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### ABBREVIATIONS

#### A. GENERAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AbhAkWiss</td>
<td>Abhandlungen der philosophischen-philologischen Classe der Akademie der Wissenschaften</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A l A J A</td>
<td>American Journal of Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AntKe</td>
<td>Antike und Christentum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BZNW</td>
<td>Beilage zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCSL</td>
<td>Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSSE</td>
<td>Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLSup</td>
<td>Dictionnaire de la Bible, Supplement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRLANT</td>
<td>Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg</td>
<td>Gregorianum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCS</td>
<td>Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HStNT</td>
<td>Handbuch zum Neuen Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HTR</td>
<td>Harvard Theological Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HTS</td>
<td>Harvard Theological Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HeyJ</td>
<td>Heythrop Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCS</td>
<td>Journal of Contextual Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JNES</td>
<td>Journal of Near Eastern Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JQR</td>
<td>Jewish Quarterly Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JTS</td>
<td>Journal of Theological Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCL</td>
<td>Loeb Classical Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHS</td>
<td>Nag Hammadi Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NovT</td>
<td>Novum Testamentum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NovTSup</td>
<td>Novum Testamentum, Supplements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NumenSup</td>
<td>Numen, Supplements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIZ</td>
<td>Orientalistische Literaturzeitung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oraison</td>
<td>Oraison Chrétienne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG</td>
<td>Migne, Patrologia Graeca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW</td>
<td>Paulus-Wissowa, <em>Realencyclopadie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAC</td>
<td>Réalisation für Antike und Christentum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSR</td>
<td>Recherches de science religieuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RevBible</td>
<td>Revue Biblique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>Revue de theologie et de philosophie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBL</td>
<td>Society of Biblical Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBLMS</td>
<td>Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Sources chrétiannes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPB</td>
<td>Studia patristica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLLZ</td>
<td>Theologische Literaturzeitung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThRd</td>
<td>Theologische Rundschau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TU</td>
<td>Lexicon und Untersuchungen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT</td>
<td>Vetus Testamentum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VTSup</td>
<td>Vetus Testamentum, Supplements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC</td>
<td>Vigiliae Christianae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZNW</td>
<td>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZPE</td>
<td>Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B. Gnostic Literature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ApocAd</td>
<td>The Apocalypse of Adam CG V, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ApocJas</td>
<td>The Apocryphon of James CG II, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ApocJbn</td>
<td>The Apocryphon of John BG I, CG II, 1; III, 1; IV, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG</td>
<td>Papyrus Berolinensis Gnosticus 8502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG</td>
<td>Cairomos Gnosticos, Nag Hammadi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DialNav</td>
<td>The Dialogue of the Saviour CG III, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eug</td>
<td>Eusonatos, the Blessed CG III, 3; V, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMary</td>
<td>The Gospel of Mary BG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPh</td>
<td>The Gospel of Philip CG II, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTh</td>
<td>The Gospel of Thomas CG II, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTr</td>
<td>The Gospel of Truth CG I, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GrProW</td>
<td>The Concept of our Great Power CG VI, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GrSeth</td>
<td>Second Treatise of the Great Seth CG VII, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NatArch</td>
<td>The Nature of the Archon CG II, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OnOogWld</td>
<td>On the Origin of the World CG II, 5, XIII, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OnsRes</td>
<td>The Treatise on the Resurrection CG I, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.S</td>
<td>Pistis Sophia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJC</td>
<td>The Sophia of Jesus Christ BG, CG III, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TestTr</td>
<td>The Testimonies of Truth CG IX, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThCont</td>
<td>The Book of Thomas the Contender CG II, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TriProt</td>
<td>Transpiration Proellenios CG XIII, 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

In his introductory essay to the papers and discussions of the Messina Colloquium, Ugo Bianchi has aptly remarked:

The studies which have been presented to this Colloquium confirm by their number and by the variety of subjects treated the legitimacy, the reality, and at the same time the difficulty of the theme of the origins of Gnosticism.1

Indeed, not only the Colloquium but also the scholarly debate during this century on the origins of Gnosticism witness to the difficulty of this theme.2 Faced with this scholarly division of opinion and with the array of new material from Nag Hammadi, one can best further the discussion at this time by examining in detail the individual pericopes of these documents and the traditions in which they stand. Only later will a synthesis of these results and assessment of the

---

1 U. Bianchi, "Le Problème des Origines du Gnosticisme", Le Origini della Gnosticità, Colloquio di Messina 13-18 April 1966, publ. U. Bianchi (NumenSup 12; Leiden 1967) 1; the translation here from the French and throughout this study from foreign languages is mine unless otherwise indicated.

broader question of gnostic origins be possible. The following study is meant as a contribution to that initial examination.

We shall examine two related pericopes from Nag Hammadi documents to show first of all that they derive from a Jewish background, as a contribution to this wider scholarly discussion on the origins of Gnosticism and on the relationship of Judaism to Gnosticism. Secondly, we shall determine which segment or segments of Judaism have contributed to these pericopes. Thirdly, of course, we shall study these pericopes in terms of their relation to one another, the traditions upon which they draw, and their function within the given documents.

The pericopes which we have chosen to study are particularly interesting, since they are unique within gnostic literature. Although many gnostic documents contain creation myths, only the two documents that we shall study have pericopes in which the offspring of the evil creator repents and is enthroned in the heavens. The very uniqueness of these pericopes will enable us to delineate the theological issues being addressed by them, to date more precisely the documents in which these pericopes occur, and to determine more exactly the place of these documents within Gnosticism and the other gnostic influences which have shaped them.

A final word concerning a proposed Jewish background is appropriate here. To determine that a pericope derives from a Jewish background, one must first show positively that its motifs and traditions appear in Jewish literature and negatively that they appear only there or only there in their particular connections or that so many motifs and combinations of motifs can be found in Jewish tradition that another source is unthinkable. Secondly, since pagans were acquainted with the OT (e.g. Poimandres), it is necessary to show an acquaintance with traditions found only in the later, intertestamental literature in order to speak of a contribution from Judaism. Obviously, this then leaves open the question as to whether the pericope was formed and/or used in Jewish or Jewish-Christian circles as well as the question as to whether Gnosticism arose within Judaism or within Christianity. In either case, it shows the contribution of Judaism to Gnosticism.3

3 Cf. the remark of Rudolph: “Naturally the usage of Israelite-Jewish traditions in no way signifies that Gnosticism as a whole must be a wild offspring of Judaism, but it is obvious that it presents this thesis as at least probable.” Rudolph, “Randscheinungen,” 115. To prove the existence of Jewish Gnosticism, one naturally seeks a document of Jewish Gnosticism that is not Christianized or whose Christian additions are removable as secondary additions.
A. The Documents

The pericopes with which we are concerned are taken from two closely related documents of the Nag Hammadi Corpus, i.e. *The Nature of the Archons* (NatArch CG II, 4) and *On the Origin of the World* (OnOrgWld CG II, 5). NatArch is a treatise, which is purportedly sent in response to enquiries concerning the reality of the heavenly authorities (86 [114], 25ff.). There are two major parts within the treatise. The first contains a gnostic reinterpretation of the early chapters of Genesis through the story of the flood, and the second consists of a revelation discourse of the angel Eleleth to Norea, the sister of Seth and probable wife of Noah. In addition to Jewish elements, the document clearly exhibits a debt to Hellenistic syncretism and is Christian in its present form.¹

Scholars have begun the analysis of this document by putting the customary, introductory questions to it. At present, it seems clear that NatArch was written originally in Greek and then translated into Coptic, since it follows the text of the LXX and retains the appropriate Greek inflection in some loan words even at the Coptic stage.²

---


provenance of the tractate has not yet been decided; nor has the date for the tractate been established, except that it is, of course, prior to the fourth century date of the codex. Scholarly attention has focused more directly upon the question of the literary unity of NatArch, although there is as yet no unanimity in answer. Schenke, Bullard and Kasser have proposed that the two main parts of NatArch are dependent upon two different written sources, which have been united by a redactor. However, it has been difficult to determine the exact beginning of the second source. Krause, on the other hand, has suggested that three sources, all dealing with Norea (i.e. the race of Seth and Norea, Norea and Noah’s ark, Norea and Eleleth), have been united by a redactor. It is clear that a full literary analysis of the text is necessary before this question can be finally answered.

Related to the question of the literary unity of the tractate is the issue as to whether non-Christian sources have been Christianized by the redactor. Bullard has noted that the quotation of Eph 6:12 at 86(134) 23-24 as well as the Christian allusions in 90(144) 13-27 (145) 21 belong to the redactor. Again, as Krause has suggested.

---

1 H.-C. Puech has suggested Egypt as the possible place in “Les nouveaux écrits gnostiques découverts en Haute-Égypte,” Coptic Studies in honor of Walter Ewing Cum (Boston 1959) 122.


3 Cf. Bullard, The Hypostasis of the Archons, 100, who emphasizes the startling change from the third person singular to the first person singular at the possible beginning of the second document Schenke in his “Review of R. A. Bullard, The Hypostasis of the Archons,” in a forthcoming issue of OLZ has placed the caesura at 92(140) 18, the change from Norea and the ark of Noah to Norea and the rulers.


12 Scholars (e.g. Kasser, “L’Hypostase des Archontes: Bibliothèque gnostique X,” 169ff) have noted the unified purpose, which the redactor achieves in his use of sources but have had difficulty in identifying the exact sources. As B. Layton has suggested to me privately and if his restoration at 86(134) 26 is correct (cf. “The Hypostasis of the Archons 364f and 397,” i.e. [αναθηματα nαei] “I have sent these” then the introduction of the first person singular in 91(144) 13 is not so startling and can be considered as merely a parenthetical remark of the composer. Secondly, it is difficult to separate the story concerning Noah from that concerning Eleleth, since the mountain (Mt. Sefi) 92(140) 14 functions as the customary site for a revelation in the literary genre of a revelation discourse. Perhaps, then, to account for this achievement by the composer, future analysis should focus on the possibility that the author is not so much exasperking written documents as using material which is well known to him and which he is summarizing either from written sources or from memory.

the full literary analysis of the text is necessary before the issue can be resolved.

