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GENERAL EDITOR OF THE COPTIC GNOSTIC LIBRARY

JAMES M. ROBINSON
INTRODUCTION

I. DISCOVERY

The thirteen Nag Hammadi codices were discovered in December, 1945, on the right bank of the Nile, near the town of al-Qasr (ancient Chenoboskia) and close to the larger town of Nag Hammadi, which is on the opposite bank. Facsimile editions of all thirteen have been published. The MSS are now preserved in the Coptic Museum in Old Cairo, Egypt.

Evidence in the cartonnage used to stiffen the leather covers suggests the library was buried sometime in the last half of the fourth century C.E. (Barns et al.: nos. 63–65). It is possible the codices had been used by monks in the nearby Pachomian monasteries and were buried during a time of heresy-hunting.  

P. Berolinensis 8502 (commonly designated simply BG) was purchased in or near the city of Achmim, Egypt, and acquired for the Berlin Museum in 1896. At first Carl Schmidt, who initially proposed to edit it, gave it a fifth-century date, although subsequently he thought it should be dated later. Stegemann placed it in the early fifth century (Till–Schenke: 6–7).

II. PUBLICATION HISTORY

The four tractates published here are two versions of "Eugnostos" and two of "The Sophia of Jesus Christ." They are presented in parallel form because of the large amount of common material.

"Eugnostos" (abbreviated, "Eug–V") is the first tractate of Nag Hammadi Codex V (1,1–17,18) and has not been published before in a critical edition. "Eugnostos, The Blessed" (abbreviated, "Eug–III") is the third tractate of Nag Hammadi Codex III (70,1–90,13). The portions of the text and translation of "Eug–III" that are variations of sections in "The Sophia of Jesus Christ" were published in Till (1955) and Till–Schenke. However, non-parallel parts, including all the frame material, were omitted. The text and translation (modern Greek) of "Eug–III" was published by Trakatellis as part of his Harvard dissertation. His text was based on preliminary work of my own with

---

1 The most authoritative account of the discovery and subsequent history of the codices is to be found in Robinson's introduction to the facsimile edition (1984).
2 See Barns: 9–18. But for cautions about Barns's conclusions, see Shelton's introduction to Barns et al.
3 For a brief account of the unsuccessful efforts of Schmidt to publish BG during his lifetime, see Till–Schenke: 1–2.
some modifications by George MacRae, who was the dissertation director (correspondence with MacRae). Translations of Eug—III by Krause (1974: 27–34) and myself (NHLE$^3$: 206–43) have been published. In both cases the portion of Eug—V covering the missing two pages of Eug—III (79–80) was also published.

The two versions of The Sophia of Jesus Christ (hereafter, SJC) vary from each other in relatively minor ways. One version is the third tractate of BG (77,8–127,12), which was edited (text and German translation) by Till (1955). His edition was later revised by Schenke (Till—Schenke). Translated portions were also published by Puech (77,9–79,18; 124,9–126,16; 126,17–127,10) (1963: 246–47).

The other version is the fourth tractate of NHC III (90,14–119,18). It was published by Till with the BG version, in the sense that places where it varied from the BG text were printed in the footnotes. Unfortunately, in many instances the Till edition (and its revision) did not completely reflect the variations, particularly the orthographic ones. Krause translated the portions of SJC—III that vary from Eug—III and published them in endnotes (1974: 35–39). A translation by myself of all of SJC—III is published in NHLE$^3$. In both cases, the parts of SJC—BG covering the missing four pages of SJC—III (109–10; 115–16) were also published.

In addition to the two Coptic MSS of SJC, one leaf of a Greek copy has survived among the Oxyrhynchus papyri. It is numbered 1081 and is presented here in a new edition, following the parallels.

III. TITLES

The title of Eug—III in the incipit is εὐγνωστός πνεκαριος, “Eugnostos, the Blessed,” which agrees with the subscript title (90,12–13). But Eug—V has only faint traces of its subscript title and the incipit is very fragmentary. Enough of the latter is visible, however, to make clear that πνεκαριος, “the Blessed,” was not part of the line. It is also evident that πνεκαριος could not have been part of the subscript title (see V 17,18n.). But what of “Eugnostos”? It appears nowhere in the tractate. The correct number of spaces is available in the incipit. And the same is true of the subscript, where, in addition, the only visible letter (omicron) is in the correct position for the reconstruction of “Eugnostos.” But since other names would also be possible, the designation of “Eugnostos” as the title of the tractate depends on the recognition of the similarity of this tractate and Eug—III.

The titles of both copies of SJC appear in superscriptions and subscripts. The superscriptions are the same in both, except that the spelling of the nomina sacra in BG (ίς and ις) differs from that in Codex III (ις and ις). In SJC—BG, the same title appears in the subscript, except that this time the nomina sacra are spelled as they are in the superscription of SJC—III. The subscript of SJC—III omits ις, “Christ,” perhaps through scribal error (see III.A, below). In regard to the difference between the nomina sacra in the
superscription and subscript of BG, it is noteworthy that while the former conform to the usage elsewhere in the codex (based on the Till–Schenke index), the latter are unique, suggesting a copyist’s adjustment.

Till leaves coφια untranslated, on the ground that the word refers to the divine hypostasis who appears prominently in the tractate (1955: 55). Doresse (1948: 146) and Puech (1963: 245), however, prefer to translate it, on the ground that it refers to the teachings of Jesus found in the tractate. The latter view seems preferable because Sophia is not the dominant figure in the tractate, as one would expect if the tractate were titled after her. However, we have adopted Till’s practice because it seems to have become generally accepted.

IV. THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE TRACTATES AND ITS SIGNIFICANCE

Because most of Eug is found in SJC, where it is attributed to Jesus, and because Eug seems to be without any obvious Christian elements, the question of priority was raised very early. It was thought that if Eug were composed first and had been used in the editing of SJC, then we would have a clear example of the movement from non-Christian Gnosticism to Christian Gnosticism.

Doresse argued for the priority of Eug (1948: 137–60) and was followed by Puech (1963: 248). Till, however, took the opposite position (1955: 54), without arguing the point. Schenke joined him, after carefully examining and rejecting the arguments of Doresse (1962: 265–67). (Schenke has since changed his mind [personal conversation in November, 1982].) A more persuasive approach (than that of Doresse) in favor of the priority of Eug was taken by Krause (1964). He began by distinguishing between the material common to both Eug and SJC and the material each has separately, and argued that that tractate was primary in which the common material and its separate material were most compatible. Using this criterion he concluded that the material special to Eug fitted better with the common material than did that of SJC, and that Eug therefore preceded SJC.

Although individual points of Krause’s argument are not convincing (Parrott, 1971: 399–404), his method has had a significant effect: since he wrote, no one has attempted to argue the priority of SJC. It appears that as scholars have examined the tractates for themselves, in the light of his approach, they have become convinced of the greater likelihood of the priority of Eug by observing the artificiality of the dialogue framework of SJC and the differences in vocabulary and ideas between the common material in SJC and its separate material (on the latter point, see Parrott, 1971: 405–06). The priority of Eug is now usually simply assumed (e.g., Perkins: 35).

That conclusion would diminish in importance, however, if Eug could be shown to be Christian in some significant way. Schenke maintained that there were signs of Christian influence, without giving any specifics (1962:
Wilson listed terminology that might be Christian (115), but admitted that it fell short of demonstrating Christian influence. I suggested that the so-called summary section of *Eug*–III (85,9ff) was deliberately edited in a Christian direction, but it is also possible that haplography occurred (1971: 412–13; 1975: 180–81), and in any case *Eug*–V lacks the changes. The one rather clear indication of Christian influence in *Eug*–III is found at the conclusion, where editing appears to have sharpened the reference to the one who is expected (90,7–11), so that it easily is seen to refer to Christ in the next tractate, which is *SJC*. Since that sharpening is not found in *Eug*–V, it is possible that *Eug*–III has been subject to some Christian modifications, but that does not alter the basic non-Christian character of the original form of *Eug* (similarly, Ménard: 137). One should perhaps note here that the last sentence in *Eug*–V may be a direct quote from Mark 4:25 or one of its parallels, but it could also have been drawn from the common treasury of secular proverbs assumed by Bultmann as the source for the passage in the gospels (102–04).

There is another aspect of the relationship between these two tractates that needs to be discussed, namely, what appears to be their symbiosis. This is immediately suggested by their juxtaposition in Codex III. It is further suggested by the above-mentioned ending of *Eug*, which in its clearest expression, in Codex III, looks forward to the coming of one who will not need to be taught but who will “speak all these things to you joyously and in pure knowledge” (90,7–11), clearly (in Codex III) pointing to Christ in *SJC*. What could be the reason for this juxtaposition and interconnection?

When Doresse discussed *SJC*, he assumed the tractate was an attempt to make Christians think that Christ taught Gnosticism (so also Krause, 1964: 223) and suggested that the knowledge Christians had of the existence of *Eug* would have made clear to them that that was in fact a fraud (1960: 198). One suspects that problem would have been obvious to the Gnostics, which suggests then that they had something else in mind for *SJC*, something which would have made the relating of these two tractates more than a mistake.

An alternative would be that Christian Gnostics were interested in having those who knew and revered *Eug* come to know that Christ fulfilled the prophecy of Eugnostos (probably initially known by them in its more ambiguous form found in Codex V). That would make it possible for them to accept Christ as the new revealer and recognize that he had triumphed over the sinister powers, thereby opening the way for them to do so also. In other words, the intention may have been to convert non-Christian Gnostics to Christian Gnosticism.

Supporting this is the allusive nature of the references to traditional gnostic doctrines in the material added to *Eug* to produce *SJC*. The reader learns something, but not very much, about the ignorant and bad creator god (III 107,5–11), the sin of Sophia (III 114,14–18), the fall of the divine drops of light into the prison of this cosmic order (III 106,24–107,6, par.), the evil of sexuality (III 108,10–16, par.), and the punishment of the creator god and his
minions (BG 121,13–122,5). In no case is one of these doctrines presented in a fully developed way. That suggests that the intended audience was made up of those who already knew those doctrines; that is, that the intended audience were Gnostics. The one doctrine that is fully developed is the doctrine of Christ. (For a similar argument and conclusion, see Perkins, 1980: 98; see also Perkins, 1971: 177.)

Eug and SJC could both have a life of their own, as is demonstrated by Codex V, which has Eug but not SJC; and BG, which has SJC but not Eug. But it is the symbiotic relationship as seen in Codex III that seems to reveal the reason for the creation of SJC.

V. DATING

The dating of the composition of the tractates is difficult because no dateable events are referred to in them. Krause has suggested the first or second centuries C.E. for Eug without specifying the reasons (1974: 26). D. Trakatellis is more specific, suggesting the beginning of the second century C.E., because he thinks that Eug belongs early in the period in which the leading figures of Gnosticism made their appearance (32). However, those figures produced systems with clear Christian elements, whereas Eug has none. A date no later than the first century C.E. seems justified. An even earlier date is likely. Eug is directed against the views of “all the philosophers” (III 70,15). From the brief descriptions of these views, the philosophers can be identified as Stoic, Epicurean, and the theoreticians of Babylonian astrology. The latest time when these could be thought of as “all the philosophers” was probably the first century B.C.E. (Parrott, 1988).

As to the date of SJC, Puech has dated P. Oxy. 1081 early in the fourth century, thus providing a terminus ad quem (1950: 98 n. 2; 1963: 245). He also suggests that SJC might have been composed in the second half of the second century, or at the latest, the third century, but gives no reason (1963: 248). Till suggests a relative dating between Ap. John (NHC II.1; III.1; IV.1; BG 1) and Pist. Soph. Assuming that SJC is an integrated whole, he argues that in it the understandable philosophical viewpoint found in Ap. John and its consistent development are diminished, while SJC seems to represent an early state in the development of a Weltbild that ends in Pist. Soph. (Till–Schenke: 56). Doresse puts SJC close to the first books of Pist. Soph. (1948: 159).

In contrast to these rather late datings, there are certain crucial elements that taken together suggest an early date. The likelihood that SJC was produced to persuade non-Christian Gnostics to accept Christian Gnosticism has already been mentioned. That suggests an early date, especially in view of the fact that it seems to be assumed that the intended audience knows little or nothing about Christ, although one cannot deny the possibility of a continuing body of non-Christian Gnostics to whom Christian Gnostics might have wanted to appeal.
Further, there is the absence of polemics connected with the gnostic-orthodox struggle. This is seen rather dramatically when the frame material of \textit{SJC} is compared with that of \textit{Ap. John}. In \textit{Ap. John}, both the beginning and the ending contain elements that seem to refer to the conflict. John is depicted as a traditional Jewish Christian (going to the temple) at the start, who is confronted with charges against Christ by the Pharisee Arimanius. He is unable to answer them and so turns away from the temple and goes to the desert (II 1,5–19). John, then, is seen as moving from the inadequate orthodox way (based on Jewish tradition) to the gnostic way.

At the end of \textit{Ap. John}, we sense the defensive posture of a group that anticipates attack in the instructions from Christ that the words of the revelation are to be given only to John’s fellow spirits (“for this is the mystery of the immovable race”), that John is to write down and keep secure what he has heard, and in the curse that follows against anyone who might sell what is written (probably to opponents) (II 31,28–37). There is none of that in \textit{SJC}. In the beginning the disciples are perplexed (no reason is given) and go to the place where they have reason to think they will receive answers from the risen savior. And in the end, they are simply told to continue the savior’s mission, which, according to the account, they begin to do by preaching the Gospel (i.e., what they have just heard).

Another reason for assigning an early date is the fact that \textit{SJC} contains nothing that would clearly indicate that it had been influenced by the great systems of the middle third of the second century. There are numerous points of contact, of course, but nothing that demonstrates dependence. Finally, when one examines the attempt in \textit{SJC} to integrate the person of Christ into the system of \textit{Eug}, it is clear that problems remain: Christ is identified with Son of Man, but not with Savior; but a major section on the work of Christ (III 106,24–108,16, par.) is placed immediately after the section on the appearing of Savior, who is the son of Son of Man (III 106,15–24), which would lead one to think that a second identification of Christ—this time, with Savior—was being made. Perhaps in an attempt to resolve this confusion, the bridge section, which provides a summary of sorts, in \textit{SJC} identifies Savior with Son of Man and ignores the son of Son of Man (BG 108,1–7) (although he is mentioned in the \textit{Eug–V} parallel). All this suggests that in \textit{SJC} we are at the beginning of the process by which Christian Gnosticism was to become rationalized or theologized.

Taken together, then, these points tend to the conclusion that \textit{SJC} should be dated early. If \textit{Eug} is dated in the first-century B.C.E., then \textit{SJC} should probably be dated late in the first or early in the second century.

\textbf{VI. ORIGINAL LANGUAGE}

Prior to the identification by Puech of P. Oxy. 1081 as a leaf from a Greek copy of \textit{SJC} (1950: 98, n. 2), Doresse asserted that \textit{SJC} was composed origi-
nally in Coptic (1948: 152). But once the identification was made, a Coptic original became improbable. And given a Greek original of \( SJC \), a Greek original of \( Eug \) is very likely. Further confirmation of this is provided by the presence in \( Eug \)-III of an untranslated conjugated Greek verb (75,8); evidently it was unfamiliar to the scribe-translator, so he left it as it was.

VII. PROVENANCE

Trakatellis holds that nothing can be concluded about the provenance of \( Eug \). The fact that the scribe of \( Gos. Eg. \) has the name Eugnostos as his spiritual name, and could therefore be the same person as the writer of \( Eug \) (on the unlikelihood of which, see the next section), might suggest Egypt. But Trakatellis argues (following Böhlig-Wisse) that one cannot be certain that \( Gos. Eg. \) was in fact directed to the Egyptians (32).

There is, however, another element in \( Eug \) that suggests Egypt, namely, the reference to “the three hundred sixty days of the year” (III 84,4–5). In \( Eug \) the number of days of the year is thought of as existing because it is a reflection (“type”) of the 360 supercelestial powers. Hence it is part of the necessary ordering of things. From ancient times the Egyptians had calculated the year as having 360 days, divided into twelve months of thirty days each, plus five epagomenal days (Bickerman: 42). Furthermore, when the Romans conquered Egypt they left the 360 day period intact, decreeing only that every four years another day should be added to the epagomenal days (Decree of Augustus, 26 B.C. [Bickerman: 49]), thus bringing the Egyptian year into line with the Julian year, which was standard elsewhere in the Roman Empire.

Przybylski has suggested several possible sources other than Egypt for the 360 day reference (I Enoch, Jubilees, a purely theoretical rather than a practical calendar, ancient Babylon) (60–62), but it seems unlikely that any of them would have been the source without some word of explanation to the reader. It was only in Egypt where such a reference would have been taken for granted.\(^4\)

A further reason for believing in an Egyptian provenance is found in the discussion of sources in Section IX.

If \( Eug \) had an Egyptian provenance, it is reasonable to think that \( SJC \) had one also.

---

\(^4\) As noted, 360 days did not constitute the whole year for the Egyptians. But the references in \( Eug \)-III and \( Eug \) V do not claim that, and indeed \( Eug \)-III seems to suggest that it is only a part of the year, with its strange word order and odd (for the context) preposition: \( \text{πηυμτ [τ] \ιώε ΡΕΝ \τηρομεννε \ροογυ} \), lit., “The three hundred sixty from the year days” (84,4–5). It should be noted that the Valentinians also assumed a 360 day period (Iren., \( Haer. \) 2.15.1, and \( Val. Exp. \) [XI,2] 30,34–38).
Eug

The name Eugnóstos is not widely attested, but there is one reference to it (Pape and Bensler: s.v.; contra Bellet [47]). From the tractate there is no reason to think that it is anything other than a proper noun (derived from an adjective). It may be a spiritual name here (in contrast to a birth name), since Eugnóstos is the spiritual name of the scribe of the colophon of Gos. Eg. (III 69,10--11). Or, if we can assume that the non-Christian Eug was earlier than the colophon of the Christianized Gos. Eg., it may be that the name became spiritual within a gnostic community because it was the name of the revered writer of our tractate. Bellet’s conjecture that Eugnóstos is the title of an official in a gnostic circle requires for credibility an unlikely transposition, since the title should be in second position in relation to the name of the person possessing the title. Such a transposition has not been found in other sources, as Bellet himself admits (47 and 55--56).

The designation ΠΝΑΚΑΡΙΟΣ, “the Blessed,” which appears only in Eug--III, would probably not have been applied by the writer to himself, since it is honorific, and should therefore be considered secondary. It may have been inserted to indicate that Eugnóstos was dead. Such usage was not limited to Christian communities, contrary to Bellet (55) (see TDNT 4:362 [Hauck] and LSJ: s.v.).

The writer of Eug may have been a teacher of some significance, since his writing is preserved in two quite different versions, testifying to long usage. In view of the fact that the compiler of Codex III placed Gos. Eg. and Eug side-by-side, he may have identified Eugnóstos with the scribe of the colophon of Gos. Eg. If that was the case, it seems unlikely that he was correct (contra Dorese, 1948: 159; 1960: 196), in view of the probability that Eug was considerably earlier than Gos. Eg.

Eug is ostensively addressed to “those who are his” (III 70,1-2). “His” may refer to Eugnóstos himself, in which case the audience would be his disciples. But one gains the impression from the tractate that the audience may not be familiar with some of Eugnóstos’ teachings (see, e.g., III 74,12--14). If that is the case, “his” could refer to a deity to whom the audience is thought to belong. “Sons of Unbegotten Father” are mentioned in III 75,22.

SJC

The author of SJC wants it to appear that he is a disciple (III 91,12--19, par.). However in point of fact we have no knowledge of who the author is.

5In Pist. Soph., Philip, Matthew and Thomas, all of whom are named in SJC (along with Bartholew and Mary), are designated as “those who are to write everything that Jesus says” (71,18--72,1; 72,11--20).
It seems clear, however, who the audience is. It is made up of those who, like the disciples in *SJC*, seek answers to basic questions about the meaning and purpose of the whole cosmic system, and about their place in it. As mentioned above, they are probably non-Christian Gnostics who are being encouraged by the writer to adopt Christianized Gnosticism.

**IX. SOURCES OF EUGNOSTOS**

It may be that *Eug* originally existed without the letter format, as a cosmogonic text, as Krause has suggested (1964: 222). The minor items that make it a letter could easily have been added, but there is no way to be certain (see XVII below).

There is evidence, however, that *Eug*, as we have received it, in both its versions, is the result of major earlier editorial activity. That can be seen in two places: in the first major portion of *Eug* (III 70,1–85,9, par.) (Part A), where two originally separate speculative patterns seem to have been combined; and in the second major part (III 85,9–90,3, par.) (Part B) where evidence is found that it may originally have been an independent unit.

**A. Two Speculative Patterns in Part A**

The two patterns emerge when a comparison is made of the first group of major deities and the second, the latter of which is described as "the type of those who preceded them" (III 82,10–11, a phrase omitted in *Eug–V!*), that is, the type of the first group. The following chart shows the comparison:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Group (III 71,13–82,6, par.)</th>
<th>Second Group (III 82,7–83,2, par.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variant terms found in only one text are indicated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) He Who Is; Unbegotten; Father of the Universe; Forefather; First Existent (III) (III 71,13–75,2,3)</td>
<td>1) Unbegotten (III); Unbegotten &lt;Father of&gt; All things (V). <em>Consort</em>: All-Wise Sophia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Self-Father; Self-Begetter; Confroner (III); Self-grown, Self-constructed Father (III); He who Put Forth Himself (V) (III 75,3–11; 76,14–17)</td>
<td>2) Self-begotten. <em>Consort</em>: All-Mother Sophia (III).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Man (V); Immortal Man; Immortal Androgynous Man (III); Self-perfected Begetter (V); Begetter Mind who Perfects Himself (V); Begotten; Perfect Mind (III); Father; Self-Father Man; Man of the Depth (V); First Man (III).</td>
<td>3) Begetter (III); Begotten (V). <em>Consort</em>: All-Begettress Sophia (III).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTRODUCTION

*Consort:* All-wise Begettress Sophia; Thought, She of All Wisdoms, Begettress of the Wisdoms (V); Truth (V); Great Sophia (V). (III 76,19–V 8.32)

4) First-begotten Son of God (V); First Begetter Father (III); Adam of the Light (III); son of Man. *Consort:* First-begotten Sophia, Mother of the Universe; Love. (V 8,33–III 81,21)

5) Savior, Begetter of All Things; All-Begetter (84,13) Son of Son of Man (V 13,12–13). *Consort:* Sophia, All-Begettress (III); Pistis Sophia (III 81,21–82,6)


The most obvious and significant thing to observe is that the second group has one more deity than the first. It is also notable that the name of the consort of the fifth deity in the second group, namely, Love, is one of the names of the consort of the fourth being in the first group. Also, the name Pistis Sophia, which belongs to the consort of the sixth deity in the second group, is one of the names of the consort of the fifth deity in the first group. Notable also is the fact that the second group lacks the terms Man, Son of Man, Son of Son of Man, and Savior.

Contrary to III 82,10–11, then, the second group is not now the type of those who preceded them in any complete sense.

If we ask which list is primary, the answer seems to be the second, since the number six is important subsequently in the tractate (see discussion below), whereas the number five is not.

If we assume that III 82,10–11 originally was correct, the first group once had six members; now it lacks Arch-Begetter.

The reason for the dropping of the antetype of Arch-Begetter seems to be that another pattern was superimposed on the first group, the pattern of Immortal Man, Son of Man, and son of Son of Man—Savior. This pattern had no figure to identify with the antetype of Arch-Begetter.⁶

⁶The name Arch-Begetter (by some translators, simply transliterated as Archigenetor) does not appear in *Eug* after III 82,18; however, it does appear in *SJC*, in a non-*Eug* section, where it is identified with Yaldabaoth, the ignorant and malevolent creator god (BG 119,14–16).
The original form of the first group, then, would have resembled that of the second, except raised to a higher level of perfection. Thus, Unbegotten Father in the second group has a consort, while Unbegotten in the first is simply one. Moreover, Unbegotten in the second group is merely father of the multiplicities (“all things”), while Unbegotten in the first group is Father of the Universe. Therefore the first group would originally have looked something like the following:

1) He Who Is; Unbegotten; Father of the Universe; Forefather; First Existent.
2) Self-Father; Self-Begetter; Confronter; Self-grown, Self-constructed Father.
3) Begotten; Self-perfected Begetter; Perfect Mind; Begetter Mind who Perfects Himself (V). Consort: All-wise Begettress Sophia; Thought, She of All Wisdoms, Begettress of the Wisdoms; Truth; Great Sophia.
4) First-begotten; First Begetter Father. Consort: First-begotten Sophia, Mother of the Universe.
5) Begetter of All Things; All-Begetter. Consort: Love Sophia.

