

DAVID CREECH

The Use of Scripture in the Apocryphon of John

*Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen
zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe*

441

Mohr Siebeck

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen
zum Neuen Testament · 2. Reihe

Herausgeber / Editor

Jörg Frey (Zürich)

Mitherausgeber / Associate Editors

Markus Bockmuehl (Oxford)

James A. Kelhoffer (Uppsala)

Hans-Josef Klauck (Chicago, IL)

Tobias Nicklas (Regensburg)

441



David Creech

The Use of Scripture in the Apocryphon of John

A Diachronic Analysis of the Variant Versions

Mohr Siebeck

DAVID CREECH, born 1976; 1999 BA; 2002 MDiv; 2011 PhD; 2008–12 Program Director for Hunger Education for ELCA World Hunger; 2012–13 Teaching Fellow at Loyola University Chicago; since 2013 Assistant Professor of Religion at Concordia College, Moorhead.

ISBN 978-3-16-152983-2 eISBN 978-3-16-153808-7

ISSN 0340-9570 (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 2. Reihe)

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

© 2017 by Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen. www.mohr.de

This book may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, in any form (beyond that permitted by copyright law) without the publisher's written permission. This applies particularly to reproductions, translations, microfilms and storage and processing in electronic systems.

The book is printed on non-aging paper by Gulde Druck in Tübingen and bound by Buchbinderei Nädele in Nehren.

Printed in Germany.

For Mom and Dad

Preface

This monograph is a slightly revised version of my doctoral dissertation submitted to the Department of Theology at Loyola University Chicago in August of 2011. The wise sage Qohelet tells us that “a threefold chord shall not be quickly broken” (Eccl 4:12, *NRSV*). Many strands made up the chord that supported me throughout the process of birthing this book. I would not have finished without the gracious help and encouragement of several key friends and colleagues.

Many thanks are due to Prof Dr. Jörg Frey for accepting this contribution into the WUNT II series. Thanks are also due to the editorial staff at Mohr Siebeck. This book could not have been completed without their helpful guidance and incredible patience.

I am also grateful to the Theology Department at Loyola University Chicago. I appreciated the collegial atmosphere and the open sharing of ideas. The faculty helped me hone my critical thinking and writing skills. Drs. Tom Tobin and Bob Di Vito served admirably on my dissertation committee, offering timely and incisive feedback. The manuscript was greatly strengthened by their input. I cannot thank my *Doktorvater*, Dr. Edmondo Lupieri, enough. He went above and beyond what can be reasonably asked of a director and provided just what I needed – feedback, ideas, even the gentle (perhaps sometimes too gentle) nudge forward – throughout the entire process. He has continued to be my greatest champion in the academy. The staff, especially Catherine Wolf and Marianne Wolfe, helped me manage and navigate the labyrinthine (and not so labyrinthine) university requirements. My cohort provided camaraderie and helped me grow ideas. Carl Toney, in particular, was a dear friend and sounding board.

The strongest strands of support continue to come from my family. Dad and Mom instilled in me from early on a love for the text and a desire to learn. My sisters and brother – Julie, Elizabeth, Jamie, and Jonathan – believed in me and offered regular encouragement. Finally, deepest thanks are to my kids, Ian, Ela, and Dylan. We all got much more out of this than we bargained for and I am grateful for your patience and endurance, and also for all the joy and laughter you bring.

David Creech
May 2017

Table of Contents

Preface.....	VII
Chapter 1: Preliminaries.....	1
A. Introduction	1
B. History of Research.....	1
1. Origins and Classification of ‘Gnosticism’	1
a. Four Perspectives on the Origins and Classification of Gnosticism	2
b. The Gnostics and Scripture	10
c. Assumptions and a Few Informed Decisions	11
2. The <i>Apocryphon of John</i>	16
a. The <i>Apocryphon of John</i> and Scripture: The <i>Status</i> <i>Quaestionis</i>	17
b. ‘Diachronic’ Analyses of the <i>Apocryphon of John</i>	21
C. Brief Overview of the Argument.....	27
1. Aims and Thesis.....	27
2. Chapter Summaries	27
Chapter 2: “Indeed He Said Through the Prophet”	29
A. Introduction	29
B. The Apocryphon and the Biblical Text: Two Common Misperceptions.....	30
1. Rejection of the Jewish and Christian Scriptures	30
a. Karen King: Deep Engagement with Scripture but Ultimately a Rejection of It.....	33
b. Gerard Luttikhuis: Engagement with Scripture to Demonstrate Its Inadequacies.....	34
c. Alastair H. D. Logan: A Dispute about Proper Interpretation ..	35
2. Intentional Misreading of Scripture: Reverse or ‘Protest’ Exegesis.....	37
a. Intermittent Value Reversals	39
b. Scriptural Chestnuts.....	41
c. Inherent Meaning?	47
d. Criticism ≠ Rejection.....	48
e. Summary	50

C. The Biblical Text as Foundational.....	50
1. Biblical Theology in the <i>Apocryphon of John</i>	51
a. The Arrogant Boast.....	53
b. Summary	59
2. The <i>Apocryphon of John</i> 's Structural Dependence on the Biblical Text.....	59
a. The Structure of the <i>Apocryphon of John</i>	59
b. A Piece of Rewritten Scripture.....	61
3. Exegetical 'Proofs'	63
a. The 'Breath of Life'	64
b. Flesh of My Flesh!.....	65
c. The Repentance of God.....	66
4. Summary of Findings	67
D. Conclusion.....	67
 Chapter 3: "Not as Moses Said"	69
A. Introduction	69
B. Moses the Unreliable Witness	69
1. The Rhetoric of Citation.....	70
2. Framing the Rejection: The Savior Laughs.....	72
C. Not as Moses Said... but Just as Moses Said	77
1. Lack of Substantial Disagreement	78
a. Adam's Trance: Sleep Need not Be Interpreted Literally.....	78
b. Noah's Companions.....	81
2. Disagreement on the Disagreement	82
a. Ialdabaoth Creates the Woman.....	83
3. Use of Existing Interpretations/Scripture Interpreting Scripture ..	86
a. Isaiah's Proof of the Nature of Adam's Trance	86
b. Noah in the Cloud.....	87
c. Sophia's Movement 'To and Fro'	88
D. Conclusion.....	90
 Chapter 4: A Diachronic Analysis.....	91
A. Introduction	91
B. An Outline of the Parameters	92
1. Three Key Moments	92
2. The Text and Its Audience	93
a. Reconstructing Social Histories from Texts	93
b. The Geographical Spread of Ideas.....	97
C. The <i>Apocryphon of John</i> in the Second Century	101
1. The Shape of the <i>Apocryphon</i> circa 150 CE.....	101

2. The <i>Apocryphon of John</i> as Rewritten Scripture	104
3. The <i>Apocryphon of John</i> in Early Christian Communities	107
D. The <i>Apocryphon of John</i> after Irenaeus of Lyons	108
1. Irenaeus' Assault on 'Knowledge Falsely So-Called'	109
2. The Gnostic Response	111
a. Sophia's Repentance Revisited	112
b. Noah's Guiding Light	113
E. The <i>Apocryphon of John</i> at Nag Hammadi	114
1. Two Versions	114
2. The Continued Use of Scripture in the <i>Apocryphon</i>	116
a. Sethianization	116
b. The Aftermath of Creation	116
F. Conclusion	118
 Bibliography	 121
 Index of Ancient Sources	 135
A. Hebrew Bible and Septuagint	135
B. New Testament	136
C. Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha	137
D. Other Greek and Latin Authors	138
E. Nag Hammadi and Related Literature	141
Index of Modern Authors	145
Index of Subjects	147

Chapter 1

Preliminaries

A. Introduction

In the second and third centuries of the Common Era, diverse breeds of Christianity proliferated and engaged in rigorous debate about the essence of the nascent faith. In addition to debating basic understandings of God, Christ, the problem of evil, and so on, the various types of Christianity struggled to articulate the role of earlier texts and traditions, both sectarian and mainstream. In this pluriform and contentious context the *Apocryphon of John* emerged and evolved with its own distinct understanding of the Christian message. This study explores how the *Apocryphon* confronts both text and tradition in its presentation of Christianity.

