ̄μ̄μαγ̄· π̄η̄ ετεσ̄ρ̄
 26 μελῑ ναϑ̄ αν̄ 2̄αλααγ̄· οϑ̄τε̄
 μ̄μ̄ν̄τ̄ϑ̄ λααγ̄ ν̄ογωϑ̄ε̄ μ̄
 28 μαγ̄· αλλᾱ ν̄τοϑ̄ <ϑ̄>εβολ̄ μ̄μοϑ̄
 ογᾱας̄ χε̄ μ̄πεϑ̄β̄ινε̄ ν̄†αρ̄
 30 χη̄ ετ̄ψοοπ̄ οντ̄ως̄· αϑ̄ρ̄ β̄λ̄
 λε̄ ν̄σανβολ̄ μ̄πιβαλ̄ ετ̄2ο
 32 ρ̄κ̄ μ̄μοϑ̄ ν̄τε̄ π̄ιογ̄ων̄2̄
 εβολ̄· π̄η̄ ετεγ̄ρε̄νεργ̄ι
 34 ερωϑ̄ πῑ εβολ̄ 2̄μ̄ π̄ιωμ̄ν̄τ̄
 βομ̄ ν̄τε̄ †ψορ̄π̄ ν̄ε̄ννοι
 36 ᾱ ν̄τε̄ π̄ια2ορατον̄ μ̄π̄να
 πᾱῑ ν̄†2ε̄ εϑψοοπ̄ εβολ̄

[64]

[*know*], and which is at rest.

- 2 Rather (ἀλλά) they are entities
of him unknowable to them
- 4 all. And (δέ) he is much higher in
beauty than all those
- 6 [*that*] are good, and (δέ) he is thus
unknowable to all of them
- 8 in (κατά) every respect. And
through them all he is
- 10 in them all, not
only as the unknowable knowledge (γνώσις)
- 12 that is proper to (κατά) him. And
he is united with the
- 14 ignorance that sees him. Whether (ἤ)
- 14a <one sees>
in what way he is unknowable,
- 16 or (ἤ) sees
him as (κατά) he is
- 18 in (κατά) every respect, or (ἤ)
would say that
- 20 he is something like
knowledge (γνώσις) , he has sinned (-ἄσεβής) against him,
- 22 being liable to judgment because he did not
know God. He will not
- 24 be judged by
That One who
- 26 is neither concerned (-μέλει) for anything nor (οὔτε)
has any desire,
- 28 but (ἀλλά) it (i.e., judgment) <is> from
himself because he did not find the origin (ἀρχή)
- 30 that truly (ὄντως) exists. He was blind
apart from the eye
- 32 of revelation that is at rest,
the (one) that is activated (ἐνεργεῖν),
- 34 the (one) from the Triple
Power of the First Thought (ἐννοια)
- 36 of the Invisible (ἀόρατον) Spirit (πνεῦμα).
This One thus exists from

[36]

(Lines 1-14 lacking)

[.....].[

- 16 [...] λ α α γ α [
 [τ α χ] ρ η ο υ ε ν [8 ± ο] γ
 18 [μ] ν τ σ α ε ι ε [μ ν] ο [γ ω ρ] π ' ν ψ ε
 ν τ ε ο γ ζ ρ ο κ · μ ν [ο γ] κ α ρ ω α
 20 μ ν ο γ μ ν τ ζ ρ ο κ [μ ν] ο γ μ ν
 [τ] ν ο β ν η α τ η ρ α τ σ ε α φ ο γ ω
 22 ν ζ ε β ο λ · ν η ε φ ρ χ ρ ι α α ν ν ο υ
 χ ρ ο ν ο σ ο γ τ ε < ν η ε φ χ ι α ν > ε β ο λ ο γ ε
 24 ω ν · α λ λ α ν τ ο γ ε β ο λ μ μ ο γ
 ο γ α α φ ε γ α τ η ρ α τ γ π ε ζ η ν ο γ μ ν τ
 26 α τ η ρ α τ σ ε ε φ ε ν ε ρ γ ι α ν ο γ
 τ ε ε ρ ο γ ζ η ν α χ ε ε φ ε ψ ω π ε
 28 ε φ ζ ο ρ κ μ μ ο γ · ο γ τ ε ν η ο γ
 ζ γ π α ρ ζ ι σ α ν π ε ζ η ν α χ ε ν ε φ
 30 ρ ζ α ε · ο γ σ ω μ α μ ε ν π ε ε φ
 ζ η ν ο γ τ ο π ο σ · ο γ α τ σ ω μ α
 32 α ε π ε ε φ ζ η ν ο γ η ε ι · ε γ η τ α φ
 ν η ο γ ζ γ π α ρ ζ ι σ ν α τ ψ ω π ε
 34 ε φ ω ο ο π ν α γ τ η ρ ο γ ε ρ ο γ
 ε μ ν τ α φ λ α α γ ν ο γ ω ψ μ
 36 μ α γ · α λ λ α ο γ ζ ο γ ε χ ι σ ε
 π ε ν τ ε ο γ μ ν τ ν ο β · α γ ω
 38 ε φ χ ο σ ε ε π ε φ ζ ρ ο κ · ζ η ν α

[35]

(Lines 1-14 lacking)

- [13[±]].NH[
 16 [10[±] αq]NAY EPOT[OY]
 αq†[BOM EPOTY THP]OY ENÇ[EP]
 18 MELI NA[γ AN] M̄[Π]H ET̄MMAγ [N̄]
 ΛAAY OYTE EPWPE EPWOT̄A
 20 XI EBOL M̄MOY MEQXI BOM OY
 TE MEREΛAAY ENERGI EPOT K̄A
 22 TA †MNT̄OYOT̄ ET̄ZOPK̄ M̄MO[C]
 OYAT̄COYWN̄Q GAP PE EYTO
 24 POS GAP PE N̄NATNIQE N̄TE
 †MNT̄AT̄NAPHX̄C ZWC EYA
 26 T̄NAPHX̄Q PE MN OYAT̄BAM
 AYW OYAT̄WPE N̄NEQ†
 28 M̄PWPE AN̄ ALLA EPWOP
 N̄NAI THPOY EPOT EPZOPK̄
 30 M̄MOY EPAT̄ZEPAT̄Q EBOL Z̄M
 PH ET̄AZEPAT̄Q N̄OYOEIΩ
 32 NIM̄ EAPOT̄YWN̄Z EBOL N̄BI
 OYWN̄Z N̄WAE NEZ̄ PIPNA
 34 N̄NAT̄NAγ EPOT AYW N̄WMMNT̄
 BOM̄ PIOYA ET̄Z̄N̄ NAI THPOY
 36 ET̄WOP AYW EP̄MPEY
 KWTE THPOY EPXOC E
 38 POY THPOY OYZAIBEC

[66]

(Lines 1-14 lacking)

[

- 16 [*he*] saw [*them*]
 and [*empowered them all*] although they do not
 18 concern (-*μέλειω*) [*themselves*] with That One at
 all, nor (*οὔτε*) if one should
 20 receive from him, does he receive power.
 Nothing (+*οὔτε*) activates (*ἐνεργεῖν*) him in accordance with
 (*κατά*)
 22 the Unity that is at rest.
 For (*γάρ*) he is unknowable;
 24 (+*γάρ*) he is an airless place (*τόπος*) of
 the boundlessness. Since (*ὥς*)
 26 he is boundless and powerless
 and nonexistent, he was not giving
 28 Being. Rather (*ἀλλά*) he contains
 all of these in himself, being at rest
 30 (and) standing out of
 the one who stands
 32 continually, since there had appeared
 an Eternal Life, the
 34 Invisible and Triple-Powered Spirit (*πνεῦμα*)
 which is in all of these
 36 who exist. And it surrounds
 them all, being higher than
 38 them all. A shadow

[67]

(Lines 1-14 lacking)

- [
 16 [he [*was filled with power. And*
 18 [*he*] stood [*before them*],
 empowering them all, and he filled
 20 them all. And concerning (+*μέν*)
 all of these (things) you have heard
 22 certainly. And do not
 seek anything more,
 24 but (*ἀλλά*) go.
 We do not (*οὔτε*) know whether
 26 the Unknowable One has
 angels (*ἄγγελος*) or (*οὔτε*)
 28 gods, or (*οὔτε*) whether the One who is at rest
 was containing
 30 anything within himself except
 the stillness, which is he,
 32 lest (*ἵνα*) he be diminished.
 It is not (*οὔτε*) fitting to
 34 spend more
 time seeking. It was
 36 appropriate that you (plu.) <alone> know
 and that they speak
 38 with another one. But (*ἀλλά*) you will receive them

[ḫḥ]

(Lines 1-14 lacking)

[13[±]]. . [

16 [. . αγω π]εχ[αφ να]ἰ χε ςζα[ἰ ḥ]

[ḥ]ḥ εἴἑναχ[οο]γ νακ· αγ[ω]

18 εἴἑναἑ μεεγε νακ ετβη

ητογ ḥḥαἰ ετναῤῥḥπωα ḥḥ

20 ḥḥḥḥσωκ· αγω εκεκω ḥḥ

πειḫωωμε ḫἰḫḥ οὔτοογ

22 ḥḥḥḥογτε εζραἰ οὔβε πιρε[φ]

αρεζ εμογ φρικτος· ναἰ

24 δε ḥḥτερεφχοογ αφωῤῥḫ

εβολ ḥḥμοἰ· ḫḥοκ δε αἰμογζ

26 εβολ ḫḥ οὔραφε· αἰςζαἰ δε

ḥḥπειḫωωμε εταγτωω

28 ναἰ παωḥρε μεσσοσ· χε

εἰεβωλḥḥ νακ εβολ ḥḥḥ ε

30 ταγταφε οειω ḥḥμοογ να

ζραἰ ḥḥḥḥ πωοῤῥḥ δε αἰḫἰ

32 τογ ḫḥ οὔḥοβ ḥḥσιḥḥ[.] αγω

αειαζεραἑ καταροἰ εἰσοβ

34 τε ḥḥ[ο]ει· ναἰ νε ḥḥ εταγ

βολπο[γ] ναἰ εβολ ω παωḥ

[68]

(Lines 1-14 lacking)

[

- 16 [and he said to me]: "Write down
[the things that I] shall [tell] you and
18 of which I shall remind you for the sake of
those who will be worthy
20 after you. And you will leave
this book upon a mountain
22 and you will adjure the guardian:
'Come Dreadful One (*φρικτός*).'"
24 And (*δέ*) after he said these (things), he separated
from me. But (*δέ*) I was full
26 of joy, and (*δέ*) I wrote
this book which was appointed
28 for me, my son Messos, in order
that I might disclose to you the (things) that
30 were proclaimed before me in
my presence. And (*δέ*) at first I received
32 them in great silence (*σιγή*) and
I stood by (*κατά*) myself, preparing
34 myself. These are the things that
were disclosed to me, O (*ὦ*) my Son

[69]

(lines 1-13 lacking)

1 [Messos

14 [*proclaim*
[them, O (ὦ) my]16 son [Messos, as the]
seal (σφραγίς) [for] all [the]18 [books of]
Allogenes.

20 Allogenes

NHC XI,3: ALLOGENES

NOTES TO TEXT AND TRANSLATION

45,6–9 “(perfect) individuals”: the repeated phrase N(I)KATA OGA (45,37–38; 46,6.15; 48,10; 49,37–38; 51,22.30; 55,13; *Steles Seth* VII,5:121,3; 124,8.24–25; *Zost.* VIII,1:18,16–17; 41,17.19) may render Greek $\tau\acute{\alpha} \kappa\alpha\theta' \acute{\epsilon}\nu$ or $\tau\acute{\alpha} \acute{\iota}\delta\acute{\iota}\alpha$ or $\tau\acute{\alpha} \mu\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\kappa\acute{\alpha}$, while the phrase often contrasted with it, $\text{NH (ETWOOΠ) ZIOΓMA}$ (“Those who are together,” cf. 45,6; 46,21–22.29–30; 55,15; *Steles Seth* VII,5:124,24; *Zost.* VIII,1:40,14–15; 125,5–7) may render Greek $\tau\acute{\alpha} \sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\theta\epsilon\tau\alpha$ or $\tau\acute{\alpha} \kappa\omicron\upsilon\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ or $\tau\acute{\alpha} \kappa\alpha\theta\acute{\omicron}\lambda\omicron\upsilon$ (or $\kappa\alpha\theta\omicron\lambda\omicron\iota\kappa\acute{\alpha}$). “Those who exist together” are called $\mu\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\kappa\acute{\alpha}$ in 55,14–15 (cf. *Steles Seth* VII,5:124,23–25), while “the individuals” are called “perfect” in 55,13 (cf. *Steles Seth* VII,5:124,8). In Proclus’ *Elements of Theology* $\tau\acute{\alpha} \sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\theta\epsilon\tau\alpha$ refers to the compositeness of things less perfect than their cause (props. 59,127,157) while $\kappa\alpha\theta' \acute{\epsilon}\nu\alpha$ refers to specificity (props. 170,180). In *Ep.* 58 Seneca refers to a sixfold division of “things that are” in which the Platonic ideas are referred to as “(those) who truly are” = (*ea*) *quae proprie sunt* (= Greek $\tau\acute{\alpha} \acute{\iota}\delta\acute{\iota}\omega\varsigma \acute{\omicron}\nu\tau\alpha$ or better, $\tau\acute{\alpha} \acute{\omicron}\nu\tau\omega\varsigma \acute{\omicron}\nu\tau\alpha$, *Ep.* 58,18) and individual things are referred to as *ea quae communiter sunt* (*Ep.* 58,22 = Greek $\tau\acute{\alpha} \kappa\omicron\upsilon\omega\varsigma \acute{\omicron}\nu\tau\alpha$; the reverse of their expected use). The significance of these terms in *Allogenes* seems best illustrated by $\tau\acute{\alpha} \mu\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\kappa\acute{\alpha}$ and $\tau\acute{\alpha} \kappa\alpha\theta\acute{\omicron}\lambda\omicron\upsilon$ in *Porph. Sent.* 22 (Lamberz, p.13, lines 13–16): “The intellectual substance ($\omicron\upsilon\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha$) is homeomeric, such that the beings ($\acute{\omicron}\nu\tau\alpha$) exist in both the particular ($\mu\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\kappa\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$) and the total ($\mu\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\kappa\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$) intellect ($\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$). But in the universal ($\acute{\omicron} \kappa\alpha\theta\acute{\omicron}\lambda\omicron\upsilon$) intellect, even particulars ($\tau\acute{\alpha} \mu\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\kappa\acute{\alpha}$) exist universally ($\kappa\alpha\theta\omicron\lambda\omicron\iota\kappa\acute{\omega}\varsigma$) whereas in the particular ($\mu\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\kappa\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$) (intellect) there exist both universals ($\tau\acute{\alpha} \kappa\alpha\theta\acute{\omicron}\lambda\omicron\upsilon$) and particulars ($\mu\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\kappa\acute{\alpha}$) individually ($\mu\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\kappa\acute{\omega}\varsigma$).” To be compared is *Corp. Herm.* XXI (Nock-Festugière, III.91): “The Pre-existing One ($\mu\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\kappa\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$) is thus pre-existing beyond beings ($\tau\acute{\alpha} \acute{\omicron}\nu\tau\alpha$) and the truly existing ones ($\tau\acute{\alpha} \acute{\omicron}\nu\tau\omega\varsigma \acute{\omicron}\nu\tau\alpha$). There is, in effect, a being ($\acute{\omicron}\nu$) one calls universal substantiality ($\acute{\eta} \omicron\upsilon\sigma\acute{\iota}\omicron\tau\eta\varsigma \acute{\eta} \kappa\alpha\theta\acute{\omicron}\lambda\omicron\upsilon$), common ($\kappa\omicron\upsilon\iota\eta$) to intelligibles ($\nu\omicron\eta\tau\acute{\omega}\nu$) considered as the truly existing ($\tau\acute{\alpha} \acute{\omicron}\nu\tau\omega\varsigma \acute{\omicron}\nu\tau\alpha$) and as beings ($\tau\acute{\alpha} \acute{\omicron}\nu\tau\alpha$) individually ($\kappa\alpha\theta' \acute{\epsilon}\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}$).” Metaphysically, “those who exist together” refers to $\tau\acute{\alpha} \acute{\omicron}\nu\tau\omega\varsigma \acute{\omicron}\nu\tau\alpha$, the Platonic intelligibles which are universal, the Ideas, while “the (perfect) individuals” refers to the Platonic intelligibles which are individuated (probably the mathematical) and traditionally held to reside in the soul. In *Allogenes* these expressions refer as well to spiritual beings inhabiting

these ontological levels; “those who exist together” are associated especially with Protophanes, the central level of the divine thought, Barbelo, while “the (perfect) individuals” are associated with Auto-genes, the third and lowest level of the divine thought, Barbelo (see note on 45,33–38 and 46,10–17).

45,9–10 The guardian as Mind appears to be Protophanes or even the Aeon of Barbelo. The one who instructs Allogenes is here unidentified, but elsewhere it is Youel (48,38–57,27) or the powers of the Luminaries of the Aeon of Barbelo (54,9–68,25). Allogenes’ reply (50,6(?)–17) to the instruction in 45,6(?)–49,38(?) assumes Youel as the revealer of the previous revelation (50,10–11; cf. “again,” 50,20). Cf. the “guardian” *φρικτός* (68,22), “Dreadful One,” but which seems not to be in view here.

45,13 “Triple Powered One” (= *τριδύναμος*, cf. Bruce Codex) cf. 47,7–38; 52,30–36; *Steles Seth* VII,5:121,32; 123,23; *Zost.* VIII,t:97,2–3; *Marsanes* X:7,17–18.23–24; 8,19–20; 9,8–9.20–21.25; 14,22; 15,2; *Trim. Prot.* XIII,t:37,26–27; *Ap. John* BG 8502,2:28,1; 39,13; *Ap. John* II,t:5,8; Schmidt-MacDermot, *Bruce Codex*, 231,20; 233,6; 234,16 passim (in particular 235,17–23). *Allogenes* often coordinates the Triple Powered One with the Invisible Spirit (47,8–9; 51,8–9; 58,25; 66,33–34; cf. *Zost.* VIII,t:97,2–3; 128,20–21), but more often mentions them separately: Triple Powered One (45,13.20.21; 52, 19.30; 53,30–31; 55,[21]; 61,6.13.20); Invisible Spirit (45,27; 49,10; 51,35); cf. the locution “the Triple Power of the First Thought of the Invisible Spirit” in 64,34–36; and similarly in *Zost.* VIII,t:20,15–19. It is difficult to tell whether the Triple Powered One or the Invisible Spirit is referred to by such phrases as the “Unknowable One” or “Unknowable God” mentioned in 59,29; 60,8; 61,1.10–12.16.20–22; 62,31; 63,30; 64,3.7.11.15; 66,23; 67,26. *Marsanes* X,7:1–29 suggests that the Triple Powered One, unbegotten and without being, derives from the silence of the highest being (“Silent One”), and is his energy.

45,15–19 The “Immeasurable One, the Light of Knowledge” is the Aeon of Barbelo (cf. 51,8–13; 59,2–3), the perfect Youth/male Virgin (51,37; 59,6–7; cf. the virginal Spirit of *Ap. John* BG 8502,2:27,13–21; *Trim Prot.* XIII,t:38,11–14 and *Marsanes* X,8,28–9,5). The Knowledge (45,16) is the self-knowledge of the Invisible Spirit produced by the Triple Powered One out of the “boundlessness” of the Invisible Spirit, making knowledge of himself revealed (49,7–21; 53,10–18). As the First Thought (48,13; 53,27–28; 64,35) of the Triple Powered One, the Aeon of Barbelo is the first Aeon, the Aeon of Aeons (54,24–25.33). Cf. 45,19; 46,34; 51,13; 53,28; 54,33; 56,26; 58,21; 59,3.

- 45,19 Supralinear stroke is visible above $\omega\sigma\pi\pi$.
- 45,20-22 The unique triple-powered Aeon is the Triple Powered One (not strictly speaking, an Aeon!); it is the source of the Aeon of Barbelo, i.e., his first Aeon. The distinction in gender used in the English translation of this text conforms to the Coptic usage. It is likely that anyone of the transcendentalia can be considered to be androgynous, or even neuter, i.e., sexless in the ordinary sense.
- 45,23 MS reads $\pi\sigma\rho\uparrow\uparrow\tau\uparrow$ $\epsilon\beta\sigma\lambda$; the masculine object seems required to fit the masculine gender context. The terms seem to designate a spontaneous unfolding of the Invisible Spirit as the Triple Powered One into the Aeon of Barbelo. Cf. the similar description in 66,28-36.
- 45,25 A trace of λ is visible on the new fragment transferred here from pages 41/42. The fragment is visible in the *Facsimile Edition: Codices XI, XII, XIII* beneath the tape on those pages; see the *Facsimile Edition: Introduction*.
- 45,26-30 "Invisible Spirit": cf. references in note on 45,13. The Aeon is the Aeon of Barbelo: cf. note on 45,15-19.
- 45,28-30 The Triple Powered One realizes itself as the Aeon of Barbelo, the divine Intellect. Plotinus once suggested and abandoned a distinction between an intelligence at rest which knows and another movement which knows that it knows (cf. Plot. *Enn.* II.9.1,33-34; III.9.1,15-26; Proc. *In Tim.* I.303,27-304.7: des Places, *Numémius*, frg. 11,12,15,16,22).
- 45,31-47.7 Cf. 51,7-38; 58,12-26. The Aeon of Barbelo, the First Thought and first Aeon of the Triple Powered One corresponds to the Neoplatonic divine Intellect. It seems to consist of three sub-aeons, hypostases or levels: (1) Kalyptos ("Hidden One," cf. 45,31-33; 46,30-34; 51,12-17) who is highest (cf. note on 45,31-33); (2) Protophanes ("First-appearing One") also called Harmedon, cf. 45,33-38; 46,17-30; 51,19-24.32-35; 58,16-17; see the note on 45,33-38); and (3) Autogenes ("Self-begotten One," cf. 46,10-11.14-17; 51,25-32; 58,12) who is lowest (cf. note on 46,10-17). Compare the triad in the *Bruce Codex* (Schmidt-MacDermot, 234,12-13). In *Zost.* VIII,1:15,2-12 the hypostases Kalyptos, Protophanes and Autogenes correspond *pari passu* with the Neoplatonic ontological triad: Existence, Mentality and Vitality (cf. 49,26-38 and note). The Aeon of Barbelo is said to be endowed with these hypostases as images ($\epsilon\acute{\iota}\kappa\acute{o}\nu\epsilon\varsigma$, 51,16.21.27). The Aeon of Barbelo also contains what seems to be a fourth hypostasis, the divine Triple Male (45,37; 51,32-33; 55,36; 58,15; cf. *Steles Seth* VII,5:120,16-30; 121,8-9; *Zost.* VIII,1:18, [23-24]; *Ap. John* BG 8502,2:27,20-21; NHC II,1:5,7-8; NHC III,1:7,23-8,1; *Trim. Prot* XIII,1:37,26; *Gos.* Eg. III,2 and IV,2:pas-

sim; Schmidt-MacDermot, *Bruce Codex*, 234,14-15); he is called "the Thought of all those who exist together" (46,17-22), "the perfect Youth" (51,32-37; 58,12-15) in whom the self-begotten ones exist (56,13-14), "the Savior" (58,12-15; cf. 51,32-37). In 51,7-38 he is mentioned after Autogenes; otherwise he is ranked between Protophanes and Autogenes. In 45,36-37 he seems to be a (feminine?) hypostasis of Barbelo who gives power to the "individuals" (those in Autogenes, cf. note on 46,10-17); in 46,17-30 it is said that the self-reflection of the Triple Male is reflection upon Protophanes; in 58,13-17 it is said that Protophanes is the goodness of the Triple Male. Since he does not fit the triadic layout of the Aeon of Barbelo that seems to form the basis for the ontology of the Aeon of Barbelo, and owing to the intimate connection he sustains with Protophanes in *Allogenes*, he may be considered as perhaps an aspect or syzygy of Protophanes, although he may constitute a fourth hypostasis. In this regard, see the following passages from *Zost.* VIII,1:44,24-31: "I blessed the living and unborn [God who is] in truth and the unborn [Kalyptos] and the invisible male perfect noetic Protophanes and the invisible youthful Triple Male and the divine [Autogenes]"; 24,2-17: "With perfect soul he seeks those of Autogenes, with mind those of the Triple Male, with pure spirit those of Protophanes; he hears of the Kalyptos from the powers of the spirit whence they come by a superior revelation of the Invisible Spirit. And in the Ennoia now existing and in the First Ennoia they hear about the invisible spiritual Triple Powered One who is a report and pure silence in a life-giving spirit; perfect, [greater than] perfect, and all-perfect"; see also 22,8-12; 60,13-17.

The fluidity of the position of the Triple Male is due to the Sethian ambiance of *Allogenes*. It seems that the Sethian movement (cf. Schenke, "Das sethianische System," 169-71) postulated a primal triad Father (Invisible Spirit)-Mother (Barbelo)-Son (Autogenes) in which the Son was originally identified with the divine Anthropos Adamas or Pigeradamas. In *Zostrianos*, Adam is the eye of Autogenes (VIII,1:30,4-14) and Geradamas is the eye of the Perfect Child (VIII,1:13,1-7). Triple Male is associated with Adamas in the untitled tractate in the *Bruce Codex* (see note to 45,13) and with Geradamas in *Steles Seth* VII,5:120,29; 121,8-9. There is a later trend to distinguish Adamas/Triple Male from Autogenes in the more strongly Christianized texts, such as the *Apocryphon of John* and *Gospel of the Egyptians*, which tend to identify Christ as the Autogenes or even as the Triple Male Child (cf. *Gos. Eg.* III,2:55,5-6; 54,13-20 and IV,2:66,2-8). This slackening of the identification of Adamas or Triple Male with Autogenes occurs here in *Allogenes*,

showing that the identification was perhaps always fluid, and that its slackening may not be due to Christianization alone, but also to the "Platonizing" of "Sethianism." In any case, aside from the Triple Male, *Allogenes* displays no trace of Adamas or of his son Seth, the Child of the (Triple Male) Child, except perhaps in the supposed identity of Seth with Allogenes himself. Finally it should be noted that the triad Kalyptos, Protophanes and Autogenes occupies the same ontological level in *Allogenes* as does the Triad Prognosis, Aphtharsia and Aionia Zoe in *Ap. John* BG 8502,2:27,1-29,8 (cf. *Iren. Haer.* I.29.1). The tripartitioning of the divine Intellect occurs in Numenius and Plotinus (see references in the three following notes).

45,31-33 Barbelo becomes the first of her levels or hypostases, Kalyptos (the "Hidden One") who is characterized directly by blessedness (58,18-19) and, by derivation, divinity (58,19-22, from the Aeon of Barbelo). Like the Triple Powered One (45,21-22), Kalyptos "truly exists" (*Zost.* VIII,t:125,11-13) and thus is the domain of "those who truly exist," whose types and forms are the image (εἰκῶν) of the Kalyptos (cf. 51,12-17 and 46,28). "Those whom she knows" (45,32-33) are the "hidden ones," whom to see is to see the Aeon of Barbelo (46,32-34). The Kalyptos level of the Aeon of Barbelo corresponds to the Existence (ὑπαρξίς) aspect of the Triple Powered One. Compare *Zost.* VIII,t:15,2-12 where Kalyptos is conjoined with the third term of the triad Life/vitality, Mentality/blessedness, Existence/divinity. Kalyptos may derive from the conception of the veil (κάλυμμα) as a limit (ὄρος) separating the high deity from the aeonic world; cf. *Iren. Haer.* I.11.1; *Val. Exp.* XI,2:27,34-38; see also the veil in *Gos. Phil.* II,3:69,36; 84,23. Kalyptos seems to correspond to the νοῦς νοητός in Plot. *Enn.* III.9.1,15-17 or to the First God of Numenius (Euseb. *Praep. Ev.* XI.17.11-18, 18.13-14, 22.3-5, 22.6-8; Proc. *In Tim.* I.303.27-304,7: des Places, *Numénius*, frg. 11,13,16,19,21).

45,33-38 Protophanes ("First-appearing One") also called Harmedon (58,17; Armedon, 54,12) is the second level or hypostasis of the Aeon of Barbelo, characterized as noetic, male and perfect (45,34-35; 46,24-30; 51,17-24; 58,15-17). He is the domain of those who are together (46,29-30); in *Zost.* VIII,t:129,4-17, Zostrianos, becoming all perfect, sees in Protophanes "all those existing there as one." Protophanes is intimately conjoined with the Triple Male (cf. note on 45,31-47,7) who is called "the Thought of all those who exist together" (46,20-22) and "the goodness" of Protophanes (58,15-17). The Triple Male is the domain of the self-begotten ones (56,13-14) who according to *Marsanes* X,3,18-21 are associated with the "Incorporeal being that exists partially." These correspond to individual souls in Platonism. In his role as "Savior" (58,13-15), the Triple

Male's contemplation of the beings resident in a lower ontological level enables their elevation to a higher level within the Barbelo Aeon. Protophanes works with craft, skill and instinct on the "individuals" in Autogenes (51,17-24); the self-reflection of the Triple Male (the Thought of those who exist together) shows Protophanes to be "the procession for those who exist together" in Protophanes, whom to see is to see "those who truly exist," whom they are to become in the Kalyptos, whom to see is to see the Aeon of Barbelo (46,11-34). Protophanes occupies a similar median position in *Zost.* VIII,1:15,2-12 where he is conjoined with the median term of the triad: Life/vitality, Mentality/blessedness, Existence/divinity. In *Steles Seth* VII,5: 123,5-9 Protophanes is identified with the divine Youth (the Triple Male of *Allogenes*) and causes multiplicity by "a division of those who truly exist." The *Bruce Codex* explains (Schmidt-MacDermot, 252,24-27): "The power that was given to the Propator is called Protophanes because it was he who first appeared." The name "Protophanes" seems Orphic in origin. In the Rhapsodies, Phanes (also called Eros, Metis, Erikepaios) was "first to appear" (πρώτος γὰρ ἐφάνθη; *Orph. Arg.* 14-16; Kern, *Orph. Frag.*, p. 65, frg. 224) "two formed," bisexual, "looking this way and that," "the key of mind" (Kern, *Orph. Frag.*, frg. 72-89; cf. Terzaghi, *Synesii Cyrenensis*, 2.63 where the Son is called πρωτοφανὲς εἶδος). Proclus (*In Tim.* III.d-f; Diehl, II, p. 102) calls Phanes the "demiurgic cause" and Zeus the paradigmatic cause. Protophanes seems to correspond to the νοῦς ὁρῶν (who is at once νοῦς and νοητός in Plot. *Enn.* III.9.1,17-21) or to the upper aspect of Numenius' Second God, νοῦς θεωρητικός who contemplates the First God (Euseb. *Praep. Ev.* XI.18.20-21; 22.3-5; des Places, *Numénius*, frg. 15,16).

46,9 Those "truly existing": i.e., those in the level of the Hidden One. For the emendation cf. XI,3:45,[14].[22]; 48,38; 55,25; 56,[12]; 64,30.

46,10-17 Autogenes ("Self-begotten One") is the lowest of the levels, hypostases, of the Aeon of Barbelo, characterized as divine and good (48,10-11; 51,25-32; 58,12). He is the "path to" or domain of the "individuals" (cf. *Zost.* VIII,1:25,10-18). The objects of his vision exist individually and they become as he is (46,14-17); both the Triple Male and Protophanes work on the "individuals" from above (45,36-38; 51,21-24). Autogenes knows each of the individuals ("these," 51,28; cf. 51,22) and works "successively and individually" to "rectify the failures from nature," the realm below him; he is thus the principle of individuation and the savior of the natural world (φύσις). In *Marsanes* X,4,24-5,26 Autogenes descends to save a "multitude," probably the sense-perceptible world which is "[worthy] of being saved entirely." In *Zost.* VIII,1:15,2-12 Autogenes is con-

joined with the first term of the triad: Life/vitality, Mentality/blessedness, Existence/divinity. The name Autogenes may derive from the Autogenes/Monogenes light generated in Barbelo by the Father (*Ap. John* BG 8502,2:30,1-31,1). In *Iren. Haer.* I.29.1 the production of Autogenes (“a light like her”) is the beginning of the *γένεσις* of all things (i.e., he is a demiurgical figure). Autogenes seems to correspond to the *νοῦς διανοούμενος* in *Plot. Enn.* II.9.6,18-21; III.9.1,21-23 and according to Numenius “he siezes upon the sense realm and draws it up to his own character” (in *Euseb. Prep. Ev.* XI.17.11-18: des Places, *Numénius*, frg. 11; cf. frg. 16). In Plotinus’ system Autogenes would correspond to the intellectual part of the soul.

46,17-27 Protophanes and the Triple Male: cf. notes on 45,31-47,7 and 45,33-38.

46,25 The vestige of ink at the beginning of the line is an apparent trace of \uparrow , ϕ or δ ; the expected locution, however, is $\text{[}\bar{\text{N}}\text{TE/}\lambda\text{IOC } \bar{\text{N}}\text{N]OY}\text{C}$, the perfect mind.

46,22-34 “procession”; $\text{TCYOPH } \bar{\text{N}}\text{ZIH}$ probably translates either *πρόδος* or *προποδισμός*, “procession” or “progression,” a sort of “path” for Aeons or perhaps human initiates (such as Allogenes in 59,4-61,22) to move from the rank of “individuals” (in Autogenes) through the rank of “those who exist together” (in Protophanes) to the rank of “those who truly exist” (in the Hidden One) so as to see the whole Aeon of Barbelo and receive a primary revelation of the Triple Powered One or Unknowable God. Cf. the Neoplatonic triad: *μονή*, *πρόδος*, *ἐπιστροφή* = permanence, procession (i.e., emanation), reversion, although here the direction of procession is upward. *προποδισμός* is used of arithmetic progression from the monad in Theon Smyr. *Expositio* in Hiller p. 18, line 3.

46,28 For $\text{[ENIO]N[TC] [ETCOP]}$, cf. 49,17-18.

46,32 ω of $\text{E}\omega\lambda\alpha\text{N}$ written over N .

46,34 $\text{BAPB}\lambda\omega$ elsewhere appears as $\text{BAPB}\eta\lambda\omega$.

47,5-7 For $\text{AKCOTM ETBE} \dots \text{Z}\bar{\text{N}} \text{OYTA}\chi\text{PO}$, cf. 67,21-22. M of COTM (47,5), $\text{OY}\alpha$ of $\text{POY}\alpha$ (47,6) and $\text{X}\rho$ of $\text{TA}\chi\text{PO}$ (47,7) are from frg. #6, *Facsimile Edition: Codices XI, XII, XIII*, pl. 82, placed there after publication of the volume; see the *Facsimile Edition: Introduction*. “You”(masc. sg.) is Allogenes; “them” may be the components of the Aeon of Barbelo. “Abundance” refers to the creative efficacy of the higher powers; cf. *περιουσία* (*Plot. Enn.* VI.7.32,33) and *περιουσία δυνάμειως* in many Neoplatonic sources: *Plot. Enn.* IV.8.6; *Porph. Sent.* 17; *Iamb. Myst.* 5,23; *Proc. Theol.* props. 27,71, 121,124; *passim*.

47,7-34 The all-sufficiency and unity of the Triple Powered One; cf.

- note on 45,13. "They" and "them" may be the components of the Aeon of Barbelo that emanate from (45,22-33) the Triple Powered One. For "perfect and greater than perfect" of the Triple Powered One, cf. *Zost.* VIII,1:24,2-17. For "non-substantial substance," cf. 55,29-30; 62,23; 65,32-33.
- 47,29 Possibly read]ΝΟΦΝϚ[, cf. Emmel, "Photographic Evidence," 272.
- 47,33-34 The sentence beginning with ΑΥΩ/ΟΥΥΙΑ needs a subject expressed by a copula, since ΠΕ in 47,35 belongs with the circumstantial clause.
- 47,38 MS reads ΜΝΤΣΑΕΙΝ; the sense demands ΜΝΤΣΑΕΙΕ ("beauty," cf. 64,5; 65,18).
- 48,6-7 ΥΑ of ΟΥΑ[ΤΒΑΜ (48,6) and ΥΩΝ of ΟΥΩΝ[Ζ (48,7) are from frg. #6, *Facsimile Edition: Codices XI, XII, XIII*, pl. 81, placed there after publication of the volume; see the *Facsimile Edition: Introduction*.
- 48,9-49,1 Apart from a digression on self-sufficiency (48,14-19) and paradoxical incomprehensibility (48,19-32), this passage suggests that even if individuals "come together" (cf. 45,6-9 note), they would be incapable of comprehending the Triple Powered One (= "Universal One," cf. 58,25-26 and 47,14-15; 52,28; 53,18), since only those who "truly exist" can see "the Triple Powered One who truly exists" (45,21-22). Rather they can only "apprehend" (48,12-13) by means of a First Thought (i.e., The Aeon of Barbelo, 53,27-28) revealed by the Triple Powered One. "First Thought" (ΥΟΡΠ̅ ΝΕΝΝΟΙΑ: 53,27; 64,35) may render Greek *πρώτη ἔννοια* (cf. *Just. Apol.* 1; *PG* 6,425—of Athena as Zeus' first thought), or even *προέγνοια*, perhaps "preconception"; see the discussion and parallels in Hadot, *Porphyre et Victorinus*, 1:117, who concludes that *προέγνοια* in late Platonic sources signifies a mode of knowledge anterior to intellection, that is a sort of non-comprehending knowledge or "learned ignorance" suggested by the English terms "prehension" or "apprehension." "First Thought" in *Allogenes* seems to be a revelation of the Invisible Spirit (64,35-36), and seems to be identified with the Aeon of Barbelo (53,27-28), although clearly in 48,13 the meaning of "preconception" would be quite fitting. Indeed, the term may refer intentionally both to (human) pre-noetic intuition (see note on 59,30-32) and to divine revelation in quasi-hypostatic form.
- 48,10 ΠΤΗΡ̅ (ΕΤΧΟΣΕ ΕΤΕΛΕΙΟΣ) is translated here and at 52,28; 53,18; 54,22 and 58,25 as "the Universal One" rather than as "the All," since in 58,25 it is identified with a specific figure, the Triple Powered One.
- 48,14-16 Perhaps the latent ("hidden") portion of existence is the same

as "Being" (ὡπαπε=τὸ εἶναι?); in any case 66,25-28 denies that the Triple Powered One gives Being.

48,18 The relative of the third future ε[τε]γεωπαπε seems to be unattested; one might parse it as ε[.]η εωπαπε εγωπαμ-, a conditionalis in protasis, but this leaves the condition without apodosis and ε[.]η unexplained.

48,23-24 "formless form": cf. Plot. *Enn.* VI.7.33,4.

48,32 Perhaps a supralinear correction above λ of αλ[λ]α.

48,35-49,1 "undivided activity": cf. the second undivided activity which appeared in the First Thought, probably the Aeon of Barbelo (53,23-28) and the "eternal intellectual undivided motion" of the Vitality or median aspect of the Triple Powered One (60,19-28). These are substantially manifested (i.e., as an hypostasis), probably as Protophanes, in the Aeon of Barbelo, the First One from the One who truly exists (the Triple Powered One). In 54,8-16 (see note on 54,6-37) it appears that Protophanes (= "Harmedon" in 45,34-36; 58,16-17) corresponds to Vitality and "first activity," and Autogenes to Mentality, "activity" and "second power." Inasmuch as 48,38 continues with "a second activity," it is likely that "first Vitality" and "undivided activity" refer to Protophanes, and "second activity" (cf. 53,25-28; 54,13-17) would refer to Autogenes.

49,1-3 The fragment appearing at 57,1-3 in the *Facsimile Edition: Codices XI, XII, XIII*, pl. 63 has been placed at this location.

49,5-21 The Triple Powered One appears to be the subject, endowed with blessedness and goodness. On the triad: blessedness, goodness and divinity, cf. note on 62,27-63,1. The boundlessness of the Invisible Spirit is the proceeding (Vitality) aspect of the Triple Powered One, here called "the traverser" (see Introduction Section IV). According to Plotinus *Enn.* III.8.9.33-39, the Supreme One is a primal life (πρώτη ζωή), an activity (ἐνέργεια) eternally traversing (ἐν διεξόδῳ) all things which must derive from something else which is not in traverse, but is the origin of traversing, the origin of life and intelligence and of all things. See also *Zost.* VIII,1:16,5-14: "having instilled a [desire] in Him who exists that he not become boundless [and] shape[less]. Rather, having [been] truly traversed, he is prior to his reification into something that has its [Spirit], in addition to Existence and [Being], standing with him, existing with him, surrounding him." Apparently, the Triple Powered One, as the boundlessness subsisting in the Invisible Spirit, traverses itself in an act of procession and reversion upon the source (the Invisible Spirit) from which it emerges. The boundlessness reverts by turning itself back towards its source in an objectivizing act of knowledge, thus becoming

a separately existing definite (bounded) being, truly existing. In this sense the Triple Powered One is a cause or point of departure for truly existing beings, since it has become a mind containing truly existing ideas. This is precisely the same process described in Plot. *Enn.* VI.7.17,13–26 where boundless life regards its source and this vision causes it to become a definite being, a separate subject perceiving its source as object. It is no longer boundless life, but bounded life, which is Mind. The text of *Allogenes* appears garbled at this point, but its intention seems clear. In particular one might emend 49,11 to read $\epsilon\sigma\kappa\omega\tau\epsilon \ \mu\mu\omicron\langle\sigma\rangle \ \epsilon\rho[\omicron\alpha]$, i.e., The boundlessness turns itself to the Invisible Spirit. As the text now stands, one must interpret: The boundless turns him (i.e., the traverser) to it (i.e., the Invisible Spirit).

- 49,21–26 The subject of the sentence (they) seems to refer to the components of the Aeon of Barbelo, who produce no subordinate aeons or hypostases; cf. 67,25–32.
- 49,26–38 In his later writings, Plotinus tends to place the triad $\delta\upsilon\nu$, $\zeta\omega\eta$, and $\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$, derived from traditional exegesis of Plato, *Soph.* 248e, into his second hypostasis, Nous, perhaps under the influence of Arist. *Metaph.* XII.7 (1072^b 27); see Plot. *Enn.* I.6.7, 8.2; III.6.6, 7.3; V.3.5, 4.2, 5.1, 5.10; VI.6.8, 6.18, 7.23, 7.36, 9.9 passim (cf. Procl. *Theol. Plat.* IV,1–3; *Theol. props.* 101–3 and Dodds, *Proclus: Theology*, 220–21; 232; 252–54; 345–46; Dam. *Dub. et sol.* 39 (Ruelle, I, p. 80, lines 7–14). See Victorinus, *Adv. Arium*, IV.21,26–27: “ $\tau\rho\iota\delta\upsilon\nu\alpha\mu\omicron\varsigma$ est deus, id est tres potentias habens, esse, vivere, intelligere.” See discussion by Hadot, “Etre, Vie, Pensée chez Plotin,” 159–77; “Discussion,” 175–90 and *Porphyre et Victorinus. Allogenes* XI,3:49,26–38; 59,9–60,12; 60,13–61,22 and *Zost.* VIII,1:15,2–12 firmly witness the triad, Being or Existence, Vitality, Mentality in that order of predominance (cf. Plot. *Enn.* VI.6.8,17–22). On the variation of the name of the leading term ($\delta\upsilon\nu$ and $\psi\alpha\rho\alpha\iota\varsigma$) and its relation to Porphyry, see Hadot, “La métaphysique de Porphyre,” 127–57; “Discussion,” 158–63 and *Porphyre et Victorinus* 1.267–72. For discussion of the triad, see Introduction Section VI. In *Allogenes*, $\tau\omicron\delta\ \delta\upsilon\nu$ seems to be rendered by $\pi\eta \ \epsilon\tau\epsilon \ \pi\alpha\iota \ \pi\epsilon, \ \tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\iota\alpha$ ($\tau\mu\eta\tau\alpha\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\iota\alpha$ is surely by attraction from $\tau\mu\eta\tau\omega\nu\eta$ and $\tau\mu\eta\tau\epsilon\iota\mu\epsilon$) and $\pi\epsilon\tau\omega\omicron\omicron\pi$; $\zeta\omega\eta$ is rendered by $\tau\mu\eta\tau\omega\nu\eta$ (i.e., $\zeta\omega\delta\tau\eta\varsigma$) and $\pi\omega\eta\eta$ ($\pi\omega\eta\eta \ \epsilon\omicron\upsilon\gamma\eta\eta\tau\epsilon$ is dittography); $\tau\mu\eta\tau\epsilon\iota\mu\epsilon$ seems to render the strange neologism $\tau\eta\omicron\eta\tau\eta\varsigma$ (for $\nu\omicron\delta\tau\eta\varsigma$). The preference for the abstracts $\mu\eta\tau\omega\eta\eta$ (for $\zeta\omega\delta\tau\eta\varsigma$), $\mu\eta\tau\epsilon\iota\mu\epsilon$ and $\nu\omicron\eta\tau\eta\varsigma$ emphasizes the non-substantiality of the aspects of the Triple Powered One. The triad occurs in *Steles Seth* VII,5:125,28–32 as $\psi\alpha\rho\alpha\iota\varsigma, \ \omega\eta\eta, \ \nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$, and in *Zost.* VIII,1:15,2–12 as $\psi\alpha\rho\alpha\iota\varsigma, \ \sigma\omicron\omicron\upsilon\gamma\eta$,

- ω̄ν̄ζ. On the unity of the three modalities, cf. Procl. *Theol.* prop. 103. Abstract qualities precede, ground, and generate substances. The variation νοῦς/νοότης; ζωή/ζωότης; ὄν/ὄντότης; οὐσία/οὐσιότητα, etc., rests on the distinction between concrete substances and abstract qualities in Stoic and Neoplatonic thought, and was systematized as the “Method of paronyms” by Proclus (*In Parm.* 1106,1–1108,19; Cousin) and is extensively analyzed by Hadot, *Porphyre et Victorinus*, 1.352–75. Cf. the similar distinction in the Valentinian, Marcus: μονότης/ἐνότης → μονάς/ἕν, *Iren. Haer.* I.15,1; cf. I.11.3 and Hipp. *Ref.* VI.49.1 and VI.38.2.
- 49,38–39 The coronis marks the transition to a new section containing four revelations of Youel: 50,17–52,6; 52,13–55,11; 55,17–30; 55,33–57,24. The quotation marks indicate the end of Allogenes’ speech to Youel (cf. “you” on 50,11 and note on 45,9–10).
- 50,1–3 The fragment appearing at 58,1–3 in the *Facsimile Edition: Codices XI, XII, XIII*, pl. 64 has been placed at this location.
- 50,2 ΠΙΟΥΑΤΟ (cf. 50,32): s.v. ΑΤΟ, Crum 19a; ΑΤΟ* should be listed s.v. ΟΥΑΤΟ (Crum takes ΟΥΑΤΟ, ΕΥΑΤΟ, ΑΥΑΤΟ as the singular indefinite article plus ΑΤΟ).
- 50,6–17 Allogenes has heard the initial doctrine (CBW, 50,11.16; 52,16) about the Triple Powered One and the Aeon of Barbelo (“these things,” “them” 50,7.10.12) probably from Youel (“you” masc., 50,10; cf. “the one who taught you,” 45,9–10) while in the flesh. At this stage, his (discursive) thought (ΜΕΕΥΕ=διάνοια?) can distinguish things beyond measure (i.e., the doctrine concerning the Aeon of Barbelo, the “Immeasurable One”) from the unknowables (i.e., doctrines concerning the Unknowable God?), which can only be conveyed by a superior revelation.
- 50,18 ΧΕ was mistakenly entered by the scribe; the quotation to Allogenes begins in line 21.
- 50,19–20 ΤΑΝΙΕΘΟΥ ΤΗΡΟΥ ΙΟΥΗΛ (cf. 52,14; 55,18.34; 57,25); see also *Zost.* VIII,1.125,12–17, and compare *Allogenes* XI,3:55,12–30. The locution apparently renders ἡ πανένδοξος Ἰουήλ, or the like.
- 50,25 Is this power (cf. 52,15; 57,20; 61,3; 66,20) an initial form of insight?
- 50,26–27 “Father of the All” is frequent in Valentinian literature but *hapax legomenon* in *Allogenes*; cf. 52,28 and note.
- 50,34–36 ΠΕΤΕ ΠΩΚ; perhaps this means one’s blessedness of self-knowledge (cf. 58,34–37; 59,10–13; 60,16–18). On the one who needs no salvation, cf. *Steles Seth* VII,5:125,18–21.
- 51,8 Or “the triple-powered invisible Spirit.”

- 51,8-11 The Aeon of Barbelo surrounds the Triple Powered One as the knowledge of the Invisible Spirit (cf. 49,5-21 and note; cf. the similar image in Plot. *Enn.* II.4.5,31-39; VI.7.17,12-26; 7.21,4-6; 8.18,1-37 and Victorinus, *Adv. Arrium* IV.24,10-20.
- 51,12-38 Cf. note on 45,6-9 and 45,26-30. The Aeon of Barbelo contains the patterns and forms of the Aeons (i.e., the Platonic ideas or intelligibles) that "truly exist"; their image is the Hidden One (cf. note on 45,31-33), their intellectual principle ("word," $\omega\lambda\chi\epsilon = \lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$) is Protophanes (cf. note on 45,33-38), the image of their individuality is Autogenes (cf. note on 46,10-17), and their salvation is Triple Male (cf. note on 45,33-38), the Perfect Youth. The sphere of activity of each is progressively lower: the aeons, human "know-how" and defective nature. On the ordering of the hypostases, cf. Procl. *Theol.* prop. 70, and on their status as images, prop. 65: "All that subsists in any fashion has its being either in its cause ($\kappa\alpha\tau'$ $\alpha\iota\tau\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu$) as originative ($\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\omicron\iota\delta\acute{\omega}\varsigma$; cf. $\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\acute{\eta}$, *Allogenes* XI,3:58,20.23), as a substantial predicate ($\kappa\alpha\theta'$ $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\alpha\rho\acute{\xi}\iota\varsigma$), or by participation ($\kappa\alpha\tau\grave{\alpha}$ $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\theta\epsilon\acute{\xi}\iota\omega$) after the manner of an image" ($\epsilon\acute{\iota}\kappa\omicron\nu\iota\kappa\acute{\omega}\varsigma$; cf. $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\kappa\acute{\omega}\nu$, *Allogenes* XI,3:51,16.21.27), and *In Tim.* I (in Diehl, I.8, lines 13-29): "All things are to be beheld in all things, but either archetypically ($\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\delta\epsilon\iota\gamma\mu\alpha\tau\iota\kappa\acute{\omega}\varsigma$) or substantially ($\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\omega\delta\acute{\omega}\varsigma$) or after the manner of an image ($\epsilon\acute{\iota}\kappa\omicron\nu\iota\kappa\acute{\omega}\varsigma$)." Protophanes here seems to act as a demiurgic intellect ($\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$), receiving the type and forms of true being from Kalyptos by means of an intellectual word ($\omega\lambda\chi\epsilon = \lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$) and imposing those on the individuals, i.e., particulars, perhaps individual souls, much as the demiurge in Plato, *Tim.* 41-42. But here Protophanes functions as the intelligence within individuals; in humans he acts by craft and skill, and in animals by partial instinct.
- 51,23-24 For the cluster: craft, skill, and instinct used in reference to the distinction between the knowledge of men and that of animals who do not possess reason ($\acute{\alpha}\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\iota$), cf. *Corp. Herm. Exc. Stob.* IV,2-3 (Nock-Festugière, III.21).
- 51,29-30 Separately ($\kappa\alpha\tau\grave{\alpha}$ $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omicron\varsigma$; cf. *Marsanes* X,3,21-22 and passim) and individually ($\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha$ $\omicron\gamma\alpha = \kappa\alpha\theta'$ $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$): cf. Procl. *Theol.* prop. 170. Autogenes may here play the role of the $\nu\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\iota$ $\theta\epsilon\omicron\iota$ in Plato, *Tim.* 41-42.
- 51,32-38 Either Barbelo (more likely) or Autogenes is endowed with the Triple Male/Perfect Youth who in Sethian theology is the Anthropos Adamas, cf. *Zost.* VIII,1:6,7-30 and note on 45,31-47,7. In 58,13-14 Triple Male is called Savior, a rare term in Sethian literature. It is also used of Seth in *Gos. Eg.* III,2:68,22.
- 51,36 $\omega\omicron\lambda\chi\eta\epsilon = \beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\eta$, a synonym of the Paternal Intellect in the Chaldean Oracles: Proc. *In Parm.* 800,20-801,5; 941,27-28; Psellus,

In Phys. in PG 122,1128 b8-c7; 1149a 10-11 in des Places, *Oracles*, frg. 37,77,88,107.