The pattern here is one that is found in Egyptian religion: An initial all-encompassing divinity (Amun, in Egyptian thought), creates a separate divinity by himself (i.e., no consort is involved). This divinity is then responsible for the creation of four other divinities, each of whom have a single female consort, thus making a total of eight (in Egyptian thought, the Eight Urgötter of Hermopolis). These, in turn, are responsible for the creation of various heavenly realms and other divine beings, leading ultimately to the structures of this world (in Egyptian thought, they create the gods who bring structure to the cosmos). This pattern can be traced to the Theban theology of the Ramesside period and (judging from Eug) became more abstract and hence more universal by the end of the Ptolemaic period. Since the pattern was not found elsewhere in the period under study, it seems reasonable to think that Egyptian religion is its source (Parrott, 1987: 82–88).

The pattern imposed on this reconstructed original pattern, namely, the pattern of three androgynous men, Immortal man, Son of Man, and Savior, appears to be the result of speculation on the first five chapters of Genesis. An important clue to that is the identification of Son of Man with Adam. He is not earthly Adam, of course, but his antetype, Adam of the Light (III 81.12), who exists in the transcendent realm. Another clue is the identification of Son of Man as also “Son of God” (V 9,2–3).

The idea that Adam was androgynous comes from Gen 1:27 and 5:1, where it is said that God created Adam male and female. He also created him in his own image, which can be taken to mean that God himself is man and that he too is androgynous. Hence, if antetype Adam is Son of Man, antetype God is Immortal Man, Adam’s father. Son of son of Man–Savior
INTRODUCTION

should then in all probability be identified with the antetype of Seth, since only of Seth is it said that he was begotten in Adam’s image (Gen 5:3) (and hence was androgynous).

The three man pattern appears to presuppose a myth like that found in *Apoc. Mos.*, where God is the benign ruler and Seth is the eschatological savior of Adam’s progeny (13.1–3). One can speculate that the reason for combining this pattern with the Egyptian one was that those who thought of Seth as a savior felt the need to give their beliefs the support of a broader theological-philosophical context. The beginning of *Eug* makes clear that the writer, at any rate, felt that he was having to deal with a spiritual threat from various philosophical teachings—teachings that presupposed either that there was no transcendent world (Stoicism and astrology) or, if there were, that there was no connection between that world and this one (Epicureanism) (Parrott, 1988: 166–67).

The two patterns were combined by the simple expedient of adding the names of the second pattern at appropriate places. This is the same method used in *SJ C*, where, in the Christianization process, Christ is identified with Son of Man. Probably the same thing has occurred in such tractates as *Ap. John* and *Gos. Eg.* (see Krause, 1964: 223; Hedrick, 1981). Since the names of the consorts are present in the second group, which was not affected by this combining, it seems likely that the three-man pattern lacked such names, and was simply identified as androgynous. As we have noted, because there was no fourth man, the antetype of Arch-Begetter (in the second group) was dropped. But instead of merely dropping his consort Pistis Sophia, the editor identified her with the consort of the preceding figure, which led, then, to the shifting of the name “Love” from that figure to the next preceding one. These names must have had some importance in the conceptuality of the editor, but what it might have been at the early date of *Eug* is not clear.

Part A then permits us to see the combining of a universalized Egyptian cosmological system and a speculative system based on Genesis. To the extent that these or similar elements are present in combined and elaborated form in later tractates, such as *Ap. John* and *Gos. Eg.*, we are probably justified in thinking of *Eug* as the source.

B. An Originally Independent Second Part:

*Part B (II 85,9–90,3, par.)*

The originally independent character of Part B is suggested by the fact that it is at odds in a number of important ways with the earlier part of the tractate. The following analysis will show the points of conflict.

Part B is introduced by a bridge section, whose purpose is to relate it to the foregoing. In particular, the intention is to relate the number of aeons in Part B to those in Part A and to suggest that the aeons to be described are the types of the preceding ones. It is here that the problems begin.
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The earliest version of the bridge section is undoubtedly in *Eug*-V (13,8–20), as Krause observed (1964: 221), which states that three aeons preceded (the same number as in Part B), with another aeon (that of Unbegotten, presumably) embracing them. The three are the aeons of Immortal Man, Son of Man, and Son of Son of Man. Left out of account, however, are Self-Begetter (the reflection of Unbegotten) and the twelve aeons created by All-Begetter for the twelve angels (III 84,13–17, par.). To be sure, no aeon is mentioned as having been created for Self-Begetter in Part A, but neither is one mentioned for Son of Man. So the three aeons of the bridge section (in *Eug*-V) do not accurately reflect the preceding material. It appears that they were designed to meet the need created by the presence of three aeons in Part B, in the light of what might be called the typological dogma.

What is described subsequently is called “the Eighth that appeared in Chaos” (III 85,19–21, par.). “Eighth” is probably to be thought of as the highest sphere of the visible cosmos (Chaos), perhaps the sphere of the fixed stars (the seven planets—including the sun and moon—each having their own spheres below it; for the fixed stars, see the description of the “multitudinous lights” in III 86,6–8). However, one cannot rule out the possibility, in view of the discussion below, that “Eighth” refers to the eighth day of creation.

The creation described in Part B is said to be the work of Immortal Man, even though his work seemed to have been concluded in Part A (V 8,15–18). The whole section appears to be based on Genesis 1–5, as was the case with the three-man pattern earlier. The clue to the Genesis connection is in the discussion of the androgyne “Assembly” (*eKKanHia*), which begins in III 86,24, par. Its female portion is called “Life” (*ZwH*), and it is explained that in this way (by giving her this name) “it might be shown that from a female came the life in all the aeons” (III 87,5–8, par.). That is closely parallel to the LXX version of Gen 3:20, where the woman is given the name *ZwH* rather than Eve, and where it is explained that she has that name “because she is the mother of all living things” (οτι αυτη μητηρ παντων των ζωντων).

Her mate, however, retains the name of the androgyne, as also happens in Genesis 3, but here he is called Assembly rather than Adam. The replacement of “Adam” with “Assembly” seems strange at first, since the Greek for “Assembly” is feminine. It thus breaks with the convention that the gender of names taken from common nouns should be the same as the sex of the being who is named (but see III 112,7–8, where it also occurs). However it seems clear that the writer is simply following the pattern of Genesis 3, without giving much thought to the convention. (Knowledge of the Hebrew Bible, where the word usually translated εκκλησια in the LXX is masculine [ניפ], is unlikely in view of the general lack of such knowledge among Egyptian Jews [e.g., Philo].) In any case, there is no hint of this change of terminology in Part A, where, as has been noted, the term Adam is used (III 81,12, par.).
The change suggests that behind the account in Part B lies a body of speculative thought identifying antetype Adam (taken in a collective sense) with the type of an assembly that would subsequently appear, perhaps the assembly of the Gnostics. This seems unrelated to the statements in Part A that antetype Adam was Son of Man, “of the Light” (III 81,12, par.), and the type for time (III 83,22–23, par.).

The editor of Eug seems unaware of the tension here, or, indeed, that speculation on Adam lies behind Assembly. In what appears to be an editorial expansion (since it relates Part B to Part A), he identifies Assembly as the type not of Son of Man / Adam of the Light but of “the Assembly that surpasses heaven” (III 86,22–24, par.), which is described in III 81,3–10, par., and is in fact the creation of Son of Man / Adam (III 81,1–12, par.).

Assembly and his mate begin the spiritual generation that leads to the appearance of multifarious immortals (III 87,8–88,3, par.). The creation of the immortals is surprising, since the aeons of the immortals had earlier been described as above the sphere of the Eighth (III 85,17–18, par.). (This generating activity suggests typological speculation on Gen 4:25–5:32, where the sons of Adam and Eve are listed, along with their amazingly long life spans.)

The immortals in turn provide themselves with great kingdoms, through the authority of Immortal Man and his consort Sophia (III 88,3–89,3, par.), who is here given the name “Silence,” which is different from her name in Part A, namely “All-wise Begettress” (III 77,3–4, par.). This realm, then, is said to provide the types for all subsequent creations (III 89,6–15, par.). That would seem to be in tension with the statement in Part A that our aeon is the type of Immortal Man (III 83,20–22, par.) (not the type of a separate realm created by him) and that temporal aspects of our aeon are the types of other beings described in Part A (III 83,22–84,11, par.).

In addition to these points of tension, it is worth noting that Part B seems to have been diminished in size as a result of being connected with Part A. The three aeons that have already been mentioned (V 14,3–7; III 86,8–13) are (1) beginning (V) or first (III), (2) the middle, and (3) the unending (V) and/or the perfect (V and III). Little is said about the first two in Part B and attention is concentrated on the third. However, the identification of the first two is important for our discussion, and that can be attempted by looking more closely at the third aeon.

The third aeon is named for Assembly (III 86,14–17, par.). If Assembly is initially antetype Adam and Eve (as androgyne), and then antetype Adam alone, then it would be reasonable to think that the third aeon is to be related (as antetype) to the account of creation that begins in Gen 2:4. The term “unending” would be appropriate, since there is no concluding formula for creation there, as there is in Gen 2:1. The term “perfect” would also be appropriate, since the third contains the ideal patterns for subsequent creations.
If that is the third aeon, then the first ("beginning") would perhaps be connected with the creation account that starts with Gen 1:1 ("In the beginning. . ."). The second, "the middle," then might refer to the divine sabbath in Gen 2:2–3, which identification would be supported by V 14,7–9, as it is restored ("[The first] in it was called ['Above] Unity [and Rest']," implying that "Unity and Rest" was the Second aeon) (but note the Eug–III and SJC parallels).

These three, then, may well have reflected the whole of the Genesis creation account and been intended to present a complete account of cosmic origins. One can conjecture that the description of the three was truncated by the elimination of most of the discussion about the first two aeons, in order to fit the account into the scheme established in Part A.

When one takes into consideration the other differences we have noted, it is not unreasonable to think that originally Part B (minus the bridge section and the conclusion, and with the inclusion of the deleted material) stood by itself, as an account of the creation of the cosmos by the antetype of the creator God of Genesis, namely androgynous Immortal Man. The first aeon would perhaps have been the super-celestial and invisible realm, the third, the visible realm, and the second, the space that separated the two. The account may well have ended where it ends now, just at the point where our part of the visible cosmos would come into existence.

To summarize, in its present context, Part B appears to be a description of the highest level of the visible universe (the Eighth), and its three aeons are seen as types of three supercelestial and hence invisible ones. The evidence suggests, however, that Part B was originally an independent speculative account based on Genesis 1–5, which provided a total description of the universe, up to the point of the creation of the world as it is.

Looking back on the whole of this section, we have found that Part A is made up of two originally different speculative systems that have been combined; and now, in the discussion of Part B, we have found a third speculative scheme, which an editor has attempted to bring into some sort of harmony with Part A.

One must ask why it would have seemed necessary to combine these three. Why not simply start fresh in constructing a speculative system that would be inwardly consistent? First, as we have learned from the critical study of the book of Genesis, the bringing together of accounts that speak essentially of the same thing (e.g., the accounts of creation, the flood, etc.) may be a sign of the alignment of groups for whom these accounts had sacred significance before that alignment. The recognition that one of the systems contains an indirect reference to Seth, suggests the identity of one of the groups—Sethians, or more likely, proto-Sethians. It was this group that made use of the Egyptian cosmological pattern. An ideological reason has already been suggested for that—to have a broader theoretical structure for dealing with philosophical challenges. But the fact that it was Egyptian may suggest a strong Egyptian component in the group, for whom the pattern
would have had special significance. As to Part B, it is not possible to identify what group might have held it in special regard, but it is so different from Part A that there must have been a separate group of origin. Second, there is the conviction that truth is a self-consistent unity (V 6,9–14; 17,13–15). That is, the various parts of truth must agree among themselves. If one believes that different parts of truth are communicated separately, as the final editor of *Eug* appears to, then one could conclude that when those parts are put together, probably under the guidance of Thought (V 3,29–4,5, par.), one would have a broader, but, *ex hypothesi*, still consistent, expression of Truth. Obvious differences among the parts could be ascribed to human error in the reception of revelation and therefore could be thought of as correctable at a later time (III 90,4–11).

It may be that this explanation would also account for later developments in gnostic systems, where disparate elements seem often to be involved.

It should be noted here that there is nothing in the sources of *Eug* that can be considered classically Gnostic. The use of the theory of types means that both parts of *Eug* assume that the structures of this world are reflections of the supercelestial world, and not the creation of an inferior deity. There is only one reference to distinctively gnostic ideology, and that seems clearly editorial (III 85,8). However, *Eug* should nonetheless be considered proto-Gnostic, since it provided a theoretical basis for later developments that led to classic Gnosticism, as *SJC* shows.

X. RELATIONSHIP OF THE TEXTS

We have already noted that *Eug* was prior to *SJC* and that *Eug–III* was apparently edited in the light of *SJC* by sharpening the prediction at the end. Since that sharpening is only apparent because of the parallel in *Eug–V*, the latter’s reading is probably to be thought of as earlier here. In addition to the prediction, there are two other places, which we noted, where *Eug–V* seems earlier than *Eug–III*, namely, the titles in the incipit and subscript.

We must now look at other evidence that bears on the question of the relationship of the texts.

An examination of the parallels shows that the two texts of *SJC* are very close. Differences in vocabulary and sentence structure mostly seem to reflect different Coptic translators rather than different Greek Vorlagen. Gaps in one text in comparison with the other, which are infrequent, can be explained as the result of homoioteleuton (e.g., BG 89,16–17, which is lacking in *SJC–III*) or minor editorial activity (e.g., BG 83,17–19, which is also lacking in *SJC–III*). If we take into consideration P. Oxy. 1081, which is very similar to the two Coptic texts, we are probably justified in thinking that there was only one major edition of *SJC*.

A further examination shows that the text of *Eug* used in composing *SJC* generally was closer to *Eug–III* than to *Eug–V*. A good indication of that is the bridge section (III 85,11–21 || BG 108,1–18; V 13,8–18). *SJC–BG* has
two aeons, which are embraced by a third. *Eug-*III has the same pattern, although the first two are listed in reverse order. But *Eug-*V has three aeons, embraced by a fourth. Beyond that we can observe that the parallels between *Eug-*III and the two copies of *SJC* are very close, both in terms of the extent of text in parallel sections and in language. On the other hand, *Eug-*V differs, in regard to the extent of text alone, some eighteen times, at points where the other texts agree with each other.

It seems impossible to tell which text of *SJC* might be closer to *Eug-*III. At four points *Eug-*III agrees with *SJC*-BG in having more text than *SJC*-III (III 72,3–6 || BG 84,13–17; III 74,3–4 || BG 89,16–17; III 86,22–24 || BG 111,3–5; III 89,5–6 || BG 115,14–15). In two of these instances, however, the lack in *SJC*-III might well be the result of homoioteleuton. In the other two, scribal error of some sort would not be surprising. There are also a few places where *Eug-*III and *SJC*-III agree against *SJC*-BG (e.g., III 72,11–13 || 95,5–7 || BG 85,6–9; III 73,12–13 || 96,7–10 || BG 87,1–4; III 76,23–24 || 101,7–8 || BG 94,9–11; III 87,9 || 111,12 || BG 112,3), but these are minor and attributable to coincidence, and may have arisen in the process of translation into Coptic.

Although the text used in the composition of *SJC* more closely resembled *Eug-*III than *Eug-*V, there are two significant places where *Eug-*V is closer to *SJC.* First, after the address proper, *Eug-*V has the same verb as the *SJC* parallels (V 1,3 || III 92,7 || BG 80,4), μοιχω, "I want" (Gr. θέλω). Neither that verb nor an equivalent is found in *Eug-*III. And second, in the last sentence of *Eug-*V, both it and the two *SJC* parallels have the word ἄλλας, "more." That word and the sentences it is found in have no parallel in *Eug-*III. Although the sentences are not exact parallels, there is a similar idea in both (*Eug-*V: "To everyone who has, more will be added"; *SJC*: "that you [the disciples] might shine in Light [even] more than these.").), which suggests that at this point the writer of *SJC* was looking at a text of *Eug* closer to *Eug-*V.

We can conclude that the text used in the composition of *SJC* was generally like that of *Eug-*III, but that in a few places it was closer to *Eug-*V. Changes in the text that resulted in *Eug-*III, as it stands, would have occurred subsequent to the composition of *SJC*.

In comparison with *Eug-*III, *Eug-*V appears to have undergone considerable expansion. Although *Eug-*V has one significant gap (it lacks III 73,14–20), there are fourteen instances where it has more text (according to the arrangement of parallels in this text and excluding the section corresponding to the missing pp. 79–80 in *Eug-*III). It should probably be thought of as later than the text represented by *Eug-*III. However, as we have noted, it seems to have some readings that are earlier. *Eug-*V, then, appears to have developed independently and to have been subject to modification over a longer period of time.
The following time chart diagrams the conclusions about text relationships arrived at above:

![Time chart diagram]

It is not clear why *Eug*-III and the *SJC* texts did not share the extensive kind of modification that is found *Eug*-V. It may have had to do with the pairing of *Eug*-III and *SJC*, which could well have acted as a brake on normal scribal tendencies to add glosses, since it would have been evident that the texts had to remain quite similar. (That assumes that *Eug*-III and *SJC* were paired for most of their textual history.) It is also possible that both texts came to be thought of in some measure as scripture among certain groups of Gnostics.

The Coptic versions of *Eug* and *SJC* were translated by different persons. That is shown by the passage left untranslated in *Eug*-III, and its parallels (75.7–8 || III 99.8–9 || BG 91.10–12 || V 4.21–3). In no case is that passage treated the same. While *Eug*-III does not translate it, *SJC*-III attempts to do so, but does it incorrectly, and *SJC*-BG also tries and succeeds. In *Eug*-V, the passage is translated, but quite differently from *SJC*-BG. (For a reconstruction of the Greek, see the section later in the volume on P. Oxy. 1081 [lines 46–50].)

As to the Coptic translations in their totality, *Eug*-III, *SJC*-III and *SJC*-BG all seem related. The grammar, sentence structure and vocabulary are frequently the same. In contrast, *Eug*-V is often quite different. The similarities of *Eug*-III, *SJC*-III and *SJC*-BG may be accounted for by assuming that they were translated by members of the same or related scribal groups, which had developed more or less common translation traditions. (For individual differences between the translators of *Eug*-III and *SJC*-BG, see endnote 4.)

### XI. THE CODICES

A codicological analysis of NHC III has been done by Frederik Wisse (1975). In the process he has also described the characteristics of the scribal hand. Codicological analyses of NHC V and BG have been done by Robinson (1979: 16–30; 36–44). His analysis of BG supersedes the one in Till–Schenke (331–32). Further developments in the analysis of these
codices are to be found in Robinson (1984: chaps. 3 [The Quires]; 4 [The Rolls]; 5 [The Kollemata]; and 6 [The Covers]).

As to the dating of the codices themselves, the material in the cartonnage of the leather cover of NHC V is dated between 298 and 323 C.E. (Barns, et al.: 3), which provides a terminus a quo for the inscribing of the codex, but is only suggestive of the terminus ad quem, since the scraps used for the cartonnage could have come from a time considerably before the time of inscribing. Unfortunately the cartonnage of Codex III is no longer extant (Facsimile Edition: xiii). The date of BG was discussed above (see I). A recent examination of the cartonnage from the BG cover suggests that the cartonnage should be dated sometime late in the third century or early in the fourth (Treu).

XII. PHYSICAL STATE OF THE TRACTATES

Eug–V. The Codex as a whole is unevenly preserved (Parrott, 1979: 3–4), and Eug is the least well preserved of all the tractates. Substantial portions of the tops and bottoms of all the leaves are missing (more of the latter than the former). In addition, the first eight pages have significant gaps in the midst of the remaining text. Fading occurs throughout and is particularly marked on the first three right-hand pages. Flaking is found on p. 11.

It should be added that the quality of the papyrus is among the poorest in the library. Examples of this can be found on pp. 1 and 5, in the breaks in the vertical fibers, and the heavy, discolored horizontal fiber on p. 6, all of which forced the scribe to compensate in one way or another.

Numerous fragments were placed prior to the publishing of the facsimile edition (1975) and therefore need no comment here. However, two were placed subsequently. On August 8, 1977, Stephen Emmel, working at the Coptic Museum in Cairo, placed two fragments, nos. 1 and 40, in the inside lower margin area of pp. 5 and 6, thus providing more text at the beginning of 5,27–29 and at the end of 6,29–31 (see 9*f/10*f in Addenda et Corrigenda in Robinson, 1984).

Eug–III and SJC–III. Three leaves are missing from the tractates: 79–80, 109–10, and 115–16. Wisse has proposed that they (and three others in the codex) were removed by a dealer for showing to prospective buyers, which would suggest that they may still be extant (1975: 227).

Damage attributable to age and rough handling by the discoverers or middlemen is very limited in comparison with Codex V. Reconstruction of the text is required on pp. 70–74 (lower inner margin area), 73–88 (middle of the top area, extending down to the 5th line at one point), 87, 89, 93 (top outer corner), 95–100 (top, toward the inner margin), 105–14 (middle, inner margin area), 117–19 (middle third of page, from the inner margin to approx. 3 cm. from the outer margin). The MS is remarkably free of flaking or fading.

SJC–BG. The leaves on the whole are well preserved. Restorations are needed on pp. 96 (outer margin area), 97–106 (top margin area) and 111–18 (inner upper margin area). Fading occurs on pp. 77–79 and 118. One leaf
(85–86) was cracked or torn in antiquity subsequent to inscribing and was repaired with narrow strips of papyrus pasted over the break on both sides of the leaf. The strips on p. 86 partially cover letters of the text.

XIII. SCRIBAL CHARACTERISTICS

A. Errors and other Peculiarities

Eug-V

I have earlier listed some of the errors found here (1979: 4–5). The present list is based on a more intensive study of the tractate and is therefore more complete.

1. Errors corrected by the scribe

a. Haplography corrected by letters written above the line or in the margin at the place of omission: 6,6.24; 7,17. In each case a stroke is placed above the letter. That occurs elsewhere in the codex only in 28,8.22. For similar corrections without a stroke, see 26,6.10.18; 27,3; 31,9.13; 56,23. This difference suggests there may have been more than one corrector of the codex.


c. Replacement of incorrect letters by letters written on top of them (i.e., covering them) without erasure: 2,18; 9,1; 10,3; 14,4.


2. Errors not corrected by the scribe.

a. Haplography: 2,16; 8,10; 9,17; 10,18.

b. Unnecessary letters: 5,18; 15,4.

c. Incorrect letters: 5,18; 6,29; 7,16; 7,20–22; 7,27; 8,7; 10,19.

3. Other peculiarities

a. Omission of a circumflex with $\lambda\acute{\omega}$ at 17,7.

b. Use of a dot ("stop") to set off an attributive from the noun it depends on (5,4; 7,10; 17,14), perhaps as a way of rendering a Greek attributive adjective in the second position (note that the parallels for 5,4 and 17,14 have relative clauses in place of the attributives).

c. Use of low dots as word separators in 8,7.16; 12,10 (see also 34,10).

d. In 7,25 a dot may replace a sentence pronoun.

e. Numeral written at end of 11,20 (a gloss, similar to those later in the codex [Parrott, 1979: 5]), with a stroke above.

f. Instead of using a second present with a noun and an adverbial expression, the scribe in one instance uses a sentence pronoun and puts the adverbial expression in first position (11,14). Also sentence pronouns are used as shorthand for $\varphi\gamma\mu\nu\pi\epsilon\varepsilon$ in 7,24–29 and for $\varphi\alpha\gamma\mu\omicron\omicron\omicron\upsilon\tau\epsilon$ $\epsilon\rho\omicron\omicron\omicron\gamma$ $\chi\epsilon$ in 11,18–20 (cf. III 106,22).

g. $\chi$ is mistakenly written for $\chi$ in 6,29; 7,20–22.
Eug-III and SJC-III

The scribe of Codex III is much more error prone than his counterpart in Codex V.

1. Errors corrected by the scribe.
   a. Haplography, corrected by letters written above the line at the place of omission: 72,14; 91,11; 95,2; 105,8; 113,11.
   b. Replacement of erased or partially erased letters by letters written on top of them: 70,2; 71,21; 72,8.21; 73,12.19.22; 77,16; 84,3; 85,9.16; 87,10; 89,10.12; 91,2; 94,15.20; 96,15 (correction of dittography); 97,11; 100,21; 102,7; 106,13; 107,1.6; 113,11; 118,2.5.6; 119,7.
   c. Erasure of unnecessary letters, etc.: 81,11 (erased point); 85,8; 87,22; 92,24 (erased dot); 95,24; 96,14 (erased stroke).
   d. Replacement of marked out letters by letters written above them: 72,12; 95,6 (marking out omitted); 97,18; 113,8. In all of these a change of meaning occurs.
   e. Marking out of unnecessary letters: 72,12; 89,10; 95,6; 106,19 (diatertal change); 113,8.
   f. Re-forming of a letter to make another without erasure: 73,4.

It is possible that a second scribe made some of these corrections. The letters written by the corrector under “d” seem somewhat different from letters in the rest of the tractate, but the differences are not sufficient to make a determination of a second scribe certain (see Böhlig–Wisse for a similar judgment regarding III,2 [4]; Wisse expresses more assurance about there being only one scribe in his later essay [1975: 236]).

