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PREFACE

This volume comprises a handful of studies dealing with Graeco-Roman (Hellenistic) religions and Gnosticism. The studies have been selected in accordance with these two principles. (1) *Ad fontes*. Each study concentrates on a religious key-text, trying to interpret it, to discover its sources, and to assess its value. Hence a heavy input on the *Quellenforschung*. (2) *Varietur*. The studies included in this volume should reflect different facets of religious beliefs in late antiquity.

Ten of the fifteen studies have been previously published in scholarly journals. Their text appears here as corrected, revised, or updated wherever necessary. I am indebted to the following publishing houses for the kind permission to reprint the articles in question: J. D. Sauerländer’s Verlag, Frankfurt am Main (for Nos. 1 and 5); E. J. Brill, Leiden (for Nos. 3 and 8); Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn (for Nos. 4 and 6); Oxford University Press (for Nos. 7 and 9); Scholars Press, Decatur, Georgia (for No. 14); The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore (for No. 15).

I am grateful to Professors H. S. Versnel and F. T. van Straten for accepting this volume for the series “Studies in Greek and Roman Religion.”

Urbana, Easter, 1986

M. Marcovich
A GOD CALLED LYCHNOS

Epigram IX Gow-Page¹ (= A.P. V. 7) of Asclepiades of Samos (born ca. 320 B.C.) reads as follows:

Λύχνε, σε γὰρ παρεοῦσα τρίς ὠμοσεν Ἡράκλεια
ηξειν κοῦχ ἤκει: λύχνε, σὺ δ᾽ εἶ θεὸς εἰ
tὴν δολήν ἀπάμυνον· ὅταν φίλον ἐνδὸν ἔχουσα
παῖζῃ, ἀποσβεσθεῖς μηκέτι φῶς πάρεχε.

"Lamp, here in your presence swore Heracleia three times that she would come to me. And she did not. Now, lamp, if you are a god punish the perjurer: When she next time has a friend at her home to entertain him, put yourself out and deny her your light."

(1) Judging by the usual sense of the participle παρεοῦσα, "when she was here present;" by the expression, ἡξειν κοῦχ ἤκει, "that she would come to me, but did not come;" finally, by the close parallelism with the twin-epigram of Asclepiades X Gow-Page (= A.P. V. 150):

'Ὡμολόγησ' ἡξειν eἰς νῦκτα μοι ὑ τιβόητος
Νικὼ καὶ σεμνὴν ὠμοσε Θεσμοφόρον,
kοῦχ ἤκει· φυλακῇ δὲ παροίχεται. ἄρ᾽ ἐπιορκείν
ῆθελε; τὸν λύχνον, παῖδες, ἀποσβέσατε.

—it seems safe to conclude that the deceived poet-lover is addressing the lamp standing in his own home. This, however, contradicts the text of lines 2-4, where clearly the lamp in the house of the hetaera Heracleia is being addressed (notice the force of ἐνδὸν ἔχουσα). And yet, we must be dealing with one and the same lamp, as it is attested by the anaphora of this invocation—λύχνε, σὲ... λύχνε, σὺ.²

(2) Hugo Stadtmüller,³ Maurice Platnauer⁴ and Walther Ludwig⁵ had tried to make also the first λύχνε refer to the lamp situated in the house of Heracleia by changing the transmitted παρεοῦσα either into πτάραντα (Stadtmüller) or into παρεόντα (Platnauer and Ludwig, independently from each other): "She swore in thy presence" (Platnauer);

⁴ Class. Review 33 (1919) 25.
⁵ O.c., 156 and 158.
“Herakleia schwur bei der Lampe gleich wie bei einem ‘gegenwärtigen Gott’...” (Ludwig).

Now, Stadtmüller’s πτάραντα is better left aside, since Asclepiades’ lamp has nothing to do with the prophetic lamp of Marcus Argentarius, whose Epigram XIV Gow-Page⁶ (= A.P. VI. 333) reads:

"Ἡδη, φιλτατε λύχνε, τρις ἑπταρες· ἦ τάχα τερπνήν
εἰς θαλάμους ἧζειν Ἀντιγόνην προλέγεις;"

Here the poet-lover wonders whether the sputtering of the lamp indicates the approach of his mistress, while Asclepiades sends an imprecation on his treacherous mistress, and the irrelevance is evident (correct are Gow and Page, Commentary, p. 122). As for Platnauer’s and Ludwig’s παρόντα (for παρεώσα), I think it is unlikely for the following reason. An Epiphany or Parousia is expected from an absent and distant god,⁷ not from a house-lamp being always present and on hand. Consequently, the phrase, λύχνος παρών, in the sense of θεὸς ἐπιφανής, deus praesens, sounds unconvincing to me. Ludwig (p. 158, n. 11) adduces Dionysus, Demetrius Poliorcetes [see Article 2] and Peitho as examples of “present gods,” but they surely belong to a different category.

(3) Peter Von der Mühll⁸ kept the transmitted παρεώσα while taking it to mean, “in Person, von sich aus, eigens, bereit:” “Herakleia hatte sich gestellt, hatte bereit, ins Gesicht dem Dichter-Sprecher dreimal bei der Lampe geschworen, sie werde zu ihm kommen.” However, the participle παρών, which is very common in drama—sometimes in the company of αὐτός, sometimes serving as a simple “Zeilenfüller” (cf. LSJ, s.v., IV),—cannot be found in the Hellenistic epigram. Accordingly, it seems safer to take παρεώσα in its usual sense of “here present” (W.R. Paton), “hier anwesend.” Then ἥζειν must imply “to come to me again” (= πάλιν ἥζειν), which does not seem to present difficulty.

(4) Mrs. N. Čistjakova⁹ translated correctly παρεώσα with “here present,” but took the second λύχνε to be the same lamp as the first one, the one standing in the house of the poet-lover, while interpreting the epigram as a humorous inscription on the lamp, and the lamp itself as the poet’s present to the treacherous hetaera (p. 44). However, a curse as an inscription on a gift-object (μηχέτι φῶς πάρεχε) seems to me unthinkable.

The situation depicted in the Epigram I Gow-Page (= A.P. V. 5) of Flaccus is quite different:

---

Flaccus had given the expensive lamp to his mistress Nape as a token of his love, before knowing that she would betray him. On the contrary, our Asclepiades already knows that his mistress Heracleia has betrayed him (δολίη). Thus the poet’s lamp cannot be taken as a credible gift to the perjuring girl. And besides, who would expect Heracleia to take the harmful present into her house as soon as she had read the imprecation inscribed on it! If so then the epigram becomes meaningless.

(5) Gow and Page (in the Commentary, II, p. 123) offer two possible explanations, neither of them being convincing enough to me. They wrote:

Two possible solutions suggest themselves. The first, that lamps make common cause and that Asclepiades’ lamp may thus control the behaviour of others; and this, though not very persuasive, may derive a little support from τὰ θεῶς τὸ (see 2 n.). The second possibility is that Asclepiades is waiting neither in his house nor in hers but in a room which she uses for assignations. If that is so the difficulty disappears, but [Epigram] X gives pause, and we know no evidence that hetaerae used, like Messalina in Juv. 6.114 ff., accommodation addresses.

The introduction of a magic Aladdin-lamp really is “not very persuasive.” For, first, how can Asclepiades know when exactly Heracleia would entertain a client at her home, in order to activate his magic lamp working on remote control? And second, according to the rules of the homeopathic magic, it suffices for the deceived poet-lover to put out his own lamp: the lamp in the house of the victim will automatically die out.

As for the second possibility, that Asclepiades and Heracleia were meeting in a neutral “rented room,” in a “Zimmer auf Stunden,” “chambre à l’heure,” such an “accommodation address” was advocated by Giuseppe Giangrande after the publication of this article. He argued against Gow and Page that such “gemietete Wohnungen” of the hetaerae did exist in Hellenistic times, while referring to H. Licht and K. Sudhoff. However, even if they existed in the time of Asclepiades, there is nothing in our epigram to indicate such a “chambre à l’heure.” For the most natural meaning of ημεν is “to come to my place,” and the usual sense of ευδον is “at her own place,” “at her home,” “chez soi”

10 R.E.G. 86 (1973) 319-22, esp. 312.
(compare, e.g., Plato Protag. 311 a 1). In addition, already Gow and Page had referred to the close parallelism with the twin-epigram X of Asclepiades ("but X gives pause"), and there the lamp in question is surely standing in the house of the poet-lover.

(6) The difficulties disappear as soon as we print λύχνε as Λύχνε. For in our epigram we are dealing with a god called Lychnos, as it is attested by the poet himself in line 2: Λύχνε, σὺ δ’ εἰ θεός εἰ ("Now, Lychnos, if you are really a god..."). The first Λύχνε refers to the lamp in the house of the poet, the second Λύχνε—to the one in the house of the hetaera. And since the anaphora, Λύχνε, σέ... Λύχνε, σὺ, indicates that the poet is addressing one and the same lamp, it follows that he is talking to a god called Lychnos. As a god, Lychnos is present wherever there is a lamp, which is but his image or manifestation.

Now, Lychnos appears as personified and divinized already in Comedy:

Βασχίς θεόν σ’ ἐνόμισεν, εὐθαίμον λύχνε:
κεῖνοι τῶν θεῶν μέγιστος, εἰ ταύτη δοξεῖς

(C.A.F. III A Adesp. Fr. 152 Edmonds). In Aristophanes’ Ecclesiaizusae 8-13, Praxagora addresses this hymn to Lychnos:

χάν τοις δωματίοισιν Ἀφροδίτης τρόπων
πειρωμέναις πλησίος παραστατέις,
10 λορδουμένων τε σωμάτων ἐπιστάτην
όφθαλμον οὐδεὶς τῶν σών ἐξείρησε δόμων.
μόνος δὲ μηρῶν εἰς ἀπορρήτους μυχοὺς
λάμπεις ἀφεύων τὴν ἐπανθοῦσαν τρίχα.

Of course, the patroness-goddess of the hetaerae is Aphrodite, by whom they swear: μᾶ τὴν Ἀφροδίτην (Aristoph. Plut. 1069; Eccl. 999). Ὡς πόρνη τὴν Ἀφροδίτην ἐμνῆσθαι, says a scholiast ad locum. But in the Aphrodisia, Lychnos appears in the role of a manifestation of (Erscheinungsf orm) or a substitute for (Stellvertreter) Aphrodite, and that is why our hetaera Heracleia could swear by Lychnos, who is her patron-god (Schutzgott).

A burning lamp must be present in the boudoir of every hetaera. If the lamp is extinguished the hetaera will remain without the necessary protection of her Schutzgott. Then she may not have success with her clients,

---

13 On this passage compare H. Kleinknecht, Die Gebetsparodie in der Antike (Tübinger Beiträge, 28), Stuttgart-Berlin, 1937, 93-98.
and eventually may go bankrupt. We are now in a better position to grasp all the force of the revenge on the part of the deceived poet-lover. His curse is not to be taken for a playful joke. What Asclepiades is actually asking the god Lychnos amounts to the following: “Lychnos, the patron-god of the hetaerae, stop protecting Heracleia the perjurer: let her lose her clients!” ( = ὃταν φίλον ἐνδον ἔχουσα / παίζη, ἀποσβεσθείς μηκέτι φῶς πάρεχε).

Lamp and Hetaera are inseparable friends in matters of the Aphrodisia since the times of Hipponax Fr. 17 West (Fr. 22 Diehl):

κύψασα γάρ μοι πρὸς τὸ λύχνον Ἀρήτη.

Lamps are the most common votive offering of the hetaerae to their goddess. After winning the affection of her master through successful Aphrodisia, a slave-girl used to honor Aphrodite with lamp-offerings: τὴν δ’ Ἀφροδίτην ὑστερ αἰτίην τοῦτον / λύχνοις ἐτίμα... (Babrius 10.6 f.). Similar in tone is Meleager’s Epigram XI Gow-Page (= A.P. VI. 162):

"Ἀνθεμά σοι Μελέαγρος ἐν συμπαύστορα λύχνον,
Κύπρι φίλη, μῦστην σῶν θέτο παννυχίδων.

"Im dritten Jahrhundert n. Chr. weihten in Ephesos ein Bruder und eine Schwester, die sich Mysten der Aphrodite Daitis nennen, einen Eros und eine bronzen Hängelampe mit zwei Dochten,” wrote M.P. Nilsson. And Augustine (De civ. dei 21.6) reports on a miraculous lamp in a shrine of Aphrodite that no storm or rain could extinguish: Fuisse vel esse quoddam Veneris fanum atque ibi candelabrum et in eo lucernam sub divo sic ardentem, ut eam nulla tempestas, nullus imber extingueret; unde sicut ille lapis, ita ista λύχνος ἀσβεστος, id est lucerna inextinguibilis, nominata est. In his turn, Plutarch tells the following χειρις about Demosthenes (Demosth. 8.3): ... Πυθέας ἐπισκώπτων ἐλλυχνίων ἔφησεν ὃς τοῦ πάντων μὲν οὖν ἢμείφατο πικρῶς ὁ Δημοσθένης. "Οὐ ταύτα γάρ,“ εἶπεν, "ἲμοι καὶ σοί, ὁ Πυθέα, ὁ λύχνος σύνοιδε.” Of course, Pytheas had in mind the lucubrations, while Demosthenes hinted at the Aphrodisia, both connotations being implied by the word λύχνος.

If the lamp of Aphrodite is extinguished in her boudoir the hetaera Heracleia may have no success in bed. The same is true of Meleager’s rival, being overwhelmed by deep sleep in the bed of Heliodora (Meleager’s Epigram LI Gow-Page = A.P. V. 165.3-6):

15 Quoted by Kleinknecht (above, note 13, p. 97, n. 2).
A GOD CALLED LYCHNOS

Compare also Meleager’s Ep. XXIII (= A.P. V. 197.3 f.): ναὶ φιλάγρυπ-

'Αντιγόνης καὶ χρώτα λαβῶν πρὸς χρώτα, τὰ λοιπὰ σιγῶ, μάρτυς ἐφ’ οίς λύχνος ἐπεγράφετο.\textsuperscript{17}


(7) The suggested interpretation that Heracleia swears three times by Lychnos exactly because he is her Schutzgott, finds support in Asclepiades’ twin-epigram Χ: Νικὼ καὶ σεμνήν ὡμοσε Θεσσοφόρον. Here the hetaera Nico swears by Demeter Thesmophoros because the latter is the Schutzgöttin of wives in their marital life. In Syracuse, on the main day of the Thesmophoria women would prepare cakes in the form of ἑφηβαία γυναικεία, to be offered to Demeter and Persephone; in the entire Sicily these cakes are called μυλλοὶ = pudenda muliebria, says Heraclides of Syracuse.\textsuperscript{18} “Weil die Thesmophorienfeier sich aber mit den intimsten Dingen des Frauenlebens beschäftigt, ist dem männlichen Geschlecht die Teilnahme an ihrer Feier meist versagt.”\textsuperscript{19}

(8) The Lychnos of Aphrodite appears as personified and divinized. Similarly, the nuptial bed appears as personified in the belief of the lovers. Hera swears by her nuptial bed (Iliad 15.39 f.: ἵππω ... ποιέων λέχος αὐτῶν / κουρίδιον).\textsuperscript{20} And in Lucian’s Cataplus 27, Λύχνος and Κλίνη appear as the main witnesses against the tyrant Megapenthes. Plutarch (De garrul. 513 F) quotes, ὡ φιλτάτι χλίνη (C.A.F. III A Adesp. Fr. 151

\textsuperscript{16} Herwerden: πολλὰ πόιντα μὲλῆ P Pl.

\textsuperscript{17} Agathias, A.P. V. 263, shows an unmistakable influence of Musaeus: αἰτὶ σὺ (sc. λύχνε) φθονεῖς τῇ Κύπρῳ, καὶ γὰρ ὅθ’ Ἡρω / ἄμοισε Λειανόρρῳ ...

\textsuperscript{18} Apud Athenaeus XIV, 647 A: ἐκ σημάδου καὶ μέλιτος κατασκευάζεσθαι ἑφήβαια γυναικεῖα, ἀ καλείσθαι κατὰ πᾶσαν Σικελίαν μυλλοὺς καὶ προσφέρεσθαι ταῖς θεαις. On the background of this custom compare W. Burkert, Griechische Religion der archaischen und klassischen Epoche, Stuttgart, 1977, 368.

\textsuperscript{19} O. Kern, RE IV. 2750.64.

\textsuperscript{20} Compare R. Hirzel, Der Eid, Leipzig, 1902, 13 and 22.

(9) Finally, a voice of caution. The lamp of the lovers, linked with Aphrodite and thus divinized, should not be confused with other personified lamps. For example, there is a different reason for the personification of the prophetic lamp in the Λυχνομαντεία. Here belongs, among others, Argentarius’ Epigram XIV Gow-Page (= A.P. VI. 333): ἡδη, φιλτατε λύχνε, τρίς ἐπταρες: 21 ἡ τάχα ... προλέγεις; ... ἀναξ... Compare also Pap. Mag. Lond. 121.667 (I p. 105 Kenyon): λέγω τὸν λύχνον ἐπτάξις πρὸς τὸν λύχνον, dealing with an ἀγωγή ἀσχέτου (593). And again, there is a different reason for the vivification of the lamp in the Seelenglauben: apparently, the λύχνοι in Lucian’s Lychnopolis (Verae hist. I. 29), which walk, talk, and have names, are no other thing than our own ‘doubles’—‘Doppelgänger’ or ‘Seelenkerzen’ (‘the soul-candles’); compare: ἔνθα καὶ τὸν ἡμέτερον λύχνον ἐγνώρισα καὶ προσειπτών αὐτόν... 22

Finally, in the signalling lamp of Hero, Musaeus seems to offer a strange combination of the two types of Λύχνος mentioned above: (a) the Lychnos of Aphrodite and (b) the Lychnos as a ‘Seelenkerze’ of Leander himself. On (a) compare Hero et Leander (ed. P. Orsini) 1 Eipé, θεά, χρυσίων ἐπιμάρτυρα λύχνοι ἑρώτων; 6 λύχνοι ἀπαγγέλλοντα διακηρύγιν Ἀφροδίτης; 8 λύχνων, ἔρωτος ἀγαλμα; 239-41:

΄Ἡρώ λύχνοι ἐφαινεν ἀναπτομένου δε λύχνου, θυμόν Ἐρως ἐφλεξεν ἐπεισοδομένου Λεάνδρου·

λύχνω καιομένω συνεκαίτο.

On (b) compare perhaps 14 f.: μίαν συνάειδε τελευτῆν / λύχνου σβεννυμένου καὶ ὀλυμμένου Λεάνδρου; 217 f. and 329 f.:

μὴ μίν ἀποσβέσσωι, καὶ αὐτίκα θυμόν ὀλέσω, λύχνων, ἐμοῦ βιότοιο φαεσφόρον ἠγεμονῆα.

καὶ δὴ λύχνων ἀπίστοια ἀπέσβησε πικρὸς ἀίτης, καὶ ψυχῆν καὶ ἔρωτα πολυτλήτου Λεάνδρου. 23

21 Compare Gow-Page ad v. 1365 (II, p. 173); Gow ad Theocrit. 7.96.
HERMOCLES' ITHYPHALLUS FOR DEMETRIUS

The hymn of Hermocles of Cyzicus in honor of the divinized Demetrius Poliorcetes, sung by a chorus on the occasion of the king's last visit to Athens (in 291 or 290 B.C.), deserves a fresh look for at least three reasons. First, the Ithyphallus is one of the most eloquent documents for the Hellenistic ruler-cult ("Herrscherkult"), rich in content. Second, Hermocles is a prize-winning poet of paeans in honor of Antigonus and Demetrius (at least since 307 B.C.: Athenaeus 697 A), and his Ithyphallus seems to have enjoyed wide popularity (cf. Athenaeus 253 F: the Athenians had sung the hymn οὐ δημοσία μόνον, ἄλλα καὶ κατ' οἰκίαιν). Third, in his effort to substantiate the worship of a personal ruler, Hermocles seems to borrow arguments both from the old Heraclitus and from the contemporary Epicurus.

The hymn displays a bipartite structure. Aretalogy of the God-King, in his Athenian Parousia (lines 2; 8; 18), comprises the first half of the poem (lines 1-19). Prayer to the new Savior for help against the Aetolian threat fills its second half (lines 20-34). In this article, I shall limit myself to offering a critical text of the hymn (preserved in Athenaeus 253 D-F), followed by a brief commentary on the key-ideas only.¹


HERMOCLES’ ITHYPHALLUS FOR DEMETRIUS

Text

‘Ο μὲν οὖν Δημοκράτης τοσαύτα εἴρηκε περὶ τῆς Ἀθηναίων κολαχείας. Δοῦρις δ’ ὁ Σάμιος ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ καὶ εἰκοστῇ τῶν Ἰστοριῶν καὶ αὐτὸν τὸν ἱθύφαλλον

***

x - O - x - O - x - O -
- O - O - O -

ός οἱ μέγιστοι τῶν θεῶν καὶ φίλτατοι
tῇ πόλει πάρεισιν:
ἐνταῦθα ἡ γὰρ Δήμητρα καὶ Ἰθυφάλλων
ἑκατέριαν ἀμαρηγὴν ὁ καιρὸς.

5 Χή μὲν τὰ σεμνὰ τῆς Κόρης μυστήρια
ἐρχεθ’ ἵνα ποῆσῃ,
ὁ δ’ ἱλαρός, ὡσπερ τὸν θεόν δεῖ, καὶ καλὸς καὶ γελῶν πάρεστι.
Σεμνὸν τι φαίνεθ’, οἱ φίλοι πάντες χύκλω, ἐν μέσοις δ’ αὐτῶς,
ὁμοίον ὡσπερ οἱ φίλοι μὲν ἀστέρες,
ζήλος δ’ ἐκεῖνος.

*Ω τοῦ κρατίστου παῖ Ποσειδώνος θεοῦ,
χαίρε, καφροδίτης.

15 “Ἀλλοι μὲν ἡ μαχράν γὰρ ἀπέχουσιν θεοῖ,
ἡ οὐκ ἔχουσιν ὡτα,
ἡ οὖς εἰσίν, ἡ οὖς προσέχουσιν ἣμιν οὐδὲ ἐν,
σὲ δ’ παρόνθ’ ὀρῶμεν,
οὐ ξύλινον οὐδὲ λίθινον, ἀλλ’ ἀληθινόν.

20 Εὐχόμεσθα δὴ σοι:
πρῶτον μὲν εἰρήνην πόησον, φιλτατε:
χύριος γὰρ εἶ σοῦ.
Τὴν δ’ οὐχὶ Θήβας, ἀλλ’ ὠλὴν τὴν Ἐλλάδα
Σφίγγα περιπατοῦσαν,

25 Ἀἰτωλόν, ὡστὶς ἐπὶ πέτρας καθήμενος,
ὕστερ καὶ παλαιάδιν,
τὰ σύμμαθ’ ἡμῶν πάντ’ ἀναρπάζας φέρει,
χουξ ἔχω μάχεσθαι
(Ἀἰτωλικὸν γὰρ ἄρπάσαι τὰ τῶν πέλας,

30 νῦν δὲ καὶ τὰ πόρρω,
μάλιστα μὲν δὴ κόλασον αὐτός· εἰ δὲ μὴ,
Οἰδίπουν τιν' εὑρέ,
τὴν Σφίγγα ταῦτην ὅστις ἡ καταχρημνεῖ
ἡ σπίλον ποίησι.

Testimonia: Athen. XV, 697 A: 'Επ' Ἀντιγόνῳ δὲ καὶ Δημητρίῳ φησὶ Φιλόχορος Ἀθηναίοι
ἀδειν παῖνας τοὺς πεποιημένους ὑπὸ Ἐρμοκλέους (Schweighaeuser: Ἐρμύππου ΑΚΕ) τοῦ
Κύζικηνο, ἐφαμάλλων γενομένων τῶν παῖνας ποιημάτων (πάντων e.g. Kaibel), καὶ τοῦ Ἐρ
μοκλέους προκρίθεντος. Athen. VI, 253 B-D: Φησὶ γοῦν ὁ Δημοχάρης ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ καὶ εἰκοστῇ
γράφῳ: ἐπανελθόντα δὲ τὸν Δημητρίου ἀπὸ τῆς Λευκάδος καὶ Κερκύρας εἰς τὰς Ἀθηναίας ο
Ἀθηναίοι ἐδέχοντο σὺ μόνον θυμωνίας καὶ στεφανοῦντες καὶ οἰκονομοῖντες, ἀλλὰ καὶ προσωδιακὸ
(Bernhardy: προσοδία καὶ ΑΚ) χοροὶ καὶ ἴθυφαλλοί μετ' ὀρχήσεωσ καὶ φθοῆς ἀπήτων αὐτῶν, κα
ἐφιστάμενοι κατὰ τοὺς ὀχλοὺς ἱδον ὀρχοῦμενοι καὶ ἐπάδοντες ὡς εἰ θύμων θεὸς ἀληθινός, οἱ δ
ἄλλοι (ἡ additi) καθεύδουσιν ἡ ἀποθησοῦσιν, ἡ οὐκ εἰσὶν γεγονὼς δ' εἰ ξὸ Ποσειδύνως κα
Ἀφροδίτης, τῷ δὲ κάλλει διάφορος καὶ τῇ πρὸς πάντας φιλανθρωπία κουφοῦς. Δεόμενοι δ' αὐτο
ἰκέτευον, φησὶ, καὶ προσυφόντο.

Apparatus criticus: Duo versus excidisse vidit Bergk (e.g.: Ἀνάγγειλε πάντες, ἀνάγγει
eὐρυχωρίαν / τοῖς θεοῖς ποιείτε) // 3 γάρ Δήμητρα καὶ suppl. Toup / Δημήτριον Casaubon
Δημήτριος Α // 4 παρὴ Πorson, παρῆ Η.Ρ. Richards: παρῆ Α: παρεῖν R. Renehai
αὐτός Α : αὐτός Α // 15 δμου Μeineke : δμου Α // 21 μέν Α : μέ Α // 23 Θήβας, ἀλλ' ἕλη
tὴν Ἐλλάδα scripsi : Θήβαν, ἀλλ' ἔλη τῆς Ἐλλάδος Α, omnes // 24 περιπταύσιν ΑΚ
περιπταύσιαν ΑΚ, omnium consensu // 25 Αἰτωλὸν scripsi (cf. 3 Δημήτριος Α, 1
dμου Α) : Αἰτωλὸς Α : Αἰτωλίδ Α // 26 πάλαι ΑΚ, corr. Casaubon // 31 κόλασον Toup
σχάλασον AC, def. Jacoby // 34 σπίλον Meineke, Bergk : σπείνον Α : σπεῖν C : σπίνο

Commentary

1-4: The Parousia of the great goddess Demeter and the king
Demetrius, who bears her name, is emphasized by the repetition of the
verb πάρειμι (in lines 2, 8, and 18, expressing the idea of
praesens divus, Horace Carm. 3.5.2), in addition to the alliteration of the sounds π/φ in
lines 1-2, 9, 13 and 21.

In v. 4, Porson’s emendation of ΠΑΡΗΝ into ΠΑΡΗΝ’ is convincing
enough. It is an imperfect standing for an aorist (Kühner-Gerth,
Satzlehre I, 143 f.). Richards’ παρῆχ’, adopted by Powell (‘‘cum perfectum
locus postulet’’), is palaeographically less likely. As for Renehan’s παρεῖν’,
it is not likely to me because the elision of the infinitive-ending -αι is
difficult to parallel (at Theognis 104, most probably we should read
μεταδοῦν, and at Phoenix 2.20 [p. 234 Powell]—δοῦν).

There is an inveeterate—and, in my opinion, wrong—interpretation of
the couple mentioned in line 3—(Δήμητρα καί) Δημητρίου—as referring
to Demetrius and his fourth wife Lanassa (the ex-wife of Pyrrhus), whom
he had just married. The interpretation of a visit to Athens by Demetrius
and Lanassa seems to go back to A.J. Reinach (1911),² and was accepted by W.W. Tarn (1913), who wrote: "Demetrios returned to Athens in the summer of 290; he probably brought Lanassa with him. It appears that she desired to be initiated into the Eleusinian mysteries; and the two made a state entry into Athens as the divine pair Demeter and Demetrios."³ K. Scott (1928) too defended Reinach's interpretation.⁴ More recently, it was adopted by A.-J. Festugière (1946) ("When in September 290 Demetrius Poliorcetes and his new wife Lanassa made their solemn entry into Athens as gods made manifest (Demetrius and Demeter), the city instituted a contest of paeans in honor of the divine couple"),⁵ by C. Wehrli (1968),⁶ A. Mastrocinque (1979)⁷ and others.

Against this widespread interpretation of Demeter as Lanassa it suffices to say the following. First, the Parousia of Demeter is sufficiently explained by the celebration of the Eleusinian mysteries in lines 5-6. Second, the link between Demetrius and his patroness Demeter is well established by the Athenian decree of 294 B.C. (the present visit is taking place in 291 or 290 B.C.). It reads: "Whenever Demetrius visits the city he shall be received with the honors usually paid to either Demeter or Dionysus" (Plutarch Demetrius 12.1: δέχεσθαι Δημήτριον, ὀσάκις ἃν ἀφίκηται, τοῖς Δήμητρος καὶ Διονύσου ξενισμοῖς).⁸ Finally, the contemporary historian Demochares (apud Athen. VI, 253 B, quoted above, in Testimonia) implies that Demetrius, after his wedding with Lanassa on the island of Corcyra, returned to Athens alone.

5-8: The presence of Demeter in the hymn was necessary for the poet to stress the idea that the goddess is Demetrius' patroness, no more. Accordingly, since the hymn is dedicated to Demetrius alone, the goddess is too quickly being sent away to Eleusis (lines 5-6). It is true that the word σεμνά (5) recurs in line 9 as an adverb (σεμνών τι), but the reason for this repetition is not to provide an additional link between Demetrius and Demeter, but rather to express two different ideas. (1) As is known, the mysteries of Demeter are holy (Hymn to Demeter 478 and N.J. Richardson ad locum). (2) In his turn, Demetrius displays a majestic radiance of the

---

² "Étolie," Journal internat. d'archéologie et numismatique (1911) 221 f.
⁴ A.J.P. 49 (1928) 232 f. ("with great probability").
⁶ O.c. (note 1) 177 f.
⁷ O.c. (note 1) 80 f. So also Kertész, Oikumene 2 (1978) 169.
⁸ F. Jacoby, in his Commentary on FGrH 328: F 166 (p. 542 f.); W.S. Ferguson, "Demetrius Poliorcetes and the Hellenic League," Hesperia 17 (1948) 131 n. 43; Habicht, o.c. (note 1) 50 ff.
gods among his retinue, just as does the sun-god amidst the stars (lines 9-12).

In lines 7-8, Demetrius shows the cheerfulness, beauty and smile of a friendly god made manifest, full of the divine grace. These traits were well pointed out by Cerfaux and Tondriaus, and need no further comment. However, I do not share the opinion expressed, for example, by Scott, Ehrenberg and Cerfaux-Tondriaus, that the expression of line 7, ὡς περ τὸν θεὸν δεῖ, refers to the god Dionysus (supposedly mentioned in the lost two lines at the beginning of the poem). For I understand the phrase to mean, “as it is meet for a god,” and to refer to the new god Demetrius, son of Poseidon and Aphrodite, alone. Finally, let me mention that Demochares (Testimonia) was wrong when paraphrasing lines 7-8 of the poem as follows: τῷ δὲ κάλλει διάφορος καὶ τῇ πρὸς πάντας φιλανθρωπίᾳ κοινός. For his κοινός is due to the misinterpretation of 7 ἱλαρός, taken for ἱλειώς, “gracious.”

9-12: The majestic radiance (σεμνότης) of the divinized Demetrius, who appears shining in the middle of his friends just as does the sun amidst the stars, is much more than a simple poetic simile. The pretension of Demetrius to be treated as a roi soleil is attested by his fondness of wearing a cosmic cloak, with the universe, the stars and the twelve signs of the Zodiac being woven in it (Duris apud Athen. XIII, 535 F; Plutarch Dem. 41.6), as Weinreich, Scott, and Cerfaux-Tondriaus have pointed out.13

13-14: Demetrius is being greeted by the Athenians as the son of Poseidon and Aphrodite. “Everyone knew of Demetrius as the master of the seas as well as the frequent conqueror on the battlefield of love,” remarks Ehrenberg. Indeed, Poseidon as Demetrius’ Schutzgott appears often on his coins, since the famous tetradrachm of Salamis on Cyprus (306 B.C.), commemorating the king’s naval victory there and displaying Poseidon on its reverse.15

9 O.c. (note 1) 183 and n. 4.
10 Scott, o.c., 233; Ehrenberg, o.c., 290 f. ( = 190 f.); Cerfaux-Tondriaus, o.c., 184 n. 1.
11 Compare, e.g., “the majestic effulgence of kings” (τὸ ἁπαύγασμα τῶν βασιλέων τὸ γαύρον), standing upon the Daughter of Light in Acta Thomae 6.—Infra, p. 157.
12 Duris 76 F 14 Jacoby: αἱ δὲ χλαμύδες αὐτοῦ ἦσαν ὄρφην καὶ ἐφοσύνησε τὸ φέγγος τής χρόνιας, τὸ δὲ πάν ἐνύφαυλον χρυσοῦς ἀτέρας ἔχον καὶ τὰ δώδεκα ζώδια. Plutarch Dem. 41.6: ἦν δὲ τις ὑπειραμενὲς χλανίς αὐτῷ πολὺν χρόνον, ἐγρον ὑπερήφανον, εἰκάσμα τοῦ κόσμου καὶ τῶν κατ' οὐρανον φανομένων. Compare E. Manni, Plut. Dem., Florence, 1953 (Bibl. di Studi Sup., 19); Taeger, o.c., I, 278 n. 151.
13 Weinreich 647; Scott 236 f.; Cerfaux-Tondriaus 184 and nn. 2-4.
14 O.c., 286 ( = 185).
However, while Ehrenberg (in 1931) and Wehrli (in 1968) are convincing enough in establishing a solid link between Demetrius and his patron Poseidon on the ground of rich numismatic evidence,\textsuperscript{16} the fact that Demetrius had enjoyed special favors of Aphrodite—as is reflected, for example, in his five "legitimate" marriages—is less convincing to me as an explanation of the greeting, "son of Aphrodite," in our hymn.\textsuperscript{17} Maybe Hermocles called Demetrius a son of Aphrodite because of his "marvelous and exceptional beauty, so that no sculptor or painter ever achieved a likeness of him" (Plutarch Dem. 2.2: ἴδεξ δὲ καὶ κάλλει προσώπου θαυμαστός καὶ περιττός, ὡστε τῶν πλαττόντων καὶ γραφόντων μηθένα τῆς ὁμοιότητος ἐφικέσθαι)\textsuperscript{18}

15-18: "For other gods are either far away, or lend no ear, or are not, or care nothing about us: but thee we can see in very presence..." This is the kernel of the poem, a cri d’esprit of the poet (and may be of the epoch as well). What is the source of Hermocles’ inspiration? Three possibilities come to mind—Critias, Plato, Epicurus (mentioned in chronological order).

In his play Sisyphus\textsuperscript{19} Critias calls "the sweetest lie" (25 f.) the people’s idea that the gods have eyes and ears, and pay attention to what men say or do (17-21):

\[ \text{ὡς ἔστι δαίμων ἀφθίτως θάλλων βίω} \]
\[ \text{νόω τ’ ἀκούων καὶ βλέπων, φρονῶν τε καὶ} \]
\[ \text{προσέχων τε τάυτα καὶ φύσιν θείαν φορῶν,} \]
\[ \text{δ’ πάν τὸ λεχθὲν ἐν βροτοῖς ἂνοῦ (<σ>εται,} \]
\[ \text{〈τὸ〉 δρώμενον δὲ πάν ἰδεῖν δυνηστεῖ.} \]

Critias may have been a source of Hermocles. Still, the idea that "the gods are far away from men" is absent in Critias, who expressly says that the gods are believed to live in the heaven as part of this cosmos (31 Ἡ ὑπερθεὶς περιφορά).

Wolfgang Haase has recently suggested\textsuperscript{20} the trilemma of Plato’s Laws X as a probable source of inspiration for Hermocles. As is known, the trilemma reads: Either the gods do not exist, or they exist but care not for

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{16} Cf. Newell (note 15) apud Ehrenberg, Plate III, a-c; Wehrli, o.c. (note 1), pp. 226, 229 f., and Plates V, X, XVI.
  \item \textsuperscript{17} The five "legitimate" wives of Demetrius are: Phila, Eurydice of Athens, Deidameia, Lanassa, and Ptolemais.
  \item \textsuperscript{18} Demetrius’ exceptional beauty finds its confirmation in the iconography: see E. Mann ad Plut. Dem. 2.2, and especially Wehrli, pp. 223-230, and Plates IX-XVI (a rich collection).
  \item \textsuperscript{19} TrGF I, Göttingen, 1971, 43 F 19 Snell = 88 B 25 Diels-Kranz.
  \item \textsuperscript{20} In a public lecture on "Gods—Men—Godmen," delivered at the University of Illinois at Urbana on 13 November 1985.
\end{itemize}
men, or else they may be won over by men (εὐπαραμύθητοι, παραιτητοί) with offerings and sacrifices.\(^{21}\) Again, the element, μαχραν ἀπέχουσιν οἱ θεοί, of the hymn is absent in Plato as well.

That leaves us with Epicurus’ contemporary theology as the most likely source of Hermocles’ criticism of the traditional gods. As is known, the foundation of Epicurus’ Κήτος coincides with Demetrius’ first visit to Athens (in 307/6 B.C.), so that the Epicurean theology must have been known enough in Athens sixteen years later (in 291/0 B.C.).

Otto Weinreich (1926) seems to be the first scholar to see in the statement of the hymn, οὐ προσέχουσιν ἐμὲ οἷς ἐν (17), an echo of Epicurus’ theology: “oder die Götter kümmern sich nicht um uns, wie Epikur lehrt” (p. 647). M.P. Nilsson accepted it,\(^{22}\) while L. Alfonsi (1963) extended the Epicurean influence to include the words μαχραν ἀπέχουσιν (15) as well. He wrote: “Colpisce πάντα il chiaro contenuto epicureo dell’inno: che si parla di dei lontani (e si rammentino μεταξόσμια, gli intermundia in cui secondo Epicuro vivono appunto gli dei!!), di dei che non si occupano delle vicende umane (eos non curare opinor quid agat humanum genus, come si esprimeva Ennio facendo parlare Telamone) ...”\(^{23}\)

Apparently, scholars were not impressed by Weinreich’s suggestion of an Epicurean influence upon Hermocles’ hymn (at least, Festugière, Dodds and Cerf-Tondrau are noncommittal), while Ehrenberg (1931) and Taeger (1957) advanced the idea of die Popularphilosophie as the most likely source for Hermocles’ rejection of the traditional gods. And this seems to be the prevailing sentiment today. Ehrenberg wrote:\(^{24}\)

> It is therefore quite possible that among other views his [sc. Epicurus’] were also alluded to in our song, though it seems more likely that we have here rather a confirmation that Epicurus’ philosophy had much in common with popular ideas. At that time quite frequently we find the view expressed that

---


\(^{24}\) *Aspects of the ancient world*, 188.
the gods neither see nor hear, and that they do not take the slightest interest in the affairs of mankind.

In his turn, Taeger wrote: 25

Ganze Reihen, Vers 15ff., erinnern Wort für Wort an die Popularphilosophie der aufklärerischen Observanz und können mit zahllosen Parallelen vor allem aus Euripides und später etwa aus den jüdischen und christlichen Polemiken belegt werden. Hier spricht trockenste und abgegriffenste Schulweisheit, die jedes echte religiöse Gefühl erstickt.

I shall argue, however, that Hermocles implies three (not four) possibilities, and that their combination is best explained as referring to the theology of Epicurus. First, the expression, ἄλλοι μαχρὰν ἀπέχουσιν θεοὶ, means, “the traditional gods live very far from us.” It does not refer to a temporary absence of the gods from Olympus, as Weinreich and Ehrenberg took it to mean. Weinreich wrote (p. 647): “Eine faule Sache mit den Olympiern! Wenn man sie braucht, sind sie fort—bei den Äthiopern oder sonstwo.” Similarly Ehrenberg (p. 188): “Perhaps the gods are too far away—among distant peoples such as the Ethiopians or Hyperboreans.” For when the Olympians are paying a visit to Oceanus and the Ethiopians, sure thing they will be back to Olympus on the twelfth day (Iliad 1.423-25).

It is true that Demochares (Testimonia) had understood Hermocles exactly as Weinreich did, when paraphrasing our lines as follows: οἱ δ’ ἄλλοι (ἤ) καθεύδουσιν, ἡ ἀποθημοῦσιν, η οὐχ εἰσίν. But how is he to be trusted when he renders the clause, οὐχ ἔχουσιν ὡτα, with καθεύδουσιν? My point is this: the other three verbs—οὐχ ἔχουσιν ὡτα, οὐχ εἰσίν, and οὐ προσέχουσιν ἡμῖν—express permanent behavior or properties of the gods; accordingly, the most likely sense of the clause, μαχρὰν ἀπέχουσιν θεοὶ, is “the gods live far from us,” not, “the gods use to travel far away from us.”

The second member, οὐχ ἔχουσιν ὡτα, means, of course, “the gods do not lend ear,” not, “the gods have no ears.” For Hermocles is very far from speaking of non-anthropomorphic gods, say, in the shape of a globe. Consequently, the expression means that the traditional gods are not ἐπήχουσι, as Weinreich had correctly pointed out (“Oder sie haben keine Ohren—sie sind nicht ἐπήχουσι”). 26 And if the gods are not giving ear to the men’s prayers and needs, it follows that they simply do not care about us at all. Accordingly, the phrase, οὐχ ἔχουσιν ὡτα, says much the same as the more common formula, οὐ προσέχουσιν ἡμῖν οὐδὲ ἐν.

25 Charisma I, 272 f.
We now come to the third and crucial member, οὐχ εἰσίν. In my opinion, it is not a strict philosophical atheistic statement (unlike that in Plato’s Laws X), meaning, ‘‘the gods do not exist.’’ For being sandwiched between the clauses, οὐχ ἔχουσιν ὡτα and οὐ προσέχουσιν ήμιν (‘‘the gods lend no ear or care nothing about us’’), our expression should be understood as an idea exactly opposite to (18), σὲ δὲ παρόνθ’ ὄρωμεν, ‘‘but thee we can see in very presence.’’ In other words, Hermocles wants to say the following: ‘‘Since other gods live far away from the mankind, lend no ear and care nothing about us, then for us it is the same as if they did not exist.’’ This fine semantic nuance was correctly perceived by Nilsson, who commented: ‘‘der Unterschied zwischen der epikureischen Lehre, die der Ithyphallikos vorträgt, und dem οὐχ εἰσίν, war für das allgemeine Verständnis nicht zu gross.’’

In conclusion, the Epicurean gods live too far away from the mankind, in the intermundia or the spaces between the countless cosmic systems (μετασχίσμον = τὸ μεταξύ κόσμων διάστημα, Diog. Laert. 10.89), a fact that seems to be expressed by the words, μαχρὰν ἀπέχουσιν θεοί. Moreover, they enjoy their peace and happiness there (according to Philodemus, they eat, drink, and converse), and certainly they do not concern themselves with human affairs, a doctrine alluded to in the phrases, οὐχ ἔχουσιν ὡτα and οὐ προσέχουσιν ήμιν οὐδὲ ἐν. It follows that the Epicurean gods are of no use to us, the same as if they did not exist at all (= οὐχ εἰσίν, 17). Compare the similarity of argument with Tertullian’s Apologeticum 47.6: Epicurei [sc. deum adseverant] otiosum et in exercitum et, ut ita dixerim, neminem humanis rebus. If the suggestion that all three members of lines 15-17 refer to Epicurus alone is correct, then we may have in Hermocles’ hymn the earliest extant criticism of Epicurus’ novel theology. I shall quote here three later sharp criticisms of this theology. Cicero N.D. 1.116 (Cotta refuting Velleius’ advocacy of Epicurus’ theology): Quae porro pietas ei debetur, a quo nihil acceperis?... qui [sc. the Epicurean gods] quam ob rem colendi sint, non intellecto, nullo nec accepto ab his nec sperato bono. Seneca De beneficiis 4.1.1: Ita-

28 Cicero N.D. 1.18 (and A.S. Pease ad loc.); De Fin. 2.75; De Div. 2.40; Lucret. 3.18-24; 5.146-155; Hippolyt. Refutatio 1.22.3; Philodem. De Dis III, col. 8.31 (p. 27 Diels: Abhandlungen Akademie Berlin 1917, 4).
29 Philodem. De Dis III, Fr. 77 (p. 67 Diels), and col. 13.36-39 (p. 36 f. Diels).
31 Epicurea, No. 363.
que non dat deus beneficia, sed securus et neglegens nostri, aversus a mundo aliud agit aut, quae maxima Epicuro felicitas videtur, nihil agit, nec magis illum beneficia quam injuriae tangunt. Hoc qui dicit, non exaudit precanium voce."  
Atticus apud Eusebium, *Praep. Ev.* 15.5.11: 'Exeino δ' ἐμοὶ κριτῇ καὶ αἰσχυντηλότερον ὡς Ἐπίκουρος δοξεῖ πεποιηκέναι ὥσπερ γὰρ ἄπογνος δύνασθαι τοὺς θεοὺς ἀποσχέσθαι τῆς ἀνθρώπων κηδεμονίας τῆς ταύτην ἠλθόντας αὐτοῖς, καθάπερ εἰς ἀλλοδαπῆν ἀπώκισε καὶ ἔξω ποὺ τοῦ κόσμου καθίσσε, τὸ ἀπάνθρωπον αὐτῶν τῇ ἀποστάσει καὶ τῇ πρὸς ἀπαντ' ἄκουνων παραπτούμενος.

19: "Nor can the dead statues of an absent god replace a living god, present and ready to help, just as you are now (= σὲ δὲ παρόνθ' ὀρῶμεν)." The pun, οὐ λίθων, ᾧ' ἀληθῶν, is eloquent enough and serves as a slogan in this *programmatic* poem. I think the most likely source of inspiration for Hermocles here was Heraclitus' famous criticism of the traditional religion, Fr. 5 DK (= 86 Marcovich): Καὶ τοὺς ἄγαλμας δὲ τουτεσσεῖν εὑρονται, ὅκιοι εἰ τις τοὺς δόμοις λεσχηνεύοιτο, οῦ τι γινώσκων θεοὺς οὐδ' ἡρωας, οὔτεινε εἰσιν. "And they [sc. the common people] pray to these statues, as if some one were to talk to houses, not knowing anything about the true nature of gods and heroes." This saying of the Enlightener was extremely popular and influential in antiquity. One example. The anonymous author of the Fourth Pseudo-Heraclitean Letter comes close enough to Hermocles' pointed paronomasia, οὐ λίθων, ᾧ' ἀληθῶν, when asking (p. 315.13 Tarán; p. 58.13 Attridge): "Ἀνθρωπος λοιδοριαν ποιεται, λιθωνος ει λεγοτο. θεος δε αληθευεται, ο (Bywater: ως codd.) τουτο το ευωνυμον 'εξ χρημων γενναται' (ἀνατίθεται addidi e.g.); Ἀπαιδευτοι, ουκ ιστε οτι ουκ εστι θεος χειροκιμητος (Westermann: χειροκιμητος codd.), ουδε εξ αρχης βασιν εχει...; In view of this passage, the possibility that Hermocles' attack on the statues of the gods derives from the early Cynicism cannot be ruled out, but I do not have evidence for such a one.

---

32 Idem, No. 364.
33 Idem, No. 362. Fr. 3 des Places.
34 The evidence is to be found in M. Marcovich, *Eraclito: Frammenti*, Florence, 1978 (Bibl. di Studi Sup., 64), ad Fr. 86.

The most eloquent examples of this criticism come from the first and second centuries A.D. For example, Plutarch *De Superstitione* 167 D: Είτα χαλκοτύποις μὲν πείθονται καὶ λιθοζύλοις καὶ κηροπλάσταις ἀνθρωπόμορφα τῶν θεῶν τὰ εἰδὴ ποιοῦσι, καὶ τοιαύτα πλάττουσι καὶ
23-24: In line 24, I keep the transmitted Ἱτυφάλλος while converting the genitives in line 23 into accusatives. Casaubon’s emendation, Ἱτυφάλες (adopted by all editors), is not likely to me for the following reasons. (1) A scribal error Π for ΚΠ seems to be less likely than the common misreading of supralinear abbreviations (in line 23). What is more important, (2) if we read with Casaubon Ἱτυφάλες it would mean that the Aetolian League had under its control the entire Greece; compare Ehrenberg’s translation (p. 179): “Punish the Sphinx that rules, not only over Thebes but over all Greece.” This would be, however, historically untrue, for around 291 or 290 B.C. the Aetolian League had extended its control to Delphi, but no farther (compare Plutarch Dem. 40.7-8). (3) On the contrary, the transmitted Ἱτυφάλος means that the Aetolians were crossing and recrossing the Hellenic lands in their plundering forays and pillages, but no more. (4) The suggested interpretation seems to find its confirmation in lines 29-30, Αἴτωλικῶν γὰρ ἄρπάσαι τὰ τῶν πέλας, καὶ καὶ τὰ πόρρω. (5) Finally, the transmitted reading is more appropriate to the traditional image of the Sphinx. She is envisaged as a winged λιονίς with the human face, as such a savage predator traversing vast fields (compare Hygin. Fab. 67.4: Sphinx..., quae agros Thebanorum vexabat). Aeschylus (Septem 776) calls her ἡ ἄρπαξάδρα Κήρ, which matches our line 27, τά σώμαθ᾽ ἡμῶν πάντ᾽ ἀναρπάσας φέρει.

κατασκευάσωσι καὶ προσκυνούσι, φιλοσόφων δὲ καὶ πολιτικῶν ἀνδρῶν καταφρονοῦσιν, ἀποδεικνύοντω τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ σεμνότητα μετὰ χριστιότητος καὶ μεγαλοροσύνης καὶ εὐμενείας καὶ κρησμονίας. The Cynic Oenomaus of Gadara apud Euseb. Praep. Ev. 5.36: οὐκ ἀθάνατοι, ἀλλὰ λίθινοι καὶ ἱλιονίν δεσπόται ἀνθρώπων (sc. οἱ θεοί). Athenagoras Legatio pro Christianis 4.1; 15.1: Ἐπεὶ οἱ πολλοὶ... προσάσαι τοῖς ἄπο τῆς ὕλης εἰδώλωις, δὲ ἐκεῖνος καὶ ἡμεῖς (sc. οἱ Χριστιανοὶ)... προσελευμέθεα καὶ προσκυνήσωμεν τὰ ἀγάλματα; 15.3; 15.7: Γῇ ταύτα καὶ λίθοι καὶ ὕλη καὶ περίεργος τέχνης; 26.5.6.

L. Alfonso (Rhein. Mus. 106 [1963] 162), however, seems to imply that line 19 of our hymn too was inspired by the Epicurean theology when writing: “di dei ..., nè lignei nè di pietra, come saranno accusati di essere appunto gli dei pagani dagli apologisti del Cristianesimo primitivo, che recorrevano per questa parte abbondantemente a motivi, a τόποι epicurei. È quell’ antitesi λίθινον—ἄλθινον, a parte il ricercato effetto paronomastico, ritorna appunto in testi cristiani.” This reasoning does not seem sound to me. A criticism of the traditional statues of gods cannot be traced to Epicurus himself, but only to Cynicism (and maybe Stoia). It is true that much of the polemics of the early Apologists may go back to Apollodorus, De Dis, to the Epicureans, and notably to Philodemus, De Pietate. But the content of this polemics is mythological: compare, e.g., A. Henrichs’ stemma in his study “Philodemus’ De Pietate’ als mythographische Quelle,” Cronache Ercolanesi 5 (1975) 7. On the other hand, the criticism of the statues of gods came to the Christian writers probably from Cynic (and Stoic) sources.

37 Compare G. Klaffenbach, in IG IX.1.1 (1932), p. XV f. (Fasti Aetolici, B.C. 290); Wehrli, o.c., 177-179.

38 Compare W.H. Roscher, Lexikon, IV, 1366 (further literature is not needed here).
Incidentally, in the last line of the hymn Meineke's σπίλον seems to be the most likely reading. Hermocles prays Demetrius either to throw the Aetolian Sphinx down the precipice into the sea or to turn her into a rock or stone (just as is the famous Sphinx from Egypt, or any other stone-sphinx throughout the Hellenic lands). Now, σπίλος seems to resume the image of the mountaineer Aetolian, "who sits on the top of a rock, just as the traditional Sphinx used to do" (25 f.: Αἰτωλόν, δόστίς ἐπί πέτρας καθήμενος, Ὄσπερ ἡ παλαι(ά), ...
The mourning Demeter at Eleusis is persuaded to laugh, break her fast, and drink the *cyceon* either by the ritual jesting and jeering (*αλσχρολογία, σκώμματα, τωθασμός*) on the part of Iambe, or by the equally ritual *indecent exposure* (*ἀνάσυρμα, ἀνασυρμός*) on the part of Baubo. The main source for the former is the Homeric Hymn to Demeter 202-204, and for the latter—Orphic Fr. 52 Kern. The *anasyrma* of Baubo is preserved in two main sources: Clement, *Protr.* 20.1-21.1, and Arnobius, *Adv. nat.* 5.25-26. Now, in support of his statement that Baubo *ἀναστέλλεται τὰ αἴδοια καὶ ἀποδεικνύει τῇ θεῷ*, Clement quotes an Orphic hymn consisting of five hexameters. Its text, in Stählin’s edition, reads as follows (Kern follows Stählin’s text):


Some one hundred years later (ca. A.D. 300), Arnobius translated Clement’s text into Latin with some rhetorical embellishments of his own *afriticās*. His text of the Orphic hymn, however, differs substantially from Clement’s version. It reads as follows:³

Sic effata simul vestem contraxit ab imo
obiecitque oculis formatas inguinibus res:
quas cava succutiens Baubo manu (nam puerilis
ollis vultus erat) plaudit, contrectat amice.

1 See the exhaustive discussion of the passage by N.J. Richardson, in his edition of *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, Oxford, 1974, 211-224.
3 The text of Arnobius is quoted from the second edition of C. Marchesi: *Arnobii Adv. nationes libri* VII (Corpus scriptorum Latinorum Paravianum), Turin, 1953.
5 Tum dea defigens augusti luminis orbes
tristitias animi paulum mollita reponit:
inde manu polum sumit risuque sequenti
perducit totum cyceonis laeta liquorem.

2 formatas inguinibus Sabaeus (1543) : formata sanguinibus P / 4 ollis P : olli Sabaeus / amice Gelenius (1546) : amicæ P / 7 polum Sabaeus : polum P / risuque Sabaeus : risu quem P

The relationship between Clement’s and Arnobius’ version of Baubo’s anasyrma is a quaestio vexata. Earlier scholarship is in Kern (ad Orphic Fr. 52, p. 129). The most recent discussion is by Fritz Graf (1974). He seems to reach a noncommittal non liquet conclusion (p. 199):

So hätten denn Clemens und Arnobius jeder nur eine Facette der schillern­den Verse des Orpheus hervorgehoben. Von Bedeutung ist jedoch, dass sich Arnobius viel enger an das orphische Vorbild zu halten scheint, dass er mehr weiss, als er den Worten des Clemens entnehmen konnte...

Baubo’s anasyrma in Clement and Arnobius deserves a closer look. In this paper, I shall argue the following points. (1) Clement’s text as transmitted is corrupt, but can be emended: there are seven scribal errors in five hexameters. (2) Arnobius translates Clement’s text into Latin, but he does not use the same text as Eusebius did: Arnobius’ copy of Clement offered a text altered by a redactor. (3) This redactor has misunderstood the sense of the word τύπος; in addition, he took ἥνεν for a copula, thus understanding in line 2, τύπος = παῖς. As a consequence, he altered Clement’s text in the second halves of lines 2 and 3, in order to eliminate the god Iacchus and make Baubo the sole subject of the sentence in line 3. (4) Finally, since Arnobius’ version is based on a distortion of Clement’s original text, its evidential value is null, leaving Clement as our only source. The relationship between Baubo’s anasyrma, the Eleusinian Mysteries and the Thesmophoria is beyond the scope of this paper.

(1) In my opinion, Clement’s text should read:

(1) In my opinion, Clement’s text should read:

rücksetzung - Fritz Graf, Eleusis und die orphische Dichtung Athens in vorhellenistischer Zeit (Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten, Band XXXIII), Berlin, de Gruyter, 1974, 194-199.

5 On the problem see Graf 169 n. 56, esp. 170 f.
Commentary

1. ἀνεσύρατο: Should be given preference over ἄνεσύρετο.6 First, it stands in Eusebius. Second, it is also to be found in Gregory of Nazianzus, who imitates the Orphic line as follows:

ὡς εἶποῦσα θεά δοιοὺς ἀνεσύρατο μηρούς.7

2. τὸπον: Is the correct reading here. First, ὁ τόπος means pudendum muliebre (LSJ, s.v., I. 3), the sense which is required here. Second, it is supported by Arnobius’ context (5.25): partem illam corporis, per quam secus feminineum et sobolem prodere et nomen solet adquirere gene(ricum...; regetis se ipsam (sc. Baubo) atque omnia illa pudoris loca revelatis monstrat inguinibus, where the words, omnia illa pudoris loca monstrat, correspond exactly to δείξε δὲ πάντα / σώματος οὐδὲ πρέποντα τὸπον. It seems likely that Arnobius had in his text of Clement both τὸπον and τὸπον (one of them being written either supra lineam or in margine). Now, Arnobius translates τὸπον as, omnia illa pudoris loca, and τὸπον—as, formatae inguinibus res (in his verse 2).

2. ἤκεν: Is the most suitable verb to go with Iacchus. Most probably, this is what the scribe Baanes wrote in A.D. 914, in the Arethas codex Parisinianus 451. Arethas then erased the κ to read η.εν. He did so probably after collating Baanes’ exemplar either with the text of Eusebius or with another manuscript of Clement, where stood η.εν.

3. ἡπτακχ’ ὅρεγων: For the transmitted ἡπτακχε γελῶν. First, there is no visible reason for the small boy Iacchus to laugh at Baubo’s indecent exposure. As an innocent Διόνυσος ἐπὶ τῷ μαστῷ, he is too young to understand the meaning of Baubo’s anasyrma. Naturally enough, he is interested only in the breasts of his nurse (3 κόλποι), not in her αἴδους γυναικεῖα. Second, while we do have a verb (ἡπτακχ’) to go with μῦν (i.e., Baubo), we badly need another verb to go with Βαυβοὺς ὑπὸ κόλπους. The participle ἥρεγων is the best candidate to yield the required sense: “while reaching with his other hand below Baubo’s breasts.” Χειρ’ ὅρεγων can be easily understood ἀπὸ κοινοῦ from the presence of χειρί in the same line. The scribal corruption seems to have developed as follows:

ΠΙΠΤΑΣΚΟΡεΓωΝ > ΠΙΠΤΑΣΚεΛεΓωΝ > ΠΙΠΤΑΣΚεΓεΛωΝ.8

Consequently, the situation described in lines 2-3 seems to be as follows. In the moment of Baubo’s anasyrma in front of Demeter, there

---

6 ἀνεσύρατο has been accepted by Claude Mondésert, Clément d’Alexandrie, Le Proléptique, 2nd edition in collaboration with André Plassart (Sources Chrétiennes, 2), Paris, 1949.
8 ἡπτακχε in this position of a hexameter: Iliad 23.827; Odyssey 8.37; 11.592.
appears (ἠεν) the small boy Iacchus. He is hungry. With his one hand he starts tossing Baubo’s skirt (τεπλοι) around, while with the other he tries to reach below her breasts (δρέγιν λαβως υπὸ κόλποις). The reason is clear enough: while Demeter is his mother, most probably Baubo is his nurse. For Demeter as the mother of Iacchus-Dionysus, compare the Oxford vase-fragment (IV century B.C.) showing a seated Demeter with the small boy Dionysus in her lap. As for the literary evidence, compare Lucretius 4.1168: at tumida et mammosa Ceres est ipsa ab Iaccho (Arnobius alludes to this verse in Adv. nat. 3.10); Diodor. 3.64.1; Schol. ad Aristid. 46, 213 (p. 648 Dindorf); Suda and Photius, s.v. "Ιαχχος. Διόνυσος ἐπὶ τῷ μαστῷ." As for Baubo as a probable nurse of Iacchus, compare Hesychius, s.v. Βαμβω. τιθήνη Δήμητρος. The change of κόλποις into κόλπους was suggested already by Daniel Heinsius.

4. ἡ δ’ ἐπεὶ οὖν μείνησε θεά, μείνησ’ ἐνι θυμῶ: The anaphora is pointless. Now, the second μείνησ’ must be kept in view of Odyssey 20.301, μείνησε δὲ θυμῶ / (contra Mullach’s change into γῆθησ’). Hermann’s change of the first μείνησε into ἐνόησε seems to be the correct reading. I think it is supported by both Clement and Arnobius. The former has (20.3): ἡ δὲ τέρπεται τῇ οὐ καὶ ἡ Δηώ... ἡθείσα τῷ θεάματι. And the latter offers (5.25): Atque pubi adfigit oculos diva et inauditi specie solaminis pascitur, plus Arnobius’ verse 5:

Tum dea defigens augusti luminis orbes.

(2) Enter a Redactor. He finds in Clement’s corrupt text of line 2: σώματος... τύπον: παίς δ’ ἥν "Ιαχχος. First, he takes τύπος to mean τὸ τετυπωμένον, i.e., “an image imprinted on Baubo’s body.” Second, he understands ἥν as a copula explaining this τύπος as a παίς. Accordingly, the redactor understood Clement’s text as follows: “The image on Baubo’s lower abdomen was the face of the boy Iacchus” (σώματος... τύπος = παίς "Ιαχχος).

As a consequence, since Iacchus no longer was a living being, able to move his hands, the redactor saw it necessary to eliminate Iacchus altogether from the text and make Baubo the only subject of the following line 3. This was achieved by such a deliberate alteration of Clement’s text in the second halves of lines 2 and 3 (the redactor’s alteration is printed supra lineam):


10 See, e.g., O. Kern in RE IX (1914) 621 f. (s.v. Iachchos); Graf, o.c., 198 et alibi.

11 Frag. Philos. Gr. 1, 175.

The redactor understood his text as follows: “Baubo pulled up her robes, and exposed the entire image on her body, not a decent one: it was the face of a small child, and Baubo started tossing him around with her hand, slapping him mildly out of love.” For our redactor this image was “not a decent one” probably because he had envisaged Baubo’s pudendum serving as the mouth of the face she had drawn on her lower abdomen. As for the expression, παῖς ἑρατός, compare Pindar O.10.99.