B. History of Research

1. *Origins and Classification of 'Gnosticism'*¹

For the last fifty or so years, the key debates in the study of the texts from Nag Hammadi have revolved around the origins and classification of the ancient religious movement that is commonly labeled 'Gnostic.'² Within these debates, how a given text or set of texts engage the Jewish scriptures is generally used in service of the questions of whence Gnosticism arose and/or what precisely Gnosticism was (if anything at all). Although I seek to answer a different set of questions in this monograph, several of my

¹ The summaries that follow are informed by Karen King, *What is Gnosticism?* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2003) and Michael Williams, *Rethinking Gnosticism: An Argument for Dismantling a Dubious Category* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996). See also the helpful literature reviews of Alastair Logan, *Gnostic Truth and Christian Heresy: A Study in the History of Gnosticism* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1996), xiii–xxiv; Simone Pétrement, *A Separate God: The Christian Origins of Gnosticism*, trans. Carol Harrison (New York: HarperSanFrancisco, 1990), 1–25; and Carl B. Smith II, *No Longer Jews: The Search for Gnostic Origins* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2004), 1–71.

² On my decision to continue the use of the terms 'Gnostic' and 'Gnosticism,' see pp. 13–15 below.

suppositions are dependent upon this discussion. A brief outline of the various positions is thus in order.

a. Four Perspectives on the Origins and Classification of Gnosticism

In 1957, the scholar of early Christianity R. McL. Wilson concluded that if scholars were to grasp “the development and mutual relationship of the various Gnostic sects,” they would first have to establish a functional chronology and definition of the movement.³ Just over fifty years later, in spite of major colloquia and numerous books and articles,⁴ those tasks are still incomplete. There remain essentially four options for the origins and classification of Gnosticism: 1) a Christian heresy, born out of the Christian movement; 2) a product of oriental syncretism, later blended into earliest Christianity; 3) a fundamentally Jewish sect, later married to Christian ideas; and 4) a breed of Christianity, developing alongside other Christianities, later reified in an effort to define the boundaries of “normative” Christianity. Each will be briefly discussed in turn.

i. The Traditional Perspective: Gnosticism as a Derivation of or Deviation from Christianity

Until the nineteenth century, and continuing into the twentieth, the Church Fathers were our primary source of information on ancient Gnosticism.⁵ Heresiologists, such as Irenaeus of Lyon,⁶ Hippolytus of Rome,⁷ Tertullian

³ R. McL. Wilson, “Gnostic Origins Again,” *VC* 11 (1957): 93–110, here 109.

⁴ The colloquia to which I refer are the 1966 colloquium in Messina, the proceedings of which were published in Ugo Bianchi, ed., *Le origini dello Gnosticismo: Colloquio di Messina, 13–18 Aprile 1966* (SHR 12; Leiden: Brill, 1967), the 1978 International Conference on the Texts from Nag Hammadi in Québec, published in Bernard Barc, ed., *Colloque International sur les Textes de Nag Hammadi (Québec, 22–25 août 1978)* (BHNC, Section “Études” 1; Québec: Les presses de l’Université Laval, 1981), and the International Conference of Gnosticism at Yale (1978), archived in Bentley Layton, ed., *The Rediscovery of Gnosticism: Proceedings of the International Conference on Gnosticism at Yale, New Haven, Connecticut, March 28–31, 1978*, 2 vols. (SHR 41; Leiden: Brill, 1981). For further references, see the following bibliographies: David M. Scholer, *Nag Hammadi Bibliography, 1948–1969* (NHMS 1; Leiden: Brill, 1971); *idem*, *Nag Hammadi Bibliography, 1970–1994* (NHMS 32; Leiden: Brill, 1997); *idem*, *Nag Hammadi Bibliography, 1995–2006* (NHMS 65; Leiden: Brill, 2009). A number of the important figures contributing to the discussion and their books and articles are summarized below.

⁵ For the critical editions and important secondary works on the ancient authors mentioned in this paragraph, see Hubertus Drobner, *The Fathers of the Church: A Comprehensive Introduction*, trans. Siegfried Schatzmann (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2007). Generally accessible English translations of all the authors mentioned in this paragraph are available in the *ANF* and *NPNF* collections.

⁶ The key work of Irenaeus is obviously *Adversus haereses*. The standard critical edition is A. Rousseau, L. Doutreau, C. Mercier, and B. Hemmerdinger, eds., *Contre les*

of Carthage,⁸ and Epiphanius of Salamis,⁹ wrote responses to what they saw as insidious challenges to their understanding of the Christian faith. Other writers, such as Clement of Alexandria¹⁰ and Origen,¹¹ wrote treatises against various Gnostic teachers and movements, all the while incorporating some of their ideas. Still other Church Fathers, such as Eusebius of Caesarea, wrote histories of the Church with certain distinctive, anti-heretical tendencies.¹² In general, up until the early twentieth century, scholars of early Christianity accepted the patristic assertion that the Gnos-

hérésies, 10 vols. (SC 100, 151, 152, 153, 210, 211, 263, 264, 293, 294; Paris: Cerf, 1965–1982).

⁷ Hippolytus' major work is *Refutatio omnium haeresium* (critical edition: M. Marcovich, *Refutation of All Heresies* [PTS 25; New York: de Gruyter, 1986]).

⁸ See esp. *Adversus Marcionem* (critical edition: E. Evans, trans. and ed., *Adversus Marcionem*, 2 vols. [Oxford: Clarendon, 1972]), *Adversus Valentinianos* (critical edition: J. C. Fredouille, ed., *Contre les Valentiniens*, 2 vols. [SC 280, 281; Paris: Cerf, 1980–1981]), *De praescriptione haereticorum* (critical edition: R. F. Refoulé and P. de Labriolle, eds., *Traité de la prescription contre les hérétiques* [SC 46; Paris: Cerf, 1957]), *Scorpiace* (critical edition: G. Azzali Bernadelli, ed. *Scorpiace* [BPat 14; Florence: Nardini, 1990]).

⁹ Epiphanius offers a 'medicine chest' to deal with various heresies in *Panarion* (*Adversus haereses*). The critical Greek text is Karl Holl, *Ancoratus. Panarion (haereses 1–33)* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1915); the standard English translation is Frank Williams, *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis*, 2 vols. (NHS 35, 36; Leiden: Brill, 1987–1994).

¹⁰ Clement wrote against the Valentinian Theodotus in *Excerpta ex Theodoto* (critical editions: R. P. Casey, ed., *The Excerpta ex Theodoto of Clement of Alexandria: Edited with Translation, Introduction and Notes* [London: Christophers, 1934] and F. Sagnard, ed., *Extraits de Théodote: texte grec, introduction, traduction et notes* [SC 23; Paris: Cerf, 1948]). Clement also cites many Gnostic teachers and works in his *Stromateis*, not all of them pejoratively. Clement even saw Christian Gnosis as an ideal (though his definition of Gnosis is distinct from his less 'orthodox' contemporaries – see Riemer Roukema, *Gnosis and Faith in Early Christianity*, trans. John Bowden [London: SCM, 1999], esp. 151–53).

¹¹ Origen has references to Gnostics scattered throughout his grand corpus. Especially valuable are Origen's commentary on John that interacts with an earlier commentary written by the Valentinian Heracleon and his response to Celsus (*Contra Celsum*) that contains some Gnostic fragments. The critical editions of Origen's commentary on John are E. Preuschen, ed., *Der Johanneskommentar* (GCS 10; Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1903) and C. Blanc, ed., *Commentaire sur saint Jean*, 5 vols. (SC 120, 157, 222, 290, 385; Paris: Cerf, 1964–1992). For *Contra Celsum*: M. Borret, ed., *Contre Celse*, 5 vols. (SC 132, 136, 147, 150, 227; Paris: Cerf, 1967–1976). The standard English translation is Henry Chadwick, *Origen: Contra Celsum* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953).

¹² I refer here to Eusebius' *Historia ecclesiastica*, available in the Loeb Classical Library: Kirsopp Lake and J. E. L. Oulton, eds., *The Ecclesiastical History*, 2 vols. (LCL; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1926–1932).

tic movement evolved out of Christianity as a distortion of true Christian faith.¹³

Though this perspective has fallen out of favor,¹⁴ it does have some modern champions with formidable arguments.¹⁵ First, of the evidence that survives, even that from Nag Hammadi, all the texts are Christian. One must strip away the Christian elements to reconstruct the putative pre-Christian document.¹⁶ Second, and related, there is no pre-Christian evidence of Gnosticism.¹⁷ The debates with Gnostics are limited to the second century CE and later,¹⁸ the texts that survive are generally dated to the

¹³ The oft-cited dictum of the learned Church historian Adolf von Harnack offers a one-line summary of this perspective: Gnosticism is essentially the “acute Hellenization of Christianity” (*History of Dogma*, trans. from 3rd German ed. [New York: Dover Publications, 1961], I: 226).