51,37 ἄτοϛ is supplied to provide a subject for the sentence.

52,12 At various points, Allogenes is filled with the goodness (52,12.17), blessedness (58,9.35; 59,10-13; 60,16-18), and divinity (52,12) of self-knowledge corresponding to similar attributes of the Aeon of Barbelo and the Triple Powered One (49,6-7; 52,30-32; 62,28-36; 63,33-37).

52,13-15 On Youel, cf. note on 50,19-20; the anointing and empowering seem to be metaphors for revelation and insight (*Zostrianos* employs baptisms and sealings). ἄωϛ may also be rendered "touched."

52,16-33 On ϙβω, cf. note on 50,6-17. The following instruction on the Triple Powered One is derived from him (52,32-33) and given only to the worthy, the properly instructed (cf. 68,16-20; *Zost. VIII, r.4,4-20*; Plot. *Enn.* VI.9.11).

52,28 On "the Universal One that is higher than perfect," cf. 48,10-12; 53,18; in 58,25-26 it is identified with the Triple Powered One.

53,9-18 Apparently the Triple Powered One (as Mentality) moves motionlessly among his objects of thought, the Aeon of Barbelo (cf. note on 45,15-19). As with Aristotle's unmoved mover, so also in the Neoplatonic ontology it is Nous who moves motionlessly (cf. Proc. *Theol.* prop. 20; see also the discussion and parallels by des Places, *Numénius*, p. 110 note 4 and Hadot *Porphyre et Victorinus*, 1.283-97, in particular note 3 p. 287). Perhaps there is a higher and lower intellect: the Triple Powered One (as Mentality, unmoved, in repose), and Barbelo (as νοῦς καθορᾶ, "contemplative intellect," cf. Plato, *Tim.* 39E) who surrounds the Invisible Spirit as his self-knowledge (49,9-14). Plotinus (*Enn.* II.9.1) accuses the Gnostics of distinguishing a νοῦς ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ, "inert intellect" (cf. the self-stilling of the Triple Powered One in 45,22; 53,34 and 59,21-26) and a νοῦς κινούμενος, "demiurgic intellect" (cf. Barbelo), a view entertained by Numenius (in Euseb. *Praep. Ev.* XI.18.20: des Places, *Numénius*, frg. 15) and the earlier Plotinus (*Enn.* III.9.1). Motionless motion in that which governs (ῥῆμμα = κυβερᾶν, "to steer, govern") signifies a stabilizing self-limitation of the Triple Powered One by his "faculty" of self-control; self-limitation alone prevents running away into the boundless (Plot. *Enn.* VI.6.18,9-11).

53,18 "The Universal One that is higher than perfect," i.e., the Triple Powered One, cf. note on 52,28.

53,24-28 These expressions seem to describe the Aeon of Barbelo. For

“the third silence of Mentality,” cf. *Zost.* VIII,1:124,1-4: “a silence of the second knowledge, the First Thought in conjunction with the Triple Powered One.” The second undivided Energy (cf. the undivided activity of 48,35 and note) seems to correspond to Protophanes and the eternal intellectual undivided motion in the level of Vitality (60,19-28) corresponding to the median aspect of the Triple Powered One. The First Thought is probably another term for the Aeon of Barbelo (cf. note on 45,15-19).

- 53,29-31 These expressions seem to describe the Triple Powered One. The Triple Powered One is coordinate (by hendiadys) with “The Indivisible One” in 66,32-35. His separate likenesses may be his Existence, Vitality and Mentality aspects discussed in 49,26-38. The “nonsubstantial Existence” (ὑπαρξίς) seems to be another version of a similar predicate (ΟΥCΙΑ...ΜἨΤΑΤΟΥCΙΑ) of the Triple Powered One in 47,34; in 55,29-30 the aspects of the Triple Powered One are described as nonsubstantial and non-being existence (ΟΥΜἨΤ)ΑΤΟΥCΙΑ ΜἨ [ΟΥΥΥΠΑΡΞΙC] ΝΑΤΨΩΠΕ). For similar terminology see the index in Hadot, *Porphyre et Victorinus*, vol. 2.
- 53,31-32 MS reads ΜἨ ὲΒΟΜ (by attraction from preceding occurrences of ΜἨ). It should read ΑΥΩ ὲΒΟΜ in order to provide an antecedent for ΑCΟΥΩΝ2; the power seems to be the Triple Powered One revealing itself through its “third silence” and “undivided activity” (53,24-26) that appear in the Aeon of Barbelo. Quotation marks in 53,31 mark what appears to be a shift from Youel’s discourse to Allogenes’ description of her ecstasy.
- 53,37-38 The antecedent of “she” (cf. 54,26) is unclear, but it appears to be Youel.
- 54,6-37 Cf. *Steles Seth* VII,5:126,4-17. Apparently Youel (“she,” 54,26) is ecstatically praising the glories (cf. ΠΙΕΦΟ[Υ, *Steles Seth* VII,5:126,4) representing the three levels of the Aeon of Barbelo according to (κατά, 54,8.13) the aspects of Existence, Vitality and Knowledge in the Triple Powered One (cf. notes on 45,31-47,7 and 48,35-49,1). The first level would correspond to Kalyptos, probably praised according to Existence, represented here only by the name Solmis, as in *Zost.* VIII,1:85,22-87,23. *Zost.* VIII,1:126,1-8 calls Solmis the first luminary and god-revealer of the Kalyptos Aeon (cf. also Solmistos in the Bruce Codex: Schmidt-MacDermot, *Bruce Codex*, p. 252, line 22). In Plot. *Enn.* VI.7.40,18-19 the first activity (πρώτη ἐνέργεια) is that which brings an hypostasis into being (οὐσία). The second level (the “first activity,” but called “second indivisible activity” in 53,24-31), would correspond to Protophanes praised according to Vitality. Elsewhere Harmedon is a cognomen of Protophanes (45,36; 58,17; cf.

Steles Seth VII,5:126,12; *Zost.* VIII,t:127,8–9), while Epiphaneus is placed in the fourth aeon of the fourth illuminator Eleleth in the level of Autogenes by *Zost.* VIII,t:127,15–128,7 (spelled Epiphantos). See the close parallel in *Zost.* VIII,t:87,16–88,21. The third level would correspond to Autogenes, praised according to Knowledge. Of the denizens of this level, Lalameu(s) and Noetheu(s) recur later (54,28) and Aphredon occurs in *Steles Seth* VII,5:126.12. Youel (?) then praises what seems to be the entire Triple Powered One of whose glories four are mentioned in the *Three Steles of Seth* (Senaon, self-begotten, 126,6–7; Asineu(s), 126,[7]; Elemaon, the great power, 126,8–9; Optaon, 126,8) and another in *Trim. Prot.* XIII,t:39,2–3 (spelled Mellephanea). On the ascription “Thou art One,” cf. *Steles Seth* VII,5:125,23–25; “Aeon of Aeons” is frequent in all gnostic literature.

- 54,14 Δε cancelled by scribe with a stroke through Δ and a dot over ε.
- 54,16 Emend ἄμοϛ to ἄμο<C> to agree with gender of antecedent ΤΗ.
- 54,21 ερο[κ]: perhaps ερο[ϛ], “he who knows (himself) knows the All,” cf. *Thom. Cont.* II,7:138,13–18.
- 55,12–17 Cf. 45,6–8; reconstruction is suggested by *Steles Seth* VII,5:124,7–10.22–25.
- 55,14 In Proclus the *παντέλειοι* are wholly perfect entities, complete in themselves, that give rise to things complete (*τέλειος*) in their kind (*Proc. Theol. prop.* 64). They correspond to the universal intelligibles or ideas of Platonism (see note on 45,6–9).
- 55,17–19 Reconstruction is suggested by 50,18–20; 52,13–15; 57,24–25.
- 55,19–20 For reconstruction, cf. 59,30–32 and note.
- 55,20–30 Apparently the glories do not exist with the Triple Powered One or its aspects, nor with the components of Barbelo’s Aeon, but only as the attributes of those hypostases: divinity (instead of “Vitality”), blessedness (instead of “Knowledge”) and Existence. The final modality of the glories, nonsubstantial and non-being existence (cf. 55,29–30), seems to correspond to the entire Triple Powered One (cf. note on 53,29–31). For “non-being existence,” cf. 62,23; 65,32–33. The term may derive from speculation on the four modes of non-being in Plato’s *Parmenides* (cf. 161e–162b); see the discussion by Hadot, *Porphyre et Victorinus*, 1.147–211.
- 55,32–35 Compare the note on 55,17–19.
- 55,37 ἄϛ]Α ΟΥΟΥΣΙΑ, perhaps for ἐπέκεινα οὐσίας, a Platonic commonplace; cf. Whittaker, “ΕΠΕΚΕΙΝΑ ΝΟΥ ΚΑΙ ΟΥΣΙΑΣ,” 91–104.

- 56,11-14 The "generation of those who truly exist" would be located in the Hidden One (cf. note on 45,31-33); on the self-begotten ones and the Triple Male, see note on 45,33-38.
- 56,14 The supralinear stroke of $\pi\iota\omega[\overline{\text{MNT}}\text{ZOOY}\tau$ is visible; for the reconstruction, cf. 58,12-16.
- 56,15-20 Reconstruction based on a possible parallel to [Plato], *First Alcibiades*, 130 D4, pointed out by M. Tardieu.
- 56,17 For reconstruction, cf. 52,12.17.
- 56,21-22 $\text{†}\Psi\epsilon\ \bar{\text{N}}\rho\text{OM}\text{Π}\epsilon$: cf. 57,31; 58,8.
- 56,24-25 On $\text{C}\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha\mu\epsilon\zeta$, $\text{C}\epsilon\lambda\mu\epsilon\text{N}$, $\text{A}\rho.$ H, cf. *Zost.* VIII,1:62,18-19; 63,19-21.
- 56,26-27 The Luminaries of the Aeon of Barbelo are restored from *Zost.* VIII,1:62,18-20; 63,19-21; 64,8. Among this triad, Selmen (not Semen as in *Allogenes*) is listed in *Zost.* VIII,1:54,20 as associated with the level of Protophanes, at which level Youel commands Zostrianos (VIII,1:62,17-64,11) to invoke them. They then give the succeeding revelation about the emergence of Barbelo from the Invisible Spirit and Barbelo's levels, Kalyptos, Protophanes, and Autogenes.
- 57-69 On pl. 4 and 63-78 of the *Facsimile Edition: Codices XI, XII, XIII*, the codex page numbers should each be reduced by two; cf. *Facsimile Edition: Codices XI, XII, XIII*, p. XVII.
- 57,1-3 The fragment appearing here in the *Facsimile Edition: Codices XI, XII, XIII*, pl. 63 has been placed on 49,1-3.
- 57,6-23 The attempt to apprehend anything above one's own level is futile; it is rather that the higher level, whose identity or being ($\text{Π}\eta\ \epsilon\tau\epsilon\ \text{Π}\alpha\iota\ \text{Π}\epsilon=\tau\delta\ \acute{\alpha}\nu$, cf. 49,28-29.33.35-36) is apprehended by the comprehender, in turn aids the comprehender to achieve at a level higher than the comprehended. But if one only remains at one's own level ($\phi\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\iota\varsigma$, "nature"), even if he has an incorporeal nature, he remains inferior since he does not associate with any superiority or any inferiority; he is both everywhere and nowhere (cf. *Zost.* VIII,1: 21,6-7; the incorporeal living thoughts are everywhere and nowhere—said of incorporeal reality by Plot. *Enn.* III.9.4; VI.4.3, 17-19; VI.8.16, and Porphyry *Sent.* 27,31,38,40). This seeming inability to control one's station is nearly cause for *Allogenes'* despair (57,27-28).
- 57,24-27 The end of the Youel revelations (45,6-49,38; 50,21-51,38; 52,15-55,11; 55,19-30; 55,35-57,24); the next revelations are from the Luminaries of the Aeon of Barbelo (59,9-60,12; 61,25-68,top, or 61,23 depending on whether "I" in 68,17 and "he" in 68,24 are the same as the powers mentioned in 61,24 and "we" in 67,25). On the structure of the ascent, see Introduction IV.

- 57,27-58,26 Allogenes' reaction to the revelation while still in the flesh (cf. 58,26-33) involves an incubation period of "a hundred years" (57,31; 58,8) and is characterized by the blessedness (57,34; 58,9-11) of self-knowledge.
- 58,1-3 The fragment appearing here in the *Facsimile Edition: Codices XI, XII, XIII*, pl. 64 has been placed on 50,1-3.
- 58,12-26 Allogenes achieves the first stage of the ascent, the vision of all the beings up until the Triple Powered One. These ascending levels and their (somewhat confused) corresponding characteristics are separated below by semicolons: Autogenes with goodness and divinity (in *Ap. John* BG 8502, r:30,14-19 Autogenes is anointed with and characterized by goodness; cf. *Iren. Haer.* I.29,1; *Gos. Eg.* III,2:44, 22-24=IV,2:55,11-14 and *Trim. Prot.* XIII, r:37,30-33); Triple Male/Savior with perfection; Protophanes/Harmedon with the goodness of the Triple Male; Kalyptos with blessedness; the Aeon of Barbelo with divinity; and finally the primal origin (ἀρχή) of Barbelo, the Triple Powered One. See the note on 45,31-47,7, and *Zost.* VIII, r:20,4-16. Barbelo is called the "primary origin" (ἠορη ἡ ἀρχὴ=προαρχή; cf. *Iren. Haer.* I.5,3; *Hipp. Ref.* VI,38.2) of blessedness, which is an alternate designation of the Mentality aspect of the Triple Powered One (cf. note on 62,27-63,1). Likewise, the Triple Powered One is the primary origin (προαρχή) of the "one without origin" (presumably Barbelo).
- 58,26 MS reads **ΕΤΑΥΤΟΡΠ̄** but the third sg. masc. pronoun has no antecedent; **ΕΤΑΥΤΟΡΠ̄** ("when I was taken") must have been intended.
- 58,26-59,9 The earthly vision of the Aeon of Barbelo is concluded, and Allogenes is raptured from the flesh (ἔνδυμα, 58,29; cf. *Plot. Enn.* I.6.7,5-7) to a holy place with no earthly analogy (cf. the ἵπερουράνιος τόπος in Plato, *Phaed.* 247c). Presumably he has risen to the level of Mentality in the Triple Powered One, where he now sees the things previously known to him only by hearing. He transcends his own active knowledge (γνώσις; cf. **СВΩ**, 50,11.16; 52,16) and participates in the knowledge of the Aeons (ἡπιτηρῶ, 59,3) of Barbelo. The ensuing ecstatic ascent will test, or confirm (πειράζειν, 59,8), his earthly knowledge.
- 59,3 On the Universals, cf. 62,20-21.
- 59,9-60,12 After Allogenes has attained the level of self-knowledge (blessedness, 58,35; 59,10; 60,17), the Luminaries ready him for the comprehension of the ontological levels of the Triple Powered One.
- 59,10-13 The level of (self-)knowledge; cf. note on 60,14-18.

- 59,14-18 The level of Vitality is achieved by seeking oneself; cf. note on 60,19-28. On "fear" cf. 59,32-33 and Plot. *Enn.* V.5.4,8-10; VI.9.3, 1-13.
- 59,18-26 The level of Existence; cf. note on 60,28-37. The one who truly is at rest is the Triple Powered One; cf. 60,34-37. On "standing and being still" cf. Plot. *Enn.* VI.9.11,12-16 and Williams, "Stability in Gnosticism," 819-29.
- 59,26-60,12 The primary revelation of the Unknowable One or Invisible Spirit, whose level cannot be achieved, but only revealed; cf. note on 61,28-67,20.
- 59,30-32 See also 60,8-12; 61,17-19; cf. Dam. *Dub. et sol.* 70 (Ruelle, I.154, lines 16-18): "Were you to incline your intellect so as to know that one as if knowing something (with the mind), you shall not know that one" (ἤν γὰρ ἐπεγκλίνῃς σὸν νοῦν κἀκεινο νοήσης ὡς τι νοῶν, οὐ κείνο νοήσεις); also found in des Places, *Oracles*, p. 66: frg. 1, lines 2-3; cf. ἔστιν αὐτοῦ (i.e., the first cause) γνώσις ἢ ἀγνωσία, Erbse, p. 183, line 26; θεωρεῖται δὲ ἀγνωσία, Porph. *Sent.* 25 in Lamberz, p. 15, lines 1-6; Anon. Parm. Comm. II,15-31 in Hadot, *Porphyre et Victorinus*, 2.68-71 and note on 48,9-49,1.
- 59,32-60,12 The fear is fear of the infinite, cf. note on 59,14-18. On "that place" cf. 58,31. The "activities" from which Allogenes is to retreat are active attempts at knowledge; only "ignorant" knowledge characterized by "stilling oneself" (59,37; cf. Plot. *Enn.* V.5.8,5) and "inactivity" (60,7) is receptive of primary revelation of the Unknowable One, apparently even for the aeons and glories (i.e., "these" of 60,1). "Withdraw to the rear" occurs also in Plot. *Enn.* III.8.9,29-32; cf. VI.9.3,1-13.
- 60,5 $\bar{\rho}\epsilon\nu[\epsilon\rho\eta\iota]$: possibly $\bar{\rho}\epsilon\nu[\epsilon\zeta]$, "be eternal"; cf. *Corp. Herm.* XI,20 (Nock-Festiguère, I.155).
- 60,14-61,22 This section describes Allogenes' ascent through the levels of the Triple Powered One and receipt of the primary revelation of the Unknowable One.
- 60,14-18 The level of Mentality is characterized by silence and blessedness, a synonym for Intellection (of oneself, cf. 58,34-37; 59,10-13).
- 60,18 MS reads $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\rho\omicron\varsigma$; the emendation is based on 59,12-13.
- 60,19-28 MS (60,20) reads $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\kappa\omega\tau\epsilon \bar{\eta}\varsigma\omega\varsigma$; the emendation is based on 59,14. The level of Vitality is entered by "infirm" standing since it is characterized by the "eternal intellectual undivided motion," probably circular (cf. Plot. *Enn.* VI.8.18,25-30; cf. Procl. *Theol. prop.* 33), undergone by the formless unlimited powers, which when limited, will become the ideas of the Intellect (cf. Plot. *Enn.* VI.7.17,13-26). Likewise, Allogenes cannot stand firmly in a place "boiling with life" (Plot. *Enn.* VI.7.12,23).

- 60,28–37 The level of Existence is static and still (ΖΟΡΚ ἤμοσ=ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ); cf. the permanence (μονή) of the triad: μονή, πρόοδος, ἐπιστροφή. Through revelation, Allogenes approximates (κατ' εἰκόνα, cf. note on 51,12–38) the stillness of the “Indivisible One” and the “One who is at rest” (hendiadys for the Triple Powered One, cf. 53,29–31 and note); cf. Anon. Parm. Comm. XIV,22–23 in Hadot, *Porphyre et Victorinus*, 2.110–11.
- 60,37–61,22 This important passage seems to imply the existence of two exalted beings: (1) the Unknowable One (61,1), the First One unknowable to them all, the God beyond perfection (61,10–12); the Unknowable God (61,16), the Mediator of the Triple Powered One; and (2) the Triple Powered One (61,6.13.20). For discussion, see Introduction IV and notes on 45,13 and 53,9–18. Most of the phrases enumerated may be hendiadys (as in 60,36–37; cf. 53,29–31 and note), but the term Mediator (μεσιτής, 61,19) applied to the Unknowable God introduces a fundamental ambiguity: if the Unknowable One is the highest principle, equivalent to Plotinus' One, how can it mediate the Triple Powered One without forsaking its primacy?
- 61,28–67,20 “primary revelation and a revelation”: unless this is ditto-graphy or another form of textual disturbance, or a case of hendiadys, it seems that “primary revelation” may refer to the negative theology (*via negationis*) section which follows (for examples see Hipp. *Ref.* VII,20.2–21.3; Plot. *Enn.* VI passim; Albinus, Ἐπιτομή, X). “Revelation,” on the other hand, may refer to a more “positive” theology. Thus the preferred “primary” negative theology in 61,32–63,27 (heavily dependent on the *Apocryphon of John*; see below) is followed by 63,28–67,20, which, while still using contrasting negative statements, is distinctly more affirmative. According to the latter, one receives “revelation” (64,30–36) about “That One” (64,25; cf. 64,37; 66,18) who “appears” (65,21; cf. 66,32) and “gives power” (67,19).
- 61,32–62,2 “something” (λαλαγ= Greek τί) in Stoic thought is the highest category of reality, encompassing both (corporeal) being and (incorporeal) non-being; see the discussion and parallels by Hadot, *Porphyre et Victorinus*, 1.159–61. “Exists and will become” (ϰωσοπ αγω κηαωωπε) is awkward. ωωπε may be the translator's equivalent to ὑπάρχειν. ἐνεργεῖν and κῶζ seem to be out of sequence and ατγπαρζις seems gratuitous. The original may have read: τὸ δὲ τί ἐστι ἢ ἔστι, ὅτι ἢ ὑπάρχει ἢ ζῶει ἢ νοεῖ ἐνεργοῦν ἀνευ νοῦ οὔτε ζωῆς οὔτε ὑπάρξεως ἀκαταλήπτως. “Now he is something (in the most general sense) in that he exists, seeing that he either exists or lives or knows, acting without mind or life or existence in an incomprehensible way.” The same phraseology is found

in Victorinus, *Adv. Arium* IV,23,19–22; cf. the note on 49,26–38 above. The substitution of ὑπαρξίς for τὸ ὄν in the triad occurs in Damascius who may have found it already in the second-century Chaldean Oracles (see discussion and citations in Hadot, *Porphyre et Victorinus*, 1.267–69). [Π]Η ΕΤΨΟΟΠ ΕΤΠ̄ΤΑϚ in 62,2 and without ΕΤΨΟΟΠ in 62,32 (negated); 63,20 and 63,21 (negated): “that being which is proper to him” seems to mean something like a property or attribute peculiar to a thing as distinguished from the thing itself. It may render the Greek ἡ ἰδιότης “specific property”; see the discussion by Hadot, *Porphyre et Victorinus*, 2.99 note 4.

62,3 [Ε]ΝCΕΨΩϚΠ̄: space requires restoration of ε producing a hanging negated circumstantial phrase. To judge from ΕΜΕΥ (line 6) a negated second tense is called for, i.e., ΝΕΥΨΟΟΠ ΑΝ (“it is not in any way that he is left over”).

62,3–6 These terms may be alchemical or metallurgical.

62,6–7 ΨΩϚΠ̄ (62,16; 63,25–26), ΨΑΧΖϚ (62,7), ΨΑΖΧϚ (62,26,27; 67,32) appear to be an euphonic metathesis and ΑΤΨΑΧΖϚ (63,27), judging from its context, is an unattested word apparently meaning “to diminish.” The passages 62,2–27; 63,25–27 and 67,16–17,32 which utilize this term reflect the Platonic conception of undiminished emanation (cf. Plot. *Enn.* III.8.8,46–8.10,19; V.1.3 and 1.6) which Dodds (*Proclus: Theology*, 26–27, notes) traces back to the Middle Stoa. It is found often, e.g., Wis 7:27 and in Euseb. *Praep. Ev.* XI.18.15–19 (des Places, *Numémius*, frg. 46). In *Enn.* V.4.2,13–28 Plotinus refers this idea back to Plato, *Tim.* 42E of the demiurge abiding in his own proper state while the junior gods make the mortal body.

62,8–11 For readings at end of line, see *Facsimilie Edition: Codices XI, XII, XIII*, pl.4.

62,13–14 “it does not affect him”: Ν̄ΝΕΨΑϚΕΙ ΑΝ ΕΖΡΑΪ ΕΡΟϚ, a negated second habitude; lit. “it is not upon him that it is wont to come.”

62,17–27 This passage concludes (cf. ΕΤΒΕ ΠΑΪ, 62,17–18) the portion of the negative theology due to the composer of *Allogenes* (i.e., 61,32–62,27), as can be seen from his characteristic terminology: “Mind and Life” (62,19), “non-being Existence” (62,23), “silence and stillness” (62,25), “(un)diminished” (62,26–27). Beginning in 63,28 and continuing through p. 67 the propositions are distinctly more affirmative, though many negative locutions occur. It stresses the unknowability of the positive attributes of the highest divinity. The intervening material (62,28–63,27), characterized by the repeated phrase ΕϚCΟΤΠ̄ Ε-, “he is superior to,” sustains an extremely close verbal

parallel with a portion of the shorter version of the Coptic *Ap. John* BG 8502,2:23,3-26,13 (especially 24,9-25,9). This parallel is so close as to suggest that *Allogenes* is dependent on some form of the *Apocryphon of John* close to the BG version, or else upon the common prototype upon which both texts drew. Cf. Plato, *Parm.* 137c-142a.

62,20-27 **ΝΙΠΤΗΡ̄** (cf. 59,3: the “Universals”) may be the all-perfect ones (**παντελείοι**) of 55,14-15; that is, the universal intelligibles or ideas of Platonism (see the note on 45,6-9).

62,23 On “non-being Existence,” cf. 55,30; 65,32-33.

62,27-63,1 Cf. *Ap. John* BG 8502,2:24,9-13: **ΟΥΔΕ ΝΟΥ/Μ̄ΝΤΤΕΛΙΟΣ ΔΝ ΠΕ ΟΥΔΕ ΝΟΥ/Μ̄ΝΤΝΑΪΔΤϚ ΔΝ ΠΕ ΝΟΥΜ̄ΝΤΝΟ[Υ]/ΤΕ ΔΝ ΠΕ ΑΛΛΑ ΟΥΖΩΒ ΕΦСОТ[Π]/ΝΖΟΥΟ ΕΡΟΟΥ ΠΕ** (Till-Schenke, *Papyrus Berolinensis 8502*). The order of predicates in *Allogenes* XI,3:62,28-30 is the reverse of those in BG. In the *Allogenes* passage, 62,30-37 (**ΑΛΛΑ ΟΥΛΑΔΥ... ἄνωγετελιος ΔΝ ΠΕ**) is interpolated into the BG material (between **ΝΟΥΜ̄ΝΤΝΟΥΤΕ ΔΝ ΠΕ** [24,10-11]) and **ΑΛΛΑ ΟΥΖΩΒ** [24,11]) to stress that the divinity, blessedness, and perfection, which function as attributes of the Unknowable God in the BG passage, are in *Allogenes* understood as reifications (“entities of”) of the Unknowable God (or Triple Powered One) that characterize the respective members of the ontological triad: Being or Existence, Vitality, and Mentality (cf. note on 58,12-26). The same point is made in 63,33-64,4. The identification between blessedness and intelligence is made in *Zost.* VIII,1:15,3-12 and in Victorinus, *Adv. Arium* I,52,3-5 in Hadot, *Porphyre et Victorinus*, 2.31. On the translation of 62,31-32 see the note on 61,32-62,2.

63,1-8 Cf. BG 8502,2:24,13-19: **ΟΥΔΕ ΝΟΥΑΠΙ/ΡΟС ΔΝ ΠΕ ΟΥΔΕ ΜΠΟΥ† ΤΩΨ ΕΡΟϚ/ΑΛΛΑ ΟΥΖΩΒ ΕΦСОТΠ ΕΡΟΟΥ ΠΕ Ϛ[Ε]/ΝΟΥСΩΜΑΤΙΚΟС ΔΝ ΠΕ ΝΟΥΑТ/СΩΜΑ ΔΝ ΠΕ ΟΥΝΟБ ΔΝ ΠΕ ΝΟ[Υ]/ΚΟΥΪ ΔΝ ΠΕ ΟΥΗΡ ΔΝ ΠΕ ΝΟΥ/ΤΑΜΙΟ ΔΝ ΠΕ** (Till-Schenke, *Papyrus Berolinensis 8502*). This parallel shows that **ηπε** (“number,” 63,8) translates the Greek *ποσότης* or *ποσόν*, “quantity.”

63,5-10 Beginning of lines preserved in *Facsimile Edition: Codices XI, XII, XIII*, pl. 4.

63,9-13 The order of the phrases (ABC) in BG 8502,2:24,19-22: (A) **ΟΥΔΕ ΝΕΨΛΑΔ[Υ]/ΝΟΪ ΜΜΟΥ** (B) **ΟΥΛΑΔΥ <Δ>Ν ΕΠΤΗΡϚ/ΕΤΨΟΟΠ** (C) **ΑΛΛΑ ΟΥΖΩΒ ΕΦСОТ[ТΠ]/ΕΡΟΟΥ ΠΕ** occurs as BACA in *Allogenes* with minor variations (the first occurrence of A is positive, not negative).

63,14-17 Material not in BG either derives from the common prototype, or more likely is an interpolation by the composer of *Allogenes* into his prototype of material proper to *Allogenes* in terms of primary

revelation = self-knowledge. The Unknowable God does not possess attributes of existing things and thus cannot be known by them, but he can only be known by himself. Cf. Anon. Parm. Comm. V,32-34 in Hadot, *Porphyre et Victorinus*, 2.80-83: "(The divine) knowledge is not as one knowing the known; rather he is this knowledge."

63,18-21 Cf. *Ap. John* III,1:5,16: $\bar{\nu}\bar{o}\gamma\lambda\lambda\alpha\gamma \ \alpha\bar{n} \ \bar{\nu}\bar{\epsilon} \ \bar{\nu}\bar{\tau}\bar{\epsilon} \ \bar{\nu}\bar{\epsilon}\tau\psi\omega\sigma\pi$ and BG 8502,2:24,21-25,1: $\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha \ \omicron\gamma\zeta\omega\bar{\nu} \ \epsilon\upsilon\varsigma\omicron[\tau\pi\bar{\iota}]/\epsilon\rho\omicron\omicron\gamma \ \bar{\nu}\bar{\epsilon} \ \omicron\gamma\chi \ \omega\varsigma \ \epsilon\upsilon\varsigma\omicron\tau\pi \ \alpha\lambda[\lambda\alpha]/\zeta\omega\varsigma \ \epsilon\pi\omega\varsigma \ \bar{\mu}\bar{\mu}\bar{\iota}\bar{n} \ \bar{\mu}\bar{\mu}\omicron\varsigma \ [\bar{\nu}\bar{\epsilon}]$ (Till-Schenke, *Papyrus Berolinensis* 8502). The Unknowable God strictly speaking cannot be compared in terms of his own attributes. The composer of *Allogenes* changes the $\omicron\gamma\chi \ \omega\varsigma \ \epsilon\upsilon\varsigma\omicron\tau\pi \ \alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha \ \zeta\omega\varsigma \ \epsilon\pi\omega\varsigma \ \bar{\mu}\bar{\mu}\bar{\iota}\bar{n} \ \bar{\mu}\bar{\mu}\omicron\varsigma \ \bar{\nu}\bar{\epsilon}$: "not as his being better, but as his being his own specific character" to $\bar{\nu}\bar{\theta}\bar{\epsilon} \ \bar{\mu}\bar{\pi}\bar{\eta} \ \epsilon\tau\bar{\eta}\bar{\nu}\bar{\tau}\alpha\varsigma \ \alpha\gamma\omega \ \bar{\mu}\bar{\pi}\bar{\eta} \ \alpha\bar{n} \ \epsilon\tau\bar{\eta}\bar{\nu}\bar{\tau}\alpha\varsigma$ to stress the superiority of the Unknowable God with respect both to his own specific character and to the specific character of anything else. See also notes on 61,32-62,2 and 62,27-63,1. *Ap. John* III,1:5,18-19 takes $\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha \ \bar{\nu}\bar{\epsilon}\tau\bar{\epsilon} \ \bar{\nu}\bar{\omega}\varsigma \ \bar{\nu}\bar{\epsilon}$ as the subject of $\bar{\mu}\bar{\pi}\bar{\tau}\bar{\mu}\bar{\epsilon}\tau\bar{\epsilon}\chi\bar{\epsilon}$: "but that which is his did not participate...." The more difficult reading is to be preferred here.

63,21-25 Cf. BG 8502,2:25,1-7: $\bar{\nu}\bar{\epsilon}\varsigma/\bar{\mu}\bar{\epsilon}\tau\bar{\epsilon}\chi\bar{\epsilon} \ \alpha\bar{n} \ \epsilon\gamma\alpha\bar{\iota}\omega\bar{n} \ \omicron\gamma\omicron\epsilon\bar{\iota}\omega/\alpha\bar{n} \ \bar{\nu}\bar{\epsilon}\tau\psi\omega\sigma\pi \ \bar{\nu}\alpha\varsigma \ (\bar{\nu}\bar{\epsilon}\tau\bar{\mu}\bar{\epsilon}\tau\bar{\epsilon}/\chi\bar{\epsilon} \ \gamma\alpha\rho \ \epsilon\gamma\alpha\bar{\iota}\omega\bar{n} \ \zeta\bar{\eta}\bar{\kappa}\omicron\omicron\upsilon\gamma\bar{\epsilon} \ \bar{\nu}\bar{\epsilon}\rho/\varsigma\omicron\bar{\nu}\bar{\tau}\bar{\epsilon} \ \zeta\alpha\rho\omicron\varsigma \ \alpha\gamma\omega \ \omicron\gamma\omicron\epsilon\bar{\iota}\omega \ \bar{\nu}\bar{\epsilon}/\epsilon\bar{\mu}\bar{\rho}\omicron\gamma\bar{\iota} \ \tau\omega\psi \ \epsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma \ \zeta\omega\varsigma \ \epsilon\bar{\nu}\bar{\tau}\bar{\iota}/\chi\bar{\iota} \ \alpha\bar{n} \ \bar{\nu}\bar{\tau}\bar{\eta} \ \kappa\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\alpha \ \epsilon\upsilon\bar{\tau}\bar{\iota} \ \tau\omega\psi \ [=for he who participates an aeon has been prepared for by others, and time has not been limited, as it were, by further limitation]) \ / \ \alpha\gamma\omega \ \upsilon\bar{\rho}\chi\bar{\rho}\bar{\iota}\alpha \ \alpha\bar{n} \ \bar{\mu}\bar{\eta}\lambda\lambda\alpha\gamma \ \psi\omega\sigma\pi/\epsilon\bar{\pi}\bar{\tau}\bar{\eta}\bar{\rho}\varsigma \ \zeta\alpha\tau\bar{\upsilon}\bar{\epsilon}\zeta\bar{\eta}$ (Till-Schenke, *Papyrus Berolinensis* 8502). *Allogenes* seems to reflect only the material prior to the parentheses, although one should compare 65,21-24 with the material before and after the parentheses.

63,26 Note marking on left margin; perhaps —| or |—?

63,33-64,4 Compare notes on 61,32-63,2; 62,27-63,1; and 63,18-21. The two negated abstracts at 63,35-36 seem to suggest that the blessedness and perfection characterizing the Unknowable One are not to be confused with the blessedness and perfection which are "an entity of his" (62,28-36). Elsewhere blessedness is associated with the Triple Powered One (49,6; 52,31), especially as the source of its Mentality aspect (54,16); it is possessed by Kalyptos (58,18.20) and by Allogenes (58,9.35; 59,10); it is equated with the glories (55,28) and "heard" by Allogenes (60,17).

63,35 MS reads $\bar{\mu}\bar{\pi}\bar{\iota}\bar{\mu}\bar{\alpha}\kappa\bar{\alpha}\rho\bar{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$; elsewhere the phrase is $\bar{\tau}\bar{\mu}\bar{\eta}\bar{\tau}\bar{\mu}\bar{\alpha}\kappa\bar{\alpha}\rho\bar{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$; see the index.

64,5-6 Fragment preserving ends of lines placed subsequent to photo in

Facsimile Edition: Codices XI, XII, XIII. See the addenda et corrigenda in the Facsimile Edition: Introduction.

64,8-14 See the note on 63,14-19.

64,14-36 The restoration/emendation [εω]/ <χε οῡνωγα εφναγ εροϷ> is supplied to complete the protasis of the sentence extending through 64,21 on the supposition that it was omitted by homoioteleuton and haplography. Anyone who knows the deity in a positive way, and not by being ignorant of him, sins against him. Yet since the deity is totally self-sufficient and without need, he cannot concern himself with punishing the sinner, who actually punishes himself by depriving himself of his object, the origin or principle (ἀρχή) that really is. Without the eye or sight of revelation (i.e., primary revelation, perhaps self-knowledge?) which stills itself (by being activated from without, not by activating itself, which would be active rather than passive or "ignorant" cognition—cf. 65,26-28), such a one is blind. The source of the revelation seems to be the Triple Powered One of the First Ennoia of the Invisible Spirit (the same locution occurs in *Zost. VIII,1:20,15-19* absolutely, without genitives). On the problem of ambiguity concerning the Triple Powered One, cf. notes on 60,37-61,22 and 53,9-18.

64,20 οοπ written over erased . ατ.

64,28 Emendation: assuming loss of Ϸ through haplography. But perhaps it originally read $\bar{\eta}\tau\omicron\omicron\langle\omicron\rangle\epsilon\omicron\lambda\bar{\eta}\mu\omicron\omicron$.

65,37-67,20 The negative theology is here applied to the Triple Powered One.

65,21-24 Cf. 63,21-25 and note.

65,22-23 $\bar{\rho}$ χρια takes a compound direct object $\bar{\eta}\omicron\chi\rho\nu\omicron\sigma$ and $\bar{\eta}\omicron\gamma\epsilon\omega\nu$; the $\epsilon\omicron\lambda\bar{\eta}$ is unnecessary. Perhaps the scribe was thinking of $\chi\iota\epsilon\omicron\lambda\bar{\eta}$, "participate."

65,24-30 The Triple Powered One is unfathomable (beyond knowledge), inactive (beyond vitality) and beyond existence (since he is non-being existence, 62,23 and 65,32-33).

65,30-32 While $\bar{\eta}\bar{\eta}\omicron\gamma\tau\omicron\pi\omicron\sigma$ ("spatially") implies corporeality, for incorporeality, one might expect $\bar{\eta}\bar{\eta}\omicron\gamma\tau\omicron\pi\omicron\sigma\alpha\bar{\eta}$. For the contrast cf. Philo, *Conf.* 136; *Somn.* I.63; Plot. *Enn.* III.9.4; VI.8.16; Porph. *Sent.* 1,2,31,38 in Lamberz; Victorinus, *Adv. Arium* I.50,8-10 in Hadot, *Porphyre et Victorinus*, 2.29 and *Zost. VIII,2:21,6-7*. $\bar{\eta}\bar{\eta}\omicron\gamma\tau\omicron\pi\omicron\sigma$ probably renders *οἰκείως*, "properly."

65,32-33 Cf. 55,30; 62,23.

65,34-35 The Triple Powered One causes the existence of the self-sufficient beings by doing nothing to cause their existence; he simply exists unto himself, having no desire to create anything else; cf. Procl.

Theol. props. 8–10: the Good has no ἔφρσις (desire) or ὄρεξις (appetite), but is only ἐφρετόν (desired) and ὄρεκτόν (craved).

66,16–38 This section seems to be similar (cf. 45,21–27; 49,7–21) and yet to contradict (cf. 48,14–16) other sections of *Allogenes*, thus suggesting separate sources. Here it is said that the Triple Powered One does not receive power (66,20) and does not grant being (66,27–28), while 45,25–26 suggests that he does receive power and 48,14–16 suggests that he does grant being. Furthermore, the way in which the Triple Powered One emanates from the Invisible Spirit here (i.e., “being at rest” [“stilled”], standing forth [ἀζερατ-], and appearing [οὔωῃζ εβολ]) as an Eternal Life surrounding all else) is similar to but uses different terminology from 45,22–26 (being stilled, being extended [πορω εβολ], and becoming perfect [ῑ τελιος]). While here the Triple Powered One is “at rest” and is “boundless,” in 49,7–21 he is “transverser of the boundlessness of the Invisible Spirit.” It is possible that “an Eternal Life” (οὔωῃζ ῑωαεεζ) may be syncope for “eternal revelation,” but “revelation” should require εβολ, and “Life” certainly seems to be the proceeding aspect or emanating modality of the Triple Powered One of the Invisible Spirit. The triad, boundless, powerless and non-existent, seems comprised of negatives of the triad, Being or Existence, Life or Vitality, Knowledge or Mentality (which is the stage at which boundless Life becomes bounded and defined as intellect in contemplative reversion upon its source).

67,16 ε of εταq read in ultraviolet light.

67,36–38 οὔαεῑῑ and εκαχιτοὔ betray some Subachmimic influence. οὔαεῑῑ must be emended either to <ῑμοq> οὔαεῑῑ (“know only him,” i.e., the Unknowable One who is at rest) or to οὔαεῑ <ῑηνε> (“that you alone know and that they speak with one another,” i.e., that *Allogenes* should know the Unknowable One directly and that “they,” perhaps Messos and his associates, should know through *Allogenes*, the “other [ἄλλος] one” who mediates the revelation). Why *Allogenes* is referred to in the plural (ῑτεῑῑεῑμε) is puzzling, unless perhaps we assume both he and Youel are here addressed, or unless we have redaction by someone other than the author of *Allogenes*, as the sudden introduction of Subachmimic features might suggest.

68,16–23 The final instructions to *Allogenes* (by one of the Luminaries or their powers, 61,24) require him to record the revelation for his successors, to leave it on a mountain (the *topos* of revelation) and

“call up” the “guardian,” the “Dreadful One,” probably a demon to strike fear into the hearts of unauthorized users. “Book” may be the author’s designation for the genre of *Allogenes*; cf. “books of Allogenes,” 69,18–19 and Epiph. *Pan.* XXXIX.5.1; XL.2.2.

68,24–69,19 *Allogenes* is left alone full of joy having written down the revelation as a witness to Messos, who is apparently to go himself and proclaim (69,14–15) its content “as the seal,” (in the sense of the conclusion of a series) “of all the books of *Allogenes*” (Schenke’s suggestion [††ε]ϸφραγic, “the five seals” [“Gnostic Sethianism,” 603] is too long for the lacuna). On the plurality of such books, see Introduction, Section II. Compare the command to preach to the worthy in *Zost.* VIII,1:4,4–20. The name “*Allogenes*” occurs in 69,20 as the title of the tractate, “The *Allogenes*” (cf. *Porph. Vit. Plot.* 16). Apparently all of p. 69 was inset from the left margin, and each of lines 1–19 was decorated with a reversed *diple obelismene* to the left and to the right approximately two *dipleis* followed by a *diple obelismene*. The titles of *Allogenes* and of the following tractate (*Hypsiphron*) in lines 19–20 are each prefaced with a reversed *diple obelismene* and surrounded above and below with short obeli with serifs at their ends.

69,17 “for”: cf. translation of ⲛⲧⲉ in *Apoc. Adam* V,5:67,3–4.

INTRODUCTION

NHC XI,4: HYPHSIPHURNE, 69,21–72,37

Bibliography: Doresse, *Secret Books*, 144, 157; Krause, “Zum koptischen Handschriftenfund,” 109–11; Krause-Labib, *Gnostische und hermetische Schriften*, 12; Puech, “Les nouveaux écrits gnostiques,” 106; Robinson, “Codicology.”

This small tractate, which occupies the last four pages of Codex XI, consists of only four large and two small fragments containing the lower portion of both margins of two leaves. The margins are separated by a large vertical gap in the center. No top and bottom margins are extant. The texture and fibers of these fragments match the texture and fibers of the first two surviving leaves of the codex (69/70 + 1/2 and 71/72 + the front flyleaf), thus suggesting that they constitute parts of the same respective sheets. It is therefore probable that the codex, and hence this tractate, concluded with p. 72. Although there has been no codicological confirmation, it appears that fragments 1 and 2 in the *Facsimile Edition: Codices XI, XII, XIII*, pl. 82 (see below, “Codex XI: Fragments, Hand 2”) may belong somewhere in this short tractate to judge from extant vocabulary: $\alpha\gamma\omega \alpha\epsilon\iota\text{N}$ (= $\alpha\epsilon\iota\text{N}[\alpha\gamma]$, frg. 1 \uparrow , line 3; cf. $\text{N}\alpha\gamma$ in 69,23; 71,22; 72,20. $\alpha\epsilon\text{I}\tau\alpha\text{M}\text{O}\text{O}\gamma$, frg. 1 \rightarrow , line 3; cf. $\tau\alpha\text{M}\text{O}$ in 70,17; 72,24–26. And possibly an occurrence of the name Hypsiphurone in frg. 2 \rightarrow , line 5: $\overline{\text{I}}\text{N}\text{H} \epsilon\text{I}\text{C} \text{Z}\text{H}$ [= $\overline{[\text{Y}\Psi\text{I}\Phi\text{R}\text{O}]\text{N}\text{H}}$ $\epsilon\text{I}\text{C}$ $\text{Z}\text{H}[\text{H}\text{T}\epsilon?$], although the supralinear stroke is not regular.

The superscript title “Hypsiph[urone]” (69,21) is only partially extant: $\text{Y}\Psi\text{I}\Phi$]. Both Doresse and Puech took it to be $\text{Y}\Psi\text{I}\Phi[\text{T}\text{O}\text{C}]$, the second member of the subscript title to the next-to-last tractate that read “The Supreme Allogenes” (see the Codex Introduction, Section IV). Since the body of text below these titles contains the readings $\text{I}\Phi\text{R}\text{O}\text{N}\text{H}$ (69,23), $\text{Y}\Psi\text{I}\Phi\text{R}\text{O}/\text{N}\text{H}$ (70,22–23) and $\text{Y}\Psi\text{I}\Phi\text{R}\text{O}\text{N}\text{H}$ (72,21), the title on 69,21 may be safely restored as $\text{Y}\Psi\text{I}\Phi[\text{R}\text{O}\text{N}\text{H}]$, and taken to be the superscript title of the fourth tractate. Since the conclusion of the fourth tractate is not extant, there can be no confirmation from a final subtitle that may have existed at the bottom of p. 72.

The script of *Hypsiphurone* is identical with that of *Allogenes*; the only feature of note is the substitution of the diaeresis above the y

in “Hypsiphronē” instead of the Coptic ζ to mark the rough breathing (69,21; 70,22; 72,21). To the extent that this can be determined from the extant fragments, the Coptic dialect is standard Sahidic, and thus differs slightly from the dialect of *Allogenes*.

Even with the title “Hypsiphronē” (“She of High Mind,” apparently derived from ὕψιφρων), the character of this small tractate is obscure. The *incipit* designates the text a “book” or “scroll” (69,22) that contains [things] (69,22–23) either seen by or communicated to Hypsiphronē (69,23–24) in the “place” of (her) “virginity” (69,25; 70,15.19.24). Although there is mention of a plurality of persons speaking (69,29), the tractate does not appear to be a dialogue; rather, the conversation with “her brethren” (69,27) must be a setting for the first-person narrative that occupies the rest of the tractate, in which dialogue is reported, in part, with a certain Phainops (ΦΑΙΝΩΨ), cf. φαίωψ, “bright-eyed,” 70,26.[29]; 72,19; cf. 69,27–28).

The tractate therefore appears to be a first-person revelation narrative, which relates the descent of Hypsiphronē (the speaker) into the world (70,20–21) and the response of others who had already come into the world, but whose abode was in the place of her virginity. The fragmentary state of the tractate makes it impossible to trace the course of the discourse.