It is this phantastic altered text of Clement that Arnobius had in his hands, exploiting it with all his africitas. The sense of τύπος, “image of a face,” is present both in Arnobius’ verses 2-4 and in his context (5.25): formatas inguinibus res (2); nam puerilis / ollis (sc. formatis rebus) vultus erat (3 f.); et in speciem levigari (sc. Baubo’s pudendum) nondum duri atque hystriculi pusionis (5.25). And since the face of a small boy has no “mustache,” Arnobius’ Baubo had to engage in a novatio (5.35), she had to shave her pubic hair: longiore ab incuria liberat (sc. Baubo her pudendum), facit sumere habitum puriorem (5.25).

Next, the redactor’s παῖς νηπίαχος δ’ ἦν becomes in Arnobius, nam puerilis / ollis vultus erat (in lines 3-4 of the Hymn), and species... pusionis (in the context). Moreover, the redactor’s change of subject and object in line 3 (Baubo becomes the subject, and μν = παιδα the object) is adequately reflected in Arnobius’ translation: quas (sc. formatas res) cava succutien Baubo manu (line 3). The correction of a long vowel in thesi (as here cava and manu) is common enough in postclassical Latin poetry. Consequently, no change of the word Baubo is needed (contra Baubus manu’ of N. Heinsius, or Bacchi manu’ of Ioannes Auratus). Finally, the redactor’s probable text, ἑρατόν... κολάφοισιν, is supported by Arnobius’ translation, plaudit, contractat amice (sc. Baubo, line 4).

Incidentally, the impressive alliteration of π in lines 1-2 of the redactor’s text (πέπλους... πάντα / ... οὖδὲ πρέποντα τύπον: παῖς νηπίαχος), as well as that of α (in line 5), was not wasted on Arnobius, who imitates them in his lines 2 (obiecitque oculis) and 8 (laeta liquorem).14

13 Already Leopardus had suggested the reading, παῖς νηπίαχος δ’, for παῖς δ’ ἦν Ἰαχχος, but as the original text of Clement, not as the deliberate alteration by a redactor. Herwerden adopted it (Hermes 5 [1871] 143).
14 More on these late Latin verses in Graf 166.
(3) The presence of a redactor intervening in Clement's text becomes even more clear from his addition of the words, αἰτόλος δὲ ὁ Δυσαυλής, in Protr. 20.2. Probably, he was inspired by such a common place as, e.g., Hesiod's Theogony 445 f., βουχολίας τε βοῶν τε καὶ αἰτόλια πλατέ' αἰγῶν / ποίμνας τ' εἰροπόκων δίων. However, Clement's original text has the advantage of keeping the names of Baubo and Dysaules together. After all, they are a married couple.\textsuperscript{15} It is the redactor who separated Dysaules from Baubo, and placed Eumolpus as the last one of the five, in order to link him with the gens Eumolpidarum of the next clause. I doubt that Arnobius was able of adding, αἰτόλος δὲ ὁ Δυσαυλής. As a rule, Arnobius limits himself to embellishing the material found in his source. Here is a comparison of the two passages.

Clement, Protr. 20.2

"Ωικουν δὲ τηνικάδε τὴν Ἑλευσίνα οἱ γηγενεῖς ονόματα αὐτοῖς Βαυβῷ καὶ Δυσαυλῆς καὶ Τριπτόλεμος, ἔτι δὲ Εὐμολπὸς καὶ Εὐβουλεὺς; βουκάλος ὁ Τριπτόλεμος ἤν, ποιμήν δὲ ὁ Εὐμολπός, συμβωτὴς δὲ ὁ Εὐβουλεὺς· ἀρ' ὅν τὸ Εὐμολπίδων καὶ τὸ Κηρύκων τὸ ιεροφαντικὸν δὴ τούτῳ Ἀθήνης γένος ἠμύθησεν.

Arnobius, Adv. nat. 5.25

Qui(unque) illud temporis has partes incolebant terrigenae, quibus nomina haec fuerant: Baubo Triptolemus Eumolpus Eubuleus Dysaules: boum iugator Triptolemus, capellarum Dysaules custos, Eubuleus porcorum, gregis lanitii Eumolpus, a quo gens ecfluit Eumolpidarum et ducitur clarum illud apud Cecropios nomen et qui postea floruerunt caduceatores, hierophantae atque praecones.

There is, however, another difference between Clement and Arnobius, which may seem to favor Arnobius' version of the story. While in Arnobius the reason for Baubo’s anasyrma is simply her desire to make her guest, the mourning Demeter, laugh (5.25 statuit exhilarare), in his turn, Clement—in a gloss typical of his style\textsuperscript{16}—tries to explain Baubo’s indecent exposure as an expression of her feeling of being despised and even offended by Demeter’s refusal to take food: περιαλγής ἦ Βαυβῷ γενομένη (ὡς ύπεροραθείσαι δῆθεν) ἀναστέλλεται τὰ αἴδοια καὶ ἐπιθεικυνεῖ τῇ θεῷ (20.3). Doubtless, Clement is improvising with his gloss, probably under the in-

\textsuperscript{15} Asclepiades of Tragilus, FGrH 12 F 4; Graf 159; Der kleine Pauly, I (1964) 843-45 (s. v. Baubo).

\textsuperscript{16} The gloss is revealed as such by the phrase, ὡς... δῆθεν. On similar Clementine glosses compare M. Marcovich, Eразclito: Frammenti, Florence, 1978, ad Fr. 7; 48; 99 (= B 35, 26; 20 DK), and H. Wiese, Heraklit bei Klemens von Alexandrien, Diss. Kiel, 1963 (typewritten), passim.
fluence of such a custom in his own time (compare Artemidorus Onirocrit. 4.44).17

This gloss of Clement, however, does not suggest that Arnobius’ version of Baubo’s anasyrma should be preferred over the one in Clement. For—pace Graf, pp. 195 and 197 f.,—Arnobius knew of Clement’s improvised explanation. In my opinion, Arnobius’ words (5.25): *Rogat illc (sc. Baubo Cererem) atque hortatur contra..., ne fastidium suae humanitatis adsumat* (sc. Ceres), reflect Clement’s gloss, ἡς ἕπερφοράθετα δῆθεν. Now, it is not difficult to see why Arnobius had chosen not to follow Clement’s explanation. For the redactor of Clement’s text had provided Arnobius with a goldmine to exploit—the interpretation of τῦπος as an image of a boy’s face drawn by Baubo on her lower abdomen. Hence the words, *in speciem... nondum duri atque hystriculi pusionis*, in Arnobius’ context; hence the words, nam puerilis / ollis (sc. formatis rebus) vultus erat, in Arnobius’ verses, serving as a motivation of Baubo’s anasyrma (5.25): vertit Baubo artes et quam serio non quibat allicere, ludibriorum statut ex hilarare miraculis. In conclusion, Arnobius’ version of the story shows no advantage over Clement’s version.

(4) Finally, I should mention two attempts at adapting Clement’s text to that of Arnobius—by converting the boy Iacchus into a part of Baubo’s body. Back in 1890, A. Ludwich had suggested in Clement’s text the reading ἰαλλος, for the transmitted ἰαχχος (line 2 of the Orphic hymn).18 And in 1907, Hermann Diels argued for the printing ἰαχχος (instead of ἰαχχος), in the sense of pudendum muliebre.19 Both attempts, however, ran into difficulties with the text of the next line 3. And besides, I would say, any attempt at separating Iacchus from the Eleusinian Demeter—a link at least as old as IV century B.C.—would be only suicidal.20 Nevertheless, Diels’ interpretation was attractive enough to find a recent adept in Graf, who writes:

“Hermann Diels hat gezeigt, dass ἸΑΚΧΟΣ mit den formatae inguinibus res identisch ist und dass die Athenaiosglosse ἰαχχος· χοῖρος diese Identifikation sichert: Baubo gibt ihrem Unterleib die Form eines παῖς, eines nondum duri atque histiculi pusionis. Das versteht man als Jux ohne weiteres, und es findet sich dazu auch eine Parallele21” (p. 196).—“Die Diskrepanz zwischen

17 Correctly referred to by Graf 195 n. 5.
18 “‘Baubo und Demeter,’” Jahrb. f. class. Philol. 141 (1890) 51-58, with reference to Suda, s.v. ἰαλλος· ὁ σκωπτός· and ἰαλλος· τὰ σχούμματα.
19 “‘Arcana Cerealia,’” in Miscellanea A. Salinas, Palermo, 1907, 1-14.
20 It suffices to refer to Graf’s exhaustive discussion, 46-69; 198; and, for a global image, to W. Burkert, Griechische Religion der archaischen und klassischen Epoche, Stuttgart, Kohlhammer, 1977, 127; 428; 430.
21 “ex Helvetiorum popularibus ludicris aut ex artificum Monacensium fescenninis.” Diels, o.c., 8 f.; Graf 196 n. 10.
Paraphrase und Versen lässt sich wohl nur verstehen, wenn man annimmt, Clemens habe angesichts des eleusinischen Milieus (wie nach ihm Generationen von Philologen bis vor Hermann Diels) "IAKΧΟΣ als Eigennamen aufgefasst" (p. 197).—"Vielmehr wird man an ein Spiel mit dem Doppelsinn von "IAKΧΟΣ denken müssen" (p. 198).

Against Diels (and Graf) it suffices to say that nowhere in Greek ἱαχχος means cunnus. Diels’ only warrant is Athenaeus III, 98 D. We read there that the Sicilian tyrant Dionysius the Elder reportedly was fond of employing such strange—and insipid—metaphors as these: μένανδρος (‘man-waiter’) for παρθένος (ὅτι μένει τόν ἄνδρα); μενεκράτης (‘standhold’) for στύλος (ὅτι μένει καὶ κρατεῖ); βαλάντιον (‘against-hurler’) for ἄκοντιον (ὅτι ἔναντιον βάλλεται); μυστήρια (‘mice-keepers’) for ἀί τῶν μυών διεκδύσεις (ὅτι τοὺς μὺς τηρεῖ); γαρότας (= γάς ἀρατήρ, ‘‘earth-plower’’) for βοῦς; finally, ἱαχχος (‘‘squealer’’) for χοῖρος.

Now, it is not difficult to see that, in this rather dull and flaccid list, the word χοῖρος has its normal sense of pig, and not the Aristophanics connotation of cunnus. This ‘‘squealer’’ (χοῖρος) squares with the rest of the examples—ox, mouse-holes, javelin, pillar, maiden. And if χοῖρος here does not mean pudendum muliebre, neither does ἱαχχος. It follows that Diels’ interpretation is unfounded.

In conclusion, the suggested intervention of a redactor into Clement’s account of Baubo’s anasyrma at Protr. 20.1-21.1 best explains the differences between Clement’s original and Arnobius’ Latin translation at Adv. nat. 5.25-26. Since the alteration of Clement’s text undertaken by this redactor is based upon a misunderstanding, on his part, of the words τύπον and ἡν (which he found in his copy of Clement), it follows that the redactor’s interpretation—τύπος = παῖς, ‘‘the drawing on Baubo’s body was the image of a boy’s face,’’—cannot be taken seriously. And finally, since Arnobius had chosen to follow this either supralinear or marginal alteration of Clement’s original text, introduced by the redactor, it follows that his testimony about Baubo, Iacchus, and Demeter is equally worthless, leaving Clement as our only source for the Orphic Baubo at Eleusis.
SATOR AREPO = GEORGOS HAR PON

I. INTRODUCTION

In his recent (1978), exhaustive—87 column long—PW RE article, Heinz Hofmann provides the historians of Graeco-Roman religions with a complete evidence on the famous—and elusive—Sator magic square (= SS). The charm is a perfect four-entry palindrome—to be read either horizontally or vertically starting from each corner of the square. It consists of the magic number of five words with five letters in each (5²):

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
S & A & T & O & R \\
A & R & E & P & O \\
T & E & N & E & T \\
O & P & E & R & A \\
R & O & T & A & S \\
\end{array}
\]

It is surprising, however, to learn that Hofmann, after discussing countless attempts at solving the SS—being advanced since 1823—, in conclusion adopts and strongly defends (558.57 ff.) the solution proposed by Hildebrecht Hommel (in 1952)—as “die einzige, methodisch wie historisch richtige und mögliche Erklärung des Satorquadrats” (560.34 ff.). Following an old French anonymous suggestion (going back to 1854), Hommel assumes that the SS was written bustrophedon (zigzag) and, in addition, that the middle word tenet should be read twice: \textit{Sator opera tenet : (tenet) opera Sator}, which he translates, “Der Schöpfer

---


(Sämann, Vater) erhält seine Werke.’’ According to Hommel, this thesis, ‘‘The Creator preserves his works,’’ and the SS itself, derive from a Stoic-Pythagorean setting: ‘‘Der Erfinder ist vielmehr in stoisch-pythagoreischem Umkreis zu suchen: etwa Nigidius Figulus, ‘Pythagoricus et magus’ (ca. 98-45 v. Chr.)?’’

The present paper has a double objective. First, I shall argue against the interpretation of the SS advanced by Hommel and defended by Hofmann. In my opinion, it simply sweeps under the rug the strange proper name Arepo (along with rotas). Second, I shall suggest that Arepo is a latinized form of a Kurzname of the extremely popular ‘‘god of good luck’’ in the Graeco-Roman Egypt—Harpon, Arpo(cras), Harpo(crates), i.e., ‘‘Horus-the-Child’’ (in Egyptian ḫr-pḥ-ḥrd)—, in other words, a manifestation of the old god Horus, ‘‘the master of magic’’ (ḥḥ kḥ). Accordingly, our Zauberformel, apotropaic charm, or φυλακτήριον would mean: ‘‘The sower Horus/Harpocrates keeps in check toils and tortures’’ (e.g., ‘‘Ἀρπων ὁ σπείρων κατ ἔχεσιόν ωυ ξακι τροχοῦς’’).

Apparently, the earliest known attempt at interpreting the SS belongs to a Byzantine scribe (end of the XIVth century), who on fol. 60v of cod. Par. gr. 2511 (Bible) wrote:

\[
\begin{align*}
\sigma \alpha \tau \omicron \rho & \omicron \sigma \pi \epsilon \iota \omega \\
\dot{\alpha} \rho \epsilon \omicron \omicron \omicron & \dot{\alpha} \rho \omicron \tau \omicron \omicron \nu \text{ (sic)} \\
\tau \epsilon \nu \epsilon \tau & \chi \rho \alpha \epsilon \iota \\
\ddot{o} \pi \epsilon \rho \alpha & \ddot{\epsilon} \gamma \alpha \\
\rho \dot{o} \tau \alpha \zeta & \tau \rho \omicron \chi \omicron \omicron \zeta \\
\end{align*}
\]

I.e., ‘‘The sower holds the plough, the works, the wheels.’’ Now, unless the Byzantine scribe knew more than we do today, the most likely source of inspiration for his interpretation arepum = ἀροτρούς Columella De re r. 5.1.6 (= Isidor. Orig. 15.15.4, p. 485 Lindsay): arepennis—a Gallic word for ‘‘half-acre’’ (compare semi-iugerum, ‘‘half-juger,’’ ‘‘quarter-acre,’’ and French arpent, ‘‘an acre’’).

However, although this arepum, meaning either ‘‘plough’’ or ‘‘half-acre,’’ is to be found nowhere, it still lives, e.g., in the Th. L. L., s.v. arepo. So does the attempt of the Byzantine scribe—in numerous modern interpretations of the SS—from F. Scolari (back in 1825) and Charles

4 Lexikon der Alten Welt, s.v. Satorformel, 2705.
5 Nuova dichiarazione dell’iscrizione Sator..., Verona, 1825: ‘‘Il seminatore di un arepo (piccola pezza di terra) mantiene con suo lavoro il convento’’ (i.e., ‘‘la Ruota’’ of the Monastery Maria Magdalena near Verona). Compare Cippola (supra, n. 2), l.c.
Wescher (in 1874)\(^6\) down to, e.g., Jérôme Carcopino (in 1948)\(^7\) and Walter O. Moeller (in 1973).\(^8\) I think, Margherita Guarducci, among others, has been successful in putting to rest Carcopino’s shaky interpretation.\(^9\)

II. Sator opera tenet : (tenet) opera Sator

The idea to read the SS bustrophedon while repeating the work *tenet—Sator opera tenet : (tenet) opera Sator*—goes back to an anonymous French author of 1854,\(^10\) who translates: ‘‘Le semeur possède (par conséquent récolte) ses oeuvres,’’ i.e., ‘‘On récolte se qu’on sème’’ (‘‘One reaps what he has sown’’). Apparently, the earliest attempts to interpret *Sator* as Jesus the Sower (Mt. 13:3; Mk. 4:3; Lk. 8:5), or as the God Creator—and then *tenet* as ‘‘holds together,’’ ‘‘preserves,’’—belong to A. Schmöger (1917),\(^11\) R. Sabbadini (1919),\(^12\) an anonymous German scholar of 1926,\(^13\) L. Wagner (1943),\(^14\) and others.

However, a new twist to this line of interpretation was given by Harald Fuchs (in 1951)\(^15\) and Hildebrecht Hommel (in 1952). The former translates (p. 47): ‘‘Der Schöpfer selbst erhalt seine Schöpfung,’’ and the latter (pp. 36 ff.): ‘‘Der Schöpfer erhält seine Werke.’’\(^16\) The only difference of significance between the mutually independent interpretations

\(^6\) *Bulletin de la Société Nationale des Antiquaires de France*, 1874, 151-54. Wescher is the discoverer of the scribe’s note on fol. 60\(^v\) of cod. Par. gr. 2511.


\(^8\) *The Mithraic Origin and Meanings of the Rotas-Sator Square*. Études préliminaires aux religions orientales dans l’Empire Romain, 38, Leiden, Brill, 1973, 10: ‘‘The sower (creator) guides (holds) the wheels carefully in (on) the field (half-acre).’’


\(^10\) In *Magasin Pittoresque* 22 (1854) 348.

\(^11\) In *Katholische Kirchenzeitung* (Salzburg), No. 21 of 24 May 1917, p. 173: ‘‘Der Sämann hält die Werke zusammen.’’ Compare Hofmann (supra, n. 1), p. 517.44.

\(^12\) In *Rivista di Filologia* 47 (1919) 34.

\(^13\) In *Der Tag* (Berlin), No. 103 of 30 April 1926: ‘‘Der Herr hält die Werke.’’ Compare V. Stegemann, in *SB Akademie Heidelberg*, Philol.-hist. Klasse, 1933-34, 79; Fuchs (supra, n. 2), 43 n. 28; Hofmann 517.61.


\(^15\) Supra, n. 2, pp. 42 ff.

of Fuchs and Hommel is in the fact that the former maintains Jewish origin of the SS (pp. 49-51), while the latter feels it rather reveals Stoic heritage (“Stoisches Gedankengut”).

In favor of his interpretation, “The Creator preservers his creation” (e.g., ὁ Γενέτωρ σώζει τὰ πάντα), Hommel refers to Cicero N.D. 2.86 and to Pseudo-Aristotle De mundo 397 b 20. This was then accepted by Hofmann. The former passage reads: Omnium autem rerum quae natura administratur seminatar et sator et parens, ut ita dictum, atque educator et a/itor est mundus, omniaque sicut membra et partes suas nutricatur et continet. The latter passage reads: Σωτήρ μὲν γὰρ ὄντως ἀπάντων ἔστι καὶ γενέτωρ τῶν ὀπωσδήποτε κατὰ τόνδε τὸν χόσμον συντελουμένων ὁ θεός (cf. 400 a 3 f.).

Now, my objections to the bustrophedon reading of the SS, and to the interpretation, Sator opera tenet : (tenet) opera Sator, are as follows.

(1) Why would anyone employ the zigzag-writing of secret magic formulas—say, of a defixionis tabella—only to express a rather trivial “Stoic” thesis, “The Creator keeps the world together”? What is so magic about this philosophical thesis? To be sure, it cannot explain the wide popularity of the SS as an apotropaic charm, spell, φυλακτήριον, Abwehrzauberamulet—being preserved in countless wall-graffiti and inscriptions, in amulets, ostraca, potsherds, papyri and parchments, from Pompeii (as early as before 79 A.D., probably even before 62 A.D.) and Rome to Aquincum in Hungary, from Manchester and Cirencester in England to Dura-Europos, Egypt, Nubia and Ethiopia, from Byzantium to Western Europe. Roman soldiers, sailors, traders, free men, freedmen and slaves alike, were not Stoic philosophers to appreciate enough, adopt and spread such a Weltformel as this: “Die Welt ist und existiert wirklich so, wie sie ist.” The point is that in such a magic charm as is the SS one would expect to find the name of the Schutzgott. In the bustrophedon-interpretation, “The Creator preserves his creation,” such a name is missing. I think, however, that the name is well provided in Arepo.

17 Hommel 51 ff.; Hofmann 534-538 and 558-560.
18 For the bustrophedon-writing Fuchs (supra, n. 2), p. 45 n. 32, refers to Defixionum Tabellae Atticae, edited by Richard Wünsch (I.G. III.3; C.I. Att., Appendix, 1897), Nos. 33; 34; 52; 65; 170. But the evidence is meager: Nos. 33 and 170 are the only clear examples of the bustrophedon-writing, while in No. 65 only the first line is written from left to right, the rest of ten lines being written all from right to left.
19 Hofmann 563.17.
(2) The earliest extant examples of the SS (at least ten of them) display this wordorder:

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{R} & \text{O} & \text{T} & \text{A} \\
\text{S} & \text{O} & \text{P} & \text{E} \\
\text{R} & \text{A} & \text{T} & \text{E} \\
\text{N} & \text{T} & \text{E} & \text{P} \\
\text{O} & \text{R} & \text{A} & \text{T} \\
\text{S} & \text{A} & \text{T} & \text{O} \\
\end{array}
\]

Notably, both graffiti from Pompeii (before 79 A.D.), the inscriptions or graffiti on a roof-tile from the governor's palace at Aquincum (ca. 107 A.D.), on an amphora-sherd from Deansgate (Mamucium near Manchester, late second century A.D.), four wall-graffiti from the temple of Artemis-Azzanathkona at Dura-Europos (ca. 200-250 A.D.), the graffito from S. Maria Maggiore in Rome, and the wall-inscription from Cirencester (Corinium Dobunorum?, Gloucestershire, both ca. 300 A.D.).

Now, since the opening words of these oldest extant examples of the SS make a perfect sense—\textit{rotas opera}, "tortures and toils" (compare, e.g., Plato \textit{Republic} 2, 365 b 6, πόνοι καὶ ζημίας; 6, 503 a 3, πόνοι καὶ φόβοι)—, the most natural assumption is that every Roman reader read each line of the inscription from left to right alone.

\[21\] Both graffiti from Pompeii may be older than the earthquake of 62 A.D.—the one on column No. 61 of the Big Palestra (Regio II, Campus), the other on a column of the house of P. Paquius Proculus (Regio I, insula 7, domus 1). To Hofmann 480-483 add the inscription on an amphora-sherd from Mamucium (Deansgate near Manchester, late II A.D., found in 1978): ROTAS/ OPERA/ TENE[...: see M.W.C. Hassall and R.S.O. Tomlin, in \textit{Britannia} 10 (1979) 353.

\[22\] The left-to-right reading is valid for the rest of the extant magic squares (listed, e.g., in Hofmann 539 ff.). A few examples:

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{A} & \text{A} & \text{Φ} & \text{A} \\
\text{Λ} & \varepsilon & \omega & \text{N} \\
\text{Φ} & \omega & \text{Ν} & \text{Η} \\
\text{Α} & \text{Ν} & \text{Η} & \text{Ρ} \\
\text{Α} & \text{Λ} & \text{Φ} & \text{Α} \\
\text{Λ} & \varepsilon & \omega & \text{N} \\
\Phi & \omega & \text{Ν} & \text{Η} \\
\text{Α} & \text{Ν} & \text{Η} & \text{Ρ} \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{C} & \text{Υ} & \text{Κ} & \text{Α} \\
\text{Υ} & \Delta & \omega & \text{Ρ} \\
\text{Κ} & \omega & \Pi & \text{Η} \\
\text{Α} & \text{Ρ} & \text{Η} & \text{C} \\
\text{S} & \text{A} & \text{T} & \text{A} \\
\text{A} & \text{D} & \text{A} & \text{M} \\
\text{T} & \text{A} & \text{B} & \text{A} \\
\text{A} & \text{M} & \text{A} & \text{D} \\
\text{N} & \text{A} & \text{T} & \text{A} \\
\end{array}
\]

On the first magic square see p. 38 ff.; on the last one, p. 44.
The advocates of the bustrophedon reading, however, while dismissing the words rotas and Arepo, are forced to assume that the Rotas-square was read beginning from right to left—Sator opera tenet. Incidentally, no Greek defixionis tabella, when it is written bustrophedon, begins from right to left but vice-versa. The defenders of the zigzag-reading are puzzled themselves. So Fuchs wrote (p. 46 n. 32): “Im Rotas-Quadrat lässt sich die Linksläufigkeit der ersten Zeile verschieden erklären.” The most likely explanation to him is that the Sator-square should have been older than the Rotas-square: “Das wahrscheinlichste ist, dass eine frühere Fassung des Quadrates, die mit dem Worte Sator begonnen hatte, später umgekehrt worden ist.” Such an assumption, however, simply contradicts the rich evidence: the oldest ten extant examples of the SS begin with Rotas, not with Sator.23

In his turn, Hommel (p. 38) believes that the Rotas-square offers the original version, but that it must be read starting from right to left. Later on, somebody had changed the word-order to Sator-square—in order to make the access to the bustrophedon-reading easier: “Man wollte den Einstieg in die Bustrophedon-Lesung erleichtern.”

Finally, Hofmann (p. 563.40) assumes that the original sense of the SS—i.e., Sator opera tenet—was forgotten; hence the shift to the normal reading from left to right: “Man muss annehmen, dass der eigentliche Sinn des Sator quadrats, wie er von seinem Verfasser verstanden wurde, frühzeitig verlorenging oder von vornherein einer grösseren Öffentlichkeit gar nicht bekannt wurde. Diese sah allein die vollkommene Form des Wortquadrats, die zu Kritzeleien geradezu herausforderde...”

Such guesswork, however, will convince nobody. The most natural assumption is that both versions of the SS—Rotas opera tenet Arepo sator and Sator Arepo tenet opera rotas—were read by the Romans beginning from left to right alone, and that in each case the sentence yielded the same (and perfect) sense: “The sower Arepo checks toils and torments.”

(3) The defenders of the zigzag-reading of the SS simply destroy the magic unity of the charm. It consists of the following elements. (a) Of the

23 Carcopino’s criticism of the bustrophedon-reading of the Rotas-square (supra, n. 7), p. 27, is valid. His objection to the repetition of the word TENET, however, has been somewhat weakened by Fuchs’ reference (p. 44 n. 29) to the Elkasai-formula in Epiphanius’ Panarion 19.4.3, where the central (sixth) word ena is to be read twice: Raba dina biom elichon misaad ena l (ena) misaad elichon biom dina raba, which is Aramaic for, “I witness for you on the day of great judgment.” See M.A. Levy, in Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft 12 (1858) 712.
magic number of five times five letters (5²). But if we read tenet twice we will be operating with thirty, no longer with twenty-five letters. (b) These five words give the same sentence in a “super-palindrome”—starting from each corner of the square either horizontally or vertically. In other words, these twenty-five letters are interlocked in a crossword, thus preventing the evil influence from penetrating the charm, and the person or house it protects. (c) As was to expect, the charm includes the name of its Schutzgott (= Arepo), along with his relevant epithet (= Sator). (d) The charm also displays a magic interlocking formula to serve as its “spine” or “cross.” This is the central word tenet = ξατέχει, “keeps in check,” “keeps under control,” “binds”—a key-word in the Bindemagie. (e) Furthermore, the charm also spells out the evils against which its Schutzgott protects—rotas opera, “torments and toils,” literally, “tortures on the wheel and forced labor.” (f) Finally, our Zauberformel comprises the three basic magic vowels necessary for the invocation of the Schutzgott. In our case, they are—more magorum—repeated four times each: A A A A E E E E O O O O. Usually, a magic λόγος consists of the full series of seven vowels (A E H I O Y Ω). But the selection of three basic vowels A E O occurs as well; e.g., in P. Mag. Leiden 384 = P.G.M. XII. 73 (A H Ω) and 102 (A Ω H). In conclusion, the zigzag-reading of the SS destroys this elaborate magic unity of the charm.

(4) Hommel’s main witness (“Kronzeuge”) for the reading Sator opera tenet in antiquity is Pseudo-Prosper of Aquitaine (ca. 415 A.D.), who in his Carmen de Providentia Dei wrote:

24 Hofmann 562.2 explains the magic power of the number five as a Pythagorean γάμος (compare Aristotle Metaph. 1078 b 23) of three (male) and two (female), while referring to Alexander In Metaph. p. 39.8 Hayduck: Γάμον δε ἔλεγον τὸν πέντε, ὅτι δ’ ἡ μέν γάμος σύνοδος ἄρρητος ἐστι καὶ θηλέος, ἐστι δὲ κατ᾽ αὐτούς ἄρρητος μὲν τὸ περὶτον, θηλὲ δὲ τὸ ἄρτιον· πράσας δὲ οὔτος ἡ ἄρτιος τοῦ δύο πρώτου και πρώτου τοῦ τρία περὶτου τὴν γένεσιν ἔχει. Compare Walter Burkert, Weisheit und Wissenschaft. Studien zu Pythagoras, Philolaos und Platon, Nürnberg, 1962, pp. 31 n. 98; 154 n. 25; 442 f.; 448 n. 57.

The magic power of the pentad, however, may be better explained by Egyptian or Hebrew sources. For example, there are five supreme gods of Hermopolis (Hans Bonnet, Reallexikon der ägyptischen Religionsgeschichte, Berlin, 1952, pp. 806 and 874). In the “Bindezauber gegen den Hund,” London Ms. Or. 1013 A, 24, Eagle (‘Αετός) from Revelation 4:7 is invoked as ΠΕΤΑΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΑ, which I would understand as ὁ πενταγράμματος δαίμων (cf. p. 39). See A.M. Kropp, Koptische Zaubertexte, Bd. II (Bruxelles, 1931), No. V.24; Bd. III, paragraph 221. Compare also the pentagram, pentacle, pentalpha. Other magic squares too consist of five times five letters; for example, the one beginning with SATAN ADAMA (supra, n. 22), or the one starting with the word RUACH (“Spirit”): compare S. Seligmann, “Die Sator-Formel,” Hessische Blätter f. Volkskunde 13 (1914) 177 ff.; Hofmann 539 f.; 542.

25 On which see, e.g., Franz Dornseiff, Das Alphabet in Mystik und Magie, Leipzig, 1922 (Stoicheia, 7) 35 ff. [The second edition, Leipzig, 1925, is not available to me.]

According to Hommel, Pseudo-Prosper imitates the SS. Hofmann is more cautious, but he too states (p. 560.14): ‘Es ist zwar nicht eindeutig beweisbar, ob der Dichter des Carmen damit tatsächlich das Sator-quadrat in einer zu einem Hexameter gedeihnten Form zitiert, doch dürfte diese Annahme sehr naheliegend und plausibel erscheinen.’

I think, however, that this assumption is not at all likely. First, there is a great difference between the statement, *Santor opera tenet* (‘Der Schöpfer erhält seine Werke’), and Pseudo-Prosper’s point, *Santor tenet momenta operum suorum* (‘Der Schöpfer enthält die Entscheidungskraft [oder Ausschlagskraft] über seine Werke.’ ‘The Creator exercises the decisive power (force or influence) over his works’). It is thanks to this ‘ultimate force’ that the Creator is able to produce a harmonious cosmos out of the quarrelling elements, which, as the poet says (v. 122 f.): *aliis alia obsistunt, contraria discors / Omnia motus alit.* In brief, the SS and Pseudo-Prosper speak of two different topics. And second, even if Pseudo-Prosper had used the SS, his lines still would be no proof for the bustrophedon reading, *Santor opera tenet.* For the poet may well have read the SS from left to right alone, while skipping the words he did not need (*Arepo* and *rotas*) and keeping the words he needed (*Sator… tenet… opera…*).

(5) *The Anagram.* The SS yields the anagram printed below. It was discovered independently by three scholars—by Chr. Frank (in 1924),27 by S. Agrell (in 1925 = 1927),28 and particularly by Felix Grosser (in 1926).29 Since 1926, this interpretation of the SS as a ‘Christian cryptogram’ has found wide acceptance: no less than sixty scholars are listed by Hofmann (pp. 514-516). One example; J. Gwyn Griffiths (in 1971) said about the possibility for the Pater Noster-Anagram of being a sheer coincidence, ‘this is too much to believe.’30 Here is the Anagram:

---

27 In *Deutsche Gaue* 25 (1924) 76. For AO Frank refers to *Revel.* 21:6 [add 1:8; 22:13, and compare Gerhardt Kittel, in *Theol. Wb. zum NT,* I (1933) 1 f.]. Frank also says that he had read about this anagram in *Die deutsche Warte* ‘vor einigen Jahren.’
28 In *Runornas talmyistik och dess antikre förebild: Skrifter utgivna av Vetenskaps-Societeten i Lund* 6 (1927) 37 f.
29 *Arch. f. Religionswissenschaft* 24 (1926) 165-169.
Now, both Fuchs and Hommel accept the Pater Noster-Anagram as being originally intended by the author of the SS, but neither of them ascribes it to the Christians. Hommel believes the Anagram itself is Greek and Stoic, while referring, inter alia, to the Homeric phrase, "Ω πάτερ ἡμέτερε, Κρονίδη (Iliad 8.31; Odyssey 1.45; 1.81; 24.473). In his turn, Fuchs feels it is rather Jewish, "ein ererbtes jüdisches Gut." But in 1973, Hommel has abandoned his interpretation of the Pater Noster AO as being intended by the author of the SS. As for Fuchs’ alleged Jewish origin of the Pater Noster AO in our charm, Hofmann (p. 558.24 ff.) was successful in putting it to rest—inter alia, by pointing out that there is no prayer in Jewish tradition called Pater Noster, so typical and fundamental as to be adopted by the author of the SS: "Aber nur eine fundamen­tale Formulierung kann auf diese Weise, wenn überhaupt, im Sator­quad­rat verschlüsselt sein (Hommel 47...), und gerade das trifft für die jüdische Gebetsanrede nicht zu."

Apparently, the first scholars to reject the Pater Noster AO anagram in the SS were E. Suys (in 1935), and Guillaume de Jerphanion (in 1936), followed by many others. P. Veyne even applied the theory

31 Supra, n. 2, p. 50 n. 43. On AO see Fuchs p. 50 n. 45, and Hofmann 549-557, No. 6 (a)—(j). Also Dornseiff (supra, n. 25) 122 ff., and my note 27.
34 Rendiconti della Pontificia Accademia di Archeologia 12 (1936) 401 ff.; Recherches de science religieuse 27 (1937) 326 ff.
of probability to prove that this anagram could not have been intended by the author of the palindrome.

The Pater Noster AO anagram then must be considered as a *sheer coincidence*. So are many other Christian anagrams obtained from our SS—some of them going back to 1627.\(^{37}\) I mention five of them only:

1. Oro te, pater, oro te, pater, sanas. (Obtained by “knight’s move” in 1917).\(^{38}\)
2. O pater, ores pro aetate nostra.
3. Retro, Satana, toto opere asper. (Both 2 and 3 from 1935).\(^{39}\)
4. Satan, oro te pro arte, a te spero.
5. Satan, ter oro te, opera praesto. (Both 4 and 5 from 1764).\(^{40}\)

III. SATOR AREPO = \(\text{γεωργος 'αρπον, 'αρπως, χαρπο('κρατες)}\)

Frustrated by the strange name Arepo, some scholars go so far as to assume that our SS is no more than a “sinnloses Wortspiel”—a gibberish, abracadabra, δβλαναθαναλβa, or ἄσημα ὄνόματα and Εφεσία γράμματα.\(^{41}\) Apparently, the first one so to do was Athanasius Kircher (in 1665),\(^{42}\) the last ones—P. Veyne (1968),\(^{43}\) H. Polge (1969),\(^{44}\) and especially C.D. Gunn, in his Yale dissertation on the SS (1969).\(^{45}\) While Veyne applied the theory of probability, Polge and Gunn resorted to the computer. As a result, Polge called our SS (p. 155): “une construction phraséomorphe anacyclique à quadruple entrée;” and after exploring 625 applicable combinations of our 25 letters supplied by the computer,
he reached this conclusion (p. 163): “qu’aucune combinaison n’est linguistiquement viable;” it follows that the name Arepo is “un anthroponyme imaginaire,” “un artifice lexicale,” “une option irrationelle.” Polge closes his study with the following caveat: “il est ainsi définitivement prouvé qu’il est parfaitement vain de chercher à arepo une interprétation assise sur les données philologiques et archéologiques classiques.”

However, if Arepo really was such a fictitious proper name, added to the palindrome in fine, one would expect the inventor of our charm to write rather:

```
S A T O R
A R E N O
T E N E T
O N E R A
R O T A S
```

This would have given the magic square even a better sense: “The sower Areno checks any burden or torment.” But this is not the case. Consequently, the most likely reason for the inventor of the SS to write down AREPO, and not ARENO, is that there existed a real magic Schutzgott called AREPO.

Let us consider briefly a similar “healing” magic square, also very popular in antiquity; it too comprises one “meaningless” word:

```
Revel. 4:7
( Ezechiel 1:10):

Α Λ Φ Α
Λ ε ω Ν
Φ ω Ν Η
Α Ν Η Ρ
```

```
Μόσχος
Λέων
’Αετός (ίε)
’Ανθρωπός
```

```
the face of Bull
the face of Lion
the face of Eagle
the face of Man
```

46 E.g., in the Cairo Ostracon No. 8147 (No. 490 Crum); in the Berlin Coptic P. 11347.29 (= XXXIV.29 Kropp); in the Vienna Coptic P. 17354.1 & 7 f. (= LXV Kr.); in the Berlin P. 8105. Compare Kropp (supra, n. 20), III, paragraphs 221 f.; Hofmann 486; 540; 542.
Obviously, the magic square comprises the names of the four living creatures around the heavenly throne of Revelation 4:7 (Ezechiel 1:10). They are identified as such by the author of the Coptic magic papyrus London Ms. Or. 1013 A (= V. 24 f. Kropp). Now, "Αλφα clearly refers to Hebrew Aleph ("ox"), but why is Eagle called Φωνή? Kropp (III, p. 130 n. 1) remarks: "Φωνή Stimme scheint mir aus dem Zwang des Akrostichons an Stelle des Adlers zu stehen." This is likely enough, but does not tell the whole story. There must be something of significance in the word Φωνή to link it to Αετός in the reader's mind. Otherwise the author of the magic square may well have written, for example:

\[
\begin{array}{c c c c c}
A & A & Φ & Α \\
Λ & ε & ω & Ν \\
Φ & ι & Ρ & Η \\
Α & Ν & Η & Ρ \\
\end{array}
\]

For the metaphor Φωρή, "theft," is more appropriate for a bird of prey like eagle. The answer is to be found in the fact that in the Book of Revelation Eagle plays a special role while serving as the voice of God: Καί εἰδον, καὶ ἥκουσα ἕνας ἀετὸς πετομένου ἐν μεσορανήματι λέγοντος φωνή μεγάλην, Οὐαὶ οὐαὶ οὐαί τούς κατασκόντας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς... (Revel. 8:13).

It is thanks to this special role of Eagle that in our Coptic φυλακτήριον (V. 24 f.) Αετός could be invoked as PETAGRAMMATA, which I understand as ὁ πενταγράμματος δαιμόν. For the same reason Eagle is invoked as AKRAMATA in Coptic magic P. Berlin 11347 (XXXIV.29 f. Kropp), and as the angel AGRAMATONAEL in Coptic magic P. London Ms. Or. 5525 (XLVIII.113 Kropp), i.e., Ἀγράμματος, "whose name is not to be written down." In conclusion, the magic name of the Eagle from Revel. 4:7—Φωνή—has a deeper meaning, and is not to be explained by the exigencies of a wordsquare alone.

Back to AREPO. The most natural assumption is that it is the name of the Schutzgott of our charm, and that SATOR is then his relevant epithet. Now, the most likely candidate for such a magic protector is the old Egyptian god of magic Horus. His epithets include: "master of magic" ("der Zaubermächtige," "ḥkꜣ); "averting evil" (ḥꜣw); "protector" (sw·t); "savior" (ṣdj); "deliverer" (wd), and many others.47 And the

most popular aspect of Horus in the Graeco-Roman Egypt is Harpocrate: (Ḥr-p3-hrd), i.e., ‘Chorus-the-Child.’

Harpocrates’ name appears in the inscriptions from Italy as: ARPOCRAS, ARPOCRAS, ARPOCRAS, ARPOCRATES. I think AREPO is a Kurzname of ARPOCRAS, ARPOCRATES. First of all, such a Kurzname is not unusual in Egypt. For example, Ḥr(‘w)-m (‘Horus is in’) is a short proper name for the full one—Ḥr(‘w)-m-wšḥ’t (‘Horus is in the hall’). Or take the Coptic Kurznamen: ISI stands for ISIDOROS, PUSI for PUSIRIS, APO for APOLLO, EPIMA for EPIMACHOS, STEPHA for STEPHANOS, etc. Coming to the point, I think there are two such Kurznamen of Ἀρποκράτης in Greek papyri—Ἄρτως and Ἀρπων. Now, Ἀρτώς appears in papyri at least eight times since III century B.C. Obviously it is a theophorous proper name deriving from the god Ἀρποκράτης, just as is another popular proper name—Ἀπόλλως—such a theophorous name deriving from Ἀπόλλων. The relationship is simple enough:

Ἀπόλλως : Ἀπόλλων = Ἀρτώς : *Ἄρτων, Ἀρποκράτης


50 E.g., C.I.L. VI.31 (Rome); compare T. Flavius Arpocras (C.I.L. VI.28.562, Rome); P. Pomponius Arpocras (C.I.L. XI.6716.80, Florence).—(H)ARPOCRAS: compare, e.g., the freedman of Claudius (Sueton. Claud. 28; Seneca Apocol. 13); another freedman of Nero (Suet. Nero 37.4; Chronogr. a. 354 Mommsen, Chron. Min. I, p. 146); the physician of Pliny, Ep. 5 (4); 7 (23); 10 (5).—Ἀρποκράτης, C.I.L. IV.2481a and b (Pompeii).

51 E.g., C.I.L. IV.2191 (Pompeii); C.I.L. VI.17255; VI.9016 (Rome); IX.136 and 137 (Brundisium).

52 Compare Aurelius Arpocrat(es): C.I.L. XIV.4569, dec. XV a 2 (Ostia).


55 Gustav Heuser, Die Personennamen der Kopten, I, Leipzig, 1929, 56; 96 f. Also Latin names, e.g., ANTO für ANTONIUS, etc. (p. 105).

56 They are listed in Friedrich Preisigke, Namenbuch, Heidelberg, 1922, p. 54, and in Daniele Foraboschi, Onomasticcon Alterum Papyrologicum (Supplem. al Namenbuch di F. Preisigke), Milan, 1967, I, p. 53.—Add: Grenfell-Hunt XXX.28; Michigan P. Inv. 6886.8 (= P. Petaus o. 48.8; Papyr. Colon. 4 [1969]).
Latin AREPO may derive either from 'Αρπῶς or from **Ἀρπὼν. The latter nominative-form, however, is not documented, but the vocative-form 'Αρπον is, so that it is not difficult to assume that **Ἀρπὼν would be a Hellenized nominative of Egyptian 'Αρπον. This 'Αρπον (once Άρπον)—which I am inclined to derive from Egyptian Ἡρ-τω ('Horus the')—appears in the combination Harpon-Knuphi, i.e., Horus-the-Chnum,\(^{57}\) and is identified with the Ἀγαθὸς Δαύμων.\(^{58}\) 'Αρπον serves as a vocative.

Now, the evening prayer to Horus in the Berlin magic papyrus 5025 AB (= P.G.M. I.26 Preisendanz) reads: α ἐς ἡμι στὸν ὄμον ὑψίτην μὲν ᾨδίαν ἀγαθόν, Ἀρπον Ἐρμύραφι. And in the long Paris magic papyrus Suppl. gr. 574 (= P.G.M. IV.2433) the same god Ἀρπον Χνουβί (or Ἄρπον Χνουβί, 2199) is again invoked as Ἀγαθὸς Δαύμων (2428), with the following prayer for success, riches and bliss (2437): Δός μοι οὖν χάριν, ἐργασίαν εἰς ταύτην μου τὴν πράξειν, φέρε μοι ἀργύρια, χρυσόν, ἵματι|σι|μόν, πλοῦτον πολύολβον ἐπὶ ἀγαθῷ.

The transition from Greek HARPŌN/HARPŌS to Latin AREPO is an easy one. First, the form arepo was conditioned by its palindrome opera anyway. Second, the anaptyxis of E is natural enough in the spoken Latin and is common in Latin inscriptions. To mention the proper names alone: ArEniensis (C.I.L. II.105); CElodia (VIII.3520); CEResce(n)s (VIII.16940; compare III.4908); GEracilis (VIII.6237); OcEtari (VIII.6239); QuadErati (VIII.6255 f.); SepEtuminus (XIII.7109); TErebonio (I.2 33; compare VIII.22424); VicEtorinus (Inscr. Gsell I.2964).\(^{59}\) In Greek, compare maybe: Ἄρπον: "Ἀρπόν; Τέρόπων: Τέρπων; Ἐρμής: Ἐρμῆς, etc.\(^{60}\)

Let us explore now the religious background of Harpocrates. He was an extremely popular god of good luck in the Graeco-Roman Egypt. In our P.G.M. I.27, Harpon-Knuphi is addressed as Ἀγαθὸς Γεωργός = Ἀγαθὸς Δαύμων, another popular Egyptian Schutzgott.\(^{61}\) As for the divine epithets, Γεωργός "Ἀρπῶν and Sator Arepo are close enough.

What is more significant, however, Harpocrates has been early identified with Eros (Plutarch Amatorius 19, 764 B), just as his mother Isis has

---

\(^{57}\) On the god Chnum see, e.g., Bonnet (supra, n. 48), 135-140, esp. 139 f.

\(^{58}\) Compare Richard Reitzenstein, Poimandres, Leipzig, 1904, 143; 226; and Preisendanz, apparatus ad P.G.M. I.27.

\(^{59}\) Compare Manu Leumann, Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre, München, 1963, 97 f. (with literature on anaptyxis in Latin).

\(^{60}\) Compare Eduard Schwyzer, Griechische Grammatik I, München, 1968, 278.

\(^{61}\) On Agathos Daimon see, e.g., Der kleine Pauly, I (1964), 121 f.
been identified with *Aphrodite*. Compare the inscriptions in the Serapeum on Delos: "Ερωτος νικηφόρου (*I. G. XI.4*, 1304; ca. 200 B.C.);\(^{62}\) "Ερωτι 'Αφοστράτει.\(^{63}\)

In countless terra-cotta figures, Harpocrates is often represented as a nude young boy with a cornucopia and either a phallus or an elongated penis. In the "‘apotropaic’" terra-cotta Graindor No. 6, however, Harpocrates’ enormous phallus takes the place of the cornucopia.\(^{64}\) In the terra-cotta Graindor No. 15,\(^{65}\) Harpocrates displays an erect phallus ‘‘de dimensions inusitées.’’ Doubtless, this is another example of the Harpocrates-χερνιβοπάτης,\(^{66}\) and his enormous phallus is believed to spread the fertility of the god Sator-Γεωργός. For Harpocrates is believed to be as γόνυμος καὶ τρόφιμος as is his father Osiris: Πανταχῶ δὲ καὶ ἀνθρωπόμορφον Ὀσίριδος ἀγαλμα δεινύσουσιν ἔξορθιάζον τῷ αἰδοίῳ διὰ τὸ γόνυμον καὶ τὸ τρόφιμον (Plutarch *De Iside* 51, 371 F).\(^{67}\) Compare also the Harpocrates terra-cottas Graindor Nos. 18 & 19,\(^{68}\) while in the terra-cotta Berlin No. 9181 his penis is represented as elongated.\(^{69}\)

Harpocrates-Eros was extremely popular at Pompeii—in wall-painting, reliefs, amulets, jewelry, and especially in statuettes of bronze or silver. Here his penis is not erect, but the cornucopia is his inseparable attribute (e.g., Catalogue Nos. 104; 107; 111).\(^{70}\) V. Tran Tam Tinh states about the Pompeii statuettes: "En effet, ces statuettes d’Isis ou d’Harpocrate, presque identiques à celles trouvées à Herculanum et en Égypte, semblent provenir des mêmes ateliers et ne remontent pas au delà du Ier siècle av. J.-C. Il est probable qu’elles provenaient d’Alexan-


\(^{63}\) Roussel (supra, n. 62), No. 194; Vidman, p. 77; *Inscriptions de Délos*, No. 2132.

\(^{64}\) Paul Graindor, *Terres cuites de l’Égypte Gréco-Romaine* (Ghent Université, Faculté de philosophie et lettres, Recueil de travaux, 86), Antwerpen, 1939, p. 75 f. and Plate V.6.

\(^{65}\) Pp. 84-86 and Plate VII.15

\(^{66}\) Compare Graindor (supra, n. 64), pp. 26 and 85 f.

\(^{67}\) Compare Plutarch *De Iside* 12, 355 E (on the Phallephoria-Pamylias); 18, 358 B (on the holy phallus of Osiris), and J. Gwyn Griffiths, *Plutarch’s De Iside et Osiride*, University of Wales Press, 1970, pp. 299 f.; esp. 342 ff.; 495.—Some scholars believe that Harpocrates is represented as ithyphallic because of the syncretism between Horus and Min, an old ithyphallic fertility god of Egypt; so notably Bonnet, *Reallexikon der ägypt. Religion*, 274; 465. But Harpocrates’ father Osiris is ithyphallic himself, and Min is not represented with a cornucopia, as is Harpocrates, i.e., ‘‘Horus-the-Child.’’

\(^{68}\) Pp. 88-90; Plates VIII.18 & IX.19.

\(^{69}\) Bonnet, *Reallexikon*, 274 (Abbildung 69.4) = Erman, *Die Religion der Ägypter*, 393 (Abbf. 165.4).

drie, ou qu’elles imitaient les prototypes alexandrins.” The same will be true of the Harpocrates-statuettes found elsewhere.

The role of the ithyphallic boy Harpocrates as an apotropaic god of good luck becomes even clearer from his identification with ithyphallic fertility god “und überhaupt Segenbringer und Übelwehrer” (Herter)—Priapus, the ubiquitous Fascinus deus, also a son of Aphrodite.

On the Egyptian terra-cottas of the ithyphallic Harpocrates-Priapiscus see Herter IV C 13 & 14 (pp. 102 and 291 f.). As for the literary sources for this syncretism, Herter (290 f.) refers to Suda, s.v. Πρίαπος 2 (2276 Adler), and to Procopius De belis 1.19.35. The Suda-passage is self-eloquent: Τὸ ἄγαλμα τοῦ Πρίαπος, τοῦ Ὄρου παρ’ Αἰγυπτίων κεχλημένου, ἀνθρωποειδὲς ποιούσιν, ἐν τῇ δεξιά σκηπτρον κατέχον..., ἐν δὲ τῇ εὐωνύμῳ κρατοῦν τὸ αἰδοῖον αὐτοῦ ἑντεταμένον, διότι τὰ κεκρυμμένα ἐν τῇ γῇ σπέρματα φανερὰ καθίστησι... And Procopius says that the Blemyes and the Nobatae reverence Isis and Osiris, and not the least of all Priapus (καὶ τὴν τῆς Ἰσιν τὸν τε Ὁσιρίν σέβουσι καὶ οὕχ ἕκιστά γε τὸν Πρίαπον), where Priapus is clearly the boy Harpocrates.

Furthermore, it is because of his role as a popular fertility and bounty god that Harpocrates is often called in monuments Καρποκράτης—a parenytology influenced by καρποφόρος, καρποδότης (Coptic Karpokratios). Another Greek form of his name—'Αλφοκράτης—may also be parenytological in origin (e.g., 'Αλφο-χράτης, “healer of leprosy”?). In the famous aretalogy of Carpocrates from the marble-inscription of Chalcis (ca. A.D. 300; No. 88 Vidman),76 the god himself reveals us some of his powers: Καρποκράτης εἰμὶ ἐγώ, Σαράπιδος καὶ Ἰσίδος ύς, ... Πάχο καρός εἰμὶ ἐγώ... πᾶσαν ἐκάθερα γῆν... πᾶσαν φαρμακείαι ἰατροῖς εἰς σωτηρίαν [e.g. δίδωμι]...77

71 O.c. (supra, n. 70), p. 10.
72 Compare Françoise Dunand, Le culte d’Isis dans le bassin oriental de la Méditerranée (Études préliminaires aux religions orientales dans l’Empire Romain, 26), 3 vols., Leiden, Brill, 1973, I, Plates XXX (Rome); XXXI (Egypt); II, Plate XVI.2 (Thessalonica). R.E. Witt, Isis in the Graeco-Roman World, Cornell U.P., Ithaca, N.Y., 1971, Plates 20 (London); 38 (Roman lamp); 52 (Mainz); 53 (Rome).
74 See Françoise Dunand (supra, n. 72), III, 329; esp. II, 153 n. 4; For Coptic, see Heuser (supra, n. 55), p. 60. Compare also Witt (supra, n. 72), p. 211 n. 7.
75 On this name of Harpocrates see Fr. Dunand, II, p. 153 n. 4.
77 Compare the Egyptian healing Zauberspruch quoted by Erman (supra, n. 48), 297, where the magician assumes the role of the god Horus: “Laufe aus, Gift, komm, fliesse zu Boden! Horus bespricht dich, er vernichtet dich, er bespeit dich. Du steigst nicht auf und fällst herab... durch das, was Horus sagt, der Zaubermächtige.”
In conclusion, the 'Αγαθός Γεωργός “Ἀρπων, Ἀρπῶς, Ἀρποχράτης is the most likely source of our Sator Arepo. As Adolf Erman (back in 1934) had stated about Harpocrates in the Graeco-Roman Egypt: “Kein Gott muss dem niederer Volke mehr am Herzen gelegen haben, als Horus das Kind, Har-pe-chrot oder wie man griechisch sagte: Harpokrates.” While Harpocrates as a baby on the knees of his mother Isis lactans had greatly influenced the Christian iconography of Maria lactans, the same Harpocrates, now as a young boy with his cornucopia etc., had become an extremely popular god of good luck among the poor and humble of the Graeco-Roman Egypt—being identified with Eros, Priapiscus or “Car­pocrates.”

There seems to exist an indication that a Copt of the seventh century A.D. had even identified our Arepo with Horus. The same Coptic ostraka (Cairo Museum No. 8147) that had preserved the ΑΛΦΑ ΛεωΝ ΦωΝΗ ΑΝΗΡ magic square, contains also the following magic square:

```
    CATωP
   A CωPH
  TωNNHN
 ωPHNNH
  PHNNHΑ
```

Just as in the magic square SATAN ADAMA TABAT AMADA NATAS (note 22), only the first two words make sense—the rest being a magic Kauderwelsch (gibberish),—so also in the Coptic ostraca only the first two words seem to make sense. Now, CATωP is clearly SATOR, but what is ACωPH? We know that the Copt had to start his second line with an A, and to end it with an H, in order to provide the three basic “vowels of invocation” (ΑΑωωωω ΗΗΗΗΗΗΗ). But what is the sense of the remainder—CωP? I think this CωP is nothing else but another Coptic form for Horus = 2 ωP. It is possible that this magic name of the god of magic Horus lives in another medieval magic square, in the form

79 Compare V. Tran Tam Tinh (avec la collaboration de Yvette Labrecque), Isis lactans: Corpus des monuments grécoco-romains d’Isis allaitant Harpocrate (Études préliminaires aux religions orientales dans l’Empire Romain, 37), Leiden, Brill, 1973, 40-49; Witt (supra, n. 72), 272-281.
80 Jerphanion (supra, n. 2), p. 197 n. 20; Hofmann 486; 540.
81 Heuser (supra, n. 55), 60 (but cf. p. 39).
of ASORA. If my guess about $\text{CwP} = 2 \omega P = \text{Horus}$ is correct, then
$\text{SATOR AREPO} = \text{CAT\omega P A-C\omega P-H (or A-SOR-A)}$.\textsuperscript{83}

However it may be, the Egyptian origin of the Sator square best explains its wide popularity in the extant Coptic amulets, papyri and ostraca, coming from Egypt, Nubia and Ethiopia. In my opinion, the SS came into existence in Alexandria (somewhere between 30 B.C. and A.D. 50), and reached Pompeii before A.D. 62—along with the cult of Isis, Serapis and the charm-boy Harpocrates. And if the words of the SS—$\text{rotas opera}$—imply “wheels of torture and forced labor” ($\tau\rho\omicron\chi\omicron\upsilon\varsigma \chi\iota \pi\omicron\omicron\nu\omicron\varsigma$), then the author of the SS may well belong to those lower layers of the society at Alexandria who had embraced Harpocrates as their charm-boy-god of good luck—maybe even a Roman soldier, sailor or trader? After all, Harpocrates is also represented as a boy-soldier in full Roman panoply.\textsuperscript{84}

It remains to determine the sense of the words $\text{rotas opera tenet}$ (or $\text{tenet opera rotas}$). Two senses are possible. First: “The Sower Harpocrates keeps in check tortures and toils.” Second: “The Sower Harpocrates keeps (maintains, protects) the carriage and the product of (agricultural) labor (i.e., crop; compare Hesiod’s $\varepsilon\gamma\alpha$).” Both senses are possible.\textsuperscript{85} The reasons for giving the preference to the former sense may be as follows. (1) $\text{Rotae}$, in the sense of “chariot,” is a poetic word limited to Vergil and a few others. On the contrary, $\text{rotae} = \tau\rho\omicron\chi\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$, “the wheels of torture,” is more common. (2) $\text{Tenet}$ preserves its usual sense, “keeps in check; controls,”—a t.t. in the $\text{Bindemagie}$ ($= \chi\alpha\tau\epsilon\chi\iota$). Finally, (3) the combination, $\text{rotae opera}$, in the sense, “tortures and toils (such as the forced labor),” seems to have been common enough in antiquity (compare, e.g., Plato $\text{Republic}$ 2, 365 b 6, $\pi\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron \chi\iota \zeta\mu\omicron\omicron\iota \iota$).\textsuperscript{87}

\textsuperscript{82} Compare Hofmann 539.—Maybe also in the magic square beginning with the word SA-SOR.

\textsuperscript{83} Presumably, the Copt did not want to keep the Latin form $\text{AREPO}$ for $\text{API\omega N}$ (and he could not make use of $\text{API\omega N}$ because of its consonant cluster), so he decided to interpret $\text{AREPO-API\omega N}$ as $\text{A-C\omega P-H}$, where $\text{C\omega P}$ hints at $2 \omega P$, i.e. Horus.

\textsuperscript{84} Compare a stele with Harpocrates as a small boy-warrior in the Flinders Petrie Collection (University College, Oxford); the picture, e.g., in J. Grafton Milne, A History of Egypt under Roman Rule, 3rd ed., London, 1924, fig. 110 on p. 210. As for the adult Horus as a warrior, compare the Berlin stele No. 17549; the picture, e.g., in Erman, fig. 167 on p. 394; Bonnet, fig. 79 on p. 314.

\textsuperscript{85} $\text{Rota} = \text{“the torture-wheel”}$ (O.L.D., s.v., 3); $\text{opus} = \text{“forced labor”}$ (O.L.D., s.v., 2); $\text{product of labor”}$ (9); $\text{tenet} = \text{“keeps in check, controls”}$ (O.L.D., s.v., 19); $\text{keeps, maintains, protects”}$ (15).

\textsuperscript{86} For the plural $\tau\rho\omicron\chi\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$, in the sense of “wheels of torture,” compare Pollux 10.187. Latin plural $\text{rotas}$ is conditioned by the word $\text{Sator}$.

\textsuperscript{87} The suggestion advanced in this paper—$\text{SATOR AREPO} = \Gamma\Epsilon\Omega\Pi\Omicron\omicron \text{“API\Pi\omicron\omicron”}$—is not the first attempt at linking the SS to Egypt. J. Gwyn Griffiths, Class. Review, N.S. 21 (1971) 7, suggested that Arepo may derive from Egyptian Hr-Hp, probably
meaning "the face of the Apis." There are three instances of this name in Ranke (supra, n. 54), I, p. 252, No. 11 (and three additional instances of the proper-name Ἰρ-ν- Hp, No. 8).—Now, my objections to this identification are as follows. First, Ἰρ- Hp is not the name of a divinity, but only a _proper name_ (theophorous as it may be). And second, Ἰρ-Hp is not documented in a Greek form. If it were, one would expect it to be Ἀράπις, which is rather far from Arepo.

Moreover, my teacher †Milan Budimir, "Miscellanea," Zentralinstitut f. Hygiene (Belgrade), 17 (1941) 145 ff.; Živa Antika 8 (1958) 301-304, had suggested that Arepo may derive from an "orphisch-pythagoreischer Heiland "Ἀρπων," while assuming such a Greek original of the SS: "Ἀρπων σάτωρ κρατεὶ Γέργα κύκλα" ("Der Heiland Arpon hält die Zauberhandlungen und die Schmerzen fern"); compare Hofmann 500.20-23; 506 No. 30.—However, such an Orphic "Heilheros" is documented nowhere.

Finally, Gerald M. Browne, Zeitschrift f. Papyrologie u. Epigraphik 52 (1983) 60, in support of my interpretation of the square suggested that AREPOTENET hints at HARPOCRATES—"on a deeper plane."—He may well be right, but there is no way of telling. I think we are on a safer ground if assuming that _tenet_ is a translation of the Greek magic technical term κατέχει, not κρατεῖ. Browne refers to the Byzantine scribe (end of the XIVth century) of cod. Par. gr. 2511 f. 60v (p. 29), who glossed _tenet_ with κρατεῖ. But "holds" of this late witness clearly depends on his understanding of the entire sentence: ὁ σπείρων ἄρτοτον κρατεῖ ἔργα τροχοῦς.
UBI MURES FERRUM RODUNT

(1) Being by nature prompt to anger (*ira* properus: Tac. *Ann.* 11.26; *ira* atque *iracundiae* conscius *sibi*, utramque excusavit edicto: Suet. *Claud.* 38), Claudius in heaven loses his temper (*excandescit hoc loco Claudius et quanto potest murmure irascitur: Seneca, *Apocolocyntosis* 6.2) and orders my lady of Fever to be taken away and decapitated (ille autem *Febrim* duci *iubebat... iusserat illi collum praecidi*).