2. Errors not corrected by the scribe.
   a. Haplography: 71,5; 73,10.14; 76,14; 83,5; 86,3.4.10.14.17; 89,10; 94,13(?); 95,22; 96,2.23; 97,7.17; 98,24.25; 99,8; 102,9; 103,6.10.23; 104,1; 107,7.8.21; 111,18.20; 113,7.
   b. Unnecessary letters: 74,10; 76,5 (dittography); 77,7; 84,5 (dittography).16; 85,4; 86,17; 95,6; 97,3 (dittography).18; 99,11; 113,8; 118,1 (dittography).
   c. Incorrect letters: 78,22–23 (reversal of letters); 82,2; 83,13.14; 84,13; 86,7; 87,23; 89,2; 91,15; 93,22; 101,20; 105,22; 106,14; 107,11; 113,1.

3. Other Peculiarities.
   a. In 99,8–9 a Greek phrase is partially, and incorrectly, translated. It is left untranslated or rendered correctly in the parallels.
   b. The status pronominalis of cwTm is always spelled c0tmes.
   c. The lack of care of the scribe is further attested by random drops of ink that appear here and there; e.g., at 92,1.10.14; 94,12–13; 100,8.
   d. A sentence pronoun is used as shorthand for wyqmvte epoc xe in 106,22 (cf. V 11,18–20).
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SJC–BG

1. Errors corrected by the scribe.
   a. Haplography, corrected by letters written above the line at the place of omission: 84,1; 89,14; 92,2; 102,15; 112,16; 127,8.
   b. Replacement of erased letters by letters written on top of them: 92,18; 116,18.
   d. Marking out of unnecessary letters: 78,10.

2. Errors not corrected by the scribe
   a. Haplography: 84,3,12; 86,11; 89,17; 91,16; 93,10; 95,10; 98,6; 101,12,18; 102,9; 110,4,5,11; 111,3,7; 112,7.10.12,16; 113,16; 114,7; 116,5; 118,15; 119,2; 123,9; 125,8 (misplacement).
   b. Unnecessary letters: 91,1; 95,10; 102,18; 105,7; 108,16; 110,12; 112,12; 115,16; 120,16; 124,15.
   c. Incorrect letters: 84,12; 87,5; 90,16; 92,11–12; 95,1,6; 99,4; 102,11; 103,15–16; 104,11; 105,8; 107,13; 109,15; 110,10; 112,14,16; 113,1,4,7 (mistranslation of Greek); 115,17; 119,11; 120,15; 121,4; 125,9–10 (misplacement). Of the above, the following may be errors of hearing: 84,12; 87,5; 105,8.
   d. Corruptions: 87,5; 103,15–16; 105,8; 116,8–9.

3. Other peculiarities
   a. Strokes are used instead of diereses over the diphthong αι in 104,11; 115,11; 123,16 (for the use of the dieresis, see 97,9).
   b. Δε appears three times in the phrase εβολα δε ζν, when εβολα is not in first position in the sentence, in 111,3–4; 112,10; 126,2. It may be that Δε simply provides a mild emphasis in these instances.
   c. Plene writing occurs in 83,7–8 (εμπεαρκη and εμπεειογεια) and 122,15 (ωριει).
   d. Χ is used for Χ in 112,15,17.
   e. Asterisks and diples in the body of the text highlight certain questions and answers (see detailed description below under Transcriptions).

B. Dialectal Influences

Eug–V

Although the dialect is basically S, there are numerous signs of other dialects, as is the case in the rest of the codex (Böhlig–Labib: 11–14):

1. The regular use of the demonstrative η, η, η with the relative, as in B and F.
2. The regular use of ετας for the first perfect relative and the second perfect, as in BAF[A2] (for second perfect: 12,6; 14,18).
3. The frequent irregular (from the point of view of S) use of ντε in the genitive construction.
4. The occasional appearance of the pronominal form $\text{ntr}$, as in $A_2$ (e.g. 3.8.15).

5. The consistent use of $e$ as the qualitative of $\text{epe}$, as in $A$ and $F$.

6. The use of $\text{maz}$-, as in $A$, $A_2$, and $B$, for the prefix for ordinal numbers (13.9.12), although $\text{mez}$- (S) occurs also (10.19).

7. The single appearance of $\text{eale}$-, as in $F$, instead of $\text{epe}$- (7.18).

8. The single appearance of the F form of the sign of the future (N$\text{es}$) (17.16).

9. The BAF form of the second perfect used as a temporal, a practice frequent in $B$ and $F$ (6.21; 10.13; 11.22; 14.18).

10. The AA$A_2$ form of the negative third future (16.4).

11. The AA$A_2$ form of the negative consuetudinis (2.17), although the S form also occurs.

12. $\bar{p}$ regularly precedes Greek verbs as in $A$ and $A_2$ (but this occurs in early S MSS also—Crum: 84a).

13. The following non-standard (for S) orthography:
   a. $\text{km}$ as in $A$ and $A_2$ (4.25);
   b. $\text{nag}$ as in $A$, $A_2$, and $F$ (6.22.25; 9.10);
   c. $\text{sam}$ as in $A$, $A_2$ and $F$ (6.10; 7.29; 12.27);
   d. $\text{xeic}$ as in $A$, $A_2$ and $F$ (6.30).

I have not mentioned $\text{nT}$, $\text{t}$-, $\text{nT}$- in the above. This form of the article is identified by Till as most characteristic of $B$ and $F$ (1961: sec. 64), but Krause subsequently noted that at least the plural is quite characteristic of early upper-Egyptian dialects as well (Krause-Labib: 29). In Codex V these forms are found intermingled with $\text{nT}$-, $\text{t}$-, $\text{nT}$-, without discernible difference in emphasis to a modern reader. Nor is it possible to see that one form of the article is preferred to the other with certain words.

As mentioned, these characteristics are essentially the same as in the rest of Codex V. Böhlig–Labib accounts for them by positing a Middle Egyptian (presumably, F) translator who intended to render the original into S but occasionally reverted to his native dialect (12). Schenke disagrees, seeing a pre-classical S dialect with $A_2$ features and only occasional signs of F (1966: col. 24). For $\text{Eug}$–V, Schenke is correct regarding the small number of items that occur only in Middle Egyptian (7. and 8. above). But his characterization of the dialect as pre-classical S makes it hard to understand the variations that go beyond spelling differences, since even the pre-classical stages of a language would need to have the internal consistency necessary for satisfactory communication. It is perhaps better to think of those differences as having appeared in the course of transmission as scribes from different regions adjusted the text in an $ad$ hoc fashion (see Böhlig–Wisse, for a similar explanation as applied to Codex III [11–12]).
Eug–III and SJC–III

The dialect employed is S with no significant indications of other influences. Occasionally one finds orthography more familiar in other dialects according to Crum (e.g. \text{Anhe} [A, A_2] for \text{enez}; \text{emate} [A_2] for \text{amaze} and \text{meoye} [A] for \text{meeye}, all of which are found along with standard S spelling). But these are also found in S texts that have become available since Crum (see Kasser) and therefore are best accounted for as reflecting an earlier non-standardized state of S spelling rather than A or A_2 influences, as proposed by Till–Schenke (21) (Böhlig-Wisse has made an observation similar to the one adopted here on the orthography of III,2 [6–7]).

SJC–BG

The dialect is basically S with some features that are similar to other dialects, especially A_2. Those features are not sufficient to make one think that we are dealing with a mixed dialect. Till–Schenke agrees with this and thinks that the translator intended to translate into pure S, that some forms were in doubt, and that in those cases he would sometimes revert to his native (non-S) dialect (21). Although all the orthographic forms referred to by Till–Schenke (18–20) are also found in S texts, the other features are not (the irregular use of the preposition \text{nte}-, and the doubling of the N before an initial vowel), and therefore support Till–Schenke’s view. The fact of the widespread nature of these peculiarities in the tractate makes Till–Schenke’s explanation preferable here to the one proposed above for Eug–V.

It should be noted here that the use of \text{ni-}, \text{ti-}, \text{ni-} is frequent in BG. This form of the article is preferred with words beginning with a. Mostly its use adds nothing discernible to the emphasis of the word to which it is attached beyond an ordinary article. When demonstrative force is desired, \text{etmmy} is normally added (105,7; 111,4; 119,12–13; 120,11–12; 121,5.8). In at least one instance, however, this form of the article (without \text{etmmy}) does have demonstrative force: 96,6.

C. Scribal Style

1. Script

In Codex V, the script is small and ligature occurs frequently where the line of one letter can naturally be extended to meet another, often without regard to word separation. The letters \text{m}, \text{y} and \text{q} regularly lean to the left, giving many lines the appearance of a bias in that direction. The scribe often ends a long vertical stroke (as with a \text{p}, \text{t}, \text{q} and \text{t}) with a slight curve to the left, showing a certain flair. The scribe also varies the width of his strokes (e.g., the middle horizontal stroke of the \text{e} is thinner than the rest of the letter). He enlarges the \text{x} when it comes at the beginning of a line. Often \text{y},
when it appears at the end of a line (and sometimes elsewhere too), will have a non-cursive form (like a printed "y").

Codex III has a larger script than Codex V. Ligature often occurs where lines can be naturally extended, but there is less here than in Codex V. The scribe's strokes are uniformly thin in width with little interest shown in decorative accents. Letter size tends to be uniform throughout. No letters regularly lean, which gives a sense of verticality to the whole. Altogether, the impression is of ascetic spareness.

In BG, the script is bold and square in character, with strokes that tend to be heavier than in Codex III, but that vary in width, as in Codex V. Ligature occurs often within words. Letter size tends to be uniform, although sometimes letters become smaller toward the end of a line, as a result (apparently) of an attempt to stay within a margin (unmarked). It should be noted that an unusually large ψ begins 120,1, for no apparent reason. Final letters (in a line) are occasionally enlarged, perhaps in an effort to make the right margin straighter (see the discussion of diphones below). The letters q and γ (the non-cursive form is used throughout) often resemble each other, resulting in occasional difficulties in transcription (see note to 107,13). Sometimes the vertical stroke of q, φ, and the like is extended into the line below.

2. Superlinear Strokes

The five uses of the superlinear stroke common to these tractates, and indeed throughout the library, are these: (1) It signals that two consonants are part of a single syllable and are united by a sub-vocalic sound; (2) It signals that an initial consonant is a sonant; (3) It is used to tie three consonants together in a sense unit (i.e., MNT); (4) It marks abbreviated Greek nouns (particularly nomina sacra); (5) It signals the omission of an N at the end of a line.

The scribe of Codex V is quite careful. In regard to the first use, he places the stroke over both consonants; for the second, he places it over only one; for the third and fourth he puts the stroke above all the letters, although typically he begins at the end of the first letter. As noted earlier, the scribe also places a stroke over letters that have been omitted in the course of copying and that are placed either above the place of omission or in the margin. In addition, at 11,20 a stroke is placed over a numeral written in the margin as a gloss for a number in the text (similar to other such numerals later in the codex).

Wisse has discussed the use of superlinear strokes in Codex III (1975: 235). I would only add to his careful analysis that they are regularly omitted with final Π, Τ and ζ in two-consonant combinations.

In BG, the scribe is inconsistent in his use of superlinear strokes. He generally omits them over the initial N of the perfect relative/second perfect prefix (but see 97,9; 105,17; 113,11; 117,15; 126,1), as he does frequently with other initial N's or M's. Also they are omitted normally over the third
person masculine singular pronoun when it is suffixed to a consonant (but see 100,10), and over the final two consonants of such words as ὁμόππ and ὃγκνς (but see 125,15). The strokes are made with a certain casualness. Often the stroke over an initial sonant begins late and is continued over a portion of the following letter. Also when one expects two strokes side by side, the scribe makes only one (e.g., 101,19). For the editorial policy on strokes, see below under Transcriptions.

3. Articulation Marks

In Codex V, the scribe places curved vertical hooks on ῥ, π and τ when they are in the final position in a sense unit; i.e., always when they come at the end of a word, but also with ετ, μντ, ατ, etc., apparently to make clear syllabic closure. Sometimes κ has a hook on it also, but there is no consistency about its use and we have therefore ignored such hooks in this edition.

In Codex III the scribe uses dots or short curved lines unattached to the letters in place of vertical hooks. These have been considered by Wisse (1975: 234).

BG has no such marks, except for the one in 88,11.

4. Page Numerals

Because of the method of presentation of the texts here, it has not been possible to show visually how the page numerals are related to the body of the text. A description is therefore provided here.

In Codex V, the few numerals that remain are found above the text just within the outer text margin. The numerals are placed between two horizontal strokes.

In Codex III, the page numerals appear in the center of the upper margin. No strokes accompany the numerals.

In BG, the page numerals are also written in the center of the upper margin. The numeral on p. 94 has, in place of the normal delta (after the fai), a figure resembling an alpha, although it is different in form from alphas found elsewhere in the text. The numerals have one horizontal stroke above them.

5. Asterisks, External and Internal Diples and Paragraph Markers

Asterisks are found only in BG. They occur in the left margin on the following pages: 86, between lines 6 and 7; 86,9; 87, between lines 8 and 9; 87,12; 106,11.14; 107,17. These serve to identify questions asked by Philip and Thomas (see textual note for 107.13) as well as the responses. On 86 and 87, the initial asterisks are accompanied by very large diples placed in the body of the text where the introduction to the question begins. In each case the scribe has lengthened the lower line of the diple so it ends on the
next line between the end of the introduction (\textit{Eug}.) and the first word of the question proper.

A similar diple is found in the body of the text at 82,19, this time introducing a question by Matthew. The marginal indicator in that case, however, is not an asterisk but a \textit{paragraphus cum corone}. Another diple marks the introduction to the response to Matthew (83,4).

Asterisks are also used at the beginning and end of each of the lines at 127,11–12, in order to highlight the title.

No paragraph markers occur in the extant text of \textit{Eug–V}. In \textit{Eug–III}, a \textit{paragraphus cum corone} appears in the left margin on p. 76, between lines 12 and 13, and two are found at the conclusion of the tractate, setting off the subscript title. In \textit{SJC–III}, a \textit{paragraphus cum corone} is found in the left margin between 96,14 and 15. In the first instance a major shift is indicated ("another knowledge principle"). In the second, a question by Thomas is signaled. In \textit{BG} a \textit{paragraphus} in the right margin is used to mark the introduction to the first general statement of the disciples' concerns by Philip at 79,18. A \textit{paragraphus cum corone} occurs also in the left margin on p. 126 between lines 16 and 17, marking the beginning of the conclusion of the tractate.

External diples, used as line fillers in Codex III and \textit{BG} (but not Codex V, except as concluding decorations), have been removed from the texts involved but have not been listed in footnotes. It is appropriate to list here the lines where they are found in the MSS.

In the two tractates in Codex III diples occur at the end of the following lines: 72,7; 73,4; 81,14.18; 82,6.22; 83,23; 85,14.23; 86,21(2); 87,15; 88,16; 91,11.23; 93,6.19; 94,8; 97,6; 98,21; 100,5; 102,16; 104,1; 106.1; 114,24; 117,10; 118,25. In \textit{SJC–BG} diples are found at both the beginnings and ends of lines. They are at the beginning in the following lines: 80,5.6; 87,13; 108,6–10.16.17; 117,7.8; 123,14–17; 124,17; 127,3–7. They are at the ends of the following lines: 83,1–4; 89,1; 106,5.17.19; 107,1.2; 108,5.6.13(2); 109,8; 110,3.7(2); 111,11; 112,7(2).12; 115,15–17; 116,6(2).15.16; 117,9.15; 119,6.13; 120,10.13; 121,1–6; 122,5; 123,12; 124,11; 125,14; 126,8.12.15; 127,10.

In \textit{BG} 108,13, the tip of the second diple is extended and curved back (as with the final \textit{e} in 127,3), giving Till–Schenke the impression of a third diple, which would be anomalous. Diples are also placed in the body of the \textit{BG} text at a number of points, all of which are noted in the footnotes. In 116,8, one precedes the final two letters, perhaps as an indicator of an anacoluthon.

\textbf{XIV. TRANSCRIPTIONS}

The transcriptions of the three Nag Hammadi tractates presented here were made on the basis of careful examination of original MSS at the Coptic Museum in Cairo and a number of sets of photographs of those MSS in the
possession of the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity, by the editor and other members of the Claremont team (see the preface). They have been compared with a preliminary draft of parallels prepared some years ago by Martin Krause. *Eug—III* was also compared with the version published by Trakatellis (see II above). The *SJC—BG* transcription was made on the basis of the editio princeps (Till–Schenke) with the aid of photographs of the original MS.

Because of the similarities of the texts and the Coptic, as well as the relatively intact character of the MSS, occasional restorations and corrections of *Eug—III, SJC—III* and *SJC—BG* were done mostly without great difficulty. The same was not true, however, with *Eug—V*, where extensive lacunae made numerous restorations desirable. As noted above, the text is considerably expanded in comparison with the parallel texts, and the Coptic translator was from a different translation tradition. These factors made the use of the parallels problematic in the restorations. I want to acknowledge again the aid I received, particularly in regard to *Eug—V*, from Bentley Layton and Stephen Emmel.

As to the citations in the footnotes, since Krause's parallel version is only in draft form, it is not cited. However, Krause's translation of *Eug—III, SJC—III* and various portions of *Eug—V* and *SJC—BG* (1974) has often made it possible to extrapolate the Coptic text that lies behind it and refer to it in relation to the transcriptions.

The following, then, are the citation policies in this edition regarding restorations and emendations in each of the tractates.

*Eug—V.* Only Emmel is cited. Those citations occur where he lists photographic evidence for particular readings.

*Eug—III.* Divergences from Krause and Trakatellis are noted. They are also cited in support of this edition in case of disagreements. Till–Schenke is always cited where it takes a clear position. Silence in regard to Till–Schenke should be taken to mean lack of evidence, since only parts of *Eug—III* are published in that edition.

*SJC—III.* Divergences from Krause are noted (where they can be determined). Support for this edition is also cited, except for pp. 117–19, where there are numerous restorations and Krause has a continuous text; then, only divergences are noted. Till–Schenke is cited when it is clear; the text of *Eug—III* was dealt with in Till–Schenke only as it related to the editing of *SJC—BG* and therefore there are places where *Eug—III* is not printed. Silence in this edition regarding Till–Schenke means no evidence.

*SJC—BG.* Till–Schenke emendations are followed except where noted, and in those cases the Till–Schenke emendations are specified. Minor divergences, such as the dotting of a letter or the position of brackets, are not noted.
In regard to superlinear strokes, the following policies have been adopted for purposes of standardization. When a stroke spans two consonants in the MS, it is here only shown over the second, with two exceptions: where an initial M or N is a sonant and has a stroke that continues over an immediately following consonant (common in BG), the stroke is placed over the first letter only. The same policy is followed in regard to the conjunctive conjugation.

When a stroke spans three consonants in the MS, it is here placed over the middle letter only. Exceptions are made in the case of proper nouns and where the stroke is the sign of an abbreviation.

XV. TRANSLATION POLICIES

Since this is a parallel edition of four tractates, it has been necessary for the translations to be fairly literal to make comparison between the texts as easy as possible.

The following translation policies have been adopted here:

1) Abstract and predicate nouns that were (presumably) anarthrous in Greek (see BDF: sec. 252, 258) seem often to have been translated with an indefinite article in Coptic (Stern: sec. 232). In rendering these Coptic words in English, I have routinely omitted the article in the case of abstract nouns (but note III 77,11) and supplied a definite article in the case of the predicate nouns. Examples: V 4,11 (cf. parr.); 7,4; 7,6-9, parr.; III 101,18, par.

2) I have translated demonstrative plurals as singulars if they appear to reflect Greek demonstrative neuter plurals, which are routinely understood as singular.

3) There is some difficulty in distinguishing among names, titles, roles and attributes for the various divine beings. I have tended where possible to take terms as names, since knowledge of them seems to have been important among the Gnostics (see V 4,14–16).

4) Ethical datives have by and large not been translated since they are generally archaic in English. Examples: V 6,22; 6,26; III 88,12 (but see 88,21).

5) Occasionally the adverb ἀρχή, which is usually translated “at first,” or the like, is here translated “very soon,” because “at first” does not seem appropriate in the context and something akin to the lexical rendering “early” does. Examples: V 6,16; 12,25; III 111,14.

6) The translation of αρχὴ has been difficult at times because of the problem of knowing whether it means “beginning” or “principle.” I have sometimes opted for giving both possibilities in the text.

7) In regard to the notes, I have attempted to give the significant alternative renderings. In some cases I have noted incorrect readings that may have attained some currency. For ease of comparison, I have translated quotations from the German and modern Greek versions into English.
8) The Greek of Greek loan words is omitted in this edition. These can be readily identified in the Coptic text by anyone with facility in Greek. Highlighting them in the translation is not only esthetically jarring but potentially misleading, since it suggests that the words have not been integrated into Coptic, which might be true in some cases, but certainly not in all. A Greek Loan Word index is provided at the end of the volume.

XVI. FOOTNOTES AND ENDNOTES

The footnotes and endnotes have been kept as brief as possible. Attention has been focused on issues connected with editing and translating. Matters of interpretation have been dealt with only in passing, in view of an anticipated commentary. Special abbreviations for earlier editions have been adopted for the notes and are identified in the list of abbreviations. A separate set of notes is provided for each text, with transcription and translation notes combined. The endnotes deal with matters involving two or more texts, and the need to refer to them is signaled by a footnote in each instance.

XVII. LITERARY FORMS

Although *Eug* is in letter form, it quickly becomes apparent that it is basically a religio-philosophical controversy discourse, which has a form of its own. This form begins with a description of the position that is opposed. There is then a refutation of that position (often very brief). Finally the alternative proposed by the writer is presented, which is often the bulk of the piece. It can be found elsewhere as a separate form (e.g., *Orig. World* [II,5]), and in combination with the letter form (e.g., *The Letter of Ptolemy to Flora* [Epiphan., *Pan.* 33.3,1–7,10], first noted by Doresse [1948: 154–55]).

*SJC* is the account of a revelation discourse of a heavenly being (Christ) who appears in a special place, in response to the perplexities of his followers. There are twelve disciples, of whom only Philip, Thomas, Matthew and Bartholomew are named, and seven women, of whom only Mary (presumably Magdalene) is named. The discourse is punctuated by the questions of the followers. *SJC* concludes with a commission to the followers by Christ, who then disappears. The disciples then set forth to carry out the commission. The form of *SJC*, while unique among the Nag Hammadi writings, has close resemblances to *Ap. John*. (For further discussion of the form of Gnostic revelatory tractates, see Fallon, and Perkins, 1980: 25–58.)
GUIDE TO THE PARALLELS
of Eug and SJC
(Minor similarities and differences are not reflected)

*Eug*-III alone is referred to for "Eug Only" and "Common Material," except for those places found only in *Eug*-V. *SJC*-III is referred to for "SJC Only," except for those places found only in *SJC*-BG.

Sections opposite each other in the outside columns are so placed not because they are parallel in language (although they may be) but because they occupy the same relative space in the tractates.

Names of deities and other "realities" are italicized only at their first appearance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>Eug Only</em></th>
<th><em>Common Material</em></th>
<th><em>SJC Only</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Address of letter (III 70,1–3).</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Male disciples and women go to mountain in perplexity and meet resurrected savior; <em>Philip</em> states the general query. (III 90,14–92,7).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Refutation of philosophers (III 70,22–71,5).</td>
<td></td>
<td>5. True knowledge to be given to elite (III 93,16–24).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Invitation to another approach (III 71,5–13)</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Matthew</em>'s request: &quot;Teach us the truth&quot; (III 93,24–94,4).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. He embraces all and is characterized by certain mental qualities (III 73,3–13).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Their whole race is with Unbegotten (omitted by <em>Eug</em>-V) (III 73,14–16).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. They have not yet become visible (omitted by Eug-V). The difference between what comes from perishableness and imperishableness. Ignorance of this brings death (III 73,16–74,7).

11. Transition to new topic (III 74,7–14)

12. The way to true knowledge: go from visible to invisible with the aid of Thought (III 74,14–19).

13. This is a knowledge principle (III 74,19–20)


15. Transition to another knowledge principle (III 76,10–14).

16. Revealing of Immortal Man (III 76,14–77,2).

17. About the female part of Immortal Man (III 77,2–77,9).

18. First appearance of names; creation of aeon for Immortal Man and the granting of authority (III 77,9–78,5).

Immortal Man’s mental qualities (III 78,5–9).

The hierarchical differences among these qualities (III 78,9–17).

19. Elaboration of differences. The relationship of numbers shows the relationship among these qualities (III 78,17–V 8,6).

9. Thomas asks why these came to be (III 96,14–21).

Response: “Because of his mercy and love” (III 96,21–97,16).