[Θ]

(Lines 1-13 lacking)

- 14 [10[±]]ο^ι αἶει [εβολ
[επιτο]πο[ς \bar{n}]τε ταμν^τ[παρ]
- 16 θε[νος] ἀγ[ω] λειβωκ ε[ρ]ρα[ί]
επ[κος]μος[· τ]οτε αγτα
- 18 μ[οῖ ετβ]ε νη[· \bar{n}]βι νη ετμην
επ[ιτοπ]ος \bar{n} τε ταμν^τ
- 20 πα[ρθεν]ος· αγ[ω] λιβωκ
ερρα[ί επκοςμ]ος· αγω πε
- 22 χαγ να[ί κε κεσπ] αψψφο
νη ρα[ναχωρι \bar{n} ς]ανβολ \bar{m}
- 24 πμα [ντες^ιμ]ν^τ παρθενος·
τοτ[ε απετα]γσωτμ \bar{n} βι
- 26 φαι^ν[ωψ πετ^ν]ιγε ερουν
 \bar{z} \bar{n} τ[επηγη \bar{n}]ςνοφ πωρ^ω
- 28 νες [εβολ· αγ]ω πεχαγ
χε [ανοκ πε φαι^ν[ω]ψ^ι·ον
- 30 α·ν[6[±]]·[·].[·].[·].
...[6[±]]·[...].γα
- 32 ...[6[±]]·[·].[·.]ιτε
...[12[±]]αγ
- 34 [

[02]

(Lines 1-16 lacking)

- 18 $\overline{\text{N}}$ [
 $\text{C}\overline{\omega\overline{\rho\overline{\mu}}}\overline{\text{M}}\overline{\text{M}}$
 $\alpha\alpha. \text{TE } \overline{\text{N}}$ 9^{\pm} OY
 20 $\overline{\text{E}}\overline{\text{P}}\overline{\text{I}}\overline{\Theta}\overline{\text{M}}\overline{\text{I}}\overline{\Lambda}$ 9^{\pm} $\text{T}\overline{\text{H}}$
 $[\text{P}]\overline{\text{E}} \overline{\text{N}}\overline{\text{N}}\overline{\text{I}}\overline{\text{K}}\overline{\text{E}}\overline{\omega}\overline{\chi}\overline{\text{P}} \overline{\text{N}}[\overline{\rho}\overline{\omega}\overline{\text{M}}]\overline{\text{E}}$
 22 $\overline{\text{H}} \overline{\text{N}}\overline{\text{T}}\overline{\Lambda}\overline{\text{N}}\overline{\Lambda}\overline{\gamma} \overline{\text{E}}\overline{\gamma}\overline{\rho}\overline{\omega}[\overline{\text{M}}\overline{\text{E}} \overline{\text{P}}\overline{\text{E}}\overline{\text{I}}]$
 $\overline{\text{N}}\overline{\text{E}} \overline{\text{N}}\overline{\text{C}}\overline{\text{N}}\overline{\Theta}[\overline{\gamma}] \overline{\text{H}}$ 8^{\pm} E
 24 $\overline{\gamma}\overline{\text{O}} \overline{\text{E}}\overline{\text{V}}\overline{\text{O}}\overline{\Lambda}$ 9^{\pm} $]. \text{TE}$
 $\overline{\text{N}}\overline{\text{N}}\overline{\text{O}}\overline{\gamma}\overline{\Lambda}$ 10^{\pm} $\text{K}\overline{\omega}]2\overline{\text{T}}$
 26 $\overline{\text{M}}\overline{\text{N}} \overline{\text{O}}\overline{\gamma}\overline{\Theta}. [$ 9^{\pm} $2\overline{\text{N}} \overline{\text{N}}\overline{\text{E}}\overline{\gamma}$
 $\overline{\text{B}}\overline{\text{I}}\overline{\chi} \cdot \text{TOTE } \overline{\Lambda}\overline{\text{N}}[\overline{\text{O}}\overline{\text{K}} \overline{\text{P}}\overline{\text{E}}\overline{\chi}]\overline{\Lambda}\overline{\text{I}}$
 28 $[\overline{\text{N}}]\overline{\Lambda}\overline{\gamma} \overline{\chi}\overline{\text{E}} \overline{\text{M}}\overline{\text{P}}\overline{\text{E}}\overline{\gamma}\overline{\omega}[\overline{\text{E}} \overline{\text{E}}\overline{\gamma}\overline{\rho}]\overline{\Lambda}\overline{\text{I}} \overline{\text{E}}$
 $[\overline{\chi}]\overline{\omega}\overline{\text{I}} \overline{\text{N}}\overline{\text{B}}\overline{\text{I}} \overline{\Phi}[\overline{\Lambda}\overline{\text{I}}\overline{\text{N}}\overline{\omega}\overline{\Psi} \overline{\text{M}}\overline{\text{P}}]\overline{\text{E}}\overline{\gamma}$
 30 $[\text{C}]\overline{\omega}\overline{\rho}\overline{\mu}. [$ 8^{\pm} $\text{N}]\overline{\Lambda}\overline{\gamma} \overline{\text{E}}\overline{\gamma}$
 $[\overline{\rho}]\overline{\omega}\overline{\text{M}}\overline{\text{E}} \overline{\text{N}}$ 10^{\pm} $]\overline{\gamma}$
 32 $[\dots] [$ 11^{\pm} $]\overline{\gamma}$
 $[$ 14^{\pm} $]\overline{\text{M}}\overline{\text{N}}$
 34 $[$ 14^{\pm} $]\overline{\Lambda}\overline{\gamma}$
 $[$ 14^{\pm} $]\overline{\text{N}}\overline{\Lambda}$

(3[±] Lines lacking)

[71]

(Lines 1-16 lacking)

- [
 18 err [
 [
 20 desire (ἐπιθυμία) [*the number*]
 of just the [*human*] remnants
 22 or (ἢ) that I may see a [*man, the blood-likeness*]
 [or (ἢ)]
 24 [
 of a [*fire*]
 26 and a [*in*] his
 hands. Then (τότε) [*as for me, I said*]
 28 [to] him: “[*Phainops*] has not [*come*] upon
 me; he [*has not*]
 30 gone astray. [*see*] a
 man [*]* him
 32 [
 [
 34 [
 [
 (3± lines lacking)

71,18 Note the vestige of ink before c of $\omega\overline{\rho\mu}$ at the beginning of the line.71,19 Possibly $\alpha\iota\tau\epsilon$ for $\alpha\iota\tau\epsilon\iota$ ($\alpha\iota\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$), “to ask.”71,23 For $\kappa\eta\sigma\theta$, cf. 70,27.71,25 For $\kappa\omega\zeta\tau$, cf. 72,28.

[O⁸B]

(Lines 1-16 lacking)

[18[±]]N.
 18 .ο[16[±]]ΓΑΡ ΕΤΑϞ
 χοο[Ϟ 11[±]]. Ν ΦΑΙΝΩΨ
 20 παί[6[±]]. Ε[.]. ΑΙΝΑΥ ΕΡΟϞ
 ΑΥ[ω πεχαϞ] ΝΑΙ ΧΕ ΨΨΙΦΡΟΝΗ
 22 ΕΤ[βε οϞ κωοο]π [N]CABOΛ MMOI
 ΟΥΩ[Ϟ MMOK NCWI·] ΑΥΩ TNA
 24 TAMO[κ ΕΡΟΟΥ· ΑΝ]ΟΚ ΔΕ ΑΕΙ
 ΟΥΑΖT [NCWQ· NEI]ΨO[O]Π ΓΑΡ
 26 [N]ZPAI [ZN OYNOB] NZOTE· ΑΥΩ
 ΑϞΤΑ[MOEI] ΕΥΠΗΓΗ NCNO[Ϟ]
 28 ΕCBO[λπ ΕΒΟΛ· ΕC]T ΚΩΖT[
 [.]EE[9[±]]ΠΕΧΑϞ[
 30 [.]EA.[8[±]]Ωκ M.[
 [..]..[
 32 [..]..[
 [..]γN[

(4[±] Lines lacking)

INTRODUCTION TO CODEX XII

Bibliography: Krause, "Zum koptischen Handschriftenfund," 111-13; Krause-Labib, *Gnostische und hermetische Schriften*, 10-12; *Facsimile Edition: Codices XI, XII, XIII*, pp. XIII-XV; pl. 85-102.

Codex XII was part of one of the groups of codices acquired by the antiquities dealer Phocion J. Tano during 1946-48. It was put in safekeeping at the Department of Antiquities in 1949, transferred to the Coptic Museum on 9 June 1952, declared national property by court action in 1956, and given the inventory number 10555 in 1959. It had been numbered XII by Jean Doresse and Togo Mina in 1949, XIII by Henri-Charles Puech in 1950, XI by Doresse since 1958, and XII by Martin Krause in 1962 and James M. Robinson in 1968 (Robinson, "Introduction" and *Facsimile Edition: Codices XI, XII, XIII*, pp. VI-VII). In April 1961 it was conserved in 12 plexiglass containers by Victor Girgis in consultation with Pahor Labib and Martin Krause. It was photographed by R. Herzog for Krause at that time and again by photographers of the Center of Documentation for UNESCO in 1966. Under the supervision of the Technical Sub-Committee of the International Committee for the Nag Hammadi Codices of the Arab Republic of Egypt and UNESCO, fragments were placed and photographs made at three work sessions during 1970-71.

Of all the Nag Hammadi Codices, Codex XII is in the poorest state of preservation. No titles or page numbers remain, although at least three tractates are represented. Of the approximately thirty-nine original pages of the *Sentences of Sextus* (XII,¹) ten survive, of which eight lack parts of the top and bottom lines, while the remaining two (from a different part of the tractate) have lost the outside half of the leaf. The *Gospel of Truth* (XII,²) has fragments of only six of the originally twenty-nine pages. Until the two larger remaining fragments (numbers 1 and 2 on pl. 101-102 of the *Facsimile Edition: Codices XI, XII, XIII*) can be associated with a known piece of literature, it is impossible to say whether they represent one or two other tractates. Two smaller fragments (number 5 on pl. 101-102 of the *Facsimile Edition: Codices XI, XII, XIII* and number 8 on pl. 23*-24* [frg. c] of the *Facsimile Edition:*

Introduction) could belong to any tractate in the codex. Since the remnants are from different parts of the codex, it is likely that the main loss was suffered since the discovery in modern times.

The original size of the codex cannot be reconstructed. The estimated original lengths of the *Sentences of Sextus* and the *Gospel of Truth* plus the four pages of a third tractate, for which evidence remains, add up to a minimum of seventy-two pages. The third tractate, however, was almost certainly longer than four pages. It is more disconcerting that the sequence of the tractates cannot be determined. This is due to the unusual make-up of the quire, unique among the Nag Hammadi Codices. In the case of the other codices the quire is formed by placing a number of papyrus sheets on top of each other, generally with the horizontal fibers facing up. In contrast, Codex XII was made up of a quire in which only every other sheet has the horizontal fibers facing up. As a result, pages facing each other always have the same fiber direction. This technique was used for the "hair side" and "flesh side" of parchment codices in the Byzantine period to give the book a more uniform appearance. Though it is less common among papyrus codices, it is not unknown, e.g., P 66 (Bodmer II of the Gospel of John).

Since the center sheet of the codex is not extant, even this clue as to which tractate belongs to the first or second half of the book is lacking. There is a slight decrease in the width of the column from page 15* to page 34*, which suggests that the *Sentences of Sextus* came in the first half of the book. This conclusion assumes that the practice of trimming a quire, after it was folded, was observed, thereby causing the pages in the center of the quire to be narrower than those at the beginning and end. A scribe who did not copy the columns of his exemplar would thus tend to make his columns narrower towards the middle of the codex. The gradual change in the width of the pages would be a much better guide, but none of the extant pages of Codex XII has complete right and left margins. Also no page with complete top and bottom margins is extant. Hence the original size of the pages had to be reconstructed by combining evidence from several pages. The result indicates an original size of approximately 19 x 25.5 cm.

The reconstructed page sequence of *Sent. Sextus* 27*-34* provided sufficient evidence to show that the sheets were cut from a roll. There is exact correspondence of fibers between the right edge of page 31* and the left edge of page 30*. A reconstruction of this

part of the roll from left to right is as follows. Numeration is by pages with horizontal fibers; the two leaves of a sheet are connected by a plus (+); adjoining sheets are connected by a slash (/); square brackets ([]) indicate the lost halves of the sheets.

$$34^* + [] / [] + 31^* / 30^* + [] / [] + 27^*$$

There are joints (kolleseis) in the roll on pages 31* and 58*. The overlap of the joint on page 31* is left over right, and measures 4 cm. The overlap on page 58* is not complete but runs also left over right. The leaves from the *Gospel of Truth* and the fragments could not be shown to form a sheet with any of the leaves of the *Sentences of Sextus*, but this may have been due to their fragmentary nature.

The papyrus used for the codex was of mediocre quality for this period. The many cracks and irregularities forced the scribe to leave some blank spaces between letters or to slant his lines. Most pages have uneven coloring. No page numbers have been preserved. The leaves which still have part of the top margin (15*/16*; 57*/58*) suggest that the codex lacked pagination.

The number of missing pages of both tractates can be calculated fairly accurately in terms of the Subachmimic *Gospel of Truth* in NHC I and the Greek *Sentences of Sextus*, assuming the Coptic version did not contain more than the 451 sentences found in the Latin version. Thus it can be established that the original codex could hardly have begun with the *Sentences of Sextus* immediately followed by the *Gospel of Truth* or vice versa. In order to do justice to the fiber direction, a third tractate must have intervened. However, for the sake of convenience, and consistency with the other codices in the collection, the pages have been numbered consecutively making the *Sentences of Sextus* the first tractate and the *Gospel of Truth* the second. This makes the *Sentences of Sextus* end and the *Gospel of Truth* begin on the same page, although this is not possible based on the estimated length of each tractate. The two remaining large fragments have been assigned to a third tractate even though they may belong to two different tractates. Since the publication of the *Facsimile Edition: Codices XI, XII, XIII*, frg. 3 has been placed on p. 33*,3-8 and p. 34*,3-8; frg. 6 has been placed on p. 33*,2-3 and p. 34*,2-3; frg. 4 has been placed on 53*,24-25 and 54*,24; and frg. 7 has been placed on 59*,24-27 and

60*,24-26. Two fragments originally conserved with Codex VIII have been placed in Codex XII, one at 59*,22-23 and 60*,21-22 and another at 59*,23-25 and 60*,22-24. Fragments 5 (*Facsimile Edition: Codices XI, XII, XIII*, pl. 101/102) and 8 (*Facsimile Edition: Introduction*, pl. 23*/24*c) have not been placed.

The writing columns have an average of 28 lines. The scribe had the tendency to make his lines slope upward. The script is a regular, square biblical majuscule somewhat similar to, but heavier than, that of Codex II. The scribe has used line fillers, usually a diple (cf. for example, 15*,4.10.19.21.25.26), to keep a straight right margin. For the same purpose he often crowds letters by writing them very small (cf. 27*,8; 33*,25.26) or by running a number of letters together (i.e., ligatures), particularly the Η, Μ, Ν, Π, Ρ, and Τ. In 29*,26 and 31*,22 the π and ρ have been fused and a mark in the shape of a "c" inclined to the right has been placed on top of the joined letters. The scribe has also made an effort not to split up a word between two pages by placing the last couple of letters of a word below the bottom line (cf. 31*,28f.; 33*,27f.; 57*,28f. and probably also 58*,29f.). The final Ν of a line has been indicated by means of a horizontal stroke in 27*,7; 29*,6; 34*,19; frg. 1A,19. An unusual feature of the hand is the rounded Μ when it is the final letter of a line, over against the square uncial Μ elsewhere.

The use of full stops and paragraphing by means of blank spaces is discussed in the introduction to the *Sentences of Sextus*. The supralinear strokes have been placed somewhat carelessly, frequently extending too far to the right. They have been standardized in the transcription. Strokes are missing in 15*,6 (ΝΕΤΚ); 16*,17 (ΝΩΩC); 27*,14 (ΜΦΑΥΛΟΝ); 29*,10 (Ν̄ΖΝ); 29*,17 (ΖΝΚΟΟΥΕ); 30*,17 (ΝΑΚΑΘΑΡΤΟC); 58*,7 (ΩΙΤC). In 16*,5 a stroke was placed on the wrong Μ (ΒΟΜ̄). These have not been corrected in the transcription. The Ν following the qualitative ο does not have a supralinear stroke before ε (27*,5 and 29*,15).

There are remarkably few corrections and misspellings, indicating the work of a skilled scribe. In 34*,8 λ was written superimposed over another letter and Ν was added above the line in 34*,27 and an ε in frg. 1A,26. π was written superimposed over Ν in 58*,26. There is no reason to believe that the corrections were made by anyone other than the original hand. Emendations were necessary in 28*,13.27; 29*,10 (haplography).13; 30*,4 (hap-

lography).20; 33*,10 (haplography); 34*,13 (dittography).14. These are discussed in the notes.

The scribe did not use the smooth breathing mark on Η, and “hooked” the final τ (τ) of a word only rarely (e.g., 33*,19). The codex was written in Sahidic with a number of archaic, i.e., pre-classical, forms appearing in the *Sentences of Sextus*. The present state of Coptic paleography does not allow for an accurate dating of the hand. However, there are no reasons why it would not fit the late fourth-century date supported by evidence found in some of the other Nag Hammadi Codices.

Table of Contents: Codex XII

Provisional codex pagination	Fiber direction
<i>Sent. Sextus</i>	
[1-14]	
15*	H
16*	V
[17-26]	
27*	H
28*	V
29*	V
30*	H
31*	H
32*	V
33*	V
34*	H
[35-39]	
[39-52]	
53*	V
54*	H
[55-56]	
57*	V
58*	H
59*	H
60*	V
[61-end]	

Tractate 3

frg. 1A	V
frg. 1B	H
frg. 2A	V
frg. 2B	H

INTRODUCTION

NHC XII, I*: THE SENTENCES OF SEXTUS, 15*, I-16*, 28; 27*, I-34*, 28

Bibliography: Chadwick, *The Sentences of Sextus*; Conybeare, *The Ring of Pope Xystus*; Edwards-Wild, *The Sentences of Sextus*; Elter, *Gnomica I*; Gildemeister, *Sexti Sententiarum recensione*s; Hermann, "Die armenische Überlieferung der Sextussentenzen"; Kroll, "Die Sprüche des Sextus"; de Lagarde, *Analecta syriaca*; Poirier, "La version copte des Sentences de Sextus (Sent. 320)"; id., "La version copte des *Sentences de Sextus*"; Ryssel, "Die syrische Übersetzung der Sextussentenzen"; Wisse, "Die Sextus-Sprüche und das Problem der gnostischen Ethik."

The Coptic *Sentences of Sextus* (abbreviated C) do not present us with a hitherto unknown piece of ancient literature. The sentences have been known throughout the centuries, in the West through the Latin version, in the East through Syriac, Armenian and Georgian versions. Only during the last part of the nineteenth century were two manuscripts of the original Greek discovered. There is no need at this point to comment on the origin and theology of the collection. Not that these matters are unimportant or settled, but they are larger scholarly issues on which the discovery of the Coptic version has no direct bearing.

With C we have now a manuscript which is at least a century and a half older than the oldest previously known copies, two Syriac manuscripts (X and x) from the mid-sixth century C.E., and more than 500 years earlier than the earliest Greek and Latin witnesses. Moreover, since it is a faithful and consistent translation from the Greek, even retaining many of the original Greek words as loanwords, it is of considerable textual interest where the Greek manuscripts differ or are corrupt, or the order of the sentences is uncertain. C also sheds light on the form in which the collection circulated at the time of its translation, i.e. in the way the maxims were separated and grouped.

Jean Dorese, who made the first inventory of the Nag Hamadi Library, missed the true identity of the tractate. On the basis of what could not have been more than a brief glance at sentences 348-349 he called Codex XII—his Codex XI—"fragments of

INTRODUCTION
NHC XII,2*: THE GOSPEL OF TRUTH,
53*,1-54*,28; 57*,1-60*,30

Bibliography: Malinine, et al., *Evangelium Veritatis and [Supplementum]*; *Facsimile Edition: Codex I*, pl. 20-43; *Facsimile Edition: Introduction*, pl. 23*/24*.

The fragments of the Sahidic *Gospel of Truth* in Codex XII had not been distinguished from the other material in the codex in the inventories made by Doresse (*Secret Books*, 142-45), Krause ("Der koptische Handschriftenfund," 121-31), and Robinson ("The Coptic Gnostic Library Today," 383-401). First mention of the fragments was made in "The Coptic Gnostic Library," 85.

No title of the tractate has been preserved with the fragments; the title, as well as the order and identification of the fragments, is wholly dependent on the parallel text of the *Gospel of Truth* in Codex I. Apart from the parallel text, these fragments would have had little value. Their present significance is limited to the light they shed on the parallel version in Codex I. Hence the notes to the text and translation only deal with the differences between the two versions.

Fragments of three leaves have been found. All of these contain a part of the bottom margin and one of the leaves has part of both top and bottom margins. Unfortunately, in every case the left and right margins are lost, which made the reconstruction of complete lines a matter of conjecture. By calculating the average number of lines in the *Gospel of Truth* (I,3) which correspond with a page of text in the *Gospel of Truth* (XII,2*), it could be estimated that the fragments belonged to pages 15, 16, 19, 20, 21, and 22 of the tractate. When put in sequence with the *Sentences of Sextus* (XII,1*) the fragments then become pages 53*-54* and 57*-60*. Assuming that both versions of the *Gospel of Truth* had the same length, XII,2* can be estimated to have ended at the bottom of page 67*. This means that the *Sentences of Sextus* ended and the *Gospel of Truth* began on page 39* of the codex. Yet the last page of Sextus must have been almost a full page, especially if the title was at the end; and also the first page of the *Gospel of Truth* comes out as a full page in the estimate. However, in order to prevent a rather

awkward codex pagination, this conflict has been ignored (see the Codex Introduction). Leaf 53*/54* is represented by two fragments, leaf 57*/58* by two fragments which join in the middle of the leaf, and leaf 59*/60* by seven fragments which clearly fit together. The small fragment of leaf 53*/54* and three small fragments of leaf 59*/60* were placed after the facsimile edition of Codex XII was published and, except for one fragment of leaf 59*/60*, are shown in position in *The Facsimile Edition: Introduction*, pl. 23*/24*. Fragment 7 shown on pl. 119/120 has been placed on p. 59*,24–27 (pl. 120) and p. 60*,24–26 (pl. 119). The extant lines on pages 53*/54* and 59*/60*, of which only the bottom parts of the leaves survive, have been numbered by estimating the number of lines the page once contained. The fact that pages 55*/56* are not represented in the sequence lends support to the suspicion that at least some of the loss was suffered since the discovery of the codices.

The *Gospel of Truth* (XII,2*), it appears, was written in pure Sahidic. The only departures from standard Sahidic, aside from a few itacisms (λοειβε 59*,28 for λοιβε; παει 54*,25 and ναει 54*,22.23.27 for παϊ and ναϊ; ψταειουγ 54*,26 for πσταϊουγ; ογχαϊ 57*,24.26 for ογχαϊ), are the following: πι, †, and νι are frequently used as articles. Once ν has not been assimilated to μ before π (53*,27). The relative form of the habitual tense is εωα- (58*,25). The “not yet” tense is spelled εμπατ- in 60*,24. The perfect relative is normally ντα- and, if reconstructed correctly, once εντα- (57*,23). The translator used remarkably few Greek loanwords.

The differences between the two versions of the *Gospel of Truth* go far beyond those expected for independent translations into different dialects. The fragments are not extensive enough to present a full comparative evaluation of both versions. If the fragments are indicative of the whole, then the version in Codex XII has a somewhat shorter text and differs often in substance. The many serious problems of syntax in I,3 are not evident in XII,2*. The text appears smoother, more direct and more transparent in meaning. Some of this could be due to the fact that the Coptic translator of XII,2* produced a version that was a simplification of the Greek. However, it is at least as likely that the Coptic of Codex I is awkward and at times corrupt. If the fragments of the *Gospel of Truth* in XII,2* indicate anything, then it is to make the student of the

Gospel of Truth aware that the difficulties in I,3 are not necessarily due to complexity of thought and gnostic obscurity but perhaps to an inferior Coptic translation of a corrupted Greek text.

53*

(Lines 1-18 lacking)

[6±]..[

- 20 [αγω] νετσωτῃ ερω[α
 [νεα]† ναγ ἡ††πε [μῆ πιστοι ἡ]
- 22 [ους]μοτ ἡταα πω[ηρε ἡμεριτ]
 [αφο]γωνῆ ναγ εβολ [αφταμοου]
- 24 [επει]ωτ̄ πιατψαφε [ἡμοα ε]
 [αφνια]ε ἡπεαμееεε ε[ααί ερο]
- 26 [ου αφειρ]ε ἡπεαουω[ω ααα βε]
 [χι ἡπου]οειν νεαῖῃ πс[μοτ ἡса]
- 28 [ρῆ νε]γῶο ἡψῃμο πε [εροου]
 [4-5] ενεακταειт ἡ.[

53*

(Lines 1-18 lacking)

[

- 20 [and] they who hear [him
 [he] granted them the taste [and the smell of]
 22 his form. The [beloved Son]
 appeared to them [and told them]
 24 [about the] Father, the ineffable one, [having]
 [breathed] his (Father's) thought [into]
 26 [them. He did] his (Father's) will. [Then many]
 [received the] light. He was in [fleshly (σάρξ) form;]
 28 (his) face was foreign [to them]
 [] since he was changed [

54*

(Lines 1-18 lacking)

- [Μ̄Ρ̄Ρ̄ ΕΤΒΛ]̄¹ΛΟΜΤ ΑΦΠΟΡ[ΚΟΥ
 20 [9[±]] ΝΒ̄Ρ̄Ρ̄ ΕΑΦΟΦ[ΖΕ Ε]
 [ΖΡΑΙ ΔΕ Ν̄ΝΑΕ]Ι Ν̄ΤΑΥΣΛΑΑΤΕ Φ[ΥΜΟ]
 22 [ΕΙΤ ΑΦΩΠ]Ε Ν̄ΝΑΕΙ ΕΤΣΟΡ[Μ̄ ΟΥ]
 [ΣΟΟΥΝ ΑΦΩ]ΩΠΕ Ν̄ΝΑΕΙ ΕΤ[Ο Ν̄ΑΤ]
 24 [ΣΟΟΥΝ Ο]ΥΜ̄Ν̄ΤΑΤΜΟΥ ΑΦΩ[ΩΠΕ]
 [Ν̄ΝΑΕΙ ΕΤΜ]ΟΟΥΤ ΠΑΕΙ Π[Ε ΠΩΩΣ]
 26 [ΕΦΚΩ ΕΖΡ]Α¹ Μ̄ΠΙΨΤΑΕΙΦ[Υ Μ̄ ΨΙΣ]
 [Ν̄ΕΣΟΟΥ]ΝΑΕΙ ΕΤΕ Μ̄ΠΟΥΣΩ[Ρ̄Μ̄ ΑΦ]
 28 [ΩΙΝΕ Ν̄Σ]Α ΠΑΙ Ν̄ΤΑΦΣΩΡ̄Μ̄ [

54*

(Lines 1-18 lacking)

ensnaring [*bonds*] he destroyed20 [] new. [*And (δε)*] he raised[*up those*] who have stumbled. [*A way*]22 [*came into being*] for those who are lost.[*Knowledge*] came to those who [*are*]24 [*ignorant.*] Immortality [*came*][*to those who are*] mortal. He is [*the shepherd*]26 [*who left behind*] the ninety [*and nine*][*sheep*] which were not lost, [*and*]28 [*searched for*] the one which was lost. [

57*

- [ϕογον̄ εβολ] ρ̄μ μα ν[ιμ εϕωαν]
 2 [τωρ ε†ρ̄γλ]η τηρ̄ π[ις†νογϕε]
 [̄νταϑ ϕ†] μμοϑ επο[γ̄οειν αγ]
 4 [ω ρ̄ν τεϕμ̄]τ̄ρ̄ωρ̄ητ [ϕχοσε]
 [εχ̄ν σμοτ ν]ιμ· πμααχ[ε γαρ αν]
 6 [πε εψαϕω]λ̄μ̄ αλλα π[̄π̄νᾱ πετ]
 [ωωλ̄μ̄ ερο]ϕ̄ μ̄πρητε ετ[επ̄π̄νᾱ]
 8 [σωκ εβολ μ̄]πις†νογϕε [εροϑ αγ]
 [ω π̄π̄νᾱ πε]τ† μ̄τον να[ϕ
 10 [6± μ̄]μ̄οϑ εχωϕ.[
 [... εβολ] ρ̄ν̄ νις†νο[γϕε ν̄ωο]
 12 [ρ̄π̄ εταρ̄ω̄ ο]γεβολ ρ̄ν̄ νι[ς†νογϕε]
 [γαρ πε· ογ]ψ̄γ̄χικον μ̄[πλασμα]
 14 [10±]. ερεπμε[ριςμοσ]
 [11±]μ̄ πμα .[
 16 [12± ε]τβε [παί αϕει ν̄]
 [̄βι πναρ̄τε αϕβωλ] εβολ μ̄[πιμε]
 18 [ριςμοσ αγω αϕε]ι επχω[κ εβολ]
 [ετ̄ρ̄ημ̄ χε]κ[αᾱσ̄ ν̄]νεϕωω[πε]
 20 [εϕσωτ] εει ν[αϑ̄ ν̄]̄βι πιαρω [αγ]
 [ω ϕη]ᾱβωλ ρ̄[μ̄ π]τωτ̄ ν̄[ρ̄ητ̄ ετ]
 22 [χηκ] παί π[ε π]ωα[χε μ̄π̄ωμ̄]
 [νογϕε εντ[αγ]ταψ[ε οειω̄ μ̄]
 24 [μοϑ πο]γ̄χαϕ[ι π]ε̄ ν̄ναε[ι ετογ]
 [μογτε] εροο[γ̄ εγ]σομ̄τ̄ ε[βολ ρ̄η]
 26 [τ̄μ̄ μ̄πο]γ̄χα[ει ε]τεογ.[
 [... ογο]ν̄ρ̄ [πα]ει ετχ[
 28 [.....] εγ̄σομ̄τ̄ εβολ
 VACAT χω[

57*

- [it appears] in every place. [If it]
 2 [mixes with] all kinds of [matter (ὕλη), its fragrance]
 [it gives] to the [light. And]
 4 [in its] patience [it is exalted]
 [over] every [form]. [For (γάρ) it is not] the ear
 6 [that] smells, but (ἀλλά) the [Spirit (πνεῦμα) is the one who]
 [smells it] just as [the Spirit (πνεῦμα)]
 8 [draws forth] the fragrance [to himself, and]
 [the Spirit (πνεῦμα) is the one] who put [it] at ease [
 10 [] him upon it. [
 [from] the [first] fragrances
 12 [which are cold. For (γάρ) he is] one of the [fragrances,]
 [a] physical (ψυχικόν) [form (πλάσμα)]
 14 [] the [division (μερισμός)]
 [] the place [
 16 [] Therefore
 [Faith came and dissolved the division (μερισμός).]
 18 [And it came] to the fullness
 [which is warm, in order that] the cold may not
 20 [again] come [to it. And]
 [it shall] dissolve [through the perfect] harmony.
 22 This is [the] word [of the gospel]
 which [was proclaimed.]
 24 [It is the] salvation for those [who are]
 [called while] waiting for
 26 [the salvation] which [is] a [
 [appear. This] which [
 28 [] while they await [
 VACAT [

58*

- [πε πογ]οειν παί [ετε μῆ ραιβες]
 2 [ἡρητ]ῆ¹ χῆ μῆ[ον εψχε ψαϚ]
 [ει ἡ]βί πιπληρψ[μα· αγω ἡπε]
 4 [πι]ψτα ψωπε [εβολ ριτοοτῶ]
 [ἡτ]πλανη· αγω α[σψωπε ετβη]
 6 [ητῶ ἡ]†μῆτνο[γτε ἡπειωτ ἡ]
 [ατ]ψιτς αϚ† ἡο[γοειψ ἡπιψτα]
 8 [και]τοι νερψοοη [ἡβι μῆ λααγ]
 [ετ]ἡαψταγο ἡπ[ρητε ἡει ἡπι]
 10 [ατχω]ρῆ ἄλλα ογ[
 [πβα]θος ἡπειω[τ
 12 [μεεγ]ε ρολωσ ρατ[οοτ
 [...]ψωπε· ε[
 14 [...]μετ ετε η[
 [...] ἡτε πτ.[
 16 [...] πβί[νε
 [.]ογῆ πε[τστο εβολ γαρ σε]
 18 [μο]γτε ερο[Ϛ χε ογμετανοια]
 ετβε παί α[αφθ]αρ[σια πωτ ἡσα]
 20 πнове ρι[ἡα] χεκ[αας ερεψω]
 [πε] ἡβι ογ[ταλ]βο· π.[
 22 [...]. ἡ.[.]ψωπε [... παί]
 [πκω] εβολ [πε] ριτοο[τῆ ἡπλο]
 24 [γ]ος ἡ¹τε [πι]πλη[ρωμα· παί]
 [γα]ρ εψαϚ[π]ωτ επ[είμα ετε]
 26 [π]ψωνε ἡ[μ]αγ ε[βολ χε Ϛ† ἡ]
 [τ]οοτῆ μ[.]λι.[
 28 [πι]ψτα· εβολ χε π[ετῆ ψτα]
 [Ϛ]† ἡτοοτῆ ταί τ[ε θε ἡπιπλη]
 30 [ρωμα]

58*

[is the] light [which has no shadow]
 2 [in it,] or rather [as if]
 the pleroma (πλήρωμα) [were to come. And]
 4 [the] deficiency [did not] occur [through]
 [the] error (πλάνη). And [it happened because of]
 6 the immeasurable divinity [of the]
 [Father.] He gave [time to the deficiency,]
 8 although (καίτοι) there was [no one]
 [who] will be able to tell the [manner of coming of the]
 10 [Incorruptible One]. But (ἀλλά) [
 [the] depth (βάθος) of the Father [
 12 [thought] entirely (ὄλως) with [
 [it] happens. [
 14 [] which [
 [] of the [
 16 [] the [discovery
 [for (γάρ) the [rejection (of sin)]
 18 [is] called [conversion (μετάνοια).]
 Therefore [Incorruption (ἀφθαρσία) pursued]
 20 Sin, in order that (ἵνα)
 healing [might occur]. The [
 22 [] happen [This]
 [is the forgiveness] through [the Word (λόγος)]
 24 of [the] pleroma (πλήρωμα). [For (γάρ) he]
 runs to the [place where]
 26 [the] sickness is, [for he gives]
 aid [
 28 [the] deficiency, because [whoever is deficient]
 [he] aids. Thus [it is with the pleroma (πλήρωμα)]

59*

(Lines 1-17 lacking)

- 18 [παῖ 2̄n̄ τοῦμητε α]γψα[χε ε]
 [πχс хεκαас] ςε[μ]αχι n̄o[γστο]
- 20 [n̄b̄i na]ῖ¹ ετωτῖτωρ αγω n̄[το]
 [otq̄ n̄c]εχι m̄πιτωz̄c̄· π[ιτω]
- 22 [z̄c̄ γαρ] ηε πnaε n̄τε πειψ[τ]
 [εαq]naε θε naγ αγχι m̄π[ιτω]
- 24 [z̄c̄ πα]ει πε αγχ[ωκ] εβ[ολ· nic]
 [κεγο]с γαρ етм[ηz] ψ[αγταz]
- 26 [coγ zo]ταν γαρ εq[ω]an[βωλ ε]
 [βολ n̄b̄i] πιτωz̄c̄¹ αqψ[
- 28 [ψογ]ειт· тлоειбе [εтρεq̄r̄]
 [n̄oγx]ria пβωλ ε[βολ m̄πi]
- 30 [τωz̄c̄] те ψαqκα[τεхе

60*

(Lines 1-16 lacking)

[.]ψ[

- 18 [.]Ν̄ επειδ[η̄ εγζ̄μ̄ πβαθος̄ μ̄]
 [π]εφμεεγε̄ πλογο[ς δε̄ ν̄ταφ]
- 20 [ε]ῑ αφογονζοῡ εβολ̄ [πνους̄ ν̄]
 τε̄ πλογο̄ς ετψα[χε̄ αν̄ χιν̄]
- 22 [μ̄π]εζοογ̄ ετενεφ̄ε[ετ̄ εγμογ̄]
 [τε̄ εροφ]̄ χε̄ μ̄[ε]εγε̄ επε[ιδη̄ εφ]
- 24 [βω̄ ν̄]ζη[τ̄]̄ εμπατ̄[ογωνζ]
 [εβο]λ̄ φηψωπε̄ Δ[ε̄ ετρεφογ̄]
- 26 [ω]ν̄ζ̄ εβολ̄ ζοτᾱν̄ [εφψανεγ̄]
 [δοκει]̄ ν̄βῑ πογωψ̄ [μ̄πετ̄]̄
- 28 [ογωψ̄]ε̄ πιογωψ̄ [πετ̄]̄μο̄
 [τ̄ν̄ μ̄]πεφζητ̄ τη[ρ̄]̄ ν̄ζητ̄]̄
- 30 [ν̄βῑ πε]ιωτ̄ αγω̄ π[ετ̄]̄εγδοκεῑ

60*

(Lines 1-16 lacking)

[

- 18 [] since (ἐπειδή) [they are in the depth (βάθος) of]
 his thought. [And (δέ)] the Word (λόγος) [which had]
 20 [come] revealed them. [The Mind (νοῦς) of]
 the silent Word (λόγος) [from]
 22 [that] day [continues to be called]
 thought, [since (ἐπειδή) it]
 24 [remained] in [it] before it [appeared.]
 And (δέ) it shall happen [that it appears]
 26 when (ὅταν)
 the will [of him who willed is pleased (εὐδοκεῖν.)]
 28 [It is] the will [in which]
 [the] father [rests] his whole heart
 30 and with [which he is pleased (εὐδοκεῖν).]

NHC XII,2*: THE GOSPEL OF TRUTH
NOTES TO TEXT AND TRANSLATION

XII,53*,19-29 = I,30,27-31,6

53*,20 It is unclear from I,30,28 what words could be missing in the lacuna.

53*,20-26 Codex XII omits the reference to the laying hold of the beloved Son (I,30,31). It also specifies that the taste and smell apply to "his form."

53*,24 ΑΤΨΑΧΕ ΝΜΟQ and ΑΤΨΑΠQ̄ (I,30,34) normally do not translate the same Greek adjective.

53*,25 The epsilon before the lacuna is very uncertain; perhaps some ink flaked off.

53*,26 ΘΕ is not present in I,30,36-37, but is needed to fill the lacuna.

53*,27-29 The text of Codex XII is significantly different from its parallel in Codex I. It appears that the first part of line 29 was left blank.

XII,54*,19-28 = I,31,25-32,3

54*,19-20 The parallel text in I,31,25-28 is worded differently; the last phrase (ΑΥΩ... ΠΕ) appears to have no equivalent in Codex XII.

54*,20-21 This sentence may be the equivalent of I,31,32-33; in that case, not only the order in XII is different but also it is no longer part of the parallel phrases which follow.

54*,20-25 Of the five parallel phrases in I,31,28-35, Codex XII lacks the third, and the fourth seems to precede the stanza in altered form (see note 54*,20-21).

54*,24 Both ΜΝΤΑΤΜΟΥ and ΜΝΤΑΤΧΩΖΜ (I,31,34) could be a translation of ἀφθαρσία.

54*,27-28 Codex XII lacks the equivalent of ΑΦΕΙ in I,32,2.

XII,57*,1-29 = I,34,4-35,4

57*,2 ΤΗΡC̄ is lacking in Codex I.

57*,4 ΜΝΤΖΑΡΨΖΗΤ (μακροθυμία) seems to fit the sense better than "his silence" in I,34,7.

57*,5 ΝΖΡΑΥ ΝΙΜ in I,34,9, which is syntactically unclear, is lacking in Codex XII.

57*,6 Codex XII lacks "the fragrance" after ΨΩΛM̄; it is not needed for the meaning.

57*,6-15 I,34,10-21 is obscure in syntax and meaning which makes the reconstruction of Codex XII at this point hazardous.

57*,8 I,34,13-14 (ΑΥΩ... ΜΠΙΩΤ) appears to be lacking in Codex XII.

- 57*,14 I,34,20-26 appears to be lacking in Codex XII.
- 57*,18 πχωκ εβολ translates πλήρωμα. Elsewhere in the fragments πλήρωμα has not been translated.
- 57*,19 There is not enough room in the lacuna for both ΕΤΖΗΜ and the equivalent of ΝΤΕ †ΑΓΑΠΗ (I,34,31).
- 57*,21 Codex I does not repeat the main verb (βωλ). ΤΩΤ ΝΖΗΤ could translate the same word as ΜΝΤΟΥΕΕΙ (I,34,33).
- 57*,23-29 The wording in Codex XII differs considerably from Codex I.
- 57*,29 One could reconstruct χωκ εβολ (= πλήρωμα) but this adds a further departure from the text of Codex I.

XII,58*,1-29 = I,35,5-35

- 58*,2 There is no equivalent for the puzzling χñ ñμον in Codex I.
- 58*,4 I,35,9 reads: "the deficiency of matter."
- 58*,5 There appears to be an omission due to homoioteleuton in I,35,10 involving the words ñ†πλανη αγω ασωπε εβολ ζιτοοτ̄.
- 58*,6-7 Codex I lacks μñτνουτε; ατωιτс and μñтатарηχ̄ (I,35,10) could be translations of the same Greek adjective, though Codex I reads it as a substantive.
- 58*,7 Codex XII suggests that the unusual form τñ- in I,35,11 is the construct form of † rather than εινε.
- 58*,10 ατχωζñ and аттeкo (I,35,14) could both be translations of ἄφθαρτος. In that case Codex XII has the normal Coptic equivalent.
- 58*,12 ζολωс has no equivalent in Codex I.
- 58*,14 The word division is uncertain.
- 58*,17 One large or two small letters would fit in the lacuna at the beginning of the line. The "rejection" is probably with reference to sin.
- 58*,19 Codex XII lacks the strange reference to the breathing of Incorruptibility found in I,35,25.
- 58*,20-21 I,35,26 reads "him who sinned" instead of "the Sin." The antecedent of the pronoun of "that he might find rest" in Codex I is unclear. Codex XII renders the purpose clause differently. The ζ in ζινα is partly obscured by blotting.
- 58*,26 ωωπε was corrected to ωωνε. I,35,31-33 (χε... ñζηт̄) is lacking in Codex XII.
- 58*,26-29 The wording in Codex I is different. There appears to be blotting in these lines.

XII,59*,18-30 = I,36,13-26.

- 59*,21 There appears to be blotting in this line.
- 59*,23-24 The wording in Codex I is somewhat different.

59*,24 There is room for one large or two small letters in the lacuna in addition to $\zeta\bar{c}$.

59*,27 The ζ in $\tau\omega\zeta\mathbf{c}$ may be \mathbf{c} ; perhaps the word was written $\tau\omega\mathbf{c}\zeta$.

59*,29-30 The wording in Codex I is different.

XII,60*,17-30 = I,37,7-21.

60*,20-22 The syntax of the parallel in I,37,10-12 is unclear and the wording is different.

60*,29 Codex I lacks "his whole heart."

INTRODUCTION

NHC XII,3*: FRAGMENTARY TRACTATE

1A-1B; 2A-2B

Fragments 1A-1B and 2A-2B have been assigned to the same tractate for the sake of convenience. There is no evidence to support or refute their belonging to the same tractate. All that can be said is that neither fragment belongs to the *Sentences of Sextus* or the *Gospel of Truth*. Both fragments contain parts of the bottom margin of the page. Since they do not contain the first line of the page, line numbers have been assigned on the assumption that the pages had a total of 29 lines, the average for the extant pages in the *Sentences of Sextus* and the *Gospel of Truth*.

With no title and only one substantial fragment surviving, the character of the tractate is obscure. It appears to contain ethical teaching within a religious context. The first-person singular and plural are used, and the speaker refers to "my father," which suggests that he may be Jesus. The speaker contrasts himself and his followers with others, referred to in the third-person plural, who are evil. Nothing in the fragments suggests that the tractate was Gnostic. There are no unambiguous Christian references but nothing precludes the tractate from being Christian. There is no reason to doubt that it was translated from the Greek.

The fragments were written in a Sahidic that is less pure than the *Gospel of Truth* but with features which distinguish it also from the *Sentences of Sextus*. It exhibits the following archaic and dialectal forms: εν (A,F,S₀)—1B,21; ε (A,S_{v1})—1B,20; νε (A,A²,F,S_{v1})—1B,21; πει (A,A²)—1B,23; ναει (S₀)—1B,19; σοογνε (S₀)—1B,10; ψμμοει (S₀)—1A,19; σεξε (A²,S₀)—1A,13. In distinction from *The Sentences of Sextus* it uses † (1A,15; 1B,23) interchangeably with the article τ (1A,14; 1B,16.17), and the indefinite article is spelled ζεν- instead of ζν-.

1A

(Lines 1-5 lacking)

6 [].[
 []εγ[
 8 []Μ.[
 []Ν.[...]ΗΡΕ Ε.[
 10 [] ἸΜΜΟΝ ἸΘΕ ΕΤΕΨ
 [ΨΕ Ν]ΕΝΕΡΗΥ ΑΛΛΑ
 12 [Ο]ΥΜΗΗΨΕ ΕΧΙ
 []Ν ΨΑΥΣΕΧΕ ΚΑΚΩΣ
 14 []ΩΝΖ ΕΤΜΝΤΒΟΟ
 [ΝΕ]ΟΥΖ ΕΒΟΛ ἸΤΜΝΤ
 16 [Π Ζ]ΩΒ ΕΝΠΕΘΟΟΥ Ε>
 []ΕΝΑΓΑΘΟΝ' ἸΣΕ
 18 [Π Ζ]ΩΒ ΕΝΕΤΕ ΝΟΥΟΥ
 []ΝΨΜΜΟΕΙ ΟΥΝ ΖΕ
 20 []Π ΖΩΒ ΕΝΕΤΕ ΝΟΥ
 [ΟΥ] ἸΖΕΝΖΒΗΥΕ ΕΝ.[
 22 [ΑΝΟ]Ν ΖΩΩΝ ΕΝΠ ΖΩ[Β
 [ΖΒΗ]ΥΕ ἸΝΕΤΜΜΑ[Υ
 24 [ΖΕΝΖΒ]ΗΥΕ ΕΥΖΟΟΥ[
 []ΕΥ ΠΕΤἸΝΑΕ[
 26 [Ν]ΕΖΒΗΥ'Ε'ΕΤΕ[
 []ΝΙ ΠΕΤΝ[
 28 [ΟΥΟ]Ν ΝΙΜ [
 []ΘΟΣ [

1A

(Lines 1-5 lacking)

6 []
 []
 8 []
 []
 10 [] us as it is
 [*fitting.*] each other, but (*ἀλλά*)
 12 [] a crowd to receive
 [] they speak ill (*κακῶς*)
 14 [] live by wickedness
 [] the []
 16 [] work evil things to
 [] the good things (*ἀγαθόν*), and they
 18 [] do their own things
 [] strangers. There are
 20 [] do their own things
 [] works which []
 22 [*we*] ourselves do []
 [*works*] of those []
 24 [] evil works []
 [] that which we shall []
 26 [*the*] works which []
 [] that which []
 28 [] every one []
 []

1A,11 The subject must have been first-person plural.

1A,14 Or: *οἰωνῶν*.

1A,15 Perhaps *μογῶν* "fill."

1A,21 At the end of the line restore perhaps *ἐνανογοῦ* "which are good."

1B

(Lines 1-5 lacking)

- 6 [9[±]].[
 [7[±]].οϋ[
 8 [.]ρε[.]βη ν̄α[
 εειχω γαρ μη[
 10 σοοϋνε μηπ[οϋτε
 με † πεγογο[
 12 πλανη· αλλα[
 σεμηπωα μηπ[
 14 ροϋν επνοϋτε ε[
 αγω ηδη αϋμο[
 16 τμητατσοοϋ[νε
 ρετδικαιοςϋν[η
 18 μοc νεγμηπ[ωα
 ν̄βι ηαιε· ν̄τοα [
 20 ει παειωτ ετε ν̄c[
 ηεϋ εν ηειωτ ε[
 22 [.]ε † μεεϋε χε π.[
 [...]ε πεει ν̄τα†η[
 24 [...]. †† οη μηπ.[
 [...]εγκω εβολ ρ.[
 26 [.....].χοοα ν̄βι[
 [.....μη]μοα ν̄βι π[
 28 [8[±]]νεϋ[
 [8[±]]εαα[

1B

(Lines 1-5 lacking)

6 []
 []
 8 []
 For (γάρ) I speak the []
 10 know [God
 gave their []
 12 error (πλάνη). But (ἀλλά) []
 they are worthy of the []
 14 into God []
 And already (ἤδη) they have []
 16 the ignorance []
 the righteousness (δικαιοσύνη) []
 18 these were worthy [of
 He []
 20 my father who is []
 not to them a father []
 22 I think that the []
 [] this which the []
 24 [] I give again to the []
 [] they forgive []
 26 [] spoke it []
 [] it []
 28 []
 []

1B,10-11 Perhaps [ρω]/με "men."

1B,11 Perhaps ογοειν "light."

1B,15 Perhaps μοοωγε "walked."

1B,23 Perfect relative ἦταν- plus the article †.

2A

(Lines 1-23 lacking)

24].[
]τε[
26]φιλ[οσοφος
]μεγυρ[
28 φι]λοσοφος[
]κοσμος τ[

2B

(Lines 1-23 lacking)

24].[
]φπ[
26]λι η[
]μμοc[
28]χποq η.[

2A

(Lines 1-23 lacking)

- 24 []
 []
 26 [] philosopher (φιλόσοφος) []
 [] they are not able to []
 28 [] philosopher (φιλόσοφος) []
 [] world (κόσμος) []

2B

(Lines 1-23 lacking)

- 24 []
 []
 26 []
 [] her []
 28 [] begot him []
 [] think that []

INTRODUCTION TO CODEX XIII

Bibliography: Krause-Labib, *Gnostische und hermetische Schriften*, 13-15; *Facsimile Edition: Codices XI, XII, XIII*, xv, xvii and pl. 104-20; Robinson, "Codicology," 15-31; Robinson, "Papyrus Codicology," 56-57.

I. PHYSICAL DESCRIPTION

From Codex XIII only eight papyrus leaves (16 pages) survive. The top margins, where pagination might be expected to appear, are not sufficiently intact to determine if the codex was originally paginated. Since the handwriting and contents of the codex are in some respects similar to those of Codex II, which has no pagination, it is here assumed that Codex XIII was not paginated.

The minimum size of the codex has been calculated by Krause-Labib (*Gnostische und hermetische Schriften*, 14) on the basis that on the last surviving page there begins a tractate that is completely preserved in Codex II, where it comprises 30 pages (NHC II,5: 97,24-127,17):

Since the measurements of Codex XIII are only slightly smaller than those of Codex II and the number of lines per page in Codex XIII and Codex II are almost identical, one may assume that the tractate whose beginning is preserved in Codex XIII comprised at least thirty further pages. The second quire of Codex XIII comprised then at least forty pages. No doubt we may assume the same size for the first quire. Thus we reach at least eighty pages as the total size.

Since XIII,2* would average 36 lines per page but II,5 averages just under 35 lines per page, *On the Origin of the World* (II,5) might require only 29 additional pages. Be that as it may, the surviving pages would have as their minimal numeration 35-50; the hypothetical nature of this numeration is indicated by an asterisk: 35*-50*. As in the case of Codex II (145 pp.), Codex XIII may well have been much larger than this minimal pagination suggests.

The original reconstruction of Codex XIII assumed two quires, since the first three leaves (six pages) have horizontal fibers on the

front and vertical fibers on the back, suggesting the second half of a first quire, and the last five leaves (10 pages) have vertical fibers on the front and horizontal fibers on the back, suggesting the first half of a second quire. However, analysis of horizontal fiber continuity subsequently showed that the sheets of Codex XIII were stacked with horizontal fibers facing up, rotated 90° in a horizontal plane and then folded inward at the center. The result was that the sheets appeared to have been stacked with vertical fibers facing up, as is actually the case with the top eleven sheets in Codex II. This is shown by the fact that the continuity of fibers from sheet to sheet in Codex XIII does not occur from the right side of one sheet to the left side of another but from the top of one sheet to the bottom of another (See Robinson, "Papyrus Codicology," 56-57). Hence, the occurrence of facing pages with vertical fibers indicates the center of the quire, which occurs at pp. 40*-41*. The theory that there was only one quire is confirmed by the continuity of horizontal fibers between pp. 39* and 42*, pp. 37* and 44*, and pp. 35* and 46*. Codex I is the only codex in the Nag Hammadi library that is comprised of more than one quire (see the *Facsimile Edition: Introduction*, 32-44).

