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This book has been long in the making. I had originally conceived it as a search for philosophical doctrines which helped to inform the cosmological model of the Apocryphon of John, one of the most coherent and comprehensive narrations of the classic ‘Gnostic’ myth. The principal aim of the study was to assess the impact of Plato’s Timaeus on the Apocryphon’s thematics, composition, and style. From the outset I was conscious of the danger of disregarding other constitutive elements of the Apocryphon: the Mosaic account of creation in Genesis, Jewish Wisdom tradition, Hellenistic philosophy, magic, science, and, last but not least, the Johannine Gospel. Yet it took a while before I realized that, in order properly to assess the status and function of philosophy in the cosmological section of the Apocryphon, I needed to take into account the other voices and explain the interplay of all these discursive domains. The consequences of this methodological shift were already visible in my Yale doctoral dissertation, and I can only hope that this thoroughly rewritten version will make them even more transparent.

This monograph still argues that the Timaeus is the key text for understanding the ‘poetics’ of the ‘Gnostic’ universe. Plato’s account of cosmogony provided the author of the Apocryphon of John with the appropriate interpretive frame for his revisionist explanation of the Mosaic story of creation; with the narrative template for his orderly exposition of cosmogony; and with the best representational schema to account for his basic presuppositions, such as the distinction between essence and appearance, original and copy, idea and image, image and apparition. At the same time, however, the universe that emerges from the Apocryphon’s narrative is more complex and more dynamic than Plato’s. Platonic forms are no longer endowed with objective existence, but are relegated to the divine subjectivity; the structure of the universe is not only more elaborate and hierarchical, but is also pervaded with an immanent principle of eternal coherence; and finally, Plato’s celebrated distinction between forms, copies, and deceptive apparitions seems obliterated in favor of the ‘Deleuzian’ duality of the original model and its distant, illusory simulacrum. In short, Plato’s Timaeus appears here not only as a text to
read and scrutinize, but also as a phenomenon to rewrite. Such a subversive transformation is effected by the intercession of homologous ‘voices’ from all of the above listed discursive domains. The relationship established between these domains is not that of mechanical juxtaposition but of partial substitution. Modern scholars have characterized this hermeneutical technique as ‘intertextuality’, yet I continue to exploit its ancient name—reasoning by analogy, syllogismos or ratiocinatio legalis, one of the four legal issues (staseis) in Hellenistic rhetorical classification.

The book is thus not intended as a work of ‘Quellenforschung,’ but rather as an essay in ‘Gnostic’ poetics. In spite of some significant divergences in wording and content between the four manuscript witnesses, I have looked at the Apocryphon of John as a unitary literary creation, in which the anonymous author makes creative use of various philosophical systems, religious traditions and rhetorical techniques of argumentation in order to articulate his original worldview. This model—perhaps best represented as a multiple-tiered fountain flowing with water that spurs from the single source at the top—is indicative of the author’s imaginative mind and ‘mannerist’ mentality. Both in style and in content, there is a tendency to excess. The universe of the Apocryphon of John is an anamorphic construction of high complexity, with tiers multiplied almost praeter necessitatem—aemons, luminaries, archangels, angels, authorities, archons, demons, humans. Its language is equally complex and intrinsically obscure, reflecting the author’s inclination to accumulate seemingly unrelated symbolic codes and disconnected ideas. The reliance on such ‘mannerist’ procedures discloses the strong conviction that truth must remain hidden from vulgar cobblers and, more importantly, that language can never adequately fill the inexpressible void of the spiritual plane.

My adjustment to the Apocryphon’s polyphony would have taken longer than it did without the timely intervention of many people. My interest in Gnosticism I owe first and foremost to my ‘Doktorvater’ from Yale’s Department of Religious Studies, Bentley Layton, my first instructor of Coptic, who introduced me to the field of Gnostic studies and allowed me to use his unpublished synopsis of the Apocryphon’s manuscripts. His critical remarks and analytical acumen have saved me from many mistakes, both in translation and in interpretation of the obscure passages in the Apocryphon of John. He has also offered an invaluable help in the last stages of manuscript prepar-
ration—the sign of his continuous interest and unwavering faith in my project.

My equally profound gratitude goes to my other advisor, Gordon Williams, without whom this book would have hardly ever been written. This is not a rhetorical exaggeration, but a mere fact. I am afraid that the full depth of my indebtedness cannot be conveyed in words, that I will miss the point if I make use of any of the stock phrases with which grateful disciples address their mentors. After traveling with me for such a long time through the rarified world of ‘Gnostic’ abstractions, after reading countless versions of my work and offering many exciting insights, he will know how to interpret my hesitance to speak.

It is a great pleasure also to acknowledge the substantial scholarly assistance and friendly advice that I have received from Stephen Emmel, the editor of the series Nag Hammadi and Manichean Studies. I am deeply grateful for his interest in my manuscript, and for never losing faith in its eventual completion.

In recent months, I have benefited from an unrelenting support of my colleague and friend Armin Lange. He has helped me immensely to expedite my work on final revision and has never stopped reminding me that humans simply cannot afford the luxury of perfectionism.

I am greatly indebted to John Dillon, Bart Ehrman, Wayne Meeks, and John Turner, who have read large sections of the earlier versions of my work and provided many useful comments and important suggestions. I am particularly grateful to Michael Waldstein, the co-editor of a recently published synopsis of the extant manuscript witnesses of the Apocryphon of John, for sharing with me a draft of his forthcoming monograph on this important ‘Gnostic’ text.
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INTRODUCTION

The Apocryphon of John (Ap. John, or Apocryphon) provides one of the most coherent and comprehensive narrations of the revelatory account traditionally labeled as ‘Gnostic’. It is not preserved in Greek, the language in which it was originally written, but only in four Coptic manuscripts: in Nag Hammadi codex (NHC) II 1–32, NHC III 1–40, NHC IV 1–49, all copied sometime between about a.d. 350 and 450 and all simultaneously discovered in December 1945 in Upper Egypt, and in the codex Berolinensis Gnosticus (BG, P.Berol. inv. 8502) 19–77, a manuscript copied probably in the fifth century a.d. and acquired for the Berlin Museum in 1896 from the Achmim region in Upper Egypt. A fair number of unconscious scribal errors (e.g., saut du même au même, haplography) in the four witnesses leave no doubt that each was copied from a Coptic exemplar. The dialect of all four witnesses is Sahidic, with occasional features resembling Lycopolitan. Codices II and IV have a virtually identical text and are considered two witnesses of a separate redaction. This redaction yields material that is not found in codices III and BG and is therefore called the longer version. Codices III and BG contain two different copies of the shorter redaction. The divergences between these two copies are limited to orthography, grammar, and phraseology. The extent to which these divergences go back either to the variant readings in the Greek exemplar(s) or to developments within the Coptic transmission cannot be determined with certainty.

The author and place of composition of the Apocryphon of John are unknown. The work is a piece of pseudepigraphy, falsely attributed to John the son of Zebedee, one of Jesus’ original disciples. The terminus ante quem of the original Greek composition is sometime around a.d. 400, the time when the Nag Hammadi codices were copied. The terminus post quem cannot be established with certainty. A similar account of cosmogony can be found in the doctrine of “a multitude of Gnostics named after Barbelo,” as summarized by Irenaeus (Adv. haer. 1.29) in about a.d. 180. Irenaeus’s compressed version differs, both in phraseology and in theological details, from the cosmological sections in all of Apocryphon’s versions. Whether the heresiologist had at his disposal a different Greek version of the Apocryphon
of John or some other “Gnostic document which was the apparent source of the first part of the main revelation discourse” in *Ap. John* (Wisse-Waldstein 1995, 1), we do not know.¹

Significant divergences between the longer version and the shorter versions have elicited conflicting interpretations about the stages in the evolution of the *Apocryphon of John*. The most obvious difference is that the longer version contains a lengthy account of Adam’s ‘melothesia’, excerpted from a certain Book of Zoroaster, and the concluding ‘Pronoia hymn’, reminiscent of the first-person Wisdom monologues in biblical literature. Less obvious, yet equally important distinctive features of the longer version are the prominent role assigned to Pronoia and the extensive use of the light-darkness imagery. The editors of the first complete synopsis of the four manuscript witnesses claim that “there is no reason to believe that the redactor of the longer version started with anything other than the form of [*Ap. John*] preserved in codices III and BG” (ibid., 7). Common sense, however, has rarely been a reliable guide in such matters. The same holds true for the alleged “law of text-criticism, form-criticism and source-criticism that short forms tend to become longer” (Quispel 1966, 379). In the process of textual transmission of ancient texts, the evidence for addition and omission is evenly balanced, and length cannot in itself confirm or deny the priority of one version to another.²

¹ For a brief yet accurate description of the extant manuscript witnesses of the *Apocryphon of John* see Layton (1987) 26–27. The only published synopsis of the four manuscript witnesses, with “parallel” texts (e.g., Irenaeus) printed in appendices, is in Waldstein-Wisse 1995. For a description of the manuscript witnesses, orthography, and dialect cf. their “Introduction,” 1–8. The dialect and orthography of the other texts in NHC II is analyzed by Layton (1989) 1–36, significant for laying out the general principles of editing Nag Hammadi texts. Emmel (1978) collated old photographs of the Nag Hammadi codices containing the text of *Ap. John*. For the discovery and date of the Nag Hammadi Codices see Robinson (1978). An older edition with translation and commentary of the longer version in NHC II is by Giversen (1963), that of the shorter version in BG by Till-Schenke (1972). Interesting observations on *Berolinensis Gnosticus* can be found in Schenke (1990) and Tardieu-DuBois (1986). Funk (1995) provides the restoration of a few extant fragments from the first two leaves of NHC III. The best published commentary of *Ap. John* is Tardieu (1984).

² For the problem of editorial tendencies in the pre-canonical Synoptic tradition, see Sanders (1969). According to Royse (1979) 155, “The principle that the shorter reading is to be preferred ... is an inadequate guide to the earliest period of the transmission of the NT text.” The opposite rule, namely that the longer reading is better and earlier, and the process is one of contraction, not of expansion, was forcefully defended by Clark (1914). An authoritative survey of causes of textual
For example, the absence of the ‘Pronoia hymn’ from the shorter versions of the Apocryphon of John has often been considered an example of abridgment, based on a series of sound observations about the structure and style of the relevant passages in codices BG and III: viz., confusing shifts from one narrative point of view to another, redundancies, and, most important, the presence of the opening and closing words of the ‘Pronoia hymn’. Other general criteria for the later date of the longer version, such as a tendency to make the material more detailed, logically consistent, and stylistically clearer, can be countered by an equally common tendency on the part of ancient copyists to trivialize, to simplify, and to eliminate the unfamiliar idea, wording or construction. Perhaps the most promising criterion is that of a consistent pattern of alterations, as formulated by Wilson (1968, 110): “If there are grounds for thinking that one version has been consistently modified to bring it into conformity with a particular theory, then we also have reason for considering that version to be later.” The longer version of the Apocryphon of John shows a consistent tendency to increase the role of Pronoia in the cosmological and soteriological parts of the narrative. Similar consistent modifications do not seem to exist in the shorter versions of Apocryphon.
However one defines the relationship between the different versions of the *Apocryphon of John*, it is clear that they all result from a textual activity that the ancient writers referred to as διασκευή, a revision involving modification in details. Galen, *In Hipp. De victu actorum* (CMG V 9.1, p. 120.5–14), defines διασκευή as the editorial labor in which the author, his pupil, or some later redactor introduce minor changes into a text while keeping intact its ὑπόθεσις (‘subject’, ‘theme’, or ‘content’) and “most of its wording.”

It is the search for this unchangeable aspect of the *Apocryphon of John*, its minimal ὑπόθεσις and its poetics that constitutes the heart of this study. In the ensuing sections, the emphasis is on analyzing the stable elements that remain unaffected in the process of textual transmission. These elements include: projection of different perspectives on tiers of narrative material; a fairy-tale structure of the plot; a considerable complexity of the world model based on two seemingly incompatible schemas of representations, *viz.*, formism and organicism; hypotactic arrangement of compatible cultural traditions; consistent application of analogy (*ratiocinatio legalis*) as the guiding hermeneutical principle; and the metaphorical fusion of seemingly unrelated domains—philosophical, religious, and biological—resulting in the characteristic loftiness of the *Apocryphon of John* and the enigmatic obscurity of its jargon. Viewed from this theoretical perspective, the aforementioned expansions in the longer version bear witness to the

---

5 Galen’s passage seems worth quoting in full. The Greek at CMG V 9.1, p. 120, 5–14 (cf. also XV 424, 5 K) is as follows: ἐπιδιασκευάσθαι λέγεται βιβλίων ἐπὶ τῷ προτέρῳ γεγραμμένῳ τῷ δεύτερῳ γραφέντι, ὅταν τὴν ὑπόθεσιν ἔχον τὴν αὐτὴν καὶ τὰς πλείστας τῶν ῥήσεως τὰς αὐτὰς, τινὰ μὲν αφηρημένα τῶν ἐκ τοῦ προτέρου συγγράμματος ἔχει, τινὰ δὲ προσκείμενα, τινὰ δὲ υπηλαξάμενα. The examples of διασκευή adduced by Galen are Eupolis’s *Autolycus*, *Cnidian Sentences*, and the *Hippocratic Acute Diseases*. διασκευή is to be carefully distinguished from διατάξις (rearrangement) and διορθώσις (emendation), on which see, e.g., Porphyry, *V. Plot.* 24.1–3, and Mansfeld (1994) 108–16.
integrative aspect of the Apocryphon of John—its tendency to assimilate compatible elements from various cultural traditions and present them as coordinate cases of the same universal message of salvation.

The Apocryphon of John is commonly regarded as an example of ‘Sethian’ Gnosticism, characterized by a distinct type of cosmography, a focus on Seth, the son of Adam, as a divine revealer and redeemer, an apocalyptic view of history, specific imagery, and a distinct cast of characters. Thirteen other texts from the Nag Hammadi corpus (Apocryphon of John, Hypostasis of the Archons, Gospel of the Egyptians, Apocalypse of Adam, Melchizedek, Thought of Norea, Thunder—Perfect Mind, Trimorphic Protennoia, Zostrianus, Allogenes, Three Steles of Seth, Marsanes) and the untitled text in the Bruce Codex are included under this heading. In this monograph I have tried to avoid this label, primarily because, in matters of doctrine, the Apocryphon of John sometimes stands closer to the texts not included in the list (Exegesis on the Soul, On the Origin of the World, various Valentinian cosmologies) than to those identified as distinctively ‘Sethian’ (Allogenes, Zostrianos).6

My analysis of the Apocryphon of John and my translation of individual sections from different redactions are based on the unpublished synopsis of the four extant manuscripts that Bentley Layton constructed “from collation of photographic facsimiles and from Till-Schenke’s critical edition of the Berlin manuscript” (Layton 1987, 26). When translating defective passages, I have regularly consulted the facsimile editions of Nag Hammadi manuscripts, the photographs of Berolinensis Gnosticus, and Stephen Emmel’s collation of the photographic record of the Nag Hammadi codices. My readings of defective passages in the manuscript witnesses of the Apocryphon of John are therefore purely conjectural. I have also made occasional use of the published synoptic edition by Michael Waldstein and Frederik Wisse (Waldstein-Wisse 1995).

---

CHAPTER ONE

NARRATIVE AND COMPOSITION

The Frame Narrative: Authorship and Narrative Voices

In the extant manuscript witnesses of the *Apocryphon*, the title is placed in the colophon, as a conclusion to the text: the *Apocryphon of John*, in the shorter versions (BG and NHC III), and *Apocryphon according to John*, in the colophon of the two copies of the longer redaction (NHC II and IV). The departure from what appears to be a common practice among the copyists of Nag Hammadi codices occurred in NHC III, where the title occurs also in the beginning, and in NHC II, where an attempt has been made to clarify the meaning of the word ‘apocryphon’.

The teaching [of the savior and] the [revelation] of the mysteries [which] are hidden in silence [and which] he taught to John, [his] disciple. (NHC II 1:1–6)

The term *apocryphon* signifies here “that which is hidden” or “concealed”—some intimate secret shared only by the chosen few. Secrecy (“mysteries...hidden in silence”) and exclusiveness ([John as a single privileged recipient]) stand, however, in clear contrast to the familiarity of the dramatis personae, John and the Savior, and point to the revisionary character of the *Apocryphon of John*—to its dependence on the Gospel tradition which is, at the same time, viewed as incomplete, unsatisfactory, and therefore subject to revision. Thus, from its very beginning, the text exploits what the early Christian heresiologists viewed as a typical ‘Gnostic’ dichotomy. On the one

---

1 On the range of meanings covered by the term ‘apocryphon’ and on the history of its usage in late antiquity and Middle Ages, see, e.g., Böttrich (1992) 58 ff., Hennecke-Schneemelcher (1968), and Santos Otero (1996).
hand, there are exoteric teachings—viz., sayings, parables, and miracles—of the earthly Jesus, such as are preserved in the Gospels, transitory images of some higher, hidden truth, conferred but never explained to the masses. On the other hand, there are esoteric, ‘apocryphal’ traditions, elucidating the figurative language of Scripture, revealed to some privileged few by the resurrected Savior, Christus redivivus.

For, even those who promulgate the contrary opinions about the Father assert that Scripture said nothing about their conceptions clearly and indisputably; they say that the Savior taught this not to all people, but only to some among the disciples who were able to grasp it (dicentes in absconso haec eadem Salvatorem docuisse non omnes, sed aliquos discipulorum qui possunt capere), understanding what was signified by him [i.e. by Jesus in the Gospels] through signs, riddles, and parables. (Iren. Adv. haer. 2.27.2)

Similar passages from the ‘Gnostic’ literature, both from original works and from second-hand heresiological summaries, amount to an extensive dossier—bearing witness to the distinctively ‘Gnostic’ flavor of the opening lines of the Apocryphon and to their utterly conventional character. The savior as a heavenly messenger, the secrecy of his paradosis, the small number of privileged recipients (apostles or other companions of Jesus), the inspiration drawn from the Gospels and, simultaneously, revisionary emulation with the scriptural tradition, are commonplaces exploited, among many others, by the Gospel of Mary and the Wisdom of Jesus Christ (both in BG), by the Ophites and Basilides. The purpose of these commonplaces is always the same—to lend authority to the ‘Gnostic’ paradosis and to surround it with the aura of novelty and exclusiveness. The same, too, seems to be their ultimate source. It is in the Gospels, more precisely in Luke (24:13–53), that the pattern was clearly established: Christ appearing to some from among his followers (to the unidentified

---

2 Cf. Clem. Al. Exc. Theod. 66: “The Savior taught the apostles, first in a figurative and mystical way (τοσικαὶ καὶ μυστικαὶ), then in parables and riddles (παραβολικαὶ καὶ Ἓνγιμέναι), and thirdly, clearly and directly in private (σαφῶς καὶ γνωμῶς κατὰ μόνας).” See also Quaest. Barth. 1.1–2: “After the resurrection from the dead of our Lord Jesus Christ, Bartholomew came to the Lord and questioned him, saying, ‘[Lord,] reveal to me the mysteries of the heavens’. And Jesus replied saying to him, ‘If I put <not> off the body of the flesh, I shall not be able to tell them to you.’” The best discussion of various Gnostic speculations concerning the career of Christus redivivus is Orbe (1976) 2:489–534 and (1987) 2:851–81.
“two” on the first occasion, then to the same two and “the eleven assembled together with their companions”), in the interim period between resurrection and ascension, “explaining (διεξήγησεν) to them the passages throughout the scriptures that were about himself, starting with Moses and going through all the prophets” (24:27), and “opening their minds to understand the scriptures” (διήνοιξαν αὐτῶν τὸν νοῦν τοῦ συνιέναι τὰς γραφὰς 24:25).³

The text begins in a way reminiscent of a folktale’s “Once upon a time” opening, implying the distance in time between the events narrated and the composition of the text. The action, however, is not set in a dim mythological past but, more likely, in view of the previous discussion about the conventional form of the Gnostic paradosis, in the period between Christ’s resurrection and ascension. John’s reply to the Pharisee’s provocative question about the Savior’s fate—“Where he came from, there he has returned”—is not of great help for determining the prologue’s tempus agendi. The event is unlikely to have occurred after the Savior’s return to his Father, that is, after his ascension. This would run, first, not only against the common ‘Gnostic’ practice and the precedent set up by the Gospel narrative (Luke), but also against the ‘Gnostic’ trichotomy of the Savior’s essential components or “bodies”—(i) worldly body (κοσμικῶν, mundiale), made of flesh and blood, which does not arise; (ii) animate (ψυχικῶν, animale), which still bears the imprint (τύπος, eidolon) of the Savior’s human form, and in which the Savior appeared to his followers upon his resurrection; and (iii) spiritual (πνευματικῶν, spiritale), which, after

³ The dossier is available in Orbe (1976) 2:518–21—comprehensive, but not complete. An often quoted testimony is that of Hippolytus on Basilides and his son Isidorus, who “claim that Matthew has related to them the secret sayings (λόγως ἰποκρύφως) he had heard from the Savior in the form a private instruction (διδασκαλία κατ’ ιδίον).” The Ophites, on their part, provided the “historical” background for their paradosis and set up the conditions necessary for receiving the Savior’s revelations: “After his resurrection, Jesus remained there for an additional eighteen months and, as the capacity of perception descended into him (sensibilitate in eum descendente), learned what is true (quod liquidum est) and taught it to the few from among his disciples (paucos ex discipulis suis), whom he considered capable of such great mysteries (capaces tantorum mysteriorum)” (Iren. Adv. haer. I.30,14). Sensibilitas which, according to the Ophites, entered Jesus upon his resurrection translates the Greek αἰσθησις—not sense-perception, but the capacity of perceiving spiritual reality, concealed from the earthly Jesus and mortal humans endowed with body and soul. For this term, see also Iren. 1.8.2 and Great Pow. NHC VI 36:1. For similar visions in the texts from Nag Hammadi Library see the list of relevant passages in Casadie (1992) 2:395–401; cf. also Filoramo (1974) 251–309.
its separation from the animate body, finally ascends to the Father (cf. Iren. 1.30.13). Second, the hypothesis confuses the point of view of an ‘omniscient’ author, the producer of the linguistic construction called the *Apocryphon of John*, with John’s perspective which, as his perplexity provoked by the Pharisee’s remarks clearly indicates, is at this point limited and, consequently, irrelevant for the ‘real’ dating of the frame story. To put it simply, John believes that his teacher ascended, but the token of his belief, the formulaic prophecy of Jesus to his disciples (*John* 7:33, 13:3, 16:5, 28), is soon proven insufficient to convince the Pharisee, let alone to prevent his own doubts and his growing distress. John does not know much about the Savior’s whereabouts after the resurrection. Hence, there arises the need, in John, for additional information, and his immediate request for a vision, construed in the form of the so-called ‘baptismal’ questions. Translated into historical terms, John’s request for vision may reflect the desire on the part of some readers of the Fourth Gospel to elucidate its obscure message and widen its limited perspective by writing a revisionary supplement—the *Apocryphon of John*.4

Back to the title, the second problem is that of the alleged authorship. Both the *incipit* and the *explicit* of the extant manuscripts attribute the text to John, the son of Zebedee. The ensuing frame story, however, complicates the meaning of this attribution by multiplying the points of view from which the action is narrated.

It happened on one of these days when John, the brother of James—these are the sons of Zebedee—came up. When he came up to the temple, a Pharisee named Arimanias encountered him and said to him, “Where is your teacher, the one whom you used to follow?” He said to him, “Where he came from, there he has returned.” The Pharisee said to him, “He has deceived you with deception, that Nazarene. [And he filled] your ears with lies. And he closed [your hearts?]. He turned you [away from] the traditions of your fathers.”

---

4 For the Fourth Gospel as the “closed system” of impenetrable metaphors lacking a comprehensive master narrative capable of explaining Jesus’ “empty revelation,” see Meeks (1972). The Jesus of the Fourth Gospel is the exclusive receiver and revealer of heavenly secrets—in contrast to the apocalyptic literature where the prophets and seers are able to receive otherworldly revelations by means of heavenly journeys—while his interlocutors are assigned the role of passive recipients asking maladroit questions. This role division is a trademark of the *erotapokriseis* genre, widespread in the Hellenistic and Roman ‘esoteric’ literature; cf. 4 Ezra 4:1–11, 20–21, and other examples listed by Meeks (1972) 53.
When I heard this, I turn[ed] away from the temple towards the mountain, into a desert place. And I was greatly distressed in myself saying, “How indeed was the savior chosen (χειροτονεῖν)? And why was he sent to the world by his father who sent him? And who is his father? And of what kind is that aeon (αἰὼν) to which we shall go? He said to us that this aeon is the type (τύπος) of that incorruptible aeon. And he did not instruct us on that one, of what kind it is.” (BG 19:6–20:19; cf. NHC II 1:5–29)

The events presented in the prologue to John’s vision are first narrated from without, from the viewpoint of an extradiegetic, impersonal narrator. After several lines, the focus changes in an abrupt fashion, and the action is viewed from the standpoint of the character in the story, i.e. John, and is told in the first person. What has been at first given as the romanticized biography of a respected authority of the past turns suddenly into an autobiographical account of a troubled person in search of a salvific vision. It is John whose point of view as the first person orients, for a short while, the presentation of events in which he himself takes part. But as soon as the vision occurs, the focus changes again, and John, from being the hero who tells his own story, becomes a witness telling the story of the real hero, viz. the Savior, whose long first-person monologue will be only occasionally interrupted by John the seer, his interlocutor. John’s status in the text is, thus, subject to continuous change—first the character in the story (i.e., He) told by an anonymous narrator; then, a first-person narrator (i.e., I) present as a character in the story; and finally, the addressee (i.e., You) of the revelatory message transmitted by another first-person narrator (i.e., I, the Savior).

In brief, John is, successively, the object of an extradiegetic narration, the narrator as protagonist, and the narrator as witness. But the concluding lines of all extant manuscripts charge him with yet another set of roles:

II 30:11–32:10 (IV 46:22–49:28)

Then I, the perfect forethought of the entirety,
I transformed myself into my seed
For, at first,
I existed traveling in every path of the travel.


Now, the blessed one, that is, the mother-father, whose mercy is great,
it is in her seed that she takes form.
At first
I have come up to that perfect aeon.  
And for my part, I say these to you (sg.), so that you (sg.) might write them down and give them secretly to your (sg.) spiritual fellows.  
For this is the mystery of the immovable race.

And he, i.e., the Savior, gave these to him so that he might write them down and keep them safe.  
And he said to him, Cursed be anyone who sells these for a gift, out of a desire for food, for drink, for clothing, or for anything else of this kind.

And these were given to him secretly (μυστήριον).  
And immediately, he vanished from before him.
And he came to his fellow disciples.
He related to them what the Savior had said to him.
Jesus Christ. Amen.
The Apocryphon according to John.

First, the Savior, an ego-narrator, issues the order to John, his interlocutor (“you”) and, simultaneously, an I as witness, to “write down” his teachings and “give them in secrecy” to John’s “spiritual companions.” The recapitulatory end of the paragraph (“For this is the mystery of the immovable race”) may seem, to a modern sensibility, a perfect conclusion not only to the Savior’s monologue but also to the text itself. Instead, the shift in focus occurs, and, as in the opening lines, an impersonal narrator intervenes, with the result that, once again, the events seem to narrate themselves. We are again in the realm of historical fiction, where John, after the Savior’s sudden departure, “came to his fellow disciples,” and “related to them (II 32:4–5; “told him,” IV 49:25; “began to tell them,” BG 77:2–3; “began to speak with them,” III 40:8) what the Savior had said to him.” As in the prologue, John’s status changes from one paragraph to another. First, he is the Savior’s solitary interlocutor commissioned to write down the revelatory message. Then he turns into a quasi-historical character passing on “things” to his companions by “relating”—it is not clear whether reciting from memory or reading aloud—the message he had received from the Savior.
In the longer version, the presence of the Pronoia-aretalogy has caused a delay in resuming the initial romance-like situation. Here, the shift to the extra-diegetic impersonal narration is effected abruptly, and is signaled by the change of grammatical persons (I-you vs. He-him) in two subsequent sentences of virtually identical content (II 31:28–29: “And for my part I have said all things to you so that you might write them down and give them secretly”; ibid., 31:32–33: “And he, i.e., the Savior, gave these to him so that he might write them down and keep them safe”). In the shorter versions, again, the Savior must first resume his first-person narration—hence the sentence “I shall teach you,” absent in the long redaction, and the decision to keep the Savior’s point of view where, in the longer version, the narration has already become impersonal. Notice, too, how the two shorter versions try to obtain the perfect circularity of the frame.

The absence of the Pronoia aretalogy in the two shorter versions (BG and NHC III) of Ap. John has elicited numerous comments and diverging hypotheses. Some scholars have considered it a later interpolation, some viewed it, again, as an essential part of the “original” document which the later redactor, responsible for the Vorlage of BG and NHC III, knew—in fact, he quoted its opening and concluding words (Tardieu 1984, 42)—but then, for some reason, “misunderstood and garbled” (Kragerud 1965). “Misunderstanding” is hardly a satisfactory explanation. Here, too, narratology may offer some useful suggestions. The hymn, presented in the longer version as an ego-proclamation, comes as a surprising finale of the Savior’s first-person narrative. It reveals the Savior’s full identity: he is, in fact, the modality of Barbelo–Pronoia, the first hypostasis emanated from the Father. The hymn, thus, redefines the status of the Savior as narrator. He is not an omniscient story-teller absent, as a character, from the action, but I as protagonist, the hero who recounts the history of his various epiphanies. Originally, the Savior is the first power (dynamis) of the Father, the first female principle, “a womb for the entirety,” and the cause of further processions, one that “makes a request” for more eons. Next, he is “the first human being”, a model according to which Ialdabaoth and his archons fashioned the “animate” Adam. Furthermore, he is a compassionate helper of the Gnostic race, its savior, trying to retrieve the power Ialdabaoth has stolen from Sophia, and, finally, the Holy Spirit that will restore the original perfection of the spiritual realm and annihilate Ialdabaoth’s world of illusory appearances. The shorter versions, on the other hand, fall short of identifying the two. They reject the ‘modalist’ view of the long redaction, in that they preserve the transcendence of Pronoia–Barbelo and keep her separate from the Savior—Christ. On the narrative plane, this is reflected (i) in the omission of all parts of the hymn that refer to Pronoia’s descent, and (ii) in preserving only those pieces which, with some textual adaptation—e.g., the change of grammatical subject (“I” in NHC II vs. “she” in BG) or verbal tense (“I,” i.e. Pronoia, “shall ascend” in NHC II, vs. “I,” i.e. the Savior, “have ascended” in BG)—confirm the distinct character and personality of Christ, the last in the long series of Pronoia’s agents.
They resume, in a reverse order, all changes in narrative focus that occurred in the opening sections, according to the principles of constructing a narrative with a frame. The initial sequence of narrators, viz., Impersonal Narrator—John—Savior, now moves in the opposite direction, from the Savior (“I shall teach you”) through John (“Then he said to me”) to the impersonal narrator (“He,” i.e., the Savior, “gave to him”; “He,” i.e., John, “began to say to them”). This does not happen in the long version, where John as a homodiegetic narrator (I as protagonist) is not reintroduced.6

Putting together both parts of the narrative frame (prologue and epilogue), we come to an impressive list of the roles John assumes in the Apocryphon of John. The changes in John’s narrative function are each time accompanied by the shift in the narrative perspective and by the alternation of genres. They signalize, too, the passage from one thematic block to another.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>John</th>
<th>Narrator</th>
<th>Genre</th>
<th>Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>character in the story</td>
<td>impersonal</td>
<td>romanticized biography</td>
<td>apocryphal history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>protagonist</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>autobiography</td>
<td>visionary account cosmology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>witness</td>
<td>Savior</td>
<td>revelatory monologue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interlocutor</td>
<td>Savior/John</td>
<td>catechetical dialogue</td>
<td>history of humankind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>character in the story</td>
<td>impersonal</td>
<td>romanticized biography</td>
<td>apocryphal history</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

6 The disagreement among the redactors over where to resume the impersonal narration shows that the change in the point of view (He-diegesis/I-narrative) is not a valid criterion either for subdividing the frame (cf. Kragerud 1965: “outer” frame story in the third person vs. “inner” frame in the first person) or for taking the shift in person as the marker of thematic division (i.e. lumping together John’s retreat to a desert place on the mountain with his subsequent visionary account and, consequently, separating the former from the introductory dialogue between the Pharisee and John), let alone as evidence for the secondary character of the third-person romanticized biography. More important than disagreement seems to me the fact that all redactors agreed upon the necessity of resuming the impersonal narration, irrespectively of when, and where, they actually did it. This is the sign, in my view, that the shift in focus was originally present in the Apocryphon, and not added to, or stitched together with, the originally autobiographical account at some later stage. And this seems to be the sign, too, of the author’s sophistication as a narrator—of his familiarity with the contemporary techniques of story-telling, such as are employed in ancient Greek romances (see infra).
How is one to account for *Apocryphon of John*’s polyphony, the multiplication of narrative levels, and the diversity of genres? The majority of modern scholars have taken all of these as evidence of the text’s composite character. Instead of an original author, they rather have talked about an original redactor who stitched together various, previously independent documents—not at once, though, but taking as his starting point a hypothetical *Grundschrift*, which would have been devoid of alternating voices (*I*-narrative, *He*-diegesis, *I–You* interlocution) and genre variety, focused on one or more particular themes (cosmology, anthropology, soteriology), and attributable to one particular religious tradition (Jewish according to many, Christian and/or Platonist according to very few, and even “Chaldaean” according to one scholar). Different levels of the text—genre and narrative technique, content, historical and social provenance—have been investigated in this type of *Quellenforschung*, but the essential presuppositions have never changed: for example, the diachronical perspective projected on tiers of the narrative material and the conviction that the *Apocryphon of John* is nothing but a mélange of other people’s ideas. What one is left with, in most instances of this kind of analytical approach, is either (i) a hypothetical core document, and, along with it, additional source material hypothetically integrated in the *Grundschrift* at some later stage; or (ii) a number of independent shorter units to which other material was added. While this sort of archeological search for sources, cultural stimuli, and intellectual borrowings may be revealing, it tends to remove from view a more important question of what the *Apocryphon of John* was intending to convey in its own right. Furthermore, such a search shows little respect for the unity of a literary creation, let alone for the ancient view of the literary text as a unified living being. As Philo of Alexandria says in a warning issued to the ‘calumniators’ of the Jewish scripture,

---

7 Tardieu (1984), for example, proposes a Chaldaean apocalypse as the base to *Ap. John*.
<But such people are like> those who judge and evaluate the whole by only one part, and not, on the contrary, the part by the whole. . . . The Legislation is, therefore, in some sense a unified living being (ζῷον ἐνόμισμον), which one should view as a whole in all of its entirety (ὅλην διὸ ὅλων) with open eyes, and examine all round the intention of the entire scripture (τὸ βούλημα τῆς συμπάθεις γραφῆς) with a far-seeing precision, not cutting up its harmony or dissecting its unity (μὴ κατακόπτοντας τὴν ἀρμονίαν μηδὲ τὴν ἔνωσιν διαρτώντας). For things deprived of their communion will appear to be of a different form and kind (ἐτερό μορφο γὰρ καὶ ἐτεροειδῆ φανεῖται τῆς κοινωνίας στερούμενα).” (Philo, QG 3.3 Petit)

Just like Galen’s previously quoted account of διασκευὴ, Philo’s warning is an important testimony to the common literary culture, shared by pagan literati as well as by Hellenized Jews, within which the Apocryphon of John was likely to originate. In this culture, a literary creation had the status of a ‘living creature’ (ζῷον) endowed with distinctive traits: e.g., subject (hypothesis), plot, narrative structure, and a distinct worldview. Like any organism, a literary work was considered prone to illnesses and injuries (errors, logical and narrative gaps, inadvertent omissions), but, as long as its integrity as a whole was never questioned, capable of surviving them all. Like any other organism, a literary text was also expected to undergo the phases of growing (redactional expansions) and shrinking (redactional abridgments). But take any of its vital parts (e.g., large thematic units, narrative structure), and it would never be what it used to be before. Once separated from one another, the parts of a previous whole, membra disiecta (source documents, Grundschrift, etc.) would turn to be “of a different kind” and “of a different form.” Putting these members together, combining bits and pieces, will not disclose much about the functioning of the previous whole because the original cohesion, a life-giving element (authorial intention), has been lost forever in dismemberment. Collectio membrorum does not restore Pentheus to life—just as the sources alone do not make up the Apocryphon of John.9

9 The image of a discourse as a living being is, of course, Platonic (Phaedr. 246c2–6). For its pre-Platonic sources (esp. Democritus’s analogy of elements with letters) see Brague (1985) 53–83, esp. 58–59. For the later elaborations of the analogy between λόγος and ζῷον or κόσμος cf. Hadot (1987) 121–28. The second analogy is particularly emphasized in the Anonymous Prolegomena to Platonic Philosophy, 15, 13–16 Westerink. The demiurgic character of the production of a discourse, and consequently of the universe, strongly emphasized by Plato and his followers, was rejected by Plotinus. According to Hadot (1987) 126, one of the reasons for this break with Plato’s tradition was Plotinus’s opposition to the Gnostic theory of a
Back to the frame story, even the most cautious critics, those who refrained from dissecting *Apocryphon*’s ‘living body’, have been mostly in unison about its secondary character. The reasons adduced are, first, the recurrence of distinctively Christian features and references, conspicuously absent, so it was believed, from the rest of the *Apocryphon*; and, second, a sudden shift in the point of view from which the story is narrated (the *he diegesis* followed by the *I-narrative*), the sign of an inadequate harmonization, on the part of the Gnostic ‘editor’, of the core text with its new frame. As one critic put it a while ago, “Already at the first glance, one can easily determine that the Christ-form or the Christian *Gedankengut* surfaces mainly in the frame narrative, but very seldom in the actual secret teaching” (Arai 1968–1969, 303). Or, as another critic has more recently expressed it, “The apocalyptic frame . . . is part of a ‘Christianizing’ of the text’s core material,” allegedly of Jewish provenience, and later designated as “the originally non-Christian Ur-text” (Pearson 1993). Again, there is a great deal of confusion here involving both terminology and the real object of investigation—for example, the problem of what exactly makes a ‘Gedankengut’ distinctively Christian. When Christ, according to Luke, appeared to his disciples, in the revelation that seems to have served as the model for the Gnostic type of paradosis, he simply “interpreted the passages throughout the scriptures that were about himself, starting with Moses and going through all the prophets” (Luke 24:27). In other words, the resurrected Christ explained to his followers the significant prefigurative passages from the Jewish scripture. Christ’s hermeneutical strategy, as described in Luke, is therefore not much different from the Savior’s exegesis of *Genesis* and *Wisdom* literature in the ‘core document’, or ‘Ur-text’, of the *Apocryphon of John*.

In light of all that has been said above, I may now propose another hypothesis about the status, function, and meaning of the frame narrative in the *Apocryphon of John*.

(i) An attitude similar to Philo’s view of discourse as an organized whole characterizes the redactorial work on the *Apocryphon of John*. sequential production, which he considered a misinterpretation of the *Timaeus’s passage* (*Tim. 39e*; cf. Plot. *Enn. II 9.6.14–28). For the whole problem, see in particular O’Meara (1980) 1: 365–78. Finally, for Philo’s holistic approach to the Bible, a distant model for the modern structuralist exegesis of the Biblical text, see Cazeaux (1988) 67–109.
There are changes in style, in theological detail, in the length of particular sections, from one version to another, but never to the point of compromising the stability of the text—that is, a literary work recognizable by its specific set of themes, its particular subject and scope, and the hypotactic organization of its narrative. The frame of the Apocryphon is one of these stable elements that mark it as identifiable whole.

(ii) Instead of discarding the frame as a later addition or explaining it as a generic device that unifies its source materials, I see it as a programmatic statement on the part of the anonymous Gnostic author—as the statement of intention (a complementary account to the Gospel of John), of self-determination (John vs. Pharisee), and of a literary affiliation (pseudo-historical romance, autobiographical account, Offenbarungsliteratur).

(iii) As for the employment of different narrative techniques in the frame, I attribute the recurring changes in the point of view not to poor harmonization, but to a complex narrative strategy intended to create, on the one hand, the sense of an objective distance from the narrated events and, on the other, the illusion of identification with John, the model visionary. At first, the events narrate themselves, without the slightest intrusion of a subjective standpoint. Such a depersonalized narration lends to the whole Apocryphon’s account an aura of ‘historical’ authenticity. The narrative focus moves, then, progressively closer to the individuality of the protagonists—first to John, who takes command of diegesis, and with whom, as a model hero, the reader (or listener) is expected to identify. By assuming John’s point of view, the reader (or listener) becomes himself the recipient of the Savior’s message. A final shift, this time to the Savior as the first-person narrator, increases the persuasiveness of his secret message, and creates a sense of intimacy in the reader (or listener).

(iv) The presence of two first-person narrators (John and the Savior) in the frame, and the abrupt transition from one I-narrator to the other, creates uncertainties about the exact separation between the outer and inner frame, as well as between the frame and the inner narratives, giving a confusing impression of their mutual overspilling. The net result is the fusion of the two first-person voices, so that one becomes the double of the other. In this complex play of mirrors, the Savior’s first-person revelatory
account reflects itself as John’s personal autobiography. Two separate planes (divine and human) and two irreconcilable perspectives (universal and individual) are thus bound together in a single “I,” following the rhetorical procedure typical for the discourse of mystic experience.\footnote{For the appropriation of scriptural verses as first-person utterances among the early Christian mystics, cf. Harl (1977) 23–25; for a more theoretical approach to the role of “I” in mystic traditions see, of course, Certeau (1982).} The multiplication of the narrative voices within the frame creates only an apparent discontinuity. What remains the same from one level to another is that single “I” within which the divine author and the human narrator speak the same message of salvation.

This complex narrative strategy may indeed seem much too sophisticated for ancient techniques of story-telling. But similar narrative techniques can be found in ancient romances, not only in modern fiction,\footnote{4 Ezra, which shows many literary parallels with Ap. John, particularly in the organization of the frame-narrative and the selection of motifs therein, does not seem to have such a complex nesting of narrative perspectives. For 4 Ezra, cf., e.g., Metzger (1983), Klijn (1992), and Stone (1990); for 4 Ezra and Ap. John see Frankfurter (1996) 159–61.} and there seems to be no good reason why the author of Apocryphon should be denied the knowledge of what the ancient novelists regarded already as a genre convention. There is, for example, a close parallel with the narrative situation of Apocryphon in the opening paragraphs of Achilles Tatius’s Leucippe and Clitophon. The romance also has two first-person narrators: the ‘author’ himself, in a short introduction, and Clitophon, a hero—protagonist, in the rest of the account. But these are not the only voices in the romance, as some modern scholars believed (Hägg 1971, Fusillo 1989). The introductory scene opens in the following way:

Sidon is a coastal city. The sea is Assyrian. The city is the Phoenicians’ ‘mother-city’, and its people are the ‘father’ of the Thebans. There is a double harbor in the bay, wide within but with a narrow entrance so as to land-lock the sea by a gentle curve. Where the bay makes an inward turn toward the right, a second inlet has been channeled out for the water to run in. Thus there is formed a further harbor behind the first, so that in winter the ships can lie safely there, while in summer they can stay in the outer port toward the gulf entrance. On arriving here after a severe storm, I made my thank-offerings for the safe arrival to the goddess of the Phoenicians—Astarte the people of Sidon call her. As I was thus walking about the city... (1.1.1–2)
A first-person narration by the ‘author’ comes after a short impersonal ecphrasis. A scrupulous reader should hardly fail to notice the distinction made between the first-person narrator who escaped from a sea-storm (the anonymous narrator or the ‘implied author’) and the impersonal omniscient narrator (the ‘real author’) busying himself with Sidon’s topographical details and hinting thereby at the distance between his tempus scribendi and the story’s tempus agendi. The sequence of narrators is, thus, the same as in the Apocryphon: ‘real author’—‘implied author’ (first I as protagonist, then I as witness)—Clitophon (I as protagonist). In contrast with Apocryphon, however, Achilles Tatius’s romance never resumes the initial point of view, neither the impersonal one nor that of the ‘implied author’—as though the ‘real author’ never had in mind to write a perfect frame story. Should one, then, infer from all this that the introductory paragraphs of Leucippe and Clitophon are a later addition, a simple ‘generic device’, or the signature of a clumsy ‘editor’?

Dramatis Personae

John’s Failed Inventio

The frame narrative has a Gospel savor: the same atmosphere, the same preoccupations and dilemmas, even the same spatial coordi-
nates: the Pharisees rebuking Jesus and his disciples for “turning away from the tradition of the elders” (Matthew 15:2; Mark 7:3); the disciples, with their hearts slow to believe (Luke 24:25), and prone to distress (John 14:1); “up there” (2:13; 11:55; 12:12, 20 etc.), Jerusalem with its temple, skeptical or openly hostile to Jesus (10:22–39, 11:45–57). At the opposite pole are the Mount of Olives, the place of prophecies (Matthew 26:30) and of the final ascension (Acts 1:6–12); the mountain in Galilee, the place of instruction (Matthew 5:1–7:27); and “a high mountain,” again in Galilee, often identified as Tabor, where the privileged few—Peter, John, and James—were granted the sight of Jesus’ transfiguration (Mark 9:2–13; Matthew 17:1–8; Luke 9:28–36).

A lack of precision is symptomatic in the Apocryphon’s frame narrative: not Jerusalem, but the elliptic “up”; the Mountain, with no further topographical specification; a Pharisee with an ominous, Persian name—“Arimanius”—that same name which the Zoroastrians assigned to the dark, evil principle. Clearly, the author decided to create an exemplary setting for his story, to turn names into symbols, history into paradigm.

Such a generalization has a double effect. First, it succeeds in transforming a pseudo-historical encounter of the Pharisee and John, the son of Zebedee, one of Jesus’ original apostles, into a cosmic conflict between the “children of light” (John 12:36), imprisoned in the midst of the material universe, and the powers of “darkness”—a polarity already exploited in the Johannine prologue. Second, it enables the author to widen his referential context, that is, to supplement the Gospel scenery with compatible features from other traditions, pagan and Jewish alike. The atmosphere of the Apocryphon of John is, thus, not distinctively Christian, but rather syncretistic: a Pharisee identified with the Zoroastrian evil principle; the Mountain upon which a heavenly creature—Yahweh or Christ, but also Hermes Trismegistos (CH XIII 1) or Adonai (PGM XII 92 ff.)—delivers his revelatory teaching;14 finally, John, whose distress and perplexity have

---

14 The motif of the revelation on a mountain is conventional both in the Old Testament (Moses on Sinai, “the mountain of God”) and in ancient Greek literature (Hesiod on Helicon, Minos on Ida). The Mountain of Transfiguration was identified as Tabor as early as the Gospel of Hebrews (Orig., In Io. 2.6). For revelatory discourses on a mountain, see n. 1 to the introductory section of the Hermes Trismegistos’s Discourse to His Son Tat (CH 13.1), in Nock-Festugière (1946) 2:200–203.
as much in common with Jesus’ puzzled and saddened disciples from the Gospels as they have with Lucius’ “uttermost extremes of tribulation” (Apul. *Metam.* 11.2), or with the astrologer Thessalos’s “pain in the soul” that made him “wander around Egypt” in an anxious search of a redeeming vision (Thessalus, *De virt. plant.*, Prooem.10 Friedrich), or with “a great distress that has entered [Enoch’s] heart,” and which only the angelic revelation, and the promise of the heavenly journey, will eventually manage to quell (2 Enoch 1:3).

Once upon the Mountain, John formulates his perplexity in a series of questions. There is no outside addressee to whom these questions are directed. It looks as though the withdrawal to “a desert place” was an attempt to elaborate a proper reply to Arimanias’s

For a further elaboration of the transfiguration scene in various apocryphal acts (*Acts Thom.* 143; *Acts Pet.* 20; *Acts John* 90–91), see Orbe (1976) 2: 96–141. A mountain can also serve as a repository place for tablets on which mysterious pronouncements were engraved. Josephus, *Ant.* 1.2.3, reports the story that Seth, the son of Adam, had left his esoteric message for posterity in the form of tablets on a high mountain. The same story occurs in the epilogue of *Gos. Eg.*, NHC III 68:2–3 = IV 80:16–17, and a similar one in the concluding section of the *Allogenes*, NHC XI 68:16–20: “And you will leave this book upon a mountain and you will adjure the guardian.” In *Stes Seth*, NHC VII 118:10 ff., Dositheos the seer is charged with the discovery and disclosure of the tablets. For the Arabic legend of Hermes (Idris) who, “afraid that the science would perish in the Flood, built the temples [pyramids], that is, the mountain which is known as al-Birba, the temple of Akhmim,” and “engraved there [the names of] all the crafts and craftsmen” cf. Ibn Abi Usaybi’a 1.16 ff., in Fodor (1970) 335–63. The motif occurs elsewhere in the Nag Hammadi codices: (i) *Gos. Phil.* NHC II 38:6–7, where Christ appeared to his disciples in glory upon the mountain; (ii) *Soph. Jes. Chr.* NHC III 90:14–91:14: the Savior appeared like a great angel of light to his twelve disciples and seven women on the mountain in Galilee called “Place of Harvest time and Joy”; (iii) ibid. 91:18–20, referring to the Savior’s previous teaching on the mountain in Galilee called “of the Olives”; (iv) *Apoc. Paul*, NHC V 18:3–19:24: the little child, later identified as the holy spirit, summons Paul to “awake” his mind and realize that the mountain upon which he is standing is “the mountain of Jericho, so that [he] may know the hidden things in those visible”; (v) 1 *Apoc. Jas.* NHC V 30:18–31:2, where James, upon ascending to “the mountain called ‘Gaugelan’ with [other] disciples,” all of them in distress because of the Savior’s suffering, and after the crowd has dispersed, sees the Lord appear to him; (vi) *Apoc. Adam* NCH V 78:7–17, according to which an angel came from heaven, appeared to Jesus the child on a high mountain, and bid him to arise since god had glorified him; (vii) ibid. 85:3–11: a message of salvation has not been written as a book, but will be revealed to those saved by angelic beings, who are “situated atop a high mountain upon a rock of truth”; (viii) *Ep. Pet. Phil.* NHC VIII 133:8–19: the apostles went upon the Mount of Olives, “the place where they used to gather with the blessed Christ when he was in the body,” and prayed until, suddenly, “a great light appeared so that the mountain shone from the sight of him who had appeared,” i.e., the resurrected Christ.
invectives (“Where is your teacher?”). John behaves as a good rhetorician. He searches through his memory in order to retrieve ideas and arguments suitable for a persuasive reply. Memory stands here for the collections of Jesus’ sayings, discourses, and signs that John had stored and subsequently, along with narrative episodes, recorded in his Gospel. Memory also stands for a grid of empty forms, or ‘places’ (τόποι, loci) over which John will begin to pass his subject (ζητήμα, quaestio):

How indeed was the Savior elected?
Why was he sent into the world by his Father, who sent him?
Who is his Father?
Of what sort is that Aeon to which we shall go?
He said to us that this aeon has been modeled (τύπος) after that incorruptible Aeon.

Yet he did not instruct us about that one, of what kind it is. (BG 20:8–19; II 1:21–29)

In spite of being formulated lege artis, by ‘passing’ a subject through a grid of narrative topics (περιστάσεις) designed to guide an aspiring storyteller (person, action, place, time, manner, cause), John’s questions (How? Why? Who? Of what sort? By what means?) have failed to produce a plausible narrative. John’s memory is filled with Jesus’ impenetrable discourses from the Fourth Gospel—the closed system of incongruous metaphors, contradictory claims, and impenetrable puns—which the confused disciple cannot translate into a narrative likely to rebuke the Pharisee. The only way to resolve this deadlock is another revelation from heaven, some master myth that would explain Jesus’ allusions to his heavenly origin and salvation promised to “his own.” One of the primary functions of the Apocryphon  

---

15 For περιστάσεις, literally ‘circumstances’ or ‘circumstantial loci’, also known as the main elements of narrative—μόρια διηγήσεως, στοιχεία διηγήσεως—see an exhaustive list (τό τε πρόσωπον... καὶ τὸ πρᾶξις τὸ πραξθὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ προσώπου, καὶ ὁ τόπος ἐν φω ἡ πράξεις, καὶ ὁ χρόνος καθ’ ὅν ἡ πράξεις, καὶ ὁ τρόπος τῆς πράξεως, καὶ ἔκτον ἢ τούτων αἰτία) and discussion thereon in Theon’s Progymnasmata 78,16–79,19 P-B. The best discussion of the ‘topics’ and its development in ancient rhetoric is by Pernot (1986). For a tripartite division of ‘topics’ into a method, a grid of empty forms, and a storehouse of filled forms, see Barthes (1988) 64–72.

16 The list of seemingly relevant verses from the Fourth Gospel is in Tardieu (1984) 83–84.
of John, therefore, is to supply, in the form of a narrative (διήγημα), the interpretive key for the enigmatic content of the Fourth Gospel, and to make up for it communicative weakness and polemical shortcomings.\(^\text{17}\)

Perplexity of a seer is one of the consecrated themes in the apocalyptic literature of the period, including the texts traditionally labeled as ‘Gnostic’. The theme implies the conviction that humans have no available means, nor intellectual capacity, to get beyond illusory appearances and reach the divine. On the psychological plane, this sense of separation provokes such feelings as alienation (Gospel of Truth, Allogenēs), the sense of abandonment (Apocryphon of John), and even suicidal thoughts (Zostrianos). But even if the solution must come from without, in the form of some heavenly messenger, the initiative must come from a human agent—from the realization that the spontaneous brings nothing in return, and that salvation presupposes the acquisition of a proper mental disposition. As Plutarch has it, “If there is advice to give for listening to a teacher, one ought to... exercise discovery (εὑρησις, inventio) over the course of learning (ασκείν ἄμα τη μαθησει την εὑρησιν), so that we may acquire a mental disposition that is neither sophist-like nor fact-oriented but reflective and philosophical” (De aud. 17–18, 47C–48D). Translated into ‘Gnostic’ jargon, knowledge is unattainable without formulating the causes of distress and perplexity into a set of ‘existentialist’ questions:

- It is not only a purifying water that sets one free,
- but also the knowledge (γνωσις) of the following:
  - Who were we?
  - What have we become?
  - Where were we?
  - Whereunto were we cast?
  - Whereto are we heading?

---

\(^{17}\) For the empty “revelation form” of the Johannine Gospel cf. Meeks (1972) 68: “Yet the Fourth Gospel never provides us with the myth which explains how some men could be from below and others from above. . . . Thus we have in a Johannine literature a thoroughly dualistic picture. . . . Yet that picture is never rationalized by a comprehensive myth, as in Gnosticism, or by a theory of predestination, as later in the western catholic tradition.”
Wherefrom are we purified?
What is generation?
What is regeneration? (Clem. Al., Exc. Theod. 78.2)\textsuperscript{18}

\textit{John’s Vision: Form and Content}

From a form-analytical perspective, all three segments of John’s action—distress, failed \textit{inventio}, increased perplexity—are conventional signals of a forthcoming revelatory vision. They belong to a set of controllable, or ‘inter-specific,’ elements in the \textit{Offenbarungsliteratur} of the Hellenistic and Roman period, irrespective of their specific provenience (Jewish, pagan, Christian). They occur, too, even in an identical order, elsewhere in the Nag Hammadi Library, as shown in the following synopsis of the \textit{Apocryphon of John} and the \textit{Sophia of Jesus Christ} (BG 3 and NHC III 4):

\textit{Ap. John} (BG 20:4–19)

When I heard these (i.e. Arimanías’s invectives),

I turned away from the temple to the mountain, into a desert place.

And I was distressed (\textit{lupeûn}) with myself saying:

How indeed was the savior chosen?
And why was he sent to the world by his father? . . . And who is his father?
And of what kind is that eon to which we shall go?
And he did not instruct us about that one . . .

Suddenly, while I was thinking this . . .

\textit{Soph. Jes. Chr.} (BG 77:9–78:11)

After Jesus Christ had risen from the dead, and when his twelve disciples and seven women . . . came to Galilee onto the mountain called “Harvest and Joy,”

perplexed (\textit{époreûn}) about the reality (\textit{ípóstasiw}) of the entirety, and the plan (\textit{oîkonomía}), and the holy providence (\textit{prònoia}), and the power (\textit{éretÆ}) of the authorities (\textit{§jousai}), about all things the Savior accomplished among them as mysteries (\textit{mystéryov}) of the holy plan, then . . .

All stages of John’s ensuing vision follow the common pattern of Hellenistic revelatory accounts. They consist of a series of stable elements characteristic of both pagan and Jewish \textit{Visionsstil}. Stability denotes here not only the presence of the same elements but also their relatively fixed order within the sequence. There is, of course,

\textsuperscript{18} The passage is discussed in Boehlig (1994) 24–27. See also Simonetti (1993) 524, n. 404, for useful references. One reference, \textit{Teach. Silv. NHC VII} 92:10–18, is particularly worth quoting, in that it shows, again, that salvation cannot be achieved without passing a problem through a grid of ‘logical \textit{topoi}’ (i.e., genus, property, accident, species, difference, division, etc): “But before everything else (e.g., supplications, observing Christ’s commands), know your generation and know yourself: From what \textit{oûsía} are you? From what \textit{génos} are you? From what \textit{phulë}?”
no uniform sequence of actions in preserved visions. The order can be changed, as in the case of the *Letter of Peter to Philip* (NHC VIII 2), where the apostles express their concerns in the form of questions *directly* to the Savior, but only *upon* his appearance (*Ep. Pet. Phil.* NHC VIII 133:13–135:4), and not *before*, as in the above quoted sections from the *Apocryphon of John* and the *Sophia of Jesus Christ*. Furthermore, there is no extant visionary account in which all ‘interspecific’ elements are present. With these remarks, relevant for the morphological analysis of any literary text, I may now turn to a partition of John’s vision into its distinctive formal elements. For each element, I will provide an abbreviated definition and quote the relevant portion of the text, followed by a brief discussion of textual problems and characteristic motifs and themes. The parallel texts of various redactions are quoted only where they significantly differ in wording or content. Otherwise, a less defective text will be given. Numerous lacunas are not restored, except in the cases where the proposed conjectures simultaneously satisfy the following five criteria: (i) paleographical, i.e. restoration neither too long nor too short for a lacuna; (ii) grammatical; (iii) internal cross-reference; (iv) parallel reading in the other versions; (v) conventionality of the motif (a word or a phrase) proposed as a conjecture.

**Opening Formula**

Suddenly, as I was thinking these things... *(BG 20:19; cf. NHC II 1:30)*

The Coptic participial conversion probably stands for the Greek genitive absolute as recorded in the *Acts of John* 89 Junod-Kaestli, ἐννοοῦντός μου ταύτα. In this case, too, the immediately preceding section portrays the narrator’s perplexity formulated into a question, viz., ὡς διασπορεῖν με ἐν ἑμαυτῷ καὶ λέγειν τί ἐστιν τοῦτο μοι; *(ibid.)*. A similar formula opens the visionary account in the Hermetic *Poimandres* *(CH 1.1)*, Ἔννοιας μοί ποτε γενομένης, which is a mere adaptation of Xenophon’s opening in the *Cyropaedia* (1.1.1): Ἐννοια ποθ’ ἢμιν ἐγένετο ὀσαί δημοκρατίαι κατελύθησαν. In Roman literature, Cicero used the same beginning-marker, also in the participial form, in *De Oratore* (1.1.1: *Cogitanti mihi saepe numero et memoria vetera repetenti*...). And it is with this same wording that the ‘Ciceronian’ Minucius Felix starts his dialogue *Octavius*, apparently in order to disclose, right from the
beginning, his literary affiliation (1.1: *Cogitanti mihi et cum animo meo Octavii boni... memoriam recensenti...*). Similarly Apuleius, who prefaces his free translation of the pseudo-Aristotelian *Περὶ κόσμου* with the following opening: *Consideranti mihi et diligentius intuenti...* (Apul. *De mundo*, Praef. 258).¹⁹

**Cosmic Semeia Followed by the Seer’s Reaction**

The heavens opened, and the whole creation shone with light that [is below] heaven. And the [whole] universe [moved]. (BG 20:20–21:2; cf. II 1:30–33)

The three cosmic *σημεῖα* announcing the Savior’s arrival have so many parallels in the Intertestamental, Christian, and pagan *Offenbarungsliteratur* that the lacunas may be restored with great certainty. Van Unnik (1964) 269–280 provides an exhaustive list of parallels.

For my part, I was afraid [and]... (BG 21:2–3; cf. II 2:1)

The intrusion of the protagonist’s point of view does not appear to be a common feature in similar visionary accounts of the period. The reference to a psychological state of the seer usually occurs in the revealer’s ‘Formula of Exhortation’—for example, μὴ φοβοῦ, θάρσσε, θαρρήσεις. As it stands, the intrusion appears to serve different purposes. First, it is a division-marker, separating one distinctive element of the *Visionsstil* from the other. Second, it increases the vividness of narration and gives it the mark of authenticity. Third, it continues to exploit the motif of a seer’s perplexity and carries it over to its full realization in the next section, when the visual revelation finally occurs. Fourth, it brings in a considerable tension in the reader or listener awaiting a solution to the riddle of John’s vision.

¹⁹ For other imitations of Cicero’s opening formula see Fausch (1966) 15–16. Genitive absolute is a typical opening-marker in Epictetus’s *Dissertationes* (e.g., 1.11, 2.14, 3.22), on which see Billerbeck (1978) 41–42.
Description of a Vision Followed by the Seer’s Reaction (Dilemma)

NHC II 2:1–9

... I] saw in the light [. . . standing] by me. When I [saw] [. . .] being like a great (old) man. And he [change]d his appearance (σματι) being like a servant.

They were not [. . .] in front of me. And there was a [. . .] [with] many forms (μορφή) in the [light]. And the [. . .] appeared through one another.

[And] the [appearance] (σματι) consisted of three forms (μορφή).

BG 20:3–13

And lo, a child [appeared to] me. But [. . .] the likeness (ειμις) being an old man [in whom there was] light.

[I gazed] into it. I did not [understand] this wonder,

as if [there was] a [. . . (f.)] with many forms (μορφή) [in the] light, its (f.) forms (μορφή) [appearing] through each [other], [nor] (did I understand) [. . .] if it (f.) was one [. . .] [. . .] consisted of three faces (2ο).

The passage in both versions is defective to the extent that a full reconstruction remains conjectural. Yet the essential content of John’s vision seems clear. The revealer, still unidentified, appears (ειμις BG, σματι and ειμις in II) to John in multiple forms (μορφή in both manuscripts) which, in the end, turn out to be only “three forms” (as in II) or “faces” (2ο, as in BG, standing apparently for μορφή). What is also clear, in spite of lacunas in both versions, is that the longer version in II, by not mentioning John’s “wonder,” fails to create the same dramatic effect as BG. The multiform appearance intensifies the seer’s perplexity which, in so far as one can infer from the fragmentary text of BG, focuses on the problem of the unity of what appears as a set of simultaneous transformations (“its forms appearing through one another”).

Another particularity of BG is that, in contrast to the longer version, it seems to identify only two out of the required three forms

---

20 The Coptic 2ο translates both Gr. μορφή (form, Lat. forma; in Platonist philosophy, an outward shape opposed to ἰδέα, and sometimes equated with εἴκος as in CH I 12–15; in LXX, often synonymous with δομίωμα, σχῆμα and εἶδος) and πρόσωπον (face, figure, outward appearance, or person, Lat. facies, adspectus faciei, persona). These two terms do not always seem to mean the same in the ‘Gnostic’ jargon, as Irenaeus suggests in his report on Mark the Valentinian in Adv. haer. 1.14.1: καὶ εἶναι τούτοις μορφάς ὡς ὁ κύριος ἀγέλεως εἴρηκε, τῶς δὲνεκέος βλέπουσας τὸ πρόσωπον τοῦ πατρός. For the Son as his Father’s πρόσωπον, the identification based on Ps 23:6, cf. Clem. Al. Exc. Theod. 10.5 and 23.4–5.
of the Savior’s appearance. Since the left side of the page’s written area containing the relevant passage is irretrievably lost due to physical damage, one can assume that the mystery of the third “form” lies hidden somewhere in this defective part of the text. And since lacunas are measurable, attempts have been made to reconstruct the missing portions of the passage. In two such attempts (Schmidt, Schenke), the identity of a third “person” was restored, but in a surprising fashion. We would expect this form to be “a servant” as in NHC II. What was proposed instead is “a woman” ({oûcàûhe}) with three forms, a separate appearance occurring after the Savior’s self-revelation in different ages of man (youth—old man in BG, youth—servant—old man in II).

And lo, a child [appeared to] me. But [when I saw] that the likeness (eûhe) [in which there] was a light was an old man, [I gazed] into it. I did not [understand] this wonder, (which gave the impression) that [there was a woman] (eûxhe-oûhi-oûcàûhe) with many forms (e-xûxe-neûcûophh) [in the] light. Her forms (neûcûophh) [appeared] through one another. (I thought), if she is one, [how] can she consist of three faces (ao)? (BG 20:3–13 Till-Schenke 1972, 82–83)

The same conjecture is next proposed for filling the lacuna in II 2:6–7: “And there was a [woman] with many forms in the [light].”

In the first complete synoptic edition of all four manuscript witnesses of the Apocryphon of John, recently published by Wisse and Waldstein (1995), the above restoration is rejected because most of the proposed readings appear too long for the available line-spaces. Yet the key point of the conjecture, viz. “a woman” in three forms, can be saved by replacing Shenke’s eûxhe-oûhi-oûcàûhe with the simple delocutive nominal sentence (eûxhe-oûcàûhe τε). Still, there remains the problem of its contextual plausibility. The surrounding lines do not offer significant support for this conjecture. In fact, only two intra-textual elements corroborate Schenke’s hypothesis. First, the lacuna requires a grammatically feminine noun. Second, the forms in which the Savior appears to John in BG—a youth, an old man, and, as it was claimed, a trimorphic “woman”—can be interpreted as perceptible manifestations of the Savior’s ensuing self-proclamation as the Father, the Mother, and the Son. Taken together, these two points make the conjecture intriguing. The degree of its plausibility, for it cannot be certain, now depends solely on extratextual factors—first, on comparing the conjecture with the parallel section in the longer version; and second, on finding at least one
compelling parallel from cognate contemporary texts. This parallel, in order to be compelling, should meet at least three criteria besides the philological one: (i) similar wording; (ii) similar content, viz., a similar trimorphic appearance; (iii) similar meaning, viz., a clear connection between the trimorphic appearance and the revealer’s real (trinitarian) identity. But all that a ‘religionsgeschichtlich’ comparison by Schenke and his followers (Werner 1977) could offer was a complicated and nowhere confirmed conflation of the solar cult—viz., Aion–Helios (a child in the morning and an old man in the evening, as in BG) or the Egyptian Horus (a child at the sunrise, a young man at the zenith, an old man at the sunset as in II)—with the “polymorphy” of the Hellenistic Selene—Isis (Till-Schenke 1972, 83). Back to the first mentioned extra-textual factor, viz., the comparison with the parallel section in the longer version, the relevant part of II 2,6, as confirmed by the photographic record, should read as ἡμενον γὰρ ἦν, “there was a likeness,” and not as ἡμενον γιγαντίας ἦν “there was a woman.”

More recently, Wisse and Waldstein (1995) proposed a new conjectural restoration, based on the paleographical evidence and the synoptic comparison with the corresponding passage in NHC II:

21 For the solar ‘modalism’ in Egyptian religion, see Hammerschmidt (1957) 238–42, and Junod (1982) 41–42. Junod, too, proposes the Egyptian origin of Christ’s polymorphy in both the Acts of John and the Apocryphon of John: “Deux textes qui pourraient trouver leur origine en Égypte” (42). Still according to Junod, “L’apparition polymorphe dans l’Apocryphon, qu’elle soit bimorphe ou trimorphe, le premier cas semblant être le plus probable puisqu’il a la caution du Papyrus de Berlin et qu’il constitue une lectio difficilior), semble être une manifestation assez banale de l’éternité et de la sollicitude divines” (43). Stroumsa (1992), again, argues in favor of the Jewish origin of the Apocryphon’s vision, and sees in Christ’s trimorphy the conflation of two separate Jewish traditions—that of God’s Biblical appearance as young (Cant 5:11: “His locks are wavy, black as a raven”) and old (Dan 7:9: “The hair of his head was like pure wool”) and that of Metatron—servant (🚴 in Ap. John). In order further to confuse an already overly complicated ‘religionsgeschichtlich’ problem, one could add to the list of possible sources the motif of a gray-haired child, or puer–senex, exploited in various apocalyptic (both Jewish and Christian) and monastic texts; cf. Caquot (1974) 161–72. Junod was not first to claim that the Savior’s polymorphy in Ap. John should be explained as the symbol of eternity. According to Quispel (1978) 5, E. Peterson mentioned in 1949 “to at least one of his friends . . . the relation of the [Encratite] concept of Aion to the description of Christ in the Apocryphon.” A threefold appearance in NHC II would therefore correspond to “the Aion in which past, present, and future coexist.” The absence of the third form in BG is accounted for by the manuscript’s inferiority: “The Berlin text, which does not mention the child [sic], contains a gap and is inferior here” (4).

22 See Emmel (1978) 199, ad loc.
Clearly, the editors did not view the absence of a third “person” in BG as problematic. Comparison with the parallel lines in NHC II may suggest a mechanical omission, an oversight on the part of the redactor, or copyist, of BG (Quispel 1978, 4). Alternatively, the absence may represent a sudden shift from the ‘youth—old man’ duality, a symbol of eternity, to a threefold image, “probably a reference to Jesus’ role as revealer” (Waldstein 1995, 87).

In most cases, the conjectures proposed by Wisse and Waldstein are possible, if not certain. Particularly attractive is their proposal to take the two clauses following “I did not understand this wonder” in the shorter version (BG 21:7–8: ἡπιομορφή/εἰς ὑπομορφή) as the alternants (21:9,12 εἰς ὑπομορφή.../εἰς ὑπομορφή...) of John’s dilemma (21:15: ο ΠΗΝ ἉΓΙΟΣ ΧΛΩΥ). John’s alternative proposition is syntactically arranged in two coordinated suppositions, each followed by the appropriate ratio (“because of the light” and “because it had three faces”) in a statim-type of succession. The lacuna in the first supposition is apparently restored by comparison with the corresponding text in NHC II. It is filled with a combinative adverb ΠΗΝ and the preposition ΠΗ-, a variant of a fixed expression ΠΗΝ ΠΗ- denoting a specific spatial orientation (‘in,’ ‘within’). The fact that the editors gave it a

---

23 See, however, their restoration of II 2:5, “There [was not a plurality] before me,” ΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗΝΠΗН

---

NHC II 2:1–9

[And behold, I] saw in [the light] a child who stood] by me. While I looked [at it, it became] like an old man.

And he [changed his] likeness (Chōt) (again), becoming like a servant.

There [was not a plurality] before me, but there was a [likeness (eis)] with multiple forms (μορφή)
in the [light,]
and [the semblances (Chōt)]
appeared through each other,
[and the [likeness (Chōt)]]
had three forms (μορφή).

BG 20:3–13

And behold,

a child appeared to me,
and [it changed] (its) likeness (eis) into an old man [while] light [existed] in him.

[As I looked] at it (him),
I did not [understand] this wonder,
whether there was [a likeness (tōδου)]
with multiple forms (μορφή)
[because of the] light—since its (f.) forms (μορφή)
[appeared] through each [other—],
[or] whether it was one [likeness (tōδου)]
[because] it had three faces (το).
causal meaning (“because of”) is indicative of their concern for the *parallelistismus membrorum*. Just as the second supposition is followed, according to the conjecture, by the causal *εἰ-* (“because”), so the first alternant, too, must have an immediately ensuing causal phrase (“because of the light”), further explained by a parenthetical clause (“its forms appeared through each other”). Besides the problematic assignment of the causal meaning to Ἁρων-1, it is not clear what meaning is to be assigned to John’s dilemma. According to the proposed reconstruction, John seems unable to assert whether multifor- mity is an optical illusion created by the supernatural light or there is a single appearance because its forms are not manifold but only three. A less confusing interpretation of John’s perplexity, one that is in tune with the parallel passage in the longer version, is that he cannot assess whether the appearance is multiform or trimorphous. Perhaps the message John tries to deliver is that he does not know whether he hallucinates as he watches how multiple forms in the light “appeared through each other,” or he really sees one, i.e. “true” appearance (μετέπειτα in NHC III 2:19, as reconstructed by Funk 1995) with three forms, or faces, in the light.

Instead of further confusing an already vexed issue, I have given above a non-committal reconstruction—one in which both of the discussed conjectures can easily fit. For this reason, I have left some of the lacunas in the BG passage unrestored. In very few instances, I have adopted minor restorations by the most recent editors, provided that they do not run counter, but philologically improve, the proposed solutions. Sometimes, again, I have suggested alternative readings, all of them dealing exclusively with morpho-syntactical features of the passage.

Yet even such a defective text, as has already been argued, reveals the core of John’s perplexity. The plurality of outward forms (“three faces”) raises the question of the revealer’s unity (“one”)—not an uncommon reaction among early Christian writers facing the riddle of divine polymorphy. The Christ who appears in multiple forms (πολύμορφος) to his disciples was a widely used motif in the early Christian literature, and the meaning of his polymorphy, its βούλησις, was a controversial subject among the first theologians. For some, multifor-mity had more to do with different spiritual capacities of recipients than with Christ’s real nature. For others, it proved that Christ was, in fact, without any form and above all determinations. For some, again, polymorphy was the visible expression of Christ’s
multiple potencies, virtues, or perfections (ἐπίνοια), in contrast with the unity, simplicity, and ineffability of the transcendent Father. For others, it was the symbol of Christ’s paradoxical status, of his being one with and, at the same time, different from the other members of the divine triad. Due to lacunas in the text of BG, John’s position in regard to this issue remains somewhat ambiguous. The unity of the Savior he refers to, does he sees it as underlying, occasioning, or transcending the plurality of forms? It is perhaps from within this wider context—that is, by resorting to the representative texts from the ancient debate about the βούλημα of Christ’s multiform appearances—that we may cast more light on the sense of John’s vision.

In no ancient Christian text is the motif of Christ’s polymorphy so thoroughly explored and given so great a dramatic value as in the Acts of John, 87–105 Kaestli-Junod. Probably during his first stay at Ephesus, John finds his fellow Christians perplexed (ἡπόρον) about the meaning of Christ’s appearance to Drusiana: “The Lord,” she said, “appeared to me in the tomb like John and as a young man” (ὡς νεανίσκος 87). In order to dispel their doubts and strengthen their faith, John evokes the period of Christ’s earthly career to which he himself bore witness. The teacher’s actions were unpredictable, his speech elusive, the ways in which he used to appear to his followers dumbfounding. Not even he and his brother (James) could have agreed on what they had seen: “a child” (τὸ παιδίον) standing on the shore or “a handsome man” (ἀνδρα εὐμορφον); a man, “rather bald but with a thick flowing beard” or “a youth (νεανίσκος) with the beard just beginning.” Often Christ would appear to John as “a small man with no good looks” (μικρὸν ἄνθρωπος... δύσμορφος), often again as immense, “as wholly looking up to heaven” (88–89). This general sense of confusion reached its dramatic peak during the second transfiguration scene “upon the mountain” (90), where Jesus took John, Peter, and James. John quietly drew near Christ while he was praying and stood looking at his hinder parts. What he saw was “not like a man at all” (ἄνθρωπον δὲ οὐδὲ ὄλως), “his head stretched up to heaven.” Afraid, John cried out. “And he [i.e., Christ], turning about, appeared as a small man (μικρὸν ἄνθρωπον), caught hold of my beard and pulled it.” This painful lesson may seem a perfect climax to the episode. But, as soon as he returned to James and Peter, John had to face yet another wonder: “The old man who spoke with the Lord on the mountain-top,” John asked his companions,
“who was he?” Only at this point John finally “understood [Christ’s] abundant grace, and his unity with multiple faces (πολυπρόσωπον ἔνότητα), and his wisdom that constantly looks after us.” But what, in fact, did John understand? What kind of unity did he discern among Christ’s multiple appearances? The reader has to reach the end of John’s diegesis to the Ephesians, his brief peroratio (104), to find the answer.

You therefore should also be persuaded, beloved, that it is not a man that I exhort you to worship, but God unchangeable (θεόν ἁματραπτόν), God who cannot be dominated (θεόν ἀκρατήτον), God higher (θεόν... ἀνωτέρον) than all authority and all power, older and mightier than all angels, all creatures, those spoken <or those conceived>, and all of the aeons in their entirety. If then you remain faithful to him, and if you build yourself in him, you shall possess your soul indestructible.

The solution John proposes to Christ’s polymorphy is the rejection of all forms. The changeability of appearances proves that Christ is, in his essence, unchangeable. By revealing himself to John and other companions in dimorphic appearances—great and small, a grown man and a child, young and old, with his breast now “smooth and soft” now “hard like rock” (89)—Christ shows that he is, in fact, neither of the opposites. Pairing contrary terms produces the paradoxical effect (ἀδυνατίον), signifying that Christ is neither of these mutually exclusive extremes. Ultimately, such a paradoxical dichotomy leads to negation of all forms and all predications. That same method is employed in the ensuing Tanzhymnus, where the singing (and dancing) Christ describes himself in antithetical terms (94–96): “I will be saved, and I will save....I wish to flee, and I wish to remain....I have no place, and I have places.” The goal of this confusing self-predication is, again, the refusal of both opposites, and the affirmation of Christ’s unchangeability, superiority, and absolute transcendence.24

24 The Acts of John would thus enjoy the privileged status of one from among “few” ancient texts which “would have considered the via negativa and the assertion of antithetical paradox to be interchangeable” (Layton 1986, 42). The phenomenon seems not so rare. Paradoxical omnipredication (via oppositionis) is a common method of apophatic theology, largely employed by ancient philosophers and the-
The *Acts of John* does not clarify whether Christ’s multiformity is a factual event or a mere fiction. Origen, on his part, had no doubts about this: Christ–Logos actualizes and discloses innumerable powers hidden in the transcendent Father. A number of forms he assumes are nothing but the outward manifestations of these potencies or perfections (*ενίωματι*). Under what guise he may choose to appear depends, ultimately, on the individual disposition (*ἐξίς*) of a recipient. Angels, for example, will see him as an angel, ordinary humans as a human being, most often in the guise of a humble servant (Orig. *In Matth.* 100: *unicuique apparebat secundum quod fuerat dignus*; C. *Cels.* 4.16: *ἀνάλογον τῇ ἐξίς τοῦ εἰσηγομένου*). The transfiguration on Tabor (Mt 17:1ff.) is a paradigmatic case, signifying the progress in knowledge, from the familiarity with the fleshly Logos, reserved for those who remained “below” (*κάτω*), to the acquaintance with the “principal form” (C. *Cels.* 4.15: *προηγομένην μορφήν*), that of the Logos–Wisdom, revealed only to the privileged few “upon the high mountain” (4.16). In between, numerous other appearances take place (*In Matth.* 100). Although being ‘one’ in essence (Logos, the only-begotten son of God), Christ is, thus, “manifold” in his virtues and properties that

ologians, from Plato (in the first hypothesis about ‘One’ in *Parm.* 137c–142a) and many Middle Platonists (e.g., Alcinous and Celsus) to various branches of the Neopythagorean movement (Whittaker 1969, 77–86), the ‘Gnostics’ (cf., e.g., Monoimos’s description of the Monad in Hipp. *Ref.* 7.12.5 and, for more references, Orbe 1956, 14–15) and Neoplatonists (e.g., Proclus, *Theol. Plat.* 2.10).

Antithetical predications do not necessarily lead to a total denial; they may also lead to a full affirmation. The outcome of *via oppositionis* largely depends on whether the established relation is that of *contrariety* or *contradiction*. The latter case (*X* is *p* and *non-p*, *X* is *p* and is not *p*) is the violation of the principle of contradiction whereby two contradictory statements cannot both be true. That is, two contradictory terms, when simultaneously predicated of the same subject, by necessity exclude or eliminate each other, to the effect that the subject ultimately remains deprived of both. In the former case (*X* is *p* and *X* is *q*, where *p* and *q* are mutually exclusive, yet not jointly exhaustive, terms within the same genus, i.e. black and white, father and mother, hot and cold, male and female, etc.), two positive extremes of opposition are simultaneously predicated of the same subject, to the effect that the subject encompasses both of them as well as their intermediates— that is, the whole genus. From these two distinct applications of *via oppositionis* arises the distinction, typically Neopythagorean but later also adopted by various ‘Gnostics’ and Neoplatonists, between the First One, a supreme principle transcending all plurality and refusing all predicates, and the Second One, which combines in itself the opposing (contrary) characteristics (One–Dyad, one–many, male–female, etc.). The *Acts of John* pays no heed to such sophisticated distinctions between the two kinds of opposition (cf. Arist. *Cat.* 10), but uses indiscriminately both contrary and contradictory predicates to prove Christ’s transcending unity.
can be mentally (epinoetically) discerned (C. Cels. 2.64: ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἔξ ὁν πλείουν τῇ ἐπινοϊα ἤν).\(^{25}\)

Origen may seem far too sophisticated a thinker for the theological preoccupations of the second-century author of the Apocryphon of John. Yet similar views about the hierarchical array of Christ’s appearances, reflecting a varying intellectual potential of the seers as well as different potencies of the revealer, appear in Hippolytus’s account of the Docetists (Ref. 8.10.3–11) and in the Valentinian Gospel of Philip:

Jesus tricked everyone. For he did not appear as he was, but in such a way that they could see him. And he appeared to all of them. He [appeared] to [the] great as someone great. He appeared [to] the small as someone small. He [appeared to the] angels as an angel, and to human beings as a human being. For this reason, he hid his ‘logos’ from everyone. Some saw him and thought they were seeing their own selves. But when he appeared to his disciples in glory upon the mountain, he was not small. He made himself great. Or, rather, he made the disciples great so that they might be able to see that he was great. (Gos. Phil. NHC II 57:28–58:10)

The most intriguing aspect of this saying is not Jesus’ adaptability to spiritual dispositions of a seer, but the ‘Origenist’ distinction drawn between Jesus’ elusive appearances to those from ‘below’—humans and angels—and his transfiguration upon the mountain, when he appeared to the privileged few in his true form (greatness). Multiformity is the way in which Jesus manifested his divine nature in this world. His appearance in the ‘principal form’ (προσγομένη μορφή) was confined to a single occasion in his earthly career—a mere prefiguration of Jesus’ revelations to chosen disciples, those capable of grasping his mysteries, during the eighteen months following his resurrection. According to Irenaeus’s report on the system of the ‘Ophites’,

This body [i.e., of the resurrected Jesus] they call animate (animale, ψυχικόν) and spiritual (spiritale, πνευματικόν), because he left behind the worldly [i.e. fleshly] elements in the world...After the resurrection, he tarried yet for eighteen months. When [spiritual] perception (sensibilitas, ἀνασκολλια) came down upon him, he learned what the truth was. He taught these things to those few disciples who he knew were capable of grasping such great mysteries. (Iren. Adv. haer. 1.30.13–14)

---

Several texts traditionally labeled as ‘Gnostic’ allude to the transparency of Jesus’ revelations during his ‘glorious’ life (vīta gloriae), clearly exploiting the same dichotomy as Origen and the *Gospel of Philip*. The main characteristic of Jesus’ earthly career is a confusing multiplicity—not only of his outward appearances but also of the meanings hidden in his parables, sermons, and signs. The event of resurrection brings resolution to this confusing play of double entendre. In the next eighteen months, the resurrected Savior will uncover his true form and reveal his mysterious teaching in a clear, simple, and open fashion.

Yet consider: nothing within the account of the truth is truly difficult. At any rate . . . he came forward for the sake of explanation, to leave nothing obscure, rather to reveal in simple terms (ἀπλοῦς) everything about coming into being. (*Treat. Res.* NHC I 45:3–9)

The Lord said to me [i.e., James], ‘. . . I first spoke with you parabolically, and you did not understand (νοεῖν). Now I am speaking with you openly, and you still do not [spiritually] perceive (αἰσθάνεσθαι). Nevertheless, for me you served as a parable in parables, and as that which is open (φανερός) in the [words] that are open. (*Ap. Jas.* NHC I 7:1–11)

The Savior taught the apostles, first in a figurative and mystical way (τυπικός καὶ μυστικός), then in parables and riddles (παραβολικός καὶ ἄνιψμων), and thirdly, clearly and directly in private (σαφῶς καὶ γνησίως κατὰ μόνας). (*Clem. Al.*, *Exc. Theod.* 66)

Back to the *Apocryphon of John*, the evidence listed in this section indicates that the Savior’s mysterious appearance to John, rather than simply diagnosing the seer’s spiritual weakness, carries some more positive content. Situated in the post-resurrection period, when Jesus taught “clearly and directly in private,” the Savior’s manifestation in three different “faces” or forms appearing “through each other” conveys the mystery of the divine nature which can be condensed in a simple formula: God may be seen either under a threefold or under a single aspect.  

---

26 This mystery of the divine nature, the absolute Unity revealing itself to a spiritual visionary as a triad of powers, was elucidated already in Philo of Alexandria’s exegetical observations on God’s revelation to Abraham “by the oaks of Mambre” (Gen 18:1–15). The language and imagery of Philo is strikingly similar to the content of John’s vision. Cf. QG 4.2 Marcus: “What is the meaning of the words, ‘He saw and, behold, three men were standing over him’? Most natural things to those who are able to see does (Scripture) present, namely that it is reasonable for one to be
figurative preamble to his ensuing self-portrayal as a trinity-in-unity: “I am the Father, I am the Mother, and I am the Son.”