Hercules wants to put Claudius to his place by frightening him considerably (*et quo terribilior esset...*): ‘Where the hell do you think you are? In your Rome?’ Then he produces the following threatening words (7.1): ‘Audi me, inquit, tu desine fatuari. Venisti hoc, ubi mures ferrum rodunt. Citius mihi verum, ne tibi alogias excutiam.’

This worked. Claudius understands at once that he is no longer in Rome and in power, and changes his attitude of arrogance (*Claudius ut *vidit* virum valentem, oblitus nugium, intellexit neminem Romae sibi parem fuisse, illic non habere se idem gratiae: gallum in suo sterquilino plurimum posse*).

(2) Now, what is so frightening in this obscure proverbial expression: *ubi mures ferrum rodunt?* (‘You just listen to me and stop playing the fool. You have come to the place where the mice nibble iron’).

(a) In 1864, Bücheler had suggested this explanation: This is a different world, where even a small creature like mouse may become dangerous and frightful.¹

(b) But August Otto preferred the interpretation offered by H. Genthe: ‘Hier bist du gefangen, wie die Maus in der Falle, hier gibt es keine Ausflucht,’ though there is no mention of the mousetrap in the text.²

(c) It was an easy task for Crusius to dismiss Otto’s interpretation, and to come back to Bücheler’s suggestion, which implied ‘a Fairyland of Nowhere, where the things are topsy-turvy:’ ‘Das Jenseits wird mit Zügen aus den Märchenutopien und der ‘verkehrten Welt’ ausgestattet.’³


(d) Continuing the line of interpretation Bücheler-Crusius, Weinreich wrote: "Wo schon ängstliche Mäuse das Eisen fressen, was für Kerle müssen dann erst Hercules und die anderen Himmelsbewohner sein!" Weinreich especially stressed the adynaton-element of such an Utopia.

(e) A new twist to this interpretation was given by Morris C. Sutphen, who saw in Seneca’s dictum a double-entendre. Namely, in view of the evidence that on the Cycladic island of Gyarus (= Yaros, between Ceos and Tenos) mice nibbled iron, and also of the fact that Yaros was used as one of Rome’s—and not only Rome’s!—political prisons since the times of Tiberius, Sutphen suggested that Seneca’s intention was to bring Claudius to the prison of the other world.

(f) Apparently without being aware of Sutphen’s interpretation, C.F. Russo, in his recent useful edition of the Apocolocyntosis, advanced the same suggestion: “Questo luogo terribile, a quanto pare, era nell’isola di Giaro.”

(g) Finally, following a second suggestion offered by Bücheler: “ubi nihil est hominum neque humanitatis,” W.H. Alexander referred to the American expression: “Tough guy chewed nails” and took the saying to mean: “Claudius... has come to a rough and tough place.”

(3) We can safely discard the interpretation of the saying, ubi mures ferrum rodunt, in the sense of a Yaros-prison in heaven (e) and (f). For Gyarus is not the only place where reportedly mice gnaw iron, other such places in antiquity being, e.g., Teredon in Caspia or the land of the Chalybes in Pontus.

(4) As for the Bücheler-Crusius-Weinreich line of interpretation, (a), (c), (d), about the heaven as a topsy-turvy land of Nowhere (‘‘eine verkehrte Welt’’), I would think it is not likely either, for the simple

---

6 Antigonus Mirab. 18; Aelian N.A. 5.15; Pliny N.H. 8.222.
7 Tac. Ann. 3.68; 4.30; Juvenal 1.73; Plutarch De exitio 8, 602 C.
9 In his edition of Herodas (1892), ad 3.74-76.
10 Class. Philol. 30 (1935) 351.
reason that the phenomenon of *mice gnawing iron* is not an *adyaton*, but a *real fact*. After all, mice and rats are rodents, and in order to keep their teeth in good shape they just have to gnaw any hard object, even metal: iron, lead, silver, or gold. 

I think the example adduced by Weinreich and others from *Kathâ Sarit Sâgara* 10.60 is misleading. For, in the anecdote about the cheating merchant who claimed that mice had eaten a whole large balance, confided to him, made of one thousand *palas* (pound) of iron, the *adyaton* does not consist in the fact that mice gnaw iron (as Weinreich and others had taken it), but rather in the merchant’s claim that mice had eaten the whole scales, made of one thousand pound of iron.

(5) We may now ask: When is such a phenomenon of rats attacking iron-objects likely to take place? I think the answer is obvious: When they had eaten everything else. When the overpopulation of rats had reached the point of *famine*, with no other food to eat left over, they will gnaw even objects of metal. This seems to be typical of small islands—such as Gyarus, Elymnium, etc.,—from which rats cannot easily emigrate, as they usually do in such circumstances. I believe that the evidence supports the interpretation of the dictum, *there where mice gnaw iron*, as implying extreme hunger, famine and starvation.

(a) There is a piece of evidence which seems to have been neglected by all scholars: Heracleidis Lembi *Excerpta Politiarum* 62 ed. Dilts = Aristotle Fr. 611 Rose: *Κατάφυσιςος δὲ καὶ Κλεονιάς Χαλκιδεῖς οἱ ἐν τῷ Ἀθώ, ἑξαναστάντες ἐξ Ἕλμυνίῳ, ὡς μὲν μυθολογοῦσιν, ὑπὸ μυῶν, οἱ τὰ τ’ ἄλλα κατήθισαν αὐτῶν καὶ τὸν σίδηρον.* From this testimony it becomes clear that the inhabitants of the island of Elymnium were forced to emigrate by a mice-plague. With nothing else left to eat rats started attacking iron-objects.

---

13 The references adduced in notes 6, 11, 12 and 16.


(b) The same will be true of Pliny’s report about the island of Gyarus (N.H. 8.222): *Theophrastus auctor est in Gyara insula cum incolas fugassent* (sc. *mures*), *ferrum quoque rosisse eos*. After driving away the inhabitants of the island rats started gnawing even objects of iron.

(c) What about the lines Herodas 3.74-76, adduced by Crusius in 1891? I think they too square with the suggested interpretation while implying extreme poverty:

Λαμπρίσχος:
'Αλλ' εἴς πονηρός, Κότταλε, ώστε καὶ περνάς
οὔδείς σ’ ἑπανέσειν, οὐδ’ ὄχιο χώρης
οἱ μίς ὁμοίως τὸν σίδηρον τράγωσιν.

To Crusius’ interpretation (adopted by Weinreich): ‘Das Land, ‘wo die Mäuse auch... das Eisen fressen,’ liegt dort, wo die Esel und Wölfe durch die Lüfte fliegen, wo die Böcke gemolken und die Kühe gesattelt werden,’” I would object: Who would think of a boy being sold as slave in a nowhere-land? I think the saying implies the following: ‘‘Cottalus, you are such a chap good-for-nothing that no slaves-trader (no matter how good a lier he may be) would be able to sell you to anybody, not even to the people of the poorest country in the whole world.’’

(d) We may now be in a better position to explain the belief that mice (a *Seelentier* by preference) can predict war by gnawing metal: *Ante vero Marsicum bellum quod clipeos Lanuvii, ut a te dictum est* (1.99), *mures rosissent, maximum id portentum haruspices esse dixerunt* (Cicero De Div. 2.59; Pliny N.H. 8.221; Livy 30.2.10). Probably, mice gnawing the silver-shields at Lanuvium was considered by the soothsayers as the most ominous sign of all simply because they associated *war* with *famine*, which is when mice would attack the objects of metal.

(6) Back to Seneca’s dictum. *Desine fatuari: venisti huc, ubi mures ferrum rodunt*. In view of the fact that the phenomenon of mice gnawing iron usually implies famine and starvation, I would advance the following interpretation: ‘‘Stop joking. This is a serious situation for you. This is no longer Rome: you will get nothing to eat here.’’ I think Seneca is alluding here to Claudius’ notorious gluttony: *Cibi vinique quocumque et tempore et loco appetentissimus... nec temere umquam triclinio abscessit nisi distentus ac madens... Convivia agitavit et ampla et assidua* (Sueton. Claud. 33; 32).

---

19 Untersuchungen... (cf. n. 3), p. 72.
This suggestion is supported by the fact that Seneca makes another allusion to Claudius’ voracity at *Apocol.* 9.5. In the senate of the gods, Diespiter proposes that Claudius be given the status of god, since ‘it is for the public good that there be some one able to join Romulus in devouring boiled turnips’ (cum... sitque e re publica esse aliquem qui cum Romulo possit ferventia rapa vorare,’ censeo uti divus Claudius ex hac die deus sit).

(7) Possibly, Seneca’s image of a heaven with no food for the souls of the dead was inspired by the Stoic eschatological idea about the souls of the dead being nourished solely from exhalations that reach them in the ethereal regions about the moon: ύπο τῆς τυχούσης ἀναθυμιάσεως τρέφεσθαι (Plutarch *De facie* 943 E); animus... aletur et sustentabitur iisdem rebus, quibus astra sustentantur et aluntur (Cicero *Tusc.* 1.43); τροφὴ τε χρῶνται οἰκεῖα τῇ ἀπὸ γῆς ἀναθυμιάσει, ὡς καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ ἀστρα (Sext. Emp. *Adv. math.* 9.73).  

THE ISIS WITH SEVEN ROBES

The Isiac inscription *Sylloge* No. 254 (Vathy, Samos; imperial age) reads as follows: 1

Σαράπιδι, Εἰσίδι, Ἄνοւβιδι, / Ἀλφοξράτη 2
Λύξος Δημοκλέους Σάμιος ὁ καί Τήνιος
ἱεροφο/ρος ἐπτάστολος σύν καὶ τῇ γυναι/κί
'Εορτῆ καθιέρωσεν εἰς τὰ ἑδί[α].

(1) On the word ἐπτάστολος Widman remarks: "Vox adhuc ignota." But Theodor Hopfner 3 and recently (1973) Françoise Dunand 4 referred to the epithet of Isis ἐπτάστολος in Hippolytus *Refutatio* 5.7.23. This text, however, should read as follows: 5

... ἵερὰ καὶ σεβάσμια καὶ ἀνεξαγόρευτα τοῖς μὴ τετελεσμένοις τὰ Ἴσιδος ἔχουσι μυστήρια. τὰ δ' εἰσὶν οὐκ ἄλλο τι ἢ ὁ ἤρπασμένον καὶ ζητούμενον ὑπὸ τῆς ἐπταστόλου καὶ μελανείμονος, ὡπερ ἐστίν αἰσχύνῃ Ὄσιριδος. Ὅσιριν δὲ λέγουσιν ὕδωρ· ἢ δὲ Ἰσις ἐπτάστολος, περὶ αὐτῆς ἔχουσα καὶ ἐστολισμένη ἐπτὰ στολὰς αἰθ(ε)ρίους (τοὺς πλάνητας γὰρ ἀστέρας οὕτω προσαγορεύοισιν ἀλληγορούντες)...

Now, I think Miss Dunand is right when interpreting that Auxos, from our inscription, wears seven robes because his goddess Isis does so ("à l’imitation de la déesse"), just as, for example, the members of the Isiac community from Delos or Eretria wear black cloaks because their goddess does so (τὸ κοινὸν τῶν μελανηφόρων). 7 I would disagree with her, however, in two points of significance: (1) that Auxos is a simple initiate

---


2 I.e., Ἀλφοξράτῃ.


4 O.c. (supra, n. 1), III, p. 64 n. 1.


6 φώς P, corregi.

7 O.c., II, 24 f.; III, 64.
or follower of Isis; (2) that the term ἑπτάστολος indicates the degree of his religious knowledge. Miss Dunand wrote: "l’hiérophore de Samos devait être un initié, et il n’est pas impossible que le terme heptastolos n’indique le degré de ‘connaissance’ auquel il est parvenu" (III, 64). "Cette expression ‘aux sept tuniques’ doit en effet faire allusion, nous semble-t-il, aux vêtements que porte le myste le jour de son initiation; dans le récit d’Apulée, Lucius apparaît en public revêtu de douze robes de consécration..." 8 (III, 173).

In my opinion, (1) unlike Apuleius’ Lucius, our Auxos is more than a simple initiate or follower (“fidele”) of Isis: he may well be her lower priest. This may be concluded from his title ἵπτοτεταρτάς, “the superintendant supervising the carrying of the sacred objects of Isis.” 9 And (2), Auxos wears seven robes for the same reason his goddess does. And she does so because she is regina caeli (Apuleius Metam. 11.2), because she rules over the orbits of the seven planets, as we read in the text of Hippolytus quoted above.

(2) Isis in her role of a cosmic goddess, as mater siderum, parens temporum orbisque totius domina (Apul. Metam. 11.7), wears seven robes because they represent seven heavens or orbits of the planets (Moon, Mercury, Venus, Sun, Mars, Jupiter, Saturn). As for the image of heaven as a robe, compare, e.g., Isaías 40:22 (Hebrew); Psalm 102:26-27 (= NT Hebr. 1:10-12); Philo De fuga 110; De somniis 1.203 & 1.207; Ps.-Chrysostom. In venerabilem crucem (P.G. 50, 819 s.f.): (ὁ θεὸς) δείξας καθάπερ λειμῶνα 10 τῶν οὐρανῶν, and in general Robert Eisler, Weltmantel und Himmelszelt, Munich, 1910, I, 87 ff.

Now, since each one of the seven heavenly bodies is thought of as possessing a different color, 11 one may imagine the statue of Isis as wear-

---

8 Apul. Metam. 11.24: Manefactum est, et perfectis sollemnibus processi duodecim sacratus stolis, habitu quidem religioso satis...


10 λειμῶν means here “an embroidered robe” = vestimentum (Latin version of Ps.-Chrysostom). The Nubian version has: T[Α]ΚΑΝ, “covering.” 11 see Gerald M. Browne, Chrysostomus Nubianus (Papyrologica Castroctaviana, 10), Rome-Barcelona, 1984, p. 18.6.—Compare Philostrat. Imagines 2.1.3: λειμῶν το ό περί τάς έσθήτας καί τά έν αύτάς χρώματα... 12

ing seven robes each one of a different color. Compare Plutarch De Iside 77, 382 C: Στολαὶ δ' αἱ μὲν Ἱσίδος ποικίλαι ταῖς βαφαῖς. If the statue, however, wears one single robe, it is likely to be a multicolored one, just as is the case in Apuleius, Metam. 11.3 Helm: ... (vestis) multicolor, bysso tenui pertexta, nunc albo candore lucida, nunc croceo flore lutea, nunc roseo rubore flammida... ("a multicolored garment, woven from fine linen, now radiant with snowy whiteness, now saffron-yellow like the crocus, now flaming with roseate red").

(3) The black cosmic cloak of Isis, her pallium cosmicum, should be distinguished from her multicolored garment, as it is clearly distinguished, for example, in Apuleius (11.3): palla nigerrima splendescens atro nitore. The statue of Isis as the moon-goddess wears a black garment (Plutarch De Iside 52, 372 D), while both types of clothing seem to be meant by Plutarch De Is. 3, 352 B: "some dark and shadowy, others bright and shining" (τὰ μὲν μέλανα καὶ σκιώδη, τὰ δὲ φανερὰ καὶ λαμπρά).

The suggestion that our Samian ἱεροφόρος, or a lower priest of Isis, wears his seven stoles just because his cosmic goddess does so, finds its support in the bas-relief of a priestess of Isis (II century A.D.) from the Museo Pio-Clementino at Rome (= Sylloge No. 453). Here the priestess wears the same pallium cosmicum with fringes adorned with crescents and stars that wear both her goddess Isis (at Apuleius 11.3-4) and the devotee of Isis, Lucius (at Apul. 11.24: hanc Olympiacam stolam sacrati nuncupant).

Finally, a parallel for the sense suggested by Hippolytus at 5.7.23—Ἰσίς ἐπτάστολος = ἐπταούρανος—is provided by the magic papyrus Berlin 1026.23.17 (IV century A.D.): θεέ, τὸ ὅνομά σου παντοκράτορος ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐπταούρανο, where Preisigke (Wb.) correctly translated ἐπταούρανος as "aus sieben Himmeln bestehend."

12 Griffith’s translation, o.c. (supra, n. 9), p. 562.
13 Plutarch adds that the deceased devotees of Isis are adorned with such dark and bright garments.
14 Compare Vidman, p. 218; Eisler, Weltmantel und Himmelszelt, I, p. 69 f. (with Fig. 19); Michel Malaise, Inventaire préliminaire des documents égyptiens découverts en Italie, Leiden, Brill, 1972, Rome, No. 107 (p. 143).
15 The statue of Mary in Monte St. Giuliano (Sicily) is constantly being covered with seven veils (except during the procession on 15 August): Eisler, I, p. 86 n. 3.—How relevant this is to our Ἱσίς ἐπτάστολος I do not know.
THE TEXT OF THE GOSPEL OF THOMAS
(NAG HAMMADI II.2)¹

Prologue and Logion 1

P. Oxy. 654.1-5
B. Grenfell-A. Hunt (= O)²

Οὗτοι οἱ {οἱ} λόγοι οἱ [ἀπόκρυφοι]³ οὗς ἐλά­
λησεν Ἰη(σοῦ)ς ζ ὑμῖν καὶ ἔγγραψεν Ἰούδα⁴ ὁ
καὶ Θωμᾶ.⁵ (1) καὶ εἶπεν· ὡστὶς⁶ τὴν ἐρμη­
νείαν τῶν λόγων τούτων εὐρήσει, θανάτου
οὐ μὴ γεύσηται.

Coptic version (= C)

These are the secret words which Jesus the Living spoke, and Didymus
Judas Thomas wrote them down. (1) And He said: He who shall find the
interpretation (ἐρμηνεία) of these words shall not taste death.

Right at the beginning of the Gospel of Thomas (= GTh) we see a red
light warning us of two things: (1) O and C might be two different recen­
sions, since C has Didymus Judas Thomas (as in the Acts of Thomas, 1, p.
100.4 Bonnet: Ἰούδας Θωμᾶς ὁ καὶ Διδύμος; cf. John 11:16; 20:24; 21:2
Θωμᾶς ὁ λεγόμενος Διδύμος),⁷ whereas O has the more common formula,

¹ Lecture delivered at Oxford (Faculty of Theology) on 13 February 1968. I am in­
debted to the Coptologist Dr. James Drescher for several useful suggestions; of course, the
responsibility for any possible mistake is mine alone.
² Lines 1-5 as restored by H.-Ch. Puech, Comptes rendus de l’Académie des Inscriptions et
slightly corrected by me.
³ Cf. Acts of Thomas, 39 (p. 156.14 f. ed. M. Bonnet): ... ὁ δεχόμενος (sc. Θωμᾶς) αὐτοῦ
(sc. τοῦ Χριστοῦ) τὰ ἀπόκρυφα λόγια.
⁴ The omission of the final -ς is common enough: E. Mayser, Gramm. der griech. Papyri,
I, pp. 205 ff.
⁵ ὡστὶς scripsi (cf. Matt. 5:41) : ὡς ἄν Puech and O. Hofius, Evangel. Theologie 20 (1960),
And (2): By twisting and distorting the canonical saying John 8:52, “If anyone keeps my word, he shall never taste death,” into, “If anyone finds the interpretation of these (secret) words, he shall not taste death,” the compiler of the GTh shows us his gnostic visiting card. Logion 1 implies that all “these secret words” of the collection are thought of as bearing a gnostic message: to find out this meaning equals to achieve the life everlasting.

How it works, we learn, e.g., from Logion 13a. Building on Matt. 16:13-17 (Mark 8:27-30; Luke 9:18-21), the compiler of the GTh lets Jesus ask his disciples: “Compare Me and tell Me whom I am like. Simon Peter said to Him: Thou art like a righteous angel. Matthew said to Him: Thou art like a philosopher ['a wise man’ seems to be a gloss on φιλόσοφος]. Thomas said to Him: Master, my mouth will not at all bear to say whom Thou art like. Jesus said: I am no (longer) thy master.” That is it: the synoptic Simon Peter had answered: σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστός ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, and the synoptic Jesus was satisfied with the answer. But not the gnostic Jesus of the GTh. Now, Thomas has found the wanted gnostic ἔμπνευσις of the nature of Jesus: being the supra-cosmic Light (cf. Logia 77a; 61b; 50; 83), Jesus is both ineffable and incomparable to anything from this perishable world (cf. Gärtner, pp. 125 ff. and 144 ff.). And Jesus’ answer implies: Since now we both are made equal in the gnosis: Οἶδα σε Ἐρμῆ καὶ σὺ ἐμέ: ἐγὼ εἰμὶ σὺ καὶ σὺ ἐγὼ10 (cf. Logion 108:


10 Pap. Mus. Brit. 122.49 f. (Greek Papyri in the British Museum, ed. F. G. Kenyon, I, p. 118). R. M. Grant—D. N. Freedman (p. 126), and E. Haenchen (Die Botschaft, p. 15 n. 5) offer different interpretations of Jesus’ words, “I am not thy Master:” with reference to Mark 10:17; Luke 18:18, the former (“Thomas... is rebuked because of the title he uses”); with reference to the Acts of Thomas, 39 (p. 156.12 B.), διδύμος τοῦ Χριστοῦ (sc. Thomas), the latter.
“Whoever drinks from My mouth shall become like Me, and I Myself will become he…”

Another clear example of the gnostic remodelling of a canonical saying we find in Logion 33a:

P. Oxy. 1r. 20 f.  
20 λέγει Ἠσαύδης (ἢ ὁ ἡμών ἀναφέρειν εἰς τὸ ἐν ὑμῖν σου καὶ [εἰς τὸ ἐτέρον, κηρύξας-] [τε ἐπὶ τῶν δωμάτων…]  

Matt. 10:27  
20 ητο ὁ ὑμῖν σου καὶ εἰς τὸ ὑπὸ ἀναφέρετε, κηρύξατε ἐπὶ τῶν δωμάτων.

C: “What thou shalt hear in thine ear (and) in the other ear, that preach from your housetops.”

Some scholars consider the words of C, “‘in the other ear,’” as a dit­
tography (cf. NH II, p. 39.11 f.: 2Η πεκ’ Μάαξε 2Η πκεμάαξε, for example, Haenchen (Die Botschaft des Th.-Ev., p. 21: “als vermutliche Dittographie zu streichen”)). But others (for example, Schrage, in his book, p. 81) think it might be a gnostic expansion of Matt. 10:27. I think the latter are right, because C agrees here with O, since the last two letters of O 1r. 21 are probably κε (= καί), and not TO, as Grenfell and Hunt in 1898 read them.13

The point is that in primitive folklore each ear is thought of as com­municating with (let us say) a separate, independent brain. The German Odin bore on his shoulders two ravens which told him, each raven in one ear, about all that was going on around him: the name of the one raven was Huginn (“intellectual power”), and the name of the other Muninn (“remembrance”).14 The Indian magicians must blow magic into disciples’ both ears: thus only will it be effective.15 And the Spanish medieval judges stopped up one ear while the first litigant presented his case: they were saving one ear for the second litigant.16 Consequently, the disciples of the gnostic Jesus are expected to hear canonical sayings in one ear, and their gnostic interpretation in the other. By the way, Logion

---

12 As Grenfell and Hunt themselves admitted in 1897 (ἈΟΓΙΑ ΗΗΣΟΥ, London, p. 15): “The last letter of the line may be ε, and the preceding one Γ or conceivably Κ.”
13 Thus the restoration of the Logion by Fitzmyer (p. 543) is partly wrong: (ὅ) ἀναφέρειν εἰς τὸ ἐν ὑμῖν σου, τοῦτο μάθει κηρύξας ἐπὶ τῶν δωμάτων. — Haenchen’s dittography-theory still lives in Thomas O. Lambdin (see note 9, above), who translates (p. 122): “Preach from your housetops that which you will hear in your ear {(and) in the other ear}.” In my opinion, the expression of Greek, εἰς τὸ ἐν ὑμῖν, makes it clear that the text, καὶ εἰς τὸ ἐτέρον, is to be expected. Consequently, the text of C is correct as transmitted.
14 Bächtold-Staubli, Handwörterbuch des deutschen Aberglaubens, VI, p. 1207.
15 Stith Thompson, Motif-Index of Folk-Literature, D1721.3.
33a seems to have been a gnostic commonplace (cf. the Naassenes ap. Hippolyt. Refut. 5.7.28, p. 149.144 f. Marc., and Clem. Strom. 1.56.2).

In short, I shall here follow the trend of Haenchen, Gärtner, Grant, and many others, in believing that we have to do with a gnostic gospel. The opposite view is shared by G. Quispel, who in 1967 wrote: "...In dieser Hinsicht haben sie sich geirrt!... Denn wenn es im zweiten Jahrhundert in Edessa keine Gnostiker gab, kann das Thomasevangelium nicht gnostisch sein! Von Gnostikern in Edessa wissen wir nichts." He was followed by T. Säve-Söderbergh and others.

We shall now discuss the differences in the text of the Logia preserved in C, O, or H (= Hippolytus’ account on the Naassenes).

Logion 2

A. 'Ανάπαυσις as the final goal

O, 654.5-9
[λέγει 'Ιη(σου)ς·] [6 μὴ παυσάσθω ὁ ζητών 19 τοῦ ζητεῖν 20 ἡς ἄν] [7 εὑρήκει· καὶ ὅταν εὑρήκει θαμβήσαται, καὶ θαμμ—.] [8 βῆσεις βασιλεύσει, καὶ βασιλεύσας ἐπαναπάται] [9 ἡστατεί. 21

B. Βασιλεύειν as the final goal

C

Jesus said: Let him who seeks cease not seeking until he finds; and when he finds, he will become troubled (disturbed, upset); and when he becomes troubled, he will be astonished, and he will rule over the All.

A. 'Ανάπαυσις as the final goal

Clement Strom. 5.96.3: Οὐ παύσεται ὁ ζητῶν (τοῦ ζητεῖν addidi) ἡς ἄν εὑρήκει· εὑρών δὲ θαμβήσαται, θαμβηθεὶς δὲ βασιλεύσει, βασιλεύσας δὲ ἐπαναπάτησε (quotation); 2.45.5: νὶ κάν


20 τοῦ ζητεῖν add. K.F.G. Heinrici.

21 ἐπαναπάτησει scrips ex Clem. V : ἀναπαήσεται Grenfell-Hunt, accepted by Fitzmyer, Hofius.

22 NH II. 2, p. 32.16-19: ... ἀγω ἐσταν εὐφανδίνε ζημα/17 ὡτρτρ τοῦ ἀγω εὐφανωτορτ τοῦ ζημα/18 (a 12 letters blank space) ζημήρ βοι ἀγω ζημα/19 προ εἰμὶ πτηρ. The blank space in the codex does not affect the text, which goes without lacuna.
There can be little doubt that O and the Gospel of the Hebrews ap. Clement give the original text of the Logion (so also Haenchen, pp. 34 n. 1; 73; Vielhauer, p. 297). Now, thanks to Vielhauer (especially pp. 292 ff.), we know what an important part is played by motif A (that of the rest as

the final goal) in the gnostic system of the GTh, which maintained that
the gnostic rest was achievable during one’s lifetime: cf. Logia 51 (and
113); 60 (end); 90 (echoing Matt. 11:28-29); 50 (end); 86. If in Logion 50
end (“If they ask you: What is the sign of your Father in you?, say to
them: It is movement and rest”) we may understand this “movement”
as a ζητεῖν καὶ ἐυρεῖν (as Haenchen, p. 73, and Vielhauer, p. 295, had sug-
ggested), then its parallelism to our Logion 2 in O = Clement would be
even greater.

Nevertheless, the translator of the GTh from Greek into Coptic
deliberately changed (Quispel is right, p. 112) motif A into motif B (that of
ruling over the All as the final goal). Why did he do so? Since the existence
of the motif B is well attested (as shown above), the possibility of a cor-
rupt Greek original must be dismissed. Thus I would suggest the follow-
ing explanation.

C presupposes such a Greek text: ... καὶ ὅταν εὑρη θαυμάζομεν, καὶ
θαυμάζεται, καὶ βασιλεύει επάνω πάντων (or τοῦ παντός). Now, I
think: (a) θαυμάζεται stood in the Greek source of C as a gloss on
θαυμάζεται, since also in Clement II, θαυμάζεται appears as a synonym
for Clement V, θαυμαθείες. The translator took over both verbs and
formed a false climax (“and when he becomes troubled, he will be
astonished”). Further, (b) he read ἐπαναπαθήσεται as ἐπάνω πάντων ἔσται,
while recalling John 3:31 (ὁ ἀνωθεν ἀρχόμενος ἐπάνω πάντων ἔστιν),
possibly his Logion 77a (“I am the Light which is above all things”), and
probably motif B as well.27 And finally, (c) the translator knew that
βασιλεύει of Logion 2 was one of so many mnemonic key-words (or
“mot-crotchets,” as G. Garitte in 1957 called them)28 which led to
βασιλεία of Logion 3. Now, he wished to bring both words even closer to
each other: thus he sacrificed καὶ βασιλεύει επαναπαθήσεται and put the
stress on βασιλεύει.

If this explanation is true, it would show us how much freedom the
Coptic translator did use: he was not translating, he was remodelling his
Greek original, and in so doing he was guided by any inspiration, even
by a gloss. Thus the probability is that the Archetype of the GTh spoke of
one single “astonishment” or “amazement” (θαυμαζεῖν = θαυμάζειν), that
belonging to the final stage of the gnosis (“and when he finds, he will be
amazed”) and probably corresponding to the “amazement” of the

27 Already Fitzmyer (p. 518), A. Guillaumont, Le Muséon 73 (1960), pp. 330 ff., and O.
Cullmann, Theol. Literaturzeitung 85 (1960), p. 324, had conjectured ἀνωθεν ἀρχόμενος ἐπάνω πάντων ἔστιν,
instead of ἀναπάθεται, in the Greek original of C, but I think they thought of a mistake, not
of a deliberate change, on the part of the Coptic translator. On the other hand, G.
Garitte, Le Muséon 73 (1960), pp. 164 ff. and 340 f., was not convincing enough to me.
28 Le Muséon 70 (1957), pp. 63 f.
Greek mystai in sight of the “marvel of marvels” (cf. Logion 29, and Hippolyt. Refut. 5.8.18, p. 158.96 Marc.: θαύμα θαυμάτων).

Incidentally, I think Clement (Strom. 2.45.4) was mistaken when he referred our Logion to the adage from the Traditions of Matthew, θαύμασσαι τὰ παρόντα. For this “wondering” follows another motif, the Platonic-Aristotelian pattern of τὸ θαυμάζειν ἀρχὴ φιλοσοφίας, and belongs to a first stage in the gnosis, as Clement himself admits: βαθμὸν τοῦτον πρῶτον τῆς ἐπέκεινα γνώσεως.

Logion 3

O, 9-21

(a) λέειν Ἡ[η(σοῦ)]ς· έλαν
10 οἱ ἐλκοντες ύμᾶς [εἰπωσιν ύμῖν· ἵδος]
ὲ βασιλεία έν οὐρα[νῳ, φθησεται ύμᾶς]
τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρ[ανοῦ· έλαν δ᾽ εἰπωσιν δ᾽
τί υπὸ τὴν γῆν ἐστιν, εἰσελεύσονται
οἱ ἱχθυες τῆς θαλάς[σης προφθάσαν-

tες30 ύμᾶς· καὶ31 ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν32
ἐντὸς ύμῶν [έσ]τι [κάστος. (b) δς ἀν ἐστιν
γνοι, ταύτην εὑρή|σει, καὶ ὅταν33 ύμείς
ἐστιν πνεύμα, ἐγνώςαθε, [εἴ]σεθη ὅτι υἱοὶ
ἐστε ύμείς τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ ζ[ώντος· εἰ δὲ μὴ
20 γνῶσ<ε>θε ἡ ἐσωτερικός, ἐν τῇ πτωχεία|έστε
καὶ ύμείς ύμεῖς ἐστε ή πτω|χεία.

C

(a) Jesus said: If those who lead you34 say to you: ‘Behold, the Kingdom is in the sky,’ then the birds of the sky will precede you (be there before you). If they say to you: ‘It is in the sea (θάλασσα),’ then the fish35 will precede you. But rather (ἄλλα) the Kingdom is inside of you, and it is outside of you.

29 The text as restored by Fitzmyer, slightly corrected by me.
30 προφθάσαντες scripsi : φθάσαντες Fitzmyer.
31 Read ἄλλα (= C).
33 ὅταν scripsi (= C) : ὅτε Fitzmyer.
35 C omits “of the sea.”
(b) When (ὅταν) you come to know yourselves, then (τότε) you will become known, and you will realize that you are the sons of the Living Father. But (δὲ) if you do not come to know yourselves, then you dwell in poverty, and you are the poverty (itself).

3 (a): O, 13, has: ὑπὸ τὴν γῆν ἐστίν, whereas C has: “it is in the sea (Θάλασσα),” instead. Now, some scholars thought that the clause with “under the earth” is missing in C as a result of an oversight on the part of the translator (so, e.g., Gärtner, p. 83). On the other hand, the attempt by Hofius to restore “or in the sea” in the text of O is improbable, because of the harsh phrase, ἔσονται φθάσαντες. His restoration reads:

τι ὑπὸ τὴν γῆν ἐστὶν ἢ ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ,
οἱ ἱχθύες τῆς θαλάσσης ἔσονται φθάσαντες.

They all follow C. Taylor\(^{36}\) in believing that three world parts are mentioned here: sky, earth, and sea (as, e.g., in Job 22:7-8; Ps. 134:6).

But I think all the difficulties disappear if we bear in mind that the Hebrew word tehôm—which implies both “a bottomless pit,” “a great deep,” and “ocean,” “floods of water”—is usually translated in the LXX either as ἁβυσσός\(^{37}\) or as θάλασσα. Thus O translated tehôm as “underworld, the depth of the earth,” and C as “sea.” They both followed the polarity idea: Heaven-Earth (as in Deut. 30:12-13; Ps. 106:26; Rom. 10:6-7), and nothing is missing in C. If this is true it might suggest to us the following: (1) that Logion 3 (at least) was originally written in Hebrew; and (2) that O and C definitely represent two different recensions.

3 (b): On the contrary, I think the Coptic translator has mistakenly omitted an entire line from his Greek original (ὅς ἔστων γνῶι, ταύτῃ εὑρήσει)—because of the similarity between O, 16, ὅς ἔστων and O, 17, ὅταν. For hardly could the Coptic translator deliberately have omitted the words of O, “Whoever knows himself will find it (the Kingdom):” the εὑρήσει-element goes well both with his system (cf. Logia 2, μὴ παυσάσθω ὁ ζητῶν τοῦ ζητεῖν ἔως ἄν εὑρήσῃ; 113: “But rather, the Kingdom of the Father is spread out upon the earth, and men do not see it!”) and with Hippolytus’ account on the Naassenes (5.7.20, p. 147.101 f. Marc.: ἡ ἐντὸς ἀνθρώπου βασιλείαν ἡ δὲ ὑπάρχειν ζητεῖται ἐν τοῖς θετομένοις).

Finally, the words of C, “When you come to know yourselves, then you will become known, and you will realize…,” presuppose such a Greek original: καὶ ὅταν ὑμεῖς ἐκατούρν ἐγνώσεσθε, ἐγνωσθήσεσθε, καὶ ἔσεσθε… It is obvious that ἐγνωσθήσεσθε is out of place in this context and that O offers the original text. My guess is that the translator into C had found in his Greek original ἐγνώσεσθε mistakenly written twice: he then took the
second γνώσεσθε for γνωσθήσεσθε while recalling the idea, γνώναι θεόν— gnωσθηκαί ὑπὸ θεοῦ, of Gal. 4:9; 1 Cor. 8:3; 13:12. Thus the arbitrary procedure of the translator into C seems to be visible here again.

Logion 4

Ο, 21-27

[λέγει Ἰη(ςοῦ)ς: οὐχ ἀποκνήσει ἀνθ[ρωπος παλαιὸς ἡμερῶν πόσ[α ἔπερωτήσαε πα[ιδίον ἐπτὰ ἡμερῶν περὶ τοῦ τόπου τῆς ζωῆς, καὶ αὐτὸς ζήσεται. ὁτί πολλοὶ ἔσονται π[ρῶτοι ἔσχατοι <καὶ>. οἱ ἔσχατοι πρῶτοι, καὶ [εἰς ἐν καταντήσουσιν.

Jesus said: The man old in days will not hesitate to ask a small child of seven days about the place (τόπος) of Life, and he will live. For many who are first shall become last <and the last first>, and they shall become one and the same.

(1) Either the translator or the copyist of C has by oversight omitted the words, καὶ οἱ ἔσχατοι πρῶτοι (so also Schrage, p. 259). C is full of such omissions; one example: Logion 55a, ‘‘Whoever does not hate his father and his mother = as I do = ὃς ἐγὼ cannot become a disciple to Me’’ = Logion 101.

(2) As for the end of Ο, Grenfell and Hunt suggested, and Fitzmyer adopted, the restoration: [ζωῆν αἶώνιον ἐξουσίαν. I do not think this trite formula is likely at all. On the other hand, Hofius’ restoration, implicitly adopted by Schrage: [εἰς μόνον γενήσουσιν, must be dismissed because of the form γενήσουσιν. But if we restore the line so: [εἰς ἐν καταντήσουσιν, it could be paralleled by such passages as Eph. 4:13: μέχρι καταντήσωμεν οἱ πάντες εἰς τὴν ἐνότητα τῆς πίστεως καὶ τῆς ἐπιγνώσεως τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ, εἰς

36 The Oxyrhynchus Sayings of Jesus Found in 1903 (Oxford, 1905).
37 Cf., e.g., J. Jeremias, in Kittel’s Thol. Dict. of the NT, s.v. ἁμαρτος.
38 παλαιὸς ἡμερῶν Hofius with reference to Dan. 7:9, 13, 22 (= C): πληρῆς ἡμερῶν C. Taylor, accepted by Fitzmyer.
39 καὶ αὐτός ζήσεται scripsi: καὶ ζήσεται Hofius (too short): καὶ ζήσει εἶσεται, ‘‘he will know’’ Fitzmyer (unlikely).
40 I think καὶ was mistakenly omitted in Ο, because there is no space for it.
andρα τέλειον, εἰς μέτρον ἡλικίας τοῦ πληρώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ; John 17:11 ἵνα ὄσιν ἐν καθὼς ἡμείς; 21; 22; 23 ἵνα ὄσιν τετελειωμένοι εἰς ἐν. As A.F.J. Klijn and H.C. Kee have shown, the return to the primal unity in the either bisexual or male Archanthropus Adam, and to the original innocence is one of the key ideas of the GTh (compare Logia 11c; 22; 106 [with 48]; 114, especially 18 and 72). Consequently, O and C seem to agree in all.

However, if we now take Hippolytus’ account on the Naassenes (Rebutatio 5.7.20, p. 147.102-105 Marc.):

περὶ ἡς (sc. τῆς μακαρίας κρυβομένης όμοιὰ καὶ φανερομένης φύσεως) διαφρήθηκε ἐν τοῖς κατὰ Θωμάν ἐπιγραφομένωι εὐαγγελικοὶ παραδίδοσι λέγοντες οὕτως: ‘ἐμὲ ὁ Ξητῶν εὑρήσει ἐν παιδίοις ἀπὸ ἑτῶν ἑπτά· ἔχει γὰρ ἐν τοῖς τεσσαρεσκαθεῖκατοι αἰῶνι κρυβόμενον φανεροῦμαι’

we realize at once that this saying cannot possibly go back to our Logion 4. Doubtless, the same GTh is meant, but the Naassene recension contained at least one Logion which is missing in C. We shall call it Logion 4bis. Hippolytus is a trustworthy source; he is quoting here (διαφρήθην = verbatim, expressly), as he elsewhere does. I shall now try to show that the message of this Logion 4bis of H is quite a different one from that comprised in Logion 4 of C and O.

The idea of C and O seems to be: A newly born child or suckling, a spiritual pure being which has just come down to this perishable world from the “place of Light,” knows that place much better than a man old in days, spoiled by this material world which is but a corpse (πτῶμα: Logia 56; 80).

The idea of a “small child of seven days” seems to be that the newborn is not yet circumcised (which will take place on the eighth day: Gen. 17:12);

47 This time contra Puech, loc. cit.: “… sehr frei zitiert und abgewandelt worden ist.”
it stands thus at the very beginning of the human lifespan. If this is true, then the parallel material would be: Logion 18: ‘‘For where the beginning (ἀρχή) is, there will be the end. Blessed is he who shall take his place in the beginning: he shall know the end, and he shall not taste death;’’ Logion 22a: ‘‘Jesus saw infants being suckled. He said to His disciples: These infants who are being suckled are like those who enter the Kingdom’’ (built upon Matt. 18:1-3; 19:13-15 and parallels). The Valentinian psalm in Hippolytus’ Refutatio, 6.37.7, p. 253.7 Marc.: ἐὰν μὴ τραγβερφός θερόμενον, and 6.42.2, p. 259.11-13 M.: καὶ γὰρ Οὐαλεντῖνος φάσαι ἐκτὸς ἑωρακέναι παῖδα νήπιον ἡρτιγέννητον, οὗ πυθόμενος ἐπέζητε τίς ἂν εἶν, οὗ ἀπεκρίνατο λέγων ἑκτὸν εἶναι τὸν Λόγον. The Gospel of Truth, p. 19.28-30: ‘‘there came the little children also, to whom the Gnosis of the Father belongs.’’

On the other hand, the idea of the Naassene Logion seems to be: The primeval Adam, ὁ τέλειος Ἀνθρωπος, is always present in man, but he remains hidden in him until the man himself attains to maturity or τελειώτης. This process begins with (ἀπὸ) seven years of age and ends at fourteen: then Adam manifests himself in man.

The background of this idea seems to be Greek. Compare, e.g., Ps.-Galen, Hist. philos. 127 (Diels, Doxographi Graeci, p. 646) plus Aetius 5.23 (pp. 434 f. Diels): Πότε ἀρχεται τῆς τελειώτητος ὁ ἀνθρωπος; Ἡράκλειτος καὶ οἱ Στωίκοι ἀρχεῖθαι τοὺς ἀνθρώπους τῆς τελειώτητος περὶ τὴν δευτέραν ἐβδομάδα, περὶ ἢν ὁ σπερματικὸς κινεῖται ὀφρός... Ἀριστοτέλης δὲ περὶ τὴν πρώτην ἐβδομάδα, περὶ ἢν ἕννοια γίνεται καλοῦ τε καὶ κακοῦ, καὶ τῆς διδασκαλίας ἀρχή. This reckoning presupposes the old folkloric division of the human lifespan into ten hebdomads (attested in Greece since Solon, Fr. 19 Diehl [= 27 West] ap. Philo, De opif. mundi 104 f., and ap. Clement, Strom. 6.144). The Naassene motif stresses the fourteenth year, i.e., the earliest age at which a man is able to beget, when he is mature. If he becomes father at fifteen, he can become grandfather at the earliest age of thirty: 2 x (14 + 1) = 30. Hence Heraclitus (A 18-19 Diels-Kranz = Fr. 108 Marc.) reckoned the space of thirty years as one human generation; i.e., as a complete cycle of the living force or soul (grandson = grandfather, after whom he is often named). Thus Hippolytus


guessed some part of the truth when he referred (Ref. 5.7.21) to the Ps.-Hippocratic folkloric adage, ἐπτά ἐτῶν παῖς πατρὸς ἥμισυ.

Now, I think the Naassene motif stressed the phallic or procreative aspect of the Archanthropus (compare Ref. 5.7.27-29; 5.7.21 ὅθεν οὕτωι τὴν ἀρχέγονον φύσιν τῶν ὠλων ἐν ἀρχέγονωι τιθέμενοι σπέρματι; 5.7.23 αἰσχύνη Ὅσιρίδος; 5.7.29 αἰσχύνη ἀνθρώπου; 5.8.10 καὶ τὰς αἰσχύνας ἀνω ἑστραμμένας). But Leisegang and Puech, following the Stoic speculation about λόγος (cf., e.g., SVF, I, No. 149; Aetius 4.11.4), believed that it is rather the divine λόγος which in the fourteenth year takes the place of the human reason, “...and the invisible presence of Christ, the perfect Man, and thereby of the Kingdom of heaven, becomes effective in us.” Wherever the stress may be, on σπέρμα—as I would rather think—or on πνεύμα, the point is that Logion 4bis has very little in common with Logion 4.

That Hippolytus’ evidence gives a reliable clue is confirmed by the Manichaean Psalm-Book (of the Chester Beatty Collection), II, f. 192.2-3: “The grey-haired old men,—the little children instruct them: they that are six years old instruct them that are sixty years old.”

I would therefore suggest these two points. (a) There existed, say, in the Archetype of the GTh, a Logion in which a seventy-year-old man was asking a child of seven about the Son of Man or Jesus (this was then modified by the Manichaean Psalm-Book into the relation: a sixty-year-old man and a child of six). Of this Logion only the text in the first part of Logion 4bis survived: ἐμε ὁ ζητῶν εὑρήσει ἐν παιδίοις ἀπό ἐτῶν ἐπτά.

(b) What follows in Logion 4bis (ἐκεῖ γὰρ ἐν τῷ τεσσαραερσαιδεκάτων αἰῶνι χρυσόμενος φανερώματι) seems to be a later expansion. It is foreign to the system of GTh, where no aeons appear. The expansion was undertaken by somebody who probably wished to obtain a pleroma with fourteen aeons. The parallels would be: Jeū book II, c. 52 (p. 327.23 f. Schmidt-Till): ‘der grosse Gott, der in dem vierzehnten Aeon ‘der grosse gerechte (χρηστός) Gott’ genannt wird;” Manichaean Kephalaia, c. X (p. 43.2 f. Polotsky-Schmidt-Böhlig): There are fourteen great Aeons of Light; the first hebdomad consists of five στοιχεῖα plus Call and Hear. (The text with the other hebdomad of Aeons is desperately corrupt.)

55 I do not know why: perhaps to get two pleromas of 30 Aeons each one, according to the Marcosian calculation? Cf. F. Sagnard, La Gnome Valentinienne (Paris, 1947), pp. 365 ff.
The Naassene Logion 4bis—along with the Naassene version of Logion 11b (see below)—is a proof for the thesis that there existed at least three very different recensions of the GTh: O, C, H (= Hippolytus). At the same time, it is a good example of how variable, how much open to modifications and expansions the Logia of a gnostic gospel might be.

Logion 5

\[\begin{align*}
\text{O, 27-31} \\
\text{λέγει Ἰη(σου)ς· γνῶθι τὸ ἐμπροσ-} \\
\text{θεν τῆς ὁψεώς σου, καὶ τὸ κεχαλυμμένον} \\
\text{ἀπὸ σου ἀποκαλυφθῆναι αἱ σοι.}^{56} \\
\text{οὐ γὰρ ἐσ-} \\
\text{τιν χρυστὸν ὁ οὐ δοκέον γενήσεται,}^{57} \\
\text{καὶ θεαμμένον ὁ οὐχ ἐγερθήσεται.} \\
\end{align*}\]

Inscription on a shroud from Behnesa: \(^{58}\)

\[\text{λέγει Ἰησοῦς· οὐχ ἐστιν θεαμμένον} \\
\text{ὁ οὐχ ἐγερθήσεται. +} \\
\]

C

Jesus said: Know what is in thy sight, and that which is hidden from thee will be revealed to thee. For (γὰρ) there is nothing hidden which shall not become manifest.

Kephalaia 65 (I, p. 163.28 f.):

Erkennt, was vor eurem Angesicht ist, und das euch Verborgene wird euch offenbar werden.

The restoration of O, 31 by Grenfell and Hunt is now confirmed by a (fifth- or sixth-century A.D.) inscription on a shroud (bought at Behnesa-Oxyrhynchus in 1953). The Kephalaia have only one member of the Logion, C has two members, O even three (and the shroud only the third one). I think the Kephalaia offer only an abridged text of C. As for the third member in O, it looks like a late Christian marginal gloss or a secondary expansion—an independent "Wanderspruch" (Haenchen). Hence perhaps its presence on a shroud (where it served as a magical formula to assure that the shroud be unbound on the day of resurrection). Probably, the saying, "There is nothing buried which shall not be raised up," was inspired by such passages as 1 Cor. 15:20: νυνὶ δὲ Χριστὸς

---

Thus the probability is that it never belonged to the Archetype of the GTh. Otherwise it would have been acceptable to C, where Jesus appears in flesh. Or, as Haenchen (Die Botschaft etc., p. 36 n. 7) put it: “Dass auch Gnostiker von (gegenwärtiger geistlicher) Auferstehung sprechen und darum auch dies Logion übernehmen konnten, ist deutlich...” Schrage (Apophoreta, p. 256 n. 18) agreed with Haenchen and referred to 2 Tim. 2:18 (ἀνάστασιν ἡδη γεγονέναι), and to the Gospel of Philip, Logion 23 end (NH II.3, p. 57.18 f.): “It is necessary to rise in this flesh (σάρξ), since everything exists in it.” The opposite view (that the version of O has preference) is shared by G. Quispel (Makarius etc., p. 71).59

Logion 6

O, 32-40

έγγερται ἐκ νεκρῶν, ἀπαρχὴ τῶν κεχοιμημένων; 22 ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ πάντες ζωοποιηθήσονται.

Thus His disciples (μαθητής) questioned Him and said to Him: How do you want us to fast (νηστεύειν), and how shall we pray, and how shall we give alms (ἐλεημοσύνη), and what diet shall we observe (παρατηρεῖν)?

Jesus said: Tell no lie, and do not do what you hate, for all things are manifest before Heaven. For (γάρ) there is nothing hidden that shall not become manifest, and nothing covered that shall remain without being uncovered.

The restoration of O, 37-40, is difficult, because we cannot be sure

59 I do not think that the adage, θαύμασον τὰ παρόντα (Traditions of Matthew, ap. Clement, Strom. 2.45.4), belongs to the same motif as, “Know what is in thy sight,” of Logion 5 (contra Puech, op. cit., p. 128, and ap. Hennecke-Schneemelcher, I, p. 225).
60 ἄδικος ἔστιν restored Hofius; ἄδικος ἔστιν restored instead.
61 Cf. James 3:14; Col. 3:9; Eph. 4:25; Lev. 19:11.
62 οὐκ ἔστιν restored Hofius: οὐκ ἔστιν restored instead.
enough about the Coptic text either. The first difficulty consists in that the *Ed. pr.* (A. Guillaumont and others) suggested the reading *με* ('Truth') in lieu of the transmitted *πε* ('Heaven'). Following this suggestion Hofius tried to avoid the reading *τοῦ οὐρανοῦ*, and then was forced to interrupt the text in the middle of a sentence. Thus his restoration is not likely; it reads:

\[ \ldots \text{πάντα γάρ ἐμπροσθεν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ ἰασ ἀνεκεκαλυμμένα ἐστίν} \]
\[ καὶ οὖν ἔγγον ἀποκάλυπτον ἐὰν μὴ ἵνα \text{φανερωθηῇ,} \]
\[ \text{γε τῇ} η(σοῦ)ς μακάρι(ός) ἐστιν \ldots \]

I think Fitzmyer was right in following the transmitted text of C, suggesting the restoration given above, which I have improved in two points: v. 38, read: *〈ἔν〉αντι τοῦ οὐρανοῦ* (cf. Acts 8:21; 1 Clem. 39.4); and vv. 39 f., read: *φανερω(θή)σεται* (cf. Mark 4:22: οὐ γάρ ἐστιν κρυπτῶν ἐὰν μὴ ἓνα φανερωθῆνα), in lieu of Fitzmyer's *φανερὸν ἔσται*.

Apparently, Fitzmyer was not aware of a second difficulty: C has *(p. 33.20) τῷ ὁμοίωσιν, which can mean either πάντες ἢ πάντα.* The *Ed. pr.* rendered it as ‘‘all things,’’ and I think it was right, *contra* the same *Ed. pr.,* which in Logion 77a *(p. 46.24)* rendered *τῷ ὁμοίωσιν* as ‘‘them all,’’ instead of ‘‘all things’’ or ‘‘everything.’’ But O, 38 has ...]HC. If we now read: *[πάντα γάρ ἐστὶ πλήρη ἡ]ς ἀληθείας* *(cf. Isa. 1:21 S1 and John 1:14), we must explain this small C in πλήρης as a lapsus calami of the copyist. But πλήρης could be read also as πληρείς; thus the possibility for the restoration: πάντες (τῷ ὁμοίωσи) γάρ εἰσὶ πληρείς ἀληθείας remains.

Now, the last clause of C—‘‘and nothing covered that shall remain without being uncovered’’—is definitely missing in O. Since this clause obviously follows Matt. 10:26 (Luke 12:2): *καὶ ἀποκαλυσθήσεται,* I would rather think that the copyist of O by an oversight had omitted a whole line of his exemplar—because of the homoioteleuton, φανερωθήσεται... ἀποκαλυσθήσεται. And since he has omitted also the phrase, λέγει τῇ η(σοῦ)ς after this clause, it seems very likely that he did so by a mistake, not deliberately. Thus there seems to be no deliberate difference between O and C in this Logion.

Logion 7

O, 40 ff.

40 μακάρι(ός) ἐστιν [ὁ λέων ὦν ἄνθρωπος ἐσθίει, καὶ ὁ λέων] ἐστὶ· καὶ ἐπ-

64 Cf. also Schrage, *Das Verhältnis,* etc., pp. 34-37.

65 As for the message of the Logion, compare Logia 14; 27; 104.
Jesus said: Blessed (μακάριος) is the lion which the man eats, and the lion will become man; and cursed is the man whom the lion eats, and the lion will become man.

O, 40 ff. probably contains Logion 7 (as Jean Doresse\textsuperscript{66} and Hofius had suggested); thus I give a possible restoration of O, 40-43. Fitzmyer’s tentative restoration seems unlikely to me; it reads:

\begin{align*}
\text{µα} \chiα\text{ρι} \text{ός} & \text{ε} \text{στιν} \ 0 \ \text{ταύτα} \ 0 \ \text{ποιών.} \\
\text{πάντα} \ 0 \ \text{γάρ} \ 0 \ \text{φανερω̣ι} \ 0 \ \text{ε̣στ} [\text{α} \ 0 \ \text{παρά} \ 0 \ \text{τοί} \ 0 \ \text{πατρί} \ 0 \ \text{δς} \\
& \ 0 \ \text{έν} \ 0 \ \text{τοί} \ 0 \ \text{ουρανώ} \ 0 \ \text{ε̣στ} [0 \ \text{ив.}
\end{align*}

As for the text of C, it seems obvious that the italicized words should be transposed to read: “and the man will become lion,” as Doresse (o.c., p. 371); the \textit{Ed. pr.} (p. 5); S. Giversen;\textsuperscript{67} Hofius (p. 35 n. 54); and Haenchen\textsuperscript{68} have already suggested. There is really no need to insist on the transmitted text (as, e.g., Gärtner did). Possibly, in such a short Logion as this one C did not disagree with O, but one cannot be sure. The lion stands here for “this material world, corpse and death.” compare Ps. 7:3; 21:21-22; 34:17; Hippolyt. \textit{Refut.} 5.8.15 (the Naassenes); Clem. \textit{Exc. ex Theodoto} 84; and Gärtner, pp. 162 f.

\textit{Logia 30 a, b}

\textit{P. Oxy.} \textit{1v, 1-21} (now Bodley MS Gk. Th. e 7 [P]), contains Logia C 26 (end): Καί \ 0 \ \text{τότε} \ 0 \ \text{διαβλέψεις} \ 0 \ \text{ἐκβάλειν} \ ΤΟ \ \text{κάρφος} \ \text{ΤΟ} \ \text{ἐν} \ \text{τοί} \ \text{ὁφθαλμοί} \ τΟΥ \ \text{ἀδελφοῦ} \ \text{σου;} \ 27; \ 28 \ \text{till NH II.2, p. 38.27: Καί \ οὐ} \ 0 \ \text{βλέ[πουσιν} \ \text{ὁτι} \ \text{κενο} \ \text{ήχουσιν} \ \text{εἰς} \ \text{τὸν} \ \text{χόσμον} ... (cf. Fitzmyer, pp. 535 f.). And O, 1r, 1-21, contains Logia C 29 (end): ... ταῦτα \ \text{τήν} \ \text{πτωχείαν} (ν) (cf. Fitzmyer, pp. 537 f.); 30a; 77b; 31; 32; and the beginning of 33a (discussed above, under Logion 1, p. 57). Now, Logia 30 a, b read in O as follows:

\begin{align*}
O, \ 1r, \ 2-9 \\
(α) \ \text{[λέγει} \ \text{[..]} \ \text{I(ησου)ς}; \ \text{ὅπ]ου} \ \text{ἐὰν} \ \text{ὡσιν} \\
& \ \text{[γ}' \ \text{θεοί,]} \ \text{ε[ἰσιν]} \ \text{θεοί;} \ \text{καί} \\
& \ \text{[ὅ]που} \ \text{ε[ἰς]} \ \text{ἐ̣στιν} \ \text{μόνος}
\end{align*}


\textsuperscript{67} Thomasevangeliet (Copenhagen, 1959), p. 38.

Logion 30. Jesus said: Where there are three gods, they are gods; where there are two or (η) one, I am with him. Logion 77b. Cleave (a piece of) wood, I am there; lift up the stone, and you will find Me there.

(1) Grenfell and Hunt restored in line 5 [λ]έγω or [λέ]γω (‘‘Where one is alone, I say: I am with him’’), and this was adopted by Guillaumont,69 Hofius (p. 185), Jeremias (p. 107), Gärtner (p. 84), and many others. Fitzmyer (p. 539) restored [αύ]τοι instead (‘‘and where one is all alone to himself’’), but his reading is linguistically weak. I myself (back in 1968) was willing to conjecture [η δ]ύω but C.H. Roberts71 and H.W. Attridge72 have re-examined the papyrus (the latter using ultraviolet light), reaching the conclusion that [λ]έγω is the correct reading (cf., e.g., Matt. 5:22; 5:28; 5:32). C omits this λέγω (maybe because of the cluster ΛεΓωεΓω).

(2) Furthermore, the Coptologist Dr. James Drescher suggested to me that in C, ‘‘where there are three gods, they are gods,’’ seems a strangely inept thing to say, and that there is possibly a dittography of the word ‘‘gods’’ in the Coptic. Consequently, we should read: ‘‘Where there are three (sc. men), they are gods.’’ If so, then we may restore simply [τρεῖς] in line 3 of O, instead of Guillaumont’s restoration [γ θεοί].

The arguments for [τρεῖς] are: (a) If O in v. 4 writes εἰς why, then, in v. 3 should it write τρεῖς as γ? (b) What is more important, the Hebrew motif speaks of three men: ‘‘The Shekinah is present wherever three study the Torah.’’ This becomes clear both from Matthew 18:20 (οὐ γὰρ εἰςιν δύο η τρεῖς συνηγμένοι εἰς τὸ ἐμὸν ὄνομα, ἐκεῖ εἰμὶ ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν) and from Pirqe Aboth 3.7 (where this number goes from ten to one only).73 The restora-

---

tion [τρεῖς] has been adopted both by Roberts (p. 91) and Attridge (p. 156).

I think the saying implies: “It is said: Wherever three men are gathered together to study the Torah, they become the holy ones (= they are in presence of the Shekinah). But I say unto you: Wherever only two or one of My disciples are gathered together, I will make the third (so that the Shekinah may be present).’’

It seems that the medieval Cathari knew this Logion: “Where there was one of his little ones, he would be with him; and where there were two, similarly; and where there were three, in the same way.’’

(3) After this [τρεῖς] in line 3, the surface is badly abraded, and the traces are compatible with both readings: ε[ισ]ην θεοί (C.H. Roberts and the majority of scholars) or ε[ισ]ην θεοί (Grenfell and Hunt, and recently Attridge). Reading line 3 so: τρεῖς, ε[ισ]ην θεοί, Attridge (p. 156) translates: ‘‘Where there are three, they are without god, and where there is but a single one I say that I am with him.’’ He feels that “the fragment asserts that any group of people lack divine presence. That presence is available only to the ‘solitary one.’” The importance of the solitary (μοναχός) is obvious in the Gospel [of Thomas]. Cf. Sayings 11, 16, 22, 23, 49, 75 and 106. This saying must now be read in connection with those remarks on the ‘monachos’.’’

This interpretation seems to me highly unlikely for the following reasons. (a) The contention that the saying denies divine presence to “any group of people” is refuted by the words of C, “and where there are two;” by Matt. 18:20 (οὖ γὰρ εἰσιν δύο ην τρεῖς); by Pirque Aboth 3.7; and by the saying of the Cathari as well. (b) Attridge’s explanation of the Coptic text is not convincing; it reads: ‘‘The α-privative was probably accidentally lost and an attempt was then made to make some sense out of the resulting saying by specifying that the three beings involved were gods.’’ But the text, [ὁ]ου εἶναι ὄρν [τρεῖς,] ε[ισ]ην θεοί, gives a good sense (“Wherever there are three [sc. men], they are gods [or godlike]’’), requiring no attempt at making some sense. And the Coptic translation is best explained as displaying a small dittography: ‘‘Where there are three [gods], they are gods.’’

(c) The sense of θεοί, “being without God,” is strange here and cannot be paralleled for the time of GTh. For at NT Ephes. 2:12, θεοί does not mean “being separate from God, being without God,” but rather, “being without the knowledge of the true God” = 1 Thess. 4:5; Gal. 4:8-9

74 Quoted by I. von Dollinger, Beiträge zur Sektengeschichte des Mittelalters, II (Munich, 1890), p. 210, and by R.M. Grant-D.N. Freedman, op. cit., p. 141.
µη εἰδότας τὸν θεόν (cf. G. Kittel, *Theol. Wb. zum NT*, III [1938], p. 122.16). (d) Finally, of the sayings of GTh adduced by Attridge, 11c; 16b; 22b; 23 and 106 are irrelevant to our case, while μοιαχός in 49 ("Blessed are the solitary and elect") and 75 has not the same sense as "and where there is but a single one."