Krause has assumed that the discoloration and deterioration of the first two leaves is due to burning, so that the missing parts of the codex would be the leaves that legend says the peasants burnt to cook their tea (*Gnostische und hermetische Schriften*, 14 and 236). But the eight surviving leaves were apparently removed from the rest of the codex in antiquity and conserved inside the front cover of Codex VI prior to the burial of the library. This is confirmed by the congruency of the contours of the last leaves of Codex XIII with the first leaves of Codex VI, the discovery of a fragment belonging to lines 8-9 of XIII,35* attached at the proper position to the inside of the front cover of Codex VI, and a photograph by Jean Doresse showing leaves of Codex XIII still inside the front cover of Codex VI. The first two leaves probably suffer from nitrification, perhaps due to dampness and direct contact with the leather of the cover (Robinson, "Inside Codex VI," 74-87; *Facsimile Edition: Codex VI*, ix and pl. 3-4; and *Facsimile Edition: Codices XI, XII, XIII*, pl. 104-107).

These eight leaves, tucked inside the front cover of Codex VI, were part of one of the groups of codices acquired by the antiquities

dealer Phocion J. Tano during 1946–48. It was put in safekeeping at the Department of Antiquities in 1949, transferred to the Coptic Museum on 9 June 1952, declared national property by court action in 1956, and given the inventory number 10545 in 1959. It has been numbered II by Jean Doresse and Togo Mina in 1949, IV by Henri-Charles Puech in 1950, IX by Doresse in 1958, and XIII by Martin Krause in 1962 and James M. Robinson in 1968 (Robinson, “Introduction,” and *Facsimile Edition: Codices XI, XII, XIII*, vi–vii).

Two fragments had remained in the cover of Codex VI and several had been put in plexiglass along with Codex XIII. But the absence of a cover for Codex XIII where fragments could have been kept together in the early period led to some of them having been put with fragments of Codices I, IV and V, where they were found and placed (see *Facsimile Edition: Introduction*, 129–30). Of the seven unidentified fragments with vestiges of ink published in the *Facsimile Edition: Codices XI, XII, XIII* on plates 119–120, fragment two has been subsequently placed on p. 47*, lines 26–27 and p. 48*, lines 26–28, and fragment three on pp. 45*–46*, lines 2–3. The minimal amount of unplaced inscribed fragments (numbers 1,4–6; 7 is the same as fragment 14 of Codex XI, hand 1) tends to confirm the assumption that only the eight surviving leaves were buried with the library. A photograph of XIII, 45*, 37*, and 50* made in 1949 by Jean Doresse contains five to six letters each at the beginnings of lines 1–4 of XIII, 45*, one letter from line one and four letters from line 33 of XIII, 37*, and five to eight letters from lines 3–6 and one to three letters from lines 10–16 of XIII, 50* that were subsequently broken off and lost (cf. pl. 104 with pl. 115, 107, and 120 of the *Facsimile Edition: Codices XI, XII, XIII* and see Emmel, “Photograph Evidence,” 274–75).

The placing of blank fragments above the first line of the first surviving page (upper left, p. 35*) made it possible to identify the first extant line as an *incipit* (“I am the Protennoia”). Thus one can move beyond the initial assumption of Jean Doresse (*Secret Books*, 181) that the surviving leaves through 50*,²⁴ were the concluding part of a tractate, to the recognition that they comprise a complete tractate. The contents of the codex may be summarized as follows:

Tractate(s) (Lost)	pp. [1*–34*]
Tractate 1* Trimorphic Protennoia	pp. 35*,1–50*,24
Tractate 2* On the Origin of the World	pp. 50*,25–[79*] or [80*]

II. THE SCRIBAL HAND

It has been suggested that the scribal hand of Codex XIII is a quicker, more cursive version of the scribal hand of Codex II (Emmel, "Final Report," 27–28). Yet there appear to be enough differences so as to allow that the two hands belong to a student and instructor. An insertion in Codex II, 12, 18 could be an overseer's correction to a similar hand. In any case, the writing and articulation marks are of a very similar style, so that with the additional observation of the similarity in Sethian content (e.g., two versions of *On The Origin of the World* and *Ap. John II, 1:30, 11–31, 25*), Codices II and XIII may be assumed to have been copied in the closest proximity to one another.

The hand of Codex XIII, which appears to be typical of the fourth century, is a regular, uncrowded biblical majuscule without embellishment (e.g., serifs), with nicely rounded ε, ο, θ, ς, and Ϸ. The supralinear strokes appear above and slightly to the right of their exponent letters, and, except for *nomina sacra* and the abstract prefix ΜΝΤ, do not intentionally bridge two or more letters. The stroke over *nomina sacra* normally begins over the second letter. There are two instances of the common practice of indicating a line-final ς by substituting for it a compendium consisting of a stroke over the preceding letter (43*, 6.7). Where the scribe wishes to indicate rough breathing on Greek nouns, he prefixes to them Ϸ; in 48*, 28 he uses both the initial Ϸ and a diaeresis over the first letter of the Greek word (i.e., ϷΥΠΗΡΕΤΗΣ), of which the latter alone without Ϸ can serve as a rough breathing, as in ΨΥΙΦΡΟΝΗ (XI, 4:69, 21; 70, 22; 72, 21).

The scribe indicates mistaken letters by crossing them out with a diagonal stroke (37*, 25; 42*, 19; 44*, 3), and adds omitted letters by writing them above and in between the letters where they should have been (38*, 20; 39*, 5).

Besides the supralinear stroke, mentioned above, there are two other forms of punctuation: the raised point (·), and an "apostrophe" mark (' or '). As is true in much of Codex II, so also in Codex XIII, neither of these marks regularly serves to denote sense units; rather they function as word and syllable dividers. The raised point occurs: (1) often directly after the stops π and τ but only when they end a word; (2) after the first-person singular

suffixal pronoun τ; (3) after the fricative q when it would have borne the supralinear stroke; and (4) occasionally after the word-final sonorants λ, μ, ν. The “apostrophe” directly follows the last letter of a closed syllable in the following cases: (1) after the stop τ at the end of the word, or at the end of a morpheme ending in τ (e.g., the privative ατ- and the relative ετ-); (2) after the fricative q when it serves as the third-person singular suffixal pronoun (regardless of whether or not it would have borne the supralinear stroke); (3) often after the stop κ at the end of a word when the next word begins with a vowel; (4) optionally, on any of the above letters when they occur at the end of a line; and (5) occasionally after the word-final c that would have borne the supralinear stroke; (6) there is also one instance of its use to divide a double consonant: ἀγῖελοϛ, 35*,16. Thus both forms of punctuation serve to denote the end of a closed syllable ending in a consonant or sonorant, and serve often as an equivalent to the supralinear stroke. The major difference between them is that the raised point occurs only at the end of a complete word, while the “apostrophe” mark can serve to separate bound morphemes, as well as to indicate closed syllables at the end of unbound morphemes. Exceptions to these observations will occur, e.g., τηρ'οϛ, 41*,18. Firm conclusions on the punctuation of codex XIII are often made difficult by a multitude of ink splatterings throughout the Codex, perhaps caused by too stiff a stylus, making the decision whether or not to count an ink dot as a punctuation mark difficult and at times subjective.

III. LANGUAGE

The language of XIII,1* will be treated under the heads of orthography, phonology, morphology and syntax; only features that depart from standard Sahidic or that are in other ways striking will be discussed here. The language of XIII,2* is standard Sahidic; except for the variants from II,5 noted in the Introduction to XIII,2*, which witness a tendency to overcome Subachmimicisms (λλαϛ for λλαϛε, δε for ḿδε, and ει for ι), the language of these ten lines is not sufficient in extent to call for analysis here.

A. Orthography

The characteristic features are: (1) arbitrary interchange of ϵ and $\bar{\iota}$; (2) a single extant instance of the monograph $\pi + \zeta = \phi$ in $\phi\omicron[\omicron\gamma$ ("day" 42*,31); yet ten instances of $\tau + \zeta = \theta$. These occur consistently in $\theta\alpha\eta$, $\theta\epsilon$, and $\theta\iota\kappa\omega\eta$ but otherwise only optionally and rarely in the juncture of the relative $\epsilon\tau$ - with $\zeta\eta\pi$ and $\zeta\omicron\omicron\gamma$ ("evil"); (3) numerous instances of syncopation, especially in the case of the singular indefinite article $\omicron\gamma$ - before nouns beginning with $\omicron\gamma$.

B. Phonology

Several phonological characteristics should be mentioned. With regard to consonants, as in standard Sahidic, the final η of bound morphemes consistently (except in pronouns) becomes μ when it precedes π , μ , and ϕ , with the exception of three of the instances of the preposition $\epsilon\chi\bar{\eta}$ - (40*,1.24; 45*,32). There are no other cases of consonantal assimilation. Nasalization occurs only with the Greek conjunction $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ ($\bar{\eta}\gamma\alpha\rho$ 3 times, $\gamma\alpha\rho$ 10 times) and $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ ($\bar{\eta}\Delta\epsilon$ 2 times, $\Delta\epsilon$ 12 times). The Greek *spiritus asper* is consistently rendered by ζ , except in the Greek portion of the title ($\acute{\alpha}\gamma\iota\alpha\gamma\rho\alpha\phi\acute{\eta}$, 50*,23). ζ is prefixed also to $\acute{\alpha}\mu\eta\eta$ and $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\kappa\acute{\omega}\nu$. ζ appears to be supplemented by a diaeresis $\zeta\ddot{\Upsilon}\pi\eta\rho\epsilon\tau\eta\varsigma$ (48*,28; in Codex XI,4:69,21; 70,22; 72,21 the diaeresis alone serves to mark the rough breathing in $\ddot{\Upsilon}\Psi\iota\phi\rho\omicron\eta$). Finally, as in Subachmimic, ω becomes ς in $\varsigma\omicron\chi\pi$ (2 times for $\omega\omicron\chi\pi$) and $\varsigma\epsilon\chi\epsilon$ (42*,2 for $\omega\epsilon\chi\epsilon$).

Insofar as vowels are concerned, there are many instances of the α tonic vowel, characteristic of Subachmimic, instead of the \omicron tonic vowel. The following list gives the number of times the α tonic vowel occurs, followed by the number of times (if any) the \omicron tonic vowel occurs; if only one instance occurs, its reference is given: $\alpha\eta\alpha\kappa$ (35*,30; 36*,5), $\alpha\eta\omicron\kappa$ (55 times); $\mu\alpha\epsilon\iota\tau$ (43*,24), $\mu\omicron\iota\tau$ (43*,18); $\eta\alpha\iota\eta$ (43*,8), $\eta\omicron\epsilon\iota\eta$ (40*,22); $\varsigma\mu\alpha\tau$ (40*,6), $\varsigma\mu\omicron\tau$ (3 times); $\omicron\gamma\alpha\epsilon\iota\eta$ (35*,15), $\omicron\gamma\omicron\epsilon\iota\eta(\epsilon)$ (21 times); $\omega\alpha\mu\tau$ (37*,28), $\omega\omicron\mu\tau$ (5 times); $\zeta\gamma\alpha\gamma$ (2 times), $\zeta\omicron\omicron\omicron\gamma$ (20 times); $\zeta\alpha\tau\tau\epsilon^\dagger$ (3 times), $\zeta\omicron\tau\tau\epsilon^\dagger$ (42*,8) and $\beta\alpha\mu$ (5 times), $\beta\omicron\mu$ (5 times).

Characteristic of Subachmimic, **ε** occurs instead of **α** in pre-tonic syllables particularly in causatives: **τεκο** (3 times), **τακο** (none); **τσεβο** (4 times), **τцаво** (none); **тсено** (2 times), **тсано** (40*,25); **теγο** (2 times), **таγο** (none); **тезо** (11 times), **тазо** (none); and in pre-tonic and tonic syllables in the following: **εμντε** (6 times), **αμντε** (36*,4); **εμαzte** (2 times), **αμαzte** (none); **εζωp** (37*,16), **αζωp** (none); **ενεz** (2 times), **ανεz** (2 times); **μετε** (43*,23), **ματε** (none); **σεχε** (42*,2), **ψαχε** (17 times), and **ογαz-** (40*,17), **ογεz-** (none).

The Sahidic double vowel (for vowel plus laryngeal) occasionally appears as a single vowel, often characteristic of Subachmimic: **βεβε** (36*,6), **βεεβε** (46*,17); **ετβηт-** (2 times), **εтβηηт-** (none); **μαγ** (46*,20), **μααγ** (7 times); **οτε** (38*,15), **ατε** (45*,6), **οοτε** (none); **νεκε** (43*,6), **νααке** (none); **πωне** (43*,16), **πωωνе** (none); **тнве** (2 times), **тннве** (none); **ψωт** (44*,16), **ψωωт** (none) and **zpaγ** (2 times), **zpooy** (20 times). The opposite feature, doubling of vowels, occurs in **καακ-** (49*,30) for **κακ-** (48*,12); the noun **πωωт** (44*,12), cf. the verb **πωт** (43*,17); and **paat-** (39*,11) for **pat-** (3 times). There is one instance of consonantal shift: **σεχε** (42*,2) for **ψαχε** (15 times). The intensifier **ογαα-** is always **ογαат-**.

Finally, in words whose final syllable consists of a consonant or an original laryngeal followed by a sonorant, one often finds the secondary vowel **ε** after the sonorant, characteristic of Achmimic and Subachmimic: **нτωтне** (44*,31), **нτωтн̄** (46*,34); **сооуне** (12 times), **сооун** (7 times); **τωzме** (45*,12), **τωzм̄** (none); **ογοεине** (21 times), **ογοεин** (16 times); **χωzме** (4 times), **χωzм̄** (none), and **ογαzме-** (2 times), **ογαzм-** (37*,18).

There are no examples of the full form (**πε-**, **τε-**, **νε-**) of the definite article before words beginning with the double consonant. The use of **πi-**, **†-**, **ни-** is frequent. The numerals are formed as in standard Sahidic except for **ψомт**, **ψамт** instead of **ψомн̄т**. The ordinal prefix is mostly **μαz-** (AA²B, 4 times) instead of the Sahidic **μεz-** (2 times). As indicated above, there are only two non-Sahidic forms among the independent pronouns, **αναк** (AA²F; 35*,30; 36*,5) for **αнок** and **н̄τωтне** (44*,31) for **н̄τωтн̄**. The possessive article displays the following variation: third-personal singular, **πq-** (3 times; no supralinear stroke, cf. **πεq-** 49*,14), **τεq-**, **νεq-**; first-person plural, **πн̄-**, **тн̄-**, **н̄н̄-** (*sic* 44*,10); and

third-person plural, ΠΟΥ-, ΤΟΥ- (ΤΕΥ-, 40*,17), ΝΕΥ- (cf. ΝΟΥΕΡΗΥ, 39*,12). Suffix pronouns are standard except for variation between ει (mostly) and ι; the second person plural is ΤΗΝΕ (AA²) instead of Sahidic ΤΗΥΤḲ. The prepositions occur as in standard Sahidic, with the following exceptions: ΕΤΒΗΤ- for ΕΤΒΗΗΤ-, ΜΜΑ- (35*,[35]; 40*,7) for ΜΜΟ-, and the heavy variation of λ- with ε-. The adverb ΤΩΝ (none) is always ΤΟ (2 times, AA²). There are two occurrences of ΖΡΑ (36*,24; 50*,12) for ΖΡΑΙ, and the fem. of ΟΥΑ is ΟΥΙΕ (SAA², 42*,8).

The following verbs manifest non-standard Sahidic forms, most of which are characteristic of Subachmimic: ḲΜΕ (Till's "II infinitive") instead of ΕΙΜΕ; ΟΕΙ† (2 times), qualitative of ΕΙΡΕ (cf. Ο† 6 times); ΜḲΤΕ- (4 times) for ΜḲΤΑ- (42*,21); ḲḲΗΥ† (40*,12), qualitative of ΝΟΥ (cf. ΝΗΥ, 42*,21); ΠḲΡΙΕ (Till's "II infinitive") instead of ΠΕΙΡΕ; ΠΑΧΕ- (3 times) instead of ΠΕΧΑ-; ΤḲ- with dative (40*,33), *status nominalis* for †- (30 times), and ΤΑΕΙ- (38*,30) as *status pronominalis* for ΤΑΑ- (5 times); ΟΥḲΤΕ- (2 times) and ΟΥḲΤΑΑ- (2 times) for ΟΥḲΤΑ- (3 times); ΟΥΟΝΖ (37*8) as *status absolutus* for ΟΥΩΝΖ (11 times); and ΖΝΑΝ (4 times) instead of ΖΩΝ (none).

C. Morphology

The morphology of XIII,^r* is as found in standard Sahidic with few exceptions. All Greek verbs are constructed with Ḳ except ἄρχεω (2 times). In the conjugation system one finds the following features not characteristic of standard Sahidic: (1) The Achmimic form of the second present occurs two times (ΑΥΤΟ, 43*,33; ΑΝΗΠ, 44*,5). (2) The imperfect occurs once in the Achmimic form ΝΑ- (41*,19; elsewhere ΝΕ-). (3) The second future consistently replaces the third future in affirmative clauses of purpose. (4) The negative habitude is ΜΑ-, never ΜΕ-. (5) The *temporalis* is ΝΤΑΡΕ- (43*,4). (6) There is the cohortative imperative ΤΩΩΝ ΜΑΡΟΝ ("let us arise and go," 43*,30). (7) In the relative perfect, when the subject of the relative clause is identical with its antecedent, one usually finds the Sahidic (and Subachmimic) ḲΤΑ-, as well as ΕΝΤΑ- (8 times), but ΕΤΑΖ- (AA²) also occurs (37*,5-30). When the subject of the relative clause differs from its antecedent

ⲛⲧⲁ- is employed, except for one instance of ⲉⲧⲁ- (AA², 43^{*},2). Finally, the negative occurs in the bipartite conjugation as both ⲛ̅...ⲁⲛ (40^{*},28; 47^{*},27), normal in Sahidic, and as ⲁⲛ alone (39^{*},24; 44^{*},8).

D. Syntax

There are some syntactic features which, though not atypical of standard Sahidic, are worthy of note. The direct object often precedes the verb; in 37^{*},9-20 and 41^{*},4-15 it occurs in apparently hymnic passages. The normal pattern for the first perfect with nominal subject is ⲡⲠⲟⲙⲉ ⲁⲒⲘⲟⲧⲙ̅ or ⲁⲒⲘⲟⲧⲙ̅ ⲛ̅ⲃⲓ ⲡⲠⲟⲙⲉ, rarely ⲁⲡⲠⲟⲙⲉ Ⲙⲟⲧⲙ̅ and never ⲁⲡⲠⲟⲙⲉ ⲁⲒⲘⲟⲧⲙ̅. Befitting an aretalogical discourse, the cleft sentence with a relative verbal clause is frequent ("it is I, he, etc. who did..." rather than simply "I, he, etc. did..."). Occasionally the circumstantial is used instead of the relative (e.g., 38^{*},10), perhaps at times to identify the antecedent by gender (e.g., 46^{*},23.29) or to continue a string of relative modifiers (e.g., 37^{*},5-8; cf. Till, *Koptische Grammatik*, § 486). Although ⲙ̅ⲛ̅ is in Coptic usually used to join words governed by the same preposition, ⲁⲮⲱ is used in 35^{*},15 (which might be emended to ⲁⲮⲱ<ⲒⲠⲁⲓ Ⲓ̅ⲛ̅> ⲒⲎⲐⲐⲟⲩⲁⲉⲓⲛⲉ—haplography?). The identity phrase ⲉⲧⲉ ⲡⲁⲓ ⲡⲉ (and variant spellings) is twice used absolutely (42^{*},28; 49^{*},30); both instances seem to function as adjectives of specification, and are translated "particular."

The language of this document is translation Coptic; the frequency of extraposition of subject and direct object, including the ⲛ̅ⲃⲓ construction, points to a fairly literal rendering of a Greek *Vorlage*. The style is highly paratactic, although there are examples of rather sophisticated hypotaxis (cf. 39^{*},26-32; 40^{*},12-18).

IV. TITLE

XIII,^r* (*Trimorphic Protennoia*), though not the first tractate of Codex XIII, is the only one to have survived completely. The page on which it concludes is the last that survives, and has at its bottom the opening ten lines of another tractate, *On the Origin of the World*.

Between XIII,¹* and 2* there is a colophon which reads (unedited) as follows:

- 50*,21: ΠΛΟΓΟΣ ἸΤΕ ΠΙΦΑΝΙΑ ᾠ̅
 22: ΠΡΩΤΕΝΝΟΙΑ ΤΡΙΜΟΡΦΟΣ ᾠ̅
 23: ΑΓΙΑΓΡΑΦΗ ΠΑΤΡΟΓΡΑΦΟΣ
 24: ΕΝ ΓΝΩΣΕΙ ΤΕΛΕΙΑ·

Lines 22–24 are purely Greek and the words there are divided from one another, a trait not at that time usual in either Greek or Coptic manuscripts. Line 21, however, is in Coptic (the articles π- and τ-; and the genitive Ἰ-). Lines 21–22 clearly refer to all or part of the preceding tractate (though the referent of lines 23–24 is less clear).

At the ends of lines 21–22 two *gammās* are written, preceded by a wide space and with a supralinear stroke (ᾠ̅), indicating that the number three is meant. Assuming that they are not purely decorative (cf. decorative letters, e.g., at VII,¹¹⁸,8–9), these require some explanation. Elsewhere in the tractate two other titles exist, of which at least one is in Coptic:

- 42*,3: Π[ΛΟΓ]ΟΣ ἸΤΕ ΠΡΩΤΕΝΝΟΙΑ
 46*,4: [ΠΑΤΖΙΜΑ]ΡΜΕΝΗ

It is clear from the content of the sections of the tractate preceding each title that they function as subtitles to those sections. If the tractate were thus meant to be divided into three parts, or subtractates, the ᾠ̅ at the end of 50*,21 would mean “part 3.” If this interpretation is correct, one would expect to find ᾠ̅, “part 1,” and ᾠ̅, “part 2,” after the other two titles, respectively. Unfortunately, lacunae at these points in the text make verification impossible. Nevertheless, the correspondence between content and colophons and the ᾠ̅ at 50*,21 make such an interpretation probable. Thus the tractate consists of three subtractates:

- 35*,1–42*,3: The Discourse on the Protennoia (Part 1)
 42*,4–46*,4: The Discourse on the Heimarmene (Part 2)
 46*,5–50*,21: The Discourse of the Appearance (Part 3)

The title of the second subtractate is reconstructed, following H.-M. Schenke, as a possessive prefix replacing the formula ΠΛΟΓΟΣ Ἰ- in the titles of the other two subtractates.

The next problem is how to interpret the ᾠ̅ at line 50*,22. The obvious identity of the character with that found in line 21 might lead one to postulate a meaningless repetition of the “part 3,” perhaps a dittography. A more satisfactory interpretation is that the

̄ at line 22 means "in three parts." This use of a single Greek letter with supralinear stroke as a numeral following a title is one common means for designating the number of books a work contains. Diogenes Laertius in *Vitae philosophorum* listed works by the various authors under discussion, often with an indication of how many books each work contained. The form alternates between e.g., *περὶ τἀγαθοῦ α'β'γ'* (by Aristotle) and *περὶ τἀγαθοῦ γ'* (by Strato), both meaning "On the Good, Three Books." Therefore one may conclude that the title of the tractate, still in Greek (in distinction to the Coptic subtitles), read "Trimorphic Protennoia, Three Parts." This title suits well the tractate as a whole.

The Greek lines 23-24, *ἄγια γραφή πατρόγραφος ἐν γνώσει τελεία*, bear no obvious relation to either XIII,*r** or XIII,*z**. One might be tempted to consider them as a superscript title to XIII,*z**. But this tractate is untitled in Codex II, where it occurs in complete form (II,5:97,24-127,17), yet makes no claim to be "Father-written," while XIII,*r** at least in part purports to be a first-person revelation by the Father. Therefore one may regard lines 23-24 as a pious recommendation appended to XIII,*r** at some point in the history of its transmission, either by its author or a subsequent copiest. As such it is not part of the title to either XIII,*r** or XIII,*z**.

INTRODUCTION

NHC XIII, I*: TRIMORPHIC PROTENNOIA

35*,1-50*,24

Bibliography: Colpe, "Heidnische, jüdische und christliche Überlieferung"; Doresse, *Secret Books*, 181, 329-32; Hedrick "Christian Motifs," 242-60; Helderman, "Bemerkungen zu Codex XIII"; Janssens, "Le Codex XIII"; *La Proténnoia trimorphe*; MacRae, "Ego-Proclamation"; id., "Sleep and Awakening," 302; id., "Sophia Myth," 91; Robinson, "Sethians and Johannine Thought," 643-62 and discussion 662-70; Schenke, G., "Die dreigestaltige Proténnoia"; id., "Die dreigestaltige Proténnoia (Codex XIII)"; id., *Die dreigestaltige Proténnoia*; Schenke, H.-M., "Das Sethianische System"; id., "Gnostic Sethianism," 588-616; Turner, "The Gnostic Threefold Path," 324-51; id., "Trimorphic Proténnoia."

I. LANGUAGE

The language of *Trimorphic Proténnoia* is discussed in the Introduction to Codex XIII, Section III above.

II. TITLE

The title of *Trimorphic Proténnoia* is discussed in the Introduction to Codex XIII, Section IV above.

III. RESEARCH TO DATE

Doresse, in his inventory of the Nag Hammadi Library, only briefly mentions *Trimorphic Proténnoia*, and gives a translation of 39*,21-30 and 50*,12-20 (*Secret Books*, 181). In Appendix I ("The Teaching of Simon Magus in the Chenoboskion Manuscripts," *Secret Books*, 329-32), he translates a number of passages (42*,4-5; 35*,7-9; 46*,14-19; 45*,10-18; 45*,21-24; 37*,8.10-29; 50*,12-20 in this order), and compares, as possible examples of Simonian Gnosticism, *Trimorphic Proténnoia* with the *Concept of our Great Power* (VI,4) and the *Three Steles of Seth* (VII,5), whose incipit ascribes it to Dositheus, the master and rival of Simon. Recent

study of *Trimorphic Protennoia* has not supported this Simonian hypothesis.

Trimorphic Protennoia has been analyzed and translated, into German by G. Schenke: "Die dreigestaltige Protennoia"; "Die dreigestaltige Protennoia (Codex XIII)"; and into French by Y. Janssens: "Le Codex XIII"; *La Prôtennoia trimorphe*. In her dissertational transcription and translation G. Schenke (adopting the papyrus collation of H.-M. Schenke) attempts to restore most of the lacunae in the text, while Janssens in both her editions makes few restorations. Both provide a lengthy commentary listing many parallels between *Trimorphic Protennoia* and other ancient sources.

G. Schenke locates *Trimorphic Protennoia* in the ambiance of non-Christian Sethian gnostic literature (cf. also H.-M. Schenke, "Das Sethianische System," and "Gnostic Sethianism"). She characterizes it as a non-Christian document which has been secondarily Christianized by the addition of what in her translation is a single sentence at the end of the tractate (50*,12-15) and the insertion of the name "Christ" as a gloss serving to identify the divine Autogenes as Christ at three points (38*,22; 39*,6-7; 49*,8). The ontology of the text, characterized by a tension between dualism and monism, and the way in which its overarching pantheism tries to reconcile this dualism, is taken as an indication of a relatively late date for *Trimorphic Protennoia*, though it is recognized that its anthropology is equally marked by a very archaic gnostic *Welt- und Daseinsverständnis*. Noting that *Trimorphic Protennoia* consists of three separate subtractates, Schenke suggests that this literary tripartition corresponds to the "trimorphic" character of the Protennoia as universal goddess (somewhat as the three-formed Hecate), with the three aspects of Father, Mother, Son: as the masculine aspect of the First Thought of the Invisible Spirit (38*,11), as the feminine "mate," and finally as the Son or Logos. The third subtractate, devoted to the appearance of Protennoia as the Son or Logos, is said to constitute a material parallel to the prologue of the Fourth Gospel, in that it lies on the same plane as the gnostic Logos hymn underlying the Johannine prologue. Whereas the motifs of that Logos hymn appear to be "artificially" made serviceable to an alien purpose in the Johannine prologue, they find their "natural context" in *Trimorphic Protennoia*. Schenke notes that the revelatory speeches of Protennoia are cast mostly in the "I am" style of self-predication, though there is an

admixture of direct address ("you," 41*,2-15; 42*,27-30; 44*,29-45*,20; 46*,33-36) and responses in the first-person plural (36*,33-37*,3; 42*,22-23), as well as sections in which Protennoia speaks of herself in the third-person; especially where appearing as Son she speaks of herself as Mother, 38*,13-16; 45*,10; 46*,9-13.20. Schenke further notes that much of the material cast in the third-person is supplementary, with the result that the first subtractate seems to be devoted to a cosmology reflecting the first appearance of Protennoia as a form of the Father, the second subtractate to be devoted to an eschatology reflecting the second appearance of Protennoia as Mother, and the third subtractate to be devoted to a soteriology reflecting the third appearance of Protennoia as Son. Finally Schenke calls attention to the prominent concept of the Voice, especially where it is portrayed as thunder (43*,4-26).

Janssens supposes *Trimorphic Protennoia* to have been the second tractate in a codex that originally contained the long version of the *Apocryphon of John* followed by *Trimorphic Protennoia* and *On the Origin of the World*. Her view is based on the similarity of the hand of Codex II to that of XIII, and the facts that the missing 35 pages of XIII would be sufficient to contain the *Apocryphon of John* (32 pages in Codex II) and that two of these three tractates are also found in Codex II. While the two hands do not appear identical, as she assumes, but nevertheless closely related, this theory is attractive owing to the close relationship between the three stanza Protennoia hymn that concludes the longer version of the *Apocryphon of John* (II,1:30,11-31,25) and *Trimorphic Protennoia* with its three subtractates (a similarity already noticed by MacRae; see the discussion in Section IV below). Janssens interprets the tripartition of *Trimorphic Protennoia* as corresponding to the three modes in which Protennoia is revealed: in the first subtractate as the Thought of the Father, in the second as the Voice of the Mother, and in the third as the Logos. Janssens then produces a survey of gnostic literature in an effort to document other occurrences of this triadic scheme, taking as her hypothesis the words of C. Baynes (*Coptic Gnostic Treatise*, 64): "Viewing the cosmos as a tripartite unit, and believing, as they did, that some form of salvation was required for the whole, they taught that the Savior was manifested in the three divisions in a form and manner suited to the mode of being and needs of each." Janssens mentions various

tripartitions: the Valentinian tripartition of the Universe (Pleroma, Mesotes or Topos, and kenoma or lower world) and the threefold Christ (spiritual, psychic and perceptible); the Basilidean triple Sonship (subtle, opaque and material); the tripartition of the Universe into levels by the Peratae (*ἀγέννητος, αὐτογενής* and *γεννητός*) and the triple nature, triple body and triple power of their Christ; in the last Bruce tractate, the tripartition of the Universe (inside, middle, outside) and its threefold manifestation of the *Spinther* (Christ); the triple manifestation of Pronoia in the main body of the *Apocryphon of John* (the perfect or merciful Father, the Epinoia of Light, and the thrice-descending Pronoia); the threefold descent of Pronoia contained in the longer ending of *Apocryphon of John* (II,1:30,11–31,25) taken as a tradition by itself; in the *Hypostasis of the Archons* the threefold appearance of Pistis (the Man of Light, Sophia-Zoe, and Logos); in the *Gospel of the Egyptians* the descent of the Triple Male Youth to the *ἀγέννητος, αὐτογενής* and *γεννητός* realms; and finally the three-in-one Barbelo figure in the second Stele of the *Three Steles of Seth*.

C. Colpe (“Heidnische, jüdische and christliche Überlieferung”) in his survey of the treatises of Codices XI, XII and XIII, summarizes the contents of *Trimorphic Protennoia*. Noting the various aspects of Protennoia, he characterizes her as a wisdom-figure similar to the all-pervading Stoic Logos/Pneuma, but which as a gnostic redeemer must bridge the gap between a dualistic world of two levels by means of soteriological descents. Colpe sees the auditory metaphors of *Trimorphic Protennoia* as evidence that, while the text is a genuine Sethian-gnostic product, its historical basis in a non-dualistic soteriological speculation on the divine self is still evident and recoverable. Colpe then goes on to enumerate “stupendous parallels” to the Johannine prologue to be found in *Trimorphic Protennoia*: 1:1–2 cf. 35*,4–6; 1:3 cf. 38*,12–13; 1:4 cf. 35*,12–13; 1:5 cf. 36*,5; 1:7 cf. 37*,3–6.8–9; 1:9 cf. 47*,28–29; 1:10 cf. 38*,16–18; 50*,15–16; 1:11 cf. 41*,15–16; 47*,22–25; 1:12 cf. 37*,18–20; 1:13 cf. 49*,25–28; 1:14 cf. 47*,13–15.16–17; 38*,20–22; 1:16 cf. 46*,16–19; 1:18 cf. 36*,30; 36*,17–22. He concludes that in *Trimorphic Protennoia* one may still recognize a kernel of Palestinian/Syrian or even earlier Mesopotamian speculation on the cosmological and soteriological functions of the divine Wisdom on the basis of which both the mythology of the Johannine prologue and the Sethian-gnostic mythology of *Trimorphic Protennoia* could

be constructed. Thus Colpe and Schenke (together with the *Berliner Arbeitskreis für koptische-gnostische Schriften* generally) substantially agree on the common background of *Trimorphic Protennoia* and the Gospel of John, though the latter moves a bit further in seeing *Trimorphic Protennoia* as providing the natural context for these materials more than does the Johannine prologue. Janssens ("Une source gnostique du prologue?" 357) also admits the naturalness of "the way in which the 'Word' follows logically from the Thought and Voice of the divine," but sees John drawing from non-gnosticizing Genesis traditions independent from the tradition behind *Trimorphic Protennoia* (cf. Robinson, "Sethians and Johannine Thought," 642-62).

Thus the evident similarities between the Gospel of John and *Trimorphic Protennoia* may be explained in large part by supposing common membership in a religious world prone to conceiving the advent of the divine into the world in terms of a descending-ascending redeeming wisdom figure. Both texts arise in this sapiental environment at a point when it had taken a gnosticizing turn characterized by dualism and a mild anti-cosmicism which holds that true liberation lies beyond this world and is conveyed by a figure personifying the divine wisdom.

IV. STRUCTURE AND CONTENT

As noted by Schenke and Janssens, *Trimorphic Protennoia* is divided into three subtractates (35*,1-42*,3; 42,4*-46*,4; 46*,5-50*,21) separated from one another by individual subtitles probably added at a very late point in the treatise's composition and transmission ("The Discourse of Protennoia," 42*,3"; [On Fate]," 46*,4; "The Discourse of the Appearance," 50*,21). Each subtractate relates one of the three descents of the gnostic redeemer (cf. the summary in 47*,5-23a) here named Protennoia, the First Thought of the Father, and none other than Barbelo (36*,17; 37*,12-13; 38*,8-9). But beneath this simple structure, *Trimorphic Protennoia* displays a complex structure no doubt caused by a complicated redactional history.

The underlying basis of the tractate may be seen in the consistent aretalogical first-person singular (*ego eimi*) self-predications of Protennoia. These aretalogical statements are always of the form, "I am the . . .," or "it is through me that . . .," and do not include

direct statements about third-person parties, e.g., as in 46*,35b-36a, "then everyone of them within me shone." These self-predications seem originally to have been structured into an introductory aretalogy of about thirty lines (35*,1-32a) identifying Protennoia as the divine Thought, followed by three aretalogies of about forty lines apiece in the same style, the second and third of which form separate subtractates in *Trimorphic Protennoia*. Each of these three aretalogical sections were probably originally integral units, but seem to have been redactionally interrupted at points to make way for various later doctrinal additions.

The first aretalogy originally portrayed Protennoia as the Voice of the divine Thought who descends below to reveal her mysteries to her fallen members and seems to have consisted of 35*,32b-36*,27a + 40*,29b-41*,1a (and perhaps portions of 41*,20b-42*,2). The second aretalogy (and second subtractate) portrayed Protennoia as the Speech of the Thought's Voice who descended to give her fallen members "shape" and spirit or breath, and seems to have consisted of 42*,4-27a + 45*,2b-12a + 45*,21-46*,3. The third aretalogy (and third subtractate) portrayed Protennoia as the Word of the Speech of the Thought's Voice who descended incognito in the likeness of the various lower levels of beings, delivered the saving rite of the Five Seals and will raise her members into the Light; it probably consisted of 46*,5-7a + 47*,5-23 + 49*,6-22a + 50*,9b-20 (although the last two of these fragments seem to have suffered a number of Christian additions).

This tripartite aretalogy seems to have been expanded by inserting six doctrinal passages, which can be recognized by a shift from the first-person singular self-predicatory style to some other style of address. The first of these passages contains the sort of Sethian cosmological speculation found especially in the *Apocryphon of John* (see below Section V) and seems to begin around 36*,27b where *Trimorphic Protennoia* lapses into third-person description (cf. the use of the first-person plural in 36*,33-37*,3, perhaps a communal response), and ends at 40*,29a where the self-predicatory style resumes (the two instances of *ego eimi* material at 38*,11-16 and 40*,12-18 are drawn from the *Apocryphon of John* and reworded as first-person). This cosmology narrates the story of the Autogenes Christ and his four Lights, the last of which, Eleleth, emits his Epinoia (Sophia) to produce the Demon Yaltabaoth who steals the Epinoia's power to create the lower aeons and

humankind, and concludes with the restoration of Epinoia-Sophia, who is regarded as innocent of all fault.

Three of the remaining five doctrinal sections are explicitly designated as “mysteries” communicated by Protennoia to her members (41*,1b-42*,2; 42*,27b-45*,2a; 47*,24-49*,top; the other two passages 46*,7b-47*,top and 49*,22b-50*,9a do not seem to involve this designation). The term *μυστήριον* at 46*,34 and 47*,7 are general instances of the term and do not designate a specifically identifiable mystery. The first mystery narrates Protennoia’s loosening of the fleshly bonds by which the underworld powers enslave her fallen members, a sort of harrowing of Hell; it is announced as a mystery and proclaimed in direct discourse to a second-person plural audience (41*,1b-42*,2). The passage 41*,20b-42*,2 which concludes the first subtractate may be a part of the original aretalogy since it is cast in the first-person singular, yet it seems to presuppose material from the first “mystery” in lines 41*,21; 41*,29 and 41*,34-35; uses third-person language in line 41*,35b-36a; and seems to anticipate the third subtractate in line 25; furthermore 41*,1 would make a fit ending for the original aretalogy. Hence, 41*,20b-42*,2 is here included in 41*,1b-42*,2.

The second subtractate contains the second mystery (42*,27b-45*,2a) which is called the “mystery of (the end of) this Aeon” (42*,28) and is addressed to a second-person plural audience. It presents an apocalyptic announcement of the end of the old age and the dawn of the new age inaugurated by judgment of the authorities of Chaos, the celestial Powers and their Archigenetor (i.e., the creator Yaltabaoth).

The third mystery (47*,24-49*,top) is contained in the third subtractate, and narrates Protennoia’s administration of the celestial baptismal rite called the Five Seals; it is called the “mystery of knowledge” (48*,33-34). The third subtractate seems to have undergone extensive redactional activity. The first-person singular aretalogical narrative breaks off in the second line of the tractate, which introduces a lengthy third-person doctrinal treatment of the relation of the Word to the other two (Voice, Speech) modalities of Protennoia, and concludes with an announcement of Protennoia’s intention to reveal more mysteries (46*,7b-47*,top). The aretalogy seems to begin again on the top of page 47*, by way of a recapitulation of Protennoia’s first two descents (47*,5-13a), and resumes narrating her deeds as the Word who descends incognito

through various levels of spiritual powers until she speaks with her members (47*,13b-23a). At this point the term "brethren" (47*,23), which was used earlier only at 46*,[35] in the previous doctrinal section, is reintroduced, followed by third-person language (47*,25b-28a) and then by first-person singular language which recapitulates doctrine from the cosmology of the first subtractate (47*,28b-35; cf. 40*,11-18). While page 47* and page 49* refer to the recipients of Protennoia's salvific activity in the third-person plural, page 48*, narrating the third (baptismal) mystery, refers to the recipients in the third-person singular. Furthermore, page 48* and the top of page 49* probably contained paraenetical second-person plural address, typical in this tractate after a phrase like "so, now" (ΤΕΝΟΥ ΒΕ).

The third aretology resumes at 49*,6 and continues at least until 49*,22a. (The suspicious similarity between the "ineffable ordinances" in 49*,22b-23a and "the ineffable [Five Seals]" in 50*,9b-10a probably reveals a redactional seam.) This aretology on the Word appears repeatedly interrupted by Christianizing comments of a Christological nature at 49*,7b-8a; 11b-15a and 18b-20a). The last doctrinal addition, concerning the "ordinances of the Father" (identified with the Five Seals), seems to begin at 49*,22b (or perhaps 23b), again using third-person language (note the use of plural references in 49*,22b-28a and 49*,34b onward, but the singular in 49*,28b-34a). First-person style resumes at the top of page 50*, yet much of page 50* seems to bear the stamp of a Christianizing redaction (50*,10b-16a), leaving only 50*,16b-20 as perhaps belonging to the original aretology (50*,top-9a is first-person but seems enclosed by the redactional seam mentioned at the beginning of this paragraph).

The herein hypothesized redactor who was responsible for inserting doctrinal passages into the original aretology seems to have drawn upon traditional materials. The cosmological section is very close to that of the *Apocryphon of John* (see below, Section V). The first mystery (41*,1b-42*,2) narrating Protennoia's descent to destroy the bonds by which the lower Powers enslave her members, a virtual harrowing of Hell, employs language similar to the Nekyia traditions found in Hom. *Il.* VIII.14; Hes. *Theog.* 736-44 and 807-12; Plato, *Resp.* 614E-F and *Phaedo* 111C-13C; Vir. *Aen.* VI, 548-625; *Orac. Sib.* II, 227-28 and in the Apocalypses of Elijah and Peter. The second "mystery" (42*,27b-45*,2a) contains a

traditional-appearing apocalyptic description of the shortening of the times, the shaking of Chaos and the celestial Powers who control Fate; and makes use of the Graeco-Egyptian astrological doctrine of the lots of Fate and the planetary domiciles (Ptol., *Tetr.* I.17,37). The two versions of the five-stage baptismal ascent ritual in 48*,15-35 (third-person singular; part of the third "mystery") and in 45*,12b-20 (second-person plural, using a different order) also have a (Sethian) traditional flavor.

On the other hand, the remaining two doctrinal passages in the third subtractate (46*,7b-47*,top and 49*,22b-50*,9a) seem to represent almost a completely original firsthand speculative/theological composition on the genetic relationship between the three modalities (Voice, Speech, Word) of Protennoia and on the salvific significance of the Five Seals baptismal rite, speculation of the sort occurring in and around the traditional materials incorporated in the other non-aretalogical doctrinal sections.

In general, the hypothesized redactor of the original aretalogical sections clearly had a great interest in the Sethian baptismal rite as can be seen in passages such as 36*,5b-7a; 37*,1b-3a; 37*,35; 41*,21b-24a; 45*,12b-20 (an anticipation of 48*,15-30); 46*,16-19a; 48*,top-48*,35; and 49*,26b-34a. According to these, the Voice modality of Protennoia is the unpolluted Spring pouring forth Living Water (characterized as radiant light, perhaps a metaphor for the four Lights). The Word modality of Protennoia, bearing Living Fruit, pays the tribute of this Fruit (perhaps the seed of Seth; cf. *Gos. Eg.* III,2:56,4-13) to the Living Water, which is poured out upon Protennoia's "Spirit" (i.e., members) which originated from the Living Water but is now trapped in the soul. The baptismal rite of the Five Seals is a mystery of celestial ascent which strips off the psychic and somatic garments of ignorance (cf. Col 2:11-15), transforming and purifying Protennoia's members and clothing them with radiant light. The author's reference to the recipients of this rite in the first-person plural (36*,33b-37*,3a; cf. 42*,22-23) and as "brethren" suggests a (Sethian) community with a well-established tradition of water baptism which has been spiritualized into a mystery of celestial ascent.

Finally, while the aretalogical sections of the first two subtractates of *Trimorphic Protennoia* bear no evidence of Christian teaching, a number of Christological statements appear in the third subtractate. It is likely that the Christological glosses found in the

cosmological section of the first subtractate at 37*,[31]; 38*,22 and 39*,6-7 came into *Trimorphic Protennoia* along with the traditional material from an incipiently Christianized source like the *Apocryphon of John*. But the Christianizing passages in the third subtractate seem to have been added perhaps at a stage later than the redaction of doctrinal passages into *Trimorphic Protennoia*, since they have been worked thoroughly into the (original) aretalogical sections of the third subtractate rather than into the doctrinal or "mystery" sections (see below, Section VI on these passages: 47*,14b-15a; 49*,7b-8a; 49*,11b-15a; 49*,18b-20a; and 50*,10b-16a). The section 49*,6-20 probably originally mentioned the beings in 47*,20-21 (Sovereignties or Archons, Powers, Angels), so that the titles, Christ, Son of the Archigenetor and Son of Man, are likely intrusions in 49*,6-20.

While it is impossible to be completely precise about the extent and exact boundaries of the original aretalogies and the secondarily added material, perhaps the following table will help to illustrate the evidence being discussed here. The first column represents the oldest layer of the document (the aretalogies), and the second, third and fourth columns a subsequent redaction. The separate listing of baptismal and Christian passages does not indicate separate redactional activity. In the fourth column, "Christian additions," the material in the first subtractate is part and parcel of columns two and three; only in the third subtractate is there reason to believe Christian additions came from yet another, later stage of redaction.

A	B — LATER ADDITIONS —		
Original First-Person Aretalogy	Doctrinal Passages	Explicitly Baptismal Passages	Christological Passages
<i>First Subtractate</i>			Christological glosses
35*,1-32a (introduction)			
35*,32b-36*,27a (voice)	36*27b-40*,29a (cosmology)	36*,5b-7a 37,1b-3a; 37*,35	(inherited from cosmology)
40*,29b-41*1a (voice)	<i>First Mystery</i> 41*,1b-42*,2 (harrowing)	41*,21b-24a	37*,[31]; 38*,22; 39*,6-7

<i>Second Subtractate</i>			
42*,4-27a (Speech)		(42*,22-23?)	
↓	<i>Second Mystery</i>		
45*,2b-12a (Speech)	42*,27b-45*,2a		
↓	(eschatology)	45*,12b-20	
45*,21-46*,3 (Speech)			
<hr/>			
<i>Third Subtractate</i>			C
46*,5-7a (Word)			<i>Added in final</i>
↓	46*,7b-47*,top	46*,16-19a	<i>redaction</i>
	(the Word)		
47*,5-23 (Word, etc.)	<i>Third Mystery</i>		47*14b-15a
↓	47*,24-49*,top	48*,top-	49*,7b-8a; 49*,11b-15a
	(Five Seals)	48*,35	49*18b-20a
49*,6-22a (Word)	49*,22b-50*9a (the	49*,26b-34a	
↓	ordinances of the		
50*,9b-20	father)		50*10b-16a

As for doctrinal content, the gist of each subtractate is to identify one by one the nature and work of each of the modalities of Protennoia. In 37*,20-30 it is said that “the Voice that originated from my Thought exists as three Permanences (*μονή*): the Father, the Mother, the Son. Existing perceptibly as Speech, it has within it a Word endowed with every <glory>, and it has three masculinities, three powers, and three names [cf. *Ap. John* BG 8502,2:27,21-28,3]. They exist in the manner of Three...quad-rangles—secretly within a silence of the Ineffable One.”

Trimorphic Protennoia identifies Protennoia with Barbelo (38*,8-9). In the platonizing Sethian-Barbeloite treatises *Allogenes* (XI,3), *Zostrianos* (VIII,1), *Three Steles of Seth* (VII,5) and *Marsanes* (X), Barbelo and her sub-aeons (Kalyptos, Protophanes-Triple Male, and Autogenes) occupy the second ontological level of true being below the highest deity and his Triple Power, but above the perceptible world. Thus Protennoia/Barbelo is probably the Sethian-Barbeloite ontological equivalent of the intelligible level occupied by Nous in Neoplatonic metaphysics (see Turner, “The Gnostic Threefold Path”).

As in *Trimorphic Protennoia*, so also in the platonizing gnostic

tractates previously mentioned, Barbelo is tripartitioned into aspects or modalities. In these platonizing tractates, including also the last tractate of the Bruce Codex, one finds many occurrences of the terms Triple Male and Triple Powered One (cf. the “three masculinities” and “three powers” of *Trimorphic Protennoia*). In these tractates, Triple Male functions as a being within the Aeon of Barbelo. The Triple Powered One seems to be the emanative potency of the highest deity which proceeds from him and then takes on definition as true being in the form of intelligence, thus producing the Aeon of Barbelo. When one recalls the late neoplatonic scheme of *μονή* (the abiding quality of the first principle), *πρόοδος* (procession therefrom to a definite being or form) and *ἐπιστροφή* (recursion of the effect back to its first principle), one is tempted to understand the three *μοναί* of *Trimorphic Protennoia* (Father, Mother, Son) as first principles of the divine Thought from which Voice, Speech and Word respectively proceed (cf. XIII,36*,17–18) so as to provide form, being and definition to the Gnostics below (cf. the similar Valentinian idea of formation according to essence and formation according to knowledge directed by Christ and the Savior respectively toward the unformed Sophia, *Iren. Haer.* I.4.1 and I.4.5).

In the platonizing Sethian-Barbeloite treatises, salvation takes place in the form of an ecstatic visionary ascent of the Gnostic which occurs in three stages of *ascent* up to the highest deity (see the Introduction to *Allogenes* above). But in *Trimorphic Protennoia*, as well as in the Pronoia hymn of the longer version of the *Apocryphon of John* (II,1:30,11–31,25), salvation comes in the form of a threefold *descent* of the First Thought of the highest deity to the Gnostic below. This threefold descent is conceptualized in two ways: (1) as a hierarchical sequence of gendered figures, namely an unbegotten male (Father and Voice), a (self-begotten?) female (Mother and Speech) and a begotten (cf. 46*,9) male (Son and Word); and (2) as a three-stage temporal sequence (cf. 47*,5–16). The revelation culminates in the third descent as Son or Word, called “the eye (i.e., focus) of the three permanences” (46*,28–29). The “vertical” hierarchical structure, clearer in the more philosophical Sethian-Barbeloite tractates *Allogenes*, *Zostrianos*, and *Three Steles of Seth* than in *Trimorphic Protennoia*, seems to derive from the contemporary Platonic philosophical milieu (see Krämer, *Der Ursprung der Geistmetaphysik*, 233–64).

