

WORSHIP IN SECOND-CENTURY GNOSTICISM

Studies in the Ritual Life
of some Early Christian Minorities.

DAVID HOWARD TRIPP

VOLUME I

Submitted in accordance with the requirements for
the degree of Doctor of Philosophy,

UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

Department of Theology and Religious Studies,

November 1984.

BEST COPY

AVAILABLE

Variable print quality

**BEST COPY
AVAILABLE**

TEXT IN ORIGINAL
IS CLOSE TO THE
EDGE OF THE
PAGE

ABSTRACT
SYNOPSIS OF DISSERTATION.

This series of interconnected studies in the ritual practice of the groups associated with the early Christian movement which are now usually now described as 'Gnostic', is a modest essay towards a survey of the subject, last undertaken by Bousset in 1907 and Fendt in 1922.

Of the three main groups of sects which became distinguishable during the investigation, these studies are concerned with two:- those here designated 'Cults of Power', and those showing signs of having their origin in the separation of church from synagogue. A consideration of the third group, here entitled 'The Gentile Counter-Churches', is omitted, to keep this dissertation within manageable compass; it would have been comparatively brief, because of the paucity of evidence. At the outset, it had been expected that general characterizations would be possible. However, the repeated discovery that the expectation of unifying characteristics, or even of some sort of underlying unitive rite, was not substantiated by the material, made it necessary to revert to a detailed survey of

each detectable ritual association on its own, with the minimum recourse to evidence from other contexts, except to note the clearest parallels and probable borrowings.

Chapter One lists the questions asked; surveys the present literature and the sources (both patristic and sectarian); lists and classifies the sects to be examined; and discusses method.

Chapter Two examines the 'Cults of Power', after a definition of that term and a characterization of such cults, past and present. The topics are:- Simon Magus; Menander; Saturnil; Cerdo; the Carpocratians; Marcus and the Marcosians; and Elchasai. In the course of this chapter, in connection with Marcus, a major suggestion is made as to the original order of Adversus Haereses I, which affects all presentations of Valentinian liturgy, and hence of all 'Gnostic' worship in general.

Chapter Three argues that a degree of liturgical continuity, combining baptismal devotion with 'Ascent-of-the-Soul' Ritual, can be traced through the users of the Gospel of Thomas, the Peratae, the Naassenes/

Chapter Three argues that a degree of liturgical continuity, combining a baptismal devotion with 'Ascent'-ritual, can be traced through the users of the Gospel of Thomas, the Peratae, the Naassenes/Ophites, Justin the Gnostic and the 'Phibionites' of Epiphanius, and certain Jewish-Christians who claimed a 'James'-tradition. (Apparently cognate groups, the users of Apokryphon of John and of the Petrine apocrypha from Nag Hammadi, offer insufficient liturgical data to be incorporated here). It is argued that this complex of sects derives from the chaos of the separation of Christianity from Judaism.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thanks, for which words are inadequate, are due to my supervisor, the Revd Dr L.W.Barnard, for his patient counsel during ten years; to my family and my colleagues in circuit, hospital chaplaincy and (since September 1983) in Lincoln Theological College, for their patience with my preoccupation; to the librarians of the University of Leeds, North Manchester General Hospital, Dr Williams's Library and of the West London Institute of Higher Education, for their willing helpfulness - and to all previous workers in this field, listed in the bibliography.

PRIOR PUBLICATION

An earlier form of the argument as to the purpose of the Gospel of Thomas in Ch.Three was published in Expository Times, 92/2 (November 1980) 41-4, as 'The Aim of the Gospel of Thomas'. A survey of the literature on Gnostic worship, much shorter than that in Ch. One, was included in The Study of Liturgy (edd. C.Jones, G.Wainwright, E.Yarnold, London, SPCK 1978, 2nd imp.1980) 52-3.

ABBREVIATIONS USED

General:-

To facilitate reading, the notes have been kept to a ~~minimum~~ ^{minimum}, and as far as possible incorporated into the text. Where they are unavoidable, they are framed according to the conventions of medical literature, and generally limited to author's surname and date of publication. For ease of reference to the bibliography, the latter is gathered into a separate volume.

AIBL	Académie des Inscriptions et de Belles Lettres,
ALW	Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft (Maria Laach)
ANT	Apocryphal New Testament, ed M.R. James, (Oxford), 1924 ² 1953.
ATR	Anglican Theological Review (New York)
Am Jl Psychiatry	American Journal of Psychiatry (New York)
BLE	Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique (Toulouse)
BZ	Biblische Zeitschrift (Basel)
CBQ	Catholic Biblical Quarterly (Boston)
CQR	Church Quarterly Review (London)
DAC	Dictionary of the Apostolic Church, ed J. Hastings, Edinburgh.
DACL	Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie (Paris)
DThCath	Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique, ed Vacandard, Paris.

ET	English translation
EvTh	Evangelische Theologie (Erlangen)
ExpT	Expository Times (Edinburgh)
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Litteratur des alten und neuen Testaments
GCS	Griechische christliche Schriftsteller
HBS	Henry Bradshaw Society
HDB	Hastings, <u>Dictionary of the Bible</u> (Edinburgh)
HTR	Harvard Theological Review (Cambridge, Mass.)
JAC	Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum (Münster/Westfalen)
JBL	Journal of Biblical Literature (New Haven)
JBR	Journal of the Bible and Religion (Brattleborough, Vermont)
JEH	Journal of Ecclesiastical History (London)
JLW	Jahrbuch für die Liturgiewissenschaft (Maria Laach)
JTS	Journal of Theological Studies (Oxford)
LMD	La Maison-Dieu (Paris)
LQF	Liturgiegeschichtliche Quellen und Forschungen (Münster/Westfalen)
MScR	Mélanges de science religieuse (Bruges)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Synopsis of Dissertation	ii
Acknowledgements; Prior Publication	v
Abbreviations Used	vi
Table of Contents	x
Ch. One: Introduction	1
1. Subject	1
2. Principal Sources: a) the hereseologists	8
3. The Catalogue of heresies and sects	13
4. Principal Sources: b) sectarian texts	16
5. A Scene Set: Worship in the Hellenistic World	27
6. A Programme	39
C.Two: The Cults of Power	40
General Considerations	40
1. Simon Magus	53
2. Menander and Baptism into Incorruptibilit Incorruptibility	104
3. Saturnil of Antioch	126
4. Cerdo	132
5. The Carpocratians	134
6. Marcus and the Marcosians	157
7. Elchasai	220
Some Concluding Remarks	242

Illustration

between 244, 245

Ch. Three: Groups Originating in the Separation of
Christianity from Judaism 245

1. Christianity within Judaism, and its
Acquisition of a Separate Identity 245
2. The Sufferings of the Jews 250
3. Jewish Liturgy and Prayer after the
Destruction of the Temple and the
Banishment of Jews from Jerusalem 260
4. Jewish Liturgical Responses to 'Minuth' 287
5. Peratae - Naassenes - Ophites: an
Ordering of the Material 292
6. The Gospel of Thomas 350
7. The Peratae 368
8. Documents Immediately Related to
the Gospel of Thomas 379
9. The 'Ophite Diagram' 398
10. 'James'-Traditions 416
11. Some Liturgical Traditions of
Uncertain Provenance 447
12. Concluding General Remarks 464

Illustrations: see between pp.244 and 245.

Vol. IV - Bibliography. 1

Bibliography Supplement 148

CHAPTER ONE INTRODUCTION

SUBJECT, SOURCES, METHODS.

1 Subject

The title of this investigation indicates the subject:
Worship in Second - Century Gnosticism - Studies in the Ritual
Life of some Early Christian Minorities.

a) "Ritual Life"

This investigation is a liturgical study, not an exercise in the history of ideas (although the insights of that discipline are respected and invoked); it is an attempt to detect and describe ritual life, things done in ritual settings and for ritual purposes, an attempt to appreciate what participation in these acts felt like,⁽¹⁾ and (where evidence is available) what the participants intended to achieve by them. The professed theology of the actors is not the only, nor indeed always a reliable, guide to the intentions and sensations and relationships of the actors; indeed, practice and conscious affirmation were not always in step in the Great Church,⁽²⁾ and such inconsistencies are even less surprising when they occur in groups that are marginal, dissident, reforming or threatened.

b) "Gnostics"

Since this study is not one of the history of ideas, it is not an investigation of the nature of "Gnosticism". Indeed, as the work has progressed, the concept of a single entity of "Gnosticism" has proved less and less helpful although it has not been necessary to adopt the severely negative judgement of Morton Smith that the entire concept is a mischievous academic fiction.⁽³⁾

1 cf Mendelson 1967, Green 1977. 2 cf Keifer 1977
3 see Morton Smith 1981

There were, after all, certainly a number of groups who explicitly and deliberately called themselves *ἑωστῆται*, "Men of Insight": the followers of Karpokrates, the Naassenes, the "followers of Prodikos", the so-called "Phibionites" and "Archontics". Some of the features of the life and thought of these groups appear also in others, and there does emerge from the chaos of second-century Christianity an amorphous but distinguishable bundle of tendencies that is justifiably studied, for some purposes, as a unity. But it is saying far too much to speak of a "Gnostic religion", as is done for example by Hans Jonas in recent times,⁽⁴⁾ and by Bousset, Anz and so many others in former days.⁽⁵⁾ Such a view - all too convenient for polemical purposes - is dangerously misleading, for it encourages a policy of basing calculations of historical probability upon a priori assumptions which are *disguised as* ~~really~~ definitions. It is not necessary to be a specialist in philosophy to see a crucial distinction between the synthetic and the analytic. For example: the interpretation of Pliny's evidence in Ep x 96 (97) is not helped by suggesting that the Christians of Amastris or Sinope could not have sincerely given up Christian practice because they were Gnostics, who by definition were indisposed to court martyrdom, or they must have been Catholics because they did court martyrdom, which Gnostics by definition did not do!

It is perhaps best to work with a description (rather than a definition) of Gnosticism as a variable conglomeration of spiritual aims - a quest for peace through understanding, through speculation, through withdrawal, through mastery, through mysticism, by affirmation

4. as in Brox 1966, Casey 1936, Wilson 1958
5 Jonas, Gnostic Religion 1963. 6 Bousset 1907,
Anz 1897 7 Bauer (W.) 1972, 90-1

of the subjective; a variable combination of religious methods - myth-making, myth-mending, myth-reinterpretation, prayer, abstention from prayer, re-interpretation or elaboration or rejection of sacraments and symbolic actions, intense individualism, intense minority collectivism; and tendency to value a number of common mythical forms: the Humiliated Lady,⁽⁸⁾ the Return of the Wanderer,⁽⁹⁾ the Ascent of the Soul with its pass-words and so on.⁽¹⁰⁾

Another danger of working with an elaborate definition of a "Gnostic religion" is that attention comes inevitably to be drawn too exclusively to philosophical systems, whereas on elementary historical grounds, far greater influence is to be expected of systems of behaviour, and especially ritual behaviour. Such a method is not indifferent to theology; but, in the words of Francis Crawford Burkitt⁽¹¹⁾ "Hymns may lie behind theology, as well as theology behind hymns".

c) "Minorities"

The groups whose practices are under consideration were in most cases sects deservedly so entitled⁽¹²⁾, followers of a specified leader, but this is not the case with all of them, and the role of the leader differs significantly from one example to another. Despite every methodological effort, "sect" cannot be freed from pejorative overtones and, although the investigator too cannot disguise unfavourable judgements ^{at many} ~~on many~~ places, historical method is subtly compromised by building such adverse judgements into the definition of the task.

8 Kramer 1950/1 9 cf Kaster, 1970, ch.24 (Sinuhe)

10 Bousset, Himmelsreise 11 Church and Gnosis 1932

12 cf Shorter Oxford English Dictionary 1947 II, 1827 (defn 3)

Like "sect", "cult" is currently being used in sociology⁽¹³⁾ to denote a particular style of group life, and especially a distinct phase of group development. In a theological discipline, "cult" is best used of a particular direction of worship, to a divinity, or to a saint, etc., which may take place at very different social levels and in widely varying communal styles. Some of the groups to be noticed here defined themselves as cult-associations (? Marcus, Peratae,) but this is not apt to all, and where the classification is applied from outside (Ophites) it is badly misleading.

"Heresies", as being "associations with divisive and arbitrary opinions", could in most cases have been applied; but this too suffers from the disadvantage of pejorative meaning, and is also inept as prejudicing sympathetic insight into the self-perception of the groups studied, some of whom felt themselves to be the norm for the Christian world, (the users of the Gospel of Thomas, and also those of the "Gospel of Philip", are examples).

It might be objected that "minorities", too, is prejudicial, especially if the suggestion of Bauer⁽¹⁴⁾ that in the earliest Church no majority orthodoxy can be assumed, is accepted or held to be probable. Even if Bauer was correct, however, the circumstances which his theory was designed to depreciate nonetheless finally prevailed - the dominance of a doctrinal orthodoxy beside which other views, however loudly they dismissed the majority as "katholikoi", common-or-garden Christians,⁽¹⁵⁾ were and remained minorities. Quite apart from the questions of minorities and majorities (and in the

13Wallis 1975, ch 1 14 Bauer (W) 1972, ch 5, 10
15 Irenaeus, AH, III.xv.2 (II,79 Harvey)

present state of our knowledge of second-century Christianity, there are many times and areas where such questions are unanswerable), the issue of orthodoxy is not an anachronism at this period, even although there may be no standard or majority convention to appeal to, no element of "Securus judicat orbis terrarum" - to say nothing of "Roma Locuta, causa finita est"!

The Acts (see especially xxi. 20 - 29) is at least in part directed to the issues of principle bitterly contended by Jewish Christians of differing views and Gentile Christians; and in Paul's speech at Miletus (xx 17 - 38) to the presbyter-bishops of the Ephesian Church the apostle is depicted as for^eseeing - of course, with the wisdom of hind-sight - the incursions of "savage wolves" (29), presumably bearers of alien pagan influences, and the emergence "even from your own body" of "men who will distort the truth to induce the disciples to break away and follow them" (30. NEB). The preoccupation of the Pauline letters with issues demanding the relation of the Gentile Christians to Israel needs no demonstration, but other doctrinal controversies are also at ^{least} making their debut.⁽¹⁷⁾ The fourth Gospel's bitter tone in reference to "the Jews" urgently needs explanation; and in addition to the shame and resentment provoked in a Christian Jew by the failure of so many of his people to receive Jesus as Messiah (and also perhaps the irritation of a Galilean with "men of Judah"?) a reference to Jewish Christians (cf. Jn vi. 59 - 71) may be a secondary or even a primary theme.⁽¹⁸⁾ In another ^{Johannine} ~~Johannine~~ writing, I John, if Konrad Weiss⁽¹⁹⁾ is correct, it is possible to detect an early phase in the distinction of a

normative from misleading versions of the Christian proclamation. In this last case, the pastoral method apparently adopted, of sharing the language of novel theories to facilitate a fruitful dialogue, is in marked contrast to the all-absorbing political motivation posited by Bauer⁽²⁰⁾. In one respect, Bauer's criticism of an unquestioning acceptance by historians of the hereseologists' terminology did not go far enough: weight must be given to the observation of N.A. Dahl⁽²¹⁾ that anti-heretical polemic was itself one of the factors that created heresy.

The contention of Bauer, as modified by H.E.W. Turner,⁽²²⁾ that issues of orthodoxy were not at first so clearly discernible or determinable as they come to be in the light of experience, and that there was for "a long time" a penumbra of undefined matters around the central core of Christian teachings, has much to commend it. It illustrates, and is in some measure confirmed by, the developing concept of "heresy" (to speak anachronistically) in the Pastoral Epistles.⁽²³⁾ In II Tim., the doctrinal danger is perceived as a preoccupation "with foolish and ignorant speculations", *μωρὰς καὶ ἀπαιδεύτας ζητήσεις* (ii 22), which lead to quarrels, distract the mind from moral concentration, and expose people fascinated by them to exploitation (ii. 23 - iii. 7); the way of orthodoxy is to avoid subtleties and keep to basic matters. In Titus, doctrinal danger is created by men *προσέχοντες ἰουδαϊκοῖς μύθοις* (i.14), a description entirely apt to the content of such works as Hypostasis of the Archons and other documents produced by the chaos of the separation of Christianity from Judaism. Finally, with I Tim.

20 Bauer (W) 1972, ch.10 21 Dahl 1964

22 Turner (H.E.W.) Pattern of Christian Truth 1954

23 assuming the order posited by Falconer 1937

heterodoxy has grown into a complex of "Subversive doctrines", with different encratite systems of ethics, and questioning of the goodness of creation (iv. 1 - 5). By observing this development, I have been led to the classification of Christian minorities which provides the structure of the presentation.

d) "Early Christian"

No attempt is made here to determine whether or not any specified group was "Christian", except in so far as it belongs or does not belong within the framework of Christian history. Simon Magus (for example) was denied by Justin Martyr the name of Christian; yet he received Christian baptism, belonged to a Christian fellowship and shared its worship. No doubt the condemnation of Peter warns him (and informs us) that Simon's understanding of religion is utterly inadequate to comprehend the Christian faith, and it is hardly possible to ask if Simon could at any time of his life have answered us if we were to question him as to his being a Christian; yet he and his reputation have affected Christian History, and his story is part of the Christian family lore, for good or ill. The case of Marcus is a little different: it will be shown that the proper milieu of his "sacrament" is Hellenistic magic, and that his use of Christian rites and words is hardly at all informed by Christian belief; but what is known of him concerns an event in a Christian Church's worship life, and he too must for our present purposes be reckoned among the Christians.

2 Principal Sources : a) The Hereseologists

Despite the disadvantages inevitably attendant upon the use of hostile evidence, the hereseologists remain the first of available sources for an investigation such as this. In the course of this work, as in the researches of others, the newly available documents from Nag Hammadi have both supplemented and corrected, but at many points confirmed, the accounts of the Catholic fathers. Some brief observations on the hereseological texts must be made.

i) The "Lost Syntagma" of Justin, and his "First Apology"

The words of Justin in I Apol xxvi, where he refers to a general work against sectarian forms of Christianity that he has beside him, and which is available to the Emperor if he is interested, (1) naturally suggest (though they do not state outright) that the work is his own composition. The possibility that this work may lie behind Irenaeus' statements about the heresies that flourished before his own time is noted at several places where it is relevant to the dating of the information discussed. However, the extent and method of such borrowing by Irenaeus cannot be reliably estimated; nor is it possible to define the relationship between Justin's book (if it existed) and other sources used by Irenaeus, such as "the tradition of the Elders".⁽²⁾ I Apol. is also a source in its own right.

ii) The "Adversus Haereses" of Irenaeus (3)

In the discussion of Marcus ("Cults of Power", 6) a major issue is raised as to the place of Irenaeus' account of this man and his disciples in the first book of Adversus Haereses (A.H.)

1 ἔστι δὲ ἡμῖν καὶ σύνταγμα κατὰ πασῶν τῶν γεγενημένων αἱρέσεων συντεταγμένον, I Apol. xxvi 8, p.44 Blunt
2 cf Bauer (U) 1922, 170

as first written. The suggestion there made ⁽⁴⁾ is so closely tied to the discussion of Marcus that it is not argued here. Nonetheless, it is of considerable import; for, if correct, it separates Marcus from the Valentinian schools entirely, and so precludes the interpretation of the Valentinian systems in terms of Marcus' ritual ⁽⁵⁾, incidently setting aside most of the evidence previously adduced on the matter of Valentinian rites; it also precludes the interpretation of Marcus in terms of a Valentinian theology, thus obviating the need to marry a speculation both subtle and profound with a mystagogy that is, frankly, gross; and it makes necessary some new exploration of the supposedly Valentinian "Sacrament of the bride-chamber" and commendatio animae.

iii) The "Hypomnemata" of Hegesippus ⁽⁶⁾

Hegesippus' five books of "Memoirs", composed after his return to the East from Rome after the start of the pontificate of Eleutherus (174 - 189), are especially relevant to the problems of sectarian Jewish Christianity.

iv) The "Physiologus"

It has been argued by Ursula Treu ⁽⁷⁾ that the "Physiologus" belongs to the second century. An examination of the text ⁽⁸⁾ has not brought to light any evidence relevant to this discussion.

v) Tertullian, "de praescriptione haereticorum"

The usual convention by which the summary of heresies appended to many MSS of this work ⁽⁹⁾ is referred to as "Pseudo-Tertullian" is not here observed, both as a mental caution against undervaluing its

(4) 159-165 infra. (5) As by Sagnard, La gnose valentinienne (1947) 416-425. (6) In Eusebius, h.e. (7) ZnW 57 (1966) 101-4. (8) See also Petavius, ed., Epiphani...Opera (1682) 189-223. (9) Cpp. 46-53; ed. Leopold III/1, 32-41; van den Brink omits.

evidence, and also as an acknowledgement that its addition does not seem to be so much an attempted falsification as a sensible step by a user of de praescriptione. It is referred to by its Incipit, "Quorum haereticorum."

vi) The "Lost Syntagma" of Hippolytus, and derived works.

The hypothesis of Lipsius in Die Quellenkritik des Epiphanius (1865) that there is a common source behind Quorum haereticorum, Epiphanius' Panarion,⁽¹⁰⁾ Theodoret's Haereticorum fabularum comperidium and Filastrius' diversarum haereseon liber,⁽¹¹⁾ is here assumed, and has proved of great benefit.

vii) The Refutation of Hippolytus

The arguments of Pierre Nautin that the Refutation is not by Hippolytus, have received little attention and less favour.⁽¹²⁾ However, Nautin's questions cannot easily be brushed aside. There remain problems about the whole Hippolytan corpus: The "resumé" in Refutation X differs in places from the previous nine books it is supposed to epitomise; the account of Noëtus in Ref is hard to reconcile with that in contra Noëtum⁽¹³⁾; the presence of a Syrian anaphora⁽¹⁴⁾ in what is taken as a Roman document, "Apostolic Tradition," has yet to be explained. Until these matters can be resolved it seems methodologically sounder to call the author of the Refutation (Ref.) "the Refutator". Whoever the author, the work⁽¹⁵⁾ is still very clearly written against bishop Callistus (217 - 222) by a contemporary who belonged to Rome, as is evidenced in the statements of the Book of Elchasai (Cults of Power, 7)

(10) ed. Holl (GCS). (11) For Theodoret, Migne PL 83,335-556; for Filastrius, Marx (CSCL). (12) Cf Nautin, Le dossier d'Hippolyte et de Mélicon (1953); Quasten, Patrology II, 166 comments without argument. (13) ed. Charlesworth. (14) See Smith (1970) (15) edd. Duncker-Schneidewin and ed. Wendland (GCS); see Koschorke, Hippolyts Ketzerebekämpfung (1975).

The Panarion of Epiphanius, and the works of Theodoret of Cyrus and of Filastrius of Brescia have already been mentioned in connection with the "lost Syntagma". Also to be mentioned, without any need for comment, are Clement of Alexandria's Stromateis⁽¹⁶⁾, and particularly the seventh book⁽¹⁷⁾, which is explicitly anti-heretical, the same author's Excerpta ex Theodoto⁽¹⁸⁾, and Origen's Contra Celsum⁽¹⁹⁾.

In such an investigation, the whole of patristic literature might reasonably be laid under contribution - not only the works of anti-heretical tone, such as the letters of Ignatius of Antioch⁽²⁰⁾, and of Polycarp⁽²¹⁾ and the Apostolic Constitutions, but also devotional works like Origen's On Prayer⁽²³⁾ and fictional literature of the character of the Acts of Peter⁽²⁴⁾ and the "Clementine Romance".⁽²⁵⁾

The few directly liturgical documents may be quickly listed. The well-known letter of Pliny, Ep.X.96 (97) is here read as an account of initiation, according to the interpretation of Harnack,

16 edd Preuschen, StHhlin (GCS) 17 ed Hort and Mayor
18 ed Casey 19 ed Koetschau (GCS), tr Chadwick
20 ed Funk etc 21 ibid 22 ed Funk 23 tr Jay 24 ed Bonnet
25 ed GCS.

which the present author has defended in print.⁽²⁶⁾ For the reasons offered in that connection, the Didache (at least in its oldest strata) is given the earlier date maintained by Audet.⁽²⁷⁾ The use of Apostolic Tradition must be very cautious in view of the as yet unanswered questions raised by Ratcliff⁽²⁸⁾ and by Smith⁽²⁹⁾ in the matter of the anaphora; on the other hand, the evidence of Tertullian's de baptismo⁽³⁰⁾ and of the Acts of Perpetua⁽³¹⁾ shows that its evidence for initiation is more reliable.

26 cf "Pliny and the Liturgy - Yet Again" in the forth-coming volume of TU devoted to the papers of the 1973 Oxford Congress of Patristic Studies.

27. and against Vokes, Riddle, 1938. 28 Liturgical Studies, 1976, 18-40. 29. cf n. 14, p.10. 30. ed Lupton.
31. edd Harris, Gifford, 1890 (Gk); ed Knopf-Krüger-Ruhbach, (Lat.)

3 The Catalogues of Heresies and Sects

It was more than a tactical need that drove the Catholics to list the heresies which they opposed. Tactical needs were certainly very real - the device of tracing a *διδασκαλῆς* of sectaries implied that they were all plagiarists and not the bold innovators they sometimes liked to seem - but the proliferation of sects that marked the second century produced a confusion that the passage of time has not completely resolved, and if the young Christian Church was to find its identity it needed to see very clearly the issues which confronted it, to distinguish the voices which threatened and wooed it.

The lists given to us by the heresiologists are indispensable as a way into the confusion, but they are not satisfactory guides, for they are tendentious in their ordering. In general, the examples felt by the particular author to be the worst, the most threatening, are placed last, at the conclusion of a crescendo of error. So Justin, in his Apology, lists Simon, Menander and Marcion. Hegesippus moves from Simon and Jewish - Christian figures onward to Valentinus and Basilides - it is curious that Saturnil is the last and he looks like an after-thought. This order appears again in Apostolic Constitutions,⁽¹⁾ However, and so perhaps Saturnil was more threatening a figure to the Syrian Church than extant evidence suggests. For Irenaeus, the pressing danger is Ptolemaeus; his argument begins with an exposition of that writer, and his survey of schismatic history begins with Simon (I xxi) and proceeds to the emergence of Valentinus and his school, Ptolemaeus returning as its extreme expression (I.xxix). From Lipsius' reconstruction of "the lost Syntagma", it appears that Marcion is the chief target. In the Refutation, Pope Callistus is certainly the arch - villain.

(1) VI.vii-viii: Simon, Cleobius, Dositheos, Kerinthos, Markos, Menandros, Basilides, Saturnil.

For the purpose of this investigation, it has proved impossible to rely on any lists left by the hereseologists - but equally impossible also to do without some attempt at classification. The groups to be considered cannot be considered as undifferentiated if their liturgical usages are to be sought with any pretence at realism. As a result of this study, they are grouped under three headings, in the order in which the three categories first made their entrance upon the early Christian stage.

The first, and in a sense the paradigmatic, "heretic" is Simon of Gitta, who is portrayed as claiming to be in person the Great Power. Thus considered, he is indeed typical of a particular form of cult, which we have called "Cults of Power". The largest bulk of available information turns out to be that which is ^{devoted} ~~devoted~~ to them. Our presentation of them as a group ^{for a} ~~calls~~ rationale, and that rationale is given in term of the psychology of religion, with especial reference to what might be called corporate religious atavism. Under this heading are ranged: Simon, Menander, Saturnil, Carpocrates, Kerdon, Marcus and "Elchasai".

A careful study of the information given by the Refutation about the Naassenes and others, using further evidence from Clement of Alexandria and Epiphanius, and adducing the bewildering mass of Nag Hammadi documents, makes it possible (in the submission of this study) to detect a series of groups created and then left isolated by the separation of Christianity from Judaism. These groups, originally eccentric Jewish-Christian in character, show signs of increasing syncretism, although there are also indications of reaction in a Christian direction. To this section of our study belong the "Naasenes" (or "Ophites"), the Peratae, the "Sethians" (not a distinct sect or tradition, but a self-designation used by several

groups of this kind at various times), and the "Archontics" of Epiphanius, who fall outside the time of our investigation.

The third heading covers the most ^{theologically} ~~theologically~~ interesting of all. Indeed, if this were a study in the history of doctrine, they could not be herded together under one general rubric. In terms of liturgy, however, there is least to say of them. Our information is most disappointingly meagre. What they have in common is that they assume a Gentile Christianity. They are therefore grouped together here as "the Gentile Counter - Churches"; they comprise Basilides, Valentinus, Marcion, Tatian and Montanus. These individuals and their grouping together is not intended to suggest uniformity, but their appearance in such numbers, and at times not far separate, is evidence that the Gentile Church, in its life and doctrine in general but in its worship in particular, had pressing questions to answer.

4 Principal Sources b) Sectarian Texts

The sources for the study of early Christian Sects, liturgy, and doctrines, of Gnosticism, and the Hellenistic world in general have been so much extended by the discovery⁽¹⁾ of the Nag Hammadi texts that a review of sectarian documents must start with the contents of these thirteen papyrus codices. Despite intense study devoted to them⁽²⁾, uncertainties remain, and any researchers who intend to use them must state the presuppositions as to their provenance and character upon which they intend to proceed.

It was at first, and quite naturally assumed that the collection ~~were~~ ^{was} theologically homogeneous, allowing for such obvious interlopers as an ^T excerpt from Plato's Republic, another from the Hermetic tractate Asclepius, and the already known Sentences of Sextus.⁽³⁾ Even the limited assumption that a single group had gathered all the texts for its own purposes would carry the implication that such a group had a corpus of doctrines and rites that called for or somehow ^maccommodated this collection of texts, diverse as they are. Such a body would be of exceptional interest to historians of religion, if it existed. The collection itself, however, shows signs of being gathered from variegated sources for a patron:⁽⁴⁾ the possibility that this patron gathered them out of mere curiosity has been described as banal⁽⁵⁾ - though this motive, banal or not, can never be ruled out, and may have contributed to the formation of the earlier collections fused in the present Nag Hammadi collection, and the always greater likelihood that the texts were assembled for and by a heresiologist (as had been done by Irenaeus, by the Refutator, and by Epiphanius in their day) has been progressively strengthened, to the point of virtual certainty, by recent research into the history of the Pachomian monastery near

(1) See Doresse, Secret Books, 116-127. (2) Surveyed by Giversen (1963) and Scholer (1971ff). (3) CG VI/5; VI/7-VI/8; XII/1. (4) See CG VI: 15, 7-end. (5) "...interpretation...toute superficielle" so Puech, 'Nouveaux écrits...' (1950) 143.

which the find was made and the special role of Shenoute.⁽⁷⁾

Though there are still some aspects under which it is right and necessary to consider the Nag Hammadi library as a single entity - as a body of new material for scholarly assimilation,⁽⁸⁾ or as the precipitate of conflicts between theologies or cultures,⁽⁹⁾ for example - it is more important to consider the significance of the individual tractates, so far as that can be estimated with or without indication of their locus of origin. (The placing and interpretation of the codices themselves, each one a collection in itself, except C. G. X, is another task in its own right, beyond the scope of this investigation).

We use here the nomenclature and codicology of the Coptic Gnostic Library Project of the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity,⁽¹⁰⁾ with minute modifications,⁽¹¹⁾ and with an eye also to the work of the French Canadian counterpart.

i) C.G. I/1 (I/5, Canadian; flyleaf, A, 1 - B, 10): Prayer of the Apostle Paul is here taken as Valentinian.

ii) C.G. I/2 (Canadian, I/1; 1:1 - 16:30) : Apokryphon of James is here taken as "Jewish - Christian of the Great Church."

iii) C.G. I/3 (I/2, Canadian; p. 16:31 - 43: 24, and C.G. XII/2): The Gospel of Truth is here read as a Valentinian text.

iv) C.G. I/4 (I/3 Canadian; p. 43:25 - 50:18): The Treatise on Resurrection or Epistle to Rheginus, is also here read as Valentinian.

v) C.G. I/5 (I/4 Canadian; p. 51:1 - 138.25) : The Tripartite Tractate is read here as a Valentinian document, albeit of a distinctive character.

vi) C.G. II/1 (p.1 - 32:9; of III/1. B.G. 8502/2, Irenaeus A.H. I xxix Massuet = I.xxvii, Vol. I, 221-6 Harvey): The Apocryphon of John

(7) See Young (1970), Sève-Söderberg (1975), Orlandi (1982).

(8) See Cullmann (1949), Wilson (1974), Ménard (1975), Wilson

(1978), Krause (1978). (9) Böhlig 1974; Mysterion und Wahrheit

(1968) 80-111. (10) NHLE xiii-xx. (11) e.g., "Authentikos Logos".

was already known, without a title, from Irenaeus, although its literary unity could be appreciated only after the Berlin papyrus had been identified by Carl Schmidt in 1909 as representing the source. It was regarded as "Barbelo - Gnostic" because of the centrality of Barbelo in Irenaeus' account; it is used here as evidence of the Peratae - ^{Naassenes} ~~Naassenes~~ - Ophites complex.

vii) C.G. II/2 (32:10 - 51: 28; of P.Ox. 1, 654, 655 and Puech's "bandelette funéraire"): The Gospel of Thomas.⁽¹²⁾

The Oxyrhynchus logia had been known since the end of the nineteenth century, and had encouraged the view that before the canonical gospels were written there existed non-narrative sayings - collections. This view is still maintained in some quarters, even with the added theory that Thomas, the coptic text of which supplies the whole of which P. Ox. 1, 654, 655 are fragments, represents a genre older and more authentic than the synoptics. Even without such extravagant hypotheses, the case has been argued for a "rehabilitation" of Thomas.

The Gospel of Thomas differs from the canonical gospels and the previously known apocryphal imitations not in being a non-narrative primitive gospel but in singling out sayings from a narrative setting. As is argued below, this singling out is directed to polemical ends immediately related to the predicaments of certain Jewish-Christians during the agonising rupture of Christianity from Judaism. The questions posed by that situation appear in Thomas as questions posed by the disciples to Jesus:

"Wouldst thou that we fast ? And how should we pray (and) should we give alms, and what diet should we observe"?

(12) Literature surveyed in Tripp (1981).

(log. 6; 81:14-18, p. 4-5 Guillaumont);

"We know that thou wilt go away from us.

Who is it who shall be great over us?"

(log. 12; 82: 25-27, p. 8-9 Guillaumont);

"Tell us how our end will be."

(Log. 18; 84: 9-11, pp 12-13 Guillaumont);

"Tell us what the Kingdom of Heaven is Like."

(log. 20; 84: 20-28, pp 14-15 Guillaumont);

"Show us the place where thou art, for it is necessary
for us to seek it."

(log 24; 86: 3-6 pp 18-19 Guillaumont);

"When wilt thou be revealed to us and when shall we
see thee?"

(log. 37; 87: 27-29, pp 22-23 Guillaumont);

"When will the repose of the dead come about, and when
will the new world come? ... Twenty four prophets spoke in
Israel and they all spoke about thee Is
circumcision profitable or not?"

(logia 51-52-53; 90: 7-10. 12-15, 18-19,
pp 28-31 Guillaumont);

"Thy brethren and thy mother are standing outside".

(log. 99; 97:21-23, pp 50-51 Guillaumont);

"When will the Kingdom come?"

(log. 113; 99: 12-14. pp 54-55 Guillaumont).

There are grounds for believing that the Gospel of Thomas was
composed in Greek but in a Semitic language milieu, which makes it
possible to infer that the traces of early and semi-independent
tradition of the words of Jesus which have been detected in Thomas

may be ascribed to a period when oral tradition of Jesus' logia in Aramaic was still alive, and could still influence the forms in which Greek versions of the same logia were presented. In essence, however, Thomas shows signs of being dependant on the four canonical gospels, and it reflects some secondary developments in Jewish Christianity after the Jewish-Christian rift. It stands near the head-waters of a distinct stream of Jewish-Christianity, within which may be also placed Apocalypse of James, Apocalypse of Paul, Hypostasis of the Archons, Origin of the World, Testimony of Truth, Trimorphic Protennoia. This sheds light on some documents which appear to react against the stance adopted by Gospel of Thomas and its cognates: II Apocalypse of James, Apocryphon of James, Gospel of Mary, Apocryphon of John.

viii) C.Q. II /3 (51:29 - 86:19): The Gospel of Philip.⁽¹³⁾

This text, one of those from the Nag Hammadi collection that have received considerable scholarly attention already, and particularly from a liturgical point of view, is not easy to place. It quotes from ^{73:8} "the apostle Philip" (~~76:18~~) in the third person, the unavoidable inferences being that the author of this book does not claim to be the apostle Philip, and that the source quoted is the "Gospel of Philip" detected among the "Phibionites" of Panarion, haer. xxvi. We are thus pointed toward the ^{Naassene} ~~Naassene~~ - ophite group, and the book does indeed appear in the same codex as products of that group (Thomas, Hypostasis of the Archons, Origin of the World). However, it lacks the typical theologoumena of that group (Mother, Snake, tree of knowledge, etc.) and before the addition of the colophon naming Philip, it has moved or has always existed outside the milieu in which The Gospel of Philip properly so called is known and used. Achamoth and Planē occur in the text; the use of these Valentinian terms causes us to

(13) Literature surveyed in Tripp (1982)

place the book among Valentinian works, albeit with some caution.

ix) C.G. II/4 (86: 20-97:23): Hypostasis of the Archons is, like the following, associated with Gospel of Thomas (vii).

x) C.G. II/5 (97:24-127:17): Origin of the World

xi) C.G. II/6 (127:18 - 137:27): Exegesis of the Soul is classed as Valentinian.

xii) C.G. II/7 (138: 1 - 145:19): Thomas the Contender belongs to the milieu of early Syrian encratism; it may in some sense be classifiable with Apocryphon of John (II/1) and other books witnessing to a reaction against Gospel of Thomas (vii), etc; but it has yielded no liturgical evidence, and is not cited.

xiii) C.G. III/1 (1:1 - 40:11) another copy of (vi)

xiv) C.G. III/2 (40:12 - 69:20). The Sacred Book of the Great Invisible Spirit which, under its misleading sub-title (69:6), "The Gospel of the Egyptians", appears in Ref.v 7.9 along with Gospel of Thomas among the books of the Naassenes.

xv) C.G. III/3 (70:1 - 90:13): Eugnostos the Blessed, which is followed by its christianized form,

xvi) C.G. III/4 (90:14 - 119: 18): Sophia Jesu Christi appears to be basically pagan work in process of adoption by Christians who also used Apocryphon of John - for the latter work is found with Sophia Jesu Christi and Gospel of Mary in B.G. 8502 (19:6-77:7).

xvii) C.G. III/5 (120:1-149:28): Dialogue of the Saviour is here classed with the same tradition as Apocryphon of John.

xviii) C.G. IV/1 (1:1-49:28 another copy of (vi).

xix) C.G. IV/2 (50:1-81:2): another copy of (xiv); its association here with Apokryphon of John argues that the Apokryphon of John and its tradition are ^{derived} ~~devised~~ from Gospel of Thomas and its tradition (including Sacred Book), and that the corrective movement which produced the Apokryphon took with it at their separation the

Sacred Book.

xx) C.G. V/1 (1:1-17:18): another copy of (xv) but here associated with Apocalypse of Paul (v/2) which suggests that Eugnostos, a pagan text, was adopted unchanged by the tradition which used Gospel of Thomas and Apocalypse of Paul. If this is correct, it would appear that (xvi), the christianized form, is the product of the corrective movement just referred to.

xxi) C.G. V/2 (17:19-24:9): The Apocalypse of Paul must be related in a way as yet not finally determined with the non-canonical Apocalypse of the same title. In its Nag Hammadi form, it is cognate with Gospel of Thomas.

xxii) C.G. V/3 (24:10 - 44:10): First Apocalypse of James is here presented as another product of the corrective movement, in this case a revision of

xxiii) C.G. V/4 (44:11 - 63:33): Second Apocalypse of James, which is here argued to be cognate with Gospel of Thomas.

xxiv) C.G. V/5 (64:1 - 85:32); Apocalypse of Adam belongs with Gospel of Thomas, according to the testimony of Panarion, haer. xxvi.

xxv) C.G. VI/1 (1:1-12:22): Acts of Peter and the Twelve Apostles *may perhaps be associated* ~~is in this investigation placed~~ with the corrective movement mentioned under (xix), *but yields no helpful information.*

xxvi) C.G. VI/2 (13:1-21:32): The Thunder - Perfect Mind is, as MacRae says "difficult to classify". Its relationship, distant but sure, with Jewish Wisdom - speculation and its combination of ascetic with erotic imagery together cause one to speculate that it may lie behind the Ennoia-myth applied to Helen in some accounts of Simon Magus; but it has yielded no evidence for this investigation.

xxvii) C.G. VI/3 (22:1 - 35:24): Authentikos Logos is here tentatively ascribed to a Syrian encratite tradition, perhaps that of Tatian.

xxviii) C.G. VI/4 (36:1 - 48:15): Noëma refers to the anomoean heresy of the fourth century; it therefore falls outside the scope of this investigation. It may be "Archontic."

xxix) C.G. VI/5 (48:16 - 51:23): Republic 588B - 589B

xxx) C.G. VI/6 (52:1 - 63:22): "Discourse on the Eighth and Ninth" is Hermetic - or is meant to seem to be Hermetic. It is here considered, albeit briefly, in connection with the Peratae.

xxxi) C.G. VI/7 (63:33 - 65:14): Prayer, from Asclepius is cognate with (xxx) as is also

xxxii) C.G. VI/8 (65:15 - 78:43): Asclepius 21-29

xxxiii) C.G. VII/1 (1:1 - 49:9): Paraphrase of Shem is here identified with the "Paraphrase of Seth" in Ref. V.22, and placed with the Peratae - Naassenes - "Sethians" sequence.

xxxiv) C.G. VII/2 (49:10 - 70:12): Second Logos of the Great Seth is here associated with the Peratae.

xxxv) C.G. VII/3 (70:13 - 84:14): Apocalypse of Peter has yielded nothing for this study.

xxxvi) C.G. VII/4 (84:15 - 118:9): Teachings of Silvanus appears to be a later monastic appeal to ethical endeavour as the best protective against heresy. On these grounds, it is omitted from examination.

xxxvii) C.G. VII/5 (118:10 - 127:7): The Three Steles of Seth is here classified as a document of Jewish Merkabah mysticism.

xxxix) C.G. VIII/1 (1:1 - 132:9): Zostrianos is placed among the works of the Peratae.

xl) C.G. VIII/2 (132:10 - 140:27): Letter of Peter to Philip is tentatively associated with the corrective movement noted in relation to (vii).

xli) C.G. IX/1 (1:1 - 27:10): Melchizedek is regarded as a Jewish Christian document of a distinctive kind.

xlii) C.G. IX/2 (27:11 - 29:5): The Thought of Norea is for present purposes considered in connection with the Peratae.

xliii) C.G. IX/3 (29:6 - end, damaged): Testimony of Truth is argued to be Naassene.

xliv) C.G. X/1 (1:1 - 68:18): Marsanes is a Peratic document.

xlv) C.G. XI/1 (1:1 - 21:35): Interpretation of Knowledge is Valentinian, as is the following

xlvi) C.G. XI/2 (22:1 - 39:39): Valentinian Exposition.

xlvii) C.G. XI/3 (45:1 - 69:20): Allaenes is argued to be a document of Merkabah mysticism.

xlviii) C.G. XI/4 (69:21 - damaged end): Hypsiphron is too damaged to be of assistance.

xlix) C.G. XII/1 (15:1 - 34:28; both ends lost): Sentences of Sextus may be classified with (xxxvi).

1) C.G. XII/2 (53:19 - 60:30; both ends lost): another copy of (ii).

1i) (The fragments from the end of C.G. XII do not merit listing here).

1i) C.G. XIII/1 (35:1 - 50:24): Trimorphic Protennoia is Peratic/Naassene.

1ii) C.G. XIII/2 (51:1 - 79 end): Another copy of (x).

1iii) B.G. 8502/1 (Beginning lost, 7:1-19:5) and P.Ryl. 468; Gospel of Mary is placed as indicated under (xvi).

1iv) B.G. 8502/4 (128.1 - 141:7): The Act of Peter may well belong to the same corrective movement; possibly as a counter to "gnosticizing" misuses of the story of Ananias and Sapphira (Acts V 1-11). It has proved too slight to be of value in the present work.

lv) Codex Askewianus, in which five documents may be distinguished, although it is convenient to cite the whole codex as "Pistis Sophia" :

lv) a) an account of the Repentances of Sophia (1 - 114; Pistis Sophia I, 1-62)

lv) a: a fragment on names (114 verso)

lv) b: Second Tome of the Pistis Sophia (115 - 233 recto; Pistis Sophia II, 63 - 100).

lv) c: Part of the Books of the Saviour (233 verso - 234 verso; Pistis Sophia. II 101);

lv) d: Part of the Books of the Saviour (235 recto - 318 recto; Pistis Sophia. III 102 - 135);

lv) e: Part of the Books of the Saviour (318 verso - 336 verso; Pistis Sophia. IV 136-143);

lv) f: Dialogue of Jesus on Final Destiny (345 recto - 354 Versa; Pistis Sophia. IV 144-148):

lv) g: Later addition (355 recto; Pistis Sophia IV 148)

That these documents belong together in a comparatively late stage of the Peratae - Naassene - Ophite tradition can hardly be doubted. How they relate to one another is less clear. Liechtenhan's views (1894) suggest caution in using them on the assumption that they represent the same stage or style of theological reflection.

lvi) Codex Brucianus, another collection of three "Ophite" and one "Peratic" work:

lvi) a: First Book of Jeu (pp. 1-53);

lvi) b: Second Book of Jeu (pp. 54-86);

lvi) c: Fragment of a gnostic hymn (p.87);

lvi) d: Fragment on the passage of the soul (p.88);

lvi) e: the "Untitled Text", or Cosmological Treatise" (pp 1 - 51, 52 - 6). which we regard as a unity, and call by the name usefully suggested by ^{Burkitt} ~~Birkett~~, Setheus.⁽¹⁴⁾

(14) Church and Gnosis (1932) 63. For Pistis Sophia, I have used Schmidt-McDermot; for the contents of Codex Brucianus, Baynes and Schmidt-McDermot. The arguments of Burkitt (1922) and (1926) have persuaded me that Pistis Sophia is a Coptic composition of the fourth century, and therefore outside the immediate scope of this study.

For the separate Nag Hammadi treatises, the editions used are noted at the first citation of the respective works.

'Gnostic gems' have not been brought into the discussion of this subject very much since the work of King (1887). They do not figure in this study, although the literature has been taken into consideration (see H. Leclercq in DACL VI/1, 1924, 838-842, 860-864), on the grounds that the gems belong in a ^{niveau} of popular religion where theological distinctions are negligible and sectarian allegiances extremely fluid. Allegedly 'Gnostic' art has not been judged helpful, either, whether in the case of the statue in Illustration I, or of the tomb painting described by Achelis in ZnW 1 (1900) 210-218.

5 A Scene Set: Worship in the Hellenistic World

An adequate appreciation of the place and significance of the rituals of the early Christian minorities would require an extensive account of the cultic observances of the Hellenistic World. Within the limits of this present study, a sketch must suffice.

a) The Extent of Ritual Expression

It would probably be unrealistic to describe the Hellenistic world as being exceptionally religious; but it was certainly a world in which ritual expression extended into every area of corporate life, and in which religious acts were likely to be self-conscious and studied. The second century of the Christian era coincided with a period of religious and social change. The end of the ~~tyrannies~~ ^{tyrannies} of ~~Antonines~~ ^{Antonines} Domitian and the accession of the ~~Flavians~~ seemed to mark a new departure in social ethics, for example: denunciation by anonymous informers was, so Trajan wrote to Pliny (Ep. X, 98), unworthy of the new world: nec nostri saeculi. This utterance was provoked by an enquiry of a provincial governor deeply disturbed by the neglect of the temples and of traditional worship (Ep. X, 97). A remarkable proportion of the Emperors showed a profound personal interest in worship: Hadrian, Marcus Aurelius, and Philip the Arabian all occur to the mind. The repeated insistence throughout the Historia Augusta ⁽¹⁾ on the observance by new Emperors of the officia, the due respects, to the deities and temples of Rome, though it is a report from the fourth century, is true also of the second. Worship was of interest at all levels of society, even where a Lucian scoffed at it and a Petronius Arbiter made it the foil for indecent humour. ⁽²⁾ The biography of Appollonius of Tyana reflects a popular belief that the mysteries give insight into truth. ⁽³⁾

(1) Hadrian i.6; Marcus xiii.1-2, xxiv.4; cf Herodian I.v.2, II.iii.11, II.vi.12, III.viii.4, IV.v.6. (2) Lucian, On Sacrifices, Judgements of the Goddess, Menippus, de dea Syria (ed. Harman, III.153-171, 384-409, IV.71-109, IV.337-411); Petronius, Satyricon xvii.44.

(3) Philostratus, Vita Apollonii III.xvi, VIII.iv-v.

Religious observance defined the identity of a community, as Artemis did for the Ephesians (Acts xix 23 - 36). Cultic practice marked the events also of family life - birth, adolescence, marriage, parturition, death. It brought together devotees, whether for the feasts of Serapis - "the god invites you to his couch", or for the initiations into Dionysiac perfection and the like.⁽⁴⁾

b) Variety and Strata of Ritual Expression

The Hellenistic world was a vast diversity brought into one by the conquests of Alexander and the succeeding hegemony of Rome. Many cults were intensely local, but many others spread from their place of origin to flourish elsewhere. This disgusted some, for whom the influx of Orontes (the drainage of Antioch) into the Tiber was an occasion for alarm; others took the mingling almost as a matter of course - we find Catullus composing epithalamia for weddings by Roman and for Greek rites without any hint of incongruity.⁽⁵⁾

Hellenistic ritual life was, as ever with cultic activity, many-layered. The oldest deities of field and chase survived, as did magical arts designed for miscellaneous purposes: revelation-magic for guidance, other magics to secure health, love or revenge. The state cults were largely traditional, but were embellished by new forms of Caesar-cult and occasionally by direct adoption or transportation of shrines and deities.⁽⁶⁾

The oracles showed a last flowering in the second century. It seems indeed that it was possible to create a new one in favourable circumstances. For those who wanted to go beyond guidance and gratification, there were the mysteries. The experience of Lucius Apuleius, fictionalised in the Golden Ass, gives an insight into the moral force of the sense of regeneration and the sheer beauty of

(4) Serapis: Koenen (1967) 121-6; Dionysus: Matz (1963) 16-21.

(5) Juvenal, Sat.iii.62; Catullus, Carm.lxi and lxii.

(6) Carcopino (ET 1956) 137-144; Ehrenberg and Jones (1955) 81-97; Suetonius, Caligula 22, Claudius 25.

mystical vision that the rites of Isis might convey. ⁽⁷⁾

c) The Jews

Against this kaleidoscopic background stood out the cultus of the Jews. Most noticeable, and most threatening to some, was their domestic worship, with its silently obtrusive day of rest and their candles burning in the window or even in the street at Hanukkah. Of circumcision, a Gentile found it hard even to speak. ⁽⁸⁾

The cultus of the Synagogue was equally distinctive. To the few who entered the House of Assembly, the House of Interpretation, the gathered men reading their sacred books, the Torah (Acts xv 21) and the Haftarothe (Luke iv 16-17) might resemble a convention of philosophers conversing upon divine things. For those who stayed outside, the synagogue might represent only a close-knit, isolated and yet international, vigorously supportive community. ⁽⁹⁾

Behind all this was the distant Temple in Jerusalem. While it stood, even pagans regarded it as an ancient and sacred place, although no doubt its cycle of daily offering, its annual Day of Atonement, and its centrality to the Pesah, were known in detail only to Jews.

In some areas at least, Judaism was a vigorously missionary religion. ⁽¹⁰⁾ It defended itself against polytheistic calumnies, and offered to teach seekers a Way of Life. A reading of the works of Philo suggests that one of their chief purposes was not only to enable Jews to deepen their religious life by means of Platonic meditation but to guide and encourage pagan enquirers to the point of taking the Torah upon themselves. At crucial points in the cumulative arguments of his books, Philo appeals for repentance (de virtutibus 175-186 ~~pp.~~ pp. 270-9 Colson), and explicitly for conversion (de praemiis et poenis 152-164, ~~pp.~~ ~~408-417~~ 408-417 Colson).

VII

(7) Parkes (1967) 140-141; Angus (1929) esp. ch. iv; Apuleius, Transformations of Lucius xviii. (8) Juvenal, Sat. vi. 542-5; iii. 13-17; xiv. 90-106, vi. 157-161; see Rankin in The Labyrinth (1935) 159-209. (9) See Bevan and Singer, Legacy of Israel (1928) 31-2 (10). Cf Joseph and Asenath (but see Kee NTS 1983); and Josephus, c. Apionem.

Conversion, if complete, called for circumcision for men. For men and women, it entailed the purifying bath, the Jewish baptism. The history of this rite is obscure, but it is so similar in outline to the later Christian rite that it must in its essentials ante-date the Christian era; it is hardly conceivable that a rite developed by Christians independently could have been adopted by a community for whom sacred differentness was so vitally important. The rite of pouring,⁽¹¹⁾ preceded by an exhortation to observe the law in full awareness of the cost of conversion, linked immediately to a personal avowal of adhesion to the Law, and followed by an address of congratulation,⁽¹²⁾ is well attested. There is some evidence that an anointing belonged somewhere in this complex, but the matter is uncertain, and the significance of the act if it was performed is more uncertain. The possibility - it is no more at present - may be mentioned that this marks the admission of Gentiles into the sacerdotal race. Two passages from the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs may be cited in association:

"And I saw seven men in white raiment saying unto me,
Arise, put on the robe of priesthood,
and the crown of righteousness,
and the breastplate of understanding,
and the garment of truth,
and the plate of faith,
and the turban of the head,
and the ephod of prophecy.
And they severally carried (these things) and put
(them) on me,
and said unto me:

(11) See C.F. Rogers (1911) and (1912); the observations of Abrahams (1911) do not seem to invalidate his case. (12) Gavin (1928) 26-58; text in Polster (1926).

From henceforth become a priest of the Lord,
thou and thy seed for ever.
And the first anointed me with holy oil, and gave to
me the staff of judgement.
The second washed me with pure water,
and fed me with bread and wine (even) the most
holy things

(T. Levi, ix2-5; ET 39-40 Charles, GK 42-43
Charles)

"Then shall the Lord raise up a new priest,
And to him shall the words of the Lord shall be
revealed.....
And the glory of the most High shall be uttered
over him,
and the spirit of understanding and sanctification
shall rest upon him. ⁽¹³⁾
For he shall give the majesty of the Lord to his
sons in truth for evermore,
and there shall none succeed him for all generations
for ever.
And in his priesthood the Gentiles shall be multiplied
in knowledge upon the earth,
and enlightened through the grace of the Lord..."

(T. Levi. xviii2, 7-9; ET 46-47 Charles,
Gk. 61-63 Charles)

Esoteric Judaism added its own elements to the variety of
Jewish cultus. Philo ⁽¹⁴⁾ describes a contemplative community not far

(13) The Christian interpolation here ("in the water") is clearly identifiable in the MS evidence; the detail under discussion may be reliably regarded as integral to the original (Jewish) text.
(14) de vita contemplativa 78-147 Doumas-Miquel.

different from a later Christian monastery - for which indeed Eusebius (h.e. II xvii) mistook it. The Qumran community have a highly distinctive cultus, as did the Essenes.⁽¹⁵⁾ Beyond a rejection of sacrifice, no influences from these groups has been traced on the Christian minorities studied in this investigation, while the influence of Jewish Merkabah Mysticism is very considerable.

Even when the Temple was no more, its cultus as described in Scripture remained as a source of ideas. The rite for the ordination, or, perhaps better, the hallowing, of the Aaronic ministers of sacrifice (Lev. viii - x, Num. iii - viii) offers a schema that was to appear later in Christian initiation: washing, clothing, anointing, (Lev. viii 6 - 12), sacrifices with following dedicatory acts (13 - 30), and eating of sacrificial meat and bread (30 - 31). This pattern is adopted also by Ezekiel as a symbol of God's relationship with Israel and his readiness to re-new Israel's spiritual health.⁽¹⁶⁾

d) The Christians

The Christian movement came upon the scene with the reputation of being subversive. Its founder, Chrestos, had been executed by Pontius Pilatus, as an insurrectionist.⁽¹⁷⁾ It posed a threat to good order and settled opinions in religion, it was a prava et immodica superstitio. Its abandonment of the gods and their temples marked its members as ἀθεοί. The strangest and most repellent thing about them was that their worship suggested a fascination with death. "They collected the bones and skulls of criminals", says Eunapius of Sardis, "who had been put to death for various crimes, made them out to be gods, and thought that they became better by defiling themselves at their graves. 'Martyrs' the dead men were called, and ministers of a sort, and ambassadors

(15) On Essenes, Conybeare, H.D.B. II (1898), Moffatt in ERE, Black (1964); on Qumran, Burrows (1958), 363-516, Driver (1965) 496-516, Leaney (1966) 91-117. (16) Ez.xvi.4-9 (17) Suetonius, Claudius xxv.4, Nero xvi.2.

with the gods to carry men's prayers." ⁽¹⁸⁾ When Polycarp had died a martyr's death, the Christians were refused his remains, and believed that their opponents expected them "to abandon the Crucified and begin to worship this man" - **ἀφέντες τὸν ἐσταυρωμένον τοῦτον ἀρξῶνται σέβασθαι** (Mart. Pol. xvii.2) - the reference to "the Crucified", as a designation requiring no explanation, nor even any apology for standing as the object of "worship", has the ring of a Christian expression; the more likely phraseology on pagan lips would lump the crucified Jesus together with other disgraced persons, as Eunapius does.

Two early pagan accounts of the cultus of the Christians are hostile, but not nearly so vituperative as pure hatred would have dictated. Pliny's report to Trajan (EP. X. 96), the discussion of which belongs in a later part of this presentation, speaks only of the Christians ^daddressing Christ as divine (quasi deo), of their assuming a commitment not to commit sins, and of their simple and innocent meals. Lucius Apuleius of Madaura, in his sharp cartoon of the baker's wife, tells of a group that insists on the existence of one god and worship that god in secretive cult-meals with ample supplies of wine, meals at which social distinctions are ignored. ⁽¹⁹⁾

The Christians, in reply, were not averse to describing their rites, which in the ante-Nicene Church were private rather than secret. Thus Justin Martyr (I Apol. 61-65-6, 66-7) describes how each person who is persuaded of the truth of Christian teaching and feels able to promise to live accordingly, prays and fasts to beg from God the forgiveness of sins, the other Christians sharing in this discipline; he or she is then taken to where there is water, to receive by a washing in water, "in the name of the God who is Father and

(18) Lives of the Sophists 472, from Brown, Cult of the Saints (1981) 7. (19) Transformations of Lucius xiii

Ruler of all things, and of our saviour Jesus Christ and of Holy Spirit", the regeneration. This washing is called "Enlightenment". The newly enlightened is then brought to the meeting place of "the Brethren", who offer prayers both for themselves and for the newly enlightened and all who are like-minded, that they may have the grace to live worthily of the knowledge they have been vouchsafed, and may receive eternal salvation. They greet one another with a kiss. Bread is brought to the president of the Brethren, with a cup of wine and water, and he takes them and offers up praise and glory to the Father of all things through the name of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, with thanksgiving for his counting them worthy of these things. He prays at length, and when he finishes all respond "Amen". "Deacons" then distribute the bread and diluted wine to those present and also to absent members. This food, known as "Thanksgiving", is not mere bread and wine, but ~~are~~ Christ's body and blood, for at his institution of this rite he said "Do this for my remembrance. This is my body", and "This is my blood". The sacred gifts are given only to the baptized.

This one-for-all event in the initiation of the individual is matched by a continuing celebration: the Brethren constantly reminding one another of their enlightenment, giving each other aid, praising the Creator through the Son and the Spirit for all benefits received. At these gatherings on every "Sun"-day they hear readings of apostolic and prophetic writings, and exhortation from the president, before they intercede, and go on into the bringing up of bread and wine-and-water, and so on, as on the days of initiation.

The outline of this account, with its indication of the baptismal rite and baptismal Eucharist taking place at different locations, is so close to that of Pliny's report that one is tempted

to infer that both are based on a prepared pattern of evidence, drawn up under pressure of persecution. That such a response was needed, so that even in martyrdom Christians could give evidence of the essential innocence of their rites, is suggested by the currency of most serious accusations of Christian malpractice. Justin himself (II Apol. xii.2) repudiates charges of cannibalism, observing that slaves and children of Christian households have been tortured into admitting the truth of them. Athenagoras (Legatio 3.1) has also to rebut charges of "Thyestean banquets, Oedippeian intercourse." Theophilus of Antioch (Ad Autol. 3.4, 3.15) and Tatian (Or. 25) meet the same accusations. In the evidence of tortured Christian slaves during the sufferings of the Christians of Lyons and Vienne (in Eusebius, h.e. V. 1.14, 1.25-6, 1.19, 1.52) we find direct denials of the same charges.⁽²⁰⁾

e) The "Gnostics"

It has been argued that these charges were provoked, and justifiably provoked, by the practices of deviant Christians such as the "Gnostics" of whom Epiphanius reports ⁱⁿ ~~is~~ his Panarion, haer. 26. This is inherently improbable, for the charges themselves were almost conventional in the Hellenistic world's attitude to minorities. The same attacks had been made against the Jews, and had been rebutted by Josephus (c. Apion. III. viii. 89-90). It is interesting to observe Trypho the Jew assuring Justin (Dial. 68.32.1) that he finds the charge against the Christians quite incredible.

Deviant Christians brought the Church's worship into disrepute in other, less ghastly ways. There were some who claimed divinity, or perhaps access to divinizing rites (Justin, I Apol. 26). Others gave Celsus the impression that Christianity was a farrago of Jewish-

(20) Cf Dölger (1934), de Labriolle (1913).

Hellenistic magic and psychopompy (see c. Celsum III 9 - 16, VI. 22 - 40).

The cultus of early Christian deviations has been commented on from time to time. R.M. Grant, in his cautious survey, "Gnostic and Christian Worship", detects cases of the acceptance, with reinterpretations, of the ordinary Christian worship-pattern (Marcion, Valentinus and most Valentinians), cases of the creation of additional modes of worship (Basilides, Marcosians, Valentinians), and cases of the total rejection of conventional worship (Docetism, Prodikos, Gospel of Thomas). This is an adaptation of the older majority view, which saw "Gnostic" worship as parasitic upon the worship of the Great Church. ⁽²¹⁾

Others have suggested that "Gnostic" rites were the means by which pagan cultic methods and purposes found their way into Christianity. This is particularly the contribution of Edwin Hatch; it was taken up by Harnack, and is perhaps the key to the proper understanding also of his view of Gnosticism as the acute assimilation of the Christian faith to the prevailing attitude of Hellenistic popular religion (Verweltlichung, Hellenisierung). Lietzmann inclined to this position also. ⁽²²⁾

Yet another principal view is that Gnosticism was (is) a religion in its own right, and that its cultus came to ^{be} merged in varying degrees with that of the Christians. This seems to be the view implicit in the hypothesis of Anz that the Origin of Gnostic cultus is in the lustral rites of Babylonia. The view of Gnosticism as a distinct religion is explicitly advocated by Bousset's Hauptprobleme der Gnosis (1907). The Gnostic mysteries used pre-Christian elements of lustration and anointing (277-305), chiefly of an exorcistic purpose. The Eucharist was largely ignored (305-

(21) e.g. by A.J.Mason (1891) 113: "a profane improvement"; and Batiffol. Eucharistie (1929) 189-203. (22) Hatch (1889); Harnack, History of Dogma (ET 1905) I.227-238; Lietzmann (1933).

-313). Bousset interpreted the gnostic master-scheme of sacraments which he detected as ordered to the ascent of the soul (313-316) and the sacred marriage-union with a heavenly being (316-8). A comparable but less sweeping view is represented by Rudolph in his Gnosis: Wesen und Geschichte einer spätantiken Religion (1977): Gnosticism is basically anti-cultic; it values sacraments only as attesting a spiritual strength already working in the men of insight. For the rest, Rudolph uses Grant's observations. (23)

Detailed studies have been devoted to particular areas of "Gnostic" worship. Fendt, in his Gnostische Mysterien (1922) interpreted the rites of the "Phibionites" of Panarion, haer. 26, as a syncretistic phenomenon. (His use of Epiphanius is trusting to a fault; but his detection of the theme of power is vitally significant). After this (1-22), he turned to the snake-cult of the Ophites (22-28), which, like Rudolph later (252-4), he took very literally; this he reads as an example of religious atavism. His analysis of water-eucharists (22-38) and "Grace"-eucharists (38-63) detects the survival of apostolic simplicity in the one and Frühkatholizismus in the other. Not very different are the findings of Max Pulver's "Das Spielraum gnostischer Mysterienpraxis" (1945).

Gnostic initiation has received much attention from various stand-points: in terms of the sacred marriage by Grant (1961, on Gospel of Philip), Batey (1964, on Jewish Gnosticism), by Cremer (1967, commenting on the "Sons of the bride-chamber"), by Orbe (1972, on the Valentinians), by Mahé (1975, on erotic symbolism), and by Horsley (1979, on Valentinianism again). Widengren (1946) and Scopello (1978) have pursued the theme of enthronement in this setting. The rites for the dying have also been the subject of investigation, by Müller (1920), Quasten (in Miscellanea Mercati) and Quispel (1951). (24)

(23) Anz (1897); Bousset, Hauptprobleme (1907) and cf Himmelsreise (1901); Maier (1963) (24) For more general studies: Buonaiuti (1935), Segelberg (1959) and (1962), Perkins (1981).

Most recently, it has been argued that "Gnostic" sacraments ante-date Christian ones, and that the latter are an etiolated version of the former. This was maintained by Arthur Drews as part of his general theory of the origin of Christianity, but without detailed argument.⁽²⁵⁾ The case was argued with reference to baptism by Reitzenstein in his Vorgeschichte der christlichen Taufe (1929) in which he leaned heavily upon the Mandaean evidence.⁽²⁶⁾ A similar position, but based on Nag Hammadi and other "Gnostic" texts, with relation to the Eucharist has been hinted at by W.Schmithals (1970), and argued from several starting-points by Jean Magne. An entire Gnostic hieros gamos rite has been detected behind Ephesians by Pokorny.⁽²⁷⁾

(25) Drews, Entstehung des Christentums aus dem Gnostizismus (1924), esp. 180-196.

(26) His thesis has not been considered in detail here because the evidence amassed by Yamauchi (1973) 117-142 seems to this writer to have put the thesis out of court. By the same token, the view of Bultmann (e.g. in Theology of the New Testament, ET 1952, I. 133-183), the historical undergirding of which leans heavily on Reitzenstein, has also been sufficiently discredited to need no explicit discussion here.

(27) Pokorny, ZnW 53 (1962) 160-194; Magne, 'L'exaltation de Sabaoth' (1973), Tradition apostolique and Sacrifice et sacerdoce (both 1975), 'Le pain d'Emmaüs' (1975), 'Ouverture des yeux' (1980).

6) A Programme

Adequate consideration of the very serious issues raised by Schmithals, Magne, and Pokerny is a pressing necessity. That, however, would require a detailed presentation of the worships of the Hellenistic World, and particularly of Judaism, far more extended than is possible within the limits of this study. A much more modest programme is all that is possible here.

The method pursued has been the analysis of the distinguishable traditions of cult attested among Christian minorities (as discussed above), taking note in passing whether any such tradition or traditions may be related to contemporary Christian usage, asking in particular whether there is evidence of primacy on either side or evidence of a common origin.

In anticipation of the presentation of the results, it may be said that the analysis has left the abiding impression that hypotheses of a corpus of "Gnostic" cultic practice have seemed less and less necessary to account for the ritual activities that can be traced. The one positive general finding that emerges for the author is that the ambivalence of many of the mystagogues and other heresiarchs in their attitude to worship may be traced in part to the risks that Jesus was prepared to take in trusting his message to his disciples. The one area of influence on the worship of the Great Church exercised by the "Gnostics" and other minority groups appears to have been in the compulsion to explain and define; this (from a theological view-point) created the risk of making the secondary and dispensable seem to be essential; but it also established the principle that οἰκονομία, a stewardship of the intellect and conscience in matters of worship, is integral to the profession of Christianity.

CHAPTER TWO

CULTS OF POWER

CULTS OF POWER:

GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

Awareness of power is at the deepest roots of religion; and an attempt at an appropriate response to the presence of power is probably the first element of ritual motivation. At every level of sophistication, there occur apotropaic, defensive responses⁽¹⁾; the avoidance of sacred places, the observance of warnings, the wearing of charms, the utterance of defensive formulae, making plans with regard to auspicious and inauspicious days. How these responses will develop depends in part on how the powerful presence that is sensed comes to be explained by a belief-system, through the accumulation of personal and corporate experience. Thus: an advance towards a theism with personal god-concepts will usually incorporate expressions of personal relationship with deity into the ritual responses, or at least many of them. If the belief-system is polytheistic, the responses will allow for playing off one god against another, or for asking one deity to secure the good offices of another. Where the belief-system is becoming monotheistic, the cultic responses touched by this change will vary between direct request and a total submission that asks for nothing. This is in turn partly determined by the

(1) cf the 'negative cult' identified by Durckheim as the first of the 'principal ritual attitudes': Elementary Forms of the Religious Life (1961 edn) 337-361.

understanding of how godhead is related to human life and its environment - but only in part, for even within a single belief-system, the personality and life-history of the single worshipper will cause the ritual responses to divine power to vary from person to person, from group to group, and from situation to situation, while they still remain consistent with the belief-system. For example, a Christian as well as a Muslim will at times say, "Not my will but thine be done", "Insh'allah", and yet be as truly consistent with the Christian Father-God theology as when he says with the frank impatience of the martyrs (Rev. vi.10), "Lord, how long?". No less may a Jew with complete consistency both say, "It is the Lord; let him do what seems good to him" (I Sam.iii.18) and at another moment hector the Eternal with all the abruptness of a Honi the Circle-Maker.⁽²⁾

The individual personality is largely modelled by the corporate experience of the family or other faith-community, both advance and decline, evolution and ^yatavism, in religion as in other areas, are possible because individual personality has and claims at least a degree of freedom and initiative. This is a major factor, perhaps a necessary condition, of communal spiritual growth, at the heart of which there is always to be found an individual with a band of disciples. On the other hand, it is this same element of non-conformism that makes possible the survival, or sometimes more accurately the revival, of ritual stances that the surrounding communal belief-system

(2) See Goldin (1963): Honi an example, not of magic, but of boldness of prayer, on the model of Abraham or Gideon.

has discarded. Examples of such survivals or revivals are numerous in every historical period. They appear most frequently less in main-stream society ^{than} but in sub-cultures and counter-cultures, in the ^{deviant} ~~eleviant~~ and the morbid far more than in the enlightened and the restrained. Although such elements of society are not those usually favoured by the liturgist or other historians, it is important for this investigation that these phenomena, however uncongenial, be adduced as evidence of social and psychological patterns which may possibly be identified in our sources.

It has been noted that the essential stance of a faith community with regard to divine power may be expected to change, although cruder attitudes and hopes survive in minorities. Similarly, there is a development in the ritual techniques employed. Defensive ^{moves} ~~moves~~ against a hostile, ambivalent or capricious power will very soon include techniques for using that divine power itself as a protection. It is not then a long step to attempting to acquire that power for one's own chosen purposes, either sharing power with or even wresting power from its original owner. Communal belief- and value-systems move further, to expect the individual or the hieratic caste to ^{seek} ~~such~~ power only for the benefit of the wider community, and then perhaps only in moments of crisis. As theism becomes personal and ethical, it discountances the seeking for the acquisition of power and favours instead rites of intercession or submission. Nonetheless, the awareness of power persists, and, just as the "magical" stage of childhood mentation⁽³⁾ often persists into adult years, just so the primitive

(3) cf R. Goldman, Religious Thinking from Childhood to Adolescence (London 1964) 21

instinct to seize control of divine power is never wholly lost, and can resurface at any time. Such a resurgence is especially likely in times when the communal belief-system is shaken by corporate catastrophe or destabilized by social and cultural change or through contact with differing value- and belief- systems.

The ambition to share or commandeer divine power may be confined within the privacy of the inner mind; but its very nature asks for expression in corporate power-seeking techniques. "Corporate", because, although the figure of the totally solitary magus is not unknown, techniques of power-acquisition frequently involve the exercise of power here and now, on an empirical level, directly upon other personalities within one's own circle. This is not surprising when the power-seeking is motivated by social inadequacy or deprivation. The victim of this sort of process may be a chance passer-by, frequently one unwarned, helpless and manifestly undeserving of such treatment⁽⁴⁾, but a pecking-order usually develops within the circle of power-seekers also, for the weakness and vulnerability of some of the circle make them the most readily available target for its tougher personalities. Just as the group itself believes that its pursuit of power feeds upon the group's difference from surrounding conventional

(4) Examples must be noted, not only in the clinical literature but also in popular reports of some notorious recent events: Manson and his 'family' (E.Sanders, The Family, London 1972; see ch.9 for cultic elements); Brady and Hindley (E.Williams, Beyond Belief, London 1967; see ch.16-17 for cultic elements); and "Michelle" (M.Smith and L.Pazder, Michelle Remembers, New York 1980; ch.31-33 and passim for cultic elements).

So society, as the leaders in such a case feed on their differences from and dominance of other members - a process that can be repeated with the leadership-circle itself, the principal leader feeding on his or her dominance of the other leaders.

The techniques of power-acquisition ^{Vary} may, naturally, with the social belief-system against which such a power-acquiring group is reacting. Formulae used in conjuring the Powers will reflect the history of that system. In particular, the use of antique formulae conveys a sense of leaping over time and resisting the onward-moving stream of restraint and caution. Antiquity in itself has meaning only by contrast with the main stream of cultural inheritance. Some such formulae are genuinely antique. The author of The Owl Service took the trouble to decipher and translate old Celtic spells, and reproduced them in the novel - carefully making small changes, just in case! - and the departments of Egyptology report that much patronage of evening classes on the Pyramid texts is from students who intend avowedly to acquire the magical repertoire of Pharaonic Egypt⁽⁵⁾. Modern occultism has produced serious attempts at scholarship, such as the translations by "S.L. McGregor Mathers" of The Book of the Sacred Magic of Abra-Melin the Mage (London, ²1900) and of The Key of Solomon the King (London 1909), and G.R.S. Meade's English edition of Pistis Sophia (London, 1892); and there is a steady market for historical studies of magic, whether from occultists, as with A.E. Waite's rendering (London, 1913, ²1969) of The History of Magic by "Eliphas Levi" (= Alphonse Louis Constant, also author of The

(5) Personal communication from an Egyptologist on the staff of the British Museum, December 1982.

Doctrine and Ritual of Transcendental Magic, 1855-6), or from others, a prominent example being Margaret Murray, author of The Witch-Cult in Western Europe (OUP^P 1921) and The God of the Witches (London 1931). However, side by side with the genuinely antique there is the spurious⁽⁶⁾. Like antiquity, real or contrived, strangeness itself conveys a sense of borrowing from alien cultures, as Hellenis/tic magic took divine titles and angelic names from esoteric Judaism.

The whole category of the forbidden is the principal resource of power-acquiring techniques, both because the things that society shuns are shunned for the very reason that power is associated with them, and also because of the psychological effort released in a deliberate attempt to confront the fearful thing. Forbidden things, thus ~~involved~~^{invoked} or otherwise used, fall under three heads: firstly, things dangerous in themselves, or thought to be so, and so shunned for common-sense reasons (the snake, the lion, the wolf, fire, lightning, the sea, dizzy heights, weapons, the moon, blood, darkness); secondly, things banned by ethical judgements of generations (wilful violence, deviant or promiscuous sexual activity, drugs); thirdly, direct defiance of deity by the abuse of holy things (the Mass, the host, holy water, the Bible, the divine name).

Most potent of all are combinations of all three categories of the forbidden:

"47. I will give thee the kingdoms of the earth,

(6) Of the many obvious examples, A. LaVey's Satanic Bible (London 1977), with its 'keys' in the 'Enochian' language, 'thought to be older than Sanskrit' (p.144; for specimens, see pp.149-222), and the pathetic Book of Shadows (in J. Johns, The King of the Witches, London 1969, Appendix A), may be mentioned.

O thou who hast mastered the kingdoms of the
East and of the West.

48. I am Apep, O thou slain one. Thou shalt
slay thyself upon mine altar. I will
have thy blood to drink.

49. For I am a mighty vampire, and my
children shall suck up the wine of the earth
which is blood.

50. Thou shalt replenish thy veins from the
chalice of heaven.

51. Thou shalt be secret, a fear to the
world.

52. Thou shalt be exalted, and none shall
see thee; exalted, and none shall suspect
thee.

53. For there are two glories diverse, and thou
who hast won the first shalt enjoy the
second.

54. I leap with joy within thee; my head
is risen to strike.

55. O the lust, the sheer rapture, of the
life of the snake in the spine!

56. Mightier than God or man I am in them,
and pervade them.

57. Follow out these my words.

58. Fear nothing.

Fear nothing.

Fear nothing.

59. For I am nothing, and me shalt thou fear,
O my virgin, my prophet within whose bowels
I rejoice.

60. Thou shalt fear with the fear of love: I
shall overcome thee.

61. Thou shalt be very nigh unto death.

62. But I will overcome thee; the new life shall
illumine thee with the light that is beyond the
stars.

63. Thinkest thou? I, the force that have
created all, am not to be despised.

64. And I will slay thee in my lust.

65. Thou shalt scream with the joy and the
pain and the fear and the love - so that
the Λογος of a new God leaps out among
the stars.

66. There shall be no sound heard but this
thy lion-roar of rapture; yea, this thy lion-roar
of rapture".

This passage from an incantation-book of Aleister Crowley,⁽⁷⁾
illustrates the use of all three categories of the forbidden: the
dangerous (blood, 48 - 50; the vampire, 49; the snake, 53, 55);
the unethical (pride, 52, 65; lust, 54-5, 59, 64-6); defiance of
God (47, 48, 56, 59, 62, 63, 65). All these are woven together in

(7) A. Crowley, Liber Stellae Rubrae, in Liber I... (Seattle, n.d.)
18-20.

invitation to power which combines the offer to the disciple of personal mastery inseparable from complete submission to the master magus.

A strong element of secrecy, or perhaps rather secretiveness, is also present in this text (see 48, Apep = ?; 51; 52; and the whole atmosphere of mystification). Together with that which is distant in time or culture and that which is forbidden, that which is secret is a major technique of power-acquisition. The secret may be powerful because the initiate has it, and the non-initiate lacks it - and the power-acquiring process will take one or other of the principal ways according as the initiate continues to withhold the secret or continuously shares it, as a Mormon missionary "identifies" the mysterious script of the Golden Plates discovered to Joseph Smith and "translated" by him.⁽⁸⁾ The secret may be powerful because it is not articulated, either because silence is itself is potent and the breaking of silence an act of appalling destructive power - a theme of most primitive myth that survived into the methodology of philosophical mysticism⁽⁹⁾ - or because the restraint of utterance creates a bond as of conspiracy, however artificial the conspiracy may be (as the mysteries of Eleusis were a matter of public knowledge but also public silence). Or the "secret" may be defiantly

(8) See 'The Book of Ether' i-ii; general background and appreciation in T.F.O'Dea, The Mormons (Chicago 1957) ch.1-2. The 'reformed Egyptian' acrypt turns out to be an adaptation of the Kabbalistic alphabet, preserved (revived ?) by Renaissance occultists: see, e.g., the appendices of P.J.French, Dr John Dee (London 1972).

(9) Cf O.Casel, De veterum philosophorum silentio mystico (Giessen 1919), cap.i.

flaunted in the face of society. The air of secretiveness is achieved by some power-acquiring groups by the deliberate obfuscation of trivial matters; one recent example is the currency of three incompatible accounts of the career of Alex Sanders, self-styled "king of witches", all of which can be traced back to him as their source. (10)

Claims made by power-acquiring groups to fit into specific belief-systems must always be treated with reserve. A major factor in such groups' psycho-dynamics, already mentioned, is their sense of difference from a society which they feel would probably - in some moods, they hope (11) would certainly - oppress and terrorize them ^{if it} ~~it if~~ knew what they did. Part of the power-acquiring game is to conceal, and to reveal in concealing, the 'true' nature of the group by professing either conventional values and beliefs or attitudes so outlandish as to be unthreatening. Closely allied with this tactic is the desire to court danger, whether for the sake of power-acquisition through the heightened awareness generated by fear and bravado, or as part of the well-known behaviour-pattern of 'risk-taking'. (12) One example of this phenomenon

(10) See e.g. J. Johns, King of the Witches (London 1967), S. Farrer, What Witches Do (London 1971), J. Johns, Black Magic Today (London 1971) for three incompatible accounts of the life of a single cult-leader (Alex Sanders), all derived from the subject! And note that two of the accounts are from the same writer.

(11) The association of a sense of divine vocation and an explicit hope of being persecuted is well illustrated in the popular account by S.W. Taylor of 'fundamentalist' Mormons who persist in clandestine polygyny: S.W. Taylor, I Have Six Wives (Kingswood, Surrey 1958), pp. 31, 53-4, 80, 110-121.

(12) See J. Steiner, E. Moran, C.P. Seager, 'Risk-Taking' in Proc. Royal Soc Medicine 63 (1970) 1271-1278; cf J.C. Flügel, Man, Morals, and Society: a Psycho-Analytical Study (London 1973 imp.) 197 for older formulations.

from Epiphanius' account (Pan. 26) of the "Gnostics", will call for attention in this investigation.

There is a sense in which a power-acquiring group does ^{possess} ~~process~~ a belief-system, indeed survives only through the unifying effect of a belief-system. It will tend, however, most noticeably in the more sophisticated of such groups, to be determined by personal stance, to be a belief-system determined by a value-system, a commitment to the pursuit, acquisition and satisfying exercise of power that demands that such power shall exist, a preference of uti over frui that obliges the metaphysic to subserve an extreme ethic, and frequently enables the group or its leader to profess, at one and the same time, two or more radically ^{different} doctrines or to demand conflicting responses to its symbolic presentations. (This goes far beyond the trivial obfuscation mentioned earlier). Indeed, the forceful offering of mutually hostile beliefs and irreconcilable images in rapid succession, in virtual simultaneity, is a favoured technique of power-acquirers, especially at a stage where the sense of power derived from the subordination of other personalities has become an end to be pursued for its own sake. One case of this method to be noticed in the material here investigated is that of some imitators of Simon Magus whom Irenaeus mentions. They confronted would-be disciples (or should we say "clients" here?) with statuettes of Simon and Helena. We must assume that either these statuettes bore the inscribed names "Simon" and "Helena", (or that at some earlier stage they had been identified as representing these two people), for the point is that the victims must now identify the statuettes - without being told the answer at

the moment - as those of Zeus and Athene. They get it wrong, of course, and their reward is a torrent of abuse. The purpose of such tactics is so to undermine the subject's hold on logic, his sense of the predictability of events and people, his confidence in his own rationality, that he becomes suggestible and dependent. (13)

In groups that want to be threatened, and in groups whose rationale has thus been reduced to the leader's will to power, the solidarity of the group is reinforced by rituals which humiliate, shock and shame the dependent members to the point where they are emotionally unable to retreat, not least because they despair of any prospect of society accepting them if they recant. A band of sectaries detected near Soissons about 1114 A.D. had a rite in which they consumed, or were told that they consumed, the cremated remains of an aborted fetus; cuique pars pro eucharistia tribuitur, qua assumpta nunquam pene ab haeresi ipsa resipiscitur. (14) It is significant that no such extreme instance can be reliably detected among the Christian minority groups here investigated, except perhaps in the case of Justin "the Gnostic".

Groups devoted to the acquisition of divine power are, in the setting of this investigation, ranged together as "Cults of Power". In some cases, and at certain stages of development, they may descend

(13) See A.Deutsch, 'Tenacity of Attachment to a Cult Leader' in Am.Jl. Psychiatry 137/12 (Dec.1980) 1569-1573, for evidence of psychological regression in disciples. On the general issue of the technique employed see N.L.Munn, Psychology: the Fundamentals of Human Adjustment (Boston, 1966) 555; J.T.Ungerleider, D.K.Wellisch, 'Coercive Persuasion (Brain-washing), Religious Cults, and Deprogramming' in Am.Jl.Psychiatry 136/3 (March 1979) 279-282.

