BERLIN-BRANDENBURGISCHE AKADEMIE DER WISSENSCHAFTEN

TEXTE UND UNTERSUCHUNGEN
ZUR GESCHICHTE DER ALTCHRISTLICHEN LITERATUR

Archiv für die Ausgabe der Griechischen Christlichen
Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte

BEGRÜNDET VON

O. VON GEBHARDT UND A. VON HARNACK

BAND 144

THE COPTIC APOCALYPSE OF PETER

(NAG-HAMMADI-CODEX VII,3)

EDITED BY HENRIETTE W. HAVELAAR

Akademie Verlag

Acknowledgements

Contents

Preface

This study aims at making more accessible the Coptic Apocalypse of Peter (Apoc.Pet.), the third text of Codex VII of the Nag Hammadi library. As a matter of course I will build on earlier research of this complicated text since the first publication in 1973 of the Coptic text and a German translation by M.Krause and M.Girgis.

Over the last two decades several translations of the text have been brought out: M.Krause, M.Girgis 'Die Petrusapokalypse' in: F. Altheim, R. Stiehl (eds.) *Christentum am Roten Meer* II, Berlin/New York (1973), 152-179; A. Werner 'Die Apokalypse des Petrus, die dritte Schrift von Nag Hammadi Codex VII. Eingeleitet und übersetzt vom Berliner Arbeitskreis für Koptisch-Gnostische Schriften', *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 99 (1974), 575-584; S.K. Brown, C.W. Griggs 'The Apocalypse of Peter, introduction and translation', *Brigham Young University Studies* 15 (1974/75), 131-145; J.A. Brashler *The Coptic Apocalypse of Peter, a genre analysis and interpretation,* Claremont 1977 (Unpubl. Diss.); J.A. Brashler, R.A. Bullard 'Apocalypse of Peter' in: J.M. Robinson (ed.), *The Nag Hammadi Library in English,* Leiden 1988; A. Werner 'Koptisch-Gnostische Apokalypse des Petrus' in: W. Schneemelcher (ed.) *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen,* Tübingen 5.Auflage 1987-1989, 633-644. J.A. Brashler, "Apocalypse of Peter", in: B.A. Pearson (ed.) Nag Hammadi Codex VII. Leiden 1996, 201-249. Despite the fact that we now have at our disposal seven different translations (and several translations of parts of the text), considerable interpretational problems have remained.

These problems call for an annotated translation which incorporates the insights articulated by the above-mentioned authors.

The only earlier study exclusively dedicated to Apoc.Pet. was carried out by J.A. Brashler (1977), cited above. It contains the Coptic text, a translation and chapters dedicated to questions of genre, Christology and the identity of the adversaries of Apoc. Pet. The present study owes a great deal to this project but also differs from it to an important extent as will become clear especially in the chapters on genre and Christology. Another significant study, is K. Koschorke's *Die Polemik der Gnostiker gegen das kirchliche Christentum,* Leiden 1978. Koschorke has tried to solve the problem of the identity of the adversaries of the Petrine Gnostics. This problem has here been reconsidered, resulting in an alternative proposal regarding the relationship between the group behind Apoc.Pet. and its opponents.

While a complete commentary on the text has not appeared before, the commentary presented here is indebted to various earlier investigations concerned with different details from Apoc.Pet. namely H.-M. Schenke 'Zur Faksimile-Ausgabe der Nag Hammadi-Schriften, Die Schriften des Codex VII'. *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache* 102 (1975), 277-285; K.-W. Tröger: Die Passion Jesu Christi in der Gnosis nach den Schriften von *Nag Hammadi.*

Humboldt Universität 1977 (Unpubl. Diss.); J.A. Cozby *Gnosis and the Cross: The Passion of Christ in Gnostic Soteriology as Reflected in the Nag Hammadi Tractates*, Duke University 1985 (Unpubl. Diss.); Ph. Perkins *The Gnostic Dialogue,* New York 1985; G. Shellrude *Nag Hammadi Apocalypses: A Study of the Relation of Selected Texts to the Traditional Apocalypses,* St. Andrews University 1986 (Unpubl. Diss.); U. Schönborn *Diverbium Salutis, Studien zur Interdependenz von literarischer Struktur und theologischer Intention des gnostischen Dialogs, ausgeführt an der koptischen "Apokalypse des Petrus" aus Nag Hammadi (NHC VII,3),* Marburg/Lahn 1987 (Unpubl. Habilitationsschrift).

The structure of the present study

Different approaches will be used to analyse the text: a philological approach dominates in chapters one, two and three and the registers; a literary approach in chapters four and five. And a combination of philological and literary insights is found in chapter six. Chapter seven analyses Apoc.Pet. with the help of sociological notions. The different approaches are not divided from each other as strictly as is suggested here. The commentary in particular combines aspects of the different methods in order to present a comprehensive interpretation. And in chapter six and seven, for instance, the Christology of Apoc.Pet. and the identity of the adversaries are discussed with the help of philological observations as well. But in general this division will be sustained.

The first three chapters are dedicated to philological questions: a description of the manuscript, an inventory of linguistic peculiarities, an edition of the Coptic text, a translation, grammatical annotations, and a commentary make up this part of the project. It is completed by a register which is included at the end of the book.

The Coptic text, based on my study of the manuscript in the Coptic Museum, corrects on several minor points the first edition by Krause. The translation is as literal as possible, without making concessions to syntactic and grammatical consistency. The commentary draws attention to the difficulties of our text and proposes an interpretation of these difficulties. I will avoid, therefore, piling up information and references that do not directly serve the main goal: explanation of the Apocalypse of Peter.

Chapter four is concerned with the question of genre. This chapter makes more explicit what has silently been assumed in the commentary viz. that Apoc.Pet. is a specimen of the genre apocalypse. Genre study is an important line of investigation in current literary research. The question as to what a genre is and, more specifically, the discussion on the apocalyptic genre, have been of particular importance the last two decades. The genre of Apoc.Pet. will be analyzed with the help of recent insights in the field of literary theory. The text is described as an apocalypse in which both general apocalyptic and more specific Gnostic features have been combined.

One of the features which helped us establish the text as an apocalypse forms the subject matter of chapter five. The abundance of references to Scripture is a characteristic element

of apocalyptic texts. In the case of Apoc.Pet. we deal with the relationship between this text and the New Testament. This relationship is very complicated and requires a thorough description. The text contains over twenty references to New Testament texts, a considerable amount for this relatively short document (14 codex pages). Many of these references seem to be taken from the Gospel of Matthew but other texts from Scripture have also been identified.

The next chapter is concerned with the Christology of Apoc.Pet. It is essential for our understanding of the text to analyze how the Saviour, who is both the subject and the object of the revelation, has been represented. It appears that the interpretation of the crucifixion is revealed to Peter by the narrating Saviour or *angelus interpres*. The crucified Saviour, who can be characterized as docetic, is described as consisting of three non-material 'natures', temporarily connected with a material body. This representation of the Saviour is found in more Christian Gnostic texts. An important parallel with another text from Nag Hammadi can be found in the Second Treatise of the Great Seth in the same codex.

In chapter seven, finally, it is tried to retrieve in which sort of religious community Apoc. Pet. may have originated. It is argued that the text functioned as the programme of a newly formed Christian Gnostic group. The author of the text could have been a spokesman of this group who polemically formulated the religious ideas of his devotees. The adversaries who are so vehemently opposed in Apoc.Pet. are thought to have formed previously a unity with the Petrine Gnostics. It is hypothesized that within this proto-orthodox community, our group gradually became a subgroup. Religious differences, finally, led to a voluntary or involuntary schism which separated the Petrine Gnostics from their parental group. This interpretation partly results from the chapters five and six in which respectively the relation with the New Testament and the Christology of Apoc.Pet. has been described. From both chapters it appears that our text has been influenced to a large extent by the Christian tradition. In particular the canonical story of the Passion has appeared to be fundamental to the composition of Apoc.Pet.

Introduction

In 1945 a collection of thirteen 4th-century papyrus codices was found near Nag Hammadi in Upper-Egypt which is now kept in the Coptic Museum in Cairo. With only a few letters missing at the bottom of some pages, Apoc.Pet. (Codex VII,3) is among the best preserved texts of the whole library. The real problem with the text lies in the difficulty the Coptic causes us. Although most of the text can be interpreted with a high degree of certainty, a number of phrases remain which are very difficult to construe, possibly due to the inadequacy of the Coptic translation of the Greek original.

Place and Date of Origin

In all probability the original text was written in Greek. However, the question as to where Apoc.Pet. was written cannot be answered with certainty. A possible place of origin seems to be Syria. Indications for this are the prominent role the apostle Peter plays in Apoc.Pet. and the preference of the author for the Gospel of Matthew, which is apparent, for instance, from the self-designation of the people behind Apoc.Pet. as 'little ones'. Apoc.Pet. also shows some resemblances with other apocryphal Peter-literature, for instance with the *Kerygmata Petrou* in the Pseudo-Clementines. The docetic Christology forms the main resemblance between Apoc.Pet. and these texts. Since this literature is usually located in Syria, it is feasible that Apoc.Pet. originated there as well.[1]

As to the date of origin of Apoc.Pet., we cannot be sure of that either, but a *terminus post quem non* can be given with certainty since in the leather cover of Codex VII some paper scraps, used to strengthen the cover, were found on which the dates 333, 341, 346 and 348 are written.[2] When we assume that with the mention of Hermas, in Apoc.Pet. (78.18), the author of The Shepherd of Hermas is intended. A *terminus a quo* of 150 could be established, since the Shepherd of Hermas is dated usually in the first part of the second century. This

---

[1] Cf. however Pearson 1990b, 71 who proposes Egypt as the place of origin. This suggestion is based on the expression "waterless canals" in Apoc.Pet. 79.30-31. According to him this is possibly an allusion to the expression "waterless springs" in 2 Peter 2.17 which has been adapted to fit an Egyptian geographical environment. The passage is discussed in Ch. 5.4.3.

[2] Cf. Barnes 1975, 12. These dates are only reliable of course when the papyruspages were written before the manufacturing of the codex. If the codex was written on after it was manufactured, the manuscript must be dated either *in* or *after* the year 348.

leaves us with a period of about 200 years, viz. 150-333, in which Apoc.Pet. has to be situated. The docetic Christology of the work does not provide us with a clue since it might just as well point to a very early date shortly after Ignatius of Antioch who already discusses this theme, as to a somewhat later date contemporary with Irenaeus and Tertullian. The many references to texts which were to become part of the New Testament might point to a later date as well. Apparently these texts had authority for the author and therefore they might have been in circulation for some time. This observation is supported by the lack of any serious concern with Old Testament texts, references to which are virtually absent. In Apoc.Pet. 76.31-34, where it is told that the opponents of the Petrine Gnostics boast that "the mystery of truth" belongs to them only, Brashler has detected an indication of a date of origin in the third century: "By citing this as a boast of his opponents, the author of Apoc. Pet. indicates that he is writing in the third century, when the exclusive claims of the orthodox church were increasingly pressed upon the minorities who did not accept orthodox teaching and practice".[3] Finally, the nature of the polemic in Apoc.Pet. directed at emerging orthodoxy and ongoing institutionalization, might point by its use of Matthew 16.18-19 to a date of origin after Tertullian's *De Pudicitia*, in which the use of this text as a source of orthodox episcopal authority occurs for the first time as far as we know.[4] However, this argument is not decisive either: we might equally consider Apoc.Pet. as the older source in which Matthew 16 is used to legitimize episcopal aspirations. Considering these arguments, a date of origin at the beginning of the third century is possible but not certain.[5]

Apoc. Pet. and the Other Texts from Nag Hammadi[6]

It might be fruitful to compare Apoc.Pet. with different clusters of texts from the Nag Hammadi collection. Since our text is part of Codex VII one could ask if there is any system in this codex. As far as the text is an apocalypse we could compare it with the other apocalypses of the Nag Hammadi library, especially with the apocalypses of Codex V.[7] As our text is one in which Peter is one of the main characters the other Petrine texts from Nag Hammadi should be taken into account.

---

[3] Brashler 1977, 217.

[4] Cf. Koschorke 1978, 17.

[5] See for instance Smith 1985, 8, who proposes an earlier date, some time in the second century.

[6] The Nag Hammadi texts cited in this study and their abbreviations are taken from *The Nag Hammadi Library in English*, Leiden 3rd rev. ed. 1988 (NHLE), with the exception of the translation of Apoc.Pet. and some other passages which will be indicated.

[7] See Ch. 4.

The first comparison, viz. with the other texts in Codex VII turns out to be negative. Codex VII contains five texts. Only the Second Treatise of the Great Seth (VII,2) shows some important, mainly Christological, parallels. The other three texts (Paraph.Shem VII,1; Teach.Silv. VII,4 and Steles Seth VII,5) have nothing to do with our text. But it is noteworthy that the language, Sahidic with some Bohairic traits, is consistent throughout the codex. The second group of texts we want to collate is formed by the other apocalypses of the Nag Hammadi library. As will become clear also from chapter 4, the Apocalypse of Peter has more generic traits in common with Jewish and non-Gnostic Christian apocalypses than with the specifically Gnostic apocalypses from Nag Hammadi. Especially the visions, a characteristic feature of Jewish apocalypses, which take up a considerable part of Apoc.Pet., are rare among the Nag Hammadi apocalypses;[8] the accent in Gnostic apocalypses is usually on the spoken word. However, there are some elements in common with Gnostic apocalypses: with the Apocalypse of Paul (NHC V,2), the Apocalypse of Adam (V,5) and the second Apocalypse of James (V,4). Apoc.Pet. shares a few features, typical of Gnostic apocalypses: present salvation by knowledge, personal afterlife and otherworldly elements described as good and evil.[9] Upon closer examination these parallels appear to be less important. The main story of the Apocalypse of Paul is the report of a heavenly journey of Paul who is guided by an angel from the third up to the tenth heaven.[10] The Apocalypse of Adam comes closer to the Jewish Testament genre in that it contains the last words of Adam directed at his son Seth. The Second Apocalypse of James, finally, only contains a smaller part which can be labeled apocalyptic. The work as a whole is not an apocalypse.[11]

The third group, finally, texts in which the apostle Peter plays an important role, is also not very specific in its relation with Apoc.Pet. Apoc.Pet. relates more to other Peterliterature such as the canonical Second Letter of Peter and the Gospel of Peter, although the similarities with these texts should not be overestimated. In addition to Apoc.Pet. the Nag Hammadi Library contains two texts and the Codex Berolinensis one text in which Peter plays a central role. These texts are: the Acts of Peter and the Twelve Apostles (VI,1), The Letter of Peter to Philip (VIII,2) and The Act of Peter (BG 8502,4). Of these texts only Ep. Pet.Phil is a Gnostic text just like Apoc.Pet. The two Acts show no explicitly Gnostic features. The only parallels between Apoc.Pet. and Acts Pet. 12 Apost. is, apart from the important position of Peter, the allusion to Mt. 16,13-19 in Acts Pet. 12 Apost. (VI,1) 9,1-15: "He said to Peter, 'Peter!' and Peter was frightened, for how did he know that his name was Peter? Peter

---

[8] Vision accounts occur only in Apoc.Pet. (VII,3), Allogenes (XI,3), Zostrianos (VIII,1) and Apoc.Pl. (V,2).

[9] Fallon 1979, 148.

[10] The otherworldly journey is a common theme in Jewish apocalypses. We find it e.g. in Apocalypse of Abraham, I Enoch 1-36. 2 Enoch, 3 Baruch. It is also found in a few Nag Hammadi texts like Zostrianos (VIII,1) and the Paraphrase of Shem (VII,2).

[11] See Shellrude 1986, 6.

responded to the Saviour, 'How do you know me, for you called my name'? Lithargoel (a cryptic name of the Saviour, hwh) answered, 'I want to ask you, who gave the name Peter to you'? He said to him, 'It was Jesus Christ, the son of the living God. He gave this name to me'. He answered and said, 'It is I! Recognize me, Peter'".[12] The Act of Peter in the *Codex Berolinensis* in which the story of Peter's paralyzed daughter is the central theme, does not resemble Apoc.Pet. at all, except for the name of the main figure.

Closer to Apoc.Pet. comes Ep.Pet.Phil. (VIII,2). The same atmosphere of esoteric revelation concerning the suffering of Jesus and the prominent role of Peter can be found in this text. Although Ep.Pet.Phil. is not an apocalypse, but a letter followed by a revelation dialogue, it has more in common with Apoc.Pet. than any of the other texts. There is no evidence, however, of a literary relation. Peter also plays an important role in the Apocryphon of James (I,2). In this text the Saviour grants a revelation to James and Peter. It is explicitly said that Peter and James take a special position among the disciples. In other Gnostic texts Peter plays a less positive role. In the Gospel of Thomas (II,2), and the Gospel of Mary (BG,1) Peter is depicted as the opponent of Mary.[13]

There are some additional elements of agreement between Apoc.Pet. and the other Nag Hammadi texts. The most important feature is the implicit use of references to Scripture.[14] We find this in the Gospel of Truth (NHC I,3 & XII,2)[15] and, for instance, in the Testimony of Truth (NHC IX,3).[16] A second general point of agreement is the pessimistic dualistic anthropology of Apoc.Pet. which can be found throughout the Nag Hammadi library. The same goes for the Christology of Apoc.Pet. which shares its docetic character with at least six other texts.[17] Finally, the polemic against orthodoxy and maybe against other, Gnostic, groups occurs in some of the other texts as well.[18]

---

[12] Robinson 1988, 292-293. Cf. Apoc.Pet. 71,14-71,21.

[13] See for instance Smith 1985, 102-117 for details on the anti-Peter tendency in these texts.

[14] See Ch. 5.

[15] Cf. Williams 1988.

[16] Cf. Pearson 1990, 29f., 39f.

[17] See Ch. 6.

[18] Cf. Treat.Seth (VII,2); Test.Ver. (IX,3); Melch. (IX,1).

1. Manuscript, Orthography and Language

1.1 Manuscript

The Apocalypse of Peter, the third text of codex VII, is kept in the Coptic Museum of Old Cairo and bears the inventory number 10546. In the manuscript our text is preceded by The Paraphrase of Shem (VII 1,1-49,9), The Second Treatise of the Great Seth (VII 49,10-70,12), and followed bv The Teachings of Silvanus (VII 84,15-118,9) and The Three Steles of Seth (VII 118,10-127,32).

The five texts were stitched as one quire into a leather binding, which is conserved separately.[19] The papyrus pages, which are conserved in plexiglass frames, still show the points of attachment. The quality of the papyrus is average compared to codex II or VIII for example.[20] The papyrus is thicker than in these two codices and has many spots, slits and holes which are not due to old age but to the inaccurate manufacturing of the papyrus. The colour varies from light beige to a reddish brown. In one instance the papyrus is not two but four layers thick viz. page 81/82 where an extra layer of papyrus is affixed, possibly as consolidation.

The text of Apoc.Pet. takes up 14 closely covered codex pages. The original size of a page was 16 x 29.2 cm[21], the average column of writing measures 10/11.5 cm x 22.5 cm. Each page contains 30-39 lines. The upper and lower margins measure about three centimeters, the outer margin is also three centimeters, and the inner margin is about two and a half centimeters. The Coptic scribe has numbered the pages from $\overline{\text{O}}$ (70) to $\overline{\text{ΠΔ}}$ (84). These numbers are written in the upper left corner of every oddnumbered page and in the upper right corner of every evennumbered page, a little more than one centimeter from the upper edge of the papyrus and three centimeters from the left and right edges respectively.

Kollèseis (joints where the papyrus has been pasted) are present on the following pages: 71, left over right at two-third of the page on the right side; 72, right over left, verso of 71; 79, left over right, at about three centimeters of the right margin, 80, verso of 79. In the last case the pasting is untidy but original, for the handwriting runs across the spots and creases.

---

[19] See Facsimile Edition, *Introduction* 1984.

[20] The criteria of papyrus quality are: thinness, regularity of fibers, surface smoothness and uniformity of colour. Cf. Lewis, 1974.

[21] The edges of all pages are slightly damaged by insects, humidity and old age.

Apoc.Pet. and codex VII as a whole are written by one scribe. The handwriting style may be identified with the second hand of codex XI (Allogenes) as already pointed out by King.[22] Close examination makes this identification most likely. The script of both texts is a formal round majuscule. It averages 18 to 20 letters per line, with rarely a variance of more than three letters. Black ink was used throughout. The handwriting of codex XI might be a little rounder in shape than the one from codex VII but this must be due to the normal variation within an individual's handwriting. Several features of the hand of codex VII occur in the second hand of codex XI as well: e.g., the circumflex above the combinations ϨΙ and ЄΙ, the backstroke on the Τ and the tendency to write the letters at the end of each line smaller than the ones at the beginning. Though the handwriting has been characterized as "a poor and mannered class one"[23], it is in general very regular and even beautiful. Furthermore it has some minor orthographic characteristics in common with codices IV, V, VI, VIII and IX.[24]

The manuscript is in very good condition. Screening the text with the help of an ultraviolet lamp has yielded no new results. With the exception of small lacunae involving only a few letters all of which can be restored with a high degree of certainty, the text is complete.[25]

1.2 Orthography

The first letter of the text after the title, the Є of ЄϤϨΜΟΟϹ, is probably meant to be a capital. It is clearly larger in size than the other letters at the beginning of a line which are up to twice as big as the letters at the end of a line. The only other decorations in the text of Apoc.Pet. consist in a carelessly drawn framework around the title at the beginning of the text and a similar ornament at the end.

The left and right margins are regular. The only noticeable deviation can be found in Apoc.Pet. 72.15 (right margin) and 72.16 (left margin) where the letters 'ΛΜ̄' and 'ΠΙ-' extend in the right and left margins respectively.

The supralinear stroke, functioning as a syllable marker, appears regularly above single consonantal sonants (Μ, Ν, Ρ; once also Β) which form syllables of their own or above two or more consonants of any sort forming syllables. The supralinear stroke over single or double consonants is generally in the rounded form of the circumflex; whereas over three or more consonants, the stroke is straight. There are a few more noticeable accents viz. the circumflex or spiritus asper above vowels in 76.5 Ⲏ̂, 77.3 ЄΟΥⲰ̄ and 77.33 ЄΙЄΠϢⲰΤ

---

[22] King 1984 (typescript), 198.

[23] Layton 1974, 4, 358.

[24] Robinson 1975, 170.

[25] Lacunae: 70.31; 71.33,34; 72.31; 78.34; 79.32,33; 80.33; 81.32; 82.32; 83.33,34.

and above the combination ЄI in four instances: 72.26; 75.4; 77.33; 79.19. A characteristic feature of the orthography of Apoc.Pet. which also appears in the orthography of codices IV, V, VI, VIII, IX and XI, is the appearance of the stroke above the combination 'ϨI' in every form (ϨIХ̄Ν, ϨINⲀ, ϨITOOT, ϨITN̄, CϨIMЄ, ϨIMⲀPMЄNH etc.). The function of this stroke has not been satisfactorily explained so far.[26] In addition, the supralinear stroke appears constantly above standard contractions (ΠN̄Ⲁ, CTOC̄, CⲰP̄ etc.) and once as emphasizing stroke (ЄⲀⲰЄIM). A stroke is never used at the end of a line to indicate a final N.[27]

Since I had the opportunity to study the original manuscript in the Coptic Museum it is possible to add some, more detailed, information than can be obtained from the facsimile edition. After checking the few lacunae once again together with various instances in which the facsimile edition was not clear enough with respect to a raised dot or other accent, the following adaptations have been made. In five instances the present punctuation deviates from Krause's first edition and follows Brashler's: 75.26 raised dot added; 77.10 raised dot removed; 79.18 raised dot added; 80.16 raised dot removed because the black spot seems to be a stain instead of a raised dot, and 80.18 raised dot added. In one case the scribe has corrected a word, namely 77.13: ϨITOOTY has been corrected into ϨITOOTOY by writing a very small O between T and Y. In 83.21 the letter I is blemished and therefore hardly readable.

There is one instance of a ligature that has not been registered before: 74.17 ΠⲀⲀNH N and H are written as one letter. Another case of ambiguous spelling worth discussing can be found in 77.18-19: ЄCⲰⲀNХIϬOM / ΠN̄Ⲁ N̄NOЄPON. Here, the supralinear stroke from ΠN̄Ⲁ seems to form one whole with the 'tail' of the Ⲱ of ЄCⲰⲀNХIϬOM above it. Krause transcribes ΠN̄Ⲁ, Brashler renders ΠNⲀ, without the stroke. Careful examination of the original shows that there is a separate stroke over ΠNⲀ.

The serif, in the form of a backstroke, appears only with the letter T and functions as an element to indicate a closed syllable and the end of a word, although its use is not consistent: there are many instances where the letter T at the end of a syllable has no hook. Its major occurrence is with the morphemes ЄT-, ⲀT-, and MN̄T-. It is present consistently at the end of words ending with T.[28]

The raised dot is used frequently, though not consistently, to mark the end of a sentence or clause. In some instances it is used to separate words and in this respect its use must be

---

[26] See Polotsky 'Review of Till, Koptische Grammatik', in: Polotsky 1971, 226-233.

[27] Perhaps with one exeption: M̄ = MN̄. See Gramm. Ann. 72.15.

[28] Böhlig/Wisse 1975, 2 n.5.: "The reason for pointing final letters of a word or syllabe is most likely an effort to facilitate reading aloud." The serif in codex VII,3 probably has the same function, although this only occurs with T-. The same use of the serif occurs in codices IV, V, VI, VIII and XI.

considered rather arbitrary.[29] Another means of punctuation in this codex is the diaeresis. It is used to mark a consonantal I, as in: ⲠⲀⲒ̈, ⲦⲀⲒ̈, ⲚⲀⲒ̈, ϨⲢⲀⲒ̈, Ⲓ̈ⲰⲦ etc. In a few cases grammatical difficulty may be identified as an error of the copyist. We found a possible dittography[30] of ⲚⲀⲒ̈ in 71.10f., the omission of ϨⲈⲚ⁻ in 76.8, a haplography of ⲞⲨ⁻ in 82.20, the omission of ⲠⲈ in 83.8, and omission of ⲞⲨⲚ̄⁻ in 83.29.

1.3 Language

It is the scholarly consensus that Apoc.Pet. is written in Sahidic and that this Sahidic is a translation of a Greek original.[31] The text does show, however, both minor internal variations and deviations from the (e.g. biblical) Sahidic. This is partly due to influence from Upper-Egyptian dialects, however: also some Lower-Egyptian features are present both in morphology and syntax.

I will determine specifically which linguistic features come into consideration. These are listed below and are divided into three larger groups: 1) internal variants comprehensible within the scope of Sahidic; 2) features giving evidence of a specific dialectal influence: Akhmimic, Subakhmimic or Lycopolitan, Bohairic; 3) traits not associated with any single dialect.[32]

Under each of these three divisions are headings supplying general categories under which the various alternatives are grouped. In parentheses following each item, the number of occurrences in Apoc.Pet. is given. Items which occur in parentheses themselves indicate Sahidic terms which do not occur in Apoc.Pet. They are only supplied for purposes of comparison.

---

[29] Cf. e.g. 70.19 where the raised point between ⲈⲦⲞⲚϨ· and Ⲛ̄ⲀⲦⲬⲰϨⲘ̄ does not have a clear function.

[30] But see Gramm. Ann. 71.10f.

[31] Indeed, there is no reason to doubt the consensus that all the Nag Hammadi tractates have been translated from Greek into Coptic; cf. e.g. MacRae 1976, 613 and Brashler 1977, 10.

[32] The divisions of the language characteristics in the three above-mentioned groups is based on King's description of the language of NHC XI,2 (Allogenes), 1984.

1) Internal variants of Apoc.Pet. comprehensible within the scope of Sahidic

<u>⁻ЄІ instead of ⁻ї</u>

suff. 1st ps. sg. (17) suff. 1st ps. sg. (10)

<u>⁻І instead of ⁻ЄІ</u>

ПІⲰⲦ (3) (ПЄІⲰⲦ)
(�̄Ⲕ)Ⲋⲟ̈ІⲚЄ (1) (Ⲋ𝚎ⲚⲊⲟⲉⲓⲚЄ (2)

<u>І instead of ЄІ in Greek words</u>

ⲀⲚⲦІⲔІⲘЄⲚⲞⲤ (1) (ⲀⲚⲦІⲔЄІⲘЄⲚⲞⲤ)
Ⲋ̄ІⲘⲀⲢⲘЄⲚⲎ (1) (Ⲋ̄ЄІⲘⲀⲢⲘЄⲚⲎ)
ⲦЄⲖІⲞⲤ (2) (ⲦЄⲖЄІⲞⲤ)
Ⲣ̄ⲪⲐⲞⲚІ (1) (ⲪⲐⲞⲚЄІ)

<u>⁻Ⲩ (after Є⁻) instead of ⁻ⲞⲨ</u>

art. Ⲩ⁻ (4) ⲞⲨ⁻ (1)
ⲨⲚ̄ⲦⲀ⸗ (1) ⲞⲨⲚ̄ⲦⲀ⸗ (1)
ⲨⲚ̄ (2) (ⲞⲨⲚ̄)

<u>ⲀⲀ instead of Ⲁ</u>

ⲬЄⲔⲀⲀⲤ (1) (ⲬЄⲔⲀⲤ)

<u>absence of anaptyctic Ⲛ</u>

ⲰⲞⲘⲦ̄ (1) (ⲰⲞⲘⲚ̄Ⲧ)

<u>absence of Ⲋ</u>

ⲀⲢЄⲊ (1) (ⲊⲀⲢЄⲊ)

<u>Є instead of Ⲏ</u>

ⲘЄⲊ (1) (ⲘⲎⲊ)

2) Features possibly giving evidence of a dialectal influence

a) Upper Egyptian (Akhmimic and/or Subakhmimic) Traits:

Stative of ⲈⲒⲠⲈ[33]

Ⲉ (6) (Ⲟ)

Plural of ⲂⲀ̄ⲖⲈ[34]

ⲂⲀ̄ⲖⲈⲈⲨⲈ (4) (ⲂⲀ̄ⲖⲈⲨⲈ/ⲂⲀ̄ⲖⲈⲈⲨ)

Ⲉ instead of Ⲁ[35]

ⲘⲈⲦⲈ (2) ⲘⲀⲦⲈ (2)
ⲚⲈⲀ⸗[36] (1) (ⲚⲀⲀ⸗)

Prep.:
Ⲛ̄ⲦⲎ⸗   ⲚⲦⲀ⸗
Ⲛ̄ⲦⲎⲈⲒ (1) Ⲛ̄ⲦⲀⲒ̈ (2)

Ⲁ instead of Ⲉ[37]

ⲘⲀϨ (1) ⲘⲈϨ (1)
Ⲛ̄ⲦⲀⲠⲈ⸗ (1) (Ⲛ̄ⲦⲈⲠⲈ⸗)
ⲘⲀⲨ⁻ (1) (ⲘⲈⲨ⁻)

.

---

[33] Cf. Till 1961. § 204.

[34] Cf. Crum 38a.

[35] Cf. Till 1961, § 23-54.

[36] The form ⲚⲈⲀ⸗ is rare, appearing only in the Nag Hammadi codices at: II,64.15f.; V,46.10; VI,96.7, 71.30; VII,64.20, 72.24; XI,57.12.22.

[37] Cf. Till 1961, § 265.

-OY instead of -ЄY[38]

art.poss. 3rd ps.pl.:
-OY (5) -ЄY (9)

N̄2PⲀï instead of 2PⲀï[39]

N̄2PⲀï (21) 2PⲀï (1)

Fut.II instead of Fut.III

2̄INⲀ ХЄ ЄYNⲀ- (1) (ЄYЄ-)

P̄- as prefix for verbs borrowed from Greek[40]

Greek verbs with P̄- (8) (Greek verbs without P̄-)

b) Bohairic Traits

Vocabulary: CPⲀ2/CTPⲀ2 (4)[41]

Morphological Elements:

-I instead of -Є[42]

ⲰNI (1) ⲰNЄ (1)

---

[38] Cf. Till 1961, § 128.

[39] Cf. Crum 698a.

[40] Cf. Till 1961, § 187.

[41] Cf. Crum 358a.

[42] Cf. Till 1961, § 54.

Stative of ϹⲰϨⲈ[43]

ϹⲎϨ (ϹⲀϨⲦ)

Stative of Ⲧ̄ⲂⲂⲞ[44]

ⲦⲞⲨⲂⲎⲞⲨⲦ (1) (Ⲧ̄ⲂⲂⲎⲨ)

Neg. fut.III 3rd ps. pl.:[45]

Ⲛ̄ⲚⲞⲨ (1) (Ⲛ̄ⲚⲈⲨ)

Syntactic Characteristics :

Cleft sentence construction: sg. after pl. vedette:

ⲠⲈⲦ- 3rd ps. pl.[46] (1) (ⲚⲈⲦ-)

Genitive construction and possessive relation:[47]

Ⲡⲓ-, ϯ-, Ⲛⲓ-...Ⲛ̄ⲦⲈ (68) Ⲡ-, Ⲧ-, Ⲛ-...Ⲛ̄ (3)

Possessive construction:

ⲠⲎ...Ⲛ̄ⲦⲈ (2) (ⲠⲀ)
ⲚⲎ...Ⲛ̄ⲦⲈ (2) ⲚⲀ (1)

---

[43] Cf. Crum 381a.

[44] Cf. Crum 399b.

[45] Cf. Till 1961, § 254.

[46] In Bohairic 'ⲠⲈⲦ-' is an unchangeable element of a cleft sentence, but not so in Sahidic. Cf. Polotsky 1987, 117.

[47] Cf. Till 1961, § 77.

Relative construction:[48]

ПH, TH, NH	П–, T–, N–
as determ. pron.	as determ. pron.
+rel. (47)	+rel. (13)

3) Traits not associated with any particular dialect

Form of the relative pronoun:

pres. ЄTЄ⸗ (2) ЄT⸗ (40)
perf. ЄTЄ Ⲁ⸗ (1)
ЄTⲀ⸗ (6)   N̄TⲀ⸗ (10)

Reduplication of N̄ before vowels:

	redupl.	not redupl.
N̄– gen. part.	0	all
N̄ +inf.	0	all
N̄– prep.	0	all
N̄– dat.	0	all
N̄ neg. part	0	all
N̄– attr. + ОY	0	all
N̄– attr. + Ⲁ/Є/ⲱ	5	15
N̄– obj. + ОY	1	5
N̄– part. ident.	2	15

Reduplication of M before a nasal:

M̄M̄N̄ (neg. exist.) (5) MN̄ (1)
M̄M̄N̄TⲀ⸗ (1)   (MN̄TⲀ⸗)
M̄M̄N̄N̄Сⲱ⸗ (3)   (MN̄N̄Сⲱ⸗)

The most striking feature of the language of Apoc.Pet. is the frequent occurrence of Lower-Egyptian forms and constructions. This is found in several other Nag Hammadi

---

[48] The same construction can be found in e.g. Ep.Pet.Phil. (VIII,2) 134.12; 137.19; 138.27f. as H.-G. Bethge brought to my notice. Cf. Till 1961, § 358.

codices as well.[49] ⁻ⲓ instead of ⁻ⲉ at the end of a word occurs only once (82.24), but nevertheless is a strong indication for Lower-Egyptian influence. The same can be said of the stative of ⲤⲰϨⲈ: ⲤHϨ (82.7) instead of ⲤⲀϨⲦ. This is one of the most discussed words in our text. It is favoured by Krause to translate it as the stative of ⲤϨⲀⲓ: 'written'[50], but this does not yield a meaningful whole. The suggestion by Brashler[51] is to deduce ⲤHϨ from ⲤⲈⲓ (be filled) and to consider the ⁻Ϩ a writing error for ⁻Ⲩ. If we derive ⲤHϨ from ⲤⲰϨⲈ (weave), as has been proposed in the present translation, and consider it the Bohairic form of the stative (Bohairic: ⲤHϬ, Crum 381a), the text does not need correction. This interpretation is supported by the appearance of another Bohairic stative: ⲦⲂ̄ⲂHⲞⲨⲦ (77.28), and by the occurrence of the word ⲤⲢⲀϨ/ⲤⲦⲢⲀϨ which is also more common in Bohairic than in Sahidic. But these spelling variations are not the only traits that point to a Bohairic influence on Apoc.Pet. The text is full of specific grammatical constructions which can only be explained against the background of a Lower-Egyptian dialect. The construction of genitive conjunctions, possessive relations and relative clauses is not Sahidic but is described by Polotsky[52] and Till[53] as Bohairic.

It does not automatically follow from this that the text was translated and/or copied in Lower Egypt. We know that the copyist of codex VII must have been working at the same time as the first copyist of codex XI because he also copied the second text of codex XI (Allogenes). Add to this that the first hand of codex XI (XI,1 Interp.Know., and XI,2 Val. Exp.) is identified as hand two of codex I,4 (Treat.Res.) and it seems very likely that codices I, VII and XI date from the same area and period. The copyists were not, however, the translators of the texts: codex I is written by two scribes and is entirely in Subakhmimic, codex VII is written by one scribe in the above described Sahidic dialect, and codex XI, written by two scribes, shows both a Subakhmimic and a Sahidic part. This leads to the conclusion that texts in different dialects were copied at one time and place.

Concerning the language of Apoc.Pet. we can formulate several alternative hypotheses. In the first place, Apoc.Pet. could be a Sahidic translation of a Greek text. Secondly, it could

---

[49] Most language-descriptions of Nag Hammadi texts point to an underlying Subakhmimic dialect. The non-standard traits in the texts are generally explained as aspects of the 'pre-classical' version of Sahidic. Cf. e.g. Böhlig/Wisse 1975, NHC II,2 and IV,2.7; Layton 1989, Nag Hammadi Codex 2-7.7. These editions do not contain observations concerning possible Bohairic influences. However, the editions of codices IX, X (ed. Pearson/Giverson 1981) and VIII (ed. Sieber, 1991), and former editions of codices IV and V also point to Bohairic features in some of the texts.

[50] Cf. Krause/Girgis 1973, 175.

[51] Brashler 1977, 60.

[52] Polotsky 1985, 86-98.

[53] Till 1961, 88, § 358.

be a Sahidic translation of a Bohairic text or, thirdly, an early Bohairic translation of a Greek original. In the latter case the orthography of this early Bohairic must have been much like that of Sahidic.

With regard to the geographic origin of the translation of Apoc.Pet. we see the following two possibilities. In the first place Apoc.Pet. may have been translated from the Greek in or near the Bohairic dialectal domain, perhaps even in Alexandria; or, secondly, it was translated in Upper Egypt by a translator from Lower Egypt who let in some specific elements from his native tongue and at the same time some Akhmimic and Subakhmimic elements from his (monastic ?) environment. It is impossible to offer more than these hypotheses.

2. The Text

2.1 Coptic Text and Translation

ⲀⲠⲞⲔⲀⲖⲨⲮⲒⲤ ⲠⲈⲦⲢⲞⲨ

ⲈϤϨⲘⲞⲞⲤ ⲚϬⲒ ⲠⲤⲰⲢ ϨⲘ
15 ⲠⲒⲢⲠⲈ ⲚϨⲢⲀⲒ ϨⲚ ⲦⲘⲈϨⲦ̄ < ... > ⲚⲦⲈ
ⲠⲒⲤⲘ̄ⲚⲈ· ⲘⲚ ⲠⲒⲦⲒⲘⲀⲦⲈ Ⲛ
ⲦⲈ ⲠⲒⲘⲀϨⲘⲎⲦ ⲚⲤⲦⲨⲖⲞⲤ· ⲀⲨⲰ
ⲈϤⲘⲞⲦⲚ̄ ⲘⲘⲞϤ ϨⲒⲬⲚ̄ ⲦⲎⲠⲈ
Ⲛ̄ⲦⲈ ⲦⲘⲚ̄ⲦⲚⲞϬ ⲈⲦⲞⲚϨ· Ⲛ̄
20 ⲀⲦⲬⲰϨⲘ̄· ⲠⲈⲬⲀϤ ⲚⲀⲒ ⲬⲈ ⲠⲈ
ⲦⲢⲈ ⲤⲈⲤⲘⲀⲘⲀⲀⲦ ⲚϬⲒ ⲚⲀ ⲠⲒ
ⲰⲦ ⲈⲨⲤⲀⲦⲠⲈ Ⲛ̄ⲚⲒⲠⲎⲨⲈ·
ⲠⲎ ⲈⲦⲀϤⲞⲨⲰⲚϨ ⲈⲂⲞⲖ ⲘⲠⲒ
ⲰⲚϨ Ⲛ̄ⲚⲒⲈⲂⲞⲖ ϨⲘ ⲠⲰⲚϨ ⲈⲂⲞⲖ
25 ϨⲒⲦⲞⲞⲦ ⲈⲀⲈⲒⲦⲘⲈⲈⲨⲈ· Ⲉ̄
ⲦⲈ Ⲛ̄ⲦⲞⲞⲨ ⲠⲈⲦⲞⲨⲔⲰⲦ Ⲙ̄
ⲘⲞⲞⲨ Ⲛ̄ϨⲢⲀⲒ ϨⲘ ⲠⲎ ⲈⲦⲬⲞⲞⲢ·
ⲬⲈ ⲈⲨⲈⲤⲰⲦⲘ̄ ⲈⲠⲀϢⲀⲬⲈ
ⲀⲨⲰ ⲈⲨⲈⲤⲞⲨⲰⲚ ϨⲈⲚϢⲀ
30 ⲬⲈ Ⲛ̄ⲦⲈ ⲦⲀⲖⲒⲔⲒⲀ· ⲘⲚ ⲞⲨⲘⲚ̄Ⲧ
ⲠⲀⲢⲀⲚⲞⲘⲞⲤ Ⲛ̄ⲦⲈ ⲞⲨⲚⲞⲘⲞ[Ⲥ]
ⲀⲨⲰ ⲞⲨⲆⲒⲔⲀⲒⲞⲤⲨⲚⲎ· ϨⲰⲤ

Ⲟ̄Ⲁ̄

ⲈⲨϢⲞⲞⲠ ⲈⲂⲞⲖ ϨⲘ̄ ⲠⲬⲒⲤⲈ <Ⲙ>Ⲛ̄
ⲰϢⲀⲬⲈ ⲚⲒⲘ Ⲛ̄ⲦⲈ ⲠⲈⲒⲠⲖⲎⲢⲰ
ⲘⲀ Ⲛ̄ⲦⲈ ⲦⲘⲚ̄ⲦⲘⲈ· ⲈⲀⲨⲬⲒ
ⲞⲨⲞⲈⲒⲚ ϨⲚ ⲞⲨⲦ ⲘⲈⲦⲈ· ⲈⲂⲞⲖ
5 ϨⲒⲦⲘ̄ ⲠⲎ ⲈⲦⲞⲨⲔⲰⲦⲈ Ⲛ̄ⲤⲰϤ
ⲚϬⲒ ⲚⲒⲀⲢⲬⲎ· ⲀⲨⲰ ⲈⲘⲠⲞⲨ
ϬⲚ̄Ⲧϥ̄· ⲞⲨⲆⲈ ⲘⲠⲞⲨϢⲀⲬⲈ Ⲙ̄
ⲘⲞϤ ϨⲀⲦⲚ̄ ⲤⲠⲈⲢⲘⲀ ⲚⲒⲘ Ⲛ̄
ⲦⲈ ⲚⲒⲠⲢⲞⲪⲎⲦⲎⲤ· ⲈⲀϤⲞⲨⲰ
10 ⲚϨ ⲈⲂⲞⲖ ⲦⲚⲞⲨ Ⲛ̄ϨⲢⲀⲒ ϨⲚ ⲚⲀⲒ

Translation

Apocalypse of Peter

As the Saviour was sitting in
15   the temple, in the threehundredth < ... > of
the construction and the grace (?) of
the tenth pillar, and
as he was resting on the number
of the living undefiled greatness,
20   he said to me: "Pe-
ter, blessed are those belonging to the Fa-
ther - because they are above the heavens - ,
he who has revealed
life to those who are from the life, through
25   me, for I reminded (them)
- those who are built
on what is strong -
that they shall listen to my word,
and that they shall distinguish words
30   of injustice and trans
-gression of law
from justice - because

(71)

they come from above - < and >
all the words of this Plero-
ma of truth, because they were
illumined graciously by
5   him whom the principalities seek
and did not
find; nor was he mentioned
in any generation
of the prophets, while he has ap-
10   peared now in these (ones):

ΝΑΪ· Ν̄2ΡΑΪ 2Μ̄ ΠΕΤΟΥΟΝ2 Ε
ΤΕ ΠΙϢΗΡΕ ΠΕ Ν̄ΤΕ ΠΡⲰΜΕ
ΕΤΧΟCΕ ΕΝΙΠΗΥΕ Ν̄2ΡΑΪ 2Ν̄
ΟΥ2Ο<ΥΟ> Ν̄ΤΕ ΝΙΡⲰΜΕ Ν̄ϢΒΗΡ
15 Ν̄ΟΥCΙΑ· Ν̄ΤΟΚ ΔΕ 2ⲰⲰΚ ΠΕ
ΤΡΕ ϢⲰΠΕ ΕΚΕΝ̄ΤΕΛΙΟC Ν̄
2ΡΑΪ 2Μ̄ ΠΕΚΡΑΝ ΝΜ̄ΜΑΙ 2Ⲱ
ΠΗ ΕΤΑϤCⲰΤΠ̄ Μ̄ΜΟΚ· ΧΕ
ΕΒΟΛ Μ̄ΜΟΚ ΑΪΕΙΡΕ Ν̄ΟΥΑΡ
20 ΧΗ Μ̄ΠΙΚΕCΕΕΠΕ ΕΤΑΪΤΑ
2ΜΟΥ Ε2ΟΥΝ ΕΥCΟΟΥΝ·
2ⲰCΤΕ Ϭ Μ̄ϬΟΜ ϢΑΝΤΕ ΠΙΑΝ
ΤΙΜΙΜΟΝ Ν̄ΤΕ Ϯ ΔΙΚΑΙΟCΥ
ΝΗ Ν̄ΤΕ ΠΗ ΕΤΑϤΡ̄ϢΟΡΠ̄ Ν̄ΤⲰ
25 2Μ̄ Μ̄ΜΟΚ· < ... > ΕΑϤΤΑ2ΜΕΚ ΧΕ
ΕΚΕCΟΥⲰΝϤ Ν̄ΘΕ ΕΤΕCΜ̄
ΠϢΑ Ν̄ΑΑC· ΕΤΒΕ Ϯ ΑΠΟΧΗ
ΕΤΠΗ2 ΕΡΟϤ· ΜΝ̄ ΝΙΜΟΥΤ
Ν̄ΤΕ ΝΕϤϬΙΧ· ΑΥⲰ ΝΕϤΟΥ
30 ΕΡΗΤΕ· ΜΝ̄ ΠΙϮΚΛΟΜ Ε
ΒΟΛ 2ΙΤΝ̄ ΝΗ Ν̄ΤΕ Ϯ ΜΕCΟ
ΤΗC ΜΝ̄ ΠΙCⲰΜΑ Ν̄ΤΕ ΠΡ̄
[Ο]ΥΟΕΙΝ Ν̄ΤΑϤ· ΕΥΕΙΝΕ Μ̄
[Μ]ΟϤ 2[Ν̄ Ο]Υ2ΕΛΠΙC Ν̄ΤΕ

Ο Β

ΟΥΔΙΑΚΟΝΙΑ ΕΤΒΕ ΟΥΒΕΚΕ
Ν̄ΤΕ ΟΥΤΑΕΙΟ· 2ⲰC ΕϤΝΑCΟ
Ο2Ε Μ̄ΜΟΚ Ν̄ϢΟΜΤ̄ Ν̄CΟΠ
2Ν̄ ΤΕΪΟΥⲰΗ· ΝΑΪ ΔΕ ΕϤΧⲰ
5 Μ̄ΜΟΟΥ ΑΕΙΝΑΥ ΕΝΟΥΗΗΒ
ΜΝ̄ ΠΙΛΑΟC ΕϤΠΗΤ Ε2ΡΑΪ Ε
ΧⲰΝ ΜΝ̄ 2ΕΝⲰΝΕ 2ⲰC ΕΥ
ΝΑ2ΟΤΒΝ̄· ΑΝΟΚ ΔΕ ΑΕΙϢΤΟΡ
ΤΡ̄ ΧΕ Ν̄ΝΕΝΜΟΥ· ΑΥⲰ ΠΕ
10 ΧΑϤ ΝΑΪ ΧΕ ΠΕΤΡΕ ΑΕΙΧΟΟC
ΝΑΚ Ν̄ΟΥΜΗΗϢΕ Ν̄CΟΠ ΧΕ
2ΕΝΒᾹΛΕΕΥΕ̄ ΝΕ ΕΜΝ̄ ΧΑΥ
ΜΟΕΙΤ Ν̄ΤΑΥ· ΕϢΧΕ ΚΟΥ
ⲰϢ ΕCΟΥⲰΝ ΤΕΥΜΝ̄Τ
15 ΒᾹΛΕ ΚⲰ Ν̄ΝΕΚϬΙΧ 2ΙΡΝ̄ ΝΙΒΑΛ Μ̄
ΠΙΠΟΔΗΡΗ Ν̄ΤΑΚ· ΑΥⲰ ΑΧΙC ΧΕ
ΟΥ ΠΕΤΚΝΑΥ ΕΡΟϤ· ΑΝΟΚ
ΔΕ Ν̄ΤΑΡΙΑΑC Μ̄ΠΙΝΑΥ ΕΛΑ
ΑΥ· ΑΕΙΧΟΟC ΧΕ Μ̄ΜΝ̄ ΛΑΑΥ

in the revealed one - who
is the Son of Man,
who is exalted above the heavens - (and) in
a <multitude> of people of the same
15   substance. You too Pe-
ter, become perfect
in your name, just like me,
the one who has chosen you. For
with you I have made a
20   start for the others whom I have
called to knowledge.
Therefore, be strong until the
imitator of the righteousness
of him who called
25   you before - he called you so that
you would know him in the worthy
way, with respect to the distance
that separates (?) him and the nerves
of his hands and his
30   feet and the crowning by
the ones of the Mid-
dle and his body of
light - to his likeness (?)
in hope of

(72)

a service because of an earning
of honour, as if he is about to
reprove (?) you three times
in this night." While he said these
5   things, I saw the priests
and the people running in our
direction with stones, in order
to kill us; I was
afraid that we would die. And he said
10   to me: "Peter, I have told
you several times that
they are blind ones who have no
guide. If you want
to understand their blind-
15   ness, put your hands on the eyes with (?)
your cloak and say
what you see." But
when I had done this, I did not see any-
thing. I said: "No one sees

20 naγ· πaλin πεxaq naï xε
     aрi πaï on· aγω acϣωπε
     m̄moï n̄6i oγ2oτε 2n̄ oγ
     paϣε· aεinaγ гaр εoγ
     oεin b̄b̄p̄pε εnεaq επoγo
25 εin n̄τε πε2ooγ· m̄m̄n̄
     n̄cωc aqεī ε2paï εx̄m̄ πcω
     тнp· aγω aεiтaмoq εnн
     εтaεinaγ εpooγ· aγω
     πεxaq naï on xε тωωn
30 n̄nεk6ix ε2paï· aγω cω_
     тm̄ επн ετoγxω m̄moq [n̄]

<div align="right">

o̅г̅

</div>

     6i nioγннb мn̄ niλaoc· aγω
     aεicωтm̄ εnioγннb εγ2мo
     oc мn̄ nica2· nεpε niмннϣε
     ωϣ εboλ 2n̄ тoγcмн· εтaq
5 cωтm̄ εnaï εboλ 2̄iтooт πε
     xaq naï xε тωωn n̄niмaλ
     xε n̄τε тεkaπε· aγω cω
     тm̄ εnн ετoγxω m̄mooγ
     aγω aεicωтm̄ on εk2мo
10 oc εγ† εooγ nak· aγω
     naï εïxω m̄mooγ πεxε πcω
     тнp xε aεixooc nak xε naï
     2εnb̄λεεγε nε aγω 2εn
     koγp nε· cωтm̄ 6ε †noγ
15 εnн ετoγxω m̄mooγ nak
     2n̄ oγмγcтнpion· aγω a
     pε2 εpooγ m̄πp̄xooγ εni
     ϣнpε n̄τε πiaiωn· εkε
     ϣωπε гaр n̄тok εγxε oγa
20 εpok n̄2paï 2n̄ nεïaiωn· εγ
     ε n̄naтcooγn εpok· εγ
     † εooγ λε nak 2n̄ oγгnω
     cic· oγn̄ oγмннϣε гaр
     naxi εboλ 2n̄ †apxн n̄τε
25 πεnϣaxε· aγω cεnako
     тoγ εpooγ on 2m̄ πoγωϣ
     n̄τε πiωт n̄τε тoγπλa
     nн xε aγεipε m̄πετε2naq
     aγω qnaoγon2oγ εboλ n̄
30 2paï 2m̄ πεq2aπ· ετε πaï
     πε nipεqϣмϣε n̄τε πϣa

20   (in this way)." Again he said to me:
        "Do this once more."
        Fear in joy came to me
        for I saw a new light
        brighter than the
25   light of day. After
        that it came down on the Sa-
        viour. And I told him what
        I had seen.
        Again he said to me: "Raise
30   your hands and lis-
        ten to what

        (73)

        the priests and the people say." And
        I listened to the priests while they were
        sitting with the scribes. The crowds were
        screaming with their voice. When he had
5   heard these things from me he
        said to me: "Prick up the ears
        of your head and list-
        en to the things they say."
        And, I listened again (and) said: "you are glorified
10   while you are sitting." And
        when I told these things the Sa-
        viour said: "I have told you that these
        are blind and deaf
        ones. Now, listen
15   to the things that will be said to you
        in a mystery and
        guard these things. Do not tell them to the
        children of this aeon. For they
        shall curse you
20   in these aeons - because
        they do not know you - while you are
        glorified in know-
        ledge. For many
        will be partakers of the beginning of
25   our word but they will turn
        themselves to them again, according to the will
        of the Father of their er-
        ror because they have done what he wants to.
        - And he will disclose them
30   in his judgement, those who
        are the servants of the

ϪΕ· ΝΗ ΔΕ ΕΤΑΥϢⲰⲠΕ ΕΥ

O̅Δ̅

ΜΟϪϬ ΜⲚ ΝΑ·Ϊ ΕΥΕϢⲰⲠΕ
Ⲛ̅ΑΙΧΜΑⲖⲰΤΟⲤ Ⲛ̅ΤΟΟΤΟΥ
ΕΥΕ Ⲛ̅ΑΝΕⲤΘΗΤΟΝ· ⲠΙΑΚΕ
ⲢΑΙΟΝ ΔΕ Ⲛ̅ΑΤΚⲢΟϤ Ⲛ̅ΝΑΓΑ
5　ΘΟΝ· ΕΥΤⲰϬⲚ̅ ΜΜΟϤ ΕⲌⲢΑΪ
ΕⲠΙⲢΕϤ2ⲰⲂ Ⲛ̅ΤΕ ⲠΜΟΥ·
ΑΥⲰ ϢΑⲌⲢΑΪ ΕϯΜⲚ̅ΤⲢ̅ⲢΟ Ⲛ̅
ΤΕ ΝΑ·Ϊ ΕΥϯ ΕΟΟΥ Ⲙ̅ⲠΙΧⲤ̅ Ⲛ̅
2ⲢΑΪ 2Ⲛ̅ ΟΥΑⲠΟΚΑΤΑⲤΤΑⲤΙⲤ·
10　ΑΥⲰ ΕΥϯ ΕΟΟΥ Ⲛ̅ΝΙⲢⲰΜΕ
Ⲛ̅ΤΕ ⲠΙΚⲰ ΕⲌⲢΑΪ Ⲙ̅ⲘⲚ̅ΤΝΟΥϪ
ΝΗ ΕΤΝΑϢⲰⲠΕ Ⲙ̅ΜⲚ̅ⲚⲤⲰΚ·
ΑΥⲰ ΕΥⲚ̅ΑΤⲰϬΕ ΕⲌⲢΑΪ ΕⲠⲢΑΝ
Ⲛ̅ΤΕ ΟΥⲢΕϤΜΟΟΥΤ· ΕΥΜΕ
15　ΕΥΕ ϪΕ ΕΥΝΑΤⲂ̅ⲂΟ· ΑΥⲰ ΕΥ
ΝΑΤⲰⲖⲘ̅ Ⲛ̅2ΟΥΟ· ΑΥⲰ Ⲛ̅ⲤΕ
2Ε ΕⲌⲢΑΪ ΕΥⲢΑΝ Ⲛ̅ΤΕ ϯⲠⲖΑΝΗ
ΑΥⲰ ΕΤΟΟΤϤ Ⲛ̅ΟΥⲢΕϤⲢΤΕ
ΧΝΗ ΕϤ2ΟΟΥ· ΜⲚ ΟΥΔΟΓΜΑ
20　Ⲛ̅ΟΥΜΗΗϢΕ Ⲙ̅ΜΟⲢΦΗ· ΕΥ
Ⲣ̅ΑⲢΧΕΙ ΕϪⲰΟΥ 2Ⲛ̅ ΟΥΜⲚ̅Τ
2ΕⲢΕⲤΙⲤ· 2ΕΝ2ΟΕΙΝΕ ΓΑⲢ
ΕⲂΟⲖ Ⲛ̅2ΗΤΟΥ ΕΥΝΑϢⲰⲠΕ
ΕΥϪΕ ΟΥΑ ΕϯΜⲚ̅ΤΜΕ· ΑΥⲰ
25　ΕΥϪΕ ϢΑϪΕ ΕϤ2ΟΟΥ· ΑΥⲰ
ⲤΕΝΑϪⲰ Ⲛ̅2ΕΝⲠΕΤ2ΟΟΥ
ΕΝΕΥΕⲢΗΥ· 2ΕΝ2ΟΕΙΝΕ
ΜΕΝ ⲤΕΝΑϯ ⲢΑΝ ΕⲢΟΟΥ ϪΕ
ΕΥΑ2ΕⲢΑΤΟΥ 2Ⲛ̅ ΟΥϬΟΜ Ⲛ̅
30　ΤΕ ΝΙΑⲢΧⲰΝ· Ⲛ̅ΤΕ ΟΥⲢⲰ
ΜΕ ΜⲚ̅ ΟΥⲤ2̅ΙΜΕ ΕⲤΚΗΚΑ
2ΗΟΥ ΕⲤΕ Ⲛ̅ΟΥΜΗΗϢΕ
Ⲙ̅ΜΟⲢΦΗ ΜⲚ̅ ΟΥΜΗΗϢΕ
Ⲛ̅ΝⲘ̅ΚΑ2· ΑΥⲰ ΕΥΕϢⲰ

O̅Ε̅

ⲠΕ Ⲛ̅ϬΙ ΝΗ ΕΤϪⲰ Ⲛ̅ΝΑΪ ΕΥϢΙ
ΝΕ ΕΤΒΕ 2ΕΝⲢΑⲤΟΥ· ΚΑΝ ΕΥ
ϢΑΝϪΟΟⲤ ϪΕ ΟΥⲢΑⲤΟΥ ΑⲤ
Ε̅Ι ΕⲂΟⲖ 2Ⲛ̅ ΟΥΔΑΙΜⲰΝ ΕϤ
5　Ⲙ̅ⲠϢΑ Ⲛ̅ΤΕΥⲠⲖΑΝΗ· ΤΟΤΕ

word. - But those who became

(74)

conjoined with these shall become
their prisoners
because they are without perception.
They push the unforged
5   and good pureness towards
him who works for death.
And during their reign
Christ is glorified
in a restoration,
10   but the men of the false proclamation
are glorified,
those who will come after you.
And they will adhere to the name
of a dead man. While they are think-
15   ing that they will be purified they
will be more defiled and they will
lapse into a name of the error
and into an evil intri-
guer with a
20   multifarious doctrine, while they
are ruled schismati-
cally: For some
of them will
taunt the truth and
25   say evil words and
they will say evil things
to each other. Some
will call themselves
- because they are standing in the power
30   of the archons - after a
man and a naked,
multifarious woman
who suffers much.
And those

(75)

who say these things will
ask about dreams. If they
say that a dream has
come from a demon
5   worthy of their error, then

ⲉⲩⲉϯ ⲛⲁⲩ ⲙ̄ⲡⲓⲧⲁⲕⲟ ⲉⲡⲙⲁ
ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲫⲑⲁⲣⲥⲓⲁ· ⲡⲓⲕⲁⲕⲟⲛ ⲅⲁⲣ
ⲙ̄ⲙⲛ̄ϭⲟⲙ ⲛ̄ϥϯ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲕⲁⲣ
ⲡⲟⲥ ⲛ̄ⲁⲅⲁⲑⲟⲛ· ⲡⲟⲩⲁ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲡⲟⲩ
10 ⲁ ⲡⲓⲙⲁ ⲉⲧⲉ ⲟⲩⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲟⲩ
ⲡⲉ ϣⲁϥϯ ⲙ̄ⲡⲏ ⲉⲧⲉⲓⲛⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟϥ·
ⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲯⲩⲭⲏ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲛ̄ϩⲉⲛ
ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲛ̄ ϯⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲙⲉ ⲁⲛ ⲛⲉ· ⲟⲩ
ⲧⲉ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲛ̄ ϯⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲧⲙⲟⲩ·
15 ⲯⲩⲭⲏ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉ ⲛⲉⲓ̈ⲁⲓⲱⲛ
ⲟⲩⲙⲟⲩ ⲡⲉⲧⲟⲩⲏⲡ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲛ̄
ⲛⲁϩⲣⲁⲛ· ⲕⲁⲑⲟⲧⲓ ϫⲉ ⲟⲩⲣⲉϥ
ϣⲙ̄ϣⲉ ⲧⲉ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓϣ ⲛⲓⲙ·
ⲉ̄ⲩⲧⲁⲙⲓⲟ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲥ ⲛ̄ⲛⲓⲉ̄ⲡⲓ
20 ⲑⲩⲙⲓⲁ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲥ· ⲙⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲧⲁⲕⲟ
ⲛ̄ϣⲁ ⲉⲛⲉϩ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲩ ⲉⲧⲉ ⲡⲉ
ⲧⲟⲩϣⲟⲟⲡ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟϥ ⲡⲉ· ⲁⲩⲱ
ⲡⲏ ⲉⲧⲟⲩϣⲟⲟⲡ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛ̄ϩⲏ
ⲧⲟⲩ̄ ⲉⲩⲣ̄ⲁⲅⲁⲡⲁ ⲛ̄ⲛⲓⲥⲱⲛⲧ ⲛ̄
25 ⲧⲉ ϯϩⲩⲗⲏ ⲉⲧⲁⲥⲡⲓⲣⲉ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ
ⲛⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲩ· ⲛ̄ⲥⲉⲉⲓⲛⲉ ⲇⲉ ⲛ̄ⲛⲁⲓ̈
ⲁⲛ ⲱ ⲡⲉⲧⲣⲉ ⲛ̄ϭⲓ ⲛⲓⲯⲩⲭⲏ ⲛ̄
ⲁⲧⲙⲟⲩ· ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲉⲫⲟⲥⲟⲛ ⲙⲉⲛ
ⲉⲥϣⲟⲟⲡ ⲛ̄ϩⲣⲁⲓ̈ ϩⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲉⲓ ⲁⲛ
30 ⲛ̄ϭⲓ ϯⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩ· ⲉⲥⲉϣⲱⲡⲉ
ⲙⲉⲛ ⲉⲥⲉⲓⲛⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲏ ⲉⲧⲙⲟ
ⲟⲩⲧ· ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲥⲛⲁⲟⲩⲱⲛϩ̄ ⲁⲛ
ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲥⲫⲩⲥⲓⲥ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ· ⲉⲥϣⲟ
ⲟⲡ ⲙⲁⲩⲁⲁⲥ ⲉⲛⲧⲟⲥ ⲧⲉ ϯ

ⲟⲋ̄

ⲁⲧⲙⲟⲩ· ⲉⲥϣⲟ̲ϫⲛⲉ ⲉⲧⲃⲉ
ⲟⲩⲁⲧⲙⲟⲩ· ⲉⲥⲣ̄ⲡ̄ⲓⲥⲧⲉⲩⲉ
ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲥⲣ̄ⲉⲡⲓⲑⲩⲙⲓ ⲉⲕⲱ ⲛ̄ⲥⲱⲥ
ⲛ̄ⲛⲁⲓ̈· ⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲙⲁⲩⲕⲉⲧⲟ̄ⲩ̄ ⲕⲛ̄
5 ⲧⲉ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲛ̄ ϩⲉⲛⲥⲟⲩⲣⲉ· ⲏ̄ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ
ϩⲛ̄ ϩⲉⲛϣⲟⲛⲧⲉ· ⲉϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲉⲩ
ϣⲁⲛⲣ̄ ⲥⲁⲃⲉ· ⲟⲩⲇⲉ ⲉⲗⲟⲟⲗⲉ
ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲛ̄ <ϩⲉⲛ>ⲥⲟⲩⲣⲉ ⲛ̄ⲛⲟϫⲉ· ⲡⲏ
ⲙⲉⲛ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲉϣⲁϥϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩ
10 ⲟⲉⲓϣ ⲛⲓⲙ ϩⲙ̄ ⲡⲏ ⲉⲧⲉϥϣⲟⲟⲡ
ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛ̄ϩⲏⲧⲟ̄ⲩ̄· ⲉϥϣⲟⲟⲡ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ
ϩⲙ̄ ⲡⲏ ⲉⲧⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩϥ ⲁⲛ· ⲉϣⲁϥ
ϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲉⲩⲧⲁⲕⲟ ⲛⲁⲥ ⲙⲛ̄ ⲟⲩ
ⲙⲟⲩ· ⲧⲏ ⲇⲉ ⲉϣⲁⲥϣⲱⲡⲉ

destruction shall be given to them instead of
immortality. For it is not possible
that evil brings forth good
fruit: for the place where
10   each one comes from,
brings forth what resembles itself.
For not every soul
stems from the truth, nor
from immortality:
15   for every soul of these aeons
is counted to death ac-
cording to us. because it is
always a slave
that is created for
20   its desires and for
their eternal destruction, in which
they are and
from which they are
because they love the creatures
25   of the matter that has appeared with
them. The immortal souls
do not resemble those, Peter,
but as long as
the hour is not coming
30   it shall look
like the dead
one but it will not reveal
its nature, that
it alone is the

(76)

immortal one, thinking about
immortality, trusting
and desiring to leave
these ones. For neither does one collect
5   figs from thorns or
thorntrees - if one
is wise - nor grapes
from thistles. For
that which always
10   stays in that from which
it is - if it stems
from what is not good - it
becomes destruction for it and
death. But that one stays

15 ϩⲙ ⲡⲓϣⲁ ⲉⲛⲉϩ ϩⲙ ⲡⲏ ⲛⲧⲉ
ⲡⲱⲛϩ· ⲙⲛ ϯⲙⲛⲧⲁⲧⲙⲟⲩ ⲛ
ⲧⲉ ⲡⲓⲱⲛϩ ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲉⲓⲛⲉ ⲙⲙⲟϥ·
ⲡⲏ ⲟⲩⲛ ⲧⲏⲣϥ ⲉⲧⲉ ⲛϥϣⲟⲟⲡ
ⲁⲛ ⲉϥⲛⲁⲃⲱⲗ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲉⲡⲉ
20 ⲧⲉ ⲛϥϣⲟⲟⲡ ⲁⲛ· ⲥⲉϣⲟⲟⲡ
ⲅⲁⲣ ⲛϭⲓ ϩⲉⲛⲕⲟⲩⲣ ⲁⲩⲱ ϩⲉⲛ
ⲃⲁⲗⲉⲉⲩⲉ ⲉⲩϩⲟⲧⲡ ⲙⲛ ⲛⲉ
ⲧⲉ ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩ ⲙⲁⲩⲁⲁⲩ· ϩⲉⲛ
ⲕⲟⲟⲩⲉ ⲇⲉ ⲉⲩⲉⲟⲩⲱⲧⲃ
25 ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲛ ϩⲉⲛϣⲁϫⲉ ⲙⲡⲟⲛⲏ
ⲣⲟⲛ ⲙⲛ ϩⲉⲛⲙⲩⲥⲧⲉⲣⲓⲟⲛ
ⲛⲥⲉⲣⲙⲁⲗⲟⲥ· ϩⲉⲛϩⲟⲓⲛⲉ
ⲉⲛⲥⲉⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ ⲙⲙⲩⲥⲧⲉⲣⲓ
ⲟⲛ ⲁⲛ· ⲉⲩϫⲱ ⲛⲛⲏ ⲉⲧⲉ ⲛ
30 ⲥⲉⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ ⲙⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲁⲛ·
ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲥⲉⲛⲁϣⲟⲩϣⲟⲩ ⲙ
ⲙⲟⲟⲩ ϫⲉ ⲉϥⲛⲧⲟⲟⲧⲟⲩ
ⲛϭⲓ ⲡⲓⲙⲩⲥⲧⲏⲣⲓⲟⲛ ⲙⲁⲩ
ⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲧⲉ ϯⲙⲛⲧⲙⲉ· ⲁⲩⲱ
35 ⲛϩⲣⲁⲓ ϩⲛ ⲟⲩϫⲓⲥⲉ ⲛϩⲏⲧ

<div align="center">ⲟⲍ</div>

ⲉⲩⲉϩⲓ ⲧⲟⲟⲧⲟⲩ {ⲉⲧⲙⲛⲧ·
ϫⲁⲥⲓϩⲏⲧ·} ⲉⲣϥⲑⲟⲛⲓ ⲉϯⲯⲩ
ⲭⲏ ⲛⲁⲧⲙⲟⲩ ⲉⲧⲁⲥⲣ ⲉⲟⲩⲱ·
ⲉϫⲟⲩⲥⲓⲁ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲛⲓⲙ· ⲟⲩⲁⲣⲭⲏ·
5 ⲁⲩⲱ ⲟⲩϭⲟⲙ ⲛⲧⲉ ⲛⲓⲁⲓⲱⲛ·
ϣⲁⲩⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲉϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲙⲛ
ⲛⲁⲓ ⲛϩⲣⲁⲓ ϩⲙ ⲡⲓⲥⲱⲛⲧ ⲛⲧⲉ
ⲡⲓⲕⲟⲥⲙⲟⲥ· ϩⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲏ ⲉⲧⲉ
ⲛⲥⲉϣⲟⲟⲡ ⲁⲛ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲓⲧⲟⲟ
10 ⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲛⲏ ⲉⲧϣⲟⲟⲡ ⲉⲁⲩⲱ
ⲃⲱ ⲉⲣⲟⲟⲩ ⲛⲥⲉϯ ⲉⲟⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲩ
ⲉⲙⲡⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩϩⲙ· ⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲙⲡⲟⲩ
ⲛⲧⲟⲩ ⲉⲧⲉϩⲓⲏ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲓⲧⲟⲟⲧⲟⲩ·
ⲉⲩⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓϣ ⲛⲓⲙ
15 ϩⲓⲛⲁ ϫⲉ ⲉⲩⲛⲁϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲉⲛⲧⲟ
ⲟⲩ ⲛⲉ ⲛⲓⲁⲧⲃⲱⲗ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ· ⲉϣⲱ
ⲡⲉ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲉⲣϣⲁⲛ ϯⲯⲩⲭⲏ ⲛⲁⲧⲙⲟⲩ·
ⲉⲥϣⲁⲛϫⲓ ϭⲟⲙ ⲛϩⲣⲁⲓ ϩⲛ ⲟⲩ
ⲡⲛⲁ ⲛⲛⲟⲉⲣⲟⲛ· ⲛⲧⲉⲩⲛⲟⲩ
20 ⲇⲉ ϣⲁⲩⲣϩⲟⲣⲙⲁⲍⲉ ⲉϫⲙ ⲡⲏ
ⲛⲧⲉ ⲛⲏ ⲛⲧⲁⲩⲥⲱⲣⲙ ⲙⲙⲟ
ⲟⲩ· ϩⲉⲛⲕⲟⲟⲩⲉ ⲇⲉ ⲉⲛⲁ

15 in the Eternal One, in that which belongs to
   the life and the immortality of
   the life which they resemble.
   So everything that does not exist
   shall be dissolved into what
20 does not exist, just
   as deaf and
   blind ones join only with
   their own kind.
   Others, however, shall take a start
25 from evil words
   and mysteries
   that lead people astray. Some
   who do not know mys-
   tery are talking about things
30 they do not know.
   But they will boast
   that the mystery
   of truth is with
   them only.
35 Full of haughtiness

   (77)

   they shall begin to {the haughtiness}
   envy the immortal
   soul which has become a hostage.
   For every authority, rule
5 and power of these aeons
   wishes to be with
   these in the creation of
   the cosmos, in order that they who
   do not exist
10 will be glorified by those who do exist,
   although they have forgotten themselves.
   Without being saved or
   brought by them on the way,
   they continually wish
15 that they will become
   the imperishable ones.
   For when the immortal soul
   receives power in an
   intellectual spirit, then immediately
20 they move towards the one
   of those whom they have deceived.
   But others who are numer-

ϢⲰⲞⲨ ⲈⲨⲦ ⲈϨⲞⲨⲚ ⲈⲬⲚ̄ Ⲧ
ⲘⲚ̄ⲦⲘⲈ: ⲈⲦⲈ ⲚⲒⲀⲄⲄⲈⲖⲞⲤ
25   ⲚⲈ Ⲛ̄ⲦⲈ ⲦⲠⲖⲀⲚⲎ· ⲈⲨⲚⲀ
ϬⲱⲣϬ Ⲛ̄ⲦⲈ̲ⲨⲠⲖⲀⲚⲎ ⲘⲚ̄
ⲠⲒⲚⲞⲘⲞⲤ Ⲛ̄ⲦⲀⲨ ⲞⲨⲂⲈ ⲚⲒ
ⲘⲈⲈⲨⲈ Ⲛ̄ⲦⲎⲈⲒ ⲈⲦⲦⲞⲨ̲
ⲂⲎⲞⲨⲦ· ϨⲰⲤ ⲈⲨϬⲰϢⲦ
30   ⲈⲂⲞⲖ ϨⲚ̄ ⲞⲨⲀ ⲈⲨⲘⲈⲈⲨⲈ
ⲬⲈ ⲚⲒⲀⲄⲀⲐⲞⲚ ⲘⲚ̄ ⲚⲒⲠⲞⲚⲎ
ⲢⲞⲚ ⲬⲈ ϨⲈⲚⲈⲂⲞⲖ ϨⲚ̄ ⲞⲨⲀ ⲚⲈ·
ⲈⲨⲢ̄ ⲈⲒⲈⲠϢⲰⲦ Ⲛ̄ϨⲢⲀⲒ̈ ϨⲘ̄