But the “horizontal” threefold sequence seems to derive from other quarters, perhaps from the partitioning of history into three or four dispensations of salvation adopted by gnostic Sethianism from Jewish apocalyptic speculation. Such a tripartitioning of *Heilsgeschichte* takes place in the *Apocalypse of Adam* where there is mentioned what appear to be three epochs of redemption (V,5:76,8–17) occurring at the times of flood, conflagration, and final salvation, and in the *Gospel of the Egyptians*, which relates three *παρουσίαι* of Seth at the times of flood, conflagration and final judgment (III,2:63,4–64,9). It is characteristic of the Nag Hammadi Sethian-Barbeloite literature to find a synthesis of philosophical and apocalyptic speculation on the nature of history and the cosmos typified by the tripartitioning of history, the cosmos, and the process of the salvation or restoration of the Gnostic.

Since in *Trimorphic Protennoia*, Protennoia is conceived mainly in auditory metaphors (Voice, Speech, Word), salvation is the hearing of a call. The Voice of the First Thought explains and thus nullifies the Gnostic’s bondage to the hostile powers (40*,8b–19a; 41*,1b–42*,2). The Speech of the Voice initiates the shift of the Ages by shaking the rule of Heimarmene with its thunder (43*,4b–44*,10a). Finally the Word illumines those in the darkness by revealing the mystery of the Five Seals (46*,30b–32; 48*,6–35).

As S. Emmel has pointed out (“Sound, Voice and Word”), careful study of the first two of the terms *ἡρῶυ* (masc. “Voice”), *σμη* (fem. articulate sound, “Speech”) and *λογος* (masc. Word) in the Sahidic NT suggests that *ἡρῶυ* refers to sound in general whether articulate or not, while *σμη* generally refers to articulate sound or speech: “Protennoia thus describes her three ‘comings’ in terms of a progressive gradation: first she comes as an all-pervasive, general sound (*hroou*), then as the articulation of that sound in voice (*Smē*), and finally as the rational content of speech (*logos*)” (Emmel, “Sound, Voice and Word,” 5). Hence there is presented the possibility of translating *ἡρῶυ* as Voice, *σμη* as Speech, and *λογος* as Word. Furthermore, taking into consideration the successive distinctions in gender of Protennoia’s descents (Father, Mother, Son) together with the assumption that the distinctive auditory terminology did not arise in Coptic (where the distinction of gender [masc. Voice, fem. Sound, masc. Word] are still maintained) but in Greek, one may surmise that we may have to do with successive modes of Protennoia coordinated in the following

way: Father=probably masc. *φθόγγος* (φρογγ); Mother=fem. *φωνή* (σμη) and Son=masc. *λόγος* (λογος). Thus the successive kinship terms and respective genders are coordinated with an increasing articulateness of Protенnoia's call or revelation manifested in each successive epoch of revelation/salvation. Insofar as *Trimorphic Protенnoia* is built upon the Pronoia hymn of the longer ending of the *Apocryphon of John* (see below), it appears that the author has nicely explained the incompleteness of salvation in the two first descents as owing to lack of complete revelatory clarity and articulateness as conveyed only by the Son in the form of the "rational" Word.

The genius of the auditory metaphors is their interpretive power. Again and again *Trimorphic Protенnoia* stresses the invisibility, intangibility, and imperceptibility of the revelatory medium. Yet the revelation itself is audible in the form of Voice, Speech and Word to those who listen for it, though only the Sons of Light can comprehend it (49*,22-26). The revelatory medium (and thus the redeemer) is neither substantial nor hypostatic, yet it is perceptible and effective in its auditory nature as speech and message. Hence *Trimorphic Protенnoia* exemplifies a very creative philosophical theology of the Word.

V. RELATION TO OTHER ANCIENT LITERATURE

The three introductory aretologies are cast in the form of the *ego eimi* style of self-predication familiar from the Isis aretologies found in Diodorus Siculus (*Bibl. Hist.* I.27.3-5) and particularly in the inscription of Kyme in Asia Minor that dates from around the second century C.E. (see Peek, *Der Isishymnus*; Müller, *Isis-Aretalogien*; Bergman, *Ich bin Isis*, and MacRae, "Ego-Proclamation").

It is especially this feature that calls for close comparison between *Trimorphic Protенnoia* and the longer ending of the *Apocryphon of John* which contains a strophic hymn distinguished by the prominent similarity of its content, structure, and form of discourse to that of *Trimorphic Protенnoia* (previously noted by MacRae, "Sleep and Awakening," 502; "Ego-Proclamation," 132; "Sophia Myth," 91 n.3, and Janssens, "Le Codex XIII," 342, 351-52).

In the ending of the longer version of the *Apocryphon of John* (II,1:30,11-31,25), one finds an account of the threefold descent of the Pronoia of Light (also "remembrance of the Pronoia") narrated in the *ego eimi* form of proclamation. There, in the *Apocryphon of John*, the Savior (who in the Christian dialogical framework is called both "Nazarene" and "Father, Mother, Son," cf. *Ap. John* II,1:2,14-15) identifies himself as the thrice-descending Pronoia. At the first descent the foundations of Chaos are shaken, but Pronoia remains hidden from her brethren, obscured by their wickedness. At the second descent the shaking of the foundations of Chaos threatens to destroy the brethren trapped therein, so Pronoia withdraws to her root of Light. But at the third descent, Pronoia, at first unrecognized, enters the prison of their bodies and succeeds in awakening them by reminding them of their root and seals them with the light of the water with Five Seals. Thus in both the *Apocryphon of John* and *Trimorphic Protennoia* we have a tripartite revelation of the divine First Thought (Pronoia=Protennoia), two preliminary descents producing great disturbance in the underworld but not resulting in final salvation, and a third and final descent into the bodies of the brethren, which results in salvation through the Five Seals. In each case salvation is realized by a revelation of man's current estate (bondage in chaotic matter), comes as a call to remember their origin, and results from the *utterance* of these things to the Gnostic.

The tripartite revelation of Pronoia in the longer ending of the *Apocryphon of John* was considered by MacRae to be "a Gnostic liturgical fragment probably recited at a ceremony of initiation much in the manner of a Christian baptismal homily or hymn" ("Sleep and Awakening," 502). He refers to Doresse's observation of its hymnic quality (*Secret Books*, 209), and cites as an example of such liturgies Pokorný's reconstruction of a Gnostic mystery-initiation from the Naasene homily in Hippolytus (Pokorný, "Epheserbrief").

If, as it is likely, the shorter BG 8502,2 and III,1 versions of the *Apocryphon of John* precede and are not digests of the longer version, the absence from them of this Pronoia hymn suggests that it may have existed separately from the *Apocryphon of John*. The strong equivalences between this text and *Trimorphic Protennoia* suggest that *Trimorphic Protennoia* is either the source of which the Pronoia text is a digest, which seems unlikely, or that *Tri-*

morphic Protennoia is an expansion based upon the source behind the hymnic Pronoia text now found in the longer ending of the *Apocryphon of John*. The cryptic reference in the latter to the Five Seals is clearly identified in *Trimorphic Protennoia* with a celestial liturgy of initiation consisting of investiture, baptism, enthronement, glorification, and transportation into the light (45*,13-20; 48*,15-35), though the order of the sequence varies. Both texts, then, demonstrate "liturgical" interest, and tend to establish the existence of a Sethian cultic mystery of baptism and celestial ascent, called the Five Seals. This ceremony is mentioned also in the *Gospel of the Egyptians* (IV,2:56,25; 58,27-59,1; 59,27-28; 66,25-26; 74,16; 78,4-5; III,2:55,12; 63,3) and in Schmidt-MacDermot, *Bruce Codex*, 232,10. Apparently the ceremony included baptism in the water of life and reception of the mysteries of Gnosis (XIII 41*,20-24) in the context of a graded series of acts, at each of which certain names are invoked (cf. XIII 49*,26-34 with 48*,15-35). It results in enlightenment and final salvation (cf. H.-M. Schenke, "Gnostic Sethianism," 604-7).

Trimorphic Protennoia is related to the *Apocryphon of John* at points other than the ending of the longer versions; above all they are related in the doctrinal exposition of the first subtractate (36*,27b-40*,29a). Comparison shows that *Trimorphic Protennoia* shares only those episodes of the Barbeloite cosmogony of the *Apocryphon of John* which are also found in *Iren. Haer.* I.29.1-4; the single exception is 40*,22-29, which is a brief notice on Yaldabaoth's production of a man in Protennoia's (Father-?) likeness. On the other hand, there are some episodes common to *Iren. Haer.* I.29.1-4 and the *Apocryphon of John* that are not narrated in *Trimorphic Protennoia*: the emanation of Barbelo from the Father or Invisible Spirit and his granting of Prognōsis, Aphtharsia, and Aiōnia Zōē to Barbelo; the generation of the Monogenes-Autogenes-Christ from Barbelo's light; the granting of Nous, Logos and Thelema to Christ; and the generation of Autogenes from Barbelo (Ennoia) and Logos (from Barbelo alone in the *Apocryphon of John*). Instead of narrating the generation of the four Lights from Monogenes-Christ, *Trimorphic Protennoia* only alludes to the generation of "Aeons" from the perfect Son (38*,16-21); as in Irenaeus and the *Apocryphon of John*, he establishes them, but only as four "Aeons" (not Lights), each conjoined with two others, while the term "Light" is only introduced in 39*,13-33 in reference to

Eleleth. Neither the tetrad (in Irenaeus) belonging to the Autogenes (Charis, Synesis, Phronēsis, and Thelēsis or Aisthēsis), nor the tetrad (in the *Apocryphon of John*) of Adam, Seth, seed of Seth, and repentant souls, nor the other inhabitants of the Aeons of the four Lights mentioned in the *Apocryphon of John* are to be found in *Trimorphic Protennoia*, which assigns rather different beings to the four Aeons Armozel, Oroiael, Daveithai, and Eleleth.

Thus not only does *Trimorphic Protennoia* (36*,27b-40*,29a) omit the multiple begettings of Aeons from various syzygies, but it also portrays the Barbeloite cosmogony only from the point at which the self-begotten Son is produced. Like Iren. *Haer.* I.29.1, it presupposes (or ignores) the emanation of Barbelo from the Invisible Spirit or Father. In place of the three faculties of Prognōsis, Aphtharsia and Aiōnia Zōē granted to Barbelo, it offers the Voice-Speech-Word interpretation of the Father-Mother-Son aspects of Barbelo (37*,20-30). Even though a gloss (38*,7-16) which lists the various epithets of Protennoia makes it clear that it is really she who is the preeminent creator of the All, the cosmology of *Trimorphic Protennoia* begins with the pleromatic work of the Son. While the third subtractate is devoted to the salvific activity (the third descent of Protennoia), the cosmogonic work of the Son in the first subtractate is to be regarded as the work of the Voice aspect of Protennoia. But for the Christian gnostic redactor (see below), the first and last subtractates of *Trimorphic Protennoia* accordingly portray the work of Christ in the creation and redemption of the cosmos respectively.

The following synopsis of *Trimorphic Protennoia*, Iren. *Haer.* I.29, and the *Apocryphon of John* (Codex II,1 and BG 8502,2) will illustrate the structure and sequence of episodes in *Trim. Prot.* XIII,1*:37*,3-40*,29:

- | | |
|-----------|--|
| 37*,3-20 | Introduction to the salvific work of the Son who originated from the Voice; this work is carried out in the three descents of Protennoia (no parallels). |
| 37*,20-30 | A description of the relation of the Voice, Speech and Word to Protennoia's three traditional modalities of Father, Mother, and Son. Cf. <i>Haer.</i> I.29.3 (Mother, Father, Son); BG 21,18-21 (Father, Mother, Son) and 27,18-28,2 (Triple Male, possessor of three powers, names and begettings)= II,2,13-14 and II,5,8-10. |

- 37*,30-38*,6 Anointing the Son with *χρηστία* (goodness) and establishing him in light over the Aeons. Cf. *Haer.* I.29.1: "As Barbelo exulted in these...this they say is the Christ" (*in quibus gloriantem...dicunt esse Christum*); BG 29,18-31,5=II,6,10-30 (cf. BG 32,3-19=II,7,15-30).
- 38*,7-16 A description of Protennoia as the ultimate Father of the divine world and image of the Invisible Spirit (not found in *Haer.* I.29). Cf. the epithets of the First Thought in *Ap. John* BG 27,8-21 (Light, Barbelo, perfect Glory, first Ennoia [=Protennoia], Image, Virgin)=II,4,29-5,7 (Light, Image of Invisible Spirit, Glory, Barbelo, First Thought [=Protennoia], Womb, Metropator [cf. Meirothea?]).
- 38*,16-39*,13 The Son reveals and establishes the twelve Aeons which include the traditional Sethian four Lights: Armozel, Oroiael, Daveithai and Eleleth (Aphtharsia is not involved). Cf. *Haer.* I.29.2: "From the light which is Christ... (the fourth whom they call) Eleleth" (*De lumine autem quod est Christus... Eleleth*); BG 32,19-34,18=II,7,30-8,28.
- 39*,13-26 The origin of Yaltabaoth from Protennoia's Epinoia (her "externalized *ἐννοια*") now resident in Eleleth. Cf. *Haer.* I.29.4: "Then moved by simplicity... to the lower regions" (*Post deinde simplicitate... in inferiora*); BG 37,6-11 (cf. the boasting of Eleleth and failure of the powers to entreat him, XIII,39*, 15-20); BG 37,16-18 (Yaltabaoth's form); BG 38,12-17 (the name Yaltabaoth and his theft of the power of the Mother [=Eleleth or Sophia]).
- 39*,26-32 (Saklas): =II,11,16-18 (Saklas, Samael). *Trimorphic Protennoia* is briefer, and does not employ the Sophia myth. It is Eleleth rather than Sophia who channels the Protennoia's Epinoia into the creation of Yaltabaoth without the assent of the powers. Consequently for *Trimorphic Protennoia*, Sophia is innocent (39*,28-32; 40*,15); since her role in other Sethian literature is here assumed by Eleleth's Epinoia, not explicitly identified with Sophia,

- Yaltabaoth's creation of the lower world is Eleleth's fault.
- 39*,32-40*,4 the restoration of the Epinoia (=Sophia?) to another order (τάξις). Cf. *Haer.* I.29.4: "When then had been born...withdrew to the higher regions" (*Generatis autem his...in altiora secessit*); BG 46,9-47,13=II,13,32-14,13. In *Trimorphic Protennoia*, the restoration seems to be complete, and because blame falls on Eleleth and not Epinoia (or Sophia), there seems to be no repentance.
- 40*,4-7 Yaltabaoth makes aeons as copies of the real Aeons with his power stolen from the Epinoia who has withdrawn. Cf. *Haer.* I.29.4: "he stole great power...she became the Ogdoad counting from below" (*virtutem autem magnam abstulisse...fit deorsum numerantibus octonatio*); BG 38,15-44,9=II,10,19-13,5. *Trimorphic Protennoia* summarizes and does not describe the angelic powers.
- 40*,8-22 Since the creator's boast is attributed by *Trimorphic Protennoia* to Eleleth (cf. 39*,13-17; to the "Archigenetor" in 43*,31-44*,2), it is not here attributed to Yaltabaoth: cf. *Haer.* I.29.4: "When she had withdrawn...beside me there is no one" (*Illa igitur secedente...praeter me nemo est*); BG 44,9-19=II,13,5-13. Instead, in *Trimorphic Protennoia* we have only the announcement of Protennoia, reaffirming Sophia's innocence: cf. BG 45,19-47,20=II,13,26-14,18.
- 40*,22-29 Yaltabaoth makes man in Protennoia's likeness, the beginning of his undoing (not in *Haer.* I.29). Cf. BG 47,20-51,1=II,14,19-19,14. *Trimorphic Protennoia* only says that man was made in Protennoia's image, while BG and Codex II imply that the image was that of Pronoia (Mother-Father=Protennoia) become First Man.

At this point where Iren. *Haer.* I.29.1-4 ends, the precise parallels with the *Apocryphon of John* also cease (except for the anthropology and Pronoia hymn of the longer ending!). Yet the basic

structure of the threefold descent of Protennoia can also be elicited from the remaining portions of the *Apocryphon of John* that are included in both the longer and shorter versions. As Janssens notes ("Le Codex XIII," 348–51), the Pronoia descends three times throughout the long anthropogonical and soteriological sections of the *Apocryphon of John* that are not found in *Trimorphic Protennoia*. In these contexts Pronoia (Protennoia) is referred to as the "Merciful Father" (or Metropator) who initiates (from the divine world) various salvific missions. Thus, in effect, her first descent occurs in BG 51,1–52,3=II,19,10–33, where Sophia gets the Metropator to send the male Autogenes and the four Lights down to Yaltabaoth and have him breathe the Mother's power into the inert psychic Adam, who is vivified. Pronoia's second descent occurs as the female Epinoia of Light who hides in Adam as Zōē and, when formed from his rib by Yaltabaoth, causes Adam to know his essence (BG 52,17–54,9; 59,6–21,7=II,20,9–31; 22,28–23,36; material on Paradise the trees, and the serpent are interpolated into this episode). The third descent of Pronoia is her (male) manifestation as Christ, which in the shorter version is in fact coincident with the appearance of the Savior in the Christian dialogical frame-story itself (see its conclusion in BG 75,10–76,9), while in the longer version it is coincident with the very Pronoia hymn (II,30,11–31,25) that underlies *Trimorphic Protennoia*!

These three descents in the main body of the *Apocryphon of John* are essentially those to be found in *On the Origin of the World* (II,5), *Hypostasis of the Archons* (II,4), and Irenaeus's "Ophite" account (*Haer.* I.30.6–12). They are thus a major feature of Sethian gnostic mythology. The *Apocryphon of John* seems to be a combination of the Sethian-Barbeloite cosmogony and Sophia myth of Iren. *Haer.* I.29, and this "Ophite" anthropogony and soteriology in which the Ophite doctrine of the serpent as the one who leads Adam and Eve to the tree of Gnosis (e.g., Iren. *Haer.* I.30.7) is severely criticized or played down (BG 57,20–58,14=II,22,9–21) in favor of Christ or Eve. It is this anthropogony and soteriology which is completely lacking in *Trimorphic Protennoia* save for the bare structure of three descents of the First Thought as Father, Mother, and Son. When the tree of knowledge is mentioned, it is a source, not of knowledge, but of ignorance (XIII,44*,20–26).

Furthermore, *Trimorphic Protennoia* does not make use of the Sophia myth of the *Apocryphon of John*. Instead, it employs a

weakened form of the myth in which the blame for the creation of Yaltabaoth is affixed to the boastful Eleleth. The innocent (and hence non-repentant) Sophia is weakly identified with the Epinoia, the creative power of Protennoia, stolen by Yaltabaoth who is created virtually by accident, not by Sophia's decision to create without a consort. Since this variant form of the Sophia myth is attested only in *Trimorphic Protennoia* and in the *Gospel of the Egyptians*, it surely cannot claim the primacy of the version found in the *Apocryphon of John* and Valentinian sources. It looks more like a reaction against the latter in an effort to separate the perfection of the divine world as far as possible from the evil of this world. This separation is not at all accomplished by the multiplication of aeonic buffer zones between the divine and material world; on the contrary, *Trimorphic Protennoia* reduces these to the bare minimum consistent with the Sethian-Barbeloite cosmology. In fact the extremely condensed version of the Aeons of the four Lights (38*,33-39*,5) seems to be included only for the purpose of providing the Epinoia with a point of exit (Eleleth) from the divine world. *Trimorphic Protennoia*, then, appears to be reacting against the excesses of the *Apocryphon of John*.

Trimorphic Protennoia intersects with the *Apocryphon of John* at only two points: the Pronoia hymn of the longer ending, and the Sethian-Barbeloite cosmogony it has in common with Iren. *Haer.* I.29. Accordingly, one should regard it as occupying a midpoint between the highly mythological *Apocryphon of John* and the more philosophical Sethian-Barbeloite treatises, such as *Zostrianos* (VIII,1). Although *Trimorphic Protennoia* shows no literary awareness of *Zostrianos*, it is close to it in spirit, particularly in its liturgical interest (cf. the baptisms in *Zostrianos* with the Five Seals of *Trimorphic Protennoia*), and in its lack of allusions to Genesis 1-6.

Yet *Trimorphic Protennoia* proved highly amenable to Christianization (see Section VI below) perhaps because of the similarity of the Logos-doctrine of its last subtractate to that of the Johannine prologue and the similarity of the eschatological language of the second subtractate to Christian apocalyptic. It further appears that *Trimorphic Protennoia* has orthodox Christian baptism in view in its presentation of the Sethian celestial baptismal-ascent ritual of the Five Seals when it interprets this as the "ordinances of the Father" proclaimed by Christ (48*,top-50*,20; cf. note on 49*,6-20). In fact, as Robinson notes in the discussion of his excellent

treatment of *Trimorphic Protennoia*: "Apart from the *Gospel of Thomas*, no greater claim has been made for the relevance of the Nag Hammadi texts to the New Testament than that made by the *Berliner Arbeitskreis* regarding the *Trimorphic Protennoia*" ("Sethians and Johannine Thought," 662). This claim principally involves the question whether and to what extent *Trimorphic Protennoia* is a non-Christian document originally composed without benefit of Christianity and subsequently Christianized by a Sethian author who was either (1) a non-Christian using materials no longer sensed as Christian or (2) was a non-Christian consciously reinterpreting (and thus confuting) Christian tradition, or (3) a Sethian consciously taking up with Christian tradition, but consciously reinterpreting it (thus confuting orthodox Christian interpretations) in Sethian fashion to yield a higher spiritual meaning in the light of Sethian teaching. In the present analysis, the third option emerges as the most likely explanation for the present text of *Trimorphic Protennoia*.

As will be argued, *Trimorphic Protennoia* originated as a non-Christian text based on the non-Christian Pronoia hymn at the end of the longer version of the *Apocryphon of John* (see below, stages 1 and 2), but subsequently (see below, stage 3) was fleshed out on the basis of the cosmological teaching in common between *Iren. Haer. I.29* and the *Apocryphon of John*. If that version of the *Apocryphon of John* were substantially the same as the four versions we currently possess, it would serve as the source for the glosses identifying the Autogenes Son with Christ (37*,31; 38*,22-23; 39*,6-7), but not for the substantial Christian interpretations of the Protennoia/Logos as the Christ in 48*,35-49*,20 and 50*,7-16. In these passages the reinterpretation of Christological titles and of the work of Christ is explicit and consciously polemical, but not as Schenke observed, anti-Christian or even non-Christian. It is rather anti-orthodox Christian, but still fundamentally sympathetic to the appropriateness of understanding the work of Seth as the work of Christ.

This acutely raises the question of the "stupendous parallels" between *Trimorphic Protennoia* and the Gospel of John (see above, section III), especially in the prologue, but also in the farewell discourse (cf. 50*,11-12 with Jn 15:4-5; cf. Jn 17:21-23; 1 Jn 2:24; 3:24; and 50*,14-16 with Jn 14:2). In general, all the parallels cited by Colpe (see above, section III) and others are most likely

due to a sapiential background common to the Johannine prologue and the *Trimorphic Protennoia* together with its basic source, the Pronoia hymn of the *Apocryphon of John*, given their common tripartition of cosmic time according to the descents of the savior figure, first shining in the darkness at the beginning, then coming unsuccessfully into the world, and finally becoming incarnate in the third (successful) coming. But with the parallels to the farewell discourse in 50*,11-12 and 50*,14-16 and with the parallel to John 1:14 in 47*,14-15, it seems that Johannine language is intentionally employed, if not reinterpreted (cf. Helderman, "Bemerkungen zu Codex XIII," criticized by Robinson, "Sethians and Johannine Thought," 659-60). In 47*,14-15 it is clear that "their tents" in which Protennoia reveals herself as Word is interpreted as the "shape" (εἰκῶν) earlier given by Protennoia to her "fellow brethren" until their consummation; indeed it is a "garment" (47*,17) to disguise her from the Powers. This guise is later interpreted docetically by means of certain redactionally added passages (in 49*,6-22a and 50*,9b-20) to the effect that the true Christ never actually became human but only appeared to be such, and that he rescued Jesus from the cross and established a dwelling place with his Father, not for believers (Jn 14:2), but for Jesus himself. This in itself does not constitute a denial of Johannine thought, but certainly takes it in a direction anathematized by the author of 1 John (cf. 4:2-3). Certainly the use of σκηνή and λόγος in a single sentence which refers to a (third and) final descent of a savior figure in 47*,13-15 is striking, even if the Coptic versions of Jn 1:14 do not use this loanword to translate ἐσκήνωσεν. On balance it seems that the final redaction of *Trimorphic Protennoia* does employ Johannine language in such a way as to score a polemical point against more orthodox Christian views of Christ's incarnation. Precisely whose views and what his direct source was for Johannine language remains unclear.

VI. COMPOSITION

Since the figure of Christ is dominant at two points in *Trimorphic Protennoia* (the activity of the Perfect Son in 37*,3-38*,6 and the activity of Protennoia as Logos in 48*,35-50*,20), one might classify it as a Christian-gnostic document. Although this

undoubtedly characterizes its present form, at an earlier stage of its composition it was probably non-Christian. That is, the figure of Christ may be secondary, a redactional addition to *Trimorphic Protennoia* (see G. Schenke, "Die dreigestaltige Protennoia," cols. 733-34), as has also been pointed out in the case of the closely related *Apocryphon of John* (cf. Arai, "Christologie des Apokryphons des Johannes"; H.-M. Schenke, "Das literarische Problem des Apokryphon Johannis").

Of the four occurrences of the term "Christ" in *Trimorphic Protennoia*, the first (37*,[31]) has been restored on the basis of context and parallel epithets ("the God who came into being by himself," i.e., "only-begotten") used in the second occurrence (38*,22-23); the third occurrence is found at 39*,6-7 (where it is likely that $\overline{\text{NTAYXΠOQ}}$ should be completed by a missing $\overline{\text{EBOΛ ZHTOOTQ}}$); the fourth occurs in a mutilated section (49*,8), to the effect that the Archons were fooled by Protennoia's incognito descent into thinking Protennoia was their (earthly?) Christ. The first three occurrences appear to be glosses appended to the phrases "it is he alone who came to be," "the God who came into being by himself" and "the God who was begotten" (add: "by himself") either by $\overline{\text{ETE ΠΑΙ ΠΕ}}$ or in simple apposition by juxtaposition. These three instances of the name "Christ" serve only to make an identification between Christ and the Autogenes Son of Protennoia/Barbelo as in the *Apocryphon of John*, and thus may imply dependence of *Trimorphic Protennoia* on an already Christianized version of the *Apocryphon of John* of the sort reflected in Irenaeus's excerpt in *Haer.* I.29. Furthermore, the first three instances of the term "Christ" all occur in the only section of *Trimorphic Protennoia* (37*,30-40*,7) that has direct parallels to the material in *Iren. Haer.* I.29.1-2 and to the theogonic material in the version of the *Apocryphon of John*.

The final mention of the term "Christ" (49*,8) occurs in the third subtractate of *Trimorphic Protennoia* (48*,35-50*,20) which is intended to give a Christian-gnostic interpretation to the descent of the revealer in opposition to other "orthodox" Christologies. Here the Word appears as Christ who, disguised successively as a son of the Archigenetor, as an angel and as a Son of Man, descends incognito and reveals the Five Seals, puts on Jesus, and bears him and his seed into the world of Light.

Only in the third subtractate does it seem that Christianization,

particularly by means of Johannine language, becomes thoroughgoing. There one finds the identification of Protennoia with the Logos as the third mode of Protennoia's descent into the world, appearing this third time (as the Logos) in their tents (*σκηνή*, 47*,11-15; cf. *ἐσκήνωσεν*, Jn 1:14). The Logos descends incognito, disguised, and hidden from all in the form of various heavenly powers until he chooses to reveal himself (47*,13b-23a). It is implied that the Logos, not the Archons, made the world (47*,25-28). Next, after the apparently non-Christian Sethian-gnostic liturgical passage on the Five Seals on page 48*, Christian language as well as the subject of incognito descent returns (49*,6-22a or 23a). As G. Schenke "Die dreigestaltige Protennoia [Codex XIII]," 130-32) argues, this passage reinterprets traditional Christological predications of Jesus as Christ, Son of God (i.e., "Son of the Archigenetor"), an Angel, a Power, and "Son of Man." *Trimorphic Protennoia* shows these to designate only the forms in which the Logos *appears* to the Archons, Angels, Powers, and Sons of Man. In actuality he is not the Son, but the Father (of everyone), the "beloved" of those in whom the Logos reveals himself. After the continuation of the Sethian passage (with no particular Christian features) on the Five Seals, Christian, especially Johannine, language returns again (to 50*,10b-16a cf. Jn 15:4; 14:2-3; 12:32).

As Schenke goes on to observe, *Trimorphic Protennoia* is at this point non-Christian, even anti-Christian. That is to say it is anti-"orthodox Christian," for the shift from the obscure, ineffective activity of the earthly Jesus to the clear revelation of saving gnosis by the Logos-Christ is located not in his earthly life, nor in a work he effects on the cross, but in his post-resurrection mode of existence; only then can the Logos-Christ and his message be recognized for what they are. Pages 49* and 50* seem to contain instances of Christian-gnostic polemic which use Christological motifs to characterize the "orthodox" Christian view of Christ as inferior and inadequate. The orthodox Son of God is a son of the demiurge-Archigenetor, their Son of Man is only a human, and their cross is only "cursed wood." Furthermore, it is to be noted that the "orthodox" version of the Johannine Logos-hymn carefully subordinates John the Baptist to the Logos, to the effect that John was not the light, but was merely a witness to it. Indeed he was not the Logos but only a voice (*φωνή*) crying in the wilderness (Jn

1:6–8.23). But contrary to this view, *Trimorphic Protennoia* exalts the Voice (not identified with John) to the status of the two earlier but not finally effective modes of Protennoia's self-manifestation as Father and Mother, while the Son-Logos is the third manifestation. Although the Logos is the final and fulfilling manifestation of Protennoia, it is not superior to the Voice, from whom the Logos in fact originated (37*,3–6; cf. 46*,3b–32).

All these considerations suggest that *Trimorphic Protennoia* had a distinctive redactional history. At its basis lies an early version of the aretalogical sapiential Pronoia hymn presently found in the longer version of the *Apocryphon of John*. This aretalogy on the threefold descent of Protennoia as Voice, Speech and Word was subsequently enlarged and supplemented by various doctrinal sections (36*,27b–40*,29a; 41*,1b–42*,2; 47*,27b–45*,2a; 46*,7b–47*,top; 47*,24–49*,top; and 49*,22b–50*,9a), the first of which was incipiently Christianized by means of the Christological glosses at 37*,[31]; 38*,22–23 and 39*,6–7. Finally the original aretalogy (46*,5–7a + 47*,5–23 + 49*,6–22a + 50*,9b–20) of the third subtractate seems to have undergone a somewhat polemical Christianizing by the addition of 47*,14b–15a; 49*,7b–8a; 49*,11b–15a; 49*,18b–20a; and 50*,10b–16a.

The purpose of Christianizing *Trimorphic Protennoia* by means of this additional material would be to point out the superiority of the docetic gnostic Logos-Christ to the "orthodox" Son of God (i.e., Son of the demiurge) or (the too-earthly) Son of Man. This hypothetical but quite conscious Christianization does not seem to employ themes from the Johannine prologue, which seem to have entered *Trimorphic Protennoia* during a prior stage of the text much as Colpe and Schenke have suggested. That is to say, the parallels to the Johannine prologue seem to belong to those parts of *Trimorphic Protennoia* that were not explicitly Christianized, suggesting that *Trimorphic Protennoia* is not directly dependent on the text of the prologue, but upon common sapiential traditions employed in each text independently. On the other hand, the Christian interpolations in 50*,10b–16a seem to reflect at least the language of the farewell discourse, but not the prologue, of the Gospel of John.

On the basis of these observations, *Trimorphic Protennoia* seems to have a compositional history consisting of approximately four stages.

(1) The first stage is represented by the *Grundform* of the non-Christian Pronoia hymn, a later version of which is represented by the ending of the longer version of the *Apocryphon of John*. This original form of the hymn was perhaps a product of general oriental speculation on the pre-existent figure of the divine Wisdom who descends into this world for salvation and judgment. Although it does not display detailed features of the Sethian-Barbeloite cosmology, it does mention the "seed" (*Ap. John* II,r:30,13) and conceives salvation as occurring in three visitations, or epochs, both of which are Sethian conceptions. Thus the Pronoia hymn may represent a very early stage of gnostic Sethianism. The version of this hymn now in the *Apocryphon of John* already bears the marks of a long interpolation (II,r:31,4-22) in its third stanza which unbalances an otherwise smoothly balanced hymn in three stanzas of approximately equal length. If the interpolation is removed, the third stanza (30,32-31,4.22-25) would then read: "Again the third time I went—I who am the Light that dwells in the Light—I am the remembrance of Pronoia—that I might enter the midst of the darkness and the inner part of the underworld. I filled my face with the light of the completion of their Aeon and went into the midst of their prison... and I raised him up and sealed him with the Light of the Water with Five Seals, that death might not prevail over him from now on." The grounds for suspecting that 31,4-22 is an interpolation are three: (a) $\epsilon\tau\epsilon\ \pi\alpha\iota\ \pi\epsilon\ \pi\epsilon\psi\tau\epsilon\kappa\omicron\ \pi\epsilon\omega\mu\alpha$ in 31,4 has the character of an interpretive gloss; (b) the number of the addressee(s) shifts from the plural (31,2-3) to the singular (31,6-20, "he" and "thou"); and (c) the length of the dialogue of awakening, cast in language similar to Eph 5:14, makes the third stanza too long and unwieldy. Whether *Trimorphic Protennoia* is literally dependent upon the version now found in the *Apocryphon of John* or some other version cannot be determined. The motifs of the call to awakening (31,5-6; cf. XIII,35*,1-22), the chains (31,10; cf. XIII,41*,4-6.18.29) and the weeping (31,6; cf. XIII,44*,11) contained in the interpolation all occur in *Trimorphic Protennoia*, but such motifs are common in gnostic literature. Of course, one should bear in mind, as Schenke and Colpe have suggested (see above Section III), that even this hypothetical first stage may be based on a yet earlier composition which underlies both the Pronoia hymn and the Johannine prologue.

(2) The first-person self-predications of the three stanzas of some

form of the Pronoia hymn were expanded into the long aretalogies of self-predication in each of the subtractates of *Trimorphic Protennoia* (35*,32b-36*,27a + 40*,29b-41*,1a; 42*,4-27a + 45*,2b-12a + 45*,21-46*,3; 46*,5-7a + 47*,5-23 + 49*,6-22a + 50*,9b-20; also the introductory aretalogy in 35*,1-32a). The creative gain from this second compositional stage was perhaps the development of the male Voice, female Speech, and male Word speculation as an interpretation of the three descents of Pronoia, now renamed Protennoia, which may have been inspired by the Sethian-Barbeloite Father, Mother, Son triad in the *Apocryphon of John* and in the source of Iren. *Haer.* I.29.

(3) The third stage represents the accommodation of this expanded Pronoia/Protennoia hymn to the developed cosmogonical mythology of the major Sethian treatises such as the *Apocryphon of John*. Into the first subtractate (35*,1-32a + 35*,32b-36*,27a + 40*,29b-41*,1a) there would later have been inserted the cosmogonic myth (36*,27b-40*,29a) drawn from the Sethian-Barbeloite cosmogony in or underlying *Ap. John* BG 8502,2:26,15-39,6 and Iren. *Haer.* I.29.1-4. Since the Christian glosses at 37*,[31]; 38*,22-23 and 39*,6-7 were probably taken over as part of this inherited cosmogonic material, *Trimorphic Protennoia* became incipiently Christian at this stage. This cosmogonic material seems to have been reworked in such a way as to exonerate Sophia from the responsibility for the creation of Yaltabaoth as depicted in the *Apocryphon of John*. Hence the blame is transferred to Eleleth, while Sophia, identified with Epinoia, is called "innocent" (39*,13-40,4). In the *Apocryphon of John* Epinoia seems to be a female (Zōē=Eve?) manifestation of Pronoia (BG 53,4-10), and is distinct from the blameworthy Sophia. But as *Trimorphic Protennoia* omits the story of the creation of Adam by Yaltabaoth in the garden, the Epinoia does not appear as Zōē or Eve, or as the tree of knowledge; rather, she is assimilated to the role usually reserved for Sophia herself, who is in turn exonerated as guileless, with the result that Eleleth tends to receive the blame for allowing the Epinoia to fall into Yaltabaoth's hands. Likewise at this stage the contents of the first "mystery" on Protennoia's harrowing of the underworld powers (41*,1b-42*,2) would have been appended to the first subtractate. If the first-person material in 41*,20b-42*,2 was part of the original aretalogy, only 41*,1b-20a would have been added here, yet this first-person material seems suspicious: 41*,20b-21a

seems dependent on 40*,10-18; 41*,21b-24a is a gloss identifying with the spirit Protennoia's portion (*meros* occurs only at 40*,13 and 41*,21; elsewhere one finds *melos*); 41*,24b-25 seems inconsistent with 41*,27; 41*,30-32 is defective; and 41*,32b-35a seems to presuppose the doctrinal section 41*,1b-20a. Alternatively one may on a different interpretation of this evidence conclude that the entire section 41*,1b-42*,2 (except perhaps 41*,21b-24a) belonged to the original aretalogy of stage two, but the use of the second-person plural form of direct address to the tractate's audience at 41*,2.5.12 and 13 is unusual for the bulk of the first-person aretalogical sections, and occurs elsewhere only at 42*,27; 44*,29b-33a; 45*,12b-20 and 46*,33-34, all of which occur in doctrinal passages which employ first-person language only to introduce a generally third-person doctrinal discourse of Protennoia.

Similarly in the third stage the eschatological teaching of the second mystery (47*,27b-45*,2a) would have been inserted into the aretalogy (42*,4-27a + 45*,2b-12a + 45*,21-46*,3) of the second subtractate. In this way the activity of the Mother or Speech aspect of Protennoia is interpreted as causing the shift of the ages and the overthrow of the power of Fate. Whether or not the anticipatory promise to introduce the baptismal rite at 45*,12b-20 was added at this stage is hard to decide; it employs the first-person language of the aretalogies, but as previously mentioned, direct address in the second plural to the reader is certainly not characteristic of the bulk of the aretalogical material.

Finally the doctrinal material at 46*,7b-47*,top (speculation on the relation of the Word to Protennoia's other modalities), 47*,24-49*,top (the third "mystery," on the Five Seals) and 49*,22b-50*,9a (on the efficacy of the "ordinances of the Father," identified with the Five Seals) would have been added to the third subtractate during the third stage. While the first and last of these sections are generally third-person description, the third mystery contains first-person narrative (47*,28b-48*,35a) typical of the aretalogies, and may be considered to be part of the aretalogical treatise produced at stage two. However, 47*,28b-47*,bottom seems dependent on 40*,10-18 (cf. 41*,20b-21) which is probably a doctrinal addition, and the section 48*,top-48*,35 refers to the recipients of Protennoia's salvific activity in the third-person singular, not in the third-person plural as is elsewhere usual (cf. a similar shift at 49*,28b-34a).

At this point, *Trimorphic Protennoia* has become an only incipiently Christian (cf. the glosses at 37*,[31]; 38*,22 and 39*,6-7) basically Sethian-Barbeloite doctrinal homily. It is no longer a hymn or even an extended self-predicatory aretalogical composition, but it is not yet a didactic mythological treatise. Its goal is no longer primarily liturgical nor is it yet completeness of speculative mythological calculation, but rather it constitutes a paraenetical appeal to the human spirit. Its lofty rhetoric, combining aretalogical announcement and compelling narrative, suits it as an appeal for conversion, as evangelistic proclamation. One may conjecture that at this stage, *Trimorphic Protennoia* may have been used as a public invitation to membership in the Sethian community, perhaps with (orthodox) Christians in view as the target audience.

(4) Finally, the rather polemical Christian Sethian material at 47*,14b-15a; 49*,7b-8a.11b-15a.18b-20a and 50*,10b-16a would have been inserted into the third subtractate, yielding *Trimorphic Protennoia* as it presently stands. The insertions on pages 47* and 50* which draw on Johannine language would tend to be attractive to both Sethian and non-Sethian Christians alike, but the generally anti-orthodox quality of the Christological insertions on page 49* make it clear that the goal of the tractate is to show the poverty of orthodox Christologies (including the Johannine) and to convey a higher (Sethian) one.

At this point the almost purely positive appeal of *Trimorphic Protennoia* in its immediately previous non-Christian dress has been modified in a polemical direction. No longer a purely evangelical announcement, it is now aimed at challenging and reinterpreting the "orthodox apostolic" Christian claims concerning Christ and the salvation offered by him. Instead of the orthodox Son of the creator God of this world, who was also the human Son of man, Christ is claimed for Sethian Gnosticism as the completely otherworldly Logos of the divine Thought itself, whose phenomenal appearances to both men and to spiritual powers were only a ruse perpetrated by the evil Archigenetor of this world and his archontic Powers. At this point the Sethian community has targeted members of the more "orthodox" Christian church as candidates for the immediate enlightenment and salvation tendered by Sethian Gnosis. *Trimorphic Protennoia* has now become a weapon in the competition for souls.

If such a compositional history be accepted (or one like it),

Trimorphic Protennoia should be considered to be roughly contemporary with the *Apocryphon of John* and *Iren. Haer.* I.29, and may have reached its final form by the mid-second century C.E. Probably surviving for some time in Greek dress, it was eventually translated into Coptic, and found its way into Codex XIII. At some point in the mid-fourth century C.E., *Trimorphic Protennoia* was removed from Codex XIII, inserted into the front cover of Codex VI, and buried with the other Nag Hammadi Codices, where it lay until the time of its discovery.

35*

2 [ΑΝΟΚ] ΤΕ ΤΠΡΩ[ΤΕΝΝΟΙΑ ΠΜ]ΕΕΥΕ ΕΤ
 Ψ[ΟΟ]Π· Ζ^Μ [ΠΟΥΘΕΙΝ ΑΝΟΚ] ΠΕ ΠΚΙΜ
 4 ΕΤΨΟΟΠ Ζ^Μ Π[ΤΗΡ] ΤΑΙ ΕΤΕ Π[ΤΗΡ] Ψ
 ΖΕ ΕΡΑΤ^Υ ΖΡΑ[Ι ΝΖΗΤ] ΠΨΟΡ]Π· ΝΧΠΟ
 6 Ζ^Ν ΝΕΝΤΑΨ[ΩΠΕ ΤΕΤΨΟ]ΟΠ ΖΑ[Θ]Η Μ
 ΠΤ[Η]Ρ^Υ· ΕΥΜΟΥ[ΤΕ ΕΡΟΣ] ΝΨΟΜΤ ΝΡΑΝ ΕΣ
 8 ΨΟΟΠ· ΟΥΑΑΤ^Σ [ΕΣΧΗ]Κ· ΕΒΟΛ' Α[Ν]ΟΚ' ΟΥ
 ΑΤΝΑΥ ΕΡΟ[Σ ΖΡ]ΑΙ Ζ^Μ ΠΜΕΕΥΕ ΜΠΙΑΤ·
 10 ΝΑΥ ΕΡΟ^Υ ΕΕ[Ι]ΒΟΛ[Π] ΕΒΟΛ Ζ^Ν ΝΙΑΤΨΙ
 ΤΟΥ ΝΙΑΤΨΑΧΕ ΜΜΟΟΥ ΑΝΟΚ' ΟΥΑΤ·
 12 ΤΕΖΟΣ ΕΕΙΨΟΟΠ Ζ^Μ ΠΙΑΤΤΕΖΟΥ ΕΕΙ
 ΚΙΜ· ΖΡΑΙ Ζ^Ν ΣΩΝΤ ΝΙΜ ΑΝΟΚ ΠΕ ΠΩΝΖ
 14 ΝΤΑΞΠΙΝΟΙΑ ΤΑ[Ι ΕΤΨΟ]ΟΠ' ΖΡΑΙ Ζ^Ν
 ΒΑΜ ΝΙΜ ΑΥΩ ΖΡΑΙ Ζ^Ν ΚΙΜ' ΝΙΜ ΝΑΝΕΖ
 16 ΑΥΩ ΖΕΝ'ΟΥΑΕΙΝΕ ΝΑΤΝΑΥ ΕΡΟΟΥ ΑΥΩ
 ΖΡΑΙ Ζ^Ν ΝΑΡΧΩΝ ΜΝ ΝΑΓΓΕΛΟΣ ΜΝ
 18 ΝΔ[ΑΙ]Μ[Ω]Ν ΜΝ ΨΥΧΗ ΝΙΜ ΕΤΨΟΟΠ'
 Ζ^Μ ΠΤ[ΑΡΤ]ΑΡΟΣ ΜΝ ΨΥΧΗ ΝΙΜ ΝΖΥΛΙΚΗ
 ΕΕΙΨΟΟΠ' Ζ^Ν ΝΕΝΤΑΨΩΠΕ ΕΕΙΚΙΜ Ζ^Ν
 20 ΟΥΟΝ ΝΙΜ [ΑΥ]Ω ΕΕΙΒΡΗ ΝΖΗΤΟΥ ΤΗ
 ΡΟΥ ΕΕΙΜΟΨΕ Ζ^Ν ΟΥΣΟΟΥΤ^Ν ΑΥΩ ΝΕ
 22 Τ^ΝΚΑΤΚ' ΕΕΙΝΕ[Ζ]ΣΕ ΜΜΟΟΥ ΑΥΩ ΑΝΟΚ'
 ΠΕ ΠΝΑΥ ΕΒΟΛ ΝΝΕΤ'ΨΟΟΠ Ζ^Μ ΠΖΙΝΗΒ
 24 ΑΝΟΚ ΠΕ ΠΙΑΤΝΑΥ ΕΡΟ^Υ ΖΡ[Α]Ι Ζ^Μ ΠΤΗΡ^Υ
 ΑΝΟΚ' ΠΕΤΨΟΧΝΕ ΝΝΕΤΖΗΠ· ΕΕΙΣΟ
 26 ΟΥΝΕ ΜΠΤΗΡ^Υ ΕΤΨΟΟΠ ΖΡΑΙ ΝΖΗΤ^Υ
 ΑΝΟΚ' ΟΥΑΤΗΠΕ ΠΑΡΑ ΟΥΟΝ ΝΙΜ· ΑΝΟΚ
 28 ΟΥΑΤΨΙΤ^Υ· ΝΑΤΨΑΧ[Ε] ΜΜΟΟΥ ΑΝΟΚ Ν
 ΔΕ ΕΕΙΨΑΝ'ΟΥ[ΩΨΕ ΤΝ]ΑΟΥ'ΟΝΖΤ ΕΒΟΛ
 30 ΟΥΑΑΤ· ΑΝΑΚ [ΤΕ ΤΑΠΕ Μ]ΠΤΗΡ^Υ ΕΕΙΨΟ
 ΟΠ ΖΑΘΗ^Μ [ΠΤΗΡ^Υ ΑΥΩ ΑΝ]ΟΚ ΠΕ ΠΤΗΡ^Υ
 32 ΕΕΙΨ[ΟΟΠ Ζ^Ν ΟΥ]Ο^Ν ΝΙΜ ΑΝΟΚ ΟΥΖΡΟ
 Ο[Υ ΕΦΨΑΧΕ Ζ^Ν ΟΥΖΗC]ΥΧΗ ΕΕΙΨΟΟΠ·
 34 Χ[Ν ΝΨΟΡΠ' ΕΕΙΨΟΟΠ Ζ]Ρ[Α]Ι Ζ^Ν †ΜΝΤΚΑ
 [ΡΩC ΕΤ^ΜΠΚΩΤΕ ΝΟΥΟΝ] ΝΙΜ ΜΜΑ[Υ]

35*

[I] am [*Protennoia, the*] Thought that
 2 [dwells] in [*the Light. I*] am the movement
 that dwells in the [*All, she in whom the*] All takes
 4 its stand, [*the first-*]born
 among those who [*came to be, she who exists*] before
 6 the All. [*She (i.e., Protennoia) is called*] by three names,
 although she
 dwells alone, [*since she is perfect*]. I am
 8 invisible within the Thought of the Invisible
 One. I am revealed in the immeasurable,
 10 ineffable (things). I am incomprehensible,
 dwelling in the incomprehensible. I
 12 move in every creature. I am the life
 of my Epinoia that dwells within
 14 every Power and every eternal movement
 and (in) invisible Lights and
 16 within the Archons and Angels (*ἄγγελος*) and
 Demons (*δαίμων*) and every soul (*ψυχή*) dwelling
 18 in [*Tartaros*] and (in) every material (*ύλική*) soul (*ψυχή*)
 I dwell in those who came to be. I move in
 20 everyone and I delve into them all.
 I walk uprightly and those who
 22 sleep, I [*awaken*]. And I
 am the sight of those who dwell in sleep.
 24 I am the Invisible One within the All.
 It is I who counsel those who are hidden, since I know
 26 the All that exists in it.
 I am numberless beyond (*παρά*) everyone. I
 28 I am immeasurable, ineffable, yet (*δέ*)
 whenever I [*wish, I shall*] reveal myself
 30 of my own accord. I [*am the head of*] the All. I exist
 before [*the All, and*] I am the All,
 32 since I [*exist in*] every[*one*]. I am a Voice
 [*speaking softly (ήσυχή)*]. I exist
 34 [*from the first. I dwell*] within the Silence
 [*that surrounds*] every[*one*] of them.

