THE COPTIC GNOSTIC LIBRARY

EDITED WITH ENGLISH TRANSLATION, INTRODUCTION AND NOTES

published under the auspices of

THE INSTITUTE FOR ANTIQUITY AND CHRISTIANITY

NAG HAMMADI CODEX I
(THE JUNG CODEX)
NOTES

CONTRIBUTORS

HAROLD W. ATTRIDGE - ELAINE H. PAGELS
GEORGE W. MACRAE - MALCOLM L. PEEL
DIETER MUELLER† - FRANCIS E. WILLIAMS
FREDERIK WISSE

VOLUME EDITOR

HAROLD W. ATTRIDGE

LEIDEN
E. J. BRILL
1985

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

XXIII

GENERAL EDITOR OF THE COPTIC GNOSTIC LIBRARY
JAMES M. ROBINSON

LEIDEN

E. J. BRILL

1985

Library of Ruslan Khazarzar

TABLE OF CONTENTS

THE PRAYER OF THE APOSTLE PAUL

I,ᒣ.A.1-B.10

Dieter Mueller

A.3 *[Your] light* ([ⲡⲉⲕⲟⲩ]ⲗⲉⲓⲛ): If the writing block on this page was the same size as that on page 1, there is room for two or three lines prior to the preserved text. These lines may have included a super-scription, an invocation or a petition. The first two letters after the lacuna are clearly ⲗⲉ, thus excluding the restoration by *ed. pr.*, [ⲛⲟⲩ-ⲟ]ⲁ̣ⲥⲙ̣. If the prayer did, in fact, begin here we might have an invoca-tion such as [ⲡⲁⲝ]ⲗⲉⲓ̣ⲥ, but the traces of the last letter in this word do not favor an ⲥ.

Give me your [mercy]: As *ed. pr.* (263) note, the plea for mercy is common in the Psalms. Cf. Ps 25:11, 29:11, 30:10. Cf. also *Gos. Truth* 31.16-20.

A.4 *Redeemer* ([ⲣⲉϥⲥ]ⲱⲧⲉ): The first letter after the lacuna is, under ultra-violet light, clearly an ⲱ, not a ⲩ, as suggested by *ed. pr.* (Fr. and Ger.). The original Greek was probably λυτρωτά μου λύτρωσαί με; cf. Ps 18:15, 25:11.

Redeem me: The request for deliverance is, once again, common in the psalms. Cf. Ps 18:11, 25:11, 30:6.

A.5 *[I am] yours, the one who has come forth*: Restoration here is difficult. The phrase "I am yours," would require the copula ⲡⲉ in S, but that copula may not be required in A² syntax. Cf. *Steles Seth* 118.30-31, ⲁⲛⲟⲕ ⲡⲉⲧⲉ ⲡⲱⲕ ⲛ̄ϣⲏⲣⲉ. After the uncertain letter there is a lacuna of approximately three spaces. The original Greek may have been σὸς ἐγὼ ὃς ἐκ σου ἐξῆλθον, cf. Ps 118:94, *CH* 1.31-32, 13.20.

A.6 *From you* ([ϩ]ⲓ̣ⲧⲟ̣[ⲟⲧⲕ]): Neither the traces nor their position on a newly placed fragment fit the expected ⲛ̄ϩⲏⲧⲕ̄ proposed by *ed. pr.* For ⲉⲓ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲓⲧⲛ̄ as a translation of ἐξέρχεσθαι ἐκ, cf. Crum 71b. The stroke over the ⲕ is faintly visible.

You are my mind: Cf *Steles Seth* 118.31-119.1 and *CH* 1.6,16,21.

A.7   *My treasure house*: The original Greek was probably ὁ θησαυ-ρός μου; cf. Col 2:3 and *Tri. Trac.* 92.34–36.

Open for me (ΟΥ̣Η̣[Ν] Ν̣Η̣Ϊ): Transcription here is uncertain, but that of *ed. pr.* (Fr. and Eng.) is the more likely. Traces of the first letter fit either ε or ο, those of the third letter fit н, м, or π. The phrase is a common and almost stereotyped formula in hymnic petitions. For references cf. *ed. pr.* (268).

A.8   *You are my fullness*: Cf. *Gos. Truth* 41.12–16; *Gos. Phil.* 68.11–14. 84.13–14.

A.9   *You are my repose*: Cf. *Gos. Heb.*, fr. 2 (Jerome, *In Is.* 4.11.2), "*tu es enim requies mea*." The theme of repose is common in Gnostic sources. Cf. P. Vielhauer, "ΑΝΑΠΑΥΣΙΣ, zum gnostischen Hintergrund des Thomas Evangeliums," *Apophoreta, Festschrift für Ernst Haenchen* (ZNW Beiheft 30; Berlin: Töpelmann, 1964) 281–99. Cf. also *Gos. Truth* 38.25–32; *Treat. Res.* 43.35–44.3; and *Tri. Trac.* 68.36, 70.18, 131.21.

A.10   *The perfect thing*: The Coptic could also be translated "the perfect one." Cf. *Gos. Phil.* 76.22–23; Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.7.1, 1.21.5; Epiphanius, *Pan.* 36.2.7. It may be that the text should be emended to [πτ]ελειον <ν̄ογλειν>. Cf. *Gos. Phil.* 70.5–7 and 86.7–9. The original Greek may have been τὸ τέλειον <φῶς> τὸ ἀκράτητον.

A.11–14   *I invoke you ... through Jesus Christ the Lord of Lords*: Cf. *PGM* 21.1–8: [ἐπι]καλοῦμαι σε, θεὲ παντο[κρά]τωρ τὸν ὑπεράνω πάσης [ἀρ]χῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας καὶ κυριότητος καὶ παντὸς ὀνόματος ὀνομαζομένου... διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Cf. also *PGM* 16.2–3. For the terminology of the "name above all names" used here, cf. Phil 2:9–11; Eph 1:21; *Gos. Phil.* 54.5–7; *Act. Thom.* 27; Hippolytus, *Ref.* 7.20.3; and *Gos. Truth* 38.6–41.3, with its elaborate speculation on the "name."

A.11–12   *The one who is and who pre-existed*: The original Greek was probably ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ πρόων. For the latter term, cf. Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.1.1 and 1.21.5.

A.14   *The Lord of Lords, the King of the ages*: Cf., e.g., 1 Tim 1:17, 6:15; 1 *Enoch* 9.4; and see the references in Bauer, *s.v.* βασιλεύς, 2b.

A.15   *Give me your gifts, etc.*: Cf. Rom 11:29.

A.16   *Through the Son of Man*: Ed. pr. (Fr. and Ger.) begin a new sentence here. As *ed. pr.* (273) note, this title is regularly applied to the "Savior" in Valentinian texts. Cf. Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.12.4, 1.15.3; *Exc. Theod.* 61.4; Origen, *In Joh* 13.49; *Gos. Phil.* 63.29–30, 76.1–3, 81.14–21.

A.17   *Paraclete*: Cf. John 14:16–17, 15:26; 1 John 2:1–2; *Man. Keph.* 14.5, ππρκ̄ᾱτ̄ϲ π̄π̄ν̄ᾱ ν̄τε τμηε. For Valentinian use of the term, cf. Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.4.5; *Exc. Theod.* 23.1–3; and *Tri. Trac.* 87.6–10.

A.18   *Give* ([м]ⲁ †): There is space for one or two letters in a lacuna between мⲁ and †, probably left empty by the scribe. Note the gap between мⲁ and † in line 9.

A.18–20   *Authority...healing*: For similar requests for power and health in magical texts, cf., e.g., *PGM* 3.575–82, 4.683–87, 13.790–824, 36.23–27. Cf. also *CH* 1.32.

A.21   *Through the Evangelist*: Ed. pr. (Fr. and Ger.) begin a new sentence here. As *ed. pr.* (275) note, the "evangelist" here is probably not a particular gospel writer nor a church officer, but Jesus himself.

A.22   *And redeem*: For the restoration, cf. line 35.
   Eternal: The position of this phrase after the first member of the following enumeration suggests attributive rather than adverbial use.
   Light soul: Cf. *Exc. Theod.* 47.3. The supralinear stroke over the initial consonant of ν̄ογⲁειν consists of a dot over the left leg of the ν. Such small marks instead of long strokes seem to be an occasional stylistic variant of the scribe. Cf. ν̄ϣηρε in 58.14, where the mark is a dot over the right leg of the ν.

A.23–24   *First born*: For the Valentinian usage of this and related terms, cf. the note to *Tri. Trac.* 57.21–22.

A.25–26   ν̄[τⲁκ]: *Ed. pr.* proposed the restoration ν[н/ει], but an early photograph of this page, including a fragment which has now been lost, shows no trace of ink after the ν at the end of line 23. A

word division such as N/HEI would be extraordinary, since N here
does not constitute a syllable. Furthermore there is clearly the trace of
a stroke over the N. Hence the lacuna should probably be filled with
the independent personal pronoun used as an intensifier.

A.26–29   *What no angel eye has seen: etc.*: The formulation here
recalls in particular 1 Cor 2:9, where a similar saying is cited as scrip-
ture. A similar saying is attributed to Jesus in *Gos. Thom.* 17. The
scripture referred to in 1 Corinthians may be Isa 64:3, although vari-
ous ancient sources attribute the saying to the *Apocalypse of Elijah*.
For a collection of parallels to 1 Cor 2:9, many of which may be inde-
pendent, cf. John Strugnell and Michael E. Stone, *The Book of Elijah*
(SBL Texts and Translations, Pseudepigrapha Series; Missoula;
Scholars Press, 1979) 41-74. The abundance of the attestations of the
saying makes it doubtful that this text is dependent on 1 Corinthians.
On the widespread saying, cf. also Pierre Prigent, "Ce que l'oeil n'a
pas vu," *ThZ* 14 (1968) 416–29.
    The relative pronoun translated as a neuter here may also be trans-
lated as masculine. The "one whom no angel eye has seen" may thus,
as *ed. pr.* (278–80) suggest, be the Christ whose descent into the
material world was hidden from the hostile celestial powers.

A.31   *Psychic God*: It would also be possible to translate, following
ed. pr. (Eng.) "which (or who) came to be angelic and, after the image
of God, psychic," or, with *ed. pr.* (Ger.) "after the psychic image of
God." For the designation of the Demiurge as psychic, which seems to
be the best understanding of the text here, cf., e.g., Irenaeus, *Haer.*
2.19.3.

A.32   *When it was formed*: The antecedent of the pronoun here
could be either the "human heart" of line 29, the "psychic God" of line
31 or possibly the Christ, if he is the one whom no angel has seen. If,
either of the latter two alternatives is adopted, translate, "When he
was formed." If, as seems likely, the text refers to the formation of the
human heart "after the image of the psychic God," there may be an
allusion to Gen 1:26 and 2:7.

A.33   *Since I have*: Ed. pr. (Fr. and Ger.) begin a new sentence here,
but in that case one would expect another imperative.

A.36–37   *Beloved, elect, and blessed greatness*: The epithets here are often applied to Christ in early Christian and Gnostic texts as *ed. pr.* (282) note. Cf. in particular *Tri. Trac.* 87.6–10.

B.1   *Wonderful mystery*: Cf. possibly Col 2:2 and *Act. Thom.* 47. It may be that text on this page did not begin with this line. There was no doubt space above this line for two or three more lines of text, though the margin may have been left wide.

B.3–6.   *Yours is the power, etc.*: Doxologies of this sort are commonplace. Cf., e.g., Jude 25; *Mart. Pol.* 20.2; 1 *Clem.* 64, 65.2; and *Tri. Trac.* 138.18.

THE APOCRYPHON OF JAMES

I,2:1.1–16.30

Francis E. Williams

1.1–2   [...]ⲟⲟⲥ: Different restorations are possible here. Schenke restores: "to the brother, Cerinthus;" Kirchner restores: "to the son, Cerinthus," Kasser restores: "to his companion in suffering," or "to the lover of suffering."

1.2   *Peace* (ϯⲣⲏⲛⲉ): For the spelling, cf. *Treat. Res.* 50.14 (ϯⲣⲏⲛⲏ).

1.3–8   *Peace...Love...Grace...Faith:* Cf. Eph 6:23–24 and 2 John 3. God is Life and Grace at *Ap. John* CG II,1:4.1–8; First Man is Faith at *Eugnostos* 78.3–5. Further parallel material may be found at *ed. pr.* 36.

1.8–10   *Since you asked...book:* This is a common epistolary formula; cf. Eusebius, *HE* 4.26.13; *Diog.* 1.1; *Treat. Res.* 44.3–7.

1.10   *a secret book* (ⲟⲩⲁⲡⲟⲕⲣⲩⲫⲟⲛ): An apocryphon in this context is a secret document, not to be shared with the general public. Cf. 1.21–25. The sense "uncanonical document" is impossible here.

1.11–12   *to me and Peter:* For James the Just, Peter (and John) as recipients of post-resurrection revelation, cf. Eusebius, *HE* 2.1.4. James alone appears in this role in *1 Apoc. Jas.* 24.10–14 and *2 Apoc. Jas.* 57.4–10. For James' superiority to Peter, or for his pre-eminence in general, cf. Gal 1:19–20, 2:9; Ps.-Clem. *Rec.* 1.43–44 *et al.*; *Gos. Thom.* 12; *Gos. Eg.* 64.13; and *2 Apoc. Jas.* 55.15–56.6.

1.19–20   *minister...of the saints:* For the title, cf. Luke 1:2, Acts 26:16, 1 Cor 4:1. On "serving the saints," cf. Rom 15:25–26. The language suggests that the *Ap. Jas.* is written for the edification of an existing community.

1.21   *take care not to rehearse:* Comparable commands to secrecy in

Gnostic and Hermetic sources are found in *Ap. John* CG II,1:31.32–32.5; 1 *Apoc. Jas.* 36.13-16; *Apoc. Pet.* 73.14-18; *Melch.* 27.3-6; 2 *Jeu* 43; *CH* 13.16; Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.25.5 and possibly *Treat. Res.* 50.1–10; *Gos. Truth* 21.3-6. Similar commands appear in orthodox sources at *Sent. Sext.* 30.22-23, 32.2-5; Hippolytus, *Treatise on Christ and Antichrist* 1; and the *Book of Resurrection of Christ by Bartholomew the Apostle* (in M. R. James, *Apocryphal New Testament* [Oxford: 1924] 182).

1.23–24   *the Savior did not wish to tell to all*: Cf. perhaps Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.30.13, 2.27.3; *Gos. Thom.* 13.

1.28   *faith*: This is the faith contained in this discourse. Cf. Phil 1:27 and possibly Eph 2:8.

2.1–4   These badly damaged lines would have contrasted the apocryphon to be revealed here with "the other," mentioned in 1.30. For the proposed restorations, see the apparatus. Schenke translates his restored text: "(diese hier) aber als [zweien geoffenbart!] / Erfasse, was [in ihr verborgen ist;] / was in ihr aber [offenbar erscheint] / [nach dessen wahrer Bedeutung] sollst du suchen!" Kipgen (168, n. 5) translates his restored text: "on the con[trary is able to make them] / attain [fullness for themselves, that is,] / those who are [saved. Endeavor] / then and seek [for this one]." Kirchner translates his restored text, "Diese / aber, [da] ich [sie noch nicht (völlig) erkannt habe und da] / sie [auch für dich und] die Deinen offenbart wurde, [sei bestrebt] / nun und suche [nach ihren Verständnis!]"

2.5–7   For possible restorations, see the apparatus. Schenke translates: "[denn] in dem Masse / [wirst du er] löst werden / samt [deinen Gefahrten,] w[ie] / du [sie] ent[hüllst]." Kipgen (168, n. 5) translates: "so also /[you may be able to receive sal]/vation with [your brethren] th[us and] / set them [free]." Kirchner translates his restored text, "So [wirst du die Er]/lösung [empfangen]. Danach / sollst du [sie auch] offen[baren]."

2.7–10   Brown (32) considers the shift to the third person in these lines a sign of editorial work. Schenke, Kirchner, and Kipgen (169, n. 5) read ⲉⲩ2ⲙⲁⲥⲧ̄, "when the twelve disciples were sitting..." With the scene that follows, cf. *PS* 2-6.

2.12–13   *whether in secret or openly*: For the same distinction, cf.
7.1–10, John 16:25, 29; *Exc. Theod.* 66; Irenaeus, *Haer.* 2.27.2–3; or
even Mark 4:33–34. *Ed. pr.* (39) suggest that "open" refers to canon-
ical Gospels; "secret" to Gnostic Gospels.

2.15–17   *my book*: Kasser's restoration has been adopted. It may be a
reference to the other apocryphon (cf. 1.31), or it might mean simply
that James had begun the writing of a Gospel. Schenke's restoration
"[jenem (dir früher übersandten) Buch]," would presuppose an awk-
ward Greek original, since, while ⲡⲏ (=ἐκεῖνο) has been used of the
"other apocryphon" at 1.33, it has been followed by ⲡⲉⲉⲓ (=τοῦτο),
referring to the present "apocryphon," at 1.35. Therefore ἐκείνῳ here
would be vague and confusing.

2.18–19   *while we gazed after him*: Cf. Acts 1:10–11 and *PS* 3. The
Greek may have read, ἡμῶν ἀποσκοπούντων αὐτόν, cf. the usage of
ἀποσκοπέω at Jdt 10:10. This suggests that the author may have
envisioned the canonical ascension as preceding his revelation, as in
PS 3–4, *Ep. Pet. Phil.* 133.13–134.18. With the less likely reading of
ed. pr., the translation might be, "after he had departed from us and
we had awaited him"; cf. *1 Apoc. Jas.* 30.16–17.

2.19–20   *five hundred and fifty days*: Brown (36), following Olm-
stead, and Parker and Dubberstein, suggests that eighteen Jewish
months, reckoned from 14 Nisan 30 C.E. through 14 Elul 31 C.E., is
532 days. Cf. A.T. Olmstead, *Jesus in the Light of History* (New
York: Scribner's, 1942); R. A. Parker and W. H. Dubberstein, *Baby-
lonian Chronology, 626 B.C.–A.D. 75* (Providence: Brown Univer-
sity, 1956). The addition of the "eighteen days" mentioned at 8.3
yields the 550 days mentioned here. In this case, the author might
have envisioned the canonical ascension as having occurred on the
532nd day. But the wording of 8.2–3 makes no reference to an ascen-
sion.

2.21–24   Cf. the opening of the dialogue at *PS* 6.

2.24   *the place from whence I came*: This is a common motif. Cf.
John 7:33; 13:3; 16:5,28; *Tri. Trac.* 123.4–12; *Ap. John* CG II,1:1.11–
12; *Orig. World* 127.14–15; *Testim. Truth* 44.24–26; *Gos. Pet.* 56;
Tertullian, *Adv. Jud.* 13. The same thing is said of the saved soul or

spirit in *Gos. Truth* 34.14–16; *Apoc. Paul* 23.9–10; *1 Apoc. Jas.* 34.17–18; *Apoc. Adam* 74.13–14; Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.21.5; Epiphanius, *Pan.* 40.2.8.

2.33   *you are full*: "Fill" and "full" are common in Gnostic sources. The Son is "full" at *Tri. Trac.* 62.37; 69.6; the Aeons are "full" at *Tri. Trac.* 69.7. Deficiency is "filled up" at *Gos. Eg.* 59.10–18. The individual is "filled" with knowledge at *Gos. Truth* 25.32–35 (see also 26.23–27); 26.8–13; and *Zost.* 23.26–24.1. Perhaps cf. *Gos. Thom.* 97. The individual is filled with Spirit at *PS* 37, 46, 72. Grace "fills" the inner man at Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.13.2. The terms "filled" and "fullness" are used to represent salvation here and hereafter at *Gos. Phil.* 85.31–32; 86.13–14.

2.37   *he drew them aside*: For private revelations to chosen disciples, cf. Matt 17:1, Mark 9:2, Luke 9:28; *Gos. Thom.* 13 and *Act. Thom.* 47.

2.39   *that which they were about*: That is, writing their books. Cf. 2.14–15.

3.1–5   Schenke translates his restoration of these lines thus: "[zu wissen, dass der Res]t sein [wird,] / [wie die Prophe]ten / [es in ihren] Büchern geschrie[ben] haben, [auf] / dass ihr [auf der Hut seid.] / [Denn] unver[ständig wird] / [ihr Tr]achten sein." Kirchner translates his restoration, "[durch den Vater, meine Wörter zu empfangen]. Wenn / [auch die übrigen Jün]ger [meine Wörter] / [in ihre] Bücher geschrie[ben] haben, als / [ob sie verstanden hätten, hütet] euch! / [Denn] un[verständig haben sie sich be]müht."

3.6–7   Schenke translates his restoration thus: "[w]ie [die Toren wer]den sie nicht hören / und w[ie die Tauben] werden sie nicht verstehen." Kipgen (258, n. 40) translates his restoration thus: "l[i]ke [the deaf] they did not hear / and l[ike the fools they did not] understand." Kirchner translates his restoration thus: "Wie [die Toren haben] sie gehört, / und w[ie die Tauben] haben sie nicht verstanden." However, the key nouns in these restorations do not occur elsewhere in the document. While all three restorations are possible, the text is too damaged to allow any certain restoration.

3.9   *drunken*: The emendation by *ed. pr.*, which has been adopted here, involves a metaphor common in Christian, pagan, and Gnostic sources, e.g., at *Gos. Truth* 22.16–20; *Ap. John* CG II,1:23.8; *Gos. Thom.* 28; *CH* 7.2. Combined with the metaphor of "waking and sleeping," it appears at 1 Thess 5:4–8 and *CH* 1.27.

3.10   *sober*: This is also a common metaphor; cf. 1 Thess 5:8; *CH* 1.27, 7.1–2; *PS* 46, 49, 51, 93.

3.11   *Therefore, be ashamed*: Cf. Ignatius, *Eph.* 11.1. Schenke places a stop after "be ashamed"; *ed. pr.* after the next phrase, "waking and sleeping."

3.13–14   *you have seen the Son of Man*: Cf. *Treat. Res.* 46.14–17; *Soph. Jes. Chr.* CG III,4:117.22–118.2: *Treat. Seth.* 64.7–12. With the whole passage, cf., in a sense, 1 John 1:1, and *Gos. Truth* 30.27–32. But in all these cases, knowing the Son of Man is considered to be a good thing. For the meaning, see the following note.

3.17–25   The woe is directed against orthodox Christians, whose religion is founded on the canonical Gospels. Though James and Peter have had this sort of experience of the Son of Man, their previously inadequate knowledge is now in process of enlargement; cf. *PS* 2. Otherwise, with *ed. pr.* (44–45), understand these woes as a variation of "Blessed are they who have not seen, yet have believed." Cf. 12.38–13.1. Cf. also John 20:29; Eusebius, *HE* 1.13.10; *Epist. Apost.* 29. Or the woes may be taken as one of this author's typical warnings. Cf., e.g., 13.9–17.

3.20   *the man*: This is perhaps merely the Coptic translator's variation of "Son of Man." See the introduction. Or, if the author intended to make a theological statement, his use of "man" may show that he equated the term "Son of Man" specifically with the humanity of Christ, as is done at *Treat. Res.* 44.21–33 (see Zandee in *ed. pr.*). But the contrast between Christ's divinity and humanity does not seem to pose a problem elsewhere in *Ap. Jas.* Kirchner (143–44) suggests that "the man" might mean the pre-resurrection, as against the post-resurrection, Christ.

3.25   *he healed you*: Healing is a common Gnostic symbol for the

acquisition of saving knowledge, e.g., at *Gos. Truth* 33.2–3; *Exeg. Soul* 134.19–21; *Acts Pet. 12 Apost.* 8.33–35; 10.32–11.26; *Auth. Teach.* 27.25–32; and *Man. Ps.* 23.6–7; 46.1–47.9. Knowledge is a source of physical healing at *PS* 110. Again, the pejorative language might be a reference to orthodox Christianity, of which James' and Peter's pre-resurrection experience stands as a symbol.

3.27   *that you might reign*: ([x]ⲉⲕⲁⲥ ⲉⲣⲉⲧⲛⲁⲣ̄ ⲣ̄ⲣⲟ): For language about "being" or "becoming kings," cf. 1 Cor 4:8; 2 Tim 2:12; Rev 20:6; *Teach. Silv.* 91.25–30. Such language appears in Gnostic sources at *Thom. Cont.* 145.14; *2 Apoc. Jas.* 56.4–5; *PS* 96, 99, 100, *et al.*; *Gos. Thom.* 2 (cf. Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.*, citing *Gos. Heb.*, 2.9.45; 5.14.96,3); *Act. Thom.* 136; *Gos. Thom.* 81. The Son of Man, or the saints of the most high, are given βασιλεία at Dan 7:27. *Ed. pr.* traces the idea to Wisdom literature, in which Wisdom makes one a king. Cf. Wis 6:20–21; Prov 9:6 (LXX, B,S,A).

3.30–34   This passage offers an assurance of salvation, comparable to the thought expressed at 14.8–19. The persons referred to should be the Gnostic community, cf. 15.37–38. Equally strong Gnostic assurances of salvation are found at *Gos. Truth* 21.3–25, *Tri. Trac.* 119.32–33, *Steles Seth* 121.1–14, *PS* 96.

3.35–36   *Become full*: The perfect soul is a "fullness of virtues" with no empty space, in Philo, *Praem. et poen.* 65.

3.37–38   *he who is coming*: This may be the devil. Note that καὶ ἐλθόν is said of an evil spirit entering an "empty house" at Matt 12:44. Note too the use of "empty" at *Gos. Thom.* 28. For diabolic indwelling in a Gnostic context, see *Gos. Truth* 33.19–21, "Do not become a dwelling place for the devil, for you have already destroyed him." The devil is often said to "mock," e.g., at Epiphanius, *Pan.* 26.5.2.

4.8   *it is good that you be in want*: The paradoxical language used here, through line 18, is apparently explained at 4.18–22. For a comparable justaposition of opposite terms, cf. *2 Apoc. Jas.* 58.10–13, "And again he shall provide an end for what has begun and a beginning for what is about to be ended." The contrast of "fullness" with "deficiency" is typically, but not exclusively, Valentinian. Cf. *Gos. Truth* 21.14–18; 24.32–25.3; *Treat. Res.* 49.4–5; Rom 11:12. ⲃⲱϫϥ̄

here is taken to represent the Greek ὑστερεῖσθαι, which can be translated either intransitively or transitively. 4.20 requires the latter. Schenke and Kirchner, in part because of the imagery of 3.36–37, take the verbs ΜΟΥϨ and ϬⲰⲬϤ̄ transitively as "erfüllen" and "abnehmen." Mueller suggests that the passage is a rejoinder to Peter's self-confident, "We are full," and that ΜΟΥϨ should therefore be translated as "be certain" (equivalent to πεπληρωφορημένος), and ϬⲰⲬⲂ̄ as "be small, humble" (equivalent to ἐλάσσων, μικρός, ἀσθενής). But this interpretation is difficult because of 4.18–21.

4.15–16 *while it is possible*: Different translations of the ϨⲰⲤ here are possible. Thus *ed. pr.*, "en tant qu'il y a possibilité de vous emplir"; Schenke, "(in dem Masse)... wie ihr euch erfullen konnt."

4.19–22 *Spirit...reason...soul* (ⲡⲛⲉⲩⲙⲁ...ⲗⲟⲅⲟⲥ...ⲯⲩⲭⲏ): See the discussion in *ed. pr.* (47). These lines suggest that there is a hierarchy ranking spirit above reason and soul. A comparable ranking appears at *CH* 4.3–4, where all souls possess λόγος, but only souls of the "perfect" have νοῦς. In Valentinian texts spirit is also ranked above reason. Note, e.g., *Exc. Theod.* 54.1, where the ψυχικοί are equated with the λογικοί, who possess only reason, and contrasted with the πνευμάτικοι. Thought is inferior to spirit at *Gos. Phil.* 78.25–79.1. For the terminology "fill with the spirit," cf. *PS* 37, "And I will fill you with Spirit so that you are called Pneumatics, fulfilled in every pleroma." A similar thought appears to be behind *Man. Ps.* 170.6, though "fulness" is not mentioned there. Cf. also *PS* 46, 72; *U* 20; *Man. Keph.* 100.6–11. At 8.11 ⲗⲟⲅⲟⲥ is the divine message, and receives different treatment.

4.21–22 *for reason belongs to the soul*: The translation follows Schenke's emendation of ⲡⲉ to ⲡⲁ. This gives a good sense and is in accord with the context; that reason is a faculty of the soul is a commonplace. Otherwise, with Kasser, place a full stop after ⲡⲉ and render, "For it is reason," a pejorative comment; but in this case one is forced to translate the next clause by the vapid, "The soul, again, is soul." *Ed. pr.* take ⲧⲯⲩⲭⲏ which follows ⲡⲉ as the predicate, but this would mean "Reason is the soul," a highly surprising identification.

4.22 *it is (of the nature of) soul*: Kirchner's interpretation of ⲯⲩⲭⲏ is adopted. He takes ⲯⲩⲭⲏ as a classificatory noun (cf., e.g., the use of

ἁμαρτία at 1 John 5:17). Kirchner translates "seelisch"; Schenke emends ⲁⲛ to ⲉⲛ and translates "(selber) Seele ist er aber <nicht>," but the author would scarcely have troubled to make such an obvious point.

4.25–28   Cf. Mark 10:28–29 and parr. The passage was much used in Gnostic writings. Cf. *Acts Pet. 12 Apost.* 10.14–18; *PS* 136; *1 Jeu* 2; *2 Jeu* 43,44; *U* 15; *Man.Hom.* 1.167.52–53; *Man. Ps.* 93.19–20, 175.25; *Act. Thom.* 61.

4.28–30   For the prayer not to be tempted, cf. Matt 6:13 and par. and Jas 1:12–13. Persecution is ascribed to the devil at Rev 12:12; *Gos. Eg.* 61.16–22; *Mart. Pol.* 2.4; Tertullian, *De fuga* 1; *et al. Ed. pr.* (48–49) note that many patristic sources paraphrased the petition against temptation in the Lord's prayer as "Suffer us not to be led into temptation," to avoid ascribing temptation to God. Cf., e.g., Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.* 4.26.

4.30   *the devil, the evil one* (ⲡⲇⲓⲁⲃⲟⲗⲟⲥ· ⲉⲑⲁⲩ): Literally, "the evil devil." The Greek original probably read ὑπὸ τοῦ διαβόλου τοῦ πονηροῦ, with the last phrase intended appositively. The Coptic translator took it as an attributive adjective.

4.32   *merit* (ⲍⲙⲁⲧ): This may translate the Greek χάρις. Cf. Luke 6:32–34. An alternative translation would be "What thanks have you?"

4.35   *as a gift*: Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* 4.4.14,1) states that it is improper to undergo martyrdom for the sake of obtaining a reward. The phrase "as a gift" may indicate a similar thought. Zandee and Wilson translate "if you are not recompensed as a present," but this seems self-contradictory. Schenke's emendation is translated, "ohne dass euch von ihm in gewissem Masse (μέρος) das Geschenk zuteil wird," but this ignores the usual meaning of the phrase ἐν μέρει.

4.37–5.2   *if you are oppressed*: On the notion that there is no reward without trial, cf. Tertullian, *De bapt.* 20.2; *Apophthegmata Patrum* PG 65.77; *et al.*

5.1–2   *he will love you*: Cf. John 14:23.

5.2–3   *and will make you equal*: At Ps.-Cyprian, *De laude martyrii* 30, the martyrs are termed *Christi compares*. Otherwise, for the idea of equality with Christ, cf. 1 John 3:2; Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.25.1; Tertullian, *De anima* 32; *Gos. Phil.* 61.30–31, 67.21–27; *Gos. Thom.* 108; *PS* 96. The setting and tone of the passages in *Gos. Phil.* and *Pistis Sophia* suggest that this type of thought did not necessarily presuppose a "low Christology" (*contra* Kipgen, 342).

5.5–6   *through his providence by your own choice*: This phrasing may be an attempt to reconcile free will with predestination. Note the predestinarian implications of 14.41–15.3 and 10.34–37. For προαίρεσις see *Teach. Silv.* 104.15–19, "But you, on the other hand, with difficulty give your basic choice to him with a hint that he may take you up with joy. Now the basic choice, which is humility of heart, is the gift of Christ." A martyr dies by προαίρεσις at Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 4.4.14,1–2.

5.8   *loving the flesh*: For "love of the flesh" in a different sense, cf. *Gos. Phil.* 66.4–6.

5.9   *sufferings*: Apostles must "suffer" because of the Lord's sufferings in *Ep. Pet. Phil.* 138.14–28.

5.10–11   *you have yet to be abused*: Cf. Heb 12:4. What follows might be based on an apocryphal passion narrative, or might be an emotionally colored expansion of a canonical one, somewhat as in *Treat. Seth.* 58.23–28; *Man. Keph.* 13.1–5.

5.12–16   *unjustly ... unlawfully*: Cf. *Man. Keph.* 13.1–3.

5.17–18   *without reason* (ϩⲛⲛ ⲟⲩⲙⲛⲧ<ⲁ>ⲗⲟⲅⲟⲥ): The emendation, suggested by *ed. pr.* (Fr.) and Schenke, is probable because of the ⲙⲛⲧⲁⲛⲟⲙⲟⲥ in the clause preceding. The unemended text could be translated "with eloquence." Might this refer to the mocking speeches beside the cross?

5.19   *shamefully*: Here Schenke's emendation (ⲟⲩϣⲱⲥ) has been adopted. The unemended text would be translated "in sand." Quispel (*ed. pr.*, 51) suggests an allusion to James' stoning in a ditch. Cf. *2 Apoc. Jas.* 62.7–12. Kasser (*ed. pr.* 93) emends to ϣⲟⲟⲩ, "perfume."

For martyrdom as imitation of Christ, see *Mart. Pol.* 1.2, *et. al.*

as was I myself: Exhortations to martyrdom often make the point that the martyr recapitulates Christ's experience. Cf. Cyprian, *Ep.* 45.3–4, *Exhortation to Martyrdom* 11.

5.21–23   *Do you dare...encircling wall:* Comparable language appears at Tertullian, *De fuga* 8.

5.25   *before you:* Schenke's emendation (ϩⲀⲦⲈⲦⲚϩⲎ) has been adopted. The parallel with the following "after you" makes this emendation attractive. *Ed. pr.* (Fr.) and Kipgen (133) translate the unemended text: "...lorsque vous (y) etés chus," implying a fall before the beginning of earthly existence. Perhaps cf. 5.29–30 and Origen, *De princ.* 1.4.1, 2.1.1, *et al. Ed. pr.* (Ger.) translate: "seid ihr gefallen"; (Eng.): "until your end."

5.28–29   *one single hour:* A martyr purchases eternal life with a "single hour" in *Mart. Pol.* 2.3.

5.29–30   *the good will not enter the world:* I.e., no one in the world deserves to escape suffering. Cf. 12.12–13, 13.9–11. If the reference is to a fall before birth, note the Basilidean idea that all martyrs suffer deservedly, since all have sinned before birth. Cf. Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 4.12.83,2. But the meaning need not be this specific. As ⲚⲀⲅⲀⲐⲞⲤ gives a good sense, Schenke's emendation to <ϩⲚ>Ⲁ-<ⲡ>ⲀⲐ<ⲎⲦ>ⲞⲤ seems unnecessary.

5.31–32   *Scorn death...life:* Cf. Ignatius, *Smyr.* 3.2; *Diog.* 1.1, 10.7. If the martyr accepts death, it is the transition to life for him. Cf. Colpe (129) and Matt 10:39 and parr.

5.37–6.1   *do not mention:* Cf. Matt 16:21–23 and perhaps *Ep. Pet. Phil.* 139.21–22.

6.4   *believe in my cross:* Cf. 1 Cor 1:17–2:8. For the phrase, cf., *Asc. Isa.* 3.18, 9.26.

6.7–8   *seekers for death:* This may be a command to seek martyrdom, a practice which Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* 4.4.17,1–3) condemns.

6.8   *dead*: This is said of those who lapse under persecution in Cyprian, *Ep.* 10.2, "For what dead person would not hasten to be made alive?" Or the sentence may be meant literally. Cf. *Gos. Thom.* 59, "Take heed of the living one while you are alive, lest you die and seek to see him, and are unable to do so," and Origen's comment on Ps 78:34 at *De princ.* 2.5.3. Otherwise the "dead" are worldlings. Cf. *Gos. Truth* 33.6–8, "raise up those who wish to rise, and awaken those who sleep." As Kirchner (158) observes, lines 9–12 indicate that the dead get their wish. These lines, then, would tend to support the second view of the interpretation of 6.8–9. Cf. also *Gos. Thom.* 11; *Gos. Phil.* 52.6–18; *Apoc. Paul* 20.18–20; 23.13–14; *Exc. Theod.* 22.2, 80.1; *et al.* At *Tri. Trac.* 107.30–31 death equals ignorance.

6.14   *election*: Martyrdom is a sign of election at Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 4.12.83,2, where he paraphrases Basilides. Cf. Ps.-Cyprian, *De laude martyrii* 21, 23.

6.17   *kingdom of God*: The emendation of *ed. pr.* is translated. Note the same phrase at 6.7. The original Coptic text would have read ⲘⲠⲚⲞⲨⲦⲈ ⲦⲀ ⲚⲈⲦⲞⲨⲘⲞⲨⲞⲨⲦ. The syllable ⲦⲈ would have been omitted by homoeoarcton, and the meaningless ⲘⲠⲚⲞⲨ later corrected to ⲘⲠⲘⲞⲨ, "of death." Schenke emends to read "of the heavens."

6.18   *those who put themselves to death* (ⲚⲈⲦⲞⲨⲘⲞⲨⲞⲨⲦ· ⲘⲘⲀⲨ): The phrase may also be translated, "who are put to death." "Put themselves to death" would be an approbatory reference to the practice of coming forward and volunteering for martyrdom. Perhaps cf. the phrase, "deliver ourselves to death," at *Testim. Truth* 34.5. Note the language used by Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 4.4.16,3, where a martyr of this sort is disparagingly called "murderer of himself;" see also *Strom.* 4.4.17,1–3. In Gnostic sources martyrdom in general is deprecated at *Treat. Seth.* 49.26–27; *Apoc. Pet.* 78.31–79.22; *Testim. Truth* 34.1–26. Cf. Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.24.2. But voluntary martyrdom is recommended at *Man. Ps.* 142.10–143.29; perhaps at *Gos. Thom.* 58, 68; and here. This passage's strong recommendation of a martyrdom which is apparently self-chosen suggests that *Ap. Jas.* is not Valentinian.