11. Mary asks how “we” will know that (III 98,9–12).

15. Matthew asks how Man was revealed (III 100,16–21)

17. Role of Immortal Man in salvation; his consort (III 101,9–19).
GUIDE TO THE PARALLELS

20. The coming to appearance of other things from these qualities (V 8,6–18).

21. Bartholomew asks whether the Son is related to Man or Son of Man (III 103,22–104,6).

22. Revealing of First-begotten (Begetter) Son of Man and his Sophia (V 8,31–III 81,3).

23. Disciples request more details about Man (III 105,3–11).

24. Son is called Adam. Rejoicing in the kingdom of Son of Man (III 81,10–21).

25. The savior is the revealer (III 106,5–9).

26. Revealing of Savior, Begetter of All Things, and his Sophia (III 81,21–82,6).


28. Creation by All ("Self"—BG) Begetter of twelve aeons for the twelve angels (III 84,12–17).

29. Creation of heavens and firmaments in these aeons (III 84,17–85,6).

30. Summary statement; defect of femaleness appears (III 85,6–9).

31. Thomas asks how many are the aeons of the immortals (BG 107,13–108,1).

32. Description of aeons: (Eug—V has four aeons; Eug—III and SJC have three. The order differs between Eug and SJC [III 85,9–21]).
Description of the revealing of the Eighth ("Seventh" SJC) by Immortal Man, with aeons, powers and kingdoms; the naming of aeons (III 85,21–86,16).

Designation of the third aeon as "Assembly" (III 86,16–87,9).

Assembly and his consort begin the engendering that leads to the revealing of all the immortals (III 87,9–88,3).

Authority of immortals comes from Immortal Man and Sophia. Immortals use it to provide themselves with domains and retinue (III 88,3–89,6).

From this area come the types of subsequent aeons and worlds (III 89,6–15).

General rejoicing by all natures (III 89,15–90,3).

33. (Inserted at III 88,21)
_The Apostles_ ask about those in the aeons (III 112,19–113,2).

34. Conclusion: Words of Eugnostos are to be accepted (preserved) until one who need not be taught comes (III 90,4–11).

34. Reason for the revelation (III 114,5–8).

35. _Mary_ asks where the disciples came from, where they are going and what they should do in the world (III 114,8–12).

The coming into the lower regions of the drop from the Light (III 114,12 BG 119,16).

Development of psychic man (BG 119,17—121,13).

Coming of the savior and his work (BG 121,13–III 118,3).

Commissioning of disciples (III 118,3–119,8).

Disappearance of the savior and beginning of disciples' mission (III 119,8–17).
THE PARALLEL TEXTS

Please note: A new page of Coptic text always begins at the left margin of a line marked by a Coptic page number. It is not otherwise indicated.
The Sophia of Jesus Christ. After 15 he rose from the dead, his twelve disciples and seven women continued to be his followers and went to Galilee onto the mountain called “Divination | and Joy.” When they gathered together and were perplexed about the underlying reality of the universe and the plan and the holy providence and the power of the authorities and about everything that the Savior is doing with them in the secret of the holy

\[\text{TCOFIA NEEC PEFC MNN}^{15}\text{CA TREUTEWOYN EBOA ZNI NE\text{TMOOYI}}\]
\[\text{NPEPENQMN\text{TENOJOYC M\text{MAEHTHS MN CA\text{SHE | NCGIME MAEHTEYE NAQ E\text{IAVEI ETRACTALAIAXA EXI\text{PTOOG}}}}\]
\[\text{E\text{WAMOYUTE EROU XE MANTH | GI RAWE NTEROYCWOYGS GIOY|COI\ E\text{YANORI ETBE TSYPOCTA | CSIC M\text{PTHRY} MNI TOIKONOMIA 5 MNI TEPRONOIA ETOYAAB MNI | TAPETH NNEDOYCSA AUY ETBE | 2WB NIM ET\text{EREPCSWTHPR EPE | TI\text{MOOY NIMMAY ZM NMYSTHPRION}}\]

The Sophia of Jesus Christ. After 10 he rose from the dead, when his twelve disciples and seven women who continued to be his followers went up to Galilee onto the mountain called “Divination | and Joy” and were accordingly perplexed about the underlying reality of the universe and the plan and the holy providence and the power of the authorities, about everything that the Savior is doing with them, the secrets of

\[\text{SJC-III:} \]
91,1 Preceding this line, MS has a short line of decoration with a *paragraphus cum corone* just below in the left margin.
91,1–2 See endnote 1.
91,2 Corr.: second e for erased o.

\[\text{SJC-BG:} \]
78,1–2 See endnote 1.
78,10 Corr.: m is marked out after on.
EUGNOSTOS

NHC V

NHC III
plan, the Savior appeared, not in his previous form, but in the invisible spirit. And his likeness resembles a great angel of light. But his resemblance I must not describe. No mortal flesh could endure it, but only pure (and) perfect flesh like that which he taught us about on the mountain called “Of Olives” in Galilee. And he said: “Peace be to you (pl.)! My peace I give I to you!” And they all marveled and were afraid. The Savior appeared to them, not in his previous form but in the invisible spirit. And his likeness was the likeness of a great angel of light. But his resemblance I must not describe. No mortal flesh could endure it, but only pure (and) perfect flesh like his, which he taught us about on the mountain called “Of Olives” in Galilee. He said: “Peace be to you (pl.)! My peace I give I to you!” And they all marveled and were afraid. The Savior

---

SJC-III:

91,15 MS has q (incorrect gender—noted by T-S).
Greetings!

Eug-V:

1,1 Stroke over Ν is partially visible in MS.

“Sons”: Here and elsewhere ωμέ could also be translated “children” (“child,” when ωμέ is in the sing.).

1,1-2 If the word ἀγέννητος appeared elsewhere in the tractate or indeed the codex, it would be tempting to restore ΝΠΩ [ΗΜΕ ἌΠΙ] [ΑΓΕΝΝΗΤΟΣ], “the sons [of] [(Unbegotten)],” on the basis of 5,7–8.

Eug-III:

70,2 Corr.: second ΝΕ for partly erased ΝΟΥ (dittography?).

“This”: lit. “these,” the Coptic of which is probably a too literal rendering of a Greek neuter pl. demonstrative, which is often used to refer to a singular thing (Smyth: sec. 1003) (so rendered by K & Tr); see also BG 120,14.

70,2–3 Bellet proposes that ΖΝ ΝΕΕΙ (incorrectly transcribed as ΖΝΝΑΙ by him) equals ΖΝΑΙ and should be translated, “It is pleasing to me that you know. . . .” ΠΑΓΕ might then be taken as rendering the Greek χαίρε, “Greetings.” Thus the initial statement would be essentially the same as the parr. (without χαίρε in SJC) (57). Attractive as that is, it is probably an impossible reading of the text as it stands, since ΖΝΑΣ does not appear to be found elsewhere with the Ν geminated, or with a stroke over the Ν. Also the scribe has placed a stop between ΖΝ ΝΕΕΙ and
laughed and said to them: “What are you thinking about? (Why) are you perplexed? What are you searching for?” Philip said: “For the underlying reality of the universe and the plan.” The Savior said to them:

laughed and said to them: 15 “What are you thinking about? What are you perplexed about? What are you searching for?” Philip said: “For the underlying reality of the universe and the plan of the Savior.” He said:

---

*SJC-III:

92,1 There is a drop of ink above η in a position that suggests it was not intentionally placed there. Other random drops are found in the MS, e.g., 92,10 and 14: 94,12–13 (rt. margin).

*SJC-BG:

79,19 MS has a paragraphus in the right margin next to noc.

---

(Eug-III continued)

εττετνείμε, indicating that he probably understood the passage as it is rendered in my translation. Contrary to Bellet’s assertion, the Coptic as it stands makes sense grammatically. The infinitive here (εττετνείμε) is not causative and dependent, but rather purely nominal, in apposition to ηηει. It is possible, to be sure, that errors were made in the course of transmission and that the original text was closer to the parr.
I want you to know that all men, who are born of the earth, from the foundation of the world until now inquired about God, who he is and what he is like, and they have not found him. And those of them who think they are wise, (speculating) from the care (taken) of the world, I have no truth in them! For the ordering of the aeon is spoken of in three ways by them, (and) hence they do not agree [with] each other. For | [ . . . ] | [ . . . ]. For | that you know that all men born from the foundation of the world until now are | dust. While they have inquired about God, | who he is and what he is like, | they have not found him. The wisest among them have speculated about the truth from the ordering of the world. | And the speculation has not reached | the truth. For the ordering is spoken of in three (different) opinions | by all the philosophers, (and) hence | they do not agree. For some | of
I want you to know that all men born on earth from the foundation of the world until now, being dust, while they have inquired about God, who he is and what he is like, have not found him. Now the wisest among them have speculated from the ordering of the world and (its) movement. But their speculation has not reached the truth. For it is said that the ordering is directed in three ways by all the philosophers, and hence they do not agree. For some of them...

“I want you all to know that those who have been born on earth from the foundation of the world until now, while they have thought to inquire about God, who he is and what he is like, have not found him. Now the wisest among them have speculated from the ordering of the world and (its) movement. But their speculation has not reached the truth. For it is said that the ordering is directed in three ways by all the philosophers, and hence they do not agree. For some of them..."
some [of them say] | that [it is spirit by] itself. 20 [Others, that] it was [subject to] | [providence]. Others, [that] | [it was subject to] fate. | [But] none [of] these has attained | [the truth].

them say | about the world that it was directed | by itself. Others 20 that it is providence (that directs it). | Others, that it is fate. | But it is none of these. | Again, of the three voices I have just | mentioned, none is true.

---

**Eug-V:**

1,19 α: see Emmel, 1979: 182. First superlinear stroke is in lacuna. See note to SJC-BG par.

**Eug-III:**

70,21 “fate”: see endnote 2.
them say about the world | that it is directed by itself. Others, | that it is providence (that directs it). Others, | that it is fate. But it is none of these. 5 Again, of the three voices I have | just mentioned, none | is close to the truth, and (they are) from | man.

some of | them say that | it is pure spirit by itself. Others, | that it is providence (that directs it). 10 Others, that it is fate. But it is none of these. Again, these three | voices that have just been mentioned | are from men 15 who have been born on the earth; none of them is of the | truth.

_SJC-III:
92,24–25 See note to _SJC-BG_ par.
92,24 Corr.: an erased superlinear stroke above το.
93,3 “fate”: see endnote 2.
93,8 Alt.: <N>PWMe, “from _the_ men” (T–S); K has “through men.”

_SJC-BG:
81,7 “pure”: “holy” (T–S). The Coptic can mean either. The T–S choice is based on the assumption that “the translator of BG took a form of άγειν for άγιον πν(ευ)μα.” That seems unlikely in view of the probable reconstruction of V 1,19. That the world is, in some sense, (pure) spirit and is directed by it was Stoic doctrine (see _TDNT_ [6], 1968: 354–56 [Kleinknecht]). The parallels in _Eug-III_ and _SJC-III_ appear to reflect the Epicurean view that there is no directing power. Since the text earlier says that these three opinions are different, and “pure spirit,” here, is, in essence, the same as providence, which is the next view, the readings in _Eug-III_ and _SJC-III_ are probably to be preferred.

81,10–11 “fate”: see endnote 2.
Whoever, then, is able to come to the God of truth by means of another voice, for whatever is from itself is an empty life; it is self-made. Providence is foolish. (And) fate is an undiscerning thing.

\[ \textit{Eug-III:} \]

71,3 \( \text{ωακαου} \) “it is self-made”: translation omitted by K & Tr (text is not emended by Tr).

71,4 “fate”: see endnote 2.

71,5 T-S emends \( \text{ογ<ειε> e} \), but elsewhere in \textit{Eug-III} and \textit{SJC-III} only \( \text{ογ<ει> e} \) is found. “is . . . thing”: “is something that is not known” (K [by an emendation?], followed by Tr, who does not emend the line).

71,6 “to get free of” (similarly, Tr): less likely, “penetrate to the solutions (sic) of” (K).
But I, who came from Infinite Light, I am here—for I know him (Light) — that I might speak to you about the precise nature of the truth. For whatever is from itself is a polluted life; it is self-made. Providence has no wisdom in it. And fate does not discern.
different from these [three voices] ⁵ that have been mentioned, he will agree [in] everything concerning him,

and he is [immortal.] But, although he is immortal, he dwells [in the midst of] mortal men.

Eug-III:

71,9 “to confess”: “and reveal” (K & Tr).
But to you it is given to know; and whoever is worthy of knowing will receive it, whoever has not been begotten by the sowing of unclean rubbing but by First Who Was Sent, for he is an immortal in the midst of mortal men."

Matthew said to him: “Lord,

He Who | Is is ineffable. 15 No principle knew him, no authority, | no subjection, nor any creature | from the foundation of the world, | except he alone.

_Eug-III:_

71,15 “principle”: “power” (K).
no one can find the truth except through you. Therefore teach us the truth.” The Savior said:

5 “He Who Is is ineffable. No principle knew him, no authority, no subjection, nor any creature from the foundation of the world until now, except himself alone and anyone to whom he wants to make revelation through him who is from First Light. From now on

no one can find the truth except through you. Therefore teach us the truth.” The Savior said:

5 “He Who Is is ineffable. No principle knew him, no authority, no subjection, nor any creature from the foundation of the world until now, except himself alone and anyone to whom he wants to make revelation through him who is from First Light. From now on
For since no divinity is over him, he is eternal. 15 Being eternal, he does not experience birth. And being unbegotten, he is without likeness.

For he is immortal and eternal, having no birth; for everyone who has birth will perish. He is unbegotten, having no beginning; for everyone who has a beginning has an end. No one rules over him. He has no name; for whoever has a name is the creation of another. 77
I am the Great Savior.
For he is immortal and eternal. Now he is eternal, having no birth; for everyone who has birth will perish. He is unbegotten, having no beginning; for everyone who has a beginning has an end. Since no one rules over him, he has no name; for whoever has a name is the creation of another.

SJC-III:
94,15 Corr.: ω for ο. 

SJC-BG:
84,3 Not emended by T–S.
84,12 MS has πcwte, “the ransom.”
And [being without] likeness, he does not take on [form]. For whoever takes on form is the creation of another...He has his own semblance—not like the semblance we have received and seen, but a strange semblance that surpasses all things and is better than the totalities. It looks to every side and sees itself from itself. He is infinite;

---

**Eug-V:**

2,18 Corr.: first π incorporates initial η (cf. 9, ln.).

2,20 ε could be ζ. Only a large dot remains immediately before the lacuna. For ε with such a dot, see 3,13 (first ε) Facsimile Edition–V. If the letter were ζ, one would expect the dot to be a bit lower.

**Eug-III:**

72,8 Corr.: second άν for an incomplete γ.

72,12 Corr.: τίς άρ' for είς άρ', “It looks at every labor” (both ε’s are marked out; a seems to be in a second hand). See note to III 95,6.
And he has a semblance of his own—not like what you have seen and received, but a strange semblance that surpasses all things and is better than the universe. It looks to every side and sees itself from itself. Since it is infinite,

SJC-III:
95,1-2 Lacunae so restored by T-S.
95,6 Corr.: zeic 'a' for ezice. "It looks at every labor"; the initial e is marked out, a is written above the next e in what may be a second hand, and that e is not marked out. The same correction was made in the same way, and by the same hand, in 72,12, except that there the second e is marked out. The a is written over an erased letter, possibly itself an a.

SJC-BG:
85,top MS has a strip of papyrus pasted above the page number. This strip and two on the other side of the leaf seem designed either to restore a broken leaf or to prevent a weakened one from breaking further.
EUGNOSTOS

NHC V 3,1–4

(5± lines lacking)

NHC III 72,14–73,3

οยวταζου πε 15 ουα ειμην εβολ πε ηαθεαρ|τος πε αυα ειμην εισηκενε πε | ουγεβε ουα ηατωβε ουάτ|ςωτ πε ουα ειμην εβολ | πε ουμακαριος πε ουατνο20ει ημον πε εσυγνουει ηημον ηημιν ηημον ηωτ\(\)πε | ουμελειος πε εμεπτευ ω\(\) ω\(\) ουμακ[\(\)\(\)\(\)\]

| (5± lines lacking) |

he is incomprehensible. 15 He is ever imperishable | (and) has no likeness (to anything). He is | unchanging good. He is | faultless. He is everlasting. | He is blessed. He is unknowable, 20 while he (nonetheless) knows | himself. He is immeasurable. | He is untraceable. He is | perfect, having no defect.

He is imperishably blessed. | He is called “Father | of the Universe.”

[3] [he is blessed. Since he is unknowable] | [... being]
unbegotten (and) | [ineffable,] he is called | [“Father of the Universe.”]

Eug-V:
3,2 Superlinear stroke is in lacuna.

Eug-III:
72,21 Corr.: ατω for partly erased ατωι.
THE SOPHIA OF JESUS CHRIST

NHC III 95,8–22

οιατταζόγον πε ευκμν εβολ· οιαφερτος πε εμνταχ
πεγεί 10νε οιαγαβοσ πε εμεσιβε οιατσωστ πε
ογσα ανντς πε οιαμακιος πε εμεγνοοηε ημμου
ωασνηε ημμου οιαττυ οιατσωστ πε οιατ15ξι σεξμε
ηςωμπε οιατειος πε εμνταχ ωσωτ οιαμακιος πε
ναφερτος ωαμογοτε ερον χε επεισ μπτηρι

φιληποος πεαξα χη παοεις
20νως οη αγουνις εντειος ον
πεαξα ναη ηνι επειος
ηςωμπε ηηρ χε

SJC-BG:

86, top MS has a strip of papyrus pasted in such a way that it covers most of the page number.

86,4–5 Between these lines a narrow strip of papyrus is pasted in the MS, extending from the fifth letter almost to the end of the lines.

86,6 MS has a large diple between πε and after φιληποος and a large asterisk in the left margin slightly below the level of the line.

86,9 MS has a large asterisk in the left margin.
Even before anything is visible of those that are visible, majesties and authorities, He Who Is in Himself continuously embraces the totality of them all but is not embraced by anything. He is mind and thought; also thinking and teaching and counsel; and he is above counsel and power—all powers are his, since [he] is the source of them all.

Before anything is visible among those that are visible, the majesty and the authorities that are in him, he embraces the totalities of the totalities, and nothing embraces him. For he is all mind, thought and reflecting, considering, rationality and power. They all are equal powers. They are the sources of the totalities. And their whole race <from
Before anything is visible of those that are visible, the majesty and the authority are in him, since he embraces the whole of the totalities, while nothing embraces him. For he is all mind. And he is thought and considering and reflecting and rationality and power. They all are equal powers. They are the sources of the totalities. And their whole race from...
EUGNOSTOS

NHC V

NHC III 73,14–16


first> to last 15 is in the
foreknowledge | of Unbegotten,
first to last was in his foreknowledge. (that of) the infinite Unbegotten Father.” Thomas said to him: 15 “Lord, Savior, why did these come to be, and why were these revealed?” The perfect Savior said: “I came from the Infinite that I might tell you all

beginning to were in his foreknowledge, (that of) the infinite Unbegotten Father.”

Thomas said: “Christ, Savior, why did these come to be, and why were they revealed?” The perfect Savior said: “I came from the Infinite that I might teach you all
EUGNOSTOS

NHC V     NHC III
things. Spirit Who Is was the begetter, who had the power to be a begetter

and form-[giver's] nature, that the great wealth that was hidden in him might be revealed. Because of his mercy and his love he wished to bring forth fruit by himself, that he might not enjoy his goodness alone but (that) other spirits of the Unwavering Generation might bring forth body and fruit, glory and honor in imperishableness and his infinite

SJC-III:

96.23 Not emended by T–S or K ("power, a begetting, form-[giving] nature").

97.7 Not emended by T–S or K, both of whom translate "isolate himself in." "Isolate" is somewhat removed from the lexical meaning of ἀπολύειν.

97.11 Corr.: z for erased m.
NEIΠΑΤΟΥΕΙ ΓΑΡ ΕΠΕΤΟΥΑΝΣ |
ΝΕΟΥΝ ΟΥΔΙΑΦΟΡΑ ΔΕ ΨΟΟΠ. |
[Ο]ΥΤΕ ΝΙΑΦΘΑΡΤΟC ΝΑΙΩΝ

| for they had not yet come to
visibility. | Now a difference existed
| among the imperishable aeons.

Eug-III:

73,19 Corr.: e NI for erased OYN.
Lacuna so restored by T–S.
grace, | that his treasure might be revealed | by Self-begotten God, 15 the father of every imperishableness and | those that came to be afterward. | But they had not yet come to visibility. | Now a great difference | exists among the imperishables."

He called 20 out saying: “Whoever | has ears to hear about | the infinities, let him hear”; | and “I have addressed those

SJC-III:
97,13 “that . . . revealed”: “for his goodness was revealed” (K).
97,17 MS has η.
97,18 Corr.: η for marked out za.; the corrector neglected to mark out the following e (see similar problem in 113,8 and to a lesser degree in 95,6); originally za.e1ae, “shadow.”

MS has c at end of line (gender agreement with za.e1ae).

SJC-BG:
88,19–89,2 “But . . . among” (so also Schenke in T–S: 340): or possibly, “But before they have come to what is revealed, a significant difference exists, however, between” (T–S).
For all that comes [from the] perishable will come to naught. Whatever is [from] imperishableness [will not come to naught] but will be more [imperishable, since] it is from 20 [ . . . ] imperishableness. [ . . . For] many men went [astray because they did] not [know] the difference; [that is,] [as with] murderers, [they died.]

Eug-V:
3,19 Letter immediately after lacuna and last 3 letters: see Emmel, 1979: 183.

Eug-III:
73,22 Corr.: second c for erased B (initially zwe).
74,1 T-S and Tr restore [s].
74,4 “so”: “so that” (T-S, K & Tr).
NHC III 97.23–98.9

who are awake.” Still he continued

and said:

“Everything that came from the perishable will perish, since it came from the perishable. But whatever came from imperishableness does not perish but becomes imperishable.

So, many men went astray because they had not known this difference and they died.”

BG 89.7–20

address | those who are awake!” Still he continued | and said:

“Everything that came from the perishable will perish, since it comes from the perishable. Whatever came from imperishableness does not perish but is imperishable, since it is from imperishableness. Just as many men went astray because they did not know this difference, (so) they died.”

SJC-III:

98.1 So restored by T–S.

98.7 The section found in the par. immediately before zwc, “so,” may be missing here through homoioteleuton (so also T–S).
Eug-V:

3,25 Omission of circumflex with εω: see 17,7.

3,26 First superlinear stroke is in lacuna.

3,30 Superlinear stroke is in lacuna, but a circumflex is visible above what would have been the second letter in the second lacuna.

Eug-III:

74,10 Not emended by Tr.

74,11 “true God”: less likely, “God of truth” (K & Tr).
Mary said to him: 10 “Lord, how will we know that?” The perfect Savior said: “Come (pl.) from invisible things to the end of those that are visible, and the very emanation of Thought will reveal to you.

Mary said to him: 90 “Christ, how will that be known?” The perfect Savior said: “Come (pl.) from invisible things to the end of those that are visible, and the very emanation of Thought will reveal to you.

SJC-BG:

90,2 T–S suggests the third person pl. prefix of the verb may be the result of dittography (πως); note that P.Oxy. 1081,26 supports the reading in SJC–III.
70

NHC V 4.3–12

ον η η το [τηρ] | ηνεωτικ | ηνετο

ηνιατ] ογωνιζ [ε] | η δο η

ηντο [ογωνιζ] τεν | 5ηνορ γαρ

ε [κανα] ταμοου [τη] πιτικικ | | γαρ

ηντεπ τε η ν η ετε η [ογωνιζ] | | η ν η ετογον | |

η τα' δε | [τε ογωρφ] | | η η

οντοωοκικ

παοεικ ηνε π [θηρ] | ηνεωγατ

παν ερου αν κα[τα τ]ημ10 τε

κα ενωτ | | ηλλα πινωτ | | ηνιωτ | |

πνωτ γαρ ογωρφ πε ητε η

ετηνογ | | εβολ' | | εβο[λ]

[| of those [that are visible], and [he will find the invisible things] | in those that [are visible.] For Thought 5 [will] teach them. For [the] higher [faith] | is (that) those things that are not [visible] | are those that are visible. And this [is a principle] | of knowledge.]

The Lord of the [Universe] | was not rightly called 10 “Father” but “Forefather.” | For the Father is the beginning (or principle) of those that are to come | through him, but the

ογ20 ρχ ηνοογν τε τα’

ηνσειτ | | ηπιηρη κατα

ηλληεια μ ε γ] ηνον ερον

κα ενωτ | | ηλλα π [ο] | | πατερπ

πειωτ | | γαρ ταρχ η

ηπεογον [εβολ] πε πετήμα May 0

| how faith | in those things that are not visible was | found in what is visible.

This is a 20 knowledge principle.