36*

1 αγω η[2]ρ[οοϋ πε ετ2]ηη ετω[οοη 2ραϊ]
 2 η2ηη 2ρ[αϊ 2μ πμεεϋε] νατ'ε2[οϋ η]
 3 ατωιτϣ 2[ραϊ 2η τμη]τκαρωσ ηατωιτ[ς]
 4 ανοκ αε[ιβωκ ε2ραϊ ετ]μηηε ηαμηη[ε]
 5 αε[ι]πρρι[ε ε2ραϊ εχμ π]κακε ανακ πε[η]
 6 ταε[ι]βεβε [μ]πμ[οοϋ αν]οκ πετ'2ηη' 2ρα[ι]
 7 2η 2ενμοοϋ ε[γπρρι]ωοϋ ανοκ πεητ[αει]
 8 πρριε μηπηηρϣ κατα με[ρ]οϣ 2ραϊ 2μ πα
 9 μεεϋε ανοκ πετοηη [μ]π2ροοϋ εβολ[λ]
 10 2ιτοοτ' εψασει εβολ [η]βι τηνωσις εε[ι]
 11 ψοοη' 2η ηιατωαχε ημοοϋ μη ηιατ
 12 σοϋωνοϋ ανοκ πε ταισησις μη ησο
 13 οϋη εειτε[γο η]οϋ2ροοϋ εβολ 2ιτοοτ[η]
 14 ηοϋμεεϋε α[η]οκ πε η2ροοϋ ετωοηη
 15 εειτ' 2ραϋ 2η οϋον ηιμ' αγω σεσο<ο>γ<η>
 16 ημας ερεοϋσπερμα' ψοοη 2ραϊ η2η[τοϋ]
 17 ανοκ πε πμεεϋε μηπιωτ α[γ]ω [εβ]ολ 2ιτο
 18 οτ' αηψωρη' ηει εβολ ηβ[ι] η2[ρ]οοϋ ετε
 19 παϊ πε ησοϋη ηηεηηη[η]τεϋ 2η εει
 20 ψοοη' ημεεϋε μη[τη]ρϣ' εει2ατρε α
 21 2οϋη' απμεεϋε ηατ[ς]οϋωηη' αγω ηατ'
 22 τε2οϣ' αειοϋοη2τ [ε]βολ ανοκ η2ραϊ
 23 2η ηεητ'αϋσοϋωηη' τηροϋ χε ανοκ η
 24 γαρ πεη2ατρε μη οϋον ηιμ η2ρα 2η
 25 πμεεϋε εη2ηη αγω 2η οϋ<2>ροοϋ εϣ'
 26 χοσε αγω οϋ2ροοϋ εβολ 2ιτοοτ[η] η
 27 πμεεϋε ηαηηαϋ εροϣ' αγω οϋατωιτϣ
 28 πε εϣωοη' 2η ηιατωιτϣ' οϋμηστη
 29 ριον πε οϋ[αηηη]2τε ημοϣ πε εβολ
 30 2ιτοοτϣ [μ]η[πιαηηη]οϣ' οϋαηηαϋ ε
 31 ροϣ πε [η]ηηαϊ τηροϋ ετοϋϋοη2 εβολ'
 32 2η ητηρϣ [ο]ϋο[ειηε πε ε]ϣ[ω]οηη 2η
 33 οϋοειηε ανον η[ε 2ωωη εηα2βω]λ'
 34 οϋααηη εβ[ο]λ' 2η ηκοσμοϣ ετοϋϋοη2
 35 εβολ εηη[οϋ2η εβολ 2ιηη ημνηηηηη]
 36 2ηη' εη2ηη [εβολ 2ιτοοτ[η] ηη2ροοϋ]

36*

And [it is] the [hidden Voice] that [dwells within]
 2 me, [within the] incomprehensible
 immeasurable [Thought, within the] immeasurable Silence.
 4 I [descended to the] midst of the underworld
 and I shone [down upon the] darkness. It is I who
 6 poured forth the [water]. It is I who am hidden within
 [radiant] waters. I am the one who
 8 gradually (κατὰ μέρος) put forth the All by my
 Thought. It is I who am laden with the Voice. It
 10 is through me that Gnosis comes forth. [I]
 dwell in the ineffable and unknowable ones.
 12 I am perception (αἴσθησις) and knowledge,
 uttering a Voice by means of
 14 thought. [I] am the real Voice.
 I cry out in everyone, and they recognize
 16 it (i.e., the voice), since a seed (σπέρμα) indwells [them].
 I am the Thought of the Father and through
 18 me proceeded [the] Voice,
 that is, the knowledge of the everlasting things. Since I
 20 exist as Thought for the [All]—being joined
 to the unknowable and incomprehensible Thought—
 22 I revealed myself—yes, I—among
 all those who recognized me. For (γάρ) it is I
 24 who am joined with everyone by virtue of
 the hidden Thought and an exalted <Voice>,
 26 even a Voice from
 the invisible Thought. And it is immeasurable,
 28 since it dwells in the Immeasurable One. It is a mystery
 (μυστήριον);
 it is [unrestrainable]
 30 by [the Incomprehensible One]. It is invisible
 [to all those who are] visible
 32 in the All. [It is a Light] dwelling in
 Light. It is we [also who] alone [have separated]
 34 [from the] visible [world (κόσμος)]
 since we [are saved by the]
 36 hidden [wisdom by means of the]

37*

1 $\bar{\nu}\alpha\tau\psi\alpha\chi\epsilon \bar{\mu}\mu\omicron\varsigma \bar{\nu}[\alpha]\tau\psi\iota\tau\varsigma' \alpha\gamma\omega \pi\epsilon\tau\bar{\nu}$
 2 $\zeta\rho\alpha\bar{\iota} \bar{\nu}\zeta\eta\tau\bar{\nu} \epsilon\tau\zeta\eta\pi \varsigma\tau' \bar{\nu}\mu\phi\omicron\rho\omicron\varsigma \bar{\nu}\eta\epsilon\varsigma\kappa\alpha\rho$
 3 $\pi\omicron\varsigma \alpha\tau\omicron\omicron\tau\varsigma' \bar{\mu}\pi\mu\omicron\omicron\upsilon \bar{\mu}\pi\omega\eta\zeta \tau\omicron\tau\epsilon \beta\epsilon$
 4 $\pi\psi\eta\rho\epsilon \epsilon\tau\chi\eta\kappa \epsilon\upsilon\omicron\lambda \zeta\bar{\nu} \zeta\omega\beta \eta\mu \epsilon\tau\epsilon \pi\alpha\bar{\iota}$
 5 $\pi\epsilon \pi\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\varsigma \epsilon\tau\alpha\zeta\psi\omega\pi\epsilon \epsilon\upsilon\omicron\lambda \zeta\iota\tau\bar{\nu} \pi\bar{\iota}$
 6 $\zeta\rho\omicron\omicron\upsilon \epsilon\alpha\varsigma\bar{\rho}\psi\omicron\rho\tau\bar{\iota} \bar{\nu}\epsilon\bar{\iota} \epsilon\upsilon\omicron\lambda \bar{\mu}\pi\chi\iota\varsigma\epsilon \epsilon\gamma$
 7 $\bar{\nu}\tau\alpha\varsigma \bar{\mu}\mu\alpha\gamma \bar{\mu}\pi\rho\alpha\eta \bar{\nu}\zeta\rho\alpha\bar{\iota} \bar{\nu}\zeta\eta\tau\varsigma' \epsilon\varsigma\omicron \bar{\nu}$
 8 $\omicron\upsilon\omicron\epsilon\bar{\iota}\eta\epsilon \alpha\varsigma\omicron\upsilon\langle\omega\rangle\eta\zeta \epsilon\upsilon\omicron\lambda \bar{\nu}\eta\bar{\iota}\alpha\tau\zeta\alpha\eta \alpha\gamma$
 9 $\omega \eta\bar{\iota}\alpha\tau\varsigma\omicron\upsilon\omega\eta\omicron\upsilon \tau\eta\rho\upsilon \alpha\gamma\varsigma\omicron\upsilon\omega\eta\omicron\upsilon$
 10 $\alpha\gamma\omega \eta\alpha\bar{\iota} \epsilon\tau\mu\omicron\kappa\zeta \bar{\nu}\bar{\rho}\zeta\epsilon\rho\mu\eta\eta\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon \bar{\mu}\mu\omicron$
 11 $\omicron\upsilon \bar{\mu}\bar{\eta} \eta\epsilon\theta\eta\pi' \alpha\varsigma\omicron\upsilon\omicron\eta\zeta\omicron\upsilon \epsilon\upsilon\omicron\lambda \alpha\gamma\omega$
 12 $\eta\epsilon\tau\psi\omicron\omicron\pi' \zeta\bar{\nu} \omicron\upsilon\gamma\mu\eta\tau'\kappa\alpha\rho\omega\varsigma \bar{\mu}\bar{\eta} \pi\psi\omicron\rho\pi'$
 13 $\bar{\mu}\mu\epsilon\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon \alpha\varsigma\tau\alpha\psi\epsilon \omicron\epsilon\bar{\iota}\psi \eta\alpha\gamma \alpha\gamma\omega \eta\epsilon\tau\psi\omicron$
 14 $\omicron\pi \zeta\bar{\mu} \pi\kappa\alpha\kappa\epsilon \alpha\varsigma\omicron\upsilon\omicron\eta\zeta\varsigma' \epsilon\upsilon\omicron\lambda \eta\alpha\gamma \alpha\gamma\omega$
 15 $\eta\epsilon\tau\psi\omicron\omicron\pi' \zeta\bar{\mu} \pi\eta\omicron\upsilon\eta \alpha\varsigma\tau\alpha\mu\omicron\omicron\upsilon \epsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma'$
 16 $\alpha\gamma\omega \eta\epsilon\tau\psi\omicron\omicron\pi' \zeta\bar{\nu} \eta\epsilon\zeta\omega\rho \epsilon\tau\zeta\eta\pi' \alpha\varsigma\chi\omega$
 17 $\epsilon\rho\omicron\omicron\upsilon \bar{\nu}\bar{\mu}\mu\varsigma\tau\eta\rho\bar{\iota}\omicron\eta\bar{\nu} \bar{\nu}\alpha\tau\psi\alpha\chi\epsilon \bar{\mu}\mu\omicron$
 18 $\omicron\upsilon \alpha\gamma[\omega] \bar{\nu}\varsigma\upsilon\omicron\omicron\upsilon\epsilon \bar{\nu}\alpha\tau\omicron\upsilon\alpha\zeta\mu\omicron\upsilon \alpha\varsigma\tau\varsigma\epsilon\upsilon\omicron$
 19 $\omicron\upsilon \alpha\eta\eta\tau\alpha\gamma\psi\omega\pi\epsilon \tau\eta\rho\upsilon \bar{\nu}\psi\eta\rho\epsilon \bar{\mu}$
 20 $\pi\omicron\upsilon\omicron\epsilon\bar{\iota}\eta\epsilon \pi\zeta\rho\alpha\gamma \bar{\nu}\Delta\epsilon \epsilon\eta\tau\alpha\varsigma\psi\omega\pi\epsilon \epsilon$
 21 $\upsilon\omicron\lambda \zeta\bar{\mu} \pi\alpha\mu\epsilon\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon \epsilon\varsigma\psi\omicron\omicron\pi' \bar{\nu}\psi\omicron\mu\tau\epsilon \bar{\mu}$
 22 $\mu\omicron\eta\eta \pi\bar{\iota}\omega\tau' \tau\mu\alpha\alpha\gamma \pi\psi\eta\rho\epsilon \omicron\upsilon\varsigma\mu\eta \epsilon\varsigma$
 23 $\psi\omicron\omicron\pi \zeta\bar{\nu} \omicron\upsilon\gamma\alpha\bar{\iota}\varsigma\theta\eta\varsigma\bar{\iota}\varsigma \omicron\upsilon\gamma\bar{\eta}\tau\epsilon\varsigma \bar{\mu}\mu\alpha\gamma \bar{\nu}$
 24 $\omicron\upsilon\gamma\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\varsigma \zeta\rho\alpha\bar{\iota} \bar{\nu}\zeta\eta\tau\varsigma' \pi\alpha\bar{\iota} \epsilon\tau\epsilon\gamma\bar{\eta}\tau\alpha\varsigma' \bar{\mu}\mu\alpha\gamma$
 25 $\bar{\nu}[\omicron\upsilon\epsilon]\langle\epsilon\rangle\omicron\omicron\upsilon \eta\mu \alpha\gamma\omega \omicron\upsilon\gamma\bar{\eta}\tau\epsilon\varsigma \bar{\mu}\mu\alpha\gamma' \bar{\nu}$
 26 $\psi\omicron\mu\tau\epsilon \bar{\mu}\mu\eta\eta\tau\zeta\omicron\omicron\upsilon\tau' \alpha\gamma\omega \psi\omicron\mu\tau\epsilon \bar{\nu}\Delta\gamma$
 27 $\eta\alpha\mu\bar{\iota}\varsigma \alpha\gamma\omega \psi\omicron\mu\tau \bar{\nu}\rho\alpha\eta \epsilon\gamma\psi\omicron\omicron\pi' \bar{\mu}\pi\epsilon$
 28 $\epsilon\bar{\iota}\rho\eta\tau\epsilon \bar{\mu}\pi\psi\alpha\mu\tau' \square\square\square\epsilon\gamma\omicron \bar{\nu}\eta\tau\omicron\upsilon \kappa\omicron$
 29 $\omicron\zeta \zeta\bar{\nu} \omicron\upsilon\pi\epsilon\tau\zeta\eta\pi \zeta\rho\alpha[\bar{\iota} \zeta]\bar{\nu} \omicron\upsilon\gamma\mu\eta\tau\kappa\alpha\rho\omega\varsigma$
 30 $\bar{\mu}\pi\bar{\iota}\alpha\tau\psi\alpha\chi\epsilon \bar{\mu}\mu[\omicron\varsigma \bar{\nu}\tau\omicron\varsigma \omicron]\gamma\alpha\alpha\tau\varsigma' \epsilon\tau\alpha\zeta\psi\omega$
 31 $\pi\epsilon \epsilon\tau\epsilon \pi\alpha\epsilon\bar{\iota} [\pi\epsilon \pi\epsilon\chi\bar{\varsigma} \alpha\gamma\omega] \alpha\eta\omicron\kappa' \bar{\nu}\tau\alpha\bar{\iota}\tau\alpha\zeta\bar{\varsigma}\bar{\varsigma}$
 32 $\bar{\mu}\pi\epsilon\omicron\omicron\upsilon [\bar{\nu}\tau\epsilon \pi\bar{\pi}\bar{\nu}\alpha \bar{\nu}\alpha]\tau\eta\eta\alpha\gamma \epsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma \zeta\bar{\nu}$
 33 $\omicron\upsilon\gamma\mu\eta\tau[\chi\bar{\varsigma} \pi\bar{\iota}\psi\omicron]\mu\tau \beta\epsilon \alpha\epsilon\bar{\iota}\tau\epsilon\zeta\omicron\varsigma \epsilon\rho\alpha\tau\bar{\varsigma}$
 34 $\omicron\upsilon\alpha[\alpha\tau\varsigma' \zeta\bar{\nu} \omicron\upsilon\epsilon\omicron\omicron\upsilon \bar{\nu}]\psi\alpha\epsilon\eta\epsilon\zeta \epsilon\zeta\rho\alpha\bar{\iota} \epsilon$
 35 $\chi[\bar{\nu} \eta\alpha\bar{\iota}\omega\eta \zeta\rho\alpha\bar{\iota} \zeta\bar{\mu} \pi\bar{\iota}\mu\omicron\omicron\upsilon] \epsilon\tau\omicron\zeta \epsilon\tau\epsilon \pi\alpha\bar{\iota}$
 36 $[\pi\epsilon \pi\epsilon\omicron\omicron\upsilon \pi\alpha\bar{\iota} \epsilon\tau\kappa\omega\tau\epsilon \epsilon\rho\omicron]\varsigma' \text{VACAT}$

37*

ineffable, immeasurable [*Voice*]. And he who is
 2 hidden within us pays the tributes (φόρος) of his fruit (καρπός)
 to the Water of Life. Then (τότε)
 4 the Son who is perfect in every respect—that is,
 the Word (λόγος) who originated through that
 6 Voice; who proceeded from the height; who
 has within him the Name; who is
 8 a Light—he (i.e., the Son) revealed the everlasting things and
 all the unknowables were known.
 10 And those things difficult to interpret (ἐρμηνεύειν)
 and secret, he revealed, and
 12 as for those who dwell in Silence with the First
 Thought, he preached to them. And
 14 he revealed himself to those who dwell in darkness, and
 he showed himself to those who dwell in the abyss,
 16 and to those who dwell in the hidden treasures he told
 ineffable mysteries (μυστήριον),
 18 and he taught unrepeatable doctrines
 to all those who became Sons of
 20 the Light. Now (δέ) the Voice that originated
 from my Thought exists as three
 22 Permanences (μονή): the Father, the Mother, the Son. Existing
 perceptibly (αἰσθησις) as Speech, it (i.e., Voice) has
 24 within it a Word (λόγος) endowed with
 every <glory>, and it has
 26 three masculinities, three powers (δύναμις)
 and three names. They exist in the
 28 manner of Three —which are quadrangles—
 secretly within a silence
 30 of the Ineffable One. [*It is he*] alone who came to be,
 that [*is, the Christ. And*] as for me, I anointed him
 32 as the glory [*of the*] Invisible [*Spirit* (πνεῦμα)] with
 [*goodness* (-χρηστός)]. Now [*the Three*] I established
 34 [*alone in*] eternal [*glory*] over
 [*the Aeons in the*] Living [*Water*], that
 36 [*is, the glory that surrounds him*] VACAT

38*

1 παῖ ἐντ[α]ϣ[ρ]ωρη ἡ πῆριε ἡ πογοειν
 2 ἡνιαίων ἐτχοσε ἄγω ζραῖ ζῆ ογοειν
 ἡεοογ ζῆ ογταχ[ρ]ο εμην ἔβολ ἄγω α[ϣ]
 4 ωζε ερατῆ ζῆ πογοειν ἡμιν ἡμο[ϣ]
 παῖ ἐτκωτε εροϣ ἐτε παῖ πε πβαλ' ἡπ[ογ]
 6 οειν ἐτρωγοειν εροει ζραῖ ζῆ ογεοο[γ]
 αϣτ' αἰων ἡπιωτ' ἡ<N>αἰων τηροϣ ἐτε [α]
 8 νοκ πε πμεεγε ἡπιωτ' ἡτπρωτεν
 νοια ἐτε παῖ πε βαρβηλω πεοογ ἐτχ[ηκ]
 10 εβολ ἄγω πατ' ναγ εροϣ εϣζηη: ἡατω[ιτϣ]
 ανοκ πε θικων ἡππῆα ἡατ' ναγ ερο[ϣ]
 12 ἄγω ἡταπτηρη' χι ζικων εβολ ζιτοοτ
 ἄγω τμααυ πογοεινε παῖ ἐντασκααϣ
 14 εφοει: ἡπαρθενος ταῖ ἐτογμογτ[ε]
 ερος χε μειροθεα τοτε ἡτα' τεζος ηζρη[ο]
 16 ογ ἡατ' εμαζτε ἡμοϣ' ἄγω ἡατωιτῆ τοτε
 πτελειος ἡψηρε αφογονζϣ εβολ ἡνεϣ
 18 αἰων ναῖ ἐνταϣωπε εβολ ζιτοοτϣ'
 αφογονζογ εβολ αϣτ' ναγ ἡογεοογ ἄγω
 20 αϣτ' ναγ ἡζενθρονος αϣωζε ερατῆ 'ζ' ἡ
 πεοογ παῖ εταϣτ' εοογ ναϣ' ζραῖ ἡζηηϣ'
 22 ἄγσμογ ἀπτελιος ἡψηρε πεχῶ πνογτε
 παῖ ἐνταϣωπε ογαατϣ' ἄγω ἄγτ' εοογ
 24 εγχω ἡμος χε ϣωοοπ ϣωοοπ πωη
 ρε ἡπνογτε πωηρε ἡπνογτε ἡτοϣ πε[τ]
 26 ωοοπ' παιων ἡτε ναιων εϣβαωτ' ανα[ι]
 ων ναει ἐνταϣποογ χε ἡτοκ ἡγαρ α[κ]
 28 χπο ζῆ πεκογωωε ογαατκ ἐτβε παῖ τ[ῆ]
 † εφογ νακ' ἡα ἡω ὦ ὦ ὦ εἰα εἰ ὄν εἰ π[ιαι]
 30 ων ἡτε να[ιων] π[αἰων] ἡταϣταειϣ τοτε
 ἡτοϣ πνο[γτε] ἐνταγ[χ]ποϣ αϣτ' ναγ ἡ
 32 ογβομ ἡ[ωνζ] ἐτρεγταχ]ρο ερος ἄγω α[ϣ]
 τεζο ἡμ[οογ] ζῆ πογμα π[ω]ο[ρη]π μεν' ἡ
 34 αἰων αϣτεζο[ϣ] εζραῖ εχῆ πωο[ρη]π: ἡρμη
 ἡωῆ ἡογϣ[ανιον] ἡρμωζηλ πμαζ]σναγ
 36 αϣτεζοϣ: [εζραῖ εχῆ πμαζσναγ ἡαιων]

38*

who first came forth to the Light
 2 of those exalted Aeons, and it is in glorious
 Light that he firmly perseveres. And [*he*]
 4 stood in his own Light
 that surrounds him, that is, the Eye of the Light
 6 that gloriously shines on me.
 He perpetuated the Father of all <the> Aeons, who am I,
 8 the Thought of the Father, Protennoia,
 that is, Barbelo, the [*perfect*] Glory
 10 and the [*immeasurable*] Invisible One who is hidden.
 I am the Image (εἰκών) of the Invisible Spirit (πνεῦμα)
 12 and it is through me that the All took shape (εἰκών),
 and (I am) the Mother (as well as) the Light which she
 appointed
 14 as Virgin (παρθένος), she who is called
 Meirothea, the incomprehensible Womb, the
 16 unrestrainable and immeasurable Voice. Then (τότε)
 the Perfect (τέλειος) Son revealed himself to his
 18 Aeons who originated through him,
 and he revealed them and glorified them and
 20 gave them thrones (θρόνος) and stood in
 the glory with which he glorified himself.
 22 They blessed the Perfect (τέλειος) Son, the Christ, the
 only-begotten God. And they gave glory
 24 saying: "He is! He is! The Son
 of God! The Son of God! It is he who
 26 is! The Aeon of Aeons beholding the
 Aeons which he begot! For (γάρ) thou hast
 28 begotten by thine own desire! Therefore [*we*]
 glorify thee: MA MŌ Ō Ō Ō EIA EI ON EI! The [*Aeon*]
 30 of [*Aeons! The*] Aeon which he gave!" Then (τότε),
 moreover, the [*God who was begotten*] gave them (i.e., the
 Aeons)
 32 a power of [*life on which they might rely*] and [*he*]
 established [*them. The*] first (+ μέν)
 34 Aeon, he established [*over the first*]: Armedon,
 Nousa[nios, Armozel; the] second
 36 he established [*over the second Aeon*]:

39*

2 ΦΛΙΟΜΙΟΝ ΔΙΝΙΟΝ ΟΡΟΙΑΝΛ ΠΜΑΖΩΜΤ
 ΕΖΡΑΙ ΕΧΜ ΠΜΑΖΩΜΤ ΝΑΙΩΝ ΜΕΛΛΕΦΑ
 4 ΝΕΑ ΛΩΙΟΝ ΔΑ ΥΕΙΘΑΙ ΠΜΕΖΩΤΟΥ ΕΖ
 ΡΑΙ ΕΧΜ ΠΜΕΖΩΤΟΥ ΜΟΥΣΑΝΙΟΝ ΑΜΕ
 ΘΗΝ' ΗΛΗΛΗΘ Ν'ΙΔΙΩΝ ΒΕ ΕΝΤΑΥΧΠΟΥ
 6 ΕΒΟΛ ΖΙΤΟΥΤΩ ΜΠΝΟΥΤΕ ΝΤΑΥΧΠΟΥ ΠΕ
 ΧΣ ΝΑΙ ΔΕ ΑΥΤ ΝΑΥ ΝΟΥΕΟΥ ΑΥΩ ΑΥΤ ΕΟ
 8 ΟΥ ΖΩΟΥ ΝΒΙ ΝΑΙΩΝ ΑΥΡΩΡΠ' ΝΟΥΩΝΖ
 ΕΒΟΛ ΕΥΧΟΣΕ ΖΜ ΠΟΥΜΕΕΥΕ ΑΥΩ ΠΟΥΑ
 10 ΠΟΥΑ ΝΑΙΩΝ ΕΥΤ ΝΖΕΝΤΒΑ ΝΕΟΟΥ ΖΡΑΙ
 ΖΝ ΖΕΝΝΟΒ ΝΟΥΟΕΙΝΕ ΝΑΤΝΡΑΑΤΟΥ ΑΥ
 12 [Ω] ΑΥΣΜΟΥ ΤΗΡΟΥ ΜΝ ΝΟΥΕΡΗΥ ΑΠΩΗΡΕ
 ΝΤΕΛΙΟΣ ΠΝΟΥΤΕ ΝΤΑΥΧΠΟΥ ΤΟΤΕ ΑΥ
 14 ΕΙ ΕΒΟΛ ΝΒΙ ΟΥΛΟΓΟΣ ΕΒΟΛ ΖΜ ΠΝΟΒ Ν
 ΟΥΟΕΙΝ ΗΛΗΛΗΘ ΑΥΩ ΠΑΧΕΥ ΧΕ ΑΝΟΚ'
 16 ΠΕ ΠΡΡΟ ΝΙΜ ΠΕ ΠΑΠΧΑΟΣ ΑΥΩ ΝΙΜ ΠΕ
 ΠΑΕΜΝΤΕ ΑΥΩ ΝΤΟΥΝΟΥ ΕΤΜΜΑΥ ΑΠΦΟΥ
 18 ΟΕΙΝΕ ΟΥΩΝΖ ΕΒΟΛ ΕΦΠΡΡΙΩΟΥ ΕΥΝΤΑΥ'
 ΜΜΑ[Υ Ν]ΤΕΠΙΝΟΙΑ ΜΠΟΥΣΠΩΠΩ ΝΒΙ
 20 ΝΒΑΜ ΝΤΕ ΝΒΑΜ ΑΥΩ ΝΤΟΥΝΟΥ ΖΩΩΥ'
 ΑΦΟΥΩΝΖ ΕΒΟΛ ΝΒΙ ΠΝΟΒ ΝΔΔΙΜΟΝΙ
 22 ΟΝ ΠΑΙ ΕΤΑΡΧΕΙ ΑΧΜ ΠΣΑΜΠΙΤΝ ΝΕ
 ΜΝΤΕ ΜΝ ΠΧΑΟΣ ΕΜΝΤΕΥ ΜΟΡΦΗ Μ
 24 ΜΑΥ ΟΥΔΕ <Ε>ΦΧΗΚ' ΕΒΟΛ ΑΝ ΑΛΛΑ ΕΥΝΤΑΥ'
 ΜΜΑΥ ΝΤΜΟΡΦΗ ΜΠΕΟΟΥ ΝΝΔΕΙ ΕΝ
 26 ΤΑΥΧΠΟΥ ΖΜ ΠΚΑΚΕ ΠΑΙ ΒΕ ΕΥΜΟΥΤΕ Ε
 ΡΟΥ ΧΕ ΣΑΚΛΑ ΕΤΕ ΠΑΙ ΠΕ ΣΑΜΑΝΛ ΙΑΛΤΑ
 28 ΒΑΩΘ ΠΑΙ ΝΤΑΥΧΙ ΝΟΥΒΟΜ' ΝΤΑΥΤΩΡΠ'
 ΜΜΟΣ ΝΤΟΥΤΩ ΝΤΑΥΤ' ΠΕΘΟΥ ΝΤΑΥΧΡΟ Ε
 30 ΡΟΣ ΝΨΟΡΠΙ ΕΤΕ ΤΑΙ ΤΕ ΤΕΠΙΝΟΙΑ ΜΠΟΥ
 ΟΕΙΝΕ ΝΤΑΣΕΙ ΑΠ[ΙΤΝ] ΤΑΙ ΝΤΑΥΕΙ ΕΒΟΛ Μ
 32 ΜΟΣ ΧΝ ΝΨΟ[Ρ]Π' Ν[ΤΑΡΕΣ]ΜΜΕ ΒΕ ΝΒΙ ΤΕ
 ΠΙΝΟΙΑ ΜΠΟΥ[ΟΕΙ]Ν ΧΕ Α[Υ]ΦΟΠΩ ΜΜΟΥ'
 34 ΕΚΕΤΑ[ΧΙΣ ΕΝΕΦΘ]ΒΒΙΑΕΙΤ' ΕΡΟΣ ΠΑΧΕΣ
 ΧΕ ΜΑ [ΝΑΙ ΝΚΕΤΑΧΙΣ ΧΕ Ε]ΚΕΨΩΠΕ ΝΔΕΙ
 36 Μ[ΜΑ ΝΨΩΠΕ ΝΤΑΤΜΩ]ΨΠΕ ΖΝ ΟΥΑΤΑΧΙΑ
 [ΝΨΑ ΕΝΕΖ ΑΥΩ ΤΤΑΧΙΣ ΜΠ]Η ΤΗΡΥ Μ

39*

Phaionios, Ainos, Oroiael; the third
 2 over the third Aeon: Mellephaneus,
 Loios, Daveithai; the fourth
 4 over the fourth: Mousanios, Amethes,
 Eleleth. Now those Aeons were begotten
 6 by the God who was begotten—the
 Christ—and (δέ) these Aeons received
 8 as well as gave glory. They were the first to appear,
 exalted in their thought, and each
 10 Aeon gave myriads of glories within
 great untraceable lights and
 12 they all together blessed the Perfect (τέλειος)
 Son, the God who was begotten. Then (τότε) there
 14 came forth a word (λόγος) from the great
 Light Eleleth and said: “I
 16 am King! Who belongs to Chaos (χάος) and who
 belongs to the underworld?” And at that instant his Light
 18 appeared radiant, endowed
 with the Epinoia. The Powers of the Powers
 20 did not entreat him and likewise immediately
 there appeared the great Demon (δαιμόνιον)
 22 who rules (ἄρχειν) over the lowest part of the underworld
 and Chaos (χάος). He has neither form (μορφή)
 24 nor (οὐδέ) perfection, but on the contrary (ἀλλά) possesses
 the form (μορφή) of the glory of those
 26 begotten in the darkness. Now he is called
 “Saklas,” that is, “Samael,” “Yaltabaoth,”
 28 he who had taken power; who had snatched
 it away from the innocent one (i.e., Sophia); who had earlier
 overpowered
 30 her who is the Light’s Epinoia (i.e., Sophia)
 who had descended, her from whom he (i.e., Yaltabaoth) had
 come forth
 32 originally. Now [when] the Epinoia of the [Light] realized
 that [he (i.e., Yaltabaoth)] had begged him (i.e., the Light),
 34 for another [order (τάξις), even though he was lower] than she,
 she said:
 “Grant [me another order (τάξις) so that] you may become for
 me
 36 [a dwelling place, lest I dwell] in disorder (ἄταξία)
 [forever.” And the order (τάξις) of the] entire house of

40*

2 ΠΕΟΘ[Υ ΝΕ]ϚΤΗ[Τ] ΕΖΡΑΪ ΕΧΝ ΠΕC
 4 ΨΑΧΕ ΑΥΕΙΝΕ ΝΟΥCΜΟΥ ΕΖΟΥΝ
 6 ΕΡΟC ΑΥΩ ΑΤ'ΤΑΞΙC ΕΤΧΟCΕ ΚΩ Μ
 8 ΜΟQ ΝΑC ΕΒΟΛ ΑΥΩ ΑΦΑΡΧΕΙ ΝΒΙ
 10 ΠΝΟΒ ΝΔΔΙΜΩΝ ΑΤCΕΝΟ ΝΖΕΝ
 12 ΔΙΩΝ ΜΠCΜΑΤ ΝΝΙΑΙΩΝ ΕΤΨΟΟΠ
 14 ΑQΤCΕΝΟ ΔΕ ΜΜΑΥ ΕΒΟΛ ΖΝ ΤΕQΒΟΜ
 16 ΟΥΑΑΤQ ΤΟΤΕ ΑΝΟΚ' ΖΩΩΤ' ΔΕΙΟΥΩΝΖ
 18 ΕΒΟΛ ΜΠΑΖΡΟΟΥ ΖΝ ΟΥΠΕΘΗΠ' ΕΕΙ
 20 ΧΩ ΜΜΟC ΧΕ ΒΩ ΝΗΤΝ ΒΩ ΝΗΤΝ
 22 ΝΑΕΙ ΕΤΡΠΑΤΙ ΝΤΖΥΛΗ ΧΕ ΕΙC ΖΗΗ
 24 ΤΕ ΑΝΟΚ' ΔΕΙΝΝΗΥ ΕΖΡΑΪ ΕΠΚΟCΜΟ[C]
 26 ΝΝΡΕQΜΟΥ ΕΤΒΕ ΠΑΜΕΡΟC ΕΤΜ
 28 ΠΜΑ ΕΤΜΜΑΥ Χ'Ν' ΜΠΖΟΟΥ ΝΤΑΥ
 30 ΧΡΟ ΑΨΟΦΙΑ ΝΑΤΠΕΘΟΟΥ ΤΑΕΙ Ν
 32 ΤΑCΕΙ' ΑΠΙΤΝ ΧΕΚΑΑC ΕΕΙΝΑΧΩ
 34 ΡΕ ΕΒΟΛ ΝΤΕΥΖΑΗ ΤΑ[[Ι]ΕΙ ΕΤΦΟΥΑΖ'
 36 CΑΖΝΕ ΜΜΟC ΝΒΙ ΠΑΕΙ ΕΤΟΥΩΝΖ
 38 ΜΜΟQ' ΕΒΟΛ ΖΙΤΟΟΤC ΑΥΩ ΑΥΨΤΟΡ
 40 ΤΡ' ΤΗΡΟΥ ΝΒΙ ΟΥΟΝ ΝΙΜ ΕΤΨΟΟΠ
 42 ΖΜ ΠΗΙ ΜΠΟΥΟΕΙΝΕ ΝΑΤCΟΥΩΝQ'
 44 ΑΥΩ ΑΦΝΟΕΙΝΕ ΝΒΙ ΠΝΟΥΝ ΑΥΩ
 46 ΠΑΡΧΙΓΕΝΗΤΩΡ ΝΤΜΝ'ΤΑΤCΟΟΥΝΕ
 48 ΑQΡ'ΡΡΟ ΑΧΝ ΠΧΑΟC ΜΝ ΕΜΝΤΕ ΑQ
 50 ΤCΑΝΟ ΝΟΥΡΩΜΕ ΜΠΑCΜΟΤ' ΜΠQ
 52 ΜΜΕ ΔΕ ΧΕ ΠΕΤΜΜΑΥ ΝΑΨΩΠΕ
 54 ΝΑQ ΝΟΥΚΡΙΜΑ ΝΒΩΛ ΕΒΟΛ ΟΥΔΕ
 56 ΝQCΟΟΥΝΕ ΑΝ ΝΤΒΑΜ ΕΤΝΖΡΑΪ Ν
 58 ΖΗΤQ ΤΕΝΟΥ ΔΕ ΑΝΟΚ ΑΪΕΙ ΑΠΙΤΝ
 60 ΑΥΩ ΑΪΠΩΖ ΨΑΖΡΑΪ ΑΠΧΑΟC ΑΥΩ
 62 ΝΕΕΙΨΟΟΠ [ΖΑΖΤ]Ν ΝΕΤΕ ΝΩΕΙ Ε
 64 ΤΜΠΜΑ [ΕΤ]ΜΜΑΥ ΕΕ[ΙΖ]ΗΠ' ΖΡΑΪ Ν
 66 ΖΗΤΟΥ ΕΕΙΨ' ΒΟΜ Ν[ΑΥ ΑΥΩ ΕΕ]ΙΤΝ
 68 ΝΑΥ ΖΙΚΩΝ ΑΥΩ Χ'Ν ΠΨΟΡΠ ΝCΟ]Π' ΨΑ
 70 ΖΟΥΝ ΑΠΖΟΟ[Υ ΕΨΝΑΨ' ΒΟΜ ΕCΧΟ]Ρ
 72 ΝΝΕΤΕ ΝΨΙ [ΝΕ ΨΝΑΟΥΟΝΖΤ' ΕΒΟΛ Ε]
 74 ΝΑΕΙ ΝΤΑΥCΨ[ΤΜ ΕΝΑΜΥCΤΗΡΙΟΝ]

40*

glory [*was agreed*] upon her
 2 word. A blessing was brought for
 her and the higher order (τάξις) released it
 4 to her. And the great Demon (δαίμων)
 began (ἄρχεσθαι) to produce
 6 aeons in the likeness of the real Aeons,
 except that (δέ) he produced them out of his own power.
 8 Then (τότε) I too revealed
 my Voice secretly,
 10 saying: "Cease! Desist!
 (you) who tread on (πατέω) matter (ἕλη); for behold
 12 I am coming down to the world (κόσμος)
 of mortals for the sake of my portion (μέρος) that was in
 14 that place from the time when
 the innocent Sophia was conquered, she who
 16 descended, so that I might thwart
 their aim which the one revealed
 18 by her appoints."
 And all were disturbed,
 20 each one who dwells
 in the house of the ignorant light,
 22 and the abyss trembled. And
 the Archigenetor of ignorance
 24 reigned over Chaos (χάος) and the underworld, and
 produced a man in my likeness. But (δέ) he neither
 26 knew that that one would become
 for him a sentence (κρίμα) of dissolution nor (οὐδέ)
 28 does he recognize the power in
 him. But (δέ) now I have come down
 30 and reached down to Chaos (χάος). And
 I was [*with*] my own who
 32 were in that place. [*I am hidden*] within
 them, empowering [*them and*] giving
 34 them shape (εἰκῶν). And [*from the first day*] until
 the day [*when I will grant mighty power*]
 36 to those who [*are mine, I will reveal myself to*]
 those who have [*heard my mysteries (μυστήριον)*],

41*

1 ετε ναει νε $\bar{n}\psi$ [$\eta\rho$]ε \bar{m} [π]ογοειν ανοκ
 2 πε πογειωτ' αγω \dagger ναχω $\eta\eta\tau\bar{n}$ $\bar{n}\omega\gamma$
 3 μϋστηριον $\bar{n}\alpha\tau\psi\alpha\chi\epsilon$ $\bar{m}\mu\omega\zeta$ αγω $\bar{n}\alpha\tau$
 4 τεγοϑ εβολ $\zeta\bar{n}$ ταπρο [η]μ $\bar{n}\varsigma\eta\alpha\gamma\zeta$ τη
 5 ροϑ δειβωλ' $\bar{m}\mu\omega\omega\zeta$ εβολ $\eta\eta\tau\bar{n}$ αγω \bar{m}
 6 $\bar{m}\rho\epsilon$ $\bar{n}\bar{n}\delta\alpha\iota\mu\omega\eta$ $\bar{n}\epsilon\mu\bar{n}\tau\epsilon$ δεικολποϑ
 7 ναϊ ετμηρ $\bar{n}\eta\alpha\mu\epsilon\lambda\omega\varsigma$ εϑ† αζητοϑ αγ
 8 ω $\eta\iota\varsigma\alpha\beta\tau'$ ετχοσε $\bar{n}\tau\epsilon$ πκακε δειωϑ̄
 9 ψωροϑ απιτ̄η αγω $\bar{m}\pi\gamma\lambda\eta$ ετορχ $\bar{n}\tau\epsilon$
 10 $\eta\iota\alpha\tau'\eta\alpha\epsilon$ δειζαψοϑ αγω $\eta\epsilon\gamma\mu\omega\chi\lambda\omega\varsigma$
 11 δειζορβοϑ αγω $\tau\epsilon\eta\epsilon\rho\gamma\iota\alpha$ ετζοοϑ $\bar{m}\bar{n}$
 12 πετζιοϑε αρωτ̄η $\bar{m}\bar{n}$ πετσωψτ $\bar{m}\mu\omega$
 13 τ̄η αγω $\pi\tau\gamma\rho\alpha\eta\eta\omega\varsigma$ $\bar{m}\bar{n}$ παντικειμε
 14 $\eta\omega\varsigma$ $\bar{m}\bar{n}$ πετο $\bar{n}\rho$ ρο αγω $\pi\chi\alpha\chi\epsilon$ ετψο
 15 οπ' ναϊ βε τηροϑ δειτσεβοοϑ ανετε
 16 $\eta\omega\iota$ $\eta\epsilon$ ετε ναει νε $\bar{n}\psi\eta\rho\epsilon$ $\bar{m}\pi\omega\gamma\omega\epsilon\iota\eta$
 17 $\chi\epsilon\kappa\alpha\alpha\varsigma$ εγναβωλ εβολ $\bar{n}\eta\alpha\iota$ τηροϑ
 18 αγω $\langle\bar{n}\rangle\varsigma\epsilon\eta\omega\gamma\zeta\bar{m}$ εβολ $\zeta\bar{n}$ $\eta\iota\varsigma\eta\alpha\gamma\zeta$ τηροϑ
 19 $\bar{n}\varsigma\epsilon\epsilon\iota$ εζοϑη $\alpha\pi\mu\alpha$ ετε $\eta\alpha\gamma\bar{m}\mu\alpha\gamma$ \bar{n}
 20 ψορπ' ανοκ πε ψορπ $\bar{n}\tau\alpha\iota\epsilon\iota$ απιτ̄η
 21 ετβε $\pi\alpha\mu\epsilon\rho\omega\varsigma$ ετσοχπ' ετε παϊ πε
 22 $\pi\pi\bar{n}\alpha$ ετψοοπ' $\zeta\bar{n}$ τψυχη $\bar{n}\tau\alpha\psi\omega$
 23 πε εβολ $\zeta\bar{m}$ $\pi\mu\omega\omega\zeta$ $\bar{m}\pi\omega\eta\zeta$ αγω εβολ
 24 $\zeta\bar{m}$ $\pi\chi\omega\kappa\bar{m}$ $\bar{n}\eta\mu\gamma\sigma\tau\eta\rho\iota\omega\eta$ δειψαχε
 25 ανοκ $\bar{m}\bar{n}$ $\bar{n}\alpha\rho\chi\omega\eta$ αγω $\zeta\epsilon\eta\epsilon\zeta\omega\gamma\varsigma\iota\alpha$
 26 δειβωκ γαρ εζραϊ επσα $\bar{m}\pi\iota\tau\bar{n}$ $\bar{m}\pi\omega\gamma$
 27 λας αγω δειχω $\bar{n}\eta\alpha\mu\gamma\sigma\tau\eta\rho\iota\omega\eta$ ανε
 28 τε $\eta\omega\iota$ οϑμϋστηριον εϑζηπ̄ι $\alpha\gamma\beta\omega\lambda$
 29 εβολ $\bar{n}\bar{n}\varsigma\eta\alpha\gamma\zeta$ $\bar{m}\bar{n}$ τβψε $\bar{n}\{\alpha\eta\}$ ανεζ
 30 αγω δει† καρποϑ ζραϊ $\bar{n}\zeta\eta\tau\omega\zeta$ ετε παϊ
 31 πε $\pi\mu\epsilon\epsilon\gamma\epsilon$ $\bar{m}\pi\alpha\iota\psi\{\eta\}$ $\bar{n}\alpha\tau\psi\omega\iota\beta\epsilon$ αγω
 32 $\pi\alpha\eta\iota$ $\bar{m}\bar{n}$ $\pi\omega\{\gamma\epsilon\iota\}$ ψτ αγω ανοκ δειβωκ
 33 εζραϊ [$\alpha\eta\alpha\iota$ ετε $\eta\omega\iota$] $\chi\bar{n}$ $\bar{n}\psi\omega\rho\pi$ αγω
 34 δειτ'ε[ζοοϑ δεισελπ \bar{n}]ψορπ $\bar{n}\psi\omega\lambda\omega\pi$
 35 $\bar{n}\tau\{\alpha\}$ $\gamma\alpha\alpha\{\gamma$ $\bar{n}\zeta\bar{m}\zeta\alpha\lambda$ · τοτ]ε $\alpha\gamma\rho\omega\gamma\omega\epsilon\iota\eta$
 36 $\bar{n}\beta\iota$ οϑον $\eta\iota\mu$ \bar{n} [$\eta\epsilon\tau\bar{n}\zeta\rho\alpha\iota$] $\bar{n}\zeta\eta\tau$ αγω

41*

that is, the [Sons] of [the] Light. I
 2 am their Father and I shall tell you a
 mystery (μυστήριον), ineffable and undivulgeable
 4 by [any] mouth: Every bond
 I loosed from you, and the
 6 chains of the Demons (δαίμων) of the underworld, I broke,
 these things which are bound on my members (μέλος),
 restraining them. And
 8 the high walls of darkness, I overthrew,
 and the secure gates (πυλῆ) of
 10 those pitiless ones, I broke, and I smashed
 their bars (μοχλός). And the evil Force (ἐνέργεια) and
 12 the one who beats you, and the one who hinders
 you, and the Tyrant (τύραννος), and the Adversary
 (ἀντικείμενος),
 14 and the one who is King, and the present Enemy,
 indeed all these I explained to those
 16 who are mine, who are the Sons of the Light,
 in order that they might nullify them all
 18 and be saved from all those bonds
 and enter into the place where they were at
 20 first. I am the first one who descended
 on account of my portion (μέρος) which remains, that is,
 22 the Spirit (πνεῦμα) that (now) dwells in the soul (ψυχῆ), (but)
 which originated
 from the Water of Life and out
 24 of the immersion of the mysteries (μυστήριον), and I spoke,
 I together with the Archons and Authorities (ἐξουσία).
 26 For (γάρ) I had gone down below their
 language and I spoke my mysteries (μυστήριον) to
 28 my own—a hidden mystery (μυστήριον)—and
 the bonds and eternal oblivion were nullified.
 30 And I bore fruit (καρπός) in them, that
 is, the Thought of the unchanging Aeon
 32 proper to me, even their [Father]. And I went
 down [to those who were mine] from the first and
 34 I [reached them and broke the] first strands
 that [enslaved them. Then (τότε)]
 36 everyone [of those] within me shone, and

42*

- 2 ΔΕΙΣΟΒΤΕ ΝΟΥ[С]ΜΟ[Τ] Ν'ΝΙΟΥΘΕΙΝΕ ΕΤ'Ν'
 ΖΡΑΪ ΝΖΗΤ' ΝΑΤΣΕΧΕ ΜΜΟΟΥ ΖΑΜΗΝ
 Π[ΛΟΓ]ΟС ΝΤΠΡΩΤΕΝΝΟΙΑ [Α]
- 4 ΑΝΟΚ ΠΕ ΠΖΡΟΟΥ ΝΤΑΦΟΥΩΝΖ ΕΒΟΛ ΖΙΤ[Ο]
 ΟΤΓ' ΜΠΑΜΕΕΥΕ ΑΝΟΚ ΓΑΡ ΠΕ ΠΕΤΖΑΤΡΕ
 6 ΕΥΜΟΥΤΕ ΕΡΟΪ ΧΕ ΠΜΕΕΥΕ ΜΠΑΙΤΝΑΥ ΕΡΟ[С]
 ΕΥΜΟΥΤΕ ΕΡΟΪ ΧΕ ΤСМΗ ΕΤΕ ΜΑΣΩΙΒΕ С[Ε]
 8 ΜΟΥΤΕ ΕΡΟΪ ΧΕ ΤΕΤΖΟΤΡΕ ΑΝΟΚ ΟΥΪΕ Ν[ΟΥ]
 ΩΤ' ΕΕΙΟ ΝΑΤΧΩΖΜΕ ΑΝΟΚ ΤΕ ΤΜΑΑΥ [Μ]
 10 ΠΖΡΟΟΥ ΕΕΙΨΑΧΕ ΝΖΑΖ ΝΡΗΤΕ ΕΕΙΧΩΚ' Ε
 ΒΟΛ' ΜΠΤΗΡΓ ΕΡΕΠΣΟΟΥΝ ΨΟΟΠ' ΝΖΡΑΪ Ν'
 12 ΖΗΤ' ΠСООУΝ Ν<ΝΕ>ΤΕ ΜΝΤΕΥ ΖΑΗ ΑΝΟΚ Π[ΕΤ]
 ΨΑΧΕ ΖΡΑΪ ΖΝ СΩΝΤ' ΝΙМ' ΑΥΩ ΑΥСОУΩΝΤ'
 14 ΕΒΟΛ ΖΙΤΟΟΤΓ' ΜΠΤΗΡΓ ΑΝΟΚ ΠΕΤ† Ν
 ΤСМΗ ΜΠΖΡΟΟΥ ΕΖΡΑΪ ΑΜΜΑΑΧΕ ΝΝΕΝ
 16 ΤΑΥСОУΩΝΤ' ΕΤΕ ΝΑΕΙ ΝΕ ΝΨΗΡΕ ΜΠΟΥΘ
 ΕΙΝΕ ΑΪΕΙ ΔΕ ΜΠΜΑΖСЕП'СНАУ ΜΠСМОТ'
 18 ΝΟΥСΖΙΜΕ ΑΥΩ ΑΪΨΑΧΕ ΝΜΜΑΥ ΑΥΩ
 †ΝΑΤΑΜΟΟΥ ΑΘΑ[Ζ]Η ΜΠΑΙΩΝ ΕΤΝΑΨΩ
 20 ΠΕ ΑΥΩ †ΝΑΤСЕВООУ ΑΤΑΡΧΗ ΜΠΑΙΩΝ
 ΕΤΝΗΥ ΠΑΪ ΕΤΕ ΜΝΤΑΓ ΜΜΑΥ ΝΟΥΨΙΒΕ
 22 ΠΑΪ ΕΤΟΥΝΑΨΙΒΕ ΜΠΝΖΟ ΖΡΑΪ ΝΖΗΤΓ'
 ΕΥΝΑΤΟΥΒΟΝ ΖΡΑΪ ΖΝ ΝΙΑΙΩΝ ΝΑΪ ΕΝΤΑΪ
 24 ΟΥΟΝΖΤ' ΕΒΟΛ ΖΡΑΪ ΝΖΗΤΟΥ ΖΡΑΪ ΖΜ ΠΜΕ
 ΕΥΕ ΜΠΙΝΕ ΝΤΑΜΝΤΖΟΟΥΤ' ΔΕΙΚΑΑΤ ΕΖ
 26 ΡΑΪ ΖΝ ΝΕΤΜΨΑ ΖΡΑΪ ΖΜ ΠΜΕΕΥΕ ΜΠΑ
 ΑΙΩΝ ΝΑΤΨΙΒΕ †ΝΑΧΩ ΓΑΡ ΑΡΩΤΗΝ ΝΟΥ
 28 ΜΥΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ Ν[Τ]Ε ΠΙΑΙΩΝ' ΕΤΕ ΠΑΪ ΠΕ ΑΥ
 Ω †ΝΑΤΑΜΩΤ'Ν' ΑΝΕ[ΝΕΡ]ΓΕΙΑ ΕΤΗΖΡΑΪ Ν
 30 ΖΗΤΓ' ΠΧΠΟ ΦΜΟΥΤΕ [ΕΖΟΥΝ ΤΟ]ΥΝΟΥ СΧΠ[Ο]
 ΝΤΟΥΝΟΥ ΦΟ[ΟΥ] ΦΧΠΟ ΜΠΖΟ]ΟΥ ΝΕΒΑ
 32 ΤΕ ΑΥΤΑΜΕ ΠΕΒ[ΟТ] ΠΟΥΘΕΙ]Ψ ΑΦΚ[Ω]ΤΕ[Β]
 ΕΦΟΥΗΖ Ν'С[Α] ΠΟΥΘΕΙ]Ψ ΠΙΑΙΩΝ ΕΤΕ ΠΑ[Ι] ΠΕ]