(14) Thus Abbot Guibert of Noyons, de vita sua III.xvii (PL 156, 952).

to the kind of "manipulationist" sect⁽¹⁵⁾ of the kind described in the last few paragraphs. However, this sort of manifestation is itself only one outworking of a deeper preoccupation - a preoccupation with Power, conceived as the most significant divine attribute, even as the constitutive element of divinity, and as the principal object of cult, i.e., of veneration and potential acquisition.⁽¹⁶⁾ Under this heading of Cults of Power this investigation considers: Simon ^{Magus} ~~Magus~~; Menander; Satornil; Kerdon; Karpokrates, Epiphanes and the Carpocratians; Marcus; Elchasai; Justin "the Gnostic".⁽¹⁷⁾

It may be asked whether any of these were in any significant sense Christian, and so whether they deserve any place in a survey of Christian minority groups. Even where they must be judged, on close examination, to be in their basic alignment ^{alien} ~~akin~~ to the Christian creed and the teaching of Jesus, they must still be included in such a survey, for they ranked themselves as Christians or were held by others to belong to the Christian movement, and their doctrines or ambitions affected the Christian mind, for good or ill.

(15) B.Wilson, Religious Sects: a Sociological Study (London 1970) 141-166. Among modern examples: J.Symonds, K.Grant, edd., The Confessions of Aleister Crowley (London 1967), esp. Sec.VI; and cf n.(7).

(16) 'Cult is here employed as denoting the act of devotion to a specific object or end (colere, cultus), and also, by extension, the practices involved and the practitioners, rather than a religious minority group at a specific stage of its social evolution, as defined by R.Wallis, 'The Cult and Its Transformation' in R.Wallis, ed., Sectarianism, (London 1975) 35-44.

(17) Justin the Gnostic is discussed directly among the cults isolated by the Christian-Jewish separation, 292 ff.

CULTS OF POWER, 1:

SIMON MAGUS

(a) Simon in the "Acts of the Apostles".

Simon the Samaritan, who was to figure so largely in the pages of the heresologists, and to enjoy the reputation of being the first head and spring of every deviant movement in Christendom, makes his first certain appearance in a ^{single} ~~simple~~ section of Acts:

(viii.5): "Philip, in particular, having reached a city of Samaria, preached Christ to the people there. (6) With one accord, the crowds paid attention to him and saw the signs which he performed - (7) for many of those who had unclean spirits came out shouting with a loud voice⁽¹⁾ and many people suffering from paralysis⁽²⁾ and lameness were cured - (8) and great joy came to that city.

(9) Now there was a certain man, by the name of Simon, already present in the city, who was practising magic and making the people of Samaria obsessed, for he maintained that he was a certain Great Personage. (10) Everybody, of low estate ^{or} ~~of~~ high, paid attention to him, and said, 'This man is the Great Power⁽³⁾ of God', (11) and they paid attention to him because he had been making them obsessed with his magical arts⁽⁴⁾ for a long time.

(12) However, when they believed Philip as he proclaimed the

- (1) *φωνῇ μεγάλῃ* : perhaps a deliberate echo of Lk.i.42, iv.43, viii.28 ?
(2) *παραλελυμένοι* : cf Bruce in loc.
(3) *καλουμένη*: is omitted by Peshitta, Sahidic (cf Clark, Acts, 49); on using capital initials to convey the distancing effect, see p.57.
(4) *ταῖς μαγίαις*: 'magical doings' - a comparatively neutral term - rather than 'sorceries' (pace Rackham in loc.)

good news of the Kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, men and women alike. (13) Even Simon himself became a believer⁽⁵⁾, and after being baptized he continued as Philip's pupil⁽⁶⁾, for he was obsessed by the signs and great works of power which he saw taking place.

(14) When the apostles in Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent them Peter and John, (15) who on their arrival were to pray for them that they might receive the Holy Spirit, for he had not yet descended on any of them, and they were merely living as those who had been baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus. (17) Then they laid their hands upon them and they received the Holy Spirit. (18) So Simon, when he saw that the Spirit was given through the laying-on of the apostles' hands, pressed valuables on them, (19) with the words, 'Give this authority to me as well, so that whoever I lay hands on may receive the Holy Spirit'. (20) Peter however said to him, 'To perdition with you and your money, for thinking you could get God's free gift for yourself by means of valuables! (21) You have neither part nor lot in this word, for your heart is not honest with God. (22) Repent, then, of this evil of yours, and beseech the Lord that perchance the scheming of your heart may be forgiven you; (23) for I see you are plunged in utter bitterness and the bondage

(5) ἐπίστευσεν : reading in the use of the aorist a note of decision.
(6) προσκαρτέρων : cf Acts ii.42; see p.60.

of unrighteousness'. (24) Simon replied, 'You (pl.) beseech the Lord that ~~name~~^{none} of the things you have mentioned may come upon me'.

In the plan of Acts⁽⁷⁾, this incident is the parallel, in the career of Peter, to the discomfiting of another sorcerer, Bar-Jesus or Elymas, at Paphos in Cyprus by Paul (Acts xiii.4-12), just as the imposition of hands by Peter and John and the consequent gift of the Spirit corresponds to the equally effective laying-on of hands by Paul at Ephesus (Acts xix. 1-7). We cannot here pursue the question as to whether either of these sets of narratives, Petrine or Pauline, should be dismissed as 'unhistorical invention to fit Luke's plan of reconciling the wings of early Christian opinion - though we may observe in passing that both Peter and Paul knew the Old Testament basis (Num. 15.11-25) for linking the imposition of hands with the conferral of Holy Spirit - for the most significant aspect of the story of Simon Magus is not his historicity but his reputation, and especially the use of his name after his death by or against people who had no real link of tradition with what Simon himself did or said. However, the historicity of Simon, Magus and Samaritan, given here in Acts, is not lightly to be rejected. In the first place, we have the character of the narrative itself. The description is in general restrained, free from the kind of polemical drama typical of even the more sober apocryphal Acts.⁽⁸⁾ Peter's rebuke leads to no

(7) cf B.S.Easton, The Purpose of Acts (1936).

(8) e.g., Vercelli Acts of Peter xvii (ET, 318-320 James).

miraculous punishment, such as we should have expected after the case of Ananias and Sapphira (Acts v, 1-11), and as indeed does occur in the case of Elymas. (If the Elymas story had been a doublet of the Simon story, as was suggested by Waitz⁽⁹⁾, the punishment of Elymas would have had a counterpart in Acts viii, which it does not). In the second place, we have the apparently independent testimony of Justin and an unexpected witness in Hegemonius, both to be noticed in due course.

The governing motive of the Acts viii narrative is of course to illustrate the triumphant progress of the Christian mission, in this instance despite the intrusion of dangerous elements into the heart of the Church's membership; to illustrate the equality and unanimity of the leading figures in the infant community; and also no doubt to reassure anxious enquiries that the new religion, far from being a new instance of the vicious occultism so prevalent in the Graeco-Roman world, was totally opposed to such occultism and could both detect and discredit it. Little attention can be spared for Simon, and as soon as he has been rebuked by Peter he falls completely out of sight. However, three points about Simon are clearly made.

One is his total inability to appreciate the spiritual and ethical requirements of the indwelling of the Spirit. He approaches the Christian community entirely on the level of magic, offering money for secret techniques, and leaves it on the same level⁽¹⁰⁾,

(9) Waitz, 'Simon Magus in der altchr. Lit.' (1904); cf Nestle, 'Der Magier in Josephus, Ant. xx' (1907), Harris, 'A Curious Bezan Reading' (1902). (10) cf Rackham in loc. (p. 119).

nervously asking Peter and the others to use their privileged access to the Deity to avert from him the ill luck threatened by his maladroitness and Peter's supposed curse.⁽¹¹⁾

The second point made about Simon is that he is a magos. This category was so readily comprehensible in the Hellenistic world that no more specific statement would be necessary, but its use here (in the use of *μαγείων* for the activity of Simon), although it classifies Simon clearly enough, leaves many details undefined. The only clues given by Acts viii to the nature of Simon's practice as understood by the author of Acts are, i): the reference to power, and, ii): his interest in distinctively Christian experience. The reference to power is first ascribed, not to Simon himself, but to the people of "the city", who identify him as "the Power of God that is called Great". The use of *καλουμένη* here fulfils for an age without printing the task carried out in modern times either by inverted commas or by capital letters: by inverted commas, if the reporter is compelled by accuracy to use the precise term given by an original, but to distance himself from it, either because he is unsure that the source is correct in applying it, or because the term itself as applied in the context is ethically or aesthetically repugnant to him; or by capital letters if a well-known title, especially one implying unique importance, is intended.⁽¹²⁾ The device seems to

(11) So regarded, clearly, by Simon, although the words of Peter are carefully phrased by Luke to be rather a solemn rebuke (so Chr. Wordsworth, in loc.) (12) In colloquial English, the emphasis (in writing, represented by underlining or italics) may do this: 'You're not the David Shepherd, are you?' (A theological student of this name reports thus being confused with Bishop David Sheppard).

function in this text on both levels. There is no doubt that the author of Acts distances himself from any suggestion that Simon is anyone great; this distancing himself from any use of superlatives about Simon is certainly allowed for in his use of *καλουμένη*, but the point has surely already been made enough in his dismissive description of Simon's giving himself out to be a certain Great Personage, as well as his terminology of "obsession". He is, then, also saying that the *καλουμένη* overtone is present also in the source that he is using. Beyschlag⁽¹³⁾ argues that the Samaritans, as reported by Acts, are quoting some ritual utterance repeatedly used by Simon: "I am the Great Power of God", or the like. This is certainly possible, for such claims made by cult-masters are common in cults of power (Marcus and the prophets cited by Celsus are examples that call for notice later in this investigation). However, if Acts is to be dated as late as Knox⁽¹⁴⁾ and others prefer, the use of such a title is much more likely to be a feature of Simon's posthumous reputation than part of his own magical teaching. Not that we need to posit a late date for Acts to question Beyschlag's view. If Acts had meant to tell us that Simon said, "I am the Great Power of God", a direct quotation would have been much more economical.

(13) K. Beyschlag, Simon Magus u.d. christliche Gnosis (1974) 99-106; cf. Lüdemann, Untersuchungen zur simonianischen Gnosis (Göttingen 1975) 41. (14) J. Knox, 'Acts and the Pauline Letter Corpus' in L. E. Keck, J. L. Martyn, edd., Studies in Luke-Acts (London 1968) 279-287.

Even if ^{such} a sentence had been too blasphemous for Acts to quote verbatim, some clear reference to Simon's claiming or accepting such a title was not beyond the author: we note his description of Herod half acknowledging divine titles in Acts. It is far more natural to read the Samaritans' words as an acceptance of Simon's divine ~~or~~ semi-divine status in terms of a theology already favoured by them. What that was or might have been must be considered when discussion of Simon's own views is complete.

The second clue to Acts' understanding of Simon's teaching and practice is the scale of priorities reflected by his interest in the new religion. He is impressed by Philip's healing miracles upon (it seems) both psycho-somatic and functional disease, and yet more impressed by the illapse of the Spirit - or rather, presumably, by manifest effects of that illapse, which can hardly be anything other than glossolalia⁽¹⁵⁾, as in the later case of Marcus. Laying-on of hands is the ritual act clearly linked with glossolalia. It may have been linked also with the healings, as ⁱⁿ some cases in the Gospels⁽¹⁶⁾, although other acts associated with Jesus' healings, such as words of command, insufflation, the use of spittle, etc.⁽¹⁷⁾, might have served

(15) Acts ii.1-13, x.44-48, xix.1-18 (not, apparently, in the cases in iv.31, ix.17-19 (16) Mk.vi.5; vii.32; Lk.iv.40,xiii.13.
(17) See surveys in E.R.Micklem, Miracles and the New Psychology (London 1922), A.Richardson, Miracle Stories of the Gospels (London 1941), J.M.Hull, Hellenistic Magic and the Synoptic Tradition (London 1974), esp.76-78,82-86,133-141; A.Oepke in TDNT III (Grand Rapids 1966) 208-211.

as Philip's models; Simon's offer of a bribe for some secret known to Peter and John but denied to Philip suggests that their outward practice was similar - leaving an occultist with no alternative to the expectation of a hidden device - and that the healings too were indeed associated with the imposition of hands, but the matter is not clear. Simon has already participated in Christian baptism, admitted among the believers. He has also taken part in the regular gatherings presided over by Philip. Since the verb in vii. 13, *προσκατερώων*, is used also in Acts ii.42 for the continuing worship of instruction and sharing, breaking of bread and prayers, it is probably meant that Simon took part in the same sort of worship-pattern (including in some sense eucharistic worship?). Of the phenomena he has observed among the Christians, then, Simon is most attracted by glossolalia. He expects to be able to pay for the secret of inducing glossolalia. The conventions of his time encouraged place-seekers to buy priesthoods⁽¹⁸⁾, but this is something more: he asks not only for status but for power, *Δότε καὶ μοι τὴν ἐξουσίαν ταύτην*. . . . This, and the outward similarity between the incomprehensible sounds of glossolalia⁽¹⁹⁾ and the strange noises of Hellenistic magi⁽²⁰⁾, make it certain that Simon

(18) See Derrett in *ZnW* 73/1-2 (1982) 52-68: 'Simon Magus (Acts 8.9-24)'. (19) cf M. Smith, 'Pauline Worship as seen by Pagans' in *HThR* 73 (1980) 1-2 (Jan.-Apr.) 241-249. (20) See E. Wellesz, History of Byzantine Music and Hymnography (Oxford 1961) 64-68.

regards the new religion as, at least in part, a power-cult, and probably as one specialising in revelation-magic.

The third point about Simon by Acts viii is that he is not a Jew, although it is often taken for granted that he was one⁽²¹⁾, perhaps because it has been natural to read "Samaritan" as "Samaritan Jew" here, as in the Gospels. His name is a Greek one, and there is no reason to assume that it represents "Simeon".

Peter's words to him,

οὐκ ἔστιν σοι μερίς οὐδὲ κλη-
ρος ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τούτῳ· ἡ γὰρ καρδία σου οὐκ ἔστιν
εὐθεία ἐναντι τοῦ Θεοῦ. εἰς γὰρ
χολὴν πικρίας καὶ σύνδεσμον ἀδικίας ὁρῶ σε ὄντα.

include (as well as a reference to Isaiah lviii.6) an allusion to Deuteronomy xxix.18:

Μὴ τις ἐστὶν ἐν
ὑμῖν ἀνὴρ, ἢ γυνή, ἢ πατριὰ, ἢ φυλὴ, τινὸς ἢ διάνοια ἐξέ-
κλινει ἀπὸ Κυρίου τοῦ Θεοῦ ὑμῶν, πορευθέντες λατρεύειν τοῖς
θεοῖς τῶν ἐθνῶν ἐκείνων· μή τις ἐστὶν ἐν ὑμῖν ῥίζα ἄνω
φύουσα ἐν χολῇ καὶ πικρίᾳ.

(so LXX).

Since these words denounce the admission of heathen cult-practices among the Jews, the implication may be that Philip's converts are Samaritan Jews; but since conversions from among Gentiles may have already begun (Acts viii. 1-4), it is not safe to assume more than

(21) Apparently assumed (e.g.) by the discussion of A.Ehrhardt, The Acts of the Apostles (Manchester 1969) 43-44.

that Peter is applying to the Church the same standards of loyalty that applied to Israel. As for Simon, he represents in person the whole of Gentile superstition. It is not the danger to him threatened by pagan influences which Peter is concerned with, so much as the threat which Simon himself poses to the Church: Simon is in person "the root of bitterness", suggested by Deut,xxix. He is not a Jewish magus, then, like the sons of Sceva in Acts xix. 13-20, but a heathen one.

Attempts have been made⁽²²⁾ to explain Simon's alleged status as "the Great Power" from Samaritan Jewish theology. This is not without value, for it may throw light on one element in the religious climate of Samaria which provided the vocabulary applied to. This information is nonetheless of limited value if, as is here argued, Simon was not a Jew. Samaria was largely Gentile. Evidence of pagan worship in Sebaste, the former Samaria and probable site of the Acts viii events⁽²³⁾, may provide some parallel to the veneration of Helen of which later sources testify, but it does not illuminate the claim to Power reported by the Lucan account. Nor is any light thrown upon Simon's cultic acts or that of any followers of his. His followers, if any, were more an audience than a congregation.

(22) See Lüdemann, Untersuchungen, 45-6.

(23) Initially by Headlam in HDB IV (Edinburgh 1902) 520-527, more substantially by L.-H. Vincent, 'Le culte d'Hélène à Samarie', RevBib.45 (1936) 2(avril) 221-232, L.Cerfaux, 'Simon le magicien à Samarie' (RechScRel XXVII/5 (déc.1937) 615-7.

(b) Simon in the Extant Works of Justin Martyr.

In his argument in the First Apology that the profession of Christianity should not be an indictable offence, Justin shows that pagan attitudes to Christians are illogical and inconsistent (I Apol. xxiv ff). Christians share the civilized distaste felt by the Greeks for grotesque rituals - yet they are punished because their worship is not conventional (xxiv). Their theology is free of the crass blemished^s of which decent pagans are ashamed - but this is not remembered to their credit (xxv). They are not tolerated, although eccentric and novel religious sects on the edge of Christianity are not persecuted, nor the behaviour of their members investigated (xxvi). The Christians care for children as the pagans know they themselves ought to (xxvii-xxix)...and so to a positive argument as to the work and dignity of Christ.

The novel superstitions which have appeared after Christ's ascension and have been allowed to flourish with impunity are those of Simon, of his pupil Menander, and of Marcion. Their two common features are (i) that they are reputed to be Christian movements (which Justin stoutly denies), and (ii) that their founders claimed divinity. (This is clearly totally inapplicable to Marcion; but the strength of the assumption is one of the many features of Justin's report which indicate how deeply ^{the} ~~that~~ figure of Simon impressed him at a receptive stage of life). Of Simon in particular Justin states ^{three} ~~these~~ things: that he was worshipped in Rome as divine; that he was worshipped in Samaria as divine; and that the Samaritans ~~knew~~ of a

woman companion of Simon's, Helen, whom they also venerated:

(evil demons unleashed upon the world) "a certain Simon, a Samaritan from the village named Gitta. In the reign of Claudius Caesar, after he had, by means of the craft of the demons who were working through him, performed powerful acts of magic in your Royal City of Rome, he was thought to be a god and was accorded the honour of a statue among you as if he had been a god. This statue was erected (on the island) in the middle of the Tiber between the two bridges, ~~leaving~~ ^{bearing} this Latin inscription: Simoni Deo Sancto".

(I Apol. xxvi, I. 190-2 Otto).

The statue mentioned was finally discovered in 1574⁽²⁴⁾, and found to bear the inscription to Semo Sancus, the Sabine (and, if Rendel Harris was correct⁽²⁵⁾, originally Egyptian) god of contracts:

Semoni
Sanco
Deo. Fidio
Sex. Pompeius S.P.F.
Col. Mussianus
Quinquennialis
Decur.
Bidentalibus
Donum. Dedit.

(24) Text in C.I.L. VI.567.
(Cambridge 1931).

(25) J.R.Harris, Semo Sancus

It is usually Justin who is blamed⁽²⁶⁾ for the error of transforming this votive statue to Semo Sancus, put up by an aristocrat of the gens Pompeia in thanks for civic honours, into a cult-statue devoted to "Simon the Holy God". He does not, however, suggest that he has seen the statue himself, as he certainly would have done if he had seen it. Indeed, he speaks of Rome throughout the First Apology as a distant, though respected, place, as of a city he had never yet visited. His later stay in Rome, where indeed he died, has made it easy for us to assume that the First Apology represents his knowledge at that stage of life, whereas it is more ~~reasonable~~^{reasonable} to set the composition of the book, addressed to the Emperor Antoninus Pius and his sons, in the days when he was still an itinerant teacher in the Levant.⁽²⁷⁾ His evidence, then, for this statue supposedly to Simon is certainly that of another, some excited visitor to Rome who was also an enthusiast for Simon and his magic, psychologically disposed to find support for his enthusiasm everywhere, most reassuringly in the great city so far west from his Levantine home. A Samaritan from Justin's or his family's circle, deciphering an alien script, would hardly be an expert in Sabine gods, with or without Egyptian antecedents. However, this linking of Simon's name with a statue is not without interest, for it recurs in the evidence of Irenaeus,

(26) e.g. by Grierson in HDB 1909, 855, and by Beyschlag, Simon Magus (1974) 11, n.11. A fairer estimate in Lüdemann, Untersuchungen (1975) 50.

(27) cf L.W. Barnard, Justin Martyr (1967) 19.

itself also perhaps from Justin.

It is suggested that such an enthusiast might be a Samaritan, not arbitrarily, but in the light of what Justin goes on to say (I Apol. xxvi):

"Almost all the Samaritans, and even a few people of other races, confess this man as the First God, and go so far as to worship him".

(I. 192. Otto).

The tenses of the verbs suggest that Justin believed a Simon-cult to be still prevalent in Samaria when he wrote this Apology. Indeed, his reference to this passage in his Dialogue with Trypho (xx. 6, where he regards his ^{own} attack on the Samaritan Simon-cult as a sharp criticism of his own people) could also be ^{read} ~~seen~~ in such a light, for there the Samaritans "say" (λέγουσι) certain things of Simon. On the whole, however, his account must be judged chiefly as describing a past situation, for in the next sentence of I. Apol. xxvi we find Helen wandering about with Simon "at that time". The present tenses have a dramatic air, as has Justin's claim to describe the feelings of "almost all" the Samaritans. Such naiveté is most understandable in a young and impressionable person. The passage is therefore to be interpreted as recalling the vivid impact made on him in adolescence by the religious interest of the circles in which his pagan parents moved, and by which his mental world was then encompassed. This points to the period of (say)

100-120.⁽³⁰⁾

The cult of Simon as First God is an enigma. It has been associated with Samaritan-Jewish concepts of deity⁽³¹⁾, but the title is hardly consistent with any sort of monotheism. Pagan parallels, such as with Samaritan-pagan cults⁽³²⁾, are more promising. It is nonetheless possible that we have here Justin's loose periphrasis of the kind of title used in Acts viii, "the Great Power of God", read by Justin, understandably, as virtual deification. This is rendered more probable by Justin's expression in Dialogue cxx.6: of Simon, the Samaritans say he "is above every principality and authority and power"⁽³³⁾, clearly not the terms used by the Samaritans, but a paraphrase of whatever they said in the language of Justin's devotions and Justin's Bible⁽³⁴⁾: "above all principality and authority and power and dominion" (Eph. i. 21). Whatever the titles applied, the statement that the Samaritans in question "worshipped" (περὸ σκυνοῦσι.) Simon is emphatic, though it may mean only that he was invoked in the course of theurgic operations, or that his statue was venerated with garlands or incense.

(30) Valuable discussion in Barnard, Justin Martyr (1967) ch.i.

(31) cf Lüdemann, Untersuchungen, 45-47; the negative remarks of Beyschlag, Simon Magus, 42-47, seem entirely justified.

(32) cf Vincent, 'Le culte d'Helene...' (1936).

(33) II, 402 Otto: ὃν θεὸν ἀπὸ πάντων ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας καὶ δυνάμεως εἶναι λέγουσι.

(34) καθίσας ἐν δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις | ὑπεράνω πάντων ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας καὶ δυνάμεως καὶ κυριότητος καὶ παντὸς ὀνόματος ὀνομαζομένου οὐ μόνον ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι.

Justin goes on to remark (I Apol. xxvi) that the Samaritans "also say that a certain Helen, who travelled about with him, having originally been a street-walker" (Justin uses the euphemism, "having stood on the roofs", ἐπὶ τέγους στε-
θεῖσιν) was the First Thought which came forth from him".

(I. 192 Otto).

Justin is the first to mention these details. That Simon had a conspicuous female disciple whose name was remembered is entirely possible, and there seems to be no reason for inventing her. That she was a converted prostitute is also possible, and this statement is apparently derived from friendly sources. There is no charge of immorality here, still less of sexual rites. Have we a "Simonian" attempt to compete with the Magdalen? Helen's role as Simon's First Thought is obscure. It may reflect some kind of male-female syzygy-doctrine associated with Simon's or similar magic. Inferences from this about Simon's cultic usage, to say nothing of any "Simonian" cult-tradition, are unjustifiable.

In his Dialogue CXX.6, as has been noted, and in I Apol. xv, the Simon-cult is portrayed by Justin as a Samaritan peculiarity, for the most part. When, in another context (Dial. xxxv. 6), Justin sets out to line up the chief perversions of Christianity, he lists only Marcionites⁽³⁵⁾, Valentinians, Basilidians and Saturnilians. Simon, apparently, does not come to mind. He is, at most, peripheral to the Christian world.

(35) With ET of Davie and of Lukyn Williams, and with Barnard, Simon Magus, 129.
Justin Martyr,

(c) Simon in the "Hypotyposes" of Hegesippus.

The enigmatic references to Simon in the extant fragments of Hegesippus ^{are} ~~is~~ mentioned for completeness and as a check on some later sources. His description of the origin of heresy and its infection of the Church (in Eusebius, H.E. IV. xxii, 4-6, pp.156-157, Schwartz) lays all at the door of one Thebuthis, who is represented as having been passed over, in preference of Symeon, a cousin of Christ, in the election of the successor of James the Just.⁽³⁶⁾ In his envy and thwarted pride, so Hegesippus seems to say, Thebuthis made common cause with the "seven sects" in the attack on the Church's faith. From this unholy alliance emerged what seem to be Jewish movements in competition with orthodox Christianity ("Simon and his Simonians, Cleobius and his Cleobienes, Dositheos and his Dosithians, Gorthaios and his Gorathenes, and Masbotheans") and subsequently the heresies of Gentile origin ("Menandrianists, Marcianists, Carpocratians, Valentinians, Basilidians and Satornilians"). The assertion that one group or opinion is derived from another is of course a polemical commonplace, and such phrases as Σίμων, ὅθεν Σιμωνιανοί, καὶ Κλεόβιος, ὅθεν Κλεοβιηνοί ... are so vague and stylised as to show conclusively that Hegesippus is trying to make some sense of a remote, largely forgotten and confusing parcel of events.

There is no hint of liturgical information about Simonians

(36) On the Christian 'khalifate', cf Brandon, Fall of Jerusalem, Ch.3, and the cautious remarks at p.52,n.2.

(or any one else) here. We may however note is passing the "seven sects". These are sceptical Jewish sects, who denied the Resurrection and the final advent of the Judge (see their debates with James the Just, described by Hegesippus apud EUS., H.E., II. xxiii.8, p.69 Schwartz). They appear to be identical with the "Essenes, Galileans, Hemero baptists, Masbotheans, Samaritans, Sadducees, Pharisees" so unhelpfully listed by Hegesippus at Eusebius IV. xxii.7 (p.157 Schwartz). In a confused fashion, Hegesippus is saying that Simonianism and heresy of all sorts are results of the Church losing its hold on its own faith and succumbing to the influence of its environment - in Hegesippus' experience, a Jewish environment.

(d) Simon in the "Adversus Haereses" of Irenaeus.

The passage devoted to Simon the Samaritan in Adversus Haereses (I. xxiii. 1-4 Massuet, I.xvi. 1-3 Harvey = Vol.I, pp.190-5) falls naturally into three sections. The first (xxiii.1 Massuet, xvi.1 Harvey = pp.190-1) is a quotation from Acts viii, with comments and two additional details (the statue and Simon's pretended status as the supreme father). The longest section (xxiii. 2-3 Massuet, xvi.2 Harvey = pp. 191-194) is, not unlikely⁽³⁷⁾, an excerpt from the lost Syntagma of Justin against all the heresies which seems to be mentioned in I Apol. xxi. The original must have included a reference to the alleged statue of Simon in Rome. Irenaeus omits it in this section altogether, having mentioned it briefly (and perhaps on the

(37) For the source-criticism of this part of AH, cf Lipsius, Quellenkritik (1865) 78-87; Hall in ERE 11 (1920) 516; Headlam in HDB IV (1902) 520-7; Beyschlag, Simon Magus, 13-18.

authority of the Apology) in the foregoing section; this omission, though small, is a clear indication that we cannot regard this excerpt, if it be such, as an exact copy of its supposed source. The concluding section (xxiii.4 Massuet, xvi.3 Harvey = pp.194-5) turns from past to present tenses, and may be taken as representing Irenaeus' impressions of the current state of the Simonians.

The whole passage about Simon and the Simonians has the appearance of an after-thought in the structure of Adversus Haereses I. The main preoccupation of the work as a whole is Valentinianism, after all, and the inclusion of other manifestations of heterodoxy, although it strengthens the polemical effectiveness of the argument, has about it a suggestion of happening for completeness' sake (and perhaps out of a pupil's pietas toward the revered Justin).

The first section, based on Acts viii, includes such commonplace observations as that Simon mistakenly regarded Christian healings as magical and the gift of the Spirit as the mark of a higher grade of magic.⁽³⁸⁾ The narrative is extended to the assertion that he went on to pursue the knowledge of all branches of magic, with the result that Claudius honoured him with a statue. Irenaeus' cautious reference to this rumour - "quippe cum esset sub Claudio Caesare, a quo etiam statua honoratus esse dicitur propter magicam" - shows how sceptical he was as to Simon's deification in Rome, either because he had looked for the statue when in Rome and failed to find it, or (more probably) because of a sound sense of

(38) There is a remote possibility that Luke's motives for the inclusion of the Simon story included concern that the developing Christian liturgy was already beginning to be surrounded by quasi-magical expectations.

probabilities.

The final feature of this section is the description of Simon's pretended divinity. Although it contains no ritual details, it is relevant to the existence and history of any Simon-cult. "He was glorified as a god by many" says hardly more than its probable source, I Apol. xxvi. However, "he taught that he himself was the one who was to appear among the Jews as Son, would descend in Samaria as Father, and would come among the other nations as Holy Spirit" is on an altogether different footing. The appearance of this "modalistic" expression in a Montanist context⁽³⁹⁾, and its obvious parallelism with the crisis of Trinitarian theology in the late second and early third centuries⁽⁴⁰⁾ is convincing evidence that we have here a theologoumenon from a contemporary of Irenaeus. In the sentence, "He said that he was the Absolute Sovereignty" (or, more probably, "Highest Power", sublimissimam virtutem), "that is the Father above all, and was willing to be called whatever men called him", we meet a combination of the information of Justin in I Apol. xxvi and Dial. cxx. with the title of Father, a divine title that could have been bestowed at any stage, and the doctrine of "polyonomasia". This doctrine, that the multiplicity of divine names concealed a basic monotheistic consensus, was a philosophical common-place of the Hellenistic

(39) cf Didymus of Alexandria, de Trinitate III.41. Note also the use of a story of magical flight followed by fatal fall in the case of Theodotus the Montanist, by the Anonymous Anti-Montanist in Eusebius h.e. V.xvi.14.

(40) For modalism, see Kelly, Early Christian Doctrines, 119-126; the Simon of Acts viii, who asks for a power, in the bestowal of the Spirit, distinct from whatever is given by baptism into the name of Jesus, is hardly a modalist !

world⁽⁴¹⁾, but its use in this context, in association with the "modalist" use of Trinitarian language is so apt that we may conclude that both ideas had been developed together, not long before Irenaeus' time, and combined in a syncretistic doctrine in which the figure of Simon loomed large. What kind of people had an interest in such a doctrine is to be learnt from the third section of the evidence of Irenaeus.

The middle section of Irenaeus' evidence (xxiii. 2-3 Massuet) ~~seems~~ in essence to go back to Justin. However, some explanation must be found for the many details which appear here but are not supported by the short references in I Apology and Dialogue. The story of the woman Helen and her release from prostitution is a little more elaborate than in I Apol. xxvi, the only substantial addition being the location of her servitude in Tyre, a feature which has been attributed⁽⁴²⁾ to confusion with the myth of Isis, probably correctly. The role of Helen as the first thought of the Creator is also compatible with I Apol. xxvi. However, the story of Helen/Ennoia's descent and enslavement and her redemption by the manifestation and apparent incarnation of Simon, with its concomitant denigration of the world and of moral obligation, goes well beyond the reports of Justin examined above. The myth of the Simonian circles which we have associated with Justin's youthful encounters was cosmological. This is soteriological; its centre of gravity has shifted.

(41) See O. Höfer, 'Polyonymos' in W.H. Roscher, Ausführliches Lexikon der gr. und röm. Mythologie, Bd. 3, Abt. 2 (Leipzig 1909), 2680-2682.

(42) cf Hall (1920) 518.

This change may be more apparent than real. The Helen-story in Irenæus, when examined as closely as possible, shows no sure signs of internal inconsistency. Simon and his First Thought move on a purely spiritual level, free from the trammels of the flesh until Helen is captured by rebellious angels who imprison her in a physical body in the material world which they have made. The act of creation as such is not evil, but is satisfactory only when directed to creating spiritual beings. What appears superficially similar to the Valentinian Sophia-myth turns out then to be significantly different from it, and we cannot simply regard the Helen-story as being a debased version of it. (43)

Some features of the story have nonetheless the appearance of being additions later than Justin. The metempsychosis of Helen and the references to Greek literature are among those, and are consistent with the syncretistic features noted in the first section of I.xxiii as being close to Irenæus' own time. The same may be said of the disguise adopted by Simon as he descends to save Helen: he passes down through the powers and authorities and angels "transformed and made like" one of them, to appear among men in the guise of a man. This has an obvious kinship with later second-century Christological developments. (43^a)

A confident decision as to precisely how much of this middle section goes back to Justin and how much is fresh matter from other sources known to Irenæus is beyond us. This is no great problem to

(43) A suggestion noticed in passing by Cerfaux (1926) 11.

(43^a) Cf Ascension of Isaiah x.8-xi.15 (according to the Ethiopic text as represented by Charles ET, 70-77 - the Latin and Sahidic, 129-30 Charles, seem to have misunderstood the logic of the passage); Latin Infancy Gospel of Thomas v.6 (ET p.60 James, ANT); 'Vercelli' Acts of Peter xx (I,68 Bonnet).

the present investigation, for no directly ritual information is involved; but it would have been helpful if some clearer evidence as to the existence of a Helen-cult had been discoverable here.

The concluding section (xxiii.4) of Irenaeus' account of Simon has every appearance of conveying in his own words his view of their current position. Its very general character and lack of detail on persons, places and customs shows that Irenaeus had little if any direct contact with professed disciples of Simon.

The first significant point is that Irenaeus is not describing a religious community, a sort of Simonian church. He speaks only of a series of individual teachers. The Latin reads: Igitur (i.e., consistently with the low view of the ^h physical world and of prophecy described in xxiii.3) horum mystici sacerdotes libidinose quidem vivunt, magias autem perficiunt, quemadmodum potest unusquisque ipsorum. The name of Simon is preserved in the lore and practice of magical practitioners (all essentially solo performers!). The Greek text as preserved in Hippolytus VI.xx has been both abridged and adapted: οἱ οὖν τούτου μαθηταὶ (1. μαθητὰς) μαγείας ἐπιτελοῦσι καὶ ἐπαοιδὰς. Hippolytus' choice of μαθηταὶ may be purely for continuity with his preceding account of Simon, but his avoidance of whatever word stood in Irenaeus' text encourages the view that the latter had chosen a phrase which Hippolytus found surprising - perhaps μυσταγωγοὶ ?

The catalogue of magical operations - exorcismis et incantationibus utuntur. Amatoria quoque et agogima, et qui diceuntur paredri et oniropompi, et quaecunque sunt alia perierga apud eos studiose exercentur - has been dismissed⁽⁴⁴⁾ as a feature transferred from the

(44) Lüdemann, 86; cf, in general, Rudolph (1977).

account of the Carpocratians in Adversus Haereses I.xxv.3 (Massuet, I.xx.2 Harvey = I, p.206), although it would have been more reasonable to suppose that the later chapter imitated the earlier. It is indeed true that these items of magical stock-in-trade are so much of a common-place that the details must not be pressed. Imaginem quoque Simonis habent factam ad figuram Jovis, et Helenae in figuram Minervae; et has adorant (προσκυνῶσι, Hippolytus).

Irenaeus has already alluded, and that with obvious scepticism, to the supposed Roman statue to Simon. This statement is clearly independent of that matter, and from another source. Irenaeus need be referring to no more than one case of a magus who displays busts alleged to be of Simon and Helen in his consulting room or in the sacred niches of his house, rather as Alexander Severus collected the busts of great men of religion and philosophy, Christ included.⁽⁴⁵⁾ "Adoration" of such busts need mean no more than burning a stick of incense or leaving a bunch of flowers before them or displaying the busts in a presiding position over the scene of magical operations. More exact we cannot be.

Irenaeus has had some recent information of the opinions of occultists who use Simon's name, for their reputation has been linked with recent Docetist, syncretistic, modalist fashions of thought. In the last resort, however, Simonianism as he knows it can be reduced to the magical performances of a few individuals, of whom nothing extraordinary can be said. If some of these occultists penetrate the heterodox fringes of the Church, that is only to be expected. They

(45) Scriptores Historiae Augustae, Alexander Severus 29.2.

do not represent any developed deviant version of Christian belief or worship.

(e) Simon Magus in the Acts of Peter, and other minor documents.

Chronology alone places the Acts of Peter between Irenaeus and Clement and Origen, for this fiction is not really comparable with the writings of those fathers as a historical source or as a vehicle of theological judgement. However, the fact of the composition of the Acts of Peter somewhere in the last two decades of the second century⁽⁴⁶⁾, and so more or less contemporaneously with Adversus Haereses, offers a criterion by which to judge the sobriety of Irenaeus, as of later patristic authors.

In the Acts of Peter⁽⁴⁷⁾ Simon appears as little more than a towed target for Peter. ^{and Paul (Is} Paul introduced to show he is on Peter's side? He is twice described as a Jew (vi and xxii; Vol. I, p. 51, l. 27 and p. 70, l. 1 Lipsius-Bonnet). Since Peter's being Jewish is also mentioned in the second case, this is not an anti-Jewish feature; and indeed Simon is made to speak as one whose faults included contempt for his own people (xiv; p. 61, l. 29). His magic is depicted as consisting in the inducement of hallucinations for dishonest ends (iv, xvii and xxxi; p. 49, ll. 1-7 - note the hour, and the use of dazzling sunshine - p. 61, l. 33 - p. 65, l. 25 and p. 80, ll. 23-25, ^{following} ~~following~~ the Greek text with James, Apocryphal

(46) On the date of Acts of Peter as 180-200, see Schneemelcher in Hennecke-Schneemelcher II, 187.

(47) Numbering the chapters consecutively as in the Latin, with James, ANT 300-336.

N.T. p.331), and in feeble attempts at theurgic healing (xxviii, p.75, l.31-p.76, l.2 and xxxi; p.80, ll.26-29), although his killing of a boy by whispering magical words in his ear⁽⁴⁹⁾ (xxv; p.72, ll.26-28) and his flight alone on the Sacred Way in a last desperate attempt to outshine Peter (xxxii; p.82, ll.16-19) are depicted as real enough, but of course only to be the more effective as a foil to Peter's greater achievements. Tangled references to Simon's claim to deity and its acceptance by some (iv, x) and what seems to be the first reference to the title "The One who Stands" applied to Simon (xxxii; p.80, l.37) are the only hints of any positive doctrinal position of Simon or his disciples. Simon is shown as an alien force invading the Christian community, his only reference to Christ being a contemptuous dismissal of his godhead (xxiii); any veneration of Simon can only be diametrically opposed to Christian worship, not the devotion of a Christian sect of any sort.⁽⁵⁰⁾

Simon had clearly become a remote figure, available for unrestrained use as a Judy to Peter's Punch in this entertaining drama; and, except for the passing reference to ὁ ἑστῶς, which may reflect some document or oral tradition that was later to be incorporated into the Clementine literature⁽⁵¹⁾, there is

(49) Cf the min who healed by whispering in the patient's ear: Herford, Christianity in Talmud and Midrash (1903), quoting Shabb.14d.

(50) cf Cerfaux (1937) 616.

(51) Cullmann, Problème littéraire et historique du roman pseudo-clémentin, 99-116, does not resolve this matter.

nothing even distantly suggestive of current developments.

Brief mention may be made here ^{of} ~~as~~ some minor sources associated with the Acts of Peter or at least their general milieu. Epistula Apostolorum (c.160, so Quasten, Patrology I,150-1, noting other views) mentions Carinthus and Simon as contemporaries of the Apostles and typical false teachers, who subvert faith in Christ; Ep. Ap. vii (Duensing, 5.8; James, ANT p.437; Hennecke-Schneemelcher, I.129-30). Both heresiarchs are lay figures, one derived from Asian traditions linked with John, the other from Acts. The Acts of Paul (c.185-195, Schneemelcher in Hennecke-Schneemelcher II p.241) include a reference to Simon and Cleobius, names perhaps derived from Hegesippus. They are described as causing confusion in the Church of Corinth. Their doctrine is Docetic (material world made by angels, not by God; denial of Christ's coming in the flesh and of the resurrection) with a rejection of the prophets and of divine omnipotence (Acts of Paul viii, Schneemelcher, pp.257-9). The details show a lively theological interest in current controversies, but the names of Simon and Cleobius are obviously inserted as those of typical opponents of orthodox Christianity. The Didascalia Apostolorum from mid-third century Syria, brings together the pictures of the Acts of Peter and the Acts of Paul (with Connolly, Didascalia Apostolorum, pp.lxxviii-lxxix and lxxxiii, against Funk's suggestion of direct dependence on Hegesippus). Again, Simon and Cleobius are typical representatives of Docetism, with various kinds of encratism added for good measure. Again, Simon flies and is shot down by Peter, but is let off more lightly - he breaks his ankle (xxiii Syriac, vi.8-9 Greek (Funk), English version of Syriac pp.200 and 202, and Latin pp. 201 and

and 203 Connolly). A scaled-down version of the competition at raising the dead, as in Acts of Peter, is found in the Syriac Teaching of Simon Cephas in the City of Rome.⁽⁵²⁾

(f) Simon Magus in the Writings of Clement of Alexandria and Origen.

In all of the third book of the Stromateis, in which particular attention is given to sectarian versions of Christianity, there is no single mention of Simon or Simonians. This is not final proof that Clement knew nothing of the subject, for he nowhere claims to give a comprehensive historical survey of heresies nor to identify their sources or order of development, and his interest is in the theological positions advanced by the sects in varying combinations. However, the absence of Simon from book VII becomes significant when it is observed that references to him and his followers elsewhere in Stromateis assume a general knowledge of Simonianism which the book itself (and the rest of Clement's writings) fail to provide. On close examination, the three passages on Simon - on the desire to be assimilated to the "standing figure" of Simon⁽⁵³⁾, on the heretical claim to apostolic tradition⁽⁵⁴⁾, and on the identification of Simonians with the Entychites and the reason for

(52) See B.P.Pratten, tr., Syriac Documents (1871), 53-4.

(53) Strom. II.xi. Abraham (Gen. xviii.22-3) and Moses (Ex. xxxiv.2) are examples of knowing God by means of their stability; an inept annotator adds that Simonians seek assimilation with the Stable One, the object of their worship. The note is doubly out of place within a list of recommended spiritual models.

(54) Strom. VII.xvii. 107 (p.188 Mayor): Μάρκος γὰρ κατὰ τὴν αὐτὴν αὐτοῖς ἡλικίαν γενόμενος ὡς πρεσβύτης νεωτέροις συνεγένετο, μεθ' ὃν Σίμων ἐπ' ὀλίγον κηρύσσοντος τοῦ Πέτρου ἐπήκουσεν.

The addition of Simon, anachronistically after Marcus, is attracted by the preceding references to Peter and Paul as alleged sources for Basilides and Valentinus.

their title⁽⁵⁵⁾, show every appearance of being interpolations. It is suggested here that they are notes attached to the text by a reader familiar with the Refutation of Hippolytus or some similar source, and erroneously brought into the text. On this view, any knowledge of Simon and Simonianism on Clement's part becomes most unlikely. If Clement with his width of knowledge has nothing to say of Simon, we may reasonably infer that neither he nor any supposed followers of his were subjects of current interest to the Christians of early third century Alexandria, orthodox or heterodox.

Origen.

Origen's information about Simon is chiefly negative. The only documentary source he clearly uses is Acts. He has heard that there are a few Simonians in Palestine (an echo of Justin?), but is sure that there are none anywhere else, and jocularly observes that there can be no more than thirty, if so many (c. Celsum I. lvii).

The mention of Simon in contra Celsum is prompted by references in the Alethes Logos of Celsus. c. Celsum I. lvii is devoted to the problem of false Messiahs and to Celsus' jibe that there have been plenty of Jews who thought that they were the fulfilment of Messianic prophecy. It does not appear that Celsus himself had mentioned Simon at this ~~stage~~^{stage}; but he did so in the passage taken up by Origen in V.lxii. Celsus 'knows ^{of} ~~es~~ some also who are Simonians, who reverence as teacher Helena or Helenus, and are called

(55) Strom. VII. xvii. 108 (p. 190 Mayor). In the passage in point, the omission of the bracketed words yields a better sense; they have probably been added by an annotator to remedy what to a later reader seemed an astonishing omission, or may just possibly be a survival from a lost part of the preceding phrase which lists eponymous cult-objects (i.e., Cain and the Snake):

... αἱ

δέ ἀφ' ὧν παρανόμως ἐπετήδυσάν τε καὶ ἐτόλμησαν,
ὡς [τῶν Σιμωνιανῶν] οἱ Ἐντυχिताὶ καλούμενοι.

"Helonians" (p.312 Chadwick), a statement which needs no explanation other than as a confused memory of Justin's First Apology. Origen's reply, based solely on Acts viii, is that Simon was never on a level with Christ, even in the view of his adherents, for they call him a 'power' of God, not 'Son' of God. Origen adds his own suggestion that Simon was ignorantly imitating Christ.

Origen (but not certainly Celsus) touches upon Simon again in the phase of ~~the~~ ^{the} argument devoted to the effects of faith (VI.xi). Against Celsus, Origen insists that, as an object of faith, Jesus is unique. His imitators, such as they are, have never begun to understand him. Examples of such folly are Simon and Dositheus, Judas of Galilee and Theudas (as in I.lvii). Both Simon and Dositheus are briefly described as founders of failed movements. Origen now says that Simonians are nowhere to be found, and that Dositheans are said to be no more than thirty in number.

It has been plausibly suggested⁽⁵⁷⁾ that the inconsistencies between I.lvii and VI.xi spring from a confusion in Origen's mind of Simon with Dositheus. He seems indeed to have met information about both in some writing or tradition in which they occurred together; yet he took no trouble to attempt any consistent account of their relationship, and when mentioning Dositheus alone is consistent to dismiss him as an eccentric Samaritan (de Princ. IV.3.326, p.736 Gurgemanns-Karpp). In any case, it is going too far to infer from any of this that Origen knew some version of the

(57) by Chadwick, ET of Contra Celsum, p.53 n.2, p.325 n.2. In the Commentary on John (VI.17), it is clear that Origen knows no other reliable source on Simon than Acts.

Pseudo-Clementine Grundschrift. The distinctive features of the Clementine tales are quite absent: Helen (Origen fails to rise at all to Celsus' mention of her at V.lxii), the rivalry of Simon and Dositheus, Simon's repeated confrontation with Peter. The only common feature is ~~to~~ ^{the} number 30. This may be a conventional number for moon-worshipping cult circles⁽⁵⁸⁾, and so a natural choice for a quick jibe by Origen; or it may be that Dositheus was described as leading a circle of thirty in Origen's source. What that source might have been must be left to conjecture. The one document older than Origen, and now available to us, in which we certainly find Simon and Dositheus mentioned in the same context is the Hypotyposes of Hegesippos.

Two sources Origen cannot call upon: personal observation and local reminiscence. No supposed sect of Simonians has been a feature of the Alexandrian scene so far as he is concerned.

(g) Simon and "Simonianism" in Tertullian and in 'de Rebaptismate'.
Tertullian.

Tertullian depends almost entirely, for his information on Simon Magus, on Acts viii, read through the eyes of a convert from polytheism. Simon is the prime example of the magician-showman, illa species magia, quae miraculis operatur, of a kind that might infiltrate the Church, but would be detected and driven out: exinde et Simon Magus iam fidelis, quoniam aliquid adhuc de circulatoria secta cogitaret, ut scilicet inter miracula professionis suae etiam spiritum sanctum per manuum impositionem enundinaret,

(58) So Higgenfeld (1865) 373; Beyschlag 57.

maledictus ab apostolis de fide eiectus est (de idololatria ix, I.37 Leopold). His offer of money is used for a moralizing comparison when Tertullian condemns the use of bribery to escape persecution (de fuga in persecutione xii, 1.216 Leopold). Tertullian regards Simon, and thereby presumably all magicians, as serving angels (de praescriptione haereticorum xxxiii.12, 38 Bakhuizen van den Brink). This is not just a reference to any supposed Simonian theory of angel-mediated creation, for he equates this angel-service with the 'nest of bitterness' which is condemned in Simon by Peter - Simonianae autem magiae disciplina angelis serviens utique et ipsa inter idololatrias deputebatur et a Petro apostolo in ipso Simone damnabatur. These remarks do not show any special interest in Simon, let alone any contemporary knowledge of Simonians, for Simon is mentioned almost perfunctorily as an example of heresies already condemned by the apostles and requiring no further refutation. Slightly more interesting is the reference in de anima lvii to necromancy, of which Simon was a typical necromancer (there must be some glancing reference to the Acts of Peter or some similar tale). Simon's "sectaries" (haereticos) still claim, it seems, to call up the souls of the prophets. In this case also, no significant evidence of a living Simonian tradition can be traced. Necromancy - and Tertullian is quite prepared to admit of its possibility, though if it happens it is still a "lying wonder" mendacium, which Christians can see through, as even pagans do, and can vanquish, unlike pagans, with superior spiritual power - was a common-place of contemporary magic⁽⁵⁹⁾, and to call a

(59) cf Justin, I.Apol.xviii, Ammianus, Hist. XXVIII.i. Discussion in Scudamore, DCA I (1880) 1383-4; A.S. Hunt, A Greek Cryptogram (1929), Wunsch, Sethianische Verfluchungstafeln (1909).

necromancer a 'dupe of Simon' is to do no more than discredit a whole genre by association with a notorious name - notorious, that is, certainly among Christians, whose sub-culture and folklore Tertullian assumes, and perhaps also among pagans, if Celsus was not exceptional in his knowledge. The only significant information here is the choice of Simon's name as typifying necromancy, a practice within the general area of cults of power.

De Rebaptismate.

A reference has been⁽⁶⁰⁾ found in de rebaptismate to a supposed Simonian baptism.

The author is aware⁽⁶¹⁾ of certain desperati homines who have taken advantage of John the Baptist's promise that Messiah would baptize in the Holy Spirit and fire, to mount an assault upon baptism: quomodo sanctitatis baptismata ita corrumpant ac violent ut etiam evacuent. So far, this is to say only that they oppose the Catholic usage of baptism, for whatever reason. After a statement that they originate from Simon, which needs separate attention, the author goes on to specify how some opponents of Catholic baptism argue their case.

Some of them claim a superior baptism, at which fire appears over the water when the candidate goes down into the water:

"tentant nonnulli illorum tractare se solos integrum atque

(60) e.g. by Hall (1920) 524.

(61) de rebapt.ix (Cypriani...Opera, Paris edn., 339-40)

perfectum, non sicuti nos mutilatum et decurtatum baptisma tradere, quod taliter dicuntur adsignare ut quam mox in aquam descenderunt, statim super aquam ignis appareat. Quod si aliquo lusu perpetrari potest, sicut adfirmantur plerique hujusmodi lusus Anaxilai esse, sive naturale quid est, quo pacto poscit hoc contingere, sive illi putant hoc se conspicerere, sive maligni opus et magicum virus ignem potest in aqua exprimere, illi tamen talem fallaciam et stropham praedicant perfectum baptisma esse".

It is interesting, but probably mere coincidence, that our author chooses, as his paradigm of the stage-magician, and for comparison with these claimants of a potent baptism, Anaxilaos, who is chosen for similar purposes by Irenaeus in his study of the devices of Marcus, another practitioner of a cult of power noticed subsequently in this investigation. If the sectarians envisaged by the author of de rebaptismate did in fact stage some sort of fire-like light shining on baptismal water, then their rites have at least the psychological concomitants of a power-cult. This confused author, however, cannot be relied upon even to have understood the claims of those he quotes. It is possible that the strange version of Jesus' baptism (Jesus confessing real sins, and accepting John's baptism at his mother's insistence, and the appearance of fire upon the Jordan) in the book that he cites, the otherwise unattested Petri Praedicatio, is the only source that he knows, and that he has inferred from the book what he expects its users to posit as the essentials of baptism. Even at that, his testimony is doubtfully reliable. All that can be said

is that he may have had to cope with a mid-second-century sect, claiming an initiation superior to the Catholic baptism, and describing its superiority by the contrasting images of fire and water (as in the Valentinian "Gospel of Philip", to be examined later), though perhaps with dualist or antinomian traits.

None of this has anything to do with Simon Magus, or with any genuine Simonian counter-church. That these sectaries originem jam exinde trahunt a Simone mago is true only in that figure of Simon is an apt symbol for all those who bring magical pretensions into the baptismal community. There is no extended comparison made here between Simon and the later sectaries, and our author virtually says as much by his choice of quotation; what interests him most is not Simon's heterodoxy but Peter's 'curse'.

(h) "The Lost Syntagma" and the "Refutation".

The reconstruction of the passage relating to Simon in the lost Syntagma posited by Lipsius is especially difficult, not least because the source behind Quorum haereticorum 46, Epiphanius Panarion 21, Filastrius' diversarum haereseon liber xxxix, and Theodoret's Haereticarum Fabularum Compendium i may well have been used also by the author of the Refutation for his section on Simon (VI.vii-xx), but also because it seems to have shared more material with Irenaeus than other parts of the Syntagma, and furthermore because an allegedly Simonian document on which it appears to draw shows signs of having been affected by Ophite interpolation before the author of the Syntagma obtained it.⁽⁶²⁾

(62) See Lipsius, Quellenkritik (1865), 74-85, esp. 76-7. Lipsius' identification of the 'Ophites' here is owing to his assumption that the 'Ophis' must have been a cosmological snake-figure; despite this error, his suggestion that the Apophasis is interpolated has force.

It is also unclear whether the Apophasis Megale, "The Great Announcement", given verbatim by the Refutator as V is given completely; whether it is itself interpolated, or expanded as a commentary on a genuine text of Simon's⁽⁶³⁾; whether it was originally given in full in the Syntagma, or only in summary form, such as now appears in Epiphanius (Pan. 21.6).

Extensive and repeated study of the available text⁽⁶⁴⁾ of the Apophasis Megale leaves one quite uncertain as to its relation with Simon and Helen. For the purposes of this investigation, this is not a difficulty, for no evidence appears in it as to how, if at all, its cosmology (expressed in the imagery of organic reproduction) might be expressed in ritual.

Epiphanius does at one point (Pan. 21.4) appear to infer that Simon advocated some sort of sexual mystery-rite:

4. Μυστήρια δὲ ἐπέθετο ἀσχηρότητος ἡύσεώς τε σωμάτων. ὅπως
σεμνότερον ἐφηγήσονται. ἀνδρῶν μὲν διὰ τῆς ἀπορροίας, γυναικῶν
δὲ διὰ τῶν κατ' ἐθισμὸν [τῶν] ἐμμηρίων συλλογῆ τινι ἀσχηροτάτη
εἰς μυστήρια συναγομένων. καὶ ταῦτα εἶναι μυστήρια ζωῆς γνώσεώς
(τε) τῆς τελειοτάτης. . . .

(63) Cf Frickel, 'Die Apophasis Megale eine Grundschrift der Gnosis ?' (1967).

(64) In the edition of Salles-Dabadie; cf also Frickel, 'Eine kritische Textausgabe der "Apophasis Megale" (Hippolyt, Ref. 6,9-18) ?' in Wiener Studien 6 (1972) 162-84.

ὀνόματα | δέ τινα ὁ αὐτὸς ἐπιτίθεται ἀρχῶν τε καὶ ἐξουσιῶν, οὐρα-
νοῦς τε διαφόρους φησί. καθ' ἕναστος δὲ στερέωμα καὶ οὐρανὸν δι-
νάμεις τινὰς ἐφηγείται καὶ ὀνόματα βαρβαρικά τοῖς ἐκτίθεται· μὴ
ἄλλως δὲ δύνασθαι σφῆσθαι τινα, εἰ μὴ τι ἂν μάθοι ταύτην τὴν
μυσταγωγίαν καὶ τὰς τοιαύτας θυσίας τῷ πατρὶ τῶν ὅλων διὰ τῶν
ἀρχῶν τούτων καὶ ἐξουσιῶν προσφέρειν.

(1, 242. 20-24, 3.2, 5-10 Holl).

The learning of pass-words for a safe journey through the heavens is an "Ophite" technique that needs attention in its proper place. It has no logical connection with the alleged *Μυστήρια* *αἰσχροτήτος* , as well as being interpolated into Epiphanius' source (unless Epiphanius himself dragged it in for good measure). As for the *μυστήρια* themselves, the reference appears to be, not to a congregational act using semen and menstrual blood, but to a challenge to defy, probably in the secrecy of the house, the almost universal tabu against marital intimacy during the woman's menses, an act of defiance calculated to "liberate" and "strengthen" the mind. A comparable counsel is given by the contemporary Power-Cult Orissor⁽⁶⁵⁾, and, although no historical continuity need be posited for one moment, the psychological parallel is noteworthy and in such an area a useful guide to probability. This would be a "mystery" in two senses: it would represent a breaking through the concealing

(65) D.Fosbrooke, Orissor is the Way for All (Sowerby Bridge 1978) 13-14.

of fear into the secrets of supposed power, and it would, even as an act entirely confined within the head of one individual, have a deliberate and resolute quality sufficient to give it a ritual status. This nexus of considerations will need be borne in mind when apparent semen-and-blood-rites are found in evidence relating to the "Gnostics" of Panarion 26. It is in any case probable that this element in Epiphanius' source is itself one of the "Ophite" additions, inserted because of the use of menstrual imagery in the cosmology already in the basic text now preserved in Panarion 21.

The Refutation has a passage (VI.19.5) of comparable import. Before introducing Irenaeus' statement about Simonian use of incantations and love-potions (Ref. VI.20), the writer observes, in connection with Simon's presentation of Helen as the ¹most sheep and the source of liberating gnosis:

οί δὲ αὐτοὶ
μιμηταὶ τοῦ πλάνου καὶ Σίμωνος μάγου γινόμενοι τὰ ὅμοια δρῶσιν, 10
ἀλογίστως φάσκοντες δεῖν μίγνυσθαι, λέγοντες· πᾶσα γῆ γῆ, καὶ οὐ
διαφέρει ποῦ τις σπείρει, πλὴν ἵνα σπείρῃ, ἀλλὰ καὶ μακαρίζουσιν
ἐαυτοὺς ἐπὶ τῇ (ξένῃ) μίξει, ταύτην εἶναι λέγοντες τὴν τελείαν ἀγά-
πην, καὶ τὸ ἅγιος ἁγίων . . . λλη . . . ος ἁγιασθήσεται· οὐ γὰρ μὴ κρα-
τεῖσθαι αὐτοὺς ἔτι τινὶ νομιζομένῳ κακῷ, λελύτρωνται γὰρ.

10 (τοῦ) καὶ Cruice μάγου Σίμωνος ~ We. 12 ποῦ τι P 13 ξένῃ
Miller, ξ wohl kenntlich, Accent auf 2. Buchst.: κοινῶ G5, ἀδιαφόρῳ Cruice un-
möglich 14 ἀγάπῃ Klost. λλη P, vorher können 1-2 Buchst. fehlen: ἐπίλληλος
We., κολληθεὶς Klost. ἁγιασθή P, στ nicht sicher kenntlich 15 ἔτι We.: ἐπὶ P

If, as seems possible, this goes back to a passage comparable with that in Epiphanius' source, we detect here an adaptation, the source behind the Refutation being the later version: the alteration is two-fold, the advocacy of sexual liberation moving away from confrontation with deep-seated aversion to more conventional libertinism, and the spiritual ideal pursued moving away from an explicit quest for potent insight to a superficially Christian pursuit of holy love. Nonetheless, the Power motif is still present: no matter who sows, some one must. The Refutator is clear on the point that that sort of material is later than Simon.

(j) Simon in the Pseudo-Clementine Romance.

In the now lost "Clementine Romance" of which both The Clementine Recognitions and the Clementine Homilies are differing abridgements⁽⁶⁶⁾, the figure of Simon Magus has a major place. It has been maintained even in recent times⁽⁶⁷⁾ that the Simon of the Clementines represents a combination of the historical Simon of the Acts and Justin Martyr with later Simonian theology and practice. The other major theory is that which regards the Simon of the Clementines as a screen for the figure of Paul, the real target of Jewish-Christian polemic.⁽⁶⁸⁾

(66) Cf Hort (1901), Cullmann(1930)

(67) e.g. Beyschlag 46-67.

(68) Still upheld by Schoeps, Theologie und Geschichte des Judenchristentums (1949) 128-33, 144-6.

The interpretation of the Clementines is a thorny problem, (too complex for any attempt at adequate solution within the limits of this investigation), which depends upon the answers given to five questions: who the probable author of the Romance may be (or, if no name can be suggested, the author's place in the varied levels of Christian society or at least his geographical location); to what extent his personal theology and practice reflect that of a local church or distinct Christian tradition or are merely his own; what his main purpose was in writing the original Romance; and who or what is represented by his Simon Magus character; and the probable date of composition. Of these, the fourth question is our present concern, and that itself requires at least a provisional answer to the third (the purpose) and the fifth (the date). Some estimate of purpose and date will make possible at least a provisional understanding of the author's use of sources, itself essential to a reading of the author's use of the figure of Simon.

As to the date, we have the clear statement of Eusebius, writing about 325 A.D.⁽⁶⁹⁾, that the Πέτρου... καὶ Ἀπίωτος διαλόγους is a recent production, attested by no authors of earlier days: Eusebius is apparently contradicted by Origen, in the extant text of whose works are found two clear references to the Clementine Romance.⁽⁷⁰⁾ It has been shown conclusively, however, by the late

(69) h.e.III.38.5; on the date, see the arguments of G.A.Williamson in his ET (1965) 19-21.

(70) Philocalia, p.204 Robinson, and op.imperf. in Matt. (the reference in the full commentary on Matt. xxvi. 10 is in any case only in the Latin text). Cf Hort (1901) Ch.1.

Abbot John Chapman⁽⁷¹⁾ that these references are interpolations of at least the fourth century. The evidence of Eusebius may stand: the Romance is a product of the last years of the third or the early years of the fourth century.

As to the purpose - and the Romance is too full of theological argument to be chiefly for edification or entertainment - we have a clue in the astonishing statement put into Peter's mouth that, when all is said and done, there is no essential difference between Judaism and Christianity:

"Since...both to the Hebrews and to those who are called from the Gentiles, believing in the teachers of truth is of God, while excellent actions are left to every one to do by his own judgement, the reward is righteously bestowed upon those who do well. For there would have been no need of Moses, or of the coming of Jesus, if of themselves they would have understood what is reasonable. Neither is there salvation in believing in teachers and calling them lords. For on this account Jesus is concealed from the Jews, who have taken Moses as their teacher, and Moses is hidden from those who have believed Jesus. For there being one teaching by both, God accepts him who has believed either of these. But believing a teacher is for the sake of doing the things spoken by God. And that this is so our Lord himself says, 'I thank thee, Father of heaven and earth, because thou

(71) In ZnW 9 (1908) 21-34.

hast concealed these things from the wise and elder, and hast revealed them to sucking babes'. Thus God himself has concealed a teacher from some, as foreknowing what they ought to do, and has revealed him to others, who are ignorant of what they ought to do.

Neither, therefore, are the Hebrews ^{condemned} ~~condemned~~ on account of their ignorance of Jesus, by reason of him who has concealed him, if, doing the things (commanded) by Moses, they do not hate him whom they do not know. Neither are those from among the Gentiles condemned, who know not Moses on account of him who hath concealed him, provided that they also, doing the things spoken by Jesus, do not hate him whom they do not know.

And some will not be profited by calling all the teachers lords, but not doing the works of servants. For on this account our Jesus himself said to one who often called him Lord, but did none of the things which he prescribed, 'why call me Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?' For it is not saying that will profit any one, but doing. By all means, therefore, is there need of good works. Moreover, if any one has been found worthy to recognize both (Moses and Jesus) as preaching one doctrine, that man has been counted rich in God, understanding both the old things as new in time and the new things as old".

(Hom. VIII. v-vii; 184-5 Dressel, ET in A.-N.F. 1978,271).

This passage⁽⁷²⁾ says much of the author's Christology and of his sense of being, as both a Christian and a Jew, in a very unusual position; it also reflects a passionate longing to reconcile Jew and Christian, even at the cost of not converting Jews to Christian belief. He is inviting his fellow-Jews, and encouraging his fellow-Christians to join him in inviting Jews, to make common cause against a single enemy - an enemy who, it seems, may inveigle Jews into seeing him, "Simon", as a valuable ally against Christians. Whoever this may have been, ^{as} the author of the Romance, ^{realized,} the danger of such an apparent ally was potentially very great, as may be seen from the ease with which Marxist advocacy has been able to play upon anti-Christian feelings among Jews (in themselves all too excusable after the treatment they have received at Christian hands), despite the avowed intention of Marxism to destroy theistic religion, which strikes as much at the rationale of Jewish existence as at the basis of Christianity.

It is now impossible to state confidently what sources relating to Simon were available to the author of the Romance.⁽⁷³⁾ It cannot be unimportant, however, that no use is made of the Lucan theme of paying for gifts of the Spirit, nor of most of the Helen story from Irenaeus and Justin. The novel view that Simon is linked with John the Baptist⁽⁷⁴⁾ may be an attempt by the Clementine author to link the Simon-theme in the minds of Palestinian readers with a baptizing

(72) From the Grundschrift; more moderately in Rec.IV.v

(73) Cf Arai (1977), esp.118. It may be going too far to say with Chapman, art.cit.147-9, that the Clementines have no source.

(74) Hom.II.xxiii.

power-cult, such as that associated with the name of Elchasai.⁽⁷⁵⁾ Descriptions of Simon's cosmology, and the style of argumentation against it⁽⁷⁶⁾, are somewhat reminiscent of the Megale Apophasis in the Refutation.⁽⁷⁷⁾ The strange tale of Simon's conjuring the soul out of a little boy⁽⁷⁸⁾ sounds like a typical example of the use of children in revelation-magic⁽⁷⁹⁾; the source is folk-lore, based on magical stock-in-trade, and does not argue an underlying source. The same may be said of most of his other achievements: making statues walk, rolling on the fire without being burnt, turning himself into a serpent or a goat, acquiring two faces, turning into gold, opening locked gates, melting iron, creating optical allusions, making plates appear to float through the air⁽⁸⁰⁾ - these are the conventional repertoire of high-class stage magic - but his claim to fly must come from the apocryphal Acts of Peter⁽⁸¹⁾, and turning stones into loaves sounds like an echo of the temptation

(75) See infra, 220ff.

(76) Hom. III. xxxviii-xlvi, Rec. xxxvi-lxix (and cf Acts of Peter xxv-xxviii).

(77) With Lüdemann, 93-5.

(78) Hom. II. xxvi.

(79) Cf the example discussed from P.Lond.465 by Hull, Hellenistic Magic and the Synoptic Tradition (1970) 21.

(80) Hom. II. xxxii.

(81) see ch. xxxii.

of Jesus.⁽⁸²⁾ In the disputations, however, Simon assumes a different character: he is an apologist for pagan polytheism.⁽⁸³⁾

It is probable that the Clementine author is using Simon as an aiming-point for several targets, but Paul is not one of them. None of Paul's distinctive ideas, even in garbled version, is maintained by the Clementine Simon⁽⁸⁴⁾; and, where Paul appears (unnamed) as an opponent of the Church⁽⁸⁵⁾, he is distinct from Simon, and represents hostile Jewry led by Caiaphas.⁽⁸⁶⁾ It is by no means impossible that the sources of the Clementines contained anti-Pauline material, but it does not survive in the Romance in connection with Simon.

One candidate for the role of hidden target does present himself: Porphyry. Porphyry was a vigorous opponent of the Christian movement, an advocate of neo-Platonist theurgy, and an apologist for the old pagan polytheism; and he sought the sympathy and support of the Jews.⁽⁸⁷⁾ His activity belongs to the period 260-280 A.D.⁽⁸⁸⁾

(82) Cf Lk.iv.3, Matt.iv.3.

(83) See Hom.III.iii, XVI.xii.

(84) Noted by Headlam (1902) 524-7.

(85) Rec.I.lxx-lxxi.

(86) Rec.I.lxi-lxxii; in I.lxx, Paul attacks Simon. The theme of Simon could be used by Christians who wanted to magnify Peter at Paul's expense (whatever their reason); but then the method would be to represent Paul-founded churches as more vulnerable to Simon's baleful influence, and needing Peter's paternal correction - we see exactly this in Acts of Xanthippe and Polyxena xxiv.

(87) Relying rather on Telfer (1914) than on Harnack (1916); cf also Bardy (1913).

(88) Helpful survey by A.C.Lloyd in A.H.Armstrong, ed., Cambridge History of Later Greek and Early Medieval Philosophy (London 1970) 283-297.

On all these counts, he is the only likely target for the kind of attack launched by the Clementine author by way of Simon. Of Simon himself, and of any supposed "Simonians", the Clementines have nothing to say.

(k) The "Acts of Archelaus" and a "historical Simon"?

The curious account preserved by Hegemonius⁽⁸⁹⁾ of the disputation held between Mani and the Christian bishop Archelaos in Mesopotamia (Maran?), probably in 277/8 A.D., while Probus was Emperor⁽⁹⁰⁾, contains the following story of one of Mani's forebears: a certain Scythianus, of Saracen descent, and a contemporary of the apostles, advocated a radical dualism (Inimicitias...inter duos ingenitos introduxit et omnia haec quae consequuntur huiuscemodi assertionem). He married a slave-woman from the Upper Thebaid, and at her suggestion settled in Egypt - the traditional home of magic, be it noted. He had a single disciple, Terebinthus, who wrote for him four books: The Mysteries, The Headings, The Gospel, and The Treasury. Scythianus and his disciple set off to Judaea to seek out well-known teachers there. Before this could be arranged, Scythianus died suddenly, and Terebinthus felt compelled to flee with his master's books to Babylonia. Here he set up as a sage, claiming the whole of Egyptian wisdom (i.e., magic), declaring

(89) In the edn of Beeson (GCS).

(90) So Acts of Archelaus 37, Cyril of Jerusalem, Cat.vi, Leo the Great, Serm.i in Pent.; Epiphanius, de mens. et pond.20.

himself to be a second Buddha, to be virgin-born, and to have been brought up on a mountain by an angel, linking these personal claims with a developed form of his late master's dualism. He lodged with his one convert, an old woman. Going up to her roof one day to offer incantations in privacy, he fell off and was killed. The old woman had him buried, and kept his books, which she subsequently left to a boy whom she had bought as a companion and attendant. The young man took up the system expounded in the books, adapted and expanded the books themselves, and made them the basis of a new sect, beginning with three disciples (Thomas, Addas, and Hermas), with himself, ^{his} ~~his~~ name now changed from Corbicius or Kourbikos to Mani, as its head. (91)

There^e are difficulties with the text of the Acts of Archelaos, not ^e last because we must content ourselves with an imperfect Latin rendering of a Greek adaptation (hardly even a free translation) of a lost Syriac original. Even for the Greek text, the evidence of Epiphanius (haer. 66) and Cyril of Jerusalem (Cat.vi) give variant readings: the forms of the names vary, and the authorship of the four books ^{is} credited directly to the master, Scythianus, and not to his amanuensis. In any case, the Syriac original claims no more than to hand on a piece of oral tradition. There are several indications that "Scythianus" and "Terebinthus" are one and the same: they both have a dominant female companion (it looks as though the Egyptian slave-woman has, as it were, turned into

(91) Acts of Archelaus lxii.1-ixiv.5 (90-93 Beeson)

Terebinthus when Scythianus and a single companion set off for Judaea), they both come to an untimely death.

Needles^s to say, this account of Mani's origins is distorted by polemic. Only recently has it become possible to have any estimate of Mani's own version of his career. The still not yet fully published Cologne manuscript of Mani's biography gives a different story, albeit with some points of contact.⁽⁹²⁾ Mani entered the baptizing sect which was his point of departure at the age of four, and at the age of twelve received the revelation which gave a sense of inward difference (liberty) from the sect's principles which he did not make public until his second experience of revelation in his twenty-fourth year.⁽⁹³⁾ The statement of Hegemonius⁽⁹⁴⁾ that the future Mani entered the woman's service at "about seven years of age" and that she died "when this boy had reached his twelfth year" sounds like a garbled version of the same general story.

The Cologne Codex identifies the baptizing sect that was the young Mani's milieu as that founded by "Alchasaïos"⁽⁹⁵⁾, thus confirming the statement of the Fihrist⁽⁹⁶⁾: "Their head is known

(92) See Henrichs and Koenen, 'Ein gr.Mani-Kodex', ZPE 5 (1970) 97-216.

(93) 119 Henrichs and Koenen.

(94) Acts of Archelaus ixiv.2 (92 Beeson)

(95) 135 Henrichs and Koenen.

(96) From GT of Flügel, quoted by Henrichs and Koenen, 133-4.

as al-Ḥasih. He is the one who founded the sect, and maintained that there are two beings, one male and one female..." (which is a clear reference to the vision of the two gigantic beings in the Book of Elchasai, to be noted later⁽⁹⁷⁾ in this investigation). The tradition that formed Mani, then, was that of "The Hidden Power"⁽⁹⁸⁾, and the denigratory story preserved in the Acta Archelai which accuses Mani of deriving his works, including his Gospel and Kephalaia from his disowned antecedents is also an attack on those antecedents by identifying their origins with a discredited itinerant occultist.

The itinerant occultist, here identified with the self-styled "Hidden Power", has several features in common with the Simon of western Christian polemic: a female companion bought from slavery, claims to fulfil the particular religious longings of the local community (the Father among the Jews, the Son among the Christians; where Christianity from the west and Buddhism from the East meet in the Persian empire, the virgin-born and the new Buddha). It was suggested above that, where the influence of a Power-Cult supplied the category, Simon had been hailed as "the Great Power": it is suggested now that this garbled tale in the Acta Archelai preserves a distant memory of the death of Simon, and also the sole clue to what his cultic practice may have included.

The story offered by Hegemonius of Terebinthus falling off a roof in the middle of his prayers suggests a credible origin for

(97) See infra, 220-241.

(98) Brandt, Elchasai (1912) 7-8.

the wild tales of Simon flying by means of magical invocations, only to be shot down by Peter's stronger magic. The story of an accidental death (which even in the less hostile version of Hegemonius is presented as a divine judgement) has in the West been linked with the theme of Simon's being rebuked by Peter, that theme having been severed from its original Lucan context, and it has been transferred with the cycle of Peter-stories to Rome - probably encouraged by the tale current there⁽⁹⁹⁾ of an unnamed actor over-reaching his acrobatic skill and falling off the god-walk. The story of the accident⁽¹⁰⁰⁾ is set at dawn, the suggestion being that the invocation of secret names is a communion with the primal Power that makes the sun to rise:

Tunc deinde mane primo ascendit solarium quoddam excelsum,
ubi nomina quaedam invocare caepit...cum ergo ascendisset
ritus nescio cuius vel artificii gratia, solus autem ascendit,
uti ne ab aliquo convinci possit, quod si dissimulasset vel
pro nihilo duxisset, cogitabat se ab aëris principibus poenis
esse subdendum haec eo cogi tante, iustissimus deus sub terras
eum detrudi per spiritum iubet, et continuo de summo deiectus,
exanime corpus deorsum praecipitatum est, quod anus illa
miserata collectum locis solitis sepeluit.

(99) Suetonius, Nero xii.21. An early discovery -
cf Fabiani, Notizie di Simon Mago (1860) 23-30.

(100) Acts of Archelaus lii.5-6 (92.7-15 Beeson).

What the nomina quaedam were, the Manichaeans claimed that their seven Chosen Ones knew, or so Hegemonius tells us. That detail belongs to the subject of Manichaeism, and so outside this investigation.

Ritus nescio quis must be for this investigation as well as for Hegemonius the summary of available knowledge of Simon's own cultic usages, beyond hints of revelation-magic (for which various techniques⁽¹⁰¹⁾ were available) and of invocations of Power or Powers. The importance of Simon lies not in his own history but in the history of his reputation: he represents the vulnerability of the Christian community's hopes, thought, and liturgy to infection by the interests and motivation of Cults of Power.

(101) Obvious examples in Lucian, Pseudoprophetes; others in Preisendanz, 'Zur synkretistischen Magie im röm. Ägypten' in Festschrift Gomperz, 111-125; F.Cunen, 'Lampe et coupe magiques', Symbolae Osloenses 36 (1960) 65-71.

CULTS OF POWER, 2:

MENANDER AND BAPTISM INTO INCORRUPTIBILITY

There is little difficulty about the sources of our knowledge about Menander⁽¹⁰⁾, for the sources resolve into one - Justin Martyr. The information provided by Irenaeus gives every sign of being derived from Justin's lost Syntagma, and the statements of Tertullian, Eusebius and Epiphanius are (and in the case of Eusebius admittedly) based on Irenaeus.

Justin's passing reference to Menander, as an example of impostors laying claim to divinity, in his First Apology, places Menander in direct association with Simon Magus, who has just been mentioned:

"I know also that a certain Menander, also a Samaritan, from the village of Capparetaia, who had become⁽¹¹⁾ a disciple of Simon, was similarly moved by the demons and, having settled in Antioch, deceived many people by magic art. He even persuaded those who followed him that they would never die. There are still some people, followers of his, who profess the same belief".

Μένανδρον δέ τινα, καὶ αὐτὸν Σαμαρεὶά τὸν ἀπὸ
κῶμης Καππαρεταίας, γεγόμενον μαθητὴν τοῦ

(10) See Lipsius, Quellenkritik (1865) 85-7; Foerster, 'Die „ersten Gnostiker" Simon und Menander', in Bianchi, ed., Le origini dello Gnosticismo (1967) 190-6.

(11) Or, 'who was', which is preferred by most translators; but a literal rendering seems more apt.

Σίμωνος, ἐνεργηθέντα καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν δαιμονίων καὶ
ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ γέγονε πολλοὺς ἐξαπατῆσαι διὰ
μαγικῆς τέχνης οἶδαμεν· ὅς καὶ τοὺς αὐτῶ
ἐπομένους ὡς μηδὲ ἀποθνήσκειν ἔπεισε, καὶ
νῦν εἰσὶ τινες ἀπ' ἐκείνου τοῦτο ὁμολογούντες.

I Apol. xxvi. 19-20, p.192 Otto.

Justin does not claim to have met or seen Menander, and suggests that, like Simon, he belongs to a ^{past} passed generation. This brief sketch has very much the appearance of being part and parcel of Justin's youthful memories of the reputation of Simon. There is no reason to dismiss his statement that Menander had spent some time as a pupil or adherent of Simon, especially if the tale comes from circles in which both men were approved of, or at least found impressive. The connection of Menander with a named village suggests well founded local tradition. For Justin, Menander is not a local figure; he has gone off to Antioch and found success there. What precisely he did by way of 'magic art' is not indicated; nor is the nature of being αὐτῶ ἐπομένοι nor the way in which belonging to these ranks was supposed to ensure that one would become immortal.

It is usually assumed⁽¹²⁾ that those whom Justin knew, or had heard of, who still (καὶ νῦν) professed the same belief were surviving disciples (ἀπ' ἐκείνου) of Menander. It is not however clear that Justin in fact says this. His expression ἀπ' ἐκείνου

(12) E.g. by Davie in his ET of Justin, and by Lawlor and Oulton in their ET of Eusebius h.e.III.26.3.

need mean no more than that there were still sectaries who perpetuated the same kind of view that Menander had represented, or even offered their own special immortality-conferring mysteries.

Justin's statement in the First Apology, then, describes a Samaritan, adherent of Simon, who settled in Antioch and flourished there in (say) the last two or three decades of the first century⁽¹³⁾, who claimed to be able to confer immortality on his disciples. To this sketch Irenaeus and his successors have some few interesting details to add.

Irenaeus' account of Menander (Against the Heresies I.xvii), which is part of his summary account of the growth of heresy before Valentinus and Ptolemy, is clearly not the fruit of his personal researches, and it is reasonable to assume that, like the rest of this summary, it comes from Justin's⁽¹⁴⁾ lost Syntagma.

Irenaeus reports (or so his Latin translator makes him say):
"Successor to this man (sc. Simon) was Menander, a Samaritan by race, who also (like Simon) reached the highest achievements of magic. He maintained that the First Power was unknown by all; and that he himself was the one who had been sent by (or from) the Invisible Ones, as Saviour, for the salvation of men. The world, he said furthermore, had been made by angels - and, like Simon, he asserted that these had come forth from Ennoia.

(13) Ehrhardt seems to be justified in his remark that Menander was dead before Ignatius' time: Framework of the New Testament Stories (London 1964) 180.

(14) Cf Lipsius, 85-7; and Salmon, art. 'Menander' in DCB III (London 1882) 902.

He claimed to make it possible, by the magical knowledge which he taught, to overcome even the angels who made the world; for his disciples (he said) received resurrection through the baptism which was into himself, and, furthermore, that they were incapable of dying, but would endure without ageing, immortal".

"Hujus successor fuit Menander, Samarites genere, qui et ipse ad summum magiae pervenit. Qui primam quidem virtutem ^{incognitum} incognitum ait omnibus; se autem esse, qui missus sit ab invisibilibus salvatorem pro salute hominum. Mundum autem factum ab angelis; quos et ipse similiter ut Simon ab Ennoia emissos dicit. Dare quoque per eam, quae a se doceatur, magicam scientiam addidit, ut et ipsos qui mundum fecerunt, vincant angelos. Resurrectionem enim per id quod est in eum baptisma accipere ejus discipulos, et ultra non posse mori, sed perseverare non senescentes, et immortales".

(Adv. haer. I. xvii, Vol. I p.195 Harvey).

In the Refutation (VII. xxviii), Menander appears only as a reference point for the teaching of Saturnil. There are signs at this point of the Refutation of specially hurried composition; but it is still surprising that Menander, with his obviously questionable baptismal theories, did not catch the imagination of the author of the Refutation as an obvious stick for the beating of Callistus. It may be mere accident, or it may be that in the Rome of the Refutation the name of Menander means entirely nothing; whatever the cause, the text of the Refutation does not in this matter give us the help with the text of Irenaeus that it affords elsewhere.

Eusebius paraphrases the account of Irenaeus admittedly and in sufficient detail to support the Latin version:

"Menander, who succeeded Simon the Magus, showed by his behaviour

that he was a second weapon of the machinations of the devil not inferior to the first". - (This is either adapted from Justin's First Apology, or the text of Irenaeus has lost it.)

- "He also was a Samaritan, and advanced to the highest achievements of (Black) Magic, falling short of his teacher in nothing, and being full of even more amazing tales of wonder. He said, indeed, that he himself was the Saviour sent from somewhere above, from the invisible Aeons, for the salvation of men. He taught also that no-one could get the better even of the world-creating angels except by first going through the magical practice taught by him and through the baptism administered into him. Those thus favoured would partake of eternal incorruptibility even in this life, and would never die, but would endure here for ever, without ageing, having become immortal". (He goes on to quote Justin, First Apology).

Σίμωνα τὸν μάγον Μένανδρος διαδεξάμενος, ὄπλον
δεύτερον οὐ χεῖρον τοῦ προτέρου τῆς διαβολικῆς
ἐνεργείας, ἀποδεικνυται τὸν τρόπον. ἦν καὶ οὗτος
Σαμαρεὺς, εἰς ἄκρον δὲ γοητείας οὐκ ἔλαττον τοῦ
διδασκάλου προελθὼν, μείζουσιν ἐπιδαψιλεῖται
τερατολογίας, ἑαυτὸν μὲν ὡς ἄρα εἶη, λεγων,
ὁ σωτηρ, ἐπὶ τῇ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀνωθεν ποθεν
ἐξ ἀοράτων αἰώνων ἀπεσταλμένος σωτηρία,
διδάσκων δὲ μὴ ἄλλως δυνασθαι τινα καὶ αὐτῶν
τῶν κοσμοποιῶν ἀγγέλων περιγενήσεσθαι, μὴ
προτερον διὰ τῆς πρὸς αὐτοῦ παραδιδομένης
μαγικῆς ἐμπειρίας ἀχθεντα καὶ διὰ τοῦ μεταδιδομένου

πρὸς αὐτοῦ βαπτίσματος, οὐ τοὺς καταξιούμενους
ἀφ' οὐρανοῦ ἰδίῳ ἐν αὐτῷ τούτῳ μεθέξεν τῷ βίῳ,
μηκετι θνήσκοντας, αὐτοῦ δὲ παρὰ μένοντας εἰς τὸ
ἀεὶ ἀγήρωσ τινὰς καὶ ἀθανάτους ἔσομένους.