In conclusion, in view of the presence of the words δύο η̃ both in C and in Matt. 18:20, I would read O as follows: [πτι]ου ἐὰν ὁσιν / [τρεις] ε[ἰς]γθεο̃: και / [ὁ]που <δύο η̃> ε[ἰς] ἔστιν μόνος, / [λ]έγω· ἐγ̃ω εἰμι μετ' αὐ/τ[οῦ.] There is no substantial disagreement between O and C.

One final remark. Our saying does not imply that God would be inferior to Jesus. Neither does Logion 100: "Give Caesar what belongs to Caesar; give God what belongs to God; and give Me what is Mine." Cf. Matt. 22:21 (Mark 12:17; Luke 20:25): 'Απόδοτε οὖν τὰ Καίσαρος Καίσαρι και τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ τῶι θεωι. The Gnostic has only expanded a synoptic saying (as he elsewhere did), but the possibility for the Hebrew God to be understood as the gnostic Unknown Father remains, and the latter is not inferior to Jesus. (The opposite view is shared by R.M. Grant—D.N. Freedman, op. cit., pp. 142; 178.)

Logion 30 b of O appears in C after Logion 77a, which reads: "I am the Light that is above all (things), I am the All. The All came forth from Me, and the All attained (reached) to Me." Now, some scholars follow K.H. Kuhn in believing that the original place of the saying was after Logion 30a, as in O. It was then transferred after Logion 77a by the compiler of C because of the mnemonic key-word principle ("Stichwortanschluss"). Namely, the verb πνω ("to attain or reach to") appears at the end of our Logion 77a, and the verb πνω ("to cleave or split") occurs at the beginning of Logion 77b, in the same line of the codex (p. 46.26), both words being homonym only in Coptic. Kuhn adduced another example of such mnemonic homonyms: μαακε ("ear") in Logion 33a (p. 39.11), and μαακε ("bushel," Egyptian μάτιον) in the following Logion 33b (p. 39.14).

However, I would rather think that the original place of Logion 77b—say, in the Archetype of the GTh—was as in C, not as in O.⁷⁶ Because (1) it suits better the pantheistic idea expressed in Logion 77a ("I am the All"), than the Midrashic Logion 30a. And (2) I think that the vicinity of the homonyms πνω in Logion 77a, b, and of μαακε in Logion 33a, b is a pure coincidence. Anyway, it seems strange that the

---


⁷⁶ So also Quispel, *Makarius*, etc., p. 100; Gärtner, p. 146 (cf. also Haenchen, op. cit., pp. 334 f.).
compiler of C did not apply the same principle to Logion 7, \textit{μοιη}, “lion” (literally “killer”?) vs. Logion 11a, b \textit{μογ}, “to die; death” (such a welcome gnostic association!).

To make myself clear: I do not think Kuhn’s hypothesis about the \textit{homonymic} linking key-words in the Coptic recension is likely; but I do think that Garitte’s\textsuperscript{77} hypothesis about the \textit{semantic} or thematic linking key-words (or items), such as, for example, σάρξ in Logia 28 and 29; or \textit{ἀνάπταυσις} in Logia 50 and 51, might work (though not all of Garitte’s examples are equally convincing).

In short, as for the Logion 30b of O, C seems to have the preference over O.

**Logion 36**

P. Oxy. 655 col. I, 1-30, and col. II, 1-22, as restored by Grenfell-Hunt, by Fitzmyer (pp. 544 ff.), and especially by R.A. Kraft,\textsuperscript{78} comprise Logia C 36; 37; 38; 39; and probably Logion 24b, in the fragment \textit{d} (cf. Kraft, p. 262).

\[\text{O 655 col. I, 1 ff.}\]

\[\text{C 36}\]

\[\text{μὴ μεριμνάτε  ...  μὴ τε [τε]τροφεῖ ὑμῶν  τι φάγετε μὴ} \]

\[\text{τε [τε]} \text{στ[ολεί ὑμῶν]  τ] τι ἐνδύσ[η]οθε. (Cf. Matt. 6:} \]


\[\text{[χρί]νον, ἀπ[ό] να ἐξά[ί]νει. \textsuperscript{79} ὁδε ἐνθ[ῆ]ετ. (Cf.} \]


\[\text{ἔν]νο[μα] τι ἐν[θετε] καὶ ὑμεί[ς; τις} \text{ἀν προσθ[ε]ι] ἐπὶ} \]

\[\text{τὴν εἰλικρίναν ὑμῶν; (Cf. Matt. 6:27; Luke 12:25.)} \]

\[\text{ἀυτό[ς δ]όσει ὑμεῖ[ν τ] ἐνδύμα ὑμῶν.}\]

This is a clear example of a \textit{deliberate} drastic cutting of the original text of the GTh by the redactor of C, who dropped both these passages of O: “(Be not solicitous)... either for your sustenance, what you will eat or”, and “Of how much more worth are you than the lilies, which neither card nor spin! But since you have one garment, what indeed do you lack? Who of you could increase (his) stature? He shall give you (each) your garment!”\textsuperscript{80}—in his zeal to bring Logion 36 logically as close as possible to the following Logion 37, which reads: “When you undress yourselves without being ashamed, and take up your clothes and put them under

\textsuperscript{77} Le Muséon 70 (1957), pp. 63 f.; cf. also Gärtner, op. cit., pp. 28 f.


\textsuperscript{79} \textit{ό} ἐξάνει J.A.H. Michelsen and T.C. Skeat, accepted by R.A. Kraft \textit{αὐξάνει}

Grenfell and Hunt, accepted by J.A. Fitzmyer.

\textsuperscript{80} Kraft’s translation (p. 259).
your feet like little children, and tread on them, then shall you see the Son of the Living One...". Because the redactor of C saw a "contradiction" between the words of Logion 36, "But since you have one garment, what indeed do you lack?... He shall give you (each) your garment," and the lack of any garment required by Logion 37 (compare also the Gospel of the Egyptians, ap. Clement, Strom. 3.92: ὅταν τὸ τῆς αἰσχύνης ἐνδύμα πατήσητε).

This is the explanation shared also by Kraft (p. 254); Gärtner (p. 86); Schrage (p. 91). The explanation given by R.M. Grant-D.N. Freedman (p. 144), "that the editor of Coptic Thomas wanted to remove such obvious traces of his sources" as are the synoptic passages quoted above, is not likely at all.

The Coptic redactor simply did not realize that Logia 36 and 37 dealt with two different topics: with the attachment to earthly wealth, the former; with the return to primeval sexual innocence in the androgynous Adam, the latter.

This might be a good opportunity for us to reflect how much freedom each one of the gnostic sects or communities used in adjusting its own GTh, and how different from each other must have looked the Naassene recension of the GTh (= H), the Coptic one (= C), and that represented by the three Oxyrhynchus papyri (= O)! But let us continue.

Logion 11c

Clem. Strom. 3.92.2

"On the day when you were one, you became two. But (δὲ) whenever ὅταν you shall have become two, what will you do?"


The second clause of Logion 11c seems to imply: "Whenever you become again out of two one, what else will be left for you to do?" = "Whenever you males and you females return to the asexual Archanthropus Adam, there will be nothing more for you to do: you will achieve the ἀπερτισμένη τελείωσις (Hippol. Refut. 5.6.6, p. 142.31 Marc.).

81 Or "when you become two." The translation of Ed. pr. "when you have become two" is misleading.
82 We find another similarity between Philo (loc. cit. and Leg. alleg. 1.31) and the GTh (Logion 84) in the distinction between Adam created according to God's image and Man created according to God's likeness, as A.F.J. Klijn, Journal of Bibl. Lit. 81 (1962), p. 277, has well pointed out.
Doresse (op. cit., p. 371) defended the transmitted second "two" in the text of C by suggesting "that the duality is in fact an aspect of the unity; for the state of 'being two' is a synthesis of opposites—male and female, upper and lower, etc...". But the compiler of the GTh was not a Heraclitean, and the transmitted text simply contradicts the rest of the corresponding Logia. Thus I think the text is corrupt here: the second "two" (αὐτός, p. 34.24) was written (by analogy with the first one) by a copyist who had found the text to be lacunose; and it was so because the original word ὁμαλός ("one") had been mistakenly dropped before the following ὅμοιος ("what").

If we read ὁμαλός instead of αὐτός, there will be no disagreement with the rest of the relevant sayings: Logion 22: "When you make the two one (ἀὐτός ὁμαλός, p. 37.25)... and when you make the male and the female one and the same, so that the male not be male, nor the female female... then shall you enter (the Kingdom);" Logion 106: "When you make the two one (ἀὐτός ὁμαλός, p. 50.19), you shall become the sons of Man...;" 83 Logion 18: "For where the beginning is, there will be the end;" and (with the only exception that here the female shall return to the male Adam):

**Logion 114:**

Jesus said: Behold, I myself shall lead her (Mary) in order to make her male, so that (ὑπὲρ) she too may become a living spirit (πνεῦμα), resembling you males. For every woman who shall make herself male will enter the Kingdom of Heaven. 84

**Gospel of Philip**

Logion 71 (NH II. 3, p. 68.22)

When Eve was still in Adam, death did not exist. When she separated from him, death came into being. Whenceover he becomes again complete and attains his former self, death shall no longer exist. 85

**Logion 11b**

In the days when you ate what is dead, you made it (or him) alive:

---

83 Compare also Logia 84; 72 ("I am not a divider, am I?"); and H.C. Kee, *Journal of Bibl. Lit.* 82 (1963), pp. 308 f.
I would like to suggest the following two points. First, the Naassene recension seems to give the original text of the saying. (1) Because the elegant mathematical proportion contained in it seems to reflect the more genuine form:

\[ \text{νεκρά φαγεῖν} : \text{ζωοποιεῖν} :: \text{ζώντα φαγεῖν} : \text{τί ποιήσετε}; \]  
(= What else is left for you to do?)

(2) Because this version can be paralleled by the Gospel of Philip, Logion 93 (p. 73.19): “This world is an eater of corpses. All the things that are eaten in it themselves die too. The truth is an eater of life. Therefore no one nourished from (the truth) shall die...” (3) Because I think we can explain why C (or its source) had changed the words \( \text{ὅν ζώντα φάγητε} \) into “whenever you come to live in the light” = \( \text{ὅταν δὴ ἐν τῶι φωτὶ ἔσεσθε} \), but not the reverse. The redactor of C made this modification to make the saying even more consistent with his system (as he did in Logion 36)—this time with the important sayings dealing with the Light-essence of Jesus. I think the version, \( \text{ὅταν δὴ ἐν τῶι φωτὶ ἔσεσθε} \), was inspired by John (cf. 1 John 1:7 μεν δὲ ἐν τῶι φωτὶ περιπατῶμεν, ὡς αὐτὸς ἐστὶν ἐν τῶι φωτὶ...; 2:9 ὁ λέγων ἐν τῶι φωτὶ εἶναι; John 12:36 ἵνα πάντες γενήσητε; etc.), just as, e.g., Logion 77a (“I am the Light that is above all things”) was inspired by John (cf. John 8:12 “I am the Light of the world; he who follows Me shall never walk in darkness, but will have the light of life;” 12:46). 86

Secondly, I think the striking idea, \( \zωντα φαγεῖν \), “to eat living things,” is also based upon John, namely, upon the well-known, predominantly eucharistic, homily 6:31-58, 87 which gives a new explanation of the manna or “the true bread from heaven” (cf. Exod. 16:4 and 15; Ps. 77:24). Now, in John the stress seems to be on the equation: “the life-giving bread from heaven = the flesh of Jesus” (cf. John 6:51 “I am the living bread which came down from heaven; if anyone eats of this bread, he shall live forever; and the bread which I shall give is My flesh, for the life of the world;” 6:55 “For My flesh is true food, and my blood is true drink;” 6:35 and 48 “I am the bread of life”).

---

On the other hand, in the Haggadah literature the equation: “the life-giving bread from heaven = the true Word of God (either Torah or Wisdom)” prevails (compare, e.g., Philo, Leg. alleg. 3.162: “That the food of the soul is not earthly but heavenly, we shall find abundant evidence in the Sacred Word: [Exod. 16:4]... You see that the soul is fed not with things of earth that decay, but with such words as God shall have poured like rain…”).

Now, it seems to me that the more concrete and probably eucharistic Johannine formula is still visible in the recension of H: compare Hippol. Refut. 5.8.11 (p. 157.59 M.), where John 6:53 is quoted, and the phrase itself, ζωντα ψαγεῖν. That this version was the original one, and not that represented by C, we may perhaps infer from the Gospel of Philip, Logion 93 (p. 73.19): “This world is an eater of corpses. All the things that are eaten in it themselves die too. The truth is an eater of life. Therefore no one nourished from the truth shall die. Jesus came from that place (=heaven) and He brought the foods from there. And to those who so desire He gave life, so that they might not die.” Logion 23 (p. 57.4): “He who shall not eat My flesh and drink My blood has no life in him (cf. John 6:53). What is it? His flesh is the word (λόγος), and His blood is the Holy Spirit. He who has received these has food and drink and clothing” (cf. Matt. 6:25). And finally Logion 15 (p. 55.10): “… Man used to feed like the beasts. But when Christ came, the perfect (τέλειος) Man, He brought bread from heaven, so that man might be nourished with the food of man.”

In short, the more concrete, probably eucharistic, and more original formula: “The life-giving food or bread from heaven is the flesh of Jesus” seems to prevail both in H and in the Gospel of Philip, while the more spiritual formula: “The life-giving food is the word of Jesus” seems to play a secondary part there (compare Hippolytus’ comment on the Logion 11b: ζωντα δὲ λέγουσι καὶ λόγους καὶ νόμος κτλ., quoted on p. 77, and Logion 23 of GPh). On the contrary, in C the flesh-idea is absent: “Whensoever you come to live in the light…”

The same shifting toward more spiritualism might be reflected also in Logion 11a: “… and the dead are not alive, and the living shall not die,” which again might be inspired by John 3:6, “That which is born of flesh is flesh, and that which is born of spirit is spirit;” 6:63, “It is the spirit that gives life, the flesh is of no avail.”

---

88 Compare P. Borgen, Bread from Heaven, Supplements to Novum Testamentum, 10 (Leiden, 1965), pp. 29 ff.; 147 ff.
Conclusions

(1) I have tried to make a distinction between a corrupt or lacunose text in C O H due to a mistake or oversight, and a deliberately modified, expanded, transposed, or omitted text.

A more likely restoration of O and the healing of the corruptions in Logia 3b; 4; 6; 7; 11c; 30a; 33a have been attempted.

(2) As for the deliberate differences in C O H, they seem to suggest the following:

(a) C does not go back to O, because C translates Hebrew tehom as "sea," and O as "underworld" (Logion 3a); C has Didymus Judas Thomas, and O only Judas Thomas (Prologue). But possibly both C and O derive from a common source (= X).

(b) C seems to have the advantage over O in the text of Logia 5 and 77b; on the contrary, in the text of Logia 2 and 36, O has the preference.

(c) In Logion 11b, H seems to give a more genuine text than C, and besides H has preserved a new Logion (4bis), which is missing both in C and O.

Consequently, a very tentative stemma of the transmission of the GTh would be:

(3) The offered interpretation of Logion 11b suggests that the GTh was inspired by John, as R.E. Brown has shown, and probably to an extent even greater than he recognized.⁹⁰

⁹⁰ Jacques E. Ménard, L'évangile selon Thomas (Nag Hammadi Studies, 5), Leiden, 1975, came to my hands too late to be used.
THE NAASSENE PSALM IN HIPPOLYTUS

Text

Νόμος ἐν γενικῷ τοῦ παντὸς ὁ πρωτὸ<τόκο>ς Νόος, ὁ δὲ δεύτερος ἐν τοῦ πρωτότοκον τὸ χυθὲν Χάος,
τριτάτη<ν> Ψυχῆ δ’ ἔλαβ’ ἐξεργαζόμενη νόμον·
διὰ τοῦτ’ ἐλάφου μορφῆν περικεμένη
χοπιά, θανάτωι μελέτημα, χρατουμένη·
pοτὲ <μὲν> βασιλ(ειούν) ἔχουσα βλέπει τὸ φῶς,
pοτὲ δ’ εἰς <σπ>ήλαιον ἐχρί<πτο>μένη χλάει.

7a { <ποτὲ μὲν> χαιρεί, ποτὲ δὲ κλαίεται,
7b <ποτὲ μὲν> χρίνει, ποτὲ δὲ χρίνεται,
7c ποτὲ μὲν θυήσκει, ποτὲ δὲ γίνεται.}

<χ>ἀνέξοδον ἡ μελέα κακῶ<ν>
λαβώρινθον ἐσῆλθε πλανωμένη.

P.f.40ε

eἰπεν/ δ’ Ἰησοῦς· ἔσορ<α>, πάτερ,
ζήτημα κακῶν <τὸδ’> ἑπὶ χθόνα
ἀπὸ σῆς πνο<ι> ἣς ἀποπλάζεται·
ζητεῖ δὲ φυγεῖν τὸ πισχόν Χάος,
χοῦξ οἶδε<ν> ὅ’<πως> διελεύσεται.

10 τοῦτοι με χάριν πέμψων, πάτερ·
σφραγίδας ἔχων καταβήσομαι,
Ἄιώνας ὅλους διοικεύω,
μυστήρια πάντα δ’ ἀνοίξω
μορφὰς τε θεῶν ἐπιδείξω·

{καῖ} τὰ κεκρυμμένα ἀγίας ὀδοῦ
γνῶσιν καλέσας παραδώσω.

1 Hippol. Refut. 5.10.2 (p. 171 f. ed. Marcovich, Berlin, 1986).—Select literature on
the Psalm: Adolf von Harnack, SEBA, 1902, pp. 542-545; A. Swoboda, Wiener Studien 27
Verzeichnis der Vorlesungen an der Akademie zu Braunsberg, 1921 u. 1922, pp. 94 ff.;
Thielko Wolbergs, Griechische religiöse Gedichte der ersten nachchristlichen Jahrhunderte, I:
Psalmen und Hymnen der Gnosis und des frühen Christentums (Beiträge zur klass.
Philol., 40; Meisenheim am Glan, 1971), pp. 6 f. and 37-59; Bernhard Herzhoff, Zwei
The universal law of the All was the First-born Mind; 
the second one after the First-born was the outpoured Chaos, 
while the Soul got the third rank, with the duty to fulfill the law. 
For that reason she put on the form of a hind 
and started toiling as a captive, being a game for Death. 
Sometimes she would live in a royal palace and look at the light, 
but sometimes she is being thrown in a den, and there she weeps. (7)

Finally, she—wretched in her sorrows—
in her wanderings entered the exitless Labyrinth. 
Then Jesus said: “Look, Father: 
this prey to evils is wandering away to Earth, 
far from Thy spirit (or breath)!
And she seeks to escape the bitter Chaos, 
but knows not how to win through. (14)

For that reason send Me, Father! 
Bearing the seals I will descend; 
I will pass through all the Aeons; 
I will reveal all the mysteries 
and show the forms of the gods. 
I will transmit the secrets of the holy way, 
calling them Gnosis (Knowledge).’’ (21)
Commentary

1. νόμος γενικός = ὁ κοινός νόμος, “the universal law” (A. Hilgenfeld). Compare Heraclitus Fr. 23 Marc. (= B 114 DK); Cleanthes Hymnus in Io vem vv. 24 and 39; Diog. Laert. 7.88; Diodorus Tarsensis Fr. 20 in Deut. (P.G. 33, p. 1583 C) γενικὴ (opp. μερικὴ) νομοθεσία.— νόμος ~ νός : Cic. De legg. 2.8: ita principem legem... mentem esse... dei; P.G.M. 5.465 ὁ μέγας Νοῦς, ἐννόμως τὸ πᾶν διοικῶν.—ὁ πρωτότοκος Νόσος : cf. Theodoret. Haer. 1.4 πρωτόγονος Νοῦς; Iren. Adv. haer. 1.24.4: (Basilides) innatum... Patrem... misisse primogenitum Nun suum; 1.1.1 (Ptolemaeus) τὸν δὲ Νοῦν τοῦτον καὶ Μονογενὴ καλοῦσι καὶ Πατέρα καὶ Ἀρχὴν τῶν πάντων; Nag Hammadi Codices (= NHC) I.1 (The Prayer of the Apostle Paul), A.38; V.1 (Eugnostos the Blessed), p. 9.7.2

2. τὸ χυθὲν Χάος = Hippol. Refut. 5.7.9 (p. 145.45 M.) τὸ ἔκχεχυμένον Χάος, “the outpoured (= boundless) Chaos;” 10.32.1 (p. 408.2 M.) Χάος ἀπειρον. Cf. NHC II.5 (On the Origin of the World), p. 99.27 f.: “all of that (sc. Chaos) is a boundless darkness and water of unfathomable depth;” p. 98.31 “the limitless Chaos;” I.5 (The Tripartite Tractate), p. 89.26 f.: “(the pit)... which is called the Outer Darkness, and Chaos, and Hades, and the Abyss” (cf. Hebrew tehôm); Iren. 1.30.1 (Ophites): ὁδῷ, σκότος, ἄβυσσος, χάος.—As for the paremology, cf., e.g., Zeno (S.V.F. I, No. 103): aquam χάος appellatum ἀπὸ τοῦ χέοσθαι.


4. ἐλάφου μορφήν περικειμένη: cf. Ps. 41:2 ὁν τρόπον ἐπιποθεῖ ἐλάφος ἐπὶ τὰς πηγὰς τῶν ύδατων, οὕτως ἐπιποθεῖ ἡ φυχὴ μου πρὸς σέ, ὁ θεός. Hence the image of a hind standing at the right hand of Jesus during his baptism, in an early Christian fresco.3 (A more remote possibility is the influence of the myth of Actaeon changed into a stag.) Compare Wolbergs, p. 45 f.—I think the reading ἐλάφου (ἐλάφον P) is strongly supported by v. 5, ἀρνάτως μελέτημα = “a spoil or game for the hunter Death:” cf. Xenophon Cyneg. 13.15 ἥ μελέτη τῶν κυνηγητῶν.4

5. κοπιᾶν (διὰ τοῦτο, i.e., ἔξεργαζομένη νόμον): “the principle Soul works hard and toils (while bringing life to the Creation).” Cf. NHC II.1

3 Cf. Joseph Wilpert, Die Malereien der Katakomben Roms (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1903), plate 259 nr. 2; cf. plate 150 nr. 3; Wolbergs, p. 45 f.; A. van Lantschoot, in Coptic Studies in Honor of W.E. Crum (Boston, 1950), p. 347 f.
4 On the other hand, to read with Harvey, Christ and others, ἐλαφρὸν μορφήν περικειμένη, “putting on a fickle form,” would be insipid.
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(The Apocryphon of John), p. 20.19 f.: “And she (sc. the luminous Epinoia) assists the whole creature, by toiling with him...”; Hippol. Refut. 5.7.25: Λέγουσι οὖν περὶ τῆς τοῦ πνεῦματος οὐσίας, ἣτις ἐστὶ πάντων τῶν γυμνικῶν αἰτία, ὅτι τούτων ἐστὶν οὐδὲν, γεννᾶί δὲ καὶ ποιεῖ πάντα τὰ γινόμενα.—Θανάτωι μελέτημα: cf. perhaps NHC II.3 (The Gospel of Philip, Logion 39), p. 60.12-14: “Echmoth is the Wisdom of death, which is the one who knows death” = Ψυχὴ in Valentinus ap. Hippol. Refut. 6.32.8-9.

6-7. potè μὲν ... βλέπει τὸ φῶς, potè δὲ... κλαίει: cf. Iren. 1.4.2 (Ptolemy): Ποτέ μὲν γὰρ ἐκλαιεί (sc. Ἀχαμὼθ ἢ ἐκτὸς τοῦ πληρώματος) καὶ ἐλυπεῖτο ... διὰ τὸ καταλελείφθαι μόνην ἐν τοῖς σκότοις καὶ τῶν κενόματι: potè δὲ εἰς ἕννοιαν ἔκχυσα τοῦ καταλυτόντος αὐτὴν φωτὸς διεχείτο καὶ ἐγέλα... (von Harnack, SBBA, 1902, p. 544 n. 1).—6 βασίλειοιν, “royal palace (open to sunshine),” cf. Xenophon Cyrop. 2.4.3.—ἐ̔χουσα = ένοικοῦσα, “dwell- ing in;” cf. Soph. El. 181.—τὸ φῶς = 1 Νόος = 1 πνεῦμα (πνεῦμα): cf. Ptolemy Ep. 7.7 (πατὴρ = φῶς); Hippol. Refut. 5.19.2 (the Sethians): φῶς καὶ σκότος: τούτων δὲ ἐστὶν ἐν μέσῳ πνεῦμα ἀκέραιον (and Wolbergs, p. 48 f.).

7. ἄναβασείς εἰς τοῦ σπήλαιον (Wolbergs, pp. 49-51); Plato Rep. VII, 514 a 5 τοῦ σπῆλαιον; Iren. 1.4.2 ἐν τοῖς σκότοι καὶ τῶν κενόματι.—Matt. 21:13 = Jer. 7:11 σπῆλαιον λήστων, “den of the robbers;” NHC II.3 (The Gospel of Philip, Logion 9), p. 53.11-13: “It (sc. the soul of Christ) fell into the hands of robbers and was taken captive, but he (sc. Christ) saved it.” Hippol. 5.6.7 (the Naassenes): καὶ τρεῖς ἐκ- κλησίαι, ἀγγελική, ψυχική, χοική ὄνοματα δὲ αὐταίς ἐκλεκτῆ, χλητῆ, αἰχμάλωτος.

6-7. βασίλειοιν : σπήλαιον = φῶς : σκότος: cf. Hippol. 5.7.9 τὰς δὲ ἑκάλαγας ταύτας (sc. τῆς ψυχῆς) τὰς ποικίλας ἐν τοῖς ἐπιγραφομένωι κατ’ Αἰγυπτίως εὐαγγελιον κειμένως ἔχουσιν (sc. the Naassenes); Corp. Hermet. 10.7 τούτων τοϊκῶν τῶν ψυχῶν πολλαὶ αἱ μεταβολαὶ, τῶν μὲν ἐπὶ τὸ εὐνυχέστερον, τῶν δὲ ἐπὶ τὸ ἔναντι (and A.-J. Festugiére ad loc.); Clement Exc. ex Theodoto 56.3 τὸ μὲν οὖν πνευματικὸν φῦσε σωζόμενον, τὸ δὲ ψυχικὸν αὐτεξουσίον ἐν ἐπιτηδειότητα ἔχει πρὸς τέ πίστιν καὶ ἀφθαρσίαν καὶ πρὸς ἀπίστιαν καὶ φθοράν, κατὰ τὴν οἰκείαν αἴρεσιν τὸ δὲ ὀλιχὸν φῦσε ἀπόλλυται; Iren. 1.6.1 (p. 51 f. Harvey).

7. κλαίει: Iren. 1.4.2: ἀπὸ γὰρ τῶν δαχρῶν αὐτῆς (sc. Achamoth) γεγονέναι πᾶσαι ἐνυγγον οὐσίαν, ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ γέλωτος τὴν φωτεινήν...; NHC II.1, p. 31.6: Pronoia in the realm of darkness (prison, Chaos, Hades) “wept and shed tears, bitter tears...” (cf. Wolbergs, p. 50 f.).

7abc: The intrusion of three dochmiacs into the anapaestic system delates the lines as being a later expansion inspired by v. 7 κλαίει (so von Harnack)—probably by somebody who wanted to have a psalm consisting of 24 (instead of 21) lines, or by somebody who wanted to
elaborate on the destiny of Soul.—7b. ποτὲ μὲν κρίνει (?), ποτὲ δὲ κρίνει-
etai: cf. Matt. 7:1-2; Luke 6:37; Sextus Sent. 183; Papyrus Berolinensis 8502.1 [= BG 1] (The Gospel according to Mary), p. 15.16-19: “And the soul (ψυχή) said: ‘Why do you judge (κρίνειν) me although I have not judged (κρίνειν)? I was bound though I have not bound’.”5


10. = 15. πάτερ: i.e., 1 Νόος. The father of Jesus, Son of Man, is Man.

11. ζήτημα κακῶν = 5. θανάτωι μελέτημα, i.e., “a prey to evils” (von Harnack). (Cf. Hippocrates. V.M. 3 ζήτημα... εὐρήμα, “thing sought and thing found”.)

12. ἀπὸ σῆς πνοῆς ἀποπλάζεται: “is wandering away far from Thy spirit (or breath):” cf. Iliad. 13.591 f.; Odyssey 1.75.—πνοητής = πνεύματος: cf. 1 Clem. 21.9 πνοὴ θεοῦ; Gen. 2:7; 7:22; Ps.-Clem. Hom. 16.16 ψυχάς... τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ πνοὴν ἡμιφρεσμένας.


14. οὐκ ὁδε〈γ ὅ〉πως διελεύσεται: the opposite is 21 γνώσις = γνώσις τῆς ἀγίας ὁδοῦ, “the (secret) knowledge of the ascent (= ἀνοδός) of the soul.” Compare Aram. mas(s)iqtā, “ascent of the soul” of the Man-deans.6

16. σφραγίδας ἑκων: probably, “passes,” or magic formulas, each one different for each Aeon, for both the descending Redeemer (Jesus) and the ascending Soul and the souls of the pneumatics (gnostics). Compare 1 Jeu 33-38 (seven seals) and 2 Jeu 45-48 (eight seals) ed. C. Schmidt;7 Fr. J. Dölger, Sphragis (1919), pp. 160 ff.; G. Fitzer, in G. Kittel, Theol. Wb. zum NT, 7 (1964), 953; Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich, Gr.-Engl. Lex. of the NT, s.v., 1 d; Wolbergs 56.

17 Αἰώνας ὅλους: probably, either seven or thirteen of them; cf. Hip-

5 Text and translation by R. McL. Wilson and George W. MacRae, in Douglas M. Parrott, Nag Hammadi Codices V, 2-5 and VI with Papyrus Berolinensis 8502, 1 and 4 (Nag Hammadi Studies, 11, Leiden, 1979), p. 463 f.


pol. 5.6.5; 5.7.20; 5.9.5. According to the Naassenes, Jesus himself is μακάριος Αἰών Αἰώνων (Hippol. 5.8.45). 8

18. μυστήρια πάντα: probably, a concrete thing: a secret password, sign or symbol, different for each one of the archons (aeons). Cf. Orig. Contra Celsum 6.31; Revel. 1:20; Hippol. 5.9.22. 9

19. μορφάς... θεῶν: “the shape (form) of each one of the aeons.”

Such as lion, bull, serpent, eagle, bear, dog, ass, cock, hyena, dragon, monkey, sheep. Cf. Origen Cels. 6.30 and 6.33; NHC II.1 (The Apocryphon of John), p. 11.26-34; Wolbergs 56 n. 95.—θεός = άλωνες, άστερες: cf. P.G.M. 13.997; Hippol. 5.16.6 (the Peratics).

20. τὰ κεκρυμμένα (“the secrets”) = σφραγίδες + μυστήρια + μορφαί θεῶν (?). —ή ἄγια ὅδες = ἡ τῆς Ψυχῆς καὶ τῶν πνευματικῶν ἁνδος. Compare perhaps The Gospel according to Mary (BG 1, p. 16.14-21): The seven powers (ἐξουσία) of wrath (ὀργή) ask the ascending soul: “Whence do you come, slayer of men, or (ἡ) where are you going, conqueror of space?” The soul answered and said: “What binds me has been slain, and what surrounds me has been overcome, and my desire (ἐπιθυμία) has been ended, and ignorance has died…” 10

21. ἀνοίξω... ἐπιδείξω... παραδώσω: sc. τοὺς πνευματικοῖς (νοεροῖς, ἐκλεκτοῖς, ἀγγελικοῖς) μόνοις: Hippol. 5.6.7.

Conclusions

(1) The Naassene psalm is a complete creed of a three-principle Gnostic system: in twenty-one brief lines the psalm comprises no less than thirty Gnostic key-words. Moreover, the psalm is a gem of the Christian Gnosticism: compare Jesus in line 10 and Hippol. 5.9.21-22 (p. 170.122 Marc.): “For we [the Naassenes] enter in through the true gate, which is Jesus the Blessed one [cf. John 10:9; Ps. 118 (117):20]. And out of all men we are the only true Christians, who perform the mystery at the third gate [cf. 2 Cor. 12:2; Gen. 28:17; Hippol. 5.8.31].”

(2) The psalm consists of three hebdomads (total, 21 lines). (Incidentally, the cosmic hebdomad of seven planets is mentioned at Hippol. 5.7.23-24; and the Naassene Jesus reveals himself in the fourteenth aeon: Hippol.

---
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5.7.20 [cf. 2 Cor. 12:2].) The first hebdomad (1-7), composed in six (1-3) and five (4-7) catalectic anapaests each line, states the three basic principles of the system (1-3; notice three past tenses: 1 ην, 2 ην, 3 ἔλαβε), and succinctly describes the mission of the third principle, the soul, in this world of ours (4-7; notice three present tenses this time: 5 κοπιᾷ, 6 βλέπει, 7 κλάει).

The second hebdomad (8-14), composed in four catalectic anapaests each line, reveals that the time for the Apocatastasis has come. Finally, the third hebdomad (15-21), with paroemiacs in lines 17-19 and 21, speaks of the Redemption itself. It is separated from the second hebdomad by no less than five future tenses, each one placed at the line end: 16 καταβήσομαι, 17 διδεύσω, 18 ἄνοιξω, 19 ἐπιδείξω, 21 παραδώσω.

As a whole, the psalm displays the figure of an inverted pyramid, with the line containing the word Gnosis (21) at its top. The intention seems to be clear: the salvation comes from above. But maybe the psalm itself was devised as a μαγική ἁρμανίδα, a "magic formula" for the pneumatics, enabling them to achieve the ascent and the salvation? As for the figure itself, it is Hellenistic: compare, e.g., the Πέλεξως by Simmias from Rhodes in E. Diehl, Anth. Lyr. 2, p. 260.

(3) The three principles of the psalm (Nous, Chaos, Psyche, 1-3) seem to be genuinely Naassene. Compare Cau-lacau, Sau-lasau, Ζενάκαρ (Ze’er Sham) at Hippol. 5.8.4 [Isaiah 28:10; Iren. 1.24.5-6, et alibi]; or ὁ Προῶν, τὸ ἑκτεχνημένον Χάος, ὁ Αὐτογενής at Hippol. 5.7.9; or else Ἄρχοντα (Arch) ἀνθρώπων, ἡ θνητή φύσις ἡ κάτω, Υἱὸς Ἀνθρώπου at Hippol. 5.8.2 and 10.9.1. To quote Hippolytus himself (5.8.1): "He who says that the All is composed of three (principles), speaks the truth and will be able to give the proof about the universe." In my opinion, the conclusion reached by Bernhard Herzhoff, in his dissertation on the psalm (Bonn, 1973), p. 135, that Valentine himself is the author of the Naassene psalm, cannot stand criticism. The psalm can be explained in terms of the Naassene system alone (involving three principles) as preserved in Hippolytus 5.6.3—5.10.2 and 10.9.

(4) In the psalm, the lion’s share belongs to the third (middle) principle, the Soul (11 lines), and to her salvation (along with the salvation of all the pneumatics; 8 lines). The Soul "fulfills the law" of the All (i.e., of Nous), by bringing life to the κτίσις: "For the Soul is the cause of everything that comes into being" (Hippol. 5.7.10). To accomplish this mission (διὰ τοῦτο), the Soul puts on the form of a hind (probably under the influence of Psalm 41:2), and descends to Earth (4-7).
In other words, I think that the word νόμος in line 3 has the same sense as the word νόμος in line 1 (a kind of ring composition): "the law of the All." It does not have the derogatory connotation of ὁ νόμος τῆς κτίσεως (contra, e.g. R. Reitzenstein, SB Akad. Heidelberg 10 [1917], p. 49; Wolbergs, pp. 44 f.). The very fact that the Soul "puts on a form" (μορφὴν περικειμένη, 4) attests to a special mission of a divine principle. That this mission is by no means limited to the κτίσις alone, becomes clear from Hippl. 5.7.11-13 (p. 145.55 M.): Πάσα οὖν φύσις ἑπορανίων, φησί (sc. Naassenus), καὶ ἐπιγείων καὶ καταχθονίων (Phil. 2:10) φυχῆς ὄργανη, where ἡ τῶν ὑπερχοσμίων καὶ αἰωνίων ἄνω μαχαῖα φύσις (p. 146.65 M.) is being included (τὰ ἐπίγεια = Ἀφροδίτη, τὰ καταχθόνια = Περσεφόνη, τὰ ἑποράνια = Σελήνη)

(5) Accordingly, there is no disagreement between the first and the second hebdomad of the psalm: the former deals with Cosmogony, the latter with Apocatastasis. In part one, χοπτάι ("works hard, toils") was to be expected as part of the Soul's mission in the κτίσις (and was authorized by the universal law of the All, Nous). However, the Soul's perishing in the Labyrinth (Chaos) was not expected. As soon as the Soul reaches this point (in part two of the psalm), the time for Redemption has come, and the Redeemer acts: "Then Jesus said: 'Look, Father: this prey for evils... For that reason send me, Father!'" This point of mortal danger for the Soul is emphasized by the expression, 12 ἄπο τῆς πνεύματος ἀποπλάζεται (implying: "wandering away too far from Thy protecting spirit"), which is sandwiched between four words expressing "hopelessness," placed at the beginning and end of the second hebdomad: 8-9 ἀνέξοιδον... λαβύρινθον, and 13-14 τὸ πικρὸν Χάος... οὐ διελεύσεται.

(6) The Redeemer Jesus (Son of Man, Adamas) is a doublet of the Soul: both are bisexual (ἀρσενόθηλος), Hippl. 5.6.5 vs. 5.7.13. The Father to whom Jesus, Son of Man, speaks (in lines 10 and 15) is Man (Archanthropos, Nous): here Harnack (SBBA, 1902, p. 544) is correct, contra B. Herzhoff, op. cit., p. 110 (Jesus' father is "the unborn Father" of Basilides). Again, there are only three principles in the Naassene system; the only apparent "fourth principle" there is the Demiurge Esaldaeus [El-Shaddai], "the fiery god, the fourth in number" (Hippl. 5.7.30), but he is equated with Chaos (Hippl. 5.8.5).

When descending to this world, the Soul takes the form of a hind: the descending Jesus apparently takes the form of Man. While Psyche is predominantly psychic, the affinity between Psyche and Jesus may well be in the fact that both share in the pneuma. Jesus is pneumatic par ex-
cellence, while Psyche is pneuma qua Life: Λέγουσιν οὖν περὶ τῆς τοῦ πνεύματος οὐσίας, ἢτις ἐστὶ πάντων τῶν γινομένων αἰτία, ὅτι τούτων ἐστὶν οὐδέν, γενναί δὲ καὶ ποιεῖ πάντα τὰ γινόμενα (Hippol. 5.7.25).

Incidentally, Psyche (and the psychics) is αὐτεξούσιος, and can choose between salvation and perdition (Clement *Exc. ex Theodoto* 56.3). Hence the Naassene ἡ φυσικὴ = ἡ κλητὴ ἐκκλησία (Hippol. 5.6.7; cf. Matt. 22:14; Clem. *Exc. Theod.* 56.1). On the other hand, Jesus, just like the three-bodied giant Geryon (Hippol. 5.6.6; 5.8.4), comprises all three “men” (pneumatic, psychic, choic: 5.6.7).

(7) Finally, the presence in the psalm of a pre-existent Jesus (for the expected Christ) does not prove Valentinian authorship of the psalm. For it may be explained by strong Christian feelings of the Naassenes. Compare, e.g., Hippol. 5.9.21-22 (quoted above, Conclusions, 1, p. 85); or 5.8.45 (Jesus as ὁ μακάριος Ἄλων Ἀλώνων); or else 5.8.20-21 (Jesus, the true gate, equated with the perfect Man, fully “characterized” from the Uncharacterized One above).

However, pre-existent Jesuses are known from other Gnostic systems as well; compare, e.g., NHC III.2 (*The Gospel of the Egyptians*), p. 64.1 and p. 65.17; VII.2 (*The Second Treatise of the Great Seth*), p. 66.8; II.5 (*On the Origin of the World*), p. 105.25; *Pistis Sophia*, c. 81 (p. 114 f. Schmidt-Till).

Valentinian flavor may be detected in v. 7, χλάει (cf. Iren. 1.4.2), as Harnack had suggested (p. 544 n. 1). But compare also, e.g., NHC II.1 (*The Apocryphon of John*), p. 31.6 f.: “And he (sc. the spirit in the chains of the prison of the body) wept and shed tears. Bitter tears he wiped from himself...”

In conclusion, the content of the fascinating Naassene psalm is Naassene, not Valentinian.
There is a puzzling piece of evidence about the mysteries of the Μεγάλη θεός (i.e., Γη: cf. Paus. 1.31.4) at the Attic Phlya, as reported by Hippolytus, *Refutatio*, 5.20.6-8 (pp. 194.29-195.40 Marc.). Unfortunately, books IV-X of the *Elenchos* are preserved in one single manuscript, the extremely corrupt and highly lacunose Par. suppl. gr. 464 saec. XIV. They were then inadequately edited by Paul Wendland (then a dying man), and posthumously published by the Berlin Academy in 1916. Nevertheless, Wendland’s text was reprinted by Otto Kern, in *Orphicorum Fragmenta* (Berlin, 1922), Fr. 243; in his *PW RE* article on Mysteries (XVI [1935], col. 1265), and recently by F.H. Sandbach, in Plutarch, *Moralia*, vol. VII (Teubner, 1967), Fr. 24, as well. I am offering the following text of the passage under consideration.

Πολλα μὲν ὦν ἔστι τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς παστάδος ἐσχείνης [sc. in Phlya] ἐγγεγραμμένα (1) (περὶ ὄν καὶ Πλοῦταρχος ποιεῖται λόγους ἐν ταῖς (2) πρὸς Ἔμπεδοκλέα δέκα βίβλιος), ἔστι δὲ ἐν τῇ τοῖς πλείοσι (3) ν ἄλλοις (4) καὶ πρεσβύτης τις ἐγγεγραμμένος (5) πολιός, πτερωτός, (5) ἐντεταμένην ἕχων τὴν καισχύνην, γυναῖκα ἀποφεύγουσαν διώκων κυνοειδῆ. (6) ἐπηγέραται δὲ ἐπὶ τοῦ πρεσβύτου. Φάος ρύετης, (7) ἔστι δὲ τῆς γυναικὸς τῇ πέρη τῇ Φίλωλα. (8) ἔσωσε δὲ εἶναι κατὰ τὸν τοὺς (9) Σητιάνων λόγον ὁ Φάος ρύετης (7) τὸ φῶς, τὸ δὲ σκοτεινὸν ὤδωρ (10) / [Par. fr. 51v] ἡ Φικόλα, τὸ δὲ ἐν μέσῳ τῶν διάστημά ἄρμονια Πνεύματος τοῦ (11) μεταξύ τεταγμένου τὸ δὲ ὄνομα τοῦ Φάο (υ)ς ρύετος (12) τὸν ρύσιν ἀνώθεν τοῦ φωτός, ὡς λέγουσιν, δηλοὶ κάτω ὡςτε εὐλόγως ἄν τις ἐπὶ τοὺς Σητιανούς ἐγγίζῃ τοῦ πολέμου παρ’ αὐτοῖς τῇ τῆς Μεγάλης Φλεισιάων ὁρίγια. (14)

---


---

1 Paper read at the Annual Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, held in Chicago, 8-11 November 1973.
PHANES, PHICOLA, AND THE SETHIANS

The grey-headed, winged old man pursuing a fleeing woman is, most probably, the Orphic god Phanes (as B. ten Brink, back in 1853, had guessed), and not Boreas pursuing Oreithyia (as Paul Tannery, op. cit., p. 100 n. 2, had suggested). For:

(a) The epithet πολιός, "grey-headed," suits Phanes well in his role of Πρωτόγονος ("first-born") and ἀρχέγονος ("primeval:") Nonnus, Dionys. 12.68) god.

(b) The epithet πετεωτός is welcome too, since Phanes has golden wings and is so represented in art.

(c) His membrum virile is erect (ἐντεταμένην ἔχων τὴν αἰσχρὴν), for Phanes is the Orphic begetter of both the gods and the mortals: γένεσις μακάρωνθητών τ' ἀνθρώπων (Orphic hymn to Πρωτόγονος 6.3 Quandt).

As such he is sometimes called Πρίαπος (Orph. hymn. 6.9), πολύσπορος (6.10), and Eros as well (cf. Proclus, In Plat. Tim. 31 a, I, p. 434.4 Diehl: οὐ Φάνης = ἄβρος Ἐρως, and perhaps Aristophanes, Birds, 696 f.). In this respect, the long Magic papyrus from Paris (Suppl. gr. 574, col. 1748 ff. = P. G. M. IV: I, p. 128 Preisendanz) seems to be of special significance: ἐπικαλοῦμαι σε, τὸν ἀρχηγήτην πάσης γενέσεως, τὸν διατείναντα τὰς ἑαυτοῦ πτέρυγας εἰς τὸν σύμπαντα κόσμον... πρωτόγονε, παντὸς κτίστα, χρυσοπτέρυγε...

(d) Φάνης = Φάος. The etymology of Phanes had been often deduced in antiquity from φῶς. Compare Orphic hymn 6.8:

λαμπρὸν ἄγιον φάος ἄγνιον, ἀρ' οὖ σε Φάνητα κιλλήσαω.


(e) As for the epithet of Phanes, ἤλεντης, I think it must be corrupt. For, it cannot be explained as being formed by analogy after αὐθέντης, συνέντης, etc. I would suggest the reading ὑπέντης as the easiest way out. This


4 Cf. Orph. hymn. 6.2: χρυσείαν ἀγαλλόμενον πτερύγεσι (and W. Quandt, ad loc.); Hermias, In Plat. Phaedr. 246 c, p. 142.13 Couvreur (= Fr. 78 Kern):

χρυσείαις πτερύγεσι φορεώμενος ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα.
Aristophanes, Birds 697, and Preisendanz, o.c., 1765.

5 Compare, e.g., the winged Phanes on a second-century A.D. relief, now in Modena: Revue Arch. 1 (1902), pl. 1; W. K. C. Guthrie, Orpheus and Greek Religion (London, 1935), pl. 12 facing p. 254.

6 Cf. Hans Herter, De Priapo (RGVV, 23, Giessen, 1932), pp. 70; 308.
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...was formed in the same way as were ὑμέτης, ἐπέτης, ἔχετης, χραγέτης, ναιέτης, ἀρχηγέτης, εὐεργέτης, ὑπηρέτης, etc. I think the emendation is strongly supported by Hippolytus' context, in which ὑμέτης is explained as indicating "the shedding or streaming of light downwards" (τὸ δὲ ὄνομα τοῦ Φάο(υ)ς ὑμέτου τὴν ρύσιν ἄνωθεν τοῦ φωτός, ὡς λέγουσι, ὕψιοι κάτω).

2. Consequently, there seems to be little room for doubt that our Φάος ὑμέτης is the Orphic primeval begetter Phanes. But who is the fleeing woman? Her name, Φικόλα, mentioned twice in the text, seems to be sound. Now, the only known partner of Phanes in Orphic cosmogonies is Nyx (cf. Orph. Fr. 98; 104; 109 Kern, and Preisendanz, op. cit., col. 1767 ff.). Thus, I would suggest that Phicola is a chthonic deity linked to the Night-goddess.

(a) She is described as being "dog-like," χυνοείδης = χυνώπις. This I would understand as a woman with the face (or maybe mask?) of a bitch. (Schneidewin's reading χυανοείδης = χυανέτη, "dark, black," is not likely Greek, though it was accepted by Cruice, Tannery, and recently by Sandbach as well.) Now, Selene is called sometimes "bitch." So in the already mentioned Pap. Mag. Par. IV, col. 2279: Κυνώ; col. 2337: χῶν χυάνεως; col. 2251: ἰσοπάρθηκεν κυόν.8

(b) No doubt, the word ΠΕΡΕΗ is a corruption. (My guess is, of ΓΕΡΑΙΗ = γεραρη, σεβαστή, "reverend, venerable, august".) Anyway, it must be an epithet of Phicola, some counterpart to Phanes' own epithet ὑμέτης (and maybe πρεσβύτης as well). Compare perhaps Νύξ ιερή, in the Orphic hymn quoted by Hermias, loc. cit.

(c) The name itself, Φικόλα, if correct, cannot be a Greek word. My guess is that it is a Semitic word. Compare the name of the commander of Abimelech's army, Phicol: Φιχόλ (LXX, Gen. 21:22 and 32; 26:26); Φιχόλος (Josephus, Ant. Iud. 1.263), and Φικόλα, name of a village in Transjordanic Peraea (Ant. Iud. 12.160).

In conclusion, I would suggest that Phicola is a chthonic partner to the Orphic Phanes (as are Selene, Hecate, Persephone, or Nyx), coming from a Semitic Orphic cosmogony.

3. This hypothesis may be supported by the following facts.

(a) In Orphic cosmogonies Semitic names sometimes do occur. So in

---


the cosmogony of Mochos ap. Damascium, *Dubit. et solut. de primis principiis* c. 125 ter (I, p. 323.8 Ruelle): Οὐλωμός, ὁ νοητὸς θεός.9

(b) We may rest assured that Hippolytus did not go to Phlya to see for himself the paintings with the Orphic cosmogony in the colonnade of the Great Goddess Earth; nor is he copying from Plutarch (as Ernst Meyer, in *PW RE*, Suppl. X [1965], s.v. Phlya, col. 537.49, suggested). Here, as elsewhere in the *Elenchos*, Hippolytus is simply copying his sources, this time a Sethian Exegesis of their doctrines. This becomes clear from the words at the end of our passage ὡς λέγουσι (sc. οἱ Σηθιανοὶ), and is confirmed by Hippolytus’ phrasing in the immediately following sentence (5.20.8, p. 195.41 f. M.). Here the Sethian source quotes *Iliad* 15.189:

τρικχῇ δὲ πάντα δέδεσται, ἕκαστον10 δὴ ἐμορε τιμῆς

in order to prove temporal priority and universal validity of the Sethian triad: φῶς, σκότος, πνεῦμα. Now, Hippolytus’ introducing words—Τῇ δὲ διαίρεσι τῇ τριχῇ μαρτυρεῖν ἔοικε καὶ ὁ ποιητής λέγων—clearly come from the same Sethian Exegesis.

Consequently, the Sethians could have used some Near-Eastern Orphic cosmogony about Phanes and Phicola, while attributing it to the ancient and famous mysteries of the Great Goddess at Phlya—ad maiorem gloriam Sethianorum.


10 ἕκαστον scripsi (cf. p. 195.43: τούτῳ τῶν τριχῆ διηπημένων ἕκαστών εἶληρε δύναμιν): ἕκαστο P : ἕκαστος Homer. et Hippol. 5.8.3.
JUSTIN’S BARUCH: A SHOWCASE OF Gnostic Syncretism

The book Baruch of the Gnostic Justin is preserved in Hippolytus alone (Refut. 5.23.1-27.5 and 10.15.1-7, pp. 198-209 and 393-395 Marc.). It displays a strong Jewish background. Nevertheless, elements of Iranian (Persian), Greek, and above all Christian beliefs are visible enough in the system. I think Justin’s Baruch may serve as a showcase of Gnostic syncretism at work.

ACT ONE: The Primordial State

Theme 1: The Three Principles of the All (5.26.1 and 10.15.1). Baruch belongs to the Gnostic systems operating with three fundamental principles (such as are the systems of the Naassenes, Peratics, Sethians, Archontics, Docetists, of Monoimus, and of the Simonian Megale Apophasis as well). The three principles of the All (ἡσαν τρεῖς ἄρχαι τῶν ὅλων) are: the Good One (ὁ 'Αγαθὸς), Elohim (Ἡλωείμ) and Edem (Ἑδέμ). All three are “unbegotten” (ἀγέννητοι), i.e., imperishable and eternal. The first two are male, the third one is female. The supreme principle, the Good One, alone possesses the foreknowledge about the All (προγνωστικὸς τῶν ὅλων), while Elohim and Edem do not (they are ἀπρόγνωστοι).

Elohim is also called “Father of all what is created” (πατὴρ πάντων τῶν γεννητῶν), and, in addition, “unknown and invisible” (ἀγνωστός καὶ
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ἀδόρατος). In her turn, the female principle, Edem, is irascible and double-minded (ὀργίλη and διγνώμων or διγνωμος). Her name is also Israel (5.26.7 and 37), and Earth (Γῆ: 5.26.7; 9; 36).

Where do these three principles come from? As for Edem, already her name tells us that she is Eden from Gen. 2:8 (Καὶ ἐφυτευσεν θύρις ὁ θεὸς παράδεισον ἐν Εδεμ κατὰ ἀνατολάς). However, since she is Earth as well, the possibility remains that Hebrew ‘adamah, “earth,” had played some part in the parenytology of the name of Edem.2

Elohim is obviously the Jewish God-Demiurge, “Father of the whc Creation.” Nevertheless, his epithets, αἰγνωστὸς καὶ ἀδόρατος, have puzzled scholars. So Hans Jonas (p. 336 and n. 1) suggested that all three epithets of Elohim—ἀπρόνωστος καὶ ἀγνωστὸς καὶ ἀδόρατος—should have active sense, while translating, “ohne Vorauswissen, Erkennen und Sehen.” But he appended this caveat: “... so ungewöhnlich in gnostischen Sprachkreise auch diese Bedeutung von αἰγνωστὸς und ἀδόρατος sein mag.” In his turn, Ernst Haenchen (p. 125 n. 4) rejected Jonas’ interpretation, while taking both adjectives in their normal passive sense, “unbekannt” and “unsichtbar.” But then he took them for a later expansion to be deleted: “Wir vermuten deshalb in den Worten καὶ ἀγνωστὸς καὶ ἀδόρατος den Zusatz eines Bearbeiters oder Abschreibers...” Thus Haenchen omits both words in his translation of Baruch in V. Foerster, Die Gnosis, p. 72.

In my view, neither is right, and αἰγνωστὸς καὶ ἀδόρατος, “unknown at invisible,” is genuine Justin’s. For, (1) both epithets are appropriate for the Jewish God. Noetus calls Him so at Hippol. 9.10.10 (p. 348.50 M., cf. 9.9.5, p. 345.19 and 21: ἀφανὴς ἀδόρατος ἀγνωστὸς ἀνθρώπος). (2) At 5.26.1 = 10.15.1, Edem has four epithets. Consequently, Elohim’s own four epithets serve as counterbalance. And (3), Elohim’s epithets “unknown and invisible” form a contrast to the very nature of Edem. She is Earth, and as such she can be known and seen, while Elohim is also Sky (Οὐρανός, 5.26.36) and Zeus (5.26.34 and 35: θύρις and χρυσός), and as such “invisible.”

While Elohim and Edem (Eden) are undeniably Jewish, the Good One is more difficult to assess. Certainly, he cannot derive from such a late script as Ezra (4 Esdras 7.138), ca. A.D. 100. Nor can he be explained by means of Mark 10:18 (Luke 18:19; Matt. 19:17): Τί με λέγεις ἀγαθόν; σοῦδεὶς ἀγαθὸς εἰ μὴ εἰς ὁ θεὸς, as Robert Grant (p. 37) and others were willing to. It is true that Mark 10:18 is a favorite Gnostic text (compare the Naassenes at Hippol. 5.7.26; Marcion at Hippol. 7.31.6; Marcus at

2 So Jonas, p. 336 n. 4; G. Scholem, Eranos Jahrbuch 22 (1953) 242 f.; van den Broeck 40.
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Iren. 1.20.2). But it hardly can be the source of the widespread Gnostic doctrine of the Good God. At Hippol. 5.7.26, for example, the NT saying is clearly a consequence, not a cause of the doctrine: Τούτον (δ’) εἶναι φησιν Ἄγαθόν μόνον, καὶ περὶ τούτου λελέχθαι τὸ ύπὸ τοῦ Σωτήρος λεγόμενον. [follows Mark 10:18].

In a group of Gnostic systems there is a clear opposition between the supreme Good God and the Jewish Just God. For example, in Cerdon, Marcion, Apelles, and, I think, in Justin’s Baruch as well (compare Hippol. 5.26.16, below, Theme 8). There can be little doubt that the Just God is the Jewish Demiurge, the God of Law, Retribution and final Justice, while the Good God is best explained as an alien, extra-cosmic, unknowable god, say, the Iranian Ahura Mazda (or Ohrmazd). This is not the place to deal with this vexata quaestio. My point is this: the unknown Good God is present in too many different Gnostic systems to be explained by any single NT passage (Mark 10:18 being included). For example, in the Naassene doctrine (Hippol. 5.7.26; 5.8.44; 5.9.14); the Marcionites (e.g., Iren. 1.27.1); Valentinus Fr. 2 (Clement, Strom. 2.114.3); Ptolemy, Ep. ad Floram (ap. Epiph. Pan. 33.7.5); The Apocryphon of John BG 8502.2, p. 25.18 f. Till-Schenke (“der jederzeit Gute (ἀγαθός), der Gutes (ἀγαθόν) Spendende, der Gutes (ἀγαθόν) Tuende’’); NHC II.1, p. 4.6 f. (“a goodness-giving Goodness’’); The Gospel of Truth (NHC I.3, pp. 33.34; 36.35; 42.30; 43.19); The Exegesis on the Soul (NHC II.6, p. 135.26); The Book of Thomas the Contender (NHC II.7, p. 145.14); Eugnostos the Blessed (NHC III.3, p. 72.17) = The Sophia of Jesus Christ (NHC III.4, p. 95.10); Asclepius (NHC VI.8, p. 74.32); The Second Treatise of the Great Seth (NHC VII.2, p. 62.11), and many others (cf. Foerster’s “Register gnostischer Begriffe:” Die Gnosis, p. 435 = p. 331 of English translation).

Theme 2: The Shape of Edem (5.25.1-4; 5.26.1; 10.15.2). She is δισώματος and μιξοτάρθενος, half virgin and half viper (from the groin down: μέχρι βουλβώνος παρθενος, ἐχιδνα δὲ τὰ κάτω). Now, what is the likely source of Justin’s inspiration? Hippolytus himself (5.25.1-4) suggested the Scythian Echidna, half virgin and half viper, the mother of Agathyrsus, Gelonus and Scythes by Heracles, according to Herodotus (4.8-10). Herodotus’ myth remains a possibility, but a remote one. For (1) the similarities between Justin’s Edem and Herodotus’ Echidna stop at their identical shape: the rest of each myth is different. And (2) There are other Greek Echidnae, closer to Justin than is the Scythian one.

In his turn, Haenchen (p. 125 n. 2 = p. 301 n. 2) suggested the zodiacal sign Virgo as the source of Justin’s Edem, since Virgo—along with Gemini, Sagittarius and Pisces—is called in Astrology “a double-bodied

However, the image of Virgo as half virgin and half viper is to be found nowhere in antiquity, and long before the publication of Haenchen’s article W. Gundel had shown (e.g., in PW RE, XVIII [1949], s.v. Parthenos 1, col. 1949.41-47) that the Virgo of the zodiac is called a δυσφές, δίσωμον, σύνθετον or πολύμορφον ζώδιον thanks to the identification of this sign with the composite figure of Isis with her small boy Horus, the famous Isis lactans (Teucer of Babylonia, ed. F. Boll, Sphaera [Leipzig, 1913]), 18: ... Ἕως τρέφοσαν τὸν Ὀμόν; Antiochus of Athens, ibid., 58: Ἑν Παρθένῳ γυνή παιδίον βαστάζουσα). This was well pointed out by R. van den Broek, op. cit., p. 37.

Robert Grant (p. 41) suggested the wedding of Zas and Chthonie from Pherecydes of Syros as the source of Justin’s marriage of Elohim and Edem. Pherecydes and Justin seem to share the information that the respective marriage was the archetype of all human marriages (Pherecydes 7 B 2, col. 2 Diels-Kranz;3 Hippol. 5.26.10), as Paul Wendland (ed., ad loc.) had pointed out. But this similarity is deceptive. All Pherecydes says is that Zas gave his wife Chthonie as gift a κοσμικός καλκός, woven by himself, on the third day of marriage, on the day of ἀνακαλυπτερία, a regular occasion for a gift from husband to wife (West, p. 17 f.). Consequently, continues Pherecydes, this was the αἰτίαν for the custom of ἀνακαλυπτερία: ταύτα φασὶν ἀνακαλυπτήρια πρῶτον γενέσθαι, ἐκ τούτου δὲ ὁ νόμος ἐγένετο καὶ θεοί καὶ ἄνθρωποισιν (B 2 DK). On the other hand, Justin says that Edem brought to Elohim in marriage her entire faculty or power (δύναμις), as kind of a property (οὐσία), and that is why brides today bring dowry to their grooms in imitation of that first and divine marriage: Πάσαν γὰρ τὴν ἑαυτῆς δύναμιν, οἱ οὐσίαι, ἐν γάμῳ ἢ Ἔδημ προσήνεγκε τῷ Ἐλωείμ. ὃθεν, φησί, κατὰ μίμησιν ἐκείνου τοῦ πρῶτου γάμου προϊόν προσφέρουσι μέχρι σήμερον αἱ γυναῖκες τοῖς ἁνδράσι, θείῳ τίνι καὶ πατρικῷ νόμῳ πειθόμεναι, τῷ γενομένῳ πρὸς (τὸν) Ἐλωείμ (ἀπὸ τῆς Ἔδημ (5.26.10). In brief, Pherecydes and Justin speak of two different things.

However, unlike Justin’s Edem, Pherecydes’ Chthonie is not half
virgin and half viper. And besides, there are other sources for the holy
matrimony between Heaven and Earth, more popular than Pherecydes,
or, as R. van den Broek correctly put it (p. 41 n. 20), “the marriage of
Heaven and Earth was a wide-spread mythologoumenon.”

Following a hint of W. Weber,4 van den Broek himself (pp. 38-42) has
argued for the Isis-Thermouthis as the prototype of Justin’s Edem. She is
usually represented as half woman and half a coiling serpent.5 She was
identified with Demeter and enjoyed wide popularity in the Hellenistic
Egypt. But the problem with Isis-Thermouthis is that she had never
carried outside Egypt, and I do not find sufficient reasons to locate our
Justin in the Alexandria of Basilides, pace van den Broek (p. 42 f.): “The
cult of Isis-Thermouthis was confined to Egypt. There are no indications
that she was venerated or even known elsewhere in the classical world.
This implies that like so many other Gnostics, Justin must have lived in
Egypt at least for some time, probably in Alexandria.”