42*

2 I prepared [*a shape*] for those ineffable Lights that are
within me. Amen.

The Discourse (λόγος) of Protennoia: [*One (α')*]

4 I am the Voice that appeared through
my Thought, for (γάρ) I am “He who is syzygetic,”
6 since I am called “The Thought of the Invisible One.”
Since I am called “The unchanging Speech,”
8 I am called “She who is syzygetic.” I am a single
one (fem.) since I am undefiled. I am the Mother [*of*]
10 the Voice, speaking in many ways, completing
the All. It is in me that knowledge dwells,
12 the knowledge of <things> everlasting. It is I [*who*]
speak within every creature and I was known
14 by the All. It is I who lift up
the Speech of the Voice to the ears of those who
16 have known me, that is, the Sons of the Light.
Now (δέ) I have come the second time in the likeness
18 of a female and have spoken with them. And
I shall tell them of the coming end of the aeon
20 and teach them of the beginning (ἀρχή) of the Aeon
to come, the one without change,
22 the one in which our appearance will be changed.
We shall be purified within those Aeons from which I
24 revealed myself in the Thought
of the likeness of my masculinity. I settled
26 among those who are worthy in the Thought of my
changeless Aeon. For (γάρ) I shall tell you a
28 mystery (μυστήριον) [*of*] this particular Aeon and
tell you about the forces (ἐνέργεια) that are in it.
30 The birth beckons: [*hour*] begets
hour, [*day begets day*]. The months
32 made known the [*month. Time*] has [*gone round*]
succeeding [*time*]. This particular Aeon

43*

was completed in [*this*] fashion, and it was estimated, and
 2 it (was) short, for (γάρ) it was a finger that released a
 finger and a joint that was separated from
 4 a joint. Then when [*the*] great Authorities (ἐξουσία) knew
 that the time of fulfillment had appeared—
 6 just as in the pangs of the parturient it (i.e., the time) had drawn
 near,
 so also had
 8 the destruction approached—all together the elements
 (στοιχείων)
 trembled, and the foundations of the underworld and the
 ceilings
 10 of Chaos (χάος) shook and a great fire shone
 within their midst, and the rocks (πέτρα) and the earth
 12 were shaken like a reed shaken by the wind.
 And the lots (κλήρος) of Fate (εἰμαρμένη) and those who
 apportion
 14 the domiciles (οἶκος) were greatly disturbed over
 a great thunder. And the thrones (θρόνος) of
 16 the Powers (δύναμις) were disturbed since they were
 overturned, and their
 King was afraid. And those who pursue Fate (εἰμαρμένη)
 18 paid their allotment of visits to the path, and
 they said to the Powers (δύναμις): “What is this disturbance
 20 and this shaking that has come upon us through
 a Voice <belonging> to the exalted Speech?
 22 And our entire habitation has been shaken, and the entire
 circuit of our path of ascent has met with
 24 destruction, and the path upon which we go,
 which takes us up to the Archigenetor
 26 of our birth, has ceased to be established for us.”
 Then the Powers (δύναμις) answered, saying:
 28 “We too are at a loss (ἀπορεῖν) about
 it since we did not know what was responsible for it. But (ἀλλά)
 30 arise, let us go up to the Archigenetor
 and ask him.” And the
 32 Powers (δύναμις) all gathered and went up to the Archigenetor.
 [*They said to*] him: “Where is your boasting
 34 in which [*you boast*]?”
 Did we not [*hear you say*]: ‘I
 36 am God [*and I am*] your Father

44*

and it is I who [*begot*] you and there is no [*other*]
 2 beside me? Now behold, there has appeared
 [a] Voice belonging to that invisible Speech
 4 of [*the Aeon*] (and) which we know not. And
 we ourselves did not recognize to whom we
 6 belong, for (*γάρ*) that Voice which we listened to
 is foreign to us, and we do not recognize
 8 it; we did not know whence it was. It came
 and put fear in our midst and weakening
 10 in the members (*μέλος*) of our arms. So now let
 us weep and mourn most bitterly!
 12 As for the future (*τολοιπόν*), let us make our entire flight
 before we are imprisoned perforce (*βία*) and
 14 taken down to the bosom of the underworld. For (*γάρ*) already
 (*ἤδη*)
 the slackening of our bondage has approached,
 16 and the times (*χρόνος*) are cut short and the days have shortened
 and our time has been fulfilled, and the weeping
 18 of our destruction has approached us so that
 we may be taken to the place we do not recognize.
 20 For (*γάρ*) as for our tree from which we grew, a fruit (*καρπός*)
 of ignorance is what it has; and
 22 also its leaves, it is death that dwells in them,
 and darkness dwells under the shadow of its
 24 boughs. And it was in deceit (*ἀπάτη*)
 and lust (*ἐπιθυμία*) that we harvested it, this (i.e., tree) through
 26 which ignorant Chaos (*χάος*) became for us a dwelling place.
 For (*γάρ*) behold, even he, the Archigenetor
 28 of our birth, about whom we boast,
 even he did not know this Speech." So now,
 30 O Sons of the Thought, listen to me, to the Speech
 of the Mother of mercy, for (*γάρ*) you have
 32 become worthy of the mystery (*μυστήριον*) hidden from (the
 beginning of)
 the Aeons, so that [*you might receive*] it. And the consummation
 (*συντέλεια*)
 34 of this [*particular*] Aeon [*and*] (of) the evil life
 [*has approached and there dawns*]

45*

[βι τα]ρχη [μ]η[α]ίων ετναωωπ]ε παϊ ετε μ[ν]
 2 [τ]ε[φ] [μ]μαγ [ν]ογωβιε ψα ενε]ζ ανοκ' ουζ[ο]
 [ο]γτςζιμε α[νοκ ουμααγ ανο]κ' ουειωτ' εε[ι]
 4 [ωωπε] ν[μ]μαϊ ογαατ' εει[ωωπε] ν[μ]μαϊ ου[α]
 [ατ μ[ν] νετμα]ειε [μ]μοει [αγω] ερεπτηρφ ψ
 6 [ζε ερατῆ] εβολ ζιτοοτ' ο[γα]ατ ανοκ πε τατε
 [ετ ζικω]ν [μ]πτηρφ εειμιε [μ]πογοειν ε[τ]
 8 [πῆριε ζ]ῆ[ν] [ογ]εοογ ανοκ πε παειων ετ[η]ν[ηγ]
 [ανοκ π]ε πχωκ εβολ [μ]πτηρφ' ετε ταϊ τε με[ι]
 10 [ρῶθ]εα πεοογ [ν]τμααγ εεινουχε [ν]ογςμη
 [ῆζρ]οογ εζραϊ αμμααχε [ν]νετσοογνε [μ]μο
 12 ει αγω ττωζμε [μ]μωτῆ αζογν απογοει[ν]
 ετχοσε ετχηκ' εβολ παει βε ετετῆωανει
 14 εζογν εροφ τετναχι εοογ [ν]τοοτογ [ν]νε[τ]
 † εοογ αγω σενα† ηητῆ θρονος [ν]βι νετ
 16 † θρονος τετ[η]ναχι στολη ηητῆ [ν]τοο
 τογ [ν]νετ† στολη αγω σενα[ρ]βαπτιζε [μ]
 18 μωτῆ [ν]βι [ν]βαπτιςτης [ν]τετῆωωπε [ν]
 εοογ [μ]ν ζενεοογ παϊ ενετετῆωοοπ
 20 ζραϊ [ν]ζητφ [ν]ωορπ' ετετῆοει [ν]ογ<ο>ειν[ε]
 αγω αειζοπτ' ζραϊ ζῆ ογον nim αειογον[ζτ'
 22 εβολ ζραϊ [ν]ζητογ αγω αγρεπιθουμει ερ[ο]
 ει [ν]βι μεεγε nim εγωβινε [ν]σωει χε ανο[κ]
 24 πενταϊ† ζικων [μ]πτηρφ νεμῆτεγ μο[ρ]
 φη [μ]μαγ πε αγω αειωβιε [ν]νεγμορφη
 26 ζῆ ζενμορφη ψα πογοειω ετογνα†
 μορφη [μ]πτηρφ εβολ ζιτοοτ' [ν]ταπζρ[ο]
 28 ογ ωωπε αγω ανοκ πενταϊκω [μ]πν[ι]
 φε ζραϊ ζῆ νετε νωϊ αγω π[π]να ετογα
 30 αβ ψα ενεζ αεινοχφ εζραϊ εροογ αγω
 αειωκ' ατπε αειωε εζογν απαογοει
 32 νε αε[ιβωκ] εζ[ρα]ϊ αχῆ πακλαδος αει
 ζμες[τ' [μ]μαγ ζραϊ ζῆ [ν]ωηρε [μ]πογοει[ν]
 34 ετογ[ααβ αει[ρ]αναχωρι] δε απογμα [ν]ω[ω]

45*

- [the] beginning (ἀρχή) of the [Aeon to come] which [has]
 2 [no change forever]. I am androgynous.
 [I am Mother (and) I am] Father since [I]
 4 [copulate] with myself. I [copulate] with myself
 [and with those who love] me, [and]
 6 it is through me alone that the All [stands firm]. I am the Womb
 [that gives shape (εἰκών)] to the All by giving birth to the Light
 that
 8 [shines in] splendor. I am the Aeon to [come].
 [I am] the fulfillment of the All, that is, Me[iroth]ea,
 10 the glory of the Mother. I cast [voiced] Speech
 into the ears of those who know
 12 me. And I am inviting you into the exalted, perfect Light.
 Moreover (as for) this (Light), when you enter
 14 it you will be glorified by those [who]
 give glory, and those who enthrone (-θρόνος) will
 16 enthrone (-θρόνος) you. You will accept robes (στολή) from
 those who give robes (στολή) and the Baptists (βαπτιστής)
 18 will baptize (βαπτίζεω) you and you will become
 gloriously glorious, the way you first were
 20 when you were <Light>.
 And I hid myself in everyone and revealed [myself]
 22 within them, and every mind seeking
 me longed for (ἐπιθυμείν) me, for it is I
 24 who gave shape (εἰκών) to the All when it had no form (μορφή).
 And I transformed their forms (μορφή)
 26 into (other) forms (μορφή) until the time when a form (μορφή)
 will be given to the All. It is through me that the Voice
 28 originated and it is I who put the breath
 within my own. And I cast into
 30 them the eternally holy Spirit (πνεῦμα) and
 I ascended and entered my Light.
 32 [I went up] upon my branch (κλάδος) and
 sat [there among the] Sons of the [holy] Light.
 34 And (δέ) [I withdrew (ἀναχωρεῖν)] to their dwelling place

46*

- 2 πε παί ε[τ
 [.].ε $\bar{m}\pi$ [$^{20\pm}$]
 ψωπε $\bar{n}\epsilon$ [οογ $^{12\pm}$] $\bar{z}\alpha\mu$]ηη
 [$^{8\pm}$] — [
- 4 [πατ \bar{z} ιμα]ρμενη[\bar{v}]
 [$^{6\pm}$] — [
- 6 ανοκ πε π[λογ]ος ετψοο[π $\bar{z}\bar{m}$ πι \bar{z} ροογ]
 $\bar{n}\alpha\tau'$ ψαχε εροϕ' εειψο[ο]π \bar{z} [\bar{n}] [ογοεινε]
 $\bar{n}\alpha\tau\chi\omega\bar{z}$ με αγω ογμεεγε αϕβ[ολπϕ' εβολ]
 8 $\bar{z}\bar{n}$ ογα $\bar{\iota}\sigma\theta\eta\sigma\iota\varsigma$ εβολ \bar{z} ιτοοτ ς [\bar{n}][†]νοβ \bar{n}
 σμη $\bar{n}\tau\epsilon$ τμα $\bar{a}\gamma$ εγ χ πο $\bar{n}\bar{z}$ οογτ ϕ[ι \bar{z} αροί]
 10 $\bar{n}\kappa\alpha\alpha\tau'$ ε \bar{z} ραί αγω εσψοοπ' $\chi\bar{n}$ $\bar{n}\psi\phi$ [ρπ]
 $\bar{z}\bar{n}$ $\bar{n}\kappa\alpha\alpha\varsigma$ $\bar{m}\pi\theta\eta\rho\phi$ ' ογ \bar{n} ογοεινε δε [εϕ]
 12 ψοοπ εϕ \bar{z} ηπ \bar{z} ραί $\bar{z}\bar{n}$ σιγη αϕ \bar{p} ωορπ [\bar{n}] ϵ [ι]
 εβολ $\bar{n}\tau\omicron\varsigma$ δε ογα $\bar{a}\tau\bar{c}$ εσψοοπ $\bar{n}\kappa\alpha\rho\omega\phi$
 14 ανοκ πε πλογος ογα $\bar{a}\tau$ ' $\bar{n}\alpha\tau\psi\alpha\chi\epsilon$ $\bar{m}\mu\omicron$ [ϕ]
 $\bar{n}\alpha\tau\chi\omega\bar{z}$ με $\bar{n}\alpha\tau\psi\iota\tau\phi$ ' $\bar{n}\alpha\tau\mu\epsilon\epsilon\gamma\epsilon$ εροϕ
 16 ογοεινε εϕ \bar{z} ηπ πε εϕ† $\bar{n}\omicron\gamma\kappa\alpha\rho\mu\omicron\varsigma$ \bar{n}
 ωη \bar{z} εϕβεεβε $\bar{n}\omicron\gamma\mu\omicron\omicron\gamma$ $\bar{n}\omega\eta\bar{z}$ εβ $\bar{o}\lambda$
 18 $\bar{z}\bar{n}$ τπηγη $\bar{n}\alpha\tau'$ ναγ ερος $\bar{n}\alpha\tau\chi\omega\bar{z}$ με
 $\bar{n}\alpha\tau\psi\iota\tau\phi$ ' ετε παί πε η \bar{z} ροογ $\bar{m}\pi\epsilon\omicron\omicron\gamma$
 20 $\bar{n}\tau\mu\alpha\gamma$ $\bar{n}\alpha\tau\omicron\gamma\alpha\bar{z}\mu\epsilon\phi'$ πεοογ $\bar{m}\pi\chi\pi\omicron$
 $\bar{m}\pi\eta\omicron\gamma\tau\epsilon$ ογπαρ $\theta\epsilon\eta\omicron\varsigma$ $\bar{n}\bar{z}$ οογτ' εβολ
 22 \bar{z} ιτοοτϕ' $\bar{n}\omicron\gamma\eta\omicron\gamma\varsigma$ εϕ \bar{z} ηπ ετε ταί τε
 τ $\bar{m}\bar{n}\tau\kappa\alpha\rho\omega\varsigma$ εσ \bar{z} ηπ' απ $\theta\eta\rho\phi$ εσο $\bar{n}\alpha\tau\omicron\gamma$
 24 $\bar{a}\bar{z}\mu\epsilon\varsigma$ ογοειν $\bar{n}\alpha\tau'$ ψιτϕ' τπηγη $\bar{m}\pi\theta\eta$ [ρ]ϕ
 τ $\bar{m}\omicron\gamma\eta\epsilon$ $\bar{m}\pi\alpha\iota\omega\eta$ $\theta\eta\rho\phi$ τβ $\alpha\sigma\iota\varsigma$ τε ετϕι
 26 ε \bar{z} ραί $\bar{z}\alpha$ κη $\eta\sigma\iota\varsigma$ $\bar{n}\iota\mu$ $\bar{n}\tau\epsilon$ $\bar{n}\alpha\iota\omega\eta$ ε[τ]
 ηπ' απεοογ ετ $\chi\omicron\omicron\omicron$ ' πκω ε \bar{z} ραί πε $\bar{n}\beta$ [α]
 28 $\varsigma\iota\varsigma$ $\bar{n}\iota\mu$ π $\bar{n}\iota\phi\epsilon$ πε $\bar{n}\bar{n}\beta\alpha\mu$ πβαλ πε \bar{n}
 †ψο $\bar{m}\tau\epsilon$ $\bar{m}\mu\omicron\eta$ εσψοοπ' $\bar{n}\bar{z}$ ροογ
 30 εβολ \bar{z} ιτοοτϕ' $\bar{n}\omicron\gamma\mu\epsilon\epsilon\gamma\epsilon$ αγω ογλο
 γος πε εβολ \bar{z} ιτοοτ ς $\bar{n}\tau\sigma\eta$ $\bar{n}\tau\alpha\gamma\tau\bar{n}$
 32 $\bar{n}\omicron\omicron\gamma\phi$ ' α \bar{p} ογοειν ανετψοοπ $\bar{z}\bar{m}$ πκ[α]
 [κ]ε εις \bar{z} ηητε δε α[$\bar{n}\omicron$]κ †[$\bar{n}\alpha\omicron\gamma$]ωη \bar{z}
 34 $\bar{n}\eta\tau\bar{n}$ εβολ \bar{n} [$\bar{n}\alpha\mu\gamma\sigma\theta\eta\rho\iota\omicron\eta$] $\chi\epsilon$ \bar{n}
 †ωτ \bar{n} $\bar{n}\alpha\psi\beta$ [$\varsigma\eta\eta\gamma$ αγω τετ $\bar{n}\alpha$]ϕ[ο]γψ
 36 $\bar{n}\omicron\gamma$ $\theta\eta\rho$ [ο]γ [

46*

- which [
 2 [become [*glorious* *Amen*].
- 4 [On Fate (εἰμαρμένη): Two (β')]
- I am the [*Word* (λόγος)] who dwells [*in the*] ineffable [*Voice*].
 6 I dwell in undefiled [*Light*]
 and a Thought [*revealed itself*]
 8 perceptibly (-αἴσθησις) through [*the great*]
 Speech of the Mother, although it is a male offspring [*that*
supports me]
 10 as my foundation. And it (i.e., the Speech) exists from the
 beginning
 in the foundations of the All. But (δέ) there is a Light [*that*]
 12 dwells hidden in Silence (σιγή) and it was first to [*come*]
 forth. Whereas (δέ) she (i.e., the Mother) alone exists as Silence,
 14 I alone am the Word (λόγος), ineffable,
 unpolluted, immeasurable, inconceivable.
 16 It (i.e., the Word) is a hidden Light, bearing a Fruit (καρπός) of
 Life, pouring forth a Living Water from
 18 the invisible, unpolluted, immeasurable
 Spring (πηγή), that is, the unreproducible Voice of the glory
 20 of the Mother, the glory of the offspring
 of God; a male Virgin (παρθένος) by
 22 virtue of a hidden Intellect (νοῦς), that is,
 the Silence hidden from the All, being unreproducible,
 24 an immeasurable Light, the Source (πηγή) of the All,
 the Root of the entire Aeon. It is the Foundation (βάσις) that
 supports
 26 every movement (κίνησις) of the Aeons that
 belong to the mighty Glory. It is the Foundation of every
 foundation (βάσις).
 28 It is the Breath of the Powers. It is the Eye of
 the three Permanences (μονή), which exist as Voice
 30 by virtue of Thought. And it is Word (λόγος)
 by virtue of Speech; it was sent
 32 to illumine those who dwell in the [*darkness*].
 Now behold [*I will reveal*]
 34 to you [*my mysteries* (μυστήριον)] since
 you are my fellow [*brethren, and you shall*] know

47*

(Lines 1-4 lacking)

- [13[±]] ΔΕΙΤΑ[Μ]Θ[ΟΥ ΤΗΡΟΥ Ε]
6 [ΝΑΜΥΣΤΗΡ]ΙΟΝ ΕΤΨΟΟΠ' Ζῆ [ΝΙΑΙΩΝ Ν]
[ΑΤ'ΤΕΖΟΟΥ Ν]ΑΤ'ΧΟΟΥ ΔΕΙΤΣΕ[ΒΟΟΥ ΑΝΜΥ]
8 [ΣΤΗΡΙ]ΘΝ ΕΒΟΛ ΖΙΤΟΟΤῆ ἄΠΖ[ΡΟΟΥ ΕΤ]
[ΨΟΟΠ] ΖΡΑΙ Ζῆ ΟΥΝΟΥΣ ἄΤΕΛΕΙΟ[Σ ΑΥΩ]
10 [ΔΕΙ]ΨΩΠΕ ἄΚΩ ΕΖΡΑΙ ἄΠΤΗΡῆ ΑΥΩ [ΔΕΙΤ']
[Β]ΘΜ' ΝΑΥ ΠΜΑΖΣΕΠ' ΣΝΑΥ ΑΙΕΙ Ζῆ Τ[ΣΜΗ]
12 ἄΠΑΖΡΟΟΥ ΔΕΙΤ' ΖΙΚΩΝ ἄΝΕΝΤΑΥΧ[Ι Ζ]Ι
ΚΩΝ ΨΑΖΟΥΝ ΑΤΟΥΣΥΝΤΕΛΕΙΑ ΠΜ[Α]Ζ
14 ΨΟΜΤ' ἄΣΟΠ' ΔΕΙΟΥΟΝΖΤ' ΕΒΟΛ ΝΑΥ [Ζ]ῆ
ἄΕΥΣΚΗΝΗ ΕΕΙΨΟΟΠ' ἄΛΟΓΟΣ ΑΥΩ ΔΕΙ
16 ΟΥΟΝΖΤ' ΕΒΟΛ Ζῆ ΠΕΙΝΕ ἄΤΟΥΖΙΚΩΝ ΑΥ
Ω ΔΕΙΨΦΟΡΙ ἄΤΟΥΖΒΣΩ ἄΟΥΟΝ ΝΙΜ ΑΥ
18 Ω ΔΕΙΖΟΠΤ ΟΥΑΑΤ' ΖΡΑΙ ἄΖΗΤΟΥ ΑΥΩ ἄΠ[ΟΥ]
ΣΟΥΩΝ ΠΕΤΤ' ΘΟΜ ΝΑΙ ΤΨΟΟΠ ΓΑΡ ΖΡΑΙ
20 Ζῆ ἄΑΡΧΗ ΤΗΡΟΥ ἄἄΝ ΔΥΝΑΜΙΣ ΑΥΩ ΖΡΑΙ
Ζῆ ἄΑΓΓΕΛΟΣ ΑΥΩ Ζῆ ΚΙΝΗΣΙΣ ΝΙΜ Ε[ΤΨ]Ο
22 ΟΠ' Ζῆ ΤΖΥΛΗ ΤΗΡῆ ΑΥΩ ΔΕΙΖΟΠΤ' ΖΡΑ[Ι] ἄ
ΖΗΤΟΥ ΨΑΝΤΟΥΟΝΖΤ' ΕΒΟΛ ἄΝΑΣΝΗ[Υ]
24 ΑΥΩ ἄΠΕΛΑΔΥ ἄΖΗΤΟΥ ΣΟΥΩΝΤ' ΚΑ[ΙΤΟΙ]
ΑΝΟΚ' ΠΕΤΡῆΝΕΡΓΕΙ ἄΖΗΤΟΥ ΑΛΛ[Α ΑΥΜΕ]
26 ΕΥΕ ΧΕ ἄΤΑΥΣΩΝΤ ἄΠΤΗΡῆ ΕΒΟΛ ἄΖ[ΗΤΟΥ]
ΕΥΟ ἄΑΤΣΟΟΥΝΕ ΕΝΣΕΣΟΟΥΝ ΑΝ ἄΤ[ΟΥ]
28 ΝΟΥΝΕ ΠΜΑ ἄΤΑΥΡΩΤ' ΖΡΑΙ ἄΖΗΤῆ Δ[ΝΟΚ]
ΠΕ ΠΟΥΟΕΙΝ ΕΤΤ' ΟΥΟΕΙΝΕ ἄΠΤΗ[Ρῆ Α]
30 ΝΟΚ ΠΕ ΠΟΥΟΕΙΝ ΕΤΡΑΨΕ ΖΡ[ΑΙ Ζῆ ΝΑ]
ΣΗΝΥ ΔΕΙΕΙ ΓΑΡ ΕΖΡΑΙ ΕΠΚΟΣΜΟΣ [ἄἄ]
32 ΡΕΥΜΟΥ ΕΤΒΕ ΠΠἄ ΕΤΣΟΧΠ' ΖΡΑ[Ι Ζῆ]
ΠΑΙ ἄΤΑ[ΥΒΩΚ ΕΖΡ]ΑΙ ἄΤΑΦΕΙ ΕΒΟΛ [Ζῆ] ΤΣΦ
34 ΦΙΑ ἄ[ΑΤΠΕΘΟΟΥ ΔΕΙΕΙ] ΑΥΩ ΑΙ[Τ] Ε[ΖΡΑ]Ι
[17[±]]-[Α]ΥΩ ΔΕΙ[ΒΩ]Κ' Α

48*

(Lines 1-4 lacking)

[13[±]]...[
6 [8[±]]ετε νεγντααα χν̄ [νωορπ· αυω]
[αιτ̄ ναα] εβολ ζμ̄ πμοοϋ [μπωνζ παϊ ετ]
8 [κωκ μ̄]μοα' αζηγ̄ μπχαοσ παϊ ε[τωοοπ]
[ζμ̄ πκα]κε νζαε ετωοοπ' μπσαν[ζοϋν μ̄]
10 [πωι]κε τηρ̄' ετε παϊ πε πμееεγ̄ [ν̄]τ[σω]
[μα]τικη μν̄ τψγχικη ναϊ τηροϋ ανο[κ]
12 [αε]ιτααϋ ζιωωτ̄· αεικακ̄ᾱ δε αζηγ̄ μμοσ
[αι]τ̄ ζιωωᾱ νογоеине εαπ̄ριωοϋ ετε
14 παϊ πε πσοοϋνε μπμееεγ̄ ν̄τμ̄ντειω[τ]
αϋω αειτ̄ μμοᾱ ατοοτοϋ ν̄νετ̄ στολη
16 ιαμμων̄ ελασσω̄ αμηναῑ αυω αυβ[ο]
ολεᾱ νοϋστολη̄ ζν̄ ν̄στολη̄ μπογоеин̄
18 αυω αειτααᾱ ετοοτοϋ ν̄νβαπτιστικσ̄ αυ
ρ̄βαπτιζε̄ μμοᾱ μιχεϋσ̄ μιχαρ̄· μν̄[η]
20 ς[ι]νοϋσ̄ αυχοκμεᾱ δε ζν̄ τπηγη̄ μπμ[ο]
[ο]ϋ μπωνζ αυω αειτααᾱ ετοοτοϋ ν̄νετ̄
22 [τ̄] θρονοσ̄ βαριηλ̄ νοϋθᾱν̄ σαβηнай̄ αυ
[τ̄] θρονοσ̄ ναα' εβολ ζμ̄ πθρονοσ̄ μπε
24 [ο]οϋ αυω αειτααᾱ' ετοοτοϋ ν̄νετ̄ εο
[ο]ϋ αρ̄ιωμ̄ ηλιεν̄ φ̄αριηλ̄ αυτ̄ εοοϋ
26 [ν]αᾱ ζραϊ̄ ζμ̄ πεοοϋ ν̄τμ̄ντειωτ̄· αυω'
[α]ϋτωρη̄ εζοϋν̄ ν̄βῑ νετ̄τωρη̄· καμαλη[λ̄]
28 [..]. ανη̄ν̄ σαμβλω̄ ν̄ζϋπηρετικσ̄ ν̄<ν>νοβ̄
[ν̄φ]ωστηρ̄ ετογααβ̄· αυχιτ̄ᾱ' εζοϋν̄ απτο̄
30 [πο]ς̄ νογоеине· ν̄τε τμ̄ντειωτ̄' αυω
[ααχι] ν̄τ̄ε̄ ν̄σφραγισ̄ εβολ ζιτοοτ̄' μ̄
32 [πογο]ειν̄ ν̄τμααϋ̄ τπρωτη̄ννοιᾱ αυω
αϋ[τ̄] ναα' α{γ}χῑ εβολ ζμ̄ [πμϋστηρ]ιον̄ μ̄
34 πσ[ο]οϋνε αυω [ααωωπε̄ νογоеι]νε̄ ζν̄
οϋο[ε]ῑνε̄ τβеноϋ̄ βε [11[±]]..[

48*

(Lines 1-4 lacking)

- [
6 [] which he had [*formerly and*]
[*I gave to him*] from the Water [*of Life, which*]
8 [*strips*] him of the Chaos (χάος) [*that is*]
[*in the*] uttermost [*darkness*] that exists [*inside*]
10 the entire [*abyss*], that is, the thought of [*the corporeal*
(*σωματική*)]
and the psychic (ψυχική). All these I
12 put on. And (δέ) I stripped him of it
and I put upon him a shining Light, that
14 is, the knowledge of the Thought of the Fatherhood.
And I delivered him to those who give robes (στολή)—
16 Yammon, Elasso, Amenai—and they [*covered*]
him with a robe (στολή) from the robes (στολή) of the Light;
18 and I delivered him to the Baptists (βαπτιστής) and they
baptized (βαπτίζω) him—Micheus, Michar, Mn[e]s[i]nous—
20 and (δέ) they immersed him in the spring (πηγή) of the [*Water*]
of Life. And I delivered him to those who
22 enthrone (-θρόνος)—Bariel, Nouthan, Sabenai—and
they enthroned (-θρόνος) him from the throne (θρόνος) of glory.
24 And I delivered him to those who glorify—
Ariom, Elien, Phariel—and they glorified
26 him with the glory of the Fatherhood. And
those who snatch away snatched away—Kamaliel
28 [] Janen, Samblo, the servants (ὑπηρέτης) of <the> great
holy Luminaries (φωστήρ)—and they took him into
30 the light-[*place* (τόπος)] of his Fatherhood. And
[*he received*] the Five Seals (σφραγίς) from
32 [*the Light*] of the Mother, Protennoia, and
it was [*granted*] him [*to*] partake of [*the mystery* (μυστήριον)] of
34 knowledge, and [*he became a Light*] in
Light. So, now, [

49*

(Lines 1-5 lacking)

- 6 [*I was*] dwelling in them [*in the form*]
 [of each] one. [*The Archons*] thought
 8 [*that I*] was their Christ. Indeed (*μέν*), I [*dwelt*]
 [in] everyone. Indeed (*μέν*) within those in whom [*I revealed*]
 10 [*myself*] as Light [*I eluded*]
 the Archons. I am their beloved,
 12 [*for (γάρ)*] in that place I clothed myself [*as*]
 the Son of the Archigenetor, and I was like
 14 him until the end of his decree, which is
 the ignorance of Chaos (*χάος*). And among the
 16 Angels (*ἄγγελος*) I revealed myself in their likeness,
 and among the Powers (*δύναμις*) as if (*ὡς*) I were one
 18 of them, but (*δέ*) among the Sons of Man as if (*ὡς*)
 I were a Son of Man, even though I am
 20 Father of everyone. I hid myself within them
 all until I revealed myself among my members (*μέλος*),
 22 which are mine, and I taught them about the ineffable
 ordinances, and (about) the brethren. But (*δέ*) they are
 inexpressible
 24 to every Sovereignty (*ἀρχή*) and every ruling (*ἀρχοντική*)
 Power (*δύναμις*) except (*εἰ μὴ τι*) to the Sons of the Light
 26 alone, that is, the ordinances of the Father. These are
 the glories that are higher than every glory, that is, [*the Five*]
 28 Seals (*σφραγίς*) complete by virtue of Intellect (*νοῦς*). He
 who possesses the Five Seals (*σφραγίς*) of these
 30 particular names has stripped off <the> garments (*στολή*)
 of ignorance and put on
 32 a shining Light. And nothing
 will appear to him that belongs to the Powers (*δύναμις*)
 34 of the Archons. Within those of this sort
 darkness will dissolve and [*ignorance*] will die.
 36 And the thought of the creature
 which [*is scattered will*] present a single appearance
 38 and [*dark Chaos (χάος)*] will dissolve and

50*

(Lines 1-2 lacking)

- [14±]εινε αγω nc[
 4 [14±]. νατ' τεροϋ[
 [11±]. .[. .] ραι ρ̄ν τ[
 6 [7±] ψαντογον ρτ' εβο[λ̄ ν̄ναψβηρ]
 [̄ν̄σον τηρο]γ αγω ψαντ' σωοϋ[ρ̄ εροϋν̄ ν̄]
 8 [ναψβηρ]̄ν̄σον τηροϋ ρρα[ι' ρ̄ν' ταμ[̄ν̄τ' ρρο]
 [̄νενερ] αγω λειταψε οειω ναγ̄ ν̄τ[τ' ε]
 10 [̄ν̄σφρ]̄ᾱγic̄ ν̄ατψαχε̄ μ̄μοοϋ χεκ[ααc]
 [εινα]ψωπε ρρα[ι' ν̄ρητοϋ αγω ν̄τοοϋ ρψ
 12 [οϋ]̄ν̄σεψωπε ρρᾱ ν̄ρητ' ανοκ' λειτ'̄ ν̄ιηc̄
 ριωωτ' λειεινε̄ μ̄μοοϋ εβολ ρ̄μ̄ πψε̄ ετc̄
 14 ροϋορτ' αγω λειτεροϋ ερατq̄ ρ̄ν̄ μ̄μᾱ ν̄
 ψωπε̄ μ̄π̄κειωτ' αγω̄ μ̄ποϋσοϋωντ'
 16̄ ν̄βῑ νετροειc̄ ανεϋμᾱ ν̄ψωπε̄ ανοκ
 γαρ̄ ανοκ' ογατ' εμαρτε̄ μ̄μοοϋ̄ μ̄ν̄ πα
 18̄ σπερμᾱ αγω̄ παcπερμᾱ ετε̄ πω[ι' πε' τ̄να[κα]
 ρ̄ε̄ εροϋν̄ αποϋοεινε̄ ετοϋααβ ρρα[ι' ρ̄ν̄ οϋ
 20̄ μ̄ν̄τκαρωc̄ ν̄ατ' τεροc̄ ραμην:

_____ _____ _____ _____
 πλογοc̄ ν̄τεπιφανα γ

- 22 _____ _____ _____ _____
 πρωτεννοια τριμορφοc̄ γ

_____ _____
 αγιαγραφη πατρογραφοc̄

- 24 _____ _____
 εν γνωσει τελεια'

50*

(Lines 1-2 lacking)

- [] and the []
 4 [] incomprehensible []
 [] within the []
 6 [] until I reveal myself [*to all my fellow*]
 [*brethren*] and until I gather [*together*]
 8 all [my fellow] brethren within my [*eternal*]
 [*kingdom*]. And I proclaimed to them the ineffable [*Five*]
 10 [*Seals (σφραφίς) in order that*]
 [*I might*] abide in them and they also
 12 might abide in me. As for me, I put on Jesus.
 I bore him from the cursed
 14 wood, and established him in the dwelling places
 of his Father. And those who watch over
 16 their dwelling places did not recognize me. For (γάρ) I,
 I am unrestrainable together with my
 18 Seed (σπέρμα), and my Seed (σπέρμα), which is mine, I shall
 [place]
 into the holy Light within an
 20 incomprehensible Silence. Amen.

The Discourse (λόγος) of the Appearance (ἐπιφάνεια):
 Three (γ')

- 22 Trimorphic Protennoia, in three (γ') parts

A Sacred Scripture written by the Father (ἁγιαγραφὴ
 πατρόγραφος)

- 24 with perfect Knowledge (ἐν γνώσει τελείᾳ)

NHC XIII,1*: TRIMORPHIC PROTENNOIA
NOTES TO TEXT AND TRANSLATION

- 35*,1-32 This section constitutes the initial aretology of Protennoia prefacing the whole tractate (see Introduction, Section IV).
- 35*,2 [ΠΟΓΟΕΙΝ: Schenke restores [ΠΕΙΩΤ.
- 35*,4-5 “firstborn”: cf. Col 1:15 and Prov 8:22-31.
- 35*,6 In *Ap. John* II,1:5,4-9 the Metropator is called the First Thought (ΠΩΟΡΠ ΜΜΕΕΥΕ=πρωτέννοια) and the threefold name (cf. *Trim. Prot.* XIII,1*:37*,20-22 where Protennoia’s Voice exists as the three μονή, Father, Mother, Son). Usually in the *Apocryphon of John* the First Thought of the Invisible Spirit is called Pronoia (BG 8502,2: 27,5-18 passim), as in the Pronoia hymn (II,30,11-31,25) underlying *Trimorphic Protennoia*.
- 35*,8-9 The Invisible One is the Invisible Spirit of the *Apocryphon of John*, *Gospel of the Egyptians*, *Allogenes*, *Three Steles of Seth*, *Zostrianos* and *Marsanes*. As is his image (38*,11), Protennoia is also invisible.
- 35*,12-26 For the motif of omnipresence cf. 47*,17-22 and Wis 7:22-24. ἐπίνοια (“externalized ἔννοια”) is the productive power of Protennoia later (39*,13-40*,7, as Sophia) stolen by Yaltabaoth.
- 35*,15-18 The levels of cosmic beings here (Invisible Lights, ἄρχοντες, ἄγγελοι, δαίμονες, ψυχαί in [Tartaros], ἕλικαὶ ψυχαί) should be compared with 47*,19-22 (ἀρχαί, δυνάμεις, ἄγγελοι, κίνησις [the soul is the principle of movement], ἕλη) and 49*,9-19 (ἄρχοντες, ἄγγελοι, δυνάμεις, Son of Man). Cf. Rom 8:38 (ἄγγελοι, ἀρχαί, δυνάμεις). *Trimorphic Protennoia* includes the biblical ἀρχαί, ἄγγελοι, δυνάμεις among the δαίμονες of the traditional Greek sequence of δαίμονες, ψυχαί, ἕλη; the Lights and ἄρχοντες are traditionally Gnostic.
- 35*,15 Or if one assumes haplography read: ΑΓΩ<ΖΡΑΙ ΖΝ> ΖΕΝΟΥΑΕΙΝΕ.
- 35*,20 Schenke emends ΒΡΗ to <C>ΒΡΗ<Z>, “rest.” A medial point is visible after η̄ of η̄ΖΗΤΟΥ.
- 35*,24 Protennoia, until now referring to itself as feminine, now refers to itself as masculine.
- 35*,26 “in it”: the antecedent is unclear.
- 35*,32 Read ΟΥ]ΘΗ ΝΙΜ with Schenke, “Die dreigestaltige Protennoia (Codex XIII),” 1:13; it might possibly be ΘΟ]Μ ΝΙΜ or ΚΙ]Μ ΝΙΜ.
- 36*,1-2 Schenke does not supply the copula; with her we restore ΖΡΟΥ and ΜΕΕΥΕ.

- 36*,4-5 In *Ap. John* II,I:30,11-31,25 Pronoia thrice descends to the underworld.
- 36*,5-6 In *Trimorphic Protennoia* water and light are apparently both metaphors for life-giving gnosis (cf. 46*,16-19; Jn 4:7-15). Whereas Protennoia is hidden in water (cf. *Ap. John* BG 8502,2:27,1-13), the Perfect Son is surrounded by light (38*,3-6; cf. 48*,15-21; but see note on 48*,19-20). Just as gnosis under the metaphor of light enlightens one, one can be immersed in gnosis under the metaphor of water (41*,24; 48*,18-21; cf. Sir 15:3 where Wisdom gives him who keeps Torah the water of wisdom to drink).
- 36*,8 The gradual (*κατὰ μέρος*) "putting forth" of the All by Protennoia occurs in three stages, as Voice, Speech and Word.
- 36*,8-14 The Voice (*ἡ φωνή*=*φθόγγος*?) originates from Protennoia's thought (36*,26-27; 37*,20-21; 46*,29-30) and is its masculine mode of revelation; the Voice is apparently the knowledge of God's thoughts (cf. 36*,17-20) which are collectively the Protennoia (36*,17; 38*,8).
- 36*,15 MS reads *σεοϋω*], the construct of *σοοϋν*, which latter is required by the proclitic pronoun *σε*. Protennoia is a Wisdom-figure, cf. 42*,9-16.
- 36*,16 MS reads: *σπέρμα*; cf. 1 Jn 3:9 where the seed of God dwells in the one born of god. For the seed cf. 50*,18. The "seed" may refer to the heavenly "seed of Seth" (the offspring or race of Seth, cf. Gen 4:25 LXX for Seth as *ἕτερον σπέρμα*, "other seed" of Adam) whom the Autogenes (Christ) established in the Third Light Daveithe (*Ap. John* II,I:9,14-16). They are the heavenly counterpart of the earthly seed of Seth who survive in the world until the Mother sends her Spirit to correct their (and her) deficiency (*Ap. John* II,I:24,34-25,16).
- 36*,17-21 Cf. 42*,1-12. The Platonists of the Roman period held that the Platonic ideas are the thoughts (*νοήματα*) of God (i.e., the All); cf. Albinus, *Ἐπιτομή*, IX,1-3.
- 36*,18 "proceed": *ἄνωγει* *ἡ* *πρόερχομαι*.
- 36*,22 One might possibly emend: *ἀνοκ* <†> *ἄνωγει* *ἡ* *πρόερχομαι*.
- 36*,22-25 The Thought of God (the Protennoia) is both the medium of revelation and the point of consubstantiality between God and man (the divine *pneuma-nous*).
- 36*,23 MS reads: *ἡ ἐν τῷ ἀνογειῶντι*.
- 36*,27-37*,3 The response of the Gnostics forms a redactional bridge to the cosmological exposition (37*,3-40*,29) which employs material parallel to Iren. *Haer.* I.29.1-4.
- 37*,1-3 Fruit is here a metaphor for the gnosis conveyed by the divine wisdom (cf. 44*,20-21). Apparently the Voice fructifies the Water of

Life (cf. note on 36*,5-6) with his thought, thus producing the Son. Cf. in particular 46*,16-20 where Voice is compared to a spring (πηγή) pouring out the Water of Life (=gnosis) as a "Fruit of Life." The Valentinian "Savior" (Iren. *Haer.* I.4.5) was sent with "fructifying power" (καρποφορία) to give Sophia "formation according to knowledge" (μόρφωσις ἢ κατὰ γνῶσιν).

- 37*,3-40,29 τότε here and in 38*,16.30; 39*,13; 40*,8 marks stages (and compositional sutures) in the cosmogonical narrative (37*,3-40*,29) of the first subtractate of the text.
- 37*,3-20 Cf. generally Jn 1:1-13; Logos in *Trimorphic Protennoia* corresponds more closely to *sermo* than *ratio*. This whole passage is an anticipatory summary of the work of the Logos in the third subtractate.
- 37*,5-6 Logos comes from Voice, and is the third (Son) aspect of Protennoia; cf. note on 37*,20-22.
- 37*,7 As in Valentinian sources, so also in *Trimorphic Protennoia* the "Name" is "the Son"; cf. *Gos. Truth* I,3:38,6-7; 39,5-40,29; *Gos. Phil.* II,3:54,1-10; *Interp. Know.* XI,1:12,20-22; *Exc. Theod.* 22.4-7; 26.1; 31.4.
- 37*,8 MS reads: ΑΦΟΓΟΝΖ ΕΒΟΛ.
- 37*,8-9 Logos is the mode of revelation of God's thoughts (i.e., the "everlasting things"; cf. Plato's "ideas") to human minds.
- 37*,12 Or "those who dwell in Silence and (in) the First Thought."
- 37*,20-22 On Father, Mother, Son, cf. *Ap. John* II,1:2,13-14; 9,10-11; and compare 5,7-10. *μουνή* is opposed to *κίνησις* (cf. note on 46*,29). The three *μουνή* are apparently the three abiding modes by which the Voice-aspect of Protennoia is to be envisioned. This tripartite representation of Protennoia's thought corresponds in gender to the major aspect of the Protennoia exhibited in each of its respective descents (i.e., in each of the three subtractates): Voice (ΖΡΟΟΥΓ masc. = φθόγγος?), Speech (ΣΜΗ fem. = φωνή?) and Logos (masc.). For the triple descent scheme *in nuce*, cf. 47*,5-16; see also *Ap. John*, II,1:30,11-31,25, where there is no distinction of genders or aspects of Pronoia. The "perceptible Speech" is an auditory metaphor of revelation, stressing the non-substantiality and yet perceptibility of the revelatory medium—speech is non-substantial since it disappears after the utterance, but has permanence in the memory of the hearer. *μουνή* can also mean an "abode" (so Schenke), or, in late papyri, an "appearance" (in court). It is also possible that *μουνή* may refer to the abiding quality of the First Principle as in the later Neoplatonic conception of universal nature as a rest-in-motion/motion-in-rest; the *μουνή* of the First Principle, a procession (πρόοδος) therefrom through the Forms to their effects, and reversion (ἐπιστροφή) of the effects

through the Forms to their First Principle (cf. Proclus, in *Tim.* III.185.20 and passim). This scheme was correlated with the Neoplatonic scheme of τὸ ὄν, ζωή, and νοῦς, and the post-psuedo-Dionysian οὐσία, δύναμις, and ἐνέργεια. The same scheme may apply to Voice, Speech, and Logos, i.e., Speech as the articulate potency of the essential Voice, which produces Word as its effect.

- 37*,21-24 The three Permanences of Protенnoia (the Thought), Father, Mother, Son, correspond to the three linguistic modalities in which the Thought is manifested: Voice (masc., perhaps Greek φθόγγος) corresponds to Father; Sound (fem., perhaps Greek φωνή) corresponds to Mother; and Word (λόγος) corresponds to Son. Appearing at first as (inarticulate) Voice, the Thought becomes perceptible as (articulate) Speech, and finally is manifested as a clear Word.
- 37*,25 It appears that the scribe wrote an extra ΟΥ, corrected it, and cancelled one too many letters.
- 37*,25-27 Cf. *Ap. John* II,1:5,8-9; III,1:7,23-8,5; IV,1:7,23-24; BG 8502,1:27,21-28,2. The three names are Father (Voice), Mother (Speech), and Son (Logos); the three masculinities and three powers seem to be theologumena familiar from other tractates such as the *Three Steles of Seth* (VII,5), *Allogenes* (XI,3), *Zostrianos* (VIII,1) and *Marsanes* (X,1), where the potency of the Unknown God is the Triple Power, and Barbelo is identified with the Triple Male, Autogenes, Protophanes and Kalyptos. See the Introduction to *Allogenes*, Section IV for analysis.
- 37*,26 Cf. *Gos. Eg.* III,2:41,7-9; 41,23-42,4; the three powers from the unknown father Autogenes are equivalent to the three Ogdoads (III,2:42,4-8).
- 37*,27-30 Or: "which are secretly quadrangles within a silence . . ." Cf. *Gos. Eg.* III,2:41,7-12 where Father, Mother, and Son proceed from the incorruptible Father in silence (σιγή). The three quadrangles (τετράγωνοι) may refer to the three tetrads of aeons begotten ultimately by Barbelo in *Ap. John* II,1:5,5-8,21; BG 8502,1:27,17-34,13, since in *Trimorphic Protенnoia* the three quadrangles take the place of the "three begettings" in the *Apocryphon of John* nomenclature of Barbelo: triple male, triple power, triple name, and triple begetting (BG 8502,2:27,21-28,2). Thus the triple begettings of tetrads (=quadrangles) would be: Prognosis, Incorruptibility, Eternal Life, and Truth (Codex II) or Ennoia (BG 8502; i.e., Barbelo herself) begotten by the Father for Barbelo; Autogenes or Christ (counted in the second tetrad), Nous, Will, and Logos begotten by the Father for Autogenes-Christ; and third the Four Lights, Harmozel (governing Charis and Adamas), Oroiael (governing Aisthesis and Seth), Davithai (governing Wisdom and the seed of Seth) and Eleleth (governing

- Sophia and the psychics) begotten by the Father through Christ. The Four Lights constitute the Third tetrad, each member of which governs or contains two further beings, making a total of twelve aeons. Schenke displaces 37*,27-29 to 37*,22.
- 37*,30-36 The narrative on the only-begotten (or self-begotten) Son's work in the divine world resumes. $\pi\epsilon\chi\zeta$ reconstructed in line 31 is to be inferred from 38*,22-23, "the God who came into being by himself," i.e., "the Perfect Son, the Christ."
- 37*,30-33 The reconstruction is based upon Iren. *Haer.* I.29.1; *Ap. John* II,1:6,23-28; BG 8502,2:30,1-31,1, where the Invisible Spirit anoints Christ with his goodness ($\text{M}\overline{\text{N}}\overline{\text{T}}\overline{\text{X}}\zeta$).
- 37*,33 $\text{M}\overline{\text{T}}\ \overline{\text{O}}\epsilon$ is visible in the *Facsimile Edition: Codices XI, XII, XIII*, pl. 104.
- 37*,33-36 The reconstruction is based on 38*,1-5.20-21. The collocation of Living Water and the surrounding light is found in *Ap. John*, BG 8502,2:26,15-27,4 applied to the Invisible Spirit.
- 37*,34 In the *Facsimile Edition: Codices XI, XII, XIII*, pl. 104 $\gamma\alpha$ is visible before the lacuna and $\omega\psi$ following the lacuna.
- 37*,36 The last quarter of 37*,36 is unscripted due to a split in the papyrus.
- 38*,1-6 Cf. Iren. *Haer.* I.29; *Ap. John* II,1:4,19-21; BG 8502,2:26,15-17.
- 38*,5 Cf. *Gos. Eg.* IV,2:61,8-23 where Adamas, the son of the first Man is the eye of the light because he comes from the light; also cf. *Soph. Jes. Chr.* BG 8502,3:100,14; 108,10-11. In BG 8502,3:101 Adam is apparently identified with Christ. In *Trim. Prot.* XIII,1*:46*,28-29, the Logos is the Eye of "the three permanences."
- 38*,7 † $\alpha\iota\omega\text{N}$ for $\alpha\iota\omega\nu\acute{\iota}\epsilon\iota\nu$ "perpetuate," or possibly a corruption of either $\alpha\iota\nu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ "praise" or $\tau\alpha\epsilon\iota\text{O}$ "praise." For a possible meaning of "give aeon," cf. 38*,18 and 38*,30-39*,13. Schenke inserts $\epsilon\beta\text{O}\Lambda$ $\zeta\iota\tau\text{O}\text{O}\tau$ before $\epsilon\tau\epsilon$ to avoid the paradoxical identification of the Father of Aeons with Protенnoia.
- 38*,7-16 Cf. Iren. *Haer.* I.29; *Ap. John*, II,1:4,21-22.26-5,11; BG 8502,2:27,10-15.18-28,4. This passage, beginning with "who am I" and incorporating material similar to *Ap. John*, II,1:4,32-5,11 is designed to show that it is ultimately Protенnoia who produced the Aeons through the Son.
- 38*,8 Or: "Thought of the Father of Protенnoia"; but cf. 36*,17. "Protенnoia" is here in apposition to "the Thought of the Father."
- 38*,11-12 Cf. Col 1:15-16 where Christ is "the image of the invisible God, for in him were created all things." In *Trimorphic Protенnoia* it is Christ who establishes the aeons, while the image of the Invisible Spirit is not Christ, but Protенnoia.