Ⲟ̄Ⲏ̄

ⲠⲀϢⲀⲬⲈ· ⲀⲨⲰ ⲈⲨⲈⲔⲰ ⲈϨⲢⲀⲒ̈
Ⲛ̄ⲞⲨϨⲒⲘⲀⲢⲘⲈⲚⲎ ⲈⲤⲚⲀϢⲦ̄
ⲈⲨⲚⲀⲠⲰⲦ Ⲛ̄ϨⲢⲀⲒ̈ Ⲛ̄ϨⲎⲦⲤ̄ ϨⲚ̄
ⲞⲨⲠⲈⲦϢⲞⲨⲈⲒⲦ Ⲛ̄ϬⲒ ⲠⲒⲄⲈ
5   ⲚⲞⲤ Ⲛ̄ⲦⲈ ⲚⲒⲮⲨⲬⲎ Ⲛ̄ⲀⲦⲘⲞⲨ
ϢⲀϨⲢⲀⲒ̈ ⲈⲦⲀⲠⲀⲢⲞⲨⲤⲒⲀ· ⲈⲨ
Ⲉ̲ϢⲰⲠⲈ ⲄⲀⲢ ⲈⲂⲞⲖ Ⲛ̄ϨⲎⲦⲞⲨ
ⲀⲨⲰ ⲠⲒⲔⲰ ⲈⲂⲞⲖ Ⲛ̄ⲦⲀⲒ̈ Ⲛ̄ⲦⲈ
ⲚⲞⲨⲠⲀⲢⲀⲠⲦⲰⲘⲀ· ⲚⲎ Ⲛ̄ⲦⲀⲨ
10   ϨⲈ Ⲛ̄ϨⲢⲀⲒ̈ Ⲛ̄ϨⲎⲦⲞⲨ ⲈⲂⲞⲖ Ϩ̄ⲒⲦⲞ
Ⲟ̄ⲦⲞⲨ Ⲛ̄ⲚⲒⲀⲚⲦⲒⲔⲒⲘⲈⲚⲞⲤ·
ⲈⲦⲈ ⲀⲒ̈ⲬⲒ Ⲙ̄ⲠⲒⲤⲰⲦⲈ Ⲛ̄ⲦⲀⲨ
ⲠⲢⲞⲤ ⲦⲘⲚ̄Ⲧ2Ⲙ̄ϨⲀⲖ Ⲛ̄ⲦⲀⲨ
ϢⲰⲠⲈ Ⲛ̄ϨⲎⲦⲤ̄ ⲈⲦ ⲚⲀⲨ Ⲛ̄ⲞⲨ
15   ⲘⲚ̄ⲦⲢⲘ̄ϨⲈ· ⲬⲈ ⲈⲨⲈⲦⲀⲘⲒⲞ
Ⲛ̄ⲞⲨϢⲰⲬⲠ̄ Ⲛ̄ⲀⲚⲦⲒⲘⲒⲘⲞⲚ
ⲈⲠⲢⲀⲚ Ⲛ̄ⲦⲈ ⲞⲨⲢⲈϤⲘⲞⲞⲨⲦ
ⲈⲦⲈ̲ ϨⲈⲢⲘⲀ ⲠⲈ Ⲛ̄ⲦⲈ ⲠⲒϢⲞ
Ⲣ̄Ⲡ̄ Ⲙ̄ⲘⲒⲤⲈ Ⲛ̄ⲦⲈ ⲦⲀⲆⲒⲔⲒⲀ·
20   ϨⲒⲚⲀ ⲠⲒⲞⲨⲞⲈⲒⲚ ⲈⲦϢⲞⲞⲠ
ⲬⲈ Ⲛ̄ⲚⲞⲨⲚⲀϨⲦⲈ ⲈⲢⲞϤ ⲈⲂⲞⲖ
Ϩ̄ⲒⲦⲞⲞⲦⲞⲨ Ⲛ̄ⲚⲒⲔⲞⲨⲈⲒ· ⲚⲀⲒ̈
ⲆⲈ Ⲙ̄ⲠⲒⲢⲎⲦⲈ ⲚⲈ ⲚⲒⲈⲢⲄⲀⲦⲎⲤ
ⲈⲨⲚⲀⲚⲞⲬⲞⲨ ⲈⲠⲒⲔⲀⲔⲈ ⲈⲦ
25   ⲤⲀⲂⲞⲖ· Ⲛ̄ⲤⲀⲂⲞⲖ Ⲛ̄ⲚⲒϢⲎⲢⲈ
Ⲛ̄ⲦⲈ ⲠⲞⲨⲞⲈⲒⲚ· ⲞⲨⲦⲈ ⲄⲀⲢ
Ⲛ̄ⲦⲞⲞⲨ Ⲛ̄ⲤⲈⲚ̄ⲚⲎⲞⲨ ⲈϨⲞⲨⲚ
ⲀⲚ· ⲀⲖⲖⲀ ⲞⲨⲦⲈ Ⲛ̄ⲤⲈⲔⲰ ⲀⲚ
Ⲛ̄ⲚⲎ ⲈⲦⲚⲎⲨ ϢⲀϨⲢⲀⲒ̈ ⲈⲠⲒⲦ
30   ⲘⲈⲦⲈ̲ Ⲛ̄ⲦⲀⲨ ⲠⲢⲞⲤ ⲠⲒⲂⲰⲖ Ⲉ
ⲂⲞⲖ Ⲛ̄ⲦⲈ ⲚⲎ· ϨⲈⲚⲔⲞⲞⲨⲈ ⲆⲈ
ⲞⲚ ⲈⲂⲞⲖ Ⲛ̄ϨⲎⲦⲞⲨ ⲈⲨⲚ̄ⲦⲀⲨ

ous and who oppose the
truth - those are the messengers
25 of error - will
prepare their error and
their law against
my pure thoughts,
because they, looking
30 from one (place) think
that the good and the e-
vil ones are from one (place).
They are merchandising with

(78)

my word - and they shall establish
a rough fate,
below (?) which the race
of the immortal souls
5 will (try to) flee in vain,
until my parousia, for they
shall live among them -
and (with) my forgiveness from
their tresspasses into which they
10 fell through
the adversaries,
whose redemption I brought
from the slavery in which they
were, in order to give them
15 freedom. For they shall create
a further imitation
in the name of a dead man
- that is Hermas - of the first
born of unrighteousness.
20 in order that the real light
shall not be believed by
the little ones. But those
of this kind are the workers
who will be thrown into the outer darkness,
25 away from the children
of light. For neither
will they themselves go inside
nor will they allow
those who are going up to
30 their approval, towards their release.
But other ones
from them again, because they have

ⲘⲘⲀⲨ Ⲙ̄ⲠⲒⲘ̄ⲔⲀϨ· ⲈⲨⲘⲈ
ⲈⲨⲈ ⲬⲈ ⲈⲨⲚⲀ.ⲬⲰⲔ ⲈⲂⲞⲖ [Ⲛ̄]

Ⲟ̄Ⲑ̄

ⲦⲘⲚ̄ⲦⲤⲀⲂⲈ Ⲛ̄ⲦⲈ ⲦⲘⲚ̄ⲦⲤⲞⲚ
ⲈⲦϢⲞⲞⲠ ⲞⲚⲦⲰⲤ· ⲈⲦⲈ Ⲧ
ⲘⲚ̄ⲦϢⲂⲎⲢ Ⲙ̄ⲠⲚ̄Ⲁ̄ ⲦⲈ ⲘⲚ̄ ⲚⲒ
ϢⲂⲎⲢ Ⲛ̄ⲚⲞⲨⲚⲈ ϨⲚ̄ ⲞⲨⲔⲞⲒ
5   ⲚⲰⲚⲒⲀ· ⲈⲦⲈ ⲈⲂⲞⲖ ϨⲒⲦⲞⲞⲦⲤ̄
ⲈϤⲈⲞⲨⲰⲚϨ̄ ⲈⲂⲞⲖ Ⲛ̄ϬⲒ ⲠⲒ
ⲬⲒ ϢⲈⲖⲈⲈⲦ Ⲛ̄ⲦⲈ ⲦⲀⲫⲐⲀⲢ
ⲤⲒⲀ· ⲈϤⲚⲀⲞⲨⲰⲚϨ̄ ⲈⲂⲞⲖ Ⲛ̄
ϬⲒ ⲠⲒⲈⲒⲚⲈ Ⲛ̄ⲅⲈⲚⲞⲤ Ⲛ̄ⲦⲈ Ⲧ
10   ⲘⲚ̄ⲦⲤⲰⲚⲈ ⲔⲀⲦⲀ ⲞⲨⲀⲚⲦⲒ
ⲘⲒⲘⲞⲚ· ⲚⲀⲒ̈ ⲚⲈ ⲚⲎ ⲈⲦⲀⲰ
Ⲭϩ̄ Ⲛ̄ⲚⲈⲨⲤⲚⲎⲨ ⲈⲨⲬⲰ Ⲙ̄
ⲘⲞⲤ ⲚⲀⲨ ⲬⲈ ⲈⲂⲞⲖ ϨⲒⲦⲘ̄ ⲠⲀⲒ̈
ⲈϢⲀϤⲚⲀ Ⲛ̄ϬⲒ ⲠⲈⲚⲚⲞⲨⲦⲈ·
15   ⲈϢⲰⲠⲈ ⲈⲢⲈ ⲞⲨⲞⲨⲬⲀⲒ̈ ϢⲰ
ⲠⲈ ⲚⲀⲚ ϨⲘ̄ ⲠⲀⲒ̈· ⲈⲚⲤⲈⲤⲞⲞⲨⲚ
ⲀⲚ Ⲛ̄ⲦⲔⲞⲖⲀⲤⲒⲤ Ⲛ̄ⲦⲈ ⲚⲎ ⲈⲦ
ⲢⲞⲞⲨⲦ· ⲈⲂⲞⲖ ϨⲒⲦⲚ̄ ⲚⲎ Ⲛ̄ⲦⲀⲨ
ⲈⲒⲢⲈ Ⲙ̄ⲠⲒϨⲰⲂ Ⲛ̄ⲚⲒⲔⲞⲨⲈⲒ Ⲛ̄
20   ⲦⲀⲨⲚⲀⲨ ⲈⲢⲞⲞⲨ Ⲛ̄ⲦⲀⲨⲢ̄ⲀⲒ
ⲬⲘⲀⲖⲰⲦⲈⲨⲈ Ⲙ̄ⲘⲞⲞⲨ· ⲈⲨ
ⲈϢⲰⲠⲈ ⲆⲈ Ⲛ̄ϬⲒ ϨⲈⲚⲔⲞⲞⲨⲈ
Ⲛ̄ⲦⲈ ⲚⲎ ⲈⲦⲤⲀⲂⲞⲖ Ⲛ̄ⲦⲈ ⲦⲈⲚ
ⲎⲠⲈ· ⲈⲨⲦ̄ ⲢⲀⲚ ⲈⲢⲞⲞⲨ ⲬⲈ
25   ⲈⲠⲒⲤⲔⲞⲠⲞⲤ· ⲈⲦⲒ ⲆⲈ ϨⲈⲚ
ⲆⲒⲀⲔⲰⲚ ϨⲰⲤ ⲈⲀⲨⲬⲒ Ⲛ̄ⲚⲞⲨ
Ⲉ̄ⲞⲨⲤⲒⲀ ⲈⲂⲞⲖ ϨⲒⲦⲘ̄ ⲠⲚⲞⲨ
ⲦⲈ ⲈⲨⲢⲒⲔⲈ Ⲙ̄ⲘⲞⲞⲨ ϨⲀ ⲠⲒ
ϨⲀⲠ Ⲛ̄ⲦⲈ ⲚⲒϢⲞⲢⲠ̄ Ⲙ̄ⲘⲀ Ⲛ̄
30   ϨⲘⲞⲞⲤ ⲚⲎ ⲈⲦⲘ̄ⲘⲀⲨ ⲚⲈ
ⲚⲒⲞⲞⲢ Ⲛ̄ⲀⲦⲘⲞⲞⲨ· ⲀⲚⲞⲔ
ⲆⲈ ⲠⲈⲬⲀⲒ̈ ⲬⲈ ⲦⲢ̄ ϨⲞⲦⲈ ⲈⲦⲂⲈ
ⲚⲎ Ⲛ̄ⲦⲀⲔⲬⲞⲞⲨ ⲚⲀⲒ̈· Ⲭ[Ⲉ] ϨⲈⲚ

Ⲡ̄

ⲔⲞⲨⲈⲒ ⲘⲈⲚ Ⲛ̄ⲚⲀϨⲢⲀⲚ ⲚⲈ ⲚⲒ
ⲠⲀⲢⲀ ⲠϢⲰⲰⲖϨ̄· ⲈⲨⲚ̄ ϨⲈⲚⲘⲎ
ⲎϢⲈ ⲘⲈⲚ ⲈⲨⲚⲀⲤⲰⲢⲘ̄ Ⲛ̄ϨⲈⲚ
ⲔⲈⲘⲎⲎϢⲈ Ⲛ̄ⲦⲈ ⲚⲈⲦⲞⲚϨ̄·
5   ⲈⲨⲞⲨⲰϬⲠ̄ Ⲙ̄ⲘⲞⲞⲨ Ⲛ̄ϨⲢⲀⲒ̈

the suffering, think
that they will fulfill

(79)

the wisdom of the brotherhood
that truly exists - which is the
spiritual fellowship with the ones
who have the same root - in a com-
5   munity, through which
shall appear the
marriage of incor-
ruption. But the kindred race of the
sisterhood
10   will appear as an imitation.
These are the ones who sup-
press their brothers while they say
to them: "through this
our God has mercy,
15   because salvation co-
mes to us through this." They do not know
the punishment of those who
rejoice with those who have
done this deed to the little ones,
20   who have looked at them with envy, who have im-
prisoned them.
But there shall be others
of those who are outside of our
number, who call themselves
25   bishop, - and also
deacons - as if they have received their
authority from God,
while they bend themselves
under the judgement of the first
30   seats. Those are
the canals without water." But I
said: "I am afraid because of
the things that you have said to me, that a

(80)

few, according to us, are
in accordance with the mark (?), while there are ma-
ny who will lead astray
many others of the living ones,
5   while they destroy them in

ⲚϨⲎⲦⲞⲨ· ⲀⲨⲰ ⲈⲨϪⲰ ⲘⲠⲈ
ⲔⲢⲀⲚ ⲤⲈⲚⲀⲦⲀⲚϨⲞⲨⲦⲞⲨ·
ⲠⲈϪⲈ ⲠⲤⲰⲦⲎⲢ ϪⲈ ⲞⲨⲬⲢⲞ
ⲚⲞⲤ ⲠⲈⲦⲦⲎϢ ⲚⲀⲨ ϨⲚ ⲞⲨ

10 ⲎⲠⲈ ⲚⲦⲈ ⲦⲞⲨⲠⲖⲀⲚⲎ ⲈⲨⲚⲀ
Ⲣ̄ Ⲣ̄ⲢⲞ ⲈϪⲚ̄ ⲚⲒⲔⲞⲨⲈⲒ· ⲀⲨⲰ Ⲙ̄
ⲘⲚ̄Ⲛ̄ⲤⲀ ⲠⲒϪⲰⲔ ⲈⲂⲞⲖ ⲚⲦⲈ
ϮⲠⲖⲀⲚⲎ ⲈϤⲈⲢ̄ ⲂⲢ̄ⲢⲈ Ⲛ̄ϬⲒ ⲠⲒⲀ
ⲦⲢ̄ϨⲀ̄ⲖⲞ <Ⲛ̄ⲄⲈⲚⲞⲤ> ⲚⲦⲈ ϮⲀⲒⲀⲚⲞⲒⲀ Ⲛ̄ⲀⲦ

15 ⲘⲞⲨ· ⲀⲨⲰ ⲈⲨⲈⲢ̄ Ⲣ̄ⲢⲞ ⲈϪⲚ̄
ⲚⲎ ⲈⲦⲈ Ⲛ̄Ⲣ̄ⲢⲞ ⲈϨⲢⲀⲒ̈ ⲈⲬⲰⲞⲨ·
ⲀⲨⲰ ⲦⲞⲨⲠⲖⲀⲚⲎ ⲈϤⲈⲦⲰ
ⲔⲘ̄ Ⲛ̄ⲦⲈⲤⲚⲞⲨⲚⲈ· ⲀⲨⲰ ⲈϤⲈ
ⲀⲀⲤ Ⲛ̄ⲤⲦⲢⲀϨ Ⲛ̄ⲤⲞⲨⲰⲚϨ ⲈⲂⲞⲖ

20 Ⲛ̄ϨⲢⲀⲒ̈ ϨⲚ̄ ⲘⲚ̄ⲦⲢⲘ̄ϨⲈ ⲚⲒⲘ· Ⲉ
ⲀⲤϢⲰⲠ Ⲙ̄ⲘⲞⲤ ⲈⲢⲞⲤ· ⲀⲨⲰ
ⲚⲀⲒ̈ Ⲙ̄ⲠⲒⲢⲎⲦⲈ ⲈⲨⲈϢⲰⲠⲈ
Ⲛ̄ⲚⲀⲦϢⲒⲂⲈ Ⲱ ⲠⲈⲦⲢⲈ· ⲀⲘⲞⲨ
ⲞⲨⲚ ⲘⲀⲢⲞⲚ ⲈϪⲘ̄ ⲠⲒϪⲰⲔ

25 ⲚⲦⲈ ⲠⲒϮ ⲘⲀⲦⲈ ⲚⲦⲈ ⲠⲒⲰⲦ
Ⲛ̄ⲀⲦϪⲰϨⲘ̄· ⲈⲒⲤ ϨⲎⲎⲦⲈ
ⲄⲀⲢ ⲤⲈⲚ̄ⲚⲎⲨ Ⲛ̄ϬⲒ ⲚⲀⲒ̈ ⲈⲦⲚⲀ
ⲤⲰⲔ ⲚⲀⲨ Ⲙ̄ⲠⲒϨⲀⲠ· ⲀⲨⲰ ⲈⲨ
ⲚⲀⲀⲀⲨ Ⲛ̄ⲤⲢⲀϨ· ⲀⲚⲞⲔ ⲀⲈ

30 Ⲙ̄ⲘⲚ̄ ϬⲞⲘ Ⲛ̄ⲤⲈϪⲰϨ ⲈⲢⲞⲈⲒ·
Ⲛ̄ⲦⲞⲔ ⲀⲈ Ⲱ ⲠⲈⲦⲢⲈ ⲈⲔⲈⲀϨⲈ
ⲢⲀⲦⲔ̄ ϨⲚ̄ ⲦⲈⲨⲘⲎⲦⲈ· Ⲙ̄ⲠⲢ̄
ϨⲞⲦⲈ ⲈⲦⲂⲈ ⲦⲈⲔⲘⲚ̄ϬⲀⲂ

Ⲡ̄Ⲁ̄

ϨⲎⲦ· ⲈⲨⲈⲦⲰⲘ Ⲛ̄ϬⲒ ⲚⲈⲨ
ⲀⲒⲀⲚⲞⲒⲀ· ⲀϤⲀϨⲈⲢⲀⲦϤ̄ ⲄⲀⲢ ⲚⲀⲨ
Ⲛ̄ϬⲒ ⲠⲒⲀϨⲞⲢⲀⲦⲞⲤ· ⲚⲀⲒ̈ Ⲛ̄ⲦⲀ
ⲢⲈϤϪⲞⲞⲨ· ⲀⲒ̈ⲚⲀⲨ ⲈⲢⲞϤ ⲈϤⲈ

5 Ⲙ̄ⲠⲢⲎⲦⲈ ⲈϢϪⲈ ⲈⲨⲀⲘⲀϨⲦⲈ
Ⲙ̄ⲘⲞϤ ⲈⲂⲞⲖ ϨⲒⲦⲞⲞⲦⲞⲨ· ⲀⲨⲰ
ⲠⲈϪⲀⲒ̈ ϪⲈ ⲞⲨ ⲠⲈϮⲚⲀⲨ ⲈⲢⲞϤ
Ⲱ ⲠϪⲞⲈⲒⲤ ϪⲈ Ⲛ̄ⲦⲞⲔ ⲘⲀⲨⲀⲀⲔ
ⲈⲦⲞⲨϪⲒ Ⲙ̄ⲘⲞⲔ· ⲀⲨⲰ ⲈⲔⲀ

10 ⲘⲀϨⲦⲈ Ⲙ̄ⲘⲞⲒ̈· Ⲏ ⲚⲒⲘ ⲠⲈ ⲠⲀⲒ̈
ⲈⲦⲢⲞⲞⲨⲦ ϨⲒϪⲘ̄ ⲠⲒϢⲈ ⲈⲦ
ⲤⲰⲂⲈ· ⲀⲨⲰ ⲔⲈⲞⲨⲀ ⲤⲈϨⲒⲞⲨ
Ⲉ ⲈϪⲚ̄ ⲚⲈϤⲞⲨⲈⲢⲎⲦⲈ ⲀⲨⲰ
ⲈϪⲚ̄ ⲚⲈϤϬⲒϪ· ⲠⲈϪⲀϤ ⲚⲀⲒ̈ Ⲛ̄

their midst. And when they say your
name they will be believed."
The Saviour said: "A time
has been fixed for them. In a
10 number belonging to their error they will
rule over the little ones. And
after the completion of
the error, the never-aging race of the
immortal intellect shall be young
15 and they shall rule over
the ones who are ruler over them.
He shall pull out
the root of their error and he will
put it to shame so that it shall become manifest
20 in every freedom that
it has claimed for itself.
Those of this kind shall become
unchangeable, Peter. So
come, let us go to the fulfilment
25 of the will of the incorruptible
Father. For behold,
they are coming, those who will
bring judgement upon themselves.They
will put themselves to shame. Me,
30 they cannot touch.
But you, Peter, you shall
stand in their midst. Do not be
afraid because of your cowar-

(81)

dice. Their minds shall be closed
for the invisible one
has taken up position against them." After
he had said these things I saw him
5 as if he was seized
by them, and
I said: "What is it that I see,
O Lord? Is it you yourself
whom they take and are you
10 grasping me? Or, who is the one
who is glad and who is laughing above (?) the wood
and do they hit another one
on his feet and
on his hands?" The Saviour said to me:

15 ϬΙ ΠⲤⲰⲦⲎⲢ ϪⲈ ΠⲎ ⲈⲦⲕ̄ⲚⲀⲨ
ⲈⲢⲞϤ ϨⲓⲬⲘ̄ ΠⲓⲰⲈ ⲈϤⲢⲞⲞⲨⲦ
ⲀⲨⲰ ⲈϤⲤⲰⲂⲈ· ΠⲀⲓ ΠⲈ ΠⲈ
ⲦⲞⲚϨ̄ ⲓⲤ̄· ΠⲎ ⲀⲈ ⲈⲦⲞⲨⲕⲰ
Λϩ̄ Ⲛ̄ⲚⲒⲈⲒϤⲦ̄ ⲈⲚⲈϤϬⲒⲬ ⲘⲚ̄ ⲚⲈϤ
20 ⲞⲨⲈⲢⲎⲦⲈ· ΠⲒⲤⲀⲢⲕⲒⲔⲞⲚ Ⲛ̄
ⲦⲀϤ ΠⲈ· ⲈⲦⲈ ΠⲒⲰⲈⲂⲒⲰ ΠⲈ
ⲈⲨⲈⲒⲢⲈ Ⲙ̄ⲘⲞϤ Ⲛ̄ⲤⲢⲀϨ· ΠⲎ
ⲈⲦⲀϤⲰⲰΠⲈ ⲔⲀⲦⲀ ΠⲈϤⲈⲒⲚⲈ
ⲀⲚⲀⲨ ⲀⲈ ⲈⲢⲞϤ ⲚⲘ̄ⲘⲀⲒ· ⲀⲚⲞⲔ
25 ⲀⲈ Ⲛ̄ⲦⲈⲢⲒⲚⲀⲨ ΠⲈⲬⲀⲒ ϪⲈ
ΠⲬⲞⲈⲒⲤ ⲘⲘⲚ̄ ⲀⲀⲀⲨ ⲚⲀⲨ Ⲉ
ⲢⲞⲔ ⲘⲀⲢⲚ̄Π̄ⲰⲦ ⲈⲂⲞⲀ Ⲙ̄Πⲓ
ⲘⲀ· Ⲛ̄ⲦⲞϤ ⲀⲈ ΠⲈⲬⲀϤ ⲚⲀⲒ
ϪⲈ ⲀⲈⲒⲬⲞⲞⲤ ⲚⲀⲔ ϪⲈ ϨⲈⲚ
30 Ⲃ̄ⲀⲈⲈⲨⲈ ⲀⲀⲞⲔ ϨⲀⲢⲞⲞⲨ·
ⲀⲨⲰ Ⲛ̄ⲦⲞⲔ ⲀⲚⲀⲨ ϪⲈ ΠⲰⲤ
Ⲛ̄ⲤⲈⲈⲒⲘⲈ ⲀⲚ ⲈΠⲎ ⲈⲦⲞ[Ⲩ]ⲬⲰ

ΠⲂ̄

Ⲙ̄ⲘⲞϤ· ΠⲰⲎⲢⲈ ⲄⲀⲢ Ⲛ̄ⲦⲈ Πⲓ
ⲈⲞⲞⲨ Ⲛ̄ⲦⲀⲨ· ⲈΠⲘⲀ Ⲙ̄ΠⲀⲀⲒⲀ
ⲔⲰⲚ ⲀⲨⲀⲀϤ Ⲛ̄ⲤⲦⲢⲀϨ· ⲀⲚⲞⲔ
ⲀⲈ ⲀⲈⲒⲚⲀⲨ ⲈⲞⲨⲀ ⲈϤⲚⲀϨⲰⲚ
5 ⲈⲢⲞⲚ ⲈϤⲈⲒⲚⲈ Ⲙ̄ⲘⲞϤ ⲘⲚ̄ ΠⲎ
ⲈⲚⲈϤⲤⲰⲂⲈ ϨⲓⲬⲘ̄ ΠⲒⲰⲈ·
ⲚⲈϤⲤⲎϨ ⲀⲈ ΠⲈ Ⲛ̄ϨⲢⲀⲒ ϨⲚ̄ ⲞⲨ
ΠⲚ̄Ⲁ ⲈϤⲞⲨⲀⲀⲂ ⲀⲨⲰ Ⲛ̄ⲦⲞϤ Πⲓ
ⲤⲰⲦⲎⲢ· ⲚⲈⲨⲚ̄ ⲞⲨⲚⲞϬ ⲀⲈ
10 Ⲛ̄ⲞⲨⲞⲈⲒⲚ ⲈϤⲔⲰⲦⲈ ⲈⲢⲞⲞⲨ
Ⲛ̄ⲀⲦⲰⲀϪⲈ Ⲙ̄ⲘⲞϤ ⲘⲚ̄ ΠⲀ
ⲰⲀⲒ Ⲛ̄ⲦⲈ ϨⲈⲚⲀⲄⲄⲈⲀⲞⲤ Ⲛ̄ⲀⲦ
ⲰⲀϪⲈ ⲈⲢⲞⲞⲨ ⲀⲨⲰ Ⲛ̄ⲀⲦⲚⲀⲨ
ⲈⲢⲞⲞⲨ ⲈⲨⲤⲘⲞⲨ ⲈⲢⲞⲞⲨ·
15 ⲀⲚⲞⲔ ⲀⲈ ⲈⲦⲀⲒⲚⲀⲨ ⲈⲢⲞϤ ⲈⲨ
ⲞⲨⲰⲚϨ̄ ⲈⲂⲞⲀ Ⲙ̄ΠⲎ ⲈⲦϮ ⲈⲞ
ⲞⲨ· Ⲛ̄ⲦⲞϤ ⲀⲈ ΠⲈⲬⲀϤ ⲚⲀⲒ ϪⲈ
ϬⲘ̄ϬⲞⲘ· Ⲛ̄ⲦⲞⲔ ⲄⲀⲢ ⲈⲦⲀⲨϮ
ⲚⲀⲔ Ⲛ̄ⲚⲈⲒⲘⲨⲤⲦⲎⲢⲒⲞⲚ Ⲉ
20 ⲤⲞⲨⲰⲚⲞⲨ ϨⲚ̄ <ⲞⲨ>ⲞⲨⲰⲚϨ̄ ⲈⲂⲞⲀ·
ϪⲈ ΠⲎ ⲈⲦⲀⲨϮ ⲈⲒϤⲦ̄ ⲚⲀϤ Πⲓ
ⲰⲞⲢΠ̄ Ⲙ̄ⲘⲒⲤⲈ ΠⲈ ⲘⲚ̄ ΠⲒⲎⲈⲒ
Ⲛ̄ⲦⲈ ⲚⲒⲀⲀⲒⲘⲰⲚ· ⲘⲚ̄ ΠⲒⲔⲀΠ
Ⲛ̄ⲰⲚⲒ ⲈⲰⲀⲨϬⲰⲢϬ̄ Ⲛ̄ϨⲎⲦϤ̄
25 Ⲛ̄ⲦⲈ Ⲉ̄ⲀⲰⲈⲒⲘ· Ⲛ̄ⲦⲈ ΠⲒⲤϮⲞⲤ

15   "The one you see
glad and laughing
above (?) the wood, that is the
Living One, Jesus. But the one into
whose hands and
20   feet they are driving the nails is his fleshly
part, which is the substitute.
They put to shame that
which has come into existence after his likeness.
But look at him and at me." But when I
25   had looked, I said:
"Lord, nobody is looking at
you. Let us run from this
place." But he said to me:
"I told you,
30   'Leave blind ones alone'.
And you, see how
they do not know what they say.

(82)

For the son of their
glory instead of my ser-
vant they have put to shame." But I
saw someone who intended to approach
5   us, who looked like him and like the one
who was laughing above the wood.
He was woven in a
holy Spirit, and he is the
Saviour. And there was a great
10   ineffable light surrounding them
and the multi-
tude of ineffable
and invisible angels,
blessing them.
15   And I, I saw that
the one who glorifies was revealed.
But he said to me:
"Be strong, because you are the one to whom
these mysteries are given to
20   know them openly,
that the one who was nailed is the
firstborn and the house
of the demons; and the vessel (?)
of stone in which they live
25   - of Elohim, of the cross,

ЄΤϢΟΟΠ ϨΑ ΠΝΟΜΟϹ· ΠΗ
ΔЄ ЄΤΑϨЄΡΑΤϤ ЄϤϨΗΝ ЄΡΟϤ
ΠΙϹϢΤΗΡ ΠЄ ЄΤΟΝϨ· ΠΙϢΟ
ΡΠ ΝϨΗΤϤ ЄΤΑΥΑΜΑϨΤЄ Μ
30   ΜΟϤ· ΑΥϢ ΑΥΚΑΑϤ ЄΒΟΛ
ЄϤ[Α]ϨЄΡΑΤϤ ϨΝ ΟΥΡΑϢЄ·
Є[Ϥ]ΝΑΥ ЄΝΗ ЄΤΑΥΧΙΤϤ Ν
ϬΟΝϹ ЄΥΠΟΡΧ ЄΒΟΛ ΝΝЄΥ

<div align="center">

ΠΓ

</div>

ЄΡΗΥ· ЄΤΒЄ ΠΑΪ ЄϤϹϢΒЄ
ΝϹΑ ΤЄΥΜΝΤΑΤЄΙϢΡϨ· ЄϤ
ϹΟΟΥΝ ΧЄ ϨЄΝΒΑΛЄ ΜΜΙϹЄ
ΝЄ· ЄϤЄϢϢΠЄ ΟΥΝ ΑΡΑ Ν
5   ϬΙ ΠΙΡЄϤΧΙ ΜΚΑϨ ЄΠΙϹϢΜΑ
ΠЄ ΤϢЄΒΙϢ· ΠΗ ΔЄ ΝΤΑΥ
ΚΑΑϤ ЄΒΟΛ ΠΑϹϢΜΑ ΠЄ ΝΑΤ
ϹϢΜΑ· ΑΝΟΚ ΔЄ <ΠЄ> ΠΙΝΟЄΡΟΝ
ΜΠΝΑ ΠΑΪ ЄΤΜЄϨ ЄΒΟΛ ΝΟΥ
10 ΟЄΙΝ ЄϤΠΡЄΙϢΟΥ ЄΒΟΛ· ΠΗ
ΝΤΑΚΝΑΥ ЄΡΟϤ ЄϤΝΗΥ ϢΑ
ΡΟΪ· ΠΙΠΛΗΡϢΜΑ ΝΤΑΝ ΠЄ
ΝΝΟЄΡΟΝ· ΠΗ ЄΤΝΟΥϨΒ Μ
ΠΙΟΥΟЄΙΝ ΝΤЄΛΙΟϹ ΜΝ ΠΙ
15 ΠΝΑ ЄΤΟΥΑΑΒ ΝΤΑΪ· ΝΑΪ ΟΥΝ
ЄΤΑΚΝΑΥ ЄΡΟΟΥ ЄΚЄΤΑΑΥ
ЄΤΟΟΤΟΥ ΝΝΙΑΛΛΟΓЄΝΗϹ
ЄΤЄ ϨЄΝЄΒΟΛ ϨΜ ΠΙΑΙϢΝ ΑΝ
ΝЄ· ΟΥ ΓΑΡ ΜΜΝ ΤΑЄΙΟ ΝΑ
20 ϢϢΠЄ ΝϨΡΑΪ ϨΝ ΡϢΜЄ ΝΙΜ
ЄΤЄ ΝϨЄΝΑΤΜΟΥ ΑΝ ΝЄ· ЄΙ
ΜΗΤΙ ΝΗ ЄΤΑΥϹϢΤΠ ΜΜΟ
ΟΥ ЄΒΟΛ ϨΝ ΟΥΟΥϹΙΑ ΝΝΑΤ
ΜΟΥ ΤΗ ЄΤΑϹΟΥϢΝϨ ЄΒΟΛ
25 ЄϹЄ ΝϬΟΜ ЄϢϢΠ ЄΡΟϹ ΜΠΗ
ЄΤϮ ΜΠЄϨΟΥΟ ΝΤΑϤ· ЄΤΒЄ
ΠΑΪ ΑЄΙΧΟΟϹ ΧЄ ΟΥΟΝ ΝΙΜ
ЄΤЄ ΟΥΝΤΑϤ ϹЄΝΑϮ ΝΑϤ ΑΥ
Ϣ <ΟΥΝ> ΟΥΟΝ ΝΑΡ ϨΟΥΟ ЄΡΟϤ· ΠΗ
30 ΔЄ ЄΤЄ ΜΜΝΤΑϤ ЄΤЄ ΠΑΪ ΠЄ
ΠΙΡϢΜЄ ΝΤЄ ΠΙΤΟΠΟϹ ЄϤ
ϢΟΟΠ ΤΗΡϤ ЄϤΜΟΟΥΤ ЄϤ
ΟΥΟΤΒ ЄΒΟΛ ϨΜ ΠΙΤϢϬ[Є] Ν
ΤЄ ΠΙϹϢΝΤ ΝΤЄ ΠΙΧΠ[Ο]

which is under the law. But he
who stands near him
is the living Saviour, he
who was in him before, (in) the one who was seized
30   and he was released,
while he is standing gladly
because he sees that those who have treated him
violently, are divided among them-

(83)

selves. Therefore, he laughs
about their inability to see. For
he knows that they are born blind.
So, the one who suffers
5   shall stay (behind) because the body
is the substitute. The one who is
released is my incorporeal
body. I <am> the intellectual
Spirit which is filled with
10   radiant light. The one
you saw coming towards
me is our intellectual Pleroma
who unites
the perfect light with
15   my holy Spirit. So,
the things you have seen, you shall give
to the strangers
who are not from this aeon.
For there will be no honour
20   in any person
who is not immortal, but only
for the ones who were chosen
from an immortal substance,
which has shown
25   that it is able to comprehend the One
who gives his abundance. That is why
I have said: "To everyone
who has will be given
and he will have abundance. But he
30   who does not have - that is
the person of this place, who
is completely dead,
who has come forth from the implantation
of the habit (?) of procreation,

π̄λ̄

ⲉⲧⲉ ⲉϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲉⲣϣⲁⲛ ⲟⲩⲁ
ⲟⲩⲱⲛⲍ̄ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉ ⲧⲟⲩⲥⲓⲁ
ⲛ̄ⲛⲁⲧⲙⲟⲩ· ϣⲁⲩⲙⲉⲉⲩⲉ ⲝⲉ
ⲥⲉⲁⲙⲁⲍⲧⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟϥ· ⲥⲉⲛⲁϥⲓ
5   ⲧϥ̄ ⲛ̄ⲧⲟⲟⲧϥ̄· ⲁⲩⲱ ⲥⲉⲛⲁⲟⲩ
ⲁⲍ̄ϥ ⲉⲡⲏ ⲉⲧϣⲟⲟⲡ· ⲛ̄ⲧⲟⲕ
ⲟⲩⲛ ⲧⲁⲝⲣⲟ ⲛ̄ⲍⲏⲧ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲙ̄ⲡ̄ⲣ̄
ⲣ̄ ⲍⲟⲧⲉ ⲗⲁⲁⲩ· ⲧⲛⲁϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲅⲁⲣ
ⲛ̄ⲙⲙⲁⲕ ⲝⲉⲕⲁⲁⲥ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲗⲁⲁⲩ
10 ⲛ̄ⲧⲉ ⲛⲉⲕⲝⲁⲝⲉ ϭⲙ̄ϭⲟⲙ ⲉⲣⲟⲕ·
ⲧⲣⲏⲛⲏ ⲛⲁⲕ ϭⲙ̄ ⲛⲟⲙⲧⲉ· ⲛⲁⲓ̈
ⲛ̄ⲧⲁϥⲝⲟⲟⲩ ⲁϥϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲍⲣⲁⲓ̈ ⲛ̄
ⲍⲏⲧϥ̄:

ⲁⲡⲟⲕⲁⲗⲩⲯⲓⲥ ⲡⲉⲧⲣⲟⲩ

(84)

who, when one
of the immortal substance
appears, they think that
they can seize him - it will be taken
5   from him and it will be
added to the one who exists."So you
be brave and do not
fear anyway, for I will be
with you, so that none
10   of your enemies shall harm you.
Peace be with you. Be strong"!
When he had said these things, he came to
his senses.

Apocalypse of Peter

2.2 Grammatical Annotations

These grammatical annotations are confined to a discussion of Apoc.Pet.'s most conspicuous grammatical problems and idiosyncrasies. For reasons of comparison I will sometimes conclude my discussion with translations proposed earlier by M. Krause and M. Girgis 1973 (Ks '73); J.A. Brashler 1977 (Br '77); J.A. Brashler and R.A. Bullard 1988 (Br '88); A. Werner 1989 (Wr '89); J.A.Brashler 1996 (Br '96). Other authors have written on aspects of Apoc.Pet., without giving a complete translation: Koschorke 1978 (Ks '78), Tröger 1978 (Tr '78) and Dubois 1982, 1983 (Db '82 and '83). In some cases also their interpretations are included.

70.13 Title: ⲀⲠⲞⲔⲀⲖⲨⲯⲓⲤ ⲠⲈⲦⲢⲞⲨ: Apocalypse of Peter. Greek genitive -ⲞⲨ. The title is also written at the end of the text.

70.15-16 ⲧⲘⲈϨⲦ̄ ⲚⲦⲈ ⲠⲓⲤⲘ̄ⲚⲈ The Ⲧ of ⲘⲈϨⲦ stands for 300 (Crum 389a) so that there can be little doubt that ⲧⲘⲈϨⲦ means "the threehundredth" (Kr '73 incorrectly identifies the last letter as ⲧ and translates "Fünfheit"). The problem is the combination of ⲧⲘⲈϨⲦ with ⲤⲘ̄ⲚⲈ: "The threehundredth of the construction" which is grammatically improbable because the numeral ⲘⲈϨⲦ and the noun ⲤⲘ̄ⲚⲈ do not have the same gender. The phrase needs an addition, for example <Ⲛ̄ⲢⲞⲘⲠⲈ> <year>, between ⲘⲈϨⲦ and Ⲛ̄ⲦⲈ. So this is what most authors suggest in their editions. A second problem is the interpretation of ⲤⲘ̄ⲚⲈ: the most straightforward translation would be 'construction' or 'building' like the German authors suggest (cf. Crum 337a). I prefer a more metaphorical meaning, in which ⲤⲘ̄ⲚⲈ refers to a Pleromatic concept. This, of course, has far-reaching consequences for the interpretation of the whole passage. Br '77: "threehundredth <year> of the agreement"; Br '88: "threehundredth (year) of the covenant"; Wr '89: "im dreihundertsten (Jahr) der Errichtung"; Br '96: "in the inner part of the building"; Db '82 (388) : "construction", "fondation".

70.16-17 ⲘⲚ̄ ⲠⲓⲧⲘⲀⲦⲈ Ⲛ̄ⲦⲈ ⲠⲓⲘⲀϨⲘⲎⲦ Ⲛ̄ⲤⲦⲨⲖⲞⲤ: ⲧⲘⲀⲦⲈ is one of the most problematic words of Apoc.Pet. It occurs three more times (also written as ⲧ ⲘⲈⲦⲈ): 71.4; 78.29f.; 80.25. In none of these instances is its meaning unambiguously clear. According to Crum (Crum 189b, 190a) ⲧ ⲘⲀⲦⲈ can be translated as: attainment, agreement, assent, good pleasure, and renders Greek nouns and adjectives: σύμφωνος, εὐδοκία, βούλησις (Eph 1.5; 1Cor 7.5; 2Cor 6.15). Schenke regards this passage as corrupt and suggests the possibility of emending the text with the words 'year', 'month' and 'day' because he understands it as an astrological speculation (Schenke 1975b, 131) Kr '73: "voll Freude"; Br '77: "good pleasure"; Br '88: "agreement"; Wr '89: "(im Monat) der Erreichung"; Br '96: "convergence"; Db '82 (388): "le bon plaisir". Also my translation ("Grace" cf. "graciously" in 71.4) is conjectural.

70.17 CTYⲖOC (στύλος) means 'column' or 'pillar'. It occurs only once in the Nag Hammadi texts. Its combination with **ⲠⲒⲘⲀ2ⲘⲎⲦ** 'the tenth' seems to repeat the former combination of a numeral with a noun (cf. 70.15-16). There is a problem in interpreting the clause "the grace of the tenth pillar".

70.18 ⲘⲞⲦⲚ ⲘⲘOⳓ is an unusual combination of a stative and a refl. pron. object, (cf. Tri. Trac. (NHC I,5) 58,36.38). The verb is combined here with the prep. **2ⲒⳘⲚ** and can be interpreted as 'rest upon' or 'be satisfied with'. This depends on whether the phrase is understood in a literal or a metaphorical sense. In either case, it might very well have a Pleromatic meaning. **ⲎⲠⲈ** means 'number', 'congregation' or 'group'. This may refer to a certain number or group, e.g. the souls which have returned to the Pleroma. Kr '73: "zufrieden über"; Br '77: "he was resting above"; Br '88: "being satisfied with"; Wr '89: "(am Tage), da Er (Gott) ruhte auf"; Db '82 (387): "le Sauveur se reposait sur".

70.22 ⲈⲨⲤⲀⲦⲠⲈ ⲚⲚⲒⲠⲎⲨⲈ: **ⲤⲀⲦⲠⲈ** is not the stative of **ⲤⲰⲦⲠ̄** as Krause assumes. The stative of **ⲤⲰⲦⲠ̄** is **ⲤⲞⲦⲠ̄**, without **⁻Ⲉ**. **ⲤⲀⲦⲠⲈ** as stative of **ⲤⲰⲦⲠ̄** is unattested in any surviving text. Furthermore, the preposition which links a hypothetical **ⲤⲀⲦⲠⲈ** with **ⲚⲒⲠⲎⲨⲈ** should be **Ⲉ⁻** instead of **Ⲛ̄⁻** if **ⲤⲰⲦⲠ̄** is the underlying verb. I think that **(ⲈⲨ)ⲤⲀⲦⲠⲈ Ⲛ̄ (ⲚⲒⲠⲎⲨⲈ)** is a compound preposition: **(Ⲛ̄) ⲤⲀ ⁻ ⲦⲠⲈ ⁻ Ⲛ̄.** (cf. B. Layton 263, in D.W. Young (ed.) 1981). I translate it as: "because they are above the heavens". Kr '73: "da sie Auserwählte der Himmel sind."; Br '77: "those belonging to the <heavenly> Father."; Br '88: "those above"; Wr '89: "<,der> oberhalb der Himmel ist"; Br '96: "heavenly"; Tr '77 (219): "<der> oberhalb der Himmel ist".

70.23 ⲠⲎ ⲈⲦⲀⳓOⲨⲰⲚ2 ⲈⲂOⲖ...: It is questionable whether this phrase should be translated as a subordinate or as a main clause. The following translations of this phrase have been proposed: Kr '73: "Der, der das Leben denen offenbart hat..." Br '77: "It is he who has revealed ..." Br '88: "who revealed life..." Wr '89: "<der>... geoffenbart hat". I have translated the phrase as an appositive of "the Father" in 70.21-22: "he who has revealed...". cf. Till § 247.

70.25 ✝ ⲘⲈⲈⲨⲈ: The only way to explain the absence of an object without supposing a corrupt text is to assume that the verb is used here in a terse sense. Otherwise an object has to be inserted: **<ⲈⲢOOⲨ>**. Kr '73: "da ich erinnert habe - "; Br '77: "when I reminded those"; Br '88: "since I reminded (them)"; Wr '89: "der ich (sie daran) erinnert habe"; Br '96: "I reminded".

70.26 ⲠⲈⲦⲞⲨⲔⲰⲦ: In Bohairic ⲠⲈⲦ⁻ is a constant element of a cleft sentence. In Sahidic one would expect ⲚⲈⲦ⁻ after a pl. vedette (Polotsky 1987, 117. See also Ch. 1.3. on the language of Apoc.Pet.).

70.27 ⲠⲎ ⲈⲦⲌⲞⲞⲢ can be translated in a personal sense: he who is strong, or as referring to an impersonal noun: that which is strong. In the first case the strength can refer to the Greek meaning of the name Peter. In the second case the strength can be explained as being a quality of the Pleroma. All former editions also have the impersonal interpretation. Kr '73: "dem, was stark ist-"; Br '77: "upon what is strong ..."; Br '88: "on what is strong"; Wr '89: "zu dem festen (Bau)"; Br '96: "on what is strong"; Db '82 (388): "ce qui est solide".

70.29-31 The difficulty with this phrase is in deciding how to interpret the constituents beginning with **ⲘⲚ̄** (70.30) (which is usually a conjunction that connects nouns) and **ⲀⲨⲰ** (70.32) (a conjunction with a tendency to separate phrases). The first meaning of **ⲤⲞⲨⲰⲚ⁻** is 'know' but it sometimes means 'distinguish' (Crum 370a). Kr '73: "und kennen lernen Worte der Ungerechtigkeit und einer Gesetzlosigkeit eines Gesetzes und eine Gerechtigkeit"; Br '77: "distinguish words of unrighteousness and transgression of law from righteousness"; Br '88: idem; Wr '89: "unterscheiden lernen zwischen Worten der Ungerechtigkeit und Gesetzwidrigkeit und (Worten der) Gerechtigkeit"; Br '96: "they should (...) distinguish between words of unrighteousness and transgression of law (on the one hand), and righteousness (on the other)". As to the first part of the sentence I prefer Brashler's translation: "they shall distinguish words of injustice and (**ⲘⲚ̄**) transgression of law, from (**ⲀⲨⲰ**) justice".

71.1f. ⲈⲨϢⲞⲞⲠ ⲈⲂⲞⲖ ϨⲘ̄ ⲠⲌⲒⲤⲈ Ⲛ̄ϢⲀⲌⲈ ⲚⲒⲘ: The **Ⲛ̄⁻**, between ⲠⲌⲒⲤⲈ and ϢⲀⲌⲈ is difficult to explain. It is possible to consider ϢⲀⲌⲈ an object of ⲈⲨⲈⲤⲞⲨⲰⲚ in 70.29. In this case <...> should be placed between ⲠⲌⲒⲤⲈ and Ⲛ̄ϢⲀⲌⲈ. Most authors interpret the 3rd ps. pl. personal (ⲈⲨϢⲞⲞⲠ) as referring to the living ones. Only Werner considers 'words of justice' the subject of ⲈⲨϢⲞⲞⲠ. Kr '73: "da sie aus der Höhe aller Worte dieses Plêrômas der Wahrheit stammen"; Br '77: "since they are from the height of every word of this pleroma of the truth"; Br '88: "as being from the height of every word of this Pleroma of truth"; Wr '89: "(Worten der) Gerechtigkeit, die ja von oben stammen, (damit sie) jedes Wort dieser Fülle der Wahrheit (erkennen)"; Br '96: "since they are from the height of every word of this fullness of truth"; Ks '78 (35): "da sie aus der Höhe aller Worte dieses Pleromas der Wahrheit stammen".

71.4 ϨⲚ̄ ⲞⲨϯ ⲘⲈⲦⲈ, see 70.16-17

71.10f. Rather than having to be understood as a dittography, ⲚⲀⲒ ⲚⲀⲒ may have a distributive meaning (cf. Brashler '96, 220; Till, §109.).

71.14 A straightforward interpretation translates ϨⲞⲦⲈ as meaning 'fear' or 'fright'. This, however, does not seem to correspond with the next phrase "people of the same substance". Kr '73 adheres to ϨⲞⲦⲈ. Brashler '77 substitutes Ϩⲟ<ⲩ>ⲉ: 'greater part', 'greatness', 'multitude' . Br '88 returns to ϨⲞⲦⲈ, Br '96 substitutes Ϩⲟ<ⲩⲟ> and Wr '89 replaces 'ϨⲞⲦⲈ' by "geoffenbart". Cf. also Ks '78 (35) who translates it as "Furcht", without denying, however, the difficulties this interpretation offers. I substitute Ϩⲟ<ⲩⲟ>, 'multitude' (cf. Crum 735a).

71.16-17 ϢⲰⲠⲈ...ⲚⲘ̄ⲘⲀⲒ̈: This phrase shows a discontinuity in its structure. Some interpreters read ϢⲰⲠⲈ and ⲚⲘ̄ⲘⲀⲒ̈ as a unit. They translate ϢⲰⲠⲈ as 'stay'. This rare meaning of the verb occurs eleven times in the Sahidic New Testament: Lk 19.5; Jn 1.39; 11.54; 12.34; Acts 16.15; 20.15; Rm 9.11; 1Jn 2.17, 24, 24, 28. (cf. Wilmet, 1959, 1227f., see also Crum 578a). I consider ϢⲰⲠⲈ as a part of a periphrastic construction, expressing an imperative in combination with ⲈⲔⲈⲚⲦⲈⲖⲒⲞⲤ (cf. Till 332): "You too, Peter, become perfect in your name, just like me, the one who has chosen you." Kr '73: "werde vollkommen in deinem Namen auch mit mir"; Br '77: "become perfect, in accordance with your name, with me"; Br '88: "become perfect in accordance with your name with myself"; Wr '89: "bleib als Vollkommener entsprechend deinem Namen allein bei mir"; Br '96: "become perfect, in accordance with your name, along with me"; Ks '78 (27): "erweise dich deinem Namen entsprechend als vollkommen (und bleibe) bei mir selbst."

71.22-25 ϢⲀⲚⲦⲈ...Ⲛ̄ⲦⲰϨⲘ̄ Ⲙ̄ⲘⲞⲔ: is an anacoluthon. It is possible that after ϢⲀⲚⲦⲈⲠⲒⲀⲚⲦⲒⲘⲒⲘⲞⲚ the verb is missing, for instance in a very frequently occurring combination with ϢⲰⲠⲈ. Other possibilities are to connect the phrase with ⲈⲨⲈⲈⲒⲚⲈ 'bring', 'resemble' (71.33) or to add e.g. 'ⲤⲒⲚⲈ' (pass away, see Crum 943b). Kr '73: "bis der Nachahmer der Gerechtigkeit dessen ..."; Br '77 inserts 'ⲚⲎ' into ϢⲀⲚⲦⲈ: ϢⲀ <ⲚⲎ> Ⲛ̄ⲦⲈ "toward <those> of the imitation of the righteousness"; Br '88: "until the imitation of righteousness - ; Wr '89: "damit der Nachahmer der Gerechtigkeit (d.h. der Nachahmer) dessen, der dich als ersten berufen hat und zwar dazu berufen hat, daß du ihn so erkennst, wie es angemessen ist (von dir angemessen erkannt wird. Solche Erkenntnis ist erforderlich)"; Br '96: "for the duration of the imitation of the righteousness of him who ...". I have translated the phrase as an anacoluthon; eventually connected with ⲈⲨⲈⲒⲚⲈ in 71.33.

71.27f. ϮⲀⲠⲞⲬⲎ ⲈⲦⲠⲎϨ ⲈⲢⲟϥ: "the distance that separates him". Usually ἀπέχω, the Greek verb with which ⲀⲠⲞⲬⲎ is connected, is translated as: 'keep off' or 'keep away from'

(Liddell and Scott 188a; 227b). According to Crum 380b, the word is the equivalent of the Coptic **COOϨE** ('removal', 'departure'). Another important element is the rare combination of a stative **ΠΗϨ** with an object **ЄPOϤ**. For an explanation of this see Polotsky 1971, 230b. Possible meanings of **ΠⲰϨ/ΠΗϨ**: 1) break, burst, tear 2) reach, attain to 3) divide in (+ **Є-**) Crum 280b. Kr '73: "der Enthaltung, die zu ihm gelangt ist"; Br '77: "the rejection that happened to him"; Br '88: "the rejection which happened to him"; Br '96: "the shedding (of blood) which tore him - "; Wr '89: "wegen des Unterschiedes, der zwischen ihm und jenem besteht"; Tr '77 (220): "wegen der Geschiedenheit, die jenem eignet"; Ks '78 (29): "angesichts seines Abstandes (jenem gegenüber)"; Db '83 (120): "La distance". See the commentary and Ch. 6.3.4. for further explanation of this phrase.

72.2f. Possible meanings of **COOϨE** are: 'remove', 'reprove', 'correct', 'be set up' (Crum 380b, 381a). Greek equivalents of **COOϨE** are: ἀνορθοῦσθαι, ἑτοιμάζεσθαι, ἐλέγχειν and καταλέγειν. The meaning of ἐλέγχειν forms the basis of my translation and renders, in my view, the most meaningful interpretation. However, a translation of this verb must be tentative until a satisfying explanation of the whole passage has been found. Kr '73: "überführen"; Br '77: "establish"; Br '88: "reprove"; Wr '89: "zum Abfall bewegen"; Br '96: "correct".

72.15f. NIBⲀⲖ M̅ΠΙΠOⲆHPH: The M̅- between **BⲀⲖ** and **ΠΙΠOⲆHPH** can be looked upon as a genitive part., as a preposition or as a shortcut **MN̅**. The choice for one of these possibilities depends on the interpretation of **ΠOⲆHPH**. If this word is taken literally, meaning 'cloak', the M̅- can only be the preposition 'in' or 'with'. When **ΠOⲆHPH** is read in a metaphorical sense, meaning 'body', then the M̅- has to be translated as a gen. part. Yet, as H.-M. Schenke suggested to me, this second possibility is unlikely. In Gnostic texts the body can be depicted as a cloak, however, this cloak is not called **ΠOⲆHPH**, but rather **ЄNⲆYMⲀ**. The third possibility, favoured by Br '77 and '96 is to consider M̅- to be MN̅. In this case the -N is represented in the stroke over the M̅: 'and your robe'. Siegert 1982 does not mention **ΠOⲆHPH** at all, **ЄNⲆYMⲀ** occurs four times: V, 58.22; VI, 44.26; 64.16; XI, 58.29 and indeed is used metaphorically. In the New Testament ποδήρη is mentioned in Rev 1,13: ἐνδεδυμένον ποδήρη, "(Among the lamps was a figure like a man,) in a robe that came to his feet." Here ποδήρης seems to be the robe of a priest (cf. Ex. 28.4 and Ez. 9.11). Kr '73: "lege deine Hände vor die Augen mit deinem Gewand": Br '77: "put your hands and your robe over your eyes"; Br '88: "put your hands upon (your) eyes - your robe - "; Wr '89: "lege deine Hände auf die Augen deines Gewandes (= deines Leibes)"; Br '96: "put your hands <and> your robe over (your) eyes"; Ks '78 (18): "lege deine Hände auf die Augen deines (leiblichen) Gewandes".

73.9 After **ⲀЄICⲰT̅M̅ ON** the next circumstance **ЄKϨMOOC** is awkward. One would

expect something like: ⲀⲈⲒⲤⲰⲦⲘ̄ ⲞⲚ [ⲈⲚⲀⲒ ⲈⲦⲞⲨⲪⲰ Ⲙ̄ⲘⲞⲞⲨ· ⲠⲈⲬⲀⲓ̈]: "And I heard [the things that they said, I told] ...". If we assume that the text is not corrupt a possible translation is: "I heard how you sat ... etc." I propose to translate it as: "And, I listened again (and said): 'you are glorified while you are sitting' ". Kr '73: "Und ich hörte wieder, während du saßest, wie sie dich priesen"; Br '77: "And I listened again 'As you are sitting, they are praising you.' "; Br '88: "And I listened again. 'As you sit, they are praising you.' "; Wr '89: "Und ich hörte wiederum <...und sagte zu ihm:> 'Während du (hier) sitzt, preisen sie dich' "; Br '96: "And I listened again. 'As you sit, they are praising you' ". See the commentary for an interpretation of this sentence.

73.24 ⲬⲒ ⲈⲂⲞⲖ ϨⲚ̄ †ⲀⲢⲬⲎ: The word ⲀⲢⲬⲎ can be translated as 'beginning', or as 'principle'. If ⲈⲂⲞⲖ ϨⲚ̄ is considered to be a preposition, connected with ⲀⲢⲬⲎ, then ⲬⲒ can be translated as 'take': Take from the beginning (of our word). Kr '73: "vom Anfang unseres Wortes empfangen"; Br '77 ('88 idem): "accept our teaching in the beginning"; Wr '89: "am Anfang unsere Verkündigung annehmen"; Br '96: see Br '77; Tr '77 (213): "viele werden (zwar) befreit werden von <ihren Irrtümern> am Anfang unserer Verkündigung"; Ks '78 (37): "eine Menge wird am Anfang unserer Verkündigung (diese) annehmen". In the present translation also the temporal meaning of the word ⲀⲢⲬⲎ is preferred. This fits in best with the historical survey to follow on the adversaries of the Petrine Gnostics: "For many will be partakers of the beginning of our word".

73.26 According to Till §393, it is possible that a pron. pers. pl. refers to a sg. noun phrase, when this noun phrase expresses a plural. Therefore ⲈⲢⲞⲞⲨ could be referring to ⲠⲈⲚϢⲀⲬⲈ (73.25: they will turn themselves from our words) or to ⲞⲨⲘⲎⲎϢⲈ (73.23: they will turn themselves from many [people]). But one can also translate it as a refl. plural.: "and they will turn themselves to themselves again." I translate this phrase as: "but they will turn themselves to them again". Kr '73: "sie werden sich wieder zu sich wenden"; Br '77: "they will turn themselves again"; Br '88: "they will turn from them again"; Wr '89: "werden sich (doch) wieder davon abwenden"; Tr '77 (213): "und werden (doch) wieder zu ihnen zurückkehren"; Br '96: "But they will turn away again"; Ks '78 (37): "und sich (dann) wieder davon abwenden".

73.30f. ⲈⲦⲈ ⲠⲀⲒ ⲠⲈ: This hermeneutical rel. clause introduces an explanation of the object ⁻ⲞⲨ in ϤⲚⲀⲞⲨⲞⲚϨⲞⲨ (73.29). Although by ⲈⲦⲈ ⲠⲀⲒ ⲠⲈ the object is explicated, the expression seems to have the same function as the more common Ⲛ̄ϬⲒ, which defines a pronominal subject.

74.5-9 ⲈⲨⲦⲰⲞ̄Ⲛ̄: this form could be a second tense, which is how it is translated here. Translating the whole phrase 74.3-9 as Brashler '77 does, who makes it depend on

ⲈⲨⲦⲰϬⲚ interpreted as 'is pushed', is problematic: "And the pure one, guileless and good, is pushed to the executioner and into the kingdom of those who praise Christ in a restoration." Brashler is actually forced by this interpretation to suggest that the word ⲀⲠⲞⲔⲀⲦⲀⲤⲦⲀⲤⲒⲤ 74.9 is a gloss, which refers to Origen, because he cannot explain it as a description of the theology of the opponents of Apoc.Pet.

74.7 ⲰⲀϨⲢⲀⲒ Ⲉ- translates the Greek μέχρι, ἄχρι and ἕως (+ οὐ) as "until", "as long as", "during" (all temporal adjuncts), cf. Mt 14.22; Rev 2.10; 1Tim 6.14 etc. (Crum 699b-701a). Kr '73 and Br '77, Br '96 consider this an adverbial adjunct of direction and translate: "zum" and "into"; Br '88: "to". Wr '89 translates this prep. as a temporal conjunction: "bis". In my interpretation "during" is prefered; see the commentary for an explanation.

74.18f. ⲢⲈϥⲢⲦⲈⲬⲚⲎ < τεχνίτης Siegert 1982, 312. This word occurs only once in the Nag Hammadi texts. Possible interpretations: Kr '73: "Handwerker" (artisan); Br '77 and '88: "a cunning man"; Br '96: "an evil, cunning man"; Wr '89: "ein Betrüger"; Ks '78 (40), who assumes a reference to Paul, translates "üblen Betrüger". Here the word is rendered as 'intriguer' ; a reference to Paul is not assumed. (Cf. my commentary).

74.28-34 In my view ⲬⲈ...ⲚⲒⲀⲢⲬⲰⲚ (74.28-30) is an inserted subordinate clause which means that ⲤⲈⲚⲀϯ ⲢⲀⲚ ⲈⲢⲞⲞⲨ (74.28) is continued by Ⲛ̄ⲦⲈ ⲞⲨⲢⲰⲘⲈ... etc. (74.30-34). The structure of the sentence is: ϨⲈⲚϨⲞⲈⲒⲚⲈ ⲘⲈⲚ ⲤⲈⲚⲀϯ ⲢⲀⲚ ⲈⲢⲞⲞⲨ - ⲬⲈ ⲈⲨⲀϨⲈⲢⲀⲦⲞⲨ Ϩ̄Ⲛ ⲞⲨϬⲞⲘ Ⲛ̄ⲦⲈ ⲚⲒⲀⲢⲬⲰⲚ - Ⲛ̄ⲦⲈ ⲞⲨⲢⲰⲘⲈ ⲘⲚ̄ ⲞⲨⲤϨⲒⲘⲈ... etc. ⲈⲢⲞⲞⲨ (74.28) has been interpreted in different ways. Kr '73 sees a direct object in it: "Einige zwar werden sie benennen"; Br '77,'88 and '96 renders a passive construction: "Others will be named", "some will be given a name"; Wr '89 considers the phrase to be a reflexive: "Einige werden sich danach benennen"; Tr '77 (217): "Etliche fürwahr werden sich benennen"; Ks '78 (49): "Einige werden sich danach benennen". I follow Werner and translate ⲈⲢⲞⲞⲨ as a reflexive pronoun: "Some will call themselves..." etc.

74.32-34 Ⲛ̄ⲞⲨⲘⲎⲎⲰⲈ Ⲙ̄ⲘⲞⲢⲪⲎ, ⲘⲚ̄ Ⲛ̄ⲞⲨⲘⲎⲎⲰⲈ Ⲛ̄Ⲛ̄Ⲙ̄ⲔⲀϨ: This is probably a translation of πολύμορφος καὶ πολυπαθής (cf. Crum 202a,b).

75.9-11 Brashler '77 reads Ⲙ̄ⲘⲞ<ϥ> instead of Ⲙ̄ⲘⲞⲞⲨ. Following a suggestion by Schenke 1975b, 132, we could also read Ⲙ̄Ⲙ<Ⲁ>Ⲩ instead of Ⲙ̄ⲘⲞⲞⲨ (cf. also Koschorke 1978, 49). However, these corrections are not necessary. The pl. suf. -ⲞⲨ, referring to the sg. ⲠⲒⲘⲀ, is grammatically correct if ⲠⲒⲘⲀ has a general meaning: 'wherever he comes from.' (Cf. Till Dial. §225, 358, 359.) Still, the phrase 75.9-11 remains ambiguous. We cannot be certain if Ⲙ̄ⲘⲞϥ (75.11) refers to ⲠⲞⲨⲀ ⲠⲞⲨⲀ or to ⲠⲒⲘⲀ. If we assume that this phrase (75.9-11)

translates a Greek ὅπου-clause, a direct equivalent for ΠΙΜλ is not necessary. If we assume a Greek original in which τόπος occurred we could translate it as: For everyone brings forth what resembles the *place* from which he comes. All authors, except for Wr '89, translate ΠΙΜλ as if a Greek τόπος occurs in the original. Kr '73: "Jeder einzelne nämlich, der Ort, aus dem einer stammt, gibt das, was ihm gleicht"; Br '77: "For where each one is from produces what is like itself"; Br '88: "For the place from which each of them is produces that which is like itself"; Wr '89: "Denn jeder - woher er auch stammt - bringt das hervor, was ihm gleicht"; Br '96: "For each source produces what is like itself"; Tr '77 (213f.): "Denn jeder einzelne - von welchem Ort er auch immer stammt - bringt das hervor, was ihm (dem Ort) gleicht"; Ks '78 (49): "Denn jeder - von welchem Ort er auch immer stammt - bringt das hervor, was ihm gleicht". My translation: "for the place where each one comes from, brings forth what resembles itself".

76.8 COYPE is used without the article, probably a writing error. <ϨEN>COYPE would be correct here, by analogy to ϨENCOYPE in 76.5.

76.8 COYPE ⲚNOẊE (= COYPE ⲚN OẊE) means 'thornbush' or 'thistle' and is a dialectical variant of CEPOẊI (cf. Crum 354b). It does not derive, as Krause assumes, from COYPE Ⲛ NOẊE (= 'false thorns').

76.11-12 EϤϢOOΠ EBOλ ϨⲘ ΠH ETNλNOYϤ λN: 1) circumst. 'if it stems from what is not good,' 2) pr. II: 'It stems from what is not good'. I prefer the first translation. There are many instances in Apoc.Pet. in which it is difficult to decide if we have a second tense or a circumstance. In all but two (76.11-12 and 79.8) of these cases I have translated a second tense: 76.12; 76.14; 76.29; 77.14.25.33; 78.24; 78.33; 79.28; 82.5.

76.12-14 With Brashler '88 and '96, I translate EϢλϤϢⲰΠE as a second tense: "It becomes destruction for it and death".

76.22-23 NETE NOYOY: 'theirs', elliptic for NETE NOYOY NE.

76.24f. OYⲰTⲂ̄ EBOλ, may render ἀπέρχομαι 'depart from' (Crum 496b; Liddell and Scott 187a). It could also translate μεταβαίνω / μετατίθημι to mean: 'pass over to' (a different kind of teaching), or simply 'change' (Liddell and Scott 1109b; 1117b). These equivalents are attested for OYⲰTⲂ̄ EBOλ as well as OYⲰTⲂ̄ EBOλ ϨⲚ̄. I propose to translate it as 'take a start from', a synonym of the first mentioned interpretation 'depart from'. Other interpretations: Kr '73: "vorübergehen an"; Br '77: "depart from"; Br '88: "change"; Wr '89: "übergehen zu"; Br '96: "depart from"; Ks '78 (52): "ablassen von, sterben/hinüber gehen".

77.1f. In all translations the oddness of this phrase has been noticed. It is solved in different ways. Schenke '75 assumes that a few words are omitted; he reconstructs: <ϹⲰⲢⲘ̄ ⲚⲚⲒⲮⲨⲬⲎ· ϢϢⲈ ⲄⲀⲢ Ⲉ-> and translates it as: "und voller Hochmut werden sie versuchen, <die Seelen> zu <verführen. Denn es ist nötig für> den Hochmut, neidisch zu sein auf die unsterbliche Seele, die zum Pfand geworden ist". Brashler considers ⲦⲘ̄Ⲛ̄ⲦⲬⲀϹⲒ̧ⲀⲎⲦ an erroneous repetition of 76.35. We could also think of a positive interpretation of ⲘⲚ̄ⲦⲬⲀϹⲒ̧ⲀⲎⲦ (cf. Crum 789/790), translating e.g. the Greek ὑψηλός: high, noble, exalted, mighty etc. The negative equivalents, μετέωρος, μεγαλόφρων, ὑπερηφανία, however, are more in line with the context (see my commentary). A second difficulty consists of the interpretation of the final clause ⲈⲢ̄ⲪⲐⲞⲚⲒ. The function of the connecting particle Ⲉ- ('in order to') and the meaning of ⲪⲐⲞⲚⲒ ('envy'), in this context, are both uncertain. A straightforward, literal translation might be the best solution. Kr '73: "Und voller Hochmut werden sie Hand an den Hochmut legen, um die unsterbliche Seele zu beneiden, die als Pfand gedient hat"; Br '77: "And in haughtiness they will begin {with arrogance} to envy the immortal soul, which has become a pledge"; Br '88: "And in haughtiness they shall grasp at pride to envy the immortal soul which has become a pledge"; Wr '89: "Und in ihrem Hochmut werden sie so weit gehen, neidisch zu sein auf die unsterbliche Seele, die zum Pfand geworden ist."; Br '96: "And in haughtiness they will begin {in haughtiness} to envy the immortal soul that has become dedicated (to God)"; Ks '78 (53): "Und aufgeblasen werden sie sich zu dem Hochmut versteigern (?), neidisch zu sein auf die unsterbliche Seele, die zum Pfand geworden ist".

77.15 �̄ⲒⲚⲀ...ⲬⲈ + fut. II, where one would expect fut. III. Possible Subakhmimic (Lycopolitan) influence. See Ch. 1.

77.21-22 The phrase ⲚⲎ Ⲛ̄ⲦⲀⲨϹⲰⲢⲘ̄ Ⲙ̄ⲘⲞⲞⲨ· can be understood in two ways: 1) who have deceived them 2) whom they have deceived (= who have been deceived). I prefer the second translation. Kr '73: denen, die sie in die Irre geführt haben; Br '77: "those who have been deceived"; Br '88: "those who misled them"; Wr '89: "die Verführten"; Br '96: "those who have been misled". See the commentary for an explanation of this phrase.

77.29-32 Ⲥ̧ⲰⲤ ⲈⲨϬⲰϢⲦ̄ ⲈⲂⲞⲖ Ⲥ̧Ⲛ̄ ⲞⲨⲀ ⲈⲨⲘⲈⲈⲨⲈ ⲬⲈ ⲚⲒⲀⲄⲀⲐⲞⲚ ⲘⲚ̄ ⲚⲒⲠⲞⲚⲎⲢⲞⲚ ⲬⲈ Ⲥ̧ⲈⲚⲈⲂⲞⲖ Ⲥ̧Ⲛ̄ ⲞⲨⲀ ⲚⲈ·   The second ⲬⲈ is grammatically superfluous.

78.3 The verb ⲠⲰⲦ has been combined here with the preposition Ⲛ̄Ⲥ̧ⲢⲀ̈Ⲓ Ⲛ̄Ⲥ̧ⲎⲦⲤ̄ followed by the adverbial expression Ⲥ̧Ⲛ̄ ⲞⲨⲠⲈⲦϢⲞⲨⲈⲒⲦ. The verb ⲠⲰⲦ may be interpreted in this particular case as 'flee' or 'run away' (Crum 274a). The combination Ⲛ̄Ⲥ̧ⲢⲀ̈Ⲓ Ⲛ̄Ⲥ̧ⲎⲦ⸗ is mentioned in Crum 700b as meaning 'below'. The specific combination, however, of ⲠⲰⲦ

with Ⲛ̄ϨⲢⲀⲒ̈ Ϩ̄Ⲛ is not further attested. In Apoc.Pet. Ⲛ̄ϨⲢⲀⲒ̈ Ϩ̄Ⲛ is used in no less than 19 instances viz. after the verbs: ϨⲘⲞⲞⲤ (sit), ⲔⲰⲦ (build), ⲞⲨⲰⲚϨ̄ ⲈⲂⲞⲀ (appear, reveal), ⲬⲈ ⲞⲨⲀ (curse), Ϯ ⲈⲞⲞⲨ (glorify), ϢⲰⲠⲈ (become), ϨⲒ ⲦⲞⲞⲦⲞⲨ (begin), ⲬⲒ ϬⲞⲘ (receive power), Ⲣ̄ ⲈⲒ̄ⲈⲠϢⲰⲦ (merchandise), ϨⲈ (fall), ⲞⲨⲰϬⲦ̄ (turn away), ⲤⲎϨ (weave) and ⲠⲰⲦ (run), (cf. the register). In these instances the following translations of Ⲛ̄ϨⲢⲀⲒ̈ Ϩ̄Ⲛ have been given: "sit *upon* the number" (70.15f.); "built *upon* what is strong" (70.27); "appear *in* people of the same substance" (71.10); "curse *in* these aeons" (73.20); "praise *in* a restoration" (74.8); in 75.29 where Ⲛ̄ϨⲢⲀⲒ̈ Ϩ̄Ⲛ has been combined with ϢⲞⲞⲠ the preposition has not been translated; in 76.35 Ⲛ̄ϨⲢⲀⲒ̈ Ϩ̄Ⲛ has been rendered as an adverbial expression: "full of haughtiness they begin", "receive power *in* an immortal spirit" (77.18); "merchandise *in* my name" (77.33); "fall *into*" (78.10); "destroy *in* (their) midst" (80.5f.); "woven *in* a holy spirit" (82.7). The instances which are not listed here are duplications: ϢⲰⲠⲈ 71.16; 73.19; (75.29); 77.6; 83.20 and ⲞⲨⲰⲚϨ̄ ⲈⲂⲞⲀ, 71.(9).11.13; 73.29; 80.19 occur more than once in a combination with Ⲛ̄ϨⲢⲀⲒ̈ Ϩ̄Ⲛ. It becomes clear from this survey that the preposition is rendered as 'in', in most cases. In two instances it has been translated as 'upon', and 'into' is used once, and in one other instance the preposition forms part of an adverbial expression, paraphrased as 'full of'.