¹⁴ Pheme Perkins (*Gnosticism and the New Testament* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993], 206 n.2), speaking specifically to the work of Simone Pétrement, is satisfied to offer only a one-line critique, asserting that the idea is “outdated.” Birger Pearson (“Eusebius and Gnosticism,” in *The Emergence of the Christian Religion*, ed. *idem* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 2004], 147–68, here 150) caustically remarks that such a position “[flies] in the face of the primary evidence now available to scholarship.”

¹⁵ See esp. A. D. Nock, “Gnosticism,” in *HTR* 57 (1964): 255–79; Simone Pétrement, *A Separate God*; Michel Tardieu, *Écrits gnostiques: Codex de Berlin* (Sources Gnostiques et Manichéennes 1; Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1984); Alastair Logan, *Gnostic Truth and Christian Heresy*; and *idem*, *The Gnostics: Identifying an Early Christian Cult* (New York: T & T Clark, 2006).

Edwin Yamauchi (*Pre-Christian Gnosticism: A Survey of the Proposed Evidences* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1973]; “The Descent of Ishtar, the Fall of Sophia, and the Jewish Roots of Gnosticism,” *Tyndale Bulletin* 29 [1978]: 143–75) argues strenuously that there was no pre-Christian Gnosticism. Although some of his statements may seem to suggest that he is arguing for an essentially Christian origin of Gnosticism, it appears that he understands Gnosticism to be the confluence of Iranian, Jewish, and Christian elements.

¹⁶ Of the possible exceptions (i.e., texts that betray little or no Christian influence), such as *Apoc. Adam*, *Par. Shem*, and the Hermetic Corpus, it can be argued that these have been de-Christianized or that the Christian elements have been intentionally obscured.

¹⁷ Argued forcefully by Yamauchi, *op. cit.*

¹⁸ It is also worth noting that when the disputes emerge in the second century, they are almost exclusively intra-Christian debates. If Gnosticism is a Jewish or pagan phenomenon, why then is there so little evidence of a dispute? On the evidence of a late Jewish response to the Gnostic doctrine of ‘Two Powers,’ see Alan Segal, *Two Powers in Heaven: Early Rabbinic Reports about Christianity and Gnosticism* (SJLA 25; Leiden: Brill, 1977). Our only evidence of pagan assaults on Gnosticism comes from Plotinus, *Ennead* 2.9, though it is clear in Porphyry’s report that all Gnostics known to Plotinus and himself were Christians. Of course, earlier, in the last third of the second century CE, Celsus had lambasted Gnostics, and he too thought they were Christians.

fourth century CE and later, and the great myths (such as the so-called ‘Redeemer Myth’) reconstructed by the *Religionsgeschichtliche Schule* are composite and dependent upon very late traditions (ninth–tenth century CE). Third, and finally, any non-Christian origin proposed for Gnosticism cannot adequately account for the beginnings of the movement.¹⁹ These arguments, however, have failed to convince the majority of modern specialists in early Christianity.

ii. The History of Religions: Oriental Syncretism

In the early twentieth century, doubts began to be expressed about the Christian origins of Gnosticism.²⁰ The German *Religionsgeschichtliche Schule*, led principally by Richard Reitzenstein and Wilhelm Bousset, used what they perceived to be thoroughly pagan (i.e., non-Christian) examples of Gnostic texts to demonstrate that at its core Gnosticism need not necessarily be a Christian phenomenon. The key methodological move here was a turn away from the Church Fathers to primary sources, such as *Poimandres* in the *Corpus Hermeticum* and the Mandaean texts recently translated and published by Mark Lidzbarski.²¹ Their interpretation of texts such as these divorced Gnosticism from early Christianity, thus opening the question of whence Gnostic ideas arose. To answer this question, they turned to Iranian sources and reconstructed the “original” Gnostic myth of the *Ur-mensch*. They believed that this myth predated Christianity and informed the ethos of many early Christian writers.²²

Although the main arguments of this thesis have since been generally rejected, the History of Religions School did succeed in creating sufficient

On a related note, Pétrement, *op. cit.*, 15–16, wonders if it is truly possible that the Church Fathers who experienced their opponents firsthand could somehow be less informed than we are some 1,800 years after the dispute.

¹⁹ In other words, if the movement is originally Jewish, why then did they break so severely with Judaism? What is the impetus for the new movement, and what led to such vitriol? If the movement is Christian, on the other hand, we have then impetus for the break, as well as some fuel for the rage. On this, see Pétrement, *Separate God*, 10–12.

²⁰ Earlier still, Moritz Friedländer (*Der vorchristliche jüdische Gnosticismus* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1898; repr. Farnborough: Gregg International, 1972]), had put forth the argument of a Jewish Pre-Christian Gnosticism against which Philo of Alexandria had written. His thesis was not well received initially but has since become the dominant paradigm. See Birger Pearson, “Friedländer Revisited: Alexandrian Judaism and Gnostic Origins,” in *Gnosticism, Judaism, and Egyptian Christianity*, ed. *idem* (SAC; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990), 10–28.

²¹ Mark Lidzbarski, *Ginzā: Der Schatz, oder, das Grosse Buch der Mandäer* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1925).

²² One of the fullest expressions of this perceived influence is seen in Rudolf Bultmann, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*, trans. G. R. Beasley-Murray, ed. R. W. N. Hoare and J. K. Riches (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971).

doubt about the Christian origins of Gnosticism.²³ That doubt led to the present consensus.

iii. The General Scholarly Consensus: The Jewish Origins of Gnosticism

The idea that Gnosticism emerged as a result of pre-Christian Oriental syncretism held sway until the middle of the twentieth century.²⁴ The discovery of the texts at Nag Hammadi in 1945 provided scholars of early Christianity with a cache of 52 primary sources,²⁵ several of which were previously unknown.²⁶ Close study of these texts revealed a thorough acquaintance with Jewish traditions, both scriptural and exegetical. Moreover, confirming the suspicions of the *Religionsgeschichtliche Schule*, it was evident that many of the texts, particularly those usually identified as ‘Sethian,’ exhibited only superficially Christian characteristics.

Most contemporary scholars, particularly in Germany and North America, thus find a Jewish background for Gnosticism compelling.²⁷ Three fac-

²³ A development lamented by Pétrement, *op. cit.*, 2–3 and extolled by King, *What is Gnosticism?*, 107–09.

²⁴ King, *What is Gnosticism?*, 141–48, credits Carsten Colpe (*Die religionsgeschichtliche Schule: Darstellung und Kritik ihres Bildes vom gnostischen Erlösermythus* [FRLANT 78; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1961]) with ringing the death knell in 1961. It should be noted, however, that at least one influential modern scholar still finds merit in an Iranian provenance. See Kurt Rudolph, *Gnosis: The Nature and History of Gnosticism*, ed. and trans. R. McL. Wilson (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1984).

²⁵ Five of the tractates have multiple copies, thus the find yielded a net of 46 works. For details, see Birger Pearson, “Nag Hammadi Codices,” in *ABD* IV: 984–93, here 987–88.

²⁶ On the discovery and its subsequent drama, see James Robinson, “Introduction,” in *The Nag Hammadi Library in English*, 3rd rev. ed. (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1988), 1–26. In an excellent recent article Mark Goodacre (“How Reliable is the Story of the Nag Hammadi Discovery?” *JSNT* 35.4 [2013]: 303–22) has rightly called into question some of the more vivid details of Robinson’s account and suggests that the details provided by Jean Doresse (*The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics: An Introduction to the Coptic Gnostic Manuscripts Discovered at Chenoboskion, with an English Translation and Critical Evaluation of the Gospel According to Thomas* [New York: Viking, 1960]), though fewer, are far more reliable.

²⁷ Important supporters of this position include Nils Dahl, “The Arrogant Archon and the Lewd Sophia: Jewish Traditions in Gnostic Revolt,” in *The Rediscovery of Gnosticism*, 689–712; Robert Grant, *Gnosticism and Early Christianity*, 2nd ed. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1966); George MacRae, “Nag Hammadi and the New Testament,” in *Gnosis: Festschrift für Hans Jonas*, ed. Barbara Aland et al. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978), 144–57; *idem*, “The Jewish Background of the Gnostic Sophia Myth,” *NovTest* 12 (1970): 86–101; Birger Pearson, “The Problem of ‘Jewish Gnostic’ Literature,” in *Nag Hammadi, Gnosticism, and Early Christianity*, ed. Charles Hedrick and Robert Hodgson (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1986), 15–35; *idem*, *Gnosticism, Judaism, and Egyptian Christianity*; *idem*, *The Emergence of the Christian Reli-*

tors support this conclusion. First, many of the texts exhibit, in the words of Carl Smith, “preoccupation with themes and terms derived from the OT and Jewish speculation.”²⁸ This preoccupation is thoroughgoing: the texts from Nag Hammadi are replete with references to the Jewish scriptures and exhibit awareness of and dependence upon more or less contemporary Jewish exegesis, that of both Palestine and the Diaspora.²⁹ Second, it is argued, the Christian features of several of the texts are superficial and secondary. Once those elements are removed, what remains is some form of Jewish speculation.³⁰ Finally, the presence of apparently non-Christian Gnostic (or Gnostic-like) texts demonstrates how these texts could stand independent from Christianity.