I think the most likely source of Justin as for the shape of Edem is “the
stout-hearted divine Echidna” of Hesiod’s Theogony (297-299), “half a
virgin with glancing eyes and fair cheeks, and half again a huge snake, awful
and mighty:”

\[
\text{θείην κρατερόφρον’ Ἐχιδναν,}
\]
\[
\text{ἡμισὺ μὲν νύμφην ἐλικωπίδα καλλιπάρην,}
\]
\[
\text{ἡμισὺ δ’ αὐτε πέλωρον ὁφιν δεινόν τε μέγαν τε}
\]

This Echidna was very much alive in late Orphic Cosmogonies, e.g., in
Fr. 58 Kern, preserved in Athenagoras, Legatio 20.4 (circa A.D. 177).
Hesiod’s Theogony was a classical textbook, and his Echidna is exactly
50% virgin, and 50% viper, just as as Justin’s Edem.

**Act Two: The Creation**

**Theme 3: The ἱερὸς γάμος between Elohim (Heaven) and Edem (Earth)**

(5.26.2; 10.15.3). In Theme 1, we have seen that Father Elohim is
άπρογνωστος, i.e., unaware of the consequences of his actions. Conse­quently, he allows himself to become victim of love-passion (ἐπιθυμία) and
to fall in love with the μεξοπάρθενος Edem-Earth. Since this feeling is
mutual, Elohim and Edem contract the first holy matrimony in history
(5.26.8 and 10). The Near-Eastern and Greek (cf. Hesiod, Theog. 45;
106; 126 f.; 133 etc.) ἱερὸς γάμος between Heaven and Earth strikes the

---

eye. It is explicitly alluded to at 5.26.36, where Heaven and Earth of Isaiah 1:2 (ἀξονε, οὐρανέ, καὶ ἐνωτίζου, ἧ γῆ) are interpreted as Elohim’s spirit and Edem’s soul (both being present in man). As a contrast, in the Simonian Gnosis, Heaven and Earth from Is. 1:2 are interpreted as Nous and Epinoia (Hippol. 6.13.1). The same ἐκρός γόμος of Greek mythology is present also at 5.26.34-35, where Elohim is Zeus, and Edem is Leda or Danae (cf., e.g., M.L. West ad Theogony 133).

Theme 4: Twice Twelve Angels (5.26.3-5). In Hesiod, the first progeny of Gaia by Uranos consisted of twelve Titans (six male and six female, Theog. 133-138). In Justin, Elohim and Edem beget twenty-four angels. Twelve of them resemble the father, and twelve the mother. That means that the angels of Elohim are pneumatic, spiritual and good, while the angels of Edem are psychic, irascible and double-minded (cf. Theme 1). Pretty soon we will learn that the angels of Edem are actually the evil cosmic rulers (archons, satraps) of this world. The contrast between pneumatic and psychic becomes clear from the role which is played by the third angel on each side. Baruch ("The Blessed One;" cf. Iren. 2.24.2: Baruch = Hebraice Deus), the right hand of Elohim, is the angel of salvation. Naas (Hebrew Nāḥāsh), the right hand of Edem, is the angel of evil.

Only the names of the first five angels of Elohim are preserved (probably because a scribe had skipped one line from his exemplar, comprising seven names, cf. Hippol., p. 201.16 M.). They are: Michael; Amen (cf. Revel. 3:14; NHC II.1, p. 16.1; Pistis Sophia 1, p. 2.18 et al.); Baruch (cf. NHC IX.1, p. 6.14); Gabriel; Ἰσαάδαιος (= El-Shaddai). The names of the twelve angels of Edem are: Babel (= Balbel (?) of NHC II.1, p. 16.10); Achamōth (= Wisdom, Σοφία); Naas (= ὕψως, Hippol. 5.6.3; 5.9.12); Bel; Belias (cf. NHC II.1, p. 11.3; III.2, p. 58.21; = Belial, Beliar, 2 Cor. 6:15); Satan; Sael (= Sheol); Adōnaios (= Adōnai); Καυίθαν; Φαραώ (= Pharaoh); Καρκαμενώς and Λάθεν.

5 Compare Gisèle Deschênes, Isis Thermouthis (Thèse dactylographiée à l'Université Laval, Québec, janvier, 1975); Idem, "Isis Thermouthis," in Hommages à Maarten J. Vermaseren, Vol. II., Leiden, 1978, 305-315 & plates XLVII-LIII; Françoise Dunand, Le culte d’Isis dans le bassin oriental de la Méditerranée, Leiden, 1973 (EPRO, Vol. 26), I, pp. 88-91 and plates XXVI-XXVIII; III, p. 266 and n. 3: "Isis Thermouthis figure sur une terre cuite et un bronze trouvés à Cyzique, mais il doit s’agir d’œuvres d’importation; la terre cuite, en particulier, est conforme à un modèle connu en Egypte."

While the great majority of these names are Jewish, Pharaoh is obviously Egyptian, and at least Bel and Babel come from Mesopotamia: Bel is the planet Jupiter (Marduk),7 and Babel is the planet Venus (= Aphrodite, Hippol. 5.26.20 and 28).8

Theme 5: Angels as the Trees of the Paradise. As an interlude only, Justin reports this Haggadah (cf. 5.26.6: Τούτου <γὰρ> τοῦ παραδείσου ἀλληγορικῶς οί ἄγγελοι κέκληνται ξύλα). The sum of these twenty-four angels also makes the Paradise (5.26.5: Τούτων δὲ τῶν ἄγγελων ὁμοῖο πάντων τὸ πλῆθος οἱ παράδεισος, φησίν, ἐστί). For that reason, Gen. 2:8: Καὶ ἐφύτευσεν κύριος ὁ θεὸς παράδεισον ἐν Εδέμ κατὰ ἀνατολάς, had to be altered into (5.26.5): Ἐφύτευσεν ὁ θεὸς παράδεισον κατὰ πρόσωπον τῆς 'Εδέμ, ἵνα βλέπῃ τὸν παράδεισον ἡ 'Εδέμ (τουτέστι τούς ἄγγελους) διὰ παντὸς. This Haggadah may be paralleled by Psalmi Salomonis 14:3, ὁ παράδεισος τοῦ κυρίου, τὰ ξύλα τῆς ζωῆς, οὐσία αὐτοῦ; VT Pseudepigr. 14:2, “The Paradise of the Lord, the trees of life, are His pious ones.” Jean Daniélou had drawn attention to the twelve trees in the Paradise in 5 Ezra 2.18: Sanc·tificavi et paravi ibi arbores duodecim gravatas variis fructibus.9

The idea of a Paradise consisting of only twelve (or twice twelve) trees may well reflect the original meaning of the Paradise as a “small walled enclosure”—Old Persian pairi-daēza = περι-τεῖχισμα. Anyway, Baruch is the Tree of life, while Naas is the Tree of the knowledge of good and evil (Gen. 2:9; Hippol. 5.26.6).

Theme 6: The Creation of the World and Man. After the creation of the Paradise (i.e., of the twenty-four angels-trees), Elohim takes care of creating heaven and earth, and all what is in them (Gen. 2:1; Hippol. 5.26.11: Κτισθέντων δὲ πάντων, ὡς γέγραπται παρὰ τῷ Μωϋσεὶ, οὐρανοῦ τε καὶ γῆς, καὶ τῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς…). But for the creation of animals and Man, Elohim delegates this task to his angels (5.26.7). As for the role of the angels as demiurges, compare, e.g., Iren. 1.24.1 (Saturnilus); 1.30.5 (The Ophites); NHC II.1, p. 15.13 ff. (The Apocryphon of John); II.4, p. 87.23 ff. (The Hypostasis of the Archons), et alibi.

Both animals and Man are created from the clay of the earth (Gen. 2:7). Animals are created from the lower, viperous, portions of the body.

---

7 Compare The Right Ginza I.192, p. 28.30; II.126, p. 46.30 Lidzbarski; A. Bouché-Leclercq, L’Astrologie Grecque (Paris, 1899), pp. 37 n. 2; 49; 69; 97; 632; Βῆλ καὶ Δράκων (LXX and VT Apocrypha).
8 Compare Βῆλα in Pap. demot. mag. Lond. et Lugd.-Batav. col. 5.9, p. 46 Griffith-Thompson; Erik Peterson, Rhein. Mus. 75 (1926), p. 398 f.
of Edem-Earth, while Man is created from her upper, human, portions (5.26.7).

Most probably, the man created by the (imperfect) angels could not stand up and walk (compare Saturnilus ap. Iren. 1.24.1 = Hippol. 2128.3). That is why Elohim and Edem had to put in Adam and Eve their respective δύναμις — Elohim spirit (πνεῦμα), Edem soul (ψυχή): 5.26.8. Compare Gen. 2:7, Καὶ ἐπλάσεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον χοῦν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς, καὶ ἐνερφύησεν εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ πνοὴν ζωῆς, καὶ ἐγένετο ὁ ἄνθρωπος εἰς ψυχὴν ζώσαν.

Now, Adam and Eve have been created in the image (εἰκόν) of Elohim and Edem, respectively (cf. Gen. 1:27, καὶ εἰκόνα θεοῦ ἐποίησεν αὐτὸν). At the same time, Adam and Eve become an everlasting token, warranty, seal, memorandum or reminder (σύμβολον, σφραγίς, ύπόμνημα) of the marital bond, love and unity between Elohim and Edem (5.26.8-9). Finally, Adam and Eve receive from their creators the commandment: "Αὐξάνεσθε καὶ πληθύνεσθε καὶ κατακληρονομήσατε τὴν Γῆν," toutéste tēn Ἐδέμ (5.26.9). The injunction of Gen. 1:28 (Αὐξάνεσθε καὶ πληθύνεσθε καὶ πληρώσατε τὴν γῆν καὶ κατακυριεύσατε αὐτῆς) was not appropriate, since Earth is Edem, who brings Elohim in marriage rich dowry (οὐσία) — her entire power or faculty (δύναμις; 5.26.10). It is this property of Edem (οὐσία) that is envisaged by Justin as the future inheritance of Adam and Eve.

**Theme 7: The Twelve Persian Zodiacal Satraps (5.26.11-13).** In addition to being trees of the Paradise, the twelve angels of Edem are also the twelve evil cosmic rulers of this world. Actually, they are the twelve Chaldaean zodiacal archons or satraps. The Persian word satrap (xshathra pāwan = "ruler of a province") appears in the text (5.26.11): οὕτως... οἱ δῶδεκα ἀγγελοί... διέσουσι τὸν κόσμον, σατραπικὴν τινα ἔχοντες κατὰ τὸν κόσμον παρὰ τῆς Ἐδέμ ἐξουσιάν.

Now, the Chaldaean astrology teaches that the twelve signs of the Zodiac are divided into four trigons (τρίγωνα, triplicitates, triquestra) — by the construction of four equilateral triangles within the zodiac circle: 1. Aries, Leo, Sagittarius. 2. Taurus, Virgo, Capricorn. 3. Gemini, Libra, Aquarius. 4. Cancer, Scorpio, Pisces. Each one of the four quadrants is called a tetraktísmóron (5.26.11 and 13; Ptolemy, Tetrabiblos, 1.19 Περὶ τριγώνων).

Consequently, the twelve satraps of Edem are also divided into four quarters or realms. Their uninterrupted circle forms a dancing chorus,

---

and they constantly circle the Earth (5.26.12: ... ἀλλ’ οἶνοι ἐν χορῷ χωλικῷ ἐμπερείᾳ χορνται ἡπάσαμεν τὴν γῆν, ἀλλάσασθε τὸν ἐκ τόπου). As a consequence, the twelve evil archons bring any kind of tripulations to every corner of the Earth—poor crops, starvation, illnesses, sufferings (λιμός, στενοχωρία, θλίψης, κακοὶ καιροί, νόσουν (συ)στάσεις).

The most probable means for the evil influence of the twelve archons upon the mankind is the astrological effluence (ἀπόρροια, emanatio). This may be inferred from Irenaeus’ report on the Valentinian Gnostic Marcus (1.17.1, p. 167 f. Harvey = Hippol. 6.53.6-7, p. 277 M.). There the twelve signs of the Zodiac exercise an influence upon the twelve climatic zones on Earth thanks to their ἀπόρροια. The twelve signs themselves are only the image of the heavenly Δοῦδεκάς.

Now, as a surprise, each astrological τρίγωνον or τεταρτημόριον of the cosmic satraps is called a river: Φεισών (Pishon), Γεών (Gihon), Τίγρις and Εὐφράτης (Gen. 2:10-14). How was the jump from Genesis (ποταμὸς δὲ ἐκπορεύεται εξ Ἐδεμ) to Chaldaean astrology (τεταρτημόρια) possible? The explanation advanced by R. van den Broek (p. 42) is not very convincing to me: “But it is also possible that his [Justin’s] conception of Edem’s activity as expressing itself in four principles, was influenced by the Egyptian idea that Thermouthis reveals herself in four separate manifestations.”

In my opinion, Justin’s equation, τεταρτημόριον = ποταμός, was facilitated by the following two interpretations. First, in Gen. 2:10, ἔκειθεν ἀφορίζεται (sc. ὁ ποταμὸς) εἰς τέσσαρας ἁρχὰς, means, “beyond there (i.e., Eden) the river divides and becomes four branches.” Justin, however, took the word ἁρχὴ to mean command as body of troops, realm, province, satrapy. That is why each one of the four branches is called also a παράταγμα and οἱ τόποι: ὁ τεταγμένοι αὐτοῖς (5.26.12). Thanks to two different senses of ἁρχὴ the four rivers have been converted into four satrapies, realms of regions of the Earth. The transition from river to land may have been influenced by Gen. 2:11-14. Much more abstract is the Naassene and Simonian interpretation of the four rivers of Eden as four senses of the Archanthpos (Hippol. 5.9.15-17; 6.15.1).

Second, the circle of the Zodiac is thought of as an uninterrupted stream. Hence Justin’s expressions: Καὶ τοῦτο ἐκ τῆς τῆς ἐκπορεύεται τῶν τεταρτημορίων ποταμῶν ὁσπερεὶ ῥεῖμα κακίας κατὰ θέλησιν τῆς Ἐδεμ ἀδιαλείπτως τὸν κόσμον περιέρχεται (5.26.13); Οὐτοὶ οἱ δώδεκα ἄγγελοι...

11 On the astral ἀπόρροια, compare, e.g., Hippol. 5.13.3 ἀπὸ τῆς τῶν ἀστρῶν ἀπορροίας τὰς γενέσεις τῶν ὑποκειμένων ἀποτελεῖσθαι; 5.15.3 ὡς γέγονεν ὁ κόσμος ἀπὸ τῆς ἀπορροίας τῆς ἀν, οὕτως (καὶ πάντα) ἐκ ἔνδεια ἀπὸ τῆς ἀπορροίας τῶν ἀστέρων γένειν ἔχειν καί φθόραν; Sext. Empir. Adv. math. 5.12-14; and, e.g., Fr. Boll, Sternglaube und Sterndeutung, 3rd ed. (Leipzig, 1926), pp. 54 f.; 134 ff.
Theme 8: The Enlightenment of Elohim (5.26.14-18). Having accomplished the creation of the world in agreement with Edem, Elohim decides to ascend above the heavenly vault or dome, to inspect his creation from above. I take the clause of 5.26.14, ἀναβήναι ἥθελησεν εἰς τὰ υψηλὰ μέρη τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ θέσασθαι μὴ τι γέγονε τῶν κατὰ τὴν κτίσιν ἐνδεές, to mean the same as 5.27.3, ὑπεράνω τοῦ στερεώματος (cf. Gen. 1:8, καὶ ἐξάλεσεν ὁ θεὸς τὸ στερέωμα οὐρανόν). Elohim takes his twelve angels with him leaving his wedded wife Edem-Earth behind and down.

Edem wants to join her husband in the ascent, but is not able to. The explanation that she is by nature ἡ κάτω Δύναμις (5.26.28), while Elohim, as Heaven (Οὐρανός), is ἡ ἄνω Δύναμις, would have done. Justin, however, decides to combine here Greek philosophy. Both Elohim and Edem are elementary physical forces in the All. The dynamis of Elohim is the light pneuma, the dynamis of Edem is the heavy element earth. Consequently, the former always shows an upward tendency (ἠν γὰρ ἀνωφερῆς), while the latter shows a downward tendency (κατωφερῆς). The same dichotomy between Spirit as ἀνωφερές καὶ λεπτομερές, and Matter as κατωφερές καὶ παχυμερές, we find both in the system of Basilides and in an Anonymous Gnostic ap. Hippol. 4.43.8.12

The point is that Elohim just had to ascend to the Good One. First, to be illuminated himself; second, to show the way of salvation to the future pneumatics, members of the Gnostic congregation of Justin. Elohim’s desire to inspect his creation from above (μὴ τι γέγονε τῶν κατὰ τὴν κτίσιν ἐνδεές) is in the text only to witness to the well-known imperfection and ignorance of the Gnostic Jewish Demiurge (cf., e.g., Sakläs = Aramaic “stupid”). He is mistaken in thinking that his creation is a perfect one, and he badly needs illumination. Through a mystic revelation Elohim

---

12 Compare, e.g., Ps.-Aristotle Probl. 13.5, p. 908 a 25; Plutarch De Stoic. repugn. 1053 E.
must recognize that he is not the supreme god, but that there is a mightier one above him (the Good One). In brief, the enlightenment of the Jewish Demiurge is a Gnostic common place, and the beloved testimony is Psalm 111 (110):10, ἀρχὴ σοφίας φόβος χυρίου, which in the interpretatio Gnostica means: “The panic fear felt by the Lord Creator of the world is the beginning of his wisdom.”

When he had ascended above the heavenly dome (ἐπὶ τὸ ἄνω πέρας τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, 5.26.15), Elohim sees an enormous light, much brighter than the one he had created (φῶς κρείττον ὑπὲρ δ’ αὐτὸς ἐδημιουργησεν). As a matter of fact, Elohim had created two lights—“day-light,” on the first day of creation, and “sun-light,” on the fourth day; just as in Hesiod (Theogony 124) Day was born much earlier than Helios. But nothing of the sort could be compared to the irradiance Elohim saw. Maybe because he saw the old Iranian, Vedic extra-cosmic light, rōkāh? Anyway, this light resides in the house of the extra-cosmic Good One (5.26.16).

Elohim is amazed, he comes to his senses, repents, and confesses: “I thought that I was the God” (5.26.15: ἔδοξον γὰρ ἐγὼ χύριος εἶναι). He approaches the gates of the heavenly palace of God (cf. Gen. 28:17), and quotes Psalm 118 (117):19, Ἀνοιεστέ μοι πῦλας, ῥα ἐισελθὼν ἐξομολογήσωμαι τῷ χυρίῳ. He receives the answer coming from the light (φωνὴ (δ’) αὐτῷ ἀπὸ τοῦ φωτός ἐδόθη λέγουσα): “This is the gate of the Lord: the just ones (δίκαιοι) enter through it” (Ps. 118:20). I think it is significant to know that Elohim is just. For this squares with the Gnostic distinction between the supreme Good God, and the Jewish Demiurge, who is only God of the Law, retribution and justice.

The gates open; Elohim leaves his twelve angels outside the gates, enters the palace of the Good One, and undergoes the mystic experience and illumination. But before doing so he swears a solemn oath, which is to be repeated by every future initiate into the Gnostic faith of Justin. We don’t know the text of Elohim’s oath sworn in the presence of the Good One, and I doubt that Justin knew it either, but all he wrote down in Baruch was Psalm 110 (109):4, Ὡμοσε χύριος καὶ οὐ μεταμεληθήσεται (5.24.1; 5.27.1). As for the text of the oath sworn by the initiates of the community of Justin, there are two slightly different versions in Hippolytus. The relevant evidence is as follows.
Justin’s Baruch: A Showcase of Gnostic Syncretism

I would draw the following two tentative conclusions. First, the original text of the oath is as in column 3 (5.27.2): “I swear by the One who is above all, by the Good One, that I shall keep these mysteries and shall not reveal them to anybody; and that I shall not return from the Good One back to the creation.” The text in column 1 (5.24.1) is a free paraphrase of Hippolytus (based on the book Baruch). Second, in the middle column (5.26.16), Hippolytus has omitted the text from the book Baruch mentioning the oath and the baptism of Elohim.

This omission seems to be confirmed by the following facts. (1) The presence of the mystic formula (1 Cor. 2:9) in all three passages (“to see what the eye has not seen, the ear has not heard, nor the human heart has conceived”). (2) The reference to the oath of Elohim both in 5.24.1 and 5.27.1, καὶ γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ ἡμῶν ὁ Ἐλωεὶμ όμοσε. And (3) the explicit mention of the baptism of Elohim in the presence of the Good One at 5.27.2-3:

... καὶ πίνει ἀπὸ τοῦ ἥλων ὦδας, ὃπερ ἐστὶ λουτρόν αὐτοῖς, ὡς νομίζουσι, “πηγὴ ᾿ζώντος ὦδατος ἄλλοιμένου” (John 4:10 and 14)... καὶ

13 1 Cor. 2:9, a beloved Gnostic reference to describe mystic revelation: Hippol. 6.24.4; The Gospel of Thomas, Logion 17 (NHC II 2, p. 36.5-9 expanded); Clement Exe. ex Theod. 10.5; Manich. Turfan Fr. M. 789; Acta Thomae 36; Acta Petri Gr. 39, et alibi.
In short, I think the Good One would not have allowed Elohim to see the holy mysteries before swearing the oath, and he certainly would not have seated him at his right hand before Elohim’s baptism and purification through “‘the living water,’” which is located above the heavenly vault (στερέωμα) and which belongs to the Good One. Consequently, Hippolytus has skipped an important text from Baruch in column 2: the foundation of the holy baptism practised by the members of Justin’s congregation (5.27.2-3).

Back to the House of the Good One. He bids Elohim to sit at his right hand (cf. Psalm 110:1, Εἴπεν ὁ χύριος τῷ χυρίῳ μου. Κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου). Elohim, however, who is now fully aware of the imperfection of his creation, wants to return to Earth and to destroy it (5.26.17: “Εασόν με, χύριε, καταστρέφαι τὸν χόσμον ὅν πεποίηκα”). But the Good One, being pure goodness, would not allow him to do so: “You may commit no evil deed while you are with me. You and Edem have created the world by a mutual agreement, so let Edem have the creation as long as she wishes, and you stay with me (cf. Deuter. 5:31)’” (5.26.18). And that was the final order. Elohim remains with the Good One, and his only communication with this world is through his third angel Baruch.

One reason for Elohim would have done: “‘The world I have created is imperfect and evil, and I want it destroyed.’” But Justin puts in the mouth of Elohim a different reason: “My spirit has been tied up in men, and I want to recover it” (5.26.18: τὸ πνεῦμα γάρ μου ἐνδέδεται εἰς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, καὶ θέλω αὐτὸ ἀπολαβεῖν). It may sound surprising to learn that Elohim wants his spirit, present in every man, recovered even before it has been subjected to tortures on the part of Edem. But Elohim’s wish becomes understandable from the general tenet of Gnosticism. For Elohim to put his spirit in Adam and Eve was a consequence of his psychic feeling of “‘love-desire’” (ἐπιθυμία, mentioned three times at 5.26.2) and of his ignorance (διὰ τὴν πατρικὴν ἀγνοιαν, 5.26.37). Now that he has been illuminated, it is his duty to recover every pneumatic particle from the psychic and choic world of decay (cf. 5.27.3).

What is more important for the strong syncretistic tendencies of Justin is that, in the brief statement of Elohim, he seems to combine Genesis with Plato. For his words, θέλω ἀπολαβεῖν τὸ πνεῦμά μου, compare Gen. 6:3, Καὶ εἶπεν χύριος ὁ θεός. Οὐ μὴ καταμείνη τὸ πνεῦμα μου ἐν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τούτοις εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτοὺς σάρκας. As for his words, τὸ πνεῦμα μου ἐνδέδεται εἰς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, compare Hippol. 5.26.37, τὸ πνεῦμα

Seeing that her husband is not returning to her, Edem-Earth first adorns herself to look well (imitating the Stoic Mother Nature), in order to attract Elohim and win him back (the psychic word επιθυμία is employed again). But Elohim remains under the control of the Good One (κρατηθείς τῷ Ἀγαθῷ ὁ Ἐλωεῖμ). Then Edem, being hurt, distressed and angry, decides to take revenge on her husband for abandoning her. Since he is beyond her reach, Edem engages in punishing and tormenting what is left from him in this world: this is his spirit, which he had put in every man and woman. The main source of inspiration for Justin seems to have been Galatians 5:16-17.

Gal. 5:16-17

Edem gives order to her first angel, Babel (Venus), to bring about adultery and divorce among men, so that Elohim’s spirit abiding in every man and woman may suffer the same torment of separation Edem herself was suffering. She also empowers her third angel, Naas (Snake), to punish and torture the spirit of Elohim in men, in every possible way - That is why Naas first seduces Eve and has intercourse with her (compare 2 Enoch 31:6; Apocal. Abrahae 23; the Archontics ap. Epiphan. Pan. 40.5.3), then he does the same with Adam, thus orginating both adultery and pederasty.

Justin quite explicitly puts an emphasis on Elohim’s departure and ascent as the αἴτιον of evil in the mankind. Consider 5.26.14, Γέγονε δὲ ἡ τῆς καχίας ἀνάγκη ἐκ τοιαύτης τινὸς αἰτίας (follows Elohim’s ascent); 5.26.21, ... ἵνα διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ἢ κολαζόμενος ὃ Ἐλωεῖμ, ὃ καταλιπτών παρὰ τὰς συνθήκας τὰς γινομένας αὐτῷ τῇ σύζυγον; and particularly 5.26.23-24:
Two questions arise. The first one: We have already learned that the evil came to the mankind with the twelve evil cosmic rulers of Edem: Καὶ τοῦτο ... ἑξαπτά μὴ κατὰ θέλησιν τῆς Εἴδημ ἀρχήν κακῶν ἐποίησε τῷ πνεύματι {τοῦ πατρὸς} τῷ ἐν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις.

I don’t think so. In my opinion, the word κακία has two different connotations. In Theme 7, it refers to external causes, misfortunes, calamities and disasters (such as θλίψις, κακοὶ καρποί, νόσους συστάσεις). On the contrary, here, in Theme 9, it refers to the moral evil (wickedness, depravity), caused by man’s behavior (such as μοιχεία, ἀρσενοκοιτία, παρανομία, χωρίσμος γάμου). The second question is more difficult to answer: How much is Elohim to blame for the origin of moral evil in mankind? For Justin is quite clear about the fact that Elohim, by abandoning his wedded wife, had broken the solemn marital bond and agreement with Edem (5.26.21, παρὰ τὰς συνθήκας).

I do not think that Isaiah 45:7—referred to by Grant (p. 39)—can help us here (“I am the One who makes well-being and creates woe”). Two points should be made. First, Elohim is the Gnostic Jewish Demiurge. As such he is both just (δίκαιος, 5.26.16) and ignorant (ἀπρόγνωστος, 5.26.1; διὰ τὴν πατρικὴν ἀγνοίαν, 5.26.37; ἐδόκουν γὰρ ἐγὼ κύριος εἶναι, 5.26.15). In addition to possessing spirit, he must possess soul as well: he is both pneumatic and psychic. Because of the latter, he allowed himself to become a victim of ἐπιθυμία, to fall in love with Edem, to create this world with her, and finally, to abandon her.

In brief, by breaking his marital contract with Edem, Elohim becomes the αἰτίαν of moral evil (παρανομία) in the mankind. And by leaving behind his spirit in men to be exposed to the punishment on the part of Edem, Elohim only displays his original “lack of foreknowledge.” All this may be explained by the imperfection of the Gnostic Demiurge, who is not the supreme God.

Second, there can be little doubt, however, about Justin’s mind: the good prevails in Elohim’s behavior after all. Justin states (5.26.24): Ἀναβὰς γὰρ πρὸς τὸν Ἀγαθὸν ὁ Πατὴρ ὄδον ἐδειξε τοῖς ἀναβαίνειν θέλουσιν, ἀποστάσθε δὲ τῆς Ἐδημ ἀρχὴν κακῶν ἐποίησε τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἐν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις. The sufferings of Elohim’s spirit in men are only temporary: Jesus will soon save the spirit and deliver it to Elohim (Theme 12). But the benefit
of Elohim’s ascent is essential and lasting. For Elohim has shown the way of salvation to all future pneumatics (Gnostics), and that is what matters. In the sentence just quoted, the advantage is given to the ascent of Elohim (although it is mentioned first). If anyone has doubts about this, let him read Hippol. 5.26.26: ...ινα τὸ πνεῦμα, τὸ ἐν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις κατοικοῦν, φύγῃ τὴν Ἑδέμ καὶ τὴν πλάσιν τὴν πονηράν, ὡσπερ ἐφυγεν ὁ Πατήρ Ἐλωείμ.

**Act Three: The Salvation**

_Theme 10: Baruch three times defeated by Nahash (5.26.21-26; 10.15.5)._ In the course of history of mankind, Elohim five times sends down to Earth his third angel Baruch, to serve as his personal messenger, in order to recover his spirit left behind in every man and woman. Elohim’s original message is addressed directly to his spirit in men, and it is loud and clear (5.26.26): “Escape the evil mould (ἡ πλάσις ἡ πονηρά) of Edem-Earth, just as the Father Elohim did!” But Justin is not quite consistent here, in his attempt to explain both Jewish and gentile history (see Theme 11).

Baruch’s first mission is to Adam (and Eve) in the Paradise. He stands in the middle of the garden of Edem, which now consists of only twelve angels-trees of Edem, and delivers this command to Adam (Gen. 2:16-17): “You may eat from any of the Trees in the Paradise, except from the Tree of the knowledge of good and evil.” We already know that this tree is Nahash, and Justin is quite explicit: “That means that you may obey the rest of the angels of Edem, with the only exception of Naas.” For, while all twelve angels of Edem are psychic—i.e., they possess emotions, passions and drives,—it is only Nahash who possesses unlawful passions (such as the fornication of Eve, and the pederasty with Adam): πάθη μέν γὰρ ἔχουσιν οἱ ἔνδεκα, παρανομίαν δὲ οὐκ ἔχουσιν, ὁ δὲ Νάας παρανομίαν ἔσχε (5.26.22).

We know from 5.26.21 that Baruch has been sent down by Elohim εἰς βοήθειαν τῷ πνεύματι ἀὐτοῦ, τῷ δὲ ντὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις πάν. Therefore, one may ask: In what way is the spirit of Elohim being helped by the command of Baruch to Adam and Eve to obey the rest of the eleven angels of Edem, including Satan (5.26.4)? My answer is: By this command the spirit of Elohim in Adam and Eve is being saved from sure perdition. For the end of Gen. 2:17—ἡ δ’ ἐν ἡμέρᾳ φάγητε ἀπ’ ἀὐτοῦ, θανάτῳ ἀποθανεῖτε—is not quoted by Justin (or Hippolytus), but it is certainly implied. At least, the sure death deriving from this Tree is mentioned in _The Hypostasis of the Archons_ (NHC II.4, p. 88.30-32).

However, Baruch’s order: “Obey the rest of the angels of Edem,” may look inconsistent with the original mission of Baruch (to save the spirit of Elohim). I think it may be explained by two reasons. (1) By the
text of Genesis, where βρώσει φάγη implies permission; hence Justin’s interpretation, πειθεσθε. (2) If Elohim himself experienced ἐπιθυμία, why should his creation Adam and Eve be deprived of legitimate emotions (πάθη)?

The rest of the missions of Baruch are no longer to Man directly, but through a chosen medium: Moses, the Jewish prophets, “the prophet” Heracles, finally Jesus. Baruch comes to Moses to use him as his own mouthpiece, in an effort to urge the sons of Israel to turn toward the Good One (ὅπως ἐπιστραφῶσι πρὸς τὸν Ἀγαθόν, 5.26.24). From the expression, αἱ ἐντολαὶ τοῦ Βαροῦχ, we may assume that Justin is referring to the Law of Moses, reinterpreted in the Gnostic way. Similarly, Baruch employs the prophets as his mouthpiece, trying to deliver the message of Elohim to his spirit abiding in every man.

Now, in four of the five missions of Baruch, either Nahash or Babel make an attempt to thwart Baruch’s effort, to make it ineffective. Three times they have succeeded (Moses, the prophets, Heracles). They employ two magic, devilish, tricks: (1) ἐπισκιάζειν, “to overshadow, eclipse or obscure the commands of Baruch;” (2) υποσώρειν, “to seduce, charm or beguile a person.” However, such an attempt is missing in the case of Adam and Eve. But since we know that they have disobeyed the command given by Baruch (Elohim or God: Gen. 3:6), it is reasonable to assume that Nahash had foiled Baruch’s command given to Adam and Eve as well—simply by beguiling Eve (Gen. 3:1-5)—and that Nahash (and Babel) had tried to neutralize each one of the five efforts of Baruch. It is Hippolytus who had skipped the respective sentence while excerpting Justin’s book (as he elsewhere does). Here is the evidence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Counteraction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.26.24-25: Baruch speaks to the sons of Israel through Moses.</td>
<td>Nahash overshadows the commands of Baruch through the soul of Edem abiding in Moses: ὁ (Νάας) τὰς ἐντολάς τοῦ Βαροῦχ ἐπεσκίασε καὶ τὰς ἱδίας ἐποίησε ἀκουέσθαι.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.26.26: Baruch speaks to the spirit of Elohim in men through the prophets.</td>
<td>Nahash beguiles the prophets through the soul of Edem in them: ὁ Νάας διὰ τῆς ψυχῆς ... ὑπέσφυε τοὺς προφήτας, καὶ ὑπεσώρησαν πάντες καὶ οὐκ ἠκούσθησαν οἱ λόγοι τοῦ Βαροῦχ, οὐς ἐνετείλατο (ὁ) Ἑλωείμ.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.26.27: Elohim sends Heracles to overpower the twelve angels of Edem and free his spirit.

5.26.28: Babel, in the shape of Omphale, beguiles Heracles and deprives him of power: ἵδη ὃμφάλη... ύποσύρει τὸν Ἡρακλέα καὶ ἀποδιώκει τὴν δύναμιν αὐτοῦ (τοινεκτί) τὰς ἐντολὰς τοῦ Βαρούχ, ὡς ἐνετείλατο ὁ Ἔλωείμ... 

5.26.30: Baruch is sent by Elohim to Jesus. He tells him: Πάντες οἱ πρὸ σοῦ προφήται ὑπεσύρησαν· πειράζητε οὖν, Ἰησοῦ, οὐκ ἀνθρώποι, μὴ υποσυρῆναι...

5.26.31: Nahash tries to beguile Jesus as well, but does not succeed: Ὑποσύραι οὖν ὁ Ἕλας καὶ τούτον ἡθέλησεν νῦν, οὐκ ἤθυνθη δὲ· πιστὸς γὰρ ἔμεινεν τῷ Βαρούχ. Ὅργησεν οὖν ὁ Ἕλας ὅτι αὐτὸν ὑποσύραι οὖν ἤθυνθη, ἐποίησεν αὐτὸν σταυρωθῆναι. 10.15.7: Καὶ τούτω δὲ ἐπιζευκεῖναι τὴν Ἰδέα, μὴ δεδυνήσθαι δὲ αὐτὸν ἀπατήσαι, καὶ τούτον ἁρίν πεποιηκέναι αὐτῶν σταυρωθῆναι.

I think the above synopsis demonstrates that the motif of ἐπισειάζειν, ὑποσύρειν, ἀπατᾷν, on the part of Edem, Baruch or Babel, plays a significant part within the Themes 10-12, and that it stood in Justin’s Baruch in the report on the first mission of Baruch as well, but was omitted by Hippolytus.

Theme 11: Elohim’s prophet Heracles defeated by Babel (5.26.27-28; 10.15.6). Since three peaceful attempts by Baruch to free Elohim’s spirit from Edem have failed, Father Elohim now decides to employ sheer force. He chooses a “prophet” from the uncircumcision (ἐξ ἄκροβυστίας), the gentile Heracles, and sends his third angel Baruch to him with the following message (αἱ ἐντολαὶ τοῦ Βαρούχ, ὡς ἐνετείλατο ὁ Ἔλωείμ, p. 206.145 M.): “Overpower the twelve angels of Edem and free the spirit of the Father from the twelve angels of the creation of evils.”

Heracles obeys and accomplishes his twelve labors, one after the other: first, the Nemean Lion; next, the Hydra of Lerna; third, the Boar of Erymanthus, and so on. Let us stop here for a moment and ask this question: How come that Elohim had chosen a prophet from the uncircumcision, and why exactly Heracles? My answer is: The Greeks had called the constellation Engonasin Heracles, and the Gnostics identified it with Adam. The constellation of the Northern Hemisphere Ὅ ἐν γόνασιν, The Kneeler (Ingenicus) is situated between Ophiuchus (The Snake-holder) and the famous Draco of the North Pole. At least since Eratosthenes’ Catasterismi 4, Engonasin has been interpreted as a kneeling Heracles (tired after accomplishing his twelve labors). And the Dragon, just
beneath his heel, sometimes has been interpreted as the dragon of the Hesperides. On the other hand, an anonymous Ophitic Gnostic in Hippolytus had identified Engonasin with Adam: *Refut.* 4.47.5; 48.3 and 7 (pp. 132.25-28; 133.12 and 31 M.), with reference to Gen. 3:15 (αὐτοῦ σου τηρήσει κεφάλήν, καὶ σὺ τηρήσεις αὐτοῦ πτέρναν). Hippolytus is quite explicit: οἱ αἰρετικοί... τοῖν Ἕν γονᾶσι φασὶν εἰναι τοῖν Ἀδὰμ, κατὰ πρόσταγμα, φησί, τοῦ θεοῦ, καθὼς εἶπε Μωσῆς, φυλάσσοντα τὴν κεφάλην τοῦ Δράχοντος, καὶ τὸν Δράχοντα τὴν πτέρναν αὐτοῦ.

There can be little doubt that we are dealing here with an astral Heracles, fighting against the twelve zodiacal archons of Edem. This is confirmed by two bits of information. First, the shape of this twelve archons—lion, hydra, boar, etc. They correspond to the usual shapes of the Gnostic cosmic rulers (cf. The *Apocryphon of John*, NHC II.1, p. 11.26-34; Origen, *Contra Celsum* 6.30 and 6.33). Second, the evil influence (ἀπόρροια) of the twelve zodiacal angels upon the twelve climatic zones on earth (Theme 7, p. 100 ff. above) seems to be present here as well. Compare Justin’s explanation of the twelve labors of Heracles as the names of twelve peoples on earth (5.26.28): τὰ δώδεκα ἄθλον τοῦ Ἡρακλέους... Τῶν ἐθνῶν γὰρ εἶναι ταῦτα τὰ ὀνόματα φησὶν, ἃ μετωνόμασται ἀπὸ τῆς ἐνεργείας τῶν μητρικῶν ἄγγελων. That is to say, under the evil influence of the twelve zodiacal angels of Edem, the twelve peoples, or rather climatic zones, on earth have changed their original names to be called now, for example, the Lion of Nemea; the Hydra of Lerna; the Boar of Erymanthus, and so on. Compare 5.26.11: Οὕτωι (δὲ) ἐμπερίε (ῥ) χονται οἱ δώδεκα ἄγγελοι τὰ τέσσαρα μέρη... καὶ διέτουσι τὸν κόσμον, σατραπικὴν τινα ἔχοντες κατὰ τοῦ κόσμου παρὰ τῆς Ἐδέμ ἐξουσίαν.

No sooner had Heracles overpowered all twelve angels of Edem than he became victim of the charms of Omphale (προσπλέκται αὐτῷ ἡ Ὄμφαλη). For this queen of Lydia is no other but a manifestation of the conquered angel of Edem—Babel or Aphrodite (the planet Venus). Omphale succeeds in beguiling Heracles with her beauty (ὑποσύρε τὸν Ἡρακλέα), and in depriving him of his power. As the myth goes, Omphale exchanged clothing with Heracles: she put on his lion’s skin, he put on her female garb. But the point is that Heracles’ power resided in his “magic tunic.” Consequently, he is now powerless. Not satisfied with

the motif of the “magic tunic,” Justin interprets Heracles’ robe as *the commands of Elohim*. If so, then the best explanation seems to be that Heracles, under the spell of Omphale’s charms and being deprived of his tunic, had simply *forgotten* the orders of Elohim. By putting on the stole of Omphale, Heracles at once had become a victim of Edem, “the lower Dynamis” (ἡ Ἐδέμ, ἢ κάτω Δύναμις, p. 207.146 f. M.)—no longer pneumatic, but psychic alone. As a consequence, his mission and his deeds have been thwarted (και οὕτως ἀπελή γένετο (και) τοῦ Ἡρακλέους ἢ προφητεία και τά ἔργα αὐτοῦ).

The question, why did the Greek Omphale exchange clothing with Heracles (whether reflecting an old ritual of Heracles from the island of Cos, or following a more common marriage custom), is irrelevant for us here. The point is that, according to Justin, through this ritual *Kleider­tausch* Heracles loses his *power* (δύναμις). What is the source of Justin’s inspiration? R.M. Grant (p. 45 n. 15) wrote: “According to Diod. Sic. 4.31.8, this exchange meant that Omphale took the courage of Heracles.” But all Diodorus is saying there is that Omphale approved of, or was pleased with, the courage displayed by Heracles in Lydia (ἡ δ’ Ὅμφαλη ἀποδεχομένη τὴν ἀνδρείαν Ἡρακλέους...). A source closer to Justin’s interpretation, Heracles’ loss of his robe meant the loss of his power or faculty, may be seen in Ovid’s *Heroides* 9.103-106 (or in Ovid’s Greek source). There, the loss of Heracles’ *virtus bellica* is clearly implied:

Se quoque nympha tuis ornavit Iardanis armis
et tuit e capto nota tropaea viro.

105 I nunc, tolle animos et fortia gesta recense:
quod tu non esses, iure vir illa fuit.

Theme 12: Jesus proclaims the Gospel about the Good One, and delivers the spirit to Elohim (5.26.29-32; 10.15.6-7). Finally, “in the days of king Herod” (Matt. 2:1; Luke 1:5), Elohim sends Baruch to his fifth and last mission—to Nazareth. There he finds Jesus, son of Joseph and Mary, as a twelve-year old boy, tending sheep (cf. John 10:11).

The information that Jesus has fulfilled twelve years of age is important: he has reached the required religious maturity enabling him to serve, e.g., as a prophet. Justin is building on Luke 2:42 (Jesus arriving at the age of bar mitswāḥ), which agrees with the Jewish law: Samuel started prophesying at the age of twelve (Joseph *Ant. Iud.* 5.348), and Mani experienced his first revelation at the same age.\(^\text{17}\) In Valenti-

nianism, Jesus’ coming of age is a manifestation of the Dodecad of Aeons (Iren. 1.3.2 [Ptolemy]; 1.20.2 [Marcus]). According to Greek belief, a boy reaches the puberty with the age of fourteen; that is why the Naassene Jesus reveals himself in the fourteenth Aeon (Hippol. 5.7.20: “Ἐμὲ ὁ θεός εὐρήσει ἐν παιδίοις ἀπὸ ἑτῶν ἑπτά· ἔσεὶ γὰρ ἐν τῷ τεσσαράκοντα ἐτῶν ἀνακινήσω ἡμᾶς.” (Cf. supra, pp. 63-67: The Gospel of Thomas, Logion 4bis).

First, Baruch illuminates Jesus by revealing to him the Gnostic gospel about the Good One, Elohim and Edem, and about the creation (5.26.29: καὶ ἀναγέλλει αὐτῷ πάντα ὡς ἀπ’ ἀρχής ἐγένετο, τοιούτου ἀπὸ τῆς Ἑδήμ καὶ τοῦ Ἑλωείμ (καὶ τοῦ Ἀγαθοῦ, καὶ τὰ) μετὰ ταῦτα γενόμενα). Then he delivers the message of Elohim by telling Jesus: “All the prophets before you have been beguiled (cf. John 10:8; Hippol. 6.35.1). So you, Jesus, son of man, try not to be beguiled, but proclaim this message to men, and tell them the good news about the Father [Elohim], and about the Good One. And then ascend to the Good One, and sit there along with Elohim, the Father of us all’” (5.26.30). Jesus obeyed the Angel while replying, Κύριε, ποιήσω πάντα, and proclaimed the gospel of Baruch.

Jesus’ mission consists of two things: (1) To proclaim the gospel about the Good One to men, and (2), To ascend himself to the Good One. Ὁ Ἀγαθὸς is mentioned four times in this text dealing with the kerygmatic mission of Jesus (p. 207.154; 157; 163 and 166 M.). Obviously, the stress is on the supreme God.

One may ask now: What about the main goal of Elohim: the recovery of his soul? As we shall see (in 5.26.32), Jesus has accomplished this task, but not as his main duty. Apparently, proclaiming the new gospel of Baruch, and showing the way of salvation to the Gnostics, was the main concern of the Jesus of Justin.

Nahash wants to beguile Jesus as well, but is not able to. For Jesus remains faithful to Baruch. Enraged by his failure, Nahash makes Jesus crucified. Since the dynamis of Edem and her main angel Naas is matter and psyche, they have power only over Jesus’ flesh and soul, not over his spirit as well. That is why Jesus leaves his psychic and choic man by the cross, while addressing Edem-Earth: Γόνατι, ἀπέχεις σου τὸν υἱόν (cf. John 19:26), and He himself, now a pure pneumatic man, ascends to the Good One (5.26.31-32).

On His way to the highest heaven, Jesus delivers his spirit (belonging to Elohim) into the hands of the Father Elohim (cf. Luke 23:46). That means that, at the time of Jesus’ ascent, Elohim takes his usual position between the highest heaven of the Good One and the earth of Edem. Conceivably, what is left of Jesus’ essence is the pure pneumatic
substance, which is inexhaustible. Probably, Jesus is being seated at the right hand of the Good One.

Hippolytus’ excerpts from Justin’s Baruch are very fragmentary, but a bit of information witnesses to the role of Jesus as the ἀπαρχὴ of the salvation of all the Gnostics (cf. 1 Cor. 15:20-23). Hippol. 10.15.7 reads: (sc. τοῦ Ἡσυχοῦ) τὸ πνεῦμα ἀνελημφθεῖνα πρὸς τὸν Ἀγαθὸν λέγειν. Καὶ πάντων δὲ οὕτως τῶν τοῖς μωροῖς καὶ ἀφαρά σώμασις λόγοις ἀφοῦ [sc. Ἰουστῖνου] πειθόμενον (τὸ μὲν πνεῦμα τοῦ Ἐλωείμ) σωθήσεθαι, τὸ δὲ σώμα καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν τῆς Ἐδέμ καταλείψεθαι.

Justin’s Christology is beyond the scope of this lecture. It suffices to say that Jesus remains purely a man (son of Joseph and Mary), although a chosen man. Probably, Jesus was envisaged by Justin as a second Adam. The fact that there is no mention of the miracles, deeds and teachings of Jesus squares with the Gnostic treatment of Jesus. In Justin, the emphasis is on the kerygmatic mission and on the way of salvation displayed by this Gnostic Redeemer.

One final remark. R. Reitzenstein18 and H. Jonas (op. cit., p. 285 n 1) had called Baruch “the Third Messenger” (in Manichaean doctrines this is the Archanthropos first, “The Living Spirit,” next). E. Haencher (p. 137 n. 2) was right when pointing out that “angel” does not mean the same as “apostle or messenger.” One may add too that Nahash as well was “the third angel,” and that Baruch was the only messenger of Elohim, in all five missions. But one may perhaps ask: Could Jesus be called “The Third Redeemer,” i.e., after Baruch and Heracles? I don’t think so. As already stated, Baruch remains as the sole messenger of Elohim, and Heracles looks rather as an additional episode. Consequently, Justin’s Jesus may be perhaps counted as the third prospective Redeemer only if Moses and the prophets are considered as the previous two (compare, e.g., Ptolemy in Hippol. 6.35.1: Πάντες οὖν οἱ προφήται καὶ ὁ νόμος ἔλαλησαν ἀπὸ τοῦ Δημιουργοῦ, μωροῖ, λέγει, θεοῦ, μωροὶ οὐδὲν εἰδότες. Διὰ τοῦτο λέγει ὁ Σωτήρ: John 10:8). But I doubt that Justin was aware of this possibility.

Epilogue

Theme 13: The Good One as Priapus (5.26.32-33). We have seen earlier (Theme 1, pp. 93-95) that the alien, extra-cosmic supreme principle of the Good One remains uninvolved in the accident of the creation of the world, which is the work of Elohim, Edem, and the angels. Now,

however, as a total surprise, Justin tells us that the Good One, this pure pneumatic extra-cosmic supreme principle, may be identified with no other than Priapus, the popular Graeco-Roman ithyphallic fertility-god, father of every procreation. What a demeaning role for a manifestation of the Iranian Ahura Mazda!

Haenchen was shocked, and declared the passage in Hippolytus “a later addition, void of understanding.” He wrote (pp. 143-145 = 319-321 and n. 1):


Of course, Haenchen (p. 144 n. 1 = 320 n. 1) was aware of the fact that the supreme principle of the Naassenes too was called Ο Ἀγαθός (Hippol. 5.7.26 and 28); that he was considered to be the cause of the entire creation, although himself remaining uninvolved in the creation (5.7.25); and finally, that the ithyphallic herms are envisaged as his manifestation (5.7.27-29). Still, he felt that there is a difference of substance between the Naassenerpredigt and Justin’s book Baruch, between the Zeugungsmacht of the former, and the Weltfeindlichkeit of the latter. At best, Haenchen felt, the Naassene doctrine may have served as a source of inspiration for the interpolator to expand the book of Baruch with the Priapus simile:


Wir haben uns demnach das Verhältnis dieser Stelle der “Naassenerpredigt” zu dem Priaposabschnitt im Baruchbuch etwa derart zu deuten, dass die — in ganz anderem Sinn vollzogene — Identifikation des Guten mit der Zeugungsmacht dazu verführt hat, auch das weltfeindliche Baruchbuch mit dieser vermeintlichen Ergänzung zu vervollständigen.20

In my opinion, Haenchen’s categorical rejection of the Priapus-passage in the book of Baruch simply cannot stand criticism. Already Maurice Olender (in 1978) has extensively argued against Haenchen’s contention, by pointing out the role of Priapus in the late religious speculations, and by involving the Good One from the Naassene doctrine, and Eros from NHC II.5 (On the Origin of the World). While I agree with Olender’s defense of the authenticity of the passage on Priapus in Hippolytus, I find his arguments too complicated to convince. For one thing, the part played by Eros in NHC II.5 (p. 109.2; 10; 14; 16; 20; 25; p. 111.9 and 19) resembles more an Orphic cosmogony than the role of the Good One in Justin.

I think the authenticity of the equation, ὁ Ἁγαθός = Πρίαπος, in the book of Baruch, may be proven by the following three arguments. (1) Τὸ πριο-ποιεῖν τοῦ Πριάπου = ἡ πρόγνωσις τῶν ὄλων τοῦ Ἁγαθοῦ. (2) Πνεῦμα = Σπέρμα. (3) Ὁ Ἁγαθός (θεός) = Ὁ Ἁγαθός Δαίμων (Πρίαπος). But first let me quote the passage in question (5.26.32-33):

(1) The main reason for Justin to compare Priapus to the Good One seems to be the paretymology, Πρίαπος = ὁ πρῖν τι εἶναι ποιήσας. The verb πριο-ποιεῖν is a little convincing neologism of Justin’s. And it is repeated three times in the short passage, for the benefit of his readers (and of modern scholars as well). This function of the extra-cosmic Good One is to be detected in Theme 1 (5.26.1 and 10.15.1; supra, p. 93). While neither Elohim nor Edem possesses the foreknowledge (ἀπρόγνωστοι), the supreme principle, the Good One, does possess “the foreknowledge about the All” (προγνωστικός or προγνώστης τῶν ὄλων). And this πρόγνωσις τῶν ὄλων

20 Similarly in Die Gnosis, l.c.: “Aber bei der Identifizierung des Guten mit Priapos steht es eben doch anders: Der Gute befindet sich in seinem jenseitigen Lichtreich, und die Behauptung, dass sein Standbild mit dem Phallus vor jedem Tempel stehe, ist gerade von der gnostischen Grundanschauung aus eigentlich eine Blasphemie.”
is manifested in the fact that the Good One pre-creates this world before its creation by Elohim and Edem (= ὁ πρὸς τι εἶναι ποιήσας). He does so by pre-creating in his mind the noetic genera and species of the future real things and beings.

I think that Justin here may stand under the influence of Basilides. Compare, e.g., Hippolytus’ summary of the doctrine of Basilides (10.14.1): “Basilides too affirms that there is a non-existent God who had created a non-existent world from non-existent elements by casting down a non-existent seed” (Βασιλείδης δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς λέγει εἰναι θεὸν οὐκ ὄντα, πεποιηκότα κόσμον ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων οὐκ ὄντα, οὐκ ὃν καταβαλόμενόν τι σπέρμα). Basilides is here re-interpreting Aristotle’s Categories (compare Article 11), and “non-existent” means simply noetic. Possibly, Hippolytus was aware of the dependence of Justin upon Basilides, by placing Justin immediately after Basilides in his Epitome (10.14 and 10.15).

However, if Justin’s teaching about the pre-creation of this world in the mind of the extra-cosmic supreme Good One is likely to be dependent on the noetic pre-creation of this world in the mind of the non-existent supreme God, then Justin must be later than Basilides, contra the usual placement of Justin’s Baruch before Basilides (e.g., in Foerster’s Die Gnosis, I: IV. Kapitel: Das Buch Baruch. V. Kapitel: Basilides). This dependence, however, is not a sufficient reason to locate Justin in the Alexandria of Basilides (as R. van den Broek was willing to do).

(2) That the pure pneumatic supreme Good God may be theoretically involved in the spermatic creation of this world—and thus be envisaged by Justin as the ithyphallic god of procreation Priapus,—becomes clear from the well-known Stoic equation, σπέρμα = πνεῦμα. E.g., in Zeno (Galen Def. med. 94 = SVF, II, No. 742): σπέρμα = πνεῦμα ἐνθερμὸν ἐν ὑγρῷ; in Chrysippus (Diog. Laert. 7.158 = SVF, II, No. 741): ἀνθρώπου δὲ σπέρμα... εἰναι πνεῦμα κατὰ τὴν οὐσίαν. Cf. Galen, De usu part. IX.4 (II, p. 12.20 Helmreich).

The Gnostic evidence is unmistakable in this respect. Compare:

Gnosticus Anonymus ap. Hippol. 4.51.11-12

Ὁ γὰρ ἐγκέφαλος κύριον μέρος ὃν τοῦ παντὸς σώματος ἐπίκειται ἀτρεμίτης καὶ ἁχίνητος, ἐντός ἐστι τὸ ἐχθρὸν τὸ πνεῦμα... Ὁθὲν καὶ τὰ σπέρματα ἐπὶ ἐγκέφαλον διὰ τῆς ὁσφύος χωροῦντα ἐκχρίνεται. 21

The Naassenes ap. Hippol. 5.7.25-26

Λέγουσιν οὖν περὶ τῆς τοῦ πνεύματος οὐσίας, ἢτις ἐστὶ πάντων τῶν γινομένων αἰτία, ὅτι τούτων ἐστὶν οὐδέν, γεννᾶ δὲ καὶ ποιεῖ πάντα τὰ γινόμενα... Διὰ τούτῳ γῆν ἁχίνητον εἶναι τὸ πάντα χιοῦν· μένει γὰρ ὃ ἐστι,

21 Compare the Peratics ap. Hippol. 5.17.11-12 (and Article 11).
Both passages provide the link between πνευματικός and σπερματικός λόγος in the interpretatio Gnostica. In addition, Hermes has been interpreted as σπερματικός λόγος both by Porphyry (ap. Euseb. Praep. ev. 3.11.42) and by the Naassene author (Hippol. 5.7.29). As for Priapus, he has been equated with σπερματικός λόγος by Porphyry (ap. Euseb. 3.11.15).22 As for the Naassenerpredigt, one cannot be sure whether its author is talking about Osiris (cf. Plut. De Is. 371 F) or rather Priapus, as I am inclined to believe. Anyway, the similarity in imagery and diction between Justin’s Priapus as ὁ Ἀγαθός, and the Naassene Priapus/Osiris as τὸ Ἀγαθηφόρον, is striking:

Justin (5.26.33-34):

Ὁ δὲ Ἀγαθός ἔστιν, (φησι,) Πρίαπος... Διὰ τούτο, φησίν, εἰς πάντα τὰν ἵπταται καὶ ἐν ταῖς ὁδοῖς, ὑπὸ πᾶσης τῆς κτίσεως τιμώμενος, βαστάζον τὰς ὁπώρας ἐπάνω αὐτοῦ, τούτατα τοὺς καρποὺς τῆς κτίσεως, ἃν αίτιος ἔγενετο προσποίησαι τὴν κτίσιν πρὸ(τε)ρον οὐκ οὔσαν.

The Naassene (5.7.27-28):

Οὐδεὶς γάρ, φησίν, ἐστὶ ναὸς ἐν ᾧ πρὸ τῆς εἰσόδου οὐχ ἐστηκε γυμνὸν τὸ κεκρυμμένον, κάτωθεν ἀνὸς βλέπον καὶ πάντας τοὺς καρποὺς τῶν ἦξι κατώτατο γυμνομένου στεφανούμενον. Ἑστάναι δὲ... λέγουσι το τοιοῦτον... καὶ ἐν πάσαις ὁδοῖς καὶ πάσαις ἀγνιαίς καὶ παρ’ αὐταῖς ταῖς οἰκίαις, ᾧ ὄρον τινὰ καὶ τέρμα τῆς οἰκίας προτεταγμένον. Καὶ τούτῳ εἶναι τὸ Ἀγαθὸν ὑπὸ πάνων λεγόμενον. Ἀγαθηφόρον γὰρ αὐτὸ χαλοῦσιν.

In the Naassene report, both epithets—ὁρὸς τις καὶ τέρμα τῆς οἰκίας and τὸ Ἀγαθηφόρον (cf. P.G.M. 4.3165)—hint exactly at Priapus.23 Then the conclusion that Justin may have stood under the spell of the Naassenerpredigt I think becomes more likely than not. My point, however, is that Gnostic equation of the pneumatic ὁ Ἀγαθός with the spermatic Priapus is utterly credible.

(3) Finally, Justin’s equation of ὁ Ἀγαθός θεός with Priapus may have been encouraged by the identification of Priapus with the old fertility god Ἀγαθός Δαιμών (cf. Cornutus De nat. deor. 27, p. 50.15 Lang). Cornutus’

23 Cf. A.G. XVI.86; 236; 237; 243; 260; 261; Epigr. 782 Kaibel, and Herter, op. cit., 246.
reason for this equation was: ἡ πλεονάζουσα ἐν τῷ θεῷ σπερματικὴ δύναμις. Justin’s supreme principle, the Good One, who had pre-created this world in his mind, could only approve of the command given to Adam and Eve by Elohim and Edem (5.26.9): ‘Αὔξάνεσθε καὶ πληθύνεσθε καὶ καταχληρονομήσατε τὴν Γῆν’ (cf. Gen. 1:28).

In conclusion, far from being a later expansion, Justin’s equation of the Good One with Priapus: (1) squares with his own system; (2) finds its support in other Gnostic systems (Basilides; the Naassenes); (3) best illustrates the range of Justin’s syncretistic drive. For, if Elohim could have been equated with Zeus; Edem with Ge (Leda and Danae); Babel with Aphrodite (and Omphale); Adam with Ganymede (or catamite); and finally Heracles with the Gnostic Redeemer, then the Good One could have been envisaged as Priapus as well.

NEW GNOSTIC TEXTS

The main objective of Hippolytus, in his masterpiece *Refutatio Omnium Haeresium*, was to demonstrate his thesis that the Christian heretics in general and the Gnostics in particular are no more than mere plagiarists from Greek philosophy and religion. Hippolytus' neologism, χλεψίληγος and χλεψιλογεῖν, is repeated seven times throughout his book. In order to prove his thesis, the author felt it necessary to expand his *Elenchos* (Books V-IX) by including an extensive survey of Greek philosophy (Book I), Hellenistic mysteries (the lost Books II and III), astrology, astronomy and magic (Books IV), called *Philosophumena* (Books I-IV).

This survey is presented as the fruit of the author’s own research effort for the benefit of the reader. Now the reader is provided with a tool for a close comparison (ἡ ἐγγύων παράθεσις ὁμοῦ καὶ σύγχροις, 6.21.2) of a plagiarizing Gnostic (e.g., Valentinus) with his Greek source (e.g., Plato and Pythagoras). That is why the same passage from a Greek philosopher is repeated several times in the work.

Nobody will deny that the Gnostics were inspired by Platonism, Pythagoreanism and Graeco-Roman mysteries (and that is why we find a Coptic translation of Plato’s *Republic IX*, 588b-589b, in NHC VI.5 in the first place). But the point is that Hippolytus was not successful in pinpointing such an influence upon a concrete Gnostic treatise. The result is that the author’s entire enterprise with *Parathesis* proves to be a gross failure. For Valentinus did not copy from Plato’s Second Letter (contrary to *Ref.* 6.37); Marcion has nothing to do with Empedocles (contrary to Hippolytus’ own *Antiparathesis*, 7.30); and the pure Christian modalist Monarchianist Noetus probably had never heard of Heraclitus of Ephesus (contrary to *Ref.* 9.8-10).

Consequently, the real purpose of Hippolytus in producing his *Philosophumena* seems to have been to impress his audience. To present himself as a knowledgeable and learned author with an encyclopaedic erudition—in the eyes of his Roman congregation, of the empress Iulia Mammaea, of the matron Severina, and the posterity in general. To the extent that everybody could see the difference between the erudite self-proclaimed Pope Hippolytus, and the ἄγράμματος Pope Zephyrinus and the ex-slave Pope Callistus, Hippolytus’ archenemy.

---

1 Κλεψίληγος: Προειμ. 11 (p. 56.65 M.); 4.51.14 (p. 139.83); 7.29.3 (p. 304.10); 10.34.2 (p. 415.8). - Κλεψίλογεῖν: 5.4 (p. 140.10); 7.31.8 (p. 314.38); 9.31.1 (p. 378.4).
The most striking discovery, however, when dealing with the Quellenforschung of the Elenchos, is the fact that Hippolytus—in his zeal to offer a "proof" of the Gnostic plagiarizing from Greek philosophy—often finds this "proof" not very far: in the same Gnostic scriptures he had set out to refute.