78.8 In my interpretation ⲀⲨⲰ ⲠⲒⲔⲰ ⲈⲂⲞⲀ Ⲛ̄ⲦⲀⲒ̈ depends on the verb Ⲣ̄ ⲈⲒ̄ⲈⲠϢⲰⲦ (77.33). Another possibility would be to read the phrase as an adverbial clause: 'And with me is the forgiveness of their tresspasses, into which they fell ...'etc. In the third place it is possible to consider the phrase an anacoluthon. Kr '73: translates it as: "und meine Vergebung ihrer Vergehen"; Br '77 prefers a translation with the verb 'have': "But I have forgiveness of their transgressions"; Br '88 assumes an anacoluthon: "and my forgiveness of their transgressions"; Wr '89 inserts a long phrase: "<Leute, die mein Wort verleugnen> und meine Vergebung ihrer Verfehlungen"; Br '96: "And I have forgiveness of their transgressions"; Ks '78 (54): "und (bis zu) meiner Vergebung ihrer Verfehlungen".

78.12 ⲬⲒ + Ⲛ̄⁻ translates ἀποφέρειν/διδόναι (Crum 749b).

78.16 Ⲛ̄ⲞⲨϢⲰⲬⲦ̄ Ⲛ̄ⲀⲚⲦⲒⲘⲒⲘⲞⲚ Ks '78 (55): "Nachahme-Rest/weitere Nachahmung". Koschorke's interpretation is possible if ⲞⲨϢⲰⲬⲦ̄ is considered a quantitative adjective. In Coptic, the reversal of regens and rectum is possible and even favoured in the case of adjectives expressing quantity. ϢⲰⲬⲦ̄ probably translates λοιπός, cf. Till §119.

78.24 ⲈⲨⲚⲀⲚⲞⲬⲞⲨ 'who will be thrown ...' etc. This subordinate clause can be translated as a relative clause because of the general function of the definite article ⲚⲒ⁻ before the antecedent (78.23). Only Krause '73 translates it as a fut. II.

79.15 According to Crum 580b ЄϢϢⲠЄ can mean: 'if', 'when', or: 'since', 'because'. Kr.'73: "wenn"; Br.'77, '88 and '96: "since"; Wr.'89: "da"; Ks. '78 (60): "da". My translation is based on the interpretation of ЄϢϢⲠЄ as 'because' while ϨⲘ ⲠⲀï (79.16) is interpreted as having the same function as ЄBOⲗ ϨⲓⲦⲘ ⲠⲀï in 79.13.

79.17 It is unclear whether ⲚⲦЄ expresses a subjective genitive or an objective genitive. Kr '73 translates literally and hence the phrase remains ambiguous; the same holds for Br '77, '88 and '96. Only Ks '78 and Wr '89 choose an unambiguously objective genitive: Ks '78 (60): "wobei sie nicht die Strafe kennen (allein schon) für die, die (auch nur) freudig denen zugesehen haben." Wr '89: "Dabei kennen sie nicht die Strafe für die, die freudig ...'. I agree with the latter interpretation.

79.20 The verb ⲚⲀY + ЄⲢOOY may translate the Greek ἐπιβλέπειν (Crum 293b; Liddell and Scott 625a): to eye with envy, to be intent on.

79.23f. The phrase NH ЄⲦСⲀBOⲗ ⲚⲦЄⲦЄNHⲠЄ can be understood in two different ways: NH ЄⲦСⲀBOⲗ ⲚⲦЄ ⲦЄN HⲠЄ, 'those who are outside of our number ', or as: NH ЄⲦСⲀBOⲗ Ⲛ ⲦЄⲦЄN HⲠЄ, 'outside your number'. Werner argues that the translation "our number" is not possible, since the combination ЄⲦСⲀBOⲗ with ⲚⲦЄ is grammatically incorrect (Werner 1989, 641 n.31). Indeed the combination СⲀBOⲗ with ⲚⲦЄ is not mentioned in Crum. But because of the direct context and the interpretation of the monologue of the Saviour as a whole, the first interpretation has to be preferred.

79.24f. ЄYϯ ⲢⲀN ЄⲢOOY ⲬЄ ЄⲠICKOⲠOC 1) Who are called bishop. 2) Who call themselves bishop. I prefer the second translation because of the polemic character of the phrase. The translation 'who call themselves' indicates that the Petrine Gnostics do not agree with the granting of the titles 'bishop' and 'deacon' to the persons in question.

79.26-28 ϨⲰС ЄⲀYⲬI ⲚNOYЄϨOYCIⲀ ЄBOⲗ ϨIⲦⲘ ⲠNOYⲦЄ. With Brashler I interpret ⲚNOY‾ as an object marker followed by a poss. art.

80.1f. NIⲠⲀⲢⲀ ⲠϢϢⲗϨ is a propositional expression with a def. article. This is not unusual in Coptic and common in Greek. Cf. 2 Treat. Seth (VII,2) 62.28.38; 63.21; 69.9 where the same expression occurs. A translation in accordance with 2 Treat. Seth (viz. 'the counterfeit ones' NHLE 1988, 368) may seem a matter of course, but this interpretation does not make sense in the context of Apoc.Pet. Therefore I propose a different interpretation, starting from the first meaning of the noun ϢϢⲗϨ (Crum 562a): stake, mark. The Greek prep. παρά used here has many functions; the one assumed here is: 'according to' (Siegert 315: ⲠⲀⲢⲀ ϢϢⲗϨ: nach dem Abdruck (oder) Abbild). I translate: "I am afraid because

of the things that you have said to me viz. that a few, according to us, are *in accordance with the mark* (=meet the demands)". Kr '73: "daß zwar vor uns, die klein sind, die entsprechend der Eigenart sind"; Br '77: "that indeed little ones (in our opinion) are the counterfeit ones"; Br '88: "that indeed little (ones) are, in our view, the counterfeit ones"; Wr '89: "Denn nur wenige - soweit wir sehen - sind es, die außerhalb der Verführung bleiben"; Br '96: "that indeed little ones are, in our view, counterfeit".

80.13-15 The most important hindrance for interpreting the phrase ΠΙΑΤΡ̄Ζ̄Λ̄Λ̄Ο Ñ̄ΤΕ †ΛΙΑΝΟΙΑ is the presence of the connection particle Ñ̄ΤΕ between ΠΙΑΤΡ̄Ζ̄Λ̄Λ̄Ο and †ΛΙΑΝΟΙΑ (80.13-14). This makes it almost inevitable to add a noun before Ñ̄ΤΕ. For example: ΠΙΑΤΡ̄Ζ̄Λ̄Λ̄Ο <Ñ̄ΓΕΝΟC> Ñ̄ΤΕ †ΛΙΑΝΟΙΑ Ñ̄ΑΤΜΟΥ· "The never-aging <race> of the immortal intellect".

80.15f. (ΑΥW ΕΥΕΡ̄ P̄PO ΕΧ̄Ñ ΝΗ) ΕΤΕ Ñ̄PP̄PO ΕΖΡΑΪ ΕΧWΟΥ: "(and they shall rule over the ones) who are ruler over them". The supposed syntactical relations which form the basis of the present translation are: ΕΤ⁻: rel. pron.; Ε stative of ΕΙPΕ; Ñ̄P⁻ particle of identity, duplicated with an assimilated second Ñ̄ before P̄⁻ (Till §36). Another possibility could be to consider the Ñ̄⁻ in Ñ̄PP̄PO as the 1st ps. pl.: ΝΗ ΕΤΕΝ P̄ P̄PO ΕΖΡΑΪ ΕΧWΟΥ: "(and they will rule over) the ones whom we overrule". The rel. pron. ΕΤΕ(Ν) does not have the normal form ΕΤ(Ñ̄) in this case but there are two more instances in Apoc.Pet. where this long form of the relative present occurs, namely 71.26 and 76.10. This second possibility, however, does not fit logically in its context. Therefore I prefer the first interpretation, in line with all previous translations.

80.19 CΤΡΑΖ: This word is rare in Sahidic, but more common in Bohairic (cf. Crum 358a, see also Schenke 1975b, 133). The gender of the noun is unknown and the spelling with -Τ- is unusual, although occurring in 80.19 and 82.3. Cf. 80.29 (CPΑΖ); 81.22 (CPΑΖ).

81.2 ΑϥΑΖΕΡΑΤϥ̄: Following Brashler, I prefer the pejorative interpretation of ΑϥΑΖΕΡΑΤϥ̄ ΝΑΥ 'take up position against', 'oppose', although this possibility is not explicitly mentioned by Crum 536-538. If used in a pejorative sense, the verb would have to be connected with a preposition like Ε⁻, ΟΥΒΕ⁻, ΕΒΟΛ, or ΕΖΟΥΝ. Kr '73: "zutreten"; Br '77, '88 and '96: "oppose"; Wr '89: "zutreten".

81.11, 16; 82.6 ΖΙΧ̄Μ̄ (ΠΙWΕ): 'above', 'upon', 'over', 'on', 'at', 'beside' (Crum 758b). On the basis of the diverse meanings of ΖΙΧ̄Μ̄ it is hard to imagine where the 'living Jesus' was situated during the crucifixion (Cf. Treat.Seth 56.12-20). The Coptic WΕ renders the Greek ξύλον and σταυρός. It is possible that ΖΙΧ̄Μ̄ translates ἐπί, cf. Joh. 19.31 ἐπὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ.

Kr '73: "am Kreuz"; Br '77: "above the cross"; Br '88: "on the tree"; Wr '89: "neben dem Holz"; Br '96: "above the cross"; Ks '78 (24): "neben".

81.21 ϢⲈⲂⲒⲰ probably renders ἀντάλλαγμα (Crum 552b). Note that the article ⲠⲒ⁻ is unusual since ϢⲈⲂⲒⲰ is a feminine noun (cf. 83.6). So, ⲠⲒϢⲈⲂⲒⲰ has the masc. art., translating the neuter of the underlying Greek noun. It may also be a writing error, the subst. inf. of an unknown variation of the verb ϢⲒⲂⲈ: ϢⲈⲂⲒⲰ, or a *constructio ad sententiam*, since it refers to a masculine figure. Siegert 138 translates the masculine form as "der Ausgetauschte".

82.7 ⲤⲎϨ: An interpretation as the Bohairic stative of ⲤⲰϨⲈ (weave) is possible, (instead of ⲤⲀϨⲦ, cf. Wr.'89) since there are Bohairic traits in Apoc.Pet. (see Ch. 1). To derive ⲤⲎϨ from ⲤϨⲀⲒ (write), as Kr '73 does, complicates the interpretion very much: "Es war aber mit einem heiligen Geist geschrieben"; Br '77 substitutes ⲤⲎ<Ⲩ>, stative of ⲤⲈⲒ (be filled): "And he was <filled> with pure spirit"; Br '88: "And he was <filled> with a Holy Spirit". A parallel to this image is found in Ep.Pet.Phil. (VIII,2), although in this text ⲘⲞⲨϨ is used instead of ⲤⲎϨ or ⲤⲈⲨ. Ep.Pet. Phil. 139,14: "[ⲀⲨ]Ⲱ ⲀϤⲘⲞⲨϨ ⲈⲂⲞⲖ ϨⲚ ⲞⲨⲠⲚⲀ ⲈϤⲞⲨⲀⲀⲂ", "[And] he was filled with a holy spirit" and 140.9-10: "ⲀⲨⲰ ⲀⲨⲘⲞⲨϨ ⲈⲂⲞⲖ [ϨⲚ] ⲞⲨⲠⲚ[Ⲁ] ⲈϤⲞⲨⲀⲀⲂ·", "And they were filled with a holy spirit"; (my translation, hwh). Wr '89: "es war gewebt in heiligem Geist"; Br '96: "And he was <filled> with a pure spirit"; Tr '77 (227): "es war aber gewebt in heiligem Geist". Another option is to assume that ⲤⲎϨ is the stative of an unknown verb 'ⲤⲰϨⲈ'. See Ch. 1.3.

82.15 ⲀⲚⲞⲔ ⲆⲈ ⲈⲦⲀⲒ̈ⲚⲀⲨ: this phrase may be a perf. I with rel. pron. ⲈⲦ⁻, ('reduced cleft sentence'): "It is me who has seen him" (cf. Till §247 ⲚⲦⲞⲔ ⲈⲦⲤⲞⲞⲨⲚ̄). It also can be a Bohairic perf. II (ⲈⲦⲀϥ instead of ⲚⲦⲀϥ) with a temporal meaning (Till, Dial. §265). This is how Br '88 has interpreted the construction: "And when I looked at him, ...". Also 82.18.

82.15-17 ⲈⲨⲞⲨⲰⲚϨ̄ ⲈⲂⲞⲖ Ⲙ̄ⲠⲎ ⲈⲦϮ ⲈⲞⲞⲨ: Kr '73: "während sie den offenbarten, der preist". Br '77 reads Ⲉ<Ⲩ>Ϯ instead of ⲈⲦϮ: "as they appeared to him and gave praise"; Br '88: "the one who gives praise was revealed"; Wr '89: "während er offenbart wurde als der, der verherrlicht"; Br '96: "And it was I who saw him when this one who glorifies was revealed". I translate: "And I, I saw that the one who glorifies was revealed". For an explanation see Ch. 6.

82.18 ⲚⲦⲞⲔ ⲅⲀⲢ ⲈⲦⲀⲨϮ is interpreted as a reduced cleft sentence (cf. 82.15 and Till §247). It also could be a Bohairic perf. II ⲈⲦⲀϥ instead of ⲚⲦⲀϥ. I prefer the first

possibility and translate it as: "You are the one to whom these mysteries are given".

82.20 ΟΥѠΝ̅Ϩ̅: haplography, **ΟΥ⁻** is missing before **ΟΥѠΝ̅Ϩ̅**.

82.23 ΚΑΠ⸗ is mentioned in Crum as a Fayumic form. The meaning of this word is obscure (Crum 113b) but with Schenute 1975b we translate 'vessel'. Cf. Test. Truth (NHC IX,3) 70.9-20.

82.25f. ΠΗ is omitted before **Ν̅ΤΕ**: (ΠΗ) **Ν̅ΤΕ ΕΛ̅ѠΕΙΜ̅**, (ΠΗ) **Ν̅ΤΕ ΠΙϹ̅Ϯ̅ΟϹ·**

82.26 ΕΤϢΟΟΠ Ϩⲁ ΠΝΟΜΟϹ. The rel. clause: **ΕΤϢΟΟΠ**... etc. is ambiguous. The antecedent can be **ΠΙϹ̅Ϯ̅ΟϹ**: "the cross, which is under the law", (Kr '73; Br '77; Br '88, '96) but it can also be **ΠΗ ΕΤⲁΥϯ ΕΙϥΤ**, "the one who was nailed" (82.21), "who is under the law" (82.26), (Wr '89, Tr '77 (228); Ks '78 (22)).

82.28f. ΠΙϢΟΡΠ̅ Ν̅Ϩ̅ΗΤϥ̅ This is an uncommon construction in Coptic, may be constructed by analogy to **ΠΙΕΒΟⲗ Ν̅Ϩ̅ΗΤϥ̅** (information from W.-P. Funk, 1989). Kr '73: "der erste von ihm"; Br '77, '96: "the primal part in him"; Br '88: "the first in him"; Wr '89: "der zuvor in ihm war"; Tr '77, 228: "<der seelische> Erst<geboren>e, <der> in ihm <war>".

83.8 The full form of the personal pronoun, **ⲁΝΟΚ**, has been used in the first position of a bipartite nominal sentence, where we would expect **ⲁΝΓ̅**. Moreover, the particle **ⲇΕ** should have been posited after the predicate, **ⲁΝΟΚ ΠΙΝΟΕΡΟΝ Μ̅ΠΝⲁ ⲇΕ**, and not, as in the present text, after the subject. Therefore I suggest inserting the copula **ΠΕ** after **ⲇΕ**. Another possible emendation is to repeat the pron. pers.: **ⲁΝΟΚ ⲇΕ <ⲁΝΓ̅> ΠΙΝΟΕΡΟΝ Μ̅ΠΝⲁ**. Cf. Polotsky 1987, 17-25.

83.19 ΟΥ is not the Coptic interrogative particle as assumed by Krause, but the Greek negation οὐ.

83.29 ΟΥΟΝ: indef. pron., incomplete construction. The full form should be: **ΟΥΝ̅ ΟΥΟΝ**. Cf. Polotsky 1987, 69, n. 17. Therefore I translate 83.27-29 as: "To everyone who has will be given and he will have abundance". If **ΟΥΟΝ** is considered the correct form we could translate it as: "To everyone who has will be given and will anyone (= **ΟΥΟΝ**) have more than he"? The first translation is closer to the περισσευθήσεται of Mt. 13.12 and 25.29, to which this part of Apoc.Pet. probably alludes. Kr '73: "und jemand wird mehr haben als er"; Br '77, '88 and '96: "and he will have plenty"; Wr '89: "so daß er Überfluß hat".

83.31f. ЄЧϢΟΟΠ ΤΗΡϤ ЄЧМΟΟΥΤ: ЄЧϢΟΟΠ can refer to **ΠΙΡШМЄ** as antecedent but also to **ΠΙΤΟΠΟС**: 1) The person of this place who is completely dead. 2) The person of this place which is completely dead. **ΠΙΡШМЄ** has a general, indefinite meaning (cf. Till Dial. §358, 359) therefore, and because it belongs parenthetically to **ΠΗ ΔЄ ЄΤЄ M̄М̄Н̄ΤΔϤ** (83.29f.), the phrase can be translated as a rel. clause. I prefer the first translation since from the observations above it seems less likely that **ΠΙΤΟΠΟС** is the antecedent. Kr '73: "der Mensch des Ortes, der ganz tot ist"; Br '77 and '88: "the man of this place who is completely dead"; Ks '78 (36) and Wr '89: "der Mensch dieses Ortes, der gänzlich tot ist"; Br '96: "the one of this place being completely dead".

83.32-34 ЄЧΟΥΟΤB̄ ЄΒΟΛ 2M̄ ΠΙΤШϬ[Є] Ñ ΤЄ ΠΙСШΝ̄Τ Ñ ΤЄ ΠΙΧΠ[Ο]. The interpretation of this phrase is hampered by a couple of words with many possible meanings: **ΟΥШΤB̄ ЄΒΟΛ 2M̄** translates the Greek μεταβαίνειν ἐκ (Crum 497a) 'develop into something different' or διαφέρειν ἐκ (Crum 496b) 'surpass'. Kr '73: "gehen aus", Br '77: "transform into", Br '88: "remove from", Wr '89: "hervorgehen aus" and Br '96: "changed by". **ΤШϬЄ** is a less complicated verb; here it probably means: 'to plant' (Crum 465a). All authors agree on this but 'attach to' is also possible (Crum 464b). Finally, the word **СШΝ̄Τ** gives us problems again because there are three homonyms **СШΝ̄Τ** according to Crum 345a-346a: 1) 'be created', 'found', 'create', as a noun, 'creation', 'foundation'; 2) 'custom'; 3) 'look'. The last possibility is very unlikely. So, the question is, do we interpret **СШΝ̄Τ** as meaning 'creation' or as 'custom'? In all translations we read 'creation', but an interpretation as 'custom' or 'habit' can also render a meaningful phrase: "who has come forth from the implantation of the custom of procreation". Kr '73: "der aus der Pflanzung der Schöpfung der Zeugung gegangen ist"; Br '77: "transformed into the planting of the begotten creation of birth"; Br '88: "who is removed from the planting of the creation of what is begotten"; Wr '89: "da er aus der Pflanzung dieser Schöpfung dieses Geschlechtes hervorgegangen ist"; Br ' 96: "changed by the planting of creation and begetting".

84.12f. ΔЧϢШΠЄ 2ΡΔï Ñ2ΗΤϤ is not a common expression in Coptic. It probably translates literally the Greek ἐγένετο ἐν αὐτῷ; cf. Acts. 12.11: Καὶ ὁ Πέτρος ἐν ἑαυτῷ γενόμενος and Lk. 15.17 εἰς ἑαυτὸν δ' ἐλθὼν (Böhlig 1989, 395-398). See for a parallel among the Nag Hammadi texts Zostr. (VIII,1): 46.14: **ΔΥШ Ñ ϤP̄ ΔΡΧΙ ΟΝ ЄϢШΠЄ 2ΡΔï Ñ2ΗΤϤ·** which is translated in the NHLE, 1988, 415 as: "And he begins again to come to his senses". Schenke proposed a literal translation for lack of a better alternative: "Als er diese (Worte) sprach, war er (Jesus) in ihm (sc. dem Geist)". He speaks about "der rätselhafte Schlußsatz, ...wo das **2ΡΔï Ñ2ΗΤϤ** vollständig in der Luft zu hängen scheint", (Schenke 1975b, 131). Shellrude has tried to identify the subject of **ΔЧϢШΠЄ** and the object of **Ñ2ΗΤϤ** as two different figures. He reads this last sentence as a reference to Jesus'

departure and refers to other texts from the Nag Hammadi corpus which show the same combination of ideas, viz. "when Jesus had finished speaking, he departed", (Shellrude 1986, 236: Ap.Jas. I,2 15.5f; Ap.Jn. II,1 32.1f; Soph.Jes.Chr. III,4 119.8f; Gos.Mary BG,1, 9.5). Schönborn, finally, also chooses a literal translation: "Nachdem er diese (Worte) gesagt hatte, war er in ihm". (Schönborn 1987, 234). He rejects the translation by Böhlig because this interpretation would only be possible if Apoc.Pet. belonged to the genre of the apocalypses, which Schönborn denies. His interpretation is that the epilogue has been kept vague deliberately in order to enable the recipient of the text to place himself in the position of a potential Gnostic (Schönborn 1987, 534-537). However, this literal translation causes a problem since the meaning of the verb ϢⲰⲠⲈ is 'to become' and not 'to be'. In order to express 'to be' the stative ϢⲞⲞⲠ should have been used. It is also not possible to connect 'to be' with a perfect tense. In the present study Böhlig's interpretation is favoured. The decisive element in this interpretation is that a change of subject is assumed. In the first part of the sentence the Saviour is the subject, ("After he had said these things"), but then the perspective switches to Peter, who recovers from his state of trance. This interpretation especially makes sense in an apocalyptic text.

3. Commentary

3.1 Introductory Notes

The structure of the commentary corresponds to the division of the text as used in chapters 4 and 5: 1. Title 70.13; 2. Introduction 70.14-72.4; 3. Account of Vision and Audition 72.4-73.14; 4. Monologue of the Saviour and Peter's Reaction 73.14-81.3; 5. Account of Vision 81.3-83.15; 6. Conclusion 83.15-84.13; 7. Subscript Title 84.14. This rough division will be subdivided into smaller sections when necessary.

In our analysis we depart from the Coptic text of Apoc.Pet. as it has come down to us. However, we shall find some indications that we are concerned with a composite writing. Apoc.Pet. may contain revisions of earlier texts as well as redactional or post-redactional interpolations. This possibility comes to mind because of the following peculiarities.

Noteworthy, first of all, is the occurrence in Apoc.Pet. of long sentences, on occasion created by the insertion of parenthetical clauses. We find the most striking instances of these parenthetical clauses in 70.22; 70.25-27; 70.32-71.1; 71.11-13; 71.25-33; 74.29-30; 76.6-7, 11-12; 77.24-25; 78.1-7; 79.2-5; 83.30-84.4. These passages contain an explanation, afterthought, or a slightly divergent strain of thought. They may form part of the original text, but in some cases there is reason to conceive of them as explicative glosses.

What also strikes us in this connection is that halfway through the introductory part (from 71.3f.) the first person account of the Saviour's words changes to the third person perspective. Or should we assume that in this section of the text the Saviour does not speak about himself (the 'intellectual spirit', cf. 83.8-9) but about one of his other aspects or manifestations, the 'living Jesus', (cf. 81.15-18; 82.26-83.3) or the 'intellectual Pleroma' (cf. 83.10-15)? Also the occurrence of the expression ⲚⲚⲀϨⲢⲀⲚ, 'according to us' (75.16f.) points to a possibly complicated process of production of Apoc.Pet.[54] As noted above, the Saviour employs the first person singular throughout the text. The plural 'according to us' might suggest that the source of this passage lies in a different context viz. 75.7-76.23, which will be described as a digression below. The use of the plural form here reminds one of the speech of a religious teacher rather than that of a celestial revealer. Because of these peculiarities the possibility cannot be excluded that the text is partly a rewriting of one or more earlier texts that belong

---

[54] ⲚⲚⲀϨⲢⲀⲚ occurs a second time. Viz. in 80.1. There it is Peter who is speaking; the interpretation of the expresson in this case is less problematic.

to a different genre, and/or that it contains explicative glosses. The possible interpolations in particular deserve our attention.

3.2 Running Commentary

Title (70.13)

The title 'Apocalypse of Peter' has not been translated into Coptic but has been taken directly from the Greek original.[55] This is clear from the use of the Greek genitive of the proper name πέτρος. We cannot ascertain whether the title is original. It may have been added to the text by a collector. The Apocalypse of Peter is not the only text from the Nag Hammadi library that is called 'apocalypse'. Codex V of this corpus also contains four 'apocalypses': the Apocalypse of Paul (V,2), the two Apocalypses of James (V,3 and 4), and the Apocalypse of Adam (V,5). The designation 'apocalypse' (revelation) does not have to be a genre indicator in the modern sense of the word,[56] but it possibly says something about the content and the purport of the text.[57] The genitive points to Peter both as the receiver and as the narrator of the revelation. The text is a story, told by Peter, which records the revelation that he experienced.

The text is clearly pseudepigraphic. The function of pseudepigraphy can be explained in various ways. Usually, it is argued that the pseudonym is used to confer more authority onto the text. The use of the apostle Peter's name in our text may have had the same effect. Yet also mere deception, literary convention within the genre 'apocalypse', sheltering the real author from persecution, and the idea of 'corporate personality' are suggested as an explanation of the phenomenon.[58]

Apart from the Saviour, Peter is the main character of the text. He can be identified as the apostle Peter right from the beginning by the allusion to Mt. 16.13-20 (71.15-21), in which the vocation of Peter is narrated, and by the possible reference to Peter's threefold treason (72.2-4). Features of the canonical Peter figure (his doubt and cowardice) can also be found in the Gnostic Peter of our text (79.32-33; 80.33 etc.). Another noticeable element is the contrast between Apoc.Pet. and a certain part of the Gospel account of the Passion of Jesus. In the Gospels it is told that Peter flees together with the other disciples when Jesus is

---

[55] See Gramm. Ann. 70.13.

[56] Cf. M. Smith 1983, 9-20.

[57] See Ch. 4 on the genre of Apoc.Pet.

[58] For a useful introduction to the problem of pseudepigraphy see Brox (ed.) 1977; see also Patte 1975, 177-180 and Collins 1984, esp. 30-31.

arrested.[59] Although he is the only one who follows Jesus at a distance,[60] he disowns him while he is sitting in the high priests' courtyard where he hears how Jesus is being questioned (Mt 26.58, 69-75 and parallels). The denial by Peter seems to be used in Apoc. Pet. as a token of his insight into the real meaning of the suffering.[61] However, Peter still displays his old character flaws: he wants to flee but is told by the Saviour to stay (81.26-82.1). We find an interesting parallel in 1 Peter 5.1 where Peter is called a witness (μάρτυς) to Christ's sufferings. Otherwise we do not find any indication in New Testament texts of Peter's possible presence at the crucifixion.

3.2.1 Introduction (70.14-72.4)

70.14-19

The first lines of Apoc.Pet. clearly have an introductory function. However, for the modern reader they no longer serve this purpose. The ample use of the definite article in these lines: *the* Saviour, *the* temple, *the* threehundredth, *the* construction, *the* Joy, *the* tenth pillar, *the* number of the living majesty etc., seems to indicate that the intended audience of Apoc.Pet. knew what was meant here. Modern scholarship, however, wrestles with this passage and comes to divergent interpretations. The obscurity of the first lines is also a serious handicap for the interpretation of the text as a whole since we may expect that the first lines give a clue to the genre of a text.[62]

Perkins, Koschorke and Shellrude consider the temple in 70.15 as the earthly temple in Jerusalem. Perkins does so because in other Nag Hammadi texts it is also this earthly temple which appears as part of the setting.[63] Koschorke points to the temple as a traditional location for Jesus' teaching.[64] Shellrude observes that nothing indicates that Peter is in a trance-like

---

[59] Mt 26.56; Mk 14.50; this is not found in the Gospels of Luke and John.

[60] See however Mk 13.51-52, 54 and Jn 18.15 where it is told that Peter and a young man (Mk) or another disciple (Jn) followed the arrested Jesus.

[61] See Schönborn 1987, 316: "Aufgrund einer Verkehrung der Bewertungsbezüge qualifiziert der Text das als positiv, was in der ekklesischen Tradition als belastende Hypothek mit dem Namen "Petrus" verbunden ist; i.e. die Verleugnung des leidenden Kyrios".

[62] Fowler 1982, 98.

[63] Perkins 1980, 116, n. 6. She mentions as examples Ap.John (NHC II,1) and 1 Apoc.Jas. (NHC V,3).

[64] Koschorke 1978, 19.

state during the revelation, and therefore the location is the normal earthly temple and, later in the text, the crucifixion site.[65]

The explanation of both Perkins and Koschorke is based on the use of the temple location in some revelation dialogues, texts with which Apoc.Pet. has certain features in common. The differences between these texts and Apoc.Pet. are so conspicuous, however, that a parallel setting is not a matter of course.[66] Shellrude's argument that the temple is not the heavenly temple because Peter is not in a state of trance,[67] can be opposed if we render the last sentence of Apoc.Pet. as: He came to his senses.[68] The first attempt to gather a meaning from the opening lines (70.15-20), has been carried out by Schenke.[69] He considers them an astrological determination of time and translates them as: "im 300. [Jahr] der Errichtung und [bei]m Erreichen der zehnten Säule [=10. Monat] und als er ruhte auf der Zahl der lebendigen, unbefleckten Größe" [= 7. Wochentag = Sabbat/ κατάπαυσις].[70] The difficulty with this translation is the need for very specific extensive explanations of almost every word which are, in the end, highly uncertain.

Brashler rejects this interpretation therefore, and states: "It seems more likely (...) that these obscure words are a more exact specification of where in the temple the Saviour is sitting".[71] 'The number' is interpreted by him as meaning 'the congregation'. He concludes that the temple from which the Saviour addresses Peter is the spiritual temple, the Pleroma, in which the congregation of the highest God dwells.[72] This 'number' could also be read as a reference to the souls which have returned to the Pleroma and are gathered in eternal contemplation of the highest God.[73]

In her study on the Gnostic exegesis of the Gospel of John, Pagels pays attention to 'the temple as an image of the ecclesia'. According to her, in Gnosticism, the temple is the

---

[65] Shellrude 1986, 229f.

[66] See Ch.4 on genre.

[67] See also Krause 1983, 628: "Das Geschehen spielt sich nicht in Ekstase oder Traum ab".

[68] See the commentary and the Gramm. Ann. on 84.12f. for a discussion of the possible meanings of this phrase.

[69] Schenke 1975b, 123-138.

[70] o.c. 131

[71] Brashler 1977, 135. See also Brashler '96, 219.

[72] o.c. 134. See also Gramm. Ann. 70.16,18.

[73] See my commentary on 71.9-15 and 74.9 and Ch. 6.3.3.

symbol of the inner self and, at the same time, of the Pleroma.[74] This supports the view that the temple in Apoc.Pet. could be the heavenly temple. The interpretation by Dubois takes the same direction: he construes the first words of Apoc.Pet. as follows: The sitting of Jesus in the temple reminds the reader of the Gospel tradition and evokes the familiar image of Jesus' teaching. At the same time Dubois considers the opening constellation a symbolic reference to the Pleromatic temple, the Pleromatic foundation of the Gnostic community to which the text is addressed. About the two difficult words CⲘⲚⲈ and CⲦⲨⲀⲞⲤ he says: " (...) et voir dans les deux termes CⲘⲚⲈ et CⲦⲨⲀⲞⲤ deux indications synonymes du temple lui-même, (...)".[75] It obviously is more difficult to explain the numbers (the threehundredth, the tenth pillar) in the preamble. Nonetheless, this view seems to be the most promising.[76] Indeed, there are some elements in the text which indicate that the temple where the Saviour is sitting is the heavenly temple; for instance, the statement that the Saviour was "resting on the number of the living undefiled greatness" (70.17-19) may suggest a Pleromatic setting. Especially when "the number of ..." is interpreted as a reference to the souls who have returned to their origin and who are glorifying the highest God. Furthermore, in the phrase ⲠⲈⲒⲠⲀⲎⲢⲰⲘⲀ ⲚⲦⲈ ⳦ⲘⲚ̄ⲦⲘⲈ, "this Pleroma of Truth" (71.2-3), the demonstrative ⲠⲈⲒ- possibly has an anaphoric meaning. It could very well be referring to the Pleroma already hinted at in the opening lines. This interpretation is supported by the occurrence in Apoc.Pet. of vision accounts, a literary form widespread in apocalyptic texts. In Jewish apocalypses visions are usually experienced during a state of trance or in a dream.[77] So, if Apoc.Pet. is read as an apocalyptic text, it is quite possible that the temple is the heavenly temple, perceived by Peter during an ecstatic vision. It has to be kept in mind, however, that any interpretation is seriously hampered by the obscurity of the vocabulary in the opening lines.

70.20-22

The first words of the Saviour have the form of a traditional beatitude as it occurs for example in Mt 5.3-10. They introduce a description of the origin and nature of 'the ones who

---

[74] Pagels 1973, 68-71.

[75] Dubois 1982, 388. For support of this view he refers to 1 Tim 3.15. In an appendix to this lecture he is opposed, however, by Vergote 1982, 393, who does not think it possible to parallel CⲘⲚⲈ with CⲚ̄ⲦⲈ (foundation). Vergote translates: "Alors que le Sauveur était assis dans le Temple, dans la cinquième partie de la construction, correspondant à (littéralement: et la correspondance de) la 10e collonne".

[76] See Gramm. Ann. 70.15, 16 and 17 for a discussion of CⲘⲚⲈ, CⲦⲨⲀⲞⲤ and ⳦ⲘⲀⲦⲈ.

[77] IV Ezra; Asc.Jes. VI,11; Daniel 7-12 etc. Cf. however the Greek/Ethiopic Apocalypse of Peter where no indication of dream or trance can be found. See also Ch. 4.

are from life' (70.24), which runs from 70.20 unto 71.3. The expression "above the heavens" may refer to the Pleroma which is conceived of in Gnostic mythology as a place exalted beyond the heavens. Note that the 'blessed ones' are *above* the heavens. This conforms with Treat.Seth 69.21-22 (NHC VII,2), in which it is said that the Son of Man is *above the heavens* (ЄТХОСЄ ⲀⲚⲦⲠⲎⲨЄ), and it completes the grammatical argument that ⲤⲀⲦⲠЄ cannot be the stative of ⲤⲰⲦⲠ (choose) because 'heaven's chosen ones' cannot refer to the ones who belong to the Father (70.21f.) but only to the archons.[78]

70.23-25

These lines describe the role and position of the Father and his relationship with the Saviour.[79] The Saviour is the instrument through which the Father reveals life to "the ones who are from the life".[80]

70.25-71.3

This passage contains two phrases which each can be explained in different ways. The first phrase is ⲠⲎ ЄⲦХООⲢ (70.27), the second problematic passage is ЄⲨϢООⲠ ЄⲂⲞⲖ ⲈⲘ ⲠХⲒⲤЄ ⲚϢⲀХЄ ⲚⲒⲘ (71.1-2).

ⲠⲎ ЄⲦХООⲢ most likely is a designation of the Pleroma. Therefore, I have translated the lines 70.26-27 as follows: "those who are built on what is strong" (viz. the Pleroma). A second possibility is that these words refer to Peter: "those who are built on him who is strong" (viz. Peter). In this case the parenthesis in 70.25-27: ЄⲦЄ ⲚⲦⲞⲞⲨ ⲠЄⲦⲞⲨⲔⲰⲦ ⲘⲘⲞⲞⲨ ⲚⲈⲢⲀⲒ ⲈⲘ ⲠⲎ ЄⲦХООⲢ implies that Peter is the strong foundation on which the living ones are built. This is repeated in 71.15-21 where Peter is called as the first one of "a rest" which has to be brought to knowledge. However, we reject this last interpretation because the relevant words form part of a speech of the Saviour who adresses Peter in the second person singular. A change of perspective in 70.25-27 to a third person singular also referring to Peter seems rather awkward.

The second problem is found in the lines 70.29-71.3. We read "they shall distinguish words of injustice and transgression of law from justice - because they come from above - <and> all the words of this Pleroma of Truth". In this passage the words ⲈⲰⲤ ЄⲨϢООⲠ ЄⲂⲞⲖ ⲈⲘ ⲠХⲒⲤЄ (70.32-71.1) are read as a parenthesis, describing the origin of "the ones who are from the life". ⲠХⲒⲤЄ (71.1 "above") is likely to be a designation of the Pleroma.

---

[78] See Gramm. Ann. 70.22.

[79] See Ch. 6 on the Christology of Apoc.Pet.

[80] See Gramm. Ann. 70.23.

The opposition which has to be distinguished (70.29f.), then, is between "words of injustice and transgression of law", on the one hand, and "justice (...) <and> all the words of this Pleroma of Truth", on the other hand. This renders a smooth translation which is only possible, however, by changing the Coptic text. The particle N̄- before ϢⲀⲬⲈ (71.2) has to be emended to ⲘⲚ̄ ("and").[81]

71.3-9

"Because they were illumined graciously by him whom the principalities seek and did not find" (71.3-7) is a subordinated clause, connected with the subject of the preceding sentences: that is to say, it explains the special nature of 'the ones who are from the life' (70.24). The adverbial phrase ⳞⲚ̄ ⲞⲨ† ⲘⲈⲦⲈ, (translated here as: 'graciously') which is frequently used in Gnostic texts to indicate a quality of the highest God, supports this view.[82] Noteworthy is the use of the perfect tense in these and the following lines ⲈⲀⲨⲬⲒ ⲞⲨⲞⲈⲒⲚ "they were illumined" 71.3f.; ⲈⲘⲠⲞⲨϬⲚ̄Ⲧϥ̄ "they did not find him" 71.6f.; Ⲙ̄ⲠⲞⲨϢⲀⲬⲈ Ⲙ̄ⲘⲞϥ "he was not mentioned" 71.7. The perfect tense may suggest that the Saviour already appeared earlier in the history of mankind in order to bring *gnosis*.[83] This may also explain the words in 70.18-19 where the Saviour is "resting on the number of the living undefiled greatness"; 'the number' could be a reference to the souls which have returned to their Pleromatic origin.[84] Another phrase which also seems more meaningful from this perspective, ⲠⲒⲔⲈⲤⲈⲈⲠⲈ ('the others' 71.20), possibly functions as an indication of the fact that part of the Gnostics have already returned to their Pleromatic origin and only 'the others', of whom Peter is the first one, are left to be saved.

Another aspect worth discussing is the change of perspective in 71.5. Here, the Saviour starts to speak about himself in the third person singular. At the same time the theme changes from statements about "the ones who are from the life" (70.17-71.4) to the relationship between the Saviour and his enemies, the archons (71.4-7): the archons sought him but could not find him. This could imply that on earlier occasions the Saviour also appeared in disguise. The inferiority of the archons is illustrated by their unability to find him. In line with this we read that the Saviour is not mentioned in any generation of the prophets (71.7-9). This shows a negative evaluation of the (Old Testament) prophets, probably because they are viewed as messengers of the demiurge. Just like the archons, the prophets do not know

---

[81] For a discussion of an alternative translation which considers Ⲛ̄ϢⲀⲬⲈ an object of ⲈⲨⲈⲤⲞⲨⲰⲚ see Gramm. Ann. 71.1f.

[82] See Gramm. Ann. 70.16-17.

[83] See also the past tense ⲈⲀⲈⲒ†ⲘⲈⲈⲨⲈ ("for I reminded") in 70.25.

[84] See my commentary above and Ch. 6.3.3.

the Saviour and they have not recognized him, although he appeared in their times. This explanation is supported by other texts from Nag Hammadi viz. Hyp. Arch. (II,4) and Orig. World (II,5) where the archons try to capture the spiritual Eve but fail to do so, not recognizing her Pleromatic nature.[85] In these texts Sophia or Eve is a Pleromatic being and, as such, an enemy of the archons. In Orig. World the archons try to rape the spiritual Eve, but she laughs at them and enters into the tree of knowledge. Next, it is told that the archons rape the earthly Eve, thinking that she is 'the true Eve' (117.2). The passage ends in 117.12-15: "And they (the archons) erred, not knowing that it was their own body that they had defiled".[86] The parallel with Apoc.Pet.'s crucifixion account is clear.[87] There can be no doubt that in Apoc.Pet. the Saviour is conceived of as the pneumatic opponent of the archontic powers.

This also provides us with a possible explanation of the change of perspective. It is possible that the Saviour is speaking in these lines about his Pleromatic aspect to which he refers as another person. This is in line with the idea that the Saviour appears in disguise and that therefore the archons cannot seize him. In the last part of Apoc.Pet. where the crucifixion of the Saviour is depicted, similar ideas return (81.29-82.3; 83.1-8). The archons fail to capture the real Saviour. They only crucify his 'substitute', viz. the material body from which the living Jesus has escaped, laughing at the ignorance of his crucifiers.[88]

A change of perspective, as initiated in 71.5, has been noticed by Speyer as occurring regularly in apocalyptic texts: "Die Ich-Rede ist aber in verschiedenen jüdischen Schriften merkwürdig mit einem Fremdbericht verknüpft. Manche Forscher sind der Meinung, daß hier derselbe Verfasser von sich bald in der ersten Person, bald in der dritten spreche".[89] Although in Apoc.Pet. it is not the assumed author who speaks about himself in the third person singular, but the Saviour, the case very much resembles the Testament of Isaac.[90] Note also

---

[85] Hyp.Arch. II,4: 89.19-30; Orig.World II,5: 116.10-34. Cf. also the unnoticed activity of Epinoia in Ap.John (NHC II,1) 20.17-28; 22.28-24.15.

[86] NHLE, 183. Cf. Apoc.Pet. 82.1-3.

[87] See Ch.6.

[88] Cf. Acts of Andrew where it is narrated that Andrew laughs when he is crucified because Aegeates, his prosecutor, does not seem to know that "the man Jesus cannot be punished". (Narr., Ep.Gr., Mart. II). James 1955, 360.

[89] Speyer 1977, 211.

[90] Testament of Isaac III, 3.6: "The angel said to *him*"; IX, 5.6: "The angel said to *me*, look and see these others too. And when *I* had looked at them, the angel said to *him*". Sparks 1984, 429,435 (italics are mine, hwh). The same phenomenon can be found for example in the Apocalypse of Ezra, in the Ethiopic Enoch and in the book of Jubilees.

the interpretation of this phenomenon in Apoc.Pet. by Schönborn.[91] He considers the change of perspective as a signal directed at the reader of Apoc.Pet. It is meant to compel the reader's attention to an important point of the story. The lines directly following the change of perspective are considered to be among the most important of the whole story, viz. the vocation of Peter.

An altogether different explanation is that this change of perspective is the result of the uncritical use of an existing text. As a support for this we notice that these lines show a change of topic viz. a change from general remarks concerning the nature of the Gnostics and the mission of the Saviour to a mythological description of the struggle between the Saviour and the archontic powers.

71.9-15

In this passage, speaking about the revelation of the Son of Man,[92] the third person style is continued. This supports our proposal that the reference is to a Pleromatic aspect which has to be distinguished from the Saviour who narrates the story.[93] In Gnostic texts from the second century the Son of Man designation appears to be more popular[94] than in non-Gnostic Christian texts from the same period. Borsch observes that, "for the most part, the usage of the Son of Man title among the Gnostics was not directly dependent upon the Son of Man sayings now contained in the canonical Gospels, however much this Gnostic usage may otherwise depend on Christian tradition". He mentions a few exceptions among Gnostic texts which use the Son of Man title but show some form of relationship with Son of Man logia now found in the canonical Gospels.[95]

The 'Son of Man' title in Apoc.Pet. should also be reckoned among these exceptions. As will be argued in Chapter 5, the use of the title Son of Man as a designation of the Saviour, is part of a structural allusion to Mt 16.13-20. The title has been adapted to its new context, for it is told that the Son of Man is raised above the heavens, an overtly Gnostic image

---

[91] Schönborn 1987, 310-311.

[92] See Caragounis 1986 for a presentation of recent research on the concept 'Son of Man'.

[93] See Ch. 6 for a detailed discussion of the different aspects of the Saviour.

[94] Compare for example: Nag Hammadi Codices I 3.14,20; 44,23; 46,15; II 25,1; 63,30; 76,1,2; 81,14-17; 81,13; 135,17; 136,21; VII 63,6; 64,12; 71,12; IX 30,18; 31,7; 32,[23]; 36,[24]; 37,[28]; 41,3; 60,6; 61,[10]; 68,11; 72,26; XIII 49,19; BG 124,2,6 et al. (Siegert 1982 74,75).

[95] Borsch 1970, 111.

which can also be found in Treat.Seth.[96] The words "in a <multitude> of people of the same substance" (71.13-15) give us an indication of the anthropology of Apoc.Pet.[97] The living ones are described as people who are consubstantial with the divine. The Son of Man who is exalted above the heavens, is connected spiritually with these people.[98] The theme of spiritual unity will return in the digression on the fate of the soul in Apoc.Pet. 75.7-76.23. The reading of these words (71.13-15) as a description of a spiritual unity in the Pleroma is understandable from a Gnostic point of view.

I have interpreted the phrase 'who is exalted above the heavens' as a parenthesis. In this case the lines 71.9-15 run as follows: He has appeared now in these ones: 1) in the Revealed One, who is the Son of Man - who is exalted above the heavens - (and he has appeared) 2) in a <multitude> of people of the same substance. The idea of the Son of Man appearing (on earth), in a multitude of (Gnostic) people, directs our attention to the following explanation of the passage. It is possibly a hidden reference to the Petrine Gnostics who form a spiritual unity on earth. In this case the phrase would be a first indication in our text that the Petrine Gnostics have a clear awareness of their forming a distinct group.[99] However, if we understand the text in this way, the transition to the next words, "You too, Peter, become perfect ..." (71.15f.), is difficult to explain. Therefore it must be kept in mind that the "people of the same substance" could also be regarded as the already saved Gnostic souls. This explains the "You too" by which words the Saviour instructs Peter to become perfect.

71.15-21 (Vocation of Peter)

These lines return to the first person perspective. The Saviour addresses Peter again and explains his position and commission in words which remind us of the vocation of Peter in Matthew's Gospel.[100] Peter is called as the first one of "the others" which are called to knowledge. "The others" (71.20) do not have to be identical with "the living ones who are from the life" (70.24), or with the "people of the same substance" (71.14-15), who may already be saved. It is possible that a different group is intended here which still has to be brought to knowledge by Peter who is addressed as the first one of this group.

As observed above, in 70.23-24 mention is made of "(him) who has revealed life to those

---

[96] One of the occurrences of 'Son of Man' in Treat.Seth. comes close to its use in Apoc.Pet.: ΑΝΟΚ ΙC ΠΕΧΡC ΠϢΗΡΕ ΜΠΡΩΜΕ ΕΤΧΟCΕ ΑΝΠΗΥΕ (I am Jesus, the Christ, the Son of Man who is raised above the heavens). Treat.Seth (VII,2) 69,21-22; Cf. also 63,5-6 and 65,18-19.

[97] See Gramm. Ann. 71.10f., 14.

[98] Cf. Apoc.Pet. 74.7-9.

[99] See Ch. 7.3.

[100] See Ch. 5.

who are from the life". This sentence reflects a well-known Gnostic idea, namely that people who stem from the Pleroma and, therefore, form part of the pneumatic reality, still have to be saved.[101] "The others" which are mentioned here may therefore consist of living ones who have not yet been brought to knowledge. The alternative interpretation of 71.14-15 which explains "people of the same substance" as a reference to the spiritually united group of the Petrine Gnostics also fits in this explanation. They apparently form a distinct group with a potential for receiving *gnosis.*

I render 71.15-17 as: "You too Peter, become perfect, in accordance with (?) your name, just like me".[102] By becoming perfect, Peter is united with the Saviour as well as with the people who have the same substance as the Revealed One (71.9-15). "You too" refers in this interpretation both to the foregoing passage and to the "just like me" that follows.

This leaves unexplained the words in 71.16-17: N̄ϨΡλϊ ϨM̄ ΠΕΚΡλΝ "in accordance with your name".[103] These words led Smith to believe that "we must assume that the author had in mind an esoteric, Gnostic, etymological explanation of the name, the significance of which is lost to us".[104] It is, however, not necessary that one has to assume such an esoteric explanation of Peter's name. (N̄)ΤΕλΙΟC, 'perfect' (71.16) might also be associated with the Greek meaning of the name Peter (πέτρος): rock, a word evoking notions like 'strength' and 'perfection'.[105]

71.22-25

The "imitator of righteousness" can be equated with the Jesus of the Gospel. The imitator is a sort of 'pseudo Saviour', a substitute (83.5-6);[106] Peter seems to obtain a warning from the Saviour against this imitator. The imitator apparently tries to deceive Peter in that he imitates "the one who called you before (or: first)". We assume here a reference to the distinction between the material Jesus, held in honour by non-Gnostic Christianity and the spiritual Saviour, revered by the Gnostic group behind Apoc.Pet. The contrast between the

---

[101] Cf. Rudolph 1983, 113f.

[102] See Gramm. Ann. 71.16-17.

[103] The notable preposition N̄ϨΡλϊ ϨM̄, which will appear to be very common in Apoc.Pet., resists a straightforward understanding. See Gramm. Ann. 78.3.

[104] Smith 1985, 132.

[105] Mt 16.18; cf. Mt 7.24. See also the introduction where I refer to the Acts Pet. 12 Apost. (NHC VI,1 9.1-15) in which text a similar reference to Peter's name can be found.

[106] Cf. Schönborn 1987, 309.

spiritual Saviour and the material Jesus, the imitator, is one of the themes which recur several times in the course of our text.[107]

71.25-72.4

These cryptic, perhaps corrupt lines seem to render a Gnostic interpretation of the crucifixion of Jesus. It is very likely that they form a syntactic whole. This is indicated by the enumeration with MN̄, and the common reference of 'he' and 'his' in 71.25, 26, 28, 29, 32 and 33. All pronouns seem to refer to either the spiritual or the material Saviour. As such, this passage might be a summary of what Peter has to know about the difference between the spiritual and the material Saviour which becomes manifest during the crucifixion.

"The distance that separates him" (71.27-28) refers in this view to the distinction between the material body of Jesus and the living Saviour and so forecasts the elaborate Christology at the end of Apoc.Pet.[108]

The next phrase "the nerves of his hands and his feet" (71.28-30) refers to the crucified body of Jesus.

"The crowning by the ones of the middle" (71.30-32) may represent the crowning of Jesus by the Roman soldiers with a crown of thorns (Mt. 27.29). The Middle, at least in Valentinian teaching, is the region between the Pleroma and the physical world, also called 'the heavens'. According to the Gospel of Philip, it is the place of death.[109]

"His body of light" (71.32-33), finally, refers to the living Saviour who is unaffected by the crucifixion.[110] The light image is reminiscent of Jewish angel representations.[111]

Because of its specific content and structure we take into consideration the possibility that the text from ЄⲀϤⲦⲀϨⲘЄⲔ "he called you" (71.25) to ⲦⲒⲤⲰⲘⲀ ⲚⲦЄ ⲦⲢⲞⲨⲞЄⲒⲚ ⲚⲦⲀϤ "his body of light" (71.32-33) is an interpolation. In this case the anacoluthon of

---

[107] See especially 83.4-15.

[108] See Gramm. Ann. 71.27f. Cf. Brashler 1996, 223.

[109] Gos.Phil. (NHC II,3) 66.15,20; 76.[36]. See also Orig.World (NHC II, 5) 109.17,18; Paraph.Shem (NHC VII,1) 6.13; 13.4,16 et al.

[110] Brashler suggests that in this passage (71.25-33) a threefold Christology and anthropology is unfolded. This view interprets the whole text in the light of a Valentinian threefold division of the saviour and of mankind as well. See Ch. 6 where I argue that here a twofold rather than a threefold division is presupposed.

[111] Cf. Perkins 1980, 45. Further on in the text (72.23-27), where Peter experiences a vision in which he sees a light descending on the revealer, the Pleromatic aspect of the Saviour is probably indicated. Cf. also Ch. 6: my discussion of 82.9-14 where 'radiant light' is mentioned as a quality of the Pleromatic Saviour.

71.25 is connected with 71.33-72.4: "of him who called you before (...) to his likeness".[112] We could assume that here a resemblance between Peter and the Saviour is intended which we already encountered in 71.15-18 ("You too Peter, become perfect (...) just like me, the one who has chosen you".). Although this explanation may seem attractive, interpretational problems remain.

Earlier authors have noticed the 'three times' and 'this night' and have tried to connect these words with the treason of Peter in the night before the crucifixion. However, the subject of the verb **COO2E** (reprove?) is not Peter but the Saviour. Furthermore the verb is not known to translate any Greek word meaning 'to betray' or 'to commit treason'.[113] Therefore, the grounds for the above-mentioned interpretation are weak. Even more difficult to construe is the sentence: "in hope of a service because of an earning of honour" (71.34-72.2). It is possible that a reference to the betrayal of Jude is intended here. The words 'hope of' and 'earning' give rise to this speculation.

3.2.2 Account of Vision and Audition (72.4-73.14)

The passage 72.4-73.14 is structured by several repetitive elements. It is enclosed by the characterization of the priests, the scribes and the people as blind and deaf ones (72.10-13 and 73.12-14). In between these lines are a vision account and an account of an audition. Initially, both the vision and the audition account are unsuccesful, but in a second instance Peter understands what he perceives.

72.4-20

Peter sees the priests and the people approaching them with stones and this frightens him. He, apparently, is witness to the events preceding the crucifixion but he does not know how to interpret them; this ignorance of Peter is a recurring motif in Apoc.Pet.[114] The Saviour tells him that the priests and the people are blind (72.10-13). This qualification will return as a characteristic feature of the opponents in the monologue of the Saviour.[115]

---

[112] See W.P. Funk 1976, 31 and 138 who, in his commentary on 2 Apoc.Jas. (NHC V,4) 54.12-14: **λϥλΜλ2ΤΕ ΜΜΟΟΥ λΥω λϥΤλΜΙΟΟΥ ΕΥΕΙΝΕ ΜΜΟϥ·**, points at the difficulty of translating as a noun. Because of **ΜΜΟϥ** it should be read as a verb. Funk translates 2 Apoc.Jas. (NHC V,4) 54.13: "Er gestaltete sie so, daß sie ihm glichen".

[113] See Gramm. Ann. 72.2f. Cf. Brashler 1996, 223 who renders **COO2E** as "to correct".

[114] See 79.32-80.7; 80.32f.; 81.26-28.

[115] Apoc.Pet. 76.20-23; 81.29-30. Cf. 73.13-14; 83.3. See also Piper 1989, 216 n.134. Blindness is a common feature of adversaries in the texts from Nag Hammadi. Cf. Teach.Silv.(NHC VII,4) 88.20-22, Gosp.Thom.(NHC II,2) 34. Used as such in other texts as well: Ps 145.8; Philo, Jos., Orig. See Ch. 5.

Thereupon we read that Peter is told to put his hands over his eyes (72.15). In the next line the Revealer gives him the instruction to "say what you see" (72.16f.).[116] Peter, however, does not see anything (72.15-20). This unsuccessful attempt reminds us of the Gospel tradition in which Peter and the other disciples are rebuked for their ignorance and lack of faith.[117] This initial failure functions also as a literary means to increase tension. In the events to come, Peter will get to know step by step the real meaning of the suffering of Jesus.

72.20-28

In the second instance Peter is successful: he experiences fear in joy, and he sees a bright light coming down onto the Saviour. These are traditional elements of an epiphany.[118] A noteworthy parallel of this scene, with the same succession of failure and success in grasping the content of a revelation, is found in 2 Apoc.Jas. (NHC V,4) 57.4-20: "Behold, I shall reveal to you everything, my beloved. [Understand] and know them [that] you may come forth just as I am. Behold, I [shall] reveal to you him who [is hidden]. But now, 'stretch out your [hand]. Now, take hold of me'. [And] then I stretched out my hands and I did not find him as I thought (he would be). But afterward I heard him saying, 'understand and take hold of me'. Then I understood, and I was afraid. And I was exceedingly joyful".[119]

72.28-73.4

After the epiphany, Peter is instructed to raise his hands (72.29-30). Above I quoted 2 Apoc.Jas. 57.10-11 where a similar instruction occurs. In the Apocalypse of James, however, the stretching out of the hand is literally meant to touch the Saviour. In Apoc.Pet. this raising of hands has the appearance of a ritual action accompanying the receiving of a revelation.

Subsequently, the Saviour instructs Peter to listen to the priests and the people (72.30-73.1).[120] Just like the first attempt to see, this attempt to hear is not successful. Peter hears the priests and how the people are screaming but he does not understand the real meaning of what he hears. The recurrently bemused reaction of Peter functions as a reference to

---

[116] See Gramm. Ann. 72.15.

[117] Especially in the Gospel of Mark: 4.40; 6,6.52; 8,14-21; 9,6.10.18.19.32; 10,32. See also Ep.Pet.Phil.(NHC VIII,2) 135.5-9.

[118] Cf. for example Gospel texts: Mt 17.1-2,6 and parallels; Mt 28.8. Nag Hammadi texts: especially NHC V,4 57.15-20; V,5 65.26-66.15 et al. See for more details Semeia 14 (1979), 28, 148; Perkins 1980, Chart 1 and 2, and Chapter 4 of the present study.

[119] NHLE 274.

[120] In apocalypses an epiphany is often followed by an audition. See Ch. 4.

tradition,[121] and, just as in 72.4-20, as a tension-increasing device. This command to 'listen' (72.30-31) reminds one of the 'hearing-formula' in, for instance, the Book of Revelation in the New Testament: "He who has an ear, let him hear".[122] The function of this formula has usually been interpreted as a signal, indicating to hearers and readers that a text contains a deeper meaning.[123]

73.4-14

The second audition is successful. After another preparatory instruction: "Prick up the ears of your head and listen to the things they say" (73.6-8), Peter is again listening to the priests and crowds, but this time he does not hear the screaming of the crowds, but he hears that "you are glorified while you are sitting".[124] This glorifying stands in clear contrast with the screaming of 73.4. The content of what Peter hears is somewhat enigmatic. The sitting reminds us of the first words of the text where the Saviour possibly is seated in a Pleromatic environment.[125]

The verb ϯ ⲈⲞⲞⲨ ('to glorify') points towards a Pleromatic setting as well. It occurs six times in Apoc.Pet. and in most of these instances it appears in a similar context, for instance in 74.8-9, where it is told of Christ that he will be glorified (ⲈⲨϯ ⲈⲞⲞⲨ) in ⲀⲠⲞⲔⲀⲦⲀⲤⲦⲀⲤⲓⲤ ('restoration'), a specifically Pleromatic situation. In 82.16f. ϯ ⲈⲞⲞⲨ is also used in a scene situated in the Pleroma, viz. after the description of the vision of the Pleromatic Saviour. In 73.21-23 it is said of Peter that he will be glorified (ⲈⲨϯ ⲈⲞⲞⲨ) in 'knowledge' while in 'these aeons' he will be cursed (73.18-20).

From this it may be derived that the glorifying, which Peter perceives here, takes place on a Pleromatic level. Apparently Peter succeeds during this second audition in grasping a deeper meaning in what he is hearing. The passage is meant as a foreshadowing of the later

---

[121] See note 118.

[122] This formula occurs eight times in the Book of Revelation: 2.7, 11, 17, 29; 3.6, 13, 22; 13.9. Cf. Gos.Thom. (NHC II,2) Logion 8, 21, 24, 63, 65, 96. Soph.Jes.Chr. (NHC III,4) 97.20; 98.20; 105.9-10; BG: 107.18 and the canonical Gospels: Mk 4.9, 23; Mt 11.15; 13.9, 43; Lk 8.8, 14,35.

[123] Enroth 1990, 609-613.

[124] See Gramm. Ann. 73.9.

[125] The verb ⲘⲞⲞⳠ is likely to have evoked associations of (doctrinal) authority and teaching. It occurs in two other cases. In 73.2f. it applies to the priests and scribes. In the other instance (79.30) sitting is a quality of bishops and deacons. This 'sitting' is used in a special way, for, in all four cases, including the 'sitting' of the Saviour, it is said of highly placed persons: the Saviour, the priests and scribes, and the bishops and deacons. The Greek κάθημαι is used like this in Rev. 18.7 where it is said of the wicked Babylon: κάθημαι βασίλισσα: I sit (enthroned as) a queen. See also Rev. chs. 4 and 5 where 'sitting enthroned' is a quality of God. Cf. Dubois 1982, 386-387.

visions connected with the crucifixion (82.3-17). The purport of these words of the Saviour is that Peter does not have to fear the present threat to which he is exposed. In these instances the verb ϯ ЄΟΟY is also associated with the Saviour. The passage ends with a second characterization of the priests, the scribes and the people as deaf and blind ones.

3.2.3 Monologue of the Saviour and Peter's Reaction (73.14-81.3)

73.14-73.22 (Introduction)

These lines form the introduction to the long discourse of the Saviour in which the opponents of the Petrine Gnostics are criticised. They contain esoteric motifs: the assignment to listen to the things that will be told in a mystery, the prohibition to tell the things which will be revealed to people outside the own circle and the typically Gnostic contrast between the lack of knowledge of the children of these aeons and the 'praising in knowledge'. This 'praising in knowledge' (73.21-23) can be understood here in a temporal way, as something which will take place in an eschatological era. The phrase might also have a spatial meaning; it could be a depiction of the Pleroma. Shellrude states that Gnostic texts do not employ the esoteric motif by which it is ordered to restrict the circulation of the text until the eschatological era.[126] However, the passage under discussion seems to refer to confinement of the message to such an era: "Do not tell them to the children of this aeon" (73.17-18).

If only the formal structure of the following part of the text were taken into consideration, it could be endorsed that the opponents of the Petrine Gnostics consist of six or seven groups or factions. However, when we study the characteristic traits of the various 'groups', it appears to be possible to conceive of them as one organisational unity, in which different beliefs are tolerated. A slightly different view is held by Koschorke.[127] He also argues that the formal division in six or seven groups is only a matter of literary composition and style. However, in his opinion all statements about adversaries actually refer to orthodox Christian leaders. Schönborn denies any historical reality for the polemic in Apoc.Pet. He believes that the author designed a fictitious scenery which serves to illustrate that the outside world represents an ongoing process of change and uncertainty while the Gnostic inner self remains stable and undivided.[128] Brashler and Shellrude hold a different view.[129] According to them

---

[126] Cf. Shellrude 1986, 240, who mentions Apoc.Pet. 83.15-18 where Jesus tells Peter that the revelation is only to be circulated within the Gnostic community. He continues: "However, the formulation of this motif is not sufficiently distinctive to indicate that it was based on the traditional apocalypse. None of these Gnostic texts employ the more distinctive motif of a restriction of the circulation of the text until the eschatological era". Cf. for similar formulae Dan. 12.4 and IV Ezra 1,57-59.

[127] Koschorke 1978, esp. 80-90.

[128] Schönborn 1987, 416.

it is possible that the polemic is directed against different orthodox and Gnostic groups.[130]

73.23-74.22 (General characterization of the opponents)

The most important impediment in interpreting these lines as referring to a specific group is the vague way in which personal pronouns are used. These undetermined references are understandable if the passage is taken to be a general introduction to the actual 'heresy-story'. This is supported by the next pages (74.22-79.31) which seem to form the heart of the polemic with their orderly structure: some ..., some ..., others ... etc. In this introductory pericope the doctrinal position of the Petrine Gnostics is called 'our word' (73.25). It is presented as the original and pure faith while it is told that many, who initially joined the group behind Apoc.Pet., have left 'our word' again (73.23-26).[131]

"The Father of their error" (73.27-28) possibly refers to the demiurgic God of the opponents of the Petrine Gnostics. This God can be equated with the creator God of the Old Testament, who in Gnostic texts is depicted as blind and conceited. Characteristic features of the demiurge are his boasting that he is the only God and his ignorance of the Pleromatic world. As such he is contrasted with the highest God of the Gnostics who is also called 'Father' a title which is often extended with an epithet like 'Father of truth', 'Father of Light' or, in Apoc.Pet.: "the incorruptible Father" (80.25-26).[132] The mention here, of the "Father of their error" may be interpreted as a general reference to the belief of the proto-orthodox Christian opponents of the Petrine Gnostics.

The "servants of the word" is apparently a reference to Luke 1.2.[133] But Koschorke believes that this expression refers to the (Petrine) Gnostics themselves.[134] He probably makes this observation because he reads 'servant' as a positive qualification. In my view, the 'servants of the word' are the opponents of Apoc.Pet. This would also explain the 'disclosing' of these servants in a judgement (73.29-32) in a less far-fetched manner. The problem in this case, however, is that the "Father of their error" cannot obviously be the one who discloses the servants of the word in his judgement. So, we have to assume a change of subject in ϥΝΑΟΥΟΝϨΟΥ "he will disclose them" (73.29). Not the demiurge, but the highest God is the one who is going to pass sentence on the (putative) servants of the word. The lines 73.32-

---

[129] Brashler 1977, 216-235; Shellrude 1986, 245-253.

[130] See Ch. 7 for a more detailed discussion of the several points of view on the identity of the adversaries.

[131] See Gramm. Ann. 73.24, 26.

[132] See Funk 1976, 199-210.

[133] See Ch. 5 for a discussion of this interpretation.

[134] Koschorke 1978, 84 n. 5.

74.6 seem to refer to a situation in which the Petrine Gnostics and the (proto) orthodox Christians belong to one community.[135] The verb **MOYXб** means 'mix' and its stative, used in 74.1, can be rendered as "be conjoined". The ones who will be conjoined with "the servants of the word" will become their "prisoners", a not very specific, but clearly negative expression. The cause of this imprisonment is that they have become **ΛΝΕϹΘΗΤΟΝ**, "without perception" (74.3).[136] This designation has a parallel in the designation of the opponents in Apoc.Pet. as blind and deaf.[137] The whole phrase (73.32-74.3) could be read as a reference to a transition of Petrine Gnostics to the hostile (orthodox Christian) side, formulated in terms that suggest struggle and oppression. It is difficult to determine if events are described here that have taken place in reality. The suggestion that the Petrine Gnostics were oppressed by their adversaries may also have been motivated by the polemical goal of the text.

ΠΙΛΚΕΡΛΙΟΝ (74.3f.) is an abstract, impersonal noun 'the purity' but it may refer to a person or to a group of persons, the Gnostics, who are persuaded by the opponents to join them. It can also be understood as a reference to the Saviour 'the pure one'[138] who is pushed towards 'the one who works for death', **ΠΙΡΕϥₚₚΩΒ ΝΤΕ ΠΜΟΥ** (74.6), viz. towards the executioner of the crucifixion. Brashler deduces from this phrase an utterly hostile relationship and bitter struggles, perhaps with real executions, between the people behind Apoc.Pet. and other groups.[139] In these lines two contrasting constellations are depicted. The first scene (73.23-25) describes how many people will become adherents of the Petrine faith. In the second scene (73.25-74.6) it is told that the situation will radically change and that Petrine Gnostics will be oppressed by the servants of the word who have turned away from their former convictions.

"During their reign Christ is glorified in a restoration" (74.7-9), can be paraphrased as follows: as long as the adversaries of the Petrine Gnostics are in power, the Saviour will not be glorified on earth but in the Pleroma. The phrase seems to contain a general reference to a situation in which the opponents are in power.[140] In the Nag Hammadi texts the concept

---

[135] See Ch. 7 for more details about the use of exclusive and inclusive language in Apoc.Pet.

[136] The word occurs in one other Nag Hammadi text, Paraph.Shem (VII, 1) 2.16: "But the crookedness of the Darkness was lack of perception" (NHLE 342).

[137] Apoc.Pet. (81.30); 83.3.

[138] Cf. Gos. Mary in wich **ΠΙΛΚΕΡΛΙΟΝ** ('the Good') refers to the Saviour (Gos. Mary BG 1,7.17).

[139] Brashler 1977, 218.

[140] o.c. 219-220.

apokatastasis is very common.[141] It is an important eschatological image used to describe the ultimate state of bliss the Gnostic is striving after. As such it is used here as well.[142]

The following sentence "And the men of the false proclamation shall be glorified" (74.10-11) continues this thought by stating that as long as the false teachers, the adversaries of the group behind Apoc.Pet., have power, they will be glorified. Not in a state of *apokatastasis*, that is, but on earth. The verb Ⲧ ⲈⲞⲞⲨ is used here in another context than in 73.10, 73.21f. or 74.8 where Peter or the Saviour are the object of this glorification. The text appears to distinguish, perhaps ironically, between a Pleromatic and an earthly 'glory'. This ambiguity can also be observed with regard to concepts like 'God' and 'Father'.[143] It may be occasioned by the dualistic world-view of Apoc.Pet., which will be discussed more extensively in the commentary on 75.7-76.23 and in 3.3.

In 74.13-14 it is said that "they will adhere to the name of a dead man". In the context of Apoc.Pet. this can solely be understood as a reference to the orthodox Christian belief in the crucified Jesus.[144] As such, this short remark explicitly connects the story of the crucifixion in Apoc.Pet. with the monologue of the Saviour about the adversaries.[145] The belief in the name of a dead man will appear to be the core of the conflict between the Petrine Gnostics and their opponents. We will encounter similar notions in the last part of Apoc.Pet. (78.17 and 82.1-3).

τεχνίτης, in Coptic ⲢⲈϤⲢⲦⲈⲬⲚⲎ (74.18f.), means 'craftsman', 'specialist', or, if used as a reference to God, 'designer' or also 'intriguer'.[146] In my translation I have chosen for the last meaning. That a term of abuse is intended appears also from the reproof that they 'lapse into a name of error', which I equally understand as a general disqualification. The accusation of 'a multifarious doctrine' (74.19-20) is another stereotype, recurring in the next line in the words ⲢⲚ ⲞⲨⲘⲚ̄ⲦϨⲈⲢⲈⲤⲒⲤ 'schismatically' (74.21-22). General remarks like this function as an introductory description of the adversaries. After this, the actual enumeration of the

---

[141] Siegert 1982, 217, defines it as 'Wiederherstellung (des Urzustandes)'. Cf: I, 44.31; 123.19.21.27; 128.(30); 133.7. II, 67.18. VI, 74.7. (VII, 74.9). XI, 39.35. Treat.Res. (I, 4) 44.30-34 contains an important example of the use of the term *apokatastasis* rendered as 'restoration': "And that (...) through the Son of Man the restoration to the Pleroma might occur" (NHLE 54).

[142] See Ch. 6.3.3.

[143] Cf. 73.26-28; see Gos.Phil. (NHC II, 3) 53.23-54.5 (par. 11).

[144] Cf. Treat.Seth (NHC VII, 2) 60.21-22.

[145] In Ch. 7 the connection between the crucifixion story in Apoc.Pet. and the monologue of the Saviour will be explained.

[146] See Gramm. Ann. 74.18f.

opponents of the Petrine Gnostics follows. Koschorke interprets ΡΕϥΡΤΕΧΝΗ as a possible designation of Paul, who worked as a craftsman, according to the tradition.[147] He connects this explanation with his identification of the man and the woman in Apoc.Pet. 74.30f.[148] However, the passage is rather vague, therefore its interpretation remains uncertain.

Since we consider this part of Apoc.Pet. to be an introduction to the actual polemic, the last words in 74.22 gain a special weight: "while they are ruled schismatically". In my translation I have placed a colon behind these words after which the description of the opponents follows. The complaint that the original unity falls apart in the course of time, and the statement that the enemies are hopelessly divided are standard rhetorical topoi in religious polemic.[149] Therefore it cannot be expected that after this phrase a precise description of the adversaries will follow. In my view, it illustrates that the structure of this part of the text serves a polemical goal.

74.22-27 (First indication of opponents)

There is nothing in this description which is distinct enough to identify the opponents in question. It is told of the people who are criticized here that "they will taunt the truth" (74.24) and "will say evil things to each other" (74.25-26). Both accusations are standard polemical phrases.

74.27-75.7 (Second indication of opponents)

This passage seems to contain a specific description of a certain group; however, a satisfying identification is hard to provide.

The man and woman mentioned here are generally thought to be the leaders of a rivalling Gnostic group. They are identified as Simon the magician and his companion, Helena.[150] This couple is considered traditionally to be the founders of Simonian Gnosticism. Tradition says about Helena that she was the same Helena on behalf of whom the Trojan war was started. As a heavenly being she transmigrates from one body to another.[151] This might explain the

---

[147] Cf. Acts 18.3; 20.34, 1 Cor. 4.12; 9.6; 1 Thes. 2.9; 2 Thes. 3.8. See Werner 1974, 575, and Koschorke 1978, 39ff. who remarks however, that a polemic against Paul in Apoc.Pet. cannot be settled with certainty but is only a possibility worth to be discussed.

[148] See my commentary below on the second indication of opponents.