In spite of the popularity of this position, it is not without problems. For one, what are we to make of the strongly anti-Jewish flavor of several of

gion; *idem*, *Gnosticism and Christianity in Roman and Coptic Egypt* (New York: T & T Clark International, 2004); *idem*, *Ancient Gnosticism: Traditions and Literature* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007); PHEME PERKINS, *Gnosticism and the New Testament* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 20–28; Gilles Quispel, “Gnosticism and the New Testament,” in *Gnostic Studies I* (Istanbul: Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituut in het Nabije Oosten, 1974), 196–212; John Turner, *Sethian Gnosticism and the Platonic Tradition* (BCNH, Section “Études,” 6; Québec: Les presses de l’Université Laval, 2001); *idem*, “Sethian Gnosticism: A Literary History,” in *Nag Hammadi, Gnosticism, and Early Christianity*, 55–86; Carl Smith, *No Longer Jews*; Gedaliahu Stroumsa, *Another Seed: Studies in Gnostic Mythology* (NHS 24; Leiden: Brill, 1984); and Michael Williams (cautiously), “The Demonizing of the Demiurge: The Innovation of Gnostic Myth,” in *Innovations in Religious Traditions: Essays on the Interpretation of Religious Change*, ed. Michael Williams, Collett Cox, and Martin Jaffee (New York: de Gruyter, 1992), 73–107; *idem*, *Rethinking Gnosticism*. Kurt Rudolph, *op. cit.*, and Edwin Yamauchi, *op. cit.*, accept that Jewish speculation played a large role in the formation of Gnostic ideas, but also see Iranian influence as essential.

²⁸ Smith, *No Longer Jews*, 39.

²⁹ Palestinian influence is evident in the presence of apocalyptic traditions and awareness of Semitic languages (the latter of which is especially evident in texts such as *Hyp. Arch.*). The Apocalyptic influence will be particularly important to this study. On this, see David Frankfurter, “The Legacy of Jewish Apocalypses in Early Christianity: Regional Trajectories,” in *The Jewish Apocalyptic Heritage in Early Christianity*, ed. James C. VanderKam and William Adler (CRINT 4; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996), 129–200, here, 150–62. As to the Diaspora, Alexandrian exegetical traditions are especially clear. On these traditions, see e.g., Birger Pearson, “Philo and Gnosticism,” in *ANRW II*:21.1, ed. W. Haase et al. (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1984), 295–342.

³⁰ This point is reiterated in several of Birger Pearson’s articles. See e.g., Birger Pearson, “Use, Authority and Exegesis of Mikra in Gnostic Literature,” in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, ed. M. J. Mulder (CRINT 2.1; Assen: Van Gorcum; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988), 635–52.

the works?³¹ Hans Jonas describes their general disposition as “metaphysical anti-Semitism.”³² Jonas understands the Gnostic caricature of the Jewish creator God to be brought about by a “spirit of vilification, of parody and caricature, of conscious perversion of meaning, wholesale reversal of value-signs, savage degrading of the sacred – of gleefully shocking blasphemy.”³³ How is it that Jews became so disaffected as to vilify the God of their sacred text? Proponents of the Jewish origins have suggested various historical and social situations that would have prompted a reevaluation of previously cherished traditions.³⁴ None have been widely accepted.³⁵ A second problem is that of method. The presence of Jewish ideas does not necessarily imply Jewish authorship. In addition to the fact that the first Christians were in fact Jews (a demographic of Christianity whose significance perhaps lasted well into the third century and beyond³⁶) and many of

³¹ This problem is spelled out well by Ithamar Gruenwald, “Aspects of the Jewish-Gnostic Controversy,” in *The Rediscovery of Gnosticism*, 713–23.

³² Hans Jonas, “Response to Gilles Quispel’s ‘Gnosticism and the New Testament,’” in *The Bible in Modern Scholarship*, ed. J. Philip Hyatt (Nashville: Abingdon, 1965), 279–93, here 288.

³³ *Ibid.*, 287. This characterization was drawn to my attention by Gerard Luttikhuisen, *Gnostic Revisions of Genesis Stories and Early Jesus Traditions* (NHMS 58; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 9.

³⁴ The most significant proposals are Grant, *Gnosticism and Early Christianity*; Birger Pearson, “Some Observations on Gnostic Hermeneutics,” in *The Critical Study of Sacred Texts*, ed. Wendy Doniger O’Flaherty (Berkeley Religious Studies Series; Berkeley: The Graduate Theological Union, 1979), 243–56; and Smith, *No Longer Jews*. Grant initially proposed that Gnosticism emerged as a result of failed apocalyptic hopes in the wake of the destruction of the Temple in Jerusalem. He himself later retreated from such a view (see Smith, *No Longer Jews*, 58). Pearson in several places (see also his *Gnosticism, Judaism, and Egyptian Christianity*, 51) speaks of the repeated social and/or psychological upheaval experienced by Jews in the first and second centuries CE that would have been fertile ground for Gnostic speculations. For a fair critique, see Williams, “Demonizing the Demiurge,” 83–86; *idem*, *Rethinking Gnosticism*, 226–28. Smith proposes that Gnosticism emerged out of disaffected Jewish circles in the wake of the failed Jewish revolt during Trajan’s reign. So far as I can tell, his thesis has not gained much traction (see, e.g., the reviews of Jonathan Armstrong, *Calvin Theological Journal*, 42 [2007]: 190–91; Nicola Denzey, *CBQ* 63 [2005]: 542–43; Simon Gathercole, *JSNT* 28 [2006]: 136–37).

³⁵ Pétrement, *A Separate God*, 10–12, in a tempting proposal, sees seeds for such a revolt in the letters of Paul and the Johannine corpus. PHEME PERKINS, *The Gnostic Dialogue: The Early Church and the Crisis of Gnosticism* (New York: Paulist, 1980), 18, wonders if in fact Gnostic believers gradually hardened against their Jewish forebears after an experience similar to that of the Johannine community.

³⁶ On this, my thinking was initially influenced by Rodney Stark, *The Rise of Christianity: How the Obscure, Marginal Jesus Movement Became the Dominant Religious Force in the Western World in a Few Centuries* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996), 49–71. For recent detailed discussions, see Oskar Skarsaune and Reidar Hvalvik, eds., *Jewish Believers in Jesus: The Early Centuries* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2007)

the surviving Jewish sources from the period (Philo, Josephus, the LXX, Pseudepigrapha, etc.) have been mediated by Christians, it is clear that by the time that Gnosticism emerged, pagans too had some knowledge of Jewish writings and traditions.³⁷

iv. A Recent Alternative to the Traditional and Consensus Positions

Dissatisfaction with both of the aforementioned options and the inevitable simplifying that accompanies any theory of origins and classification has led several recent scholars to abandon the search altogether. In North American scholarship, Michael Williams mounted the first serious challenge to the category in his 1996 monograph, *Rethinking Gnosticism*. In that book, Williams demonstrated how the term ‘Gnosticism’ connotes several ideas that serve to distort rather than elucidate the ancient phenomenon.³⁸ In this way, the category acts as a hindrance to a proper understanding of the very thing it is attempting to describe. Williams’ solution was to propose new categories that would be more descriptive and less evaluative. Though the book was well received and several of his points

and Adam Becker and Annette Yoshiko Reed, eds., *The Ways that Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007).

³⁷ King, *What is Gnosticism?*, 188. On pagan awareness of the Jewish scriptures, see John Granger Cook, *The Interpretation of the Old Testament in Greco-Roman Paganism* (STAC 23; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004); Louis Feldman, *Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World: Attitudes and Interactions from Alexander to Justinian* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993); John Gager, *Moses in Greco-Roman Paganism* (SBLMS 16; Nashville: Abingdon, 1972); Menahem Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism*, 3 vols. (Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Arts and Sciences, 1974–1984); Victor Tcherikover, “Jewish Apologetic Literature Reconsidered,” *Eos* 48 (1956): 169–93. Although Tcherikover’s conclusion that pagans did not read the LXX until the Christian era is generally accurate, there are several noteworthy exceptions. Beginning in the early third century BCE with Hecataeus of Abdera, we find several likely quotes from the LXX sprinkled throughout various pagan works. In the late second century CE, when the *Apocryphon* was likely penned, Celsus interacted heavily with the LXX, and in the third century CE, Porphyry demonstrates some awareness of its contents. It should be noted that by ‘pagan,’ I simply mean neither Jewish nor Christian.