The *Fourteenth Act of Philip* (Ms. Xenophontos 32, fols. 83v–88v = *Acts Phil. 14* Bovon-Bouvier-Amsler) follows the adventures of Philip, Mariamne (Marianne, Mariamme, i.e., Mary Magdalene), and Bartholomew following their arrival to Ophiorymus, identified in the title of the *Thirteenth Act* with Hierapolis in Phrygia, whose inhabitants “worshipped snakes and the Viper since times immemorial” (*Acts Phil. 14* 4.4). Philip has just completed his prayer to Christ, “the eye of him who cannot be contemplated, the face of the invisible, the glory of the untouchable, the ordering of the infinity, and the path of the unfathomable” (*ibid.* 13.5). It turns out that Stachys, a well-to-do Hierapolitan, sitting at the window of his nearby house, listened to the prayer. Stachys next prostrates himself before Philip and begins to tell the story of his life. A former priest of the Viper and serpents, he used to prosecute the Christians until, forty years ago, he lost his sight. Three days ago, Stachys continues, he had a strange dream—a voice urged him to go the city’s gate to meet his healer. Upon coming there, he lifted his eyes and saw the appearance of a handsome young man with three forms or faces (14.4: ἐνεπάθη αὐτός τεν σύνεκτον τινὸς ὀρασίον ἔχοντος τρία πρόσωπα). The first had the shape (μορφή) of a beardless youth carrying a jar; the one in the middle, of a woman (γυνή, παρθένος) clad in a glorious garment, a torch in her hand; and the third was of an older man.

three and for three to be one, for they were one by a higher principle. But when counted with the chief powers, the creative and kingly, He makes the appearance of three to the human mind. For this cannot be so keen of sight that it can see Him who is above the powers that belong to Him, namely God, distinct from anything else. For so soon as one sets eyes upon God, there also appear, together with His Being, the ministering powers, so that in place of one He makes the appearance of a triad. . . . As I said earlier, He cannot be seen in His oneness without something else, the chief powers that exist at once with Him, namely the creative, which is called God, and the kingly, which is called Lord. . . . And having become an eye, [the virtuous man] begins to see the sovereign, holy and divine vision in such a way that the single appearance appears as a triad, and the triad as a unity . . . With a single turning of the eyes the mind apprehends a double appearance; the one was of God coming with His two highest powers, by which He is served, namely the creative . . . and the kingly; and the other was that of the strange men . . . most perfect of body according to human nature and of venerable holiness. And being struck by either appearance, he was drawn toward seeing, now by one, now by the other. And he was not able to see just which of them was likely to be the true one”; cf. also *ibid.*, 4.30, Mut. 19–26, and Umemoto (1991) 207–256.
Philip’s reply is a long prayer of thanksgiving to Christ, at the end of which he provides the explanation of Stachys’s vision (14.5):

In your beneficient providence (πρόνοια), you have planted a paradise for us,
You the Perfect Man (ὁ τέλειος ἀνθρωπος),
the Perfect One who came from heaven,
whose name is ineffable;
the right hand bringing salvation (ἡ δεξιὰ ἡ σωτηρίας),
whose name our impure lips cannot pronounce;
You the Perfect One who came from heaven,
whose name is ineffable;
the right hand bringing salvation (ἡ δεξιὰ ἡ σωτηρίας),
whose name our impure lips cannot pronounce;
You the Great Spirit (το μεγα πνεύμα)
who are the highest in your aeons of light;
You the Father,
who keep yourself in secret,
who are with us in three perfect forms (ἐν τρισὶ μορφαῖς τελείωσι),
the images of the invisible,
and who are blessed for ever.

As a whole, the Acts of Philip is probably of Encratite origin. Yet in spite of the late date of its composition (fourth century A.D.), it abounds in Gnostic, or Gnosticizing, motifs and themes. The above passages clearly illustrate the point. The rapprochement of Philip, Mariamne, and Bartholomew is a distinctively ‘Gnostic’ feature (cf. Soph. Jes. Chr. 79:18–80:3; 86:6–8; 89:20–90:3, and 98:7–13),27 and so are “the aeons of light,” Christ as the image of the invisible, and the perfect man with an ineffable name. Even more significant in this respect is the content of Stachys’s vision and Philip’s exegesis thereof. In the vision, the female figure is conjoined with two male forms which, taken together, represent the divine triad of a ‘Gnostic’ type (Father—Mother—Son; the Valentinian Bythos—Ennoia—Nous). In Philip’s prayer, again, Christ is identified with “the Great Spirit,” and “the Father”—a sort of modalism that blurs clear-cut distinctions between the three separate persons within the divine trinity.

Stachys’s vision of Christ under three forms or “faces” (πρόσωπα), one of them a virgin woman (παρθένος, γυνή), which Philip subsequently explains as the visual expression of the divine triad, brings us back to Schenke’s conjectural restoration of the BG passage. The ‘Gnostic’ flavor of the episode from the Fourteenth Act of Philip corroborates Schenke’s hypothesis of the Savior’s threefold appearance

27 For the pairing of Philip and Mary Magdalene see also Pist. Soph. 72,5–73,8.
to John as an old man, a youth, and a woman—an enigma which the revealer will later relate to his threefold identity as the Father, the Mother, and the Son.  

Offenbarungsrede

The mysterious visual revelation is followed by an equally mysterious revelatory account—an example of what E. Norden (1913, 188–90) called “ein soteriologische Redetypus,” and H. Becker (1956, 14–59) “eine gnostische Offenbarungsrede.” Its paradigmatic form is recorded by Celsus who, as we learn from Origen (Contra Cels. 7.9), blamed the Christians for holding in contempt famous oracles of the Greeks and for adopting instead the revelations of Oriental pseudo-prophets (οἱ περὶ Φοινίκην τε καὶ Παλαιστίνην). These prophecies consist of a limited number of fixed elements: a revealer’s self-identification (ὄνομα, δυνάμεις, ἔργα or πράξεις) in the Ego-Eimi style (“It is I who am . . .”); an appeal (parainesis) to conversion (‘alarm call’), and a promise of salvation or retribution. In the Savior’s revelation to John, the promise of salvation, where salvation corresponds to communicating a secret knowledge of reality, is incorporated in a statement of intention beginning with a ‘Botenselbstbericht’ (ἡ ἐγοὶ ὑμῖν). Finally, the Savior’s revelatory account opens with a short exhortation formula—“Do not be afraid,” μὴ φοβοῦ . . . ἔγὼ εἰμι, or θάρσει . . . ἔγὼ εἰμι—also typical for visionary accounts of both pagan and Judeo-Christian provenience. The Savior’s Offenbarungsrede has the outline as follows: (i) Exhortation Formula; (ii) Ego-Proclamation (‘Selbstprädikation’); (iii) Statement of Intention; (iv) Parainesis (‘Alarm Call’).

(i) Exhortation Formula

[He said to me], John, [why do] you have doubts.
Then (he said), [Do not be afraid!]
Surely (γάρ) you are not alien to [this appearance]?
Do not be [faint-hearted!] (BG 21:14–18; cf. II 2:9–12)

28 For the Acts of Philip see now the new edition by Bovon-Bouvier-Amsler (1999) vols. 1–2, as well as the earlier article by Bovon (1988) 4431–4527. The manuscript Xenophontos 32 contains “la presque totalité des Actes de Philippe” (4434), and by far exceeds all manuscripts M. Bonnet used while preparing his critical edition (Bonnet 1903, 1–90). It provides exciting new material including so far unknown Acts Phil. 11 (end) and 12–15. First mentioned by S. Lambros in his Catalogue of the Greek Manuscripts on Mount Athos, Cambridge (1895) 1:64, the MS. was photographed by Bovon during his visit to Athos in 1974.
The whole section is an elaboration of the conventional μη φοβοῦ formula, immediately followed by the first-person aretalogy (Rev 1:17; cf. Mark 6:50 and Luke 24:36: ἐγὼ εἰμί, μὴ φοβεῖσθε). The affirmative variant θαρσεῖτε, θαρσήσεις, θάρσησον occurs in ‘passwords’ from ancient mystery cults and pagan visionary accounts—for example, in the Epiphaneia A from the temple at Lindos: ἐπιστάσασα καθ’ ὑπὸν παρεκάλει θαρσὲν, Blinkenberg 1915, 36)—and was also used in the Second-Temple Judaism, but, as noted by K. Berger (1984) 1316–17, only in texts originally written in Greek. 29 With the same question, “Why do you have doubts” (τί διστάζεις), Christ begins his revelatory account in the Epistle of the Apostles (pp. 222, 300 Schmidt).

(ii) Ego-Proclamation (Selbstprädikation)

It is I who am with you (pl.) always.
It is I who am [the father].
It is I who am the mother.
It is I who am [the son].
It is I who always exist:
the undefiled [and the un]mixed. (BG 21:18–22:1; cf. II 2:12–15)

The scholarly literature on the revelatory “Ich-Stil” self-proclamation (or the first-person aretalogy) is immense. 30 There is a plethora of pagan parallels, from magical papyri to aretalogies of Isis, Sarapis, and more obscure local deities, that one could include in this ever-growing corpus. 31

(iii) Statement of Intention

[Now I have come] to teach you:
[what is] that which exists;
and what is that [which has come to] be;
and what is that which [must come to] be,
so that you might . . .
the things invisible [and the things] visible,
and to [. . .] concerning the perfect [man]. (BG 22:2–9; cf. NHC II 2:16–20)

---

29 For additional references, see Berger (1976) 433–434, nn. 23–25.
30 For a concise survey of the most relevant titles, the reader may now consult Poirier (1995) 101, n. 236.
31 For the Isiac and other pagan ‘ego-proclamations’, and for the ‘aretalogical’ genre in general, see Berger (1984) 1218–1231, with an extensive bibliography, 1218–19.
Viewed as an act of literary communication, the Savior’s self-revelation is an example of a first-person ‘Botenselbsterich’ (‘Now I have come to teach you,’ the ἱκώ-formula), whose formal elements are analyzed by Bühner (1977). The role of a messenger, according to Bühner’s analysis of various Jewish, and particularly of Rabbinic sources, is twofold. The messenger may figure as the mouthpiece of a more powerful sender, but he/she may also be a disguised divinity, whose recognition provides the solution for the riddle of a seer’s vision. Gnostic visions, as already pointed out by Casadio (1988) 2:396, can be similarly divided into those in which “the otherworldly mediator is [. . .] as a rule an angel, the so-called angelus interpres,” and those in which the messenger is “Jesus Christ the Savior (in general after the Resurrection).”

(iv) Parainesis (Appeal to the Audience; ‘Alarm Call’)

Now, then, lift up your [face] and listen, and [receive what I] will say to you today, [so that] you may in turn proclaim these to your spiritual fellows, those who are [from] the immovable race [of the] perfect human being; and [. . .] to understand. (BG 22:10–17; cf. II 2:20–26)

Two points in the Savior’s self-introductory address deserve a more detailed treatment. First, there is the Savior’s intriguing identification as Father–Mother–Son in the “Ego-proclamation” section (ii), to which I will turn in the next chapter when analyzing the ‘procession’ (προβολή) of the subordinate levels of reality from a single supreme principle in the Apocryphon of John. The second intriguing passage, important for understanding the structure of the Savior’s ensuing monologue, is that part of the ‘statement of intention’ (iii) which, according to some critics, represents a standard prophetic formula: “Now I have come to teach you what exists and what has come to be and what must come to be.”

32 For an attempt to apply Bühner’s scheme to Gnostic self-proclamations, and for the interesting results derived from such an application, it is worth reading the literary analysis of the Thunder, Perfect Intellect (NHC VI 2) in Poirier’s edition (1995) of the treatise.
‘Dispositio’: What Is—What Has Come to Be—What Will Come to Pass

After a brief self-proclamation in *Ich-Stil*, the Savior introduces the ἢκω-formula to explain the purpose of his appearance to John. He “has come” to teach his former disciple about “that which is, that which has come to be, and that which will come to pass,” so that John may acquire the knowledge of “things invisible and visible.” Furthermore, he promises to instruct John about “the perfect man.”

A common scholarly wisdom is that the formula *what is, what has come to be, what will come to pass* expresses “the whole of history in its three aspects of past, present and future” (Van Unnik 1963, 89). The formula has numerous parallels in Jewish, Christian, and pagan circles. It describes “the office and privilege of a prophet,” and reveals “a certain aspect of ‘prophecy’ which has been overlooked so far.” For, as the formula supposedly makes clear, “It was the privilege of the prophets, granted by divine inspiration, to have an insight into this mystery [i.e., of history in its totality] which they alone could declare, not in part, but as a whole.” The very fact that the Savior resorts to this standard formula in the *Apocryphon of John* betrays thus, in this view, the author’s intention that his book be “considered as a prophetic revelation.” In conclusion, “It seems as though the author wants to stand in a certain apocalyptic tradition, although the contents of the book [i.e., *Ap. John*] are toto caelo different from apocalyptic traditions” (93–94).

Van Unnick acknowledges that the formula was often exploited as a simple rhetorical *figura* or a poetic intensification, with no obvious religious connotations, standing simply as the *verbum proprium* for ‘everything’. He also acknowledges, but does not consider as important, the fact that the formula was often placed in the mouth of gods—as often in fact, judging from the list of examples, as it was uttered by prophets. Isis, for example, and the Eleusinian Aion, both refer to themselves as being “what has come to be, is, and will be,” symbolizing the totality of existence and their absolute transcendence. It is, therefore, equally plausible that the author of the *Apocryphon of John* wished his book to be a divine proclamation of the same style as, for example, Isis’ revelation to Lucius in Apuleius’s *Metamorphoses*, and not as a prophetic statement “standing in the tradition of Jewish apocalyptic” (87).
Comparing the Savior’s use of the formula with the usual sequence of its elements, Van Unnik points to an “interesting” discrepancy. Instead of “past, present, future,” the order adopted in the *Apocryphon of John* is “present, past, future.” The survey of examples shows that such an inverted order was, after all, not that uncommon. There was, in fact, “not a special word-order: past, present, future”—often “the elements change their places, although the future tense usually stands at the end. The cause of these changes may be due to outward circumstances, such as the necessities of the poetical meter, but does not seem to be essential” (93).

Metrical constraints indeed caused the reversal of order, from Homer onward (*Iliad*, 1.70), to the extent that even the future tense could change its ‘usual’ terminal position (Ovid, *Metam*. 1.517–518). In prose, however, the order tends to be fixed, with the formula presenting three dimensions of time in (chrono)logical succession. It seems as though not only the concepts of past, present, and future, but also the natural sequence in which they unfold, were constitutive of the formula—unless some important “outward circumstances” were introduced that made the change in this natural order unavoidable. What are these “outward circumstances”?

Among numerous examples, Van Unnik also quotes the passage from Plato’s *Timaeus*:

When the father who had begotten [the world] saw it set in motion and alive, a shrine brought into being for the everlasting gods, he rejoiced and, well pleased, he took thought to make it yet more like its model (τὸ παράδειγμα). So as that pattern is an ever existing living being (ζωῆν αἰώνιον ὄν), he sought to make this universe (τὸδε τὸ πᾶν) also like it, so far as might be, in that respect. Now the nature of that living being was eternal (αἰώνιος), and this [nature] it was impossible to confer in full completeness on the generated thing (τὸ γεννητὸ). But he took thought to make, as it were, a moving likeness of eternity (εἰκώ... κινητῶν τινα αἰώνος). And, at the same time that he ordered the heaven, he made, of eternity that abides in unity, an everlasting likeness moving according to number (μένοντος αἰώνος... κατ’ ἀριθμὸν ιοῦσαν αἰώνιον εἰκώνα)—that to which we have given the name of time (χρόνον). For there were no days and nights, months and years, before the heaven came into being. But he [i.e. the demiurge] planned that they should now come to be at the same time that the heaven was framed. All these are parts of time (ταῦτα δὲ πάντα μέρη χρόνου), and ‘was’ and ‘shall be’ are forms of time that have come to be (καὶ τὸ τ’ ἦν τὸ τ’ ἔσται χρόνου γεγονότα εἶδη), which we are wrong to transfer inadvertently to eternal being (ὁ δὲ φέροντες λανθάνομεν ἐπὶ τὴν αἰώνιον οὐσίαν οὐκ ὀρθῶς).
We say that it [i.e. eternal Being] was and is and shall be (ὡς ἔστιν τε καὶ ἔσται). But is alone really belongs to it and describes it truly; was and shall be are properly used of becoming which proceeds in time (περὶ τὴν ἐν χρόνῳ γένεσιν ἰοῦσαν). For they are motions, while that which is for ever in the same state immovably (τὸ δ’ ἄει κατὰ ταῦτα ἔχων ἀκινήτως) cannot be becoming older and younger by lapse of time, nor can it ever become so. Neither can it now have been, nor will it be in the future. And in general nothing belongs to it of all that Becoming attaches to the moving things of sense; but these have come into being as forms of time, which imitates eternity and revolves according to number (χρόνου ταῦτα αἰῶνα μιμομένου καὶ κατ’ ἀριθμὸν κυκλομένου γέγονεν εἶδο). (Plato, Tim. 37c6–38a8)

Van Unnik has noticed, quite rightly, that Plato criticizes here the meaning usually attributed to the threefold formula “because the notion of time cannot be applied to eternity” (92). Yet Plato does not only criticize the common opinion (“We say that eternal Being was and is and shall be”). He also proposes the correct way of interpreting the formula. That is, he rearranges the formula according to the order of ontological priority. Thus, instead of distinguishing between the three dimensions of physical time, the traditional formula, in its Platonic reinterpretation, expresses the dichotomy of Being and Becoming, as already set forth in the opening sections of the Timaeus (27d–28a).

In his account of cosmogony, Plato follows the very same rule formulated by Socrates in the Phaedrus (264c2–6). Just as, in general, the organization of a literary work must be similar to the structure of a living being, so the discourse of cosmogony in the Timaeus must resemble the image of the universe. The task set before Plato is, thus, to re-enact, in the form of a narrative, the demiurge’s fabrication of the visible universe—that is, to represent, to the degree in which it is possible, the order of the cosmogonic process. And indeed, before engaging in a more detailed analysis of the factors of becoming (Tim. 48c2–3: ἡ δ’ οὖν αὐτῆς ἀρχὴ περὶ τοῦ παντὸς ἔστω μειζόνως τῆς πρόσθεν διηρημένη), Plato describes in detail the hierarchical arrangement of the universe.
Whether this hierarchical order is to be taken diachronically, in the
sense of one level of reality being generated from another, or syn-
chronically, as a structural differentiation of contingents from their
principles, has been a matter of controversy throughout the history
of Platonism, from Plato’s first successors in the Old Academy to his
modern commentators. The latter interpretation has been more pop-
ular, partly because of the occasional discrepancy in the narrative
of the *Timaeus* between the time of the narrated story and the time
of the narration. Plato clearly imposed limits on the human capac-
ity of faithfully mimicking the diachronical sequence of cosmogonic
events—in one instance (*Tim.* 34b–c) he even admits that the world
soul, “although it comes later” in the narrative, must be in fact
viewed as “prior” to the world body, and explains this inversion by
the unfortunate fact that “there is, in us, too much of the casual
and random, which shows itself in our speech.” The ‘natural’ order
of presentation also seems subverted in 37c–40d, where the effect
(‘time’) occurs before its cause, i.e. the planets. Another vexed issue
among the followers of Plato was defining the order and kind of pri-
ority in which God, or intellect (νοῦς), stands to the realm of forms
or ideas. Still, the logical, ontological, and diachronical priority of
Being over Becoming is carefully preserved throughout the *Timaeus.*
As Plato says, “was and shall be are forms of time that have come to
be,” and we should be careful not to “transfer them inadvertently to
eternal Being” (37e4–5). The proper order of the ‘Drei-Zeiten-Formel’

---

33 The issue became even more complex by bringing some other texts of Plato
into discussion—for example, *Soph.* 248a–249d, where, in contrast to the *Timaeus,*
the intellect (νοῦς) is firmly positioned in Being. The problem of the composition
of the *Timaeus* and of Plato’s reasons for subverting the ’logical’ order of presenta-
tion still awaits a comprehensive analysis, literary and philosophical alike. Along
with many a useful remark on individual passages in the modern commentaries on
the *Timaeus*, esp. Taylor (1928), Cornford (1937), Brisson (1995) and (1999), and
Marcel (1995), the following articles are also worth consulting: Gadamer (1980)
is, thus, not what was, is, and will be, but what is, was, and will be. For Plato and his followers in antiquity, this is the natural order in a hierarchically organized reality and the natural order of exposition in the plausible cosmological account (εἰκός μὴθος or λόγος).

We seem now to be in the position of explaining the “interesting” discrepancy in the Savior’s use of the ancient formula of prophecy as given in the Apocryphon of John. When the Savior announces to John that he is about to teach him “what is, has come to be, and will come to happen,” he behaves like a Platonist, one for whom Being, or “what is,” must come before Becoming, or “what was and will be,” both in the order of reality and in the properly constructed cosmological narrative. The Savior’s prophetic formula is thus, in fact, both the proposition of the subject matter (propositio) and the enumeration of the points (partitio) to be covered in his ensuing monologue. In developing his subject, the Savior will respect the logical order of exposition. He will first discuss that which comes first in reality—Plato’s everlasting Living Being, or “that which exists”—and only later “what has come to be” and “what will come to pass,” which stands for Plato’s realm of Becoming. Graphically,

I. Part One: What Is (The Realm of Being)
   A. Agnostos Theos
   B. Procession of Aeons and the Organization of the Spiritual Realm (Fullness)

II. Part Two: What Has Come to Be (The Realm of Becoming, Part One)
   A. Cosmogony (1): Sophia’s Fault and Miscarriage
   B. Cosmogony (2): Ialdabaoth’s Fabrication of the World
   C. Cosmogony (3): Sophia’s Repentance
   D. Anthropogony: Creation of Adam and Eve
   E. Biblical History and the Conflict of the Two Spirits

III. Part Three: What Will Come to Pass (The Realm of Becoming, Part Two)
   A. Soteriology
   B. Destruction of Ialdabaoth’s World and the Restoration of the Original Fullness

Plot: The Logic of the Savior’s Narrative
At the level of an overall organization of the narrative, the three thematic units of the Apocryphon of John constitute the three moments in a typical folktale sequential structure: Initial Order—Violation—Restoration of the Initial Order. Each of these three generic units consists of a series of individual episodes, each characterized in turn by
a specific chain of actions. The logic according to which the events in each episode unfold is a complicated game of giving or not-giving, and taking or not taking. Thus, in the first part (I.B), the effusion of aeons from the first principle proceeds as a sequence of identical actions: requesting the gift—granting—taking. For example,

Barbelo requested from him [i.e., the Invisible Spirit] to grant her Foreknowledge.
When he had consented,
Foreknowledge came forth
and stood firm [. . .] glorifying the Invisible One, etc. (BG 28:4–11)

In the second part (II.A), this monotonous rhythm of reciprocal giving and taking comes to an abrupt end. First, an agent (Sophia) requests a gift that is immediately denied, but continues to act alone as though the permission was given (requesting the permission—not giving—taking what was not given). Next, in yet another violation of the prescribed pattern (II.B), a new personage, the real villain of the story (Ialdabaoth), steals that which he has neither requested nor been granted (not requesting—not giving—taking what is not given, i.e., stealing). The rest of the second part, following the fulfillment of Sophia’s repentance (II.C), or her request for help (requesting—giving—taking what is given), consists of the repeated attempts (II.D–E) on the part of various agents (Sophia and her helpers), none of them fully successful, to take back what has been previously stolen (requesting—not giving—gradually taking away, i.e., stealing). Finally, in the third section (III.B), the theft is recovered and the initial situation restored.

The congruence between the Apocryphon’s thematic division, the organization of its plot, and the logic according to which its narrative unfolds, may be presented in the following fashion:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic Composition</th>
<th>Plot</th>
<th>Narrative Logic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. “What Is”</td>
<td>i. Initial Order</td>
<td>Searching for the “Self”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Agnostos Theos</td>
<td></td>
<td>Asking–Granting–Taking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Pleroma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. “What Has Come to Be”</td>
<td>ii. Violation</td>
<td>Asking–Not Giving–Taking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Sophia’s Fault</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Giving–Stealing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Ialdabaoth’s Demiurgy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Asking–Giving–Taking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Sophia’s Repentance</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Giving–Partly Recovering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Anthropogony</td>
<td>iii. Partial Recovery</td>
<td>Not Giving–Partly Recovering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Biblical History</td>
<td>[same]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. “What Will Come to Pass”</td>
<td>iiiib. Initial Order Restored</td>
<td>Not Giving–Fully Restoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. The Destiny of Souls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Final diakrisis/synteleia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Note: The text contains a typographical error in the section on Ialdabaoth, where the word “staring” should likely be “stealing.”]
The Savior’s partition of the subject, which he outlined in his Platonizing revision of the “prophetic” formula, is simple, clear, and, most importantly, faithfully maintained throughout his monologue. For this reason, the ensuing chapters and sections of this monograph will follow the order of presentation as laid out by the Savior himself, concentrating mostly on the first two parts of his monologue—more specifically, on those sections of the revelation which primarily deal with the construction and arrangement of the universe (I.A–B and II.A–C).

The hierarchical arrangement of reality into Being (i.e. God and his eternal paradigm) and Becoming (i.e. the visible world and its elementary constituents) does not seem to be the only feature borrowed from the *Timaeus*. A synoptic comparison between the thematic structure of the *Apocryphon of John* and the first section of the cosmogonic account in the *Timaeus* reveals a similar order of presentation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>Apocryphon of John</em></th>
<th><em>Timaeus</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. <em>What Is</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. ‘Agnostos Theos’</td>
<td>God—πατήρ καὶ ποιητής (28c–30c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Pleroma</td>
<td>Eternal Model, τὸ παντελὲς ζῶον, containing τὰ νοητὰ πάντα (30c–31b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. <em>What Has Come to Be</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Sophia’s Fault</td>
<td>World-Soul and Its Double Orientation (35a–37c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Ialdabaoth’s Fabrication of the Universe</td>
<td>The Demiurge Fabricates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Fiery Realm</td>
<td>(a) World-Body (31a–34b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Twelve Signs of Zodiac</td>
<td>(b) Heavenly Gods = Stars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Seven Planets</td>
<td>(c) Planets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Other Chronocrators</td>
<td>(d) Time (37c–40d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Sophia’s Adventures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Disorderly Movement = Repentance</td>
<td>Soul in Body: Disorderly Motion (42a–44d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Sophia Rescued to the Ninth Heaven</td>
<td>Soul Returns to Heaven (42b–c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Anthropogony</td>
<td>Composition of Human Souls (41d–e) and of Seven Parts of the Human Frame (73b–76e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Creation of the Seven Parts of Adam’s Animate Body</td>
<td>Implanting of Souls into Bodies (44d–45b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Adam Relegated to the Material Realm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Paradise, Eve, Snake, and the Subsequent History of Humankind</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. <em>What Will Come to Pass</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. The Destiny of Souls</td>
<td>The Laws of Destiny (41d–42d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Final Diakrisis/Synteleia</td>
<td>δυτ ἐμὸν γευομένα ἄλυτα ἐμὸν γε μὴ ἔθελοντος (41a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The above comparison suggests that the Savior, in shaping his cosmological account, decided to follow the first part of the *Timaeus’s* cosmogonic account exactly as it unfolds. That is, he appears to have taken the *Timaeus’s* linear exposition (*diegesis*) as though it reflects the actual order in which the cosmogonic events took place. This assimilation of the ‘narrative time’, or the order of presentation, with the ‘real time’, or the rhythm in which things actually happened, was not uncommon among the ancient readers of the *Timaeus*. The partisans of such a ‘literal’ reading (Plutarch, Atticus, Iunclus, and, according to Proclus, “many others,” *In Tim.* 1.276,31–277,1 Diehl), were not discouraged by Plato’s own warnings that his diegesis does not always follow the order of events. The simple fact that, in such places, he found it important to warn the reader about his departure from the actual chronology could only strengthen the illusion that, whenever a similar warning was not issued, things were told in the order in which they occurred. The advocates of a non-chronological reading of the *Timaeus* considered this a dangerous misreading. In their view, Plato in his account simply sets in motion an eternal structure. The chronological order of exposition is consequently attributed to constraints imposed by the linearity of language—the linearity which rules out the possibility of pronouncing two different things, or statements, at one and the same time. When, on some occasions, Plato warns that some parts of his account are not given in a chronological sequence, he wants to say that chronology does not matter—that the world was not created in time, and that *genesis* means no more than its ontological dependence as a contingent on its principles. This is certainly a more sophisticated solution. And yet, as Paul Valéry said, people prefer to apply, to everything they perceive as composite or sequential, that same chronological thread upon which they string their individual lives. Many literalist readers of the *Timaeus*, including the Gnostics, seem to have simply chosen this more “natural” way.

La croyance au temps comme agent et fil conducteur est fondée sur le mécanisme de la mémoire et sur celui du discours combinés. Le type du récit, de l’histoire, de la fable contée, du dévidement d’événements et d’impressions par celui qui sait où il va, qui possède ce qui va advenir, s’impose à l’esprit. (P. Valéry, *Tel Quel* 2, Paris 1943, 272)

What is peculiar about the Savior’s ‘natural’ reading of the *Timaeus* is that, in the end, it manages to produce a story only vaguely sim-
ilar to its model account. The above table has shown some striking correspondences in the order of exposition between the first part of the *Timaeus* and the Savior’s diegesis. Yet upon taking a closer look at the parallel units in the two texts, similarities begin to fade and differences to rise. These are not only superficial differences, such as various names given to ‘dramatis personae’ in each account. Moreover, the Savior’s ‘Unknown God’ turns out to be an inexact replica of Plato’s “maker and father.” Furthermore, the Pleroma is not structured in the same fashion as the eternal model of the *Timaeus*. And, unlike Plato’s world-soul, Sophia does not lead “ceaseless and intelligent life for all time” (*Tim. 36c*). The life she leads resembles, instead, the vicissitudes of the individual “immortal soul” which, upon being “sown” on Earth (*42d*), found itself “confined within the strong river of the body,” and “was moving and being moved in a violent fashion” (*43a*) for some time before “regaining the calm” (ibid. *44a–b*).

Two different standards appear to have been applied in the *Apocryphon*’s use of the *Timaeus*. At the large scale, or the plane of an overall organization, the Savior’s revelatory account follows Plato’s narrative. At the smaller scale, however, or the level of individual episodes, the author of the *Apocryphon of John* introduces into Plato’s cosmological model a series of adjustments, assimilations, and bold distinctions that many ancient commentators of Plato’s cosmogony would have viewed, and in fact did view (e.g., Plotinus) as illicit manipulations. In this respect, the *Apocryphon* comes close to the works by those Gnostics who had so much infuriated Plotinus for “falsifying Plato’s manner of representing the fabrication of the universe” (*Enn. II 9.6*). This corrective work, as will be seen in the forthcoming sections, had a twofold purpose: first, to straighten the ‘ambiguities’ left in the *Timaeus*’s presentation concerning the actual order of cosmogonic events; and second, to set firm boundaries between various levels of reality that Plato, in his “playfulness” (*paidiã, Tim. 59c–d*), often tended to confuse.

(i) According to the Savior’s revelatory account in the *Apocryphon of John*, the god described in the *Timaeus* as a rational regulating principle that informs reality with a specific finality after the pattern of ideal forms (*28c–30c*), must be viewed as distinct from the divine craftsman who fabricates the world-body, heavenly gods, and time (*31a–34b; 37c–40d*). The gap separating these two agents of creation, which the Savior calls the Father of the Entirety and Ialdabaoth the Demiurge—is filled with the Pleromatic Realm, the correlate of
the *Timaeus*’s eternal model of ideas. In the *Apocryphon of John*, the Father and the Demiurge differ both in the manner in which they create and in the kind of material at their disposal. The Demiurge fabricates the visible world out of corporeal stuff (οὐλη, elements) by some vague reference to the outside model. The Father, in contrast, generates his progeny, the Pleromatic Realm, out of his own substance and passes on to the progeny a portion of his substance and vitality.

(ii) In the *Timaeus*, Plato states that it is “hard to find the maker and father of this universe” (*Tim.* 28c). Later in the narrative, he adds that “the maker looked” at the eternal model of forms while creating the world (29a). In view of (i), the most obvious solution for the author of the *Apocryphon* would be to identify the maker with Ialdabaoth the Demiurge. Instead, he seems to have taken the copula in Plato’s phrase τὸν ποιητὴν...καὶ πατέρα as epexegetic—“the Maker, namely the Father.” Thus, in the shorter version of *Apocryphon*, the supreme principle is endowed with the capacity to ‘make’ (ἐιρής), but not to ‘fabricate’ in a demiurgic fashion (ΤΑΗΙΟ).

And the invisible spirit wanted to make (ἐιρής) something; and his will became a deed; it was shown forth; it stood firm together with Intellect and the Light, glorifying him. And Word followed after Will; for it is by the Word that Christ, the divine Self-Originate, fabricated (ΤΑΗΙΟ) all things. (BG 31:11–18)

(iii) The eternal model of forms is called in the *Timaeus* a “perfect living being,” and this may be why the *Apocryphon of John* considers the Spiritual Realm and its constituents, or Aeons, as the Father’s progeny. Plato, in addition, calls this eternal realm intelligible, that is, the object of God’s thought. As stated in the *Timaeus* (39e 8–10),

> Whosoever forms intellect (νοῦς) beholds (καθορῶ) in the living being that truly is (τῶ ὁ ἐστὶν ζῶν) in their kinds and numbers, such and so many he planned (discursively conceived, διηνοήθη) that this world also should receive.

Yet these forms, the Savior argues, are not just the objects of God’s thought. The entirety of eternal forms, which the *Apocryphon of John* calls the Pleroma, cannot exist outside of the divine Intellect (νοῦς). Platonic forms, or Aeons in the Savior’s jargon, are therefore not only God’s thought-content but also the products of God’s activity as Intellect (νοῦς). No longer endowed with an independent existence, they are now relegated to the realm of God’s subjectivity.
(iv) Following the Savior’s argument in (iii), the Pleroma must be thought of as God’s progeny—that is, not only the content but also the product of his intellectual activity. Yet somewhat surprisingly, the Savior does not assert that God the Father is the same as Intellect. The latter, in fact, he associates with the Son, also called the Self-Originate (Autogenes) and Christ. But how can forms, or Aeons, simultaneously figure as the progeny of both the Father and Intellect, His offspring? To solve this puzzle, the Savior introduces a non-Platonic distinction between ennoiai (conceptions) and their ennoêmata (concepts). The Father, a pure act of thinking, is capable of generating only vague and “subjective” conceptions (e.g. the generic thought of man, god, goodness, etc.). Only through their further articulation on the part of Intellect can the Father’s conceptions become self-subsistent entities (υποστάσεις) or concepts—the chain of predicates rendering a fully articulated definition of God. In the Apocryphon of John, the externalization of God’s predicative content is symbolically represented as the gradual ‘procession’ (πρόοδος) of Aeons, the sum total of his inner dispositions.

(v) The world-soul which, as the Timaeus has it, God created by blending the forms of sameness, difference, and existence (35a, 37a), so as to have it partake of both being (i.e., ideas or forms) and becoming (i.e., perceptible things), is assimilated by the Savior with “the immortal [human] soul,” one which appears later in the Timaeus as “confined within the flowing and ebbing tide of the body” (43a). Because of this identification, the world-soul of the Apocryphon of John, Sophia, cannot lead the “ceaseless and intelligent life for all time” characteristic of the Platonic world-soul (36c). Reduced to the rank and fate of the individual human soul, Sophia falls into matter, is “moving and being moved in a violent fashion” (43a), and only eventually “returns once more to the form of [its] first and best condition” (42d). Three stages can thus be distinguished in the life of this ‘Gnostic’ world-soul, to which the Savior gives the Biblical name of Sophia:

Stage One: The “intelligent life” (36c) within the superior realm
Stage Two: The fall into a fluctuating bodily substrate followed by a disorderly movement (42d–44d)
Stage Three: “Regaining the calm” (44b), returning to the original condition.

In the Savior’s narrative, these stages correspond to the three episodes in the life of Sophia:
Act One: Sophia appears as the last aeon of her Father’s Pleroma
Act Two: Sophia turns away from her consort and falls into matter
Act Three: Upon repenting, Sophia rises to the “ninth heaven” and eventually returns to the Pleroma

(vi) In the sentence from the *Timaeus* quoted above (iii), the Savior distinguishes between “the living being that truly is” (viz., the Pleroma), the intellect (νοῦς) that “beholds” it, and the discursive planner (διηνοηθή). In the *Apocryphon*, this third entity is Sophia. She exercises her διάνοια, or the discerning capacity characteristic of the rational soul, and organizes the material substrate by separating its elements. Her activity is, therefore, demiurgic, but not in the same sense as that of the Demiurge proper, Ialdabaoth, who fabricates heavenly bodies and time. In contrast to Sophia, Ialdabaoth is without knowledge and discursive capacity—he is portrayed as “dim,” “jealous,” “arrogant,” and “stupefied in his ἐνοια”—and “does not see the incorruptible” while creating the visible world. Two characteristic functions of Plato’s Demiurge—separating elements, then shaping, out of them, the world-body—are thus divided in the *Apocryphon of John* between Sophia and Ialdabaoth. The former separates, the latter fabricates. The former sees the model, the latter can only imagine it by exercising the image-making capacity (φαντασία) of his irrational soul. The former acts in the latter (ἐνέργεια) and provides him with the impulse to create. The former is the preliminary cause of the world’s creation (τὸ ὡφ’ οὐ, τὸ ἐξ οὗ), the latter is its instrumental cause (τὸ διέ ὁδὸ).

(vii) In his account of the framing of Adam’s animate body, the Savior follows, both in the order of presentation and in wording, the *Timaeus*’s analysis of the main parts of the human frame (73b–76e). This may suggest that the Savior was, in fact, familiar with the whole of the *Timaeus*. If that was indeed the case, what did he do with the second part of Plato’s account of cosmogony (48e–69a)? The main intention of that whole section was to provide “a fuller classification than one made before” (48e) and to analyze the same cosmogonic events as in the first part, but more thoroughly and from the opposite quarter—that is, from ‘below’, starting from the lowest level of reality. The analytical flavor of the whole section was probably the reason why the Savior, interested primarily in *mythopoeia*, paid little attention to it. Yet he did not overlook those sections dealing with the third genus of reality, “the receptacle of becoming” (48e–53c). The visible world, which is an image of the intelligible living being,
must, insofar as being an image, “come to be in something else” (52c). This “principle-in-which” (τὸ ἐν ὃ), one that receives impressions taken from intelligible forms (figurae impressae) and turns them into their outward representations or images (imaginæ expressæ), Plato in the Timæus compares with the “mother” (50d2–3: προσεικώσατο πρέπει τὸ μὲν δεξόμενον μητρὶ), suggesting that the world’s becoming abides by the laws of biological reproduction. Plato, however, proposes only one such female principle. The Savior, in turn, claims that, in a hierarchical reality, there must be a separate female, or ‘hyletic’, principle for each level—at least one for the Pleromatic Realm, and the other for the visible world fabricated by Ialdabaoth. According to this sort of analogous reasoning, Plato’s “receptacle of becoming” must have a correlate in the eternal living being. Translated in the Savior’s jargon in the Apocryphon, Sophia, who plays the role of a feminine principle, the receptacle (“that in which”) of becoming, must thus have a paradigmatic counterpart in the Pleromatic realm. This is Ennoia–Barbelo, called in the longer version “the womb of the entirety” (II 5:5).

(viii) According to Plato’s own instruction in the Timæus, the world-soul is to be taken as “prior in birth and excellence to the world-body,” although, in the order of narrative presentation, the world-body happens to come first (34b–c). The same inversion of the chronological order of events occurs in the narrative sequence dealing with the creation of time, the seven planets, and the fixed stars (37c–40d). The Savior rearranges the Platonic sequence in order to re-establish its logical and ‘chronological’ order.

The Savior’s solutions do not strike one as particularly original. For almost each of these corrective interventions into Plato’s account of creation in the Timæus, there are many parallels in the philosophical literature of the period. To trace these interventions back to their hypothetical stimuli, I take each of the points above in the identical sequence.

(i) The conceptual distinction between the Father and the Demiurge is the Middle Platonist legacy. Plutarch has dedicated one of his ζητήματα to that issue (Quæst. Plat. 2). He does not separate them into two distinct entities, but he outlines the arguments that will, eventually, lead some later interpreters of the Timæus to that conclusion. In the first place, the father differs from the maker (for Plutarch, this is just a more generic name for the demiurge) as birth differs from coming to be: “In the case of a maker, . . . his work
when done is separated from him, whereas the principle or force belonging to the parent is blended in the progeny and sustains (συνέχει) its nature, which is a fragment and part (ἀπόσπασμα καὶ μορίον) of the procreator” (2.1, 1001A–B). Second, the father differs from the demiurge as the world-soul differs from the world-body: the latter “God did not beget, but, matter having submitted itself to him, he formed and fitted it together... The soul, however, when it has partaken of intelligence and reason... is not merely a work but also a part of god (2.2, 1001C: οὐκ ἔργον ἐστὶ τοῦ θεοῦ μόνον ἄλλα καὶ μέρος) and has come to be not by him but both away from him as source and out of him as substance (οὐδὲ ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ ἄλλα καὶ ἄτ’ αὑτοῦ καὶ ἐξ αὐτοῦ γέγονεν).” A clear ontological distinction between the two is later drawn by Numenius of Apamea (flor. ca. A.D. 150): “For it is not necessary for the First One to fabricate; in fact, the First God ought to be considered the Father of the Demiurge God” (frag. 12 Des Places: καὶ γὰρ οὔτε δημιουργεῖν ἔστι χρέων τὸν πρῶτον καὶ τὸν δημιουργοῦντος δὲ θεοῦ χρὴ εἶναι νομίζεσθαι πιστέρα πρῶτον θεόν). 

(ii) Taking Plato’s “father and maker” as one and the same God while distinguishing between the Father who ‘makes’ (ποιεῖν, εἰρέ) and the Demiurge who ‘fabricates’ (δημιουργεῖν, ταλιο) was not a common way of interpreting Plato’s famous saying (Tim. 28c). Ancient commentators on the Timaeus preferred not to introduce any ontological distinction between the maker and the demiurge. They either took these two terms as synonymous or, as seen in Plutarch’s passage quoted in (i), contrasted them semantically as genus vs. species. Thirty-four One author who seems to have made an important philosophical point by distinguishing between ποιεῖν and δημιουργεῖν, that is, by attributing these verbs to the two distinct principles, was Numenius of Apamea. In the above quoted fragment from the dialogue On the Good (frag. 12 Des Places), he claims that the first God is inactive (ἔργον), and that he can be described as active only in the sense of taking advantage of, or ‘using’ (πρόσχρησις), the creative capacity of the second God. It is thus possible to say that the father “makes” as his son, the demiurge, “fabricates,” provided that “making” denotes the father’s categorical and ontological superiority to his son, and not a type of activity inherent to his nature (εἰ μὲν οὖν περὶ τοῦ

---

34 See also Max. Tyr. Orat. 2.10 Koniaris (ὁ μὲν γὰρ θεὸς, ὁ τῶν ὄντων πατήρ καὶ δημιουργὸς), Philo Opif. 7, and Justin, 2 Apol. 10.6.
δημιουργικόν ξητούμεν, φάσκοντες δείν τὸν πρῶτον ὑπάρξαντα οὕτως ἀν ποιεῖν ἔχειν διαφερόντως, ἐσοικύια ἡ πρόσοδος αὐτή γεγονοῦσα ἢν εἴη τοῦ λόγου: εἰ δὲ περὶ τοῦ δημιουργοῦ μὴ ἐστὶν λόγος, ξητούμεν δὲ περὶ τοῦ πρῶτου; ἀφοσιώματε τα λεγόμενα καὶ ἔστω μὲν ἔκεινα ἅρρητα). 35 Several passages from the Corpus Hermeticum betray a similar kind of reasoning: ποιεῖν is a less marked and a more generic term (genus) than δημιουργεῖν (species), and so it suits best the highest genus in reality. 36

(iii) By placing Plato’s eternal model in the divine Intellect, or the Self-Originate, the Savior adopts the Middle Platonist dogma that “form is considered in relation to God, his thinking” (Alcinous, Didasc. 9.163.14–15 Whittaker: ἔστι δὲ ἡ ἰδέα ὡς μὲν πρὸς θεόν νόησις αὐτοῦ). The origins of this dogma are still disputed, and will remain so,

---

35 In another interesting fragment (frag. 17 Des Places), Numenius agrees with Plato’s saying that everyone is capable of knowing the Demiurge—in fact, Plato himself gave a detailed account of the divine craftsman and his activity. On the other hand, Numenius continues, the First Intellect, “which is called αὐτόν (Being ‘par excellence’), is completely unknown to mankind. For that reason, [Plato] declared what one could state as follows: ‘O men, what you consider as Intellect is not the first, but there is another Intellect prior to it, older and more divine’.” As noticed by Baltes (1979) 264, Numenius here provides his own reading of Tim. 28c. In Numenius’s interpretation, Plato regarded the Demiurge as accessible to all men, but the First Intellect, whom he named in the Timaeus as “the maker and father,” as impossible to find and know. On the other hand, as Baltes himself has noticed, Proclus (In Tim. 1.303, 27–304, 7 Diehl = frag. 21 Des Places) says that Numenius proclaimed “three Gods, calling the first ‘Father’, the second ‘Maker’ and the third ‘Creation.’” Whatever the cause of discrepancy—second-hand testimonia or Numenius’s own incoherence—this is certainly not the only subject on which Numenius’s opinion displays traces of inconsistency. Compare, for example, the ongoing debate about the identity of Numenius’s Third God, who may stand for the universe, for the World-Soul, for the rational Soul, for Intellect in its downward motion to the realm of matter, and, most likely, for all of the above. For Numenius’s doctrines, see esp. Krämer (1964) 63–92, Baltes (1979) 241–70, and Frede (1987) 1034–75.

36 Evidence from the Hermetica can be found in Mahé (1986) 3–53, whose attempt to derive some clear-cut semantic distinctions from the collection notorious for its lack of doctrinal unity is praiseworthy, yet by necessity conjectural. Still, his semantic comparison of the use of ποιεῖν and δημιουργεῖν deserves serious consideration, in that it seems congruent with Numenius’s and the Savior’s practice (ibid., 15): “ποιεῖν (‘faire’) est donc sémantiquement moins marqué que δημιουργεῖν (‘fabricuer’). Il fait office de terme générique, incluant δημιουργεῖν comme une de ses espèces. C’est ce qu’on peut déduire, par exemple, de CH 9.5, où ‘Dieu fabricateur de toutes choses, en les fabricant, fait toutes choses semblable à lui’ (θεὸς πάντων δημιουργός, δημιουργεῖν πάντα ποιεῖ μὲν αὐτῷ ὀμοίω). Δημιουργεῖν apparaît ici comme une modalité particulière du ποιεῖν, ainsi qu’en CH 16.9: ‘comme (Dieu) agit sur les grands corps en les fabriquant’ (καθάπερ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν μεγάλων σωμάτων ποιεῖ δημιουργῶν).”
ranging from Antiochus of Ascalon’s identification of Plato’s forms with the Stoic ‘common notions’ (Cic. Or. 8: ideai... ratione et intelligentia contineri) to the Old Academic definition of the soul as τόπος εἰδόν, which Aristotle later applied only to the soul’s intellective part (An. 3.4.429a27–28: πλὴν ὅτι οὖσε οἶλη ὁλλὰ ἡ νοητικῆ). (iv) Separation of the Father and Intellect in the Apocryphon probably draws on Neopythagorean speculations about the first two hypotheses in Plato’s Parmenides, and on their positing the first principle not only above Being (cf. Plato, Rep. 6.509b6–9: ἐπέκεινα τῆς ὀυσίας) but also above Intellect. The question already provoked disputes in the Old Academy, but only became a commonplace theme with the rise of ‘Pseudopythagorica’ in the first century B.C., when philosophical matters became intertwined with religious concerns and the borders between theology and philosophy got increasingly blurred. The logic behind the Savior’s move reflects theological tendencies of the period. If God is the same as Intellect, then, according to a commonly accepted principle of συνένεως (‘like knows like’), he should be attainable by the human intellect. Yet already Plato claimed that the knowledge of the divine surpasses human intellectual capacities and belongs only to gods (Symp. 204a). Meditation (ab infra) reduces the distance, but, in order to attain the principle that refuses all determinations, one needs an outside intervention (ab extra)—that is, a mediation on the part of a divine messenger who, in a hierarchically organized reality, stands closer than humankind does to the transcendent deity. The Savior’s dubitatio is indicative of this insurmountable gap:

What shall I say to you about him, the incomprehensible One? So far as I am able to conceive (νοεῖν) him, this is the image of the light. Indeed, who will ever conceive (νοεῖν) him? (BG 26:1–5).

The solution to this expression of doubt comes a few lines later:

For no one from among us has been acquainted with that which belongs to the immeasurable One except for him who has dwelled in him. It is he who said these things to us. (ibid. 26:11–15)38


38 The opinion whereby the first principle transcends intellect (νοῦς) was not pop-
The distinction between conceptions, *ennoiai*, and their objects or concepts, *ennoêmata*, is, of course, Stoic—just as the ‘vitalism’ of the Pleroma, with its manifold emanations and derivations, seems to have as much in common with Plato’s view of the intelligible Being in which life, soul, and intelligence reside along with ideas (*Soph*. 248a–249d), as it has with the Stoic view of the outward movement of the divine *pneuma* “producing quantities and qualities” (Nemesius, *Nat. hom.* 70.6–71.4), and with their theory of concept-formation.

(v) Identification of Plato’s world-soul with the individual “immortal soul” of the *Timaeus*, the latter of which moves in a disorderly way in the fluctuating corporeal substrate, seems to owe a great deal to a cross-referential, synchronic reading of the Platonic corpus—more precisely, to the identification of a notorious “all soul” (ψυχή πᾶσα) from the *Phaedrus* (245c5, 246b7) with the universal soul, and not, as often suggested, with “every soul.” Hermias, the Neoplatonist commentator (*In Phaedr.* 102.10 ff. Couvreur), traces this identification back to Posidonius “the Stoic.”

(vi) The triad Living Being (the Pleroma and its Father)—Intellect (Self-Originate)—Discursive Planner (Sophia, the rational World-Soul) is derived from the above quoted passage in the *Timaeus* (39e), and appears an almost exact replica of Numenius’s exegesis, as recorded in Proclus (*In Tim.* 3.103.28–32 Diehl; Numenius, frag. 22 Des Places):

ular among the Middle Platonists. They preferred the following formula: *God is Intellect and therefore intelligible* (ὄνομαί); cf. Plutarch, Alcinous, Maximus of Tyre, and Numenius. Apuleius, *De Plat.* 2.1.220, remains ambiguous: *prima bona esse deum summum mentemque illam quam vocat idem vocat*. Neopythagorean authors were in fact divided over the issue, but the majority defended the absolute transcendence of the first principle (Archytas, Perictios, Crito, Timaeus Locrus, Brotinus). Some, again, decided to remain non-committal: Onatas and Timaeus Locrus, for example. For the list of relevant passages from the ‘Pseudopythagorica’, see Moraux (1984) 2:639, n. 175; Lilla (1982–1987) 242–48; Centrone (1990) 155–57. Both opinions also occur in the *Corpus Hermeticum*. Philo identifies God with Intellect—see again Lilla (1982–1987) 230hr ff.—but probably under the influence of his Neopythagorean sources, also claims that “God is prior to Intellect” (*LA* 2.46). As shown above, the ‘Gnostics’ viewed the intellect as derivative, i.e. as proceeding from the first principle, on which see Irenaeus’s criticism of the Valentinians, *Adv. haer.* 2.13.1, discussed infra, chap. 2, pp. 94–104).

39 For an ‘orthodox’ Platonist who proposed the same solution as, allegedly, Posidonius, see Alcin. *Didasc.* 25.178,18 ff. Whittaker. Plotinus had dedicated one of his early essays to the confutation of such a “tragic view” of the world-soul in *Enn.* IV 8.2 ff. For other ‘testimonia’ cf. Moreschini (1993) 191–205.
Numenius ranks his First God with (Plato’s) “living being” and says that he conceives (νοεῖν) only by using (ἐν προσχρήσει) the Second; this Second God he ranks with Intellect (γνῶς) and (says that) this one fabricates (δημιουργεῖν) by using the Third; this Third God, again, he ranks with the Discursive Planner (τὸν διανοοῦμενον).

As for the relation between Ialdabaoth and Sophia, it probably draws on the Middle Platonist distinction between the appetitive part of the precosmic soul, lacking intelligence and coextensive with matter, as is the case with Plutarch’s disorderly soul inherent in matter and with Numenius’s anima silvae or silva animata, and the “mettlesome” part of the soul which “is not purely affective but frequently has a mental image of what is fair” (Plut. Quaest. Plat. 9.1, 1008C–D), and which, upon acquiring part of the divine intellect and “growing rational” (Plut. De an. procr. 24, 1024F), begins the ceaseless life of the rational world-soul. As Plutarch has it, “For soul without intelligence (ἀναξίων ψυχῆς) and amorphous body were always coexistent with each other. . . . But when the soul had partaken of intellect and concord and, grown rational through consonance, had become a cause of change for matter . . . This is the way in which the body of the universe got generated by the soul” (Quaest. Plat. 4, 1003A).

What all of the above passages seem to suggest is the hierarchical sequence in which each principle acts by using (ἐν προσχρήσει) one that immediately ensues:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plato Pythagoricus</th>
<th>Apocryphon of John</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First God (the Living Being)</td>
<td>Father and the First Ten Aeons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellect (and his Thoughts)</td>
<td>Self-Originate and his Twelve Aeons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational World-Soul</td>
<td>Sophia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrational Soul</td>
<td>Ialdabaoth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matter</td>
<td>Darkness/Ignorance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A strikingly similar sequence can also be found in Porphyry’s account of the cosmology of the first-century A.D. ‘Pythagorean’ Moderatus of Gades. Just like Numenius and the Savior in the Apocryphon of John, Moderatus managed to find, too, the triad of gods in the famous passage from the Timaeus (39e). The starting point for this sort of exegesis might have been Plato’s Second Epistle (312e).40

40 Baltes (1979) 264–65, writes as follows: “Die Dreigötterlehre des Numenios stammt nicht aus dem Timaios. . . . Ausgangspunkt für die Lehre war wahrscheinlich der im mittlere Platonismus hochgeschätzte 2. platonische Brief (312e).” Numenius’s
The postulate that each level of reality must have a separate ‘material’ principle is as old as Speusippus’s and Xenocrates’ theories of the derivation of a multi-layered reality from the two supreme principles, the One and Multiplicity or the Indefinite Dyad, allegedly propounded already by Plato in his later years. Thus, in Book M of his *Metaphysics*, Aristotle criticizes Plato’s followers, and most notably Speusippus, for “generating magnitudes from the point...which is not one, but like the one, and another material principle which is like Multiplicity, but not Multiplicity,” and for positing “one [matter] for the line, another for the plane, and another for the solid” (*Metaph.* 13.1085a31–b4 = frags. 83–84 Isnardi Parente).\(^{41}\) However

\(\text{\footnotesize 41 Xenocrates distinguishes three degrees of density (πυκνὸν) within the material substrate, claiming that each of them, in combination with one of Plato’s elementary bodies of the *Timaeus* (53d ff.), produces a different layer of the visible universe. Thus, “the stars and the sun are composed of first density, the moon of the second density and air...and the earth of water and the third kind of density” (Plut. *De facie* 24,944A). In chapter four of Iamblichus’s *De communi mathematica scientia* (DCMS 4.15, 5–18, 13 Festa = frags. 72 and 88 Isnardi-Parente), commonly held to contain traces of Speusippus’s metaphysical theory, the very existence of a multi-layered reality is said to imply a different pair of different principles for each level. For if the whole reality had derived from the same pair of simple and undifferentiated first principles—that is, if “the idea of the One [had acted upon] one and only one indefinite matter and receptacle” (16, 19–21)—their union would have produced only one level, that of mathematical numbers. For this reason, it is necessary to hypothesize a series of “differentiations” (μίαν τὴν ἀπαντος πλήθους τε καὶ μεγέθους αἰτίαν πρώτην, διαφορὰς δὲ πολλὰς ἐν αὐτῇ παρεχομένῃν 17, 1–3) within the single continuous material principle (described as “fluid and pliable,” ὑγρὰ τινὶ παντάπασι καὶ ἐυπλαδεῖ ὕλη, in 15, 12–13) which, at each subsequent level, acquires a higher degree of density or “thickness” (ἡν παχύτητα τῆς ὕλης 17, 6). In the realm of mathematical numbers, for example, the ‘hyletic’ principle is said to be responsible for their being “continuous, contaminated and thicker” (τὸ συνεχὲς καὶ τὸ συμμεμολογημένον μᾶλλον τῶν ἀριθμῶν καὶ συχνότερον 17, 20–21) The ensuing level of geometrical magnitudes proceeds from the union of the point and yet another ‘degree’ of matter, viz., “spatial extension” (διάστασις τόπων 17, 16), which Speusippus, according to Aristotle (*Meta.* 14.1092a17–20), identified with physical space (τόπος), alluding, in all likelihood, to the ‘Receptacle’ of Plato’s *Timaeus*. A thorough analysis of Speusippus’s and Xenocrates’ fragments can be found in Isnardi Parente (1980, 1982) and in the recent monograph by Dillon (2003); see also the influential book by Krämer (1967) and a series of studies by Halfwassen\)
much the particular mechanics of deriving a series of hierarchically organized levels of reality from a pair of simple first principles might vary in the doctrines of Speusippus and Xenocrates or, later on, in the metaphysical systems of the ‘Neopythagoreans’, ‘Gnostics’, or Plotinus and his followers, all of these derivational models postulated ‘analogy’ (ἀναλογία) or ‘equivalence’ (ὁμοιότης) as their basic organizing principle. In the *Apocryphon of John*, too, each level of reality—intelligible (the Pleroma), animate (the ‘liminal’ realm of Sophia, the Gnostic ‘world-soul’), and corporeal (the visible world controlled by Ialdabaoth and his ‘authorities’)—derives from a pair of opposite principles. The first ten Aeons of the Pleroma derive from the Father and his consort Barbelo; the twelve additional Aeons from the ‘union’ of the Self-Originate Intellect with Foreknowledge; and the visible world from Ialdabaoth and the corporeal substrate. To understand the logic of this derivative process, it is important to notice that, once the first level is produced out of the union of the two supreme principles, its most active constituent unites in its turn with another material principle and produces the next level of being. The principle of analogy is violated only in the case of Sophia, the material principle of the animate level, who assumes, in the absence of her male “consort”, the inappropriate role of active cause. Sophia’s violation results in ‘miscarriage’—it introduces a gap in the rational constitution of reality, leading to an increasing disorder in the system and, eventually, to entropy and stagnation.42

42 For ‘similarity’ (ὁμοιότης) as the link between different levels of being in Speusippus’s cosmology, cf. also Arist. *Top.* 1.18.108b23 ff. = frag. 85 Isnardi Parente: ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ἐν τοῖς πολύ διεστῶι χρήσιμοι πρὸς τοὺς ὁρισμοὺς ἢ τοῦ ὁμοίου θεωρία, οἷον ὅτι ταύτων ἐγκαθή μὲν ἐν ἔμπνευσι τῆς ἂν ἐν ἀέρι ἐκάτερον γὰρ ἡσυχίᾳ, καὶ ὅτι στυγή ἐν γραμμῇ καὶ μονάς ἐν ἁριθμῷ· ἐκάτερον γὰρ ἄρχη. See also Stenzel (1929) 1645 ff., who studies Speusippus’s usage of the term and its mathematical and analogical applications. For analogy and its different applications (proportion, transposition, juxtaposition) in Plato, cf. Robinson (1953) 202–22; for Middle Platonist applications of analogy to various aspects of reality, cosmology included, see the selection of relevant texts and excellent commentaries thereon in Dörrie-Baltes (1996) 100–109, 360–76. A three-level universe and the interference of circularity and verticality in its organization are distinctive features of Platonist world-hypothesis. Plato had himself postulated in the *Timaeus* an intermediate level between the two incompatible extremes, intelligible and sensible—i.e., the world-soul—following the rule that opposites, insofar as being mutually exclusive, require intercession by some
Finally, the Savior’s attempt to restore the logical and chronological order in Plato’s narrative of creation is not without precedents. In this case, too, the Savior might have simply adjusted the narrative structure of the *Timaeus* to the order in which various Hellenistic and Middle Platonist doxographical compilations arranged Plato’s “physical tenets” (φυσικοί δόξαι).43

### Harmonizing element: e.g., mathematical mean, a common substrate, or an intermediary entity or substance possessing the characteristics of both opposites. Xenocrates proposed a similar division into “three forms of being,” viz., the sensible (αισθητή), the intelligible (νοητή), and that which is composite of two and operable (δοκοστή, Sext. Emp. Adv. Math. 7.147 ff. = frag. 83 Isnardi Parente). Even the five-level model conceived by Speusippus presupposes Plato’s triadic division into intelligible objects (Speusippus’s numbers and geometrical), soul, and the lowest level of physical things (the “fourths and fifths . . . combined from the lowest [i.e., corporeal] elements” according to Iamb., *DCMS* 4.18, 9–12 Festa, possibly referring to Plato’s distinction between sensible objects and their transitory images or apparitions in *Soph.* 266b–c, or to the distinction between animate and inanimate beings, as suggested by Dillon (2003) 53–54, or to that between physical beings and artifacts). The same triadic division applies by analogy to all other domains—cognitive, psychological, and even political. The available ‘Gnostic’ texts, including the heresiological testimonies thereon, also operate within the same model, distinguishing between the intelligible realm, the heavenly sphere, and the sublunar world, to which correspond three respective substances (spirit, soul, flesh), three forms of cognition (intellection, opinion, sense perception), the triad of powers presiding over each realm and substance (God and his Intellect, Sophia and the Ignorant Demiurge, Satan or the Counterfeit Spirit), and three classes of human beings (spiritual, animate, fleshly).

43 My table follows the order of Plato’s physical tenets as given by Alcinous, the Middle Platonist epitomizer, in his *Didaskalikos*, chs. xii–xxvi Whittaker, on whom see also Dillon (1993). The headings are borrowed from the hypothetical *Vetustorum Placitorum Tabula* in Diels (1879), where the order of the last two sections is reversed (V. De Anima; VI. De Corpore). Festugière (1971) 375–380, upon comparing the partition in various Hellenistic and Roman ‘placita’, concludes that the individual headings in Diels’ tabular presentation sometimes change places, in particular V and VI, and that III and IV figure only in the Peripatetic elaborations of Plato’s tenets: “Cette répartition des matières doit remonter, on l’a vu, à Théophraste. Mais l’origine première en est incontestablement le *Timée*” (376). The plan of the *Vetusta Placita*, as Festugière points out, is not identical with the layout of the *Timaeus*. Ancient doxographers arranged Plato’s likely account according to individual subjects—that is, they had to regroup, under a single heading, what Plato had repeatedly discussed, in each of the three sections of his long monologue, from different standpoints (cf. *Tim.* 47e–48b; 69a–d). Diels, *op. cit.*, argued that the tradition of doxography began with a topic-oriented treatise in sixteen books composed by Aristotle’s pupil Theophrastus (*Physikai dokai* or *Physikôn dokai*). According to Mansfeld (1998) 22, this was “a systematic collection of the problematic tenets of the physi-cists (and of some doctors) according to genera and species, [where Theophrastus] applied the method of diairesis, and availed himself of the question-types and the arrangement according to categories.”
I. De Principiis
   1. Matter
   2. Ideas
   3. God
II. De Mundo
   2. Elements
   3. World-Soul
   4. Stars and Planets
   5. Other Gods
III. [De Sublimibus]
IV. De Terrestribus
   1. Earth–Aether–Air
   2. Animals
V. De Corpore
   1. Structure of the Human Body
   2. Senses
   3. Physiology
   4. Aetiology of Diseases
VI. De Anima
   1. Human Soul: Its Nature and Its Parts (or Faculties)
   2. Immortality of the Rational Soul
   3. Mortality of the Souls Deprived of Reason
   4. Transmigration
   5. Laws of Destiny

Can one, then, be sure that the author of the *Apocryphon of John* consulted the *Timaeus* at all? It has been preferable to believe that he did not, and that the Plato with whom he grew familiar had already been filtered through a long tradition of school interpretations—in short, the ‘Plato’ of Alcinous’s manual, the Neopythagorean and Stoicizing ‘Plato’, but never Plato himself. Such a hypothesis results, on the one hand, from derogatory assessments of ‘Gnostic’ writings promoted by the historians of a post-Hellenistic philosophy—“Platonism run wild” (Nock), “Proletarierplatonismus” (Theiler), the “underworld” of Platonism (Dillon). On the other hand, the hypothesis is a logical consequence of the widespread ‘doxographical’ approach to the philosophical and sub-philosophical texts of the Imperial period, characterized by a complete disregard for their literary aspect. Instead of being first considered as narratives, these texts are immediately divided into their constituent thematic units, then into stock sayings (*doksai, dogmata*) and individual concepts that are, in the end, measured against their hypothetical sources (*placita, compendia, anthologies, manuals, εἰσαγωγαί*, etc.).
The ‘doxographical’ hypothesis can be countered on several grounds. One is that the reading of authoritative texts was part of a student’s curriculum in philosophical schools. Another is that, in the early centuries of the Empire, Plato’s *Timaeus* enjoyed the status of a sacred narrative (τερός λόγος, παλαιώς λόγος) which, for all of its symbolic imagery, its references to alien traditions (the Egyptian lore), and its intertwining of cosmology with soteriological concerns, was more likely to exert influence on the authors of new revelatory accounts (e.g. the collections of *Gnostica, Hermetica, Pseudopythagorica*, or *Oracula Chaldaica*) than dry classifications of Plato’s ‘physical tenets’ available in school manuals.

Another argument against the hypothetical doxographical source can be extracted from Plutarch’s creative use of Plato’s philosophical myths. In three of his dialogues, Plutarch outlines his eschatological views in the form of mythical accounts. On each occasion, he not only follows Plato’s rules of myth-making—that is, its conformity to the normative discourse of philosophical argument—but also looks at Plato’s eschatological myths as literary models. The myth of Thespiesios in *On Delays in Divine Punishment* (*De sera num.* 22,563B–23,568F), for example, is a rival version of Plato’s myth of Er in the final book of the *Republic*. The myth of Sulla in *On the Face of the Moon* (*De facie* 26,940F–30,945D) is a miniature copy of the *Timaeus*. Finally, the vision granted to Timarchus during his consultation of Trophonius’s oracle at Lebadaea, and recorded in *On the Daemon of Socrates* (*De genio Socr.* 21,589F–22,592E) draws both on Socrates’ ‘myth’ from the *Phaedo* and, just as in *De sera num.*, on the story of Er the Pamphylian. It is within this Platonic frame that Plutarch then incorporates a non-Platonic imagery, creating his own vision of the world, demonology, divine providence, and the destiny of human souls. The results, in all three cases, are new literary creations, bearing only a vague resemblance to their original sources of inspiration—so vague, in fact, that the emperor Julian later viewed them as valuable exemplars of the original myth-making, in contrast to a common practice of adjusting ancient myths in rhetorical exercises (Julian, *Adv. Heracl.* 226d–227a Rochefort). Still, the starting point of Plutarch’s myth-making was the mythical accounts of his venerable teacher, and not the summaries of Plato’s opinions about immortality, soul, providence, or fate. In Plutarch’s case, and I would argue in the case of the *Apocryphon of John*, too, emulation of literary tradition, considered as a phenomenon not to read but to rewrite,
implies the appropriation of predecessors’ themes, literary techniques, and genre conventions. In the final reckoning, the formula that best explains the status and function of the Timaeus in the Apocryphon of John is that of a ‘hypertext’—a text not simply to read and adopt, but to emulate and rewrite. On the one hand, Plato’s creation myth from the Timaeus plays the role of a master text, providing both the narrative outline and the main themes for the Savior’s revelatory monologue. On the other hand, various aspects of Plato’s cosmological model are subjected to a significant revision, one that seems very much in accordance with contemporaneous reinterpretations (Stoicizing, Aristotelianizing, and Pythagoreanizing) of the Timaeus. It is precisely this revisionary attitude that Plotinus criticizes when referring to the Gnostic “falsifications” of Plato:

In general, some of these people’s doctrines have been taken from Plato, but others, all new accounts they have brought in (καινοτομοῦσιν) to establish a philosophy of their own, are things they have found outside the truth... And in general they falsify Plato’s manner of presenting the fabrication of the universe, and a great deal else, and degrade the man’s opinions as if they had understood the intelligible nature, but he and other blessed philosophers had not. (Plot. Enn. II 9.6)

44 The earliest reference to imitation as artistic emulation of predecessors occurs in Theognis 370: “None of the unskilled will be able to emulate (mimeisthai) me. For mimesis as a ‘swerve away’ from earlier models, see Bloom (1973). Plutarch’s complex attitude to μυθος was the subject of a detailed study by Vernière (1977). The author investigates in detail “the doctrinal content” of Plutarch’s eschatological myths, and assesses the extent to which they depend on Plato’s model narratives (ibid. 57–267, esp. 95–101). Betz (1983) examines Timarchus’s vision in De genio Socr., whose narrative organization betrays numerous similarities with that of Ap. John. The vision Timarchus received from Trophonius is narrated in the third person, by a narrator, Simmias, who is absent as a character from the story, but analyses its events from within, that is, from Timarchus’s point of view. Interestingly enough, although Simmias assumes Timarchus’s perspective, he never allows Timarchus to speak as the first-person narrator, not even when directly addressed by Trophonious (“Timarchus, what do you have me explain?” And he said, “Everything, for what is here that is not marvelous?”). It looks as though Simmias wanted to prevent the listener’s identification with Timarchus’s experiences, implying thereby that the story he was telling (μυθος) is to be taken cautiously—that is to say, as a plausible μυθος, and not as an abiding λογος. The exchange between Trophonius and Timarchus contains an interesting variant of Van Unnik’s “prophetic formula” (πάντα). As in Ap. John, Trophonius’s revelatory account is preceded by a visual revelation and, once it begins, is occasionally interrupted by Timarchus’s requests for further clarifications of what he sees (ερωταποκρίσεις).
Yet neither Plato nor Platonism, in all of its variants, can explain the whole of the Savior’s revelation—otherwise, Plotinus would not so repeatedly insist on the novelty (καινοτομεῖν) of the Gnostic jargon and ideas. As soon as the Savior turns from the diegesis of “what exists” to the narration of “what has come to be” he starts acting in the manner of the resurrected Christ from Luke’s gospel—“opening [his disciples’] minds to understand the scriptures” (24:45) and “explaining (διερμήνευσεν) to them the passages throughout the scriptures that were about himself, starting with Moses and going through all the prophets” (24:27).

The whole second part of the *Apocryphon of John* (“What Has Come to Be”) is, in fact, a reinterpretation of Moses’ account of creation and of the early history of humankind in the opening chapters of Genesis (Gen 1–7), from “the beginning” (1:1, ἐν ἀρχῇ) to the story of Noah and the flood (6:5–7:9). The Savior’s hermeneutical stance is polemical and revisionary. What he contests is not the facticity of events recorded by Moses, but the perspective from which they are told—that is, the authority of Moses as a reliable witness and narrator of these events: “Do not suppose that it means . . . as Moses said . . .” “It is not as you have heard that Moses wrote . . . but rather . . .” (II 13:19–21 and BG 45:8–10; II 22:22–24, III 29:4–6 and BG 58:16–18; II 23:3–4, III 29:21–23, and BG 59:17–18; II 29:6–7, III 37:22–23, and BG 73:4–5).

Moses is the prophet of an ignorant and jealous god—of Ialdabaoth–Saklas, the Biblical Yahweh, who fabricated the visible world. Moses is blind like his master, and blind like all creation, imprisoned in body and “cast into deep sleep” of forgetfulness, so that “the deity above [him] may not be recognized” (II 28:27–9). Moses’ perspective is limited, confined to the visible world. He lacks proper knowledge since he does not see this world as an imperfect replica of the invisible realm. Nor does he see the liminal zone between the two realms, the temporary dwelling place of Sophia, from which she has been occasionally sending her messengers, down to Ialdabaoth’s realm of darkness, to retrieve the light that had been stolen from her. What Moses perceives, on these occasions, is the material disguise in which Sophia’s “helpers” (Epinoia, the Spirit of Life, παραθήματος, and finally the Savior, Sophia’s consort) appear—their visible images in the form of Eve, an eagle upon the Tree of
Knowledge, or Noah’s ark, whose hidden, non-literal meaning he is unable to uncover.

The second part of the Savior’s paradosis is an exercise in hermeneutics, in which a proper interpretative framework—one already construed in the first section (“What Exists”)—is applied to the Mosaic account of creation. Along with changing the referent, for the context is no longer Jesus’ teachings from the Fourth Gospel but the Book of Genesis, the Savior also changes his expository mode. So far he has addressed John, his “beloved pupil,” in an ex cathedra style, revealing what “no one has been acquainted with . . . except for the one that has dwelled with him” (BG 26:11–14). Now he begins to operate from within coordinates familiar to John, the ones that Arimanias, in the frame narrative, called “the traditions (paradoseis) of the fathers” (BG 20:2–3; III 1:14–15; II 1:17). While, in the first part, the communication was all one-way (a revelatory monologue), John now enjoys the opportunity of comparing what he is hearing with that which he was previously told about the “traditions of the Fathers,” and even of giving his feedback (a revelatory dialogue, erostapokriseis). The Savior, in his turn, is prepared to engage in a dialogue because he does not want to impose a dogmatic solution—not Moses, but his version of Plato’s cosmological model—on his ignorant interlocutor. What he wants to demonstrate is that his interpretative model has already been alluded to in the “traditions of the fathers.” For this reason, he assumes John’s limited perspective and takes the Jewish Scripture (scriptum, ‘that which is written’) as the premise from which his model (non scriptum, ‘that which is not written’) may be inferred as a logical conclusion. In short, he resorts to the rhetorical theory or issue (στάσις, status, constitution) and reasons by analogy (ratio inatio legalis, syllogismos; Cicero, Inv. 2.142: ex scripto non scriptum aliquid inducere per ratiocinationem).

The interpretation of Moses’ saying from the very beginning of Genesis—“the spirit of god moved upon (ἐπιφέρει, ἐπιφέρεσθαι) the waters” (Gen 1:2b)—is a good case study of the Savior’s interpretive strategy. First, he takes Moses’ verse (scriptum) as the initial premise (propositio). Next, he juxtaposes a compatible statement from Wisdom Literature, that is, Sophia’s oracular verdict (scriptum) of what really happened “in the beginning,” as a supporting reason (ratio): “I walked around—περιεπάθσα—in the depth of the abyss” (Sir 24:5). The conclusion (complexio) is the Savior’s philosophical version of the Mosaic verse (non scriptum in Scriptura): “Sophia (Wisdom) moved to and fro
in the darkness of her ignorance, and in the darkness of matter.” The divergences between the coordinated scriptural premises and the proposed conclusion are obvious: neither Moses nor Ben Sira had made the slightest allusion to repentance or ignorance, clearly borrowed from some other texts and traditions (Plato, Stoicism, etc.) to corroborate the supporting reason (rationis confirmatio) introduced by the Savior. As for the conclusion the Savior has inferred from the premises, he may argue for its validity on the ground that it meets all criteria of the genus ratiocinativum. It is reasoned by analogy (a simili tractare) and therefore compatible, both in content and in structure, with its premises (scripta).46

Moses: The Spirit of God moved (ἐπέφερεν) upon the waters. (Gen 1:2b) Propositio
Wisdom: I [Sophia] walked around (περιπάτείν) in the depth of the Abyss. (Sir 24:5) Ratio
‘Plato’: The soul moves in a disorderly fashion when falling into matter. Rationis confirmatio
Savior: Sophia [the World-Soul] moved to and fro in the darkness of matter Complexio
Sophia [the fallen soul] repented (μετανοέοι) in the darkness of her ignorance 47

A never-ending debate on Jewish vs. non-Jewish origin of the Apocryphon may be presented, in the light of what has just been said, as the disagreement over how to explain the Savior’s motives in choosing Wisdom Literature as his supporting reason (ratio). Those who consider the Apocryphon of John “an organic development within

45 Legal reasoning or syllogismos, one of the four kinds of ‘issue’ (στάσις), is the form of rhetorical argument known as epicheireme—an elaboration of a simple syllogism comprising a premise, a supporting reason, and a conclusion inferred from the combination of the two. The full form of epicheireme consists of five parts: besides the three essential parts, the ratio may be corroborated by additional arguments (rationis confirmatio), and the latter, in their turn, further enriched (exornatio). All these divisions and their further elaborations are discussed in the rhetorical manuals under the heading inventio (ἐπερευαί), from Cicero to Hermogenes, and can be traced back to some Hellenistic source, most likely Hermagoras. See, e.g., Matthes (1958), Heath (1997) 89–119, and Braet (2004).

46 The use of in scriptis controversiae by early Christian theologians is described by Hadot (1957) 209–20. The author discusses only Latin material. The Gnostics could have learned such debate techniques in schools or in rhetorical manuals, but also from Alexandrian textual exegeses. For Philo’s education and the place he assigns to rhetoric in his exegesis of the Pentateuch, see Alexandre (1999). The impact of Hellenistic rhetoric on Rabbinic methods of exegesis is discussed by Daube (1949) 239–64.

47 To illustrate reasoning by analogy (a simili) in theological controversiae, I quote Hadot’s example, taken from Marius Victorinus’s debate with the Homoeans: ὅποιοιδιο τεκτον μην οἴκετο; Sed si aliqua similia, vel similiter denomina, tecla sunt, iure pari et istud denominatum accipere debemus (Mar. Vict. Adv. Ar. 2.7.13–15).
Judaism” (e.g., Pearson 1984, 464) believe that the Savior used Jewish scriptures (scripta) as normative text. In this view, the Savior’s model is derived from Moses’ account of creation by reference to Sapiential texts and their philosophical interpretation, such as preserved in Aristoboulos or Philo of Alexandria, then elaborated by the intrusion of Christian features and updated by contemporary (second-century) philosophical doctrines.

This, however, is not the Savior’s procedure in the Apocryphon. He starts from Jesus’—actually his own—sayings in the Johannine Gospel and elaborates out of them a complex, essentially Platonist, model of the universe, demonstrating a complete disregard for “traditions of the Fathers.” This model is next applied to Hellenistic Jewish scripture in order to be proven superior to Moses’ account of creation, yet still partly compatible with the Wisdom oracles. In this sort of interpretation of the Apocryphon’s hermeneutical strategy, the Savior’s ratiocinatio has a purely propedeutic function. The purpose of his revelation to John is to explain his Platonizing Christian model in terms and images familiar to the seer, and thereby indicate that his message, though originally coined of a non-Jewish material, may still be acceptable to Hellenized Jews—provided they read their scriptures selectively.

According to the first hypothesis, the Apocryphon of John is nothing but rewritten (Jewish) scripture. According to the second, the Apocryphon of John is the Platonizing version of the Fourth Gospel, made compatible with the Septuagint to reach the Hellenized Jewish audience. If the former, then the Apocryphon is an example of Hellenistic Judaism with philosophical sensibilities and mystical tendencies, later deemed acceptable, and for that reason modified, by the Christians. If the latter, then the Savior’s revelatory account, for all of its syncretistic flavor and universal aspirations, represents a Christianized version of Platonist ‘Orientalism’, best exemplified in the work of the philosopher Numenius, a Greek-speaking Syrian from Apamea.

Probably because of his ‘Oriental’ origin, Numenius had a vivid interest in non-Greek cultures—an interest that went beyond nostalgic antiquarianism and ultimately ended in the denunciation of the Favorifolk doctrine. For Numenius, appropriation of ‘barbarian philosophy’ was part of the hermeneutical program of elucidating obscurities in the corpus of Plato, his venerable teacher. When a cross-referential, synchronic reading of the Plato’s works fails to
uncover the intent (διάνοια) behind Plato’s words (ῥητόν), a true Platonist, faithful to his hermeneutical task, must

   go beyond (ἀναχωρήσασθαι) [Plato’s own words] and conjoin them with the teachings of Pythagoras, and then appeal to peoples of good reputation, bringing in comparison (προσφερόμενον) their rites, beliefs, and institutions in so far as they chime with Plato (συντελούμενας Πλάτωνι ὁμολογομένως), those, that is, such as the Brachmanes and Jews and Magoi and Egyptians have laid down. (Numenius, frag. 1a Des Places)

The final step in Numenius’s program—bringing in comparison with Plato the rites and beliefs of foreign traditions—reflects the same exegetical technique as in the Apocryphon of John. This is yet another instance of the rhetorical reasoning by analogy (συλλογισμός) discussed on the previous pages—the reasoning in which an obscure text is elucidated by application of a seemingly unrelated, yet analogous, statement. To illustrate Numenius’s creative use of ‘Oriental’ analogues in the elucidation of Plato, I quote the passage where, as in the Apocryphon of John, the Mosaic verse from Genesis 1:2 is used as one of the coordinated premises. The only difference is that, this time, “the spirit of god’s moving upon the waters” is not the initial premise (propositio) but the supporting reason (ratio). The passage comes from Porphyry’s On the Cave of the Nymphs, where it is said that

   Some Pythagorean philosophers believed that souls are attracted to the water because of the divine spirit dwelling in it (τῶν ὕδατόν θεοπνεύον ὄντι), as Numenius says, adding that this is the reason why the prophet [Moses] had stated that “the spirit of god moved upon the waters.”  
   (Numenius, frag. 30 Des Places)

Numenius next adduces two other analogues, one from Egyptian religion and the other from Heraclitus. The phrase “the water in which the divine spirit is dwelling” proves, however, that the primary impetus for this extraordinary explanation of the reason for the soul’s descent came from reading the Septuagint. Numenius’s reasoning by analogy unfolds somewhat as follows: Plato has already established that the individual souls fall from their perfect state down into creation. Why they descend is a matter of controversy because Plato was deliberately obscure regarding this issue. In order to elucidate this ambiguity, one must bring forward those foreign doctrines of the soul that “chime” with Plato. Moses, among others, states that “the spirit of God moved upon the waters” (Gen 1:2b). The conclusion
inferred from the premises is that souls fall into the cycle of generation because the divine spirit dwelling in the waters—that is to say, in the flowing and ebbing tide of matter—attracts them to do so.

What makes Numenius so attractive a point of comparison with the *Apocryphon of John* is the simple fact that both search for analogous structures and intertextual relations in an almost identical group of culturally heterogeneous texts (Greek, Jewish, Egyptian, Zoroastrian, Christian). Both of them, too, consider analogy an important method of discovery. The point at which they diverge is their interpretation of these textual and cultural intersections. Numenius’s juxtaposition of Plato, Pythagoras, and ‘barbarian philosophy’ leads him to an important discovery that they are all, in the end, coordinate cases of the same universal wisdom—a set of contiguous positions that cannot be viewed in terms of progress and degradation, or ranked according to their relative superiority to one another. God, who is the pure active Intellect, disseminates his intellectual power among all men, irrespective of their race and origin (frag. 14 Des Places). This intellectual kinship between God and humankind, as well as between men of different origins and languages, precludes any attempt at assigning a higher value to one intellectual tradition (e.g., Judaism) over another (e.g., Platonism). This is, of course, not the case with the *Apocryphon of John*, where Moses and the Platonizing Christ are

48 Identification of the “waters” of Genesis with the material substrate to creation is effected by reference to their common ever-flowing quality, the sign of their disorderly, immeasurable, and infinite nature. Cf. Numenius, frag. 3 Des Places, where matter is portrayed as a “violent and unstable current”; frag. 11 Des Places, where matter is qualified as “having appetitive and ever-flowing character”; and frag. 18, in which matter is compared to “the sea,” probably an allusion to Plato’s “boundless ocean of dissemblance” in *Politicus* 272e–273a. For ancient controversies regarding the possible causes of the soul’s descent into matter and creation see Petersen (1959) 248, Dillon (1981) 1:357–64, and Moreschini (1992) 191–204.

49 Whether Moses’ verse helped to inform Numenius’s explanation of the descent of souls or simply served as an additional piece of evidence confirming the theory he had already conjectured in debates with his fellow Platonists and Neopythagoreans, has been a debated issue. The issue sounds very much like the problem of the Jewish origin of *Ap. John*, and the question that E. R. Dodds (1957) 6–8, posed about Numenius and his Jewish background appears quite relevant for the ‘Gnostic’ text, too: “The crucial question is whether Numenius had any doctrines to which analogues existed in the oriental world but not in the tradition of Greek thought. The negative condition is as important as the positive one: without it, the existence of oriental analogues cannot establish, though it may confirm, the hypothesis of direct oriental influence.”
two dissonant voices, only occasionally made compatible through the intercession of the individual passages from the Septuagint—passages where Dame Wisdom (Sophia), speaking in person (Proverbs, Sirach, Wisdom of Solomon) or through the prophets (e.g., Isaiah), hints at the existence of the parallel reality that neither Moses nor his blind master Ialdabaoth can see. In this way, Sophia’s oracles provide the link between Moses’ material imagery and the Savior’s “true account” (ἀληθὴς λόγος). No longer purely ‘material and not yet fully ‘spiritual’, Sophia’s prophecies make use of a language in which equivocal symbols are combined with philosophical concepts—just as, in the world conceived by the Apocryphon of John, Sophia dwells in the liminal zone (the realm of the world-soul, Regio Medietatis) as the mediator between the ‘spiritual’ realm and its distant ‘material’ image.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels of Reality</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Voices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pleroma</td>
<td>Gospel of John, Philosophy</td>
<td>Christus Platonizans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regio Medietatis</td>
<td>Wisdom Literature</td>
<td>Sophia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ialdabaoth’s Realm</td>
<td>Genesis</td>
<td>Moses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following chapters are essentially an elaboration on the points raised in the previous paragraphs. The forthcoming chapter analyzes the Savior’s account of the spiritual realm or the Pleroma (“What Exists”). Next, I will examine in greater detail the Savior’s polemic with Moses and, more important, the kind of reasoning (ratiocinatio) by which he sets out to prove that his new model of the universe (non scriptum) may be deduced from certain parts of Jewish scriptures (ex scripto non scriptum deducere). A modern and more fashionable name for this complex textual strategy is—intertextuality.
CHAPTER TWO

THE REALM OF BEING

Agnostos Theos

Praising Oneness: A Literary Analysis

Following the outline proposed in his introductory statement, the Savior opens his revelatory monologue with what comes first in reality. At the top of the ontological scheme he places a solitary first principle which, as he says to John, “no one has been acquainted with . . . except for him who has dwelled in it” (BG 26:11–15). The Unknown God (agnostos theos) cannot be reasoned from his consequent effects by means of reductional analysis or analogical translation. The proper way of describing him is the discourse of praise (epainos), in which the positive language of eminence (via eminenciae), interspersed with the equivocal metaphors borrowed from the Fourth Gospel (light, spirit, water, pure thinking), alternates with a series of negative determinations (via negationis, via oppositionis).