(h.e. III. xxvi. 1-3, p.105 Schwartz).

One possible ambiguity must be noted here and kept for a discussion before we leave Menander. The Latin version of Irenaeus seems to indicate that the instruction in magical techniques for getting the better of the world-creating powers was a distinct process from the baptism "into" Menander. Eusebius, by interpreting Menander as making the instruction and the baptism conjoint conditions of the outwitting of the angels and the attainment of incorruptibility, seems to suggest that the instruction and the baptism were perhaps identical.

Epiphanius also follows Irenaeus (Panarion 22). He renders Menander's claims to heavenly origin and mission as ἑαυτὸν δὲ ἔλεγεν ἀνωθεν δύναμιν Θεοῦ καταπέμψαι - "he said that he himself, a power of God, had been sent down from above". At least Epiphanius indicates that the contemptuous Ποθεν is an addition and comment by Eusebius, not part of Irenaeus' text. The notion of δυναμὶς Θεοῦ, "a power of God", has clearly been dragged in by Epiphanius from the account of Simon; as a comment that Menander belongs among the cults of power, it is justifiable, but it cannot be taken as a fair quotation of Menander. Eusebius also paraphrases the purpose of Menander's mission. εἰς σωτηρίαν • δῆθεν εἰς τὸ συναγαγεῖν τινὰς εἰς τὸ ἑαυτοῦ μυστήριον διὰ τὸ μὴ ὑπὸ τῶν τὸν κόσμον πεποιηκότων ἀγγέλων καὶ ἀρχῶν καὶ ἐξουσιῶν

κατακυριευθῆναι (haer 22, p. Holl): " So that he might bring together certain persons to the Mystery-Initiation linked with himself, for the sake of their being free from the domination of the angels, principalities and authorities that created the world". It is probable that Eusebius and the translator of Irenaeus are right in making Irenaeus call Menander's rite a "baptism", and that Epiphanius shies away from calling so deviant a procedure by the same name as a Christian sacrament; but it is worth asking whether Menander's rite was known as a "baptism", especially as Justin in his Apology is not explicit on the detail. At all events, Epiphanius supports Eusebius in describing Menander's "magic" as γοητεία, evil magic. This was no doubt also Irenaeus' term; his Latin translator had perhaps a more restricted vocabulary, and was limited to the less severe magia. (Justin does not use γοητεία; but neither does he use μαγεία alone: διὰ μαγικῆς τέχνης, I. Apol. xxvi.20; μαγικὰς δυνάμεις, I. Apol. lvi; pp.102 and 250 Otto).

Hegesippus speaks of "Menandrianists" among the miscellaneous Christian heresies that sprang up as soon as the Church of Jerusalem lost its pristine innocence and seclusion (in Eusebius, h.e. IV. 22. 4); but the reference is entirely formal and represents nothing significant in Hegesippus' experience, at Jerusalem or elsewhere. It may perhaps just be significant that he includes Menander among the Christian heretics, but leaves Simon among the purely external phenomena that should never have touched the Church's inner life - and that he mentions Saturnil in the fifth and last phase, and not in direct association with Menander: but the whole passage is too

rhetorical to be pressed.

Tertullian, as is well known, used Irenaeus' Against the Heresies, and his references to Menander are clearly dependent on it. In his book On the Resurrection of the Flesh (ch. v), he mentions Menander and Marcus, in passing, as proponents of the doctrine that the human body is made by angels:

futile et:
frivolum istud corpusculum, quod malum denique appellare non horrent, etsi angelorum fuisset operatio ut Menandro et Marco placet, etsi ignei alicuius extractio aeque angeli ut Apelles docet, sufficeret ad auctoritatem carnis secundae divinitatis patrocinium:

(p.14, cap.5, ll.6-11 Evans; 'futtile' error for 'futile')

His book On the Soul, in ch. xxiii, refers also to this view of Menander as being shared by Saturnil, whose opinions receive fuller discussion, but Ch. 1, which is devoted to the inevitability of death, deals with Menander more fully:

"According to the general sentiment of the human race, we declare death to be 'the debt of nature'. So much has been settled by the voice of God (Gen, ii. 17); such as the contract with everything that has been born: so that even from this the frigid conceit of Epicurus is refuted, who says that no such debt is due from us; and not only so, but the insane opinion of the Samaritan heretic Menander is also rejected, who will have it that death has not only nothing to do with his disciples, but in fact never reaches them. He pretends to have received a commission from the secret power of One above, that all who partake of his baptism become immortal, incorruptible, and instantaneously invested with resurrection-life. We read, no

doubt, of very many wonderful kinds of waters: how, for instance, the vinous quality of the stream intoxicates the people who drink of the Lyncestis; how at Colophon the waters of an oracle-inspiring fountain affect men with madness; how Alexander was killed by the poisonous water from Mount Nonacris in Arcadia. Then, again, there was in Judæa before the time of Christ a pool of medicinal virtue. It is well known how the poet has commemorated the marshy Styx as preserving men from death; although Thetis had, in spite of the preservative, to lament her son. And for the matter of that, were Menander himself to take a plunge into this famous Styx, he would certainly have to die after all; for you must come to the Styx, placed as it is by all accounts in the regions of the dead. Well, but what and where are those blessed and charming waters which not even John Baptist ever used in his preministrations, nor Christ after him ever revealed to his disciples? What was this wondrous bath of Menander? He is a comical fellow, I ween." [pun on Menander]. "But why (was such a font) so seldom in request, so obscure, one to which so very few ever resorted for their cleansing? I really see something to suspect in so rare an occurrence of a sacrament to which is attached so much security and safety...The whole question resolves itself, in short, into this challenge: Where are to be found the men whom Menander has baptized? Whom he has plunged into his Styx? Let them come forth and stand before us - those apostles of his whom he has made immortal?"

(p.521-523, P. Holmes, tr.)

This does very little for our investigation but assure us further that Tertullian's source which said clearly that Menander baptized. Tertullian observes only that Menander's baptism is also supposed to convey immortality (a claim which he takes utterly literally), and does not even mention the fact that Menander's baptism, according to Irenaeus, caused the initiate to enter some special relationship with the saviour-figure of Menander. Nor does he even notice Menander's claim to techniques that protect believers from angels. One detail only, and that perhaps no more than a mistake, is new: the description of Menander's initiates as "apostles". If there were signs of Tertullian having known Justin's Syntagma as well as Irenaeus, this new feature might be important. As it is, Tertullian's treatment of Menander as a convenient target for abuse does not encourage us to take his interpretation of his source very seriously.

The Libellus "Quorum haereticorum" that has survived at the end of Tertullian de praescriptione, and is thought to reflect the material in Hippolytus' lost Syntagma, and may also indirectly go back to Justin⁽¹⁵⁾, affords little extra light, except to confirm a clear, explicit reference in the earlier documents to baptism:

"After him (Simon) his disciple Menander, also a magician, taught the same doctrines as Simon, and whatever Simon had called himself, so Menander styled himself, and he denied that anyone could have salvation unless he had been baptized

(15) See again Lipsius 84-7; also Hilgenfeld, Ketzergeschichte (1884) 21-30, 187-90

in his name".

(Quorum haereticorum, 2, tr. R.M. Grant, Second-Century Christianity, p. 126).

"Post hunc Menander, discipulus ipsius, similiter magus, eadem dicens ~~eadem dicens~~, quae Simon ipse, quicquid se Simon dixerat, hoc se Menander esse dicebat, negans habere posse quemquam salutem, nisi in nomine suo baptizatus fuisset.

(p.32 Leopold).

This very condensed report of Menander squeezes together his claim to be a saviour with his special form of baptism into a combination of ideas and practice to which this author gives a more Christian sound than the earlier accounts do. Particularly, in suo nomine is very reminiscent of orthodox Christian baptism. Irenaeus, in the Latin version and as quoted by Eusebius, avoids this term. It might be that Irenaeus' source used this term and that Irenaeus and others altered it lest they seem to suggest that Menander's baptism closely resembled the baptism which they confessed. As the documents stand, however, it is more likely that the author of Quorum haereticorum himself introduced in suo nomine to make Menander's rite more comprehensible to Christian readers. It looks like interpretation, not quite accurate but not entirely unreasonable either.

Lipsius, in his Quellekritik (pp.85-87), suggests that the common source of Quorum haereticorum, the Panarion and Philastrius depicts a later condition of Menander's sect and its views and uses than (Justin and) Irenaeus do. However, as there is no clear evidence that Menander left an organised sect, it is more likely - what is in any case inherently more probable - that the common source was a rewriting of Irenaeus, possibly of Justin's book

directly.

The resultant picture is of a Samaritan mystagogue, influenced by Simon and probably associated with him for a time, setting up on his own account in Antioch. His successful career in that city may be attributed to the years around 70 to 90 A.D., for, although his memory was green in some Samaritan circles in the early second century, he is not mentioned, even indirectly, by Ignatius; by 110, he had been forgotten in the city where he had flourished.

His doctrine resembled that of Simon, but with significant differences:

the absolute God, the 'Highest Power' is unknown;
the Invisible Aeons, who must be powers inferior to the Highest Power and superior to the creating angels, are concerned with the salvation of the human race;
the created order is the work of angels, emanated from or commanded by the (apparently rebellious) Ennoia, and these angels keep humankind in subjection, and part of this subject state is human mortality:- the creation of man, already mortal and in subjection, follows the creation and so, it seems, the pre-cosmic fall of the angels and Ennoia;
from the Invisible Aeons is sent a Saviour, with whom Menander claims identity ;
the salvation offered by this emissary includes both freedom from the angels and freedom from death and corruptibility;
this salvation is appropriated through receiving Menander's teachings and by undergoing his baptism.

The exact relationship between the two aspects of the salvation offered (freedom from angels, incorruptibility) and the two aspects

of Menander's work (teaching, baptising) is not clear. Irenaeus seems to speak as if Menander's exposition of secret knowledge was a distinct activity, and offered a distinct grace, namely the liberation from world-creating powers. If this impression were correct, the most probable view would be that Menander's secret doctrine was concerned with pass-words and other devices that allowed the initiate to pass into blessedness in direct despite of the angelic rulers (such as is familiar in Orphism and in various "Gnostic" systems). Menander's ministry of baptism would then be a separate activity in its own right (for an inner circle of devotees? - but Irenaeus does not hint at this), offering incorruptibility. On examination, however, Irenaeus' apparent distinctions appear to be purely stylistic. Eusebius and Epiphanius⁽¹⁷⁾ must have read him in this sense, for the two activities are portrayed by both of them as belonging together, and as together offering the one salvation under two aspects. In any case, the idea of this saviour conveying an incorruptibility effective in some sense here and now makes otiose the notion of pass-words for the soul's journey through the heavens. It is risky to interpret the mysteries of a mystagogue on the assumption that he is consistent; but it is not illogical to infer that, for Menander, baptism into incorruptibility was itself the essential liberation from the archons - even though he may have had further instruction to offer on the future destiny of the incorruptible believer.

Menander clearly belongs, with Simon, among the exponents

(17) While Tertullian, in de anima, is concerned only with baptism, and with baptism as an observable ritual event. There is here, as elsewhere in Tertullian, an element of wilful misunderstanding: he reads Menander's claim to Power as a claim about Menander's baptismal water, not Menander's word.

of Cults of Power. His Supreme Being is Virtus, power. Although Irenaeus (and Justin) must be right in not suggesting that Menander identified himself with that Power, his role as emissary from the unseen realms confers upon him a share in the vigour of that power. So far, Epiphanius is justified in interpreting Menander as claiming to be "a power from on high". It is important, then, to notice the importance of accepting, not only Menander's doctrine, but also Menander as its teacher, and not only his baptism, but also him as its source or administrator. Also symptomatic of the presence of a cult of Power is the dominant idea of salvation in terms of potency, of vitality.⁽¹⁸⁾

Before considering Menander's baptism any further, we must ask if his personal cult of Power is in any sense Christian. An emphatically negative answer has been given by some.⁽¹⁹⁾ Lipsius, for example, places Menander in an anti-Jewish Syrian gnostic milieu⁽²⁰⁾, Gwatkin, in an interesting phrase, assigns Menander (with Simon and others) "to the age of false Messiahs".⁽²¹⁾ Menander certainly gives an appearance of coming, like Simon, from a heathen Samaritan background, but of having learned from

(18) Variousy described as 'a doctrine of natural redemption' (Lampe, Seal of the Spirit, 1967, 169) or as vitalism (so Bianchi, 'Perspectives de la recherche sur les origines du Gnosticisme' in Rudolph, ed., Gnosis und Gnostizismus, 1975, 722).

(19) e.g. by Puech (1933), in Rudolph, ed., Gnosis..., 311.

(20) Lipsius (1860) in Rudolph, ed., Die Gnosis... 94.

(21) Early Church History to A.D. 313 (London 1909) II, 31.

Judaism, directly or indirectly, some sort of monotheism. His angelology is not that of orthodox Judaism, but not therefore to be put down hastily as anti-Jewish. If more were known about his whole system and also about contemporary heterodox Jewish speculation, considerable agreement between the two might well be observed. There are, however, grounds for giving Menander some place, however marginal, within the story of the Christian movement. First, there is his association with Simon, in whose career Christianity, however misconceived, played a major part. Second, there is his choice of a rite of baptism, interest in which had been important in Simon's relationship with Christianity. These two features, taken together, would of themselves link Menander with Christianity. Third is his description of himself as one sent, an apostle. This was not exclusively Christian language if Schmithals⁽²²⁾ is right; but, in association with the title of "Saviour" and the first two points, may reasonably be read as echoing Christian terms of (e.g.) the Johannine vocabulary. Fourth is the combination of a baptismal rite with the person (if not explicitly the name) of a specified Saviour - at this period, only Christian baptism offers a parallel. Fifth is the inclusion of Menander among the heretics of Christian history by Justin, Hegesippus and Eusebius. Justin and Irenaeus, particularly, add that Menander and his ilk are not

(22) Office of an Apostle (ET London 1971) 143-5.

genuine representatives of Christianity; but he is admitted to the claim to be one. It is at least true, as Hilgenfeld observed⁽²⁴⁾, that Menander has moved from Simon's position nearer to Christianity; and it is helpful to think of Menander as one of those who, while starting from a non-Christian base, found it natural and attractive to seek a place under the new Christian umbrella.⁽²⁵⁾ The social situation of Menander and his like, if it was indeed that of an educated and lively middle class whose civic role had been taken from them by foreign domination, as Rudolph suggests⁽²⁶⁾, would reinforce such a tendency - but evidence is lacking.

Some few notes on the baptismal rite of Menander may now be set down in conclusion:

(a) A phase of preparatory instruction, of unknown duration, as suggested by the sequence of (Justin and) Irenaeus' report.

(b) The baptism, from the sense of the name, must have included the application to the initiates of a liquid. Tertullian naturally assumes that it was water; but we do not know.

(c) Tertullian is clearly quite wrong in suggesting that the water (etc.) of Menander's baptism was supposed to have some intrinsic efficacy. Justin, however, in I. Apol. xxvi, shows that the efficacy

(24) Hilgenfeld (1890) in Rudolph, ed., ~~IMM~~ Gnosis... 183.

(25) cf the remarks of Herzog in REPTK (1858).

(26) Rudolph, 'Randerscheinungen...' (1967) in Rudolph, ed., Gnosis... 776-7.

lay, not in the water, but in the adhesion of the initiate to the teacher Menander and his words. This strongly suggests:-

(i) that there was some act of adhesion to the teacher, as there was an adhesion to the Torah in proselyte-baptism and to the Way of Life in contemporary Christian baptism⁽²⁷⁾; and,

(ii) that the administration was performed, at some stage, by Menander himself, acting explicitly on the authority of his celestial mission; and, similarly,

(iii) that at some stage near the heart of the rite the result, the gift of incorruptibility, was mentioned - perhaps rather in the way that later Christian baptismal orders add in vitam aeternam, and so forth, to the baptismal formula.⁽²⁸⁾

(d) The natural place for further instruction in "magical" techniques for living the incorruptible life in this world and the next, and for defying angels in the process, is after the central act of initiation, either in the position occupied in Jewish and Christian use⁽²⁹⁾ by the "address of congratulation", or in subsequent weeks of instruction, analogous with the much later Christian "mystagogical lectures".

What was this incorruptibility which Menander believed himself to impart? (Justin and) Irenaeus and others maintain by implication,

(27) cf supra, p.30; the cautious argumentation of Paul in I Cor. ii.10-18 suggests that the administration of baptism in the Pauline churches could be misread as the making of a disciple of the ministrant.

(28) cf Bobbio Missal; conveniently in Whitaker, Documents of the Baptismal Liturgy,² 1970, 212.

(29) See Gavin, Jewish Antecedents (London 1928) 35, and Tripp, 'Eperotema...' (1981).

and Tertullian with brutal directness, that he expected his devotees to be in every sense immortal and incorruptible, ageless and ever-young. No doubt his figurative Semitic manner of speech occasionally sounded very much like this, as the Odes of Solomon might, if read with literalness. It is noticeable, however, that the obvious mockery that such a claim would provoke is not evident, except in Tertullian. Menander's eschatology cannot now be reconstructed⁽³⁰⁾; but the most just and rational view is that he believed his baptism to confer a 'spiritual', or 'inward'⁽³¹⁾ immortality. There is, beyond doubt, some connection between this view and the doctrine of Hymenaeus and others that the resurrection had already taken place. That heresy must be considered as part of the process of Christianity's separation from Judaism, for that is where it belongs. Menander the Samaritan who may for a moment and for this purpose be associated with the Samaritan Jews, has replaced the whole idea of resurrection with that of immortality; and he has linked the whole issue with baptism. That baptism is linked with the gift of eternal life is certainly not Menander's invention⁽³²⁾; but he is the first certainly attested example of the linking of baptism with a version of the 'Hymenaeian' doctrine of the resurrection.

(30) With Loisy, Birth of the Christian Religion (ET 1948) 300

(31) So Lipsius, Quellenkritik, 87

(32) Cf Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament (ET London 1965 edn) I.140-2, however questionable his historical reconstruction of influences.

Such knowledge as we have of Menander's baptism affords a little light on the history of Catholic Christian worship. The presence of pre-baptismal catechesis and of some act of adhesion seems to be common to both, Menander's acting in the authority of his mission is reminiscent of the mistaken impression that the act of baptism could give in at least the Pauline Churches - that the minister was acting on some entirely personal authority and was therefore involving the candidate in some special loyalty to the minister (this strengthens our earlier suggestion that "I baptize..." was a formula in use in the earliest times, and also suggests that Menander imitated or adapted such a formula). The intimate association of sacraments with the longing for immortality, particularly for the incorruptible state, to which Menander's cult witnesses, is subsequently found (as entirely Christian and right) ^{presented} in Ignatius of Antioch.

For Ignatius, eternal, incorruptible life is of the essence of salvation: "the prize-money is incorruptibility and life eternal", he tells Polycarp (ii.3), and the purpose of the Church's ministry may be summed up as the provision of "a model and doctrine of incorruptibility" (Magn. vi.2). For Ignatius, eternal life is a colourful, full-blooded affair, and the existence of a mere disembodied spirit is a damnation (Smyrnaeans ii).

The gift of immortality is available through Christ; he is the one whom the father has sent (Magn. viii.2) - perhaps a two-fold protest against the claims made by Menander or his kind as to their mission from the invisible realms, but not a very vigorous protest, for this threat seems to have been replaced by other

heterodoxies. The anointing of Jesus enables him to breathe incorruptibility on the Church (Ephesians xvii.). Particularly - and this must be stressed against docetism - Christ is able to offer this boon only because of his own suffering and death (Trallians ii.i). Christ is victor over magic, evil, and death (Ephesians 13.3).

The gift of immortality is received by sharing the suffering and death of Jesus Christ: "if we do not willingly choose to die through him and so to enter into his suffering, his vitality is not in us" (Magnesians v.2). "By this mystery (of Christ's death and resurrection, celebrated on the Lord's day), we received the gift of believing, and because of this we endure, so that we may be found (sc. at the judgement) disciples of Jesus Christ our only teacher" (ix. 1). For the prophets who longed for Christ, Ignatius may have thought that the resurrection had already taken place (Magnesians ix. 2, probably taking up Matthew xxvii. 52-53); but this was certainly not so for everybody else, for all present believers must expect to be tested so that any surviving element of corruption in them may be exposed and expunged (Magnesians x.2).

Ignatius's evidence as to the growth of Christian worship cannot be adequately studied in this work, but his exposition of baptism and Eucharist must be briefly noted here in the context of Menander. Entry into Christ's suffering is by baptism, an act of faith in Christ's death (Trallians ii. 1). Indeed, it is Christ's death, applied to water by his own baptism, which has "purified" water for this purpose (Ephesians xviii. 2). It represents an inward crucifixion of desire, an extinguishing of the fire of lust

by living waters⁽³⁴⁾ that call the believer to the Father (Romans vii.2). The evidence of the Didache, taken with I Peter, suggests that the baptismal rite known to Ignatius incorporated an act of adhesion to the Way of Life; in the light of the probability that Menander's baptism involved his disciples in public affirmation of allegiance to him, it must be asked here in passing whether the association of the Two Ways homily with Christian baptism was encouraged (even caused) by the need to repudiate such claims to subservience of Menander's. If his rejection of the world-creating angels involved a rejection of the God of Israel's commandments, a Christian reaction in favour of the Two Ways, with its use of the Decalogue, would be more probable; but the uncertainty in our exegesis of Menander leaves this matter also insoluble.

Unlike Menander, Ignatius lays more stress on the continuing process of entering into the incorruptible life brought by the Saviour than on the first initiation. After the inward crucifixion of baptism, "I take no delight in the food of corruptibility or the pleasures of this life, I long for the bread of God, which is the flesh of Jesus Christ, descended from the sect of David; for drink, I long for his blood, which is love incorruptible" (Romans vii. 3). Faithful participation in the Eucharist, which is the flesh of the Saviour crucified and risen, is an anticipation of the Resurrection, and is inseparable from practical expression here and now of Christian love to the needy (Smyrnaeans vi. 3 - vii. 1). It is in the Eucharist, that, for Ignatius, his dominant concerns come together, and are

(34) cf Elchasai, discussed below, 220-241. Ignatius' reference to 'living waters' turns the mind to Didache vii; and his imagery of 'speaking waters' is perhaps reminiscent of Jn iv.10, vii.38.

expressed with singular vigour and clarity, as he envisages the Christians gathered in harmony with their bishop,

ἓν ἄρτον κλῶντες,
ὅς ἐστιν φάρμακον ἀθανασίας,
ἀντίδοτος τοῦ μὴ ἀποθανεῖν,
ἀλλὰ ζῆν ἐν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ διὰ παντός.

"breaking one bread,

which is the medicine of immortality,

the antidote which ensures we shall not die

but shall live in Jesus Christ for ever."

(Ephesians xx. 2).

Whether or not derived from Menander, this language of vivid sacramental realism, combined with an awareness of experiencing even now a life of eternal and unfading quality, reflects exactly the religious longings which Menander fostered, although in Ignatius it is carefully shorn of the distinctive doctrines which he taught.

CULTS OF POWER, 3:

SATORNIL OF ANTIOCH

Irenaeus⁽¹⁾ (probably following Justin), places Saturnil after Menander, partly for chronological reasons, partly because of a shared belief in an unknown Father and angels. The Refutation, however, while similarly treating Saturnil as a contemporary of Basilides, sees him as a forerunner of Marcion⁽²⁾. This may be based on the lost book of Hippolytus thought to lie between the Refutation and Justin⁽³⁾, or it may be a personal contribution from the author of the Refutation. However that may be, the amended order is more logical than the earlier one. To associate Saturnil with Menander is to treat his system as a cult of power; but, on examination, it shows a different character.

Saturnil was a native of Antioch, "ea quae est apud Daphnen" (Irenaeus), and appears to have spent his life in Syria, and to have been prominent in the reign of Hadrian, A.D. 117-138⁽⁴⁾. According to the account of Hippolytus, as reconstructed by Lipsius⁽⁵⁾, he

(1) AH I.xviii (I.196 Harvey)

(2) Ref.VII.28 (380 Duncker-Schneidewin), Cf the schema in VII.1-12, esp.3 (and 10, Cerdo),

(3) Lipsius, Quellenkritik 87-93.

(4) See discussion in Hölgenfeld, Ketzergeschichte 194-5

(5) Quellenkritik 89.

"maintained a doctrine similar to Menander's, saying that the cosmos had been created by angels; and that there existed the Unbegotten Power above all things in the infinite and most exalted Places; and that the angels were far inferior to the Higher Power; and that the cosmos was apportioned in lots to the several angels according to their various offices".

Irenaeus' account of this part of the scheme (preserved in the original Greek by the Refutation) is comparatively superficial⁽⁶⁾: the One is "the Unknown Father", who is credited with creating angels, archangels, authorities and powers, seven of whom, in their turn, create the cosmos and its contents. This version is less consistent than Hippolytus' with what follows, and presents Saturnil as teaching a basically monistic theology closer to orthodox Judaism and Christianity than the rest of his system seems to be.

"There appeared" (continue Irenaeus and the Refutation⁽⁷⁾) "from above, from the Supreme Authority, an image of light, which they (the angels) were unable to detain to misuse it, and it withdrew on high; and they called one to another, saying, "Let us make man according to the image and according to the likeness."

When they had done this, the thing they had formed could not stand upright because of the feebleness of the angels; it jerked about like a worm. Then the Power on high took pity on it, because it had come into existence in the

(6) cf comments of Hilgenfeld, 'Der Gnostizismus' (1870) in Rudolph, ed., Gnosis..., 199-203; Wilson, Gnostic Problem, 102-3.

(7) pages as in n.1

likeness of that Power, and sent a spark of life
(according to Hippolytus⁽⁸⁾, "a spark of that same Power")
to lift the man up and make him live.

According to him, this spark of life returns after death
to its own kindred, while the rest of the constituents from
which man is made are dissolved into their separate states.

He assumes that the Saviour is unbegotten and incorporeal
and formless, and that he appeared to men only as an apparition;

and that the God of the Jews is one of the angels;

and that, because of the Father's decision⁽⁹⁾ to do away
with the Archons, Christ came here to do away with the God of
the Jews and to save those who are obedient to him⁽¹⁰⁾ and that
these are they who have the spark of life in themselves. This is
part of his theory that two kinds of men were formed by the angels,
one evil, one good;

and that, whereas the demons give aid to the evil,
the Saviour came to do away with the despicable men and demons
and to save the good;

He maintains that marriage and procreation are of the Satan.

In addition, many of those who share his views abstain from
eating living things,

(8) sc. in the 'lost Syntagma' as reconstructed by Lipsius,
Quellenkritik 92.

(9) following the reading of Theodoret (see Harvey I.196).
Irenaeus's Latin translator prefers to see here a
decision of the archons to abolish the Father - also
a possible reading (cf Wilson, Gnostic Problem, 113, n.47).
This rendering is hard to square with Saturnil's account of
the relations of Christ, the elect, the Satan and the God
of the Jews.

(10) So Ref. and Epiphanius, haer. 23.2.2. = 250, 1.11 Holl:
τῶν πιστευμένων αὐτῷ ; Irenaeus lat. credentium ei
represents perhaps πιστευσάντων, probably expected by
the reader in a baptismal context.

(and lead many astray - so Irenaeus) by this pretence of self-discipline.

He also maintains that the prophecies have been uttered, some by the angels that made the cosmos, some by the Satan, whom he portrays ^{as} an angel working against the angels who made the cosmos, chiefly against the God of the Jews".

As Salmon noted a century ago⁽¹¹⁾, Saturnil's system is an inconsistent combination of unreconciled views. The distinction between the Unbegotten Power and the world-creating angels and that between the Satan and the world-creating angels clearly do not belong to the same scheme of speculation. The deepest assumptions appear to belong to a non-Jewish monotheism, although a place - even an honourable place - is found in the system for Jewish⁽¹²⁾ ideas and scriptures. The most important figure, after the Unbegotten Power, is the "Saviour", who "came". The forefront of Saturnil's mind⁽¹³⁾ is taken up with a presentation of his version of Christianity, for this Saviour is directly identified with Christ. What exactly the Saviour has to do with the Unbegotten Power, with the spark of life (or of the Power), or with the angels, is unclear; but the Saviour is certainly not incarnate, and appears among mankind solely as an apparition. Although Saturnil's view of deity owes much to the cults of power, his own system is not such a cult: there is no claim to be

(11) art. 'Saturninus' in DCB IV (1887)587-8.

(12) On the crawling Adam: Genesis Rabbah viii.1, xv.8; see van Unnik, 'Die jüdische Komponente...' (1961) in Rudolph, ed., Gnosis..., 488-9. Cf the discussion of Saturnil's angelology (Jewish, ultimately Zoroastrian) in Reitzenstein, Hellenistische Mysterienreligionen 1927, 347, and general estimate by Rudolph, 'Randerscheinungen...' (1967), as repr. in his Gnosis..., 785

(13) against Puech, 'Ou en est le problème du gnosticisme ?' (1933/4) in Rudolph, Die Gnosis..., 311-2, 341, who gives Jesus a secondary place in Saturnil's system.

identical with the Power.

Satornil is obviously wrestling with the reconciliation of the same conflicting influences and convictions that were to preoccupy Marcion, whether or not Marcion was directly influenced by him.

The scattered excerpts from Satornil preserved by Justin (and by Hippolytus, if he had sources of his own besides Justin) say nothing at all of Satornil's scheme of worship. We are not told how the good race of men, those who have within them (presumably from the start of their existence) the spark of life, come into the state of being "obedient to the Saviour". This is not the style of language we should normally expect in a "Gnosticizing" author (although it may be less surprising in a writer of Encratite inclination).⁽¹⁴⁾ It is possible then, that Satornil's Christianity included an initiation rite which featured an act of adhesion to the moral teaching of Christ, such as we have traced in the late first and early second centuries in the Christian use of the "Two Ways" homily as an ἑπερωτημα with its attendant response⁽¹⁵⁾. The "salvation" bestowed on those "obedient to the Saviour" is clearly liberty from the created order and from its makers - but not because they are hostile; they are merely obsolete - and safety from the Satan. More we are not told.

(14) Not merely 'die Anerkennung Christi als des vom Urvater gesandten Erlösers' attested by a life of abstinence, as suggested by Hilgenfeld (1890), in Rudolph, Gnosis... 217.

(15) The choice of verb cannot be fortuitous; see Tripp, 'Eperotema...' (1981).

vii/2

"The Second Treatise of the Great Seth" (C.G. vii 12): a Satornilian
Opkite
Document adapted for Opkite use.

"The Second Treatise of the Great Seth" does not mention Seth anywhere in its text, and the title is clearly added as part of a deliberate adaptation of the text for use in a group that claimed to represent the progeny of Seth. That such an adaptation has taken place may also be seen from the conflicting accounts of the coming of Christ. At 51:20ff, the perfect one who dwells with the perfect Majesty "visited a bodily dwelling...cast out the one who was in it first, and went in. And the whole multitude of the archons became troubled. And all the matter of the archons as well as all the begotten powers of the earth were shaken when it saw the likeness of the Image, for it was mixed". At 56:21ff, by contrast, we find an account of the descent from Christ, changing his form as he comes down, very much as in the Ascension of Isaiah: "...as I came downward no one saw me. For I was altering my shape, changing from form to form. And therefore, when I was at their gates I assumed their likeness. For I passed by them quietly, and I was viewing the places, and I was not afraid nor ashamed, for I was undefiled". Both descriptions are in different ways docetic; but the former description uses the image of indwelling, the second the image of phantasm.

CULTS OF POWER, 4:

CERDO

According to Irenaeus (I. xxiv), whose Greek text is preserved in the Refutation (VII. 37), and by Eusebius (h.e. IV. xi) Cerdo's doctrine was that "the God proclaimed by the Law and the Prophets was not identical with the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ: for the former was knowable, the latter unknowable; the former merely just, the latter good". So far as it is reported, this system appears to be a simplification (and perhaps a more Christianized form) of the view of Saturnil⁽¹⁾. The statement that Cerdo is in the succession of Simon is no more than a detail of Irenaeus' polemical method. The chief interest of Cerdo lies in his having brought notions like Saturnil's to Rome, and having provided Marcion with the distinction between the just God and the good. His opinions in the matter of worship are not recorded: but we may infer that his liturgical usage was, at least at times, sufficiently close to that of other Christians for him to enjoy some degree of communion with the Roman bishop. This alone can explain the fluid state of his relations with Hyginus, during whose episcopate (c.139-c.143) Cerdo "often came into the Church and made an open profession of his faith, and then went on, at one moment teaching in secret, at another making open profession again,

(1) The 'Saturnilian' features of Marcion's system in Ref. X.19 (differing human natures, Christ coming to save those inwardly akin to his Father, a docetic Christology, rejection of marriage) are there apparently regarded as having been mediated to Marcion by Cerdo.

at yet another being refuted as to the evil elements of his teaching and expelled from the fellowship of the devout", as Irenaeus reports⁽²⁾.

- (2) AH III.iv.3 (II.17 Harvey), quoted in Greek by Eusebius h.e. IV.11.1-3 (134-5 Schwartz), who reads, 'from the fellowship of the brethren', τῆς τῶν ἀδελφῶν συνουσίας. Does Irenaeus (lat.) suggest that Cerdo had a regular congregation which was from time to time in varying degrees of fellowship with the more conventional (to later eyes, the orthodox) congregations? - whereas Eusebius assumes that either such a man or group must be in the Church ('the fellowship of the brethren) or outside it?

CULTS OF POWER, 5:

THE CARPOCRATIANS

Hegesippus (fr.3, in Eusebius h.e. IV. 22.4) mentions ~~Carpocratians~~^{Carpocratians⁽¹⁾} between Marcionites and Valentinians; but what else, if anything, he had to say of them is now unknown. His reference is interesting only in being the earliest surviving reference to this group - unless Irenaeus' description uses an excerpt from some book that pre-dates Hegesippus - and thus in establishing that the name was known in the Syrian region before 180. (It is interesting therefore that the name seems to be totally uninteresting to the author of Ap. Const.).

Irenaeus and Clement of Alexandria are our only two substantial sources of information.

Irenaeus' account (I.xx, Vol. I pp.204-210 Harvey, I.xxx. Massuet), which is also the same for Tertullian, de anima 23,35. and for the Refutation (VII. 32), and has influenced the lost Syntagma, begins with a description of Carpoocratic cosmology and christology.

1 (a) 'Karpokrates and those who spring from him say that the world and the things that are in it were made by angels far inferior to the Unbegotten Father. Jesus, also, was begotten of Joseph' [as in the Greek cited by Refutation], 'and, although he was begotten similarly to other human beings, was distinguished from the others [became more righteous than the others, Ref.] in that when his soul had become vigorous and pure it remembered

(1) II/1 370, 372 Schwartz. On the relation of the sources: Lipsius, Quellenkritik 109-115, Hilgenfeld, Ketzergeschichte (1884) 397-408. On their value: de Faye, Gnostiques et gnosticisme (1913) 391-7. For the letter of Clement, M. Smith, ed., Clement of Alexandria and a Secret Gospel of Mark, 1923. Refutation: 217-221 Wendland; c.Celsum, II.65-7 Koetschau; de anima, 815, 836-7 Waszink.

what had been seen by it within the sphere of the Unbegotten God and thereby power was sent to it from him so that it [by means of this (power) Ref] might be able to escape the world-creators, and passing through them all and having been set free in all, it might ascend to him and embrace the things whose return it shared [*τὰ ὅμοια αὐτῆς ἀσπαζομένην, Ref.*].

(b) They say that the soul of Jesus was brought up according to Jewish customs [i.e., according to the Law - a correct gloss in Ref.], but despised them, and for this reason received Powers through which it annihilated the passions which cling to human beings and torment them.

(c) That soul, therefore, which can despise the world-making archons, just as Jesus' soul did, similarly receives Powers to perform similar things. And so they have come to such a pitch of boasting that they even say they are like Jesus - and some say they are superior to his disciples, such as Peter and Paul and the rest of the apostles: these people say they fall short of Jesus in nothing. Their souls, having come down from the same sphere and so similarly despising the world-makers, were counted worthy of having the same Power, and of returning to the same Power, and of returning to the same destination. If anyone has despised the things of this world more than he did, they can be better than him.

2 (a) These people, therefore, practise magical arts, and incantations, charms and spells (*φίλτρα τε καὶ χαριτήσια, Ref.*), familiar spirits and dream-senders and all other sorts of evil rites, saying that they have authority for the domination

of the archons and makers of this world, and not only of them but also of all that has been created in it.

(b) They were driven by Satan to cause the divine name of the Church to be detested among the heathen, so that people who hear of their deeds of one sort or another, and think that we are all like them, may turn away their ears from the proclamation of the truth - or even, actually seeing their deeds, may blaspheme all of us, though we have nothing in common with them, either in teaching, or in morals, or even in day-to-day relationships. But their life is self-indulgent and their outlook immoral; they misuse the Name as a mask for their own evil-doing, and "their condemnation is just" (Rom. iii.8), for they receive from God the retribution fitting for their works.

(c) Their frenzy has brought them to such a pitch of madness that they say they have it in their power to perform, and that they do perform, whatever is godless and immoral. They say that good or bad actions are merely a matter of human opinion: that souls ought, in the course of transmigrations through a succession of bodies, to experience every kind of life and action, if, in a single incarnation anyone does not take care to do all at once and in equal completeness everything unfit for us to mention or even to imagine or think possible for people living in what we call civilisation - so that, according to what their writings say, their souls, formed by every possible experience of life, may, ^{not} at their departure still suffer any lack; throughout their experience they must so act that they may ^{not} be forced to be sent

into a body again because anything is deficient in their liberty.

(d) For this reason, they say, Jesus told this parable: "If you are with your adversary in the way, take care to be freed from him, lest he hand you over to the judge and the judge to the officer, and he cast you into prison. Amen I say to you, you shall not come out of ~~these~~ ^{there}, until you repay the last farthing" (Luke xii. 58-9, Matt. v. 25-6). They say that the adversary is one of the angels who exist in the world, whom they call the devil, saying that he was made for the purpose of leading the souls which have perished from the world to the Ruler. He, they say, is the first of the world-makers, and he hands on such souls to a second angel who is his 'officer' so that he may enclose them in other bodies - they say that the body is the ^(1^a) prison. And the words, 'You shall not come out of ~~these~~ ^{there} until you repay the last farthing', they interpret to mean that no-one shall leave the power of those angels who made the world, but is always re-embodied until he has experienced every conceivable kind of act ['sins', as glossed in Ref.]. When there is nothing left that he has not done, then his liberated soul departs to that God Who is above the world-making angels. Thus are all souls saved, whether those who take care to enter into every kind of action in one incarnation, or those who migrate from body to body, or fulfil their task in one form of life or other into which they have been sent, they are set free, so that they are no longer born in a body.

(1^a) cf Plato, Cratylus 400C

(3) I do not want to believe that such godless, unrighteous and unmentionable things (as they claim) are in fact practised among them. For in their own writings it is written thus - they themselves offer this exposition: that 'Jesus spoke in a mystery to his disciples and apostles privately, and commanded them to hand it on to those who were worthy and gave assent to these traditions. Salvation is by faith and love - since everything else is indifferent, and whether this or that is called good or bad is a matter of mere human opinion, for nothing is evil by nature'.

4 (a) Some of them brand' [reading *καυτηρίασους*, with Ref., and signant, cauteriantes as pedantic unpacking]' their disciples on the back of the lobe of the right ear.

(b) One of them [unde], Marcellina, who came to Rome in the time of Anitetos, since she was of this teaching, brought many into disaster.

(c) They call themselves "Gnostics". They have images, some painted, others made of different materials, and they say they have a likeness of Christ made by Pilate at that time when Jesus was among men. They crown these images, and display them with images of the philosophers of the world, that is, with the image of Pythagoras and Plato and Aristotle and the rest. And the rest of their cult of these images they perform like pagans'.

Of Irenaeus' other references to the Carpocratians, two use them as a standard of reference for other groups - Ebionites, in Christology (I.xxii. Vol. 1, p.213 Harvey, I. lxxvi.2. Massuet) and Cainites in the morality of experiencing everything (I. xxviii. 9 Vol. 1, p.242 Harvey,

I. xxxi. Massuet); two are merely negative - Carpocratians and other sectaries have no healing powers, nor do their names have saving virtue (II. xlvi.1 and xlix.3 Vol. 1, pp.369,376 Harvey, II. xxxi.1 and xxxii.5 Massuet). One concerns promiscuity, and needs separate comment.

This account from Irenaeus, which (as Hilgenfeld 1913, 399 remarks) ^{is} clearly a unity and based on personal ^a knowledge of Carpocratian books and, more interestingly, is concerned with a current situation (see Salmon 1877, 409), is here set out in full because it clearly describes, at every turn, a cult system. Before commenting upon it, the other sources must be noticed.

Celsus is quoted by Origen c. Cels. V. 61-2 as referring to Christian sectaries who include 'Marcellians from Marcellina, Harpocratians from Salome, and others from Mariamne and others from Martha'. The proximity of Marcellina's name makes it likely ⁽²⁾ that 'Harpocratians' is a natural error for 'Carpocratians'; and the use of 'Salome' in the context of a secret tradition such as that of the ^a Carpocratian gospel exegesis is entirely to be expected.

The only major addition to our knowledge of the Carpocratians ^a is offered by Clement of Alexandria, in the Stromata and in the recently discovered letter published by Morton Smith.

Stromata III. 2.5 remarks that 'The disciples of Karpokrates and Epiphanes believe that women are to be shared, and as a result it is they who have caused the worst blasphemy against the Name. This Epiphanes, whose writings are extant, was the son of Karpokrates and his mother's name was Alexandria - though it was his father who was Alexandrian - his mother came from Kephallenia.

(2) With Hilgenfeld (1913) 39

He was only seventeen when he died, and he has been given divine honours at Samē in the island of Kephallenia, where a temple made of great stones, altars (βωμοί), sacred precincts, a shrine of the Muses, was built and dedicated to him; and the Kephallenians, gathering at the temple at new moon for Epiphanes' birthday, and the day of his deification, offer sacrifice and libations and prayers to Epiphanes, and sing hymns. He was educated by his father in the Comprehensive Syllabus (ἐγκύκλιον παιδείαν) and in Platonism, and was the inventor of the Monadic Gnosis. It is from him [or, 'from this situation, ἀφ' οὗ] also that the sect of the Carpocratians is derived!.

Before examining Clement's account of Epiphanes' book On Justice, this passage must be examined for any liturgical information it may offer. Harnack supposed that the Carpocratians had a body of literature which included not only the syggrammata quoted by Irenaeus, and Incantations mentioned by Irenaeus, and the book Περὶ Δικαιοσύνης written by Epiphanes, but also the text of hymns addressed to Epiphanes (Geschichte der altchr. Literatur, I. 161-2, II. 537). This last detail rests on an assumption about the whole character of this passage of Clement, an ^assumption which comes to the surface in Leclercq's article in D.A.C.L., where he remarks in an aside, 'Outre la vénération et le culte qu'ils rendaient à leurs fondateurs, ils possédaient des images...' (col.2176). But Clement does not suggest that the Carpocratians as he knew them still included any veneration of Epiphanes or his father: the alleged cult belongs to one place only, Samē on Kephallenia.

It has been suggested, in various terms, (first by Mosheim,

de rebus Christianis 370, then by Volkmar 1856, and most recently by Kraft 1952), that Clement has created a historical figure out of a misunderstanding of a Kephallenian festival and its accompanying myth. However, the author of On Justice, whom Clement describes in such circumstantial detail, certainly must be a historical person. That he was a juvenile prodigy is hardly impossible - German authors compare him with Melanchthon, who gave university lectures at the age of 17, and an English author might adduce the case of Newton. Nonetheless, de Faye (1913, 392) makes a substantial point when he asks how the veneration described by Clement could have been devoted by the pagans of Samē to a known Christian author; and he resolves the problem by classing both Epiphanes and his father as pagan philosophers, and denying any direct link between them and the later Christian sectaries who used their book(s) and their reputations. As will be noted below however, On Justice does contain Christian references, and so de Faye's question retains its full force.

Such solution as is possible must be sought in the mind and personality of Karpokrates, who is reasonably inferred to have survived the tragically premature death of his brilliant son. How such a bereavement can affect a devoted and strong minded father may be seen from the example of Sir Oliver Lodge, whose son's death caused him to devote the rest of a life-time to psychical research.⁽⁴⁾ Salmon (1880) suggested that Karpokrates published his own ideas in

(4) O.J.Lodge, Raymond, or Life and Death (London 1916); his interest in psychical research was already well established; see the anonymous article on Lodge in Encyclopaedia Britannica (Chicago and London, 1959 edn) Vol.14, 293-4. On the psycho-dynamics involved, E.H.Goin, R.W.Burgoyne, and J.N. Goin, 'Timeless Attachment to a Dead Relative' (Am.Jl.Psychiatry 136:2 / July 1979, 988-9) offer one of the few positive evaluations.

his son's name in On Justice; and certainly the contiguity in Stromata III of Clement's account of the Kephallenian cult and his quotation from On Justice makes it very likely that the younger man's work was published with an introductory memoir and explanatory addenda by his father.

It is not far-fetched to imagine how such a memoir could interpret sympathetic behaviour by Karpokrates' Samian neighbours in joining in the bereaved father's commemorations of his dead boy as popular ratification of his adoration of his son. Anyone who reflects on the late Victorian and Edwardian habit⁽⁵⁾ in England of incorporating photographically exact likenesses of the departed into the figures of saints in stained-glass windows will find such a reading of Clement's text not only admissible but even probable. Another possibility - that Karpokrates simply lied about the popular deification of his son - is, in human terms, far less likely.

The second-century Ephesian Tale of Anthia and Habrocomes⁽⁶⁾ by Xenophon of Ephesus reflects a circle of social and literary conventions - from the same period and even from the same general area - which seem to explain both Karpokrates' report and the neighbourly response of his Samian neighbours which we detect behind it. Of Habrocomes, Xenophon says that he "grew handsomer every day, and the qualities of his soul ^{kept} ~~kept~~ equal pace with the beauty of his person. He was diligent in every form of culture,

(5) e.g., in the stained glass from the former Wesleyan Methodist Church, Windmill Road, Brentford, Middlesex, now preserved in the Methodist Church, Clifden Road, Brentford.

(6) ET from M.Hadas, Three Greek Romances (1953) pp. 101, 103, 113.

and practiced the various arts; his training included the chase and horsemanship and the various arts. By all the Ephesians he was cherished, and likewise by the inhabitants of other parts of Asia; all expected that he would one day bring great distinction to his city. They honored the lad as he were a god, and indeed some there were who bowed down when they saw him and offered him prayer". And similarly of Anthia: "Her eyes were lively, shining sometimes like a girl's, sometimes severe, as of a chaste goddess. Her dress was a frock of purple, fitted down to the knee and hanging loose over the arms. Her wrap was a fawn skin, and a quiver hung from her shoulder. She carried bow and javelins, and dogs followed at her heels. Time and again when the Ephesians saw her in the sacred precinct they bowed down as to Artemis.⁽⁷⁾ And now too when Anthia came into view the entire multitude cried out in astonishment; some of the spectators asserted that she was the very goddess, others declared she was a replica fashioned by the goddess. But all did obeisance to her and bowed down and called her parents blessed". Their honeymoon takes them to various places, including Samos, sacred island of Hera, and Rhodes: "Astonished at the beauty of these two the Rhodians gathered in a crowd, and none who saw them passed in silence. Some said that these were divinites come to sojourn on the island; others bowed down to them and sought their favor...Public prayers were addressed to them and many victims were sacrificed, and their arrival was celebrated as a festive day...the entire

(7) whose emblems she displayed: fawn-skin, quiver, bow, javelin, dogs: cf H.J.Rose, Gods and Heroes of the Greeks (London 1957) 19,43-5.

multitude of the Rhodians escorted them to their sailing". This is fiction; but in a society where such hyperbolic language was acceptable, even in fiction, the use of deification language in tribute to a precocious (and handsome?) youth is entirely to be expected. If Karpokrates and his friends used in their tributes to Epiphanes terms reminiscent of the local moon-cult, this would be less emphatic than Xenophon's use of features of the cult of Artemis.

It is quite unclear from Clement whether there was any continuity at all between Karpokrates and the devotions at his son's memorial and the group, known to Clement, who were using the book On Justice, or whether there was 'ein Harpokrates-Kultverein' which 'hat sich gnostisiert und christianisiert' (Kretschmar 1959). The example of the so-called 'followers of Prodikos', discussed below, suggests that we should not be surprised ^{if} ~~it~~ it turned out that the 'Carpocratians' were a totally new group who took over Karpocrates' name for the sake of a 'philosophical', 'intellectual' public image, because his moral teaching suited their ends.

Clement continues (Strom. III. ii.6) with a long quotation from On Justice. Since this says nothing about worship, we shall not reproduce it at length. We must note however that Epiphanes addresses himself to a Christian readership who, if they are not Jewish Christians, nonetheless use and revere the Old Testament. 'The sun causes food to grow for all living beings alike; the universal justice given to all equally. In this respect there is no difference between the species of oxen and particular oxen, and so on with all the rest.' In them universality is manifest as justice:..

'The light of the sun, which is the cause of the daytime and the

and the father of light, God pours out from above' [cf. James i.17] 'upon the earth in equal measure on all who have power to see. For all see alike, since here is no distinction between rich and poor, people and governor, stupid and clever, female and male, free men and slaves' [cf. Mt. 5.45] '....Furthermore, all plants "after their kind" are sown equally in the earth. Common nourishment grows for all beasts which feed on the earth's produce; to all it is alike. It is regulated by no law, birth rather is harmoniously available to all through the gift of him who gave it and commanded it to grow' [Gen. i. 11-12, 22] '.... As the laws could not punish men who were ignorant of them, they taught men to transgress' [cf. Gal. iv. 19] '....[and in Strom. III. 3.9]: 'Consequently one must understand the saying "Thou shalt not desire" [Ex. xx.17, Dt. v.21] 'as if the lawgiver was making a jest, to which he added the even more comic words, "Thy neighbour's goods". For he who gave the desire to sustain the race orders that it is to be suppressed, though he removes it from no other animals. And by the words, "thy neighbour's wife", he says something even more ludicrous, since he forces what should be common property to be treated as a private possession.' (using Grant's trans., Anthology 39,40).

We cannot agree with de Faye that this is a purely pagan product; it uses Jewish and Christian scriptures with sympathy and even some respect, however mischievous the exegesis of Paul may be. What else may have been in the book we cannot guess, but these passages at least are more than superficially Christian. Indeed, their view of the Creator is essentially that of orthodox Jews and Christians - and

- and although his commandments are expounded as jests, they are benevolent jests, and the physical world they speak of is a good and wonderful gift from a kindly maker: we are a long way from the 'world-creating angels' whom Irenaeus' Carpocratians made a point of defying. They deserved Clement's strictures of being at war with God the Creator (III. 3.9., 119 Stählin), but this is not obviously applicable to Epiphanes.

Clement is judging Epiphanes by the activities professed by the Carpocratians of his acquaintance, who were clearly of the same stamp as those who troubled the Roman Church during the pontificate of Aniketos. Clement is certainly quoting from a written source when he describes them (III. ii. 198 Stählin), for at two points he goes out of his way to say that his quotation avoids the precise terms of his source - though whether this source was incorporated with the text of On Justice or was a separate document there are at present no means of saying:

"They also say that they, and certain other imitators of such evils" [sc., the principles of On Justice], "gather together for meals - I cannot allow myself to call their gathering an 'Agape' -" [obviously, their own name for it] - "both men and women in association" [sc., they dined 'promiscuously', not sitting in separation], "and that, after they have filled themselves with foods of the kind that stir up lust, the lamp that would rightly put to shame their fornication is taken out, and when the light is removed they copulate just as they will and with whom they will; their view is that, in such sharing (of women) in this 'Agape', they exact, from whatever women they choose, obedience to 'the law of Karpokrates' - it would be wrong to call it" [as

they clearly did)" 'the divine law'."

Clement remarks that the ideas behind this rite, and also behind On Justice, are partly inspired by Plato's Republic, which advocates the sharing of women⁽⁸⁾, and, more pertinently, by the Magica of Xanthus, which admitted the link between the arts of magic and incest and woman-sharing.^(8^a) whether or not Xanthus' book was a direct influence on the Carpocratians, Clement has rightly pointed to the underlying character of their cult as they themselves described it: its sexual features characterise it as a cult of power.

The evidence offered by Clement is valuably enlarged by the discovery of a letter bearing his name and couched in his style, which was identified by Morton Smith in 1958 in a leaf pasted into the binding of a copy of Voss' edition of Ignatius in the library of the monastery of St. Saba. The letter encourages its addressee, an unknown Theodore, in his opposition to the Carpocratians. The Carpocratians have appealed in justification of their rites to the Gospel of Mark, and specifically to a version of that Gospel longer and fuller of esoteric matter than the version publicly available. Clement argues that this fuller version did exist, that Mark was its author, and that it was kept in the Alexandrian Church, reserved for those ready for admission to 'the great mysteries'. He adds that Karpokrates had by devious means secured a copy of this fuller version and had himself then added spurious passages to it.

Such details as the letter affords must be examined for their value as evidence for the Catholic liturgy of Alexandria. Clement agrees with Theodore that there is a passage (which he is happy to quote in full) which in the esoteric version is inserted between

(8) Plato, Republic IV.423, V.449, V.457B-466D.

(8^a) See Herter, art 'Xanthus der Lyder' in PWK, 2.Reihe 18.Halbband (1967) 1353-74.

Mk. x.34 and x.35. Then the esoteric version is again identical with the text of the exoteric version through the section x.35:45. In the esoteric version of x.46ff, there is a single sentence added to the text publicly read.

It is clear from Clement's letter that the Carpocratian version of the added passage after x.34 had a number of embellishments of its own, which are not in the authentic text of the esoteric version. Only one of them is even partially quoted by Clement - *γυμνὸς γυμνῶ*, "naked man to/with naked man". There are also additions in the Carpocratian version of x.46 ff, but no hint is given of their nature. Clement does not repeat the quotations from the Carpocratian gospel which clearly occurred in Theodore's enquiring letter, perhaps to avoid unnecessary repetition, but also more probably also to avoid repeating distasteful statements.

If *γυμνὸς γυμνῶ* is typical of the sort of additions that Theodore and Clement are discussing, then their character is clear: the Carpocratians' Gospel presented Jesus as engaged in sexual rites - in this context, specifically in homosexual acts. Where exactly *γυμνὸς γυμνῶ* occurred in the Carpocratian text we are not told; but it belonged somewhere in the passage, 'And after six days Jesus told him what to do and in the evening the youth comes to him wearing a linen cloth over (his) naked (body). And he remained with him that night, for Jesus taught him the mystery of the kingdom of God'. (Smith 1973, 453 Gk, Smith 1974, 17 English).

Morton Smith's rendering prefers to link "naked man with naked man" with *ἔμεινε σὺν αὐτῷ* "remained with him", but a link with "taught

him" has at least as much to commend it, for the sexual innuendo has greatest force in an initiatory setting, and it is clear that "taught...the mystery..." is a periphrasis for baptism (Smith 1973, 173-183).

What are we to make of this account? Clement, and the Church he represents, are clearly embarrassed by the whole situation. On Bauer's view⁽⁹⁾, the Alexandrian Church would have been (at any time these events might reasonably be placed - say 125 - 140?) still doctrinally uncritical: but even Bauer's thesis can hardly posit a Church so comprehensive as to approve of Karpocrates if he appeared under his true colours, and the character of the surviving Christian manuscripts from second-century Egypt suggests in any case that the prevalent form of Christianity there in the earliest period was not 'heterodox' - as has been shown by C.H. Roberts in Manuscript, Society and Belief in Early Christian Egypt (p. 1-17). Clement's explanation that Karpocrates had tricked one of the Alexandrian presbyters into lending him the esoteric Gospel is so humiliating that it has the ring of truth.

The account of Karpocrates in the lost Syntagma (Quorum haereticorum ix; Philastrius, haer. 15; Epiphanius, haer. 37; Theodoret, haer. fab. comp. I.v.) lacks all this information kept by Clement, and adds little to what we learn from Irenaeus. It shows, however, signs of being independent of Irenaeus to the extent of using the same Carpocratian text that Irenaeus used but quoting it directly where Irenaeus prefers indirect speech. (The

(9) Bauer, Orthodoxy and Heresy (ET London 1972), Ch.2

close agreement of the two sources is therefore all the more significant). The lost Syntagma gives another version of the heresiarch's name: Karpokras. It also gives a date, saying of Karpokras and his son that 'These men began to push their evil sect while Hadrian was Emperor' - i.e., between 117 and 138 (Theodoret, I.v, P.G. 83, 351D). Three of the passages in which Epiphanius seems to claim to quote the words of the Carpocratians directly where Irenaeus paraphrases, are relevant to this investigation.

In the passage equivalent to Section 2 (a) in Irenaeus, as quoted earlier, Epiphanius cites the reasons given by the Carpocratians ^{as:} for their use of invocations ~~is~~ that they allure familiar spirits to themselves so that by this great juggling-trick (*διὰ πολλῆς μαγανείας* - clearly Epiphanius' hostile addition!), 'they may reign, as they put it, with full authority over all things: *εἰς τὸ ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ μεγάλῃ πάντων, φασὶ, κυριεύειν* (PG 41, 366 D). The impression given is other than in Irenaeus: where for him the Carpocratians ^a *because they have authority, for Epiphanius they do so* conjure ^a in order to have authority - and indeed to rule over everything. Epiphanius' 'as they put it' is an apology for their whole claim, which he quotes in their own terms.

In section (3) of our excerpt from Irenaeus, he refers to the Carpocratians' claim to a commission from Jesus to transmit the secret doctrine. Here too Epiphanius clearly cites the Sectarian text word-for-word: "They also say" - and then *ὅτι*, indicating a literal quotation - "We think fit to teach these things to those who are worthy, so that they may practice the things that are thought to be bad, which are not bad by nature, so that, having been made disciples they may be set free" (PG. 41, 372A).

The use of *ἐνδὲ μαθόντες ἐλευθερωθῶσι* in this context suggests that 'being taught', 'being made a disciple', here involves a ritual initiation in which the principle of defying the distinction of good and evil was demonstrated by practising it. That we are in the area of initiation is shown by the immediate transition (as in Irenaeus, but with some differences in detail) to the rite of ^{the} branding-iron, ^Λ The 'seal' may be made with a knife or razor; it is not certain whether these details are in his source, or are added for effect.

Lastly, at the end of his account of the Carpocratian use of images, he adds, with apparent inconsequentiality: *ψυχῆς δὲ εἶναι μόνης σωτηρίαν φασί, καὶ οὐχὶ σωμάτων* (PG 41, 376 A). This may not be a quotation, or at least not from the same context ^(9^a); it may be that the inconsistency of venerating images and at the same time despising the flash ^e suddenly strikes Epiphanius. The use of *σωτηρία*, however, suggests that the Carpocratians themselves found it necessary to forestall misunderstanding, and that at a sensitive moment. In their initiation, the ritual movement into salvation, they displayed the images of their philosopher-heroes to encourage their initiands to rise above common prejudice as the philosophers did. (If the initiands were Jews, the mere presence of the images would be in itself a defiance of tabu). During the mystagogy, however, it was found necessary to warn the simple that this use of material things did not endorse the vulgar attachment to matter or the material body or any moral constraints upon it. The *σωτηρία* now being entered upon is of the soul only.

A sketchy picture of Carpocratian ritual can be put together:

(9^a) Quorum haereticorum attaches a similar statement to the Carpocratians' 'Christology': hunc apud Iudaeos passum, solum animam eius in coelo receptam, eo quod ei firmior et robustior ceteris fuerit, ex quo colligeret, lentata animarum sola salute, nulla corporis resurrectiones III. 50 Leonola, II. 1405 Kroymann

Initiation was at the heart of the sect's life. As with mystery religions, there was teaching, even indoctrination, to overcome moral scruples and inherited ethics. During the preparatory instruction and/or at the definitive event the initiate would be taught formulae of power for use in invocation of Power.

These formulae no doubt included such 'Pass-words' as are quoted by Irenaeus as a piece of floating tradition. (AH I.xxi.4, I.186-8 Harvey). Indeed, if they occurred in a stray papyrus, one would place them in the Carpocratian ritual; but, as Irenaeus does not link them with any particular sect, and as the genre itself is clearly much older than the Carpocratians, these formulae are discussed separately.

Rising through, past, and above the world-makers has been hailed as typically Jewish (Daniélou 1964, p.84): but there is no hint here of Merkabah mysticism, of rising now in spirit above the bonds of flesh to glimpse the divine Kabod. Karpokrates' interest is in rising to the divine sphere ultimately and as soon as possible; present contemplation is concerned with oneself, one's freedom from the trammels of false moral distinctions, one's growing superiority over angels, one's sense of power.

How was that power claimed and the escape of the soul speeded up? Was the definitive act some version of Christian baptism? The Carpocratians claimed the Christian name emphatically, as Epiphanius complains, and Marcellina must have been a convincing Christian at first sight, for her to have made dangerous inroads into Anicetus' flock; and Karpokrates was associated with the edition of the Alexandrian church's Gospel which it used at baptism. It must

be concluded therefore that the Carpocratians used Christian baptism; while its relation to their distinctive rites (combined? one supplementing or 'perfecting' or in some way reversing the other?) remains unclear. Clement's letter suggests that in this process, however it was arranged, Christian baptism was interpreted in an amoral way as an act of homo-erotic ritual magic, and thus as an example of the defiance of the world-makers.

The rites of initiation took place in the presence of venerated cult-images of philosophers (perhaps including Epiphanes and later Karpocrates - and Alexandria^c ?); and they included a marking of the neophyte's right ear-lobe with a secret tattoo. This has been seen by both Dölger and Liboron as a deliberate taking up of the Johannine image of baptism with fire. It is far more akin, however, to Hellenistic cult-usages such as those of the rites of Cybele⁽¹⁰⁾, and is almost certainly indicative of personal commitment to the cult-leader. Peterson (1949, p.929) points out helpfully that the right ear is on the side of the body dedicated to memory. An apotropaic element, detected by Liboron (p.50), may also be present.

The continuing rite of "Agape", in which the lesson of moral indifference is reinforced and practised^s, and the saving Power given ever wider scope for its inner work of liberation, is obviously related to the Christian Agape-Eucharist, but no less akin to Hellenistic cult-meals. Where Karpocrates met the Christian Eucharist we cannot guess, for it is not certain that he took up Christianity

(10) See Minucius Felix, de error. prof. relig. ix and xxxxi; Clement of Alexandria, ecl. proph. 25, 1; Origen, c. Cels. V.64. Discussion of general issue in E. Maass, 'Segen, Weihen, Taufen' (1922). Dölger, 'Sphragis als religiöse Brandmarkung im Einweihungsakt der gnostischen Karpokratianer' in AC I/1 (1929) 73-8; Liboron, Die karpokratianische Gnosis (1938).

while still in Kephallenia; but, if he did, he learned of it in an area where rumour pictured the Christian cult-meals as a disorderly carouse in which social distinctions were ignored. That at least is the view reflected by Apuleius in The Golden Ass (xiii. (ch.xiii): that is the natural reading of his cruel account of the baker's wife, 'malicious, cruel, spiteful, lecherous, drunken, selfish, obstinate, as mean in her petty thefts as she was wasteful in her grand orgies, and an enemy of all that was honest and clean. She also professed perfect scorn for the Immortals and rejected all true religion in favour of a fantastic and blasphemous cult of an "Only God". In his honour she practised various absurd ceremonies which gave her the excuse of getting drunk quite early in the day and playing the whore at all hours...' (11) Such were the rumours current in Thessaly about (say) 230. Of personal devotions among Carpocratians we read understandably little. Peterson (1949, p.930) has however observed that uses for pagan cult-statues included their being carried about on the person for apotropaic purposes; and cult-systems that teach their cult-members formulae of Power usually generate customs of rote prayer - the Cathari are the obvious example. (12)

Typically of Cults of Power, women had a major place among the Carpocratians, whether they proved particularly compelling as leaders of sexual rites, or whether giving them prominence was in itself a defiance of social prejudice. Of how many other religious leaders of the Romano-Hellenistic world do we know their wives' names and origins as we know Alexandria's? (Akiba's wife is the only case that comes

(11) ET Robert Graves, 214.

(12) See also Nock in Journal of Roman Studies 37 (1947), and Leclercq, art. 'Carpocratians' in DACL X/2 (1925) 2176-8, Dölger in AC 4, 69. The scanty discussion in Beck, Bilder und Bilderverehrung (1957), 9, suggests that he has little confidence in the reliability or significance of this evidence. Cf our remarks on Illustration I. On the Cathars, see Tripp (1977).

to mind). Marcellina is the only leader of the cult known after Karpokrates, and she may be his contemporary. Celsus certainly thought Salome was claimed as a founder; and he may mean the same in his references to Mariamme and Martha.

Mention of these last raises the issue of the possible use of a Gospel attributed to, or largely featuring, Salome. What relationship such a book, if it existed, had with the purloined esoteric edition of Mark, cannot be suggested. Knowledge of Matthew, Galatians, perhaps James, also of Genesis, Exodus and Deuteronomy is indicated in Epiphanes. What use he and his father's sect might have made of these books beyond quoting them for purposes of debate we cannot tell.

The unanswerable question of the Carpocratian scriptures renders insoluble also the problem of stating the role of Christ in Carpocratian worship. Their speculative theology presents him as a model, exceptional but not unique, not even insurpassable - and not apparently as a mediator, though possibly as a pioneer⁽¹³⁾. It is interesting that Karpokrates himself is not quoted as claiming a mediatorial role⁽¹⁴⁾. Although he shows few signs of Jewish influence, his 'monadic gnosis' is so far monotheistic as to require no mediator (unless the impersonal Power from on high is in some sense mediatorial or messianic). It may be that the idée fixe of universal oneness so dominated Carpocratian interests that any mediatorial concepts they took over incidentally in Christian scriptures and rites which they adopted or adapted remained

(13) When Bousset (Hauptprobleme 1907,327) observes: 'Wir gewinnen auch hier den Eindruck, dass in eine schon vollkommen fertige Winkel-Religion, deren Ideen auf völlig anderem Boden erwachsen sind, der Person Jesu nachträglich und künstlich eine gewisse Position eingeräumt ist', he is somewhat overstating.

(14) There is not the slightest evidence for Schmithals' statement (Office of an Apostle 116 and 171n) that Karpokrates made such a claim.

as part of their vocabulary, although not assimilable to their central convictions.

Unlike the Cainites, the Carpocratians were not worshippers of evil⁽¹⁵⁾, nor were their rites calculated to debase matter or humiliate individuals, as so easily happens in cults of Power. Bareille suggested that their recruits would be from the dregs of society⁽¹⁶⁾; their appeal might well cross social divides, bringing together the mischievous and the unconventional; but there are no sure signs of the exploitation and even down-right cruelty that a totally degraded cult tends to display.

(15) Against Salmon (1877) 409.

(16) Bareille (1905) col.1803.

CULTS OF POWER, 6:

MARCUS AND THE MARCOSIANS

The extant works of Justin make no mention of Marcus at all, though he fits into the category of men who claimed divinity for themselves, a trait which for Justin characterizes the heretics listed in the Syntagma which he had compiled or inherited (I. Apol. xxvi,). Hilgenfeld (Ketzergeschichte 1884, Bk. 2) omits Marcus from Justin's list and classes him (369-384) with those first mentioned by Irenaeus. However, Irenaeus himself quotes a poem against Marcus by one of the 'elders', presumably from the same source that informed him of Marcus' doings in Asia, and the possibility cannot be ruled out that this source was in circles within which Justin moved.

The poem itself treats Marcus as a dangerous opponent in his own right, needing separate attention, and not as a disciple of some other master or as a representative of a school, that of Valentinus or any other. That this impression is strengthened by a study of the rest of Irenaeus' report will be maintained below. The poem also characterizes Marcus as a magician, as the exponent of a cult of power.

The Latin of Irenaeus I.viii.17 (I.155 Harvey) reads:^a

Idolorum fabricator, Marce, et portentorum inspector

Astrologiae cognitor et magica^e artis

Per quae confirmas erroris doctrinas,

Signa ostendensⁿ his qui a te seducuntur

Apostaticae virtutis operationes,

Quae tibi praestat tuus pater Satanas

Per angelicam virtutem Azazel facere, habensⁿ te

Praecursorem contrariae adversus Deum nequitia^e).

And the underlying Greek is preserved by Epiphanius, Panarion,
(haer.34.11.11), copying from Irenaeus:

εἰδωλοποιε̄ Μάρκε καὶ τερατοσκοπε̄,
ἀστρολογικῆς ἔμπειρε καὶ μαγικῆς τέχνης,
δι' ὧν κρατύνεις τῆς πλάνης τὰ διδάγματα, |
σημεῖα δεικνύς τοῖς ὑπὲρ σοῦ πλανωμένοις, |
ἀποστατικῆς δυνάμεως ἐγχειρήματα, |
ἃ σοὶ χορηγεῖ σὺς πατὴρ Σατάν ἀεὶ!
δι' ἀγγελικῆς δυνάμεως Ἀζαζήλ ποιεῖν,
ἔχων σε πρόδρομον ἀντιθέου πανουργίας.

II.23.8-15 Holl

1.6 *Α σοι χορηγεῖ σὺς Πατήρ Σατάν ἀεὶ.

em. Harvey.

'O Marcus, idol-maker, seeker-out of wonders,
skilled in the devices of astrology and magic,
by means of which you enforce the deceptive teachings,
displaying signs to the people deceived by you,
operations of power that turn them from God:
these things your father Satan always grants you
to perform through the angelic power of Azazel,
so he has you as the pioneer of his whole campaign against God'.

This octet may be part of a longer poem against Marcus or against
a number of heretics; but is also complete in itself. Its author
cannot yet be identified. When the denunciations are left aside,
there is a little information left about Marcus: his teaching and
practice are aimed at winning converts, and their dominant theme
is the acquisition of power over or by means of angels.

The other information given by Irenaeus is consistent with this, and may be from the same source. Earlier discussion of the text of Irenaeus at this point must here be recalled. It was argued above that the original order of Adversus Haereses I was (citing by Harvey's chapters):

- (a) the Valentinian system, i-vi;
- (b) Simon and his successors, xvi-xxix, and especially
- (c) Marcus, vii-ix.2
- (d) Heresy in general analysed and judged, ix.3 - xv.

Consistently with this view, Marcus is not here examined on the assumption of his being a disciple of Valentinus, of his scheme being a variant on the Valentinian gnosis. Nor will it be felt necessary to find room in Marcosian usage for the rites described in xiv-xv.

As the text of Adversus Haereses now stands, it is natural - indeed, scarcely avoidable - to conclude that Irenaeus describes Marcus as being, like Ptolemaeus, a pupil of Valentinus. The author of the Refutation (VI. xxxiv-1) certainly read Irenaeus in this sense. This is not impossible, for one who imagines himself a true disciple may diverge from his master to an astounding degree - Mani himself claimed, no doubt sincerely, to be an Apostle of Jesus Christ. However, the change from the lofty speculation of Valentinus and Ptolemaeus to the crudities of Marcus is nonetheless startling; and the fact that Valentinians known to the author of the Refutation stoutly denied that they got up to this sort of thing (Ref. VII.37).

cannot be dismissed, as he does, by accusing them of deceit - there is an incompatibility between the styles of Valentinus (or of Ptolemaeus) and of Marcus, and another solution than that Marcus transformed Valentinianism out of recognition is in fact available. It is best discussed at this point, despite the disadvantage of making our section devoted to Marcus disproportionately long.

The preface to Adversus Haereses II includes a careful summary of Book I (I, 249-50 Harvey).

In primo quidem libro, qui ante hunc est,

(a) arguentes falsi nominis agnitionem ostendimus tibi, dilectissime, omne ab his qui sunt a Valentino per multos et contrarios modos adinventum esse falsiloquium;

(b) etiam sententias exposuimus eorum qui priores extiterunt, discrepantes eos semetipsos ostendentes, multo autem prius ipsi veritati.

(c) Et Marci quoque magi sententiam, cum sit ex his, cum operibus ejus omni diligentia exposuimus, et quanta ex Scripturis eligentes adaptare conantur fictioni suae, diligentes^y retulimus: et quonam modo per numeros, et per viginti quatuor elementa alphabeti veritatem affirmare conantur et audent, minutatim perexivimus.

(d) Et quemadmodum conditionem secundum imaginem invisibilis apud eos Pleromatis factam dicunt, et quanta de Demiurgo sentiunt ac docent, renuntiavimus,

(e) et progenitoris ipsorum doctrinam Simonis magi Samaritani,

account of the heretical view of the Creator needs to lead directly into his account of heretical initiations to form a logical sequence: these chapters display the heretics' depreciation of the Creator in both theory ('quanto de Demiurgo sentiunt ac docent') and practice ('impia et irreligiosa dogmata induxerunt in hanc vitam').

This leaves us with sections (b) and (e) of the Preface, and xvi-xxix of the present text of Book I. A hasty reading would identify I.xvi-xxix with (e); but this identification must be rejected on three grounds. Firstly, Irenaeus' clear logical progression from (a) to (d) and onwards requires (b) to function as a substantial step in the argument; but, ^{unless} ~~when~~ (b) is I.xvi-xxix, there is a serious gap in the development. Secondly, the description of Marcus in (c), 'cum sit ex his', is, because of the present order of Book I, read as including him among the disciples of Valentinus, on whose heritage he had 'improved' - but a more natural reading of the preface would be that Marcus belongs among those, described in (b), 'qui priores extiterunt' (sc. before the Valentinians), and that the master on whom he 'improved' was Simon, the head and fount of all heterodoxy. Thirdly, the logical development of the Preface from (a) to (f), and its obvious intention to lead into Book II, the refutation of the distinction between Supreme God and Creator, requires that the climax of Book I be that: 'neque super illum (the Creator) neque post illum est aliquid'. Such a climax cannot be xvi-xxxix; it can only be I.xv - compare 'non postremitatis fructus' of (f) with 'de qua defluerunt tales fructus' of I.xv.

The inference is that the original order of Book I as planned by Irenaeus was:

(a) the description of the Valentinian system (I.I), criticized for its presumption (I.ii-iv) and for its variability (I.v-vi);

(b) the background of the Valentinians in the earlier history of heresies, starting from Simon (I.xvi-xxix), with (c) Marcus (I.vii-ix.2) forming a major item in this catalogue;

(d) + (f) the common characteristic of all these movements, the defiance of the Creator in doctrine and cultic practice is identified (I. x.3-xiii) and challenged (I. xiv-xv).

It remains to account for (e) of the Preface and for the present state of Book I. There is no need to suggest any deliberate alteration of Irenaeus' text by another. A complete explanation would lie in physical damage to the autograph of Book I (we assume this to have been in codex form, as it is in a very early papyrus⁽¹⁾), leading to the detachment of one gathering of leaves. This may have been an accident or due to the author himself removing that section to make additions to it - xxv.2 seems to mark the end of a section and xxvi-xxviii.9 to represent Irenaeus' additions from new sources or his own observation. The detached gathering is returned to the wrong place - surely not by Irenaeus, but perhaps by his deacon, faced with the task of sorting out his papers - has Irenaeus died in the Sack of Lyons in ¹⁹⁷~~297~~, having just revised the text without having had a chance to bind up his book again? If the codex was still in a rough

(1) See M. Richard, B. Hemmerdinger, 'Trois nouveaux fragments grecs de l'Adversus Haereses de saint Irénée', ZnW 53 (1962), 252-5; discussion in C.H. Roberts, Manuscript, Society and Belief in Early Christian Egypt (London 1979), 23, 53 and ch.3 in general.

state, the proper destination for the extracted gathering would not be obvious. A section beginning 'alius vero' (=Marcus, I.vii.1) would seem naturally to follow a catalogue of names now in I.v-vi - there was no obvious gap to fill. So the attachment of the detached gathering at the end of the codex was a natural and sensible thing to do. This left, of course, an apparent gap in the summary in the Preface to Book II; (e) is composed to fill it.

Both Tertullian's Adversus Valentinianos (cap.iv) and the Refutation assume the order of Adversus Haereses that we now have; hence our inference that the dislocation took place in the autograph, or in the rough copy Irenaeus retained when he had sent off the fair copy to the friend who had asked for the book in the first place.

The practical consequence of our observations is that Marcus cannot be interpreted as an exponent of Valentinianism (nor as a starting-point for Marcus); he belongs rather in the company of Simon Magus⁽²⁾. The rituals of Marcus and his 'disciples' are found only in I.vii-ix.2; the important formulae and rites described in xiv-xv must be omitted here.

The information added by Irenaeus falls into these distinct blocks: an account of Marcus' own ritual practice (vii. 1-4), and a similar account of the ritual practice of some of Marcus' wandering disciples (vii.5-6), and then a summary (viii) of Marcus' special system of speculation. The theological exposition is so complex that it argues a written source, and a written source, (the same or another) must also underlie the long quotations of ritual formulae in both the liturgical accounts; but Irenaeus' own pastoral experience is reflected

(2) The similarity is noted (without any inferences) by Schmithals, Office of an Apostle, 177 and note, 339.

in the report of Marcosian disciples in the Rhone valley, and the first block of ritual information has features of an eye-witness account and seems to be based at least in part on the public confession of the deacon's wife who had been involved in one of Marcus' rituals and had then returned to the Great Church (vii.4).

Before examining the liturgical information, we turn to the theological exposition, linking with it the statements of general doctrinal import from the two blocks of material in I.vii so that Marcus may be placed theologically and his cultus interpreted in that context.

A. The Marcosian Theology

The opening sentence of viii.1 has been found problematic⁽³⁾:

Hic igitur Marcus

vulvam et susceptorium (v.l. exceptorium) Colorbasii Silentii
semet solum fuisse dicens,

quippe unigenitus existens,

semen, quod depositum est in eum, sic enixus est...

(Irenaeus Lat.) I. 127-8 Harvey.

cf. Panarion, haer.34.4.1 (II.10 Holl):

Ὅτις (οὖν) ὁ Μάρκος μήτραν καὶ ἐκδοχείον τῆς Κολορβάσου Σιγῆς
αὐτὸν μονώτατον γεγονέναι λέγων, ἅτε μονογενῆς ὑπάρχων, αὐτὸ τὸ τοῦ
Ἰσπερήματος (σπέρμα) κατατεθὲν εἰς αὐτὸν ὥδέ πως ἀπεκύησεν.

(3) By Harvey, notes in loc., and A.Stieren, ed.,
S.Irenaei...quae supersunt omnia, I (Leipzig
1853) 158-60, n.7.

The Tetrad (ΥΙΓΧ - Γ) that is Silence, who is the source of Marcus' Power, can only be understood in terms of the 'alphabetic' system which follows; but for practical purposes the Tetrad is defined in terms of the person of Marcus. It is he who, by his apparently submissive, feminine relationship to the Tetrad, is the means by which the Power of the Tetrad is operative in present experience. Marcus is the unique womb and receptacle for the seed of Power which becomes ^effective through the vision to be described a few lines below. But the centre of the stage is held not by the seed or even by the Tetrad but by Marcus. The ^text underlying the quotation can only be an 'I am' saying: 'I am the sole womb and receptacle of the Silence-Tetrad; I am the only-begotten; thus I gave birth to the seed that was in me:...' This 'I am' opening characterizes the whole system and determines the intention of the ritual formulæ: Marcus is himself an essential part of the salvation-economy and its sacramental realisation. Unlike Karpokrates, he does not point away from himself to some other model, such as Jesus, nor is the privilege he claims achieved by askesis; he is already the unique receptacle of power, and his vision simply realizes for him and then for others what he already was. The 'I am's' are of course typical of Johannine language; but their prevalence in Hellenistic aretalogy⁽⁴⁾ makes it unsafe to suggest any imitation of the Fourth Gospel here. More significant is its use at the outset of Marcus' book, suggesting that the book was to be read aloud for liturgical or quasi-liturgical purposes. P
parallels with the use of 'I am' in Old Testament covenant ritual

(4) R.E.Witt, Isis in the Graeco-Roman World (London 1971) 100-110.

(Exodus xx.2: ἐγώ εἰμι Κύριος ὁ Θεός σου, LXX , etc.) may be noted; but associations are as much with revelation-magic (cf. PMG 4.1117;5, 110,147,248ff.; 7.825ff., 12.228ff.; 13.254ff) as with covenant-making.

Marcus goes on to recount his vision. The all-highest four-fold silence came down to him from the invisible and unnameable levels of reality (locis) in female form, - since the masculine version of that being's self-manifestation is more than created nature can endure⁽⁵⁾ - and showed him Her own nature, and the beginning of all things, hitherto never revealed to anyone, divine or human. (The centrality and uniqueness of Marcus is asserted more emphatically still).

The Tetrad begins: First, when the Father who has no father, beyond understanding and existence (insubstantivus, ανουσιος - perhaps the link with Basilides detailed by Jerome, de vir.ill.121, Epistle lxxv.3), who is neither male nor female, wished to make his inexpressible nature expressible, to give form to his invisible nature, he opened his mouth and brought forth a word like to himself, which, standing beside him, showed him what he himself was, having itself appeared as the form of the invisible. Such a Logos-theology could prove fruitful in a Christian setting - such diverse authors as Hippolytus contra Noetum x-xi and Anselm of Canterbury Monologion are examples. The first word of the Name is APXH, and a 'syllable' of four letters (does this flight of fancy take off from John I.i?). From the letters of APXH develops a fantastic numerology, Marcus' equivalent of an aeonology to account for the

(5) An interesting contrast here with the theophany at the opening of the Apokryphon of John (ET Wisse, NHLE,99) where the whole three-fold nature of the Father-Mother-Son is manifested to John. Helpful exegesis in the brief preliminary note by Cullmann in ThZ 25 (1949) 156.

emergence of the many from the one. As a series of numbers/letters is generated, so it can be reduced at the last to unity, which will be the final utterance of 'Amen' by all of 'us' together. The system of letter-configurations includes 'Alpha and Omega' and the figure of archetypal anthropos (viii.4), 'Christ Jesus' (viii.5), the day of the Transfiguration and the descent of the dove at the baptism (viii.7), the creation of man on the sixth day and the manifestation of the Saviour on the sixth day, the cena pura, and the sixth hour (viii.7). Seven is the number of the senses (viii.7) and of the deacons (viii.8), and of the seven heavens, that sound the seven vowels in a celestial music (viii.8). The Word is praised by seven Powers, as the souls of children glorify Marcus by weeping and complaining to him. (This, surely the only known theologou^umenon on the symptoms of infant cholera, is clearly part of Marcus' patter in conversations with women). The longing of the soul, expressed by Ω, is thus also an utterance of praise, and a means by which the soul above may recognise the soul on earth as her kin, and may send her aid (viii.9). This interpretation of incoherent sounds comes into its own in the ritual reports which describe Marcus' incitement of glossolalia.

The system starts again from the primal Tetrad, now based on numbers rather than letters (viii. 10-16). In this calculus, the Saviour has (for example) an utterable name and a birth that can be uttered, and a name and a birth that cannot: the unutterable aspects of Christ concern the saving power hidden within him. When therefore his six-letter name (IHCOYC) was manifested,

he clothed himself in flesh, so that he might come down to the world of human sense, having within himself both the six (IHCOYC) and the twenty-four (Arrhetos + Sige + Pater + Aletheia), then those who know him ceased from ignorance, rose from death to life, the name having become for them the way (cf. Jn. xiv.6) to the Father of Truth. For the Father has willed (indirect speech here - a close quotation) to undo (ἀποκαί) the ignorance of all and to destroy death. He assumes the human name "Jesus", with creaturely limitations, so that he may be the elect Man providentially provided (so Hippolytus, οὐκονομηθέντα) in the image of the Power Above, according to the will of himself (or, of the Father?). The baptism of Jesus has a key place in this economy "When he came to the water, there descended upon him, as a dove, he that ascends on high, and fulfilled the number 12 (the 'number' of the emanations); in it exists the seed of those who are of the same seed as he, and who therefore descend with him and ascend with him'. He says that this Power which came down is the seed of the Father, and the Son and the ineffable Power of Silence which is known through them, and all the Aeons". This formula sounds a little muddled - how can the Father's seed be said to contain the Father? - and Hippolytus has tried to improve the sense by altering "father" to "Pleroma", but the less coherent form is to be preferred. Marcus' "seed of the Father" is a pagan concept, found both in Hellenistic mythology (Zeus^(5a), etc.) and Egyptian mythology (Ammon) and he attempts to gloss it for use with Christians by taking on a quasi-Trinitarian formula, derived from Christian use, but adapted to his imagery of the divine Silence. If we lacked any other evidence, we should expect that this description

(5a) See art. 'Zeus' in RE Supplementband XV.

of Jesus' baptism would reflect the kind of ritual language employed by Marcus in any use or adaptation of Christian baptism.