Two remarks are in order here. First, Gnostic authors often quote texts from Greek poets and philosophers. They do so openly and deliberately, in order to produce their Exegesis or Interpretatio Gnostica. According to the Gnostics, Greek poets and philosophers were "spontaneous Gnostics," without being aware of that. Once "correctly interpreted" (i.e., Gnostically reinterpreted), they all serve as witnesses to the universal validity and primordial truth of the respective Gnostic doctrine. In other words, there is no difference between Gnostic treatment of OT and NT, and of Greek philosophers: Μαρτυρεῖν δὲ φασιν αὐτῶν τῷ λόγῳ οὐχ ἀπλῶς μόνην τὴν Ἡραῖ, ἄλλα γάρ, ὡς ἐπος εἰπεῖν, ὀλην τὴν κτίσιν (Ref. 5.7.16). And that is why, for example, the Naassenerpredigt quotes Odyssey 24.1-12, or Hymn to Attis, or else P.M.G., No. 985 (Ref. 5.7.30-37; 5.9.8-9; 5.7.3-6).

Second, Hippolytus, however, copies these passages dealing with Greek philosophers from the respective Gnostic Exegesis, and presents them as his own discovery and "proof" of the Gnostics plagiarizing Greek philosophers. In brief, a plagiarist accuses a quoting author of plagiarizing. Now, that Hippolytus was able of doing just that is supported by the fact that he has been long recognized as a reckless plagiarist, verbatim copying entire pages from Irenaeus, Sextus Empiricus, Flavius Josephus and others without stating his source.

The fact that Hippolytus copies passages from Greek poets and philosophers from Gnostic Exegeses is of significance for us, because we are now in a position to include those passages into the respective Gnostic treatise and thus to increase the extant Gnostic material. I shall now substantiate my discovery on a few clear examples.

(1) *Aratus* (4.47-49) is copied from an Ophitic Exegesis²

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aratus</th>
<th>The Naassenes</th>
<th>The Peratae</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.47.1-2: Εἴλεισθαί δὲ</td>
<td>5.8.34: Τὸν αὐτὸν δὲ</td>
<td>5.16.15: Ἐπὶ τοῦτου, κατὰ τὰς ἄρκτους αὐτὰς τοῦτον, φησίν, οἱ Φόρυγες φησίν, ἔστι τὸ 'μέγα</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

² The term Ophitic is employed in this paper in a very loose sense—to designate any significant role of the Serpent (Dragon), not necessarily its role as a Gnostic Redeemer. In this anonymous Gnostic doctrine, the Serpent plays a negative role (cf. p. 123), just as it does in the system of Justin’s *Baruch* (Nahash), or in the doctrine of the Ophites ap. Irenaeus, *Adv. haer*. 1.30.7-8 and 15.—Greek text is quoted from my edition of Hippolytus’ *Refutatio*, PTS, Vol. 25, Berlin, 1986.
Hyū, ot6v 'tt O'tatµoG pEGµat, '' µ€ya 0atGµat "xp&xoV'tO 7tEAwpou" (Aratus 45 f.; 57). Kat 'tOG't' dvcx(cp1jcrtV o ev 't4'> 'Iw� 1tpo� 'tOV (0u'iv o) Ol(X�OAO [cprr "eµ1tEpt- 7tCX't�(j(X� 't�V U1t' OUpCXVOV xct 7tEptEA0wv" (lob 1: 7), 'tOU'tEcr'tt m.ptcr'tpati:pd� xcxt 1tEptcrX07t�crat� 't(X ytv6µEvcx. TE't&x0cxt y2£p voµ((oucrt XCX'tet 'tOV &px'ttxov 1t6Aov 'tOV �p&xov'tcx, 'tOV o cp tv, <X7t0 'tOG u�riAo't&'tou 1t6Aou 7t(XV't(X em�AE7tOV'tCX xcxt 7t(XV'tCX E (j) OpWV'tCX, lVCX µriolv 'tWV 7tpCX't'tOµ€vwv CXU'tOV A&0tJ. (Arat. 61 f. = Ref. 4.47.3). Toùt' Ėstti, (φησι,;) peri o0 eìtev ἡ ἀγνωσία· ἐν ὀὐρανῷ 'εἰλεῖται μέγα θαύμα Δράκον<τος'>, 'δεινοῖο πελώρου' (Arat. 46).

Hippolytus’ account of Aratus is in Book IV (Philosophumena), i.e., in the part of the work dealing with the pagan Greek, non-Gnostic, sources. And it is introduced by these words (4.46.1-2): ... ὅπως ὁ τετάγμεθα περὶ τῶν αἰρέσεων ἐπιδείκζοντος, ἐκάστοις τα τὰ ἱδια ἀποδοὺν ἀναγκάζοντες γνω- νοῦ τοὺς αἱρεσιάρχας φανερώσωμεν... "Ἰνα δὲ συνεπετρα τοῖς ἐντυγχάνουσι τὰ ῥηθησόμενα φανῆ, δοξεί καὶ (τὰ) τῷ Ἀράτῳ περιστραφέντα καὶ τῆς αὐτᾶ τοῦ ὀὐρανοῦ ἀστέρων διαθέτος ἐξειπεῖν... However, that Hippolytus is copying from a Gnostic Exegesis on Aratus, becomes clear both from his following introductory words, ὡς τινες εἰς τὰ ὑπὸ τῶν γραφῶν εἰρημένα ἀπεικονιζόντες αὐτὰ [sc. τὰ τῷ 'Αράτῳ περιστραφέντα] ἀλληγοροῦσι, and from the quotation Job 1:7, in 4.47.2.

The constellation of Dragon, situated in the region of North Pole, never sets below the horizon but is always visible. As such the Dragon could become an ideal Gnostic Overseer (ἐπιστάτης): Πάντων γὰρ δυνώντων τῶν πατά τοῦ ὀὐρανοῦ ἀστέρων μόνος οὕτως ὁ πόλος οὐδέποτε σώνει, ἀλλ’ ἄνω ὑπὲρ τὸν ὀρίζοντα ἐρχόμενον πάντα περισκοπεῖ καὶ ἐπιβλέπει, καὶ λαθεῖν αὐτὸν τῶν πραττομένων, φησί, δύναται οὕδεν (4.47.3). This is confirmed both by the Naassene aeιπόλος and by the Peratic passage.

The only difference of significance is that with the Naassenes and the Peratics the Dragon is a positive principle (cf. 5.16.16: ὁ τέλειος "Οφῖς", while in the anonymous Gnostic Exegesis on Aratus he is a negative principle—Satan or Demiurge of this world, keeping under his watch the entire creation (περιστραφεῖ καὶ περισκοπῆς τὰ γνώμενα). This is confirmed by Job 1:7 (‘‘And the Lord said to Satan: ‘Whence do you come?’ Then
Satan answered the Lord and said: ‘From roaming the Earth and patrolling it.’), and also by the fact that at 4.47.5, the Dragon is identified as the Serpent from Genesis 3:15.

Now, a systematic analysis and assessment of this anonymous Gnostic system (4.47.4—4.49.4) is beyond the scope of this paper. My only purpose here is to demonstrate that Hippolytus is copying from a Gnostic Exegesis on Aratus. Therefore, it will suffice to add these two points. (1) In this Gnostic system, the constellation of the Kneeler (Engonasin) is explicitly interpreted as Adam (4.47.5; 4.48.3 and 7). The first instance reads: οἱ δὲ αἱρετικοὶ... τὸν Ἑν γόνασι φασιν εἶναι τὸν Ἀδάμ, κατὰ πρόσταγμα, φησὶ, τοῦ θεοῦ, καθὼς εἴπε Μωσῆς, φυλάσσοντα τὴν κεφαλὴν τοῦ Δράκοντος, καὶ τὸν Δράκοντα τὴν πτέρναν αὐτοῦ (Gen. 3:15).

(2) The similarity between our Anonymus Gnosticus and a Peratic passage—as for the role of the constellations of the Kneeler (Engonasin, Adam), the Dragon (Satan), Crown, Lyre, Serpent ("Ὀφις"), and the Snakeholder (Ophiuchus)—is striking. Compare:

### Anonymus Gnosticus (4.48.4-6)

"Εσοχὲ δὲ ὁ Ἑν γόνασιν ἐκατέρωθεν ἐπιβάλλων τὰς χειράς καὶ τοῦτο μὲν τῆς Λύρας, τοῦτο δὲ τοῦ Στεφάνου ἐφάπαξθαί... Ἐπιστολεύεται δὲ ὅμως καὶ ἀποστάται ὁ Στεφάνος αὐτοῦ ὑπ’ ἄλλου θηρίου, τοῦ μικροτέρου Δράκοντος, ὁ ἐστὶ γέννημα τοῦ φυλασσομένου ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἑν γόνασι τῷ ποδὶ. ὁ Ἀνθρώπος δὲ ἐστηκεν, ἐκατέρας ταῖς χερσὶν κατασφιγγών καὶ εἰς τὰ ὅπως ἑλκὼν ἀπὸ τοῦ Στεφάνου τὸν Ὅφιν καὶ σύχ ἐστὶν ἐφάπαξθαι βιαζόμενον τοῦ Στεφάνου τῷ θηρίῳ. Ὅφιοῦχεν δὲ αὐτῷ ὁ Ἄρατος καλεῖ, ὅτι κατέχει τὴν ὁμήν τοῦ Ὅφεως, ἐπὶ τὸν Στεφάνον ἐλθεῖν πειρωμένου. Λόγος δὲ, φησίν, ἐστὶν ὁ Ὅφις, ἀμφιτέραις ταῖς χερσὶν κατασφιγγών ὑπὸ τοῦ Ὅφιοῦχεν καὶ καλυμμένος ἐφάπαξθαι τοῦ Στεφάνου, παρακειμένου τῷ τελείῳ Ὅφει [i.e., τῷ Δράκοντι].

### The Peratae (5.16.16)

'Εκατέρωθεν δὲ αὐτοῦ [sc. τοῦ Δράκοντος] παρατέτακται Στέφανος καὶ Λύρα, καὶ ἄτην ἀνωθεν τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀκραν ἔλεεν ἄνθρωπος, ὁ Ἑν Γόνασι (καλούμενος), ἐστίν ὁ Ὅφις, τὸ ἰντερποὺ ποὺ ἔχουν σκολιότο Δράκοντος’ (Arat. 70 = Ref. 4.47.5). Κατὰ δὲ τὸν νότον τοῦ Ἑν γόνασι ἐστὶν ὁ ἄτηλ Ὅφεις, ἀμφιτέραις ταῖς χερσὶν κατασφιγγών ὑπὸ τοῦ Ὅφιοῦχεν καὶ καλυμμένος ἐφάπαξθαι τοῦ Στεφάνου, παρακειμένου τῷ τελείῳ Ὅφει [i.e., τῷ Δράκοντι].

In both Gnostic systems Ophiuchus plays the role of a Gnostic Redeemer (Logos, Anthropos), but while in the Anonymus the Crown is being reserved for Adam (Engonasin: 4.48.3: ὁ Ἀδάμ... παρακειμένον
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αὐτῶ τὸν Στέφανον λήψεται), in the Peratic exegesis it is being saved for the Dragon, as ὁ τέλειος ὁ Ὄφις. But the point is that both Exegeses of Aratus are Gnostic.

(2) A pneumatic medical treatise (4.51.10-13) is copied from another Ophitic Exegesis

Medical Treatise

4.51.11: Ο γὰρ ἐγκέφαλος κύριον μέρος ὧν τοῦ παντὸς σώματος ἔπίκειται άτρεμής καὶ ἀκίνητος, ἑντὸς ἐστι τοῦ πνεῦμα... Ο μὲν γὰρ ἐγκέφαλος ἀνατημθεὶς ἔνδον ἔχει τὸ καλοῦμενον καμάριον, οὗ ἐκατέρωθεν ὑμένες εἰσὶ λεπτοὶ, οὓς πτερύγια προσαγορεύουσιν, ἱρέμα ὑπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος κινοῦμενα καὶ πάλιν ἀπελάυνοντα τὸ πνεῦμα ἐπὶ τὴν παρεγκέφαλίδα. (12) "Ο διατρέχον διὰ τινὸς ἁγγείου καλάμῳ ἐοικότος ἐπὶ τὸ κωνάριον χωρεῖ, ές πρόσκειται τὸ στόμιον τῆς παρεγκέφαλίδος, ἔκδοχόμενον τὸ διατρέχον πνεῦμα καὶ ἀνακύδον ἐπὶ τῶν οὐριαίων λεγόμενον μελέλων, θεῖον πάν τὸ σῶμα μεταλαμβάνει τὸ πνευματικόν, πασῶν τῶν ἁρτηρίων δίκην κλάδου ἐκ τούτου τοῦ ἁγγείου ἤρτημένων. Οὐ τὸ πέρας επὶ τὰ γεννητικὰ ἁγγεία τερματίζεται; ἰθὲν καὶ τὰ σπέρματα ἐξ ἐγκέφαλου διὰ τῆς ὀσφοῦς χωροῦντα ἐκχρίνεται. (13) "Εστι δὲ τὸ σχῆμα τῆς παρεγκέφαλίδος ἑοικός κεφαλῆς ηδάνοντος...

The Peratae

5.17.11: Πρὸς τούτων τὴν ἀπὸδειξιν φέρουσι τὴν τοῦ ἐγκέφαλου ἀνατομήν, αὐτὸν μὲν τὸν ἐγκέφαλον ἀπεικονιζόντες τῷ Πατρὶ διὰ τὸ ἀκίνητον (εῖναι), τὴν δὲ παρεγκεφαλίδα τῷ Υἱῷ διὰ τὸ κυνησθαι καὶ δρακοντοειδὴ ύπάρχειν. (12) "Ἡ ἀρρήτως καὶ ἀσημάντως ἐπισπάσθαι διὰ τοῦ κωνάριου φάσχουσι τὴν ἐκ τοῦ καμάριου ἀπορρέουσαν πνευματικὴν καὶ ζωγρόνον οὐσίαν: ἦν υποδεξαμένη ἢ παρεγκεφαλίς, ὡσπερ ὁ Υἱὸς, ἀλάλως μεταδίδωσι τῇ ὑλῇ τὰς ἰδέας (τουτέστων ἐπὶ τὸν νοτιαῖον μυελόν διαρρέει τὰ σπέρματα καὶ τὰ γένη τῶν γενομένων κατὰ σάρκα)

As the case (1), our pneumatic medical treatise is presented as part of Hippolytus’ own research on Greek pagan sources of Gnostic plagiarism: that is why it has been placed in Book IV (Philosophumena). However, that Hippolytus had copied it from a Gnostic source is proven beyond doubt by the following three facts. (1) Both in the medical treatise and in the Peratic doctrine the brain plays the part of the Father. That is why we read in the former: ο γὰρ ἐγκέφαλος κύριον μέρος ὧν τοῦ παντὸς σώματος (4.51.11) and: λέγοντες τὴν τοῦ παντὸς οὐσίαν καὶ δύναμιν καὶ πατρικὴν θειότητα ἀπὸ τῆς τοῦ ἐγκέφαλου διαθέσεως διδάσκαλοι (4.51.10). Both the brain and the Father are immobile (ἀκίνητος), while the pneuma flows down from the brain to the organs of generation. The source of the
pneuma is immobile also in the Naassene doctrine (5.7.25, quoted supra, p. 117 f.).

(2) Equally important is the fact that the cerebellum has the shape of a serpent: ἐστὶ δὲ τὸ σχῆμα τῆς παρεγκεφαλίδος ἑοικὸς κεφαλῆ δράχοντος (4.51.13). That is why it has been equated with the Son by the Peratics: it is an ideal μεσίτης between the Father and the material world: (5.17.11) ἀπεικονίζοντες... τὴν δὲ παρεγκεφαλίδα τῷ Υἱῷ διὰ τὸ κινεῖσθαι καὶ δραχυν-τειθῇ υπάρχειν. This Ophitic element is surely Gnostic. Compare another Ophitic simile in the doctrine of the Ophites (ap. Iren. 1.30.15): Quidam enim ipsam Sophiam Serpentem factam dicitur: quapropter et contrariam estitissæ Factori Adae, et aegniionem hominis immisisse, et propiter hoc dictum Serpentem omnium sapientiorum (Gen. 3:1). Sed et {propiter delevi} positionem intestinorum nostrorum, per quae esca infertur, eo quod talern figuram habeant, ostendentem absconsam generatricem Serpentis figurae substantiam in nobis. (Compare Theodoretus, Haer. fab. comp. 1.14.)

(3) The equation, τὰ σπέρματα = ἡ πνευματικὴ οὐσία, is well documented in Gnosticism (cf. p. 117), and is confirmed by the Peratic passage (the fact that the pneumatic substance is explained here as the forms or the genera for the shapeless matter does not contradict this).

(3) Hippolytus’ report on the Mysteries of the Great Goddess at Phlya (5.20.6-8) is copied from a Sethian Exegesis.

The text has been discussed supra, pp. 89-92. The report is clearly introduced as Hippolytus’ own discovery (5.20.4-5). However, that it was copied from a Sethian source, is proven (1) by the telltaling words (5.20.7), κατὰ τὸν Ἱ<>6:oπα Ἰ<>6:oπα Ἰ<>6:oπα Ἐπαθανόν ὄνομαν καὶ ὡς λέγουσιν; (2) by the clear Sethian interpretation of the Orphic divinities: Φάος ὑμέτερος = τὸ φῶς; Φιχόλα = τὸ σκοτεινὸν ὕδωρ; τὸ ἐν μέσῳ τούτων διάστημα = ἀρμονία πνεύματος. Notice the contrast:

5.20.4-6:

"Εστὶ δὲ αὐτοῖς [sc. τοῖς Σηθαναίοις] ἡ πάσα διδασκαλία τοῦ λόγου ἀπὸ τῶν πάλαιων θεολόγων, Μουσαίου καὶ Λίνου καὶ τοῦ τάς τελετάς καὶ τά μυστήρια μάλιστα καταδειξάντως Ὄρφεώς... Τετέλεσται δὲ ταῦτα [sc. τὰ]

5.20.7-8:

"Εσιχε δὲ εἰσὶ κατὰ τὸν <τῶν> Σηθαναίων λόγον ὃ Φάος ὑμέτερος τὸ φῶς, τὸ δὲ σκοτεινὸν ὕδωρ ἢ Φιχόλα, τὸ δὲ ἐν μέσῳ τούτων διάστημα ἀρμονία Πνεύματος <τοῦ> μεταξὺ τεταγμένου. Τὸ δὲ ὅνομα τοῦ Φάο<υ>ς ὑμέτερον τὴν

3 The comparison of Edem with brain in the Naassene doctrine (5.9.15) is different in kind: Ἔδεμ δὲ εἰσὶ λέγουσιν τὸν ἐγκέφαλον, οἰονεῖ δεδεμένον καὶ κατασφεγμένον ἐν τοῖς περιχειμένοις χύτωσιν ὀστεροπ οὐρανοῖς. In addition to the obvious etymology ("Εδέμ = τὸ δεδεμένον), the Naassene author may have been influenced by an idea similar to that in Philo, Leg. alleg. 1.64: τῆς Ἐδέμ, τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ σοφίας.
Since Phicola is probably a Semitic name (cf. p. 91 f.), it is highly unlikely that her name was ever inscribed in the colonnade of the temple of the Great Goddess at Phlya, but comes from a Semitic Orphic cosmogony. Hippolytus is clearly copying from a Sethian source. Even his claim that the mysteries of the Great Goddess are older than the Eleusinian mysteries (5.20.5) may derive from the same Sethian source, where it may have been intended to prove the *primordiality* of the Sethian faith—of their three principles Φως, Σκότος, Πνεύμα, interpreted by them in Orphic terms as Φάνης, Φικόλα, διάστημα.

(4) *The “Pythagorean”* (6.24-25) and *“Marcionite”* doctrine (7.29) is copied from a Gnostic Commentary on Empedocles.

Hippolytus ascribes both to Pythagoras and Marcion a *Neoplatonic* interpretation of Empedocles’ Φιλία and Νείκος. According to this interpretation, Philia stands for the extra-cosmic intelligible world of unity, while Neikos represents the plurality of this sensible cosmos of ours (6.24.1 and 3; 7.29.17; 7.31.3). Recently, the Neoplatonic origin of this interpretation has been convincingly pointed out by Walter Burkert. My only disagreement with Burkert is in my belief that the direct source of Hippolytus here is a *Gnostic* one. This may be proven by the following three main facts.

(1) The presence of the quotation from 1 Cor. 2:9 at 6.24.4—a beloved Gnostic text (cf. Hippol. 5.24.1; 26.16; 27.2; *Ev. Thomae*, Logion 17; Clem. *Exc. ex Theod.* 10.5; Manichaean Turfan Fr. M 789). (2) The role of Neikos as the Gnostic “evil Demiurge of this world” (ὁ δημιουργός τοῦ κόσμου, ὁ πονηρός, 7.29.15; 7.31.3), and of Philia as the Redeemer both of the elements and the souls. (3) The presence of the Christian and Gnostic term, ἡ κτίσις, “this creation of ours,” at 7.29.9 and 24. This cannot be a “Zusatz des Hippolytus” (*contra* Burkert, p.

---

“Pythagoras”

If...}
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“Marcion”
“Pythagoras”

ξοικε, κατὰ Πυθαγόραν ἡ τοῦ χόσμου διαμονή.

“Marcion”

καὶ προσοικείοι τῷ παντὶ, ἵνα μένῃ τὸ πᾶν ἐν, ὑπὸ τῆς φιλίας ἀεὶ διαχοσμούμενον μονοτρόπως καὶ μονοειδῶς. (12) “Ὅταν δὲ ἡ φιλία ἐκ πολλῶν ποιήσῃ τὸ ἐν καὶ τὰ διεπαρμένα προσοικοδομήσῃ τῷ ἐνι, πάλιν τὸ νεῖκος ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐνός ἀποστᾶ καὶ ποιεῖ πολλά, τουτέστιν πῦρ, ὕδωρ, γῆν, ἀέρα, τὰ (τ') ἐκ τούτων γεννώμενα ζῶα καὶ φυτὰ καὶ ὅσα μέρη τοῦ χόσμου κατανοοῦμεν.

7.29.15: ...“νεῖκος” μοινόμενον’
(Empeodc. B 115.14) καὶ τέταρτον οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ δημιουργοῦ τοῦ δεικνύοντος τοῦ κόσμου ὁ ἕμπεδοκλῆς ἀποκαλών.

7.29.20 Αὕτη (δή) ἐστιν ἡ κολασίας ἡ κολάζει (τὰς ψυχὰς) ὁ δημιουργός...
(21) Μισομένας οὖν τὰς ψυχὰς καὶ βασανιζομένας καὶ κολαζομένας ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ κατὰ τὸν ἕμπεδοκλέα συνάγει ἡ φιλία, ἀγαθὴ τὰς ὤσις καὶ κατοικτεῖρουσα τῶν στεναγμῶν αὐτῶν καὶ την ἀτακτόν καὶ πονηρὰν ‘τοῦ νείκου τοῦ μοινόμενου’ κατασχεσθήν, καὶ ἐξάγειν (αὐτὰς) κατ’ ὀλίγον ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου καὶ προσοικείοις τῷ ἐνι σπεύδουσα...

In conclusion, the entire imagery, language and atmosphere in this interpretation of Empedocles’ Neikos as the evil Demiurge of this world, and of Philia as its good Savior are Gnostic. However, as a surprise, Hippolytus tells us that, in addition to Philia and Neikos, there is a third principle both in Empedocles and in Marcion. This third Dynamis or divinity takes the middle position between the principle of Good (Philia) and the principle of Evil (Neikos, the Demiurge). His name is Logos. As Philia, he too is noetic (intelligible), and he serves as the right hand of Philia in her activity as a Savior (7.31.5: ὁ Λόγος, ὁ τῇ φιλίᾳ συναγωνιζόμενος, τουτέστι τῷ Ἀγαθῷ). It was not difficult for Hippolytus to equate Empedocles’ Philia with Marcion’s Good God; Neikos with the Demiurge, and this third, middle, principle, called Logos—with Jesus in his role of ὁ μεσίτης (cf. Gal. 3:20; Clem. Exc. ex Theod. 53.2, and Cyrilus of Alexandria, De trinitate dial. 1 [V.1, p. 410 D Aubert]: τὸν ἀμφοῦν
Two questions now arise. (1) Hippolytus derives the existence of such a third principle in Empedocles from his B 110 and B 131. Why? And (2) Is Hippolytus here copying the same Gnostic Commentary on Empedocles, or rather another, non-Gnostic, source? But first the evidence.

7.29.25-26:

Toisúthē (dē) tis {η} kata tòn 'Empedokleía hèin hè tòu kósmou génesis kai ftheta kai sústasis, ëx ãgathò kai xakhoi sunestóstasa, filosófetai. Einai ði fhsi kai nosthèn trîthn tìna Δýnamin, hèn kàn ëx toutwn (tòw pollòn) épinoeûntai dúnavathai, légon òdè pòw· (Empedocl. B 110.1-10) ... "pánta gàr ìsthi fhrónhn eìchon kai nóymatoç (α)îsan."
My only disagreement with Bignone and Guthrie is in this. In his source, a late interpretation of Empedocles, Hippolytus had found probably the Stoic term, ὁ ὀρθὸς λόγος, understood as “the right reason, expressible by men.” It is he who had changed ὀρθὸς into δίκαιος, in order to meet the third principle of Prepon (7.31.2): Τρίτην <τινά οὖν> φάσχων δίκαιον εἶναι ἄρχην, καὶ μέσην ἁγαθοῦ καὶ κακοῦ τεταγμένην, οὐδ’ οὔτως δὴ ὁ Πρέπων τὴν Ἐμπεδοκλέος διαφυγεῖν ἠσχυνε δόξαν.

Back to 7.29.25-26. I think it is not difficult to see the same Stoic “reason, spread throughout the cosmos,” in “the third, intelligible, Dynamis, which can be perceived in the manifold particular things around us.” According to this Stoic interpreter, this universal reason may be detected in Empedocles’ famous thesis (B 110.10): πάντα γὰρ ἔσθι φρόνησιν ἔχειν καὶ νόμωσιν αἴσαν. While the words φρόνησις and νόμα were interpreted as the Stoic λόγος, the word πάντα stands for “all manifold particular things of this cosmos.” That is why my supplement was necessary at 7.29.25, ἐν καὶ ἐκ τούτων <τῶν πολλῶν> ἐπινοεῖσθαι δύνασθαι. Here the expression, ταῦτα τὰ πολλά, means, “this sensible world of plurality,” and is confirmed both by B 110.10 πάντα and by Hippol. 7.29.14 (p. 307.67 M.), γενέσθαι ἐν τοῖς πολλοῖς τούτοις, “to be born in this world of plurality.”

And what about Empedocles’ B 131? Why is the Muse there identified with Logos? The answer is not easy. My guess is that a late interpreter of Empedocles understood the Muse, the source of wisdom and truth, as ὁ θεῖος λόγος or ὁ ἀληθὴς λόγος, on which Empedocles’ own ἀγαθὸς λόγος (B 131.4) depends. The Muse-Logos is an assistant to Philia as the principle of Good (ὁ Λόγος ὁ τῇ φιλίᾳ συναγωνιζόμενος, τούτῳ τῷ Ἀγαθῷ, 7.31.5). As a mediator between the goddess of Good (Philia) and man (here, the poet), the Muse-Logos becomes an ideal assistant to man as well (τούτων δὲ τὸν δίκαιον Λόγον, τὸν τῇ φιλίᾳ συναγωνιζόμενον, Μοῦσαν ὁ Ἐμπεδοκλῆς προσαγορεύει καὶ αὐτὸν αὐτῷ συναγωνίζεσθαι παρακάλει, 7.31.4). The interpretation of the Muse as Logos seems to find its support in Sextus Empir. 7.124, as Guthrie had pointed out (II, p. 261 n. 1). There, the Muse, who σοφίς ἐπ’ ἄκρους θεάζει (Empedocles B 3.8), seems to have been interpreted as Logos: Ὁ Ἐμπεδοκλῆς... παρίστησιν ὅτι τὸ δὲ ἐκάστης αἰσθήσεως λαμβανόμενον πιστῶν ἐστὶ τοῦ λόγου τούτων ἐπιστατοῦντος (follows B 3.1-13).

(2) It is more likely than not that Hippolytus here continues copying
the same Gnostic source. For the idea expressed by Empedocles B 110.10, and interpreted by Sextus (8.286) as: 'Εμπεδοκλῆς ἔτι παραδοξότερον πάντα ἥξιον λογικά τυγχάνειν (καὶ οὐ ζώα μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ φυτά), is a beloved Gnostic theme. And the line B 110.10 itself has been quoted by the Simonians (Hippol. 6.12.1; 10.12.2).

(5) Aristotle (7.15-19) is copied from a treatise of Basilides.

It is Basilides, not Hippolytus, who quotes Aristotle here, in order to substantiate his own basic doctrine: “In the beginning, a non-existent (i.e., pure noetic) God had pre-created a non-existent (noetic) world out of non-existent (noetic) elements, by throwing a non-existent (noetic) seed, comprising the entire diversity and multiplicity of the future real world.” Aristotle’s genus serves as a proof of Basilides’ non-existent (intelligible) seed of all particular things, while Aristotle’s definition of God as νοησις νοησεως (Metaph. Α 9, 1074 b 34) is quoted to prove Basilides’ “non-existent,” pure noetic God.

Aristotle’s γένος as σωρός τῆς πανσεπτερμίας

Aristotle

7.15.1-2: Ἀριστοτέλης μὲν οὖν τὴν οὐσίαν διαιρεὶ τριχώς: ἔστι γὰρ αὐτῆς τὸ μὲν τί γένος, τὸ δὲ τὶ εἰδὸς, τὸ δὲ τὶ ἀτόμον... Τὸ δὲ γένος ἐστὶν οἰονεί σωρός τις, ἐκ πολλῶν καὶ διαφόρους καταμετριμένους σπερμάτων, ἀφ’ οὗ γένος ὀιονεὶ τινος σωροῦ πάντα τὰ τῶν γενοντῶν εἰδὴ διαικεῖ χρήσεται. Καὶ ἐστὶ τὸ γένος ἐν ὑπὸ πᾶσι τοῖς γεγενημένοις ἀρχοῦν.

Basilides

7.22.16: Ἡ δὲ τρίτη υἱότης, φησίν, ἡ ἀποκαθάρασεσ, δεομένη, μεμενύκτη δὲ τὸ μεγάλῳ τῆς πανσεπτερμίας σωρῷ. 7.23.3: ... διεσφυζέναι καὶ ἔγεν(ν)ἡθη ἀπὸ τοῦ κοσμίκου σπέρματος καὶ τῆς πανσεπτερμίας τοῦ σωροῦ ὁ μέγας ἀρχῶν...

7.24.5: Τὰ δ’ ἐν τῷ διαστήματι τούτῳ ὁ σωρὸς αὐτὸς ἔστι, φησί, καὶ ἡ πανσεπτερμία.

7.25.6: ... οὖτω κάτωθιν, ἀπὸ τῆς ἀμορφίας τοῦ σωροῦ, διήκουσιν, φησίν, οἱ δύναμεις ἄνω μέχρι τῆς υἱότητος.

6 The terms employed by Basilides for this purely noetic pre-creation of the world by the “non-existent” God are: προβουλεύεσθαι 7.22.1; 22.6; 23.6; 10.14.2. προλογίζεσθαι 7.27.5. προλογισμὸς 10.14.9: Ταῦτα δὲ πάντα κατὰ προλογισμὸν εἶναι ἐκείνου τοῦ οὐκ ὄντος (θεοῦ) λέγονται.

7 Πανσεπτερμία as a philosophical term is linked both with Anaxagoras (cf. Β 1: Ὁμοο πάντα χρήματα ἐν) and with Democritus’ ἀθροισμὸς τῶν ἄτομων. Compare Aristotle’s expression, πανσεπτερμία πάντων τῶν στοιχείων, at Phys. Γ 4, 203 a 21 ( = 59 A 45 DK); De caelo Γ 4, 303 a 16 ( = 67 A 15 DK); De anima A 2, 404 a 4 ( = 67 A 28 DK), and Walter Spoerri, Spätellenistische Berichte über Welt, Kultur und Götter (Schweizerische Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft, 9), Basel, 1959, pp. 14 ff.
Aristotle’s γένος as τὸ μὴ ὁν

Aristotle

7.16.1-2: Λέγομεν εἶναι ζῷον ἀτλῆς, οὕτω τι ζῴουν. ἓστι δὲ τούτο τὸ ζῷον οὐ βούς, οὐχ ἕπος, οὐχ ἀνθρώπος, {οὐ θεός,} οὐκ ἀλλο τι τῶν ὁτιδήποτε ἐστὶν δηλοῦν, ἀλλὰ ἀτλῆς ζῷον. Ἀπὸ τούτου ἐκ τοῦ ζῶου αἱ πάντων τῶν κατὰ μέρος ζῴων ἴδειν τὴν ὑπόστασιν ἐξουσία, καὶ ἐστὶν πάσα τοῖς ζῴοις τοῖς γεγενημένοις ἐν (<e>ίδει τούτο τὸ ανθρώπος ζῷον ἄρχης), καὶ τῶν γεγενημένων οὐδὲ ἐν (<έστιν). 7.17.1: Ἐλ δὲ οὐχ ἐστιν τούτων οὐδὲ ἐν έκείνῳ τὸ ζῷον, εξ οὗ ὄντων τῶν γέγονεν κατ᾿ Ἁριστοτέλην ἡ τῶν γεγενημένων ὑπόστασις. (<’Εκείνῳ> γάρ τὸ ζῷον, θὰν ταύτα τὰ τῶν ἐλήφθη κατὰ μέρος, ἐστὶν οὖν ἐν οὐδὲ ἐν δὲ οὖν, γέγονεν τῶν ὄντων μία τις ἄρχης. 7.19.7: Ὅ γὰρ ὁρὸς, ὁν Ἁριστοτέλης ἀποδίδοσι περὶ τοῦ θεοῦ, χαλεπὸς μὲν οὖν ἐστὶν (<ν εἰπεῖν), γνωσθῆναι {νοθήναι} δὲ ἐστὶν ἀμήχανος. “Νόησις” γὰρ, φησίν, ἐστὶ ‘νοησεως’· ὀπερ ἐστιν παντάπασιν οὐκ ὁν.

Basilides

7.21.4: Οὔτως ἀποίησε κόσμον οὐκ ὁκατὰ ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων, ὁκατὰ ὄντων καταβαλόμενον καὶ υποστήριξι στέρμα τι ἐν, ἔχουν πᾶσαν ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὴν τοῦ κόσμου πανσπερμίαν. 10.14.1-2: Βασιλείδης δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς λέγει εἶναι θεόν οὐκ οὖντα, πεποιηκότα κόσμον εξ οὐκ ὄντων οὐκ οὖντα, οὐκ ὄντα καταβαλόμεναν τί στέρμα... Καὶ τούτῳ εἶναι φησὶ τὸ τοῦ κόσμου στέρμα, εξ οὔ τά πάντα γέγονεν· εἴχεν γὰρ ἐν ἑαυτῷ τά πάντα τεθησαυρισμένα καὶ κατακείμενα οἶνον οὐκ οὖντα, ὑπὸ τοῦ οὐκ οὖντος θεοῦ γενέσθαι προβεβουλευμένα.

Aristotle’s God as ὁ μὴ ὁν

Aristotle

7.19.7: Ὅ γὰρ ὁρὸς, ὁν Ἅριστοτέλης ἀποδίδοσι περὶ τοῦ θεοῦ, χαλεπὸς μὲν οὖν ἐστὶν (<ν εἰπεῖν), γνωσθῆναι {νοθήναι} δὲ ἐστὶν ἀμήχανος. “Νόησις” γὰρ, φησίν, ἐστὶ ‘νοησεως’· ὀπερ ἐστιν παντάπασιν οὐκ ὁν.

Basilides

7.21.1: Ἐπεὶ ἀποίησε κόσμον, (φησίν, ἢν,) οὐχ ὑλή, οὐξ οὐσία, οὐξ ἀνουσίαν, οὐξ ἀτλῆς, οὐξ ἀνθρώπων, οὐξ ἀγγέλων, οὐξ ἥθελε, οὐξ ὅλως τι τῶν ὄνομαξεμένων ή δι’ αἰσθήσεως λαμβανομένων ή νοητῶν πραγμάτων... ὁ δὲ οὐκ ἡθεός (ὁν Ἁριστοτέλης χαλεῖ “νόησιν νοησεως”, οὔτοι δὲ οὐκ οὖντα) ἀνοητως, ἀναισθητος, ἀξιοῦν ἦν τοις ἦν, ἀποκρητῶς, ἀπαθῶς, ἀνεπιθυμητώς κόσμον ἢθελησε ποιῆσαι.8

From the close parallelism between both columns it becomes clear beyond doubt that it is Basilides—not Hippolytus—who had attributed to Aristotle a doctrine of a non-existent (pure noetic) God, of the univer-
sal genus as something non-existent, and of the same genus as a huge heap of all kinds of seeds necessary for the future cosmos (ὅ σωμάτη τῆς πανσερμίάς). Consequently, it is Basilides who quotes from Aristotle to prove his own theory.

In conclusion, future scholars dealing with the Gnostic systems preserved in Hippolytus’ *Refutatio* should include the respective Exegeses on Empedocles, Aristotle, and Aratus, as well as the interpretations of the Mysteries at Phlya and of Pneumatic medicine. They all have been copied by Hippolytus from different *Gnostic treatises*—Ophitic, Sethian, Basilidean and others.

MONOIMUS’ LETTER TO THEOPHRASTUS

The Gnostic system of Monoimus the Arab, as preserved in Hippolytus (Refut. 8.12-15 and 10.17), is highly syncretistic, with apparent borrowings from the Naassenes, Peratics, Simonians, Basilides, and may be Ptolemy as well. However, at the closing of his—very fragmentary—account of the doctrine of Monoimus (8.15.1-2 and 10.17.5), Hippolytus verbatim quotes parts of a letter of Monoimus addressed to a Theophrastus. The text of the letter is both lacunose and corrupt, and scholars are puzzled by its content. The words of Werner Foerster may best illustrate this puzzlement:

Wenn ein Stück aus einem Brief des Monoimos zitiert wird, das dazu auffordert, in sich selbst hineinzuschauen, so scheint das auf eine mystische Frömmigkeit hinzudeuten; aber das Stück ist zu kurz, um feste Schlüsse daraus zu ziehen, zumal der Menschensohn “leidensfähig” sein soll; das lässt darauf schliessen, dass auch “Jesus” in diese Spekulationen einbezogen ist.

I shall try to heal the text of Hippolytus, and to offer an interpretation of Monoimus’ letter within the frame of his teaching. But first let me describe briefly the main points of Monoimus’ system.

(1) One Principle of the All: Man and Son-of-Man. There is one single principle of the All (ἡ ἀρχὴ τῶν ὀλῶν), which may be thought of as twofold: Man and Son-of-Man. The only difference between them is that the former is unborn, while the latter is born. This reminds us at once of the Naassene primeval Archanthropos Adamas and his Son (Refut. 5.9.1). But there are two differences of significance. First, in the Naassenerpredigt in Hippolytus, the stress is on the primordial Adamas: in Monoimus, however, the emphasis is on Son-of-Man. And second, Monoimus’ Son-of-Man is born independently of time, will or plan (8.12.3: ἀχρόνως γενόμενον, ἀβουλήτως, ἀπροορίστως τοιαύτη γάρ ἔστιν, φησίν, ἡ δύναμις ἐκείνου τοῦ Ἀνθρώπου... γενέσθαι τὸν ὦν λογισμοῦ καὶ βουλήσεως τάχιον).

This act of the primeval Man of Monoimus reminds us of a similar act of the primeval “non-existent” God of Basilides: (ὁ) οὐχ ὦν θεός... ἀνοητώς,

² On the God “‘Man’” see the seminal study by Hans-Martin Schenke, Der Gott “Mensch” in der Gnosis, Göttingen, 1962.
The existential relationship between Monoimus’ Man and Son-of-Man is best illustrated by the example of the simultaneity of fire and light. Like Man, fire “was;” and like Son-of-Man, light “came into being” (cf. Gen. 1:3, καὶ ἐγένετο φῶς), but before any time and simultaneously with the existence of fire: Καὶ τοῦτο ἔστι, φησὶ, τὸ εἰρημένον ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς: “ζῶν καὶ ἐγένετο.” “Ὅπερ ἔστιν {ὁ} ἢν “Ἀνθρωπὸς, καὶ ἐγένετο Υἱὸς αὐτοῦ, ὡς ᾧς ἔστιν τις εἰποι· ἦν πῦρ, καὶ ἐγένετο φῶς ἀχρόνως καὶ ἄβουλήτως καὶ ἀπροορίστως, ἀμα τῷ εἶναι τὸ πῦρ (8.12.4).

(2) Man and Son-of-Man as Iota. Monoimus’ supreme god called Man possesses absolute perfection (τελειότης): 8.12.6 and 7; 8.13.3. This τελειός “Ἀνθρωπὸς reminds us of the Naassene τελειός “Ἀνθρωπὸς Adamas (5.8.20). And since Son-of-Man is as inseparable from Man as is light from fire, it follows that Son-of-Man too is τελειός: such father, such son: ἐκ τελείου τέλειος 8.14.2; 10.17.3 and 5. The expression may be paralleled by the Valentinian way of speaking (6.31.5): the aeon Stauros is μέγας, ὡς ᾧς ἔστιν μεγάλου καὶ τελείου Πατρός (i.e., Βοθοῦ).

The perfection of both Man and Son-of-Man is best illustrated, continues Monoimus, by the example of the letter Ιωτα, which he calls: τοῦ τελείου ὁ Ἀνθρώπος ἡ μεγίστη εἰκών (8.12.6). For in Greek alphabet Iota (I) stands for Decad, which is called ὁ τελειός ἀριθμός (8.14.6) or ὁ χύριος ἀριθμός (10.17.2) because it comprises every single number (8.13.1). Of course, the erudite Monoimus is well aware of the fact that the Decad is called the perfect number thanks to the Pythagorean holy Tetractys or Tetrad (since 1 + 2 + 3 + 4 = 10). Because at 8.14.6 he mentions: ή γὰρ μονὰς ἑως τῆς (τετράδος) ... ἔστι, (φησὶ,) τὸ κεφαλαιον... τοῦ τελείου ἀριθμοῦ· τό τε γὰρ ἐν, δύο, τρία, τέσσαρα γίνεται δέκα...
He prefers, however, to explain the Decad as the perfect number by means of NT: “ἴῶτα ἐν ἡ μία κεραία” (Matt. 5:18; cf. Luke 16:17), “the smallest letter or a tip (apex) of it only.” This he understands as a hen-diadys (just as the anonymous Pythagorean source at 6.24.1 did, quoted in n. 4): ἰῶτα ἐν, ἡ μία κεραία or ἡ μία τοῦ ἰῶτα κεραία (8.12.6 and 7; 8.13.1; 2 and 4; 8.14.1; 2 and 3; 10.17.2 and 3).

Monoimus builds his theology on the image of Iota as representing both Man and Son-of-Man. For in Roman alphabet, Iota, interpreted as “the one stroke,” stands for Monad (I). As Monad, it reflects the unity of the All in the supreme god Man. In Greek alphabet, the same Iota stands for Decad (I), thus manifesting the plurality, multiplicity and totality of the All, comprised in the same primeval supra-cosmic Man. Thus, Iota may be called both ἀπλή and πολυσχιδής. Monoimus is quite explicit in this respect (8.12.5-7):

5 Ὅ δὲ Ἄνθρωπος οὐτὸς μία μονάς ἐστιν, <φησίν·> ἀσύνθετος, συνθετή, ἀδιαίρετος, διαιρετή, πάντα φιλή, πάντα μαχίμη, πάντα εἰρηνική, πάντα πρὸς ἑαυτὴν πολέμιος· ἀνόμιος, ὅμοιος, οἰόνει τις ἁρμονία μουσική.5 πάντα ἔχουσα ἐν ἑαυτῇ, ὡς ἂν τις εἰπῇ <ἡ·> καὶ παρασεκάθισεν μη νόησα.6 πάντα ἀναδεικνύουσα, πάντα γεννώσα· αὐτή μὴ ἄκρη, αὐτή πατήρ, τὰ δύο ἁθάνατα ὑνόματα.7 (6) Ὕποδειγμάτος δὲ χάριν, τοῦ τελείου Ἄνθρωπου <τούτου> κατανάζει, φησί, <τὴν> μεγίστην εἰκόνα <άς·> “Ιῶτα ἐν, τὴν μίαν κεραίαν” (cf. Matt. 5:18): ἤτις ἐστὶ {κεραία μία} ἀσύνθετος, ἀπλή, μονάς εἰλικρινής, εἰς οὐδὲνς ὅλως τὴν σύνθεσιν ἔχουσα. <καὶ αὗ> συνθετή, πολυειδής, πολυσχιδής, πολυμερής. (7) Ἡ ἀμερής ἐκείνη μία <μονάς>, φησίν, ἐστὶν ἡ πολυπρόσωπος καὶ μυριόματος καὶ μυριώνυμος μία τοῦ Ἰῶτα κεραία, ἤτις ἐστὶν εἰκὼν τοῦ τελείου Ἄνθρωπον ἐκείνου, τοῦ ἀοράτου.

The same (noetic) unity and plurality of the All is comprised in the image of Son-of-Man as Iota, interpreted both as Monad and Decad. When speaking of Son-of-Man, two points should be made here. (1) I think there can be little doubt that Monoimus’ Son-of-Man is actually Jesus. And (2), Son-of-Man—not Man—is the real source of the Creation. Consequently, the image of Iota as the totality of the Cosmos fits better Son-of-Man than Man.

5 Compare, e.g., Ps.-Aristotle De mundo 5, p. 396 b 15: Μουσική δὲ ὡς ἡ ἀμα καὶ βαρείς, μαχρώς τε καὶ βραχεῖς φύσιγμα μέξα σὲ διαφόρους φωναῖς μίαν ἀπετέλεσαν ἁρμονιάν.
6 This is a beloved Gnostic phrase to express, “absolutely everything;” compare Refut. 5.19.1 (the Sethians); 6.9.7 (the Simonians); 7.22.1 (Basilides).
7 This is another borrowing from the Naassene doctrine: compare Refut. 5.6.5; Synesius Hymn. 5 (2) 63 f.; and E. Norden, Agnostos Theos (Leipzig, 1913), p. 229 n. 1.
(1) **Son-of-Man as Jesus.** (a) Already the name Son-of-Man hints at Jesus. To quote only Schenke: “Im frühen hellenistischen Christentum ist nämlich die spätjüdische Messiasbezeichnung “Menschensohn” bald zu einem kaum mehr verstandenen Titel Jesu geworden... Über das Christentum gelangte der Heilands-Titel “Menschensohn” in die Gnosis und gewann hier eine spekulativ-theologische Bedeutung, die ihm in der Kirche vorenthalten worden war.”

(b) At 8.13.2, the term, “absolute fullness” (παν το πλήρωμα), clearly refers to Jesus as the Decad (I), not to Man: Καὶ τοῦτό ἐστιν, ἡγίστε, τὸ εἰρήμενον. “ὅτι παν το πλήρωμα ημὸκης κατοικῆσαι” ἐπὶ τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Ἄνθρωποῦ “σωματικῶς”. αἱ γὰρ τοσαῦτα τῶν ἀριθμῶν συνθέσεις εἰς ἀπλῆς καὶ ἀσυνθέτου τῆς μιᾶς κεραίας τοῦ Ἰῶτα σωματικαὶ γεγόνασι, φησίν, ύποστάσεις. The same quotation from Colossians 1:19 and 2:9 has been interpreted as referring to Christ by the Peratics (Refut. 5.12.4; 10.10.4) and by the Valentinians (Iren. 1.3.4; Clement Ex. ex Theod. 31.1).

(c) At 8.13.3, the allusion to Jesus is obvious: Γέγονεν οὖν, φησίν, ἀπὸ τοῦ τελείου Ἄνθρωποῦ ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ Ἄνθρωποῦ, “ὅν ἔγνωκεν οὐδείς” (cf. Matt. 11:27): φαντάζεται γὰρ (αὐτὸν), φησίν, ὃς γέν(ν)ημα (τῆς) ἡθελεῖας ἡ κτίσις πᾶσα, τὸν Υἱὸν ἀγνοοῦσα.

(2) **Son-of-Man Jesus as Iota.** (a) The super-cosmic Son-of-Man should be thought of as taking place beneath the supreme Man but above the Creation (Cosmos), as kind of a Μεσότης-Μεσίτης. This becomes clear from 8.13.3: Οὐ Υἱὸν (δὲ) ἀκτίνες ἀμυδραί πάνυ, ἐμπελάζουσα τῷ τῷ κόσμῳ, συνέχουσιν, φησί, καὶ συγχατοῦσι τὴν μεταβολὴν, τούτεστι τὴν γένσειν. This I understand to mean: “The very dim beams coming down to this world from the Son maintain and strengthen the qualitative change (of matter), i.e., the generation.’’ Now, in order to serve as source of Creation, Son-of-Man must ‘‘flow down’’ to this Cosmos, just as does a vertical stroke of Iota. Compare 8.13.4 (= 10.17.2): “Εστι γάρ, φησίν, ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ Ἄνθρωποῦ Ἰῶτα ἐν, μία κεραία, ρυεῖσα ἄνωθεν,9 πλήρης ἀποπληροῦσα, πάντα ἔχουσα ἐν ἑαυτῇ, ὡσα καὶ ὁ Ἄνθρωπος ἑχει, ὁ πατὴρ τοῦ Υἱοῦ τοῦ Ἄνθρωποῦ.

(b) At 8.12.2, Monoimus says that Man is ἄγεν(ν)ητος, ἀφθαρτος, while Son-of-Man is γεν(ν)ητός καὶ παθητός. Since Son-of-Man, as that pleromatic Iota ‘‘flowing down to this world,’’ is the source of Creation, I think παθητός has here its philosophical sense, ‘‘liable to qualitative...

---

9 The phraseology is Gnostic. Compare the Peratics (Refut. 5.17.4): ἀπὸ τοῦ Υἱοῦ ἐπὶ τὴν ὡλὴν ἄνωθεν, ὃς γέν(ν)ητός καὶ παθητός. Since Son-of-Man, as that pleromatic Iota ‘‘flowing down to this world,’’ is the source of Creation, I think παθητός has here its philosophical sense, ‘‘liable to qualitative...
change” (cf., e.g., Athenagoras Leg. 16.3). However, the allusion to the possibility of Jesus is unmistakable, in view of the same terminology both in the Simonian doctrine (6.18.1) and in Noetus (9.11.3).

(c) The Valentinians interpreted the Decad (Iota) as referring to Jesus = Iesus), and Monoimus must have known it. Compare Iren. 1.3.2 = Epiphan. 31.14.8: Καὶ τοὺς δέχα αἰώνας ὡσάτως διὰ τοῦ Ἰῶτα γράμματος, ὃ προηγεῖται τοῦ ὄνοματος αὐτοῦ [sc. τοῦ Ἡσαῦ], σημαίνεται λέγοις: καὶ διὰ τούτο εἰρηκέναι τὸν Σωτῆρα, “Ἰῶτα ἐν ἑ μία κεραίᾳ οὐ μὴ παρέλθῃ, ἐὼς ἀν πάντα γένηται’’ (Matt. 5:18).

(3) Son-of-Man and Creation. According to Monoimus, this Cosmos derives from a part of the Son-of-Man, that ideal Iota or perfect Decad, comprising in itself the plurality, multiplicity and fullness (πληρωμα) of this world of ours (8.13.4): Γέγονεν οὖν, φησίν, ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀνθρώπου ἑκείνου οὐδὲν τῶν ἐνθάδε, οὐδ’ ἐσται πάσοτε: τὰ δὲ γεγονότα πάντα οὐκ ἀπὸ ὅλου, ἄλλ’ ἀπὸ μέρους τινὸς γέγονεν τοῦ Υἱοῦ τοῦ Ἀνθρώπου. “Εστὶ γὰρ, φησίν, ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ Ἀνθρώπου Ἰῶτα ἐν, μία κεραίᾳ, μυεία αὖνθεν, πλήρης ἀποτληροῦσα, πάντα ἔχουσα ἐν ἑαυτῇ, ὥσα καὶ ὁ Ἀνθρώπος ἐχει, ὁ πατήρ τοῦ Υἱοῦ τοῦ Ἀνθρώπου.

The image of Iota as the perfect Decad has been preserved throughout Monoimus’ description of Creation, sometimes being brought to its extreme limits. So, the world has been created in six days, which means, in six powers being comprised in the one stroke of Iota (8.14.1: Γέγονεν οὖν ἐὰν ἰοαύος, ὡς φησί Μωϋσῆς, ἐν ἐξ ἑμέραις, τούτου ἐν ἐξ Συνάμεσι, ταῖς ἀπειλημμέναις ἐν ὑμῖν κεραίᾳ τοῦ Ἰῶτα). These six powers are a clear borrowing from the Simonian Megale Apophasis (Refut. 6.13.1; 6.14.1-2).

The four elements too derive from the Iota-Decad. For, as Plato had shown (Tim. 55 a-56 b; Tim. Locr. 98 d [35 Marg]), earth, water, air and fire are no other things than cubes, icosahedra, octahedra and pyramids. Consequently, they are reducible to numbers comprised in the perfect Decad (8.14.2): Οἱ τε γὰρ κύβοι καὶ τα ἑικοσάεδρα καὶ τὰ ὀκτάεδρα καὶ ταὶ πυραμίδες καὶ πάντα τα τούτους παραπλῆσσα σχήμα (τα), ἐξ ὧν συνέστηκε πῦρ, ἀέρ, ὕδωρ, γῆ, ἀπὸ τῶν ἀρίθμων γεγόνασα τῶν κατειλημμένων ἐν ἑκείνῃ ὑμῖν κεραίᾳ τοῦ Ἰῶτα, ἦτε ἐκείνῃ Ἑιδος Ἀνθρώπου, ἐκ τελείου τέλειος.

Furthermore, the staff of Moses turned into the ten plagues against the Egyptians (Exod. 7:8-11:10) also witnesses to the creative power of the Iota-Decad. For the ten plagues of Egypt (8.14.3: τὰ πάθη τὰ κατὰ τὴν Ἁγιοττον—ἀτινα, φησίν, ἐστὶ τῆς κτίσεως ἀλληγορούμενος σύμβολα) refer to the qualitative change of matter, i.e., to generation (τὰ πάθη = μεταβολή, 10 On the other hand, the explanation of the seventh day or Sabbath as deriving from the heavenly Hebdomad (8.14.1) seems to be a borrowing from Valentinianism (cf. Refut. 6.32.7-8).
And this generation is being caused by the blows of the stroke-staff Iota (8.14.3-4): Αὕτη ἡ δεκάπληγος ἡ κοσμικὴ κτίσις; πάντα γὰρ πλησάμενα γεννᾶται καὶ χαρποφορεῖ, καθάπερ αἰ ἀμπέλοι.

"Ἀνθρώπος ἐξ ἀνθρώπου ἔζεσε(σ)υται," φησίν, "καὶ ἀποσπᾶται, πληγῇ τινι μεριζόμενος," (Democritus B 32 DK) ἦν γένηται. Similarly, the Decalogue of Moses too attests to the creative mysteries of the Son-of-Man as Iota (8.14.4-5): ... ἡ δεκάλογος ἄλληγορούσα τὰ θεῖα τῶν ὅλων μνήμηια. Πάσα γὰρ, φησίν, ἡ γνώσις τῶν ὅλων δεκάπληγος ἑστὶ καὶ δεκάλογος: ἦν οἶδεν οὐδεὶς τῶν περὶ τὸ γέν〈ν〉ημα τῆς θηλείας πεπλανημένων (another allusion to the heavenly origin of Son-of-Man Jesus).

One question now arises. The perfect Son-of-Man possesses absolute beauty (8.13.4): Τὸ δὲ κάλλος ἐκείνου τοῦ Ὕιοῦ τοῦ Ἀνθρώπου μέχρι νῦν, ἡ φησί, ἐστὶν ἀκατάληπτον ἀνθρώπου, ὅσοι περὶ τὸ γέν〈ν〉ημα τῆς θηλείας εἰσὶ πεπλανημένοι. If the perfect and beautiful Son-of-Man is the source of this Creation, why the Creation itself is not perfect and beautiful? My answer would be: the perfect Son-of-Man is only the Source of Creation, he is not its Agent as well. The real creator of this world is the imperfect and malevolent Jewish Demiurge: that is why his work is imperfect. It seems that Hippolytus is excerpting Monoimus’ treatise so carelessly that the Jewish Creator is mentioned once only (and incidentally). He must, however, have played a significant role in Monoimus’ doctrine, so that the latter may belong to the three-principle Gnostic systems after all (i.e., Man, Son-of-Man, Demiurge, as “the third god”). Anyway, the relationship between the perfect Son-of-Man and the imperfect Jewish Creator may be seen from the following comparison:

Son-of-Man (8.13.3):


Demiurge (8.14.8):

Χαῖρει γὰρ ὁ θεὸς τῆς κτίσεως τῇ μεταβολῇ, (φησίν,) ἢτις ὑπὸ τῶν δέκα πληγῶν τῆς κεραιάς ἐνεργεῖται τῆς μιᾶς ἢτις ἐστὶ Μωσῆς βάβδος ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ δεδομένην. Ἡ τῶν Αἰγυπτίων πλῆσιν ὅ θεὸς μεταβάλλει τὰ σώματα, καθάπερ τὴν χείρα Μωσήως (εἰς χύνα, καί) τὸ ὅδωρ εἰς αἴμα, καὶ τὰ λοιπά.

11 This absolute beauty of the Son-of-Man reminds us of the similar absolute beauty of the Naassene Snake-Nahash (Refut. 5.9.14), or of the beauty of the Great Archon, Ogdoad, of Basilides (7.23.3): ὁ μέγας ἄρχων, ἢ κεφαλὴ τοῦ χόσμου, κάλλος τε καὶ μέγεθος ἢ Δύναμις (αὐ)ληθῆναι μὴ δυναμένη.
The clause of 8.14.8, χαίρει γάρ ὁ θεός τῆς κτίσεως τῆς μεταβολῆς, refers clearly to the imperfect and malevolent Jewish Creator. It is he who has converted the positive Creation (8.13.3, μεταβολὴ = γένεσις) granted by the Son-of-Man into a negative Gnostic “constant transformation of matter” (μεταβάλλει τά σώματα, 8.14.8). The same negative activity of the Jewish Demiurge is implied by “the transformation of the elements into flesh” (8.14.8: ἄγες τῶν στοιχείων εἰς σάρξ μεταβολῆς).

Strangely enough, Hippolytus embarks on an extensive explanation by Monoimus (8.14.6-7) of the Passover (based on Exodus 12:6-20) as an eternal cosmic feast in honor of the God, i.e., of the Son-of-Man, the perfect One Stroke: Ὁλος γὰρ ὁ κόσμος καὶ πάντα τῆς κτίσεως στοιχεία πάχα ἐστίν, ἡ σάρξ, ἡ χυρία. But, at the same time, he tells us nothing about Monoimus’ doctrine of the final Salvation. It is, however, difficult to imagine any Gnostic system without a doctrine of the salvation of the pneumatics, members of the respective Gnostic community. This fact cannot be explained by a negligence on the part of Hippolytus. The only possible explanation is that he had in his hands only the first half of Monoimus’ treatise (dealing with Creation), the second half (dealing with Salvation) being lost.

Armed with this summary knowledge of Monoimus’ doctrine we may now approach his Letter to Theophrastus. Its text, as restored by me, runs as follows.

8.15.1-2:

8.15.1-2: Τουγαροῦν Μονόιμος αὐτὸς ἐν τῇ πρὸς Θεόφραστον ἐπιστολῇ διαρρήθη λέγει: “Εἰ θέλεις ἐπιγνώναι τὸ πᾶν, ὁ θεός τῆς κτίσεως καὶ πάντα τὰ στοιχεῖα πάχα ἐστίν, (φησίν,) ἐστὶ χυρία. But, at the same time, he tells us nothing about Monoimus’ doctrine of the final Salvation. It is, however, difficult to imagine any Gnostic system without a doctrine of the salvation of the pneumatics, members of the respective Gnostic community. This fact cannot be explained by a negligence on the part of Hippolytus. The only possible explanation is that he had in his hands only the first half of Monoimus’ treatise (dealing with Creation), the second half (dealing with Salvation) being lost.

Armed with this summary knowledge of Monoimus’ doctrine we may now approach his Letter to Theophrastus. Its text, as restored by me, runs as follows.


12 Supplevi ex 10.17.5.
13 ἀπὸ σκετοῦ P.
15 χριστοῦ Schneidewin-Duncker (conl. 10.17.5): έαυτοῦ P.
16 Seclusi.
17 se addidi (conl. 8.15.1: ἐν σοί).
My impression is that in Book 8 Hippolytus verbatim quotes (compare διαρρήδην λέγει) Monoimus’ Letter, but skips some clauses. In his Summary (Epitome, Book 10), he freely paraphrases the same passage from the Letter, while adding the clauses he had skipped in Book 8. Consequently, a combination of both versions would yield the following content of the Letter.

“If you want to learn to know the All stop searching for God in the Creation and similar things: search for Him starting from yourself. And learn who is this who had appropriated to himself absolutely everything in yourself, as somebody different from you, by saying: my mind, my reason, my soul, my body. And learn what is the cause of your feeling grief or joy, love or hatred; and what is the cause of your being awake against your wish or feeling sleepy against your wish; of your being angry against your wish or feeling affion against your wish.

And if you accurately examine all these things you will find Him [i.e., God] in yourself, the perfect One coming from the perfect One, considering everything as His own—both the so-called non-existent things and the existent ones—and being one and many, just as is that ‘One Stroke’ [i.e., Iota]. And you will find the explanation from yourself.’

(1) Son-of-Man. The first key-expression to the understanding of the Letter is: τέλειον ἐκ τελείου. From 8.14.2 (and 10.17.3 as well): ... ἐν ἑκείνῃ τῇ ἀπλῇ τοῦ Ἰῶτα κεραία, ἡτίς ἐστίν Υίος Ἀνθρώπου, <ἐκ> τελείου

Addidi.
18 ἄυτὸν (sc. θεόν) P : ἄυτὸν Wendland.
19 σεαυτῷ coniec. Schneidewin-Duncker : ἑαυτῷ P.
20 Addidi.
21 Addidi.
22 Addidi.
23 Addidi.
24 ἐν (σοὶ) Cruice ex 8.15.1 : ἐν P.
25 <σε>αυτῷ scripsi : αὐτῷ P : αὐτῷ Wendland.
26 Addidi.
27 νοή(σεις) scripsi (cf. 8.15.2: εὐρήσεις) : νόει P.
28 ὅψ ἄντα τὰ P, transposui.
29 Delevi.
τέλειος, it becomes clear that the God Monoimus refers to in the Letter is no other than the perfect Son-of-Man (or Jesus), coming from the perfect father, Man. It is He who is called “the perfect Iota or Decad,” “the One Stroke,” par excellence. And it is He who is the source of plurality and diversity of both this world and a man’s inner self.