Rules for praising a god had been long established. Before saying of what sort of things he or she is the cause, one has to state what that god, or goddess, is like. On the other hand, form and style of praise may vary, prose discourses of praise being equally acceptable as metrical hymns. In Philo’s words,

We should never tire of composing encomiastic accounts or poems (λόγους ἐγκομιαστικούς . . . ποιήματα συντιθέντες), so that, whether with or without music (καὶ ἐμμελῶς καὶ χωρίς μέλους), and whichever of its characteristic functions the voice may assume, be it speech or song (καθ’ ἐκκατέραν φωνῆς ἰδέαν, ἥ το λέγειν καὶ τὸ ἄδειν ἄποκεκλήρωται), high honor may be given both to the Maker of the world and to the world: “the former,” as one has said (Plato Tim. 29a), “the best of causes, the latter the most perfect of things that have become.” (Philo Plant. 131)

Philo’s reference to the Timaeus is important. It shows that some sections of Plato’s cosmogony were considered a material suitable for honoring God and his creation (λόγος ἐγκομιαστικός). More systematic treatments of the laudatory genre, such as the list of rules for prais-
ing gods by Alexander, son of Numenius (flor. ca. A.D. 150), indicate that the *Timaeus* was, in fact, proposed as a model of how to praise a god—not only in matters of form (prose) and style (grandeur), but also in matters of content. Menander Rhetor went even as far as to call Plato’s account of creation “a hymn on universe,” and classified it among the “scientific hymns” characteristic for their elevated style approaching “the heights of dithyramb” (336.24–337.32 Russell-Wilson).¹ In their interpretation of the *Timaeus* as a sublime celebration of the divine, the experts on epideictic rhetoric might have been encouraged by Plato’s own statement from the *Phaedrus*, that “the relevant high-mindedness (*τὸ ὑψηλόν*) and effectiveness of all sciences of importance” seem to “come from the addition of rhetorical amplification and lofty talk about nature (*ἀδολεσχίας καὶ μεταφορολογίας φύσεως πέρι*)” (269e4–270a3).² Writing about the universe and its creation, Plato composed the most sublime hymn to the creator. Philosophy in its highest form is thus nothing but an act of worship, and the ideal philosopher an expert in epideictic oratory.³

The list of topics obligatory for hymn-writing is handily available in the extract from Alexander’s lost tract on rhetorical subjects (*риторικά ἐφόρματα*). Before one engages in praising individual gods, their origin and age, the universality of their worship, their powers, their powers,
deeds, skills, inventions, and places of their cult, one has to turn at first to the Timaeus and contrive a “philosophical discourse” (φιλόσοφος λόγος) of the first God, one from whom all other gods originated.4

The philosophical discourse (ὁ μὲν φιλόσοφος λόγος) on divinity asserts that God exists “non-generated and indestructible” for all time (ὅτι οἱ θεοὶ ἀγέννητοι ἐστὶ καὶ ἀνώλεθρον ἀεὶ ἀν. Tim. 52a2); but Plato also appears to admit a kind of discourse where gods are said to have come into existence by the agency of the first God (ὅτι γεγόνασι θεοὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ πρῶτον θεοῦ, cf. Tim. 41a–d), thereby approving of the ordinary discourse (ὁστε καὶ τὸν κοινὸν λόγον ἐνδέχεσθαι). For it is from the former [i.e. philosophical] discourse that the path eventually proceeds to the generated gods. We therefore must make use of both of these established accounts, arguing, in accordance with Plato, that knowledge of the totality belongs to god, whereas, out of human discourses, one is more philosophical and the other more commonplace (τῶν δὲ ἀνθρωπίνων λόγων ὁ μὲν σοφότερος ὁ δὲ κοινότερος). So we first must lay down the more philosophical, because it concerns the nature of god in general, and only secondly, that of the many. (Alex. Num. in Rhet. Graec. III 4, 16–28 Spengel).

The Savior’s praise of the Unknown God seems to follow the same basic pattern. Before describing the first God’s deeds and accomplishments (the generation of the Pleromatic realm), he states what divinity itself is like regarding its nature (φύσις) and power (δύναμις). He does so in a highly rhetorical style, following the rules of epideictic oratory. In its form, his discourse of the first God is a type of “encomiastic” account (λόγος ἐγκωμιαστικός) to which Philo alluded in De plantatione. In its content, this is a philosophical account (λόγος φιλόσοφος) of a kind described by Alexander, positing Plato’s “praise of God” in the Timaeus as its distant model.

That which becomes, we say, must necessarily become by the agency of some cause (ὑπὸ ἄτιον τινός). The maker and the father of the universe it is a hard task to find (τὸν μὲν ποιητήν καὶ πατέρα τούδε τοῦ παντός

---

And having found him it is impossible to declare him to all. (Tim. 28c2–5)

Now if this world is good and its fabricator is good (ὁ τε δημιουργὸς ἀγαθός), clearly he looked to the eternal. . . . Indeed, the world is the best of things that have become, and he is the best of causes (ὁ δ’ ἀριστός τῶν αἰτίων). (29a2–6)

He was good; and in the good no envy in any matter can ever arise (ἀγαθὸς ἦν· ἀγαθὸς δὲ οὐδεὶς περὶ οὐδένος οὐδέποτε γίγνεται φθόνος). Being thus without envy, he wanted that all things should come as near as possible to being like himself. (29e1–4)

This being so, we must agree that there is, first, the unchanging kind (τὸ κατὰ ταὐτὰ εἰδὸς ἔχον), non-generated and indestructible (ἀγέννητον καὶ ἀνώλεθρον), which neither (οὔτε) receives anything else into itself from elsewhere nor (οὔτε) itself enters into anything elsewhere, invisible and otherwise imperceptible (ἄόρατον καὶ ἀλλὰς ἀναίσθητον); that, in fact, which intellection (νόησις) has as its object. (52a1–5)

The passages from the Timaeus served only as a foil for more elaborate speculations about the nature of the first God. Combined with compatible sections from other works of Plato (Parmenides, Seventh Letter, Republic, Sophist, Philebus), these statements were divided into separate groups, in accordance with different intellectual operations (viae) by which they had been informed—that is, the Platonic analysis (ἐπὶ τάς ἀρχάς), further divided into the categorical (homonymy, analogy) and dimensional (aphairesis, via reductionis) subspecies, as well as various techniques of concept-formation proposed by the Stoics (cf. D.L. 7.53 καθ’ ὁμοιότητα, κατ’ ἀναλογίαν, κατὰ μετάθεσιν, κατὰ σύνθεσιν, κατ’ ἑναντίωσιν, κατὰ μετάβασιν, κατὰ στέρησιν). Along with this repertoire of fixed techniques of how to conceive, and praise, the first God, the authors of philosophical discourses of praise (Philo of Alexandria, Alcinous, Celsus, Maximus of Tyre, and various ‘Gnostic’ authors) had also at their disposal an equally established set of linguistic devices and descriptive stereotypes—e.g., alpha privativum/negativum, the negative coordination οὔτε...οὔτε, superlatives,\(^5\) and an array of prefixes (αὐτ-, προ-, ὑπερ-, παν- along with the suffix -της)—all capable of conveying the ontological primacy (eminencia) of God. Other conventional features of the genre include the exalted tone of presentation, parallelismus membrorum, some rudimentary rhythm, and the

---

\(^5\) For the extensive use of superlative forms in the Timaeus, the main constitutive element of Plato’s (hymnal) language of excellence, see Runia (1992).
accumulation of epithets ad nauseam. As noted by Pierre Hadot (1968, 457), the length of such compositions would rarely surpass “twenty to thirty lines of a modern edition.”

The Savior’s discourse on the first principle makes use of all such stereotypes. It is replete with rhetorical figures (alliteration, anaphora, homoioteleuton, antithesis, accumulatio, enumeratio); it has a clear progression and climax of theme (priamel), and is arranged into a set of parallel cola and commata. All these features give it a certain rhythmical lilt, one which will become instantly visible from the ensuing colometric presentation. This does not mean that the Savior’s account is a piece of poetry. Nor is my division thereof into distinct thematic units intended as an arrangement of verses into strophes or stanzas—although the passages printed in italics do indeed sound like refrains separating one theme from another.


He said to me,

(i) The [Monad],
since it is Monarchy
and [nothing] presides over it,
is the God and the Father of the entirety,
the holy one,
the invisible that is above the entirety,
which exists in its incorruptibility,
[existing in] the pure light,
into which no eye-light is able to gaze.

(ii) It is not fitting to think of it as god,
or that it is of that kind.
For it is superior to a god.
It is a principle over which nothing presides.
For nothing is prior to it,
nor does it need any of them.
It has no need of life
given that it is eternal.
It does not need anything
because it cannot be perfected:
for it has not been defective
so as to be perfected.
Rather, it is always utterly perfect.

Light is it.

---

(iii) It is unlimited, for nothing is prior to it so as to bestow limit upon it. The indiscernible one, for nothing is prior to it so as to discern it. The immeasurable one, for no one else has measured it as if being prior to it. The invisible one, for no one has seen it. The eternal one, which always exists. The ineffable one, since no one has attained it so as to speak of it. The unnamable one, since there is no one prior to it so as to give a name to it. This is the immeasurable light, the holy and undefiled purity: the ineffable one, perfect, incorruptible.

(iv) It is neither perfection nor blessedness. It is not divinity, but something far superior to these. Neither is it unlimited nor has it been limited; rather, it is something superior to these. It is not corporeal, it is not incorporeal. It is not great, it is not small. It is not quantifiable, for it is not a creature. It is not qualifiable. (cf. III 5:14) Nor can anyone conceive it. It is not at all something that exists; rather, it is something superior to these—not as though it were superior, but as being its own self. It is not in an aeon (eternity) that it partakes. No time belongs to it. For whoever partakes in an aeon (eternity), there are others that have prepared (it) for him. And there is no time that has limited it, since it does not receive from another who sets limits. And it is without need. There is nothing at all prior to it. It searches for its own self in the fullness of the light. It shall contemplate the pure light, the immeasurable greatness.

(v) The eternal one, bestowing eternity; the light, bestowing light; the life, bestowing life; the blessed one, bestowing blessedness; the acquaintance, bestowing acquaintance; the always good one, bestowing good and doing good—not as if possessing, but rather as bestowing. The mercy, bestowing mercy; the grace, bestowing grace.

The immeasurable light.

(vi) What shall I say to you about it, the incomprehensible one? This is the image of the light, in so far as I am able to conceive. For who will ever conceive it? In so far as I can speak to you, its aeon is incorruptible, at rest, reposing in silence. The one that is prior to the entirety is yet the head of every aeon—given that there exists anything else beside him.

(vii) For no one of us has known what belongs to the immeasurable one except for him who dwelt in it. It is he who told us these things.

The Savior’s philosophical discourse of praise consists of three sections. In the opening section (Propositio, i–ii), he first (i) describes the first principle in more ‘positive’ terms (Monad, Monarchy, Father, Holy Spirit, Pure Light, Eternity, Self-sufficiency, Perfection), then (ii) emphasizes its absolute transcendence (“superior to gods,” “a principle over which nothing presides,” “prior to all”).
Occasionally, John will be reminded of these ‘positive’ attributes and determinations (set in italics) throughout the second, argumentative part (*Argumentatio*, iii–v). These short, refrain-like statements serve a double purpose. On the one hand, they sustain the unity of the Savior’s speech. On the other, they signal the change in the Savior’s argumentative technique. They appear whenever he introduces a new way of proving the absolute priority of the first principle (iii. *via negationis*, iv. *via oppositionis*, v. *via eminentiae*).

Moving on to the argumentative section (*Argumentatio*), the purpose of *via negationis* (iii) is to show the inferiority of created beings, including humankind (“nothing is prior to him, nothing has seen him,” etc.). *Via oppositionis* (iv) is the most suitable way of negation: it does not simply refuse single determinations (e.g., *God is not x*), but denies opposed pairs of qualities and, in this way, transcends the genus which such contradictory terms jointly exhaust (e.g., *God is neither x nor non-x*, but something superior to it). Finally, the third method (v) argues for the causal priority of god. The first principle is not good for it would then participate in the form of Goodness and thereby turn as inferior to it. Rather, the first principle is good insofar as bestowing goodness on its creation.

The final section (*Peroratio* or *Conclusio*, vi–vii) opens with *dubitatio* (vi): “What shall I say to you about him, the incomprehensible one? . . . For who will ever conceive him?”7 At this point, the Savior admits his inability to coin the language suitable for describing God’s transcendence. Finally, there comes the climax (vii) of the whole discourse of praise. All arguments accumulated in the preceding sections (iii–v) serve, in fact, as a foil for the grand finale, the saying from the Johannine prologue: “No one has ever seen God; it is the only-begotten son [var. God], who dwells at the Father’s bosom, who has interpreted him” (John 1:18; cf. Matthew 11:27). The Savior’s encomium is, in fact, a philosophical elaboration of the mystery revealed in the Fourth Gospel. The first principle cannot be attained by intellection. It can only be made known by the mediation of him “who has dwelled in it.”

---

7 Cf., e.g., the development of Menander’s Σμινθιακός, a prose hymn addressed to Apollo, 437.5–446.13 Russell-Wilson, and esp. 445.25–28, where the penultimate section repeats the embarrassment and hesitation from the opening section: “O Smithian, and Pythian, from you my speech began, to you it shall return. By what names shall I address you?”
The rhetorical structure of the Savior’s speech can be outlined as follows:

I. PROPOSITIO: Nature of the First Principle
   i. Kataphasis (Spirit, Light, Father, Monad)
   ii. Transcendence (Absolute Priority, Perfection, Self-Sufficiency)

II. ARGUMENTATIO: Ways of Proving Its Transcendence
   iii. Via Negationis
   iv. Via Oppositionis
   v. Other-Related Causality

III. PERORATIO: God Attainable through Revelation, not by Intellection
   vi. Dubitatio
   vii. Climax (John 1:18; cf. Matthew 11:27)

The outline gives the argumentative aspect of the Savior’s discourse. What it fails to convey is an equally important organizing principle—that of the contrast between the ‘strophes’ developing the ‘apophatic’ argument and the short refrain-like (italicized) sections reiterating the positive, ‘kataphatic’, portrayal of the first principle from the initial section (i). Clearly, this formal contrast reflects a much more significant antinomy, one between the two possible ways of attaining the transcendent reality: philosophical, which relies on discursive knowledge and intuitive intellection (noēsis), and religious, which depends on the otherworldly revelation and prefers the language of equivocal symbols and obscure metaphors. On the psychological plane, the contrastive principle of organization generates the sense of deadlock that only the ensuing climax (vii) will be able to resolve with its ‘cathartic’ quote from the Fourth Gospel. This internal movement of contrary ideas that, while developing in opposite directions, strive to meet at a single climactic point, this rondeau-like game of mutual interposition, separation, and convergence, provides the Savior’s discourse with the affective content and raises its rhetorical ‘prosaism’ to a higher aesthetic level, that of an emotionally charged sermon.

---

9 Vygotsky (1971) provides the best analysis of this transformation of ‘prosaism’ of verbal material into a work of art through antinomies and the “movement of opposite feelings.” Another good example for this contrastive organization of material in ancient Christian poetry is the poetic work of Romanos the Melod, as analyzed, superbly, by Averintsev (1977) 210–20. The same tension between the contrastive and argumentative principles of literary composition occurs in the Gospel of Truth, one of the most rhetorically powerful Valentinian texts. As stated by Layton
The God without Qualities

The self never grasps its impressions and utterances singly, but always in context, in real or imagined, similar or dissimilar, harmony with something else; and so everything that has a name leans on everything else in regular rows, as a link in large and incalculable unities, on relying on another and all penetrated by a common tension. But for that reason,” he suddenly went on, differently, “if for some reason these associations fail and none of them addresses the internal series of orders, one is immediately left again to face an indescribable and inhuman creation, indeed a disavowed and formless one”. (Robert Musil, The Man without Qualities, transl. B. Pike, 1185)

The Savior does not seem to innovate much in his discourse of praise. He follows the formal rules of the *logos philosophos*, and makes use of already formalized content elements, vocabulary, and techniques of argumentation. This formalization results from a long process of expansions, adaptations, and elaborations of various passages from Plato’s works—the process in which the Middle Platonist systematizations played a particularly important role. Even a superficial comparison of the discourse with the portrayals of the first God by Alcinous, Apuleius, or Celsus reveals striking similarities, both in the formal presentation of arguments and in matters of content. For this reason, it has repeatedly been argued that, in his praise of the first God, the Savior behaves as a typical Platonist of the period, and that, in this particular passage, he makes an extensive use of Middle Platonist textbooks. Yet a closer look at one such extant compendium

(1987) 251, “the rhetoric of GTr is not linear but athmospheric, just as its cosmology is not linear but concentric... Ideas and images are developed slowly by repeating key points with minor changes.” Layton’s insight seems to correspond to what Vygotsky (1971) described as the “movement of opposite feelings,” as well as to the contrastive principle of organization of the Savior’s discourse of praise in *Ap. John*. The movement of the *Gospel of Truth* is rondeau-like, in that its main theme—i.e., Christ, in all variety of its roles, from savior, teacher, revealer, mediator, and shepherd to that of his Father’s fragrance and name—is inserted as a ‘refrain’ following each argumentative section (creation, existence within the Father, predestination of the elect, the arrival of the Book, disappearance of the material world, a sense of alienation as the source of *gnosis*, duties of the elect, repentance and restoration, the Father’s paradise, final repose in the Father). As in the Savior’s praise of *Ap. John*, only the argumentative sections of *Gos. Truth* can be analyzed according to the schematic rules and regulations of ancient oratory.

10 Most recently Dillon (1999) 74: “I am inclined to regard the Gnostic [account of the first principle] as derivative from Platonism.”
of Plato’s doctrines, the Didaskalikos of Alcinous, discloses some significant divergences.\textsuperscript{11}

Alcinous dedicates a whole chapter of his handbook to the problem of the Platonic ‘first God’ \textit{(Did. 10.164.7–166.14 Whittaker)}. Along with matter and ideas, Plato is said to have proposed a third independent \textit{arkhê} and considered it, at least so Alcinous infers from the famous passage in the \textit{Timaeus} \textit{(Tim 28c)}, as “all but ineffable” \textit{(164.8: μικρὸ ὤν καὶ ἄρρητον)}. Upon providing two proofs of its existence \textit{(164.9–27)}, Alcinous defines its ontological status and its relation to the subordinate levels of reality \textit{(viz., the demiurgic intellect and the soul)}. This supreme principle is identified with the Aristotelian first cause \textit{(Metaph. 12.7–9.1072a19–1075a10)}: an unmoved \textit{(ἀκίνητος)} mover, the final cause of all creation \textit{(ὁ τὸ ὀρθότον κνευτι τὴν ὀρθὴν)}, and the first intellect \textit{(ὁ πρῶτος νοῦς)} “everlasting engaged in thinking of itself and its own thoughts” \textit{(ἐκ τὸν ὄν ὄν καὶ τὰ ἐκ τοῦ νοηματικοῦ ὀνοματικοῦ νοοῦ)}. Next there comes the list of typical positive epithets predicated of this supreme God \textit{(Did. 10.164.31 ff.)}. The new section opens with the key statement, adapted from Plato’s \textit{Seventh Letter} \textit{341c5} and the \textit{Phaedrus} \textit{247c7–8}, that God is “ineffable and graspable only by the intellect” \textit{(165.5 ἄρρητος δ’ ἐστὶ καὶ νος μόνος ληπτός)}. The remaining part of this section elaborates on the meaning of “ineffable”—God refuses all predicates, including such universal categories as quantity or quality \textit{(via oppositionis: “neither bad nor good” . . . “not endowed with quality . . . nor unqualified”)}. The next two sections \textit{(165.16–34)} clarify the second part of the key statement made above \textit{(165.5)}, namely that “God is graspable only by the intellect.” Indeed, God is intelligible, and he can be grasped in three ways, all prescribed by Plato. These three ways are dimensional reduction \textit{(κατ’ ἀφορίσειν)}, analogy \textit{(κατὰ ἀναλογίαν)}, and analysis according to “pre-eminence” \textit{(κατὰ τὴν ἐν τῷ τιμίῳ ὑπεροχήν)}. Each

\textsuperscript{11} For the bibliographical survey of the scholarly work on Alcinous (Albinus), see Mazzarelli (1980) 108–44, and, more recently, Dillon (1993) 212–16. Important comments on Alcinous’s, metaphysics are made by Krämer (1964) 101–14. The best edition is the new Budé, by Whittaker (1990). Whittaker was able to consult an unpublished edition prepared in the 1930s by R. E. Witt, the author of an important monograph on Albinus and the developments within Middle Platonism \textit{(Witt 1937)}. See also Dillon (1999) 69–79. The following are the scholarly works I refer to in my ensuing argument: Freudenthal (1879), Wolfson (1952) 115–30, Festugière (1954) 92–140, Invernozzi (1976), and Mansfeld (1988) 92–117.
method is illustrated with well known examples from the Platonic tradition: *aphaeresis* (reduction) with the abstraction from a solid body to a mathematical point, the procedure borrowed from the Old Academic στοιχείον-metaphysics; *analogia* with the sun-simile from Plato’s *Republic* (6.508b–509b); and *hyperochê* with the ascent to the Form of Beauty in *Symposium* (210a6–d4). This last example, interestingly enough, Alcinous has already used in one of his previous chapters (5.157.11 ff.) to illustrate the first type of *analysis*, that is, “an ascent (anodos) from sense-objects to the primary intelligibles.” The chapter draws to a conclusion (10.165.34–166.14) with a set of arguments against corporealistic notions of God.

There is a problem, visible even in this sketchy summary of Alcinous’s theology, which has long puzzled the learned. If the first God is “ineffable,” then why does Alcinous, right before engaging in a thorough demonstration of this claim, attach to him a set of positive attributes? The passage (10.164.31–165.4) seems worth quoting at length:

Indeed, the first God is eternal (αἰωνίος), ineffable (ἀρρητός), self-perfect, that is, non-deficient (ἀκτινής τούτων ἀπροσδέπτης), ever-perfect, that is, always perfect (ἀειτελής τούτων ἀεὶ τέλειος), and all-perfect, that is, perfect in all respects (παντελής τούτων πάντη τέλειος); divinity (θεότης), essentiality (οὐσιότης), truth (ἀλήθεια), commensurability (συμμετρία), and good (ἀγαθόν). I am not listing these terms by separating them from one another, but as though one single thing is conceived by all of them. He is the Good (ἀγαθόν) because he benefits all things according to their capacities, being the cause of all good (παντὸς ἀγαθοῦ αἰτίος ὧν). He is the Beautiful (καλὸν) because he is perfect and commensurable by his own nature (ἀυτὸς τῇ αὐτοῦ φύσει τέλεον ἔστι καὶ συμμετρον). He is Truth (ἀλήθεια) because he exists as the source of all truth (πάσης ἀληθείας ἀρχὴ ύπάρχει), as the sun is of all light. And he is Father (πατὴρ) through being the cause of all things (τῷ αἰτίος εἴναι πάντων) and ordering the heavenly Intellect and the world-soul according to himself and his own thoughts.

The puzzle has been resolved in various ways. According to the most common opinion (Freudenthal 1879, Wolfson 1952, Festugière 1954, Invernizzi 1976), positive attributes do not describe God’s essence but his causal priority—for example, God is good not essentially, but causally, insofar as bestowing good. The fact that Alcinous makes such a distinction only for three out of eleven positive epithets he attaches to the first principle (viz., Good, Truth, Father) has not troubled the advocates of this theory. They have argued that the
remaining epithets, too, demonstrate God’s relation to his creation. But this does not always seem to be the case. Alcinous calls God “the Beautiful” not because he is bestowing beauty but “because he is perfect and commeasurable by his own nature.” And he does not say that the first principle is God insofar as creating gods, or Essence in the sense of bestowing essence, or Perfection on account of causing perfection in all of his creation. Instead, he applies to the first principle such terms as Divinity, Essentiality, and All-, Ever-, or Self-Perfection, which rather allude to God’s absolute transcendence (above gods, essence, perfection, or any other substantial form and accidental predicates) than to his causal primacy.

A more ingenious solution has been proposed by Mansfeld (1988), who reads Alcinous’s list of God’s attributes, both positive (164.31–165.4) and negative (165.5–16) in connection with the immediately following section discussing the three ways of conceiving God (165.16–34). These ways, or modes (viae), Mansfeld argues, are introduced by Alcinous to justify the previous blend of positive and negative attributes, and are arranged in the order of importance. According to the first and most abstract mode (via negationis), all opposed pairs of qualities must be withheld from the first principle (e.g., “neither qualified nor unqualified”). According to the second (via analogiae) mode, all notions that express “other-directed causal” relations (Good, Truth, Father), can be attributed to God. Following the third mode (via eminentiae), “the positive among polar attributes” is predicated of God “in the most eminent way.” The argument that Alcinous could use to defend his peculiar blend of attributes was that he was just employing “the alternative modes of cognition, compatible albeit of unequal value” (Mansfeld 1998, 110). In short, he simply refined Eudorus of Alexandria’s (first century B.C.) presentation of the monistic and dualistic Pythagorean doctrines (One vs. Monad and Dyad) as alternative ways of “contemplating the same realities” (100).12

This is not the place to discuss the complicated doxographical genealogy of Alcinous’s mixture, let alone Mansfeld’s interpretation of Eudorus’s fragment. What I would like to tackle briefly is the supposition upon which Mansfeld builds his analysis of Alcinous’s

---

theology—namely, that Alcinous introduces the three ways of cognition (aphairesis, analogia, hyperochê) to justify his blending of positive and negative attributes of God in the previous passages.

When Alcinous denies all attributes to his "ineffable" first God (10.165.5–16), he simply applies, in Mansfeld’s view, the first and the highest, cognitive mode: aphairesis. But the geometrical example Alcinous chose to illustrate this mode—an abstraction from a solid body to a mathematical point—has hardly anything to do with the negative method (οὐτε...οὐτε...) exploited in the “ineffability” section. This negative method (via oppositionis) has not much to do with aphaeresis (reduction). It simply shows that the first principle is not susceptible to definition (by genus, species, and differentia), and cannot be attained by discursive reasoning—in short, that God is ineffable (ἄρρητος). Alcinous’s illustration of aphaeresis (via subtractionis, reductio
nis, abstractionis) demonstrates, in contrast, that God is graspable by intellect (νοητός) through a kind of abstraction legitimately used in mathematics. This method leads up to the denial of all predicates (ἀπόφασις) but to the subtraction of less dignified characteristics (ἀφαίρεσις, viz., from body to plane, from plane to line, and from line to point). As Alcinous states later in the chapter (165.34), we can prove by a gradual dimensional subtraction that God is partless (ἀμερής) in the sense of being the primary (πρῶτον) part (μέρος) out of which (τὸ ἔξ ὦ) things having part (ἄλω) are composed:

God is partless (ἀμερής) because there is nothing prior to him. For the part, and that out of which (a thing is composed), exists prior to that of which it is a part. Indeed, plane is prior to body, and line is prior to plane. (Alcin. Didask. 10.165.34–37)

Alcinous’s description of the second mode (analogia) fits best in Mansfeld’s hypothesis. The method is illustrated by the famous sun-simile from Plato’s Republic (6.508b9–c2). Just as the sun is not itself sight, but provides vision to sight and visibility to objects, so the first Intellect (πρῶτος νοῦς) is not intellection (νόησις) itself, but bestows the intelligizing capacity (τὸ νοεῖν) on the soul and intelligibility (τὸ νοεῖσθαι) on its objects. This may indeed seem a justification of Alcinous’ earlier use of such positive appellatives as Good, Father, or Truth for the first God—for instance, that he is the Good (ἀγαθόν) in the sense of being the cause of all good. In other words, God may be intuitively grasped (νοητός) by all sorts of analogous translation. Yet all these analogies are not to be confused with God’s essence, which is ineffable (ἄρρητος).
The third mode (hyperochê), again according to Mansfeld, justifies Alcinous’s use of the vocabulary of pre-eminence (Divinity, Essentiality, epithets ending in -teles). The method was already outlined in Chapter Five of the Didaskalikos, but under a different heading—that is, not as hyperochê, but as the first of the three kinds of analysis, “an ascent from sense-objects to the primary intelligibles” (5.157.11–12). Alcinous exploits the same illustration for both methods—that of the ascent to the Beautiful as described by Diotima in the Symposium (210a6–d4). As he writes in his explanation of hyperochê (10.165.27–34), upon contemplating beauty in bodies, then in soul, then in laws and customs, we must turn to

“the great sea of beauty” (Plato Symp. 210d4), after which one gains an intuition of the Good itself and the final “object of love” (204c4) and “striving” (Plato Phil. 20d8; cf. Arist. Metaph. 12.7.1072a26; Phys. 1.9.192a17 ff.), like a light appearing and, as it were, shining out to the soul (Plato Ep. vii 341c–d) which ascends in this way.

Now if Alcinous had indeed used such categorical analysis—the abstraction from beautiful sensible particulars to the intelligible form of beauty—as the model for the positive predication, he would probably have called his first principle “the Beautiful Itself,” as he did in his previous reference to Diotima’s discourse on Beauty (5.157.21 τὸ ωὖτὸ τοῦτο καλὸν), or the Good Itself, the Substance Itself, the God Himself. Instead, he attributes to the first principle such abstract epithets as Divinity (θεότης) and Essentiality (οὐσιότης), implying, as it were, that the supreme principle transcends even the level of universal forms (beyond God, beyond Being) and so cannot be reached by the sort of comparison characteristic of the third mode (10.165.34–35: “eminence in honor,” διὰ τὴν ἐν τιμῇ ὑπεροχῆν). Alcinous’s abstract nouns seem therefore neither recommended nor “justified” by the third method of cognition. They do not express the positive idea “in the most eminent way” (Mansfeld 1988, 110). Rather, they are positive expressions of a negative idea—

---

13 For superiority beyond comparison as a negative idea, it is worth quoting Theophrastus’s passage from the Metaphysics (1.5.5α5–7) μέχρι μὲν δὲ τούτον ὁμοίως ὁ λόγος, ἀρχὴν τε ποιῶν μίαν πάντων καὶ τὴν ἐνέργειαν καὶ τὴν οὐσίαν ἄποδοσε, ἐπὶ δὲ τὴν διαρέτον μηδὲ ποσὸν τὴ λέγον ἀλλὰ ἀπλάς ἐξαίρων εἰς κρέπτω τινα μερίδα καὶ θειοτέραν. οὕτω γὰρ μᾶλλον ἀπόστεον ἢ τὸ διαρέτον καὶ μεριστὸν ἀφαιρετέον· ἄμα γὰρ ἐν ὑψηλοτέρῳ τε καὶ ἀληθινοτέρῳ λόγῳ τοῖς λέγουσιν ἢ ἀπόφασις.
comparable with Being and Essence, but something beyond Being and Essence, i.e., Essentiality)—just as, in Alcinous’s own glossing, the term “self-perfect” (αὐτοτελής) is nothing but a positive correlate of “non-deficient” (ἀπροσδήτης).14

In view of all this, I take the central part of Alcinous’s account of the first God (Did. 10.164.31–165.34) as an elaboration of his key assertion that “God is ineffable and graspable only by intellect” (165.5 ἀγρήπτος δ’ ἐστι καὶ νόμῳ μόνῳ ληπτός). The first member of the statement is explained in the surrounding paragraphs (164.31–165.15): God transcends discursive reasoning and refuses univocal definitions (omnis determinatio negatio). ‘Positive epithets’, even when applied to God, say nothing about his essence, but simply emphasize God’s absolute transcendence and ontological priority. For example, God is not essentially good but only bestows good, is not Being but beyond Being (οὐσίότης), and is Self-Perfect in the sense of being non-deficient, etc.15 The methods by which Alcinous proves God’s ineffability include a simple negation (by means of ἀλφα ἀποφαστικὸν), a simultaneous negation of contradictory terms (via oppositionis), the argument from other-directed causality (not X, but causing x), and the argument from superiority beyond comparison (not x, and not even X, but X-ness).

14 That attributes ending in -telēs may denote the lack of any need, self-sufficiency, or non-deficiency, can be confirmed by a series of passages ranging from Plato (Tim. 33d2–3, 34b7–8) and Plutarch (San. tuenda 122E) to Apuleius (De Plat. 1.5.190) and Calcidius (In Tim. 204.8–9 cum ipse sit plenae perfectionis et nullius societatis indigens), all quoted in Dillon (1993) 104. To this list we may further add the passage from the Savior’s praise of the first God: “He needs nothing; for he cannot be perfected as if he were defective so as to be perfected. Rather, he is always utterly perfect” (Ap. John BG 23:11–14). For the meaning of οὐσίότης, a term rarely found in the pre-Neoplatonist texts, I quote the following important passage from a Hermetic tractate (12.22): εἶτε δὲ ὡλὴν εἶτε σῶμα εἶτε οὐσίαν φής, ἵθει καὶ τούτας αὐτὰς ἐνεργείας τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ ὡλῆς ἐνεργείας τὴν ὑλότητα, καὶ τῶν σωμάτων <τὴν> σωματότητα, καὶ τῆς οὐσίας τὴν ουσιότητα· καὶ τούτῳ ἐστιν ὁ θεὸς, τὸ πᾶν. The sense of οὐσιότητα is that of God’s activity prior to any positively defined and predicative essence (ousia). The word was later discussed by Marius Victorinus, Adv. Ar. 3.7.9–17 Hadot: Id est existentia vel subsistentia vel, si altius, metu quodam, propter nota nomina (i.e., logical categories) condendas dicasque vel existentialitatem vel substantialitatem vel essentialitatem id est ὑπαρκτότητα, οὐσιότητα, ὄντοτητα. Omnibus his, hoc esse quod dico, manens in se, suo a se motu, virificans potentia sua qua cuncta virificantur et potentiificantur, plena, absoluta, super omnes perfectiones, omnimonidis est divina perfectio. Hic est deus, supra voūν, supra veritatem, omnipotentens potentia et idcirco non forma.

15 For the non-essential way of applying epithets to the first principle, see Dillon (1999) 72–75.
The last two sections of the central part of Alcinous’s argumentation (165.16–34) demonstrate the second part of his key statement in 165.5—namely that God, albeit ineffable and not susceptible to any definition, is still graspable by intellection (νόητος). As recently suggested, Alcinous “seems here to be making creative use of Aristotelian principles . . . culminating in the conclusion of [Posterior Analytics] 2.19, that there can be no ‘scientific knowledge’ (epistêmê) of first principles, only intuitive knowledge (noûs), and applying them to God” (Dillon 1993, 107). Intuition of God, Alcinous says, is attainable by various types of reductive translation—dimensional (aphairesis), analogical (analogia), or categorical (hyperochê, ἐπὶ τὰ πρῶτα νοητὰ ἄνωθεν). None of them leads to firm knowledge (ἐπιστήμη). All simply entail an intuitive insight indicating only that God is, but not what he is.

In other words, Alcinous appears to have resorted to two separate kinds of methodological procedure, one for each part of his supposition that God is (i) “ineffable” and (ii) “graspable only by the intellect” (165.5):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Method</th>
<th>Specific Methods</th>
<th>“Ineffable” (ἄρρητος)</th>
<th>“Graspable only by Intellect” (νοητός)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Via Oppositionis</td>
<td>Aphairesis (Dimensional Reduction)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Via Negation</td>
<td>Analogy (Analogical Translation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other-Related Causality</td>
<td>Hyperochê (Categorical Analysis)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incompatibility of Power</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For each part of his two-member supposition, Alcinous seems to have relied on different sources. The modes of conceiving God are the legacy of Plato (analogia, hyperochê) and the Old Academy (Speusippus’s στοιχεῖον—metaphysics). By accepting God’s intelligibility, Alcinous also asserts the consequent that God, in so far as intelligible, must be the same as the intellect (Phaedr. 247c; Tim. 28a). In this way, he brings Aristotle’s divine νοῦς, the unmoved mover from the Metaphysics Lambda, into his account of the first principle. In his negative description of God, Alcinous makes use of Plato’s language (Tim. 28c, Phil. 65a) as well as of his negative method (Parm. 137c–142a). When he emphasizes God’s absolute transcendence, he seems to have drawn on some Neopythagorean sources. Thus, the triad of epithets ending in -telês has already been used to denote the first principle (the Monad) by ‘Neopythagorean’ authors as well as by Philo of
chapter two

Alexandria. Abstract terms ending in -otēs have a ‘Neopythagorean’ flavor, too, and appear in those authors who were in contact with the Pythagorean ‘current’ of Alexandrian Platonism (first century B.C.–first century A.D.). The idea that God bestows upon others the characteristics that he himself cannot possess goes all the way back to Speusippus (see below, pp. 107–11). Most of these sources emphasize God’s absolute transcendence—his superiority to the intellect and his unknowability. Alcinous’s adoption of this idea stands in contradiction to the other part of his supposition, namely that God is intelligible. Clearly, he was not always successful in harmonizing these ultimately incompatible alternatives.

Mansfeld, of course, did not fail to notice that the Savior’s discourse of praise contains a “blend of positive and negative theology” (Mansfeld 1988, 116) that is similar to Alcinous’s account. Indeed, all but two of Alcinous’s epithets (“commensurability” and “beauty”) occur in the Savior’s speech. The same, too, are the techniques of proving God’s ineffability: via negationis (BG 23:15 ff.: “unlimited . . . indiscernible . . . immeasurable,” etc.), via oppositionis (24:9 ff.: “neither perfection nor blessedness, . . . neither unlimited nor limited,” etc.), and withholding from God the characteristics bestowed by him upon others (25:18–21: “the always good One, the One that bestows good, and does good—not as though possessing, but rather as bestowing”). Yet conspicuously missing from the Savior’s litany are the three modes of conceiving God and their accompanying examples. Mansfeld finds nothing unusual in this absence. In his opinion, the Apocryphon

---

16 Philo seems to have been the first author to describe God as “ineffable”; cf. Wolfson 1952, 115–130. Philo was also Alcinous’s predecessor in simultaneously denying the pair “qualified–unqualified” (LA 3.206).

17 The term θεότης, for example, occurs in the Wisdom of Solomon 18:9, in Paul (Rom 1:20), in Plutarch (Quaest. conv. 6.665A), whose teacher was the ‘Neopythagorean’ philosopher Ammonius of Alexandria, and in the Hermetic Corpus (9.1; 11.11; 12.1; 13.1, 7; frag. 24.3). As for οὐσίοτης, which was widely used among Neoplatonists, it occurs already in the Hermetic Corpus (12.1, 22; frag. 16.1; frag. 21.1) and in Jamblichus’s account of the anonymous “Egyptians” whose doctrines bear a striking resemblance to the cosmology of the Pythagorean Moderatus of Gades (first century A.D.).

18 Early in chap. 10, for example, Alcinous says that God is the first intellect “everlastingly engaged in conceiving itself and its own thoughts” (Did. 10.164.29–31). Later in the text (165.24–26), he asserts that God, still called the first intellect, “is not the intellection itself,” but that it only “provides intellection to the soul.”
could have simply lifted the formula for blending positive and negative attributes “from the standard Middle Platonist literature” (Mansfeld 1998, 117), “taking for granted” the modes of cognition which Alcinous “was more conscientious in informing us about” (111). But the concluding sections of the Savior’s praise (vi–vii: Peroratio or Conclusio) clearly indicate that the omission was intentional. God, as the Savior discloses to John, is “incomprehensible” (BG 26:2), and “no one of us has been acquainted with that which belongs to the immeasurable one” (26:11–12). Discursive reasoning (λόγος) is inadequate to designate the transcendent principle which rejects all univocal predicates—hence the need for negative theology. Intellection (νόησις), likewise, is also incapable of attaining the principle that is superior to intellect, even when conducting a comparison starting from the principiates (analogia, aphairesis, hyperochê)—hence the need for an otherworldly revelation as a solution for the inadequacies inherent in all three modes of intellection.

The second part of Mansfeld’s formula—withstanding at first all attributes from God, then applying to him, as a second-best option, the positive among polar attributes in the open-ended Pythagorean systoicheia—appears unacceptable to the Savior. Such positive appellations would effectively blur the distinction between the first God and Barbelo; between the first One that transcends opposites and the second One that encompasses them all; between the creative potential of the Absolute and its self-actualization; between God’s initial indetermination (‘something’) and the first realization of his predicative content (Ennoia, ‘conception’). As we shall see in the following section, the Savior makes use of positive language; but this is not the language of univocal predications characteristic of the secondary level of reality, where God appears as the sum total (πλήρωμα) of his inner dispositions.

Kataphasis

Formation of the Spiritual Realm

Esprit. Attente pure, Éternel suspens, menace de tout ce que je désire. Épée qui peut jaillir d’un nuage, combien je ressens l’imminence! Une idée inconnue est encore dans le pli et le souci de mon front. Je suis encore distinct de toute pensée; également éloigné de tous les mots, de toutes les formes qui sont en moi. Mon œil fixé reflète un objet sans vie; mon oreille n’entend point ce qu’elle entend. O ma présence
sans visage, quel regard que ton regard sans choses et sans personne, quelle puissance que cette puissance indéfinissable comme la puissance qui est dans l’air avant l’orage! Je ne sais ce qui se prépare. Je suis amour et soif, et point de nom. Car il n’y a point d’homme dans l’homme, et point de moi dans le moi. Mais il y aura un acte sans être, un effet sans cause, un accident qui est ma substance. L’événement qui n’a de figure ni de durée, attaque toute figure et toute durée. Il fait visible les invisibles et rend invisibles les visibles. Il consume ce qui l’attire, il illumine ce qu’il brise . . . Me voici, je suis prêt. Frappe. Me voici, l’œil secret fixé sur le point aveugle de mon attente . . . C’est là qu’un événement essentiel quelquefois éclate et me crée. (Paul Valéry, *Tel Quel* II, 103)

The first God is not an *ousia* to accept definitions; nor is it an intellect to be grasped by intellectual abstraction. To prove this point, the Savior introduced three different methods in the argumentative section of his praise. The purpose of *via negationis* (iii) was to show the inferiority of the human condition (“nothing is prior to it,” “nothing has seen it,” “nothing existed prior to it so as to give a name to it”). *Via oppositionis* (iv) provided the proper method of negation. This method does not simply refuse single determinations (God is *not x*)—indeed, Plato had already warned (*Soph.* 251a–259) that simple negative statements might be ambiguous (God is *different from x*), but also God is *deprived of x*)—but denies the opposite pairs of qualities and, in this way, transcends the genus which these contrary terms jointly exhaust (God is *neither x nor non-x*, but something *superior to it*). The third method (v), finally, argued for the causal priority of God. The first God is *not good*, for that would make him partake in, and therefore be subordinate to, Goodness. Rather, the unknown God is good only insofar as bestowing it on his creation.19

Yet ‘positive’ terms are scattered throughout the Savior’s discourse of praise. They occur already in the *propositio*, and are regularly

---

19 For the distinction between negation (*ἀπουσία*) and privation (*ἀφαίρεσις*), see the representative collection of passages from Plato, Aristotle, Theophrastus, and Choeroboscus in van Raalte (1993) 155–68. The best discussion of “negative theology” among the ‘Gnostics’ is Orbe (1958) 1:3–38. For the *via oppositionis*, see *ibid.*, 14: “Para abordar el Absoluto, unidad indiferenciada, se han de superar las antinomias, distinciones y límites. La experiencia justifica tal método. Subiendo de las especies al género y de los generos al supremo predicamento, las diferencias quedan eliminadas en la unidad del *genero supremo indeferenciado* ‘a fortiori’ en el Uno.” As already mentioned, Philo of Alexandria was among the first to describe God as
repeated in all of the refrain-like sections, marking a strong contrast with argumentative sections and their negative mode. These terms do not yield a definition of God as an individual essence (ousia). Rather, they describe the first principle as an indeterminate substance (Spirit or Light), as the only source of creation (Oneness, Father), an unreflected preconsciousness, a pure gaze, a free expansion of thinking—in short, an absolute creative potential, the abyss of pure freedom, the Schellingian Sehnsucht.

The Monad . . . Monarchy . . . the Father of the Entirety, the Holy Spirit . . . Dwelling in the pure light . . . the Spirit . . . always utterly perfect . . . This is the immeasurable light, the holy and undefiled purity . . . He searches for his own self in the fullness of the light . . . He shall conceive the unmixed light, the immeasurable greatness . . . (BG 22:17–25:13)

John has grown familiar with most of these terms while listening to his earthly teacher. Jesus spoke of his remote Father as a spring of “living water” (John 4:10), “spirit” (4:24), “life” (5:26; 6:57), and “light” (1 John 1:5). But other positive terms like Oneness, Monarchy, and a self-relational language (e.g., “searching for,” “conceiving,” or “looking at,” one’s own self) did not belong to Jesus’ repertoire. The Savior must have borrowed them from elsewhere—from the sources which also proposed the idea of God’s absolute transcendence, yet in a more systematic, more philosophical fashion. The Oneness (μήτ-ογχα), for example, is probably the Coptic translation of the

`αρητος, ἀκατανόμωστος, ἀκατάληπτος, ἀπερίγραφος, ἀπερινότος. He was also familiar with the via oppositionis, whose method owes a great deal to Plato’s discussion of ‘a one beyond being’ in the first hypothesis of the second part of the Parmenides (137c–142a); see, e.g., L1 3.206 τίς ἄν ἰσχύσαι ἢ ὅτι ἀσώματον ἢ ὅτι σώμα ἢ ὅτι ποιόν ἢ ὅτι ἄπων τὸ αἰτίων εἰπεῖν ἢ συνόλως περὶ ὀψίας ἢ ποιήτης ἢ σχέσεως ἢ κινήσεως αὐτοῦ βεβαιώς ἀποφήγμαται; cf. Dillon (1975) 5–6, and (1993) 108. In spite of its late date, Proclus’s “order of negations” in Theol. plat. 2.5, pp. 38, 18 ff W-S, seems worthy of comparison with the ‘modes’ (iii–v) employed by the Savior: αἱ μὲν γὰρ ἀποφάσεις τριπλῆς, ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκοῦσι, ἐν τοῖς πράγμασιν ἰδιότητα προτείνουσι· καὶ ποτὲ μὲν ἄρχοιδέτεραι τῶν καταφάσεων οὐσία, γεννητικαὶ καὶ τελειωτικαὶ τῆς ἀπογεννήσεως αὐτῶν υφεστήκασι· ποτὲ δὲ τὴν σύστοιχον ταῖς καταφάσεσιν ἐκληρώσαντο τάξιν καὶ οὐδὲν μᾶλλον ἡ κατάφασις τῆς ἀποφάσεως σεμνοτέρα· ποτὲ δὲ αὐ καταδεικτέραν ἔλαχον φύσιν τῶν καταφάσεων καὶ οὐδὲν ἀλλ᾽ ἡ στερηθεὶς εἰσὶν ἐκεῖνων.
Greek term μονάς, the name some Pythagoreans used to denote their transcendent first principle.\(^{20}\) As for self-relational language, however, it is much easier to find later beneficiaries of it (e.g., Plotinus, *Enn. VI* 8) than to pinpoint its sources.

The most likely source for the Savior’s self-relational vocabulary seems to be Aristotle—more specifically, his definition of God, or the unmoved mover, as “the intellect thinking of itself by participation in that which is being thought” (Arist. *Metaph.* 12.7.1072b19–20: αὐτὸν δὲ νοεῖ ὁ νοῦς κατὰ μετάλλησιν τοῦ νοητοῦ; 1074b33–5: αὐτὸν ἄρα νοεῖ, ἐξεπερ ἐστὶ τὸ κράτιστον, καὶ ἐστὶν ἡ νόησις νοῆσεως νόησις). The same idea, and the same kind of language, was also in vogue among the ‘scholastic’ Platonists of the Imperial period. Alcinous, for example, equates the prime mover with the active intellect from Aristotle’s *On the Soul*, and defines the transcendent God as “everlastingly engaged in thinking of itself and its own thoughts,” the latter being nothing but the Platonic ideas (*Did.* 10.164.29–31 ἐαυτὸν ἄν ὄν καὶ τὰ ἐαυτοῦ νοῆματα ἄει νοοῦ, καὶ αὐτὴ ἡ ἐνέργεια αὐτοῦ ἰδέα ὑπάρχει). He even evokes the Aristotelian analogy of the active intellect to light—“and there is an intellect which of this kind by becoming all things, and there is another which is so by producing all things, as a sort of disposition (ἕξις) such as light does; for in a way light too makes colors in potentiality into actual colors” (*De an.* 3.5.430a14–17)—in order to explain how the first God operates as the cause of intellection in the soul.

The first intellect is not the power of intellection (νόησις) itself, but provides intellection (τὸ νοεῖν) to the soul and intelligibility (τὸ νοεῖσθαι) to intelligible objects (τοῖς νοητοῖς), illuminating the truth contained in them. (*Did.* 10.165.24–26)

This notion of the self-thinking active principle that is, in addition, made analogous to light, seems quite close to the Savior’s oracles in the *Apocryphon of John*, both in his discourse of praise and in the immediately ensuing section, where he states that divinity conceives (νοεῖν) itself in its own light. Yet nowhere in the hymnal passage has a reference been made to God’s thinking his own thoughts. Furthermore, the Savior does not say that his first God is the same as

---

intellect (νοῦς). Intellect will be disclosed, or brought into existence, much later, as a “coactor” to the Self-Originate (αὐτογενῆς, αὐτογένητος), the only begotten offspring of the Father of the Entirety and His first Conception, Ennoia–Barbelo (BG 31:5–6; II 6:33–34).

There is something paradoxical in the idea that the first principle is capable of thinking (νοεῖν) and forming a vague conception (πνεύμα) of its own self, and yet is not itself an intellect (νοῦς). Irenaeus, was outraged by a similar argument proposed by the Valentinians (Adv. haer. 2.13.1):

Even the first series of their emanations is to be rejected; for they claim that from the Deep (Bythos) and its Conception (Ennoia) both Intellect (Nus) and Truth were emitted, which is clearly a contradiction. Indeed, the intellect (nus) is that which is primal and supreme and, as it were, the principle and source of all mental activity, while conception (ennoia) proceeds from it, being any kind of (intellectual) motion concerning whatsoever (intelligible) object.21

The same sequence of mental process is set out in the Apocryphon of John. The first principle, dwelling in its transcendent solitude, “searches (αἰτεῖν) for its own self” (BG 25:10) or “gazes (εἰσωρθέται) at itself in his light” (II 3:36). Although not the same as intellect, it “conceives (νοεῖν) itself, or looks (κοιτᾶται) at itself (II 4:5), in its own surrounding light” (BG 26:15–16)—the pure gaze finding enjoyment in contemplating its undefined being, a self-contented Will that wills nothing. This primordial state of pure potentiality and absolute solitude can best be understood if contrasted with the ensuing section of the Apocryphon, where God begins to exercise the positive will, the Will which wants something, and initiates the procession of aeons.

Ⅱ 3:36–5:2 = Ⅳ 5:23–7:8

For it gazes (εἰσωρθέται) at its [own self] [in its] light.

[For] the [. . .] is great (μέγεθος).
[ - - - ] is immeasurable [purity].

---

... It searches (αἰτεῖν) for its own self in the fullness of the light.
It shall conceive (νοεῖν) the unmixed light (ἀξιόρητον),
the immeasurable greatness.

21 For Irenaeus’s layout of the proper sequence of mental process cf. 2.13.1–2; see an excellent discussion in Orbe (1958) 1:363–85 (“Las actividades mentales en la procesión del Logos”).
For it looks at ($κωπτέω$) itself, in its light, that is, the fountain of the living water.

And it [provides all] the [aeons.]

[And] in every way it gazes ($εἰσὶν ἡτέρας$) at its image, by seeing ($ἰδαίας$) it in the fountain ($πηγή$) of the spirit ($πνεῦμα$), exercising will ($οὐγώνει$) in its watery light of the [pure luminous] water that surrounds it. And [...] actual and she was disclosed, namely she who had appeared before him, [in the radiance of] his light. This is [the first . . . that] came to be before all, [which was shown forth from] his thinking ($ἰησεύει$), that is [. . .] her light [. . .] light, the perfect power, which is the image ($εἰκὼν$) of the invisible virginal ($παρθενικόν$) spirit ($πνεῦμα$) who is perfect; [. . .] power, the glory of Barbelo, the perfect glory among the aeons ($αἰῶν$), the glory of the manifestation.

The Savior distinguishes between the two separate stages in the life of the first God. First, the Absolute is presented as a pure gaze “conceiving,” or “looking at,” its own self. Then, it recognizes, or “sees,” itself as an object (image, $εἰκόν$) and, as a result, forms the first notion ($πρόνοια$) or conception ($ἐννοια$) of the ‘self’. 22 The medium
in which this process takes place is God’s unlimited substance—the pure light with mirror-like characteristics. All this sounds strikingly similar to the Lacanian *stade du miroir* in the gradual process of ego-formation. An even more ‘Lacanian’ version can be read in the *Sophia Jesu Christi*:

> The Lord of All, it is not ‘Father’ that it is called, but rather Fore-Father (τροπάτωρ). For it is the Father of the beginning (ἀρχή) for those that will be shown; yet, in fact, it is the Fore-Father without beginning (ἀνάρχος). Seeing (τυχ) its own self within itself as in a mirror (εἰςπρότροφος; P.Oxy. 1081.43 εἰςόπρότροφος), it is shown forth resembling itself. And its image revealed itself as the Fore-Father, as a divine Father, and as its face-to-face (ἀντωπός), for it stands before the face of the Preexistent Unbegotten Father. It is of equal time (ισόχρονος) with the Light that is before it, but it is not equal to it in power. ([Soph. Jes. Chr. BG 90:15–91:13; cf. NHC III 98:22–99:13; P.Oxy. 1081r, 36–50 Barry](#))

The text delivers, more clearly than the *Apocryphon of John*, Plato’s axiom of the inferiority of the image in relation to its model. The image of the first God is of equal time (ισόχρονος) with its model because, in the spiritual realm, there is no “before” and no “after” but only a *synchronic* unfolding of contingents (principiata) from their principle (principium). But this image is not of equal power (ισοδύναμος) because it is “a transient apparition” of its paradigmatic source (*Tim.* 52c3 ἐτέρου δὲ τινος ἀεὶ φερέται φάντασμα), and because, in contrast to its model, its coming into being requires “something else in which” (52c4 ἐν ἐτέρω προσήκει τινι γενέσθαι) it may appear. But, transient as it is, the image may disappear as easily as it came to be—it “clings somehow to existence (οὐσίας ἀμοστέπως ἀντεχομένην) on pain of being nothing at all” (52c4–5). The moment God’s image becomes actual denotes the passage from “some sort of existence” (*Soph.* 240b ὁν πας) to the subsistence (ὑπόστασις) of a “perfect aeon.”

Plato’s theory of the image accounts for the ontological inferiority of God’s first emanation. What it does not explain, however, is the process by which God formed this image-like notion of himself. Priority assigned to perception, to “seeing one’s one image,” as an essential prerequisite for concept-formation, points to a Stoic influence.23
According to the epistemological model of the ‘orthodox’ Stoics, human conceptions (ἔννοια) are founded on impressions (φαντασία, τυπώσεις) coming from external objects: “When a man is born,” one doxographical source informs us (Act. Plac. 4.11.1–4), “he has the commanding part of the soul (τὸ ἰγμομονικὸν μέρος τῆς ψυχῆς) like a chart well-wrought for writing upon.” First impressions to be inscribed on this “chart” are sensory ones (“through the senses”). The accumulation of impressions that are of the same kind (όμοιωσεῖς) leads eventually, i.e., by the end of our first seven years, to the formation of vague preconceptions (προλήψεις, or the “natural” conceptions, the subgroup of ἔννοια). The primal notion of god, for example, which is common to all men, is “received in addition (i.e., by accumulation) from the beauty of perceived phenomena” (1.6.2 ἔσχον δὲ ἔννοιαν τοῦτον πρῶτον μὲν ἀπὸ τοῦ κάλλους τῶν ἐμφανισμένων προσλαμβάνοντες). In contrast to experience (ἐμπειρία), which is the storage-place of multiple sensory data, ἔννοια is their rational interpretation, their first generalization. Since it cannot be formed without impressions, the Stoics referred to it as “a kind of impression” (Plut. De comm. not. 45, 1084F–1085A φαντασία γὰρ τὶς ἕννοια ἑστι, φαντασία δὲ τύπωσεσ ἐν ψυχῆ). But since it also presupposes generalization (conceptualization) out of the data accumulated in experience, the Stoics defined it, too, as “a kind of stored thinking” (1085A τὰς ἕννοιας ἀποκειμένας τινὰς ὀριζόμενοι νοήσεις).

Once formed, these “natural” conceptions—natural inasmuch as they arise through our experience of the outside world—are vague, “imperfect,” and so require a further articulation. As Epictetus puts it (Diss. 2.17.10–11),

Who among us does not speak of good and evil, of advantageous and disadvantageous? Indeed, who among us does not have a preconception (πρόληψις) of each of them? But do we have it differentiated and perfect (ἀρ’ ὁμοίωσις καὶ τελείως)? This you must show. How? Apply it in an appropriate fashion to particular essences (ἔφαρμοσον αὐτὴν καὶ ταῖς ἐπὶ μέρους ὀφθαλμίσεις).

of Aristotle’s De Anima, on which see, e.g., D. Frede (1992). This rule does not apply to a divine intellect, as clearly postulated by Alcinous (10.164.14–18): “Even when they set out to conceive of the intelligible, human beings still retain sense-perceptions in their imagination, to the extent of conceiving along with it often a notion of size, shape, or color; for that reason, they cannot conceive of the intelligible in a pure fashion, but the gods are free from sense-perception, and therefore apprehend them in a pure and uncontaminated mode.”
Differentiation or articulation (διάρθρωσις) to which Epictetus refers is just another name for definition (ὁρος), or, as Chrysippus had it, “a presentation of a peculiar characteristic” (D.L. 7.60 ἵστου ἀπόδοσις)—the process whereby a generic characteristic becomes the logical subject, *definiendum*, in a propositional judgment. In other words, our notion (ἐννοια) of good, evil, advantageous, god, man, etc., becomes, in the act of definition (ὁρος ἐννοηματικος), a universal concept (ἐννοημα)—the universal man, god, good, etc.—susceptible to predication. This notion, still according to Epictetus (Diss. 2.17.7), must be made “perfect” (τελευων) through differentiation and subsequent application.

But it is not possible to apply natural conceptions (ἔφαρμόζειν τας προλήψεις) to corresponding essences without differentiating them and considering in particular what kind of an essence ought to be subjected to each of them.

The same operation is also referred to by Epictetus as the “filling out” of conceptions with other, non-essential characteristics—that is, with their accidental differentiations (‘dispositions’, διωθεσεις) resulting from particular applications and specific circumstances. This gradual specification of primal vague conceptions leads eventually to the constitution of scientific knowledge (ἐπιστήμη). The primal notion of good and evil turns thus into a complex ethical system of virtues and passions; the notion of god into theology; and the conception of what is healthy and harmful into medicine. Science (ἐπιστήμη), in short, is an ἐννοια turned into a system of individual qualifications or “dispositions.”

The stages of this cognitive process are laid out in Lucullus’s exposition of the epistemological theory of Antiochus of Ascalon (Cicero *Lucullus* 30 Schäublin):

> For the intellect itself (mens), which is the source of the senses, and even itself a sense, has a natural power that it directs (intendit) to the things by which it is moved. And so, some visual impressions (visa) it seizes on so as to use them at once, others as it were it stores (recon-

---

24 For the distinction *ennoia/ennoêma*, see, e.g., Elorduy (1944) and (1972), and Sedley (1985) 87–92.

dit; cf. above, ἐννοεῖσθαι), these being the source of memory. The rest, again, it constructs by means of resemblances, and from these are formed the conceptions of things which the Greeks now call ennoiai and now prolēpseis. With the addition of reason (ratio) and logical proof and an innumerable multitude of things, there comes cognition (perception, κατάληψις) of all these things, and this same reason, having been perfected (perfecta; cf. above, τέλειος) by these stages (his gradibus), finally arrives at wisdom (sapientia).

Although a Platonist, Antiochus seems to agree with the Stoics that mental constructs stem from the elaboration of previously ‘impinged’ sense-data. Originally, the intellect is a divine substance, pneuma, in its highest degree of tension, the substrate capable of receiving external impressions. In Philo’s words (Deus 42), it is “a vast and all-receiving storehouse (μέγιστον . . . ταμεῖον καὶ πανδεχές) in which all that comes through sight or hearing and other sense-organs is placed and treasured,” and which, “like wax, receives the impress (κηρῷ δὲ ἔωκις ὁ νοῦς τὸ ἐκμαγεῖον δεξάμενος) and retains it with acuity” (43). Sense-impressions activate intelligizing capacity (νόησις) by means of which they get transformed into generic conceptions (προλήψεις or φυσικὰ ἐννοια). This first conceptualization yields a grasp of a thing but not its full predicative content, its definition (ὅρος, διάρθρωσις). Definition, in its turn, requires the formal subject, and it is the task of abstract thinking (διάνοια) to stabilize a generic conception (ennoia) into a mental construct, a “figment of thought” called ennoêma (D.L. 7.60 ἐννόημα δὲ ἐστὶ φάντασμα διανοιαίς). In order to be further articulated, this mental construct, or concept, activates the reasoning faculty (λόγος), whose function is to classify the concept (ennoêma) by genus and differentia (ἴδιος ποιόν) and to divide it into a set of individual, accidental characteristics. This set of obtained definitions constitutes scientific knowledge (ἐπιστήμη), the validity of which must be checked by application (ἐφαρμόζειν) to everyday situations and particular phenomena. At this point, the reasoning faculty is supposed to have reached the state of perfection (perfectus, τέλειος). That is, it has exhausted all ways of analyzing its definitendum, and has come in possession of stable and systematic knowledge thereof. As Antiochus says, it has “arrived at wisdom” (sapientia, σοφία).

The set of various dispositions gradually acquired by the intellect (a pneuma disposed in a certain way), as well as of their corresponding effects, can be presented as follows:
Among the terms listed in the right column, *ennoêma* holds a special status. It does not denote a cognitive activity but a universal concept reached by abstraction from sensible data. This is the same reductionist process (*aphairesis*) by means of which the Platonists used to attain an understanding of eternal forms. *Ennoêmata* thus figure as the Stoic correlate to the Platonist forms or ideas. They differ from the latter, however, in one important aspect. According to one doxographical source, “the Stoic philosophers say that ideas are nonexistent (*énupârktouς*), and that what we participate in is the concepts” (Stob. *Ecl.* 1,137.1 ff. Wachsmuth). What the Stoics say, in fact, is that Plato’s universals are pure mental abstractions to which nothing in reality corresponds. Our participation in universals is, therefore, not ontological but logical—not that of contingents partaking in their ontologically independent principles, but that of individual specimens in their common *species*. Concepts are the formal subjects of all definitions, conceived by abstract thinking (*dianoia*). They are a necessary tool of logical analysis, and not the eternal patterns which, as is the case with Plato’s ideas, come first in reality.

Later, however, some serious attempts were made to mitigate this disagreement about the status of universals. Antiochus of Ascalon, for his part, held that “Stoicism should be considered an emendation of the Old Academy rather than a new school of thought” (Cic. *Luc.* 43).26 What is more, he believed that “the Stoics agreed with the Peripatetics in substance and disputed only in terminology” (Cic. *ND* 1.16). Thus, in the case of universals, he identified Plato’s ideas with *cogitatae species* (Cic. *Or.* 8 ff.), which probably correspond to the Stoic *ennoêmata* (rather than *katalêpseis*, as suggested by Dillon 1977, 93),

---

26 A useful survey of Antiochus’s doctrines can be found in Dillon (1977) 52–106; see also Barnes (1989) 5–96, Lévy (1992), and, more recently, Görler (1994) 717–989, and Fladerer (1996).
but did not relegate them to the realm of simple “figments of thought.” On the other hand, partly in view of Aristotle’s objections to transcendence of Plato’s forms, he denied to these forms a causally independent status and defined them as the objects of “intellection and reason” (ratione et intellectu contineri). The concept of “reason” (ratio), again, seems to belong to Stoic legacy, as well as the claim that sense-perception is a necessary prerequisite for concept-formation (cf. Cic. Luc. 30, quoted above). Finally, Antiochus accepted the Stoic position that the mind should be considered as corporeal—the contrary claim would render it incapable of either acting or being acted upon, so that neither perception nor ensuing conceptualization could ever take place. In his own words, “the intellect is not some empty immaterial something . . . but is itself a certain kind of body” (Cic. Fin. 4.36).

Antiochus also agreed with the Stoic claim that the universe is a corporeal continuum where the same principles are at work both in the whole and in each of its parts. Did he, then, assign to the cosmic intellect the same set of cognitive dispositions which he applied to the individual mind? The evidence at our disposal suggests that he identified God with Aristotle’s divine intellect, everlastingly engaged in a kind of thinking which does not require any sensible images—that is, with “perfect intelligence and wisdom” (Cic. Luc. 28 mentem et sapientiam perfectam). To do otherwise would entail a twofold assumption, about a pre-conceptual and non-rational stage in the life of God, and about a state of precosmic chaos in the world which Antiochus conceived as an eternal and indestructible rational being. Analogies with human psychology can be drawn, but only to the extent they do not challenge God’s everlasting perfection. For Antiochus, as later for Alcinous and Irenaeus, God involves the absolute contemporaneity of its entire predicative content.

The above-mentioned Valentinians did not respect these limits. As Irenaeus angrily objected, they introduced in their discourse of God the distinctions and “movements” that belong to the inner life of a developing human being. But God cannot be reduced to a set of mental activities characteristic of the human mind (Adv. haer. 2.13.3):

27 Cf. Cicero, Luc. 28 Schäublin partis autem esse mundi omnium, quae insint in eo, quae natura sentientes teneantur, in qua ratio perfecta insit, quae sit eadem sempiterna.

28 See n. 20 above, with the crucial quotation from Alcino (10.164.14–18).
Those who say that Conception was emitted from God, and Intellect (Nus) from Conception (Ennoea), and then from all these Reason (Logos), should first be refuted for their improper use of emissions (cf. 2.13.2); second, on the ground that they, in fact, describe states, passions, and intentions of the human mind (sensus), and know nothing about God. . . . Had they known the scriptures and had been taught by the truth, they would know that God is not like men (Num 23:19), and that his conceptions are not like men’s thoughts (Isa 55:8–9). For the Father of all is at a great remove from human mental states and passions, and is simple, not compounded and without different members, entirely alike and equal to himself, for he is all intellect (mens), all spirit, and all intellection (sensuabilitas), all conception (ennoia) and all reason (ratio), all hearing and all seeing, all light and entirely the source of all good things, as religious and pious people befittingly speak of him.

For Irenaeus, the only legitimate analogy that can be applied to God is that of a self-thinking intellect—fully determined, in possession of all qualities, with a stable character (diathesis) “unsusceptible to intensification and relaxation” (Simpl. In Cat. 237.25 ff.). As he replies to the Valentinians, God is a perfect “intellect comprising all things” (Adv. haer. 2.13.4 sensus enim capax omnium) and a fully developed, articulated ‘self’ (2.13.3). For Irenaeus’s opponents, on the other hand, God is at first potential intellect, potential reason, and potential wisdom. All of these faculties will be actualized gradually, just as they gradually emerge in the developing human, triggered by their respective objects—the faculty of sense-perception (aesthesis) by sensible objects, the faculty of imagination by the images of sensible objects, the faculty of intellection, or intuitive thinking, by their vague conceptions, and the faculty of discursive thinking by the mental constructs called concepts. The rule adopted by the Valentinians is that the object defines the faculty and its activity. Perception of the sense cannot occur without there being perceptible objects. The same applies to the intellect, which cannot think without having the images, or vague notions (ennoiai), of these perceptible objects. This is why Ennoia (Conception) “emits” Nus (Intellect), and is both logically and ontologically prior to it.29

29 The rule is clearly laid out by Aristotle; cf. e.g., De an. 2.4.415a16–20: “But if we must say what each of them is, e.g., what is the faculty of thought or of perception or of nutrition, we must first say what thinking and perceiving are; for activities and actions are logically prior faculties”; 2.5.417a2–9: “There is a prob-
The Savior’s account of the effusion of aeons from the first principle in the Apocryphon of John commits the same kind of anthropomorphic fallacy: it applies human mental states and affections to the inner life of God, and it follows the rule according to which the object defines the faculty. The first principle in the Apocryphon of John also cannot conceptualize before receiving information from the ‘senses’. That is, it first must “see” (ιδέα) its own reflection (image) in a mirror-like substrate so as to attain the first notion (ἐννοια) of the ‘self’. At the next stage, it will turn into a reflecting subject (nous, Autogenes) and think of itself as a separate object (idea, ἐννοëma). Next, by engaging in discursive reasoning (logos), it will analyze this separate ‘self’ (definiendum) down to its individual dispositions (twelve aeons) and acquire, as a result, the systematic knowledge (sophia) of the ‘self’.

Each of the above stages ascribes a different meaning to the notion of ‘self’. In the order of appearance, God’s ‘self’ is at first a sensible image, then a vague notion, then a hypostasized definiendum, and finally the object of systematic knowledge.

Turning finally to the Savior’s self-relational vocabulary, what sense, then, does it make to apply it to the stage when God was just a pure, indefinite, and immeasurable substance (viz., light, spirit, living water), and when there was no outward impressor to be perceived, recognized, or objectified? Two solutions are possible. According to the first, the ‘self’ here is the object of God’s striving, something which God does not yet have, but, as the shorter versions of the Apocryphon say, “searches for” (αἰρεῖν). That same conative meaning must be consequently ascribed to all other verbs governing the direct reflexive pronoun. Thus, the first principle does not simply “gaze” or “look” at itself, but “gazes” or “looks” expectantly at its own ‘self’. And when, a few lines later, the Savior says that God “conceives its own self in its own light” (BG 26:15–16; III 7:2–4), this statement should be taken proleptically, as anticipating the next stage of God’s

---

lem why there is no perception of the senses themselves, and why they produce no perception without there being any external objects... It is clear that the faculty of sense-perception does not exist in actuality but only in potentiality; for this reason, the perception does not occur, just as the fuel does not burn of and in itself without something that can make it burn; otherwise it would burn itself and would need no actually existing fire”; ibid. 6, 418a7–25; cf. EN 1139a8–11.
self-realization, when it will perceive and conceptualize its image. This is why, in the description of this stage, the text of the shorter version (BG 25:11–12; III 6:4–5) uses the non-contingent future tense: “He shall conceive the unmixed light.”

Another solution is that, in this case, too, the Savior follows the Stoic epistemological model and equates the initial pre-conceptual stage of the first God with the stage of a non-reflected self-awareness (συναισθησις, cf. Hierocl. 1.51–57 Arnim): the sense of internal coherence (ἐξίς) that any living being experiences upon its birth. While the function of aisthēsis is to perceive external objects, συναισθησις denotes the preceding phase of involution, the primal awareness of one’s own constitution (σύστασις). In Seneca’s words, this is the same experience that an infant has of its own natura (Ep. 121.11–12):

Nature is easier to grasp intuitively than to explain. The infant does not know what constitution is, but is conscious of its own constitution; and does not know what a living being is, but feels of itself as of an animal. Moreover, that very own constitution of its own, it only understands confusedly, slightly, and dimly.30

At the cosmological level, this is the very unity which the Stoic god experiences whenever the conflagration takes place. “The god of the Stoics,” as one source states, “has then the whole substance as his commanding-faculty” (Orig. C. Cels. 4.14 ὅτε μὲν ἠγεμονικὸν ἐχει τὴν ὀλην οὐσίαν). All distinctions that characterize the cosmogonic process are here annulled—god becomes inseparable from matter, the active cause indistinguishable from the passive. God is the “intelligent and eternal pneuma” (Alex. Aphrod. Mixt. 11.225.2–3)—(i) the pneuma which, at this unitary stage, has no outward medium to pervade it and extend through it; (ii) the intelligence (νοῦς) which, by lacking information from the senses and having nothing external to interpret and conceptualize, is “all dedicated to its own thoughts” (Sen. Epist. 9.16 adquiescit sibi cogitationibus suis traditus); (iii) and the sensory faculty of sight which, not yet confronted by any outside object, “pours forth the rays of light” (Aet. Plac. 4.15.2 ἐκ γὰρ τῆς ὀράσεως προχειρισθαί τινα εἰς σύντο αὐγήν) to illuminate this perfect, non-differentiated unity.

30 Facilius natura intellegitur quam narratur. Itaque infans ille, quid sit constitutio non novit, constitutionem suam novit; et quid sit animal nescit, animal esse se sentit. Præterea ipsam constitutionem suam crasse intellect et summam et obscure. For this letter by Seneca, one of the clearest expositions of the Stoic theory of oikeiosis, see Lévy (1992) 403–7.
The God without qualities and the God who combines in himself all qualities are not, as suggested by Mansfeld, “compatible alternatives.” In the first case, God refuses all predications (via oppositionis). In the second, God comprises all opposites (coincidentia oppositorum). If these two ways of understanding God were indeed compatible, then Irenaeus would not have been so outraged by Valentinian speculations. Irenaeus rejects the idea of God’s changeability, of a gradual development of his cognitive capacities. In his interpretation, God is perfect intelligence, perfect reason, perfect mind, and perfect knowledge. Like a wise man, God is endowed with impregnable consistency and stability of thoughts. For the Valentinians, again, and for the Apocryphon of John, too, the unity of the first principle recalled the image of an infant—that same sense of a pre-conscious integrity (incolumitas) which Augustine recalled in the nostalgic reminiscence of his own infancy (Conf. 1.20):

For at that time I existed; I lived and had self-awareness (sentiebam) and took care of my self-preservation (incolumitas), a vestige of that most profound unity whence I derived my existence.31

---

31 For the importance of the Stoic theories of the supreme genus (τι), self-preservation (οἰκείωσις), tenor’ (ἐξης), and various cognitive dispositions of intellect for the formation of Neoplatonist metaphysics, see Hadot (1967) 1:225 ff. Platonizing variants of the Stoic classification of genera, as well as the problem of the Stoic supreme genus, are discussed in Brunschwig (1989) 19–127. The self-relational language was popular among the Neoplatonists, eager to yield some more positive idea of their transcendent One. Compound nouns with the ἑν-prefix were extensively used by Plotinus, e.g., self-awareness, self-coherence, self-knowledge, self-consciousness (συνειδησίας, συνεδής, συνονωσίας), often in combination with the paradoxical predication and the via eminentiae: “comprehension without comprehension,” “thinking that conceptualizes nothing” ([Porphy.] In Parm. frag. 2,16–17 μὲν ἐν ἀκαταλήπτω καταλήψει καὶ μὴν ἐννόησι νοῆσει), “prevention” (προέννοαι), “super-intellection” (ὑπερνόησις Plot. Enn. VI 8.16.32). Plotinus was fully aware of the ambiguity of the notion of ‘self’ in its application to the solitary and non-reflecting principle. For this reason, whenever using self-relational expressions, he adds the “as if” proviso: it is not that the first God, or the One, sees or thinks itself, but it is “as if it were looking toward itself” (ibid. 16.18–19 οἶνον πρός αὐτὸν βλέπει). In order to suit the first principle, the language of self-relation must be used in a hypothetical sense—asymptotically, and by analogy with the first ensuing principiate (i.e., intellect, νοῦς, in which the subject–object distinction is first articulated)—proving, again, that there is no appropriate way to define the Absolute in a univocal way. In modern Plotinian scholarship, the self-relational predication of the first principle has been a favorite subject. The ambiguity inherent in the notion of ‘self’, it has been argued, can be reduced, if not annulled, by a set of further specifications: for example, that the One’s ‘self’ is “a floating ego—consciousness to be distinguished from the full range of human personality” (Dodds 1960, 1–7); cf. also Schroeder
The Language of Procession in the Apocryphon of John

The praise of the Unknown God in the Apocryphon of John has a polemical flavor. As shown in the previous section, its arguments are best understood if located in the context of an ongoing philosophical controversy within contemporary Platonism as to how one should (i) define the Absolute, (ii) describe the mechanics of deriving a multi-layered reality from its original source, and (iii) conceive the appropriate discursive mode capable of conveying both (i) and (ii). For Irenaeus, the Absolute, which is identified with Intellect, involves the contemporaneity and concatenation of its entire content. For his Valentinian opponents, as well as for the author of the Apocryphon of John, the Absolute is ‘apophatic’—the abyss of pure freedom rejecting all determination, a self-contented Will which wants nothing, and a pure Nothingness rejoicing in its own indefiniteness. In the former case, the ontological problem of the transition from the One to a determinate plurality is merged in the logical problem of deducing the plurality of concrete particulars from the selfsame universal. In the latter, logical necessity gives way to the vitalist notion of Lebensprozess and the stages of God’s development. Each alternative, moreover, articulates its appropriate discursive mode. The former conceives the Absolute, or Intellect, in the mode of dialectical deduction which renders its inner articulation, viz., intelligible forms. The latter, in contrast, resorts to a mythical narrative that goes beyond the imminent self-deployment of the divine Intellect to reach the pre-symbic stage of the pure potentiality of the first principle and its primordial freedom from any kind of determination.

These two responses to the metaphysical problematic of the transcendent Absolute have a long prehistory and can be traced all the way back to the Old Academy and the metaphysical systems developed by Plato’s first successors, Speusippus and Xenocrates. Irenaeus’s position ultimately derives from Xenocrates’ identification of the first

principle, the Monad, with an Intellect (*nous*), possibly conceived in response to criticisms by Aristotle. This Intellect acts, and produces, as it understands itself and logically deduces its predicative content as the form-numbers. According to the testimony of the fourth-century B.C. rhetorician Alcimus, Xenocrates had posited that “each Form is an eternal thought susceptible to change” (D.L. 3.13), laying the ground for the Middle Platonist doctrine that the forms or ideas are the products of God’s internal design, of the divine subjectivity. The way in which God conceptualizes and externalizes his inner content is effected by dialectic—a “divine method” which, following Plato’s description thereof in the *Philebus* 16c–18d, consists of a two-way movement of collection and division establishing the “exact number of every plurality between the unlimited and the one,” between the unity of a form and its multiplication in the sensible world. This view of God as an accomplished dialectician who ‘divides’ himself into subgenera, species, and subspecies, and who articulates forms in himself and subsequently realizes them in the corporeal substrate, will be taken over and further developed by a considerable number of Middle Platonist (Antiochus, Plutarch, Alcinous, Apuleius) and early Christian theologians (Irenaeus, Origen, Eusebius, Augustine). The distant echoes of this theory can be discerned in Spinoza’s identification of knower, knowledge, and known, and in the Hegelian logical necessity of the self-deployment of the absolute Subjectivity.32

The other position, clearly preferred by both the Valentinian opponents of Irenaeus and the *Apocryphon of John*, stems from the ontological interpretation of Plato’s contradictory deductions about ‘One’ in his dialogue *Parmenides*, popular in the Neopythagorean circles of the Hellenistic and Imperial periods (Pseudo-Brotinus, Alexander Polyhistor, Eudorus of Alexandria, Moderatus of Gades, Nicomachus of Gerasa, Theon of Smyrna) and later developed by Plotinus, yet first formulated, in all likelihood, in the Old Academy by Speusippos. In the second part of the *Parmenides* (135d–166c), where Plato applies

---

32 The necessity of God’s deduction of his own predicative content is explained by Deleuze (1992) 102–3, in his analysis of Spinoza’s formal distinction between the unity of substance and the plurality of attributes in God: “That God should necessarily produce things tells us also how he produces. Understanding himself as a substance composed of an infinity of attributes, existing as a substance composed of an infinity of attributes, God acts as he understands and as he exists, this then in these attributes that express at once his essence and existence.”
his deductive method to infer both the affirmative and negative consequences of a simple hypothesis about the being of ‘one’—“if there is a one”—, the first two deductions distinguish between a ‘one’ beyond ‘being’ that negates any kind of plurality (137c–142a), and a ‘one-that-is’, which, insofar as partaking of ‘being’, becomes (i) a duality of ‘unity’ and ‘being’, capable of generating numbers, and (ii) a whole consisting of parts, that is, of its ‘being’ and its ‘unity’ (142b–155e).\(^{33}\) Transferred to the ontological level, these two movements—denying and affirming, respectively, the same set of properties to the ‘one’—lay the logical foundation for the distinction between the transcendent One above Being and refusing all predication, and the derivative One coordinate with Being and encompassing all sorts of predicates.\(^{34}\) The ‘apophatic’ view of the Absolute is deduced from the negative results established for the ‘one’ in the first movement, summarized in the following two postulates: first, that unity is not identical with anything but unity and thus cannot be many; and second, that every attempt at determination amounts, in fact, to negation.\(^{35}\) The Absolute, therefore, cannot be identified, as Xenocrates, Aristotle, and the ‘orthodox’ Middle Platonists had done, with the primal Intellect and the forms as its positive thought-content, for these intelligible entities require a source that is prior to and inde-
pendent of them. And since Plato himself had claimed that to ‘be’ is to be a form accessible to the intellect, this implies that the Absolute, insofar as independent of and prior to all forms, must be both unintelligible and beyond Being.

The principal problem facing the metaphysical interpretation of Plato’s *Parmenides* and, for that matter, all monistic systems that postulate a simple first principle, the absolute One, devoid of all qualities and prior even to ‘being’, is how to account for the passage from this One beyond Being to the ‘existing One’ capable of generating a finite multitude of subordinate entities. This passage cannot be deduced dialectically since we are no longer dealing, as in the case of Xenocrates and his followers, with a necessary act of self-understanding on the part of God identified with an Intellect. Instead, it can only be explained by resorting to analogies and metaphors borrowed from such diverse domains as physics, geometry, biology, arithmetic, human psychology, or sexual reproduction—that is, by the very same device for which Hegel criticized Plotinus, the best known ancient representative of radical monism:

But out of the First all proceeds, owing to the One’s revealing itself; that is the connection with creation and all production. But the Absolute cannot be conceived as creative, if it is determinate as an abstract, and is not rather comprehended as the One which has energy in itself. This transition to the Second is thus not made by Plotinus philosophically or dialectically, but the necessity of it is expressed in representations and images. Thus he says (*Enn.* III 8.10) . . ., “The one absolute Good is a source which has no other source, but is the principle for all streams, so that it is never exhausted by these, but as source remains at rest in itself,” and thus contains these streams as such in itself; so that they, “flowing out in one direction and another, have yet not flowed away, but know beforehand whence and whither they will flow”. (G. W. F. Hegel, *Lectures on the History of Philosophy*, trans. Haldane-Simson, slightly modified, 1894, 2:415–16)

The metaphysical problematic of the One beyond Being and beyond intellection cannot thus be resolved by intellectual argument or logical methods of proof. What is required instead is a series of analogies capable of supplying an intuitive insight into the paradox of the transcendent principle which, while remaining in itself unchanged and totally simple, creates the finite plurality of actually existing entities. Two kinds of analogy can provide this insight. The first kind imagines the One as “unlimited in power” (*Plot. Enn.* VI 9.6 τῷ ὑπεριλήπτῳ τῆς δυνάμεως), whose “superabundance” (*VI 2.1 ὑπερπλήρες*)
and “the excess of creative potential” (ὑπερβολὴ τῆς δυνάμεως) implies the presence of latent plurality and its eventual actualization (i.e., irradiation, pouring forth, extension, generation). The metaphors used to convey these two moments in the life of the Absolute, viz., its infinite potency and the necessary realization thereof, are those of the spring and its stream of water, of the radiant sun and its rays of light, of the seed and the living being, of the root and its tree, and of the circle with its center. Illustrations of this sort abound in Plotinus (cf., e.g., *Enn. III* 8), and earlier in late Hellenistic ‘Neopythagorean’ circles, but the majority of them already occur in some of Plato’s most poetic passages. Thus, Plotinus’s representation of the

---

36 Plotinus’s claim that the One is “of unlimited power” (VI 9.6) is just one among competing ancient interpretations of Plato’s deduction in the *Parmenides* 137d, that “the One is unlimited if it has neither beginning nor end.” A detailed discussion of this problem, including the descriptions of principal interpretations, is available in Proclus, *In Parm.* 6.1118.7–1124.37 Cousin, transl. Morrow-Dillon (1987) 459–66. Plotinus seems to have shaped his view in response to Speusippus’s position that the One is unlimited “on account of its smallness” (διὰ σμικρότητα Ἄποι. *In Parm.* 1.25 ff. Hadot), on which see Proclus, *ibid.*, 1118.10–19: “Some declare the One to be termed unlimited in this sense, that it is non-traversable (ἀδιαζύτητον) and is the limit of everything else; for the term ‘unlimited’ has two senses, the one as being incomprehensible (ἄληπτον) and unencompassable (ἀπεριέγχοντον), the other as being the limit of all things and not having any other limit . . .” In VI 9.6, Plotinus criticizes the view of the absolute One construed by analogy with mathematics and its reductive method, as an absolute minimum: “The oneness of the One is greater than that of [arithmetical] monad and [geometrical] point; for these the soul abstracts extension and numerical quantity and rests upon the very minutest possible (τὸ σμικρότατον), ending in the indivisible but still in something that began as divisible and is always in something other than itself. The One, however, is neither in any other nor in the divisible; nor is its divisibility that of extreme minuteness; for it is greatest of all not in size but in power, and so is sizeless by its very power” (transl. McKenna, p. 542, slightly modified). The method of arriving at the first principle by analogy with the mathematical analysis of numbers and magnitudes into their ‘atomic’ minima (i.e., monad and point) can be traced back to Speusippus; cf. Iambl. *DCMS* 4.17.12–16 Festa: τὸ γὰρ ἀπλούστατον παντοκρατοῦσα στοιχείον εἶναι . . . ὥς ἐν ἀρθμοῖς μονάδα κατὰ τὸ ἕν, οὕτως στυχήμαν ἐν γραμμαῖς τιθέναι. For Speusippus, in short, the One is unlimited in the sense of being a numerically and quantitatively immeasurable minimum—an absolutely simple ‘element’ (στοιχεῖον cf. Arist. *Metaph.* 13.9.1085b21–34) comparable to the “seed” (σπέρμα) comprising the potencies of all things (ibid. 12.10.1072b30 ff.; 14.5.1092a11–17). In Plotinus’s view, this identification of the One with the primal *stoicheion*, as well as the choice of the seed-metaphor, undermines its absolute transcendence: “For that which is prior to these [principiates] is their principle, not as immanent in them; for that from away which (ὁφ’ οὗ) something comes cannot be immanent, but only that from which (ἐκ οὗ) it grows, or consists” (*Enn.* V 3.11). For Speusippus’s theory of the ‘unlimited’ One, see the important contribution by Halfwassen (1992b) 43–73.
absolute transcendence in terms of superabundance (ὑπερπλήρεις) and overflow (ὑπερρεῖν V 2.1) results from the juxtaposition and blending of Plato’s argument in the Parmenides about the One as unlimited (137d7–8 ἀπειρον ἄρα τὸ ἔν, εἰ μήτε ἁρχὴν μήτε τελευτήν ἔχει) with the famous assertion in the Republic that the primary idea of Goodness is not the same as being, but even beyond being, “surpassing it in dignity and power” (6.509b9–10 ἐπέκεινα τῆς οὐσίας πρεσβεία καὶ δυνάμει ὑπερέχοντος). Another pair of ‘root metaphors’ important for representing the derivation of reality from the infinite One, that of the radiant sun and the circle with its center, is nothing but a refinement of Plato’s sun-simile from the Republic (6.508b–509b). Finally, even the comparison of the first principle with a source that has no source outside itself, which Hegel adduced to demonstrate the non-discursive character of Plotinian thought, can be traced all the way back to Plato’s identification of the first principle of movement with “source” (πηγή) in the Phaedrus (245c).37

The second group of analogies tends to emphasize the dualism of opposite drives in the Absolute, picturing the passage from its initial unity and indetermination to plurality and finitude as a temporary resolution of the inner tension between the two antagonistic drives, of self-preservation and self-differentiation, of rejecting any specification and formulating a determinate predicative content. The analogies are chosen from two discursive domains: the Stoic theory of the self-transforming God identified with the vitalizing breath or pneuma, and contemporaneous epistemological theories of cognitive process and concept-formation, discussed in detail in the previous section of this chapter (pp. 91–106).