The origin of this system is questionable, and may not have been very clear to Marcus himself. Its concern for Jesus shows obvious Christian influence - at least in the presentation designed for Christian consumption, we must say, for we have no right to assume that Marcus addressed himself only to Christians: his personal starting-point is his own vision, real or pretended, of the Tetrad in female guise. It is tempting to suggest that the detailed exposition of Jesus' baptism argues a specifically Jewish-Christian influence, since "Ebionite" expositions of the baptism are well known⁽⁶⁾; but the exposition is more typical of the cults of Power. The use of ܝܠܝܫܐܘܢ is not conclusive, for not all Aramaic expressions are Jewish, let alone Jewish-Christian.

Valentinian influence is more easily assumed than proven. The Marcosian and Valentinian aeonologies are not exactly the same; and, if they were, they could come from a common source. The fall of Sophia is conspicuous by its absence, and the concept of a defect in the emanations is not a complete substitute. The essentially moral and devotional tone of the Valentinian scheme does not really harmonize with Marcus' ambition for power through knowledge. For Valentinus, ignorance is ~~isn~~^{Sin}; for Marcus, it is an ~~informal~~^{infernal} nuisance.

The numerology has many pagan parallels⁽⁷⁾, particularly in

(6) As in the Gospel of the Ebionites in Epiphanius, haer.30.137

(7) Dornseiff, Das Alphabet, 81-91, 118-141.

Pythagoreanism⁽⁸⁾ and in astrology⁽⁹⁾.

The discovery of the tractate Marsanes^(9a) among the Coptic Gnostic texts at Nag Hammadi (C.G.X/1) has proved enlightening for the study of Marcus, though it does not answer all questions. It does not contain all of his teachings as transmitted by Irenaeus. Nor does his teaching so transmitted contain all the matters expounded in Marsanes, although the force of this observation is limited both by the possibility that Irenaeus' account is selective, and by the fact that much of Marsanes is lost. More significantly, there are substantial differences between the tractate and Marcus' system.

A full discussion of these differences belongs to a specialist commentary on Marsanes, but two may be indicated briefly here, which indicate far-reaching discrepancy between the theologies and epistemologies of the author of the tractate and Marcus. Firstly: Silence is a regulative concept for both; but while Marcus personifies Silence as a divine or quasi-divine entity, in Marsanes Silence is an attribute of the Three-Powered One (C.G. X, 4:21, 7:3, 7:20-22; 13:17-18), and therefore in itself the way to the insight that transcends the active acquisition of knowledge: 'Be silent in order that you may [not] know'^(9b) (C.G. X, 8:21-25, cf. 9:21-28). Secondly: the mystical way, which for Marcus is centred in an epiphany of a descending Revealer, is for the author of Marsanes an inward way of understanding: 'I have deliberated (ΔΙΔΚΡΙΝΕΙΝ) and have attained

(8) Dornseiff, 11-14.

(9) Dornseiff, 81-91, 133.

(9a) edd. ~~Pearson~~ and Giversen.

(9b) 'not' is bracketed by the editor, but its retention is to be preferred as lectio difficilior.

to the boundary of the sense-perceptible world...have come to know the intelligible world...' (C.G. X, 5:17-19; 5:22-23).

It is necessary to note these and other features of Marsanes that are inconsistent with Marcus' book because the similarities between two passages of Marsanes and Marcus are so striking that ~~are inconsistent with Marcus' book because the similarities between two passages of Marsanes and Marcus are so striking that~~ dependence is virtually certain. The injunction to receive the imperishable seed (C.G. X, 26:11-17) must be considered in connection with Marcus' liturgical forms. The other passage is the alphabetology/numerology of C.G. X. 25:12 - 32:6. The progression of thought (alphabet-symbolism to number symbolism) is so closely parallel to the progression from AH I.viii.4-9 (alphabet-symbolism) to viii.10-16 (number-symbolism) that dependence is ~~virtually certain.~~ *hardly to be doubted.* A comparison of the two expositions suggests that Marcus is the debtor, for his version seems (in Irenaeus' report) to be a vulgarisation of Marsanes; more cogently, Marcus' passage is presented as virtually a system in itself, while the equivalent paragraphs in Marsanes are but parts of a longer meditation on the Many and the One (C.G. X, 25:1-34:5?), into which they fit better than into Marcus' eclectic farrago.

It is not easy to classify Marcus. As he appears in a Christian setting, as will be seen especially in his ritual action, he has a Christian colouring; but the underlying cast of his mind is hellenistic and pagan. There are Semitic elements, which may or may not be Jewish or Jewish-Christian. As to how (if at all) Marcus was related to the community that produced Marsanes, there is at

present no evidence.

B. The Ritual practices of Marcus Himself (AH I.vii.1-4 = I.114-122 Harvey;
AH I.xiii.1-5 = II.198-201 Rousseau-Doutreleau).

For Irenaeus, (and for us) Marcus is most clearly displayed in his ritual practice. Irenaeus begins his account of Marcus, integral to which is his series of charges against him - a claim to "improve" upon his master (Simon), magical trickery, seduction of women, the offering of himself as an object of devotion (ad se converti), pretended possession of Supreme Power from the unutterable Places - with a graphic scene in which Marcus begins a ritual with a cup.

Marcus is portrayed as 'pretentiously giving-thanks-over (*προσποιούμενος εὐχαριστεῖν*, Epiph.) cups of mixed wine, and, as he is dragging out the formula of invocation to a great length (*καὶ ἐπὶ πλέον ἐκτείνων τὸν λόγον τῆς ἐπικλήσεως*, Epiph.), he causes it to appear to become purple and red, so that it may be thought that Grace who comes from the Things *which* are over all is trickling her blood into that cup at ~~her~~ ^{his} invocation, (*ὡς δοκεῖν τὴν ἀπὸ τῶν ὑπὲρ τὰ ὅλα Χάριν τὸ αἷμα τὸ ἐαυτῆς* *στάζειν ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ ποτηρίῳ διὰ τῆς ἐπικλήσεως αὐτοῦ*, Epiph.); and insists (*ὑπερμείρεσθαι*) that those present shall taste of that drink, so that Grace, who has been summoned by this magus, may pour (*ἐπομβρήση*) into them also.

Then, giving the mixed drinks to some women,

he commands them to give-thanks there in his presence.

When this has been done, he holds out another cup,
much bigger than the one for which the misguided woman gave thanks,
and empties out the smaller one, which has been thanked-for
(*ἡὐχαριστημένον*) by the woman, into the one designated⁽¹⁰⁾ by him,
at the same time giving utterance thus:

"May she that is before All Things,
the inconceivable and inexpressible Grace
fill for you the inner man
and multiply in you the knowledge of herself,
sowing the grain of mustard seed in the good ground".

Saying several things of this sort, and maddening the miserable
woman, he poses as a wonder-worker, filling the big cup from the little
one till the latter makes the former over-flow.

This fellow also claims to have a familiar spirit, by means of
whom he is supposed to prophesy, and he makes to prophecy also such
women as he judges worthy to be partakers of his grace. For he busies
himself with women, especially those well-born and nobly clothed and
exceptionally rich, whom he often tries to seduce, flattering them
with these words:

"I wish to share my grace with you,
for the Father of All always beholds your angel before his
face.

The Place of the Greatness is within us,
It is right that we should become one.

(10) For this use of *κεκοσμημένον*, see Liddell and Scott⁸ 1901, 836

Receive, firstly, grace from me and through me.

Adorn yourself

like a bride receiving the bridegroom to herself⁽¹¹⁾,

so that you may be what I (am),

and I (may be) what you (are).

Enthroned⁽¹²⁾ in your bride-chamber the seed of light

Take from me the bride-groom.

Make room for him,

and let room be made for you in him.

Behold;

Grace has come down upon you.

Open your mouth -

and prophesy!"

Then, when the woman replies, "I have never prophesied and do not know how to prophesy", he performs certain invocations (*ἐπικλήσεις τινὰς ποιούμενος*) afresh, to amaze the woman he is deceiving⁽¹³⁾, and then says to her:

"Open your mouth;

Say anything at all -

and you will be prophesying!"

Then, flattered and swept off her feet by these things aforesaid⁽¹⁴⁾,

(11) Literally, 'her own bride-groom'; but the structure of the text calls for a clear parallelism between *σεαυτῆν* and *ἑαυτῆς*

(12) Or, 'implant'.

(13) *ἀπατωμένης* read as strictly passive, not as primarily indicating self-deception (as in Sophocles, *Oedipus Rex* 594, *Ajax* 807). Irenaeus seems concerned to lay the blame on Marcus rather than on his victims.

(14) Or perhaps, 'these utterances introducing something important': cf Isocrates 43 E, Plato, *Symposium* 198E.

her soul inflamed by the thought of being about to prophesy, and her heart racing, plucks up courage to speak whatever meaningless shameless balderdash occurs to her...'

Irenaeus continues (vii.2. II p.119 Harvey) with the statement that a woman so enabled to 'prophecy' is moved to such gratitude to Marcus (does *εὐχαριστεῖ Μάρκῳ* here have overtones of idolatrous adulation?) that she can withhold from him neither her wealth nor her body. It is all too likely that Marcus will succeed in enticing her into *τὴν τοῦ σώματος κοινωνίαν*, as well as a participation in his 'grace', and that his formula saying that Grace has come down (*κατηῆλθεν*) upon her so that she may be one with Marcus will be all too aptly reflected in a union that ~~drags~~^{drags} her down with him in abasement (*ἵνα σὺν αὐτῷ κατέλθῃ εἰς τὸ ἔν* - surely a deliberate pun⁽¹⁵⁾).

His account of the psychology of this procedure (inflammation of the soul) Irenaeus ascribes to his acknowledged master (*ὁ κρείστων ἡμῶν*); but the information as to the practices and some at least of the evidence about their emotional atmosphere clearly comes from women who have been involved with Marcus but have managed to escape his influence and come back to the Great Church. Their experience is quoted in vii.3. They have come to realise that the prophecy is inspired by God's command, not ~~but~~^{at} the behest of a magus such as Marcus. They have also learned that any technique of evoking 'prophecy' by mutual exhortation (as between equals, not

(15) And confirming Harvey's restoration of line 4, following the Latin, as *δεῖ ἡμᾶς ἐν καταστήσαι*.

necessarily with a dominant mystagogue) is equally mistaken. Clearly, we detect here the existence of a Marcisian group or groups, that subsisted after Marcus had moved on; without his personal magnetism, they tried to maintain the phenomena he had elicited by conjuring each other, the turns decided by drawing lots. The setting for these continued rituals was a cultic meal:

Εἰ οὖν Μάρκος μὲν κελεύει, ἢ ἄλλος τις, ὡς εἰώθασιν ἐπὶ τοῖς δείπνοις ἑτοῦ κλήρου οὗτοι πάντοτε παίζουσιν, καὶ ἀλλήλοις ἐγκελεύεσθαι τὸ προφητεύειν, καὶ πρὸς τὰς ἰδίας ἐπιθυμίας ἑαυτοῖς μαντεύεσθαι, ἔσται ὁ κελεύων μείζων τε καὶ κυριώτερος τοῦ προφητικοῦ πνεύματος, ἄνθρωπος ὢν, ὅπερ ἀδύνατον.

They have come to recognize vii.3 (I.120 Harvey) the nature of a Cult of Power: it is the ascription to a self-assertive, self-deifying, human being of the power that properly belongs to God, the sole true author of prophecy.

This information has become available (vii.4 I.121-2 Harvey) from detailed confessions recorded⁽¹⁶⁾ in the course of of the reconciliation with the Church of women in this position, especially the wife of a deacon in Asia, the common home-land of Irenaeus and of his intended reader,^(16a) τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ τῶν ἡμετέρων. The deacon himself had taken Marcus into his home: obviously, Marcus has been able to pose convincingly as a Christian, and as a wandering teacher with a claim on Christian hospitality - we are still, it seems, in the

- (16) Hence the mingling of eye-witness testimony and pastoral comment in Irenaeus' source.
- (16a) No suggestion here of Marcus himself visiting the Rhone Valley; cf Griffe, 'Le gnostique Marcus est-il venu en Gaule?', Bull. Litt.Eccl.LIV (1953) 243-5, and Salmon in DCB III (1882) 829. Discussion in H.Chadwick, Priscillian of Avila (Oxford 1976) 205 and n.2, where Marcus and his disciples are not distinguished (and there is further confusion in the index, 246).

climate of Didache xi-xiii. and III John.

(i) The quoted formulae.

It is necessary first to analyse Marcus' two distinctive formulae⁽¹⁷⁾, and then to interpret the liturgical sequence and context in which they are set.

We are told nothing about the content of Marcus' "Eucharistic Prayer" or "Epiclesis". What is reported is in each case Marcus' 'Words of Administration'. There are no 'words of administration' in Didache ix-x. In the Acts of John, (ch. cx), however, a formula in this position is assumed⁽¹⁸⁾: 'he brake the bread and gave unto all of us, praying over each of the brethren that he might be worthy of the grace of the Lord and of the holy Eucharist. And he partook also himself, likewise, and said: Unto me also be there a part with you...' (ET M.R. James, p.268). A similar prayer for worthiness may be assumed by the Vercelli Acts of Peter ch.ii, (p.304 James), where Paul rebukes Rufina as she approaches the table, and ch.v (pp.308-9 James) where Peter concludes his eucharistic prayer with these words over the newly baptized Theon: 'Therefore in thy name do I impart unto him thine eucharist, that he may be thy perfect servant without blame for ever'. In the Acts of Thomas also we find administration-formulae: 'This eucharist shall be unto you for compassion and mercy, and not unto judgement and retribution'

(17) Taking the second command to prophesy as a coda to the former, and integral to it.

(18) II/1,208-9 Bonnet: *Καὶ κλάσας τὸν ἄρτον ἐπέδωκεν πᾶσιν ἡμῖν, ἐκάστῳ τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἐπευχόμενος ἄξιον ἔσθθαι αὐτὸν τῆς τοῦ κυρίου χάριτος καὶ τῆς ἀγιωτάτης εὐχαριστίας. γευσάμενος δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς ὁμοίως καὶ εἰρηκῶς Κάμοι μέρος ἔστω μεθ' ὑμῶν, καὶ Εἰρήνη μεθ' ὑμῶν ἀγαπητοί,*

(18a) I,51 Bonnet: sic itaque in tuo nomine eucharistiam tuam communico ei, ut sit consummatus seruus tuus sine reprehensione in perpetuo.

(ch.29, p.377 James) and similarly 'This shall be unto thee for remission of sins and eternal transgressions' (ch.50, p.388 James). Apostolic Tradition (whatever its provenance and date) seems to be the earliest attestation of 'Words of Administration' in main-stream Christian use⁽¹⁹⁾. None of these developments is surprising in a tradition of usage that flows from a narrative (Mk. ¹⁴10:22 and parallel) in which the distinctive and determinative words are 'words of administration'. Whether any of these parallels are relevant to our reading of Marcus, and what inferences might be drawn from them can be discussed only after an examination of his formulae for their own sake, and of their significance in the context chosen for their use.

Both formulae are concerned with the power and workings of Grace; they agree also in using images of fecundity: fill, multiply, sowing, seed - but differ in that the second links images of fecundity more explicitly with that of union: conception, bride-groom, bride, implantation, seed, bride-chamber.

Both formulae echo New Testament phrases: the inner man (Eph.iii.16), the mustard-seed, (Mk. iv.31, Lk.xiii.19, Mt.xiii.31) the good ground (Mark iv.8, Lk.viii.15, Mt.xiii.8) the angels before the Father's face (Mt.xviii.10) - though all of these allusions misuse their originals almost perversely: the inner man is filled and not renewed, the mustard-seed has been entrusted to the sower who went forth to sow, it is the Father who sees the little one's angel

(19) 56-8 Botte: Panis caelestis in Christo Iesu. Amen.
....In deo patri omnipotenti.Amen. Et domino Iesu.
Et spiritu sancto et sancta ecclesia. Amen.

rather than the angel who gazes upon the Father (and 'your Father in heaven' is moved subtly away to being 'the Father of All').

(ii) The first 'words of administration'

Irenaeus (Latin)

- (1) Illa quae est ante omnia
- (2) inexcogitabilis et inerrabilis Gratia
- (3) adimpleat tuum intus hominem
- (4) et multiplicet in te agnitionem suam,
- (5) inseminans granum sinapis in bonam terram.

(Lat. Irenaeus, p.192 Rousseau-Doutreleau).

1.2: tuum CV Q; tum S; vac A (Suppl. s.l. A³)

1.3: et om. AQ S Erasmus.

Hippolytus (Greek)

- (1) ἡ πρὸ τῶν ὄλων
- (2) ἡ ἀνευνόητος καὶ ἄρητος χάρις
- (3) πληρῶσαι σου τὸν ἔσω ἄνθρωπον
- (4) καὶ πληθύναι ἐν σοὶ τὴν γνῶσιν αὐτῆς.
- (5) ἐγκατασπείρουσα τὸν κόκκον τοῦ σινάπεως εἰς τὴν ἀγαθὴν γῆν.

Hippolytus (p.171, 15-18 Wendland) cf. Epiphanius.

1.2 (ἡ) in VM (Epiph.), Rousseau-Doutreleau, trans.; om.

P (Hipp.), Miller, Wendland;

bracketed Duncker-Schneidewin.

- (1) "May she that is before all things,
- (2) the inconceivable and inexpressible Grace,
- (3) fill your inner man
- (4) and multiply in you the knowledge of herself,
- (5) sowing the grain of mustard-seed in the good ground".

(1) cf. Col,i.17: καὶ αὐτός ἐστιν πρὸ πάντων

(3) cf. Rom,xv.14: πεπληρωμένοι πάσης τῆς γνώσεως,

Col.i.9: ἵνα πληρωθῆτε τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ

Eph.v.18:... πληροῦσθε ἐν Πνεύματι,

Eph.iii.16: δυνάμει κραταιωθῆναι διὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος αὐτοῦ
εἰς τὸν ἔσω ἀνθρώπου

2 Cor.iv.16: εἰ καὶ ὁ ἔξω ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπος διαφθείρεται, ἀλλ' ὁ
ἔσω ἡμῶν ἀνακαυοῦται ἡμέρα καὶ ἡμέρα.

Rom.vii.22: συνήδομαι γὰρ τῷ νόμῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ κατὰ τὸν ἔσω ἄνθρωπον

(4) cf. 2 Pet.i.2: χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη πληθυνθείη ἐν
ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν.

I.Pet.i.2: χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη πληθυνθείη.

2 Cor.ix.10:... καὶ πληθυνεῖ τὸν σπόρον
ὑμῶν καὶ αὐξήσει τὰ γενήματα τῆς δικαιοσύνης ὑμῶν.

2 Pet.iii.18: αὐξάνετε δὲ ἐν χάριτι καὶ γνώσει τοῦ Κυρίου
ἡμῶν καὶ Σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

Col.i.10: αὐξανόμενοι τῇ ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ Θεοῦ
(and see Col.i.9, noted for 1.3)

2 Cor.viii.7: ὡς περ ἐν παντὶ περισσεύετε, πίστει καὶ λόγῳ καὶ
γνώσει καὶ πάσῃ σπουδῇ καὶ τῇ ἐξ ἡμῶν ἐν ὑμῖν
ἀγάπῃ, ἵνα καὶ ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ χάριτι περισσεύητε.

(and see Rom.xv.14, noted for 1.3)

(4)-(5) cf. 2 Pet.i.8: ... ταῦτα γὰρ ὑμῖν ὑπάρ-
χοντα καὶ πλεονάζοντα οὐκ ἀργούς οὐδὲ ἀκάρπους
καθίστησιν εἰς τὴν τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χρι-
στοῦ ἐπίγνωσιν.

(5) cf. Mk.iv.31: (the Kingdom is) ὡς κόκκῳ σινάπεως, (= Lk.xiii.19, Mt.xiii.31: 'Ὁμοία ...κόκκῳ σινάπεως,).

Lk.xvii.6 (= Mt.xvii.20): Εἰ ἔχετε (εἴην ἔχητε Mt.)

πίστιν ὡς κόκκον σινάπεως: ... (not in parallel Mk.xi.23).

cf. Lk.viii.8 (= Mk. iv.8, Mt. xiii. 8): εἰς τὴν γῆν τὴν ἀγαθὴν

(εἰς τὴν γῆν τὴν καλὴν , Mk; ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν τὴν καλὴν , Mt. The Mss.

of Luke which read either καλὴν, or ἀγαθὴν καὶ καλὴν or καλὴν

καὶ ἀγαθὴν all manifestly represent assimilations of Lk. to

the parallels).

The terminology of this 'formula of administration' is clearly reminiscent of the New Testament epistles, both of the Pauline corpus (particularly Colossians) and of the Petrine (particularly 2 Peter - though we must not ignore the possibility that 2 Peter, an emphatically 'anti-Gnostic' tractate⁽²⁰⁾, may even be late enough to include Marcus among its targets. There are also clear echoes of Luke (xiii or xviii or both, and certainly of viii.2).

Beneath the terminological similarity with the New Testament there are more significant differences of understanding (quite apart from the amusing confusion of two parables!): the language of grace is quite removed from the theological ideas of grace as mercy and forgiveness and as a motive for and aid to ethical living. Grace has become a principle of fecundity; and grace itself is here the invoked agent, not an attribute or act of the Supreme Being, but the Supreme Being itself. In the light of this shift of concept, it becomes advisable to retain ἡ^ν at the start of line 2: there is a

(20) Cf D.J.Rowston, 'The Most Neglected Book in the New Testament', NTS 21/4 (July 1975) 554-64; earlier view in J.B.Mayor, The Epistle of St Jude and the Second Epistle of St Peter (London 1907), clxxi-clxxx.

climax through the concept of the absolute, through that of transcendence to the reverent naming of Grace; she is the one who precedes all, the one beyond thought and expression. There is in the imagery of the blood of Grace an echo - no more - of the imagery of blood-drinking in love-magic⁽²¹⁾.

The prevalence of N.T. expressions suggests - though no more - that Marcus may have heard other celebrants at Christian eucharists employ comparable formulae at the distribution of the 'eucharistized' elements.

(iii) The Second 'Words of Administration'.

Irenaeus - Latin (Vol I p.118 Harvey = I.vii.2; Tom.I p.194 Rousseau-Doutreleau = I.13.39-47).

- (1) Participare te volo ex mea Gratia,
- (2) quoniam Pater omnium Angelum tuum semper videt ante faciem suam.
- (3) Locus autem (tuae) magnitudinis in nobis est:
- (4) oportet nos in unum convenire.
- (5) Sume primum a me et per me gratiam.
- (6) Adapta te ut sponsa sustinens sponsum suum,
- (7) ut sis quod ego et ego quod tu.
- (8) Constitue in thalamo tuo semen luminis.
- (9) Sume a me sponsum
et cape eum et capere in eo.
- (10) Ecce gratia descendit in te:
- (11) aperi os tuum
et propheta.

(21) Cf P.Wertmann, 'Das Blut des Seth (P.Colon.inv.3323)' ZPE 2 (1968) 227-301: ἐξορκίζω τὸ αἷμα, ὃ ἔλαβεν ὁ μέγας θεός 'Ιωθαθ.

And the subsequent exchange:

(12) Numquam prophetavi, et nescio prophetare.

(13) Aperi os tuum et loquere quodcumque, et prophetabis.

(1) te om. C (suppl. C²).

ex mea: extranea S.

(2) omnium: omnem AQ Er S (influence of Mt. xviii.10).

(3) (tuae) bracketed Tripp; or suae?

(6) adapta te: adaptare V Er

sponsa: S Er sponsam CVAQ.

(8) constitue: constituæ C.

(11) aperi: apperi V; aperui S (u expunct) os tuum: hostium V.

(13) os tuum: hostium V quodcumque: quoc - Q; quae - Er.

Epiphanius - Greek.

(haer.34,2,7-8 + II.7.6-16 Holl)

(1) μεταδοῦναί σοι θέλω τῆς ἐμῆς Χάριτος.

(2) ἐπειδὴ ὁ πατήρ τῶν ἔλων τὸν ἀγγελὸν σου διὰ παντὸς βλέπει πρὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ.

(3) ὁ δὲ τόπος τοῦ Μεγάλου ἐν ἡμῖν ἐστὶ·

(4) δεῖ ἡμᾶς εἰς τὸ ἐν καταστῆναι.

(5) λάμβανε πρῶτον ἀπ' ἐμοῦ καὶ δι' ἐμοῦ τὴν Χάριν.

(6) εὐτρέπισον σεαυτὴν ὡς νόμφη, ἐκδεχομένη, τὸν νομφίον ἑαυτῆς,

(7) ἵνα ἔσῃ ὡς ἐγὼ καὶ ἐγὼ ὡς σὺ.

(8) καθίδρυσον ἐν τῇ νομφῶνί σου τὸ σπέρμα τοῦ φωτός.

(9) λάβε παρ' ἐμοῦ τὸν νομφίον

καὶ χώρισον αὐτὸν καὶ χωρήθητι ἐν αὐτῷ.

(10) ἰδοῦ, ἡ Χάρις κατέλθεν ἐπὶ σέ·

(11) ἀνοιξὸν τὸ στόμα σου

(12) καὶ προφητεύσονε.

And the subsequent exchange:

(13) τοῦ προφητεύουσα πώποτε καὶ οὐκ οἶδα προφητεύεινε,

(14) (after 'epikleses') ἀνοιξὸν τὸ στόμα σου (καὶ) ἄλλῃσον ἕ τι δὴ ποτε
καὶ προφητεύσεις.

(4) δεῖ Holl: δι' V M

καταστῆναι (καταντῆσαι Harvey, Holl: εἰς τὸ ἐγκαταστῆσαι VM.

(7) ἔσθ V^{PC}M: om V^{ac}.

(13) προφητεύουσα, προσε sup. pas. V.

(14) (καὶ) Holl.

1. cf. Phil.i.7: (ἐν τε τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου ἔχειν με ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ὑμῶν, καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀπολογίᾳ καὶ βεβαίωσει τοῦ εὐαγγελίου) συνκοινωνούς μου τῆς χάριτος πάντας ὑμᾶς οἶτας.

For the mistaken reading of the unbracketed words as a unit, see

also Vulg. socios gaudii mei omnes vos esse - note the careful avoidance of an even more misleading gratiae meae - and KJB:

'ye all are partakers of my grace'.

2 Peter i.4: ἵνα διὰ τούτων γένησθε θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως

Heb.iii.14: μέτοχοι γὰρ τοῦ Χριστοῦ γεγονάμεν

vi.4: ... καὶ μετόχους γενηθέντας Πνεύματος Ἁγίου καὶ καλὸν γευσάμενους Θεοῦ ῥῆμα δυνάμεις τε μέλλοντος αἰῶνος

xii.10: εἰς τὸ μεταλαβεῖν τῆς ἀγιότητος αὐτοῦ.

1 Cor.ix.13: (?) ... τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ συνμερίζονται

x.17: οἱ γὰρ πάντες ἐκ τοῦ ἐνὸς ἄρτου μετέχομεν.

x.18: κοινωνοὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου.

2. cf. Matt. xviii.10: ... οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτῶν (SC. τῶν μικρῶν τούτων)

ἐν οὐρανοῖς διὰ παντός βλέπεται τὸ πρόσωπον τοῦ Πατρὸς μου τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς.

3: cf. PGM IV.26-29 (I.68 Preisendanz):

Τ]ελετή· προαγνεύσας Σ' ἡμέρας ἐλθὼν τῇ τρίτῃ [τ]ῆς ἐελήνης εἰς τόπον ἀπο-
γυμνωθέντ[α γε]ωστὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ Νείλου, πρὶν ἐπιβῆ τις αὐτοῦ τὸ περίρυτον (ἢ ἄλ-
λως· κατακλυθέντα ἀπὸ τοῦ Νείλου).

PGM III.36 (I.34 Preisendanz): ... ὅτι ὀρκίζω σε τὸν τὸ|προν [τ]οῦτον, τὴν ὥραν ||
ταύτην κατὰ τοῦ ἀπα[ρ]αιτήτου θεοῦ //

PGM III.616 (I. 58 Preisendanz): ἐν ἐρήμῳ τόπῳ

PGM III.699-700 (I.62 Preisendanz): κατ'ελθὼν ἐπὶ τόπον καθαρ[όν]

PGM IV.1927 (I. 130 Preisendanz): ταῦτα δὲ ἐν ἐπιπέδῳ ποιήσεις, καθαρῷ τόπῳ.

PGM IV.3090 (I.172 Preisendanz): πράσσε δὲ νυκτὸς ἐν τόπῳ, ὅπου χόρτος | φύει.

PGM XII.211 (II.72 Preisendanz): πρὶν ἰσθῆσαι ἐν ἡγνισμένῳ
τόπῳ ὑπαίθρῳ, εἰ [δὲ μή, ἐν] σήματι καθαρῷ ἡγνισμένῳ, || β]λέποντι πρὸς ἀνα-
τολήν,

cf. PGM III.599 (I.58 Preisendanz):

μ[ε]ν, ὅτι σεαυτὸν ἡμῖν ἐδείξας, χαιρομεν, ὅτι ἐν πλάσματιν ἡμᾶς ὄντας ἀπέθεω-
σας τῆ σεαυτοῦ γνώσει. χάρις ἀνθρώπου πρὸς σέ μία· τὸ μέγεθος | γνωρίσαι. ἐγνω-
ρίσαμεν, ὡ τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης ζωῆς (ζωῆ), | ἐγνωρίσαμεν, μήτρα πάσης γνώσεως.
ἐγνωρίσαμεν, ὡ μήτρα κυηφόρε ἐν πατρὸς φυτεία, ἐγνωρίσαμεν, ὡ πατρὸς κυη-
φοροῦντος αἰώνιος διαμονή·

Heb.i.3: ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τῆς Μεγαλωσύνης ἐν ὑψηλοῖς

(and c P viii.1).

4: cf. PGM XXXII a 14-18 (II.158 Preisendanz):

τῇ αὐτῇ ὥρᾳ καὶ τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ, ἔξ αὐτῆς συνκατάμειξον τὰς ψυ-
χὰς ἀνφωτέρων

6-7: cf. PGM VIII.49-50 (II.47 Preisendanz): οἶδά σε, Ἐρμῆ, καὶ σὺ ἐμέ. ||

ἐγὼ εἰ<μι> σὺ καὶ σὺ ἐγώ.

8-9: cf. PGM XXXVI.286-9 (II.172 Preisendanz):

σοὶ λέγω,

μήτρα τῆς δῖνα, χάνει καὶ δέξαι τὸ | σπέρμα τοῦ δῖνα καὶ σπ[έ]ρ[μ]α τὸ ἀκρα-
τὲς τοῦ ἱερῆ ἀφει

PGM IV 3147.8 (I.174 Preisendanz): {καὶ εἰς πιττάκιον ἱερατικὸν | γράφε τὰ ὀνόματα ταῦτα
καθιδρύσας αὐτό, εἰς ὃν προαιρῆ τόπον, | θύε αὐτῷ λευκομέτωπον <ὄν>άγριον καὶ
ὄλοκαυ'στοῦ.

PGM VII 2-4 (II 45 Preisendanz):

ἔλ[θ]έ μοι, κύριε Ἑρμῆ, ὡς
τὰ βρέφη εἰς τὰ<ς> κοιλίας τῶν γυναικ]ῶν. ἔλθέ μοι, κύριε Ἑρμῆ, συνάγων τὰς
τροφὰς τῶν θεῶν | καὶ ἀνθρώπων, <ἐλθ>έ μοι, τῷ δεῖνα, κύριε Ἑρμῆ, καὶ δός μοι
χάριν, τροφῆν, νίκην, εὐημερίαν, ἐπαφροδίσιαν, προσύ<π>ου εἶδος, | ἀλκὴν ἀπάν-
των καὶ πασιῶν.

Marsanes 26*. 12-17 (pp.294-5 Pearson and Giversen): ...ΜΠΟΥΔΕΙΝ
ΩΩ[Π ΔΡ]ΩΓῆ ἤΤΕΤῆ ΔΙ Μ[ΠΕΣ]ΠΕΡΜΑ ἤΑΤΤΕΚΟ ἸἸ[ΤΕΤῆ]

ΚΑΡΡΟΟ : '...light. (Control) yourselves, receive the imperishable
seed, bear fruit...'

The affinities of this formula differ markedly from those of the former. There is an unambiguous reference to the Gospels (line 2). There are echoes of New Testament language, though rather distant, in lines 1 and 3. By contrast, the use of terms and notions prominent in the Greek Magical Papyri are numerous and substantial. There is even a probable use of Marsanes in line 8. The dominant impression is of a magical milieu, particularly one heavily committed to revelation-magic and the magic of sexual conquest. Marcus starts with Christian language, and moves into that of the occult.

The relationship between mystagogue and adept is also entirely different. The first formula encourages the intended adept to hope for spiritual blessings, and the status of the mystagogue is hinted at only by the authoritative tone of benevolence. In this second formula, the adept is more emphatically a dependent - we note how

the dominant saying is so altered that the 'angel' is passive, it is God who sees the angel, not vice versa; and the very use of this allusion tells the woman that she is as an innocent child - while the mystagogue is at least the channel and perhaps even the source of grace (lines 1,5) and the adept's relationship to this sexually masterful man (lines 4,6,8,9, possibly⁽²²⁾ also 7). Line 3 has been read⁽²³⁾ as an example of the Jewish periphrasis "Place" for God. However, the use of "Greatness" - a pagan and Jewish-Christian periphrasis for God, suggests that 'place' is meant more literally. While in magic (as our numerous parallels show) is greatly concerned with the location of theurgic operations, with places that will entice or even compel the god invoked, ^{place}the ~~place~~ for contact with the divine, according to Marcus, is 'in us'. This could be taken as an allusion to the Kingdom in the soul discovered in one reading of Luke xvii.21; but the context suggests a more specific reading: the place for encounter with the Greatness is in both you and me together, in our relationship - that is why union of adept with mystagogue is imperative.

Even more interesting is the difference in construction. The first formula is fairly short, with limited use of Marcus' preferred images of fecundity, and a simple development, the second is marked by a firm and subtle progression, clearly designed to awaken interest and enthusiasm and even growing curiosity. A hint of shared privileges

(22) Dieterich, Mithrasliturgie (³1923, Darmstadt 1966) 122-34. Such an overtone is present, but the magical power of the fusion of the two personalities seems to be more important.

(23) J. Doresse, Secret Books, 33.

(line 5, echoing line 1), with a slightly enhanced hint of Marcus' mediatorial role. This stress on himself is matched by a sudden insistence on the adept taking a dependent and receptive role (line 6). This is only the beginning (cf line 5), but promises mystical identification (line 7). Having drawn back from coitive imagery (line 5, line 7), Marcus returns to it vigorously (8-9): the vigour of his demand is equalled by the insistence on the adept's active submission - her presentation of her needy soul is like the placing of a sacrifice. Then with a sudden pun (καταστῆσαι, line 4, κατῆλθεν, line 10), Marcus draws back from provocative imagery, and simply insists that the woman prophesy.

In the light of the imagery in the second formula, it is reasonable to see the concluding lines of the first as pointing forward to the developments planned in the second. There can be no doubt that the second 'words of administration', emotionally weighted and skilfully articulated as they are, are the personal creation of Marcus. We may conjecture that the first 'words of administration' owe something to him, especially after the opening two or three lines; but it then becomes reasonable to wonder whether in the first formula he was doing no more than expand on such forms of words as were customary in the Church of Asia Minor.

Elaine Pagels⁽²⁴⁾ has suggested that the brief interchange after the second 'words of administration' was a carefully orchestrated

(24) E. Pagels, ' "The Demiurge and his Archons" - a Gnostic view of the Bishop and his Presbyters ?' HThR 69/3-4 (July-Oct. 1976) 301-324, esp. 321-4.

Sagnard's remark (La gnose valentinienne et le témoignage de saint Irénée, Paris 1947, 416) that the formulae of Marcus and the Marcosians are 'de forme spontanée plutôt que fixe' is applicable only in the case of this exchange.

little piece of ritual, to emphasise the adept's unworthiness and the miraculous quality of Marcus' authority. That was, in all likelihood, his purpose; but so natural a disclaimer, followed by a swift and overwhelming ^{response} ~~reasonable~~, would be more effective if unscripted. It would not need to be orchestrated!

(iv) The Marcosian Eucharist: and its Affinities and Psycho-dynamics.

Assuming such a reading of the formulae, the liturgical practice which forms their context may be set out thus:

- (a) Marcus gives-thanks-over ($\epsilon\upsilon\chi\alpha\rho\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ + acc.) a cup of mixed wine, and
- (a') utters a lengthy $\epsilon\pi\iota\kappa\lambda\acute{\eta}\sigma\iota\varsigma$ over it, calling down Grace to pour her blood into it;
- (b) as he does so, the contents turn purple, then red (visibly - the cup must be of glass);
- (c) all present are instructed to drink from the cup to the end, probably expressed in an administration-formula similar to the one that follows as (f'), that Grace, whom he has invoked, may pour into them;
- (d) particularly (or, perhaps, going round again to selected persons after all have received once), he singles out women, to whom he gives mixed chalices,
- (d') and commands them to give-thanks-over them (again, $\epsilon\upsilon\chi\alpha\rho\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ + acc.) in his presence (is this showmanship - "Do this right now, in front of me, so that I, as well as everyone else, can see and be impressed"; or is it magic - "I'm here to help you; you can do this because I'm here to help you"?);
- (e) at his bidding, she empties the chalice into a larger one, and the larger overflows;

(f) as she receives from the cup (Irenæus does not mention her drinking, but the formula f' seems to require it, although he treats it as a versicle to accompany the pouring),

(f') Marcus says: 'May Grace, who is before all things...':
What follows could represent a different style of mystagogy on different sorts of occasion. Since, however, formula (g) assumes an act of reception as formula (f') does, it is more natural to read the next lines as representing an immediate development (perhaps on selected occasions) of what has just been described.

(g) to some of the already select women, just after they have received from the cup, Marcus says: "I wish to share my Grace with you...open your mouth, and prophesy";

(h) the woman replies; "I have never prophesied - and don't know how to prophesy".

(i) Marcus then utters further invocations, and repeats the command: "Open your mouth and say anything at all - and you will be prophesying!";

some sort of glossolalia is then expected;

(j) Other women may be similarly called upon to prophesy, but without any link with the cup, which is replaced by invocations over the women themselves, with exsufflations and imprecations.

This whole sequence, or just the incident with the coloured liquid, could be dismissed as a conjuring trick, as Ganschietz prefers to do, on the reasonable ground that the trick of changing water into apparent blood is a well attested piece of ancient stage magic at least as old as Moses (Exodus xxiv) and surviving into

eighteenth century occultism⁽²⁵⁾.

There is force in this argument, for Irenaeus himself equates Marcus with Anaxilaus, the philosopher-physician-showman⁽²⁶⁾, of whom Pliny the Elder tells us:

'lusit et Anxilaus ^a ^a ~~es~~ (sc. a form of fuller's earth) ,
addens in calicem vini prun^aque subdita
circumferens, exardescentes repercus^sum
pallorem dirum velut defunctorum effundente
in conviviis. Natura ei^us excalfecit, concoquit,
sed et discutit collectiones co^rporum, ob
hoc talibus emplastis malagmatisque miscetur'.

Hist. Nat. XV (50) 174-5 (V. 259-6 Ian-Mayhoff).

Nor are modern equivalents missing: "Dissolve a little

(25) R.Ganschietz, 'Zur Eucharistie der Marcosianer',
ZwTh 35 (1914) 45-7.

(26) M.Wellmann, 'Anaxilaus (5)' in RE 1894.

phenolphthalein in spirit and stir it into a large amount of water. If you do not use too much phenolphthalein you will get a perfectly clear water-like solution. You can show this to your audience, for smell etc, will show no difference from ordinary water. Have by you a glass rod dipped beforehand in strong caustic-soda solution (washing-soda will do if this is not allowed to dry). At a reasonable distance this will look like an ordinary glass rod. Stir the solution, with appropriate magical incantations, and it will become crimson⁽²⁷⁾.

Precedents in Hellenistic Magic were ready to hand. The third century (A.D.) papyrus P. gr. CXXI of the British Library (P.G.M. VII) offers this invocation over a cup - we may assume that the text is a piece of established magical stock-in-trade generations older than the manuscript:⁽²⁸⁾

Ποτήριον καλόν. ἐ[π]ὶ ποτηρίου λέγε Ζ'· 'Κανωπι[τι] προη|ρωδοχ[.]φ̄ καλυ- 385
ψας ερεκιν ποθηεας ερατευν | μορφος Χάρις Φαφιετι Εἰαι ω Βούβασι Ποθηπι, | ἔΞορκίζω
ὕμας, ἄγια ὀνόματα τῆς Κύπριδος, ὅπως, | ἐὰν καταβᾶτε εἰς τὰ σπλάγγ<ν>α τῆς
δεΐνα, <ῆν> ἢ δεΐνα, ποιῆσαι φιλεῖν.' κοινά. ||

"An Excellent Cup.

Say over the cup seven times:

(27) F.Sherwood Taylor, The Young Chemist (Edinburgh ²1961) 126.

(28) Preisendanz, Papyri Graecae Magicae II.17: text and commentary.

'Canopic Dawn Rudoch-ph (?)

veiled, longed-for, much desired, lovely-formed Grace,

dedicated to Ophok, Isis,

O Boubastis Pothopi (=?):

I adjure you (pl.), holy names of Kypris,

that, when you descend into the inner parts of N, daughter of N,

make her to love (sc. me).'

(For general use)."

Of this rendering, the attempt to translate the title of the goddess of love must remain conjectural - even Preisendanz cautiously says 'Z.W., darunter "Isis aus Kanopos", "Charis", "Bubastis", "den Opet gegeben"' - but the name "Charis" is indisputably recognizable, and the purpose of this spell is unmistakable: the powers of the goddess of love are commanded, by the invocation of her names - ^{one} ~~out~~ of which is "Grace" - to descend into the person of the desired girl and make her love the magus. The immediate context does not say whether the cup is then drunk by the magus or poured out as a libation. Unless we are to suppose that N daughter of N is at hand and prepared to drink from the cup herself, which is unlikely, then it must be inferred that drinking by her would-be lover or a libation are intended as a vicarious drinking on her behalf, as is not uncommon in sympathetic magic.

Marcus stands in this traditon. His obvious interest in women, and the fascination he exerts on them illuminate, and are themselves illuminated by, his selection of Charis, Grace, for the object of his invocations and 'words of administration.'

The formal cult of the Charites, Graces, with its own shrines and even mysteries^(28a), was by this time largely of local or antiquarian ^{interest} ~~interests~~ (cf. Pausanias, IX.35). In popular speech and piety, however, they were still very much present. Some lines of Panyasis (fr.13), listing the Graces among those to be invoked in the libations at the outset of a feast, were still extant when Athenaeus⁽²⁹⁾ wrote his Deipnosophistae about 200 A.D.:

Πρῶται μὲν Χάριτες τ' ἔλαχον καὶ εὐφρονες ἄραι
μοῖραν καὶ Διόνυσος ἐρίβρομος, οἵπερ ἔτευξαν.
τοῖς δ' ἔπι Κυπρογένεια θεὰ λάχε καὶ Διόνυσος.
ἔνθα τε κάλλιστος πότος ἀνδράσι γίνεται οἴνου:
εἴ τις (τόν) γε πίοι καὶ ἀπότροπος οἴκαδ' ἀπελθοῖ
δαιτὸς ἀπὸ γλυκερῆς, οὐκ ἂν ποτε πῆματι κύρσαι:
ἀλλ' ὅτε τις μοίρης τριτάτης πρὸς μέτρον ἐλαύνοι
πίνων ἀβλεμέως, τότε δ' ἵβριος αἴσα καὶ Ἄτης
γίνεται ἀργαλέα, κακὰ δ' ἀνθρώποισιν ὀπάζει.
ἀλλὰ πέπον, μέτρον γὰρ ἔχεις γλυκεροῖο ποτοῖο,
στεῖχε παρὰ μνηστήν ἄλοχον, κοινίζε δ' ἐταίρους:
δεΐδια γὰρ τριτάτας μοίρης μελιηδέος οἴνου
πινομένης, μή σ' ἵβρις ἐνὶ φρεσὶ θυμὸν ἀέρση,
ἔσθλοῖς δὲ ξενίοισι κακὴν ἐπιθήσει τελευτήν.
ἀλλὰ πιθοῦ καὶ παῦε πόλυν πότον.

(28a) Cf Escher, art., 'Charites', RE VI Halbb. (1899) 2150-2167, and L.R.Farnell, Cults of the Greek States Vol.V (New York 1977), 426-31, 462-4.

(29) I.184 Kaibel.

For Horace, in whose writings Roman and Hellenistic manners flow together, a Grace (in the singular) was a significant figure, with powerful erotic associations and also linked with divinatory libation:

da lunerae properae novae

da noctis mediae, da, puer, auguris

Murenae: tribus aut novem

miscentes cyathis pocula commodis.

qui Musas amat imparis,

ternos ter cyathos attonitus petit

vates, tris prohibet supra

nixarum metuens tagere Gratia

nudis iuncta sororibus:

insanire iuvat: cur Berecythiae

cessant flamina tibiae?

cur pendet tacita fistula cum lyra?

parentis ego dexteris

odi: sparge rosas. andiat invidus

dementem strepitum Lycus

et vicina seni non habilis Lyco.

spissa te astitit coma,

puro te similem, Telapho, Vespero

tempesta petit Rhode:

me lentus Glyceræ torret amor meae.

(Carmina III xix. 9-28; p.92 Klingner).

Erotic associations of Gratia recur frequently:
iam Cytharea choros ducit Venus imminente luna,
iunctaeque Nymphis Gratiae decentes
alterno terram quatiunt pede...

(Carmina I. iv. 5-7, p.6 Klingner).

Gratia cum Nymphis geminisque sororibus audet
ducere nuda choros.
Immortalia ne speres, monet annus et alnum
quae rapit hora diem.

(Carmina IV. vii. 5-8, p.119 Klingner).

Comparisons have understandably been made⁽³⁰⁾ between Marcus and the false prophet Alexander of Abonoteichos described by the merciless pen of Lucian. Although we prefer to read Lucian's Alexander as a caricature of a type, rather than an account of a historical individual (the obvious real target is Julian and his fellow Theurgists, whom it might not have been politically discreet to attack by name), it is certainly a type to which Marcus does in several respects conform. 'Alexander' offers the prospect of becoming a heavenly body by union with a child of the moon (Alexander, p.237 Turner) ; he includes a hieros gamos in his 'mystery play' (p.238); and he presents himself as conferring a great favour on women by seducing them (p.239 Turner). Inspiration sought by invocation in terms of sexual union is also found in the magical papyri: e.g.,

(30) By Dornseiff, Das Alphabet 126.

'Come to me, Lord Hermes, as foetuses do to the wombs of women'
(PGM, VIII, 2-3; Vol. II, p.45 Preisendanz). Similar overtones may
be detected, as has been observed above, in the formula of identity
'I am you and you are I' (PGM VII, 36 and 50; PGM XIII. 795).

Seen in his context, however, Marcus adds another dimension to
the practice typical of 'Alexander' and the authors of the magical
papyri. His concentration on Grace is clearly directed at a Christian
clientele, for whom *Χάρις* is a central term of their sacred literature⁽³¹⁾
and also of at least one tradition in contemporary Christian liturgy⁽³²⁾:
'Let grace (Grace!) come, and let this world pass away!' (Didache x.
6). Marcus both picks up this phraseology to serve as a bridge
between his Christian disciples and the magical-erotic atmosphere
of Romano-Hellenistic occultism, and in so doing also joins in the
tendency among Christians to transform eschatological expectation
into the expectation of an immediate illapse of the divine into
present experience. It is true that, as Wetter suggested⁽³³⁾, Marcus
also typifies the move to turn Grace from a divine act into a
communicable substance, the move that made necessary⁽³⁴⁾ the later

(31) On the frequency of the term and its centrality, see
Zimmerli and Conzelmann, art. 'ΧΑΡΙΣ' in TDNT, IX
(ET, Grand Rapids, 1974) 372-402, esp. 391-401; on
'Gnosticism', 401-2; on cognates (equally significant),
402-15.

(32) Leaving open the question of the status and typicality
of the Didache: Lietzmann, Messe und Herrenmahl,
(Berlin, de Gruyter, 1955), esp. Kap. XIV (230-8): pre-Pauline;
Vokes, The Riddle of the Didache (London 1938: Montanist,
archaeologising); J. Magne, Origines chrétiennes, II:
sacrifice et sacerdoce (Paris 1975, esp. ch. v: preserves
original character of Eucharist as charity-meal).

(33) G.P:sson Wetter, Charis. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte
des Ältesten Christentums (Leipzig 1913), esp. Kap. 3. T.F.
Torrance, Doctrine of the Grace in the Apostolic Fathers
(Edinburgh 1948) (concentrates on orthodoxy and legalism).

(34) cf. A.L. Lilly, Sacraments (London 1938), ch. vii.

introduction of the concept of transsubstantiation; but this aspect of his significance is secondary to his role in the adaptation of Christian eschatology.

In Irenaeus' account, we note that thanksgiving (a) (already in itself a consecratory procedure, so that εὐχαριστῶ can take a direct object, as in Justin, I Apology lxv,5) leads into an epiklesis (a'). Reiling⁽³⁵⁾ has rightly pointed out that this prefigures the sequence found in later Christian anaphoræ; but a more impressive comparable sequence is found in the prayer of Polycarp⁽³⁶⁾ - from the same general period and from the same area of Asia - which exhibits the same pattern in a less developed form:

(a) Thanksgiving - for the divine being and for revelation through Christ.

"O Lord God Almighty,
Father of thy beloved and blessed Child, Jesus Christ,
through whom we have received full knowledge of thee,
the God of angels and powers, and of all creation,
and of the whole family of the righteous who live before thee?

(a') Thanksgiving for a share in Christ.

I bless thee, that thou hast granted me this day and this hour,
that I may share, among the number of the martyrs,

- (35) 'Marcus Gnosticus and the New Testament: Eucharist and Prophecy' in T.Baarden, A.F.J.Klijn and W.C.van Unnik, edd., Miscellanea Neotestamentica (= Supplements to Novum Testamentum XLVII), Leiden 1978, 161-79.
- (36) H.Lietzmann, 'Ein liturgischer Bruchstück des zweiten Jahrhunderts', ZwTh 54 (1912) 56-61, leans heavily on parallels in rites of the fourth century and later; although this proves directly only that the prayer must have served as a model to later liturgiographers, it establishes indirectly that its liturgical language is native to the Great Church of earlier periods.

in the cup of thy Christ,

for the resurrection to everlasting life, both of soul and
body,

in the incorruptibility of the Holy Spirit.

(b) Prayer for acceptance of the oblation.

May I be received among them before thee, this day,
as a rich and acceptable sacrifice,
as thou hast prepared beforehand and revealed beforehand and
hast fulfilled,

O God never lying but true.

(c) Concluding doxology.

For this and for all things I praise thee,

I bless thee,

I glorify thee,

through the eternal and heavenly High Priest Jesus Christ,
thy beloved Child,

through whom to you, with him and the Holy Spirit,
belongs glory both now and into the ages to come.

Amen.

(Martyrdom of Polycarp xiv. 1^b-3; PP.330-3 Lake,
ET adapted).

The section (a'), though clearly adapted to the situation of martyrdom, is no less clearly based on the equivalent section in the eucharistic prayer such as Polycarp's church heard it regularly uttered by their bishop. In this text it is closely linked, as part of the thanksgiving, with praise for God's being and for his self-

revelation through Christ; but its description of the cup (metonymously, of both species) as being instrumentally effective for the gift of the Spirit and so for resurrection, ⁿeternal life of body and soul and incorruptibility, and its place as an introduction to the petition for the acceptance of oblation, are both indicators that this is where an epiklesis is about to develop. The account of Marcus shows no sign of his including prayer for the acceptance of an oblation or subsequent doxology; but he appears to have elaborated the sequence thanksgiving-epiklesis already seen in development in the usage of Polycarp. In this process of elaboration, the epiklesis has become a distinct feature rather than an extension of the thanksgiving. It is interesting to contrast this pattern of development with the extant text of the Anaphora of Addai and Mari: even if this is an interpolated text⁽³⁷⁾, it ~~still~~ represents a stage at which the epiklesis is still hardly distinguishable from the flow of thanksgiving:

And we also, O Lord,—3 Times—your lowly, weak and miserable servants who are gathered together and stand before you at this time have received by tradition of the example which is from you rejoicing, and glorifying, and magnifying, and commemorating and praising, and performing this great and dread mystery of the passion and death and resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ.

May he come, O Lord, your Holy Spirit and rest upon this oblation (of)

And the deacon says: Be in silence:

of your servants, and bless and hallow it, that it may be to us, O Lord, for the pardon of debts and the forgiveness of sins, and a great hope of resurrection from the dead and a new life in the kingdom of heaven with all who have been pleasing before you.

And for all your marvellous economy towards us we give you thanks and praise you without ceasing in your Church redeemed by the precious blood of your Christ, with open mouths and with uncovered faces.

Qanona. As we offer up

And they reply: Amen.

(37) On Addai and Mari: E.C.Ratcliff, 'The Original Form of the Anaphora of Addai and Mari: a suggestion', JTS XXX/1 (Oct.1928) 23-32; B.Botte, 'L'Anaphore Chaldéenne des Apôtres', OrChr.Per. XV/3-4 (1949) 259-76; W.F. Macomber, 'The Oldest Known Text of the Anaphora of the Apostles Addai and Mari', OrChrPer XXXII/2 (1966) 335-371; E.J.Cutrone, 'The Anaphora of the Apostles: implications of the Mar Eša-'Ya Text', Theological

This consideration of Marcus' 'consecratory' method⁽³⁸⁾ ~~method~~ points to the conclusion that here at least his usage was deliberately designed to resemble and to fit into the eucharistic practice of the Great Church. But can the same be said of his ritual schema as a whole?

It may be argued⁽³⁹⁾ that, since Marcus concentrates on a cup, and seems to show no interest in the liturgical use of bread, he is not concerned with the Christian eucharist, of which bread was an essential element. On the other hand, Polycarp's prayer, certainly based on eucharistic phraseology, singles out the imagery of the cup, although admittedly for the special circumstances of martyrdom, and makes no use of the imagery of bread, Polycarp's example, ^{therefore,} argues that the omission of any specific feature is not conclusive evidence.

A more conclusive method than appeal to individual features is the comparison of liturgical sequences. A comparable sequence is not hard to find. The eucharistic order in the Didache (ix.x) exhibits this sequence:

(a) Thanksgiving over the First Cup.

"We give thanks to thee, Our Father,
for the Holy Vine of David thy child,
which thou madest known to us through Jesus thy Child
To thee belongs the glory into the ages.

Studies 43 (1973) 624-42; B.D.Spinks, 'The Original Form of the Anaphora of the Apostles: a suggestion in the light of Maronite Sharar', EphLit 91 (1977) 146-61; id., Addai and Mari - the Anaphora of the Apostles: a Text for Students (Bramcote 1980 = Grove Liturgical Study No 24).

- (38) 'Whatever form it took, Marcus' ἐπίκλησις was clearly believed to be the means of effecting a "consecration": E.C.Ratcliff, 'The Eucharistic Institution Narrative of Justin Martyr's First Apology', JEH XXII/2 (April 1971), p.100, n.2.
- (39) As by Ganschietz (1914). Wetter (Charis 191, Anm.4) sympathises with this view, but insists that the cup

(b) Thanksgiving over the Broken Bread + Prayer for the Church.

"We give thanks to thee, our Father,
for the life and knowledge
which thou madest known to us through Jesus thy Child.
To thee belongs the glory into the ages.

Just as this broken-bread was scattered upon the mountains,
and was brought together and made one,
so let thy Church be brought together from the bounds
of the earth into thy Kingdom;
for thine is the glory and the power through Jesus
Christ into the ages."

(c) Thanksgiving after the Meal + Prayer for the Church.

"We give thanks to thee, Holy Father, for thy holy name which
thou didst make to tabernacle in our hearts, and for the
knowledge and faith and immortality which thou madest known
to us through Jesus thy Child."

To thee belongs the glory into the ages.

Thou, all-ruling Master, establishedst the universe for thy
name's sake; thou gavest food and drink to humankind for their
enjoyment; but us hast thou favoured with spiritual food
and drink and life eternal through thy Child.

Above all we give thanks to thee for that thou art powerful.
To thee belongs the glory into the ages.

Be mindful, Lord, of thy Church, to cleanse it from
all evil, and to perfect it in thy love;

is nonetheless presented as a „Gnadenmittel“, and also
that the setting is eucharistic (Altchristliche Liturgien,
Göttingen 1921, 76-7). Peterson (art. 'Marco, gnostico',
Enc.Catt.VIII, Vatican City 1952) 49-50) sees evidence of
an existing Catholic belief in 'transmutazione eucaristica'.
Wetter also (Der Sohn Gottes', Göttingen 1916, 41-2), sees
'das Kultwort, die heilige Formel, die mysteriöse geheime
Weisheit in den Weihen mitgeteilt' as the actual regenerative
instrument in Marcus' rite.

and gather it from the four winds, sanctified, into

thy kingdom which thou has prepared for it:

because thine is the power and the glory into the ages.

Let grace come, and let this world pass away!

Hosanna to the God of David".

(d) Invitation.

"If any one be holy, let him come;

(39a)

if any one be not, let him repent. Maranatha. Amen".

The composition of this text was discussed in the review of the origins of Christian worship; we assume here our conclusion that its extant form was available before the time of Marcus. (b) and (c) are clearly separated by a meal. (a), said over the first cup according to the Lucan order, preserved here perhaps especially for the initiatory setting, is oddly similar to the first part of (b), and a swift repetition of such phrases is peculiar unless something substantial occurs between. We have argued above that something substantial is the ~~free~~ and spontaneous exercise of prayer, singing and prophecy mentioned obiter in I Corinthians xiv. (For another case of prayer before prophecy at the start of a liturgical, but not certainly eucharistic, gathering, we ~~shall have occasion to refer~~ ^{may refer to} ~~refer~~ Hermas, The Shepherd, Mandates xi. 8-9, in our review of the development of Christian worship). Reitzenstein⁽⁴⁰⁾ is justified in calling Marcus' ritual a Prophetenweihe; but it belongs in a eucharistic setting.

We need not go so far as the excessively charitable Mosheim⁽⁴¹⁾,

(39a) Author's ET from Funk-Bihlmeyer-Schneemelcher, edd., Die Apostolischen Väter (Tubingen 1956), 5:29-6:26.

(40) Reitzenstein, Hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen, 251.

(41) I.L. Mosheimii De rebus christianorum ante Constantinum magnum commentarii (Helmstadii MDCCLIII) 390-4.

who suggested that Marcus presided at a perfectly respectable if somewhat decorated eucharist - pouring red wine symbolic of the Passion into white wine symbolic of Christ's purity - and that individual communion cups, when nearly drained, were then emptied into a large principal chalice which was not always big enough to hold the remains (this tells us more of Lutheran liturgy in the Enlightenment than of ante-Nicene usages); but a deliberate imitation of the Eucharist cannot cogently be denied.

Our conclusion is that Marcus presented himself, probably as a wandering prophet (^{whose} ~~when~~ especial liturgical liberty at the Eucharist was recognized in the Didache, x.7 albeit with a note of reserve dictated by experience, xi. 7-12), at Christian eucharists, and, after the opening cup-thanksgiving for knowledge - which he made more impressive by his conjuring - he picked out women to prophesy, and among them made a further selection of women to whom he promised an even more intimate religious union with the agent of inspiration - himself. At some stage in this process, perhaps not at the first such occasion, he used his book beginning with his self-declamation: "I am...".

On the other hand, it is not safe to assume (despite the coincidence of the common use of $\nu\upsilon\mu\phi\acute{\omega}\nu$, 'bride-chamber') that Marcus is adapting the Valentinian "sacrament of the bride-chamber" which some have postulated. (Quite simply: while the Valentinian $\nu\upsilon\mu\phi\acute{\omega}\nu$ is the scene of the eucharistic action and also of the eschatological fulfilment to which it $\overset{\circ}{p}$ oints, Marcus's $\nu\upsilon\mu\phi\acute{\omega}\nu$ is the receptive soul of his disciple). It may be that Marcus encouraged

such developments elsewhere; but is more reasonable to see Marcus' liturgical adaptation as an example of the ways in which the Synoptic imagery of the eucharist as a wedding feast could provoke speculation and ritual creativeness.^(41a)

However tentatively, the question of Marcus' personal motivation must be raised. The hankering for power which is typical of those who practice³ the magical quest for power which Irenaeus' anonymous source more than hints at, was no doubt one element in his emotional make-up. So too, quite possibly, was the need for sexual manipulation of a variety of women, which Irenaeus' report clearly suggests - however much we allow for Irenaeus' own hostility. His alleged preference for upper class women as the targets of his manipulation may have been due to simple greed, as Irenaeus says; but a strain of social resentment surviving from a deprived or humiliating youth is at least as probable.⁽⁴²⁾ His choice of female imagery ('the womb and receptacle') is a strong suggestion of a profound sexual ambivalence and inadequacy. Is it possible to detect here, at some deeper level, any more truly religious imperative?

The suggestion that Marcus saw himself, and was seen by others, as a 'Gottessohn' made by Wetter⁽⁴³⁾, is not very helpful here. Nor is the classification of Marcus as a 'prophet'⁽⁴⁴⁾; there is

(41a) It may be added that this term for 'bride-chamber' would have cultic associations for some reared in a Greek religious atmosphere: see Pausanias 2.11.3, on a shrine to Dionysos, Demeter and Korē (1,156 ET Levi).

(42) cf the case of Bonsels, infra (n.45).

(43) G.P:son Wetter, „Der Sohn Gottes". Eine Untersuchung Über den Charakter und die Tendenz des Johannes-Evangeliums (Göttingen 1916) 8,41-7, 70 Anm.1, 74 Anm.1, and Kap.7.

(44) As by Schmithals, Office of an Apostle 171,

remarkably, no quotation that makes him call himself merely a prophet - though no doubt prophesying was incidental to his higher status and functions.

An interesting and potentially enlightening parallel came by chance to light in the short story, "Das erste Abendmahl" ("The First Communion") chapter 4 in the novella Menschenwege, the first part of Waldemar Bonsels' series Notizen eines Vagabunden.⁽⁴⁵⁾ For the atmosphere of Hellenistic occultism we must substitute the pantheistic native-mysticism and intense introspection of German Romanticism; instead of a vision we have an inner voice; instead of Charis we have a hungry and compelling love: but the psychodynamic patterns that made it natural for Marcus to run mysticism, sexual imagery and eucharistic symbolism together appear again unmistakably in the young wanderer. Albeit in a fictional setting Bonsels gives first-hand evidence of a state of mind in which a man can, in his fantasy, be a god who confers his very life-blood upon a female worshipper by means of ritual copulation.

C. The Ritual Practices of Marcus' Disciples.^(45a)

'There are also various disciples of his', (continues Irenaeus, after his summary of Marcus' rites and before his exposition of Marcus' theology, AH I. vii.5 = I. 123-7 Harvey; I. 13.6 - I. 200-205 Rousseau-Doutreleau) 'who drift about on the same sort of business,

(45) Berlin 1930; see pp.90-9.

(45a) Limited discussion in Bousset, Hauptprobleme der Gnosis (Gottingen 1907) 64; Wetter, Phos...Eine Untersuchung über hellenistische Frömmigkeit... (Uppsala, Leipzig, 1915) 8-10; Sagnard, La gnose valentinienne..., 418-9.

PAGE

NUMBERING

AS ORIGINAL

made open admission, others have kept it secret, silently despairing of the life of God; some go in for it entirely, others waver and suffer the proverbial fate of being neither in nor out - the only fruit they get from the seed of the Children of Knowledge!'

Irenaeus has clearly been less successful in winning back the women seduced by Marcosians than his Asian colleagues had been with the deacon's wife. His personal observation of the psychological effects on women in his own flock suggests that the disciples of Marcus who moved in his own area used the same rites as Marcus (though this point is never explicitly made), but had added this new formula, a 'liturgy' for use after death but probably taught by recitation in a ritual setting on earth.

If a link between this section and I.xiv be insisted on, then "redemptions" there are liturgical events and processes. When, however, this passage is allowed to speak for itself, "redemption", read naturally, has the wider sense of 'the new status of the believer', considered generally. Being redeemed is an entire new state of existence, beyond the power of the angelic judge. The enlightened can confront him with the fact of their belonging to the company of the redeemed. Entry into redemption is, of course, inseparable from ritual initiation; but there is no suggestion here, as there is in I.xiv, of an additional rite or rites peculiar to Marcosians and singled out as "Thy Redemption" or "Redemptions".

There is no indication of the identity of those disciples of Marcus, nor any hint that they have any organisation. Indeed, Irenaeus' description of their adepts strongly suggests that ~~the~~

the 'Marcosians' were wandering mystagogues, and that those whom they ~~initiated~~ ^{initiated} were left to their own devices when their teachers moved on. Discussion of the relationship between I.vii.5 and I.xiv has been hampered by assuming too readily that both passages must refer to the life of an organised community with a developed liturgy. Observers of occultism are familiar with the genre of the 'hit-and-run' mystagogue, who specialises in one particular piece of secret lore and is happy to leave behind whatever emotional confusions his encounters have caused. Marcus is clearly one such - as perhaps Simon also was - and his 'disciples' are no different.

The claim to be perfect, to have privileged access to total knowledge of the Unutterable Power, to be superior to the Apostles, even to exist in superiority over all Power, and to be free from any inner or outer restraint, is compatible with the claims made by Marcus; but there seems to be no claim like his to be recipients of a revelation - the revelation they enjoy is apparently a personal achievement - and the general tone of these claims is more like that ascribed to the Carpocratians (AH I.xx), though there is no echo here of the distinctive theories of the Carpocratians (the omission of any claim to resemble or outclass Jesus is notable).

The solid information available to Irenaeus is confined to the formula taught by these mystagogues for use by the departed soul as a means of evading the Judge of the dead.

The invocation reads:

(Latin)

(1) O assessor Dei et mysticae illius pro Aeonon Siges,

- (2) quam Magnitudines semper videntes faciem Patris
(3) te viae duce et adductore utentes,
(4) abstrahunt sursum suas formas,
(5) quas valde audax illa ducta phantasmate
(6) propter bonum Propatorem emisit nos imagines illorum,
(7) tunc intentionem illorum quae sunt sursum quasi somnium
habens:

- (8) ecce iudex in proximo
(9) et praeco me iubet meae defensionem adesse;
(10) tu autem,
(11-12) quasi quae scias ^{utrorumque} ~~utrorumque~~ nostrorum rationem tamquam
unum (te) existentem,
(13) iudice adsiste

(1) et om AQS Erasmus.

aeonon: eo non AQ enon S.

Siges: syges AQ sygos S.

- (2) magnitudines: magnitudine A magnitudinem A.
(3) te viae duce: via te CY sui a te AQS Erasmus.
(4) abstrahunt: abstruunt Q; ? astruunt S.
suas formas: suam formam S.
(7) tunc intentionem illorum om Q.
somnia: omnium V^{ac}.
(8) iudex: inde S.
(11-12) te: mss. te ex te Erasmus.

(Vol.I, p.202: 114-204:123, Rousseau-Doutreleau).

(Greek: Eriphanus, Panarion 34,3,7-8; II.9.13-20 Holl)

- (1) ὃ παρέδρε θεοῦ καὶ μουσικῆς πρὸ αἰῶνων Σγξ;
- (2) ἦν τὰ Μεγέθη διὰ παντὸς βλέποντα τὸ πρόσωπον τοῦ Πατρὸς,
- (3) ἐδηγῶ σοι καὶ προσαγωγῆι χρώμενα,
- (4) ἀνασπῶσιν ἄνω τὰς αὐτῶν μορφάς,
- (5) ἅς ἡ μεγαλότολμος ἐκείνη φαντασιασθείσα
- (6) διὰ τὸ ἀγαθὸν τοῦ Προπάτορος προεβλάτεο ἡμᾶς ἴστας εἰκόνας < αὐτῶν >

(7) τότε ἐνθύμιον τῶν ἄνω ὡς ἐνόηκον ἔχουσα —

(8) ἰδοὺ ὁ κριτῆς ἐγγύς

(9) καὶ ὁ κήρυξ με κελεύει ἀπολογεῖσθαι·

(10) σὺ δέ.

(11) ὡς ἐπισταμένη, τὰ ἀμφοτέρων,

(12) τὸν ὑπὲρ ἀμφοτέρων ἡμῶν λόγον ὡς ἓνα ὄντα ,

(13) τῷ κριτῇ παράστησονε.

(cf I.203-5 Rousseau-Doutreleau)

(1) αἰῶνων edd.; αἰῶνος VM

(2) ἦν : <Δ> ἦ; Rousseau-Doutreleau. (Holl ἦν, but as „alter Fehler“)

(3) προσαγωγῆι V^{corr.}, edd.; προσαγωγῆ V^{first hand} M.

χρώμενα M: χρώμεθα V.

(5) φαντασιασθείσα, : -σασθεῖ sup. ras. V.

(6) < αὐτῶν > Rousseau-Doutreleau; τὰς εἰκόνας]alter Fehler für κατ' εἰκόνα αὐτῶν (Holl)

(7) † τότε] tunc lat.; alter Fehler für τὸ τε (Holl) (12) τὰ ἀμφοτέρων (ἡμῶν ? (Holl)

The only textual point calling for discussion here is the conjecture $\delta\iota' \hat{\eta}\varsigma$ offered by Rousseau and Doutreleau. $\Delta\iota' \hat{\eta}\varsigma$ certainly makes the Greek text read more smoothly. However, the

Latin unquestionably reflects $\eta\upsilon$, and, although the construction is clumsy (as indeed the whole formula is clumsy), sense can be made of line 2 by regarding $\tau\acute{o}$ $\eta\rho\acute{o}\sigma\omega\pi\epsilon\nu$ $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ as in apposition to $\eta\upsilon$. The figure addressed functions as viae dux et adductor to the Magnitudes as they gaze upon her. The preoccupation of Marcus with the vision of the Father's face has already been noted; its appearance here, in an oddly phrased sentence, is good reason both for marking it as importation into an existing text to make that text fit into a 'Marcosian' schema, and also for ascribing the earlier form of the text to some other group.

We render therefore: (45a)

- (1) O companion of ~~divine~~ ^{God} and mysterious Silence -
- (2) you, whom the Magnitudes, ever gazing upon you - (the
Father's face) -
- (3) employ as guide and leader
- (4) as they withdraw upwards their forms,
- (5) (the forms) which that foolhardy deluded being,
- (6) because of (her fascination with) the Forefather's goodness,
emanated as images of them - namely, ourselves -
- (7) then being obsessed with the Higher Beings, as if in a dream:
- (8) lo, the Judge is at hand,
- (9) and the herald commands me to make my defence;
- (10) you, then,
- (11) as knowing the essence of us both,
- (12) that the essential nature of us both is as one,

(45a) Or, just possibly, 'divine and', if $\theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ has its debased adjectival sense here.

(13) oppose the Judge (for me).'

The terms of the petition and of its expected fulfilment find obvious counterparts in the system of Ptolemaeus as expounded by Irenaeus.

The emanation of images by a foolhardy deluded (female) being occurs there as the act of Achamoth the inferior Sophia:

Hanc autem Achamoth extra passionem factam

Τὴν τε Ἀχαμῶθ ἐκτὸς πάθους γενομένην,

concepisse de gratulatione eorum,

καὶ συλλαβοῦσαν τῇ χαρᾷ

quae cum eo sunt luminum visionem,

τῶν ἐν αὐτῷ φώτων τὴν θεωρίαν,

id eWant, Angelorum qui erant cum eo,

τουτέστι τῶν Ἀγγέλων τῶν μετ' αὐτοῦ,

et delectatam in conspectu eorum

καὶ ἐγκισσῆσασαν αὐτοῖς,

peperisse fructus secundum illius imaginem docent,

κεκυκέναι καρποὺς κατὰ τὴν εἰκόνα διδάσκουσι,

partum spiritalem secundum similitudinem satellitum Salvatoris.

κύημα πνευματικὸν καθ' ὁμοίωσιν γεγονὸς τῶν δορυφόρων τοῦ Σωτῆρος.

(AH I.i.8 (I. p.41 Harvey).

The nature of the pneumatics is as one with that of the higher Sophia:

Partum vero matris ipsorum, quae est Achamoth,

Τὸ δὲ κύημα τῆς μητρὸς αὐτῶν] τῆς Ἀχαμῶθ,

quem secundum inspectionem eorum Angelorum qui sunt

ὁ κατὰ τὴν θεωρίαν τῶν περὶ τὸν Σωτῆρα ἀγ-

erga Salvatorem generavit,

γέλων ἀπεκύησεν,

existentem ejusdem substantiae matri suae spiritalē...

ὁμοούσιον ὑπάρχον τῇ μητρὶ, πνευματικόν...

(AH I.i.9 (I. p.50 Harvey)).

The response which the 'Marcosians' expect their Mother to make to their prayer has also its parallel in the places of Ptolemaeus' higher Sophia:

Cum autem universum semen perfectum fuerit,

Ὄταν δὲ πᾶν τὸ σπέρμα τελειωθῇ,

Achamoth quidem matrem ipsorum transire de medietatis loco,

τὴν μὲν Ἀχαμῶθ τὴν μητέρα αὐτῶν μεταβῆναι τοῦ τῆς μεσότητος τόπον

dicunt, et intra Pleromā introire,

λέγουσι, καὶ ἐντὸς πληρώματος εἰσελθεῖν,

et recipere sponsum suum Salvatorem,

καὶ ἀπολαβεῖν τὸν νυμφίον αὐτῆς τὸν Σωτῆρα,

qui est ab omnibus factus,

τὸν ἐκ πάντων γε γονότα,

uti syzygia fiat Salvatoris et Sophiae, quae est Achamoth.

ἵνα συζυγία γένηται τοῦ Σωτῆρος καὶ τῆς Σοφίας τῆς Ἀχαμῶθ.

Et hoc esse sponsum et sponsam: nymphonem vero universum Pleroma.

Καὶ τοῦτο εἶναι νυμφίον καὶ νύμφην, νυμφῶνα δὲ τὸ πᾶν πλήρωμα.

Spiritales vero exspoliatos animas,

Τοὺς δὲ πνευματικούς ἀποδυσασμένους τὰς ψυχὰς

et spiritus intellectuales factos,

καὶ πνεύματα νοερὰ γενομένους,

inapprehensibiliter et invisibiliter intra Pleroma ingressos,
ἀκρατήτως καὶ ἀοράτως ἐντὸς πληρώματος εἰσελθόντας

¹¹⁵
sponsas reddi ~~us~~ qui circa Salvatorem sunt angelis.

νύμφας ἀποδοθήσεται τοῖς περὶ τὸν Σωτῆρα ἀγγέλοις.

(AH I.i.12 (I. p.58-9 Harvey)).

This hope for fulfilment of the individual pneumatic's destiny through the consummation of Sophia's relationship with Saviour was vividly expressed by some Valentinians on behalf of their departed friends, as is movingly exemplified by the inscription of Flavia Sophe (a full examination of which must be left until the Valentinian communities and their rites are discussed); this passage from Ptolemy (via Irenaeus) is therefore not confined to the realm of universal eschatology, but was seen by Valentinians as realised in some measure also in individual eschatology, so that it could aptly be mentioned in prayer for individuals.

The formulae taught to the dying, or to be learned in anticipation of death, according to AH I.xiv.4 (I.186-7 Harvey) are comparable, insofar as they too are words of power to accompany the soul on its journey after death and to enable it to survive the challenge of the Powers. However, whereas the 'Marcosian' formula is a prayer to the Mother, and the inscription of Flavia Sophe suggests an attitude of dependence on the Mother if not explicit petition addressed to her, the words in AH I.xiv.4 are words of direct challenge - 'I am a son from the Father, the Father pre-existent...', 'I am a precious vessel...' - and they are designed to cope, not with a single judge

(as the 'Marcosian' prayer is), but with many potestates, with eos qui sunt circa Demiurgum. Both formulae assert a kinship with the superior Sophia, and therefore belong (at least in their origin) within a community that used the Sophia myth, and they clearly come from a milieu akin to that which produced the 'Marcosian' formula; but the differences of address and stance make it inadvisable to insist too confidently that they must all be of one provenance.

The 'Marcosian' formula can hardly come from anything but a Ptolemaean-Valentinian body of prayers, but has been adapted for 'Marcosian' use: it is not the Powers or Magnitudes in general that are the threat, not yet the Demiurge, but the Judge, and Marcus' own fascination with the face of the Father is dragged in bodily. How a formula expressing calling for aid against fear of a judge (presumably of morality - Rhadamanthus?) came to be favoured by men who 'do all things freely, fearing no-one and nothing' is beyond explanation. The impression cannot be avoided that some element of Hellenic popular religion associated with some such figure as Rhadamanthus has also had a part to play in the growth of this formula. There is no suggestion that the Judge has any moral claim on the departed initiates, or any significant relationship with the protective power of the Mother or with whatever beings preside over the Nymphon. Another Hellenistic feature is the reference to Homer's helmet of Hades from Iliad V.844⁽⁴⁶⁾; even if it is Irenaeus' ironic touch, it attests a link in his own mind between 'Marcosian' psychopompy and Greek paganism.

(46) With AH lat.; while Rieu (ET 113) prefers 'cap of invisibility'.

Another influence, coming from the side, may also be detected here. The 'Marcosian' formula is, unlike the other noticed, emphatically a petition. This is typical (so far as can be judged from the few surviving sources) less of the Valentinian than of the Ophite style of formula for this sort of setting. The example of Pistis Sophia ch.58 has long been known:

'I will sing praises unto thee, O Light,
for I desired to come unto thee.
I will sing thee praises, O Light,
for thou art my deliverer.

Leave me not in the chaos,
Save me, O Light of the Height,
for it is thou that I have praised.

Thou hast sent me thy Light through thyself
and thou hast saved me.

Thou hast led me to the higher regions of the chaos.

May the emanations of the Self-Willed which pursue me
sink down into the lower regions of chaos,
and let them not come to the higher regions to see me.

And may great darkness cover them
and darker gloom come upon them
and let them not see me in the light of thy power
which thou hast sent unto me to save me,
so that they may not again get dominion over me...'

(ET Meade).

The probability is that the "Marcosians" have adapted a formula from the body of prayers originally composed by an 'Ophite' author, itself perhaps borrowed (like so much else) from that tradition by some Valentinian or Ptolemaean teacher. The plain inference is that Marcus himself left his imitators nothing to meet the sort of need envisaged by such formulae. His special line in liturgy was of limited extent, and had soon to be supplemented.

CULTS OF POWER: 7

ELCHASAI

"The Book of Elchasai", as it appeared on the Christian scene⁽¹⁾, was noticed by three principal⁽²⁾ observers whose comments have survived: the author of the Refutation (IX.xiii-xvii and X.xxix), Origen, whose homily on Ps. LXXXII is quoted by Eusebius (h.e. VI. xxxviii), and by Epiphanius, whose remarks are made essentially obiter (see haer. 9.1.2, 10.4.1, 53.1) but more extensively within reports of Jewish-Christian groups influenced by the book: the Ossenes (haer. 19) and the Ebionites (haer. 30). Whether 'Elchasai' refers to the subject or to the author of the book⁽³⁾ is not entirely clear; what is clear is that it is indeed a book that is in question, a book around which a varied cult developed, and not a clearly demarcated sect which happened to use the book, or a philosophy expounded in it.

The Refutation speaks of a book brought to Rome by Alcibiades of Syrian Apamea (IX.13). Origen emphasises rather the unnamed

- (1) On the relevance of the role of Alcibiades in dating this, see particularly Chapman (1909).
- (2) Nothing added by Theodoret or Filastrius, following the 'lost Syntagma', to which, in this case, Epiphanius seems to owe very little (Lipsius, Quellenkritik, 35).
- (3) There is no indication in the title, however read, to suggest that the author presented himself as a redeemer-figure (vs Waitz, 1920, 89).

teacher⁽⁴⁾ who has come into the public eye wielding the book allegedly sent down from heaven. Epiphanius notes the influence of the book, and summarises substantial passages with an accuracy that would not be apparent if the more literally cited excerpts in the Refutation were not available to vouch for his accuracy. Allowing for their varying interests, the three witnesses give essentially compatible reports of the content of the book. Analysis may fairly take as its starting-point the account in the Refutation, noting the additional material, especially identifiable quotations, in Epiphanius, but also checking his references for additional clues as to the book's composition and character.

The Refutation states (p.251, 1.9 - p.252,1.4 Wendland) (xiii.1):
'...a crafty and irrational man, by name Alcibiades, who lived in Apamea in Syria,...came to Rome bringing a certain book, saying that this had been received from the Chinese (?) of Parthia by a righteous man named Elchasai; (2) and that he had handed it on to the so-called Sobiai as having been granted by a messenger (angel) whose height was 24 schoenoi, [= 96 miles], whose width was 4 schoenoi, and 6 schoenoi from shoulder to shoulder, the tracks of his feet 3½ schoenoi in extent [= 14

(4) Perhaps Alcibiades; so, quite reasonably, J.Chapman (1909) - but this is not an assumption from which safe conclusions may be drawn.

miles, $1\frac{1}{2}$ schoenoi and $\frac{1}{2}$ schoenos high. (3) With him was said to be a female whose measurements are alleged to match those just mentioned. And the male is said to be the Son of God, and the female to be called Holy Spirit'. (Epiphanius refers to this at haer. 10.4.1, 19.4.2, 30.3.12 and 53.1, and again at 30.17.7, where he ends with a direct citation: 'I saw from the mountains that their heads extended to them, and having learnt the dimensions of the mountain I knew the dimensions both of Christ and of the Holy Spirit').

'With this tale of marvels he reckons to dupe the stupid, and goes on to say that (4) 'There was proclaimed to humankind the good news of a new forgiveness of sins as from the third (year) of the reign of Trajan"; and he specifies baptism, as I shall explain' (whereas Origen's summary speaks of a forgiveness promised to those who hear the book and believe, but does not name baptism); 'he says that "^{anyone} ~~people~~ involved in all kinds of indecency and turpitude and illicit acts, if he is also a believer, after being converted and listening to the book and believing, receives forgiveness of sins by baptism".'

After describing the controversy stirred up by the Refutator in opposition to Alcibiades (13.5-6), he resumes his summary thus

(p.252, l.18-p.253,l.5 Wendland, xiv.1):

'This man proposes a rule of life based on the Law - for the purposes of decoy - saying, "All who have come to faith (ΠΕΠΙΣΤΕΥΗΚΌΤΑϚ) must be circumcised and live according to the Law". Picking elements from the heresies described above, he also says that Christ is a man generated in the manner common to all, that he was not now for the first time born of a virgin, but was born previously and will be born often again, destined to appear and exist, changing his condition of birth and migrating from body to body - an obvious adherence to the dogma of Pythagoras. (2) They even presume so far as to claim fore-knowledge, adopting clearly the nebulous measures and numbers of the aforementioned Pythagorean art. These people cleave to mathematicians and astrologers and magicians as if they told the truth, and by adopting these things they dupe the senseless into thinking that they have access to a Word of Power (λόγου δυνατοῦ μετέχειν).

(3) Also, they teach certain incantations and formulæ (ἘπαλοιδάϚ τε και ἐπιλόγουϚ τίναϚ), for the benefit of people suffering from dog-bites, for demon-possessed persons and those afflicted by other illnesses'.

The application of this corpus of ritual precepts which aroused the ire of the Refutator, and gave him ammunition for his attack on Callistus, was Alcibiades' offer of a second baptism. In reading the carefully quoted passage from the Book of Elchasai, it is important to notice what the text itself says of its relation to the book as

a whole: it refers back to the core of the book for certain essential phrases, the plain assumption being that this section of the book (IX.xv) is at or near the end.

'(xc.1): He transmits baptism, therefore, to those who' (the text is here irrecoverably damaged) '...saying to those he deceives: "Now, children, if any one has had intercourse with any sort of creature, or a male, a sister, or a daughter, has committed adultery or fornication, and wishes to receive forgiveness of sins, from the moment that he listens to this book, let him be baptized a second time in the name of the Greatest and Most High God and in the name of his Son the Great King. Let him be cleansed and hallowed, and let him call as his witnesses the seven witnesses written in this book: sky and water, and the holy spirits and the angels of prayer, and oil and salt and earth". (And after a scornful interjection:) "Again, I say, O adulterers and adulteresses and false prophets, if you wish to be converted so that your sins may be forgiven you, there will be for you peace and a portion with the righteous, from the moment that you listen to this book and are baptized a second time, together with your ⁷garments". (p.253, 1.10-19, 23-26 Wendland).