6.20   *like the son of the Holy Spirit*: In the context of "become better than I" the text might mean simply "like someone better than a son of

the Son of Man." For the phrase "son of the Son of Man," see *Gos. Phil.* 81.14–15. The text may also be interpreted, with *ed. pr.*, as "like Jesus himself." Perhaps cf. *Soph. Jes. Chr.* CG III,*4*:91.10–15, "Now the Savior appeared to them, not in his first form, but in the invisible spirit. And his form was the form of a great angel of light. And his likeness I must not describe." Or, also with *ed. pr.*, the phrase may be taken to mean "like Jesus himself," in the sense that Jesus is himself the son of the Holy Spirit, as at *Gos. Heb.* fr. 2 and 3 (on which see E. Hennecke, W. Schneemelcher, *New Testament Apocrypha* [London: Lutterworth, 1963] vol. 1. 163–64), but *Ap. Jas.* does not seem to hold this doctrine elsewhere. Note also that at *Ap. John* CG II,*1*:6.18–7.4 the progenitor of Christ may be identified as "Holy Spirit." Finally the phrase may mean simply, "like a man filled with the Holy Spirit," cf. 4.19; or "like a man begotten of the Spirit," cf. John 3:5; *Gos. Phil.* 69.4–7, 85.21–23.

6.22–23   *how shall we be able to prophesy*: For a suggested interpretation, see the introduction. Christian sources connect prophecy with martyrdom and persecution in various ways. At Cyprian, *Ep.* 8, the martyr Mappalicus prophesies under torture. At 74.10 (Firmilian to Cyprian) a false prophetess appears in Cappadocia in a time of persecution. Note the prophetic dreams found in the *Passion of Perpetua* and the inspiration of martyrs by the Spirit at Tertullian, *De anima* 55.5; *De fuga* 14.3. See also the anti-Montanist polemic at Epiphanius, *Pan.* 48. Christian prophecy was commended by Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catech.* 7.37.

6.30–31   *the head of prophecy was cut off*: Cf. Matt 11:13 and par. With the thought, cf. *Acta Archelai* 45.7, "Et usque ad Johannem aiebat (Mani) lex et prophetae; aiebat autem Johannem regnum caelorum praedicare. Nam et abscisione capitis hoc esse indicatum quod, omnibus prioribus et superioribus eius abscissis, posteriora servanda sunt." Contrast *Interp. Know.* 15.35–37, "Does someone have a prophetic gift? Share it without hesitation."

6.35–38   *what 'head' means*: Here the thought, "prophecy issues from the head," is combined with the thought that the members are joined to the head and nourished through it, cf. Eph 4:15–16; or that they sprout from the head, cf. Plato, *Tim.* 45B; or the like.

7.2–5   *parables...openly*: Cf. Matt 13:34; John 16:25,29; Mark
4:13. Gnostic revelation is open revelation, rather than revelation
made in parables at *Treat. Res.* 45.6–8; *Exc. Theod.* 66; *PS* 6, 90, 107.
Cf. also *Gos. Thom.* 92, "Seek and you will find. Yet, what you asked
me about in former times and which I did not tell you then, now do I
desire to tell you, but you do not inquire after it."

7.7–8   *you served me as a parable*: I.e., as Jesus addressed the dis-
ciples concerning themselves in the canonical Gospels, thus conveying
his revelation in parables, so now he addresses James and Peter con-
cerning themselves, thus conveying his revelation openly. Or, Peter
and James are not clearly known by Jesus and "appear" to him; cf. 1
Cor 13:12, *Thund.* 16.32–35. Or, with Kasser (*ed. pr.*, 93): "Pour
Jésus...ses disciples ont toujours été à la fois énigmatiques (par leur
encroyable incompréhension) et fondamentalement compréhensibles
(puis qu'il connaissait bien la cause de leur stupidité.)" The trans-
lation of *ed. pr.* (Eng.) understands the lines differently; "But you
were for me a parable (when I spoke) in parables and manifest (when
I spoke) openly."

7.10–11   *Hasten to be saved without being urged*: The meaning
might be, "Go to martyrdom without benefit of prophetic exhortation
and encouragement." The original might have read σπεύδετε εἰς
σωτηρίαν. Cf. Clement of Alexandria, *Prot.* 9.88.2.

7.12–13   *be eager*: The translation follows *ed. pr.* (Fr.) and Schenke,
who assume a translation from προθυμεῖσθε, against *ed. pr.* (Ger. and
Eng.) who assume a translation from εὐθυμεῖσθε.

7.16   *the Father will love you*: Cf. John 14.21, 23.

7.17–22   Cf. *Teach. Silv.* 95.20–24, "For he casts into your heart evil
thoughts as good ones, and hypocrisy in the guise of firm intelligence."

7.22–23   *Do not allow the kingdom of heaven to wither*: I.e., pick the
fruit rather than letting it fall; in other words, care for the kingdom
within rather than neglecting it. Cf. 13.17–19.

7.24   *shoot*: The translation follows the emendation of *ed. pr.*

(ϣⲁⲍ). Since ϣⲁⲍ is masc., the pronouns in the following phrase probably refer to it and not to the fem. ⲃⲛ̄ⲛⲉ. Hence Schenke's emendations are unnecessary. The Coptic ⳓⲉⲧⲉ probably translated ἀπορρύειν, used of leaves falling from trees, e.g., at Epiphanius, *Pan.* 26.8.7.

7.26–27 *They put forth leaves*: The translation follows that of Kirchner (164-66), who emends ⲁϥⲧⲉⲩⲟ to ⲁⲩⲧⲉⲩⲟ. The image is that of the dates, which have not been picked, falling to the ground and sprouting there themselves.

7.28 *womb* (ⲁⲧⲉ): With Kirchner (165) ⲁⲧⲉ is taken as a metaphor for the fallen dates, which are the "womb" of the new leaves. *Ed. pr.* (57) take the expression to mean the pith of the tree. This is a possible meaning of the Greek μητρά. Cf. the Latin *matrix* = "stem."

7.29–35 This difficult passage appears to reinforce the parable and apply its teaching to the individual Gnostic. It is possible to interpret "the fruit which had grown" as the Gnostic himself, or his state of knowledge, and the "single root" as the Kingdom, or the like. At 7.31 we read ⲧⲁⲕⲙ̄ϥ, "picked" with Zandee; "picking" the fruit is the opposite of letting it "pour down," as at 7.25–26. Till corrects to "planted," but this seems less in accord with the sense of the whole passage.

7.33–35 Alternative translations of these obscure lines are possible: Mueller: "Truly it would have been good if it were possible to produce the new plants now; then you would find it"; *ed. pr.* (Fr.): "Sans doute était-elle bonne, puisque il est devenu maintenant possible de produire pour toi ces plantes nouvelles, de la trouver;" Schenke, emending ⲉⲡⲉⲉ in line 35: "Es wäre wahrlich gut-wenn es (dir) jetzt möglich wäre-diese Pflanzen (wieder) frisch zu machen, so würdest du finden dass seine (des Himmelreichs) Herrlichkeit ... "; Kirchner: "Es war zwar gut (in dem Gleichnis), diese neue Pflanzen aufzuziehen. Wäre es dir jetzt möglich, würdest du es finden." Here we adopt Kirchner's proposal to supply an additional ⲛⲉⲕ in line 35, which may well have fallen out through haplography. We also adopt his suggestion that the suffix of ⲛⲉⲕⲁϭⲛⲧⲉ̄ refers to a fact, rather than to the "root" mentioned in line 30. But there appears to be no clear indication that this whole passage alludes to the Parable of the Sower.

7.36   *I have been glorified*: I.e., at the canonical ascension. Cf. 2.17–19.

   already (ϩⲁⲑⲏ ⲙ̄ⲡⲓⲟⲩⲁⲉⲓⲱ): Schenke translates: "von Beginn der Zeit."

7.37–38   *why do you hold me back?*: Cf. John 20:17; *Gos. Phil.* 76.22–26; *Exc. Theod.* 1.2, 22.7.

8.1   *after the [labor]* (ⲙⲛ̄ⲛ̄ⲥⲁ ⲡϩ[ⲓⲥ]ⲉ): The restoration here follows Kirchner. The lacuna does not have room for ⲡϩ[ⲟⲟⲩ]ⲉ, "the day" proposed by *ed. pr.* Kasser's (*ed. pr.*, 94) ⲡϩ[ⲁⲓ]ⲉ, "the end," would be an unusual spelling. Schenke's ⲡϩ[ⲙ]ⲉ, "den vierzig (Tagen)," does not obviously accord with the chronology assumed by the document.

8.3   *eighteen days*: Perhaps this should be emended to eighteen months, with J. M. Robinson, "Gnosticism and the New Testament," *Gnosis, Festschrift für Hans Jonas* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1978) 140, unless the eighteen days is a period additional to the eighteen months. Cf. 2.19–21. For the eighteen month period of post-resurrection appearances, cf. Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.3.2; 1.30.14.

8.5–10   A comparable series of references by title to NT passages is found at *Dial. Sav.* 139.8–13.

8.6   *The Shepherds*: Cf. Matt 18:12–14 (or Luke 15:4–7), and John 10:11–17. The passages from Matthew and John appear to be conjoined at *Gos. Truth* 31.36–32.37.

8.7   *The Seed*: Cf. Mark 4:4–9 and parr. or conceivably Mark 4:26–29.

   The Building (ⲡⲕⲱⲧ): cf. Matt 7:24–27 and par. This parable is cited in a Valentinian context at *Exc. Theod.* 86.2.

8.7–8   *The Lamps of the Virgins*: Cf. Matt 25:1–13.

8.8–9   *The Wage of the Workmen*: Cf. Matt 20:1–16. A specifically Valentinian interpretation of this parable is reported at Epiphanius, *Pan.* 31.10.15. This is an example of Gnostic reinterpretation of canonical parables.

8.9   *The Didrachmae*: Cf. Luke 15:8–10.

8.9–10   *The Woman*: This may be a reference to Matt 13:33, as Kipgen (115) suggests; or to a Gnostic parable on the order of *Gos. Thom.* 97, as J. M. Robinson suggests in private correspondence. *Ed. pr.* (58) associate the Woman with the Didrachmae as a reference to the same parable, Luke 15:8–10.

8.11   *the word*: This is probably the "word of the Kingdom," cf. Matt 13:18–23. For material comparable to the whole paragraph, cf. *Gos. Phil.* 79.18–33 and *Gos. Truth* 34.28–35.2. Kirchner translates ⲗⲟⲅⲟⲥ here as "Verständnis (der Gleichnisse)."

8.16–18   *the word is like a grain of wheat*: A similar Gnostic metaphor, linking farming with faith-hope-love-knowledge, is found at *Gos. Phil.* 79.23–30, "God's farming likewise has four elements–faith, hope, love, and knowledge. Faith is our earth, that in which we take root. And hope is the water through which we are nourished. Love is the wind thorugh which we grow. Knowledge then is the light through which we ripen." But our passage appears to concentrate on the individual's response to the word. The farmer trustfully waits for the crop to grow at Jas 5:7 and Origen, *Con. Cels.* 1.11.

8.21   *he was saved* (ⲁϥⲟⲩϫⲉⲉⲓ): The Coptic, like the Greek σώζεσθαι which it probably translates, can mean either "be saved," or "be preserved, kept alive."

8.24–25   *receive the kingdom of heaven*: Cf. Mark 10:15.

8.29   *do not be deceived*: Cf. Matt 24.4 and parr; 1 Cor 6:9, Gal 6:7, and Jas 1:16.

8.34   *follow me*: Schenke interprets this phrase as "follow me (in death)," and connects this with the tradition of James' martyrdom, e.g., at *2 Apoc. Jas.* 61.20–63.32.

   For confirmation of this interpretation, he calls attention to the appearance before the archons which follows immediately here at 8.35–36; cf. *1 Apoc. Jas.* 32.29–36.1. Schenke suggests that lines 32–36 are interpolated from a source concerned with the person of James, and that the original wording has been affected by the interpolation.

But neither the hypothesis of interpolation, nor Schenke's suggested emendation, seem necessary to make the point of James' death or to connect this with James' appearance before the archons.

8.36 *archons*: The interpretation follows that of Quispel (*ed. pr.* 60). For a set speech delivered before hostile powers in heaven, cf. *1 Apoc. Jas.* 33.13–35.20; Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.21.5; *PS* 112; *Apoc. Paul* 23.1–28; *Asc. Isa.* 10.24–29, *et al.* The term ὑπόθεσις is to be understood as a "speech," cf. LSJ 1882a. "What to say" is a paraphrastic rendering, emphasizing the pre-determined character of this speech and the circumstances of its delivery.

Ed. pr. (60), apart from Quispel, take "archons" as earthly rulers. But 15.9–13 implies that there are hostile powers in the heavens who oppose the Savior's ascent, and our author would have been likely to expect the Spirit-filled martyr to rely on the Spirit's inspiration in an earthly court, as at Mark 13:11.

8.38 *undergone tribulation*: With this terminology, cf. the Gnostic use of the expression at *PS* 100, "Truly I say to you, concerning the race of mankind, because it is material, I have troubled myself, I have brought all the mysteries of light to them," and *Epist. Apost.* 39.

8.39 *crown*: The term is often used of the reward for martyrdom, e.g., at Cyprian, *Exhortation to Martyrdom* 8.

9.1 *after saving you* (ⲚⲦⲀⲢⲒⲚⲞⲨϨⲘ ⲘⲘⲰⲦⲚ̄): Schenke translates as "um euch zu erlösen," taking ⲚⲦⲀⲢⲒ as finalis (Till, *Koptische Grammatik*, #311), but this is not in the style of *Ap. Jas.* and it is difficult to understand how Jesus "took his crown" for the purpose of "saving."

9.2–3 *to dwell with you*: Cf. John 1:14, 14:23, 15:4.

9.5 *houses*: These are probably to be understood as bodies, as at 2 Cor 5:1; *Treat. Seth.* 51.4–7, 13–16.

9.5–6 *unceiled* (ⲈⲘⲚ̄ ⲘⲈⲖⲰⲦ ϨⲒⲰⲞⲨ): As *ed. pr.* (61) suggest, the Coptic probably translates the Greek ἄστεγος, which can mean both "without a roof, unceiled," and "incapable of holding." The disciples, then, would be said to be incapable of holding the Savior's word. Cf. John 8:37.

9.7   *houses that could receive me*: Cf. *Gos. Truth* 25.21–24, "we must see to it above all that the house will be holy and silent for the Unity."

9.10–11   *understand what the great light is*: I.e., become enlightened; cf. 13.19–20, 16.15–16.

9.11–17   The sense of the passage is: "You have no claim on the Father; he does not even need the Son, let alone you." For the spirit of this, cf. 11.29–35. Discussion of the nature of fatherhood and sonship is common in orthodox and Gnostic documents, both in connection with Trinitarian questions and with Gnostic theology. Cf. *Tri. Trac.* 51.8–15; *Gos. Phil.* 58.22–26; *Teach. Silv.* 115.11–16; Epiphanius, *Pan.* 73.3.2–4 (Basilius and Georgius), *et al.* Our document's statement that the Father does not need the Son is very unusual, and *Teach. Silv.* 115.11–16 takes precisely the opposite position.

9.16–17   Schenke translates his emended text: "<Folgt dem Sohne nach,> denn (auch) euer bedarf der Vater des Sohnes nicht, <sondern ihr seiner.>"

9.18–24   The assurance of salvation offered here may be compared with *Gos. Phil.* 86.4–11, but 9.22–23 seems to imply that the saved are not indefectible.

9.20–21   *no one will persecute you*: A similar statement is found at *Gos. Phil.* 86.9–11, but the line here might refer specifically to martyrdom.

9.24–10.6   *O you wretches*: Comparable invective may be found at *Thom. Cont.* 143.8–145.1; *Act. Thom.* 44; *Act. John* 30, *et al.*

9.28   *sinners against the Spirit*: Cf. possibly Mark 3:29 and par.

9.29–31   *can you still bear to listen* (ϩⲓⲉ ϣⲁ ⲧⲛⲟⲩ ⲁⲛ ⲧⲉⲧⲛⲣ̄ ϩⲩⲡⲟⲙⲓⲛⲉ ⲁⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄): *Ed. pr.* (Eng.) translate, "do you wait until now to listen?" The Gnostic "speaks" (i.e., teaches) because of his contact with the source of inspiration and truth, cf. *Interp. Know.* 15.26–16.38. "Speaking and hearing" are paradoxically predicated of God or the Revealer at *Dial. Sav.* 126.13–17; *2 Apoc. Jas.* 59.17–19; *Thund.* 20.30–31.

9.33   *sleep...be awake*: Cf. Rom 13:11 and see the note to 3.9.

10.2–4   *pure one...man of light*: If the first phrase refers to the believer on earth, as at 1.20, and the second similarly means the illumined Gnostic, as at *Gos. Thom.* 24, this is a statement of the Gnostic's indefectibility; cf. 1 John 3:9; *Gos. Phil.* 62.17–26; and Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.6.2. But in this case the passage would be saying that James and Peter are not indefectible. Alternatively, "pure one" or "saint" may refer to a heavenly being, as at 10:38; cf. the use of "man of light" at *Orig. World* 107.25–27, *Od. Sol.* 36:3–4. In this case there is no specific reference to the indefectibility of an earthly individual, and James and Peter are simply being charged with tepidity; cf. in a sense Rev 3:15. On this interpretation "defilement" and "darkness" are equivalent to the world; cf. *Gos. Eg.* 59.19–20, *1 Apoc. Jas.* 28.10–19, *Auth. Teach.* 29.11–16.

10.8   *while you say*: The Greek original probably read τὴν λύπην ὑμῶν, λεγόντων ὑμῶν, μακρύνονται. The genitive absolute would have been omitted by homoeoteleuton.

10.10   *Father's inheritance*: Cf. Gal 4:1–7, *Gos. Phil.* 52.4–5.

10.11   *weep*: A comparable call to repentance is found at *Exeg. Soul* 135.4–29. Cf. also *Treat. Seth.* 59.33–60.1. With the language, cf. John 16:20.

10.13–14   *preach what is good, as the Son is ascending as he should*: Kipgen (150) translates "proclaim the good (news), so that the Son may ascend rightly." Schenke and Kirchner translate similarly. The suggestion is attractive but lacks lexicographical support. On this view the Greek ought to have been εὐαγγέλιον; but one would have expected either ϣⲙ̄ⲛⲟⲩϥⲉ (Crum 570a) or the Greek word itself.

10.15–21   Cf. 13.8–11. Kirchner (179, 190–91) takes both passages as references to those who heard the earthly Jesus. This would make them criticisms of orthodox Christians. Alternatively, the passages may simply be strong statements of a thought comparable to that found at Mark 2:17, Matt 9:13. See the introduction. Schenke translates his emendation "wenn ich nicht gesandt worden wäre." But this is commendatory of the persons to whom Jesus is sent and thus out of keeping with the rest of the passage.

10.21   *for these things*: Mueller's emendation would be translated "before these things."

10.23   *and go away*: The translation follows the emendation of *ed. pr.* (ⲚⲦⲀⲂⲰⲔ) which makes the form the conjunctive.

10.32   *in many*: *Ed. pr.* and Schenke translate alternatively, "among many."

10.32–34   *Invoke the Father...and he will give to you*: Cf. Matt 7:7 and par. and John 16:23–24.

10.34–38   *Blessed...life*: *Exc. Theod.* 18.1 gives a close parallel to this passage: ὁ σωτὴρ ὤφθη κατιὼν τοῖς ἀγγέλοις, διὸ καὶ εὐηγγελίσαντο αὐτὸν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῷ ᾿Αβραὰμ καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς δικαίοις ἐν τῇ ἀναπαύσει οὖσιν ἐν τοῖς δεξιοῖς ὤφθη. Cf. *Asc. Isa.* 9.27–29. Read against this background, our passage might suggest the pre-existence of the elect. Perhaps cf. 14.41–15.3; *Gos. Thom.* 18 and 19; *Treat. Res.* 47.4–12.

The third person forms, "him" and "he," are inconsistent with the rest of the speech. Schenke, postulating a corruption of the text, emends and translates, "heil euch, die ihr bei ihm gesehen wurdet! - heil dem, der gesehen hat, wie er verkündet wurde!" Kirchner takes ⲚⲘ̄ⲘⲈϥ reflexively and translates, "Heil dem, der euch bei sich gesehen hat! Er wird verkundigt unter den Engeln..."

10.36–38   *angels...saints*: The two are equated here, as at Dan 4:13.

10.39–11.1   *Rejoice and be glad*: Cf. Matt 5:12, *PS* 6.
   as sons of God: On the privileged status of God's sons, cf. Rom 8:14–17.

11.1–2   *Keep his will that you may be saved*: Cf. τὸ θέλημα for "his will" at Rom 2:18. *Ed. pr.* point out that the restoration, [ⲡⲉϥ]ⲟⲩⲱϣⲉ, "his will," is impossible, as the lacuna is too short. The command utilizes a play on words, ⲦⲞⲨⲪⲞ = σώ ͅειν; ⲞⲨϪⲈⲈⲓ = σώ ͅεσθαι. Kipgen (190) translated, "Overcome desire that you may be saved." Cf. 11.35.

11.4–5 *I intercede on your behalf:* Cf. John 14:16, Rom 8:34, 1 John 2:1–2. If the advocate at 11.12 is to be identified, it should be with Christ. At *Exc. Theod.* 23.1–12 the Valentinians are said to identify Christ with "the Paraclete."

11.7–8 *we become glad, etc.:* Comparably worded reactions to the sayings of Jesus occur at *PS* 83, 85, *et al.*

11.9–10 *the words we have mentioned before:* This is perhaps a reference to the invective at 9.24–10.21. Note Mueller's emendation to "the words he had said."

11.10–11 *But when he saw us rejoicing:* Kirchner (181) suggests that this section contrasts orthodox Christians, who "need an advocate," with Gnostics who "have obtained grace for themselves." Perhaps cf. the polemic against the orthodox theory of atonement which occurs at 11.32–33. Colpe (130) suggests that James and Peter are represented as interpreting the preceding words of encouragement in a "quietistic" fashion, and that what follows, through 12.17, is a warning against such an interpretation.

11.11–12 *Woe to you who lack an advocate:* Or, "who need an advocate," parallel to ⲣ̄ ⲭⲣⲓⲁ at 11.13. If the advocate is Christ, see on 11.4, or "advocate" may be taken generally, as at 2 *Clem.* 6.9, εἰ τὶς ἡμῶν παράκλητος ἔσται, ἐὰν μὴ εὐρεθῶσιν ἔργα ἔχοντες ὅσια καὶ δίκαια.

11.13–17 *Woe to you...grace for themselves:* Quispel (*ed. pr.*, 64) suggests that ⲁ2ⲟⲩ⳹ⲭⲡⲟ (line 16) is the translation of κέκτηνται "obtained" and is contrasted with ⲣ̄ ⲭⲣⲓⲁ (line 13), which translates χρῶνται "borrowed." Thus this passage would express the Valentinian distinction between "the spiritual," who "possess" grace by right and "the psychics" who have it ἐν χρήσει, "on loan." But the term ⲛⲉⲧⳡ̄ⲁⲁⲧ in line 12, parallel to ⲛⲉⲧⲣ̄ ⲭⲣⲓⲁ, suggests that the latter term here means "stand in need." Cf. 9.12–14. With ⲣ̄ ⲡⲁⲣⲏ̄ⲥⲓ-ⲁⲍⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲩ in lines 15 and 16, cf. perhaps Heb 4:16.

11.17–18 *Liken yourselves to foreigners* (ⲧⲛ̄ⲧⲛ̄ⲧⲏ̄ⲛⲉ ⲁ2ⲛ̄ⳡ̄ⲙ-ⲙⲁⲉⲓ): The translation follows Schenke's "nehmt euch zum Gleich-

nis," against *ed. pr.* "ressemblez aux étrangers." *Ed. pr.* interpret the Gnostic as a stranger in the world; but the context suggests that a rebuke is being administered. Cf. especially 11.19–20.

Ed. pr. cite references such as Heb 11:13–16, 1 Pet 2:11, whose point is that the Christian is a stranger and sojourner on earth. Here the point seems to be that the believer, by neglect, is exiling himself from his true city. For a Stoic parallel to the language here, cf. Marcus Aurelius, *Med.* 4.29, "If he is an alien in the universe who has no cognizance of the things that are in it, no less is he an alien who has no cognizance of what is happening in it. He is an exile, who exiles himself from civic reason (πολιτικὸν λόγον)...a limb cut off from the community (ἀπόσχισμα πόλεως), he who cuts off his own soul from the soul of all rational things."

11.20 *city*: "City" is a common image in Gnostic writings for the assembly of the elect, or for the heavenly world which is in store for the elect. Cf. *Acts Pet. 12 Apost.* 5.7–12; *U* 12; *Man. Ps.* 1.17; *et al.* In contrast, all creatures are "citizens" in *Disc. 8–9* 59.3–5. In contrast, the soul itself is a city at *Teach. Silv.* 85.20–21.

11.27–28 *O you outcasts and fugitives*: Kirchner translates, "O, ihr Erwahlten und (dennoch) Fliehenden!"

11.29 *caught*: Perhaps meaning caught in the filth of the world, as at *1 Apoc. Jas.* 28.16–20.

11.29–31 *Or do you perhaps think that the Father is a lover of mankind*: The translation follows *ed. pr.* (Ger.) and Schenke, against *ed. pr.* (Fr. and Eng.), "Ou bien peut-être ne pensez-vous pas du Père qu'Il est ami des hommes." The translation adopted here appears probable in the light of 11.32–35, 9.11–17. Cf. the *Teaching of Peter*, quoted by John of Damascus, *Sacred Parallels* A.12, "Allying myself with sin I said unto myself, God is merciful, and will bear with thee, and because I was not immediately smitten I ceased not, but rather despised pardon, and exhausted the long-suffering of God." Cf. also *Exeg. Soul* 135.26–29, "But the Father is good and loves humanity, and he hears the soul that calls upon him and sends it the light of salvation."

If *ed. pr.* are followed, perhaps emend with Mueller (ⲙⲉⲩⲉ <ⲉⲛ>) "or do you perhaps not consider."

11.31–32   *Without prayers* (ⲁⲭⲛ̄ ϩⲛ̄ⲥⲁⲡⲥⲛ̄): Cf. 10.32–34. Alternatively the phrase could be translated "by prayers," with *ed. pr.*, Schenke, and Kirchner.

11.33   *remission to one on another's behalf:* The translation follows *ed. pr.* (Ger.). This may be an attack on the traditional doctrine of the atonement. Alternatively, the phrase may be translated, with *ed. pr.* (Fr. and Eng.) and Kipgen, "to one after another."

11.34   *he bears with one who asks:* Cf. *Teach. Silv.* 114.26–30, "O the patience of God, which bears with everyone, which desires that everyone who has become subject to sin be saved!"

11.37–38   This, and what follows, is governed by the idea that it is not a good thing to "desire the soul." The spirit is preferable as an object of desire. Cf. 4.18–22.

11.38–12.2   *soul...body...spirit* (ⲯⲩⲭⲏ...ⲥⲱⲙⲁ...ⲡⲛⲉⲩⲙⲁ): Cf. the tripartite division of man at 1 Thess 5:23; *Teach. Silv.* 92.19–25; Epiphanius, *Pan.* 36.3.6. Man is "carnal" or "spiritual" as the soul opts for flesh or spirit at Origen, *In Rom.* 1.5, *De princ.* 3.4.2–3. For the Valentinian account of spirit-soul-flesh, see, e.g., Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.7.5. Cf. *On Bap. B* 42.34–37, *Tri. Trac.* 119.16–122.12, *et al.* That the body is dead without the soul is a commonplace. Cf. e.g., Origen, *De princ.* 3.4.4.

12.1–2   *the soul is not saved without the spirit:* The soul is saved through the spirit at Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 4.13.90,3; 91,3 and Tatian, *Apology* 13.

12.3   *saved (when it is) without evil:* Schenke translates somewhat differently, "erlöst wird von dem Bösen."

12.5–6   *it is the spirit that raises the soul:* ⲧⲁϩⲟ (=ἐγείρειν) is preferred over ⲧⲛ̄ϩⲟ (=ζωοποιεῖν) as the more difficult reading. The meaning is roughly the same with either reading. Spirit raises Adam's soul up, or vivifies it, at *Hyp. Arch.* 88.1–15.

12.6–9   Perhaps cf. *Teach. Silv.* 105.26–106.14.

12.12–13   *who have worn the flesh*: To "wear the flesh" is a common-place in Gnostic literature. Cf. *Ap. John* CG II,*1*:25.34–35, *Gos. Phil.* 56.29–30; *Dial. Sav.* 132.10–12, *Paraph. Shem.* 34.25, *et al.* With the thought, cf. 1 Cor 15:50 or *Sent. Sextus* 27.20–21, "Do not seek good-ness in flesh." The statement is hyperbolic, and attempts to integrate it into specific Gnostic theologies are out of place. Kirchner (186) inter-prets, "keiner, der das Fleisch getragen hat, wird durch Gebet und zusätzliche Gnade erlöst werden, wie es jedoch die Meinung anderer ist."

12.14–15   *For do you think that many have found the kingdom of heaven*: Cf. Luke 13:23.

12.16   *as a fourth one in heaven*: This beatitude is perhaps related to the common thought that few are saved; cf. Luke 13:24, par.; *Gos. Thom.* 23; and *Exc. Theod.* 56.2. Wilson (in *ed. pr.*, 68) cites *Act. Thom.* 108–113, on the reunion of the king's son with his father, mo-ther, and brother, making four. Schenke emends to ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲛⲧⲁⲩⲛⲉⲩ and interprets of the fourth type of ground in the Parable of the Sow-er, and paraphrases, "Heil dem (Ackerteil), der als vierten in (Gleich-nis vom) Himmel(reich) betrachtet wurde." But if the author were referring to the Parable of the Sower, one would expect the title to be ⲡⲭⲟ, as at 8.7.

12.22   *know yourselves*: In Gnostic literature, this refers both to knowing one's own origin and knowing the ultimate reality, which are one and the same. Cf. *Gos. Thom.* 3; *Gos. Phil.* 76.17–22; *Thom. Cont.* 138.17–20; *Dial. Sav.* 132.6–19. In an orthodox context, cf. *Teach. Silv.* 92.10–33.

12.22–30   *ear of grain*: This allusion is perhaps inspired by Mark 4:26–29, but the main point here may be that the field–that is, the individual–is "filled" (line 26). Cf. 2.33, so interpreted by *ed. pr.*

12.28   *hasten to reap*: Cf. *Gos. Thom.* 21. Truth is "reaped" at *Gos. Phil.* 55.19–22.

12.29   *reap an ear of life*: This may be equivalent to making the prop-er response to the kingdom sown within one, cf. 7.23–24, 13.15–17. Cf. Heracleon's phrase "fruit of eternal life" in Origen, *In Joh.* 13.46,

§299, but it is likely that the phrase, "ear of life" is used loosely here.

12.35   *remember me*: Perhaps cf. 1 Cor 11:24–25, εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀναμνησιν.

12.36   *you did not know me* (ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲧⲛ̄ⲥⲟⲩⲱⲛⲧ): Till takes the Coptic form to be the equivalent of ⲉⲙⲡⲉⲧⲛ̄ⲥⲟⲩⲱⲛⲧ, "when you did not know me." Schenke's emendation is translated "weil, <als> ich bei euch wäre, ihr mich (noch) nicht (in Wahrheit) erkannt habt." Cf. John 14:9.

12.41–13.1   *Blessed will be they who have not seen, etc.*: Cf. John 20:29. If correctly restored, this is the tractate's most direct quotation of a NT passage. A similar quotation appears at *Epist. Apost.* 29; Eusebius, *HE* 1.13.10 (in the reply of Jesus to Abgar).

13.2   *And once more I [prevail upon] you*: Schenke translates "aber noch gebe ich euch Anweisungen."

13.3–8   *building a house*: This may be the author's interpretation of the Parable of the Building, Matt 7:24–27 and par., mentioned at 8.7. The "houses" would be the houses on high which replace the bodily houses. Cf. 2 Cor 5:1–3 and perhaps John 14:2. Quispel (*ed. pr.* 69) interprets, "je construis (en haut) une maison pour vous, qui pourrait vous être très utile, puisque vous y trouverez abri (alors que votre maison terrestre s'écroule ou quand elle s'écroulera), de même ... "

13.5   *when you find shelter* ([.] ⲉⲣⲉⲧⲛ̄ϫ︦ⲓ ϩⲁⲉⲓⲃⲉⲥ): If the restoration of *ed. pr.* [ⲭ]ⲉⲣⲉⲧⲛ̄ϫⲓ is read, the phrase would be translated, "since you find shelter."

13.6–7   *able to stand* (ⲛⲁϣ ⲱϩⲉ ⲁⲣⲉⲧϥ̄): This perhaps translates παριστάναι. Cf. the use of the verb with πάρεδρος at Wis 6:14. *Ed. pr.* (Fr. and Ger.) and Schenke translate, "support;" *ed. pr.* (Eng.) translate, "stand ready for." For the inadequacy of man's earthly house, cf. *Auth. Teach.* 27.25–27; *Treat. Seth.* 51.4-13. Cf. also *Gos. Truth* 33.22–23, "Do not strengthen (those who are) obstacles to you who are collapsing, as though (you were) a support (for them)."

13.9–11   *Woe to those for whose sakes I was sent down*: See the note

on 10.15-21. Perhaps cf. *Epist. Apost.* 39, "Whoso then hath kept my commandments shall be a son of light. But because of them that corrupt my words am I come down from heaven."

13.11-13   *blessed will they be who ascend to the Father*: Cf. John 20:17.

13.14   *reprove*: Cf. Mark 16:14.
  you who are: Perhaps cf. 4.3-22. "Those who are" refers to true, as against illusory being; cf. *Gos. Phil.* 64.10-12; *Apoc. Pet.* 77.4-11; 2 *Clem.* 1:8; Origen, *In Joh.* 2.13§98; *CH* 1.26. At *Tri. Trac.* 65.12, 66.19, "those who exist" are the aeons. Cf. *Allogenes* 49.16-18.

13.18-19   *kingdom...within you*: Cf. Luke 17:21, *Gos. Thom.* 3.

13.20   *the Light that illumines* (ⲡⲓⲟⲩⲁⲉⲓⲛ ⲛ̄ⲣⲉϥ`ⲣ̄`ⲟⲩⲁⲉⲓⲛ): *Ed. pr.* translate "la Lumière, source d'illumination;" Schenke, "das (euch er)leuchtende Licht." Cf. John 1:9, so interpreted at *Exc. Theod.* 41.3-4. The expression is common in Gnostic literature. Cf. *Man. Keph.* 37.9-10; *Man Ps.* 205.16; *et al.* James is an illuminator at 2 *Apoc. Jas.* 55.17-18.

13.21-23   *be to yourselves as I myself am to you*: Cf. John 13:15.

13.23-25   *For your sakes I have placed myself under the curse, etc.*: Cf. Gal 3:13. Here the "curse" is probably earthly existence.

13.39-14.1   *I have revealed myself to you, James*: A special appearance or revelation to James is mentioned at 1 Cor 15:7; Jerome, *De viris illustribus* 2 (quoting the Gospel according to the Hebrews); *1 Apoc. Jas.* 31.2. A theory of partition would make of this phrase an editorial insertion. Note that Peter, not James, has asked the question that is being answered.

14.1-2   *you have not known me*: Cf. 12.35-36 and John 14:9.

14.2-8   Kirchner punctuates these lines differently and translates, "Jetzt sehe ich wiederum, dass ihr oftmals froh seid, und zwar, wenn ihr euch über [die] Verheissung des Lebens freut. Aber ihr seid

tr[au]rig und betrübt, w[e]nn ihr über das Himmelreich belehrt werdet."

14.9 *faith [and] knowledge*: The two terms are equated, in a sense, at 8.11–27 and at John 6:69 and *CH* 9.10. Gnostic material emphasizing the importance of faith, while comparatively rare, is found at *Treat. Res.* 46.3–7; *Gos. Phil.* 61.36–62.6; *Exc. Theod.* 61.8; Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 2.3.10,1; and Origen, *In Joh.* 13.10§36.

14.15–19 *he who...will believe in the kingdom will never leave it*: This is the document's strongest statement of the indefectibility of the elect; note, however, that even here faith is demanded of them. Gnostic indefectibility is presented in even stronger terms at Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.6.4; *Tri. Trac.* 119.16–18; Origen, *In Joh.* 13.10§60–64; and perhaps *Gos. Phil.* 62.17–26 and *2 Apoc. Jas.* 59.6–10. In *PS* (97, 98, 100) souls which have received the higher mysteries are certain of salvation.

14.19 *to banish him* (ⲀⲠⲰⲦ ⲚⲤⲰϤ): Schenke translates "ihn verfolgen zu (lassen)," as though he were reading Ⲁ<ⲦⲢⲞⲨ>ⲠⲰⲦ. Kirchner (195–6) suggests that this is a reference to the danger of the martyrdom which has been mentioned earlier.

14.25 *you have pursued me*: Kirchner translates, "habt ihr mich verfolgt," and explains (197), "(sc. um mich aufzuhalten)."

14.26–36 Comparable ascension scenes, combining the elements of hymns of rejoicing, the stripping away of the body, and a stated or implied ascent in a vehicle, are found at *CH* 1.26, Turfan Fragment T II D 79. A full discussion, with further parallel material, may be found in *ed. pr.* (73–74).

14.26 *glory*:The term is used in this sense at John 17:5, 1 Tim 3:16, 1 Pet 1:21. Brown (49–50) sees the promise made here as contradicted by 15.26–28, and takes the fact as a sign of editorial activity.