The Lord | of the Universe is not rightly | called “Father” but “Forefather.” | For the Father is the beginning (or principle) of what is visible. For he (the Lord)

Eug-V:

4.8 Third superlinear stroke is in lacuna.

4.10 First and second superlinear strokes are in lacuna.

Eug-III:

74.21 So restored by T-S.

75.1 T-S and Tr restore [ε εβολ η].
The Sophia of Jesus Christ

NHC III 98,16–25

[Text in Greek]

EIBOA XE PWC TNIC 20TIC
NECEOYONYZ EIBOA AN‘ AYENTEC
ZIN NETOYONYZ EIBOA

BG 90,9–91,2

[Text in Greek]

EIBOA XE PWC TNIC
NEIA TOYWNZ EIBOA AY‘EPOC
ZIN NETOYONYZ EIBOA

NETHTI E20PIARENHTOC NEIWT
PE‘ TE OYNTI MAAXE EISWTM‘
MAPEQSCWM‘
NAOEIC MTHRY‘ EWAYXOOC
EPOQ AN XE EISWT‘ ALAA
PRONATWP NEIWT GAP TAPXH
NE‘25 NETNAOYWNZ EIBOA NE‘PETM

| how faith in those things that are not visible was found in those that are visible, those that belong to 20 Unbegotten Father. | Whoever has ears to hear, let him hear.

The Lord of the Universe is not called ‘Father’ but ‘Forefather.’<For the Father is> the beginning (or principle) of 25 those that will appear, but he (the Lord)

How faith 10 in invisible things was found in those that are visible | of Unbegotten Father. | Whoever has ears | to hear, let him hear.

15 The Lord of the Universe is not called ‘Father’ but ‘Forefather.’ For the Father is the beginning (or principle) of those that will appear, but he (the Lord)

SJC–BG:

90,16 EIN:<A>N (T–S). Emendation is not necessary (see Kasser: 2).
Unending Non-Principle (or beginning) is Forefather — in order that we might be ready to greet him by name. For we do not know who he is.

Now he always understands himself within himself as in a semblance that appears and resembles himself. And it is [his resemblance that] was [called] “Self-Begotten Father.” He [Who Is before His Presence,”] since in [his resemblance he appeared

He sees himself within himself, like a mirror, having appeared in his likeness as Self-Father, that is, Self-Begetter, and as Confronter, since he confronted Unbegotten First Existent.
is [the] beginningless Forefather.

| SJC-III: |
| 99,1–2 Lacunae not restored by T–S. |

| SJC-BG: |
| 91,8–9 εἰς ἄντοντιτόν: The par. make clear that the translator mistook the Greek subordinate conjunction, ἐπεί, for the preposition, ἐπί, and attempted to transform the subsequent word into a noun. |

91,8–9 ἀγογος, “his likeness appeared”: Translation assumes that the Coptic translator was rendering a Greek aorist middle (see P.Oxy. 1081,45). Alt. “But he showed his likeness as...” (T–S).
before him) | Unbegotten. He was not equal] | [in age] with the one [before him, who is] 25 [light] since he did not know him [at first. But] | [there was no] time when he was [non-existent, since he was] | always [in him. And some] | [think] that he is [not] equal [to him in] | [power. Afterward] he revealed 30 [....], who [....] | [....] And then in [....] | [....] self-begotten [....]

10 He is indeed of equal age with the one who is before him, but he is not equal to him in power. Afterward he revealed many confronting, self-begotten ones, equal in age 15 (and)
Father. He is indeed of equal age with the Light that is before him, but he is not equal to him in power. And afterward was revealed a whole multitude of confronting, self-begotten ones, equal in age 

SJC-III:

99,11 Not emended by T-S ("in the light").

SJC-BG:

91,15 “with . . . light”: “with that from the lights, which is before him” (T-S). ÑNOYØN is most likely an attributive. The doubling of N before OY is a frequent practice in BG (T-S: 21). See P.Oxy. 1081,49–50 for a reconstruction of the Greek.
5 [ ... ] [ ... in] glory (and)
numberless, [are those] who are
Kingless 5 [Among the] Kingdoms
That Exist."

And the whole multitude 20 of the
place over which there is no |
kingdom is called ["Sons of
Unbegotten | Father.”

---

Eug.-V:

5.3 Translation assumes the second half of a cleft sentence begins here.

5.4 The punctuation is not a stop but seems to be a way of dealing with a Greek attribute adjective in the second position. Note that the parr. use a relative. See also 17,14-15 and 7,10 (related).
and power, | being in glory (and) without number, whose race is called | 'The Generation | over Whom There Is No Kingdom’
† from the one 20 in whom you yourselves have appeared | from these | men. †
And that whole multitude | over which there is no | kingdom is called
‘Sons of Unbegotten | Father, God, [Savior], | Son of God,’ | whose likeness is with you.

and power, being in | glory without number. 5 His race is called | ‘The Generation | over Whom There Is No | Kingdom.’
It is in this (race) that | you appeared. And by these men

10 of the place over which | there is no kingdom, <he> is called | ‘Unbegotten,
| God, Savior | of the Sons of God,
15 He Who Has No Likeness | among You.’
Now the Unknowable is full of every imperishable glory and ineffable joy. Therefore all his sons also have rest in him, ever rejoicing in their unchanging glory and the measureless jubilation that was never heard of or known among all their worlds and aeons.

Now the Unknowable [is] ever [full] of imperishableness and ineffable joy. They all are at rest in him, ever rejoicing in ineffable joy over the unchanging glory and the measureless jubilation that was never heard of or known among all the aeons and their worlds. But this much is enough, lest we go on endlessly.
Now he is the Unknowable, who is full of every imperishable glory and ineffable joy. They all are at rest in him, ever rejoicing in ineffable joy in his unchanging glory and measureless jubilation; this was never heard or known among all the aeons and their worlds until now."

Now the Unknowable is full of every glory and imperishableness and ineffable joy. And they all are at rest in him, ever rejoicing in ineffable joy in his unchanging glory and the measureless jubilation that was never heard or even known among all the aeons and their worlds until now."
EUGNOSTOS

NHC V 5.21–27

πηγά [την ταύτα] ὑ γνῶντα ἐβολα
γαθοῦ τιτῆρα 25 ἠ [πευνό

καὶ τὰ καθηκόντα εἰς τὸ ὕμνων]

οὐάξι ομοιο ἐτε [ε] | [Ν]ἀρχὴν [τη]

another principle | [from his] Only-
begotten, Wholly Unique | [Word;]

NHC III 76,13–17

πεζογεῖτ 15 Νταγουωνης γαθοῦ
tιτήρα | ἠ παπεραντόν

οὐαγοτούπιον | Να δοκτικτος Νεωτί

This is another knowledge
principle from | <Self->begotten.

for it is [in] him [who] | [appeared]
before the universe 25 [in the] infinite
[aeon], the Father | [Who Put Forth]
Himself, who [is] | [the] principle
(or beginning).

The First 15 who appeared before the
universe | in infinity is Self-grown, | Self-constructed Father,

---

Eug.-V:

5.22 First three letters after the lacuna: see Emmel, 1979: 183.
5.22–33 See 17,11.
5.23 [νωάξε], "[Word]": or [νωηρε], "[Son]"; see III,2 (Gos. Eg.) 68,25–26 (πευ-

καὶ τὸ φανωνης νωηρε). The next sentence makes the reconstruction in the text
more likely.

παν: see Emmel, 1979: 183.
5.24 οα: see Emmel, 1979: 183.

Eug.-III:

76,13 "knowledge principle from": "beginning of knowledge. Through" (K & Tr).
76,14 "<Self->begotten": "unbegotten" (K); Tr does not emend but translates

"unbegotten." Support for my emendation: 82,13–14 and V 5.20.
76,14–16 Both K & Tr have a comma after "-begotten" and a grammatical break after

"infinity."
Matthew said to him: “Lord, Savior, how was Man revealed?” 15 The perfect Savior said: “I want you to know that he who appeared before the universe in infinity, Self-grown, Self-constructed Father,
that the Word \[\text{d}w\text{l}e\], full of shining, \[\text{i}n\text{effable}\] light. 30
And \[\text{in} the beginning,\] when he took thought \[\text{t}o have\] \[\text{h}is likeness\] become \[a great power of\]
\[\text{shining light . . . ,}\] \[\text{immediately}\] Man, who is the principle \(\text{or}\) beginning) \[of that\] \[light, appeared\] as \[the androgynous\] \[immortal\] aeon.
\[\text{The}\] \[5\] maleness \[is called\]
being full | of shining light | and ineffable, | in the beginning, when he decided to have his likeness become a great power, | immediately the principle (or beginning) | of that light appeared as Immortal | Androgynous Man,

being full | of shining light | and ineffable, | in the beginning, when he decided to have his likeness come to be in a great power, | immediately the light | of that principle (or beginning) | appeared in a first immortal | androgynous man,
Eug-V:

6.6 The unusual stroke over η indicates that the letter, written above the line, should be inserted (see 6.24; 7.17 [insertion from the margin]; 28.8.22). Although the stroke seems to continue to the left of the letter in the MS, the line is almost certainly the result of the bleeding of the ink along a papyrus fiber.

Second superlinear stroke is in lacuna.

Eug-III:


77.6–8 “consort . . . truth”: “consort, a truth against which there is no contention; for as to the lower truth, the error that is with it” (K & Tr). Line 7 is not emended by Tr.
—who is indisputable truthfulness, knowing herself within herself in secret, and having error fighting against her.

| She is uncontested truth; | for here below error, which exists with truth, contests it.

---

Eug-V:

6.12 εξ[ cười ]υ: The space in the lacuna seems sufficient for only three letters. One must assume therefore that the scribe either wrote very small or omitted something. Although the facsimile edition makes it appear that the final letter could be an ε, ultraviolet examination suggests that Ν is more likely.
that through that Immortal 10 Man they might attain | their salvation and awake | from forgetfulness through the interpreter | who was sent, who | is with you until the end 15 of the poverty of the robbers. And his | consort is the Great Sophia, | who from the first was destined in him | for union by | Self-begotten Father, that through | that Immortal | Man they might attain | salvation and awake 15 from forgetfulness through | the interpreter who was sent, | who is with you until <the> | end of the poverty of the robbers, | since his companion is Sophia, the great one, | who from the first was destined in [him] | for union by Self-begotten | Father.

S/C-III:
101,14 MS unaccountably has stroke over ω.

S/C-BG:
94,11–13 “through . . . attain”: “through this immortal one men might attain” (T–S).
95,1 MS has q (active instead of passive).
Now 15 from Immortal Man very soon appeared the name of divinity and lordship and kingdom and those that came afterward from them. And he who is called "Father, Man of the Depth, Self-Father," when he revealed this, created a great aeon [for] his own majesty. There is [a companion] in conjunction

Through 10 Immortal Man appeared the first designation, namely, divinity and kingdom, for the Father, who is called "Self-Father Man," revealed this. He created a great aeon

---

Eug-V:
6,15–17 See endnote 4.
6,24 The stroke over τ: see 6,6n.

Eug-III:
77,11 "appeared . . . designation": “first appeared a designation” (T-S, K [similar] & Tr).
77,16 Corr.: ταιμίον for partly erased τανοι να.ν.
from Immortal Man † who appeared as First and divinity and kingdom, † for the Father, who is called ‘Man, Self-Father,’ revealed this. And he created a great aeon, whose name is Ogdoad, for his own majesty.

Through Immortal Man, then, we first appeared in divinity and kingdom, † for the Father, who is called ‘Man, Self—Father,’ revealed this. And he created a great aeon, whose name is Ogdoad, for his own majesty.

SJC-III:

101,21 zi: <zĩ> (T–S sugg.), resulting in the following rendering: “From Immortal Man he appeared first in (?) divinity. . . .” See endnote 4.

SJC-BG:

95,7 Alt. {NZ} ἰΜΝΤΝΟΥΤΕ, etc. (T–S), which results in the following rendering for lines 6 and 7: “we first revealed divinity and kingdom.” See endnote 4.

95,10 Not emended by T–S (“he appeared”). It may be that the Coptic translator mis­took ὁυτόν for ὁυτός (see III 102,2).
to whom he [gave] great authority. He ruled [over them], having created [gods] and archangels, unnumbered myriads [for] retinue. He gave him [great authority], and he ruled [over all creations]. He created gods and archangels [and angels, myriads] without number, for retinue.

Now from him [originated] divinity and lordship [and kingdom] [and]

Now through that Man [originated] divinity

---

Eug-V:

6,29 MS has \(x\) (a common scribal error for \(x\)).

6,29–31 The right side of the text reflects fragment placements made by Stephen Emmel on August 8, 1977, at the Coptic Museum, Cairo, which are not included in the facsimile edition. The fragments are those numbered 1 and 40 in the facsimile edition.

6,29–32 The left margin in the MS appears to have been shifted about one letter's width to the right, perhaps because of an imperfection in the sheet.

Eug-III:

77,23 T-S holds that the section found in SJC following \(\gamma \upsilon \nu \iota \pi \eta \rho \varepsilon \varsigma \iota \varsigma\) is missing from Eug–III through homoioteleuton. However it seems more closely related to the Sondergut of SJC than to Eug.
He was given great authority, and he ruled over the creation of poverty. He created gods and angels, archangels, myriads without number for retinue from that Light and the tri-male Spirit, which is that of Sophia, his consort.

For from this God originated divinity and kingdom.
Eugnostos

NHC V 6,31–7,8

MNH ETQH [NCOWO'] | [ETB]KH [PAI] AH PAN E[POU AE PNOY]
NIP EPOY | [APPOYNE DE E]BOL
OM [PAI]E NEx ET[7±], O[-
ET]E OYNFH 5 [PE NTE NH
ET]AYPH[P]E MNOCWY
| [OYNTAH DE NO]YNOYC MN
OYEN|NO\A]

MN OYPH OYMEEY DE | [MN]
OYCB[\W] MN OYQOXYNE

those that follow [them]. | Therefore he was
called ["God"
[of gods, Lord of] | [lords, King] of
kings." | [And] from [him appeared]
another | [...], who [is] the source
5 [of those who came] afterward. | [Now he has] mind and [thought]
| and will, also thinking | [and
teaching] and counsel

NHC III 78,1–8

NOYTE MN TMTPP' E|THE PAI
AH | PNCH XE PNOY[TE
NNOY]TE NPPO | NRPO
YPOY | PEP[YEIT N]PWE

NHC III 78,1–8

| TPICTIC PE NN[E]TNAWME 5
MNNCA NA'I
OYNTAH NHTI N|OYDION
NNOC OCENOIA

MN ETE 40 NNOC
OYNEYMHCIC | MN
OYPONHCIC OYLOGICOC

[78]

Eug-V:

7,3 Third superlinear stroke is in lacuna.
7,4 The trace immediately following the first lacuna is compatible with the tail of an ρ or ρm.

Eug-III:

78,3–4 So restored by T–S (but superlinear stroke is omitted).
78,6–7 See endnote 5.
Therefore he was called ‘God of gods,’ ‘King of kings.’ First Man has his unique mind, within, and thought—just as he is it (thought)—(and) considering, reflecting, rationality,
—even [that which] is over counsel—
and power: 10 perfect and immortal [attributes]. | Now [in respect to] imperishableness, they are [equal] to [those] that resemble them. | But [in respect to power], they are different, just | as father differs from 15 son, and the son from thought, | and the thought surpasses everything else. | And in the (same) way, among uncreated things, | the monad

—and power. All the attributes 10 that exist are perfect and immortal. In respect to imperishableness, they | are indeed equal.

(But) in respect to power, there is a difference, | like the difference between father | and son, and son and thought, 15 and the thought and the remainder. As | I said earlier, among the things that were created, | the monad is first.
power. All the attributes that exist are perfect and immortal. In respect to imperishableness, they are indeed equal.

(But) in respect to power, they are different, like the difference between father and son, and thought, and the thought and the remainder. As I said earlier, among the things that were created, the monad is first.

and power. All the attributes that exist are [perfect] (and) [immortal]. In respect to imperishableness, they are indeed equal.

But in respect to power, they are different, like the difference between father and son, and son and thought, and thought and the remainder. Now, as I said earlier, the monad is not among the first creations.

---

SJC-III:

103,6 Erroneous omission noted by T–S.

SJC-BG:

97,10 MS has just one stroke over the last two letters.

97,10–11 TMONAC ... AN, “the monad ... creations”: T–S sees a textual corruption here and proposes that the text read TMONAC ΝΥΩΡΠ or ΤΕ ΤΨΩΡΠ ΖΗ ΝΥΩΡΠ ΝΑΝΟ, “the monad is the first among the first creations” (omitting AN). T–S may be correct, but see V par.
and the dyad | go up to [the] decades, and the decades $^{20}$ rule the hundreds, | and the hundreds rule | the thousands, and the thousands rule | the ten thousands. Again it is this pattern | [that] exists among the immortals: the monad $^{25}$ and the thought are those things that belong to [Immortal] Man. | The thinkings [are] for | <the> decades, and the hundreds are [the teachings,] | [and the thousands] are the

---

Eug-V:
7,20–22 MS has in each case $\times$ (a common scribal error for $x$).
7,24–25 “the monad . . . Man”: see 7,6–7. Apparently mind, thought and will are referred to. The punctuation in line 25 is a word separator but may also be intended to replace a missing sentence pronoun.
7,26 Corr.: ωορίζ, “first,” is deleted at the beginning of the line by a dot over each letter.
7,27 MS has $\dagger$ (sing.).

Eug-III:
78,19–21 Tr translates the fractions as whole numbers without emending the text. See endnote 6.
78,22 First emendation: MS has $\nu$. 
78,22–23 MS has $\nu_2$, “of immortals” (not emended by Tr, although his translation reflects an emendation).
THE SOPHIA OF JESUS CHRIST

NHC III          BG
counsels, [and] the ten thousands [are] the powers. [Now] those [who] come [from the ... ] | exist with their [ ... ] | [in] every aeon [ ... ] | [ ... ]

[8] [ ... In the beginning, thought] | and thinking [appeared from] mind, [then] teachings [from] | thinking, counsels | [from teachings], (and) power [from] | [counsels].
And after all [the attributes,] | all that [was revealed] | appeared from

---

Eug-V:

7,33 Corr.: γ deleted between ά and ω by two superior dots.
8,4 ω: see Emmel, 1979: 183 (line identified as 8,30 up).
8,5 ες: see Emmel, 1979: 183 (line identified as 8,29 up).
8,7 Low dot probably indicates word separation; see 8,16n.

MS has γ (incorrect pl. pron.).

ά: see Emmel, 1979: 183 (line identified as 8,27 up).
And after everything, I all that was revealed I appeared from his power.  

And finally he who I revealed it all I revealed everything I from his power.

---

SJc-III:  
103,11-12 “all... power”: “all that was revealed from his power appeared” (T-S); less likely because of the Coptic punctuation and the parr.

SJc-BG:  
97,11-14 “And... power”: or “... he who wholly revealed himself...”; “But he brought to appearance the last (pl.) of all things from his power, namely, the one whom he brought to appearance completely” (T-S). The sentence appears to be corrupt; see parr.
And what was created, what was fashioned appeared. And what was formed appeared from what was fashioned. What was named appeared from what was formed, while the difference among begotten things appeared from what was named, from beginning to end, by power of all the aeons.

---

_Eug-V:_

8,8 ονηθ: see Emmel, 1979: 183 (line identified as 8,26 up).

8,9 ζη: see Emmel, 1979: 184 (line identified as 8,25 up).

8,10 Last three letters and preceding superlinear stroke: see Emmel, 1979: 184 (line identified as 8,24 up). The stroke is visible in the MS. Emmel reports seeing a remnant of the letter under the stroke, but none is visible in a photo taken prior to removal of transparent tape.

8,11 γογνζ: see Emmel, 1979: 184 (line identified as 8,23 up).

8,12 Final word: see Emmel, 1979: 184 (line identified as 8,22 up).

8,13 Final letter: see Emmel, 1979: 184 (line identified as 8,21 up).

8,16 Low dot after initial οΥ is not a stop; it makes clear word separation; cf. V 34,10.
And from what I was created, I all that was fashioned appeared; from what was fashioned I appeared what was formed; from what was formed, I what was named. Thus came the difference among the unbegotten ones from beginning to end.”

15 And from everything that he created, all that I was fashioned appeared; from what was fashioned, appeared what was formed; from what was formed, I what was named. From this came the difference among the unbegotten things from beginning to end.”
Now Immortal Man is full of every imperishable glory and ineffable joy. His whole kingdom rejoices in everlasting rejoicing, those who never have been heard of or known in any aeon that came after [them and] its worlds. | Afterward [another] | [principle] came from
Then Bartholomew said to him: "How (is it that) he was designated in the Gospel 'Man' and 'Son of Man'? To which of them, then, is this Son related?" The
Immortal [Man], | who is [called]  
“Self-perfected 30 [Begetter.]” |  
[When he received the consent] of his [consort,] | [Great Sophia, he] revealed | [that first-begotten androgyne,]  
[9] | [who is called] | “First-begotten [Son] | [of God].”

---

_Eug-V:_

8.33 Third superlinear stroke is in lacuna.

9.1 Corr.: η incorporates initial q (cf. 2,18n.).

9.2 First superlinear stroke is in lacuna.
Holy One said to him: “I want you to know that First Man is called ‘Begetter, Self-perfected Mind.’ He reflected with Great Sophia, his consort, and revealed his first-begotten, androgynous son. His male name is called ‘First Begetter | Son of God’; related?”

SJC-BG:

98,18–99,1 T S mistakes the last 7 letters of 98,18 for two words and divides thus: ἐν, “to them” and τοτε, “then.” The latter word is made the beginning of a new sentence, which is continued by T S on 99,1 with the questionable restoration of οὖν.

99,3 Alt. μῆμπε<σ> (T S; unnecessary since μῆμπε is also fem. [Kasser: 84]).

99,4 MS has πρωτογενετωρ, “First Begetter” (harmonization: see lines 7 and 14). T-S has only the first emendation, but translates as above, which is possible because of the ambiguity of the word (see LSJ, s.v.). It is difficult to believe, however, that that ambiguity was involved here.
Eug-V:

9,10 First superlinear stroke is in lacuna.

9,12 First superlinear stroke is in lacuna.

For the remarkable reconstruction of the first word I am indebted to Bentley Layton.
his female name, ‘First Begettress Sophia, Mother of the Universe.’ Some call her ‘Love.’ Now first-begetted is called ‘Christ.’ Since he has authority from his father, he created a multitude of angels without number for retinue.

105

SJC-BG:

100,1 Restoration is T–S, alt. Others are: ε[γυμνε] (correctly rejected by T–S as too short); ε[γον εγυμνε] (T–S, alt.; a combination not found elsewhere in BG). Meanings are similar in all cases.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NHC V 9,15-21</th>
<th>NHC III 81,5-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>tekklhia</strong> ἡνετογααβ</td>
<td><strong>tekklhia</strong> ἡνετογααβ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15 “Assembly of the Holy Ones.” | 5 “Assembly of the Holy Ones, the Shadowless Lights.”
are the lights and shadowless ones. | Now when these angels kiss each other, their embraces become angels like themselves.

---

**Eug-V:**

9,21 MS has a blank of approx. 1 cm. between the lacuna and the subsequent word.

**Eug-III:**

81,5-6 “Assembly . . . Lights” (similarly, Tr): “The church of the saints of light without shadow” (K): “. . . of the holy lights . . .” (K, footnote).
from Spirit and Light.” His disciples said to him: “Lord, reveal to us about the one called ‘Man’ that we also may know his glory exactly.” The perfect Savior said: “Whoever

from [Spirit and Light.” His disciples said to him: “Christ, teach us about the Father, who is called ‘Man,’ that we also may know his glory exactly.” The perfect Savior said: “Whoever
Their first-begotten [ ... father] is called [“. . . Mind, Adam,” who] [is the Eye of Light,] who 25 [came from Light,]

First Begetter | Father is called | “Adam of the Light.”

Eug - V:

9,23 MS has a stroke above the second lacuna.

Eug - III:

81,11 Corr.: an erased point between first ω and Ρ. The point following Ρ is inexplicable, unless it, together with the erased point, was intended to signal the deletion of Ρ.
THE SOPHIA OF JESUS CHRIST

NHC III 105,9–19

οὐντῇ ὁ Μαχαιριστὴς Νέον Υἱόν Εὕρων μετανεύσεις ἐν Μαρτύρεις εἰς ἡμᾶς

First Begetter | Father is called ‘Adam, Eye of Light,’ because he came from shining Light,

15 [and] his holy angels, who are ineffable | (and) shadowless, ever rejoice with joy | in their reflecting, which they received from their Father.

has 10 ears to hear, let him hear.

BG 100,10–101,6

οὐντῇ οἱ Μαχαιριστὴς Νέον Υἱόν Εὕρων μετανεύσεις ἐν Μαρτύρεις εἰς ἡμᾶς

has | ears to hear, let him hear.

First Begetter | Father is called ‘Adam, Eye of Light,’ 15 because he came from Light.

| And his whole kingdom | is of the shining Light,

| and his holy angels, who are | 101

[ineffable] | (and) [shadowless], ever rejoice | with joy | in their reflecting, which they received from | their Father.

SJC-III:

105,14 Regarding the section in the parr. (added here by K) following ποιοῖν, “Light,” see BG 100,16–17n.