No indication is given of the conditions⁽⁶⁾ upon which Alcibiades admitted the penitents he was seeking to bring forward. The statement

(6) Pericoli Ridolfini (1950) suggests a fore-going confession, but without evidence.

that he transmitted this new baptism, that is, passed on teaching concerning it, does not indicate⁽⁷⁾ whether he performed it or guided people as they administered it to themselves (or simply left them to do it for themselves on their own!). The recommended invocation of the seven elemental witnesses says nothing as to the presence or absence of human witnesses. The Refutator says plainly that Alcibiades was cashing in on Callistus' policy of extending the ministry of reconciliation: did he offer a quick and do-it-yourself method that by-passed even Callistus' relaxed but no doubt still demanding *discipline?* ~~disciples?~~ The apotropaic retention of garments is carried over with no explanation.

What is meant by 'listening to this book' at the end of which this invitation stands, and particularly how one is to invoke the seven witnesses listed in the book's formulae, the reader can learn only by turning back⁽⁸⁾ into the volume. This the Refutator proceeds to do, selecting the treatment of choice for dog-bites (IX. xv. 4-6), and also that for phthisis (IX.16.1). He gives no example of any formulae for revelation-magic, although his remarks about Alcibiades and his friends claiming prophetic powers suggests the book contained such; but he does give a selection of the general rubrics warning the ~~theologist~~ ^{theurgist} against bad days for his theurgic operations (IX.xvi. 2-4), and guarding the secrecy of the book (IX.xvii.1).

(7) With Brandt (1912), 19, as against Waitz (1921) 93-4.

(8) This seems to be the only case in which the Refutator does not simply follow the order of his source; we must modify the otherwise correct observation of Bareille (1901).

The treatment for dog-bites (p.254, 1.2-15 Wendland):

"If therefore a dog, foaming at the mouth and mad, in whom there is a spirit of destruction, bites or gnaws or licks any man or woman or boy or girl, in that same hour let that person run, with all his clothing, go down into a river or spring where-ever there is a deep (enough) place, and be baptized together with his entire clothing, and pray to the Great and Most High God in heartfelt faith, and then let him call to witness the seven witnesses written in this book: 'Behold, I call to witness sky and water and the holy spirits and the angels of prayer and oil and salt and earth, I call to witness these seven witnesses that I shall not sin again, I shall not commit adultery, I shall not steal, I shall not do injustice, I shall not be greedy, I shall not hate, I shall not despise, nor shall I take pleasure in any evil things'. So, after saying these things, let him be baptized together with his entire clothing in the name of the Great and Most High God".

The list of witnesses given by Epiphanius differs. At haer. 30.17.4, he lists 'heaven and earth, salt and water, the winds, the angels of righteousness, bread and oil', and begins the following petition, "Help me, and deliver me from the evil!" (p.356, 10-15 Holl). It is too readily assumed that this is simply a variant upon the Refutation text, or that either the Refutation must be mistaken in applying this formula to dog-bites when it was meant for snake-bites, or that Epiphanius has made the same mistake in the opposite direction. Hence the confusion in Wendland, who cites haer. 30.17

only as a parallel to IX. 15.1-2 (the 'second baptism'), whereas it is obviously more comparable with 15.4-6. Hence also the attempt, as by Peterson⁽⁹⁾, to make both 'Hippolytan' and Epiphonian versions different allegories of carnal concupiscence and its sacramental cure. A more economical explanation (if less edifying and exciting) is that, while the Refutator has selected the formula for dog-bites, another item in a varied collection, that for snake-bites, has caught the eye of Epiphanius. This is not to argue that both writers must have reproduced their sources infallibly. Even in their respective sources, translation difficulties may have confused the material: the problems of rendering a semitic text into Greek are reflected in the expressions τὰ πνεύματα τὰ ἄγρια (Ref.) and τῶν τε ὀφιδίων (Epiph.), which clearly represent Π) Γ or some cognate. In any case, of course, the presence of eight members in Epiphanius' list raises questions, which need separate discussion below.

As to the treatment of phthisis (IX.xvi.1):

'(16.1)...he has a formula for consumptives, teaching that that they are to be baptized ἐν ψυχρῶ forty times a day for seven days, the same as for demon-possessed persons'.

(p.254, 11.17-18 Wendland).

From the general rubrics:

(IX.xvi. 2-4): "'There exist evil stars of wickedness. This now has been declared to you, devout ones and disciples: guard

(9) 'Behandlung der Tollwut' (1947).

yourselves (middle voice) from the authority of the days of their dominance, and do set the commencement of your operations" (= 'theurgic operations', τὴν καταρχὴν τῶν ἔργων) "upon those days, and do not baptize man or woman on the days of their dominance, when the moon rises from their sector and shares their trajectory.

(3) Keep that day for when she does not rise from their sector - then baptize, and commence the first stage of any of your operations. Moreover, honour the day of the Sabbath; that is one of such days.

(4) But guard also against making a commencement on the third day after Sabbath, for on completion of three years of Trajan Caesar, from the time when he subordinated the Parthian by his own authority, when three years were completed, there breaks forth warfare between the angels of wickedness of the north; thereby all kingdoms of wickedness are in confusion".

(p.254, 1.21-p.255, 1.5 Wendland).

The colophon (?) on secrecy (IX. xvii.1):

"Do not read out (ἀναγινώσκειτε) this word to all persons, and guard these commandments carefully, for not all men are faithful, nor are all women upright".

(p.255, 1.8-11 Wendland).

Before reviewing the complementary information from Epiphanius, we may pause for a provisional characterization of the Book of Elchasai as known to the Refutator. A distinction may be made at once between the special features emphasised, and without much doubt composed

also⁽¹⁰⁾, by Alcibiades: the reference also singled out by Origen as the definitive feature of the book, the gospel of a new forgiveness of sins proclaimed in the third year of Trajan (the same date, when cited in the rubrics, marks an astrological interpretation of world politics, not a kairos in the economy of grace); the invitation to penitential re-baptism, which assumes ('now') that the candidates have already been selected to hear the reading of the book - and the book which he inherited. That inherited book contained: an account of a theophany or prophetic vision; exhortations to live by the Mosaic Law; a 'returning prophet' Christology; formulae for revelation-magic; incantations and formulae for theurgic healings (dog-bites, snake-bites, phthisis, demon-possession); rubrics about propitious and unpropitious seasons for theurgic operations; a colophon enjoining secrecy. There are signs that the inherited book was itself composite: the treatment for dog-bites seems to require a double baptisms, one followed by an invocation of the seven witnesses and another⁽¹¹⁾ in the name (?= with the invocation⁽¹²⁾ of) the Great and Most High God; injunction to avoid the Sabbath (ἔτι δε τιμήσατε τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ σαββάτου), appears oddly among a catalogue of days ruled by evil stars, involves a forced reading of Exodus xx.8,

(10) A point noted only by Chapman (1909).

(11) Brandt's suggestion that the first baptism was an anticipation of the second (Brandt, 1912, 32) is not helpful.

(12) Brandt (1912, 33) well expresses the uncertainties surrounding this invocation.

Μνήσθητι τὴν ἡμέραν τῶν σαββάτων ἀγιάζειν αὐτὴν , and in any looks like an afterthought (ἔτι δὲ).

Further characterization of the book inherited by Alcibiades requires an analysis of the report by Epiphanius on the version he found among the "Ossenes", whom he depicts (haer. 19) as a Jewish, not a Jewish-Christian, sect.

The Ossenes, or 'Strong Men' (Epiphanius seems to suggest an etymology with $\int \Sigma \Upsilon$ Aram, 'be strong') are presented as a group originally living near the Dead Sea, who were joined during the reign of Trajan by one Elxai, a brother of whom, Iexeos, was also remembered among them. Since 'Iexeos' may go back⁽¹³⁾ to an Aramaic expression for 'Hidden God', both names raise questions. It is tempting to dismiss both Elxai/Elchasai and his 'brother' as fictions; but the memory of historical persons, both bearing cult-titles that survived when their personal names had been lost - as if Simon's name and his dismissive soubriquet 'Simon the Magus' had been forgotten, and he had been remembered only as 'Power-of-God' (or Elymas!) - is not even improbable. Other members of the family turn up later, as will be seen.

This Elxai professed adherence to the Law, but seemed, at least to Epiphanius, to have set very light to it: ἀπὸ Ἰουδαίων ὀρμώμενος, καὶ τὰ Ἰουδαίων φρονῶν, κατὰ νόμον δὲ μὴ πολιτευόμενος (19.1.5, p.218, 11-7-9 Holl). The most un-Jewish feature of Elxai's activity was his doctrine of the seven witnesses, which

(13) So Bareille (1901).

explained their use in invocations. He scorned virginity, and insisted on the necessity of marriage. He claimed to have revelations. He deplored martyrdom, and argued that a pretended adherence to idolatry in time of persecution was excusable, on the grounds that outward ^{utterances} ~~utterances~~ do not compromise ^{inward} ~~inward~~ integrity (19.1.5-9).

Epiphanius had heard news of Ossenes thus influenced by Elxai, whose name they rendered as "Hidden Power":

φαντάζονται δὲ δῆθεν καλεῖν τοῦτον δύναμιν
ἀποκεκαλυμμένην, διὰ τὸ Ἑλ καλεῖσθαι
δύναμιν, Ἐαῖ δὲ κεκαλυμμένην.

(19.2.10, p.219, 11.8-10 Holl.).

- a rendering since tested and found to be sound. (14)

The Ossenes, now known as "Sampsaeans", dwelling in Nabatea and Peraea in Epiphanius' day, claimed to have had descendants of the original Elxai living among them but lately - the sisters Marthos and Marthana, whose spittle and other effluvia were said to have healing properties (19.1.12-13). These Sampsaeans forswore the eastward-facing attitude of prayer, but insisted on facing Jerusalem. Epiphanius, who spells this out with mocking exactness, dismisses this preference as inconsistent, for these people reject animal sacrifice, the very *raison-d'etre* of the Jerusalem temple. (This rejection of the Temple cult, linked with a rejection of fire and an exaltation of water, is not ascribed to the Book of Elchasai, and since it is attested

(14) Particularly by Chwolson, cited by Waitz (1921) 88-9.

elsewhere⁽¹⁵⁾ in sectarian Judaism, can be adequately explained here by reference to such origins).

It appears, however, that we return to the Book of Elxai at haer. 19.4.1-2:

Εἶτα δὲ διαγράφει Χριστὸν τίνα εἶναι δύναμιν, οὗ καὶ τὰ μέτρα σημαίνει: εἰκοσιτεσσάρων μὲν σχοίνων τὸ μῆκος, ὡς μιλίων ἐνενηκονταῆξ. τὸ δὲ πλάτος σχοίνων ἕξ, μιλίων εἰκοσιτεσσάρων: καὶ τὸ πάχος ὁμοίως τερατευόμενος, καὶ τοὺς πόδας, καὶ τὰ ἄλλα μυθολογήματα. Εἶναι δὲ καὶ τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα καὶ αὐτὸ θήλειαν, ὅμοιον τῷ Χριστῷ, ἀνδριάντος δίκην ὑπὲρ νεφέλην, καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον δύο ὀρέων ἕστος.

(p.221, 11.6-12 Holl.).

This corresponds obviously to the vision recorded by the Refutator in connection with the original gift of the Book of the Hidden Power - this link survives in Epiphanius' reference to 'a certain Power' - but there is a suggestion (καὶ τὰ ἄλλα μυθολογήματα) that the original account of the male figure detailed many more features than the Refutator's version, perhaps pruned away by the Christian Alcibiades. The appearance of the reference at this late stage in Epiphanius' account does not argue the presence of the theophany at a later stage of the book than in Alcibiades'

(15) By the Essenes: see Conybeare in HDB I (1898) 767-8, Moffatt in ERE V (1912) 396-401.

version; the 'Christology' of the Ossenes/Sampsaeans - or, rather, their 'Messianology', if we take seriously Epiphanius' clear conviction that they were Jews - something Epiphanius naturally singles out for special mention.

The other feature singled out for such special mention before the closing tirade of haer. 19.5 is a peculiar prayer-formula of the Ossenes (19.4.3):

Τίσι δὲ λόγοις καὶ κενοφωνίαις ὕστερον ἐν τῇ βίβλῳ ἀπατᾶ λέγων: Μηδεὶς ζητήσῃ τὴν ἐρμενεΐαν, ἀλλ' ἢ μόνον ἐν τῇ εὐχῇ τάδε λέγετω. Καὶ αὐτὰ δῆθεν ἀπὸ Ἑβραϊκῆς διαλέκτου μετενέγκας ὡς ἀπὸ μέρους κατελιήφαμεν οὐδὲν ὄντα τὰ παρ' αὐτῷ φανταζόμενα. Φάσκει γὰρ λέγειν: Ἀβάρ, Ἀνίδ, Μωΐβ, Νωχιλὲ, Δαασίμ, Ἀνῆ, Δαασίμ, Νωχιλὲ, Μωΐβ, Ἀνίδ, Ἀβάρ, Σελάμ.

(p.221, ll.13-18 Holl.).

'He concludes with these deceptive words and nonsense-syllables: "None shall ask the interpretation; this shall simply be uttered in the prayer:" - he imposes formulae in a Hebrew dialect, which we have partly understood, for none of his own strange interpretations are extant; he instructs them to say, "Abar, Anid, Moib, Nochile, Daasim, Ane, Daasim, Nochile, Moib, Anid, Abar, Selam'.

Epiphanius, not a man to be deterred from confident statement by mere lack of knowledge, proceeds to offer his interpretation (19. 4.4): 'Let humiliation pass from my fathers, the humiliation of their condemnation, of their crushed state, of their labour, by their crushed state in the condemnation of my fathers, from humiliation which has passed into the apostolate of perfection'. Petavius did his best (MGP XLI 265-6) to justify this rendering, and had to confess himself beaten; Scaliger's effort (ibid.) was no more convincing. The riddle was finally resolved in 1858 by Ign. Stern and M.A. Levy⁽¹⁶⁾, who read the text by the rules of gematreia thus:

אנא במהל עיכון ביום ר'וא ר'וא

'Ich werde über euch Zeuge sein am Tage des grossen Gerichts' -

'I shall be a witness in your case on the Day of the Great Judgement' -

not indeed, a prayer in the usual sense, but a threat, a magical defiance-formula⁽¹⁷⁾, apt to the needs of a persecuted minority: precisely who 'you' means need not be spelled out, for safety's sake, and in the natural thought and feelings of people under

(16) References in Brandt (1912) 39-40 to Ben-Chananja (Jan.1858) and to Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft XII (1858) 712.

(17) Bareille (1901, 2238-9), ignoring or ignorant of the work of Stern and Levy, attempted to revive Epiphanius' rendering thus: עַוְרָה עֲנִיחַ מִהֵיב נִכְלִי דְאֲשִׁימָא נִי

"Elle est passée d'affliction, don des fraudulents adorateurs d'Achima" (cf II Kings xvii.30). 'Achima' is said to be a covert allusion to Christ; so 'Les fraudulents adorateurs du Christ...ne seraient autres que les chrétiens orthodoxes, et les elcésaites se seraient félicités de voir passer l'affliction, don de ces mêmes chrétiens.' Pericoli Ridolfini (1950) adapts this theory slightly, to see the whole text as 'una formola blasfema contro gli adoratori del Christo'. Both are surely right in detecting a note of covert threat and defiance.

e

threat often has no definite sense, but corresponds with Malvolio's 'I'll be revenged on the whole miserable pack of you!'

Much trouble⁽¹⁸⁾ has been caused by the divergence of Epiphanius' account of the Seven witnesses from that in the Refutation. Epiphanius writes as if the use of the formulae in ritual prescriptions was prefaced by an explanation of their nature and value, a section not mentioned by the Refutator, but surely to be expected in a book with an apocalyptic introduction.⁽¹⁹⁾ Indeed, this was the core of Elxai's departure from essential Judaism:

....ιδίαν αὐτῷ ἀρεσιν πλάσας, ἄλας καὶ ὕδωρ καὶ γῆν καὶ ἄρτον καὶ οὐρανὸν καὶ αἰθέρα καὶ ἄνεμον ὄρκιον αὐτοῖς εἰς λατρείαν ὀρισάμενος: ποτὲ δὲ πάλιν ἄλλους μάρτυρας ἑπτὰ ὀρισάμενος, τον οὐρανὸν φημι καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ καὶ πνεύματα, <ὡς> φησιν, ἅγια καὶ τοὺς ἀγγέλους τῆς προσευχῆς καὶ τὸ ἔλαιον καὶ τὸ ἄλας καὶ τὴν γῆν.

(19.1.5-6; p.218, 11.9-14 Holl.).

(18) e.g. for Brandt (1912) 14-22.

(19) But the work as an entity does not belong to an apocalyptic Gattung - vs Waitz (1921) 100.

Both these lists differ from that in the Refutation, and also from that mentioned as in Ebionite use in Panarion haer. 30 - we need not complicate matters by including the list in Panarion haer. 19.6 (pp.223-4 Holl.); it is not the catalogue of Elkesaite 'witnesses' that is the target there⁽²⁰⁾, but the notion that natural elements (such as those that Elxai revered) could be divine, or have salvific power independent of their Creator.

The lists are:

<u>Refutation</u>		<u>Epiphanius</u>		
A	B	C	D	E
(dog-bites)	(Alcibiades)	Ossenes: theory	Ossenes: Practice	Ebionites
sky	sky	salt	sky	sky
water	water	water	water	earth
holy spirits	holy spirits	earth	holy spirits	salt
prayer-angels	prayer-angels	bread	prayer-angels	water
oil	oil	sky	oil	winds
salt	salt	air	salt	angels of righteousness
earth	earth	wind	earth	bread
				oil

Epiphanius notices the inconsistency within the Book of Elxai as he met ^{it} among Ossenes (i.e. the divergence between our lists C and D); his degree of attention at this point suggests that he had checked his sources. The economical explanation is that the original form of the

(20) Holl's conjectural insertion of ἐν ἄπτω καὶ (p.223, 27-224, 1) is therefore otiose.

Book of Elschasai listed the seven witnesses - all 'pure' things, spiritual and physical 'elementals' as in A and D. The Ossenes, though they used the original list in rites (D), altered the theoretical section of the book (list C), perhaps preferring naturalistic uses of 'air', 'wind', to avoid polytheism, and replacing 'oil' with 'bread' (= manna?). Alcibiades, adapting the book to mission among Christians, nonetheless kept the original list B. The Ebionites, at least by the time Epiphanius knew them, had altered the list, perhaps on the basis of the Ossene list C; references to Christian sacraments have been seen here⁽²¹⁾, but the order is odd. Most significant perhaps is the expansion of the list to eight items - a surprising departure from the magical seven - so surprising that it must be regarded as deliberate.

It has been suggested⁽²²⁾ that these lists are of basic necessities of life: i.e., 'May I be for ever deprived of water, bread, etc, if ever I sin again'; but this formula, in all its variants, is not a curse but an adjuration: From Epiphanius' protest (haer. 30.17.4), from his change that $\lambda\alpha\tau\rho\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha$ is virtually offered to the seven, and from the terms of the direct appeal at the end of the Ebionite version - $\beta\omicron\eta\theta\epsilon\iota\tau\acute{\epsilon}$ $\mu\omicron\iota$ $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ $\acute{\alpha}\pi\alpha\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}\xi\alpha\tau\epsilon$ $\acute{\alpha}\pi'\acute{\epsilon}\mu\omicron\upsilon$ $\tau\acute{o}$ $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\eta\gamma\mu\alpha$ (p.356, ll.14-15 Holl.) - it is clear that we are verging upon the language of prayer,

(21) e.g. by Uhlhorn (1898).

(22) Considered tentatively by Brandt (1912) 19-20.

prayer within a polytheistic setting. We meet here a bargain made with powers that, though potentially dangerous, are essentially benevolent.

We must therefore see the two figures of the theophany also in polytheistic^{tic} terms. Of course, the adjuration of the witnesses does not explicitly deify them. The formula, without~~h~~ the direct plea for help, can be transported into a monotheistic context if the witnesses are reinterpreted as being invited to witness before God against the worshipper, rather as God calls heaven and earth to witness in Deut. iv.26. But their original status was greater; it is ironic that it is in the monotheistic Ebionite context that ~~be~~^{the} liturgical trace of polytheism has survived. There is also an apotropaic element in the retention of clothing, a feature, furthermore, so unrabbinic as to be almost pointedly non-Jewish.^(22a) The promise made in the prayer is not the vow of an initiate in a mystery. It is made after the theurgic immersion; it neither assumes nor intends any new relationship between worshipper and deity, as implied in Christian baptism⁽²³⁾, requires neither maintenance nor relinquishment of other cults⁽²⁴⁾,

(22a) See Uhlhorn (1858) 772, Brandt (1912) 25.

(23) As in Acts ii, let alone Rom.vi.

(24) In contrast to (e.g.) the vow of the Isis-initiate; cf R.Merkelbach, 'Der Eid der Isismysten', ZPE 1 (1967) 55-73.

- (iii) Adaptation by Alcibiades⁽²⁹⁾ for propaganda among Christians, c.200. Additions: Gospel of new forgiveness.
Theophany reinterpreted?
Concluding invitation to re-baptism.

The group or groups that used (i) survived as the Mughtasila of the Fihrist⁽³⁰⁾, although the latter had changed by the time Ibn an-Nadim came across them, as one group of the same complex had changed more markedly by the time they provided Mani with his spiritual cradle.⁽³¹⁾

As its name implies, the Book is a manual of esoteric power techniques; as the Refutator says, its users sought the reputation of being party to, having a share in, a Logos of Power.

The bulk of the material in the Book of Hidden Power is pagan, not Christian. Despite the efforts of Waitz and others⁽³²⁾, it cannot be made the foundation for an extensive reconstruction of Jewish Christianity. Its only certain addition to ^{our knowledge of} Christian worship before

- (29) The Refutator's plain statement that Alcibiades made substantial changes is noticed only by Chapman (1909).
(30) Brandt (1912), Kap.8.
(31) Klijn and Reinink, 'Elchasai and Mani', Vig.Chr. 28 (1974) 277-289.
(32) Waitz (1921); Schoeps, Judenchristentum 325ff; Strecker, as in n.27 supra.

Nicaea is Alcibiades' invitation to second baptism which was extremely short-lived. The essential content of the book was liturgical. The liturgy in question however, was not that of initiation, but of theurgy. The adaptation of theurgic practice indicates how profound was the need for a potent answer to the problem of post-baptismal sin. No considered Christian teaching ever admitted the possibility of such a cult of power providing the means of reconciliation, although popular devotion may have thought otherwise. What appeal, also, the idea of bargaining for safety by means of baptismal vows may have had we can only speculate.

At what stage the Elchesaite theurgy was taken up by some Ebionites is unknown. The question of the Elchesaite influence on other areas of Jewish-Christian liturgy must be left for our discussion of the Clementine Romance.

CULTS OF POWER:

Some Concluding Remarks.

Of the individuals and groups noticed in this part of our investigation, some illustrate the powerful drive to personal domination that was mentioned in the introductory comments - perhaps Karpokrates, almost certainly Marcus, possibly Alcibiades - and also the tendency of cults of power to single out the miraculous, time-defying types of experience which appeal to the deprived, the lonely, the inadequate, the inferior - Simon, Marcus again, Karpokrates. In the case of Elchasai, we see the instinct to meet the needs of the troubled conscience, and, in the work of Karpokrates himself (if not of his disciples), the instinct to meet the needs of the bereaved.

Certain persons and groups who will claim attention later might have been considered as candidates for inclusion here. In the case of Justin the Gnostic (Ref. V), we shall consider a man whose use of the Jewish-Christian traditions of speculation and cult he took over produced what, for his personal purposes at least, must have been a cult of power. He is not included here because his rites seem clearly to fit into a particular category of Jewish-Christian tradition; but he must be mentioned at this point as illustrating the way in which cults of power are parasitic upon more responsible, balanced and sophisticated traditions of worship, and also the readiness with which any liturgical tradition may degenerate into a cult of power. Another case is the "Phibionites" whom Epiphanius knew personally (haer. 26). The way in which his female informant presented their practices to him has much in it that is reminiscent of a cult of power - the flooding of the recipient with bewildering quantities

of information, the recurrent emphasis on secrecy, the repeated exploitation of sexual interest - and, although the woman in question might be regarded as a power-cult with a membership of one, it will be shown that her information, when analysed, disguises a very different reality - another Jewish-Christian liturgical tradition.

The case of Simon, in particular, illustrates the ways in which cults of power flourish in and by means of reputation. The name of Simon crops up again and again simply because of the fascination always exercised by the thought of power. A similar process is seen at work in the case of Nicholas and the "Nicolaitans". They are mentioned, of course, in the Revelation⁽¹⁾ without any explanation. The proximity of the name of Jezebel suggests that the term is being used as a conventional portmanteau expression for syncretistic and amoral doctrines⁽²⁾; but there is no clear suggestion of any specific group. By the time of Irenaeus⁽³⁾, it has become a term with no historical associations at all. This does not embarrass (for example) Epiphanius, who is anxious to find heresies to fill his list⁽⁴⁾, and he is not ashamed to invent scandalous tales⁽⁵⁾, ~~which allow him to use the "Nicolaitans" as a means of categorizing other, genuinely existing, groups~~

(1) Rev. ii.6,15.

(2) E.Schürer, 'Die Prophetin Isabel in Thyateira. Offenb. Joh.2.20', in A.Harnack et al., Theologische Abhandlungen Carl von Weizsäcker...gewidmet (Freiburg-i.-Br. 1892) 37-58.

(3) AH I.xxvi.3 (Massuet) = I.xxiii/I.214 Harvey.

(4) Cf F.Young, 'Did Epiphanius know what he meant by "Heresy"?', in E.A.Livingstone, ed., Studia Patristica XVII/1 (Oxford 1982) 199-208.

(5) Pan.haer.25.1 (I,267-8 Holl). The tendency had begun with the 'lost Syntagma' (cf Quorum haereticorum, i, III.33 Otto) and Refutation (VII.36.3).

which allow him to use the "Nicolaitans" as a means of categorizing other, genuinely existing, groups⁽⁶⁾ and of damning them by association. Clement of Alexandria's account⁽⁷⁾ of the pious simplicity of the deacon Nicholas shows how ascetic enthusiasm can be misunderstood, wifully as well as innocently, and then abused. Once the story was abroad, it had a life and power of its own.

(6) And cf also Tertullian, de praescr. 33 (and R.W.Moss on the use of the name as 'a convenient description of the morals of some of the Gnostics' in ERE IX (1917) 363.

(7) Strom. III.iv.25.6 (II.207 Stählin), and reproduced in Eusebius h.e.III.29.2-3 (108 Schwartz). The misuse of this source by Epiphanius (see n.5) does not make Clement's statement any less likely to be true. Brox, 'Nikolaos und Nikolaiten', Vig Chr 19 (1965) 23-30, esp.29-30, dismisses this too readily; he has not noted the evidence of Moss (1917) on the misunderstanding of 'contempt of the flesh'.



a



b

- a. Statuette of Christ (?). Museo delle Terme, Rome. Early third century. (See p. 32.)
 b. Christ in the attitude of a Greek poet. Part of a sarcophagus found in Constantinople.

From W. Lowrie, Art in the Early Church, Plates 101 a and 101 b;
 of the former he says (p. 32):

A marble statuette of Christ (pl. 101a), recently discovered and now in the Museo delle Terme at Rome, has been widely published as a portrait of Christ. But its admirers are put to some embarrassment by the fact that the breasts are evidently those of a woman. The artist must have taken as his model a statue of Serapis, which he transformed into a statue of Christ by putting in one hand a roll to represent the Gospel, and by elevating the other to imitate the gesture of a teacher. It probably was made about the time Irenæus told of Gnostic groups which claimed to possess a portrait of Christ. I believe Wilpert is right in saying that this likely was a Gnostic production, and in remarking that the dealer was not far wrong when he described it as "a Hellenistic poetess."

The apparently parallel case of the second figure may just conceivably support this argument; but I see no cause to identify the former as a portrayal of Christ.

(2) A process of re-identification is in progress here of the Gnostic groups of the Apostles' Church.

CHAPTER THREE

GROUPS ORIGINATING IN THE SEPARATION OF CHRISTIANITY FROM JUDAISM.

1. Christianity within Judaism, and its Acquisition of a Separate Identity.

When the Christian movement appears upon the public scene, it is presented as a renewal movement within Judaism, and yet already looking further to a universal mission: "Men of Judaea and all who dwell in Jerusalem...Men of Israel...Let all the house of Israel therefore know assuredly that God has made him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom you crucified...Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the forgiveness of your sins; and you shall receive the gift of the forgiveness of your sins; and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit. For the promise is to you and to your children, and to all that are far off, every one whom the Lord our God calls to him" (Acts ii.14, 22, 36, 38-39). The gift of baptism preached in the name of the glorified Messiah, and the annexed gift of the Holy Spirit, is offered to the covenant people of Israel, in fulfilment and continuation of the divine promise made and kept through successive generations⁽¹⁾, and is now, with a new comprehensiveness, to be offered also to the Gentiles.⁽²⁾

Jewish response to the new movement was varied. Substantial numbers joined it, including 'a great many' of the hereditary

-
- (1) Bruce, on v.39, cites Gen.ix.9, xii.15, xvii.7ff, Gal.iii.16, Ps.xvii.50, lxxxix.34ff, cxxxii.11f.
- (2) A process of decision is hidden behind the use here of the OT quotations: Ehrhardt, The Acts of the Apostles (Manchester 1969) 15.

Aaronic ministry (Acts vi.7); but opposition was no less substantial, and when the effective centre of the movement had been driven by the opposition from Jerusalem to Antioch, the scene of exceptional proselytising successes⁽³⁾, and it there received for the first time a distinctive name - 'the disciples were for the first time called Christians' (Acts xi.19-26, esp. 26) - the question of the compatibility of this new body with its parent faith was clearly becoming urgent.

The account in Acts of the conflicts and martyrdom of Stephen seems to reflect, among other things, a tension already present within Judaism, an existing controversy about relationships with the Gentiles⁽⁴⁾, as emotive and explosive as such issues of social and spiritual identity must always be. A renewal movement like that of John the Baptist, which asked a whole nation conscious of commitment to God to repent, to set aside its confidence in inherited faith and see itself as under divine judgement and in need of forgiveness, must in itself provoke reaction; but when that movement, ^{or} ~~of~~ its successor, ^{breeds} goes on to set lesser ~~lands~~ without the Law on a par with one's own uniquely privileged people - then the difficulty of humbling one's individual pride is magnified by the even more shocking demand for corporate humility. Yet the new Christian movement was asking no less.

There were Jews who were equal to this demand; and when such persons embraced the Christian Gospel they had agonizing decisions to make: granted that their loyalty to God required them still to

(3) So Josephus, BJ VII.iii.3.

(4) cf Ehrhardt, Acts, 29-33.

keep Sabbath and festivals, to circumcise their sons, to observe kashruth in their diet, should they accept Gentiles as fellow adherents to the Gospel only if they did the same? or, if the Gentile disciples were free from these obligations, how close could association with them be? or, did openness to such Gentiles make the old obligations unnecessary even for Jews who were Christians? - or, as some bold spirits seemed to say, did the new relationships render the old observances actually wrong?

These issues had been implicit in the Gentile mission of Judaism from the beginning. This, and other contacts with the Gentile world from the Exile onwards, had left marks on Jewish worship and understanding of worship: some passages in the Synagogue prayers may reflect influence from Persian angelology⁽⁵⁾, and such influences are more than obvious in the development of Jewish Merkabah mysticism. The very concept of a transport of the soul to gaze upon the divine throne has the same roots as the 'Avaywḥ' of Julian and his fellow Neoplatonists.⁽⁶⁾ The hymns and acclamations of earthly worship provide models for this style of meditation, and the two universes of discourse of theology and devotion meet in the notion of knowledge by adoration, of doxology as a means of cognition.⁽⁷⁾ If, as has been

(5) cf Schrire, Hebrew Amulets (London 1966), ch.10.

(6) Lewy, Chaldaean Oracles and Theurgy, Cairo 1956, ch.III; E.des Places, Oracles chaldaïques (Paris 1971); P.Boyancé, 'Théurgie et téléstique neoplatoniciennes', RHR (1955) 189-209.

(7) Heiler, Prayer (ET of 1932), New York 1958, 184-7.

suggested,⁽⁸⁾ the Hermetica and the Septuagint are both products of an attempt by Ptolemy Soter to reconcile his Jewish with his polytheistic subjects to the enrichment of both, then it is not unlikely that (e.g.) the Prayer of Thanksgiving in the Asclepius exemplifies a Jewish effect on Gentile thought and practice:

'We rejoice because thou hast shown us thyself. We rejoice because while we were in the body thou hast made us divine through thy knowledge'

(ET Brashler, Dirkse, NHLE 298).

Gentiles entering the ranks of the Christians were faced with corresponding decisions. Were they obliged now to rest on Sabbath, observe ~~kashruth~~ ^{kashruth}, circumcise their children? Were they to require other Gentile Christians to conform with whatever degree of observance of these Jewish rules they individually felt bound to? How far, and on what terms, were their new Christian ekklēsiai to resemble the Jewish synagogai, to accommodate the ~~sensitivities~~ ^{sensitivities} of visitors who were Jews?

One matter in which these questions showed themselves with brutal practicality was capable of immediate and unambiguous answer: during a famine in Judaea, when you were collecting hard for famine relief and decided that the beneficiaries were to be your fellow-Christians, who got the cash? Such records as survive⁽⁹⁾ suggest that The Collection marked a high point in Jewish-Christian/Gentile/Christian relations. But religious cohesion, especially in

- (8) B.H.Stricker, 'Corpus hermeticum' in Mnemosyne 1945; Bleeker, 'Egyptian Background of Gnosticism', in Bianchi, Origini (1957) 234-5.
(9) K.P.Nickle, The Collection - a Study in Paul's Strategy, London, 1962; Haenchen, Acts of the Apostles (ET Oxford 1971) 372-9.

a community poised between two cultures so distinct, cannot wait upon disasters.

The sequence of the events in which the admission of Gentiles to the infant Church was decided and the terms for their admission determined is not clear⁽¹⁰⁾, even within the limited time-span covered by Acts. Acts viii gives the impression that the Gentile mission began before Peter met Cornelius - unless, perhaps, the eccentricities of Philip did not commit the Church at large, even if Jerusalem sent Peter and John to lend respectability to his alarming experiments with Samaritans. The practical issue, itself a thorny question of ~~principle~~^{principle}, was given an even more threatening aspect when in the work and teaching of a Saul of Tarsus it became a debate on the very basis of divine-human relationships. Just what is such a man suggesting by "the end of the Law" (Rom.x.4)? Brandon's view that, after Paul's death, his theology was totally eclipsed⁽¹¹⁾, and that only the fall of Jerusalem ended the dominance of a "James-party" that kept Christianity within the confines of Judaism, thus making possible (and necessary) a synthesis between the conservatives and Pauline radicals, has proved fruitful, but is still debatable. However, Brandon's reference to the fall of Jerusalem rightly identifies the most powerful factor in the process that left Jews

(10) e.g., the mission of Philip in Samaria precedes the events at Caesarea, and seems to arouse no interest at the Jerusalem Council.

(11) Brandon, Fall of Jerusalem, ch.7

and Christians distinct - the Sufferings of the Jews.

2. The Sufferings of the Jews.

Of one Hebrew account of the sufferings of the Jews, Emak Habacha, "The Valley of Weeping", it has been observed⁽¹²⁾: "the story of horror is told with a dull monotony in which all separate incidents are merged in one long agony of grief". This could be said also even of the descriptions of the exceptional catastrophes that befall the Jewish people between the middle of the first and the middle of the second century C.E.

After the upheavals of Alexandria in the autumn of 38 C.E., and the rebuff of Philo's embassy by Caligula's own short-lived plan to place his own statue in the Jerusalem temple, Claudius' reversal of this policy and his own subsequent expulsion of Jews from Rome - all routine events in the thorny history of Jewry - there is an acceleration of conflict and disaster, first to the point of the fall of Jerusalem and the destruction of its temple.

Josephus' account spares the reader nothing of the ghastliness, and even in its detached tone presents the inexorable course of catastrophe not only as a tragedy but also as a divine judgment. In terms that his pagan readers would recognize all too well, he recalls the omens, or, in the terms of his own faith, prophetic warnings: the wilfully optimistic, misled by false prophets,

"...did not attend, nor give credit, to the signs that were so

(12) by R.T.Herford, in Bevan and Singer, edd., The Legacy of Israel (Oxford, 1928 edn)119. On the following: Philo, in Flaccum; Legatio ad Gaium, esp.346ff, quoted in Eusebius h.e. II.v.; Claudius, Rescript to Alexandria (ET in M.Grant, Jews in the Roman World (London 1975) 135; Josephus II.ix; Acts xviii.2; Suetonius, Claudius 25.4.

evident, and did so plainly foretell their future desolation; but like men infatuated, without either eyes to see, or minds to consider, did not regard the denunciations that God made to them. Thus there was a star resembling a sword, which stood over the city, and a comet, that continued a whole year. Thus also before the Jews' rebellion, and before those commotions which preceded the war, when the people were come in great crowds to the feast of unleavened bread, on the eighth day of the month Xanthicus, and at the ninth hour of the night, so great a light shone around the altar and the holy house, that it appeared to be bright day-time; which ~~lasted light~~ ^{light lasted} for half an hour. This light seemed to be a good sign to the unskilful, but was so interpreted by the sacred scribes, as to portend those events that followed immediately upon it. At the same festival also, an heifer⁽¹³⁾, as she was led by the High Priest to be sacrificed, brought forth a lamb in the midst of the temple...Moreover, at that feast which we call Pentecost, as the chief priests were going by night in to the inner temple, as their custom was, to perform their sacred ~~ministrations~~ ^{ministrations}, they said that, in the first place, they felt a quaking, and heard a noise, and after that they heard a sound as of a great multitude, saying, 'Let us remove ~~hence~~'. But, what is still more terrible, there was one Jesus, the son of a plebeian and

(13) a symbol of the means of reconciliation with God: Numbers xix.1-10.

and a husbandman, who, four years before the war began, and at a time when the city was in very great peace and prosperity, came to that feast, whereon it is our custom for every one to make booths to God in the temple⁽¹⁴⁾, began to cry aloud, "A voice from the east, a voice from the west, a voice from the four winds, a voice against Jerusalem and the holy house, a voice against the bridegroom and the brides, and a voice against this whole people!".

(B.J. VI.V.3, ET Whiston alt.).

The attitude of the Jews to their own holy place and the other desperate behaviour provoked by the siege of Jerusalem (particularly the eating of her own child by Mary of Bethzob, (B.J. VI.iii.4), are represented as calling forth devout words from Titus - God's people justly rebuked by the holy pagan:

"Why do you trample upon dead bodies in this temple? - and why do you pollute this holy house with the blood of both foreigners and Jews themselves? I appeal to the gods of my own country, and to every god that ever had regard to this place (for I do not suppose it to be now regarded by any of them); I also appeal to my own army, and to those Jews that are now with me, and even to you yourselves, that I do not force you to defile this your sanctuary; and if you will but change the place whereon you will fight, no Roman shall either come near your sanctuary, or offer any affront to it; nay, I

(14) cf Nah.viii.16.

will endeavour to preserve you your holy house, whether you will or not".

(B.J. VI.ii.4).

"...for Caesar, he excused himself before God as to this matter, and said that he had proposed peace and liberty to the Jews, as well as an oblivion of all their former insolent practices; but that they, instead of concord, had chosen sedition; instead of peace, war; and before satiety and abundance, a famine. That they had begun to burn down that temple, which we have preserved hitherto; and that therefore they have deserved to eat such food as this was".

(B.J. VI.iii.5).

With almost icy detachment, Josephus touched on the devastating question posed by these events to all who revered the Temple: "...yet hath not its great antiquity, nor its vast riches, nor the diffusion of its nation over all the habitable earth, nor the greatness of the veneration paid to it on a religious account, been sufficient to preserve it from being destroyed" (B.J. VI.x.1).

This curt avowal of a personal and corporate faith tested well-nigh to breaking-point is matched by Josephus' portrayal of Titus' triumph; the humiliation of the Jewish people and the spoliation of their sanctuary are portrayed being dedicated to the gods of Rome. His uncritical, almost admiring, narrative is eloquent of the upheaval in his religious life, and gives an opportunity to infer how much more terrible the impact of these events must have been

on Jews who, without Josephus' powers of survival, had still to witness such scenes of pagan worship apparently victorious over their own:

"Vesparian...gave them a signal of silence. And when every body entirely held their peace, he stood up, and covering up the greatest part of his head with his cloak, he put up the accustomed solemn prayers; the like prayers did Titus put up also; after which prayers Vesparian made a short speech to all the people, and then sent away the soldiers to a dinner prepared for them by the Emperors. Then did he retire to that gate which was called the Gate of Pomp, because pompous shows do always go through that gate; there it was that they tasted some food, and when they had put on their triumphal garments, and had offered sacrifices to the gods that were placed at the gate, they sent the triumph forward...

...(among the scenes portrayed on the processional floats) was to be seen a happy country laid waste, and entire squadrons of enemies slain; while some of them ran away, and some were carried into captivity; with walls of great altitude and magnificence overthrown, and ruined by machines; with the strongest forifications taken, and the walls of most populous cities upon the tops of hills seized on, and an army pouring itself within the walls; as also every place full of slaughter, and supplications of the enemies, when they were no longer able to lift up their hands in way of opposition. Fire also sent upon temples was here represented, and houses overthrown,

and falling upon their owners; rivers also, after they come out of a large and melancholy desert, ran down, not into a land cultivated, nor as drink for men, or for cattle, but through a land still on fire on every side...

...for the other spoils, they were carried in great plenty. But for those that were taken in the temple of Jerusalem, they made the greatest figure of them all; that is the golden table, of the weight of many talents; the candlestick also, that was made of gold, though its construction were changed from that which we made use of; for its middle shaft was fixed upon a basis, and the small branches were produced out of it to a great length, having the likeness of a trident in their position, and had every one a socket made of brass for a lamp at the tops of them. These lamps were in number seven, and represented the dignity of the number Seven among the Jews; and the last of all the spoils, was carried the Law of the Jews.

After these spoils passed by a great many men, carrying the images of Victory, whose structure was entirely either of ivory, or of gold.

After which Vespasian marched in the first place, and Titus followed him; Domitian also rode along with him, and made a glorious appearance, and rode on a horse that was worthy of admiration.

Now the last part of this pompous show was at the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus, whither when they were come, they stood still; for it was the Romans' ancient custom to stay till

brought the news that the general of the enemy was slain. This general was Simon, the son of Gioras, who had then been led in this triumph among the captives; a rope had also been put upon his head, and he had been drawn into a proper place in the forum, and had withal been tormented by those that drew him along; and the law of the Romans required, that malefactors condemned to die should be slain there. Accordingly when it was related that there was an end of him, and all the people had set up a shout for joy, they then began to offer those sacrifices which they had consecrated, in the prayers used in such solemnities; which when they had finished, they went away to the palace...

After these triumphs were over, and after the affairs of the Romans were settled on the surest foundations, Vespasian resolved to build a temple to Peace, which he finished in so short a time, and in so glorious a manner, as was beyond all human expectation and opinion; for he having now by Providence a vast quantity of wealth, besides what he had gained in his other exploits, he had this temple adorned with pictures and statues; for in this temple were collected and deposited all such rarities as men aforesaid used to wander all over the habitable world to see, when they had a desire to see one of them after another: he also laid up therein those golden vessels and instruments that were taken out of the Jewish temple, as ensigns of his glory. But still he gave order that they should lay up their Law, and the purple veils of the holy place, in the royal palace itself, and keep them there".

(B.J. VII. v.4, 5, 5-7).

This report is cited at length as conveying more than any modern comment can of the devastating effect of these happenings upon the surviving Jews. Little need be added of the further slaughters in the time of Hadrian, for the events of 66-70 C.E. had produced what for the purpose of this investigation were the most significant effects - a gross deformation of Jewish liturgical life, and what has ever since seemed an irreversible division between Christians and Jews. Eusebius reports (h.e. III.v.3) that the Christians of Jerusalem had been warned by an oracle - one wonders if there is a reference to the Jesus who prophesied against Jerusalem and the Temple according to Josephus B.J. VI.v.3? - to leave Jerusalem before the war, and that they had therefore moved away to Pella in Peraea, the modern Fahl. Brandon's objection that such a move would have been impossible during the invasion, and that a more likely refuge would have been in Egypt⁽¹⁵⁾, is only cogent if we ignore Eusebius' plain statement that the move occurred before the outbreak of hostilities. Whether true or not, the statement itself may indeed have the two-fold function posited by Michael Grant⁽¹⁶⁾, namely, of reassuring ^{Romans} ~~Romans~~ that Christians were not involved in the rebellion of 66 C.E., and also of explaining what had happened to the Jerusalem Church. Another, more obvious yet not apparently previously considered, explanation for the currency of this report is that it represents the growth of a new centre of Christian activity and thought in Peraea, the emergence there of a Christian group that sought validation by a claim to continuity

(15) Brandon, Fall of Jerusalem, 118-75.

(16) Grant, Jews in the Roman Empire, 210.

with the church of the Holy City, the church of James the Lord's brother. It is often asserted⁽¹⁷⁾ that this move was resented by the Jews as an act of desertion, a not improbable view but one lacking specific supporting evidence. At least we may see the move (or at least the statement that it took place) as in part a distancing by Jewish Christians of themselves from Jewish nationalism.

Reference may usefully also be made at this point, nonetheless, to the Second Revolt and preceding events, for it brings into our field of vision two factors of lasting significance for this whole investigation: the mysterious history of the Alexandrian church, and the figure of Rabbi Akiba.

The traditions preserved by Eusebius as to the origins of the Alexandrian church (h.e. II. xvi-xvii, xxiv, III.xiv, xxi, IV.iv) have been dismissed as legendary - dismissed indeed, in too cavalier a fashion⁽¹⁸⁾, although his misreading of Philo's account of the Therapeutae from the work On the Contemplative Life is certainly a blunder. This apparent vacuum in early Church history was seized upon by Bauer, for whose anti-Roman theory it was very suitable to argue that the earliest Christianity in Alexandria was "gnostic" in character.⁽¹⁹⁾ That the church of Alexandria produced no giant like Irenaeus, Ignatius, Polycarp, or even a celebrity of lesser stature

(17) e.g. by Grant, Jews in the Roman Empire, 210.

(18) as by Brandon, Fall of Jerusalem, 168-173. Even Lüdemann, in his careful survey in Studies in Jewish and Christian Self-Definition, I, fails to consider that the Pella-flight story might be the tradition of a minority group.

(19) Orthodoxy and Heresy, ch.2

such as Hermas or Theophylus, does not of itself argue that Basilides and his like had a monopoly of the Christian name. The survey by C.H. Roberts of the surviving papyrus fragments from second-century Egypt⁽²⁰⁾ suggests both that the earliest Christianity in Egypt was mostly what later controversialists would have called "Catholic" and also that the earliest Christian community was more closely associated than some other contemporary churches with the neighbouring Jewish community, and shared with it the crushing reverses caused by pagan onslaughts in 115-47. Such an hypothesis would explain both the status in the earliest Egyptian Church of the Gospel of Matthew⁽²¹⁾, with its manifest Jewish interest, and also the concentration in Egypt, as will be noted later in this part of our investigation, of eccentric Christian groups whose peculiar preoccupations can be traced to the traumas of the emergence from Judaism of the still malleable Christian tradition.

The role of Akiba in the revolt of bar Kosiba, his supplying the rebel leader with his quasi-Messianic title 'bar Kochbar', his convinced anti-Christian stance (which bar Kosiba translated into inquisition and persecution, according to Justin Martyr, I Apol. xxix), and his martyrdom are well known; but it is significant for our present study to link these things with his special place in the history of mysticism.

(20) Manuscript, Society and Belief in Early Christian Egypt, London 1979.

(21) Brandon, Fall of Jerusalem, ch.12.

3. Jewish Liturgy and Prayer after the Destruction of the Temple and the Banishment of Jews from Jerusalem.

The cessation of the Temple cultus punched the core out of most of the festivals of the Jews - in theory, at least, for the Jews of the Diaspora must have accommodated themselves already to long absences from the Holy City: Yom Kippur and Pesah, to take the most acute examples, required a new rationale once the ashes of the red heifer were no more to be had and the paschal sacrifice in the temple was ended. These elements were not secondary or decorative, but of the divinely given essence of things:

Ἡ

γὰρ ψυχὴ πάσης σαρκὸς αἷμα αὐτοῦ ἐστὶ καὶ ἐγὼ δέδοκα αὐτὸ ὑμῖν ἐπὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου ἐξιλάσκεισθαι περὶ τῶν ψυχῶν ὑμῶν τὸ γὰρ αἷμα αὐτοῦ ἀντὶ ψυχῆς ἐξιλάσεται.

was there in plain sight in the Septuagint (Lev. xvii.11), for Jew and Gentile alike to see.

The synagogue service inevitably changed. On the most obvious level, the destruction of the Temple needed penitential remembrances: "On the 9th of Ab it was decreed against our fathers that they should not enter into the Land, and the Temple was destroyed the first and second time, and Beth Tor was captured and the City was ploughed up. When Ab comes in, gladness must be diminished" (Mishnah, Taanith 4.6, p.200 Danby). The table of calendrical precedence had to be rethought: "R. Eliezer says: Since the destruction of the Temple Pentecost is deemed to be like the Sabbath. Rabban Gamaliel says: The New Year and the Day of Atonement are deemed like to the Feasts. But the Sages say: It is not according to the opinion of either of them, but Pentecost

is (still) deemed like to a feast and the Day of Atonement like to the Sabbath" (Mishnah, Moed Katan 6.3, p.210 Danby). To replace the now impossible morning, afternoon, Sabbath and holy-day offerings, Mishnaic "Korbanoth" and other passages descriptive of these offerings were introduced into the daily prayers at appropriate times⁽²²⁾: "After the destruction of the Temple, said God unto Abraham, your children shall study the laws concerning sacrifices, and I will consider it as though they had actually offered them and will forgive their sins".

The period under discussion was one in which the synagogue seder called for freedom and creativity in those who voiced the prayers. Although the elements and structure of the services ~~was were~~ becoming uniform, the precise content of many elements was not fixed, but also deliberately and on principle left open to extemporisation. This meant that criteria had to be worked out by

(22) Idelsohn, Jewish Liturgy and its Development, New York ³1975, 26: b.Meg.31b; Taanith 27b; Menahoth 40a; Tanhuma, Tzav; Peikta da Rav Kohana 6; Yalkut 776; cf P.S.Goldberg, Karaite Liturgy, Manchester 1957, 2-4. Neusner, 'Map without Territory' (1979) urges caution: the sources are of no earlier than 3rd century date; apart from the fall of the Temple, there was a general move in late antiquity from concern with sacred place to concern with sacred man - e.g., from Eretz Israel to the people of Israel, who survive the loss of the land. And on the survival of Jerusalem worship after 70: Walker 1975.

which dangerous tendencies could be identified and stopped - hence the proscription of particular phrases, some of which we must notice shortly - but it also meant that Jewish worship was extremely sensitive to current religious thought and feeling. It is agreed⁽²³⁾, specifically, that a major influence on Synagogue prayer (more noticeably in Palestine and thus on the Ashkenazi rite than in Babylon and the Sephardi rite⁽²⁴⁾), after the cessation of Temple worship, and especially on the character and status of the Kedusha, was Merkabah mysticism, the search for the vision of the divine splendour, of which the central symbol was the throne (merkabah) of God. Prominent among the contemporary practitioners of this mysticism was Akiba.⁽²⁵⁾

The vision of the Lord seated upon his throne, with his royal robes filling the Temple, granted to the prophet Isaiah in the year of King Uzziah's death (Is.vi), is described by him as if it happened unsought. So it may have been; but there are already hints in earlier Jewish prophetic tradition - the apparently self-induced ecstasies ~~ecstasies~~ of the nabiim (I Sam. x.9.12 and xix.24, read in an ironic sense), the role of sacrifice (I Sam. xvi.2-3) and of music (I Sam. x.5, I Chron. xxv.3, II Kings iii.14-15) - that these moments of revelation were deliberately sought by the individual. Whatever alien examples

(23) Iserlohn 32.

(24) Zimmels, Ashkenazim and Sephardim (OUP 1958), Pt II, ch.3.

(25) G.Scholem, Jewish Gnosticism, etc. New York 1960, passim.

may have done to encourage Merkabah mysticism, the principle itself may be thought of as continuous with some ancient elements of Israelite prophecy. Some of the literature of the Merkabah technique is now being published⁽²⁶⁾, and studies of this area of spirituality are advancing rapidly. What most concerns the present investigation is to point out the awareness of Akiba, R. Johanan ben Zakkai and other practitioners of Merkabah technique of the dangers attendant upon this mystical quest and of its inherent theological ambiguity.⁽²⁷⁾

Of the four rabbis who 'entered Paradise' in course of this mystical quest, 'One saw and died, the second ~~saw and died~~, the ~~second~~ saw and lost his reason, the third laid waste the young plants. Only Rabbi Akiba entered in p^eace and came out in peace.'⁽²⁸⁾ The dangers warned of are essentially two-fold: danger to the mystic's survival and sanity, and danger to his spirituality, his orthodoxy, and his influence upon the younger generation ('the young plants'). Among the signs of the former danger,

(26) Scholem, Jewish Gnosticism, Appendix C.

(27) Maier, Gefährdungsmotiv (1963); Séd, 'Traditions secrètes' ((1973)).

(28) b.Hag 14^b, using ET in Scholem, On the Kabbalah and its Symbolism, New York 1969, 57.

R. Akiba singled out the vision of water. The latter kind of danger, exemplified by R. Elisha ben Abuya, who in his apostate condition was known as 'the stranger', Aher, is that of foundering upon the problem of good and evil, of divine justice in an unjust world, of being tempted to deny the uniqueness of God, to posit 'two powers in heaven'. G. Stroumsa^{sa} has helpfully gathered for English readers the evidence that Aher felt compelled to adopt a dualist stance: if God allows the virtuous to suffer as a result of virtuous acts, "Where is the 'good' of this one, his 'length of days'?"⁽³¹⁾ Later tradition spelled this out: "Aher thought that there are two powers, like the Magi, who speak about Ohrmuz and Ahriman, the source of good and the source of evil, the abode of light and the abode of darkness", according to R. Hai Gaon.⁽³²⁾

That these dangers were terribly real, no student of the history of religious enthusiasm can doubt.⁽³³⁾ It is not surprising

(31) Stroumsa, 'Aher: a Gnostic', in Layton, ed., Rediscovery of Gnosticism, Two, Leiden 1981, 809.

(32) Osar haGaonim, 4, ET in Stroumsa, *ibid.*

(33) cf Teresa of Avila, Interior Castle; Louis of Blois, Divine Meditations; A.Huxley, The Devils of Loudun; R.Knox, Enthusiasm.

that Akiba and others committed to the Merkabah quest were concerned to do more than utter warnings. In the best tradition of spiritual direction⁽³⁴⁾, they offered counter-measures. One of these, a 'ritual' defence, has been studied by Maier (1963) and especially by Séd (1973); the other has not, apparently, been recognized. Maier's excellent study of 'Das Gefährdungsmotiv bei der Himmelsreise in der jüdischen Apokalyptik and Gnosis'⁽³⁵⁾, after analyzing the concepts of spiritual threat used in b Hagiga and the Hekhalot, detected (N. 38-40) the development of ritual structure in the discipline recommended, but went no further. Nicolas Séd, in his sympathetic essay on 'Les traditions secrètes et les disciples de Rabban Yohanan ben Zakkai'⁽³⁶⁾, notes the importance of doctrinal succession, and asks why the succession is defined, not by masters teaching pupils, but by pupils expounding to masters. This calls for explanation, *and enquiry into the underlying* ~~and~~ ritual pattern of instruction here. At the crucial point, there is a liturgical principle of sequence, but it is not the usual didactic sequence of exposition and assimilation/questioning; because of the acute danger of the master going too fast for his pupil and destroying his entire spiritual life (even his sanity) by minute ambiguity, it is necessary at this stage for the pupil to expound to the master, before the

(34) cf., e.g., Scupoli, Spiritual Combat;
Harton, Elements of the Spiritual Life;
J.Chapman, Spiritual Letters.

(35) Kairos 5 (1963) 18-40.

(36) Revue de l'Histoire des Religions 184 (1973),
49-66.

master comments. He illustrates this sequence from the Jerusalem and Babylonian versions of Hagigah. The simpler (Jerusalem) version will suffice. (37)

"Once, Rabban Yohanan ben Zakkai was journeying, sitting on an ass. R. Eleazar ben Arak was following him. He said to him, 'Teach me a chapter of the Ma'aseh Merkabah'. He replied, 'Have not the wise taught you that the Ma'aseh Merkabah is not to be explained, lest the (pupil) is unwise and unable to learn by himself?'

(Eleazar) said to him, 'Rabbi, permit me to say something in your presence'. 'Say it', he replied.

When R. Eleazar ben Arak was on the point of expounding the Ma'aseh Merkabah, R. Yohanan ben Zakkai got down from the ass, saying, 'It is not fitting for me to listen to (words about) the glory of the Creator sitting on an ass'. They went and sat down under a tree.

Fire came down from heaven and surrounded them. Ministering angels disported about them, like wedding guests rejoicing before the bride-groom. One angel began to say, in the midst of the fire, 'As you are about to expound it, Eleazar ben Arak, even so is the Ma'aseh Merkabah'. At once the trees gave voice, and chanted the song, 'Let all the trees of the forest shout for joy'.

When Eleazar ben Arak had ended his discourse on the Ma'aseh

(37) from *Séd*, 1973, 57-8.

Merkabah, R. Yohanan ben Zakkai rose and kissed him on the forehead and said, 'Blessed be the LORD the God of Abraham and of Isaac and of Jacob, who has given our father Abraham a wise son, that of himself understands the glory of our Father who is in heaven. For, sometimes, one explains fittingly, but (the hearer) cannot put it into practice, and at other times he can put it fittingly into practice, but (the master) cannot explain it. Eleazar ben Arak explains fittingly, and knows how to put it into practice. Blessed are you, Abraham our father, to have Eleazar ben Arak among your progeny!'

This sensitivity to perilous topics of meditation was not confined to the intimate circles of the mystics. Even in the Mishnah we read (Hagigah 2.1, pp. 212-3 Danby): "The forbidden degrees may not be expounded before three persons, nor the story of Creation before two, nor the Merkabah before one alone, unless he is a Sage that understands of his own knowledge. Whoever gives his mind to four things it were better for him if he had not come into the world - What is above? What is beneath? What was beforetime? and what will be hereafter? And whosoever takes no thought for the honour of his Maker, it were better for him if he had not come into the world".

The other counter-measure is psychological rather than procedural. The chosen title of the Merkabah mystics was "Yoredei Merkabah," those who descend to the chariot/throne."⁽³⁸⁾ This is

(38) See Séd, 1973, 51.

used in preference to an image of 'rising', certainly used later⁽³⁹⁾, and also, of course, used earlier by Paul the apostle (II Cor. xii.

2-3: ἀρπαγέντα ἕως τρίτου οὐρανοῦ --- εἴτε ἐν σώματι εἴτε χωρὶς τοῦ σώματος οὐκ οἶδα, ὁ θεὸς οἶδεν

The image of the mystical quest as descent - as it were, sinking into oneself - is used by Akiba⁽⁴⁰⁾ with remarkable persistence. Conjecture is hazardous, but this striking choice of terminology asks for some explanation, however tentative. The suggestion here is that the image of ascent, with its obvious psychological overtones of achievement and mastery, proved too heady for any but the most humble, whereas the image of descending into oneself served both to humble and to warn the mystic, and no less to remind him that all his perceptions were still inward, subjective, and creaturely.

All these signs of caution point to a danger that was not remote, and, indeed, also to a body of dangerous practice that had grown up and needed guarding against. A heady mysticism of ascending into the heavens, defying danger on the way, and perhaps expecting to arrive at a vantage-point superior to that of the Creator, leaving one with a sense of being an alien in this fallen and ignorant world of fallen and ignorant people, if traces of such a

(39) e.g. by Rashi: Scholem, Jewish Gnosticism, 101.

(40) See Scholem ch.IV.

a thing could be found, would explain the warnings of Akiba and Yohanan and the others.

In an already ancient example of a mysticism of this very sort it is possible to distinguish the driving forces (concern with the problem of evil, vividness of metaphor) that made such a tradition so compelling and at the same time so perilous. In the oldest stratum⁽⁴¹⁾ of the Book of Enoch (xiv. 8-24, ET Charles 41-2), carefully described as the content of a dream (xiv.1), we find:

"Behold, in the vision clouds invited me and a mist summoned me, and the course of the stars and the lightnings sped and hastened me, and the winds in the vision caused me to fly and lifted me upward, and bore me into heaven. And I went in till I drew nigh to a wall which is built of crystals and surrounded by tongues of fire: and it began to affright me. And I went into the tongues of fire and drew nigh to a large house which was built of crystals: and the walls of the house were like a tessellated floor (made) of crystals, and its groundwork was of crystal. Its ceiling was like the path of the stars and the lightnings, and between them were fiery cherubim, and their heaven was (clear as) water. A flaming fire surrounded the walls, and its portal blazed with fire. And I entered into that house, and it was hot as fire and cold as ice: there were no delights of life therein: fear covered me, and trembling got hold upon me. And as I quaked

(41) Perhaps pre-Maccabaeon; discussion summed up by Oesterley in his introduction to ET in Charles, ed., Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament, II (Edinburgh 1917),

and trembled, I fell upon my face. And I beheld a vision, and lo! there was a second house greater than the former, and the entire portal stood open before me, and it was built of flames of fire. And in every respect it so excelled in splendour and magnificence and extent that I cannot describe to you its splendour and its extent. And its floor was of fire, and above it were lightning and the path of stars, and its ceiling also was flaming fire. And I looked and saw a lofty throne: its appearance was as crystal, and ~~the~~ ^{the} wheels thereof as the shining sun, and there was the vision (?) of the cherubim. And from underneath the throne came streams of flaming fire so that I could not look thereon. And the Great Glory sat thereon, and his raiment shone more brightly than the sun, and whiter than any snow. None of the angels could enter and could behold his face by reason of the magnificence and glory, and no flesh could behold him. The flaming fire was round about him, and a great fire stood before him, and none around could draw nigh him: ~~the~~ ^{ten} thousand times ten thousand (stood) before him, yet he needed no counsellor. And the most holy ones who were nigh to him did not leave by night nor depart from him. And until then I had been prostrate on my face, trembling: and the Lord called me with his own mouth, and said to me: 'Come hither, Enoch, and hear my word'."

In the same tradition, though now with the presumption that the vision of the divine Splendour needs to be, and may be, sought by deliberate means, is the Nag Hammadi tractate VII/5, The Three

Steles of Seth.⁽⁴²⁾ This book declares itself from the outset to be a Jewish book⁽⁴³⁾, and specifically a product of esoteric rather than of "normative" Judaism: "The revelation of Desitheus" (C.G. VII. 118:10), "which he saw and understood" (VII. 118:13-14). We therefore read the sub-title, "about the three steles of Seth, the Father of the living and unshakable race" as having nothing to do with any supposed "Sethian" cult, school, or group; it simply lays claim to a theologoumenon on the spiritual life current in some Jewish esoteric debate.⁽⁴⁴⁾

The recipients of this privileged information regard themselves as "the elect" (118:18); they are akin to the divine, more particularly as the divine is conceived as the archetype of humanity, Geradamas (118:26-119 end); but this is not enough to ensure direct personal knowledge of the divine - that depends on the divine goodness (119:18), power (120:16) shown in salvation (120:34, 121:2-3, 121:12.13, 123:15-16, 124:1, 125:13, 125.14, 125.16-17, 125.19-21, 126.24, 126.30-31 - the terminology of "salvation" is at the heart of this

(42) using ET of Robinson and Wisse in NHLE 362-7, compared with GT of Berliner Arbeitskreis in TLZ 100 (1973) 571-4.

(43) The mystical names include Greek forms: Mirotheos, Senaon, Optaon, Elamaon, Emouniar, Aphredon, Armedon, Antitheus include at least three such; but they are also no less 'Jewish' than 'Metatron.' The Berlin group (572) note an Egyptian quality in 'Emmacha' (118:29); no continuity with the Egyptian Set can be established, but an Egyptian-Hellenistic milieu is indicated.

(44) The data assembled by Klijn and Reininck, Seth in Jewish, Christian and Gnostic Literature (1977) preclude the assumption that there was a distinct and consistent 'Sethian' system, vs the suggestions of Schenke in P.Nagel, ed., Studia Coptica, 1974.

S

spirituality). Salvation is the bestowal of power otherwise denied; power that brings every aspect of deity to bear upon the mystic:

"I bless his power which was given to me,
who caused the malenesses that really are to become male three
times,
who was divided into the pentad,
the one who was given to us in triple power,
the one who was begotten unconceived,
the one who came forth from what is select;
because of what is humble, he went forth in the midst".

(120; 16-26).

"For their sake (= those of the one, 122:16),
thou hast empowered the eternal in being;
thou hast empowered in divinity in living;
thou hast empowered the shadows which pour from the one.
Thou hast empowered this (one) in knowing;
thou hast empowered another one in creating;
Thou hast empowered him who is equal, and him who is not equal,
him who is similar, and him who is not similar...

(122: 18-30).

At the height of vision, the sense of this power as utter gift is intense: it is not the property of the visionary, but keenly felt as a gracious gift. At this stage, the seeker realizes both that his acquisition of knowledge by means of praise is a response to his being already saved, but now also an admission of a newly realized need and an even more longing plea for the state of salvation:

"As what shall we bless thee?

We are not empowered.

But we give thanks, as being humble toward thee.

For thou hast commanded us, as he who is elect,
to glorify thee to the extent that we are able.

We bless thee, for we were saved. Always we glorify thee.

For this reason we shall glorify thee, that we may be saved

to eternal salvation.

We have blessed thee, for we are empowered.

We have been saved, for thou hast willed always that we should

do this.

(126:18-32, ET Robinson).

The saving vision of the divine, the supreme gift, may be sought, and that by ritual means. Several lines on p.127 of Codex VII have been described⁽⁴⁶⁾ as "rubrics", and this is not inept: "...they all bless thee individually and together" (127:11-12).

places the tractate (interestingly and unusually) in two contexts often kept separate - personal devotion and corporate liturgy. "And afterwards they shall be silent" (127:13-14) seems to apply to both uses; the prescribed silence is no doubt for the sake of reverence, as modern readers naturally assume, but also has apotropaic overtones,

(46) by the Berlin Group; cf n.42.

for in this setting $\sigma\upsilon\eta\sigma\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega$ $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha$ $\sigma\acute{\alpha}\rho\xi$ (47), and even more importantly, is itself a kinship with the divine⁽⁴⁸⁾, although these aspects are not made explicit in The Three Steles of Seth. "And just as they were ordained, they ascend" (127:14-15)

appears to refer not to a stage of ritual after the silence, nor to inner experiences in the silence; rather, there is a suggestion that, even in a corporate exercise, the individual experiences will differ greatly from one to another. The awareness of this may hinder and humiliate the less advanced, and trap the more advanced with pride; all are therefore reminded that their varied degrees of inward exaltation vary only as God appoints, and perhaps also that the shared silence may be an act of fellowship reconciling those of differing attainments. Lines 16-17, "After the silence, they descend", show that the first reference to silence does not refer to the closing stages of the proceedings, but to their central part: "bless" is both the prayer and its fruit in vision, and it is at the high point⁽⁴⁹⁾ that silence is kept. The mystics must come down from that high point, and the same technique is used, though now in reverse, for that descent to

(47) from the Liturgy of St James (in F.E. Brightman, ed., Liturgies Eastern and Western, I (OUP 1896), 41:15.

(48) cf Ignatius of Antioch, Ephesians vi.1: 'And the more anyone see that the bishop is silent, the more let him fear him. For every one whom the master of the house sends to do his business ought we to receive as him who sent him. It is clear that we must regard the bishop therefore as the Lord himself.'

(49) '...zwischen dem ersten und zweiten Beten des 3. Gebetes hat man sich als eigentlichen Zweck der Liturgie die schweigende Gottesschau vorzustellen': so K.Wekel in TLZ 100 (1973) 571.

be achieved in safety. "After the silence they descend. From the third they bless the second; after these the first. The way of ascent is the way of descent" (127:20-1). In terms of external observance, this clearly means that the three sections of the tractate are recited as mystical doxologies, first in 'ascending', then in 'descending' (reverse) order.

Each of the three doxologies, one on each of the "Steles", is essentially pure praise, though a petitionary element comes in.

Thus, in the "First Stele" (118:24-121:19), we find

"I bless thee" (118.25-6)

119.4.5

I bless thee as God 119:13-14

I bless thy divinity 119:15

I shall utter thy name 119.20

by mind thou art glorified. 119.19-20

I bless his power 120.15

We bless thee, Thrice Male. 120.29

We bless Thee eternally 121.1.

We bless, thee, once we have been saved. 121.2-3.

Thou art perfect, thou art perfect, thou art perfect. 121.14-16.

From the "Second Stele" (121.19-124.16):

"Great is the first aeon" (121.20)

"We bless thee, producer of perfection"

(121.4-5).

"Thou hast heard! Thou hast heard!

Thou hast saved! Thou hast saved!

"We give thanks! We bless always! We
shall glorify thee" (124.10-14).

In the "Third Stele" (124.17-126? - text damaged):

"We rejoice! We rejoice! We rejoice"
(124.18).

"We bless thee, non-being..."
(124.25-26).

"We all bless thee, knower" (124.34).

"How shall we give thee a name? We
do not have it" (125.26).

"As what shall we bless thee?" (126.18).

"We give thanks, as being humble
toward thee" (126.19-20).

"We bless, for we are saved" (126.24).

"Always we glorify thee" (126.25-6).

"...we shall glorify thee..."
(126. 26-27).

"We have blessed thee..." (126.19).

It is clear from the frequent occurrence of terms of praise, thanksgiving and exultation that these elements are not accompaniments of the mystical process, but its very essence.

Progress in the saving work of praising is due to the divine graciousness, which makes possible by the divine command what otherwise the creature could not do:

"Present a command to us to see thee, so that we may be saved.

Knowledge of thee, it is the Salvation of us all. Present a
command!

When thou dost command, we have been saved!"

(125:11-15).

The doctrine of godhead is presented in strongly triadic form, but so as to return repeatedly to assertions of the divine unity:

"I bless his power which was given to me,
who caused the malenesses that really are to become male three
times,
who was divided into the pentad,
the one who was given us in triple power..."

(120:16-22).

"We bless thee, thrice male,
for thou didst unite the all through them all..."

(120:29-30, cf. 121:8-9).

"Thou art perfect! Thou art perfect! Thou art perfect!"

(121:14-16).

Thus much in the First Stele; in the second we find:

"We bless thee, Lady that-bringest-to-perfection⁽⁴⁹⁾, and
givest aeons;

Thou hast seen the eternal ones, that they are from a shadow.

And thou hast become numerable.

(49^a) There is a devotional tone caught by the GT, 'Erzeugerin, Schöpferin' - and an irony - that the ET has to forfeit.

And thou didst find, thou didst continue being one Lady;
yet becoming numerable in division, thou art three-fold.
Thou art truly thrice, thou one (fem.) of the one (masc.)..."
(122:4-13).

"Fatherly God, divine child,
begetter of multiplicity according to a division of all who
really are,

thou (masc.) hast appeared to them all in a word.

And ^{thou} ~~then~~ (masc.) ^{dost} ~~doest~~ possess them all unconceived

and eternally indestructible on account of thee (fem.).

Salvation has come to us; from thee is salvation.

Thou art wisdom, thou art knowledge; thou art truthfulness.

On account of thee is life; from thee is life.

On account of thee is mind; from thee is mind.

Thou art a mind, thou a world of truthfulness,

thou a triple power, thou threefold.

Truly thou art thrice, the aeon of aeons...

But the first divisions are as thou wast divided.

Unite us as thou hast been united".

(123:6.26, 29-31).

Similarly, but more succinctly and confidently, in the third

Stele:

"We bless thee,

non-being, existence which is before existence, first being

which is before beings,

Father of divinity and life,
creator of mind, giver of good, giver of blessedness!"

(124:25-33).

"Thou art one, thou art one,
just as there is one we will say to thee,
'Thou art one, thou a single living spirit'.

How shall we give thee a name? We do not have it.

For thou art the existence of them all; thou art the life of
them all; thou art the mind of them all..."

(125:23-32).

The doxological use of a tripartite formula is strongly reminiscent of the three-fold qds^v of Isaiah vi, and can hardly fail to be continuous with use of the Qedusha in earlier Jewish Merkabah mysticism. Its use here also resolves a theological and spiritual tension, by enabling the mystics both to rejoice in the multiplicity of the manifestations and apprehensions of the divine (roughly grouped: God's kinship with humanity, the "sacred Adam" imagery; God's tenderness, the "life-giving Maiden" imagery; the sovereign Father), and also triumphantly to assert the divine unity. God is one, and good, and the good Creator; and creation is good, a multifarious reflection of creating goodness.

The affirmation of unity includes a solution to philosophy's problem of the One and the Many, but goes far beyond it, unifying the divided self of the mystic and creating a unity in the fellowship of mystics which mirrors the divine unity. The masculine and the feminine elements of reality are one, and, although this

mystical writer moves in a milieu where one knows that other people posit a fundamental dualism of "male" and "female", such a dualism is overcome here. This is perhaps one aspect of the strength derived from this mystical practice by those who share the quest of the perfect: "He who will remember these and give glory always will become perfect among those who are perfect, and unattainable from any quarter" (127.6-11:

(Coptic not available)

- we are not yet at a formula for defence of the soul after death against the angels that beset the way, but the basic idea of all-round supernatural protection is already present.

In The Three Steles of Seth, then, we have a document of Jewish "Throne"-mysticism, a liturgy, for use in a circle of mystics on earth, which affords access to the heavenly realm, ascent through it to the climactic vision, and then safe return to normality and egress from the celestial. It is rooted in the Jewish traditions that use the typology of Seth and his stelai, adding a third to the traditional two⁽⁵⁰⁾ to match the pattern of the Qedusha. The mystical names reflect a Hellenistic, perhaps also Egyptian-Hellenistic, milieu⁽⁵¹⁾; but we are still in the ambience of a Jewish monotheism.

Our placing of The Three Steles of Seth enables us to do the same for two further documents from the Nag Hammadi collection,

(50) cf n.43. *The longer form*

(51) No real parallel with the 'identification'-formulae of P.Caernarfon, Cairo 45060, vs Berliner Arbeits-Kreis, 573: the formulae of StelSeth are doxological, not identificatory; there is no suggestion, vs Wekel, op cit 574, that Seth is a cult god.

Allogenes (C.G. XI/3) and Marsanes (C.G. X/1).

C.G. XI/3 (XI, 45:1-69:20) is clearly an apocalypse, with the colophon "Al(1)ogenes" (69:20), and a concluding exhortation to "my son Messos" (68:24-69:19). The identity of the book with the apocalypse Ἀλλογενούς καὶ Μεσσοῦ (52), among others, mentioned by Porphyry (vita Plotini xvi) and with the βίβλους ἑτέρας Ἀλλογενούς treasured by the Sethians of Epiphanius (haer. 39.5.1), which these details of the book make certain, will concern this investigation again at a later point. The apparent contradiction between the singular and plural of "Stranger" is resolved by the tradition, preserved by the Archontics (haer. 40.7.1-2), that Seth was called Ἀλλογενῆς and his sons Ἀλλογενεῖς. (53)

Allogenes portrays the elect revealer as taken up in an ascent to vision:

"When (I) was taken by the eternal light
out of the garment that was upon me,
and taken up to a holy place
whose likeness cannot be revealed in the world,
then by means of a great blessedness
I saw all those about whom I had heard.
And I praised all of them.
and I (stood) above my knowledge

(52) preferring the longer form (double sigma), with Puech and P.Henry, vs Armstrong.

(53) Baur, christliche Gnosis, 201; Hort, DCB I.86.

and (inclined to) the knowledge (of) the Totalities,
the Aeon of Barbelo".

(58:26-59:3).

The garment laid aside is the flesh, human limitation, as in
50:9-10, which cannot hinder lesser revelations. (There is no
suggestion of ritual unclothing). There is no doubt here that he
is *Χωρίς τοῦ σώματος* (II Cor. xii.3).

Although there is little development to be traced in the content
of the six revelations recounted, beyond perhaps a shift of emphasis
away from the triple nature of the Triple Power (47:7-49:38) to the
Unity of Existence (62:28-63:82) there is an appreciable development
in the causality of the revelation experience. The first five^(53^a) are
attended by Youel ("Jah is God"), who touches⁽⁵⁴⁾ Allogenes to
signalise a gift of power already ~~bestowed~~ ^{bestowed} on him "which the Father
of the All, the Eternal put upon you before you came to this place,
in order that those things that are difficult to distinguish you
might distinguish and those things that are unknown to the multitude
you might know, and that you might escape in safety to the One who
is yours, who was first to save and who does not need to be saved"

(53^a) I.e.: 45: 26-50:17; 50:17-52:12; 52:12-55:16;
55:16-30; 55:30-58:6.

(54) an anointing ?

(50:26-36). During the sixth revelation⁽⁵⁵⁾, Youel does not appear, although she snatched out of the body (58:26-59:3) already in converse with the powers previously beheld, and they advise him to ascend by means of self-knowledge (59:40-60:18).

Youel, preparing to expound during one revelation, is moved by hearing the Triple Power snore (!) in its perfect rest (53:32-37), is moved to a hymn of praise:

"...but thou art

...Solmis (=?) !

...according to the Vitality that is thine,
and the first Energy from whom divinity derives.

Thou art great, Armedon!

Thou art perfect, Epiphaneus!

And according to that Energy of thine,

the second power and the Mentality from whom all bliss

derives -

(Autoer! Beritheus!

Erigenaor! Orimenios!

Aramen! Aphleges!

Elელიoupheus! (L)alameus!

Yetheus! Noetheus!) -

(55) = 58:7-67:end; not a wholly different scene,
vs Wire, NHLE 443.

thou art great! He who knows (thee) knows the All!

Thou art One, thou art One,

He who is good. Aphredon!

Thou art the Aeon of Aeons,

He who is perpetually!"

(So far, presumably, addressing the Triple Power under three distinct aspects, for)

"Then she praised the Entire One, saying,

Lalameus! No(eth)eus! Senaon!

Asine(us ! ...)riphanios! Mellephanens!

Elemaoni! Smoun! Optaon!

He who is!

Thou art he who is, the Aeon of Aeons,

the Unbegotten, who art higher than the unbegotten,

- Yatomenos! -

thou alone for whom all the unborn ones were begotten,

the Unnameable One...knowledge".

(54: 6-55:11).

There may be some suggestion here of knowledge-by-adoration, but the heavy use of the language of Hellenistic-Jewish magic makes this hard to interpret.

At all events, Allogenes does not join in this hymn. He prays for fuller revelation (55:31-2). Before the ultimate vision he praises the Powers (58:37-38), but after it he is reduced to plain statement. There are no formulae for this ascent: it is a gift. At the last, even when power to stand is needed, there are no prayers or other formulae to say, for Allogenes must purely know himself:

"...behold your blessedness in the manner that exists in silence, wherein you know yourself as you are, and, seeking yourself, ascend to the vitality that you will see moving" (59:9-16). Truly to know is not to know - "I was seeking the ineffable and Unknown God, whom if one should know completely one would be ignorant of him, the mediator of the Triple Power who subsists in stillness and silence and is unknown" (61:14-22). "Cease hindering the inactivity that exists in you" (61:28-29).

The recipient of the revelations is addressed throughout as "Allogenes". From the closing paragraph (p.68), we learn that he is not the scribe, who is the father of Messos. The opening paragraph, now lost, may just have given the scribe a name (Seth?). The purpose, if any, of a Rahmengesichte format here must remain unknown without that information; it probably does no more than suggest an atmosphere of remote and venerable tradition, but it might just conceivably have indicated the adoption of this apocalypse by some group other than its originators.

The mystical tractate Marsanes is comparable with this book, but there are significant differences. Although there is an ascent to a mystical vision (C.G.X, 16:20ff), it occurs only after the Spirit - the tractate is too fragmentary to say confidently who this "Spirit" is in relation to the Triple Power - has descended (X, 6:2ff) and then run upward again (X, 9:29ff), so that the soul's mystical ascent is an imitation or accompaniment of the Spirit. The centre of interest has shifted from a contemplation of the divine glory to a comprehension of the mysteries of

creation (X, 21-39). Of Jewish origin, however, or at least in sympathy with Judaism, is the promise that the dangers of the ascent are restrained by God's mercy, and that ethical considerations are paramount:

Α]Υ

...they

ΕΝΤῪ ΖῪ ΟΥΡΗΤ ΕΥΤ[Ο]ΥΒΗΥ

found him with a pure heart,

ΕΝΣΕΡΑΚΙ ΕΝ ἸΤΟΟ[Τ]Ὺ

they are not afflicted by him

ἸΖΜΠΕΘ[Α]Υ· ΝΕΝΤΑ[Υ]ΧΙ

with evils. Those who have received

ΤΗΝΕ ΣΕΝΔ+Υ ΝΕΥ Ἰ[Π]ΟΥ

you will be given their

ΒΕΚΕ ΕΥΣΑΤῪ ΕΤΒ[Ε] ΟΥ

choice reward for

ΖΥΠΟΜΟΝΗ ΔΥΩ ΥΝΑ

endurance and he will

ῪΑΝΕΧΕ ΖΗΤΟΥ Ἰ[ἸΠΕ]

ward off from them the

ΘΔΥ· ΜΝΤΡΕΛΑΔΔΥ[Ε ΔΕ Ἰ]

evils. But let none of us

ΖΗΤῪ ῪΛΥΠΕΙΣΘΑ[Ι ΔΥΩ]

be distressed and

ΜΝΤΡΕΥ ΜΕΕΥ[Ε ΖῪ Π]ΕΥ

think in his

ῥητ̄ ἄε ἑρ̄απ̄ [...]

heart that...

ἡ̄γι π̄νᾱς ἡ̄ε[ι]ωτ̄ ἑ[ρω]

...the Great Father;

ὤτ̄ γαρ̄ ἀσ̄μ̄ π̄τηρ̄ ἑ[ρω]

for he looks upon the All and

ἑ̄χι ἡ̄πο̄υρᾱσ̄ω τ̄η[ρω].

cares for them all.

(C.G. X,1: 11-25, 252-3 ^{Pearson} ~~Persian~~).

The name "Gamaliel" appears (X,64:19), another Jewish feature. In its entirety, however, the tractate seems to belong outside Judaism⁽⁵⁷⁾, and in this investigation will be considered in relation to the Peratae.⁽⁵⁸⁾

4. Jewish Liturgical Responses to "Minuth".

Changes made in synagogue worship in the first two centuries of the Christian era were caused not only by the loss of the Temple but also by pressures from minim. Exactly what the offence of minuth was that qualified persons as minim is not clear. Before 135 A.D., the category seems to include only heterodox Jews, but later came

(57) Note Pearson (1978) on Marsanes as a Platonist document.

(58) see pp.368-72.

to cover a wider variety of opponents or corrupters of rabbinic Judaism.⁽⁵⁹⁾ One very obvious change was the inclusion in the Amidah of a special prayer against such persons, the Birkat ha-minim, perhaps designed as a liturgical-doctrinal test.⁽⁶⁰⁾

Another change was the abandonment of the recitation of the Decalogue "because of the carping of the Minim".⁽⁶¹⁾ It has been suggested that this "carping" was the use of the Decalogue in Christian-Jewish synagogues⁽⁶²⁾, but Buchler⁽⁶³⁾ is probably nearer to the mark when he suggests that the "carping" was the argument of several groups that the Torah was not uniformly inspired and that the Decalogue was one of the passages more truly inspired than the rest.

Changes in the rite for making proselytes may be more significant. Instead of a concentration on the Decalogue in the final instructions before the Mikveh, we find concentration on other, seemingly minor, aspects of the Jewish Law, particularly

(59) cf. Iserlohn, 30

(60) Herford, Christianity in Talmud and Midrash 125-36.