The choice of pneuma-analogy seems particularly suitable here. This dynamic and corporeal continuum which, according to the Stoics, is the divine principle constituting and pervading all reality, comprises in itself two simultaneous yet opposite movements of contraction and expansion, the former producing “unity and substance” and the second “quantities and qualities” (Nemesius, Nat. hom. 70.6–71.4).38

37 The development and morphology of these analogies are discussed in Krämer (1967) 339 ff. and, more recently, in Beierwaltes (1985) and Halfwassen (1992a) 126–130.
38 Nemesius’s passage runs as follows: “If they should say, as the Stoics do, that there exists in bodies a kind of tensile movement which moves simultaneously inwards
In the inward movement of contraction, this divine ‘breath’ stabilizes itself as a substance of all things, whereas, in the opposite movement of expansion, it externalizes itself in a series of qualitatively distinct modes—divine intelligence, or mind, in rational entities, soul in animals, physique in plants, and tenor in inanimate objects—and thereby loses the firm ground of its initial stability. Reality is the result of a temporary balance in the tension between these two antagonistic drives, a fragile equilibrium which, “at set periods of time,” goes amok and collapses back to the stage prior to any distinction between ‘substance’ and ‘qualities’, when “god [will] consume all substance into himself” (D.L. 7.137) and enjoy its absolute indifference and indetermination, “all dedicated to its own thoughts” (Sen. Epist. 9.16).

A similar scenario can be construed, as we have already seen in Irenaeus’s polemic with the Valentinians, by resorting to analogies from Stoic epistemology. God’s primordial state of absolute indetermination and unlimited potentiality, of a willing which wants nothing, corresponds to the stage of non-reflective self-awareness and internal coherence that man experiences in infancy, prior to becoming a rational subject (S), and prior to ‘putting on’ a set of defining characteristics or predicates (P). God undergoes an analogous set of self-transformations: like any human being, he disengages himself from his initial indifference, then posits himself as a subject (S) capable of formulating his own characteristics (P), and generates reality as his symbolic representation. Yet God’s infinite potential can never
be adequately expressed in a finite multitude of predicates, so that every attempt at establishing the stable relationship between God \textit{qua} subject and his predicative content ends in ‘miscarriage’—that is, in revealing the dark residue in God which resists symbolic representation. Reality is therefore, as in the case of the \textit{pneuma}-analogy, viewed as inherently fragile, the result of God’s abortive desire to comprehend his incomprehensible nature. No wonder, then, that the Valentinian opponents of Irenaeus were particularly fond of this analogy—for, in their view, the world is precisely the result of a divine miscarriage, an \textit{éktrvma}.\textsuperscript{40}

Most of the aforementioned analogies play a prominent role in the Apocryphon’s discourse of procession. The gradual unfolding of reality from the transcendent first principle is expressed here, too, in the images of overflow, efflux, irradiation, concept-formation, and natural reproduction. None of these analogies, however, is fully developed in any single redaction of the Savior’s monologue. Rather, as we shall soon be able to demonstrate, individual elements of one analogy are fused with the elements of another. \textit{The primary task of a commentator is to reconstruct these original analogies and to supply all terms left out in the process of their ‘condensation’ into hardly penetrable metaphors.}

We have already seen how, in the Savior’s praise of the transcendent God, the apophatic language occasionally gets interspersed with more positive qualifications. Albeit “ineffable” and “unintelligible,” God is

\textsuperscript{40} The presence of that dark residue in the Absolute, of that irrational exception refusing rational idealization, entails the opposite movement of contraction in which the Absolute withdraws into itself and annihilates the world as its imperfect symbolic expression. In contrast to the Stoic \textit{pneuma}-analogy, here the reconstitution of world-order does not take place. Plotinus will oppose to this conception his view of a universe without beginning or end in time, grounded in the metaphors of a never-ending and necessary irradiation or overflow of the Absolute’s “superabundance” (\textit{Enn.} V 2.1 \textit{τὸ υπεραλήρες αὐτοῦ πεποίηκεν ἀλλο}). Plotinus’s universe is a spiritual continuum extending, in a decreasing order of power and dignity, from the One above being to ‘dark’ matter, where the latter is the everlasting consequence of a necessary degradation, and not just a temporary outcome of God’s aborted attempt at self-clarification. In Plotinus’s system, matter can never be cut off from the superior principles to which it owes its existence in the first place: “Nothing is separated or cut off from that which is before it” (V 2.2), or, as Plotinus formulates it in his treatise \textit{Against the Gnostics} (\textit{Enn.} II 9.3), “Matter will [forever] be illuminated.” In the view of his ‘Gnostic’ opponents, matter symbolizes the irreparable defect in the system, which will eventually destroy the whole edifice of the rational world-order.
portrayed as “Monarchy,” “the Father of the Entirety,” “the perfect invisible virginal spirit,” “the immeasurable light,” the holy and undefiled purity,” “the pure luminous water,” a free expansion of thinking that has nothing external to reflect on, a pure gaze not yet confronted by any object, and a self-contented will which wants nothing. These images provide the starting point for the Savior’s narrative of ‘procession’, articulated as a series of middle steps in a downward movement towards the opposite pole.\footnote{One of the most ingenuous modern descriptions of this process is available in Klee (1961) 5–16: “Everything (the world) is of a dynamic nature; static problems make their appearance only at certain parts of the universe, in ‘edifices’, on the crust of the various cosmic bodies. . . . What first interests us in the scale of tone values is the abundance of tonalities between the two poles. Rising from the bottom towards the source of light, we feel an increase of unparalleled intensity and breadth between the poles. Below, dark subterranean rumbling, in between, the half shade of under water, and above, the hiss of brightest brightness. On the scale the middle steps may be distinguished by weight or critical evaluation. The practical task is this: to fix them in the scale by mixing them or glazing them.”}

(i) By analogy with the natural reproductive pattern, the transcendent Absolute eventually disengages itself from its blissful indiffERENCE and becomes the Father of Entirety mating with his first emanation, the female consort Ennoia–Barbelo, described in the longer redaction of the Apocryphon as “the Womb” (μητρα) of the Entirety” (NHC II 5:5). In this way, God assumes the role of an active male cause that contributes both the form and the source of movement for a new individual nature—a perfect male offspring, the “only-begotten Self-Originate,” or Christ, endowed with individual characteristics of his Father. The subsequent production of other natural beings, or aeons, in the Father’s spiritual kingdom results from the analogous ‘mating’, this time of the Self-Originate Christ and his ‘coactors’ (Intelect, Logos, Will) with the individual feminine aeons of Barbelo.\footnote{See NHC II 6:33–7:34 for allusions to the process of sexual reproduction: “And he [the divine Self-Originate] made a request that he be given a coactor, namely Intellect [νοός m.]. . . . And while the invisible Spirit was consenting, Intellect was disclosed and stood at rest with Christ [the divine Self-Originate] glorifying it [the Spirit] and Barbelo. And all these came into being in Silence [σιγή f.] and Thinking [ἐννοία f., i.e., in the silent thinking of Ennoia–Barbelo]. And he wished to make something by the Word [λόγος m.] or the invisible Spirit. . . . And Word followed after Will [θέλημα, a grammatically neuter noun assigned to an efficient, male cause]; for by the Word, Christ, the divine Self-Originate, fabricated the entirety. But Eternal Life [ζωή αἰώνιος f.] is with his Will, and Intellect with}
the last of the twelve aeons fabricated the Self-Originate, commits an illicit act. In the manner of Aristotle’s ‘unruly matter’ (*GA* 4.3.767b 9–30), she tries to conceive in spite of “not being mastered” (769b13 τῆς δ’ ὰλής οὐ κρατουμένης) by the form coming from the male consort. This futile attempt at parthenogenesis results in a miscarriage, or the discharge of dark matter (that is, her ‘menstrual fluid’), the only thing that Sophia can contribute to generation. The outcome, in this case, is an ugly, dark, and deformed product—the future ruler of the visible world, Ialdabaoth. As for Sophia, she will repent

---

Foreknowledge [*πρόγνωσις*]. Indeed, from [*ὕπο?*] the Light that is Christ and out of [*ἐκ?*] Incorruptibility [*ἀνεπαρκεία*], through the gift of the Spirit, the four luminaries from the divine Self-Originate gazed out. Cf. Irenaeus’s report on a very similar procession of aeons in *Adv. haer.* 1.29.1: “They say that this Light [similar to the Majesty of the Father] is Christ, who in turn asked that Intellect be given him as a coactor, whereupon Intellect came forth. Furthermore, Father emitted Will and Word. Then there came to be the *conjugal couples of Conception* (Ennoia) and Word, of Incorruptibility and Christ. Likewise, Eternal Life was added to Will, and Mind to Foreknowledge.” The same principle of sexual reproduction governs the mechanics of procession in the ‘Valentinian’ systems, too; cf. Clem. Alex., *Exc. Theod.* 32.1: “In the Pleroma, since there is a unity, each of the aeons has its own pleroma, which is a conjugal couple (*συζύγιο*). What proceeds from a couple, they say, are pleromas, whereas what proceeds from one are images.”

---

43 The Aristotelian theory of ‘unruly matter’, clearly laid out in Aristotle’s tract *On the Generation of Animals* 4.3, might have provided a theoretical basis for the Savior’s account of Sophia’s miscarriage in the *Apocryphon of John*. In Aristotle’s theory of reproduction, ‘deformity’ (ἀναπηρία) is a term that encompasses every defect in offspring from, in a downward order, a more regular type (“the female”) to less frequent (“human beings” bearing no similarity with their biological parents) and, finally, such exceptional cases as monstrosity (τέρας). Deformity thus denotes any departure from ‘natural’ pattern of biological reproduction, which is the creation of a male offspring endowed with the individual characteristics of his father. The formation of a female offspring is “the first beginning of this deviation” (*GA* 4.3.767b6–8), occurring whenever the male factor, or seed, which provides the form and the source of movement (formal and efficient cause), fails to gain a full mastery (κρατεῖν) over the female contributing factor, the menstrual fluid (material cause). This gradual relapsing process may next lead to the removal (λύσθαι) of all individual characteristics (τὸ καθ’ ἐκαστὸν, τόδε τι, or primary substance) of both the father and the mother, to the point where “all that remains is just a human being” (768b12–13 τὸ κοινὸν, ἐδοκιμασμένον, τῇ τις τοῦ Εννοίας). Sometimes, as Aristotle argues, “what remains is that which is most general, and this is the animal” (769b14 τὸ καθώλου μαλλισταί, γόνιος, or secondary substance *qua species*). This “sometimes” stands for those situations “when the movements [arising from the seed, the carrier of the father’s gender specifications and his individual characteristics] relapse and matter [that comes from the female] does not get mastered” (769b12–13 τέλος γὰρ τῶν μὲν κινήσεων λοιμών, τῆς δ’ ὰλής οὐ κρατουμένης). At this stage, when the offspring fails to preserve even its determination as a species, the reproductive process loses its whole purpose, i.e., the continuation of a particular species, and Nature gives way to the blind, purposeless force of matter. The
of her mischief and, by the intervention of her would-be consort, the Holy Spirit, eventually rise up to the “Ninth Heaven,” the liminal zone between the Pleromatic world and the realm of Ialdabaoth, which represents the intermediate level of the World-Soul in the three-level universe of the *Apocryphon of John*. Finally, the lowest level of the edifice, or the visible world, comes into being out of the union of the two contrary principles, with Ialdabaoth mating with his own ‘madness’ ἀπόνοια. What we have here, in short, is a rather dualistic scenario, where each subsequent level of a multiple-tiered universe, with the exception of Sophia’s animate realm, derives from the two opposite yet complementary principles which, in their turn, are the products of an analogous conjugal couple at a higher level. The logic of this derivative process, stemming from the transcendent

only trace of Nature’s original design which did not yield to material constraints is the “most general” characteristic of monstrosity—its being an “animal” (ζώον). For that “in virtue of which an animal is animal” is “sentient soul” (2.3.736b2 τὴν αἰσθητικήν [ψυχήν] καθ’ ἕν ζῷον), and that is still something which only the male, by virtue of his seed, is capable of supplying. “Thus, if the male is the factor that produces the sentient soul in cases where male and female are separate, it is impossible for the female alone to generate from itself an animal, because the faculty just mentioned is the essence of what is meant by the male” (2.5.741a13–18). But then Aristotle the biologist raises the puzzle of birds laying wind-eggs, which “proves that, up to a point, the female is able to generate. Yet there is a puzzle here too: In what sense are we to say that these eggs are alive? We cannot say that they are alive in the same sense as fertile eggs, for in that case an actual living being would hatch out of them; nor are they on a par with wood or stone, because these eggs go bad just as fertile ones do, and this seems to indicate that they, in some way, partake of life. Hence it is clear that potentially they possess some sort of soul. What sort, then? The lowest, it must be, and this is nutritive Soul; for this is what exists alike in all animals and plants” (741a19–26). Back to Sophia’s mischief in the *Apocryphon of John*, her spontaneous attempt at giving birth without male consort and the resulting expulsion of a misshapen fetus appears a figurative version of Aristotle’s account of parthenogenesis; likewise, Sophia’s ensuing act of giving some of her light to Ialdabaoth or, alternatively, Ialdabaoth’s theft of his mother’s light, may represent the acquisition of the sentient soul ἀισθητικήν ὕποσ—-for, once in possession of the divine light, Ialdabaoth acquires the image-making capacity, φαντασία, which, according to Aristotle, is ‘parasitic’ on sense-perception: “Since imagination (φαντασία) is thought to be a kind of movement and not to occur apart from sense-perception (ἀισθησία) but only in things which perceive and with respect to those things of which there is a perception,...this movement cannot exist apart from sense-perception or in things which do not perceive” (De an. 3.3.428b10–15). See infra, pp. 144–48.

44 The “Holy Spirit,” or simply “Spirit,” pneuma (II 14:5–9; III 21:5–11; BG 47:1–5), which will eventually “come from the holy aeons” and heal Sophia and her seed from their deficiency, so that “the whole Pleroma may become holy and without lack” (II 25:12–13, III 32:16–19, BG 64:6–9; cf. BG 60:12–14 and III 30:10–12).
One and its primordial self-division into male and female can be presented as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principles (Causes)</th>
<th>Levels of Reality (Effects)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transcendent One</td>
<td>First Ten Aeons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father and Barbelo</td>
<td>with Christ the Self-Originate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christ and Incorruptibility</td>
<td>Twelve Additional Aeons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophia alone</td>
<td>Ialdabaoth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consort and Sophia</td>
<td>Sophia in the “Ninth Heaven”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ialdabaoth and Madness</td>
<td>Visible World</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(ii) Based on the Savior’ comparison of the transcendent One with an absolute monarch—“The Monad . . . a Monarchy over which nothing presides” (BG 22:17–19; II 2:27)—the spiritual realm, or the Pleroma, resembles an idealized version of Hellenistic monarchy, as described in the standard works of late Hellenistic and imperial political philosophy. The supreme king is portrayed as ruling through

---

45 Strato of Lampsachus, the head of the Peripatetic school since 287/6 B.C. to his death in 269/8, is said to have written one such treatise. Further information about the content of a typical kingship treatise is provided by pseudo-Aristeas’ Letter to Philocrates, probably written in mid-second century B.C. The idea of the king as god’s representative on earth is a commonplace in Stoic and Platonist literature, partly based on Plato’s designation of monarchy as the best form of government in the *Politicus*. The most influential among the kingship treatises of the imperial period were produced in ‘Neopythagorean’ circles in the first centuries B.C. and A.D., some of them preserved in substantial fragments—e.g., the three essays *On Kingship* attributed to Diotogenes, Ephanteus, and Sthenidas, edited by Thessleff (1965) 71–75, 79–84, and 187–88. The analogy of king and god is fully exploited by Diotogenes: “As god is related to the world, so is the king to the city; and just as the city is to the world, so is the king to god. . . . The king, his rule unaccountable, and himself a living law (νόμος ἔργα), is as god among men” (Thessleff 72). The analogy is often employed in theological and cosmological speculations as a heuristic tool clarifying the relationship between god, subordinate divine beings, the world, and mankind; cf., e.g., the Eleventh Oration by Maximus of Tyre (ca. A.D. 125–185): “Think of a great empire and a mighty kingdom, in which all bow willingly (συμπεραίνων νενευκτών ἐκάντων) to one soul, that of the best and most revered of kings. The boundary (ὅρος) of this empire is . . . the heavens above and earth below: the heavens like a circuit of an impenetrable wall, completely enclosing the universe and shielding all within itself; the earth like a watch-house (φρουράν cf. Plat. *Phaed.* 62b) and a prison for sinful bodies (δέσμως ἄλληρον σωμάτων cf. *ibid.* 67d, 82e, 83c). The Great King himself sits motionless (ἀτέκμοντο) like the law, bestowing on his subjects the security that resides in him. As his partners in
a limited number of functionaries, or “aeons,” each appointed to the rank of “attendant” (παριστάσθαι, παρεστάναι) following the petition (αἰτεῖν) by a superordinate courtier and the king’s “nodding” approval (κατανεῦειν). At the next stage, a portion of royal power is transferred to the sovereign’s son (Christ, the Self-Originate) who, acting as a vice-regent, sets out to create his own court hierarchy. The monarchic constitution of the Pleromatic realm is built upon two complementary premises: that a monarch and his viceroy govern by reason and that their subjects submit to this rational rule voluntarily. Sophia’s disobedience poses a challenge to the rule of law, whereupon both she and her imperfect product, Ialdabaoth, are “cast out,” or declared outlaws. Ialdabaoth’s foundation of his own kingdom represents a degeneration of the ideal monarchic constitution into

power, he has a whole host of visible and invisible deities, some gathered close round the vestibule of his throne-room, like a king’s viziers and close relatives, sharing his table and his hearth, others subordinate to these, and yet others further subordinate to them. Here is a succession, a hierarchy for you to behold, from God above to the earth below” (Diss. 11.12 ed. trans. Trapp). Similar passages, replete with Platonic motifs and numerous allusions to the Demiurge’s discourse to the inferior gods from the Timaeus (41a–d), also abound in the works of Philo of Alexandria, for example in Decal. 60–61 and Spec. 1.13–15: “Moses’ opinion was that the universe was generated and is like the greatest city, having magistrates and subjects; for magistrates, all the heavenly bodies, planets and fixed starts; for subjects, such beings as exist below the moon in the air, or on the earth.” Philo uses the same analogy to explain the inner structure of the desert tabernacle and its ten curtains, as described in Exod 26:1: “The structure which includes the whole of wisdom (σοφία) has obtained the perfect number, ten, and wisdom is the court and royal palace of the all-ruler and the sole absolute king. And this is a dwelling accessible only to the intellect, whereas the world is sense-perceptible, since he weaves the curtains from such materials as are symbolical of the four elements: for they are wrought of fine linen [a symbol of earth], of dark blue [air], of purple [water], and of scarlet [fire].” For Philo’s employment of political imagery in his theological discourse, see Umemoto (1991) 207–56; Platonist and Pythagorean political treatises are discussed by Centrone (2000) 559–84; for Hellenistic theories, cf. Hahm (2000) 457–76.

46 As already shown in Chapter One, pp. 47–49, the progression of aeons in the Pleromatic realm follows the rhythm of reciprocal giving and taking: requesting the gift-granting-taking. This sequence of actions is interrupted when Sophia’s request for a gift, i.e. her union with a consort, is denied, so that she continues to act alone (requesting the gift-not giving-taking what was not given). The last act in this three-member sequence, viz., “nodding in consent” (κατανεῦειν), plays an important role in Plotinus’s metaphysics, denoting a “downward inclination” or “decline” in the scale of being—for example, the soul’s decline into matter (cf., e.g., Enn. I 8.4 and Skeel-an-Pollet 1980, 676). The ‘decentralization’ of God’s absolute power in the Apocryphon of John is therefore a negative process—it increases the risk of egotistic assertion of autonomy among the subordinate subjects (Sophia) and eventually results in apostasy (Ialdabaoth).
tyranny and all of its concomitant characteristics: self-aggrandizement, arrogance, jealousy, and disorder. The royal power in the *Apocryphon of John* is thus divided among the three separate rulers, in an obvious reference to a curious account of the Second Platonic Letter (312e–313a) about the three “kings” ruling, in descending order, over the respective levels of reality. The “unbegotten Father,” who stands for the Platonic ‘First King’, reigns along with his

---

47 The relevant section of the Second Platonic Letter runs as follows (312d–313a): “According to his report, you [i.e. Dionysius] say that you have not had an adequate demonstration concerning the nature of the first [principle]. Now, I must state it to you in riddles, so that in case something happens to the tablet ‘in folds of ocean or of earth’, he who reads may not understand. In relation to [or: ‘about’, ‘around’ περὶ] the King of All, all things exist, and for his sake they all are, and of all fair things he is the cause; and related to [about, around] the Second are the secondaries; and related to [about, around] the Third the tertiaries. About these, then, the human soul strives to gain knowledge of what sort they are, looking to the things with which it has some affinity; yet none of them is adequate. But as to the king and the things I mentioned, they are nothing like this. Thereupon the soul inquires, ‘But what are they like?’ This very question, O son of Dionysius and Doris, or rather the travail (δουλεία) that this question occasions in the soul, is the cause of all evils, and if that be not eradicated from a man, he shall never really attain the truth.” Tarrant (1993) 170–73, relates this letter to Rhodes, where Posidonius taught and where “Thrasyllus met Tiberius,” and considers the latter “responsible for including it (or its esoteric part) within the *Corpus Platonicum*” as an oblique version of Plato’s deductions about the One in the *Parmenides*. In spite of the enigmatic language of ‘kingship’, the central themes of the passage are Platonic commonplaces: (i) the hierarchical structure of reality; (ii) the soul’s affinity with the higher realm; (iii) the soul’s desire to apply a discursive reasoning to that which cannot be grasped in a rational fashion, a “travail” that results in (iv) its ‘fall’ and in generating evil. All these themes play an important role in the metaphysical system of the *Apocryphon of John*, where Sophia performs a similar set of actions as the soul in the Second Letter: striving for knowledge–travail–generation of evil–fall. For the history of Middle Platonic, early Christian, and Neoplatonist usages of this esoteric text, cf. Dörrie (1970) 217–35 and Saffrey-Westerink (1974) xx–lix. From the aesthetical point of view, the passage can be viewed as a further refinement of the analogy of king and god, highlighting a gradual subordination of vertical hierarchy, as formulated by Philo or Dio of Prusa (cf. supra, n. 46), to a circular organization of space, with the first principle occupying the central position rather than the highest post in the pyramidal structure. Plotinus (*Enn.* V 1.8.1), for example, interprets the recurrent use of the proposition περὶ in the Second Letter in terms of spatial organization, as the relation between the geometric center, occupied by the ‘King of All’ (“all things exist around the King of All”), and the concentric spheres ranged around the center and governed by the ‘Second’ and the ‘Third’ (“around the Second are the secondaries and around the Third the tertiaries”). For other instances of Plotinus’s reading of the Second Letter in terms of metaphysical progression (e.g., VI 7.42, V 5.3, II 9.9), and for his refinements of the analogy by resorting to the visuals aspects of contemporaneous imperial processions (Elagabalus, Gallienus), cf. Doerrie (1970) 231–32, and nn. 20–21.
consort Barbelo over the “androgy nous quintet of aeons” (BG 29:14–17; II 6:8–10). His son, Christ the Self-Originate, or divine Intellect, who corresponds to the Platonic “Second King concerned with the second things,” was appointed to rule over the “entirety,” i.e., the intell i gible realm of the twelve additional aeons, and to him the Father “subordinated all authority and truth that was in him” (NHC II 7:23–27; BG 32:13–18). As for Ialdabaoth, the product of Sophia’s lawless desire, who corresponds to the Pl atonic ‘Third King’ and bears a vague resemblance to Plato’s divine craftsman, he is described as the “chief ruler” who “fabricated for himself an aeon burning with a luminous fire, in which he still exists” (BG 38:14–39:4; II 10:19–25) along with his authorities and powers.

What unites the other set of analogies developed in the Apocryphon of John is the starting hypothesis of the first principle as an infinite, indeterminate, and continuous substance: “the immeasurable light,” “the pure luminous water,” “the perfect virginal spirit.” Transition from indetermination to the determinate is thus explained in ‘continuist’ terms, borrowed from Stoic physics, as a series of alterations within an infinite substance that naturally contracts and expands in

---

48 According to Hippolytus, Ref. 6.37.5–6, a similar interpretation of the riddle of the three ‘kings’ in the Second Platonic Letter was offered by Valentinus; the latter identified Plato’s ‘King of All’ with “the Father, viz., the Abyss and Silence, of all aeons,” the ‘Second’ with the intellect reigning over “the totality of aeons inside the boundary [of the spiritual realm],” i.e., the realm of intelligible forms, and the ‘Third’ with the ruler of “the whole structure outside of the Pleroma,” i.e., the visible world. Cf. Iren. Adv. haer. 1.11.1: “He [Valentinus] conceived two boundaries: one, between the Abyss and the Pleroma, separates the generated aeons from the ungenerated Father, and the other separates the Pleroma from their Mother [Achamoth].” For these two boundaries, Valentinus and his followers found a scriptural support in the obscure reference to the two curtains (καταπετάσματα) dividing the earthly and heavenly sanctuaries in Heb 9:3, an allusion to Exod 25:9.40 and 26:30, where God revealed to Moses the heavenly model of the earthly tabernacle. In fact, Heb 9:3 mentions only “the second curtain” (τὸ δεύτερον καταπέτασμα) separating the first tent, called the “Holy Place” (’Αγαθωστήρα), the inner called the curtain (καταπέτασμα) and the outer the covering (κάλυμμα), he [Moses] set the remaining three of the aforementioned equipments. For the Valentinian usage of the temple-analogy, see, e.g., Clem. Al. Exc. Theod. 38.1–2 and Gos. Phil. 68 and 105 (NHC II 69:14–70:4, 84:14–85:20), and an excellent discussion in Orbe (1976) 2:353–93.
volume, and whose infinitely divisible parts, later in the process, blend with and pervade the opposite, passive element.

(iii) God is initially a pure and immeasurable light capable of limitless extension and infinite division—the pure gaze whose rays of vision, in accordance with ancient optical theory, are assimilated with rays of light. God irradiates light without suffering diminution, yet these rays of light, as they spread outwards, lack the subtlety and intensity (“purity”) of the original source. God’s first emanation, whose name is Barbelo, is the “likeness of the light” (BG 27:12) and the offspring of her subsequent union with God, viz., Christ the Self-Originate, is a “luminous spark” (σπονθήρ III 9:13–14; cf. BG 30:1–2, II 6:13). This portion of light is then further divided among the “four great luminaries” (φωστήρες), each presiding over three aeons. As the process reaches Sophia, the lowest aeon in the spiritual realm, the light-substance has lost so much of its brightness that Sophia “grows dark.” The remaining light then blends with darkness, gets condensed, and turns into fire—the realm of the ignorant demiurge called Ialdabaoth. The differentiation of various levels of reality in

49 The idea that the source of vision lies in the eyes of the beholder and the rays of light emanating from there is, of course, Platonic; cf. Timaeus 45b–46c and Cornford (1937) 151–56. For appropriation of this optical theory by later Platonists, from Posidonius to Plotinus, cf. Witt (1930) 198–207, and Alliez-Fehler (1989) 58: “The One and its series of hypostases [in Plotinus’s metaphysics] can thus be seen both as a contemplating eye and as a source of radiant light.” For ancient theories of optics see, above all, Simon (1988).

50 See Tardieu (1975) 225–55.

51 Cf. II 11:10–15, for the application of the Stoic theory of total blending to the creation of Ialdabaoth fiery realm. The outcome of the blending of light and darkness depends on which of the two gains control, or becomes active in the process: if light, then darkness is shining; if darkness, then light is dimmed. The ‘Sethian’ Gnostics conceived the insertion of the divine spark of light into darkness in terms of total blending, too; and they even advised their followers to read “the account of blending and mixture” (το ξειρ ράσατες και μιξεος λόγοι)—the subject in which “many a writer had taken an interest, and especially Andronicus the Peripatetic” (Hipp. Ref. 5.21.1). The Stoic doctrine of total blending (κράσις) did not only served as an explanatory model for various ‘Gnostic’ accounts of cosmogony—it also provided a ‘scientific’ background for the doctrines of the final diakrisis, viz., the separation of the divine element from Ialdabaoth’s realm of darkness. As the ‘Sethians’ explained, “Blending . . . implies separation . . . For each of the blended elements is eventually separated and apportioned to its proper region” (5.21.5–6). See a thorough discussion of the problem in Orbe (1958) 1:219–31. For the Stoic theory of blending, cf. Todd (1976).
the *Apocryphon of John* is, in short, an articulation of the movement from light to dark in measurable ‘shades’—the process of elemental change described in the Stoic categories of condensation and compression:

[The Stoics] say that the luminous and tenuous part of the ether by reason of its subtility became sky and the part which was condensed or compressed became stars, and that of these the most sluggish and turbid is the moon. (Plut. *De facie* 15, 928C–D Cherniss.)

(iv) God is the pure virginal spirit, or *pneuma*, in its most refined state. As it begins to expand, or move outwards, this dynamic continuum undergoes a series of modifications in the degree of tension (τόνως) and density, and becomes, in the order of increased slackness, Intellect (Christ the Self-Originate and the spiritual realm), Soul (Sophia and her ‘ninth sphere’), and Physique endowed with imagination and irrational impulse (Ialdabaoth and the visible world over which he rules). The hierarchical world-model of the *Apocryphon of John* is, in short, an articulation of the movement, from tensility (ἐπτόνως) to slackness (ἀπτόνως), of the divine ‘breath’ permeating all levels of reality. As Chrysippus phrased it in his work *On the Passions*, “just as ‘tensions’ in the body are called soft and firm with regard to its sinewy character, so too the ‘tone’ in the soul is called tensility and slackness” (Galen, *PHP* 4.6.5, trans. De Lacy). Whereas the

---

52 For the Stoic theory of elemental change and the continuist conception of infinite divisibility of matter as its necessary presupposition, cf. Hahm (1985) 39–56, Long-Sedley (1987) 297–304, and White (2003) 124–52. For a gradual condensation, or degradation, of the pure and refined ‘divine’ substance in various ‘Gnostic’ cosmologies (e.g., Basilides’ doctrine of a threefold Sonship in Hippol. *Elench.* 7.22.7–8, with “one part composed of light particles, another coarse, and a third in need of purification”), as well as for a brief yet representative survey of philosophical stimuli (e.g., Chrysippus’s distinction of three kinds of fire based on the theory of the opposite processes of rarefaction and condensation or of expansion and contraction), cf. Orbe (1956) 110–16.

53 Cf. supra, pp. 112–13.

54 Philo Alex., *LA* 2.22–23 (SVF 2.458): “The intellect, when as yet unclothed and not bound up with the body... has many powers: the tenor kind, the physical, the psychic, the rational, the intellectual, and countless others, varying both in species and genus. Tenor is common to inanimate stones and blocks of wood, of which the bones in us, which resemble stones, also partake. Physique extends to plants, and in us there things resembling plants, such as nails and hair. Physique is, in fact, tenor in actual motion. Soul, again, is physique which has acquired presentation and impulse. This is shared also by irrational animals.”

55 The incomplete list of ancient sources discussing the ‘tension’ (τόνως) in the soul can be found in Matelli (1999) 64–67 and n. 34. Cf., e.g., Philo Alex., *Ios.*
spiritual realm is characterized by firmness, vigor, and tensility, Sophia, who typifies the level of the rational soul, acts in a way that abandons, or rejects, “correct judgments because the tension of the soul . . . does not persist to the end to carry out fully the commands of reason, . . . revealing a certain weakness and slackness” (4.6.3, 12) and yielding to a violent “to-and-fro” movement of passions (II 13:13–27; BG 44:19–45:19). Ialdabaoth, Sophia’s ugly miscarriage,  

61: “. . . the political crowd is solely occupied in choosing what charms and pleases their ears, by means of which the tensions of the intellectual faculty are slackened and the sinews of the soul, so to speak, unstrung.”  

56 Sophia’s tumultuous movement of passion (shame, weeping, repentance) originates from her failed attempt to attain God by discursive reasoning (ἐνθομνήσθαι). This is, of course, the ‘orthodox’ Stoic position, which claims that the affective and kinetic aspects of passion have their source not in some irrational part of the soul, or in its irrational capacity, but in the rational commanding faculty—hence Chrysippus’s equation of passions with false judgments (cf. Galen PHP 4.14 ff.). Does this mean that Ap. John departs, in this case, from the alternative Platonist position which places passions in the soul’s irrational parts, appetitive and desirative? The description of Sophia in terms of a victimized heroine “moving to and fro . . . in the darkness of ignorance” upon “learning that the garment of darkness [Ialdabaoth] has not come to exist perfectly” (II 13:22–36), reflects the Chrysippan intellectualist account of repentance (μετανοία, cf. Plut. De virt. mor. 7, 447A). On the other hand, “darkness” in Ap. John is synonymous with “matter” (II 21:7–8, BG 55:7–8), so that Sophia’s disorderly movement seems to result from her fall into a flowing matter—a well-known Platonist topos whereby the soul is at rest when contemplating forms and confused and moved in a disorderly fashion when imprisoned in the bodily flux. Following this Platonist model, Sophia would stand for the “desirative part in the soul”—one which “is not purely passionate (παθητικῶς) but frequently has a mental image of what is fair, though one commingled with what is irrational” (Plut. Quaest. Plut. 9.1, 1008C–D), “sometimes joining forces with the appetitive part” that is “willing to consort with body,” and “sometimes lending strength and vigor to reason” (Plut. De virt. mor. 3, 442A). This is exactly the way Plutarch describes the precosmic soul, or “soul in itself” (De an. procr. 6, 1014B ψυχή καθ’ ἑαυτὴν)—a “third principle and capacity intermediate between matter and god” (6, 1015B), having a nature sensitive and akin to both, “its perpectivity laying hold on matter and its discerning faculty on the intelligibles (23, 1024B). In this precosmic phase, prior to the establishment of world order, the soul converts motionless ideas into shifting perceptible images within the primary matter, “keeping all things in disorderly and jangling motion” (7, 1015E) and being simultaneously “moved” by sense perception (24, 1024C). In sum, Sophia’s movement of repentance combines two seemingly incompatible alternatives—it represents a particular state of mind stirred by the rational acknowledgment of evil as well as an irrational affecion resulting from the soul’s union with the flowing and ebbing tide of the bodily substrate. A similar blending of Stoic and Platonist ethical ideas can be found in Posidonius of Apamea who, albeit reverting to Plato’s pluralist psychology and placing passions in the soul’s irrational parts, viz., appetitive and desirative, retained many essential views of the ‘orthodox’ Stoa. For a detailed discussion of Sophia’s repentance and her double meaning (individual and universal, ethical and noetic, psychological and cosmological), see chap. 3, pp. 246–63.
occupies an even lower level—he lacks reason and cannot even depart from right judgment. Born from Sophia’s womb as an aborted fetus and assigned a plant-like status, it is only upon taking a portion of Sophia’s divine breath, her “great power” (II 10:21–22; BG 38:15–16), that he evolves into an ensouled creature—an irrational animal capable of receiving impressions (φαντασία) from the senses and responding to them in an automatic way, as well as of uttering an unlimited variety of non-referential, magic-like, sounds (voces magicae). Ialdabaoth, in sum, possesses all the natural faculties of an animal’s soul—impression, irrational impulse, and locomotion—and

---

57 The analogy from the field of ancient linguistics is not as developed in Ap. John as in some other ‘Gnostic’ systems (e.g., the Marcosian ‘letter mysticism’ in Iren. Adv. haer. 1.13–20, Gos. Eg. IV 54:3–13, 78:10–19, Heracleon frags. 3–5), but the movement from absolute silence of the One, via the “unrestrained and measurable sound” (Trim. Prot. XIII 38:14–15) of the first female principle (indefinite Dyad) and its further articulation into a limited set of specific units that constitute rational discourse (Logos), down to an unlimited variety of vocal sounds (the unlimited plurality of sensible objects), is still discernible in the Savior’s revelatory monologue. The first series of aeons, starting from Barbelo down to Christ the Self-Originate and his Intellect, “came into existence within silence (σιγή) and conception (γνώμη)” (BG 31:10–11; cf. II 7:3–4). Next, the Self-Originate “fabricated the entirety [of aeons] by the Word” (BG 31:17–18, II 7:10–11), that is, by the articulated discourse consisting of a limited set of distinct elements (vowels, consonants, semi-consonants), whose combinations, governed by certain organizing principles, make up the basic units of meaning (syllables, words). The names assigned to the Pleromatic aeons constitute a signifying chain of articulated divine dispositions (truth, perception, memory, intelligence, love, wisdom, etc.). Ialdabaoth’s authorities and powers, in contrast, have pairs of names: “one set given…after the superior glory,” that is, by reference to their paradigmatic counterparts in the Pleroma, and the other assigned by Ialdabaoth from “desire (επιθυμία) and anger (οργή),” and “with reference to appearance (φαντασία) and their powers” (BG 40:19–41:12). The latter set of names, one which stems from Ialdabaoth’s capacity of uttering non-referential sounds (e.g., Athoth, Harmas, Kalila-Oimbri, Abrisene, etc.), is a series of nomina barbara and voces magicae, the Semitic-sounding names borrowed from magical incantations of the period and displaying many characteristics of religious glossolalia: the high frequency of vowels, the utterance of incomprehensible sounds such as mumbling, gurgling or groaning, and the alliterative combination of syllables reminiscent of the abecedaria and writing exercises in the Hellenistic primary schools. For the derivation of ‘Gnostic’ nomina propria from the Hellenistic magic see Jackson (1989) 69–79 and Fauth (1973) 79–120. The etymology of such names as Barbelo or Ialdabaoth is still disputed. For the etymology of Ialdabaoth cf. e.g. Scholem (1974) 405–21 (Aram. yld and the abridged form of Sabaoth, viz., “Begetter of Sabaoth”), Fauth (1973) 91 n. 75 (the combination of “elements” taken from Iao, Elohim, Adonai, and Sabaoth), and Dan (1996) 557–64 (“a combined form of the formula used by the Hekhalot mystics to describe the powers of the divine pleroma,” i.e. the combination of Yah, the L of Elohim, the D of Adonay, and the ending “baoth” of “Zevoath”). For the etymology of Barbelo see, among others, Harvey
stands for the ‘pneuma’ in its lowest degree of tension, one which the *Apocryphon of John* calls the “counterfeit” (ἀντίμιμον) or “adversary spirit” (ἀντικείμενον πνεῦμα). For this reason, the first product of his modeling, viz., the animate body of Adam, had also been born weak and incapable of moving, until Sophia’s power, or *pneuma*, was blown into it, so that “the body moved, became strong, and shone” (II 19:10–33; cf. BG 50:11–52:1). As his “intelligence grew stronger than those who had made him, and stronger than the first ruler” (II 20:3–5, BG 52:8–11), Adam was cast down in matter and clothed in the body, experiencing the condition common to all of his posterity—an uneasy coexistence of two incompatible elements,
viz. the divine *pneuma* and the material body, with soul serving as a necessary link between the two and capable of moving either way. Which of the two courses the soul will take depends on the outcome of the struggle for mastery between the “spirit of life”, characterized by a high degree of tension and vigor, and its weakened counterpart, the “counterfeit spirit,” which “derives from matter” (II 21:7–8) and consorts with the body.

Indeed, the power will descend unto everyone, for without it no one can stand up; and after they are begotten, if the spirit of life increases... it strengthens the soul, and nothing can mislead it into the works of wickedness... In those... who have not known to whom they belong, the despicable spirit has increased within them while they were going astray, and it weighs down the soul and beguiles it into the works of wickedness, and casts it down into forgetfulness. And after it [the soul] has come forth, it is handed over to the authorities, who came to exist through the ruler; and they bind it with bonds and cast it into the prison, and they go around with it until it awakens out of forgetfulness and takes knowledge unto itself. (II 26:13–27:10, BG 67:4–69:13)

(v) In accordance with the Biblical association of water imagery with the presence of God, and starting from Jesus’ obscure references to a “spring” and “rivers” of “living water springing up to eternal life” in the Fourth Gospel (John 4:10, 14; 7:38–39), the God of the *Apocryphon of John* is conceived as “the spring of living water” overflowing endlessly and “supplying (χορηγεῖν) all aeons and worlds” (BG 26:17–27:1; II 4:21–22). The universe is imagined as a series of effluences from God’s overabundance—a multiple-tiered fountain with water spurting copiously from the top and gathering at the base as a disorderly tide of water “above matter” (II 14:27–28). The distinction between the pure water of the Pleromatic realm and the

---

59 Isa 44:3 “I will pour water... I will place my spirit upon your seed”; Joel 3:18 “A fountain shall come from the house of the Lord”; Zech 13:1, 14:8 “On that day, the living waters shall flow out from Jerusalem;” Prov 18:3–4 “The words of the mouth are deep waters; the fountain of wisdom is a gushing stream”; cf. Jer 2:13, Ezek 47:1–12.

60 The representation of reality as a continuous effluence from God’s substance is a literary topos of the period. The list of structurally homologous passages from Hellenistic literature that might have contributed to the development of the water-analogy in *Ap. John*, is available in Winston (1979) 184–87. In this complex network of texts and textual fragments, Philo and his intertextual strategy of juxtaposing Platonist and Stoic images of effluence (e.g., Plato, *Phaedr.* 255c9, *Rep.* 6.509b, Cicero, *ND* 2.79) with those stemming from his own milieu (Prov 18:3–4; Sir 1:9–10, 19;
bottomless chaotic waters underlying the visible world is of Biblical origin, too, and refers to God’s separation of “the waters under the firmament from those above the firmament” in the Book of Genesis (Gen 1:7). Sophia’s agitated movement in “the darkness of ignorance” (BG 45:13–15, II 13:24–25) or dark “matter” (cf. II 21:7–8) results from the contact with the lower waters of chaos, whose ever-flowing quality resembles a turbulent welter of elemental qualities from Plato’s *Timaeus* (52d–53c). In its final transformation, water is, along with earth, fire, and “spirit” (air), one of the four elements constitutive of “matter” (üler), the “source” (πηγή) and “mother” of their respective properties: “hot” for fire, “cold” for spirit or air, “wetness” for water, and “dryness” for earth (II 18:2–5). It is out
of these elements and their generic properties that Ialdabaoth and his companions modeled Adam’s material body, “bringing him into the shadow of death” (BG 54:14–55:7, II 20:35–21:7).

The final two analogies which, along with the aforementioned five, make up the discourse of procession in the Apocryphon of John, represent modified versions of the Stoic model of mental process and of Plato’s craft-analogy, the structuring principle of the Platonist theory of causality.

(vi) By reference to the Stoic theory of cognitive process, the God of the Apocryphon of John is conceived as initially an intellect in potentiality, which does not yet receive information from the senses and has nothing to conceptualize. Only upon perceiving his image in a luminous, mirror-like substrate, he attains the first notion (Ennoia) of the ‘self’. This first notion is vague and requires further specification of its essential characteristics. For this reason, according to the Apocryphon’s longer redaction (II 6:10–18; IV 9:11–23), God next “looks into” Ennoia and begets his “only-begotten son,” Christ the Self-Originate, who assumes the role of an active Intellect (Nous) capable of thinking of itself as a separate object and, by engaging in discursive reasoning (Logos), analyzes the content of its own thought into a set of individual predicates (aeons). The sum total of these individual traits is Sophia, the last aeon of the Pleroma—God’s vague notion of the ‘self’ turned into a closed system of his defining characteristics. The process unfolds differently in the two shorter versions of the Apocryphon (BG 29:18–30:8, III 9:11–19). Here it is Ennoia—Barbelo who “looks into the pure light” of God, then “commits the act of ‘conversion’ (ἐπιστροφή), or “turns herself” to God, and, by giving birth to Christ the Self-Originate, activates the faculty of intellection, or Intellect (Nous), capable of articulating her intuitive notion of God into a signifying chain of distinct dispositions. Sophia, the lowest aeon in the Pleromatic realm, follows Ennoia’s example and attempts to “unite” with her divine consort. This time, however, ‘conversion’ does not take place because Sophia, from her remote position in the divine realm, and endowed only with discursive think-

---

may be the Platonic dichotomy, drawn in the Timaeus (50a–53c), between the ideal forms of Fire, Air, Water, and Earth, and their shifting qualities, or “vestiges,” in the “receptacle of becoming” at the pre-cosmic stage.

64 See supra, pp. 98–106.
ing (ἐνθύμησις)\textsuperscript{63} cannot “look into God” and grasp him in the same intuitive fashion as Ennoia. For this reason, Sophia’s discursive thinking collapses back into itself and ends up in “miscarriage” (Ialdabaath). Incapable of moving upwards and conceiving God’s primordial unity

\textsuperscript{63} III 14:9–19 “Our fellow-sister Sophia, being an aeon, conceived a thought from herself in the ἐνθύμησις (BG 36:18–19 γραλ ἡμίσεις) of the Spirit and Foreknowledge; she wished to bring forth her likeness out of herself. Her ἐνθύμησις was not ineffective and her deed came forth imperfect and without sharing in form with her form, because she had made it apart from her consort” (cf. II 9:25–29). The author of Ap. John was not the first to take this term in a pejorative sense. The verb ἐνθυμεῖσθαι had already been used by Thucydides as meaning both ‘consideration’ and ‘irritation’; cf. Huart (1968) 238–39. For Aristotle, ἐνθυμεῖσθαι and ἐνθύμημα denote a deductive inference whose premises are not certainties, viz., axioms and theorems, but “probabilities and signs” (Rhet. 1.1.1357a31–32, 2.25.1402b13 ff) belonging to the realm of “commonly held opinions” (ἐνδοξα) and reflecting values and attitudes shared by a speaker (ἐθος) and his audience (πάθος). Philo of Alexandria argues against the “careless” literalist interpreters of Gen 6:6–7 (ἐνθυμήμη ο θεός ὃτι ἐποίησεν τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ διενοήθη ... καὶ εἰπέν ο θεός, ἀναλείψω τὸν ἄνθρωπον ... ὃτι εὐθυμόθην ὃτι ἐποίησα αὐτοῦς) who supposed that ἐνθυμήμη means ‘repentance’ (μεταμέλεια), hinting that “the demiurge repented of the creation of men” (Deus 21). The same scriptural passage is cited as an argument against God’s immutability by Celsus (Origen, C. Cels. 6.58 πῶς ὁ ἐπ’ αὐτοῖς ἀχρήστους καὶ πονηροῖς γενομένους μεταμελεῖ καὶ τὴν εὐακοῦν τέχνην μέμειται καὶ μισεῖ καὶ ἀπειλεῖ καὶ φθειρεῖ τὰ άδικὰ εἴρονα) and by Simon in Ps.-Clem. Hom. 3.39.4, where ἐνθυμεῖσθαι is portrayed as a vacillating thought stemming from ignorance and lacking a clearly defined goal: καὶ τὸ γεγραμμένα ὃ ἐνθυμήμη ὁ θεός ὃτι ἐποίησεν τὸν ἄνθρωπον καὶ μετενεκεὶ καὶ ἁγνοεῖ τὸ γὰρ ἐνθυμήμημα σκέψεις ἐστὶν ἣ τις δι’ ἁγνοιαν ἄν δειλίται τὸ τέλος ἀκριβῶς θέλει ἢ ἐπὶ τὸ μὴ κατὰ γνωσμὸν ἀποβαίνει μεταμελημένων. In all these cases, the ambiguity of ἐνθυμήμη is the basic issue (στασις) of the dispute where each party (Philo vs. the ‘literalists’, Peter vs. Simon, Origen vs. Simon) appeals to a different reading of Gen 6:6. In Philo’s view, the terms ἐνθυμήμη and διενοήθη point to the two most constant and unvacillating powers of the divine intellect—“the thought stored up, or stocked, in [God’s] intellect and the thought in its all-traversing course” (Deus 34)—and to God’s “lucid reasoning (ἀκριβώς λογισμοῦ considering the reason why He made man upon the earth” (QG 1.93). The Stoic base of this positive evaluation of ἐνθύμησις is discernible in Philo’s terminology (τὴν μὲν ἐναποκειμένην οὖσα νόσημα, τὴν δὲ νόσησας διεξόδον), but the conclusive proof for the Stoic influence comes from Irenaeus’s polemics against the Valentinians. There, in Adv. haer. 2.13.1–2, we find ἐνθύμησις included in the sequence of mental process and defined, in an obvious allusion to the ‘growing argument’ of the Stoics, as one of the expanding movements of the mind from the initial, intuitive conception (ennoia) of some object to its final articulation in the “utterable word” (verbum emissibile). In this process of expansion and growth, during which the mind remains unaltered and retains its identity, ἐνθύμησις figures as the “amplification” of the initial conception (ennoia)—a comprehensive consideration of an object “which apprehends the entire soul” and “spends much time on the same until it gets, so to speak, completely approved”: prima enim motio eius [scil. mentis aut sensus] de aliquo ennoia appellatur; perseverans autem et aucta et universam comprehendens animam enthymesis vocatur; haec autem enthymesis, multum temporis faciens in eodem et velut probata sensatio
beyond being, she inclines downwards and conceives dark matter—
the unfathomable kernel of God’s being which she could not artic-ulate66 and in which she will later act as Epinoia, or practical wisdom.67

66 Phrased in ontological terms, Sophia’s attempt at conceiving the One beyond being, or the transcendent Non-Being, ends up in a ‘miscarriage’, that is, in conceiving “that which is really not-being” (cf. Plato, Soph. 237b–239c). Sophia, who occupies the intermediate soul-level on the ontological ladder consisting of five tiers (the One or the transcendent non-being, that which really has being or the intelligible realm, that which is not really being or Soul, that which is not really not-being or the sensible world, and that which is really not-being or matter), symbolizes the risk that every individual soul is destined to incur—the risk of mistaking utter nothingness (matter) for the absolute One which transcends the distinction between being and non-being. Plotinus, Enn. VI 9.11 offers a more optimistic scenario: “It is not in the soul’s nature to come into the absolute non-being; when moving downwards, it does come into evil and, so far, into non-being, but to utter non-being, never. When the soul moves the opposite direction, it comes not to something alien but to its very self, and thus, not being in something else, it cannot be in nothing but itself; self-gathered, it is no longer in the order of Being, it is ‘in Him’. For this reason, whoever approaches Him becomes not Being but ‘beyond Being’ (Plat. Rep. 6.509b9). For the modalities of being and non-being in Neoplatonist ontology and its indebtedness to Plato’s treatment of the subject in the Sophist and Parmenides, see Kohnke (1957) 32–40 and Hadot (1968) 1:176–78.

67 Epinoia, or Afterthought, who represents Sophia’s saving power and her miraculous appearances history—the same rescuing role that Dame Wisdom plays in Sapiential literature (cf. Wis 10:1 ff.)—is defined by Plotinus as the act of discursive planning and practical thinking concerned with the making of things; cf. Plotinus, Enn. V 8.7: “Consider the universe; we are agreed that its existence and its nature come to it from elsewhere; are we now to think that its maker first thought it out in detail (ἐπινοια) . . . and that having thus arranged every item, he then set about the execution? No, such designing (ἐπίνοια) was not possible; for how could the plan like this come to one that had never seen anything? Nor could he work on material gathered from elsewhere as our craftsmen do, using hands and tools; for feet and hands are of the later order” (transl. MacKenna, slightly modified). According to Eon (1970), 252–89, esp. 268–70, the term is used in different meanings which, in most cases, refer to the same domain as Spinoza’s products of reason, viz., apparitions and fictitious beings. “C’est, peut-on dire, la pensée en tant qu’elle est seulement
(vii) Taking as its structuring principle the Platonic analogy between “the products of nature” and “the works of divine craft” (Soph. 265e), the universe of the *Apocryphon of John* is conceived as a complex artifact founded on a vertical interpretive schema linking sensible phenomena to a transcendent regulating principle. In Plato’s *Timaeus*, this regulating principle is portrayed as the divine craftsman, or demiurge, who informs phenomenal reality with a specific finality (beauty and goodness) after a preordered and ontologically independent pattern (ideas). While adopting this schema of representation, the *Apocryphon* introduces in Plato’s craft-analogy a series of adjustments and refinements that seriously alter its original make-up. The first refinement deals with the psychological attitude of the craftsman in action: whereas Plato’s craftsman operates from conscious purposes (cf. Soph. 265c μετὰ λόγου καὶ ἐπιστήμης) and is determined to produce a world bearing as close a resemblance as possible to the model, the demiurge of the *Apocryphon of John* (Ialdaboth) cannot deliberate and does not have thoughts about whatever he does. Craft is essentially practical, and calls for someone else to provide the plan for the craftsman’s activity—hence the distinction drawn by the Savior between a craftsman who fabricates (Ialdabaoth) and a discursive planner who designs (Sophia). The second objection to Plato’s craft-analogy challenges the metaphysical objectivity of the model accessible to the craftsman: whereas Plato’s craftsman has direct access to the intelligible model (*Tim.* 28a and 29a δῆλον ὡς πρὸς τὸ ἀίδιον ἐβλεψε), Ialdabaoth “did not see the incorruptible ones, but it was the power in him, one which he had taken from his Mother, that produced in him the image of the ordered world” (II 13:1–5). What Ialdabaoth imitates is not the objective pattern outside of himself but a distant semblance of forms construed by the “image-making power” of imagination (φαντασία) in his irrational soul. This conjunction of imagination, the power of producing illusory semblances of intelligible forms (φαντάσματα), with the soul’s irrational impulses can be traced all the way back to Plato and his analysis of the soul’s appetitive part (ἐπιθυμητικόν) and its divinatory power in the *Timaeus* (70d–72b):

une pensée. En tant que telle, elle a deux opposés: ὑπόστασις, l’existence (VI 2.13)... et έννοια, la pensée qui se rapporte à un objet reel (VI 8.7)...”
That part of the soul that is appetitive (τὸ ἔπιθυμητικὸν τῆς ψυχῆς) of food and drink [...] they tethered like a beast untamed (ὡς θρήμα ἄγριον) but necessary to be maintained along with the rest if a mortal race were ever to exist... And... since it would not understand the discourse of reason (λόγος)... whereas it would most readily fall under the spell of images and apparitions (ὅπο δὲ εἰδώλων καὶ φαντασμάτων... μάλιστα ψυχικαγηθείτο)... for this reason the god, forming designs upon it (or: plotting against it, θεὸς ἐπιβουλεύοντας αὐτῷ) composed the form of liver... so that the power proceeding from the intellect, making impressions of its thoughts upon it, which would receive them like a mirror and give back visible appearances, might strike fear in it (ἳνα ἐν αὐτῷ τῶν διανοημάτων ἢ ἐκ τοῦ νοῦ φερομένη δύναμις οἷον ἐν κατόπτρῳ ἐκχωροῦσα καὶ κατιδεύουσα εἰδωλικὰ παρέχοντε, φοβοῦντα γὰρ αὐτὸ)... but when some inspiration of gentleness coming from the reason delineates semblances of the contrary sort (καὶ ὅταν ἀναντία φαντασΜατα ἀποκωσματει ἀρνητικοὶ τῆς ἐκ διανοίας ἐπίπνοια)... it makes that part of the soul dwelling around the liver serene and tame (ὁλεθρὸν τε καὶ εὐμέρεν), by night passing its time in the sober exercise of divination by dreams (μαντεῖον χρωμένη καθ' ὑπνοι), since it had no part in rational discourse or understanding (ἐπείδη λόγου καὶ φρονήσεως οὐ μετείχε). The third refinement starts from Plato’s own theorem that the visible world is the analogon of the invisible model (Tim. 29a–d) and concludes therefrom that the relations between the principles and causes in this universe must have their exact counterparts in the intelligible world of forms. This means that the Pleromatic realm of aeons must have its own ‘designer’ (the remote Absolute and its providential plan, i.e., Pronoia-Ennoia-Barbelo) and its own ‘demiurge’ (Christ the Self-Originate). In contrast to Plato’s world of ideas, the Pleroma of the Apocryphon of John is no longer endowed with an independent existence, but is relegated to God’s subjectivity. Plato’s ideas thus become a set of inner dispositions that the solitary God, or his thinking capacity, 68 gradually brings into existence, by using the demiurgic capacity of his Son, the divine Self-Originate. In a similar fashion, the Son fabricates his twelve aeons by making use of his

---

68 Notice what seems to be a disagreement among the redactors of Ap. John as to whom the act of “making” (εἰρή) should be assigned; cf. BG 31:10–13 and III 10:14–17 “And all these came to be within silence and thinking (ἐννοια). The invisible spirit wished to make (εἰρή) something” (III 10:17 supplies “...by the Word”) vs. II 7:3–6 and IV 10:19–22 “And all these came to be within silence. And thinking (ἡσεγε) wished to fabricate (ταγιο) something by the Word.”
“coactors,” viz. Intellect and Logos (BG 31:11–18)—just as, at the next stage, Sophia, who plays the role of a discursive planner, will act in her son Ialdabaoth and provide him with the impulse to create, and just as, later on, Ialdabaoth will make use of his coactors (powers and authorities) to model the first human being (Adam) and clothe him with the material body.69

The following table provides a synoptic survey of the above described analogies, or ‘codes’, which constitute the discourse of procession in the various redactions of the *Apocryphon of John*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dramatis Personae</th>
<th>Reproduction</th>
<th>Kingship</th>
<th>Light/ Darkness</th>
<th>Pneumatology</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Epistemology</th>
<th>Causation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First God</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Monarch</td>
<td>Pure Light</td>
<td>Pneuma</td>
<td>Living Water</td>
<td>Self-Searching</td>
<td>‘Maker’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbelo</td>
<td>‘Womb’</td>
<td>Image of Light</td>
<td>Ennoia</td>
<td>Designer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christ</td>
<td>Son</td>
<td>Viceroy</td>
<td>Spark of Light</td>
<td>Intellect</td>
<td>Nous/ Logos</td>
<td>Demiurge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophia</td>
<td>Mother alone</td>
<td>Light Diminished</td>
<td>Soul</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ialdabaoth</td>
<td>Miscarriage</td>
<td>Ruler</td>
<td>Fiery Realm/ Darkness</td>
<td>Physique/ Counterfeit Pneuma</td>
<td>Waters of Chaos</td>
<td>Anoia</td>
<td>Blinder</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table should first be read vertically, column by column, so as to identify different stages in the downward movement of procession. The blank slots in the table indicate that some analogies are not fully developed in the extant redactions of the *Apocryphon of John*. The longer redaction, however, shows a consistent tendency to supply some missing terms and even to engage in the refinement of certain analogies—most notably, the analogy of light and the sequence of mental process. The interplay of light and darkness is especially developed in the section dedicated to Ialdabaoth’s demiurgic activity,

---

69 For a more detailed discussion of the Savior’s revision of Plato’s craft-analogy see chap. 1, pp. 51–62.
where the nature of the visible world is explained in terms of the total blending of darkness and light, and in the episode dealing with the modeling of the first human being.\textsuperscript{70}

\textbf{BG}  

(41:12–15)  
And he ordered that seven kings  
reign over the heavens  
and five over the chaos of the underworld.

\textbf{NHC II}  

(11:4–15)  
And he established seven kings,  
one per firmament of heaven,  
to reign over the seven heavens  
and five over the depth of the abyss.  
And he shared some of his fire with them,  
but he did not bring forth any of the power of the light that he had gotten from his mother;  
for he is dark and without knowledge.  
Indeed, when light mixed with darkness  
it made the darkness shine;  
but when darkness mixed with light  
it darkened the light,  
so it became neither luminous nor dark,  
but rather became dim.  
Now, this dim ruler has three names . . .

(44:19–45:5)  
Then the mother began to “move upon”  
when she recognized her lack;  
for her consort had not come in harmony with her  
as she was rebuked by her perfection.

(48:4–16)  
The blessed one revealed his image to them.  
And the entire ruling power  
of the seven authorities inclined downwards,

\textsuperscript{70} A strikingly similar refinement of the light-darkness analogy occurs in the longer redaction of the Greek text of Sirach. Schlatter (1897) was the first to locate this editorial work in the context of Alexandrian Judaism (Aristoboulos). For an excellent analysis of the relevant passages in the expanded Greek version (G II) of Sirach (1:10c–d; 3:19, 25; 11:15–16; 16:15–16; 17:18, 26b; 25:10–11 see Prato (1990) 317–46, 423.
they saw in the water the form of the image. They said to each other, “Let us fabricate a human being in the image of God and the likeness.” And they fabricated out of one another’s power and the likeness.

(51:17–52:2) And he blew at him from his spirit, which is the power from his mother, into the body.

And then it moved [ - - - ] and immediately the rest of the authorities became envious . . .

The analogy borrowed from Stoic epistemology is further refined, too. The longer version states that the first principle, when seeing his image, “exercised his will” (II 4:24–5), hinting at teleological implications of God’s act of self-definition. This may also explain the prominence assigned to Pronoia, identified with Ennoia-Barbelo, the second principle, in the cosmological and soteriological parts of the longer version.71

Let us now read the table synoptically, or synchronically, row by row. Each stage in the downward movement of procession, along with its characters and the actions they perform, is represented in a variety of ‘codes’. Barbelo, for example, is the feminine principle providing matter for, and giving birth to, a perfect male offspring, the First-Begotten Son of the Pleroma (Self-Originate, Christ). She is also the “likeness” or “image” (μορφή) of God’s immeasurable light responsible for the emanation of the divine Self-Originate, “a luminous spark.” And finally, she is also Ennoia, the first vague conception of God’s ‘self’ which will, upon giving birth to Intellect (the Self-Originate), articulate her intuitive understanding of God into a coherent symbolic presentation and externalize the ‘inexpressible’ into a signifying chain of individual predicates.

71 See chap. 1, pp. 2–4, 13.
There is, however, one important feature that could not be conveyed in the table. None of the above described analogies is fully developed in either redaction of the Apocryphon of John. Rather, individual elements of one analogy are fused with the elements of another, creating almost impenetrable metaphors and resulting in an enigmatic obscurity of the discourse of procession. An illustrative example is the language in which the longer redaction articulates Sophia’s fault and her subsequent repentance (II 9:25–31; 13:13–17, 23–26):

And the Wisdom (σοφία) of practical thinking (ἐπίστολα), being an aeon, thought a thought from herself and from a discursive reasoning (ἐξερεύνησα) about the invisible Spirit (ἄσωτον πνεῦμα) and foreknowledge (πρόγνωσις).

She wanted to show forth an image out of herself without the spirit’s will—for he had not approved (εὐδοκεῖν)—and without her consort and without his consent. . . .

Then the mother began to move.

She recognized her lack as the radiation of her light was diminishing.

And she grew darker, for her consort had not come in harmony (συμφωνεῖν) with her. . . .

She repented (μετανοεῖν). And forgetfulness came to her in the darkness of ignorance.

And she began to be ashamed with a movement.

Rather than presented in strictly univocal and transparent terms, the decisive moment in the development of the Apocryphon’s account of creation is narrated by patching together a series of condensed and seemingly unrelated analogies: the sequence of cognitive process (foreknowledge, wisdom, discursive reasoning, practical thinking, wishing, approval for action, ignorance, repentance, shame), light vs. darkness (radiation of light, growing dark, darkness), physical causation (disorderly movement in matter), pneumatology (the invisible spirit vs. Sophia as the divine spirit “moving upon the waters”), and biological reproduction (Sophia’s desire to “bring forth” without a consort).

What may have been the reasons for such a deliberate cultivation of obscurities, for conjoining seemingly unrelated codes, and for condensing analogies? The most obvious explanation is that the discourse of the Apocryphon of John is informed by exigencies and presuppositions typical for the revelatory literature of the period. It was a widely shared belief in all ancient Mediterranean cultures that divine wisdom is intrinsically obscure—partly because of its subject matter, and partly because it must remain hidden from vulgar cobblers. Gods, prophets, and wise men, from Apollo and Heraclitus to Plato and Jewish Wisdom, prefer to riddle. And the principle of the
riddle, as Aristotle states in his *Poetics*, is to create impossible combinations of words, or ‘codes’—to “conjoin impossible elements while speaking of what is taking place” (22.1458a26–27: οὐνόματος τε γὰρ ηδέ αὕτῃ ἐστὶ, τὸ λέγοντα ὑπάρχοντα ἀδύνατα συνάψαι).

Conceptual blending, however, is not only the way in which gods speak—it is also the way in which human beings represent the content of their experience, discover connections between heterogeneous inputs and seemingly non-contiguous positions, and create new structures of meaning. The *Apocryphon of John* is one such attempt at projecting unrelated inputs—that is, symbolic systems borrowed from religious and philosophical traditions—to a single plane and present them, in this act of blending, as coordinate cases of the same universal. This universal should not be confused with the universalistic claim, so typical for the Antonine period, that various cultural traditions are compatible disclosures of the same divine wisdom. The basic presupposition sustaining and legitimizing the accumulation and fusion of various codes in the *Apocryphon John* is that there is an irreducible dissonance between the Absolute qua subject and its signifier; that the Absolute can never be adequately expressed by linguistic means; and that language can only fill God’s inexpressible void with disconnected concepts and equivocal images lacking any necessary continuity with its transcendent subject. In this admission of the inadequacy inherent in any symbolic representation lies the subversive core of the Gnostic ‘poetics’. What unites all analogies exploited in the *Apocryphon of John*—Plato’s craft-analogy, the Stoic doctrine of *pneuma*, the symbolism of light and darkness, etc.—is their incapacity to fill the minimal gap that forever separates the infinite Absolute (*theos*) from any account of its essence and its qualities (*theology*).

Ogni testo che pretenda di asserire qualcosa di univoco è un universo abortito, ovvero il risultato del fallimento di un cattivo Demiurgo il quale, ogni volta che tenta di dire “questo è così,” scatena una ininterrotta catena di infiniti rinvii, nel corso della quale “questo” non è mai la stessa cosa. (Eco 1990, 53)72

---

72 “Every text that pretends to assert something univocal is an aborted universe, or rather, the result of the failure on the part of an evil demiurge who, whenever attempting to say ‘This is so’, unravels an uninterrupted chain of infinite deferrals, where ‘this’ never remains the same thing.” This never-ending filling of the inexpressible void with non-contiguous analogies is a commonplace of Mannerist poetics—a literary procedure called ‘marquetry’ or ‘inlay work’ (*intarsiare*). As Galileo phrased it in his critique of Tasso’s poetry (Galileo 1970, 494), “questo andare empiendo...le stanzé di concetti che non hanno una necessaria continuazione con le cose dette e da dirsi, l’addomanderemo *intarsiare*.”
CHAPTER THREE

THE REALM OF BECOMING

Sophia “Our Sister” (Prov 7:4)

Sophia the Lowest Aeon

The universe that emerges from the Savior’s revelatory narrative in the *Apocryphon of John* is a complex multi-layered structure based on two seemingly incompatible schemas of representation: formism and organicism. Formism, a distinctive feature of Platonist speculations of the period, links the visible world to a preordered pattern (ideas) conceived in the mind of God. Organicism, in contrast, is of Stoic provenience, and sees the universe as a dynamic continuum endowed with an immanent principle of internal coherence (*pneuma*) in its qualitatively different manifestations (mind–soul–physique–tenor). Two features common to both of these ‘input models’ seem to have contributed to their partial matching and conceptual integration in the *Apocryphon of John*: the hierarchical arrangement of various levels of reality (intelligible sphere–animate realm–sensible world); and a gradual derivation of these levels from a single principle (the Platonist ‘One’, the divine *pneuma* of the Stoics), leading to an increasing disorder in the system and, eventually, to entropy and stagnation:

First Principle (Transcendent Unity, Invisible Spirit)
Intelligible Sphere (Pleroma)
Animate (‘Liminal’) Realm
Visible World
Matter (‘Chaos’)

The mechanics of deriving such a complex reality from the transcendent Absolute does not follow the mode of logical deduction. The supreme principle of the *Apocryphon of John* is not identical with the Middle Platonist Intellect that constantly externalizes its eternal thought-content in a two-way movement of analysis and collection. Rather, it is what Plato’s *Parmenides*, Speusippus, and some Neo-Pythagoreans defined as the unfathomable One beyond Being—the abyss of pure freedom that rejects all determination and which, for
reasons that cannot be accounted for by dialectical method but only described *post factum* in a mythical narrative, actualizes itself in the guise of a will for self-determination and self-acquaintance. The Savior’s revelatory account in the *Apocryphon of John* is precisely this kind of mythical narrative, the remembrance of the past of the Absolute, a piece of metaphysical fiction that reenacts the stages of God’s history in a folktale sequence—his primordial unity (‘initial situation’), his gradual self-differentiation into a series of defining characteristics (‘preparation for misfortune’), his alienation from the state of absolute determination (‘violation’), his tragic realization (‘repentance’) of the abortive desire (‘villainy’) to comprehend his incomprehensible nature, his attempt to restore the original identity (‘quest’), and his final self-affirmation or return to self (‘restoration of the initial situation’). In this autobiographical narrative, God must play the roles that an ordinary folktale distributes among various characters: he is both the hero and the villain in the story, both the helper and the opponent, both the victim and the rescuer.

The passage from the ‘initial situation’ to ‘violation’ is effected by building what Vladimir Propp (1968, 27) described as “a contrasting background for the misfortune to follow”—the realm of prosperity and “fullness,” the Pleroma, organized in a tripartite genealogical scheme: (1) a single supreme principle in its “immeasurable majesty” (BG 25:12–13) and “purity” (IV 5:16); (2) its inner dispositions, or aeons, “brought into existence in Silence” (BG 31:10–11; II 7:3–4); (3) “the entirety” of the twelve additional aeons which “Christ, the divine Self-Originate, fabricated by the Word” (BG 31:17–18; II 7:10–11).

### Transcendent First Principle

Barbelo–Ennoia–Pronoia
The Decad of Secret Aeons

---

Christ and His Coactors: Intellect and Logos
Twelve Manifested Aeons
(Sophia the Last Aeon)

The leading analogy in the Savior’s portrayal of the Pleroma is taken from late Hellenistic political philosophy—more specifically, from the Neopythagorean treatises on kingship that extolled monarchy as the ideal form of government. The monarchic constitution is projected onto the heaven, where God, an absolute ruler, organizes a court
of attendants (παρεστάναι), or ‘aeons’, each appointed to their appropriate rank upon the request (αἰτεῖν) by a superior courtier and the king’s “nodding” approval (κατανεῖεν). The principal duty of these attendants is worship and veneration of the ruler—a heavenly liturgy in which “all bow willingly to one soul, that of the best and most revered of kings” (Max. Tyr. Orat. 11.12 Trapp) and, in the manner reminiscent of the angelic songs of praise from early Jewish mystical literature (e.g., Mart. Ascen. Isa. 7:12–10:6, Jub. 38:6–7, 2 Enoch 20–22), “glorify the invisible spirit and Barbelo” as the sources and guarantors of their prosperity (BG 32:2–3, II 7:14). In order to secure the continuity of his rule and the absolute loyalty of his subjects, the divine monarch imposes at the next stage the law of hereditary succession—that is, he confers some of his authority on the only-begotten son, Christ the Self-Originate, who, with the help of coactors (Intellect and Logos), sets out to create his own court hierarchy consisting of four ‘luminaries’ and twelve ‘aeons’. The appointment of Sophia to the lowest post in the Pleromatic kingdom marks the end of the process and the fulfillment of all theoretical underpinnings of monarchical constitution: the rational basis of the king’s rule, hereditary succession, voluntary submission of all subjects, and reciprocity of benefaction.

And yet, “the specter of the misfortune to follow already hovers invisibly above the happy family” (Propp 1968, 27). The order in God’s kingdom is the result of a temporary balance between two opposite egotistic drives: the monarch’s desire for self-preservation and the competitive centrifugal tendency of his subjects, which can, at any moment, explode into one of two extremes—tyranny or anarchy. In the narrative of the Apocryphon of John, the blame for subversion of this fragile power structure is laid on the least likely candidate—Sophia, the Wisdom of God. This surprising move signals a radical departure from Judaism, where Dame Wisdom figures as an eternal emanation of God’s beneficent power, and from contemporaneous philosophy, for which ‘wisdom’ (σοφία) is synonymous with divine order, rationality, and systematic consistency. By placing responsibility for ‘violation’ on God’s Wisdom, the highest expression of cosmic order, the Apocryphon of John introduces a crack into all rationalist systems of the period—it discloses the impossibility of an adequate rational representation of God’s inexpressible nature. This impossibility, this irreducible gap between the subject and its signifier, corresponds to Sophia’s ‘fault’ in the Savior’s revelatory
account and marks the moment of ‘complication’ in the development of the plot. The dominant ‘code’ in this episode is no longer the analogy of god and king. Political jargon now gives way to imagery borrowed from the spheres of human psychology and biological reproduction.

*Sophia’s Miscarriage*

Sophia is the last of the twelve aeons, all feminine nouns denoting the twelve abstract dispositions of the Self-Originate Christ, God’s only-begotten son and the viceroy in the Pleromatic kingdom. The twelve aeons make up four triadic groups, each governed by one of the four luminaries (φωστηρεῖς), whose names—Harmozèl, Ōroaël, Daueithai, and Élêlêth—sound like *nomina barbara* from magical formulas or like syllabic exercises from Hellenistic elementary schools (ὑπογραμμοὶ παιδικοὶ). Sophia ranks as third in the fourth luminary Élêlêth, standing below Perfection and Peace. The fourth luminary is the dwelling place of the ‘archetypal’ souls of those “who were not acquainted with the Pleroma, and did not repent at once, but rather persisted for a while, and afterwards repented” (BG 36:7–11; III 14:1–6; II 9:18–22). The destiny of these souls, which is in fact the destiny of the majority of humankind, is comparable to the situation in which we find Sophia after her fall. This is why the shorter redactions of the *Apocryphon* address her in the same way as Proverbs, “our sibling” (7:4).

Sophia’s action—her “bringing forth” of an offspring—is not without precedent in the narrative of the *Apocryphon of John*. The model for her mimetic activity is the successful mating of the Father of Entirety with his first emanation, Ennoia–Barbelo, resulting in the birth of a perfect male offspring, Christ the Self-Originate, and in the successful completion of the supreme divine trinity (Father–Mother–

---

1 A papyrus from the third century B.C. reveals the method; after the alphabet, students would learn two-letter combinations of consonant and vowel, then three-letter syllables with an extra consonant, then words of more than one syllable (cf. Guérard–Jougouet 1938), and finally the strings of hardly pronounceable syllabic sequences (ὑπογραμμοὶ, cf. Ziebart 1913, 57, no. 6). For the resemblances between elementary reading and writing exercises and *voces magicae* see Crippa (1999) 95–110; for the employment of linguistic analogies in presenting the passage from the absolute One (silence) to the multitude of sensible objects (vocal sounds) in various ‘Gnostic’ systems, see chap. 2, n. 57, pp. 125–26.
Son). Sophia, a feminine entity, desires to imitate Barbelo’s paradigmatic action accomplished in sinu Dei. But neither was she, a feminine character, able to “look into the pure light” and “turn herself to God” (BG 29:18–30:8, III 9:11–19) in the manner of Barbelo, her androgynous predecessor, nor was her discursive reasoning (ἐνθυμησίας) the proper match for Barbelo’s intuitive thinking (έννοια); nor did the divine Father give Sophia his consent as he had previously granted to Barbelo by, as the longer version of the Apocryphon has it, “gazing into her with the pure light” (Π 6:10–11).

However, Sophia’s bold project of “bringing forth an image out of herself,” did not remain unrealized. She “was filled” (III 15:2 ἐηκ ἐβολ) and “brought forth” (Π 9:35 ἐηκ ἐβολ, BG 37:10 τοικ ἐβολ),2 thanks to the element or faculty in her about whose exact nature the three versions seem to disagree. One manuscript witness describes this element as Sophia’s “invincible power” (II 10:1 τοικ ... Ν-να-ρο-ς), the other as her impetuous, vulgar, or licentious nature (BG 37:1 προφυλικων, προφυλικων),3 and the third...
as the “guarding” element (III 15:3 πεφρούρικον, φρουρικόν) within Sophia. Next, her product (ἀνα) came out as “imperfect,” “different from his mother’s form” (Π 10:3–7), and “not resembling the image of his mother” (BG 37:16–18)—a “dark miscarriage” (BG 46:10), “the garment of darkness” (Π 13:33).

The deformity of Sophia’s offspring results from the absence of the male factor (semen) that would set up its form-producing move-

(προφέρω) with the intention of organizing the inferior elements or a shapeless matter (abortion), and this organization is carried out through rejection, expulsion, through separation as well as through dissension (ναίκος), because of Sophia’s impetuosity, of her zeal or even of her excessive secundation” (art. cit., 59). The term occurs also in III 23:19–21, “the mother wanted to cast (τύχε) the power which she [had given] to the ruler impetuously (στ-ουφρουρικός “in dissension” or “insubordination” according to Pasquier), and, once again, in the parallel section of BG (51:3–4), where it denotes Ialdabaoth’s appurtenance to Sophia: παρχων ἕτε-πεφρούρικος, “the ruler belonging to, or born from, the impetuous one.” In her translation, Pasquier disregards ἕτε-, the mark of appurtenance, and translates this phrase as “the Archon of insubordination or of dissention” or “who cannot be tamed,” adding that “one would rather expect here the word προυνικαί” (art. cit. 60, n. 49). The noun πεφρούρικος can hardly stand for an abstract noun, and it is even less likely that it refers to Ialdabaoth (“who cannot be tamed”). A more plausible explanation may be that the Coptic translator mistakenly took the ending -ος as the mark of masculine gender: Greek προφήρειν, -on is, of course, an adjective of two terminations, using the masculine for the feminine. Wisse–Waldstein (1995) 112 insist on the sexual connotation of the term (“sexual desire”). Earlier interpretations of the term, from Beausobre (1739) to Nilsson (1947), emphasize, in my view quite correctly, the ‘liminal’ dimension in the ‘Gnostic’ usage of the term (‘porter’ or ‘messenger’) and its relation to προφέρειν, ‘carry forward, set forth, express’. Sophia is the world-soul, the intermediary between the intelligible and visible realm, ‘expressing’ the content of the former in the corporeal substrate.

4 For Pasquier (1988) 57, n. 37, “φρουρικον, which means ‘of a watch’, is perhaps a mistake. The word is interesting, however: a watchman stands on the frontier and looks outside (maybe an allusion to the watchers in 1 Enoch?).” For Wisse-Waldstein (1995) 60, “a scribe may have had Latin prurigo, ‘itch’, in mind”—an unlikely suggestion turning a Coptic scribe into a polyglot capable of creating subtle phonetic associations in the process of copying. Rather than a simple “mistake” or a semi-conscious change, φρουρικόν may be a conscious variant, an attempt at ‘Platonizing’ Sophia’s nature. The word φρουρά, ‘prison’ or ‘guard-duty’, is a common Platonist metaphor for the body as a kind of prison of the soul (Plato, Phaed. 62b3–5 ὡς ἐν τοι φρουρά ἔσμεν οἱ ἄνθρωποι). As reported by Athenagoras, Leg. 6 (fr. 15 D–K), Philolaos the Pythagorean claimed that “the universe is encased by god as though in a custody (or in a prison-house),” ἀσπερ ἐν φρουρά πάντα ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ περιελήφθαι λέγον. Like Philolaus’s god, Sophia is a prison-guard, a ‘liminal’ being dwelling at the outer rim of the heavens, viz., in “the Ninth” (BG 47:12 της-γίτε, Π 14:12 της-γίτε), which “like the circuit of an impenetrable wall completely encloses the universe and shields all within itself,” including the earth, “a prison-house and fetters for sinful bodies” γῆν ἐν οἴνον φρουράν καὶ δεσμοῖς ἄλητρων σωμάτων Max. Tyr. Or. 11.12; cf. Dio Chrys. Or. 30.10). For the Platonist and Early Christian usage of the word see Courcelle (1966) 406–43.
ments in Sophia’s womb and entail the formation of a new living being, from the zygote all the way down to the mature fetus. Sophia’s desire to generate without a mate is thus a violation of the natural process of reproduction as postulated by Aristotle and reiterated, albeit with some important modifications, by the Stoics. This process follows the basic requirement of natural change: the preexistence of the active ‘male’ principle providing form (and movement) and the passive ‘female’ element contributing a sufficient amount of matter.

As Aristotle states it (GA 2.5.741b2–10),

In all living beings where the male and female are separate, the female is unable by itself to generate offspring and bring it to completion; if it could, the male would have no purpose, and nature does nothing in vain. Hence in such living beings the male always brings generation to an end—for it implants sentient Soul (τὴν σωματικὴν ψυχήν), either through itself or by means of semen. As the parts of the future living being are potentially present in the matter [coming from the female], once the principle of movement has been activated, one part follows on after another in a series, just as it does in the miraculous automatic puppets.

Conception takes place when the seed imparts motion upon the menstrual blood and initiates the epigenetic differentiation of the parts of the ‘zygote’ that are potentially present in the female residue. The semen does not mix up with the residue, but rather, as Aristotle

---

5 The Stoic theory of conception can be reconstructed from a brief summary in Eusebius (PE 15.20.1) and from the papyrus fragments of ‘Ἡθυκὴ στοιχεῖος’ by Hierocles, a Stoic of the second century A.D. (L-S 53B); cf. Hahn (1994) 175–225, esp. 217–24. For Aristotle as well as for the Stoics, both the sperm and the kata-menial blood, also a seminal residue, contain the life-giving pneuma and the soul heat. Both Aristotle and the Stoics distinguish the four stages of human embryonic development, from conception and vegetative growth to animation and the development of reason. The crucial difference lies in assessing the exact time of animation, that is, of the embryo’s loss of its plant-like status—forty days upon conception for the male and eighty days for the female fetus according to Aristotle (HA 7.3.583b), vs. the moment of birth, viz. the embryo’s “falling out” (ἐξεσθάνη) of the womb into the environment (ἐμπεσώσα τῷ περιέχοντι L-S 53B.3), according to the Stoics.

explains (1.21.730a15–18), “causes the matter and nourishment in the female to take on a particular character.” The exact mechanics of actualizing the residue’s potential is likened to the above mentioned “automatic puppet” which, once wound up by a spring, continues to move on its own:

It is possible that one part [of the developing embryo] should move another, and this one move yet another one, and that the process should be like that of the ‘wondrous’ automatons: their parts, even while at rest, have in them somehow a potentiality, and when some external agency sets the first part in movement, then immediately the adjacent part comes to be in actuality.... Now semen, and the movement and the principle which it contains, are such that, as the [initial] movement ceases each one of the parts gets formed and acquires soul; for there is no such thing as face or flesh without soul in it. (2.1.734b9–26).

Compared with this model of natural reproduction, Sophia’s attempt at parthenogenesis represents a radical deviation from the normal patterns of coming-to-be provided by higher animals, most notably humans. The absence of a pre-existing form-bearing male relegates Sophia’s action to the reproductive activity characteristic of the lowliest among living beings—spontaneous generation.7 In this anomalous kind of reproduction, the female residue has to take on a more active role and have a certain extra capacity that could impart movement. In plants and some animals, where male and female are not distinct, this capacity is the male principle “mixed in” with the female residue; in some other animals, where male and female are separate, this is “the seasonal heat present in their environment” or, as in the unfertilized production of the eggs of fish and birds, “the heat from the incoming nourishment” (3.11.762a35–b18). The case of the hen laying infertile eggs without the intervention of the male counterpart is perhaps the best analogue for Sophia’s spontaneous generation.