SJC-BG:

100,16–17 τευμνήτεροὶ ὁ τέθι, “And ... Light” (omitting “shining”): T-S holds that this section is missing in SJC-III through homoioteleuton.
Eug-V:

10,2 First superlinear stroke is in lacuna.
THE SOPHIA OF JESUS CHRIST

NHC III 105,19–106,6

The whole kingdom of Son of Man, who is called ‘Son of God,’ is full of ineffable and shadowless joy, and unchanging jubilation, (they) rejoicing over his imperishable glory, which has never been heard until now, nor has it been revealed in the aeons that came afterward and their worlds. I came from Self-begotten and

BG 101,6–102,3

Now the kingdom is that of Son of Man, who is called ‘Christ.’ It is completely full of ineffable and shadowless joy, (they) ever rejoicing over his imperishable glory, which has never been heard until now, nor has it been revealed in the aeons that came afterward and their worlds. I came [from Self-begotten] and

SJC-III:

105,22 MS has 裣 (incorrect gender, by attraction to πωνηρε, “Son”; not emended by T–S).

SJC-BG:

101,12 Alt.: <ςι>τελη (T–S, alt.).

101,18 Alt.: ζς αιων <νιμ >, “in <every> aeon” (T–S, alt.).
| Afterward [ . . . ] came from | him, [who] is Son | of Man. | Having consented [with Sophia, his] | consort, Then Son | of Man consented with | Sophia, his consort, |

\textit{Eug.-V:}

10.3 Corr.: a over false start of another letter.
First Infinite Light that I might reveal everything to you.” | Again, his disciples said: 10 “Tell us clearly how (it is that) they came down from the invisibilities, from the immortal realm to the world that dies?” The perfect Savior said:

“Son of Man consented with Sophia, his consort...
he [revealed] a great luminary, [who is] androgynous (and) whose [male name] is called ["Savior, Begetter of All Things"]). Some call his feminine name ["Pistis"]. Then Savior consented with his consort, Pistis Sophia, and revealed six spiritual beings, who are androgynous, (and) whose masculine names are these:

Eugnóstos

NHC V 10.6–18

NHC III 81.23–82.12

82.1 T–S restores only πευρ.

82.2 MS has ζ. Alt. ωφελ [εξόν χρητικε, "name is called"] (ʔ) (Tr: an unusual locution in the context; see lines 5 and 6). All that remains of ζ is the lower part of the long vertical line, which would be compatible also with π or τ.
| consort, and revealed a great androgynous light. | His male name is called ‘Savior, Begetter of All Things.’ His female name is ‘All-Begettress Sophia.’ Some call her ‘Pistis.’ |

SJC-BG:

102,18 Not emended by T–S (“appeared in”). I had earlier thought it best not to emend [1975: 176, n.3], but the testimony of the other texts here, as well as the evidence of scribal carelessness elsewhere in BG, have persuaded me otherwise.
[ . . . ] the [feminine names] [are these: first, . . . ] [6± lines lacking]

[And] they have [other names, which] I gave [you earlier.]

Now from the consent [of those who have just been mentioned, thoughts appeared] in the aeons that exist.

[From the] consenting [of those I have just mentioned, thoughts appeared] in the aeons that exist. 5

From thoughts, reflectings; [from reflectings, considerings; from considerings, rationalities; from rationalities, wills; from wills, words.

15 Now they have other names. Thoughts are called "gods"; thinkings, "lords"; teachings are "angels"; counsels are

---

Eug-III:

83,3–4 K omits "in" and incorrectly makes "aeons" the subject of "appeared" (followed by Tr).

83,5 Not emended by Tr, although his translation reflects the above emendation (so also K’s translation). My translation omits the articles here and elsewhere in the list because it appears that inclusive collectivities are referred to.
THE SOPHIA OF JESUS CHRIST

NHC III

BG
When the twelve powers who have just been discussed achieved consent, each (pair) revealed six spiritual powers. Just as the masculine (off-spring) "angels"; [wills] [are] "words." [Now] when the twelve powers who have just been [discussed] achieved [consent], each (pair) revealed [six spiritual powers].

"angels"; [wills] [are] "words." [Now] when the twelve powers, whom I just discussed, I consented with each other. [Six] males (each) (and) [six] females (each) were revealed, so that there are seventy-two powers. Each one of the seventy-two | revealed

**Eug-V:**

11,19-20 Some text has apparently dropped out: ηωξαιε, "words," is not another name (11.15).

11,20 The numeral at the end of the line following the written number is probably a scribal gloss, similar to those in *Apoc. Adam* (V,5) 80,9; 81,14; 82,4; 82,10. Apparently interest in the gloss led the final copyist to overlook the second half of the number.


Second superlinear stroke is in lacuna.

11,24 Emmel reconstructs ηηη[τττ]τττ (1979: 184). An examination of the photographs leaves me unconvinced of any ink traces before τττ; moreover the abbreviation Emmel employs for πνευματικη differs from that used in the one other place in the codex where the word is found: 10,16.


**Eug-III:**

83,13–14 MS has, in each case, ε ε. Since ε is the numeral for 200, it is inappropriate in the context. At some point in the transmission of the text stigmas (ς) were apparently mistaken for sigmas (ε). Not emended by Tr, although his translation reflects an emendation (so also K).

Corr.: second ε (line 13) for erased time.
NHC V 11.26–12.4

\[
[\text{[\text{[N]TE NEYCO[O\text{Y}]1 \text{[Z]}CTE [N[ET]\text{[w]}pE N]Z[IONEME N]](\Pi[N])a\text{[E]}[E\text{[N]}co]c[O\text{A}y\text{N}a\text{[E]}\text{ET]}e\text{NIA [N}y\text{N]e[NN]OYO}\text{y}N\text{TE NIA]YN^{30}[AMIC NE AYOYWN}\text{EBOA 6±]}}
\]
\]

(2± lines lacking)

[18] [. NIANWM [N\text{\text{\text{\text{N}}}TY\\text{\text{\text{\text{G}}}ECE PEYWSWT PE]} [PEY\\text{\text{\text{\text{G}}}WS \text{\text{\text{\text{G}}}NPMI}\\text{\text{\text{\text{G}}}WT Y [N [ET]\text{\text{\text{\text{G}}}AYOYWNZ]} [XE [E\text{[E]}W]\text{[w]}PEN [N\text{\text{\text{\text{G}}}ZENTYP\text{[C]}[E] PIR\text{\text{\text{\text{G}}}WM [E E E} NNN[ATM\text{\text{\text{\text{G}}}OY}
\]

| of the six (pairs) of them are six each, | so [those who] are [female] | [spirits are six each. And these] | [seventy-two] \text{30 [powers revealed . . .]} | (2± lines lacking)

[12] [. . . the three hundred sixty. Their union is] | [the will of the Father, who revealed them] | that they might become [types.]

| Therefore our aeon

NHC III 83.16–20

\[
\text{N61 T0YEI TOY[EI MMOOY N\text{\text{\text{\text{N}}}FOY M\text{\text{\text{\text{N}}}NEYMATI[I}]KON ETE NAI NE T\text{\text{\text{\text{W}}}M\text{\text{\text{\text{S}}}\text{\text{\text{\text{C}}}E}] N[DA\text{[NMIC PEYWSWT THROU PE 20 P0WWS]\text{\text{\text{\text{W}}}E]}
\]

| five spiritual (powers), | which (together) are the three hundred sixty powers. The union of them all is \text{20 the will.}

Therefore our aeon came to be as the type.

---

\text{Eug-V:}


11.27 \text{ET}: see Emmel, 1979: 184. Emmel reconstructs \text{E} immediately after the first lacuna, but all that is visible is the top of the curve. Since a middle stroke, which usually extends to the right of the upper curve, is not visible, the more likely reconstruction is \text{E}.

12.1 First superlinear stroke is in lacuna.

12.2 See endnote 7.

\text{Eug-III:}

83.20 \text{“will”: see endnote 7.}
THE SOPHIA OF JESUS CHRIST

NHC III  BG
Eug.-V:

12.5 Superlinear stroke is in lacuna.
12.6 First superlinear stroke is in lacuna.
12.10 Low dot may indicate word separation (see 8.7 and 8.16).
12.12 Third superlinear stroke is in lacuna.

Eug.-III:

83.21–22 K unaccountably does not translate the possessive article οnpos (“our”), leaving instead a lacuna indicator. He also incorrectly makes “the immortal Man” the subject of the sentence.

84.1 Aυψωπε (Tr—incorrectly restored).

[τερομπε], “[the year]”: “[the all-begetter]” (οnposερενετωρ) (K) (too long for the lacuna).

84.2 “savior”: not restored by K.

84.3 Corr.: τυπος for τοπος (erasure).

MS has the second superlinear stroke in lacuna.
THE SOPHIA OF JESUS CHRIST

NHC III

BG
12 The absence of punctuation after 
e may indicate that 
afrelos 
e, “They are the angels,” is a gloss (see par.), or it may mean that the scribe intended the rendering “The angels are the three hundred sixty days of the year. They came to be . . . .”

Eug-III:
84,5 MS has 
epomte . Tremends this word but lacks the initial emendation.
All who come 25 into the world, like a drop from the Light, I are sent by him I to the world of Almighty, I that they might be guarded 5 by him. And the

All who come into the world have been sent by him, like a drop from the Light, to the world of Almighty, to guard it by him. And the

SJC - III:

107, 1 Corr.: second Λ for erased ρ; z for erased letter.
EUGNOSTOS

NHC V

NHC III
bond of his forgetfulness bound him by the will of Sophia, that the matter might be revealed through it to the whole world in poverty concerning his (Almighty's) arrogance and blindness and the ignorance that he was named. But I came from the places above by the will of the great Light, (I) who escaped from that bond;

fetter of his forgetfulness bound him by the will of Sophia, [so that the] matter might be revealed to the whole world in poverty concerning his (Almighty's) arrogance and blindness and his ignorance that he was named. But I came from the places above by the will of the great Light; I have loosed that bond;

107,6 Corr.: second ζ for erased Ν.
107,7 So emended by T–S (in translation only) & K.
107,8 "in poverty": "as poverty" (K).
107,9 "concerning": "because of" (K).
107,11 MS has θ (active rather than passive: "he gave himself a name"; not emended by T–S or K). For the significance of a deity's being named, see 94,21–24, and part.
107,13 T–S restores [πε].
107,14 "who": "which" (K) (great light? will?).

104,4 "concerning": "because of" (T–S).
104,6–7 See III 107, 11n.
104,11 MS has τ, "that creation" (not emended by T–S).

N.B. the stroke rather than the expected dieresis in the last word; see also 115,11 and 123,16.
EUGNOSTOS

NHC V     NHC III
I have cut off the work of the robbers; I have wakened that drop that was sent from Sophia, that it might bear much fruit through me and be perfected and not again become defective but be <joined> through me, the Great Savior, that
his glory might be revealed, so that Sophia might also be justified in regard to that defect, that her sons might not again become defective but might attain honor and glory and go up to their Father and know the words of the masculine Light. And you were sent by the Son, who was sent that you might receive Light and remove yourselves from the forgetfulness of the authorities, and that it might not again come to appearance because of you, namely, the unclean rubbing that is

SJC-III:
108,11 “because of you··:· "for your sakes" (K).

SJC-BG:
105,8 MS has maqwine, “that does not seek.”
Thus, again, I the father of those who appeared, I Begetter of All [Things], very soon created

And when those whom I have discussed appeared, I All-Begetter, their father, very soon I created

---

*Eug-III:*

84.12 ἂντειγε ονηδέπων (Tr; unnecessary emendation).

84.13 MS has γ (correction of untranslated ethical dative): not emended by Tr, who translates “for them” (so also K).

“their father, very soon”: “their first father” (T–S. K & Tr).
from the fearful fire that I came from their fleshly part. Then Thomas said to [him]: “Lord, Savior, how many are the aeons of those who surpass the heavens?”

The perfect Savior said: “I praise you (pl.) because you ask about the great aeons, for your roots are in the infinities.

Now when those whom I have discussed earlier were revealed, he [provided]
NHC V 12.24–30

| So each of the [aeons] of [the seventy-two powers who appeared [from him have five] firmaments [in all their heavens], so 30 [there are three hundred sixty firmaments . . . ]
| (2± lines lacking)

NHC III 84.15–85.3

| twelve aeons | for retinue for the twelve | angels. And in | each aeon there were six (heavens), | so 20 there are seventy-two heavens of the seventy-two | powers who appeared [from him. And in each of the heavens | there were five firmaments, | so there are (altogether) three hundred sixty [firmaments] of the three hundred | sixty powers that appeared [from them.

_Eug-V:_

12.28 Fifth superlinear stroke is in lacuna.

12.30 MS has a superlinear stroke visible in the second lacuna above the letter that would have followed cterewma .

_Eug-III:_

84.16 Not emended by T–S, K or Tr (“with the twelve”).

85.1 Tr restores as above but leave ÍTE untranslated (“[firmaments]. Three hundred-dred”) (similarly, K).

85.3 “from . . . firmaments”: less likely, “from the firmaments. When they” (K & Tr).
(Coptic pages 109 and 110 are missing.)

5 twelve | aeons for retinue | for the
twelve | angels.
When the firmaments were complete, they were called "The Three Hundred Sixty Heavens," according to the name of the heavens that were before them. And all these are perfect and good. And in this way the defect of femaleness appeared.

---

*Eug-V:*

13.1 Superlinear stroke is in lacuna.

*Eug-III:*

85.4 Not emended by Tr.

85.8 Corr.: erased ι at end of line.

85.9 Corr.: ἀμα for erased.
All these are perfect and good. Thus the defect in the female appeared."

And he said to him: "How many are the aeons of the immortals, starting from the infinities?" The perfect Savior said: "Whoever has ears to hear, let him hear.

\[\text{SJC-BG:}\]

107.13 T-S has υ, "they" (followed by K), but it is difficult to determine from the photograph whether the scribe intended γ or q. If the pl. was intended, this is the only instance in the tractate where the questioner or questioners are not clearly identified. If the sing., the questioner remains Thomas.

107.14–16 "How... infinities?: "How many aeons are there of the boundless ones of the immortals?" (T-S).

107.17 MS has a large asterisk in the left margin.
Now the first aeon is that of Man. The second is that of Son of Man, who is called "First Begetter," (and) who is called "Savior." The third is that of the son of Son of Man, who is called "Savior." Now that which embraces these is the aeon of the Unruled One, of the Eternal God, of the Infinite, (the aeon) of the aeons of the immortals.

The first aeon, then, is that of Immortal Man. The second aeon is that of Son of Man, who is called "First Begetter," (and) who is called "Savior." That which embraces these is the aeon over which there is no kingdom, (the aeon) of the Eternal Infinite God, the aeon of the aeons of the immortals.

Eug -V:
13,8 First superlinear stroke is in lacuna.
13,9 Superlinear stroke is in lacuna.

Eug -III:
85,15 "embraces" (so also Tr): "rules over" (K); see 73,6n.
85,16 Corr.: second τ for partially inscribed and erased Τ.
85,17 "Eternal Infinite God" (similarly, K [footnote], & Tr): "divine, boundless Eternal One" (T-S); "eternal, divine unlimited" (K).
The first aeon is that of Son of Man, who is called ‘First Begetter,’ who is called ‘Savior,’ who has appeared. The second aeon (is) that of Man, who is called ‘Adam, Eye of Light.’

That which embraces these is the aeon over which there is no kingdom, (the aeon) of the Eternal Infinite God, the Self-begotten aeon of the aeons that are in it, (the aeon) of the immortals,
aeon) [above the Eighth] 20 [that appeared in] chaos.

[Now Immortal Man revealed] | [aeons] and [kingdoms] | [and powers] | [and gave authority to] all 25 [who appeared] from him | [ . . . ] | [ . . . of] chaos. | (5± lines lacking)

Now Immortal Man | revealed aeons | and powers and kingdoms | and gave authority to everyone who [appeared from] him | to make [whatever they desire] | until the days that are above chaos. | For these consented with each other 84

---

Eug-V:

13,22 First letter after lacuna: see Emmel, 1979: 185.

Eug-III:

85,19 “above”: “the upper part of” (K & Tr).
85,20 “in” (so also T–S): “out of” (T–S, alt., K & Tr).
86,1 So restored by T–S, except that second ζ is in lacuna.
86,2 Alt.: [ὁ ἐνετογούσις] ἱώγι (T–S & Tr); the doubling of ογι is uncharacteristic of the scribe (see 84,12; 89,4).
86,3 “that are above”: “of the upper part” (Tr).
86,4 Not emended by Tr, although his translation, which follows K, reflects the above emendation.
I whom I described earlier, (the aeon) above the Seventh that appeared from Sophia, which is the first aeon.

Now Immortal Man revealed aeons and powers and kingdoms and gave authority to all who appear in him that they might exercise their desires until the last things that are above chaos. For these consented with each other.

---

SJC-BG:

109,2 “from” (so also T-S, alt.): “in” (T-S).

109,3 “which”: or “who” (presumably Sophia).

109,12 Corr.: a mostly erased letter (α?) after the first τ, whose superlinear stroke remains.
[14] [ . . . ] [ in glory (and) numberless. ]

They [received] their [names, those] of the [beginning] and [the middle and the] unending, which [is the perfect, the] first aeon [and the second] and the third. [The first] in it was called ["Above" | Unity [and Rest."]]

10 Each one has

5 and revealed | every magnificence, even from spirit, | multitudinous lights | that are glorious and without number. These | received names in the beginning, that | is, the first, the middle, | the perfect; | that is, the first aeon and | the second and the third. | The first was called | "Unity and Rest." 15 Since each one

---

**Eug-V:**

14,2 Superlinear strokes are in lacuna.

Reconstruction: see 5,2.

14,4 Corr.: after first ε, N is crossed out. The following † seems to be made from an initial i (i.e., the scribe first wrote NI [pl. art.]).

**Eug-III:**

86,7 MS has Ν (not emended by Tr).

86,10 MS has Ν. Not emended by T–S or Tr, although Tr’s translation, which follows K’s ("the midst, the perfection"), reflects the emendation TMHTE (M]ΠΧΩΚ EBOA.

86,14 Tr lacks the first emendation but has the second.
and revealed every magnificence, even from spirit, multitudinous lights that are glorious and without number. These were called in the beginning, that is, the first aeon and the second and the third. The first called ‘Unity and Rest.’ Each

---

*SJC-BG:

109,15 MS has ζ, “he revealed” (not emended by T–S).

110,4 Not emended by T–S (“and two and three”), although T–S recognizes that *Eug–III* par. has the better text.

110,5 Not emended by T–S. The gap in the sentence, remedied here by the insertion of a copula, may be caused by the omission of a line of text (see V par.).
When the multitude that appeared in the one, so that they all might be gathered together and named “Assembly,” from the Assembly above the heavens, has its (own) name, the third aeon was designated “Assembly” from the great multitude that appeared in the multitudinous one. Therefore, when the multitude gathers and comes to a unity, they are called “Assembly,” from the Assembly that surpasses heaven. Therefore, the Assembly of

Eug-III:

86,16–20 See endnote 8.

86,17 Not emended by Tr, although his translation reflects the second emendation, as does K’s, which lacks the other two also; T–S does not have the first emendation; see endnote 8.
and come to a unity, we call them 'Assembly of the Eighth.'

one has its (own) name; for the third aeon was designated 'Assembly' from the great multitude that appeared: in one, a multitude revealed themselves. Now because the multitudes gather and become one, therefore <they> are called 'Assembly,' from that Assembly that surpasses heaven. Therefore the Assembly of

\[\text{\textit{TJC-Ill:}}\]
111.2 The section in the parr. immediately after χε may be missing here through homoioteleuton (so also T–S).

\[\text{\textit{TJC-BG:}}\]
110.9–16 See endnote 8.
110.10 ms has a.
110.11 Not emended by T–S ("the three aeons").
110.12 Not emended by T–S.
of the Ogdoad 1
appeared, it [was named,] 20
[because it was androgynous,
according to] | [a male portion and] | a [female] portion. [The male] |
[portion] was [called] “Assembly,” |
[and the female portion,] 25 [“Life,”
that it might be shown that] | life for |
all [things came] | [from a female. 
And] all | (the names . . . ) | (3±
lines lacking)

[Assembly] of the Ogdoad | appeared, it [was named.] 20
[because it was androgynous,
according to] | [a male portion and] | a [female] portion. [The male] |
[portion] was [called] “Assembly,” |
[and the female portion,] 25 [“Life,”
that it might be shown that] | life for |
all [things came] | [from a female. 
And] all | (the names . . . ) | (3±
lines lacking)

the [Eighth was] revealed | as [androgy
uous] and was named | partly as male and partly | as female. 
The male was called “Assembly,” 5
the female, “Life,” that | it might be
shown that from | a female came the life | in all the aeons. Every
name was received, | starting from the beginning. 
From his 10 concurrence with his thought, | the powers
appeared who were called | “gods”;
It appeared as androgynous and was named partly as male and partly as female. The male is called 'Assembly,' while the female is called 'Life,' that it might be shown that from the female came the life for all the aeons. And every name was received, starting from the beginning. For from his concurrence with his thought, the powers very soon appeared who were called 'gods';

the Eighth was revealed as androgynous and was named partly as masculine and partly as feminine. The male was called 'Assembly,' while the female was called 'Life,' that it might be shown that from the female came the life for all the aeons. And all the names were received from the beginning (or principle). For from his consent with his thought, the powers very soon appeared who were called 'gods';

SJC-III:
111.13 See endnote 9.

SJC-BG:
111.7 Not emended by T-S.
112.4 See endnote 9.
[15] (Line 1 lacking) | [. . . . gods of] the [gods;]
| [and the gods of the gods] | and the gods | from their considerings revealed | divine gods;
| [revealed] gods in 5 [their wisdoms;] and the gods | [revealed] from their teachings | [lords of] lords; [and] 15 and the gods from their | considerings revealed lords; | and the lords of the lords from

---

_Eug-V:_

15,4 MS has ἵ, “in.”

_Eug-III:_

87,14–15 ἅνοιγτε, “divine”: untranslated by K; the English translator’s note in K suggests it may be a dittography; Tr renders “gods of gods.”
I and [the] gods of the gods from their wisdom revealed gods; I and the gods from their wisdom revealed lords; and the lords of the lords from their thinking revealed lords;

| and [the] gods of the gods 10 from their considering revealed |
| <the> divine gods; I and the gods from their wisdom revealed 15 <the lords> of <lords>; and the <lords> of the <lords> |
| from thinking |

SJC-III:

111,17–18 The first letter of each line has been lost from the MS but is preserved in old photographs. See Emmel, 1978: 204.

111,19-20 MS has first superlinear stroke in lacuna (line 19).

At the beginning of each line T–S restores [N] and [N] respectively.

Line 20 is not emended by T–S ("the lords of the lords revealed their thoughts of lords"). However T–S considers the correct reading to be found in Eug–III.

SJC-BG:

112,10 {Δε} (T–S). Although untranslatable, Δε does seem to have an emphasizing function here in Coptic, perhaps on analogy with its use with pronouns in Greek.

112,12–13 <Ν>ΝΟΥΤΕ ... ΝΝΙΤ, "<the> ... gods": "<the> gods. The divine gods" (T–S).

Alt.: first emendation: <ΝΙΣΕ> (indefinite article) (T–S, alt.).

112,14 MS has ι (incorrect pronoun number).