(2) The Introspection. The second key to the understanding of the Letter is an undeniable contrast between the external Creation and the man’s internal self. The former is rejected by Monoimus (καταλιπών ζητεῖν θεόν κατὰ κτίσιν καὶ τὰ τούτων παραπλήσια), the latter is recommended as the proper way of grasping the essence of the All (εἰ θέλεις ἐπιγνώναι τὸ πᾶν).

As a kind of Ringcomposition, the Letter opens with the phrase, ἀπὸ διότι σαυτοῦ, and closes with the same expression, ἀφ’ ἕαυτοῦ τὴν διέξοδον εὐρών. The result of this careful self-analysis will be the discovery of the Son-of-Man in your own self (εὐφήσεις or νοῆς σεις) αὐτόν ἐν (σε)σαυτῷ, who is present in every part of your mind and body.

One may now ask: If Son-of-Man is the only source of the entire Creation—both of Macrocosm and Microcosm—why could not He be discovered as easily in the external world, why is the introspection specially recommended? My answer would be: Of course, Son-of-Man is present in every particle of the external world, but it is much easier for a man to discover His presence in our inner self. Why so? Because, at present the external world is being dominated by the “evil ruler,” the Jewish imperfect and malevolent Demiurge, the Lord of Matter. It is his hylic-choic nature that makes the discovery of the pneumatic Son-of-Man (Jesus) more difficult.

In my view, the presence of the Jewish Creator may be discovered in the expression, καταλιπών ζητεῖν θεόν κατὰ κτίσιν καὶ τὰ τούτων παραπλήσια. Here, the phrase, θεός κατὰ κτίσιν, says much the same as, χαίρει γὰρ ὁ θεός τῆς κτίσεως τῆς μεταβολῆ at 8.14.8, while referring to the “third god,” the Demiurge of the Old Testament. At present, he may have power over the Matter (compare 8.14.8: τῶν στοιχείων εἰς σάρκα μεταβολῆ), but not over a man’s Spirit as well. And that is why the spiritual Jesus, the perfect Son-of-Man, the noetic Iota-Decad, may be discovered much easier in a man’s inner self, through the process of introspection and self-analysis.

(3) Jesus is every part of your mind, soul and body. The third keyword to the understanding of the Letter is a complete expropriation of a man’s entire mind, soul and body. Everything in our self without exception belongs actually to Jesus-I(esus)-Iota: mind, reason, soul and body. This ap­propriation of a man’s entire content by the Son-of-Man is clearly expressed by such terms as: ὁ πάντα ἀπαξαπλῶς ἐν σοὶ ἐξιδιοποιοῦμενος = (ὁ)
The presence of an agent different than ourselves in our self is emphasized by the repetition (four times) of the phrase, "against your own wish or will," and by the telltaling expression, ως ἔτερος ἀυτοῦ.

In order to demonstrate the presence of an agent (God) different than "I," Monoimus—at least in this part of the Letter—concentrates on psychological phenomena (feelings and emotions): grief-joy; love-hatred; anger-affection; being awake-feeling sleepy. They are arranged in pairs of opposites, maybe imitating Plato? Compare, e.g., Republic, 4, 437 b 1: το ἐπινεῦει τῷ ἄνανεῦει καὶ τὸ ἐφίσθαι τινός λαβεῖν τῷ ἀπαρνεῖσθαι καὶ τὸ προσάγεσθαι τῷ ἀπωθεῖσθαι, based on τὸ ἐπιθυμητικὸν and τὸ θυμοειδὲς μέρος τῆς ψυχῆς.

This special attention paid to ψυχή is puzzling. One would expect from a Gnostic to pay more attention to νοῦς and διάνοια. Anyway, these feelings and emotions seem to be understood in the expression of 10.17.5: τὰ οὐκ ὄντα καλούμενα, "the so-called non-existent things," which Son-of-Man considers as His own property. In brief, Son-of-Man is present in everybody's self in the form of that perfect and simple "One Stroke" or Iota, which is the source of every single feeling, emotion, affection or disposition (εὐρήσεις αὐτῶν εν ἀει, ἐν ὄντα καὶ πολλά, κατὰ τὴν κεραίαν ἐκεῖνην ἐν τὴν μίαν).

(4) The Source. One final question: what may be the source of inspiration for Monoimus in his Letter? The answer is not easy. My guess is: a Stoic source, similar to Marcus Aurelius. (a) God in man’s self: M.A. 3.5.2 ὁ ἐν σοὶ θεός. (b) God as the only owner of everything ‘ours’: 12.26.2 Ἐπελάθου δὲ καὶ τοῦ, ὡς ἐκάστου νοῦς θεός καὶ ἐκεῖθεν ἐρρύχετο τοῦ, ὡς οὐδὲν ιδιον οὐδενός, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ τεκνίον καὶ τὸ σωμάτιον καὶ αὐτὸ τῷ ψυχάριον ἐκεῖθεν ἐλήλυθε. (c) Call to introspection: 4.3.2 ... ἔξον, ἃς ἐν ὀρας ἑθελήσης, εἰς ἑαυτὸν ἄναχωρεῖν; 7.28 Εἰς αὐτὸν συνειλοῦ. (d) Finally, the four parts of man: νοῦς, διάνοια, ψυχή, σῶμα (8.15.2). At 10.17.5, Hippolytus mentions only three parts: ψυχή, σάρξ, νοῦς. These three parts correspond to the terminology of M.A.: σῶμα (or σάρξ), ψυχή (or πνευμάτων), νοῦς (or ἡγεμονικόν): 2.2.1; 3.16.1; 12.3.1; 12.14.5. Now, if διάνοια in Monoimus is genuine, it too may be Stoic in origin. For at M.A. 12.3.1, the source of A (= Vaticanus graecus 1950 saec. XIV) glosses πνευμάτων with διάνοια, and at M.A. 6.32 διάνοια stands for ψυχή.30

30 Marcus Aurelius, ed. J. Dalden (Teubner, Leipzig, 1979).—Some Stoics explained διάνοια as τὸ ἡγεμονικόν: SVF, I, p. 50.6; III, pp. 75.9 and 111.19.—Monoimus employs the word διάνοια at 8.14.6.—Plato, e.g., Republic 6, 511 d 2-5, seems to be a less likely source for Monoimus’ διάνοια here.
In his account of the Essenes (Refutatio 9.18.2—28.2), Hippolytus is evidently dependent on Josephus (Bellum Iud. 2.119—161 Niese). This fact has been correctly recognized by Emmanuel Miller (1851) first,¹ by Christoph Burchard (1974) last.² After the exhaustive study of Burchard, ‘‘Die Essener bei Hippolyt,’’ I think the suggestion advanced by Kaufmann Kohler (1903),³ Matthew Black (1956),⁴ and particularly Morton Smith (1958)⁵—that both Josephus and Hippolytus go back to a lost common source—may be put to rest.

The question now arises, how to explain the differences between Josephus and Hippolytus. Burchard’s answer seems to be that Hippolytus alone is responsible for all the alterations of Josephus’ text and the additions to it. Burchard concludes his study as follows: ‘‘... für die Abweichungen ist niemand anders verantwortlich als Hippolyt selber’’ (p. 33). ‘‘Hippolyt als Autor des Textes... Grade die grossen Änderungen gehen sicher auf sein Konto, von den kleineren mindestens ein Teil. An der starken Christianisierung ist er an wichtigen Stellen beteiligt, so dass man ihm die übrigen auch zutrauen kann’’ (p. 38). Finally: ‘‘Eine Zwischenquelle bleibt theoretisch möglich; viel mehr spricht nicht für sie’’ (p. 39).

Judging by Hippolytus’ methodology throughout the Refutatio, however, I have the feeling that he is unable of deliberately altering his source so as to involve misrepresentation. As a rule, Hippolytus either verbatim copies whole pages from his source, or excerpts it. His occasional expansions are easily detectable as such: sometimes he is being car-

¹ In the Editio princeps of the Refutatio, Oxford, 1851.
³ In The Jewish Encyclopedia, 5 (1903), 224-232, esp. 228b (s.v. Essenes).
⁵ ‘‘The Description of the Essenes in Josephus and the Philosophumena,’’ Hebrew Union College Annual 29 (1958), pp. 273-313.
ried away by his heresiological zeal, more often his additions are mere explanatory glosses. In brief, Hippolytus may well be called a plagiarist, but there is no solid evidence to accuse him of forgery as well.

Accordingly, I would like to suggest that the relationship between Josephus and Hippolytus, as far as the account of the Essenes is concerned, is not as simple as scholars seem to have assumed hitherto. In my opinion, the differences between Josephus and Hippolytus are best explained by a strange combination of the following four factors.

(1) Hippolytus uses a manuscript of Josephus which is different from the extant textus receptus. (2) In addition, Hippolytus copies not directly from Josephus but from an Interpretatio Christiana of Josephus’ Bellum 2.119-161. This fact has been first recognized by Patrice Cruice (1860). Later on, A. Berendts and K. Grass (1925), and more recently Solomon Zeitlin (1958), have suggested Hegesippus as the most likely source of Hippolytus here. (3) Furthermore, Hippolytus uses a source supplementing Josephus—not only in the chapters dealing with the Essenes (9.25.2; 26.1-3; 27.1-2), but also in those speaking of the beliefs of the Pharisees (9.28.3-4), Sadducees (9.29.2-4), and of all the Jews in general (9.30.1-8). My guess is that this source coincides with that mentioned under (2), probably Hegesippus. (4) Finally, Hippolytus’ own rhetorical embellishments and heresiological remaniements of his respective source can be easily recognized as such and, after Burchard’s study, need no special attention. I shall now substantiate—as briefly as possible—the existence of each one of the four factors.

(1) **Hippolytus uses a different manuscript of Josephus**

(a) Josephus 2.137

Τοῖς δὲ ζηλοῦσιν τὴν αἴρεσιν αὐτῶν οὐκ εὐθὺς ἢ πάροδος...

Hippolytus 9.23.1

Τοῖς δὲ βουλομένοις τῇ αἵρεσι καθειτεύειν οὐκ εὐθεῖας τὰς παραδόσεις ποιοῦνται...

‘‘Candidates who are anxious to join the sect of the Essenes are not immediately admitted,’’ states Josephus. ‘‘The Essenes do not immediately reveal (or hand over) their doctrines (or traditions) to those wishing to be in-

---

7 In their translation of the Old Slavonic version of Josephus into German: Flavius Josephus, *Vom jüdischen Kriege. Buch I-IV*, Dorpat, 1924-1927, pp. 31-34 and 252-264.
structured by the sect,’ says Hippolytus instead. Obviously, the source of
Hippolytus’ inspiration about ‘‘The Essene traditions’’ (αἱ παραδοσεῖς) is
the wrong reading of two old MSS of Josephus—ἡ παράδοσις Π A, for the
correct ἡ πάροδος of the majority of MSS (i.e., M V L R C, and Por-
phyry, De Abstinentia 4.12 p. 248.9 Nauck²). Incidentally, it may be in-
structive to remark that the Old Slavonic version of Josephus (p. 254.6
Meščerskij), ¹¹ and Georgius Monachus (Chronicon 8.5 p. 330.20 de Boor)
presuppose a different text of Josephus here. For the former reads: Ἡο-
τοια κατ’ ζητήματι, πριν προστεθῆ, τοῖς οὐκ ἐνθύθῃς οἱ
πλείων χώσων τοὺς ὑποτεταχμένους
ὑπερλαμπρωνε οἵσθαι.

The old Slavonic version has here (p. 254.23); … i ukrasitsja izlixa odevce
svetloju, ni inoju krasotoju (‘‘… nor to adorn himself above the rest with a
shining raiment or with any other ornament’’). Hence my emendation in
Hippolytus, ἀγ(λαοίς) ἐσθήσε(ς)ν, of the corruption, ἀπειθήςειν Π. Hip-
polytus then seems to be in agreement here with the Slavonic version, but
not with the textus receptus of Josephus.

¹¹ N. A. Meščerskij, Istorija iudejskoi vojn i losifa Flaviya u drevnerusskom perevode, Moscow,
1958, pp. 252-257 and 492-494.

¹² τη addidi ex Iosepho.

¹³ ἀγ(λαοίς) ἐσθήσε(ς)ν scripsi ex versione Slavica: ἀπειθήςειν Π.

¹⁴ scripsi ex Iosepho : πλείων Π.

¹⁵ (συν)ήθους scripsi (cf., e.g., Georgii Monachi 8.5, p. 330.13 de Boor: καὶ
dειπνήσαντες μετὰ τῆς συνήθους σιωπῆς [sc. the Essenes] = Jos. 2.132; Hippol. 9.21.5) :
ἐθους Π.

¹⁶ (μεγάλω ληθη)η scripsi : (litterae evanidae 8)ή Π : (καταγνωσθ)ή Miller : (καταληθη)ή
Wendland.

¹⁷ δώματος scripsi ex versione Slavica : δόγματος Π : τάγματος ex Iosepho scripsit Miller
omnium consensus. Compare already Burchard (JSJ, p. 13 n. 70): ‘‘τάγματος : δόγματος Π;
vgl. εις domu “aus (dem) Haus” Altruss. (für τοῦ δώματος?). Wie lautete Hippolyt
ursprünglich?’’
Those who are convicted of serious crimes they expel from the order," says Josephus. But Michael, the scribe of the Parisinus suppl. gr. 464 (the only extant MS of Hippolytus, Books IV-X), writes δόγματος for Josephus' τάγματος. Now, all editors were quick to emend the meaningless δόγματος into τάγματος, but the Old Slavonic version has here (p. 254.31): ... to izdenut' iz domu ("... they throw him out of the house or convent"). This fact indicates that Hippolytus' source read δώματος for Josephus' τάγματος.

I think this assumption is confirmed by two facts. First, two folios later, at Ref. 9.28.1, Michael correctly writes 'Εσ(σ)ηγωνν τάγμα (= Josephus 2.160). And second, eight folios earlier, at Ref. 9.11.1—in a passage in which Hippolytus says Callistus used to give bribes to the Pope Zephyrinus,—Michael again mistakenly writes δόγμα: for the correct δόμασι (Schneidein-Duncker): ὁν (sc. Zephyrinum) πείθων (sc. Callistus) δόμασι καὶ ἀπαιτήσεσιν ἀπειρημένας ἤγεν εἰς δ ἐξ' βούλετο, ὄντα δωρολήπτην καὶ φιλάργυρον.18

As in the case (b), here again Hippolytus agrees with the Slavonic version, not with the extant text of Josephus. And since the Slavonic version does not depend on Hippolytus, the most natural conclusion is that both Hippolytus and the Version had used a manuscript of Josephus different from the extant textus receptus.

(2) The "Christianization" of Josephus' Essenes is prior to Hippolytus

(a) Josephus 2.128

(The worship of the sun by the Essenes)

Πρός γε μὴν τὸ θεῖον εὐσεβείς ἱδίως—πρῶτον γὰρ ἀνασχείαν τὸν ἑλιὸν οὐδὲν φθέγγονται τῶν βεβηλών, πατρίδος δὲ τινὰς εἰς αὐτὸν εὐχάς, ὡσπερ ἰκετεύοντες ἀνατείλαι.

Hippolytus 9.21.1

Παραμένουσι δὲ εὐτάκτως καὶ ἐπιμόνως εὐχόμενοι ἐωθεν, μηδὲν πρότερον φθεγτάμενοι εἰ μὴ τὸν θεὸν ὑμνήσωσιν.

The phrase, εὐτάκτως καὶ ἐπιμόνως, is one of Hippolytus' rhetorical embellishments (in view of Ref. 9.30.4, εὐτάκτως καὶ παραμόνως ἐλειτούργουν, sc. all the Jews).19 So may be the words, εἰ μὴ τὸν θεὸν

18 There are two additional scribal errors in the cod. Par. suppl. gr. 464 saec. XIV, involving the Christian keyword δόγμα. But they seem to be due to wrong transliteration of the uncial script rather than to a "Christian" mistake on the part of the scribe Michael. At Ref. 5.6.4, P has διαφόρος δόγμας for the correct διαφόρος ὄνομα (Usener, conl. 5.11.1), and at 9.9.1 we read in P δόγματος for the correct λόγου (Bernays = Heracliti Fr. 50 DK = 26 Marcovich).

19 Cf. Burchard, supra, n. 9.
As for the more substantial matter of the Essenes “entreating the sun to rise” (ἐκτεινόντες ἀνατείλατι), Hippolytus is not the only author to get rid of it. For Georgius Monachus too omits it (pp. 329.22-330.2 de Boor): Καὶ πρὶν μὲν ἀνασχείν τὸν ἥλιον οὔθὲν ἄργον φθέγγονται, προσευχὰς δὲ καὶ φαλαμφίδιας πρὸς τὸν θεὸν ἐκ μέσης νυκτὸς μέχρις αὐτῆς ἀναφέρουσι μετ’ εὐλαβείας καὶ σεμνότητος.

Now, while Georgius’ account of the Essenes is in part dependent on Porphyry as a Zwischenquelle between Josephus and Georgius,20 there is no evidence that he knew of Hippolytus’ account as well.21 The most likely conclusion then is that both Hippolytus and Georgius go back to an Interpretatio Christiana of Josephus’ account of the Essenes which was careful enough to omit the Essenes prayers to the sun, entreating him to rise, by cleverly replacing Josephus’ εἰς αὐτὸν [sc. τὸν ἥλιον] with τὸν θεὸν [sc. the Judeo-Christian God].

But there seems to be more to it than that. Hippolytus’ phrase, παραμένουσι δὲ… εὐχόμενοι ἐσθεν, and Georgius’ wording, φαλαμφίδιας πρὸς τὸν θεὸν ἐκ μέσης νυκτὸς μέχρις αὐτῆς ἀναφέρουσι, seem to indicate that each had used a Greek text of Josephus different from the extant textus receptus. I think this is confirmed by the Old Slavonic version, which reads (p. 253.6-10): I k’’ bojestvu blagot’stivi sut’ pače všx. Malo že počivajut noš’ju i v’’stajut’ na pěnje, slavjašče i moljašče Boga. I prež s’’ln’’nago v’’sxoda ničto že ne glagoljut’, no tokmo molitvy ot’’skia k nemu vosylajut’, jako moljaščesja o vo-sianii ego. (“To the divinity they are devout beyond anybody else. During night they sleep little, rising to sing, praising the Lord and praying to Him. Before the sun is up they would utter no other word, but only offer to him [i.e., to the sun] the prayers of their forefathers, as though praying him to shine.”).

The Slavonic version is independent of the Christian version of Josephus, since it preserves the Essene prayers to the sun to rise and shine. On the other hand, it shares with Georgius the prayers to the God starting at midnight, which are missing both in Josephus and Hippolytus. The conclusion is that Hippolytus cannot be held responsible for the Christianization of Josephus.

(b) The Essene Superiors. While at Ref. 9.19.2, Hippolytus retains the term οἱ ἐπιμελήται, taken over from Josephus (2.123, οἱ τῶν κοινῶν ἐπιμελήται, compare the Qumran mebaqqer), elsewhere he either omits it

---

20 On this relationship see Burchard, Josephus-Studien, p. 87.
21 Burchard’s stemma too shows no dependence of Georgius Monachus on Hippolytus: Josephus-Studien, p. 92.
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(as at 9.21.1 = Jos. 2.129) or rather replaces it with a Christian term—ὁ προεστώς (9.22.1 = Jos. 2.134, oí ἐπιμεληταί), or ὁ ἀρχων (9.19.1). Josephus’ term ὁ κηδεμών (2.125) also becomes a προεστώς in Hippolytus (9.20.2), as Burchard has convincingly shown (p. 34 f.).

Furthermore, a gross Christianization of the Essene congregation, present in Hippolytus, becomes obvious by the following comparison:

**Josephus 2.146**

Τοῖς δὲ πρεσβυτέροις ὑπακούειν καὶ τοῖς πλέοσιν (= harābīm, cf. 1 QS 6.1 et alibi) ἐν καλῷ τίθενται.

**Hippolytus 9.25.1**

Τοῖς δὲ ἀρχουσι καὶ πρεσβυτέροις (cf. Acts 4:5 4:8) ὑπακούειν διδάσκονται.²²

Now, my point is that Hippolytus is not the only one to replace Josephus’ Jewish terms for the Essene superiors with Christian ones. For Georgius too replaces Josephus’ term oí ἐπιμεληταί (2.129) with the Christian term ὁ προεστώς (p. 330.3 de Boor), and he is not dependent on Hippolytus. Consequently, there must have existed an Interpretatio Christiana of Josephus’ account of the virtuous Essenes prior to Hippolytus: it served as a source for both Hippolytus and Georgius Monachus.

(c) The “Christianized” Brahmans. There is another similar case of “Christianization” of a pagan sect in Refutatio for which Hippolytus should not be blamed. Speaking of the sect of Brahmans in India (1.24.2), Hippolytus says that they call God both Light and Logos. The influence of John 1:1 and 1:4-5 on this report on the Brahmans seems to be evident. However, the same “Christianization” of the Brahmans we find in another source, independent of Hippolytus. It follows that Hippolytus is faithfully copying his source, where this Christianization was already accomplished. Compare:

**Hippolytus 1.24.1**

"Εστι δὲ καὶ παρὰ ‛Ινδοῖς αἱρέσις φιλοσοφομένων ἐν τοῖς Βραχμάναις. (2) Όυτοί τὸν θεὸν φῶς εἶναι λέγουσιν, ὦντας ὅποιον τις ὄρος οὔδ' οἶον ἱλιος ἢ πῦρ, ἀλλ' ἐστὶν αὐτοὶς ὁ θεός λόγος, ὦντας ὁ ἐναρθρος, ἀλλ' ὁ τῆς γνώσεως, δι' οὗ τὰ

**Collatio Alexandri cum Dindimo p. 14.35 Pfister:**

Deus... per Verbum exaudit orantem hominem, quia de Verbo tantummodo homo simile est Deo, ut Deus Verbum est. Et Verbum istum mundum creavit, et per Verbum vi­vunt omnia. Nos autem [sc.

²² The Old Slavonic version (p. 255.4) is of no avail here. It has only: A starčišiny poslušajut” (“And they obey the superiors”), which seems to correspond to the corrupt text of Josephus’ codd. P A: Τοῖς δὲ πρεσβυτέροις ὑπακούουσιν καὶ τοῖς πλέοσιν ἐν καλῷ, with the second clause being omitted probably as being incomprehensible to the translator.
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χρυστά τῆς φύσεως μυστήρια ὅραται σοφοίς. Τοῦτο δὲ τὸ φῶς, ὃ φαίνει λόγον καὶ θεόν, αὐτοῦς μόνους εἰδέναι Βραχυμάνες λέγουσιν...

Bragman] hoc Verbum colimus et hoc adoramus et hoc amamus.

(3) Hippolytus’ material absent in Josephus derives from a source supplementing Josephus (probably Hegesippus)

(a) Josephus 2.147

(Strict observance of Sabbath by the Essenes)

... ἀλλ’ οὐδὲ σχεῦσι τι μεταχινήσαι θαρροῦσιν οὐδὲ ἀποπατεῖν.

Hippolytus 9.25.2

... ἀλλ’ οὐδὲ σχεῦσις (τι) ἡ μετάτιθέσαι οὐδὲ ἀποπατήσασαι, τινὲς δὲ οὐδὲ κλινιδίου χωρίζονται.

“Some of them do not even leave their couch on Sabbath,” adds Hippolytus. This bit of information looks like a gloss, added by an expert in matters of Jewish customs. Hippolytus was no such expert (and could not add this gloss), but Hegesippus—a Jew converted to Christianity and writing in Rome ca. A.D. 180—was such an expert and could provide this gloss (compare Eusebius, Hist. eccl. 4.22.7).

(b) Josephus 2.150

Διήργηται δὲ κατὰ χρόνον τῆς ἁσκήσεως εἰς μοίρας τέσσαρας,

Hippolytus 9.26.1-3

(1) Διήργηται δὲ κατὰ χρόνον καὶ οὐχ ὀμοίως τῇ ἁσκήσῃ φυλάττουσιν, εἰς τέσσαρα μέρη διαχωρισθέντες.

“Ετεροί γὰρ αὐτῶν τὰ ὑπὲρ τὸ δεόν ἁσκοῦσιν, ὡς μηδὲ νόμισμα βαστάζειν, λέγοντες μὴ δείν εἰκόνα ἢ φέρειν ἢ ὀράν ἢ ποιεῖν... "

(2) “Ετεροί δὲ, ἐπάν ἀχουσώσει τινος περὶ θεοῦ διαλεγομένου καὶ τῶν τούτων νόμων, εἰ ἀπερίτμητος εἴῃ, παραφυλάξεις (τις αὐτῶν) τὸν τοιοῦτον ἐν τόπῳ τινὶ μόνον, φονεύειν ἀπείλει εἰ μὴ περιτμηθεῖν: οὐ, εἰ μὴ βουλίστο πείθεσθαι, οὐ φείδεται ἀλλὰ καὶ σφάζει:

23 τι addidi ex Iosepho.
24 ἀποπατήσασι scripsi : ἀποπατήσασι P. Compare 9.25.3 ἀποπατήσασι Miller : ἀποπατήσασι P.
25 As for the custom itself, Kohler (supra, n. 3, p. 229b) refers to Targum ad Exod. 16:27; Mek., Beshallah 5. In his turn, Burchard (JSJ, p. 38 and n. 198) quotes Jerome, Comm. in Esaiam, 15 ad 56:2 (ed. M. Adriaen, C. Chr. 73A, p. 630.23 f.): neque enim prodest sedere in sabbato, sive dormire, et epulis inhiare.
27 addidi concl. 9.26.1 et 4.
28 οὐ scripsi : οὐ P.
Hippolytus’ account of the division of the Essenes into four classes is a deliberate reinterpretation of Josephus’ account, as Burchard had shown (p. 29 f.). Most probably, Josephus here refers to the distinction of four classes within a given Essene congregation, such as Qumran. For instance, a division into “the priests,” “levites,” “laics” (“the Israelites”) and “the proselytes.”

Hippolytus, however, takes the Essenes described by Josephus in 2.119-149 to form the first class, adding in 9.26.1-3 three additional classes of Essene “fundamentalists” (έτεροι γὰρ αὐτῶν..., έτεροι δὲ..., έτεροι δὲ αὐτῶν...), i.e., (1) those who shun any image; (2) the Zealots (or Sicarii), who do not tolerate any uncircumcised talking about God and His laws; (3) those who would call no one lord but God alone.

Again, Hippolytus is not likely to be the author of this considerable expansion, involving a specific knowledge about the Essenes-Sicarii and others. But the Jew Hegesippus is. Now, the phrase (9.26.3), τὰ ἀρχαῖα ἔθη, recurs at Ref. 9.30.7, where Hippolytus speaks of the Messianic expectations of all the Jews: εἰς ἑν (sc. Jerusalem) ἐπισυνάξει (sc. the Messiah) ἀπαν τὸ ἔθνος (‘Ἰουδαίων) καὶ πάλιν ἐπὶ τὰ ἀρχαῖα ἔθη ἀποκαταστῆσει. Hippolytus’ source for 9.30.5-8 is a Christian one (cf. 9.30.5), being well acquainted with the Jewish Messianism. Again, Hegesippus is the best candidate.

---

29 addidi.
30 addidi.
31 H. Sauppe: ψαύσοιεν P.
33 addidi ex Hippolyto.
34 At Ref. 9.30.7, Hippolytus seems to refer to the restoration of the kingdom of David. I think Burchard (p. 30 and n. 157) is wrong when referring to 9.18.1 (‘Ἰουδαίων μὲν ἄρχῃ εἰς ἑν ἔθος... ἄρχῃ... τὸ ἄρχη καὶ ἅπασα εἰς τὸν διὰ τὸν ἑαυτόν τὸν τόσον μᾶλλον τῷ ἐν τῇ...’ or σύν τῷ τινι... τὴν θεοῦ τε θεσεῖ διδασκαλος Μωσῆς...).
(The Essene Eschatology)

(153) ... εὑρήκατος τὰς ψυχὰς ἱρίεσαν, ως πάλιν χομιούμενοι. (154) Καὶ γὰρ ἔρρωται παρ’ αὐτοίς ἢ δὲ ἡ δόξα· φθαρτα μὲν εἶναι τὰ σώματα καὶ τὴν ὑλὴν οὐ μόνον αὐτῶν, τὰς δὲ ψυχὰς ἀθανάτους ἢ διαμένειν... (155) ... ἐπειδὰν δὲ ἀνεθύσατο τῶν κατὰ σάρξα δεσμῶν, οί δὲ μαχρὰς δουλείας ἀπηλλαγμένας, τότε χαίρειν καὶ μετεώρους φέρεσθαι. Καὶ ταῖς μὲν ἁγαθίαις, ὀμοδοξοῦντες πασίν Ἑλλήνων, ἀποφαίνοντα τὴν ὑπερ ὀξεανὸν δίαιταν ἀποκεῖσθαι καὶ χώρων οὔτε ὁμφαῖοι οὔτε νεφελοῦς καθώσις ἐβαρυνόμενον, ἀλλ’ ὅν ἐξ ὀξεανοῦ πραξός ἢ δὲ ξέφυρος ἐπιπνέων ἀναφέχει... (156) Δοκούσι δὲ μοι κατὰ τὴν αὐτὴν ἔννοιαν Ἑλλήνης τοῖς τέλεος ἀνθρώπων, οὕς ἄριστας καὶ ἡμίθεους καλοῦσιν, τὰς μαχάρων νήσους ἀνατεθεικέναι,

(1) "Ερρωταί δὲ παρ’ αὐτοῖς καὶ ὁ τῆς ἀναστάσεως λόγος· ὀμολογοῦσι γὰρ καὶ τὴν σάρκα ἀναστήσεσθαι καὶ ἑσθαίαι ἀθάνατον, ὅν τρόπον ἢ δὲ ἡ ἀθανάτος ἢ ἡ ψυχή. "Ἡν χωρισθεῖσαν τοῦ σώματος.\(^{35}\)

(2) Αλλὰ καὶ ετερα τοὺτων δόγματα πολλὰς τῶν Ἑλλήνων τοὺς σφετερισάμενοι ίδιας δόξας συνεστήσαντο· ἐστὶ γὰρ κατὰ τοὺτος ἀκακησίαν περὶ τὸ θεῖον ἄρχοιστερά πάντων ἔθνων, ὡς δεικνυθήσατο πάντας τοὺς περὶ θεοῦ εἰπέτι τετολμηκότας ἢ περὶ τῆς ὁντων δημιουργίας μὴ ἔτερωθην παρειληφθήναι τὰς ἀρχὰς ἢ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίης νομοθεσίας. (3) Ὡν μάλιστα Πυθαγόρας καὶ οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Στοαίς παρ’ Ἀιγυπτίων τούτων μαθητευθέντες τὰς ἀρχὰς.\(^{42}\) παρέλαβον· ἠγούσι γὰρ καὶ κρίσιν ἑσθαίαι, καὶ τοῦ παντὸς ἐκτύρωσιν, καὶ τοὺς ἄδικος κολασθήσεσθαι εἰς ἀεί.

\(^{35}\) τοῦ σώματος supplevi conlato Iosepho.

\(^{36}\) ἐστὶν delevi ut dittographiam.

\(^{37}\) ἀναφέρεσθαι καὶ ἑκεῖ supplevi conlato Iosepho.

\(^{38}\) τούτων addidi conlato Hippolyto.

\(^{39}\) πολλάς οἱ scripsi : πολλοὶ P.

\(^{40}\) σφοι addidi conlato Hippolyto.

\(^{41}\) τῆς perii P.

\(^{42}\) τὰς ἀρχὰς supplevi conlato Hippolyto.

\(^{43}\) γὰρ scripsi : δὲ P.
Hippolytus’ account of the Essene eschatology is a pastiche deriving from three sources—from Josephus (2.153-156), from a Christian supplement to Josephus (probably Hegesippus), and from Hippolytus himself. Now, what goes back to Josephus can be easily recognized as such by comparing the coinciding passages of both columns. The Zwischenquelle between Josephus and Hippolytus is responsible for the attribution to the Essenes of a belief in the resurrection of the body—(9.27.1) ὁμολογοῦσι γὰρ καὶ τὴν σάρκα ἀναστήσεσθαι καὶ ἔσθαι ἀθάνατον, against Josephus’ text (2.154) φθαρτὰ μὲν εἰναι τὰ σώματα καὶ τὴν ὕλην οὐ μόνιμον αὐτῶν, τὰς δὲ ψυχὰς ἀθανάτους ἄει διαμένειν.

The suggestion advanced by Jean Carmignac— that Hippolytus had read in his text of Josephus ἄφθαρτα for φθαρτά—I think cannot stand criticism. For then we would have to assume that Hippolytus read μόνιμον for οὐ μόνιμον as well, and that he had missed the construction μὲν...δὲ, which is highly unlikely. Hippolytus’ addition at the end of 9.27.1—Εἰς χρίσεως—attests to the fact that we have to do here with a deliberate alteration of the original text of Josephus.

The question now arises: Who is the author of this alteration? O. Michel-O. Bauernfeind (1962), and especially Burchard (1977), believe it is Hippolytus himself (“Das ist nun nicht die einzige Passage, die von Hippolyt selber ist,” says Burchard 32). I feel, however, that nowhere in the Refutatio did Hippolytus engage in a deliberate alteration of his source so as to involve misrepresentation. But Hegesippus, in his zeal to present the Jews as pre-Christians, may have engaged in such a misrepresentation.

I think that this Zwischenquelle (probably Hegesippus) had deduced a belief in the resurrection of the body from Josephus’ statements about the eternal physical punishment of the wicked in the hell, which he thought to take place only after the Final Judgment. Consider the following passages in Josephus and Hippolytus.

---

46 JSJ 8 (1977) 31-33.
47 An Essene belief in the resurrection of the body may be supported by Qumran 1 QH 6.34-35; 11.12-14 (in the same way in which their belief in a world-conflagration may be supported by 1 QH 3.24 ff., and their belief in the Final Judgment by 1 QS 4.11-14; 1 QM), but the point is that it is questionable whether Hegesippus knew of the Qumran community.
Josephus 2.155

The Essenes

... ταῖς δὲ φαύλοις (sc. ψυχαῖς) ἐπιφώνη ἔδειξεν Ἐνεμέρων ἀφορίζονται μυχῶν, γέμοντα τιμωρίων ἀδιαλείπτων.

Hippolytus 9.27.1

The Essenes

ομολογοῦσι γὰρ καὶ τὴν σάρκα ἀναστήσασθαι καὶ ἔσασθαι ἀθάνατον, ὅν τρόπον ἦδη ἄθανατός ἐστιν ἡ ψυχή.

Josephus 2.163

The Pharisees

ψυχὴν τε πᾶσαν μὲν ἀφθάρτον, μεταβαίνειν δὲ εἰς ἔτερον σῶμα τὴν τῶν ἁγαθῶν μόνην, τὰς δὲ τῶν φαύλων ἀιδίω τιμωρίᾳ χολάζεσθαι.

Hippolytus 9.28.5

The Pharisees

όὑτοι καὶ σαρκὸς ἀνάστασιν ὄμολογοι, καὶ ψυχὴν ἀθάνατον ἐρυθον, καὶ χρίσιν ἐσομένην καὶ ἐκπύρωσιν, καὶ δικαίους μὲν ἀφθάρτους ἔσασθαι, ἀδίκους δὲ εἰς ἀεὶ κολασθήσεσθαι ἐν πυρὶ ἀσβεστώ.

Josephus 2.165

The Sadducees

Ψυχῆς δὲ τὴν διαμονήν καὶ τὰς καθ’ ἀδου τιμωρίας καὶ τιμᾶς ἀναφέρουσιν.

Hippolytus 9.29.1

The Sadducees

Ἅναστασιν δὲ οὐ μόνον ἀρνοῦνται σαρκὸς, ἀλλὰ καὶ ψυχὴν μὴ διαμένειν νομίζουσι.

Each time Josephus mentions τὰς καθ’ ἀδου τιμωρίας, the source of Hippolytus deduces from this a σαρκὸς ἀνάστασις, as he believes that there can be no punishment of the flesh before a resurrection of the flesh for the Final Judgment.

Finally we come to Hippolytus’ own expansion of the text of Josephus at 9.27.2-3 (p. 152). It deals with the trite subject of both Greek philosophers and Barbarians borrowing their wisdom from Jewish theology and cosmology. This expansion can be easily recognized as Hippolytus’ own work thanks to two elements in it. First, it shifts from the Essenes to all Jews (μὴ ἔτερωθεν παρειληφέναι τὰς ἁρχὰς ἦ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰουδαϊκῆς νομοθεσίας). Compare Hippolytus 10.30.8: ...φανερῶς ἐπιδείκνυται τὸ τῶν θεοσεβῶν γένος (sc. the Jews) ἁρχαίοτερον ἐν τῶν πάντων Χαλδαίων, Αἰγυπτίων, Ἐλλήνων. And second, it mentions the example of Pythagoras as a student of the Egyptians, being envisaged here only as transmitters of the Jewish wisdom: this example Hippolytus employs also at Refut. 1.2.18 and 9.17.2.

---

48 addidi.
49 ἀρνοῦνται οὐ μόνον P, transposui.
50 Cf. Burchard, p. 32 n. 165.
51 Hippolytus probably saw a connection between the Stoic and Jewish cosmology in their assumed common beliefs in Final Judgment and Ecpyrosis (world-conflagration):
In conclusion, we have tried to prove the existence of four factors responsible for the differences between Josephus' and Hippolytus' account of the Essenes: (1) fluctuations in the transmission of this extremely popular text of Josephus; (2) the author of an *Interpretatio Christiana* prior to Hippolytus; (3) the author of substantial alterations and expansions of the text of Josephus (probably identical with 2); (4) finally, Hippolytus' own expansions and embellishments. Now, it seems safe to conclude that Hippolytus had used Josephus' account of the Essenes through a *Zwischenquelle*, which is responsible for both the Christianization of the Essenes and for the alterations or expansions of the text of Josephus. Hegesippus seems to be the most likely candidate for the author of this *Interpretatio Christiana* of Josephus.\(^5\)

\(^5\) I think Hegesippus is Hippolytus' source also for the chapters dedicated to the Pharisees, Sadducees, and the Jewish Messianism (*Refut. 9.28-30*), but to discuss this would go beyond the subject of relationship between Josephus and Hippolytus as far as the Essenes are concerned.
THE WEDDING HYMN OF ACTA THOMAE

The puzzling and elusive Wedding Hymn of the *Acts of Thomas* 6-7—first published back in 1823—has not yet found a satisfactory interpretation and assessment.¹ I assume that the lost original was written in East-Aramaic or Syriac: the Semitic *Doppeldreier* of the original—a distich with three beats in each line—still seems to be detectable in the extant Greek version. This couplet meter was popular in Aramaic and Syriac poetry, notably in the *Psalms of Thomas.*² Compare, for example, line 1 of our Hymn, "The Bride is the daughter of Light," with *Ps. Thomae* 1.1, "My Father, the joyful Light."


² A Manichaean Psalm-Book, Part II, edited by C.R.C. Allberry (Manichaean Manuscripts in the Chester Beatty Collection, Vol. II; Stuttgart, Kohlhammer, 1938), pp. 203-227.—For a list of Aramaic and Syriac poems composed in the *Doppeldreier* see T. Säve-Söderbergh, *Studies in the Coptic Manichaean Psalm-Book: Prosody and Mandaean Parallels* (Uppsala, 1949), 88-90.—Of course, I am aware of the fact that some couplets seem to indicate four beats (instead of three) in the lost Syriac original, notably 13 and 15. But the difference may well be explained by expansion on the part of the Greek translator. So in couplet 15, the Syriac original might well have read: ‘‘Her groomsmen surround-her, seven-of-them, elected by-her,” and in couplet 13 the phrase ὁμήρῳ ἓκει τὸ ‘sweet odor’ may well mean the same as κόμωδία of couplet 3, while παμπόλλων in 13b could be an addition of the Greek translator. I trust that the Semitic *Doppeldreier* are visible enough in the rest of the couplets (with the exception of the last couplet, which is evidently spurious).
If so then the 4:4 beat in the last couplet (27) of the Hymn alone speaks against the authenticity of the closing distich. And Wilhelm Bousset was right in detecting Manichaean theology in this couplet, notably in "the Living Spirit," as was Günther Bornkamm—in seeing in this couplet a later Manichaean addition (Zusatz). As a matter of fact, 27 ἐδόξασαν τὸν πατέρα is redundant in view of the presence of καὶ δοξάσουσι τὸν πατέρα τῶν ὅλων in 23.

The translator of the Hymn into Greek sometimes uses two words to translate one single word of the original: 1 ἐνέστηκε καὶ ἐγκεκαί; 10 σημαίνουσι καὶ ὑποδεικνύουσι; 18 τὸν σχοτὸν καὶ τὸ θέαμα; 23 ἐν χαρᾷ καὶ ἀγαλλίασε.

As is known, the extant Syriac version departs considerably from the original text—due to its systematic catholicizing effort. It tries to remove every trace of Gnosticism from the Hymn. Accordingly, "the Bride" (1) is replaced with "my Church" (with far-reaching consequences). The aeons are eliminated: "the place of the blessed aeons" (10) is replaced with "the place of life;" the thirty-two (7) are replaced with the twelve apostles and the seventy-two envoys (borrowed from Luke 10:1, and being popular later among the Manichaeeans); in 15-17, the figures twice seven and twelve are eliminated; finally, in 20 and 21, "the great ones (grandees, princes)" and "the eternal ones"—i.e., the Gnostics—are replaced with "the just ones" and "some," respectively. In brief, the Syriac version must be used with extreme caution. But occasionally—where there is no reason to suspect its catholicizing zeal—it proves to be a helpful means in restoring the corrupt Greek text.

The Greek version of the Hymn is preserved in sixteen manuscripts. I retain Bonnet’s MSS sigla (p. 99). Here is the text of the Hymn as restored by me.

I. Greek Text and Translation

'H xorh tou phwtos thugathe,
ē enestike kai egekeita to apogausma touv basileōn

2 to gauōn, kai epitesterēs tautēs to thēma,
faidrō xallēi xatayagazousa.

3 ZNTW 18 (1917) 10 f.
4 Mythos und Legende, 88.
5 Compare, e.g., Klijn’s Commentary, pp. 168-179.
3 ἡς τὰ ἐνδύματα ἐοιχεν ἐαρινοῖς ἀνθειν, ἀποφορὰ δὲ εὐωδίας ἐξ αὐτῶν διαδίδοταί.

4 καὶ ἐν τῇ χορυφῇ <αὐτῆς> ἱδρυταί ὁ βασιλεύς, τρέφων τῇ ἐαυτοῦ ἀμβροσίᾳ τοὺς ὑπ’ αὐτὸν ἱδρυμένους.

5 ἐγκειταὶ δὲ ταύτης τῇ κεφαλῇ ἀλήθεια, χαράν δὲ τοῖς ποσίν αὐτῆς ἐμφαίνει.

6 ἡς τὸ στόμα ἀνέωντα καὶ πρεπόντως αὐτῇ· <quoniam eo omnes laudes edit.>

7 τριάχοντα καὶ δύο εἰσίν οἱ <ἐν> ταύτη ὑμνολογοῦντες, <— —.>

8 ἡς ἡ γλώττα παραπετάσματι ἐοιχεν τῆς θύρας, ὁ ἐκπιστεύτα τοῖς εἰσιοῦσιν.

9 ἡς ὁ αὐχήν εἰς τύπον βαθμῶν ἐγκειταί, ὅν ὁ πρῶτος δημιουργὸς ἐδημιουργήσεν.

10 αἱ δὲ δύο αὐτῆς χεῖρες σημαίνουσιν καὶ ὑποδεικνύουσιν, τὸν χῶρον τῶν εὐδαιμόνων αἰώνων κηρύσσοντες.

11 οἱ δὲ <δέκα> δάκτυλοι αὐτῆς τὰς πύλας τῆς πόλεως ἀνοιγνύουσιν.

12 ἡς ἡ παστὸς φωτεινῶς, ἀποφορὰν ὀποβαλσάμου καὶ παντὸς ἀρώματος διαπνέων,

13 ἀναδιδοὺς τε ὅσμην ἤδειαν σμῦρνης τε καὶ φύλλου, καὶ ἀνθέων παμπόλλων ἠδυπνών.

14 ὑπέστρωνται δὲ ἐντὸς μυρσίναι, αἱ δὲ κλισιάδες ἐν καλάμοις κεχόσμηνται.

15 περιεστοιχισμένην δὲ αὐτὴν ἔχουσιν οἱ ταύτης <παρά>γνυμον, ὅν ὁ ἀριθμὸς ἐξωμοῦ ἐστίν, οὐς αὐτῇ ἐξελέξατο·

16 αἱ δὲ ταύτης παράνυμφοι εἰσίν ἐπτά, αἱ ἐμπροσθὲν αὐτῆς χορεύουσιν.

17 δώδεκα δὲ εἰσίν τὸν ἀριθμὸν οἱ ἐμπροσθὲν αὐτῆς ὑπηρετοῦντες καὶ αὐτῇ ὑποκείμενοι,

18 τὸν σχοπὸν καὶ τὸ θέαμα εἰς τὸν νυμφίον ἔχοντες, ἵνα διὰ τοῦ θέαματος αὐτοῦ φωτισθῶσιν.

19 καὶ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα σὺν αὐτῷ ἔσονται εἰς ἐκείνην τὴν χαράν τὴν αἰώνιον·
20 καὶ ἔσονται ἐν τῷ γάμῳ ἐκείνῳ,
ἐν ὦ οἱ μεγιστάνες συναθροίζονται·
21 καὶ παραμενοῦσιν τῇ εὐωχίᾳ,
ης οἱ αἰώνιοι καταξιοῦνται·
22 καὶ ἐνδύονται βασιλικὰ ἐνδύματα
καὶ ἁμφιάσονται στολὰς λαμπράς·
23 καὶ ἐν χαρᾷ καὶ ἀγαλλιάσει ἔσονται ἁμφότεροι,
καὶ δοξάσουσι τὸν πατέρα τῶν ὠλων.
24 οὗ τὸ φῶς τὸ γαύρων ἐδέξαντο,
καὶ ἐφωτίσθησαν ἐν τῇ θέσι του δεσπότου αὐτῶν.
25 οὗ τὴν ἁμβροσίαν βρῶσιν ἐδέξαντο
μηδὲν ὠλως ἀποσυνάν ἔχουσαν,
26 ἔπιον δὲ καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ οἴνου ᾧ αὐτοῦ,
τοῦ μὴ δίψαν αὐτοῖς παρέχοντος καὶ ἐπιθυμιάν.
27 {ἐδόξασαν δὲ καὶ ὠμίσθησαν σὺν τῷ ζωντὶ πνεύματι
τὸν πατέρα τῆς ἀληθείας καὶ τὴν μητέρα τῆς σοφίας.}

Translation

1. The Bride

The Bride is the daughter of Light:
the majestic effulgence of kings stands upon her;
2 delightful is the sight of her,
radiant with cheerful beauty.
3 Her garments are like spring flowers:
    sweet fragrance spreads around from them.
4 On the crown of her head sits the King,
    feeding with his ambrosia those who sit beneath him.
5 Truth rests upon her head,
    (the movement of) her feet makes joy appear.
6 Her mouth is open, and it becomes her:
   (for she utters with it all songs of praise.)
7 Thirty-two are they who sing praises (in) her,
   (e.g., glorifying the Father of all.)
8 Her tongue is like a door-curtain (cf. Hebrews 6:19; 9:3; 10:20)
    that is moved aside for those who enter it.
9 Her neck is shaped like the (lofty) steps
    that the first Demiurge created.
10 Her both hands make signs,
    proclaiming the place of the blessed aeons.
11 Her (ten) fingers
    open the gates of the City.

2. Her Bridal Chamber

12 Her bridal chamber (cf. Matt. 9:15; 22:10) is full of light,
    breathing a scent of balsam and every spice;
13 giving off a sweet fragrance of myrrh and silphium,
    and of all kinds of sweet-smelling flowers.
14 Its floor is covered with myrtle twigs
    and the portals are adorned with wands of reed.

3. Her Attendants

15 Her groomsmen keep her surrounded,
    seven in number, whom she herself had chosen.
16 And her bridesmaids are seven,
    who dance before her in chorus.
17 Twelve in number are those
    who serve before her and are subject to her.

4. The Bridegroom and the Elect Ones

18 They have their gaze toward the Bridegroom (cf. Matt. 9:15;
    John 3:29),
    so that by the sight of him they may be enlightened
    (cf. John 1:7-9; 2 Timothy 1:10; Hebrews 6:4).
19 And they shall be with him forever  
in that eternal bliss;  
20 And they shall be present at that wedding (cf. Matt. 22:2)  
at which the great ones are assembled (cf. Mark 6:21;  
Apocal. 6:15; 18:23);  
21 And they shall attend the banquet (cf. Apocal. 19:9)  
of which the eternal ones are deemed worthy (cf. Matt. 22:14).  
22 And they shall put on royal robes (cf. Matt. 22:11-12)  
and be arrayed in shining cloaks (cf. Apocal. 3:4-5; 3:18; 4:4; 6:11;  
7:9; 7:13-14; 1 Cor. 15:53; 2 Cor. 5:3-4; 1 Enoch 62:15-16; 71:1;  
108:12; 2 Enoch 22:8-10).  
23 And all of them shall be in joy and exultation,  
and they shall glorify the Father of all.  
24 (For) his majestic Light they have received,  
by the vision of their Lord they have been enlightened.  
25 His ambrosial food they have received,  
which is free of all decay;  
26 Of (his) wine they have drunk,  
which causes them neither thirst nor desire.  
27 {And they glorified and praised along with the Living Spirit  
the Father of truth and the Mother of wisdom.}

II. Interpretation

1. The Structure of the Hymn. The text of the Hymn, in the reconstruction  
offered above, easily falls into four parts: 11 + 3 + 3 + 9 couplets. The  
lion’s share (couplets 1-11) belongs to the description of the Bride, i.e., of the  
Lichtjungfrau (1 τοῦ φωτός θυγάτηρ). She appears in the role of a Mediator  
between the Heaven (in 11 she opens the gates of the Heavenly  
City Jerusalem) and the pneumatics on earth. That is why her neck has  
been shaped by the first Demiurge (i.e., by the Father of all, cf. 76 and  
236) as “a lofty flight of steps” (9a), leading to that City.  

Consequently, Part I (1-11) anticipates Part IV (18-26): the redemption  
of the pneumatics (Gnostics), “the great and eternal ones” (20-21). It also anticipates the description of the Bridegroom (in 18-26)—by indicating his place both at the wedding banquet and in the Pleroma: 4 “on the crown of her head sits the King.” Here, by ὁ βασιλεύς the Bridegroom  
(Savior or Christ) must be meant (as already Thilo had suggested), and  
not “the Father” or “ein dominierender Stern” (as Lipsius 305 and  
Bousset, Hauptprobleme der Gnosis, 69 n. 1, respectively, had thought). For the ambrosia of this King is nothing else but the ambrosia provided by  
Christ (in the closing couplets 25-26), i.e., eucharist. Compare Acta
Thomae 25 (p. 140.13 Bonnet) and 36 (p. 154.2), where ἡ ἁμβροσιώδης πηγή of Jesus and ἡ ἁμβροσιώδης τροφή, along with τὸ ποτὸν τῆς ἁμπέλου τῆς ἀληθινῆς, clearly refer to eucharist.

Part II (12-14) briefly describes the Bridal Chamber. Such Bride, such her bride-chamber—full of light, sweet fragrance, spring flowers, myrtle twigs, chastity and purity. Add to this that her bridesmaids are cheerfully dancing in chorus before her (16), just as she herself seems to be cheerfully moving her feet (in 5).

Some of the wedding customs taken from the real life seem to be detectable in this Interpretatio Gnostica. For example, the place of the bridegroom at the wedding banquet was really “above the bride” (as Bousset, ZNW 18 [1917] 21 f., had correctly pointed out): that is why the King sits “on the crown” of the Bride’s head (in 4). Moreover, it was the duty of the groomsmen to serve as the groom’s “guardians of the bride:” that is why the seven groomsmen (i.e., the seven planets) keep the Bride “surrounded” (in 15). Furthermore, Miss E.S. Driver had drawn attention to the similarity between the bride-chamber of our Hymn and the bride-chamber of the modern Mandaeans of Iraq: it is adorned with fresh flowers and myrtle, and with tree-twigs of every kind. Finally, the apotropaic decoration of the house entrance with myrtle twigs (dedicated to Aphrodite: Athenaeus XV, 767 AB) during a wedding ceremony was common enough in Greece (Plut. Amatorius 755 A; Stobaeus IV.22a.24 [IV, p. 506.19 Hense]).

Part III (15-17) resumes the spatial location of the Bride from couplet 4. She is totally encompassed by her seven groomsmen (i.e., by the seven planets), being entertained by her seven bridesmaids (i.e., by the seven archons of these planets). In addition, the twelve archons of the Zodiacal Circle serve before her (17).

Couplet 18 serves as a “bridge” between Parts III and IV: The attendants have their gaze fixed on the Bridegroom, who is probably seated above the Bride (cf. 4), in order to receive light from him and thus become “enlightened.” The aeons are the ἀπαρχή of the ultimate redemption, a guaranty for the redemption of the pneumatics, who are to be understood under “the great and eternal ones” of couplets 20-21.

---

9 Cf. Origen Contra Celsum 6.31. Thilo 144; Bornkamm 83 n. 1.
The nine couplets of Part IV (18-26), dealing with the Savior, serve as a counterbalance to the eleven couplets describing the Bride in Part I. The Savior is able to enlighten both the aeons and the pneumatics (18 and 24b) because he himself is Light, as Son of the Light (the Father of all). In 24, Light is best explained as a synonym of Lord, referring to the Savior-Christ (cf. John 1:9, Ὄν τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινὸν, ὁ φωτείζει πάντα ἀνθρώπον, ἐρχόμενον εἰς τὸν κόσμον). In brief, Light is the essence of all three divine persons—the Father of all (1, “the daughter of Light;” 24a, “his Light”), the Bride (1; 12), and the Bridegroom (18; 24).

Couplets 19-23 are strongly liturgical (or macaristic) in character (“And they shall...”). Their content is explained by the closing couplets 24-26. The redemption of the pneumatics will be achieved through the following sacraments, mysteries and Gnostic enlightenment: the eucharist (25-26); the enlightenment through Christ (18 and 24); the acquisition of the “royal raiment” (22); and, above all, through a Marcanian sacrament (?) of the Bridal Chamber (20-21).

The elaborate structure of the Hymn is enhanced by the fact that the same keyword has been placed at different strategic points (including a kind of Ringcomposition). A few examples. The expression, 1-2 τὸ φῶς and τὸ ἀπαύγασμα τὸ γαβρον, 12 φωτεινός, 18 ἵνα φωτισθῶσιν, 24 τὸ φῶς τὸ γαβρον and ἐφωτισθησαν, serves as a thread linking the Father of all, Bride and Bridegroom. Moreover, 10 οἱ εὐθαμόμενες αἰώνες, 19 εἰς τὸν αἰώνα and αἰώνας, lead to 21 οἱ αἰώνοι, by implying, “the elect Gnostics as the partakers in that eternal bliss.” Furthermore, 2 ἐπιτερτές, 5 χαρά, 19 χαρά and 23 ἐν χαρᾶ καὶ ἀγαλλιάσει ἐσονται (in addition to 16 χαρεύουσαν) link the Bride with the pneumatics in the everlasting joy and exultation. Finally, 4 ἀμβροσία anticipates the eucharist of the closing lines (25-26), ἡ ἀμβροσία βρῶσις, and the Father of all seems to be glorified by both the Bride (in 6b and 7b) and the pneumatics (in 23b; couplet 27 is a later Manichaean expansion).

2. Exit Bardesanes and the Manichaeans. The opening word of the Hymn, η κόρη, means both “Maiden” and “Bride” (it means “bride” at Odyssey 18.279; Theopompus Com. 14 ap. Σ Aristoph. Plut. 768). Since bridal chamber (12) and Bridegroom (18) are mentioned in the Hymn, the sense “Bride” is the most natural. If so, then Klīn’s commentary: “She [i.e., the daughter of Light] is never called bride” (p. 177), must be wrong. Now, the key-problem of the Hymn seems to be to identify the Bride, since it may lead us to the very Gnostic system from which the Hymn originally had derived. Who is the Bride: the Near-Eastern “Maiden of Light” (παρθένος τοῦ φωτός); the Jewish Sophia-Achamoth; or rather a combination of both?
A. Dieterich brought our "daughter of Light" in connection with the *Lichtjungfrau* of the *Pistis Sophia* (pp. 126.14 ff.; 212.12 ff. ed. C. Schmidt et passim). She is accompanied by seven maidens (i.e., seven planets: pp. 138.26; 188.16 ff.; 211.33; 212.25; 216.7), and by twelve *διάκων* (i.e., by the twelve zodiacal signs: pp. 9.3; 126.18; 138.27; 148.24), just as is our Bride. Then Bousset enriched the picture in the classical opening chapters on "Die Sieben und die Μήτηρ" of his *Hauptprobleme der Gnosis* (pp. 9-91, esp. pp. 62 n. 1 and 69).

Lipsius (305 and 309 f.), Preuschen (75 f.), and especially Bornkamm (*Mythos* 85 f.) brought Bardesanes (Bardaišan, A.D. 154-222) into the picture. However, in my opinion, the enigmatic text of Bardesanes' *psalm ap. Ephraem the Syrian* (*Psalms* 55.5 ed. Beck) is irrelevant to our Hymn. It reads:

"When shall we see thy wedding feast, o youthful Spirit?" [asks the mother, the Holy Spirit, her daughter, either Earth or Water]. She [i.e., the youthful Spirit] is the daughter whom she [i.e., her mother, the Holy Spirit] set upon her knees and sang to sleep.

To be sure, a "Bridal chamber of light" does appear in Bardesanes. It is the *Crossing-place* at which the departed souls are being hindered because of the *sin of Adam* ("because the sin of Adam hindered them")—until the coming of the Savior Christ: "Therefore, everyone that keeps my word [says Jesus: John 8:52] death forever he shall not taste,—that his soul is not hindered when it crosses at the Crossing-place, like the hindrance of old..." But, as H.J.W. Drijvers had pointed out in his dissertation on Bardesanes, this idea is not Gnostic. For the souls are being stopped at the Crossing-place not because of a primordial Gnostic "fall" of the soul, but because of Adam's original disobedience of God's command. In conclusion, Bardesanes cannot help us in assessing the *Wedding Hymn*. His influence, however, seems to be detectable in the *Acts of Thomas*, but this is a different matter. For there is a strong possibility that our Hymn had been composed long before the *Acts of Thomas*: it was then inserted into the *Acts* by its author (Bornkamm 86 f. seems to confuse the two issues).

As for the Manichaeans, expressions like these: "Jesus Christ, receive me into Thy Bride-chambers of light" or "into Thy Aeons" do occur in Manichaean Psalms (e.g., on pp. 54.5; 63.3; 79.17-20; 80.18 and 20 f.;

81.13 f.; 117.29 f.; 150.18?; 197.5 Allberry). But the point is that the Manichaean sources cannot help us in explaining our Hymn for chronological reasons—they are much later than our Hymn (contra the approach of, e.g., Geo Widengren13).

3. Enter the Valentinian Vogue. With the ιερός γάμος between Sophia-Achamoth and Savior-Christ of the widespread Valentinianism we are on safer grounds (as already Thilo and Lipsius had recognized). The locus classicus is Irenaeus Adv. haer. 1.7.1: ... τὴν μὲν Ἀχαμώθ τὴν Μητέρα αὐτῶν μεταστήναι τοῦ τῆς Μεσότητος τόπου λέγουσι καὶ ἑντὸς Πληρώματος εἰσελθεῖν, καὶ ἀπολαβεῖν τὸν υμηρόν αὐτῆς τὸν Σωτήρα..., ἵνα συζύγια γένηται τοῦ Σωτήρος καὶ τῆς Σοφίας τῆς Ἀχαμώθ. Καὶ τούτο εἶναι “νυμφίον καὶ νύμφην” (cf. John 3:29), “νυμφόν” δὲ (cf. Matt. 9:15; 22:10) τὸ πάν Πλήρωμα.14 (Compare Hippolyt. Refut. 6.34.4.)

There can be little doubt about the identity of the Bridegroom in our Wedding Hymn: the Savior-Christ is the Light and the Enlightener in couplets 18 and 24 (cf. John 1:4-5; 1:7-9), and certainly He is the giver of the holy eucharist in couplets 25-26. After all, the Father of all is ἀγνωστός and invisible, while the Savior-Christ is visible: “by the vision of their Lord they have been enlightened,” (24).

But the striking similarity between our Hymn, the Acts of Thomas and the Valentinianism is in the sacramental character of the Bridal Chamber. It is expressed in the closing liturgical formulas of the Hymn. There are no less than seven future-tenses (“and they shall...”) in couplets 19-23 (καί... ἔσονται; καί... ἔσονται; καί παραμενοῦσιν; καί ἐνδυόνται; καί ἀμφιάσονται; καί... ἔσονται; καί δοξάσουσιν), capped with four explanatory aorists in couplets 24-26 (τὸ φῶς... ἔδέξατο, καὶ ἐφωτίσθησαν; τὴν βρῶσιν ἔδέξατο; ἔπιον δὲ καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ οἴου).