A final introductory question with regard to NatArch is that of the gnostic school to which the document belongs. Scholars early noted the relationship of NatArch with the unnamed gnostics in Iren. *Adv. haer.* 1.30 and the sect called the Gnostics in Epiph. *Pan.* 26. On the basis of the title, Dorese then proposed that NatArch belonged to the Archontics of Epiph. *Pan.* 40.14 Puech, however, suggested the Gnostics of Epiph. *Pan.* 26 because of the reference there to the book *Norea.*15 Schenke, Jonas and Wilson considered the tractate as Barbelognostic because of the reference to *Norea,* Samael and Eleleth.16 Bullard proposed that the first part stemmed from the Ophites, because of its relationship with Iren. *Adv. haer.* 1.30, and that the second part was influenced by Valentinianism.17 Layton has assigned the document to the Sethians while Krause has left the question open until a full assessment of the relations of NatArch with other gnostic documents and the reports of the Father.18 Even more necessary before a final answer, however, is a reassessment of our customary division of gnostics into sects.19

OnOrgWld is a treatise20 or, more precisely, a tract,21 which claims to be written against the views of both the gods of the world and men in order to defend the thesis that before chaos something did in fact exist, namely, the light (97[145]:240). OnOrgWld contains a gnostic interpretation of Genesis but only up to the expulsion from paradise and has no revelation discourse. With regard to the introduc-

---

20 The edition of OnOrgWld is A. Böhlöö and P. Luhb, *Die koptisch-gnostische Schrift ohne Titel aus Codex II von Nag Hammadi* (Berlin 1962); the translation is mine.
tory questions, the source of its provenance is not definitely known. Its date is not certain, although its citation of other gnostic writings and its developed mythology would suggest a later date; however, its mythology is less overgrown and therefore its date is probably earlier than *Petit Sophia*. In reference to literary unity, Böhlig has argued that two sources, characterized respectively by their use of *exousiai* and *archontes*, have been used by a redactor; he has also portrayed OrOrgWd as a compilation. The separation into sources by means of these different terms, however, appears to be unsuccessful, since it is established on too narrow a base; our own study and the study of M. Tardieu would also indicate the need to consider redaction and purposeful integration as well as mere compilation on the part of the composer. Finally, while Schenke and Jonas have attributed the document to the Barbelognostes, Pouc'h has ascribed it to the Ophites and Tardieu has cautiously attributed it to the Archontics. Böhlig, on the other hand, while recognizing the affinities with the Ophites, has wisely refrained from assigning the document to any one school, because of its composite nature. Again, until our categories for division into gnostic sects are more firmly established, it is more appropriate merely to note the relations of the documents to the various sects rather than to assign it to one particular sect.

Both of the writings are cosmogenic works and so they follow a pattern, which is familiar in other gnostic pieces. First, Wisdom

---

22 Cf. Böhlig, *Die koptisch-gnostische Schrift ohne Titel*, 31ff, who suggests Euse* as the place but acknowledges the uncertainty in this matter.
29 Böhlig, *Die koptisch-gnostische Schrift ohne Titel*, 35.
30 Cf. G. MacRae, *Some Elements of Jewish Apocalyptic and Mystical Tradition and Their Relation to Gnostic Literature* (Ph. D. diss., Cambridge University, 1966), 81-84.
31 In translating the term as Wisdom rather than transliterating as Sophia, we follow a suggestion of B. Layton. Although such is a departure from present scholarly convention, it commends itself for the following reasons. The term "Sophia" is obviously not a loan-word or foreign word when the document is written in Greek (cf. *Achamoth*, on the other hand). Secondly, transliteration can impede us from communicating that which may be helpful in interpretation (cf. the connotation of a lack of continuity in speaking
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...she wanted to fashion a product by herself without her partner (NatArch 94[142]5-7) or an image flowed out of Faith-Wisdom, which willed and became a work (OnOrgWld 98[146]13-16). Secondly, from the work of Wisdom there came into being matter and the Demiurge (NatArch 94[142]10ff//OnOrgWld 98[146]28-99[147]1: 99[147]17-22; 100[148]1-10). Thirdly, the demiurge arrogantly asserts that he is the only God (NatArch 94[142]21ff//OnOrgWld 100[148]29-34; 103[151]11-13; 108[156]1f). And lastly, there is a repentance; in both of these works and only in these works it is the repentance of Sabaoth rather than Wisdom (NatArch 95[143]13ff//OnOrgWld 104[152]26ff).

That the two documents are closely related has already been noted by their respective editors in their commentaries. They contain points of contact not only in their cosmogonic elements (especially the accounts of Sabaoth, as we shall see) but also in their presentation of the creation of earthly man, the fall of Adam and Eve, their expulsion from paradise, and even the final reintegration into the light. The works are so close that Bullard has called for an examination of the exact relationship of the two works to one another.32

B. The Sabaoth Accounts

Our concern in this study is with the parallel Sabaoth accounts in these documents, i.e. NatArch 95(143)13-96(144)3//OnOrgWld 103 (151)32-106(154)19. As the son of the Demiurge faldaboath, Sabaoth repents of his father’s blasphemy, is snatched up into the heavens, instructed and given a name; whereupon he builds a chariot for himself (and dwelling place and throne in OnOrgWld) and creates angels before him. Then there follows a separation into right and left by which the forms or prototypes of life (or justice) and injustice are established. In NatArch the account forms a distinct pericope within the cosmogonic myth. Similarly, in OnOrgWld the Sabaoth account is such a distinct pericope that Böhtling in his edition has proposed that it is an interpolation.33

32 Bullard, The Hypostasis of the Archons, 115.
33 Böhtling, Die kopernikus-scholastische Schriften ohne Titel, 50.
In this study, we shall examine in the first chapter the relationship between these two accounts. By a detailed, synoptic comparison we shall demonstrate that both accounts draw upon the same tradition, that the additional features in OnOrgWld are redactional elements, and that thus the account in NatArch represents the typologically earlier form.

In our second chapter, we shall analyze the Sabaot account in NatArch. In this analysis, our concern will be to show that the Sabaot account derives from Judaism (mainly from Apocalyptic Judaism). Since J. Magne has proposed that Phil 2:6-11 and the NT in general, especially the passages on the enthronement of Christ (e.g. Acts 2:32-36; Eph 1:18-21; 4:7-16; Col 1:15-20) have drawn upon and been deeply influenced by the Sabaot account in NatArch, we shall consider the relationship of the Sabaot account to the NT and show that it has neither influenced nor been influenced by the NT. Our further concern will be to exegete the passage. In our exegesis, we shall utilize the principles of tradition-criticism and conclude that the Sabaot account draws upon two Jewish traditions: heavenly enthronement and the ascent of the apocalyptic visionary to see the divine chariot and/or throne. We shall then propose that the Sabaot account functions to justify the worth of certain parts of the OT and to evaluate more positively than some other gnostics in the late second century the God of the OT and the Jewish people. We shall also reflect upon the political consequences of maintaining that the ruler of this world is the son of an evil Demiurge. In order

---

34 J. Magne, La naissance de Jésus-Christ, L'Évaluation de Sabaot dans Hypostases des Archontes 143, 1-31 et l'Évaluation de Jésus dans Philippiens 2, 6-11 (Cahiers du cercle Ernest-Renan, No 83; Paris 1973) especially 23-48. Magne has proposed that NatArch presents a partial rehabilitation of the God of the OT (Kyrios Sabaot) under the name Sabaot and Phil 2 a later, complete rehabilitation under the name Kyrios. While his proposal of a non-Christian Sabaot account is theoretically possible, it is not shown to be historically probable. His study as a whole suffers from lack of proper, tradition-critical methodology and from working only with general patterns.

35 By a tradition, we understand a recurrent sequence of motifs. The methodology of tradition-criticism then is to identify and trace a tradition by establishing a relationship among literary units on the basis of content, form, context, and function. Within content are included terminology (i.e. vocabulary, names, titles, specific terms), motifs (also particular combinations of motifs), and the patterns of the motifs. There is also a wider designation of the term tradition in scholarly usage and in our usage, e.g. the wisdom tradition, or apocalyptic tradition, or Jewish tradition, which we understand to mean the “handing on” of related conceptual materials within continuous circles of people.
to confirm our view, we shall consider related gnostic literature and the theological issues raised within them.

In our third chapter, we shall examine the Sabaoth account in OnOrgWd. Here we shall demonstrate that this Sabaoth account is more developed but uses the same Jewish traditions of heavenly enthronement and ascent of the visionary to the divine chariot and/or throne. Further, we shall show that this account—contrary to Böhlig—is not just an interpolation but a carefully redacted piece, which suits the author's purpose. We shall conclude that in accord with influence from Valentinianism the Sabaoth account serves in this document an anthropological function, i.e. to represent a particular class of men, rather than a theological function, and probably dates from the first half of the third century. By his heavenly enthronement, Sabaoth is validated as divinely appointed ruler, but only of the psychic class of men. Since the psychic class of men form the Christian church, we shall see that Sabaoth's enthronement in the seventh heaven has ecclesiological as well as political implications. We shall again investigate possible relations of this Sabaoth account with the NT. Lastly, we shall consider whether the specific tradition of these Sabaoth accounts is found in other gnostic documents, since such an analysis can be of assistance not only in understanding these Sabaoth accounts but also in tracing the development of this particular tradition and in classifying into groups in a preliminary way the literature of Gnosticism.
CHAPTER TWO

THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE TWO ACCOUNTS:
A COMMON TRADITION

A. A COMMON TRADITION

Before analyzing in detail the individual pericopes, it is appropriate to consider the relationship between the accounts as wholes in these documents. As we have previously remarked, the parallels between the accounts indicate that there is a relationship. Specifically, the Sabaoth accounts in NatArch and OnOrgWld share the same tradition. The data, however, are insufficient to determine whether this tradition consisted of oral or written elements or a combination thereof. The conclusion that a common tradition is being used, though, is justified first of all because of the identity of topic considered in both accounts, namely, Sabaoth. Although the conception of Sabaoth as one of the offspring of the Demurge is familiar in gnostic thought (e.g. Iren. Adv. haer. 1, 30), the conception of Sabaoth as enthroned above him is not.

This conclusion is further justified because the structure or sequence in the accounts is the same. It appears as follows:

1. the repentance of Sabaoth 95(143), 13-16; 100(151), 32-34; 104(152), 6
2. the ascent and enthronement of Sabaoth 95(143), 19-25; 104(152), 6-31
3. creation of the throne/chariot of Sabaoth 95(143), 26-28; 104(152), 31-34; 105(153), 16
4. creation of the angels 95(143), 28-31; 105(153), 16-106(154), 3
5. the instruction of Sabaoth 95(143), 31-34; 104(152), 30-31 and 106(154), 3-11
6. the separation into right and left 95(143), 34-36; 104(154), 11-19

There are two minor elements, which disturb this identity of sequence. First, the giving of a name of Sabaoth appears in NatArch as part of section "2", the ascent and enthronement, whereas in OnOrgWld it appears within "1" the repentance of Sabaoth. Second, section "5" the instruction of Sabaoth is reduplicated in OnOrgWld; it appears once within the enthronement of Sabaoth and then again later at the point corresponding to NatArch. It will be argued shortly that within OnOrgWld the giving of a name to Sabaoth and the first occurrence of the instruction of Sabaoth can be explained as intentional alterations.
on the part of the redactor. If such be true, these minor differences in sequence would not militate against the use of the same tradition but would rather presuppose it. The second occurrence of the instruction of Sabaoth, it will be then argued, is another piece of tradition introduced by the redactor into the account.