(61) b.Ber.12^a; other texts in Herford, 308-15.

(62) Coulter in Classical Philology 35 (1940) 60-3

(63) Buchler, Studies in Jewish History (London 1965) 273.

the rule on leaving the corner of the field unreaped. The proselyte is to be warned off, because Jews are inevitably to expect persecution, and after the bath he is to be reminded forcibly of the exclusive position of the Jews:

"If (the proselyte) has taken upon himself (the Law), then he must be takendown to the bath-house (לבת-הטבילה). While the water covers him up to the loins, some particular points of the commandments shall be repeated to him: (he may become a Jew only) on condition that he observe the forgotten sheaf (Deut. xxiv.19), the second gathering and the corner of the field (Lev. xix.19), and the ^{tithe} ~~tithe~~ (for the poor, Deut. xxvi.12ff). As that is said to a man, so to a woman must be said: (She may become a Jewess only) on condition that she is conscientious about the Rule (of removing the leaven) and the lighting of the candles (Sabbath-eve, Hannukah).

Then he is dipped and brought up, then friendly and encouraging words are to be said to him: To whom have you committed yourself? Salvation be yours! To him who by his word created the world! For only for Israel's sake has the world been created! It is only the Israelites who are called God's children! Only the Israelites does God love! And all that we have said to you, we have caused you to remember, only to make greater your reward!"

(Gerim, after Polster⁽⁶³⁾).

(63) G.Polster, 'Der kleine Talmudtraktat über die Proselyten', AGGELOS 2/1 (1920) 1-38; see 3-4. cf Slotki, Yebamoth (London 1936) 298-314.

There is a new emphasis on the isolation of the Jews (persecution, divine favour); there is a new emphasis on the laws of generosity that counter-act the conventional Gentile slanders - and there is avoidance of the singling-out of the Decalogue which continues in Christian use of "proselyte-baptism", such as will be seen in the Didache.⁽⁶⁴⁾

Some of the changes in the synagogue prayers and regulations may have a reference, then, to Christians. Mishnah Megillah iv.8-9 condemns the ambition to go before the Ark in coloured garments or in sandals, the wearing of a round tephillin or wearing it on the forehead or the palm of the hand - there may just be references to the words of Jesus⁽⁶⁵⁾ here - the wearing of a gold tefillin or placing it on the robe (no Christian reference), and "if one say, 'The good shall bless thee', lo, this is the way of Minuth. (If one say), 'Thy mercies reach to the nest of the bird', 'Let thy name be remembered for good', 'We praise, we praise', they silence him". "The good shall praise thee" has been taken to mean that there is no hope for sinners, but may be a covert acknowledgement of Gentile fellow-believers; the "nest of the bird" is distinctly reminiscent of Jesus' words on the sparrow⁽⁶⁶⁾; "Let thy name be remembered" is

(64) Didache i-vi. General disussions:- Jeremias, 'Proselytentaufe und Neues Testament', ThZ 5/6 (1949) 418-28; Torrance, 'Proselyte Baptism', NTS I/1 (Oct 1954) 150-4.

(65) cf Matthew xxiii.5.

(66) Matthew x.29/Luke xii.6-7.

likewise reminiscent of εἰς τὴν ἑμὴν ἀνάμνησιν in the Institution Narrative; and perhaps "We praise, we praise" may indicate an association of the Lord Jesus with the praise offered to Adonai.⁽⁶⁷⁾

The Birkat-ha-minim, however, seems to be of wider reference. It included the words, "That castest down the proud" (j. Ber. 9c, see also b. Ber. 28b-29a, b. Meg. 17b). Its omission was one, but only one, of the signs of Minuth (j. Ber. 9c). It ought to be linked, however, not so much with the Christians as with those who worship the powers in heaven (b. Sanh. 38b) - and this is to be linked, not with the Christians, but with those whose preoccupation with mysticism had led them into dualism. The classic case of one who had thus fallen is that of Aher, the Alien (Allogenes), Elisha ben Abuyah; the compassionate account of him in the Babylonian Talmud⁽⁶⁸⁾ depicts a man who had thus been led astray, and felt incapable of repenting, though he wished to. A prayer in the later Sephardi liturgy⁽⁶⁹⁾ preserves the underlying motive: aspiration to divine mysteries was perilous, and the dangers of pride call for divine protection.

(67) Herford 202-3.

(68) excerpted by Stroumsa, as in n.31.

(69) S.Gaon, ed., Book of Prayer of the Spanish and Portuguese Jews' Congregation, London, I (London 1980), 146: 'As we attempt to leap towards thee, but cannot touch thee...'

4. Peratae-Naassenes-Ophites: an Ordering of the Material.

It will next be argued that an analysis of certain patristic sources makes possible a tentative reconstruction of a group of liturgical traditions detectable behind those accounts and some of the texts recovered through the Nag Hammadi find, traditions which are related with one another and may credibly be interpreted as derivatives from Jewish-Christian liturgy as affected by the tensions experienced by Christians who were also Jews during the difficult years of the separation of the two faith-communities, and also influenced by Jewish Merkabah mysticism. Since the immediate contexts of the sources belong to different times and places (all of them late in the history of the developments detected), it will be necessary to survey some of the material twice, first detached from and then within their chronological order.

(a) Justin the Gnostic and the Fifth Book of the Refutation.

The fifth book of The Refutation of All Heresies is devoted to four subjects: the Naassenes, or self-styled "Gnostics" (V. 6-11); the Peratae, founded by Euphrates the Peratic and Celbes the Carystian, a group that, as the Refutator observes, has hitherto remained in obscurity (V. 12-17); the 'Sithians', as he calls them (V. 19-22); and Justin the Gnostic, with whom is associated the book Baruch (V.23-28).

The grouping together of these four heresies is not solely done for the sake of forming a conveniently sized volume. They have much in common: a triadic theological system (Naassenes, V.8.1-4 ; Peratae, V. 12.1-7, 17.1-2; 'Sithians', V.19.1-12; Justin, V.26. 1-2) and similar cosmological ideas.⁽¹⁾ They share a policy of

(1) cf Gass, 'Ophiten' in Herzog REPTK 1858; Müller, 'Peraten', ibid. 1859.

wide-ranging syncretistic interpretation of Jewish, Christian and pagan rites, literature and traditions: thus the Naassenes claim links with James and Mariamne (V.7.1) but also with Barbarians and Greeks (V.7.1-2, 7.3-6), and unique understanding of the religions of Assyria (7.15) and Phrygia (7.20). The Peratae, it seems, are less ambitious, and plagiarise the Chaldaeans (V.13) and other astrologers (V.14). The 'Sithians' imitate the mysteries of Eleusis (V.20. 4-5) and of the Great Mother (20.5-8). Justin has syncretistic interpretations to offer of Hercules, Babel/Venus (26.20, 26.26-28), of Priapus (V. 26-32) and of Zeus (V. 26-32). They share also a preoccupation with sexual imagery and themes: in the account of the Naassenes, there is mention of Adonis and Venus (V. 7,4-13), of the evil nature of sexuality (7.14, 8.33, 9.11), of Attis (7.15), of unnatural affection (7. 17-18), of Mercury as a priapic figure (7.29, 8.10), of generation (7.39-40), of the Samothracian mysteries as priapic (8. 9-12), of Jesus at the Cana wedding to symbolise fertility (8.7), of fruitfulness (8.31-8), and of emasculation (8.40); while the Peratae dwell upon hermaphroditism (14.3, 14.10), on Kronos as a symbol of generation (16.1-2), on generation itself as corruptible or incorruptible (17.4), on Eve as the Mother (16. 12-13), the Sithians assert that the creating Powers perform coitus, detest the womb as evil (19. 19-21), are fascinated also by priapic imagery (20. 6-7) and that of commingling (21. 1-6); and Justin has an interest in the sexual aspects of Heracles (25. 2-3), of Ed^em and Elohim (26.2); of Naas, Eve and Adam (26. 22-3), of Naas' designs upon Jesus (26.31), of Priapus (26. 32-3) and of the

loves of Zeus (26. 34-5). All of them, finally, share a further preoccupation - with mystery-rites, and in particular with their secret nature and with their provision for advance from lower grades to higher. The language of mystery is found in all four accounts (Naassenes, V.7.1, 8.39, 8.40, 8.42, 9.6, 9.22, Peratae, 17.13; Sithians, 20. 4-6; Justin, 24.1, 24.2, 27.2, 27.4).

In his important study, Hippolyts Ketzerbekämpfung,⁽²⁾ Dr. Klaus Koschorke has argued that these similarities are suspicious, and suggested that some crafty book-seller, detecting in the credulous Hippolytus a ready market for anything savouring of salacious deviant religion, has had a series of works fabricated for his customer. This is at least more charitable - and more probable - than the charge preferred by Salmon⁽³⁾ that Hippolytus himself forged the whole farrago. More probable than either view is the suggestion that the Refutator has used his sources as he found them, albeit with varying degrees of detail, and quotes less of the Peratae and the Sithians than he has of the Naassenes, for very weariness - "the rest of the books" of Peratae "contain the same method, if it were agreeable to any one to wade through them all" (V. 15.1), and "If...any one is desirous of learning the entire doctrine according to" (the Sithians), "let him read a book inscribed Paraphrase of Seth , for all their secret tenets he will find deposited there" (V.22) - but

(2) Koschorke, Hippolyts Ketzerbekämpfung, 96-9.

(3) cf Koschorke, 99.

that these sources were already contaminated before he received them, and that the principal author of the contaminations was Justin the Gnostic himself.

The accounts cited in the Refutation indicate by title some of the books allegedly used by the sects in question and also, not necessarily on the same footing, the texts on which the sects' writers commented. The Naassenes claim traditions of James and Mariamne (7.1); they use a Gospel according to the Egyptians (7.9) and a Gospel according to Thomas (7.21, cf 8.32), and possess at least⁽⁴⁾ one psalm of their own (V. 10.2). They are said to offer comments on Genesis (8.6, 8.20, 9.14, 9.17) on Deuteronomy (8.30, 9.14), perhaps on Joshua (7.40); on 1 Sam. (9.22), on the Psalms (V. 7.24, 32, 35, 39; 8.15, 18, 19, 45; 9.6), on Isaiah (V. 7.2, 8.16, 8.17, 8.34, 8.38, 8.45, 9.21), on Jeremiah (8.37), on Daniel (7.36), and on Job (8.19). They also comment on New Testament texts: most of all on Matthew (V. 7.26, 7.28, 8.38, 8.8, 8.23, 8.27, 8.28, 8.29, 8.31, 8.37, 8.45), on Mark (8.11), on John (V. 7.40, 8.5, 8.7, 8.11, 8.14, 8.20, 8.27, 9.2, 9.3, 9.6, 9.19, 9.20), on Romans (7.18, 7.34), on 1 Cor. (8.26, 8.28), on 2 Cor. (7.15, 8.25), on Galatians (7.15, 7.39, 8.36), and on Ephesians (7.33, 7.35, 8.22). They are further quoted as commenting on Homer (7.30, 7.34, 7.37-8, 8.3, 8.35), Anacreon (8.6) and Pindar (7.3); in addition to named authors⁽⁵⁾, the Naassenes are said to claim support from a hymn 'to

(4) Discussion in Wolbergs, Griechische religiöse Gedichte der ersten nachchristlichen Jahrhunderte, I (Meisenheim 1971) 37-82.

(5) The reference to Hippocrates is a polemical insertion by the Refutator.

Attis' (9.8-9). The Peratae, it seems, have also a sacred library. One book, quoted without a title in V.12, either includes comments on, or is illustrated by parallels in Colossians i.19 and ii.9. A cosmological treatise of theirs, The Suburbans up to the Aether, is summarized in V.14. They are said to offer comments on unknown Greek poets (16.3), on Heraclitus (16.4), on Exodus (16.15-16), on Matthew (17.7). For the 'Sithians', we are referred only to a Paraphrase of Seth (22.1), and to a collection of "interminable commentaries" (21.1, = ἐν ἀπέροις συγγράμμασι), though whether these are distinct works or passages in the Paraphrase or simply a characterisation of one of the kinds of things they write in their books generally, is not clear. They are said to comment on Philippians ii.7 and Acts ii.24, and perhaps on John iv.7.14 (see 19.20), and also on Genesis and Exodus (20. 1-3) and on Plutarch (20.6). Like Naassanes and Peratae, the 'Sithians' like Jewish and Christian scriptures and pagan literature. In the case of Justin, his book Baruch is the only source used, but the impression is conveyed that Justin had written others too (24.2). He is said to offer comments on Isaiah (24.1), on Psalms (24.1, 26,15, 26,16, 26,17, 27.3), Herodotus (24.2-3), Genesis (26.5, 26.9, 26.22), perhaps on Hebrews (24.1, 27.2), on Galatians (26.24), on John

(26.2, 27.2), and on Hosea (27.4).

These references are given with the aid of the notes in MacMahon's translation and in the editions of Duncker and Schneidewin and Wendland. They are not examined in any detail, for they are, for the most part, to be set aside for the immediate purpose of this stage of the investigation. It is to be argued that the syncretistic exegesis of Jewish and Christian scriptures and pagan Greek literature, and also of the mystery-religions^η and their rites, far from being doctrines of the Naassenes, Peratae and "Sithians", are tendentious additions made to their books by Justin. It is possible now to believe in the existence of the books named in the Refutation, as documents available for Justin to tamper with, now that Nag Hammadi has yielded up its codices.

The Gospel of Thomas named at 7.21 is safely to be identified with the Nag Hammadi Gospel of Thomas on the strength of the quotations in V.7.21 (explicitly) and V.8.32 (tacitly) - compare:

... ἥνπερ φησὶς ἐν τῇ > ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ βασιλείαν
οὐρανῶν ζητούμενην, περὶ ἧς διαρρήδην ἐν τῷ
κατὰ Θωμᾶν ἐπιγραφόμενῳ εὐαγγελίῳ παραδιδόσασιν
λέγοντες οὕτως· Ἐμεῖ οἱ ζητῶντες εὐρήσομεν ἐν παιδίοις
ἀπὸ ἑπτὰ ἔτη· ἐκεῖ γὰρ ἐν τῷ
τεσσαρεκαδεκάτῳ αἰῶνι κρυβόμενος φανεροῦμαι.

(V. 7.21, p.83:12-16 Wendland), and

λέγουσιν γοῦν· εἰ νεκρὰ ἐφάγετε καὶ ζῶντα
ἐποιήσατε, τί, ἂν ζῶντα φάγητε, ποιήσατε;

(Ref. V.8.32, p.95:3-4 Wendland).

with the following:

ΑΛΛΑ ΤΜΝΤΕΡΟ ΣΜΠΕΤΝ̄ΡΟΥΝ' ΑΥΩ
ΣΜΠΕΤΝΒΔΛ'

"But the Kingdom is within you and
outside you..."

ΠΕ ΔΕ ΙΣ ΗΝΑΔΝΑΥ ΔΝ
Ν̄ΒΙ ΠΡΩΜΕ Ν̄Ρ̄ΛΛΟ Ρ̄Ν ΝΕΥΘΟΥ ΕΔΝΕ
ΟΥΚΟΥΕΙ Ν̄ΥΗΡΕ ΨΗΜ ΕΥΡ̄Ν ΣΑΨ̄Υ
Ν̄ΡΟΥ ΕΤΒΕ Π̄ΤΟΡΟΣ Μ̄ΠΩΝ? ΑΥΩ
ΗΝΑΩΝ? ~~ΔΕ ΟΥΝ Ρ̄ΔΕ Π̄ΥΘΡΠ'~~

"Jesus said: The man in days will not
hesitate to ask
a little child of seven
days about the Place of life, and
he will live".

(Gospel of Thomas, log,3,4, pp.2-3 Guillaumont et al.);

15 ... καὶ ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν
ἐντὸς ὑμῶν [ἐ]στι[...]

....
οὐκ ἀποκνήσει ἀνθ[ρωπος] πρῶτος ἡμε-
ρων ἐπερωτῆσαι πα[ιδίω] ἑπτα ἡμε-
25 ρων περὶ τοῦ τόπου τῆ[ς] ζωῆς...

(P. Ox. 654, verso, lines 15-16, 22-5; Grenfell and Hunt⁽⁶⁾,
15,17).

"...And the Kingdom of Heaven
is within you..."

(6) B.P.Grenfell, A.S.Hunt, New Sayings of Jesus
(1904) 15, 17, but with the damaged lines
reconstructed in the light of R.M.Grant,
D.N.Freedman, The Secret Sayings of Jesus
(1960) 80.

PAGE
NUMBERING
AS ORIGINAL

A man (old of d)ays shall not hesitate
to ask a ch(ild of seven
d)ays concerning the Place of (Life..."; and also

ΔΥΩ ΝΕΤΜΟΟΥΤ ΣΕΘΝΘ ΔΝ ΔΥΩ ΝΕΤΟΝΘ
ΣΕΝΑΜΟΥ ΔΝ ΝΘΟΥ <Ε>ΝΕΤΕΤΝΟΥΩΜ'
20 ΜΠΕΤΜΟΟΥΤ' ΝΕΤΕΤΝΕΡΕ ΜΜΟΥ ΜΠΕ
ΤΟΝΘ ΖΟΤΑΝ ΕΤΕΤΝΥΔΑΝΥΩΠΕ ΖΜ ΠΟΥ
ΟΕΙΝ ΟΥ ΠΕΤΕΝΔΑΥ. ΖΜ. Ψ

"And the-things-that-are-dead are not living, and the living
shall not die. In the days when you devoured
that-which-is-dead you made ^{it} as that-which-
lives. When you come into
light, what will you do?

(Gospel of Thomas, logion 11, pp.6-7 Gaillaumont et al.;
ET after Grant-Freedman, p.123).

There is nothing in the ^{surviving} ~~surviving~~ Greek or Coptic texts of the
Gospel of Thomas that corresponds to the passage referring to Christ's
return in the fourteenth aeon as quoted in the Refutation. The Greek
text differs from the Coptic text at sufficiently numerous points
to make it impossible to be sure that this passage did not occur in
the Greek text of the "Gospel" at some stage in its history. As it
appears in the Refutation, it does not fit into any detectable plan
of Justin, and is therefore probably a genuine quotation from that
book as Justin himself received it, but was added to the Greek text

* NB: no p.299

at some stage before the Coptic version was made. It is hardly likely to belong to the original text, for it is quite inconsistent, vague though it is, with the firm disavowal of any prediction in logion 113 (p.54-7, Guillaumont et al.): "It (sc., the Kingdom) will not come by expectation; they will say, "See, here", or "See, there"; but the Kingdom of the Father is spread upon the earth and men do not see it".

The Refutation's version of the saying on seven-day-old children sounds like a garbled form of that saying as in Thomas confused in the Refutator's mind⁽⁹⁾ with the saying that those who receive little ones also receive Jesus, as that saying is found in the canonical text of Matt. viii.10, or perhaps with the saying that the Kingdom is granted only to those who receive it ὡς παιδίου (Mark x.15).

Were it not for the fact that the themes of the inward Kingdom and the insight granted to infants occur so close together both in the Refutation and in the Gospel of Thomas, there would have to be serious doubt among identifying the "Gospel" cited by the Refutation with the latter; but their close proximity in both documents ^{makes} ~~marks~~ that identification morally certain - and therefore sheds valuable light on the method of the Refutator (who here seems to quote from memory and with prejudice) and on the textual history of Thomas.

At Ref. v.7.9, we read: τὰς δὲ ἑξαλλαγὰς ταύτας τὰς ποικίλας ἐν τῷ ἐπιγραφομένῳ κατ' Αἰγυπτίου εὐαγγελίῳ κειμέναις ἔχουσιν (pp.80: 21-81:2 Wendland). The backward reference to

(9) Quoting from memory? - and therefore assimilating to the proverb attributed to Hippocrates, which he is about to quote?

"these multifarious transformations" is unclear; it may extend back to V.6, the description of the primal Adamas, to whom hymns are addressed, one of which includes these words: ἀπὸ σοῦ πατὴρ καὶ διὰ σε μήτηρ, τὰ δύο ἀθάνατα ὀνόματα, αἰώνων γονεῖς, πολῖτα οὐράνου, μεγαλύνουμε ἀνθρώπων (Ref. V. 6.5, p.78:10-11 Wendland). This primal man has three parts: rational, psychic, and material. To know him is to have the power to know God. A hymn (the same or another) addresses him thus: ⁽¹⁰⁾ ἀρχὴ τελειώσεως γνῶσις ἀ[νθρώπου, θεοῦ δέ] γνῶσις ἀπηρτισμένη τελειώσις (V. 6.6, p.78: 14-15 Wendland). All three parts or expressions of the primal man have descended into one man, Jesus who was born of Mary. Each of three respective inner resources (ἀπὸ τῶν ἰδίων οὐσιῶν) to the several categories of persons - i.e., the rational, the psychic, and the material - who correspond respectively to each. These three categories form three races - angelic, psychic, material - these correspond to three "churches" (the angelic, the psychic, and the material), which are therefore entitled "Elect", "Called", "Captive". These, and similar speculations, are taught on the authority of Mariamme ⁽¹¹⁾ and James the Lord's brother. We are now in Ref. V.7, but, although it is convenient for editor and reader to start a new paragraph here, there is no break in the flow of exposition such as there is immediately after, for the tone of the

(10) The reading assumes an expansion of ΑΝΟΥ for which there is room in the MS; on this as one of the Jewish-Christian nomina sacra contractions, see Roberts, Manuscript, Society and Belief, ch.1.

(11) So Duncker-Schneidewin; Wendland reads, with codd., 'Mariamme'.

Refutator becomes polemical at V. 7.1^b, just as the subject-matter changes. Although he is quoting from what is before him as a single document or group of documents, his change of tone suggests that he detected a major shift in his document at this point.

The Naassenes, it seems, argue from pagan mysteries as well as from doctrines taught by Mariamne and James. Mythological traditions of "the Greeks" (V.7. 3-4), of "the Libyans" (V.7.5), of "Assyrians" and "Chaldaeans" (V.7.6) are adduced on the subject of a primal man. (This may be a polemical insertion by the Refutator,⁽¹²⁾ but this is not certain).

The exposition goes on (Ref. V.7. 6^b-8^a, p.80:5-17 Wendland) to treat of the first man on earth, who is the image of the Primal Man to whom the hymns were addressed. There is an inconsistency in the account of his origin. At one moment he is derived from earth alone (80:5-6 Wendland); at another, he is brought into being by the great concourse of Powers, "concerning each one of which", says the Refutator, "there is an extended statement". As first made, this earthly man is empty of breath, immoveable and unmoved, or, as we might now say, showing no physical or mental activity. He is, however, given Life, or Soul ($\Psi\upsilon\chi\eta$), but only for the remarkable purpose that he may suffer, and so that through his sufferings his prototype, "the Great and Most Lovely and Perfect Man", may also suffer; so Ref. V.7.7^b is to be read. During this process of the

(12) It would be in line with his method of tracing all deviations back to pagan thought; but it is also consistent with Justin's method of brain-washing by a flood of diverse data.

enlivening and tormenting of the man and his original, the soul, or life, goes through many changes, so that it is impossible to define (V.7.8). It is clear that two quite inconsistent narratives are fused here. In one stratum, the origin of man on earth is the creation by all the supernal Powers collaborating, of a reproduction of the Primal Man, in his greatness, beauty and perfection - for the author of this stratum, creation is good. To this has been added another stratum, in which human life in this world is of purely material origin, and the purpose of the gift of life is to inflict pain and humiliation both on the earthly creature and also on the heavenly model of good - for the author of this stratum, creation is an act of ingenious malice, and the only way of turning creaturely existence to good account is to rise above the limits of reason (and probably of morality also).

The immediately preceding references to the instability of the soul would lead us naturally to interpret the "multifarious transformations" mentioned in V.7.9 as the subject of the "Gospel according to the Egyptians" as meaning that the "Gospel" was solely devoted to such transformations.⁽¹³⁾ However, the transformations have little meaning without the cosmogonical and theogonical framework, and it is reasonable to conclude that the Naassene "Gospel according to the Egyptians", as known to the Refutator, told most of the story that began at Ref. V.6, though just possibly without the passage on comparative mythology at V.7.3-6. At the

(13) as, apparently, Schneemelcher does: Neutestamentliche Apokryphen I, 111-2.

same time, the text as he knew it showed signs of having been tampered with, and expanded in a way inconsistent with its original character.

There is a strong suggestion in ^{the} ~~the~~ phrasing⁽¹⁴⁾ of Ref. V.7.9 that the summary of this "Gospel" continues as far as V.7.20, where the comments on the Gospel of Thomas begin. There is a discussion of the relation of life to inanimate nature (9-10); everything tends to desire life (11), and this desire underlies the various pagan myths of divine lust (12-13). The Naassenes are said to jumble together the mythology of Rhea with Paul's letter to the Romans to prove that sexuality ^{is} ~~is~~ per se evil, and that the ideal is a return to an hermaphroditic state (14-18). The final comment on Rom. i.20-27 is so strange, moving abruptly from ~~an assertion that in~~ his condemnation of idolatry and homosexual behaviour as containing, hidden within it, τὸ κρύφιον αὐτῶν καὶ ἄρρητον τῆς μακαρίας μυστήριον ἡδονῆς, to the praise of a rite containing lustration and anointing - the only link is the dual meaning of μυστήριον as "hidden message" and "rite" - that here also we must trace an overlaying of one source with another. The exposition of Paul's words, and indeed the presence of the quotation itself, belong to the more pessimistic of the two strata identified before, while the other, the more optimistic, has provided the other: ἡ γὰρ ἐπαγγελία τοῦ λουτροῦ οὐκ ἄλλη τις ἐστὶ κατ' αὐτούς, ἢ τὸ εἰσαγαγεῖν εἰς τὴν ἀμάρτανον ἡδονὴν τοῦ λουόμενου κατ' αὐτούς ζῶντι ὕδατι καὶ χρισίμενο^ν ἀλάλω χρίσματι.
(p.83: 5-8 Wendland).

- (14) A quotation-formula (varying between singular and plural, since the Refutator is aware that he is dealing both with a group and with an idiosyncratic individual interpreter of it) at least once in every section as marked by Wendland from &.10 to 7.20, except in 7.17-18, which is interjected comment.

This book, of course, is not the "Gospel according to the Egyptians" previously known in fragmentary form among the New Testament apocrypha.⁽¹⁵⁾ The fragments quoted by Clement as from that book come from something resembling the canonical books enough for Clement to quote it with a modicum of respect, and certainly from a book in which words of Jesus figure largely. In the book summarised by Ref. V.6-7.19, by contrast, Jesus appears almost as a lay figure, and the emphasis falls on theogonic and other lofty speculation and allegory.

The situation is very different with the work recovered from Nag Hammadi in two copies (C.G. III/2 and IV/2), The Sacred Book of the Great Invisible Spirit, subtitled, or re-titled by some who used it, The Gospel of the Egyptians. In that book, three Powers come forth from the great Invisible Spirit, the Father (in what Böhlig and Wisse⁽¹⁶⁾ call "The Introduction"). At a later stage, Adamas is produced from the first man (III. 49:8-16). There exists in heaven an incorruptible, spiritual Church (III. ss:2-16, IV.66:14-67:1). There are various races or generations (*γεγεά*) of men (e.g., III.60:2, IV.73:7-26),^{There are references} to spiritual rebellion (e.g. III.58:23-29:1, IV.72:27-74:9) and to repentance (III.59:9-60:2, IV.70-71), to which nothing corresponds in the Refutator's account. There are indeed references to sufferings (III.61:1-15, IV.72:10-27), but without any suggestion that they humiliate the Supreme Good or that

although the fragments from Ref. are grouped with those from Clement in
(15) Hennecke-Schneemelcher, Neutestamentliche Apokryphen, I.109-117; James, ANT 10-12; *further discussion in* R.McL.Wilson, 'The Coptic Gospel of Thomas' NTS V/2 (Jan 1959) 273-6; 'One Text, Four Translations', in Jonas-Festschrift (1978), 441-8.

(16) intro. to the edn by themselves and P.Labib in NHS IV (1975), 52. See also Böhlig, 'Die himmlische Welt...', Muséon LXXX (1967) 365-77; 'Christentum u.Gnosis im Agypt.ev', 1969; Schenke, 1970; Hedrick, 'Christian Motifs' 1981.

they are the result of some spiteful trick underlying all creation. If the book cited in the Refutation is indeed the Sacred Book of the Great Invisible Spirit, then either the Refutator knew it in a form slightly fuller at some points (Classes of human nature, identity of the "races", cosmic significance of suffering) than in its Nag Hammadi form, but also at other points less developed (^afull, repentance). It is difficult to make confident comparisons, for the Sacred Book is too fragmentary, even with two copies to use, to be sure that it lacked the sort of inconsistencies that the Refutator's source betrays. That the two are in fact identical is made virtually certain, however, by two substantial points of contact: "The Man exists, and ^{the} Son of Man" (ϣϣϩϩΠ Ν̄ϩΙ ΠΡΩΜΕ Μ̄Ν ΨΗΡΕ Ν̄ΠΡΩΝΕΙΙΙ. 59:2-4, p.126 Böhlig-Wisse; cf. ΤΙΜΩΣΙΝ Δ'ΑΝΘΡΩΠΟΥ ΚΑΙ ΥΙΟΝ Δ'ΑΝΘΡΩΠΟΥ, Ref. V.6.4, p.78:6 Wendland), and the concluding "baptismal liturgy" of the Sacred Book (III.62:24-68:1; IV.74:19-80:15), the climax of the Nag Hammadi tractate as it is of the Refutator's source. It is tantalising that the Refutation's references to living water (cf. "baptism of the living", III.64:17, IV.76:5-6) and to chrism (cf. CFΡΑΓΙC, III.66:3, IV.78:5) are neither exactly reproduced in, nor certainly absent from, the Sacred Book. In this case also, however, by bracketing syncretistic and erotically directed passages, as with the Gospel of Thomas, we can identify a now available text and also tendentious additions made to it before it came into the hands of the Refutator.

Of the books of the Peratae, "The Suburbans up to the Aether",

summed up in Ref. V.14 appears to remain unknown. It is clearly more than an astrological treatise, although astrological themes dominate it, for the voice whose utterance it records announces its intention to strip the Powers of "Chaos" (V.14.1); i.e., some mystical or theurgic operation is intended. There is no trace of tampering with this text (again, we may have to allow for the Refutator growing weary, but it is likely that he would have picked out any particularly offensive passage). By contrast, an extant work can be identified as the source of the theological exposition in V.12-13. In her edition of Setheus, Untitled Work in the Codex Brucianus,⁽¹⁷⁾ Charlotte Baynes noted a large number of close parallels with the Refutation: most of the parallels of thought seemed to her to savour of Valentinianism⁽¹⁸⁾, but most of the terminological similarities belong to the account of the Peratae.⁽¹⁹⁾ The shared ideas are less significant than the shared terminology, for the common body of concepts was shared by a wide variety of schools of a "gnosticizing" character. The origin of all is a 'spring', both in Refutation V.12.2 and in Setheus (p.1 Schmidt, xi and 40 Baynes; p.3 Schmidt=xiii and 51 Baynes; p.5 Schmidt=xv and 56 Baynes; p.49 Schmidt=lix and 177 Baynes). The basic triad of categories,

(17) C.Baynes, A Coptic Gnostic Treatise in the Codex Brucianus (CUP 1933); also C.Schmidt, V.MacDermot, 1982; Liechtenhan, 'Untersuchungen zur koptisch-gnostischen Literatur', ZwTh 44, 1901, 236-52; Abramowski, 'Nag Hammadi „Zostrianus“, das Anonymum Brucianum, Plotin, Enn.2,9 (33)', ZnW 74, 1983, 108-28.

(18) Baynes 14, 22, 29-30, 44-6, 76-7, 91, 93, 99, 106-7, 119-20, 128, 130.

(19) Baynes 44, 93, 98, 154.

"Unbegotten" (ἀγεννητος), "Self-Begetting" (αὐτογενες) and "Begotten" (γεννητος), the all-determining principle of the system in Ref. V.12, runs also throughout Setheus (see, e.g., p.58 Schmidt = pp.vii and 32 Baynes; pp.10-11 Schmidt = pp.xx-xxi and 81-3 Baynes; p.49 Schmidt = lix and 177 Baynes). In both documents, the triadic nature of the Triple-Powered One is throughout the Pleroma and all the works ad extram of the Powers, even to the three-fold realisation of aspects of the humanity of Jesus (see p.39 Schmidt = pp. xlix and 152 Baynes). Perhaps most impressive of all is the concluding⁽²⁰⁾ note of hope that all creation will ascend through Christ (Ref. V.12.6, cf. p.51 Schmidt = pp. lx-lxi, and 180 Baynes). This alone would raise the probability of the source of Ref. V.12 being Setheus to a virtual certainty. Whether Setheus as known to the Refutator was the extant form in the Bruce Codex must remain uncertain, for there is no mention in Ref. V.12 ^{of} ~~to~~ the intercession of the Mother (p.32 Schmidt = pp.xlii and 136 Baynes; p.39 Schmidt = pp. xlix and 152 Baynes; pp.44-46 Schmidt = pp. lix-lvi and 167-169 Baynes), while the exegesis of Colossians i.19 and ii.9, and of John iii.17 in Ref. V.12.7 makes no appearance in Setheus although its theme (the humble state of Christ as saviour of creation) fits the book entirely, and although similar exegetical comments do occur in the extant text of Setheus - so frequently⁽²¹⁾, and so

(20) The evidence of Ref.V.4 supports the theory of Baynes that her leaf xlix belongs to the end of the book.

(21) e.g.: Schmidt-MacDermot, 226, 233,236,237,238.

well integrated into the text, that they are certainly not mere interpolations.

There is less certainty with regard to the data in Ref. V.13. It is not clear from 13.1 that the Refutator is quoting from the same source as in V.12. If he is, then the astrological exposition must have been a tendentious addendum to the conclusion of Setheus, for the plot of the universal drama recounted in Setheus comes to a natural and satisfying denouement with the ascension of the created order with Christ. It is more likely, however, that the Refutator has turned away from Peratic sources to cite purely astrological material in readiness for his account (V.14) of The Suburbans up to the Aether.

One further passage of the Refutation's account of the Peratae may also now, albeit with considerable caution, be identified with an available text, C.G. IX/3, The Testimony of Truth⁽²²⁾: Ref. V.15.2-16.16. For the Refutator, the key phrase is 'right and left power' (V.15.5). This distinction occurs at a crucial passage of Testimony of Truth (C.G. IX, p.43:10-17): "And when he had received power, he turned towards the parts of the right, and he entered into the truth, having forsaken all things pertaining to the left, having been filled with wisdom, with counsel, with understanding, and with insight and an eternal power". The exposition of the theme of Christ typified by the serpent in Paradise and the snake held up by Moses

(22) ET Giversen and Pearson, HNLE 406-16; also Koschorke in ZnW 69 (1978) 91-117; 'Polemik der Gnostiker' in NHS XII (1978).

in the desert (V.16.6-12) matches, in general, the argument in Testimony of Truth (C.G. IX, p.45:23-49:10). Both these themes occur also in Hypostasis of the Archons (C.G.II/4) and Origin of the World (C.G.II/5 and XIII/2), which give every appearance of emanating from the same circles but with less of the vividness that characterizes Testimony of Truth.⁽²³⁾ That work itself, as we now have it, is certainly in a more developed state than it was as known to the Refutator; the lengthy homiletic⁽²⁴⁾ and the polemical asides against Valentinians, Basilides and Isidore, and "Catholics" look like ad hoc adaptations of a standard text.

The group that treasured Setheus must have also revered the authorities cited in it. In addition to the references⁽²⁵⁾ to canonical scripture - Psalms, Song of Songs, Galatians, II Corinthians, Matthew, John, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Luke, Hebrews - there is a respectful reference to an unidentified Phosilampes (p.12 Schmidt = pp.XXV and 46 Baynes) and also this quotation (p.12 Schmidt = pp.xxii-xxiii and 86 Baynes): "They did homage, namely, the Powers of the mighty Aeons, to the power of Marsanes, saying, 'Who is this who beheld these things with his own eyes, that is,

(23) Christ and the serpent: cf C.G.II 89-90, 118-20.

(24) Thus Pearson, intro., NHLE 406.

(25) Listed by MacDermot in Schmidt-MacDermot, 339-40.

concerning him who in this manner was revealed?' Nikotheos spake concerning him, 'He had seen him, for he is one who was in that place'. He spake and said, 'He is, even the Father, who excels all perfection; he revealed the invisible triple Power'." That this is a direct reference to the tractate Marsanes now recovered from Nag Hammadi (C.G. X/1) can hardly be doubted. The Peratae of the Refutation may therefore be credited with the use, if not also the composition, of Setheus, The Testimony of Truth (probably), Marsanes, and possibly Hypostasis of the Archons and Origin of the World. Their general position in the history of religion, particularly as exemplified in the subject-matter and affinities of Marsanes, is indicated⁽²⁶⁾ by the hint at Merkabah mysticism which occurs in Setheus (p.14 Schmidt = pp.xxiv and 89 Baynes): "The Chariot of God is ten th thousandfold..." ΖΑΡΜΑ ΜΠΝΟΥΤΕ ΟΥΤΒΑ ΝΚΩΒ ΠΕ, from Psalm lxxvii.18 - Τὸ ἄρμα τοῦ θεοῦ μυριοπλάσιον (LXX).

Coming to the "Sithians", we are on different ground. The summary in the Refutation suffers from the author's increasing irritation. Sketchy as it is, however, it offers parallels to the treatise now entitled The Paraphrase of Shem (C.G. VII/1). There exist Light and Darkness, and the Spirit is between them (Ref. V. 19.2-5; cf. C.G. VII.p.1: 25ff). The terrible water that is Darkness longs for the Light, and the concourse of the two Powers generates Chaos (Ref. V.19.6; cf. C.G. VII, pp.4-15). The perfect

(26) The reference to Ps lxxvii was identified by Baynes, 89.

God descends to liberate mind (Ref. V.19. 16-17; cf. C.G. VII, pp. 15-20). Thus creation appears (Ref. V.19. 17-18; cf. C.G. VII, pp. 20-24). To rescue imprisoned spirit from the foulness of creation, the Saviour assumes the form of the serpent, and enters the defiled creation ~~himself~~ and shared^s the pollution of matter by being baptized; he assumes his garment of glory (Ref. V. 19-21; cf. C.G. VII, pp.30-49). The Refutator here offers less than the present text would have justified. It is impossible to say whether he omits the more sordid details, or is simply brief for the sake of brevity, or whether he had before him a shorter form of the book than C.G. VII offers. One concluding ritual detail which the Refutation (V.19.21) gives is not in the Paraphrase - καὶ ἔπινε τὸ ποτήριον ζῶντος ὕδατος ἀλλομένου , "he drank the cup of living bubbling water" (p.120: 25-6 Wendland). The repetition of this detail in the next sentence (ὁ δὲ δεῖ πάντως πίνειν p.120:26 Wendland), as a condition of stripping off the servile garb and donning the celestial, shows that this is not an addition by the Refutator but stood, as an emphatic item, in his original. That ~~is~~^{it} was in the Paraphrase as first composed, and was lost before the Refutator saw it, is not impossible, but it is far more probably an addition by Justin who designed this as an anticipation of his own rite, as in Ref. V.27.2: καὶ πίνει ἀπὸ τοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος ὕδατος (p.133; 6 Wendland).

The further account of the "Sithians" (Ref. V.20-21) adds nothing to the information in V.19, and no surviving text can be identified as its source⁽²⁷⁾; as in the cases of the Naassenes and

(27) None of the works considered by Tardieu, 'Les livres mis sous le nom de Séth et les Sethiens de l'hérésiologie', in M.Krause, ed., Gnosis and Gnosticism (NHS VIII,1977), 204-10, or by Schenke, 'The Phenomenon and Significance of Gnostic Sethianism' in Layton, ed., Rediscovery, Two, 588-616.

the Peratae, the references to pagan cults and to most of the scripture texts allegedly "fulfilled" have every appearance of being additions from the hand of Justin - with the one exception of the inference drawn in V.20.8, that "one may reasonably assert that the Sithians celebrate rites among themselves very closely bordering upon those orgies of the Great Mother that are observed among the Phliasians"⁽²⁸⁾, the detached and judgemental tone of which is more typical of the comments of the Refutator, although it does betray the Refutator drawing exactly the conclusions that Justin wants his readers to draw.

The emergent hypothesis is that Ref. V draws on a genuine sectarian source, and a very bulky one: a whole library of tractates from more than ^{one} minority group, distinguishable from but akin to one another, tendentiously edited by Justin with the final addition of books bearing his own name. The whole is arranged on a progressive plan.

That Justin worked in such a way, and to a detectable plan, is stated directly in the Refutation (V.23), with a confidence that encourages the belief that Justin himself candidly stated something of his proposed end and method:

"This man endeavours to lead his hearers into an acknowledgement of prodigies detailed by the pagans,

(28) On the associations of the passage: Marcovich, 'Phanes, Phicola and the Sethians', JTS NS XXV (1974) 447-51.

and of doctrines inculcated by them. And he narrates, word for word, legendary accounts prevalent among the Greeks, and will not teach or deliver his 'perfect mystery' until he has bound his dupe by an oath. Then he brings forward fables for the purpose of persuasion⁽²⁹⁾, in order that, their heads swimming with the boundless nonsense of these books, they may find new stimulation in his tales,⁽³⁰⁾ like thirsty travellers turning aside to an inn; then, urged on again to pursue the diffuse theory of these lessons they will not detest them until they blunder, bewildered by excessive instruction, into the lawless things that he has devised.

Having previously bound these people by fearful oaths not to publish or to abjure his doctrines, and having by this means compelled them to admit their truth from the outset, he then delivers the 'mysteries' impiously invented by himself, employing, as we have already described, partly the Greek legends, partly the books admitted to be his own - which to some extent show resemblances to the heresies described above. So, bound together by one spirit, they are all drawn into one abyss of pollution, with all their supposed

(29) ψυχαγωγίας χάριν = brain-washing.

(30) παραμύθιον ἔχωσι τα μνηθευόμενα: παραμύθιον = stimulant, as in Plato, Critias 115B, Ath.690E (Liddell-Scott); also, in relation to next stage of the experience, = a refreshment.

uniqueness offering the same interpretations, telling the same tales. And this is the way that all these folk^k display themselves as 'Gnostics'!"

(Ref. V.23. 1-2; p.125: 6-23 Wendland).

Justin's method is to whet the appetite of enquirers by offering secrets, exciting desire for occult advancement, overwhelming their minds with vast amounts of information, remaking their whole milieu by giving new meanings to familiar tales, mingling the well-known and the arcane, the ascetical with the libertinistic, holding out at one moment and at the next withdrawing hints of salacious mysteries, until at last they have been led to the point where Justin can offer his own mystery, similar to the mysteries he has compelled them to study before and (as he suggests) foreshadowed by them, but transcending them.

What Justin himself offered as the perfect mystery must be considered a little later, as one of the last and deviant developments of the tradition which he plagiarizes. At this stage of the investigation, it has been possible to isolate some features of that tradition upon which Justin the Gnostic is a parasitic growth. The tradition, which Justin appears to have encountered after it had already developed for some generations, is the fusion of at least two ^{earlier} ~~earlier~~ streams of tradition, or the confluence of two groups. One has come to be characterized by its opponents as "Naassene", "Snake-worshipping", a cross-cultural neologism that belongs to a setting where Semite and Hellene are in close contact. Their

preferred imagery uses the figure of the serpent in Genesis iii as the paradigm of misunderstood wisdom; applied ^{to} Christ, this manner of speech is most natural in a Christian community with a long experience of being betrayed by the faith, or at least the community of faith, on which they had once expected to be able to trust, and expected to accept and support them. Among their sacred books are the Gospel of Thomas and The Sacred Book of the Great Invisible Spirit. The other group are called "Peratae". This sobriquet has no obviously ~~pejorative~~ ^{pejorative} sense; indeed, the "Peratae" themselves are happy to be so called, and have come to give it what for their

purposes is a flattering interpretation: καλοῦσι δὲ αὐτοὺς Περᾶτας, μηδὲν δύνασθαι νομίζοντας τῶν ἐν γένεσει κατεσθηκότων διαφυγεῖν τὴν ἀπὸ τῆς γενέσεως τοῖς γεγεννημένοις ὠρισμένην μοῖραν... μονοὶ δὲ, φησὶν, ἡμεῖς οἱ τὴν ἀνάγκην τῆς γενέσεως ἐγνωκότες καὶ τὰς ὁδοὺς, δι' ὧν εἰσελήλυθεν ὁ ἄνθρωπος εἰς τὸν κόσμον, ἀκριβῶς δεδιδαγμένοι διελθεῖν καὶ περᾶσαι τὴν φθορὰν μόνοι δυνάμεθα.

(V. 15. 1, p.111: 6-8, 9-12

Wendland) - "They call themselves 'Peratae' (Transcenders'), on the theory that none of the things that exist on the transient level of things ^{begotten} ~~beginning~~ can escape the fate of things that came into being from a ^{begetting} ~~beginning~~... 'We alone', he says, 'and only we, who have insight ⁽³⁰⁾ into the necessity that governs ^{generation} ~~beginning~~ and into the ways by which man ⁽³¹⁾ has come into the world, are enabled by our

(30^a). Or, 'have come to have insight'.

(31) Or, 'The Man' (= Christ).

thorough instruction to pass through and transcend destruction". This interpretation of their name does not seem to be its original sense, however, for Clement of Alexandria^(31^a) lists their title, without further explanation, among the names of sects who are called after their place of origin, ἀπὸ τόπου. Further, the negative view of the created order implied by this interpretation is not entirely consistent with the comparatively hopeful view preserved in Setheus.

The prayer of the Mother for the perfecting of her children is essentially based on an optimistic view of creation - too optimistic to come to him despairing of "the wicked creation" (Ref. V.27.3). It is, all the more interesting that he retains the doctrine of final ascent (V. 27. 1-3), and to do this he has to limit ~~the ascent to~~ the ascent to the elect few who drink the "living water" and bind themselves by oath after the model of Elohim. He has removed it, apparently, from his edition of Setheus, where it is applied to all creation, and it is astonishing that it has survived, and in its *universalistic* ~~universalistic~~ form, in the Paraphrase. So optimistic a theme is surprising enough in so world-denying a text as the Paraphrase, and its survival can only be explained by its being deeply embedded in an earlier tradition held to be authoritative. The survival of this world-affirming note is therefore strong evidence that Justin encountered the series of writings Gospel of Thomas + Sacred Book of the Great Invisible Spirit + Setheus + Suburbans up to the

(31^a) Strom. VII.xvii.108 (190-1 Hort and Mayor).

Aether + Testimony of the Truth + (? Hypostasis of the Archons + Origin of the World) + Paraphrase of Shem/Seth as an already formed corpus.⁽³²⁾ Within that corpus, and within the group that treasured it, the Paraphrase and the 'Sithians' seem hardly distinguishable, except for a new note of sombre disgust. On what grounds Justin (or the Refutator?) ascribed the Paraphrase to a distinct group at all, and whether it was this ascription which led to the erroneous reading of the title as Paraphrase of Seth, is as yet beyond solution.

The Refutation speaks of Justin (V. 27.1) in the past tense, although the historic present is used when quoting his book or books. By the time, therefore, that he was included in ~~his~~^{this} book apparently provoked by the actions of bishop Callistus of Rome (217-222), he was dead. Unless he appears elsewhere in history under another name, no more precise date can be ascribed to him than the second half of the second century; the history of the developments culminating in the group upon which he based his parasitic cult can be reconstructed only from other sources.

(b) The "Heresy" of Prodikos and the "Gnostics" of Plotinus.

A little earlier than the composition of the Refutation is the record by Clement of Alexandria of contemporary⁽³³⁾ sectarians who "propagate the heresy of Prodikos". Since he reserves the term "heresy" for deviations within Christianity, "the sects which

(33) All Clement's statements (and those of Tertullian in the Scorpiace 15 and adv. Praxeian 3, where Prodikus is mentioned in the same breath as Valentinus) are in the present tense. The name was current; this cannot be affirmed of the man.

(32) Since Marsanes is assumed by Setheus, it may also belong to the corpus; but there is not sufficient evidence to be confident

deserted the Primitive Church", (Strom. I.xx), he obviously understands Prodikos to be, or to have been, a heterodox Christian. The views of the "Prodikians" on worship are of especial interest to this investigation.

...βίβλους ἀποκρύφους τάνδρος τοῦδε οἱ τὴν
Προδίκου μετιοντες αἵρεσιν αὐχούσι κεκτῆσθαι.

(Strom. I. xv. 69.6); II. 44:6ff Stählin-Früchtel):

"Those who propagate the heresy of Prodikos boast of possessing secret books by this same man" (sc., by Zoroaster the Magos).

τοιαῦτα καὶ οἱ ἀπὸ Προδίκω ψευδονόμως
Γνωστικὸς σφᾶς αὐτοὺς ἀναγορεύοντες δογματίξουσιν,
υἱὸς μὲν φύσει τοῦ πρώτου Θεοῦ λέγοντες
αὐτοὺς· κατὰ χρώμενοι δὲ τῇ εὐγενείᾳ καὶ
τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ ζῶσιν ὡς βούλονται· βούλονται
δὲ φιληδόνως, κρατηθῆναι ὑπ' οὐδένοσ
νενομικότες ὡς ἂν κύριοι τοῦ σαββάτου
καὶ ὑπεράνω πάντος γένους πεφυκότες
βασιλείῳ παῖδες, βασιλεῖ δὲ, φασί,
νόμος ἀγράφος.

(Strom. III.iv.30.1-2; II.209 Stählin-Früchtel):

"A similar doctrine" (sc., elevating carnal pride to the level of prophecy)" is promulgated by the followers of Prodikos, who proclaim themselves by the undeserved title of 'Gnostics', and describe themselves as being by

nature sons of the first God. They make a great play of being entitled, by their noble origin and their liberty, to live as they choose: they choose to live in the pursuit of pleasure, acknowledging the rule of none, on the grounds that they are Lords of the Sabbath, superior to every race, royal children by their lineage: and for a king, they say, there is (only) an unwritten law" (and Clement goes on to observe that they are not in practice free to do as they choose, and their libertine behaviour, far from regal boldness, is furtive and fearful).

Ἐνταῦθα γεγονημένος ὑπερμνήσθην τῶν περὶ τοῦ μὴ δεῖν εὐχεσθαι πρὸς τινῶν ἑτεροδόξων, τουτέστιν τῶν ἀμφὶ τὴν Προδίκου αἵρεσιν, παρεισαγομένων δογμάτων. ἵνα οὖν μηδὲ ἐπὶ ταύτῃ αὐτῶν τῇ ἀθέῳ σοφίᾳ ὡς ξενὴ ὀγκύλλωται αἵρεσει, μαθετώσαν προειληφθαι μὲν ὑπὸ τῶν Κυρηναϊκῶν λεγομένων φιλόσοφων.

(Strom. vii. 41.1-2; III.31 Stählin-Früchtal-Treu).

"This calls to mind the doctrines current among certain heterodox persons - namely, the adherents of the heresy of Prodikos - that it is not right to pray. These people, lest they be puffed up with pride by the notion that their godless 'wisdom' is some new and strange heresy, need to be taught that they have got it from the so-called Cyrenaic philosophers".

Τίς γάρ ὡς ἀληθῶς ἐν τηλικούτοις ἀνδράσιν, κατὰ τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν λέγω γυνῶσιν, ὑπελείπετο λόγος Μαρκίωνος, φέρε εἶπεῖν, ἢ Προδίκου καὶ τῶν ὁμοίων τὴν ὀρθὴν οὐ βαδισάντων ὁδόν; οὐ γὰρ ἂν ὑπερέλαβον σοφία τοὺς ἔμπροσθεν ἄνδρας, ὡς προσεξευρεῖν τι τοῖς ὑπ' ἐκείνων ἀληθῶς ῥηθῆσιν, ἀλλ' ἀγαπητὸν ἦν αὐτοῖς, εἰ τὰ προπαραδεδομένα μαθεῖν ἡδυνήθησαν.

(Strom. VII.xvi.103.6-7) III.73 Stählin-Früchtel-Treu. (34)

Tertullian also knows the name of Prodikos, and mentions him in association with Valentinus as teaching that martyrdom is not meritorious (Scorpiace 15) and as maintaining a multiplicity of gods (adv. Praxean 3). These vague references betray a knowledge at best indirect. The information offered by Theodoret (haer. fab. i.6) may safely be ignored. (35)

So far, the patristic accounts may be summed up in the words of bishop Kaye⁽³⁶⁾: "Clement mentions Prodicus as a leader of one of the Gnostic sects. His followers asserted that they were by nature the sons of the Supreme or First God, and ~~consequently~~ ^{consequently} at liberty to live as they pleased, being in subjection to no one, lords of the

(34) 'For indeed what place was left among the great men of old - according to the Gnosis of the Church, I mean - for Marcion, say, or Prodikos or the like, who walked not along the right road? For they could not have surpassed in wisdom the men who went before, so as to discover something beyond what had been truly spoken by them; but might have been well content if they had been able to understand what had been already handed down.'
(after Hort and Mayor 183).

(35) cf Salmon in DCB IV (1887) 4107; anon. in Herzog REPTK XII (1860) 199.

(36) Some Account of the Writings and Opinions of Clement of Alexandria (edn, Ancient and Modern Theological Literature, London n.d.) 187.

Sabbath, born superior to every other, royal children. They denied the necessity of prayer".

The Nag Hammadi materials offer some clues as to the interests and even affiliations of the "followers of Prodikos". "The First God" is reminiscent of the "First Father" or the "First-existing God" mentioned in

the "Valentinian Exposition" (C.G. XI/2, 24: 2-7) and the Teachings of Silvanus (C.G. VII/4, 91:15); and of the "Archigenetor" who appears in Trimorphic Protennoia (C.G. XIII/1, 40:23; 43:25,30,32; 44:27; 49:13). The claims to be royal offspring, and to be subject to ^{none} are closely parallel to the concepts of the "Kingless Generation" in Apocalypse of Adam (C.G. V/5, 82:19-20) and of "the kingless realm" in Origin of the World (C.G. II/5, 127:13-14), of "the generation over which there is no kingdom", "the sons of the Unbegotten Father" in Eugnostos the Blessed (III/3, 75:16-23) and its Christian edition, Sophia Jesu Christi (III/4, 99:21-100:2). The claim to lordship over the Sabbath, obviously related to Mark ii.28/Matt. xii.8/Luke vi.5, may also be compared with the use of John v. 17 ('my Father is working until now, and I work') in Interpretation of Knowledge (C.G. XI/1, 11:16-25). Parallels to the antinomian stance are less easy to document; Clement does not here seem to be exaggerating for polemical effect, but it is not impossible that his knowledge of these people was derived from their more outré representatives, people who liked (in safe company, anyway) to be shocking. A "book of Zoroaster" is named

~~God" mentioned in Eugnostos the Blessed and Sophia Jesu Christi (C.G. III/3, 75:9; C.G. III/4, 99:9-~~

in the Apokryphon of John (C.G. II/1, 19:9-10); and, as will be observed shortly, ⁽³⁷⁾ another "book of Zoroaster" is to be identified in Zostrianos through the deciphering of its end-colophon (C.G. VIII/1, 132:6-9), so that Zostrianos is reasonably to be reckoned among the "other secret books by this same man" of which the "followers of Prodikos" claimed to be the proud possessors. The people known to Clement who reckoned to be followers of Prodikos appear, therefore, to belong to the group of sects that produced and used Origin of the World, The Sacred Book of the Great Invisible Spirit, Trimorphic Protennoia, The Apocalypse of Adam, Eugnostos the Blessed and/or Sophia Jesu Christi, Zostrianos, Apokryphon of John, and The Interpretation of Knowledge. ⁽³⁸⁾ (The "Valentinian Exposition" and Silvanus show fewer points of contact and, on other grounds, are in any case to be placed in another context.

It has long been observed ⁽³⁹⁾ that these "followers of Prodikos" are in some way associated with the people of whom Porphyry writes in his Life of Plotinus (xvi):

Γεγόνασι δὲ κατ' αὐτὸν τῶν Χριστιανῶν πολλοὶ
μὲν καὶ ἄλλοι, αἰρετικοὶ δὲ ἐκ τῆς παλαιᾶς
φιλοσοφίας ἀνηγμένοι οἱ περὶ Ἀδέλφου καὶ Ἀκυλίνου,
οἱ τὰ Ἀλεξανδρου τοῦ Λίβυος καὶ Φιλοκώμου καὶ
Δημοστράτου καὶ Λυδοῦ συγγράματα πλείστα

(37) 375-82 infra .

(38) On parallels with Apocalypse of Adam, Origin of the World (and, less convincingly, Thomas the Contender), cf Rudolph, Die Gnosis (1977) 283.

(39) e.g. by Cotelier in his notes on the Clementines, cited in PG at Strom. I. xv. 69.6; subsequently, e.g., by Harnack, Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur Teil II: Chronologie, Bd II, 413; now also Abramowski, 'Marius Victorinus, Porphyrius und die römischen Gnostiker' ZnW 74 (1983) 108-28.

κεκτημένοι, ἀποκαλύψεις τε προφέρουντες Ζωροάστρου
καὶ Ζωστριανοῦ καὶ Νικοθέου καὶ Ἀλλογενοῦς καὶ
Μεσσοῦ καὶ ἄλλων τοιούτων πολλοὺς ἑξηπατῶν.

(p.43 Armstrong).

Porphyry clearly finds these would-be hangers-on of Plotinus' circle so irritating that he has no time to distinguish the different groups involved. Were some pagans and some Christians, or were some already Christians and the others enquirers on the fringe of some Christian assembly? Into which category do Adelphios and Aquilinus belong? Did the avid readers of the works of Alexander the Libyan, Philokomos, Demonstratos and Lydos also appeal to the revelations "of Zoroaster and Zostrianos and Nikotheos and Allogenes and Messos", and did the users of the latter also adopt the books of the minor Greek philosophers⁽⁴⁰⁾ mentioned?

The titles of the apocalypses listed by Porphyry are jumbled together in a contemptuous heap; the dismissive tone of the repeated *καὶ* is eloquent of his feelings. Only the Nag Hammadi evidence has made it possible to make sense of parts of this list.

C.G. VIII/1 concludes with a partly cryptographic colophon:

(40) Or is it meant that these books are by Christian authors?

ZΩCΤPΙΑΝOC

ΟΛΖΛΥΘΟΒΔΕΥ [ΘΩΓ]CΟΨ
ΥΒΥ ΘΝΛΧΑΕΛΩ]ΘΟΒΔΕΥ
ΘΩΟΛΖΔΥΓCΥΡΛΘΩΨΥΡ [ΛΧ]

This type of cryptogram had been known for more than twenty years before the Nag Hammadi discovery.⁽⁴¹⁾ It is a modified form of that known to cryptographers as the "Atbash"⁽⁴²⁾; the Greek alphabet is divided into three sections, and the encypherment is then carried out by the usual "Atbash" procedure of reversing the order of letters in each of the three sections. The text as decrypted reads:

ZΩCΤPΙΑΝOC
ΛΟΓOC ΔΛΗΘΕΙ[ΔC Ζ]ΩCΤ
PΙΑΝΟΥ ΘΕOC ΔΛΗΘΕΙ
ΔC ΛΟΓOC ΖΩΡΟΔCΤΡΟΥ

which is usually⁽⁴³⁾ rendered:

"Zostrianos.

Words of Truth of Zostrianos.

God of Truth.

Words of Zoroaster".

If ~~Θ~~Θεοc is taken as a distortion of an original Greek Θειοc , an adjective qualifying Λογοc , and Λογοc is read as "Discourse",

(41) J. Doresse, 'Les Apocalypses de Zoroastre, de Zostrien de Nicothée... (Porphyre, vie de Plotin, 16)', in M. Malinine, ed., Coptic Studies in Honor of Walter Ewing Crum (Boston 1950), 255-64: 258-60.

(42) So-called because, in Hebrew (the language for which an early form of the cypher was used), Aleph is represented by Tau, Beth by Shin.

(43) As by Sieber, NHLE 393.

the title is a little simplified: "Zostrianos. The Discourse of Truth, by Zostrianos. The Divine Discourse of Truth, by Zoroaster". Doresse suggested⁽⁴⁴⁾ that Porphyry's Ἰποκαλύψεις Ζωροάστρου καὶ Ζωστριανῶ should be read as a single title with two authors, which would come closer to the apparent sense of the colophon of C.G. VII/1. Attractive as ~~his~~ ^{this} suggestion is, it is probably less likely than that of Puech⁽⁴⁵⁾, to the effect that in Porphyry's list the books of Zoroaster and of Zostrianos should be distinguished, in the light of the fact that Porphyry's fellow-philosopher Amelius devoted a work of several volumes to disproving the alleged authorship of Zoroaster - Zostrianos is not mentioned in this connection. As will be suggested in the relevant place,⁽⁴⁶⁾ C.G. VIII/1 shows signs of being a composite text; the curious double title in its present colophon may then acceptably be interpreted as an indication that the scribe of this or some earlier copy knew that it was so. Zoroaster and "Zostrianus" also appear in Arnobius of Sicca's adversus Gentes⁽⁴⁷⁾ as bearers of the same tradition of mysticism, ~~it~~ ^{but} not as joint authors of a book: "Age,

(44) Doresse (as n.41) 261-2.

(45) Puech, 'Les nouveaux écrits gnostiques découverts en Haute-Égypte', in Crum-Festschrift (see n.41) 91-154: 108.

(46) 368-82 infra, esp. 375-8.

(47) edn Douai 1636, p.30.

(48)

nunc veniat, qui super igneam Zonam magus, interiore ab orbe Zoroastres, Hermippo ut assentiamur auctori... Armenius Zostriani (so MS) nepos, et familiaris Pamphylus Cyri, Apollonius, Damigero, et Dardanus, Belus, Julianus, et Baebalus, et siquis est alius qui principatum et nomen fertur in talibus habuisse praestigiis".

Whichever form of Zostrianos is in question, some version of C.G. VIII/1 or its sources may be traced among the Christian hangers-on of Plotinus. The "Apocalypse of Nikotheos" which they used is partly identified for us by the quotations of Nikotheos, associate ^{or} of disciple of Marsanes, in Satheus, the book of the Peratae.⁽⁴⁸⁾ Further, C.G. XI/3 provides a book Allogenes, purporting to be written for "my son Messos" (see C.G. XI, 68:28; 69:17); the possibility that our Allogenes may be a Rahmengeschichte over the name of Messos may identify the Nag Hammadi text as the sole document referred to by Porphyry in his mention of the two names, but the case of "Zoroaster and Zostrianos" warns us to be cautious.

Clement does not speak of Prodikos himself as a contemporary, and Salmon⁽⁴⁹⁾ argued that by Clement's time the heresiarch was dead. An earlier Prodikos can indeed be found whom the "followers of Prodikos" might well have claimed as a patron of their doctrine of the futility of prayer - Prodikos of Keos,⁽⁵⁰⁾ well known as one of the first to

(48) See 372-5 infra.

(49) DCB IV 490.

(50) F.G.A. Mullachius, Fragmenta Philosophorum Graecorum II (Paris 1881), lxxv-lxxviii, 135-41; R.D. Hicks, 'Sophists', ERE XI 687^b-692b; G.B. Kerferd, 'Prodicus of Ceos', Encyclopedia of Philosophy, Six (New York 1967) 482-3.

attempt a social theory of the origin of religion, sc. of the deification of natural agencies beneficial to man. This theory, far from being inherently hostile to religion, can be interpreted as favouring it, as witness the use made of it in the Bacchae of Euripides.⁽⁵¹⁾ However, Prodikos was thought by many to have radically undermined religion, both in his own time by Aristophanes (Birds 692), and on the eve of the Christian era by Cicero, who asked, quam tandem religionem reliquit? (de natura deorum I.118). Such a reputation needs explaining, and the explanation is provided by the pseudo-Platonic dialogue Cryxias.⁽⁵²⁾ Prodikos is there depicted as being forced into a debate on ethical relativism, which he does not really favour.⁽⁵³⁾ He is driven to admit that prayer has no good purpose - and at this point the gymnasiarch intervenes and turns Prädikos out of the gymnasium as being a threat to the morals of the young. Such a story makes Prädikos at least potentially a by-word for the rejection of prayer - quite in contradiction, it seems⁽⁵⁴⁾, to his genuine views on religion.

There is no need to suppose for a moment that the heretics criticized by Clement had studied Prodikos at all. They were ready,

(51) G.Murray, Humanist Essays (London 1964) 51-77.

(52) in Burnet's edn of Plato, Vol.V; excerpts in Mullachius (n.50) 139-41.

(53) G.B.Kerferd, 'The "Relativism" of Prodicus, Bulletin of the John Rylands Library 37 (1954) 249-56.

(54) W.Jaeger, The Theology of the Early Greek Philosophers (Oxford 1967 edn) 179-83.

however, to borrow his name and reputation, as they were ready, then and later, to use the name and reputation of Zoroaster to dignify views of their own which both Prodikos and Zoroaster would have abhorred. By the time this group begins to penetrate Plotinus' circle, (that is, about 242-3, when Porphyry arrived in Rome), their claims to use a work of Zoroaster are being challenged, both by ~~Pamelius~~ **Amelius** and by Porphyry himself (vita Plotini xvi); and they have given up claims to Prodikos, claims that were impressive enough while they moved in less sophisticated Christian circles.

They were convincing enough to persuade Clement that there had been a Christian Prodikos, who had rejected prayer. He knew of the historical Prodikos of Keos, and refers with approval to his moral tale of Herakles' choice between Good and Evil both in the Paedagogos (1.223.10) and the Stromateis (V.v.31.2).

A theory rejecting prayer - or, at least, prayer as petition - is attacked by Origen in his Treatise on Prayer, v-viii. He links its adherents with "those who do away with the things of sense altogether, (and) have no use for Baptism and the Eucharist"; in particular, however, he reproaches them that they "falsely accuse the scriptures of not meaning prayer by that word, but of teaching something else with a different meaning".⁽⁵⁴⁾ There is a lacuna at V.1, where the name of exponents of this view may have been named. However, that lacuna cannot be filled. It is no more probable that

(54^a) v.2; ET Jay, 93-4

Prodikos' name stood there than that the passage mentioned Tatian. Tatian is first mentioned at xxiv.5, in another dispute on the nature of prayer, and there Origen observes that he has criticised him at an earlier point in the Treatise, although in the extant text his name is not found before xxiv.5. If the targets of Origen's strictures in v-viii are the "followers of Prodikos" attacked by Clement, then by the time of Origen's writing, about 236,⁽⁵⁵⁾ they have probably already dropped the name of Prodikos.

The group attested by Clement and Porphyry, and perhaps by Origen, is for us a shadowy one, of whose own practices we have no information; only their public propoganda is reported. They are trying to give their Christianity⁽⁵⁶⁾ an intellectual and a mystical dimension, bringing in (however superficially) the mysticism of the East and the sophistication of Hellas, typified by Zoroaster and Prodikos, as supplements to their ~~preferred~~ ^{preferred} heritage of Jewish mysticism (Allogenes) and works of Peratic origin (Nikotheos, ?Marsanes, ? Setheus, etc.). The denial of the duty of prayer may indicate also the presence of the Gospel according to Thomas, with its exchange (logion 104, 52-3 Guillaumont): 'Come and let us pray today and let us fast. Jesus said: Which then is the sin I have committed, or in what have I been vanquished ?'

c) The 'Phibionites' of Epiphanius

Panarion, haer.26 is one of the few passages of Epiphanius that reflects personal observation. Epiphanius is obviously

(55) so Jay; 233-4, according to Quasten, Patrology II (Utrecht 1953) 66.

(56) On Zostrianus as a Christian text with a spurious pre-Christian air, see Abramowski (n.17).

embarrassed by the memory of his close contact with the sectarians in question, and speaks explicitly of it only towards the close of his detailed and wearisome account.

He is led to a consideration of them by his reflections (haer. 25) on the "Nicolaitans". Typical of the corrupting amorality taught by them is the teaching of these "Gnostics" - the acrimonious tone of the whole opening sentence of 26.1.1 indicates that this title is their own self-designation. Their offensive remarks about "the Womb" are as disgusting to pagans as to Christians (26.1.2). They possess a book called "Noria". Noria herself, they say, was the wife of Noah, and corresponds to Deukalion's wife Pyrrha in Greek mythology - a ~~syncretistic~~ ^{Syncretistic} observation supported by dubious etymological arguments (26.1.3-7). Part of the purpose of the Flood was the determination of the Creator to destroy Noria along with everything else. Noria foiled this plan by burning the ark three times (26.1.8). She was assisted in this by the supreme Power Barbelo, and so commanded resources greater than the creating powers that had produced a material world that depends on human reproduction (26.1.8-9). The method of 26.1 is significant. On the one hand, Epiphanius may be seen at work, picking up themes from his sources at random, indifferent to any order of priority or attempted consistency that may be found there by a more patient reader. On the other hand, he is using his source with some accuracy - for it is identifiable, and available as a check. Although no "Book of Noria" is extant under that title, Origin of the World (C.G. II/5, 102:10-11, 24-25) mentions a "First Book" and a "First Logos" (or, Discourse) of "Noraia". The "book" and the "discourse" are probably identical,

and the difference in the spelling of the personal name is insignificant. The tiny tractate (C.G. IX/2) that contains the plea of Norea (IX, 27:21) is clearly related to the heroine of the Phibionites' Flood story, but it does not contain the narrative details mentioned by Epiphanius. Those details do occur, however, in Hypostasis of the Archons (II/4, 92:4-18) - at least, so far as Norea's first burning of the ark. Hypostasis of the Archons is certainly not the product of a single act of authorship - the sudden change from a third-person to a first-person narrative at C.G.II, 93:18 is alone strong evidence of this⁽⁵⁷⁾ - and the reference to Noah's building the ark "again...for a second time" (C.G. II, 92:18) has the ring of a story about to be repeated, but this does not happen, and it seems likely that the story of the burning of the ark was curtailed during the editorial process of expanding the dialogue between Norea and Eleleth which now concludes the tractate (C.G. II, 92:3-97:23), leaving the reader with a sense of unfinished narrative - an editorial process which also abandoned Barbelo.

Epiphanius continues, with an unconvincing apology for treating of disgusting subjects (26.2.1), to say⁽⁵⁸⁾ that some groups of this sect use a prophetic work by one Barcabbas (26.2.2-4), of whom nothing is known (unless we take seriously Epiphanius' charge that Barcabbas taught gross amorality) beyond a statement of Agrippa Castor (in Eusebius h.e. IV.7.7) that Barcabbas was also revered as a prophet

(57) So Bullard, The Hypostasis of the Archons (Berlin 1970) 2; also B.Layton, The Hypostasis of the Archons (=HTR 67/4, Oct 1974) 352-426: 365.

(58) 26.2.2-4.

by the Basilidians. Others, goes on Epiphanius⁽⁵⁹⁾ use a fictitious "Gospel of Perfection": since this detail occurs in Filastrius of Brescia, "alii autem evangelium consummationis et visiones inanes... adserunt" (haer. fab. 33.7, p.18 Marx), this information may just possibly come from the lost Syntagma, but it is not safe to work on that supposition. Yet others, Epiphanius tells us (26.2.6), have a "Gospel of Eve", in which wisdom comes to humankind from the snake. Of the various presentations of such a scenario in the Nag Hammadi documents, in Hypostasis of the Archons (C.G. II/4, 89:31-90:12), Testimony of Truth (C.G. IX/3, 45:22-46:15), and Origin of the World (II/5, 118:16-120:17), it is the last which gives Eve, "the Eve of life" (115:31-116:25), the most central and significant role. In his edition of Epiphanius, Holl (p.277) draws attention to the passage in Irenaeus, AH I.xxx.37 (p.I, p.234 Harvey): "Mater autem ipsorum argumentata est per serpentem seducere Evam et Adam supergredi praeceptum Jaldabaoth; Eva autem quasi a filio dei hoc audiens facile credidit et Adam suasit manducare de arbore, de qua dixerat deus non manducare. Manducantes autem cognovisse eam quae est super omnia virtutem dicunt et abscessisse ab his qui fecerant eos". This account of Irenaeus, which must concern us further at the next stage, does not tally with the exact version given in any extant document: Irenaeus ascribes to Jaldabaoth personally the prohibition of the tree of knowledge, whereas all the Nag Hammadi

(59) 26.2.4-5.

texts ascribe it to all seven of the creating archons together. Another area of disagreement is the effect of the eating of the forbidden fruit. For Irenaeus, the result is knowledge of the female Power who transcends the creating archons; in all the extant texts, the immediate result is awareness of shame. The nearest parallel is in Hypostasis of the Archons (II/4, 89:31-90:17), where the "Female Spiritual Element" uses the snake to enlighten the man and woman and then abandons it, and the man and woman, having eaten, are aware specifically of their lack of the (Female) Spiritual Element. There must remain a large measure of uncertainty as to which version of the story of the forbidden fruit Irenaeus is here quoting; but that his source here is from the same stock as Hypostasis of the Archons and Origin of the World is sufficiently clear. How the quotation in 26.3.1 - "I was on a lofty mountain, and I beheld a large man and another, stunted, man; and I heard as it were a voice of thunder, and I drew near to hear, and it spoke to me, and said: 'I am you and you are me, and wherever you are, there am I, and I am scattered in all things; and wherever you wish you will gather me, and gathering me you will gather yourself'" (p.278: 8-13 Holl), said to be "in the Gospel" - is related to the Origin of the World as cited in 26.2, is quite unclear.

After a rude listing of the insulting terms applied to these people in different areas (26.3.2-9, probably the point at which he wanted to stop), Epiphanius feels compelled to press on to

Rhibionite

describe their rites. So far as he is concerned, ~~Rhibionite~~ liturgy is dominated by promiscuous intercourse (26.4.1: *πρώτον μὲν ...*). They have a secret sign of recognition, consisting of a suggestive handshake, before admitting a stranger to their cultic meal (26.4.2). Poor as they are, these cultic meals are lavish (26.4.3), and conclude with scenes of wild excitement (*εἰς οἶστρον τρέπονται*, 26.4.3).

καὶ ὁ μὲν ἀνὴρ τῆς γυναικὸς ὑποχωρήσας φάσκει λέγων τῇ ἑαυτοῦ γυναικί ὅτι "ἀνάστα, ποιήσον τὴν ἀγάπην μετὰ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ"

"Then each man's husband, turning away from his wife, says - to his own wife! - 'Rise, celebrate the Love (- feast) with *this* brother!'"

(p.280:21-23 Holl) -

and Epiphanius is too ashamed to describe the sequel (26.4.4). He masters his feelings sufficiently, however, to give all the details:

— μετὰ γὰρ τὸ μιγῆναι πάθει πορνείας πρὸς ἐπὶ τούτοις ἀρεταί- 5
ροντες τὴν ἑαυτῶν βλασφημίαν εἰς οὐρανὸν δέχεται μὲν τὸ γύναιον
5 καὶ ὁ ἀνὴρ τὴν ῥύσιν τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἄρρενος εἰς ἰδίαν αὐτῶν χεῖρα·
καὶ ἴστανται εἰς οὐρανὸν ἀνανεύσαντες, ἐπὶ χεῖρας δὲ ἔχοντες τὴν
ἀκαθαρσίαν καὶ εἴχονται δῆθεν, οἱ μὲν Στρατιωτικοὶ καλούμενοι καὶ 6
Γνωστικῶν, τῶ πατρὶ φέσει τῶν ὅλων προσφέροντες αὐτὸ τὸ ἐπὶ
ταῖς χερσὶ, καὶ λέγουσιν ἰαναγέρομέν σοι τοῦτο τὸ δῶρον, τὸ σῶμα
10 τοῦ Χριστοῦ.

(26.4.5-6, p.281:3-10 Holl).

That is to say, both women and men (in pairs) take male ejaculate on their hands and adopt the orante position and pray. Their prayer is addressed to the One who is by nature the Father of all, and it is a prayer offering to him what is on their hands. Epiphanius quotes the prayer as, "We offer you this gift, the Body of Christ". After this "Anaphora", the "Words of Administration":

καὶ οὕτως αὐτὸ ἐσθίουσι μεταλαμβάνοντες τὴν ἐαν-
τῶν ἀδελφότητα καὶ φασὶ τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ
τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ πάσχα, δι' ὃ πάσχει τὰ ἡμέτερα σώματα καὶ ἀναγκά-
ζεται ὁμολογεῖν τὸ πάθος τοῦ Χριστοῦ.

(26.4.7, p.281: 10-13 Holl).

The ritual is expanded (ἰσάδύτως, a deliberate parallel to I Cor. xi.25, beyond doubt) to include the (?offering and) degustation of the woman's menstrual blood at suitable times, the additional words of distribution being, Τοῦτο ἐστὶν τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ (26.4.8, esp. p.281: 16-17 Holl); no change to the formula of offering is indicated. This detail is interpreted by reference to the Paradisal trees of Rev. xxii, that bear fruit in every month of the year (26.5.1).

Epiphanius

The Phibionites, continues Irenaeus, do their best ⁽⁶⁰⁾ to avoid conception; but, if one of their women conceive, the fetus is aborted, beaten in a basin with honey and pepper and other spices

(60) Apparently, by some sort of 'Karezza' discipline - hence the following reference to gathering the 'failing' of the brother.

and myrrh, and eaten with the fingers. The purpose of this "worship" is said to be to escape the mockery of the Archon of Lust by "gathering up the failing of the brother". This is said to be "the perfect Passover" (26.5.2-6).

To round off their celebrations, the Phibionites are said (26.5.7-8) to smear their whole bodies with the fluids mentioned, and to pray entirely naked, so as to learn freedom of speech in the presence of God. They spend day as well as night in caring for their bodies, with scents, with washing, with feasting, indulging leisurely in the pleasures of the bed and the bottle: *μυριζόμενοι, λουόμενοι, θοιναζόμενοι, κούταις τε καὶ μέθαις σχολαζόντες* (p.282:20-21 Holl). They scoff at anyone who fasts, on the grounds that "fasting is of this Archon who made the (?present) aeon". This is oddly expressed, and it is tempting to adjust the phrase as is done by the Latin translation in Migne (P.G. XLI 339C): "quod ad hujus saeculi conditorem principem jejunium pertineat": but the ^{phrasing} odd ~~phrasing~~ may be half-deliberate, with a half-realised ^{allusion} to some such formula as logion 2 of the Gospel of Thomas, which enjoins "fasting to the world". More positively, the Phibionites insist that food is needed to strengthen the body so that it may bear fruit in due season (an allusion to Ps.i.3, LXX: *ὁ τὸν καρπὸν αὐτοῦ δώσει ἐν καιρῷ αὐτοῦ* , but more significantly related to the just mentioned "sacramental" imagery).

They use both Old and New Testaments, but interpret them in a sense consistently hostile to the Creator, an exercise which seems to betray a constant preoccupation with the Jews (26.6.1-7.6).

They possess also a vast number of other books: a Questions of

Mary (Ἐρωτήσεις... Μαρίας 26.8.1, p.284:11-12 Holl); works under the name of Seth, in which Jaldabaoth is given hostile treatment (26.8.1); Ἀποκαλύψεις τοῦ Ἀδάμ (26.8.1, p.284:13 Holl); "other Gospels attributed to the Disciples", in which Christ himself appears as the patron of their immoral precepts (26.8.1). There are two editions of, or two different books both entitled, Questions of Mary, the Greater and the Lesser; in the former, Jesus is portrayed upon a mountain, bringing forth a woman from his side and practising with her the rites described above. In this book, or in the catechesis surrounding its use, are said to be claims to fulfil some arcane sentences⁽⁶¹⁾ chiefly from the Fourth Gospel (26.8.2-6).

In the same or some other book are expositions (26.9.1-5) of Old Testament passages (Joshua ii., Prov. V.15), that also "justify" their rites. Each act of sacral coition is to be performed in one of the 365 divine names, preceded by a ritual invitation to the woman to allow herself thus to be conducted to the Archon - an odd detail in a cult supposed to defy the creating archons:

μίγηθι μετ' ἐμοῦ, ἵνα σε ἀνεύρω πρὸς τὸν ἀρχοντα. (26.9.6): p.286:

11 Holl). Each separate act is accompanied by a formula of dedication, apparently asking one of the Powers to make ~~the~~ the act an approach to a yet higher Power: *προσφέρω*

σοὶ τῷ θεῖνι, ἵνα προσενέγκῃς τῷ θεῖνι. (26.9.7, p.286:13-14 Holl) - the utterer inserting any "divine name" that occurs to the mind. The aim is a sort of mystical ascent through the Powers until the seeker can

(61) Matthew xiv.31; John iii.12, vi.62, vi.33, vi.60, vi.66; Psalms i.3.

finally say (26.9.8-9), ἄγω εἰμι ὁ Χριστός, ἐπειδή
ἄνωθεν καταβέβηκα διὰ τῶν ὀνομάτων τῶν τρεῖς ἀρχόντων. (p.286:22-23 Holl),

"I am the Christ, for I have come down from above through the 365 names".

The Greater and Lesser Questions of Mary cannot be identified, if all the antinomian exegesis must be regarded as contained in them. If not, the usually rejected identification with some elements of Pistis Sophia may turn out to be correct.⁽⁶²⁾ "Sethian" works hostile to Jaldabaoth are extant: Apocryphon of John, Hypostasis of the Archons, Second Treatise of the Great Seth; but the evidence is lacking for identification. An Apocalypse of Adam (C.G. V/5) is now available, but only one; perhaps Epiphanius saw a volume of apocalypses with the Apocalypse of Adam at the end, and ~~lost~~^{took} its title at the end as the title of the whole. The body of expositions and ritual prescriptions in 26.8.2 - 9.9 need not belong to a single book, or to any book; but the scenario of a transit through the 365 powers, downwards by Christ, then upwards by the redeemed with Christ, is reminiscent of Origin of the World (C.G. II/5), with its apparatus of Powers (C.G. II, 97:24-102:23) and the final ascent of Light (127:4-5). The casting of the seed of the Powers upon the duplicate Eve (117:4-15) may be the original for the Phibionite portrayal of Christ doing the same to the woman drawn from his side (haer. 26.8.2).

(62) cf Liechtenhan, 'Untersuchungen' (n.17); Meade, Pistis Sophia (London 1921) xxxiii-xxxiv.

After accusations of various kinds of immorality among members of the "Levites" of the sect, and comments on their strange notions of virginity (26.11), Epiphanius sums up another of their books, *Τέννα Μαρίας* (26.12), from which he quotes a tale about the violent death of Zechariah, father of John the Baptist. Zechariah is struck dumb because he sees the ass-shaped man worshipped in the Jerusalem Temple. When he recovers his speech, he is killed to protect this secret - a secret usually kept because the spurious god is warned to hide by the jingling of the bells on the High Priest's vestments. A more infantile anti-Jewish slander is hard to imagine. Further changes of immorality, this time against the clergy of the sect, their "Levites" (again, a preoccupation with the Jews!), are followed by a description of their Gospel of Philip (26.13). This last appears to be chiefly a ~~manual~~ ^{manual} of ascent-of-the-soul mysticism, perhaps including also the odd tale of Elijah and the succuba (26.13.4-5).

The Gospel of Philip quoted is, beyond doubt, the same work as that mentioned by the Refutator in a Naassene context ~~(26.13)~~:

ἀπεκαλύφέν μοι ὁ κύριος
15 τί τὴν ψυχὴν δεῖ λέγειν ἐν τῷ ἀνιέναι εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ πῶς
ἐκάστη τῶν ἄνω δυνάμεων ἀποκρίνεσθαι· ὅτι ἐπέγων ἐμυτήν.

φησί, καὶ συνέλεξα ἑμαυτὴν ἐκ πανταχόθεν, καὶ οὐκ ἔσπειρα τέκνα
τῷ ἄρχοντι, ἀλλὰ ἐξερρίζωσα τὰς ρίζας αὐτοῦ καὶ συνέλεξα τὰ μέλη
τὰ δισκορπισμένα, καὶ οἶδά σε τίς εἶ. ἐγὼ γάρ, φησί, τῶν ἄνωθεν
20 εἶμιε.

(p.292; 14-20 Holl).

"The Lord revealed to me what the soul must say at its ascent into
heaven and how it must answer each one of the Powers above⁽⁶⁴⁾:

'I have come to know myself,
and I have gathered myself from all directions,
and I have not sown children for the Archon,
but I have uprooted his root
and have gathered the members that were scattered,
and I know you for who you are -
but⁽⁶⁵⁾ I am of those that are above'".

καὶ οὕτως, φησὶν, ἀπολύεται. ἔαν δέ, φησὶν, εὐρεθῇ γεννή-
σασα υἱόν, κατέχε|ται κάτω ἕως ἂν τὰ ἴδια τέκνα δυνηθῇ ἀναλαβεῖν
καὶ ἀναστρέψαι εἰς ἑαυτήν.