- 38*,15 For Meirothea, "goddess Fate" (μοῖρα), cf. 45*,[10]; *Zost.* VIII,1:6,30; 30,14 (Mirothea); *Steles Seth* VII,5:119,12 (Mirotheas and Mirotheos); 120,15 (Mirotheos), and *Gos. Eg.* III,2:49,4 (Mirothoë = Ionic fem. sg.; cf. Böhlig-Wisse, *The Gospel of the Egyptians*, 176). This name designates the primal Adam in the *Three Steles of Seth*. In *Trimorphic Protennoia* Meirothea is clearly feminine, and is identified as the intangible Womb (τοτε for τοοτε), Virgin, Mother, Barbelo, and as Protennoia in her Voice aspect. The cited passages suggest that Meirothea is to be construed as perhaps either the female aspect of Adamas or as his mother.
- 38*,17-39*,13 Cf. *Iren. Haer.* 1.29; *Ap. John* II,1:7,30-8,21; BG 8502,2:32,19-34,12 where Christ reveals the Four Lights (Harmozel, Oroiael, Daveithe and Eleleth) and establishes the Aeons.
- 38*,22-23 ΠΝΟΥΤΕ ΠΑΙ ΕΝΤΑϞΩΠΕ ΟΥΑΛΤϞ=θεὸς μονογενής; cf. 38*,31.
- 38*,29 Perhaps read: ΜΑ ΜΩ Ω Ω Ω Εἰ α' εἰ ον εἰ ὁ αἰών τῶν αἰώνων. Coptic "Give! Take! Thrice-great" plus Greek "Thou art first! Thou art (the One who) is! Thou art the Aeon of the aeons!" or: ΜΑ ΜΩΩΩ Ω' εἰ: α' εἰ: ὄν εἰ="Give to the thrice-great One! Thou art last! Thou art first! Thou art (the One who) is!" Cf. *Gos. Eg.* III,2:41,15; 43,9-10; IV,2:51,2-5; 53,5-6 where the Aeon of aeons is Domedon Doxomedon, the αὐτογενής.
- 38*,31 ΠΝΟ[ΥΤΕ ΕΝΤΑΥ]ΧΠΟϞ perhaps should be ΕΝΤΑϞ]ΧΠΟϞ complemented by ΟΥΑΛΤϞ, i.e., ὁ αὐτογενής θεός, since Christian Sethianism identifies Christ as establisher of the Four Lights with the Autogenes god. Perhaps the scribe erroneously omitted ΟΥΑΛΤϞ; without this emendation, however, the third person plural ΕΝΤΑΥ- produces an intelligible locution. Cf. *Ap. John* II,1:7,10-11 of Christ, the αὐτογενής God.
- 38*,32 Schenke restores in the lacuna ⲙ[ⲙⲛ ⲗⲗⲗϞ ⲛⲗⲟϞϞ]Ϟ.
- 38*,33 Restoration following Schenke.
- 38*,34-39*,5 Proper names are rendered in translation in their Greek nominative case at points where the text employs the vocative. The Four Lights Harmozel, Oroiael, Daveithai and Eleleth are a constant feature of gnostic Sethianism (H.-M. Schenke, "Das sethianische System," 166, 168-69; id., "Gnostic Sethianism," 595). In these four triads of three names, the last of each triad is the Semitic name for each of the Four Lights. The first two names of each triad seem Greek and perhaps secondary; they and their cognates appear elsewhere in the Sethian-Barbeloite group of texts (the *Three Steles of Seth*, *Zostrianos*, *Allogenes*) which have a strong affinity with mystic Platonism:

(H)armedon: cf. VII,5:126,12; VIII,r:86,19; 119,[5]; 120,3; 126,[23]; 127,9; XI,3:45,36; 54,12; 58,17.

Nouo[then]: cf. Nouthan, XIII,r*:48*,22.

Phainios: cf. Phainops, XI,4:69,27; 70,25.[29]; 71,[28]; 72,19 and Protophanes, VII,5:123,5; VIII,r:passim and XI,3:45,36; 46,[25]; 51,20; 58,17.

Ainios: cf. Ainon, III,2:44,25.

Mellepheaneus: cf. XI,3:54,30.

Loios: cf. Loel, VIII,r:47,4.

The Semitic names of the Four Lights appear in the Sethian texts: the *Apocryphon of John* (II,r), the *Gospel of the Egyptians* (III,2), *Zostrianos* (VIII,r) and *Melchizedek* (IX,r):

(H)armozel: cf. II,r:8,5; 9,2; III,2:51,18; 52,10.22; 65,13; VIII,r:29,2; 32,[5]; 51,17; 100,[6]; 127,[22]; IX,r:6,4; (H)armas: II,r:10,30; 17,8; III,2:58,11.

Oroiael: cf. III,2:51,18; 52,11.24; 57,8; 65,16; VIII,r:29,6; 51,18; 127,[27]; IX,r:6,4; 17,12; Oriel, II,r:8,9; Oroiel, II,r:9,14.

Daveithai: cf. II,r:8,13; 9,16; Daveithe, VIII,r:29,8; 51,18; 128,3; IX,r:6,4; Davithe, III,2:51,19; 52,13.25; 56,22; 65,19.

Eleleth: cf. II,r:8,18; 9,23; II,4:93,8.18; 94,3; III,2:51,19; 52,14; 53,1; 56,24; 65,21; VIII,r:29,10; 31,17; 51,18; 128,6; IX,r:6,5; XIII,r*:39*,15; Elilioupheus/Elelioupheus, VIII,r:88,12; XI,3:54,19.

The Four Lights do not appear in the Platonizing Sethian (Barbeloite) treatises the *Three Steles of Seth* (VII,5), *Allogenes* (XI,3), and *Marsanes* (X,r), leaving *Zostrianos* (VIII,r) and *Trimorphic Protennoia* as the two Sethian texts where both the graecicizing and semiticizing name traditions intersect in the use of the names (H)armedon and Mellepheaneus. In *Zost.* VIII,r:119,3–11 it may be that [Arme]don is the first of four “lights” [Arme]don, Diphane[us], [Malsed]on and [Solmi]s. In *Allogenes* XI,3:45,36; 58,17 (cf. *Steles Seth* VII,5:126,12; *Zost.* VIII,r:127,8–9) Harmedon is a cognomen of Protophanes, a member of the sub-aeons (Kalyptos, Protophanes, Autogenes) of the Aeon of Barbelo.

39*,6 “The God who was begotten,” cf. Just. *Dial.* 61, of Christ. Perhaps ΠΝΟΥΤΕ ΝΤΑΥΧΠΟΥ should be emended to ΠΝΟΥΤΕ ΕΝΤΑΥΧΠΟΥ <ΕΒΟΛ ΖΙΤΟΟΤῶ ΟΥΑΑΤῶ> “the God who begot himself,” i.e., ὁ αὐτογενῆς θεός; cf. 39*,13.

39*,13–32 This section narrates the creation of Yaltabaoth from the Epinoia of Eleleth. On “the God who was begotten” see note on 39*,6.

39*,13–19 Cf. *Gos. Eg.* III,2:56,22–57,1. Eleleth’s aeon contains Sophia;

can she be identified with Eleleth's ἐπίνοια (39*,19)? As in *Ap. John* II,1:20,9-28; 22,28-24,15, the ἐπίνοια appears to be a manifestation of Pronoia/Protennoia; in the *Apocryphon of John* the ἐπίνοια is not said to reside in Eleleth, nor is it identified with Sophia, but appears as the second manifestation of Pronoia/Metropator (in the form of Eve; the first manifestation is Autogenes, i.e., Christ, in BG 8502,2: 51,1-52,11); can it also be inferred to be the power by which Sophia creates Yaltabaoth? In *Trimorphic Protennoia* it is not said how ἐπίνοια comes into Eleleth's possession, nor how Sophia falls from Eleleth, bearing with her some of this ἐπίνοια, and produces Yaltabaoth. In the system of the *Apocryphon of John*, Sophia creates Yaltabaoth without permission; it is an act of *hybris* (cf. *Iren. Haer.* I.29; II,1:9,25-35; BG 8502,2:36,16-37,11). If the composer of *Trimorphic Protennoia* is dependent on a source common to Irenaeus and the Coptic versions of the *Apocryphon of John*, he may be altering the myth at this point. However, see 39*,29-30, where (Eleleth's) ἐπίνοια is virtually identified with "the innocent one," who is Sophia (40*,15). This reference, in conjunction with 39*,31-32, constitutes an implicit claim that Sophia is the innocent creator of Yaltabaoth.

- 39*,20-26 For Yaltabaoth's lack of perfection, cf. *Iren. Haer.* I.29.4; *Ap. John* II,1:10,1-7; BG 8502,2:37,12-18.
- 39*,21 In *Gos. Eg.* III,2:57,17-18.22 the great demon is called [Neb]-rouel.
- 39*,24 <Ε>ϞΧΗΚ: Perhaps ε of <Ε>ϞΧΗΚ elided with the final ε of οΥΔΕ or was lost through haplography because of the proximity of οΥΔΕ.
- 39*,26-32 For the names of Yaltabaoth and his robbery of Sophia's (i.e., Epinoia's?) power, cf. *Iren. Haer.* I.29.4; *Ap. John* BG 8502,2: 38,15-39,1; II,1:10,19-23; 11,15-18; 13,27-30. On Sophia as Yaltabaoth's mother (39*,31-32), cf. *Iren. Haer.* I.30.5.
- 39*,32-40*,4 Though damaged, this passage appears to relate the restoration of Eleleth's ἐπίνοια from the realm of disorder to another, presumably higher, order (τάξις). This higher order is the house of glory (the divine world of Aeons), and the order which she now has may be characterized with disorder (ἀταξία). This may be the *Trimorphic Protennoia* counterpart to the repentance and restoration of Sophia in *Iren. Haer.* I.29.4 and *Ap. John* II,1:13,32-14,5; BG 8502,2: 46,9-47,13, except that in *Trimorphic Protennoia* there is no word of the Epinoia's repentance. The failure of *Trimorphic Protennoia* explicitly to credit Sophia with the creation of Yaltabaoth by her *hybris* and without her partner is reflected by Sophia's epithet "innocent" (ἀπνεθοογ). Sophia has done no bad thing; she was merely

overpowered by the great demon produced from Eleleth's Epinoia. She needs no repentance because it was Eleleth's fault. Schenke restores 39*,34-37 rather differently.

- 40*,4-7 Yaltabaoth makes counterfeit aeons, cf. Iren. *Haer.* I.29.4; *Ap. John* BG 8502,2:39,1-6; II,r:10,23-28 (cf. 12,33-13,5). Since the ἐπίνοια is forgiven (40*,2-4), Yaltabaoth makes them only with his own power.
- 40*,10 Janssens refers to the Naasene password παῦε, παῦε addressed to the primal man Papas: "Stop the cosmic disorder!" (Hipp. *Ref.* V.8.22).
- 40*,12-15 Cf. 41*,20-23; 47*,31-34.
- 40*,13 μέρος refers to the spiritual substance within, but not coextensive with, the soul.
- 40*,16-19 Yaltabaoth "appointed" that his counterfeit aeons keep Protennoia's spirit (μέρος, cf. 41*,21-22; μέλος, 41*,7; 49*,21-22), man's *pneuma*-self snatched from Sophia, entrapped in matter.
- 40*,19 The trace between λ and γ of λϞϞΤΟΡ/ΤΡ must be a slip of the pen.
- 40*,19-22 Cf. *Ap. John* II,r:14,24-26. The unknowable light is Eleleth whose Epinoia produced Yaltabaoth; the denizens of Eleleth's house are, besides Sophia (II,r:8,14-20), the now repentant souls (i.e., psychics?) once ignorant of the Pleroma (II,r:9,18-23). On the trembling of the abyss on the first descent, cf. II,r:30,19-20. Schenke forgives Eleleth's culpability by emending 40*,20 to ΕΤΨΟΟΠ<ΑΝ>.
- 40*,21 ΗΙ probably refers to the celestial realm.
- 40*,22-25 The Archigenetor is Yaltabaoth; cf. 43*,25-30.32; 44*,27; 49*,13; *Ap. John*, II,r:12,28-30 (also called Protoarchon, II,r:14,25). Yaltabaoth creates Adam in *Ap. John*, II,r:14,25-15,13; the anthropological material found in the *Apocryphon of John* is conspicuously absent. Yaltabaoth is called Archigenetor in the Exousiai-source of *On the Origin of the World* (occurrences at II,5:102,11; 103,4; 104,12; 106,13,19; 107,18; 108,5.11.31; 112,27; 114,22.25; 117,20; 126,21.26); see Böhlig's discussion in Böhlig-Labib, 26-30. Schenke's emendation of 40*,24 to Ε<Τ>ΑϞϞΡΟ is unnecessary.
- 40*,29-34 In *Ap. John*, II,r:20,9-28 this descent of Protennoia would correspond to the descent of the Epinoia aspect of the Metropator in the form of Eve. For "receiving shape" as a metaphor for receiving gnosis, see the note on 45*,23-27.
- 40*,33-34 ΕΕ]ΙΤῚΝΝΑΥ ΖΙΚΩΝ: See Emmel, "Proclitic Forms."
- 40*,37 ἸΤΑΥϞϞ[ΤΡ: Janssens restores ἸΤΑΥϞϞ[ϞΩΝΤ.
- 41*,2-3 "mystery": cf. 42*,27-28 and note.
- 41*,4 Read Ζῆ ΤΑΠΡΟ [ΝΙ]Μ with Janssens.

- 41*,4-20 The evenly balanced lines in synonymous parallelism with preposition of object seem intentionally rhetorical (cf. 37*,8-19). Salvation is the nullification of the effect of the hostile powers that control the fleshly body; it is accomplished by explaining them.
- 41*,4-7 On the chains of the demons, cf. *Orac. Sib.* II.287-90, *passim*. Here the instruments of punishment of the underworld, conceived as a place of torture and imprisonment, are a metaphor for the imprisonment of Protennoia's spirit (μέρος, cf. 41*,20-23) in man's material body. The features of the underworld are standard in most of the Nekyia literature from Homer onward.
- 41*,7 † ἀζητοῦ: cf. XI,J.14,31 († ἀζῆ- with the nuance of "oppose," "restrain." These forms may be related to Achmimic ἀζτῆ-, Crum 23b.
- 41*,8-11 Cf. *Soph. Jes. Chr.* BG 8502,3:121,18-122,1: "I broke the gates (πυλῆ) of the pitiless ones." On the walls, bars and gates of the underworld, cf. *Hom. Il.* VIII.13-16; *Hes. Theog.* 726-816; *Vir. Aen.* VI.548-627; *Orac. Sib.*, I.127-28; *Thom. Cont.* II,7:142,30-143,8. Cf. the harrowing of Hell (1 Pet 3:19; 4:6). In *Trimorphic Protennoia*, Protennoia/Voice is destroying the prison, not of the underworld, but of the flesh.
- 41*,11-14 "The one who beats you" is probably Tartarouchos; cf. *Thom. Cont.* II,7:142,40-143,2. The hinderer may be a celestial "toll-collector." This passage seems to be a collection of popular epithets for demonic powers in general, not necessarily at home in Sethian texts.
- 41*,18 MS reads: τηρῶν.
- 41*,20-23 Cf. 40*,12-15; 47*,31-34. Apparently, Protennoia is consubstantial with the human spirit that originated from the Water of Life and was perhaps nourished by immersion (baptism?) in the mysteries, even though it now dwells (or languishes!) in the soul (as μέρος; cf. note on 40*,16-19). Schenke's emendation ἄτα<ρε>ϥ-ϥωπε (41*,23) is unnecessary.
- 41*,29 ἄανεζ: scribe wrote ἄανανεζ by simple dittography.
- 41*,33 MS reads: ἄωορπ.
- 41*,36 there is an additional trace of ink to the upper left of the supra-linear stroke over the initial ἄ in the line.
- 42*,3 On [ἄ], see Introduction to Codex XIII, Section IV.
- 42*,4-9 "syzygetic": lit. "He/she who is doubled, united." Protennoia exists in the three aspects of Voice, Speech and Word, all of which would be aspects of the "Thought of the Invisible One" (i.e., Protennoia, the invisible Father's Thought, 35*,7-9; 36*,17, *passim*). On the first descent, Protennoia appeared under the aspect of Voice (35*,1-42*,3; 47*,5-11); hence Protennoia, the Thought of the

Father, could be conceived as undergoing a syzygy with its masculine (ΠΖΡΟΟΥ) aspect of the Voice—"he who is (a) double" (of Thought and Voice). On the second descent, Protennoia appears under the aspect of Speech (42*,4-46*,4; 47*,11-13); hence Protennoia could be conceived as undergoing a syzygy with its feminine (CΜΗ) aspect of Speech—"she who is (a) double" (of Thought and Speech).

42*,9-10 "Mother [of] the Voice": Protennoia, under its feminine aspect of Speech, can be conceived of, in a contorted way, as the mother of its masculine aspect of Voice; cf. 45*,3-4.27-28. Janssens calls attention to Heb 1:1 in connection with ΝΖΑΖ ΝΡΗΤΕ (=πολυτρόπως) and to ΧΩΚ ΕΒΟΛ (=τελειοῦσθιν?) as suggesting an act of the last days. Janssens reads ΤΜΑΛΥ [ΜΝ]/ΠΖΡΟΟΥ: I am the Mother [and] the voice.

42*,11-12 Cf. 36*,17-21 and note.

42*,12 Or: ΔΝΟΚ Π[Ε Π]/ΨΑΧΕ, "I am the Speech."

42*,12-14 Cf. 36*,15-16.

42*,13 MS reads: ΔΥΩ.

42*,14-16 Cf. 45*,10-12.

42*,17 ΠΜΑΖΣΕΠCΝΔΥ "second time": cf. 47*,11 and *Ap. John* II,1:30,22.

42*,17-18 The female likeness is the Speech (fem.), corresponding to Pronoia's appearance in Eve in *Ap. John* II,1:23,20-24,16; BG 8502,2:53,4-19; 59,6-61,7. See also XIII,1*:47*,11-13.

42*,19 Text: ζ of ΑΘΑΖΗ emended by scribe with a diagonal stroke. Schenke's suggestion that ΕΦΩΟΥΕΙΤ may have been lost following ΕΤΝΑΨΩΠΕ is unnecessary; the antecedent is ΖΑΗ, not ΔΙΩΝ.

42*,22 Cf. 1 Cor 15:52.

42*,23-25 I.e., "my masculine likeness," the Voice-aspect of Protennoia's first appearance.

42*,27-28 Cf. 1 Cor 15:51 and XIII,1*:41*,2-3.

42*,30 The raised point after ΖΗΤϚ is obscured in the *Facsimile Edition: Codices XI, XII, XIII*.

42*,30-33 Comparison of the inauguration of the new age to the travail of birth (cf. 43*,6-8) is a common apocalyptic motif: cf. Mk 13:8.17. Schenke restores 42*,30 differently, and in 42*,32 reads ΔΥΝ[Τ]Ϛ ΕϘ[ΟΛ] "brought forth" for ΔϚΚ[Ω]ΤΕ[Ϙ] (Ϙ is cancelled by scribe with a diagonal stroke; perhaps he started to write ΚΩΤΕ ΕΒΟΛ).

43*,2-4 ΤΗΒΕ and ΜΡΡΕ may refer to measures of length, so that the phrase may refer to the shortness of the time before the end of the present aeon; the time is shortened by a ΤΗΒΕ (finger's length) less a ΤΗΒΕ, and a ΜΡΡΕ (a knuckle's length—even shorter?) less a ΜΡΡΕ—i.e., no length at all. Alternatively, the passage may refer to the mutilation (κολοβοῦν) of parts (finger, joint) of the body, and

κολοβοῦν is used to refer to the shortening of the days in Mk 13:20. Schenke takes ΤΗΒΕ as a form of ΤΗΒΙ, "bandage."

- 43*,6-8 The destruction coincides with the end of the present aeon (cf. 43*,8-12; 44*,16-18; *Ap. John* II,r:14,24-26; 30,27-29). On the birth pangs of the New Age, cf. the ὠδῖνες of Isa 13:8; Hos 13:13; Mk 13:8. Schenke's emendation to <ψ>α<σ>ΖΝΑΝ (43*,6) is unnecessary. ἀΖΙΡῼ ΠΡΟ literally: near, "unto the door"; cf. Mk 13:29.
- 43*,6-17 The destruction overturns the netherworld (8-11), the earth (11-12) and the celestial realm (13-17).
- 43*,9-10 Cf. *Ap. John*, II,r:30,19-20.27-28: ἄΝῚΤΕ... ΜΠΧΛΟC ΑΥΚΙΜ.
- 43*,13 The lots of Fate (κλήροι εἰμαρμένης) may be the κλήροι τύχης (Ptol. *Tetr.* III.10.129); an individual's lot of fortune (or fate) is determined by the relative positions of the sun and moon with respect to the horoscope or ascendant sign at the time of his birth; cf. also *Ap. John*, BG 8502,2:72,3-11; *Orig. World*, II,5:121,13-27.
- 43*,14 The οἶκος system allots each planet and its celestial deity patronage over a particular sign of the Zodiac as its domicile; cf. Ptol. *Tetr.* I.17.37.
- 43*,15-16 The planets are the seats (θρόνοι) of the celestial deities.
- 43*,17-18 The stars (including the planets), governed by fate, make their appointed revolutions; the "path" is their orbit.
- 43*,19 MS reads: ΠΙΨΤΟΡ/ΤΡ.
- 43*,19-26 The planets inquire of their governing deities (δυνάμεις), probably Yaltabaoth's counterfeit aeons (cf. 40*,4-7 and *Apoc. Adam* V,5:77,4-18), as to who has destroyed their order.
- 43*,21 For the emendation, cf. 44*,3: ΖΡΟΟΥ ΕϞ[Ζ]ΗΠ ΑΪCΜΗ. The Voice belongs to the Speech, its mother: cf. notes on 42*,4-9.9-10.
- 43*,23-24 "the entire circuit of our path" is probably an astrological term, possibly rendering Greek πᾶσα ἡ περίοδος τῆς ἀνόδου ἡμῶν.
- 43*,35-36 For the boast of the Archigenetor (derived from Isa 44:6, 45:5, 46:9) see *Iren. Haer.* I.30.6; I.29.4; *Ap. John*, II,r:11,18-22; 13,5-9; *Orig. World* II,5:112,28-29; *Hyp. Arch.* II,4:94,21-22; 2 *Apoc. Jas.*, V,4:56,25-57,3.
- 44*,2-10 Cf. The disturbance produced by the voice in *Iren. Haer.* I.30.6 and *Ap. John*, II,r:14,13-26.
- 44*,3 ΕϞ[Ζ]ΗΠ: Ζ of ΕϞΖΗΠ cancelled by the scribe with a diagonal stroke.
- 44*,4 ἸΜΟ[Ϟ]C: c written over Ϟ of ἸΜΟϞ.
- 44*,10-19 The weeping of the powers: Schmidt-MacDermot, *Bruce Codex*, 239,20-21. Yaltabaoth, the Archigenetor, and the Powers had formerly imprisoned Protennoia's spirit in matter; now, their grip on it lapsing, they are about to be imprisoned in their own underworld.

- 44*,16 Cf. Mt 24:22 par.
- 44*,17-18 I.e., "our mournful destruction."
- 44*,19 Emendation following Schenke.
- 44*,20-29 The powers recognize the ignorance of their creator Yaltabaoth. In *Ap. John*, II,r:21,24-22,2; BG 8502,2:56,17-57,5 the evil tree is the tree of life which the Archons plant for the psychic Adam to eat of; in reality it offers life in the material body that results in death. Cf. 47*,24-28.
- 44*,29 MS reads: ΕΤΒΗΤΙ.
- 44*,20-21 Fruit is a metaphor for knowledge. Cf. 41*,30-31, where Protennoia's fruit is the Thought of an unchanging Aeon, whereas here the fruit of Yaltabaoth's tree is chaotic ignorance.
- 44*,27-29 Cf. *Ap. John*, II,r:14,15-18 and *Apoc. Adam* V,5:77,18-27.
- 44*,29-30 Cf. the exhortation of Wisdom, Prov 7:24.
- 44*,31 "Mother of your mercy": i.e., "your merciful Mother," here referring to the Speech (fem.) of the Voice; probably Meirothea is meant (45*,9-10; but cf. 38*,14-16 where Meirothea is also the Voice). In the *Aprocryphon of John* the "merciful Mother" refers to Sophia (BG 8502,2:71,5-13).
- 44*,32-33 "mystery": cf. Col 1:26.
- 44*,33-34 "Consumation of the age" (συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος): cf. Mt 13:39,40,49; 24:3; 28:20; also Heb 9:26.
- 45*,1-4 The second letter of line 2 and the second and third letters of line 3 are from frg. 3 (*Facsimile Edition: Codices XI, XII, XIII*, pl. 119) now placed at this location on p. 45. Letters five through nine on lines 1 and 4, letters four through eight on line 2, and letters four through nine on line 3 are transcribed from pl. 104.
- 45*,1-2 For reconstruction, cf. 42*,19-22.
- 45*,5-6 For reconstruction, cf. 35*,2-4.
- 45*,7-8 Schenke reads [πα/τογῶν μῆ] η[ε]ζοογ.
- 45*,10-12 Cf. 42*,14-16.
- 45*,12-20 This celestial "initiation ceremony" is one of the two complementary components of the soteriology of *Trimorphic Protennoia*. One component is the reception and appropriation of the revealer's gnosis (the explanatory "mystery," s.v. μυστήριον in the index) and the other is the initiate's (mental?) participation in the celestial liturgy of the Five Seals. Here the Five Seals proceed in the order of glorifying, enthroning, investiture, baptizing, and becoming light (the Gnostic's primal state). In 48*,15-35 we have the more elaborate, but more natural (and original?) order of the Five Seals: investiture, baptizing, enthroning, glorification, and transportation into the light. The Five Seals are the mode of salvation in the original core of the Pronoia hymn in *Ap. John*, II,r:30,11-32; 31,22-25, which as it now

stands appears to have a secondary mode of salvation (i.e., awakening from sleep) interpolated into it (31,4-22). Thus, in both *Trimorphic Protennoia* and in the Pronoia hymn in the *Apocryphon of John*, salvation *via* the Five Seals was thought to need supplementation by a more noetic mode of salvation; not simply sealing with the Five Seals, but also the explanatory revelation (*Trimorphic Protennoia*) or awakening call (*Apocryphon of John*) of the revealer-figure, Protennoia (*Trimorphic Protennoia*) or Pronoia (*Apocryphon of John*). Compare the enrobing of the mystery-initiation in Apul. *Metam.* XI.24.

45*,21-22 Cf. 47*,18; 49*,20-21.

45*,23-27 Cf. 38*,12; 47*,12-13. In the *Gos. Truth* I,3:27,15-33 by knowing the Father one receives form ($\mu\omicron\rho\phi\eta$) and a name, and thus comes into existence. To receive a form ($\chi\iota\ \mu\omicron\rho\phi\eta$) is to be "restored" and thus perfected. This brings about the consummation: cf. *Iren. Haer.* I.6.1 and *Interp. Know.* XI,1:14,14-15; *Val. Exp.* XI,2:33,21-23. Cf. the Valentinian formation according to essence and knowledge (*Iren. Haer.* I.4.1-5).

45*,27-28 Cf. note on 42*,9-10.

45*,28-30 Cf. *Ap. John*, BG 8502,2:63,14-64,13 where the mother Sophia sends her spirit into her seed to awaken them and restore their deficiency; cf. also *Ap. John* II,1:25,9-16; 27,33-28,5; BG 8502,2:71,5-13. In BG 8502,2:51,4-20 the voice of the mother commands the Archon to breathe the spirit into Adam (cf. II,1:25,3-16).

45*,31-32 The scribe intended a *supralinea completa*, but obviated it in the next line by adding NE ; OYOEIN and OYOEINE vary freely in this text.

45*,33 Supralinear strokes visible above $\overline{\text{Z}}\overline{\text{N}}\overline{\text{N}}$.

45*,32-34 Cf. Pronoia's withdrawal to the light in *Ap. John* II,1:30,30.

46*,3 $\text{ZAM}]\text{HN}$ is restored from frg. #3 (*Facsimile Edition: Codices XI, XII, XIII*, pl. 50).

46*,4 On $\overline{\text{E}}$, see Introduction to Codex XIII, Section IV.

46*,5-10 The Son/Word aspect of Protennoia (cf. 37*,4-6) is about to succeed the Mother/Speech aspect (who having withdrawn to the light now exists alone as Silence, 46*,13) as the revelatory mode of Protennoia (cf. 47*,11-16).

46*,10-11 KAA -, "foundation" appears to be an unattested feminine noun derived from KW , "to set," (so also Schenke).

46*,11-13 The Logos, who is a light and was first to come forth, is the Perfect Son (37*,3-8).

46*,16-19 the Spring (πηγή) pours forth Living Water (i.e., gnosis, 36*,5-6 and note) just as a luminary radiates light. Cf. 48*,19-20

and Jn 4:14; 7:37; Rev 21:6 where Christ is the source of living water. The Spring is also a metaphor for Yahweh (Jer 2:13; 17:13; *1 Enoch* 96,6) but mostly for Wisdom (Prov 13:14; 14:27; 18:4; *1 Enoch* 49,1) whence comes the reference to the Spring as the source of gnosis.

46*,19-20 The glory of the Mother is Meirothea (45*,9-10), who is the Speech of the Voice (38*,14-16; 44*,30-31).

46*,22 On Intellect (νοῦς), cf. 47*,9.

46*,28 "breath": cf. Wis 7:24-25 where wisdom is the breath of God's power.

46*,28-30 The "Eye" (βαλλ) probably signifies the Son (38*,3-6) as central focus of the three permanences (μονή) of the Voice (37*,20-22). Voice and Thought are similarly related in the Simonian *Megale Apophasis* (Hipp. Ref. VI.9.4): "This is the treatise (γράμμα) of revelation of Voice (φωνή) and Name (ὄνομα) by means of Thought (ἐξ ἐπινοίας) of the great infinite Power (ἡ μεγάλη δύναμις ἡ ἀπέραντος)." Cf. 37*,4-6 where the Son originates from Voice which comes from Thought.

46*,29 "Permanences": 37*,20-22. μονή (permanence) is the opposite of κίνησις (movement, cf. 46*,26; Arist. *Phys.* 205^a 17; 230^a 20), and is thus akin to βάσις.

46*,30-32 Cf. Isa 9:2; Mt 4:16; Jn 1:5.

47*,5-16 Revelation of the Protennaio as: first, Voice (masc.); second, Speech (fem.); and third, Word (masc.). See the note on 37*,20-22.

47*,5-11 Cf. 40*,8-42*,2.

47*,9 On Intellect (νοῦς), cf. 46*,22.

47*,11 ΠΜΑΖΣΕΠΣΝΔΥ: cf. 42*,17.

47*,11-13 Cf. 45*,23-27; 42*,17-18.

47*,13-15 "tents": cf. Sir 24:8; Jn 1:14.

47*,17-22 Cf. 35*,12-26.

47*,18 Cf. 45*,21; 49*,20-21.

47*,19-22 On this series of beings, see 35*,15-18 and note.

47*,20 2 of ΖΡΑΙ from frg. #45 in Codex V (*Facsimile Edition: Codex V*, pl. 99) and now placed at this location. "Movement" is a metaphor for Soul, source of motion.

47*,24-25 On the failure to recognize and accept the divine representative, cf. Jn 1:10-11 (the light/logos); *1 Enoch* 42,2 (wisdom).

47*,25-28 The powers (47*,19-22) do not recognize the ignorance of their root, i.e., their creator the Archigenetor, the tree of ignorant Chaos (44*,20-26). On the creature's ignorance of the creator, cf. Wis 13:1-3; Rom 1:19-23.

47*,26-27 ΝΖ of ^[1]ΝΖ[ΗΤΟΥ] (47*,26), ΝΤ of ΝΤ[ΟΥ] (47*,27) are from

frg. #2, *Facsimile Edition: Codices XI, XII, XIII*, pl. 119, and now placed at this location.

47*,31-34 Cf. 40*,12-16; 41*,20-23.

47*,35 Schenke reads: ΕΤΟΝ]ζ [α]γω λε[κω]κ' α/[ζηγ.

48*,5 Schenke reads: ΕΒΟΛ ΖΙ]ΤΡΦ[ΤΣ ΝΤΒΙΝΤΩΟΥΝ Μ/ΠΜΕΕΥΕ.

48*,6-14 The psychic and corporeal aspects of man's thought are regarded as abysmally chaotic; it is another device to keep man's *pneuma* entrapped in the material world, and as such must be removed and replaced by the Thought of the Fatherhood—chaos must be replaced by Light (cf. Gen 1:1-5). This is accomplished when Protennoia/Logos, almost in substitutionary fashion, strips man of the corporeal and psychic thought as if it were a garment and puts it on himself in man's place and places upon man a shining Light. For "corporeal darkness" and "psychic chaos in mind," cf. *Zost.* VIII,1:1,10-13. On the removal of the old nature and putting on of the new, cf. Col 3:9-10; Eph 4:22-24. On "Christ's circumcision" as a putting off of the body of flesh and being raised with Christ in baptism, cf. Col 2:11-12. See also 49*,28-32 below.

48*,6 Schenke reads: ΝΕΥΝΤΑΛΛ<α> Χ^[1]Ν [ΤΖΟΥΕΙΤΕ].

48*,7 Supralinear stroke visible over Μ of ΜΠΩΝΖ.

48*,15-35 The initiation ceremony proleptically sketched in 45*,12-20 (see note) in the future tense, is now cast in a past tense, reflecting a sort of "realized" eschatology. The putting upon man of the shining Light is interpreted by means of the ceremony of the Five Seals, by which man is transported from the corporeal and psychic realm to the spiritual world of light (cf. 49*,26-32).

48*,19-20 Cf. *Gos. Eg.* III,2:64,14-17 (=IV,2:76,2-6) where Micheus, Michar and Mnesinous preside over the πηγῆ of truth; also over the πυλῆ of waters (III,64,19-20 = IV,76,8-10). In *Apoc. Adam* V,5: 84,5-22 Micheus, Michar and Mnesinous preside over the holy baptism and living water (which they pollute). In the *Bruce Codex* (Schmidt-MacDermot, 263,22-28) Michar and Micheu(s), purified by Borpharanges, are located in the self-begotten (αὐτογενής) level of the Aeon of Barbelo, and preside over the Living Water. Finally see *Zost.* VIII,1:6,7-17, where Micheus and Michar both baptize and seal, and VIII,1:47,4 where Mnesinous is a keeper of the immortal soul.

48*,20-21 I.e., they immerse him in the "saving gnosis," cf. 46*,16-19 and note on 36*,5-6.

48*,26 Vestige of ink at the end of the line appears to be line "filler," such as occurs at 36*,25-31; 37*,15; 43*,17-24. Schenke reads ω for [ο]Ν.

- 48*,26-28 $\alpha\theta$ of [N] $\alpha\theta$ (48*,26), $\gamma\tau$ of [α] $\gamma\tau\omega\rho\pi$ (48*,27), τ of [.] ΔNHN (48*,28) from frg. #2, *Facsimile Edition: Codices XI, XII, XIII*, pl.120.
- 48*,27 One is seized ($\tau\omega\rho\pi$ = $\acute{\alpha}\rho\pi\acute{\alpha}\zeta\epsilon\upsilon$; cf. $\acute{\alpha}\rho\pi\alpha\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\alpha$ in 2 Cor 12:2), i.e., raptured, into the light by the servants of the holy Luminaries Harmozel, Oroiael, Daveithai and Eleleth; see 38*,34-39*,5 and note. Cf. *Gos. Eg.* III,2:52,20-53,1 where Gamaliel, Gabriel, Samlo and Abrasax are associated with Harmozel, Oroiael, Davithe and Eleleth respectively (in IV,2:64,13-24 they are called $\delta\iota\acute{\alpha}\kappa\omicron\nu\omicron\iota$). In *Apoc. Adam* V,5:75,21-31 Abrasax, Samblo and Gamaliel lead men from the punishing powers. In *Zost.* VIII,1:47,24 Samblo is receiver [$\pi\alpha\rho$] $\alpha\lambda\eta\mu\pi\tau\omega\rho$. In the *Bruce Codex*, 239,24-27 (Schmidt-MacDermot) Gamaliel, Strempsuchos and Agramas are watchers who aid those who believe in the Savior.
- 48*,31-32 Cf. *Ap. John* II,1:31,23-24: "I sealed him with the light of the water." This may be a type of hendiadys (water and light as metaphors for gnosis, cf. note on 36*,5-6), or $\mu\omicron\omicron\upsilon\gamma$ ("water") may be a corruption of $\mu\alpha\alpha\gamma$ ("Mother") from an original "Light of the Mother." Conversely, the "Light of the Mother" (48*,32) may be a corruption of an original "light of the water." On $\sigma\phi\rho\alpha\gamma\iota\varsigma$, cf. note on 49*,25-33.
- 48*,35-50*,20 $\tau\epsilon\text{noy } \theta\epsilon$ is a formulaic introduction to an exhortation, cf. 44*,10.29-30. The section 48*,35-50*,20 contains extensive and polemical Christian glosses interpreting the word modality of Protennoia in terms of a highly docetic Christology (see Introduction, Section VI). At this point, "until I reveal myself [to all my fellow brethren]" is suspiciously continued with a Christianizing passage which begins with redundant language: "and until I gather [together] all [my fellow] brethren. . . ." Sethian language again returns in 50*,16-20, suggesting that 48*,35-49*,20 (rejoining the description of the Five Seals with the bridging passage 49*,20-26) and 50*,7-16 are Christianizing additions to an original sequence: 48*,top-48*,35; 49*,26-50*,7; 50*,16-20.
- 49*,6-20 Protennoia/Logos is identified with the Christ of Protennoia's "brethen" (cf. 49*,23 which is part of a redactional bridge 49*,20-26; and 50*,6-9, the opening of a Christianizing addition). Successive Christological titles familiar to orthodox Christians are here applied to the Logos: "Christ;" Son of God (i.e., "Son of the Archigenetor," or Creator God), Angel, Power and "Son of Man." But the repeated use of $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$, "as if," shows that the applications are polemically intended, i.e., contrary to popular orthodox belief Christ was never identical with these guises, but only *appeared* as Christ, Son of the Creator,

Angel, Power and Son of Man to those (orthodox) Christians who mistakenly honor the Son of the Creator God of the Old Testament, but who is really the Archigenetor and chief of the evil Archons. This Sethian passage shows that the Logos is not the orthodox Christ and Son of God, but rather the "Father" of everyone (49*,20), a term attributed to Seth, "Father" of the incorruptible race (*Gos. Eg.* III,2:54,9-11). On the motif of Christ's incognito descent, cf. *Iren. Haer.* I.30.12; *Treat. Seth* VII,2:59,18; 65,18-19 and especially *Ep. Pet. Phil.* VIII,2:136,16-137,4. The occasion for the addition of this description of Christ's incognito descent in the context of a description of the Five Seals may be Sethian tradition found in *Gos. Eg.* III,2:62,24-64,9. Here it appears that the Five Seals are involved in the redemptive sending of Seth through flood, conflagration and judgement of the Archons into the world with a baptism (cf. *Apoc. Adam* V,5:85,22-31), perhaps the Five Seals, by means of a secretly prepared "Logos-begotten" (λογογενής) body which is "put on" by Seth (cf. XIII,1*:50*,12). On the identification of Seth with Jesus, cf. *Epiph. Pan.* XXXIX.1.3; MacRae, "Seth in Gnostic Texts," and Pearson, "Seth in Gnostic Literature."

49*,11-20 See the note to 49*,6-20. The appositive phrase "which is the ignorance of Chaos" (49*,14-15), though grammatically feminine, must refer to the Archigenetor's decree (2απ); cf. the tree of ignorant Chaos (44*,20-26) and the stripping away of the chaotic corporeal and psychic thought (48*,8-12). Here Logos/Protennoia only appears as if (ὡς) he were a Son of Man (cf. 47*,13-16 and contrast *Jn* 1:14), since in truth he is the Father (cf. 36*,17, "the Thought of the Father," and 45*,3, "[Mother] and Father").

49*,18 ς of ζως is better preserved in an earlier photograph; see *Facsimile Edition: Introduction*, pl. 23*.

49*,20 Cf. 45*,21; 47*,18.

49*,24 n at end of line is better preserved in an earlier photograph; see *Facsimile Edition: Introduction*.

49*,25-33 On the Five Seals, cf. *Ap. John* II,1:31,22-25 (the Pronoia hymn), *Gos. Eg.* III,2:55,12; 63,3; 66,3; IV,2:56,25; 58,6; 59,1.27-28; 66,26; 74,16; 78,4-5 and notes on 45*,12-20; 48*,15-35. The "seal" (σφραγίς) originally signified a stamp or brand marking one as the property of a god. Having thus become taboo, he is protected from other (hostile) divine powers (49*,31-34). In *Gos. Eg.* III,2:66,2-11 the Five Seals are associated with certain "invocations" and "renunciations" in the "spring-baptism" (πιβαπτισμα πηγη). G. Schenke ("Die dreigestaltige Protennoia (Codex XIII)," 125-27; 134-35) suggests on the basis of 49*,29-30 ("the Five Seals of these particular names") that at each stage of the Sethian baptismal rite a

divine name was invoked and the person being baptized was provided with a seal. H.-M. Schenke's ("Gnostic Sethianism," 603-4) supposition that these names reflect a "Quinity" of five divine beings in one on the analogy of the Christian Trinity, and similar metaphysical groupings of beings suggested by Böhlig-Wisse (*Gospel of the Egyptians*, 27,50,174) seems to be speculative at best. It is more likely that the Five Seals are a single baptismal rite consisting of five stages of enlightenment: investiture, baptism in the spring of (Living) Water, enthronement, glorification, and an ecstatic rapture into the place of Light, as in 48*,15-30. The "invocations" of *Gos. Eg.* III,2:66,2-4 would involve calling on certain named beings at each stage, as reflected in *Trim. Prot.* XIII,1*:48*,15-30, and in the ascent through the series of baptisms in *Zostrianos* (VIII,1:4,20-26,2; especially 5,14-22; cf. the "sealing" in 6,14-17), or even one's own name (*Melch.* IX,1:16,13-16). *Zost.* VIII,1:130,5-6 suggests the ascent is ecstatic, out of the body (cf. *Allogenes* XI,3:58,26-59,3). See also the ascending series of thirteen seals in *Marsanes*, X,1:2,12-4,23; also the statements by the thirteen kingdoms of *Apoc. Adam* V,5:77,27-82,19. In *Apoc. Adam* V,5:84,4-22; 85,22-31 the baptism brought by Seth is the knowledge of Adam, contrasted with a form of polluted baptism (cf. the polemic against Christian baptism in *Testim. Truth* IX,3:69,7-24) suggesting that certain Sethians rejected water baptism in favor of a baptism with gnosis. In general, baptism in these texts and the Five Seals may represent a projection into the spiritual realm of an older established Sethian community practice of water baptism (cf. the discussions of Hedrick, *The Apocalypse of Adam*, 192-201 and Schenke, "Gnostic Sethianism," 602-7).

49*,26-32 Salvation is already realized for him who possesses the Five Seals, which implies that the "initiation ceremony" in 45*,12-20 (in the future tense) and 48*,15-35 (in the past tense) has now been completed. The phrase "the Five Seals that are complete by virtue of intellect" (ΕΤΧΗΚ ΕΒΟΛ ΖΙΤῆ ΟΥΝΟΥΣ) may imply that the celestial "initiation ceremony" is completed in the initiate's mind, i.e., that salvation is a noetic process (although we would expect: ΕΤΟΥΧΩΚ ΕΒΟΛ ἸΜΟΟΥ ΖΙΤῆ ΟΥΝΟΥΣ "that are completed by intellect").

49*,37 Schenke reads: ΕΤΠΦ[ΡΧ ΕΒΟΛ ΦΝΑ]ῤ ΟΥΣΜΟΤ.

49*,38 Restore with Schenke [ΠΧΛΟΣ ἸΚΑΚΕ].

50*,3-6 Text reconstructed from *Facsimile Edition: Codices XI, XII, XIII*, pl. 104. 50*,3 may read ΕΙΝΕ "likeness" or more likely ΟΥΟ]ΕΙΝΕ "light." In 50*,4 the first trace has a supralinear stroke, perhaps ἡ.

50*,9 the (Five) Seals are also called "ineffable" in *Gos. Eg.* IV,2:78,4-5.

- 50*,11-14 "abide in me": Jn 15:4-5; cf. 1 Jn 2:24; 3:24. Ends of lines 11-14 are reconstructed from the *Facsimile Edition: Codices XI, XII, XIII*, pl. 104.
- 50*,12-16 The putting on of Jesus is a prominent motif: *Iren. Haer.* I.30.13: where Christ descends on Jesus, openly confessing himself as Son of the First Man (on Son of Man, cf. 49*,18-19). Cf. also *Gos. Eg.* III,2:63,24-64,3 on the "baptism by the incorruptible *λογογενής* and Jesus, and he whom the Great Seth has put on"; IV,2:75,15-17: "Jesus who has been begotten by a living word, whom the Great Seth has put on"; and *Treat. Seth* VII,2:57,7-11 in which a being (presumably Seth) identified with Christ (VII,2:59,18), raises "the Son of the Majesty (=Jesus) hidden in the region below. . . to the height, where I am above all these aeons." Cf. also *Epiph. Pan.* XXXIX.1.3. For the dwelling places prepared by Christ; cf. Jn 14:2, to which this passage seems to make specific and polemical reference.
- 50*,17-20 The Seed of the Father (the Great Seth) is the *ἄφθαρτον γενεά* (*Gos. Eg.* III,2:54,9-11; cf. *Zost.* VIII,1:130,16-17 "the holy Seed of Seth"). In *Gos. Eg.* III,2:60,9-11 the Great Seth sows his seed into the aeons he has begotten.
- 50*,21-24 On the title, see discussion in the Codex Introduction, Section IV.

INTRODUCTION

NHC XIII,2*: ON THE ORIGIN OF THE WORLD

50*,25-34

Bibliography: Böhlig-Labib; Crum, *Catalogue of Coptic Manuscripts*; Oeyen, "Fragmente"; Schenke, H.-M., "Vom Ursprung der Welt."

50*, 25-34 is the beginning of the untitled text now called *On the Origin of the World*, which is completely extant in Codex II,5:97,24-127,17. The portion extant in Codex XIII coincides with II,97,24-98,5. The two copies are quite similar, with but minor orthographic variants: [Ε]ΠΙΔΗ ΟΥΟΝ ΝΙΜ (50*,25) for ΕΠΕΙΔΗ ΟΥΟΝ ΝΙΜ (II,97,24), ΜΝ ΛΑΔΥ (50*,25) for ΜΝΛΑΔΥΕ (II,97,25-26), ΑΝΟΚ ΝΔΕ (50*,27) for ΑΝΟΚ ΔΕ (II,97,26-27), ΕΝΣΕΟΟΥΝ (50*,28) for ΕΝ' ΣΕΟΟΥΝ (II,97,28), ΑΠΟΔΙΞΙΣ (50*,30) for ΑΠΟΔΙΞΕΙΣ (II,97,30), ΠΕ (50*,31) for ΠΕ (II,98,2), ΚΑΚΕ (50*,33) for ΚΑΚΕ (II,98,3), and [Ϡ]ΧΙΝ Π[] (50*,34) for ΧΙΝ ΤΕΖΟΥΕΙΤΕ (II,98,5). The two copies may presuppose the same Coptic translation. Hence, lacunae in one may be restored on the basis of the other; in one instance a photograph of V,64-[65] taken in 1949 (*Facsimile Edition: Codex V*, pl. 4) shows also the bottom left corner of XIII,50* with the now-missing opening letters of lines 27-31, which make it possible to read ΕΙ at XIII,2*:50*,30 and in the parallel text at II,5:97,29.

A fragmentary Subachmimic copy of *On the Origin of the World* in the British Museum was identified by Christian Oeyen in 1972-73: BM Or 4926 (1), catalogued by Crum as item 522 (Oeyen, "Fragmente," 125). Comparison of the fragments with II,5 should provide a basis for more precise clarification of the relation of the Coptic translation attested by II,5 and XIII,2* to the assumed Greek original.

The survival of the opening ten lines of *On the Origin of the World* as XIII,2* is due to the chance circumstance that they were on the final page of XIII,1*, a tractate removed from its codex in late antiquity and conserved inside the front cover of Codex VI (see Robinson, "Inside Codex VI"). There was apparently no interest in conserving XIII,2*. The material discussion of XIII,2* is to be found with the complete copy of *On the Origin of the World* in II,5.

50*

[ε]πιαν ογον νιμ ν̄νουτε ἄπκοσμος αγ[ω]
 26 [ῥ]ρωμε σεχω ἄμος χε μ̄λλααυ ψοοπ' ρ[α]
 τ̄ρη ἄπχαος ανοκ ἄδε †ναῤαποδικνηε
 28 χε αγῥπλανα τηρου ενσεσοογν ^{VACAT}
 αν ἄτ̄ςυστασις ἄπχαος μ̄ν τεφνουνε τα
 30 ει δε τε τ'αποδιζις εψχε σῥ̄ςυμφωνει μ̄[ἄ]
 ῥρωμε τηρου ετβε πχαος χε ο[γ]κακε πε
 32 ογεβολ δε πε ρ̄ν ογρ̄αιβ[ε]ς αγμουτε εροϋ
 χε κακε θ[ρ]αιβες δε ογ[ει] εβολ τε ρ̄ν ογερ]
 34 γον εψοοπ' [[ρ]̄]χιν π[ψ]ορπ'

50*

Seeing that (*ἐπειδή*) everyone—the gods of the world (*κόσμος*)
and

- 26 men—says that nothing exists [*prior*]
to Chaos (*χάος*), I now (*δέ*) will demonstrate (*ἀποδεικνύειν*)
28 [*that*] they all erred (*πλανᾶσθαι*) because they did not know
the structure (*σύστασις*) of Chaos (*χάος*) and its root. And (*δέ*)
this
30 is the demonstration (*ἀπόδειξις*): How agreeable it is
(*συμφωνεῖν*) with
all men to say concerning Chaos (*χάος*) that it is a sort of
darkness!
32 Actually (*δέ*) it derives from a shadow, [*and was (merely)*
named]
“darkness.” And (*δέ*) the shadow [*derives from a*] work (*ἔργον*)
34 existing from the [*first*].

50*,27-31 The left edge of these lines is restored from a 1949 photograph of J. Doresse reproduced in the *Facsimile Edition: Codex V*, pl.4.

50*,28: The right part of the line was left blank because of a split in the papyrus.

50*,32-34: The right edge of these lines is lacking because the horizontal fibers are missing; *ΧΙΝ ΗΓΥΟΡΠ* is restored on analogy with *ΧΙΝ ΤΕΖΟΥΕΙΤΕ* in II,5:98,5. Layton (*Facsimile Edition: Codex II*) reads *ΧΙΝ ΤΕ[* and does not emend *ΘΖΑΪΒΕC*.