The conclusion that the same tradition is being used in both documents is also justified by the verbal identity between the two accounts, an identity which is visible even in the Coptic, although both documents are probably translations from the Greek. Some sixty words of the account in NatArch—and therefore approximately 50% of its account—are shared by OnOrgWld. Since OnOrgWld is a longer account, these same sixty words represent only approximately 14% of its total. The following synopsis shows clearly the amount of detail that is common to both accounts (underscored in unbroken lines are elements that are identical and in broken lines are elements that are common but exhibit a different form or position within the account).
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---

1 C. Nagel, Das Wesen der Acharmen, 15ff und Böhlup, Die koptisch-gnostische Schrift ohne Titel, 17.
3) Creation of the Throne/Chariot of Abaddon

(152.31-105(153).16)

GOS EUNTAH DE NOUSOUSA

32 ADATHMAI NAH NOUSOUSA NAH
33 NAH NOUSOUSA NAH NOUSOUSA NAH
34 [TOUS] NAH NOUSOUSA NAH NOUSOUSA NAH
35 NAH NOUSOUSA NAH NOUSOUSA NAH

5) NAH NOUSOUSA NAH NOUSOUSA NAH
10 NOUSOUSA NAH NOUSOUSA NAH NOUSOUSA NAH
15 NOUSOUSA NAH NOUSOUSA NAH NOUSOUSA NAH


GOS EUNTAH
17 NAH NOUSOUSA NAH NOUSOUSA NAH
5) The Instruction of Sabaoth—95(143).31-34/104(152).26-31 and 106 (154).3-11

When one extracts from the two accounts the common elements, one can see clearly the amount of shared tradition. The following presents the wording common to both accounts but follows the order of NatArch. Understood in broken lines are words which although common, are not identical either in their placement within the narrative or their form.

From this identity of topic (Sabaoth), identity of sequence and identity of wording, one can conclude to the use of a common tradition. On the other hand, the lack of more extensive and more continuous verbal identity and the greater length and detail of OnOrgWid prevent one from concluding to literary dependence of OnOrgWid on NatArch or vice versa.
B. Possible Identifications of the Common Tradition

At this point we must consider the possibility that the common tradition behind NatArch and OnOrgWld is part of the book entitled Nora, which is referred to by Epiphanius. In his Panarion 26.1.3-9,² Epiphanius speaks of this book Nora and presents the story connected with this mythological figure Nora. Because of the impressive list of parallels between the contents of NatArch and the story of Nora, scholars have been divided in their assessment of the relationship between NatArch and this book entitled Nora:

1) Porch considered them identical.¹
2) Dorese considered much of NatArch as an abridgement of this book Nora.²
3) Schenke denied the identity between the two.³
4) Bohlig denied the identity between the two and suggested that NatArch knew this book Nora and/or its traditions but that it was impossible to decide whether the source of NatArch and this book Nora were exactly the same.⁴
5) Bullard suggested that the revelation section of NatArch was once "an independent Revelation of Nora, but that it was not the same as that referred to by UW (OnOrgWld) or by Epiphanius."⁵

Surely Bohlig is right in denying that the present form of NatArch can be said to be identical with the Nora in Epiphanius. In his reference to this book Nora, Epiphanius merely relates the myth associated with the person of Nora. He does not indicate the genre, the limits or necessarily the full contents of this book.⁶ Thus, it is impossible to say whether or not this Nora mentioned by Epiphanius contained a gnostic reinterpretation of Genesis, as the first half of NatArch does. If with Bullard one considers the possibility that the latter half of NatArch, the revelation section, is identical with Nora, the parallels are indeed striking. The following are the details mentioned by Epiphanius and found in NatArch 92(140),3-18:

1) Nora is the wife of Noah.
2) She fights against the Ruler, the creator of the world.

¹ Ed. K. Holl 1 (GCS 25, Leipzig 1915) 27f.
⁵ Bohlig, Die Gnostischie Schriften ohne Titel, M1.
⁶ Bullard, The Hypostasis of the Archons, 103.
⁷ I am grateful to B. Linton for calling this point to my attention.
3) Her husband, Noah, obeys the Ruler.
4) She reveals the existence of the powers above.
5) The creator seeks to destroy her in the flood.
6) She is not allowed to enter the Ark.
7) She burns the Ark three times (only two are recounted in NatArch).
8) Noah must rebuild it.

However, there are also differences in the source of Epiphanius, which must be noted:

1) Barbele is the name of the mother above rather than Wisdom.
2) There is no mention of the repentance, ascent and enthronement of Sabaoth, the offspring of Ildabaoth.
3) Noreia teaches that what has been stripped from Barbele, the mother above, must be regathered from the rulers. This motif is missing in NatArch.

Thus, it is clear that the revelation section of NatArch, even if it existed as an independent Revelation of Noreia, is not the same as Noreia in Epiphanius. Rather, one would have to say that both the Revelation of Noreia and the book Norea in Epiphanius stem from the same stream of gnostic tradition. Thus also, for the purposes of our own concern here, the Sabaoth account in NatArch and OnOrgWld is not a part of the Norea referred to in Epiphanius.

A final possibility that we must consider here is that the common tradition about Sabaoth behind NatArch and OnOrgWld is part of the First Book of Norea or the First Logos of Norea, referred to in OnOrgWld 102(150),10f. and 24f. First, as Böhlig has suggested, these references are well taken as applied to the same piece. Second, neither NatArch nor any of its parts is this First Book or Logos of Norea, since the further and more exact knowledge concerning the names and occupants of the seven heavens, supposed to be found in it, is not in NatArch. Third, it appears more probable that this First Book or Logos of Norea is not identical with NatArch or its parts but uses the same tradition. Thus, again, the First Book or Logos of Norea cannot be proved to be the written source behind the common tradition concerning Sabaoth in NatArch and OnOrgWld.

C. The Earlier Stage of the Tradition

If the two accounts derive from the same tradition, a further question is raised. Which account reflects a stage in the tradition?

*Böhlig, Die kompil.-gnostische Schrift ohne Titel, 32.
which is historically earlier? The mere observation that OnOrgWld is longer and fuller by no means establishes it as later. In the following pages it will be argued that OnOrgWld represents the later stage since its account contains internal contradictions and variations which can be identified as redactional elements. NatArch, on the other hand, presents a simpler, more consistent account in which the variations from OnOrgWld cannot be identified as redactional elements and therefore represents an earlier stage of the tradition.

As we begin our detailed analysis of the various sections, we turn first to the section on the repentance of Sabaoth. According to NatArch 95(143).14f it is "the strength of that angel" which prompted the repentance of Sabaoth, whereas in OnOrgWld 103(151).33f it is "the voice of Faith." This phrase in OnOrgWld exhibits secondary elements of the author and therefore represents the later stage of the tradition. Sophia, a single designation, had been the name of the OT hypostasis of Wisdom since the LXX translation (e.g. 1ov 8:22-31; Sir 24:1-7; Wis 8:20f). Through association with πίστις, although the reason for that association is as yet unclear, Wisdom received a double name Faith-Wisdom, e.g. in NatArch 87(135).7-8; 94(142).5-6; 95(143).6. The origin of the name is still remembered in the formula "Wisdom, she who is called Faith" which occurs in NatArch 94(142).5-6; Eug CG III.3: 82.5-6; and SJc BG 890: 103.7-9. In OnOrgWld, on the other hand, the origin has been forgotten so that the formula is inverted to "Faith, she who is called Wisdom" (98[146].13-14) and Faith alone can function as the name, as here (cf. also 99[147].2 etc.). NatArch, on the other hand, does not use the title Faith alone.

The "voice" of Faith is also redactional since it refers to the previous utterance of Faith concerning the immortal Light-Man, who is a major element in the author's own theology (103[151].15-28; cf. 104[152].2-3). To demonstrate this, we must first discuss the motif of light—and its opposite, darkness—in the treatise as a whole. This contrast between light and darkness expresses the basic dualism of the author's theology. In enunciating its central theme, the treatise has argued that something did exist before chaos (97[145].24ff). If one will grant the author that chaos is darkness and therefore a shadow, he believes that he can prove that the light existed previously (98[146].23-27):

the Aeon (διαίνω) of truth has no shadow within, for

---

16 Cf. Gad 3 for the hypostatization of Faith
the light (οὐδείς) which has no measure
is throughout it. Its outside
is shadow. It is called darkness (κακέ).

This theme, then, of the contrast between light and darkness pervades
the text. The term “light” (οὐδείς) occurs 41 times and “darkness”
(κακέ) 17 times in the text. Within the Sabaoth account alone light
occurs 6 times (and once more in the phrase “to receive light,” ἧν
οὐδείς) and darkness twice. On the other hand, in NatArch the
basic contrast is not between light and darkness. The realm above
the veil is termed imperishability (τὸ ἡμέρας) rather than light—e.g.
94(142):4f.11 That which is below the veil is termed more frequently
matter (δύναμιν) than darkness—e.g. 94(142):4-12. Naturally enough,
though, such a familiar contrast as light versus darkness is presupposed
and does occur, e.g. 94(142):30-34. The motif of light occurs 7 times
and that of darkness 4 times—but note that in 3 of the 4 instances
the term appears in the phrase “the authorities or rulers of darkness”
rather than in contradistinction to the light: 86(134):22; 87(135):14;
92(140):23; and 94(142):33. However, neither term occurs in the Sabaoth
account of NatArch.

One further illustration may show that the theme of light vs. dark-
ness is part of the author’s own theology and contribution to his
treatise. This illustration derives from the pericope concerning the
tree of the knowledge of good and evil in NatArch and OnOrgWld.
NatArch draws upon the biblical texts (Gen 2:17; 3:15, 22) and
speaks of the tree of knowledge of good and evil at 88(136):26-30
and inverts the order to evil and good at 90(138):1,10. Similarly,
OnOrgWld at 119(167):2-4 maintains the inversion and speaks about
knowing the difference between evil and good men. But at 120(168):
26-29 OnOrgWld diverges from both the biblical text and NatArch
to state that Adam knows the difference between “light and darkness.”

In addition to and related to the importance of light for the
author of OnOrgWld is the importance of the immortal Light-Man.
Faith in OnOrgWld 103(151):19-28 in her response to the blasphemy
of the Demiurge proclaims that this Light-Man will appear in his
fashioning and trample upon him.12 Sabaoth praises Faith that she

11 CT also 87(135):1, 2, 12, 20; 90(136):18; 93(141):29; 94(142):5. Even in 96(144):22
where the light occurs, it is the imperishable light and the light is opposed to matter
rather than darkness (90(141):19f).
12 A further indication that this pericope derives from the hand of the redactor is the
occurrence of the term onaiλειν to indicate the end of time. It occurs frequently.
has instructed him about this immortal Light-Man (104[152].1-3). Later that light does come from the Eighth, with the form of a man in it, and that angel is henceforth called the Light-Adam (108[156].2-22). After revealing himself upon the earth, the Light-Adam returns toward the light (111[159].29-112[160].1) but is unable to enter the Eighth because of the fault with which his light has been mixed. Therefore, he builds a great Aeon which is in a boundless region between the Eighth and chaos (112[160].10-22), i.e. the middle. In addition to this Light-Adam, the author distinguishes the psychic and choric Adams (117[165].28-36). Then, in accord with this description of the three Adams, for the author there are also three kinds of men and their races until the end of the world: the pneumatic of the Aeon, the psychic and the earthly (122[170].6-9). All souls are at first captured and enclosed in the bonds of matter (114[162].14ff). It is the light of gnosis, however, which makes one aware of the true situation (119[167].12-15). To complete his light theology, the author then adds that at the end of time the light will return to its root (127[175].4ff) and the perfect ones will go to the unbegotten (127[175].5ff). Thus, the “voice” of Faith is reductional in this pericope, since it alludes to this theology of the immortal Light-Man, which is characteristic of the redactor’s own theology.