14.27–28 *having opened your heart*: Kirchner translates, "Und wenn ich euer oben gerichtetes Herz geöffnet habt, hört..." on the assumption that ⲈⲦϬⲰϢⲦ̄ ⲀⲂⲢⲎⲒ is out of place, and originally belongs with ⲠⲈⲦⲚ̄ϨⲎⲦ in line 28.

14.30–31   *take (my place at) the right hand* (ⲁⲧⲣⲁⲙⲟⲩϩ ⲛ̄ⲥⲁ ⲟⲩⲛⲉⲙ): With Zandee and Quispel in *ed. pr.*, the Coptic is taken to mean "fill the right hand place," on the analogy of πληρῶσαι τόπον, as used at *Hermas, Sim.* 9.7.5. cf. Plato, *Tim.* 79B. The expression is admittedly difficult. Kasser (*ed. pr.*, 94) translates "que je brille à la droite du Père," taking ⲙⲟⲩϩ as "burn, glow." The session at God's right hand is linked with the glory of God at Acts 7:55–56, with the ascension at Mark 16:19, and with the angels' subjection to Christ at 1 Pet 3:22. For a general survey of the use of the terminology in the NT, cf. D. M. Hay, *Glory at the Right Hand: Psalm 110 in Early Christianity* (SBLMS 18; Nashville: Abingdon, 1973).

14.34   *chariot of the spirit*: Since this vehicle is "of spirit," it is invisible to James and Peter. "Chariots of spirit" appear at 1 *Enoch* 70.2; cf. 2 Kgs 2:11. For an extensive discussion of the use of the chariot in ascension scenes, cf. *ed. pr.* 75–78.

14.35   *I shall strip myself*: Stripping away the body in order to don a glorious garment is a common motif. Cf. *Asc. Isa.* 9.9. In Nag Hammadi texts, cf. *Gos. Truth* 20.30–34; *Dial. Sav.* 143.22–23; *2 Apoc. Jas.* 56.7–13; and *Paraph. Shem* 38.29–39.10, *et al.* Cf. also 2 Cor 5:2–4, with Marcion's variant ἐκδυσάμενοι for ἐνδυσάμενοι; *Od. Sol.* 25:8; *Act. Thom.* 111 and 113 (Hymn of the Soul), and 142.

14.39–40   Note the change from the third to the first person. *Ed. pr.* (Fr.) translate, "avant qu'Il fut descendu sur la terre, de telle sorte que, quand je vois, je monterai," taking ⲝⲉⲕⲁⲥⲉ as rendering consecutive ἵνα. With "when I have come, I might ascend," cf. perhaps John 3:13, Eph 4:8–10. Kirchner takes ⲝⲉⲕⲁⲥⲉ as causal, and renders, "Denn ich (herab)gekommen bin; werde ich wieder heraufsteigen." To both renderings it can be objected that ⲝⲉⲕⲁⲥⲉ is always final elsewhere in the tractate.

15.1–3   *they who [were] proclaimed by the Son before they came to be*: This might refer to the pre-existence of the elect, as do, perhaps 10.34–38, 16.26–28; cf. *Gos. Thom.* 19, *Gos. Truth* 28.5–9; *Treat. Res.* 46.39–47.7, *Gos. Phil.* 64.10–12. But it might simply be a strong statement of predestination or election, somewhat as at *Gos. Truth* 21.25–31, "Those whose names he knew in advance were called at the

end, so that one who has knowledge is the one whose name the Father has uttered."

15.6 *he departed*: Brown (49) suggests that this phrase is an editorial substitution for a more elaborate ascension scene; but cf. 2.18, 22. The scene which follows implies a belief in three heavens as at 2 Cor 12:2–4.

15.7–8 *and gave thanks and sent our heart(s) upwards*: Schenke translates "es wurde uns die Gnade zuteil (as if ⲁⲛ̄ⲭⲓ ⲯ̄ⲙⲁⲧ), unseren Sinn zum Himmel emporzuschwingen." Experience of the heavens at Nag Hammadi is recorded at *Disc. 8–9* 57.31–60.1 and *Paraph. Shem.* 1.6–16. Kirchner renders, "wir empfingen Gnade," referring to the Manichaean expression, ⲁⲩϣⲱⲡ ⲡⲉϥⲯ̄ⲙⲟⲧ.

15.11–13 *noise of wars, etc.*: Perhaps these phrases refer to the attempts by hostile powers to prevent the Son's ascent (*PS* 15–16); or to the consternation into which the powers are thrown by that ascent (*PS* 3); or to the quarreling of the lower powers, as in *Asc. Isa.* 7.9–12. As *ed. pr.* note, the symbols here are not eschatologized.

15.18–19 *hymns and angelic benedictions*: This is a common motif. Cf. e.g., the hymns of the angels at *Asc. Isa.* 9.28–33, 11.21–33, and those heard by the mystic at *Disc. 8–9* 58.17–20, 59.28–32; *CH* 1.26. Brown (49–50) comments that the mind only hears hymns instead of beholding the glory as promised at 14.26–28 (as if taking ⲡⲣⲟⲥⲉⲭⲉ at 14.26 as equivalent to προσέχειν τὸν νοῦν). But the anthropology of the *Ap. Jas.* is inconsistent. Why is "soul" not mentioned here, for example, or "heart" and "mind" at 11.37–12.9?

15.21 *majesties* (ⲯⲉⲛⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲛⲁϭ): The use of this term in the plural is to be distinguished from its use in the singular at 15.25–26. For the plural as a Valentinian term denoting "aeons," "angels," or "spirituals," see *ed. pr.*, 84.

15.22–23 *we too rejoiced*: The visionary joins in the heavenly praises at *Asc. Isa.* 9.28–33, *Disc. 8–9* 60.1–10, and *Zost.* 129.2–12.

15.25 ⲁⲣⲉⲧϥ̄: The gender of the pronoun here agrees *ad sensum* with ⲧⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲛⲁϭ, which is a designation for God.

15.25-26   *Majesty*: The term is used in the singular for God at *Gos. Truth* 42.13-14; *Ap. John* CG II,*I*:4.1-2; *Dial. Sav.* 135.20; *Paraph. Shem.* 1.6; *Treat. Seth.* 50.10; Epiphanius, *Pan.* 31.5.4; *Man. Keph.* 35.17; *et al. Ed. pr.* suggest a Jewish origin for the term, but it is at least partially rooted in secular Greek usage. See LSJ 1089a. With the entire scene contrast *Asc. Isa.* 9.37, "And I beheld the great glory, for the eyes of my spirit were open, and I was not thereafter able to see," where the visionary actually beholds the "great glory" with his spirit before being blinded. Brown (50) suggests that 15.26-28 contradicts the promise which has been made at 14.26-27, but the latter passage does not specifically promise the Beatific Vision.

15.28-29   *the other disciples called us*: After the revelation is over the visionaries are reunited with the other disciples as at *Ap. John* CG II,*I*:32.4-5.

15.30   *What did you hear*: With the question of the disciples here, cf. *Gos. Thom.* 13.

15.36   *pledge* (ⲇⲉⲝⲓⲁ): The context suggests that the term used here means "pledge," rather than "greeting," as in some Gnostic literature. Brown (51) suspects editorial work here, since the giving of the right hand is not specified in what precedes. However, 14.14-19 might fairly be termed a "pledge."

16.5   *about those to be born*: Does this refer to the rise of the Gnostics? Cf. the introduction.

16.6   *to give them offense*: Literally, "cast them into offense."

16.7-8   *each one to another place*: Contrast Acts 1:12, where all the disciples return to Jerusalem.

16.11   *who will be made manifest*: By being informed through knowledge, the "beloved" are revealed as what they really are. This motif is common in Valentinian and Valentinian influenced literature. Cf. Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.8.5; *Exc. Theod.* 41.2-3; Origen, *In Joh.* 2.21 (Heracleon); *Gos. Truth* 20.6-9, 37.38-38.6, 43.9-11; *Treat. Res.* 45.9-11,28-31; *et al.* But the term is also used in non-Valentinian Gnostic

works, e.g., *Soph. Jes. Chr.* CG III,4:96.14–97.17; *Great Pow.* 36.7–10.

16.23–26 *For because of what I have said, etc.*: The Greek would have read, ἀνθ᾽ ὧν γὰρ προείρηκα, τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν οὐκ ἀπεκάλυψεν ἡμῖν ὁ σωτήρ δι᾽ αὐτούς. "To us" would mean "to all of us, his twelve disciples," as at 1.23–25. The point is that the revelation was not given to the Twelve, and hence to the church, but was given to James and Peter only, and preserved for the Gnostics to come.

Ed. pr. (Fr.) take ⲀⲂⲀⲖ ⲚⲚ in line 23 as representing ἐκτός, παρά, or the like, and render, "En effet, excepté ce que j'ai dit, le Sauveur ne nous a pas fait de révélation à ce sujet." *Ed. pr.* (Ger.) appear to take ⲀⲂⲀⲖ ⲚⲚ as representing an objective genitive dependent on ἀποκάλυψιν, and render, "Denn von den (Dingen), die ich sagte, hat der Erlöser die Apokalypse uns nicht geöffenbart wegen jener." Schenke and Kirchner give similar translations, but take them to mean that, for the sake of the Gnostics, James and Peter have not been allowed to understand the revelation fully. But ⲀⲂⲀⲖ ⲚⲚ representing the objective genitive is difficult, and, in the light of 1.23–25, it is doubtful whether the author would have had James say that he did not understand the revelation.

16.25 *the revelation*: Colpe (127) takes this as "a larger, not fully revealed" revelation. But it might simply refer to the "secret book which was revealed to me and Peter by the Lord," 1.10–12. Colpe's interpretation, if adopted, would tend to support the view that *Ap. Jas.* has been excerpted from a larger work and turned into a letter.

16.26 *We do, indeed, proclaim, etc.*: Even though the revelation was not made to the whole twelve (i.e., to the Church), we do make the proclamation of a portion with those for whose benefit the proclamation was made (i.e., the Gnostics).

THE GOSPEL OF TRUTH

1,3:16.31–43.24

Harold W. Attridge and George W. MacRae, S. J.

Introduction (16.31-17.4)

An elaborately constructed paragraph introduces the major characters to be discussed throughout the text and enunciates some of the major themes which will be subsequently explored. The style of the introductory paragraph is, as Standaert (*NTS* 22 [1975/76] 246–52) notes, typical of such rhetorically sophisticated products of early Christianity as Rom 1:1–7 and Heb 1:1–4.

16.31 *Gospel of truth:* The incipit may have served as a title for the work. For discussion of this issue, see the introduction. The term "gospel" here, in any case, is not a technical term for a literary genre. Rather, it refers to the contents of the work, the proclamation of the revealer's message. Cf. the similar usage at Rom 1:16 and Eph 1:13.
  joy: The motif appears frequently in the *Odes of Solomon,* as Schenke (*Herkunft,* 33) notes. Cf. *Od. Sol.* 6:14, 7:2,17; 15:1; 23:1; 31:3,6; 32:1. However, as Ménard (*L'Évangile,* 72) notes, it is common in Valentinian texts as well. Cf. *Exc. Theod.* 65.1–2 and *Tri. Trac.* 88.15–20.

16.32–33 *received...the grace:* That revelation is a gracious gift of God is a common affirmation in religious texts of the period. Cf., e.g., *CH* 1.21–22. For other examples, see Lafrance, *SMR* 5 (1962) 62. Note in particular John 1:1 and, for Valentinian examples, *Tri. Trac.* 51.5 and Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.1.1.

16.33 *Father of Truth:* The term appears at *Od. Sol.* 41:9, but, as Ménard (*L'Évangile,* 73) notes, it is quite common in Valentinian sources. Cf. Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.15.2; Heracleon, fr. 2 (Origen, *In Joh.* 16.97); and Epiphanius, *Pan.* 31.5.5.
  knowing him: This enunciates the theme of the work. Grobel (*Gospel,* 35) suggests that the pronominal object may refer to the

Gospel rather than to the Father. The similar remark opening the
Tri. Trac. suggests that the object here is personal. Cf. *Tri. Trac.*
51.5–8.

16.34   *through the power* (ϨΝ ΤϬΑΜ): Nagel (*OLZ* 61 [1966] 9)
suggests that the phrase used here, with the instrumental ἐν, reflects a
Syriac source. The usage of the preposition ἐν in an instrumental
sense is common in koine Greek, as Böhlig (*Muséon* 79 [1966] 328)
notes, and there is no need to posit a Semitic original. In the NT, cf.
Luke 4:14.
   the Word: Here, as frequently, the language is ambiguous, since the
term can be used to refer to both the message of revelation and the
revealer himself. This use of "the Word" for the revealer, familiar
from John 1:1, was common in Christological discussions of the
second century. In some Valentinian systems the Word is a
component of the Ogdoad or complex primary Godhead. Cf.
Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.1.1, 1.8.5. In other contexts the term can be used for
the figure like Sophia who initiates emanation of the extra-pleromatic
world. Cf. Heracleon, fr. 1 (Origen, *In Joh.* 2.14), and *Tri. Trac.*
75.22 and frequently. Use of the term for the revealer or Savior is
unusual in Valentinian contexts.

16.35   *Pleroma:* Cf. Col 1:19, Eph 3:19. In Valentinian sources, e.g.,
Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.1.1, *Exc. Theod.* 21.1, this is usually a technical
term for the spiritual or divine world. Here it occasionally seems to be
used in a similar sense. Cf. 41.1, 43.15. It can also be used of the
"fullness" which the revealing Gnosis brings (34.30, 36; 35.8, 35.29,
35–36). Reception of this revelation then makes a being a "pleroma"
(36.10, 41.16) or returns one to his "pleroma" or resting place (41.14).
The same multiplicity of references which characterizes this term is
also encountered in other key terms in the text, which regularly refer
both to cosmic and personal or psychological spheres. On the Gnostic
use of the term pleroma, cf. most recently, V. MacDermott, "The
Concept of Pleroma in Gnosticism," *Gnosis and Gnosticism* (NHS 17;
Leiden: Brill, 1981) 76–81.

16.35   *who is in the thought and mind of the Father:* In some
Valentinian systems Thought (*Ennoia*) and Mind (*Nous*) are
hypostases in the Ogdoad or pleroma. Cf. Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.1.1. Here,
as in the *Tri. Trac.* (e.g. 60.3), these terms refer rather to attributes of

the Father. The antecedent of the pronoun here is probably the Word, as *ed. pr.* (Eng.), Grobel (*Gospel,* 35) and Ménard (*L'Évangile,* 43) maintain, and not the pleroma, as *ed. pr.* (Ger.) suggests. The Word, like all beings which emanate from the Father, has initial, potential existence in the mind of the Father. Cf. 18.34–35, 19.36, 37.7–14, and *Tri. Trac.* 60.1–5.

16.38–39 *Savior – redemption:* The text plays on ϲⲱⲧⲏⲣ and ϲⲱⲧⲉ, which probably reflects a play in Greek of σωτήρ and σωτηρία, as various commentators maintain. Cf. Böhlig, *Muséon* 79 (1966) 329. It is thus unnecessary to posit with Nagel (*OLZ* 61 [1966] 10) a Syriac play on *pārōqā – purqānā.* Bellet (*CBQ* 40 [1978] 49–52) maintains that the paronomasia is in Coptic between ϲⲱⲧⲏⲣ and ⲣ̄ ϲⲱⲧⲉ since ϲⲱⲧⲉ regularly translates not σωτηρία but λυτρόν as in 1 Tim 2:6. For further examples of the Coptic pun, noted by Bellet, cf. Besa, *Letters and Sermons* (ed. K. H. Kuhn; CSCO 157; Louvain: Durbecq, 1956) 42.8 and 99.2 and Shenoute, *Vita et opera omnia IV.* (ed. J. Leipoldt; CSCO 73; Paris: Gabalda, 1913) 34.6. Bellet's

suggestion is ingenious, but unconvincing, since ⲣ̄ ϲⲱⲧⲉ does not, in fact, appear in the text.

16.38 *the work* (ϩⲱⲃ): Bellet (*CBQ* 40 [1978] 49–52) suggests that the word is an orthographic variant of ϩⲱⲡ ("secret"), but the text makes quite good sense without presupposing such an odd orthography. For a similar problem, cf. 39.21.

17.1 *ignorant:* The condition of deficiency which the revelatory Word is to eliminate is mentioned here. Ignorance is the source of passion (17.10), and it characterizes both the aeons which emanate from the Father (18.35, 19.8–10, 27.21–22) and anyone not "called" by the revealing Word (21.30–31). The analysis of the human condition as one of ignorance of the transcendent Godhead and of the relation of the self to that Godhead is a common one in the religious literature of the first centuries of the common era, as Ménard (*Rev. Sci. Rel.* 45 [1971] 146–61) and Lafrance (*SMR* 5 [1962] 57–82) note. Cf. e.g., Acts 17:23–30, 1 Cor 15:34, 1 Pet 1:14; *CH* 1.27, 11.21; Plotinus, *Enn.* 5.1.1; Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.21.4; and *Tri. Trac.* 60.9 and 60.21.

17.1–2 *name of the gospel:* The phrase appears at *Tri. Trac.* 127.35, applied to the Trinity.

17.2   *proclamation*: The translation presupposes that the underlying Greek contained a play on εὐαγγελία, "gospel" and ἀναγγελία, "proclamation," which may be rendered in Coptic by ογωΝϨ ⲁⲃⲁⲗ. Cf. Crum 486b. Nagel (*OLZ* 61 [1966] 10) finds here evidence of a Syriac original, arguing that the play is on "gospel" and "hope" (*sebartā-sabrā*) in Syriac. This is unlikely on other grounds, as Böhlig (*Muséon* 79 [1966] 330) argues, and is clearly unwarranted if ἀναγγελία lies behind ογωΝϨ ⲁⲃⲁⲗ.

17.3   *hope*: There may be an allusion here to Col 1:5–9. Note especially 1:5: διὰ τὴν ἐλπίδα τὴν ἀποκειμένην ὑμῖν ἐν οὐρανοῖς ἣν προηκούσατε ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τῆς ἀληθείας τοῦ εὐαγγελίου. Grobel (*Gospel*, 36–39) also suggests a possible allusion to Rom 8:24 and Tit 2:13. Cf. also Heb 10:23.

17.3–4   *discovery for those who search*: There may be here an allusion to a widespread saying, based perhaps on Prov 8:17, attributed to Jesus. Cf. Matt 7:7, Luke 11:9–13, and *Gos. Thom.* 3, 94; *Dial. Sav.* 129.14–16. Cf. Koester, *Rediscovery*, 1.238–244. For the aeonic search for the Father, cf. Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.2.1 and *Tri. Trac.* 61.24–28, 65.14–31, 71.9–10. In the *Gos. Truth* searching for the Father is not confined to the aeons, but is a general characteristic of all beings dependent on him.

I. *The Rule of Error* (17.4–18.11)

The first segment of the text discusses in an allusive way the origin of the world and, by implication, the human condition generally. The exposition of the workings of Error (*Planē*) proceeds with two interruptions (17.21–29, 17.36–18.11), which are concerned to clarify the implications for theodicy which might be drawn from the story of Error.

17.5   *the totality*: The singular collective noun in this passage is used with plural verbs. This *constructio ad sensum* is common in Coptic, as Till (*Or.* 27 [1958] 271) notes. Cf. the use in Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.2.6 and the *Tri. Trac.* (52.4 and frequently) of the plural, "the totalities."

The precise referent of the term here is unclear. It may, as in other Valentinian texts (e.g., Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.14.1, *Exc. Theod.* 30.2), refer to the totality of spiritual beings which emanate from the Father, as suggested by Haardt (*WZKM* 58 [1962] 25) and many other

commentators. It is significant, however, that the term in this text is not confined to such a precisely limited group and it could be taken to refer to the totality of all creatures, as Grobel (*Gospel*, 39) maintains. Similarly, it is difficult to see it referring exclusively or primarily to a part of any human being, as Ludin Jansen (*Ac. Or.* 31 [1968] 115–118) suggests. Like other key terms in the text, "the totality" certainly includes a reference to human beings, but this is not its only reference.

17.6–7 *the totality was inside of him*: Cf. 16.35. That the totality has its origin within the Father is frequently affirmed in this text (19.8, 21.9, 27.21, 22.28), and is a principle found elsewhere in Valentinian sources. Cf. Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.2.6 and *Tri. Trac.* 60.1–5, 18.

17.7–8 *the incomprehensible, inconceivable one*: These epithets for the Father are repeated at 17.22 and 18.33. The incomprehensibility of the first principle is commonly affirmed in religious texts of the first Christian centuries. For Valentinian sources, cf. Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.2.1, 1.2.2, 1.2.5, 1.15.5 and *Tri. Trac.* 54.12–23, 40–41.

17.9–10 *ignorance* (ⲉϯⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲧⲥ{ⲛ̄}ⲟⲩⲱⲛ): The initial ⲉ is taken as a circumstantial converter by Grobel (*Gospel*, 40) and as a sentence introductory particle by Till (*Or.* 27 [1958] 271). It is simplest to construe it as a preposition ("about," Crum 50b), marking the preposed subject of ⲁⲥϥ̄ ⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩϣⲡ̄.

17.10–11 *anguish and terror*: In Valentinian sources generally emotions, which are viewed negatively, arise from ignorance. Cf. Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.2.3 on the experience of Sophia and the parallel in the *Tri. Trac.* 77.23, on the experience of the Logos.

17.12 *fog*: Cf. 17.30–31.

17.14–15 *error*: Error is a key figure in the *Gos. Truth*, and the use of the term has been frequently discussed. Cf. Ménard, *SMR* 7 (1964) 3–36; Haardt, *WZKM* 58 (1962) 24–38; Grobel, *Gospel*, 43; Jonas, *Gnomon* 32 (1960) 329–33; Finnestad, *Temenos* 7 (1971) 38–49; Colpe, *JAC* 21 (1978) 140–143; and Helderman, "Isis as Plane." Imagery relating to error is common in contemporary religious texts. Cf., e.g., Eph 4:14, 1 John 1:8, 2:26; *CH* 1:19; Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.8.4.
    In the *Gos. Truth*, the term is used to refer both to a cosmic force or

power, as here, and to a characteristic of the human condition, as at
31.25, 32.35. Thus, the term has some of the same polyvalence as
Paul's ἁμαρτία, a parallel especially emphasized by Cerfaux (*NTS* 5
[1958–59] 104). When used to refer to a cosmic force or hypostasis, the
term recalls elements of the myth of the fall of Sophia. Cf. Irenaeus,
Haer. 1.2.2–**6**. It may be that there underlies the text an alternative
version of that myth of Sophia. It is also possible that the author has
carefully chosen language which would evoke that myth in those who
knew it, without explicitly identifying the major actor in the cosmic
drama of the fall. Other proposed sources for the figure of *Planē*, such
as Helderman's suggestion that she reflects the wandering Isis, are
unconvincing.

17.15 *became powerful*: Grobel (*Gospel*, 42–43) offers an alter-
native translation, "took confidence," suggesting that the underlying
Greek is the same as that translated with a similar Coptic phrase at
Job 27:14 (S), Dan 10:19 (B) and Matt 14:27 (F).

   it worked on its own matter: The status of this "matter" (ϨΥΛΗ) is
problematic. As Grobel (*Gospel*, 43) suggests, it is possibly the essence
of error itself, that which grew solid like a fog. Recall the Sophia myth
in Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.4.2, 1.5.4, where Sophia's passions become the
stuff of the material world. Various commentators have noted the
parallel in Heracleon, fr. 23 (Origen, *In Joh.* 13.20), ἐν τῇ βαθείᾳ
ὕλῃ τῆς πλανῆς. The imagery used here may be further developed in
the discussion of the "jars" (2**6**.8–27).

17.1**6** *foolishly* (ϨⲚⲚ ⲞⲨⲠⲈⲦϢⲞⲨⲈⲒⲦ): This phrase could also be
translated "in a void." There would then be an allusion to the motif
common in Gnostic sources that what is outside the pleroma of divine
being is a κένωμα or ὑστέρημα. Cf. Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.21.4, 2.4.3.
Other references to the contingent or phenomenal world which have
both cosmic and psychological references are to be found at 17.23 and
24.21–25.2.

17.17 *truth* (†ⲦⲘⲚ̄ⲦⲘⲎⲈ): The peculiar orthography here, with the
doubled article, also appears at 2**6**.28, 33, 34; 27.1 and at *Tri. Trac.*
5**6**.10, 59.3**6**, **6**5.20, 128.25. Till's emendation (*ZNW* 50 [1959] 1**6**9)
is unnecessary.

17.18 *it set about with a creation* (ⲀⲤϢⲰⲠⲈ ϨⲚⲚ ⲞⲨⲠⲖⲀⲤⲘⲀ):

The phrase is difficult. ϣⲱⲡⲉ is no doubt to be construed with ⲉⲥⲥⲁⲃⲧⲉ as a complementary circumstantial (so Haardt, *WZKM* 58 [1962] 28), and Till's suggestion (*ZNW* 50 [1959] 169) that ϣⲱⲡⲉ ϩⲛ̄ⲛ is equivalent to ϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲛ̄- is unlikely. Cf. Arai, *Christologie*, 55, n.9. The term ⲡⲗⲁⲥⲙⲁ creates the most difficulties. Elsewhere in the text it regularly means "creature, creation, form," its most normal meaning in Greek. Cf. LSJ 1412a. Our translation assumes this meaning for a Greek ἐν πλάσματι. It might also be possible to take the term pejoratively. Note that the term πλάσμα can mean "fiction, pretense, delusion." Hence, it might be possible to translate the phrase adverbially, parallel to ϩⲛ̄ⲛ ⲟⲩⲡⲉⲧϣⲟⲩⲉⲓⲧ as "in a deluded way," *vel sim.* If we take the passage in the sense initially proposed, there might be an allusion to Plato, *Tim.* 37C–38C, as Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 82) suggests. Cf. also *Ap. John* BG 48.17. *Ed. pr.* (51) also note a parallel phrase (ἐν πλάσει) in a fragment of Valentinus in Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 4.13.90,1, although here πλάσις refers primarily to Valentinus' metaphor of a picture, the meaning of which is supplied by its title or label. Cf. also Philo, *Op. mun.* 48.

17.23   *nothing*: Cf. 28.22–24.

17.24   *oblivion* (ⲃϣⲉ): This probably translates Greek λήθη, a characteristic of the human condition according to Plato, *Rep.* 621A–B and Plutarch, *De sera numinis vindicta* 27, although here there is no suggestion that what one is oblivious or forgetful of is some prior experience, as Haardt (*WZKM* 58 [1962] 29) and Arai (*Christologie*, 50) correctly note. Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 83) suggests that the roots of the imagery here may be found more specifically in Philonic texts which speak of μέθη or "drunkenness." Cf. *Somn.* 2.101, *Plant.* 177, *Ebr.* 154. For similar imagery in Gnostic sources, cf. *Ap. John* BG 64.2–4; CG III,*1*:26.23, 32.13.

17.26   *immutable*: Cf. 36.13. The stability of the Father and of the pleromatic world is a common Gnostic motif, probably derived from the Platonic tradition. For a discussion of that tradition, cf. M. Williams, "The Nature and Origin of the Gnostic Concept of Stability" (Diss. Harvard, 1977). For Valentinian parallels, noted by Ménard (*L'Évangile,* 83), cf. Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.2.2, 1.2.4, 1.2.6, 1.21.3.

17.27 *imperturbable*: The language recalls Plato, *Tim.* 47C, as Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 84) notes.

perfect in beauty (ογατ<τ>cαειαc): Literally, "unembellishable." Cf. Grobel, *Gospel*, 46.

17.30 *root*: This metaphor for the relationship of dependent beings to God is common in religious texts of late antiquity, as noted by Lafrance (*SMR* 5 [1962] 69, n. 86). Note especially Oppian, *Halieutica* I. 409: Ζεῦ πάτερ, εἰς δὲ σὲ πάντα καὶ ἐκ σέθεν ἐρρίζωνται cited by Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 84). In the *Gos. Truth*, see further 28.17, 41.17, and 42.33. Note the similar imagery in the *Tri. Trac.* 51.3, 15–19; 74.11–13.

17.34–35 *entice those of the middle*: In Valentinian texts, "those of the midst" are psychics. Cf. Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.5.4, 1.6.1, 1.8.3, and Ptolemy's *Letter to Flora* 7.8. A description of how such beings are "drawn into a material union" appears at *Tri. Trac.* 98.30. It is unclear, however, whether the term has such a specific, technical sense here, as Grobel (*Gospel*, 47) and Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 84) maintain. Haardt (*WZKM* 58 [1962] 30), following Schenke (*Herkunft*, 17), suggests that the beings in view are any emanations of the Father who are not implicated in matter. The terms ΤΜΕϹΟϹ and ΤΜΗΤΕ are used in the *Pistis Sophia* to refer to the realm ruled by the Demiurge and his archons (e.g., *PS* 7 [p.12.22] and frequently). Cf. also *Od. Sol.* 22:2, noted by Schenke (*Herkunft*, 34). Once again, as in the case of "Error," Valentinian myth and technical terminology may be presupposed, but the term is not used in an unambiguous way.

17.35 *capture them*: Αἰχμαλωτίζειν is a common Valentinian term, appearing at Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.3.6, as Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 85) notes. Cf. also *Tri. Trac.* 117.24. Cerfaux (*NTS* 5 [1958–59] 106) suggests that there may be an allusion to Rom 7:23.

17.37–18.1 The suggestion for filling the lacuna offered by Dubois (*VC* 29 [1975] 140) is attractive but uncertain. He restores ΝΝΟΥ[ΛΕΙΝ] ΕΝ, "it is not a light."

18.1 *from the Father* (ϨΑΤΜ ΠΙϢΤ): The precise sense of the preposition is obscure. As Grobel (*Gospel*, 49) notes, it would mean literally "under the hand of," hence "under the control of" or "at the instigation of."

18.1–3   *oblivion did not come…from the Father*: A similar dialectic is found in the *Tri. Trac.* 62.12–13, 71.7–18, 121.7–8. Ignorance is not produced by a direct act of the Father, but arises indirectly, because he witholds his essence from dependent beings. Cf. 18.35–36. That witholding is simply a function of the Father's transcendence. Cf., with Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 86), Irenaeus, *Haer.* 2.17.10: *magnitudinem enim et virtutem Patris causas ignorantiae dicitis. Ed. pr.* (71) and Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 85) see here an interpretation of John 1:1–4, but connections with that text are weak.

18.4–11   *what comes into existence in him, etc.*: Cf. 24.28–32. The text here articulates the fundamental soteriological principle of Gnosticism generally, and of Valentinianism in particular, as Jonas (*Gnomon* 32 [1960] 330) argues. As several commentators (e.g., Ménard, *L'Évangile*, 86) have noted, the phrasing is similar to the formula attributed to the Marcosians in Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.21.4: ὑπ' ἀγνοίας γὰρ ὑστερήματος καὶ πάθους γεγονότων διὰ γνώσεως καταλύεσθαι πᾶσαν τὴν ἐκ τῆς ἀγνοίας σύστασιν, ὥστ' εἶναι τὴν γνῶσιν ἀπολύτρωσιν τοῦ ἔνδον ἀνθρώπου.

18.4   *knowledge*: Knowledge of various sorts was important for various religious groups of late antiquity, and the topic has been frequently discussed by commentators on the *Gos. Truth.* Cf. Cramer, *An. Bib.* 12.3 (1959) 48–56; Lafrance, *SMR* 5 (1962) 57–82; Ménard, *Rev. Sci. Rel.* 41 (1967) 1–28; Colpe, *JAC* 21 (1978) 125–46. In the *Gos. Truth* knowledge is at once objective and subjective. By learning about the transcendent Father (18.7) the recipient of revelation also learns about his or her "root" (28.16–18), the source and goal of his or her own existence (21.14–15, 22.13–15). Both elements of this complex are essential for Christian Gnosticism, and it is a mistake to reduced the doctrine of this text to a simple process of self-discovery.

18.7   *the Father might be known*: The phrase is reminiscent of such Johannine texts as John 16:3, 17:3, as *ed. pr.* (51) and Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 86) note, but there is no explicit reference to such texts. Cf. also *Od. Sol.* 7:12, 12:10, noted by Schenke (*Herkunft*, 34).

II. *The Coming of the Revealer* (18.11–19.27)

The second major segment of the text enunciates the author's soteriology. The condition of oblivion produced by Error, described in the previous section (17.4–18.11) is removed through the Gospel, the

hidden mystery, which Jesus Christ revealed on the cross. After an
elaborate introduction (18.11–21), discussion of the revealer's activity
proceeds in two stages. First the image of the fruit is developed
(18.21–31), then the picture of Jesus as teacher is presented (19.10–
17). Between these passages comes another section which continues
the concerns of the earlier section on theodicy (17.21–29, 17.36–
18.11).

18.11–17   *through this...he enlightened those in darkness*: The
sentence is a florid piece of rhetoric which has occasioned
commentators a good deal of difficulty. The syntax is, however,
comprehensible, though complex. The main predication is ⲁ�q̄ⲣ̄
ⲟⲩⲁⲉⲓⲛ. The subject pronoun could refer to the Father, but that is
unlikely, since the following paragraph assumes that Jesus is the
revealer. Hence the subject of ⲁ�q̄ⲣ̄ ⲟⲩⲁⲉⲓⲛ is preposed in ⲓⲏ̄ⲥ̄ ⲡⲉⲭⲣ̄ⲥ̄
ⲡⲉⲉⲓ. The means by which Jesus enlightens those in darkness is the
Gospel. Thus, ⲡⲉⲉⲓ ⲡⲉⲩⲁⲅⲅⲉⲗⲓⲟⲛ (18.11–12) is the preposed
antecedent of the pronominal suffix in ⲁⲃⲁⲗ ϩⲓⲧⲟⲟⲧⳓ̄ (18.16). For
another instance of such complex topicalization, cf. 34.10–12. Another
ambiguous element in the sentence is ⲡⲓⲙⲩⲥⲧⲏⲣⲓⲟⲛ ⲉⲑⲏⲡ, which
could be in apposition with either "Gospel," or, as assumed here, with
"Jesus Christ." This is basically the analysis of the syntax suggested
by Till (*Or.* 27 [1958] 272). For the prepositioning of several nominal
elements, cf. Till, *Koptische Grammatik*, #385. Another possibility is
suggested by Grobel (*Gospel*, 51) who takes "Jesus Christ" to be in
apposition to "the hidden mystery," which is, in turn, construed as the
object of ⲟⲩⲁⲛϩⳓ̄ (18.13). This construal would be more likely if
ⲡⲓⲙⲩⲥⲧⲏⲣⲓⲟⲛ were marked as an object. Another alternative
construal would be to take ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⳓⲟⲩⲁⲛϩⳓ̄ not as a perf. rel. but as
perf. II. The sentence would then be translated: "As for the Gospel,
the hidden mystery, it was through the mercies of the Father that it
was revealed." The pronoun in ϩⲓⲧⲟⲟⲧⳓ̄ could have the same
referent as in the first option. Alternatively, "hidden mystery" could
be the subject of ⲁⳓ̄ⲣ̄ ⲟⲩⲁⲉⲓⲛ and ϩⲓⲧⲟⲟⲧⳓ̄ could refer to "Jesus
Christ." Cf. Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 45).

   A further problem is presented by the referent of the pronominal
subject in ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⳓⲟⲩⲁⲛϩⳓ̄. See the next note.

18.13   *which <was> revealed* (ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⳓⲟⲩⲁⲛϩⳓ̄): The subject in the
MS is singular. Without emendation, it might refer to "what they are
seeking," as Grobel (*Gospel*, 49) suggests, but this hardly yields a

satisfactory sense. The pronoun might also refer to "Jesus Christ." *Ed. pr.* understand the clause in this way, and implicitly emend to <M̄>ΠΙΜΥϹΤΗΡΙΟΝ ΕΘΗΠ Ñ6ι ΙΗ͞C ΠΕΧΡC. Till (*Or.* 27 [1958] 272) offers a simpler emendation of the pronominal subject from singular to plural, thus making the verb passive, and that suggestion has been followed here.

18.13–14   *those who are perfect*: Cf. 19.4. The term "perfect" is common in Valentinian texts as a reference to spiritual human beings. Cf. Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.8.3, 1.8.4, 3.2.1, 3.3.1, 3.12.7, cited by Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 87). The reception of the revelation is later said to perfect its recipients (21.8–18), so the term may be somewhat misleading here. It refers to the results of the soteriological process, not to its precondition.

18.14   *mercies* (ΝΙΜÑΤⲱ̄ⲁΝ̄Ϩ̄ⲧ̄Ηϥ): The plural noun here, as well as ΝΙΜΕϨⲦ at 24.15, is taken by Nagel (*OLZ* 61 [1966] 8) as evidence of a Syriac original, but it can readily be seen as a translation of τὰ σπλάγχνα, as Böhlig (*Muséon* 79 [1966] 319) argues. Cf. Luke 1:78.

18.15   *hidden mystery*: The language here is strongly reminiscent of Eph 3:3–4:9, 6:19, Col 1:26, 2:2, as Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 4, 87) notes, and of *Act. Thom.* 47, cited by *ed. pr.* (51). As Grobel (*Gospel*, 51) notes, Valentinus is reported to have used Col 1:26 according to Hippolytus, *Ref.* 6.35.1.

18.16   *Jesus, the Christ*: The title "Christ" appears only here and at 36.14 in the *Gos. Truth*. On Valentinian speculation on the significance of the title, cf. *Treat. Res.* 43.26–27 and *Tri. Trac.* 87.9.

18.17   *enlightened those in darkness*: "Enlightenment" is a common metaphor in Hellenistic religious texts, as it is in early Christianity and Gnosticism. Cf. 1 Cor 4:5; 2 Tim 1:1; John 1:5, 8:12; Heb 6:4; *CH* 1.17, 10.6; *Treat. Res.* 49.2–4; Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.8.5 and 2.12.3. In this text, cf. 24.37, 36.11–12.

18.18   *from oblivion*: This phrase could also be construed with what follows, "From oblivion he enlightened them."