112,15 MS has Χ for each emendation. Without the emendation the translation would be "Christos" here and on line 17 in each case (not emended by T–S, although the error is recognized). Χ for Χ is a common scribal error.
NHC V 15.7–20

NIXO[eiכ דב נ]XOEC
AYOUWNZ [EBOL ZN
NE]YWQXNE ΝΖΕΝΧΟ10[ΕΙC ·
ΑΝΙΧΟE]C DE OYWNE EBOL | ZN
[NEYSOM] ΝΖΕΝΑΡΧΙΑΓΕΛΟC | ΝI[ΑΡΧΙΑΓΓ]ΕΛΟC DE AYOYNWZ | ΕΒΟΛ ZN NEYWAKE
ΝΖΕΝΑΡΓΡΕ ΛΟC ΑΨ ΕΒΟΛ ZN
ΝΑΪ ΑΓΟY15WNZ ΕΒΟΛ ΝΞI
GNEIΔOC ΜΝ | GECXΗΜΑ ΜΝ
ZENMORΦΗ | ΜΝ ΝΗΨΝ ΤΗΡΟΥ
ΜΝ NEYΚΟC[ΜΟC] ΟΥΝΤΛΕ
ΝΙΑΤΜΟΥ ΤΗΡΟΥ | [ΝΙΣΤΟΥYCIA
ΕΒΟΛ ZN ]ΣΩΜ ΜΠΙ 20|ΡΩΜΕ

the [lords of the] lords revealed | [from their] counsels lords; 10 and [the lords] revealed | from [their powers] archangels; | and the [archangels] revealed | from their words angels; | and from them appeared 15 shapes and | structures and forms | and all the aeons and their worlds. | All the immortals have | [authority from the power] of 20 [Immortal Man

NHC III 87.18–88.7

ΝΕΥΛΟΡΟC ΑΥΟΥΝΖ ΕΒΟΛ | ΝΣΝΑΟΕIC · ΝΧΟEIC DE ΕΒΟΛ ΖΝ
20 ΝΕΥΣΟM ΑΥΟΥΝΖ ΕΒΟΛ
ΝΖΕΝ|ΑΡΧΑΓΕΛΟC · ΝΑΡΧΑΓΕΛΟC ΑΥΟΥΝΖ ΕΒΟΛ
ΝΖΕΝΑΓΕΛΟC Ε|ΒΟΛ ΖΝ <Να นาย
ΑΤΙΔΕΑ ΟΥΨΝ€
Ζ1 ΞΗΜ[Α Ζ1 ΜΟΡΦΗ] Ε Φ ΠΑΝ | ΕΝΙΑΙ [WN ΤΗΡΟΥ ΜΝ]
ΝΕΥΚΟ|ΣΜΟC ΝΑ[Θ]ΑΝΑΤΟC ΤΗΡΟΥ ΝΤΑ|ΕΙΦ ΨΠ ΝΙΑΟΟΥ
ΕΥΝΤΟΥ ΤΕΣΟΥYCIA ΤΗΡΟΥ
ΕΒΟΛ ΖΝ ΤΣΟM ΜΝΙΑΘΑΝΑΤΟC ΝΡΩΜΕ ΜΝ ΤΟCΦΙΑ

| their words revealed lords; | and the lords from 20 their powers revealed | archangels; the archangels | revealed angels; from | <them> the semblance appeared with structure [and form] for naming | [all] the aeons and their worlds. | All the immortals, whom I have just described, have authority—all of them—5 from the power of I Immortal Man and Sophia,

---

Eug-V:
15.13 First superlinear stroke is in lacuna.

Eug-III:
87.21 “archangels” (2): +“<out of their words> (K).
87.22 Corr.: at the end of the line the letters BOΛ are erased.
87.23 MS has ταϊ, “her” or “this” (not emended by K or Tr).
88.2–3 Lacuna in line 3, so restored by T-S.

“their worlds. All the immortals” (so also T–S): “all their immortal worlds” (K & Tr).
And the lords from their power revealed archangels; and the archangels from their words revealed angels; and from them semblances appeared with structure and form and name for all the aeons and their worlds. And the immortals, whom I have just described, have authority from Immortal Man, who revealed <lords>; and the <lords> from their power revealed archangels; and the archangels from their words revealed angels; and from them <semblances> appeared with structure and form and name for all the aeons and their worlds. And the immortals, whom I have just described, have authority from the power of Immortal Man, who

SJC-BG:

112,16 Not emended by T–S ("the <lords> of the <lords> revealed <lord>-thoughts"). However T–S considers that the correct reading is found in Eus–Ill.

112,17 MS has x for both emendations (not emended by T–S).

113,1 MS has q (incorrect pronoun number).

113,4 MS has q (incorrect pronoun number).

113,7 MS has αιναυς ε, “I saw that structure . . . appeared”; T–S plausibly suggests that the translator of the Greek misunderstood ιδέα and thought it meant, “I saw,” but T–S does not emend the text. In the T–S translation, however, “<semblances (ιδέα) >” is inserted before “structure,” while “I” and “saw” remain as the subject and verb!
to name them. | [Sophia they called] “Silence,” | [because she perfected her] whole [majesty] | [by reflecting without a word. | [. . . ] 25 (8± lines lacking)

[16] [. . . ineffable] | [glory, who

Eug-V:

16,2–3 Reconstruction: see 8,23–24.

Eug-III:

88,10 See endnote 10.

88,11 See endnote 11.

88,12 “provided”: “created” (K. translating ταμιός instead of τεμάναο; followed by Tr, who does not emend).

is called ‘Silence’ because by reflecting without speech all her own majesty was perfected. For since the imperishables had the authority, each created a great kingdom in the Eighth and (also) thrones and temples (and) firmaments for their own majesties.

is called ‘Silence,’ because by reflecting without speech he perfected all his own majesty. Since the imperishables had the authority, they created a great kingdom. Each one is [in] his ogdoad with his firmament and thrones and temples for their own majesties.

SJC-III:
112,10 See endnote 10.
112,11 See endnote 11.
112,16 προς: προς (T-S).

SJC-BG:
113,16 Not emended by T-S.
113,18–114,1 See endnote 10.
114,2 See endnote 11.
114,4 Alt. {N}νοῦ (T-S; unnecessary in view of examples in 78,16 and 95,14).
114,7 Not emended by T-S (“his firmament of thrones,” although T-S translates “his firmament, thrones,” i.e., as though the N before ενθεόνος were deleted).
Now they created [hosts] of archangels [and]

5 Now they created [hosts] of archangels [and]

ineffable glory 20 and not able to be sent into any creature,

5 Aytyamio de n[ay

Aytyamio de n[ay

have] [never been heard of, since] [they cannot [be sent] into [any creature.]
For these all came by the will of the Mother of the Universe.” Then 20 the Holy Apostles said to him: “Lord, Savior, tell us about those who are in the aeons, since it is necessary for us to ask about them.” The perfect Savior said: “If you ask about anything, I will tell you. They created hosts of angels, myriads without number for retinue and their glory. They

For these all came by the will of the Mother of the Universe.” Then the Holy Apostles said to him: “Christ, Savior, reveal to us those who are in the aeons, since it is necessary for us to ask about them.” The perfect Savior said: “If you ask about anything, I will tell you. They created hosts of angels, myriads without number for retinue and glory. And

SJC-III:

113,1 MS has a (not emended by T-S).
And thus was completed the aeons, with (its) heaven and firmament, of Immortal Man.

Eug-V:
16,8 Stroke over m is visible.
16,10 Third superlinear stroke is in lacuna.
†: see Emmel, 1979: 185 (line identified as extant line 9).
16,11 End of line: see Emmel, 1979: 185 (line identified as 16, extant line 10);
Emmel’s restoration is too short for the lacuna.

Eug-III:
89,1–2 “even ... lights”: less likely, in view of V 16,9–11, “indescribable virgin spirits of light” (K & Tr).
89,2 MS has η (not emended by Tr).
89,6 “Thus” could be taken with the preceding sentence (noted by T–S).
89,8 “for”: “of” (T–S, but “perhaps ‘for’”; K & Tr).
NHC III 113,5-12

αὐτὰ|μίο ἃζενπαρῆπονος

BG 115,7-18

αὐτὰ|μίο δὲ ἃζενπαρῆπονος

εὐοός ἃοὐοῖν ἃῖς

ζίςε γὰρ ἀγᾶς | γαθοῦ αὐς

ἀναίων ἄξωκ ἐβολὴν ἐπόεις ἡμὶ

οὐσὲν ἡ ἁμὶ ἀπὸ | ἁμὶ

νεκτερεωμα ἡμὶ πεοοῦ |

created | virgin spirits, the | ineffable and unchangeable lights. |
For they have no sickness | nor weakness, | but it is will. |
Thus the aeons were completed | quickly with the heavens | and the firmaments in the glory |

they | created virgin | spirits, | the ineffable and shadowless | lights. |
For there is no sickness | among them nor weakness, | but it is only will, | and they came to be in an instant. |
Thus were completed the aeons | with the heavens | and the firmaments for | the glory of Immortal Man |

SJC-III:

113,8 Corr.: ἃ for marked out θα; έ marked out after second e (see 97,18 for similar correction); uncorrected, the text agrees with the BG par.

113,11 Corr.: first m for erased letter.

SJC-BG:

115,15 “Thus” could be taken with the preceding sentence (noted by T–S).

115,17 MS has π, “the firmament” (not emended by T–S).
“for”: “of” (T–S, but “perhaps ‘for’”).
NHC V 16.17-28

[and] his Sophia, [which has in] it the [pattern of every aeon and] 20 [every world and those that came] | afterward, [in order to provide the types] | [from there] | in the [heavens of chaos and their] | worlds. [And all natures ... ]

25 [ . . . ] | [ . . . ] | [ . . . ] | [ . . . ] |

Eug-V:

16.25 The superlinear stroke is visible, since a large portion of it is over \( p \) (not an unusual position for a final stroke in this tractate).

Eug-III:

89,10 Corr.: \( \tau \) for erasure; corr.: \( \nu \) for \( \sigma \); a letter has been marked out between \( \epsilon w n \) and \( \nu i m \); not emended by K or Tr, although both note (as does T-S) that the sentence is incomplete as it stands.

89,12 Corr.: third \( N \) for \( \tau \).

“provide”: “create” (K, translating \( \tau a m i o \) instead of \( \tau e n a n o \); followed by Tr, who does not emend).

89,14 \( \nu p e x a o c \), “of chaos”: \( \mu < \nu > \) \( p e x a o c \), “<and> chaos” (T-S, “probably”).

89,18 “are”: omitted by T-S, K & Tr, for all of whom the predicate begins in line 21 (“ever delight themselves . . . ”).
...of Immortal Man and Sophia, his consort: the area from which every aeon and world and those that came afterward took (their) pattern for their creation of likenesses in the heavens of chaos and their worlds. And all natures, starting from the revelation of chaos, are...

SJC-III:

113,16 Lacuna so restored by T-S.
113,18 Alt.: Ἄ<ν> πεξαοκ, "<and> chaos" (T-S, "probably").

SJC-BG:

116,5 Not emended by T-S.
MS has final superlinear stroke in lacuna.
116,8–9 On line 8, MS has a large diple followed by NA at the end of the line (not emended by T-S). On line 9, T-S does not emend but divides the first four letters, ει νε, and translates the whole, "in order to create. These are: the heavens and chaos" (see explanatory n., T-S: 273). The lack of clear meaning, the parallels, and the unusualness of ταμιο without an object make the T-S solution unacceptable. The problem may have been caused by an error of hearing.
116,12 πεξαοκ, "chaos": <πνεύματος>, "<Christ>" (Schenke, 1962: 275, n. 57).
[21±] [21±] | [8± eγραψεν
εγινήν]

[ι] [ζην πενεοούν. ἡνατ][ψι[ε]] | [μν ἦτε μν υ'[σωμ η[ογ]ψαξε
| [εξω ἠμοού]· ἰνε[φ]χνφούνου
5 [ζην νειν νθρ]ογ εταγψψνε
| [μνηνά] η[α]ί] μν νεγσομ·
| [7±] ζω ερωτή ωα πειμα
| [κα δε τθρο[γ] εταγψ ψορφ | η[ξοου νητ]· α'[ψαξε ἠμοού

[... ] 30 [... ] | [... ever
rejoicing]

[17] [in their unchanging glory] | [and the
unchanged rest,] | [which cannot be
described] | [or [known] 5 [among all
the aeons] that came to be
[afterward] and their powers.

| [... ] this much is enough for you.
| [Now all] that has just been | [said
to you, ] I spoke

the light that shines without shadow
| and (in) ineffable joy 20 and
unutterable jubilation. | They ever
delight themselves | on account of
their glory that does not change | and
the rest that is not measured, | which
cannot be described
or conceived | among all the aeons | that
came to be and their powers.

| But this much is enough.
Now all 5 I have just said to you, | I said

---

*Eug-V:*


17,3 Second superlinear stroke is in lacuna.
THE SOPHIA OF JESUS CHRIST

NHC III 113,21–114,7

114

in the Light that shines without shadow | and joy that cannot be described | and | unutterable jubilation. They ever delight themselves on account of their unchanging glory and the immeasurable rest, | which cannot be described | among all the aeons that | came to be afterward and all their powers.

Now all that I have just said to you, I | said

SJC-III:

113,21 “are in”: “from” (T–S; for T–S the predicate begins in lines 24–25, “ever delight themselves . . .”).

SJC-BG:

116,13–15 “are . . . being”: “from the light . . . are” (T–S).

116,17–18 Corr.: ωι erased at the end of line 17; τ for partly erased ι at the beginning of line 18; originally ωινηε, “be ashamed.”
in [such a way that] you might preserve it | [all], until the word that need not be taught | comes forth | among you, and it will | interpret these things to you in knowledge 15 that is one and pure.

For [to] everyone who has, | more will be added.

[EUGNOSTOS] THE BLESSED

Eug.-V:
17,11 Translation: see 5,22–23.
17,14 Punctuation: see 5,4n.
17,17 Stroke over μ is visible.
17,17–18 Decorative dieres and a line to the margin follow the full stop. Decorative marks are also visible on the next line to the right of what remains of the title. The left side of that line is in lacuna.
17,18 A small mark appears on the Facsimile Edition–V page to the upper left of the omicron. An ultraviolet examination of the original by James M. Robinson in December, 1980, failed to show any indication of ink.

It seems likely that the title contained only εὐγνωτος. It is only one line long (there is no decoration for a second line), and the practice of the scribe elsewhere in the codex is to center titles so there is about as much decoration on the right side as on the left. If that held true here, the space between the left and right decorations would have allowed only one word of nine letters, not two words, as in Eug.–III.

Eug.-III:
90,11 MS has a paragraphus cum corone in the left margin just below the line. The end of the text is decorated, as is the title, with dieres and lines.
that you might shine in Light more than these.”

10 that you might shine in Light even more than these.”
Since *Eug* concludes on p. 166, both facing pages will be used for the remainder of *S/C*, beginning with p. 170.
Mary said to him: “Holy Lord, 10 where did your disciples come from and where are they going and (what) should they do here?” The perfect Savior said to them: “I want you to know that Sophia, 15 the Mother of the Universe and the consort, desired by herself to bring these to existence without her male (consort). But by the will of the Father of the Universe, that his unimaginable goodness might be revealed, he created that curtain between the immortals and those that came
afterward, 25 that the consequence might follow

NHC III 114,24–25

MNÜNCA NAÎ 25 XE
EPEPAKOLOUGEOÜON AΣKOLOY[ΘEIm]
(Coptic pages 115 and 116 are missing.)

BG 118,10–119,11

ΝΕΝΤΑΓΨΩ|ΠΕ ΜΝÜNCA NAÎ
XΕΚΑ|ΑC EPEPETHTH ΕΨΩ|ΠΕ
ΕΨΕΟΥΑΓΨ
ΝΚΑ ΑI|ΩΝ ΝΙΜ ΑΨΩ ΠΕΧΑΟC 15
ΧΕ ΕΨΕΟΥΑΓΨΝ|ΗΡΙ ΠΕΨ|ΤΑ
ΝΤΕΣΩΜΕ ΝΚΨΩ|ΠΕ
ΕΡΕΤΕΠΛΑΝΗ ΠΝΜΗΜΑ ΝΑÎ ΑE
ΝΤΑΓΨΩ
ΠΕ ΝΚΑΤΑΠΕΤΑΣΜΑ | ΝΝΟΥΠΠΑ
ΕΒΟΛ IN <Ν>ΑI|ΩΝ ΝΤΙΠΕ
ΝΝΝΑΠΟΡ|ΡΟΙΔ ΝΟΥΟΪΝ ΝΕΕ
ΝΣΤΑΪΧΙΟΟC ΝΨΩΡΙ ΟΥ|ΤΑ|ΛΕ
ΕΒΟΛ ΕΜΝΟ|ΟΕΙΝ ΜΝ ΠΕΠΝΑ
ΕΑΣΕΙ | ΕΣΡΑΪ ΕΜΜΕΡΟC ΝΠΙ | ΤΗ
ΝΤΕ ΠΝΑΤΟΚΡΑ 10ΤΨΡ
ΜΠΕΧΑΟC ΧΕΚΑ|ΑC

that came afterward, that | what has to be | might follow
every aeon | and chaos, 15 that the
defect of the female | might
<appear>, and it might come about
that | Error would contend with | her.
And these became
the curtain | of spirit. From <the>
aeons | above the emanations | of
Light, as 5 I have said already, a |
drop from Light | and Spirit came |
down to the lower regions | of
Almighty 10 in chaos, that

SJC-III:

114,24 T–S restores χ[ . ] at the end of the line, but the remains are more likely those of a diplo.

114,25 Bracketed letters are presumed to be at the beginning of 115,1 (so restored by T–S).

SJC-BG:

118,15 Not emended by T–S or K ("might live"). Emendation is T–S sugg.; for support, see 107,11–12.

118,16–18 "and it . . . her": "and she engage in a struggle with Error" (an admittedly free translation by T–S); "and she (Sophia) might come to be, since Error fights with her" ("literal" rendering by T–S in n.); "and she (female) exist, Error contending with her" (K).
their molded forms might appear from that drop, for it is a judgment on him, Arch-Begetter, who is called ‘Yaldabaoth.’ That drop revealed their molded forms through the breath, as a living soul. It was withered and it slumbered in the ignorance of the soul. When it became hot from the breath of the Great Light of the Male, and it took thought, (then) names were received by all who are in the world of chaos and all things that are in it through that
Immortal One, when the breath blew into him. But when this came about by the will of Mother Sophia—so that Immortal Man might piece together the garments there for a judgment on the robbers—he then welcomed the blowing of that breath; but since he was soul-like, he was not able to take that power for himself until the number of chaos should be complete.

---

**SJC-BG:**

120,14 “this”: lit. “these” (rendered as above by T–S but not by K); see III 70,2n.

120,15 MS has ΝΤΜΑΥ; alt.: <ε>ΤΜΑΥ, “by that will of Sophia” (T–S, alt.).

120,16–121,3 Apparently a gloss on lines 14–15 that has crept into the text. It represents an ascetic interpretation of the will of Sophia; i.e., she brought all this about so that nakedness might be covered and the robbers (who use sex to enslave the soul) might therefore be rebuked (cf. Gen 3:21).

121,2–3 “for a judgment on the robbers” (so also Schenke in T–S: 340, & K): less likely, “while (or “whereby”) the robbers were condemned for them” (T–S).

121,4 MS has Υ, “they” (emended as above by Schenke in T–S: 340; not emended by T–S or K).
that [...] and Breath, and might | from two become one, just as from | the first, that you might yield much | fruit | and go up to 5 Him Who Is | from the Beginning, in | ineffable | joy and
glory and [honor and] grace of [the Father of the Universe].

Whoever, then, knows [the Father in pure knowledge] 10 [will depart] to the Father [and repose in] Unbegotten [Father]. But whoever knows [him defectively] will depart [to the defect] and the rest 15 [of the Eighth. Now] whoever knows [Immortal [Spirit]] of Light in silence, through reflecting and consent

| with ineffable joy and glory and | honor and grace |
| of the Father of the Universe. | of the Father of the Universe. |

Whoever, then, knows the Father [in pure knowledge] will go to the Father 5 and repose in Unbegotten Father. But whoever knows him [defectively will dwell] in the defect and repose 10 in the Eighth. Now whoever knows Immortal Spirit, [who is Light, in silence, through reflecting and consent 15 in truth,]

---

SJC-III:
117,9 T-S restores only ῳΝ.
117,10 T-S restores only θαρων and ἵω.
117,12 T-S restores only τοκ.
117,14 T-S restores only ρἱ.
117,16 T-S restores only ἀθ.
117,18 εὐδοκία, “consent”: “the eudokia (= the decree)” (K) (?). See endnote 9.

SJC-BG:
123,14–15 T-S leaves both ένθυμησις and εὐδοκία untranslated. See endnote 9.
in the truth, I let him bring me signs 20 of the Invisible One, and he will become I a light in the Spirit of Silence. I Whoever knows Son of Man I in knowledge and love, I let him bring me a sign of Son of Man, that he might depart I to the dwelling-places with those in the Eighth. Behold, I have revealed you to you the name of the Perfect One, the whole will 5 of the Mother of the Holy Angels, I that the masculine [multitude]
may be completed here, that there [might appear, in the aeons,] [the infinities and] those that [came to be in the] untraceable [wealth of the Great] Invisible [Spirit, that they] all [might take] [from his goodness,] even the wealth [of their rest] that has no [kingdom over it]. I came [from First] Who Was Sent, that multitude may be completed here, that they might appear in all the aeons, from the infinities to those that came to be in the untraceable wealth of the Great Invisible Spirit, that they all might take from his goodness, even the wealth of their place of repose that has no kingdom over it. And I came from First Who Was Sent,
I might reveal to you Him Who Is from the Beginning, because of the arrogance of Arch-Begetter and his angels, since they say about themselves that they are gods. And I came to remove them from their blindness that I might tell everyone about the God who is above the universe.

Therefore, tread upon their graves, humiliate their malicious intent and break their yoke and arouse my own. I have given you authority over all things as Sons of Light, that I might reveal to you Him Who Is from the Beginning, because of the arrogance of Arch-Begetter and his angels, since they say about themselves that they are gods. And I came to remove them from their blindness that I might teach everyone about the God who is above the universe.
...that you might tread upon their power with your feet.” These are the things the blessed Savior said, and he disappeared from them. And his disciples began to preach the Gospel of God, the eternal, imperishable Spirit.

SJC-BG:

126,16 ms has a paragraphus in the left margin just below the line of the text.
127,1–12 ms has extensive decorations in both margins and surrounding the title.
127,4–5 See endnote 15.
THE SOPHIA OF JESUS CHRIST

NHC III 119,16-18

N(N.l.1 [e]Nes zamhn:
TCOFIA N[HC

| Amen. | THE SOPHIA
OF JESUS

BG 127,8-12

NPI N'O'Y|TE PEIW'T NWA ENEZ
N10NATTako YA NlENES |
TCOFIA N[HC NEXFT

God, | the eternal Father, 10
imperishable forever. | THE
SOPHIA OF | JESUS CHRIST

SJC-III:
119,17 Lacuna so restored by T–S.
119,17–18 MS has diple and line decorations at the end of the text proper and surrounding the title.
ENDNOTES

1. III 91,1–2 || BG 78,1–2 “Divination” (derived from μαντεία): less likely, “Place of Harvest Time” (T–S) or “Place of Ripeness” (Pu & K). See Till’s note, T–S: 327. The word division ma n, assumed by T–S, Pu & K, is not supported by the scribe of either III or BG. The former omits the expected stroke over the n, and in BG the scribe treats n as though it were a part of ma by using the conventional stroke over a at the end of the line in place of the n. The spelling ma nth may reflect an Ionic form (μαντηή) and may have been an attempt to archaize. Μαντεία is related to joy, as here, in Plat. Tim. 71d.

2. III 70,21 oγνηθην ovyn e<9wne, “fate” || III 93,3 (do.) || BG 81,10–11 oγνηθοντ, “fate”: The par. in V, of which Till was unaware (T–S: 327), makes clear that “fate” is the correct translation, both here and where ηενθοντ recurs (III 71,4 [Τετςαντ]; III 93,15–16 [do.]; BG 82,7). Crum says that ζοντ is a qualitative of unknown meaning, citing only the instance in BG (691b). Till considers that it might be an unattested qualitative of ζων, “bid, command” (Crum: 688a) but expresses his uncertainty (T–S: 327). It is more likely a qualitative of ζωντ, “approach,” where the form ζωντ (found in III) is attested (Crum: 691b). Its basic meaning then would be “that which comes,” or the like (so also K & Tr). The use of the fem. article probably reflects η είμαρμένη.

3. III 73,14 || III 96,10 || BG 87,4–5 T–S suggests, probably correctly, that behind the differences among these texts lies confusion over γένος and γενόμενος.

4. V 6,15–17 || III 77,11–13 || III 101,20–22 || BG 95,6–8 The lack of the term onomacia (pán), “designation” (“name”), in either version of SJC, while it is present in both versions of Eug, shows that the haplography probably occurred in the text of SJC rather than Eug. And further, since the Greek text used by both SJC translators was, in all probability, uniform (see Introduction, sec. X), and the Coptic texts are so different, we are probably justified in thinking that the translators met the problem in the Greek independently and attempted to deal with it each in his own way in their translations. (It is possible that subsequent Coptic copyists were involved, but that seems less likely in view of the fact that both texts deal with the problem, suggesting that it could not easily be overlooked by a translator.) If that was the case, then those attempts provide us with some evidence about the two Coptic translators of SJC.
The translator of SJC-III seems to be more conservative (e.g., he preserves the correct person and number of the, for him, lost subject), but he makes a clumsy and basically meaningless connection with the preceding sentence. The translator of SJC-BG is more daring, conceiving of the idea that the passage was a reference to the initial appearance of the gnostic race, which would mean that it was engendered by Immortal Man. Unfortunately, in taking that position, he has ignored a preceding statement that the gnostic race appeared prior to Immortal Man (III 99,13–19 || BG 91,17–92,9).

5. III 78,6–7 || III 102,23 || BG 96,16 ἀπε ἐτε ὑὸ Ἕνωος (and the like), “just as he is it (thought)”: Appears to be a gloss (n.b. its absence in V). The point seems to be that First Man not only has thought but is thought. That is perhaps based on an identification of his feminine aspect, the Great Sophia (see III 104,10–11 & parr.), with hypostasized thought. T–S renders “just as he is” (connection with preceding and following is not clear); K, “just as he is a reflection”; Tr, “thought as he is” (?). 