(p.292:20-293:1 Holl).

"And thus (they say) the soul is liberated. But if (they say)
the soul is discovered to have produced a son, it is cast
downward until it has succeeded in taking its own offspring
and recovered its true identity".

If this is typical of the content of the Gospel of Philip,

(64) cf Gospel of Thomas and cognates; Ophite diagram;
'First' Apocalypse of James, all infra.

(65) The conjunction is literally 'for'; but contrast
is clearly intended.

that book is a remarkable document ^{of} ~~ee~~ syncretism. There are some Jewish associations - the ascent, and perhaps the story of Elijah and the succuba (haer. 26.13.4-5) - but a polytheistic thought-world (τῶν ἀνωθεν) is not so far away. Creator and material creation are objects of revulsion and defiance. The power in which the soul defies the archons which threaten the upward path is apparently available solely from the soul's own self-awareness and theurgic practice. The whole scenario (at this point) is typical of Orphism, ⁽⁶⁶⁾ and the gathering of the scattered members has overtones of Osiris ⁽⁶⁷⁾ - a confluence of notions and techniques typical of Hellenistic magic. ⁽⁶⁸⁾

The remainder of Epiphanius' report (26.14-19) is given over chiefly to adverse comment, but there are revealing personal ~~remiscences~~ ^{reminiscences} woven into it. Epiphanius himself had got involved with a group of this sort, and his repeated assertions of relief that he was not wholly swept away by their propaganda suggest strongly that he was more closely involved than he cared to remember. He owes his information chiefly to women of ^{this} ~~his~~ sect; at first fascinated by them, he becomes increasingly alarmed through reading their books for himself (26.17); then, or ^{perhaps} ~~perhaps~~ later, to reassure himself that he has done the right thing, he consults other orthodox persons, who confirm his impressions (26.18). He reports the whole matter to the local bishops, who, presumably with the assistance of the civil authorities, investigate, with the result that a total

(66) e.g. in Diels, Fragmente der Vorsokratiker II, 175.

(67) cf R.E.Witt, Isis in the Graeco-Roman World (London 1971), 36-45.

(68) J.M.Hull, Hellenistic Magic and the Synoptic Tradition (London 1974), 27-37.

of eighty people are exiled from the city.

This last detail is extremely significant, and provides an invaluable check on Epiphanius' report. That a deviant group was indeed detected is confirmed by the punitive measures applied. However, any group that could be proved to have practised the magical uses of the fluids mentioned would beyond reasonable doubt have received far more terrible punishment, as we see from the personal reminiscence of St. John Chrysostom, nearly caught in his adolescence in innocent possession of a book of spells.⁽⁶⁹⁾ The public action of the authorities entitles us to distinguish levels of reliability in Epiphanius' information.

His account of the books of the "Phibionites", on which he obviously made careful and detailed notes, may be in general accepted, especially as much of his information can be checked against extant copies of the books that he quotes, even if the extant ~~recensions~~ ^{recensions} and those that he possessed show differences. Much of the Phibionite library can therefore be listed: the books of the Old and New Testaments; Hypostasis of the Archons, Origin of the World, ?Gospel of Thomas; Greater and Lesser Questions of Mary; Apocalypse of Adam; Γέννα Μαρίας ; and Gospel of Philip.

What does not come from these books must be attributed to the women who were Epiphanius' teachers on behalf of the sect. His comparison of the situation with Joseph's experiences with

(69) A.A.Barr, 'The Survival of the Magic Arts', in A.Momigliano, ed., The Conflict between Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century (Oxford 1963) 100-25: 116, citing John Chrysostom, In Acta Apost. Hom. xxxviii, PG IX.273-4.

Potiphar's wife indicates that one woman in particular was taking the initiative (26.17. She has a companion and confidante with whom she jokes in Epiphanius' presence and at his expense, saying that the young man is not ready yet for adult adventures (26.17). It is her report (later disproved in the course of police investigation, although Epiphanius is unwilling to realize this) which provides the "information" about rites with male ejaculate and menstrual blood, aborted fetus, prayer in nudity, sodomy among the "Levites" and oral intercourse (26.19. - the detail obviously hardest for Epiphanius to mention). To say such things in an attempt to inveigle a young man into an affair is an extremely risky course of action under the prevailing circumstances. Cases are known from modern sectarianism of young women deliberately attracting male disciples by an initial tactic of flirtatious behaviour.⁽⁷⁰⁾ It is more likely, however, that in this case we are observing an individual pursuing personal ends by exploiting the imagery of a sect with a severe ~~ascetic~~ ^{encratite} character; and her behaviour has a strong element of "risk-taking".⁽⁷¹⁾

Beyond the woman's distorting and tendentious account of her sect's private acts of worship only the haziest picture can be detected. Prayer in the orante position is too conventional to be dubious. A prayer of offering is to be seen as derivative from contemporary orthodox Christian anaphoral prayer, such as that in

(70) J.Lofland, Doomsday Cult (London 1966), ch.6 - 'Embodied Access'; ch.9 - 'Promotion Tactics'.

(71) Rettig and Singh, 'The Risk Hypothesis' (1963).

fourth-century Egypt, attested by "the prayer of offering of bishop Sarapion",⁽⁷²⁾ with its statement as, *Σοὶ προσηγάκαμεν τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον, τὸ ὁμοίωμα τοῦ σώματος τοῦ μονογενοῦς.*

There is no indication of any attempt to interpret the relationship of the liturgy of the sect to that of the Great Church - some very angry comment from Epiphanius must surely have been provoked by any claims on that score. It is remotely possible that the description of sybaritic Phibionites indulging in anointings, washings (a very monastic touch there!), and feastings is a serious misreading of an attempted reinterpretation of Christian initiation rites of chrismation, water-baptism and Eucharist in purely naturalistic terms. It is not uninteresting that a sect preoccupied at so many points with anti-Judaistic slogans should choose the Passover as the liturgical ideal - "This is the true Passover" - and the inference that the underlying ritual pattern is Jewish-Christian, gravely distorted in course of time by resentment at non-Christian Jews, is *this sect is derived from a Jewish-Christian tradition.*

Although Epiphanius' female teacher and would-be femme fatale has made the rite of her community into an instrument for dominating another person, and has thereby in a sense created her own Cult of Power, the underlying tradition does not fall into this category - but its resort to potent erotic imagery in much of its peculiar

(72) ed. F.E. Brightman, JTS I/1 (Oct 1899), 105: 31-2.

literature (e.g., the spilling of seed in *Τέννα Μαρίας* and Apocryphon of John) exposed it to such misuse.

(d) Materials in Irenaeus and Origen.

It will be argued in our next sub-section that the liturgical traditions that can be uncovered in the evidence of the Refutation, Clement of Alexandria, and Epiphanius betray a continuity that suggests a single line of tradition springing from one form of Jewish Christianity, given its distinctive character by the confusion which surrounded the emergence of the Church from its parent faith.

This working hypothesis provides also a milieu for some documents preserved by Irenaeus and Origen which may be briefly noted here. It was discovered by Carl Schmidt⁽⁷³⁾ that in A.H.I. xxix (= I.xxvii, Vol. I, pp.221-226 Harvey) Irenaeus was using some form of the Apocryphon of John, then recently discovered in the Berlin Papyrus 8502, which was not itself published until many years later.⁽⁷⁴⁾ From the text there extant, and from the other material now available from Nag Hammadi (C.G. II/1, III/1, IV/1), it becomes clear that Irenaeus does not attempt to summarize the entire content. That much was in any case to be read out of the impatient conclusion of his account - "Et hi quidem talia mentiuntur". He gets no further than "I am a jealous God", etc (I.xxvii.2, Vol.1, p.226 Harvey = I.xxix.4 Massuet), which in, for example, C.G.II is

(73) and summarised in his paper in Philotesia Paul Kleinert (1909).

(74) ed. W.Till, Die gnostischen Schriften des koptischen Codex Berolinensis 8502 (Berlin 1955).

on page 13, little more than a third of the way through the book.⁽⁷⁵⁾ The next chapter of Adversus Haereses (I.xxx Massuet = I.xxviii, Vol. I, pp.226-241 Harvey) is devoted to another body of doctrine, which is related also in some way to the Apocryphon of John or at least its milieu. Parallels have been noted by Holl in his edition of Epiphanius⁽⁷⁶⁾ between this section of Adversus Haereses and Panarion haer. 26.9-10, of which we maintained above⁽⁷⁷⁾ that it represents a summary of Origin of the World. Although the information ~~called~~ ^{called} by Irenaeus from this source does not seem to offer evidence as to the rites of the users of the book, the mere fact that Irenaeus uses it entitles us to date the work itself back into the second century.

Information more germane to a liturgiological investigation is found in Origen's account of the "Ophians" in the sixth book Contra Celsum (VI.31), where the "Ophite diagram" is described. Although the ritual details are not found in Origin of the World, the myth from that book does appear in Origen's text, most significantly where the scheme of archons to be passed in the mystical ascent is set forth (C.G.II/5, 100: 29-102:7, cf. c. Cels. VI. 31, p.101

(75) NHLE 104.

(76) I.284-6 Holl.

(77) 334-5 supra.

Koetschau). In this case also, the dating of Origin of the World made possible by the reference in Irenaeus enables us to place at least the essence of the scheme reported by Origen well back before the composition of contra Celsum, about 244-9⁽⁷⁸⁾, so that not only Celsus' information (Alethes Logos was written about 177-180) but also Origen's additional evidence may be used to throw light on second-century conditions.

(e) Peratae-Naassenes-Ophites: a liturgical continuity?

It has long been noticed that the cosmological notions of the ~~Peratae~~ ^{Peratae}, the Naassenes and the Ophites are related, and that they show a development with a certain consistency.⁽⁷⁹⁾ The suggestion to be made here, and offered as a working hypothesis, is that there is a liturgical continuity also. With the proviso that the congregations involved were probably unstable in both membership and theological stance, and that their books were subject to frequent adaptation and re-interpretation, the following scenario is suggested:

(a) the liturgical notions of these groups represent a survival among Christians of a chiefly Jewish ascent-of-the-soul mysticism, with a liturgical pattern of mystical prayer for this purpose, mingled with a mythology and ritual of the "interceding Mother"; and that this schema is superimposed on a sacramental pattern

(78) H. Chadwick, Origen contra Celsum (CUP 1953), xiv.

(79) W. Foerster, 'Die Naassener', in Bianchi, ed, Studi di storia religiosa della tarda antichita (Naples 1968), 21-33; R.P. Casey, 'Naassenes and Ophites', JTS XXVII/4 (July 1926) 378-87.

characterized by baptism;

(b) that the stage at which these traditions were fused is represented by the Peratae, and that their name, (derived, according to Clement of Alexandria, Strom. VII. xvii.100, p.190 Hort-Mayor, $\alpha\eta\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu\ \tau\omicron\pi\omicron\upsilon$), points to this process having occurred initially in Peraea, the area to which the Jerusalem Church had fled before the investment of Jerusalem by the armies of Vespasian and Titus;

(c) that the initial optimism of the Peratic phase was overcome by disillusionment and scepticism, to the point where the goodness of the Creator came to be doubted, and salvation to be conceived as an escape from the Creator and his ethics; that the reinterpretation of Old Testament myth along these lines, typified by an inversion of the tale of the snake, caused these people to be nicknamed "Naassenes" by their less pessimistic fellow Jewish-Christians, a sobriquet which was given a Greek form, "Ophites", when they emerged into a wider Hellenistic social milieu;

(d) that such a pessimistic and antinomian style of thought was particularly susceptible to distortion and exploitation by occultists like Justin the Gnostic and by such immoralists as Epiphanius' friends - and that, in general, a world-denying atmosphere of this character was naturally attractive to those whom contemporary society relegated to marginal roles;

(e) and that this development began ^{as parasitic} ~~as parasitic~~ upon Jewish-Christianity of a particular kind, and continued to be parasitic upon the developing life of the Great Church.

6. The Gospel of Thomas.

The book now ^{known,} ~~known~~ from its Coptic form recovered from Nag

Hammadi (C.G. II/2), as "The Gospel according to Thomas", **ΠΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ ΠΚΑΤΑ ΘΩΜΑΣ** (C.G. II, 99:27-8), cannot but be compared with the four canonical gospels, and similarly with the apocryphal gospels modelled upon them. Evidence has been gathered⁽⁸⁰⁾ which suggests that some of its material goes back to an earlier stage of the oral transmission of Jesus' words than that which has survived in the Synoptics, and there are even those who maintain that it represents the earliest, non-narrative, form of the Gospel genre.⁽⁸¹⁾

However, the 114 logia of which the "Gospel" consists are not all free-standing utterances of spiritual wisdom; there are in several cases signs that the sayings have been removed from some original narrative setting and rearranged to fit a systematic exposition. Some logia are provoked by questions or comments from individual disciples, Mary (log. 21), Salome (log. 61), Simon Peter (log. 114), others by people outside the circle of disciples, an unnamed woman in the crowd (log. 79), or ~~unspecified~~ ^{unspecified} "them" who happen to speak to Jesus (log. 22, 91, 100, 104). Logion 60 is more explicitly in a narrative setting: "They saw a Samaritan carrying a lamb on his way to Judaea..." Even if this setting is itself fictitious, and created for a special polemical purpose, its form is an acknowledgement that the sayings of Jesus belong in the setting of his life-history. Although the omission of that history strongly suggests that the compiler of the Gospel of Thomas

'Some Remarks'

(80) Quispel 1959; Cullmann, 1960; Hunzinger 1960; Nagel 1960; Bartsch 1960; Frend 1967; Englezakis 1979; Horman 1979; Lindemann 1980.

(81) opposed by Tripp 1980.

has lost interest in the historical setting of Jesus' life and the events of that life itself, his dehistoricizing method is still secondary to a narrative form of Gospel, which was itself secondary to a kerygma of historical narrative form: "God has raised this Jesus..." There is no evidence in Gospel of Thomas of an earlier "timeless" Gospel genre.

As it is framed, the Gospel of Thomas is addressed to an esoteric circle, a select band whose existence assumes a wider community within which they were formed. **ΝΑΕΙ ΝΕ ΝΨΑΧΕ ΕΘΚΤ' ΕΝΤΑΙΣ ΕΤΟΝΖ' ΣΟΟΥ** (C.G. II, 80:10-11), "These are the secret words which the living Jesus spoke" - calling for a restoration of Papyrus Oxythynchus 654 which had occurred to none who had attempted it⁽⁸²⁾ - presumes the availability of more public words to the many. As will be noted, there are elements in Gospel of Thomas which are critical of the many, the conventional majority of Christians. The book is written for a minority.

The text (and where the Greek is extant, it confirms the Coptic version sufficiently for this observation to hold of the original Greek composition) may be divided into an introduction and ten "chapters". Such a division is indicated by the use of the introductory rubric, "His disciples asked..." (logion 6: **ΔΥΣΟΥΧ ΝΒΙ ΝΕΥ'ΜΑΘΗΤΗΣ ΠΕΣΑΥ ΝΑΥ ΧΕ**), "The/ "His disciples said..." (logia 12, 18, 20, 24, 37, 43, 51-2-3, 99, 113):

ΠΕΧΕ ΜΜΑΘΗΤΗΣ ΝΙΣ ΧΕ (log. 18,20);

ΠΕΧΕ ΝΕΥΜΑΘΗΤΗΣ ΧΕ (log. 24, 37);

ΠΕΣΑΥ ΝΑΥ' ΝΒΙ ΝΕΥ'ΜΑΘΗΤΗΣ ΧΕ (log. 43, 51, 52, 53, 113);

(82) H.G.Evelyn White, 'The Introduction to the Oxyrhynchus Sayings', JTS XIII/1 (Oct 1911) 74-6.

ΠΕΧΕ ΜΑΘΗΤΗΣ ΜΑΥ ΧΕ (log. 99).

(The other utterances which Jesus answers do not mark new sections; only the questions of the disciples do this).

Running through all the sections are a number of recurrent themes: the "disciples" addressed by the book are essentially a distinct group, and their distinctiveness is frequently the occasion of conflict, as to claims to the Kingdom, and chiefly conflict with the Jews, although conflict with other Christians also makes an appearance.

The distinctiveness of the disciples consists above all in their possessing the secret of life through finding the interpretation of Jesus' secret words (log. 1). They are the chosen fish (log. 8); their master is the incomparable Jesus (log. 13). Their destiny is to obeyed by the brute creation (log. 19). Part of the secret of the Kingdom is the very fact that they are the elect (log. 23). As the enlightened ones, they have the privilege of illuminating the cosmos (log. 24), although they have renounced the cosmos as a fasting man renounces ^{food} ~~food~~ (log. 27). They may expect the decisive moment to be one in which their Master is revealed uniquely to them (log. 27). They may fail him, and relapse into a pre-Christian level of religion, and if they do so they may expect no mercy, privileged as they have been (log. 43-44). Yet theirs is the Kingdom (log. 54), if they are true to the life ^{bestowed} ~~bestowed~~ upon them (log. 59), and they will be safe even though those closest to them will perish (log. 61). Their communion with Jesus makes them akin to him (log. 108); they may be sure of the kingdom (113-114).

In the conflicts occasioned by their distinctive status, human

pride will be humbled by their vindication (log. 4). The cause of Jesus is fire cast upon the cosmos (log. 10), not peace but a sword (log. 16). Their faith must be guarded in vigilance and strength (log. 21). They will spoil the strong (log. 35). They have in the meantime to become detached from the world: (log. 42)

- ΠΕΧΕ ΤΙ ΔΕ ΛΥΩΝΕ ΕΤΕΝΜΑΡΑΓΕ
Guillaumont
Guillaumont et al.), "Said Jesus, Become Passers-by". They must choose where their loyalty lies (log. 47). In particular, family loyalties (log. 55) must be subordinated to the claims of faith; like Jesus, the elect must expect to suffer and to be rejected and persecuted (log. 65, 66, 68). They must, for this among other reasons, be discreet in their choice of those who may hear the deep things of God (log. 95). Rejection of family ties is repeatedly and sharply called for (log. 101, 105), not for its own sake but as part of the discipline of renouncing the world's riches in order to live on the Living One (log. 110, 111).

C.G.

(~~EE~~. II, 88:19, p.24

The sense of distinctness has deeply affected the versions of the "Parables of the Kingdom", which have a large place in the Gospel of Thomas.⁽⁸³⁾ This tendency is perhaps clearest in logion 107, a quite perverse adaptation of the Parable of the Lost Sheep;⁽⁸⁴⁾ "Jesus said, The Kingdom is like a shepherd who had a hundred sheep. One of them went astray, which was the largest. He left behind ninety-nine, he sought for the one until he found it. Having tired himself

(83) cf Mueller 1973.

(84) Matthew xviii.12-14.

out, he said to the sheep, I love thee more than the ninety-nine" (C.G. II, 98:22-27, pp.52-5 Guillaumont et al.). What counts is not that the sheep is lost, but that it is favoured. The frequency of the use of the parables of the Kingdom is, significantly, greatest in the long cardinal section, logia 51-98: 54, 61, 63, 64, 65, 66, 73, 76, 78, 86, 96, 97, 98.

In particular, the intended users of Gospel of Thomas see themselves as distinguishable chiefly from, embroiled principally in conflict with the Jews. The dispute as to the right of inheriting the Kingdom is an ideal medium for Christian/Jewish polemic. In logion 6, "If those who lead you say to you: See, the Kingdom is in heaven", then the birds of the heaven, then the birds of the heaven will precede you. If they say to you: It is in the sea, then the fish will precede you. But the Kingdom is within you and it is without you...", it is not far-fetched to read "those who lead you" as referring to the Rabbis, and the whole logion as referring to discussions of the signs of the Messiah.⁽⁸⁴⁾ Fasting, prayer, almsgiving and dietary laws (log. 6, and cf. 14, 27, 104), which are major issues of contention, are characteristic of Jewish abodah. The prominence of James the Just (log. 12) is a direct indication of a Jewish-Christian milieu, and one in which persecution and martyrdom loom very large. The elect possess the Paradise of Genesis (log. 19).

(84^a) cf Matthewxii.38; xvi.1 parr.; xxiv.3, etc.

(log. 19). Jesus' distinctive glory is his "Place", (log. 24), a well-known Jewish periphrasis for deity. The elect observe the true Sabbath in their renunciation of the cosmos (log. 27). Jesus and his disciples are contrasted with the Pharisees and Scribes (log. 39, 102). The vine planted without the Father (log. 40) is clearly Judaism (cf. Isaiah li.7), especially Rabbinic Judaism. When Christians decline in faith, they become like Jews (log. 43), when they ought to transcend, for they have privileges denied to everyone else between Adam and John the Baptist (log. 46). They must not lower Jesus to the level of the (Jewish) prophets (log. 52). Circumcision (log. 53) is the Jewish/Christian issue par excellence.⁽⁸⁶⁾ The Jews, who have rejected the Messiah (log. 65,66), are on the very brink of baptism, but do not go the whole way (log. 74). The fact that they are Messiah's kindred helps them not at all (log. 79, 99, cf. 105), for their religion is external (log. 89) and negative (log. 104, cf. 6, 14, 27), and they have no faith. They will not, however, realize their lack until it is too late; that seems, at least, to be the tragic meaning of logion 97, the parable of the meal lost unnoticed from the cracked jar, a parable with no canonical parallel). Logion 102 seems to suggest that the Pharisees prevented the Jews from becoming a world-evangelizing people. The issues are so specific⁽⁸⁷⁾ that it is literally the Jews that must be understood

(86) as in Galatians iii.1-v.25; Panarion haer.30.2.2.

(87) see Neusner, 'Zaccheus/Zakkai', HTR 57 (1964), 57-9

here, not conventional Christians.

All these themes - distinctness, conflict, confrontation with the Jews - are also all present in the canonical Gospels, but not to the extent of dominating the scene as they do in Gospel of Thomas, where their prominence can only be the result of deliberate choice. In the light of this polemical bias, the "chapters" of the Gospel of Thomas may be characterized by these titles:

Introduction: The Secret of the Kingdom

(logia 1-5 = C.G.II, 80:10-81:14, cf. P.Ox. 654:1-31).

Ch.1: The elect do not need external religion

(logia 6-11 = 81:14-82:24, cf. P.Ox. 654:32-42).

Ch.2: Issues to be faced after the departure of Christ

(logia 18-19 = 84:9-25).

Ch.3: The final lot of the elect (and the delay of the ~~Parousia~~ ^{Parousia?})

(logia 20-23 = 84:26-86:3).

Ch.5: The nature of the Kingdom and of Inward Life revealed by Jesus

(logia 24-36 = 86:4-87:26, cf. P.Ox.1:1-44, P.Ox.655: fr.1 a - b).

Ch.6: Jesus reveals himself to those who renounce

(logia 37-42 = 87:27-88:19, cf. P.Ox.655, fr. 1b:sff, fr.11).

Ch.7: The Questioned Authority of Jesus

(logia 43-50 (= 88:20-90:7)).

Ch.8: Jesus the Final Revelation of Life; the need for ~~mortification~~ ^{mortification} ~~notification~~ in readiness for that life.

(logia 51-2-3 to 98 = 90:7-97:20), and for logion 67 see

H. Puech, 'Una bandelette funeraire', RHR CXLVII/1955).

Ch.9: Conflict of Loyalties

(logia 99-112 = 97:21-99:12).

Ch.10: When will the Kingdom come?

(logia 113-114 = 99:13-26)

Colophon: "The Gospel according to Thomas"

(= 99:27-8).

On questions of worship, Thomas is very reserved. Prayer, as typical of Jewish devotion, is, it seems, wholly discountenanced. In logion 14, Jesus says: "If you fast, you will beget sin for yourselves, and if you pray, you will be condemned, and if you give alms, you will do evil to your spirits. And if you go into any land and wander in the regions, if they receive you, eat what they set before you, heal the sick among them. For what goes into your mouth will not defile you, but what comes out of your mouth, that is what will defile you." The missionary scene assumed places this re-interpretation of Luke x.8-9 combined with Matthew xv.17-18 in a time when the Christian mission has gone beyond the bounds of the Holy Land. In the Gospel of Thomas, this logion is part of the answer to the question (see logion 12) "who is it who shall be great over us?" The immediate answer is, "wherever you have come" (again, the mission is assumed to have become international), "you will go to James the Just, for whose sake heaven and earth came into being." There seems no obvious connection between this and the following discussion (logion 13) on the uniqueness of Jesus: While Peter compares him with an angel, and Matthew with a philosopher, Thomas alone admits that he is unclassifiable. Thomas alone therefore becomes the recipient of three secrets so terrifying that even elect Christians might recoil from them with horror (cf logion 17: "What eye has not seen..."). One at least of these

secrets may be the three fold abjuration of conventional piety in logion 14. (Possibly, the three principles are the three secret words of logion 13. Liberation from these destructive acts of piety is by worshipping the unique Jesus, not born of a woman (logion 15), even at the cost of violent opposition from nearest and dearest (logion 16). If adoration is so needful, it may be inferred, then the author of Thomas does not reject all worship in his condemnation of prayer.

This condemnation is repeated in logion 104: When it is said to Jesus by unnamed persons (perhaps, by conventional religion), "come and let us pray today, and let us fast", Jesus replies, "Which then is the sin that I have committed, or in what have I been vanquished? But when the bridegroom comes out of the bridal chamber, then let them fast and let them pray." On first reading, the impression given is that prayer, at least of a certain kind (confession? petition for the coming of Messiah?) is out of place, like fasting is in Mark ii, 19-20 parr., while the disciples have Jesus with them. However, the replacement of the reference in the synoptic version to the time of fasting when Messiah is taken away, sc. by crucifixion, by a reference to the time when Messiah comes forth from the bridal feast, that is, out of heaven for judgement, then it seems that the synoptic saying has been transformed into a threat against such as

reject Jesus as a sinner. Fasting and prayer are signs of terror, apt in those who face Jesus as the judge. Those who will have no need for fear are those who reject all natural ties - those who acknowledge father or mother will be called "the son of a harlot" (logion 105), i.e., they will know the shame of the accusation that was levelled by "the Jews" against Jesus.⁽¹⁾ Those who are the Messiah's favourites, his big sheep (logion 107), those who have the secret of the Kingdom (as in the closing logia 109-113), are those who have fulfilled two conditions: they have become "sons of Man" (106), and have "drunk from the mouth" of Jesus, and so become as he is (108).

In the detailing of these two requirements may be detected the scheme of Christian initiation as interpreted by Thomas: a two-stage rite of baptism and eucharist.

It may seem far-fetched to detect baptism in logion 106, where Jesus says, "When you make the two one, you shall become sons of Man." "The two" that are to be "made one" are the male and female elements. Thomas uses the image of the female as an image of fallenness; to become masculine" is to know salvation. This is true of final salvation: "See, I shall lead her" (Mary, whom Peter wishes to exclude), "so that I will make her male, that she too may become a living spirit, resembling you males.

(1) an echo of Mark viii. 31-8? Mark x. 26-31 par.

For every woman who makes herself male will enter the Kingdom of Heaven" (logion 114). In Thomas, the abolition of the male/female dichotomy, the abolition of shame, the defiance of the world-rulers, the achievement of childlikeness, are all fused into one complex of images: So, in logion 21, Jesus says of his disciples, "They are like little children who have installed themselves in a field which is not theirs. When the owners of the field came, they will say, 'Release to us our field.' They take off their clothes before them to release it (the field) to them and to give back their field to them" (i.e., disciples defy the world-rulers by stripping off their own bodies, which belong to this world). When the disciples ask Jesus when he will be revealed to them, he assures them (logion 37): when you take off your clothing without being ashamed, and take your clothes and put them under your feet as the little children and tread upon them, then (shall you behold) the Son of the living One and you shall not fear." The use of the imagery of unclothing in these two so different contexts suggests that, in addition to its symbolizing the abandonment of worldly things, it also has a literal reference to an unclothing - the baptismal ekdysis.

If it is correct to see a ritual allusion in Thomas's use of the image of unclothing, it might be objected that

the suppression of the imagery of washing infers at least a rejection of water-baptism. However, one short sequence of thought in Thomas seems to betray an assumption on Thomas's part that lustration is involved. Logion 74 rebukes the "many around the cistern", none of whom enter it. In logion 75, Jesus agrees with this criticism, and observes, "Many are standing at the door, but the monachos, the solitary ones, are the ones who will enter the bridal chamber." He distinguishes those who encourage participation in the final wedding-banquet of Messiah but do not take steps to be partakers of it themselves from those who, by embracing the "solitary" life (another expression for those who abolish the male/female dichotomy) do indeed qualify for the great feast. Logion 74 seems to transfer this tragic distinction back to the case of those who advocate baptism for others (perhaps the witnesses at a proselyte-baptism) but do not accept baptism for themselves: compare the use of Matt. xxiii.13-15 in logion 39, 102.

The imagery of the feast cannot but provoke discussion of the sacramental meal. Here again, the references are very oblique, and there seems to be an uneasiness in Thomas's attitude to sacramental actions. Jesus' words in logion 108, "Whoever drinks from my mouth shall become as I am, and I myself will become he, and the hidden things shall be revealed to him" are as apt to the purely mental

imbibing of doctrine as to a sacramental cup. There are, however, in addition, several instances of the use of eating- and drinking-imagery which, taken together, encourage an interpretation in terms of a sacramental meal: the strange picture of the man eating the lion and the lion eating the man (log. 7); the even more distasteful image of the eating of a corpse (log.11), which may be read as a protest against the (Pauline?) interpretation of the Christian sacramental meal in terms of the death of Jesus; the turning of stones into bread (log.19); the suckling babes in logion 22; the invitation to the feast (log.64). Most interesting of all is logion 60: watching a Samaritan carrying a lamb on his way to Judaea (this scene is so unlikely that we are obviously dealing with an encoded message), Jesus asks his disciples why the man is carrying the lamb with him, they reply, "In order that he may kill it and eat it." Jesus makes the rather superfluous observation, "As long as it is alive, he will not eat it, but (only) if he has killed it and it has become a corpse." The disciples reply (and the reader is expected to echo their common-sense rejoinder), "Otherwise he will not be able to do it." Jesus goes on, "You yourselves, seek a place for yourselves in Repose, lest you become a corpse and be eaten." No doubt much of the meaning of this odd exchange is denied to us until we can recover its source. (2) Some levels of meaning are nonetheless recoverable. The lamb laboriously carried to Judaea cannot but refer to the

(2) With Doresse, Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics (ET London 1960) 375.

Passover. It is not only the Jewish Passover that is meant, for the Samaritan would go to Gerizim, not to Zion. The conclusion must be that this is the Christian Passover, which, if read as a commemoration of Jesus' death must, according to Thomas, remain on a "Jewish" level, and must involve those who so celebrate it in the death of this world. The very fact that the Christian Passover needs to be reinterpreted by Thomas as an anticipation of the eternal Rest (that is, when it is rightly practised and understood) can only mean that the church of Thomas did indeed have a sacramental meal that could be interpreted as a Christian Passover.

The statement that the initiate is brought into identity with Jesus, made in both logia 106 and 108, by linking this effect with both baptismal and eucharistic imagery, more than suggests that baptism and meal belonged together in one observance. The claimed effects assert, on one level, a "high" sacramental theology; but there is also a balancing assertion that the true "sacramental causality" is in fact self-realisation: ⁽³⁾ "Whoever finds himself, of him the world is not worthy" (log.111); this self-discovery is patently available to all, if only men will see (log.113) "the Kingdom of the Father is spread upon the earth, and men do not see it."

Some reference to anointing might just possibly be present

(3) cf C.J. Albanese, 'Inwardness. A Study of Some Gnostic Themes and their relation to Early Christianity, with special reference to the Gospel according to Thomas', RThAncMed. XLVIII (1976) 64-88.

in the allusion to the five trees of Paradise (log.19),⁽⁴⁾ which in Jewish love would point to the oil of unction, and also in the references to warmth in Jesus (not in log. 10, but in log.82: "He who is near me is near the fire"), which is later used in the Gospel of Philip⁽⁵⁾ as a reference to chrism; but this is quite uncertain.

Questions incapable of solution also surround logion 61: "Salome said: 'Who are you, man? Have you as from the One mounted my bed and eaten from my table?' Jesus said to her, 'I am he who came into existence from that which is equal; I was given the things of my Father.' (Salome replies) 'I am your disciple.' (Jesus says) 'Therefore I say, when it is deserted, it will be full of light, but when it is shared, it will be full of darkness.'" This rendering is from Schoedel,⁽⁶⁾ and makes more sense in the context (following the sentence referring to two persons in one bed, 91:23-25, alluding to Luke xvii.34) than that of Guillaumont et al. Grant and Freedman (ibid.) observe, "If it is the deserted bed which is full of light, we may have a reflection of the Naassene rejection of sexual intercourse (Hippolytus, Ref; 5,7,13)". That this passage in the Refutation includes direct quotations of Thomas we have already argued. This logion may be read as a defence of the sacramental meal, with its accompanying interpretation in terms of the marriage-feast, against slanders from hostile outsiders.

(4) 438-441 infra, but see

(5) C.G.II/3, 57:22-28; R.McL.Wilson, The Gospel of Philip (London 1962), 33, 90-1; W.C.Till, Das Evangelium nach Philippos (Berlin 1963), 18-19.

Philippos

(6) in Grant, Freedman, Secret Sayings, 158 (Their numbering is 62).

Logion 50 offers a series of potent answers to challenges:

1. "Jesus said:
2. If they say to you, From where have you originated?,
3. say to them, We have come from the Light,
4. Where the Light has originated through itself.
5. It (stood) and it revealed itself in their image.
6. If they say to you, Who are you?,
7. say, We are his sons,
8. and we are the elect of the living Father.
9. If they ask you, What is the sign of your Father in you?,
10. say to them, It is a movement and a rest.

This logion is markedly rhythmic, and bears the marks of a passage to be learned by heart. The questions posed are clearly challenges which may be expected on the Great Journey to the Kingdom, of which the preceding logion (49) says: "Blessed are the solitary and elect, for you shall find the Kingdom; because you come from it, you shall go there again." The challengers would appear to be hostile archous. (7) "There image" in line 5 is obscure, and may indicate that the lines are an excerpt from a longer formula. The "rest" which is within the elect, and is one of the resources which protects them on their journey after death, is both an inward quality and also a sacramental experience, as is noted in the foregoing discussion of the sacramental meal. It is conceivable that the church of Thomas had some sort of viaticum, at which these formulae were repeated as a

(7) Not merely hostile men, vs Grant and Freedman 152

reminder to the dying initiate. Although the "Rest" is also an eschatological concept, and is considered as such in logion 51, with its discussion of the date of the Anapausis, in logion 50 it has also its sacramental overtones. The likelihood is that these pass-words, as in logion 50 or in fuller form, were taught in a homily during the initiation ceremonies.

How, if at all, these pass-words were related to the theme of the Mother, in the tantalizingly damaged logion 101, is impossible to say; but the role of the interceding Mother as in Setheus, may be alluded to in this passage.

7. The Peratae

Before noticing the documents associated immediately with the Gospel of Thomas tradition, it is necessary to refer to a group of documents which seem to be the vehicle by means of which the themes of heavenly ascent and of the interceding Mother, already present in Thomas,⁽¹⁾ were fed into this tradition, where they were ~~amalgamated~~ ^{amalgamated} with the Christian liturgical themes of baptism and eucharist. In foregoing discussion of our sources, we have identified this group, comprising Marsanes, Setheus, The Thought of Norea, and Zostrianos, as belonging to the Peratae.

Marsanes (c.G. $\bar{x}/1$) is a mystical tractate, in which Jewish and neo-Platonic elements are mixed⁽²⁾, devoted to

(1) C.G.II/2, 50:1 (meaning obscure, and ignored).

(2) Pearson, 'Tractate Marsanes and the Platonic Tradition' (1978).

the theme of the Mystical Ascent. The teacher begins with the reassurance that he who is the longed-for vision is good, and not ill-disposed to those who seek him: "they found him with a pure heart, they are not afflicted by him with evils" (1:11-14). The teacher expounds the technique of the ascent in terms of thirteen stages, each one characterized by a "seal" (2:A-4:24). Each stage is marked by particular insights into truth: in the first, second, and third the topic is the distinction of truth from that which is cosmic and material, and the inner discipline of shunning passion and distraction; the fourth and fifth concern knowledge of the three Powers and the principle of Repentance - and so it goes on up to the thirteenth stage, the realisation of the unknown Silent One (4:19-24). It is this thirteenth stage which the teacher has reinterpreted, according to his introduction of the whole scheme (2:12-16) as being a Knowledge, Gnosis, and a Rest, Anapausis. He is, interpreting an inherited tradition with new material.

The teacher goes on to extol the privilege which he enjoys, and something of its significance (4:24-8:11). In particular, he observes, "I have deliberated and have attained to the boundary of the sense-perceptible world" (5:17-19), perhaps the passage that lies behind the Refutator's statement ⁽³⁾ that the Peratae claimed to ^{have} passed the bounds of sense. He has come to recognize his quest as being for "the Kingdom of the Three-powered One" (6:17-20).

His inner discipline of questioning had yielded results: for instance, that the One works from silence (7:1-6), and that a vision of his supremacy is possible (7:20-21). His being granted revelation is a source of joy to, he seems to say, the entire creation (7:24-8:11).

His further questioning is met by direct counsel from the third Power (8:12-13:16, and perhaps onward, but pages 13 to 24 are beyond recovery). His continuing quest must be by silence (8:18-25). The complete revelation will be not only of timeless truths but of a salvific process. There ^{has} ~~is~~ been division between the Maiden and the Male; to heal the division, she has been made masculine, an event which is part of a process of withdrawal by the three Powers. The Spirit descends and ascends to give light to the confused universe (9:1-10:7). It is now possible for the Spirit to be bestowed upon the elect, who may as a result ascend with the Spirit (10:16-12end).

The next recoverable section of the tractate (25:12-39end) is devoted to an "alphabetology". Since this seems to mark a regression from the new revelation in 8:12-13:16, from the thought of salvation to a mere catalogue of cosmological fact, it may represent an older stratum of the tractate or its tradition, before Marsanes added his new insights. The course of the exposition includes asides of mystical counsel: "(control?) yourselves, receive the imperishable seed, bear

fruit, and do not become attached to your possessions"
 *
 (26:12-17); "For these reasons we have acquired sufficiency;
 for it is fitting that each one acquire power for himself to
 bear fruit and that we never cast aspersions on the mysteries
 *
 (39:18-24).

The "alphabetology" is followed by a discussion of the
 final reward of the mystical quest (40 ff), which is
 *
 damaged at the end. After a large gap in the codex, there
 is a closing conversation (55* - 68*) also in a very
 fragmentary state. It is at this stage that allusions to
 ritual acts appear, or seem to appear, although the sadly
 battered state of these pages makes the interpretation
 problematic in the extreme. "(After) I was silent, (I
 said), 'Tell me, what is the.....that will wash... entire
 generation?'" (55:17-21). The image of washing appears again
 at 65:21 (perhaps, "fountain of immortality"), and at
 66:1-4, where an agent, whose identity is lost by the
 damage to the manuscript, will "wash her from... of God...
 the one whom they sealed has been adorned (with the) seal
 of heaven" (reading ΣΔΚΜC ΔΒ[ΑΛ ΖΝ...Ε ΜΠΝ[ΟΥΤΕ....
 Π[ΘΝ]ΤΑΥ[С]Φ[ΡΑΙΧΕ ΗΜΛΥ] ΔΖ[ΟΥ]ΤCΛΕΙ[ΛΥ ΖΝ ΤCΦΡΑ]ΠΙ[С
~~ΠΙ~~ Π]ΤΠΕ , with Pearson p. 342). This apparent
 reference to baptism (either accompanied by another act of
 "sealing", or itself interpreted as a seal, i.e. a
 recognition-mark for protection during the Ascent of the
 Soul), prepares the initiate for the awesome vision, as of
 blazing light (64:2-5) The appearance nearby of angels

(64:^{*}16), and specifically of Gamaliel, "who is in command of the spirits" (64:^{*}19-20), with "the angels who receive" (65:^{*}1-3), the paraleptores familiar from 2 Jeu 42, (4) Setheus ch. 8, and elsewhere in the related literature, suggests that, now that a redemptive element has been brought into this mysticism, a sacramental means for identifying the initiate with the ascending Spirit, and at the same time for protecting the initiate after death from the perils of the Great Ascent, is provided in baptism. The seal, or identity - disk of knowledge which the mystic needs is now a mark placed upon him or her by a lustral sacrament.

Setheus admits to depending on Marsanes. The praise given to the power of Marsanes referred to in that book (CG.x̄,7:24-8:11) is mentioned, and given precise wording here (p.xxii and 84 Baynes, p.12 Schmidt, p235 Schmidt - MacDermot). This work is not so much an apocalypse as a system based on the data of apocalyptic. The whole cosmos is a reproduction, on three levels, of the inner life of the Triple Power. Even in the primal glory are the essential ingredients of the redemption-story: the spring (sc. for baptism) in the First Father (p226:13-14 Schmidt-MacDermot); the cross in the Father of All (p.227:15-19), which is also the spring; gnosis and life and hope and rest and love and resurrection and the seal (p.227:24-26). The cross is significant, precisely because the whole theme of the cross is foreign to this

(4) Apokryphon of John, C.G.III.33; Sacred Book, C.G.III.64-5; B.G.8502.66-7; cf Pearson in loc.

work. The only other reference to it is the quotation of Mark viii.34 parr., on taking up the cross and so following Jesus, which occurs in chapter 16 of Setheus (p.256:3-6, Schmidt-MacDermot), the chapter devoted to the rescue of humankind from darkness by the first-born, acting under the guidance of the Mother. There is no mention of the crucifixion in the system; the real need is not of an atonement for sin but for the realisation of a frustrated ideal.

The Mother's role is far more substantial. She prays (ch.17) for her offspring, that the One, who begot Man in his mind, should order them and give them knowledge of himself as Saviour. The answer of the One (ch.18) is to send the light-spark to wear the world like a garment, as the Mother's first-born had done. This act evokes praise from the celestial powers. He draws to him worshippers, divides the land into the area of life and that of death (ch.19), and promises those in the land of life - no-one appears to choose the other land! - that they will be gods, and that God will dwell among them. Then he departs. The Mother's children then pray on their own account (ch.20) for powers of discernment, spirits that may indwell them and teach them.

This he does by constructing an edifice of spiritual beings, at the centre of which is a place for baptism. "In that place they are immersed ($\psi\lambda\gamma\zeta\omega\kappa\mu$) in the name

of the self-begotten one who is God after them. And in that place over the spring (**QIZN-TPIHGH**) of living water were put powers which were brought forth as they came. These are the names of the powers which are over the living water: Michar and Micheu. And they are purified through Barpharanges..." (p.263:22-27). Since the self-begotten one in whose name the Mother's children wash themselves is the one who invites them to take up their cross and follow him, we certainly have a version of Christian baptism. The names of the attendant angels are (5) Jewish; since they do not occur in the opening stages of the system it must be concluded that the tradition of baptism which the author of Setheus has built into his optimistic system is Jewish - Christian. He has met it in a form in which repentance is mentioned (p.263:19-20, 20-21), but the emphasis falls on enlightenment and guidance, presumably the gift of the Spirit. The intention with which he expects this sacrament to be administered is summed up, therefore, in the preceding prayer (p.262:9-263:10). It is very improbable that this prayer reproduces one actually in use, for it assumes a scene in pre-temporal history; but it suggests that a pre-baptismal prayer for the gift of the spirit was known in the Jewish-Christian baptismal rite upon which Setheus has drawn. The presence of **CTAYPOC** and **COΦAΓIC** in the opening sections of Setheus also indicates that the rite was described as a seal, and that it referred to the

(5) So Schmidt-MacDermot 263.

crucified Jesus, although both these features have been omitted when the rite itself ^{has} adapted for insertion into the system.

The Thought of Norea (c.G. ix/Z) is a very different version of the Prayer of the Mother, as in Ch. 17 of Betheus. The transformation of a pre-cosmic mother-figure into Noah's wife suggests that there is here the iceberg-tip of an otherwise lost process of adapting the mythological system represented by Setheus to closer affinity with the thought-world of Jewish Christianity.

In the longest tractate (132 pages) of the Nag Hammadi find, c.G. VIII/1, Zostrianos, another amalgam of Hellenistic and Jewish occultism, ⁽⁶⁾ another phase or style of this SYNCRETISTIC process is to be observed. The complexities of this composite text dictate caution in its interpretation until research has clarified many questions. There are signs that two different ^{Cosmologies,} ~~cosmologies~~ a three-heaven scheme, with an accompanying programme of four baptisms, and a seven-heaven scheme, with a corresponding programme of five or seven baptisms, have been combined. Apparently common to both schemes is the view that the experience of baptism is a moment of revelation, a move upward through the Aeons. Each one is a baptism in a name (6:7, 7:1-9, 7:9-16, 7:16); and the series is to be used in reverse as a technique for a safe return from

(6) J.R.Sieber, 'An Introduction to the Tractate Zostrianos from Nag Hammadi', NT XV (1973), 230-40; M.Scopello, 'The Apocalypse of Zostrianos (Nag Hammadi VIII.1) and the Book of the Secrets of Enoch', Vig Chr 34 (1980) 376-85. ET, Sieber, NHLE 368-93.

the terrible heights of vision. The four baptisms just listed, which belong to the tree-heaven scheme, are "the washings of YOUEL"; the fifth baptism, itself repeated (58-9) to fit the seven-heaven scheme and to enable entry into "the great Aeon" (60:24-62:10), incorporates or is followed by, an anointing (63:23). The "seal" has now, it seems, become a distinct feature of the process, probably the anointing; this new arrangement is combined with the angelological presentation of baptism as it occurs in Sethus: "I was baptized in the name of the Self-begotten God by these powers which are upon living waters, Michar and Mi(?chea; ?cheus). I was purified by (the) great Barpharanges. Then (? they revealed) themselves to me and wrote me in the glory. I was sealed by those who are on those powers, Michar, Micheus and Seldas and Ele(nos) and Zogenthlos" (6:7-17). The baptismal scheme, and the visionary quest which it makes possible, must meet a soteriological need - the conquest of death, and therefore also the conquest of the female principle. Like Seth, Zostrianos leaves three tablets for the guidance of later generations (130:1-4) He then descends, unseen by the angels and rulers (130:5-13), and appeals in impassioned tones, concluding (131:2-132:5),

"Do not baptize yourselves with death"

(i.e., baptism must not be linked with the crucified Jesus),

"nor entrust yourselves to those lower than you
instead of to those who are better"

(probably asserting that the elect transcend the
world-makers).

"Flee from the madness and the bondage of
femininity,

and choose for yourself the salvation of
masculinity.

You have not come (? to suffer),
but to escape your bondage.

Release yourselves,
and that which has bound you will be dissolved.

Save yourselves,
in order that it (=?) may be saved.

Why are you hesitating?

Seek when you are sought;
when you are invited, listen.

For the time is short.

The aeon of the aeon of the living ones is great,
but the (punishment) of the unconvinced is great
also,

Many bonds and chastisers surround you.

Mature quickly before destruction reaches you.

Look at the light.

Flee the darkness.

Do not be led astray to your destruction."

This passage, with its carefully constructed balance of

long and short sentences, its use of parallelism and contrast, its concatenation of imperatives, is very apt for use as an exhortation before an act of initiation. It is not impossible that the whole book was used for such a purpose; but its author's design was also to make it a manifest of a changed view of religion and ritual. The opening section (1:1-4:19) is a sort of religious autobiography, in which Zostrianos recounts how, after a time of limited spiritual aspirations, during which he is content to seek a vision of the Perfect Child by a discipline of daily speculative prayer, he is accosted by a messenger of light and rebuked for forgetting his true vocation to mediate saving truth for the whole human race. It is this rebuke which impels him to the mystical ascent. Such an autobiographical introduction makes the entire book into an invitation to a new style of religious thoughts, the newly introduced, or further elaborated, initiation rite is part of a new religious construct.

These documents of the Peratae are here interpreted as products of ^asyncretising group who combine Hellenistic speculation (in which ~~templ~~^{θεωπία} is both thought and mystical vision) with Jewish Merkabah mysticism, and fuse this with a Jewish-Christian baptismal devotion. The stance of the Peratae is basically optimistic and world-affirming, but contact with Jewish-Christians

seems with the passage of time to have brought in a pessimistic and world-denying note. The natural inference is that the Jewish-Christians in question are suffering from disillusionment; and the obvious candidates for such a role are Jewish-Christians who have fled to Pella in Peraea, and have witnessed the ~~unpunished~~ ^{unpunished} desecration of the Holy Place in Jerusalem.

8. Documents immediately related to the "Gospel of Thomas" Tradition

In foregoing discussion of the sources, the Gospel of Thomas was observed in association with a number of other books, including the Gospel according to the Egyptians (subtitled in Nag Hammadi MSS The Sacred Book of the Great Invisible Spirit), the Paraphrase of Shen, the Apocalypse of Adam (all these attested by name), and, after detective work, with Origin of the World and Hypostasis of the Archons, Testimony of Truth, and Apocalypse of Paul.

In varying ways, these works reflect a liturgical pattern like that in Thomas.

The Apocalypse of Adam (C.G. \bar{v} /S begins with a rehearsal of a version of the Fall: from an original state of being superior to the Creator (\bar{v} , 64:6-19), Adam and Eve are divided, and robbed of their knowledge,

so that they are enslaved to the Creator (64:20-65:25). They are roused by a deputation of three messengers (65:26-66:1) who promise new life. The fulfilment of this promise is slow, and the story of the Flood is part of the long preparation for that fulfilment. When "the man upon whom the Holy Spirit has come" finally arrives (77:16-18), then the hostile angels are confused, and attempt to explain him away by telling how "he came to the water". This last phrase occurs as the climax of each one of a series of inadequate Christologies: pre-existent glory (77:26-78:5), a version of the Elijah story (7:6-17), the virgin-born banished with his mother (78:18-26), another version of the same (78:27-79:19), gestation in the sea (79:19-27), the virgin-born nourished in a garden (79:28-80:9), the droplet from heaven (80:10-20), a rock overshadowed by a cloud (80:20-29), a self impregnation by one of the Muses (81:1-14), a cloud impregnated by a god (81:14-23), the fruit of an incestuous union (81:24-82:4), the product of two Illuminators (82:4-10), a sort of Logos theology (82:10-17). It is hard to take this list of heterodoxies literally or seriously; but they seem to stand for various popular speculations about Jesus. What all of them and the author of this Apocalypse, all have in common is the assumption that the baptism of Jesus is a concial moment in the history of salvation. Each erroneous view is put forward by a different "generation", **γενεά** ; the cause of erroneous Christology is erroneous self-understanding. Only the

generation without a King rightly understands how Jesus "came to the water". He was chosen from the aeons, and filled with a special gnosis. He came as the illuminator to make the generation he had chosen to shine upon the universe (82:19-83:4).

The salvation-history hinges upon the baptism of the elect, as well as on that of Jesus:

"Then the seed, those who will receive his name upon the water, will fight against the power.

And a cloud of darkness will come upon them". (83:4-8). which will cause the peoples to repent, and to lament their ignorance, while praising the gnosis of the elect: "Blessed is the soul of these men, because they have known God with a knowledge of the truth! They shall live forever, because they have not been corrupted by their desire, along with the angels, nor have they accomplished the work of the Powers, but they have stood in his presence like light that has come forth from fire and blood..." (83:10-23).

At this point, the angels appointed to preside over baptisms are rebuked for having allowed the holy living water of baptism to fall under the power of the powers (84:4-23). The three angels are Micheu and Michar and Mnesinous (84:5-6), two of whom appear (v. supra) in Setheus, Zostrianos and Sacred Book, and all of them in

Trimorphic Protennoia (XIII, 48:18-21). The correction of the angels concludes with an affirmation (84:23-85:18) that the elect will at the last be the means of vindicating the wisdom of the all-knowing God.

The closing paragraph identifies this whole doctrine, the hidden knowledge taught by Adam to Seth, as being itself "the holy baptism of those who know the eternal knowledge through those born of the word and the imperishable illuminators who came from the holy spore: Yesseus, Mazareus, Yessedekus, the living water." (85:24-31). True baptism, the living water, is now available because it can be administered in the names appropriate to the Three-Powered One, and by those who have the gnosis. The baptizing sect presents itself, then, as sent to renew the gift of saving baptism which conventional and popular Christianity has compromised.

The Sacred Book of the Great Invisible Spirit (C.G. III/2 and IV/2) is an extremely complex work, of which any analysis or survey must be hazardous. It combines a Seth-mythology with a richly developed Jewish angelology, and a baptismal devotion with an ascent-of-the-soul devotion. The book as a whole is filled with references to the giving of promise, and occasional "Quotations" of the content of that promise; its whole atmosphere suggests an exhortation that will lead into

prayer - which is, in effect, what this tractate does. After describing how Seth, the saviour-figure, passes through the ruined universe to save the errant race, and to provide "the cosmic reconciliation and the baptism of the body through the Logos-begotten one (so IV, 74:24-26); "through a Logos-begotten body", III, 63:10-11), which the great Seth secretly prepared through the virgin, to beget again the saints through the Holy Spirit, and invisible and secret symbols, through the reconciliation of world with world, through the renunciation of the world..." (C.G. IV, 74:24-75:5), we are introduced to the powers that administer "the baptism that surpasses the heavens" (IV, 75:13), the "great attendants... Yesseus, Mazareus, Yessedekus the living water" (IV, 75:25-27), "... (those) who preside over the springs of the truth, Micheus and Michar and Mnesinous, and he who presides over the baptism of the living, the purifer Sesengenbarpharanges ..." (IV, 76:3-7), among other beneficent angelic figures. The mention of these details is not gratuitous, for the blessed, the sons of Seth, are those who "are worthy of the baptisms of the renunciation and the ineffable seals of (their) baptism, these have known their receivers (paralēptor) as they (have learned) about them, having known (through) them, and they shall not taste death" (IV, 78:3-10).

The "hymnic section". (as the editors call it) at 111, 66:8-22 = 1V, 78:10-79:3, is the doxology into which the exposition naturally leads. It is not easy of interpretation; but it appears to indicate that it accompanies a baptism about to be self-administered, for the singer is the beneficiary of the sacrament, and it is he who has mixed "the incense of life" into the water. This is said to be performed "according to the type of all archons"; but no detail in the surviving text explains the phrase; the pouring of a sweet unguent into the water, so that it diffused slowly in a manner vaguely suggestive of smoke, would perhaps fill the bill. Such a ritual act is mentioned by Irenaeus at A.H. I. xiv. 4, in connection with a rite performed for the dying (but not, it seems, by them), and perhaps more comparably, at A.H. I.xiv.3 with reference to an initiation (I, 186-7, 185 Harvey).

The hymn, or pre-baptismal thanksgiving, has been rendered thus:

1. "Yesseus, EO OU EOUO OUA, really truly,
2. O Yesseus, Mazareus, Yessedekeus, O living waters
3. O child of the child, O glorious name, really
truly,
4. thou that art eternal,
5. 1 1 1 1, E E E E O O O O U U U U O O O O
A A A A, really truly!

6. EI A A A A $\bar{O} \bar{O} \bar{O} \bar{O}$,
7. O existing one that seest the aeons, really truly!
8. AEE $\bar{E} \bar{E} \bar{E}$ 1 1 1 U U U U U $\bar{O} \bar{O} \bar{O} \bar{O} \bar{O} \bar{O}$,
9. Who art eternally eternal, really truly!
10. $\bar{I} \bar{E} A$ A $\bar{I} \bar{O}$ in the heart, that existest.
11. U for ever and ever,
12. thou art what thou art, thou art who thou art.
13. This great name of thine is upon me,
14. O self-begotten Perfect One, who art not outside me.
15. I see thee, O thou who art invisible to everyone.
16. For who will be able to comprehend thee in another tongue?
17. Now that I have known thee,
- 17a I have mixed myself with the immutable;
18. I have armed myself with an armour of light
- 18b I have become light.
19. Therefore I have stretched out my hands while they were folded.
20. I was shaped in the circle of the riches of light which is in my bosom,
21. Which gives shape to the many begotten ones in the light into which no complaint reaches.
22. I shall declare thy glory truly,
23. for I have comprehended thee,
24. Sou IES (=Jesus?) IDE AE $\bar{I} \bar{O}$ AEIE OIS \bar{O}
25. Oh eternal, eternal, O God of silence!

26. I honour thee completely.
27. Thou art my place of rest, O sou $\bar{E}S \bar{E}S O E$,
28. the formless one that existed in the formless ones,
29. that existest, raising up the man in whom thou
wilt purify
30. me into life,
according to thine imperishable name!
31. Therefore the incense of life is in me.
32. I mixed it with water according to the type of
the archons,
33. in order that I may live with thee in the peace
of the saints,
34. thou that existest really truly for ever."

(after Böhlig and Wisse, 154-160;

C.G. 111/2, 66:8-68:2)

Until further evidence is available, it is impossible even to guess whether the vowel-rows are encoded divine names, or are to be uttered as a rhythmic mantra just as they are, or represent musical notation. (1)

This pre-baptismal doxology says nothing explicitly about the guardian angels mentioned in the preceding homily, once the opening lines are passed, and nothing of Seth, or of the interceding mother, who has been mentioned in the exposition at 111, 59:9-60:2 = IV 77:?-78:10. It is very probable that the doxology,

(1) Considered in passing by E. Werner, The Sacred Bridge (London 1959), 381-2, 395-6.

at least in its outline or style, belongs to an earlier pattern of ritual upon which the complex homily has been grafted. It may be that ⁽²⁾ ~~alleged~~ ^{alleged} Egyptian features of the homily point to the general area where this happened; but no date can at present be convincingly suggested.

The baptismal rite assumed in the Sacred Book has gone beyond that behind Gospel of Thomas in ritual development - and also in theological development, for association of baptism with the Cross is ignored, and not even disowned. Like Thomas, however, Sacred Book orders baptism emphatically to life after death, and makes renunciation of the world an essential condition. If, as seems beyond doubt, the cult-association which used Thomas used Sacred Book and included them in the same codex, the sub-title of the latter coming at the end of the codex, the odd confusion between Thomas and the Gospel according to the Egyptians in the citations of Clement⁽³⁾ is explained.

The rites assumed in Apocalypse of Adam and Sacred Book are very similar, as is the presentation of them in an angelological setting. The more combative tone of Apocalypse of Adam may reflect a different stage of development, or simply a different context. Apocalypse of Adam, at least, reflects the defensive attitude of a minority very much aware of its superiority over a more conventional body.

(2) Schenke in NTS 16/2 (Jan 1970) 196-208.

(3) James, ANT 10-11; all Clement's references correspond with Gospel of Thomas material.

An even more combative tone is to be heard in Paraphrase of Shem, C.G. VII/1. In this text, (4) which uses the most unpleasant imagery to convey a sense of disgust with material things, the usual baptism itself has been grossly perverted by the demon who has it seems, made Faith itself into an evil delusion (VII, 29:33-16). "For because of him the whole world will be disturbed. For he will seek the power of Faith and Light; he will not find it. For at that time the demon will also appear upon the river to baptize with an imperfect baptism and to trouble the world with a bondage of water." (30:17-27). Yet this demonic act can be turned to good: ".... when the appointed days of the demon draw near - he who will baptize erringly - then I shall appear in the baptism of the demon to reveal with the mouth of Faith a testimony to those who belong to her" (31:14-22). There are (5) elements in C.G. VII/1 that may be interpolations, and precisely in the apparently secondary strata are utterances that seem to disown the use of water-baptism altogether, even though the earlier stratum offers a defence of water-baptism through reinterpretation, by the claim that the Redeemer-figure has entered both the element and the custom and wrested from the demon his own instrument of harm.

The treatise which has come to be know as Testimony of Truth (C.G. 1X/3), although less emphatic in tone

(4) ET, F.Wisse, NHLE 309-28; also Wisse, 'The Redeemer Figure in the Paraphrase of Shem', NT XII (1971) 130-40; D.A.Bertrand, 'Paraphrase de Sem et Paraphrase de Seth', in Menard, ed., Textes de Nag Hammadi (NHS VII) 1975, 146-57. (5) e.g., 'he who will baptize erringly'.

than the Paraphrase, assumes the same negative stance toward material things, and therefore toward water-baptism, or at least toward water-baptism as conventionally understood. The Jordan is said to represent carnal desire (IX, 30:30-31:3), and John the Baptist to symbolize the destructive feminine principle (31:3-4). This interpretation is, on the surface, anti-Jewish; but is used to attack conventional Christians who make the usual baptismal confession (ΕΥΧΑΝΟΜΟΛΟΤΕΙ, 31:24) and say, "we are Christians" (31:24-25) without aiming beyond a this-worldly initiation to one that conquers death (31:25-32:14). It is implied that the true initiation fore-shadowed by the descent of the Spirit or Jesus' baptism (30:18-30), brings to the initiate the power of Christ's harrowing of hell, his healing miracles and his transcendence of the laws of nature (32:22-33:24). This true initiation is by means of the hearing of the Word (40:1-41:4, 45:1-22), which reproduces in the believing hearer the self-awareness of Jesus. The whole history of Jesus is depicted as the journey into self-discovery of the representative man; he even repents of the sins which others have implicated him in by their misdeeds (43:1-9; and the wider context in 41:11-44:30). How this self-discovery, when replicated in the believer, this reception of "the crown unfading" (45:5-6), is translated into ritual, it is not clear. (6)

The hostile attitude taken even to Valentinian baptism, the alleged "seal" that pledged eternal

(69:7-17), suggests that the author may be taken literally when he says (69:22-24): "But the baptism of truth is something else; it is by renunciation of the world that it is found."

This treatise may be one of the foundation documents of the "Caiana haeresis" that Tertullian had to argue with in his de baptismo i, which denied any value in baptism whatever. This view is not in essence a sacramental theology or a doctrine of creation or a matter (although it implies all of these things), but the expression of the renunciation of a community. The denunciation of a whole series of Christian minorities - Valentinians, Basilidians, Simonians (=?), and others (54-70) - comes to its climax with these words: "Others have demons dwelling with them, as did David the King. He is the one who laid the foundation of Jerusalem; and his son Solomon, whom he begat in (adultery), Lo the one who built Jerusalem by means of the demons, because he received (power). When he (had finished building, he imprisoned the demons in the temple. He placed them in seven water-pots. They remained a long time in the water-pots, abandoned there. When the Romans went up to Jerusalem, they discovered the water-pots, and immediately the demons ran out of the waterpots like those who escape from prison. And the water-pots remained pure thereafter. And since those days they dwell with men who are in ignorance, and they have remained

M

upon the earth" (70:1-24). The fragmentary comments which follow (note the reference to "mystery" in 70:30) indicate that this passage is not to be read only on a literal level. Part of its meaning seems to be that the Roman attack on Jerusalem caused the dissemination throughout the world of the teaching of baptism which our author so much detests.

Consonant with the author's rejection of the Judaic Christianity which has formed his thought-world, even in his Egyptian milieu,⁽⁷⁾ is his rejection of the Law, and his interpretation of the story of the fall as a moment of enlightenment (45:23-49:10).

Pearson⁽⁸⁾ may be correct in his view that the version of the midrash on the serpent given by Testimony of Truth is older than that in Hypostasis of the Archons and its companion work Origin of the World (C.G. II/4 and C.G.II/5). There is certainly a sympathy in general attitude between the two versions, not least in their view of the tempting serpent as a benefactor (II/4, 89:32-90:19; II/5, 166:10-167:13). However, the two latter books reflect a more positive and optimistic appreciation

(6) Pearson, intro to his edn (1981); see also Koschorke, ZnW 69 (1976) 91-117.

(7) Pearson (1981) 117. (8) op cit 106.

of worship and sacraments that Testimony of Truth offers. In both of them, the role of Norea the interceding mother survives.⁽⁹⁾ Even the creator, Sabaoth, [{] ~~as~~ more fool than rogue, and when he is converted he sings praises to Wisdom and to Life (II/4, 20-23). The saving knowledge conveyed by archetypal Man is portrayed by an anointing: "...he will teach them about everything, and will anoint them with the chrism of eternal life, which has been given him from the kingless generation" (97:1-5). As in Gospel of Thomas, initiation confers hope for the Great Journey. There is, however, in the view of the author of Hypostasis of the Archons, no more need for pass-words; the anointing will of itself enable its recipients to vanquish the archons: "Then they will cast away from them blind thought, and they will trample the powers to death, and they will go up to the Infinite Light, where this seed is. Then the powers will renounce their times, and the angels will weep over their destruction, and their demons will mourn over their death." (97:6-14). The salvation of the ^{redeemed} ~~redeemed~~ will enable the whole universe to praise the Father and the Son with the Sanctus, thus combining the goal of the

(9) cf Layton, ed., Hypostasis, 365.

mystical quest of Merkabah with the Naassene-Christian version of the history of salvation: "Then all the sons of light will indeed know the truth and their root, and the Father of the All, and the Holy Spirit. They will all say with a single voice, 'Righteous is the truth of the Father, and the Son is over the All.' And from everyone, for ever and ever: 'Holy, Holy, Holy, Amen.' " (97:15-20, combining the versions of Bullard and Layton).

It is inadvisable to make confident assertions about the way in which this faith was translated into ritual. There may be a liturgical sequence of chrismation+renunciation+doxology (said over the prostrate initiate ?)+raising-up, in II/4, 95:13-25. However, Layton's rendering ("caught up" rather than "raised up"), which is preferable, transfers at least the closing items of this sequence into the setting of the ascent of the redeemer which the initiate may share; it is more probably a theologoumenon than a direct use of ritual imagery. ⁽¹⁰⁾

In Trimorphic Protennoia (C.G. XIII/1), we find a fusion of a baptismal tradition with the theme of a redeeming and protecting mother-figure (Epinoia). The process of salvation is summed up in XIII, 47:29-48:35 : baptismal imagery is there used in a curiously two-~~directional~~ ^{directional} way. One the one hand, the Redeemer appears

(10) regretfully dissenting from Segelberg, 'The Baptismal Rite according to some of the Coptic-Gnostic Texts of Nag-Hammadi', in Studia Patristica V (1962), 117-28: 127; and from Magne (1980), (1973).

to apply salvific water to the candidate, to strip him of psychic thought before he is clothed with knowledge (48:6-14; this passage is too badly damaged to be confident of the ~~reconstruction~~ ^{reconstruction}). An uncl³othing before a baptism is a familiar sequence; more ~~surprising~~ ^{surprising} is an enclothing before a baptism, but this seems to be implied in the following lines (C.G.VIII, 48:15-38):-

"And I delivered him to those who gave robes-

Yammon, Elasso, Amenai -

and they....him with a robe from the robes of light;

and I delivered him to the baptizers

and they baptized him -

Micheus, Michar, Mn(e)sinous -

and they immersed him in the spring of the (Water) of Life.

And I delivered him to those who enthrone -

Bariel, Nouthan, Sabenai -

and they enthroned him from the throne of glory.

And I delivered him to those who glorify -

Ariom, Elien, Pariel -

and they glorified him with the glory of the Fatherhood.

And those who snatch away snatched away -

Kamaliel, (...)anen, Samblo,

the servants of the Great Luminaries -

and they took him into the light-(place ?) of his Fatherhood.

And (he received) the Five Seals from the Light of
the Mother, Protennoia,
and it was (granted) him to partake of the (.....) of knowledge,
and (.....) in light."

The author assumes a rite consisting of: unrobing + water-baptism + robing + further baptism + enthronement + coronation - the last two details perhaps to be understood by analogy with nuptial ceremonies.⁽¹¹⁾ The "Five Seals" are more enigmatic. They may represent a further stage of ritual action (but, if this is the case, they may be conceived of as taking place only after death, without any corresponding detail in the action on earth); they may indicate a style of formula used in the invocation at each stage of the progress; or they may in some way identify the character and effect of the whole initiatory process. The reference in XIII,49:29-30 to "the Five Seals of these particular names" suggests that there was an invocation of the five angelic triads of 48:15-23 at the various stages, or all together at an early stage of the whole series of acts. No safe answer to any of these questions can be inferred from any other document.

In the documents associated with the milieu of Gospel of Thomas, the use of ritual imagery reveals a combination (not always a harmonious one) of the

(11) Topic illuminated by M.Scopello, 'Un rite idéal de l'intronisation dans trois textes gnostiques de Nag Hammadi', in R.McL.Wilson, ed., Nag Hammadi and Gnosis (1978) 91-5.

themes of the true baptism and of the pass-words for the journey of the soul. How compelling an interest the latter could become may be observed in the Apocalypse of Paul. The date and character of this work are problematic.⁽¹²⁾ The brevity and abruptness of its Coptic form (C.G. V,22:25-23:28) indicate an abridgement, a highly tendentious abridgement, of a longer apocalypse; and the multifarious forms of the later apocryphal work of the same name, as analysed by R.P. Casey,⁽¹³⁾ give every evidence of going back to the same original: the vision of the enthroned aged figure, which has a major place in the later texts and so also in the original,⁽¹⁴⁾ is made the centre of attention in the Nag Hammadi version (C.G.V,22:25-23:28), as a means for advertising the technique of by-passing the Demiurge.

The aged man enthroned in the seventh heaven challenges Paul: "Where are you going, Paul, O blessed one and the one who was set apart from his mother's womb?" (23:1-4). (The subsequent conversation shows that this allusion to Paul's blessedness and in particular to Gal.i.15 are not expressions of approval but of hostile acknowledgement of his unique status). Encouraged

(12) So Parrott, intro., NHLE 239; edn, ET, Murdock and MacRae in Parrott, ed., NHS (1979).

(13) JTS XXXIV/1 (Oct 1932) 1-32; James, ANT 525-55.

(14) Casey, art cit 21-3.

by his attendant spirit (23:5-7), Paul replies: "I am going to the place from which I came" (23:8-10). Asked by the aged figure to be more precise, Paul adds: "I am going down to the cosmos of the dead in order to lead captive the captivity that was led captive in the captivity of Babylon" (23:10-17). This curious adaptation of Eph.iv.8 and Ps.lxviii.18 depicts Paul as both an alter Christus and the prototype of the soul ascending through the heavens in imitation of Christ. Unlike the guardians of the previous heavens, who have been silenced by a command (22:9-13), the old man is not overcome even by these potent claims. He threatens Paul (23:18-21): "How will you be able to get away from me?" Advised by his companion, Paul succeeds in deflecting his attention by showing him the sign which he is carrying (23: 23-30), and passes on. Nothing in the surviving text identifies this talisman.

The affectionate greeting with which Paul's fellow apostles welcome him in the Ogdoad (24:2) may refer to a Kiss of Peace after the definitive moment of initiation (conceivably the impartation of the pass-words) in the rite known to the author of the Apocalypse of Paul. As a whole, the document is something of a maverick; it is probably to be regarded as a rather half-hearted attempt to capture the name of Paul, and especially II Cor.xii.1-4, for the Naassene propaganda.

9. The 'Ophite Diagram'

The strand of tradition, combining a baptismal with an ascent-of-the-soul liturgical piety, which has here been traced provides the natural setting for the 'diagram' cited by Celsus as quoted by Origen, and also by Origen himself, in c.Celsum VI:

XXV. | Ἐν ᾧ ἦν διαγραφὴ κύκλων ἀπολελυμένων μὲν ἀπ' ἀλλήλων δέκα συνδουμένων δὲ εἰς ἓν ἐνὸς κύκλου. ὃς ἐλέγετο εἶναι ἢ τῶν ὕλων ψυχὴ καὶ ὠνομάζετο Λευϊθάαν.

ἔτι δὲ ὁ Κέλσος μελαίρῃ γραμμῇ παχείᾳ γηθὶ διειλημμένον εἶναι τὸ διάγραμμα, καὶ ταύτην ἐφασκεν εἰρηθεῖν αὐτῷ τὴν Γένναν, οὐσαν καὶ Τάρταρον.

XXVII. Ἐξῆς δὲ τοῖς περὶ τοῦ διαγράμματος μηδὲ παρακού-

σας τῶν περὶ τῆς καλουμένης παρὰ τοῖς ἐκκλησιαστικοῖς σφραγίδος ἱαντῷ τινα ἐκτίθεται ἀλλόκοτα καὶ ἁμοιβαίως φωνᾶς. ὡς τοῦ μὲν τὴν σφραγίδα περιτιθέντος καλουμένου πατρὸς, τοῦ δὲ σφραγιζομένου λεγομένου γέροντος καὶ υἱοῦ καὶ ἀποκρινομένου κέχρισται χρίσματος λευκῷ ἐκ ξύλου ζωῆς. | ὅπερ οὐδ' ἐν τοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν αἰρετικῶν ἠκούσαμεν γίνεσθαι. εἶτα καὶ ἀριθμὸν ὀρίζει λεγόμενον ὑπὸ τῶν παραδιδόντων τὴν σφραγίδα ἀγγέλων ἐπιτά. ἐκατέρωθεν τῆ ψυχῇ τοῦ ἀπαλλαττομένου σώματος ἐγισταμένων, τῶν μὲν τοῦ φωτὸς ἑτέρων δὲ τῶν ὀνομαζομένων ἀρχοντικῶν, καὶ λέγει τὸν ἀρχοντα τῶν ὀνομαζομένων ἀρχοντικῶν λέγεσθαι θεὸν | κατηραμένον.

(xxx)

καὶ ἀρᾶς ἀξίως κατὰ τοῦ ταῦτα περὶ αὐτοῦ δοξάζοντας, ἐπιπέτρῳ τῷ ὄφει. γνώσειν καλοῦ καὶ κακοῦ τοῖς πρώτοις ἀνθρώποις εἰσηγομένῳ, κατηράσαστο.

οὗτοι δὲ οἱ ἀνόσιοι ἀπὸ τοῦ πολεμιωτάτου ἀνθρώπου ὄφεις καὶ γριζοτάτου ὡς οὐκ ἀνθρώποι, ὧν ἐχθρὸς ἐστὶν ὄφις, ἀλλ' ὡς ὄφεις σεμνύρονται ἐπὶ τῷ Ὑγιανοῖ καλεῖσθαι, Ἐνφράτην τινὰ εἰσηγητὴν τῶν ἀνοσίων ἀναχόντες λόγων.

φραγμών πυρός ἀφόβως, πρώτης λαχὼν ἀρχὴν πύλης Ὁρατε, πάρες με, ὅης ὄρων δυνάμεως σύμβολον καταλθὲν τύπῳ ζωῆς ξύλου, ἐκόντι καθ' ὁμοίωσιν ληφθὲν ἀθέων· ἢ χάρις δυνέτω μοι, πάτερ, δυνέτω.

XXXIII. Εἶθ' ἐξῆς ἄλλους μύθους ὁ Κέλσος ἐκτίθεται. ὡς τινῶν εἰς τὰς ἀρχοντικὰς μορφὰς ἐπανερχομένων. ὅστε τινὰς μὲν γίνεσθαι λέοντας ἄλλους δὲ τεύρους καὶ ἄλλους δράκοντας ἢ αἰτούς ἢ ἄρκους ἢ κύρας. εὔρομεν δὲ ἐν ᾧ εἶχομεν διαγράμματι καὶ ᾧ ὠνόμασε Κέλσος τετράγωνον σχῆμα καὶ τὸ ἐπὶ τῶν τοῦ παραδείσου πυλῶν λεγόμενον ἐπὶ τῶν ἀθλίων ἐκείνων. ἐξωγραφεῖτο δὲ ὡς διάμετρος κύκλον τινὸς προειδοῦς ἢ φλογίνη ῥομφαία ὡς δορυφορομένη τῷ τε τῆς γνώσεως ξύλῳ καὶ τῆς ζωῆς. ὁ μὲν οὖν Κέλσος οὐκ ἠθέλησε τὰς δημηγορίας ἢ οὐκ ἐδενήθη ἐκθέσθαι. ἀς καθ' ἐκάστην πύλην κατὰ τοὺς τῶν ἀσεβῶν μύθους ἐροῦσιν οἱ δαῖόντες αὐτάς.

XXXIV. Μετὰ δὲ τὸ ἐκθέσθαι τὰ προειρημένα καὶ τὰ ἀνάλογον αὐτοῖς, ἅτινα ἡμεῖς προσεθήκαμεν, τοιαῦτά γησα ὁ Κέλσος· οἱ δ' ἐτι προστιθέασιν ἄλλα ἐπ' ἄλλοις, προσηγνῶν λόγους καὶ κύκλους ἐπὶ κύκλοις καὶ ἀπορύθιας ἐκκλησίας ἐπιγείων καὶ περιτομῆς καὶ Προνοικοῦ τινος φέουσας δύναμιν παρθένου καὶ ψυχὴν ζῶσαν καὶ σφραζόμενον οὐρανὸν, ἵνα ζήσῃ, καὶ γῆν σφραζομένην μαχαίρα καὶ πολλοὺς σφραζομένους, ἵνα ζήσωσι, καὶ πανόμενον ἐν κόσμῳ θάνατον, ὅταν ἀποθάνῃ ἢ τοῦ κόσμου ἀμαρτία, καὶ κάθοδον αὐθις στενὴν καὶ αὐτομάτως ἀνοιγομένης πύλας· πανταχοῦ δὲ ἐκεῖ τὸ τῆς ζωῆς ξύλον καὶ ἀνάστασιν σαρκὸς ἀπὸ ξύλου, (κχχviii)

θεῦμα δ'

αὐτῶν οὐκ ἥκιστα ἐκείνο· ἐξηγοῦνται γάρ τινα μεταξὺ τῶν ὑπερουρανίων ἀνωτέρω κύκλων ἐπιγεγραμμένα, ἄλλα τε καὶ δύο ἅττα, μείζον τε καὶ μικρότερον νιοῦ καὶ πετρὸς· εὔρομεν δ' ἡμεῖς ἐν τούτῳ τῷ διαγράμματι τὸν μείζονα κύκλον καὶ τὸν μικρότερον, ὃν ἐπὶ τῆς διαμέτρου ἐπεγέγραπτο „πατὴρ καὶ υἱός“, καὶ μεταξὺ τοῦ μείζονος, ἐν ᾧ ὁ μικρότερος ἦν, καὶ ἄλλον συκκιμένον ἐκ δύο κύκλων, τοῦ μὲν ἐξωτερῶν ξανθοῦ τοῦ δὲ ἐνδοτέρω κραιοῦ, τὸ ἐπιγεγραμμένον διάγραμμα πελεκοειδὲς σχῆματι, καὶ ἀνωτέρω μὲν αὐτοῦ κύκλον φραχὴν ἐχόμενον τοῦ μείζονος τῶν προτέρων, ἐγγεγραμμένον ἔχορτα „ἀγάπη“, κατωτέρω δὲ ἐχόμενον τοῦ κύκλου γεγραμμένον ἔχορτα „ζωή“· τῷ δὲ δευτέρῳ κύκλῳ ἐνεγέγραπτο, περιπεπλεγμένῳ καὶ ἐμπριελληγόντι ἄλλους δύο κύκλους καὶ ἄλλο σχῆμα ῥομβοειδὲς, „σοφίας πρόνοια“, καὶ ἔνδον μὲν τῆς κοινῆς αὐτῶν τομῆς „σοφίας φέσις“, ἀνωτέρω δὲ τῆς κοινῆς αὐτῶν τομῆς κύκλος ἦν, ἐν ᾧ ἐπεγέγραπτο „γνώσις“, κατωτέρω δὲ ἄλλος, ἐν ᾧ ἐπεγέγραπτο „δυνέσις“.

εἰ δὲ καὶ

ὑπισχνοῦνται οἱ ἐπὶ τοῖς τοιοῦτοις σημεινόμενοι μαγικὴν τινα γοητείαν, καὶ τοῦτ' ἔστιν αὐτοῖς | τὸ τῆς σοφίας κεφάλαιον.

(p.95:3-5, 18-20; 96:31-97:11; 98:10-13; 98:29-99:2; 99:31-100:22; 100:28-102:4; 102:27-103:8; 103:11-21; 107:2-19, 22-24 Koetschau)

(23) ' "It contained a drawing of ten circles, which were separated from one another and held together by a single circle, which was said to be the soul of the universe and was called Leviathan..." Celsus further said that "the diagram was divided by a thick black line", and asserts that they informed him that "this was called Gehenna, also called Tartaros"....

(27)He is inventing out of his own head when he mentions strange doctrines and a "dialogue in which the one who administers the seal is called Father and the one who is sealed is called Young Man and Son, and he answers, "I have been anointed with white ointment from the tree of life". Not even among heretics have we heard that this takes place. Then, giving the precise number, he says that "those who impart the seal say that there are seven angels standing on either side of the soul when the body is dying, the one group being angels of light and the other of what are called archontic angels." And he says that "the chief of those called archontic angels is said to be an accursed God." '

(28. Origen identifies the source of these opinions as the Ophites): '...such a God even deserves to be cursed in the opinion of those who hold this view of

him, because he cursed the serpent which imparted to the first human beings knowledge of good and evil...these impious men pride themselves on being called Ophites, taking their name from the snake, which is a reptile very hostile to men and very dreadful, as though they were not human beings, to whom the serpent is an enemy, but snakes. And they boast that a certain Euphrates was the man who taught them their impious doctrines' (cf Ref. IV. 2.1; V.13.9; X.10.1).

(30) 'Then he returns to "the seven archontic demons" which are not "mentioned by Christians" but which are, I believe, spoken of by the Ophites. In the diagram which we obtained on their account we found the arrangement set out in a similar way to that which Celsus describes. Celsus said that "the first is formed in the shape of a lion"; but he does not inform us what those people, who are really "the most impious ones", call it. However, we found out that the angel of the Creator, who in the holy Scriptures is spoken of with honour, was affirmed by that diagram to be Michael the bear-like. Celsus said that "the next, the second, is a bull". The diagram in our possession said that Suriel is the bull-like. Then ^{Celsus} ~~G~~ said that "the third was a sort of double being and hissed dreadfully",

while the diagram said that the third is Raphael, the serpent-like. Again, Celsus said that "the fourth has the form of an eagle", while the diagram says that Gabriel is the eagle-like. Celsus then said that "the fifth has the face of a bear"; the diagram says that Thauthabaoth is the bear-like. Celsus then said that "the sixth is asserted by them to have the face of a dog"; the diagram said that he is Erathoth. Then Celsus said that "the seventh has the face of an ass", and that "he is called Thaphabaoth or Onoael"; but in the diagram we found that this one is called Onael or Thartharaoth, and has the shape of an ass...

(31) If anyone wishes to learn even the inventions of these sorcerers, which they use with the aim of leading men astray by their teaching, pretending to the possession of certain secret truths, though they have met with little success, let him hear what they are taught to say at the eternally chained gates of the archons after passing through what they call "the Barrier of Evil".

"Solitary King, bond of blindness, unconscious oblivion, I hail thee, the supreme Power, preserved by the spirit of providence and wisdom (Pronoia and Sophia); from thee I am sent in purity, being already part of the light of Son and Father. May grace be

with me; yea, father, let it be with me." And they say that the Powers of the Ogdoad come from him.

Then as they pass through the one they call Ialdabaoth they are taught to say next: "And thou Ialdabaoth, first and seventh, born to have power with boldness, being ruling Word of a pure mind, a perfect work of Son and Father, I bear a symbol marked with the picture of Life, and, having opened to the world the gate which thou didst close for thine eternity, I pass by thy power free again. May grace be with me, father, let it be with me." And they say that the star Saturn is in sympathy with the lion-like archon.

Then they think that the person who has passed through Ialdabaoth and reached Iao must say: "And thou, archon of the hidden mysteries of Son and Father, who shinest by night, thou Iao, second and first, lord of death, portion of the guiltless, I bear already thine own mind's symbol (reading, with Matter, Histoire critique du gnosticisme, II,419,

τὴν ἰδίαν τοῦ νοῦ σύμβολον),

and after his words allowed, as when it is right to speak as follows: "Father, I have prevailed over him that was born of thee. May grace be with me, father, let it be with me."

of the principalities. May grace be with me.

let it be with me."

Then next comes Sabaoth, to whom they think one should say: "Archon of fifth authority, mighty Sabaoth, defender of the law of thy creation which grace is destroying, by a more potent pentad, look upon a blameless symbol of thine art, and let me pass by, preserved by the image of a picture, a body set free by the pentad. May grace be with me, father, let it be with me." '

(The list given in VI.32 shows that the fourth place, in both ascending and descending order, belongs to Adonai; both this archon and the appropriate pass-word have been omitted, most probably through a homoioteleuton with "let it be with me").

'And after him comes Astaphaios, to whom they believe one should say the following formula:
"Archon of the third gate, Astaphaios, overseer of the original source of water, look on an initiate, and let me pass, who have been cleansed by a virgin's spirit, and see the world's essence. May grace be with me, father, let it be with me."