18.18–21   *he showed (them) a way*: Although Grobel (*Gospel*, 51) suggests that the antecedent of the pronominal subject is "the Gospel,"

it is more likely Jesus, the revealer who is in view throughout the passage. He is later said to be a guide (19.17) and to be himself the way (31.28–29). The image of the way is, of course, widespread in Judaism and in early Christianity (e.g., Philo, *Post. Cain.* 31; *Immut.* 143; Mark 12:14, Acts 9:2 and John 14:6, *Od. Sol.* 7:2,13; 11:3; and frequently.), as well as in Gnosticism. Cf. *CH* 6.5, 10.15, 11.21, Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.13.6, 1.21.5 and the Naassene hymn in Hippolytus, *Ref.* 5.10.2 and *Tri. Trac.* 71.21, 123.31.

The term way (ΜΑΕΙΤ) is problematic in some passages of the *Gos. Truth.* In the sense of "way, path" it appears also at 19.17, 31, 29. In the sense of "space" it appears at 20.21, *q.v.*

18.23–24 *was distressed at him (and) was brought to naught*: Ed. *pr.* and Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 88) take these verbs as transitive. Grobel (*Gospel*, 51) correctly construes them as intransitive. The destruction of Error is described in abstract terms at 18.10–11, and 24.28–32. The same process is described with concrete imagery at 25.19–26.27. For possible NT precedents, cf. Heb 2:14, 1 Cor 15:55, 2 Tim 1:10; 1 John 3:8. Cf. also *Od. Sol.* 7:21, noted by Schenke (*Herkunft*, 34).

18.24 *nailed to a tree*: For the expression, cf. Acts 10:38, and the Marcosians mentioned in Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.14.6, noted by Robison (*JR* 43 [1962] 241). That archontic powers are responsible for the crucifixion is suggested by 1 Cor 2:8, noted by Grobel (*Gospel*, 53) and Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 88), and is a frequent theme in Gnosticism. Cf. Haardt (*WZKM* 58 [1962] 33), who cites Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.30.13.

Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 88–89) argues that the crucifixion is here understood symbolically, as enslavement of the spiritual self of the Gnostic to the world of matter. This anthropological symbolism, though attested elsewhere, does not seem to be present here. Rather, the crucifixion is an event which involves Jesus and which here and elsewhere (20.27) will be interpreted, in very Johannine terms, as a revelatory act.

18.24–25 *he became a fruit of knowledge*: The image of the Savior as a fruit of the pleroma is common in Valentinian texts. Cf., e.g., Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.2.6 and *Tri. Trac.* 86.25. Here the imagery is not used, as in those contexts, of the primordial generation of the Savior. It refers, rather, to his soteriological function. The imagery recalls the

sapiential imagery used in Philo, *Somn.* 1.57–58, as noted by Lafrance (*SMR* 5 [1962] 71). It may be that allusion is also made to Gen 3:3. In any case, we here find the beginning of the author's interpretation of the crucifixion as a revelatory act. Fecht (*Or.* 31 [1962] 103, 32 [1963] 319) and Ménard (*Rev. Sci. Rel.* 44 [1970] 130) suggest that the text moves from a more orthodox, historical interpretation of the cross to a more Gnostic, spiritual interpretation (20.6–25.35). However, the text holds both poles in tension. It does not, in a docetic fashion, deny the reality of Christ's suffering and death, nor is it unaware of the deeper, "spiritual" significance of the crucifixion event. Rather, it probes the significance of the historical event, as does the Gospel of John.

18.26   *It did not, however, cause destruction*: The verb, ⲧⲉⲕⲟ should be understood as transitive, as suggested by *ed. pr.*, Grobel (*Gospel*, 53), Schenke (*Herkunft*, 35) and Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 89). An intransitive rendering is preferred by Till (*Or.* 27 [1958] 272), and Fecht (*Or.* 31 [1962] 102). If the verb is transitive, the allusion to Gen 3:3, suspected at 18.25, may be continued. The fruit of the Garden of Eden was destructive, while the fruit of the tree of Calvary was not.

18.26–27   *although it was eaten* (ⲝⲉ ⲁϩⲟⲩⲁⲙϥ): The verb form involves a common crasis of the third person pronoun and the initial ⲟⲩ of the infinitive. There is possibly a sacramental allusion here, as Segelberg (*Or. Suec.* 8 [1959] 7) suggests, although more general metaphorical language may be involved, as in John 6:30–46.

18.29–30   *and he*: Grobel (*Gospel*, 53) takes ⲛ̄ⲧⲁϥ not as the independent personal pronoun but as the preposition (=ⲛ̄ⲧⲉϥ) and translates "his finding." He then construes the following ⲛ̄ϫⲉ as ϫⲉ. The latter particle is more likely an orthographic variant of ⲇⲉ, a common orthographic variant in Codex I. For ⲛ̄ⲧⲁϥ ⲇⲉ cf. 19.23–24.

18.29–31   *he discovered them in himself and they...him*: Cf. 21.11–25, 42.27–28. The effect of the revelatory act of Jesus on the cross is to awaken in the recipients of the revelation consciousness of their relationship to the Father. In the *Tri. Trac.* the Son in the pleroma both contains (64.19) and is contained by (65.27) the aeons. The imagery is thus applicable to the transcendent, divine world, but it is also appropriate to the human world. For possible allusions to NT

texts, cf. 1 Cor 8:6, Eph 4:6, Col 1:17, noted by Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 90) and John 14:10, 17:21, noted by Grobel (*Gospel*, 199).

18.31–19.10   The paragraph forms an excursus on the Father. The story of Jesus, begun in 18.11–18.31, continues at 19.11.

18.34–35   *within him is the totality, etc.*: The repetition of the phrase at 19.7–10 forms an *inclusio* for this paragraph. For the notion that the totality or the "spaces" are within the Father, cf. 16.35, 17.6–9, 22.27–33.

18.35   *of him the totality has need*: That all beings which emanate from the Father, including members of the divine world, have need of him is a common affirmation of the *Tri. Trac*. Cf. 60.9, 21; 105.21 and 124.25–125.5. Cf. also Irenaeus, *Haer*. 2.19.8, cited by Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 91).

18.36   *he retained their perfection*: Cf. 19.4 and 21.11–25. In the *Tri. Trac*. there is a similar description of the reason for which the aeons of the pleroma search for the Father, the fact that he retains their perfection in himself by preserving his transcendent being in himself until he makes it known by a revelatory act. Cf. *Tri. Trac*. 62.12–13, 64.37–65.1.

18.38   *the Father was not jealous*: In the *Gos. Truth* we find an emphatic theodicy. The Father is not responsible for ignorance, although his transcendence is the cause of it. Cf. 17.1–3. Nor, according to this passage, is the ignorance of the totality caused by jealousy on the Father's part. For a similar reflection, cf. *Tri. Trac*. 62.20–21, 69.26–27.

18.40   *members*: The term may ultimately be derived from the Greek myth of Dionysus Zagreus, as Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 90) suggests, but the Greco-Roman background of the NT "body of Christ" image is probably more relevant. Cf., e.g., Seneca, *Ep*. 95.52; Marcus Aurelius, *Med*. 2.1, 7.13; Epictetus, *Diss*. 2.10.3 and H. Conzelmann, 1 *Corinthians* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975) 211. The term is used here to describe the intimate relationship between the Father and beings which emanate from him, a relationship frequently emphasized in Valentinian sources, such as *Tri. Trac*. 73.18–74.18, 123.11–22.

For, if (ⲉⲛⲉⲑⲉ ⲛ̄ⲣⲁⲡ): The particle ⲉⲛⲉ is normal in contrary-to-fact conditions. Cf. Till, *Koptische Grammatik*, #456. Note the apodosis with ⲛⲉⲩⲛⲁ at 19.2. The form ⲉⲛⲉⲑⲉ is unusual, although it appears again at 22.33. It is probably simply an alternative form for ⲉⲛⲉ. Cf. Till, *Or.* 27 (1958) 272. Grobel (*Gospel*, 54) takes ⲑⲉ as a noun, "for if the way of this aeon." However, ⲛ̄ⲧⲁ is never used for ⲛ̄ⲧⲉ in this text. ⲛ̄ⲧⲁ is, no doubt, the prenominal conjugation base of the perf. I.

For reasoning similar to that which appears here, cf. *Tri. Trac.* 62.14–23.

19.1 *this aeon*: Grobel (*Gospel*, 55) suggests that the term refers to "this world," as in the NT, with no technical Gnostic sense. However, in this context, which speaks about the relation of the Father and his members, there is probably an allusion to the collectivity of the aeons of the pleroma, as Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 91) suggests. Nonetheless, this may be another example of the intentional ambiguity of the language of the *Gos. Truth*.

19.1–2 *[received] their [perfection]*: For a parallel to the restoration, initially suggested by Säve-Söderbergh (*Evangelium Veritatis*, 7), cf. 18.36 and 19.4.

19.2 *could not have come [...]*: A preposition meaning "to" would be appropriate here. Hence, Säve-Söderbergh suggests the restoration ⲁϩⲣ[ⲉⲓ] ⲁ. However, the remaining traces do not fit the letters of that proposal.

19.5 *return*: Here, as in Gnostic texts generally, the soteriological process is one of return to the source of all being, which is at the same time a return to one's own true self. Cf. the description of the return of Sophia in Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.2.2, noted by Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 91). Cf. also *CH* 1.13, noted by Lafrance (*SMR* 5 [1962] 63–67), along with other Hellenistic examples of the theme. Cf. also *Tri. Trac.* 78.1–3, 123.32–33. In the *Gos. Truth* the return involves an initial appropriation of salvific Gnosis and an ultimate reintegration to unity with the Father. Cf. 21.5–11, 25.11–19, 28.9–19.

19.6–7 *perfectly unitary knowledge* (ⲟⲩⲥⲁⲩⲛⲉ ⲟⲩⲉⲉⲓ ϩⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲝⲱⲕ): Literally, "knowledge, one perfectly." Unity is an impor-

tant theme in the *Gos. Truth*. It characterizes the transcendent realm of the Father (23.15, 24.26–27), and it is the ultimate state to which all beings which have come from the Father will return (25.10–19). On the unitary nature of the Father, cf. also *Tri. Trac.* 51.8–9.

19.7   *it is he who* (Ⲛⲧⲁϥ ⲡⲉ Ⲛⲧⲁϥ-): Grobel (*Gospel*, 57) finds the expression syntactically puzzling, but it is simply a three-member nominal sentence. Cf. Till, *Koptische Grammatik*, #247.

19.10–17   *as in the case of a person ... he became a guide* (ⲘⲡⲢⲏⲧⲉ ⲁⲃⲁⲗ Ϩⲓⲧⲟⲟⲧϥ̄ ... ⲁϥϣⲱⲡⲉ Ⲛ̄ⲭⲁⲩⲙⲁⲓⲧ): The syntax here is problematic and the sentence has been variously construed. A basic problem is the prepositional phrase ⲁⲃⲁⲗ Ϩⲓⲧⲟⲟⲧϥ̄. Is it agential or is it a peculiar way of introducing a comparative sentence? The parallel in 24.32–33 suggests that the latter is the case. Some commentators, such as Till (*ZNW* 50 [1959] 170–71) and Fecht (*Or.* 32 [1963] 306), prefer to take the prepositional phrase as agential and see an ellipse "as (sent) from one who is unknown, he (*scil.* Jesus) became a guide." This leaves construal of ϣⲁϥⲟⲩⲱϣⲉ unclear. In order to resolve the difficulty Till introduces an adversative, "but he wishes, etc." Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 92) avoids the problem by taking ⲘⲡⲢⲏⲧⲉ ⲁⲃⲁⲗ Ϩⲓⲧⲟⲟⲧϥ̄ as a conjunction (=ὥσπερ ἄν). This might be a possibility for ⲘⲡⲢⲏⲧⲉ alone, but hardly for the whole phrase used here. Grobel (*Gospel*, 56) takes ⲘⲡⲢⲏⲧⲉ as if it were the predicate of an adverbial sentence, but this is unwarranted. Schenke (*Herkunft*, 35) translates in a similar way, but it remains unclear how he construes the syntax.

If we have here a comparative sentence, as we have presupposed, the sentence is compressed and elliptical because of an anacolouthon, not unlike Paul's at Rom 5:12. Fully expressed, the comparison would be: "As a person who is unknown wants to be known and loved (and thus sends an emissary to make himself known), so (the Father sent Jesus and) he became a guide, etc."

19.13   *wishes to have them know him and love him*: These verbs could also be passive. The notion that the Deity desires to be known and loved is common in the NT and other contemporary religious literature. Grobel (*Gospel*, 57) cites 1 John 4:7–8, 5:2–3; John 14:15–21; *CH* 1.31, 10.4, 15. Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 91–92) adds 1 Tim 2:4 and Heb 8:11.

19.17   *he became a guide*: As most commentators agree, the subject pronoun certainly refers to Christ and not the Father, as the following remarks make clear. On the image of the guide, cf. Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.15.2, *Exc. Theod.* 74.2, *Act. Thom.* 10, and *Act. John* 27, cited by Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 92). Cf. also Philo, *Conf. ling.* 92–98, *Immut.* 142, *Heres* 98, *CH* 1.20, 7.2 and Heb 2:10, 6:20.

19.19   *in schools*: This is possibly an allusion to Luke 2:46–49 or to a non-canonical infancy gospel. Cf. Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.20.1 or *Act. Thom.* 79, cited by *ed. pr.* (52). The image of the school is used of the aeons of the pleroma in *Tri. Trac.* 71.22–23, although there is no reference there to the activity of Jesus. The childhood of Jesus is alluded to at *Tri. Trac.* 133.27–28.

   he appeared (ⲁϥⲓ ⲁⲧⲙⲏⲧⲉ): Literally, "he came into the midst." Cf. 20.8 and 26.4. The language is possibly biblical. Cf. Luke 24.36 and John 20:19,26.

19.22   *wise in their own estimation*: Literally, "wise in their heart." Cf., with *ed. pr.* (52), Isa 5:21, Rom 1:22, 12:16, and *Act. Thom.* 79. Grobel (*Gospel*, 59) suggests that the passage, through 19.30, with its contrast of the wise and the children, is a dramatization of Matt 11:25 and Luke 10:21. Similarly Cerfaux (*NTS* 5 [1958–59] 106). On the apologetic theme of the weakness of human knowledge, cf. also 1 Cor 1:27 and *Tri. Trac.* 126.14.

19.23   *putting him to the test*: Puech and Quispel (*VC* 8 [1954] 34, n. 70) find here an allusion to Luke 2:42–52, or to the episode reflected in Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.20.1, but the language is typical of controversy stories of the public ministry. Cf. Matt 16:1, 19:3, 22:18, 35 and Mark 8:11, noted by Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 93). Cf. also Leipoldt (*TLZ* 82 [1957] 831) and Cerfaux (*NTS* 5 [1958–59] 107, n.1).

19.25   *foolish*: Literally, "vain" or "empty." Cf. 17.16.

III. *The Revelation as a Book* (19.27–24.9)

   The third segment of the text begins with a development of the image of Jesus as teacher presented in 19.10–27, but the text quickly shifts into a complex exploration of the imagery of the Book, which falls into four discrete parts. First, the image of the scroll taken by the one who was slain is presented (19.27–20.14). Then the Book is

considered as Edict and Testament (20.15–21.2). Third, the Book is described as the Book of Life (21.2–25). This is followed by reflection on the Book as a living Book (22.38–23.18). Between the third and fourth sections there are two paragraphs which consider the process of reception of the message of the Book (21.25–22.20) and the effects of that reception (22.20–37). The latter paragraph in particular anticipates the explanations of the next major segment of the text (24.9–33.22). The whole section, and the first third of the text, then closes with a hymnic reprise on the coming of the revealing Word (23.18–24.9).

19.30   *having been strengthened* (ⲉⲀⲩⲦⲰⲔ): Various commentators, such as Fecht (*Or.* 32 [1963] 323, n.1), Segelberg (*Or. Suec.* 8 [1959] 7), and Nagel (*OLZ* 61 [1966] 9) find here a sacramental allusion, either to baptism or to confirmation. Ménard (*L'Évangile,* 14) further finds a possible play on the Syriac words to confirm (*šar*) and truth (*šarīrā*). While language associated with sacramental practice may be used here, it is hardly necessary to posit a Syriac original, as both Böhlig (*Muséon* 79 [1966] 326) and Ménard (*L'Évangile,* 15) correctly argue. For Valentinian use of στηρίζειν and similar terms, cf. Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.2.2, 1.2.4, 1.2.6, 1.21.3. Cf. also *Tri. Trac.* 128.25–26. Note, too, the earlier discussion of the theme of immutability at 17.26.

19.31   *impressions* (ⲚⲓⲘⲞⲨⲚϤ Ⲛ�Ձⲟ): Literally, "forms of face." The term reappears at 23.33–24.3 and in the *Tri. Trac.* 66.14 and 86.28. It may be based on the notion that the angels contemplate the face of the Father (Matt 18:10) alluded to in the account of the Marcosians in Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.13.3 and 1.13.6, as noted by Robison (*JR* 43 [1963] 241) and Ménard (*L'Évangile,* 94).

19.32–33   *they knew, they were known*: Cf. 1 Cor 8:2–3, 13:12; Gal 4:9 and John 10:4 and 13:31.

19.33–34   *they were glorified, they glorified*: Cf. Rom 8:30. In the *Tri. Trac.* (68.4–69.14) the aeons achieve their own authentic existence by glorifying the Father. Cf. also Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.1.2, 1.14.8; Hippolytus, *Ref.* 6.29.7–8, 6.32.1; *Ap. John* BG 27.16 and Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 4.13.90,2.

19.35   *living book of the living*: Nagel (*OLZ* 61 [1966] 7) suggests that the phrase "living book" reflects an ambiguity in Syriac where *sefrā de ḥayyē* (Rev 8:17) means both "book of life" and "book of the living." However, a play in Greek is also possible and likely in view of the complex image of the book which is developed in the following pages. The sources of the imagery are certainly biblical. Cf. Ps 68:29; Phil 4:3; Rev 3:5, 5:2–9, 13:8, 20:12, 15; 21:27, noted by Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 95). Similar imagery is widespread, appearing, for instance in the *Hymn of the Pearl* (*Act. Thom.* 110), noted by Lafrance (*SMR* 5 [1962] 68, n.81) and Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 95), and in *Od. Sol.* 9:11, as noted by Schenke (*Herkunft*, 36). For a survey of materials pertinent to this theme, cf. L. Koep, *Das himmlische Buch in Antike und Urchristentum* (Bonn: Hanstein, 1952). In the *Gos. Truth* the Book is an image of what is revealed (here and at 20.3–4, 12–14). As the agent of awakening and return, what is revealed can be portrayed as itself alive (here and at 22.38–39). As the instrument of reintegration into the primordial unity, what is revealed can be depicted as the Book onto the pages of which the names of the elect are inscribed (21.4–5). The complex imagery thus illustrates the intimate association of the means and the results of revealing Gnosis.

19.37   *in the thought and the mind of the Father*: The "Book" is thus like the revealing Word itself and the totality (16.35, 17.6–9).

20.1–2   *before the foundation of the totality*: Cf. Eph 1:4.

20.3   *his incomprehensibility*: Literally, "the incomprehensibilities of him." Grobel (*Gospel*, 61) usefully compares such English expressions as "His Majesty." *Ed. pr.* (53) and Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 96) compare Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.2.5, τὸ ἀκατάληπτον τοῦ πατρός. The preposition ⲚⲦⲞⲞⲦ⸗ is used frequently throughout this text for ⲚⲦⲈ⸗ as the possessive.

20.5–6   *since it remains...to be slain*: As Till (*Or.* 27 [1958] 273) argues, the phrase ⲈⲤⲔⲎ, with the feminine pronominal subject, should be construed as impersonal, with the conjunctive ⲚⲤⲈⲘⲖ2ⲰⲖⳋ as complementary. It cannot be the case that the *book* remains for the one who is to take it, since ⳖⲰⲰⲘⲈ is masculine. The sentence clearly alludes to Rev 5:2–9. Grobel (*Gospel*, 61–62) finds the present tense of ⲈⲤⲔⲎ troublesome. It need not, however, be a

mistranslation, but may be understood as expressing a general truth.

20.6   *become manifest* (ογληζ): The form of the simple infinitive
here is unusual and it appears again at 20.23 and 23.22. In all three
cases the anomaly is resolved by the emendation of Till
(ληογληζ<ϥ>). The parallelism in structure at 23.22 suggests that
such an emendation is warranted there, but whether it is in the other
two cases is hardly certain. It would appear, rather, that the form is
an A² simple infinitive. For possible analogous formations, cf. ϲλρϻ
(31.23; 29; 32.3), ϲλμτ̄ (34.37; 35.2, 3; 42.14) and τλκϻ (33.9).

20.10   *merciful...faithful*: Cf. Heb 2:17.

20.11   *he was patient* (λϥρ ϣλρ'ϣ'2ητ): The second ρ is possibly
written over an ν. Till (*Or.* 27 [1958] 273) takes this to be the original
and correct reading, to which the supralinear ϣ is also a secondary
correction. The resultant text ρ̄ ϣλν2ητ would mean "he pitied."
    in accepting suffering: The physical reality of the passion of Jesus
is not ignored here, pace Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 96–97). Its
significance is, however, seen as revelatory, not atoning. For similar
remarks about the importance of the suffering of Jesus, cf. *Tri. Trac.*
65.12, 115.4.

20.13–14   *his death is life for many*: Cf. Mark 10:45 and 1 Tim 2:6.

20.15   *will*: Early Christian imagery (cf. Mark 14:24, 1 Cor 11:25,
Gal 3:15, Heb 9:15–17) is here, as elsewhere in the text, developed
and reinterpreted, as van Unnik (*Jung Codex*, 109) notes. Grobel
(*Gospel*, 63) suggests that the comparison is really between heirs, who
are not made known until the will is opened, and the recipients of the
revelation. The point is rather that the essence of the Father (note
ογϲιλ at 20.16, which in the image means the property of the
testator, but also connotes the "being" or "substance" of the Father) is
made known by the opening of the Book of the revelation. The content
of the revelation is, thus, the fact that "the totality" is in and part of the
Father. Cf. Ménard, (*L'Évangile*, 89).

20.15–16   *before it is opened* (εϻπλτογην): For the crasis involved
here, cf. 18.26.

20.20   *invisible*: This is a common designation of the primordial principle in religious literature of the first Christian centuries. Cf. Ménard, *L'Évangile*, 98.

something (ΟΥΕΕΙ): The Coptic probably translates not a Greek adjective μόνος, as Grobel (*Gospel*, 65) suggests, but an indefinite pronoun, as at 19:11. Cf. *Tri. Trac.* 51.28–30.

20.21–22   *every space* (ΜΑΕΙΤ ΝΙΜ): The Coptic word in S and A normally means "way" or "path." It is translated thus here by Till (*ZNW* 50 [1959] 171) and Böhlig (*Muséon* 79 [1966] 327–28). In this text it certainly has this meaning at 18.19–20 and 31.29. Note also the compound ϪΑΥΜΑΪΤ at 19.17. These passages presumably translate the Greek ὁδός. Otherwise, as here, the term seems to mean "space," probably translating the Greek τόπος or possibly διάστημα, a term which appears in Hippolytus, *Ref.* 7.24.5, as Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 99) notes. Cf. 20.35, 22.22, 26.5, 27.10, 27.25, 28.11. The term τόπος appears in Hermetic and Valentinian texts to refer to the divine realm. Cf. *CH* 2.3; Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.14.5; and *Tri. Trac.* 59.26. The use of the term ΜΑΕΙΤ at 26.15 and 27.10, where it seems to refer to sentient beings, and at 27.25 and 28.11, where the ΜΑΕΙΤ are said to be "in" the Father, probably reflects this usage. Note too that at 26.15–26 the ΜΑΕΙΤ seem to be equated with the emanations of Error. Why ΜΑΕΙΤ should have been chosen to translate τόπος is unclear. Nagel (*OLZ* 61 [1966] 9) argues for a Syriac original, since in Syriac *madrē* can mean both "place" and "way." It is just as likely that ΜΑΕΙΤ can have both senses in A, as it does in B. While in S the term regularly means "way," there is at least one attestation of its use in the sense of "space." Cf. Crum 188b. Note, however, that at 22.26 ΜΑ ΝΙΜ is corrected by an ancient scribe to ΜΑΕΙΤ ΝΙΜ. It is possible that ΜΑ was originally used to translate τόπος.

20.24   *he put on that book* (ΑϤϬΑΛΕϤ): Grobel (*Gospel*, 65), followed by Arai (*Christologie*, 101), emends to ΑϤϬΑΛΠϤ̄, "he revealed," making the image simpler and more in conformity with what was said earlier about the book. However, the new twist in the image is probably comprehensible. Note, with Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 99–100) the image of the letter in the *Hymn of the Pearl* (*Act. Thom.* 111–112) which leads the recipient to regain his royal robe. That image of the heavenly garment, reflected in such NT texts as 2 Cor 5:3, may well lie behind the *Gos. Truth* here. In the *Tri. Trac.* 66.32,

the Son is said to clothe himself with the aeons of the pleroma, and recall that the totality is the content of the testamentary "book" according to 20.18–21.

20.26–27 *he published the edict...on the cross*: There may be an allusion here to Col 2:14, although, if so, the image has been radically reinterpreted, as Grobel (*Gospel*, 67) notes. It may be that the author has conflated the images of Colossians with that of John 3:14, 12:32. In any case, what Christ does on the cross is to "take up" and publish the "living book," the revelation of the oyciʌ of the Father. As Grobel (*Gospel*, 67) notes, "edict" (διάταγμα) is a technical term for the stipulations or contents of a will. Here the overlap in the imagery of the book and the testament becomes clear.

20.28–29 *he draws himself down to death*: Cf. Phil 2:8.

20.29–30 *though life eternal clothes him*: In the NT there is frequent allusion to the eschatological clothing with immortality. Cf. 1 Cor 15:53–54, 2 Cor 5:2–3. The text here also recalls such passages as John 11:25 where Christ is said to be eternal life, as Grobel (*Gospel*, 67) notes. This imagery in the *Gos. Truth* could support a Docetic understanding of the text's Christology, although it can also be construed as "two natures" or "pneumatic" Christology. Cf. Arai, *Christologie*, 93–96, 120–24. There is certainly no support in the text for the suggestion of Grobel (*Gospel*, 67) that the whole sequence described here is understood to take place prior to the incarnation.

20.30–31 *stripped himself*: Segelberg (*Or. Suec.* 8 [1959] 7) finds in the divestiture language a baptismal allusion. Garment imagery in a baptismal context in a Valentinian text appears at *Tri. Trac.* 128.21 The imagery is certainly common in sacramental contexts, but it is hardly confined to them. Cf. 2 Cor 5:4, where the language is applied to the believer, not to Christ, in reference to eschatology.

20.35 *empty spaces*: Here мʌειτ must refer not to the aeons of the transcendent world, but to the phenomenal world. Cf. *Tri. Trac* 91.22. Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 102) suggests that χώρα not τόπος lies behind мʌειτ here.

20.36 *he passed through those who, etc.*: Till (*Or.* 27 [1958] 274)

suggests that something has dropped from the text here, but such a supposition is quite unnecessary

21.1   A few letters and letter traces remain on this line, but there is not enough to support any restoration.

21.3   *those who are to receive teaching*: This is a good example of the catchword association which occasionally links paragraphs in the text. Cf. 21.2.

21.5   *it is about themselves, etc.*: The verb ⲉⲩϪⲓ at 21.5 is construed as a pres. II., emphasizing the adverbial phrase ⲁⲣⲁⲩ ⲟⲩⲁⲉⲉⲧⲟⲩ, which might also be translated, "themselves alone." Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 103) sees here a reference to a Gnostic esotericism, which separates pneumatics and hylics, but this is not the force of the remark. The author does not here emphasize a distinction between different recipients of revelation but between the content of the revelation (self-knowledge) and other possible contents.

21.6-7   *receiving it from the Father*: The plural pronominal object (ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲩ) agrees with ⲥⲃⲱ (21.5), which may serve as a plural form. Cf. Crum 319b.

21.9   *perfection...is in the Father*: Cf. 17.6-9, 18.35, 19.9.

21.10-11   *necessary...to ascend*: Cf. 19.6. For redemption as ascent, cf. also *Tri. Trac.* 124.13.

21.11-12   *if one has knowledge*: Note how easily the text moves from discussion of "the totality" to discussion of the individual. As is common in Gnostic texts generally and particularly in Valentinian systems, the soteriological process is analogous at all levels of reality.

21.13   *his own*: Cf. John 10:3, 4 and Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.21.5. In receiving knowledge of his identity with the transcendent Father, the Gnostic at once comprehends his true self and his alienation from the world of matter. The possible allusion to John 10 is interesting in light of the discussion in the next paragraph of the significance of calling by name, a motif which appears at John 10:3. The Johannine

passage may also be in view in the later discussion of the shepherd. Cf.
31.35–32.30.

21.14–15   *he who is ignorant is in need*: Note the earlier remarks on
the need of the totality (18.35, 19.9). This formula is a classic
expression of the fundamental Gnostic soteriological principle. Cf.
Exc. Theod. 78.2.

21.18–22   *since...his own*: These lines repeat, almost exactly, 21.8–
11. The repetition reinforces the basic soteriological message about
the need for return to the ultimate source of all being. What follows
the repeated phrases in each case emphasizes, in slightly different
ways, the importance of the Father's initiative in the process. This
highlights an important feature of the *Gos. Truth* and of Christian
Gnosticism generally. Though the content of the revelation is self-
knowledge, i.e., knowledge of the relation of the self to its source, it
comes, not through self-contemplation, but through a revelatory act
which occurs at the Father's initiative.

21.23   *he enrolled them in advance*: The verb is here construed as a
perf. II, with *ed. pr.*, Grobel, Till (*ZNW* 50 [1959] 172). Schenke
(*Herkunft*, 38) takes it to be a perf. rel. This necessitates taking the
impersonal ⲀⲚⲀⲄⲔⲎ of 21.19–20 as the main predication, but the
following ⲚⲆⲈ seems to coordinate it with Ϣⲟⲟⲡ within the
ⲈⲠⲈⲓⲆⲎ clause.
    The *Gos. Truth* here and in the following paragraph uses predes-
tinarian language redolent with NT allusions to such texts as Rom
8:29; John 6:37, 17:12. It is unclear whether this belief in
predestination is identical with the position attributed to Valentinians
by the heresiologists, that human beings are "saved by nature," as is
suggested by Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 104-05). On the whole issue of
determinism in Valentinian soteriology, cf. the notes to *Tri. Trac.*
118.15. Cf. the cautions expressed by Grobel (*Gospel*, 73–77).
    prepared: Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 104) suggests Irenaeus, *Haer.*
1.5.6 and 2.19.4 for comparison.

21.24   *to give* (ⲀⲦⲈⲈⲓ): The form is problematic. We construe it as
an orthographic variant of ϯ. Till (*Or.* 27 [1958] 274) suggests
emending to ⲀⲦⲈⲈⲓ<ⲦⲞⲨ>, "to give them."

21.25–27   *those whose name he knew...were called*: The sentence

possibly alludes to various biblical texts, such as Isa 43:1, 45:3; Rom 8:29–30; John 10:3; 2 Thess 2:13, as noted by van Unnik (*Jung Codex*, 118) and Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 104). Cf. also John 20:16, a dramatic scene of which this whole paragraph may be a development. The theme of naming touched upon here becomes important in the Christological reflection of 38.7–40.23, although the connection between these two types of naming activity is not made explicit.

21.28   *so that* (ϩⲱⲥ): Our translation assumes that the conjunction is used in a consecutive sense, as do *ed. pr.*, Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 48) and Schenke (*Herkunft*, 38). Grobel *(Gospel*, 72) takes the conjunction as comparative, but that makes little sense here.

21.30–31   *for he...ignorant*: As Grobel (*Gospel*, 75) notes, this sentence stands in an antithetical, chiastic relation with the preceding sentence. The close association of the two leads us to take 21.25 as the beginning of a new section on the significance of the name, while this section is linked to the preceding by the catch-word association in ⲛⲧⲁϥⲣ̄ ϣⲣⲡ̄ ⲛ̄ⲥⲁϩⲟⲩ (21.24) - ⲛⲧⲁϥⲣ̄ ϣⲁⲣⲡ̄ ⲛ̄ⲥⲁⲩⲛⲉ (21.26).

21.32–33   *how is one to hear*: Cf. Rom. 10:14.

21.35–36   *creature of oblivion*: Cf. Hippolytus, *Ref.* 5.7.36, τὸ πλάσμα τῆς λήθης, cited by *ed. pr.* (54). Cf. 17.24–25.

21.36–37   *will vanish*: Cf. *Tri. Trac.* 79.1–4 and 119.8–16.

22.1   What Grobel (*Gospel*, 77) records as letter traces above the first line of the page are parts of the page number, ⲕⲃ, 22.

22.3   *if one has knowledge* (ⲉϥϣⲁⲥⲁⲩⲛⲉ): The form of the conditional conjugation base (without a final ⲛ) is common in A and is now well attested in A². Cf. *Gos. Truth* 24.34, 34.5 and *Tri. Trac.* 57.6, 62.4, 86.33, 108.14, 131.31, 132.16.

22.3–4   *he is from above*: Cf. John 3:31, 8:23; Epiphanius, *Pan.* 26.13.2; Irenaeus, *Haer.* 3.15.2, cited by *ed. pr.* (54).

22.5–7   *he hears, answers...ascends*: Cf. Eph 4:8–10; Rev 4:1, 11:12; and *CH* 13, cited by Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 106). Note also the

recognition scene involving Mary Magdelene at John 20:16–17.

22.9–10 *he does the will*: Cf. John 7:17 and 20:17–18. Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 106) notes the deployment of language about the divine will in such Hermetic texts as *CH* 10.2, 13.2, 4, 20, where it is seen as the divine seed which engenders the rebirth of the spiritual human being, although such symbolism is foreign to our text.

22.11 *to be pleasing to him*: Cf. Rom 8:8; 1 Thess 2:15, 4:1; 2 Cor 5:9, cited by Grobel (*Gospel*, 79) and Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 106).

22.12 *rest*: The theme of rest is a biblical image (cf. Deut 12:9; Ps 132:8, 13, 14; Isa 14:3, 66:1) which is widely attested and elaborately developed in Jewish and early Christian literature. For that development, see O. Hofius, *Katapausis: Die Vorstellung vom endzeitlichen Ruheort im Hebräerbrief* (WUNT 11; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1970). For examples of the use of the symbol, cf. Philo, *Mig. Abr.* 26–33, *Cher.* 87–90; *4 Ezra* 8:52–62; *M. Tamid* 7:4; Heb 4:1–11; and *Od Sol.* 11:12; 26:12; 30:2, 7; 35:6, noted by Schenke (*Herkunft*, 38). In Gnostic texts the symbol becomes particularly common as a reference to that final state of reintegration of the self into the divine. Cf. Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.2.6, 3.15.2; *Exc. Theod.* 65.2; Heracleon, fr. 31 (Origen, *In Joh.* 13.38), noted by Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 106-1–7, 117). Cf. also *Tri. Trac.* 58.36 and the literature cited *ad loc.* For further development of the motif in the *Gos. Truth*, cf. 23.29, 24.18, 33.36, 40.33, 42.21–22, 43.1.

   the name of each one: With most commentators we take ⲡⲟⲩⲉⲉⲓ as indefinite. Till's emendation (*Or.* 27 [1958] 275) to ⲡⲟⲩⲉⲉⲓ <ⲡⲟⲩⲉⲉⲓ> makes this clearer, but is unnecessary. Cf. Crum 469b. Schenke (*Herkunft*, 38) suggests that it refers to the Father, the "One." Although the text does speak about the Unity of the Father (e.g., 23.15), it does not refer to the Father simply as "the One." For the use of the indefinite pronoun, cf. 19.10.

22.14–15 *knows where he comes from and where he is going*: Cf. the classic Gnostic formula of *Exc. Theod.* 78.2 and Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.21.6.

22.17 *drunk*: This is another common image for the condition of ignorance in contemporary religious literature. Cf., with Ménard

(*L'Évangile*, 108), *CH* 1.27, 7.2; Philo, *Somn.* 2.101, 162, *Plant.* 177, *Ebr.* 154–55.

22.18 *returned to himself*: Cf. Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.4.5, cited by Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 108).

22.19 *set right what are his own*: The Coptic word order is unusual and probably reflects the order of the Greek original. Cf. 23.16. Segelberg (*Or. Suec.* 8 [1959] 8) sees here another allusion to a ritual act associated with baptism. Cf. also 30.11.

22.20 *He has brought back*: The text returns to a discussion of the actions of the revealer, last encountered at 20.11. Here, however, the actions described are not those of the human Jesus, but of the Son or Savior acting on a cosmic level. For the wording here cf. Acts 3:26, although, as Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 109) notes, the revealer does not produce repentence from sin, but release from ignorance.

22.21–22 *gone before them*: Cf., with *ed. pr.* (54), John 10:4.

22.22 *spaces*: Cf. 20.21–22.

22.24–25 *since it was on account of the depth, etc.*: The form ϵΝΤΑΥΧΙ is a perf. II. circ. On this relatively rare conjugation base, cf. Polotsky, "The Coptic Conjugation System," *Or.* 29 (1969) 400 (= *Collected Papers*, 246).

22.25 *depth*: Cf. 35.15, 37.8, 40.29. The term appears in some NT contexts, e.g., Rom 11:33, 1 Cor 2:10, Eph 3:18. It is common in Valentinian sources, either as an hypostasis (Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.1.1, 1.11.1, 1.21.2; Hippolytus, *Ref.* 5.6.4) or as an attribute of the Father (*Tri. Trac.* 54.20, 60.21, 64.28–37). Cf. especially Irenaeus, *Haer.* 2.17.10: *magnitudinem enim et virtutes patris causas ignorantiae dicitis*, cited by *ed. pr.* (54). Cf. also Irenaeus, *Haer.* 2.5.3, cited by Schoedel, "Monism," 388.

22.26–27 *who encircles...all spaces...while none encircles him*: This is a commonplace affirmation of the religious philosophy of the early Christian era. Cf. Philo, *Somn.* 1.61–66, noted by Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 111). Cf. also Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.15.5; 2.31.1;

Epiphanius, *Pan.* 31.5.3; *Treat. Res.* 46.39; and *Tri. Trac.* 53.24, 60.5. On the theme in general, cf. Schoedel, "Monism," 380–81. Note that ⲙⲁⲉⲓⲧ ⲛⲓⲙ, "all spaces," has been corrected in antiquity from ⲙⲁ ⲛⲓⲙ, "all places." ⲙⲁ is the term used in the *Tri. Trac.* in equivalent contexts.