The instance of the birds laying wind-eggs proves that up to a point the female is able to generate. Yet there is a puzzle here too: In what sense are we to say that these eggs are alive? We cannot say that they [i.e. the wind-eggs] are alive in the same sense as fertile eggs, for in that case an actual living being would hatch out of them; nor are they

7 For Aristotle’s analysis of spontaneous generation and the problems it poses to his doctrine of the pre-existing form as a necessary condition for every coming-to-be, see Balme (1962) 91–104 and Lloyd (1996) 104–25.
on a par with wood or stone, because these eggs go bad just as fertile ones do, and this seems to indicate that they, in some way, partake of life. Hence it is clear that potentially they possess some sort of soul. What sort, then? The lowest, it must be, and this is nutritive soul; for this is what exists alike in animals and plants. Why then does this soul fail to bring the parts to their completion and so produce an animal? Because the parts of an animal are bound to possess sentient soul, since they are not on a par with those of a plant; and that is why the male is required to take a share in the business, the male being separate from the female in such animals (2.5.741a19–30).

Whichever of the proposed analogues for the nature of Sophia’s miscarriage one decides to follow—automatic puppet or wind-eggs—it is clear that, in both cases, the product of her spontaneous generation is matter informed to a certain degree and possessing the nutritive function, but lacking the sentient soul and therefore incapable of further differentiation into a fully formed living being. In the absence of a male consort required to “complete the business of generation” (2.5.741b5–6), Sophia assumes the unlikely role of an active cause and, in a glaring reversal of Aristotle’s doctrine of biological reproduction, endows her misshapen creation with a sentient soul.

---

8 The automaton-analogy was actually applied to Ialdabaoth: Tertullian, *Adv. Val.* 18, refers to the Valentinian Sophia–Achamoth as a hidden force controlling the demiurge’s activity “as if pulling the strings in a puppet theater.”

9 If Aristotle’s theoretical treatment of the causes of becoming is indeed compatible with the empirical field of biology, as argued by Balme (1962) 94, Verdenius (1983) 102, and Lloyd (1996) 122–23, then Sophia’s ‘animation’ of her miscarriage, that is, her taking on a more active role in generation, can be attributed to *appetitus materiae*—a natural longing (ὅρεσθαι, ἐφιεμόνη) of matter for actuality and form, “as the female [longs] for the male and the base for beautiful” (Arist. *Phys.* 1.9.192a13–23). This active tendency of matter, its longing and yearning for actualization, can be accounted for by positing some sort of life and soul-element in it, and this is exactly the way in which some Middle Platonists interpreted this innate tendency to change. Plutarch, for example, preoccupied with intertextual connections between Plato’s and Aristotle’s thought, “translates” the Aristotelian notion of prime matter yearning for form and “moving by itself” (Meta 6.9.1034b5–6 ἡ ὠλη δύναται καὶ ὃ ἁὐτής κινεῖσθαι ταῦτα τὴν κίνησιν ἦν τὸ σπέρμα κινεῖ) into a pre-cosmic ‘material’ principle, reminiscent of Plato’s space, “the mother” of becoming at the stage when “deity was still absent from it” (Tim. 53b), and portrays it as “neither inanimate nor without reason nor unable to move of itself...but constantly yearning and longing for and pursuing what is better” (De Is. et Osir. 48, 370D–371A τινὰ μεταξύ φύσιν ὁὐκ ἄφυσιν ὀὐδ’ ἄλογον ὀὐδ’ ἀκίνητον εἶναι...ἐφεμένην δὲ τὴς ἀκινήτου ἀει καὶ ποθόσαν καὶ διώκοσαν). This Middle Platonist ‘feminine’ principle of coming-to-be, which Plutarch identifies with the pre-cosmic world soul and portrays as the Egyptian goddess Isis, provides perhaps the closest parallel to Sophia—the conceptual blend of Plato’s space-receptacle producing in itself the chaotic flux of abortive, “shifting copies of the eternal forms”
and its vital characteristics: sensation, impulse, and locomotion. In the narrative of the *Apocryphon*, this transformation of a dark miscarriage into a non-rational animal—"a lion-faced snake" (II 10:9)—is effected through Sophia’s gift of light to her imperfect product or, alternatively and in a more dramatic fashion, the latter’s theft of Sophia’s light.

**Sophia’s Motivation: The Soul “in Travail of Birth”**

Concealed behind the cloud of heterogeneous metaphors, Sophia’s ultimate motive for her impetuous action of “bringing forth” with-

---

*(Tim. 50c5–6)* and of Aristotle’s prime matter which, lacking of itself in form, has a soul-like desire for it, yet occasionally, in cases when it does not get mastered by the form, manifests its innate lack or “evil tendency” (*Phys.* 1.9.192a15 τὸ κοσμοτόπον οὐτίς) by generating deformities. For the ‘dynamism’ inherent in the Aristotelian prime matter see Kullmann (1979) 51–53 and Verdenius (1983) 110–12.

10 This theriomorphic mutant closely resembles *Aion*, the lion-headed god representing time, with a snake entwining his human trunk—the epiphany of an end-lessly revolving life-cycle of the world found in many Mithraic temples, and, in a less frightful iconographic modality of a semi-nude youth (with or without the swirling snake), the vehicle of the Antonine Golden-Age propaganda; cf. Gall (1978) 511–25 and esp. Jackson (1985) 17–45 and (1994) 131–164 with the accompanying plates i–xxi. The unfavorable interpretation of this leontocephaline cosmocrator in *Ap. John*, possibly a subtle critique of Antonine imperialism and cultural universalism (cf. e.g., the reverse of Hadrian’s aureus representing *saeculum aureum* in Jackson 1994, plate XIa), is effected by resorting to Plato’s passage from Book 9 of the *Republic* (588d–590b, trans. Cornford, slightly modified), where the three parts of the soul—desiring, spirited, and rational—are compared to the three hardly compatibile creatures: “Let us shape the soul’s image as one of those mythical natures said to have existed long ago, such as the Chimaera, Scylla, Cerberus, which combined many forms in one. . . . Shape, to begin with, the form of a multifarious and many-headed beast, girt round with heads of tame and wild animals, and capable of growing them and transforming out of itself. . . . Now add two other forms, a lion and a man, and let the first be the largest by far, and the second next to it in size. . . . Then join them in such a way that the three somehow grow together into one. . . . Lastly, mold the outside into the image of one of them, a man, so that, to those unable to see inside the outward sheet, the whole may look as a single creature, a human being. . . . All our words and actions should tend towards giving our inner man complete mastery over the whole human being, and letting him take the many-headed beast under his care. . . . He should enlist the lion as his ally. . . . You will agree, too, with the reasons why certain faults have always been condemned: profligacy, for its giving too much license to the multiform monster. . . . Arrogance (αὐθάδεια) and ill temper (δυσκολία) are blamed whenever the lion and serpent part of us grows (ὅταν τὸ λεοντοῦδες καὶ φιδιῶδες αὐθάδεια) and its sinews get overstrung; . . . and flattery (κολακεία) and meanness (ἀνέλελυθρία) whenever one makes the spirited part subordinate to the turbulent beast” (ὅταν τὴς τῶν ὅμωδων θηρίῳ ποιή). The section of this ‘parable’ (588a–589b) was rendered in Coptic and included in the sixth codex of the Nag Hammadi ‘Library’ (NHC VI 48:16–51:23).
out a mate represents the principal hermeneutical challenge facing
the reader of the *Apocryphon of John*. Prior to the action, there was a
willful impulse to act—“she wanted to show forth an image out of
herself” (II 9:28–29, BG 36:20–37:1). And prior to the will, there
was a thought—for “no one wishes for the sort of thing he does not
think he should go for” (Arist. *NE* 5.9.1136b6–9). In Sophia’s case,
this thought is identified with discursive reasoning (ἐνθέμησις), a com-
prehensive consideration of an object (God, “the invisible Spirit”) which,
insofar as inferred from weak suppositions, fails to receive
“the Spirit’s approval.”11 The narrative of the *Apocryphon of John* con-
catenates these stages of Sophia’s mental process in the following
logico-temporal sequence:

(i) And the Wisdom (σοφία) of practical thinking (ἐπίνοια), being an
acon,
thought a thought from herself and [from] a discursive reasoning
(ἐνθέμησις)
concerning the invisible Spirit and foreknowledge (πρόγνωσις).
(ii) She wanted to show forth an image out of herself without the
Spirit’s will
—he had not approved (εὐδοκεῖν)—
and without her consort and without his consent (ὁρισκείτω, κατανεῖν).
(iii) And although he had not approved (συνευδοκεῖν),
that is, the face (πρόσωπον) of her maleness,
and although she had not discovered her partner,
but consented (ὁρισκείτω, κατανεῖν) without the Spirit’s will
and the acquaintance with her partner,

The line of causation leading to Sophia’s act of “bringing forth” fol-
lows the intellectualist account of human action (iv) as a voluntary
assent (iii) given to an impulse to act in accordance with (ii) the
rational evaluation of (i) external impressions or innate conceptions.12

---

11 Cf. chap. 2, pp. 129–32, and n. 65.
12 The priority of impulse to assent seems to be an aberration from the ‘ortho-
dox’ Stoic sequence of causation as outlined by Chrysippus (external impression,
assent, impulse, action), according to which all impulses are acts of assent. Seneca,
*Ep*. 113.18, has impulse preceding assent: “Every rational being is inactive unless
it is first aroused by the some external impression (specie alicuius rei invitatam), then
gets an impulse (impetum) and finally assent confirms this impulse (adsensio confirmavit
quoted Seneca’s passage, “the word impetus is uncharacteristically used for initial
shock” and takes this term as synonymous with *agitatio*, first agitation, and *primus*
Sophia’s fault lies in (iii) assenting precipitately to (ii) her ‘enthymematic’ analysis of God into (i) a signifying chain of predicates. The last aeon of the Pleroma, she encompasses all of God’s previously manifested dispositions, including the eleven aeons directly superordinate to her (Grace, Truth, Outward Form, Afterthought, Perception, Memory, Understanding, Love, Ideal Form, Perfection, and Peace). Yet predication, however exhaustive and systematic, does not amount to knowledge. As the Savior states in his negative praise of the One beyond Being, discursive thought can only demonstrate what God is not, so that establishing the stable relationship of identity between God qua Subject and its predicative content is a faltering effort. The problem with Sophia is that she is incapable of achieving a bottom-up movement of synthesis, of collecting a multiplicity of divine qualities into the original self-unity of the Absolute. Translated into gender categories, she cannot “discover her partner” and, inasmuch as failing to obtain the approval of “the face of her maleness,” gives assent, in advance of perfect cognition, to her weak supposition of God—a mocking ‘simulacrum’ of true wisdom.

For its blending of biological and psychological metaphors, the description of Sophia’s situation leading to the fatal ‘miscarriage’ closely resembles the Platonic image of the soul’s conceiving, and laboring with, new conceptions. The idea of pregnancy of soul occurs
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*motus*, a first movement of the mind, “not merely independent of judgment and emotion, but . . . actually occur[ing] before it.” For the problem of the first involuntary movements in Seneca’s psychology and their identification with the pre-emotions (προπάγεια) in the post-Panethian period of Stoicism, see Inwood (1993) 150–83 and Graver (2000) 300–325. The problem is as old as Chrysippus, as indicated in Plutarch’s account of Stoic self-contradictions (De Stoic. rep. 47, 1057A–B): on one hand, both Chrysippus and Antipater hold a thesis that “there is neither action nor impulse without assent and that they are talking fiction who maintain that upon the occurrence of an appropriate impression impulse follows immediately without any prior yielding or assent”; on the other hand, “Chrysippus claims that both god and the sage induce false impressions, not asking us to assent or yield but only to act and be impelled towards what impresses itself, but that we, being inferior, out of weakness assent to such impressions.” In his refutation of the Stoic view that assent is a prerequisite for action, Plutarch appropriates Arcesilaus’ stance: “For in spite of all their [the Stoics’] probing and wrenching, impulse refused to turn into assent or accept sensation as what tips the scale; it was seen instead to lead to action on its own initiative, requiring no approval from other quarters” (Adv. Col. 26, 1122A–B). Seneca’s departure from the typical Stoic sequence (external impression–assent–impulse) seems thus a simple reiteration of the Academic order: “The soul has three movements: impression, impulse, and assent” (ibid. 26, 1122B τριῶν περὶ τὴν ψυχὴν κινημάτων ὄντων, φανταστικοῦ καὶ ὀρμητικοῦ καὶ συγκαταθετικοῦ).
in the *Symposium* (208b7–209e4), in Diotima’s discourse on the soul’s travail “in beauty” and its ultimate delivery, after much labor and the communion with an older male, of “wisdom and virtues” as its perfect philosophical offspring. The same idea is also introduced in the opening pages of Plato’s *Theaetetus* (147c–151d), where Socrates describes his god-given educational program and likens it to the art of midwifery. When the young Theaetetus acknowledges his incapacity to offer an account of knowledge, of collecting the multiplicity of individual kinds of expertise into a coherent and universal definition of what knowledge is, Socrates exclaims that “this is because *Theaetetus* is suffering the pains of labor because [he is] not barren but pregnant” (148e7–8). By referring to pregnancy, Socrates reassures his ‘model student’ that, acting as a spiritual “midwife,” he “will make a difficult labor easy” or, when necessary, “cause a miscarriage at an early stage” (149d1–3). Socrates’ method of cross-examination, of testing every hypothesis posited by a student, has the same purpose as the art of ‘midwifery’: just as “the habit of women is to give birth sometimes to genuine children and sometimes to mere phantoms (ἐἴδωλα τίκτειν) and the task of midwives, themselves past the age of bearing, “to discern (κρίνειν) the true from what is not” (150a8–b4), so “the highest point of [his] art is the power to test (βασανίζειν), by any means, whether the mind (διάνοια) of a young man gives birth to a phantom and falsehood (ἐἴδωλον καὶ ψεύδος) or something fertile and true” (150b9–c3). Those who frequent Socrates’ company will gain an intimate experience of having their opinions delivered and tested and, as a result, “discover by themselves many admirable truths” (150d6–8). They will “feel pain, and [be] full of difficulties, night and day, far more so than the woman,” but his “art will be able to bring on these pains and allay them” (151a5–b1). To this successful outcome of his midwifery, Socrates opposes two other, less fortunate, scenarios. One is the refusal of his company, the sign of the soul’s complete barrenness (151b1–3); the other is abandoning Socrates as a spiritual guide

---

13 The sterility characteristic of that sort of youth, several of whom Socrates happily “gave away to Prodicus and to other wise and gifted gentlemen” (151b5–6), is not to be confused with Socrates’ self-presentation as a mere midwife of others’ thoughts, himself “unproductive of wisdom” (ἀγνώς ἐιμι σοφίας) and “bearing not a single discovery of that sort as the offspring of [his] soul” (150c3–d2). As Socrates explains earlier, “midwifery is not given to barren women” but “to those unable
sooner than one should. The passage that describes the consequences of this impetuous decision is worth quoting for its striking resemblance with Sophia’s mental state:

There have been many who did not know [that the delivery is God’s and Socrates’ responsibility] and held themselves responsible while making light of me; and, either of their own motion or persuaded by others, they have gone away sooner than they should and, once they have gone away, miscarried the rest [of their thoughts] through falling into bad company; and they have lost the ones delivered by me by bringing them up badly, caring more for false phantoms than for the true; and at last they have come to appear as ignorant both to themselves and to everyone else. . . . When these come back, begging for my company and doing extraordinary things to get it, sometimes the divine power that comes to me stops me communing with them, but with others it lets me, and these make progress again. (150e1–151a6)

Similarly to Socrates’ disreputable student, Sophia in the *Apocryphon of John* first becomes pregnant with a conception of God “holding herself responsible” for it, then “goes away of her own motion sooner than she should,” and finally “miscarries” her sham wisdom, her phantom-like, uncertified opinions about God. Yet once she begins to “appear as ignorant to herself,” Sophia will try to “come back,” “beg for the company” of her consort and, eventually, upon becoming aware of her barrenness and emptying herself from false conceit of wisdom, recover to some extent and “make progress again.” In her double movement of downfall and partial recovery, Sophia thus stands as the paradigmatic case of the human condition—of the soul’s ‘diversion’ from the source, which is God, and of its subsequent ‘con-
version’ back to the divine master; or, as the *Apocryphon of John* states it, “of the souls of those who were ignorant of the fullness and did not repent at once, but persisted for a while and then repented” (II 9:19–22; cf. BG 36:8–12, III 14:3–6).

The images of intellectual midwifery and the soul’s pregnancy were so often commented among ancient Platonists, including those roughly contemporary with the author of the *Apocryphon of John*—Plutarch, Alcinous, the *Anonymous Theaetetus Commentary*—that we may reasonably assume his familiarity with these Platonic commonplaces.¹⁴ The decisive stimulus might have come from the work of Philo of Alexandria, more specifically from his hermeneutical program of reading the Greek text of the Pentateuch and the Prophets as a monumental ‘diary of the soul’, in which Biblical characters symbolize various states, or modalities, of the soul—from its original residing with God through its ‘diversion’ from the divine source and the subsequent ‘laboring’ with false suppositions to the eventual rediscovery of its true identity.

Philo’s narrative of the soul’s passage from the fixed state of unity with God to the unbalanced and alienated state of the individual ‘self’ results from the conflation of the several already existing endeavors to explain how the primal harmony eventually disintegrated—Plato’s account of the ‘fall’ of the soul, the story of Adam’s original sin in Genesis, and the Stoic analysis of false value-judgments resulting in turbulent, self-degrading passions in the human soul. Philo’s version of the story begins with the initial situation of the closed ‘organic’ community, where the soul “lives the virgin life in the house of God and clings to knowledge” (*Cher.* 52) in the non-reflected awareness of its divine identity, “illumined by the bright and pure rays of wisdom (φρόνησις), through which the sage sees God and his potencies, with none of the messengers of falsehood having access to the reasoning capacity (λογισμός)” (*Deus* 3). The original soul, which Philo identifies with the pure mind (νοῦς) “docked of all powers of sense-perception” and unable to “apprehend incorporeal things as well as solid bodies” (*Cher.* 59–60), is described as “clothed in neither vice nor virtue, yet absolutely stripped of either [and] naked, just as the

¹⁴ For diverging interpretations of Plato’s *Theaetetus* among ancient Platonists see Sedley (1996) 79–103. The puzzle of Socrates’ midwifery is the subject of Plutarch’s *First Platonic Question* (999c–1000e), on which see Opsomer (1998) 27–82.
soul of an infant, since it is without part in either good or evil, is bared and stripped of coverings” (Leg. 2.53). At this stage, the soul does not have to discern good from evil, virtue from vice, true knowledge from false suppositions, but “possesses virtue instinctively (αὐτομομοθῶς) and without incitement to it” (Leg. 1.92; cf. Opif. 148), “regarding as its goal to become fully conformed to God who begat it” (Opif. 144 ψυχαῖς...τέλος ἠγουμένας τὴν πρὸς τὸν γεννήσαντα θεὸν ἔξομοιωσιν).15

The dramatic reversal of this original balance occurs when “the mind gets diverted and deflected from honoring God” (Conf. 129 τὸν μετατραπήναι καὶ μετακλήθηναι διάνοιαν ἀπὸ τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ τιμῆς) and, departing from its “virgin” life with God, begins to search for another end—itself. This act of “apostasy from knowledge” (Cher. 52 ἀποστατεῖς), of “turning away from God” (Conf. 129 ἀποστροφῆ θεοῦ), results from the impious “self-love” (φιλαυτία) that Philo defines as “a swollen, vanity-ridden condition, robed in a vesture of pride beyond measure and making some people appear to dishonor virtue” (Congr. 128).

The soul is now in the distracted state of Socrates’ renegade students, “ascribing to [itself] with a boastful speech the choice and the birth” (129) of its thoughts and perceptions, in the manner of an “impious man” who thinks that

The mind has sovereign power over what it deliberates, and sense over what it perceives (αὐτοκράτορα μὲν εἶναι τὸν νοῦν ἄν χουλεύεται, αὐτοκράτορα δὲ καὶ τὴν αἰσθήσιν ἄν αἰσθάνεται). He [i.e. the impious man] holds that the latter judges corporeal things and the former all things, and that both are free from fault and error. Yet what could be more blameworthy or more clearly contested by the truth than these beliefs? Is not the mind often (πολλάκις) convicted of delusion on innumerable points, and all the senses judged guilty of false witness, not before irrational judges who are likely to be deceived, but at the bar of nature herself whom it is impossible to corrupt? And surely if the criteria [of

15 Compare Philo’s interpretation of Zech 6:12: “I have heard also an oracle of one of Moses’s fellow disciples, which runs as follows: ‘Behold a man whose name is branching out’ (ἀνασταλῇ), a strangest of titles, surely, if you consider that what is spoken of here is the compound of body and soul. But if you suppose that this being is incorporeal, not differing from the divine image, you will agree that the name of ‘branching out’, which is applied to him, hits the mark; for that man the Father of all caused to spring up as his eldest son, whom he called elsewhere the first-born (πρωτόγονον); and indeed the son thus begotten, imitating (μιμούμενος) the ways of his Father, shaped the different forms by looking to His archetypal patterns” (Conf. 62–63).
[truth] within us, supplied by mind and sense, are liable to error, we
must admit the logical consequence, that it is god who showers con-
ceptions (ἐννοιαὶ) on the mind and apprehensions (ἀντιλήψεις) on sense,
and that what comes into being is no gift of any part of ourselves,
but all are bestowed by Him, on account of whom we too have been
made. (Conf. 125–27)

Whereas the original soul lived its virginal life in the state of impreg-
nable stability and instinctive virtue, the ‘fallen’ soul no longer takes
itself as depending on God as the only criterion of truth, asserting
instead its epistemological autonomy and positing its own mind and
senses as unfailingly accurate reports of reality. But for Philo, who
seems here to follow the skeptical Academics’ refusal to grant infal-
libility to either criteria, “the distinguishing properties which things
present sometimes reach the eye of the soul as blurred and con-
 fused, and sometimes as clear and distinct” (Congr. 135), so that the
soul has no capacity on its own to distinguish the true from the
defective impressions or to differentiate between true conceptions
and false suppositions. This state of confusion, of anarchic disconti-
nuity with the original providential order, Philo portrays by resort-
ing to the sexual imagery of “begetting for oneself” instead of
“begetting for God,” of “having in the womb” instead of “receiving
in the womb,” and of “conceiving without deliberative wisdom” as
opposed to “becoming pregnant with deliberative wisdom.”

The souls, then, whose pregnancy is accompanied with deliberative
wisdom (μετὰ φρονήσεως κυοφοροῦσι), [although they labor,] manage to
deliver, for they distinguish and separate what is in confusion, just as
Rebecca, receiving in her womb the knowledge of the two nations
(λαβοῦσα γὰρ ἐν γαστρὶ τῶν διπτῶν διανοίας ἐθνῶν ἐπιστήμην, cf. Gen
25:23) of the mind, virtue and vice, separated and distinguished the
nature of the two founding thereby a happy delivery. But those whose
pregnancy is without deliberative wisdom (ἀνευ φρονήσεως) either abort
(ἀμβλύσκοψιν) or bring forth a quarrelsome ‘sophist’ who shoots with
the bow [i.e., Ishmael, Hagar’s son; cf. Gen 21:20] or is the target of
the bowman. And this is surely reasonable. For the one kind of soul
thinks that it receives and the other that it has in the womb, and this
is a mighty distinction. Indeed, those supposing to ‘have’ boastfully
ascribe the choice and the birth to themselves, while those who claim
to ‘receive’ confess (συνομολογοῦσι) that they have of themselves noth-
ing that is their own but seize upon the seeds of impregnation show-
ered on them from outside and, in their admiration of the Giver, repel
the greatest of evils, the love of self (φιλαυτία), by reverence (θεοσεβεία),
the perfect good. (Congr. 129–30).
The opposition that Philo draws in the above passage between two kinds of soul is reformulated in his interpretation of Eve’s birth of Cain and Abel into the contrast between “two opposite and conflicting opinions” (δύο τοίνυν δόξας . . . ἐναντίας καὶ μαχομένας ἀλλήλαις) within the single soul,

One that ascribes all things to the mind as our master, whether we are reasoning or perceiving, in motion or at rest, the other that follows God as though it were his handiwork. The first of these [opinions] is figured by Cain who is called ‘possession’ because he thinks that he possesses all things, the other by Abel, whose name means ‘one who refers [all things] to God’. Now it is with both of these opinions that the single soul is in labor (ἀμφοτέρας μὲν ὄν τὰς δόξας ὁδίνει μία ψυχή); yet when they are brought to birth, they must needs be separated, for enemies cannot live together forever. Thus so long as the soul had not brought forth Abel, the God-loving thought (τὸ φιλόθεαιν δόγμα), Cain, the self-loving thought (τὸ φιλαυτών) resided in it; but once it produced agreement with regard to the cause (τὴν πρὸς τὸ άττιν ομολογιών εγέννησε), it abandoned the concord with the mind’s conception of wisdom (τὴν πρὸς τὸν δοκησίσωφον νοῦν ἕξελίπε). (Sacr. 1–3)

Philo here distinguishes between the two successive stages in the life of the soul—according to his translation of the Genesis verse, God “added the birth of Abel to that of Cain” (Gen 4:2 καὶ προσέθηκε τεκεῖν τὸν ἄδελφον αὐτοῦ τὸν “Αβέλ”), implying that, “as in the case of arithmetical quantities or the soul’s discursive thoughts, the addition of one thing entails the removal of the other” (Sacr. 1). The first stage is dominated by the soul’s perverted will or foolishness (ἀφροσνη), whose distinctive trait is “travailing” indiscriminately with the opposites (good and evil, virtue and vice, true concepts and false opinions), but never producing anything but “abortions and miscarriages (ἀμβλωθρίδια καὶ ἐκτρώματα)” (Leg. 1.75–76). The second stage is in the exponent of “intermediate” or deliberative wisdom (φρόνησις

---

16 Philo seems to provide here a theologized version of the Stoic doctrine of the supreme human good; cf. Cicero, Fin. 3.21 “A human being’s earliest attachment (conciliatio) is to what is in accordance with nature. But as soon as he has acquired some understanding (intelligentiam), or rather conception (notionem), what the Stoics call ennoia, and sees an order and so to speak harmony of things which one ought to do, he values this much more highly than all those earlier objects of affection and so concludes through rational cognition that in this lies the supreme good for man, one which is praiseworthy and choiceworthy for its own sake. This good the Stoics call homologia, and we may call it ‘consistency’ (convenientiam), if you approve, for in this resides that good to which everything else must be referred, namely moral action and morality itself (honestum).”
μέση; cf. e.g., Opif. 154), “the science of knowing through which the good and beautiful things are distinguished from bad and ugly” (QG 1.11), the disposition to make right practical decisions. The decisive moment in this passage from criterial impotence to the rule of deliberative wisdom occurs when the soul “confesses to have nothing of its own,” and, “by a single power of attraction, begins to incline to the Good, never swaying in the opposite direction nor oscillating into equilibrium between the two” (Praem. 63). This confession that freedom is merely an illusion grounded in ignorance and that the perfect good can be acquired only by “reverence for God” (θεοσέβεια) and his ‘midwifery’ marks the beginning of the soul’s recovery—of its “disowning and discarding the offspring of ignorance” (62) and becoming again a virgin, barren of false suppositions and ready to receive God’s seed of virtue. As Philo states it commenting on Sarah’s conception of Isaac (Gen 21:1), “at the time when God visited her in her solitude” (μονοθείσαν),

For it is appropriate that God should hold converse with the truly virgin nature, which is unpolluted and free from impure touch. Yet it is opposite with us; for the union of human beings for the procreation of children turns virgins into women. But when God begins to consort with the soul, he turns what before was a woman into a virgin again; for he takes away the degenerate and emasculate desires that unmanned it and brings in instead the genuine and undefiled virtues. (Cher. 50)

Philo’s solution to the exegetical problem of the miraculous transformation of Sarah, whom “the [Biblical] oracles earlier describe as barren [i.e. Sarai, Σάρα] and now admit that she will become a mother [i.e. Sarah, Σαρα]” (Mut. 143),17 is the bold suggestion that barrenness is ultimately redeemed by a spiritual fecundity. He arrives at this solution by conflating two culturally separate, yet structurally homologous discourses—on the one hand, Socrates’ self-professed barrenness in human wisdom in the Theaetetus and, on the other, the Jewish Wisdom theme of “the barren unstained woman who...shall bear fruit at the great assize of souls” (Wis 16:13; cf. Sir 16:1–4). This “startling paradox” (παραδοξότατον) of Sarah, “represented as

17 Cf. Cher. 7, 50; Deus 10–15; Congr. 1–12; QG 3.53–54; for the opposition between Sarai and Sarah see the pertinent remarks by Nikoprowetzky (1977) 149–85, esp. 166–78.
at once barren (στείραν) and exceedingly prolific (πολυγονότατον)” (Congr. 3), for which Philo finds linguistic support in a paronomastic play on the words στείρα and στέρρα (“barren” as “firm”), is consistently set in contrast to barrenness as sterility (στείρα καὶ ἄγονος, “barren” as “unproductive”) unreceptive to virtue (e.g., Praem. 108, Spec. 3.34–36, Mut. 225)—a split by means of which Philo cleaves the notion of ‘barrenness’ from within and formulates a complex ‘dialectic’ of spiritual sterility and fecundity as the outcome of an anamorphic shift of perspective.

Back to the Apocryphon of John, it is precisely by reference to this Philonic ‘dialectic’ that we can best explain the character, motivation, and actions of the ‘fallen’ Sophia—her original, fertile state of “the solid and indestructible wisdom of God” (Det. 115) marked by the religious reverence for God, her ultimate source; her diversion from God resulting in criterial impotence and sterility as regards to true wisdom; her painful realization that, because she travailed without God’s ‘midwifery’, her thoughts and desires have no positive truth-content and therefore must be miscarried, or “cast away”; 19

---

18 Deus 13: “We might reasonably expect that the ‘barren’ woman (τὴν στείραν)—not the ‘unproductive one’ but the ‘firm’ who still abound in power (οὐ τὴν ἄγονον ἀλλὰ τὴν στείραν καὶ ἄτι σφιγγόσαν), who struggles in her contest with endurance, courage and perseverance in order to acquire the best, should bring forth the monad which is of equal power with the seven; for her nature is prolific and blest with offspring.”

19 Seeing the imperfection of her miscarried product, Sophia “cast it away (οἰκτε ἐξολοθ, ποιγκε μικα νηολ καὶ ἰδια νηολ) from her, outside those places, so that no one among the immortal ones might see it” (BG 38:1–5; III 15:13–15; II 10:11–13). Philo uses the similar jargon of “disowning” or “discarding one’s offspring,” and of “removing” or “cutting away” the extremities, to convey the Stoic ethical ideal of the eradication of erroneous opinions, or passions, root and branch. See, e.g., Praem. 61: “Thus everyone who is taught, when he passes over to knowledge, must abandon ignorance. . . . For the learner may also be said to disown the offspring of ignorance (ἀποκηρύται τὰ τῆς ὁμοθείας ἔκοφα) and discard (παρατείται) them as hostile and ill-willed”; LA 1.52: “Whoever does not conceive [God as One and incorruptible and unchangeable] fills his soul with a false and godless opinion (δοξής). Do you not see that, even if He brings us into virtue and even if, when brought in, we plant no fruitless thing but ‘every tree good for food’, He yet bids us ‘thoroughly to cleanse its uncleanness’ (Lev 19:23)? Indeed, he demands the cutting away of self-conceit (ἀποστειμένη όρησιν), and self-conceit is in its nature unclean”; ibid., 3.131: “So [Moses] cuts out, as he needs must, anger, discordant offspring of the soul that loves strife and contention, (τῆς οὐν ἐρειστικῆς καὶ φυλοειδοῦ ψυχῆς πλημμελές γεννῆμα θυμῶν ἐκτέμνει δεθτὸς) so that it may be rendered barren (στειροθείσα), and cease bearing harmful progeny, and that this may become a portion befitting the lover of virtue, not the breast nor the seat of anger, but the removal of these
and, finally, her renewal of the intercourse with God and of the virtuous life “in agreement with the cause” (Sacr. 3), once she has become barren of her erroneous and ‘abortive’ suppositions.

(τὸ ἀφελεῖν ταῦτα); for God assigned to the wise the best possible share—the ability to cut out the passions (τὸ ἐκτήμενυ τὰ πάθη δυνάσθαι).” At the cosmological level, the same action of casting or cutting away signals the moment of rupture in the universe conceived as a spiritual continuum capable of limitless extension (ἐκτείνεσθαι)—the moment, that is, when dark matter is separated and shut off from the superordinate levels of reality. Cf. Det. 90: “For nothing that belongs to the divine cuts itself off and becomes separate, but only extends itself” (τὸ ἄφενεν τοῦ θεοῦ κατ’ ἐπάρτισιν, ἀλλὰ μόνον ἐκτείνεται). Philo’s distinction between “extension” and “excision” is a commonplace in early Christian theories of procession. Tatian, for example, explains the emission, or “springing forth, of God’s Logos (προφθολὸ λόγος) as follows: “He came into being by distribution (κατὰ μερισμὸν), not by section (κατ’ ἄποκτησιν), for what is cut away (τὸ γὰρ ἀποτεθηκέν) is separated from its source, but what has been distributed (τὸ δὲ μερισθέν) takes on a distinctive function in the [divine] dispensation (οἰκονομίας τὴν διάφοραν προσληφθέν) without diminishing the source from which it has been taken” (Tat. Graec. 5). Similarly Tertullian who, taking issue with the Monarchian identification of father, son, and spirit, proposes the notion of divine economy as the passage of God’s unity into trinity “not by the separation of substance but through disposition” (Prax. 19.8 non ex separatione substantiae sed ex dispositione, 21.3: not quasi separatum, dispositione alium non divisione). Ernesti (1795) 209 and Schlossman (1906) 417 point to the grammatical and rhetorical roots of this dichotomy: whereas ἄποκτησι implies excision, for example of final letters of a word, μερισμός and διάφορας denote the distribution of an indiscriminate whole into distinct constitutive elements, for example of a diphthong into its constitutive vowels, or of the content of a speech into principal points. The distinction between these two modes of procession can be followed all the way down to their respective results: ‘part’ (μέρος, pars) in the case of ἄποκτησι, and ‘portion’ (μόριον, portio) as the outcome of μερισμός. For Calcidius, In Tim. 33, pars and portio result from the separate processes at two different levels of reality—one which is corporeal and composite, and the other which is simple and incorporeal: Portio enim elocutione notanda est. Non enim partem quippe simplicis et incorporeae rei, sed portionem, id est partis instar, dixit esse sublatam. It is perhaps by reference to this distinction that the Hermetic tract Poimandres (CH 1.4) explains the generation of darkness out of the primordial light-substance as ἐν μέρει γεγενημένον, fearful and gloomy, coiling sinuously.” Festugière (1954) 4: 41–42 was the first to establish the link between the term μέρος and the breakup of the continuous process of derivation within the divine realm: “Je crois que nos parallèles pythagoriciens (Modératus–Jamblique) nous donnent le sens exact. L’Obscurité s’est ‘formée à part’, c’est-à-dire, comme il n’y a d’abord que la Lumière, qu’elle s’est séparée de la Lumière en se portant vers le bas, tout de même que, selon Moderatus, Dieu a séparé de lui-même la posôτης (αὐτοῦ ἐξώρισε τὴν ποσότητα), et que, selon Jamblique . . . Dieu a fait exister ταργήγαγεν la matière par scission de la matérialité (ὑποσχεθείσας υλότητος) à partir de la substance divine.” Festugière’s treatment of Moderatus’s account of the generation of ‘matter’ is somewhat superficial. What Moderatus, as quoted by Porphyry (Simpl. In Arist. Phys. 231,7–24), actually says is that “the unitary Logos, as Plato somewhere says (Tim. 30a2), wishing to constitute the generation of beings
Yet even when miscarried, the false judgments of Sophia continue their fleeting existence as shadowy phantoms of the Real—as Plato says, “clinging in some sort to existence on pain of being nothing at all” (Tim. 52c). It is to these fluttering and unstable products of Sophia’s ignorance, embodied in the figure of Ialdabaoth and his creation, that the revelatory narrative of the Apocryphon of John now turns.

**Cosmogony, Part One: The ‘Gnostic’ Demiurge**

Seeing what has come out of her will (οὐράς, καιρής)—a serpent-like, lion-like impression (τύπος) or form (μορφή), its eyes shining with fire—Sophia “cast it away from her, outside those places, so that no one of the immortals might see it” (II 10:6–13; BG 37:18–38:5). Next, she harnessed it in, or surrounded it with, “a luminous cloud, and placed a throne in the midst of the cloud, so that no one might see it except the Holy Spirit, which is called Life (Ζωή), the Mother of all” (BG 38:6–11; II 10:14–18). Only then, after finding an appropriate place for it, Sophia gave it a name: Ialdabaoth.

Two separate stages are discernible in this episode. First, Sophia manifested out of herself a theriomorphic being, and cast it away from her, that is, outside of the lowest region of the Pleroma. Second, she hid it in a luminous cloud and placed him on a throne in the midst of it. Removed from the Pleroma, surrounded with light of a cloud, and granted a name, the offspring has gotten a distinct position, and a distinct personality—Ialdabaoth, the First Ruler, and the Demiurge.

From himself, by selfprivation left room for (ἐχώρησε; Zeller: ἐχώρισε ‘separated off’) quantity (ποσότης) depriving it of all his logoi and forms.” The identity of the unitary Logos (ὁ ἕνιος λόγος) is still debated by scholars—for Baltes in Dörrie-Baltes (1996) 480–82, it corresponds to Plato’s demiurge occupying the third rank in Moderatus’s universe (a ‘Third One’), or the level of Soul, while Tornau (2000) 210–11, following Dodds (1928) 137, assigns it a superior rank, that of the ‘Second One’, and identifies it with the Intellect in its twofold role of thinking forms and logoi and generating intelligible matter (“als denkender und als schöpferischer Geist”). Moderatus’s ‘quantity’ (ποσότης) is indeed the intelligible or ‘prime’ matter, described as the first manifestation of “Not-Being” (Simpl. In Arist. Phys. 231,4) and endowed with the attributes of Plato’s Receptacle of becoming from the Timaeus. In Moderatus’s account, this ‘prime’ matter is clearly distinguished from the corporeal substrate as “the paradigm of the matter of bodies” (παράδειγμα ἐστι τῆς τοῦ σωμάτου ὕλης).
Ialdabaoth in the Luminous Cloud

Like several other texts traditionally labeled as ‘Gnostic’, the *Apocryphon of John* exploits the Biblical symbolism of cloud as a privileged medium of divine epiphany in both of its traditional aspects: first, the cloud that hides in its interior the power and glory of god (*separating aspect*); and second, the cloud that ‘covers’ and transfigures an entity exterior to it—for example, the earth, the tabernacle, a mountain, water, or some special human being (*mediatory or creative aspect*). Along with this motif and its complex symbolic value, some ‘Gnostic’ authors also adopted a cluster of images and symbols traditionally associated with it: fire, light, spirit, voice, and throne. Thus, it is not the content and function of the Biblical motif that has changed in its various ‘Gnostic’ applications, but rather, as it will become clear in the ensuing pages, the extension of its application.

In Exodus, a cloud often figures as the place of God’s self-revelation and as the symbol of divine transcendence. It is a murky cloud (Exod 19:16, γνωφόδεξι) on Mount Sinai whose primary function is to cover and hide (2:16 ἐκάλωσε). This cloud is paired with fire—God comes upon the mountain both in fire (19:18 ἐν πυρὶ) and in the column of cloud (19:9 ἐν στολῷ νεφέλης)—and represents the dwelling place of God’s glory (δῶξα κυρίου) as he appears on Mount Sinai (24:16) and upon the tabernacle (40:34 σκηνὴ τοῦ μαρτυρίου; κυβοτός in Num 10:34–36). Yet the function of the cloud is not only to hide and overshadow (cf. also Num 10:36 καὶ ἡ νεφέλη ἐγένετο σκιάζουσα ἐπ’ σύντοίς), but also to display and guide. Thus, it is within the column of cloud by day, and in the column of fire by night, that God “guides” (ἡγεῖσθαι) and “shows the way” (δεῖξαι τὴν ὁδὸν) to his people (Exod 13:21). Finally, a cloud is the privileged medium by means of which God utters his oracles (Exod 33:9; Num 11:25, 17:7–8).

A cloud as the place of Yahweh’s glory occurs in the opening lines of Ezekiel’s vision (Ezek 1:4 ff.), along with other images and symbols with which it has been traditionally affiliated: the flashing fire (1:4 πῦρ ἐξαστράτηστον), radiance (1:28 φέγγος), wind or spirit (1:12, 20 πνεῦμα; 1:21 πνεῦμα ζωῆς), voice (1:25 φωνῆ), throne (1:26) murkiness (1:28 “a cloud on a rainy day,” ἐν ἡμέρᾳ υἱῶτοῦ), rainbow (τόξον), and the oracular utterance (φωνὴ λαλούντος).

Wisdom literature associates the motif of a cloud with Sophia, the wisdom of God. In the Wisdom of Solomon, Dame Wisdom assumes the same appearance of two columns, of cloud and of fire, as Yahweh in Exodus (13:21–22): “She guided them on a wondrous journey,
and became a covering (σκέπη) for them by day, and a blaze of stars by night” (Wis 10:17). In his portrayal of God’s wisdom, Sirach combines several stock motifs—the column of cloud, lodging in a tent, and the throne of glory: “I placed my tent in heights (ἐν ὕψηλοις κατεσκήνωσα) and my throne was in a column of cloud” (Sir 24:3–4). In Baruch, Sophia dwells in heaven amidst the clouds, and nobody knows her but God (Bar 3:29–32). Both Baruch and Sirach emphasize the separating aspect of the cloud, that is, its power to hide and protect the remoteness and inaccessibility of divine wisdom: “There is no one who knows her way, no one who can think of her path” (3:31). Yet besides hiding and separating, the same cloud plays also an active role in the cosmic process: “One could see the cloud overshadowing (σκιαζουσα) the camp, the emergence of dry land out of what before was water” (Wis 19:7). A similar imagery occurs in Sir 24:3, where Sophia is described as a breath coming out of God’s mouth and covering (κατεκάλυψα) the earth like a mist (ὡς ὀμίχλη)—probably an allusion to the spirit of God and the pre-cosmic stage as portrayed in the opening lines of Genesis (1:2). In these cases, the cloud that overshadows and hides is a positive intermediary power triggering the process of creation and acting as a link between the heavens and the earth.

The same function of overshadowing belongs to a cloud in the Synoptic accounts of the transfiguration scene. Only Matthew (17:5) qualifies this cloud as “luminous” (νεφέλη φωτεινή). The luminous cloud corresponds, as it seems, to the Biblical “cloud of glory”—in the Septuagint, glory (δόξα) often stands as a synonym for light (cf. also Philo, Spec. 1.45). Matthew could also have in mind here the fiery aspect of the cloud from Exodus (24:17), just as the voice speaking from the luminous cloud (Matthew 17:5) may be a distant reminiscence of the oracles coming out of the cloud in the Pentateuch (Exod 33:9; Num 11:25; 17:7–8). Here, too, the cloud of transfiguration conveys a double meaning: not only does it symbolize God’s unattainable remoteness (separating or privative aspect), but also, through its act of overshadowing, enables communication between the earth and the heavenly realm (mediatory or creative aspect). A similar role belongs to a cloud in Luke—Acts—that of a vehicle of Jesus’ ascension, “taking him away from the eyes of his disciples” (Acts 1:9).20

20 See Apoc. Pet. 15–17 and Acts Pil. 16.6, where the cloud of ascension is identified with the luminous cloud of Jesus’ transfiguration.
The motif of a luminous cloud occupies a prominent place in the so-called ‘Sethian’ Gnostic corpus, where its complex symbolism finds manifold applications, depending on the level of reality—spiritual, animate, material—to which it is assigned. The Gospel of the Egyptians, for example, situates the luminous cloud within the spiritual or ‘Pleromatic’ realm and identifies it with Mirothea (Mirothoë), “the Mother of the holy incorruptible beings,” as she was about to give birth to Adamas, the heavenly prototype of humankind (III 49:1–16; IV 60:30–61:18). The “great cloud of light” embodies here the notion of divine transcendence. At the same time, the association of the luminous cloud with the female entity points to its traditional function in Wisdom literature—that is, to its positive role in creation.

The cloud-motif is reintroduced later in the narrative (III 56:22–57:21; IV 68:5–69:4) to signal the appearance of Saklas, the great ruler over Hades and chaos, brought into existence at the instigation of the great ‘luminary’ Eleleth, the representative of the spiritual world, and not, as is the case in the Apocryphon of John, on account of Sophia’s erroneous thought (ἐνθυμητικ) and sinful desire: “After five thousand years the great light Eleleth spoke, ‘Let someone rule over Chaos and Hades.’” The account of the ensuing events is partly preserved in one of the two manuscript witnesses (III 56:26–57:21 Böhlig–Wisse):

And there appeared a cloud [whose name is] hylic (ἢλκή) Sophia [. . .] gazed upon the parts [of Chaos], her face being like [. . .] her form [. . .] blood. And [the great] angel Gamaliel spoke [to the great Gabriel], the attendant belonging to [the great] luminary Oroiael. [He said, “Let an] angel come forth [to] rule over Chaos [and Hades.”] Then the cloud, [as it was agreed, came from] the two monads, each one [having] light. [. . .] [the throne?] which she established [. . .] within the cloud [. . .] Sakla the great [angel] beheld Nebroul, the great demon [that was with him.] And they became [together] an earthborn spirit [and begot] assisting angels.

The portrayal of Sophia owes a great deal to Sirach’s account of Wisdom’s role in creation (Sir 24:3–4). Sophia, who is qualified as “hylic” because of her entering into contact with a disorderly matter, or “Chaos,” becomes assimilated to the cloud in which, if the restoration of the lacuna is correct, she subsequently places a throne. Her act of gazing out (ἐσωτερικ), seems a typical ‘Gnostic’ concept which, in the context of cosmogony, denotes the illumination of the primeval darkness. Plotinus reports that “[the Gnostics] say that the soul which declined [i.e. Sophia] saw the darkness and illuminated
it” (Enn. 2.9.12 Ἡ γάρ ψυχή ἡ νεώσασα ἤδη ὤν τὸ σκότος... ἐϊδε καὶ κατέλαμψε). The cloud’s luminous nature, although nowhere made explicit, can be inferred from the reference to Sophia’s gaze: according to the optical law postulated already by Plato in the Timaeus (45b–46c), rays of vision are in fact rays of light emanating from the eye. Again, the cloud plays here the mediatory role of illuminating and transfiguring, yet this time not within the Pleroma, but in a liminal zone between the spiritual world and the dark realm of matter.

A similar intermediary position—but in this case between the ‘Ogdoad’ of the immortal beings and the ‘Hebdomad’ belonging to Ialdabaoth—is assigned to a cloud, the place of Sabaoth’s glory, in On the Origin of the World. The cloud appears “after the heaven, along with its earth, consolidated itself” (II 103:2–3), and after Ialdabaoth, blind in his ignorance, proclaimed himself a supreme god. Sophia’s reaction to Ialdabaoth’s impiety is twofold. Besides announcing the eschatological consummation of Ialdabaoth’s material realm, she also provokes an immediate repentance in Sabaoth, the son of Ialdabaoth. First,

She stretched out her finger and poured upon him some light out of her light... And because of his light, all the authorities of Chaos became jealous of him; and when they had become disturbed, they made a great war in the seven heavens. Then Pistas Sophia, seeing the war, sent seven archangels to Sabaoth from her light: they snatched him up to the seventh heaven and they stood firm in his presence as attendants. Furthermore, she sent him three other archangels and established the kingdom for him over everyone so that he might reside above the twelve gods of Chaos. When Sabaoth had taken up the place of repose in return for his repentance, Pistis also gave him her daughter Zoe together with great authority so that she might instruct him about all that exist in the Ogdoad. (II 104:3–31)

It is in the region between the seventh heaven and the ‘Ogdoad’ that Sabaoth subsequently creates his dwelling place, or dome, and, in front of it, “a throne upon a four-faced chariot called Cherubim,” whose description bears a strong resemblance to Ezekiel’s vision of the throne above the heavenly vault (Ezek 1:4–28, 10:1–5). Next, upon creating “a congregation of angels” along with “a first-born called Israel, ‘the man who sees God’,” Sabaoth establishes a ruling trinity in his heavenly court, himself sitting on his throne in the middle, with Jesus Christ, an ‘animate’ image of “the Savior above the
Ogdoad,” placed at his right, and with “the virgin of the holy spirit,” probably Zoe, upon a throne at his left (II 104:35–105:32). The episode of Sabaoth’s enthronement concludes with a summary description of his realm:

He sits upon a throne of light in a great cloud\(^{21}\) that covers (σκεπάσσε) him (it). And there was no one with him in the cloud except Sophia Pistis, instructing him about all the things that exist in the Ogdoad. (II 106:3–8)\(^{22}\)

As already pointed out, the association of the cloud of Sabaoth with the motifs of light and a throne is a literary and theological commonplace in ancient Judaism, from Ezekiel’s vision to early Merkabah speculations. Another commonplace in the story of Sabaoth, one which it shares with the Gospel of the Egyptians and the Apocryphon of John, is the conjunction, already established by Sirach, between Sophia and a cloud, the privileged medium of her epiphany. In the previously quoted passage from the On the Origin of the World, Sophia Pistis, as well as her daughter, Zoe, also called the “virgin of the holy spirit,” is said to reside in a great cloud along with Sabaoth. In addition, Sophia seems to bear responsibility for the appearance of Sabaoth’s cloud; for it is by her pouring of some light upon Sabaoth, and by her act of dispatching the archangels, that the kingdom of Sabaoth (II 104:23–25)—that is, his place of repose (II 104:25–26) and his cloud—became established.

\(^{21}\) Painchaud (1995) 167 renders ἐν τῷ ἄμωμεν τῷ οὐμόσι Οὐσία τῷ Οὐσία τῷ κλαύλας ἐκ σκεπάσσε τῷ οὐ-κλοόλε ἐκσκεπάσσε τῷ οὐ-κλοόλε ὑπὸ τοῦ κλοόλε ὑπὸ τοῦ κλοόλε as follows: “Et c’est sur un trône recouvert d’une grande nuée lumineuse qu’il est assis.” I follow Bethge–Layton (1989) 47 and Funk (1995) 51, who take οὐσία as an attributive term modifying οὐφοροσ. As noted by Emmel (1981) 142–43, the mark of attribution τοῦ is sometimes omitted before the indefinite determiner οὖ- or words in initial οὖ, viz. οὐσία, but only when this οὖ is realized as a glide /w/. Painchaud (1995) 327 admits that “la construction de cette phrase est curieuse. On attendrait quelque chose comme οὐγοσ τῷ κλαύλας τῷ οὐγοσ.” Painchaud’s proposition τοῦ οὐγοσ τῷ οὐσία τῷ κλαύλας presupposes (i) the omission of the adverbial τοῦ; (ii) simplification of the vowel pair οὐογ in οὐ-οὐογι, and (iii) a “curious” variant of inverted attributive construction, one in which οὐσία, a common gendered noun, acts as an attributive term preceding the noun it modifies—the role generally assigned to genderless common nouns.

\(^{22}\) The contrast between the claim that “there was no one with him in the cloud except Sophia Pistis” and the previous elaborate description of Sabaoth’s heavenly “congregation” (ἐκκλησία) suggests the conflation of different redactions in this episode; cf. Painchaud (1995) 327.
The function of a great cloud in the *On the Origin of the World* is to separate and to ‘cover’ (σκεπάζειν)—to “set Sabaoth apart from the darkness and summon him to her [Sophia’s] right” (II 106:11–13), to protect him from the powers of chaos, and to raise him from his inferior position to the upper limits of the material world. Besides serving as an intermediary between the two contrasted realms of light and darkness, the cloud of Sabaoth also protects its beneficiary from the powers of darkness (matter) and conceals the glory of his kingdom.

The same twofold role of a cloud—its power to hide and protect as well as to illuminate and transfigure—plays an important role in the *Apocryphon of John*, most notably in the Savior’s reinterpretation of the Biblical story of Noah and the flood (II 28:32–29:15; III 37:14–38:10; BG 72:12–73:18):

And he [Ialdabaoth] repented of all things that he had come to be by his agency; again he plotted to bring down a flood (κατακλυσμός) upon the human creation. But the greatness of the light of Forethought (πρόνοια) taught Noah, and he preached to all posterity, that is, the children of humankind. And those who were alien to him did not listen to him. It is not as Moses said, ‘they hid (匠) in an ark’ (κιβοτός)—rather, it was in a certain place (τόπος) that they were hidden (匠; III, BG σκεπάζει) not only Noah, but also many other men from the immovable race (γενεά). They went into a place (τόπος) and were hidden (匠; NHC III and BG σκεπάζει) within a luminous cloud; and he [Noah] recognized his absolute power (σαθεντία). And with him was she who belongs to the light, who illuminated them because he [Ialdabaoth] had brought darkness down upon the whole earth.

As in several other places in his revelatory narrative, the Savior here contests the Genesis version of the early history of humankind. Contrary to what Moses said, Noah did not receive instruction from the god of the Old Testament (Gen 7:7 κύριος ὁ θεός). Rather, it was the greatness of Forethought—or the Afterthought of Light (BG 72:16; cf. III 37:19–20)—that came from above to instruct Noah

---

23 The Savior’s version of the Genesis story of the flood and Noah opens with a reference to Gen 6:6 καὶ ἐνεθυμήθη ὁ θεός ὅτι ἐσοφνεν. The verb ἐνεθυμήθη, whose meaning was an object of dispute between Philo (Deus 34 “the thought stored up in the intellect) and some “careless inquirers” (ibid. 21 “the creator repented of the creation of men” ἐπὶ τῇ γενέσει τῶν ἐνθρόπων ὁ δημιουργός μετέγινο), is rendered in all three redactions as ἁυθ-φ-τή-ω, in a manner that would have pleased Philo’s ‘literalist’ opponents.
and have him rescue the spiritual seed. Clearly, Moses was not aware of the true significance of the events he described—he had been made blind like “the whole creation (κτίσις), “so that the deity above them all might not be recognized” (II 28:27–9) and they might not discern the spiritual meaning behind the material symbolism of Noah’s ark. Moses’ condition is thus similar to those “who have not known to whom they belong,” whose souls were “weighed down” by the counterfeit spirit, “cast into a deep sleep” of forgetfulness, and imprisoned into bodies by Ialdabaoth’s authorities. Moses’ cognitive state resembles Adam’s “ecstasy” (ἐκστασις), which the Apocryphon of John describes in terms of ignorance and oblivion—the state that Adam had to endure before the messenger from the superior realm “uncovered the veil placed upon his heart,” so that “he became sober out of his drunkenness of the darkness” (BG 59:20–21; NHC III 30:1–2). Moses is a blind prophet of Ialdabaoth, himself a blind creature “stupefied in his madness” (II 10:26) and “without acquaintance of where his strength comes from” (II 11:21–22). Moses’ incompetence as an interpreter of primordial events is ultimately due to the distorted perspective of his master—more specifically, to Ialdabaoth’s unawareness that he is only an instrument, and not the principal cause, of creation. What escapes both Ialdabaoth and Moses, his exemplary prophet, is that the history of humankind unfolds at two separate levels: (1) the material level, governed by Ialdabaoth and his authorities (destiny or ἐνεργεια, and physical time), whose ‘history’ Moses recorded in a chronological order; and (2) the spiritual level, exemplified in the figure of Sophia, whose representatives occasionally come into contact with the material world in order to recover the divine power stolen by Ialdabaoth.

Just as there is the hand of a hidden, superior master “pulling the strings” (cf. Tert. Adv. Valent. 18: velut sigillario extrinsecus dextu) in the puppet theatre of Ialdabaoth’s world, so is there a higher meaning hidden behind the literal reading of the Mosaic account of creation. According to the texts traditionally labeled as ‘Gnostic’, the interpretive key for uncovering that hidden meaning sometimes came from the Savior’s revelations issued during his public career on earth or in the wake of his resurrection (vita gloriosa). Sometimes, paradoxically, it came from individual sayings and oracles in the Septuagint, spoken by the prophets of Yahweh–Ialdabaoth, yet, as some ‘Gnostics’ believed, not issued from him. Rather, it was Sophia, the Logos, or some other members of the Pleroma, who spoke occasionally through
the mouth of various Biblical “prophets, priests, and kings” (Iren. *Adv. haer.* 1.7.3), and sometimes even through their ruler:

The Logos used (χρήσθω) him [i.e. the intermediate Ruler] as a hand in order to beautify and work on that which is below, and used him like a mouth in order to say things which will be prophesied. (*Tri.Trac.* I 100:30–35)

The *Apocryphon of John* appropriates the same theory of the multiple authorship of Jewish scripture. The existence of the spiritual realm, for example, finds its confirmation in Yahweh’s recurrent self-proclamations as a “jealous god” beside whom no other god exists (Exod 20:5; Deut 5:9; Isa 45:5–6, 46:9):

In uttering this, he signified to the angels attending him that there is another god. For if there were no other, of whom would he be jealous? (*II* 13:9–13; cf. *BG* 44:15–17)

The distant realm of light also shines through the obscure language of Adam’s prophecy in Genesis (2:23): “This now is bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh. For this reason, man will leave his father and his mother and cleave to his wife, and they shall together become one flesh” (*II* 12:10–14; *BG* 60:5–11; *III* 30:5–10). This oracle, which Adam uttered at the sight of a woman (Eve) beside him, announces the final συντέλεσις—the annihilation of a fragmentary human existence (male and female) and the restoration of a primordial, androgynous unity within the Pleroma.

Another similar prophecy of a more sublime nature is God’s commission of Isaiah as the messenger of tribulations awaiting his people (6:10). Isaiah’s terrifying portrayal of the exalted suzerain ordering severe punishment for a morally corrupt Zion serves a double purpose in the Savior’s revelatory narrative. On one hand, it demonstrates the tyrannical character of Yahweh–Ialdabaoth. On the other, it helps to uncover the true meaning of Yahweh’s casting a deep sleep (*.assetsiwi*) upon Adam in the Genesis story of creation (*Gen* 2:21).

Not as Moses said, “He made him asleep,” but he veiled his sensations (*a.evthsia*) with a veil and weighed him down with insensitivity (*a.novsithsi*a). Indeed, he said through the prophet, “I will weigh down the ears of their hearts, so that they may not understand and may not see.” (*BG* 58:16–59:5; *III* 29:4–11; *II* 22:20–28)

The presence of a higher reality is paradoxically confirmed by the sayings of those separated from it by the veil of ignorance. This
means that even prophecies of the Jewish scripture prove the legitimacy of the ‘Gnostic’ worldview. As argued in the *Apocryphon of John,* it was not by his own design that Yahweh blew some of his spirit into Adam’s face (Gen 2:7). Rather, it was because of the advice given by Sophia and five luminaries, the agents of the Pleroma, that Ialdabaoth decided to share some of his spirit with the first human being—not his own spirit, in fact, but some of “his mother’s power” he had previously stolen. Similarly, it was not a rib, “as Moses said,” that the ruler of this world extracted from Adam while creating a woman. Rather, it was “a part (μέρος) of his power” (II 22:33) that he wanted to extract from Adam’s rib and restore it for himself. This same exegetical method is next applied to the flood story:

> [It is] not as Moses said, “They hid in an ark (κιβωτός),” but she [the greatness of Forethought, which is the Afterthought of the light] hid (σκέπάζειν) him in a place (τόπος)—not Noah alone but men from the immovable race. They entered a place (τόπος) and were covered (σκέπαζε) with a luminous cloud (ὑπ’ΟΥΣΙΑΝ Ἡ-ΟΥΟΙΗ). (BG 73:4–12; III 37:22–38:5; II 29:6–12)

As in the case of his interpretation of Adam’s “ecstasy,” the Savior probably got the idea to assimilate the Biblical ark (κιβωτός) with a place (τόπος) and a “luminous cloud” in his cross-referential reading of the structurally compatible Septuagint passages. In this particular case, he seems to have associated Yahweh’s box (κιβωτός) from Numbers (10:33), which guided Moses and his people, with the column of cloud (ἐν στύλῳ νεφέλης) leading (ηγεῖτο) them on their way out of Egypt, from Exodus (13:21). He also appears to have linked the motif of a cloud that covers and hides (καλέπτειν, σκιάζειν), the symbol of Yahweh’s glory, with the “place” (τόπος) where Yahweh will “shelter” (σκεπάσω) Moses “with his hand” while passing by in his glory (Exod 33:21–22).

Like Moses in Exodus, so Noah and his followers also “entered a certain place (τόπος), and were covered (σκεπάζει) with a luminous cloud” (BG 73:10–12; NHC III 38:3–5). Here, too, the cloud reveals its traditional twofold aspect, of protecting and transfiguring. It protects from the darkness which Ialdabaoth had brought down upon earth by “hiding” within itself the privileged members of the human race; and it transfigures by “illuminating” Noah and the immovable race with the light of knowledge, so that they managed to “recognize the lordship (αἰθεντία, τήτιτ-χοιεις) from above” (III 38:5–7; cf. BG 73:12–14; II 29:12–13).
To conclude, various texts traditionally labeled as ‘Gnostic’ draw on the Biblical symbolism of a cloud in its twofold function or aspect: (i) that of hiding, in its interior, the glory of a transcendent deity (separating aspect); and (ii) that of covering, or overshadowing, some external object (e.g., box, mountain, earth, water, human being) in order to illuminate it and change its ontological status (mediatory, creative aspect). The only novelty these texts bring to the Biblical motif is the widening of its application. In a complex and hierarchically organized ‘Gnostic’ universe, a cloud becomes the vehicle of numerous divine epiphanies at all levels of a multi-layered reality. At the spiritual level, it appears in some narratives as the cloud of Mirothea. At the animate level, again, it manifests itself as the cloud of Sabaoth or Ialdabaoth, with Sophia, Zoe, or “the virgin of the holy spirit” residing in it. Finally, in the material realm, it is the cloud of the luminous Afterthough (ἐπίνοα), disguised under the material appearance of an ark (χίβωτός).

Both aspects of the Biblical image of the cloud are present in the Sophia–Ialdabaoth episode of the *Apocryphon of John*. By surrounding her miscarriage “with a luminous cloud,” Sophia illuminates this dark deformity and transfigures it into a ruler by granting it a throne (“she put a throne in the midst of the cloud”) and a name (“she called it Ialdabaoth”). Sophia’s cloud is nothing but the “cloud of light” already encountered in the *Gospel of the Egyptians* (III 56:26–57:21) and in *On the Origin of the World* (II 103:2–106:19). But this is also the cloud that hides the future demiurge and the ruler of the visible realm so that, as the *Apocryphon of John* puts it, “no one may see him except the holy spirit (ἄγιον πνεύμα), which is called Life (ζωή), the mother of all” (BG 38:9–13; III 15:18–21; II 10:16–18)—just as, in *On the Origin of the World*, “there was no one with him [Sabaoth] in the cloud except Sophia Pistis” (II 106:3–8).

In its twofold aspect of illuminating and hiding, the luminous cloud of the *Apocryphon of John* is thus associated with both Sophia and Ialdabaoth. As a symbol of liminality, it represents the place (τόπος) where the light of the Pleroma (Sophia) encounters the darkness of material chaos (Ialdabaoth). And, like other Biblical symbols and motifs in their ‘Gnostic’ reinterpretation, it carries at once two separate meanings: the material or ‘literal’ meaning, signifying the glory in which Yahweh–Ialdabaoth appeared to Moses; and the spiritual or ‘figurative’ meaning, expressing Sophia’s illuminating and transfiguring power. Moses’ account remains confined to the level of mate-
rial symbols. The spiritual level discloses itself through the Savior’s exegesis, which is nothing but the elucidation of Sophia’s veiled oracles in Sirach, Baruch, Proverbs, and the Wisdom of Solomon.

Finally, in the context of the narrative organization, the episode of Sophia’s “harnessing” her abortion in a luminous cloud stands as a transitional point toward the story of Ialdabaath’s creation of the visible realm. The cosmogonic process cannot take place before Sophia’s original product, a “dark” miscarriage, acquires creative power (light), authority (throne), and identity (name). While Sophia’s desire to generate and her subsequent production of a theriomorphic mutant represent the violation of the intra-Pleromatic harmony, her act of placing the ugly miscarriage in the cloud creates the necessary condition for the movement of the plot—it introduces into the story the agent whose role is to entail, and preside over, the cosmogonic process and the subsequent history of humankind. In this sense, the luminous cloud is not only the vehicle of transformation initiated by Sophia, but the symbolic expression of the situation that immediately precedes creation of the material universe. The luminous cloud is the dwelling place of Ialdabaath’s glory, before he begins to fabricate the visible universe—in the manner of a luminous cloud from various magical spells, wherein God “the Father” is said to have been “hidden (ἦν) before fabricating anything (Πηγετεῖα Θεία άθανάτω):

I adjure you, Yoriel, by the luminous cloud (τῇ ἔνας ἠγείρετε) that is with the father, in which he was hidden before fabricating anything; whose name is Marmarami, the great One, the place of the spirit of Adonai Eloei, the allmighty. (A. M. Kropp, Ausgewählte koptische Zauber-texte 1.69, 2.181, 3.45)

It is I who am Jesus Christ—I took a chalice of water in my hand and called upon it by the name of Marmaroi, the power standing before the Father, the great power belonging to Barbaraoth, the [right] forearm of Baraba, the luminous cloud (τῇ ἔνας ἠγείρετε) standing before Iao Sabaoth. (ibid. 1.47–48, 2.57–58)

I invoke, Gabriel, by the great honored virgin [Marmaroi, Marmarami], in whom the father was hidden from the beginning, before fabricating anything, that you come to me today. (ibid. 1.74, 2.187)

Ialdabaath the Villain

Ialdabaath now begins to act—he commits a theft, a typical act of villainy in traditional tales, and thereby introduces the complication in the movement of the plot.
This is the chief ruler (ἐρχώς): he took a great power (δύναμις) from (τοιχε ἐρως; II κι ωρος) the mother, retreated from her, and moved away from the place where he had been born. He embraced another place and fabri cated for himself an aeon (αἰεί) burning with a luminous fire, in which he is now; and he united with madness (ἀπόνοια), which is with him. (BG 38:14–39:6; III 15:22–16:6; II 10:19–27)  

The importance of Ialdabaoth’s villainous act for the actual movement of the story is confirmed by recurrent allusions to it later in the text, in all of its three redactions:

He [Ialdabaoth] divided between them some of his fire, but he did not send forth any of the power of the light which he had taken from (ἐν ἑτει) his mother (II 11:6–9; cf. BG 42:13–17; III 18:12–15).  
Not that he had seen the incorruptible ones, but the power in him, which he had taken from (ἐν ἑτει) his mother, had begotten in him the image of the ordered world. (II 13:1–5)  
But when she [Sophia] saw the evil (κακία) that had come to happen, and the theft that her son had committed (πεί ἐντα σθένε), she repented (μετανοεῖν). (II 13:21–23; BG 45:10–13)  
Now when the arrogant one [αἱραται] had taken power from the mother, he was ignorant of many things surpassing his mother. (BG 45:20–46:3; cf. II 13:26–29)  

One passage in the narrative, however, does not identify Ialdabaoth’s acquisition of his mother’s power with theft, claiming instead that Sophia “wanted to retrieve the power that she had given (τσοι ἐντας ταν) to the chief archon” (II 19:15–16; BG 51:2–3). What this act of “giving” most likely alludes to is the preceding episode, in which Sophia surrounded her miscarried offspring with a luminous cloud and thereby provided it with a power to create (light), authority (throne), and personal identity (name). In light of this passage, Ialdabaoth’s immediate reaction, a theft, appears somewhat...

---

24 Cf. Irenaeus’s summary, Adv. haer. 1.29.4: virtutem autem magnam abstulisse eum a matre enarrant et abstulisse ab ea in inferiora et fecisse firmamentum caeli, in quo et habitare dicitur.  
25 In NHC III and BG, the passage comes later in the narrative (BG 42:13–17; NHC III 18:12–15): “He shared with them some of his fire (BG only: “that belongs to him”), and some of his power, but of the pure light, that is (BG has instead: “of”), the power that he had detached (NHC III κισκετάλοκο κισκεθίν; BG has the Coptic equivalent ταρσ ἐρως) from the mother, he did not bestow on them any.”
confusing: how could he steal, or take away, what he was previously given? One way to solve this anomaly is to posit the mechanical conflation of two originally independent variations on the same theme—the loss of a portion of spiritual power into the hand of an extra-Pleromatic being. The probability of this assumption can be tested by the following synoptic comparison:

**Episode One**
BG 38:1–12 (II 10:11–18)

She cast it away from her, outside those places so that no one of the immortals might see it; for she had begotten it without acquaintance.
She harnessed it in a luminous cloud.
She placed a throne in the midst of the cloud, so that no one might see it except the Holy Spirit, which is called Zoe, the Mother of all.

**Episode Two**

He took a great power from the mother, retreated from her, and moved away from the place where he had been born.
He embraced another place and fabricated for himself an aeon, burning with a luminous fire, in which he is now.

In *Episode One*, the initiative for action belongs to Sophia. She casts away her dark abortion outside of the Pleroma and harnesses it in a luminous cloud—that is, she hides it from the sight of the immortals and, at the same time, provides it with a luminous power that will enable it to fabricate. Sophia’s transfiguration of her formless miscarriage comprises two additional acts: she places a throne in the midst of the luminous cloud and thus transforms it into a ruler; and she gives it a name, Ialdabaoth, thereby providing it with personal identity. In *Episode Two*, the perspective has changed. Now it is Ialdabaoth who plays the role of an agent and imposes his point of view on the narrative. He takes a great power from his mother, moves away from the Pleroma where he was born, and, with the help of the power taken from his mother, fabricates a luminous, fiery realm in which he still dwells.

The preceding synoptic comparison reveals a number of similarities in content and structure between the two episodes. Both episodes highlight the moment of a spatial transgression, of the transference out of the Pleroma. In the first, Sophia transfers her offspring out of the invisible realm; in the second, Ialdabaoth transfers himself out of the place where he was born. Another common feature is the acquisition of the divine power by Sophia’s offspring. But while in *Episode One* Sophia acts by means of a luminous cloud and Ialdabaoth
is just a passive recipient of Sophia’s gift, the roles are reversed in *Episode Two*, to the point that it is now Ialdabaoth who plays the role of an agent and commits a theft in order to acquire the power. The two episodes are thus related to each other by structural inversion—in fact, a double inversion, first with regard to the relation between the dramatis personae (active subject vs. passive recipient), and second with respect to the sequence of actions (transgression—giving the power vs. stealing the power—transgression). Finally, both episodes bring about a similar outcome. In the first, the outcome is a luminous cloud, the replica of a fiery cloud from Ezekiel’s vision (Ez 1:4), the dwelling place of Ialdabaoth’s glory; in the second, the result is a fiery aeon in which Ialdabaoth dwells. But whereas Ialdabaoth’s fiery aeon is the product of his own creative effort, in the case of a luminous cloud it is Sophia who bears responsibility for its apparition. The following diagram displays the structural homologies between the two episodes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Episode One</th>
<th>Episode Two</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>(I) In the Pleroma</strong></td>
<td><strong>(II) Outside of the Pleroma</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agent:</strong> Sophia</td>
<td><strong>Agent:</strong> Ialdabaoth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action:</strong> Casting Away (B)</td>
<td><strong>Action:</strong> Stealing Sophia’s Light (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action:</strong> Moving Away (B)</td>
<td><strong>Action:</strong> Fabrication the Fiery Realm (C)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The two consecutive episodes in the plot of the *Apocryphon of John* appear thus to be equivalent not only in their content and structure but also in their narrative function. It is therefore hardly surprising that other ‘Gnostic’ accounts of creation considered these two variants of the same theme—the loss of a portion of divine power and its transference out of the Pleroma—as mutually exclusive. Irenaeus, for example, in his summary of the doctrine of Barbelognostics, which provides a cosmogonic account strikingly similar to the Savior’s in the *Apocryphon of John*, does not even allude to Sophia’s giving up some of her power to Ialdabaoth.

After that, moved by simplemindedness and kindness, she [Sophia Prounikos, Holy Spirit] generated a work in which there were ignorance and audacity. They claim that this work of hers was the first ruler, the fabricator of this creation. But they tell us that he took a great power from his mother, moved away from her to the lower
On the other hand, Ialdabaoth’s theft is not so common a theme in the extant ‘Gnostic’ narratives and the heresiological reports thereof. Besides the Apocryphon’s versions and the above quoted Irenaeus’s summary of the Barbelognostic myth, the theme occurs in the Pistis Sophia, as well as in Epiphanius’s report on the sectarian book ‘entitled Noria,’ where the heroine, Noah’s wife, sets out to recover “the parts stripped off (τὰ συληθέντα) from the superior mother by the
ruler who created the world” (Pan. 26.1.9). More often, it was Sophia, and not Ialdabaoth, whom the Gnostics blamed for the creation of the visible universe. As for Ialdabaoth, he figured as a mere instrument (‘that—through—which’, δ’ο’ω) of creation—an ignorant ruler manipulated by his mother, the actual triggering cause.

Why did the author of the Apocryphon of John decide to concatenate both variants and shift the focus from Sophia to Ialdabaoth, at the risk of introducing inconsistencies and creating redundancy in the Savior’s revelatory narrative? First, as has been already noticed, a continuous oscillation between the two levels at which the creation story unfolds—the material one, governed by Ialdabaoth, and the animate one, presided over by Sophia—is the pivotal point of the author’s narrative strategy. Second, the author desired to clear Sophia, the heroine in the story, of any direct involvement in the material creation, making Ialdabaoth primarily responsible for creation on account of his villainous theft. Similarly to many other narratives traditionally labeled as ‘Gnostic’, the Apocryphon of John represents Ialdabaoth as an ignorant demiurge who, in order to fabricate the world out of matter, requires the presence of some superior power. In this case, however, Sophia does not seem personally involved—she does not fabricate the world by means of an inferior agent, by imprinting in his soul the images of the invisible reality. As the Savior states in the longer version of the Apocryphon, it is rather “the power in him, which he had taken from his mother,” that “had begotten in him the image of the ordered world” (II 13:2–5).

Pleromatic villain, the story concerns the duel in cunning, played out between the arrogant villain (αδδονα) and his superordinate, Sophia. Albeit a victim, Sophia is ultimately responsible for the chain of ensuing tragic events—the violation of the initial order results from her desire to overcome her rank, to move up to the height “without her consort, take the light, and create of it for herself luminous aeons.” Sophia’s deceitful plan is recompensed by her submission to the villain’s deceit—that is, by her mistaking the semblance of light in the dark ‘chaotic’ substrate for its original source in the Pleroma.

---

27 See the previous note and the discussion on the “luminous cloud” in the previous section, chap. 3, pp. 160–71; see, in addition, Ptolemy’s version of the Valentinian cosmogony (Iren. Adv. haer. 1.4–5) which portrays the demiurge as “sur-reptitiously moved by the mother” (1.5.1); cf. also Clem. Al. Exc. Theod. 49.1–2, and the excellent analysis of the ‘Gnostic’ mediators by Orbe (1972) 265–301 and (1987) 1:180–82.

28 In Hippolytus’s account of the “Valentinians” (Ref. 6.33), Sophia acts as both
Finally, Ialdabaoth’s theft is introduced in the narrative to initiate the movement of the plot. This is the point in the story at which the actual intrigue begins. Ialdabaoth’s villainous act produces an insufficiency (Sophia’s “lack”) which, in its turn, entails the quest for the object (Sophia’s “power”) he has stolen and transferred to another place (Ialdabaoth’s aeon and, at the next stage of the story, the material world).

Related to the previous episode, in which Sophia surrounded her offspring with a luminous cloud and thereby transferred to it some of her “power” (the Pleromatic light), Ialdabaoth’s theft introduces a new movement in the story, bringing about the shift in emphasis from Sophia to Ialdabaoth. What originally might have been two hardly compatible versions of the same theme (viz., the acquisition of Sophia’s light by Ialdabaoth) become now two distinct moments in the sequential structure of the narrative—the preparatory action (Sophia’s illumination of her offspring) and the beginning of complication (Ialdabaoth’s villainy).

Whereas the preceding synopsis has shown how, under the apparent inconsistencies between the two episodes, there lie hidden numerous affinities in their structure and content, the following diagram indicates how the author of the Apocryphon of John managed to incorporate them both into the traditional narrative scheme of a folktale type: initial situation—violation—lack—quest—restoration of initial situation.29 By doing so, he introduced a series of important spatial distinctions in the description of the events preliminary to creation: (i) between Sophia’s miscarriage (primordial darkness, material substrate) and Ialdabaoth (the illuminated darkness, viz., the archon of a fiery realm); (ii) between the “place(s)” where Sophia miscarried her ugly product (the lower part of Pleroma) and “another place,” or “places,”—where she hid it (the luminous cloud); and finally, (iii) between the place to which Sophia removed her offspring (the superior part of the extra-Pleromatic realm) and the place into which

Ialdabaoth removed himself (the lower part of the region outside of the Pleroma, where the material creation will take place).

As a result, we have two almost identical sets of actions, one performed by Sophia and the other by Ialdabaoth, yet each occurring at two different levels of the cosmological model, and at two different stages of the cosmogonic process.

(I) IN THE PLEROMA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial situation 1</th>
<th>Sophia and her miscarriage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transgression 1</td>
<td>Sophia casts out her miscarriage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Agent: Sophia]

(II) OUTSIDE OF THE PLEROMA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gift/Enthronement 1</th>
<th>Sophia surrounds her miscarriage with a luminous cloud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial Situation 2</td>
<td>Ialdabaoth in the cloud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft/Violation</td>
<td>Ialdabaoth takes power from Sophia [Agent: Ialdabaoth]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgression 2</td>
<td>Ialdabaoth moves away from Sophia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Upper Part

| Enthronement 2 | Ialdabaoth embraces another place and fabricates his fiery realm |

Lower Part

Ialdabaoth the Demiurge

Ialdabaoth’s theft of Sophia’s power affects simultaneously both agents. Ialdabaoth “embraces another place” and becomes the ruler of the cosmogonic process, while Sophia, deprived of her original perfection, experiences “lack” (ἐξαιρέσις). From now on, the narrative will alternately follow the ‘villain’ and the ‘victimized heroine’—Ialdabaoth, engaging in creation of the material world and, later on, in the gradual enslavement of humankind; and Sophia, determined to restore the “lack” by recovering the light stolen by Ialdabaoth.

The story at first focuses on Ialdabaoth and takes his point of view. Upon obtaining his mother’s power and seizing a different place, Ialdabaoth begins to inform phenomenal reality by imitating

---

30 Ialdabaoth’s appropriation of Sophia’s light announces a shift in narrative perspective. As pointed out to me by Gordon Williams, the light stolen by Ialdabaoth stands for “the view point of Ialdabaoth. Sophia’s is that she ‘gave’, but Ialdabaoth misused it... When the transition is made to Ialdabaoth, the aspect changes and the narrator locates himself within the physical world where light is only derivative... and Ialdabaoth’s perception totally constricted.”
the superior model—in the manner of the Platonic craftsman, “according to the likeness of aeons that exist from the beginning” (BG 44:7–8; II 12:34–35), or “according to the likeness of the prototype which precedes him” (BG 39:16–18; III 16:13–14).

Yet Ialdabaoth’s initial acts of world production only partly overlap with the design of the intelligent demiurge from the Timaeus. He has neither a direct access to the ideal model nor a carefully designed plan for shaping the phenomenal world—for he is “dark and without acquaintance,” and “impious in his madness” (II 11:10, 18). Nor does he operate from conscious purposes like his Platonic counterpart: he does not begin by shaping the four primary elements, nor does he fit the world’s body into the frame of the rational world-soul (Tim. 69a–c, 31b–32c, 36d–e). Ialdabaoth’s first product is not the universe consisting of the four successive elements forming the concentric spherical layers, with fire in the outer celestial region and earth in the midst of this harmonious construction. Instead, Ialdabaoth first “fabricated (ταμιό) for himself an aeon burning with a luminous fire, which still exists” (BG 39:1–2; cf. II 10:24).

In the Timaeus, the genesis of the phenomenal world begins with the demiurge giving a distinct configuration to a constant flux of elemental qualities “by means of shapes and numbers” (53b), and thus forming the four primary elements. These elements are subject to the everlasting process of transformation—upwards from water to fire, and downwards from fire to water—due to the dissolution and recombination of their constituent units, the mathematical figures of triangles. This version of elemental change postulates the hierarchical arrangement of the elements, with fire as the most refined and active of all, and not, as is the case with the Apocryphon of John, the chronological priority of fire over the other elementary bodies. The fiery world of Ialdabaoth points thus to another source, whose origins can be traced all the way back to the vitalist cosmology of the Stoics.

According to the Stoic model, the world comes into being through the change in volume and in density of a continuous corporeal substance (prime matter) and, in its initial stage, consists exclusively of fire. This change results from the activity of god or pneuma. Blending with prime matter, god causes this bare and unqualified substrate to expand, transforms it into fire, and “has the whole substance as its controlling principle” (Origen, C. Cels. 4.14). Chrysippus describes this phase of the world cycle in his lost work On Providence as the
state in which “the cosmos is fiery throughout” and “is simply its own soul and controlling principle” (Plut. De Stoic. rep. 1053b). The subsequent stages of the cycle, from the conflagrational phase to a gradual differentiation of fire into the remaining three elements, represent thus a self-transformation of god in his changing relationship with the original bare substance.31

Apart from the fieriness of Ialdabaoth and his realm, other features of the cosmogonic process in the Apocryphon of John display much less affinity with the Stoic cosmology. The Savior agrees with the Stoics that the duration of the world-order is finite, but he neither alludes to an everlasting recurrence of natural processes nor describes further cosmic stages by differentiating fire into three other elements on the basis of their increased density (hot air–moisture–earth).32 The ensuing sections of his revelatory account are not concerned with elemental change, but with the demiurge’s organization of the fiery realm. At this point, the sequence of events begins to coincide anew with the narrative line of the Timaeus, moving from (i) the plane of the Zodiac to (ii) the Planets, including the Sun and Moon, and ending with (iii) the stars of the sky. To this hierarchically arranged outline of celestial entities the longer redaction of the Apocryphon of John will also supply the list of the decans, the constellations occupying thirty-six segments of the celestial circle, and of the pentads representing the seventy-two stars that preside over the Egyptian weeks of five days. Such an amalgamation of two originally independent systems, zodiacal and decanal, traditionally attributed to the legendary Egyptian astrologers Nechepso and Petosiris (Firm. Mat. Math. 4.22.2), signals a gradual lapse from the ‘scientific’ discourse of astronomy to the realm of popular astrological speculations.33 As


32 See Arius Didymus’ summary of Chrysippus’s theory of elemental change: “First there is the change from fire into air by contraction, second, from this into water, and third, into earth when the water contracts proportionately even further” (Ar. Didym. fr. 21 = SVF 2.413). The process is of course reversible.

33 Firm. Mat. Math. 2.4: “Each sign is divided into three parts, and each part has one decan. . . . In addition, the decans themselves are allotted to individual planets, so that if the planet should be in that decan, even though it is in a strange sign, it is considered as being in its own sign. . . . Certain [astrologers], wishing to explain
the contours of Ialdabaoth’s universe begin to take shape out of the fiery blaze, one becomes increasingly aware of its oppressive character, of the negative influences exerted by the planets and stars on the sublunary world, and of the inexorable laws of destiny to which these heavenly rulers will subject the human race.

The physical world emerging from the Savior’s presentation in the *Apocryphon of John* is a ‘mannerist’ construction peopled with demonic figures, which is organized around the following astrological assumptions: first, that the revolutions of celestial bodies are associated with time and its circular movement; second, that each segment of time is assigned to a particular heavenly body and its recurrent rhythm of rising and setting; and third, that the celestial sphere does not tolerate the presence of void, leaving no place empty of heavenly bodies. Twelve zodiacal constellations, seven planets, thirty-six decans, and their numerous attendants (*leitourgoi*) play thus the double role as units of celestial time (*chronocrators*) and cosmic space (*cosmocrators*). It is their role as the instruments of time that the Savior first sets out to examine.

Ialdabaoth begins to fill up his fiery realm by mating with Madness (*épÌnoia*)—in a grotesque imitation of the original union of God with his feminine consort Conception (*Ìnoia*) or Forethought (*prÌnoia*)—and by “engendering the authorities (*Ìxôsiai*) that are under him as the twelve angels, each of them unto its own aeon, after the pattern (*tÌpow*) of the incorruptible (*êfyartow*) aeons” (BG 39:4–8; cf. III 16:7–11). Translated into astronomical terms, he divides the circle of the ecliptic into twelve sections and assigns to each of them one of the twelve zodiacal constellations or signs. The individual signs are further divided, according to the text of the shorter redactions, into seven unequal fractions, each assigned to an angel—the total of eighty-four angelic attendants representing, in all likelihood, the stars rising and setting with the zodiac (*paranatellonta*). Ialdabaoth continues to create by allotting another three powers to each angel, this with more refinement, add three divinities each to every decan, which they call ‘attendants’ (*munifices*), that is, *Ìeitourgôi*; so that for every sign nine ‘attendants’ can be found and every decan is divided into three ‘attendants.’”

---

34 III 16:7–11 runs as follows: “He begot the authorities that are under him along with the twelve angels, and each of them as an aeon, after the pattern of the incorruptible ones.”
“so that all that belong to him are 360 angelic beings” (BG 39:13–15), each controlling a single degree of the zodiacal band (monomoiriai) and corresponding to the individual day in the yearly cycle. The division of the ecliptic into elementary units that mark off the regular periods in the revolving solar year—i.e., months, weeks, and days—is now completed. Taken as a whole, these units constitute the realm of Fate (eilarm°nh), or “the bond of forgetfulness,” representing the proportional ratio of “measures, times, and ages” with which Ialdabaoth will later bind “the whole creation” (II 28:21–32; cf. BG 72:2–10, III 37:6–13).