And after him comes Ailoeus, to whom they think it right to speak as follows: "Archon of the second gate, Ailoeus, let me pass as I bring to thee a symbol of thy mother, a grace hidden by the powers of the principalities. May grace be with me, father, let it be with me."

Finally they mention Horaeus, and think fit to say to him: "Thou who hast fearlessly passed beyond the wall of fire, who hast been assigned the power over the first gate, Horaeus, look upon a symbol of thy power Vanquished by a picture of the tree of life, taken by an image made in the likeness of a guiltless man, and let me pass by. May grace be with me, father, let it be with me." '

(32) Origen explains that the choice of names for archons is symptomatic of a general confusion in the minds of the Ophites, who have derived from misunderstood magic 'Ialdabaoth', 'Astaphaios' and 'Horaeus'; and from misundestood Hebrew scriptures 'Iao', 'Sabaoth', 'Adonai' and 'Eloaeus').

^{Celsus}
(33) 'Then ~~Origen~~ describes other fables to the effect that "some return into the archontic forms so that some become lions, some bulls, and others serpents or eagles or bears or dogs." In the diagram which we had we also found what Celsus called "a rectangular figure" and what those wretches say about "the gates of Paradise". The flaming sword, as guarding the trees of knowledge and of life, was drawn as the diameter of a circle of fire. Celsus, however, was unwilling or unable to quote the passwords which, according to the fables of these

impious

~~impious~~ people, are to be recited at each gate by those who pass through them....'

(34: Celsus reports that these people collect sayings of prophets, and ~~construct~~ ^{construct} systems, 'circles upon circles', with) ' "emanations of an earthly Church, and of circumcision, and a power flowing from a certain virgin Prunicus, and a living soul, and heaven slain that it may have life, and earth slain with a sword and many men slain that they may have life, and death in the world being stopped when the sin of the world dies, and a narrow descent again, and gates that open of their own accord. And everywhere they speak in their writings of the tree of life and of resurrection of the flesh by the tree...." (38)"....they interpret certain words inscribed between the upper circles above the heavens, and in particular two among others, a larger and a smaller circle, which they interpret of Son and of Father." In this diagram we found the larger and smaller circles, on the diameter of which was inscribed "Father" and "Son". And between the larger circle, within which was the smaller one, and another which was compounded of two circles, the outer circle being yellow and the inner blue, we found inscribed a barrier shaped like a double axe. ~~Above~~ it there was a small circle

touching the greater of the first two circles, which had been inscribed with the word "Love"; and below it next to the circle there was written the word "Life". In the second circle, within which were intertwined and enclosed two other circles and another figure in the shape of a rhombus, there was inscribed "Providence of Wisdom" (Pronoia of Sophia). And inside the sector common to them there was a circle in which was inscribed the word "Knowledge" (Gnosis), and below it another in which was inscribed the word "Understanding" (Synesis). Celsus, it seems, states that these people) ' "profess also some magical sorcery, and this is the summit of wisdom to them" '.

(ET from Chadwick, 340-354).

The diagram, as we know it from both Celsus and Origen, was embedded in a longer text (and, no doubt, surrounded by a considerable body of verbal commentary). Celsus' source probably did include the name which Origen supplies (30), for Celsus mentions the names variously applied to the seventh archon (ibid.), and his omission of the other names is sufficiently explained by the distaste of a self-conscious Hellene for uttering 'barbarous names' (cf VI.39); though a further cause, if needed, may be suspected in a residual fear of possible potency in

'barbarian names of daemons and magical formulas' (VI.40). On the other hand, Celsus' source seems to have lacked the pass-word system quoted in full by Origen in VI.31, or else he would have at least glanced at it; in Origen's version, they look like an interpolation (as will be argued in the next paragraph but one), and their absence from the version used by Celsus does not justify Origen's tone of surprise.

The archon-system common to both versions is that found in Hypostasis of the Archons and Origin of the World; ⁽¹⁾ but, whereas in these works the archons belong in cosmogony and theodicy, they function in the diagram as directly encountered hostile personal entities. It is impossible to identify the diagram and the document containing it with any of the Nag Hammadi tractates.

That the pass-word system is an interpolation in the version of the diagram used by Origen is to be inferred principally from three facts: that the sovereign protection appealed to by the initiates is not that of the Mother (she occurs only in the address to Aiolaus) but that of the Father, whose grace is invoked at each transition; that the archons

(1) Not mentioned in Hypostasis (which includes Norea, unmentioned in the diagram); but in Origin:II/5, 100-102, with an added system of secondary, 'feminine' names, derived (?) from the First Book of Norea (see II.102:7-11), as the male names come from the Archangelike of Moses the Prophet.

themselves, dangerous though they are, and transient though their effectiveness is (compare 'Sabaoth, defender of the law of thy creation which grace is destroying' with Didache x.6: 'let grace come, and let this world pass away !'), yet retain some kinship with the elect; and that the double numbering of the archons, first-to-seventh + seventh-to-first, like the two-directional numbering of the heavens in the Three Steles of Seth,⁽²⁾ is quite inept for a one-way transit after death but entirely suitable for an ascent-plus-return of the Merkabah mysticism. These features betray a document of Jewish (-Christian ?) mysticism, from whatever source and of whatever age, (re)intruded into an 'Ophite' schema.

How the 'Ophite diagram' was employed is yet another area of lasting uncertainty. It has been called⁽³⁾ 'an Ophite liturgy', and it may reasonably be so entitled -. with the qualification that the scene of the essential liturgical action, albeit rehearsed in this life, was in the hereafter. Matter⁽⁴⁾ was convinced that the showing and contemplation of the picture⁽⁵⁾ was itself the sole initiatory act of the Ophites. In their different ways, however,

(2) See 270-80 supra.

(3) e.g. by J.Stevenson, A New Eusebius (London 1965) 105.

(4) Histoire critique du gnosticisme, II (Paris, 1843) 437.

(5) The 'gnostic gems' give no recognisable clue here.

both versions of the diagram assume a context of other ritual actions: in Celsus' version, there was an accompanying 'dialogue' about anointing with the white ointment from the tree of life, and in Origen's interpolated version the initiate refers to previously experienced initiation(s) - 'overseer of the original source of water, look on an initiate', and also 'a symbol marked with the picture of life...', 'I bear...a symbol', 'look upon a blameless symbol of thine art', 'a symbol of thy mother', 'a symbol of thy power vanquished by a picture of the tree of life'. The references to 'life' and 'the tree of life' may be to features of the diagram (cf VI 34, 38); if so, perhaps the diagram itself was expected to be shown, in some sense, to the archons. Whether some form of traditio of such a physical talisman took place in 'Ophite' liturgy must remain uncertain. Matter's conjecture of a ritual display of the diagram is in itself a reasonable one: as a reminder of past initiation experiences and as a 'visual aid' to teaching, it would have served the same end as the holding of a crucifix before a dying man's eyes while the Act of Contrition is being said by or for him, in later orthodox Christian practice.

The 'anointing with white ointment from the tree of life', found by Celsus in his source but lacking in Origen's, is to be noted here, both for its association with the theme of the Great Journey and also for its changing status in this tradition; further discussion is postponed⁽⁶⁾ to the discussion of the origin and overtones of anointing as found in this context and also in that of the 'James'-tradition.

Origen's assertion that the 'Ophites' made the serpent their eponymous cult-hero does no more than link their name (whether of their own choice⁽⁷⁾ or originally applied by hostile observers) with their peculiarly high estimation for the serpent of Genesis iii. No cult of a snake is asserted. Epiphanius' entertaining description of the 'Eucharist' of the 'Ophites' in Panarion haer.36.5 (II.56-8, Holl), where he claims that they kept a snake in a box and fed it, ready for the climactic moment of their mysteries, at which the snake would be enticed out on to a table heaped with loaves and encouraged to writhe about upon and among them, its movements being held to be consecratory, is almost certainly a pure fabrication based upon misreading of such statements as Origen's in c.Celsum

(6) To 436-8 infra.

(7) A name imposed: Ref.V.6; a name chosen, Origen on I Cor (see p.412).

V.29. The scene itself is not incredible - snake-handling cults of the twentieth century are well documented⁽⁸⁾ - and there are suitable precedents in the world of Hellenistic paganism.⁽⁹⁾ If Epiphanius has any source⁽¹⁰⁾ but his own imagination (and the isolation of this account in the midst of a series of vague charges against unnamed 'Ophites' makes this unlikely), it is unnecessary to look further than his inventive female informants already noted⁽¹¹⁾ in connection with his account of the Phibionites in haer.26.

Origen's statement that the 'Ophites' admitted to their ranks only those who cursed Jesus (c.Celsum VI. 28) appears also in his commentary on I Cor.:

*ἔστι τις αἵρεσις ἣτις οὐ προσίεται τὸν προσ-
ιόντα ἰὰν μὴ ἀναθεματίσῃ τὸν Ἰησοῦν. καὶ ἡ αἵρεσις ἐκείνη ἀξία ἐστὶ τοῦ
ὀνόματος οὗ ἠγάπησεν· ἔστι γὰρ ἡ αἵρεσις τῶν καλουμένων Ὀφιδανῶν, οἵτινες
οὐ θεμιτὰ λέγουσιν εἰς ἐγκώμιον τοῦ ὄφeos.*

(ed. C.Jenkins, 'Origen on I Corinthians', JTS X/1 (Oct 1908), p.30, incorporating Jenkins' conjecture):

'There is a certain sect which does not admit a convert unless he pronounces anathemas on Jesus; and that sect is worthy of the name which it has chosen; for it is the sect of the Ophites, who utter blasphemous words in praise of the serpent.'

(8) Daugherty, 'Snake-Handling as Sacrament' (1976);

(9) L.Fendt, Gnostische Mysterien (München 1922).

(10) Quorum haereticorum vi has no mention.

(11) 331-47 supra.

Since Origen is here commenting on the in itself problematic passage on those who shout 'Jesus anathema' (I Cor.xii.1-4), it is not safe to infer that Origen means that 'Ophites' used that precise formula. There must remain doubt⁽¹²⁾ as to whether Origen's statement is justified at all, beyond his view that assent to the Ophite view of the Saviour was grossly unworthy of Jesus.

Such statements as the Nassenes/Ophites seem to have made about Jesus may be adjudged heterodox (and therefore to the mind of the Great Church blasphemous); but they were not expressly blasphemous, if we may judge from the two fragmentary hymns which have been preserved in association with this group of sects:- namely, those in Ref.V.6 and Ref.V.10.2.

The former (p.132,11.63-5 Duncker-Schneidewin) reads thus:

Ἀπὸ σοῦ πατῆρ
καὶ διὰ σὲ μήτηρ,
τὰ δύο ἀθάνατα ὀνόματα,
αἰώνων γονεῖς,
πολιτα οὐρανοῦ,
μεγαλῶνυμε ἄνθρωπε.

(12) Part of the problem is the underlying doubt about the anathema: cf Hommel (1914); Moule (1960); Albright and Mann (1970); Holt (1972); Black (1973); van Unnik (1973); Derrett (1975).

'From thee (comes) father,
and through thee (comes) mother,
two names immortal,
progenitors of Aeons,
O denizen of heaven,
illustrious man ! '

In Ref.VIII.12-15 occurs the account of Monoimusⁿ the Arab, whose theology of introspection posits an anthropomorphic view of the Absolute, thus justifying his conclusion that the divine is to be found ^{by} ~~be~~ looking within oneself. This anthropomorphic Absolute, the Monad, is, he says (426, 20-21 Duncker-Schneidewin), Father and Mother, 'two names immortal'. In this passage, possibly commenting on Eph.iii.15, Monoimus is clearly in some sort of relation with the hymn. He may indeed be its author. His relationship with the Naassene/Ophite group is unclear⁽¹³⁾ and whether this hymn really belongs to the Naassenes, or has been arbitrarily attached to them by Justin⁽¹⁴⁾ is equally unclear. Answers to these questions are important for the history of ideas, but offer no indication as to the liturgical function of this hymn.

(13) Salmon, 'Monoimos', DCB III (1882) 934-5.

(14) Possibility not noticed by Herzhoff (1973).

The original context of the second hymn is also disputed. Herzhoff (1973, 77-140) has devoted an elaborate philological study to it, and ascribes it to Valentinus. Marcovich (1981) opposes this conclusion, arguing that the thought is entirely Naassene in character. The argument is not conclusive, for the possibility remains that Valentinus himself assimilated ideas from the Naassene/Peratae/Ophite group and then turned them into verse. Marcovich also contributes (1981, 770-1) a new critical text and translation:

- Νόμος ἦν γενικός τοῦ παντός ὁ πρωτό(τοκο)ς Νόος,
ὁ δὲ δεύτερος ἦν τοῦ πρωτοτόκου τὸ χυθὲν Χάος,
τριτάτη(ν) Ψυχὴ δ' ἔλαβ' (ἐξ)εργαζομένη νόμον
διὰ τοῦτ' ἐλάφου μορφὴν περικειμένη
κοπιᾷ, θανάτῳ μελέτημα, κρατουμένη·
7 ποτὲ (μὲν) βασιλ(ειον) ἔχουσα βλέπει τὸ φῶς,
ποτὲ δ' εἰς (σπ)ήλαιον ἐκρι(πτο)μένη κλάει.
7a { (ποτὲ μὲν) χαίρει, ποτὲ δὲ κλαίεται,
7b (ποτὲ μὲν) κρίνει, ποτὲ δὲ κρίνεται,
7c ποτὲ μὲν θνήσκει, ποτὲ δὲ γίνεται. }
(κ)ἀνέξοδον ἢ μελέα κακῶ(ν)
λαβύρινθον ἐσήλθε, πλανωμένη.
εἶπεν δ' Ἰησοῦς· ἐσόρ(α), πάτερ·
ζήτημα κακῶν (τόδ') ἐπὶ χθόνα
ἀπὸ σῆς πνο(ι)ῆς ἀποπλάζεται·
ζητεῖ δὲ φυγεῖν τὸ πικρὸν Χάος
14 κοῦκ οἶδε(ν ὄ)πως διελεύσεται.
τούτου με χάριν πέμψον, πάτερ·
σφραγίδας ἔχων καταβήσομαι,
Αἰῶνας ὅλους διοδεύσω,
μυστήρια πάντα δ' ἀνοίξω
μορφάς τε θεῶν ἐπιδείξω·
(καὶ) τὰ κεκρυμμένα τῆς ἀγίας ὁδοῦ,
21 γνῶσιν καλέσας, παραδώσω.

TRANSLATION

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 fulfil the law.

For that reason she put on the form of a hind
and started toiling as a captive, being a game (spoil) for Death.
Sometimes she would live in a royal palace and look at the light;
7 but sometimes she is being thrown in a den, and there she weeps.

7a [Sometimes she rejoices, sometimes she weeps aloud;

7b sometimes she is a judge, sometimes she is being judged;

7c sometimes she dies, sometimes she is being born.]

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 (breath).
And she seeks to escape the bitter Chaos,
14 but knows not how to win through.

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 (deliver) the secrets of the holy way.
21 calling them Gnosis (Knowledge)."

The liturgical locus of this hymn may be tentatively
identified as in the initiation rite or in the rite
preparing for death, shortly before the moment at
which the pass-words were transmitted.

10. 'James'-Traditions.

Logion 12 of the Gospel of Thomas gives to James,
the brother of Jesus, a uniquely important role.
To match this there is a series of documents claiming
association with the name of James and also clearly
cognate with Gospel of Thomas and apparently developing

the tradition to which it belongs: the 'First' Apocalypse of James (C.G. V/3); Ps-James, Sermon on John the Baptist; with the Apokryphon of James (C.G.I/2) representing a 'catholicizing' adaptation of this style of spirituality.

A further document under the name of James is related to this series in a way not easily divined: the 'Second' Apocalypse of James (C.G.V/4). There is a natural temptation to read this tractate in closest association with the preceding item in the same codex, the 'First' Apocalypse; but, although they share a concern with the martyrdom of James the Just, they have otherwise little in common. C.G.V/4 lacks the 'ascent-mysticism' of C.G.V/3 and Thomas, although its soteriology is couched in terms of Christ taking those oppressed by the evil archon 'above him who wants to rule over them' (V.48:18-19). Jesus is 'the brother in secret, who prayed to the Father' (V.48:20-24), which contrasts sharply with the opposition to prayer found in Thomas and 'First' Apocalypse'.⁽¹⁾ We are, nonetheless, in the milieu of a dissident theological tradition, for the evil archon is identified as the creator (V.58:2-6), and the christology is docetic (V.57:10-17).

(1) cf 359-61, supra, 423-6 infra.

What most differentiates 'Second' Apocalypse from Thomas and its close relations and 'First Apocalypse is its liturgical interest. In the prayer (V.62:12-63:29) which dominates the account of the martyrdom (61:7-63:end), James is placed in the hole in which he is to be stoned. The text and translation according to Funk (1976, 212 and 230-1) read thus:

- ΠΑΝΟΥΤΕ ΛΥΩ ΠΑΪΩΤ
ΠΕΝΤΑΧΗΛΑΣΜΕΤ ΕΒΟΛ Ζ̄Ν †ΖΕΛΠΙΣ ΕΣΜΟΟΥΤ.
ΠΕΝΤΑΧΤΑΝΣΘΕΙ Ζ̄ΝΝ ΟΥΜΥΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ Ν̄ΤΕ ΠΕΤΕ ΖΗΛΑΧ.
- ΝΕΚΤΡΕΥΩΣΚ̄ ΝΑΪ̄ Ν̄ΒΙ ΝΕΪΖΟΥ Ν̄ΤΕ ΠΕΪΚΟΣΜΟΣ.
6 ΑΛΛΑ ΝΕΖΟΥ Ν̄ΤΕ ΝΕΚΟΥΘΕΙΝ ΕΚΕΤΡΕΦΟΥΘΕΙΝ ΕΧΩΪ.
ΑΝΙΤ ΕΠΜΑ Μ̄ΠΛΟΥΧΑΪ.
ΒΟΛ̄Τ̄ ΕΒΟΛ Ν̄ΣΑΒΟΛ Μ̄ΠΕΪΜΑ Ϊ̄ΣΘΕΙΛΕ.
Μ̄Π̄ΡΤΡΕΦΩΨ̄Χ̄Π̄ Ν̄ΖΗΤ̄ Ν̄ΒΙ ΝΕΚΖΜΟΤ.
ΑΛΛΑ ΜΑΡΕΦΩΨΠΕ ΕΦΟΥΛΑΒ Ν̄ΒΙ ΝΕΚΖΜΟΤ.
- 10 ΝΑΣΜΕΤ ΕΒΟΛ Ν̄ΝΟΥΜΟΥ ΕΦΖΟΥΟΥ.
ΧΕ Ν̄ΤΟΚ ΠΕ ΠΩΝ̄Ζ̄ Ν̄ΤΕ ΠΩΝ̄Ζ̄.
ΑΝΙΤ ΕΒΟΛ Ζ̄ΝΝ ΟΥΜ̄ΖΛΟΥ ΕΙΟΝ̄Ζ̄.
ΧΕ ΦΟΝ̄Ζ̄ Ν̄ΖΗΤ̄ Ν̄ΒΙ ΝΕΚΖΜΟΤ.
ΝΑΣΜΕΤ ΕΒΟΛ Ζ̄ΝΝ ΟΥΣΑΡ̄Ξ̄ Ν̄ΝΟΒΕ.
15 ΧΕ ΑΪΤΩΤ Ν̄ΖΗΤ̄Κ̄ Ζ̄Ν ΤΑΘΟΜ ΤΗΡ̄Σ̄.
ΝΑΣΜΕΤ ΕΒΟΛ Ζ̄ΙΤΟΟΤ̄Ç̄ Ν̄ΝΟΥΧΑΧΕ Ν̄ΡΕΦΘ̄ΒΒΙΟ.
ΝΕΚΤΑΑΤ ΕΤΟΟΤ̄Ç̄ Ν̄ΝΟΥΡΕΦ†ΖΑΠ Ν̄ΡΕΦΩΨΩΤ.
ΝΑΣΜΕΤ ΕΒΟΛ Ζ̄Μ ΠΝΟΒΕ.
ΚΩ ΝΑΪ̄ ΕΒΟΛ Ν̄ΝΗ ΕΤΕΡΟΪ ΤΗΡΟΥ Ν̄ΤΕ ΝΕΖΟΥΟΥ.
20 ΧΕ †ΟΝ̄Ζ̄ ΑΝΟΚ Ζ̄ΡΑΪ̄ Ν̄ΖΗΤ̄Κ̄.
ΦΟΝ̄Ζ̄ Ν̄ΖΗΤ̄ Ν̄ΒΙ ΝΕΚΖΜΟΤ.
- ΑΪΡΑΡΝΙΣΘΕ Ν̄ΟΥΟΝ ΝΙΜ.
Ν̄ΤΟΚ ΔΕ ΑΪΟΥΟΝ̄Ζ̄Κ̄ ΕΒΟΛ.
ΝΑΣΜΕΤ ΕΒΟΛ Ζ̄ΝΝ ΟΥΘΑΪΨΙΣ ΕΣΖΟΥΟΥ.
25 †ΝΟΥ ΔΕ ΠΟΥΘΕΨ ΠΕ ΛΥΩ ΤΟΥΝΟΥ ΤΕ.
ΠΙΠΝΑ ΕΤΟΥΛΑΒ ΜΑΤΗΝΟΟΥ ΖΑΡΟΪ Ν̄ΟΥΟΥΧΑΪ.
ΠΟΥΘΕΨ ΕΒΟΛ Ζ̄Μ ΠΟΥΘΕΨ ΜΑ†ΑΝΗΨ ΕΧΩΪ Ζ̄Ν ΟΥΣΟΜ
ΠΑΤΤΑΚΟ Ϊ̄ΨΑΓΕΝΕΖ.

'But he stretched out his hands, and spoke this prayer -
not the one he was accustomed to speak:

"My God and my Father !

You that have saved me from this dead hope !

You that have brought me to life through a mystery
of your benevolence !

Do not let these days of this world be prolonged for me,
but the day of your light -

in (which there) is (no resid)ue (of ni)ght -
(let it sh)ine (upon me !)

(Take me to the place of my sal)vation,

and save me from this (place of) sojourn !

Do not let your grace be left behind in me,

but let your grace become pure !

Save me from evil death ((because you are the life of life !))

Bring me alive out of the tomb because your grace is alive in me !

- the desire to be instrumental in the matter of fulfilment.

Save me from sinful flesh,

because I have conformed to you with all my strength. (())

Save me from a humiliating enemy,

and do not hand me over to a severe judge !

(Save me) from sin,

and forgive me all the debts of the days !

For I am alive in you - in me there lives your grace.

I have renounced everything - but you I have openly confessed.

Save me from severe distress - now the time and the hour are come !

Holy Spirit, send (m)e salvation !

Light (from) Light, crow(n me) with (imper)ishable,(eternal) power

There are a number of apparent New Testament allusions here:

'from this dead hope': cf I Peter i.5.

'grace become pure': cf II Cor.vi.1.

'out of the tomb': cf John xi.38-44.

'sinful flesh': Rom.viii.3.

'debts' : Mt.vi.12.

'alive in you': Rom.vi.11.

'lives your grace': II Cor.ix.14.

'openly confessed': (cf I Tim.vi.12), Rom.x.19.

'the time and the hour': John xii.23-25.

The composition of the passage, as Funk's ordering recognises and makes plain, is in liturgically apt⁽³⁾ 'sense-lines', arranged in parallelisms and antitheses. The only exceptions are 'the desire...fulfilment' and possibly 'in (which)...(of ni)ght', both of which may be reasonably bracketed, on grounds of sense, as glosses by the author of the Apocalypse, who in V.63:30-32 virtually acknowledges that he is quoting an existing formula. As a whole, the prayer is in the classic⁽⁴⁾ 'collect'-form: Address ('My God...'); Reference to previous benefaction ('You that have... benevolence'); Petition ('Do not let...send me salvation'), incorporating an appeal to God's purposes, already

(3) cf Norden Agnostos Theos (Darmstadt 1974) 355-364, 380-7.

(4) J.W.Legg, 'Notes on Collects' (1912).

partly realised in the suppliant ('For I am alive... openly confessed'); Doxology ('Light from Light...'). It is either quoted from a liturgy, or composed in conscious imitation of an established liturgical style and by an author experienced in leading corporate prayer.⁽⁵⁾ Funk (1976, 212-20) has brought together as parallels other prayers: from the Acts of Thomas, in preparation for death; from Pistis Sophia (Sophia's repentance); from the Manichaean Psalm-Book, in preparation for death); from the Mandaean Masiqta-liturgy, in readiness for death; and (with suitable caution) from Tripartite Tractate, the Hermetica and the Valentinian Exposition in C.G.XI.40-44 - prayers for revelation. Closer, however, than any of the parallels cited by Funk is the Prayer of the Martyr Polycarp,⁽⁶⁾ which interprets martyrdom by analogy with eucharistic offering. In 'Second'Apocalypse of James, the analogy is with baptism: James goes down into the hole, not only in a scene exactly described⁽⁷⁾ from Jewish law, but also in a manner reminiscent of the font; and the New Testament allusions are nearly all to passages with baptismal associations. (The reference to unclothing⁽⁹⁾ may also be baptismal; but the image is used so frequently and with so many different connotations - of the mode of incarnation in

(5) The progressively stylised freedom in the Great Church (R.P.C.Hanson, Liberty of the Bishop, 1961) is detectable here also.

(6) ET, 199-200 supra.

(7) Brown, Jewish and Gnostic Elements (1978).

(9) cf Segelberg (1962); on other possibilities, Magne, 'Ouverture des yeux' (1980).

V.46, of Jesus' humility in his apostolic office at V.56, and of the docetic humanity of Jesus at V.58 - that this interpretation is dubious).

It remains virtually certain that the prayer of James is from a baptismal setting, and reflects a Jewish-Christian baptismal rite in which the candidate, standing in the water, prayed (at dictation ?) for the redemptive grace of God in Jesus. Just how the author of 'Second' Apocalypse stood in relation to this rite is uncertain, for the discourse of James and the martyrdom may have been originally independent documents,⁽¹⁰⁾ and the author may be using liturgical material from a stage of doctrinal development which he and his circle had left behind.

With its use of the New Testament, its expectation (V.44:16) that allies of Christianity may be found among the Jewish establishment, and its omission of any criticism of other Christians, 'Second' Apocalypse is closer to the Great Church than Thomas or 'First Apocalypse, and has about it less of the alienation associated with the estrangement of Christian and Jew than is found in these books and their affines. Although it may represent a later 'catholicizing' of the 'James'-tradition, it is more probably an early witness to it.

(10) Again, Brown (n.7).

'First Apocalypse of James (C.G.V/4) is closer to Gospel of Thomas than C.G.V/3, and shares several determinative features:

the place of James the Just (V.24:14-17; 26:2-27:14; 28:10-24 and passim; cf Gospel of Thomas logion 12);

the use of the categories of femaleness and the transcendence of femaleness as concepts of alienation from God and the conquest of that alienation (V.24:27-30, 38:13-41;18; cf Gospel of Thomas , logia 15, 114);

the hostile attitude to Jerusalem (V.24:15-18; cf Gospel of Thomas logion 71);

the negative ^{attitude} attitude to prayer (V.30:13-30, 32:3-12; cf Gospel of Thomas logia 14, 104);

concern with preparation for passing the powers on the way to the beatific vision (V.33:2-35:25; cf Gospel of Thomas logion 50).

Of particular interest to a liturgical investigation are the last two of these features. A further ritual allusion might conceivably be the mention of the kiss (V.31:4-5). This possibility is remote; the kiss ^{is} ~~is~~ interpreted in V.32:3-12 as a symptom of James's sound spiritual instinct, but it does not convey any grace (in apparent marked contrast with Thomas,

logion 108), nor does it occur in a congregational setting. Its sole liturgical interest would seem to be that it testifies to the inner state of James (V.28:10-24) which makes external acts insignificant, and marks, for James, a transition out of prayer and into an apprehension of reality to which prayer is inimical. The sequence into which the kiss fits is psychological rather than liturgical.

The chief burden of the Apocalypse is the assurance that James (and so also the initiate, whom James typifies) can overcome the danger presented by the archons. The archons pose a two-fold threat, which is countered by two-fold measures. On the one hand, the archons, concentrated in Jerusalem, dominate all earthly phenomena (26:2-24), their number of seventy-two representing their ubiquity⁽¹¹⁾; this threat is met by an invincible recollection of inward silence, manifested by Jesus (28:1-3) and repeated in James (28:10-24). Silence as spiritual power is known elsewhere in Syrian Christianity in the person of Ignatius of Antioch⁽¹²⁾; here, however, it is a rationale for a cessation of prayer - we note that Jesus' commentary on the cessation of prayer follows his reassurance that there is no need to be concerned with earthly enemies (31:6-26, followed by 32:3-12). On the other hand, the

(11) Schoedel, 'Scripture and the 72 Heavens' (1971);
Séd, 'Les douze hebdomades' (1979).

(12) Ignatius, ad Eph. vi.1, xv.1-3.

archons are a threat to the spiritual destiny of the individual (27:14-end), and bar the way to the beatific vision; this danger is met by the provision of pass-words of power that will enable the believer to pass them unscathed (33:2-35:25).

Two apparent inconsistencies claim attention. Firstly: it does not seem consistent to advocate an abandonment of prayer and in the next breath to offer formulas of power. The prayer discountenanced may, of course, not be prayer of every sort, but only petitionary or penitential prayer, and the formulae of power are declaratory and triumphal (and yet the expression 'call upon', ἐπικαλούμαι,, must be held to retain some petitionary overtones). Secondly, the schema of archons and other entities assumed by the formulae of power does not ^{relate} to anything mentioned elsewhere in the surviving text of the apocalypse. To infer from this, however, that the formulae come from some other tradition is unwarranted. At all events, the producer(s) of the present text cannot have felt that the ensemble was irreconcilable with itself.

The theme of the cessation of prayer may be

succinctly noted. James is praying (in a context where it is clear that 'prayer' is in sorrow and fear) after the crucifixion of Jesus (30:13-29, where damage to the manuscript has lost many details). As soon as the risen Jesus appears, James stops praying, and greets Jesus with a kiss (31:2-5). In the ensuing conversation, Jesus interprets James's action thus (32:3-8, pp.82-3 Schoedel):

'You see how you will become sober
when you see me.
And you stopped this prayer.
Now, since you are a just man of God,
you have embraced me and kissed me.'

More substantial is the account of Jesus instructing James in the pass-words. The theme of the discourse is 'your (sc. James's) redemption', $\bar{\mu}\bar{\nu}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\omega}\bar{\tau}\bar{\epsilon}$ (33:1). It is not clear whether this title is intended as a liturgical term or connotes the whole eternal destiny of the initiate, with the liturgical expression of it as part, but only part, of the way to the beatific vision - the question is not resolved by the interpretation of similar sources in Irenaeus, AH I.xxi, although he does supply other valuable evidence.

'When you are seized, and you undergo these sufferings, a multitude will arm themselves against

you, and may seize you. And, in particular, three of them will seize you - they who sit as toll-collectors. Not only do they ~~they~~ demand toll, but they also take away souls by theft. When you come into their power, one of them who is their guard will say to you (Question 1): "Who are you or where are you from?" You are to say to him (Response 1): "I am a son, and I am from the Father."

He will say to you (Question 2): "What sort of son are you, and to what father do you belong?" You are to say to him (Response 2): "I am from the (Pre-existent) Father, and a son in the Pre-existent One." '

(V.33:2-24, 84-7 Schoedel).

At least Question 3 and Response 3 are too damaged to reconstruct. Of Question 4, only 'alien things' survives (34:1). However, the general sense of the question - about the mortal and passible aspects of James which are inconsistent with his filial ^{relation} to the Father - may be inferred from Response 4:

'You are to say to him: "They are not entirely alien, but they are from Achamoth, who is the female. And these she produced as she brought this race down from the Pre-existent One. So then they are not alien, but they are ours because she who is mistress of them is from the Pre-existent

One. At the same time they are alien because the Pre-existent One did not have commerce with her, when she produced them."

When he also says to you (Question 5):

"Where will you go?", you are to say to him (Response 5): "To the place from which I have come, there shall I return."

And if you say these things, you will escape their attacks.

But when you come to (these) three detainers who take away souls by theft in that place...'

(V.34:1-24; 86-9 Schoedel).

There is apparently no challenge from these new opponents, but James is to say (Response 6):

"I am a vessel much more precious than the female" - (so far, the text is a highly conjectural reconstruction by Schoedel, p.89 n., following Irenaeus) - "...You, too, will become sober... But I shall call (upon) the imperishable Gnosis, which is Sophia, who is in the Father (and) who is the mother of Achamoth. Achamoth had no father nor male consort, but she is female from a female. She produced you (pl.) without a male, since she was alone (and) in ignorance

as to what (? lives through) her mother
because she thought that she alone existed.

But I shall cry out to her mother."

And then they will fall into confusion and
will blame their root and the race of their mother.'

(V.34:26-35:23; 88-91 Schoedel).

The parallel between this passage and one section
of Irenaeus AH I.xxi (=I.232-5 Stieren; AH I.xiv.4
=I.186-8 Harvey) is too close to be other than evidence
of a common source:

Alii sunt (Irenaeus does not state, or claim to know,
who these 'others' are), qui mortuos redimunt ad finem
defunctionis, mittentes eorum capitibus oleum et
aquam, sive praedictum unguentum cum aqua, et
supradictis invocationibus, ut incomprehensibiles
et invisibiles principibus et potestatibus fiant,
et ut superascendat super ^{invisibilia} ~~invibilia~~ interior
ipsorum homo, quasi corpus quidem ipsorum in
creatura mundi relinquatur, anima vero projiciatur
Demiurgo. Et praecipunt eis venientibus ad potestates
haec dicere, posteaquam mortui fuerint: Ego
filius a Patre (so edd.; Patris codd.), Patre
qui ante fuit, filius autem in eo qui ante fuit.
Veni autem videre omnia quae sunt mea et aliena;

non autem aliena in totum, sed sunt Achamoth,
quae est faemina, et haec sibi fecit: deducit
enim genus ex eo qui ante fuit, et eo rursus
in mea unde veni. Et haec dicentem evadere
et effugere potestates dicunt. Venire quoque
ad eos qui sunt circa Demiurgum, et dicere
eis: Vas ego sum pretiosum, magis quam
faemina quae fecit vos. Si mater vestra
ignorat radicem suam, ego autem novi
meipsum, et scio unde sim, et invoco
incompactibilem Sophiam, quae est in
Patre, mater autem est matris vestrae,
quae non habet patrem, neque conjugem
masculum; faemina (so codd., Harvey; coniugem:
masculo-femina, Massuet, Stieren)
autem a faemina nata effecit vos, ignorans
et matrem suam, et putans seipsam esse
solam: ego autem invoco ejus matrem.

Haec autem eos qui circa Demiurgum sunt
audientes, valde conturbari, et reprehendere
suam radicem, et genus matris: ipsos autem
abire in sua, projicientes nodos ipsorum, id
est animam. Et de redemptione quidem ipsorum
haec sunt quae quidem in nos venerunt.

The Greek text is preserved in an odd fashion by

Epiphanius in his account of the Heracleonites (haer.36.2 = II.46.16-47.12 Holl; with improved apparatus in Volker, Quellen, 140-1). The fact that Epiphanius attributes this passage to the Heracleonites is of interest only insofar as it indicates that he did not regard AH I.xxi as a unity. The original of 'Ego filius a Patre...in nos venerunt' is cited exactly, while the original of 'Alii sunt...mortui fuerint' is much adapted and expanded. Volker (ibid.) concludes, too readily, that 'die altlateinische Übersetzung angeführt werden muss'; but Stieren (I.232-4) has successfully identified the central elements of the Greek text, and his edition is followed at this point:

5. . . . τοὺς τελευτώντας ἀπὸ αὐτῶν καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν αὐτὴν ἔξοδον φθάνοντας ... λυτροῦνται ... ποτὲ γάρ τινες ἐξ αὐτῶν ἔλαιον ὕδατι μίξαντες, ἐπιβάλλουσι τῇ κεφαλῇ τοῦ ἐξεκθόντος. Οἱ δὲ μύρον τὸ λεγόμενον ὀποβάλαμον καὶ ὕδωρ τὴν ἐπίκλησιν κοινὴν ἔχοντες... ἵνα δῆθεν... ἀκράτητοι γίνωνται καὶ ἀόρατοι ταῖς ἄνω ἀρχαῖς καὶ ἐξουσίαις, εἰς τὸ ὑπερβῆναι ἀοράτως τὸν ἔσω αὐτῶν ἄνθρωπον ... ὡς τῶν σωμάτων τούτων ἐν τῇ κίσει καταλιπανομένων· τῆς δὲ ψυχῆς αὐτῶν παρισταμένης τῷ Δημιουργῷ... ἐγκλεῦνται δέ... ὅτι... ἐὰν ἔλθῃ ἐπὶ τὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ ἐξουσίας, ἔχε ἐν μνήμῃ τάδε εἰπεῖν μετὰ τὴν ἐντεῦθεν τελευτήν· ἐγὼ υἱὸς ἀπὸ Πατρὸς, Πατρὸς προόντος, υἱὸς δὲ ἐν τῷ παρόντι. Ἦλθον πάντα ἰδεῖν τὰ ἀλλότρια καὶ τὰ ἴδια· καὶ οὐκ ἀλλότρια δὲ παντελῶς, ἀλλὰ τῆς Ἀχαμώθ, ἣτις ἐστὶ Θήλεια, καὶ ταῦτα ἑαυτῇ ἐποίησε. Κατάγω δὲ τὸ γένος ἐκ τοῦ προόντος, καὶ πορεύομαι πάλιν εἰς τὰ ἴδια, ὅθεν ἐλέλυθα. Καὶ ταῦτα εἰπόντα... διαφεύγειν τὰς ἐξουσίας... ἔρχεσθαι δὲ ἐπὶ τοὺς περὶ τὸν Δημιουργόν, καὶ λέγειν... σκευδὸς εἰμι ἔντιμον μᾶλλον παρὰ τὴν Θήλειαν τὴν ποιήσασαν ὑμᾶς. Εἰ ἡ μήτηρ ὑμῶν ἀγνοεῖ τὴν ἑαυτῆς ρίζαν, ἐγὼ οἶδα ἑμαντὸν καὶ γινώσκω, ὅθεν εἰμί, καὶ ἐπικαλοῦμαι τὴν ἀφθαρτον Σοφίαν, ἣτις ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ Πατρὶ, μήτηρ δὲ τῆς μητρὸς ὑμῶν τῆς μὴ ἐχούσης μητέρα, ἀλλ' οὔτε σύζυγον ἄρρενα· Θήλεια δὲ ὑπὸ Θηλείας γενομένη ἐποίησεν ὑμᾶς, ἀγνοοῦσα καὶ τὴν μητέρα αὐτῆς καὶ δοκοῦσα ἑαυτὴν εἶναι μόνην· ἐγὼ δὲ ἐπικαλοῦμαι αὐτῆς τὴν μητέρα. Τούτους δὲ τοὺς περὶ τὸν Δημιουργόν ἀκούσαντας σφόδρα ταραχθῆναι καὶ καταγῶναι αὐτῶν τῆς ρίζης καὶ τοῦ γένους τῆς μητρὸς. Αὐτὸν δὲ πορευθῆναι *εἰς τὰ ἴδια, ρίψαντα τὸν δεσμὸν αὐτοῦ, τουτέστι τὴν ψυχὴν. Καὶ περὶ μὲν τῆς ἀπολυτρώσεως ταῦτά ἐστιν ὅσα εἰς ἡμᾶς συνελήλυθαμεν. . . .

Irenaeus quotes the pass-words as a continual text, as if they were to be ~~uttered~~^{uttered} all at once and without waiting for any challenge to elicit them. There are, however, signs in his text that he is abbreviating, for some of the statements as to the purpose of the formulae suggest that he is quoting, in reported speech, some of the utterances of the administrant, and is reserving direct speech for the words which the ascending spirit is to utter.

Irenaeus' source (derived, he says, from books handed in to himself or some other bishop of the Catholic Church by converts from the unnamed sect) may be tentatively reconstructed thus:

Certain persons confer redemption on those who are dying, at the very moment of expiry, by pouring on their heads either oil-and-water or the myron called 'opobalsam' (following the Greek; the Latin translator assumes that Irenaeus is identifying the sect and its sacramental elements with those mentioned in AH I.xxi.4), using the usual invocation (again following the Greek where the Latin has assimilated the source to the preceding section), saying:

'...so that ^{you} may become uncontrollable
and invisible to the Principalities and
Authorities above, and so that your
inner man may ascend invisibly (so Greek;
Latin: "may ascend above the things
invisible"), as if your body were abandoned
at the creaturely level (of this world, Lat.)
and your soul were cast away to the Demiurge.

When you come the Powers (here, perhaps, Question
1 as in 'First' Apocalypse of James was predicted),
then you are to say, "I am a son, from a Father."
(Then, perhaps, Question 2; with the response)
"(I am) a son of the pre-existent Father and
in the pre-existent One." (Then either a
third question followed, or the next words
continue what in the Coptic text of 'First'
Apocalypse we have called Response 2): "I
have come to see both the things that are
alien and the things which are my own" (the
Latin has reversed the order of terms, probably
to restore what seemed a more natural sequence).
"Yet they are not entirely alien, but they
are of Achamoth, who is feminine, and made
these things for herself. For she brought

the race from the Pre-existent One."

(Since the next sentence in the Coptic text clearly translates a Greek sentence ending with 'from the Pre-existent One', we may suspect a homoioteleuton which has lost this sentence either from Irenaeus' Greek text or even in his own composition of the text: "So they are not alien, but are ours because she who is mistress of them is from the Pre-existent One".

At the same time, the next sentence in the Coptic, "At the same time...produced them", is more problematic. It is not consistent with Irenaeus's, or the Coptic, version of Response 5, and at first sight has therefore the look of an interpolation. On the other hand, Irenaeus's eye may have passed over this sentence in his Greek source by accident as he deliberately omitted Question 5, and went on to Response 5, which is obviously consistent with the last sentence which he had just quoted.

He therefore went ^{straight} ~~stright~~ on to): "I go again to the things which are my own, whence I came."

(The administrant then addresses the initiate again directly): 'Saying this, you will escape the Authorities, and then come upon those who surround the Demiurge, and you will say, "I am an honourable vessel, better than the

feminine being who made you. If your mother is ignorant of her own root, I know myself and know whence I came, and I invoke the incorruptible Sophia who is in the Father, and Mother of your mother who has no father" (with Lat.) "nor male consort. She being a female from a female" (here the Coptic confirms the Greek against the Latin), "made you, for she was ignorant even of her own mother and thought that she alone existed. I, however, call upon her mother." They that surround the Demiurge, hearing these words' (^{taking τούτους to mean τούτους τοὺς λόγους} ~~reading τούτους λόγους~~ = the Words of Power), 'will be flung into confusion, and will blame their own root and the race of the mother. But you will make your way to the things that are your own, casting aside your fetter - that is, the soul.'

The text thus reconstructed, cited in abbreviated form by Irenaeus and either verbatim or with very slight expansion in 'First Apocalypse', could equally well have circulated in pamphlet form alone, or as part of a body of liturgical formulae. Of the uncertainties remaining, the most puzzling is the mention of 'the usual invocation', τὴν ἐπίκλησιν κοινὴν.

The most obvious (though clearly to the Latin

translator utterly ^{un}welcome) sense is that the users of this liturgy employed a formula of anointing common to themselves and to 'Catholic' Christians. What Irenaeus regarded as the 'usual' formula of anointing he does not say.⁽¹³⁾

One possible point of departure for the elaboration of the 'gnosticized' formula is James v.14-15:

Ἄσθενεῖ τις ἐν ὑμῖν ; προσκαλεσάσθω τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους τῆς ἐκκλησίας, καὶ προσευξάσθωσαν ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἀλείφαντες ἐλαίῳ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι (τοῦ Κυρίου). καὶ ἡ εὐχὴ τῆς πίστεως σώσει τὸν κάμνοντα, καὶ ἐγερεῖ αὐτὸν ὁ Κύριος: καὶ ἁμαρτίας ἧ πεποιηώς, ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ.

'Is any among you sick ? Let him call for the Elders of the Church, and let them pray over him (perhaps also: laying hands on him), anointing/having anointed him with oil in the Name (of the Lord). And the prayer of faith will save the ailing man, and the Lord will raise him up; and if he has committed sins, he will be forgiven.'

This passage of James, the isolated locus classicus on the unction of the sick, is a tantalising piece of evidence. References to healing in the New Testament are many, ^{but the} ~~not the~~ only explicit reference to anointing with oil for the purpose is in Mark vi.13, where the disciples are seen acting with Jesus' authority to cast out demons (vi.7) but apparently without needing

(13) Not even when speaking of healing: AH II.vi, x.4, xxxi.2, xxxii.4, xxxii.5, III.v.2. Texts gathered in E.Frost, Christian Healing (London 1949 edn) 100-6.

his specific instructions to choose this means. The only very early attestations of this method are in Tertullian ad Scapulam iv and in the apocryphal Acts: Acts of John 115 (22) - a 'sealing of the whole body, in readiness for death (II/1,215 Lipsius-Bonnet); Acts of Thomas 157 (II/2 266-7 Lipsius-Bonnet) - during the consecration of oil for the pre-baptismal unction, one of epithets of the Saviour is 'symbol and joy of the ailing'. The earliest liturgical evidence in support is in prayers for the consecration of oil for healing, principally for self-administration, in 'Apostolic Tradition' (p.18 Botte).

There are issues of liturgical interpretation attached to James v.14-15 in itself. Prayer 'over' the sick man may connote the laying on of hands, which may in any case be included in the notion of anointing. The aorist participle in the verb for the anointing may indicate a temporal sequence of prayer followed by and distinct from the anointing; but the majority opinion (see Laws in loc.) is that the two acts are meant to be simultaneous. The omission of 'of the Lord' after 'in the Name' by Codex Vaticanus, (feebly supported by C.Alexandrinus and some others, which omit the definite article), is probably - with Mayor in loc. - the original reading. In a Jewish or Jewish-Christian context, it yields a perfectly

workable sense: the anointing is performed in The (Divine) Name.⁽¹⁴⁾ The addition of the explicit reference to 'the Lord (Jesus)' is clearly, on one level, part of the progressive christianization of a Jewish formula;⁽¹⁵⁾ the question must also be asked - even if it cannot be answered - whether, on another level, the addition was aimed at excluding 'Gnostic' abuse of an indeterminate expression. It is heaping conjecture upon conjecture to speculate whether a fairly settled Jewish-Christian formula, even this very passage, expressing confident prayer for the 'lifting-up' of a sick person was being abused as a hook upon which the 'gnosticizing' scheme of ascent through the archons might be hung. The question needs to be posed, for at least in some Christian circles (I Cor.vi.14; II Cor.iv.14; Acts xxvi.8) an association with personal eschatology could attach to ἐγερῆν.

Behind the early Christian tradition of anointing and also its 'gnosticizing' adaptation lies a body of Jewish apocalyptic narrative, in contexts where both theodicy and soteriology are at issue. It must suffice to note the key passages, for the extent to which they were present to, and influential upon, the early Christian mind cannot be ^{gauged} ~~gauged~~ in the ^{present} ~~present~~ state of the evidence:

(14) D.Daube, The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism (London 1956) 236-7.

(15) So Mayor in loc.

From the (Slavonic) Book of the Secrets of Enoch, or
'2 Enoch', 22.4-10:

'And I fell prone, and bowed down to the Lord,
and the Lord with his lips said to me: "Have
courage, Enoch, do not fear, arise and stand
before my face into eternity." And the
archistratege Michael lifted me up, and led
me to before the Lord's face. And the Lord
said to his servants tempting them: "Let Enoch
stand before my face into eternity," and the
glorious ones bowed down to the Lord, and said:
"Let Enoch go according to Thy word." And the
Lord said to Michael: "Go and take Enoch from
out his earthly garments, and anoint him with
my sweet ointment, and put him into the garment
of my glory." And Michael did thus as the Lord
told him. He anointed me, and dressed me, and the
appearance of that ointment is more than the
great light, and his ointment is like sweet dew,
and its smell mild, shining like the sun's ray,
and I looked at myself, and was like one of the
glorious ones.'

(ET R.H.Charles, Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha
of the Old Testament, 1913, II.443;

this is from the 'A' version; the place of the
unclothing+unction+clothing is different in
the 'B' version, ibid., and may therefore be
an interpolation - of uncertain origin and date).

From The Apocalypse of Moses (c.100 A.D.),
viii.3; xiii.2; xxxi.3-4:

'But Adam said to Eve, "Arise and go with my son Seth near to Paradise, and put earth upon your heads and weep and pray God to have ~~mercy~~ ^{mercy} upon me and send his angel to Paradise, and give me of the tree out of which the oil floweth, and bring it me, and I shall anoint myself and shall have rest from my complaint".....

And God sent the archangel Michael and he spake to Seth: "Seth, man of God, weary not thyself with prayers and entreaties concerning the tree which floweth with oil to anoint thy father Adam. For it shall not be thine now, (3) but in the end of the times. Then shall all flesh be raised up from Adam till that great day - all that shall be of the holy people. Then shall the delights of Paradise be given to them and God shall be in their midst. And they shall no longer sin before his face, for the evil heart shall be taken from them and there shall be given them a heart understanding the good and to serve God only." '

(At this point, in the christianized version of The Life of Adam and Eve, there was inserted a prediction that, in the last days, Christ would come to 'anoint from the oil of mercy all that believe in Him...those who are ready to be born again of water and the Holy Spirit.'

This is probably from the Gospel of Nicodemus ⁽¹⁷⁾.
If M.Stone, in HTR 59/3, July 1966, 283-91,
is correct, the evidence of the Armenian Adam-
Book suggests that even the limited reference
to anointing in Apocalypse of Moses is an
interpolation - but it need not be a Christian one).

'And Adam saith to her:But when I die, anoint
me and let no man touch me till the angel of the
Lord shall speak somewhat concerning me. For God
will not forget me, but will seek his own creature;
and now arise rather and pray to God till I give up
my spirit into His hands who gave it me. For we
know not how we are to meet our Maker, whether He
be wroth with us , or be merciful and intend to
pity and receive us." '

(ET L.S.A.Wells, in Charles, ed., Apocrypha, etc.,
II, 143, 144, 149).

In connection with 'James'-traditions, three
minor sources may be noted in conclusion: the Apokryphon
of James (C.G.I/2); Ps.-James, Sermon on John the
Baptist; and the account of the martyrdom of James the
brother of John.

C.G.I/2 offers a form of the ascent-mysticism
considerably amended for alignment or re-alignment
with the Great Church. There is no indication in this
tractate of its liturgical affinities, but the
insistence on the realities of Christ's sufferings -
'none will be saved unless they believe in my cross.

(17) or, 'Acts of Pilate' (iii/xix, James ANT 127.

But those who have believed in my cross, theirs is the Kingdom of God' (I.5:3-7) - suggests a marked reaction against Docetism, and the consequent doctrine of mortification - 'Therefore become seekers for death, like the dead who seek for life, for that which they seek is revealed to them...the kingdom of death belongs to those who put themselves to death' (I.5:7-11, 17-18) - is in line with such a reaction. There is a teaching of the ascent, and a reference to pass-words for eluding the archons, but the pass-words are available only because Christ has descended to suffer after teaching them, and the conflict which he endures ends only after a violent confrontation during the Ascension:

' "To you alone, James, have I said, Be saved !
And I have commanded thee to follow me, and
I have taught you what to say before the archons.
Observe that I have descended and undergone
tribulation and carried off my crown after
saving you" ' (I.8:31-9:1).

'...he departed. But we bent (our) knee(s),
I and Peter, and gave thanks, and sent our
heart(s) upward to heaven. We heard with our
ears, and saw with our eyes, the noise of wars
and a trumpet blare and a great turmoil.

And when we had passed beyond that place, we

sent our minds further upward and saw with our own eyes and heard with our own ears hymns and angelic benedictions and angelic rejoicing. And heavenly majesties were singing praises, and we too rejoiced' (I.15:5-23).

There is a confident assertion that the disciple can be assimilated to Christ, but only in humility: ' "Do not make the kingdom of heaven a desert within you. Do not be proud because of the light that illumines, but be to yourselves as I am to you. For your sakes I have placed myself under the curse, that you may be saved" ' (I.13:17-25). According to C.G.I.15:35-16:11, a singularly obscure passage, it seems that one aspect of this Christian humility is self-discipline for the sake of the evangelisation of coming generations. If this passage is here rightly interpreted, as a testimony to the role of Christian families, it is another indication that the author is trying to rescue the 'James'-tradition for main-stream Christianity.

An instance of the persisting instinct to link the ascent-mysticism (albeit more as a technique of revelation, as in Apocalypse of Paul, than as a means of redemption, as in 'First' Apocalypse of James) with a Christian rite, in this case the

Eucharist, is found in four papyrus leaves from the White Monastery, now Paris. copte 129¹⁸, 116-120, of the Bibliothèque Nationale, at least three of which are from A Sermon on John the Baptist, the author of which says (p.117; p.202:2-7 Winstedt), 'It is I, James the Apostle, who recounts this to you.' In this case, James is purely a narrator, and the centre of the stage is held by Jesus and John the Baptist. James relates how Jesus holds a Eucharistia or Agape (both terms are employed; as Winstedt p.244, n.1 observes, they seem to be synonymous here) for his deceased kinsman John the Baptist at the Feeding of the Five Thousand:

'But when Jesus the merciful and compassionate and Son of the Compassionate saw, he took compassion in his heart on the multitude, as being the good shepherd of everyone. The disciples said, "Let the multitudes go that they may go to the towns and buy something to eat." Said the Saviour: "Nay"; thinking, "What εὐχαριστία is it that I shall take before my kinsman, to hold feast with those who trouble me for it, if they go fasting thus?" Even as Joseph the patriarch made the ἀγάπη at the death of his father Jacob even so did Christ distribute the ἀγάπη for his kinsman John. Moreover,

this thing and this custom was with ~~with~~ every one for ever, that kinsfolk should distribute the agape with their kin when they die'

(ET 244-5 Winstedt; Coptic, p.116= 241:9-14).

It is apparently during the discourse at this commemorative Eucharist/Agape that Jesus takes his Apostles (including his brother James, and with Paul, Luke and Mark added for good measure) in an ascent through the heavens. Of all the heavens they pass, the third, the most beautiful, is reserved for John the Baptist and his parents. The closing excerpt, which in Winstedt's view may be from another work, emphasizes the dignity of John the Baptist by dwelling upon the torments ~~meted~~^{meted} out to an angel (not a policeman, as Winstedt, 240, 247, reads) who is disrespectful to him. Despite Winstedt's caution, this probably is part of the Sermon on John the Baptist, for in the preceding pages there are allusions to the terrors of the after-life, even though the itinerary there described concentrates on the heavens of blessedness. Even on the way to the heavens, there is 'a stream of fire, through which all my saints and righteous men pass, all without exception, be they righteous or sinners' (p.247). The only ones exempted from this ordeal (and they will be

ferried across the stream of fire by John in a golden boat) will be those who have commemorated John on earth: 'any man that shall make thy memorial on earth, be it oblation, or alms to the poor and needy, or writing a book of thy praise in thy name and giving it to the Church' (pp.246-7; Coptic, p.243:1-25 Winstedt).

In many respects, this is all very far from the Gospel of Thomas and 'First' Apocalypse of James: it is popular literature of the Great Church, late enough for the custom of holding a Eucharist/Agape at the grave of the departed,⁽²⁰⁾ and for the cult of saints to have replaced merkabah mysticism in Semitic Christianity; the passing of the heavens is now a matter of unqualified works-righteousness; the anti-Jewish preoccupation is muted, although not forgotten. The survival of the link between Christian rites and ascent-mysticism is therefore all the more remarkable.

One last small example of the use of liturgical 'James'-traditions is that of the account by Clement in the Hypotyposesis (as quoted by Eusebius, h.e. II.ix.2-3) of the martyrdom of James the brother of John. James is depicted forgiving, and reconciling with a kiss, the man who has denounced⁽²¹⁾ him but has

(20) Still possibly second century; a refrigerium seems to be implied by Acts of Paul 25 (ANT 277).

(21) Rather than simply 'led him into court'; or why does James have to think before forgiving him ?

now admitted himself to being a Christian. There can be no doubt that this is an aetiological myth in aid of the principle of reconciling apostates, deriving from the Syrian (Jewish-Christian ?) church. Why the lesser James was chosen for this purpose we cannot say - it is possible that too much was already attached to the memory of James the Great, and/or that the latter's memory was linked with rigorism. The story is at all events testimony to the use of a 'James' name in support of a liturgical policy in the second century Semitic church, and therefore a side-light on the vitality of the 'James'-traditions.

11. Some Liturgical Traditions of Uncertain Provenance.

There survive some materials which must belong in the setting of the chaos left by the separation of Christianity from Judaism, but which cannot be assigned a place within any identifiable religious community, although they may turn out to be related to the 'Peratae-Nassenes-Ophites' group or to the 'James'-tradition group(s).

The first is a formula for water-baptism cited by Irenaeus (AH I.xxi.3^b/ I.xiv.2^b):

Alii autem adducunt ad aquam, et baptizantes ita dicunt: In nomen incogniti Patris Omnium, in veritate(m) matrem omnium, in descendentem (in) Jesum ad unitatem (et redemptionem) et communionem virtutum.

(Latin of Irenaeus: I.183 Harvey).

- 3: οἱ δὲ ἄγουσιν ἐφ' ὕδαρ καὶ βαπτίζοντες οὕτως ἐπι-
1 λέγουσιν «εἰς ὄνομα ἀγνώστου πατρὸς τῶν ὅλων, εἰς Ἀλήθειαν μητέρα
2 <τῶν> πάντων, εἰς τὸν κατελθόντα εἰς Ἰησοῦν, εἰς ἔνωσιν καὶ ἀπο-
3 λύτρωσιν καὶ κοινωνίαν τῶν δυνάμεων».

2 <τῶν> + Euseb., Holl.

(Greek of Epiphanius, ed.Holl;

from Völker, Quellen, 138:31-139:3).

'Others, however, conduct (candidates) to water,
and , as they baptize, say (something like this?):
"In(to) the Name of the Unknown Father of All Things;
In(to) Truth, Mother of all;
In(to) the One who came down upon Jesus;
(following words omitted by Eusebius, h.e.IV.11.5, 135 Schwartz):
Into unity with and redemption by and sharing of the Powers."
OR:
"Into unity; and into redemption; and into sharing..."
OR:
"Unto the unification and redemption and participation of..."
OR:
"Unto unity with and redemption by and fellowship with..."

Eusebius' omission is probably no more than an accident,
for he is abbreviating his source here very noticeably,
and the longer text is attested both by the Latin
and by the citation in Epiphanius. It may be that,
accidentally or not, Eusebius has detected a transition
in the sense of the formula, from the essential content
to an interpretative gloss incorporated into the rite.

The logical relationship of the clauses of the form
remain problematic. Is it to be read as baptism into a
six-fold name ? or do the second three clauses correspond to

the three former clauses and unpack their respective meanings (sc., baptism into the Father is into unity with/ unto the unification of, the Powers, etc.) ? More probable than either of these interpretations is the view that baptism into the three-fold Name - and there can be little doubt that this formula is an adaptation, perhaps an intended explication, of the three-fold formula of Matthew xxviii.19 - is intended to convey a three-fold benefit. Liturgical instincts incorporated comparable glosses into later Catholic baptismal formulae: ...in remissionem peccatorum ut habeas vitam aeternam (Missale Gothicum, No.260, II.77 Bannister); ..unam habentem substantiam ut habeas uitam aeternam parte cum sanctis (Bobbio Missal, No. 260, II.75 Lowe). In the Catholic cases, the expansions are importations from the preceding creed. A comparable process may explain the formula quoted by Irenaeus.

Some of the terms of the basic three-fold name formula are reminiscent of the teachings of the pupils of Marcus (AH I.xv.3/I.viii.14, Vol.I,p.150 Harvey): Pater omnium... cum autem venisset ipse ad aquam, descendisse in eum, quasi columbam, eum qui recurrit sursum, et implevit xii numerum; in quo inerat semen eorum, qui conseminati sunt cum eo et condescenderunt et coascenderunt (perhaps an illuminating parallel to communione[m] virtutum ?); but the place given to Alethia in the Marcosian passage is less exalted than in the baptismal formula, which makes her "the Mother of All Things" - a title apparently reserved by Marcosians to Sigē, according to AH I.xv.2/I.viii.11, Vol.I,p.146 Harvey.

A closer similarity may be detected between the quoted baptismal formula and the theological scheme assumed in Apokryphon of John and also in Trimorphic Protennoia. In the former we encounter a saving Trinity, "the Father, the Mother, and the Son, the perfect Power" (CG II/1, 9:10-11), with specific reference to the Holy Spirit as "the Mother of the living" (CG II/1, 10:17-18). More impressive (although here too the explicit identification of Truth as the Mother is lacking) is the comparability with the baptismal formula of this sequence of thoughts in Trimorphic Protennoia:

"Now the Voice that originated from my thought exists as three permanencies: the Father, the Mother, the Son. A sound that is perceptible, it has within it a Word endowed with every glory, and it has three masculinities, three powers, and three names..." (CG XIII/1, 37: 20-26; ET p.463 Turner, NHLE)

"...(I am) the Mother (as well as) the Light which she appointed as Virgin, she who is called Meirothea, the intangible Womb, the unrestrained and immeasurable Voice" (CG XIII/1, 38:11-16; ET p.463 Turner)

"...I am the first one who descended on account of my portion which is left behind, that is, the Spirit that (now) dwells in the Soul, but which originated from the Water of Life. And out of the immersion of the mysteries I spoke, I together with the Archons and Authorities." (CG XIII/1, 41: 20-25; ET p.465 Turner)

"And I am inviting you into the exalted, perfect Light. Moreover, (as for) this (Light), when you enter it you will be glorified by those

who give glory, and those who enthrone will enthrone you. You will receive robes from those who give robes and the baptizers will baptize you and you will become gloriously glorious, the way you first were when you were (Light)."

(CG XIII/1, 45:10-20, ET p.467 Turner)

"...there is a Light (that) dwells hidden in Silence and it was first to (come) forth. Whereas she (the Mother) alone exists in Silence, I alone am the Word, ineffable, incorruptible, immeasurable, inconceivable. It is a hidden Light, bearing a fruit of life, pouring forth Living Water from the invisible, unpolluted, immeasurable spring, that is, the unreproducible Voice of the glory of the Mother, the glory of the offspring of God; a male Virgin by virtue of a hidden Intellect, that is, the Silence hidden from the All, being unreproducible, an immeasurable Light, the source of the All, the root of the entire Aeon. It is the foundation, that supports every movement of the Aeons that belong to the mighty glory. It is the founding of every foundation. It is the breath of the powers." (CG XIII/1,46:11-29; ET p.468 Turner).

Although the verbal parallels are not close, the version of the Naassene triadic theology contained in Trimorphic Protennoia fits the baptismal formula in Irenaeus; so also does its high doctrine of the redeeming work of the Mother and its account of the one who descends upon the redeemed Redeemer. The identification is not beyond doubt, but it seems more than probable that the formula comes from the tradition which, in more developed and speculative form, finds expression in Trimorphic Protennoia.

Next comes a baptismal formula in 'Hebrew', from the same series of quotations in Irenaeus (AH I.xxi.3^c/

I.xiv.2^c): Alii autem adducunt ad aquam, et baptizantes ita dicunt: *³In nomen incogniti Patris omnium, in veritate[m]⁴ matrem omnium, in descendentem ⁴[in] Jesum ad unitionem ⁴[et redemptionem] et communionem virtutum.* Alii autem et Hebraica nomina superfantur, ut stupori sint, vel deterreant eos qui sacrantur. sic: *Basima cacabasa eanaa irraumista diarbada caëota bafobor camelanthi.* Horum autem interpretatio est talis: *Hoc quod est super omnem virtutem Patris invocato, quod vocatur lumen, et spiritus, et vita, quoniam in corpore regnasti.*
(Latin of Irenaeus, I.183-4 Harvey);

ἄλλοι δὲ Ἑβραϊκά τινα ὀνόματα ἐπιλέγουσι πρὸς τὸ μᾶλλον καταπλήξασθαι τοὺς τελουμένους, οὕτως· βασεμὰ χαμοσσή βασιαννοορὰ μισιαδία θουαδὰ κονστα βαβοφόρο καλαχθεῖ. τούτων δ' ἡ ἐρμηνεία ἐστὶ τοιαύτη· ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν δύναμιν τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐπικαλοῦμαι * φῶς ὀνομαζόμενον καὶ πνεῦμα ἀγαθὸν καὶ ζωή, ὅτι ἐν σώματι ἐβασίλευσας.

7 *) Holl ergänzt: *οἱ τὸν.*

(Greek of Epiphanius, ed. Holl;
from Völkner, Quellen, 139:3-8).

That the transmission of Irenaeus' transliterations has been fraught with mishaps is hardly surprising. Of the suggestions listed by Stieren in his edition of Irenaeus (I.228-30) and by Hugo Gressmann in his article, 'Jüdisch-Aramäisches bei Epiphanius' in *Znw* (Jahrg.16, 1915, 191-7), every one requires both emendation of the Greek and Latin texts and also the hypothesis that Irenaeus' own 'translation' is either substantially mistaken or has itself been unaccountably mangled in transmission.

Among the many proposed reconstructions and interpretations of the 'Hebrew', two may be singled out: those of Hoffmann (in *Znw* 4, 1903, 298) and of Gressmann (197).

Hoffmann's theory yields a text that could be rendered:
'In the name of Achamoth, be baptized ! The Life,
the Light, which has been poured forth, the Spirit
of Truth be present for thy redemption ! ' ;
while Gressmann's would yield: 'In thy name, O
Father ! Be baptized (in.....), in the Light
into which the Spirit of Truth is emanated for thy
redemption. Mayest thou live !' All that is secure
is that we have here some sort of liturgical utterance,
almost certainly for an initiatory context. If
the invocation is of Achamoth, we are in the milieu
of the Naassene ascent-mysticism in the form found
in the 'First' Apocalypse of James. If the invocation
is of the Father, there is no obvious affinity -
it is not even clear that the text is Christian, unless
the apparent reference to baptism must be taken as
entailing this. The formula is in some Semitic language,
which its later users called 'Hebrew', and is therefore
probably to be traced back to some Jewish-Christian
group, who were still using Aramaic.

Those whom Irenaeus directly quotes must not be
assumed to have been Aramaic-speaking themselves. The
'interpretation' given by Irenaeus is not claimed by
him as his own, and can be read as that given by the
users. It is probably Irenaeus' translator

who has added 'ut stupori sint, vel deterreant'; but he seems rightly to have gauged Irenaeus' tone of dismissal. With that in mind, it is advisable to read 'the interpretation of these', not as 'the interpretation of these expressions' but as 'the interpretation given by these people' - with the clear implication that the words have now lost whatever meaning they originally had, and are now used by 'these people' for mere effect. The 'interpretation' is therefore most probably derived from the liturgical book which Irenaeus is quoting:

'Other people pronounce over (the candidates) certain Hebrew expressions' (or, literally, 'names') 'the more to astound those whom they are initiating, thus: "Basema chamosse baaianora mistadia rouada kousta babophor kalachthei." The interpretation given by these people' (or, 'of these expressions') 'is as follows: "I invoke the Light of the Father which transcends all power, and is called also Holy Spirit and Life; because in the body thou hast reigned." '

In the same series of Irenaeus quotations occurs a responsive liturgy for baptism+anointing 'unto angelical redemption' (AH xxi.3^d/ I.xiv.2^d):

Alii autem rursus redemptionem profantur sic: *Nomen quod absconditum est ab universa deitate, et dominatione, et veritate, quod induit Jesus Nazarenus in zonis luminis, Christus Dominus viventis per Spiritum sanctum in redemptionem angelicam. Nomen quod est restaurationis: Messia ufar magno in seenchaldia mosomeda eaacha faronepseha Jesu Nazarene. Et horum interpretatio est talis: Christi non dirido spiritum, cor, et supercaelestem virtutem misericordem: fruar nomine tuo Salvator veritatis. Et hæc quidem profantur ipsi qui sacrant. Qui autem sacratu respondet: Confirmatus sum, et redemptus sum, et redimo animam meam ab æone hoc, et omnibus quæ sunt ab eo in nomine Iao, qui redemit animam ejus in redemptionem in Christo vivente. Dehinc superfantur qui astant: Pax omnibus in quos hoc nomen requiescit. Post deinde unguunt sacratum opobalsamo. Unguentum enim hoc typum esse dicunt ejus suavitatis, quæ sit super universa.*

(Latin of Irenaeus; I.184-5 Harvey);

Ἄλλοι δὲ πάλιν τὴν λύτρωσιν * ἐπιλέγουσιν οὕτως πρὸ ὄνομα τὸ ἀπο-
 10 κεκρυμμένον ἀπὸ πάσης θεότητος καὶ κυριότητος καὶ ἀληθείας, δ
 ἐνεδύσατο Ἰησοῦς ὁ Ναζαρητὸς ἐν ταῖς ζώναις τοῦ φωτός τοῦ Χριστοῦ,
 Χριστοῦ ζῶντος διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου, εἰς λύτρωσιν ἀγγελικὴν. ὄνομα
 τὸ τῆς ἀποκαταστάσεως· «Μεσσία οὐφαρέγνα μεμψαι μὲν χαλ δαίαν
 μοσομὴ δαέα ἀκφαρ νεψεν ονα Ἰησοῦ Ναζαρία». καὶ τούτων δὲ ἡ ἐρμη-
 15 νεία ἐστὶν τοιαύτη· «οὐ διαίρω τὸ πνεῦμα, τὴν καρδίαν καὶ τὴν ὑπερου-
 ράνιον δύναμιν τὴν οἰκτίρμονα· ὀναίμην τοῦ ὀνόματός σου, Σωτὴρ ἀλη-
 θείας». καὶ ταῦτα μὲν ἐπιλέγουσιν αὐτοὶ οἱ τελοῦντες, ὁ δὲ τετελεσμένος
 ἀποκρίνεται· «ἐστήριγμα καὶ λελύτρωμαι καὶ λυτροῦμαι τὴν ψυχὴν
 μου ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου καὶ πάντων τῶν παρ' αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι
 20 τοῦ Ἰαώ, ὃς ἐλυτρώσατο τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ εἰς ἀπολύτρωσιν ἐν τῷ
 Χριστῷ τῷ ζῶντι». εἰτ' ἐπιλέγουσιν οἱ παρόντες· «εἰρήνη πᾶσιν, ἐφ' ὃς
 τὸ ὄνμα τοῦτο ἐπαναπέπναιται». ἔπειτα μυρίζουσι τὸν τετελεσμένον τῷ
 ὀπῶ, τῷ ἀπὸ βαλσάμου. τὸ γὰρ μύρον τοῦτο τύπον τῆς ὑπὲρ τὰ ὅλα
 εὐωδίας εἶναι λέγουσιν.

9 *] Holl ergänzt: ἐπιτελοῦντες. 11 ζώναις] Holl, ζωῆς VM. zonis lat.
 13 f. Abteilung und Sinn der Formeln sehr schwierig, ich schließe mich Holls
 Interpunktion an. 20 αὐτοῦ] VM. eius lat., εμαυτοῦ Holl, K. Müller will
 μακρίως einschieben (S. 194) 22 ἐπαναπέπναιται] Holl, ἐπαναπέπναιται VM.
 Harv.. requiescit lat.

(Greek of Epiphanius, ed. Holl;
 from Völker, Quellen, 139:9-24).

In this case also there are problems with the Aramaic element of the formula. The various solutions put forward are listed by Stieren (I.229-30), by Gressmann (1915, 193-6), and by Müller, in his 'Beiträge zum Verständnis der valentinianischen Gnosis' (Nachr.d.kgl.Ges.d.Wiss.zu Göttingen, phil.-hist.Klasse, 1920, esp. 189-94). The least problematic seems to be that of Stickel, in a private

letter to Stieren:

„Viros doctos, qui periculum faciebant, formulam Marciorum aut ex hebraeo aut e syro sermone interpretandi, quum viderim a vero aberrasse ac mihi sese obtulerit nova exponendi ratio, quam unice rectam esse persuasissimum habeo, permittas, eam ut tibi proponam. Verba sunt chaldaica, hoc modo constituenda:

מְשִׁיחָא וְפָרְק נַפְשֵׁי גִין (מִן) חַלְדָּיָא
מִעֻ שֵׁם יְהוָה (יְהוָה) אֲכַפְרָה (נַפְשָׁא)

נַפְשָׁהּ הוּא יְשׁוּעַ נַצְרֵתָא
hoc est: „Messias et redemptor animae
meae ab aeonibus propter potestatem nomi-
nis Jah (Iehova), redimentis animam eius,
hic (Messias) est Iesus Nazaraeus. —

De nomine חַלְדָּיָא, eo sensu, quem equi-
dem sumsi, in lexico Buxtorfi non obvio,
conferas locum Kimchii, in Gesenii The-
sauro linguae hebraeae s. h. v., ubi sy-
nonymum esse dicitur vocabuli עֵילָם,
cui respondet illud apud Epiphanium
lectum αἰών.“

'The Messiah and the Redeemer of my soul
from the aeons on account of the power of the
name of Jah, him that redeems his soul,
he is Jesus the Nazarene.'

Despite the reservations of Gressmann (194), this
is the only rendering that does not seem to make
Jao unambiguously a saviour-figure. Even in Stickel's
reconstruction there is an ^{ambiguity} ambiguity, but it is at
least possible to take the saviour-hood of Jesus
as being necessary because of the (malign) power
of Jah/Jao; if this is the correct reading, then
the apparent reference to Jao's 'self-redemption'
stresses his dependence upon Jesus.

This must all remain highly conjectural, but it
is not necessary to go so far as Müller in
dismissing the attempt to make some sense out of
the Aramaic - he compares it with the story of
a pharmacist who made up a medicine from a badly

written theatre-ticket (191) ! - and, at all events, as with the preceding example, this formula, however garbled, attests a Jewish-Christian corpus of ritual adapted, albeit unintelligently, by a Greek-speaking group of a generally dissident character. We translate (chiefly after Epiphanius):

'Others, again, pronounce (as they initiate):

"The Name hidden from all deity and dominion
and truth" (OR:"dominion: the Name of Truth")-

That (Name) which Jesus the Nazarene donned in the
regions of the light of Christ,

Of the living Christ, through the Holy Spirit,

Unto angelical redemption -

Name of Restoration -

Messia oupharegna mempsai men chal daian

mosome daea akphar nepseu oua Iesou Nazaria -"

(a missing line ? - perhaps, "Now rests upon you" ?).

And the interpretation given by these people is this:

"I do not divide the Spirit, the heart, and
merciful power that transcends the heavens;

I enjoy the benefit of your name, Saviour of Truth."

The ones who initiate pronounce these words,

and the one being initiated replies:

"I have been established and redeemed,

and I redeem my soul from this aeon and

from all that surrounds it in the name of Jao,

who redeemed his soul,

unto redemption in the living Christ."

Then those who are standing by say:

"Peace be to all, upon whom this name has come to rest."

Then they anoint the one who has been initiated with 'opobalsam', for they say that this ointment is a type of the all-transcending fragrance.'

This last example sets out something of the ritual setting in which its formulae were used. There remains about it and both the others an irremovable uncertainty, nonetheless, for Irenaeus gives no direct indication of their provenance.

The whole passage, AH I.xxi (Massuet, = I.xiv, Vol.I, pp.180-8 Harvey) has, pardonably, been read as a unity, and, because of the present ordering of AH I, been attributed to the followers of Marcus: hence we find Völker (Quellen zur Geschichte der christlichen Gnosis, 1932, 136-41) using the heading, 'Kultische Bräuche bei Marcus und den Marcosiern', and RM.Grant's Gnosticism: an Anthology (1961, 192-4) presenting excerpts from AH I.xxi as 'Marcosian Worship'. We have argued above (Ch. 2, Sec.7) that AH I needs to be re-ordered, especially with regard to the place of the account of Marcus and the position of AH I.xxi. This section gives every

appearance of being designed as a general characterisation of all the deviant groups which Irenaeus has tried to describe in his first book, and as an indication, by reference to their liturgical uses as a sensitive index to their beliefs and the tendencies of their beliefs, of the extent to which, in their various ways, they abandon the essential faith of the 'Katholikoi', the 'Common-or-garden', Christians.

The passage as a whole falls into the following sub-sections:

- (a) a general statement that 'redemption', as taught and practised by 'these people', is removed to the realm of the supersensible; that it varies according to the teacher who is expounding; and that its one and only constant feature is incompatibility with true Christian baptism and with the faith of the Great Church. This is a programmatic statement; since his conclusion (j) will be *that* their very variety is ~~as~~ a sign of their reckless individualism, he will be able now to turn away from a detailed survey of their vagaries to an exposition of the truth, which will go to the root of the issue;

- (b) a summary of 'their' argument that a distinction must be made between the baptism of the visible Jesus, which is for the forgiveness of sins, and is still on the level of John's baptism, and the redemption brought by the spiritual Christ who descended upon the visible Jesus. This relates, not only to the teaching of Marcus, but also of Ptolemaeus (AH I.vii.2/I.i.13,I.60 Harvey), of Kerinthos (AH I.xxvi.1/I.xxi, I.211 Harvey), and of the Valentinian Exposition (C.G.XI/2, 41:10-38) - possibly. This section also is programmatic: it adumbrates the christological issues to be faced in the rest of the book;
- (c) a description of an initiation administered by 'some people' in a nuptial setting. It has been argued elsewhere (Tripp, 'The "Sacramental System" of the Gospel of Philip', in Studia Patristica XVIII, 1982, 251-60) that this refers to the ritual assumed in C.G.II/3, and that the rite is Valentinian;
- (d) a formula used by 'others' for water-baptism (cf 447-451 supra). On the strength of the Latin translator's 'alii', this has been distinguished from the previous section, although the Greek text would allow it to

be seen as continuous with (e), and included in the present context. This decision must be tentative. There would be a natural fittingness in a formula for the bride-chamber including a reference to 'union with/ unification of the Powers'; but it is easier to explain Epiphanius' text as his interpretation making the two groups uniform than it is to explain the Latin translator's 'alii';

(e) another formula, 'in Hebrew', used by 'others' (cf 452-4 supra);

(f) a further formula, partly in 'Hebrew', for use 'unto angelical redemption' (cf 454-8). The fact that both (e) and (f) include 'Hebrew' expressions makes it necessary to ask whether they come merely from the same general, originally Jewish-Christian, milieu, or from different parts of the same ritual. They could be fitted into a rite with a series of repeated baptisms for various purposes, particularly in association with the traditio of the pass-words. A further question is as to the relation between this text and Excerpta

ex Theodoto 22 (56-9 Casey), where Clement of Alexandria reports that 'they', presumably the followers of Theodotus, and perhaps other Valentinians too, say, at the cheirothesia, in conclusion, 'unto angelical redemption.' Theodotus, it seems, interprets this as meaning that initiates are to receive that redemption that the angels have already received on behalf of humans in a heavenly baptism, the archetypal 'baptism for the dead'. Clement's use of a standard Christian liturgical term, cf Turner, 1923, may reflect his own assumption that Theodotus' rites were in general the same as those of the Great Church, but is more probably a true indication that they were so. Any Aramaic formulae attached would certainly have been noted by Clement. The rite of Theodotus is therefore different in character from the rite cited by Irenaeus. Whether there was more than an accidental parallel between the two it is as yet impossible to say;

- (g) a description of 'some' who use similar invocations (sc., presumably similar to those in the two preceding cases), but administer baptism in oil-and-water, yet

also add a post-baptismal unction with balsam. It is to be inferred that Irenaeus' church already knew a post-baptismal unction with myron. There is no indication whose usage Irenaeus is here describing, unless 'similar' invocations suggest the survival here also of Jewish-Christian formulae;

(h) an exposition of the views of 'others' who regard knowledge as the only permissible initiation and eschew all outward and visible cultic acts. These include the followers of Prodicus (cf 319-31 supra), and no doubt many others unnamed;

(i) an account of redemption-rites for the (? dead and) dying. The precise text has been identified in the 'James'-tradition (cf 423-36 supra), and a parallel is known in the usages of the followers of Marcus (see Ch.2, sec.7), who have borrowed it from an 'Ophite' source;

(j) closing comment about the variety of heretical practice.

Of the ten sections here listed, three are programmatic

announcements or general comments; one reports a theologoumenon (h); one - (c), possibly (c)+(d) - belongs to a Valentinian setting; one (g) is a piece of unassignable floating tradition; three - (e), (f), (i) - certainly from the complex of sects thrown up by the Jewish/Christian breach, while a fourth (d) probably does, and a fifth (h) includes a reference to one such group.

Concluding General Remarks

In this third chapter, a tangled skein has been traced through groups thrown up by the separation of Christianity from Judaism. Pessimistic forms of the Merkabah mysticism, influenced by the sufferings of the Jews, have been detected as helping to shape the liturgical piety of groups with Jewish-Christian origins. Beneath a great personal variety, in which baptism is divergently estimated, is a unifying theme of meditation, prayer and liturgy, that of the Great Journey through the heavens, prepared for and (for some) fore-shadowed by liturgy on earth.

Parallel traditions have been distinguished, although no dogmatic statements are possible as to how sharply distinct they were, or how they may have been interrelated. One line of tradition leads through the Gospel of Thomas to its cognate treatises,

this line being influenced (from the side ?) by the 'Peratae'. Other side-influences have not been ruled out, but are not considered here, either because their attestation is later than that of the tradition here traced (e.g., the neo-platonist theurgy of Julian), or because their date and location are too uncertain to be brought into the calculation (as with the Hermetica). The line from Thomas is branched, with the self-styled 'followers of Prodicus' and the Christians attacked by Plotinus and his friends on the one side, representing the move to replace cult by theoria, and the users of the Apocalypses of Adam and Paul, Origin of the World and Hypostasis of the Archons, Paraphrase of Shem and Sacred Book of the Great Invisible Spirit representing, on the other side, a retention, in varying guises, of the baptism+ascent mystical/ritual schema. A distinct line of tradition has been traced through the 'James'-literature.

It has not been possible to place the Apokryphon of John within this framework, (although that is probably where it belongs), not least because the 'five seals' which give the only clue to its liturgical affinities (see C.G.II/1,31:22-25; ET Wisse, NHLE 116) cannot be safely identified.

Very occasional side-connections with the Valentinians have been noted. There is, however, no indication

that these traditions are derived from the speculations of Valentinus or of the other system-creating heresiarchs whom we have characterised as founders of the 'Gentile counter-churches.' All the essential elements of these liturgical traditions are already available in Jewish and the earliest Christian materials.

It is not for one moment suggested that these traditions represent the majority or the normal forms of 'Jewish Christianity' - a concept which, in any case, must now be used with caution.⁽²⁾ However, one question remains to which an answer can here be only distantly hinted at, and noted as a topic for future inquiry: what is the origin of the anti-cultic strain in several strands of these traditions? - for, occurring as early as it does, in Thomas, it must be close to the fountain-head.

The antipathy of the Hebrew prophets to the cult⁽³⁾ is certainly in the back-ground here; but, since in Thomas it is Jesus himself who is credited with the repudiation of all prayer, some explanation must be sought in the traditions surrounding him.

Part of the explanation may be found in Jesus'

(2) Especially in the light of Brown (R.E.) 1983.

(3) Summary: Rowley, Worship in Ancient Israel (London 1967) 144-75.

saying in Mark ii.18-22 parr., that fasting is untimely while the disciples have the bride-groom with them. Another part may lie in the Lucan account of the Last Supper (Luke xxii, esp.15-19^a), where, according to the reading of reliable textual witnesses (P757, Sinaiticus, Alexandrinus, Vaticanus, Koridethianus, the 'Lake' minuscules, Sahidic and Bohairic), Jesus, having made preparation for the Pesah, deliberately abstains from it, thus, by implication, forfeiting God's covenanted protection of the children of Israel (cf Exodus xii.1-27, esp. 15, 19, 23). Such a thought, that Jesus would apparently step so decisively out of the framework of divinely appointed worship, was so intolerable that the textual transmission of the Lucan Last Supper narrative has tried to blot this detail out - it was sufficiently unwelcome to the other Synoptists as to be transformed out of recognition (Mark xiv. 25, Matthew xxvi.29). Only a theology of salvation which could see salvific purpose in Christ being made a curse for us (Gal.iii.13), or in Christ's suffering in isolation from the Father (Heb.ii.9, with M,424^c, 1739, and copies known to Origen, Eusebius, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Jerome and Ambrose), could cope with such a concept. A world-despairing, defiant mysticism would seize upon it for another use.