22.27–28   *great wonder*: The following sentence repeats a fundamental affirmation of the text. Cf. 17.6–9. The *Tri. Trac.* deals with the issue involved here in a similar way. Cf. especially 60.16–62.5. The aeons are in the Father, yet are unaware of the fact. They are brought forth from him, from potential to actual existence, by his summons which leads them to search for him. This process is the archetype of all movement toward the Father.

22.32   *to comprehend* (ϣⲱⲡ ⲁⲣⲁⲩ): Literally, "to take to themselves." The text might be corrupt and in need of emendation to ϣⲱⲡ ⲁⲣⲁϥ, where the pronominal object of the preposition anticipates the object of ⲥⲁⲩⲛⲉ.

22.33   *for if* (ⲉⲛⲉⲟⲉ ⲅⲁⲣ): For the form ⲉⲛⲉⲟⲉ, cf. 18.40. Grobel (*Gospel*, 80) takes the conditional protasis with what precedes, but the post-positive ⲅⲁⲣ precludes that possibility. Either the sentence beginning here is an anacolouthon, or something has been lost in transmission. Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 42) suggests that ⲉⲛⲉⲟⲉ translates οὕτως, but that is unlikely, and, in any case, it does not produce a more acceptable syntax.

22.34   *his will*: Cf. 24.2, 30.36, 33.34, 37.4–34. In some Gnostic texts the will of the Father is hypostatized as the agent of the generation of the aeons of the pleroma. Cf. Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.12.1; Hippolytus, *Ref.* 6.38.5–7; Epiphanius, *Pan.* 33.1.2–7, cited by Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 112). Cf. also *Exc. Theod.* 7.1–4. It may be, as Grobel (*Gospel*, 81) suggests, that the will is here implicitly identified with the Son. The importance of the Father's will is emphasized at *Tri. Trac.* 55.34–35, 71.35, where it is identified with the Spirit which "breathes" in the aeons and leads them to search for the Father.

22.36–37   *in which...its* (ⲉⲩⲧⲏⲧ ⲛⲙⲙⲉⲥ...ⲛ̄ⲧⲟⲟⲧⲥ̄): The Coptic pronouns here are feminine and thus have no proper antecedent in the context. In the Greek original the gender of the pronouns may have

been due to the fact that γνῶσις was their antecedent, as Grobel (*Gospel*, 81) notes. Schenke (*Herkunft*, 39) emends the pronouns to masculine and construes the clause quite differently: "while all his emanations were joined with him," i.e., the Father makes his revelation before the fall of the aeons from the pleroma. The clause as understood here probably is paralleled by the account in the Valentinian myth of the cooperation of the aeons of the pleroma in the act of producing the Savior. Cf., e.g., *Tri. Trac.* 81.30–82.9.

22.37 *emanations* (ⲛⲓϯ): The Coptic word is attested only in the *Apoc. Elijah* 50.4, A 9.15, as a "ray" or "gift" of the Son. It is used in the *Gos. Truth* at 26.25, 29; 41.14, 16; and probably at 27.11 in the form ϯ. The etymology and sense of the term here are problematic.

Most commentators assume a derivation from ϯ (Crum 392a–396a) and translate, as here, "emanations." This would be the Coptic equivalent of προβολή, used frequently in the *Tri. Trac.* Grobel (*Gospel*, 83) suggests that the word is a feminine collective in -ⲉ, citing Steindorff (*Lehrbuch*, p. 70, 4). Grobel argues on the basis of an analogy with ϩⲟⲉⲓⲙ (S), ϩⲁⲓⲙⲉ (A, A²), ϩⲓⲙⲏ (S, A, A) whose plural is ϩⲓⲙⲉⲩⲉ. Accordingly ϯ is seen to be derived from ⲧⲟⲉ (S), ⲧⲁⲉⲓⲉ (A, A²), meaning "part" (Crum 396a). The analogy is not convincing, as Arai (*Christologie*, 46, n, 10) notes, since the A plural of ⲧⲁⲓⲉ is simply ⲧⲁⲓⲉ. Cf., as well as the plural here, *Tri. Trac.* 63.7, and *Man. Ps.* 227.4. Another etymology is proposed by Weigandt (*Der Doketismus im Urchristentum und in der theologischen Entwicklung des zweiten Jahrhunderts* [Diss. Heidelberg, 1961] II.20, n. 270), cited by Arai (*Christologie*, 46), who derives ϯ from Egyptian *tje*, "form" or "image."

22.38 *knowledge*: Note the catch-word association with 22.36.

22.39 *living book*: Cf. 19.35. The "book" image is here developed in a new direction, where the individual letters written in the book are the focus of attention. The early Christian roots of this speculation may be reflected in such NT texts as Gal 4:3, 9; Col 2:8, 20. Cf. also 2 Pet 3:10, 12. For Valentinian speculation on the letters of the alphabet as symbols of spiritual realities, cf. especially the Marcosians discussed at Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.14.1–5. See also *Marsanes* 28.1–39.25. This paragraph affirms that the medium of revelation, the "living

book," does not consist of ordinary vowels and consonants, but of powerful, living letters or thoughts (23.11).

23.1   aeons, at the end: The term aeons seems to be used to refer primarily to the members of "the totality," but, as Grobel (*Gospel*, 83) notes, it could be simply understood here and at 23.16 as "the world." Cf. Heb 1:2, 11:3. This is another example of the systematic ambiguity in the use of possibly biblical terminology characteristic of this text. That more than a temporal referent is involved here is suggested by 23.17–18.
   as [his letters]: For the restoration, cf. 23.17.

23.3–4   vowels...consonants: Literally, "places of voices," and "letters lacking sound." Cf. the Marcosian alphabetic speculation in Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.14.1–6.

23.9   speak: As Grobel (*Gospel*, 85) notes, the force of the image here is derived from the ancient practice of reading aloud.

23.11   complete \<thought\> (ⲉⲟⲩⲙⲉ\<ⲉⲩⲉ\> ⲉϥϫⲏⲕ): The un-emended text might be translated "a complete truth," but the usual form for the word "truth" in this text is ⲙⲏⲉ, and the word is usually feminine. The "living book" of revelation does not depend on the combination of its symbols to convey truth. The whole is contained in each of its parts.

23.15   Unity: Cf. 19.6, where the unitary character of the salvific knowledge is stressed. Here the term is probably used of the Father. Note the use of the term to designate an hypostasis in Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.11.3; Epiphanius, *Pan.* 31.6.5, cited by *ed. pr.* (85). Cf. also *Tri. Trac.* 51.8–9, which associates unity more closely with the Father.

23.18–20   his wisdom contemplates his Word: Here begins a short hymnic section (23.18–24.9) on the Word of the Father. For a similar hymnic form, cf. *Tri. Trac.* 66.14–29. Grobel (*Gospel*, 87) analyzes the syntactical structure of this section somewhat differently, seeing it begin with ⲛ̄ⲛⲓⲥϩⲉⲉⲓ ⲛ̄ⲧⲟⲟⲧϥ· ⲉⲩⲁⲥⲟⲩⲱⲛ ⲡⲓⲱⲧ. This phrase does parallel the frequent ⲛ̄ + ⲛ̄ⲧⲟⲟⲧϥ̄ phrases in what follows, but this is a device connecting the two paragraphs here. The fut. III at 23.18 is in a clause beginning with ϣⲓⲛⲁ at 23.15. That syntax is not continued. Grobel also suggests that ⲛ̄ⲧⲟⲟⲧϥ̄ at 23.19 refers to the

book and translates "The wisdom (gained) from it," but ⲚⲦⲟⲟⲧ⸗ is frequently used in this text as Ⲛⲧⲉ⸗ elsewhere.

Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 115–115) suggests that the first line of the hymn refers to the conceiving of the Word by Sophia, but such a mythical event is certainly not explicit in the text. The text does suggest (23.34–35) that one way to construe the poetic affirmations here is to see the attributes of the Father as designations of the hypostatic aeons of his pleroma, but in that case the Word is not subordinated to or derived from an entity like Sophia.

23.19 *contemplates* (ⲙⲉⲗⲉⲧⲁ): The term, as H. D. Betz ("The Sermon on the Mount: Its Literary Genre and Function," *JR* 59 [1979] 285–57) notes, is common in philosophical texts. It combines theoretical reflection and practical experience. Cf. e.g., Epictetus, *Diss.* 1.1.21–25, 1.25.31, 2.16.27.

23.22 *revealed <it>* (ⲟⲩⲁⲛ⳽<ϥ>): Cf. 20.6.

23.23 *forbearance* (ⲁⲥⲟ): For the meaning of the term, cf. Grobel (*Gospel*, 89), who equates it with B ⲁⲥⲟ; S ⲥⲟ (Crum 317a). Cf. ἀνοχή at Rom 3:26. *Ed. pr.*, Arai (*Christologie*, 74) and Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 115) take ⲁⲥⲟ as the equivalent of S ⲁⲥⲟⲩ (Crum 18a) and see it as a translation of τιμή. Cf. Rom 2:7.

23.24 *crown*: As Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 115) notes, the image is a common one in Jewish and Jewish-Christian texts. Cf. *Od. Sol.* 1:1, 9:8, 9; 17:1 and *PS* 59.

23.31 *love has made a body*: Although the language sounds superficially incarnational, as Grobel (*Gospel*, 89–91) and Schenke (*Herkunft*, 40) suggest, it is a mistake to take it as any less figurative than the rest of the poetic affirmations in this section.

23.33–35 *the Word...goes forth in the totality*: For the whole relationship of the Word (or the Son) to the beings which emanated from the Father, cf. the *Tri. Trac.* 57.8–67.37. Haardt (*WZKM* 58 [1962] 35) and Schenke (*Herkunft*, 40) interpret the passage, through 24.3, as a description of the relation of the Son to the beings which have fallen outside the pleroma. That realm of reality does not seem to be specifically or exclusively in view here. In the *Tri. Trac.* the Word

or Logos is an hypostasis distinct from the Son who relates to entities outside the pleroma as does the Son to the aeons within. Such a distinction is not made here and the language used here may be applicable to various cosmic levels.

23.35   *fruit*: Cf. 18.24–25. The use of the term here is closer to the common Valentinian image than is the earlier passage. The Word is here pictured much as the Book at 19.34–20.3.

24.2   *impression*: Cf. 19.31.

24.3   *it supports the totality*: Schenke (*Herkunft*, 40) argues that the text here continues the imagery of 23.30 and, on this basis, he suggests that 23.30–24.3 is an interpolation. The style of the intervening lines is different from what precedes and follows and it is possible that the author of the text has adapted some traditional hymnic material with additional material of his own.

The affirmation that the Word supports the totality may be dependent on such cosmic Christological texts as Col 1:17 and Heb 1:3. Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 118) suggests that the function of the Word here may also reflect Valentinian thinking about the Horos or Limit. Cf. Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.2.2–6, and *Tri. Trac.* 76.32. Grobel (*Gospel*, 91) also notes *Man. Ps.* 116.5.

24.5   *impression*: Cf. 19.30. The association of the imagery in this section with themes of Heb 1:3 suggests that the mysterious моүнг̄ п̄2о may be related to the terms ἀπαύγασμα and χαρακτήρ of that verse. Cf. also Rom 8:3, 2 Cor 5:21, noted by Grobel (Gospel, 91). Schenke (*Herkunft*, 40) suggests that the passage refers to the assumption of a heavenly form by the revealer upon his return to the heavenly realms, but as Arai (*Christologie*, 74–75) argues, this is quite unlikely.

24.6   *purifying*: Cf. Heb 1:3, and Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.2.4. Segelberg (*Or. Suec.* 8 [1959] 8) finds here further evidence of liturgical language.

24.7   *Father…Mother*: The feminine imagery here is striking. Valentinian texts regularly speak of the aeons of the pleroma as androgynous. Cf. Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.1.1. Speculation on the an-

drogynous nature of God and other spiritual beings was common in early Christianity. Cf. W. Meeks, "The Image of the Androgyne: Some Uses of a Symbol in Earliest Christianity," *HR* 13 (1974) 165–208. Such speculation may lie behind this text, although the precise referent of the term "Mother" is unclear. Schenke (*Herkunft*, 40) suggests that the term is a designation for Wisdom (Sophia) mentioned at 23.18. That is not impossible, but, as noted above (23.18), Wisdom here does not function as does Sophia in other accounts of the basic Valentinian myth. Grobel (*Gospel*, 91) suggests that the text should be emended to ϯⲙⲉⲉⲩⲉ, "remembering," which would eliminate the reference to a feminine actor here, but, given the speculation on the sexuality of God in Valentinian and other contemporary sources, such an emendation is unwarranted. Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 119) notes the reference to a Triad, Father-Mother-Son in such Gnostic texts as the *Book of Baruch* (Hippolytus, *Ref.* 5.26.1–27.5) and *Ap. John* BG 21.20, 35.19; CG II,*1*:2.14; IV,*1*:3.7–8, as well as the use of bi-sexual imagery for God in *Od. Sol.* 19:2.

24.8   *Jesus*: The syntactical position of the last figure mentioned here is unclear. It is perhaps to be construed, with Grobel (*Gospel*, 93), as in remote apposition to the subject of this paragraph, the Word (23.33).

24.8–9   *infinite sweetness* (ⲙⲛ̄ⲧ<ⲁⲧ>ⲁⲣⲏⲭ̄ⲥ̄ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉ· ⲡⲓϩⲗⲁ6): For the emendation, cf. 31.19 and 35.10. Nagel (*OLZ* 61 [1966] 13) suggests that sweetness is a common metaphor for goodness in Syriac sources, but the motif of the Deity's sweetness is also well attested in Valentinian sources, as Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 119) notes. Cf. Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.2.2; *Tri. Trac.* 56.11–15, and, in this text, 33.33, 41.3, 42.8. For the possible NT sources of the imagery, cf. Rom 2:4, 1 Pet 2:3, citing Ps 33:9. Cf. also Böhlig's critique of Nagel on this point (*Muséon* 79 [1966] 320).

IV. *Revelation Unifies* (24.9–27.7)

The fourth segment of the text begins with the author's intensive consideration of the effects of revelation. The first (24.9–25.18) and third (26.28–27.7) paragraphs revolve around the theme of the reunification with the Father which is effected by the revelation. Between them comes a paragraph (25.19–26.27) which discusses the obverse side of the revelatory event, suggesting that there is

judgmental separation as well as unification which occurs with the coming of the revealer.

24.10   *bosom*: For similar use of bodily parts as images of spiritual realities, cf. 2**6**.34–27.3. Such metaphorical language is also found at John 1:18 and *Od. Sol.* 19.2–4, noted by Schenke (*Herkunft*, 40), although the imagery here is hardly as graphic as that of the *Odes*, where the breasts, those of the female Spirit, give suck to believers.

24.10–11   *his bosom is the Holy Spirit*: The parenthetical remark, giving an allegorical explanation of the image of the Father's bosom, may, as Grobel (*Gospel*, 93) suggests, be the work of a glossator. For similar interpretative parenthetical comments, cf. 24.13, 22–24; 2**6**.34–35. It should be noted, however, that parenthetical remarks are common in the *Gos. Truth*. They are not confined to explanatory glosses and may simply be a feature of the author's style. Cf. 17.**6**–9; 19.15–17; 19.3**6**–20.3; 2**6**.**6**–8, 24–25; 31.22–25; 32.22–23; 37.31–33; 41.9–10.

On the Holy Spirit in the *Gos. Truth*, cf. 2**6**.3**6**; 27.4; 30.17, and note the image of the fragrance, 34.3–34. Discussion of the Spirit probably does not, as Grobel (*Gospel*, 94) tentatively suggests, indicate a fourth-century date for either the text or its possible glossator. For Valentinian speculation on the Spirit, cf. e.g., Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.2.5–**6**, 1.3.1, 1.4.1, 1.5.3, 1.11.1; Heracleon, fr. 13 (Origen, *In Joh.* 10.33); *Exc. Theod.* 1**6**. The last passage in particular, where the Holy Spirit is equated with the "thought" of the Father, is close to the imagery of the *Gos. Truth*. However, from the cryptic allusions to the spirit here little can be inferred about the author's pneumatology.

24.11–12   *he reveals what is hidden*: Cf. 27.7–8.

24.13–14   *what is hidden ... is his Son*: Grobel (*Gospel*, 95) questions whether this parenthetical remark accurately reflects the presuppositions of the text and *ed. pr.* (55) note a contradiction with Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.8.5, where the Son is said to be the comprehensible aspect of the Father. In fact, the contradiction is only apparent. The Son is, after all, said here to be revealed, thus making him comprehensible. Furthermore, *contra* Grobel, it must be noted that the Son is clearly described as the agent of revelation (18.11–21). He can, moreover, be identified with the Word (1**6**.34), the content and

subject of the revealed Gospel (36.13–14). He is such because of his intimate association with the Father (38.7–39.28).

24.15   *mercies*: Cf. 18.14.

24.17–18   *cease laboring in search of the Father*: On the search of the aeons for the Father, cf. 17.3–4 and the texts cited there.

24.18   *resting there* (ⲉⲩⲙⲁⲧⲛ̄ ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲩ ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲩ): For the motif of rest, cf. 22.12. *Ed. pr.* (55) assume a dittography of the second ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲩ, but the word may well be, as Grobel (*Gospel*, 95) suggests, the S form of the adverb "there" (=A² ⲙ̄ⲙⲉⲩ). Cf. 29.19.

24.21   *deficiency* (ⲱⲧⲁ): This important term appears for the first time in this context. Like many other key terms, it is systematically ambiguous, being used both cosmologically of the world outside the pleroma, and psychologically of the condition of ignorance or oblivion which is generated by Error. It probably translates, as Haardt (*WZKM* 58 [1962] 33) suggests, either κένωμα or ὑστέρημα, technical Valentinian terms used in the same polyvalent way. Cf., e.g., Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.16.2, 1.21.4. Note, too, the remark of Valentinus, fr. 5 (Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 4.13.90,1), τὸ ὄνομα ἐπλήρωσεν τὸ ὑστέρημα ἐν πλάσει, noted by Haardt (*WZKM* 58 [1962] 33) and Ménard, (*L'Évangile*, 120).

24.22   *the form* (ⲡⲓⲥⲭⲏⲙⲁ): Cf. 1 Cor 7:31 and Phil 2:7–8.

24.24   *in which he served*: Cf., possibly, Mark 10:45, with Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 121) or Rom 8:20, with Grobel (*Gospel*, 97) or Phil 2:7–8, with Schenke (*Herkunft*, 41), though none of these passages is particularly close to the *Gos. Truth* here. The antecedent of the pronoun is probably Jesus, or the Son, although the reference is by no means clear. If the parenthetical remark is the work of a glossator, this pronominal ambiguity would be readily understandable, although it may simply be a function of translation.

24.25–26   *envy and strife*: Note the description of the hylic powers produced by the Logos in the *Tri. Trac.* 79.16–32. Similar vices are manifested by human "hylics" in the same text, 122.9. The place of envy and strife envisioned in the *Gos. Truth* could thus be either the

whole extra-pleromatic world, or, more specifically, the human realm where hylic people and attitudes are abundantly manifested.

24.28–32 *since...will no longer exist*: The phrase repeats, in a slightly altered form, the soteriological principle expressed at 18.7–11, where "oblivion" and not "deficiency" is in view, thus indicating the synonymity of the two terms.

24.32–25.2 *as in the case of the ignorance*: For the construction, cf. 19.10–17. Schenke (*Herkunft*, 41) ignores the parallel and emends, unnecessarily, "ignorance" to "knowledge."

24.34–35 *when he comes to have knowledge* (ⲉϥϣⲁⲥⲁⲩⲛⲉ): For the conjugation base used here, cf. 22.3.

24.37 *darkness vanishes*: Cf. 18.17.

25.3 *the perfection*: Cf., possibly, 1 Cor 13:10, ὅταν δὲ ἔλθῃ τὸ τέλειον.

25.6 *fusion of Unity*: The eschatological return to unity is a common Valentinian motif. Cf. Heracleon, fr. 18 (Origen, *In Joh.* 13.11); Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.14.5, 2.12.3; *Exc. Theod.* 36.2, cited by *ed. pr.* (55) and Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 122–23). Cf. also *Tri. Trac.* 132.16–133.7. In the *Gos. Truth*, cf. also 25.6, 9, 24; 34.33.

25.7 *their works*: The antecedent of the possessive pronominal prefix is unclear. It may be, as *ed. pr.* (55) suggest, that it refers to the "unity" and the "form." However, it is more likely a reference to the "deficiency" or the "form," treated, like "the all," as a collective.

25.10 *the spaces*: Cf. 20.21–22.

25.11–12 *each one will attain himself*: The text here moves, as it frequently does, from the cosmic to the individual plane. Cf. 21.5. "Each one" could refer to each of the "spaces," understood as emanations from the Father, or to individual human beings. The process of restoration to the primordial unity is, in any case, the same for both types of being, as it is in the *Tri. Trac.* Cf. 82.1–9, on the

return of the Logos to "himself" and 118.28–35 and 123.3–22, for the reintegration of the spiritual race into the body of the "true man."

25.13   *purify himself*: Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 123) notes the use of purification in Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.2.4 as a metaphor for liberation from passion.

25.14   *multiplicity* (ϨⲚⲚ ⲞⲨⲦⲞ Ⲛ̄ⲢⲎⲦⲈ): Literally, "a multitude of forms." For "multiplicity" as a characteristic of alienated existence, cf. *Tri. Trac.* 106.16; 132.19.

25.15–16   *consuming matter*: For the imagery, cf. 1 Cor 15:54, and 2 Cor 5:4. Grobel (*Gospel*, 101) argues that the circumstantial modifies "knowledge" (25.13), but the masculine pronominal subject precludes that referent.

25.19   *if these things have happened*: As Grobel (*Gospel*, 101) and Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 124) note, the shift in tenses here is possibly significant. The futures of 25.10–19 are more logical or conditional than chronological. The reintegration into the primordial unity is achieved, at least proleptically, for the Gnostic upon reception of the revelation. Cf. the realized eschatology of John 4:23; 5:25 or *Treat. Res.* 47.24–30.

25.20   *to each one of us*: Grobel (*Gospel*, 101) infers from this use of the first person pronoun that the text is addressed to a Gnostic group. The sentence is, however, conditional, implying that "these things" need not have happened to "each one of us." Nonetheless, the phrase may be an indication that the work is addressed to a community which at least includes people who share the author's basic perspective.

25.22   *see to it above all* (Ⲛ̄ⲦⲚ̄ⲘⲈⲈⲨⲈ ⲀⲠⲦⲎⲢϤ̄): The phrase might also be translated "be mindful of the all." Cf. Grobel (*Gospel*, 100–101).

25.23   *the house*: The image of the pure house is used by Valentinus, fr. 2 (Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 2.20.114,3–6), as noted by Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 124). A similar image is used by Philo, *Mig. Abr.* 194–95, noted by Lafrance (*SMR* 5 [1962] 70–71). There may also be a vague allusion to such NT texts as 2 Cor 5:2 and Heb 3:6.

The house image may be used here either of the world, or, more likely, of the self, as in the fragment of Valentinus.

25.25–29 *(it is) as in the case, etc.*: The syntax and precise force of the imagery are unclear. The sentence begins with a comparative clause, but there is no correlative, unless, as Grobel (*Gospel*, 103) suggests, something has fallen out of the text at 25.35. The particle ⲝⲉ there makes that suggestion unlikely.

The ambiguity in the imagery also rests on syntactical ambiguity. ⲡⲱⲛⲉ (25.26) could be construed, with Grobel (*Gospel*, 102–103) as transitive, with ⲛ̄ⲍⲉⲛⲥⲕⲉⲩⲟⲥ (25.27) as its object. Such a construal, however, leaves ⲉⲩⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲩ ⲙ̄ⲙⲉⲩ dangling and Grobel's translation, "that were theirs" is unsatisfactory. The noun modified by ⲉⲩⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲩ ⲙ̄ⲙⲉⲩ could be either the people who move, or, more likely, the places. ⲍⲛ̄ ⲍⲛ̄ⲧⲟⲡⲟⲥ could refer to the places in the houses from which some move or to places on the jars themselves. Grobel (*Gospel*, 103) adopts the first alternative, implying that it was not the jars themselves that were faulty, but this contradicts the reference to bad jars at 25.33.

The image, on our reading, depicts the situation where tenants, upon moving from their rented property, destroy jars which belong with that property, but the landlord does not object, because the jars were unusable and needed to be replaced. This is an image of the situation where revelation occurs. That event causes some damage, but only to the unworthy.

25.28 *jars*: For the image, cf. Rom 9:20–24; 2 Tim 2:20–21; Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.21.5; and Epiphanius, *Pan.* 34.20.9–12, cited by Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 124–25). The application of the jars image to the products of Error is made clear at 26.8–27. Recall the image of Error working on its own matter at 17.15–18. Perhaps the current passage continues and develops the image initially presented there.

25.32 *rather <he> is glad*: We emend the feminine subject pronoun, following *ed. pr.* (56). Grobel (*Gospel*, 102–103) takes the feminine as impersonal, translating, "there is rejoicing."

25.35–36 *such is the judgment*: Cf. John 3:19, noted by Schenke (*Herkunft*, 42).

26.2–3 *drawn sword with two edges*: As most commentators note, the imagery is closely related to such NT texts as Rev 2:12,16; 19:5 and especially Heb 4:12. Cf. also Philo's description of the Logos as the divider in *Heres* 130–140.

26.4–5 *when the Word appeared*: Cf. 19.17. As Grobel (*Gospel*, 105) notes, the author plays in this passage on the literal and figurative senses of the "Word."

26.5–6 *the one that is within the heart of those who utter it*: The coming of the revelatory Word can be portrayed both as an objective, external event and as a subjective, internal one. This soteriological complexity parallels the complex relationship of all beings to the Father and to the revealer. Cf. 18.29–35.

26.8 *it became a body* (ⲁϥⲣ̄ ⲥⲱⲙⲁ): Referring now explicitly to the objective aspect of the revelatory event, the author, or possibly a glossator, emphasizes the substantial, effective quality of the Word. The author may be alluding to such incarnational texts as John 1:14, although, as Grobel (*Gospel*, 105) and Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 125–26) note, the author avoids the term ⲥⲁⲣⲝ which is used in John. He may, as Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 126) suggests, be influenced by Platonic languge about the σῶμα τοῦ κόσμου (*Tim.* 32D). There is no indication that there lies behind the text Valentinian speculation about Christ's psychic body, as is found at Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.6.1.

26.9 *disturbance*: Grobel (*Gospel*, 105) suggests that the Johannine σχίσμα (John 7:43, 9:16, 10:19) lies behind this phrase. As Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 126) notes, the term used here is broader, possibly translating the Greek θάμβος, which indicates the condition of fear and trembling consequent on a revelatory experience. For the effects of the Savior's coming, see *Tri. Trac.* 89.4–8, 118.28–119.16. Note, too, the "stupefied wonder" (ἐκπληκτόν...θαῦμα) of Sophia when she fails of her purpose in Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.2.2.

26.12 *that is* (ⲭⲉⲥ): the deletion of the first ⲥ by *ed. pr.* is unnecessary. As Till (*Or.* 27 [1958] 276) suggests, form is equivalent to ⲭⲉ ⲉⲓⲥ.

26.16–17 *the spaces were shaken*: Cf. *PS* 4 and 1 *Jeu* 40. For the

term "spaces," cf. 20.21–22. Here the term seems to be equivalent to the emanations (†H) of error. Cf. 26.25.

26.19 *error was upset*: Error appears here in highly personified terms reminiscent of the account of the passion of Sophia at, e.g., Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.2.3. Sophia's passion, however, takes place not at a moment of revelation, but when she fails to attain her goal of comprehending the Father or of reproducing offspring without a consort.

26.22 *afflicting herself* (ⲉⲥⲱⲥⲋ̄ ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲥ): The Coptic verb is problematic. ⲱⲥⲋ̄ is probably a metathesized form of ⲱⲋⲥ̄, attested in A². Cf. Crum 538b and Kasser, *Compléments* 82a. The term usually means "reap" or "mow" and only one metaphorical use is attested, in Shenute, who applies it to the tearing of garments. Cf. Crum 539a and Grobel (*Gospel*, 107). Perhaps this concrete sense is involved here and Error is pictured as tearing at herself in her grief. Nagel (*OLZ* 6 [1966] 9) suggests that the verb translates the Syriac *mlg*, which has both the concrete and metaphorical senses which seem to be involved in ⲱⲋⲥ̄ here. However, Greek verbs for "mowing," such as θερίζω and ἀμάω, noted by Böhlig (*Muséon* 79 [1966] 327), have various metaphorical senses. Note in particular "reaping" as an image of eschatological judgment at Rev 14:15.

26.25 *emanations*: Cf. 22.37.

26.23–27 *when knowledge drew near it, etc.*: The protasis of this sentence could also be translated "since knowledge drew near it (or her)." The apodosis, with its present tense, constitutes a slight anacolouthon, caused perhaps by the parenthetical comment of 26.24–26. We would expect in the apodosis: "she recognized that she is empty," *vel sim.* Cf. 18.7–11. On the emptiness of Error, cf. 17.16.

26.28 *truth appeared*: The following paragraph recapitulates the theme of unification with the Father which was prominent in 24.9–25.19. "Truth," here a personified abstraction, functions as the revealer and as the positive counterpart to Error (17.14). Cf. John 1:17.

26.29 *its emanations*: Cf. 26.25. The term may serve as a catch-word connecting this section with the preceding section, but the

"emanations" in each case are different. For the response of "his own" to the revealer, cf. *Tri. Trac.* 118.28-36.

26.31–32 *power that joins them with the Father*: Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.12.1, is not, *pace* Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 128) really relevant here. Cf., possibly, John 17.21, noted by Grobel (*Gospel*, 109) and Rom 8:35–39.

26.33–35 *For, as for everyone, etc.*: The syntax of these lines is broken by parenthetical comments which may, as Grobel (*Gospel*, 109) suggests, be glosses, but see the discussion of the issue in the note to 24.10–11. Grobel suggests that the glossator, here and elsewhere, may have misunderstood the figurative language of the original text and that the "mouth" of the Father may be a symbol for his will. Cf. Exod 18:1, Num 14:41, Deut 1:26. For similar imagery, cf. *Od. Sol.* 12:3. However, the imagery here, though artificial, is consistent. Truth is the Word uttered by the tongue (Spirit) of the Father. He who loves the truth is joined to the Father by the source of the Word. Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 128) speculates that the language of the Father's tongue may be related to early Christian charismatic phenomena, but there is little warrant for this conjecture. It is, however, possible that "tongue" is used here metaphorically for "language."

27.3–4 *whenever he is to receive* (ϵϥⲁⲭⲓ): The form is certainly a fut. circ. The A² future in ⲁ is rare in the *Gos. Truth*, where the future is more commonly in ⲛⲁ-.

27.5 *since this*: The referent of the demonstrative here is unclear. It could be the Holy Spirit, conceived of as the means of revelation, or, more likely, the whole process of the coming of Truth and the unification with the Father through the Spirit.

27.6–7 *revelation to his aeons*: As frequently in this section (from 24.9), the primary focus has been on events in the supernal world, where the Father manifests himself to the aeons which emanate from him. This process in turn serves as the paradigm for the soteriological process on every level of reality.

V. *Revelation Brings Authentic Existence* (27.7–30.16)

The fifth segment of the text begins as did the fourth, with a remark

on the Father's revealing of what was hidden. Then the effects of
revelation are explored in two complementary paragraphs. The first
(27.7–27.34) deploys imagery of maturation; the second (28.32–30.16)
deploys images of waking from a dream. Both sets of images are used
to convey the understanding of the reception of revelation as the
actualization of authentic existence. The intervening paragraph
(27.34–28.31) makes the thematic focus of the section clear by
clarifying the types of existence obtaining in those who have not
received the revelation.

27.7–8   *he manifested what was hidden*: Cf. 24.9–12. The subject is
apparently the Father, as in that earlier passage.

27.8   *he explained it*: Cf. John 1:18, although Jesus is not said to be
the revealer or the one who explains here.

27.9–10   *who contains if not the Father* (ΝΙΜ ΓΑΡ ΠΕΤϢϢΠ ΕΙΜΗΤΙ
ΑΠΙϢΤ): *Ed. pr.*, Grobel (*Gospel*, 108–09), Schenke (*Herkunft*, 43),
and Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 130) divide the text differently
(ΠΕΤϢϢΠΕ ΙΜΗΤΙ) and translate, "For who exists if not the Father."
Our translation follows that of Till (*Or.* 27 [1958] 276). The
affirmation that the Father exists in the fullest sense is not impossible.
For similar sentiments, cf. 28.13 and *Tri. Trac.* 52.7–33 and 57.9. For
the Father's containing the Totality, cf. 18.34–35.
   Grobel (*Gospel*, 111) further takes the prespostion ⲁ after ΙΜΗΤΙ to
be agential, translating "who exists except by the Father." This would
be an unusual use of this preposition, which is quite normal with
ΕΙΜΗΤΙ.

27.11   *emanations* (†): With most editors we take this as a variant of
†Η on which see the note to 22.37. Grobel (*Gospel*, 110–111) takes the
word as the noun "gift" (Crum 395b).

27.13–14   *they came forth...like children*: For the image of the
emanations of the Father as children of the perfect or mature man, cf.
especially *Tri. Trac.* 60.32–61.24. The notion of the primordial
heavenly man, probably based on Jewish speculation about the
primal Adam, is probably the ultimate origin of this imagery. Cf. H.
M. Schenke, *Der Gott "Mensch" in der Gnosis* (Göttingen:
Vandenhoeck und Reprecht, 1962) and G. Quispel, "Der gnostische

Anthropos und die jüdische Tradition," *Eranos Jahrbuch* 22 (1953) 215–24. Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 131) cites further parallels, but these are more remote.

27.14–15 *grown man* (ογρωμε εϥϫΗΚ): The Coptic probably translates the Greek ἄνθρωπος τέλειος, as Grobel (*Gospel*, 111) suggests. Cf. *Ap. John* BG 22.9, 35.4, 48.2–3, 71.13, cited by Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 131). Cf. also *Tri. Trac.* 123.4, where the image is deployed in a somewhat different way.

27.16–18 *had not received form nor ... name*: Cf. 21.25–22.13. That the aeons which emanate from the Father receive form and name is mentioned, as *ed. pr.* (56) note, in *Exc. Theod.* 31.3. The text also recalls the notion of the "two formations" of Sophia, found in Ptolemy's system. Cf. Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.4.1, 1.4.5. The intimate association of achieving form with being named is suggested by the image used by Valentinus of the picture, the sense of which is given by its title. Cf. Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 4.13.89,6–90,4. The unformed state of the aeons depicted here is paralleled by the imagery of the aeons as fetal in *Tri. Trac.* 60.32–61.24. In that passage (61.14–18) the aeons emerge from potential (or "fetal") existence into actual (or "mature") existence through the bestowal upon them by the Father of his own name. The distinction between potential and actual existence, clearly expressd in the *Tri. Trac.* is operative here and explains some of the paradoxical formulations in what follows, especially 27.32–33. The distinction is expressed, somewhat allusively, in 27.34–28.4.

27.20 *when they receive form* (εγϣΑΝϪΙ ϕΟΡΜΗ): The conditional here may be a translation of temporal clause in Greek. Cf. Steindorff, *Lehrbuch*, #498. The Latin term used here also appears at *Tri. Trac.* 55.8 and 61.12. In all these cases there may simply be a metathesis of the consonents in ΜΟΡϕΗ, used at 27.17, but the possibility of Latin terminology being used either by the author of the text or by a translator cannot be excluded.

27.21 *by his knowledge* (ΜΠΙΣΑγΝΕ): The form may be a genitive, which would make little sense in the context. The emendation of *ed. pr.* (Μ<Ν̄>) is, however, unnecessary. The preposition, as Grobel

(*Gospel*, 113) suggests, is probably to be construed as instrumental (=
ϩⲛ̄ or ϩⲓⲧⲛ̄).

27.22–23   *they do not know him*: Despite the fact that the aeons have
been formed by the knowledge of the Father they remain in
ignorance. The same situation is envisioned in *Tri. Trac.* 60.16–
61.28, where the aeons are granted to know that the Father exists, but
must search for knowledge of what he is. For the ignorance of the
aeons while within the Father, cf. 22.28–33.

27.23–24   *the Father is perfect*: The same word (ⲭ̅ⲏ̅ⲕ) is used of the
Father as is used of the "grown man" at 27.14–15. This probably
represents a play in Greek, which is difficult to reproduce in English.
For the term "perfect Father," cf. Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.2.2.

27.26   *if he wishes*: For similar stress on the will of the Father, cf.
Tri. Trac. 55.31, 60.8, 61.27–33, 70.32–36.

27.32–33   *before they came into existence are ignorant*: Cf. *Tri. Trac.*
61.20–24.

27.35   *I do not say, then, that they are nothing*: In this paragraph the
author develops the distinction between potential and actual existence
of the aeons of the Father which lay behind the discussion of the
preceding paragraph. The first lines (27.34–28.4) repeat many of the
phrases used at the end of the preceding section. Contrast the remarks
on the products of Error (17.23).

28.6–7   *he knows what he will produce*: Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 133)
finds here a notion of the predestination of the spiritual emanations of
the Father. On this topic, cf. 21.23–25.

28.7   *fruit*: For the image, cf. 17.30.

28.11   *every space*: Cf. 20.21.

28.13   *the one who exists*: Cf. Exod 3:14 (LXX) and Plutarch, *De E
apud Delphos* 17 (392A). The absolute being of the primordial
principle is also stressed at *Tri. Trac.* 52.7–33.

28.14–15   *who established it from what does not exist*: Commentators

such as Grobel (*Gospel*, 115) and Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 134) express surprise to find a doctrine of *creatio ex nihilo* in a Gnostic text. The language here may well be used in a metaphorical sense, where non-existence is equivalent to ignorance and (full) existence to knowledge. The *Tri. Trac.* (53.21–37) does, however, strongly deny the involvement of any pre-existent matter in creation, and it may be that the *Gos. Truth* here reflects the same position on this cosmogonical issue which was much discussed in the second century. Cf. also *Tri. Trac.* 52.5–6.