Within this section on the repentance of Sabbath the repetitive statement concerning “the condemnation of hate” of the father” in OnOrgWild is also a later stage of the tradition. In NatArch (95[143].15ff) the condemnation of the father is mentioned only once, and the father is simply to be identified as Sabbath (95[143].2ff). OnOrgWild (103[151].35) uses the exact same terms (καταγενέσθαι and πενειοῦν), and the father is probably to be identified here as well as Sabbath (103[151].4; 102[150].11ff). The idea is repeated a few lines later (104[152].5ff) in a synonymous phrase (διακατάρπασα μετεχεῖον). It is to be noted that here the father is left unidentified and that what makes possible the condemnation of the father is the light from Faith-Wisdom (lines 3ff). Again the idea is repeated in the clause “he hated his father” (ἀγνότης πενειοῦν 104[152].10). The motif of light has also been recalled as the source of this hate (line 7).

throughout the work in this usage: ἐνεβλήθη (seven times: 110[158].13; 114[162].24; 122[169].26ff; 122[170].6ff; 123[171].30; 123[172].32; τοῦτο τοῦ θεοῦ ἐνέβληθη (122[170].7ff); τοῦτο τοῦ θεοῦ ἐνέβληθη (110[151].29); τοῦτο τοῦ θεοῦ ἐνέβληθη (117[165].11; 123[171].19); and τοῦτο τοῦ θεοῦ ἐνέβληθη (110[154].10).
and here the father is identified as darkness. As the previous discussion would indicate, the contrast between light and darkness suggests redactional expansion. Thereby, the repetition of the condemnation of the father can be understood—to incorporate the earlier tradition and at the same time to articulate the redactor's own dualistic contrast.

In the section concerning the ascent and enthronement of Sabaoth there are also several indications that NatArch represents the earlier stage of the tradition. In NatArch 95[143].22-24 Sabaoth receives a name "God of the Forces" as part of his enthronement and after he has been placed in charge of the seventh heaven. In OnOrgWld (105[152].3-10) Sabaoth receives his name "Lord of the Forces" prior to his ascent. The giving of the name appears to be more appropriate after the installation and as part of the enthronement (cf. Phil 2:6-10). Also, it is again the light from Faith-Wisdom, which gives him the great authority over the powers of chaos, which is thus the cause of his name, and which enables him to hate his father, the darkness. Since the redactional element of light versus darkness is present in the motif, it seems more probable that NatArch has preserved the earlier order. Thirdly, in our later discussion we shall see that the odd formulation "God of the Forces" is purposely constructed in NatArch in order to serve the original function of the Sabaoth account, i.e. Sabaoth is to be the God of the OT, a lower God beneath the transcendent God of the Eighth. OnOrgWld, on the other hand, has lost sight of this original function and thus returned to the customary name "Lord of the Forces."

The discrepancy over who "catch up" Sabaoth also provides an insight into the earlier stage of the tradition. NatArch 95[143].19f provides—quite consistently with the context—that Wisdom and Life catch him up. In OnOrgWld 104(152).17-21, on the other hand, Wisdom sends seven archangels, who have not been previously mentioned, to catch up Sabaoth. This sudden introduction of the seven archangels intrudes in the narrative; also since the seven archangels are necessary in another passage of the work (105[153].10-16) to reach the number of the seventy-two languages and gods, they appear as part of the interest of the author and thus as redactional elements in this passage. Another indication that the seven archangels derive from the redactor's hand is the presence of the motif of light. It is because of the light, which Sabaoth has, that the powers of chaos make war; and then it is because of the war that Faith-Wisdom from her light sends the seven archangels.
The pericope in OnOrgWld 104(152).22-26 concerning the three further archangels, who are sent to Sabaoth that he might be over the twelve gods of chaos, also represents the redactor’s contribution. First, it is not clear why these three other archangels are then sent to Sabaoth; the figure may be a remnant of other calculations.13 But, just as the seven previous archangels may be attributed to the redactor, so the inclusion of these further archangels is appropriately ascribed to the redactor. Secondly, the motif that Sabaoth has the “kingdom” occurs not only here (line 23) but also in another passage (106[154].9-11), which we shall identify as redactional.

One final pericope in this section concerning the ascent and enthronement of Sabaoth indicates that OnOrgWld represents the later stage of the tradition. At this point in the narrative, OnOrgWld 104(152).28-31 has Faith give her daughter Life to Sabaoth in order to instruct him concerning things in the Eighth. In similar wording (τετελεσθή ημίθυμα ... τοῦ άνευσον ... καὶ τὰ θάρσμονε) NatArch 9(143).31-34 places this incident after the creation of the throne/chariot. There are two signs of redactional elements in OnOrgWld—the name Faith alone (cf. above) and the phrase “with a great authority” (line 29). The phrase occurs in connection with the motif of the light, and the authority itself is derived from the light in 104(152).4-8—again a sign of the redactor’s hand. It is the authority then which is emphasized as the source of Sabaoth’s ability to create his throne, chariot and other accoutrements (104[152].31). The instruction concerning the Eighth is later alluded to in the angelic church, which is “like the church in the Eighth” (105[153].20-23). If in fact the placement of the instruction of Sabaoth in OnOrgWld is due to the redactor, he accomplishes two things. He explains the source of Sabaoth’s creative capacity; but by specifically directing Sabaoth’s authority and knowledge to this ability, he also softens the importance of that knowledge for men. In discussing the function of the Sabaoth accounts, we shall see more completely the significance of that change. Briefly, in NatArch the instruction of Sabaoth concerning what exist in the Eighth serves to insure that the God of the OT has communicated some worthwhile revelation in the books of the OT; in OnOrgWld,

13 Cf. Apocryphal BG 39.10-19 and CG III, 1: 16.8-11 in which each authority under Ialdabaoth has seven angels and three powers of fours. In the BG version the number of angels is then given as 360, although the exact number of tabulations is not clear.
on the other hand, this function is bypassed and Sabaoth serves as
king over all below him and as the type of the psychic class of men.

The section on the throne of Sabaoth in OnOrgWld is obviously
longer. Use of the motif of the seven archangels here and also in
104[152].19f indicates that the section is an expansion of what is
found in NatArch rather than that NatArch is a contraction of what
is found in OnOrgWld.

In the section on the creation of the angels, OnOrgWld presents a
fuller account with its reference first to the creation of Seraphim
and then to the creation of the angelic church. There is no clear sign
that the material on the Seraphim is a redactional addition to the
earlier tradition. However, in the material on the creation of the
angelic church there is one indication that OnOrgWld represents the
later stage of the tradition. In NatArch 95[143].29-30 the angels are
said to "minister" to Sabaoth (ἐπιστήμων). The term occurs only once
in NatArch and therefore does not appear to be redactional. This
same term occurs elsewhere in OnOrgWld at 102[150].23 and 123
(171).7, where Ialdabaoth is the recipient of the service, but in the
parallel passage on the creation of the angels the expression is "to give
him glory" (τι εὐδοκούν). The presence of this expression in the passage
previously identified as reflecting the author's own theology (104
[152].1-3 "he gave her glory for she instructed them about the immortal
Man and his light") and its frequency throughout the work suggest
that it is a part of the redactor's material.14

Also within this section on the creation of the angels in OnOrgWld,
the pericope concerning the creation of Jesus Christ (105[153].25-33)
appears as part of the redactor's contribution. It is not necessary to
the context. Rather, introduction of the right/left schema with Christ
and the Holy Spirit overloads the scene and appears as a later develop-
ment based on the righteousness or life/unrighteousness set. Elsewhere
in the treatise the author refers to Christ (114[162].17) or the Savior
(124[172].33) and alludes to the NT (125[173].14-19). Also, of course,
there is no creation of Jesus Christ at this point in NatArch.

As we previously suggested, NatArch 95[143].31-34 preserves the
earlier placement in the tradition of the section on the instruction of

---

14 It is not possible, however, to separate (σημείως) as preserved for Ialdabaoth
and τι εὐδοκούν as preserved for figures associated with the light. To be sure, Faith at
104[152].1, Sabaoth at 104[153].19, 31 and 106[154].1, 2, and Adam after he has received
a breath from Wisdom-life at 115[163].23 are given glory. But Ialdabaoth can also
be said to "receive glory" as at 104[151].5, 8; cf. 120[168].33ff.
Sabaoth, as opposed to the first report of it in OnOrgWld 104(152)26-31. The second report in OnOrgWld 106 (154)3-11 then appears as another piece of tradition, which the redactor has incorporated into his text. First of all, the pericope is obviously a reduplication. Secondly, it contradicts the preceding report in that the former states that Life was given to Sabaoth to instruct him, while this latter pericope introduces the motif of the cloud and states that no one was within the cloud with him except Faith-Wisdom, whose role was to instruct him. Thirdly, it contradicts the following pericope as well, which states that rather than being alone, Sabaoth also has Ialdabaath beside him. Fourthly, only in this pericope is the title rendered as Wisdom-Faith rather than Faith-Wisdom. This is particularly strange in a work where the title has been explained as “Faith, she who is called Wisdom” (98[146]14) rather than the customarily opposite—as we have previously discussed. Thus, the pericope is clearly an extra piece of tradition that interrupts the context. However, the pericope is also manifestly the work of the redactor rather than a later interpolator. The second purpose clause—“so that the kingdom might remain for him until the consummation (συντέλωσα) of the heavens of the chaos and their powers”—betrays the theological concern and the terminological usage of the author in the term συντέλωσα. Thus, at least this second purpose clause stems from the hand of the redactor.

In the final section concerning the separation into right and left, NatArch 95(143)31-34 again exhibits the earlier stage of the tradition. It is consistent with the preceding account that Life and the angel that cast Ialdabaath into Tartarus are seated at the right and left. The right was then called Life and the left became a type of unrighteousness. On the other hand, OnOrgWld 106(154)11-18 begins with a contradiction. Faith-Wisdom is said to separate Sabaoth from the darkness (line 11f), although he has previously already been snatched up by the seven archangels (104[152]19-21). One notes also in the phrase “from the darkness” the hand of the redactor. Thirdly, introduction of the motif of righteousness appears as a slight interruption in the narrative since it has not been previously mentioned. Further, the term is significant for the author of OnOrgWld, since the righteousness is later said to fashion Paradise (110[158]2-13) within which grows the olive tree which will cleanse the kings and high priests of righteousness (111[159]2ff).