³⁸ Several of the constructs that Williams critiques include protest exegesis, parasitism, anti-cosmic world rejection, asceticism, and libertinism. In each case, Williams demonstrates that 1) The sources reveal a diversity of thought (i.e., there is no monolithic entity) and 2) The categories employed are not neutral but rather in the ‘description’ have already made distorting judgments. Take, for example, protest exegesis. With respect to point 1, the primary sources reveal a diversity of interactions with the scriptural text – some are more critical (such as *Steles Seth* or *Testim. Truth*) while others are much more affirming (such as *Val. Exp.*); the majority of the texts fall somewhere between those two extremes. As to point 2, the very term ‘protest exegesis’ is already evaluative of the type of interpretation. What if we saw the interpretation as ‘hermeneutical problem solving’ as Williams suggests? An entirely different picture of the movement would emerge.

were foundational to subsequent discussion, Williams' own proposal itself did not find much support.

In 2003, Karen King broached the topic again in her book, *What is Gnosticism?* Through her survey of nineteenth and twentieth century scholarship on Gnosticism, King argued that the categories that have been employed are essentially a "reification of a rhetorical entity (heresy) into an actual phenomenon in its own right (Gnosticism)..."³⁹ In other words, typologies and phenomenologies that are used to ascertain the origins and classification of Gnosticism are doomed to fail because they do not adequately take into account the complexity of ancient culture and religion. Moreover, these typological descriptions are often in service to a description of 'normative' Christianity. In other words, when Gnosticism is not understood in its own right, the inevitable result is a distortion. Thus, for King, typology ought to be disposed of and replaced with "analysis of the practices of literary production and social formation."⁴⁰ Instead of formulating ideas and categories about ancient Christian groups, attention ought to be directed to what can be known about the production of texts and formation of communities around those texts. Although King's proposal is not without critics,⁴¹ more and more scholars of religion in antiquity are adopting her approach. I understand the present study to be operating under similar assumptions.

b. The Gnostics and Scripture

Because so many of the primary sources interact with Jewish scripture and traditions, much research has been invested into exploring the relationship of the various Gnostic texts to scripture and tradition. In general, those studies have been in service of the traditional questions of origins and classification.⁴² Although earlier scholarship tended to see the rejection of scripture as the natural outcome of the "acute Hellenization of Christianity," such a view today is generally rejected.⁴³ We find evidence against

³⁹ King, *What is Gnosticism?*, 189 and *passim*.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 190.

⁴¹ Birger Pearson, "Gnosticism as a Religion," in *Gnosticism and Christianity in Roman and Coptic Egypt*, ed. *idem* (New York: T & T Clark International, 2004), 201–23, here 213, simply dismisses her position with one line: "I find no merit in her arguments."

⁴² For further, see Williams, *Rethinking Gnosticism*, 54–57.

⁴³ For this early view, see, e.g., von Harnack, *History of Dogma*, 1.169–73. The view is somewhat surprisingly echoed in Walter Bauer, *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*, 2nd ed. (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971), 195–228. Although he was more or less a contemporary of von Harnack (he published the original German *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum* in 1934), Bauer's understanding of Christian origins is quite distinct. Rather than seeing Gnosticism as a deviation from original, unde-

Index of Ancient Sources

A. Hebrew Bible and Septuagint

<i>Genesis</i>		5:20–23	82
<i>In toto</i>	18, 36, 51, 108	6–9	60
1–11	62, 67	6:1–4	61, 63
1–7	19, 62, 67, 70, 91, 108	6:5–7	46 (bis)
1–4	25, 51, 59, 104, 111,	6:6	45 (bis), 63, 66, 87
	118	6:7 (LXX)	46 (bis)
1–3	57, 62, 70	6:8	81
1:1–2:4	62	6:17	63
1:2	42 (bis), 63, 89	6:18	81
1:2b	42	7:1	82
1:26–27	41	7:7	63, 81, 87
1:26	53, 57, 63	7:13	82
1:27	67	7:18	42
2–4	60	7:23	81
2:4–25	62	8:1	81 (bis)
2:4	62	8:16	82
2:9	63	8:18	82
2:15–16	63	10:3	82
2:17	63	15:12	43
2:18–20	65	18:12–15	73
2:18	83		
2:21–22	44 (bis), 63	<i>Exodus</i>	
2:21	29, 43, 63, 65–66, 80,	1–14	108
	103	13:21	88
2:22 (LXX)	84	20:3	67
2:23–24	40, 84	20:3 (LXX)	57, 58
2:24	63	20:5	53–56, 57, 58, 67, 86
3:5	57	24:15–18	88
3:7	117	32:6	73
3:10	117	34:14	53–55
3:16	63		
3:17 (LXX)	118	<i>Numbers</i>	
3:20 (LXX)	83, 116	9:15–23	88
3:22	57	10:33–36	88
3:23–24	63	10:36 (LXX)	88
3:23	63		
4:25	63, 116	<i>Deuteronomy</i>	
5–9	26	4:24	53
5:1	62	4:35	53
5:3	116	5:9	53
5:4 (LXX)	62	6:15	53

24:1–4	49	<i>Ezekiel</i>	
32:19	55	14:12–23	82
32:39	53	16:36–42	53
		28:13	63
<i>Joshua</i>		31:8–9	63
24:19	53	36:6	53
		<i>Daniel</i>	
<i>1 Kings</i>		3:29	56
8:56–61	56		
8:60	53	<i>Joel</i>	
		2:27	53, 56
<i>1 Chronicles</i>			
16:26	56	<i>Nahum</i>	
		1:2	53
<i>Psalms</i>			
2:4	77	<i>Wisdom of Solomon</i>	
37:13	77	7:21–22	89
59:8	77	17:7 (LXX S ¹)	42
95:5	56		
		<i>Sirach</i>	
<i>Proverbs</i>		22:9	43
1:26	77	24	88
8	88	24:5	89
8:22–30	89		
26:19	73	<i>4 Maccabees</i>	
		5:11	43
<i>Isaiah</i>		15:6 (LXX S)	42
6:10	35, 86, 103	18:9	53
44:8	53, 56		
45	53, 56		
45:5	53, 54, 58, 86		
46:9	53		

B. New Testament

<i>Matthew</i>		<i>Mark</i>	
<i>In toto</i>	49	4:10–12	86
1:1	62	13:32–37	79
1:20–25	79		
2:12	79	<i>Luke</i>	
2:13	79	<i>In toto</i>	119
2:19	79	6:25	73
2:22	79		
19:8	49	<i>John</i>	
24:36–44	79	<i>In toto</i>	22, 26, 70, 100
25:1–13	79	1:1–18	88
27:19	79	18	99

<i>Acts</i>		<i>Colossians</i>	
<i>In toto</i>	79	1:15–20	88
9:1–16	79		
10:1–11:18	79	<i>1 Thessalonians</i>	
16:6–10	79	5:1–11	79
17:32	73		
22:6–16	79	<i>1 Timothy</i>	
26:12–18	79	2:13	44
<i>Romans</i>		<i>1 Peter</i>	
13:11	79	3:20–22	113
13:13	55	3:20–21	82
<i>1 Corinthians</i>		<i>2 Peter</i>	
10:7	73	3:5	82
<i>2 Corinthians</i>		<i>2 John</i>	
4:4	66	10–11	98
12:20	55		
		<i>3 John</i>	
<i>Galatians</i>		3–8	98
5:20	55		
		<i>Revelation</i>	
<i>Ephesians</i>		<i>In toto</i>	23, 60, 70
5:14	80	1:4	60
5:29	65	1:8	60

C. Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha

<i>Gen. Ap.</i>		<i>Jub.</i>	
<i>In toto</i>	19, 61, 107	<i>In toto</i>	19, 61, 106, 108
		1.7	70
<i>1 En.</i>		1.26	70
<i>In toto</i>	19, 61, 107	1.27	70
10.1–3	82	2.1	70
10.2	87	3.10	70
32.3–4	71	3.14	70
67.1–3	82	3.31	70
106	82	4.5	70
		5.6	45
<i>4 Ezra</i>			
3.11	82	<i>LAB</i>	
<i>Ep. Arist.</i>		3.1–3	45
301–11	111	3.4–8	82
		32.15	45
<i>Jos. Asen.</i>		<i>LAE</i>	
<i>In toto</i>	104	<i>In toto</i>	44, 107
16.7	73, 77	41–42	85