28.17   *root*: On the imagery, cf. 17.30.

28.20   *yet* (ⲉⲓⲧⲉ ⲁⲛ): Between the ⲓ and the ⲧ ink has seeped through the papyrus from the recto of this leaf. The scribe left blank the area where this seepage had occurred. The poor quality of the papyrus also affected the ink of the last letter of the line. No correction was involved. For the meaning of the Greek particle εἴτε, cf. LSJ 498b.

   "I have come into being": The essential fault of "one who has no root" is not to recognize his dependence on the Father, the source of all being. According to the *Tri. Trac.* (62.24–27), it was to prevent such a misconception that the Father withheld knowledge of his essence from the aeons of the pleroma. The attitude of the Demiurge in many Gnostic texts is similar. Cf. *Ap. John* CG II,ⲣ:10.19–22.

28.22–24   *for this reason...never come into existence*: For a similar principle, cf. *Tri. Trac.* 79.1, 137.10.

28.24–25   *did he wish*: The pronoun here most probably refers to the Father (28.12), as Grobel (*Gospel*, 115) suggests. Alternatively, Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 135) refers it to Jesus. The Father wishes dependent beings to realize that without knowledge of himself and of their relationship to him they live in a dream-like state, which is graphically described in what follows.

28.27–28   *phantoms of the night*: For the imagery here and in the following paragraph, cf. G. W. MacRae, "Sleep and Awakening in Gnostic Texts," *Le Origini dello gnosticismo: Colloquio di Messina, 13–18 Aprile 1966* (Supplements to Numen 12; Leiden: Brill, 1967) 496–507. Cf. also *Tri. Trac.* 82.27. Segelberg (*Or. Suec.* 8 [1959] 8)

suggests that the imagery is most appropriate to a baptismal context, but its wide attestation precludes such a specific *Sitz-im-Leben*.

28.29   *when the light shines*: Cf. John 1:7–9. For the common Hellenistic mystical motif of the light of revelation, cf. 30.37, 35.5, 43.13 and *Tri. Trac.* 62.34.

28.31   *he knows* (ⲉϥϣⲁϥⲙ̄ⲙⲉ): *Ed. pr.* (56) emend to ϣⲁϥⲙ̄ⲙⲉ, but this is unnecessary. The form is praes. cons. II.

29.6–7   *by means of these* (ϩⲓⲧⲟⲟⲧϥ̄ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲉⲓ): Till (*Or.* 27 [1958] 277) emends the pronominal suffix on the preposition to the plural, but lack of concord in number is a common occurrence in this construction. Cf. 31.23, 40.1, 41.34. Emendation is thus unnecessary.

29.11–14   *either a place to which they are fleeing, etc.*: The description of the nightmare here recalls *Iliad* 22.199–201, as Quispel (*Jung Codex*, 52) notes.

29.18–19   *or they take off into the air*: Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 136) speculates that the elaborate attention devoted to the nightmare image may reflect a critique of theories of ecstasy. The imagery recalls such descriptions of ecstasy as Philo, *Spec.* 2.3 and *CH* 11.19.

30.11   *come to knowledge* (ⲥⲁⲧⲛⲉ): The Coptic verb ⲥⲁⲧⲛⲉ may be related to ⲥⲟⲩⲧⲛ̄, ⲥⲁⲧⲛⲉ A, "straighten, stretch" (Crum 371a) and is taken as such by *ed. pr.*, Grobel (*Gospel*, 118), Schenke (*Herkunft*, 45), and Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 57). Till (*ZNW* 50 [1959] 177) suggests emending to ⲥⲁⲩⲛⲉ and that emendation has been adopted here. The corruption was probably due to a scribe's applying to the referent of the imagery of awakening language appropriate in the image itself.

30.12–13   *Good for the man*: (ⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩϥ ⲙ̄ⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ): Nagel (*OLZ* 61 [1966] 7), followed by Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 13, 138), suggests that the beatitude formula here is evidence of a Syriac original, since in Syriac *ṭūbau (hi) lе* would be the ordinary way of expressing a macarism. Cf. *Od. Sol.* 9:8, 11:18 and Matt 5:3. It is more likely, however, that the Coptic for this verse translates a Greek formula different from that used in the parallel beatitude of 30.14–16,

such as καλόν ἐστι τῷ. Cf. Matt 17:4, 18:8, 26:24. This formula is regularly translated with ⲚⲀⲚⲞⲨⲤ in the Sahidic NT. Cf. also Eph 6:3, cited by Böhlig (*Muséon* 79 [1966] 322–23).

Standaert (*NTS* 22 [1975/76] 254) notes that the double beatitude here at 30.12–16 occurs precisely at the center of the *Gos. Truth* and marks off the long discussion of the state of those who are in ignorance from the exhortation which follows.

The conjunction before the first beatitude is probably a scribal error, although it is also possible that it reflects a καί...καί ("both ...and") construction linking the two beatitudes.

30.13 *who will return* (ⲈⲦⲀⲤⲦⲀϥ): Literally, "who will turn himself around." The conjugation base is the A² fut. rel., as Till (*Or.* 29 [1958] 277) notes, and not the perf. rel., as is assumed by *ed. pr.*, Grobel (*Gospel*, 118), Schenke (*Herkunft*, 45), and Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 138). Turning oneself around and returning to one's source are common images for the conversion effected by the reception of Gnosis. Cf. Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.4.1 and *Tri. Trac.* 77.37–78.7, 81.19–29, 82.1–9, 128.12. The lack of an explicit reference to Sophia who undergoes such a conversion cannot be taken as evidence that such a mythical paradigm is not presupposed by the *Gos. Truth*. Nor is Leipoldt's (*TLZ* 11 [1957] 831) formula of a demythologized Gnosis necessarily apt. Here as elsewhere the text uses language that can be understood as referring to various levels of reality.

30.15–16 *who opened the eyes of the blind*: Cf. Matt 11:5, Luke 7:21–22, John 9 and 11:37. The imagery here is probably used metaphorically. The verb form ⲞⲨⲎⲚ, although usually the qualitative in S, cannot (*pace ed. pr.*) be such here, where it is used with the perf. rel. conjugation base, where the qualitative is excluded. Hence, it must be an A² infinitive, as noted by Grobel (*Gospel*, 119). This form of the infinitive is otherwise attested in both S and A². Cf. Crum 482b. The one who opened the eyes of the blind is presumably the revealer, Jesus.

VI. *Revelation Brings a Return to the Father* (30.16–33.32)

In the preceding section the effects of revelation have been described with the imagery of awakening from sleep. After a brief recapitulation of this imagery (30.16–32), introducing the figure of

the Spirit, the author reflects on how revelation initiates a process of return or reintegration of the self into the primordial Unity.

30.17   *the Spirit*: Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 138–39) notes that it seems to be the Spirit of whom the macarism at 30.14 is pronounced and remarks that similar usages are attested in Philo. Cf. *Immut.* 55, 161; *Sacr.* 101; *Spec.* 1.329, 2.53. The author may, however, have in mind the paraenesis which follows in 32.33–33.32, which seems to suggest that the Spirit can have human agents in the awakening process.

30.20   *to him who lay upon the ground*: Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 139) suggests that these lines possibly allude to the descent of the spirit on Christ at his crucifixion, and Wilson (*The Gnostic Problem* [London: Mowbray, 1958] 106) finds a reference here to the resurrection. Both note *Exc. Theod.* 61.6–8, where the descent of the Spirit at Christ's baptism is discussed, which, as Arai (*Christologie*, 76) notes, is hardly relevant. Our passage does not directly allude to Christ at all. The imagery used here ultimately derives from traditional Jewish speculation about the primal man, who lay inert upon the earth before being vivified by the insufflation of the divine breath. For other Gnostic uses of this speculation, cf. especially *Hyp. Arch.* 88.10–16, 89.11–17; Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.30.6; *Ap. John* BG 50.15; Hippolytus, *Ref.* 5.7.6. As used here, the imagery is a general metaphor for the "new creation" of the human being who receives the revelatory Gnosis, as Till (*ZNW* 50 [1959] 50) and Arai (*Christologie*, 76–77) argue. For earlier allegorical speculation on the subject of the divine breath in Adam, cf. Philo, *Leg. All.* 1.31–42; *Heres* 55; *Somn.* 1.34.

30.23   *he had not yet arisen*: The language continues the Genesis imagery, but it may also contain a metaphorical reference to the "resurrection" provided by the reception of the revelatory Gnosis. If so, the text reflects the "realized eschatology" of such texts as *Treat. Res.* 45.14–28.

30.24   *he gave them the means of knowing*: This comment interprets the Genesis imagery of the preceding lines. This fact probably explains the shift in the number of the pronoun from him (30.20) to them (30.24). For the form used here at 30.26 and at 31.17, cf. S. Emmel, "Proclitic Forms of the Verb † in Coptic."

30.25–26   *knowledge of the Father and the revelation of his Son*: As

Grobel (*Gospel*, 121) notes, the phrase is probably a hendiadys. The Father is known in and through the revelation of the Son. It is also possible to construe these phrases as the collective subject of ⲁⲋϯ in 30.35–36 and to translate, "as for the knowledge of the Father and the revelation of his Son, it gave these the means of knowing."

30.27–31.1   *they heard … strangers*: Fragments of another version of the *Gos. Truth* are found in CG XII,2:53–60. For the text of this and the other fragments from Codex XII, cf. the appendix.

30.27–32   *when he had seen him and had heard him, etc.*: As *ed. pr.* (57) note, the author here alludes to several NT texts, especially 1 John 1:1–3. Cf. also Luke 24:36, John 6:52–58, 2 Cor 2:14, Heb 6:4 and 1 Pet 2:3. The pronoun "him" refers to the Son. Segelberg (*Or. Suec.* 8 [1959] 10) finds in the sensory imagery here an allusion to the eucharist, but the author may simply be utilizing the scriptural language without a specific reference to a sacramental context. For similar language in early Christian texts emphasizing the reality of the resurrected Christ, cf. Ignatius, *Smyr.* 3:3; *Act. Pet.* 20; *Epist. Apost.* 29; Irenaeus, *Haer.* 3.22.2; Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 6.9.71,2; Origen, *Con. Cels.* 8.34, noted by Arai (*Christologie*, 79).

30.31–32   *the beloved Son*: Cf. Matt 3:17, 17:5; 2 Pet 1:17.

30.32–33   *appeared instructing them*: Cf. 19.19–20.

30.34   *breathed into them*: Cf. John 20:22. The author here is clearly speaking of the action of the revealer in the human sphere, but it is probably not accidental that the language is also appropriate to the initial insufflation of the divine breath into the first human being. Cf. 30.19–23. The imagery of the insufflation of the spirit, with its rich texture of allusions to Genesis and to the NT, reemerges in the discussion of the Father's fragrance in 33.33–34.34 and 34.24–27.

30.35–36   *doing his will*: Cf. John 4:34, 5:30, and 6:38–40.

30.36–37   *when many had received the light*: Cf. John 1:5, 9, 12.

31.1   *the material ones*: The term ⲍⲩⲗⲏ (31.4) is used here in a collective sense, as at *Man. Ps.* 49.26. As Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 144)

notes, the term is common in the *Ap. John*, while the adjective ὑλικοί
is more common in Valentinian texts. This may be an indication that
the *Gos. Truth* stands early in the Valentinian tradition. For typical
Valentinian comments on the material ones, cf. *Tri. Trac.* 119.8–16.
Here the source of the "material ones" is no doubt the "matter" of
Error (17.4–20).

    strangers: Cf. *Tri. Trac.* 119.9, *Man. Ps.* 54.19.

31.2   *his likeness* (ⲡⲉϥⲉⲓⲛⲉ): This may be an allusion to Phil 2:7. In
the *Tri. Trac.* ⲉⲓⲛⲉ is a technical term for the psychic level of reality,
inferior to the ⲉⲓⲕⲱⲛ yet superior to the ⲧⲁⲛⲧⲛ̄. Cf. *Tri. Trac.*
98.12–26. If Valentinian Christological speculation lies behind this
text, the language here too may be quasi-technical. Because of the
revealer's fleshly form (31.5–6), "material" human beings were
unable to perceive even his psychic reality. It is more likely, however,
that the term is not used in such a precise technical sense, and that it
simply refers to that aspect of the revealer which was in the "likeness
of God," as in the hymn in Philippians.

31.5–6   *fleshly form* (ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲥⲁⲣⲝ ⲛ̄ⲥⲙⲁⲧ): Cf. Rom 8:3. This phrase
has occasioned considerable debate about the precise Christology of
the text. Many commentators argue that it should be translated
"fleshly appearance," *vel sim.*, which suggests a blatantly docetic
Christology. So *ed. pr.*, Haardt (*WZKM* 58 [1962] 35), Till (*Or.* 27
[1958] 277 and *ZNW* 50 [1959] 177), Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 36–37,
145). Others, noting that ⲥⲙⲁⲧ is not the most natural term for
"(mere) appearance," suggest the sort of translation offered here. Cf.
Schenke (*Herkunft*, 46), Arai (*NT* 5 [1962] 216 and *Christologie*, 83–
85), Shibata (*Annual of the Japanese Biblical Institute* 1 [1975] 130).
Grobel (*Gospel*, 123) suggests yet another alternative, taking ⲛ̄ⲥⲙⲁⲧ
as a correlative adjective and translating "in a flesh of (such) sort that
nothing blocked." This is remotely possible, but as Haardt (*WZKM*
58 [1962] 35, n. 37) notes, it is rather artificial. We would expect
ⲙ̄ⲡⲣⲏⲧⲉ ⲉⲧⲉ, *vel sim.*, for such a construction, as Arai (*Christologie*,
85, n.2) notes.

    The docetic interpretation of the passage appeals to Valentinian
descriptions of the way in which the revealer clothes himself with a
psychic body. Cf. Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.15.2. In addressing this issue two
considerations are important. (1) Many Gnostic Christologies were
not strictly docetic, but are more aptly described as "pneumatic" or

early forms of a "two natures" Christology. For a discussion of this issue, cf. K. Koschorke, *Die Polemik der Gnostiker gegen das kirchliche Christentum* (NHS 12; Leiden: Brill, 1978) 44–48. (2) In Valentinianism the theory represented in Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.15.2 was not universal and many texts, especially in the Western Valentinian tradition, stress the reality of the physical Incarnation and of the suffering of the revealer. (Cf. especially *Tri. Trac.* 114.31–115.11. For other Valentinian views on the nature of Christ's flesh, cf. the note to *Treat. Res.* 44.14–15.) It seems likely, then, that the *Gos. Truth*, although it explores the spiritual and existential significance of the incarnation and passion of the revealer, does not deny the reality of that event.

31.8   *incorruptibility is irresistible*: Most translators take the two abstract nouns as asyndetically coordinated predicates of the two-member nominal sentence and translate, "because it (*scil.* his coming) was incorruptibility (and) irresistibility," *vel sim.* Till (*Or.* 27 [1978] 277) assumes the same structure but emends to avoid the asyndeton. It is, however, probable that the sentence is a three-member nominal sentence, as Grobel (*Gospel*, 123), Schenke (*Herkunft*, 46) and Arai (*Christologie*, 80) assume. The indefinite article with the predicate may well have been accidentally omitted following the o in ⲘⲚ̄ⲦⲀⲦⲦⲈⲔⲞ. For the incorruptibility of the revealer, cf. Valentinus, fr. 7 (Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 3.7.59,3) and the Valentinians mentioned in Tertullian, *De carne Christi* 15, cited by *ed. pr.* (57) and Acts 2:31, exegeting Ps 16:10, noted by Grobel (*Gospel*, 125). The latter passage in particular suggests that the incorruptibility of Christ's flesh need not imply a docetic Christology.

"Irresistible" (<ⲞⲨ>ⲘⲚ̄ⲦⲀⲦⲈⲘⲀϨⲦⲈ ⲘⲘⲀⳜ) might also be translated "unseizability" as in Grobel (*Gospel*, 122). Cf. John 1:5. The ambiguity of κατέλαβον ("seize," "comprehend") might also be present here.

31.9–10   *spoke new things*: The text may echo NT apocalyptic language. Cf. Rev 21:1. Cf. also *Od. Sol.* 31:3, noted by Schenke (*Herkunft*, 46).

31.10–11   *speaking about what is the heart of the Father*: Cf. 16.35–36; 24.9–14.

31.13-16   *light...life*: Cf. John 1:4. For Valentinian exegesis of the verse, cf. Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.8.5. The *Gos. Truth* has previously spoken of revelation in terms of the appearance of light. Cf. 24.37-25.19, and in terms of the speaking of the word. Cf. 16.34, 31.9-12. Here the imagery is boldly combined. Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 147) argues that the motif of "life" is deployed here in a distinctively Gnostic way which is different from its use in John, but this is hardly clear. On the one hand, the imagery here, as elsewhere, is fluid and can be taken in various senses. On the other, the life which Jesus provides in John is associated closely, as it is here, with the spirit which he sends (John 14:16-17) and the revelation of the Father which he makes known (John 17:3). The language of the *Gos. Truth* at this point would be quite congenial to Christians at home with Johannine imagery. For similar imagery, see also *Trim. Prot.* 46.4-32.

31.18   *powerful spirit*: Cf. Isa 11:2, 2 Tim 1:7, Acts 1:8, Heb 2:4 and *Ap. John* BG 67.10, noted by Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 148).

31.20   *sweetness*: Cf. 24.9.

31.21-22   *punishments and tortures*: Apocalyptic imagery is in evidence here, but, as usual, it is taken in a metaphorical sense. The "punishments and tortures" are characteristic of human existence in the nightmarish state of the unilluminated. Cf. 28.32-29.25.

31.22-23   *which were leading astray* (ⲡⲉⲧⲉⲛⲉⲩⲥⲁⲣⲙ̄): The verb form here is problematic. It could be the qualitative of ⲥⲱⲣⲙ̄ (cf. 31.39), which would be translated "which were gone astray," but the qualitative cannot take an object. Grobel (*Gospel*, 127) resolves the difficulty by emending ⲛ̄ⲛⲓϩⲁⲉⲓⲛⲉ in 31.23 to ⲛ̄ϭⲓ ϩⲁⲉⲓⲛⲉ, thus making it the subject of ⲥⲁⲣⲙ̄ and translating, "it was such as had need of mercy who were astray." Till (*Or.* 27 [1958] 278), emends to the infinitive ⲥⲱⲣⲙ̄ but this emendation may be unnecessary. The form is probably an irregular infinitive, like ⲟⲩⲁⲛϩ̄ (20.6, 23; 23.22). Note that the infinitive ⲥⲁⲣⲙⲉ is attested for AA², the form on which the emendation of *ed. pr.* is based. For the notion that the "punishments and terrors" lead some astray, cf. 17.29-36.
  from his face: Till (*Or.* 27 [1958] 278) takes this as the object of ⲥⲁⲣⲙ̄ and translates "die den Blick (wörtl. das Gesicht) dieser manchen irreführten."

31.23   *some* (ⲚⲚⲒϨⲀⲈⲒⲚⲈ): The definite article with the indefinite pronoun is unusual, as Grobel (*Gospel*, 127) notes, in support of his emendation to ⲚϬⲒ ϨⲀⲈⲒⲚⲈ. Perhaps the Coptic has translated rather woodenly a Greek relative pronoun such as οἵτινες.

31.25   *error*: Here the term is used to characterize unilluminated human existence, and not as a personification or designation of an hypostasis.

31.26–32.2   *he destroyed...which had gone astray*: Another fragment of the *Gos. Truth* from Codex XII parallels the material in this section. Since the two versions apparently diverge significantly at the beginning of this section, it is difficult to determine precisely where the parallel begins. For the text of the fragment, see the appendix.

31.26   *destroyed them with power*: Cf. the imagery of the jars being broken, 25.25–26.27.

31.28–29   *he became a way*: Cf. John 14:6. Here the revealer is said to be what he earlier was said to provide. Cf. 18.19–21. The imagery of the Book underwent a similar transformation, first referring to what the revealer offers (20.12), then referring to the reality in which the recipients of the revelation are incorporated (21.4), the reality which the recipients in fact are (22.38–23.18).

31.31   *discovery for those who are searching*: The same transformation of the images evident in the term "way" (31.29) is manifest here. The revealer is what the Gospel was said to provide (17.3–4).

31.32   *support*: Cf. 19.30, 30.21.

31.34   *immaculateness*: The language of defilement and cleansing, common in the NT (e.g., 2 Cor 7:1; Heb 9:14; 1 John 1:7,9), is unique in the *Gos. Truth*, and is, no doubt, as metaphorical as the other images used in this context.

31.35   *he is* (ⲈⲚⲦⲀϤ): The pronoun here is an orthographic variant of ⲚⲦⲀϤ. Cf. *Tri. Trac.* 52.5.
  the shepherd: In the following paragraph the author develops the imagery of the parable of the shepherd (Matt 18:12–14; Luke 15:4–7;

Gos. Thom. 107) along arithmological lines attested elsewhere in Valentinian literature. Cf., especially, the Marcosians discussed in Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.16.2; 2.24.6; Hippolytus, *Ref.* 6.19. Cf. also *Man. Ps.* 193.26. The interpretation of the shepherd imagery here follows the tendency already evident in John 10:11 to equate Jesus with the Good Shepherd. Cf. also Heb 13:20; 1 Pet 2:25, 5:4.

32.2–3   *one which was lost*: For the lost sheep as a symbol for the fallen Sophia, cf. Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.8.4, 1.16.1, 1.23.2, passages noted by *ed. pr.* (57).

32.4–5   *ninety-nine is a number that is in the left hand*: This text, like Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.16.2 and 2.24.6, presupposes a method of counting common in antiquity whereby the position of the fingers of the two hands could be used to indicate numbers from 1 to 9,999. The system was not confined to Italy, as van Unnik (*Jung Codex*, 96–97, 112–113) maintained, but was practiced in the orient as well, as Marrou (*VC* 12 [1958] 98–103) and Poirier (*Rev. des Etud. August.* 25 [1979] 27–34) have shown. The polarity of the left-odd-imperfect and the right-even-perfect is common in other Gnostic and early Christian texts. Cf. *Od. Sol.* 8:20–21, *Gos. Phil.* 55.14–23; *U* 19 (p. 261.7–8), noted by Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 150). Cf. also *Tri. Trac.* 95.16.

The parallel with the Marcosian numerological speculation in Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.16.2 suggests to Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 150) that the *Gos. Truth* is to be closely associated with that branch of the Valentinian school. If the attribution on other grounds of this text to Valentinus himself is correct, what we see in Marcus and his followers is a bit of older speculative tradition on which they then built their more elaborate numerology.

Schenke (*Herkunft*, 20, n.10) argues that the interpretation of the parable in Irenaeus is by the heresiologist and not the Marcosians, but this is unlikely. Cf. Schoedel, "Monism," 388.

32.8–9   *the entire number passes to the right*: In the system of manual counting, numbers up to ninety-nine are indicated by positions of the fingers of the left hand, the number 100 is indicated by the fingers of the right.

32.9   *as that which lacks draws*: For a relative clause with ⲡⲓⲣⲏⲧⲉ as the protasis of a comparative sentence, cf. *Tri. Trac.* 57.8, 62.27, 69.20. The point of the comparison made here is that as the hands change in counting from the imperfect left to the perfect right, so the quality of the number itself changes from the imperfect ninety-nine to the perfect 100. The whole process is a symbol of the perfection attained by the one who receives Gnosis.

32.10–12   *that is, ... deficient*: Grobel (*Gospel*, 131) takes this to be a "pedantic interpolation." It is better to limit the parenthetical remark to "that is, the entire right (hand)," and, like other epexegetical parentheses in the text, it is hardly clear that this is an interpolation.

32.15–16   *so too the number becomes one hundred* (ⲡⲓⲣⲏⲧⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉ ⲡⲱⲡ ⲣ̄ ϣⲉ): We construe this clause as the apodosis of a comparative sentence. The use of the conj. is unusual in such a syntactical context in A², but the *Gos. Truth* frequently uses this conjugation base in positions where it seldom appears in S and A². Note, e.g., the final clauses at 17.33, 18.5–6, 23.6, 24.14, 36.15, 37.28–29 and the use of the conj. with impersonal verbs at 25.21–22 and 32.24.

32.16   *it is the sign*: Perhaps the gesture signifying the number 100 itself is a sign of the unitary Father, as Grobel (*Gospel*, 133) suggests. The number 100 would be indicated by the end of the index finger touching the first joint of the thumb of the right hand, thus making a circle. But as Grobel himself goes on to note, the number 400 would be an even more appropriate symbol, since for that number the tip of the index finger joins the tip of the thumb. Here, it is more likely that the author takes the sign to be the movement from the left to the right.

32.17   *their sound*: It is difficult to see what sound has been involved in the preceding illustration, unless it is the sound of the number "one," of which the manual system of counting, in moving from 99 to 100 is a symbol. Grobel (*Gospel*, 133) suggests that the Coptic mechanically translates φωνή, here meaning not "sound," but "language." The pronoun must, in any case, refer to the human beings whose voice or language expresses the numbers involved in the illustration. Schenke (*Herkunft*, 48) suggests that what is in "their voice" is the name Father.

it is the Father: Grobel (*Gospel*, 122–35) takes this remark as another interpolation, but the comment is an appropriate closure to the illustration.

32.18   *even on the Sabbath he labored:* Cf. John 5:17.

for the sheep (εⲡⲉⲥⲁⲩ): For the function of the proposition ⲉ, taken by Till (*Or.* 27 [1958] 278) as a sentence introductory particle, cf. the note to 17.9–10.

32.19–20   *which he found fallen into the pit:* Cf. Matt 12:11 and Luke 14:5. Falling here may well refer to the soul which has fallen from its heavenly home into the world of matter, as Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 153) suggests.

32.20   *he gave life to the sheep:* Cf. John 10:10.

32.38–39   *you the sons of interior knowledge:* This phrase was accidentally omitted by homoioteleuton by a copyist, who included it at the bottom of the page, indicating with sigla the place where it should have come in the text. For the phrase, cf. Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.13.7, which, as Grobel (*Gospel*, 137) notes, may be an ironic use of the Gnostics' own terminology. There is no need to see with Nagel (*OLZ* 61 [1966] 9) a Syriac expression here.

32.27–28   *day from above, which has no night:* Cf. *Man. Ps.* 190.14, noted by *ed. pr.* (57). Cf. also Heb 4:9–10, on the divine state of Sabbath rest, and 4 *Ezra* 2:35 and Rev 21:22–25, alluding to Isa 60:1,19–20.

32.29–34   *light which does not sink:* For examples of similar imagery cf. Clement of Alexandria, *Prot.* 11.114.2; Methodius of Olympus, *Symp.* 11; Ps.-Hippolytus, *Pascal Homily* 1.2, texts noted by *ed. pr.* (57) and *Man. Ps.* 193.19, noted by Grobel (*Gospel*, 139); as well as *Od. Sol.* 32:1, noted by Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 154). Cf. also *Tri. Trac.* 129.1.

32.31   *say, then:* Grobel (*Gospel*, 135–37) suggests that the exhortation in this section (32.31–33.32) possibly derives from a previous homily delivered by the author of the *Gos. Truth.* Here the author appears to speak to those who have accepted and understood his own interpretation of the Christian message, and this passage would be a

major support for the position that the homily is esoteric in character. However, the exhortations here have the same ambiguous quality as the doctrinal affirmations of the text. Ordinary NT and early Christian language is deployed, with the suggestion that the concrete practices advocated have a deeper, metaphorical meaning. The whole hortatory section serves as a conclusion to the preceding discussion, much as the hymnic material of 23.18-24.19 concluded the first third of the text.

32.32 *perfect day*: The exhortation begins by reflecting the motif which concluded the preceding section. As with other motifs in the text (cf. the note to 31.28-29), the image of the perfect day shifts from being a symbol of the supernal realm to being a symbol of what the recipients of the revelation are. Once again, the shift is not accidental, but expresses the intimate association of the revealer, the content of the revelation and its recipients. For similar NT language, cf. 1 Thess 5:5, noted by Grobel (*Gospel*, 139).

32.35-36 *speak of the truth with those who search*: There may, as Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 154) suggests, be an allusion to psychic Christians here, but this is hardly explicit. For the seekers, cf. 17.4.

32.37 *error*: Again error is a charactertistic of human existence, not a hypostasis. Note that sin is seen to be based in, if not made equivalent to, ignorance.

33.1 *make firm the foot*: Cf. the "establishing" of Sophia in Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.2.4 and note that the revealer is said to support those who waver (30.32-33).

33.2-3 *stretch out your hand*: Cf. 30.19, and for possible NT sources of the imagery, Matt 8:3, Mark 1:41, Luke 5:13, Acts 4:30.

33.3 *those who are ill*: Illness here is a metaphor for the human condition of ignorance, as at *Tri. Trac.* 77.28. The text will later (35.30) use the image of the physician as a metaphor for the revealer.

33.3-4 *feed those who are hungry*: Cf. Matt 25:35, 37; Rom 12:20; John 21:15, cited by Grobel (*Gospel*, 141). In Valentinian sources revelation is often said to provide nourishment. Cf. *Tri. Trac.* 65.19. The metaphorical sense of the imagery here may be related to the

"feeding" language of the bread of life discourse in John 6:32-51.

33.5 *give repose to those who are weary*: Cf. Matt 11:28. Later (35.24-27) the "breath of incorruptibility" will be said to give rest to the sinner.

33.6-7 *raise up...awaken*: The hortatory remarks continue to reflect activities attributed to the revelatory agents. Cf. the remarks on the spirit at 30.18-22.

33.8-9 *you are the understanding that is drawn forth*: The phrase is obscure. The verb (ⲦⲀⲔⲘ, if the qualitative of ⲦⲰⲔⲘ), means "pull up, pluck." As Wilson (*NTS* 9 [1962/63] 295-98) suggests, it probably translates ἀνασπάω used of the drawing up of human souls to the divine realm at Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.7.5. There may be, as Grobel (*Gospel*, 141) suggests, an allusion to the drawing up of the sheep from the pit (32.19-24). Alternatively, ⲦⲀⲔⲘ may be an infinitive, like ⲞⲨⲀⲚⲌ at 20.6, 23 and ⲤⲀⲡⲘ at 31.23. Hence the translation could be "you are the understanding that draws forth."

Other translations of the problematic verb have been suggested. Grobel (*Gospel*, 140) and Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 155) translate actively, taking the form as if it were the infinitive. *Ed. pr.* translate, "vous êtes la conscience en plein jour," "ihr seid die gezuckte (d.h. tatbereite) Klugheit," and "you are wisdom unsheathed (as a sword for the fight)." Till (*ZNW* 50 [1959] 178) also adopts the last suggestion. Schenke (*Herkunft*, 48) translates "Ihr seid die starke Vernunft," suggesting that ⲦⲀⲔⲘ is a form of an otherwise unattested verb.

33.9-10 *if strength acts thus*: Cf. 1 John 2:14, where the addressees are labeled "strong" (ἰσχυροί). Similar terminology is used by Paul in his treatment of the factious and possibly proto-Gnostic elements in the Corinthian community. Cf., e.g., 1 Cor 4:10, 10:22. What is it for "strength" to "act thus"? The enigmatic phrase, which invites a metaphorical reading, perhaps suggests that the concrete admonitions which precede and follow are also to be understood metaphorically.

33.11 *be concerned with yourselves*: Despite the exhortations to "works of mercy," the focus of the reader's attention is directed primarily inward. Cf. also 21.11-14.

33.15 *do not return* (ⲘⲡⲢ ⲤⲱⲦⲉ): Grobel (*Gospel*, 141) takes the verb from ⲤⲱⲦⲉ, "redeem" (Crum 362a), but, as at 34.32 and 38.2, it must be seen as a form of ⲤⲱⲦ, "return" (Crum 360a). For the proverb here, cf. Prov 26:11, cited at 2 Pet 2:22. The "vomit" here is no doubt a symbol for involvement in the world of matter and ignorance.

33.14–15 *to what you have vomited*: In the Coptic the object is preposed. Grobel (*Gospel*, 142–43) and Ménard take the phrase with what precedes, in apposition to "things which you have rejected."

33.16–17 *do not be moths...worms*: Cf. Matt 6:19–20, Mark 9:48, Luke 12:33 and *Gos. Thom.* 76. The imagery of the saying is reinterpreted and the addressees are warned not to become again part of the material world which brings destruction.

33.20 *(dwelling) place for the devil*: Cf. Eph 4:27, Matt 12:43–45, Luke 11:24–26, and Valentinus, fr. 2 (Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 2.20.114,4), noted by *ed. pr.* (12).

33.21 *you have already destroyed him*: Cf. Luke 10:18, 1 John 3:8, Heb 2:14 and Rev 12:9–11. Such texts call into question the contention of Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 157) that the NT does not speak of the defeat of the devil as having already occurred.

33.22 *obstacles*: This probably translates πρόσκομμα. Cf. Rom 9:32, 33; 14:13, 20; 1 Cor 8:9, noted by Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 157). The referent of the term "obstacles" is unclear. Perhaps the author has in mind the "hylic" beings who have proved quite alien to the revelation. Cf. 31.1–3.

33.23 *as though...a support*: The meaning of the imagery here is problematic. The term Ⲥⲟ� 2ⲉ is probably a form of Ⲥⲟⲟ2ⲉ, which may mean basically either "remove," "set upright" or "reprove" (Crum 380a–b). *Ed. pr.* translate variously as "autant qu'il y a abstention," "weil es Abfall ist," and "when we abstain from them." Cf. *Exc. Theod.* 52.2. Grobel (*Gospel*, 145), noting that Ⲥⲟ2ⲉ is used at Deut 19:16 for "accusation," assumes a play on διαβολή – διάβολος in the Greek original. Schenke (*Herkunft*, 49), followed by Ménard, translates as "blame." Till (*Or* 38 [1959] 178 and *ZNW* 50 [1959] 179) translates "Abfall." Our translation assumes that the noun is to

be connected with cooϩε, "set upright," which is appropriate in the
context of the imagery deployed here.

33.24   *the lawless one* (ⲡⲓⲁⲧϩⲉⲡ): Most commentators understand
the word in this way, as used in contrast to ⲡⲓϩⲉⲡ and ⲟⲩⲇⲓⲕⲁⲓⲟⲥ
in 33.25, 29. The Greek would presumably be ἄνομος. Grobel (*Gos-
pel*, 147) however, takes it as "one who does not sue." Cf. Luke 12:58.
He notes that ἄνομος is usually transliterated in Coptic bible trans-
lations, but the translator of the *Gos. Truth* need not have followed
that convention. Grobel's construal of the rest of the sentence is quite
artificial and forced.

   is someone (ⲟⲩⲗⲁⲩⲉ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲡⲉ): Most commentators have assumed
that ⲗⲁⲩⲉ is negative, but this is not the necessary meaning of the
term. Cf. Crum 146a. To take it as negative renders the meaning of
the remark quite obscure.

33.30   *among others*: These could be other people or other works, as
ed. pr. (13) note. Cf. Matt 12:35 and Luke 6:45, noted by Schenke
(*Herkunft*, 49).

33.32   *for you are from him*: Doing the will of the Father is com-
monly recommended in early Christian literature. Cf. Matt 7:21,
12:50, 21:31; Rom 12:2. Here the motivation for this conformity to the
divine will is quite specifically Gnostic. For similar remarks on the
divine source in the NT, cf. 1 John 4:4, John 8:47, Acts 17:28, and
possibly Heb 2:11.

VII. *Redemption Is a Gentle Attraction* (33.33–36.39)

   In the next section of the text the author explores the way in which
the revelation of Gnosis effects a return to the Father. Here he
develops the image of the sweet "fragrance" of the Father, which is
associated with other images, the physician, the jars, and their
ointment.

33.33–34   *Father... in his will*: As often in the text the author begins
the development of a new theme with reference to imagery used in
concluding the preceding section. Cf. 33.31. On the sweetness of the
Father, cf. 24.9 and 42.8.

33.35   *he had taken cognizance* (ⲛⲉ·ⲁϥϫⲓ ⲥⲁⲩⲛⲉ): The force of the

pluperfect here is obscure, but cf. 21.23–25 on the Father's foreknowledge. Alternatively it might be possible to take the ⲚⲈ as a copula with what precedes. The raised dot after the ⲚⲈ might support that construal, but see the punctuation at 19.24. Against that construal is the fact that nothing in the preceding clause is plural, and emendation would be required. Hence, Till (*ed. pr.*, 13) emends to ⲌⲚ<ⲈⲂⲞⲖ ⲌⲚ> ⲠⲒⲞⲨⲰϢⲈ ⲞⲨⲠⲈⲦⲚⲀⲚⲞⲨϤ ⲚⲈ, which would mean, "things from his will are good." The adverbial predication in the text as it stands in 33.33–35 is perfectly acceptable and it seem best to take the ⲚⲈ at the preterit converter.

33.36   *things that are yours*: This obscure phrase refers to the "perfection" of each individual, which the Father retains within himself (18.36, 21.18) and which each individual receives from the Father when he ascends to him (21.20–25). This language refers in objective terms to the process of attaining self-awareness consisting in the recognition of the relation of the individual to his source or root.

   that you might find rest: The conjunctive is used here in a final sense without any conjunction. Cf. Till, *Koptische Grammatik*, #323. On the motif of rest, cf. 22.12.

33.37–38   *by the fruits*: Cf. Matt 7:16, 12:33, and Luke 6:44. The term here seems to be used as a symbol for the revealer and his message, a fruit of the Paternal root, by which recipients of Gnosis come to know what is "their own," their true identity.

34   The Coptic pagination here (ⲖⲈ = 35) is incorrect.

34.1   *his fragrance*: Here the author introduces a new image to describe the process of revelation and its effects. He begins with the notion that beings which have come from the Father exhibit the sweet fragrance of their source. They have, in other words, an element of the Father in themselves which attracts them back to him. Yet, this element or pneumatic potentiality is not enough in and of itself to guarantee that return. It is like the breath which has grown cold (34.18) and needs to be rewarmed. Hence "faith came" (34.29), bringing the "warm fulness of love" (34.30–31). Or, in terms of a related image, the Father breathes forth (35.24–25) and fills what is empty with his breath (36.30–34).