---

15 CI supra, p. 12
In conclusion, then, NatArch exhibits the earlier form of the tradition, which is common to it and to OnOrgWld. In the two interruptions in sequence—the giving of the name and the instruction of Sabaoth—NatArch preserves the earlier form. OnOrgWld, on the other hand, shows clearly a greater number of internal contradictions and redactional touches and thus must be deemed the later form of the tradition. In the following chapters, then, we shall exegete first the Sabaoth account in NatArch and then that in OnOrgWld in order to understand more precisely the motifs which are used, the traditions which are drawn upon, and the functions which are assigned to these Sabaoth accounts.
CHAPTER THREE
THE SABAOTH ACCOUNT IN NATARCH
A. EXEGESIS

In NatArch the Sabaoth account is set within the revelation discourse of the Angel Eleleth to Noreia. The discourse itself follows the pattern: 1

1) a mountain is the scene of the revelation 92(140).14
2) the appearance of the revealing angel from heaven 93(141).2-3
3) his self-presentation 93(141).6-10, 19
4) the revelations occur mainly in question and answer form 93(141).32ff

In response to the request of Noreia that he teach her about the authorities—their capacity, their matter, and their creator—he reveals the myth of Wisdom (94[142].4ff). Imperishability exists above in the infinite abyss. Ultimately, because Wisdom desired to fashion a product alone, there came forth a shadow which became matter. From this matter the Demiurge took shape. For his blasphemy the Demiurge Ialdabaoth is at first rebuked by a voice from above (94[142].23ff). He then builds a great aion and begets seven offspring (94[142].34ff). Because of his second blasphemy, he is cast into Tartarus (95[143].4ff). The Sabaoth account then follows, after which Ialdabaoth begets envy and thereby enables all of the heavens of chaos to be filled (96[144].3ff). Then the angel Eleleth responds to questions of Noreia as to whether she belongs to matter and how long a time must pass (96[144].17ff).

Within this discourse and within the presentation of the myth itself, the Sabaoth account forms a distinct unit. Since Sabaoth is presented as a child of Ialdabaoth, this unit is tied with what precedes it; and yet the focus of interest is now different—Sabaoth rather than Ialdabaoth. The unit closes when Ialdabaoth returns as the center of interest in 96(144)3.

1 In this particular revelation discourse, the revelation is not accompanied by signs of typology nor is there a curse formula at the end, as one might expect if the description of the pattern by H. Koester in H. Koester and J. M. Robinson, Trajectories Through Early Christianity (Philadelphia 1971) 194-95.
1. The Repentance of Sabaoth 95(143).13-18

Now (66) when his offspring
Sabaoth saw the force (δυναμις) of
that angel (αρχιερεας) he repented (περισσευσας) and
condemned (καταβαφθεις) his father, and his
mother.

Praise and thanksgiving to God and his daughter
Wisdom (μοιρα) and her daughter Life (ζωή).

The particle ἀν links this new section with the preceding material. Sabaoth is here presented as one of the seven offspring of Ildabaho (95[143].2-3, 11), who represent the seven planets of astrology. Unlike OrOrgWild 101(149).2ff and Iren. Adv. haer. 1.30, the names of the other offspring are not given. Although there is no hint within this section itself that Sabaoth is androgynous, all of the offspring have previously been identified as such (95[143].3). In the clause, "when he saw the strength of that angel," the author then refers to the previously related punishment of Ildabaho (lines 10-13) as the motive for the repentance of Sabaoth.

In this pericope as well as in the tractate as a whole, Ildabaho emerges from the constellation of three figures: that of the God of the OT, the leader of the fallen angels and the god ʿĔlām. First of all, Ildabaho is clearly identified as the God of the OT. In his mouth there is placed the claim of Yahweh to be the only God, a claim found in Deut 4:35 and 32:39 and frequently in 2 Isa (e.g. 43:10f; 44:6; 45:5f; 18, 21f; 46:9; cf. also Exod 20:5 and Joel 2:27). Here the claim is considered as blasphemy and bespeaks the devaluation of that OT God.

Secondly, Ildabaho is also clearly identified as the leader of the fallen angels. He is called Samael (94[142].25), a name which is given to one of the fallen angels and/or their leader in the intertestamental literature and the Targumim (e.g. as the angel of death in TargPs-Jon on Gen 3:5; as a tempter in Mart Isa 1:8, 11f; 2:1ff; and as the equal to Satan in Asc Isa 2:1 and 3 Bar 4:8). Further, motifs that are

---

2. This same description is given to God at Qumran IQS 11:18; IQH 7:32; 10:9; 12:10.
appropriate to the leader of the fallen angels are applied to him. His
sin, for example, is that of blasphemous rebellion (94(142),21ff and
95(143),4ff). In late Jewish tradition, the fall of the angels was originally
associated with Gen 6:1-4 and the בֵּיתָ אֱלֻא (v.1) who took to wife the
daughters of men; but their sin was that of lust for women and the
revelation of the heavenly secrets (1 Enoch 6:2; 9:6f). Subsequently,
because of influence from the tradition about Lucifer the sin was
considered as blasphemous rebellion. In its origin, the tradition about
Lucifer derives from that of Abtar of ancient Canaanite myth, who
attempted to fill the throne of Baal but was found inadequate and
therefore had to descend and rule in the underworld, just as the
morning star retreats before the rising sun.6 Isa 14:12-20 uses this
tradition in its taunt against the king of Babylon and brings out the
blasphemy in verse 14b: “I will make myself like the Most High”
(cf. Ezek 28).7 This same tradition is then applied to the rebellion of
the leader of the fallen angels in Vita Adae et Eva 15:2f, as Michael
speaks to the devil:

And Michael saith, “Worship the image of God but if thou wilt not
worship him, the Lord God will be wrath with thee.” And I said, “If
He be wrath with me, I will set my seat above the stars of heaven and
will be like the Highest.”8

Again this tradition occurs in 2 Enoch 29:4f (Rec. A):

And one from out of the order of angels, having turned away with the
order that was under him, conceived an impossible thought, to place his
throne higher than the clouds above the earth, that he might become
equal in rank to my power. And I threw him out from the height.9

It was but a short step for the gnostic then to change this rebellious
assertion from the claim to be equal to God to the claim to be the only
God. In particular, as the God of the OT was devalued, this step was

---

6 L. R. Clapham, Samhunmuth. The First Two Cycles (Ph.D. diss., Harvard Uni-

7 Clapham, Samhunmuth. 152f. The otherwise helpful articles of W. Förster are
delicient in that they do not take into account the Rau-Shamra material: G. von Rad
and W. Förster, haššmu; TDNT 2 (1964) 71-81. W. Förster, Untersuch.; TDNT 7 (1971)
51363.

14 (Munich 1878) 276. Translation from R. H. Charles, APOT 2, 137.

9 APOT 2, 247. In Apoc Ahr 14, 2 Enoch 7:1 (Rec. A), and 2 Enoch 18:3 the
motif of rebellion is present, but the blasphemous desire to be equal to or higher than
God is not present; in Asc Isa 4:1-8 Beliar uses the claim, which appears in the
mouth of Ialdabaoth in gnostic writings. Cf. also Bousset, Die Religion des Judentums,
335.
made easier by considering the Yahwistic claim "to be the only God" as the blasphemy itself.

In reference to the origin of Gnosticism, we note that this motif of the blasphemous rebellion of the leader of the fallen angels derives not from the OT but from later Judaism. Further, this motif cannot be said to have influenced or to have been derived from the NT, since it is lacking there.9

A further motif appropriate to the leader of the fallen angels is that he is "bound and cast into Tartarus" (95[143]:11ff). Frequently in the intertestamental literature, the leader of the fallen angels is portrayed as bound and cast into the abyss, e.g. 1 Enoch 88:1:

And I saw one of those four who had come forth first, and he seized that first star which had fallen from the heaven, and bound it hand and foot and cast it into an abyss.10

Bullard in his commentary has correctly noted that Tartarus in this context is somewhat strange.11 Usually, the fallen angels are kept in a place of internment (e.g. the desert in 1 Enoch 10:4 or the abyss in Jub 5:5f; 10:7-9; 1 Enoch 14:5; 88:3) and only at the end of time are they cast into the lower part of the abyss, the place of punishment (e.g. 1 Enoch 21:7-10; 90:24ff). However, the prior consignment of the fallen angels to Gehenna or Tartarus is not completely unattested. It occurs in the hymn of chapter 60 of Ps.-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum, a hymn which shows such close affinities to gnostic language (vv. 21):

There were darkness and silence before the world was, and the silence spoke, and the darkness became visible. And then was thy name created, even at the drawing together of that which was stretched out, whereof the upper was called heaven and the lower was called earth. And it was commanded to the upper that it should rain according to its season, and to the lower that it should bring forth food for man that should be made. And after that was the tribe of your spirits made. Now therefore, be not injurious, whereas thou are a second creation, but if not, then remember Hell (lit. be mindful of Tartaros) wherein thou wast dead. Or is it not enough for thee to hear that by that which resoundeth before thee I sing unto man? Or forgiest thou that out of a rebounding echo in the abyss (or chaos) thy creation was born?12

---

11 Bullard, The Hypostasis of the Archon, 106.
As a final motif, the motif that from him comes death is also appropriate to the leader of the fallen angels. As we previously mentioned, Samuel can also be considered as the angel of death. Of course, the difference is that in this gnostic text death is considered as an offspring of Ialdabaoth.

Lastly, the figure of Ialdabaoth arises from the tradition concerning the god 'Olam/Aion of ancient Canaanite theogonic myth. In a recent dissertation L. R. Clapham has demonstrated the reliability of the account of Sanchuniathon, translated by Philo Byblos and preserved in Eusebius’ Praeparatio evangelica 1.10, for reconstructing ancient Canaanite theogonic myth. He has been able to do so by an examination of new material—the Ras Shamra tablets, a newly-found Babylonian theogony, the Hitite myths, the Seferi treaty—as well as by a reconsideration of biblical material—Gen 1 and the theogonic witnesses to covenant lawsuits, e.g. Mic 6:2a.

In the ancient Canaanite myths there is to be distinguished first of all the theogonic myth from the cosmogonic myth. In the former the origin of the gods is presented and the myth is characterized by the language of procreation, by pairs whose names are abstract or natural opposites, and by gods whose abode is now the netherworld. They are the old gods, the dead gods, whose influence nevertheless is still felt in this world. In the latter type of myth the conflict or war is presented from which the victory of life and order comes. These are the younger or executive gods, whose cult is at present observed. Conflict among the gods can occur between the succeeding

14 L. R. Clapham, Sanchuniathon: The First Two Cycles.
17 J. A. Fitzmyer, The Aramaic Inscriptions of Sefer (Rome 1967). The three steles and the treaties upon them date from the 8th c. B.C.
generations in the theogony or between the younger gods and the old
gods—especially between the head of the younger gods and the old
gods. When the old gods are bound and cast into the netherworld, the
victory for the young gods and for life and order is achieved.