[149] Perkins 1985, 194.

[150] Brashler 1977, 223; Pearson 1975, 145-154; Shellrude 1986, 225.

[151] Cf. Iren. Adv. Haer. I, 23, 2: *"Hic Helenam (...) transmigraret in altera muliebra corpora. (...) Fuisse autem eam et in illa Helena, propter quam Troianum contractum est bellum"*. Lüdemann 1975, 17: "Der Syrische

use of the adjective ⲚⲞⲨⲘⲎⲎϢⲈ ⲘⲘⲞⲢⲫⲎ (πολύμορφος) in Apoc.Pet. 74.32-34.[152] In this view the nakedness of the woman and the adjective ⲚⲞⲨⲘⲎⲎϢⲈ ⲚⲚⲘⲔⲀϨ (πολυπαθής) (74.31f. and 33f.) could be referring to the tradition in which it is told that Helena once was a prostitute.[153]

In chapter 7, where it is suggested that all seven groups formed one organisational unity, it will be explained how such a Gnostic (Simonian) group could be part of a proto-orthodox Christian community.

Koschorke, who looks upon the man as Simon the magician as well, considers this name a hidden reference to Paul.[154] In connection with this, he mentions the couple Paul and Thecla.[155]

The next phrase is equally difficult to explain. "And those who say these things will ask about dreams. When they say that a dream has come from a demon worthy of their error, then destruction shall be given to them instead of immortality" (74.34-75.7). A partial parallel (viz. of 75.2-7) can be found in Gal. 1.8: "But even if we or an angel from heaven, should preach to you a gospel contrary to that which we preached to you, let him be accursed".[156] In this Pauline verse, everybody who proclaims a deviant teaching is accursed. Although Apoc.Pet. 75.2-7 does not show verbatim parallels, the purport is the same. In Galatians, the angel who preaches a false gospel is accursed. In Apoc. Pet. destruction shall be given to those who ask about dreams. Despite the many small differences, the function of both texts seems to be to intimidate and curse the rivalling group.[157]

75.7-76.23 (Digression about the fate of the soul)

In the following respects this part of Apoc.Pet. differs from the surrounding text: 1) The phrase "according to us" (75.16f.) is a first person plural. The use of this expression better

---

Simonianismus sei besonders gekennzeichnet durch die Gestalt der Helena".

[152] See Gramm. Ann. 74.32-34.

[153] Lüdemann 1975, 55, 72f. Cf. Brashler 1977, 37, 223.

[154] Koschorke 1977, 41. Based on a reference in the *Kerygmata Petrou* (incorporated in: Homilies II 17.3). See Schneemelcher 1989, 484.

[155] o.c. 42, n. 9.

[156] This parallel is not discussed in Ch. 5 because the wording of the two texts is too diverse.

[157] Cf. also Testim.Truth (IX, 3) 73.18-24 where Gal. 1.8 is quoted explicitly: "They say, even if an angel comes from heaven and preaches to you, beyond that which we preached to you, may he be anathema". (NHLE 458).

fits a religious teacher than a Pleromatic revealer.[158] 2) There is a striking number of untranslated Greek words in this part of Apoc.Pet., about three times as many as in the rest of the text. 3) The sentences used in this part of Apoc.Pet. contain relatively many nominal sentences, statives and almost all the aorist-forms found in Apoc.Pet. 4) A New Testament text (Luke 6.43-44) is incorporated in a specifically structural way whereas this part of Apoc.Pet. is otherwise dominated by anthological references.[159] 5) The subject matter of this part of Apoc.Pet. is of a different, more abstract, nature. We find no discussion here of the conflict between the Petrine Gnostics and other groups but a metaphysical reflection upon this conflict. On the other hand we find the exclamation, "O Peter" (75.27), which indicates that this part of the text has been shaped to fit in its present context.

Because of the deviating features, however, we should reckon with the possibility that this passage was taken from another text. Therefore, its function in Apoc.Pet. has to be examined with special attention.

It readily appears that this digression reflects in detail a dualistic anthropology, presented as teachings of the Saviour, in which the fates of 'dead souls' and 'living souls' are depicted. The dead ones originate from 'this aeon' i.e. from the cosmic world. They love the products of creation and are themselves cosmic creatures as well. The dead soul is depicted as a slave of its desires (75.17-20). The living soul, on the contrary, is of a totally different nature. It is immortal, it longs to leave the dead souls in the cosmic world and contemplates immortality. However, as long as both dead and living souls are on earth, they cannot be distinguished from each other.[160] This could point to a situation in which Gnostic and orthodox Christians were part of one community.[161] An eschatological feature is the reference to the coming hour (75.29).[162] After this decisive hour the fundamental difference between the souls will become clear. The eschatological fate of the dead souls is death, 'eternal destruction', and dissolution into nothingness. The fate of the living soul is the return to the 'Eternal One' and a life in immortality.

It is possible to understand the dualistic features of this part of the text as expressions of a Gnostic world-view. A phrase like: "they (viz. the dead souls) love the creatures of the matter that has appeared with them" (75.24-26) apparently stems from a world-view in which the material reality is repudiated, a position which, in its extreme form, is characteristic of Gnostic thinking. The same counts for the description of the immortal soul which is said to desire to leave the mortal souls. The whole passage functions as a metaphysical explanation

---

[158] Cf. above 3.1.

[159] For this distinction see Ch. 5.2.

[160] Cf. Gos. Phil. (II,3) 64,5-10; Herm. 52-53, (=Sim. III-IV).

[161] This has also been suggested in the discussion of 73.32-74.2. See also Ch. 7.

[162] Cf. Mt 26.45; Mk 14.41; Jn 2.4; 7.30; 8.20; 17.1.

of the controversy and as an aid to the reader who had to be made to understand and accept the inevitability of this conflict.

76.24-27; 76.27-77.4 (Third and fourth indications of opponents)

What is presented as two parties may be considered as one. The reason to conceive of this passage as describing two different groups of opponents is a formal one: the presence of the word ϨⲈⲚϨⲞⲒⲚⲈ 'some' in line 76.27, which functions in all other instances as an indicator of the transition to a following section.

The central concept in these lines is 'mystery (of truth)' (76.26, 28f., 76.33-34). The adversaries are said to mislead people with false mysteries and to take pride in 'the mystery of truth' although they do not know it. Just as in the lines 74.22-27 the content of the polemic is clear, but it can only be guessed against whom it is directed. It seems possible that here the orthodox claim of superiority and exclusivity is being objected to. The verb ϢⲞⲨϢⲞⲨ 'boast' (76.31) renders one of the main characteristics of the Gnostic demiurge, who *boasts* that he is the only god.[163] His adherents are likely to have the same arrogance, which is based on ignorance. They *boast* about possessing the truth.

"Full of haughtiness, they begin to envy {...} the immortal soul".[164] This is the introduction to the next section. Despite their ignorance the adversaries realize that the immortal souls have something they themselves do not have and, driven by envy, they try to obtain it for themselves.[165]

Since the Coptic of the lines 76.35-77.2 is possibly corrupt, it is hard to give a reliable interpretation of the words that directly follow in 77.3. The phrase 'which has become a Hostage' (77.3) apparently describes a quality of the immortal soul. The Coptic ⲈⲞⲨⲰ can be rendered in English as 'pledge' or 'surety'[166] but might have been used here in a pejorative sense, meaning 'hostage'. If so, this reminds us of the images of struggle and imprisonment used earlier in the text (74.2).[167] What is perhaps meant here is that the immortal soul is imprisoned in the material world.

---

[163] Cf. Ap.John (NHC II) 11.20-22; 13.8-9; Orig.World (NHC II) 103.9; 2 Apoc.Jas. (NHC V) 53.10-11, 54.5, 56. [23]; Paraph.Shem. (NHC VII) 2.34; Trim.Prot. (NHC XIII) 43.33, [34]. Iren. Adv. Haer. I, 7.4.

[164] See Gramm. Ann. 77.1f.

[165] For the concept of 'envy' in Gnostic texts cf. Van Unnik, 1972.

[166] See Crum 62b.

[167] Cf. also 79.20f.

77.4-22 (Digression on the Cosmic Powers and their desire to become immortal)

These lines have been accurately categorized by Peel in his study of Gnostic eschatological motifs under 'the final dissolution of evil Matter'.[168] Although the verb ΒⲰⲖ ⲈΒΟⲖ 'dissolve' does not occur, it is clear that here a struggle between the perishable and the immortal souls is hinted at. This passage contains a mythological reflection upon the relationship between the mortal and the immortal souls. "Authority, rule and power" all seem to refer to the archontic powers.[169] The archons and their creation can be equated with the ones "who do not exist" (77.8-9). The opposite group is designated as "those who do exist" (77.10). One way or another "they who do not exist" try to capture "those who do exist" and to take their immortality for themselves. In other words, the archons wish to take the place of the ones "who do exist" without fulfilling the conditions of "being saved" (77.12), or "being brought on the Way by them" (77.12-13).

The "intellectual Spirit" we encounter here (77.19) is mentioned in 83.8-9 as well. In the latter passage the Saviour identifies himself as "the intellectual Spirit". The Saviour may be conceived as the representation of the intellectual Spirit in the cosmos, possibly alluded to in the present passage.

When we relate 71.14-15 (ⲚΙⲢⲰⲘⲈ Ⲛ̄ϢΒΗⲢ Ⲛ̄ΟΥⲤΙⲀ "people of the same substance") to 77.19, it is possible to understand the present passage as another reference to the consubstantiality of the immortal souls with the Saviour. It is a characteristic Gnostic topos that the immortal ones have forgotten who they are and where they come from.[170] This same state of oblivion might have been hinted at earlier, viz. in 70.25, where the Saviour says that he had come to remember.

This digression discusses the same theme we found in 75.7-76.23. It is even possible to consider 77.4 the logical continuation of 76.23. The dualistic speculations concerning the origin of the mortal and immortal souls have a parallel in the description of the conflict between the ones "who do not exist" and "those who do exist".

The conflict between the Petrine Gnostics and their adversaries is presented as the worldly equivalent of the struggle between heavenly powers. The scene has been transferred to a mythological level. And, just as in the first digression, the function of this reflection is to explain the situation of oppression that threatens the Petrine Gnostics.

77.22-78.30 (Fifth indication of opponents)

The 'others' of 77.22-78.30 quite possibly are proto-orthodox Christians. The accusation

---

[168] Peel 1970, 159.

[169] See Gramm. Ann. 77.4f.

[170] Rudolph 1983, 88f.

that "they are looking from one (place)", because they are thinking that the good and the evil ones stem from one place, is an indication of a belief in one god who created heaven and earth.

The parenthesis "and they shall establish a rough fate, below which the race of the immortal souls will (try to) flee in vain, until my *parousia;* for they shall live among them" (78.1-7) seems to explain the situation of oppression the Gnostics have to endure. As such it equals other passages which comprise metaphysical explanations of the hardships of the Petrine Gnostics.[171] This explanation contains the astrological concept of *heimarmene,* or universal fate, a key-word in ancient astrology.[172] Gnostics adapted this concept to their own ideas; *heimarmene* became to mean tyranny instead of providence, as it was perceived in Greek thinking.[173] In Apoc.Pet. the word *heimarmene* occurs once. Since 'fate' apparently is ordained by the opponents of the Petrine Gnostics, probably the 'messengers of error' (77.24f.), it is possible to understand these orthodox Christians as henchmen of the archons.

In 78.3-4 the combination of ⲈⲨⲚⲀⲠⲰⲦ Ⲛ̄Ⲟ̄ⲢⲀⲒ̈ Ⲛ̄ϨⲦⲤ̄, "they will flee below" with ϨⲚ̄ ⲞⲨⲠⲈⲦϢⲞⲨⲈⲒⲦ, "in vain" causes us interpretational problems. We suggest reading the verb as meaning: 'flee' or 'run away from'.[174] This clarifies the sentence to a certain extent since the combination with the adverbial expression ϨⲚ̄ ⲞⲨⲠⲈⲦϢⲞⲨⲈⲒⲦ becomes understandable. Ⲛ̄ϨⲢⲀⲒ̈ Ⲛ̄ϨⲦⲤ̄ 'below', could in this constellation be interpreted as 'below the *heimarmene'* or 'fate'. It then appears from this phrase that it is impossible for the immortal souls to flee *below* the *heimarmene* which has been established by the messengers of error, i.e. they cannot escape from their fate as long as they live in the cosmic world.

With the mention of the *parousia* of the Saviour (78.6) the eschatological purport of this passage is continued. After the inevitable hardship which the Petrine Gnostics have to endure, the Saviour will return. This clearly eschatological inclination can also be found in several other passages in Apoc.Pet.[175]

"For they shall live among them" (78.7) is possibly an indication of the relation between the Petrine Gnostics and their enemies. As has also been observed in the discussion of 74.1, the Petrine Gnostics and their adversaries seem to have been part of the same organisational

---

[171] Cf. 75.7-76.23; 77.4-22.

[172] Jonas 1963 (reprint 1992), 254-265; Gundel/Gundel 1966, 318-332.

[173] Jonas o.c. 255.

[174] See Gramm. Ann. 78.3; Crum 274a; Charron 1992, 543.

[175] Apoc.Pet. 73.29-74.9 and 80.27-29: final judgement; 75.28-32: the coming eschatological hour; 76.14-20, 77.4-21 and 83.29-84.5: the annihilation of / the victory over the dead ones / the ones who have not; 78.23-26 and 79.16-18: punishment of the adversaries of the Petrine Gnostics; 80.8-21: eschatology. Cf. Peel 1970 who lists all these images used in Apoc.Pet. (and other texts from Nag Hammadi) to describe the eschatological time.

structure.[176] In 78.8, after the parenthesis, the sentence initiated in 77.33, continues.[177] In 78.11 we find the only instance in our text of the word ⲀⲚⲦⲒⲔⲒⲘⲈⲚⲞⲤ, adversary or opponent. It is not used, however, to designate orthodox Christians, the regular adversaries of the Petrine Gnostics, but as a reference to the archons. Orthodox Christians have 'fallen into tresspasses' (78.9-10) through these adversaries.[178]

In 78.12-15 we read that the Saviour brought redemption from slavery. It is not quite clear, though, how we should interpret the genitive construction in 78.12 (ⲘⲠⲒⲤⲰⲦⲈ ⲚⲦⲀⲨ). In the first place, the words may refer to "the messengers of error" in 77.24-25. They (78.15 ⲈⲨⲈ-), viz. the same messengers of error, obviously ignore the Saviour's offer of redemption and create "a further imitation" and try to lead the little ones, the Petrine Gnostics, astray. It is important to note that in this interpretation the proto-orthodox Christians are also offered freedom by the Saviour, but they reject this and create "a further imitation". This would be, then, the only instance in Apoc.Pet. where a less rigid distinction is made between the two categories.

It is more likely, however, that ⲘⲠⲒⲤⲰⲦⲈ ⲚⲦⲀⲨ (78.12) is an objective genitive. It could be a literal translation of the Greek λύτρωσις αὐτῶν. In this case we interpret the passage as follows: the Saviour has brought redemption *from* the oppressors, (viz. from the adversaries) in order to give them (viz. the little ones) freedom. The advantage of this interpretation is that it harmonizes with the belief in a strict division between the Petrine Gnostics and their adversaries, as expressed in the digressions on the destiny of the soul.

A central problem in the identification of the adversaries in this passage is the interpretation of the words ⲞⲨⲰⲰϪⲠ̄ Ⲛ̄ⲀⲚⲦⲒⲘⲒⲘⲞⲚ (78.16). This expression can be understood in two different ways, firstly as imitation remnant,[179] and secondly as further/additional imitation. Brashler, who favours the first rendition, reads these words as a reference to the orthodox community which is imitating the true community of Christian Gnostics.[180] With Koschorke, I prefer the second translation starting from the idea that Hermas, a name occurring only a few lines below (viz. in 78.18), and his second penance are opposed in these lines. The interpretation of the text that supports this view is only possible, however, if ⲞⲨⲰⲰϪⲠ̄ is considered a quantitative adjective.[181] This view is reflected in Koschorke's translation: "Denn sie werden schaffen eine weitere Nachahmung auf den Namen

---

[176] See further Ch. 7.

[177] See Gramm. Ann. 78.8.

[178] See Koschorke 1977, 57.

[179] Brashler 1977, 49, n. 78. 7-8.

[180] Cf. the discussion of the sixth indication of opponents (78.31-79.22).

[181] See Gramm. Ann. 78.16.

eines Toten, das ist Hermas ...".[182] Another argument which substantiates the possibility that a reference to Hermas and his second penance is intended is based on the connection of ЄYP ЄIЄПϢⲰⲦ Ñ2ⲢAÏ 2Ñ ПAϢAⲬЄ, "they are merchandising with my word" (77.33-78.1), with AYⲰ ПIKⲰ ЄBOⲖ ÑⲦAÏ, "and my forgiveness" (78.8).[183] "They are merchandising with my word (...) and (with) my forgiveness from their tresspasses...". "Merchandising (...) with my forgiveness" can be read as a reference to the second penance.

The next phrase explicitly mentions Hermas (78.18). He is called "a dead man" and "the firstborn of injustice", utterly negative designations which function as imputations of heresy.[184] The adversaries of the Petrine Gnostics are accused of establishing a further imitation and of merchandising with forgiveness, "in the name of a dead man" (78.17). From this last phrase we may infer that the mention of Hermas refers to Hermas or rather to the Shepherd of Hermas.

Apoc.Pet., then, rejects the development by which the bishop obtained the right to repeatedly forgive sins.[185] This makes it possible that the adversaries attacked in this passage (77.22-78.31) are orthodox leaders who, inspired by Hermas, have facilitated the possibility of penance and forgiveness.

In 78.22 the group behind Apoc.Pet. is designated for the first time as "the little ones". This self-designation also occurs in 79.19 and 80.11.[186] Several authors have suggested a link with the designation 'little ones' in Matthew's Gospel.[187] The title goes unparallelled in the other texts from Nag Hammadi, though 'smallness' (MÑⲦKOYЄI) occurs in e. g. Ep.Pet.Phil. 138.20.[188]

---

[182] Koschorke 1978, 54-60.

[183] See the commentary on 78.8 above.

[184] In New Testament texts the expression 'firstborn from the dead' is used as a Christological title. See Col. 1.18b; Rev. 1.5; 2.8. Compare also: Psalm 89.27; Ign. Trall. interpol. 10f.; Polyc. 7.1; Iren. III, 3.4; Mart. Polyc. Epil. Mosq. 2; Eus. h.e. IV, 14.7; Didym. Comm. Jes. VI. The expression in Apoc.Pet. may be used ironically.

[185] Apoc.Pet. 79.22-31. Cf. Von Campenhausen 1953, 260: "Die Vollmacht der Bischöfe ermöglicht die Fortführung und die lebendige Ausgestaltung des Bußwesens im Sinne einer immer von neuem wirksam werdenden Vergebung. (...) Die Bußbestimmungen werden gelockert und die Autorität des bischöflichen Amtes wird entsprechend gestärkt".

[186] The 2ЄNKOYЄI in 80.1 is not a name but a numeral. It differs from the other instances inasmuch as it is not preceded by the definite article.

[187] See Ch. 5: Mt 10.42; 18.6.10.14. Cf. esp. Schweizer 1974, 216; Stanton 1977, 67-83.

[188] See Koschorke 1978, 83, n.4, for a survey of this designation in the Nag Hammadi texts. See also Funk 1976, 141. Cf. e.g. 2 Apoc. Jas. (NHC V,4) 55.1-2: "he will come to me, [like] small children" (my translation, hwh). See also Gramm. Ann. 78.24.

78.31-79.21 (Sixth indication of opponents)

Here the Petrine Gnostics and their opponents are presented as rivalling parties: a 'brotherhood' and a 'sisterhood'. Brotherhood is a designation of the Petrine Gnostics, the true community.[189] Sisterhood is its negative counterpart, which appears as an imitation, something which only looks like the true community. The sisterhood possibly consists of orthodox Christians because it seems to attach weight to the 'suffering' (78.32-34) which is understood by me as 'martyrdom'.[190] It is stated unambiguously that this community suppresses its brothers (79.11-12). The verb used to denote this suppression, ⲁⲱϫϩ̄, may even point to a situation of persecution. The sisterhood is apparently accused of pride and conceit since it claims that salvation will only be bestowed through her (79.14-16). The claim of exclusivity by the sisterhood also seems to point at a situation of rival teachings.

In 79.2-4 we encounter another parenthetical clause which has a clearly explanatory purpose. It gives additional information about the brotherhood. The members are said to share a "spiritual fellowship" (79.3) and to have "the same root" (79.4). Both features are likely to have a Gnostic meaning. The 'spiritual fellowship' might refer to the shared pneumatic nature of the Petrine Gnostics. The 'same root' might be a reference to the Pleromatic origin of their souls.[191]

The "marriage of incorruption" (79.7f.) which will appear through the brotherhood is a well-known symbol of Valentinian Gnosticism. This marriage is connected with the sacrament of the bridal-chamber (ⲙⲁ ⲛ̄ϣⲉⲗⲉⲉⲧ) which represents symbolically the reunion of the female soul with its male counterpart in order to re-establish the original Pleromatic unity.[192]

"Through this our God has mercy, because salvation comes to us through this" (79.14-16). This statement, uttered by members of the sisterhood, reflects how the orthodox adversaries of the Gnostics claim the sole access to salvation. Only through them and their church, will salvation be bestowed.

The polemic ends with an eschatological threat probably directed at the sisterhood: the sisterhood will be punished because its members rejoice with the ones who did 'this deed' to the little ones. They have looked at them with envy, and they have imprisoned them (79.16-

---

[189] As such it is used in many of the Nag Hammadi Texts: II,7; 138.4-21; V, 3.24.12-18; V, 4.42.20ff.; 50.11-51.19. See Koschorke 1977, 62 for more references.

[190] Cf. Brashler 1977, 233; Koschorke 1978, 63.

[191] Cf. Apoc.Pet. 75.7-76.23; 77.4-22; 83.15-84.6.

[192] Cf. Exeg. Soul, a text which follows in its main lines the Valentinian myth of Sophia (NHLE 190): NHC (II, 6) 132.9-133.10; The concept occurs also in Treat. Seth. not a specific Valentinian text (NHC VII, 2) 57.14.15; 66.1.6; 67.6, and in the Valentinian Gos. Phil. (NHC II, 3) 70.17-35; 71.7-15; 74.22; 76.5; 82.1-26; 86.4-5.

21).[193] It appears from these lines that the orthodox opponents of the Petrine Gnostics are accused of being in league with the enemies, the archons. The archons are the ones who envy the immortal souls and try to capture them. We encountered this already more explicitly in 77.2f. The imprisonment has also been mentioned in the introduction to this monologue (74.2). The members of the sisterhood are said to rejoice over this archontic deed.

79.22-79.31 (Seventh indication of opponents)

Here we find an explicit reference to the orthodox clergy: bishops and deacons. They are accursed of being arrogant and to care too much for hierarchy. Their arrogance can be deduced from their claim to have received authority from God (79.26-28). Their preference for a hierarchical organization is expressed by the phrase "they bend themselves under the judgement of the first seats." Although the word πρωτοκαθεδρία is a common word in anti-heretical polemics,[194] the reproof which is given here seems to be directed specifically at the misuse of authority and at the existence of offices.

"Those who are outside of our number" is a significant phrase, as it betrays a strong awareness of the group's own identity, and consequently of other positions.[195] This is an important phrase in determining the relation between the Gnostics behind Apoc.Pet. and their surroundings. With the repudiation of these opponents the monologue on the adversaries ends.

79.31-81.3 (Peter's reaction and the Saviour's answer)

Peter's reaction shows that he has not yet reached the state of mind necessary to understand the events forecasted by the Saviour. He reacts to the depicted threat by saying that the words of the Saviour frighten him (79.32f.). He then mentions four important points of concern evoked by the monologue: 1) Only a few people meet the demands[196], i.e. belong to the little ones (79.33-80.2). 2) Many will try to lead many others of the living ones astray (80.2-4). 3) They will destroy them in their midst (80.5-6). 4) They use the Saviour's name and therefore they will be believed (80.6-7).

These remarks by Peter, give support to the supposition that the Petrine Gnostics had a strong awareness of their own identity and probably formed a minority. Especially indicative of this are the lines 79.33-80.2, in which apparently it is told that there are only a few people

---

[193] See Gramm. Ann. 79.17. See also 2 Apoc. Jas. (V, 4) 54.10-15 where the principle Archon is told to imprison the Gnostics: "After he imprisoned those who are from the Father, he seized them and fashioned them to resemble himself. And it is with him that they exist" (NHLE 272).

[194] Cf. Andresen 1971, 99. See also Koschorke 1977, 65, n. 48. Cf. Orig.comm.Matt. 16.22; Herm.Mand. 11,12; Clemens Strom. 6.13.16. Brashler 1977, 234f.

[195] See Ch. 7 and the Gramm. Ann. 79.23f., 24f., 26-28.

[196] The translation of this phrase is uncertain, see Gramm. Ann. 80.1f.

who belong to the group represented by Peter.[197] The reaction of the Saviour to Peter's words has an eschatological character: 1) A time has been fixed for them, i.e. for the oppressors. 2) During this time they will rule over the little ones. 3) But after the fulfilment of this inevitable period the little ones will rule over the ones who suppressed them. 4) The former oppressors will be punished, their error will become manifest 5) and the little ones shall become unchangeable. So, the Saviour points to the oppression in the near future, but also to the final victory of the little ones. As is well-known, descriptions of the time of oppression and the ultimate triumph are common motifs in apocalyptic literature.[198] With the phrase "in a number belonging to their error" (80.9-10) the Saviour possibly gives an indication of either how long or in which degree the opponents will suppress the Petrine Gnostics. The exact meaning of this designation is not clear.[199] This passage also contains ideas indicative of Gnosticism. These are expressed in the next parenthetic clause: ⲀⲨⲰ ⲘⲘⲚⲚ̄ⲤⲀ ⲠⲒⲬⲰⲔ ⲈⲂⲞⲖ Ⲛ̄ⲦⲈ ϮⲠⲖⲀⲚⲎ ⲈϤⲈⲢ ⲂⲢ̄ⲢⲈ Ⲛ̄ϬⲒ ⲠⲒⲀⲦⲢ̄ϨⲖⲖⲞ Ⲛ̄ⲦⲈ ϮⲀⲒⲀⲚⲞⲒⲀ ⲚⲀⲦⲘⲞⲨ· "And after the completion of the error the never-aging <aeon, race> of the immortal intellect will be (still) young" (80.11-15).[200] These lines contain some obscure concepts and constructions: ⲀⲦⲢ̄ϨⲖⲖⲞ 'never-aging' is probably used to describe a quality of the Gnostics.[201] ϮⲀⲒⲀⲚⲞⲒⲀ ⲚⲀⲦⲘⲞⲨ, 'immortal intellect' is a more common concept in Gnosticism which designates an attribute of the highest God. However, the meaning of the phrase, as a whole, remains uncertain. It might be read as a polemical remark, in which it is implied that, in the course of time, the belief of the opponents becomes worn out, whereas the beliefs of the Petrine Gnostics will stay unaltered and 'young'.

To reach a state of immutability, ⲀⲦⲰⲒⲂⲈ (80.23), is also a Gnostic idea. It contrasts with the image as depicted in the foregoing enumeration of the opponents in which the world is presented as unreliable and fickle.

80.23-81.3

The incitement "so come, let us go" marks the transition to the last part of the text. We do not hear anything anymore about the adversaries. The author goes on to recount the

---

[197] This is confirmed by the statement in 79.22-24 where a reference is made to 'the ones outside our number'. See also Ch. 7.

[198] See Ch. 4.

[199] See 2Apoc. Jas. (NHC V,4) 53.19-21: ⲀⲨⲰ ϤⲚⲀⲢ̄ⲬⲞⲈⲒⲤ ϨⲚ̄ ⲞⲨⲬⲢⲞⲚⲞⲤ ⲈⲀⲨϮⲎⲠⲈ ⲈⲢⲞϤⲚⲀϤ· 'And he will rule for a time that is measured to him' (my translation, hwh).

[200] See Gramm. Ann. 80.13-15.

[201] ⲀⲦⲢ̄ϨⲖⲖⲞ occurs in one other text from Nag Hammadi as a quality of the Father, viz. in the Gospel of the Egyptians (NHC III, 2) 41.4.

Passion story, with which he began in 70.14-72.4. Peter is now going to perceive the crucifixion. At this point in the story the location shifts from the temple to the place of the crucifixion. The words "come, let us go", uttered by the Saviour, indicate this. But we hear nothing about the crucifixion site itself and how Peter and the Saviour get there. As will be argued in chapter 5, the words "come, let us go" are alluding to the text of Mt. 26.46.

The crucifixion is designated by the Saviour as "the fulfilment of the will of the incorruptible Father". This may seem a remarkable position in a Gnostic context but in fact it is not unique among the Christian Gnostic texts of the Nag Hammadi library.[202] The Saviour says that the crucifixion will not really affect him: "Me, they cannot touch" (80.29-30). Peter, on the other hand, is going to stand "in their midst" (80.32) and he will see what is going to happen. However, Peter still has not gained a higher state of knowledge; it is said by the Saviour that Peter is afraid because of his cowardice (80.32-81.1). To ease Peter's mind the Saviour adds that "their minds will be closed, for the invisible one has taken up position against them" (81.1-3).[203] 'The invisible One' is probably a reference to the highest God.[204] The closing of their minds (81.1-2), then, relates to the inability of the people who crucify Jesus to perceive the real meaning of what they are doing.

3.2.4 Account of Vision (81.3-83.15)

81.3-82.3

Considering his questions: "What is it that I see O Lord? Is it you, yourself"? (...) "Who is the one who is glad and laughing above the wood"?[205] Peter seems to be utterly bewildered during the scene. And even after the Saviour's explanation, Peter wants to flee (81.27-28).[206]

The laughing of the Saviour at the crucifixion also occurs in the Second Treatise of the Great Seth.[207] As a typically Gnostic motif it is mentioned by Irenaeus who connects the

---

[202] Cf. Treat. Seth 57.3-6: "I was doing all these things because of my desire to accomplish what I desired by the will of the Father above" (NHLE 365f.).

[203] See Gramm. Ann. 81.2.

[204] Other instances of this phrase in the Nag Hammadi texts: Gos. Truth I, 20.20: "The Father of the totality was invisible"; Gos. Egypt. III, 51.1f.: "The glory and the power of the invisible Father". For further references see Siegert 1982, 214.

[205] See Gramm. Ann. 81.11. Cf. Acts of John 98.39: "And the Lord himself I beheld above the cross, not having any shape, but only a voice". M.R. James 1955, 254.

[206] The Christology as reflected in this passage of Apoc.Pet. is analyzed in Ch. 6.

[207] Treat. Seth (VII, 2) 56.19: "I was laughing at their ignorance".

image of the laughing Saviour with Basilides.[208] The possible background of this image can be found in Psalm 2.4.[209]

At first sight the pronouns 'their' and 'they' in 81.18f. (ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲕⲱⲁϩ), 81.22 (ⲉⲩⲉⲓⲣⲉ), 81.32 (ⲛ̄ⲥⲉⲉⲓⲙⲉ, ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲭⲱ), 82.2 (ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲩ), and 82.3 (ⲁⲩⲁⲁϥ) refer to Roman soldiers who have crucified Jesus. However, these soldiers are probably conceived of as henchmen of the archons.[210]

The mention of "their son" (82.1-2) can only relate to the material Jesus who is crucified. If so, the pronoun 'their' refers to the archons. "Their son" can be connected with the expression "the name of a dead man" in 74.13-14. This phrase expresses the idea that the material Jesus is a creature of the archons.[211] The passage is closed by the statement that the ones who crucify the Saviour are blind. This equals the conclusion of the earlier vision in 73.13-14. The blindness of the opponents is demonstrated by the fact that they crucify "the son of their glory" instead of the real Saviour. In Apoc.Pet. blindness, in most cases, is a feature of the Jewish priests (72.12-15; 73.13-14; 83.3).

82.3-83.15

Peter seems to come at last to a certain insight.[212] He does not ask any more questions. He only reports that again he sees "someone who approaches us" (82.3-5) and he recognizes this figure "woven in a holy spirit" (82.7-8)[213] as the Saviour. Subsequently, the scene is described in the following terms: "a great ineffable light surrounding them" (82.9-11), and "the multitude of ineffable and invisible angels blessing them" (82.11-13). Apparently, Peter sees the Pleromatic Saviour (82.3-17).

Peter is told that he is the one to whom these mysteries are given, in order to know them openly (82.18-20).[214] This phrase is similar to the one we encountered at the beginning of the

---

[208] Adv. Haer. I.24.4.

[209] "He who sits enthroned in the heavens laughs, the Lord derides them". See Ch. 6 where several explanations of this idea of the laughing Saviour are discussed.

[210] Cf. 1 Apoc. Jas. 30.1-5 and esp. 31.21-25: "And this people has done me no harm. But this (people) existed [as] a type of the archons" (NHLE, 265).

[211] Cf. Ep. Pet. Phil. (VIII, 2) 136,19-20.

[212] See 72.4-20; 72.21-28; 72.28-73.13.

[213] See Gramm. Ann. 82.7.

[214] Cf. Mt 13.11; Mk 4.11 see Ch. 5. Gramm. Ann. 82.18, 20.

monologue of the Saviour (73.14-23).[215] In 82.21-83.15 the Saviour gives an interpretation of the different figures perceived by Peter.[216] It appears that, at last, Peter is able to comprehend the things he has seen.

The explanation by the Saviour begins with some disparaging designations of the material body of the Saviour. The material body is called: the "firstborn" [and] "the house of the demons"; the "vessel of stone in which they (viz. the demons) live"; "belonging to Elohim"; "(belonging to) the cross which is under the law".[217] "Firstborn of the demons" must be understood as an ironical designation of the material body (as opposed to the firstborn of God). These negative qualifications are presented as part of the mystery which is granted to Peter. Again it seems that the essential message of Apoc.Pet. bears upon the proper understanding of the relationship between the spiritual Saviour and the material Jesus. The statements that follow in the lines 82.26-83.15 mainly contain statements about the non-material aspects of the Saviour.[218]

In 82.26-30 "He who stands near him" is identified as "the living Saviour (ΠΙ-ϹⲰⲦⲎⲢ), he who was in him before, (in) the one who was seized and he was released". 83.6-8 describes "the one who is released" as "my incorporeal body". In 83.8-10 the Saviour says: "I am the intellectual Spirit who is filled with radiant light". In 83.10-15 we read "the one you saw coming towards us is our intellectual Pleroma who unites the perfect light with my holy Spirit".

In 82.26-30 and 83.6-8, we encounter two statements on the non-material nature(s) of the Saviour. The 'Living One, Jesus' is the one whom Peter saw glad and laughing above the wood in 81.15-18. This figure is identical with the living Saviour "who was in him before" (in the body) and who was released (ⲔⲰ ⲈⲂⲞⲗ) (82.26-31). It is also the same figure that is depicted in 83.6-8: "The one who is released, is my incorporeal body". In both passages the same verb "release" (ⲔⲰ ⲈⲂⲞⲗ) is used, from which we understand that the Living One, Jesus, the living Saviour, and the incorporeal body are one and the same figure.

Next, we encounter a second non-material aspect of the Saviour viz. the intellectual or holy Spirit (83.8-10 and 83.15). This figure is identical with the Saviour who narrates the story.

The third non-material figure which is initially mentioned in 82.4-9 is described in more detail in 83.10-15: "the one you saw coming towards us is our intellectual Pleroma who unites the perfect light with my holy Spirit". This is the Pleromatic counterpart of the spiritual Saviour who stays in the Pleroma and whose task it is to guard over the unity of the Saviour. The Saviour of Apoc.Pet., then, seems to consist of three non-material figures: 1)

---

[215] A comparable phrase occurs in 83.15-19.

[216] See Ch. 6.

[217] See Gramm. Ann. 82.23 and 82.25f.

[218] These lines will be discussed in more detail in ch. 6.

an intellectual Pleroma, 2) an intellectual or holy Spirit and 3) an incorporeal body or the living Saviour. This tripartite Saviour is temporarily connected with a fourth element, a material body.[219]

3.2.5 Conclusion (83.15-84.13)

83.15-84.6

The prohibition of 73.17-18: "Do not tell these things to the children of this aeon", has a positive counterpart in the exhortation in 83.15-19: "The things you have seen, you must give to the strangers who are not of this aeon". Peter is here commissioned to tell all the things he has seen to the 'Allogeneis', the 'other race' (83.17). From this Gnostic selfdesignation it becomes clear that the text distinguishes between 'the ones of this aeon' and 'the ones who are not of this aeon' (cf. 73.17-23).

This dualistic world-view is elaborated in the following passage (83.19-26), where the contrast between the mortal and the immortal ones returns (cf. 75.7-76.23). The immortal one is told to be able to comprehend the One who has given his abundance. The latter reference designates the highest God.

After these considerations, a saying of Jesus is incorporated. It is noteworthy that we have here the only instance in Apoc.Pet. where an explicit quotation formula is used: "That is why I have said: To everyone who has will be given and he will have abundance. But he who does not have (...) it will be taken from him and it will be added to the one who exists" (83.26-84.6).[220] In this saying of Jesus, we come across a parenthetical comment (83.30-84.4). This time the dualism of Apoc.Pet. is not expressed with the help of the antithesis between dead and living souls but with an analogous theme: the opposition between 'the ones who have' and 'the ones who have not'. 'The ones who have' is a designation of the immortal souls. Other appellations of the immortal soul(s) in this passage are: "the ones who were chosen from an immortal substance" and 'the one who exists'. 'The ones who have not', consequently, are the mortal souls, designated also as "the person of this place, who is completely dead".[221] In 83.32-34 'the one who has not', is said to have originated from "the implantation of the habit of procreation".[222] This may be a reminiscence of the Gnostic idea, as expressed in the myth of Sophia, that human procreation is an unwelcome result of the

---

[219] The Christology of Apoc.Pet. will be discussed more extensively in Ch. 6.

[220] See Ch. 5; also Piper 1989, 254 who argues that this saying has circulated independently from the Gospels. It also occurs in Gos. Thom. (II, 2) 41.

[221] See Gramm. Ann. 83.31f., 32-34. See also Treat. Seth (NHC VII, 2) 61.21.

[222] The translation of this passage is uncertain.

creation by the demiurge.[223] From this it can be understood that in a Gnostic way of thinking, procreation of the ones who do not have a Pleromatic origin only leads to a useless increase of matter. The theme of the mortal souls who try to capture the immortal souls, also discussed in 77.4-22, recurs in the elliptic phrase: "who, when one of the immortal substance appears, they think that they can seize him-" (84.1-4).

The whole passage 83.15-84.6 has an eschatological tendency. Here, once more, the fate of the mortal and the immortal souls is described.

84.6-13

The Saviour ends his speech with traditional encouraging phrases and greetings. The lines 84.6-11 are reminiscent of Acts 18.9-10.[224]

The very last words (84.12-13) are cast in the third person. By ending the text like this, it is as if the author takes over Peter's place as narrator. The interpretation of these words is complicated, since the expression ⲁϥϣⲱⲡⲉ ϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲛ̄ϩⲏⲧϥ̄ which is used here is extremely rare in Coptic.[225]

The most probable interpretation of these last words is: "He came to his senses". This explanation, which is based on a Greek parallel in Acts 12.11, is proposed by Böhlig.[226] His most important argument is that in the Sahidic New Testament the words of Acts 12.11 ἐν ἑαυτῷ γενόμενος have been rendered as ⲁϥϣⲱⲡⲉ ϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲛ̄ϩⲏⲧϥ̄.[227] Besides, it will be argued in chapter 4 that Apoc.Pet. has many features of the apocalyptic genre. In apocalypses we often see that the recipient of the revelation finds himself in a state of trance. Therefore interpreting this last phrase as Peter's recovering from a condition of rapture seems only natural.

I want to mention the possibility of reading this phrase in a more Gnostic sense. The translation does not change but gets a different accent: He *really* came to his senses; he discovered his true self. This interpretation is not based on grammatical arguments but on the

---

[223] Cf. Ap. John (II, 1) 24.26-31: "Now up to the present day sexual intercourse continued due to the chief archon. And he planted sexual desire in her who belongs to Adam. And he produced through intercourse the copies of the bodies, and he inspired them with his counterfeit spirit". NHLE, 119. See also Gos. Phil. (NHC II, 3) 58.26-32; 71.22-26; 75.2-10.

[224] See Ch. 5.

[225] See Gramm. Ann. 84.12f.

[226] Böhlig 1973, 11-13.

[227] Another instance of this expression in the Nag Hammadi texts can be found in Zostrianos (VIII, 1) 46.14-15: ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛ̄ϥⲣ̄ ⲁⲣⲭⲓ ⲟⲛ ⲉϥϣⲱⲡⲉ ϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲛ̄ϩⲏⲧϥ̄ · which is translated in the NHLE 1988, 415: "And he begins again to come to his senses".

observation that in Apoc.Pet. Peter comes to a sort of esoteric knowledge. This process starts in 71.15-17 where the Saviour explicitly asks Peter to become perfect. Then, from several instances in the text, it becomes clear that Peter obviously has not yet reached the necessary state of mind for understanding the revelations. In the course of the story, however, his insight seems to develop, as has been argued in the commentary above.[228] Finally, at the end of the revelation, Peter comes to real knowledge, as possibly expressed in the last phrase of the text.

Subscript Title 84.14

The title is repeated at the end of the text. We find this in many of the Nag Hammadi texts.[229]

3.3 The Ideology of the Text

Although Apoc.Pet. does contain various features usually connected with Gnosticism, the text is not traditionally Gnostic.[230] Well-known Gnostic themes such as descriptions of the Pleroma and the highest God, the Sophia-myth and the reinterpretion of the creation story of Genesis do not, or only in the faintest way, occur in Apoc.Pet.[231] Nothing in the text gives the reader the impression that the author of Apoc.Pet. knew any of the great systems, for example, Valentinianism. We do find, however, some other Gnostic elements: the archons,[232] the heavens as the place where these archons dwell[233] and their defeat at the crucifixion of Jesus,[234] the final return of the living souls to their origin,[235] a Christology in which the existence of the Saviour's material body is not denied but considered of no importance,[236] and

---

[228] Cf. the commentary on Apoc.Pet. 73.9-10; 79.32-80.7; 81.7; 82.3f.

[229] E.g. in Codex VII: Treat. Seth (VII, 2) and Steles Seth (VII, 5).

[230] It should be realized that the absence of specific Gnostic features can also be interpreted as a sign of their importance. In this last case it could be argued that the Gnostic myth was so familiar to the audience of Apoc.Pet. that the writer did not have to narrate this myth in detail but could confine himself to a few implicit references by which a complete Gnostic world-view was evoked.

[231] The first lines of Apoc.Pet. possibly refer to a Pleromatic setting (70.14-19).

[232] Apoc.Pet. 71.6; 74.30.

[233] Apoc.Pet. 70.22; 71.13.

[234] Apoc.Pet. 81.28-82.3; 82.32-83.6.

[235] Apoc.Pet. 75.7-76.27; 77.4-77.22.

[236] Apoc.Pet. 81.3-83.15.

the necessity of having *gnosis*.[237] Despite the presence of these features I tend to agree with Koschorke who says that there is no Gnostic myth in the background of Apoc.Pet.[238] There are several arguments for this. In the first place the scattered Gnostic references can be interpreted as remainders of an earlier ideology, or as evidence of superficial contact only. In the second place it could be argued that Apoc.Pet. displays a world-view complete in itself which has no need of an additional Gnostic myth.

Therefore a Gnostic myth as such is considered here of no importance for the ideological background of Apoc.Pet. The ideology of Apoc.Pet. can be characterized as a combination of Christian and Gnostic elements. The Gnostic myth is, so to speak, replaced by the Passion story and the crucifixion account, but the Gnostic way of interpretation plays an important role. These observations have consequences as well for one's ideas on the character of the audience of Apoc.Pet. The audience possibly consisted of people who were familiar with Gnosticizing ideas but whose beliefs were also shaped by Christian traditions.[239] The absence of a Gnostic myth does not exclude of course the presence in Apoc.Pet. of a specific world-view. What then is this world-view? First of all it should be kept in mind that it is composite and syncretistic; Gnostic and Christian features have shaped it. The two constituting themes of the world-view of Apoc.Pet. are the character and mission of the Saviour and, connected with this, the anthropology as reflected in the different passages on the soul. It will appear that the specific Christology and anthropology determine the outlook of our text.

It becomes clear from the text that a strict two-fold division is made in mankind: good opposite bad, saved opposite lost, and living opposite dead souls.[240] Corresponding to this dualistic anthropology is a basically dualistic Christology. Although the revealer of Apoc.Pet. exists as three non-material 'natures' connected with a material body, it is obvious that the real dichotomy lies between the fleshly body on the one hand and the three non-material figures on the other hand. In this respect both the Christology as well as the anthropology of Apoc.Pet. are dualistic. This dualistic position marks all related events in Apoc.Pet. Whether we characterize the text as Christian or Gnostic, all important topics, including the Passion, appear to have been presented consistently against a dualistic background.

The dualism forms so to speak the frame in which the whole text has to be situated. However, the text does not contain enough information to enable us to give a precise description of its dualism. The relation between good and evil, between the Pleroma and the material reality, and between the demiurge and the highest God, is not specified in any detail.

---

[237] Apoc.Pet. 71.20-21; 73.21-23.

[238] Koschorke 1978, 16.

[239] This does not exclude the possibility that the text might have been appreciated in a thoroughly Gnostic environment. The indefiniteness of many phrases makes it an attractive text for different audiences.

[240] According to Irenaeus (Adv. Haer. I, 24.2) the first one who introduced this dualistic anthropology in Syria was Satornilus.

Apoc.Pet. contains these antitheses but does not reflect on the cause and origin of the dualistic constellation presupposed by them.

Therefore, it cannot be recovered exactly which type of dualism Apoc.Pet. displays. But it will be argued here, that the dualism of this text is based on the belief in a duality of worlds, a higher and a lower cosmos. I agree with Armstrong's view that we have to determine the degree of 'other-worldliness', that is of hostility to, alienation from, and desire to escape from, the lower cosmos.[241] In the Nag Hammadi texts in general a rather dark pessimism regarding the material world predominates. Apoc.Pet. appears to be no exception to this rule.

One of the most characteristic aspects of a pessimistic two-world dualism is the negative evaluation of the earthly reality and the body. We find examples of this in 75.24-26, 81.18-22 and 83.30-34. This is not an exclusively Gnostic feature, but it is known to be of great importance in Gnostic thinking and the extreme form it takes in Apoc.Pet. confirms the Gnostic character of the text. In contrast with this solely the non-material, spiritual, reality is considered important (75.32-76.4).

Another specifically Gnostic feature which is an indication of the dualism of Apoc.Pet. is the mention of the principalities or archons, the enemies of the Saviour (71.6-9; 74.30; 77.4-22). These archons appear to be in a constant struggle with the Pleromatic forces. They try to hinder the Saviour in his revelation (71.6-9) and intend to capture the immortal souls in order to take their immortality for themselves. They also play an important part at the crucifixion of Jesus. Thinking that they are crucifying the Saviour, they only kill their own son, the material part of his (82.1-3). In the crucifixion story we find another example of the extreme dualism of Apoc.Pet.: the image of the spiritual Saviour mocking the archons who are crucifying his earthly body (81.10-12; 82.31; 83.2).

The general purpose of Apoc.Pet. is to call people to knowledge (70.25) and to make them remember their origin which they apparently have forgotten (77.10-11). The message of the Saviour, mediated through Peter, is explicitly connected with this 'coming to knowledge' (70.25-71.3). Again a dualistic tendency surfaces in these passages. The suggestion that the Petrine Gnostics have to remember their origin implies the existence of another, better, world.

Consequently, we understand the location at the beginning of the text as Pleromatic (70.18-20). This is confirmed by other possible references to the Pleroma (70.26; 70.32-71.1; 71.2-3; 79.4-5). In contrast with this another, lower, sphere is mentioned: the heavens (70.22). This is the place where the archons dwell while the living ones are above these heavens in the Pleroma.

The highest God has some characteristic Gnostic titles in Apoc.Pet.: living undefiled greatness who has revealed life, undefiled Father, invisible one (70.19-21; 79.26; 81.3). These positive qualifications are contrasted by the description of the God of the opponents who is called Father of error (73.27-28). One of the most characteristic features of this demiurge is

---

[241] Armstrong 1992, 46.

his boasting. This verb actually occurs in 76.31 where it is said to be a quality of the adversaries of the Petrine Gnostics.

The potential Gnostics who are called to knowledge have a specific nature: they are called 'living ones' (70.24) and they are consubstantial with the divine (71.14-15) and with the Saviour in particular, who is called 'Living One' as well (81.18). The Petrine Gnostics are said to share a 'spiritual fellowship' together (79.3) and they have 'the same root' (79.3-4).[242] They are called once: 'allogeneis' (strangers), a typically Gnostic name which is itself a clear example of the 'other-worldliness' of the group behind Apoc.Pet. However, this is not the regular designation of the Petrine Gnostics; more often they are called 'little ones'. In contrast, their opponents are designated as 'the dead one' (75.31f.) and 'he who does not exist' (76.18).

Finally we may try to approach the problem from a different angle, and ask: who is likely to have appreciated the text, orthodox Christians or (Christian) Gnostics? The answer to this question is obvious to a large extent: the text must have been unacceptable for proto-orthodoxy, both because of its idiosyncratic interpretation of the Passion and because of its anti-orthodox polemic. It was probably not very appealing to non-Christian Gnostics either, because of the value that is attached to the Passion of Jesus. However, Apoc.Pet. could very well have been read by Christian Gnostics, for the text narrates a central Christian story and contains a dualistic Gnostic interpretation of this story. At the same time the anti-orthodox polemic may have been approved of.

---

[242] See Ch. 7.3.1.

4. Genre

4.1 Introduction

Genre is one of the central concepts in literary theory. At the same time it is one of its most problematic notions; questions of definition and classification have always dominated the discussion. There is no need to go into details here; several excellent studies have been written on the subject.[243] But it is important to make clear the fundamental problems arising in every discussion on genre. These problems revolve around a few specific antithetical concepts, such as: static-dynamic, prescriptive-descriptive and synchronic-diachronic.

For a long time the notion that genres are static, prescriptive entities, existing independently of literary texts, as a set of rules, has been unquestioned.[244] However, contemporary literary theory tends to stress the dynamic, descriptive and diachronic aspects of genre. This so-called evolutional approach to genre is not new but it has been forgotten during the last few decades and has only recently been rediscovered.

In the 1920's, the Russian formalists[245] reintroduced the Aristotelian idea of the evolution and revolution of literature.[246] Wellek and Warren were the first ones to recognize the value of those ideas. In their main work *Theory of Literature* they stress the descriptive function of genre-labelling and the dynamic nature of genres themselves. They have no fixed idea on how and in what direction genres are supposed to develop, but this is exactly the strength of their position: while change and development are considered fundamental for each genre, no fixed prescriptions concerning generic rules and the direction of these developments can be established. Since Wellek and Warren launched their ideas, most of what is written on the subject basically agrees with this fundamental insight. Classification of genres has disappeared for a large part in literary theory.

In line with this approach, Fowler has written an important work on our subject.[247]

---

[243] Wellek and Warren 1963, Doty 1972, Dubrow 1982, Fowler 1982, Gerhardt 1988.

[244] E.g. Hough 1966, 84; Schönborn 1987, 178. These authors take genre as Fowler's 'historical genre' or 'kind'. Fowler 1982, 56f.

[245] E.g. J. Tynjanov 'De l'Evolution Littéraire' 1927, in: Todorov 1965, 120-138.

[246] For a summary of these developments see Wellek 1963, 37-53.

[247] For a discussion of the main concepts of Fowler's ideas on 'genre' see Tigchelaar 1987.

According to him a genre is not a class but is rather analogous with a family,[248] members of which have specific mutual relations, without the necessity that one particular feature occurs in every single member. This seems to be a very important and helpful analogy. It makes one understand that different texts can belong to the same genre without it being essential that a fixed number of features be present in each text. The individual deviating features of texts are not regarded as problematic but as natural and necessary. Fowler also stresses the importance of change and development of genres and, as his family analogy predicts, he can include all kinds of developments: linear, dialectical and even reverse.[249] This approach also leaves room for the view that one text can belong to different genres simultaneously.[250]

This view does not necessarily replace Fowler's earlier description of the development of literary genres as a process of historical growth, maturity and decay.[251] The same goes for his reference to the structuralist *langue-parole* model as a model to understand genres. The *langue* contains the generic blueprint, the *parole* is its actualization in a specific text. These points call for explanation.

The family analogy and the *langue-parole* model are based on a structuralist hypothesis: genres can be conceived of because of a presupposed shared genetic/generic make-up. On the basis of this genetic make-up several mutually-related specimens appear. These specimens can be very different from each other but are connected by their hereditary qualities. This concept of genre makes it possible to explain that not all characteristic features of the genre need to be present in every member of the family. Some characteristic elements may be thought of as constituting the family, but no single feature needs always to be present.

The concept of growth, maturity and death is historic. It completes and modifies the structural view and makes it possible to speak of 'the most characteristic' or 'typical specimen' of a genre. These terms are meant to denote texts that were written at a certain moment in history when the genre they belong to was most widespread in a geographic and literary sense. From this historic angle the conceived genetic structure appears to be a dynamic structure, changing with time and causing the ongoing development of a genre. In this way the structuralist and the historical view have been combined. This dynamic view on genre

---

[248] Fowler 1982, 42f. "In literature, the basis of resemblances lies in literary tradition. What produces generic resemblances, ..., is tradition: a sequence of influence and imitation and inherited codes connecting works in the genre. As kinship makes a family, so literary relations of this sort form a genre. Poems are made in part from older poems: each is the child ... of an earlier representative of the genre and may yet be the mother of a subsequent representative. Naturally the genetic make-up alters with slow time, so that we may find the genre's various historical states to be very different from one another. Both historically and within a single period, the family grouping allows for wide variation in the type".

[249] o.c. Ch. 10 'Transformation of Genre'.

[250] o.c. 37: "... critics such as Blair and Kames were able to see that the genres have no clear dividing boundaries, and that the membership of one by no means rules out membership of others".

[251] Fowler 1971, 199-216.

excludes the possibility of strict classification but still leaves room for a description of genres and for the construction of what has been called a 'generic horizon'.[252] The family analogy indicates that the generic description of a text does not prescribe how exactly a related text should be constructed. It only functions as a background, as a system of conventions with which a text can be compared in order to establish its relation to the family or genre.

A description of a genre usually contains elements of form, content and function. These three aspects in their mutual relation are responsible to a large extent for the specific character of a family of texts. Wellek and Warren base the description of a genre on outer and inner form. The outer form consists of metre or structure, the inner form includes content (subject matter) as well as function and, related with this last element, social setting (attitude, tone, purpose, audience).[253]

While this division into outer form, content, function and social setting adequately covers most descriptions of modern genres, an exception should be made for ancient texts. This is not a principled standpoint but a practical modification. Since the function and social setting of these texts usually cannot be established with certainty any more, these elements should not form part of the description of ancient genres.[254] Only elements which are present in the text itself, i.e. elements of form and content, should be taken into consideration as means of construction and interpretation.

There has been a recent proposal, however, to include function in the description of ancient genres as well, as an analogy to the general view on the description of genre. An important advocate of this view is Hellholm.[255] What Hellholm wants to include in a definition of genre is the 'intended' or 'intrinsic function'. It consists of the direct effect the author wants his text to have on the reader. What makes other experts reject this notion is the observation that the function of any genre is always attributed by a reader, which means that it is always 'extrinsic' and therefore subject to change. The intended function is only realized when the text is actually read.

It appears from the above that we have to distinguish two different concepts of function: the intended or intrinsic function and the attributed or extrinsic function. The first, intrinsic function, which is used by the author to direct the reaction of his readers, is the one Hellholm wants to include in the definition of a genre. From this demand it becomes clear that Hellholm's view of genre has a deterministic bias. Dubrow has adequately summarized the risk of such determinism in literary theory: "Viewing genres too deterministically has led to

---

[252] Fowler 1982, 259 quoting Hirsch 1967, 222.

[253] Wellek and Warren 1963, 231.

[254] Collins 1979, 1: "At least in the case of ancient literature our knowledge of function and setting is often extremely hypothetical and cannot provide a firm basis for generic classification". Cf. also Aune 1986, 89.

[255] Hellholm 1983, 157-198. Cf. also Aune 1986, 89, for a discussion of the inclusion of function in the description of the genre 'apocalypse'.

oversimplifying readers' responses to them. We need to remember that, as several critics have observed, generic codes frequently function like a tone of voice rather than a more clearcut signal: they provide one interpretation of the meaning of the text, they direct our attention to the parts of it that are especially significant, but they do not and they cannot offer an infallible key to its meaning".[256] The second, attributed function, obviously cannot be incorporated in any definition at all. The response of a reader can only be directed to a certain extent and it is therefore extremely difficult to predict the response of a specific person or of a group of readers. This is even more clear in the case of ancient texts, because in the most optimistic case, original intentions of writers and responses of readers can only be reconstructed, never observed. Considering the above, it seems wise not to include function in the definition of ancient genres.

4.2 Previous Research on the Genre of Apoc.Pet.

Before approaching Apoc.Pet. from this generic angle, I will give a survey of previous research on the genre of Apoc.Pet. The study of the genre 'apocalypse' in the texts of Nag Hammadi is still in its infancy but there has been some research on Apoc.Pet. as an apocalypse by J.A. Brashler (1978), F. T. Fallon (1979), M. Krause (1983) and G. Shellrude (1986). Besides, a few studies designate Apoc.Pet. as a specimen of the Gnostic revelation dialogue: Ph. Perkins (1980) and U. Schönborn (1987). Two studies by K. Koch are also discussed here. The first one (1970) is of a more general character; the second one (1982) contains some observations on Apoc.Pet. None of these studies is concerned with the theoretical question of what a genre is and how a genre should be described. They are all applications of existing models.[257]

Brashler as well as Krause state that Apoc.Pet. should be characterized as a 'real' apocalypse, although Krause seems to be less certain of this than Brashler.[258] Both have come to their qualification by way of comparing relevant aspects of Apoc.Pet. with the four well-known characteristics Vielhauer has set up for the genre 'apocalypse'.[259]

---

[256] Dubrow 1982, 105-106.

[257] Shellrude, however, provides us with a discussion on the genre 'apocalypse' and sets up his own definition. Schönborn's study is not concerned with the description of the genre of Apoc.Pet. as a whole but confines himself to an analysis of the dialogue parts.

[258] Brashler 1977, 146, 156 etc.; Krause 1983, 628 n. 39: "Nach Wilson 1978, 355, handelt es sich nicht um eine Apokalypse des üblichen Typus, sondern um die Wiedergabe einer Offenbarung, die Petrus im Tempel zuteil wird, und zwar bemerkenswerterweise vor der Verhaftung Jesu".

[259] Vielhauer 1961, 408-411.

1) Pseudonymity is mentioned as an apocalyptic feature, present in Apoc.Pet., by both authors.[260]

2) Vision account is only noticed by Brashler.[261] Krause says that in Apoc.Pet. the events do not occur in rapture or dream.[262]

3) Review of history, narrated in the future tense is found in Apoc.Pet. by both Krause and Brashler.[263]

4) Multiplicity of short literary forms is not dealt with as a separate feature by Krause. Following Vielhauer, Brashler does mention this fourth characteristic, and he lists the different literary forms that occur in Apoc.Pet.: "a short beatitude (70.21-22); paraenetic passages (70.28-31; 71.15-25; 84.6-10)[264], a benediction (84.11); interpretation of quoted scripture (75.7-76.23)[265] and a fragment of a Gnostic hymn (70.22-27)".[266] Finally both authors conclude that Apoc.Pet. can be reckoned among the group of traditional, Jewish and Christian, apocalypses.[267] Brashler is even more specific in arguing that Apoc.Pet. comes close to the early Christian apocalypses.[268]

Koch has devoted himself to the re-evaluation and definition of the (Jewish) apocalypse.[269] He has set up two lists, one containing the formal literary elements of the genre 'apocalypse' and one containing the historical content of apocalypticism.[270] This enumeration has many elements in common with Vielhauer's earlier proposal. According to Koch the formal literary elements of an apocalypse are: 1) long discourses 2) confused state of mind of the recipient

---

[260] Krause ibid.; Brashler o.c. 127.

[261] Brashler o.c. 128.

[262] Krause ibid., but cf. my translation of the last words of Apoc.Pet. (84.13): "after he had said these things he came to his senses". See the commentary for the different interpretations of this phrase.

[263] Krause ibid.; Brashler o.c. 137.

[264] More paraenetic passages can be found in Apoc.Pet. 73.14-18; 80.31-81.1; 82.18-20; 83.15-19.

[265] See Ch. 5.

[266] Brashler o.c. 139.

[267] Krause ibid.; Brashler o.c. 141.

[268] Brashler ibid. also contemplates the possibility to define Apoc.Pet. as a dialogue but then decides against it: "Apoc.Pet. should not be classified as a dialogue because the interchanges it contains are vision descriptions followed by their interpretations rather than a didactic conversation between a teacher and a pupil designed to inculcate specific teachings".

[269] Koch 1970.

[270] Ibid. 19-24 and 24-31.

(s) 3) paraenetic discourse 4) pseudonymity 5) symbolic and mythic language 6) composite structure. Historic characteristics of apocalypticism are: 1) eschatological expectation 2) cosmic catastrophe 3) world history 4) angels and demons 5) salvation 6) God's throne 7) Son of Man 8) glory. It appears that in Apoc.Pet. all literary elements mentioned by Koch are present, while only a few of the historic elements can be detected. This last observation should not amaze us. Gnostic texts reflect a world of thought different from the one of the Jewish apocalyptic writers.

In a later study[271] Koch adds a short discussion of the apocalypses of Nag Hammadi. In his view, the Apocalypse of Adam (NHC V,5), the Apocalypses of James (NHC V,3 and 4), as well as the Apocalypse of Paul (NHC V,2) hardly deserve this title. The only exception is Apoc.Pet.: "Much closer to the otherwise wellknown type comes the Apocalypse of Peter, in which the apostle foresees the fate of Christ in visions, which simultaneously portray the history of the (Gnostic) church".[272] Apoc.Pet. is, according to Koch, an exception among the Nag Hammadi writings in that it follows the 'traditional' Jewish and Christian apocalypses. Visions which contain the fate of Jesus and the history of the Gnostic 'Church' apparently make Koch judge that Apoc.Pet. has important features in common with traditional apocalypses.

The study by Fallon,[273] as part of the Semeia project, has a less formal outlook. All apocalypses of the Nag Hammadi texts and of the Askew, Berlin and Bruce codices are discussed in the light of the definition and the paradigm of the genre 'apocalypse' as set up by Collins.[274] Fallon states that the Gnostic apocalypses fulfill the requirements of Collins' definition but omits and changes some elements of the paradigm to make them match the Gnostic world-view. The elements he modifies or omits are all part of the temporal and spatial axes which form together the 'transcendent reality' in the definition. Modified elements are: cosmogony and theogony (paradigm: cosmogony), present salvation through knowledge (paradigm: present salvation), judgement of sinners or ignorant (paradigm: judgement/destruction of wicked), personal afterlife (paradigm: resurrection and other forms of afterlife). On the spatial axis Fallon changes the 'otherworldly regions and otherworldly beings' into 'otherworldly elements': 'good and evil'. Four elements are omitted: recollection of the past, persecution, other eschatological upheavals and cosmic transformation.

In the contiguous discussion of the typically Gnostic traits of the Gnostic apocalypses,

---

[271] Koch 1982.

[272] Ibid. 8 (my translation).

[273] Fallon 1979, 123-158.

[274] Collins 1979, 9. An elaborate discussion of the Semeia project, the definition and its utility for the study of Apoc.Pet. is provided in 4.3.

Fallon mentions Apoc.Pet. as an exception three times.[275] But he does not go into the question why Apoc.Pet. differs from other Gnostic texts. It seems to me significant that one of the features in which Apoc.Pet. deviates from the other Gnostic apocalypses is the occurrence of vision accounts, a common feature of Jewish and early-Christian apocalypses. Apoc.Pet. contains two elaborate accounts of visions[276] while Gnostic apocalypses in general show a strong tendency towards the spoken revelation.[277] Moreover, Apoc.Pet. contains several references to a possible persecution, a feature of the paradigm left out by Fallon. From this it becomes clear that Apoc.Pet. shares some important features with Jewish and Christian apocalypses along with features of Gnostic apocalypses.

Shellrude's principal concern is to determine whether the apocalypses of Nag Hammadi are based on the traditional Jewish and Christian apocalypses. In order to carry out this project he sets up a definition of the genre 'apocalypse' which runs as follows: "An apocalypse is a literary work structured around a first person narrative account of a mediated revelation. The two basic structural elements within this account are: 1. the narrative setting or frame story; 2. the account of the revelatory event itself".[278] With regard to Apoc.Pet., he concludes that the text is "an excellent example of a case in which an author has derived the essential structure of a literary genre from the traditional apocalypses and then shaped the individual elements of the genre to suit his own requirements".[279] To this conclusion he adds that in the case of Apoc.Pet. formal similarities with the traditional apocalypses dominate. Since Apoc.Pet displays an obvious Christian Gnostic provenance and since no other genre comes into account as a literary background, Shellrude thinks it likely that the author used the traditional apocalypse as an example.[280]

The genre study by Perkins starts from a different angle.[281] She treats the Gnostic revelation dialogue as a genre of its own[282] but she does not give a definition of the genre. Essential characteristics have to be deduced by the reader from the five charts she has added,

---

[275] Fallon 1979, 125: 1) "There is little emphasis upon vision (...) although there are some exeptions (e.g. *ApcPt*, PS IV, ApcPl)". 2) "For the revelations by Christ, the time is usually after the resurrection (see however the *ApcPt*". 3) "It can be noticed that very often the origin of man and his fall are recounted. However, this is not true in every case (e.g. *ApcPt*)". (italics are mine, hwh).

[276] Apoc.Pet. 72.4-28 and 81.3-83.15.

[277] See note 277.

[278] Shellrude 1986, 5.

[279] o.c. 253.

[280] o.c. 331.

[281] Perkins 1980.

[282] o.c. 27.

containing features of the genre. For reasons of comparison the most important features of the revelation dialogue are listed here. However, it should be noted that the absence of a genre definition in the work of Perkins is no coincidence but based on her rejection of generic classification.

In Chart One she has listed 'Features Common to Gnostic Revelation Dialogues'.[283] These features are: 1) a specific setting; 2) the risen Saviour; 3) the appearance of the revealer with angelic features. The revealer uses 'I am' proclamations and rebukes; 4) opponents are mentioned, the receivers of the revelation are to preach Gnosis and they face persecution. The revelation has to be kept hidden; 5) post-resurrection commission; 6) questions are listed, sometimes in the form of erotapokriseis; 7) CONTENT: Sophia myth, ascetic preaching, ascent of the soul, Christ as the Gnostic Saviour and a Christian Gnostic doctrine. Along with this list she gives a survey of texts which contain these 'common features' and which consequently are characterized as revelation dialogues: Pr.Paul (I,1); Ap.John (II,1); Hyp.Arch. (II,4); Thom.Cont. (II,7); Soph.Jes.Chr. (III,4); Dial.Sav. (III,5); 1Apoc.Jas. (V,3); ActsPet. 12Apost. (VI,1); *Apoc.Pet. (VII,3)*; Zost. (VIII,1); Ep.Pet.Phil. (VIII,2); PS (BG). (Italics are mine, hwh.)

From this inventory it appears that Perkins deems Apoc.Pet. to be a revelation dialogue. But, just as in Fallon's analysis, Apoc.Pet. actually stands on its own in the list of these Gnostic revelation dialogues. Perkins notices the special position of our text within the larger corpus of revelation dialogues, without giving it any special weight.[284] Many Gnostic features, such as the listing of questions after a self-definition of the revealer, descriptions of the highest God or the Pleroma and the Sophia myth, are almost completely absent in Apoc.Pet.[285] The presence in Apoc.Pet. of vision accounts is noticed by Perkins, but she does not pay special attention to it and, by referring to Fallon in a footnote, remarks only marginally that this is not typical of a Gnostic text.[286] A considerable number of elements which Perkins mentions in the other four Charts with characteristic features and which do occur in Apoc.Pet. are, according to her own words, not in the first place characteristic features of the Gnostic revelation dialogue. They are also, and in the first place, representative of the Jewish apocalypse.

In her discussion of the *narrative setting* of the Gnostic dialogue Perkins sums up place, name of the receiver(s) of the revelation, his/their activity and mental state. In one breath she adds to this: "These are common features which correspond (...) to the opening of Jewish

---

[283] o.c. 31.

[284] o.c. 62.

[285] o.c. 31, Chart one, 69 Chart five. These features are present in Apocr.Jn (II,1); Hyp.Arch. (II,4); Soph.Jes.Chr. (III,4); Zostr. (VIII,1) et al.

[286] o.c. 52, n. 36.

apocalypses".[287] Further on she deals with the *luminous appearance* of the revealer. This element, also present in Apoc.Pet., is called by Perkins "the standard Jewish picture of angels as appearing in white and gold".[288]

Regarding the *narrative conclusion* at the end of a Gnostic revelation dialogue: again Apoc.Pet. comes closer to the Jewish apocalypses than to the Gnostic dialogues: "Jewish apocalypses typically speak of the seer's awakening or his return to earth as we find in ApocPet and Zostr".[289]

Finally, Apoc.Pet. contains a *concluding commission:* "These commissions combine features of Jewish apocalypses, where the seer is to make known what he has seen or is to assume a specific role, with the mission charge of the risen Jesus to his disciples".[290]

Perkins explicitly says that Apoc.Pet. holds a special position in the corpus she has analysed: "ApocPet has an unusual combination of visions and exegesis of the crucifixion account. (...) Thus, ApocPet has taken over the format of apocalyptic vision to serve as New Testament interpretation. (...) Peter's visions are interrupted by *discourse*"[291] (my italics, hwh).

A different approach is made by Schönborn.[292] He analyses Apoc.Pet. with the purpose of determining the function of the dialogue parts. He does not set up a definition of dialogue as a genre and explicitly rejects classification,[293] but several times his idea of the Gnostic dialogue comes very close to what could be called a genre.[294]

In his discussion of the dialogues of Apoc.Pet. Schönborn puts the interaction between Peter and the Saviour in the centre of our attention. In particular, the double function of Peter as narrator and as agent in the story appears to be responsible for the specific tension within the text. Schönborn explains this as 'meta communication'. By re-telling the discussion with the Saviour - a discussion in which Peter slowly comes to some sort of insight - it is made possible for the reader to go through the same experience by mentally taking the place of

---

[287] o.c. 41.

[288] o.c. 45.

[289] ibid.

[290] o.c. 57.

[291] o.c. 62.

[292] Schönborn 1987.

[293] o.c. 185: "Im Fall der gnostischen Dialoge sollte es darum selbstverständlich sein, nicht von einer abstrakten Dialogdefinition auszugehen. Das Spezifikum ist vielmehr aus jedem Text individuell zu erheben".

[294] o.c. 158-164, especially 161: "Als Sprachkonvention mit fast institutionellem Charakter ist der Dialog den Gnostikern vorgegeben gewesen".

Peter. This is, in short, the essential function of the dialogues in Apoc.Pet. according to Schönborn.[295]

4.2.1 Evaluation

This survey of the major studies on the genre of Apoc.Pet. shows significant differences of opinion among the authors. One could imagine a kind of continuum where Koch and Fallon are situated at opposite ends: among the Nag Hammadi texts, Koch regards only Apoc.Pet. as an apocalypse, whereas Fallon regards many of the Nag Hammadi texts as apocalypses and includes texts in which apocalyptic sections are part of a larger text, like Melch. (NHC IX,1), Paraph.Shem (NHC VII,1) and Gos.Mary (BG 8502,1).[296] Brashler and Krause take a more moderate position. They exclude, for example, both the apocalypses of James (NHC V,3 and 4) but do reckon Apoc.Adam (NHC V,5), Apoc.Paul (V,2) and Apoc.Pet. among them.[297] Shellrude starts with sixteen potential apocalypses but ends with applying this description only to Apoc.Pl. and Apoc.Pet. Schönborn, finally, rejects the possibility of a genre-description of 'apocalypses'.[298] But however much the opinions differ, Apoc.Pet. is considered either a Christian-Gnostic apocalypse with Jewish apocalyptic elements[299] or a Christian-Gnostic revelation dialogue with Jewish apocalyptic traits.[300]

The labelling of Apoc.Pet. as a traditional apocalypse by Krause, Brashler and Koch is rather formal, based on a static concept of genre which neglects the historic and literary development of genres. Fallon's study displays a more dynamic view on genre but does not take into account the specific features in which Apoc.Pet. deviates from the other Gnostic apocalypses.

The most thorough discussion of Apoc.Pet and genre is the one by Shellrude. After a careful consideration of the different definitions of the apocalypse as a genre, he sets up his own definition. The most important difference with the earlier definitions is that Shellrude rejects the necessity of including elements of content in the definition of genre. He puts his finger on the problem by identifying the elements of content as the main source of confusion

---

[295] o.c. 346f.

[296] The texts of the Gnostic Codex of Berlin (BG) are included in Fallon's analysis because of their relationship with the Nag Hammadi texts.

[297] Krause 1983; Brashler 1977.

[298] Schönborn is the only author who does not call Apoc.Pet. an apocalypse. This is because he thinks it impossible to set up a description of the genre 'apocalypse'.

[299] Brashler 1977, Fallon 1979, Koch 1982, Krause 1983, Shellrude 1986.

[300] Perkins 1980.

and, indeed, rejects all foregoing attempts to define the genre on this basis.[301] He employs a definition in which only elements of form and structure are included.[302] On the basis of his reduced definition of the apocalypse genre Shellrude comes to the conclusion that Apoc.Pet. should be read as an apocalypse.