		1.265–79	82
<i>Pss. Sol.</i>			
16.1–4	44	<i>Syr. Men.</i>	
		2.68	43, 44
<i>Sib. Or.</i>			
1.42–45	45	<i>T. Reu.</i>	
1.210	82	3:1–9	43

D. Other Greek and Latin Authors

Apuleius		<i>Didache</i>	
<i>Meta.</i>		3.1–10	55
9.14	57	5.2	58
		11.1–6	98
Aristobulus		Epiphanius	
Frag. 4	111	<i>Pan.</i>	
Aristotle		<i>In toto</i>	3
<i>Met.</i>		31	107
983A	56	33.3–7	11
Athenagoras		Epictetus	
<i>Leg.</i>		<i>Diss.</i>	
3	58	2.20.15	43
35	58	<i>Epistle of Barnabas</i>	
Cicero		<i>In toto</i>	20
<i>De nat. deo.</i>		20.2	58
1.43	56	Eusebius	
Clement of Alexandria		<i>Hist. eccl.</i>	
<i>Excerpt. Theod.</i>		<i>In toto</i>	3
<i>In toto</i>	3	3.5.1	110
<i>Paed.</i>		5.3–27	109
2.9	80	5.15	109
<i>Strom.</i>		5.20	109
<i>In toto</i>	3, 33	5.20.4	109
Cyprian		<i>Praep. Ev.</i>	
<i>Ep.</i>		13.12.1–2	111
74.15	113	Galen	
		<i>In Hipp. De victu acutorum</i>	
		120.5–14	82

Hesiod		4.26.3–4	109
<i>Theog.</i>			
40	77	Josephus	
		<i>Ant.</i>	
Hippolytus of Rome		1.35–36	80
<i>Haer.</i>		1.78	82
<i>In toto</i>	3	12.12–118	111
V.16.9–10	37	<i>C. Ap.</i>	
		2.148	57
Homer			
<i>Il.</i>		Julian (the Apostate)	
1.595–600	77	<i>Contra Galileos</i>	
15.101	77	93D–94A	54
21.389	77		
Ignatius		Justin Martyr	
<i>Smyrn.</i>	31	<i>1 Apol.</i>	
		<i>In toto</i>	107
Irenaeus		5–6	57
<i>Adv. haer.</i>		6	58
<i>In toto</i>	2, 13, 108, 109, 111	26	15
1 <i>praef.</i> 1	110	44	33
1.9.1	110	54–60	33
1.9.3	110	58	15
1.9.4	110	<i>2 Apol.</i>	
1.18	111	<i>In toto</i>	107
1.18.1	110	2	107
1.21.5	40	<i>Dial.</i>	
1.27.2	119	<i>In toto</i>	107
1.29	17, 21, 25, 99, 101	138	113
1.29.4	53, 101, 102, 112	<i>Cohort.</i>	
1.30	26, 101	13	111
2 <i>praef.</i> 1	110		
2.10.1	32, 56	<i>Korē Kosmou</i>	
3.1.1	110	23.10	73, 77
3.2	110		
3.2.1	110	Longus	
3.2.2	110	<i>Daphn.</i>	
3.4.3	107	1.4	77
3.5.1	110		
3.5.12	107	Lucian	
3.6	110	<i>Alex.</i>	
3.9–12	110	38	57
3.11.7	111	<i>Rhet. praec.</i>	
3.15.3	111	22	55
3.21.2–3	110		
4 <i>praef.</i>	107		
4.2	111		
4.26	110		

<i>Mart. Pol.</i>					
12.2	57			<i>Somn.</i>	
				1.121	43
				2.162	43
Minucius Felix				<i>Vita Mos.</i>	
<i>Oct.</i>				2.33–44	111
8	58				
Origen				Plato	
<i>Cels.</i>				<i>Phaed.</i>	
<i>In toto</i>	3			247A	55
4.37–38	45			<i>Resp.</i>	
4.38	44			VI, 503d	43
4.71–73	55			VII, 537d	43
6.58	45–46			IX, 571c–572b	43
8.21	56			<i>Tim.</i>	
<i>Princ.</i>				<i>In toto</i>	71
2.4.4	55			29D–E	55
4.2.1–2	55			73B	85
4.2.2	119			73D	85
<i>Hom. Gen.</i>				Pliny the Elder	
2	113			<i>Nat. Hist.</i>	
Philo				7.15.72	77
<i>Deus</i>				Pliny the Younger	
21	46			<i>Ep.</i>	
60–69	55			10.96	57
<i>Leg.</i>				Plotinus	
1.31	65			<i>Enn.</i>	
1.33	65			<i>In toto</i>	4
2.19–21	85			2.9	71
2.19–20	44			Plutarch	
2.19	44			<i>Aem.</i>	
2.21	85			25.1–2	77
2.31	43			Procopius of Gaza	
2.40–41	85			PG 87, 45–48	42
<i>Migr.</i>				<i>Shepherd of Hermas</i>	
222	43			3.3.5	113
<i>Opif.</i>				3.8.2	73, 77
134	65			Tacitus	
151	44			<i>Hist.</i>	
<i>QG</i>				5.4–5	57
1.25	44				
1.28	84				
1.100	66				
2.26	81				
4.2	43				

5.5	57	<i>Praesc.</i>	
		<i>In toto</i>	3, 118
Tertullian		15	118
		17	32
<i>Apol.</i>		19	118
10.1	58		
<i>Bapt.</i>		<i>Scorp.</i>	3
8.4	113	<i>Val.</i>	
<i>Idol.</i>		<i>In toto</i>	3
24	113		
<i>Marc.</i>		Theocritus	
<i>In toto</i>	3	<i>Id.</i>	
1.2	55	7.19–20	77
5.19	15	7.42	77
		7.128	77

E. Nag Hammadi and Related Literature

<i>1 Apoc. James</i>		26,1–6	22
<i>In toto</i>	16	36,16	83
34,1–20	40	38,12	83
3,37	74	44,14–15	53, 86
		44,19–45,1	89
<i>2 Apoc. James</i>		45,1	42, 63
60,20–22	74	45,7–19	70, 72
		45,7	42, 63, 76
<i>Act Pet.</i>		45,10	63
129,8–9	75	45,19	42, 63
129,9–19	77	46,10	60, 78
132,5–7	75	48,10	63
		48,16–17	72
<i>Acts Pet. 12 Apos.</i>		49,16–18	85
3,31	74	55,15–18	80
		56,1–10	63
<i>Allogenes</i>		57,8–19	117
<i>In toto</i>	17	57,8–11	63
		57,12–13	63
<i>Apoc. Adam</i>		57,20–58,7	70, 72
<i>In toto</i>	4, 17, 61	58,4	76
		58,16–59	70
<i>Apoc. Pet.</i>		58,16–18	29, 71
8	58	58,17–18	63
81–83	75	59,1–2	70
		59,7–9	84
<i>Ap. John</i>		59,12–15	85
<i>In toto</i>	<i>passim</i>	59,17–19	70
		59,18–19	63
BG 8502		60,5–7	84
21,19–21	51	60,7–11	63

61,10	118	15,29–19,10	104
61,11–12	63	16,28	65
61,19–62,1	63	18,18–24	53
63,12–14	63	19,9–10	71
63,13	62	19,10	114
63,18–64,1	80	19,15–33	78
68,3	74	19,23–28	64, 72
72,11	66	19,23–27	40
72,12–14	63	20,14–19	83
72,14–17	63	20,25–21,13	65
73,4–12	70	20,35–21,13	73
73,4–9	81	21,11	64
73,5–6	63	21,15–16	80
74,1–5	63	21,17–22,2	41
		21,19–22,9	71
NHC II		21,23–34	71
1,1–2,25	59	22,3–23,8	102–03
2,13–9,24	51	22,3–8	117
2,13–14	51	22,7–8	72
2,16–18	60	22,9–16	70, 72
2,26–9,24	60	22,9–15	103
4,34–14,13	101	22,12–15	47
9,25–25,16	60, 62	22,12	39, 74–76
9,25–25,1	51	22,13–14	40
9,26–13,4	60	22,18–28	79
10,4–9	49	22,20–28	29
10,20–21	64	22,20–24	71
10,30–31	53	22,21–23,4	104
11,7–15	64	22,21–29	78 (bis)
11,19–21	53	22,21–28	103
11,20–21	36	22,22–25	70
12,6–9	64	22,22–24	29, 40, 43
13,5–25,16	60	22,24	79, 114
13,5–17	104	22,25–29	86
13,8–13	102	22,25–28	86
13,8–9	36, 53 (bis), 86, 101	22,25–26	71
13,9–13	54	22,29–23,24	83
13,13–32	102, 104	22,29–23,4	78
13,13–26	88	22,36–23,4	103
13,14	89	23,3–4	40, 44
13,18	39, 42	23,10–16	64, 65, 72
13,19–26	70, 72	23,20–23	83
13,19	74–76	23,23–24	83
13,27–36	104	23,25–31	116
13,32–14,1	102	23,30–31	80
14,26–15,6	64	23,32–33	117
14,26–34	89	23,34	80
14,33	60	23,37	117 (bis)
15,1–3	72	24,4–25	47
15,2–4	40	24,6–8	41
15,14–15	84	24,15–25	64
15,21	53	24,35–25,2	47