In Canaanite myth then one can reconstruct that the promontorial
pair consisted of the East Wind (Qedem) and Chaos (Bahat). From
the desire and union of East Wind with Chaos there resulted the
second pair *Olamu and *Olamtu, the masculine and feminine forms
of the epithet “Ancient” or “Eternal.” In Greek the term is translated
as Aion and can be seen, for example, in Euseb, Praep. evang. 1.10.7:

Then, he says, there was begotten of the wind Khoniu (khônia) and his
wife Baau (Bašn) (this, he explains, is Night) Aion.19

The final pair of the theogony then was Heaven and Earth. Thereupon
the cosmogenetic gods. El Dagon (Baal) and Ashhtaroth followed.

In this gnostic text the similarity in basic principles to the Canaanite
myth is striking. Wisdom takes the place of East Wind (94[142].5).
However, this is not surprising in the light of late Jewish presentation
of Wisdom as a spirit (e.g., Wis 1:6f; 7:22-24) and of gnostic excesses
of the ruāh of Gen 1, e.g. Apocryph BG 44:19-45:10:

Then the mother began (ἐξενεγήθη)
to move (ἐπεκενθήθη)
when she knew
her fault; that
her partner (μῖκρος) had not
agreed (ἐνυπποψιών) with her
when she was damaged (ψυγγειών)
in her fulness.

But (καὶ) I said, “Christ, what
is to move (ἐπεκενθήθη)”?

But (καὶ) he
laughed. He said, “Do you think
that it is as Moses said
‘over the waters?’ No!”20

19. Cf. Clapham, Sanchunianon, 80f for an analysis of this passage as well as
the translation. In these pages Clapham follows the suggestion of Albright that KOAM III
is a corruption of KOAM, the figure of Canaanite myth. Baau he then derives from
Bohu.

20. Text from W. C. Till, Der gnostischen Schriften des kopernischen Papyrus Berolinensis
8502 (TU 60; Berlin 1955) 128-31; cf. CG II, 1: 13.13-21; CG IV, 1: 20.29-21.8; in
CG III, 18 and 20, where this account would appropriately fall. Missing.
Cl. also the identification of Wisdom and the Spirit in the Barbelogonics in 1 Enoch
The second principle is the shadow, which became matter and equals chaos. Because of Wisdom’s will or desire, from that chaos comes Ialdabaoth (94:142.4-95:143.11).

As Clapham has pointed out, the name Ialdabaoth probably comes from two parts, *Iald and baath, which mean “son of chaos.” *Iald then would come from the root *yal with a frozen accusative ending upon it and *baath would come from the same root as biblical *bath. Originally the form of *bath was *hathu in Hebrew or *bathu in Phoenician. By the process of normal vowel development in Phoenician, the final short vowel would be dropped and the first vowel *h would be lengthened by stress to *o to produce *hathu*bathu. Similarly, baath in the gnostic name probably represents the feminine form of the same noun: *bathu*bathu*bathu*bathu, which corresponds to Greek *bathu. 21

Lastly, Ialdabaoth is overcome and cast into the netherworld (95:143.11-13). In the Greek mythology, which is dependent upon the Semitic myths, the old gods are bound and cast into the netherworld, which is explicitly identified as Tartarus, e.g. Hes. Theog. 713-35, 850-68. 22 Therefore, Ialdabaoth in this gnostic document is formed from the fusion of three figures. Or, better said, the God of the OT has been devalued by identifying him with the evil leader of the fallen angels and with the old, dead god Ialdabaoth and thereby presented as the source of this evil world. 23

Before we can rest with this assertion, it is necessary to consider the possibility of influence from Canaanite myth upon a gnostic document because of the obvious and lengthy time span involved. First of all, it must be said that the myths were still known in the Graeco-Roman period. Philo Byblos lived from A.D. 64-140. Further elements of Canaanite myth are also preserved by Damascus in De prince. 125.3 and attributed to Mochus and Eudemus. 24 Secondly, recent studies have focused on the recrudescence of myth in apocalyptic: P. Hanson, for example, has shown the resurgence of Canaanite myth

21 Clapham, Sanchuniathon, 39ff.
22 Cf. Lambert and Walsh, “A New Babylonian Theogony and Hesiod.”
24 Bullard’s statement is thus true that this episode of the Demiurge is “the result of Jewish legend being worked into a previously existing myth” (The Hypostasis of the Archons, 50f). But it should be modified somewhat in that the myth itself is also adapted to the legend.
in 3 Isa and Zech 9. Similarly, scholars have concluded to the ancient Canaanite myth concerning El and Baal as the most probable history-of-religions background to the Ancient of Days of the Son of Man in Dan 7. Thirdly, on philological grounds the name Ialdabaoth derives from West Semitic lore. Fourthly, it is important to note that the genre is the same—a theogonic and cosmogonic myth. Lastly, just as the royal cult carried mythical elements which were used in apocalyptic, so the apocalyptic groups could have carried these same elements to the gnostics. On these grounds it seems reasonable then to postulate that ancient Canaanite myth, transmitted over the centuries, has influenced this gnostic document.

It is necessary to note, however, that these myths not only re-surface but that they are also reformulated and re-applied and thus, to this extent, can be said to be secondary myth. As we mentioned previously, Wisdom takes the place of East Wind in relation to chaos. Further, as in the biblical transformation of the ancient cosmogonic myth, there is a first principle, the Great Invisible Spirit (93[141]; 21-22) or the Father (96[144]; 19-20), who is superior to Wisdom and chaos. Further, Wisdom is here considered as androgynous. Her desire then is not a hetero-sexual one for chaos; it is rather the aberrant will to make a work alone without her partner in the Ogdoad (94[142]; 6-7). The result of this errant desire is then matter, which is chaos and out of which Ialdabaoth proceeds. Next, it is Wisdom who by her angel defeats Ialdabaoth; he is not defeated by one of his own offspring or one of the younger gods as in Canaanite myth. We shall see the re-application when we discuss the function of the Sabaoth account.

Recently, an alternate hypothesis to the preceding has been offered by G. Scholem. In his article he has criticized sharply those scholars

---

30 Hanson, “Jewish Apocalyptic Against its Near Eastern Environment,” 34ff.
32 For the significance of the myth of the androgyn, see M. Eliade, Mephistopheles and the Androgyn: studies in Religious Myth and Symbol, tr. J. M. Cohen (New York 1965) 78-124.
who derive Ialdabaath from "son of chaos." He accuses them of philological inexactness in deriving the terms from non-existent Hebrew or Aramaic words. He then notes that in the Nag Hammadi documents (e.g. NatArch and OnOrgWld) chaos is called the mother of Samael, but the name Ialdabaath is not used in these pericopes. Lastly, Scholem proposed that Ialdabaath derives from two terms: the Aramaic active participle \(\text{y\text{a}}\text{led} \) meaning "to beget" and the personal name Abaoth which originated as an abridged form or substitute of Sabaoth and which was used in magical circles. Ialdabaath then is the secret name of Samael and means "the begetter of [S]abaoth" or "the begetter of Abaoth." The name for Scholem is probably connected with the fact that Ialdabaath creates six or seven powers in the gnostic sources. Of these Scholem contends that Sabaoth or Abaoth was important since he occupied the main role among the powers and since the word sums up all the powers. The fale of Sabaoth’s repentance is also taken by Scholem as a sign of Sabaoth’s importance.

In response, one should note that Scholem does not consider the possible Canaanite background or the philological analysis of Clapham, who has recourse to the Phoenician rather than Hebrew or Aramaic language. Here one must grant to Scholem that Clapham’s analysis ultimately rests on a hypothetical feminine form of the noun. Secondly, while Scholem is correct in observing that the name Ialdabaath is not used, for example in NatArch 87(135)6-8, it is still remarkable that the figure known ultimately as Samael/Saklas/Ialdabaath is here associated with origin from chaos, i.e. a son of chaos. Thirdly, it is not clear that Sabaoth is the most important of the powers for all the gnostics. For some gnostics Adonais can be the most important power (e.g. GrSeth CG VII, 2; cf. ch. 4). The repentance of Sabaoth also does not prove that Sabaoth is the main figure among the powers, if our interpretation of the Sabaoth passage is correct. Rather, Sabaoth’s repentance answers a particular need in the late second century for some gnostics (see infra). Lastly, Scholem’s proposal involves a play upon words whether Sabaoth or Abaoth was the term combined with \(\text{y\text{a}}\text{led} \). If Sabaoth was used, it is indeed conceivable that Sabaoth could function as both the personal name of one god and the plural noun for many powers or gods. But then the omission of the "S" in Sabaoth is to be explained in Ialdabaath. If Abaoth was used, it is clear that Abaoth could function as the personal name of one god (as Scholem has demonstrated) but it is less clear that Abaoth
would have the further connotation of a plural noun for many powers or gods in the name Ialdabaoth. In conclusion, then, the origin of the name Ialdabaoth from the terms meaning “son of chaos” still seems to us the more likely hypothesis in accord with the interpretation of Clapham.

Sabaoth also arises from the conflation of three figures: those of the God of the OT, the leading angels, and the apocalyptic visionary. First of all, the name is clearly drawn from the OT God, Yahweh Sabaoth, as well as, of course, the portrayal of him upon a chariot of cherubim (Ezek 1, 10; Isa 6).

Secondly, the tradition concerning a leading angel, especially Michael, has influenced the figure of Sabaoth. In NatArch, Sabaoth is presented as a figure less than the high God who is against Satan (Ialdabaoth) from primordial time, enthroned, bears the name of the God of the OT, has power over chaos, and is the maker—and thus leader—of angels. In later Judaism similar features are ascribed to Michael or a leading angel. For example, Michael is the prince over Israel (Dan 10:13, 21; 12:1; 1 Enoch 20:5) and is the opponent of Satan—e.g. 1 Dan 6:1-4 (cf. NatArch 95[143]20ff):

And now, fear the Lord, my children, and beware of Satan and his spirits. Draw near unto God and unto the angel that intercedeth for you, for he is a mediator between God and man, and for the peace of Israel he shall stand up against the kingdom of the enemy. Therefore is the enemy eager to destroy all that call upon the Lord. For he knoweth that upon the day on which Israel shall repent, the kingdom of the enemy shall be brought to an end. 32

In the teaching of Qumran he is also the “Prince of Light,” the “Spirit of Truth,” who from primordial time is opposed to the “Prince of Darkness,” and the “Spirit of Error” (1 QS 3:13-25). 33 He also appears at Qumran (1 QM 17:6-8), at least in the eschatological battle, as the angel who is installed in power over Satan, the Prince of Darkness (cf. NatArch 95[143]20ff):

---


6. He will send eternal assistance to the lot to be redeemed by Him through the might of an angel: He hath magnified the authority of Michael through eternal light.

7. to light up in joy the house of Israel, peace and blessing for the lot of God, so as to raise amongst the angels the authority of Michael and the dominion.

8. of Israel amongst all flesh.34

Although Michael does not bear the name of the God of the OT, in late Judaism a leading angel can be so described. Thus the angel Yaaoel appears in the Apoc Ab 10: “Go, Yaaoel, and by means of my ineffable name raise me yonder man, and strengthen him (so that he recover) from his trembling.”35 Further, the “lesser Yahweh” of 3 Enoch 12:5; 48C:7; 48D:1, 102 and Pistor Sophia 1.7 both derive ultimately from Jewish speculation upon an angel bearing that name.36 However, it must be admitted that there is no evidence of a leading angel who bears the name of Sabaoth.37

Michael is lastly the master over chaos (1 Enoch 20:5; cf. NatArch 95[143]23-25) and leader of the angels (1 QM 17:7; cf. NatArch 95[143]28).38 In conclusion, then, it seems clear that the figure of a leading angel, especially Michael, has contributed to the portrayal of Sabaoth in this account.