Apoc.Pet. also displays some elements of the revelation dialogue as described by Perkins. Most of these elements, however, are identified by Perkins herself as characteristics of Jewish apocalypses. It is obvious that Apoc.Pet. is not a normal exponent of the genre as described by Perkins. To state the most important argument: a text cannot be designated as a dialogue unless it contains a considerable amount of a specific type of communication between (at least) two agents, in which questions and answers are the main ingredients. Apoc.Pet. contains only two such dialogue parts. The first one takes up a little more than one codex page (72.4-73.13). The second dialogue (79.31-82.3) occupies two codex pages. Together only three pages out of fourteen contain dialogue; the parts which contain discourse form a large majority.

Furthermore, the specific way of listing questions we find in Gnostic revelation dialogues only occurs in the second dialogue part (81.7-81.14). And even here it is questionable if this passage of Apoc.Pet can be compared with the questions in, for instance, Ap.John (II,1), Thom.Cont (II,7), Soph.Jes.Chr. (III,4), Zostr. (VIII,1) and Ep.Pet.Phil. (VIII,2).[303] The questions in these revelation dialogues are mainly cosmological and ontological.[304] Thus in Ep.Pet.Phil. we read: "Lord, we would like to know the deficiency of the aeons and their pleroma". And: "How are we detained in this dwelling place"? Further: "How did we come to this place"? And: "In what manner shall we depart"?[305] These questions are representative of the type of questions posed in Gnostic revelation dialogues.

In Apoc.Pet., however, Peter asks the Saviour to explain what he sees at a particular moment, viz. during the crucifixion: "What is it that I see, My Lord? (...) who is the one who is glad and laughing upon the wood? and do they hit another on his feet and on his hands"? The Saviour said to me: "The one you see glad and laughing upon the wood, that is the living one, Jesus. But the one into whose hands and feet they are driving the nails is his

---

[301] His critique of the Semeia project also circles around the question of the relation between form and content. This will be discussed in 4.4.

[302] Shellrude 1986, 18-23.

[303] According to Perkins these texts contain the 'listed questions' typical of Gnostic revelation dialogues. Perkins 1980, 31.

[304] See Rudolph 1968, 95-102 for a characterization of the questions in the most important Gnostic revelation dialogues.

[305] Ep.Pet.Phil. (NHC VIII,2) 134.20-26.

fleshly part, which is the substitute".[306] This type of question and answer is not unusual in apocalypses. In Asc.Jes., a Christian apocalypse, we find a similar composition: "What is that, which I see, My Lord?' and I asked the angel who was with me and said: 'Who is that one, who forbade me, and who is this one who allowed me to ascend'? and he said to me: 'He who forbade you is he who is seated above the songs of praise of the sixth heaven, and he who gave you permission is your Lord Christ, who shall be called Jesus on earth".[307] The parallels between these two dialogues are evident. We do not find this type of dialogue in Gnostic revelation dialogues.[308]

Perkins rightly observes: "It is also clear that Gnostic and orthodox Christians remained together in the same ecclesial circles into the third and perhaps even the fourth centuries".[309] If this is true, as it very well might be, there is no reason to compare the genre of Apoc.Pet just with the genre of other Nag Hammadi texts, as Perkins does. In his study Schönborn rejects the generic approach to apocalypses. He quotes the words of Von Rad from 1965 to explain why Apoc.Pet. should not be regarded as an apocalypse: "Schon Gerhard von Rad hat darauf aufmerksam gemacht, daß ... 'die Apokalyptik in literarischer Hinsicht keine besondere 'Gattung' repräsentiert. Sie ist im Gegenteil in formgeschichtlicher Hinsicht ein mixtum compositum, das überlieferungsgeschichtlich auf eine sehr komplizierte Vorgeschichte schließen läßt'.[310] His main problem with generic studies lies in the almost unavoidable aspect of reducing each individual text to its characteristic genre features, at the sacrifice of the study of specific features which are responsible for the unique character of a text. However, this view does not take into account the approach to genre in more recent studies.[311] These are not concerned with labelling and grouping but with literary influence and development. Apart from that, Schönborn's analysis of the dialogues in Apoc.Pet. appears perfectly compatible with an approach that concentrates on the description of genre. These two methods of investigation are complementary instead of mutually exclusive.[312] To use two ancient concepts: the first approach is based on *rhetorica*, the second on *poetica*, a distinction commensurate with the difference between a psychological and a literary approach. The psychological or pragmatic approach concentrates on the communicative function of the text,

---

[306] Apoc.Pet. 81.7-21.

[307] Asc.Jes. VIII,4 and IX,3-6.

[308] We also find this type of dialogue in the Shepherd of Herm.

[309] Perkins 1980, 203. See my chapter 7.

[310] o.c. 178, quoting Von Rad *Theologie des Alten Testaments*. II München 4.Aufl. 1965, 330. Anm. 28.

[311] o.c. 176-177.

[312] But the small amount of dialogue in Apoc.Pet. should warn one against a too-easy acceptance of his approach.

and tries to discover which elements in a text are included to provoke specific reactions in the readers. The second, literary, approach is purely descriptive and tries to make an inventory of aspects of the structure and style of specific texts, eventually resulting in ascribing the text(s) to a larger group of texts which together make up a genre.

This survey illustrates what has been said before (4.1) about the fluctuating nature of a genre. However, we do not want to confine ourselves to this observation. The labelling of a text as a specimen of a genre is a form of interpretation. Or, the other way round, interpretation is impossible without a notion of genre. In order to reach a coherent interpretation of a text it has to be decided in which context of related texts the text under discussion will be read. As stated before, Apoc.Pet. seems to have many striking features in common with texts that are traditionally called apocalypses. It is unlikely that Apoc.Pet. could have been written in the present form and with the present content without a tradition of apocalyptic writings.[313]

This does not mean that the author did not know other texts and genres, like the revelation dialogue, traces of which also can be found in Apoc.Pet. As has been argued in the introduction to the present chapter, it is only natural that a text shows features of different genres simultanously. Indeed a literary genre is not a self-contained entity and a well-established generic framework is never the only factor that shapes a text. Consequently, there is always a corpus of related literature that is relevant, in varying degrees, to the understanding of a particular text.[314] But it is the corpus of apocalyptic texts that has formed the generic horizon of the author of Apoc.Pet.[315] Whether or not Apoc.Pet. can be called an apocalypse as traced out and defined by Collins, is the next question we have to discuss.

4.3 Apoc. Pet. and the Genre 'Apocalypse'

During the last two decades the problem of determining and describing an 'apocalypse' genre has concerned many scholars.[316] The discussion on this issue parallels the broader discussion on genre, insofar as it has gone through the same development from a static to a more dynamic view on genre.[317] Until now, research on apocalyptic literature has been almost

---

[313] Fowler 1982, 42: "In literature the basis of resemblance lies in literary tradition. What produces generic resemblances ... is tradition".

[314] Cf. Collins 1984, 7-8.

[315] Fowler 1982, 259.

[316] Vielhauer 1961; Koch 1970; Hanson 1976; Collins e.a. 1979; Hellholm 1983; Aune 1986.

[317] This development can be observed for instance in the previous studies of the genre of Apoc.Pet. as discussed 4.2.

exclusively directed at the Jewish and early-Christian apocalypses originating in the period between 250 B.C.E. and 250 C.E. The Gnostic apocalypses of Nag Hammadi however, most of which were written in the third century C.E., have not been dealt with to any great extent, apart from the two studies mentioned before.[318]

The most thorough and influential attempt to describe the apocalypse as a genre has been carried out by Collins c.s.[319] The authors started with a systematic analysis of a number of texts that were previously qualified as 'apocalypse' (on traditional or intuitive grounds).[320] Next they drew up an inventory of all regularly appearing characteristics. On this basis a definition of the apocalypse genre was set up which claims to be valid for all relevant writings: in their words, the apocalyptic genre is: "A genre of revelatory literature with a narrative framework, in which a revelation is mediated by an otherworldly being to a human recipient, disclosing a transcendent reality which is both temporal, insofar as it envisages eschatological salvation and spatial insofar as it involves another supernatural world".[321]

Traits which do occur regularly but not in all analysed texts, are, together with the constant elements from the definition, grouped in a master paradigm. With the help of this paradigm it is relatively easy to check which resemblances and differences the texts show with respect to one another. Since we have here a large corpus of texts that are designated apocalypses, it seems useful to examine Apoc.Pet. for its compatibility with Collins' definition of the genre 'apocalypse' and the accompanying paradigm.

When we actually compare Apoc.Pet. with the elements from the definition by Collins, it appears that all these elements can be found in Apoc.Pet.: 1) a revelation: 73.14-79.31. 2) an otherworldly being as mediator: the Saviour, see for example: 72.21-72.27. 3) a human recipient: Peter: 70.13.20; 71.15f.; 72.10; 75.27; 80.23.31; 84.14. 4) a transcendent reality: four verses speak of the heavens or (which is not the same) the Pleroma: 70.22; 71.2.13; 83.12. The 'eschatological salvation' can also be detected, though in a Gnostic sense 75.7-76.23; 77.4-77.22; 79.31-81.3; 83.19-84.6. The outer feature, 5) a narrative framework, is also present in Apoc.Pet.: 70.14-20 and 84.11-13.

Moreover, a large number of characteristics which are grouped in the master-paradigm can be detected in Apoc.Pet.

---

[318] Fallon 1979; Shellrude 1986.

[319] Collins 1979; Cf. Hartman 1983, 337-338, who typifies the Semeia project as: "the most thorough-going recent attempt to render further precision to the discussion before us". See also Collins 1991, 11-32.

[320] The texts under discussion in the Semeia project are either traditionally considered apocalypses, called apocalypse in their title, or resemble the genre by first reading. This last criterion is of course utterly unreliable since it contains a circular argument. One should also be aware of the fundamentally a-historical approach of the Semeia project. The requirement formulated by Hirsch 1967, 110, that the texts under discussion should be historically related to each other is only partly taken into consideration.

[321] Collins 1979, 9.

These elements are: *visions* (72.4-28; 81.3-83.15), *epiphany* (72.21-28), *audition* (72.28-73.13) (epiphanies are always followed by auditory revelation,[322] either in the form of *discourse* or *dialogue*, in Apoc.Pet. the audition is in the form of a dialogue), *Christ as otherworldly mediator* (70.23-25), *pseudonymity* of the recipient of the revelation (the title),[323] *reaction of the recipient* of the revelation (usually awe and/or perplexity) in Apoc.Pet.: "fear in joy" (72.22f.), *ex eventu prophecy* (73.14-75.7; 76.23-77.3; 77.22-79.31), *eschatological crisis in the form of persecution* (73.14-79.31), *(eschatological) judgement and personal salvation* (75.7-76.23; 78.22-31; 79.15-21; 80.2-23; 83.19-84.6), *otherworldly regions* (70.14-22; 71.2f.; 71.13-15; 83.12) *otherworldly beings* (74.30; 75.4; 82.12; 82.23) *paraenesis* (70.28-31; 71.15-25; 84.6-11), *instructions to the recipient* (83.15-26) and a *narrative conclusion* (83.15-84.13).[324]

The occurrence in Apoc.Pet. of numerous elements regarded by Collins c.s. as characteristic of the apocalyptic genre enables us to consider our text as an apocalypse according to their definition. Although it possibly is a third century Gnostic apocalypse, it still resembles Jewish and Christian apocalypses.

4.3.1 The Formal Structure of Apoc.Pet.

In this section we will present the indications of Apoc.Pet.'s apocalyptic character in a more convenient arrangement. To this end the formal structure of Apoc.Pet. will be presented in detail. However, the survey below of the formal structure of Apoc.Pet may show as well how certain elements have influenced the decision to associate the text with another genre. The above-mentioned (4.2) differences among interpretations of the genre of Apoc.Pet. can be traced to this multiplicity of possibly determining features. Perkins and Schönborn, for example, have stressed the dialogue parts. Brashler, on the other hand, has stressed the visions and the "vaticinia ex eventu".

Whether one focuses on the dialogues or on the visions depends on the line of approach of one's analysis. One's specific focus determines the description of the text as belonging to

---

[322] Collins 1984, 6.

[323] *First person account of the revelation*, an additional feature, pointed at by Aune 1986, 78 and 87, is present in Apoc.Pet. as well.

[324] *Present salvation through knowledge*, a specific feature of Gnostic apocalyptic texts according to Fallon 1979, 125, does not occur explicitly in Apoc.Pet. Perkins' observation is correct where she remarks on this allegedly Gnostic feature: "Fallon's attempt to make *present salvation through knowledge* the defining characteristic of the Gnostic apocalypses is too broad to fit the genre. Many Gnostic writings are engaged in intense debate over present and future salvation both with Christians and with other Gnostics". Perkins 1982, 32.

a certain genre.[325] On the basis of its formal structure the text could be designated as a narrative, a dialogue (interrupted by discourse and embedded in a narrative) or a discourse (interrupted by dialogue and embedded in a narrative). A more complicated combination of features renders further possible genre designations: 'Gnostic revelation dialogue'[326] and, indeed, 'apocalypse'.

The words and phrases which are printed bold in this presentation refer to the over-all structure of the text as introduced in 3.1. of the commentary. Italics correspond to elements occurring in Collins' master paradigm.

The Formal Structure of Apoc.Pet.

70.13 **Title,** labelling of the text as an 'apocalypse'.

70.14-72.4 **Introduction** (A)

70.14-70.20	*Narrative part* in which the setting is described (3rd ps.sg.)
70.20-70.22	Beatitude (1st ps.sg.)
70.22-70.24	Aretalogy (1st ps.sg.)
70.26-71.3	Characterization of the blessed ones and description of the mission of the Saviour (1st ps.sg.)
71.3-15	Change of perspective to third person singular
71.15-72.4	*Paraenesis* and vocation (1st ps.sg.)
71.25-33	Stylistic unit (possibly a parenthesis)

72.4-73.14 **Account of Vision and Audition** (B)

72.4-20	Introduction of the first *vision* including *dialogue*
72.20-72.28	Account of *vision*, reaction of Peter and *epiphany*
72.28-73.14	Account of *audition* (in the form of a *dialogue*)

73.14-81.3 **Monologue of the Saviour and Peter's Reaction** (C)

(*Christ as an otherworldly mediator*)

73.14-75.7	*Instruction and Vaticinia ex eventu*
75.7-76.23	*Eschatological teaching*
76.23-77.3	*Vaticinia ex eventu*

---

[325] Fowler 1982, 37.

[326] Cf. Perkins 1980.

77.4-77.22	*Eschatological teaching*
77.22-79.31	*Vaticinia ex eventu*
79.31-81.3	*Dialogue* containing *eschatological teaching* (Peter's Reaction)

81.3-83.15 **Account of Vision** (D)

| 81.6-82.3 | *Dialogue* introducing *vision* |
| 82.3-83.15 | Account of *vision* (and short monologue) |

83.15-84.13 **Conclusion** (E)

83.15-83.26	*Instruction* to esoteric preaching
83.19-84.6	*Eschatological teaching*
84.6-84.11	*Paraenesis*
84.11-84.13	*Narrative conclusion* (3rd ps. sg.)

84.14 **Subscript Title**

4.4 'Transcendent Reality' in Apoc.Pet.

Before assigning Apoc.Pet. definitively to the family of the apocalypses, the question has to be answered how it is possible that a text can have so many features in common with Jewish apocalypses, yet tell a completely different story.

The element from the Semeia definition that seems to cause this difference in content is 'transcendent reality', called by Collins "the key word in the definition".[327] Indeed this element is the source of every important variation within the genre. This is because the description of the transcendent reality obviously is closely connected with the religious background of the text. It may therefore be assumed that differences between Jewish, Christian and Gnostic apocalypses are caused by differences in ideas about a transcendent reality.

This explains why apocalypses from different religious backgrounds, on the one hand show large mutual differences caused by a difference in describing the transcendent reality, but, on the other hand, have in common all or most of the features of the genre. One might assume that this paradox is due to the abstractness of the definition. However, it might also be the outcome of the specific way the genre has adapted to its religious environment.

An important observation which can clarify this last statement is made by Brashler: "It should not be overlooked that many of the major examples of this genre appeared at

---

[327] Collins 1979, 10.

approximately the same time".[328] Brashler quotes Koester to support this statement: "No doubt the older Jewish apocalypses antedate the beginnings of Christianity. But the typical Jewish apocalyptic literature (4 Ezra, 2 Baruch etc.) was produced in the same period in which the first Christian apocalypses (synoptic apocalypse, Apocalypse of John, Shepherd of Hermas) and probably also the first Gnostic revelations (Apocryphon of John), were written, i.e. in the 2nd half of the first century and in the beginning of the 2nd century A.D. Thus, Judaism, Christianity and Gnosticism seem to have developed writings of the same genre almost simultaneously".[329]

Apparently, constitutive elements of the apocalyptic family were fixed for the most part in the second half of the first century C.E. Indeed, from a literary point of view it would have been unusual if apocalyptic texts that form together the major examples of the genre had *not* appeared at the same moment in history but with intervals of a century or more.[330] This supports the view that Jewish, Christian and Gnostic apocalypses are offshoots of the same tree. The genre apocalypse passed through several stages of development and at its zenith was used in Jewish, Christian and Gnostic circles. Therefore, the reconstruction of a rectilinear development of the Gnostic apocalypse from the Jewish and Christian apocalypses is without a solid base. Koester makes a similar observation, although from a different angle: "Differences, (between apocalypses of Jewish, Christian and Gnostic origin (hwh)) (...) were apparently caused by particular religious experiences and convictions. They are visible in nonliterary symbols and traditions which represent the basic criteria of belief".[331] This remark on the transcendent reality (i.e. nonliterary symbols and traditions which represent the basic criteria of belief) supports the view that the specific religious ideas, which are responsible for the actual content of 'transcendent reality', is not elementary but secondary when it comes to a description of the genre.

Shellrude's critique on Collins partly contains the same observation.[332] His main argument is that Collins lays too much stress in his definition on the particular content of an

---

[328] Brashler 1977, 97.

[329] Koester/Robinson 1971, 271-272. Apoc.Pet. was possibly written about a century after the above mentioned flourishing period. A few characteristic elements point to this direction. See the Introduction. Collins for instance, draws attention to the fact that the increasing use of the genre designation 'apocalypse' might be considered as an indication of the growing awareness of the genre features. J.J. Collins 1984, 3. However, this awareness does not always coincide with modern criteria for the labelling of a text as an apocalypse. The title is used sometimes for texts with a revelatory character which we, however, would not qualify as an apocalypse. E.g. the Apocalypse of Adam (NHC V,5) which actually is a testament, and the Second Apocalypse of James (V,4), in which the apocalyptic section forms only a small part of the whole.

[330] Fowler 1971.

[331] o.c. 272.

[332] See above: 4.2.1.

apocalypse. Shellrude, however, in his definition, proposes to leave aside all features concerning the content of an apocalypse. According to him the only constituting elements of the genre apocalypse are formal ones: the narrative framework and the account of the revelatory event itself. He adds that the narrative frame must be cast in the first person.[333]

Shellrude's argument for excluding from the definition the content elements runs as follows: Collins claims that an apocalypse is defined in terms of structure and content. In fact, according to Shellrude, the apocalypses have been initially identified by Collins c.s. on the basis of structural features and then a list of topical categories has been drawn up on the basis of these texts.[334] He then states: "This is evident from the treatment of the Gnostic revelatory texts (...). The content of many of these texts differs radically from the Jewish and Christian apocalypses.

Consequently if one defined the content of an apocalypse on the basis of Jewish apocalypses then it would be impossible to classify most of these Gnostic texts as apocalypses. This difficulty is circumvented by defining the content of the apocalypse on the basis of both the traditional apocalypse (Jewish and Christian) and the Gnostic apocalypses. (...) The important point is that these Gnostic revelatory texts have been classified as apocalypses on the basis of the structural characteristics which they have in common with Jewish and Christian apocalypses".[335] From a formal point of view Shellrude's observation is correct. His analysis of Collins' mode of investigation has brought to light a special version of the hermeneutic circle: knowledge of individual works depends on knowledge of the genre and vice versa.[336] However, definition of a text as belonging to a special genre cannot always be settled by comparing formal features only.[337] Features of a higher level of abstraction which are less easy to detect at first reading can also be of major importance. In the case of apocalypses 'transcendence' is such a feature.

As a matter of fact, this problem has been obviated by Collins' method. Transcendent reality as such is a constant feature of the genre apocalypse and is included in the definition. However, the *specific content* of the transcendent reality forms part of the paradigm. As we have seen, the elements making up the paradigm are optional for the definition of the genre apocalypse. So, the specific transcendent reality is an optional and not a constant feature of

---

[333] Shellrude 1986, 22. We find this same addition in Aune 1986, 87.

[334] Shellrude 1986, 33.

[335] o.c. 33.

[336] Cf. Fowler 1982, 260.

[337] Fowler 1982, 260 "A few generic features, especially external ones, might be arrived at by comparison. But the genres themselves are known inwardly by a complex interaction of insights, experimental relations with literature, and relations with other critics by a 'familiarity' acquired through encounters, direct and indirect with the generic family".

the genre. By a preselection in Jewish, Christian and Gnostic apocalypses the problem has been further averted. In all instances transcendence is a fixed element of the definition but the paradigm contains the specific Jewish, Christian and Gnostic features.

4.5 Conclusion

Returning to Apoc.Pet., we conclude that this text can be attached to the family of the apocalypses as defined by Collins. All elements of the definition of the genre and most of the characteristic elements of the paradigm are present in the text. The text has some important traits in common with Jewish and Christian apocalypses. Interpreted visions are mentioned by almost all authors as typical of Jewish apocalypses. Paraenesis is found especially in Christian apocalypses.[338] The Gnostic apocalypses and revelation dialogues are, however, closer to Apoc.Pet. in their depiction of the transcendent reality: in Apoc.Pet. the content of the ex eventu prophecy, the eschatological judgement and the otherworldly regions and beings all have a typical Gnostic disposition. In our text we also find some features of the revelation dialogue, viz. listed questions and dialogue, as described by Perkins and Schönborn.[339] These features are not as central to the composition of Apoc.Pet. as the features of the apocalypse genre. Apoc.Pet. can be considered related to this genre but certainly not as a typical specimen.

These observations confirm what has been said about the nature of genres in 4.1. It is not necessary that a fixed number of features be present in a certain text in order to group that text with a specific genre. Individual deviating features are regarded as natural and a text can even belong to different genres simultaneously. Obviously, however, generic grouping entails a considerable level of abstraction and, consequently, individual features remain subordinated to group features. This means that only little has been said about a specific text when we have determined the genre or family it belongs to.

The function and social setting of Apoc.Pet. are not included in the description of the genre of Apoc.Pet. In chapter 7 a few tentative conclusions are drawn concerning the social constellation in which Apoc.Pet. could have originated and a proposal regarding its function is formulated.

---

[338] Brashler 1977, 148.

[339] See 4.2.1.

5. The Apocalypse of Peter and the New Testament

5.1 The Vagueness of the References

Apoc.Pet. displays a variety of generic, textual and thematic relations with various texts: other texts from the Nag Hammadi collection, Jewish, Christian and Gnostic apocalypses and New Testament texts. The most important relations between Apoc.Pet. and other Nag Hammadi texts are mentioned in the commentary. The problem of the position of Apoc.Pet. within the apocalyptic genre has been discussed in chapter 4. The present chapter will be restricted to the intertextual relation between Apoc.Pet. and early Christian texts that were to become parts of the New Testament.

Apoc.Pet. obviously contains important Christian features. The choice of the apostle Peter as the main personage, Christ as the mediator of the revelation, and the prominent place of the story of his Passion are clear indicators of the Christian character of the text. Nevertheless, it would appear to be quite difficult to determine the precise textual background of the references to early Christian tradition.

One of the aspects that complicate the recovering of references to other texts is that the original Greek text of Apoc.Pet. has not survived. This original would be necessary for studying connective particles, prepositions and other elements of the text, in order to collate the use of these elements with the Greek of the New Testament texts.

The Coptic translations of the New Testament do not come into consideration as sources from which the references in Apoc.Pet. could have been taken. As the Coptic translation of Apoc.Pet. probably dates from the end of the third or the beginning of the fourth century, we have compared the New Testament references of Apoc.Pet. with the Coptic New Testament in the Bohairic and the Sahidic dialects which are also considered to date back to the third or fourth century. However, both the Sahidic and the Bohairic version of the New Testament,[340] do not show any specific resemblance with the New Testament references of Apoc.Pet.

As an example we may compare the Sahidic and Bohairic translations of Mt. 25.30 and Mt. 23.13b with the allusions to these texts in Apoc.Pet. 78.22-31. We first present Mt. 25.30 followed by Mt. 23.13b because the texts are referred to in Apoc.Pet. 78.22-31 in this order.

---

[340] Mink 1989, I & II. Horner 1911-1924.

Mt. 25.30 (Sahidic):

ⲀⲨⲰ ⲠϨⲘϨⲀⲖ ⲚⲀⲦϢⲀⲨ ⲚⲦⲈⲦⲚⲞⲨϪⲈ ⲘⲘⲞϤ ⲈⲂⲞⲖ ⲈⲠⲔⲀⲔⲈ ⲈⲦϨⲒⲂⲞⲖ.
And cast (pl.) the worthless servant into the outer darkness.

Mt. 23.13b (Sahidic):

ⲚⲦⲰⲦⲚ ⲄⲀⲢ ⲚⲦⲈⲦⲚⲂⲰⲔ ⲀⲚ ⲈϨⲞⲨⲚ ⲞⲨⲀⲈ ⲚⲈⲦⲂⲎⲔ ⲈϨⲞⲨⲚ ⲚⲦⲈⲦⲚⲔⲰ
ⲘⲘⲞⲞⲨ ⲀⲚ ⲈⲂⲰⲔ ⲈϨⲞⲨⲚ.
For you (pl.) neither enter yourselves, nor allow those who would enter to go in.

Mt. 25.30 (Bohairic):

ⲞⲨⲞϨ ⲠⲒⲀⲦϢⲀⲨ ⲘⲂⲰⲔ ⲈⲦⲈⲘⲘⲀⲨ ϨⲒⲦϤ ⲈⲠⲒⲬⲀⲔⲒ ⲈⲦⲤⲀⲂⲞⲖ.
And cast that worthless servant into the outer darkness.

Mt. 23.14b (Bohairic):

ⲚⲐⲰⲦⲈⲚ ⲄⲀⲢ ⲦⲈⲦⲚⲚⲎⲞⲨ ⲈϨⲞⲨⲚ ⲀⲚ. ⲞⲨⲀⲈ ⲚⲎ ⲈⲐⲚⲎⲞⲨ ⲦⲈⲦⲈⲚⲬⲰ ⲘⲘⲰⲞⲨ
ⲀⲚ ⲈⲒ ⲈϨⲞⲨⲚ.
For you neither go in, nor they who do go, do you permit them to come in.[341]

Apoc.Pet. 78.22-31:

ⲚⲀⲒ ⲀⲈ ⲘⲠⲒⲢⲎⲦⲈ ⲚⲈ ⲚⲒⲈⲢⲄⲀⲦⲎⲤ ⲈⲨⲚⲀⲚⲞϪⲞⲨ ⲈⲠⲒⲔⲀⲔⲈ ⲈⲦⲤⲀⲂⲞⲖ ⲚⲤⲀⲂⲞⲖ
ⲚⲚⲒϢⲎⲢⲈ ⲚⲦⲈ ⲠⲞⲨⲞⲈⲒⲚ· ⲞⲨⲦⲈ ⲄⲀⲢ ⲚⲦⲞⲞⲨ ⲚⲤⲈⲚⲚⲎⲞⲨ ⲀⲚ· ⲀⲖⲖⲀ ⲞⲨⲦⲈ
ⲚⲤⲈⲔⲰ ⲀⲚ ⲚⲚⲎ ⲈⲦⲚⲎⲨ ϢⲀϨⲢⲀⲒ ⲈⲠⲒϯ ⲘⲈⲦⲈ ⲚⲦⲀⲨ ⲠⲢⲞⲤ ⲠⲒⲂⲰⲖ ⲈⲂⲞⲖ ⲚⲦⲈ
ⲚⲎ·
But those of this kind are the workers who will be thrown into the outer darkness, away from the children of light. For neither will they themselves go inside nor will they allow those who are going up to their approval, towards their release.

The comparison of these texts shows that Apoc.Pet. does not have any specific element in common with the Sahidic and Bohairic versions of Mt. 25.30. The Sahidic has the verb ⲚⲞⲨϪⲈ 'throw' and the noun ⲔⲀⲔⲈ 'darkness' in common with Apoc.Pet. With the Bohairic text, Apoc.Pet. only shares ⲈⲠⲒ(Ⲭ)ⲀⲔ(Ⲓ) ⲈⲦⲤⲀⲂⲞⲖ "into the outer darkness". We can make the same observation with regard to the second passage. Here, we find a parallel, in both the Sahidic and Bohairic, in the use of the verb ⲔⲰ (ⲬⲰ), 'allow', a frequent verb in Coptic. In addition, Apoc.Pet. shares the equally common stativ ⲚⲎ(Ⲟ)Ⲩ (go) with the

---

[341] Quotations from Matthew: G. Horner 1911-1924.

Bohairic text. For the rest the texts differ in practically every possible detail. The other references in Apoc.Pet. to texts which are now part of the New Testament also appear to deviate to a large extent from the Sahidic and Bohairic versions of the New Testament. Therefore, a direct dependence of Apoc.Pet. on the Coptic versions of the New Testament is unlikely.

Moreover, it will appear that in many cases the similarities between Apoc.Pet. and certain New Testament texts are far from clear and specific: verbatim citations do not occur and a quotation-formula is used only twice.[342] As a rule we are concerned with more or less clear allusions which are incorporated seamlessly, while they are interwoven with quite specific interpretations. Words and phrases are changed, left out or added, in order to convey the author's own Gnostic views.[343] Still, it will appear that a sufficient part of the passages in question can be recognized as references to early Christian texts. However, this particular method of incorporating texts probably precludes our recovering the exact biblical text form, even if the original Greek version of Apoc.Pet. were available.

This vagueness of the references in Apoc.Pet. is a common feature of references to Scripture in apocalyptic texts. A study of this phenomenon by Patte has demonstrated this.[344] In all the Jewish apocalyptic texts he analysed, he finds the same pattern: on the one hand an intensive contact exists between the apocalyptic text and texts from Scripture; on the other hand this contact usually surfaces in extremely vague references. The use of numerous biblical phrases in these apocalypses appears to resemble the use of Scripture in liturgical texts of classical Judaism where sometimes Scripture is used so loosely that it is not properly speaking a use of Scripture anymore. It has become an integral part of liturgical language.[345]

The explanation Patte offers for this phenomenon is based on his observations of modern Pentecostal groups: in these groups Scripture is meditated day and night. According to Patte one cannot but be struck by the use of biblical slang when one speaks with members of these groups.[346] A similar practice in ancient Christian circles might explain the specific use of 'New Testament' phrases in Apoc.Pet. Like modern Pentecostal groups, the ancient Christians (Gnostic Christians included) are liable to have read Scripture and meditated on it. Against such a background, the characteristic allusive style of Apoc.Pet. might be explained. The

---

[342] Apoc.Pet. 75.7f. and 83.26f.; cf. Williams 1988, 8-12.

[343] Cf. Williams 1988, 11, who is confronted with the same textual situation in the Gospel of Truth (NHC I, 3).

[344] Patte 1975. See also: Hartman 1966; Schüssler Fiorenza 1983; Collins 1984.

[345] Patte 1975, 172.

[346] o.c. 201. See also Schüssler Fiorenza 1983, 300, on the occurrence of allusions to Scripture in Christian apocalypses: "Such a use of Scripture must not necessarily be the fruit of conscious 'desk-labors'. It still occurs today in enthusiastic groups that are steeped in Scripture".

vagueness of the references quite possibly is a consequence of an ongoing influence of certain texts on the minds of people and, consequently, on the language of a group. In his analysis, Patte makes a very useful distinction between structural and anthological references.[347] It is my contention that this distinction is also of great help in our analysis of the references to 'New Testament' texts in Apoc.Pet.

5.2 Structural and Anthological References

A basic feature of the incorporation of Scriptural texts in Jewish and Christian apocalypses is the use of two different styles of reference. Patte calls the first the structural style of reference and describes this phenomenon as follows: "By the structural use of Scripture we refer to the structuring of apocalyptic texts by one or several biblical passages. In this case it appears that Scripture itself is the primary locus of revelation".[348] This definition indicates that the references to Scripture are based on a coherent text. In our case it appears that parts of Apoc.Pet. follow the structure of the Passion story as it is told in the synoptic Gospels. This is caused by the incorporation of several allusions to this specific New Testament story. The Gnostic story depends, so to speak, on the New Testament story.

The second style of reference is characterized by its interest in the actual words of separate Biblical phrases. These words are used as 'proverbs' to illustrate the new text. This atomistic or 'anthological' style is a common characteristic of apocalypses as well.[349] As Patte puts it: "The apocalyptist's teaching is expressed by means of numerous biblical phrases, to such an extent that it is possible to consider many of these apocalyptic texts a kind of anthology of biblical phrases".[350] An important feature of this style of reference as it occurs in our text, is that the references to New Testament texts are not restricted to one specific story but contain allusions to different Scriptural texts. This use of Scripture displays less interest in the normative or authoritative character of Scripture, although it apparently remains meaningful to refer to these texts. Here, the emphasis is on its own Gnostic discourse. In fact, any text can be used, as long as it is able to illustrate the Gnostic view of the author.

In Apoc.Pet. we will find a structural use of New Testament texts in the first parts of our text (70.14-73.14) and again at the end of the text (81.3-83.15). The anthological type of

---

[347] Patte borrowed this terminology from A. Robert's: 'Genres Littéraires' *Dictionnaire de la Bible, Supplément* vol. V, 411f.

[348] o.c. 171f. Patte has only analysed Jewish apocalyptic texts, but the pattern of alluding to Scripture appears to be the same in Christian apocalypses. Cf. Schüssler Fiorenza 1983, 300, for a description of this phenomenon in early Christian apocalypses.

[349] Cf. also Schüssler Fiorenza 1983, 300, and Collins 1984, 14.

[350] Patte 1975, 172.

referring to New Testament texts dominates in the monologue of the Saviour (73.14-81.3) and in the conclusion (83.15-84.13).

5.3 Analysis of the Relations between Apoc.Pet. and New Testament Texts

Below is a survey of possible New Testament references in Apoc.Pet. Clearly, it is sometimes difficult to decide whether an allusion to an earlier text is really concerned. In my analysis I will include 33 references.[351] Most of the references have already been identified by other authors, as the following survey makes clear.[352]

5.3.1 Previous Identifications of New Testament References

The references which will be discussed in 5.4. have all been mentioned, although not in a systematic way, by one or more of the following authors: Krause '73, Werner '74, Brashler '77, Tröger '77, Koschorke '78, Dubois '82, Smith '85, Tuckett '86, Pearson '90b.

---

[351] Some of these references in Apoc.Pet. are grouped together because of thematic resemblances, which reduces the 33 examples to 23.

[352] Possible references, mentioned by previous authors, which are not discussed in the present analysis: **Werner '74**: *71.27-33* / Mk. 9.2-8; 2 Pt. 1.16ff.; 81.27 / Mt. 16.22. **Brashler '77**: 73.16 / 1 Cor. 15.51; *73.18-19* / Lk. 16.8; 20.34; *77.13* / Acts 19.23; 22.4; *78.12-15* / Gal. 2.4; 5.1; Jn 8.34-36; *80.6-7* / Mt 7.21-22; Lk. 6.46; *81.21* / Mk. 8.37; Mt. 16.26. **Tröger '77**: *71.14f.* / Mt. 23.6-11; *72.23-27* / Mt. 26.55; 72.24 / Mt. 17.2; *74.15* / Eph. 5.26; *82.1-3* / 1 Cor. 2.8. **Koschorke '78**: *70.29-31* / Mt. 24.12; *73.32-74.9* / Mt. 24.9; *74.5* / Mt. 23.34; *75.2* / 1 Cor. 9.1; 15.8; Gal. 1.12 (Acts 9.3f.); *76.16-22* / 1 Cor. 9.19; 2 Pt. 3.16; *78.1-6* / Mt. 24.27f.; *78.16* / Rom. 9.27; 11.5; *78.17* / 1 Cor. 2.2; Rom. 6.2; *79.11* / Mk. 3.12; *79.25-26* / Lk. 22.25. **Dubois '82**: *72.3-4* / Mk. 14.26f., 29; *72.16* / Mk. 15.24; *72.21* / Mk. 16.5. **Smith '85**: *70.21-32* / Mt. 5.45; *78.6* / Mt. 24.3, 27; *80.15-16* / Mt. 25.31-46; *83.17* / Mt. 21.43; *84.12-13* / Acts 12.11. **Tuckett '86**: 74.27 / Mk. 13.12. **Pearson '90b**: *73.23-28* / 2 Pet. 2.18; 3.17; *74.15-16* / 2 Pet. 2.13; 2.2; *74.20-22* / 2 Pet. 2.1; *75.6* / 2Pet. 2.1.3; 3.7.16; *75.12-13* / 2 Pet. 2.14; *75.15 -20* / 2 Pet. 1.4; *76.18-20* / 2 Pet. 3.10; *76.25-27* / 2 Pet. 1.16; *76.29-30* / 2 Pet. 2.12; 77.13 / 2 Pet. 2.2, 15, 21; *78.6* / 2 Pet. 1.16; 3.4, 12; *78.13-15* / 2 Pet. 2.19; *78.19* / 2 Pet. 2.13, 15; *79.17* / 2 Pet. 2.19.

Apoc. Pet.

Ref	Kr '73	W '74	B '77	Tr '77	K '78	D '82	Sm '85	Pr '90	T '86
70 .14					K '78				T '86
70.21-22				Tr '77	K '78				T '86
70. 26-27		W '74			K '78				T '86
71.12						D '82			
71.15-21							Sm '85		T '86
72.2				Tr '77	K '78				
72.5-9				Tr' 77		D '82			
72.10-13			B '77	Tr '77	K '78			Pr '90	T '86
73.1-4				Tr '77					
73.11-14					K '78			Pr '90	
73.29-32			B '77						
74.10-12			B '77		K '78			Pr '90	T '86
74.22-27					K '78			Pr '90	T '86
75.7-10			B '77				Sm '85		T '86
76.4-10			B '77				Sm '85		T '86
77.24-27					K '78			Pr '90	T '86
77.33-78.1			B '77					Pr '90	
78.20-22							Sm '85		T '86
78.22-31		W '74	B '77		K '78		Sm '85	Pr '90	
79.18f.		W '74		Tr '77	K '78				T '86
79.28-31		W '74		Tr '77	K '78				T '86
79.30-31		W '74	B '77		K '78		Sm '85	Pr '90	
80.2-4									
80.9-11				Tr '77	K '78				T '86
80.23-29									T '86
81.3-16				Tr '77	K '78	D '82			T '86
81.11									T '86
81.28-32					K '78			Pr '90	T '86
82.18-20									
82.25-26					K '78				
83.26-30	Kr '73	W '74	B '77				Sm '85		T '86
84.4-6									
84.6-9									T '86

5.4 Analysis of the Texts

As I have done in my commentary I will divide Apoc.Pet. into five sections: A) Introduction (70.14-72.4), B) Account of Vision and Audition (72.4-73.14), C) Monologue of the Saviour and Peter's Reaction (73.14-81.3), D) Account of Vision (81.3-83.15) and E) Conclusion (83.15-84.14).[353]

The first parts of Apoc.Pet. (A and B) seem to be structured partly after Matthew 16.13-20, the confession of Peter. In these introductory sections we also find a transition to the Passion of Jesus as a structuring frame, apparently on the basis of the Gospel tradition but not yet as elaborated as in the fourth main part (D) of the text. The very first allusion, however, can be qualified as an anthological reference. We will find this pattern throughout the text: the structural references are punctuated with anthological allusions,[354] while the monologue of the Saviour (C), which is characterized for the most part by the anthological style of quoting, displays one smaller structural allusion. However, we will see that, by and large, the structural style dominates in the frame story about the Passion (parts A, B and D) while the anthological style is especially found in the monologue of the Saviour on the various heresies (C) and in the conclusion (E).

In section 1 of each item the references will be listed together with the New Testament text(s) with which they seem to be intertextually connected.[355] Parallel texts from the Synoptic Gospels and similar texts from the Gospel of John will not be quoted verbally but will be noted in parentheses. By including references to these texts in parentheses, my intention is to avoid giving the impression that the textual base of each reference goes undiscussed. In several cases possible references to texts other than the New Testament will be mentioned without quoting them. The differences between Apoc.Pet. and these texts appear to be too large to be of interest for a close comparison. These texts might be of some significance, though, because of their thematic resemblances.

In other instances more than one text has to be quoted. In some of these cases it cannot be decided which text is closest to Apoc.Pet. In other cases a discussion about the supposed background is illustrated by different references.

In section 2 the linguistic similarities and differences between the reference in Apoc.Pet. and its possible New Testament background will be described.

In section 3, finally, an attempt will be made to indicate the new function of the reference within the context of Apoc.Pet.

---

[353] These headings are also used in chapter 4.3.1.

[354] Patte 1975, 185.

[355] The English translation of the texts of Apoc.Pet. is my own. The Greek New Testament texts are taken from Nestle-Aland 26th ed. The English quotations of the New Testament texts are from the Revised Standard Version.

5.4.1 A. Introduction (70.14-72.4)

As observed above, the introduction of Apoc.Pet. is characterized by the structural style of referring to the Gospel tradition. This relationship suggests that authority is attached to the Gospel story concerned and their subjects, Jesus and Peter. The first reference, however, is anthological and makes clear immediately the author's independent position vis-a-vis the Gospel story.

1.

1)   Apoc.Pet. 70.14

ⲉϥϩⲙⲟⲟⲥ ⲛ̄ϭⲓ ⲡⲥⲱ̄ⲣ ⲛ̄ϩⲣⲁⲓ ϩⲙ̄ ⲡⲣ̄ⲡⲉ
As the Saviour was sitting in the temple

Mt. 26.55 (cf. Jn. 8.2; Mk. 14.49; Lk. 19.47; 21.37; 22.53)
καθ᾽ ἡμέραν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ ἐκαθεζόμην διδάσκων
Day after day I sat in the temple teaching.

2)   Several places in the New Testament speak of Jesus being in the temple. Matthew actually relates that he is *sitting* in the temple for teaching. In Apoc.Pet. this last specification does not appear. The statement in the Gospel of Matthew, of Jesus sitting in the temple, differs in perspective: Matthew's account is in the first person singular: in Apoc.Pet. the third person singular is used. Regarding this element, Jn 8.2 is closer to Apoc.Pet. than Matthew's text. However, the text of Jn 7.53-8.11 is part of a later insertion.[356] It is not found in any of the important Greek textual witnesses, nor in the Coptic translations. It is therefore not likely to form the source of Apoc.Pet. So, the description of Jesus sitting in the temple is more likely based on this scene in the Gospel of Matthew.

3)   This picture of Jesus, sitting in the temple for teaching, seems to be used in Apoc.Pet. to create a traditional setting. However, while Jesus is sitting in the temple, he does not speak to the people or to the religious leaders of Israel, but to Peter alone. In the monologue of the Saviour (73.22-80.8) we have a direct account of this teaching in the first person singular. Although the function of this reference is to depict a traditional image, it should be kept in mind that the Gospel tradition is used in a different way: not only does the person addressed differ from the audience in Matthew, but also the temple seems to be a different temple from

---

[356] Cf. Jn 8.2 in Nestle-Aland 1981²⁶ᵉᵈ·, 273.

the one in Jerusalem.[357] So, the first line of Apoc.Pet. already confronts us with a tension between the New Testament text and the present Gnostic story.

2.

1)   Apoc.Pet.

70.21-22

ⲤⲈⲤⲘⲀⲘⲀⲀⲦ ⲚϬⲒ ⲚⲀⲠⲒⲰⲦ· ⲈⲨⲤⲀⲦⲠⲈ ⲚⲚⲒⲠⲎⲨⲈ·
blessed are those, belonging to the Father - because they are above the heavens -

70.26-27

ⲚⲦⲞⲞⲨ ⲠⲈⲦⲞⲨⲕⲰⲦ ⲘⲘⲞⲞⲨ ⲚϨⲢⲀⲒ ϨⲘ ⲠⲎ ⲈⲦϪⲞⲞⲢ·
- those who are built on what is strong -

71.12f.

ⲠⲒϢⲎⲢⲈ ⲠⲈ ⲚⲦⲈ ⲠⲢⲰⲘⲈ ⲈⲦϪⲞⲤⲈ ⲈⲚⲒⲠⲎⲨⲈ ...
- who is the Son of Man, who is exalted above the heavens -

71.15-21

ⲚⲦⲞⲔ ⲆⲈ ϨⲰⲰⲔ ⲠⲈⲦⲢⲈ ϢⲰⲠⲈ ⲈⲔⲈⲚⲦⲈⲖⲒⲞⲤ ⲚϨⲢⲀⲒ ϨⲘ ⲠⲈⲔⲢⲀⲚ
ⲚⲘⲘⲀⲒ ϨⲰ ⲠⲎ ⲈⲦⲀϤⲤⲰⲦⲠ ⲘⲘⲞⲔ· ϪⲈ ⲈⲂⲞⲖ ⲘⲘⲞⲔ ⲀⲒⲈⲒⲢⲈ ⲚⲞⲨⲀⲢⲬⲎ
ⲘⲠⲒⲔⲈⲤⲈⲈⲠⲈ ⲈⲦⲀⲒⲦⲀϨⲘⲞⲨ ⲈϨⲞⲨⲚ ⲈⲨⲤⲞⲞⲨⲚ·
You too Peter, become perfect in your name, just like me, the one who has chosen you. For with you I have made a start for the others whom I have called to knowledge.

Mt. 16.13-18 (cf. Mt. 5.3-12; Mk. 14.62f)

[13] τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου

[17] μακάριος εἶ, Σίμων Βαριωνᾶ, ὅτι σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα οὐκ ἀπεκάλυψέν σοι ἀλλ' ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.

[18] Πέτρος, καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ οἰκοδομήσω μου τὴν ἐκκλησίαν καὶ πύλαι ᾅδου οὐ κατισχύσουσιν αὐτῆς.

---

[357] See the commentary ad loc.

[13] Now when Jesus came into the district of Caesarea Philippi, he asked his disciples, "Who do men say that *the Son of Man* is"? [14] And they said, "Some say John the Baptist, others say Elijah, and others Jeremiah, or one of the prophets". [15] He said to them "But who do you say that I am"? [16] Simon Peter replied, "You are the Christ, the Son of the living God". [17] And Jesus answered him: *"Blessed are you, Simon Bar-Jonah! For flesh and blood has not revealed this to you but my Father who is in heaven.* [18] *And I tell you, you are Peter (the rock), and on this rock I will build my church, and the powers of death shall not prevail against it".*[358]

2)   This part of Apoc.Pet. is structured by the story of the confession of Peter in Matthew's Gospel. In 70.21-22, however, not Peter is blessed, but "those belonging to the Father". Matthew's "my Father" has become "the Father" and "in heaven" has been changed into "above the heavens". As for 70.26-27: one verb in Apoc.Pet. 70.25 indicates an intertextual relationship. This is the use of ⲔⲰⲦ (build), which points to the Matthean οἰκοδομήσω (vs.18). The combination ⲔⲰⲦ with ⲈⲦⲬⲞⲞⲢ makes the allusion even more plausible.[359] 71.12: The title 'Son of Man' is not unusual in Gnostic texts[360] but is unique in Apoc.Pet. Tuckett also notices the unusual occurrence of this title in our text.[361] This makes it possible that it goes back to the Matthean story. So, Apoc.Pet. 71.15-21 is clearly an allusion to Mt 16.13-20. Our text renders the quintessence of this Gospel story and extends it with a Gnostic interpretation. Peter is summoned to become perfect, in accordance with his name: a rock, strong. Matthew also uses the meaning of Peter's name as an argument for his being chosen. This word pun only functions in Greek, not in Coptic.[362]

3)   Peter is here introduced as the first one of a group of Gnostics. He is, however, not the foundation of the Church as is told in Mt. 16.20 but "the beginning of the rest that I have called to knowledge" (71.18-21). In Apoc.Pet., the Gnostic answer to the question: "Who is the Son of Man"? (Mt. 16.13) is revealed to Peter: "The revealed one - who is the Son of Man, who is exalted above the heavens -" (Apoc.Pet. 71.12f.). At the beginning of the story the author wants to demonstrate the authority of Peter. The Matthean Peter tradition and its significance for Gnostic thinking is one of the main themes in Apoc.Pet.

---

[358] Because we have here a structural allusion I have cited the complete English text of Mt. 16.13-18.

[359] Cf. Smith 1985, 133.

[360] See for example 2 Log. Seth (NHC VII,2) 65.19; 69.22.

[361] Tuckett 1986, 118.

[362] See my commentary for an explanation of the speculations on Peter's name.

3.

1)   Apoc.Pet. 72.2

ϨⲰⲤ ⲈϤⲚⲀⲤⲞⲞϨⲈ ⲘⲘⲞⲔ ⲚϢⲞⲘⲦ ⲚⲤⲞⲠ ϨⲚ ⲦⲈⲒⲞⲨϢⲎ·
when he is about to reprove you three times in this night.

Mt. 26.34 (cf. Mk. 14.26-31; Lk. 22.31-34; Jn. 13.36-38; Jn. 21.15-18)

ἔφη αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· ἀμὴν λέγω σοι ὅτι ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ νυκτὶ πρὶν ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι
τρὶς ἀπαρνήσῃ με.
Jesus said to him, "Truly I say to you: this very night, before the cock crows you
will deny me three times".

2)   Two indicators point toward specific New Testament passages: 'three times' and 'in this
night'. This passage, however, is very difficult to grasp. The uncertain meaning of the verb
ⲤⲞⲞϨⲈ is the most important impediment to identifying the textual background of this
allusion.[363]

3)   The phrase has a certain resemblance with the foreboding of Peter's disowning of Jesus.
In this regard, we can interpret ⲤⲞⲞϨⲈ (reprove) and ⲦⲈⲒⲞⲨϢⲎ (this night) as the first
signals of the Passion story which structures the second half of the introduction. The function
of this allusion is the recollection of early Christian traditions about the life and Passion of
Jesus and the structuring of Apoc.Pet. after them.

5.4.2 B. Account of Vision and Audition (72.4-73.14)

4.

1)   Apoc.Pet. 72.5-9

ⲀⲈⲒⲚⲀⲨ ⲈⲚⲞⲨⲎⲎⲂ ⲘⲚ ⲠⲒⲖⲀⲞⲤ ⲈϤⲠⲎⲦ ⲈϨⲢⲀⲒ ⲈϪⲰⲚ ⲘⲚ ϨⲈⲚⲰⲚⲈ
ϨⲰⲤ ⲈⲨⲚⲀϨⲞⲦⲂⲚ· ⲀⲈⲒϢⲦⲞⲢⲦⲢ ϪⲈ ⲚⲚⲈⲚⲘⲞⲨ·
I (sc. Peter) saw the priests and the people running in our direction with stones, in
order to kill us: I was afraid that we would die.

Jn. 8.59a

---

[363] Gramm. Ann. 72.2f.

ἦραν οὖν λίθους ἵνα βάλωσιν ἐπ᾽ αὐτόν.
So they took up stones to throw at him;

Jn. 10.31 (cf. Acts 14.5)

᾽Εβάστασαν πάλιν λίθους οἱ ᾽Ιουδαῖοι ἵνα λιθάσωσιν αὐτόν.
The Jews took up stones again to stone him.

2)   New Testament parallels for the text of Apoc.Pet. can be found in the Gospel of John.
In two passages of this Gospel Jesus is threatened with stones by the Jews. It is possible that
a reference to this Gospel tradition is made, although the only literal connection between
Apoc.Pet. and the Johannine texts consists of the word 'stones'. The use of a final clause is
another parallel between the two texts but this is a common stylistic device and therefore of
no overriding importance.

3)   The function of this allusion is in accordance with the New Testament references of the
introduction. Events from the life of Jesus just before the crucifixion structure the story and
are used as stepping-stones.

5.

1)   Apoc.Pet. 72.10-13 (cf. 73.11-14; 76.21-22; 81.28-32)

ⲁⲉⲓⲭⲟⲟⲥ ⲛⲁⲕ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲙⲏⲏϣⲉ ⲛ̄ⲥⲟⲡ ⲭⲉ ϩⲉⲛⲃⲗ̄ⲗⲉⲉⲩⲉ ⲛⲉ ⲉⲙⲛ̄
ⲭⲁⲩⲙⲟⲉⲓⲧ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲩ·
I have told you several times that they are blind ones who have no guide.

Mt.15.14a (cf. Mt. 9.36; 23.16.17.19.26; Jn 9.39-41)[364]

ἄφετε αὐτούς· τυφλοί εἰσιν ὁδηγοὶ [τυφλῶν]·
Let them alone; they are [blind] guides.

2 Pt. 1.9

ᾧ γὰρ μὴ πάρεστιν ταῦτα, τυφλός ἐστιν μυωπάζων
For whoever lacks these things is blind and shortsighted.

2)   The use of 'blind ones' as a metaphorical designation of the Pharisees is especially
frequent in Matthew. The other Gospels usually speak of a specific blind person who has to

---

[364] Mt. 16.13; Mk. 2.10; Lk. 6.5; Jn. 13.31 et al. circa 70 references. Cf. Smith 1985, 138-139.

be healed.[365] The text of Apoc.Pet. seems to suggest that all the Matthean texts about blind Pharisees and blind people are implicitly present. Note that in the preceding pages of Apoc.Pet. nothing has been said of blind ones; and yet Jesus says here: "I told you several times that they are blind ones". Possibly the author knew that several times in Matthew mention is made of blind Pharisees. By using the words 'several times' the author seems to make the Saviour refer directly to the Matthean verses 9.36; 15.14; 23.16, 17, 19 and 26. Smith and Pearson both refer to 2 Peter 1.9 as a possible background of the designation 'blind ones'.[366]

3)   The function of this allusion is, as of the allusion in 70.14, the recollection of facts of the life of Jesus. As such it helps to establish the overall structure of the introduction to the monologue of the Saviour in 73.14f.

6.

1)   Apoc.Pet. 73.1-4

ⲀⲨⲰ ⲀⲈⲒⲤⲰⲦⲘ̄ ⲈⲚⲒⲞⲨⲎⲎⲂ ⲈⲨϨⲘⲞⲞⲤ ⲘⲚ̄ ⲚⲒⲤⲀϨ·
And I listened to the priests while they were sitting with the scribes.

Mt. 2.4a (cf. Mt. 16.21b; 21.15.23; 26.57; 27.41; Mk. 14.1; 15.1; Lk. 22.2.66; Jn. 19.6)

καὶ συναγαγὼν πάντας τοὺς ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ γραμματεῖς τοῦ λαοῦ
and assembling all the chief priests and scribes of the people.

2)   The combination (chief) priests and scribes occurs at least five times in Matthew but not in the account of the eve of the crucifixion. Preceding that occasion, only scribes and elders, 'who gather at Caiaphas', are mentioned. In Mark and Luke, (chief) priests and scribes are mentioned on the eve of the crucifixion. But on the whole, there is too little evidence for picking out one text as the exclusive source. The allusion has to be considered a general reference to the role of the Jewish leaders in the Gospels.

3)   Its function is the same as the function of the foregoing references: this reference is in line with the information of New Testament texts. It confirms the tradition but appropriates it for a Gnostic purpose. As such it contributes to the structuring of the text. The allusion is

---

[365] See however Jn 9.39-41.

[366] Smith 1985, 138; Pearson 1990b, 70. A discussion of the possible connection between 2 Peter and Apoc.Pet. is provided in the conclusion of this chapter (5.7).

part of the rewriting of the Passion story in which the gathering of the religious authorities is a recurrent element.

7.

1)　　Apoc.Pet. 73.3f.

ΝΕΡΕΝΙΜΗΗϢΕ ШϢ ΕΒΟΛ ϨΝ ΤΟΥϹΜΗ·
The crowds were screaming with their voice.

Mt. 27.23b (cf. Mk. 15.13; Lk. 23.18.23; Jn. 19.6.15)

οἱ δὲ περισσῶς ἔκραζον λέγοντες· σταυρωθήτω.
But they shouted all the more, "Let him be crucified".

2)　　Shouting crowds are a regular feature of the different versions of the Passion story.[367] This passage also seems to be a general reference to the events leading to the crucifixion, apparently based on New Testament data, but not reducible to one special text.

3)　　Here we find the last structural allusion (before the monologue of the Saviour) which, in referring to the Gospel tradition, functions as another building block of the scenery against which Peter is going to witness the explanation of the Saviour concerning the different heresies.

Conclusion

These seven references are grouped together in the first parts of Apoc.Pet. to make up a recognizable description to readers who were familiar with the Gospel story of Jesus' Passion: the sitting of Jesus in the temple, the confession of Peter, possibly his denial of the Saviour, the stone-throwing crowd, the blind priests and people, the congregation of priests and scribes and the screaming crowds. Together these allusions structure the first pages of Apoc.Pet. Two of these references are evidently based on the Gospel of Matthew. The stone throwing crowd reminds us of the Gospel of John, the other four instances cannot be identified with one specific Gospel or other New Testament text. They are all, however, possibly based on New Testament material.

---

[367] Mt. 27.23; Mk. 15.13; Lk. 23.18,23.

5.4.3 C. Monologue of the Saviour and Peter's Reaction (73.14-81.3)

It will appear that from here on we find in Apoc.Pet. mainly the above-mentioned anthological references to New Testament traditions. The Gnostic discourse is only illustrated by these references and does not in any way depend on them. The specific amalgamating use of New Testament material, in which the New Testament texts are sometimes reduced to religious clichés, is typical of the anthological style of referring to Scripture in apocalypses. The function of these intertextual relations in Apoc.Pet. can be characterized for the most part as polemic.

8.

1)   Apoc.Pet. 73.29-32

ⲁⲩⲱ ϥⲛⲁⲟⲩⲟⲛϩⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛ̄ϩⲣⲁⲓ ϩⲙ̄ ⲡⲉϥϩⲁⲡ· ⲉⲧⲉ ⲡⲁⲓ ⲡⲉ
ⲛⲓⲣⲉϥϣⲙ̄ϣⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉ ⲡϣⲁϫⲉ·
And he will disclose them in his judgement, those who are the servants of the word.

Lk. 1.2

καθὼς παρέδοσαν ἡμῖν οἱ ἀπ᾽ ἀρχῆς αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρέται γενόμενοι τοῦ λόγου
Just as they were delivered to us by those who from the beginning were eyewitnesses and ministers of the word.

2)   The Coptic ⲣⲉϥϣⲙ̄ϣⲉ as well as the Greek ὑπηρέτης means 'servant'. Bauer (for the Greek) and Crum and Siegert (for the Coptic) accentuate the cultic, religious connotations of these concepts.[368]

3)   The 'ministers of the word' appear in Lk. 1.2 in a positive sense. In Apoc.Pet. 'servants of the word' apparently is a negative and polemic expression and the phrase: "he will disclose them in his judgement" seems to predict an eschatological punishment for the adversaries of the people behind Apoc.Pet. The Lucan text gives a clue to the identity of these servants of the word. There the expression refers to the apostles, the witnesses of Jesus' ministry. I therefore suggest that in Apoc.Pet. we encounter a polemical reference to the position of the apostles in orthodoxy and to the apostolic tradition.

---

[368] Cf. also *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* VIII. Stuttgart etc. 1969, 544f.

9.

1)   Apoc.Pet.

74.10-12

ΝΙΡⲰΜΕ ⲚⲦⲈ ⲠΙΚⲰ ⲈϨⲢⲀⲒ̈ ⲘⲘⲚ̄ⲦⲚⲞⲨϪ
The men of the false proclamation

77.24-25

ⲈⲦⲈ ⲚⲒⲀⲄⲄⲈⲖⲞⲤ ⲚⲈ ⲚⲦⲈ ϮⲠⲖⲀⲚⲎ
- those are the messengers of error -

80.2-4

ⲈⲨⲚ̄ ϨⲈⲚⲘⲎⲎϢⲈ ⲘⲈⲚ ⲈⲨⲚⲀⲤⲰⲢⲘ̄ Ⲛ̄ϨⲈⲚⲔⲈⲘⲎⲎϢⲈ ⲚⲦⲈ ⲚⲈⲦⲞⲚϨ·
many who will lead astray many others of the living ones

Mt. 24.11 (cf. Mt. 24.24; Mk. 13.5-6; Jd. 18; 1 Tim. 4.1; 2 Tim. 3.1)

καὶ πολλοὶ ψευδοπροφῆται ἐγερθήσονται καὶ πλανήσουσιν πολλούς·
And many false prophets will arise and lead many astray.

2 Pt. 2.1-2

[1] Ἐγένοντο δὲ καὶ ψευδοπροφῆται ἐν τῷ λαῷ, ὡς καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν ἔσονται ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι, οἵτινες παρεισάξουσιν αἱρέσεις ἀπωλείας καὶ τὸν ἀγοράσαντα αὐτοὺς δεσπότην ἀρνούμενοι. ἐπάγοντες ἑαυτοῖς ταχινὴν ἀπώλειαν, [2] καὶ πολλοὶ ἐξακολουθήσουσιν αὐτῶν ταῖς ἀσελγείαις δι' οὓς ἡ ὁδὸς τῆς ἀληθείας βλασφημηθήσεται
[1] But false prophets also arose among the people, just as there will be false teachers among you, who will secretly bring in their destructive heresies, even denying the Master who bought them, bringing upon themselves swift destruction. [2] And many will follow their licentiousness, and because of them the way of truth will be reviled.

2)   False teachers, prophets and messengers occur very often in New Testament texts. But "the messengers of error" and "many who will lead astray many others" cannot be found literally in any of them. The text does, however, evoke a New Testament tone. These three

passages might be allusions to Mt. 24.11. Brashler, Smith and recently Pearson[369] have suggested that these lines refer to 2 Pt. 2.1 because of a supposed connection between Apoc.Pet. and this Petrine writing.

3)   These New Testament echoes are wholly assimilated by the Gnostic text. Even if the possible background is not recognized, the text remains clear. This is a good example of the anthological style of referring. For readers familiar with New Testament traditions a typically Sriptural atmosphere is evoked by this technique.

10.

1)   Apoc.Pet. 74.22-27

ϨⲈⲚϨⲞⲈⲒⲚⲈ ⲄⲀⲢ ⲈⲂⲞⲖ ⲚϨⲎⲦⲞⲨ ⲈⲨⲚⲀϢⲰⲠⲈ ⲈⲨⲬⲈ ⲞⲨⲀ ⲈϮⲘⲚ̄ⲦⲘⲈ·
ⲀⲨⲰ ⲈⲨⲬⲈ ϢⲀϪⲈ ⲈϤϨⲞⲞⲨ· ⲀⲨⲰ ⲤⲈⲚⲀϪⲰ Ⲛ̄ϨⲈⲚⲠⲈⲦϨⲞⲞⲨ
ⲈⲚⲈⲨⲈⲢⲎⲨ·
For some of them will taunt the truth and say evil words and they will say evil things to each other.

Mt. 24.10 (cf. Mt. 10.21; Mk. 13.12; Lk. 14.26; 21.16-17; Gal. 5.15)

καὶ τότε σκανδαλισθήσονται πολλοὶ καὶ ἀλλήλους παραδώσουσιν καὶ μισήσουσιν ἀλλήλους·
And then many will fall away, and betray one another, and hate one another.

2)   This phrase is of the same nature as the previous allusions to the false prophets. In several places in the New Testament similar statements can be found. Therefore, a specific source cannot be determined with certainty.[370]

3)   The text is easily comprehensible. This also holds well if no link with a New Testament text is discovered. The polemic against other, non-Gnostic Christians is obvious.

11.

1)   Apoc.Pet.

75.7-11

---

[369] Cf. Brashler 1977, 55; Smith 1985, 138f.; Pearson 1990b.

[370] See also Hartman 1966, 169, where the relation between Matthew and Daniel is discussed.

ΠΙΚΑΚΟΝ ΓΑΡ MMN̄ϢϬΟΜ N̄ϥϯ N̄ΟΥΚΑΡΠΟⲤ N̄ΑΓΑΘΟΝ· ΠΟΥΑ ΓΑΡ
ΠΟΥΑ ΠΙΜΑ ΕΤΕ ΟΥΕΒΟΛ MMΟΟΥ ΠΕ ϢΑϥϯ MΠΗ ΕΤΕΙΝΕ MMΟϥ·

For it is not possible that evil brings forth good fruit: for the place where each one
comes from, brings forth what resembles itself.

76.4-8

ΟΥΤΕ ΓΑΡ ΜΑΥΚΕΤϤ ΚN̄ΤΕ ΕΒΟΛ ϨN̄ ϨΕΝⲤΟΥΡΕ Η ΕΒΟΛ ϨN̄
ϨΕΝϢΟΝΤΕ· ΕϢⲰΠΕ ΕΥϢΑΝΡ̄ ⲤΑΒΕ· ΟΥΔΕ ΕΛΟΟΛΕ ΕΒΟΛ ϨN̄
ⲤΟΥΡΕ N̄ΝΟⲬΕ·

For neither does one collect figs from thorns or thorn trees
- if one is wise - nor grapes from thistles.

Lk. 6.43-44

[43] Οὐ γάρ ἐστιν δένδρον καλὸν ποιοῦν καρπὸν σαπρόν, οὐδὲ πάλιν δένδρον
σαπρὸν ποιοῦν καρπὸν καλόν. [44] ἕκαστον γὰρ δένδρον ἐκ τοῦ ἰδίου καρποῦ
γινώσκεται· οὐ γὰρ ἐξ ἀκανθῶν συλλέγουσιν σῦκα οὐδὲ ἐκ βάτου σταφυλὴν
τρυγῶσιν.
[43] For no good tree bears bad fruit, nor again does a bad tree bear good fruit; [44] for each
tree is known by its own fruit. For figs are not gathered from thorns nor are grapes
picked from a bramble bush.

Mt. 7.16-18 (cf. Mt. 12.35)

[16] ἀπὸ τῶν καρπῶν αὐτῶν ἐπιγνώσεσθε αὐτούς. μήτι συλλέγουσιν ἀπὸ ἀκανθῶν
σταφυλὰς ἢ ἀπὸ τριβόλων σῦκα; [17] οὕτως πᾶν δένδρον ἀγαθὸν καρποὺς καλοὺς
ποιεῖ, τὸ δὲ σαπρὸν δένδρον καρποὺς πονηροὺς ποιεῖ. [18] οὐ δύναται δένδρον
ἀγαθὸν καρποὺς πονηροὺς ποιεῖν οὐδὲ δένδρον σαπρὸν καρποὺς καλοὺς ποιεῖν.
[16] you will know them by their fruits. Are grapes gathered from thorns, or figs from
thistles? [17] So, every sound tree bears good fruit, but the bad tree bears evil fruit. [18] A
sound tree cannot bear evil fruit, nor can a bad tree bear good fruit.

2)   Brashler splits up the two quotations before and after the long interpolation on the
destiny of the soul (between 75.11 and 76.4).[371] Perkins neither thinks of one text structure
behind these texts about the tree and its fruit.[372] According to Perkins, the first part refers to

---

[371] Brashler 1977, 151.

[372] Perkins 1974, 6.

Mt. 7.18 and the second part to Mt. 7.16.[373] However, there is a considerable difference between the text of Mt. 7.16-18 and the texts of Apoc.Pet under discussion.

According to Brashler and Perkins, Mt. 7.16-18 corresponds with Apoc.Pet. 75.7-11: "For it is not possible that evil gives good fruit. For the place, where each one comes from brings forth what resembles itself". The separate elements are present in the Matthean text indeed. But the order in which these elements occur in Apoc.Pet. and Mt. differs thoroughly. Besides, none of the elements in Apoc.Pet. has a precise parallel in the text of Matthew. The words are very similar but every single phrase in Apoc.Pet. holds a different position compared to the text of Mt. 7.16-18. Moreover, the γάρ-sentence does not occur in the text of Matthew as it does in Luke and Apoc.Pet.[374]

I consider Lk. 6.43-44 the background of Apoc.Pet. 75.7-11 and 76.4-8 because the two texts show an important structural resemblance. In this view the two allusions (75.7-11 and 76.4-8) are considered to be one text separated by the long digression about the nature of the soul (75.10-76.4).

Lk. 43a: For no good tree bears bad fruit,
Apoc.Pet.: *absent*

Lk. 43b: nor again does a bad tree bear good fruit.
Apoc.Pet. 75.7: For it is not possible that evil gives good fruit.

Lk. 44a: For each tree is known by its own fruit.
Apoc.Pet. 75.9: For the place where each one comes from, brings forth what resembles itself.

Lk. 44b: For figs are not gathered from thorns
Apoc.Pet. 76.4: For neither does one collect figs from thorns or thorn trees

Lk. 44c: nor are grapes picked from a bramble bush.
Apoc.Pet. 76.7: nor grapes from thistles.

The Lucan text has undergone only one important change: Lk. 6.44a: "Each tree is recognized by its own fruit" becomes in Apoc.Pet.: "For the place where each one comes from brings forth what resembles itself". The text of Apoc.Pet. renders the meaning of Lk. 6.44a, but without quoting it. Finally, a short addition can be detected in Apoc.Pet. 76.6: "if

---

[373] See also Smith 1985, 129.

[374] It remains possible that the author of Apoc.Pet. has taken this saying from a different sayings source since it occurs as well in Gos.Thom. (II,2) 45a; Gos.Truth (I,3) 33.30; 38.9; Tri.Trac. (I,5) 118.23-24; Test.Truth (IX,3) 31.21-22; Val.Exp. (XI,2) 36.32f. Cf. Piper 1989, 218.

one is wise". These facts show that Luke 6.43-44 has much in common with the text of Apoc.Pet. under discussion. The agreement in phraseology and especially the structural resemblance is striking.

3)   The meaning of the passage has been radically changed in a Gnostic direction by the interpolation about the nature of the soul. Words of Jesus are cited with approval, it is true, but the words have a meaning different from the passage in Luke. They function as an exposition of Gnostic ideas on the mortality and immortality of the soul.

The entire text 75.7-76.10 is a good example of what Patte calls the 'structural style of referring'. All the characteristics of this style are present: the text from Luke functions as a frame and a structuring principle. Against the foil of this Gospel text, the Gnostic text is brought into relief. The beginning and end of this passage are marked by Gospel texts which function as introduction and conclusion.

12.

1)   Apoc.Pet. 77.33-78.1

ⲉⲩⲣ̄ ⲉⲓⲉⲡϭⲱⲧ ⲛ̄ϩⲣⲁⲓ̈ ϩⲙ̄ ⲡⲁϣⲁϫⲉ·
They are merchandising with my word.

2 Cor. 2.17a

οὐ γάρ ἐσμεν ὡς οἱ πολλοὶ καπηλεύοντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ,
For we are not, like so many, peddlers of God's word;

2 Pt. 2.3

καὶ ἐν πλεονεξίᾳ πλαστοῖς λόγοις ὑμᾶς ἐμπορεύσονται
And in their greed they will exploit you with false words;

2)   The Greek καπηλεύω is mentioned by Crum as a possible synonym of the Coptic ⲣ̄ ⲉⲓⲉⲡϭⲱⲧ.[375] The phrases in Apoc.Pet. and in 2 Corinthians show a noticeable similarity. There is one other New Testament-text which comes close to this text: 2 Pet. 2.3.[376] The verb ἐμπορεύομαι is another synonym of ⲣ̄ ⲉⲓⲉⲡϭⲱⲧ. Because of the rareness of the combination with 'word' it is very well possible that the author refers here to the second letter

---

[375] Crum 590b.

[376] Cf. Smith 1985, 138, 139.

to the Corinthians. We also find, however, examples of the figurative use of καπηλεύω in non-biblical texts.[377]

3)   The function of this possible anthological reference is to set forth a clear statement against the adversaries of Apoc.Pet., by using a traditionally polemical phrase. It is as if the author is returning a reproach: not *we* but *they* are adulterating the word of God. This passage suggests a struggle between the Petrine Gnostics and their opponents about the true interpretation of 'the word of Christ'.

    This example shows the same characteristics as the first three cases from the monologue of the Saviour: although it is not possible to identify a New Testament background with certainty in any of these instances, the biblical overtones are evident and contribute to the familiar Christian atmosphere.

13.

1)   Apoc.Pet.

78.20-22

ϨΙΝΑ ΠΙΟΥΟΕΙΝ ΕΤϢΟΟΠ ϪΕ Ñ̄ΝΟΥΝΑϨΤΕ ΕΡΟϤ ΕΒΟΛ ϨΙΤΟΟΤΟΥ Ñ̄ΝΙΚΟΥΕΙ·
The real light shall not be believed by the little ones.

79.18f.

ΝΗ Ñ̄ΤΑΥ ΕΙΡΕ Μ̄ΠΙϨϢΒ Ñ̄ΝΙΚΟΥΕΙ
Those who have done this deed to the little ones.

80.9-11

ϨÑ̄ ΟΥΗΠΕ Ñ̄ΤΕ ΤΟΥΠΛΑΝΗ ΕΥΝΑϤ Ρ̄ ΡΡΟ ΕϪÑ̄ ΝΙΚΟΥΕΙ
In a number belonging to their error they will rule over the little ones.

Mt. 10.42 (cf. Mt. 18.6.10.14; 25.40.45; Mk. 9.42)

καὶ ὃς ἂν ποτίσῃ ἕνα τῶν μικρῶν τούτων ποτήριον ψυχροῦ μόνον εἰς ὄνομα μαθητοῦ, ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐ μὴ ἀπολέσῃ τὸν μισθὸν αὐτοῦ.
And whoever gives to one of these little ones even a cup of cold water because he is a disciple, truly, I say to you, he shall not lose his reward.

---

[377] Cf. Bauer 1979 (Eng. ed.), 403a.