Ialdabaoth now proceeds to the creation of the planets within the zodiacal band: “And he established seven kings, each corresponding to the superior firmament, in charge of the seven heavens, and five over the depth of the abyss” (II 11:4–6; BG 41:12–15; III 17:17–20). The passage describes the distribution of the twelve zodiacal signs among the seven planetary rulers, effected according to the following astrological principles: first, that the celestial sphere is divided along the line of horizon into two hemispheres, diurnal and nocturnal; second, that the zodiacal constellations appear either as diurnal signs in the upper hemisphere (“heaven”) or as nocturnal signs in the lower hemisphere (“the depth of the abyss” II 11:6, “the chaos of the underworld” BG 41:15, “the chaos and the underworld” III 17:19–20); and third, that the signs of the zodiac are ruled by the planets which, with the exception of the Sun and Moon, have two

---

35 The computation leading up to the number of days in the yearly cycle—12 authorities (angels) + 12 aeons assigned to them + seven angels for each authority (84) + seven powers for each angels (252), i.e., “the total of 360 angelic beings”—is absent in NHC III, perhaps because the redactor considered the separation of the twelve authorities from their corresponding aeons as problematic. In NHC II, again, the creation of angels ruling over 365 days—an increase effected by the addition of the five intercalary days—occurs later in the narrative (II 11:22–26), following the appearance of the seven planetary kings, and is attributed to the “rulers” (αρχοντες) who seem to represent the seven planets, and not to Ialdabaoth and his “authorities” (εξουσίαι), or the twelve zodiacal signs: “And the (seven) rulers made seven powers for (each of) themselves, and the powers made six angels for each of themselves, until they amounted to 365 angels.” Yet the arithmetic calculation does not yield the desired number: 12 authorities, 7 archons, 49 powers, and 294 angels make up the total number of 362 astrological beings. The redactor’s computation can be “saved” by adding the demiurge’s three names—Ialtabaoth, Saklas, Samael (II 11:16–18)—taken as self-subsistent entities or hypostases. For various ways of dividing the zodiacal circle down to its single degrees, each ruled by an astrological entity (χρονοκράτωρ), see Bouché-Leclercq (1899) 216–218.
signs, one per each hemisphere, as their domiciles or ‘houses’ (οἰκοι) in which they exert an increased influence (οἰκοδεσπόται) and “rejoice” (χαρέων, gaudere).

Ialdabaoth’s command that seven kings rule over the same number of heavens and five over the fathomless abyss, or the chaos of the underworld, appears thus to stand for the allocation of the seven planets to their zodiacal domiciles (‘houses’). Five of the planets—Mercury, Venus, Mars, Jupiter, Saturn—are allocated to their double domicile, one in the upper or ‘diurnal’ hemisphere of the zodiacal circle, and the other in its lower or ‘nocturnal’ hemicycle. As for the remaining two, the Sun and Moon, they rule only one sign and have their single dwelling place in heaven. In the traditional system of ‘houses’, as recorded by Ptolemy, these signs are identified as Leo and Cancer.

Since of the twelve zodiacal signs the most northern, which are closer than the others to our zenith and therefore most productive of heat and warmth, are Cancer and Leo, they [i.e. previous astrologers] assigned these to the greatest and most powerful heavenly bodies, that is, to the luminaries, as houses—Leo, which is masculine, to the sun and the feminine Cancer to the moon. In keeping with this they hypothesized the semicircle from Leo to Capricorn to be solar and that from Aquarius to Cancer to be lunar, so that in each of the semicircles one sign might be assigned to each of the five planets as its own, one bearing aspect to the sun and the other to the moon, consistently with the spheres of their motions and the peculiarities of their natures. (Ptol. Tetr. 1.17 trans. Waddell)

The odd thing about the Apocryphon’s system is that the Moon, the luminary of night, appears to have its domicile in the diurnal hemisphere. The astrological model that may best account for this ‘anomaly’ is of a mixed Greco-Egyptian origin, and deals with the manner of constructing the world horoscope (thema mundi, mundi genitura). According to this model, attributed to the legendary astrologers Nechepso and Petosiris (Firm. Mat. Math. 3.1 Monat 15 = frag. 25 Riess), the celestial machine was set in motion by the demijure at the beginning of the Sothiac year—that is, at the time of the heliacal rising of Sothis, or Sirius, over the eastern horizon (Ascendant), when the Sun was in the middle of Leo, and the Moon in the middle of Cancer (Solem in Leonis parte XV, Lunam in Cancri parte XV, . . . horam in Cancri parte XV). The “seven heavens” of the Apocryphon of John should thus represent the seven zodiacal constellations that, in part
or completely, lie above the horizon: Cancer, Leo, Virgo, Libra, Scorpio, Sagittarius, and Capricorn.\textsuperscript{36}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.7\textwidth]{figure1.png}
\caption{Thema Mundi}
\end{figure}

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{36} Firm. Mat. \textit{Math.} 3.1: “They [i.e. Petosiris and Nechepso] set up the birthchart of the universe (\textit{mundi . . . genituram}) following Aesculapius and Anubis, to whom most powerful Mercury [i.e. Hermes] entrusted the secrets of this doctrine. They placed the Sun in the fifteenth degree of Leo, the Moon in the fifteenth degree of Cancer, Saturn in the fifteenth degree of Capricorn, Jupiter in the fifteenth degree of Sagittarius, Mars in the fifteenth degree of Scorpio, Venus in the fifteenth degree of Libra, Mercury in the fifteenth degree of Virgo, and the Ascendant [i.e. Horoscope] in the fifteenth degree of Cancer.” Firmicus does not discuss the positions of the planets vis-à-vis the remaining five zodiacal signs, an omission that is easy to rectify: Mercury in the fifteenth degree of Gemini, Venus in the middle of Taurus, Mars and Jupiter in the middle of Aries and Pisces respectively, and Saturn in the fifteenth degree of Aquarius. The model is an amalgamation of two different calendars: a tropical solar year beginning with the summer solstice, when the Sun is at the first point of Cancer, and the Egyptian sidereal year regulated by the heliacal rising of Sirius–Sothis in the middle of Cancer. For the \textit{thema mundi} see Bouché-Leclerq (1899) 182–92 and Boll–Bezold–Gundel (1931) 58–60.
The theory of planetary ‘houses’ also provides the best explanation for a few oddities in the Apocryphon’s list of the twelve zodiacal “authorities” and their corresponding planetary archons. In the shorter versions (BG 40:4–18, 41:16–42:8; cf. III 16:19–17:5, 17:20–18:7), this list runs as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zodiacal Authorities</th>
<th>Planetary Rulers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iaoth</td>
<td>Iaoth, the lion-faced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermas, “the eye of fire”</td>
<td>Eloaios, the donkey-faced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galila</td>
<td>Astaphaios, the hyena-faced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iobel</td>
<td>Iao, the serpent-faced with seven heads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adonaios</td>
<td>Adonaios, the dragon-faced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabaoth</td>
<td>Adoni, the monkey-faced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kainan–Kae, “the Sun”</td>
<td>Sabbataios, the face of a shining fiery flame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abiressine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iobel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmoupiael</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adonin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belias</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ‘anomalous’ division of the zodiacal band into two asymmetrical groups of the seven and five signs may also stem from the classification of the signs and their corresponding months on the basis of their respective ratios of daylight to night. Following this division of the zodiac by the celestial equator, the months in which the day is longer than the night belong to the ‘diurnal’ signs, from Aries to Virgo, and the remainder, in which the night prevails, to the ‘nocturnal’ zodiacal constellations, ranging from Libra to Pisces. According to Macrobius, who traces the classification all the way back to “the Assyrians and Phoenicians” (Sat. 1.21.1), the ‘nocturnal’ signs occupy the lower hemisphere (inferiora signa), identified with the underworld or the realm of Persephone (Proserpina), where the Sun, in its apparent yearly path round the Earth, seems to experience a “temporary death” (tamquam sole raptu mortis temporalis amisso et a Proserpina retento). Hippolytus (Ref. 4.50) attributes a similar interpretatio mythologica of the zodiacal classification to an unidentified ‘heretical’ commentary on Aratus, which distinguished between the ‘diurnal signs’ of the upper hemisphere (“a bear, lion, kid, waterman, Cepheus, and Andromeda”) and “the figures that have names given them in Hades” (τῶν ἐν “Ἄιδων ὁνομαζομένων εἰδώλων). Hippolytus’s opponents seem to have used the Greek form of the Zodiac, probably construed by Hipparchus and adopted by Aratus, which represented the sign Libra as the claws (Chelai) of the Scorpion. If this assumption is correct, there remain, strictly speaking, only five zodiacal constellations ruling over Hades or, as the Apocryphon calls it, “the depth of abyss” and “the chaos of the underworld”—that is, Scorpio, Sagittarius, Capricorn, Aquarius, and Pisces. Boll (1914) 68–77, argues that these five ‘nocturnal’ signs ruling the realm of Hades were conflated in the extravagant imagination of the anonymous author of the Revelation to John (Rev 9:1–12) into a horrifying vision of the locusts, “allowed to torture [people] for five months” (9:5) and having a composite appearance of “horses equipped for battle,” with “crowns of gold on their heads,” with “faces like human faces” and “scales like iron breastplates,” and with “tails like scorpions” (9:7–11). The problem is that,
The astrological doctrine of ‘houses’ (οἰκοί) has an important corollary: any conjoining of heterogenous astrological items (planets and zodiac signs, but also decans, parananatellonta, and astral leitourgoi or attendants) results in the blending of their respective peculiar properties. Each planet, for example, exerts influence over the zodiacal wheel or the decanal band by lending its particular shape (πρόσωπον, ‘mask’ or ‘face’), and even its name, to a sign or decan allotted to it. The converse often held true, too, depending on how each astrologer determined the causal relation between various astrological entities.38

Applied to the above list of the twelve authorities and seven archons, the rule explains many of its striking features: (i) the inclusion of a planet’s name (Hermes or Hermas) into the zodiacal list; (ii) the names (Iaoth, Adonaïos) shared by the signs and their planets; and (iii) the odd duplication of the name Iobel in the series of the zodiacal ‘authorities’, referring to two different signs—one in the diurnal and the other in the nocturnal hemisphere—allocated to a common planetary ruler.

Taken together, these oddities provide a sufficient number of clues to identify the zodiacal signs and planets hidden behind their mag-
ical names. Assuming that their order of appearance follows the arrangement of the planetary houses, that the reference to Harmas concerns not only the sign but also its governing planet, and that at least some of the planetary archons (e.g. Iaoth, the lion-headed planetary archon) appropriate a theriomorphic “mask” (prosopon) of the signs they govern (e.g. Leo, the Sun’s astrological sign), there emerges the following set of identifications:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Zodiacal Sign</th>
<th>Planet</th>
<th>Archon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iaoth</td>
<td>♌️ Leo</td>
<td>☉ Sun</td>
<td>Iaoth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermes</td>
<td>♉️ Virgo</td>
<td>☉ Mercury</td>
<td>Eloaios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galila</td>
<td>♏️ Libra</td>
<td>☉ Venus</td>
<td>Astaphaios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iobel</td>
<td>♄️ Scorpio</td>
<td>☊ Mars</td>
<td>Iao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adonaios</td>
<td>☉ Sagittarius</td>
<td>☉ Jupiter</td>
<td>Adonaios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabaath</td>
<td>♑️ Capricorn</td>
<td>☉ Saturn</td>
<td>Adoni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kainan–Kac</td>
<td>☉ Aquarius</td>
<td>☉ Saturn</td>
<td>Sabbataios⁴⁰</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abiressine</td>
<td>☊ Pisces</td>
<td>☉ Jupiter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iobel</td>
<td>☉ Aries</td>
<td>☊ Mars</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmoupiel</td>
<td>☉ Taurus</td>
<td>☉ Venus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adonin</td>
<td>♐️ Gemini</td>
<td>☉ Mercury</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belias</td>
<td>☊ Cancer</td>
<td>☊ Moon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

³⁹ Macrobius, Sat. 1.21.16: “The Egyptians call the sign of Leo the domicile of the Sun.” The tauroctonous Mithras is sometimes portrayed as the solar god with a lion’s face (Sol leonis vultu cum tiara, etc.) because “the ineffable sun treads down and curbs its principal sign, that is, Leo” (Lact. Plac. Schol. in Stat. Theb. 1.719–20). In a magical spell addressed to the sun god who, during his apparent path along the δώδεκαορος (the Egyptian circle of twelve hours), assumes twelve theriomorphic masks (PGM 4.1596–1715), the sixth hour has a leontine form: “In the sixth hour you have the form of a lion and your name is Bai solbai, the ruler of time” (1667–68); the most recent commentary on the spell is in Merkelbach (1990) 104–22. For the δώδεκαορος and its Egyptian origins see Gundel (1968) 4–8 and Gasse (1984) 189–227. A well-known ‘Gnostic’ adaptation of the δώδεκαορος-system is the series of twelve rulers with animal faces governing the “twelve chambers” inside “the great dragon of the outer darkness” in Pist. Soph. 317, 13–319, 23, on which cf. Boll–Bezold–Gundel (1931) 187–91.

⁴⁰ Sabbataios seems to relate to the Hebrew Shabbathai, the seventh planet or Saturn, as suggested by Michl (1962) 230 and Welburn (1978) 245. For other ‘Gnostic’ lists of the seven planetary rulers, see Orig. World II 101:7–102:7 and the ‘Ophite’ series in Iren. Adv. haer. 1.30.5 and Orig. C. Cels. 6.30. As noted by Broek (1981) 42, the most important difference between these lists and that of Ap. John is that “in the former Ialdabaoth, the demiurge, is one of the seven planetary rulers, whereas in the latter he stands above them as their creator”; this dissociation of the demiurge from the lesser gods is rightly attributed to “the influence of Plato’s Timaeus” (ibid.).
Clearly, the names of the archons do not fully correlate with the planetary order. In this arrangement, the same planet (Saturn) would belong to two different archons (Adoni and Sabbataios).\(^41\) The only satisfactory solution for bringing the names into correlation with the planets is to move Adonaios one place back in the list so that it rules the two homonymous signs (Iobel \(\text{μ} \) and \(\text{π} \)), and to relocate Iao, the seven-headed solar–lunar anguipede of Hellenistic magical papyri and amulets,\(^42\) to the last or lunar position—or even more disquieting discrepancies.

\(^41\) Besides, both methods of running the list of the planetary rulers down to the Moon—symmetrical pairing or mechanical repetition in reverse order—would raise even more disquieting discrepancies.

\(^42\) Iao appears to be the Greek transcription of \(\text{yhw} \), the abbreviated form of the tetragrammaton. His anguipede figure with the head of a cock, a lion, a jackal, or a man, is a common motif on magical amulets of the Hellenistic and Roman periods. Most of his iconographical attributes (serpent, lion, the whip of Helios) point to solar symbolism; cf. Goodenough (1953) 2:245–58 and 3:1078–115 (figures). On some engraved gems (figs. 1090–91), the field about the figure of Iao contains the Hebrew phrase \(\text{semes eilam} \) ‘eternal sun’. The anguipede Iao is often paired with, and even assimilated to, a considerable number of other deities, most of them with solar characteristics. One amulet (fig. 1096) shows a cock-headed anguipede, with the name \(\text{Iao} \) engraved on his shield, \(\text{Abraxas} \) in the field, and \(\text{Mithras} \) on the reverse; another (fig. 1096) presents the same anguipede, \(\text{Iao} \), with the Sun and Moon below his serpentine legs, surrounded by a series of Semitic-sounding magical names—\(\text{Iao Adonai Eloai Abraxas Ablanathanal} \)—and paired with a lion-headed god, engraved on the reverse of the amulet, with seven rays emanating from his head; another gem, again (fig. 1097), shows the ithyphallic lion-headed Iao with a pair of snakes in the place of legs, holding a torch and a whip in his hands. Whether juxtaposed or conflated in a single composite figure, the lion, Helios, and the anguipede were interchangeable stock-motifs in the portrayal of this ‘syncretistic’ version of the aniconic Jewish god. In magical spells, Iao figures either as the Supreme god with many names and powers or as one of god’s attending powers. In the \(\text{Prayer of Jacob} \) (PGM XXIIb), for example, he is the manifestation of the supreme “Father of all powers” who “[sits upon] the sun as Iao” (4–5, 13); but in the Vienna papyrus K 192, published by Stegemann (1934) 12–14 and magisterially analyzed by Polotsky (1937) 119–27, Iao is the first emanation of the universal god and the highest among the seven planetary powers, represented by the first horizontal row of a \(\text{plinthon} \) (magical ‘square’) as a string of seven alpha-vowels. The seven-headed serpentine \(\text{prosòpon} \) of Iao in the \(\text{Apocryphon of John} \) probably illustrates a similar idea—that of the ruling Sun, the most powerful of all planets, encompassing in itself all other planetary archons. Polotsky (1937) 123–24, supplies additional evidence for Iao’s dominant role in the visible universe: Epiphanius’s report on the ‘Gnostics’ (\(\text{Pan.} \) 26.10.1) and the London Oriental Ms. 5525 (Kropp 1930, 1:16 = C 38–39), where Iao presides over the seven archons, as well as the Michigan papyrus Inv. 4932 f (Worrell 1935, 185) and the London Oriental Ms. 5987 (Kropp 1930, 1.25 = D 89–92), where he is promoted to the rank of “God almighty” (\(\pi\nu\tau\omicron\omicron\kappa\omicron\rho\omicron\tau\omicron\omicron\pi\omicron \)) wearing manifold, most often the total of seven, animal ‘masks’. The Michigan love charm contains the invocation of a deity, most likely Iao Sabaoth (2–3), “whose head is in the heaven and the feet in the abyss, his front being the face of a sheep.
better, have Iao trade place with Iaoth, possibly the substitute for Athoth, a variant of the Egyptian lunar god Thoth, who occupies the initial slot in the longer version of the Apocryphon. The latter solution is Welburn’s (1978) 255–75, who, however, does “not believe that Athoth has any connection with Thoth” (250), as suggested by Giversen (1963) 210. Welburn does not provide a persuasive evidence for identifying Athoth, the longer version’s substitute for Iaoth in BG and Aoth in NHC III, with the Moon. For Tardieu (1984) 278–79, Athoth is “probably” a transcription of of the Semitic *athaḥ, ‘ram’—an appellative turned into a proper name and assigned to Aries, the sign from which the zodiac was commonly held to begin. Since Tardieu does not discuss the astrological theories of planetary ‘houses’ and πρόσωπα, it remains unclear how the name ended designating one of the planetary archons. Besides, etymological deciphering of magical names may not be the best way to deal with the ancient magicians’ ingenuity in evolving their Semitic-sounding names and formulas. Like many other magical deities, Athoth could also be the product of a sorcerer’s creative wordplay—more specifically, an instance of the gradual increase, or decrease, in the length of the magical name or word which, in its pre-modified form, denoted the identifiable referent. This technique of cumulative variation could easily explain such derivative forms of Iao as Iav, Iavb, Iavl, all recorded in Coptic magical texts; such variant spellings as αλδαβαυ, αλδαβαυ, ιαοθ, among others.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Zodiacal Sign</th>
<th>Planet</th>
<th>Archon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iaoth</td>
<td>♌ Leo</td>
<td>☀ Sun</td>
<td>Iao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermes</td>
<td>♉ Virgo</td>
<td>♅ Mars</td>
<td>Eloais</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galila</td>
<td>♎ Libra</td>
<td>♃ Venus</td>
<td>Astaphaios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iobel</td>
<td>♍ Scorpio</td>
<td>♉ Mars</td>
<td>Adonaios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adonaios</td>
<td>♎ Sagittarius</td>
<td>♄ Jupiter</td>
<td>Adoni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabaoth</td>
<td>♒ Capricorn</td>
<td>♃ Saturn</td>
<td>Sabbataios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kainan–Kae</td>
<td>♒ Aquarius</td>
<td>♄ Jupiter</td>
<td>Adoni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abiressine</td>
<td>♈ Pisces</td>
<td>♄ Jupiter</td>
<td>Astaphaios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iobel</td>
<td>♉ Aries</td>
<td>♃ Mars</td>
<td>Adonaios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmoupiel</td>
<td>♉ Taurus</td>
<td>♃ Venus</td>
<td>Astaphaios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adonin</td>
<td>♈ Gemini</td>
<td>♃ Mercury</td>
<td>Eloais</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belias</td>
<td>♊ Cancer</td>
<td>♀ Moon</td>
<td>Iaoth (NHC II: Athoth)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Plainly, this is a hypothetical reconstruction, which brings the signs and their correlated planets into full agreement with the astrological theory of planetary ‘houses’. Yet all extant versions of the *Apocryphon* fall short of such a perfect arrangement, keeping the solar Iao entrenched in his central position among the planetary archons. Thus, in spite of adopting the birthchart of the universe (*Thema Mundi*)—one which presupposes the classic ‘Pythagorean’ order of the planets with the Sun coming second after the lowly Moon—they all retain the solar Iao in the fourth lot, in accordance with the ‘Chaldaean’ order.\(^{44}\) This simultaneous application of two hardly compatible planetary orders prompted each redactor to make different jottings, which later insinuated themselves into the tradition. The results of such tampering are visible in the following synopsis of the names and animal-masks (*prosopa*) attached to the planetary rulers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athoth (sheep or ram)</td>
<td>Aoth (lion)</td>
<td>Iaoth (lion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eloaiou (donkey)</td>
<td>Eloaios (donkey)</td>
<td>Eloaios (donkey)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astaphaios (hyena)</td>
<td>Astaphaios (hyena)</td>
<td>Astaphaios (hyena)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iao (seven-headed serpent)</td>
<td>Iazo (serpent and lion)</td>
<td>Iao (seven-headed serpent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabaoth (dragon)</td>
<td>Adonaios (dragon)</td>
<td>Adonaios (dragon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adonin (monkey)</td>
<td>Adonin (monkey)</td>
<td>Adoni (monkey)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabbede (shining fire)</td>
<td>Sabbadaios (shining fire)</td>
<td>Sabbataios (shining flame of fire)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Apart from minor varieties in spelling in all three redactions and the substitution of Sabaoth for Adonaios in the longer version (NHC and \(\text{\u039b}\)\(\text{\u03a8}\)); and such an alternation of vocalic prefixes as in \(\text{\u039b}\)\(\text{\u03a8}\), \(\text{\u039a}\)\(\text{\u03a8}\), and \(\text{\u0391}\text{\u0390}\)\(\text{\u0390}\) (Test. Sol. 18.16 P, Mc Cown 54). For other examples in Coptic magical papyri see Kropp (1930) 3:28–30 and 129–39; for a variety of formal techniques applied to magical spells consult Versnel (2002) 130–41. As for the connection of the Egyptian god Thoth and the Moon, the coupling of his name with the moon-good Iah (Sah. \(\text{o}\)\(\text{o}\), \(\text{\u0392}\)\(\text{\u0392}\), Old Coptic \(\text{\u0392}\)\(\text{\u0392}\)) is, according to Griffiths (1970) 458, “unequivocal” and can be dated as far back as the New Kingdom; cf. Plutarch, *De Is. et Os.* 41, 367D–E, who reports on the Egyptian story in which “Hercules, making his seat in the sun, goes around it, and Hermes [i.e. Thoth] does the same with the moon; for the affaires of the moon are like those of reason and wisdom, while those of the sun are like blows inflicted with might and main.”

\(^{44}\) Ptolemy also adopted the ‘Chaldaean’ order, notwithstanding its incompatibility with the theory of the planetary houses. The ‘Pythagorean’ order, better known as ‘Egyptian’ among ancient astrologers, resembles Plato’s exposition of the system of planetary revolutions in the *Timaeus* (38c–39d). In Macrobius’s words (In *Somn. Scip.* 1.21.27), “It must be noticed here that, regarding the birthchart of the universe, it was either the providential order of things or ancient ingenuity that gave to the planets the same order which Plato assigned to their revolutions; cf. Bouché-Leclercq (1899) 185–86 and Armisen–Marchetti (2003) 198–200.
II), the most interesting disagreements pertain to the treatment of the first and fourth archons. One shorter redaction (BG) distinguishes them by form, the former carrying the mask of a lion and the latter that of a seven-headed serpent, yet assigns to each the variants of the same name: Iaoth and Iao. The other shorter version (NHC III) distinguishes them by name, Aoth and Iazo, but has them both partake in the leonine form; thus, Aoth has the “face of a lion,” while Iazo, an alternative spelling of Iao, wears a composite “mask of a lion and a serpent,” well attested in magical objects and formulas. Finally, the redactor of the longer version, determined to dispel any confusion, assigns to each planetary ruler not only a different name—that is, Athoth, which may be an incantatory variant of the lunar Thoth, and Iao—but also a distinct form, of a sheep (or ram) and of a seven-headed serpent respectively.

Similar lists of the planetary archons appear in other narratives traditionally labeled as ‘Gnostic’, in contemporary heresiological

45 Like Iaoel, Iaoth is just another Semitic-sounding variant of Iao with the characteristic ‘magical’ suffix -oth, probably construed by analogy with Sabaoth. In some spells, the name denotes the supreme deity (PGM V 141, 476); in the Jewish Testament of Solomon, however, it represents one of the ‘thwarting angels’, capable of restraining and rendering powerless the cohort of decanal demons: “The ninth [demon] said, ‘I am called Kourtael. I send four colics into the bowels. If I should hear, ‘Iaoth (Sabaoth H), imprison Kourtael’, I retreat at once’” (18:13 McCown 53). In Rossi’s ‘Gnostic’ tractate (Kropp 1930, 1:70 = R 9, 21–22), Iaoth is one in the series of proper names denoting a divinity “seated in the heights”: ὁ ἄγιος ὁ ἁγιασμένος ὁ ἀρχιάγγελος ὁ κυρίος ὁ θεός ὁ πατήρ ὁ ἐξωκόσμων ὁ κύριος ὁ θεός. Tardieu (1984) 278–79 explains the change of Iaoth for Athoth in BG by the redactor’s ignorance of the latter name, and Welburn (1978) 252 by the similarity of the ‘Chaldaean’ and ‘Egyptian’ sequence of the planets, the former commencing with the Moon and the latter with the Sun: “The initial name in these would be Athoth and Iao(th) respectively, and no doubt soon brought in chaos.” But the anguipede Iao was affiliated with both the Sun and Moon, as pointed out by Goodenough (1953) 249 and 254, so it may be that the distinction Iao–Iaoth was introduced to separate these two affiliations.

46 Aoth is not the scribal error but a variant of Iao–Iaoth. The name occurs on a lead tablet from the Roman cemetery of Hadrumentum, in a spell addressed to the spirit of a deceased person and to its master, the god of Israel: “I adjure you daimonion spirit who lies here, by the holy name Aoth Aboath, you the god of Abraham and Iao, the god of Jacob, Iao Aoth Abaooth” (Merkelbach 1996 XII transl. Gager 1992, no. 36, 112–15). See also PGM V 133 (“Aoth Abraoth Basym Isak Sabaoth Iao”) and XII 118 (“I am going to say the great name, Aoth”). Blau (1987) 102–5 and Merkelbach (1996) 118 derive the name from Sabaoth; yet Aoth seems rather a typical product of the ancient magicians’ taste for wordplay, variation, rhyme, and repetition. For the magical technique of cumulation and alliterative variation see supra, n. 41. For the epenthesis of ‘zeta’ in Iazo cf. Philonenko (1979) 301–2.

47 The longer redaction’s substitution of a sheep’s face (ἐκόοο) for a lion’s (ἵουτι, ἱοῦτι) is explained by Giversen (1963) 221 as an attempt to dispel the semantic
reports on heterodox cosmographies, in Hellenistic Jewish writings, and in magical amulets and papyri. The stable element in these lists is the triad Iao–Sabaoth–Adonai(os), apparently a fixed incantatory formula. The names of the remaining archons vary from one list to another. Horaios, for example, is absent from the Apocryphon’s list, whereas Ialdabaoth either occupies the first position in the series or, as in the Apocryphon of John, stands above the archons as their creator and ruler. The lists thus combine Jewish theophoric names found in the Hebrew Bible with Semitic-sounding nomina barbara—the move that, in the eyes of ‘mainstream’ Christian theologians, had some troubling side-effects. The assemblage of traditional Hebrew appellatives of God and the sorcerer’s incantatory words could easily lead toward associating Judaism with illicit magical practices. What

ambiguity inherent in the word ΜΟΥ, a homonymous term applying to both ‘lion’ and ‘ram’; but see Crum (1939) 161a, who states that the ΜΟΥ, ‘ram’, can be found only in the place-name ΜΟΥ. The motive lying behind this substitution may not have been purely linguistic. In the Michigan love charm (Mich. Inv. 4932) edited by Worrell (1935) 185 (cf. supra, n. 40), a deity that pervades the whole world, probably identical with “Iao Sabaoth” from the opening lines of the charm (2–3), is portrayed as having his front in the face of a sheep and his back in that of a serpent” (13–14): ἐπι-αἰ-μο-ο-ι ο ο-α-λ-ε-ο-ο-ι ο ο-α-λ-ε-ο-ο-ι ο ο-α-λ-ε-ο-ο-ι. In addition, the figure of a sheep is found engraved on two magical amulets, both recorded by Kopp (1829) 4:5–7, 216–18, the first of which was given the label Iao; cf. Goodenough (1953) 288, who finds this association of the sheep and Iao “quite inexplicable.” The association is most likely of Egyptian provenience: Plutarch states in his On Isis and Osiris (4, 352C and 72, 380B) that Egyptians venerated the sheep for its usefulness. As pointed out by Griffiths (1970) 547, however, “the sheep-deities are hard to come by,” in contrast to the well-attested “ram-deities embodied in Amûn and Khnum.” Since the Coptic noun εὐκού is gender-unmarked, it may denote both ‘ram’ and ‘sheep’. The problem is that neither ‘sheep’ nor ‘ram’ appear as animal-prosopa of the Moon; and there is no version of the houses of the planets where Aries figures as the dwelling place of the Moon.


49 See Broek (1981) 42 and n. 15.
is more, it could turn the appellatives expressive of God’s peculiar qualities into a series of proper names that indicate unique individuals. This is precisely the issue that Origen takes with the ‘Ophite’ list of the planetary archons (C. Cels. 6.32–33).

It is necessary to realize that those who composed these things confused everything without any understanding of the art of magic or any clear idea of the divine scriptures. From magic they took Ialdabaoth, Astaphaios, and Horaioi, and from the Hebrew scriptures they took Iao Ia, as called among the Hebrews, and Sabaoth, Adonaios and Eloaios. But the names taken from the Bible are titles (ἐπώνυμα) of one and the same God; but this God’s enemies did not understand, as even they admit, thinking instead that Iao was one god, Sabaoth another, and Adonaios, whom the scriptures call Adonai, a third besides, and Eloaios, whom the prophets call in Hebrew Eloai, yet another.

For “God’s enemies,” as Origen calls the ‘Ophites’, Sabaoth, Adonaios, Eloaios, Iao, etc. are the proper names revealing the essential identity, or the proper substance (οὐσία), of the individuals they designate. For Origen, in contrast, only ‘God’ deserves the status of a proper name, or a name in the strict sense (κύριον ὄνομα), denoting a unique individual constituted by a peculiar concurrence of stable qualities. As for Sabaoth, Adonaios, Iao, or Eloaios, they do not have the function of proper names—they are eponyms, or titles, which the ancient grammarians defined as the class of names “applied together with another, proper name, to a unique entity.”

Eponyms stand half-way between common and proper names. They can be predicated of several items (e.g. φοίβος, ‘bright’), yet they also have “the power of proper names” (δύναμιν ἔχων κυρίου Schol. Marc. in art. Dion. 391, 29 Hilgard)—that is to say, they can counterpredicate with the proper name they qualify and reveal its inherent property (e.g. Φοίβος ὁ Ἀπόλλων).

The grammarians’ claim that eponyms, notwithstanding their capacity to designate unique objects, do not lack in descriptive or connotative content, made the way wide open for Irenaeus to ‘translate’

---

50 Dion. Thrax, Ars. gramm. 12, 38.3–5 Uhlig. Dionysius provides two examples for the class of ‘eponymous names’: Ἐνοσίκθθον (‘Earth-shaker’) Poseidon and Φοίβος (‘Bright’) Apollo. The passage runs as follows: Ἐπώνυμον δὲ ἐστι, ὃ καὶ διῶνυμον καλεῖται, τὸ μὲθ’ ἐτέρου κυρίου καθ’ ἐνός λεγόμενον, ὡς Ἐνοσίκθθον ὁ Ποσειδῶν καὶ Φοίβος ὁ Ἀπόλλων.
the Semitic-looking names of the planetary archons into a set of common nouns or adjectives revelatory of God’s inherent properties (Adv. haer. 2.35.2–3).

As for the others who are falsely called ‘Gnostics’, who say the prophets made their prophecies from various gods (1.30.11), they are easily refuted by the fact that all the prophets proclaimed one God and Lord as Creator of heaven and earth and everything in them, and that they announced the coming of his Son, as we shall prove from the scriptures themselves in the subsequent books. Now if anyone should oppose us on the ground of the various Hebrew expressions (dictiones) placed in the Scriptures, such as Sabaoth and Eloë and Adonai and others of this sort, trying to prove from them that there are various powers (virtutes) and gods (deos), they must learn that all such terms are signifiers and titles (significationes et nuncupationes) for one and the same entity. In fact, the word Eloë in Hebrew means ‘true God’ and Eloëuth means ‘that which contains all’. Adonai sometimes means ‘unnamable’ and ‘admirable’, while sometimes, with a double delta and an aspiration, i.e. Haddonai, it means ‘He who separates the earth from the water so that the water cannot rise up against it’. Similarly Sabaoth with omega in the last syllable means ‘voluntary’, while with omicron it means ‘first heaven’. Just so, Iaôth with omega means ‘fixed measure’, while with omicron it means ‘he who puts evils to flight’. And all the rest are titles (nuncupationes) of one and the same entity, such as ‘Lord of Hosts’, ‘Father of All’, ‘God Omnipotent’, ‘Most High’, ‘Lord of Heavens’, ‘Creator’, ‘Maker’, and others similar to these. All these are eponymous titles (nuncupationes et pronomina) not of separate entities but of one and the same being, by means of which the one God and Father is revealed, the one who contains all and who provides existence to all.

The same issue of the semantics of proper and common names seems to lie behind a curious passage in the Apocryphon about the two sets of names allotted to the planetary rulers. First, the longer version (II 12:11–33):

And in his thinking, he [Ialdabaoth] mixed the seven powers with the authorities (ἐξουσίαι) subordinate to him; as he was speaking, they came to exist; and he assigned a name to each power beginning (ἄρχεις) from above:

First is goodness (χρηστότης), with the first, Athoth; second is providence (πρόνοια), with the second, Eloai; third is divinity (ἡμιτιμιουτε), with the third, Astraphaio; fourth is lordship (ἡμιτιμιουτε), with the fourth, Iao; fifth is kingship (ἡμιτεροσει), with the fifth, Sabaoth; sixth is zeal (κορ), with the sixth, Adonein; seventh is intelligence (ἡμιτιμιουτε), with the seventh, Sabbateon.
And each of these has a firmament (στερέωμα) corresponding to each acon–heaven. On the one hand (μὲν), they were given names after the glory of the heavenly ones for the [destruction of the] power[s]; on the other hand (δὲ), it is in the names given to [them by] their first begetter (ἄρχιγεννητῶρ) that they exercise power. And (δὲ) the names given to them according to the glory of the heavenly ones exist for their destruction and their powerlessness; and so they have pairs of names.

Ialdabaoth’s pairing of powers (δυνάμεις) and ‘authorities’ (ἐξουσίαι) bears clear sexual connotations. The seven powers, all of them abstract feminine nouns in the Greek original, are united with the seven male authorities in Ialdabaoth’s attempt to imitate the ‘syzgies’ of aeons in the Pleromatic realm. The clearest expression of this doubling of archontic names along gender lines is the Nag Hammadi treatise On the Origin of the World (II 101:23–102:3), which asserts that the seven archons who “appeared in chaos [are] androgynous: they have their masculine names [Sambathas, Iao, Sabaoth, etc.] and their feminine names [providence, lordship, deity, etc.].” Surprisingly, the longer redaction of the Apocryphon plays down the androgynous identity of the planetary rulers and explains their two sets of names by bringing in the classic Platonist dichotomy, most clearly drawn in the Sophist (235e–236a), between two kinds of images (eidôla)—that is, between copies (eikones) and simulacra (phantasmata). The “names given after the glory of the heavenly ones,” which signify “the seven powers,” are the copies of God’s individual properties (aeons) endowed with an internal resemblance to their models. In contrast, the “names given by their first begetter”—that is, the proper names of the archons accompanied by their respective animal ‘masks’—are the products of the blind Ialdabaoth and his subversing imagination (φαντασία), bearing the character of dreamlike, subjective illusions and producing only an external effect of resemblance to their models. It is by

---

51 In this passage, the term ‘authority’ (ἐξουσία) is not the common name for twelve signs of the zodiac, as was the case earlier in the text; in this particular context it is plain that it signifies the planetary ‘rulers’ (ἀρχοντες) or ‘kings’ (βασιλεῖς).

52 Here is the hypothetical Greek list: χρηστότης πρόνοια θείας κυρίως βασιλεία κτητοπία σύνεσις. For the similar list in LXX see Isa 11:2 “The spirit of the Lord shall rest on him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and the fear of the Lord” (καὶ ἀναπαύεται ἐπ’ αὐτοῦ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ, πνεῦμα σοφίας καὶ συνέσεως, πνεῦμα βουλῆς καὶ ἰσχύος, πνεῦμα γνώσεως καὶ εὐσεβείας). See Orbe (1976) 1:76–81, and Schlütz (1932) 148–68.
means of the latter set of names that the planetary archons, disguised in their frightening theriomorphic appearances, “exercise power” in the visible word as the guardians of physical time (chronocra tors) and space (cosmocrators), as the implacable tyrants of destiny, and as the controllers of all aspects of human existence. The former set of names, on the other hand, assigned to the seven archons “after the glory” of the Pleromatic realm, “exist for their destruction and powerlessness.” The function of these names consists thus in revealing the distortive semblance of the archons vis-à-vis the spiritual model, and in exposing them, ultimately, in the eyes of the recipients of the Savior’s revelation, as false pretenders destined for “destruction” following the final deliverance of the human race from their tyrannical influence.

The shorter redactions explain the mystery of two sets of names in a somewhat different fashion, shifting the focus from the Platonist copy–simulacrum dichotomy to the grammarians’ distinction between proper name and appellative or common name.

53 Even the position of the passage in both versions is confusing, in that it follows immediately after the list of the twelve zodiac signs—in contrast with the longer redaction (II 12:25–33), which places the passage after the list of the seven kings and their respective powers. This could mean that, in the shorter redactions, the discussion of the double set of names refer to the zodiacal band. Later, however, both redactions use the phrase “names of glory” (BG 41:16, III 17:21)—clearly the reference to the set of names assigned “after the glories on high” (III 17:8–10), or “after the superior glory” (BG 41:3–4)—to designate the seven planetary archons.
semantics of proper names as opposed to appellatives or common names. The criterion of distinction, again, is the thesis borrowed from the Alexandrian grammarians:

A proper name (κύριον, scil. ὄνομα) is one which signifies a peculiar substance (τὴν ἱδιὸν οὐσίαν σημαίνων), e.g. ‘Homer’, ‘Socrates’; an appellative name (προσηγορικόν, scil. ὄνομα) is one which signifies a common substance (τὴν κοινὴν οὐσίαν σημαίνων), e.g. ‘man’, ‘horse’. (Dionysius Thrax, Ἀρν. γρ. 12, 33.6–34.2 Uhlig)

Proper names belong to a single item, common to a plurality. The former are called ‘proper’ or ‘dominant’ (κύρια ὄνομα) because, as pointed out by the scholiast ad locum (385.25–26 Hilgard), they “dominate (κυριεύει) a single existence (ὑπαρξίας) and substance (οὐσία) and denote it alone.” They reveal the true nature of the individual entity (‘Plato’) they designate, pointing to a property (ὁμοιότης) peculiar to it (Platonitas), whereas the latter, insofar as predicable of many things, have the status of either universals (‘man’) or accidents (‘wisdom’ or ‘vice’). Applied to the discussion about the double names of the planetary archons in the shorter versions of the Apocryphon, the proper names correspond to those “given after the superior glory,” which “designate their nature (φύσις) in accordance with truth (κατ’ ἀληθείαν),” and the common names to those derived from the “desire (ἐπιθυμία) and anger (ὀργή)” of Ialdabaoth’s irrational or appetitive soul, which is capable of producing, through its image-making power (φαντασία), only the distant semblances (φαντασμάτα) of God’s mental dispositions, or ‘aeons’. Eloaios, for example, is the name that designates the true nature (φύσις) of an individual archontic entity, whose peculiar property is the mask (πρόσωπον) of a hyena. The other name assigned to Eloaios “with regard to [Ialdabaoth’s] imagination and [Eloaios’s own] “power” is “Divinity,” which holds of him only secondarily, as an accident, while belonging primarily, as a peculiar property, to God in the Pleromatic realm. Eloaios is thus a possessor of ‘divinity’ of the inferior rank, the false pretender participating in God’s disposition in the same way in which degraded semblances participate in their distant models.54

54 Compare Eunomius’s distinction of names “in accordance with truth” (κατ’ ἀληθείαν) and “in accordance with human conception” (κατ’ ἐπίνοιαν ἀνθρωπινήν)
The shorter versions offer thus an interpretation of the two sets of archontic names that is directly opposite to that in the longer version. In the former, “the names given after the superior glory” are explicitly related to the proper names of the seven archons and their animal ‘masks’: “And the names of glory belonging to those in charge of the seven heavens are as follows: first is Iaoth, the lion-faced; second, Eloiaios, the donkey-faced,” etc. (BG 41:16–42:8; cf. III 17:20–18:7). In the latter, “the names given after the glory of the heavenly ones for the destruction of the powers” are the names of the seven powers (δυνάμεις) by means of which the planetary rulers participate in various spiritual dispositions inhabiting, in the manner of hypostasized acons, the Pleromatic realm. This is why the redactor of the longer version announces the list of the archontic names and their corresponding theriomorphic appearances (prosōpa) in a different way: not as “the names of glory,” but as “the bodies (σώμα) belonging to the names” (II 11:26).

To summarize: The physical world of the Apocryphon of John is a complex creation that binds together several cosmological models—a sort of palimpsest in which the underlying texts, albeit rubbed out,
still reveal their traces. Ialdabaoth’s fabrication of the visible universe functions as a radical revision of Moses’ account of the first, second and fourth day of creation (Gen 1:1–8, 14–19)—so radical, in fact, that, aside from some lexical affinities (e.g. “firmament,” “darkness,” “abyss” II 11:5–7; cf. BG 41:12–15) and Ialdabaoth’s two short addresses to his authorities, both taken from the Septuagint (Gen 1:26 and Isa 42–46), it seems totally disconnected from the Biblical narrative. In order to make up for gaps and errors in the Mosaic version of cosmogony, the author of the Apocryphon resorted to other compatible discourses—to contemporary astrological speculations, to the doctrines of Stoic and Platonist philosophers, and even to Plato’s cosmology in the Timaeus. From Stoic physics, he borrowed the fiery nature of god and the idea that, at the beginning of the cosmic cycle, the world is coextensive with the state of pure fire. From Platonic tradition he appropriated the chronological unfolding of cosmogony (zodiacal band—planets—time), as outlined in the first part of the Timaeus (36b–40b), as well as the metaphor of the demiurge fabricating in accordance with a preexisting rational model. Yet whereas Plato’s craftsman “looks to that which is always unchanging” (28a) in his goodness, for “in the good no jealousy (φθονος) in any matter can ever arise” (29e), Ialdabaoth is a “blind” and incompetent pretender, moved by the impulses of his irrational soul and therefore capable of producing only deceptive semblances of ideal forms. Finally, contemporary astrology provided the model of the world horoscope (thema mundi) and, more importantly, the overall ‘mannerist’ image of a multi-layered universe in which various concentric spheres, occupied by archons, authorities, angels, and demons, leave no space empty of bodies and no gap to escape the tyranny of physical laws implemented by the rulers of time (chronocrators) and space (cosmocrators). Here is perhaps the most detailed and vivid description of such a universe, as preserved in the dialogue between Hermes and his son Tat (Stob. frag. 6.3–6, 12):

Hermes: I told you elsewhere, my son, that there is a body encompassing all things. You must conceive the shape of that body as circular; for such is the shape of the universe. Tat: I conceive its shape as circular, just as you bid me, father. Hermes: And you must imagine that below the circle of that body are placed the thirty-six decans, between this whole circle and that of the zodiac, separating the one circle from the other—bearing up, as it were, the circle of the universe and delimiting the zodiac; and that, as they are moving along
with the planets, they exert, alternately, the same power as the seven (planets) in the revolution of the universe. Furthermore, they retard the all-encompassing body—for this body would move by itself with extreme velocity inasmuch as it encloses all things—yet, at the same time, they urge on the seven other circles because these move with a slower movement than the circle of the universe. Thus, both of these are borne according to necessity. Let us conceive then that the decans preside over the circles of the seven and the universal circle, and furthermore that they preside over all these as the guardians of all things in the world, holding all things together and watching over the order of all. . . . Moreover, in their heavenly course they [the decans] also generate their attendants, whom they hold as servants and soldiers. And these, mingled by the order of their superiors, are borne along floating in the ether, filling all the region of that element lest there be no place in heaven empty of stars; they contribute to the order of the universe having a force that is their own, yet subject to the force of the six and thirty.

“Let Us Make a Man”

The planetary gods of the Apocryphon of John are not just the controllers of physical time and space. They also act, later in the narrative, as Ialdabaoth’s collaborators in shaping Adam’s animate body and they do so “according to the image of God,” revealed to them in the primordial waters.

55 Planets have their domiciles not only in individual zodiac signs. Each planet also lends its properties and its outward appearance, or ‘mask’ (prosôpon), to one of the thirty-six decans, distributed equally within the zodiacal band—three to each zodiac sign. The best iconographical representation of such a blend of different astrological entities, and the clearest example of the theory of planetary ‘prosopa’ dominating individual decans and zodiac signs, is Tabula Bianchini, discussed in Boll (1903) 295–346, Gundel (1936) 178–79, 184–85, and plates 16–17, and in Nock-Festugièrè (1954) 3:xlv–xlviii. For the theory of planetary prosopa see Bouc’h-Leclercq (1899) 224–30, Gundel (1936) 248–56, and supra, n. 37.

56 The author of Ap. John takes two Genesis accounts of the creation of man not as variants but as two consecutive moments in cosmogony: while Gen 1:26–27 refer to the creation of Adam’s animate body, Gen 2:7 (“God molded the human being as dust from the earth, and he inbreathed onto his face the breath of life”) describes the formation of the empirical or ‘fleshy’ man. A similar distinction occurs in Philo, Opif. 134: “There is a vast difference between the man who has been molded now and the one who previously came to be after the image of God. For the man who has been molded as sense-perceptible already partakes in quality, consists of body and soul, is either man or woman, and mortal by nature. The man after the image is an idea or genus or seal, is attained by intellect, incorporeal, neither male nor female, and immortal by nature.” Yet whereas Philo’s distinction is based on the Platonic dichotomy between the intelligible model and its perceptible copy, the
The author of *Ap. John* applies to the two Biblical accounts another Platonic dichotomy, that between soul and body, taking Plato’s comment in the *Timaeus* about the ‘priority’ of soul over body in a literal or diachronical sense: “Now this soul, though it comes later in the account we are now attempting, was not made by the god younger than the body....But the god made soul prior to body and most venerable in birth and excellence, to be the body’s mistress and ruler” (34b–c). Just as the Platonic demiurge first creates the world’s soul with all of its concentric circles representing the movements of the planets and stars—the process that corresponds to Ialdabaoth’s formation of his realm peopled with archons, authorities, and angels—and only thereafter fits the world’s body into this construction, so will Ialdabaoth, who possesses the natural faculties of an animal’s soul and represents the soul-substance devoid of reason and intelligence, first mold an ‘animate’ human being, or Adam’s animate body, and only later fit it or, better, imprison it, into matter—the act that the versions of *Ap. John* designate as the second modeling ($\alpha\nu\acute{\alpha}l\lambda\acute{\alpha}p\acute{\alpha}t\acute{\iota}w$) after which the foundations of the abyss moved. And through the waters that are over matter ($\upsilon\eta$) the bottom [shone] by the revelation of his image (eikôn) that had appeared.

The blessed one ($\mu\alpha\kappa\acute{\alpha}r\acute{i}w$) revealed his image to them. And the entire rulership ($\acute{o}r\rho\omicron\omicron\nu\omicron\tau\omicron\acute{i}k\acute{t}i$) of the seven authorities ($\acute{\iota}\zeta\sigma\omicron\omicron\sigma\omicron\iota$) bent down ($\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\nu\gamma\eta\nu\epsilon\omicron$).

They saw in the water he form of the image (eikôn), They said to each other, “Let us fabricate a man in the image (eikôn) of God and the likeness.”

They fabricated out of themselves and all of their powers; they molded ($\pi\lambda\acute{o}ss\omicron\epsilon\nu$) a form ($\pi\lambda\acute{o}sm\acute{a}$) out of themselves. And [each] of the powers [fabricated] from its power the soul (ψυχή); they fabricated it from the image that they had seen by imitating (κατά μήμης) him who is from the beginning, the perfect (τέλειος) man. They said, “Let us call him Adam, so that his name and his power might become a light for us.”

And he (the Mother-Father) revealed his image; and the whole realm (αἰών) of the first ruler (πρωτάρχειν) trembled, and the foundations of the abyss moved. And when all the authorities ($\acute{\iota}\zeta\sigma\omicron\omicron\sigma\omicron\iota$) and the first ruler (πρωτάρχειν) looked, they saw that the whole bottom part shone; and by the light they saw in the water the form (τύπος) of the image (eikôn).

And he said to the authorities ($\acute{\iota}\zeta\sigma\omicron\omicron\sigma\omicron\iota$) attending him, “Come, let us fabricate a man after the form (τύπος) of God and after our likeness, so that his image (eikôn) might become a light for us.” And they fabricated by means of one another’s power, according to (κατά) the characteristics given to them. And each authority ($\acute{\iota}\zeta\sigma\omicron\omicron\sigma\omicron\iota$) supplied a characteristic in the form (τύπος) of the image (eikôn) that he had seen. He fabricated a subsistent entity ($\upsilon\nu\sigma\omicron\sigma\omicron\tau\omicron\acute{\alpha}t\omicron\acute{\iota}w$) after (κατά) the image of the perfect (τέλειος) first man. And they said, “Let us call him Adam, so that his name might become a luminous power for us.”}

Section 14:24–15:29
The story of cunning and deceit, as *Ap. John* sees the whole Biblical account of creation, Genesis 2:7 represents the duel of wits between the messengers of the Pleroma and Ialdabaoth and his host of rulers: first, Ialdabaoth is tricked into “blowing some of the spirit” (cf. Gen 2:7) he has stolen from Sophia into the face of the animate Adam (II 19:19–28; BG 51:8–20); next, acting in recompense for the loss and feeling envy at Adam’s acquisition of divine power, Ialdabaoth and his helpers molded Adam’s material body, or the material Adam (cf. Gen 2:7): “they brought him in the shadow of earth, in order to mold ($\pi\lambda\acute{o}ss\omicron\epsilon\nu$) him again out of earth, water, fire, and the spirit that derives from matter” (II 21:4–7; BG 55:2–7).
And the powers began (ἐρχέσθαι) from below: the first is divinity—it is a bone-soul (ψυχή); the second is goodness (χρηστότης); it is a sinew-soul (ψυχή); the third is fire— it is a flesh (σάρξ)-soul (ψυχή); the fourth is providence (πρόνοια)— it is a marrow-soul (ψυχή) and the entire foundation of the body (σῶμα); the fifth is kingship—it is a [blood]-soul (ψυχή); the sixth is intelligence (σοφία)— it is a hair-soul (ψυχή). And they ordered (κοσμεῖν) the whole body (σῶμα), and their angels (ἐγγέλω) attended them. From that which the authorities (ἐξουσία) had first prepared <they fabricated> animate (ψυχή) substances (ὑπόστασις), the harmony of the limbs (μέλος) and joints (ἀρμος).

The passage yields yet another example of the Apocryphon’s emulative use of the Mosaic narrative. The major source of signification here is Genesis 1:26, where, for the first time in the cosmogonic account, God is not alone responsible for his work. During the whole six-day period of creation, God acts on his own (Gen 1:1, 7, 16, 21, 25, 27, 31), yet in this particular verse, marked by a sudden shift to direct discourse, he uses the extraordinary plural form...
of the hortatory subjunctive: “Let us make (a) man in our image and likeness” (Ποιήσωμεν ἄνθρωπον κατ’ εἰκόνα ἡμετέραν καὶ καθ’ ὁμοιόμοιον). This puzzling plural stirred numerous debates among early Christian and Jewish exegetes, for rather obvious reasons: it posed a radical challenge to the legitimacy of absolute monotheism and its core assumption about God’s unity and omnipotence. Solutions to this puzzle ranged from intratextual (the plural “us” referring to products of God’s creation listed in the preceding verses of the Mosaic account of creation) and grammatical (“let us make” as plural of majesty) to explicitly intertextual. The last solution—grafting one text upon another—was most common. In this case, the obscurity of the Biblical verse was resolved by bringing in structurally homologous passages, individual works, or generic models borrowed from the dominant cultural discourses of the period: Jewish sapiental tradition (the plural “us” designating God and his Wisdom) and apocalyptic literature (God and the host of his angels), early Christological speculations (God and his creative Word, or Logos), Hellenistic astrology (God and the zodiacal signs, planets, decans), and, finally, Plato’s cosmological account in the Timaeus (the divine craftsman and his “younger gods”), often enriched by Stoicizing, Pythagorean, and Aristotelian transpositions.61 The revisionist interpretation of Gen 1:26 in the Apocryphon of John seems particularly indebted to Plato’s Timaeus, and specifically to the demiurge’s address to the younger gods, charged with the “task of making the generation of mortals” (Tim. 69c).

Now, take heed to what I declare to you. There are still three kinds of mortal creatures that have not been born. If these be not born, the heaven will be imperfect; for it will not contain all the kinds of living being, as it must if it is to be fully perfect. Yet if they came to exist through me and partook of my life, they would be equal to gods. In order, then, that mortal things may exist and this All may be really all, turn according to your nature to the fabrication of living beings, imitating my power during your generation. And insofar as it is appropriate that something in them should be homonymous with the immortals, being called divine and ruling over those among them willing to follow after justice and after you—that part, having sown it and brought it to existence, I will hand over to you. For the rest, do you, weaving mortal to immortal, produce living beings and bring them to birth;

---

61 For a brief yet detailed discussion of various Jewish and early Christian interpretations of Gen 1:26, see Alexandre (1988) 169–73.
give them food and have them grow; and once they fail, receive them back again. (41b–d)

In contrast with the *Apocryphon*’s narrative of the formation of Adam’s animate body, Plato does not identify God’s coworkers with the seven planets. The divine offspring of the Platonic demiurge comprises both “all that revolve before our eyes,” that is, the fixed stars and the planets, and “all that reveal themselves in so far as they will” (41a), signifying, in all likelihood, the anthropomorphic divinities of traditional religion. In the *Timaeus*, the planets serve as receptacles to the ‘fallen’ immortal souls, to which the generated gods will add the mortal or irrational parts, their bodily vessels, viz. individual organs, and the outward human frame. What might have prompted the identification of the younger gods with the seven planets is the section in the *Timaeus* where Plato ascribes to the demiurge and/or his helpers the framing of the seven successive layers of the human body: marrow, bones, sinews, flesh, skin, hair, and nails (73b–76e). The catalyst in this process was contemporary astrology—more precisely, astrological medicine (*iatromathematics*) and its doctrine of planetary *melothesia*.

The doctrine of *melothesia*, or the allotment of parts of the human body to various astrological entities, assumed numerous forms. A founding principle of astrological medicine, it postulated that the individual constituents of the human physique remain under the influence of celestial powers responsible for their formation. The identity of these powers varied from one astrological tract to another. Manilius allotted parts to zodiac signs, Ptolemy to planets, the legendary ‘Nechepso’ to decans, the allegedly Babylonian *Salmeschiaka* to seventy-two pentads, while the ‘Gnostic’ *Pistis Sophia* filled the womb of the woman, at the time of conception, with three hundred sixty-five “ministers” (λειτουργοί), “kneading the blood” and “building mem-

---

62 Throughout this section, Plato does not maintain the distinction between the demiurge and his fellow-workers, assigning the work sometimes to “the gods” and sometimes, again, to “the god”; cf. Cornford (1937) 279–80.

bers in the image of the body of the human being” (342, 4–344, 11 Schmidt).64

Other iatromathematical texts resorted to combining different kinds of celestial powers. In a fragmentarily preserved imaginary encounter (σύνοδος) of Plato with the Egyptian priest Peteesis, the latter communicates a version of astrological medicine that links parts of the bodily frame to the zodiac signs and vitals organs, the seats of senses and emotions, to the planets:

Peteesis: Listen! The Sun is the right eye, the Moon the left; the tongue, smell, and hearing belong to Hermes, the viscera to Zeus, the chest to Aries, the spleen to Aphrodite, the kidneys to Cronos, the head to the Ram, the neck to the Crab, the belly to the Lion, the cheek and loins to the Maid, the buttocks to the Balance, the seat to Scorpion, the...to Sagittarius, the nails to Capricorn, the calf of the leg to the Waterman, the extremities to the Fishes. (P. Ryl. 63, 3–12)

A similar blending of the zodiacal and planetary versions of melothesia characterizes the iatromathematical discourse of Hermes Trismegistus to Ammon (Hermet. Iatromath. 1.1–6, Phys. med. gr. min. 1:387). The doctrine of astral influence over humans stems here from the idea of an analogical relationship between man (microcosm) and the universe (macrocosm). As Hermes states it, “At conception the rays emanating from the seven planets mingle with each part of the human being, as is the case, too, with the allotment of the twelve zodiac signs at birth” (1.2–3). The head is assigned to Aries as a chieftain of all signs, and the seven sensory organs, all located in the head, to the planets: the right eye to the Sun, the left to the Moon, the ears to Saturn, the brain to Jupiter, the tongue and the palate to Mercury, smell and taste to Venus, and all bloody parts to the aspects of Mars (1.4–5).

Other combinations were in use, too,65 some of them involving the set of thirty-six decans or the related system of ‘pentads’, the


65 Another example of the blending of the planets and zodiac signs is CCAG VI
seventy-two stars in charge of the Egyptian weeks of five days. An illustrative example of this tendency to multiply bodily parts and to articulate the human body as a work without gaps is the longer redaction of the Apocryphon of John, where the “multitude of angels,” seventy-two in numbers, and the host of demons presiding over elementary qualities and irrational affections, all originally listed in the mysterious Book of Zoroaster and interpolated in the Savior’s revelatory account, continue the process of melothesia initiated by the planetary archons. Just as the celestial sphere cannot tolerate the presence of void, man, too, conceived as a perfect replica of macrocosm, must have his bodily frame completely filled with layers of volumes. The choice of a particular set of agents in charge of melothesia affected the ways of imagining the human body, of defining its essential constituents, and of determining their proper sequence. The above mentioned Book of Zoroaster, for example, had an ambitious program of listing three hundred and sixty-five celestial beings assigned to an equal number of bodily parts, organs, and emotional states—the program that betrays not only the ‘mannerist’ obsession with details but also a thorough knowledge of human anatomy. On the opposite pole stood the simplest versions of planetary melothesia, with their restrictive rule that each of the seven planets relate to one specific element or region in the human body (e.g. Hermippus)—the rule often cleverly superseded by applying the sevenfold division to the outward frame, to its internal content, and even to each of the exter-

---

83–84 Kroll (On the twelve signs of the zodiac, the seven planets, and the plants in sympathy with them); for the combined influence of the zodiacal band and the thirty-six decans on the human body see also CCAG VI 73–78 Kroll (On the decans belonging to the twelve signs).

66 The representation of melothesia as the act of filling the void of the bodily frame with volumes, all the way down to the infinity of smallest magnitudes, alternates with that of dismembering the original whole of the ‘spiritual’ body. See the fragment of a ‘Gnostic hymn’ in 1 Jeu 79, 7–26 Schmidt–Till), whose twelve ‘stanzas’ repeat the same praise of “First Mystery . . . who has caused Jeu to establish” the twelve aeons. The seventh praise goes as follows (79, 22–80, 3: “Hear me as I praise you, O First Mystery, who has shone in your mystery, who has made Jeu establish the seventh [aeon], and has set up archons and decans and attendants in the seventh aeon, whose imperishable name is Khazabraoza. Save all my members (melos nim nta) that have been scattered (nai etêoore ebol) since the foundation of the world in the archons and the decans and the attendants of the seventh aeon; gather them all together (sooyà-thy thr-oy) and take them to the light!”
nal and internal bodily parts. The arrangement of these constituents depended not only on anatomical considerations but also on the position of astral rulers in the celestial sphere. In the ‘Egyptian’ version of planetary melothesia, where the Sun occupies the middle, fourth position, the center of the human microcosm is reserved for the heart, the source of life-giving heat (Hermippus). In Ptolemy’s version, again, the body consists of two parts, right and left, one governed by the Sun and the other by the Moon, following the division of the celestial globe into the ‘diurnal’ (right) and ‘nocturnal’ hemisphere. To conclude with an instance of zodiacal melothesia, as put into verse form by Manilius, several parts of the human body seem to have been chosen as its essential constituents for their structural similarity with the iconography of specific zodiac signs: “Bull receives as of his estate the handsome neck; evenly bestowed, the arms to shoulders joined are accounted to the twins; . . . the belly comes down to the Maid as her rightful lot, . . . and over the feet the Fishes claim jurisdiction” (Astron. 2.453–65, trans. Goold).

Compared with the previous examples of melothesia, the framing of Adam’s animate body in the Apocryphon of John displays several distinctive characteristics. This is a rarely attested instance of the creative association of Plato’s division of the human frame with Hellenistic astrological medicine, resulting in the simplest form of planetary melothesia—one in which each of the seven planets belongs to one, and only one, bodily part. The sequence of Adam’s parts closely resembles that of the Timaeus, which starts from the marrow and then proceeds outwards, through the successive layers of bones, sinews, flesh, to the exterior parts—the skin, hair, and nails. Two important modifications are made to this list in the Apocryphon: first, the blood, which Plato viewed as a stream of nourishment for “the flesh and the whole body” (Tim. 80e) and not as bodily part, is substituted for the nails; and second, the marrow, man’s fundamental substance, no longer heads the list but occupies the fourth position. The relocation of the marrow was most likely prompted by astrological considerations—more specifically, by the adoption of the ‘Egyptian’

---

67 Arithmological speculations about the importance of the number seven provided an important impetus for such sevenfold subdivisions of the human body; see Philo, Opif. 117–25; cf. Manfseld (1971) 196–204, and Runia (2001) 260–66, 288–93.
planetary order that assigned the central position to the Sun, the source of the cosmic *élan vital*. The association of the Platonic series of essential bodily parts with the ‘Egyptian’ sequence of the planets leads thus to subordination of axial thinking to circular thinking—while Plato construed the body from the inside out along the rectilinear axis, the Savior emphasizes the relation of the geometric center to the circumference in a multiple-layered organism.

Who was the instigator of this astrological reinterpretation of Plato’s analysis of the human frame in the *Timaeus*? Did the author of the *Apocryphon of John* himself tamper with Plato? Did he simply adopt the jottings he had found in his copy of the *Timaeus*? Or did he use some doxographical manual, epitome, or medical handbook to ascertain the view of Plato in brief? Or did he have no direct access to the *Timaeus*? A strikingly similar, yet not fully identical, version of planetary *melothesia*, as recorded by the ninth-century A.D. Persian author Zadspram, seems to favor the presence of some intermediary source—that is, of some Hellenistic astrologer, or physician, who systematized Plato’s division of the human body and brought it into connection with the planets.\(^68\) However one might reconstruct this process of transmission, the existence of an intermediary doxographical source does not preclude the hypothesis of direct intertextual relations between the *Apocryphon of John* and the *Timaeus*, already demonstrated, by means of comparative narratological analysis, in the previous chapters. The reason why the Savior resorts to planetary *melothesia* is his global revisionist attitude, directed not only at the flaws of the Mosaic cosmogony but also at the limitations of Plato’s world-model.\(^69\) Just as the *Timaeus* is grafted unto the Biblical narrative not as a commentary, but as a subversive transformation, so Plato, too, becomes a phenomenon not to read, but to rewrite. If Moses could not even identify God’s fellow-workers, Plato failed to understand their tyrannical character, their negative power over humans, and their unfounded pretension *vis-à-vis* the spiritual world.

---

\(^{68}\) On the planetary *melothesia* in Zadspram’s *Selections* 30, 4–12 see Broek (1981) 48–50.

\(^{69}\) Compare, once again, Plotinus’s assessment of ‘Gnostic’ revisionism in *Enn.* 2.9 [33] 6: “And in general they falsify Plato’s manner of presenting the fabrication of the universe, and a great deal else, and degrade the man’s opinions as if they had understood the intelligible nature, but he and other blessed philosophers had not.”
In the *Timaeus*, the celestial divinities are assigned the task of shaping the human body and the mortal parts of the soul in order to make the world “perfect and complete” (41c–d), to bring rational design in the corporeal realm of “Necessity” (69a–d), and to free their divine parent from all responsibility for “the future wickedness” of mankind (42d). Their task, too, is to “govern and guide the mortal creature to the best of their powers, save in so far as it should be a cause of evil to itself” (42e)—that is, to turn men’s eyes to their orderly “circuits of intelligence in the heaven,” beneficial for “the revolutions of [their] own thought” (47b–c), and to help them reconstruct, in their own mind, the rational laws governing creation.

In the *Apocryphon*, on the contrary, the seven planets and other astral deities are no longer intelligent auxiliaries of the rational demiurge, but false pretenders serving the blind and aggressive craftsman, capable of producing only the external effects of resemblance—the *simulacrum*, a third-rank copy of the “form of the image” of the archetypal human being,70 as reflected in the primordial waters of chaos. In short, Ialdabaoth’s rulers and authorities in the Savior’s account stand in the same relation to Plato’s celestial gods as the external resemblance of deceptive apparitions stands to the exemplary similitude of good copies. Plato’s celebrated distinction between ideas, copies, and apparitions is thus effectively obliterated in favor of the duality of the original model and its distant *simulacrum*.

The rules governing the Savior’s interpretive technique in this episode have been laid out in my opening chapter.71 Taking as his hermeneutical model the rhetorical theory of issue (*status, constitutio, στάσις*), more specifically its *genus ratiocinativum* or analogous reasoning, he posits the obscure Biblical verse (Gen 1:26)—“Let us make

---

70 The archetypal man corresponds to “the holy and perfect (τέλειος) father” in the shorter versions (BG 48:1–4, III 21:22–24) and to “the holy and perfect (τέλειος) Mother-Father (μητροπάτωρ), the perfect providence (πρόνοια), the image of the invisible (ἀόρατος) Father of all” in the longer redaction (II 14:19–22). The longer version adds up yet another degree in the hierarchy of images—the “form of the image” which the archons see in the water is not a direct copy of the Father of the entirety, but of Barbelo, “the image of the invisible Father.” In this kind of elective participation in the foundational paradigm, the animate Adam is a possessor of the third rank in the shorter versions, and of the fourth rank in the longer redaction.

man in our image and likeness”—as the initial premise (propositio). To elucidate obscurities in Moses’ account of the creation of Adam, he first brings in the homologous sections from the *Timaeus* that deal with the creation of man, both of his sevenfold bodily frame and of the mortal parts of his soul, by the celestial gods subordinate to the demiurge. Plato’s text, in turn, also undergoes significant modifications—excisions, transpositions, amplifications—all effected through the intercession of the astrological discourse of planetary melothesia, which narrates the distribution of parts of the human body to the seven planets (rationis confirmatio). The relationship established between the premises is not that of mechanical juxtaposition but of partial substitution. The conclusion drawn from these premises (complexio), namely that the seven planetary rulers fabricated the seven parts of Adam’s animate body upon seeing the reflection of the ideal human type in the waters of primordial chaos, is a sort of palimpsest in which there still appear traces, some tenuous and some clearly visible, of all previous hands—Moses’, Plato’s, and that of an anonymous expert in iatromathematics.

---

**Moses:** “Let us make man in our image and likeness.”  
**Plato:** God orders heavenly gods to make man’s mortal soul and his sevenfold frame.  
**Astrology:** Seven planets create and influence different parts of the body and/or soul.  
**Savior:** Seven planetary archons fabricate seven parts of Adam’s animate body.

---

**Ialdabaoth the Jealous God**

The demiurge of Plato’s *Timaeus* was good—“and in the good no jealousy (ϕόβος) in any matter can ever arise; so, being without jealousy, he desired that all things should come as near as possible to being like himself” (29e). The only restriction imposed on his pur-

---

72 On Adam’s animate body see *supra*, n. 55. By distinguishing between the three kinds of Adam—spiritual, animate, and empirical—the author of *Ap. John* probably resorted to the same scriptural passages as Ptolemy (*Iren. Adv. haer. 1.8.3*), and especially to 1 Cor 2:14–15, 15:42–55. The same tripartition applies, too, to other aspects of reality: (1) to the macrocosmic level, which *Ap. John* divides into the intelligible realm, the heavenly sphere, and the sublunary world; (2) to different forms of cognition: intellection, opinion, sense perception, and (3) to the series of efficient causes, one per each layer of the universe: the ‘self-originate’ intellect (Autogenes), the demiurge of the animate world (Ialdabaoth), and the ruler of the corporeal substrate (Counterfeit Spirit).
poseful work is the independent disorderly factor, Necessity, which can be subdued to his preordered program yet never fully controlled. Plato’s demiurge is thus a metaphorical expression of two theological axioms, or molds (οἱ τύποι περὶ θεολογίας), postulated in the Republic (2.378e–383c), which posit that God is good and that, insofar as being good, he can neither do harm nor keep his goodness jealously to himself. The demiurge of the Apocryphon of John, on the contrary, is the irrational principle originating from the disorderly ‘darkness’ of Sophia’s ignorance—a blind, ignorant, and jealous god (ογνωγτε ἔλθει κακόν).

And seeing the creation which surrounded him and the multitude of the angels around him, those that had come into being out of him, he said to them, “For my part, I am a jealous god, and there is no other god apart from me.” (II 13:5–9; cf. BG 44:10–15)

Ialdabaoth’s words paraphrase the basic tenet of Israelite faith—the unity of God—reiterated throughout the Law and in Prophets (LXX), and particularly in Deutero–Isaiah:

For it is I who am the lord your God, a jealous God (θεὸς ζηλαστῆς) punishing children for the iniquity of parents . . . (Exod 20:5)
You shall worship no other god, because God, whose name is jealous (ζηλοτόν ὄνομα), is a jealous god. (34:14)
So acknowledge today and take to your mind that God is your lord, this god in heaven above and on the earth beneath, and that there is no other besides him. (Deut 4:39)
You shall not bow down to them or worship them; for it is I who am the lord your God, punishing children for the iniquity of parents . . . (5:9)
Hear, O Israel: The lord our God is the lord alone (κύριος εἷς). (6:4)
See now, see, that I am, and there is no god besides me (καὶ οὐκ ἐστιν θεὸς πᾶλιν ἐμὸν). (32:39)
I am the lord God, this is my name: I give my glory to no other. (Isa 42:8)

---

Iren. Adv. haer. 3.25.5: “Plato appears to be more religious than they [the ‘Gnostics’] are, for he acknowledged this same God as both just and good, having power over all, and himself making judgement. . . . Again, he shows that the maker and fabricator of this universe is good: “In the good no jealousy (φθόνος) in any matter can ever arise” (Tim. 29e), setting as the beginning and the cause of the making of the world the goodness of God, not an ignorance or a fallen aeon or a ‘fruit of deficiency’ or a weeping and lamenting Mother or another God and Father.” Plotinus raises the same Platonic argument about God’s ἀφθονία in Enn. II 9.17 (ὅτι μὴ θέμις φθόνον ἐν τοῖς θεοῖς εἶναι).
God’s self-proclamation of unity was commemorated in the liturgy, during the daily recitation of the Shema (Deut 6:4–9)—“Hear, O Israel, the Lord is our God, the Lord alone” (6:4)—not only as a reminder of the essence of Judaism and a deterrent against idol-worship but also as a defense against dualism. Familiarity with scriptural passages proving God’s exclusiveness and unity served as a powerful weapon in rabbinic anti-dualist polemics.74 Early Christians also made use of the same Old Testament quotations—some to bring their charges against pagan polytheism, and some, surprisingly, to contest the monotheistic tenor of the Jewish Law.

The hermeneutical presuppositions of these opposite claims are best evidenced in the Pseudo-Clementine Homilies, which contain a series of imaginary disputes between Peter, the partisan of God’s unity and Simon, his dualist opponent. Peter’s assumption throughout the dispute is that one could best refute the arguing party from one’s own authoritative tradition. Simon, on the other hand, applies the revisionist strategy—the best way to challenge the monotheistic opponent is to show that his own sacrosanct scriptures are ridden with lexical ambiguities (amphibolia), that the implicit intention of Yahweh’s proclamations does not correspond to their explicit formulation (rhēton vs. dianoia), and that even the proclamations themselves often contradict each other (antilogia). In one homily, for example (16.5–21), Peter repels Simon’s claim that the Jewish scriptures support polytheism by quoting from a comprehensive anthology of Biblical monotheistic declarations (16.7–8). In another dispute (2.43–44), Simon refutes Peter’s argument for the unity and goodness of the Biblical god by adducing the whole catalogue of his sins, all extracted from the Jewish scriptures: God is ignorant, changes his purpose, hardens hearts, makes blind and deaf, mocks, is weak and unjust.

74 On the rabbinic reports about the heresy of ‘two powers in heaven’ see Segal (1977).
does evil, is false, dwells in shadow, darkness, storm, and smoke, loves war, and likes to change his mind. And he envies, too, as Simon reminds Peter in yet another public encounter (3.39.1, 3):

To begin with Adam, who has been made after his likeness, he is created as blind, is reported not to have knowledge of good or evil, is found a transgressor, is cast out of paradise, and is punished with death. . . . And in his saying about Adam—“Let us cast him out lest he reach out his hand and take from the tree of life, and eat, and live forever” (Gen 3:22)—in saying “lest” he is ignorant (ἀγνοεῖ); and in adding “lest he should eat and live forever,” he is also envious (καὶ φθονεῖ).

Simon’s agenda appears very much in tune with the Savior’s in the Apocryphon of John, or with that of Marcion and the group of second-century theologians traditionally labeled as ‘Gnostics’. As he pointed out to Peter, in front of the crowd,

And now I wish, in the presence of all, to discuss with you from these books [that are common among the Jews] on the necessity of believing that they are gods, first demonstrating with regard to him whom you call God that he is not the supreme and omnipotent [power], insofar as he is without foreknowledge, imperfect, needy, not good, and subject to many and innumerable grievous passions; then, after this has been demonstrated from the scriptures, there remains another, not written of, foreknowing, perfect, without need, good, removed from all grievous passions. Yet he whom you call the demiurge is subject, as it were, to the opposite. (3.38)

Simon and Peter are both experts in conducting rhetorical controversies. They both use commonplace arguments bearing upon the main issue—the conflicting nature (antinomia) of the Jewish scripture. Peter’s solution is that the sayings accusatory of the Biblical god are forgeries “not written by a prophetic hand,” and that they are “both rendered void by the opposite sayings which are alongside of them, and refuted by the creation” (3.46). Simon, on the other hand, argues that the accusatory sayings were “written by another power and not according to (Yahweh’s) choice,” proving his radical dualist thesis of the existence of two divine powers.

Simon speaks here primarily as a rhetorician, focusing on the issue of the scope of scripture and disregarding the metaphysical presuppositions of his dualist thesis. For philosophical arguments in favor of this position, one has to turn to the ‘Gnostic’ camp. The anonymous ‘Gnostic’ opponents of Plotinus, for example, arrived at Simon’s
conclusion, namely that the Biblical creator is ignorant and subject of all the vices, yet they did so from a different angle, focusing on his ontological status in the hierarchical order of reality. The maker of the material world, in their view, is “the maker derived from matter and apparition” (ἐμποιεῖν ἐξ ὡλης καὶ ἐφόδωλου τὸν ποιήσαντα)—the figurative version of the Platonist disorderly soul inherent in the corporeal substrate—who creates “out of arrogance and rashness” (δῆ ἄλλαξονείαν καὶ τόλμαν ποιεῖ Ἐμ. II 9.11). This is not a well-founded aspirer who creates the world modeled on the Idea, but an aggressive semblance-maker who conceals his incompetence by an unfounded pretension, guarding his false prerogatives as a “jealous god,” and directing his grudge or envy at superior competitors.

Both Christian heresiological literature and the Nag Hammadi material suggest that the ‘Gnostics’ also compiled the lists of Biblical passages accusatory of the Biblical creator. Like Simon, they turned on the issue of antinomia, conflict of laws, and argued that the proclamations of unity issued by a god subject to emotional disturbances are indicative of his ignorance, of his limited value judgment, and, ultimately, of his status inferiority. Their favorite books were also Genesis, Deutoronomy, Psalms, and Deutero-Isaiah. Few Biblical passages were quoted as often as Isa 44:6, 45:5–6, and 46:9—the same verses that figured so prominently in Jewish arguments in favor of God’s unity. For the ‘Gnostics’, they served as the ultimate confirmation of the demiurge’s arrogance, madness, and ignorance.

This is why [according to the ‘Ophites’] Ialdabaoth exulted and boasted over everything below him, saying, “I am God the Father and there is none above me”; but the Mother, hearing this, cried out against him: “Do not lie, Ialdabaoth; above you are the Father of all, the First Man, and the Man, the Son of Man!” (Iren. Adv. haer. 1.30.6)

They [the Valentinians] say that the demiurge believed that he was constructing these things from himself, yet he really made them through Achamoth’s emission. For he made a heaven without knowing about the [spiritual] Heaven, modeled a man without knowing the Man, and showed forth earth without knowing the [real] Earth. And in all other cases, he was similarly ignorant (ἐγνωσθηκεν) of the ideal forms of the things he was making and of the Mother; rather, he thought (ἐφησθα)...

---

that he was all alone.... For this reason, being too slack (ετωνότερον) to know spiritual beings, he thought that he alone was god and so said through the prophets, “I am God, and there is no one besides me.” (ibid. 1.5.3–4)

When the ruler saw his magnitude—and it was himself that he saw: he saw nothing but water and darkness—then he thought that it was he alone who existed. . . . When the heavens had established themselves together with their powers and all their administration, the prime parent became elated; and the whole army of angels glorified him, and all the gods and their angels gave blessing and honor to him. And for his part he rejoiced in his heart and continually boasted, saying to them, “I have no need of anyone.” He said, “It is I who am god, and besides me there exists no other one.” . . . And when the prime parent saw the image of Pistis in the waters, he grieved very much, especially upon hearing her voice resembling the first voice that had called to him out of the waters. And when he realized that it was she who had given a name to him, he sighed and became ashamed of his transgression. And having come to know in truth that an immortal man of light had existed before him, he was greatly disturbed; for he had previously said to all the gods and their angels, “It is I who am god, and besides me there exists no other one.” For he had been afraid they might realize that another had existed before him, and might condemn him. Yet, foolish as he was (ενομικος), he scoffed at the condemnation and acted impetuously (τολμαων). He said, “If anyone has existed before me, let him appear so that we may see his light.” And, behold, immediately light came out of the eighth heaven above and passed through all of the heavens of the earth. (Orig. World II 100:29–33, 103:2–13, 107:17–108:5)

Their chief is blind. [Because of his] power and his ignorance [and his] arrogance he said, with his [power,] “It is I who am god and

---

76 For the divine pneuma and its various degrees of tension (των), from its original tensility (ετωνία) down to slackness (ατονία), cf. supra, chap. 2, pp. 112–13, and 123–27.

77 Compare Hippolytus’s summary of the ‘Valentinian’ doctrine: “Sophia acted from above, from the Ogdoad as far as the Hebdomad. For the demiurge, so they say, knows nothing at all, but is, according to them, without understanding (ανους) and mad (μαφος), and does not know what he is doing or working at. Yet it was in him, who does not know what he is doing, that Sophia was active and empowered all things. And while she was active he believed that he was bringing about from himself the creation of the world; hence he began to proclaim: “I am God, and besides me there is no other” (Ref. 6.33.1); cf. Tert. Adv. Val. 21. See also Epiphanius’s report on the ‘Nicolaitans’ (Pan. 25.2.2) and Hippolytus’s on Justin’s Baruch (Ref. 5.26.15) and Basilides, who quotes Exod 6:2–3 (7.25.2–3). The best survey and analysis of early Christian responses to Yahweh’s self-proclamation of unity are in Orbe (1968) 345–79.
there is none [besides me]."
When saying this, he sinned against [the entirety]. And this pronouncement reached up to incorruptibility; and, behold, a voice came forth from incorruptibility saying, “You are mistaken, Samael,” which is ‘god of the blind’. His thoughts turned blind: and having cast out his power, that is, the blasphemy it had spoken, he was pursued down to chaos and the abyss, his mother, by Pistas Sophia. (Hyp. Arch. II 86:27–87:7)\(^7\)

In all previous passages, the most sacred dogma of the religion of Israel becomes the essential error of Judaism. What many generations of Jews viewed as the confirmation of Yahweh’s unity, of his omnipotence and omniscience, the Gnostics took as the proof of Ialdabaoth’s limited perspective, the result of his arrogance (αἰθαδηγεῖς, χαρισταιτήτης) and his false opinion (οἰσθαται, μεθεγετεῖ); of his lack of tension (ἀτονότερον) and understanding (ανόητον); of his madness (μωρός) and audacity (θράσος); and of his tyrannic nature (τύραννος) and impulsive character (τόλμω).

The extant versions of the *Apocryphon of John* and Irenaeus’s summary of its cosmological section offer a similar interpretation of the Biblical formula of exaltation:

And he is impious (ματέ) in his lack of understanding (ἀπόνοω) which is in him. For he said, “It is I who am god and there is no other god besides me,” because he was without acquaintance of where his strength comes from. (II 11:18–21)

And seeing the creation (κτίσις) surrounding him and the multitude of angels around him,

\(^7\) See ibid. 94:19–95:13: “[Ialdabaoth] opened his eyes and saw a vast unlimited matter. And he became arrogant, saying, “It is I who am god, and there is none other besides me.” When he said this, he sinned against the entirety. But a voice came forth from above, from the realm of absolute power, saying, “You are mistaken, Samael,” which is ‘god of the blind’. And he said, “If any other exists before me, let it appear to me.” And immediately Sophia stretched out her finger and brought the light into matter, and pursued it down to the regions of chaos, and then withdrew up to her light... This ruler, being androgynous, fabricated for himself a great aeon, a limitless extension, and thought about fabricating offspring for himself; and he fabricated for himself seven offspring, androgynous like their parent. And he said to his offspring, “It is I who am the god of the entirety.” And Zoe, the daughter of Pistas Sophia, cried out and said to him, “You are mistaken, Sakla,” whose alternate name is Ialdabaoth. She breathed into his face, and her breath became a fiery angel for her; and that angel bound Ialdabaoth and cast him down into Tartarus, at the bottom of the abyss.” Among other relevant passages from the Nag Hammadi treatises, see especially Gos. Eg. III 58:23–59:9, Trim. Prot. XIII 43:31–44:4, and Treat. Seth VII 53:27–31; 64:18–27.
who had come forth from him, he said to them, “As for me, I am a jealous god, and besides me there is no other god.” Yet by announc-
ing this, he signified (σημαίνειν) to the angels under him that there was another god. For if no other existed, of whom would he be jealous? (II 13:5–9; BG 44:10–15)

Now, the arrogant one (αὐθαδίως) had taken a power from the mother. Indeed, he was ignorant, for he supposed (jisayγει) that there existed no other except his mother alone. And [seeing] the multitude of the angels that he had created, he then exalted himself over them. (II 13:26–32; cf. BG 45:20–46:9)

He [i.e. Protarchon] stole a great power from his mother, as they say, and departed from her to the lower regions and made the firmament of heaven, in which he dwells. And since he is ignorance, he made powers that are beneath him, and angels and firmaments and all earthly things. Next, they say, he was united with arrogance (authadia) and generated wickedness (kakia), jealousy (zelus), envy (phthonos), strife (eris), and desire (ēpithymia). Once they were generated, the mother Sophia fled in grief and withdrew above, becoming the Eight for those counting from below. When she withdrew, he supposed he was alone, and therefore he said, “I am a jealous god, and besides me there is none.” (Iren Adv. haer. 2.29.4)

The novelty in comparison with other ‘Gnostic’ accounts is the explicit reference to jealousy or envy as the rationale for Ialdabaoth’s exaltation, effected by reasoning from analogy (συλλογισμός, ratiocinatio)—that is, by a clever blending of Yahweh’s first-person proclamations from Exodus (“I am a jealous god”) and from Deutero-Isaiah (“I am the lord God, and there is no other god besides me”).79

In the preceding passages from other ‘Gnostic’ writings, jealousy or envy (ζήλος, φόνος, κόρη) are passions that governed Ialdabaoth in his interaction with Adam. It was because of his jealousy that, as

---

79 Irenaeus criticizes this revisionist technique, based on the rhetorical issue of ‘assimilation’ (συλλογισμός, ratiocinatio). “They [i.e. the ‘Valentinians’] transfer and transform, and making one thing out of another, deceive many by the ill-constructed apparition (φαντασία) that they make out of the Lord’s words they adjust. It is as if someone destroyed the figure of a man in the authentic portrait of a king, carefully arranged by a skillful artist out of precious stones, and transferred the stones to make the image of a dog or fox, declaring that this badly composed image is the same beautiful image of the king constructed by the skillful artist. . . . In the same way these people combine old wives’ tales and then, plucking words and sayings and parables from here and there, wish to adapt these words of God to their fables” (1.8.1).
was often explained, Ialdabaoth forbade the first couple to eat from the tree of knowledge (Gen 2:17 and 3:3); and it was out of envy, too, that Ialdabaoth subsequently expelled them from the garden (Gen 3:22). In the *Apocryphon*, however, jealousy and envy also refer to Ialdabaoth’s attitude toward the spiritual realm, long before he and his authorities set out to create the first human being. Irenaeus’s summary even refers to the moment when jealousy (*zelos*) and envy (*phthonos*), along with Ialdabaoth’s other passions, assumed the status of subsistent entities. In this version, the Deutero-Isaian formula of exaltation, modified by the insertion of the epithet ζηλότης from Exodus (20:5, 34:14), provides the scriptural support for raising envy and jealousy to the level of independent ‘hypostases’. In the manuscript witnesses of the *Apocryphon of John*, on the other hand, the insertion of jealousy and envy serves a different purpose—it turns Ialdabaoth’s proclamation of unity into yet another instance of his ambiguous prophecies, hinting at the existence of the superior reality.