Thirdly, the figure of the apocalyptic visionary has influenced the portrayal of Sabaoth. Later, in considering the tradition underlying this pericope, we shall discuss in greater detail the terminology and the pattern of motifs within the tradition concerning the apocalyptic visionary. For the moment it can be summarily stated that in apocalyptic the seer is taken up, receives a vision of the divine throne and/or chariot, and is then given revelation concerning secret mysteries. The seer himself can also be installed in heaven in a position of authority (e.g. Enoch in 1 Enoch 69-71; cf. also 2 Enoch 20-22). In the related traditions concerning Moses, he can sit upon the divine throne (e.g. Ezechiel the Tragedian in Euseb. Princ. 9.29) and also be called God and king (theos kai basileus, Philo De vita Mosis 1.158). Similarly,

34 Yadin, The Scroll of the War, 240ff.
36 Cf. Odeberg, 1 Enoch, 188-92 for discussion of the matter. The references to the ‘little Yahweh’ may be found in C. Schmidt-W. C. Tull, Keilisch-semitische Schriften. 3 Auf. (GS 45; Berlin 1962).
37 However, cf. in Josh 5:14 the term Yahweh. This reference was pointed out to me by Professor Cross.
38 Cf. Tuckey, Michael, 32-43.
Sabaoth is taken up, placed in charge of the seventh heaven, receives
the name God of the Forces, fashions his own chariot, and then
receives a revelation from Life.

In conclusion, then, Sabaoth has been formed from these three
figures. Or, perhaps again better said, in these gnostic documents the
God of the OT has been split in two—into a father who is totally
evil and into an offspring, who is rehabilitated through Wisdom.

To return to the text from these lengthy discussions of Ialdabaoth
and Sabaoth, we note that since Sabaoth had seen the angel cast his
father down to Tartarus (95[143]10-15), he repented. In this context, the
“strength of that angel” serves to terrify Sabaoth, to instill fear in
him. Here, then, “to repent” (μετανοεῖν) is used in the sense familiar
to Diaspora Judaism of a religio-ethical conversion, a change in
one’s relation to God. In this case, however, there is no sin on the
part of Sabaoth but rather his turning away from the blasphemous
claim of Ialdabaoth and his turning toward Wisdom.

Besides repenting, Sabaoth condemned his father, namely, Ialdabaoth
(95[143]25). Further, matter is identified as his mother and equally
condemned as hostile to the heavenly realm. The metaphor that
“matter is a mother” is not present in the OT or NT. However,
in Plato’s Timaeus within the universe the principle which receives
forms is described as Μητήρ τοῦ γεγονότος (51A) and also as τὸ θητὲρ
(49A and 52D). Then, Philo in a section alluding to the Timaeus
draws upon this metaphor and identifies the receptive principle as
matter. He utilizes the metaphor in De etsrietice 61 in an ethical
context, in which he allegorically discusses the soul. Noticeable here,
however, is the depreciation of matter as something negative. In
sections 56-64 Philo is treating of the soul (ψυχή) and its relation with
apparent goods. He admires the soul that confesses that it cannot
withstand these but praises the mind (δύναμις), such as Sarah, who
has no part with the mother’s side and has only male parentage
(Gen 20:12). Then in section 61 Philo describes Sarah in these words:

---

19 Instead of ἐμπνεύσεως, μετανοεῖν becomes the translation equivalent of the OT
3ρωτος in the later translations of the OT and in the later translations and/or compositions
20 Although the term ὄμηντως is rare in the LXX, it occurs at Deut 25:1
in the sense of courtroom condemnation.
41 Plato, Timaeus, tr. R. G. Bury (LCL: Cambridge 1906) 112-13, 118-19, and 124-
25.
She is not born of that material substance perceptible to our senses, ever in a state of formation and dissolution, the material (οὐρά) which is called mother (μητέρα) or foster-mother or nurse of created things by those in whom first the young plant of wisdom grew, she is born of the Father and Cause of all things.  

Similarly, in Leg all 2.51, when speaking about Levi, Philo uses this same metaphor of matter as a mother but in this case with the mind (νοῦς) considered as the father. Here it should also be noted that Levi leaves both father and mother since his portion is God. Philo writes:

This man forsooks his father and mother (μητέρα), his mind and material (οὐρά) body, for the sake of having as his portion the one God, “for the Lord himself is his portion” (Deut 10:9).

Although this metaphor of “matter as a mother” then is not ultimately from Judaism, its usage by Philo indicates that its presence in this gnostic document could be mediated through Jewish circles.

Next, Sabaoth is said to loose (ἐκθετεῖν) his mother matter. Then, in contrast, he is said to sing songs of praise up to Wisdom and her daughter Life. Usually in the OT it is God who is the object of praise, except for Prov 1:20 and 8:3 where Wisdom in the LXX is praised. In this change in object from the usual, one sees in miniature the significance of Wisdom for Gnosticism. Further, if in fact the Sabaoth account derives mainly from apocalyptic literature, we already see mirrored in this pericope a contributing factor to the rise of Gnosticism—the combination of wisdom and apocalyptic traditions.

---

41 Philo, *De creatura* 61, ed. L. Cohn and P. Wendland (Berlin 1897) 2. 181; translation F. H. Cohn and G. H. Whinfield, I.C.T. (1900) 3 349.
42 Text in Cohn-Wendland, 1. 100 and translation from I.C.T. (1902) 1 257.
43 Cf. also NatArch 94(142)12-18 in which matter is also considered as feminine and produces the abortion, who is Ialδαβαθ. I am grateful to B. Layton for refining my understanding of these passages.
44 The term ἐκθετεῖν does not appear in the LXX, Philo, or NT but does appear in the translation of Aquila.
45 The Hebrew ἐκθετεῖν “to cry out” is rendered passively so that Wisdom is praised.
46 G. Delling, *Syrac.* vol., *TDNT* 8 (1972) 493-98. Also in the NT it is God who is either explicitly or implicitly the object of praise (Matt 26:30; Mark 14:26; Acts 16:25; Heb 2:12).
47 Cf. J. E. Wickens, *Eccles.* TDNT 7 (1971) 509, who writes that the Wisdom myth belongs to the basic foundation of the gnostic systems. However, this remark is appropriate only to certain systems based on a female principle within the Jewish and Christian forms of Gnosticism; cf. the systems based on a male principle in Jonas, *Gnosis und spätantiker Geist*, 1. 335-51.
Now that Sabaoth has repented and praised Wisdom and Life, they catch him up and place him in charge of the seventh heaven, where he is given a divine name and later fashions a chariot for himself and receives instruction concerning the eighth heaven. When we ask what tradition or traditions lie behind this material, the answer must be that two traditions from Judaism have been conflated here: the tradition concerning the divine throne and the tradition concerning heavenly enthronement.

We begin with the tradition concerning the ascent of the apocalyptic visionary. First of all, we note that the term “to catch up” or “to snatch up” (ὕψασθαι ὑψώσασθαι)44 is used in apocalyptic contexts for the translation to heaven (e.g., Enoch in Wis 4:11; Adam in Apoc Mos 37) or for the mystic rapture of the visionary (e.g., Paul in 2 Cor 12:2, 4). Next, as for the chariot and instruction or revelation by Life, ultimately the material derives from the prophets Ezekiel (1, 10 and 43:3) and Isaiah (6), who have a vision of the divine chariot (τὴν ὄψιν) and/or throne (τὸν ἄξονα). But, then, within apocalyptic Judaism, the visionary is first snatched up or taken up, given a vision of the divine throne and/or chariot and then provided with a revelation concerning secret mysteries. For example, in 1 Enoch, Enoch in his dream vision is lifted up into heaven by the winds (14:8) and brought into a house within a house where he saw “a lofty throne: its...

---

44 The active translation “they called him” seems to me preferable to the passive translation “he is called” proposed by Layton, since the other verbs in the prescopic are active, since the tense is perfect, since Wisdom and Life are available as the subjects and since the giving of the name seems to be part of the enthronement scene. If the verb were to be translated as “he is called,” I should think that one would expect a present tense as in the clause “since he is up above the Forces of chaos.”
46 See also 1 Thess 4:17 and Rev 12:5. Cf. W. Förster, ὄψιν, TDNT 1 (1964) 472-73. Note that in Wis 4:11 the verb refers not to the death (sic Förster 472, n. 2) but to the translation of Enoch.
appearance was as crystal, and the wheels thereof as the shining sun; and there was the vision of cherubim." (14:18). As in Enoch, the association here of wheels and a throne indicates that the motifs of chariot and throne have been united. Enoch then receives revelation first in the form of audition. He is charged to bring the word of the Lord to the Watchers (14:24-16:4). Then he receives revelation in the form of vision and interpretation. He is taken through the cosmos, and through Sheol in order to see the hidden places and treasuries, while the angel accompanying him explains all to him (17-36). Similarly, in the T. Levi, in a dream-vision Levi ascends to heaven at the bidding of an angel (2:7). As he ascends through the three heavens their contents are revealed to him and explained by the accompanying angel (2:8-3:10). Upon arriving at the highest heaven, he is given a vision of the Most High upon his throne of glory (5:1). Then Levi receives the revelation that is more important for this document: "Levi, I have given thee the blessings of the priesthood until I come and sojourn in the midst of Israel," (5:2; cf. 8:2-19; 14:7; 16:1; 17-18). Again in 2 Enoch, Enoch is taken up by angels (3:1) through the various heavens (3:2-19:6). Through vision and audition the contents of these heavens are revealed to him by the angels. Then finally he beholds the throne of the Lord and the glory of his face (20-22). Enoch himself is then transformed from his earthly garments (22:4-12). He is instructed first by the angel Pravuil or Vertil (23:1-6); then, after being seated at the left of the Lord near Gabriel, he is given the major revelation as he is instructed by the Lord concerning the origins of the cosmos (24-33).

Also in Apoc. Ab we find this pattern. In c. 15 Abraham is taken up by an angel and given a vision of the divine throne and chariot (17:18): "And as I stood alone and looked, I saw behind the living creatures a chariot with fiery wheels, each wheel full of eyes round about; and over the wheels was a throne; which I saw, and this was covered with fire, and fire encircled it round about, and leapt an indescribable fire environed a fiery host. And I heard its holy voice like the voice of a man." In both vision and instruction by the Lord, the universe and also the history of mankind are then revealed to Abraham (19-29). Interestingly enough, for our purposes, the vision of mankind consists of multitudes of people on the right and multitudes on the left (21-22, 27). The

---

history of the world is then told from this perspective with those of the right representing the people of God and those of the left representing the nations (21-29), some of whom are to be saved, and some damned (22).