   The image of the divine fragrance was common in religious

literature of the first Christian centuries. Cf. E. Lohmeyer, "Vom göttlichen Wohlgeruch," *Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Phil.-Hist. Kl. 10, 9 (1919) 13 and H.-Ch. Puech, "Parfums sacrés, odeurs de sainteté, effluves paradisiaques," *L'Amour de l'art* (Paris, 1950) 36–40, cited by *ed. pr.* 14. Cf. in particular, 2 Cor 2:14–15, Eph 5:2, Phil 4:18, where Paul seems to rely primarily on sacrificial imagery. Among Valentinians traces of the Father's spirit are also referred to as his scent. Cf. Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.4.1, 1.23.1, and *Tri. Trac.* 72.6–7.

Segelberg (*Or. Suec.* 8 [1959] 10) finds here an allusion to a ritual of anointing, but the widespread metaphorical attestation of the imagery makes this highly uncertain.

34.5–35   Extensive remains parallel to this page are found in the fragments of the text in Codex XII. See the appendix.

34.5–6   *if it mixes with matter*: For the conjugation base, cf. 22.3. It may be proper, with Grobel (*Gospel*, 149) to translate as "since" here, although a concessive sense would be even more appropriate. The mixing of the fragrance with matter recalls the notion of the mixture of πνεῦμα with matter in Stoicism, a notion which, as Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 160) notes, has older roots. Cf., e.g., Plato, *Tim.* 41D–42D. For Gnostic attestation of this notion, cf. Hippolytus, *Ref.* 5.19–21, noted by *ed. pr.* (14).

34.7   *repose* (**c6pλ2τ̄**): Alternatively, the term could be translated "silence," as is done by Wilson (*ed. pr.*, 31). Cf. *Ap. John* BG 26.6–8.

34.8   *he causes it to surpass* (**ⲱλϥⲧⲣⲉϥⲣ̄ ⲥλ ⲧⲡⲉ**): Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 160–61) construes the words differently, taking **ⲥλⲧⲡⲉ** from **ⲥⲱⲧⲛ̄** and translating, "il lui laisse assumer toute form." The suggestion is quite unconvincing, since **ⲥλⲧⲡⲉ** is unattested as a form of **ⲥⲱⲧⲛ̄**. Furthermore, **ⲥⲱⲧⲛ̄** does not readily mean what Ménard suggests it to mean here. The point of the remark is that although the spiritual "fragrance" is found mixed with matter, it is superior to every element of the material, phenomenal world. Till (*Or.* 28 [1959] 179 and *ZNW* 50 [1959] 179) cites for comparison, *PS* 97 (p.235.4); 97 (p. 237.6); 98 (p. 240.23).

34.9–10   *it is not the ears that smell*: Till (*Or.* 28 [1959] 174, 179)

emends by supplying a resumptive prepositional phrase after the verb and providing a pronominal subject. His suggestion "Denn nicht die Ohren sind es, <mit denen> er den Geruch riecht," makes for a smoother reading, but, given the text's penchant for striking metaphors, it is unnecessary. The point of the remark seems to be to compare two modes of appropriating the revelatory insight. What comes through the ears is seen to be less effective, less direct and less intimate than what comes "through the breath/spirit." The author obviously plays on the two senses of *pneuma* (34.11). Similar remarks on the hierarchy of modes of revelation are found at *Tri. Trac.* 129.30–34 and 133.1–6, although there the contrast is between hearing and vision.

34.10–12 *but...the fragrance*: The word ⲡⲥⲧⲁⲉⲓ (34.10) is not, as *ed. pr.* (15), Grobel (*Gospel*, 151) and Schenke (*Herkunft*, 49) suggest, a dittography. Nor is Till's emendation of ⲡⲉⲡⲛⲁ to ⲡⲉ<ⲡ>ⲡⲛⲁ necessary. The word is probably the preposed object of ⲱⲁⲩⲥⲱⲕ in apposition with ⲡⲱⲱⲗⲙ̄ in 34.12. Nagel (*OLZ* 61 [1966] 11) suggests that the term is a mistranslation of the Syriac, where the words for the organs of sound and smell are similar. However, the contrast of the two sensory organs is quite comprehensible in this context, as Böhlig (*Muséon* 79 [1966] 323) notes.

34.14 *he shelters it*: The conjugation base here is probably the conj., although the form is normally found in B. Cf. Till (*Or.* 28 [1959] 174) and note the similar forms at *Tri. Trac.* 51.2, 25. Grobel (*Gospel*, 150) and Schenke (*Herkunft*, 49) construe ⲛ̄ⲧϥⲙⲁⲛⲉϥ as ⲛ̄ⲧϥ ⲙⲁ ⲛⲉϥ ("There is a place for him" and "Er ist ja der Ort für ihn"), but both translations are impossible without an article before ⲙⲁ. For the verb, which means literally "bring to harbor," cf. Crum 173b.

34.15 *take it to the place*: For the need to "return" to the Father, cf. 21.21, 22.7, 38.2–4, 41.4–14.

34.18–19 *it is something* (ⲟⲩⲉⲉⲓ...ⲡⲉ): Schenke (*Herkunft*, 49) emends to ⲟⲩ{ⲉ}ⲉⲓ and renders "it is a coming," but this is unnecessary, as Grobel (*Gospel*, 153) and Arai (*Christologie*, 37, n.4) note. For similar expressions, cf. 19.6; 36.28; 37.6, 11. Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 161) seems to construe as if the text read ⲉϥⲟⲉⲓ,

although he does not suggest an emendation. This construal ignores the пє in 34.19.

34.19 *psychic form*: In this passage, the author has already played on the double meaning of пиєүма (34.11). Here he plays on the similarity of ψυχή ("soul") and ψῦχος ("cold"). A similar connection was frequently made in ancient discussions of the soul and its relationship to matter. Cf. Tertullian, *De anima* 25.2, 25.6, 27.5 and Philo, *Somn.* 1.31, cited by *ed. pr.* (15). There is hardly any sacramental allusion here, as Segelberg (*Or. Suec.* 8 [1959] 36) suggests. The point here is clearly that the warm spiritual breath of the Father becomes cool and psychic by its association with matter.

34.21 *which has frozen* (єитаϩωτє): The verb ωτє is problematic. Grobel (*Gospel*, 155) thought he detected a ϣ written above the line, but this was merely ink seepage from the preceding page. Reading ϣτє, which he takes to be a variant for ϣτа (Crum 593b), he translates "cold water that has waned," but that is hardly satisfactory. Schenke (*Herkunft*, 49) suggests a connection with ωτ (Crum 531b), an equally obscure word. Dubois (*VC* 29 [1975] 139) suggests that ϩωτє is a A² form of ϩατє, "flow," but both in terms of morphology and the sense of the image this is unsatisfactory. Another solution is proposed by Lucchesi (*Or.* 47 [1978] 483–84), who derives the word from Egyptian '*d*, "to dig, scoop out," and translates, rather loosely, "eau qui détruit." Once again, this translation does not fit the imagery well. W. Westendorf (*Koptisches Handwörterbuch*, 295) does not propose an etymology, but suggests that the term might mean "einsinken." Why there should then be a "dissolution" (34.24) of such water is unclear. The illustration demands something like the sense of our translation. Water mixed with loose soil and frozen would give a deceptive appearance of solidity. As Grobel (*Gospel*, 155) notes, the illustration presupposes conditions in Italy rather than in Egypt.

34.22 *that is not solid*: Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 162) suggests that the language reflects speculation about the fluidity of matter generally. Cf. Plato, *Tim.* 30A, Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.5.5. The "fluidity" here, however, is applied metaphorically not to matter, but to spirit. As пиєүма is mixed with matter and "frozen" into forgetfulness, it loses its fluidity. The elements of the illustration need not be further allegorized.

34.25–26   *if a breath draws it*: Here the author has concluded the illustration dealing with water and combines it with the image of the fragrance. Here he notes that if a breath draws the fragrance, it becomes warm. He goes on to indicate how this illustrates the situation of the children of the Father. Schenke (*Herkunft*, 50) and Till (*Or.* 28 [1959] 179) suggest a different translation, "When a breath draws itself in," it (the breath itself) becomes hot. This would be a new illustration, which fits ill with what precedes.

34.28   *from the division*: The remark is obscure. In this context it apparently refers to the separation of the fragrances of the Father from their source, effected by Error. Cf. 17.29–36. There may be a parallel in the episode of the cosmogonic myth in which Sophia separates herself from her defective offspring. Cf. Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.2.4 and *Tri. Trac.* 88.23–25, where the Logos undergoes the same experience.

34.28–29   *faith came* (ⲁϥ ⲛ̄ϭⲓ ⲡⲛⲁϩⲧⲉ): Although the last letter of line 28 is uncertain, the word here is certainly not ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ, as suggested by Schenke (*Herkunft*, 50) and Grobel (*Gospel*, 155). The author uses language of faith only here and at 23.32. Faith presumably "comes" through, and as a response to, the revelation of the gospel (34.35). Thus, the term is used metonymously, much as is "hope" (35.3).

34.30   *pleroma*: A translation "fulness" would be quite appropriate here, but the author may be playing with the technical sense which the term may also have. Cf. 16.35.

34.32   *should not come again* (ⲛⲉϥⲥⲱⲧⲉ ⲁϣⲱⲡⲉ): The conjugation base here is the neg. fut. III., not the conj., as Grobel (*Gospel*, 155) suggests.

34.35   *gospel*: Here the Coptic term ⲱ̄ⲙ ⲛⲟⲩϥⲉ is used, whereas elsewhere the Greek ⲉⲩⲁⲅⲅⲉⲗⲓⲟⲛ is employed.

34.36   *discovery* (ⲧϭⲓⲛⲉ): As Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 163) notes, the use of the feminine article with the normally masculine noun is perhaps due to the gender of the underlying Greek, εὕρησις, *vel sim.*

Till (*Or.* 28 [1959] 174) unnecessarily emends to ⲧⲟⲓⲛⲉ<ⲓ>, "the coming."

of the pleroma: This phrase links the following paragraph with the preceding. Cf. 34.31. Here, and at 35.7, the term could well be translated "fulness," as in the preceding section.

34.37–35.1   *those who await the salvation*: The language, reminiscent of Rom 8:18–25 or 2 Cor 5:1–5, is eschatological, but the problem dealt with here is not. The basic issue is whether there should be any "waiting" or any "searching" for the truth of revelation.

35   The Coptic pagination (ⲗⲋ = 36) is again incorrect. Cf. the similar error on page 34.

35.2–11   *while their hope, etc.*: The syntax and the sense here are problematic. Earlier translators ignore the circumstantial converter in ⲉⲥⲥⲁⲙⲧ and hence take the remark about the "waiting hope" independently from what follows. The phrase, however, is intimately connected with what follows, beginning the time at which the "pleroma is coming" (35.6–8). Part of the difficulty in seeing the connection is due to the parenthetical remark of 35.4–7. That remark probably occasioned an anacolouthon in this lengthy sentence.

The paragraph as a whole serves the same sort of qualifying function found in earlier sections of the text. Cf. 17.21–29, 17.36–18.11. The author wants to indicate that the delay in effecting a return to the Father is not really the Father's fault, any more than is the very existence of oblivion and error (35.9–11). Nonetheless, the delay is somehow occasioned by the depth of the Father (35.14–18). Such an overly subtle, and hardly satisfactory, distinction is also made at 18.1–3.

Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 165) suggests that the author is basically struggling to preserve the transcendence of the Father while affirming his implication in the soteriological process. The problem seems, rather, to be one of theodicy.

35.3   *their hope*: The term refers metonymously to the object of hope, the salvation from on high. Cf. 34.28–29.

35.5–35   Extensive fragments parallel to this page are preserved in Codex XII. See the appendix.

35.5 *light with no shadow*: Cf. 1 John 1:5, James 1:17. Those who are to accept the revealing Gnosis are like the realm of light from which they have come. Descriptions of the transcendent world as a world of light are common in the religious literature of the first Christian centuries.

35.6 *at that time* (ⲙ̅ⲡⲥⲁⲡ ⲉⲧⲙ̅ⲙⲉⲩ): Cf. 36.27. Schenke (*Herkunft*, 50) construes the words differently as ⲙ̅ⲡⲥⲁ ⲡⲉⲧⲙ̅ⲙⲉⲩ, "von jener Seite," i.e., from "on high." The use of the article with the demonstrative ⲉⲧⲙ̅ⲙⲉⲩ would be highly unusual for this text, as Grobel (*Gospel*, 157) notes. Cf. the index, *s.v.* ⲙ̅ⲙⲉⲩ. The reference here is to the time of hope and expectation already described.

   Then (ⲉⲓⲱϫⲉ): It is also possible to translate the word as a conditional conjunction, "if." (Crum 64a). The exact logic of the sentence is obscure. It is possible that the conditional would have concessive force. Thus, the argument might be paraphrased, "Even if, while those who wait for salvation are waiting, the fulness (of knowledge and love) is (only) in the process of coming; nonetheless, the condition of deficiency, which obtains in this situation, is not due to the Father's limitlessness. The coming of the revelation provides time for the deficiency which is mysterious, but in any case, Error does not exist in the great depth of the Father's being." The shift in tenses between lines 8 and 9 suggests that ⲉⲓⲱϫⲉ should be taken as an illative particle and that a new sentence should begin with "the deficiency."

35.8 *proceeding to come* (ϣⲁϥⲙⲁⲁϩⲉ ⲁⲉⲓ): Such an auxiliary use of ⲙⲁⲁϩⲉ (= S ⲙⲟⲟϣⲉ) is attested. Cf. Crum 203b. The construction may be used here to emphasize the fact that the coming of the fulness involves an extended period of time. Cf. 35.11. In the *Tri. Trac.* 118.28–119.8, there is a discussion of the sudden illumination of spiritual people and a gradual illumination of psychics, but the *Gos. Truth* does not seem to be operating with such a distinction.

35.9 *<deficiency>* (ϣⲧϣ): The form is unknown and is probably simply a scribal error for ϣⲧⲁ, which appears in the fragmentary parallel of Codex XII:59.4.

35.11 *to give time* (ⲁⲧⲛ̅ ⲟⲩⲁⲉⲓϣ): The form ⲁⲧⲛ̅ has been read by most earlier translators as a preposition (Crum 427b), to be translated

"at the time." This requires the emendation suggested by *ed. pr.*, ⲁⲧⲛ̅ <ⲡ>ⲟⲩⲁⲉⲓⲱ. Alternatively, ⲧⲛ̅ may be the pre-nominal form of †, usually found with the dative. If so, there is here another example of the "proclitic †" discussed by Emmel. Cf. the note to 30.25–26.

35.13   *incorruptible one*: As Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 165) notes, this epithet is common for various elements of the pleroma in Valentinian and other Gnostic sources. Cf., e.g., Hippolytus, *Ref.* 6.29.2; Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.21.5; Origen, *In Joh.* 13.51; *Ap. John* BG 20.16, 24.9, etc.

35.14   *in this way*: That is, in such a way as to "give time" to the deficiency.

35.15   *depth*: The "depth" of the Father was previously cited as the cause of error (22.24–25). So, too, here it is not through the "limitlessness" of the Father, but through the "depth" of his being that deficiency and error arise. The contrast between limitlessness and depth is obscure, but, as the following remark indicates, the inference to be drawn from the contrast is that error and deficiency are extrinsic to the being of the Father. Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 166) suggests that the "multiplying of the depth" causes the destruction of error. In view of the earlier passage on the significance of the Father's depth (22.24–25), this is highly unlikely. Cf. also 18.1–3.

    was multiplied (ⲁϥⲁϣⲉ{ⲉ}ⲉⲓ): The verb form here is probably a misspelled form of ⲁϣⲁⲓ, as suggested by Schenke (*Herkunft*, 50) who translates "reich war," and Till (*Or.* 28 [1959] 176). Grobel (*Gospel*, 159) alternatively emends to ⲁϥ{ⲁ}ϣⲉ ⲉⲉⲓ and translates, "he proceeded to come."

35.18–19   *it is a thing that falls ... stands upright*: The force of this remark is as obscure as much else in this paragraph. The point seems to be that the situation of deficiency and error, being extrinsic to the being of the Father, is easily rectified. Recall the imagery of waking the sleeper (30.21–22). Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 166) unnecessarily takes ⲍⲱϥ as equivalent to Greek μυστήριον here. Cf. 39.20–21.

35.20   *discovery*: The paragraph ends with an *inclusio* on the theme of "discovery" (cf. 34.36), which is effected by the one who "brings back." This remark introduces the subject of the next paragraph,

which thus returns to the theme of the return effected by the revelation, a theme interrupted by the qualifying paragraph.

35.22–23   *bringing back is called repentence*: Repentence, μετάνοια, is a common theme in Hellenistic religious literature and in Gnosticism, as *ed. pr.* (17) and Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 166–167) note. The paradigmatic Valentinian conversion is that of Sophia, who turns away from the passions she has engendered toward the transcendent world. Cf. Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.4.2 and *Tri. Trac.* 81.19–29. This is the only explicit allusion to the theme in this text. Grobel (*Gospel*, 162–63) suggests that behind the remark here lies a Semitic etymology, since in Hebrew repentance, *teshuvah*, is derived from the root "to return" *shwb*.

35.24–25   *incorruptibility breathed forth*: The breath imagery from the discussion of the fragrance (34.1–33) reemerges here. The passage also recalls the description of the spirit chasing the sleeper and setting him on his feet (30.16–23). There, however, the spirit awakened; here the breath brings to a state of rest. The images are antithetical, but they relate to the same experience.

35.25–26   *the one who had sinned*: Cf. 32.37. "Sin" is probably understood here metaphorically in terms of error and ignorance.

35.26–27   *he might rest* (ϻⲀⲧⲚ ϻ̄ⲘⲀϥ): We take the verb as reflexive as do most translators. It could also, however, be transitive, "might give him rest" as Grobel (*Gospel*, 163) maintains. In either case, the "sinner" finds rest through an external agent.

35.29   *the word of the pleroma*: Cf. 16.34. This phrase probably stands in apposition with "what remains." Grobel (*Gospel*, 165) suggests that the phrase is in apposition to the light, but that is unlikely. Throughout the text the word which comes from the pleroma serves salvific functions. Here the "light in the deficiency" is the object of the salvific activity, imaged first as forgiveness, then as healing.

35.30–31   *the physician runs*: Ed. pr. (17) note a non-canonical saying of Jesus similar to this phrase and found in the Diatessaron, *"Sed ubi dolores sunt, ait, illic festinat medicus."* Cf. A. Resch,

Agrapha (2nd ed.; TU 15: Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1906; reprinted Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1967) #176, p. 202 and Ephrem, *Commentaire de l'Évangile concordant* (ed. L. Leloir; CSCO 145, 175).

35.32   *the will*: On the level of the illustration, the comment simply refers to the ordinary intention of physicians. The term also recalls the importance of the Father's will (22.10, 34). It is the Father's will to heal the sickness of ignorance which motivates the revealer-physician. Cf. John 5:17-23.

35.35-37   *pleroma...fills the deficiency*: Cf. 24.20-27. The latter part of this clause could also be translated "but the deficiency fills itself up." In either case the basic structure of the sentence is a three-member nominal predication, where the subject, "pleroma" is modified by a compound relative clause (35.36-37).

35.37-36.1   *he provided from himself*: The subject is presumably the Father.

36.2   *what he lacks*: The pronoun refers to the "one who has a deficiency" (35.33).

36.3   *grace*: Cf. 16.32.

36.8-9   *when that which was diminished was received*: What was diminished is presumably the knowledge of the Father. Alternatively, the phrase could be personal, "he who was diminished" and synonymous with "the one who suffered a deficiency." His "reception" would be the return to the Father. Cf. 35.18-23.

36.9-10   *he revealed what he lacked, being (now) a pleroma*: Having been "filled up," the one who was deficient now is full, and he thereby shows forth what he had been missing. Grobel (*Gospel*, 166-67) suggests a different construal: "he (the Father) whom he (the deficient one) had lacked, revealed him (the deficient one) to be a pleroma." *Ed. pr.*, Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 63), Till (*ZNW* 50 [1959] 181), and Grobel (*Gospel*, 166) take the phrase "what he lacked" in apposition with an element in the preceding clause, rather than the preposed object of ⲁϥⲟⲩⲁⲛϩϥ, as here. Schenke (*Herkunft*, 51) also

begins a new section with ⲁϥⲟⲩⲁⲛϨϥ (36.9) and takes the subject to be Christ. Cf. 36.14.

36.11   *that is the discovery, etc.*: This clause summarizes the whole process which has been described in the preceding paragraph.

36.13   *immutable*: Cf. 17.26.

36.14   *Christ*: Only here is the title used. As Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 170) suggests, the term is probably employed because of the play on anointing in this paragraph. Cf. *Ap. John* BG 30.17, CG II,*r*.6.25–26, CG III,*r*.10.2–4.

in their midst: The various designations for the revelation have been spoken of as appearing or coming "into the midst." Cf. 19.19; 20.9–10; 26.4–5, 27–28. Note in particular that Jesus "came into the midst" and "spoke" (19.19). Does the passive voice here imply some sort of distinction between Jesus who spoke and Christ who was spoken about? Further fragments from Codex XII parallel this section. See the appendix.

36.15   *so that* (ⲱⲓⲛⲉ): Although the spelling with a final ⲉ rather than ⲁ is unusual, the word is certainly the final conjunction, and is taken thus by most editors. Grobel (*Gospel*, 166), however, takes it as an imperative of ⲱⲓⲛⲉ (Crum 569a). What is said about Christ thus becomes "Seek and they shall receive," a possible allusion to Matt 7:7. The continuation of the imperative with a third person conj. is forced and artificial.

36.17   *anoint them with the ointment*: Nagel (*OLZ* 61 [1966] 10) sees a Syriac word play here, but the same play is possible in Greek. Cf. 1 John 2:20–27. Segelberg (*Or. Suec.* 8 [1958] 12) also notes Theophilus, *Ad Autolycum* 1.12, καλούμεθα Χριστιανοὶ ἐπειδὴ χριόμεθα ἔλαιον θεοῦ. For a Gnostic example of this common paronomasia, cf. *Gos. Phil.* 74.12–19, noted by Böhlig (*Muséon* 79 [1966] 329.)

There may be in this phrase some allusion to a sacramental practice, as suggested by Ludin Jansen (*Ac. Or.* 28 [1964–65] 215–19) and Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 170). For Valentinian rituals involving anointing, cf. Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.21.3–4. There, the ointment is said (1.21.3) to be "a type of the sweet savor which is above all things,"

which recalls the image of the fragrance developed at 34.1–34. Cf. also *Val. Exp.* 40.8–29.

36.17–18   *ointment is the mercy*: As Segelberg (*Or. Suec.* 8 [1958] 13) notes, there is a play here on ἔλαιον (oil) and ἔλεος (mercy). Cf. 35.27, and the remarks there on forgiveness, and 39.26, where mercy "finds a name" with the Father. Here, as frequently in the text, we seem to have ordinary Christian symbolic language used with a new layer of metaphorical meaning.

36.20   *those who have become perfect*: Those who receive the ointment of mercy are already perfected. If there is any allusion to a sacramental practice, such as to baptism or confirmation, as suggested by *ed. pr.* (18–19) and Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 171), it is clear that the importance of such a ritual is minimized. For Valentinian debates about the significance of sacramental practice, cf. Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.21.4.

36.21   *full jars*: The author returns to the jar imagery which had been developed earlier (25.25–26.15). Here, the imagery first illustrates the principle that unction comes to the perfect, since only full jars are "anointed" with a seal (36.21–22). Then the author develops the illustration in a more obscure way, by noting that when a jar's seal is removed, the jar is emptied and the cause for the emptiness is whatever removed the seal. This further development of the jar image serves as a symbol of what does *not* happen in the comparandum. No "seal" is removed from the analogue of the full jar, the perfect one, whose deficiency the Father has filled. The whole jar image thus serves to reinterpret radically the notion of the Father's mercy.

36.22   *anointed*: The term signifies the sealing, probably with pitch, of the stopper of an amphora, as is clear from the reference to a seal at 36.31. Cf. Grobel, *Gospel*, 169.

36.25–26   *reason for there being a deficiency is the thing by which its ointment goes*: The phrase is obscure. *Ed. pr.* (Eng.) and Grobel (*Gospel*, 169) translate "the reason...is the fact that its ointment goes," but the relative clause would not normally be used for such a

construction. Whatever the precise point of the remark, it is closely associated with the following, equally obscure, notice.

36.28   *breath draws it*: Till (*Or.* 28 [1959] 181) translates "pflegt ein einzigen Hauch...es zu füllen," noting that in the A version of Nah 3:14 ἐπισᾶσαι is translated by ΜΟΥϩ, while in B it is translated by ϹⲰⲔ. *Ed. pr.* (Fr.) and Guillaumont (*Rev. d' Eg.* 24 [1972] 80–82) note that ΜΟΥϩ in Nah 3:14 has the special sense of "to draw water," so the passage does not warrant Till's translation.

The imagery here recalls the "fragrance" passage, especially 34.25–26, and the subsequent allusion to that passage at 35.24–25. However, the image of the breath which "draws out" the contents of an unsealed jar does not represent the spirit which warms the cold psyche or gives rest to the errant "sinner." It is simply part of the illustration showing what does not happen to a sealed jar.

36.28–29   *a thing in the power of that which is with it*: The phrase is in apposition, either with "breath" or with the "it" which is drawn forth from the jar. In either case, the referents of the pronouns are obscure. We understand "a thing" to refer to the content of the unsealed jar, which, once the seal is gone, is in the power of the external air which is now "with it." Despite the obscure language and quaint physics, the point is a rather simple one. When a jar is unsealed, liquid can and often does come out. Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 171) suggests a rather unconvincing allegorical interpretation of the passage, which is quite foreign to the point being made in this section. He suggests, "A ce moment, l'esprit, qui prend conscience de lui-même à l'intérieur du pneumatique, attire l'Esprit à lui par la puissance de celui qui est avec lui, c'est-à-dire le Père, la puissance signifiant ici la force céleste."

36.30–32   *but from him who has no deficiency, etc.*: We translate personally, although an impersonal translation would also be possible. This sentence could still be part of the illustration, contrasting a full, sealed, jar with an unsealed one (36.22–29). By 36.33 the author is clearly involved in application of the imagery and that application seems to begin here.

The logical order of the elements of the image has been reversed. In the image, the removal of the seal is the cause for a deficiency. In contrast, we would expect here, if we were still only within the image,

the notice that from an unsealed jar nothing is emptied. Instead, we hear that a non-deficient jar remains sealed. This remark repeats in terms of the imagery of the passage the principle enunciated above that the perfect get the anointing (36.19–20).

36.33–34   *what he lacks the perfect Father fills again*: The remark may be a bit jarring in light of the preceding affirmation that non-deficient jars, i.e., perfect people, are sealed and do not get emptied. The text does not apparently envision an emptying of full and sealed jars, but it has regularly spoken about the need to eliminate the initial deficiency. Before the seal is smeared on, the jar has to be filled. "Again" (ⲁⲛ) may be a mistranslation of the prepositional prefix in a verb such as ἀναπίμπλημι or of an adverb such as ἄνωθεν. Cf. John 3:3.

36.34   *perfect Father*: Cf. Matt 5:48 and Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.2.2. Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 171) claims that this epithet seems to be unknown in Gnostic documents before Valentinianism. Cf. also *Tri. Trac.* 61.29.

36.35   *good*: Cf. Matt 19:17, Mark 10:18, Luke 18:18; *Ap. John* BG 25.18–19; CG II,*r.*4.6–7; III,*r.*6.10–11; IV,*r.*6.4–5, noted by Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 171) and cf. also *Tri. Trac.* 61.29.

36.36   *plantings*: The beings which emanate from the Father are frequently depicted with such agricultural imagery. Cf. Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.7.3; *Ap. John* BG 36.3; 57.5; 62.7; 64.5; 71.10, cited by Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 172). Cf. also *Tri. Trac.* 62.5–11, 88.20–22. More general use of the imagery may be found at 1 Cor 3:9; John 15:1; Ignatius, *Trall.* 11:1, *Phil.* 3:1; *Od. Sol.* 11:18–19; *Gos. Phil.* 87.29–31, texts noted by *ed. pr.* (20–21).

36.37   *paradise*: For the "heavenly" paradise, a Jewish apocalyptic image widespread in Gnosticism, cf. Irenaeus, *Haer.* 3.15.2; *Ap. John* BG 55.20; 62.1; CG II,*r.*21.18, 25–26; 24.7, cited by Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 172). Cf. also *Tri. Trac.* 96.29; 101.30.

36.38–39   *his paradise in his place of rest*: The phrase may be an interpolation or gloss, as Grobel (*Gospel*, 173) suggests, but that is hardly certain. The motif is hardly a late Gnostic one, as Ménard

(*L'Évangile*, 172) suggests. Cf. *4 Ezra* 8:52. See also the note to 22.12.

VIII. *Return Is by the Will and through the Name of the Father* (36.39–40.23)

The next section of the text contains a new reflection on the process of salvation effected by revelation (36.39–38.6). First, the revealing Word is characterized as an expression of the will of the Father. Then follows a meditation on the name of the Father, which is the Son. This meditation (38.7–39.28) reverently explores the major content of the revealing Word. The author concludes with a response to a possible objection to the theory of the significance of the "name" (39.28–40.23).

36.39   *this*: The antecedent is unclear. It is probably a general reference to the whole revelatory message. The paragraph beginning at 34.34 opens in a similar way.

37.1   *perfection*: Note the linkage with the conclusion of the preceding paragraph, where the "perfect Father" was in view (36.34).
     in the thought: This section of the text begins, as did the work as a whole, with a reference to what is in the Father's thought. Cf. 16.35–36.

37.1–3   *thought…his meditation*: Terms such as this appear in Valentinian sources, such as the account of Ptolemy's system in Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.1.1, to designate hypostases within the complex being of the Godhead. In other sources, however, such terms appear only as attributes of the Father. Cf. *Tri. Trac.* 51.5, 55.37, 57.3–8. The possessive pronoun in 37.3 probably refers to the Father, despite the objection of Grobel (*Gospel*, 173), as Story (*Nature*, 31) notes.

37.4   *each one of his words*: The aeons of the pleroma are called "words" at Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.14.1. In the *Tri. Trac.* 60.34, they are said to have been produced "like a word." Here the systematic ambiguity of the text again appears in full force. The author uses terminology which can have a technical, speculative and esoteric sense or an exoteric, salvation-historical sense. The basic point of the remark is to affirm the unity of the underlying "will" and the multiplicity of "words" which issue from the Father, however those words are to be understood. For similar emphasis on the unity in the

multiplicity of the divine world, cf. *Tri. Trac.* 66.34–67.14, 73.28–74.18.

37.6   *will*: Cf. 22.34. This brief remark sounds the theme that will occupy the bulk of the following section (37.14–38.6).

37.7   *while they were still depths* (ⲉⲩⲟ ⲛ̄ⲃⲁⲑⲟⲥ): Cf. *Tri. Trac.* 60.16–22, for the aeons being in the depth of the Father. The current passage might be translated "while they were still in depths of the Father," as is done by *ed. pr.*, Ménard, and Schenke, although this would not be the regular meaning of ⲟ ⲛ-. Further fragments from Codex XII parallel this section. See the appendix.

37.8–9   *the Word…revealed them*: Here and at 37.11 the Greek term λόγος is used rather than Coptic ϣⲉϫⲉ which appears elsewhere. The Word in the *Gos. Truth* is here seen to function iɪ much the same way as the Son does in the *Tri. Trac.* (where the Woro or Logos is the name of subordinate emanation, roughly equivalent to Sophia in other Valentinian sources). In the *Tri. Trac.* the Son is the "first" emanation of the Father (56.23–30, 57.19–23), who is the source of the rest of the pleromatic world (66.5–37).

37.10–12   *mind…silent grace*: These terms recall the names of other members of the complex primal divinity in various Valentinian systems. Cf. Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.1.1 and Epiphanius, *Pan.* 31.5.1–4. The reference to a "mind that speaks" is the closest that the *Gos. Truth* comes to hypostatizing explicitly any of the attributes of the Father mentioned here.

37.12–14   *he was called thought since they were in it*: The gender of the pronouns is problematic. As Till (*Or.* 27 [1958] 278) suggests, the underlying Greek probably played on the terms νοῦς, "mind" (37.10) and ἔννοια, "thought" (37.13). The gender of the first is reflected in the masculine subject; the gender of the second in the pronominal phrase with its feminine pronoun. The text may here be hinting at the androgynous nature of the components or aspects of the Father, a notion frequent in Valentinian texts. Cf. Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.1.1.

37.15   *he*: This is, no doubt, a reference to the Word.

37.16 *at the time*: As Grobel (*Gospel*, 175) notes, it is unclear whether the reference is protological or incarnational, although in the context of the various, thinly veiled allusions to the origins of the emanations of the Father the protological reference is probably primary, but the ambiguity may be intentional.

37.19–21 *and the will...is pleased with*: Grobel (*Gospel*, 175) views this parenthetical remark as another interpolation. Cf. *Tri. Trac.* 58.34–59.1, where the Father is said to rest upon the Son, who "rests upon" the Church. Cf. Matt 12:18.

37.22 *without him*: The pronoun probably refers to the Word.

37.23 *without the will*: This is perhaps an allusion to Matt 10:29 in the form attested in several Latin Fathers, "*sine patris vestri voluntate.*" Cf. van Unnik (*Jung Codex*, 120–21).

37.25 *unsearchable* (ⲟⲩⲁⲧⲧⲉϩⲉⲣⲉⲧϥ̄): The word is otherwise unattested, but the abstract appears at *Tri. Trac.* 87.12. *Ed. pr.* (58) plausibly suggest a connection with Rom 11:33, ἀνεξιχνίαστος. Cf. also Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.2.1, 1.15.5, 2.18.1. Grobel (*Gospel*, 175) suggests a translation of "not predeterminable." On the incomprehensibility of the Father himself, recall the formulaic expression of 17.8 and 18.32.

   trace (ⲓ̈ⲭⲛⲟⲥ): For remarks on other "traces" of the incomprehensible Father, cf. *Tri. Trac.* 66.3, 73.6. The unusual orthography is paralleled at CG IX,*I*:14.15.

37.27 *will know him*: The referent of the pronouns here and in the following two phrases is unclear. They all could refer to the "unsearchable will." Yet, while the will is mysterious, it is the "trace" of the incomprehensible Father. Hence, we take the pronouns to refer to the Father himself. For similar remarks about the Father keeping himself unknown while giving hints about his transcendent being, cf. *Tri. Trac.* 61.1–18.

37.29–34 *but when...desiring the Father*: The syntax here is complex. The basic structure of the sentence is a three-member nominal predication, interrupted by a parenthetical remark which dramatically delays the disclosure of what the Father's will is.

37.31-33   *even if the sight does not please them*: The referent of the
pronoun is unclear. It may be the "they" of 37.8, i.e., the "words" or
emanations of the Father. Cf. also 37.35. Or it could be simply a
general reference to anyone confronted with "the sight." That term is
quite obscure. It may simply refer to the "sight" of the Father's will
which is ascertainable. This might be unpleasing because it consists
only in willing or desiring the Father.

37.33   *before God*: "God" appears only here in the text. The phrase
could also be taken with the following, as is done by *ed. pr.*, Grobel
(*Gospel*, 176), Schenke (*Herkunft*, 52) and Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 64).
In either case, the phrase probably functions as an exclamation and
not as an allusion to an inferior deity below the Father and his will, as
Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 176) suggests.

37.33-34   *desiring the Father* (ⲡⲟⲩⲱϣⲉ ⲡⲓⲱⲧ): With Till (*Or.* 27
[1958] 279), we construe ⲡⲟⲩⲱϣⲉ as the predicate of the nominal
sentence of 37.31. With Till, we also associate ⲡⲓⲱⲧ with what
precedes. Other translators, *ed. pr.*, Grobel (*Gospel*, 176), Schenke
(*Herkunft*, 52) and Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 64) take the term ⲡⲓⲱⲧ
with the following sentence, but the post-positive ⲅⲁⲣ after ⲉϥⲥⲁⲩⲛⲉ
(37.34) precludes that option. Till takes ⲡⲓⲱⲧ in loose apposition
with ⲡⲟⲩⲱϣⲉ but another possibility is to see it as the object of the
substantivized infinitive. ⲟⲩⲱϣⲉ is a slightly unusual pre-nominal
form of the infinitive, although ⲟⲩⲱϣ- and ⲟⲩⲉϣⲉ- are attested.
Cf. Crum 500a. For the notion expressed here, cf. *Tri. Trac.* 61.24-
28.

37.35   *of all of them*: These are presumably the same beings referred
to at 37.32.

37.36-37   *he will question them directly* (ϥⲛⲁϣⲛⲧⲟⲩ ⲁ2ⲣⲉⲩ):
The phrase has caused editors a good deal of consternation, especially
because of the form ⲁ2ⲣⲉⲩ. This is simply the preposition ⲁ with the
normal A² pre-suffixal form of 2ⲟ, literally, "to their face." This may
be an allusion to 1 Cor 13:12.

37.37   *the end is receiving knowledge*: Cf. John 17:3.

37.38   *and this is the Father*: Grobel (*Gospel*, 179) unnecessarily
considers this another interpolation.

38.1   *the beginning*: As Ménard (L'*Évangile*, 177) notes, the first principle or beginning (ἀρχή) of all was the Son, who, in turn, generated the Logos, according to Ptolemy in Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.8.5. Here, the "beginning" would seem to be the Word. Cf. 37.9–10.

38.3   *return* (cⲱⲧⲉ): No emendation is necessary here. The form is simply an orthographic variant of cⲱⲧ. In Codex I there is considerable variation in the forms of cⲱⲧ and cⲱⲧⲉ. See the indices, *s.v.* cⲱⲧ, cⲱⲧⲉ.

38.5–6   *they have appeared for the glory and the joy of his name*: In the *Tri. Trac.* it is frequently emphasized that the aeons have come forth from the Father for his glory. They, in fact, find their authentic existence in glorifying the one from whom they have come and whom they have come to know. Cf. *Tri. Trac.* 64.8, 20–21; 68.4–69.14. Cf. also Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.1.2 and *Exc. Theod.* 65, noted by Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 177).