In announcing this [i.e. that he is a jealous god, with no other besides him], he signified (σημαίνειν) to the angels dwelling with him that there was another god. For if no other existed, of whom would he be jealous? (II 13:9–13, BG 44:15–19)

What has been said earlier about the Gnostic interpretation of the Biblical motif of a cloud80 applies, too, to the *Apocryphon*’s modified version of the formula of unity. Individual Biblical verses occasionally have two meanings, depending on the level of reality to which they refer. Yahweh’s self-proclamation of unity and omnipotence to his people, repeated at various points throughout the history of Israel, is relocated in the *Apocryphon of John* to the pre-historic stage, in the wake of cosmogony. The same holds true for Ialdabaoth’s self-presentation as a jealous god. The words that Yahweh issued to Moses on Mount Sinai (Exod 20:5, 34:14) as a warning against idol-worship and as the explicit refusal to surrender his divine privileges become now, in Ialdabaoth’s mouth, the declaration of ill-will and envy directed at a superior being. The Biblical formula of exaltation encloses thus two different levels of signification:

(i) the public or common meaning, revealed to Moses and Jewish prophets, which represents the symbol of faith for the ‘animate’

---

men, the offspring of Adam and Eve, imprisoned in matter and deprived of the ‘pneumatic’ element;
(ii) the proper or hidden meaning, which Ialdabaoth, because of his ignorance, only “signifies” (σημαίνει), and only the recipients of the Savior’s revelation are capable of fully uncovering.

The Greek verb σημαίνει is a terminus technicus of allegorical exegesis. Signifying, or giving a sign, means saying one thing that in turn means another—‘signifying other than what is said’ (Ps.-Heraclit. Quaest. Hom. 5). Ialdabaoth, however, is not as shrewd an allegorist as Delphic Apollo, who “neither reveals nor conceals, but signifies” (B93 D–K); nor is he so skilful as ancient ‘physiologists’ who consciously veiled their physical doctrines “in riddles and hidden meanings” (δι’ αἰνηγμάτων καὶ ύπονοιῶν), with the result that “what is spoken is less clear to the masses than what is unsaid, and what is unsaid gives cause for more speculation than what is said.” (Plut. Daed. Plat. frag. 157, 1). Ialdabaoth has neither knowledge nor intention to imply more than what he literally declares. And if he occasionally signifies something more sublime, something which lies beyond the surface meaning and belongs to the higher realm, it is because Sophia, Logos, or any other agent of the Pleroma, “used him like a mouth in order to say the things to be prophesied” (Tri. Trac. I 100:33–35).

The most persuasive refutation of the sort of questions posed by the Savior and all others who challenged the internal coherence of the Jewish Scriptures came from the tannaim.81 In one of his disputes with the anonymous heretics, or minim,82 Rabbi Nathan appears to address exactly the sort of criticism raised in the Apocryphon of John.

Rabbi Nathan says: From this one, one can cite a refutation of the heretics (minim) who say: “There are two powers.” For when the Holy One Blessed be He, stood up and exclaimed, “I am the Lord thy God” (Exod 20:2, 5), was there any one [i.e., of the alleged heavenly powers] who stood up to protest against Him? If you should say that

---

82 Min, the Hebrew word for sectarian, has many applications—it designated various individuals and groups challenging the doctrines and practices of the Yavnean and post-Yavnean rabbinic authorities. For the semantics and history of this term, for the main stages in the development of the bikkat-ha-minim, the ‘benediction against heretics’, and for a comprehensive bibliography on these problems, see now Vana (2003) 201–41.
it was done in secret—but has it not been said, “I have not spoken in secret,” etc. (Isa 45:19)? “I said unto the seed of Jacob” (ibid.) that is, to these alone I will give it. “They sought me in the desert” (ibid.). Did I not give it in broad daylight? And thus it says, “I the Lord speak righteousness, I declare things that are right” (ibid.). (Mek. Bahodesh 5, 2:232 Lauterbach)

As a matter of fact, the ‘Gnostics’ would probably reply to Rabbi Nathan, the heavenly powers did rise up against the arrogance of the Jewish god. “Do not lie, Ialdabaoth”—exclaimed his mother Sophia (Iren. Haer. 1.30.6), just as, in the ‘Nicolaitan’ cosmogony, the mother Barbelo immediately began to cry (Epiph. Haer. 25.2.4). In the treatise On the Origin of the World, the light “came out of the Ogdoad and passed through all of the heavens of the earth” (II 108:2–5). In the Hypostasis of the Archons, again, Sophia’s irradiation of light follows after the voice of indignation came from the realm of the absolute power: “You are mistaken, Samael” (II 94: 21–25). And, immediately afterwards, as soon as Ialdabaoth proclaimed his unity and authority over the entirety, it was Zoe, the daughter of Pistis Sophia, who interfered and refuted him for the second time with the same words: “You are mistaken, Sakla” (II 95:5–7). Finally, in the Apocryphon of John, it was a voice “coming forth from above the exalted aeons” that Ialdabaoth heard proclaiming, “The man exists, and the son of man” (II 14:13–15; cf. BG 47:14–16, III 21:16–18).

It seems unlikely that Rabbi Nathan would have been moved by this argumentation—for none of the aforementioned voices of indignation finds support in scriptural verses or passages. What Rabbi Nathan demanded was a refutation of his literalist interpretation from within Scripture—the refutation, that is, which would take into account the immediate context of God’s pronouncements and refrain from cross-referential tampering. In rabbinic comments on the incriminated passages, Yahweh’s ordinances and statutes, including those affirming his unity and jealousy, are directed at Israel, not at other gods. Yahweh can indeed be angry and jealous—but at the idolatry of his people and their lack of respect, not at some superior power. And even when acting out of jealousy and anger, he never surrenders to these pathological states—omnipotent, he never loses grip over them as men do.

“For I the Lord Thy God Am a Jealous God.” Rabbi says: A God above jealousy. I rule over jealousy, but jealousy has no power over
Me. I rule over slumber, but slumber has no power over Me. And thus it says, “Behold, He that keepeth Israel doth neither slumber nor sleep” (Ps. 121:4). Another Interpretation “For I the Lord Thy God Am a Jealous God.” Zealously do I exact punishment for idolatry, but in other matters, I am merciful and gracious. A certain philosopher asked R. Gamaliel: It is written in your Torah, “For I the Lord thy God am a jealous God.” But is there any power in the idol that it should arouse jealousy? A hero is jealous of another hero, a wise man is jealous of another wise man,... but has the idol any power that one should be jealous of it? R. Gamaliel said to him: Suppose a man would call his dog by the name of his father, so that when taking a vow he would vow: “By the life of this dog.” Against whom would the father be incensed? Against the son or the dog? (Mek. Bahodesh 6, 2:244–45 Lauterbach)

Such counterarguments could hardly persuade the other party in the debate, including the heavenly revealer of the Apocryphon of John. The Old Testament is full of obscurities, some intrinsic to the subject-matter and some deliberately cultivated by its multiple authorial voices. In this sense, Jewish scripture does not differ from any other law, nor scriptural exegesis from any dispute about the meaning and proper application of legal documents. The task of the Biblical exegete is very similar to that of the legal expert—both are entitled to search for contradictions in the document (antinomia); to find the hidden intention behind the explicit formulations (rhêton kai dianoia); to solve verbal ambiguities in the text (amphibolia); and to elucidate one part of the document by bringing into discussion other compatible sections (sullogismos). The Savior’s effort in the Apocryphon of John to move beyond literal meaning bespeaks not a desire to mystify or, as Irenaeus put it, “lead astray by the badly constructed phantom” (Adv. haer. 1.8.1), but the adoption of an ordered series of steps in developing a persuasive argument. There is an ambiguous term or statement in the legislator’s document (“I am the lord thy God, a jealous God”). This ambiguity (“jealous God”) discloses the contrast between letter and intent (resentful of idolaters vs. suspicious of a superior rival). The proper intent can be elucidated by means of compatible propositions from other parts of the document (“I am the lord God, and there is no other god besides me”); yet such supportive evidence can unexpectedly disclose incompatible alternatives in the law (unity vs. jealousy). In the manner of a skilled Hellenistic rhetorician, the Savior passes his subject over a grid of abstract headings; and from this contact between the subject and each of the headings he formulates
his revisionist theory of the multiple authorship of Old Testament prophecies.

And just as we said that the speaker who is upholding the letter of the law would find it most useful to lessen in some degree the justice or equity which supports his opponent’s claim, so the speaker who opposes the letter will profit greatly by converting something in the written document to his own case or by showing that it contains some ambiguity; then on the basis of that ambiguity he may defend the passage which helps his case, or introduce a definition of some word and interpret the meaning of the word which seems to bear hard upon him, so as to support his own case, or develop from a written word something that is not expressed; this is the method of reasoning from analogy. (Cicero, Inv. 2.142)83

Cosmogony, Part Two: Sophia’s Repentance

Narrative Function of the Episode

In the majority of ‘Gnostic’ texts listed above, the response of the superior world to Ialdabaoth’s arrogant proclamation of unity follows right away. This does not happen in the Apocryphon of John, where, before a voice from the Pleromatic realm announces the existence of a higher deity, the story first goes back to Sophia, the victimized heroine.

Now (σε), the mother began to rush over (ἐπιφέρεσθαι BG 44:19–45:1; ἐπάρκει ἐπιφέρεσθαι II 13:13–14).

The manuscript witnesses describe Sophia’s reaction in three subsequent sections of the narrative.84 Differences in phraseology and theological details between the shorter and the longer redaction are significant enough to deserve a separate synopsis.

---

83 The author of Ap. John does not draw directly on Cicero, of course, but rather on their common Hellenistic source: Hermagoras of Temnos and other Greek-speaking contributors to stasis-theory.

84 There is a two-page lacuna ad locum in NHC III.
Shorter redaction (BG 44:19–45:19, 46:9–15)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>44:19–45:5</th>
<th>45:5–19</th>
<th>46:9–15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Now the mother began (ἀρχεσθαι) to rush over (ἐπιφέρεσθαι):</td>
<td>And I said, “Christ, what does it mean ‘to rush over’ (ἐπιφέρεσθαι)?” But he smiled and said, “Do you think that it is as Moses said, ‘over the waters’? she recognized her lack; for her consort (σύνζυγος) had not agreed (συμφωνεῖν) with her, as she was blamed (φέγειν) by her perfection.</td>
<td>When the mother recognized the miscarriage of darkness, that it was not perfect, for her consort (σύνζυγος) had not agreed (συμφωνεῖν) with her, she repented (μετανοεῖν) and wept with much weeping.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And I said, “Christ, what does it mean ‘to rush over’ (ἐπιφέρεσθαι)?” But he smiled and said, “Do you think that it is as Moses said, ‘over the waters’? she recognized the lack; for her consort (σύνζυγος) had not agreed (συμφωνεῖν) with her, as she was blamed (φέγειν) by her perfection. When the mother recognized the miscarriage of darkness, that it was not perfect, for her consort (σύνζυγος) had not agreed (συμφωνεῖν) with her, she repented (μετανοεῖν) and wept with much weeping.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Now, the mother began (ἀρχεσθαι) to come and go (φεσεῖ).</td>
<td>And I said, “Lord, what does it mean, ‘she came and went’?” But he smiled and said, “Do not think that it is as Moses said, ‘over the waters’. She recognized the lack when the shining of her light diminished. And she grew dark, for her consort had not agreed (συμφωνεῖν) with her. she repented (μετανοεῖν) with much weeping.</td>
<td>When the mother recognized the garment of darkness, that it had not come out perfectly, she knew that her consort had not agreed (συμφωνεῖν) with her. She repented (μετανοεῖν) with much weeping.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And I said, “Lord, what does it mean, ‘she came and went’?” But he smiled and said, “Do not think that it is as Moses said, ‘over the waters’. She recognized the lack when the shining of her light diminished. And she grew dark, for her consort had not agreed (συμφωνεῖν) with her. she repented (μετανοεῖν) with much weeping. When the mother recognized the garment of darkness, that it had not come out perfectly, she knew that her consort had not agreed (συμφωνεῖν) with her. She repented (μετανοεῖν) with much weeping.

Now, the mother began (ἀρχεσθαι) to come and go (φεσεῖ). And I said, “Lord, what does it mean, ‘she came and went’?” But he smiled and said, “Do not think that it is as Moses said, ‘over the waters’. She recognized the lack when the shining of her light diminished. And she grew dark, for her consort had not agreed (συμφωνεῖν) with her. she repented (μετανοεῖν) with much weeping. When the mother recognized the garment of darkness, that it had not come out perfectly, she knew that her consort had not agreed (συμφωνεῖν) with her. She repented (μετανοεῖν) with much weeping.
Each of the three sequences has a specific function in the organisation of the text as a narrative. The first sequence brings Sophia back into the tale, right at the moment when she realizes her deficiency, or lack (ἐτα). It reveals the immediate result of Ialdabaoth’s villainy which, in turn, provokes a new action: Sophia’s movement, designated by the Biblical verb ἐπιφέρεσθαι, ‘rush over’ or ‘move upon’ (ὡς ἐβην in the longer redaction). The second sequence is a dialogue between the savior and the seer, in which the former proposes a true interpretation of Genesis 1:2b, “The spirit of god rushed upon the waters.” Finally, the third sequence resumes the narrative following the exegetical digression; but instead of proceeding immediately to the next point of complication—the disclosure of Sophia’s deficiency to the Pleromatic realm—it first summarizes briefly the main points of the whole Sophia–Ialdabaoth episode, from Ialdabaoth’s theft and his act of arrogance to Sophia’s movement of repentance (μετανοεῖν).

Although all three sections focus on the same theme—Sophia’s reaction to Ialdabaoth’s villainy—each grants this theme a different purpose. In the first, Sophia’s disorderly movement is an immediate reaction to Ialdabaoth’s theft. In the second, it becomes the exegetical problem for John and the Savior. In the third, again, it determines the next point of the intrigue: the response by the Pleromatic realm to Sophia’s repentance, followed by her establishment in the ninth heaven, right above the fiery realm of Ialdabaoth.

On the other hand, viewed in isolation from both what precedes and what follows in the text, these three sections represent three successive stages in the gradual discovery of the true meaning of Sophia’s action. In the first section, the action is presented as an allusion to Genesis 1:2b, with Sophia’s “rushing over” (ἐπιφέρεσθαι, ἡς ἐβην) made equivalent to the movement of the spirit of God upon the waters. In the second, the Biblical imagery is rejected and its hidden, spiritual meaning uncovered—not “rushing over the waters,” but rather “being ashamed,” “not daring to return” and, as a result, moving disorderly in “the darkness of unacquaintance.” In the third section,

---

85 The Coptic intransitive verb ἡς ἐβην carries the idea of a disorderly movement (περιφέρεσθαι), ‘go and come, wander’, which is lacking in the Biblical ἐπιφέρεσθαι; cf. Crum (1939) 547a–b.
the interpretation suggested by the Savior assumes the form of a narrative in order to replace the Mosaic account in Genesis 1:2b: “The mother . . . repented with much weeping” (II 13:36–14:1; cf. BG 46:13–15).

Other ‘Gnostic’ Interpretations of Genesis 1:2b

In their diverging approaches to the Old Testament, early Christian writers shared a couple of general exegetical principles. They followed the path announced by Jesus in his discussions with the Jews: “You search the scriptures in which you think you have eternal life; they too testify about me” (John 5:39); or, “Because you had believed Moses, you would believe me; for it is about me that he wrote” (5:46). Most of them read and interpreted the Jewish scriptures on the basis of the Septuagint and other Greek translations. Finally, they did not refrain from offering several readings of the same Biblical verse or passage as simultaneously valid and equally abiding.

Procopius of Gaza’s Commentaries on Genesis provides a succinct and comprehensive survey of various ‘orthodox’ interpretations of Genesis 1:2b (PG 87, 45–48). For one group of commentators, the “spirit of god” represents the Holy Spirit that warms (θάλπειν) the water like a brooding bird, setting it in motion (κινεῖν) and producing living creatures. In this interpretation, the verb ἐπιφέρεσθαι cannot be the divine spirit “unless understood in the sense of God’s descending, ascending, or walking around.” Other exegetes rejected this identification, arguing that “one should not count together the uncreated and the creation,” and suggesting instead that the Biblical “spirit” (πνεῦμα) stands either for the air, finer (λεπτῶτερον) and more agile (κινετικότερον) than other elements, or for the wind (ἀέριος), which is the air set in motion. There were also some who interpreted “the spirit of God” as the divine “energy” (ἐνέργεια) warming up the waters. Others, again, saw in the spirit rushing over the waters “the gift of holy baptism” and emphasized the “purifying nature” (τὸ κοθάρσιον) of the water imbued with the divine spirit. Finally, some theologians interpreted the Biblical pneuma as the Holy Spirit, the primordial “waters” as holy powers, and the “deep” (άββασσος) below them as evil powers ruled by the devil and his “darkness” (σκότος).

One reading does not necessarily undermine the other. To early Christian interpreters of the Jewish scriptures, different interpretations were mutually compatible and equally acceptable. Augustine, for example, clearly preferred the interpretation by the Holy Spirit,
yet he did not reject the identification of “the spirit of God” with the air or with the “life-giving” breath (spiritus vivificator, vitalis creatura; cf. Gen. imp. 4.466, 22–471, 2 Zycha). Didymus the Blind, on the other hand, following Origen’s, and ultimately Philo’s, exegetical technique, moves beyond a mere tolerance of apparently disparate readings. In his view, all of them are in fact complementary with one another, each conveying either of the two meanings inherent in the Biblical prophecies: the non-literal one, which refers to things spiritual (πνευματικά), and the literal one (κατὰ τὴν ἀπλουστέρου διάνοιαν), which remains at the level of “perceptible descriptions” (ταῖς αἰσθηταῖς διήγεσιν) and is often (πολλάκις) employed by the Holy Spirit to disguise the higher spiritual reality. According to this way of reading, “the spirit of God rushing over the waters” is the breath or wind blowing over the physical waters which, in the beginning, covered the earth and made it invisible. Following the non-literal or spiritual reading, the “darkness” from Genesis 1:2 stands for the darkness of “ignorance” (ἀγνωσία), the “abyss” below for the devil with his evil spirits, and “the spirit of God” for the Holy Spirit of the superior realm, moving over the angelic authorities (ἐξοσίαι, θρόνοι) disguised as the primordial waters (In Gen. 1:2, 39–41 Nautin–Doutreleau).

The variety and originality of ‘Gnostic’ interpretations of Gen. 1:2b is equally astounding. All of these start from the following two assumptions:

(i) The sayings of Biblical prophets reflect the voices of various divine powers assigned to one of the three levels of reality: spiritual, animate, material
(ii) Every Biblical verse has accordingly three levels of application

Depending on the immediate context in which individual ‘Gnostic’ exegetes situated the Genesis account, “the spirit of god rushing over the water” could stand for the manifestation of

(i) the divine spirit in its most refined state within the Pleromatic realm;
(ii) the intermediate spirit (πνεῦμα μεθόριον) moving between the divine realm and chaotic matter;
(iii) the spirit imprisoned in matter and responsible for the formation of phenomenal reality.
The doctrine of the ‘Ophites’, as summarized by Irenaeus (Haer. 1.30), emphasizes the female character of the Biblical “spirit of God,” derived from the feminine gender of the Hebrew equivalent ruah. The ‘Ophite’ account opens with the portrayal of the pre-cosmic stage, clearly alluding to the opening lines of Genesis:

There exists a certain first light in the potency of the Deep—blessed, incorruptible, and infinite; this is, moreover, the Father of All, called First Man (Primum Hominem). Furthermore, a Conception (Ennoeam) proceeding from him they call the Son of him who emits it, and this is the Son of Man, the Second Man (Filium Hominis Secundum Hominem). Below these, again, is the Holy Spirit (Spiritum Sanctum), and under this superior Spirit are the segregated elements—water, darkness, abyss, chaos—over which the Spirit moves (super quae ferri Spiritum dicunt), called First Woman (Primam Foeminam). Next, they say, since the First Man exulted with his Son over the beauty of the Spirit, that is, of the Woman, and shed light upon her, he generated from her an incorruptible light, the Third Male (Tertium Masculum), whom they call Christ, the son of the First and Second Man and of the Holy Spirit, the First Woman. (Iren. Adv. haer. 1.30.1)86

Irenaeus’s static description of the pre-cosmic stage does not allow for clearcut diachronical distinctions. The absence of temporal sequence can hardly surprise if one takes into consideration the fact that, in the spiritual realm, time has not yet come to exist. The ‘Ophites’ seem to have appropriated here the Platonic postulate that “time came into being together with the heaven” (Tim. 38b; cf. Plut. Quaest. Plat. 7, 4.1007C) and, as a result, maintained the distinction in verbal aspect between timeless processes in the Pleroma, expressed by a series of present infinitives and participles (esse, progredientem, emitentis, ferri), and the concatenation of actions regarded as single consecutive events in the realm of Becoming, marked by the perfect indicatives, participles, and infinitives (generavit, arreptum statim, decidisse

The ‘Ophites’, in other words, did not confuse diachrony and chronology, interpreting the series of derivations within the realm of Being in terms of a synchronic unfolding, or a structural differentiation, of contingents from their principles. As much as one can deduce from Irenaeus’s sketchy summary, they seem to have envisaged this mechanics of derivation in the following fashion.

At the topmost point of what will eventually become a multiple-layered universe there is the absolute first principle, split into the substance of “indefinite light” and “the potency of the deep.” This primary split that cleaves the Absolute from within into an indefinite substance and the void of its unfulfilled potential manifests itself, at the outset of the derivational process, as the opposition of two gendered principles—the Father of All, called First Man (Primus Homo), the instigator of reproductive process, and the Father’s feminine counterpart, his first self-conception (Ennoea)—whose ‘mating’ produces a perfect male offspring, the Son of Man or Second Man (Filius Hominis, Secundus Homo). All subsequent derivations will obey the same logic of sexual procreation: at each stage, the first product of the union of the immediately preceding pair of principles will become an active (male) principle, mating with another material principle and producing the next level of reality. Following this logic, the Son of Man or Second Man, acting together with its paternal source, the First Man, unites with the Holy Spirit, the First Woman, generating from her “an imperishable light, the Third Male, called Christ.”

---

87 For the category of verbal aspect in Latin (infectum vs. perfectum) see Ernout–Thomas (1972) 216–19.
88 The shift from the original Twoness of an indefinite light and the potency of the deep (BuyÒw) to the oppositional determination of the male and female principles is announced by the particle autem, the marker of transition throughout Irenaeus’s report; cf. supra, n. 85.
89 Such an interpretation of Irenaeus’s obscure sentence presupposes the conjectural emendation of emittentis into emittere. “Furthermore, they say that a Conception proceeding from him emits the Son” (Ennoeam autem eius progredientem filium dicunt emittere). In this way, the generation of the Son of Man or Second Man in the ‘Ophite’ system would correspond to the derivation of Christ the Self-Originate, the offspring of the Father of the Entirety and his first Conception (Évvoa), in the Apocryphon of John. For a different interpretation, which sees in the Son of Man an androgynous fusion of the Father’s Conception (Ennoea) and his first offspring or Intellect (Nous), see Orbe (1973) 191–230 and (1976) 1:17–20, and esp. Simonetti (1993) 424, n. 106.
Principles

First Light and Potency of the Deep
Father of All (First Man) and Conception (Ennoea)  \(\rightarrow\) Son of Man (Second Man)
Son of Man (and First Man) and Holy Spirit (First Woman)  \(\rightarrow\) Christ (Third Man)

The Holy Spirit, called First Woman (Prima Foemina), is said to be borne above the four segregated elements—water, darkness, abyss, and chaos—in an obvious allusion to the Biblical “spirit of God” from Gen 1:2. This seems to suggest that the opening verse of Genesis (“God created the heaven and the earth”), albeit not mentioned in Irenaeus’s summary, figured in the ‘Ophite’ cosmology as a symbolic expression of the preceding stage—that is, the stage “in the beginning” (ἐν ἀρχῇ), when the Father of All attains the vague notion of himself, his first Conception (Ennoea), and unites with this feminine ‘dyadic’ principle to generate the “heaven,” viz. the Son of Man and his aeons. The “earth,” on the other hand, represents the unfathomable (Gen 1:2a: “invisible and non-differentiated”) remainder of the Father’s abyssal potency (in virtute Bythi), the primordial chaos out of which, at the next stage, the Holy Spirit called First Woman will segregate and make visible the primary “elements” (Gen 1:2).

This secondary ‘dyadic’ principle of division, multiplicity, and materiality will not only fill up the void with elementary substances—it will also serve as the female consort to both the Father of All and his Son, giving birth to the next conjugal couple, viz. Christ and Sophia, and, in the manner of a typical ‘Gnostic’ liminal figure, act as the mediator between the Father’s incorruptible abode and the lower realm, “moving above the elements” (super quae ferri Spiritum dicunt).

IMPERISHABLE ‘HEAVEN’

Father of All (Gen 1:1 θεός)

Conception (Ennoea)
Son of Man and His Aeons (Gen 1:1 οὐρανός)

Holy Spirit (Gen 1:2 πνεῦμα θεοῦ)
Water (Gen 1:2 ὑδάτι)
Darkness (Gen 1:2 σκότος)
Abyss (Gen 1:2 ἁβυσσός)

PERISHABLE ‘EARTH’

Chaos (Gen 1:2 γῆ)
Two opposite tendencies characterize this liminal figure of the Holy Spirit. One is to attain the superior realm of the Father and Son, and the other is to incline downwards, to the realm of matter, due to the ‘dyadic propensity’ of its feminine nature. Both of these tendencies become manifest at the next stage of cosmogony, in the dichotomy between Christ and Sophia, the products of the Spirit’s simultaneous union with the Father and his Son (Haer. 1.30.2). This dichotomy assumes the form of a traditional polarity of left (female and weak) and right (male and strong). The generation of Christ and Sophia is consequently explained in terms of the ancient theory of sex-differentiation, attested already in Parmenides (B 17 D–K: “in the right boys, in the left girls”) and still in vogue among Hellenistic and Roman medical theorists, according to which the sex of a newborn is determined during conception, and depends on which side of the bicameral uterus—left or right—retains the seed. Christ, therefore, placed as it were on the right side of the Spirit’s womb (quasi dextrum), is male (Tertius Masculus), and therefore incorruptible and luminous (incorruptibile lumen), tending by his nature to what was higher (in superiorea levaticium). On her left side, however, the superior feminine Spirit was “filled to saturation and overflowed” (superrepletam et superbullientem secundum sinisteriores partes) because she was unable to “endure and contain the greatness of the lights” (cum autem non potuisset portare nec capere magnitudinem luminum). The product of this “overflow” is Sophia Prunicos, an imperfect product—for she possessed a sprinkle of light (humectationem luminis 1.30.3), that is, certain male characteristics, yet inasmuch as conceived on the left side (sinistram), she was also feminine (masculo-feminam) and therefore predestined to move downwards (decidisse deorsum), toward the material realm of the already differentiated corporeal elements.

Descending into the waters while they were [still] immobile, she set them in motion by impetuously agitating them all the way down to the abyss and assuming a body from them. For they say that all things rushed toward her moisture of light (humectationi luminis) and clung to it and enveloped it. Had she not possessed it, she would perhaps have been totally absorbed and submerged by matter. Bound as she was by a body composed of matter and greatly weighed down, she repented (resipisse) at one time and attempted to escape from the waters and ascend to her mother; but she could not do so because of the weight of the enveloping body.... But when she had received power from her moisture consisting of light, she rebounded (resiliit) and was lifted up on high, and once she reached the height, she spread out as a
covering and thus made out of her body the heaven that is visible (Gen 1:7–8). And she remained under the heaven that she had made, still having the form of an aqueous body. (Adv. haer. 1.30.3)90

Contrary to Christ, who represents the Spirit’s inclination toward the superior realm of light, and whose bottom-up movement eventually results in the formation of the holy congregation (sanctam Ecclesiam), that is, in his and the Spirit’s union with the Father and his Son, Sophia descends into the motionless primordial waters and, in what is an unambiguous allusion to Genesis 1:2b, sets them in motion (movisse). While bestowing movement upon the material substrate, Sophia herself does not remain at rest. She moves, too, “by impetuously agitating them all the way down to the abyss” (petulanter agentem usque ad abyssos).

The Biblical image of “the spirit of God rushing upon (ἐπιφέρεσθαι) the water” is interpreted here as an impetuous movement (petulanter agentem) on the part of the divine element (Sophia, humectatio luminis), proceeding downwards to the lowest parts of matter (usque ad abyssos). This agitated movement has its ultimate cause in the original imperfection of Sophia’s mother, (Foemina, sinisteriores partes)—in her incapacity to contain the greatness of the divine light in the right side of her uterus (superrepletam et superbullientem) of the Holy Spirit. Its immediate cause, on the other hand, is the fall of Sophia from the stable existence of the Fathers (a patribus decidisse deorsum) into matter. This fall reflects the condition of a divine element when newly incarnated (assumpsisse ex eis corpus)—weighed down by amorphous matter (valde gravatam), and devoid of reason and discursive capacity. Yet along with this negative aspect, the fall of Sophia also performs a positive role in the cosmogonical process. It gives life (movisse) to the previously motionless material substrate, and eventually, as it becomes more ordered and synchronized—that is, as Sophia “repents”

---

90 Et descendentem simpliciter in aquas, cum essent immobiles, et movisse quoque eas, petulanter agentem usque ad abyssos, et assumpsisse ex eis corpus. Humectationi enim luminis eius omnia accurrisset et adhaessisse duceret et circumtenuisset: quam nisi habuisset, tota absorpta fortasse fuisset et demersa a materia. Deligatam igitur hanc a corpore, quod erat a materia, et valde gravatam respisset aliquando et conatam esse fugere aquas et ascendere ad materiam; non potuisset [eam] autem propter gravedinem circumpositi corporis. . . . Et cum virtutem accepisset ab humectatione eius quod erat secundum eam lumen, resiliit et in sublimitatem elata est, et facta in alto dilatavit et cooperuit et fecit coelem hoc quod appararet, a [e] corpore eius; et remansit sub coelo quod fecit, adhuc habens aquatilis corporis typum.
or “becomes rational again” (*resipisse*)—will separate the visible heaven (*fecit caelum hoc quod apparebat*) from matter.

The first three paragraphs of Irenaeus’s summary of the ‘Ophite’ cosmology contain the exegesis of the first eight verses of the Mosaic cosmogony. A special emphasis was laid on the image of “the spirit of god rushing upon the water” (Gen 1:2b), in which the ‘Ophites’ saw two distinct agents working at two separate stages of the cosmogony:

(i) At the stage preliminary to the creation of the visible world, the spirit rushing upon the water” stands for the superior Holy Spirit, called First Woman, borne (*ferri*) over the differentiated elements, and separating the realm of light (Father of All–Conception–Son of Man) from the material substrate

(ii) In addition, the “spirit of God” from Genesis 1:2b stands for Sophia, the offspring of the Holy Spirit, as she descended into the material substrate and set its superior parts (primordial waters) into motion, initiating the fabrication of the visible universe

One interpretation does not exclude the other. Even though they both ultimately interpret the Biblical “spirit of God rushing over the waters” in the same fashion, as the organization of the material substrate (*materia prima* in the first case, and separated elements in the second) by a divine agent (Superior Spirit, Sophia)—they carefully distinguish between the cosmological levels, and the stages of cosmogony, at which this ordering activity takes place.

Similarly to the ‘Ophites’, the author of the tract *On the Origin of the World* applies the words of Genesis 1:2 to the fabrication of the visible universe. This time, however, the Biblical spirit “rushing over the waters” is not the fallen Sophia but Ialdabaoth, her imperfect product. The relevant episode begins with Pistis Sophia appearing over the spiritless “matter of chaos”, the product of her own miscarriage, and moving disturbingly (*ετορτέ*) because of the defective (*υτίκα*) nature of her creation. The result of this disturbance is a fearful and spiritless entity which Sophia subsequently transforms, upon bestowing some of her spirit—more precisely, upon “blowing into its face”—into a ruler “over matter and over all of its forces.” This ruler is “lion-like in appearance, androgynous, having great authority within him, but ignorant of whence he had come into existence” (II 99:24–100:10).
Now, when Pistis Sophia saw him moving in the depth of the waters (ἁπάντιος ἡπιοῦ ἐξ ἰδή), she said to him, “Child, pass through to here,” whose equivalent is ialdabaoth. Since that day, there appeared the principle of verbal discourse (ἐλάσσε, λόγος). Now when he had come to have authority over matter, Pistis Sophia withdrew (ἀναχωρεῖν) up to her light. When the archon saw his magnitude—and it was only himself that he saw, and he saw nothing else except for water and darkness—then he thought (μεγέθε) that it was he alone who existed. [And] his thinking was completed by means of verbal expression (ἐλάσσε, λόγος), and appeared as “a spirit moving to and fro over the waters” (ὀυπάπα ἐξ ἰδή ἐξ ἰδήν ἣριδίπ ἡπιοῦ). And when the spirit appeared, the archon set apart the watery substance (ὡσία); and what was dry was set apart into another place. And from matter (ὕλη) he fabricated for himself a dwelling place and called it heaven; and from matter the archon fabricated a footstool (ὑποπόδιον) and called it earth.

(Orig. World II 100:10–101:9)

The product of Pistis Sophia’s disturbance (ἐπορτῆ) was in a state of disorderly movement as soon as it came to exist. At first, it “rushed toward” (πυτερατ) the mother “in the chaos” (99:32), and Sophia reacted by granting it spirit and form (τύπος) and turning it into the ruler of the lower realm. Since the ruler’s movement (κῆ) over the waters of chaos could not produce any positive effect, Pistis Sophia addressed him and thus passed onto him the power of verbal expression (λόγος). The result of all these corrective actions is Ialdabaoth, the character endowed with spirit, form, verbal expression, and (discursive) thinking, now capable of configuring the amorphous matter.91

91 The clue for understanding the nature of Ialdabaoth’s thinking is given later in the narrative, in the episode describing the rebellion of Sabaoth, one of Ialdabaoth’s archontic powers, who “hated his father, the darkness, and his mother, the abyss, and loathed his sister, the thinking (μεγεθε) of the prime parent, which moved to and fro over the waters (ὁ-εται-παι έται-πην μεγαται-πηνου)” (104:10–13). A masculine noun, the Coptic word for thinking, μεγεθε, does not convey the full meaning of the Greek original. The fact that the thinking of Ialdabaoth equals Sabaoth’s “sister” (τευται-παι) implies the presence of a feminine noun in the Greek Vorlage, probably one of the technical terms designating the discursive activity of reason—διάνωσι (calculation, reasoning, pondering) or, more appropriate for Gnostic jargon, ἐνθομητος (intention, conception, reflection). Both terms often assumed a pejorative meaning in the writings traditionally labeled as ‘Gnostic’, in that they (i) referred to a persevering discursive process in contrast to the intuitive and spontaneous act of thinking (ἔννοια) characteristic of God the Father, and (ii) pointed to the changeability and vacillation of thinking in contrast to the constancy of divine knowledge (ἐπιστήμη).
To summarize, the Biblical “rushing of the spirit over the water” is not simply a local movement of the active physical element over the corporeal substrate. In this particular ‘Gnostic’ application, it symbolizes the movement of Ialdabaoth’s discursive thinking (ἐνθύμησις or διάνοια), by means of which he designed the fabrication of the visible heaven and the sublunar earth. In order to carry out his design, he made use of the creative power of verbal expression (λόγος, ἐας)—for his intention would have come to naught had it not been “completed by means of verbal expression (λόγος)” (100: 33–34).

Sophia’s Movement and Wisdom Literature

Unlike the above discussed interpretations of Gen 1:2b, the Apocryphon of John engages in an open polemic with the Biblical portrayal of the stage preliminary to the ordering of the visible world. Speaking through the mouth of the Savior, the author of the Apocryphon draws an explicit distinction between the literal and non-literal meaning of Moses’ account of creation: “Do not think that it is as Moses said... No, but...” (II 13:19–21, BG 45:8–10).

The polemic is announced by the shift of emphasis, from Ialdabaoth the villain to Sophia the victimized heroine: “Now, the mother began to rush over” (ἐπιφέρεσθαι BG 44:19–45:1; ἔεσαι II 13:13–14). The Savior was about to expand on this statement when John, thus far totally speechless, suddenly interrupted his monologue and posed a brief question: “Christ, what does it mean, ‘to rush over’?” (BG 45:6–7).

Two features in this short sequence deserve a more detailed treatment. First, it is at this point that the narrative, following a long revelatory lecture by the Savior, resumes the form of a dialogue. This dialogue is, in fact, a brief exchange between the heavenly revealer and the seer, presented in question-and-answer form (ερωταποκρισεῖς)—not a replica of Platonic dialogue, which consists of “detailed answering and ranging through everything” (Plato, Parm. 136d–e), but rather a sort of revelatory catechesis reminiscent of the atmosphere of school instruction. Second, and in accordance with the polemical objective of the passage, it is at this point that the Savior makes the first explicit reference to the Mosaic account of creation—the verb ἐπιφέρεσθαι in the shorter versions and its Coptic equivalent ῥεσεῖ in the longer.
The resumption of the dialogue format is triggered by the introduction of the Biblical reference. By inserting the term ἐπιφέρεσθαι in the first of the three sections portraying Sophia’s reaction to Ialdabaoth’s villainy, the Savior points to the compatibility of his account of Sophia’s movement with the Mosaic cosmogony. John’s immediate reaction discloses both curiosity and confusion. The Biblical ἐπιφέρεσθαι appears to him as an anomaly in the Savior’s narrative, an obscurity that requires explanation. In the original context of the Mosaic account of creation, the verb denotes the local movement of a physical entity (the divine pneuma in Gen 1:2b, and Noah’s ark in Gen 7:18) over the material substrate (water in both cases), so that John does not see how the use of this verb, with all of its materialistic overtones, should be accounted for in the present context. The simple question—“What is ἐπιφέρεσθαι?—bears witness to John’s perplexity: What meaning, he seems to ask, should one assign to the Biblical term in the context of the Savior’s cosmological exposition?

The Savior’s reaction is a commonplace in contemporary Offenbarungsvisionen—an omniscient teacher smiles benevolently, albeit slightly ironically, at his pupil’s confusion, and then modifies or flatly rejects his erroneous belief. What the Savior contests is the literal interpretation of Genesis 1:2b: “Do not think that it is as Moses said, ‘over the waters’” (II 13:19–21). The verb ἐπιφέρεσθαι is not to be understood spatially, as the movement of one corporeal (πνεῦμα, κύματα) entity over another (τὰ οὐδοτα) tamquam loco sicut corpus, to use Augustine’s words. Rather, says the Savior, it designates an agitated movement of the fallen Sophia “in the darkness of unacquaintance” (BG 45:14–15; II 13, 24–25).

There is yet another question that John as an inexperienced neophyte failed to formulate—the question of the Savior’s hermeneutical strategy. On what grounds did the Savior make his narrative compatible, and comparable, with the Mosaic account? In other words, why did he consider as legitimate his insertion of the Biblical phrase in his account of Sophia’s movement?

92 For the motif of a smiling god, or angel, often employed in visionary accounts and in the cosmogonic context, see for example Jos. Asen. 16.7; Herm. Vis. 3.8.2; Korê kosmou 23.10; PMG IV 1611; III 161–91, 471–522.
The reference of Sophia’s movement to the Biblical rushing of God’s spirit over the waters was effected through the intercession of a third text—the group of Biblical passages, mostly from Hellenistic Wisdom literature, which openly set forth, or at least allude to, the identity of the spirit of God and the divine Wisdom as the creative principles in cosmogony. The first traces of this equation, which was often extended to encompass even the divine Word (λόγος, ρήμα), appear in Psalm 103 (24: “You made everything in wisdom, and the earth was filled with your creation”; 30: “You will send forth your spirit, and they will be created”). The famous self-proclamation of the personified Wisdom in Proverbs (8:22–31), although it falls short of associating Sophia with the spirit of God, appears to have been a catalyst in this process of fusion that was finally completed in Sirach. It is here (Sir 24:3–5) that, in a clear allusion to the spirit of Gen 1:2b, Sophia portrays herself in the following fashion:

I came forth from the mouth of the most high (cf. Ps 32:6)
and covered the earth as a mist (cf. Gen 1:2b);
I dwelt in the highest heavens
and my throne was in a pillar of cloud (cf. Exod 13:21–22).
Alone I encircled the heavenly vault
and walked around in the depths of the abyss (cf. Prov 8:27–29).

The assimilation is pushed even further in the Wisdom of Solomon (7:22–24):

For there is in her [Wisdom] a spirit intelligent and holy,
unique of its kind yet manifold, subtle,
agile, lucid, and unsullied,
clear, inviolable, loving the good, keen,
irresistible, beneficent, humane,
firm, steadfast, and free from anxiety,
all-powerful, surveying all,
and moving through all spirits
that are intelligent, pure, and altogether subtle.
For wisdom is more mobile than any motion,
because of her pureness she pervades and permeates all things.

Wisdom (σοφία) and the intelligent spirit (πνεῦμα νοερόν) personify here the same cosmic ‘élan vital’ that sustains and governs the universe. Just as Wisdom “stretches mightily from one end of the earth to the other and orders all things befittingly” (8:1), so “the spirit of the Lord has filled the world” and “sustains all things together” (1:7).

Among many a relevant passage from Wisdom literature, there is one that seems most likely to have served as an intertextual link for
the Savior’s interpretation of Genesis 1:2b. This is the last verse of Sophia’s self-proclamation in Sirach (24:5).

I walked around in the depth of the abyss (ἐν βάθει ἀβύσσων περιπάτησα).

Two features in the Savior’s exegesis corroborate this assumption. First, there is a clear structural analogy between Sir 24:5, Gen 1:2b, and the Savior’s interpretation of Gen 1:2b: an agent (pneuma, Sophia) conducts movement (“rushing,” or “walking around,” or “going to and fro”) while confined to a certain alien medium (“over the waters,” or “in the depth of the abyss,” or “in the darkness of ignorance”). Second, in the final poem of deliverance, fully recorded only in the longer redaction of the Apocryphon (II 30:11–31:31), the Savior refers to Sir 24:5 in the similar context of his own descent as the heavenly agent of salvation, identified with “the perfect Providence of the entirety” (II 30:12): “I walked in the greatness of darkness” (II 30:15–17 ἀεὶ-μοιεὶ ἀεὶ-τὴν-τιθῆναι ἡ-πίκλη).94

The Savior’s interpretive strategy very much agrees with the basic principles of the ‘Gnostic’ exegesis of Biblical oracles. The common presupposition was that the prophecies of the Old Testament issued from prophetic spirits belonging to distinct levels of reality. Thus, (i) certain oracles issued exclusively from Ialdabaoth and were uttered by his obedient, blind prophets; (ii) other oracles issued from Sophia, or other representatives of the Pleroma (e.g., Logos, the spiritual seed), and were promulgated directly by their prophets; (iii) finally, some prophecies originated in the Pleromatic realm but were transmitted by Ialdabaoth, clad in deceptive images and symbols, to his blind prophets.

In the case of the last group of oracles, the task set before any ‘Gnostic’ exegete is to uncover the hidden wisdom behind their literal meaning and their material imagery—that is, to interpret such oracles by means of allegorical ‘translation’.

The interpretation of Genesis 1:2b is the first in a series of similarly structured allegorical ‘translations’ in the Apocryphon of John. Their common elements can be specified as follows:

Most of these allegorical readings start with the same narrative device, that is, with John interrupting the Savior’s exposition and putting forward a short question.

All of them occur at those points in the Savior’s revelatory account when the superior realm comes in contact with the material realm of Ialdabaoth—that is, whenever Pleromatic messengers and helpers, disguised under various material appearances, enter the phenomenal world in order to recover the divine power of light that Ialdabaoth had originally stolen from Sophia.

Finally, most of them claim the superiority of their allegorical reading by quoting from, or alluding to, the aforementioned first and second group of Biblical oracles—that is, those in which Ialdabaoth openly revealed his ill-willed intentions to the prophets (e.g. Isaiah), or those issued by the Pleromatic figures to very few privileged individuals (‘Solomon’, Sirach).

Whereas in his exegesis of Genesis 1:2b the Savior only alluded to his ‘intertext’ (Sir 24:5) when identifying Sophia with the divine 

Now, the mother began to ἐπιφέρεσθαι: she recognized her lack, for her consort had not agreed with her as she was blamed by her perfection.

And for my part I said, “Christ, what does it mean, ἐπιφέρεσθαι?” But he smiled.

He [the chief archon] wanted to bring out the power that he had given to him [Adam].

And he cast an ἔκστασις over Adam.

And for my part I said, “Lord, what is ἔκστασις?”

[III 29:4 He smiled.]
In both passages, the Savior departs from the formal postulates of allegorical exegesis. He does not quote the whole Biblical verse as a *lemma* to be supplied with a comment or gloss. Nor does he keep a clearcut distinction between the text he interprets and his own interpretation. His *lemma* is, in fact, an already initiated interpretation of the Mosaic verse, one in which Sophia has already been substituted for the divine pneuma, and Ialdabaoth for the Biblical god, and retaining only a word (§pif°resyai) or a phrase (ka‹ §p°balen ı ¶kstasiw §p‹ tÚn Adãm) from the original Mosaic account. Placed in the new context of the Savior’s revelation, the material overtones of Biblical wording become an obscurity that John cannot resolve on his own. Before offering the correct reading of §pif°resyai and ¶kstasiw, the Savior first rejects the literal meaning—not “over the waters,” and not “he made him asleep.” As for his ‘correct’ interpretation, it finds a crucial corroboration in a third text, also borrowed from the Septuagint, which functions as the interpetant—in the case of §pif°resyai, in the verse from Sirach (24:5); in the case of Adam’s ¶kstasiw, in a slightly modified quote from Isaiah (6:10).

Sirach and Isaiah, however, do not provide a sufficient clue on their own. Between Sirach’s Dame Wisdom “walking around in the depth of the abyss” and the Savior’s Sophia “moving to and fro in the darkness of unacquaintance,” between the Yahweh of Isaiah that “weighs down the ears of their hearts” and the Savior’s Ialdabaoth “weighing down Adam’s senses with insensitivity,” there still lies a wide gap that needs to be filled with analogous propositions from various philosophical traditions. In the case of Adam’s ¶kstasiw, such philosophical stimuli can be determined with relative certainty. Here,
the Savior’s solution echoes one of Philo’s Stoicizing interpretations of the same Biblical passage (QG 1.24 Petit). During his sleep or “ecstasy,” Adam’s senses slackened (τὴν τῶν αἰσθήσεων ὑφεσίν) and separated themselves from sensible objects (ἐξίστανταί τῶν αἰσθητῶν), while his discursive reasoning “withdrew” (τὴν ἀναχώρησιν τοῦ λογισμοῦ) and remained still (ἡμεῖ), unable to activate any of the senses (οὐδὲ παρέχων κίνησιν αὐταῖς). In the case of Sophia’s agitated movement, things appear even more complex—partly because of a variety of philosophical ideas that informed the Savior’s exegesis of Gen 1:2b, and partly because many of these stimuli underwent a thorough revision and assumed a new meaning in order to fit in the specific context of the Savior’s world hypothesis.

There is yet another level in the Savior’s account of Sophia’s movement that seems worthy of a more detailed comment, and this is the relationship he establishes between the temporal-logical order of events in the episode (fabula) and their order of presentation in the narrative (plot). A strictly formal analysis of the episode of Sophia’s reaction to Ialdaboth’s theft has already been conducted, both in respect to its internal division into three parallel sequences and in respect to its position within the larger narrative context.

What remains to be determined is the content of Sophia’s movement of repentance and its order of presentation—that is, the spatial and temporal coordinates within which it occurs, and the role it plays in the cosmogony of the Apocryphon of John.

Temporal Coordinates of Sophia’s Movement: Sophia, Ialdabaoth’s Assistant

At the initial stages of the mythic drama, the narrative thread of the Apocryphon of John faithfully mirrors the rectilinear progression of events. The actions are presented as they logically ensue, in their natural order, from the blissful tranquillity of the solitary Invisible Spirit gazing at the surrounding light down to the generation of aeons in the Pleromatic realm. Even the sense of causality coincides with this chronological sequence—post hoc, ergo propter hoc. But a per-

---

95 The distinction between fabula, the system of events in their logical order (the time of the narrated story) and plot, the system of events in their artificial order (the time of narration), is borrowed from Shklovsky (1990) 15–51; see also Segre (1979) 1–56 and Fusillo (1996) 280–88.
96 Cf. supra, pp. 222–25.
fect congruity between the narrative order (plot) and the natural course of the events (fabula) begins to fade as soon as the action moves away from the Pleroma, and another dimension emerges besides the spiritual one—darkness alongside light, and the fiery realm of Ialdabaoth alongside the Pleromatic perfection. From now on, the heavenly narrator in the Apocryphon’s account has to deal with the problem of how to string a multidimensional reality upon a single unidimensional thread—especially at the moments when the representatives of the two separate levels of reality cross the boundaries and act simultaneously with one another.

A traditional story-teller’s solution amounts to focusing exclusively on one dimension of reality. “There is no instance in our material,” as Vladimir Propp argued referring to the corpus of Russian fairytales, “in which a tale follows both seeker and victimized heroes.”97 When kidnapped, the princess disappears both from “the horizon of her father” and from “that of the listener.” Such a narrowing down of narrative perspective is not a solution acceptable to the Savior in the Apocryphon of John. To link the narrative thread only to the events in Ialdabaoth’s realm would amount to mimicking Moses, his prophet, who was ignorant of any other dimension of reality. On the other hand, focusing exclusively on Sophia, the victimized heroine, or any other agent of the Pleroma, would deprive the story of its complication and its denouement. In this case, the reader would learn a great deal about Sophia’s and, by extension, his own tragic separation from the spiritual realm, but would know virtually nothing about important historical consequences of this separation. Nor would the reader, unacquainted with the reasons for Sophia’s and his own descent into the body, be able to discover the way of ascent and to attain salvation. As the Savior points out to John, one has to know the path that leads downwards in order to be able to reverse the process: “The way of ascent” is that same way “by which [all creation] descended” (II 20:22–24).

In the Apocryphon of John, all levels take part in the cosmic drama: the spiritual realm, Ialdabaoth’s fiery universe, and that mysterious ‘liminal’ zone in between which serves both as a boundary separating the two worlds and as their meeting place. The narrative line

---

97 Propp (1968) 36.
moves forward, but in a tortuous course, oscillating between the separate levels of reality, following now Ialdabaoth and his rulers, now Sophia and her helpers. This constant shift of perspective, clearly visible in the section dedicated to Sophia’s illumination of Ialdabaoth and his theft of Sophia’s luminous power, may occasionally raise serious interpretative problems. Should one, for example, consider these two separate episodes in the narrative sequence as two chronologically distinct moments, or rather as two simultaneous actions, in the cosmic drama? Or is it perhaps that both these episodes, which, as has been shown above, display many affinities in content and internal organisation, simply describe the same cosmogonic event, yet from two different points of view? Similar questions arise whenever the narrator shifts perspective and moves from one level, or one agent, to another. The account of Sophia’s conversion is such a turning point. Once again, Sophia enters the stage and Ialdabaoth, for a little while, disappears from the reader’s sight.

The episode of Sophia’s repentance (μετάνοια) is knotted into the narrative thread following Ialdabaoth’s fabrication of the visible world and his declaration of unity. The transition to this new point is signaled by the Coptic connective and resuming particle άες, which usually stands for the Greek οὖν, and marks that which follows after (post hoc), or that which results from (propter hoc), the previous event or statement. In its first meaning (post hoc), the particle may denote (i) a new stage in the chronological sequence of events, but also (ii) a new stage in the march of thought, without referring to such ‘external’ categories as time, temporal succession, and causality. Now, in the cosmogonical story where, as in the *Apocryphon of John*, the events are supposed to proceed chronologically, the particle άες is expected to have both temporal (‘next’, ‘then’) and inferential (‘then’, ‘so’) connotations. To explain Sophia’s movement as the consequence of an immediately preceding action would thus seem natural. *Post hoc, ergo propter hoc*.

Yet the Savior’s narrative does not seem to support this way of reading. None of the three sequences that constitute this episode links Sophia’s repentance to Ialdabaoth’s creation of the phenomenal world. Each sequence offers instead its own explanation, which varies in wording and content from one redaction to another:

---

98 See *supra*, pp. 171–78.
Now the mother began to rush over (ἐρέσθαι). She recognized her lack; for her consort had not agreed (συμφωνεῖν) with her, as she was blamed (ψέγειν) by her perfection. (BG 44:19–45:5)

Now the mother began to come and go (μετανοεῖν). She recognized the lack when the shining of her light diminished. And she grew dark, for her consort had not agreed (συμφωνεῖν) with her. (II 13:13–17)

She saw the evil (κακία) and the coming separation (ἀποστασία) of her son; she repented (μετανοεῖν). (BG 45:10–13)

When she saw the evil (κακία) that had come to be and the theft committed by her son, she repented (μετανοεῖν). (II 13:21–23)

When the mother recognized the miscarriage of darkness, that it was not perfect, for her consort had not agreed (συμφωνεῖν) with her, she repented (μετανοεῖν) and wept with much weeping. (BG 46:10–15)

When the mother recognized that the garment of darkness had not come out perfectly, she knew that her consort had not agreed (συμφωνεῖν) with her. She repented (μετανοεῖν) and wept with much weeping. (II 13:32–14:1)

One thing turns out to be common to all of these explanations. They all view Sophia’s repentance and her disorderly movement as the reaction to Ialdabaoth’s theft, and not to his fabrication of the material universe—the reaction triggered as soon as Sophia became aware of her deficiency (ἐτα) and able to foresee the “forthcoming” separation, or ‘apostasy’, of her son. Post hoc, at non propter hoc.

Sophia’s action lasts for a while, as indicated by the Savior’s choice of the continuous and ingressive verbal aspects: “The mother began to (ἀρχεῖν) rush over”; “She began (ἀρχεῖν) to feel shame going to and fro (ἐς-να ἐς-να)”; “She did not dare to return but was going to and fro (ἵπτερα ἓς-τερα).” This agitated movement, an outward expression of Sophia’s continuing repentance and feeling of shame, came to an end only when “the prayer of her repentance” was heard and after her “brethren prayed on her behalf” (BG 46:15–18; II 14:1–5 “the whole fullness”). It was then that the invisible Spirit “poured over her a spirit from the perfection” (BG 47:1–3; NHC II 14:5–6) and rescued her from her predicament.

And she was taken up not to her own aeon but, because of a rather great ignorance that she had shown, she resides in the Ninth until she has rectified her lack. (BG 47:8–13; II 14:9–13)

The terminus ad quem of Sophia’s ordeal could hardly be clearer. Her ascent to the ninth heaven implies that Ialdabaoth’s fabrication of the eight cosmic spheres, his own and those assigned to his seven archons, has been completed. With Sophia’s ascendance, the universe
of the *Apocryphon of John* reaches consolidation. Above, there is the spiritual realm; below, the geocentric universe of Ialdabaoth presiding over the seven planetary spheres; and at the outer surface of the visible world, right next to the Pleroma, Sophia’s temporary dwelling—the liminal zone enabling the two separate worlds to communicate.

Sophia’s movement of repentance unfolds in three separate sequences: its initial stage, its continuance, and its terminal point. Its *terminus a quo* is Ialdabaoth’s theft, and it starts right after Sophia has recognized the loss of power, but before Ialdabaoth initiates the cosmogonic process. It continues all the way through Ialdabaoth’s creation and ends only after his work, the visible universe, is complete. In a word, its position in the narrative does not reflect its real place in the natural course of events. As they stand in the narrative, all stages of Sophia’s disorderly movement appear to be dislocated with regard to the natural order. Thus, the moment when Sophia recognized her miscarriage and began to move precedes, in fact, Ialdabaoth’s creation (BG 45:11–12: “she saw the evil and the coming separation of her son”). Her movement of repentance runs along with the cosmogonic process, and does not come after it, as suggested by the order of presentation. Finally, even Sophia’s ascent to the ninth heaven does not necessarily ensue Ialdabaoth’s arrogant self-proclamation as a “jealous god”—for an inverse order, in which Sophia’s withdrawal from the visible world comes prior to Ialdabaoth’s formula of unity, was already indicated by Irenaeus as more ‘natural’: “When she [Sophia] withdrew, he opined to be alone and said, ‘I am a jealous God and there is none but me’” (*Adv. haer.* 1.29.4). The whole episode, therefore, is a regressive excursus that introduces a surprising discontinuity in the rectilinear presentation of events—to make use of Umberto Eco’s paradoxical formula, *post hoc ergo ante hoc.*

The confusing tension between the temporality of the events and the temporality of the narrative might have been eased by a simple reversal of the order in which the two episodes, Ialdabaoth’s fabrication and Sophia’s movement, appear in the *Apocryphon*. The author of the *Apocryphon of John*, however, decided to sacrifice clarity for the sake of preserving the Biblical order of the cosmogonic

---

events. Sophia’s movement of repentance occurs in his narrative after Ialdabaoth’s creation of phenomenal reality just as, in the Mosaic account, the spirit’s “rushing over the waters” (Gen 1:2b) follows after the “creation of the heaven and earth” (Gen 1:1). Changing the original Biblical order would destroy the perfect congruity between Moses’ and the Savior’s account of cosmogony—a price that the author of the Apocryphon was not willing to pay. Besides, keeping the original Biblical sequence of events does not obscure the intertextual character of the Savior’s reinterpretation of Genesis. What the Savior sets out to teach the ignorant recipient of his revisionary revelation is the simultaneity of Sophia’s disorderly movement of repentance and of Ialdabaoth’s fabrication of the visible universe—the idea he has borrowed from Sophia’s proclamation in Proverbs 8:27: “When he [God] established the heavens, I was there with him” (ἡνίκα ἤτοιμαζεν τὸν οὐρανὸν συμπερήμαν αὐτῷ).

Once again, Sophia’s prophecies borrowed from Wisdom literature supplied the clue for a proper understanding of the Mosaic account of creation. The sequence of cosmological events in the first two verses of Genesis is not to be understood diachronically, as portrayed by Moses. What Sophia has revealed in Prov 8:27 is that she is herself the spirit that, in the beginning, “rushed upon the waters” (Gen 1:2b), assisting (“being there with”) God in the creation of the heavens. Translated into the jargon of contemporary philosophical theories of causality, Ialdabaoth acts here as the instrumental, demiurge-like cause (τὸ δι’ οὗ, ‘that through which’) of creation, while Sophia stands for both the preliminary (τὸ ἀφ’ οὗ, τὸ ἔξ οὗ, ‘that away from which’ and ‘that out of which’, i.e. acting by impulse or impression) and auxiliary (τὸ σὺν ὧ, αὐτὸν συνεργῶν) causes. Taken separately, neither Sophia nor Ialdabaoth can alone bring the universe into existence. Each one is a necessary contributory factor to the world’s becoming, yet neither of them is alone entitled to take the full credit for it.100

100 Other writers traditionally labeled as ‘Gnostic’ also drew on contemporary philosophical theories of causation, as indicated by their complex classification of Biblical prophecies, on which see supra, pp. 237–38. In Tri. Tra. I 100:30–35, the divine Logos, Sophia’s correlate, is presented as “using” (χρωσθεὶς) the demiurge “like a hand in order to beautify and work on that which is below.” According to Tertullian’s summary of ‘Valentinian’ doctrines, Sophia Achamoth acted as a hidden master controlling the demiurge as though pulling strings in a puppet theatre.
Spatial Coordinates of Sophia’s Movement: Metanoia, Its Meaning and Function

The spatial coordinates of Sophia’s movement are not readily distinguishable. In the whole episode, there is no single clear reference to the place in the cosmic structure where Sophia’s action took place. The local term from Genesis 1:2b, ἐπιφέρεσθαι, is interpreted by the Savior in an ethical sense, as an internal movement of repentance (μετάνοια)—and not as Moses said, rushing “over the water” (BG 45:9–10).

The three sections in which the Savior describes Sophia’s response to Ialdabaoth’s theft display the uniform sequence of actions. First, Sophia recognizes her deficiency, described as the partial loss of her light, and sees that the offspring she has brought forth is in fact a miscarriage, an evil (κακία). Only then she becomes aware of the dreadful fact that her male “consort (σύνζυγος) has not come in harmony (συμφωνεῖν) with her” (BG 36:20–37:1, II 9:28–29)—dreadful inasmuch as showing that her desire to “show forth an image out of herself,” her whole plan to generate the replica of her ‘enthymematic’ analysis of God into a signifying chain of predicates, was ill-conceived from the very beginning. Sophia knows how to evaluate her consort’s refusal to “come in harmony with her”—whatever thought or intention God “keeps at distance” must be a fault, a wrongdoing (Tert. Paen. 3.2). The acknowledgement of fault and the acceptance of responsibility for it entail the internal tumult of repentance (μετάνοια)—a violent, disorderly motion accompanied with shame and “much weeping,” which weakens the soul to the point of losing audacity (τόλμα) to find the way out of this tumult. As the Savior

explains it to John, Sophia “did not dare (τολμᾶν) to return, but continued to move to and fro” (BG 45:16–18, IV 21:13–15).

The lexical and thematic context within which Sophia’s repentance (μετάνοια) takes place in the *Apocryphon of John* is reminiscent of the use of *metanoia* in the Septuagint, in the Hellenistic Jewish pseudepigrapha, and in the New Testament writings. The association of repentance with shame and grief occurs, for example, in Paul, who connects *metanoia* with distress (λύπη): “Now I rejoice, not because you were grieved, but because you did so for the sake of repentance (2 Cor 7:9). The reference, later in the *Apocryphon*, to “the place where there is no repentance” (II 27:26; cf. BG 70:13–14), reserved for the souls of ignorant renegades, echoes the Biblical motif of “the place of repentance” (τόπος μετανοιῶν Wis 12:10; cf. Sir 4:5, Rom 12:19, Eph 4:27, Heb 12:17). The “baptism of repentance,” proclaimed by John the Baptist “for the forgiveness of sins” (Mark 1:4, Luke 3:3; cf. Matt 3:2–6, Acts 19:4), along with Peter’s Pentecost order to “repent and get baptized . . . for the forgiveness of . . . sins and “for receiving the gift of the holy spirit” (Acts 2:38), might have served as the narrative model for Sophia’s own baptism of repentance. After the invisible Spirit had heard her prayer of repentance, accompanied by that of her brethren, “he poured over her a spirit from the fullness” and “her consort came down to her” (BG 46:15–47:4; cf. II 14:1–5). Even the opposition of light and darkness—the symbolic frame of Sophia’s movement of repentance in the *Apocryphon*—seems to owe a great deal to Hellenistic Jewish literature: “For . . . repentance destroys disobedience, puts darkness to flight (φυγάδευε τὸ σκότος), illumines (φωτίζει) the vision, provides the soul with knowledge (γνῶσιν), and guides the deliberative powers (τὸ διαβούλιον) to salvation” (*T. Gad* 5:7). Finally, the whole episode dealing with Sophia’s dramatic fall into the darkness of ignorance, from her realization of wrongdoing and her change of attitude to her transformation by God, her partial ascent and her union with the heavenly “consort” (σύνζυγος) mirrors the syntagmatic development of Aseneth’s conversion to Judaism—separation, liminality, repentance and self-castigation, prayers of confession, request for acceptance, transformation by a heavenly visitor, reintegration—in the ‘haggadic’ romance *Joseph and Aseneth*.

But not every feature of Sophia’s repentance can be traced back to Biblical and pseudepigraphic sources—and particularly not the assimilation of *metanoia* with an agitated movement (μετάνοια μετανοιῶν,
It is true that connecting repentance with an erratic movement can be traced as far back as Isaiah—“repent, you who have wandered (μετανοήσατε οἱ πεπλανημένοι) and convert in your heart” (Isa 46:8)—and as close to the Apocryphon as the cosmogony of the Hermetic Pοiμανδρες—“repent, you who have journeyed with error” (CH 1.28: μετανοήσατε οἱ συνοδεύσαντες τῇ πλάνῃ). Yet in neither does repentance stand for an agitated motion; on the contrary, both texts view it as the cancellation of the preceding erratic movement. It is also true that, in the story of Joseph and Aseneth, the heroine’s repentance includes a series of uncontrolled bodily moves; but in contrast with the Apocryphon’s portrayal of Sophia’s ordeal, there is no clear reference in the narrative to Aseneth’s metanoia as a tumult of the soul, a passion (πάθος) that forestalls the proper functioning of reason. Sophia’s repentance seems rather a philosophical construct, belonging to the domain of Stoic and Platonist ethics.

In its philosophical application, metanoia is a term unsuitable for any divine being. Changeability, in all of its aspects—physical, ethical, and noetic—is incompatible with God’s undisturbed existence and the wise man’s intellectual firmness. God is incapable of repenting (ἀμετανόητος) because he never acts out of ignorance, never commits sins, and never has to change his thoughts, let alone repent for his actions. Such a godlike existence is accessible at least to some humans—more specifically, to those endowed with mind (Stob. Ecl. 2.113, 5–11 Wachsmuth) and “possibly,” as Philo adds, “to a divine

---

101 Jos. Asen. 11.1: “And Aseneth . . . was exceedingly tired and could not control her limbs because of the want for the seven days . . . And Aseneth clasped her hands, finger against finger, and shook her head to and fro (ἐξετε τὴν κεφαλήν σώτης ἐνθεν καὶ ἐνθεν), and struck her breast constantly with her hands . . .

102 See, however, Aseneth’s dreamlike vision of being persecuted by “the father of the gods of the Egyptians,” represented as “the wild old lion” (Jos. Asen. 12.9–11): “But you, O Lord, rescue me from his hands, and from his mouth deliver me, lest he carry me off like a lion, and tear me up and throw me into the flame of fire; and fire will throw me into the big wave (εἰς τὴν καταγίδα), and the big wave will wrap me up in darkness and throw me out into the deep of the sea, and the big monster existing since eternity will swallow me; and I will be destroyed for ever.” What these tumultuous movements represent is not the soul of the repentant, which oscillates between good and evil, but the state of the soul that failed to repent and, as a result, surrendered itself to the “lion,” the symbol of fortuitous impulses characteristic of irrational emotions.
man”—for “conversion (μεταβολαίν) from sin to a blameless life is the property of a man of wisdom who has not been ignorant of what is for his benefit” (Virt. 177).

Viewed from the divine perspective, metanoia is thus a negative notion indicating change, both ethical (‘repentance for sin’) and noetic (‘change of mind’: τρόπη γνώμης Plut. Mar. 10.5; γνώμη μεταβολή Philo, Deus 26). In fact, it is an emotion (πάθος) “depending on false assent” (Stob. Anth. 2.113,6 Wachsmuth: καὶ γὰρ τὴν μετάνοιαν ἐξεσθαί ψευδοῦς συγκαταθέσεως; Philo, Aet 38 πάθος καὶ νόσημα . . . ψυχῆς), the product of opinion (δόξα), rather than knowledge (ἐπιστήμη). Just like the synonymous metamολεία (Ps.-Andron. Pass. 2.227, 44–45 G–T), metanoia is a species of distress (λύπη), defined by the Stoics as the recognition of a present evil. Yet this is a special kind of distress, in which we acknowledge, and grieve over, our own misdeeds, previous sins, and wrong decisions (ibid.). Oftentimes, metanoia is accompanied with other kinds of distress—shame, crying, mourning (αἰδώς, αἰσχύνη). The acknowledgment of a wrongdoing provokes an upheaval, a fluttering motion (SVF 1.206 πτοσία) devoid of clear direction, yet capable of changing swiftly (Plut. De virt. mor. 7, 447A). Like other passions, metanoia, too, is “an opinion . . . possessing disorderly movement” (SVF 3.394 τὸ ἀτακτὸν κινητικὸν).

Viewed from the human perspective, however, metanoia is a highly ranked ethical category—“a younger brother of sinlessness” (Philo, Somn. 1.91), “standing second to perfection” (τέλειότης Abr. 26) and

103 Plut. De virt. mor. 12, 452D; Aen./Tim. 2.11; De soll. an. 3, 961D λύπην δι’ ἀληθοῦς . . . ἣν μετάνοιαν καλοῦμεν).
104 Cf. Tertullian, Paen. 1.1 passionem animi quandam esse, quae obveniat de offensa sententiae prioris.
105 For μετάνοια in relation to δόξα, see esp. Tab. Ceb. 11, where repentance is said to “release a man from his ills and provide him with another opinion, which leads him to true education, and also with another, which leads him to false education, as it is called”; ibid. 29, where opinion, δόξα, is described as inferior to knowledge, ἐπιστήμη: “For it is not allowed for opinion to move into the realm of knowledge.” For repentance in the sense of acknowledging and grieving over previous misdeeds see Philo, LA 3.12 ἐπὶ τὴν πάλαι τροπὴν, and Fuga 157 ἀμαρτιμέτων μετανοιῶν; cf. also Plut. De Her. mal. 860E–F τοιχὶ γὰρ μετανοήσασθαι . . . αὐτοῦς ὡς ὡς ποίησαντας ὀρθῶς. For the association of this term with other kinds of distress see Agis et Cleom. 53.3–4 αἰδώς καὶ μετάνοια; Mul. virt. 23, 259D ὡκτείρε καὶ μετανεῖ; De virt. mor. 12, 452C μετάνοιαν καὶ αἰσχύνην; De tranq. an. 19, 49, 147F τὴν δὲ μετάνοιαν . . . δοκιμομένην σὺν αἰσχύνη; Philo, Ios. 87 μετανοοῦσι . . . αἰσχυνομέθα.
to “the perfect memory of divine things” (Virt. 176). If the principal characteristic of the human condition is a proneness to cede to harmful emotions, or passions, then metanoia is the sage’s weapon (Fuga 157 τὸ δὲ μετανοεῖν σοφοῖ) for their eradication. Suppose that desire (ἐπιθυμία) carries the soul to wrong; it is through metanoia that the soul will next “recover itself again” (Plut. De virt. mor. 7.447A). Metanoia is “the healing process” (Philo, L1 1.106 ἰᾶσις), “the recovery from an illness” (ἐκ νόσου ἀναλαμβάνει), aimed at “sobering out” (2.60 ἀνανήσει) and “self-rectification” (3.106 ἔπανορθοσίς; cf. Plut. Virt. mor. 11, 452C πρὸς τὰς ἐπανορθώσεις). Like any recovery, this one, too, may be very “slow and tarrying” (Philo, Fuga 159 ἐσταλμένον δὲ καὶ βραδὺ καὶ μέλλον ἠ μετάνοια). A “strong rock of safety,” metanoia is something we should not “quit hold of until we have been completely delivered from the tossing sea, that is, from the motion of our lapse” (Post.177 ὁσπερ ἐκ κλυδόνος ἀνανησάμενοι λαβόμεθα μετανοίας ... τὸ κυμάτιον πέλαγος, τὴν φθορὰν τῆς τροπῆς, διεκδύναι). The process is not immune from relapses, so that the life marked by metanoia “consists of darkness and light—of darkness by the impact of passions and injustices, and of light when the light of virtue shines out, and its splendor is very bright” (QG 1.84). The award for perseverance is the life “outside of passions” (Post. 135 ἐκτὸς τῶν παθῶν), ready to convert to (ἐπιστρέφει πρός) the incorruptible one and to “fellowship with god” (πρὸς θεὸν οἰκείοσίς).

To conclude, metanoia is a concept laden with ethical ambiguity and semantic complexity:

(i) In so far as implying changeability and stemming from the false assent, metanoia is a negative term, a genuine Stoic emotion (πάθος), “a disease of the soul,” and a sort of distress (λύπη), opposed to divine impassivity and the life of virtue

(ii) At the same time, in so far as being a voluntary recognition of evil and a πάθος opposite to desire (ἐπιθυμία), metanoia is the only kind of distress that reason does not “extirpate, but itself activates” (Plutarch, Tranqu. an. 19, 476F τὰς μὲν γὰρ ἄλλας ἀναιρεῖ λύπας ὁ λόγος: τὴν δὲ μετάνοιαν αὐτὸς ἐνεργάζεται)—a distress “tamed and domesticated by reason” (De virt. mor. 12, 451D τοῖς

πάθεια δεδαμασμένος χρήται καὶ χειροθεσίν ὁ λογισμός, a moderate and ordered emotion, and even a sort of “good emotion” (εὐπάθεια) serving as “the vehicle and stirring power of reason”\(^{107}\)

(iii) Finally, in so far as characterized as an emotion set in order by reason, μετανοια comes close to an ethical virtue (ἡθικὴ ἀρετή), a “proportionate mean between passions” (De virt. mor. 4, 433C σωματεία παθῶν καὶ μεσότης), which helps men “recover their sight and come from the deepest darkness to behold the most radiant light” (Philo, Virt. 179 ἀνέβλεψαν ἐκ βαθυτάτου σκότους αὐγοειδέστατον φῶς ἰδόντες)

Excursus: Ambiguities of Metanoia

Most of the above quoted evidence comes from Philo and Plutarch,\(^{108}\) not only because of their extensive and diverse use of the term μετανοια, but also for their value as the epitomizers of earlier philosophical and exegetical traditions. The term was apparently in vogue among the Stoics even before Epictetus (Ench. 34; Diatr. 2.22, 35; fr. 25), as suggested by Arius Didymus’s and Plutarch’s doxographical reports.\(^{109}\) Initially, it seems to have been loaded with negative connotations—even its etymology indicates a

---

\(^{107}\) The ‘Platonizing’ redefinition of εὐπάθεια as a moderate passion represents a serious modification of its original Stoic meaning as a healthy, rational, and thoughtful impulse (Epict. Diss. 2.68–9 φρονίμη ὁμή) directed at predicating goodness to virtue and badness to vice—the modification introduced in accordance with Plato’s parts-of-the-soul theory. See, for example, Plutarch’s definition in De virt. mor. 9, 449B: “For a good emotion (εὐπάθεια) arises when reason does not destroy emotion but adorns it and sets it in order in temperate people (τοῦ λογισμοῦ τὸ πάθος οὐκ ἀναιρεῖται ἀλλὰ κοσμοῦται καὶ τάσσεται ἐν τοῖς σωφρονοῦσιν); 4, 443C: “Ethics is...a quality of the irrational,...since reason does not wish to eradicate emotion completely...but puts upon it some limit and order [οὐ βουλαμένου [τοῦ λόγου] τὸ πάθος ἐξαιρεῖν παντάσαιν... ἀλλ’ ὀρόν τινα καὶ τάξιν εἰπτεῖντος] and implants the ethical virtues, which are not insensitive to emotions”; cf. also 12, 451F. For metanoia and the other principal emotions (shame, desire, pleasure, distress, ambition) serving as vehicles to reason see 12, 452D: καθάπερ ὀρίμημα τοῦ λογισμοῦ καὶ ὀχύρμα τοῦ πάθος προστιθέντος. According to Plutarch, even his Stoic opponents, when educating young people, chastise them with admonitions; what they hope to provoke by this is a kind of distress (λύπη), or repentance (μετάνοια), and a kind of fear (φόβος), or shame (αἰσχύνη), which may then lead to rectification (πρὸς τάς ἐπανορθώσεις).

\(^{108}\) For Philo’s ethics and his reading of the Jewish scriptures as a ‘diary’ of the soul, see supra, pp. 148–60; for Plutarch’s psychotherapeutic views see esp. Ingenkamp (1971; 1999, 79–94; 2000, 251–66).

\(^{109}\) For Arius Didymus see Stob. Anth. 2.113, 5–11 Wachsmuth; Plutarch discusses the term in the context of his polemic with early Stoic ‘orthodoxy’ (Chrysippus); cf. De virt. mor. chaps. 7, 9, and 12. A thorough discussion about Plutarch’s sources is available in Babut (1969) 44–54 and Becchi (1990) 10 ff.
swift change of mind, fluttering, and cognitive instability, which are
precisely the opposites of the Stoic ideal of systematic consistency and secure
knowledge. Yet this sense of fluctuation and swiftness of change, which is
inherent in metanoia, sets it at the same time apart from other bad emo-
tions. As Chrysippus put it, metanoia denotes the change in both directions,
to aversion and “shameful conduct” as well as to virtuous life. With the
rise of the Platonizing trend within Stoicism in the mid-second century b.c.,
followed by a gradual abandonment of Chrysippus’s ethical monism, metanoia
underwent further important modifications. In one of his earlier ethical trea-
tises On Tranquility of Soul, Plutarch gives an interesting definition of metanoia,
clearly intended to bridge the gap between the Stoic intellectualist view of
emotions and the Platonist parts-of-the-soul doctrine (Transqu. an. 19, 476E–F):

We can make this reply to Menander: True, “No man alive may say, ‘I shall not suffer this’” (Men. frag. 355 Kock), yet while still alive one
can say, “I will not do this: I will not lie nor play the villain nor defraud
nor scheme.” For this, lying as it were within our power, is not a small
but a great help toward tranquility of soul (πρὸς εὐθυμίαν)—just as, on
the contrary again, “My conscience, since I know I have committed
a dreadful deed” (Eur. Or. 396), like an ulcer in the flesh, leaves
behind in the soul regret which ever continues to wound and prick it
(ἡ σύνεσις . . . τὴν μεταμέλειαν αἰμάσσουσαν ἀιὲ καὶ νόσσουσαν ἐναποκέπει). For the other kinds of distress reason does away with (τὰς μὲν γὰρ ἡλίκιας ἀναιρεῖ λόγας ὁ λόγος), but repentance it exerts itself, when the soul
feels stung with shame and self-chastised (τὴν δὲ μετάνοιαν αὐτὸς ἐνεργάζε-
tαι δοκιμομένης σὺν αἰσχύνῃ τῆς ψυχῆς καὶ κολαξομένης ὲφ’ αὐτῆς).

First, Plutarch takes metanoia as synonymous with μεταμέλεια, which acquired
a clear ethical connotation as early as Democritus (frag. 43 Luria). Second,
he defines metanoia as a special kind of distress (λύπη) which, unlike all other
kinds, is not extirpated by reason, but, on the contrary, arises by the agency
of the same reason. Since earlier in his work Plutarch promoted the parts-
of-the-soul theory, assigning autonomy to the passionate and irrational part
(465B) and proclaiming it the ultimate source of all emotions, his assertion
that metanoia, albeit a species of one of the cardinal emotions (λύπη, dis-
tress), originates in reason, comes as a surprise. The apparent contradic-
tion may result from Plutarch’s concession to the Stoicizing view of metanoia
as the product of mind, the “commanding faculty” of the soul (ἡγεμονικόν).
In his later work, On Moral Virtue (19, 449B–D, 452D) Plutarch will pro-
pose a genuinely Platonist solution to the problem of the ethical status of
metanoia—a species of distress produced by the soul’s irrational part, but set
in order by reason.

Another important feature in Plutarch’s passage is the association, often
reiterated in his vast corpus, of metanoia with the soul’s pricking of con-
science (δημοσία).110 This term has an interesting prehistory. In Philo’s revi-

---

110 Cf. De aud. 16, 47A; De ad. et am. 12, 56A ὁ μὲν ἐλέγχω καὶ ψόγῳ δημοσίων
sion (QG 2.57) of the original Stoic list of ‘good emotions’ (ευπόθεσια), it figures, along with compunction (κατάνυξις), as the rational equivalent of grief (Λύπη). Philo’s non-orthodox treatment of the Stoic good emotions—for example, his occasional claim that hope, ἑλπὶς, and not volition or willing, βούλησις, is a positive analogue to desire, ἐπιθυμία—has often been credited to his drawing on the hypothetical ethical doxographies.113 Yet such a radical move as adding to the Stoic list of εὐπαθείαι a positive emotion towards present evils—radical in so far as the sage cannot have any vice present to himself, and so can experience neither distress nor biting and compunction—seems to have more to do with Philo’s exegetical program of turning the Biblical narrative into a manual for spiritual therapy. Following this program, he had to account for many morally ambiguous statements in the Law and Prophets, and to exculpate Biblical heroes, the exemplars of virtue, for their occasional erratic behavior. For example, if reptiles symbolize poisonous passions, why does God enjoin them as food (Gen 9:3)? Philo’s answer in QG 2.57 is that negative passions have their positive counterpart in good emotions (tame reptiles). Or why did Abraham and Sarah fall on their face and so disrespectfully laugh at God’s promise of a son? Philo replies that “virtue is full of exceeding joy at her pregnancy” (LA 3.217), and so laughter is a presentiment (σχοπάθεια) of goods to come.

But Philo is not consistent in assigning a positive ethical meaning to δέχμοι and cognate expressions (δάκνειν, δήγμα). In certain situations, the word may also denote a psychosomatic disorder that originates from distress.
and fear and deals almost a physical blow to the body, “whenever throbbing passion rages in the soul” (Det. 110). Elsewhere, again, δόξανευ is described as the activity of “reason and temperance” (ὁ δὲ λόγος σωφροσύνης) directed at “biting and wounding and destroying passion” (LA 2.99)—clearly, neither an involuntary reaction to non-voluntary stimuli (Sen. Ira 2.3.2 corporis pulsus, animi ictus) nor an instance of pre-emotion (propatheia), defined as an impulse refusing to turn into assent (2.3.4; Plut. Adv. Col. 26, 1121F). The ethical complexity of δημιός is thus not unsimilar to that of metanoia—the term designates both an outward manifestation of passion (pathos) and its exact opposite, just as metanoia is both a sort of distress and an instance of positive emotion (eupatheia). The way to interpret this seemingly inconsistent treatment of the two terms is to posit the ongoing Platonizing revalorization of the Stoic ethical concepts—both metanoia and δημιός are the products of the soul’s irrational part that reason “does not destroy...but composes and sets in order in the souls of temperate people” (Plut. De virt. mor. 9, 449B). Such a view, shared by both Philo and Plutarch, presupposes Plato’s parts-of-the-soul theory in which reason and passion, assigned to the opposite parts of the soul, struggle for domination. As Plutarch says in his polemic against orthodox Stoicism (449B–C),

For if emotion (πάθος) and judgment (κρίσις) were one, love and hate would follow upon our judgment of what we ought to love and hate; but as it is, the contrary happens: with some judgements the emotion joins forces, others it disregard. Therefore even these very men [the Stoics] affirm, since the evidence forces them to do so, that not every judgment is an emotion, but that which sets in motion a violent and excessive impulse, thereby admitting that in us the faculty of judgment and the faculty of experiencing emotion are different, in the sense that the former is that which sets in motion and the latter that which is moved.

For the orthodox Stoics, good emotion (eupatheia) and passion (pathos) are mutually exclusive concepts. Both are impulses that originate in our commanding faculty, the former being a rational (φρόνιμος ὀρμή) and the latter an excessive impulse (ὀρμή πλεονάζουσα). Since rationality is their common place of origin, the Stoics think that they cannot exist simultaneously in it. Rather, they ensue upon one another, as “the single reason turns in both directions” (ἄλλα ἐν ὁμοιω Τροπήν ἐπ’ ἀμφοτέρα), in the process “we do not notice on account of the sharpness and swiftness of the change” (λαυθάνουσαν ἡμῶς ὁξύστητι καὶ τάχει μεταβολῆς 7, 446F–447A). For Philo, on the other hand, δημιός is a passion, a “poisonous” and “unclean reptile” from Gen 9:3 which, whenever controlled by reason, may turn into a good emotion—still a reptile, true, but a “tame” and “clean” one (QG 2.57). It is not that, as orthodox Stoicism would claim, εὐπάθεια arises as a positive affective response to good or wrong only after our reason destroys a pre-existent passion. On the contrary, good emotions come into being whenever the passionate part of the human soul obeys the rule of reason. Passions cannot be fully destroyed simply because they are an inextricable part of
human existence, which virtuous men can only set in order, or tame, but never eradicate. Every passion is thus potentially a good emotion, and every good emotion is nothing but a passion tamed by reason. This is a difference in degree, which does not require a clearcut lexical distinction—hence the semantic ambiguity of both *metanoia* and δημιοῦς in the works of Philo and Plutarch.

The complexity of *metanoia* and its seemingly contradictory aspects—negative/noetic and positive/ethical—could not pass unnoticed by such authoritative scholars of the past as Eduard Norden and Werner Jaeger. The former blamed its inherent ambiguity on an uneasy fusion of conflicting cultural traditions (Hellenistic philosophy vs. Jewish ‘Vorstellungskreisen’), the latter on lively debates in Hellenistic philosophical schools (Stoics vs. Neopythagoreans). Yet Norden’s and Jaeger’s discussions are often schematic, and occasionally treat the available evidence in a rather superficial manner.

Norden believed that the positive (ethical) meaning of *metanoia* had developed in Judaism and for that reason doubted the authenticity of a fragment attributed to Democritus (B43 D–K, frag. 43 Luria), where μεταμόλυβα, the synonym of *metanoia*, carries salutary and salvational connotations—“Remorse for shameful deeds is salvation in life.” In spite of Norden’s reservations, the notions of sin and repentance seem to go as far back as the fifth century B.C. Athenian sophist Antiphon (B39 D–K). Besides, it is hard to believe that the Greek translators of Biblical books would have chosen a thoroughly negative concept to render the Hebrew *niham*, ‘have pity’ or ‘feel remorse’. Some sort of positive meaning must have been granted to *metanoia* on the basis of what we know about the linguistic habits of the Septuagint translators. They used the Greek idiom of their own time and milieu when translating the Hebrew original, without coining new terms or altering the meaning of a Greek word in order to adjust it to the semantics of a Hebrew correlate.

It is even harder to imagine that Callimachus, when describing the statue of the Delphian Apollo holding the graces in his right hand and bow and

---


115 As suggested by Luria (1970) 151, 591. See also Jaeger (1913) 590, who takes the polemic of the early Stoics against *metanoia* as an argument for “the widespread presence of a type of ethics where [the term] had high value.”