Doubtless, the redemption of the Aeons attending the sacrament of matrimony between Sophia and Christ serves as a guaranty for the future redemption of the pneumatics. This expectation is clearly expressed in the Acts of Thomas 12 (p. 118.7): προσδοκώντες (sc. ὑμεῖς) ἀπολήψεσθαι ἐκείνον τὸν γάμον τὸν ἄφθορον καὶ ἀληθινὸν, καὶ ἔσεσθε ἐν αὐτῷ παράνυμφοι συνεισερχόμενοι εἰς τὸν νυμφῶν ἐκείνον τὸν τῆς ἅλανσας καὶ φωτός πλήρη. Compare also c. 14 s.f. (p. 120.8), of the same Act 1, where the heavenly wedding is preferred to “this marriage that passes away from before my eyes” (Καὶ ὅτι ἔξωθενία τὸν ἀνδρα τοῦτον καὶ τοὺς γάμους τούτους τοὺς παρερχομένους ἀπ’ ἐμπροσθὲν τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν μου, ἐπειδὴ ἐτέρω γάμῳ

13 Especially in Mesopotamian Elements in Manichaeism (supra, n. 7), pp. 109-112.
The renunciation of the carnal, earthly (choic and psychic) perishable marriage in favor of the spiritual (pneumatic) everlasting wedding in heaven is one of the key-motifs of the Acts of Thomas, as Bornkamm (68-81) had well pointed out. First the king’s daughter in the city of Andropolis renounces her earthly marriage in Act 1 (cc. 4-15). Then—and especially—Mygdonia does the same in Acts 9 and 10 (cc. 88; 93; 98; 117, culminating in the c. 124, quoted above). Next, the queen Tertia (in Act 11, esp. c. 135), and finally the king’s son Vizan (Vazan) and his wife Mnasara (Manashar) follow the trend (in Acts 12 and 13, esp. c. 150). Most probably, this prevailing motif of the Acts of Thomas—the spiritual marriage to Jesus—was the reason for the author to insert our Wedding Hymn in Act 1.

The sacramental character of couplets 19-23, referring to the pneumatics (couplets 20-21) and being echoed in c. 12 s.f. of the Acts, is best explained by the sacrament of the “Bridal Chamber” as being practiced by the Marcosians:


16 Cf. Lipsius 303 f.; Bornkamm 77 f.

The redemption of the pneumatics through the Bridal Chamber was well known to the Valentinians, as Irenaeus (1.7.1), Clement (Exc. ex Theodoto 63-65; 68; 79), and Heracleon (Fr. 12 Brooke) attest. The sacrament of the Bridal Chamber (or the spiritual marriage for the consecrated ones) is prominent also in the Gospel of Philip (Nag Hammadi II.3), Logia: 61; 66; 67; 68; 73; 76; 79; 80; 82; 87; 95; 102; 124-127. In Logion 76 (p. 69.23) we even read that the Bridal Chamber is the highest among the sacraments (‘Redemption is ‘the Holy of the Holy.’ ‘The Holy of the Holies’ is the Bridal Chamber’). It also occurs in the Exegesis on the Soul (NH II.6), pp. 132.13 ff.; 132.25 ff. Both gnostic treatises are Valentinian in character.

In conclusion, the Valentinian background of the Wedding Hymn seems to be undeniable. If so then the Hymn may be dated at the end of the second century A.D.

4. Back to the Lichtjungfrau. At the same time, there are differences of significance between the Hymn and the Valentinianism. Apparently, we are expected to envisage the Bride (Sophia) as restored to the Pleroma (Bridal Chamber). But it is disturbing to find the seven planets (and their seven archons) in her company, “keeping her surrounded” (15). In the Valentinian system, they belong to the Hebdomad (our world), along with the twelve zodiacs. Moreover, it is unthinkable of the Valentinians to call the invisible Father “the first Demiurge” (as our poet seems to do in couplet 9). In Valentinianism, the first Demiurge is the Savior: Πρωτος μὲν οὖν δημιουργὸς ὁ Σωτήρ γίνεται καθολικός (Clem. Exc. 46.2; cf. Iren. 1.5.1: ... τά παρὰ τοῦ Σωτῆρα μαθήματα; ... τὸν Σωτῆρα δὲ αὐτῆς).

Also in Nag Hammadi VII.2 (The Second Treatise of the Great Seth), pp. 57.13 ff.; 66.1 ff. Cf. Kurt Rudolph, Die Mandaer, II (Göttingen, 1961), pp. 317 f.; 318 n. 3.—The Valentinian ιερός γάμος between Sophia and Christ may well have its source in the Ophitic system ap. Irenaeus 1.30.12: Et descendem Christum in hunc mundum induisse primum sororem suam Sophiam, et exsultasse utrosque refrigernantes super invicem: et hoc esse ‘sponsum et sponsam’ (cf. John 3:29) definiunt. Now, it is not difficult to see how different this account is from the one in our Hymn: The union between Christ and Sophia in the Ophitic account forms part of Christ’s descent (in <quem> [i.e. Iesum] Christum perplexum Sophiae descendisse, et sic factum esse Iesum Christum), not of their ultimate redemption in the Pleroma (Bridal Chamber), as in the Valentinian account and in our Hymn.
In addition, Bornkamm 83 had remarked that our Bridegroom does not show the characteristics of the Valentinian Σωτήρ, nor is there in the Hymn any hint at the “fall” of Sophia. On the other hand, the presence of the seven attendants (and twelve servants) around the Lichtjungfrau (e.g., in the Pistis Sophia) is established. Hence I would assume that our poet is combining the Valentinian Sophia with the Near-Eastern Maiden of Light as a Himmelsgöttin. Manichaen Kephalaia p. 24.18 ff. Polotsky explicitly state: “Wisdom (Σοφία) is the Maiden (παρθένος) of Light,” but, again, Manichaen sources are posterior to our Hymn.

5. Enter Jewish Wisdom Poetry. But there is more to it than that, when speaking of Gnostic syncretistic drive: our Bride displays some striking similarities with the Jewish Wisdom. Here are some of them.19

1. ἀπαύγασμα: In Sap. Salom. 7:26 Sophia is called ἀπαύγασμα φωτός ἀπὶ φωτὸς. In 7:29 she is described as being fairer than the sun, and above all the constellations of the stars; being compared with the light, she is found to be before it (φωτὶ συγκρινομένη εὑρίσκεται προτέρα). Compare Philo De migrat. Abrahami 40: σοφία... θεοὶ τὸ ἀρχέτυπον φέγγος, οὐ μίμημα καὶ εἰκὼν ἥλιος. Hence she is the enlightenment: Philo De spec. legg. 3.6: φωτὶ τῷ σοφίας έναυγάζομαι. 1.288: διανοίας δὲ φῶς ἐστὶ σοφία. De congressu erudit. gratia 47: Sophia is φῶς φυχῆς.20

1. κόρη: In Sap. Sal. 8:2 Sophia is compared to a beautiful bride. At 8:3 she lives with God (as a spouse?): συμβίωσιν θεοὶ ἔχουσα. In Philo De Cherubim 49, God is called Husband of Wisdom (σοφίας ἀνήρ).

3. ἀποφορὰ εὑωδίας: In Sirach 24:15 Wisdom gives forth a scent of perfumes as cinnamon and aspalathus (sweet balm), and as a choice myrrh, galbanum, onyx and stacte. Compare couplets 12-13 of our Hymn.


6. θυ πο στόμα ἀνέφρηκται: In Sirach 24:2 Wisdom opens her mouth in the assembly of the Most High, and is honored in the presence of His (heavenly) hosts. Cf. Prov. 8:4 ff.—As for the place of Wisdom (compare couplets 4; 9; 11 of the Hymn), in Sap. Sal. 9:4 (cf. Iren. 1.13.6), Sophia sits beside the God on His throne (δός μοι τὴν τῶν σῶν θρόνων πάρεδρον σοφίαν). In Sirach 24:4, she dwells in the highest places, and her throne is on a pillar of cloud (i.e., in heaven).

19 Many of the parallels between our Hymn and Sap. Sal. and Sirach have been pointed out by Klijn, in his Commentary, pp. 170-178: I have enlarged the list within the allotted space.
15. οὕς αὐτῆς ἐξελέξατο: Sophia herself chooses her attendants (in our Hymn: her groomsmen): Sap. Sal. 6:16, ὡς τοὺς ἄξιοὺς αὐτῆς αὐτῇ περιέρχεται ἥτοιοσα κλ. Cf. Proverbs 9:1-6, where Sophia is described as inviting people to her feast.

6. Three Problems.
(a) The Shining Royal Raiment. The elect ones—implying both the Aeons and the pneumatics—who are present at the heavenly Wedding Banquet shall put on two kinds of raiment: first, royal robes (βασιλικά ἐνδύματα); second, shining cloaks (togas, mantles, στολὰς λαμπρὰς, 22). And that reminds us at once of the Hymn of the Pearl in the same Acts of Thomas (cc. 108-113). For its poet seems to be insisting on the fact that the royal garment of the King's son consists of two pieces—ἔσθής plus στολή: c. 108 (p. 220.3 and 8 Bonnet); c. 110 (p. 221.1); c. 113 (p. 224.9 f.). Notice that the poet of the Wedding Hymn does not call the raiment of the wedding-guests ἐνδύμα γάμου (from Matt. 22:11-12), as one would expect him to do in view of the use of this phrase by the Gnostics—by the Valentinians (ap. Clem. Exc. ex Theod. 61.8, τὰ πνευματικὰ... σώζεται, “ἐνδύματα γάμου” τὰς φυχὰς λαβοντα; 63.1) and by the Naassenes (ap. Hippolyt. Refut. 5.8.44). Nor does he call it “robes that never grow old,” πέπλα μὴ παλαιούμενα, as the author of the Acts of Thomas does (c. 124, p. 234.3, inspired by Psalm 102:27; Hebrews 1:11); hence in Manichaean Psalms 146.42 and 155.10 Allberry: “I have received my washed clothes [cf. Gen. 49:11; Apocal. 7:14; 22:14], my cloak (στολή) that grows not old.”

Our poet calls it royal raiment, and that links him with the Hymn of the Pearl, where the name ἔσθής βασιλική may be explained by the fact that the prince’s raiment has the image of “the King of kings” (Parthian sāhinśāh) embroidered all over it (c. 112, p. 223.19 f.: καὶ ἥ εἰκόνων τοῦ τῶν βασιλέων βασιλέως ὄλη ὑ’ ὄλης; cf. c. 110, p. 221.19). In addition, the μεγιστάνες of our Hymn (20) may be paralleled by the μεγιστάνες, βασιλεῖς, οἱ ἐν τέλει, οἱ πρωτεύοντες and οἱ δυνάσται of the Hymn of the Pearl, c. 109 (p. 220.22); c. 110 (p. 221.16 ff.). Now, Geo Widengren has convincingly shown that the Hymn of the Pearl is best explained in the geographical, political and cultural background of the Parthian dynasty of the Arsacids (whose fall was in A.D. 226).²¹ And I wonder whether the poet of the Pearl Hymn and the poet of the Wedding Hymn may well be one and the same person.

To the question about the nature and origin of the heavenly "royal garment" of the pneumatics in our Hymn I have no positive answer. However, if, on the one hand, **Light** dominates the entire Hymn (Father of all, Bride and Bridegroom are all light; both the Aeons and the pneumatics receive light from them, 24), and if, on the other hand, the "glittering robe of splendor" of the *Hymn of the Pearl* seems to be no other thing but the primordial *Lichtmantel der Seele*, then it is an educated guess to assume that the "royal robe" of our Hymn suggests the Gnostic ultimate return of the spirit to the everlasting realm of Light.

If so, then the Manichaeans have correctly understood the *Hymn of the Pearl*: compare the role of the "raiment of light" in *Kephalaia*, p. 36.24 Polotsky; *Manichaean Psalms* 50.25; 81.9; 193.10 et passim; probably also in the *Psalms of Thomas* 2.32; 2.37 and 11.7. Other possible parallels may be: "Kleider (ενδυματα) des Lichtes" in *Pistis Sophia* pp. 227.5 and 11; 6.9 et passim; ξυδεμα ουφαναιν of the Sethians (in Hippolyt. *Refut.* 5.19.21); *Gospel of Philip*, Logion 24 (p. 57.19): "In this world those who put on garments are better than the garments. In the Kingdom of heaven the garments are better than those who have put them on." The Ophites ap. Iren. 1.30.9: *Adam autem et Evam prius quidem habuisse levia et clara et velut spiritualia corpora, quemadmodum et plasmati sunt: venientes autem huc, demutasse in obscursius et pinguius et pigrius.—The Qumran Manuale disciplinae*, col. 4.7 f., "every everlasting blessing and eternal joy in life without end, a crown of glory and a garment of majesty in unending light." 1 *Enoch* 62:15-16 (Garments of glory and life from the Lord of spirits for the righteous and elect ones risen from the earth); 71:1; 108:12 (Those who love God’s holy name will be clad in shining light... "and they shall be resplendent for times without number"). 2 *Enoch* 22: 8-10 (The raiment of the blessed, composed of God’s glory and light, "shining like the rays of the sun"). 1 *Cor.* 15:53; 2 *Cor.* 5:3-4; *Apocal.* 3:4-5; 3:18; 4:4; 6:11; 7:9; 7:13-14; *Ascension of Isaiah* 4:16; 7:22; 8:14 (about the spiritual bodies of the blessed); *Isaiah* 61:10; et alibi.

(b) The Thirty-two. The text as transmitted reads (7): τριακοντα καὶ δύο εἰσὶν οἱ ταύτης υμνολογοῦντες. Lipsius (306) had suggested that the thirty-two Valentinian Aeons are meant, praising the Father of all through the

---


mouth of Sophia. Since then this interpretation has become the *communis opinio*. But, first of all, the Valentinian Pleroma consists of thirty—not thirty-two—Aeons: an Ogdoad, a Decad, and a Dodecad. The Valentinians supported their Triacontad by means of Luke 3:23 (Καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν Ἰησοῦς ἀρχόμενος ὤσε ἐτῶν τριάκοντα): “That is why the Savior, they say, did nothing in public for years, thus setting forth the mystery of these Aeons” (Iren. 1.1.3; 1.3.1).

I think Lipsius’ number thirty-two is due to a misunderstanding of the text of Hippolytus (*Refut.* 6.31.3), which reads:

Καὶ γίνονται τριάκοντα ἄγων μετὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ τοῦ Ἀγίου Πνεύματος: τινὲς μὲν οὖν αὐτῶν ταύτη (scripsi: ταύτην P) εἶναι θέλουσι τὴν τριάκονταδα τῶν Αἴωνων, τινὲς δὲ συνυπάρχειν τῷ Πατρὶ Σιγῆ καὶ σύν αὐτῶς καταριθμεῖσθαι τοὺς Αἴωνας θέλουσι.

All Hippolytus seems to be saying here is that one Valentinian school of thought counted thirty Aeons by including the pair Christ-Holy Spirit (but excluding the pair Father-Sige), while another Valentinian school counted Father-Sige as one pair of Aeons (while excluding the pair Christ-Holy Spirit, probably as being an additional emanation outside the Pleroma): in each case the total number of Aeons is thirty, not thirty-two.

Back to the text of our couplet 7. In couplet 6 we read that the Bride’s mouth is open (because she utters all songs of praise, most probably of the Father of all). And in couplet 8 we learn that her tongue is like a door-curtain in a temple. Now, sandwiched between the Bride’s mouth and her tongue is our couplet 7. Therefore, it must refer to something in her mouth. Certainly, the Bride has not opened her mouth in order to listen to the praises of the Thirty-two—contra the translation of Werner Foerster: ‘‘Her mouth is opened and (it is) becoming to her. There are thirty-two who sing her praise.’’ I think the Syriac version can help us in restoring the text; it reads: ‘‘The twelve apostles of the Son, and the seventy-two thunder forth in her.’’ ‘‘In her’’ (in ea) means ‘‘in her mouth.’’ Thus read: ἐν ταύτη for ταύτην.

Now, Thilo (p. 136) had suggested that thirty-two teeth are meant here. But if our Bride is Sophia, then the later Jewish speculation of *Sefer Yetirah* (‘‘Book of Creation’’) may be a closer parallel. The Book opens with the statement that God created the world by means of the thirty-two secret paths of Wisdom, which consist of the twenty-two elemental letters

---

of the Hebrew alphabet plus ten Sefirot beli mah, total—thirty-two.\(^{25}\) If so, then Sophia seems to be using all the sounds available in her mouth to praise the Father of all (cf. 6b; 7b), in the same way in which she is using all her ten fingers to open the gates of the heavenly city Jerusalem (in couplet 11).

(c) *Her neck is shaped like the lofty steps* (9). The comparison is puzzling and unparalleled. My guess is that this image should be brought in connection with the gates of the Heavenly City (in 11). The vertebrae of Sophia’s neck are envisaged as the steps of a lofty stone-stairway leading to that City. Lipsius (p. 306 f.) referred to *Canticum* 4:4 (‘‘Your neck is like David’s tower girt with battlements’’) and 7:5 (‘‘Your neck is like a tower of ivory’’). A closer parallel may be found in the later *Acta Philippi* (composed ca. A.D. 400, referred to by Lipsius), c. 138 (p. 70.6 Bonnet), where the Savior’s cross of light, reaching down to the Abyss, has the shape of a ladder provided with steps (καὶ ἂν ὁ σταυρὸς ἐν όμοιώματι κλίμακος ἔχουσις βαθμοὺς), so that the masses of people may be saved and see again τὸ φῶς τοῦ θεοῦ. Bousset (*Hauptprobleme der Gnosis* 68) thought that the steps of the Bride’s neck ‘‘sind nichts anderes als die etagenmässig übereinander gelagerten Himmelssphären.”

7. **Conclusions.** Starting from the assumption that the extant Greek version of the Wedding Hymn still reflects the meter—the Semitic *Doppel dreier*—of the lost Syriac original, and using the extant Syriac version wherever it seemed reliable, I was able to offer a reconstruction of the corrupt Greek version of the Hymn. It displays an elaborate structure (of 11 + 3 + 3 + 9 couplets), and attests to a skillful poet. As a matter of fact, our Hymn proves to be a *gem* of Gnostic poetry, comparable only to the Naassene Psalm in Hippolytus, *Refut.* 5.10.2.\(^{26}\) The *Hymn of the Pearl* belongs to a rather different literary genre—a Hellenistic romance in verse, 105 couplets long.

The popular Valentinian ἱερὸς γάμος between Sophia-Achamoth and Savior-Christ makes the core of our Hymn. The Marcosian sacrament of the Bridal Chamber seems to have been known to our poet, while the influence of Bardesanes (and of Manichaeism) is not detectable in the

---

\(^{25}\) Cf. G. Scholem, in *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 16 (1971) 783-786. Bousset (*Hauptprobleme der Gnosis*, 69 n. 1) was the first to refer to *Sefer Yeẓirah* (cf. also Klijn 171). I am well aware of the fact that the “Book of Creation” is later than our Hymn (it may have been written somewhere between 3rd and 6th centuries A.D.), but its Pythagorean and other sources are much older. Cf. Franz Dornseiff, *Das Alphabet in Mystik und Magie* (Stoicheia, 7; Leipzig, 1922), pp. 35 and 140.—Compare also the thirty-two hermeneutic rules of the *Talmud*.

\(^{26}\) See supra, No. 8, pp. 80-88.
Hymn. The very theme of the heavenly "spiritual marriage" which dominates the entire Acts of Thomas seems to have been the reason for its author to insert our Hymn in the Acts.

At the same time, the Wedding Hymn shows a certain influence of the Near-Eastern Maiden of Light (such as is present in, e.g., Pistis Sophia), and it reveals a strong inspiration coming from the Jewish Wisdom poetry. Finally, if I am right in seeing some common motifs in our Hymn and in the Hymn of the Pearl, we may posit one and the same poet for both Hymns.

In brief, the Wedding Hymn is a classical example of the Gnostic syncretism. Most probably, it belongs to the Syrian Judeo-Christian Gnosticism, and is slightly earlier than the Acts of Thomas (end of the second century A.D.).

The Fortleben of the Hymn is of interest, attesting to its importance and popularity. First, a Manichaean poet had added a clumsy couplet (27), trying to adapt the Hymn to the Manichaean creed. Then a Syriac redactor undertook major surgery and rewriting, in a futile effort to eliminate the Gnostic elements of the Hymn and convert it to Catholicism. Of course, he had replaced the Manichaean closing couplet with the orthodox Trinitarian dogma.

However, once restored to its original shape, the Wedding Hymn shines in its pristine beauty—as far as it is reflected in its Greek translation,—just as does the Bride the Hymn so vividly depicts—φαίδρῳ κάλλει καταγάζουσα (2).
PYTHAGORAS AS COCK

Micyllus, the poor cobbler of Lucian’s Gallus, has had the overwhelming desire of becoming rich since his boyhood (28). To acquire gold has become an obsession for him (6-7, with reference to Midas), and that is why he is told that he was an Indian ant in one of his previous lives (μύρμηξ Ἰνδικός, τῶν τὸ χρυσὸν ἀναμμεττόντων, 16: compare Herodotus 3.102).

But Pythagoras, the master of transmigrations, reincarnations and ἀναμνήσεις of his previous lives, appears to Micyllus in a dream in the shape of a cock, and succeeds in curing him of his obsession (ἐγὼ σε ἱάσομαι, ὦ Μίκυλλε, 28)—first, by telling Micyllus of his own former unhappy existence as a rich and powerful king, poisoned by his own son (21-25), then by showing him (by means of magic) the wretched way of life of his rich neighbors Simon, Gnipho, and Eucrates (who in reality proves to be an ἀχράτης) (28-33).

The question is now: Why did Lucian’s Pythagoras choose the shape of a cock for his apparition and revelation? Why did he not appear as Pythagoras himself, or as the Cynic Crates (20), or else as a prophesying horse (for Pythagoras was that too: 20; 26; 27, with reference to Achilles’ Xanthus in 2)?

Rudolf Helm (Lucian und Menipp [Leipzig, 1906] 334), after referring to Tereus of Aristophanes’ Birds and to the dialogue Jackdaw of the Cynic Diogenes (Diog. Laert. 6.80) as examples of speaking birds, left the question unanswered. Pythagoras himself had been a jackdaw in one of his former lives (Gallus 20 and 27); nevertheless, he did not choose to appear as such to Micyllus.

Otto Skutsch (“‘Notes on Metempsychosis,’” Class. Philol. 54 [1959] 115b) first pointed out the link between Pythagoras and the peacock (cf. Ennius Annals 15; Persius 6.11 pavone ex Pythagoreo and Schol. ad loc.), and Lucian’s allusion to a Samian peacock (i.e., Pythagoras) converted into a Boeotian rooster (ἀλεκτρυὼν φιλόσοφος... ἀντὶ μὲν ἀνθρώπου ὅρνις, ἀντὶ δὲ Σαμίου Ταναγραῖος ἀναπέφηγας, 4); then he dismissed this possibility while stating: “This interpretation, however, seems entirely forced.” With good reason, for Lucian certainly did not introduce the cock into his dialogue just for the sake of a pun.

Jacques Bompaire, in his inspiring book Lucien écrivain: imitation et création (Paris, 1958) 697 n. 3, thought of the proverbial cock as prophet of evil (oiseau de malheur), while referring to Petronius’ Satyrikon 74.1-4. This
is not likely either, for Micyllus respectfully calls his enlightening cock-teacher ὤ σοφῶτατε ἀλεκτρυών (7).

The Socratic cock as a customary offering to Asclepius in gratitude for a cure (Plato Phaedo 118 a 7, τῷ Ἄσκληπιῷ ὁφείλομεν ἀλεκτρυώνα; compare Herodas 4.11 ff.; Artemidorus 5.1.9; Aelian Fr. 186 Didot = 98 Teubner) is out of place here. For neither is Micyllus a patient, nor is the sage cock, a leading character in the dialogue, a simple sacrificial animal.¹

Furthermore, the link between the cock and Hermes cannot explain the leading role of the cock in the dialogue either. For this link is used by Lucian to explain only two secondary achievements of the cock: (1) the ability to speak (‘I am a friend of Hermes, the most talkative and eloquent of all the gods,’ 2); and (2), the magic power of the cock’s feather, given to him by Hermes (‘Hermes, to whom I am consecrated, gave me this privilege,’ 28).

As for (1), Lucian himself dismisses this explanation while stating that the real reason (ἡ ἀληθεστέρα αἰτία, 2) for the cock’s ability to speak consists in the fact that he was a man not long ago (οὗτος γὰρ ὁ νῦν σοι ἀλεκτρυών φανόμενος οὗ πρὸ πολλοῦ ἀνθρώπος ἦν, says the cock in 3. Compare Stith Thompson, A Motif-Index of Folk Literature, D166.1.1 ‘Man transformed to Cock’).

As for (2), the cock’s right longest tail feather having the magic power of (a), Opening every door, and (b), Making a man invisible (ἀνοίγειν τῇ ὁ τοιούτῳ πᾶσιν θύραν δύναται καὶ ὁρᾶν τά πάντα οὐχ ὀρόμενος αὐτός, 28), neither power is due to a cock’s tail exclusively, but rather belongs to the motif of magic feathers (Stith Thompson, D1021) or hair in general. Compare, e.g., D1562.2 ‘Hair from fox’s tail opens all doors;’ D1361.10 ‘Magic feather renders invisible;’ B172.4 ‘Bird with magic bones and feathers;’ D1313.10 ‘Magic feather indicates road;’ D1323.16 ‘Magic feather gives clairvoyance;’ D1380.22 ‘Magic feather protects.’²

Finally, one may think it only natural for a household rooster to engage in a dialogue with his master, being ‘a close comrade and messmate of men’ (2). Perhaps so, but Lucian uses the cock’s close relation to men only as an opportunity for the cock to learn the human language without difficulty, no more (2). In addition, the dog is an even closer friend of man. Pythagoras himself was a dog in one of his previous

¹ Compare, e.g., Isidor Schefetlowitz, Das stellvertretende Huhnopfer (RGVV XIV.3, Giessen, 1914), 19.
² Compare H. Bächtold-Stäubli, Handwörterbuch des deutschen Aberglaubens, II, 1282; III, 1327; Stith Thompson, D1400.1.19 ‘Magic feather defeats enemy.’—The examples adduced by Tadeusz Zielinski, ‘Die Märchenkomödie in Athen,’ Jahresbericht der St. Annen-Schule (St. Petersburg, 1885), 22 and 58 n. 18, are irrelevant, since they deal with the motifs of the woodpecker’s mandrake (Springwurzel) opening every door (Bächtold-Stäubli VIII, 140 f.), and of the siskin’s stone rendering a man invisible (B.-St. IX, 888).
lives (20 and 26). And indeed the dog is the oldest Pythagorean reincarnation of a man in our sources (Fr. B 7 of Xenophanes, a contemporary of Pythagoras). And nevertheless, Pythagoras does not choose to appear to Micyllus in the shape of a dog, but prefers that of a cock instead.

Consequently, there must be a special reason for Lucian to make Pythagoras appear as a cock. Micyllus keeps addressing the cock as Pythagoras (4; 6; 7; 20), but Pythagoras prefers to be addressed as cock: ‘‘Of late I have often been a cock, for I liked that sort of life’’ (τὰ τελευταῖα δὲ ἀλεκτρων πολλάκις ἰσθήν γὰρ τὸ τοιοῦτο βίω), and ‘‘you had better call me a cock, so as not to slight a bird usually held in low esteem, though it has in itself so many souls’’ (… ἀλεκτρωνά ὄνομάζων ἄμεινον ἄν ποιοῖς, ως μη ἄτιμαξος εὐτελεῖς εἶναι δοιχοῦν τὸ ὀρνεον, καὶ ταῦτα τοιοῦτας ἐν αὐτῷ ψυχάς ἔχον, 20).

Accordingly, since the genre of the Cynic satire required an animal to serve as the leading character, I would like to suggest that the cock was the only such animal to serve as a link between Pythagoras and Apollo, all three of them being considered in antiquity as diviners by preference. Let me now substantiate this suggestion.

1. Cock-Apollo. It is only just lately that Pythagoras took the shape of a cock (καὶ πάνω ἐναγχος εἰς ἀλεκτρωνα σοι μεταβήσηκα, 4). His first life, however, was as the god Apollo: ‘‘How my soul originally left Apollo, flew down to earth and entered into a human body… would make a long story’’ (‘Ως μὲν εξ Ἀπόλλωνος το πρῶτον ἡ ψυχή μοι καταταμένη εἰς τὴν γῆν ἐνέδυ εἰς ἀνθρώποι σῶμα… μαχρὸν ἄν εἰῇ λέγειν, 16). Hence the ability of the cock to prophesy. He knows Micyllus’ past (‘‘Formerly you were an Indian ant,’’ 16); he knows his future (‘‘For you too will become a woman… many times,’’ 19). Cock is known as a prophetic animal by preeminence (cf., e.g., the ἀλεκτρομομαντεῖα).

The link between Cock and Apollo-Helios is well established too. The cock is often represented as sitting on Apollo’s arm (shoulder or head): Plutarch De Pythiae oraculis 400 C, ὁ τὸν ἀλεκτρωνα ποιήσας ἐπὶ τῆς χειρὸς τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος ἐωθηνὴν ὑπεθήλωσεν ὡραν καὶ καιρὸν ἐπιούσις ἀνατολῆς. The cock is Apollo’s sacrificial animal: A.G. 6.155; 12.24; Pausanias 5.25.9; Aelian Fr. 98 Teubner.3

2. Apollo-Pythagoras. The identification of Pythagoras with the Hyperborean Apollo can be traced as far back as Aristotle’s Περὶ τῶν

Pythagoras as Cock

Pythagoreów Fr. 191 Rose ap. Aelian V.H. 2.26 (‘Αριστοτέλης λέγει ύπο τῶν Κροτωνιατῶν τὸν Πυθαγόραν Ἀπόλλωνα Ὑπερβόρειον προσαγορεύεσθαι). Compare also Diog. Laert. 8.11 and 13; Porphyry Vita Plotini 2; Iamblichus Vita Pyth. 5; 8; 92; 135. As for Lucian, Pythagoras is being addressed as Ὁ Ἀπόλλων at Mortuorum dial. 6 (20).3.

Pythagoras’ renown as diviner is well established too (Diels-Kranz 14 A 7; 71 A 6). Aristippus of Cyrene (ap. Diog. Laert. 8.21) explained even the name of Pythagoras as deriving from Πύθ(ιος) and ἀγορ(ευειν): ὅτι τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἠγόρευεν οὐχ ἦττον τοῦ Πυθίου. In Lucian’s Vitae auctio 2 Pythagoras is introduced as μάντις ἀξιός (so also in Alexander 4 and 40).

3. Pythagoras-Cock. This link may be due to the fact that a white cock was taboo for the Pythagoreans: ἀλεκτρυόνος μὴ ἀπεσθαί λευκοῦ, ὅτι ιερὸς τοῦ Μηνὸς καὶ ἱετῆς Diog. Laert. 8.34; Aelian V.H. 4.17; Suda, s.v. 3124 Pythagoras [4.266.40 Adler].

In conclusion, the role of the cock in Lucian’s Gallus seems to be of greater importance than hitherto believed. For the cock acts as a reincarnation of both Pythagoras and Apollo. In addition to possessing magic powers (28-33), the divine cock through his persuasion and revelations succeeds in converting Micyllus to a Cynic adept of the vow of poverty. So effective and lasting was this conversion that Micyllus remained faithful to his vow even after his death. For in Lucian’s Cataplus 14-17 we find him appearing in Hades as a laughing scorners of the powerful and rich: ήμεῖς μὲν γὰρ οἱ πένητες γελῶμεν, ἀνιώνται δὲ καὶ οἰμώζουσιν οἱ πλούσιοι (15); γελασάμεθα οἰμώζοντας αὐτοὺς ὀρῶντες (17).
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<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defixionum Tabellae Atticæ ed. Wuensch</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democritus</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diodorus Siculus</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diodorus Tarsensis <em>In Deuteron. Fr. 20</em></td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diogenes Laertius</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empedocles</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ennius, <em>Annales</em></td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ephraem Syrus, <em>Psalmi</em></td>
<td>55.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epicurea, ed. Usener</td>
<td>25 n.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epigrammata Graeca, ed. Kaibel</td>
<td>16-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epiphanius, <em>Panarion</em></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eratosthenes, <em>Catasterismi</em></td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euripides, <em>Medea</em></td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eusebius</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historia ecclesiastica</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praeparatorio evangelica</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democritus</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diodorus Siculus</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diodorus Tarsensis <em>In Deuteron. Fr. 20</em></td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diogenes Laertius</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empedocles</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ennius, <em>Annales</em></td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ephraem Syrus, <em>Psalmi</em></td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epicurea, ed. Usener</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epigrammata Graeca, ed. Kaibel</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epiphanius, <em>Panarion</em></td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eratosthenes, <em>Catasterismi</em></td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euripides, <em>Medea</em></td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eusebius</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historia ecclesiastica</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praeparatorio evangelica</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen, <em>De usu partium</em></td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo-Galenus, <em>Historia philos.</em></td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geoponica</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgius Monachus, <em>Chronicon</em></td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregorius Nazianzenus <em>Or. in Iulianum 1.141</em></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heraclides Lembus, <em>Excerpta Politiarum</em></td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heraclitus Philosophus</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr. 12 Brooke</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heracleon Gnosticus <em>Fr. 12 Brooke</em></td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heraclides Lembus, <em>Excerpta Politiarum</em></td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heraclides Lembus</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excerpta Politiarum</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 Dilts</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heraclides Lembus</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excerpta Politiarum</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heraclides Lembus</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excerpta Politiarum</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heraclides Lembus</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excerpta Politiarum</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heraclides Lembus</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excerpta Politiarum</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heraclides Lembus</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excerpta Politiarum</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heraclides Lembus</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excerpta Politiarum</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heraclides Lembus</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excerpta Politiarum</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heraclides Lembus</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excerpta Politiarum</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heraclides Lembus</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excerpta Politiarum</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heraclides Lembus</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excerpta Politiarum</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo-Heracliti <em>Epist.</em></td>
<td>5.7.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.7.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermias <em>In Phaedrum</em></td>
<td>5.7.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 142.13 Couvreur</td>
<td>5.7.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 149</td>
<td>5.7.23-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herodas</td>
<td>5.7.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.74-76</td>
<td>5.7.25-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 n.9; 50</td>
<td>5.7.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.11 ss.</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herodotus</td>
<td>5.7.27-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>5.7.27-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 n.11</td>
<td>5.7.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.102</td>
<td>5.7.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>5.7.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8-10</td>
<td>5.7.30-37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>5.8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesiodus, <em>Theogonia</em></td>
<td>5.8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>5.8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>5.8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>5.8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>5.8.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>5.8.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126-127</td>
<td>5.8.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>5.8.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>5.8.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>5.8.20-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133-138</td>
<td>5.8.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>5.8.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124-125</td>
<td>5.8.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesychius, s.v. Βαυτό</td>
<td>5.8.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hieronymus, <em>Comm. in Esaiam</em></td>
<td>5.8.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ad 56:2</td>
<td>5.8.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158 n.25</td>
<td>5.8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hippocrates, <em>De priscia medicina</em></td>
<td>5.8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>5.8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hippolytus, <em>Refutatio omnium haeresium</em>, ed.</td>
<td>5.8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcovich</td>
<td>5.8.9-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prooemium 11</td>
<td>5.9.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120 n.1</td>
<td>5.9.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.18</td>
<td>5.9.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.1</td>
<td>5.9.16-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155 n.51</td>
<td>5.9.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.21.4</td>
<td>5.9.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155 n.51</td>
<td>5.9.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.22.3</td>
<td>5.10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 n.28</td>
<td>5.12-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.24.1-2</td>
<td>5.12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149-150</td>
<td>5.13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>5.13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.43.8</td>
<td>5.13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>5.14.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.46.1-2</td>
<td>5.15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>5.15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.47-49</td>
<td>5.16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121-122</td>
<td>5.16.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.47.1</td>
<td>5.16.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>5.17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.47.5</td>
<td>5.17.11-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>5.18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.48.3</td>
<td>5.19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>5.19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.19.1</td>
<td>5.19.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.48.4-6</td>
<td>5.20.4-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>5.20.6-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page Numbers</td>
<td>Index Locorum Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.23.1-27</td>
<td>6.31.3 171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.24.1</td>
<td>6.31.5 135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.25.1-4</td>
<td>6.32.7-8 138 n.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.26.1</td>
<td>6.32.8-9 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.26.2</td>
<td>6.34.4 165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.26.3-5</td>
<td>6.35.1 113; 114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.26.6</td>
<td>6.37 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.26.7</td>
<td>6.37.7 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.26.8</td>
<td>6.42.2 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.26.8-9</td>
<td>6.53.6-7 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.26.9</td>
<td>7.15-19 131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.26.10</td>
<td>7.15.1-2 131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.26.11</td>
<td>7.16.1-2 132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.26.11-13</td>
<td>7.17.1 132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.26.12</td>
<td>7.19.7 132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.26.13</td>
<td>7.21.1 132-133; 135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.26.14</td>
<td>7.21.4 132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.26.14-18</td>
<td>7.22.1 131 n.6; 136 n.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.26.15</td>
<td>7.22.3 135 n.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.26.16</td>
<td>7.22.6 131 n.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.26.17</td>
<td>7.22.16 131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.26.17-26</td>
<td>7.23.3 131; 139 n.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.26.20</td>
<td>7.23.6 131 n.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.26.21</td>
<td>7.24.5 131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.26.21-26</td>
<td>7.24.8-12 127-128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.26.25</td>
<td>7.25.9 126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.26.26</td>
<td>7.26 126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.25.27-28</td>
<td>7.29.3 120 n.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.26.28</td>
<td>7.29.14 130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.26.29-32</td>
<td>7.29.15 126; 128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.26.30-31</td>
<td>7.29.17 126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.26.31-32</td>
<td>7.29.20-21 128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.26.32</td>
<td>7.29.24 126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.26.32-33</td>
<td>7.29.25-26 129; 130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.26.33-34</td>
<td>7.30 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.26.34-35</td>
<td>7.31 130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.26.36</td>
<td>7.31.2 129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.26.37</td>
<td>7.31.2-4 129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.27.1-2</td>
<td>7.31.3 126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.27.2-3</td>
<td>7.31.3-4 129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.27.3</td>
<td>7.31.4 130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.28.1</td>
<td>7.31.5 128; 130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.28.3</td>
<td>7.31.6 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.9.7</td>
<td>7.31.8 120 n.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.12.1</td>
<td>8.12.2 137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.13.1</td>
<td>8.12.3 134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.15.1</td>
<td>8.12.5-7 135; 136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.18.1</td>
<td>8.12.6 135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.21.1</td>
<td>8.12.15 134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.24.1</td>
<td>8.13.1 135; 136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.24.2</td>
<td>8.13.2 136; 137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.24.3</td>
<td>8.13.3 135; 137; 139; 140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.24.4</td>
<td>8.13.4 136; 137; 138; 139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Index Locorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.14.1</td>
<td>136; 138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.14.2</td>
<td>135; 136; 138; 141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.14.3</td>
<td>136; 138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.14.3-4</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.14.4-5</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.14.6</td>
<td>135; 143 n.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.14.6-7</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.14.8</td>
<td>139; 140; 142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.15.1-2</td>
<td>134; 140-141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.15.2</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.8-10</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.9.1</td>
<td>147 n.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.9.5</td>
<td>Hipponax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.10.7</td>
<td>155 n.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.10 10</td>
<td>Homerus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.11.1</td>
<td>Ilias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.11.3</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.17.2</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.18.1</td>
<td>151 n.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.18.2-28.2</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.19.1</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.19.2</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.20.2</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.21.1</td>
<td>147; 149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.21.3</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.21.5</td>
<td>146 n.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.22.1</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.23.1</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.23.4</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.24.1</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.25.1</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.25.2</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.26.3</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.27.1</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.27.1-3</td>
<td>152; 153; 154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.28.1</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.28.4</td>
<td>151 n.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.28.5</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.28-30</td>
<td>155 n.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.29.1</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.30.4</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.30.5-8</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.30.7</td>
<td>151; 151 n.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.31.1</td>
<td>120 n.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.9.1</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.10.4</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.12.2</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.14.1</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.14.1-2</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.14.2</td>
<td>131 n.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.14.5-6</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.14.9</td>
<td>131 n.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.15.1</td>
<td>93; 94; 116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.15.1-7</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.15.2</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index Locorum</td>
<td>Page Numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nr. 16</td>
<td>53 n.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nr. 88</td>
<td>40 n.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nr. 234</td>
<td>40 n.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nr. 453</td>
<td>40 n.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inscriptiones Latinae: C.I.L.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. 33</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. 105</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. 4908a</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. 2191</td>
<td>40 n.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. 2400</td>
<td>40 n.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. 2481a,b</td>
<td>40 n.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. 31</td>
<td>40 n.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. 42</td>
<td>40 n.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. 200</td>
<td>40 n.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. 7255</td>
<td>40 n.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. 9016</td>
<td>40 n.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. 28562</td>
<td>40 n.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII. 3520</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII. 6239</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII. 6237</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII. 6255-6256</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII. 16940</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII. 22424</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX. 136-137</td>
<td>40 n.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX. 4722</td>
<td>40 n.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX. 4772</td>
<td>40 n.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI. 6716-80</td>
<td>40 n.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII. 7109</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIV. 4569</td>
<td>40 n.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inscr. Gsell</td>
<td>I. 2964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iosephus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antiquitates Iudaicae</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.263</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.348</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.160</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.297</td>
<td>151 n.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De bello Iudaico</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.119-149</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.119-161</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.123</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.125</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.128</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.129</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.132</td>
<td>146 n.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.134</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.137</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.140</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.143</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.146</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.147</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.150</td>
<td>150-151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.153-156</td>
<td>152; 153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.155</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.160</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.163</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Irenaei, Adversus haereses

Isidorus, Origines

Iuvenalis

Kathā Sarīt Sāgarā

48 n.12; 49

49 n.16; 50

177

177

6

177

7

177

16 n.28
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1168</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.146-155</td>
<td>16 n.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manichaei Kephalaia, ed. Polotsky</td>
<td>p.12.27-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p.24.18-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p.36.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p.43.2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p.163.28-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psalms, ed. Allberry</td>
<td>p.22.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p.50.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p.54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p.63.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p.79.17-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p.80.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p.81.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p.81.13-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p.117.29-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p.140.38-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p.146.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p.150.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p.155.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p.193.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p.197.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II, p.192.2-3</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turfan Fr. M 789</td>
<td>104 n.12; 126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcus Aurelius</td>
<td>2.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martialis</td>
<td>14.39.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musaeus, Hero et Leander</td>
<td>1; 6; 8; 239-241; 217-218; 329-330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nag Hammadi Codices</td>
<td>I.1 A,38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>77a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>77b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85; 111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INDEX LOCORUM 185

II.2 (Evangelium Thomae)

Logion 4

157 n.6 64; 113

69-70; 74; 77

74; 78

74; 76; 77; 78

64; 72; 73; 75

56

72; 73

64; 64 n.44; 76

70

70

70

70-71

70

73

73

73

74-75; 77

74-75

72; 73

64

72; 73

60; 74

63

64

64

56

56

56

56

56

60; 76 n.83

72; 73

72; 73

64

56

60; 72; 73; 76

60
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEX LOCORUM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.3 (Evangelium Philippi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:7-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:31-58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:51-52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Acta Apostolorum**

| 4:5   | 149      |          |      |
| 4:8   | 149      |          |      |
| 8:21  | 69       |          |      |
| 10:35 | 82       |          |      |
| 16:25 | 148      |          |      |

**Epistula ad Romanos**

| 7:12  | 82       |          |      |
| 10:6-7 | 62      |          |      |

**Epistula ad Corinthios 1**

| 2:9   | 104; 104 n.13; 126; 127 |          |      |
| 15:20 | 67-68    |          |      |
| 15:20-23 | 114 |          |      |
| 15:22 | 68       |          |      |
| 15:53 | 161; 170 |          |      |

**Epistula ad Corinthios 2**

| 5:3-4 | 161; 170 |          |      |
| 6:15  | 98       |          |      |
| 12:2  | 85; 86   |          |      |

**Epistula ad Galatas**

| 3:20  | 128      |          |      |
| 3:28  | 75       |          |      |
| 4:8-9 | 72       |          |      |

**Epistula ad Ephesios**

| 2:12  | 72       |          |      |
| 4:13  | 63-64    |          |      |
| 4:25  | 68 n.61  |          |      |

**Epistula ad Philippienses**

| 2:10  | 87       |          |      |

**Epistula ad Colossenses**

| 1:19  | 137      |          |      |
| 2:9   | 137      |          |      |
| 3:9   | 68 n.61  |          |      |

**Epistula ad Thessalonicenses 1**

| 4:5   | 72       |          |      |

**Epistula ad Timotheum 2**

| 1:10  | 160      |          |      |
| 2:18  | 68       |          |      |

**Epistula ad Hebraeos**

| 1:10-12 | 53     |          |      |
| 1:11    | 166; 169 |          |      |
| 6:4     | 160      |          |      |
| 6:19    | 160      |          |      |
| 9:3     | 160      |          |      |
| 10:20   | 160      |          |      |

**Epistula Iacobi**

| 3:14  | 68 n.61  |          |      |

**Epistula Ioannis 1**

| 1:7   | 77       |          |      |
| 2:9   | 77       |          |      |

**Apocalypsis Ioannis**

| 1:20  | 85       |          |      |
| 3:4-5 | 161; 170 |          |      |
| 3:14  | 98       |          |      |
| 3:18  | 161; 170 |          |      |
| 4:4   | 161; 170 |          |      |
| 4:7   | 38-39    |          |      |
| 5:10  | 59       |          |      |
| 6:11  | 161; 170 |          |      |
| 6:15  | 161      |          |      |
| 7:9   | 161; 170 |          |      |
| 7:13-14 | 161; 170 |          |      |
| 7:14  | 169      |          |      |
| 8:13  | 39       |          |      |
| 11:4  | 159      |          |      |
| 14:13 | 59       |          |      |
| 18:23 | 161      |          |      |
| 19:9  | 161      |          |      |
| 20:4  | 59       |          |      |
| 20:6  | 59       |          |      |
| 22:5  | 59       |          |      |
| 22:14 | 169      |          |      |

**Acta Apostolorum**

| 4:5   | 149      |          |      |
| 4:8   | 149      |          |      |
| 8:21  | 69       |          |      |
| 10:35 | 82       |          |      |
| 16:25 | 148      |          |      |

**Epistula ad Romanos**

| 7:12  | 82       |          |      |
| 10:6-7 | 62      |          |      |

**Epistula ad Corinthios 1**

| 2:9   | 104; 104 n.13; 126; 127 |          |      |
| 15:20 | 67-68    |          |      |
| 15:20-23 | 114 |          |      |
| 15:22 | 68       |          |      |
| 15:53 | 161; 170 |          |      |

**Epistula ad Corinthios 2**

| 5:3-4 | 161; 170 |          |      |
| 6:15  | 98       |          |      |
| 12:2  | 85; 86   |          |      |

**Epistula ad Galatas**

| 3:20  | 128      |          |      |
| 3:28  | 75       |          |      |
| 4:8-9 | 72       |          |      |

**Origenes, Contra Celsum**

<p>| 6.30  | 85; 111  |          |      |
| 6.31  | 85; 162 n.9 |      |      |
| 6.33  | 85; 111  |          |      |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orphicorum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr. 52 Kern Kern</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr. 58</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr. 98</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr. 104</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr. 109</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr. 243</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orphici Hymni</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>90 n. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>90 n. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.9-10</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostracon Cairo Nr. 8147</td>
<td>38 n. 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ovidius, <em>Heroides</em></td>
<td>90 n. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.103-106</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papyri Berolinenses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nr. 1026.23.17</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nr. 8105</td>
<td>38 n. 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nr. 8502.1 (BG 1: <em>Ev. Mariae</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 15.16-19</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 16.14-21</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nr. 8502.2 (BG 2: <em>Apocryphon Joannis</em>)</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 25.18-19</td>
<td>38 n. 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papyri Londinenses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nr. 121.677</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nr. 122.49-50</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Or. 1013 A</td>
<td>34 n. 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papyri Graecae Magicae, ed. Preisendanz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.26 et 237</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1748</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2198</td>
<td>85 n. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2251 et 2279</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2337</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2433</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3165</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.465</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.73 et 102</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.997</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxyrhynchus Papyri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>57; 70-71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>654</td>
<td>55; 58; 61; 63; 67; 68; 69-70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>655</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Paris. 5021</td>
<td>71 n. 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Vindobon. 17354.1 et 7-8</td>
<td>38 n. 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. Parisinus gr. 2511 f. 60v</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pausanias 1.31.4</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.25.9</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persius 6.11</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petronius 74.1-4</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pherecydes 7 B 2 DK</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>De opificio mundi</em></td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plato, <em>Leges</em> 10, 885 b</td>
<td>13-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Vindobon. 17354.1 et 7-8</td>
<td>38 n. 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. Parisinus gr. 2511 f. 60v</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pausanias 1.31.4</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.25.9</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persius 6.11</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>De opificio mundi</em></td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Page(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, 514 a 5</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9, 588 b-589 b</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10, 616 e-617 a</td>
<td>53 n.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timaeus</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 a 4</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 a 8</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 a-56 b</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plinius, <em>Naturalis historia</em></strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>51 n.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.221</td>
<td>49 n.15; 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.222</td>
<td>48 n.6; 48 n.12; 49 n.16; 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pliniius, <em>Epistulae</em></strong></td>
<td>40 n.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plotinus</strong></td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demetrius</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.7-8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>12 n.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demosthenes</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amatorius</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>755 A</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>764 B</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>De exilio</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>602 C</td>
<td>48 n.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>De facie</strong></td>
<td>943 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>De garrulitate</strong></td>
<td>4 n.12; 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>De Iside</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>352 B</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>355 E</td>
<td>42 n.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>371 F</td>
<td>42; 118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>372 D</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>382 C</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>De Pythiae oraculis</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400 C</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>De Stoicorum repugn.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1053 E</td>
<td>102 n.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>De superstitione</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167 D</td>
<td>17 n.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moralium</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr.24 Sandbach</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Poetae Melici Graeci</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr.985 Page</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Porphyrius</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>De abstinencia</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vita Plotini</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proclus, <em>In Plat. Timaeum</em></strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p.434.4 Diehl</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Procopius, <em>De bellis</em></strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.19.35</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prosper, <em>De providentia Dei</em></strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122-123</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130-133</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Psalmi Thomae</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.32 et 37</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Ptolemaeus, <em>Tetrabiblos (Apotelesmatica)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ptolemaeus Gnosticus, <em>Epistula ad Floram</em></strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Epiphan. Pan.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.6.6</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.7.5</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.7.7</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Qumran</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QS (Serek Hayyahad; Manuale disciplinae)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19-23</td>
<td>151 n.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7-8</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.11-14</td>
<td>153 n.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QH (Hōdāyōt; Psalmi)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.24 ss.</td>
<td>153 n.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.34-35</td>
<td>153 n.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.12-14</td>
<td>153 n.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QM (Serek Hammilhamā)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD (Canon Damascenus, Cairo)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.3-6</td>
<td>151 n.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scholia in Aristidis Orat.</strong></td>
<td>46.213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scholia in Aristophanis Plutum</strong></td>
<td>768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seneca</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Apocolocyntosis</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sefer Yeẓirah</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171; 172 n.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Senex</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sententiae</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183 Chadwick</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Solon</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr.27 West</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sophocles Electra</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stobaeus, <em>Ecl.</em></strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.22a.24</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Page Numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta, coll. ab Arnim</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, Nr.149</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, p.50.6</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II, Nrr.741-742</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III, p.75.9</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III, p.111.9</td>
<td>111; 123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suda</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s.v. &quot;Ἰακχος&quot;</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s.v. Πρίαπος</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s.v. Πυθαγόρας</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suetonius, Claudius</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nero</td>
<td>85; 103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synesius, Hymni</td>
<td>77; 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (2).63-64</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (2).67</td>
<td>150 n.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacitus, Annales</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>68 n.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targum ad Exod.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150 n.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teucer Babylonius</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Boll</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thocritus</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.19</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theognis</td>
<td>166; 169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theophrastus</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr.174.8</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 n.16</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timaeus Locrus</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valentinus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr.2 Völker</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vetus Testamentum (LXX)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genesis</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:6</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:8</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:27</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:28</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:1</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:7</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:8</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:9</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proverbia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:4 ss.</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:7</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:1-6</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canticum</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:5</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sapientia Salomonis</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:26</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:29</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:2</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:3</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:16</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:4</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siracides</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:28</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:2</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:4</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:15</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psalmi Salomonis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:3</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:2</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:21</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28:10</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40:22</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45:17</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61:10</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremias</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:11</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezechiel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:10</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:9; 7:13; 7:22</td>
<td>63 n.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT Apocrypha et Pseudepigrapha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Esdras</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Achamōth : 83; 165. As angel : 98. Cf. Sophia
Adōnaios, as angel : 98
Aeons, Gnostic : 64; 66; 84-85. Thirty (not thirty-two) Valentinian Aeons : 171
Agathēphoron : 118
Agathos Daimōn : 41; 118-119
Agathos Geōrgos : 41
Agrammatos Daimōn : 39
Ahura Mazdā : 95
Amazement, Gnostic : 60-61
Anagram Pater Noster AO : 35-37
Anapausis as the final goal : 58-60
Anasýrma, of Baubo : 20; 21; 24; 25-26
Andropolis : 166 n.17
Angels, twenty-four, in Justin’s Baruch 98-99. As trees of the Paradise : 99
Anōphērēs Dynamis : 102
Apocatastasis, Gnostic : 86
Aporrhoia : 101
Archanthropus, Naassene, as procreative : 66
Arepo < Harpon : 29; 40-41
Aristotle’s genos as sōros, in Basilides 131-132; as to mé on : 132
Aristotle’s god as ho mé on, in Basilides 132-133
Asclepiades of Samos : 1; 5
Babel (the planet Venus), as angel 98; 99; 111-112
Baptism of Elōhīm : 104-105
Bardaiān : 164
Baruch, as angel : 98; 108-109; 110; 112-113
Basileuein as the final goal : 58-60
Basilides, Gnostic : 117
Baubo : 20-21, 23
Bel, as angel : 98-99
Belias, as angel : 98
Brahmans, as Christians : 149-150
Brain, as symbol of the immobile Father : 124-125
Bridal Chamber, sacrament of : 163; 165-167
Catholicizing, of the original Syriac Wedding Hymn : 157
Cerebellum, as Serpent, and as Son (Peratics) : 124-125
Chaos, as Labyrinth : 84. To chythen chaos : 82
Činvat-bridge : 166 n.15
Claudius as a glutton : 50-51
Cock : and Apollo : 176; and Asclepius : 175. Cock’s feather opening every door : 175
Cosmic cloak : of Demetrius Poliorcetes : 12; of Isis (pallium cosmicum) : 53-54
Crossing place, for departed souls : 164
Demetrius Poliorcetes : 8; 11; 12-13
Demiarge, Jewish, in Gnosticism 102-103; 139-140. As “the third god” 139. As “the fourth god” : 87. Cf. also El-Shaddai, Just god; Neikos; Saklās Den, of Soul : 83
Disōmon zōidion (Virgo) = Isis with Horus : 95-96
Dog-like (kynoeides) Demon : 91
Doppeldreier, Semitic : 156-157
Dragon, Constellation, as Satan : 122-123. As Redeemer (Naassenes, Peratics) : 121-122
Dysaules : 25
Eagle of Revelation 4:7 : 38-39
Eater of life, Gnostic : 76-78
Echidna : 95-97
Eirēnopoios : 14 n.23
Elōhīm, in Justin : 93-94; 97-98; 99-100; 102-106; 107-108; 110; 112
El-Shaddai : 87; 98
Empedocles, Gnostic commentary on : 126-131. Empedocles’ noēma (B 110.10) in Gnostic interpretation 130. Empedocles’ Muse (B 131.1) as Gnostic Logos : 129-131
Engonasin, Constellation, as Adam 123-124. As Heracles : 110-111
Enlightenment, Gnostic, of Elōhīm 102-103; 104-105. Of Jesus : 113
Ephesia grammata : 37; 44
Épicurean gods : 14-17
epiškiazēn : 109-110
Essenes, Christianized : 147-149. Essene eschatology, in Hippolytus, a pastiche 152-154. Four classes of the Essene con-
gregation (Qumran), reinterpreted by Hegesippus (?): 150-151. Essenes and Sabbath: 150
Evil, origin of, in Justin: 106-108
Euphrates: 101

Final undressing, Gnostic: 74-75
Fourteenth Aeon: 64; 66

Gihon: 101

Gnosis, definition of (Naassene): 81; 85
Good God (ho Agathos), Gnostic: 93; 94-95; 103; 105; 113; 116-117. As Priapus, in Justin: 114-119

Hegesippus, Christianizing the Essenes in Josephus: 145; 150; 151; 153; 155

Heptaouranos: 54
Heptastolos, Isis: 52-54

Hermes, as Gnostic Redeemer: 110-111
Heraclitus, Life-cycle of thirty years: 65-66

Harpocrates: 40; 44. As boy-god of good luck: 42-43. As Eros: 41-42. As Priapus: 43. As chernibopastès: 42. As Carpcrates: 43; 52

Hebdomads: 85-86

Hierophoros, of Isis: 52-53


Hind as Soul (Psalm 41:2): 82; 86-87

Hippolytus of Rome, a plagiarist but not a forger: 144-145

Horus, as ‘master of magic’: 39-40

Hyposyrein: 109-110; 111

Iacchus: 22; 23; 24; 26-27. ἔχχυς is not cunnus: 26-27

Introspection leading to the knowledge of God: 142-143

Iota as perfect number (Monad and Decad): 135; 136. As perfect Man: 135. As Son of Man (Monoimus): 137-138; 141

Ithyphallus: 9 n.1. Hermocles’ Ithyphallus, text of: 9-10


Josephus, transmission of Bellum Iudaicum: 145-147

Lactancius, as angel: 98

Lichtjungfrau: 161, 163; 164; 167-168; 173


Lion as a symbol of the perishable world: 69-70

Lithinos: ὃ θήνως, ἁλλ’ ἄλθενως: 17

Logos as Mesites: 125; 128-131

Lychnomanteia: 7

Lychnos as god: 4-6


Man, the supreme god of Monoimus: 134-136

Man, creation of (Justin): 99-100. Man’s maturity at seven or fourteen years of age: 64-66

Mandaean wedding customs: 162

Manichaeans: 157; 164-165; 170; 173

Manna from heaven as the words of God: 78. As the flesh of Jesus (cf. John 6:37-58): 77-78

Marcus Aurelius, and Monoimus: 143

Mas(s)iqti (Aramaic): 84

Mebaqger (Qumran): 148-149

Mice gnawing iron, a consequence of famine: 48; 49; 50

Monoimus’ Letter to Theophrastus, text: 140-141

Moses: 109
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Naas (Nāḥāš), as angel (Justin) : 98; 106; 108-109; 113
Naassene Psalm : 80-81; 86
Netkos as the Jewish Demiurge : 126; 128
Noetic, pre-existent, universe (Basilides) : 117; 131-133
Nomos = noos : 82
Nous, as Naassene supreme god : 81; 82; 87. As Father of Jesus : 87
Oath of Elohim (Justin) : 103-104
Omphale, in Justin : 111-112
Ophitic Exegesis of Aratus : 121-124
Ophiuchus, Constellation, as Gnostic Redeemer : 123-124
Orthos logos : 129-130
Oulomos : 92
Pairi-daeza : 99
Parustia : 10
Passover, Monoimus’ explanation of : 140
Peleky : 86
Pentad : 34 n.24
Pentagrammatos Daimôn : 34 n.24; 39
Personification : of Lychnos : 4-7; of nuptial bed : 6-7
Phanes, as Phaos : 90-91; as Eros : 90; as Priapus : 90
Pharaoh, as angel : 98
Pherecydes : 96-97
Phicola : 91-92
Philia, as Gnostic Redeemer : 128
Phylactēria : 31; 38
Pishon : 101. Φισών - φειδωλός : 102
Plato : 13-14; 105-106
Pneuma : 87-88; 102. Pneuma as sperm : 117-118; 124-125
Pneumatic medical treatise, Gnostic re-interpretation of : 124-125
Pre-existent Jesus : 88
Priapus : as Harpocrates : 43; as the Good One (Justin) : 114-119. Priapos and prio-poiēn : 116-117
Pythagoras : as Apollo : 165-177; as cock : 176; 177
Raiment, Royal : 169-170
Redeemer, Naassene, Jesus : 87
Resurrection of the flesh, belief attributed to the Jews by Hippolytus : 154. Resurrection, spiritual : 67-68
Return to the asexual Adam : 75-76
Le Roi Soleil : 11-12
rotae et opera, “tortures and toils” : 32; 34; 35
Royal palace, of Soul : 83
Sael (Sheol), as angel : 98
Saklas : 102-103
Satan, as angel : 98
Sator, as God Creator : 30-31
Satraps, Zodiacal : 100-102
Schutzgott : 4-5; 6; 11; 31; 34; 39
Seal, of marriage between Elöhim and Edem : 100. Gnostic seals as “passes” : 84
Seelenkerze : 7
Sethians and the Mysteries at Phlya : 89; 92; 125-126
Shekinah is present wherever three study the Torah : 71-72
Six : a six years old boy is wiser than an old man : 64; 66
Son-of-Man : as the supreme god of Monoimus : 134-140; as the perfect Iota : 135-138; as telete : 141-142; as the absolute beauty : 139; as the source of Creation : 136; 138-139
Sophia : as God’s bride : 168; as the bride of Christ : 161; 165; her eloquence : 168; as the Mesites : 161; her neck is a ladder leading to heaven : 172
Sōr (Coptic) = Horus : 44-45
Soul, as life-giver (Naassene) : 82-83
Sphinx : 18-19
Spirit, of God (Nous), Naassene : 84; 87. Of Elöhim, being tied up in every living man : 105-106; 108; 113. Spirit vs. soul : 100; 108
Spontaneous Gnostics : 121
Stereōma : 104-105
Syncretism, Gnostic : 93; 98; 100; 110-111; 117; 119; 134
Tēhôm (Hebrew) : 62; 82
telēωσις, ἀπηρτισμένη, Gnostic : 75-77
Tetartēmorion, as a river : 101-102
θεοὶ ἐπήκοοι : 15
Third God : 139. Third Messenger : 114
Thirty-two teeth as the paths of God’s wisdom : 171-172
Three-principle Gnostic systems : 85; 86; 92; 93
Tigris : 101
Trigons, Zodiacal, : 100-102
tόπος = pudendum muliebre : 22
Tunic, magic, of Heracles, as his dynamis : 111-112
tύπος = τὸ τετυπωμένον, “tattoo” : 23-24
Two ears - two brains : 57
Valentinianism : 165-167
Vowels, of magic invocation : 34; 41; 44
Wedding, spiritual in heaven, a key-motif of *Acta Thomae*: 166


Week: the perfect week of a newly born child: 64-65

-Zauberformel* (Charm), its magic unity: 33-34