25,2–30,11	51	58,32	74
25,16–30,11	60, 104		
25,16	62	<i>Ep. Flor. (apud Epiphanius)</i>	
25,31	53	<i>In toto</i>	11, 20, 30, 31, 119
25,33–35	66	33.3.2	49, 119
26,25–26	76	33.3.4	48
26,25	66	33.3.8	49
26,26	74, 75 (bis)	33.4.6	48, 49
28,3–29,15	47	33.4.10	48
28,14	66	33.4.14	49
28,22–26	66	33.5.1–2	48
28,27–28	66	33.6.6	49
28,32–29,12	103	33.7.3	49
28,32–34	64, 66, 87	<i>Ep. Pet. Phil.</i>	
28,32–33	46	<i>In toto</i>	16
28,32	66	<i>Eugnostos</i>	
29,6–12	70, 87, 113	<i>In toto</i>	23
29,6–10	103	<i>Exeg. Soul</i>	
29,6–7	40, 45	132,27–133,10	65
29,8–10	78, 81	<i>Gos. Eg.</i>	
29,12	87	<i>In toto</i>	16, 17
29,15	87	<i>Gos. Jud.</i>	
30,11–31,25	104	<i>In toto</i>	15, 16, 17
31,6	80	34,2–10	74–75
31,20	80	36,23–37,15	74–75
31,32–32,6	59	55,12–20	74–75
32,8–10	59	<i>Gos. Mary</i>	
NHC III		<i>In toto</i>	16
14,9–10	83	<i>Gos. Phil.</i>	
22,8–9	72	59,6–11	83
28,6–15	117	60,10–15	40
28,16–23	70, 72	65,15	74
28,19	76	68,22–26	44
29,4–7	70, 72	74,26–36	74
29,4–6	29	84,20–85,21	88
29,4	74–76	84,34–85,1	88
29,13–15	84	<i>Gos. Thom.</i>	
29,21–24	70	<i>In toto</i>	16, 99
30,5–6	84	11	65
30,23	118	<i>Gos. Truth</i>	
32,6–7	62	<i>In toto</i>	16
34,21	76	18,38–40	56
37,13–14	66	29,32–30,14	80
37,22–38,5	70		
<i>Asclepius</i>			
65,33	74		
72,32–33	75		
<i>Disc. 8–9</i>			
58,32–59,1	75		

Hymn Pearl

109.32–35 80
 111.65 80

Hyp. Arch.

In toto 7, 17, 61
 88,3–10 64
 88,3–5 64
 88,10–15 64
 89,3–7 81
 89,24 74
 90,6–10 54
 92,4–18 87
 92,11 87

Marsanes

In toto 17

Melch.

In toto 17

Norea

In toto 17

Orig. World

In toto 16, 20, 61
 112,27 74
 113,13 74
 116,26 74
 119,4–6 54

Par. Shem

In toto 4, 61
 24,29–26,36 113

Plato Resp. (NHC VI, 5)

In toto 12

Poimandres

In toto 4

Soph. Jes. Chr.

In toto 16, 23
 92,1 74, 75, 77
 111,1–3 65

Steles Seth

In toto 9, 17

Testim. Truth

In toto 9, 31
 47,14– 48,7 54

Thom. Cont.

142,22 74
 143,24 74

Thund.

15,12 74

Treat. Seth

In toto 31
 53,32–33 75
 54,3 75
 54,13 75
 56,6–19 75
 60,13–14 75
 62,27–64 75
 63,4–31 75
 64,18–65,1 54, 75

Trim. Prot.

In toto 17

Untitled Text (Bruce Codex)

In toto 17

Val. Exp.

In toto 9
 34,22–38 75

Zost.

In toto 17

Index of Modern Authors

- Alexander, Philip 105
Armstrong, Jonathan 8
- Bagnall, Roger 96
Balz, Horst 43
Barc, Bernard 2, 26, 64, 115
Barclay, John 54, 57, 58
Barns, J. W. B. 115
Bauckham, Richard 94, 97, 98
Bauer, Walter 10, 14, 30, 97
Becker, Adam 9
Berger, Peter 95
Bermejo Rubio, Fernando 75
Bianchi, Ugo 2
Bickerman, Elias 57
Bloom, Harold 38
Bousset, Wilhelm 5
Bovon, François 79
Bowley, James 19
Brakke, David 13, 14, 113
Brashler, James 12
Broek, Roelof van den 84
Brox, Norbert 76
Bultmann, Rudolf 5
- Campanhausen, Hans von 11, 31, 32, 49, 118, 119
Clabeaux, John 15, 119
Clivaz, Claire 75
Colpe, Carsten 6
Cook, John Granger 9, 54
Crawford, Sidnie White 105, 106–07
Crum, Walter 74, 75
Culianu, Ioan 38, 72
- Dahl, Nils 6, 11, 38, 40
DeConick, April 15
Denzey, Nicola 8
Dimant, Divorah 105
Doresse, Jean 6
Drobner, Hubertus 2, 109, 110
Dunn, Geoffrey 119
Dunn, James D. G. 57, 100
- Ehrman, Bart 15, 94
Epp, Eldon 12, 98, 99–100
Evans, Craig 65, 86
- Feldman, Louis 9
Ferguson, Everett 54, 58
Filoramo, Giovanni 30, 38, 39, 47, 50
Fishbane, Michael 105
Fisk, Bruce 71, 105, 106
Fitzgerald, John 54
Fossum, Jarl 52
Foucault, Michel 47
Frankfurter, David 7, 99
Friederländer, Moritz 5
- Gager, John 9
Gathercole, Simon 8
Gianotto, Claudio 30, 39
Gilhus, Ingvild Sælid 76
Giversen, Søren 18, 19, 22, 38, 62–63, 70, 72, 73, 89, 104, 117
Goodacre, Mark 6
Grant, Robert 6, 8, 47–48
Green, Joel 48
Gruen, Erich 13
Gruenwald, Ithamar 8, 11, 32, 39
- Habel, Norman 62
Halliwell, Stephen 74, 76
Harnack, Adolf von 4, 10, 30
Hays, Richard 48
Hengel, Martin 11
Horbury, William 111
Horrell, David 95
Hurtado, Larry 36, 93
Hvalvik, Reidar 8
- Janssens, Yvonne 16
Janz, Timothy 12
Jonas, Hans 8, 17, 30, 37, 39, 79
- Kaler, Michael 116
Kasser, Rodolphe 52