116 On this issue, see the remarks by Marguerite Harl in Dorival–Harl–Munnich (1988), esp. 243–44, about the lexical correspondences between the Septuagint and the contemporary Greek papyri. Cf. also the verdict by Lee (1983) 146, that “the bulk of the Pentateuch vocabulary [in the Septuagint version] is the same as that of contemporary Greek.”
arrow in his left “because he is slower to chastize if man repents” (frag. 114.8–17 Pfeiffer), was under the influence of ‘Oriental’ religious traditions, or that the meaning he assigned to μετανοεῖν was not ethically positive. 117

Contrary to Norden’s claim, Jewish authors like Philo, the ‘Pythagoreans’ of the Tabula Cebetis, the ‘Jewish’ author of the Hermetic Póimandres, or early Christians like Tertullian did not always attribute a positive religious value to the term. Nor did the Stoics, considered by Norden and Jaeger as the main proponents of the negative/noetic value of metanoia, view this as an exclusively negative concept, as shown in the preceding discussion. For the Stoics, metanoia is indeed a sort of passion, yet this particular pathos seems to have had a positive, ‘healing’ value in Stoic epistemology and ethics, perhaps even as early as Chrysippus (Plut. De virt. mor. 7, 446E–447C). It is true that the philosopher “never repents...or changes his opinion” (Cic. Mur. 61), but the change of mind from opinion and vice to virtue and knowledge is clearly the sign of moral progress.

The polysemy of metanoia has clearly something to do with intercultural contacts, too, yet it is misleading to explain it as an abstract, almost Hegelian synthesis of mutually exclusive conceptions. Metanoia had been an ambiguous term from the beginning, carrying both ethical and noetic connotations, and heading both in bonam atque malam partem. The syncretistic culture of Hellenism had just exploited, and further developed, these intrinsic ambiguities. The pagan component, and particularly Hellenistic philosophy, appears to have been a major factor in these developments; yet the Hellenized Jews, like the Septuagint translators, Aristoboulos, or Philo—that is, the readers and interpreters of the Biblical texts—appear to have been particularly sensitive to these ambiguities and interested in their further refinement.

The author of the Apocryphon of John was clearly aware of all these complexities when applying the term metanoia to the Biblical σπουδαι (Gen 1:2b). What he needed was a complex concept conveying ethical, noetic, and even physical connotations—so that the spirit’s “rushing over the water” might be simultaneously interpreted as the cosmogonic movement (physical dimension), as emotional conflict (ethical dimension), and as the lack of consistent direction in thinking (noetic dimension).

Sophia’s movement of repentance contains much of the above discussed ambiguity. Her metanoia is a passion, a kind of distress (λύπη), and as such accompanied with shame (μυθις) and tears (μυσε). Having surrendered herself to such a strong irrational emotion, Sophia grows weak, lacking coherence (ἐποκορος), stability, and consistent direction.

117 See Pfeiffer (1960) 69–71, and particularly his discussion about the inscription from the Delphic temple at Miletoupolis (SIG 3 1268.I.8), “not to be dated much later than 300 B.C.,” which contains the phrase μετανοεῖ ὁμαρτον, “repent upon doing wrong,” and which, still according to Pfeiffer, removes “any doubt about the pre-Christian existence of this idea [i.e., of metanoia as repentance].”
She flutters, she moves in a disorderly way, shaken and disturbed in her distress. Yet this distress, paradoxically, is at the same time the signal of recovery. It indicates Sophia’s acceptance of responsibility for evil, her renunciation of a sinful desire (ὀξυσθε, θαυμήσις) to travail without God’s ‘midwifery’, and her determination to abandon all erroneous suppositions about God, conceived by her ‘abortive’ discursive reasoning (μεγεγεστα, ἐπίθομαςις). Chrysippus’s model (Plutarch, De virt. mor. 7, 447A) seems thus easily applicable to Sophia’s situation. Just as she has first been “moved by pleasure to wrong,” so now, “while moved,” she “recovers herself again.” The recovery is tarrying and relapsing, yet rewarding. Although she “has not dared (τοῦλμαι) to return” (BG 45:16–17, IV 21:13–14), Sophia will eventually, once her invisible parent gives his approval, convert (“return”) and have her lack (έταιρ) rectified.

The Savior’s interpretation of Genesis 1:2b appears thus as primarily psychological. Sophia’s movement of repentance signifies the soul’s ‘fluttering’, a passion stirred by the perception (ΗΝΥ) and acknowledgement (ἴθις, εἶθε) of a wrongdoing. Shame, crying, forgetfulness, audacity, all of them psychological concepts, only strengthen the initial impression that Sophia’s movement of repentance represents an inner change rather than locomotion. Even such a notorious cosmogonic metaphor as darkness, modified by the explanatory genitive (“of unacquaintance”), seems deprived of its usual semantic association with matter, indicating Sophia’s inner state and not an external physical medium for movement. The same appears to hold true for the reflexive verb κτός, ‘return’, to which Hellenistic philosophers and religious specialists frequently applied the ethical meaning of turning to oneself or ‘converting’ (ἐπιστρέψεσθαι, ἐπιστροφή).

---

118 Hadot (1953) 31–36 and Foucault (2001) 197–219 reexamined the concepts of repentance and conversion in the Hellenistic and Roman periods, problematizing the standard view proposed by Nock (1933). For Hadot, the idea of conversion manifests itself in Western thought in two ways. One is the Platonic model of ἐπιστροφή, the soul’s return to its divine source following its “turning away from this changing world” (Plato, Ῥεπ. 7.518c–d)—the spiritual move whose triggering cause is recollection (ἐπιστροφή). The other model of conversion, characteristic for Christianity, is μετανοια, with its radical requirement of total self-renunciation and the death of an old ‘self’ as a prerequisite for “being born anew” (John 3:3). Foucault appropriates this dichotomy in his investigation of ancient “technologies of the self,” but argues that Hadot’s model is too static. Plato’s theory of conversion, built on the fundamental ontological opposition between phenomenal reality
Yet spatial allusions are quite distinguishable in this episode. In the final scene, Sophia is “brought not to the aeon of her own, but above her son, so as to dwell in the ninth (heaven) until she rectifies her lack” (II 14:9–13; BE 47:8–13). Instead of returning to her aeon, she found her temporary place in the region above Ialdabaoth’s realm—in the manner of Plato’s “immortal souls” which “come at the top, take their stand at the outer surface of the heaven, and gaze on the things outside the heavens” (Phaedr. 247b–c; cf. Tim. 34b4, 36d9–e1, 36e3). The following implications can be deduced from this passage:

(i) Before her ascent took place, Sophia performed her agitated movement in the lower realm, outside of the spiritual Pleroma—that is, in the place where Ialdabaoth, her imperfect offspring, upon “turning away from the place where he had been born,... fabricated for himself a [fiery] aeon” (BG 38:17–39:4; cf. II 10:22–25)

(ii) In order to ascend to the ninth heaven—and “not to her own original aeon” (BG 46:8; II 14:9–10)—Sophia must have fallen down from her aeon within the Pleroma. Thus, albeit suppressed, the motif of the descent of Sophia into matter remains present in the Apocryphon’s version of the ‘Gnostic’ myth. Sophia’s ascent and the world of forms, persisted in Platonist and Pythagorean circles. Yet soon after the emergence of the Hellenistic schools of philosophy, a new theory of conversion began to take shape. Whereas Plato and his followers insisted on a split which cleaves the ‘self’ into two opposite parts, viz. reason and passion, this new theory postulated a unitary ‘self’ lacking consistent direction and caught in a vicious circle of opening oneself up to indifferent contingencies of life and retreating into oneself, or ‘converting’, for the sake of ongoing self-examination. For the Platonists, conversion means turning one’s inner eyes away from this world towards transcendence; for the Stoics, Cynics, and Epicureans, conversion signifies a change of perspective within the unitary ‘self’ and the establishment of a firm rational control over one’s actions and feelings. As Clement of Alexandria explains, “To find one’s own soul is to know oneself. For the Stoics, this conversion (μεταστροφήν) to divine things occurs by change (ἐν μεταβολῇ), when the soul changes into wisdom (μεταβολῶσις τῆς νοῆς εἰς σοφίαν); and for Plato, when the soul turns about and converts (περιεγαγόν λαβοῦσις καὶ μεταστροφήν) from a day that is like night to what is better” (Strom. 4.6.27, 3–28, 1 Staelin). Regarding metanoia, Foucault claims that it did not have any shade of positive meaning before late antiquity (e.g., Hierocles, Carm. Aur. 14.10, p. 66 Koehler), and he adduces in support of this claim Thucydides, Epictetus, and Marcus Aurelius (Med. 8.2 “On the occasion of each act, ask yourself, ‘How is this related to me? Shall I repent of it?’”). But Hierocles’ positive view of metanoia as “the beginning of philosophy” appears as old as Philo and Plutarch, on which see supra, pp. 249–56.
would not be possible had her descent not happened in the first place.

The surprising finale of Sophia’s repentance, her dramatic ascent to the ninth heaven, provides thus the whole episode with an additional, cosmological, meaning. Sophia’s agitated movement is not only a πάθος, the fluttering of the soul, but also a local motion. “The darkness of ignorance” is not only a metaphor expressing Sophia’s state of mind, but also the representation of an external medium in which her movement takes place. This medium is the corporeal substrate, or matter (ἐλή), as explicitly stated in a learned gloss preserved in the longer redaction: “matter, which is the ignorance of darkness” (II 21:7–8 τρίγανεν ἔτε−ταῖ τὸ τὴν ἀτο−μογήν ἐν−πάκα). Finally, Sophia’s “not daring to return” does not only mean that she had no audacity to turn away from her unstable passions, but also that she did not dare to do what will be eventually effected through the intervention of her consort—to ascend, or to “return” to the place where she belongs. Sophia’s return does not only signify an inner, moral conversion (ἐπιστροφή), but it also refers to an upward motion—exactly what Sophia, while “moving to and fro,” was lacking.

To demonstrate the link between conversion (ἐπιστροφή) and the “upward” spatial movement, it suffices to adduce Irenaeus’s summary of the ‘Valentinian’ version of Sophia’s fall—her wrongful desire to understand the incomprehensible, her ensuing repentance, her daring yet unsuccessful attempt at departing from the rotary motion of her blind drives, and, finally, her conversion (Adv. haer. 1.2.3):

Upon undertaking an impossible and unattainable deed, she [Sophia] gave birth to a formless substance (οὐσίαν ἀμορφόν), of such a nature as a female could bring forth. When she recognized (κατανοήσασα) it, she was filled first with grief (λυπήσασα) because of the imperfection (τὸ ἀτελές) of her creation, and then was afraid (φοβήσασα) lest her very being should end. Next she became distraught and perplexed (κστήσασα καὶ ἀπόρησα) as she sought the cause of what happened and how she might conceal it. While submerged in these passions, she converted (λοβεῖν ἐπιστροφήν) and tried to run up (ἀναδρομεῖν) to the father. She had audacity for some time (μέχρι τινὸς τολμήσασαν), but

119 Sophia’s incapacity to move upwards on her own is signaled by the passive “she was brought up” (BG 47:8 ἠγιασθή συν εἰρήκατο Π 14:9–10 Αγελαίον Εἰρήκα). 120 For the meaning of ἀναδρομεῖν ἐπί see a thorough analysis in Mansfeld (1992) 14–18.
then grew exhausted (ἐξαθανήσασα) and entreated (ικέτων γενόθσαι) the father. And the other aeons, especially Mind, made supplication along with her (συνθεσθήσασα αὐτῇ). Hence, they say, the substance of matter took its beginning: from ignorance and grief, fear and perplexity.

Lexical and thematic similarities with the Sophia episode in the Apocryphon of John are striking. In both narratives, Sophia first gave birth to a formless product (οὐσίαν ἀμορφον; “an imperfect product...without form when compared to the image of his mother, being a different form” II 10:3–7; cf. BG 37:13–18). Then, she realized that what she had done was a misfit (κατανοήσασαν; εἴη BG 45:1–2; ἢνε II 13:14) and tried to hide it (ἀποκρύψῃ τὸ γεγονός; “she cast it away of her...harnessed it to a luminous cloud” BG 38:1–10; II 10:11–18). As soon as she acknowledged her wrongdoing, the ‘Valentinian’ Sophia succumbed to passions (λυπηθήσαν, φοβηθήσαν, ἐγκατασχενομένην...τοῖς πάθεσι), just as her counterpart in the Apocryphon of John “repented,” “began to be ashamed,” and “wept with much weeping.” Unable to recover her former perfection, she converted, that is, attempted to run up to her Father, and dared for a while (ἐπὶ τὸν Πατρὸν ἀναδραμεῖν πειραθήσαν καὶ μέχρι τινὸς τολμήσασαν; “she did not dare to return” IV 21:13–15) before turning to prayer (ικέτων τοῦ Πατρὸς; “the prayer of her repentance” BG 46:16; II 14:2) and having other aeons pray with her for mercy (συνδεσθήσαν δὲ αὐτῇ καὶ τοὺς λουποὺς αἰώνας; “and the brethren entreated on her behalf” BG 46:17–18; II 14:1–2).

The manner in which the ‘Valentinians’ described Sophia’s conversion (ἐπιστρεφθή) is particularly interesting for the present purpose. Like repentance (μετανοεῖ) in the Apocryphon of John, Sophia’s conversion is associated here with audacity (τολμήσασαν) and upward movement (ἀναδραμεῖν). It is a bold attempt on the part of the exemplary ‘fallen soul’ to turn away from the lower realm, prompted by the same impulse to cross over imposed boundaries (τόλμα) that has brought her down in the first place. But whereas in the ‘Valentinian’ version of the myth conversion was attempted, yet turned out to be abortive, in the Apocryphon it did not even take place. Instead of running up, Sophia remained in the lower realm and, “not daring to return,” continued to “flutter” in a dark and disorderly substrate. Repent she did (μετανοεῖ), yet she never found the audacity to “return” (ἐπιστρέφεσθαι) on her own.

The discovery of spatial allusions in what at first appeared to be the story of Sophia’s interior struggle and personal distress reveals
anew an important characteristic of the ‘Gnostic’ myth—its ability to operate simultaneously at different levels, individual and universal, ethical and noetic, psychological and cosmological. The ‘Valentinians’ of Irenaeus, for example, traced the origin of matter down to Sophia’s passions (Adv. haer. 1.2.3). Plotinus, in his turn, criticized his Gnostic opponents for ascribing to the world soul the same passions as those affecting individual souls (Enn. II 9.6). In a similar vein, Sophia’s metanoia in the Apocryphon implies more than just the internal tumult of a repentant soul. Sophia is the actor in a cosmogony, and every act of hers, including her agitated movement, carries eo ipso a cosmic significance.

It is by no means easy to discern the cosmological repercussions of Sophia’s miscarriage, her subsequent repentance, and her partial rescue at the end of the episode. It looks as though the author of the Apocryphon of John decided, once again, to disentangle his fallen heroine from any direct involvement in the organization of phenomenal reality—something he had already done at the earlier stage when inserting the motif of Ialdabaoth’s ‘theft’ into the narrative.121 Here, as it seems, he suppressed the Platonizing, cosmological aspect of Sophia’s fault—one in which the agitated motion of repentance resulted from her fall into the flowing tide of matter122—and intro-

---

121 Cf. supra, pp. 171–78.

122 To uncover the cosmological significance of Sophia’s actions, so elusive in the extant versions of the Apocryphon of John, it seems best to turn to contemporary Platonist interpretations of the Timaeus, and especially to Plutarch’s ‘literalist’ take on Plato’s cosmogony in his treatise On the Generation of the Soul in the Timaeus. This essay is in fact a thorough discussion of Timaeus 35a1–36b5, in which Plato described the composition and structure of the world soul. The question in dispute (ζήτημα) is how to elucidate many semantic and syntactical obscurities in Plato’s passage. Plutarch employs here his favorite dialectical method of conducting philosophical discussion. He adduces two extreme interpretations, Xenocrates’ and Crantor’s, and then proposes a compromise solution, one whose standard (κανά) is plausibility (τί πιθανόν), or conformity with Plato’s physical and theological axioms (De an. procr. 3, 1013B). Plutarch’s argument runs as follows: (i) God is good and cannot cause evil. (ii) Evil in the world must therefore originate from some other independent principle. (iii) This independent source of evil cannot be matter, which is “unqualified and void of all causality” (6, 1015A). (iv) A third principle besides these must be posited, which is recalcitrant to God (ibid.). (v) This principle manifests itself as a “disorderly and irrational motion that moves matter” (7, 1015E). (vi) Inasmuch as soul is the ultimate cause and principle of motion, the third principle must be the soul devoid of rationality and order (ibid.) (vii) God, accordingly, did not create the world out of nothing; he produced the visible universe by arranging the pre-existing chaos—the amorphous corporeal matter set in motion by the precosmic soul.
duced instead the intellectualist, Stoicizing account of metanoia as Sophia’s state of mind stirred by the rational acknowledgment of her erroneous, ‘abortive’ suppositions.

(7–9, 1015C–1017B). (viii) God was father and craftsman not of body and soul in the absolute sense: in the case of body, he separated four elements out of the primordial mass; in the case of soul, he simply regulated its irrational impulses, as well as its imaginative and opinionative potencies (ibid. 9, 1017A τις φανταστικής καὶ δοξοστικής ἀλόγου δὲ καὶ ἀτάκτου φορᾶς καὶ ὀρμῆς δύναμιν αὐτοκίνησιν καὶ αἰεικίνησιν. (ix) Plato therefore distinguished between two world-stages in the Timaeus: the precosmic stage, “before heaven came to be” (52d2–4) and the ordered universe (Tim. 50c7–d1). (x) The “simple” precosmic soul (ἀπλός ψυχή) acts as a mediator between Plato’s motionless forms and unqualified matter. It “disperses here [i.e. in unqualified matter] the images from that [intelligible] world yonder” (24, 1024C), by means of which it transforms matter from primary and unqualified into perceptible and corporeal (3, 1013C), and then moves these corporeal images of eternal forms in a disorderly fashion. (xi) The reason why the simple precosmic soul cannot produce the ordered world lies in the nature of its relation to the intelligible world. The simple soul’s encounters with the “better nature” happen exclusively “by chance” because its intellectual faculty (τὸ νοηρὸν) is “immobile and impassive” (ἀεικίνητον καὶ ἀπαθές), and therefore only capable of transmitting ideas but not of attaining the intelligible realm through an active intellective motion (τῆς νοησίας κίνησις). The only motion proper to this soul is that of sense perception, by which “it moves toward what is perceptible without” (23, 1024A–C). (xii) In order that this soul may activate its intellectual faculty, an intervention from ‘above’ must take place—that is, the “superior principle” must provide it with intellect (27, 1026E τοῦ δὲ νοῦ μετέχειν ἀπὸ τῆς κρείττονος ἀρχῆς ἐγγενομένου) which, “while abiding and immobile all by itself, upon having got into the soul and taken control makes her turn toward him (ἐπιστρέφει εἰς ἑαυτόν)” (24, 1024C–D). (xiii) Once the soul is converted to its ‘male’ consort, she become the rational world soul, “accomplishing the circular motion around that which always remains fixed, a motion that is most closely in contact with real being” (ibid.). Plutarch applies a very similar model to the Egyptian myth in his tract On Isis and Osiris. Here, too, he distinguishes between the precosmic stage and the ordered universe, with Osiris representing the stable element (intellect), and with Isis and her evil brother Typhon typifying two faculties of the precosmic soul: intellectual, still immobile and impassive, and irrational, which causes disorder in the material substrate. From the very beginning, when “gods were still in the womb of Rhea,” Isis was in love with Osiris and so, “even before they were born,” gave birth to Horus the Elder, “only an image and appari tion (εἰδωλὸν τι καὶ . . . φάντασμα) of the world to come” (De Is. et Os. 54, 373A–C). The ordered universe will come only after Isis becomes “transformed by reason (ὑπὸ τοῦ λόγου τρεπομένη) and receives all corporeal and spiritual forms” (53, 372E). Affinities with the Sophia episode in Ap. John are rather obvious: Sophia stands for the intellectual faculty of the precosmic soul, eventually transformed by her male consort (σύνζυγος), or intellect, into the rational world soul, and then “restored to the ninth heaven”; Ialdabaoth, in his turn, represents the irrational soul, “the mindless cause disturbing matter” (De an. procr. 7, 1015E), capable of producing only the chaos of deformed simulacra without any inner resemblance to their distant model (φαντάσματα). Still, there is one important difference between Plutarch’s cosmological model and that of Ap. John. Plutarch is an orthodox ‘Platonist’ who distinguishes between ideas, copies, and simulacra—once the divine reason “gets into the
What is highlighted in this psychological interpretation is the didactic aspect of Sophia’s repentance (metanoia)—its therapeutic value for every ‘fallen’ human soul and, along with it, its soteriological dimension. The struggle of Sophia is, in fact, the story of everyone’s inner life, the struggle of everyone’s reason that “desires as well as repents, feels both anger and fear, is moved by pleasure to wrong and, while moved, recovers itself again” (Plut. De virt. mor. 7, 447A). While repenting, Sophia turns away from her wrongful desire and from Ialdabaoth, the miscarried product of her false reasoning. She struggles for her previous life of eternal contemplation; for the world of light she had known before diverting from God and generating, as a result of her diversion, the darkness of ignorance (matter); for the paradigmatic world of stable forms (“what is”), which had existed before the phenomenal world came into existence (“what has come to be”). The message that human recipients of the Savior’s revelatory account are supposed to get from the ordeal of their “sibling,” Sophia (Prov 7:4) is that matter, as well as the world created out of it, is nothing else than the product of false reasoning, of intellectual failure, and therefore nothing else than a mere illusion, an appearance (φαντασία) without substance, the darkness of unacquaintance; and also that, insofar as being an illusion, matter and the material world may be annihilated by intellectual effort—by distancing oneself from this appearance, and by departing from excessive impulses and false thinking that created this appearance in the first place. Metanoia is, in the end, the healing process (σωτηρία) that not only brings recovery to individual souls, but will also, eventually, bring to naught the material world, the greatest of all illusions.

“What Will Come to Pass”—Diakrisis, or Final Separation

In the remaining part of his revelation, the Savior develops a revisionistic reading of the Genesis version of early history (Gen 2–7), from the events leading to the expulsion from paradise to Noah,
Nephilim, and the great flood. The approach to the Mosaic account is rather selective, focusing on the situations where the superior realm is brought into contact with the chosen representatives of the human race by the agency of Sophia and her assistants. The concept of Sophia’s providential guidance of history is borrowed from Wisdom literature, most notably from the Hellenistic Wisdom of Solomon (9:13–10:14), which describes Dame Wisdom’s election of seven righteous men, one for each generation, as vehicles of her saving message (Adam, Noah, Abraham, Lot, Jacob, Joseph, Moses). Once again, the Savior’ revisionist strategy assumes the form of intertextual grafting of one text upon another. The purpose of this endeavor is not to challenge the historical accuracy of Genesis, but to provide a broader interpretive framework for the correct understanding of these events and their true motivation. Once incorporated in the Savior’s story of salvation, the earliest history of Israel becomes a series of attempts on the part of Sophia and her envoys to rescue the previously stolen portion of the divine power, and not the providential care for Israel’s prosperity. In fact, the same folktale sequence of quest, struggle, and partial recovery characterizes the whole historical process, which tediously replays the same scene—the hero’s quest for the original unity, or “fullness,” which repeatedly aborts, yet at the same time weakens the villain’s resistance and thus prepares the ground for the final liquidation of the “lack.”

The Apocryphon of John thus envisages salvation as a long process of gradual recovery. Just as “the consort had come down to [Sophia] to correct her lack” (BG 47:4–5; cf. II 14:7–9), “so the Mother also sent down her own [spirit]” (BG 63:16–17; II 25:3), which remained for a while and labored for her seed (σπέρμα) so that, when (ὁσιος) the Spirit eventually comes forth from the holy aeons, it may rectify the lack for the sake of rectifying the aeon, in order that it might become a holy perfection and that, therefore, there may be no lack in it. (BG 64:4–13; cf. II 25:9–16)

---

124 III 32:17 has “the holy Spirit,” perhaps in order to distinguish between the historical presence of Sophia’s own spirit (32:9–10 ὁσιος πνευμα) in the posterity of Seth and the ultimate salvation brought about by the Holy Spirit.
The passage clearly alludes to final deliverance—that is, to the separation of the stolen spiritual portion from Ialdabaoth’s kingdom. The deliverance that first occurs at the individual level, by “the visitation of those beings who take away” (παραλήμπτορες II 25:36–26:1; BG 66:4–6), will eventually bring about a total recovery of light. Individual salvation is thus the sine qua non of universal salvation.

What will ultimately happen with the material realm, the extant versions of Apocryphon of John do not say. Other texts traditionally labeled as ‘Gnostic’ defined the process of final separation in terms of the Stoic lex naturae, by resorting to the Chrysippean doctrine of total blending (κράσις): “For the capacity to be separated again from one another is a peculiarity of blended substances, and this only occurs if they preserve their own natures in the mixture” (Alex. Aphr. Mixt. 3.216.23–217.2 εἶναι γὰρ ἴδιον τῶν κεκραμένων τὸ δύνασθαι χωρίζεσθαι πάλιν ἀπ' ἄλληλον, δ' μόνως γίνεται τῷ σφόδρῳ ἐν τῇ μίξει κεκραμένον τὰς αὐτῶν φύσεις). Or, in the ‘Sethian’ version, as recorded by Hippolytus (Ref. 5.21.5–6),

Blending . . . implies separation (πάντα τὰ συγκεκραμένα διαικρίνεται). Indeed, he says, you can derive the same lesson from living beings. For when the living being is dead, each of its constituents is separated; thus dissolved, the living being vanishes (καὶ λυθὲν οὖν τὸ ζωὸν ἀφονίζεται). This is, he says, what has been said: “I have not come to bring peace to the earth but a sword” (Mt 10:34)—that is, to divide and separate what has been blended. For each of the things that have been blended is divided and separated when it reaches its proper place (οἰκείοις χωρίοις τυχόντα). For as there is one place of blending for all living beings, so also has there been established one of [their] separation, which, however, no one is aware of save we alone, the born-again spirituals (οἱ ἀναγεννώμενοι πνευματικοί), who are not carnal (οὐ σαρκικοί) and whose “citizenship is in heaven” (Phil 3:20).

The ‘Valentinians’, in their turn, specify the exact position of these places: According to Irenaeus (Adv. haer. 2.14.4; cf. 1.7.5),

To the spirituals (spiritualibus) they assigned their own region, one within the Pleroma; to the psychics (animalibus), the place of the Middle (regionem Medietatis); and to the corporeals, (corporalibus) the place made of dust (choicum).

The longer redaction of the Apocryphon seems to allude to the same law of nature. The outcome of the blending of light with darkness, as the redactor tries to explain, depends on which of the two constituents is active in this process. If this is light, then darkness will
shine. But if darkness assumes the role of active principle, as in the case of Ialdabaoth’s theft of Sophia’s light, it darkens the light, “so that it [is] neither luminous nor dark, but dim” (II 11:10–15). This seems to imply, at least in the case of the longer redaction, that the complete restoration of light to the Pleroma will entail the separation of previously blended substances, with different consequences for the main agents of cosmogony. Sophia, on one hand, will not “gain repose in the place of the Middle”—she will leave the Ennead, her temporary dwelling place, “upon correcting her lack” (BG 47: 11–13), and return to the Pleroma. Ialdabaoth, on the other hand, will simply turn to naught, along with the substance of which he was made—“the garment of darkness,” a mere illusion generated by Sophia’s subversive thinking (ἐνθομήσις) and unfounded pretension.
CONCLUSION

Irenaeus, the ‘proto-orthodox’ bishop in the province of Gaul and one of the most prominent critics of various ‘heretical’ groups, blamed his adversaries for corrupting the simple and innocent people with seductive myths and genealogies “on the pretext of gnôsis” (Haer. Pr. 1). Even worse, he claimed, these blasphemous teachers set out to destroy the simple souls with their “absurd and inconsistent” interpretations of the most sacred books of Jews and Christians, turning them into “a badly constructed phantom” (1.8.1):

It is as if someone destroyed the figure of a man in the authentic portrait of a king, carefully created by a skilful artist out of precious stones, and, rearranging the stones to make the image of a dog or fox, declared that this badly composed image is that same good image of the king made by the skilful artist.

The practice of turning a king into a fox has not only been a ‘Gnostic’ trademark. Later in cultural history, the Mannerist poets and painters made use of a similar ‘patchwork’ technique. Perhaps the best illustration of this procedure is Arcimboldo’s representation of ‘Summer’: take all summer fruit you can, put a cherry here, a peach there, and suddenly, within a newly imposed frame, a peach will turn into a cheek, and a cherry into an eye, of a noble man. Breaking an object, or a text, into pieces, then patching these pieces together into a jumble, a “badly constructed phantom,” might indeed, in the eyes of such a rationalist theologian as Irenaeus, have looked like a devilish plot aimed at destroying the simplicity and realistic clarity of the holy writ. Yet the “badly constructed phantoms” of the impious teachers of gnôsis still presuppose some sort of poetics—a collection of choices, made at the levels of thematics, style, and composition, which helped them to inform their ‘mannerist’ constructions. It is against this background that I have undertaken my study of the ‘poetics’ of the Apocryphon of John, a firsthand and fully narrated version of the classic ‘Gnostic’ myth. The purpose of this conclusion is to enumerate the principal results of my enterprise.

1. Genre. A typical representative of the second-century A.D. cultural universalism, the Apocryphon of John belongs to the genre of revelatory
literature, one which intertwines cosmological speculations with a desire to attain personal salvation. Another common feature of this genre is the selection and arrangement of the main thematic blocks. In this arrangement, the present human condition, characterized by a sense of fatal alienation from its divine origins, is deduced from some traumatic pre-historic event. Correct understanding (gnosis) of this tragic narrative of origins provides the ground for escaping the present situation and attaining salvation. This means that, in the order of exposition, cosmology precedes anthropology and anthropology comes before soteriology.

2. Narrative-within-narrative. A commonplace, too, is the presence of the narrative frame. The Apocryphon begins as an impersonal report of John’s encounter with the Pharisee Arimanios. The impersonal narrative turns abruptly into a first-person account by John, the son of Zebedee, who soon becomes the listener of the Savior’s revelatory account about the secrets of the universe, human history, and final salvation. The flow of the Savior’s first-person narration is occasionally interrupted by John’s brief questions. The text does not end with the departure of the heavenly revealer, but with the enclosure of all frames, resuming at the very end the initial extra-diegetic mode. Another commonplace is the uncertainty about the separation between the frame and its subordinate narratives, giving the confusing impression of their mutual overspilling. The net result is the conflation of the two first-person narrators into a single voice, so that one becomes the double of the other—a rhetorical procedure characteristic of the discourse of mystic experience.

3. Structure and narration. The salient feature of the Savior’s revelatory account is his radical revision of the Mosaic account of creation in the opening chapters of Genesis. In a series of brief exchanges with John, the Christus redivivus argues that Moses’ understanding of the events in cosmogony was limited because his perspective was confined to the visible realm. The Apocryphon of John offers a broader perspective, in which sensible phenomena are referred to their invisible model. The contrast between a visible copy and its invisible paradigm is clearly a Platonist legacy, and can be traced all the way back to Plato’s cosmology in the Timaeus. The universe that emerges from the Savior’s revelatory account is a hierarchical structure arranged in tiers and organized along the vertical axis that links visible effects to their transcendent causes. Application
of this Platonist framework to the Mosaic story of creation raises both organizational and interpretative problems. The first problem is how to string a multidimensional reality upon a single unidimensional narrative thread. The second problem is how to justify the superimposition of Plato’s world model on the Genesis creation story. The problem of designing a coherent narrative is solved by the choice of a linear, chronological exposition. The more serious problem of proving the compatibility of Plato and Moses is resolved by resorting to syllogistic reasoning, borrowed from rhetorical schools and manuals of the period—specifically, by the intercession of Wisdom literature as the ‘minor premise’.

4. Composition. The problem of presenting the complex universe of the Apocryphon of John in the linear sequence is resolved during the Savior’s introductory address: “Now I have come to teach you what is, what has come to be, and what will come to pass.” Viewed from a form-analytical perspective, this statement represents the classic formula describing the office and the privilege of a prophet. In this formula, the prophet announces his knowledge of things past, present, and future. The Savior inverts the formula’s original order and rearranges it according to the order of ontological priority. Instead of distinguishing between the three dimensions of physical time in their natural succession, the traditional formula of prophecy now expresses the Platonic dichotomy of Being and Becoming, as set forth in the Timaeus (27d–28a, 37e–38a). The revised formula outlines the program of the Savior’s revelatory monologue. In the ensuing exposition, he will follow the sequence of events in their causal and temporal order. He will first talk about the realm of Being: the absolute first principle and its ideal realm. Next he will proceed to the realm of Becoming in its two constituent aspects: “What has come to be,” i.e. creation of the visible world and the human race, and “What will come to pass,” that is, the gradual salvation of humankind and the final dissolution (diakrisis) of phenomenal reality. Such a linear presentation of the cosmic process can only be conveyed in a mythical narrative, one that is capable, first, of moving beyond the logical deduction of contingents from their causes and, second, of describing the stages of divine development, from the original fullness of the absolute first principle, the Platonist ‘One’, down to its tragic kenosis, the state of entropy and stagnation.

5. Plot. At the level of an overall organization of the narrative, the
three thematic units figure as three separate moments in a typical folktale sequential structure: initial order—violation—restoration of the initial order. Each of these three generic units consists of a sequence of individual episodes, each characterized in turn by a specific chain of actions. The pervading logic of the whole narrative is a complicated game of giving and not-giving, taking and not-taking. The monotonous rhythm of reciprocal giving and taking in the first narrative block (e.g., the Invisible Father approving Barbelo’s request for the gift of Foreknowledge, and so on) comes to an abrupt end when Sophia’s request to unite with her heavenly ‘consort’ is flatly denied, yet she nevertheless continues to act alone. Next, and in yet another departure from the previous pattern, the villain of the story, Ialdabaoth, commits a theft of what he has neither requested nor been granted (Sophia’s power). The rest of the story is a series of attempts on the part of the victimized heroine Sophia and her assistants to recover the stolen object. In the end, the theft will be recovered and the initial situation, prior to the initiation of the game of reciprocal giving and taking, fully restored.

6. Metaphysical fiction. In the Savior’s presentation of the gradual derivation of a multiple-tiered reality from the unfathomable One beyond Being—the abyss of pure freedom rejecting all determinations—logical deduction had to give way to mythical narrative. The revelatory account in the *Apocryphon of John* is a piece of metaphysical fiction, an instance of “der gnostische Roman der Selbsterkenntnis” (Sloterdijk 1993, 44), which reenacts the stages of God’s history in a folktale sequence: his primordial unity (‘initial situation’); his gradual self-differentiation into a series of defining dispositions (‘preparation for misfortune’); his departure from the state of logical determination (‘violation’); his realization (‘repentance’) of the abortive desire (‘villainy’) to comprehend his unfathomable nature; his attempt to restore the original identity (‘quest’), and his final return to self (‘restoration of the initial situation’). In this autobiographical narrative, God must play manifold roles and assume the disguise of various mythical characters: he is both the hero (Christ–Savior) and the villain (Ialdabaoth) in this story, both the helper (Afterthought of Life and other assistants of Sophia) and the opponent (Archons), both the victim (Sophia) and the rescuer (Consort).
7. **Genesis and Plato’s Timaeus.** I have already alluded to Plato and Moses as the principal sources of the *Apocryphon*’s world-hypothesis, and to the role played by Wisdom literature as intermediary. The following synoptic table shows how the first part of Plato’s account of cosmogony and the opening chapters of Genesis are combined, and occasionally fused, in the narrative of the *Apocryphon*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Apocryphon of John</th>
<th>Plato (Timaeus)</th>
<th>Moses (Genesis)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. WHAT IS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. <em>Agnostos Theos</em></td>
<td>God – <em>pater kai poiētēs</em> (28c–30c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Pleroma</td>
<td>Eternal Living Being Containing All Intelligibles (30c–31b)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II. WHAT HAS COME TO BE</strong></td>
<td>World-Soul and Its Double</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Sophia’s Fault</td>
<td>Orientation (35a–37c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Ialdabaoth’s Fabrication</td>
<td>The Craftsman Fabricates:</td>
<td>Gen 1:1–2a: “In the beginning..”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Fiery Realm</td>
<td>(a) World-Body (31a–34b)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Twelve Signs of Zodiac</td>
<td>(b) Heavenly Gods = Stars</td>
<td>Gen 1:3–8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Seven Planets</td>
<td>(c) Planets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Other Chronocrators</td>
<td>(d) Time (37c–40d)</td>
<td>Gen 1:14–19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Sophia’s Adventures</strong></td>
<td>Soul in Body:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Disorderly Motion</td>
<td>Disorderly Motion (42a–44d)</td>
<td>Gen 1:2b: “God’s spirit moved upon the waters”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Sophia Rescued (Ascent)</td>
<td>Soul Returns to Heaven (42b–c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D. Creation of Adam</strong></td>
<td>Composition of Human Soul and 7 Parts of Human Frame (73b–76c)</td>
<td>Gen 1:26: Let us make...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Seven Parts of Adam’s Animate Body Created</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gen 2:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Adam in Matter (<em>hulē</em>)</td>
<td>Soul Implanted into Body (44d–45c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E. Biblical History</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Trees in Paradise</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gen 2:9.15–17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) The Snake</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gen 3:1–7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Adam’s Unconsciousness</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gen 2:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Creation of the Woman, Adam’s Self-recognition</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gen 2:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Expulsion from Paradise</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gen 2:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) Cain, Abel, Seth</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gen 3:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) Noah in the Luminous Cloud</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gen 4:1–2.25–26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h) Angels and the Daughters of Men, Counterfeit Spirit</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gen 6:5–7:16: Noah in the Ark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>III. WHAT MUST COME TO BE</strong></td>
<td>The Laws of Destiny (41d–42d)</td>
<td>Gen 6:1–2.4: Nephilim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Destiny of Souls</td>
<td>God’s Handiwork is Indissoluble, Save With His Consent (41a)</td>
<td>Gen 6:3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The first section of the Savior’s revelatory monologue (“What is”) reiterates the main themes in the *Timaeus* and follows its order of exposition. As the Savior turns to the next section (“What has come to be”), he introduces the Mosaic creation story and follows for a while both Genesis and Plato. In my table, this section appears as the ‘middle’ zone, where Plato’s world-model comes into contact with Moses’. In the concluding section of the Savior’s lecture, the story line follows the early history of humankind (Adam and Eve, Cain and Abel, Noah, and the *Nephilim*) in the same order as Genesis. The shaded zone in the synoptic table offers an interpretive key for recovering the hidden meaning of Moses’ materialistic imagery. For example, “the spirit of God’s moving upon the water” (Gen 1:2b) is not to be understood in its literal sense, as the movement of one corporeal substance (breath, wind) over another (water). The deeper meaning can be found in the parallel section of Plato’s *Timaeus* (42a–45e)—an agitated movement of the soul imprisoned in matter.

8. *Rhetoric and Hermeneutics*. The Savior’s reinterpretation of Genesis 1:2b provides the best illustration of his overall hermeneutical strategy. He does not simply impose the Platonizing reading of the Biblical verse on his ignorant interlocutor, but assumes instead John’s limited perspective and posits the verse as a premise (*propositio*) from which his ‘correct’ explanation may be inferred as a logical conclusion (*complexio*). In short, he resorts to the rhetorical theory of issue, more specifically to the issue of analogical assimilation (*ratioinatio, συμμορφωσις*), and inserts between the starting premise and the conclusion a compatible verse from Wisdom Literature as a supporting reason (*ratio*)—“I walked around in the depth of the abyss” (Sir 24:5). This simple insertion serves two important functions: on one hand, it effectively obliterates the materialist flavor of the Genesis verse (‘the breath or wind of God moving upon the material waters’); on the other, it makes the way wide open for bringing in other compatible passages, this time from various philosophical traditions (Platonism, Stoicism), in order to spiritualize even further the crude language of Moses’ oracle (*rationis confirmatio*). The Savior’s conclusion (*complexio*) is a philosophical revision of Genesis 1:2b—not the spirit of God moving upon the waters, but Sophia (Sirach), the cosmic soul (Plato), moving to and fro in the darkness of matter (Plato), and repent-
ing for her faulty reasoning in the darkness of her own ignorance (Platonizing Stoicism).

9. ‘Gnostic’ Platonism. For the author of the *Apocryphon of John*, the lore of Moses is a troublesome legacy which calls for a thorough revaluation in the form of allegorical interpretation. Yet Plato’s legacy is considered as troubling, too, and for that reason subjected to a series of refinements and adjustments. Revisionism emerges thus as the distinctive mark of ‘Gnostic’ mentality. Just as ‘proto-orthodox’ Christian theologians denounced the false teachers of gnōsis for misreading the scriptures, so some contemporary Platonists accused them of “falsifying” Plato: “They falsify Plato’s manner of presenting the fabrication of the universe, and a great deal else, and degrade Plato’s opinions as if they have understood the intelligible nature, but he and other blessed philosophers had not” (Plot. *Enn.* II 9.6). The focus of this revisionist agenda, as presented in the *Apocryphon of John*, is a thorough revaluation of craft-analogy, the structuring principle of Plato’s theory of causality, which posits a rational regulative principle—Plato’s divine craftsman (demiurge)—capable of informing phenomenal reality with order and finality after the preordered pattern of forms. The first refinement focuses on the psychological attitude of the craftsman in action: in contrast with Plato’s demiurge who operates from conscious purposes, the blind creator of the *Apocryphon of John* cannot deliberate and cannot understand whatever he does. Craft is essentially practical, and calls for some higher designer to outline the plan for the craftsman’s activity. The net result is the distinction drawn in the *Apocryphon* between a craftsman who fabricates (Ialdabaoth) and a discursive planner responsible for the preordered design (the Self-Originate, i.e., Divine Intellect, and Sophia). This introduction of the notion of a designer has serious repercussions for the objective status of Platonic ideas—they are no longer endowed with an independent existence, but are reduced instead to the status of the thoughts of God. The second objection to Plato’s craft-analogy deals with the model’s accessibility to the demiurige: whereas the Platonic craftsman had a direct access to the realm of forms, Ialdabaoth “did not see the incorruptible ones, but it was the power in him, which he had taken from his mother, that produced in him the image of the ordered world” (II 13:1–5). Ialdabaoth cannot create copies that bear internal resemblance with the ideal pattern—he can only generate infinitely
degraded simulacra of the model by his “image-making power” of imagination (φαντασία). The phenomenal world has thus traded its privileged status as a perfect copy reflecting the measures and proportions of the original for the status of Plato’s ‘cave’—that is, of anillusory and unstable semblance (φάντασμα) of the superior world.

10. *Imagination and appearances.* Such a negative appraisal of artistic imagination (phantasia) is at odds with the dominant aesthetics of the period, best summarized by Apollonius of Tyana in his praise of Phidias’ sculpture of Zeus: “That was done by imagination (phantasia), which is a better artist than imitation (mimesis), for imitation can only depict what it saw, but imagination what it has not seen” (Philostr. *Vit. Apoll.* 6.19). Apollonius emphasizes the creative role of imagination (phantasia) in retaining and synthesizing various sensations into mental images which, in their turn, provide the substrate of all thought. In the *Apocryphon of John*, on the contrary, imagination is related to the soul’s irrational impulses and stabilized in one central image of the aggressive impostor (Ialdabaoth) who, driven by his appetitive soul (ἐπιθυμία), produces deceptive semblances of the model while pretending to have the capacity to reproduce its essential features. This conjunction of phantasia with irrationality can be traced all the way back to Plato’s *Timaeus* (70d–72b, 86b2–4), which situates the process of semblance-making in the spirited or ‘epithymetic’ part of the soul, the source of mindlessness (aponoia), ignorance (amathia), and prophetic power (mania). Such a low appraisal of Ialdabaoth’s craftsmanship informs the Savior’s negative portrayal of the visible world. If the invisible realm remains out of the craftsman’s reach, and if the world he creates is the product of his unfounded pretension, then the human race, imprisoned as it were in this world by the astrological laws of Destiny, cannot reach back to the ideal exemplar. Ialdabaoth’s world is a labyrinth of deceptive symbols leading the terrestrial man astray from his transcendent origins. The only means for the human race to get beyond these illusory appearances is the experience of separation and loss, one that will eventually entail an encounter with the spiritual world in the form of a heavenly revelation.

11. *Language.* As indicated in the above synoptic table, Moses and Plato represent two dissonant yet diachronically complementary narrative voices, only occasionally made compatible through the
intercession of passages from Jewish Wisdom literature. In the Savior’s analysis of the multiple authorship of Jewish scriptures, Wisdom’s oracles provide the link between Moses’ material imagery and the Savior’s sublime discourse of the One. Just as Sophia dwells in the liminal zone, simultaneously dividing and uniting the spiritual realm and its distant material copy, so does the language she uses combine equivocal symbols with philosophical concepts. *The Apocryphon of John* speaks at once three languages: the language of speculative philosophy; the language of symbolic Wisdom theosophy; and the Biblical language of historical contingency.

12. *Authorship* and provenience. The solution to the problem of the *Apocryphon*’s provenience depends on how one explains the Savior’s motives in choosing Wisdom literature as his favored ‘intertext’. Had he simply imposed the Platonist framework on the Mosaic account of creation (Gen 1:2b), without inserting the verse from Wisdom literature (Sir 24:5), the *Apocryphon of John* could be identified as a Christianized version of Platonist ‘Orientalism’, best exemplified in the work of the philosopher Numenius, a Greek-speaking Syrian from Apamea. Yet the intermediary role assigned to sapiental oracles, the initial position of Genesis quotations (*lēmmata*) in the Savior’s argumentation, and close affinities between his interpretive technique and Philo’s *hypomnēmata*, point to the *Apocryphon*’s indebtedness to exegetical traditions of Greek-speaking Alexandrian Jews. This does not yet mean that the *Apocryphon of John* represents an organic development within Judaism. Indebtedness does not necessarily imply embeddedness. After all, Sophia is not the most authoritative voice in the text, but the Savior, Christus redivivus, who speaks the lofty language of speculative Platonism interspersed with allusions to the Johannine gospel. A “badly constructed phantom,” the *Apocryphon of John* is an early Christian response to the cultural universalism of the Antonine period, refusing to engage in any sort of demiurgic ‘mimesis’ and claiming instead that dominant cultural models and discursive modes should not be reproduced but thoroughly transformed.
The list of publications provided below includes all the works referred to in this study, as well as other consulted works that relate to the study of Platonism and ‘Gnosticism’. Standard editions of the Nag Hammadi manuscripts and ancient authors can be found under the names of the editors in the index locorum. An exception has been made for editions with substantial introductions and commentaries referred to in this monograph, and these editions are listed below.

### Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAST</td>
<td>Atti dell’Accademia delle Scienze di Torino, II. Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABG</td>
<td>Archiv für Begriffsgeschichte.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACOr</td>
<td>Acta Orientalia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGPh</td>
<td>Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AmSE</td>
<td>Annali di storia dell’esegesi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANRW</td>
<td>Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AntTard</td>
<td>Antiquité tardive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR</td>
<td>Archiv für Religionswissenschaft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ArchPhil</td>
<td>Archives de philosophie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATDan</td>
<td>Acta Theologica Danica.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>Augustinianum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAGB</td>
<td>Bulletin de l’Association Guillaume Budé.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCNH</td>
<td>Bibliothèque copte de Nag Hammadi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BETL</td>
<td>Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BJS</td>
<td>Brown Judaic Studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSAC</td>
<td>Bulletin de la Société d’Archéologie Copte.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CQ</td>
<td>Classical Quarterly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPHE</td>
<td>École Pratique des Hautes Études.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPRO</td>
<td>Études préliminaires aux religions orientales dans l’Empire romain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EstEcl</td>
<td>Estudios eclesiásticos,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FZPhTh</td>
<td>Freiburger Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GGA</td>
<td>Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRBS</td>
<td>Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg</td>
<td>Gregorianum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSCP</td>
<td>Harvard Studies in Classical Philology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HTR</td>
<td>Harvard Theological Review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUCA</td>
<td>Hebrew Union College Annual.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAC</td>
<td>Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JBL</td>
<td>Journal of Biblical Literature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JETS</td>
<td>Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JHB</td>
<td>Journal of the History of Biology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JRS</td>
<td>Journal of Roman Studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSP</td>
<td>Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JTS</td>
<td>Journal of Theological Studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTP</td>
<td>Laval théologique et philosophique.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH</td>
<td>Museum Helveticum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MusPat</td>
<td>Museum Patavirum.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NHMS Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies.
NHS Nag Hammadi Studies.
NTOA Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus.
NTT Norsk Teologisk Tidsskrift.
OC Oriens Christianus.
OS Ostkirchliche Studien.
Phil Philologus.
PhJ Philosophisches Jahrbuch.
PhRdschau Philosophische Rundschau.
PP La parola del passato.
RAC Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum.
ReE Revue d’Egyptologie.
RE PW.
REA Revue des études anciennes.
REAug Revue des études augustiniennes.
RechAug Recherches augustiniennes.
RecSR Recherches de science religieuse.
REG Revue des études grecques.
RFIC Rivista di filologia e di istruzione classica.
RFN Rivista di filosofia neo-scolastica.
RhM Rheinisches Museum für Philologie.
RIph Revue internationale de philosophie.
RPhe Revue de philologie, de littérature et d’histoire anciennes.
RSPT Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques.
RSR Revue des sciences religieuses.
RTP Revue de théologie et de philosophie.
SBLSP Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers.
SecCent Second Century.
SJPPh The Southern Journal of Philosophy.
SO Symbolae Osloenses.
SPhA Studia Philonica Annual.
StPatr Studia Patristica.
TP Theologie und Philosophie.
TU Texte und Untersuchungen.
VChr Vigiliae Christianae.
WUNT Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament.
ZNW Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche.
ZPhF Zeitschrift für philosophische Forschung.
ZRGG Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte.
ZTK Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche.
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## INDEX LOCORUM

### I. GNOSTIC WRITINGS

**Nag Hammadi Codices**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codices</th>
<th>Text Title</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NHC I, 3</td>
<td><em>Gospel of Truth</em></td>
<td>9:28–29, 149, 246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>per totum</td>
<td>81–82, n. 9</td>
<td>9:35, 143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHC I, 4</td>
<td><em>Treatise on Resurrection</em></td>
<td>10:1, 143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45:3–9</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>10:6–13, 160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHC I, 5</td>
<td><em>Tripartite Tractate</em></td>
<td>10:9, 148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100:30–35</td>
<td>168, 245 n. 100</td>
<td>10:11–13, 158 n. 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100:33–35</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>10:11–18, 173, 260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHC II, 1</td>
<td><em>Apocryphon of John</em></td>
<td>10:14–18, 160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:1–6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10:16–18, 170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:5–29</td>
<td>10–11</td>
<td>10:19–25, 121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:17</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>10:19–27, 172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:21–29</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10:22–25, 258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10:24, 179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:1–9</td>
<td>28–31</td>
<td>10:26, 167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:9–12</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>11:4–6, 182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:12–15</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11:4–15, 135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:16–20</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11:5–7, 199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:20–26</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>11:6, 182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:26–4:19</td>
<td>78–79</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>39:1–2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:14–18</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39:4–8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:2–9</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>39:16–18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:10–17</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40:4–18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:17–19</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>40:19–41:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:17–26:14</td>
<td>78–79</td>
<td>41:12–15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:15ff.</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>41:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:9ff.</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>41:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25:9–27:15</td>
<td>95–96</td>
<td>41:16–42:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25:10</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>42:2–5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25:11–12</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>42:13–17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25:12–13</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>43:10–44:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25:13–20</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>44:7–8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26:1–5</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>45:10–13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26:2</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>44:10–15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26:11–12</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>44:15–17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26:11–14</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>44:19–45:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26:11–15</td>
<td>58, 74</td>
<td>44:19–45:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26:15–16</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>44:19–45:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26:17–27:1</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>45:8–10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27:12</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>45:9–10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28:4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>45:10–13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28:4–11</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>45:11–12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29:14–17</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>45:13–15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30:1–2</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>45:16–17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31:4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>45:16–18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31:5–6</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>45:20–46:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31:10–11</td>
<td>125 n. 57, 140</td>
<td>45:20–46:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31:11–18</td>
<td>52, 134</td>
<td>46:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31:17–18</td>
<td>125 n. 57, 140</td>
<td>46:9–15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32:2–3</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>46:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32:13–18</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>46:10–15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33:16</td>
<td>3 n. 4</td>
<td>46:13–15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36:7–11</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>46:15–18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36:8–12</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>46:15–47:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36:20–37:1</td>
<td>149, 246</td>
<td>46:17–18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37:1</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>47:1–3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37:10</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>47:1–5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37:13–18</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>47:4–5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37:16–18</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>47:6–7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37:18–38:5</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>47:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38:1–5</td>
<td>158 n. 19</td>
<td>47:8–13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38:1–10</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>47:14–16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Index Locorum

| 48:4–50:11 | 201–2 | 66:4–6 | 265 |
| 50:11–52:1 | 126 | 70:13–14 | 247 |
| 51:2–3 | 172 | 72:2–10 | 182 |
| 51:17–52:2 | 136 | 72:12–73:18 | 166 |
| 52:8–11 | 126 | 72:16 | 166 |
| 55:2–7 | 201 n. 56 | 73:10–12 | 169 |
| 55:3–4 | 201 n. 56 | 73:12–14 | 169 |
| 55:7–8 | 124 n. 56 | 75:2–3 | 3 n. 4 |
| 55:10–11 | 201 n. 56 | 75:10–77:7 | 11–12 |
| 58:10–59:5 | 238–39 | | |
| 58:16–18 | 67 | | |
| 58:16–59.5 | 168 | BG 8502, 3 Sophia of Jesus Christ | 25 |
| 59:17–18 | 67 | 77:9–78:11 | 77 |
| 59:20 | 167 | 79:18–80:3 | 39 |
| 60:5–11 | 168 | 86:6–8 | 39 |
| 60:12–14 | 117 n. 44 | 86:16–87:1 | 131 |
| 63:16–17 | 264 | 89:20–90:3 | 39 |
| 64:4–13 | 264 | 90:15–91:13 | 97 |
| 64:6–9 | 117 n. 44 | 98:7–13 | 39 |

### Codex Askewianus

| Pētis Sophia (ed. Schmidt) | 107, 6–8 | 175 n. 26 |
| 72, 5–73, 8 | 39 n. 27 | 317, 13–319, 23 | 187 n. 39 |
| 43, 7–46, 22 | 175 n. 26 | 342, 4–344, 11 | 204–5 |
| 86, 25–87, 2 | 175 n. 26 |

### Codex Brucianus

| Two Books of Jeu (ed. Schmidt–Till) | 1 Jeu 79, 7–26 | 206 n. 66 |

### Greek Papyri

| P.Oxy 1081 (Sophia of Jesus Christ) | 1081r, 36–50 | 97 |

### II. Biblical Literature

#### Old Testament/Septuagint

<p>| Gen 1–7 | 67 | 1:26 | 202, 209–10 |
| 1:1 | 67, 202, 245 | 1:26–27 | 200 n. 56 |
| 1:2 | 232 | 1:31 | 202 |
| 1:2a | 229 | 2:7 | 169, 200–201 n. 56 |
| 1:2b | 68–69, 71, 128 n. 61, 224, 225, 231, 232, 235, 236, 237, 238, 240, 245, 246, 257 | 4:2 | 156 |
| 1:7 | 128 n. 62, 202 n. 60, 6:5–7:9 | 67 | 67 |
| 1:16 | 292 | 6:6 | 130 n. 65 |
| 1:21 | 161, 167 | 6:6–7 | 130 n. 65 |
| 1:25 | 161, 188 n. 42 | 7:7 | 166 |
| | | 7:18 | 235 |
| | | 9:3 | 233 |
| | | 21:1 | 157 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exod</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:16</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>10:1ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:2–3</td>
<td>215 n. 77</td>
<td>10:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:21</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:21–22</td>
<td>161, 236</td>
<td>16:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:9</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>18:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:16–18</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>19:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:2</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>1:9–10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:5</td>
<td>168, 211, 218</td>
<td>1:10c–d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25:1ff</td>
<td>121 n. 48</td>
<td>1:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25:9</td>
<td>121 n. 48</td>
<td>3:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25:40</td>
<td>121 n. 48</td>
<td>3:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26:1</td>
<td>119 n. 45</td>
<td>4:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26:30</td>
<td>121 n. 48</td>
<td>11:15–16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33:9</td>
<td>161, 162</td>
<td>16:1–4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33:21–22</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>16:15–16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34:14</td>
<td>211, 218</td>
<td>17:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40:34</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>17:26b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Num</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:33</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>24:3–5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:34–36</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>24:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:25</td>
<td>161, 162</td>
<td>24:23–34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:7–8</td>
<td>161, 162</td>
<td>25:10–11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:19</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>Joel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:39</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>14:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:9</td>
<td>168, 211</td>
<td>6:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:4</td>
<td>211, 212</td>
<td>11:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:4–9</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>42:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32:39</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>44:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32:6</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>44:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103:24</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>45:5–6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103:30</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>46:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prov</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:22–31</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>55:8–9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:27</td>
<td>245</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:27–29</td>
<td>236</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:3–4</td>
<td>127 nn. 59–60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Song</td>
<td></td>
<td>5:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:11</td>
<td>30 n. 21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:1</td>
<td>236</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:4–28</td>
<td>164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:13</td>
<td>127 n. 59, 128 n. 60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Enoch</td>
<td>1:3</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20–22</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Ezra</td>
<td>4:1–11</td>
<td>10 n. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4:20–21</td>
<td>10 n. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph and Aseneth</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>248 n. 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.9–11</td>
<td>248 n. 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>235 n. 92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jubilees</td>
<td>38.6–7</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Old Testament Pseudepigrapha**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Martyrdom and Ascension of Isaiah</th>
<th>7:12–10:6</th>
<th>141</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prayer of Jacob</td>
<td>per totum</td>
<td>191 n. 46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testament of Gad</td>
<td>5:7</td>
<td>247</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testament of Solomon</td>
<td>18,13</td>
<td>191 n. 45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18:13–18</td>
<td>192 n. 48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18,16</td>
<td>189–90 n. 43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Philo of Alexandria**

| De opificio mundi | 117–25 | 207 n. 67 | 134 | 200 n. 56 | 144 | 154 | 148 | 154 |
| De sacrificiis    | 1      | 156       | 1–3 | 156       | 3   | 159 |
| Quod deterius     | 90     | 159 n. 19 | 110 | 254       | 115 | 158 |
| De posteritate Caïni | 138–39 | 253 n. 112 | 140 | 253 n. 112 |     |     |
| Quod deus immutabilis sit | 3 | 153 | 10–15 | 157 n. 17 | 13 | 158 n. 18 |
### INDEX LOCORUM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Index Locorum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>130 n. 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>130–31 n. 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*De plantatione*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Index Locorum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*De confusione*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Index Locorum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62–63</td>
<td>154 n. 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125–27</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168–82</td>
<td>202 n. 60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*De congressu*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Index Locorum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1–12</td>
<td>157 n. 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129–30</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*De fuga*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Index Locorum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197–98</td>
<td>128 n. 60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*De mutatione nominum*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Index Locorum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19–26</td>
<td>38 n. 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>253 n. 112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*De somniis*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Index Locorum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*De Abrahamo*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Index Locorum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>253 n. 112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*De Iosepho*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Index Locorum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>123–24 n. 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>249 n. 105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*De vita Moysis*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Index Locorum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.101</td>
<td>121 n. 48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*De decalogo*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Index Locorum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60–61</td>
<td>119 n. 45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*De specialibus legibus*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Index Locorum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.13–15</td>
<td>119 n. 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.34–36</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*De virtutibus*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Index Locorum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>248–49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*De praemiis*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Index Locorum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*De aeternitate mundi*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Index Locorum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Quaestiones in Genesim*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Index Locorum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>253 n. 112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>130 n. 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>252–53, 254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.53–54</td>
<td>157 n. 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>37 n. 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>38 n. 26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**New Testament**

*Matt*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Index Locorum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3:2–6</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:1–7:27</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:27</td>
<td>80–81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:2</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:1–8</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:1–13</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:5</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26:30</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mark*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Index Locorum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:4</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:2–13</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Luke*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Index Locorum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3:3</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:28–36</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:13–53</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:25</td>
<td>9, 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:27</td>
<td>9, 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87–105</td>
<td>33–34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88–89</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>26, 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90–91</td>
<td>22 n. 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94–96</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>22 n. 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts of Philip</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### III. ANCIENT GREEK AND LATIN WRITINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
<th>Index Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Achilles Tatus</strong></td>
<td><em>Leucippe et Clitophon</em></td>
<td>1.1.1–2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aetius</strong></td>
<td><em>Placita</em></td>
<td>1.6.2</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.7.20</td>
<td>58 n. 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.11.1–4</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.15.2</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alcinous</strong></td>
<td><em>Didaskalikos</em></td>
<td>5.157.11−12</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.157.21</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.163.14−15</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.164.7−166.14</td>
<td>83–89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.164.29−31</td>
<td>90 n. 18, 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.165.24−26</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25.178.18ff.</td>
<td>59 n. 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alexander Aphrodisiensis</strong></td>
<td><em>De mixtione</em></td>
<td>3.216.23−217.2</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.225.2−3</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alexander Numenios</strong></td>
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<td>III 2, 8–4, 15</td>
<td>75 n. 1</td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>III 4, 16–28</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
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<td><strong>Alexander Polyhistor</strong></td>
<td><em>ap. Diog. Laert.</em></td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>94 n. 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anon.</strong></td>
<td><em>Prolegomena in Platonem</em> (Westerink)</td>
<td>15, 13–16</td>
<td>16 n. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Apuleius</strong></td>
<td><em>De mundo</em></td>
<td>Praef. 258</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aristotle</strong></td>
<td><em>Analytica Posteriora</em></td>
<td>2.97a6−19</td>
<td>109 n. 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arius Didymus</strong></td>
<td><em>Fragmenta physica</em></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>180 n. 32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The index location refers to the page numbers where each work is discussed in the text.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author/Work</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Topica</td>
<td>62 n. 42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.18.108b23ff.</td>
<td>92 n. 42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fragmenta (ed. Ross)</td>
<td>49 n. 37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Timaeum (ed. Waszink)</td>
<td>159 n. 19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cebetis tabula</td>
<td>49 n. 105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cebetis tabula</td>
<td>249 n. 105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cicero</td>
<td>68, 222</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De divinatione</td>
<td>186 n. 38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De finibus</td>
<td>156 n. 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De inventione</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucullus (Acad. pr.)</td>
<td>102 n. 27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>99–100, 102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orator</td>
<td>58, 101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corpus Hermeticum (ed. Nock-Festugière)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermetis Libelli</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 (N–F 1:7)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 (N–F 1:10)</td>
<td>159 n. 19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.12 (N–F 2:235)</td>
<td>57 n. 35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stobaei Fragmenta</td>
<td>186 n. 38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democritus</td>
<td>199</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fragmenta (ed. Diels–Kranz)</td>
<td>255</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fragmenta (ed. Luria)</td>
<td>255</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diogenes Laeritus</td>
<td>94 n. 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitae philosophorum</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.60</td>
<td>99, 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.137</td>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De oratore</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dionysius Thrax</td>
<td>197</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ars grammatica (ed. Uhlig)</td>
<td>193 n. 50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholia Marciana in artis Dionysianae (ed. Hilgard)</td>
<td>197</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>385.25–26</td>
<td>193</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>391.29</td>
<td>193</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epictetus</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissertationes</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.10–11</td>
<td>251</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.17</td>
<td>251</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>251</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>251</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 (N–F 1:96)</td>
<td>90 n. 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1 (N–F 1:115)</td>
<td>57 n. 35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.11 (N–F 1:151)</td>
<td>90 n. 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.1 (N–F 1:174)</td>
<td>90 n. 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.22 (N–F 1:183)</td>
<td>90 n. 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.1 (N–F 2:200)</td>
<td>21 n. 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.7 (N–F 2:203)</td>
<td>90 n. 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.9 (N–F 2:235)</td>
<td>57 n. 35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114.8–17</td>
<td>256</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.3–4 (N–F 3:35–36)</td>
<td>186 n. 38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3–6 (N–F 3:34–36)</td>
<td>199</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.9 (N–F 3:36)</td>
<td>186 n. 38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.12 (N–F 3:36–37)</td>
<td>199</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.1 (N–F 3:72)</td>
<td>90 n. 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.1 (N–F 3:90)</td>
<td>90 n. 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.10 (N–F 4:4)</td>
<td>235 n. 92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.29 (N–F 4:9)</td>
<td>186 n. 38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.3 (N–F 4:53)</td>
<td>90 n. 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>94 n. 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.53</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.60</td>
<td>99, 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.137</td>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12, 33.6–34.2</td>
<td>197</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12, 38.3–5</td>
<td>193 n. 50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>385.25–26</td>
<td>197</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>391.29</td>
<td>193</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.10–11</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.17</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>251</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>251</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Enchiridion
34 251

Fragmenta
25 251

Eudorus
Fragmenta (ed. Mazzarelli)
3 85 n. 12
3–5 109 n. 34

Firmicus Maternus
Mathesis
2.4 180–81 n. 32
2.24 205 n. 64
3.1 183, 184 n. 36
4.22.2 180

Galenus
De placitis Hippocratis et Platonis
(ed. De Lacy)
4.6.3, 12 124
4.6.5 123
4.14ff. 124 n. 56

In Hippocratis De victu acutorum
(CMG V 9.1)
p. 120.5–14 4, 16

Hermetica Astrologica
Astrological Calendar
(P.Oxy. 465, ed. Grenfell–Hunt)
per totum 205 n. 64

On the Decans (CCAG VI 73–78 Kroll)
per totum 206 n. 65

Iatromathematics of Hermes Trismegistos
(Phys. et med. Gr. mi n. ed. Ideler)
1.1–6 (1:387) 205

Hermippus (ed. Kroll)
1.13 205 n. 64
2.3 205 n. 64

Secret Book of Hermes to Asclepius (ed. Ruelle)
per totum 205 n. 64

On the Twelve Signs of Zodiac
(CCAG VI 83–84 Kroll)
per totum 205–6 n. 65

Hermias
In Phaedrum (ed. Couvreur)
102.10ff. 59

Hierocles Platonicus
In Carmen Aureum
14.10 258 n. 118

Hierocles Stoicus
Elementa Ethices (ed. von Arnim)
1.51–57 105, 144 n. 4

Iamblichus
De communi mathematica scientia
(ed. Festa)
4.15, 5–18, 13 61 n. 41
4.17.12–16 111 n. 36
4.18, 9–12 63 n. 42

Julian
Adversus Heracleum
226d–227a 65

Lactantius Placitus
Scholia in Statii Thebaidem
1.719–20 187 n. 39

Macrobius
In Somnium Scipionis
1.21.27 190 n. 44

Saturnalia
1.21.1 185 n. 37
1.21.16 187 n. 39

Manilius
Astronomica
2.453–65 205 n. 64, 207

Maximus Tyrius
Dissertationes
11.12 118–119 n. 45, 141

Menander Rhetor
On Epideictic (edd. Russell–Wilson)
336.24–337.32 75
437.5–446.13 80 n. 7

Moderatus
231, 4 160 n. 18
231, 7–24 159–60 n. 19
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</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Ovid | 2.378e–383c | 211 |
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<td>36e</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>1.5.18</td>
<td>96 n. 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36e3</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>128 n. 60</td>
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<td>106 n. 31</td>
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<td>VI</td>
<td>9.11</td>
<td>131 n. 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47b–c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47e–48b</td>
<td>Plutarch</td>
<td>Aemilius et Timoleon</td>
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<td>52c4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52c4–5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52d–53c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>147 n. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69a–c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69a–d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>63 n. 43, 209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70d–72b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>132, 274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73b–76e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>54, 204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>202 n. 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>202 n. 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>202 n. 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>202 n. 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86b2–4</td>
<td>Mulierum virtutes</td>
<td></td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin Title</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Iside et Osiride</td>
<td></td>
<td>192 n. 47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De virtute morali</td>
<td></td>
<td>190 n. 43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De tranquillitate animi</td>
<td></td>
<td>147 n. 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De vitioso pudore</td>
<td></td>
<td>262 n. 122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De animae procreationem in Timaeo</td>
<td></td>
<td>192 n. 47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De communibus notitiis adversus Stoicos</td>
<td></td>
<td>261 n. 122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Stoicorum repugnantiss</td>
<td></td>
<td>261 n. 122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praecepta gerendae rei publicae</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>253 n. 110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Herodoti malignitate</td>
<td>860E–F</td>
<td>90 n. 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De facie in orbe lunae</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>90 n. 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De soppertia animalium</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>249 n. 103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author/Title</th>
<th>Book/Topic</th>
<th>Pages/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theologia Platonica</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>93 n. 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>35 n. 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo-Andronicus</td>
<td>De passionibus</td>
<td>2.227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo-Heraclitus</td>
<td>Quaestiones Homericae</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudoppithagorica</td>
<td>Anonymus Photii (ed. Thesleff)</td>
<td>237, 18ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diotogenes. De regno (ed. Thesleff)</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptolemy</td>
<td>Tetrabiblos</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seneca (Iunior)</td>
<td>De ira</td>
<td>2.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Epistulae morales</td>
<td>9.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>113.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>121.11–12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sextus Empiricus</td>
<td>Adversus mathematicos</td>
<td>7.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.147ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simplicius</td>
<td>In Aristotelis Physicorum</td>
<td>181, 10–12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>181, 7ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>231, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>231, 7–24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Categorias</td>
<td></td>
<td>237.25ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stobaeus (Ioannes)</td>
<td>Exlogae (ed. Wachsmuth)</td>
<td>1.137, lff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.113, 5–11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aelius Theon</td>
<td>Progymnasmata (ed. Patillon)</td>
<td>78, 16–79, 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theophrastus</td>
<td>In Aristotelis Metaphysicam</td>
<td>1.5.5a5–7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thessalus of Tralles</td>
<td>De virtutibus plantarum (ed. Friedrich)</td>
<td>Prooem. 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xenocrates</td>
<td>Fragmenta (ed. Isnardi Parente)</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>83–84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xenophon</td>
<td>Cyropaedia</td>
<td>1.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zosimus of Panopolis</td>
<td>On the Letter Ω (ed. Mertens)</td>
<td>10, 5–6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustine</td>
<td>De Genesi ad litteram imperfectus liber (ed. Zycha)</td>
<td>4.446, 22–471, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Confessiones</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clement of Alexandria</td>
<td>Excerpta ex Theodoto</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>28 n. 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.4–5</td>
<td>28 n. 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>116 n. 42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.1–2</td>
<td>121 n. 48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.1–2</td>
<td>176 n. 27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>8 n. 2, 37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.2</td>
<td>24–25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stromateis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6.27, 3–28, 1</td>
<td>257 n. 118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clementina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homiliae (ed. Rehm–Irmscher)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.5–21</td>
<td>212</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.7–8</td>
<td>212</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.43–44</td>
<td>212</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>213</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.39.1</td>
<td>213</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.39.3</td>
<td>213</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>213</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didymus of Alexandria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Genesim (ed. Nautin–Doutreleau)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39–41</td>
<td>226</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epiphanius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panarion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.2.2</td>
<td>215 n. 77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.1.9</td>
<td>175–76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.10.1</td>
<td>188 n. 42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>126 n. 58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eunomius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apologia (ed. Sesboüé–Durand–Doutreleau)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8, 246–49</td>
<td>197–98 n. 54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8.2</td>
<td>235 n. 92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hippolytus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refutatio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.21.5–6</td>
<td>265</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.26.15</td>
<td>215 n. 77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.27.3</td>
<td>128 n. 61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>176–77 n. 28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.33.1</td>
<td>215 n. 77, 246 n. 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.37.5–6</td>
<td>121 n. 48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.12.5</td>
<td>35 n. 24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irenaeus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adversus haereses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.2–4</td>
<td>131 n. 65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3</td>
<td>259–60, 261</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4–5</td>
<td>176 n. 27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5.3–4</td>
<td>214–15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5.4</td>
<td>126 n. 58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7.3</td>
<td>168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7.5</td>
<td>265</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8.1</td>
<td>217 n. 79, 221, 267</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8.2</td>
<td>9 n. 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8.3</td>
<td>210 n. 72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.11.1</td>
<td>121 n. 48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.13–20</td>
<td>125 n. 57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.14.1</td>
<td>28 n. 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.14.2</td>
<td>126 n. 57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.29.1</td>
<td>116 n. 42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.29.4</td>
<td>174–75, 244</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.30.1</td>
<td>227</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.30.1–3</td>
<td>227–28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.30.2</td>
<td>230</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.30.3</td>
<td>230–31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.30.5</td>
<td>187 n. 40, 192 n. 47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.30.6</td>
<td>214</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.30.13–14</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.30.14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.1</td>
<td>59 n. 38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.3</td>
<td>102–3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.4</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.4</td>
<td>265</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.27.2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.29.4</td>
<td>217</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.35.2–3</td>
<td>194</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.35.3</td>
<td>192 n. 48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.25.5</td>
<td>211 n. 73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8.2</td>
<td>235 n. 92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minucius Felix</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Octavius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nemesius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De natura hominis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.6–71.4</td>
<td>59, 112–13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Origen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commentarii in evangelium Matthaei</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Contra Celsum
2.64 36
4.14 105, 113 n. 38, 179
4.15 35
6.22 192 n. 48
6.30 187 n. 40
6.58 130 n. 65

TERTULLIAN
De paenitentia
1.1 249 n. 104
3.2 246

Adversus Praxeum
19.8 159 n. 19

Procopius of Gaza
Commentarii in Genesin (PG 87)
87, 45–48 225

Adversus Valentinianos
18 167
21 215 n. 77

Pseudo-Justin
Cohortatio ad Graecos
19 94 n. 20

Marius Victorinus
Adversus Arium (ed. Hadot)
2.7.13–15 69 n. 47
3.7.9–17 88 n. 14

Tatian
Oratio ad Graecos
5 159 n. 19

VI. ZOROASTRIAN WRITINGS

Selections of Žadāspām
30, 4–12 208 n. 68
Adam and Adamas, 163
animate body of (Gen 1:26–27), 3n., 5, 49, 54, 126, 169, 200–210, 271
cast down in matter, 49, 126, 219, 271
and creation of man in Timaeus, 204
‘ecstasy’ of, 167–69, 238–40
expelled from paradise (Gen 3:22), 215, 217–18
as hero in Wisdom literature, 264
material body of (Gen 2:7), 129, 134, 201
original sin of, 153
in Philo of Alexandria, 200–201
his prophecy (Gen 2:23), 168
three kinds of, 210

aeons
as constituents of spiritual realm, 52, 198
as god’s inner dispositions, 54, 104, 125–26, 129, 133–34, 140, 142
governed by luminaries, 122
as feminine nouns, 142
fiery, of Ialdabaoth, 121, 173–175, 177, 179, 181
as heavenly attendants, 119, 141
and Platonic forms, 52–53
prayer of, 260
subsistence (hypostasis) of, 97, 198
’syzygies’ of, 115–16, 121, 195

Alcimus Rhetor, 108

Alcinous
Aristotelian influence on, 83–91, 102
epitomizer of Plato, 63–64
and Eudorus, 85
on forms as god’s thoughts, 57–58
on god as active intellect, 58, 98, 102, 108
on god as ineffable but intelligible, 83–91
on intellectual ‘midwifery’, 153
and modes of conceiving god, 34–35, 83–91

‘Neopythagorean’ elements in, 89–90
and philosophical praise of god, 77, 82–83
Alexander Polyhistor, 94, 108
Alexander son of Numenius, 75–76

analysis, Platonic
applications in Platonism, 62–63
condensed and blended, 114, 135, 237
as ‘example’ (paradigma), 103, 106, 110–12, 114–15, 118–22, 125, 129–32, 135–38, 140, 142, 147, 151, 191
as mode (via) of conceiving god, 83–86, 89–91
reasoning by (syllogismos), 68–69, 71–72, 217, 222, 273
see also craft-analogy; pneuma; procession; ratiocinatio

Antiochus of Ascalon
cognitive theory of, 99–102
on god as intellect, 102, 108
on Platonic forms as common notions, 58
apheiresis
different from apophasis, 86
as mode of conceiving god, 77, 83–86, 89–91
see also analysis, Platonic

Apocryphon of John
astrology in, 181–92, 194–98
authorship and provenience of, 10–20, 275
discourse of procession in, 114–38
dramatis personae in, 7, 20–25, 51
enigmatic obscurity of, 4, 20–25, 51
folktales structure of, 4, 8, 47–49, 140–41, 269–70
frame-narrative in, 10–14, 17–20, 268
genre variety, 14–15, 76–79, 267–68
and Gospel of John, 10, 18, 21,
23–24, 70, 73–74, 80–81, 127,
275
and Hellenistic rhetoric, 18–19,
68–71, 75–78, 81–82, 209, 213,
221–22, 272–73
hypotactic arrangement in, 4, 18,
268
interspecific elements in, 25–28
intertextuality in, 72–73, 236–38,
245, 264
Jewish origin of, 69–70, 72, 275
levels of reality in, 4, 42, 51, 62,
73, 102, 118, 122–23, 139, 159,
167, 170, 176, 226, 232, 237,
241–42
linguistic ‘codes’ in, 73, 81, 134–38,
274–75
‘mannerism’ of, 138, 181, 199, 206,
267
manuscript variants of, 1–4, 134–38,
194–98, 222–23
as metaphysical fiction, 140, 270
narrative logic of, 46, 48–49, 115,
172–180, 241–42, 268–71
narrative voices in, 10–15, 19, 271
and parallels with Timaeus, 27,
44–46, 49–55, 59, 63–65, 74–77,
128, 132, 164, 179–80, 199,
203–4, 207–10, 261–63n. 122,
268–69, 271–272, 274
revisionist character of, 7–8, 10, 49,
66–67, 199, 203, 208, 212, 217,
245, 263–64
soteriology of, 23–25, 40, 237, 241,
263–65
thematic division of, 14–16, 43–49,
64, 268–70
universalism of, 70, 72, 138, 148,
267, 275
and Wisdom literature, 2, 17, 67–73,
131, 137–38, 141, 157, 161–63,
234–40, 264, 269, 271–72, 275

Apollonius of Tyana, 274
Arcimboldo, 267
Aristotle
and critique of Old Academy, 58,
61–62
on deformity, 116–17
on definition of riddle, 137–38
on divine intellect, 83, 94, 102,
108–9
natural reproduction in, 144–47
on soul as receptacle of forms, 58
on spontaneous generation, 146–47
and ‘unruly’ matter, 116–17, 147–48
Aseneth, repentance of, 247–48
astrology
monomoiriai, 182
paranatellonta, 181, 186
pentads, 180, 204–6
principles of, 180–83, 204, 207–8
see also decans; melothesia; planets;
zodiac
Augustine, 106, 108, 225, 235
Autogenes
see Self-Originate Christ

‘barbarian philosophy’, 70–72
see also Numenius; ‘Orientalism’
Barbelo
and coincidentia oppositorum, 91, 106, 143
conversion (epistrophê) of, 129
etymology of, 125–25
as female principle, 55, 62, 115,
118, 129, 136
as god’s first conception, 91, 95, 136
identified with Pronoia, 3–4, 13
and light-analogy, 122
and Sophia, 55, 142–43
see also ennoia; Pronoia
‘Barbelognostics’
see Irenaeus
blending
see krasis
body
animate, 9–10, 49, 54, 126, 200,
204, 207
formation of, 202, 204, 206–8
‘Gnostic’ tripartite division of, 9–10
material, 9–10, 127, 129, 134, 201,
230
Platonic world-body, 46, 49, 51,
54–56, 60, 179, 199–200
and soul, 51, 60, 144, 101, 106, 262
spiritual, 9–10, 209
text and, 17
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see also demiurge; procession
darkness
blending of with light, 122, 134–35, 265–66
generation of, 69, 158–60
as ignorance, 60, 128, 247, 257, 263
synonymous with matter, 69, 124, 257–59, 263
decans, 180–81, 186–87, 199–206
see also astrology; melothesia; planets; zodiac
dégmos (compunction), 252–54
see also metanoia
demiurge (divine craftsman)
and causation, 245–46
father and, 52, 55–56
ignorant, 63, 122, 214–15
maker and, 52, 56–57
and phantasía, 132–33, 195, 274
Platonic vs. ‘Gnostic’, 132–34, 199, 209–11
two figures of in *Ap. John*, 133–34
see also craft-analogy; Ialdabaoth;
Self-Originate Christ
Democritus, 255
Dionysius Thrax, 193, 197

diastékhê (revision), 4–5, 16
diataktikê (rearrangement), 4
diorthôsis (emendation), 4
ennôia (conception), 26, 39, 55, 140, 142, 156
and ennoêma (concept), 53, 59, 99–100
vs. enthûmêsis (discursive thinking), 130–31, 143
and epinoia (practical wisdom), 130–32
and epistêmê (knowledge), 98
as god’s first self-notion, 91, 95, 104, 129, 136
and nous (intellect), 95, 103
see also Barbelo; enthûmêsis; Pronoia; Sophia
enthûmêsis (discursive thinking), 124, 266
as predicative analysis, 150, 246
and Stoic ‘growing argument’, 130–31
see also ennoia; Sophia
epicheireme (rhetorical argument), 69
see also ratiocinatio; rhetoric
Epictetus, 27, 98–99, 251, 258
epinoia (practical wisdom), 67, 131–32
see also ennoia; Sophia
epiphérêsthai (Gen 1:2b), 68–69, 71–72
in other ‘Gnostic’ texts, 225–34
in Jewish Wisdom literature, 236–38
see also Genesis; Sophia
epistrophê (conversion), 129, 242, 247–50, 257–61
see also Aseneth; Barbelo–Ennoia;
metanoia; Sophia
erôâpokriseis, 10, 66, 68, 234
Eudorus of Alexandria, 85, 108–9
exegesis, Biblical
in Numenius, 71–72
‘Ophite’, 227–32
in Philo of Alexandria, 39, 69, 130, 153–59, 275
Rabbinic methods of, 69, 221
see also Adam; epiphérêsthai; Noah
form (*eidos, idea*), Platonic, 46, 51, 55, 87, 123, 147–48
as eon in *Ap. John*, 52–53
and formism, 139
as god’s thought, 52–53, 57–58, 101–2, 107–8
Genesis, Book of
cosmogony in, 135, 137, 199, 223–25, 234–40
creation of man in, 200–203, 208–10
early history of mankind in, 67, 166, 263–64
Moses as alleged author of, 67–68, 72–73, 158, 167–70, 199, 210, 234, 241, 245
as ‘Oriental’ wisdom, 71–72
see also Adam; Apocryphon of John; epiphrethis; Noah; Wisdom literature, Jewish
god
absolute transcendence of, 79
active intellect in Aristotle, 94
in Alcinous, 83–91
ineffability of, 78, 80, 83–91
inner life of, 104–6
as One beyond being, 109–11
Platonist controversies over, 107–12
positive determinations of, 78–80, 93, 95, 97, 107–34
preconceptual stage of, 102–6
unity of, 211–14
see also analogy; aphairesis
Gospel of John (‘Fourth Gospel’)
as ‘intertext’, 18, 23, 73, 80
metaphors of, 74, 177
obsccurity of, 10, 24
Platonizing expansion of, 70, 275
prologue of, 21, 80
Hegel, G. W. F., 108, 110, 112, 256
Hermeticism
astrological doctrines of, 186, 205
cosmogony in, 199–200, 248
on generation of matter, 158–60
theology of, 57, 59, 88, 90
Hermagoras of Temnos, 69, 222
 Hermippus, 206–7
Hermogenes of Tarsus, 69
 hyperochê (categorical analysis), 84, 87, 89, 91
Ialdaboth
apostasy of, 243
his authorities and rulers, 13, 62, 125, 167, 181–83, 192–95, 200–202, 209
and creation of man, 167, 169, 200, 218, 239
and fate (heirmamenê), 182
as fâlkte villain, 13, 48, 117, 172–78, 224, 243–44, 261, 266, 270
as instrumental cause, 54, 167, 176–77, 245–46
as irrational soul, 60, 125, 197, 262
as jealous/envious ruler, 67, 210–11, 214, 217–20, 222, 244
in luminous cloud, 160, 164, 170–74, 178
as miscarriage and deformity, 116, 119, 130–31, 143–48
and Mithraic Aiôn, 148–9
and Moses, 67–68, 73, 167
oracles of, 237–38
and phantasia, 117, 123, 125, 132–33, 195, 197, 273–74
vs. Plato’s demiurge, 54, 132–34, 179
as tyrannical pretender, 119–20, 168, 199
and voces magicae, 125–26
Iao, 171, 185–93
iatromathematics
see melothesia
image, theory of, 54–55, 97–98
imagination
see phantasia
intertextuality
in Numenius, 70–72
in Philo of Alexandria, 127–28
in Plutarch, 147–48
see also analogy; ratiocinatio; rhetoric; stasis-theory
Irenaeus
cognitive theory of, 130–131
on ‘Gnostics’, 193–95
on ‘Ophites’, 36, 187, 192, 214, 227–32
and summary of ‘Barbelognostic’ myth, 172, 174–73, 216, 218, 244
theology of, 95, 103, 106–8
Jesus Christ
as animate image of the Savior, 164
ascension of, 162
in magical spells, 189
name of, 198
polymorphy of, 28–39
post-resurrection appearances of, 8–10, 17, 22, 37, 67, 175
roles of in Gospel of Truth, 82
transfiguration of, 21, 162
see also Gospel of John; Self-Originate Christ

kingship (basileia), theories of, 118–21, 134, 140

Sethian account of, 265
Stoic theory of, 122, 179, 265
Valentinian account of, 265

magic, Hellenistic
amulets in, 188, 192
and cumulative variation in spells, 189–91
and nomina barbara, 125, 142, 188–99, 191, 193
supreme god in, 171, 187–88, 191–92
uterine, 145
and voces magicae, 125–26
see also astrology; Iao; names, semantics of

Manilius, 187, 207
‘mannerism’ see Apocryphon of John

Marcosians, 125–26
‘marquetry’ (inlay work), 138

matter
and constitutive elements, 120, 179–80, 201
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