2) The use in Apoc.Pet. of **NIKOYEI** as a designation of the Gnostics to which this text is addressed,[378] strikes us as being identical with the use of οἱ μικροί in the synoptic Gospels, especially in the Gospel of Matthew. The parallel is noticed by several commentators.[379]

3) It is difficult to determine the function of this reference. This is due to the fact that in the word **NIKOYEI** the historical and the literary analysis interfere with each other. It could be a historical fact that these 'little ones' are the actual target group of Apoc.Pet. In this case the Petrine Gnostics apparently called themselves 'little ones' and this name would be more than a reference to Matthew. But the use of 'the little ones' could also be polemic in that the author temporarily employs the designation 'little ones' in a provocative way. Likewise, the appropriation of the apostle Peter and the synoptic Jesus in Apoc.Pet., replenished by the use of New Testament language throughout the text, function in an overtly polemical way.[380]

14.

1)   Apoc.Pet. 78.22-31

NA̅Ï ΔE M̅ΠΙΡΗΤΕ ΝΕ ΝΙΕΡΓΑΤΗC ΕΥΝΑΝΟϪΟΥ ΕΠΙΚΑΚΕ ΕΤCΑΒΟΛ
N̅CΑΒΟΛ N̅ΝΙϢΗΡΕ N̅ΤΕ ΠΟΥΟΕΙΝ· ΟΥΤΕ ΓΑΡ N̅ΤΟΟΥ N̅CΕN̅ΝΗΟΥ
ΕϨΟΥΝ ΑΝ· ΑΛΛΑ ΟΥΤΕ N̅CΕΚϢ ΑΝ N̅ΝΗ ΕΤΝΗΥ ϢΑϨΡΑÏ ΕΠΙϮ ΜΕΤΕ
N̅ΤΑΥ ΠΡΟC ΠΙΒϢΛ ΕΒΟΛ N̅ΤΕ ΝΗ·
But those of this kind are the workers who will be thrown in the outer darkness, away from the children of light. For neither will they themselves go inside nor will they allow those who are going up to their approval, towards their release.

Mt. 25.30 (cf. Mt. 7.23; Lk. 13.27)

καὶ τὸν ἀχρεῖον δοῦλον ἐκβάλετε εἰς τὸ σκότος τὸ ἐξώτερον· ἐκεῖ ἔσται ὁ κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὁ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων.
And cast the worthless servant into te outer darkness; there men will weep and gnash their teeth.

---

[378] See ch.7.

[379] Perkins 1974, 6; Schweizer 1974, 216; Stanton 1977, 82; Koschorke 1978, 61, 83; Smith 1985, 133; Tuckett 1986, 122.

[380] See the commentary.

Mt. 23.13

Οὐαὶ δὲ ὑμῖν, γραμματεῖς καὶ Φαρισαῖοι ὑποκριταί, ὅτι κλείετε τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων· ὑμεῖς γὰρ οὐκ εἰσέρχεσθε οὐδὲ τοὺς εἰσερχομένους ἀφίετε εἰσελθεῖν.

But woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! because you shut the Kingdom of Heaven against men; for you neither enter yourselves, nor allow those who would enter to go in.

2) In Mt. 25 we read after "the outer darkness": "there men will weep and gnash their teeth". This passage has been left out in Apoc.Pet. and is replaced by a phrase with a Gnostic ring: "away from the children of light". The subject of Mt. 23.13 are the scribes and Pharisees. In Apoc.Pet. "they", that is, "the workers" is substituted for the original subject. "The kingdom of Heaven" in Mt. 23.13b returns in the Coptic text of Apoc.Pet. as "their release". Finally, the content of Mt. 23.13 is placed *after* the words of Mt. 25.30. As a result of this relocation, the text has taken on a different meaning in Apoc.Pet.: the punishment, which in Matthew was meant for the servant who had hidden his talent, is transferred to 'the ones who do not allow them to go up to their release'.

To sum up: the actors and the place (the Kingdom of Heaven) of the Gospel text are replaced by other, Gnostic concepts. At the same time the syntactic order of the text is changed. The elements that both texts still have in common is the "throwing into the outer darkness" and the statement that "they do not allow them to go in nor will they allow those ...".[381]

3)   The Gospel text has been manipulated in such a manner that its original function has disappeared. Jesus, the subject of the earlier text, is still cited as an authority but the content of his words has very little in common with the possible source text. In Apoc.Pet. the figurative Gospel language about the workers is actualized: the servants who will be thrown into the outer darkness are persecutors of the Petrine Gnostics. The text has been transformed into a Gnostic representation of words of Jesus. The original (con)text is of no consequence for the clear understanding of this part of the Gnostic text.

15.

1)   Apoc.Pet. 79.28-31

ⲈⲨⲢⲒⲔⲈ ⲘⲘⲞⲞⲨ ϨⲀ ⲠⲒϨⲀⲠ ⲚⲦⲈ ⲚⲒϢⲞⲢⲠ̄ Ⲙ̄ⲘⲀ Ⲛ̄ϨⲘⲞⲞⲤ
While they bend themselves under the judgement of the first seats.

---

[381] Cf. also Gos.Thom. log. 39.

Mt. 23.6 (cf. Mk. 12.39; Lk. 11.43; 20.46)

φιλοῦσιν δὲ τὴν πρωτοκλισίαν ἐν τοῖς δείπνοις καὶ τὰς πρωτοκαθεδρίας ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς
And they love the place of honour at feasts and the best seats in the synagogues.

2)   The "first seats" or "best seats" are mentioned in several New Testament texts. In the Synoptics the word is used by Jesus in his speech against the scribes and Pharisees.[382] The Coptic is a literal translation of the Greek πρωτοκαθεδρία but since we only have one word, though a very characteristic one, a source can not be identified with certainty.

3)   The function of this reference can be accurately described by referring to the original context: Jesus, who blames the Jewish authorities. Apoc.Pet. transfers this reproach, unaltered, to the orthodox Christian leaders: bishops and deacons. The criticism is the same: religious leaders pay too much attention to ostentation and hierarchical relations.

16.

1)   Apoc.Pet. 79.30-31

NH ЄТⲘⲘⲀⲨ ⲚЄ ⲚⲒⲞⲞⲣ ⲚⲀⲧⲘⲞⲞⲨ·
Those are the canals without water.

2 Pt. 2.17 (cf. Mt. 12.43; Lk. 11.24)[383]

οὗτοί εἰσιν πηγαὶ ἄνυδροι καὶ ὁμίχλαι ὑπὸ λαίλαπος ἐλαυνόμεναι
These are waterless springs and mists driven by a storm;

Jd. 12b

νεφέλαι ἄνυδροι ὑπὸ ἀνέμων παραφερόμεναι
(These are) waterless clouds carried along by winds;

2)   2 Peter speaks of "springs". Jude mentions "clouds", whereas Apoc.Pet. speaks of "canals", which might point to an Egyptian origin of the text, according to Pearson.[384] This

---

[382] Mk. 12.39; Lk. 11.43; 20.46; Mt. 23.6. Also said of pseudoprophets in the Shepherd of Hermas 43.12.

[383] But see also Prov. 25.14 and Acta Pauli 8.11 (PH).

[384] Pearson 1990b.

does not affect the general meaning of the phrase. Canals, springs or clouds: without water, they are useless. Furthermore, waterless places are considered in Mt. 12.43 and Lk. 11.24 as a dwelling place for demons. Together, these texts seem to reflect a motif which associates waterlessness with sinners and demons.[385]

3) In this allusion a Gnostic polemic can be read, especially when a conscious reference to 2 Pt. 2.17 is assumed. In this case, one has to read the text with the accent on "they". In other words, not *we* but *they* are the canals without water, because 2 Pt. 2.17 is directed towards the false prophets, false teachers and treacherous heresies, possibly Gnostics.[386] The text of 2 Pt. calls those people "waterless springs". It is possible that the Gnostics behind Apoc.Pet. felt addressed by this reproof and in Apoc.Pet. 79.31 return the offense by means of this allusion (cf. number 12 above). The formula by which groups of persons are identified, "these are the ones who...", can also be found in Mk. 4.15.16.18.20 and in Jd. 12 and 19.[387]

17.

1)   Apoc.Pet. 80.23-29

    ⲀⲘⲞⲨ ⲞⲨⲚ ⲘⲀⲢⲞⲚ ⲈⲬⲘ̄ ⲠⲒⲬⲰⲔ Ⲛ̄ⲦⲈ ⲠⲒϮ ⲘⲀⲦⲈ Ⲛ̄ⲦⲈ ⲠⲒⲰⲦ
    Ⲛ̄ⲀⲦⲬⲰϨⲘ· ⲈⲒⲤ ϨⲎⲎⲦⲈ ⲄⲀⲢ ⲤⲈⲚ̄ⲚⲎⲨ Ⲛ̄Ϭ︦Ⲓ ⲚⲀⲒ̈ ⲈⲦⲚⲀⲤⲰⲔ ⲚⲀⲨ
    Ⲙ̄ⲠⲒϨⲀⲠ·

So come, let us go to the fulfilment of the will of the incorruptible Father. For behold, they are coming, those who will bring judgement upon themselves.

Mt. 26.46b (cf. Mk. 14.42; Lk. 22.46)

ἐγείρεσθε ἄγωμεν· ἰδοὺ ἤγγικεν ὁ παραδιδούς με.
Rise, let us be going, see, my betrayer is at hand.

2)   The third person singular ("my betrayer") from the Gospel text is a plural in Apoc.Pet. ("they are coming"). But apart from this, the texts show some striking similarities. In both texts, the incitement "come, let us go" has the following structure: imperative + adhortative. In the Coptic text of Apoc.Pet. the adhortative is expressed by an optative while the Greek Gospel text uses a subjunctive. The syntactic structure of the second part is also identical in the two texts. In both cases the subject is placed at the end of the clause. Previous to the

---

[385] Cf. Smith 1985, 138, 139.

[386] See 2 Pt. 2.1: "The ruler who has bought them, they deny".

[387] Cf. Koester/Robinson 1971, 86.

introduction of "he who will bring judgement upon himself" in Apoc.Pet., and "the betrayer" in Matthew, we also find identical exclamations in the Coptic text and in the Greek Gospel text: **ЄIC ҀHHTЄ** (look) and ἰδού (look).

3)   In Matthew, Jesus calls his three sleeping disciples to come with him: Peter, John and James. In Apoc.Pet. Jesus only addresses Peter. In both cases, however, these words are said just before Jesus' custody and crucifixion. It seems possible that this text refers directly to the Gospel story. With these words, the structural way of referring to the Gospel is reintroduced.

5.4.4 D. Account of Vision (81.3-83.15)

In this part of Apoc.Pet. the frame story about the Passion is continued. We will see a change of style already prepared in the foregoing allusion (number 17): the anthological style in the monologue of the Saviour is replaced by the structural style we saw before in the introduction and in the account of the first vision.

18.

1)   Apoc.Pet. 81.3-6

ⲀIⲚⲀⲨ ЄⲢⲟϥ ЄϥЄ M̄ⲠⲢHTЄ ЄϢⲬЄ ЄⲨⲀMⲀ҄ⲦЄ M̄Mⲟϥ ЄBⲞⲖ ҀIⲦOOⲦⲞⲨ·
I saw him as if he was seized by them.

Mt. 26.50b (cf. Mk. 14.46; Lk. 22.54; Jn. 18.12)

τότε προσελθόντες ἐπέβαλον τὰς χεῖρας ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰησοῦν καὶ ἐκράτησαν αὐτόν.
Then they came up and laid hands on Jesus and seized him.

2)   The only lexical conformity between Matthew and Apoc.Pet. is the verb 'to seize' (**ⲀMⲀ҄ⲦЄ** is a synonym of κρατεῖν).[388] Considering the context, however, this one indicator is enough to evoke the entire story about Jesus being taken captive.

3)   The author of Apoc.Pet. does not need an extensive quotation to call the Gospel scene back to the reader's mind. It only takes a short allusion after which an extensive Gnostic interpretation is expounded. This reference shows, just like the previous one, the importance of the reader's familiarity with the Passion story.

---

[388] Crum 9a.

19.

1)   Apoc.Pet. 81.10f.

H NIM ΠЄ ΠλΪ ЄΤΡΟΟΥΤ ϨΙϪϾ ΠΙϢЄ ЄΤCⲰΒЄ·

Or, who is the one who is glad and who is laughing above the wood?

Acts 5.30 (cf. Mt. 27.32.40.42; Mk. 15.30; Acts 10.39; Gal. 3.13; 1 Pt. 2.24)

ὁ θεὸς τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν ἤγειρεν Ἰησοῦν ὃν ὑμεῖς διεχειρίσασθε κρεμάσαντες ἐπὶ ξύλου·

The God of our fathers raised Jesus; whom you killed by hanging him on a tree.

2)   In this passage, again, the only point of contact between Apoc.Pet. and the New Testament text is one word: ϢЄ, in Coptic means literally 'wood' or 'tree' but it also can be an equivalent of the Greek σταυρός 'cross'.[389] 'Wood', in Apoc.Pet., occurs several times, 'cross' only once.[390] The preference for 'wood' resembles the use of τὸ ξύλον in Acts. The synoptic Gospels employ σταυρός in most cases.

3) 'Wood' is a normal euphemism for cross, which makes the allusion to either Acts or a Gospel text possible. The wood does not need any further explanation for readers of Apoc.Pet. One word apparently suffices to remind the reader of the story of Jesus' crucifixion. Without recognizing this allusion, the person "above the wood" would remain a stranger. This passage forms the subsequent and last step in the crucifixion story. The announcement of the event (number 17), the seizing of Jesus (number 18), and the actual crucifixion (number 19), have been incorporated in Apoc.Pet. and together form the backbone of this part of the text.

20.

1)   Apoc.Pet. 82.18-20

ϬⲘϬΟⲘ· ⲚΤΟΚ ΓλΡ ЄΤλΥϯ ΝλΚ ⲚⲚЄΪⲘΥCΤΗΡΙΟΝ ЄCΟΥⲰΝΟΥ ϨⲚ ΟΥⲰΝϨ ЄΒΟλ·

Be strong, because you are the one to whom these mysteries are given to know them openly;

---

[389] Crum 546a.

[390] ϢЄ: 81.11.16; 82.6. CϯΟC: 82.25.

Mt. 13.11 (cf. Mk. 4.11; Lk. 8.10)

ὅτι ὑμῖν δέδοται γνῶναι τὰ μυστήρια τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν
To you it has been given to know the secrets (mysteries) of the kingdom of heaven.

2)   In the Gospels μυστήριον is found only in one context, where Jesus uses the word in answering the disciples who have asked for an explanation of the parables. Mark has the singular and misses the verb γνῶναι, Mt. and Lk. both have the plural μυστήρια as well as γνῶναι, rendered as **NEΪMYCTHPION** and **COYⲰN**⸗ in Apoc.Pet. The contexts are also remarkably alike: in Apoc.Pet. it is Peter; in the Gospels it is the disciples who get to know the mysteries. Even the choice of the verb is similar: the passive of 'to give'. It is plausible that we have here a reference to either the Gospel of Matthew or Luke.[391]

3)   When we assume a polemic against orthodox Christianity it is possible that a subtle struggle about the correct interpretation of the words of Jesus is incorporated: it is not the disciples from the Gospel story who receive the mysteries; only the Gnostic Peter is acquainted with them.[392]

21.

1)   Apoc.Pet. 82.25-26

ΠΙCϮOC ET ⲰⲞⲞⲠ ϨⲀ ΠNOMOC
The cross, which is under the law.

Gal. 4.4 (cf. Gal. 3.13)

ἐξαπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ, γενόμενον ἐκ γυναικός,
γενόμενον ὑπὸ νόμον
God sent forth his Son, born of a woman, born under the law.

2)   **ϨⲀ ΠNOMOC** translates literally ὑπὸ νόμον though the Coptic has an article and the text of Galatians does not. However, the meaning of 'nomos' is the same in both texts. It has come to mean, apart from the literal 'law', the Jewish religion. Although the relative clause in Apoc.Pet. can be connected with two different antecedents, the meaning of the relative clause is clear. The first possibility reads 'the cross which is under the law', in the second

---

[391] Cf. Siegert 1982, 273, who also mentions Mt. 13.11 with Apoc.Pet. 82.19. Other instances in Apoc.Pet. where the word 'mystery' occurs are 73.16 and 76.26, 28f., 33.

[392] See the Commentary and Ch. 7 on the question of the identity of the adversaries in Apoc.Pet.

case it is 'the one who was nailed (...) who is under the law'. In Paul's text we find: 'the Son of God born under the law'.

3)   This reference to the law is one of the few explicit anti-Judaic references in Apoc.Pet. What we already suspected from an expression like "the Father of their error" (73.27-28) is here confirmed. The Father of their error, who has been identified in my commentary as the God of the Old Testament, and the law, which is a synonym for Judaism, are rejected. Although the language of the phrase seems to be Pauline there is an important difference between the three references to the law in Apoc.Pet. (70.31; 77.27; 82.26) and Galatians. Paul states that 'the Son of God is born under the law', necessarily so, because He had to save the people who were under this law as well. Apoc.Pet. states that 'the cross' is under the law or that 'the one who was nailed' is under the law and therefore powerless. Both statements reflect the Christology of their authors. Paul is moderate: he only says that with the coming of Christ the law has become superfluous. In Apoc.Pet the soteriological significance of the bodily crucifixion is that by this the real Saviour is freed from his material prison.[393] In these few phrases we encounter the whole complex of Gnostic associations connected with materiality: the crucifixion is conceived of as a violation of the body only, and the body is a product of the material creation (cf. e.g. 75.15-26; 83.30-34). These passages in Apoc.Pet. could have been inspired by the common Gnostic myth which holds that the creation is a product of the demiurge (who is identified with the God of the Old Testament) and in which 'the law' is more or less synonymous with the Old Testament. The implicit presence of such ideas might explain why here in Apoc.Pet. 82.25-26 the crucifixion is connected with the law.

5.4.5 E. Conclusion (83.15-84.14)

In the conclusion Apoc.Pet. will show the anthological use of Scripture once more.

22.

1)   Apoc.Pet. 83.26-84.6

ETBE ΠⲀI ⲀⲈIXOOC XE OYON NIM ETE OYⲚ̄TⲀϥ CENⲀϯ NⲀϥ ⲀYⲰ
OYON NⲀⲣ̄ ⲞOYO EⲣOϥ· ΠⲎ ⲀE ETE ⲘⲘⲚ̄TⲀϥ ETE ΠⲀI ⲠE ΠⲓⲢⲰⲘE
Ⲛ̄TE ΠITOΠOC Eϥⲱⲟ̄ⲟΠ ΤⲎⲣϥ̄ EϥⲘOOYT EϥOYOTⲂ̄ EBOⲖ ⳂⲘ̄
ΠⲓTⲰⳞE Ⲛ̄TE ΠⲓCⲰⲚ̄T Ⲛ̄TE ΠⲓXΠO ETE EϥⲱⲱΠE EⲣⲱⲀNOYⲀ OYⲰⲚⳂ
EBOⲖ Ⲛ̄TE ϯOYCIⲀ Ⲛ̄NⲀTMOY· ⲱⲀYⲘEEYE XE CEⲀMⲀⳂTE ⲘⲘOϥ·
CENⲀϥⲓTϥ̄ Ⲛ̄TOOTϥ̄ ⲀYⲰ CENⲀOYⲀⳂϥ̄ EΠⲎ ETⲱⲟⲟΠ·

That is why I have said: "To everyone who has will be given and he will have

---

[393] See ch. 6.5.2.

abundance. But he who does not have - that is the person of this place, who is completely dead, who has come forth from the implantation of the habit of procreation, who, when one of the immortal substance appears, they think that they can seize him - it will be taken from him and it will be added to the one who exists".

Mt. 25.28-29 (cf. Mt. 13.12; Lk. 19.26; Mk. 4.25; Lk. 8.18)

[28] ἄρατε οὖν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ τὸ τάλαντον καὶ δότε τῷ ἔχοντι τὰ δέκα τάλαντα· [29] τῷ γὰρ ἔχοντι παντὶ δοθήσεται καὶ περισσευθήσεται, τοῦ δὲ μὴ ἔχοντος καὶ ὃ ἔχει ἀρθήσεται ἀπ' αὐτοῦ.

[28] So, take the talent from him, and give it to him who has the ten talents. [29] For to everyone who has will more be given, and he will have abundance; but from him who has not even what he has will be taken away.

2)   The most important difference between Apoc.Pet. and Matthew's text consists of an addition in Apoc.Pet. between 'But he who does not have' and 'it will be taken', etc.[394] A smaller addition is inserted after ⲚⲦⲞⲞⲦϥ̄: "It will be added to the one who exists". This reminds us of Mt. 25.28: "Take the talent from him and give it to him who has the ten talents". The translation of the Coptic ⲞⲨⲞⲚ ⲚⲀⲢ̄ ϨⲞⲨⲞ ⲈⲢⲞϥ is problematic.[395] I have decided in favour of a translation that is close to the text of Matthew. There is no danger of a circular argument here, for the quotation-formula points towards an explicit quotation of words of Jesus, which is indeed confirmed by the resemblances of this passage with the text of Matthew.

    The second part "he who has not (...) it will be taken from him and it will be added to the one who exists" starts with quoting Mt. 25.29 but then alludes to Mt. 25.28b. "It will be added to the one who exists" seems to be a parallel to "give it to him who has the ten talents". In other words, Mt. 25.29 is quoted literally, but vs. 28 is adopted as an allusion and is inserted after vs. 29.[396]

3)   We find here a positive evaluation of the New Testament Jesus, and a negative evaluation of the ideas expressed in his words. An explicit quotation of words of Jesus,

---

[394] See my commentary for an explanation of this phrase.

[395] See Gramm. Ann. 83.29.

[396] This saying occurs in Gos.Thom. as well (NHC II,2 41): "Whoever has something in his hand will receive more, and whoever has nothing will be deprived of even the little he has". It is possible, just as in the case of Apoc.Pet. 75.7f. that the saying in Gos.Thom. has been taken from an independent sayings source. It is noteworthy that these two texts are the only instances in Apoc.Pet. where a quotation-formula is used which also could point to a different source than the Gospels. However, it is impossible to settle this problem with certainty. Both possibilities should be reckoned with.

possibly taken from the Gospel of Matthew, is commented upon in a Gnostic sense. Not much is left of the former meaning. "The ones who have" and "the ones who have not" are "the people who do have the true knowledge" and "the people who do not", viz. the people of the place "which is completely dead".

The function of this quotation resembles the function of the references in the monologue of the Saviour. In these parts of Apoc.Pet. we also find references which are possibly taken from New Testament writings although the original content and context are of no interest. The main interest of the author appears to be a demonstration of the Gnostic view with regard to the material world. In the present example, the text from Matthew merely serves as an illustration of this opinion.

23.

1)   Apoc.Pet. 84.6-9

ⲚⲦⲞⲔ ⲞⲨⲚ ⲦⲀⲬⲢⲞ Ⲛ̄ϨⲎⲦ Ⲙ̄ⲠⲢ̄Ⲣ̄ ϨⲞⲦⲈ ⲀⲀⲀⲨ· Ⲧ̄ⲚⲀϢⲰⲠⲈ ⲄⲀⲢ ⲚⲘ̄ⲘⲀⲔ
ⲬⲈⲔⲀⲀⲤ Ⲛ̄ⲚⲈⲀⲀⲀⲨ Ⲛ̄ⲦⲈ ⲚⲈⲔⲬⲀⲬⲈ Ⲟ̄Ⲙ̄ϬⲞⲘ ⲈⲢⲞⲔ· Ⲧ̄ⲢⲎⲚⲎ ⲚⲀⲔ Ⲟ̄Ⲙ̄
ⲚⲞⲘⲦⲈ·

So you, be brave and do not fear anyway, for I will be with you, so that none of your enemies shall harm you. Peace be with you, be strong!

Acts 18.9b-10

⁹ᵇ μὴ φοβοῦ, ἀλλὰ λάλει καὶ μὴ σιωπήσῃς, ¹⁰ διότι ἐγώ εἰμι μετὰ σοῦ καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐπιθήσεταί σοι τοῦ κακῶσαί σε
Do not be afraid, but speak and do not be silent; for I am with you, and no man shall attack you to harm you.

Mt. 28.20

διδάσκοντες αὐτοὺς τηρεῖν πάντα ὅσα ἐνετειλάμην ὑμῖν· καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ μεθ᾽ ὑμῶν εἰμι πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας ἕως τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος.
Teaching them to observe all that I have commanded you; and lo, I am with you always, to the close of the age.

2)   Tuckett connects this phrase with Mt. 28.20.[397] But when one compares Acts 18.9 more similarities can be detected. Not only does "I will be with you" occur in both texts but also "do not be afraid" and "no man shall attack you". This last phrase reads in the Coptic text of Apoc.Pet.: "so that none of your enemies shall harm you". However, there are some minor

---

[397] Tuckett 1986, 120; Koschorke 1978, 20.

differences as well: Acts 18.9. "Keep on speaking, do not be silent", does not occur in Apoc.Pet. Instead of Acts 18.10. "For I am with you", we find in Apoc.Pet. "For I will be with you", and Acts 18.10 "no man" is in Apoc.Pet. extended as follows: "no one of your enemies".

We cannot speak of a direct quotation but the similarities are noteworthy. The context of Acts 18.9 gives us some additional information: in Acts 18 the 'Lord' appears before Paul in a vision and says "do not be afraid" etc. In Apoc.Pet. the Saviour appears before Peter, in a vision, with the same message: "do not fear anyway" etc. Both passages contain a commissioning: Paul has to preach among the Corinthians. Peter has to communicate the things he has seen to "the strangers who are not of this aeon" (83.15f.).

3)   It is possible to see in this anthological allusion a continuation of the polemic against Paul which is possibly present in Apoc.Pet.[398] But it might as well be a traditional encouragement.

5.5 Summary

In the first segments of Apoc.Pet. (70.14-72.4 and 72.4-73.14) the Saviour reminds Peter why and to which purpose he (i.e. Peter) was called. These three pages are partially structured after the Gospel story of the confession of Peter and partially after the Passion story. The references to New Testament texts we encounter here seem to express the writer's esteem for Peter and Jesus. In Patte's terminology: the Gospel story is "the primary locus of revelation". The reported facts of the lives of Jesus and Peter have an unquestioned importance. But their Gnosticizing interpretation deviates from prevalent Christian tradition. By the technique of structural referring, Peter's prestige is established, authority is claimed for the position he represents and, at the same time, a particular tone is given to the subsequent revelation. For it is suggested that the rest of the story will also be in line with early Christian tradition. This section functions as an introduction to the next part of the text in which the Saviour speaks to Peter about the threat of various hostile groups.

Most references in the middle part (73.14-81.3) show a different relation to New Testament texts. The monologue of the Saviour is intelligible, even when the New Testament references are not recognized. The allusions do not depend on one well-known New Testament story but stem from different contexts and only illustrate and substantiate the Gnostic discourse. In other words, the Gnostic discourse forms the main stream of thought in which the anthologically-used references to New Testament texts are fully integrated. Here, Apoc.Pet. is not structured after a New Testament story. Rather, the text reflects events of the contemporary history of the author, i.e. the persecution of the 'little ones' by their opponents (see further the Commentary and Ch. 7).

---

[398] See the commentary.

Just like the introductory part of Apoc.Pet. and the first account of a vision, the fourth main part (81.3-83.15) is characterized by a direct dependence of Apoc.Pet. on a story told in the Gospels. The Passion story of Apoc.Pet. would hardly make sense if one failed to recognize the link with the Gospel accounts. The relation, however, between the Gospel story and this part of Apoc.Pet. differs slightly from the relation between the Gospel story and parts A and B of Apoc.Pet. in that the possible allusions are now even more implicit. Apparently a few words are enough to evoke the entire Passion story, which shows that the author and the intended readers must have been very familiar with this tradition.

The analysis of the conclusion of Apoc.Pet. (80.15-84.14) yields two more anthological allusions. In the same way as in the monologue of the Saviour these texts are taken from different contexts and are smoothly integrated into the Gnostic discourse.

5.6 New Testament texts, mentioned in this chapter, listed in biblical order[399]

---

[399] References in italics have been identified in Apoc.Pet. with some certainty.

		9	128			62f.	132
		10	139		15.	1	136
		11	138,158			13	136
Mt.	24.	12	128	Mk.	15.	24	128
		24	138,158			30	149
		27f.	128		16.	5	128
	25.	*28-29*	152				
		30	124,125,144	Lk.	1.	2	138
		31-46	128		6.	5	135
		40	143			*43*	140,141
		45	143			*44*	140,141,158
						46	128
Lk.	8.	10	149	1Cor.	2.	2	128
		18	152			8	128
	11.	24	146		9.	1	128
		43	145			19	128
	13.	27	144		15.	8	128
	14.	26	139			51	128
	16.	8	128				
	19.	26	152	2Cor.	2.	17a	142
		47	131				
	20.	34	128	Gal.	1.	12	128
		46	145		2.	4	128
	21.	16-17	139		3.	13	149,150
		37	131		4.	4	150
	22.	2	136		5.	1	128,158
		25	128			15	139
		31-34	133				
		46	147	Eph.	5.	26	128
		53	131				
		54	148				
		66	136	1Tim.	4.	1	138,158
	23.	18	136				
		23	136	2Tim.	3.	1	138,158
Jn.	7.	53	131	2Pt.	1.	4	128
	8.	2	131			9	135,157,158
		11	131			16f.	128,157
		34-36	128		2.	1	128,139,147,157,158
		59a	134			2	128,139,157

	9.	39-41	135,158			3	128,142,157
	10.	31	134			4	157
	13.	31	135			9	128,157
		36-38	133			12	128,157
	18.	12	148			13	128,157
Jn.	19.	6	136	2Pt.	2.	14	128,157
	19.	15	136			15	128,157
	21.	15-18	133			17	146,157,158
						18	128,157
Acts	5.	30	149			19	128,157,158
	9.	3f.	128			21	128,157,158
	10.	39	149			24	149
	12.	11	128		3.	4	128,157
	18.	9b-10	153			7	128
	19.	23	128			10	128,150
	22.	4	128			12	128,157
						16	128
Rm.	6.	2	128			17	157
	9.	27	128				
	11.	5	119	Jud.		12b	146,147
						18	138, 158
						19	147

5.7 Conclusion

Apoc.Pet. shows a notably large amount of references to, and language from, the Gospels. Although it appears to be impossible to connect any of these references with one specific text tradition, the influence of Gospel narratives is evident on indeed every page of Apoc.Pet.

Despite the uncertain textual base of the greater part of the allusions, it is likely that Apoc.Pet. shows a predilection for the Gospel of Matthew (cf. numbers 1, 2, 5, 13, 14, 15, 20 and 22). Another Gospel which might have been used, directly or indirectly, is Luke (cf. number 11 and possibly 8). No clear references to the Gospel of Mark can be detected. There is one phrase that might stem from the Gospel of John (number 4) and perhaps one from Acts (number 23). Another possible connection exists between Apoc.Pet. and the letters of Paul. However, there are no marked references, although the language of some verses is very specific (cf. number 12, also mentioned as a possible reference to 2 Peter, and number 21). The relationship between Apoc.Pet. and the second letter of Peter, as claimed by some

authors, is also difficult to prove.[400] Points of contact could be numbers 5, 9, 12 and 16. It is possible that they refer to 2 Pt. 1.9; 2.1-3 and 17 respectively.[401]

Pearson explicitly argues that the author of Apoc.Pet. has used 2 Peter as a literary source. He presents us with a list of similarities between the two texts[402] which only appears to contain passages of the monologue of the Saviour, the large middle part of Apoc.Pet.[403] However, we find in this part of the text an abundant use of polemical clichés which cannot be traced back to one specific textual base. Many of the references to 2 Peter that Pearson mentions can be reckoned among these polemical stereotypes, which also occur in the Gospel of Matthew, the letters of Paul and other, extra-biblical texts. A few instances should make this clear.

Pearson draws a parallel between Apoc.Pet. 74.10f., where false teachers ("men of the false proclamation") are mentioned, and 2 Peter 2.1: "But false prophets also arose among the people". However, we find similar language in Mt. 24.11, Mt. 24.24; Mk. 13.5-6; Jd. 18; 1 Tim. 4.1 and 2 Tim. 3.1 to mention the most important cases. The same goes for Apoc.Pet. 76.21-22 (72.10-13; 73.11-14; 81.28-32): "deaf and blind ones" do indeed occur in 2 Peter 1.9, but there are almost 70 references to blind people in the texts of the New Testament. They occur, for instance, in the synoptic Gospels, especially in Matthew, and in John: Mt. 9.36; 15.14a; 23.16,17,19,26; Jn. 9.39-41. An exclusive reference to 2 Peter is therefore not self-evident. As a last instance the supposed parallel between Apoc.Pet. 78.13-15 and 2 Peter 2.19 could be mentioned. In both verses the pair of opposites 'freedom and slavery' occurs. However, the use of strong contrasts is a common rhetorical device. The antithesis freedom/slavery is found in the letters of Paul as well, for instance in Galatians 5.1. As an example of the dependency of Apoc.Pet. on 2 Peter it is not convincing. The most likely parallel is between Apoc.Pet. 79.30-31 and 2 Peter 2.17. However, from this it does not automatically follow that the other passages are also based on 2 Peter, especially not in the light of the above-noticed phenomenon of unrelated anthological references in this part of Apoc.Pet.

My conclusion is that 11 out of 23 allusions can be identified with some degree of

---

[400] Cf. Smith 1985, 126-142.

[401] Smith 1985, 138, 139.

[402] Pearson 1990b: Apoc.Pet. 73.23-28 - 2 Pet. 2.18; 3.17; Apoc.Pet. 74.11 - 2 Pet. 2.1; Apoc.Pet. 74.15-16 - 2 Pet. 2.13; 2.2; Apoc.Pet. 74.22-24 - 2 Pet. 2.2; Apoc.Pet. 74.20-22 - 2 Pet. 2.1; Apoc.Pet. 75.6 - 2 Pet. 2.1,3; 3.7,16; Apoc.Pet. 75.12-13 - 2 Pet. 2.14; Apoc.Pet. 75.15-20 - 2 Pet. 1.4; Apoc.Pet. 76.18-20 - 2 Pet. 3.10; Apoc.Pet. 76.21-22 - 2 Pet. 1.9; Apoc.Pet. 76.25-27 - 2 Pet. 1.16; Apoc.Pet. 76.29-30 - 2 Pet. 2.12; Apoc.Pet. 77.13 - 2 Pet. 2.2,15,21; Apoc.Pet. 77.24 - 2 Pet. 2.4; Apoc.Pet. 77.33-78.1 - 2 Pet. 2.3; Apoc.Pet. 78.6 - 2 Pet. 1.16; 3.4,12; Apoc.Pet. 78.13-15 - 2 Pet. 2.19; Apoc.Pet. 78.19 - 2 Pet. 2.13,15; Apoc.Pet. 78.24-25 - 2 Pet. 2.17; Apoc.Pet. 79.17 - 2 Pet. 2.19; Apoc.Pet. 79.30-31 - 2 Pet. 2.17.

[403] Apoc.Pet. 73.14-79.31.

probability. The other references are either to traditions occurring in more than one Gospel or very weak anthological references in which the New Testament background has been reduced to religious clichés (cf. numbers 3, 6, 7, 9, 10, 17, 18, 19).

In two cases it is possible that not Gospel texts but sayings from an extra-canonical sayings tradition have been used. Precisely these quotations are introduced by a quotation-formula. The first one (no. 11 Apoc.Pet. 75.7-11 and 76.4-8) is introduced by ΓΑΡ/γάρ, the second (no. 22 Apoc.Pet. 83.26-84.6) more explicitiy by "That is why I have said". The fact that the first reference also resembles Luke 6.44 in detail has been interpreted above as a sign that the author knew this Gospel and used it. It could be argued, however, that this saying was taken from a different source. In this case both Luke and Apoc.Pet. may have preserved the original text sequence compared to Matthew 7.16-18 and 12.33-35.[404] Its occurrence in five other texts from Nag Hammadi supports this view but does not prove it. The same goes for the second quotation, which occurs in the Gospel of Thomas as well and could have been taken from another source than the Gospel of Matthew. In both cases however, the parallels with the Gospel texts remain noteworthy and a more direct borrowing remains possible throughout.

As has been argued, the New Testament references in Apoc.Pet. can be divided into structural and anthological references. The structural style is found especially in the frame story of Apoc.Pet., the anthological style prevails in the long monologue of the Saviour and in the conclusion. Patte's description and explanation of these two styles of referring appears to be most illuminating. The results of this observations on the compulsive use of biblical language in modern Pentecostal groups might indeed explain the use of Scripture in ancient apocalyptic circles, whether these were Jewish, Christian, or Christian-Gnostic.[405]

The main difference with the rather traditional interpretation of Scriptural material in for instance the Jewish apocalypses which Patte has analysed is that in Apoc.Pet., as a result of its controversial world-view, the interpretation of the New Testament texts differs widely from the interpretation of these texts in other Christian circles. With this change in interpretation the author of Apoc.Pet. betrays his position regarding the Christian tradition. By the specific, sometimes contrary way he assimilates the references he demonstrates that he is in constant discussion with this tradition. The following observations may clarify this.

The discussion in Apoc.Pet. is mainly characterized by both a positive attitude towards the New Testament facts as such, and a negative attitude with regard to the interpretation of these facts in mainstream Christianity. This double engagement explains phenomena which at first sight seem to be conflicting. For example, the choice of the Passion story as a structuring frame in Apoc.Pet. indicates a positive attitude towards this tradition. It obviously has authority and a religious value for the author (and subsequently for the audience) of

---

[404] Cf. Piper 1989, 45f.

[405] Patte 1975, 201f.: "As noted already we can describe this inspiration as the work of the creative imagination of a man permeated with scripture".

Apoc.Pet. However, the synoptic interpretation of this story has disappeared completely and has been replaced by a different, Gnosticizing, explanation. The same is valid for the many references to the New Testament which are scattered throughout the text; these are obviously considered worth using but their interpretation differs radically from what they quite likely mean in their original context.

An attitude like this betrays a very specific relation between the author of Apoc.Pet. and proto-orthodox Christianity. On the one hand a close contact is suggested by the many references to New Testament stories and texts. On the other hand an ideological gap appears between the interpretation of the Passion story in Apoc.Pet. and the account of this event in the Gospels. An explanation of this phenomenon can be found in the specific relation between the Gnostic Christians behind Apoc.Pet. and the proto-orthodox community of which they formed a part.

Initially, the Petrine Gnostics may have formed a subgroup in a broader proto-orthodox community. Although they apparently shared important religious symbols with their surrounding group, they developed their own specific interpretation of some central Christian concepts. This finally led to the schism as postulated in chapter 7.

From these observations it follows that, although the authority of certain New Testament traditions is acknowledged in Apoc.Pet., the explanation of these traditions is, to a considerable degree, susceptible to debate. The author obviously did not have to or wish to adhere to a method of interpretation in which the New Testament text had the inviolable authority orthodox Christianity ascribes to it. Apparently the texts of the New Testament had not yet obtained full canonicity, which would have prevented a free reading as offered in our text. The characteristic method of interpretation explained above was occasioned by this non-canonical or pre-canonical status of the New Testament texts. In line with this, the New Testament texts were obviously not considered the only source of revelation. Personal revelations, attributed to Peter in this case, were considered of greater value than the accounts of the Gospels.

6. Christology

6.1 Introduction

There is a considerable number of texts from Nag Hammadi which contain an elaborate account of the suffering and death of Jesus.[406] In Apoc.Pet. the story of Jesus' Passion and its interpretation makes up about one third of the text and obviously is one of its most prominent themes.[407] Therefore it seems necessary to discuss the Christology of Apoc.Pet. in greater detail than the commentary can offer. Before doing so, some of the concepts used in this chapter need to be elucidated.

In the first place, Christology will be taken to include more than views on the relation of the divine and the human in Christ. Here it will include, beside this element, every feature which sheds light on the identity, mission and origin of the figure of the Saviour, both in his role as narrator/*angelus interpres* of large parts of the text and as the figure who is revealed to Peter in visions explained by the Saviour as *angelus interpres*. A proper description of the character of the Saviour of Apoc.Pet. includes a review of the names and titles attributed to him, his relation with the highest God and the occurrence of specifically eschatological and soteriological concepts like *apokatastasis, parousia* and redemption in connection with the mission of the Saviour.

In the second place I will try to distinguish the different 'natures' of the Saviour, as revealed to Peter in his second vision (81.3-83.15). The use of the qualification 'natures' may seem anachronistic but in our study it is not yet the technical term as used in later centuries. It is considered a useful word to denote the composite character of the Saviour of Apoc.Pet.

In the third place, it is often said of Gnostic Christology that it is docetic.[408] Before we investigate if this qualification also holds true for Apoc.Pet. two types of docetism must be distinguished, for it appears that the word is often used to cover different, partly overlapping, views.

The first type, docetism in a narrow sense, denies the material reality of the body of Christ.

---

[406] Ep.Jas.; Gos.Truth; First and Second Apoc.Jas.; Treat.Seth; Apoc.Pet.; Ep.Pet.Phil.; Interp.Know. and Treat.Res. Cf. Tröger 1977, 301.

[407] Apoc.Pet. 70.21-25; 71.4-17; 71.27-72.2; 72.23-27; 73.30; 74.7; 78.4-6; 78.8-15; 80.23-83.13.

[408] Cf. Davies 1969, 14-29. He mentions examples of docetic Christologies recorded by Irenaeus and Hippolytus, including numerous Gnostic systems which are supposed to be docetic.

In most cases his body is described as a heavenly, light-body.[409] The second, broader type of docetism does not deny the existence of a body of Christ but it holds that any real relation between the divine person and the material world is impossible. A consequence of this view is that in texts with the latter type of docetism, the material body of Christ is viewed merely as a temporary dwelling place of the real Christ.[410]

In the Nag Hammadi texts the first limited type of docetism does not appear. This is an important conclusion of Tröger's study on the Christology of the Nag Hammadi texts.[411] However, a considerable number of the texts, among these Apoc.Pet., show a form of docetism in the broader sense, assuming that Jesus had a material body which, as such, was a product of the archons and therefore had no soteriological meaning at all. This last view is called 'docetistic' by Tröger. In our discussion of the Christology of Apoc.Pet., the word docetism is used only in this broader meaning.

6.2 Previous Research

At this point it is useful to consider what has been said about the Christology of Apoc.Pet. in previous research. Seven studies pay attention to this subject. The most elaborate observations are made by Brashler, Tröger and Cozby, shorter examinations are offered by Schenke, Koschorke, Werner and Schönborn. Their positions are presented here in chronological order.[412]

Schenke adheres to a modified type of the 'Bultmann hypothesis' in which the influence of a Gnostic Redeemer Myth on the Christological parts of the New Testament is considered

---

[409] Cf. Brox 1984, 306: "In einem engeren Begriff ist Doketismus die Doktrin, nach der die Erscheinung Christi, sein historisch-leibhaftiges Dagewesensein, also vor allem die menschliche Gestalt Jesu, insgesamt bloßer Schein, ohne wahrhafte Realität gewesen ist. Menschsein und Leiden Christi als reiner Schein".

[410] A definition of the second, broader type of docetism is also presented by Brox, ibid.: "Jesus Christus als göttlicher Erlöser, der keinen auch noch so flüchtigen Kontakt mit der Materie hatte, weil er ihn von seinem Wesen und seiner Aufgabe her nicht haben konnte".

[411] Tröger 1977, 304-305: "Der Doketismus in seiner engeren Bedeutung eines fleischlosen Scheinlebens des Soter (...) kommt in den Nag-Hammadi-Schriften nicht vor. (...) Eine größere Anzahl von Nag-Hammadi-Texten weist jedoch eine mehr oder weniger starke doketistische Tendenz auf. (...) Zu diesem gnostisch-christlichen Vorstellungsbereich sind auch jene beiden Texte zu rechnen, die das Leiden des himmlischen Soter entschieden verneinen und es ausdrücklich seinem "Sarkikon" (ApcPt) bzw., was dasselbe bedeutet, "einem Typos der Archonten" (1ApcJac) zuweisen".

[412] Schenke 1973, 205-229; 1975a, 283-285; Brashler 1977, 158-196; Tröger 1977, 209-234; Koschorke 1978, 18-37; Cozby 1985, 248-265; Werner 1989, 636-637; Schönborn 1989, 480-486.

to be beyond doubt.[413] In his discussion of Apoc.Pet. 82.3-9 he perceives the Saviour as a pneumatic figure, who forms a part of a tripartite scheme. In the same study, however, he observes that the Christology of Apoc.Pet. seems to hesitate between bipartition and tripartition. I quote his conclusion where he describes a tripartite Saviour: "Der auf Erden wandelnde Erlöser besteht nur aus zwei Naturen; das eigentliche geistige Wesen des Erlösers ist gar nicht herabgestiegen, sondern wirkt vom Himmel aus".[414]

Brashler's position has much in common with Schenke's view. He detects in Apoc.Pet. a tripartite Christology that has to be interpreted, according to him, against the background of a Gnostic Redeemer Myth.[415] Entirely on a par with the history of religions school, Brashler compares the Christology of Apoc.Pet. with the twenty-eight features Bultmann has set up as characteristics of the Gnostic Redeemer.[416] His main arguments are based on certain parallels between Apoc.Pet. and the Second Treatise of the Great Seth (NHC VII,2)[417] and on the parenthetical passage 71.27-33, which is thought to reflect this Christology in detail: 1) The phrase "the rejection that happened to him, even the sinews of his hands and his feet", is interpreted by Brashler as referring to the crucifixion of Jesus' material body ($\sigma\tilde{\omega}\mu\alpha$). 2) "and the crowning by those of the middle region" is regarded as a reference to his psychical aspect ($\psi\upsilon\chi\dot{\eta}$).[418] 3) "and the body of his radiance", finally, is connected with the spiritual aspect of the Saviour ($\pi\nu\epsilon\tilde{\upsilon}\mu\alpha$):[419]

"To summarize the Christological views of Apoc.Pet., therefore, it can be said that the revealer is understood to be composed of three parts: a physical body, which is his fleshly part; an incorporeal light-body; and an intellectual Pleroma, which is his spiritual part".[420] He concludes that the Saviour in Apoc.Pet. is not the early-Christian Jesus adapted to Gnostic teaching but the Gnostic Redeemer who is Christianized.

---

[413] Schenke 1973, 207.

[414] Schenke 1975a, 285.

[415] However, the notorious lack of pre-Christian Gnostic texts, in particular, gives us reason to doubt the position of the history of religions school. See e.g. Colpe 1961, Hengel 1975, 53f.

[416] Brashler 1977, 187-193.

[417] Brashler 1977, 182: "Thus the docetic Christology of Apoc.Pet., which has as its focal point the crucifixion of Jesus and only a few hints of the mythological presuppositions within which the passion interpretation can be understood, appears to be a demythologized version of the same Christology attested in the Treat.Seth replete with its mythological background".

[418] o.c. 167.

[419] o.c. 23-25. Brashler's translation of Apoc.Pet. 71.27-33. See also 165-168 for Brashler's interpretation of this passage.

[420] o.c. 173.

Brashler, who postulates a Valentinian tripartition in the Christology of Apoc.Pet., based on a specific reading of 71.26-71.33, has trouble including the lines at the end of the account of the Passion (82.4-83.15).[421] In itself his interpretation of the passage 71.27-72.2 is alluring. However, the syntax and semantic of these lines is problematic: in the end his interpretation has no solid textual base. Moreover, Brashler defends this interpretation by referring to the Gospel of Philip[422] and by doing so relates Apoc.Pet. to a Valentinian cosmology from which stems, for example, the division of mankind into three groups, which is not found in Apoc.Pet.[423]

Tröger starts from the assumption that *Gnosis* has come into being independently from Christianity although he does not speak about the Gnostic Redeemer Myth. He confines himself to rendering the text data as accurately as possible and does not connect these with extra-textual data.

According to Tröger, Apoc.Pet. belongs to the group of Nag Hammadi texts in which it is narrated explicitly that only the material body of the Saviour has suffered. Tröger distinguishes four aspects in the Saviour of Apoc.Pet.: 1) His pneumatic 'Wesen' and, identical with this, the revealing 'Ich' of the Saviour. 2) The living Saviour who stands laughing near the cross. 3) The incorporeal body of the living Saviour 4) The material body. But however complicated this Christology might seem, Tröger thinks it likely that actually the Christology of all Christian-Gnostic Nag Hammadi texts, including the Christology of Apoc.Pet., is based on a two-natures scheme: the material vs. the (three) non-material part(s) of the Saviour.[424]

Tröger's analysis takes this direction in part because of an interpretation error; he fails to see the parallel construction of nominal sentences.[425] As a result of this the intellectual Pleroma is excluded from his Christology.[426] He reads ΠΗ N̄ΤΑΚΝΑΥ ЄϥNΗΥ ϢΑΡΟΪ (83.10f.: (the light), which you saw coming towards me) as a relative clause, referring to: ΑΝΟΚ ΔЄ ΠΙΝΟЄΡΟΝ etc. (83.8f.: I am the spiritual intellect), and he starts a new sentence with ΠΙΠΛΗΡϢΜΑ N̄ΤΑΝ (83.12f.),[427] translating: "Unsere geistige (NOЄΡΟΝ)

---

[421] o.c. 173. Brashler identifies the pneuma with the Pleroma. Because of this the two figures, 'pneuma' and 'Pleroma', form together the third element of the Saviour. The text does not support this view, cf. 6.3.

[422] Gos.Phil. NHC II, 3, log. 63.

[423] See 6.4.4.

[424] Tröger 1977, 230f., 304.

[425] See 6.3, for a discussion of these phrases.

[426] Tröger 1977, 229-231.

[427] In my interpretation, a new nominal sentence starts with ΠΗ N̄ΤΑΚΝΑΥ (83.10f.).

Erfüllung (ⲠⲖⲎⲢⲰⲘⲀ) ist jener (Vorgang?), der das vollkommene Licht mit meinem heiligen Geist verbindet".

Koschorke's view on the Christology of Apoc.Pet., which resembles Tröger's view to a large extent, has to be evaluated against the following statement about the mythological background of Apoc.Pet.: "ApcPt setzt keine gesondert zu entfaltende Mythologie voraus, sondern spricht vielmehr das, was sie zu sagen hat - daß nämlich der Gnostiker als 'unsterbliches' Wesen sich seines himmlischen Ursprungs 'erinnern' und alles meiden wird, was ihn an 'diesem Ort' festhalten könnte, - auch klar aus".[428] He does not refer, therefore, to the Gnostic Redeemer Myth or any other Gnostic myth to explain the Christology of Apoc.Pet. He only lists the relevant passages and concludes: "Für das leibliche Auge ist der Soter also dem Leiden unterworfen, für das geistige jedoch ist er diesem gänzlich entnommen".[429]

In detail, Koschorke distinguishes: 1) the Saviour himself πνεῦμα νοερόν (83.8-10.14f.) 2) the laughing, living Saviour and 3) the non-material body of the Saviour (ⲤⲰⲘⲀ Ⲛ̄ⲀⲦⲤⲰⲘⲀ). Thus, a tripartite Saviour, filling in the scheme: σῶμα, ψυχή, πνεῦμα. Koschorke argues further that during his earthly life the Saviour is united with a 'Fleischesleib' (81.20). A different aspect, according to Koschorke, is the Pleroma of the Saviour, for which figure he refers to 82.3-17, 83.10-15 (81.2-3).[430]

Koschorke points at the use of the verb 'unite' by which the activity of the Pleroma after the crucifixion has been described. He observes that the Pleroma unites the perfect light with the holy Spirit of the Saviour, i.e. the 'I' of the Saviour. The perfect unity between the Saviour and his Pleroma was not possible before, because the Saviour inhabited a material body.[431] This clarifies also the function of the crucifixion in Apoc.Pet.; it symbolizes the path to perfection. Only after Peter has understood this he is able to communicate his knowledge to other people. Koschorke's argumentation differs from that of Tröger but in the end his view on the different 'natures' of the Saviour is very much alike.

The subject of Cozby's study is "the soteriological significance ascribed to the Passion of Jesus Christ in the Gnostic works preserved in the Nag Hammadi codices".[432] It is also for a large part similar to the earlier study of Tröger's. The difference between the two studies is that Tröger explores Gnostic Christology in general with the emphasis on the question whether or not the Nag Hammadi texts contain a docetic Christology, whereas Cozby focuses

---

[428] Koschorke 1978, 16.

[429] o.c. 18.

[430] o.c. 25.

[431] ibid.

[432] Cozby 1985, 5.

on the soteriological significance of Christ's Passion in the Nag Hammadi texts. According to Cozby the most important part of Apoc.Pet. is the description of the different aspects of the Saviour. These four figures make up Apoc.Pet.'s three-part Christology. He discerns: 1) the intellectual Pleroma which is identical with 2) an intellectual Spirit 3) an incorporeal body who is the living Jesus, unaffected by the Passion. 4) a fleshly body, creature of the archons. Cozby designates the intellectual Spirit and the intellectual Pleroma as the spiritual component and its Pleromatic counterpart respectively.[433]

Cozby's interpretation resembles the foregoing two to a large extent but he has a different view on the role of the Pleroma. He considers the Pleroma to be an aspect of the Saviour and identifies it with the intellectual Spirit.

Werner's observations on the Christology of Apoc.Pet. are rather scanty. His remarks about a dichotomic Christology correspond with the results of Tröger: "Insgesamt stehen sich also in den christologischen Aussagen der ApcPt eine göttliche und eine menschliche Natur gegenüber".[434] Schönborn calls the radical dualistic character of the Christology of Apoc.Pet. the most significant feature: "Mit pointierter Entschiedenheit nimmt der Sprecher einen Schnitt zwischen dem lebendigen Soter und dem vor, der dem sarkischen Kosmos verhaftet ist und den die Archonten zu einer Projektion ihrer Illusionen gemacht haben".[435] Schönborn does not present a detailed analysis. In a footnote[436] he appears to sympathize with Brashler's view on the Christology of Apoc.Pet., in which, as has been discussed, a Gnostic redeemer myth behind Apoc.Pet. is presumed.

6.2.1 Summary

We can distinguish two different lines of interpretation in the views on the Christology of Apoc.Pet. Brashler, Schenke and, less explicitly, Schönborn, favour the position of the History of Religions school, including the Gnostic Redeemer Myth. Of these authors, only Brashler discusses the Christology of Apoc.Pet. extensively. He assumes a tripartite scheme and connects the Christology of Apoc.Pet. with Valentinianism. The other authors, Cozby, Tröger, Werner and Koschorke, do not mention this hypothesis and limit themselves to the rendering of text data. Their interpretations all discern three non-material aspects of the Saviour and a material body with which the Saviour is temporarily united. Koschorke however, discerns a fifth figure, the Pleroma, which does not form part of the Saviour but *connects* the perfect light with the holy Spirit, i.e. the 'I' of the Saviour. Tröger does not

---

[433] Cozby 1985, 258-261.

[434] Werner 1989, 637. Tröger is the only author mentioned by Werner on this subject.

[435] Schönborn 1988, 484.

[436] o.c. 673, 674, n. 62.

include this Pleroma at all in his description of the different aspects of the Saviour while Cozby considers it to form part of the Saviour.

Five out of these seven authors, despite differences in details, typify the Christology of Apoc.Pet. as basically dualistic.[437] Below, I will argue that in Apoc.Pet. the important 'events' are the ones that take place on a Pleromatic level, the level on which 'the living Saviour', 'the intellectual Spirit' and 'the Pleroma of the Saviour' dwell. The material body is placed opposite these immaterial aspects of the Saviour. In this respect, the Christology of Apoc.Pet. could be called dualistic indeed.

6.3 The Passion Account

The complicated Christology of Apoc.Pet. can be reconstructed best by adhering closely to the text. The following discussion of the lines 81.15-83.19 will shed more light on the different 'natures' of the Saviour. In these lines we find an account of the crucifixion of Jesus and of the subsequent reunion of the Saviour with his Pleromatic aspect. The events are perceived and interpreted by Peter.

The vision of Peter (81.4-14) is explained by the Saviour in the following way:
81.15-18: "The one you see glad and laughing above the wood, is the Living One, Jesus".
81.18-22: "But the one into whose hands and feet they are driving the nails is his fleshly part which is the substitute. They put to shame that which has come into existence after his likeness".
82.1-3: "The son of their honour, instead of my servant they put to shame".

In these passages two different aspects of the Saviour are mentioned. The first aspect is referred to as: "The one above (or: upon) the cross" who is, as the Saviour *(angelus interpres)* explains, identical with "the Living One, Jesus" and probably also with "my servant". The second figure is called: "The one into whose hands and feet they are driving the nails" who is identical with "his fleshly part". This figure is also called "substitute", "that which has come into existence after his likeness", and "son of their honour". So, two figures are discerned here, the living Jesus and his fleshly part which is crucified. In the next part of the vision we encounter a third figure, depicted by Peter, with the help of different qualifications:[438]

---

[437] Schenke 1975a, Tröger 1977, Koschorke 1978, Werner 1989 and Schönborn 1989.

[438] It is also possible to consider this part of Apoc.Pet. as a new vision. This does not affect the interpretation.

82.4-6: "someone who intended to approach us, who looked like him and like the one who was laughing above the wood".
82.7-8: "He was woven in a holy Spirit",
82.8-9: "and he is the Saviour"
82.16: "And I, I saw that the one who glorifies is revealed".

This figure has to be distinguished from the earlier two, since it is called "someone who intended to approach us" and "who looked like him and like the one who was laughing above the wood". Both verbs "to approach" and "to look like" only make sense in a situation where another figure is present who can be 'approached' and 'resembled'. The appellations "woven in a holy Spirit", and "the Saviour" are both designations of the Pleromatic Saviour, who has to be distinguished from the Saviour as narrator.[439] "The one who glorifies" might be the designation of a third non-material, possibly Pleromatic aspect of the Saviour.

From this we could deduce that, so far, Peter understands the Saviour in the following way: 1) a material body, called his 'fleshly part', 'son of their honour' and 'substitute' (viz. of the Living One) 2) the Living One, Jesus, laughing above the cross 3) the Saviour, intending to approach them, woven in a holy Spirit and 4) the one who glorifies. However, half of these lines are part of the words of Peter who witnesses the crucifixion, but who does not yet fully understand what he is looking at.[440] He apparently has fallen victim to a state of confusion. This becomes clear from the lines 81.24-28 where Peter actually interrupts the explanation the Saviour offers to him: "Lord, nobody is looking at you, let us run from this place". This also explains the presence of a second account of the crucifixion scene (82.21-83.15) which apparently is necessary to convince Peter of the Pleromatic nature of the Saviour.

The second exposition directly following the above-depicted scene is less chaotic and contains an explication of Peter's vision. Although there is still a certain overlap between the statements, the different 'natures' of the Saviour are listed more systematically in these lines (82.21-83.15). The Saviour explains the vision of Peter. Apparently the nominal sentences in 82.21-26; 82.26; 83.6; and 83.10-15 are meant as definitions of both the material and the non-material aspects of the Saviour. Each phrase portrays an aspect of the Saviour:

82.21-26 deals with the material body of the Saviour. "The one who was nailed is the firstborn and the house of the demons; and the vase of stone in which they live; - of Elohim, of the cross - which is under the law".

In 82.26-30 "He who stands near him" is identified as "the living Saviour (ΠΙ-ⲤⲰⲦⲎⲣ), he who was in him before, (in) the one who was seized and he was released".

---

[439] See 6.4.1, where it is suggested that "the revealed one" (71.11) is identical with "the one who glorifies" (82.16). In this case the figure referred to here, must be identical also with the 'Son of Man' (71.12).

[440] See 6.5, where the possible allusion to the ascension of the Saviour is discussed.

83.4-6 describes again the material body of the Saviour: "the one who suffers shall stay (behind) because the body is the substitute".

83.6-8 describes "the one who is released" as "my incorporeal body".

In 83.8-10 the Saviour says: "I am the intellectual Spirit who is filled with radiant light".

In 83.10-15 we read "the one you saw coming towards us is our intellectual Pleroma who unites the perfect light with my holy Spirit".

Two of these passages contain a description of the material body of the Saviour, 82.21-26 and 83.4-6. In both instances this material aspect is looked upon as a noxious element with which the Saviour has been connected only temporarily.

In 82.26-30 and 83.6-8, we encounter two statements on the non-material nature(s) of the Saviour. The 'Living One, Jesus' is the one whom Peter saw glad and laughing above the wood in the first interpretation (81.15-18). This figure is identical with the living Saviour "who was in him before" (in the body) and who was released (ΚⲰ ⲈⲂⲞⲗ) (82.26-31). It also is the same figure that is depicted in 83.6-8: "The one who is released, is my incorporeal body". Note that in this last passage the same verb 'release' (ΚⲰ ⲈⲂⲞⲗ) is used. This seems to imply that the Living One, Jesus, the living Saviour and the incorporeal body are one and the same figure.

So far it is clear that in these lines the same two figures we already saw in 81.15-82.3 are described in more detail. In the first place we find two designations of the material body of the Saviour viz. in 82.21-26 and in 83.4-6. In the second place, a non-material body is mentioned which has been released before the crucifixion. It is called 'Living One, Jesus' (81.18), 'incorporeal body' (83.6-8) and 'living Saviour' (ΠⲒ-ⲤⲰⲦⲎⲢ) (82.26-30).

Next, we encounter a second non-material aspect of the Saviour viz. the intellectual or holy Spirit (83.8-10 and 83.15). This figure is identical with the narrating Saviour.

The third non-material figure which Peter initially perceives in 82.4-9 also returns here. 82.4-9 reads: "someone who intended to approach us, who looked like him (the narrating Saviour) and like the one who was laughing above the wood" (the living Saviour). He is woven in a holy Spirit and also he is the Saviour" (ΠⲒ-ⲤⲰⲦⲎⲢ). This figure is explained in 83.10-15: "the one you saw coming towards us is our intellectual Pleroma who unites the perfect light with my holy Spirit". This is the Pleromatic counterpart of the spiritual Saviour, the I-figure, whose task it is to attend to the unity of the Saviour. Formerly this figure has been indicated perhaps as "the one who glorifies" (82.16). This is the true Pleromatic Saviour who stays in the Pleroma during the Saviour's descent into the cosmos.

If these observations are accurate, we are dealing with three non-material figures, to wit, 1) an intellectual Pleroma, 2) an intellectual or holy Spirit and 3) an incorporeal body or living Saviour. This tripartite Saviour is connected with a fourth element, a material body. Although nothing is said explicitly about the way in which the Saviour inhabits this body, the text is very clear in its negative attitude towards it. It is suggested that the Saviour has

occupied a human, physical body via 'his servant', his incorporeal body.[441] The physical body is an imitation of and a substitute for this light body.[442]

6.4 Identity and Mission of the Saviour

Now, we will analyse all pericopes of Apoc.Pet. which do not relate directly to the crucifixion but nevertheless contain information on the identity and mission of the Saviour.

6.4.1 The Names and Titles of the Saviour

In the first place it is important to record the different names and titles which are attributed to the Saviour, both in his function of narrator/*angelus interpres* and as object of the revelation: Saviour, (ⲤⲰⲦⲎⲢ, 70.14, 72.26, 73.11f., 80.8, 81.15, 82.9.28); the Living One (ⲠⲈⲦⲞⲚⲄ̄, 81.18); Jesus (ⲒⲤ̄, 81.18); Christ (ⲠⲓⲬⲤ̄, 74.8); Son of Man (ⲠⲓϢⲎⲢⲉ ⲚⲦⲉ ⲠⲢⲰⲘⲉ, 71.12); Lord (ⲠⲬⲞⲈⲒⲤ, 81.8), the Revealed One (ⲠⲈⲦⲞⲨⲞⲚⲄ̄, 71.11).

These names and titles are attributed to the Saviour at different levels of the story. In the narrative parts of Apoc.Pet. viz. in the connecting texts, in the introduction and in the last part of Apoc.Pet. the Saviour is called ⲤⲰⲦⲎⲢ by Peter. In five instances (70.14; 72.26; 73.11f.; 80.8; 81.15) this name is connected with the definite article Ⲡ-. Here 'Saviour' seems to have become a kind of proper name; it is the most frequent designation of the main character and narrator/*angelus interpres* of the text.[443]

In two places (82.9 and 82.28) the title is used in a different way. In these cases ⲤⲰⲦⲎⲢ is connected with another form of the definite article: Ⲡⲓ-, and it is used as a predicate to denote a spiritual entity: "And he is the Saviour" (82.9); "who stands near him is the living Saviour" (82.28). The use of the definite article Ⲡⲓ- instead of Ⲡ- and the predicative position sets these cases apart from the five instances mentioned above where Saviour is almost a proper name. One has to realize that the appellation 'Saviour' is used in this double function.[444] The name 'Jesus' without article, is used once by the Saviour to identify 'the one

---

[441] Note that the incorporeal body of the Saviour may also be a unique, non-recurring figure, viz. the living part of Jesus, who is the historical manifestation of the 'intellectual Spirit'. Apparently, the 'intellectual Spirit' accompanies mankind through the ages, while he becomes manifest in different 'Saviours' until the final *parousia*. See also my commentary on 71.3-9.

[442] See also 71.22-33.

[443] Apoc.Pet. 70.14, 72.26, 73.11, 80.8, 81.15. Cf. also Just.dial. 8.2; Or.Cels. 6.43; Ath.Ar. 2.8.

[444] In this chapter I will usually indicate to which 'Saviour' I am referring. In cases where no further explanation is provided, the Saviour as narrator or *angelus interpres* is meant. See 6.1.

who is glad and laughing upon the cross' and 'the Living One' (81.15-18). The designation 'Living One' has special weight in its function as an appositive to the name 'Jesus'. 'Living One' seems to parallel the many passages in Apoc.Pet. where a difference is made between the dead (mortal) souls and the living (immortal) souls (75.30-76.4; 76.15-20), and especially one instance where the Petrine Gnostics are called 'the living ones' (80.4). The use of this designation suggests that the 'Living One' and the 'living ones' have something essential in common.[445]

The title 'Christ', with the definite article ΠI⁻, is used once, by the Saviour as well, in his monologue: "(the) Christ is glorified in a restoration" (74.8-9).

'The Son of Man'[446], with the definite article ΠI⁻, occurs once in the introductory words of the Saviour as an explanation of the preceding designation 'the Revealed One'. "The revealed one - who is the Son of Man, who is exalted above the heavens" (71.11-13). We find a similar expression in 82.15-17. In these lines it is told that Peter saw that "the one who glorifies was revealed". Both figures are said to be 'revealed'. This might be an indication that the Son of Man is identical with the figure in 82.15-17.

The title 'Lord' (Π-ⲪⲞⲈⲓⲤ) finally, is uttered once, by Peter, as part of the description of his second vision, in a vocative function (81.8). All of these names and titles are traditional Christian vocabulary.

Beside the occurrence of these different names and titles we have to note that the Saviour sometimes uses the first person singular to speak about himself. In 83.6-8, for example, we read: "the one who is released is my incorporeal body". In 83.8-10 the Saviour says: "I <am> the intellectual Spirit which is filled with radiant light". A few lines further, in 83.13-15, we find a similar expression: "...who unites the perfect light with my holy Spirit".

In these passages a relationship is established between the Saviour as narrator, and different aspects of the spiritual Saviour which are perceived by Peter in his vision. The narrating Saviour refers to his incorporeal body, and he may be identified with the intellectual Spirit and with the holy Spirit. It becomes clear as well that there is another non-material aspect of the Saviour which cannot be identified directly with him, viz. the intellectual Pleroma. These non-material natures of the Saviour have been discussed in 6.3.

---

[445] Cf. my commentary on 71.9-15.

[446] There is no reason to assume a non-Christian background for this title. It refers to Mt. 16.13f. Cf. F.H. Borsch 1970, 110-111 and esp. 112, n. 198 where the Son of Man reference of Treat.Seth is qualified as language with a Christian imprint. The occurrence in Apoc.Pet., which is not mentioned by Borsch, fits into this classification as well.

6.4.2 The Relationship between the Saviour and the highest God

The relationship between the Saviour and 'the Father', the highest God, is expressed in the following two phrases:[447]
70.21-25: "blessed are those belonging to the Father - because they are above the heavens - , he who has revealed life to those who are from life through me"
80.23-26: "So come, let us go to the fulfilment of the will of the incorruptible Father".

Both quotations enunciate clearly that the Saviour acts under the authority of the Father. The Father is the actual source of the revelation. The first phrase, in which the Saviour addresses Peter, indicates that the content of the revelation, the true life, is communicated to Peter by the Saviour, yet stems from the Father. The second quotation, which is an introduction to the Passion account, shows that the narrated events manifest the Father's will. The Passion appears to be a part of the Father's plan to free the living ones from the material world.[448]

6.4.3 *Apokatastasis* and *Parousia*

The word *apokatastasis* occurs once in Apoc.Pet.: 74.7f: "And during their reign Christ is glorified in a restoration". There is no indication in our text of a sophisticated theology behind this concept. Therefore I read it as part of the Gnostic eschatology and soteriology which Apoc.Pet. contains. The term *apokatastasis* denotes here the fulfilled process of the abandoning of the material reality and the return of the Gnostic souls to their Pleromatic origin.[449] This course proceeds without interruption. While in the cosmos the living souls are still suffering from the oppression by demonic powers, Christ is continuously praised by those Gnostic souls which have already returned to their origin.[450]
Parousia is the second eschatological concept which helps us to understand the identity of the Saviour: 78.6: "until my parousia". Apparently our text reckons with the return of the Saviour in an eschatological future. The two statements on a final judgement point in the

---

[447] There are no other passages in Apoc.Pet. where the highest God is called 'Father'. 'Father' (ⲓⲱⲧ) occurs a third time (73.27), but here the demiurge is called by this name instead of the highest God. The two instances in which the text uses the word 'God' (ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ) likewise refer to the lower God (79.14 and 79.27f.).

[448] Cf. 6.5.2.

[449] We find the same use of the word in other texts from Nag Hammadi, e.g. Ev.Ver. and Treat.Res. See Siegert 1982, 217.

[450] See my commentary on 70.18f.; 71.18-21.

same direction: 73.30 and 80.28. The *parousia* of the Saviour is a common Christian apocalyptic notion.[451]

6.4.4 Forgiveness and Redemption

Two other concepts worth mentioning in this context are 'redemption' in combination with 'forgiveness', found in 78.8-15: "my forgiveness from their tresspasses into which they fell through the adversaries, whose redemption I brought from the slavery in which they were in order to give them freedom". In another text from Nag Hammadi, the redemption the Saviour offers is connected with the restoration into the Pleroma.[452] It is possible that in Apoc.Pet. the same connection is implied in the words 'forgiveness' and 'freedom'. However, the evidence is too scarce and the translation of ΠΙΚⲰ ⲈⲂⲞⲖ ⲚⲦⲀⲒ as 'my forgiveness' too uncertain to state such a connection with certainty. Apart from these specific concepts, the Saviour uses many eschatological statements and images. As a matter of fact the whole monologue of the Saviour might be read as an eschatological warning directed at the adversaries of the little ones. The two digressions on the fate of the soul, 75.7-76.27 and 77.4-77.22, and the lines 80.8-23 in which the end of times is foretold are the most explicit eschatological parts of this discourse.[453]

6.4.5 Christological Statements in the Introduction (70.14-72.4)

Next, three statements from the introduction of the text have to be discussed which may shed some light on the Christology of Apoc.Pet.:
71.4-15: "...by him, whom the principalities seek and did not find; nor was he mentioned in any generation of the prophets; while he has appeared now in these (ones): in the revealed one - who is the Son of Man, who is exalted above the heavens - (and) in a <multitude> of people of the same substance". The spiritual Saviour is searched for by the principalities, but

---

[451] Cf. Ch. 4. Parousia usually forms part of the eschatological judgement we find in Christian and Gnostic apocalypses. However, the word occurs only five times in the Nag Hammadi texts: II 123,23; 135,22; IV 74,18; VI 28,18 VII 78,6 and IV 74,18. Siegert 1982, 284. Note that Siegert adds the remark "Bedeutung unklar" to our passage: VII 78,6. Cf. Schüssler - Fiorenza 1983, 300-302.

[452] The word ⲤⲰⲦⲈ 'redemption' in combination with the verb ϪⲒ 'receive', 'bring' occurs only in one other Nag Hammadi text, viz. the Tripartite Tractate (I,5), a Valentinian treatise on the whole process of devolution from and reintegration into the primordial godhead. In this text 'redemption' is a technical term which forms part of a description of the process of *apokatastasis*.

[453] See the commentary for a discussion of these eschatological statements.

not found.[454] He is not mentioned in any generation of the prophets. In this passage we are likely to detect a possibly anti-judaic strain, for the Saviour of Apoc.Pet. is explicitly separated from the Messiah announced by the Old Testament prophets. These lines may suggest that the Saviour has appeared before in the history of mankind but has not been recognized by the prophets.

The orthodox who confess the crucified Jesus are making a mistake by believing in the earthly Jesus in which the living Saviour appears on earth. Consequently they also fail to recognize the real Saviour who exists independently from this fleshly being (e.g. 82.32-83.8). In the same direction points the depiction of the activity of the archons who are searching for the Saviour in order to capture him, as may be inferred by these lines. It will appear that at the crucifixion they are not able to seize the living Saviour (ΠΙ-ⲤⲰⲦⲎⲢ) but only capture their own 'son' the material body of the Saviour.[455]

The mention of 'the people of the same substance' might be a reference to the souls who have already returned to their Pleromatic origin.[456]

71.16-17: "You too Peter, become perfect in (accordance with) your name, just like me, the one who has chosen you. For with you I have made a start for the others whom I have called to knowledge". The Saviour calls himself perfect and has chosen Peter to become perfect as well ("with you I have made a start").

71.27-33: "The distance that separates him and the nerves of his hands and his feet and the crowning by the ones of the Middle and his body of light".[457] We interpret this passage as meaning that there is a dichotomy between the material and the spiritual aspects of the Saviour, viz. between his hands, his feet, and the crowning by the soldiers, on the one hand, and his body of light on the other hand. This all functions in a Gnostic story of Christ's Passion and it is in line with the detailed description of the different natures of the Saviour at the end of Apoc.Pet.[458]

6.4.6 Conclusion

The identity of the Saviour is composed of several typically Gnostic, many eschatological and some what one could call proto-orthodox features. In the first place I want to point at the

---

[454] See my commentary on this passage for an explanation of the change from a first to a third person perspective.