- King, Karen 1, 6, 9, 10, 13, 24–25, 26,
32, 33–34, 35, 36, 37, 49, 58, 70, 72,
92, 93, 101, 114, 115
Klauck, Hans Josef 53
Kleinknecht, Hermann 54
Koester, Helmut 97, 99, 101
Kroll, Wilhelm 70
- La Porta, Sergio 83
Lambdin, Thomas 75
Lampe, Peter 15, 55, 107, 109
Layton, Bentley 2, 14, 16, 17, 59, 73,
75, 76, 80, 96, 97, 101, 108
Lewis, Jack 45, 113
Leyerle, Blake 98
Lidzbarski, Mark 5
Logan, Alastair 1, 4, 11, 16, 19, 25–26,
31, 32, 35–36, 81, 92, 94, 99, 101,
104, 111, 112, 114, 116
Lövestam, Evald 43
Luck, Georg 77
Luckmann, Thomas 95
Lupieri, Edmondo 84
Luttikhuisen, Gerard 8, 11, 20–21, 34–
35, 39, 47, 58, 83, 86, 87
Luzarraga, Jesús 88
- MacRae, George 6, 40, 51, 79, 80
Malina, Bruce 74, 94
Meyer, Marvin 40, 73, 74
Moxnes, Halvor 74
- Nagel, Peter 30, 39
Neyrey, Jerome 74
Nickelsburg, George 105
Nock, A. D. 4
- Orbe, Antonio 31, 43, 77, 88
Osiek, Carolyn 76
- Pagels, Elaine 15
Painchaud, Louis 12, 20, 26, 32, 64, 89,
105, 115
Pasquier, Anne 40
Pearson, Birger 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 14,
16, 17, 18, 19–20, 22, 23–24, 29, 32,
38, 39, 51, 61, 94, 99, 101, 104, 106,
108
Perkins, PHEME 4, 7, 8, 23, 48, 59, 106
Pétrement, Simone 1, 4, 5, 6, 8
Piovanelli, Pierluigi 94, 96, 97
Pleše, Zlatko 42, 71, 73, 82, 87–88, 89
- Quispel, Gilles 7, 112
- Reed, Annette Yoshiko 9
Reeves, John 19
Reitzenstein, Richard 5
Rengstorf, Karl 76, 77
Roberts, Colin 32, 108, 109
Robinson, James 6, 115
Rohrbaugh, Richard 74, 95
Roukema, Riemer 3, 32
Rudhardt, Jean 76
Rudolph, Kurt 6, 7, 31, 38
- Scholer, David 2
Scott, Walter 77
Segal, Alan 4, 52
Skarsaune, Oskar 8
Smith, Carl 1, 7, 8
Stern, Menahem 9
Stark, Rodney 8
Stroumsa, Gedaliahu 7, 45, 51, 52, 77,
119
Stumpff, Albrecht 53
- Tardieu, Michel 16, 18–19, 22–23, 51,
59, 60, 61, 62, 67, 72, 77, 92, 101,
104, 114
Tcherikover, Victor 9
Thompson, Michael 98
Till, Walter 72
Tiller, Patrick 95
Timbie, Janet 42
Tobin, Thomas 62
Turner, John 7, 16, 17, 24, 92, 116
- VanderKam, James 97
Vanhoozer, Kevin 93
Völker, Walther 14, 118
Vos, Craig de 57
- Waldstein, Michael 21, 26, 72, 92, 101
Webb, Robert 65
Williams, Michael 1, 7, 8, 9–10, 11, 13,
14, 16, 25, 31, 37–39, 41, 43, 45,
46–47, 51–53, 67, 83, 94, 115, 116,
117
Wilson, R. McL. 2, 20, 31, 38
Wisse, Frederik 13, 14, 17, 21, 72, 92,
93, 94, 95, 96, 101, 115
Wolfgang-Tröger, Karl 11, 30
- Yamauchi, Edwin 4, 7, 38

Index of Subjects

- Adam 29, 39–40, 41, 43–45, 46, 53, 62, 64–65, 71–72, 76, 78–81, 83–85, 86, 89, 90, 101, 103–04, 116–18
- Apologists 33, 58
- Apostle, apostolic 15, 21, 73, 114, 119
- Anthropology 67, 101
- Anthropomorphism 22, 55
- Anti-Jewish, Anti-Semitic 7, 8
- Apocalyptic 23, 26, 61
- Ark 81–82, 87–88, 103, 113
- Ascetic, Asceticism 52, 119
- Authority 28, 64, 66, 90, 91, 104–07, 109–11
- Barbelo 17, 40, 53, 60, 78, 83, 90, 112
- Biblical 18–20, 22, 27, 29, 31–68, 69, 71, 72, 78, 81, 83, 86, 87, 91, 93, 104–07, 108, 111, 112, 115–116
- Book 29, 36, 48, 62, 114, 115, 118
- Book of Zoroaster 22
- Cain 37, 47, 64
- Church Fathers 2, 3, 5, 11, 14
- Cosmogony 14, 101, 102, 104
- Cosmology 16, 67
- Creator 8, 34, 37, 40, 41, 46, 49–51, 53–55, 59, 68, 78
- Creation 29, 33, 40, 42, 45–46, 49, 53, 59, 60, 62, 64, 66, 68, 69, 86, 91, 107–08, 111, 113
- of Adam/man 53, 64, 101
- of Eve/woman 44, 65–66, 70, 78, 81, 83–85, 90, 116
- Demiurge 53, 55, 59, 67
- Early catholic 15, 24, 27, 32–36, 38, 41, 46–50, 54, 56–59, 78, 86, 90, 91, 99, 108–114, 116, 118
- Enoch, Enochic 61, 87, 97
- Epinoia 26, 65, 80–81, 83–85, 103–04, 117
- Eve 39–41, 44, 83, 85, 90, 116–17
- Exegesis, exegetical 6–7, 9, 27, 36, 37–42, 46, 47, 49, 50–52, 55, 58–59, 63, 67, 68, 80, 90, 105, 106, 117
- Flesh 44, 65–66, 75, 83–84
- Flood 40, 41, 45–46, 60–61, 66–67, 78, 82, 87, 88
- Gnostic
- Classification 1–15
- Community, group 12, 17, 25, 30, 31, 90, 93–97, 100, 108, 113
- Interpretation 5, 11, 25–26, 28, 30, 31, 34, 37–39, 41, 47, 51, 78, 81, 118–19
- Gnosticizing 12, 28, 91
- Greek influence
- Culture 33, 45, 54, 74
- Language 11, 13, 21, 73–74, 99
- Hellenization, Hellenized 4, 10, 30, 48
- Heresiologists 2, 15, 31, 37, 99, 110
- Heresy 2, 3, 10, 33, 107, 119
- Hermeneutic 9, 11, 18, 25, 30–39, 49, 50, 61, 65, 69, 71, 72, 90, 108, 116
- Heterodox 12, 77, 107, 109, 117, 119
- Ialdabaoth 36, 46, 49, 53–55, 58, 60, 64, 65, 66–67, 68, 83–86, 101–02, 104, 112, 117–18
- Identity 17, 27, 90, 95, 97, 111–14, 118–19
- Johannine 8, 34, 88, 99
- Laughter 27, 54, 72–77, 90
- Marcion, Marcionite 11, 15, 20, 55, 98, 107, 119
- Melothesia 22–23, 26, 114, 115
- Moses 27–28, 29, 33, 35, 39–40, 43, 45, 49–50, 60, 65, 67–68, 69–90, 91, 93, 102–06, 108, 111–14, 116–18

- Nag Hammadi 1, 4, 6, 7, 11, 12, 13, 15,
 16, 21, 30, 31, 39, 52, 65, 74–75, 77,
 81, 94, 114–119
 Noah 40, 42, 45, 47, 70, 78, 81–82, 87–
 88, 90, 103, 112, 113
 Orthodox 3, 14–15, 38, 39, 107, 110
 Passions 46, 53, 55
 Paul, Pauline 34, 49, 70, 73, 79, 119
 Philo 5, 9, 20, 41, 43–44, 46, 55, 62, 65,
 81–82, 85
 Plato, Platonism 12, 24, 33, 55–56, 85
 Porphyry 4, 9, 54
 Primordial History 42, 61, 62, 67
 Pronoia Hymn/Monologue 22–23, 26,
 61, 80, 114–15
 Protest exegesis, reverse exegesis 9, 30–
 33, 37–39, 47, 48, 50, 59, 71–72,
 116
 Pseudepigrapha 9, 19, 61, 97
 Rib 44–45, 46, 65, 83–85, 103
 Septuagint 11, 36, 40, 42–43, 45, 48,
 51, 53, 60, 62, 80, 81, 87–88, 110–
 11
 Seth, Sethian, Sethianism 14, 24, 26, 31,
 47, 62, 112, 116
 Scripture
 – Christian 11, 29, 30–31, 70, 77
 – Jewish 1, 7, 9, 11, 17, 18, 20, 27–28,
 33, 41, 77, 89, 110–11
 – Rewritten 19, 45, 61–63, 64, 67–68,
 93, 104–08, 111
 Sleep 29, 40, 43–44, 51, 78–81, 89, 103
 Sophia 25, 40, 42–43, 46, 60, 64, 76,
 83, 88–89, 90, 101, 102, 104, 112–
 13
 Textual criticism 12, 117
Toledoth formulae 62, 67, 68
 Trance 29, 43–44, 46, 70, 71, 72, 76,
 78–79, 86, 90
 Translation 12, 13, 21, 54, 57, 75, 117
Urtext 19, 23, 26, 61, 108
 Valentinus 98, 99, 107–08
 Valentinian 26, 32, 49, 107–09
 Wisdom 39, 40, 43, 88–89
 Zoe 83, 116–18