6. V 7,19–22 || III 78,19–21 In V there are whole numbers, while III has fractions. The former version is probably to be preferred since it is the more difficult reading, i.e., it is easier to imagine larger fractions (e.g., tenths) ruling over smaller fractions (e.g., hundredths), than smaller whole numbers (e.g., tens) ruling over larger ones (e.g., hundreds). N.B. that the last two numbers were left unchanged in III.

7. V 12,2 || III 83,20 “will”: less likely, “interval” (Crum: 501b).

8. III 86,16–20 ἀγονομάζε... ὑῃ ἐν τῇ... multitude” || BG 110,9–16: “they called the church in the third aeon ‘the multitude from the multitude, which the multitude caused to appear from the one’” (K [III]; similarly Tr); “the ‘church of the three aeons’ was spoken of, because, from the crowd that came to appearance in (or ‘from’) one, a multitude was revealed” (T–S [BG]); “the church of the three aeons was furnished with names . . .” (Schenke in T–S: 340 [BG]). The problem of III 86,16–17 and BG 110,9–12, reflected in the variety of translations above (n.b. the similarity of the texts), may go back to the Greek where the distinction between the designation and the designee may not have been clear grammatically. That the designation is “Assembly” or “Church,” however, is evident from III 86,22 and BG 111,3. And that one of the aeons is the designee is clear from III 86,14–16 and BG 110,8–9. As to the omission of the ordinal prefixes, see 110,4 for additional examples of the error in BG. In III, lines 11–13 make clear the error (for omission of numeral prefixes, see 78,21–22). Both texts appear to have been adjusted in minor ways in hopes of making sense out of what was received, but the result was to make a difficult situation worse. The text of V, lacking those adjustments, seems closer to the original. Since the original can be discerned, I have chosen to edit EUG-III and SJC-BG accordingly.
For ΝΟΥΑ ΝΟΥΑΤΟ, "the multitudinous one" (III 86,19–20), T-S has "one as a multitude"; K & Tr omit a translation of ΝΟΥΑΤΟ, although Tr leaves the text unemended.

9. III 87,10 μετέ, "concurrence" || III 111,13 κωνω, "concurrence" || BG 112,4 εὐδοκία, "consent": "good will" (Tr [Eug–III]); "good pleasure" (K [Eug–III]); untranslated (T-S [BG]). Basic for understanding εὐδοκία here, as well as the Coptic words used to translate it, is the observation of LSJ that εὐδοκία can be equivalent to εὐδοκησις when used of God. Thus it can mean "consent, concurrence." See also TDNT (2), 1964: 750 (Schrenk).

10. III 88,10 || III 112,10 || BG 113,18–114,1 The fem. pronouns in III 88,10 refer to Sophia (contra T–S). It appears that the reference to Sophia was dropped at an early stage from SJC and that the BG version (with masc. pronouns) reflects a more careful adjustment to that fact than does SJC–III.

11. III 88,11 || III 112,11 || BG 114,2 Should ἄφθαρσις (Eug–III & SJC–III) or ἄττακο (BG) be translated with the preceding ΜΝΤΝΟΣ, "majesty," as an adjective (as though a genitive) (so also K & Tr [Eug–III]) or in an identity relationship ("as imperishability") (so T–S [Eug–III & SJC–III])? Or should they be taken with the following ΕΥΝΤΟΥ, "had," as the plural subject, as I have done (so also T–S [BG])? My decision is based on the clear-cut nature of the case in BG and the difficulty of relating ἄφθαρσις (in Eug–III & SJC–III) satisfactorily to ΜΝΤΝΟΣ.

12. V 16,4 || III 88,20 "sent": or "sown" (κο, Crum: 752a).

13. III 114,7 || BG 117,10 "that you might shine" (so also T–S): "until you shine" (K).

14. III 118,18–19 || BG 125,14–15 "Him Who Is from the Beginning": "that which is from the beginning" (T–S, D & K).

15. III 119,13–14 || BG 127,4–5 "from that day on. And his": "From that day (on) his" (T–S, Pu. D & K).
χρόνος V 4,[24]: 12,[5]. III 83,22.
χωρείν. χωρί III 117,[10],[13]; 118,1.

ψυχή BG 120,1.3.
ψυχικός BG 121,6.

ὡς V 3,14,[19]; 16,[3]. III 73,22; 74,3; 98,7; 119,6. BG 89,11,16; 126,14.
ὡστε V 12,[29]. III 74,4; 83,14; 84,19,24.

PROPER NOUNS

ἀδαμ. ἀδάμ πᾶλ ἤποιο(ε)ίν V 9,[23]. III 105,12. BG 100,14; 108,10. ἀδάμ πά ποιοείν III 81,12.

βαρθολομαῖος III 103,22. BG 98,8.

γαλιλαῖα III 90,19; 91,20. BG 77,15; 79,9.

εὐγνωστός V 1,[1]; 17,[18]. III 70,1; 90,12.

ὖμας III 96,14; 108,17. BG 87,8; 106,11.

τὰλαδαβάσθι BG 119,16.

ἵσεος. ἴνο III 119,18. ἴνο πέξε BG 90,14. BG 127,12. ἴν πέξ BG 77,8.

ματαιος III 94,1; 100,17. ματαιος BG 82,19; 93,13.

μαριζαμμα III 98,10; 114,9. μαριζαμ BG 90,1; 117,13.

σοφία V 6,8,9; 8,[32]; 9,4; 10,[5]; 15,[21]; 16,18. III 81,23; 88,6; 89,9; 101,16; 102,13; 104,11; 106,16; 107,19,24; 113,13; 114,14. BG 95,1; 96,5; 99,[2]; 102,17; 104,1,17; 105,6; 109,3; 116,1; 118,[2]; 120,16. ἀγαθ σοφία V 11,[3]. III 82,24. πανγενήτηρα σοφία III 82,22; 106,22. σοφία πανγενε(ο)τ(e)ίρα III 82,5. BG 103,7. παννήσταρ σοφία III 82,21. πανσοφος σοφία III 82,20. πανσοφος σοφία ἰγενετήρα III 77,3. πνευμ σοφία V 10,[12],14; 11,[4]. III 82,8; 83,[1]. πρωσ(ο)τογενετ(e)ίρα σοφία III 82,23. BG 99,10. σοφία ἱπρωστογενητήρα III 104,17.

φιλιππος III 92,4; 95,19. BG 79,18; 86,6.

χριστός . ΧΡΙΣΤΩ ΤΙ 104,22. ΧΡΙΣΤΙ BG 99,9,16; 101,9; ΧΡΙΣΤΩ where it is perhaps an error for ΧΡΙΣΤΙ (i.e., ΧΡΙΣΤΙ ΤΙ) BG 83,1; 86,7; 87,9; 90,2; 100,4; 102,8; 106,11; 114,14; 117,13. (ΧΡΙΣΤΙ in BG 112,15 four times. and 112,17 twice, is clearly an error.) See further ἱσεος.
PAPYRUS OXYRHYNCHUS 1081
GREEK FRAGMENT OF THE SOPHIA OF JESUS CHRIST

INTRODUCTION

P. Oxy. 1081 is closely parallel to both SJC–III, from 97,16 to 99,12, and SJC–BG, from 88,18 to 91,15. It is related, but less closely, to the parallel sections of the two Eug texts.

P. Oxy. 1081 was first edited and published by Hunt in 1911 (16–19), who was not aware of its connection with the as yet unpublished SJC–BG. Wessely republished it 13 years later; he depended on the Hunt collation, but added some restorations.¹

In 1950 Puech identified the papyrus as a fragment of SJC (98, n.2; see also 1963: 245). Till included edited portions of the text in his edition of BG, but made no attempt to publish the complete text: he considered P. Oxy. 1081 too fragmentary to help with understanding the Coptic of SJC–BG and parr. (1955: 216) and expected Puech himself soon to publish a new edition of the papyrus (1955: 53). That edition never appeared. In 1975, Attridge published an edition based on infrared photographs, taking into account all the relevant Coptic texts with the exception of Eug–V, which is less useful than the other texts mentioned above.

I began working on P. Oxy. 1081 in 1970 in preparation for this volume, and at the suggestion of Alan Sparks, then Associate Director of the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity in Claremont, I wrote to Peter Parsons of Christ Church, Oxford, with the request that he examine the papyrus directly and respond to my queries. This he graciously did in May 1971 and again in November of the following year (in response to follow-up questions). More recently Attridge generously lent me the photographs he used in his edition.

The text and translation published here, then, are the result of the reworking of the fragmentary text in the light of the earlier editions (especially that of Attridge), with the aid both of the observations and suggestions of Parsons and of Attridge's photos. The numerous differences from earlier editions are discussed in the notes.

The MS consists of three large fragments of one leaf from a papyrus codex, with writing on both sides. The largest (A) measures 15.9 × 5.7 cm. The next in size (B) is 12.9 × 5.1 cm. The smallest (C) is 6.5 × 5.8 cm. “A” has the remains of the text along most of the inside margin, starting with the top lines. “B” has the remains along with outside margin for the middle half of the page. And “C” has what remains of the bottom of the page. The

¹ Hunt’s text was reprinted by E. Klostermann, and Wesseley’s, by A. De Santos Otero.
verso/recto designation given to sides one and two respectively by Hunt is misleading as these terms are used today, since, in the codex from which the leaf came, side one would have been the recto and side two the verso. The recto has the vertical fibers, while the verso has the horizontal. It is evident from a calculation of the average size of extant letters that those restored with certainty in the lacuna between the lower part of “B” and “C” require a space 3 to 4 mm. wider than that provided in the present fragment placement. The additional space (created by moving “B”) would also straighten the lines that run between “A” and “B”, which now would, if written out, appear slightly bowed.

In view of the above, the MS measurement given by Hunt (20.3 x 10.7 cm.) must be modified to 20.3 x 11.1 cm. The average length of the lines whose beginnings and endings are extant (16 in all) is 9 cm., according to Attridge; but this also must be changed by the addition of 4 mm. The MS is located in the Library of Cambridge University, where it has been given the acquisition number 5894. Paleographic evidence suggests that it is to be dated early in the 4th century.

Attridge holds that the text of P. Oxy. 1081 is closer to that of SJC–III than SJC–BG (8). He cites four instances where P. Oxy. 1081 agrees with SJC–III against SJC–BG: line 7 (III 97,21–22; BG 89,5–7); line 9 (III 97,23; BG 89,7); line 25 (III 98,10; BG 90,2); and line 26 (III 98,11; BG 90,2).

Line 7 involves a shift of a phrase from one part of the sentence to another; line 9 involves a difference in tenses (but in fact there is no agreement among any of the texts here, and similar minor tense differences are found elsewhere also); line 25 has to do with the difference between ἔν and ἔμ, which might be accounted for on the basis of individual scribal error, since confusion over these terms is widespread; and line 26 involves a difference of pronominal subject, which might be the result of dittography (see BG 90,2n.). Of these, then, only the first may be significant.

As to the agreements between P. Oxy. 1081 and SJC–BG against SJC–III, Attridge cites only two: line 11 (BG 89,10–11; III 98,1–2) involving the difference of the number of the pronominal subject, which, as he says, is not significant in this instance; and line 34 (misidentified by him as line 35) (BG 90,12; III 98,19), where there is a minor addition in SJC–III, which is probably a scribal gloss, as Attridge says. Neither of these can be considered significant. There are two other agreements, overlooked by him, where P. Oxy. 1081 and SJC–BG have a phrase in common that is omitted in SJC–III: line 18–19 (BG 89,16–17; III 98,7); and line 38 (BG 90,17–18; III 98,24). Since the omissions in SJC–III in these instances could be explained as the result of homoioteleuton, one can say only that a special connection between P. Oxy. 1081 and SJC–BG is possible.

P. Oxy. 1081, then, is a text that is very close to the two Coptic texts of SJC. Its special affinities to one or the other of those texts seem too minor to permit a judgment about which one is closer to the Greek.
[τοῖς μετὰ ταῦ]  

Vertical  

τα γεγονόσι[ν. εἰς δὲ]  

Fibers  

2 τὸ ἐμφανές[οὐκ ἔτι ἐ]  

ληλύθεισαν. [διαφο]  

4 ρά τε πολλῇ [μεταξύ]  

tῶν ἀφθάρῳ[τ]ων. [ὁ δ' ἐφώ]  

6 νεὶ ὁ ἔχον ὃτα τ[ῶν ἁ]  

περάντων [ἀ]κο[ύει]ν α  

8 κοινέω κα[ὶ] τοῖς ἐγρη  

γοροῦσιν [ἐγ]ὼ λαλῶ. ἐτ  

10 προ[σθει]ς ἔ]πεν· πᾶν  

tὸ γε[νύμε]νον ἀπό  

12 τῆς [φθορᾶς] ἀπογει  

νετ[α] ὁς ἀπ]δφθορᾶς  

14 γεγ[ονός· τὸ] δὲ γε[ν]νό

Line 1, Att restores [οῦ δὲ εἰς]. For restoration here of movable ν, see BDF sec. 20.  

Line 2, Att restores ἐμφανεῖς[ουτοὶ ἦ]. For the position of the negative, relative of the verb, see BDF sec. 433. ἦ is incorrect as the augment of the pluperfect in this case.  

Line 4, τε may be a mistake for δὲ. Att restores [ἣν ἑντός]. The use of the imperfect contrasts with the Coptic of SJC. Regarding ἑντός, Crum cites no instance where the Coptic par. ὁντε, translates ἑντός. As Att himself notes, ὁντε is commonly used to translate μεταξύ.  

Line 5, γ: so also Att. H brackets it. The top of the left stroke is visible. Att restored [ὁ δὲ φω]νεῖ. However, since the Coptic calls for an imperfect tense, he has in correspondence suggested the restoration adopted here. H restored τυγχάνει at the suggestion of Swete.  

Lines 6-8, ὁ . . . ἀκούετω: SJC–III has the exact par. (97,20-22) in contrast to BG.  

Line 6, Both H and Att bracket the first τ. However, the photo shows the tip of the right end of the crossbar.  

Line 8, Both H and Att show the second τ as certain. However all that remains is 1 mm. of the right portion of a horizontal line, which would be compatible also with π. Att is undoubtedly correct that ε should be read rather than α (H) before γη, although the traces are not as clear-cut as he indicates.  

Line 9, γης: Att considers all as certain. H correctly places a dot under σ. Only a trace of the bottom of the υ remains. Only a bit of the left side of the curve of the o remains, which would be compatible also with ε or σ. Of the σ only the top and bottom ends of the curve remain, which would be compatible also with ε.  

Line 10, προ[σθει]ς: restored by W.
μεν[ον ἀπὸ] ἀφ[θ]αρ
16 σίς[ς [οὐκ ἀπὸ] γείν[εταὶ]
18 τὸν ῥῶς ἀπὸ ὀ[θ][φ]θ[αρ]
20 [ὑος] τῶν ἄν[θρο[πο[ν]
 ἔπλανήθ[η]σασ[ν καὶ]
22 μὴ εἰδότ[ες τῆς διώ
φ[θ]ο[ν] τα[ύτην ἀπέ]
24 θ[ανον]. [λέγει δὲ αὐτῷ]

Horizontal
[Μαριμὸ ὅτι] κε πῶς οὐν

Fibers
26 [ταῦτα γίνεσκομεν; λέγει[ι]
[ὁ τέλειος σ]οτήρ· διέλθε
28 [τε ἀπὸ τῶν] ἀφανῶν κα[ἰ]
[eἰς τῷ] τέ[λ][λο]ς τῶν φαινο

Line 16, Att inadvertently omitted the bracketing of the last four letters (acknowledged in correspondence).

Line 19, Last half of line: [.] τ[ίς] (H followed by T–S); [.] π[ληθό] (Att). τ seems more likely than π since the portion of the crossbar to the left of the vertical (all that can be seen) is longer than the crossbars of most of the π's in the ms. Both H and Att accepted the placement of the two fragments involved, relative to each other. When they are further separated by 3 or 4 mm. (see introductory discussion), then it becomes possible to make the restoration preferred by Att and incorporated above. It also makes unnecessary Att's unlikely word division.

Line 20, Initial lacuna: H (followed by T–S) restores only two letters (δέ). Att rightly finds room for three (ζ δέ).

Line 21, π: considered certain by H and Att, but all that remains is 1 mm. of the bottom of the left leg. It would be compatible also with τ, κ, ν etc.

Line 22, μ: considered certain by H and Att, but much of it has been lost to holes and flaking, and what remains is only a bit of the beginning and end and a small part of the center.

Lines 22–24, μὴ . . . [ἀνέθ]ανον: Restorations made by T–S.

Line 23, ψ: considered certain by H and Att, but remaining traces would be compatible also with η.

Line 24, An historical present is restored because of λέγει in line 26 (so too Att), but note the aorist in line 10.

Line 26, γν[ώςκομεν: late form (see BDF: sec. 34 [4]). T–S and Att restore γν[ώςκομεν (Att omits the dot). All that remains of the ω is a 2 mm. vertical portion of its right side, which made it possible for H to reconstruct τ.

ε: considered certain by H and Att, but only a portion of the curve remains and there is no sign of the horizontal strokes. An ο or σ could also be read.

Line 28, ἀπό: ἐκ (Att); διά (T–S). For ἀπό rather than ἐκ, see BDF: sec. 209. Regarding διά, Crum cites no instance of the Coptic ΧΙΝ (III 98,13; BG 90,5) being used to translate it (773a).
30 [μέ]νων καὶ συνῇ ἡ ἀπό[ρ]
ροια τῇ [ς] ἐννοίας ἀνα
32 δεῖξει ύ[μ]ίν πῶς ἡ πίστ[ις]
—τῶν [ά]δή[λ]ων—
εῦρ[ε]ς[α] τῇ φαινόμε
ὁ ἔχων ὄ[ν] ἀκο[ύ]ειν ἀ
36 κο[πε]το[ς]. [ὁ τῶν ὁλ.]ων δὲ
σπότης ο[ὗ κοιλίτα]ι πρὸ ἀλ
38 λά προπά[τω ρό γάρ] πρό [άρ]

Line 29, Att brackets the first o, but a bit of the bottom of the letter is visible. H restores [ε]ςς το (incorrectly reported by Att), which leaves too much unfilled space in the lacuna, as H admits. T-S suggests, as an alternative to H, εςς το [λος]ς (incorrectly reported by Att).

Line 30, W, T-S and Att incorrectly accent συνή as a demonstrative. H, W, and Att do not restore p at the end of the line, perhaps because of concern that the letter would have been beyond the margin established by the scribe. But the vertical side shows the scribe exercising considerable freedom regarding the right margin, and there is thus no reason to think that he would not have done the same on the horizontal side when necessary. T-S restores p.

Line 32, Att inadvertently omitted the bracketing of the last two letters of the line (confirmed in correspondence).

Words between dashes are in the left margin of the MS. As to whether any letters preceded τῶν, H says it is not certain, "but there is a speck of ink over the ω, and the margin above is imperfect." Att claims to see more than H and on that basis reconstructs [ή] ἔκ. But a close examination of the photos suggests that the ink traces Att describes are mostly shadows seen through tiny holes in the papyrus—holes resulting in part from the flaking off of the vertical layer of papyrus on the opposite side of the leaf. The few genuine ink specks may have been either random drops from the scribe's pen, or the remains of a sign indicating an insertion, or the remains of the fem. article relating the phrase attributively to ἡ πίστις, or blotting from the opposite page.

Line 33, τῇ φαινόμενη, "through that which appears": Att suggests the reference is to ἡ ἀπόρροια, "the emanation," but that would yield doubtful sense in the context. A more likely reference is τρενέα ἐτε μὴ μηττρο πιγκ εβολ, "the Generation over Whom There Is No Kingdom" (III 99,18--20), i.e., the community of those who belong to Unbegotten Father (III 99,22--100,2).

Line 34, τ, so also Att, but H reconstructs κ. All that remains is 3 mm. of the right side of the crossbar, but it is angled up about 20 degrees, unlike any other τ found in the MS. As Att notes, the presence of the Greek loanword in both versions of SJC seems to resolve the uncertainty of the trace. The scribe may have been forced by an imperfection in the papyrus to make the top of his vertical stroke lower than usual, and then the crossbar was used to reestablish the former line level. T-S reconstructs κ[έν][ή]τον (omitting a dot under the τ).

Line 35, ε: so also H, but considered certain by Att. All that remains is the right tip of the horizontal stroke.

Line 36, ο: considered certain by H and Att. but all that remains is the right curve, which would be compatible also with ο.

ε: considered certain by H and Att, but only 2 mm. of the horizontal stroke remains.
χὴ ἑ[σ]τὶν τὸν μὲλλόν
40 τῶν [φαίνεσθαι] ἐκείνο[ς]
[δὲ ὁ ἄνωρχος πρὸ πάτω[ρ].]
42 [εἰσορο[ῦ]ν σύν[ὺ]ν [ἐ]ν ἐμα[ῦ]
[ἐσόπτρῳ ὁμ[ὸ] [οῖος] ἑαυτῷ
[τῷ ὁμ[ῷ] [ιω] μὰ ἁν[εφάνη ὠς]
46 [προτάτ[ω]ρ θη[π] [π] θ[α]]
48 [τῷ προ[σώ]ν] το ἔγεννητ[φ]]
[πρὸ. ἰσόχρονον]ς μὲν τὸ[ῦ

Line 38, Att inadvertently omitted the bracketing of the last two letters of the line.

Line 39, ψ: considered certain by H and Att, but only the left stroke is visible. It would be compatible also with τ.

Lines 40–41, ψ: considered certain by H and Att, but all that is visible is the top 2 mm. of the left stroke.

Att restores δὲ at the end of line 40 rather than in line 41, and omits the article in line 41. The result is that line 40 is longer in his reconstruction than one would expect, while line 41 is shorter.

Line 43, Att has εἰσοπτρῷ, but εσόπτρῳ is the more common form. Att restores ἐ[στὶ], but remains of both α and υ are clear in the photo.

Line 45, Att restores ἀ[υ]μ[α]το [ἄν[αφαίνει]. Although he makes no attempt to restore the words, H records ω after the first lacuna, and υ immediately after the second. What remains of the letter after the first lacuna is about of a circle, with the opening where one would expect if it were the right half of an ω. But the curve is rounder than with most of the ω's in the text and more resembles that of an o. In addition, there are signs in the photo of flaking where the remainder of the circle would have been if the letter were an o.

As to what appears after the second lacuna, Att thinks he sees not the beginning of a μ but the tail of an α (although he does not dot the α in his transcription). But α’s in this text mostly have the long stroke steeply angled to the end of the tail, whereas the remnant is horizontal. It is certainly not the beginning of a μ, but is, in all likelihood, the end of one. The space between μ and α is 2 mm. and does not offer room for the τ proposed by Att. The vertical line he describes is very uncertain, and there is no sign of a crossbar, which would be expected. The reconstruction offered above agrees in number with the Coptic.

Att’s reconstruction of the present active form of ἀναφαίνειν disagrees with the Coptic, which calls for an aorist and in BG, probably a middle (see BG 91,8n.). The reconstruction adopted above, although passive in form, is understood as a middle (see Smyth: sec. 814), and is compatible with the Coptic perfect without a reflexive pronoun in SJC–III.

Line 46, ω: so also H, but considered certain by Att. All that remains is about 1 mm. of the middle section of the curve on the right side. It would be compatible also with ω, θ, and φ.

Att brackets κ, overlooking the remains of the foot of the right leg, which had been seen by H. Att places ὁμ, from ἀντωπο[δ], at the end of the line.

Line 47, ἀντ[ωνιπ[τε]: Att restores ἀντ[ωνιπ[τε]. Remains of the mid-portion of τ are clear. A Greek imperfect middle is called for (see III 75,8).

Line 48, Att puts the article in the preceding line, making his reconstruction of the first
[φοίνικας πρὸ ἀυτῷ]τῷ φωτός]

TRANSLATION

[to those] that came to be afterward. But they had not yet come

Now there is a great difference

[among]

the imperishables.” [Then he called out,]

“Whoever has ears [to]

[hear] about the infinities,

let him hear. And I speak to those who are awake.” Still

[continuing] he said: “All that [comes] from

the [perishable] passes away,

[since] it [came] from the perishable.

But what comes

[from] imperishableness

[does not pass away]

but [remains] imperishable,

since it came from [imperishableness].

[So, many]

went astray, [and,]

not knowing

[this] difference, they died.”

...
[And Mary said to him:]

"Lord, how then do we know [that?]" The perfect Savior said:

"Come [from] invisible things even [to the end] of those that are visible,

and the very emanation of Thought will show [you] how faith—in the invisibles—must be found through that which appears of [Unbegotten] Father.

Whoever has ears to [hear], let

him hear. [The] ruler [of everything] [is not called] 'Father' but 'Forefather.' For [the] Father [is the beginning] [of those that are to appear; but] that one is [the beginningless] Forefather.

[Seeing] himself within himself [in a mirror], he [appears] [like] himself, [but his likeness] [appeared as]

[Forefather], Divine Father, [and] [Confronter], since [he] was confronting [First Existent] Unbegotten [Father]. [He is] indeed [of equal age] with the one [before him, who is light]