[455] See 6.5.1.

[456] See my commentary on this passage and on the two "digressions on the soul".

[457] Cf. the discussion of Brashler's interpretation of the Christology of Apoc.Pet. above.

[458] See the Gramm. Ann. on this passage and the commentary where I have discussed whether or not these lines are a redactional insertion. Cf. also 6.2 where Brashler's interpretation of these lines is discussed.

eschatological tendency in the words of the Saviour: the Saviour speaks about the end of time and about the punishment the adversaries will get for the oppression of the little ones. Concepts like *apokatastasis* and *parousia* but also the mentioning of the final judgement and the fate of the soul are indicative of this. An explicitly Gnostic trait in the identity of the Saviour appears from the title 'Living One'. This is the same name with which the Petrine Gnostics are designated once (80.4). The mission of the Saviour is explicitly Gnostic as well. This becomes especially clear from the assignment Peter is given by him: "For with you I have made a start for the others whom I have called to *knowledge*" (71.18-21). More traditional Christian elements are the other titles of the Saviour, the dichotomy between the spiritual aspects of the Saviour and his material body, and his relation to the highest God.

6.5 The Christology of Apoc.Pet. as a Type of Docetism

As has been set forth above, the Christology of Apoc.Pet. can be characterized as docetic in the broader sense of this term. The relation between the Saviour and his material body can be accurately described as that between an inhabitant and his temporary dwelling place. It is clear that the attitude towards the bodily existence of the Saviour is negative, although its reality is not denied. The body is called 'fleshly part', 'substitute', 'son of their honour', and further on 'firstborn and house of the demons'.[459]

6.5.1 The Soteriological Meaning of the Passion in Apoc.Pet.

Symptomatic of this type of Christology is the absence of some traditional elements of the Passion. There is no mention, first of all, of the traditional Gospel story about the death and resurrection of Jesus.

We see this docetism also reflected in other passages of Apoc.Pet. It has influenced not only the account of the crucifixion and the Saviour's reunion with his Pleromatic counterpart. Earlier in the text, the mentioning of the 'light-body' (cf. the incorporeal body) of the Saviour (71.32-33) and the first appearance in a "new light, brighter than the light of day" (72.24f.), already indicated the tendency in Apoc.Pet. to describe the Saviour in docetic terms. In 80.29-30, finally, the Saviour says: "But me they cannot touch". From these phrases it can be concluded that no real unity between the Saviour and his earthly body is thought to be possible.

Connected with this is the question whether or not the crucifixion as it is rendered in Apoc.Pet. has any soteriological meaning. It has been stated several times that the crucifixion in Gnostic texts, especially when its Christology has docetic traits, is emptied of any

---

[459] In several parts of Apoc.Pet. this negative attitude towards the material reality is stressed explicitly, especially in the digressions on the fate of the souls: 75.7-76.23.

meaning.[460] But Cozby has successfully criticized this idea and demonstrated his view by setting up a scheme in which all the accounts of the Passion, as occurring in the Nag Hammadi texts, are included.[461]

In the first place it appears from the present chapter that the crucifixion functions as an example of the repudiation of the material world. This world as it is represented by the material body of the Saviour is rejected. From the relevant passages it becomes clear that the Saviour adopted the body to conquer, not to redeem it. From this, parallels can be drawn between the redeemer and the redeemed that are of soteriological interest: if the Saviour's flesh is not really part of him, neither is that of the Gnostic really part of his true nature. The Saviour's release from the world is a paradigm for that of the Gnostics.

A related aspect of the crucifixion in Apoc.Pet. is that it is the necessary consequence of the incarnation. This can be found explicitly in the exhortation by the Saviour in 80.23-26 in which the imminent crucifixion is called: "the fulfilment of the will of the incorruptible Father". From these words it becomes clear that the Passion is part of the will of the Father. This implies that the Saviour's whole mission manifests the Father's will (cf. also 70.20-25) and that this mission accords with the will of the Saviour himself. This would mean that the Passion takes on a soteriological function. The Saviour enters the fallen state, to free 'the living ones' who are imprisoned in that state (cf. 78.9-15).

On the other hand, the crucifixion can also be conceived of as a metaphysical battle between the Saviour and the archons which is won in the end by the Saviour.[462] From Apoc.Pet. 80.23-32 it appears that the crucifixion is the work of the archons who act as a group (71.5-7; 76.34-77.22; 81.18-23). The enmity on the part of the archons seems to be occasioned by the Saviour's Pleromatic nature. In Apoc.Pet. the Jewish authorities and orthodox Christian leadership seem to represent these archons.[463]

The actual result of the crucifixion is that the archons are misled and ridiculed. From several places we can deduce this: 81.31-82.3;82.32-83.3.[464] In 82.33 we are told that the crucifiers are "divided among themselves". Furthermore, "they do not know what they say.

---

[460] Perkins 1980, 114; Brashler 1977, 172-173. There are about 15 texts in the Nag Hammadi collection that contain a non-docetic description of the suffering and death of Jesus. E.g. I,3 The Gospel of Truth II,7 The Book of Thomas the Contender; XI,5 The Interpretation of Knowledge. See also Tröger 1977, 15.

[461] Cozby's scheme consists of the following categories: A) *The Crucifixion and the Archons*, subdivided into two categories: 1) The Crucifixion as the Work of the Archons. 2) The Crucifixion as the Defeat of the Archons. B) *The Crucifixion and the Incarnation*, also subdivided: 3) The Crucifixion as a Consequence of the Incarnation. 4) The Crucifixion as the repudiation of the Material World. Cozby 1985, 317-345.

[462] See Ch. 7 where it is argued that this battle functions as the justification of the schism between Apoc.Pet. and the parental group.

[463] See the commentary on 81.3-83.15, esp. 81.18, 22, 32; 82.2, 3.

[464] Cf. Tröger 1977, 305. Cozby does not recognize this aspect in Apoc.Pet.

For the son of their glory instead of my servant they have put to shame" (81.32-82.3). So, the archontic powers may think that they destroyed the Saviour by crucifying him, but in reality they only put themselves to shame. From a soteriological point of view the Saviour's defeat of the archons functions as an example of the Gnostic's victory over evil. In order to place this docetism in a historic context, it is important to bear in mind that the second and third century orthodox development stressed more and more the theological meaning of the 'flesh'.[465] This was accompanied with the rejection of pneumatic, or docetic, Christologies. Ignatius already fights docetism at the end of the first century, and, at the end of the second century, Irenaeus in his 'Adversus Haereses'[466] and Tertullian in 'De Carne Christi'[467] more and more stress the importance of the suffering of Jesus. They both argue vehemently for the reality of Christ's corporeal nature. This increasing accent on the physical suffering of Jesus and the emphasis on its meaning for salvation can partly be understood as a natural attitude of Christians who, in a hostile environment, held martyrdom very much in veneration. For another part it can be interpreted as a reaction against the opposite tendency in Gnostic circles, a tendency to trivialize the bodily suffering of Jesus, which in fact was a natural consequence of the Gnostic world view. As a matter of fact this docetic position is not unique in the early church.[468] The main difference between the Christology of Apoc.Pet. and non-Gnostic docetic Christology originates from the pessimistic anthropology of Apoc.Pet. as expressed in the digressions about the fate of the soul, and from the metaphysical subdivision in the personality of the Saviour. It is in these respects that our text can be considered thoroughly Gnostic.

6.5.2 Nag Hammadi and the Christology of Apoc.Pet.

The last question is whether the Christology of Apoc.Pet. has parallels in other texts from the Nag Hammadi collection. As has been mentioned above, a study by Tröger is devoted to this question,[469] but some additional remarks can be made. The most important parallel can be found in Treat.Seth (VII,2). This text displays some important resemblances with Apoc.Pet., not only with regard to the crucifixion account but also concerning several other

---

[465] See esp. Mac Rae 1980, 131f.

[466] Irenaeus, Adv.Haer. I, 9.2: *"Cum enim unus et idem ostenditur Logos et Monogenes et Zoe et Phos et Soter et Christus Filius Dei, et hic incarnatus pro nobis, soluta est Octonationis illorum compago".* (Sources Chrétiennes 264, 146-147). Irenaeus Adv.Haer. V, 14.2: *"si autem ob alteram quandam dispositionem Dominus incarnatus est ex altera substantia carnem attulit, non ergo in semetipsum recapitulatus est hominem: adhuc etiam nec caro quidem dici potest".* (Sources Chrétiennes 153, 186-187). Cf. also III, 16.2f.; 16.8; 17.4; IV, 6.7.

[467] De Carn.Chr. 17f.

[468] Cf. Denker 1975 on the docetism of the apocryphal 'Gospel of Peter'; also Van de Kamp 1983.

[469] Tröger 1977.

themes. According to Tröger, however, the Passion account as articulated in Treat.Seth differs fundamentally from this story as expressed in Apoc.Pet. This conviction is based on the fact that Simon of Cyrene is mentioned as the substitute of Christ at the crucifixion in Treat.Seth. On the other hand both Treat.Seth and Apoc.Pet. mention the laughing of the Saviour at the crucifixion.[470] We do not find this feature in any other Nag Hammadi text. An anthology from Treat.Seth will make clear the many parallels to Apoc.Pet. 81.15-24. The "I" we encounter in these passages can be identified as the Saviour who is, just like in Apoc.Pet., both the object of revelation and the narrator of the text.

51.20-52.3: "I visited a bodily dwelling. I cast out the one who was in it first and I went in. And the whole multitude of the archons became troubled. And all the matter of the archons as well as all the begotten powers of the earth were shaken when it saw the likeness of the image, since it was mixed. And I am the one who was in it, not resembling him who was in it first. For he was an earthly man, but I, I am from above the heavens".[471]

55.16-20: "I did not die in reality but in appearance, lest I be put to shame by them".

55.30-35: "For my death which they think happened, (happened) to them in their blindness, since they nailed their man unto their death".

55.36-56.20: "For their Ennoias did not see me, for they were deaf and blind. But in doing these things, they condemn themselves. Yes they saw me; they punished me. It was another, their father, who drank the gall and the vinegar; it was not I. They struck me with the reed; it was another, Simon, who bore the cross on his shoulder. It was another upon whom they placed the crown of thorns. But I was rejoicing in the height over all the wealth of the archons and the offspring of their error, of their empty glory. And I was laughing at their ignorance".

A comparison between these passages from Treat.Seth and Apoc.Pet. 81.15-24 shows in one glance that the analogies are abundant: the laughing Saviour, the body as a substitute, the archons who put the material body to shame, and the likeness of the bodily image to the Saviour occur in Treat.Seth. as well as in Apoc.Pet.[472]

The idea that Simon (of Cyrene) functioned as a substitute of Jesus, which we also find in Treat.Seth 56.9, has been identified by Irenaeus as stemming from Basilides.[473] The laughing of the Saviour also resembles Irenaeus' description of the Christology of Basilides. The idea that those who worship the crucified Lord are in fact worshipping the demiurge who made his material body, and the distinction between the fleshly suffering body and other,

---

[470] Cf. Ps. 2.4 and my commentary on 81.15-24.

[471] See also Treat.Seth 69.21-23: "I am Jesus Christ, the Son of Man, who is exalted above the heavens".

[472] The designation 'blind ones' , (Treat.Seth 55.33; Apoc.Pet. 72.12,14; 73.13; 76.22; 81.30; 83.3) and 'the doctrine of a dead man' (Treat.Seth 60.21-22; Apoc.Pet. 74.13-15; 78.17) are common motifs as well.

[473] Cf. Irenaeus, Adv.Haer. I, 24.4; Epiphanius, Pan. 24.3.

spiritual bodies is a Basilidean position as well.[474] However, there is some disagreement among scholars on the function of the name of Simon in Treat.Seth. Brashler points out that the text does not state explicitly that it was Simon who was crucified, but only says that Simon bore the cross.[475] Gibbons suggests that the whole passage 55.15-56.13 is a gloss.[476] Cozby finally proposes to consider that only the name Simon was inserted under Basilidean influence and not the whole passage. If we assume, with Gibbons, that the name of Simon is secondary indeed, 'the person who drank the gall and the vinegar', the one 'who bore the cross and the crown of thorns' could be identified as the Saviour's material body, a view which comes very close to Apoc.Pet. 81.10-23; 82.1-3 and 82.21-83.3.[477] Whether or not we take the name of Simon as a gloss it is clear that Treat.Seth and Apoc.Pet. share some important Christological notions. The three figures that form the spiritual Saviour occur only in Apoc.Pet., but the view of the crucifixion as a fraud and the vision of the laughing Saviour who ridicules his crucifiers is found in both texts. In Treat.Seth the laughing of the Saviour is naturally connected with a long passage in which Old Testament authorities are mocked and called 'laughingstocks'. In Apoc.Pet. the laughing of the Saviour is not embedded in a refutation of Old Testament authorities but is connected with a polemic against Christian authorities.

It is also possible to interpret the laughing of the Saviour as the reversal of certain Gospel accounts.[478] In Mk. 15.20 for example the soldiers mock Jesus and so do the chief priests in verse 31. Another possible background is provided by Lk. 6.21: "Blessed are you that weep for you shall laugh".[479] In the Nag Hammadi texts the motif of mocking the archons is used in Hyp.Arch. (NHC II,4). Here it is Eve who laughs at the archons who attempt to rape her but fail to do so because she changes herself into a tree (i.e. the tree of knowledge).[480]

Other noteworthy parallels in the Nag Hammadi corpus, where the suffering of Jesus is described as having nothing to do with the real Saviour, occur in the First Apocalypse of James (V,3), the Second Apocalypse of James (V,4), the Letter of Peter to Philip (VIII,2),

---

[474] Cf. Adv.Haer. I, 24.4 where Irenaeus speaks about Basilides: "If anyone confesses the crucified, that man is still a slave, and under the power of those who formed our bodies; but he who denies him has been freed from these beings, and is acquainted with the dispensation of the unborn father" (translation T.V. Smith, 1985, 93). Cf. also Adv.Haer. I, 7.2; I, 30.13.

[475] Brashler 1977, 179, n. 27.

[476] J.A. Gibbons 1972, 203-212, unpublished dissertation cited by Cozby 1985, 231.

[477] Cf. Cozby 1985, 231-233.

[478] Cf. Dart 1988, 97.

[479] See also Mt. 5.4; Jn. 16.20; Ps. 2.4; Prov. 1.26.

[480] Hyp.Arch. II, 89.20-29.

and the Tractatus Tripartitus (I,4). The backgrounds of these texts differ from one another and from Apoc.Pet. but they all seem to discern between a real Saviour and his material, bodily appearance.

We find this most distinct in 1 Apoc.Jas. (V,3) 31.17f.: "I am he who was within me. Never have I suffered in any way".[481] This passage parallels Apoc.Pet. 82.26-29: "But he who stands near him is the living Saviour, he who was in him before, (in) the one who was seized ...". In both texts a distinction is made between the material body of the Saviour and the living Saviour, the one who was (temporarily) within the body.

2 Apoc.Jas is a composite writing holding divergent literary forms. A statement on the different aspects of the Saviour which has a docetic tendency can be found in 2 Apoc.Jas. V, 49.18-23: "If I have come into existence, who then am I? For I did [not] come as I am, nor would I have appeared as I am".

In Ep.Pet.Phil. VIII, 139.21 we find a clearly docetic statement, similar to what we saw in Apoc.Pet.: "Jesus is a stranger to these sufferings".

Tri.Trac., is a Valentinian theological treatise which gives an account of the whole process of devolution from and reintegration into the primordial godhead. Tri.Trac. I, 11.36-38 reads: "And that which he is eternally, an unbegotten, impassible one from the Logos who came into being in flesh". This phrase also seems to speak about an eternal, "unbegotten" aspect which only appeared in the flesh.

In Apoc.Pet the impassibility of the real Christ and the strict division between his material and non-material aspects are more elaborately discussed than in the texts mentioned above. But it is important to bring the Christological statements of these texts to notice, because it becomes clear from them that the idea of a division between the real Saviour who cannot suffer and the material Jesus who is crucified is a common theme in the Nag Hammadi corpus.

6.6 Summary

In this chapter we have discussed several problems in order to come to a better understanding of the Christology of Apoc.Pet. After a presentation of previous analyses of the natures of the Saviour, we have discussed the names of the Saviour, his relation with the Father, and the character of his mission. From this I conclude that the Saviour of Apoc.Pet. cannot be understood as solely Gnostic or Christian. Several traditions have left their imprint on his character. Especially eschatological features, whether they are Christian or Gnostic, appear to be of importance.

In a detailed description of the crucifixion account of Apoc.Pet. I have especially tried to describe the non-material 'natures'. In my view, the Saviour consists of three spiritual aspects, which are connected temporarily with an earthly body. Then, I have included a description

---

[481] Translation of 1 Apoc.Jas. by W.R. Schoedel in Parrot 1988, 82f.

of the docetic traits of Apoc.Pet.'s Christology. The commonness of this docetic Christology in Christian-Gnostic writings has been elucidated by a comparison with other texts from the Nag Hammadi corpus, especially with Treat.Seth. The soteriological aspects of the Passion, finally, appeared to be affected by a thoroughly Gnostic anthropology and cosmology.

7. The Adversaries

7.1 Introduction

In this last chapter we will study in more detail the polemic in the monologue of the Saviour, in particular the passages on the opponents of the Petrine Gnostics. Who are these opponents and how do they relate to one another and to the group behind Apoc.Pet.? I will first discuss the previous research on this part of Apoc.Pet. After that I will present my own interpretation.

7.2 Previous Research

The first scholar to tackle the problem is Brashler. His interpretation of the polemics in the monologue of the Saviour can be summarized as follows. In Apoc.Pet. a sharp contrast between various opponents and the Petrine Gnostics is sketched. The latter group is possibly violently persecuted by different groups three of which are identified as orthodox (76.23-77.3; 78.31-79.21; 79.21-31), and one group as possibly Gnostic (74.27-75.7), whereas the identity of two groups cannot be recovered at all (74.22-27; 77.22-78.31).[482] The reaction of the Petrine Gnostics to this situation is one of despair, in that they hope for the return of the Saviour (78.6) who will destroy their opponents and establish the kingdom of the 'little ones'.[483] Brashler does not doubt the historical reality of different groups of adversaries. With regard to the nature of the conflict he states that the main cause of it was that the oppressors no longer formed one community with the Petrine Gnostics.[484]

In Koschorke's study we encounter a different interpretation of the polemic in the monologue of the Saviour.[485] He states that the multiformity of the opponents as presented in the text is misleading. He considers this part of Apoc.Pet. to be a literary construction describing seven groups, where in reality only one group is targeted, viz. orthodox clergy. The first group which Brashler did not further identify, because there is nothing specific in

---

[482] Brashler 1977, 223-235.

[483] o.c. 235.

[484] o.c. 234.

[485] Koschorke 1978, 80-90.

its description (74.22-27), is left aside by Koschorke for the same reason.[486] The other group which has not been identified by Brashler (77.22-78.31), is regarded as being orthodox by Koschorke.[487] The group which has been identified as possibly Gnostic by Brashler, because the man and the woman might be Simon and Helena (74.27-75.7), gives Koschorke interpretational problems as well. But by suggesting that the man represents Paul he makes it possible to interpret this passage as referring to orthodoxy as well.[488]

According to Koschorke, the presentation of only one group as seven different groups has a polemical function. His position is reflected in the following sentence: "ApcPt ist das Dokument der Auseinandersetzung zwischen gnostischem und orthodoxem Christentum und spiegelt das Ringen der Wortführer beider Seiten um den Einfluß auf die Masse der Gemeindechristen wider".[489] At stake in this struggle is the influence on lay Christians. The leaders of both sides try to capture the loyalty of lay Christians in order to win them over to their own side. This presupposes that the potential Gnostic and orthodox Christians formed one group. This is indeed what Koschorke claims for Apoc.Pet.: "the little ones" are the large mass of lay members of the proto-orthodox community. They are not a small exclusive Christian Gnostic group as has been assumed by other authors.[490]

Koschorke's interpretation of the structure of the monologue of the Saviour has found much support. Shellrude, however, has pointed out that other aspects of Koschorke's view cause problems. Two elements in particular have been criticized by him.[491] In the first place, he thinks it doubtful that the opposition as described in Apoc.Pet. has to be understood solely in terms of orthodox leadership. In the same line Shellrude criticizes Koschorke's conclusion that the 'little ones' are identical with the large mass of lay Christians, consisting of potential Gnostics and Christians.[492]

To support his first objection Shellrude discusses two passages which are used by Koschorke as evidence for his above mentioned interpretation: 73.23-74.22 and 78.31-

---

[486] o.c. 49. Koschorke had no knowledge of Brashler's study.

[487] o.c. 54f. See also my commentary ad loc.

[488] o.c. 41, 51. See also my commentary ad loc.

[489] o.c. 89.

[490] o.c. 81-85; Brashler 1977; also Schweizer 1974.

[491] Shellrude 1986, 245-253.

[492] Shellrude gives indeed a lenghty repudiation of the position of Koschorke, but he does not formulate his own ideas on the relation between the orthodox and Gnostic Christians in any detail. This is probably caused by the fact that he is mainly interested in the study of the genre of Apoc.Pet. We find Shellrude's view on this problem on page 243: "There is no doubt but that the text was written in the context of a crisis created by the threat posed to the Gnostic community by the orthodox".

79.10.[493] The first passage, in which the opponents are attacked, concludes with the phrase: "They will be ruled heretically".[494] Although the subject of the verb, 'they', is not specified in the Coptic text, Shellrude rightly argues that the author probably had in mind a whole community and not only its leaders.[495] With the verb 'to rule' that is used here, a distinction is implied between leaders and followers. The second passage contains part of the description of the sixth hostile group. Here the rivalling communities are described as a 'sisterhood' (79.9) and a 'brotherhood' (79.1), words which imply the existence of complete communities consisting of both leaders and followers.[496]

To exemplify his second critical remark, Shellrude argues "that the interpretation of lay Christians as 'immortal souls' whose potential for receiving Gnosis is frustrated by the orthodox leadership represents a highly distinctive theology. In fact there are no parallels for this view in other extant Gnostic sources or Patristic accounts of Gnostic doctrine".[497] The separation between two types of Gnostics (lay Christians and those who have already obtained salvation) is not clearly drawn by the author of Apoc.Pet. He could have done this, for instance, by a more distinctive designation of lay Christians, earlier in the text. Since he fails to do so Shellrude thinks it improbable "that lay Christians, the proposed target audience (according to Koschorke (hwh)), would have recognized themselves as the 'little ones' of GnApocPet".[498]

Shellrude's critique of Koschorke is important, although his argumentation in the second case is not decisive. He only thinks it 'improbable' that lay Christians would have recognized themselves as the target audience. Curiously enough, he forgets to draw the logical conclusion out of his first point of critique against Koschorke. For his argumentation in this first case also provides us with a decisive argument against Koschorke's second hypothesis in which the 'little ones' are identified with the group of lay Christians.

As already mentioned, in his first critical remark Shellrude successfully argues that the adversaries of Apoc.Pet. are leaders and lay Christians alike and not only orthodox Christian leaders as Koschorke proposes. A consequence of this for the second critical observation is

---

[493] o.c. 248. Koschorke 1978, 81.

[494] ibid. Shellrude's translation of Apoc.Pet. 74.21f.

[495] The Coptic construction can be interpreted both as an active and as a passive form. Therefore the subject of the verb 'to rule' cannot be identified with certainty. The semantic subject of the verb 'to rule', however, is, in either case, the leaders.

[496] Shellrude mentions the word sisterhood in his critique because he only wants to reject the idea that the opponents consist of orthodox leaders. The occurence of the parallel term 'brotherhood' as a designation of the community of the Petrine Gnostics substantiates Shellrude's argumentation.

[497] Shellrude 1986, 249.

[498] o.c. 251.

that at least part of the opponents of necessity cannot be 'little ones' or 'immortal souls'. For it is very hard to imagine that the 'little ones' in Apoc.Pet. are their own adversaries, which they would be if they were part of the group of lay Christians. Therefore, it can be concluded from Shellrude's argumentation, although he does not make this inference himself, that we have to distinguish two groups: the 'little ones', who may be identical with the Petrine Gnostics, and the 'orthodox' Christians, leaders and followers alike, who are mentioned as the opponents of the Petrine Gnostics.

To these observations by Shellrude the following may be added. Koschorke reads in Apoc.Pet. 71.33-72.2 a reference to Jn. 21.15f., where Peter is called to lead the flock of believers.[499] This pericope, from which Koschorke subsequently deduces a struggle between Gnostic and ecclesiastical leadership, forms one of the most difficult passages of Apoc.Pet. Its interpretation is far from certain, let alone the evidence of a reference to the Gospel of John.[500] Together, these remarks question some of the central ideas of Koschorke's interpretation.

A rhetorical approach can be found in Schönborn's study.[501] In this study he claims that there are no real opponents at all against which the author of Apoc.Pet. polemicizes. There is only a rhetorical depiction of conceivable future problems threatening the people behind Apoc.Pet. The vagueness of the opponents' identity is caused precisely by the fact that they did not exist in reality. Schönborn states that the language in this part of Apoc.Pet. consists almost completely of "Ketzerschablonen" formulated in such a general sense that it is impossible to reconstruct a historical setting from them. He therefore rejects the approach of Koschorke and interprets the text about the adversaries from a different angle[502]: the opponents as depicted in the text have no historical identity. They are depicted with the help of polemical clichés and are thus emblematic of the situation of oppression of the Gnostics. The function of the monologue of the Saviour is to develop and activate the identity of the readers of Apoc.Pet. According to Schönborn, the text seems to announce and depict dramatic events but, he argues, heresiological clichés used in traditional Christian texts are directed against their originators by the Gnostic technique of literary inversion. Therefore, the events under discussion should be interpreted ironically: the desire of the opponents to destroy the Gnostics turns against themselves. The reader of Apoc.Pet. has to recognize this function in order to understand his own actual situation and in order to be able to cope with his present difficult circumstances.[503] The historical question we try to answer here is almost completely

---

[499] Koschorke 1978, 30.

[500] See Ch. 5 and my commentary ad loc.

[501] Schönborn 1987, 416f.

[502] o.c. 409.

[503] o.c. 409-412.

left aside in Schönborn's rhetorical analysis. He rightly remarks that the description of the adversaries is vague, but this does not exclude the possibility that the author is referring to a real situation of oppression. In fact, it might even be this situation of actual persecution which caused the author of Apoc.Pet. to avoid naming his adversaries. The original readers of Apoc.Pet. might have had no difficulty at all in recognizing the opponents which are mentioned in the text. To this we could add that the vague way of referring to them is a characteristic feature of Gnostic texts not necessarily caused by lack of serious conflicts. It is sufficiently known from other (Gnostic) sources that there were ongoing problems between Gnostics and orthodox Christians.[504]

7.2.1 The Little Ones

Above we have argued that the 'little ones' are not identical with lay Christians. But there is another question in this matter which I want to answer: are the 'little ones' identical with the audience of Apoc.Pet., the Petrine Gnostics? This is a different, although related, problem which is discussed by Koschorke as well.[505] He comes to the conclusion I mentioned above, viz. that the 'little ones' are the lay Christians, while both orthodox and Gnostic leaders try to get into favour with them. According to Koschorke, the orthodox leaders partly succeed in this and they have won many of the 'little ones' over to their own side.[506] However, I think there is reason to doubt the success of the orthodox leaders in their attempts to convert the 'little ones'. I would rather identify them with the Petrine Gnostics who are determined to adhere to their own convictions. The following observations may shed some light on this matter. The three instances where the 'little ones' are mentioned in the text all describe a situation of extreme oppression which could be interpreted as a reference to the transition of the 'little ones' to the orthodox side.[507] A closer view, however, makes clear that the text is not univocal in its description of the relation between oppressors and oppressed. A discussion of these three instances and one instance where a group of 'living ones' is mentioned may illustrate the complexity of this relation:

1) In 78.15-22 we read: "For they shall create a further imitation (...) in order that the real light shall not be believed by the little ones". The second part of this sentence starts with the Greek ἵνα + a negative futurum III. It is not probable that here an actual event is described: only the intention of the opponents might be reflected, viz. that the real light shall not be

---

[504] See esp. Koschorke 1978 and Pearson 1990 who discuss the polemic in Testim.Truth NHC IX, 3.

[505] Koschorke 1978, 81-85.

[506] o.c. 82: "Handelt es sich hier (80.3f.) um ehemalige Gnostiker, die selbst dann noch als "unsterbliche Seelen" gelten, wenn sie inzwischen abgefallen sind"?

[507] o.c. 81f.

believed by the 'little ones'.[508] From this we cannot conclude that the opponents succeeded in their efforts to win the 'little ones' over to their side. Therefore, I see no need to make a distinction between the 'little ones' and the Petrine Gnostics.

2) The phrase in 79.18-19 reads: "Those who have done this deed to the little ones". This deed is probably the suppression, mentioned before, of their brothers, 79.11-12: "These are the ones who suppress their brothers...". Again we do not need to distinguish between these 'little ones' and the Petrine Gnostics, especially not in light of the above mentioned argument of Shellrude that here a clear opposition between two lay groups is described, designated as 'brotherhood' and 'sisterhood'. These lines can be read without difficulty as a description of a conflict between the Petrine Gnostics, who in 79.1 are called 'brotherhood', and a community of (proto-orthodox) Christians, who in 79.9-10 are called 'sisterhood'.

3) From the words in 80.2-4: "there are many who will lead astray many others of the living ones", it becomes clear that the enemies will partly succeed in their efforts to convince the 'living ones' (= 'little ones') and to win them over to their own side. Nevertheless, some caution is required since it is Peter who draws this conclusion, not the Saviour, as was the case thus far. Throughout the text Peter appears as a misinterpreter of what he hears and sees. Several times the Saviour corrects his words or encourages him, for Peter is afraid and faint-hearted.[509] Here again he speaks in fear; therefore his words should be read with circumspection, and the following words of the Saviour could also be interpreted as a correction of Peter's words instead of as an affirmation.

4) In 80.9-11 the Saviour says: "In a number belonging to their error they will rule over the little ones". Again there is no explicit reference to defection or conversion of the little ones to the orthodox side. The only thing which is stated explicitly is that the 'little ones' will be ruled by their opponents. But the fact that the little ones are ruled by their opponents does not imply at all that the rulers and the ones who are ruled have the same beliefs.

7.2.2 Conclusion

From this discussion of the views concerning the opponents of the Petrine Gnostics, it appears that as yet a conclusive answer to the question of the identity of the opponents and the nature of the conflict as postulated in Apoc.Pet. has not been formulated. It seems probable, however, that the 'little ones' are identical with the Petrine Gnostics. This group had and, at the time Apoc.Pet. was written, still might have been having a very hard time as a minority over against an orthodox majority, but they probably stayed loyal to their own

---

[508] Cf. Till 1986, § 308-309.

[509] Cf. 72.8-13, 18-20; 79.32-33; 80.32-81.1; 81.7-14; 81.25-30; 82.18-20; 84.6-11.

Gnostic beliefs and this very loyalty might have caused the conflict we encounter here. In order to specify the nature of the disagreement between the Petrine Gnostics and their opponent(s), I now want to reconsider the questions regarding the relation between the different groups and the Petrine Gnostics.

7.3 Unity and Conflict

The specification of the relationships between the groups that seem to be present in the text is hampered by the fact that in Apoc.Pet. both unity and conflict between the Petrine Gnostics and proto-orthodox Christians can be detected. Unity can be deduced from specific passages where inclusive language is used. Conflict becomes clear from the polemical parts of the monologue of the Saviour and from some explicitly separative expressions. The same tension appears in the abundant use of New Testament traditions which are usually interpreted in a controversial way.

Several short phrases, scattered throughout the text, suggest unity of organisation. For example, in the digression on the soul, it is said of the living soul (the Gnostic) that it will "look like" the dead soul (the non-Gnostic) and it will not reveal its nature (75.31-33). Very significant are the words "for they shall live among them" (78.7-8), in which 'they' clearly refers to the Petrine Gnostics, and the passage where it is told that the adversaries of the 'little ones' will destroy them "in their midst" (80.5-6). Finally, we can point to the phrase "these are the ones who suppress their brothers" (79.11-12). These phrases suggest a situation of just one ecclesiastical organisation in which the Petrine Gnostics formed a (suppressed) minority.

Diversity and conflict, on the other hand, between the Petrine group and the other, orthodox, groups appear from the following phrases. In 73.32-74.1, it is told that "those who became conjoined with these shall become their prisoners". In 79.23 we read: "there are others, outside our number", 80.2: "I am afraid because there are only a few who meet the demands", 75.17, 80.1: "according to us". In these lines the separative tendency is stronger.[510]

The use of a large amount of New Testament material in Apoc.Pet. shows, on the one hand, that the author had a more than coincidental knowledge of Christian traditions.[511] The way he has used this material, on the other hand, is highly peculiar. The story of the Passion of Jesus, for example, is a radical reinterpretation of the account of this story as it is told in the Gospels and, as we may assume, as it was accepted in (other) Christian circles.[512] Therefore it is probable that the author of Apoc.Pet. (and the group he might be

---

[510] See also the commentary on these passages.

[511] See Ch. 5.

[512] See Ch. 6.

representing), had important differences of opinion with the group(s) repudiated in the text. We can clearly see from this survey that the text transmits different, conflicting signals. It cannot be fully deduced from these passages what sort of relation the Petrine Gnostics had with the proto-orthodox Christians and their relation with the other possibly Gnostic group which is mentioned in 74.27f. is even more enigmatic.

7.3.1 Positive and Negative Qualifications

A clear sign of conflict appears in the names the author assigns to different groups. Positive qualifications are used to describe the Gnostics in general and the people behind Apoc.Pet. in particular. They are called: the ones who are above the heavens (70.22), those belonging to the Father (70.21), people of the same substance (viz. as the Son of Man) (71.14-15), the others whom I have called to knowledge (71.20-21), the unforged and good pureness (perhaps referring to the Saviour) (74.4), the immortal soul(s) (75.26; 77.2f., 17; 78.4), the children of light (78.25f.), the brotherhood that truly exists (79.1), the living ones (80.4), the strangers who are not from this aeon (83.17f.), the ones who were chosen from an immortal substance (83.23f.), the ones who have (83.27f.), the one who exists (84.6).

Negative qualifications designate: the priests and people (72.12,14; 73.13), the non-Gnostics in general (73.18; 75.17-20,31; 76.18,22; 78.24f.; 80.28; 83.29-34; 83.3,31; 84.10), proto-orthodoxy (74.10f.; 79.9f.; 73.30-32), and the archons (81.30).

They are called: blind ones (who have no guide) (72.12,13; 73.13; 76.22; 81.30; 83.3), the children of these aeons (73.18), the servants of the word (73.30-32), the men of the false proclamation (74.10f.), a slave created for his desires (75.17-20), the dead one (75.31f.), he who does not exist (76.18), the workers who will be thrown into the outer darkness (78.24f.), the imitating race of the sisterhood (79.9f.), those who will bring judgement upon themselves (80.28), he who does not have, who has come forth from the implantation of the habit of procreation (83.29-34),[513] the person of this place (83.31), and your enemies (84.10).

These designations reflect the controversy between the Petrine Gnostics and whoever their adversaries are. Many of these designations exhibit a strong antagonism: immortal/mortal; brotherhood/sisterhood; the ones who have/the ones who have not; the strangers who are not of this aeon/the children of these aeons; the one who exists/the one who does not exist. Although these opposite pairs may give us an indication of the intensity the conflict had in the mind of the author, they do not add much to our understanding of the identity of both parties.

Neither do the other designations provide us with a clue to the actual identity of the different parties and their mutual relations. We are dealing largely with religious clichés.

It is possible, as was already suggested above in the commentary, that in several passages of Apoc.Pet. positions are challenged that could be connected with orthodoxy. The adversa-

---

[513] See the Gramm. Ann. 83.32-34 for a discussion of this phrase.

ries in question boast that they possess the one and unique truth (third and fourth group, 76.23-27 and 76.27-77.4), they are convinced that good and evil have the same origin (fifth group, 77.22-78.31), and that a second penance is possible (fifth group), they appreciate martyrdom (sixth group, 78.31-79.22) and have introduced a hierarchy of bishops and deacons (seventh group, 79.21-31). The second group (74.27f.), however, is likely to be a rivalling Gnostic group, while the first group (74.22-27) does not contain any specific lead for further identification.[514] The identity of the second group (74.27-75.7) in particular has given rise to speculation. Whereas five groups show more or less clear features of (proto-) orthodox Christianity, this one group cannot possibly be connected with orthodoxy. This observation also frustrates the solution that in Apoc.Pet. only one, orthodox, group is opposed which, for polemical and/or literary reasons, was presented as seven groups.[515]

The discussion about the structure and content of the monologue of the Saviour is dominated by this problem. I will try to formulate an alternative solution.

7.4 The Structure of the Community

On the basis of the above presented data I pose the following hypothesis: the Petrine Gnostics originally formed part of a proto-orthodox Christian community where they became more and more unwanted because of their explicitly deviating beliefs. The conflict escalated to such an extent that the Petrine Gnostics had to leave the community.

This course of events presupposes a situation of ideological diversity within one community.[516] In current sociological and anthropological theory it is deemed evident that, on the one hand, members of a group share a certain range of symbols while, on the other hand, they may attribute different meanings to these symbols.[517] Thus groups that actually hold different beliefs are liable to believe themselves to belong to one community since they share common symbols (Christ, the Cross etc.). As long as these symbols are not explicitly

---

[514] See further my commentary on these passages.

[515] See Koschorke 1978, 41f. who proposes to identify the man and woman in this group with Paul and Thecla. Cf. note 488 above.

[516] The question of whether these Petrine Gnostics saw themselves as an 'inner-circle', as the real spiritual church built on the fundament of the earthly church, has been discussed extensively by Koschorke 1978, 220f. In his view, the Christian community consisted of different levels or concentric circles in which the Gnostics obtained the highest level, or the middle circle. Indeed, several sources confirm this for Valentinian Gnostics: Just as the body of Jesus consists of a pneumatic and a psychic part so does the church possess both parts (Exc.Th. 58.1). According to the same text the church consists of "to ekleton kai to kleton" - the chosen and the called.

[517] Cohen 1985, 15f.

provided with a particular content there is no need within a group to distinguish between right and wrong doctrine.[518] In the same line Robinson describes ancient religious communities as 'pools of acceptable diversity'.[519]

From this it follows that a schism can be the result of a conflict concerning the explicit interpretation of certain common symbols. The separation of the Petrine Gnostics from their 'parental group' can be understood against this background. In terms of social psychology the alienation has been conceived of as the result of a process of 'subgrouping' and, consequently, 'group schism'.[520] The concept of subgrouping has been described as follows: "This phenomenon indicates that while all group members accept the basic group beliefs, some of them form and hold additional beliefs, which unite and characterize them as a subgroup".[521]

Groups may have few, several or many subgroups.[522] If we assume that the Petrine Gnostics formed a subgroup in a larger community it might be just as likely that other Gnostic groups also formed part of this community. At the time of the conflict, as reflected in Apoc.Pet., some of these groups could still have been tolerated as subgroups of the proto-orthodox group. This would explain why the polemic, which consists of at least five references to orthodoxy and only one to another, possibly Gnostic, group seems so unbalanced.[523]

In the case of the Petrine Gnostics the conflict between them and their parental group apparently became insolvable. It is possible that the Petrine Gnostics did not want to leave the larger community of their own accord: they might have been forced to leave. Either way, whether the parent group forced them to go because they challenged their basic beliefs, or the Petrine Gnostics themselves decided to leave the proto-orthodox community, for whatever reason, the result was probably a schism between the two groups. "Once a group splits, the new group will try to differentiate itself from the parental group. (...) The formulated group

---

[518] o.c. 74.

[519] Th.A. Robinson 1988, 29: "It seems to me that the fact of early diversity cannot be properly understood unless we have some sensitivity to the way that diverse groups draw lines of inclusion and exclusion. Difference does not always mean exclusion, though often it might. We would have a better appreciation of the relevance of early diversity to our problem of orthodoxy and heresy were we to investigate the early diversity in termes of what I suggest we call 'a pool of acceptable diversity', for it is within such a pool that religious and ideological groups comfortably live".

[520] Bar-Tal 1989, 81-90. See also Th.A. Robinson 1988; Bax 1988 and especially Cohen 1985.

[521] Bar-Tal 1989, 81.

[522] o.c. 82.

[523] In this respect Koschorke could very well be right: the plurality in the description of the adversaries might have a purely polemical function as in reality all attacks are directed at only one adversary, which is not the orthodox clergy, but their own former group. The author's predilection for texts that were to become New Testament texts and the vehemence of the polemic can be understood this way.

beliefs have to be noticeably different from the group beliefs of the parent group in order to justify the schism".[524] If we start from the assumption that the Petrine Gnostics split from the (proto) orthodox community, the connection between the two main parts of Apoc.Pet. (the Passion story and the discourse about the different opponents) appears to possess an amazing inner logic. The two main elements of Bar-Tal's description of 'group-schism', differentiation and justification, appear to cover the content of Apoc.Pet. adequately. This can be explained by analyzing the text of Apoc.Pet. with the help of the above quoted description of the process of group schism. The term 'differentiation' expresses the sense that the beliefs of the subgroup have to be "noticeably different from the beliefs of the parent group". This could also be defined in more general terms as the need to formulate explicitly their own interpretation of certain common symbols. In Apoc.Pet. this differentiation is realized by including a highly specific interpretation of the Passion story which differs greatly from the regular orthodox belief.[525]

The second element in the description is 'justification' which is closely connected with the foregoing concept of 'differentiation'. With the help of this notion it is argued that the deviating group's beliefs function as a justification of the schism. This is the main concern of the large middle part of Apoc.Pet., which contains the polemic against the different hostile groups. The whole refutation of deviating convictions can be interpreted as an attempt to justify the group's own position.

Watson discerns similar steps in the process of separation of a sect from its environmental group.[526] He starts from the assumption that a group needs a 'legitimation' for its separation from the parental group. He then mentions three forms of legitimation: 1) denunciation, in our case severe criticism, 2) antithesis and 3) reinterpretation. All these strategies appear to be present in Apoc.Pet. The first element appears in the repeated reproaches of suppression and violence against the Petrine Gnostics. In several passages from the monologue of the Saviour it is suggested that the Petrine Gnostics are oppressed by hostile forces (73.32-74.2; 77.33-78.7; 79.11-12, 20-21; 80.5-6, 9-11). In the digressions on the fate of the soul, 75.7-76.27; 77.4-22, this persecution is explained as a necessary course of events, caused by a dualistic cosmic order. The harsh fate of the living souls, and the temporary victory of the dead souls are explained by a fundamental difference in origin of these souls. Their respective fates on earth will be reversed when they return to their origin.[527] The second strategy to legitimize a separation becomes apparent in the antitheses used to describe the Petrine Gnostics and their opponents (cf. 7.3.1). The third aspect is present throughout our text in the reinterpretation of the Passion of Christ.

---

[524] o.c. 88.

[525] See Ch. 6.

[526] See Watson 1986, 40-48.

[527] See the commentary, ad loc.

7.5 Conclusion

There is no need to regard all groups mentioned in Apoc.Pet. as orthodox Christians or more particularly 'orthodox leaders', the way Koschorke does. The concept of the early Christian communities as a large group, including one or several subgroups, leaves room for the above suggested situation in which both Gnostic and orthodox Christians formed part of one community. This also explains the problems the text causes us in deciding who belongs to which group. Emotionally, the Petrine Gnostics still formed part of the proto-orthodox community, though not in reality. In the course of time a conflict concerning doctrine must have arisen, as a result of which the Petrine Christians were forced to leave the parent group. Our hypothesis, holding that Apoc.Pet. originated in the course of a struggle with the parent community, includes the assumption that relations were changing. One of the polemical issues of Apoc.Pet. which might have caused the conflict, is the safeguarding of orthodox episcopal authority by apostolic succession.[528] Orthodoxy gained ground, the church began to institutionalize itself and the Petrine Gnostics may even have been combatted. The interpretation also might shed new light on the function of Apoc.Pet.: the text seems to reflect the search for a new group identity. By rejecting the former group and its beliefs, it became necessary for the Petrine Gnostics to formulate (perhaps for the first time) their own convictions. They did this by reinterpreting the Passion tradition. By choosing this story, which must have played a central role in the belief of the parental group, the author made it clear that the schism was inevitable. Apoc.Pet. might have been the programme of a newly formed group.

---

[528] See the commentary on 79.21-31.

Register

Coptic Words and Forms

ⲀⲘⲀϨⲦⲈ v.tr. *seize, grasp* 81.5.9f;82.29;84.4

ⲀⲚ part.neg.:

    negating NS 83.18

    negating Pres. I circumst. 75.29

    negating Adjectiv Verb rel. 76.12

    negating Instans 75.32

Ⲛ̄...ⲀⲚ:

    negating NS 75.12f;83.21

    negating Pres. I 75.26f;76.18f.20.28f.29f;77.9;78.27f.28;79.16f.81.92.

ⲀⲚⲞⲔ pron.pers.I:

    In extraposition 72.8.17;79.31;80.29;81.24;82.3

    Predicate in reduced cls 82.15

    Predicate in reduced NS 83.8

ⲀⲠⲈ n.f. *head* 73.7

ⲀⲢⲈϨ v.intr. *guard* 79.16f. (imperative)

ⲀⲦ-

    pref. s. ⲂⲰⲖ, ⲈⲒⲰⲢϨ̄, ⲔⲢⲞϥ, ⲘⲞⲞⲨ, ⲘⲞⲨ, ⲚⲀⲨ, ⲤⲞⲞⲨⲚ, � ⲰⲒⲂⲈ, ⲰⲀϪⲈ, ϨⲖ̄ⲖⲞ, ϪⲰϨⲘ̄; σῶμα

ⲀⲨⲰ conj. *and*

    70.17.29.32;71.6.29;72.9.16.21.27.28.30;73.1.7.9.10.13.16.25.29;74.7.10.13.15.16.18.24
25.34;75.22;76.3.21.34;77.5;78.1.8;80.6.11.15.17.18.21.28;81.6.9.12.13.17.31;82.8.13.30;83.28;84.5.7

ⲀⲰⲀⲒ̈ v. intr. *multiply*:

    subst. *multitude* 82.11f.

ⲀϨⲈⲢⲀⲦ⸗ v.comp. *stand, take up position against*:

    ⲀϨⲈⲢⲀⲦⲔ̄ 80.31f.

    ⲀϨⲈⲢⲀⲦϥ̄ 81.2;82.27.31

    ⲀϨⲈⲢⲀⲦⲞⲨ 74.29

ⲂⲈⲔⲈ n.m. *earning* 72.1

ⲂⲀⲖ n.m. *eye* 72.15

ⲂⲞⲖ n.m. *outside*:

    ⲤⲀⲂⲞⲖ, adv. *outer* 78.25

    (+prep. Ⲛ̄- /Ⲙ̄ⲘⲞ⸗) *outside of* 79.23

    Ⲛ̄ⲤⲀⲂⲞⲖ: (+prep. Ⲛ̄-/Ⲙ̄ⲘⲞ⸗) *away from* 78.25

B**ω**ⲗ v. tr. *release*:

    B**ω**ⲗ ⲈⲂⲞⲗ *dissolve* 76.19

    subst. *release* 78.30f.

    ⲀⲦⲂ**ω**ⲗ ⲈⲂⲞⲗ *imperishable* 77.16

B̄ⲗⲎⲈ adj. *blind* 83.3.

    Bⲗ̄ⲗⲈⲈⲨⲈ pl. 72.12;73.13;76.22;81.30

    MⲚ̄ⲦBⲗ̄ⲗⲈ *blindness* 72.14f.

BⲢ̄Ⲣ̄ⲢⲈ adj. *new* 72.24

    Ⲣ̄ BⲢ̄Ⲣ̄ⲢⲈ v.comp. *become young* 80.13

Ⲉˉ prep. *in, at* s. Mⲗ

    Ⲉ + nomen 71.13;72.24;73.17;74.24.27;76.13;77.1.2.13;78.17.24;81.19

    Ⲉ + inf. 72.14;76.3;77.2.6;78.14;82.19;83.25

    Ⲉ + subst. rel. cl. 84.6

    ⲈⲢⲞ⸗:

    ⲈⲢⲞK 73.20.21;84.10

    ⲈⲢⲞ**ϥ** 71.28;75.16;78.21;82.27;83.29

    ⲈⲢⲞⲤ 80.21;83.25

    ⲈⲢⲞⲚ 82.5

    ⲈⲢⲞⲞⲨ 74.28;77.11;79.24

Ⲉ**ϩ**ⲞⲨⲚ Ⲉˉ *to* 71.21

Ⲉ**ϩ**Ⲣⲗ**ï** Ⲉˉ *towards, to, into* 74.5f.13.17;76.19

ϣⲗ**ϩ**Ⲣⲗ**ï** Ⲉˉ: *during, until, up to* 74.7;78.6.29

Ⲉˉ as an object marker 70.28;72.5.18.23.27.31;73.2.5.8.15;81.32;82.4.32

    ⲈⲢⲞ⸗:

    ⲈⲢⲞⲈⲒ 80.30

    ⲈⲢⲞK 81.26f.

    ⲈⲢⲞ**ϥ** 72.17;81.4.7.16.24;82.15;83.11

    ⲈⲢⲞⲞⲨ 72.28;73.17.26;79.20;82.10.13.14.14;83.16

    s. ⲚⲗⲨ, **ϣ**ⲗ, ⲬⲈ

Ⲉ rel. s. conjugations: imperf. aor.

Ⲉ circumst. s. conjugations: pres.I, instans, perf.I. neg. perf.I, aor.

    +neg.Pr. I 76.28f.;79.16

    +adj.v. 72.24;77.22

    +NS 75.34;77.15;83.5

    + ((Ⲟ)ⲨⲚ̄Ⲧⲗ⸗) 78.32

    + ((Ⲟ)ⲨⲚ̄) 80.2

    + MⲚ̄ 72.12

ⲈⲂⲞⲗ adv. *out* s. B**ω**ⲗ, K**ω**, MⲞⲨ**ϩ**, ⲦⲒⲢⲈ, ⲞⲨ**ω**Ⲛ**ϩ̄**, **ωϣ**, **ϩ**Ⲛ̄-, **ϩ**ⲒⲦⲚ̄-, Ⲭ**ω**K, Ⲛ̄- prep.

ⲈⲗⲞⲞⲗⲈ n.m. *grape* 76.7

ⲈⲚⲈ**ϩ** n.m. *eternity*:

    ϣⲗ ⲈⲚⲈ**ϩ** adj. *eternal* 75.21;76.15

ЄРНУ n.m.pl. *comrades*, to express the reciprocal pronoun: *each other.*

    ΝЄΥЄРНΥ 74.27;82.33f.

ЄΤ rel. s. conjugations: pres.I, instans, perf.I + adj.v. 76.12

ЄΤЄ rel. s. conjugations: aor.affirm., perf.fut.III + neg. pres.I 76.18.19f.29;77.8

    + ΝС 71.11f.;73.30;75.10.21;76.22;77.24;78.18;79.2;81.21;83.18.21.30

    + cls. 70.25f.

    + ΟΥΝ̄ΤΑ⸗ 83.28

    + M̄ΜΝ̄ΤΑ⸗ 83.30

    + 2ΝΑ⸗ 73.28

ЄΤΒЄ prep. *with regard to, because of, about,* 71.27;72.1;75.2;76.1;79.32;80.33

    ЄΤΒЄ ΠΑΪ *therefore, that is why* 83.1.26f.

ЄΤΝ̄⁻ prep.:

    ЄΤΟΟΤϥ̄ 74.18

    ЄΤΟΟΤΟΥ 83.17

ЄΟΥⲰ n.f. *hostage:*

    Р̄ ЄΟΥⲰ v.comp. *become a hostage* 77.3

ЄΟΟΥ n.m. *glory* 82.2

    † ЄΟΟΥ v.comp. *glorify* 73.10.22;74.8.10;77.11;82.16f.

ЄϢⲰΠЄ conj. *when* 76.6;77.16f;79.15;84.1

ЄϢΧЄ conj. *if* 72.13

ЄϢΧЄ conj. comparative: as if 81.5

Є2ΟΥΝ adv. *inside* s. Є⁻ prep., Ν̄ΝΗΟΥ

    † Є2ΟΥΝ v.comp. *oppose* 77.23

Є2ΡΑΪ adv. *up, down* 72.30 s. Є⁻ prep., ЄΧΝ̄⁻, ΚⲰ, 2Є

ЄΧΝ̄⁻ prep. *over, at* etc. 77.23;80.11.15;81.13.14

    ЄΧⲰ⸗:

    assim. ЄΧΜ̄⁻ 77.20;80.24

    Є2ΡΑΪ ЄΧΜ̄⁻ 72.26

    Є2ΡΑΪ ЄΧⲰΝ 72.6f.

    ЄΧⲰΟΥ 74.21

    Є2ΡΑΪ ЄΧⲰΟΥ 80.16

НЄІ n.m. *house* 82.22

НΠЄ n.f. *number* 70.18;79.24;80.10

ЄІ v.intr. *come, go* 72.26;75.4

    subst.75.29

    ΑΜΟΥ imper. 80.23

ЄΙΜЄ v.tr. *know* 81.32

ЄΙΝЄ v.tr. *bring:*

    Ν̄Τ⸗:

    Ν̄ΤΟΥ 77.13

ЄΙΝЄ v.tr. *resemble, look like* 75.11.26.31;76.17;82.5

    subst. 71.33 (?);79.9;81.23

ЄΙЄΠϢϢΤ n.m. *merchandise*:

    P̄ ЄΙЄΠϢϢΤ v.comp. *merchandise* 77.33

ЄΙΡЄ v.tr. *do, make* 71.19;73.28;79.19;81.22 s. CΡΑϨ

    P̄- s. BΡΡЄ, ЄΙЄΠϢϢΤ, ЄΟΥϢ, P̄ΡΟ, CΑBЄ, ΟΥΟЄΙΝ, ϢϢΡΠ̄, ϨϢB, ϨᾹΛΟ, ϨΟΤЄ,

    ϨΟΥΟ; ἀγαπᾶν, αἰχμαλωτεύειν, ἄρχειν, ἐπιθυμεῖν, ὁρμάζειν, τέχνη, φθονεῖν, πιστεύειν

    ΑΑ⸗:

    ΑΑq 82.3

    ΑΑC 71.27;72.18;80.19

    ΑΑΥ 80.29

    s. CΡΑϨ

    Є stativ 73.21;74.3.32;80.16;81.4;83.25

    ΑΡΙ- imper. 72.21

ЇΟΟΡ n.m. *canal* 79.31

ЄΙϢΡϨ̄ v.tr. *see, perceive*:

    MN̄ΤΑΤЄΙϢΡϨ̄ *unability to see* 83.2

ЄΙC ϨΗΗΤЄ part.dem. *look!* 80.26

ЇϢΤ n.m. *father* 70.21f.;73.27;80.25

ЄΙqΤ n.m. *nail* 81.19

    ✝ ЄΙqΤ v.comp. *nail* 82.21

ΚЄ n.m. *other*:

    ΚЄ- 71.20;80.4

    ΚЄΟΥΑ *another* 81.12

    ΚΟΟΥЄ pl. 76.24;77.22;78.31;79.22

ΚϢ v.tr. *lay, set, put* 72.15;78.28

    ΚϢ ЄBΟΛ *forgive*:

    subst. *forgiveness* 78.8

    ΚΑΛ⸗ ЄBΟΛ:

    ΚΑΑq ЄBΟΛ 82.30;83.7

ΚϢ ЄϨΡΑЇ *proclaim, establish* 78.1

    subst. 74.11

    ΚϢ + N̄CϢ⸗ refl. *leave* 76.3

ΚΑΚЄ n.m. *darkness* 78.24

ΚϢΚ *peel, strip off*:

    ΚϢΚΑϨΗΥ *undress*:

    ΚΗΚΑϨΗΥ stative *be naked* 74.31f.

ΚΛΟΜ n.m. *crown*:

    ✝ ΚΛΟΜ v.comp. *crown*:

    subst. 71.30

ΚϢΛϨ̄ v.tr. *drive* 81.18f.

ⲔⲚⲦⲈ n.m. *fig* 76.4f.

ⲔⲀⲠ n.m. *vessel* (?) 82.23

ⲔⲞⲨⲢ adj. *deaf* 73.14;76.21

ⲔⲢⲞϤ n.m. *forgery*:

    ⲀⲦⲔⲢⲞϤ *unforged* 74.4

ⲔⲰⲦ v.tr. *build* 70.26

ⲔⲰⲦⲈ v.tr. *surround*:

    ⲔⲞⲦ⸗ refl. *turn (oneself)*:

    ⲔⲞⲦⲞⲨ 73.25f.

    med.: 82.10

    ⲔⲰⲦⲈ ⲚⲤⲀ- *seek*:

    ⲔⲰⲦⲈ ⲚⲤⲰ⸗:

    ⲔⲰⲦⲈ ⲚⲤⲰϤ 71.5

ⲔⲰⲦϤ v.tr. *collect*:

    ⲔⲈⲦϤ- 76.4

ⲔⲞⲨⲈⲒ adj. *little, few*: 78.22;79.19;80.1.11

ⲖⲞ v.intr. *leave, cease*:

    ⲖⲞ ϨⲀⲢⲞ⸗ *leave alone*:

    ⲀⲖⲞⲔ ϨⲀⲢⲞⲞⲨ imper. 81.30

ⲖⲀⲀⲨ pron. indef. *somebody, something*:

    (with neg.) *nothing, no one, nobody, none* 72.18f.19;81.26;84.9

    adv. *no way* 84.8

ⲖⲰϪϨ v.tr. *suppress* 79.11f.

ⲘⲀ n.m. *place* 75.10;79.29;81.28

    ⲈⲠⲘⲀ Ⲛ- *instead of* 75.6f.

    assim. ⲈⲠⲘⲀ Ⲙ- 82.2

ⲘⲈ n.f. *truth*:

    ⲘⲚⲦⲘⲈ 71.3;74.24;75.13;76.34;77.24;

ⲘⲞⲨ v.intr. *die* 72.9

    subst. *death* 74.6;75.16;76.14

    ⲀⲦⲘⲞⲨ *immortal* 75.28;76.1.2;77.3.17;78.5;80.14f.;83.21.23f.;84.3

    ⲘⲚⲦⲀⲦⲘⲞⲨ *immortality* 75.14;76.16

ⲘⲔⲀϨ v.intr. *suffer* 74.34;78.33

    ⲢⲈϤϪⲓⲘⲔⲀϨ *one who suffers* 83.5

ⲘⲘⲚⲚⲤⲀ- prep. *after* 80.11f.

    ⲘⲘⲚⲚⲤⲰ⸗:

    ⲘⲘⲚⲚⲤⲰⲔ 74.12

    ⲘⲘⲚⲚⲤⲰⲤ as adv. *after that* 72.25f.

ⲘⲘⲀⲨ adv. *there*:

    after (Ⲟ)ⲨⲚⲦⲀ⸗ meaning 'have' 78.33

ⲈⲦⲘ̄ⲘⲀⲨ after a determined expression *that* 79.30

ⲘⲚ̄⁻ conj. *and* as a copula between nomina 70.16.30;71.28.30.32;
72.6;73.1;74.31.33;75.20;76.13.16.26;77.26.31;81.19;82.5.11.22.23

ⲘⲚ̄⁻ prep. *with* 72.7;73.3;74.1.19;76.22;77.6;79.3;83.14

    ⲚⲘ̄ⲘⲀ⸗:

    ⲚⲘ̄ⲘⲀⲊ̈ 71.17;81.24

    ⲚⲘ̄ⲘⲀⲔ 84.9

    ⲚⲘ̄ⲘⲀⲨ 75.26

(Ⲙ̄)ⲘⲚ̄ *there is not* 72.12.19*;81.26*;83.19* s. ϬⲞⲘ

    *as an auxiliary construction (and negation) for pres.I (with verbal predicate) and instans (with indefinite nominal subject)

    Ⲙ̄ⲘⲚ̄ⲦⲀ⸗ *have not*:

    Ⲙ̄ⲘⲚ̄ⲦⲀϥ 83.30

ⲘⲚ̄Ⲧ⁻ pref. s. ⲂⲀ̄ⲖⲈ, ⲈⲒⲰⲢϨ̄, ⲘⲈ, ⲘⲞⲨ, ⲚⲞⲨⳘ, ⲚⲞϬ, ⲢⲘ̄ϨⲈ, ⲢⲢⲞ, ⲤⲀⲂⲈ, ⲤⲞⲚ, ⲤⲰⲚⲈ, ϢⲂⲎⲢ,
ϨⲘ̄ϨⲀⲖ, ⳘⲒⲤⲈ, ϬⲀⲂ; αἵρεσις, παρανόμος

Ⲙ̄ⲠⲢ̄⁻ imp.neg. 73.17;80.32;84.7

Ⲙ̄ⲠϢⲀ v.intr. *be worthy* 71.26f.;75.5

ⲘⲒⲤⲈ v.tr. *give birth*:

    subst. *offspring* 78.19;82.22;83.3

ⲘⲞⲈⲒⲦ n.m. *way*:

    ⳘⲒ ⲘⲞⲈⲒⲦ v.comp. *lead*:

    ⳘⲀⲨ ⲘⲞⲈⲒⲦ *guide* 72.12f.

ⲘⲀⲦⲈ / ⲘⲈⲦⲈ v.intr. *attain*:

    ✝ ⲘⲀⲦⲈ v.comp. *reach, agree, consent*:

    subst. *grace, will* 70.16;80.25

    ✝ ⲘⲈⲦⲈ   subst. *approval* 78.29f.

    in the adverbial expression ϨⲚ̄ ⲞⲨ✝ ⲘⲈⲦⲈ *graciously* 71.4

ⲘⲎⲦ card. *ten*:

    ⲘⲀϨⲘⲎⲦ ord. *tenth* 70.17

ⲘⲎⲦⲈ n.f. *middle* 80.32

Ⲙ̄ⲦⲞⲚ (Ⲙ̄ⲘⲞ⸗) v.intr. *rest*:

    ⲘⲞⲦⲚ̄ (Ⲙ̄ⲘⲞ⸗) stative *rest* (refl.) 70.18

ⲘⲀⲨⲀⲀ⸗ *alone*:

    ⲘⲀⲨⲀⲀⲔ 81.8

    ⲘⲀⲨⲀⲀⲤ 75.34

    ⲘⲀⲨⲀⲀⲨ 76.23.33f.

ⲘⲈⲈⲨⲈ v.intr. *think* 74.14f.;77.30;78.33f.;84.3

    subst. *thought* 77.28

    ✝ ⲘⲈⲈⲨⲈ v.comp. *remind* 70.25

ⲘⲞⲞⲨ n.m. *water*:

    ⲀⲦⲘⲞⲞⲨ *waterless* 79.31

ⲘⲞⲨⲦ n.m. *nerve* 71.28

ΜΟΥΟΥΤ v.tr. *kill*:

    ΜΟΟΥΤ stative *be dead* 75.31f.;83.32

    ΡΕϤΜΟΟΥΤ *dead man* 74.14;78.17

ΜΗΗϢΕ n.m. *crowd* 72.11;73.3.23;74.20.32.33;80.2f.4

    N̄ΟΥΜΗΗϢΕ N̄ϹΟΠ in adverbial usage *several times* 72.11

ΜΟΥϨ v.tr. *fill*:

    ΜΕϨ stative *be filled*:

    ΜΕϨ ΕΒΟΛ 83.9

    ΜΕϨ/ΜΑϨ pref. s. ΜΗΤ, Τ̄

ΜΑΑΧΕ n.m. *ear* 73.6f.

ΜΟΥΧϬ v.tr. *mix*:

    ΜΟΧϬ stative *be conjoined* 74.1

N̄⁻ art.def.:

    N⁻ (without supralinear-mark because of syllable-formation with preceding or following element) 72.5;79.31

    N⁻ used as determinative pronoun introducing a subst.rel.clause 76.22;80.4

ΝΕⸯ art.poss.:

    ΝΕΚ⁻ 72.15.30;84.10

    ΝΕϤ⁻ 71.29.29;81.13.14.19.19

    ΝΕΥ⁻ 79.12;81.1 s. ΕΡΗΥ

    ΝΟΥ⁻ 78.9;79.26

ΝΑ pref.poss. 70.21

ΝΟΥⸯ pron.poss.:

    ΝΟΥΟΥ 76.23

ΝΑϊ pron.dem. 71.10.11;72.4;73.5.11.12;74.1.8;75.1.26;76.4;77.7;78.22;79.11;80.22.27;81.3;83.15;84.11

ΝΕϊ⁻ art.dem. 73.20;75.15;82.19

ΝΗ pron.dem. 71.31;78.31;79.30

    used as determinative pronoun introducing a rel.clause (instead of N⁻) 72.27;73.8.15.32;74.12;75.1;76.29;77.8.10.21;78.9.29;79.11.17.18.23.33;80.16;82.32;83.22

ΝΙ⁻ art.dem.:

    used as def. art. (instead of N⁻). 70.22.24;71.6.9.13.14.28;72.15;73.1.1.2.3.3.6.17.31;74.10.30;75.19.24.27; 77.5.16.24.27.31.31;78.5.11.22.23.25;79.3.19.29;80.1.11;81.19;82.23;83.17

ΝΕ pron./copula in NS 72.12;73.13.14;75.13;77.16.25.32;78.23;79.11.30;80.1;83.4.19.21

N̄⁻ part.gen. 71.1;76.35

    Μ̄⁻ assim. 72.15;78.23;80.22

N̄ + inf. 71.27f. s. ϢΟΡΠ̄

N̄⁻ part.ident.71.16;74.2.3.18.32;77.10;78.11.22;80.19.29;81.22;82.3;83.17.25

    Μ̄⁻ assim. 81.5

    N̄Ν⁻ (reduplication before vowels and sonora) 73.21;80.23

    N̄Ρ⁻ 80.16

N̄– part.attrib.70.17.19;71.14.15;72.3.11;74.4.20;75.9.21.27;76.27;77.3.17.19;
    78.5.16;79.4.9.29.31;80.14.26;82.10.11.12.13.24;83.7.13.14
    M̄– assim. 74.20.33;76.25;78.19;79.3.29;82.22;83.3.9
    B̄– assim. 72.24
    N̄N– (reduplication before vowels and sonora) 74.4.34;76.8;83.23;84.3
N̄– part.neg. s. ⲀⲚ
N̄–obj. 71.19;72.15.30;73.6;74.26;75.1.8.24.26.31.33;76.4.29;77.26;78.2.14.16.29.[34];
    79.12.17.26;80.3.18;81.19;82.19
    M̄– assim. 70.23;73.28;74.11;75.6.11;76.28;78.12.33;79.19;80.6;82.16;83.13.25.26
    N̄N– reduplication before art. indef. sg.: (79.26) (art. poss.)
    M̄ⲘⲞ⸗:
    M̄ⲘⲞⲒ 72.22;81.10
    M̄ⲘⲞⲔ 71.18.25;72.3;81.9
    M̄ⲘⲞϤ 70.18;71.7f.[33f.];72.31;74.5;75.11;76.17;81.6.22;82.1.5.11.29f.;84.4
    M̄ⲘⲞⲤ 75.19;79.12f.;80.21
    M̄ⲘⲞⲞⲨ 70.26;72.5;73.8.11.15;76.30.31f.;77.21f.;79.21.28;80.5;83.22f.
N̄ prep. *in, through, at, on* 70.22;72.3.11;75.5;78.25;79.23;81.27; s. ⲘⲀ, ⲞⲨⲞⲈⲒϢ, ⲘⲎⲎϢⲈ, ϢⲞⲘⲦ̄, ϨⲈ
    M̄– assim. 71.20
    M̄ⲘⲞ⸗:
    M̄ⲘⲞϤ 75.22
    ⲈⲂⲞⲖ N̄– 82.33;83.9
    assim. ⲈⲂⲞⲖ M̄– 81.27
    ⲈⲂⲞⲖ M̄ⲘⲞⲔ 71.19
    ⲈⲂⲞⲖ M̄ⲘⲞⲞⲨ 75.10
N̄– prep.dat. 70.24;74.10;75.19;79.19
    assim. M̄– 74.8
    ⲚⲀ⸗:
    ⲚⲀⲒ 70.20;72.10.20.29;73.6;79.33;81.14.28;82.17
    ⲚⲀⲔ 72.11;73.10.12.15.22;81.29;82.19;84.11
    ⲚⲀϤ 82.21;83.28
    ⲚⲀⲤ 76.13
    ⲚⲀⲚ 79.16
    ⲚⲀⲨ 75.6;77.11;78.14;79.13;80.9.28;81.2
N̄– as element of adverbs s. ϨⲞⲨⲞ, N̄ϨⲢⲀⲒ
ⲚⲀ v.intr. *have mercy* 79.14
ⲚⲈⲀ⸗ adj.v. *be big*:
    ⲚⲈⲀϤ 72.24
ⲚⲈ praet.:
    + (Ⲟ)ⲨⲚ̄ 82.9
ⲚⲒⲘ everyone 71.2.8;75.12.15;77.4;80.20;81.10;83.20 s. ⲞⲨⲞⲚ, ⲞⲨⲞⲈⲒϢ
ⲚⲞⲘⲦⲈ n.f. *power, strenght*:
    ϬⲘ̄ ⲚⲞⲘⲦⲈ v.comp. *be strong* 84.11* (*imperative)

ⲚⲀⲚⲞⲨ⸗ adj.v. *be good*:

ⲚⲀⲚⲞⲨϥ 76.12

ⲚⲞⲨⲚⲈ n.f. *root* 79.4;80.18

Ⲛ̄ⲤⲀ⁻ prep. *behind* 83.2 s. ⲂⲞⲖ, ⲔⲰ

ⲤⲀ s. ⲂⲞⲖ, ⲦⲠⲈ

Ⲛ̄ⲤⲰ⸗:

ⲚⲤⲰϥ 71.5

ⲚⲤⲰⲤ 76.3

Ⲛ̄ⲦⲈ⁻ prep. *from, of* as a circumscription of the genitive or the possesive relation 70.15.16f.19.30.31;
71.2.3.8f.12.14.23.29.32.34;72.2.25;73.7.18.24.27.27.31;74.6.7f.11.14.17.29f.30;75.15.24f.;76.16f.34;
77.5.7.25;78.5.8.17.18.19.26.31;79.1.7.9.17.23.23.29;80.4.10.12.14.25.25;82.1.12.23.25.25;
83.31.33f.34;84.2.10

Ⲛ̄ⲦⲀ⸗:

Ⲛ̄ⲦⲀï 78.8;83.15

Ⲛ̄ⲦⲎⲈⲒ 77.28

Ⲛ̄ⲦⲀⲔ 72.16

Ⲛ̄ⲦⲀϥ 71.33;81.20f.;83.26

Ⲛ̄ⲦⲀⲤ 75.20

Ⲛ̄ⲦⲀⲚ 83.12

Ⲛ̄ⲦⲀⲨ 75.21;77.27;78.12.30;82.2

In an expression "have not":

Ⲛ̄ⲦⲀ⸗:

Ⲛ̄ⲦⲀⲨ 72.13

as element of the possessive "prefix":

(ⲠⲎ) Ⲛ̄ⲦⲈ: 76.15;77.21

(ⲚⲎ) Ⲛ̄ⲦⲈ: 71.24.31

Ⲛ̄ⲦⲞⲔ pron.pers. *you*:

in extraposition 71.15;80.31;81.31;84.6 predicate in reduced cls. 81.8;82.18
as reinforcer 73.19

Ⲛ̄Ⲧ̄Ⲛ⁻ prep. *from*:

Ⲛ̄ⲦⲞⲞⲦ⸗

Ⲛ̄ⲦⲞⲞⲦϥ̄ 84.5

Ⲛ̄ⲦⲞⲞⲦⲞⲨ 74.2;76.32

Ⲛ̄ⲦⲞⲤ pron.pers. *she*:

predicate in NS 75.34

Ⲛ̄ⲦⲞⲞⲨ pron pers. pl. *they*:

in extraposition 78.27
predicate in cls. 70.26
predicate in NS 77.15f.

Ⲛ̄ⲦⲞϥ pron.pers. *he*:

in extraposition 81.28;82.17
Ⲛ̄ⲦⲞϥ predicate in reduced NS 82.8

ⲚⲀⲨ v.intr. *see* 72.5.17.18.20.23.28;79.20;81.4.7.15.25.26;82.4.15.32;83.11.16

ⲀⲚⲀⲨ imper. 81.24.31

ⲀⲦⲚⲀⲨ ⲈⲢⲞ⸗ *invisible* 82.13f.

(Ⲛ)ⲚⲎ(Ⲟ)Ⲩ v.stative *come, be on one's way*:

    Ⲛ̄ⲚⲎⲨ 80.27

    ⲚⲎⲨ 78.29;83.11

    Ⲛ̄ⲚⲎⲞⲨ ⲈϨⲞⲨⲚ *go inside* 78.27

ⲚⲞⲨⲦⲈ n.m. *god* 79.14.27f.

ⲚⲀϢⲈ⁻ adj.v. *be numerous*:

    ⲚⲀϢⲰ⸗:

    ⲚⲀϢⲰⲞⲨ 77.22f.