38.7   *the name of the Father is the Son*: This sentence is hardly, as Grobel (*Gospel*, 181) suggests, an interpolation. It functions well to introduce the elaborate reflection on the theme which extends through 40.23. This passage has attracted a good deal of attention and comment. See in particular Arai, *Christologie*, 62–73; Ménard, *SMR* 5 (1962) 185–214; Dubois, *RThPh* 24 (1974) 198–216, and J. Fineman, *Rediscovery*, 1.289–318, with the further literature cited in those discussions.

The roots of the speculation elaborated here would appear to be in Jewish reflections of the Hellenistic and early Roman periods on the ineffable name of God, the *Shem hammephorash*, and those beings who bear that name and thus reveal God. Early evidence of such speculation is Philo's description of the Logos as God's "firstborn" and "name" (*Conf. ling.* 146). Philo's text may be a philosophical interpretation of such esoteric traditions as are represented in the later *3 Enoch* 12; *Apoc. Abr.* 10 and *PS* 7, where an angel (Metatron in *3 Enoch*) is given the name, and with it, the authority of Yahweh. For a discussion of this tradition and its significance, cf. Quispel, *Jung Codex*, 72–76 and "Christliche Gnosis und jüdische Heterodoxie," *ET* 14 (1954) 474–84. Such speculation is probably reflected in early Christian sources such as Phil 2:9–12; John 12:28, 17:12; Heb 1:4; Acts 2:21; Hermas, *Sim.* 8.10.3, 9.13.2–3, 9.14.5–6; 1 *Clem.* 58.1,

60.4; *Did.* 10.2, and in such Gnostic texts as *Ap. John* BG 24.4, 32.19; CG II,*1*:7.29; III,*1*:11.14; IV,*1*:11.23–24; *Exc. Theod.* 28.4,6, 43.1, 80.3, 86.2; and *Gos. Phil.* 54.5–13 (on which see K. Koschorke, "Die 'Namen' im Phillippusevangelium: Beobachtungen zur Auseinandersetzung zwischen gnostischem und kirklichem Christentum," *ZNW* 64 [1973] 307–22). The importance of the "name," especially the "proper" name, of any entity is also an element in the Greek philosophical tradition and in popular magic, as noted by Ménard (*SMR* 5 [1962] 186–193).

Whatever the ultimate or immediate sources of the name speculation, the Son is the name of the Father in two related and overlapping senses. (1) The Son *bears* the name of the Father as is suggested by the first comment in this paragraph (38.7–14); i.e., the Son is called by the Father's name, although that name is not specified. (2) More significantly, the Son also is the name of Father insofar as he *functions* as a name, by indicating what the reality of the object named is. The Son functions in this way because he is the comprehensible part of the Godhead, as is suggested by 38.15–24.

In the process of developing this doctrine, the term "name" has at least two distinct but related senses. On the one hand, it is that which designates something else. Hence, the Son, *qua* "name," is distinct from the Father. But the "name" also is the essence of the thing named. Hence, the Son is identical with the Father. It is because the Son shares the very being of the Father, yet is distinct from him, that he can reveal him to all other beings dependent on him.

38.7   *he...first gave a name*: The subject is certainly the Father. In Valentinian and other Gnostic theogonic or cosmogonic accounts, the Father does not regularly give a name to his first emanation.

38.8–9   *who came forth from him*: In this text the first emanation has been the Word. Cf. 16.34–35 and 37.9. Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 178), apparently reflecting 37.35 and 38.1, suggests that the text distinguishes "Word" from "Beginning" as two successive hypostases, parallel to the exegesis of John 1:4 in Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.8.5. There the sequence is Father, Son (=Beginning), Logos (Word). Although the principle of emanation is certainly similar in both texts, the figures involved cannot easily be equated. The *Gospel of Truth* rather seems to equate Word and Son.

38.9   *who was himself*: The identity of the first and second principles is a common tenet in the more philosophically oriented Gnosticism. The notion is ultimately based on the Aristotelian conception of the deity as filtered through middle-Platonic speculation. The primal one contemplates himself, and in the process produces an expression of himself. For Valentinian applications of the principle, cf. the account of the Marcosians in Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.14.1 and especially the *Tri. Trac.* 56.1–59.1, with the literature cited in the notes to that passage.

38.10   *he begot him as a son*: Cf. Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.8.5 and *Tri. Trac.* 57.8–23. The phrase may recall the numerous NT texts which allude to or use Ps 2:7, as noted by van Unnik (*Jung Codex*, 121) and Giversen (*StTh* 13 [1959] 88–91), especially Acts 13:33 and Heb 1:5. Grobel (*Gospel*, 181) sees here an allusion to the incarnation, but that is improbable.

38.11   *he gave him his name*: Cf. Phil 2:9–12; John 17:12 and Heb 1:4. Precisely what the name is that is given to the Son is not specified.

It is probably not one of the names mentioned in Philippians or Hebrews, i.e., Jesus, Christ, Lord, Son. It may be the name Father. Note that in the *Tri. Trac.* 61.14, the Father gives the name "Father" to the aeons as the first stage of his revelation to them, and that at 67.10–11, the Son is said to bring the Father to the Totalities. The Son is, in fact, given the name of the Father, at least in a derived sense, at *Tri. Trac.* 65.10–11.

38.13–14   *around him, the Father* (ⲣⲁ2ⲧⲏϥ ⲛ̄ϭⲓ ⲡⲓⲱⲧ): As Grobel (*Gospel*, 181) notes, the resumptive particle ⲛ̄ϭⲓ is used here irregularly, as at 40.26. Such a usage is, however, not unattested. Cf. Crum 252a.

38.15–16   *it is possible for him to be seen*: This is, no doubt, a reference to the Son, recalling Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.2.5, where the Son is styled the comprehensible part (τὸ καταληπτόν) of the Father. Cf. also *Tri. Trac.* 63.10–14. Here the second sense in which the Son is the name of Father is suggested. The Son is now seen to point to the reality of the Father. For the name as a pointer to the reality, cf. Valentinus, fr. 5, (Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 4.13.89,6–90,4), where Valentinus uses the image of a picture's title which points to the reality depicted, in order to illustrate how the terms Father and

God applied to the Demiurge point to the reality of the transcendent
God and Father.

38.16–17   *the name, however, is invisible*: This and the following
lines present several problems. (1) The text seems to contradict itself,
since at 38.23 it affirms that the name is apparent. (2) The distinction
between Son and name, implied by the visible-invisible contrast of
38.15–17, seems to contradict the basic affirmation that the Son is the
name of the Father. These problems can be resolved when it is
recognized that the "name" here is used in a metaphorical sense for
the "essence" or "fundamental reality" of the Father. That invisible,
incomprehensible reality is made known through the revelation
provided by the Son. For the distinction between knowledge of the
existence of the Father and knowledge of his essence, and for a similar
theory of revelation, cf. *Tri. Trac.* 61.24–28, 65.17–34.

That the name is a metaphor for the essence of the Father thus
explains why it is hidden, yet revealed. It also explains how the Son is
and, at the same time, is not the same as the Father. He does share the
essence of the Father (38.9), but is distinct from him and is not
"invisible."

Ed. pr. (58) note a similar passage in *Exc. Theod.* 26.4, where
Jesus is said to consist of a visible part, the "Wisdom and the Church
of the Superior Seed" and an invisible part, the "Name, which is the
only-begotten Son." The *Gospel of Truth* is not speaking about Jesus
here, but it uses the term "name" in a formally similar way. Note, too,
the distinction in Marcus (Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.14.4) between the
exoteric and esoteric names of the revealer.

38.19   *mystery of the invisible*: As *ed. pr.* (58) note, the name of God
given to the Demiurge by Sophia and kept secret by him is styled a
"mystery" at Hippolytus, *Ref.* 5.36.2.

38.20–21   *filled with it by him*: The first pronoun probably refers to
the name; the second to the Son. The ears here are like the jars of
36.30–34.

38.21–22   *the Father's name is not spoken*: Here, as Grobel (*Gospel*,
183) notes, we find the most explicit reference to the Jewish tradition
of the *Shem hammephorash*. Cf. 38.11–12. The fact that the Father's

name is not spoken serves as the image for the transcendence of the Father's essence.

38.23–24   *it is apparent through a Son*: Cf., with *ed. pr.* (58), fr. 2 of Valentinus (Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 2.20.114,3), εἶς δέ ἐστιν ἀγαθός, οὗ παρρησία ἡ διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ φανέρωσις.

38.25   *will be able* (ⲉⲧⲁϣ): *Ed. pr.*, Grobel (*Gospel*, 182), Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 179–80) construe the conjugation base as a perf. rel. However, the *Gos. Truth*, unlike the *Tri. Trac.*, does not use ⲉⲧⲁ(ⲅ) as a form of that conjugation base. This must be an A² fut. rel., as Till (*Or.* 27 [1958] 280) recognized.

38.25–26   *for him, the great name*: The reference here is ambiguous, perhaps deliberately so, given the intimate relationship between Father and Son. The "great name" is most likely the Father himself, the "name" that remains invisible. It could also be the Son, who is the name of the Father in the senses described in the preceding paragraph.

38.26–28   *him alone to whom the name belongs*: Again the phrase is ambiguous. The name belongs to the Father, but it has been given to the Son (38.11–12). It might be possible to construe the affirmation here to be saying that the Father alone can utter a name for himself, since he alone knows himself in a way that enables him to do so. Cf. 38.34. This notion is explicit in the *Tri. Trac.* 54.40–55.14. It is more likely, however, that the one to whom the name belongs is now the one to whom the name has been given, namely, the Son. He "alone" (yet along with other "sons" of the name) has the power to utter a name for the Father. The question asked in the next paragraph (39.30–32) clearly presupposes that the Son has been said to utter a name for the Father.

38.28   *sons of the name*: Nagel (*OLZ* 61 [1966] 8) sees here another example of translation from Syriac, but the construction is at home in the NT. The author may have modeled the phrase on such expressions as "sons of God" in Gal 3:26 and Rom 8:14. Cf. Böhlig, *Muséon* 79 (1966) 320. If such texts did influence this phrase, the alteration from "sons of God" to "sons of the name" may be a way of suggesting that those who accept the revelation have a more

mysterious or exalted Father than the being characterized as "God" in the NT.

38.29   *in whom rested the name of the Father*: Ed. *pr.* (59) note the Valentinian liturgical formula recorded in Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.21.3, "Peace to all on whom this name rests." Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 180–81) suggests that the "name" here is a symbol for the Pleroma. Although the term is a flexible and complex one, as we have seen, the primary referent here is the Son. For a close parallel to the affirmation here, cf. *Tri. Trac.* 58.36–59.1, where the Son is said to "rest" on the Church, as the Father "rests" on him.

38.31–32   *(who) in turn themselves rested in his name*: Cf. 24.9–21.

38.33   *the Father is unengendered*: Cf. *Tri. Trac.* 51.19–52.4 and 57.8,12, where the point is developed that the Father is a father in the truest and fullest sense of the term because he is unbegotten.

38.34   *begot him for him (self) as a name*: As Schenke (*Herkunft*, 53) notes, the object pronoun probably refers to the Son, him alone to whom the name belongs. Cf. 38.10.

38.36–38   *the name...should be over their head as lord*: Cf. Phil 2:9–12. There may here be the same paronomasia as at 40.8–9.

38.36   *the aeons*: The term is used here apparently in a technical sense to refer to the emanations of the Father in the pleroma, although it could possibly be understood as a more general term for "the worlds" as at Heb 1:2.

39.1   *the name in truth*: The *Tri. Trac.* frequently evidences a concern with the proper sense of the divine names. Cf. *Tri. Trac.* 51.21, 52.2 and frequently.

39.3–6   *the name is not from (mere) words...but is invisible*: The distinction which is made here is between the sense or meaning of a word and the audial or visual symbols used to express that sense. That "sense" is "invisible," i.e., imperceptible to the senses. Such a distinction was known to Stoic linguistic theorists in their discussion of ἀσώματα λεκτά. Cf. *SVF* II.166–171,181. This bit of semantic

theory is applied to the name of the Father. The "sense" or "meaning" of that name is, like the sense of any word or name, invisible, because the referent of the name is the transcendent and incomprehensible one.

39.5   *appellations* (ϩⲛⲙⲛⲧⲧⲁⲉⲓⲣⲉⲛ): Nagel (*OLZ* 61 [1966] 12) derives the term from Syriac *šummāhā*. The retroversion by Ménard, λόγοι ὀνομάστικοι is possible. It would also be possible to see the Coptic as a translation of an abstract Greek term such as ὀνομασία. Cf. LSJ 1233a. Böhlig (*Muséon* 79 [1966] 320) properly notes that the Coptic word is otherwise unattested and says nothing about the term it translates.

39.7   *he gave a name to him alone*: There are several related problems in this and the following clauses. (1) The meaning of ⲟⲩⲁⲉⲉⲧϥ can be either "self" or "alone." Previously in this paragraph (38.27, 33) it has meant "alone" and we assume that it does so again here. (2) It is unclear in several cases what pronoun ⲟⲩⲁⲉⲉⲧϥ intensifies. It most frequently intensifies the immediately preceding noun or pronoun, although it can modify an earlier element in the sentence, as Grobel (*Gospel*, 185–87) notes. Only the context can determine the proper construal and here the context is ambiguous. (3) The referents of the pronouns throughout the passage are uncertain. We shall specify what seems to be the most satisfactory construal, but others are certainly possible. (4) The term "name" can have several senses, as has already been noted.

In this case it would appear that the author refers back to the event mentioned at 38.7–8. The Father "named" or conveyed the fulness of his being to the Son alone. Cf. Schenke, *Herkunft*, 53. It is also possible that the text here refers to the Son's "uttering a name." Cf. 38.25–28. Later, at 39.31, the terminology of "giving a name" will be applied to the Son. Till (*ZNW* 50 [1959] 183) and Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 66) adopt the alternative meaning of ⲟⲩⲁⲉⲉⲧϥ, "himself" and render "He (the Father) gave himself a name."

In general, it might be suspected that the ambiguity involved here is intentional, designed perhaps to reflect the intimate and mysterious association of Father and Son.

39.8   *since he alone sees him*: Here the adjective "alone" could modify either the subject or the object. We assume, as does Schenke

(*Herkunft*, 53) that it is the Son alone who sees the Father. Cf. John
6:46. It might also be possible that the author claims that the Father
names the Son because the Father sees the Son alone, perhaps in the
primordial state mentioned at 38.35. For this construal, cf. Grobel,
Gospel, 185–187.

39.9   *he alone having the power*: Giving a name was an activity of
the Father at 38.11–12, and probably at 39.7; here the term may
already be used as at 39.30–31 for the naming activity of the Son. We
suggest that the pronouns have the same referents as in the
immediately preceding clause, and thus that the Son alone has the
power to "name" the Father. For the alternative construal, that the
Father alone has the power to name the Son, cf. Schenke, *Herkunft*,
53. The pronominal ambiguity may have been less acute in a Greek
original, where the phrase represented by the subordinate clauses
here would have been represented by participles which would clearly
indicate the nouns or pronouns modified.

39.17   *he alone knows it*: Presumably the one who exists alone knows
the name. Again it might be possible to construe the intensifier with
the object rather than the subject. Thus "He (the one who exists with
his name, i.e., the Father) knows it (the name) alone." It might even
be possible to see the referents of the pronouns reversed. Thus, "It (the
name, i.e., the Son) alone knows him (the Father)." None of these
other possible construals lead as naturally into the next phase of the
argument as does the first. That argument seems to be: Since the one
who exists (the Father) alone really knows the name (i.e., his
essence), he alone can give it (i.e., communicate and reveal it) to the
Son.

39.18–19   *and alone (knows how) to give him a name*: Again, the
position of the adjective "alone" is problematic. The clause could read
"and (knows how) to give him alone a name." The infinitive ⲁⲧⲣⲉϥϯ
is construed as complementary after ϥⲥⲁⲩⲛⲉ. It could also be
construed as the subject of the following nominal predicate, which
functions possessively. This is the understanding of the syntax
adopted by Till (*Or.* 27 [1958] 280) and Schenke (*Herkunft*, 54).
They thus translate, "and to give him alone a name is the task of the
Father." *Ed. pr.*, Grobel, and Ménard misconstrue the clause as if it

were a cleft sentence, translating, "it was to him alone (the Son) that the Father gave a name," *vel sim.*

39.19   *it is the Father*: On our construal of the syntax here, the two-member nominal sentence identifies the main actor in the preceding clause.

39.19–20   *the Son is his name*: Cf. 38.7.

39.20–21   *he did not hide it in the thing*: More pronominal ambiguity surfaces here. Presumably the Father did not keep the "name," i.e., his essential nature, hidden. *Ed. pr.*, Grobel (*Gospel*, 186), Schenke (*Herkunft*, 54), and Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 183), citing Hippolytus, *Ref.* 6.36.2, all take ϩⲛ ⲡⲓϩⲱϥ as equivalent to ϩⲛ ⲡⲓϩⲱⲡ, "in secret." Till's explanation (*Or.* 27 [1958] 280) is to be preferred on orthographical and phonological grounds, since in Codex I, ϥ and ⲃ, as well as ⲡ and ⲃ are frequently confused, while ϥ and ⲡ are not. The author is here again speaking in terms of the semantic theory which has been the underpinning of the discussion about the name. Any name is thought to be intimately related to the essence of what it signifies. If that essence does not come to expression, it remains "hidden" in the thing named.

39.22–23   *but it existed*: Most translators take the following noun, "the Son" as the subject, but this would be odd without the resumptive particle ⲛϭⲓ or an ⲛ used to mark the complement after ϣⲟⲟⲡ. Till (*Or.* 27 [1958] 280) correctly construed ⲡϣⲏⲣⲉ as the preposed subject of the following sentence. The present phrase then contrasts with the preceding remark. The name was not kept hidden nor did it exist only potentially in the thing named, but it was itself fully existent as well, as the Son.

39.23   *as for the Son, he alone gave a name*: *Ed. pr.*, implicitly, Till (*Or.* 27 [1958] 280) and Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 66), explicitly, emend by introducing an indirect object, as would normally be expected with expressions for "naming" in this context. If the Father is in view as the subject of the name giving, then that emendation would be appropriate. It is likely, however, that here, as at 38.25, it is the Son's "naming" of the Father that is in question. The objection encountered at 39.30–33 presupposes this. Hence no emendation is necessary.

39.24   the name is that of the Father: This and the following clause together summarize the two major points which have, in a rather convoluted fashion, been developed in the preceding paragraph. The first point is a more formal one. The "name," the vehicle for revealing the essence of the Father, indeed the very essence of the Father himself, is by definition, "of the Father."

39.25–26   as the name . . . is the Son: The second summary point is a more material one, indicating or identifying what fulfills the formal condition just specified. That which is the name of the Father, because it shares in the essence of the person named and points to or reveals that essence, is the Son.

39.26–28   where indeed would compassion find a name: This is a surprisingly concrete conclusion to the discussion of the "name." "To find a name" is also a curious phrase, which is unparalleled in the lengthy discussion of having or giving a name, although the term "name" probably functions in the same complex way it has heretofore. The question, then, is "what adequately expresses, because it really conveys the nature of," compassion. The answer is that it is something that is with the Father, namely the Son. Recall that speaking about Christ was earlier associated with the mercy of the Father (36.13–19). This remark probably functions in a similar fashion to interpret an affect, compassion, intellectually.

39.29   no doubt one will say: As Grobel (*Gospel*, 187) notes, this objection is typical of a diatribe style. The objection is in essence, how can the Son in any sense be said to name the Father who existed before him. One rather obvious answer would be that the Father does not in fact pre-exist the Son, but generates him eternally. Cf. *Tri. Trac.* 57.40–58.18, where the co-eternity of Father and Son is explicitly affirmed. The *Gos. Truth* does not make this move explicitly, although it could have on the basis of its description of the relation of Father and Son in 38.9–10. Here the author deals with the issue indirectly by reflecting further on the name. The revelatory name that the Son possesses is as much his own as it is the Father's. The formulation of the question recalls *Ap. John* BG 24.4–5; CG II,*1*.3.15–17; III,*1*.11.12–14; IV,*1*.4.24–28.

39.32   pre-existed (ϣρπ ⲛϣοοπ): For earlier discussions of the

anomalous qualitative, cf. Till (*Or.* 27 [1958] 280) and Quecke (*Muséon* 75 [1962] 297–98). The construction is also now attested in the *Treat. Res.* and the *Tri. Trac.* See the indices *s.v.* ϣⲱⲡⲉ. B. Layton (*The Gnostic Treatise on the Resurrection* [HDR 12; Missoula: Scholars, 1979] 191–92) discusses the construction and notes that it is not as anomalous as it first appears.

40.6   *it is not therefore* (ⲛ̄ⲧⲁϥ ⲉⲛ ϭⲉ ⲡⲉ): *Ed. pr.* (126) followed by Grobel (*Gospel,* 188), apparently Schenke (*Herkunft,* 54) and Ménard (*L'Évangile,* 67), construe ⲉⲛϭⲉ as an orthographic variant of ϭⲉ. Till (*Or.* 27 [1958] 280) and Arai (*Christologie,* 64, n.2) correctly construe as two words, the negation and the conjunction.

40.7   *the name from the Father* (ⲡⲣⲉⲛ ⲁⲃⲁⲗ ⲙ̄ⲡⲓⲱⲧ): This expression contrasts with the "proper name." Hence, less literally, it might be rendered, "the derived name" or "improper designation."

40.8–9   *proper name* (ⲭⲁⲉⲓⲥ ⲛ̄ⲣⲉⲛ): Nagel (*OLZ* 61 [1966] 12) sees here a reflex of a Syriac expression, but it is more likely a translation of the Greek κύριον ὄνομα, as most commentators recognize. The *Tri. Trac.* (51.39 and frequently) has a similar concern with the "proper name."

40.9–10   *name on loan*: *Ed. pr.* (59) usefully note Tertullian, *De test. anim.* 2 and Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.6.4, where psychics are said to have grace only "on loan," while pneumatics own it. The issue is different, but the terms of the contrast are the same. The Son owns the "proper name" of the Father because he shares his very being (38.9–10). Cf. also *Tri. Trac.* 134.20.

40.10–11   *as (do) others*: Note, for instance, how the Demiurge at *Tri. Trac.* 100.27–30 is called by all the names which pertain to the highest level of reality.

40.14   *this is the proper name*: The demonstrative could well refer to the Son, as Grobel (*Gospel,* 189) notes.

40.15   *there is no one else*: There is no one but the Father who "gives the name" to the Son. Because the Father really communicates his

being to the Son (38.7–15), the Son can, in turn, utter the name and hence, reveal the essence, of the Father.

40.16   *unnamable*: Cf. 38.22. As Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 184) notes, the namelessness of the first principle is a common affirmation in second-century religious texts. Cf. Festugière, *La Révélation*, vol. 4.1, 70. Note also the unnamability of Jesus in Marcus (Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.15.1, 6).

40.18–19   *he who is perfect*: This phrase, and the demonstrative in 40.20, presumably refer to the Son, who is the perfect expression of the Father.

40.22–23   *to see it*: The object pronoun could refer either to "the name" or it could be translated "to see him" and be taken as a reference to the Father. In either case, the point of the remark is the same. The perfect Son alone has the power to see, and to articulate in revelation, the essential being of the Father.

IX. *The Goal of Return: Rest in the Father* (40.23–43.24)

The final section of the text recapitulates the doctrine of the whole text about the movement from and to the Father, with emphasis on the final state of those who return to the primordial unity.

40.23   *when it pleased* (ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲣⲉ⟦ϥϥ̄⟧ϥⲱⲕ): The papyrus surface here is quite pithy and it apparently caused the scribe some difficulty. After two botched attempts to write ϥ, he finally succeeded. He then apparently tried to cancel the first two ϥ's with a horizontal stroke. The bad surface then caused the ink to seep to the left, leaving a horizontal line through ⲁⲣⲉ as well.

40.24–25   *which is loved* (ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁϣϥ̄): Grobel (*Gospel*, 189), Schenke (*Herkunft*, 54) and Arai (*NT* 5 [1962] 215; *Christologie*, 64, n. 1) analyze the verb form here as ⲉⲧⲟⲩ ⲁϣ-ϥ "which was uttered," but this is impossible since objects cannot in general be suffixed directly to the infinitive in bi-partite conjugations. *Ed. pr.* implicitly; Till (*Or* 27 [1958] 281), with some hesitation; and Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 184) emend to ⲉⲧ<ϥ>ⲟⲩⲁϣϥ̄ "which (or whom) he loved." This emendation is possible, since ⲟⲩⲱϣ is an exception to the rule of the direct object. However, no emendation is necessary. As

is the case in the *Tri. Trac.* (57.34, 65.15, 69.22 and frequently) the pronominal element of the relative converter has been omitted by crasis with the initial ογ of the infinitive.

40.26   *that is* (Ñ6ι): As Grobel (*Gospel*, 191) notes, the particle is probably here used irregularly as at 38.14, to resume the object, not the subject, of the preceding clause. Till (*Or.* 27 [1950] 281) and Schenke (*Herkunft*, 54) however, take it as resuming the subject.

40.27   *who came forth from the depth*: The bestowal of the name, i.e., the communication of the essence of the Father to the Son, brings the latter from potential existence in the mind of the Father into actual existence, where he can reveal the Father's secrets. Cf. 22.25.

40.28   *secret things*: Cf. 24.12–14, 27.7–8.

40.29   *without evil*: Cf. 18.36–40 and *Tri. Trac.* 53.6.

40.32   *the place*: As Grobel (*Gospel*, 191) notes, this term recalls the common rabbinic periphrasis for God, *hammaqom*, although a specific connection with rabbinic traditions here is unlikely. For a similar designation of the Father, cf. *Tri. Trac.* 60.5.

40.33   *resting place*: Cf. 22.12. As *ed. pr.* (19) note, the pleroma is referred to in similar terms at Irenaeus, *Haer.* 3.15.2 and *Exc. Theod.* 55.2.

41.1   *glorify*: Cf. 19.33–34.

41.3   *sweetness*: Cf. 24.8–9.

41.4   *the place each one came from*: Cf. 22.14–15. The revelation by the Son about the Father's place is at the same time revelation about the source and destiny of all beings which come from the Father.

41.6   *establishment* (Τε20 ᴀρετϥ): Cf. 28.14. The term appears frequently in the *Tri. Trac.*, meaning something like "constitution," "establishment," or "essential being." It perhaps translates ὑπόστασις. Cf. Heb 1:3, 3:14, 11:1.

41.7   *he will hasten*: The referent of the subject pronoun is ambiguous. It is probably not the same actor as the one who "will speak" (41.5), who is presumably the Son, but is rather a reference to "each one" (41.3-4), as Till (*Or.* 27 [1958] 281) suggests.

41.7-8   *return again*: Cf. 21.10-11, 22.21-23, 25.8-19.

41.9-10   *the place where he stood*: Standing and "stability" are images commonly used to describe the transcendent, immutable being of the Pleroma. Cf. Simon Magus in Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 2.11.52,2 and the *Megale Apophasis* in Hippolytus, *Ref.* 6.12.3, 6.13, 6.17.1, 6.18.4.

41.10-12   *taste...nourishment...growth*: For similar imagery, cf. *Tri. Trac.* 62.12, 69.19, 104.22, 126.32.

41.13-14   *his own resting-place is his pleroma*: On the general ambiguities of the term pleroma, cf. the note to 16.35. For the designation of individual emanations from the Father as "pleromas," cf. Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.14.2 and *Exc. Theod.* 32.1, noted by Robison (*JR* 43 [1963] 241) and Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 186). The point of this remark is that the return of "each one" (41.4) to his source restores him to the fulness of being, and deficiency is thus eliminated. Cf. 18.7-11, 24.28-32.

41.14-15   *all the emanations*: For the word †н, cf. 22.37.

41.16   *and* (ⲁⲩⲱ2ⲛ̄): The form of the conjunction is quite unusual, appearing only here. It is, no doubt, equivalent to ⲟⲩⲁ2ⲛ̄ which appears at 19.37 and frequently. Alternative forms are ⲟⲩⲉ2ⲛ̄ at 37.2 and ⲟⲩⲱ22ⲛ̄ at 43.5.

41.17   *root*: Cf. 17.30.
    is in (ⲡⲉ 2ⲛ̄): The Coptic irregularly combines the copula with an adverbial predicate, hence, Till (*Or.* 27 [1958] 281) deletes the copula. The text probably is an overly literal translation of a Greek phrase.

41.19-20   *destinies* (ⲛ̄ⲛⲟⲩⲧⲱ ⲱ): The precise force of the term "destiny" here is unclear. Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 186) indirectly associates ⲧⲱ ⲱ with Valentinian speculation on the ὅρος or Limit,

on which see *Tri. Trac.* 75.13, 76.32, but it is hardly clear that the term used here refers to any of the various principles which divide and articulate the cosmos. It is more likely that here the eschatological position of the beings which emanate from the Father is in view. For the element of "predestination" in the text, cf. 21.22–25.

41.20–21   *each one is manifest*: It may be, as Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 186) suggests, that the author here alludes to a protological manifestation or formation of the beings which emanate from the Father, but it is more likely that a soteriological moment is in view. Cf. *Tri. Trac.* 118.14–28.

41.22–23   *through their own thought* <...>: Something has probably been omitted by the copyist at this point. A verb such as "they might be perfected" (Schenke, *Herkunft*, 55) or "they might ascend" (Grobel, *Gospel*, 195) was probably involved.

41.24   *the place to which they send their thought*: The soteriological process envisioned here is described in detail at *Tri. Trac.* 77.37–78.7 and 78.23–28, where the paradigmatic experience of the Logos is recounted.

41.28–29   *his head*: Cf. *Tri. Trac.* 118.34–35, where Christ is said to be the "head" of the spiritual class of human beings. The imagery recalls such NT texts as Eph 1:22, 4:15; Col 1:18, 2:10, 19. Cf. also *Exc. Theod.* 42.2, 43.1–3, noted by *ed. pr.* (59).

41.30   *they are supported* (ceeмaϩтe ñммеʏ): Grobel (*Gospel*, 195) emends by deleting the ñ, translating "they are enclasped." Schenke (*Herkunft*, 55) emends the plural object pronoun to the singular, translating "they rule with him." The text does not need emendation, and the proper meaning of the verb is indicated by Till (*Or.* 27 [1958] 282).

41.33   *they participated in his face*: As *ed. pr.* (59) note, similar imagery, derived possibly from Matt 18:10, is found at *Exc. Theod.* 23.4–5. Cf. also Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.3.3.

41.34   *by means of* (aвaλ ϩïтоотϥ): The singular pronominal object is resumed by a plural noun, leading to the emendation

ϨⲒⲦⲞⲞⲦⲞⲨ proposed by Grobel (*Gospel*, 195). It should be noted, however, that in such constructions concord of number is often not observed. Cf. Till, *Or.* 27 (1958) 282.

41.34   *kisses*: According to *Tri. Trac.* 58.24, the aeons emerge from the Father and Son "like kisses." Here the imagery is used rather of eschatological reunion. Segelberg (*Or. Suec.* 8 [1959] 14) sees here a possible allusion to a sacrament of the bridal chamber mentioned in *Gos. Phil.* 67.30, 69.1–4, 69.24–70.4 and 71.9–15.

42.1   *in this way, for* (Ⲙ̄ⲠⲒⲢⲎⲦⲈ ⲬⲈ): Most translators construe these words as correlative, thus producing a translation such as "they do not become manifest in such a way as not to surpass themselves." The litotes implies that the emanations do "surpass" or "transcend" themselves. The use of Ⲙ̄ⲠⲒⲢⲎⲦⲈ ⲬⲈ as correlative would, however, be unusual. It seems simpler to take the prepositional phrase as retrospective, referring to the intimate unity of the emanations and the Father upon receipt of the revelation. For this understanding of the syntax, cf. Till, *Or.* 27 (1958) 282. The "emanations" are not manifested as such because to do so would be an act of hybris. Their exaltation depends on the revelation which they have received.

42.2   *they were not themselves exalted* (ⲘⲠⲞⲨⲢ̄ ⲦⲠⲈ Ⲙ̄ⲘⲒⲚ Ⲙ̄ⲘⲀⲨ): The intensifying pronoun Ⲙ̄ⲘⲒⲚ Ⲙ̄ⲘⲀⲨ must refer to the subject. Till (*Or.* 27 [1958] 281) and Grobel (*Gospel*, 195) emend, by introducing after ⲦⲠⲈ an object pronoun <Ⲙ̄ⲘⲀⲨ> which yields "they did not exalt themselves." The meaning would be the same, but no emendation is necessary, if the verb is understood as intransitive.

42.3   *(yet) neither did they lack the glory*: Cf. Rom 3:23. There is an implicit contrast between the appearance of the recipients of revelation (41.35ff.) and their actual state of unity with and proper apprehension of the Father. Schenke (*Herkunft*, 56) understands the phrase quite differently as "they did not fail in praising the Father."

42.5–6   *small...harsh...wrathful*: The second and third terms used here allude to attributes of the God of the OT, who is viewed as inferior to the transcendent Father in most Gnostic systems. The precise allusion of the first term is unclear. As Grobel (*Gospel*, 197) notes, Irenaeus, in *Haer.* 3.24.2, accuses the *Gnostics* of considering

God "small" (*minimum arbitrantes eum*). Contrast the affirmation of the Father's greatness at 42.14.

42.8   *sweet*: Cf. 24.9 and 33.33.

42.10   *no need to be instructed*: For OT evidence that God needs instruction Grobel (*Gospel*, 197) suggests that Gnostics might have appealed to Job 21:22. Gen 2:9 is used in precisely this way at *Hyp. Arch.* 89.20–21.

42.12–13   *of the ...greatness* (ⲚⲦⲞⲞⲦⲤ̄ Ⲛ†ⲘⲚⲦⲚⲀϬ): Nagel (*OLZ* 61 [1966] 8) sees this phrase with pronominal suffix and noun objects of the preposition as a Syriacism, but the construction is common in Coptic. Cf. Till, *Koptische Grammatik*, #236, and Böhlig, *Muséon* 79 (1966) 320–21.

42.14   *immeasurable greatness*: Cf. 35.10. This is a common designation for the primordial Father in various Gnostic sources. Cf. *Ap. John* BG 25.13; 72.18; CG II,*r.*4.1, 29.1; CG III,*r.*6.5, 37.19; CG IV,*r.*5.25–26, 44.25, noted by Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 189) and Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.2.1, noted by *ed. pr.* (60). Cf. also *Tri. Trac.* 52.26 and 54.20.

42.15   *wait for*: Cf. 34.37–35.3. The verb may retain here something of its basic meaning of "stretch after."

42.17   *the perfect one*: Cf. 18.33, 21.9.

42.21–22   *they rest*: Cf. 22.12.

42.24   *twisted around* (ⲈⲨϬⲀⲘ̄ⲖⲀⲘⲚⲦ̄ ... Ⲙ̄ⲠⲔⲰⲦⲈ): As Grobel (*Gospel*, 197) notes, the graphic but obscure image used here may be reflected in Irenaeus, *Haer.* 2.16.4, where the heresiologist accuses the Valentinians of "circling about those things which are below."
   the truth (Ⲙ̄ⲦⲘⲎⲈ): The preposition is unusual. One would expect Ⲛ̄ⲦⲘⲎⲈ and there is no reason for assimilation here.

42.27–28   *the Father is within them*: Cf. 18.30–31.

42.32   *they are set at rest* (ⲈⲨ† Ⲙ̄ⲦⲀⲚ): Literally "they give rest."

The construction usually has a dative of the person to whom rest is given. Cf. 33.5. Either a dative has accidentally fallen out of the text here, or the verb is used intransitively.

42.33-34 *they will heed their root* (ⲉⲩⲛⲁⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄ ⲁⲧⲉⲩⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉ): For the image of the root, cf. 17.30. "Heeding" the root is an oddly mixed metaphor. Nagel (*OLZ* 79 1966 12) suggests that ⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉ mistakenly translates the Syriac *qr'*, "call," taking it to be *'qr*, "root." However, the author often uses odd metaphors in his effort to speak about the ineffable and to provoke reflection about the transcendent and there is no need to see a Syriac original here, as Böhlig (*Muséon* 79 (1966) 323-24) rightly argues.

42.39 *the rest*: The "rest" are, presumably, those other than the "blessed" of 42.38, whose place is with their "root." This language may well cloak a pneumatic, psychic and hylic distinction, as Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 191) argues, but it is significant that this distinction is not made explicit. Ménard's inference that the text is addressed only to pneumatics is unwarranted. Uninitiated hearers could understand the word in terms of a Christian/non-Christian dichotomy, as Grobel (*Gospel*, 199) suggests.

42.41 *it is not fitting*: Cf. *Tri. Trac.* 51.2.

43.1 *having come to be in the resting place*: The author here expressed something of the "realized eschatology" common to many Gnostic systems. He suggests that, having had his deficiency of ignorance removed, he has already, in some sense, arrived at his ultimate destination, although there apparently remains a final reintegration (43.3). The first person references here and at 43.3 are the only ones in the text.

43.3 *in it*: Presumably this is the "resting place," although the pronoun could also be translated "him" and refer to the Father.

43.3-4 *and to be concerned* (ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁⲥⲡ̄ϥⲉ): The sentence is elliptical and what is to be supplied is unclear. It is probable that the infinitive may be coordinate with ⲁⲩⲉⲝⲉ in 43.2 and that the conjunctive has adversative force. Thus, it is not fitting for the author

to speak of anything else, but it is fitting for him to be concerned about the Father and the "true brothers."

43.5   *and* (oyⲱ22ⲛ̄): On the unusual spelling of the conjunction, cf. 41.16.

43.9   *who appear*: As Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 191) notes, something appears or becomes manifest when it achieves actual existence. Note the distinction between potential and actual existence developed at 27.34–28.7.

43.12–13   *light which is perfect*: Cf. 32.26–30.

43.14   *seed*: Cf. 1 John 3:9. As Ménard (*L'Évangile*, 192) notes, the collocation "seed of light" appears at Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.13.2 and 1.15.3. Seed imagery is common in Valentinian texts and it is developed in diverse ways. Cf. *Treat. Res.* 44.35 and *Tri. Trac.* 88.20.

43.19   *good*: Cf. 36.35.