Ⲛ̄ϢⲞⲦ v.intr. *harden*:

    ⲚⲀϢⲦ̄ stative *be rough* 78.2

ⲚⲞⲨϨⲂ̄ v.tr. *unite* 83.13

ⲚⲞⲨϨⲘ̄ v.tr. *save* 77.12

Ⲛ̄ϨⲢⲀⲒ̈ adv. *under* s. ϨⲚ̄

Ⲛ̄ⲚⲀϨⲢⲀ⸗ prep. *according to*:

    Ⲛ̄ⲚⲀϨⲢⲀⲚ 75.16f.;80.1

ⲚⲀϨⲦⲈ v.intr. *believe* 78.21

Ⲛ̄ϨⲎⲦ adv. s. ⲦⲀⲬⲢⲞ

ⲚⲞⲨⳊ v.tr. *throw*:

    ⲚⲞⳊ⸗:

    ⲚⲞⳊⲞⲨ 78.24

ⲚⲞⲨⳊⲈ adj. *false*:

    ⲘⲚ̄ⲦⲚⲞⲨⳊ *falsity* 74.11

Ⲛ̄ϬⲒ part.subj. to introduce the following nominal subject, after a conjugation

    70.14.21;71.6;72.22;72.[31f.];75.1.27.30;76.21.33;78.4;79.6.8f.14.22;80.13.27;81.1.3.14f.;83.4f.

ⲚⲞϬ adj. *great, big* 82.9

    ⲘⲚ̄ⲦⲚⲞϬ *greatness* 70.19

ⲞⲚ adv. *once more, again* 72.21.29;73.9.26;78.32

ⲞⳊⲈ *thornbush* s. ⲤⲞⲨⲠⲈ

Ⲡ⁻ art.def.70.14.21.24;71.1.12.32;72.24.26;73.11.26.27.31;74.6.13;76.16;78.17.26;
79.27;80.2.8.25;81.5.8.15.26;82.1.2.11.26 s. ⲘⲀ, ⲞⲨⲀ

    ⲠⲈ⁻ 72.25;83.26

    Ⲡ⁻ as a determ. pron. in subst. rel. clause 71.11;73.28;74.26;75.21f.;76.19;81.17f. s. ϢⲞⲨⲈⲒⲦ, ϨⲚⲈ⁻

    Ⲡ +rel. in cls. 70.26;72.17;75.16;80.9;81.7.8*;82.15*.18* (*omission of Ⲡ⁻)

ⲠⲈ⸗ art.poss.:

    ⲠⲀ⁻ 70.28;78.1;82.2;83.7

    ⲠⲈⲔ⁻ 71.17;80.6f.

    ⲠⲈϥ⁻ 73.30;81.23

    ⲠⲈⲚ⁻ 73.25;79.14

ⲠⲀⲒ pron.dem. 72.21;73.30;79.13.16;81.10.17;83.1.9.27.30 s. ⲈⲦⲂⲈ

ⲠⲎ pron.dem 76.8.15;77.20 s. ⲦⲎⲢ⸗

    used as determinative pronoun introducing a relative clause (instead of Ⲡ⁻)

    70.23.27;71.5.18.24;72.31;75.11.23;76.10.12;81.15.18.22.32;82.5.16.21.26;83.6.10.13.25.29;84.6

ⲠⲈⲒ⁻ art.dem. 71.2

ⲠⲒ⁻ art.dem. used as art.def. (instead of Ⲡ⁻)

    70.15.16.16.17.23;71.12.20.22.30.32;72.6.16;73.18;74.3.6.8.11;75.6.7.10;76.15.17.33;77.7.8.27;

    78.4.8.12.18.20.23.24.29.30;79.6.9.19.28;80.12.13.22.24.25.28;81.3.11.16.20.21.27;

    82.1.6.8.21.22.23.25.28.28;83.5.5.8.12.14.14.18.31.31.33.34.34

ⲠⲈ pron./copula in NS 71.12;73.31;75.11.22;78.18;81.10.17.21.21;82.8*.22.28;83.6.7.8*.12.30

    (*omission of ⲠⲈ in red.NS)

ⲠⲈ part. after imperf. 82.7

ⲠⲈ n.f. *heaven*:

    ⲠⲎⲨⲈ pl. 70.22;71.13

ⲠⲒⲢⲈ v.intr. *come into being, appear*.

    ⲠⲒⲢⲈ ⲈⲂⲞⲖ *appear* 75.25

    ⲠⲢⲈⲒⲰⲞⲨ stative 83.10

ⲠⲰⲢⲬ v.tr. *divide*:

    ⲠⲞⲢⲬ stative 82.33

ⲠⲰⲦ v.intr. *flee, run* 78.3;81.27

    ⲠⲎⲦ stative 72.6

ⲠⲰⲢ v. intr. *reach*:

    ⲠⲎⲢ stative 71.28

ⲠⲈⲬⲈ⁻... *said* 73.11;80.8

    ⲠⲈⲬⲀ⸗:

    ⲠⲈⲬⲀⲒ 79.32;81.7.25

    ⲠⲈⲬⲀϤ 70.20;72.9f.20.29;73.5f.;81.14.28;82.17

ⲢⲒⲔⲈ v.tr. *bend* 79.28

ⲢⲰⲘⲈ n.m. *man, people, person* 71.12.14;74.10.30f;83.20.31

ⲢⲘϨⲈ n.m. *free person*:

    ⲘⲚⲦⲢⲘϨⲈ *freedom* 78.15;80.20

ⲢⲀⲚ n.m. *name* 71.17;74.13.17.28;78.17;80.7

    † ⲢⲀⲚ v.comp. *call* 79.24

ⲢⲠⲈ n.m. *temple* 70.15

ⲢⲠⲞ n.m. *king*:

    Ⲣ ⲢⲠⲞ v.comp. *rule* 80.11.15.16

    ⲘⲚⲦⲢⲠⲞ *kingdom* 74.7

ⲢⲀⲤⲞⲨ n.f. *dream* 75.2.3

ⲢⲀⲦ s. ⲀϨⲈⲢⲀⲦ⸗

ⲢⲎⲦⲈ n.m. *kind* 78.23;80.22;81.5

ⲢⲀϢⲈ v.intr. *enjoy, be glad* 72.23;82.31

ⲢⲈϤ⁻ pref. s. Ⲙ̄ⲔⲀϨ, ⲘⲞⲨⲞⲨⲦ, ⳉⲘ̄ⳉⲉ, ϨⲱⲂ; τέχνη

ⲤⲀ⁻ s. Ⲛ̄ⲤⲀ⁻
ⲤⲀⲂⲈ adj. *wise*:
      Ⲙ̄ⲚⲦⲤⲀⲂⲈ *wisdom* 79.1
      Ⲣ̄ ⲤⲀⲂⲈ v.comp. *be wise* 76.7
ⲤⲰⲂⲈ v.intr. *laugh* 81.12.17;82.6;83.1
ⲤⲰⲔ v.tr. *bring upon* 80.28
ⲤⲘⲎ n.f. *voice* 73.4
ⲤⲘⲞⲨ v.intr. *bless* 82.14
      ⲤⲘⲀⲘⲀⲀⲦ stative *be blessed* 70.21
ⲤⲘ̄ⲚⲈ v.tr. *build*:
      subst. *construction* 70.16
ⲤⲞⲚ n.m. *brother*:
      ⲤⲚⲎⲨ pl. 79.12
      Ⲙ̄ⲚⲦⲤⲞⲚ *brotherhood* 79.1
ⲤⲰⲚⲈ n.f. *sister*:
      Ⲙ̄ⲚⲦⲤⲰⲚⲈ *sisterhood* 79.10
ⲤⲰⲚⲦ̄ v.tr. *create*:
      subst. *creature, creation, habit* 75.24;77.7;83.34
ⲤⲈⲈⲠⲈ n.m. *rest* 71.20
ⲤⲞⲠ n.m. *time* s. ⲘⲎⲎⳉⲉ, ⳉⲱⲘⲦ̄
ⲤⲞⲨⲢⲈ n.f. *thorn* 76.5
      ⲤⲞⲨⲢⲈ Ⲛ̄ⲚⲞⲬⲈ *thorntree* 76.8 (cf. Bohairic: ⲤⲈⲢ ⲞⲬⲒ)
ⲤⲰⲢⲘ̄ v.tr. *deceive, lead astray* 77.21;80.3
      ⲤⲈⲢⲘ̄⁻ 76.27
ⲤⲢⲀϨ (ⲤⲦⲢⲀϨ) n.? in the construction ⲈⲒⲢⲈ Ⲙ̄ⲘⲞ⸝ (BP)/ ⲀⲀ⸝ (TP)
      Ⲛ̄Ⲥ(Ⲧ)ⲢⲀϨ *put someone to shame* 80.19.29;81.22;82.3
ⲤⲰⲦⲈ v.tr. *redeem*:
      subst. *redemption* 78.12
ⲤⲰⲦⲘ̄ v.tr. *hear, listen* 70.28;72.30f.*; 73.2.5.7f.* 9.14* (*imperative)
ⲤⲰⲦⲠ̄ v.tr. *choose* 71.18;83.22
ⲤⲞⲞⲨⲚ v.tr. *know* 76.28.30;79.16;83.3
      ⲤⲞⲨⲰⲚ⁻ 70.29;72.14
      ⲤⲞⲨⲰⲚ⸝:
      ⲤⲞⲨⲰⲚϥ̄ 71.26
      ⲤⲞⲨⲰⲚⲞⲨ 82.20
      subst. *knowledge* 71.21
      ⲀⲦⲤⲞⲞⲨⲚ̄ *ignorant* 73.21
ⲤⲀϨ n.m. *scribe* 73.3
ⲤⲞⲞϨⲈ v.tr. *reprove* (?) 72.2f.
ⲤⲰϨⲈ v.tr. *weave*:

CH2 stative 82.7

CϨIME n.f. *woman* 74.31

T⁻ art.def. 77.1;78.19

TE⁻ 77.13 s. OYNOY

TEⸯ art.poss.:

    TA⁻ 78.6

    TEK⁻ 73.7;80.33

    TEC⁻ 75.33;80.18

    TETEN⁻ 79.23

    TEY⁻ 72.14;75.5;77.26;80.32;83.2

    TOY⁻ 73.4.27;80.10.17

TEï⁻ art.dem. 72.4

TE pron./copula in NS 75.18.34;79.3

TH pron.dem. used as determinative pronoun introducing a relative clause (instead of T⁻) 75.31;76.14;83.24

†⁻ art.dem. used as art.def. (instead of T⁻) 70.15.18.19.30;71.3.23.27.31;73.24;74.7.17.24;

    75.7.13.14.25.30.34;76.16.34;77.2.17.23.25;78.13;79.1.1.2.7.9.17;80.13.14;83.6;84.2.11

T̄ "counting sign" for 300

    MEϨT̄ ord. *threehundredth* 70.15

† v.tr. *give* 75.6.8.11;78.14;82.18;83.26.28

    †⁻ s. EOOY, EIϥT, KⲖOM, MⲖTE, MEEYE, PⲖN

    TⲖⲖⸯ:

    TⲖⲖY 83.16

    s. EϨOYN

T̄BBO v. tr. *purify* 74.15

    TOYBHOYT stative *be pure* 77.28f.

TⲖEIO v.tr. *honour*:

    subst. 72.2;83.19

TⲖKO v.tr. *destroy*:

    subst. 75.6.20;76.13

TⲰKⲘ v.tr. *pull out* 80.17f.

TⲰⲖⲘ v.tr.: med. *be defiled* 74.16

TⲖMO v.tr. *tell*:

    TⲖMOⸯ:

    TⲖMOϥ 72.27

TⲰM v.tr.: med. *be closed* 81.1

TⲖMIO v.tr. *create* 75.19;78.15

TⲰⲰN v.tr. *raise, prick up* 72.29;73.6

†NOY adv. *now* 71.10;73.14

TⲖNϨOYT v.tr. *believe*:

    TⲖNϨOYTⸯ:

    TⲖNϨOYTOY 80.7

ⲦⲠⲈ n.m. *upper part*:

ⲤⲀⲦⲠⲈ (+prep. Ⲛ̄-/ⲘⲘOⸯ) *above* 70.22

ⲦⲎⲢⸯ augens, *all, complete*:

ⲦⲎⲢϥ̄ 83.32

ⲠⲎ...ⲦⲎⲢϥ̄ *everything* 76.18

ⲦⲰⲰϢ v.tr. *fix*:

ⲦⲎϢ stative *be fixed* 80.9

ⲦⲰ2Ⲙ̄ v.tr. *call* 71.24f.

ⲦⲀ2Ⲙ(Ⲉ)ⸯ:

ⲦⲀ2ⲘⲈⲔ 71.25

ⲦⲀ2ⲘOⲨ 71.20f.

ⲦⲀⲬⲢO v.tr.: med. *become strong*:

ⲦⲀⲬⲢO Ⲛ̄2ⲎⲦ 84.7

ⲦⲰ6Ⲉ v.tr. *plant*: med. *adhere* 74.13

subst. *implantation* 83.33

ⲦⲰ6Ⲛ̄ v.tr. *push* 74.5

OⲨ- art.indef.sg. 70.30.31.32;71.4.14.19.[34];72.1.1.2.22.22;
73.16.22.23;74.9.14.18.19.20.21.29.30.31.32.33;75.3.4.8.10.
16.17.20.29;76.2.13.35;77.4.5.18;78.2.4.14.16.17;79.4.10.15.
26;80.8.9;82.7.9.20*.31;83.23 (* haplography) s. ⲘⲎⲎϢⲈ

( )Ⲩ- elision of omicron in following Ⲉ- 71.21;72.23;74.17;76.13

OⲨ pron.interrog. *what?* 72.17;81.7

OⲨⲀ m. number, and pron.indef. *one, someone* 77.30.32;82.4;84.1 s. ⲔⲈ

ⲠOⲨⲀ ⲠOⲨⲀ *each one* 75.9f.

OⲨⲀ n.m. *curse*:

ⲬⲈ OⲨⲀ v.comp. *curse, taunt* 73.19;74.24

OⲨBⲈ- prep. *against* 77.27

OⲨⲀⲀB v.stat. *be holy* 82.8;83.15

OⲨⲎⲎB n.m. *priest* 72.5;73.1.2

OⲨOⲈⲒⲚ n.m. *light* 72.23f.24f.;78.20.26;82.10;83.9f.14

Ⲣ̄ OⲨOⲈⲒⲚ v.comp. *give light*:

subst. [71.32f.]

ⲬⲒ OⲨOⲈⲒⲚ v.comp. *receive light* 71.3f.

OⲨOⲈⲒϢ n.m. *time*:

Ⲛ̄OⲨOⲈⲒϢ ⲚⲒⲘ *always, continually* 75.18;76.9f.;77.14

(O)ⲨⲚ̄ *there is* 73.23*;80.2;82.9;83.29* (absorbed by OⲨOⲚ)/ *as auxiliary construction for pres.I, imperf.,
verbal predicate and instans with indefinite nominal subject. s. (Ⲙ̄)ⲘⲚ̄

OⲨⲚ̄ⲦⲀ *have*:

OⲨⲚ̄ⲦⲀϥ 83.28

Ⲩ̄ⲚⲦⲀⲨ 78.32

OⲨⲚOⲨ n.f. *hour* 75.30

 N̄TEYNOY adv. *immediately* 77.19

OYON pron.indef. 83.29

    OYON NIM *everyone* 83.27

OYⲰN̄Ⳍ v.tr. *reveal*:

    OYONⳌ stative 71.11

    OYⲰN̄Ⳍ EBOⲖ *reveal, appear, become manifest, show*
    70.23;71.9f.;75.32;79.6.8;80.19;82.16;83.24;84.2

    OYON̄Ⳍ⸗ EBOⲖ:

    OYONⳍOY EBOⲖ 73.29

    in the adverbial expression ⳌN̄ <OY>OYⲰN̄Ⳍ EBOⲖ *openly* 82.20

OYПOT v.intr. *be glad*:

    POOYT̄ stative 79.18;81.11.16

OYEPHTE n.f. (dualis) *foot* 71.29f;81.13.20

OYⲰTB̄ v.tr. *turn (back)*: med. *take a start from* 76.24

    OYOTB̄ stative 83.33

OYⳜH n.f. *night* 72.4

OYⲰⳜ v.(tr.) *want, wish* 72.13f.;77.6.14

    subst. *will* 73.26

OYⲰⳌ v.tr. *put*:

    OYⲀⳌ⸗:

    OYⲀⳌq̄ 84.5f.

OYⳜⲀⲓ v.intr. *get saved*:

    subst. *salvation* 79.15

OYⲰϬT̄ v.tr. *destroy* 80.5

ⲰBⳜ v.tr. *forget* 77.10f.

ⲰNE n.m. *stone* 72.7

    ⲰNI 82.24

ⲰN̄Ⳍ v.intr. *live*:

    subst. *life* 70.24.24;76.16.17

    ONⳌ stative 70.19;80.4;81.18;82.28

ⲰП v.tr. *count*:

    HП stative 75.16

ⲰⳜ v.tr. *call*:

    ⲰⳜ EBOⲖ *scream* 73.4

Ⳝ⁻ auxiliary *be able* s. ϬOM

ⳜⲀ⁻ prep. *towards* s. ENEⳌ

    ⳜⲀPO⸗:

    ⳜⲀPOⲓ 83.11f.

ⳜE n.m. *wood* 81.11.16;82.6

ⳜIBE v.tr. *change*:

ⲁⲧϣⲓⲃⲉ adj. *unchangeable* 80.23

ϣⲉⲃⲓⲱ n.f. *substitute* 83.6

ϣⲉⲃⲓⲱ v.tr *substitute*:

    subst. 81.21

ϣⲃⲏⲣ n.m. *friend*:

    ϣⲃⲏⲣ ⲛ̄ *companion in* 71.14;79.4

    ⲙⲛ̄ⲧϣⲃⲏⲣ *community* 79.3

ϣⲉⲗⲉⲉⲧ n.f. *bride*:

    ϫⲓ ϣⲉⲗⲉⲉⲧ v.comp. *marry*:

    subst. *marriage* 79.7

ϣⲱⲗϩ̄ v.tr. *mark, sign*:

    subst. 80.2

ϣⲟⲙⲧ̄ card. *three* 72.3

    ⲛ̄ϣⲟⲙⲧ̄ ⲛ̄ⲥⲟⲡ *three times* 72.3

ϣⲙ̄ϣⲉ v.tr. *serve*:

    ⲣⲉϥϣⲙ̄ϣⲉ *servant, slave* 73.31;75.17f.

ϣⲓⲛⲉ v.tr. *ask* 75.1f.

ϣⲟⲛⲧⲉ n.f. *thorntree* 76.6

ϣⲱⲡ v.tr. *claim, comprehend* 80.21;83.25

ϣⲱⲡⲉ v.intr. *become, come, be, stay*

    71.16;72.21;73.19*.32*;74.1.12.23*.34f.*;75.30*;76.9.13.14;77.6.15*;
    78.7.14;79.15f.22;80.22;81.23;83.4.20;84.8.12 (*in periphrastic use)

    ϣⲟⲟⲡ stative *be* 71.1;75.22.23.29.33f.;76.10.11.18.20.20;77.9.10;78.20;79.2;82.26;83.32;84.6

ϣⲏⲣⲉ n.m. *child, son* 71.12;73.18;78.25;82.1

ϣⲱⲣⲡ̄ ord.m. *first, before* 78.18f.;79.29;82.22.28f.

    ⲣ̄ ϣⲟⲣⲡ̄ ⲛ̄- preverbal *do something before* ... 71.24

ϣⲧⲟⲣⲧⲣ̄ v.tr.: med. *be afraid* 72.8f.

ϣⲟⲩⲟ v.tr. *pour, flow*:

    ϣⲟⲩⲉⲓⲧ stative *be empty*:

    ⲡⲉⲧϣⲟⲩⲉⲓⲧ as adj. *in vain* 78.4

ϣⲟⲩϣⲟⲩ v.tr. *boast*:

    ϣⲟⲩϣⲟⲩ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟ⸗ *boast* 76.31

ϣⲁϩⲣⲁⲓ̈ adv. *upwards* s. ⲉ- prep.

ϣⲁϫⲉ v.intr. *mention* 71.7

    subst. *word* 70.28.29f.;71.2;73.25.31f.;74.25;76.25;78.1

    ⲁⲧϣⲁϫⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟ⸗/ⲉⲣⲟ⸗ *ineffable* 82.11.12f.

ϣⲟϫⲛⲉ v.tr. *think* 76.1

ϣⲱϫⲡ̄ v.tr. *leave over*:

    as adj. *further* 78.16

ϥⲓ v.tr. *take*:

    ϥⲓⲧ⸗:

ϥⲓⲧ̄ϥ 84.4f.

ϨⲀ⁻ prep. *under* 79.28;82.26

    ϨⲀⲣⲟ⸗:

    ϨⲀⲣⲟⲟⲨ 81.30

ϨⲈ n.f. *way, manner*:

    Ⲛ̄ϬⲈ + rel. *in the...way* 71.26

ϨⲈ v.intr. *lapse, fall* 74.17;78.10

ϨⲰⲰ⸗ *self*:

    ϨⲰ 71.17

    ϨⲰⲰⲔ 71.15

ϨⲰⲂ n.m. *deed* 79.19

    Ⲣ̄ ϨⲰⲂ v.comp. *work*:

    ⲡⲈϥⲣ̄ϨⲰⲂ *worker* 74.6

ϨⲒⲎ n.f. *way* 77.13

ϨⲞⲈⲒⲚⲈ pron.pers.indef.pl. *some* 74.22.27

    ϨⲞⲒ̈ⲚⲈ 76.27

Ϩⲗ̄ⲗⲟ n.m. *old man*:

    Ⲣ̄ Ϩⲗ̄ⲗⲟ v.comp.:

    ⲀⲦⲣ̄Ϩⲗ̄ⲗⲟ adj. *never-aging* 80.13f.

ϨⲘⲟⲟⲤ v.intr. *sit* 70.14;73.2f.9f.;79.30

ϨⲘ̄ϨⲀⲗ n.m. *slave*:

    ⲘⲚ̄ⲦϨⲘ̄ϨⲀⲗ n.f. *slavery* 78.13

ϨⲚ̄⁻ prep. *in, through, at* etc. 71.4.[34];72.4.22;73.4.16.22.74.21.29;78.3;79.4;80.9.32;82.20.31

    ϨⲘ̄⁻ assim. 70.14;73.26;76.10.15.15;79.16;83.33

    ⲈⲂⲞⲗ ϨⲚ̄⁻ *from, out, through* 73.24;75.4.14;76.5.5f.8.25;77.30.83.23

    substantivated with the next rectum 70.24;75.12f.;77.32

    ⲈⲂⲞⲗ ϨⲘ̄⁻ assim. 71.1;76.11f.

    substantivated with the next rectum 83.18

    (Ⲛ̄)ϨⲣⲀⲒ̈ ϨⲚ̄⁻ :

    Ⲛ̄ϨⲣⲀⲒ̈ ϨⲚ̄⁻ *in, at* 70.15;71.10.13;73.20;74.8f.;75.29;76.35;77.18;80.20;82.7;83.20

    Ⲛ̄ϨⲣⲀⲒ̈ ϨⲘ̄⁻ assim. 70.27;71.11.16f.73.29f.;77.7.33

    Ⲛ̄ϨⲎⲦ⸗:

    Ⲛ̄ϨⲎⲦϥ̄ 82.24.29

    ϨⲣⲀⲒ̈ Ⲛ̄ϨⲎⲦϥ̄ 84.12

    ⲈⲂⲞⲗ Ⲛ̄ϨⲎⲦϥ̄ 75.23f.;76.11

    Ⲛ̄ϨⲎⲦⲤ̄ 78.14

    Ⲛ̄ϨⲣⲀⲒ̈ Ⲛ̄ϨⲎⲦⲤ̄ 78.3

    ⲈⲂⲞⲗ Ⲛ̄ϨⲎⲦⲞⲨ 74.23;78.7.32

ϨⲚⲈ⁻ v. *want*:

    ϨⲚⲀ⸗:

    ⲡⲈⲦⲈϨⲚⲀϥ *will* 73.28

ϨⲈⲚ⁻ art.indef.pl. 70.29;72.7;12;73.13.13;74.22*.26.27*.;75.2.12;76.5.6.8**.21.21.23.25.26.27*;
77.22.32;78.31;79.22.25.33;80.2.3;81.29;82.12;83.3.18.21
(*before ϨⲞ(Ⲉ)ⲒⲚⲈ, **omission)

ϨⲰⲚ v.tr.: med. *approach, come near* 82.4
ϨⲎⲚ stative 82.27

ϨⲀⲠ n.m. *judgement* 73.30;79.29;80.28

ϨⲒⲠⲚ̄⁻ prep. *on* 72.15

ϨⲎⲦ n.m. *heart* s. Ⲛ̄ϨⲎⲦ, ⲬⲒⲤⲈ, ϬⲂ̄ⲂⲈ
Ⲛ̄ϨⲎⲦ adv. s. ⲬⲒⲤⲈ, ⲦⲀⲬⲢⲞ

ϨⲞⲦⲈ n.f. *fear* 72.22; for 71.14 s. ϨⲞⲨⲞ
Ⲣ̄ ϨⲞⲦⲈ v.comp. *be afraid* 79.32;[80.32f.];84.8

ϨⲰⲦⲂ̄ v.tr. *kill*:
ϨⲞⲦⲂ⸗:
ϨⲞⲦⲂⲚ̄ 72.8

ϨⲀⲦⲚ̄⁻ prep. *in* 71.8

Ϩ̄ⲒⲦⲚ̄⁻ prep. *by, because of, through, from*:
ⲈⲂⲞⲖ Ϩ̄ⲒⲦⲚ̄⁻ 71.30f.;79.18
ⲈⲂⲞⲖ Ϩ̄ⲒⲦⲘ̄⁻ assim. 71.4f;79.13.27
ⲈⲂⲞⲖ Ϩ̄ⲒⲦⲞⲞⲦ⸗:
ⲈⲂⲞⲖ Ϩ̄ⲒⲦⲞⲞⲦ 70.24f.;73.5
ⲈⲂⲞⲖ Ϩ̄ⲒⲦⲞⲞⲦⲤ̄ 79.5
ⲈⲂⲞⲖ Ϩ̄ⲒⲦⲞⲞⲦⲞⲨ 77.9f.13;78.10f.21f.;81.6

ϨⲰⲦⲠ̄ v.tr. *join*:
ϨⲞⲦⲠ̄ stative 76.22

ϨⲞⲨⲞ n.m. *abundance, multitude* 70.14*;83.26 (*manuscript: ϨⲞⲦⲈ)
Ⲛ̄ϨⲞⲨⲞ adv. *much, more* 74.16
Ⲣ̄ ϨⲞⲨⲞ v.comp. *be abundant* 83.29

Ϩ̄ⲒⲞⲨⲈ v.tr. *hit* 81.12f.
Ϩ̄Ⲓ⁻:
Ϩ̄Ⲓ ⲦⲞⲞⲦ⸗ v.comp. *begin, try*:
Ϩ̄Ⲓ ⲦⲞⲞⲦⲞⲨ 77.1

ϨⲞⲞⲨ n.m. *day* 72.25

ϨⲞⲞⲨ v.stat. *be evil* 74.19.25
ⲠⲈⲦϨⲞⲞⲨ as adj. *evil* 74.26

Ϩ̄ⲒⲬⲚ̄⁻ prep. *on* 70.18
Ϩ̄ⲒⲬⲘ̄⁻ assim. 81.11.16;82.6

ⲬⲈ to introduce direct speech 70.20;72.10.19.20.29;73.6.12;79.13.24.32;80.8;81.7.8.15.25.29;82.17;83.27

ⲬⲈ *that, namely* (explicative) 70.28;72.9.11.16;73.12;74.15;75.3.17;76.32;77.15.31.32;78.34;[79.34];81.29;
82.21;83.3;84.3

ⲬⲈ *if* (introduction of an oblique question) 81.31

ⲬⲈ *because, for* (causal) 71.18;73.28;74.28

ⲬⲈ *in order to, so that* (final) 71.25;78.15.21

ⲬⲒ v.tr. *receive, take, get* 73.24;78.12;79.26;81.9 s. ϬⲟⲚⲤ̄, ⲞⲨⲞⲈⲒⲚ

      ⲬⲒ- s. Ⲙ̄ⲔⲀϨ, ϢⲈⲖⲈⲈⲦ, ϬⲞⲘ

      ⲬⲀⲨ- part.conj. s. ⲘⲞⲈⲒⲦ

ⲬⲰ v.tr. *say, speak* 72.4.31;73.8.11.15;74.26;75.1;76.29;79.12;80.6;81.32

      ⲬⲈ- 74.25 s. ⲞⲨⲀ

      ⲬⲞⲞ⸗:

      ⲬⲞⲞⲤ 72.10.19;73.12;75.3;81.29;83.27

      ⲬⲞⲞⲨ 73.17*;79.33;81.4;84.12 (*with neg. imperative)

      ⲀⲬⲒⲤ imperative 72.16

ⲬⲞⲈⲒⲤ n.m. *lord* 81.8.26

ⲬⲰⲔ v.tr. *fulfill*:

      subst. 80.24

      ⲬⲰⲔ ⲈⲂⲞⲖ *fulfill* 78.34

      subst. *completion* 80.12

ⲬⲈⲔⲀⲀⲤ conj. *so that* 84.9

ⲬⲠⲞ v.tr. *procreate*:

      subst. 83.34

ⲬⲢⲞ v.tr. *make strong*:

      ⲬⲞⲞⲢ stative *be strong* 70.27

ⲬⲒⲤⲈ v.tr. *raise, heighten*:

      subst. *height* 71.1

      ⲬⲒⲤⲈ Ⲛ̄ϨⲎⲦ *haughtiness* 76.35

      ⲬⲞⲤⲈ stative 71.13

      ⲬⲀⲤⲒ- part.conj.:

      Ⲙ̄Ⲛ̄ⲦⲬⲀⲤⲒϨⲎⲦ *pride, haughtiness* 77.1f.

ⲬⲰϨ v.intr. *touch* 80.30

ⲬⲰϨⲘ̄ v.tr. *defile*:

      ⲀⲦⲬⲰϨⲘ̄ adj. *undefiled, incorruptible* 70.20;80.26

ⲬⲀⲬⲈ n.m. *enemy* 84.10

ϬⲈ enclitic part. *now* 73.14

ϬⲂ̄ⲂⲈ v.intr. *be weak, be a coward*:

      ϬⲀⲂ- part.conj.:

      Ⲙ̄Ⲛ̄ⲦϬⲀⲂϨⲎⲦ *cowardice* 80.33f.

ϬⲞⲘ n.f. *power* 74.29;77.5;83.25

      ⲬⲒ ϬⲞⲘ v.comp. *receive power* 77.18

      ϬⲘ̄ϬⲞⲘ v.comp. *be strong* 71.22*;82.18*; 84.10 (*imperative)

      Ⲙ̄ⲘⲚ̄ϢϬⲞⲘ *it is not possible* 80.30

      Ⲙ̄ⲘⲚ̄ϬⲞⲘ 75.8

ϬⲒⲚⲈ v.tr. *find*:

      ϬⲚ̄-:

ϬⲘ̄- assim. s. ⲚⲞⲘⲦⲈ, ϬⲞⲘ
ϬⲚ̄Ⲧ⸗:
ϬⲚ̄Ⲧ̄ϥ 71.7
ϬⲞⲚⲤ̄ n.m. *injustice, violence*:
   ⲬⲒ ... Ⲛ̄ϬⲞⲚⲤ̄ *treat someone violently*:
   ⲬⲒ⸜ Ⲛ̄ϬⲞⲚⲤ̄:
   ⲬⲒⲦ̄ϥ Ⲛ̄ϬⲞⲚⲤ̄ 82.32f.
ϬⲱⲣϬ v.tr. *prepare* 77.26
ϬⲱⲣϬ v.tr. *live* 82.24
ϬⲱϢⲦ̄ v.intr. *look* 77.29
ϬⲒⲬ n.f. *hand* 71.29;72.15.30;81.14.19

Conjugations

Adverbal clauses (bipartite)

Present I
(Ⲙ̄Ⲙ̄Ⲛ̄) noun (indef.) 72.19;81.26

✝	79.32
Ⲕ	72.13
ϥ	76.18.20
ⲤⲈ	70.21;75.26;76.20.30;77.9;78.27.28; 79.16;80.27;81.12.32;84.4

Circumstantial clauses
ⲈⲢⲈ + noun 79.15

ⲈⲒ	73.11
ⲈⲔ	73.9
Ⲉϥ	70.14.18;72.4.6;74.19.25;75.4; 76.11;81.4.16.17;82.5.8.10.27. 31.32;83.2.10.11.31.32.32
ⲈⲤ	74.31.32;75.29.31.33;76.1.2.3; 78.2;83.25
ⲈⲨ	70.22;71.1.33;73.2.10.19.20.21. 32;74.3.10.14.20.24.25.29;75.1. 19.24;76.22;77.23.29;78.33;79. 12.24.28;80.5.6;81.5;82.14.15

Instans
(ⲞⲨⲚ̄+) noun (indef.) +ⲚⲀ 73.23f.;83.29*
          (*ⲞⲨⲞⲚ = ⲞⲨⲚ̄ ⲞⲨⲞⲚ)
(Ⲙ̄Ⲙ̄Ⲛ̄+) noun (indef.) +ⲚⲀ 83.19
✝ⲚⲀ 84.8

ϥⲚⲀ	73.29
ⲤⲚⲀ	75.32
ⲤⲈⲚⲀ	73.25;74.26.28;76.31; 80.7;83.28;84.4.5

(Circumstantialis)

ⲈϥⲚⲀ	72.2;82.4

ⲈⲨⲚⲀ	72.7f;78.3.24;80.3

Relative clauses

ЄТ	70.19.26.27;71.13.28;75.1.11. 31;77.10.28;78.20.24.29;79. 2.11.17.23;80.16;81.11.11;82.16. 26.27.28;83.9.13.15.26;84.6 s. ϢOYЄIT, 2OOY
ЄТK̄	72.17;81.15
ЄТЄЧ	76.10
ЄТЄC	71.26
ЄТOY	71.5;72.31;73.8.15;75.21f.23;76.17; 81.9*.18.32 (*reduced cls.)

(Relative clauses)
ЄТNᴧ 74.12;80.27

Present II

ЄK	81.9
ЄЧ	76.32;83.1
ЄY	74.5.8.10;76.29; 77.14.33;81.22;82.33

Fut. II

ЄЧNᴧ76.19;79.8
ЄYNᴧ 74.13.15.15f.23;
　　　77.15.25;78.34;80.10.28f.

Imperfect clauses
NЄPЄ + noun (def.) 73.3
NЄЧ 82.7

Imperfect relative clauses
ЄNЄЧ 82.6

Verbal clauses (tripartite)

Perfect affirm. I

ᴧЄI	72.5.8.10.19.23.27;73.2. 9.12;81.29;82.4;83.27
ᴧï	71.19;81.4
ᴧЧ	70.23;72.26;81.2;84.12
ᴧC	72.21;75.3
ᴧY	73.28;82.3.30

Perfect I neg.

MTTI 72.18

MTTOY 71.7;77.12

Perf. I affirm. circumst.

ЄᴧЄI	70.25
ЄᴧЧ	71.9.25
ЄᴧC	80.20f.
ЄᴧY	71.3;77.10;79.26

Perf. I neg. circumst.

ЄMTTOY 71.6;77.12

Perf. I affirm.+ rel.conv. N̄T-
N̄TᴧK 79.33;83.11
N̄Tᴧq 84.12* (*in temporal subsidiary function)

ⲚⲦⲀⲨ 77.21;78.9.13;79.18.19f.20;83.6

Perf. I affirm. + rel.conv. ⲈⲦ-
ⲈⲦⲀ̈ 71.20;82.15*
ⲈⲦⲀⲈⲒ 72.28
ⲈⲦⲀⲔ 83.16
ⲈⲦⲀ� 70.23;71.18.24;73.4;81.23
ⲈⲦⲀ�� 75.25;77.3;83.24
ⲈⲦⲀⲨ 73.32;82.18.21*.23.29;83.22 (*reduced cls.)

Perf.I affirm. + rel. conv. ⲈⲦⲈ-
ⲈⲦⲈ Ⲁ̈ 78.12

Aorist affirm.   Aorist neg.
ⲰⲀ� 75.11
ⲰⲀⲨ 77.6.20;84.3   ⲘⲀⲨ 76.4

Aor. affirm. rel.
ⲈⲰⲀ� 76.9
ⲈⲰⲀⲤ 76.14
ⲈⲰⲀⲨ 82.24
ⲈⲦⲈ ... ⲰⲀⲨ 84.1/3

Aorist II
ⲈⲰⲀ� 76.12;79.14

Future III   Fut. III neg.
                                                      ⲚⲚⲈ + noun 84.9
ⲈⲔⲈ 71.16.26;73.18;80.31;83.16
ⲈⲶⲈ 79.6;80.13.17.18;83.4
ⲈⲤⲈ 75.30

ⲈⲨⲈ   70.28.29;74.1.34;75.6;76.24;   ⲚⲚⲈⲚ 72.9
       77.1;78.1.6f.15;79.21f.;80.15   ⲚⲚⲞⲨ 78.21
       22;81.1

Fut. III affirm. rel.
ⲈⲦⲈ ... ⲈⲶⲈ 79.5/6

Imperative causative affirm.
ⲘⲀⲣⲚ̄ 81.27
ⲘⲀⲣⲞⲚ 80.24

Subordinate clause conjugations

Conjunctive
Ⲛ̄ϥ 75.8
Ⲛ̄ⲥ 80.19
Ⲛ̄ⲥⲉ 74.16;77.11;80.30

Temporal
Ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲣⲓ 72.18
Ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲣⲓ 81.25
Ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲣⲉϥ 81.3

Limitative
ϢⲀⲚⲦⲈ + noun 71.22

Conditional
ⲈⲢϢⲀⲚ + noun 77.17;84.1
ⲈⲤϢⲀⲚ 77.18
ⲈⲨϢⲀⲚ 75.2f.;76.6f.

Greek Words

ἀγαθός adj. *good* 74.4f.;75.9;77.31
ἀγαπᾶν v.tr. *love* (Ⲡ̄ ⲀⲄⲀⲠⲀ) 75.24
ἄγγελος n.m. *messenger, angel* 77.24;82.12
ἀδικία n.f. *unrighteousness* 70.30;78.19
αἵρεσις n.f. *heresy* (ⲘⲚ̄ⲦϨⲈⲢⲈⲤⲓⲤ) as adj. *schismatically* 74.22
αἰχμαλωτεύειν v.tr. *imprison* (Ⲡ̄ ⲀⲒⲬⲘⲀⲖⲰⲦⲈⲨⲈ) 79.20f.
αἰχμάλωτος n.m. *prisoner* 74.2
αἰών n.m *age, aeon* 73.18.20;75.15;77.5;83.18
ἀκέραιος adj. *pure* 74.3f.
ἀλλά conj. *but* 75.28.32;76.31;78.28
ἀλλογενής n.m. *stranger* 83.17
ἀναίσθητος adj. *without perception* (ⲀⲚⲈⳞⲐⲎⲦⲞⲚ) 74.3
ἀντικείμενος n.m. *adversary* (ⲀⲚⲦⲓⲔⲓⲘⲈⲚⲞⲤ) 78.11
ἀντίμιμον n.m. *imitator, imitation* 71.22f;78.16;79.10f.
ἀόρατος adj. *invisible* (ⲀϨⲞⲢⲀⲦⲞⲤ) 81.3
ἀποκάλυψις n.f. *apocalypse* 70.13;84.14
ἀποκατάστασις n.f. *restoration* 74.9
ἀποχή n.f. *distance* 71.27
ἄρα part. 83.4
ἄρχειν v.intr. *rule* (Ⲡ̄ ⲀⲢⲬⲈⲒ) 74.21
ἀρχή n.f. *principality, start, beginning* 71.6.19f.;73.24

ἄρχων n.m. *archon* 74.30
ἀφθαρσία n.f. *immortality, incorruption* 75.7;79.7f.

γάρ conj. *for, as* 72.23;73.19.23;74.22;75.7.9.12.15;76.4.9.21;77.4.17;
        78.7.26;80.27;81.2;82.1.18;84.8 s. οὐ
γένος n.n. *race* (Copt.: n.m.) 78.4f.;79.9
γνῶσις n.f. *knowledge* 73.22f.

δαίμων n.m/f *demon* 75.4;82.23
δέ conj. *but* 71.15;72.4.8.18;73.22.32;74.4;75.26;76.14.24;77.20.22;78.23.31;79.22.25.32;80.29.31;
        81.18.24.25.28;82.4.7.9.15.17.27;83.6.8.30
διακονία n.f. *service* 72.1
διάκων n.m. *deacon, servant* 79.26;82.2f.
διάνοια n.f. *intellect, mind* 80.14;81.2
δικαιοσύνη n.f. *justice* 70.32;71.23f.
δόγμα n.n. *doctrine* (Copt.: n.m.) 74.19

εἱμαρμένη n.f. *fate* (ϨΙΜΑΡΜΕΝΗ) 78.2
εἰ μήτι conj. *except* (ΕΙΜΗΤΙ) 83.21f.
εἰρήνη n.f. *peace* 84.11
ἐλπίς n.f. *hope* (ϨΕΛΠΙC) 71.34
ἐξουσία n.f. *authority* 77.4;79.27
ἐπιθυμεῖν v.intr. *desire* (P̄ ΕΠΙΘΥΜΙ) 76.3
ἐπιθυμία n.f. *desire* 75.19f.
ἐπίσκοπος n.m. *bishop* 79.25
ἐργάτης n.m. *worker* 78.23
ἔτι adv. *also* 79.25
ἐφ' s. ὅσον

ἤ conj. *or* 76.5;81.10

ἵνα conj. *in order that* (ϨΙΝΑ) 77.8.15;78.20

καθότι conj. *because* 75.17
κακός adj. *evil* 75.7
κἄν conj. *if* 75.2
καρπός n.m. *fruit* 75.8
κατά prep. *as* 79.10;81.23
κοινωνία n.f. *community* 79.4
κόλασις n.f. *punishment* 79.17
κόσμος n.m. *cosmos* 77.8

λαός n.m. *people* 72.6;73.1;76.27

μέν adv. *indeed* 74.28;75.28.31;76.9;80.1.3
μεσότης n.f. *middle* 71.31
μορφή n.f. *form* 74.20.33

μυστήριον n.n. *mystery* (Copt.: n.m.) 73.16;76.26.28f.33;82.19

νοερός adj. *intellectual* 77.19;83.8.13
νόμος n.m. *law* 70.31;77.27;82.26

ὄντως adv. *truly* 79.2
ὁρμάζειν v.intr. *move* (P̄ ϩΟΡΜΑΖЄ) 77.20
ὅσον adv. *as far as*:
    ἐφ' ὅσον *as long as* 75.28
οὐ neg. *not*:
    οὐ γάρ 83.19
οὐδέ neg. *nor* 71.7;76.7
οὖν *so* 76.18;80.24;83.4.15;84.7
οὐσία n.f. *substance* 71.15;83.23;84.2
οὔτε neg. *nor, neither, not* 75.12.13f.;76.4;77.12;78.26.28

πάλιν adv. *again* 72.20
παρά prep. *in accordance with* 80.2
παράνομος adj. (Copt.: n.f. MN̄TΠΑΡΑΝΟΜΟС) *transgression* 70.31
παράπτωμα n.n. *tresspass* (Copt.: n.m.) 78.9
παρουσία n.f. *parousia* 78.6
πιστεύειν v.intr. *trust* (P̄ ΠΙСΤЄΥЄ) 76.2
πλάνη n.f. *error* 73.27f.;74.17;75.5;77.25.26;80.10.13.17
πλήρωμα n.n. *pleroma* (Copt.: n.m.) 71.2f.;83.12
πνεῦμα n.n: *spirit* (Copt.: ΠN̄Α n.m.) 77.19;79.3;82.8;83.9.15
ποδήρης adj. *hang down*:
   subst. n.m. (ΠΙΠΟΔΗΡΗ) *(the) cloak* 72.16
πονηρός adj. *evil* 76.25f.;77.31f.
πρός prep. *from, towards* 78.13.30
προφήτης n.m. *prophet* 71.9
πῶς adv. *how* [81.31]

σαρκικός adj. *fleshly* 81.20
σπέρμα n.n. *generation* (Copt.: n.m.) 71.8
σταυρός n.m. *cross* (С̄Ϯ̄ΟС) 82.25
στῦλος n.m. *pillar* 70.17
σῶμα n.n. *body* (Copt.: n.m.) 71.32;83.5.7.8
σωτήρ n.m. *saviour* 70.14*;72.26f.;73.11f.;80.8;81.15;82.9.28 * С̄Ш̄Р̄

τέλειος adj. *perfect* (ΤЄΛΙΟС) 71.16;83.14
τέχνη n.f. (Copt.: n.m. PЄϥP̄ΤЄΧΝΗ) *intriguer* 74.18f.
τόπος n.m. *place* 83.31
τότε adv. *then* 75.5

ὕλη n.f. *matter* (ϨΥΛΗ) 75.25

φθόνειν v.tr. *envy* (P̄ ϕΘΟΝΙ) 77.2

φύσις n.f. *nature* 75.33

χρόνος n.m. *time* 80.8f.

ψυχή n.f. *soul* 75.12.15.27;77.2f.17;78.5

ὦ vocative sign 75.27;80.23.31;81.8
ὡς conj. *because, as if, in order to* (ϩⲱⲥ) 70.32;72.2.7;77.29;79.26
ὥστε conj. *therefore* (ϩⲱⲥⲧⲉ) 71.22

Names

Ἑρμᾶς *Hermas* (ϩⲉⲣⲙⲁ) 78.18
Ἰησοῦς *Jesus* (ⲓⲥ̄) 81.18
Πέτρος *Peter*.
   Πέτρου 70.13;84.14
   Πέτρε 70.20f.;71.15f.;72.10;75.27;80.23.31
Χριστός *Christ* (ⲭⲥ̄) 74.8
ⲉⲗⲱⲉⲓⲙ Elohim 82.25

Bibliography

B. Aland (ed.), *Gnosis, Festschrift für Hans Jonas*. Göttingen 1978.

   C. Andresen, *Die Kirchen der alten Christenheit*. Stuttgart 1971.

A.H. Armstrong, 'Dualism: Platonic, Gnostic, and Christian', in: R.T. Wallis (ed.) *Neoplatonism and Gnosticism*. New York 1992, 33-54.

W.F. Arndt, F. W. Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. A translation and adaptation of the fourth revised and augmented edition of Walter Bauer's Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur*. Chicago 2nd ed. 1979.

V. Arnold-Döben, *Die Bildersprache der Gnosis*. Köln 1986.

D. Aune, 'The Apocalypse of John and the Problem of Genre', *Semeia* 36 (1986), 65-97.

D. Aune, 'Intertextuality and the Genre of the Apocalypse', *Society of Biblical Literature*. Seminar Papers, 1991, 142-160.

J.W. Barns, 'Greek and Coptic Papyri from the Covers of the Nag Hammadi Codices', in: M. Krause (ed.) *Essays on the Nag Hammadi Texts: in Honour of Pahor Labib* (NHS vol. 6), Leiden 1975, 9-18.

D. Bar-Tal, *Group Beliefs: a Conception for Analyzing Group Structure, Process and Behavior*. New York/Berlin 1990.

W. Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum*. Tübingen 1934, 2nd rev. ed. by G. Strecker, 1964.

T. Baumeister, 'Die Rolle des Petrus in gnostischen Texten' in: T. Orlandi, F. Wisse (eds.), *Acts of the Second International Congress of Coptic Studies*. Rome 1985, 3-12.

M. Bax, *Religieuze Regimes in Ontwikkeling*. Hilversum 1988.

K. Berger, 'Unfehlbare Offenbarung, Petrus in der gnostischen und apokalyptischen Offenbarungsliteratur' in:

P.G. Müller, W. Stenger (eds.), *Kontinuität und Einheit, Festschrift für F. Mussner*. Freiburg 1981, 261-326.

K. Beyschlag, *Simon Magus und die christliche Gnosis*. (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 16), Tübingen 1974.

U. Bianchi, 'Docetism. A Peculiar Theory about the Ambivalence of the Presence of the Divine' in: J.M. Kitagawa, Ch. H. Long (eds.) *Myths and Symbols, Studies in Honour of Mircea Eliade*. Chicago 1969, 265-273.

U. Bianchi. 'Observations on Valentinianism' in: B. Layton (ed.), *The Rediscovery of Gnosticism I*. Leiden 1980, 103-118.

A. Böhlig, 'Zur Apokalypse des Petrus', *Göttinger Miszellen* 8 (1973), 11-13.

A. Böhlig, F. Wisse, *Nag Hammadi Codices III, 2 and IV, 2. The Gospel of the Egyptians*. (NHS vol. 4), Leiden 1975.

F.H. Borsch, *The Christian and the Gnostic Son of Man*. (Studies in Biblical Theology, 2nd series: 14), London 1970.

J.A. Brashler, *The Coptic Apocalypse of Peter, a Genre Analysis and Interpretation*. Unpubl. Diss. Claremont 1977.

J.A. Brashler, R.A. Bullard, 'Apocalypse of Peter' in: J.M. Robinson (ed.), *The Nag Hammadi Library in English*. Leiden 3rd ed. 1988.

J.A. Brashler, M. Desjardins; 'NHC VII,3: Apocalypse of Peter', in: B.A. Pearson (ed.), *Nag Hammadi Codex VII*. Leiden 1996, 201-240.

S.K. Brown, C.W. Griggs, 'The Apocalypse of Peter, Introduction and Translation', *Brigham Young University Studies*. 15 (1974/75), 131-145.

N. Brox, *Pseudepigraphie in der heidnischen und jüdisch-christlichen Antike*. Darmstadt 1977.

N. Brox, ' "Doketismus" - eine Problemanzeige', *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 95 (1984), 301-314.

R. Bultmann. 'Die Bedeutung der neuerschlossenen mandäischen und manichäischen Quellen für das Verständnis des Johannesevangeliums', in: id., *Exegetica*. Tübingen 1967, 55-104.

H. Frhr. von Campenhausen, *Kirchliches Amt und geistliche Vollmacht in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten*. Tübingen 1953.

Chr. C. Caragounis, *The Son of Man: Vision and Interpretation*. Tübingen 1986.

R. Charron, *Concordance des Textes de Nag Hammadi*, le Codex VII. Louvain/Paris 1992.

A.P. Cohen, *The Symbolic Construction of Community*. London 1985.

J.J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination*. New York 1984.

J.J. Collins, 'Towards the Morphology of a Genre', *Semeia* 14 (1979), 1-19.

J.J. Collins, 'Genre, Ideology and social Movements in Jewish Apocalypticism' in: J.J. Collins and J.H. Charlesworth (eds.), *Mysteries and Revelations: Apocalyptic Studies since the Uppsala Conference*. Sheffield 1991, 32.

C. Colpe, 'New Testament and Gnostic Christology' in: J. Neusner (ed.), *Religions in Antiquity* (FS E.R. Goodenough), Leiden 1968. 127-143.

J. Cozby, *Gnosis and the Cross: The Passion of Christ in Gnostic Soteriology as Reflected in the Nag Hammadi Tractates*. Unpubl. Diss. Duke Univ. 1985.

W.E. Crum, *A Coptic Dictionary*. Oxford 4th ed. 1979.

J. Culler, 'Presupposition and Intertextuality', *Modern Language Notes* 91/6, (1976), 1380-1396.

J. Culler, *The Pursuit of Signs. Semiotics, Literature, Deconstruction*. London 1981.

J. Dart, *The Jesus of Heresy and History*. San Francisco 1988.

J.G. Davies, 'The Origins of Docetism' in: F.L. Cross (ed.), *Studia Patristica* VI, Berlin 1969, 29-41.

H. Dembowski, *Einführung in die Christologie*. Darmstadt 1987.

J. Denker, *Die theologiegeschichtliche Stellung des Petrusevangeliums. Ein Beitrag zur Frühgeschichte des Doketismus*. Frankfurt/M. 1975.

H. Dörrie, H. Dörries, 'Erotapokriseis', *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* 6 (1966), 342-370.

W.G. Doty, 'The Concept of Genre in Literary Analysis' in: *The Genre of the Gospels: Studies in Methodology, Comparative Research and Compositional Analysis*. Missoula, Mont. 1972.

J.-D. Dubois, 'Le Préambule de l'Apocalypse de Pierre (Nag Hammadi VII, 70.14-20)', *Gnosticisme et monde hellenistique: Actes du Colloque de Louvain-la-Neuve (11-14 mars 1980)*. Louvain-la-Neuve 1982, 384-393.

J.-D. Dubois, 'L'Apocalypse de Pierre (NHC VII,3) et le Nouveau Testament' in: J. Ménard (ed.), *Écritures et Traditions dans la Littérature Copte*. Louvain 1983, 117-125.

H. Dubrow, *Genre*. (The Critical Idiom 42), London 1982.

J.D.G. Dunn, *Christology in the Making: An Inquiry into the Origins of the Doctrine of the Incarnation*. London 1980.

M. Elze, 'Häresie und Einheit der Kirche im 2. Jahrhundert', *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 71 (1974), 389-410.

A.M. Enroth 'The Hearing Formula in the Book of Revelation', *New Testament Studies* 36 (1990), 609-613.

The Facsimile Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices published under the auspices of the department of antiquities of the Arab Republic of Egypt in conjunction with the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. Codex VII, Leiden 1972.

F.T. Fallon, 'The Gnostic Apocalypses', *Semeia* 14 (1979), 123-158.

A.J. Festugière, *La Révélation d'Hermes Trismegiste* I. Paris 1944.

A. Fowler, 'The Life and Death of Literary Forms', *New Literary History* 2 (1971), 199-216.

A. Fowler, *Kinds of Literature. An Introduction to the Theory of Genres and Modes*. Oxford 1982.

W.-P. Funk, *Die zweite Apokalypse des Jakobus aus Nag-Hammadi Codex V*. Berlin 1976.

W.-P. Funk, 'Koptische Isoglossen im oberägyptischen Raum', *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache* 112 (1985), 19-24.

F. Garcia Martinez, 'Encore l'Apocalyptique', *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 17 (1986), 224-232.

M. Gerhart, 'Generic Competence in Biblical Hermeneutics', *Semeia* 43 (1988), 29-45.

A. Guillaumont, 'Textes de Nag Hammadi: l'Apocalypse de Pierre', *Annuaire du Collège de France 1979-1980*, 80 (1980), 471-473.

W. Gundel, *Beiträge zur Entwicklungsgeschichte der Begriffe ANANKE und HEIMARMENE*. Gießen 1914.

W. Gundel, H.G. Gundel, *Astrologumena, die astrologische Literatur in der Antike und ihre Geschichte*. Südhoffs Archiv, Beiheft 6, Wiesbaden 1966, 303-340.

P. Hanson, 'Apocalypse, Genre and "Apocalypticism"', *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*. Suppl. Vol.(1976), 27-34.

L. Hartman, *Prophecy Interpreted*. Uppsala 1966.

L. Hartmann, 'Survey of the Problem of Apocalyptic Genre' in: D. Hellholm (ed.), *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East*. Tübingen 1983.

P.M. Head, 'On the Christology of the Gospel of Peter', *Vigiliae Christianae* 46 (1992), 209-225.

D. Hellholm (ed.), *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East. Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Apocalypticism Uppsala, August 12-17, 1979*. Tübingen 1983.

K.W. Hempfer, *Gattungstheorie*. München 1973.

M. Hengel, *Der Sohn Gottes: die Entstehung der Christologie und die jüdisch-hellenistische Religionsgeschichte*. Tübingen 1975.

J. Hills, 'The Epistula Apostolorum and the Genre "Apocalypse"', *Society of Biblical Literature*. Seminar Papers, Atlanta 1986.

G. Horner, *The Coptic Version of the New Testament in the Southern Dialects* I-VII, Oxford 1911-1924.

G. Hough, *An Essay on Criticism*. London 1966.

L.W. Hurtado, *One God One Lord, Early Christian Devotion and Ancient Jewish Monotheism*. Philadelphia 1988.

M.R. James, *The Apocryphal New Testament being the Apocryphal Gospels, Acts, Epistles and Apocalypses*. Oxford 6th ed. 1955.

H. Jonas, *The Gnostic Religion. The Message of the Alien God and the Beginnings of Christianity*. London 1963 (reprint 1992).

G.C. van de Kamp, *Pneuma-Christologie: een Oud Antwoord op een Actuele Vraag?* Amsterdam 1983.

K. Koch, *Ratlos vor der Apokalyptik*. Gütersloh 1970.

K. Koch, 'Esras erste Vision', *Biblische Zeitschrift* 22 (1978), 46-76.

K. Koch, J.M. Schmidt, *Apokalyptik*. Darmstadt 1982.

K. Koch, 'Vom profetischen zum apokalyptischen Visionsbericht' in: D. Hellholm (ed.), *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East*. Tübingen 1983, 413-446.

H. Koester, J.M. Robinson, *Trajectories through Early Christianity*. Philadelphia 1971.

K. Koschorke, *Die Polemik der Gnostiker gegen das kirchliche Christentum*. (NHS vol. 12), Leiden 1978.

H.J. Krämer, *Der Ursprung der Geistmetaphysik*. Amsterdam 1964.

M. Krause, 'Die Petrusakten in Codex VI von Nag Hammadi' in: id. (ed.), *Essays on the Nag Hammadi Texts in Honour of Alexander Böhlig*. (NHS vol. 3), Leiden 1972, 36-58.

M. Krause, 'Aussagen über das Alte Testament in z.T. bisher unveröffentlichten gnostischen Texten aus Nag Hammadi', *Ex orbe religionum* I (1972), 449-456.

M. Krause, M. Girgis, 'Die Petrusapokalypse' in: F. Altheim. R. Stiehl (eds.), *Christentum am Roten Meer* II, Berlin/New York 1973, 152-179.

M. Krause, 'Die literarischen Gattungen der Apokalypsen von Nag Hammadi' in: D. Hellholm (ed.), *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East*. Tübingen 1983. 621-637.

G.W.H. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*. Oxford 1961-1968.

B. Layton, 'The Text and Orthography of the Coptic Hypostasis of the Archons' *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 11 (1973), 173-200.

B. Layton, 'The Hypostasis of the Archons', *Harvard Theological Review* (1974), 352-396.

B. Layton, 'Appendices', *Harvard Theological Review* (1976), 33-90.

B. Layton (ed.), *The Rediscovery of Gnosticism, Proceedings of the Conference at Yale, March 1978.* (I and II), Leiden 1980.

B. Layton. 'Compound Prepositions in Sahidic Coptic' in: D.W. Young (ed.), *Festschrift für H.J. Polotsky*. East Gloucester, Mass. 1981, 239-268.

B. Layton, *The Gnostic Scriptures*. New York 1987.

B. Layton. *Nag Hammadi Codices II, 2-7*. (NHS vol. 20), Leiden 1989.

B. Lenz. 'Zur Transformation literarischer Gattungen' in: U. Broich, M. Pfister (eds.), *Intertextualität*. Tübingen 1985, 158-178.

N. Lewis. *Papyrus in Classical Antiquity*. Oxford 1974.

H.G. Liddell, R. Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Oxford 9th New ed. rev. 1925.

G. Linton, 'Reading the Apocalypse as an Apocalypse', *Society of Biblical Literature*. Seminar Papers, Atlanta 1991, 161-186.

E. Lohse, 'Apokalyptik und Christologie', *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 62 (1971), 48-67.

R.N. Longenecker, *The Christology of Early Jewish Christianity*. London 1970.

G.P. Luttikhuizen, 'The Evaluation of the Teaching of Jesus in Christian Gnostic Revelation Dialogues', *Novum Testamentum* 30 (1988), 158-168.

G.P. Luttikhuizen, 'Intertextual References in Readers' Responses to the Apocryphon of John' in: S. Draisma (ed.), *Intertextuality in Biblical Writings*. Kampen 1989, 117-127.

J. van Luxemburg, M. Bal, *Inleiding in de Literatuurwetenschap*. Muiderberg 1985.

G. Mac Rae, 'Nag Hammadi' in: *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible* Suppl. Vol. (1976), 613.

G. Mac Rae, 'Why the Church rejected Gnosticism' in: E.P. Sanders (ed.), *Jewish and Christian Self-definition.*Vol. I London 1980, 126-134.

G. Mac Rae, 'Apocalyptic Eschatology in Gnosticism' in: D. Hellholm (ed.), *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near-East*. Tübingen 1983, 317-329.

J. Mansfeld, *Studies in Later Greek Philosophy and Gnosticism*. London 1989.

M. Mees, 'Petrustraditionen im Zeugnis kanonischen und ausserkanonischen Schrifttums', *Augustinianum* 13 (1973), 185-203.

M. Mees, 'Das Petrusbild nach ausserkanonischen Zeugnissen', *Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte* 27 (1975), 193-205.

M.W. Meyer, 'The Letter of Peter to Philip' in: J.H. Sieber (ed.), *Nag Hammadi Codex VIII*. (NHS vol. 31), Leiden 1991, 227-251.

O. Miller, 'Intertextual Identity' in: M.J. Valdés & O. Miller (eds.), *Identity of the Literary Text*. Toronto 1985, 19-41.

G. Mink, *Liste der Koptischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments*. Berlin 1989-1991.

U.B. Müller, *Die Menschwerdung des Gottessohnes*. Stuttgart 1990.

P. Nagel, 'Die Auslegung der Paradieserzählung in der Gnosis' in: K.W. Tröger (ed.), *Altes Testament-Frühjudentum-Gnosis*. Gütersloh 1980, 49-70.

Novum Testamentum Graece. E. Nestle, K. Aland (eds.), Stuttgart 26th ed. 1981.

E.H. Pagels, 'Visions, Appearances and Apostolic Authority: Gnostic and Orthodox Traditions' in: B. Aland (ed.), *Gnosis, Festschrift für Hans Jonas*. Göttingen 1978, 415-430.

E.H. Pagels, *The Gnostic Gospels*. New York 1979.

E.H. Pagels, 'Gnostic and Orthodox Views of Christ's Passion' in: H. Layton (ed.), *The Rediscovery of Gnosticism* I, Leiden 1980, 262-283.

E.H. Pagels, *The Johannine Gospel in Gnostic Exegesis*. Society of Biblical Literature, Monograph Series 17, Atlanta 1973 (repr. 1989).

D.M. Parrot (ed.), *Nag Hammadi Codices V, 2-5 and VI with Papyrus Berolinensis 8502, 1 and 4*. (NHS vol. 11), Leiden 1979.

D. Patte, *Early Jewish Hermeneutics in Palestine*. Society of Biblical Literature, Dissertation Series 22, Missoula Mont. 1975.

J. Paulien, *Allusions, Exegetical Method and the Interpretation of Revelation 8:7-12*. Ann Arbor, Michigan 1987.

B.A. Pearson, *The Pneumatikos-Psychikos Terminology*. Society of Biblical Literature, Dissertation Series 12. Missoula Mont. 1973.

B.A. Pearson, 'Biblical Exegesis in Gnostic Literature' in: M.E. Stone (ed.), *Armenian and Biblical Studies*. Jerusalem 1976, 70-80.

B.A. Pearson, S. Giversen, *Nag Hammadi Codex IX, X*. (NHS vol. 15), Leiden 1981.

B.A. Pearson, *Gnosticism, Judaism, and Egyptian Christianity*. Minneapolis 1990a.

B.A. Pearson, 'The Apocalypse of Peter and Canonical 2 Peter' in: J.E. Goehring e.a. (eds.), *Gnosticism and the Early Christian World*. Sonoma California 1990b, 67-75.

B.A. Pearson (ed.), *Nag Hammadi Codex VII*. Leiden 1996.

M.L. Peel, 'Gnostic Eschatology and the New Testament' *Novum Testamentum* 12 (1970), 141-165.

W. Van Peer, 'Intertextualiteit: traditie en kritiek', *Spiegel der Letteren* 29 (1987), 16-24.

Ph. Perkins, 'Peter in Gnostic Revelation', *Society of Biblical Literature*. Seminar Papers, Cambridge 1974, IB

Ph. Perkins, 'Apocalypse of Adam: The Genre and Function of a Gnostic Apocalypse', *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 39 (1979). 382-395.

Ph. Perkins, *The Gnostic Dialogue*. New York 1980.

Ph. Perkins, 'Logos Christologies in the Nag Hammadi Codices', *Vigiliae Christianae* 35 (1981), 379-396.

R.A. Piper, *Wisdom in the Q-tradition*. Cambridge 1989.

H.J. Polotsky, *Collected Papers*. Jerusalem 1971.

H.J. Polotsky, 'Die koptischen Possessiva', *Enchoria* 13 (1985), 86-98.

H.J. Polotsky, *Grundlagen des koptischen Satzbaus*. Decatur 1987.

H.J. Polotsky, *Grundlagen des koptischen Satzbaus, zweite Hälfte*. Atlanta 1990.

J. Reiling, *Hermas and Christian Prophecy, a Study of the Eleventh Mandate*. Leiden 1973.

J.M. Robinson, 'On the Construction of the Nag Hammadi Codices' in: M. Krause (ed.), *Essays on the Nag Hammadi Texts*. (NHS vol. 6), Leiden 1975, 170-190.

J.M. Robinson, 'On the Codicology of the Nag Hammadi Codices' in: J.E. Ménard (ed.), *Les Textes de Nag Hammadi*. (NHS vol. 7), Leiden 1975, 15-31.

J.M. Robinson (ed.), *The Nag Hammadi Library in English*. Leiden 3rd ed. 1988.

Th.A. Robinson, *The Bauer Thesis Examined, The Geography of Heresy in the Early Christian Church*. Lewston/Queenston 1988.

K. Rudolph, 'Der gnostische "Dialog" als literarisches Genus' in: P. Nagel (ed.), *Probleme der koptischen Literatur*. (Wiss. Beitr. der Martin-Luther Univ.), Halle 1968, 85-107.

K. Rudolph, *Gnosis, the Nature and History of an Ancient Religion*. Edinburgh 1983.

H. Sahlin, 'Wie wurde ursprünglich die Benennung "Der Menschensohn" verstanden?', *Studia Theologica* 37 (1983), 147-179.

E.P. Sanders (ed.), *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition*. (Vol. I: The Shaping of Christianity in the Second and Third Centuries), London 1980.

W. Schenk, 'Textverarbeitung in Frühjudentum, Frühkirche und Gnosis', in: K.W. Tröger (ed.), *Altes Testament-Frühjudentum-Gnosis*. Gütersloh 1980, 299-316.

H.-M. Schenke. 'Die neutestamentliche Christologie und der gnostische Erlöser' in: K.W. Tröger (ed.), *Gnosis und Neues Testament*. Gütersloh 1973, 205-230.

H.-M. Schenke, 'Bemerkungen zur Apokalypse des Petrus' in: M. Krause (ed.), *Essays on the Nag Hammadi*

Texts: in Honour of Pahor Labib. (NHS vol. 6), Leiden 1975a, 277-285.

H.-M. Schenke, 'Zur Faksimile-Ausgabe der Nag-Hammadi-Schriften, Die Schriften des Codex VII', *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache* 102 (1975b), 123-138.

D.H. Schmidt, *The Petrine Writings: Their Redactors and Their Relationships.* Diss. North-Western University, Evanston, Illinois 1972.

W. Schmithals, 'Gnosis und Neues Testament', *Verkündigung und Forschung* 21 (1976), 22-46.

W. Schneemelcher, *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen I & II.* Tübingen 5th ed. 1987-1989.

U. Schönborn, *Studien zur Interdependenz von literarischer Struktur und theologischer Intention des gnostischen Dialogs, ausgeführt an der koptischen "Apokalypse des Petrus" aus Nag Hammadi (NHC VII,3).* Habilitationsschrift, Marburg 1987.

L. Schottroff, *Der Glaubende und die feindliche Welt.* Neukirchen 1970.

E. Schüssler Fiorenza, 'The Phenomenon of Early Christian Apocalyptic. Some Reflections on Method' in: D. Hellholm (ed.), *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near-East.* Tübingen 1983, 295-317.

E. Schüssler Fiorenza, 'The Followers of the Lamb: Visionary Rhetoric and Social-Political Situation', *Semeia* 36 (1986), 123-147.

E. Schweizer, 'The Matthean Church', *New Testament Studies* 20 (1974), 216.

G. Shellrude, *Nag Hammadi Apocalypses: A Study of the Relation of Selected Texts to the Traditional Apocalypses.* Unpubl. Diss. St. Andrews Univ. 1986.

A. Shisha-Halevy, *Coptic Grammatical Categories: Structural Studies in the Syntax of Shenoutean Sahidic.* Rome 1986.

A. Shisha-Halevy, *Coptic Grammatical Chrestomathy.* Leuven 1988.

J.H. Sieber, *Nag Hammadi Codex VIII.* (NHS vol. 31), Leiden 1991.

F. Siegert, *Nag-Hammadi-Register* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 26), Tübingen 1982.

M. Smith, 'On the History of APOKALYPTO and APOKALYPSIS' in: D. Hellholm (ed.), *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East.* Tübingen 1983, 9-21.

T.V. Smith, *Petrine Controversies in Early Christianity.* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe, 15), Tübingen 1985.

H.F.D. Sparks (ed.), *The Apocryphal Old Testament.* Oxford 1984.

W. Speyer, 'Religiöse Pseudepigraphie und literarische Fälschung' in: N. Brox (ed.), *Pseudepigraphie in der heidnischen und jüdisch-christlichen Antike.* Darmstadt 1977, 195-263.

G.N. Stanton, '5 Ezra and Matthean Christianity in the Second Century', *The Journal for Theological Studies* 28 (1977), 67-83.

V. Stegemann, 'Fatum und Freiheit im Hellenismus und in der Spätantike', *Gymnasium* 50 (1939), 165-191.

E.J.C. Tigchelaar, 'More on Apocalyptic and Apocalypses', *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 18 (1987), 137-4

W. Till, *Koptische Grammatik.* Leipzig 6th ed. 1986.

W. Till, *Koptische Dialektgrammatik.* München 2nd ed. 1961.

T. Todorov, *Théorie de la Littérature.* Paris 1965.

T. Todorov, *Literature and its Theorists.* New York 1987.

J.W. Trigg, 'The Angel of Great Counsel: Christ and the Angelic Hierarchy in Origen's Theology', *The Journal of Theological Studies* 42 (1991), 35-42.

K.W. Tröger (ed.), *Gnosis und Neues Testament.* Berlin 1973.

K.W. Tröger, 'Der zweite Logos des Grossen Seth. Gedanken zur Christologie in der zweiten Schrift des Codex VII (p.49.10-70.12)' in: M. Krause (ed.), *Essays on the Nag Hammadi Texts: in Honour of Pahor Labib.* (NHS vol. 6.), Leiden 1975, 268-276.

K.W. Tröger, 'Doketische Christologie in Nag Hammadi Texten', *Kairos* (1977), 45-52.

K.W. Tröger, *Die Passion Jesu Christi in der Gnosis nach den Schriften von Nag Hammadi.* Unpubl. Diss. Humboldt Univ. Berlin 1978.

C.M. Tuckett, *Nag Hammadi and the Gospel Tradition*. Edinburgh 1986.

W.C. van Unnik, 'Les idées des Gnostiques concernant l'église' in: J. Giblet (ed.), *Aux Origines de l'Eglise*. Louvain 1964, 175-187.

W.C. van Unnik, 'Der Neid in der Paradiesgeschichte nach einigen gnostischen Texten' in: M. Krause (ed.), *Essays on the Nag Hammadi Texts in Honour of Alexander Böhlig*. (NHS vol. 3), Leiden 1972, 120-132.

M.J. Valdés, O. Miller, *Identity of the Literary Text*. Toronto 1985.

J. Vergote, 'Observation écrite, communiquée après le Colloque' appendix to: J.-D. Dubois, 'Le Préambule de l'Apocalypse de Pierre (Nag Hammadi VII, 70.14-20)', *Gnosticisme et monde hellénistique: Actes du Colloque de Louvain-la-Neuve (11-14 mars 1980)*. Louvain-la-Neuve 1982, 384-393.

Ph. Vielhauer, G. Strecker, 'Apokalypsen und Verwandtes' in: W. Schneemelcher (ed.), *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen* II, Tübingen 5th ed. 1989, 491-515.

F. Watson, *Paul, Judaism and the Gentiles: a sociological approach*. Cambridge 1986.

R. Wellek, A. Warren, *Theory of Literature*. London 3rd ed. 1963.

R. Wellek, 'The Concept of Evolution in Literary History' in: R. Wellek, *Concepts of Criticism*. New Haven 1963.

A. Werner, 'Die Apokalypse des Petrus, die dritte Schrift von Nag Hammadi Codex VII, eingeleitet und übersetzt vom Berliner Arbeitskreis für Koptisch-Gnostische Schriften', *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 99 (1974), 575-584.

A. Werner, 'Koptisch-Gnostische Apokalypse des Petrus' in: W. Schneemelcher (ed.), *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen* II, Tübingen 5th ed. 1989, 633-644.

M. Werner, *Die Entstehung des christlichen Dogmas*. Leipzig 1941.

J.A. Williams, *Biblical Interpretation in the Gnostic Gospel of Truth from Nag Hammadi*. Society of Biblical Literature, Dissertation Series 79, Atlanta 1988.

M. Wilmet, *Concordance du Nouveau Testament Sahidique*. Louvain 1957-1964.

R. McL. Wilson, 'The Gnostics and the Old Testament' in: G. Widengren (ed.), *Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Gnosticism*. Uppsala 1977, 164-168.

O. Wintermute, 'A Study of Gnostic Exegesis of the Old Testament' in: J.E. Efird (ed.), *The Use of the Old Testament in the New and Other Essays*. Durham N.C. 1972, 241-270.

F. Wisse, 'The Nag Hammadi Library and the Heresiologists', *Vigiliae Christianae* 25 (1971), 205-223.

B. Witherington, 'A Petrine Source in Second Peter', *Society of Biblical Literature* (Seminar Papers), Atlanta 1985, 187-192.

E. Van Wolde, 'Van tekst via tekst naar betekenis: Intertekstualiteit en haar implikaties', *Tijdschrift voor Theologie* 30 (1990), 333-361.

E.M. Yamauchi, *Pre-Christian Gnosticism*. London 1973.

A. Yarbro Collins, 'Early Christian Apocalypticism', *Semeia* 36 (1986), 1-13.

W. Zeegers, J. Jansen, 'Betekenisgeving als sociaal proces', *Psychologie en Maatschappij* 43 (1988), 117-132.

Indices

Index of Subjects

Index of Modern Authors