Likewise in Test Abr this pattern is discernible. Abraham is lifted up by Michael into the heavens (10, Rec. A; 8, Rec. B) and receives a vision of a throne. However, here there are two thrones, one for Adam (11, Rec. A; 8, Rec. B) and one for Abel (12-13, Rec. A, cf. also 11, Rec. B, where the second throne, however, is not explicitly mentioned). Also through vision and through the instruction of Michael a revelation is given to Abraham, especially about the judgment of souls after death (11-14, Rec. A; 8-12, Rec. B). Again, for our purpose, it is important to note that there is an angel on the right who represents the righteous and an angel on the left who represents the wicked (12-14, Rec. A). From these two late pieces of apocalyptic literature, Apoc Abr and Test Abr, one can conclude that the motif of separation into right and left became incorporated as a final part of this tradition concerning the ascent of the apocalyptic visionary in late Judaism.

As one considers this pattern of the ascent of the apocalyptic seer, his vision of the throne/chariot and reception of revelation, it is important to note that there are variations. The seer may behold not only God upon his throne but also some other important figure upon a throne (e.g. Adam or Abel in Test Abr 11-12, Rec. A). Secondly, the seer himself may be transformed into one like an angel and seated in heaven (Enoch in 2 Enoch 22). Or the seer may be himself installed in a position of power, i.e. enthroned (e.g. Enoch in 1 Enoch 69-71). The revelation may then consist in a vision of the judgment that is given by the enthroned figure (e.g. Test Abr 11-12, Rec. A). Lastly,

---

44 This same pattern can be found in Christian apocalyptic material. For example, in Rev John ascends (4:10) and sees the throne (4:2-3) and then receives revelation by vision and audition (5:1-12; 7). In Isa 66:22--cf. 1:20), he sees the glory of the Lord (4:1-3) and then receives the revelation concerning the future descent of Christ into the world, his life and death and resurrection (10:7-11:36).

45 Box dates the Apoc Abr between the fall of Jerusalem and the early decades of the second century (The Apocalypse of Abraham, XVI) and the Test Abr in its original form to the first half of the first century A.D. (G.H. Box, The Testament of Abraham, London 1927, XXVIII). Schmidt dates the short recension of Test Abr to the same period and proposes the first half of the second century A.D. for the longer recension (F. Schmidt, Le Testament d'Abraham, Diss. Strasbourg 1937, I, 190-201).
the judgment upon men may be made in terms of a distinction between right and left (e.g. Apoc Abr 21-39; Test Abr 12-14; Rec. A).

It is clear then that the Sabaoth account draws upon this tradition of the ascent of the apocalyptic seer. The terminology is the same (τυμπέρις εὐπραξίας, ἀρχηγός). The sequence of motifs is the same: ascent, the chariot/throne, revelation by instruction and the separation into right and left. Here Sabaoth not only ascends but is also installed in a position of power. As we have seen, the variety within the tradition of the apocalyptic seer also provides examples of this possibility.

While the main and direct influence upon the Sabaoth account derives then from apocalyptic literature, we would not exclude but rather include further influence from Diaspora Judaism. Specifically, some traditions concerning Moses, which are themselves related to the traditions found in apocalyptic literature, portray Moses as seated upon God’s own throne (Ezechiel the Tragedian in Eiseb. Proep. evang. 9:29) and given the name of God and king (Philo De vita Mosis 1.158). However, in these passages the reference is to a throne rather than a chariot and there is no mention of separation into right and left.

Specifically new in the Sabaoth account are the context of time (i.e. as the origin of the universe), the application of this tradition, to the son of the Demiurge rather than to a mortal, his repentance, prior to ascent, and the fashioning of rather than simply the vision of the chariot. Also new is the fact that Wisdom and Life take Sabaoth aside rather than an angel or angels as in apocalyptic literature (e.g. Apoc Abr 15). Again, in this alteration we see in miniature the confluence of the wisdom and apocalyptic traditions.

After his ascent, Sabaoth is placed in charge of the seventh heaven. In translating the phrase as “installed him over the seventh heaven,” Bullard has failed to see that underlying the Coptic usage καλειτθημεν εκατον “to place in charge of.”

54 Bullard, The Hypostasis of the Archons, 37.

55 καλειτθημεν appears frequently in the Hellenistic period in the sense of “to place in charge of,” or “to set in an office” or “to install” (cf. W. Bauer, Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen archaischen Literature, 5. Aufl. (Berlin 1988) 771. The verb can be used absolutely with only an accusative object, e.g. Tit 1:5, but appears more frequently with the preposition εκατον (cf. A. Oppel, καλειτθημεν, TDNT 3 1963:444-47). This idiom καλειτθημεν εκατον is thus rendered as καλειτθημεν εκατον in the Sahidic NT at Matt 25:21. Besides installation as king, e.g. Ps 2:6 LXX, the term can apply to other offices (e.g. high priest 1 Macc 10:22 LXX) or responsibilities (e.g. Matt 25:21).
Subsequently Sabaoth will receive a name, fashion a chariot, and henceforth have the right hand called life and the left hand called unrighteousness.

It seems to us that the Sabaoth account here conflates the traditions concerning heavenly enthronement with that of the ascent of the apocalyptic visionary.\(^{19}\) When Sabaoth is placed in charge of the seventh heaven, he is installed as king although he is not given the title. We shall see that Sabaoth then functions to rule over those who are not gnostics, while the gnostics belong to the "kingless race" (v[7][145]) 4-5.

Recent studies, especially those of P. Hanson, have strikingly illuminated the myth and ritual pattern which underlies enthronement material in Judaism.\(^{20}\) Basically the myth relates that in response to a threat the divine warrior appears, defeats his enemies, returns to assume his kingship which is evidenced in the building of his temple, and then manifests his reign. Within the Mesopotamian realm

---

19 By heavenly enthronement, I mean installation in heaven in royal power, whether in fact the person sits on a throne or not. For the sake of terminological clarity, I also follow the distinctions of G.W.E.Nickelsberg, Jr., who writes, "Hereafter, I use 'crowning' to mean exaltation to authority, 'assumption' to mean the translation of the soul or spirit to heaven immediately upon death, and 'ascension' and 'elevation' to mean a literal going up to heaven, with no specification of time (before death, immediately after death, or at the time of a future resurrection)." His remarks are found in *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism* (HTS 26; Cambridge 1972) 82, n. 134. To this list of terms one should also add "installation of a prophet" as the transfer of authority to the prophet. It would be further helpful to distinguish not only the terms but also the traditions of enthronement, installation as prophet, and exaltation. Besides over-utilization of Mesopotamian parallels and under-utilization of Canaanite material, the basic flaw, for example, in Geo Widengren's book *The Ascension of the Apostle and the Heavenly Book* (Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis 7; Uppsala 1950) is the failure in the period of the classical prophets to distinguish installation of a prophet from enthronement of a king. In this regard, he is followed by J.P. Schultz, "Angelic Opposition to the Ascension of Moses and the Revelation of the Law," *JQR* 81 (1971) 282-308. On the installation of a prophet, see F. M. Cross, Jr., "The Council of Yahweh in Second Isaiah," *JNES* 12 (1953) 274-75; G. E. Wright, "The Law-suit of God: A Form-Critical Study of Deuteronomy 32," *Israel's Prophetic Heritage: Essays in Honor of James M. Mays, Jr.* ed. B. W. Anderson and W. Harrelson (New York 1962) 41-43; K. Baltzer, "Considerations Regarding the Office and Calling of the Prophet," *HTR* 61 (1968) 567-81. For the tradition of exaltation, particularly in some intertestamental texts, see Nickelsberg, *Resurrection, Immortality and Eternal Life.*

20 P. Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic,* idem, "Jewish Apocalyptic Against its Near Eastern Environment", idem, "The Old Testament Apocalyptic Reexamined"
the classical statement of this myth occurs in the Enûma Eliš. This same mythical pattern is found as well in a simplified form in the Apsu-Ea conflict of tablet 1: e.g. threat (37-58), combat-victory (59-70), and temple built (71-77). Also in the Baal cycle from Ugarit, Hanson has found the same ritual structure as the most common reconstruction of the Baal-Yam conflict.

Israel as well drew upon the myth and ritual pattern of this material but directed it towards its own historical experience. Thus, Israel interpreted the Conquest in terms of the triumph of Yahweh as the Divine Warrior. In one of the earliest examples of Israelite poetry, Exodus 15, we find this same pattern in a hymn from the League, which celebrates the ritual conquest. Specifically, as Hanson suggests, the pattern is as follows: 

- Combat-Victory (vv. 1-12) →
- Theophany of Divine Warrior (8-9)
- Salvation of the Israelites (13-16a)
- Procession and Building of Temple (16b-17) 
- Manifestation of Yahweh’s Universal Reign (18)

---

** H. Hanson presents the pattern in detail as follows in The Dawn of Apocalyptic, 302:
- Threat (V: 109-111.91)
- Combat-Victory (IV: 33-122)
- Theophany of Divine Warrior (IV: 39-60)
- Salvation of the Gods (IV: 123-6, VI: 1-44; cf. VI: 126-27, 140-51)
- Procession and Victory shout (V: 67-89)
- Temple Built for Marduk (V: 117-56; VI: 45-68)
- Banquet (VI: 59-94)
- Manifestation of Marduk’s Universal Reign (anticipated: IV: 3-18; manifested: VI 95-VII: 144)

** Hanson, The Dawn of Apocalyptic, 303.

** In detail Hanson provides the following pattern in The Dawn of Apocalyptic, 302:
- Threat (2.1[17])
- Combat-Victory (2.4[68])
- Temple Built (4[51])
- Banquet (4.6.39[51])
- Manifestation of Baals Universal Reign (anticipated: 2.4.9-10[68]; manifested: 4.7-9-12[51])
- Theophany of Divine Warrior (4.7.7-39[51])
- Fertility of Restored order (anticipated: 4.5.58-71[51]; effected: 4.7.18-30[51]; cf. 6.3.6-7, 12.1[49])

The psalms, and particularly the enthronement psalms (Ps 47, 93, 95-99) demonstrate that the old mythic patterns were kept alive in the royal cult at Jerusalem. Thus in Ps 47, for example, the victory of Yahweh is portrayed in the opening verses (2-5). The procession or ascent of the Lord (v. 6) is followed by the acclamation of Yahweh as king (vv. 7-8). In the following verses (9-10), then, his universal reign is made manifest.** Similarly, in the royal psalm, Ps 2, this pattern is maintained with the added motif of the Davidic king has been adopted by Yahweh as his son (v. 7: cf. also Ps 110).

Within proto-apocalyptic this material again re-surfaces. As Hanson has shown, the oracle in Zech 9 recapitulates the ancient myth and ritual pattern and the League pattern of ritual conquest.*** In his dissertation, W. Millar has extended this analysis to the cycles of the Isaiah Apocalypse (Isa 24-27) and shown that the same pattern is visible in this material, i.e. Yahweh’s battle and victory (Isa 24:1-13, 18c-23; 25:10-12; 26:1-27:1), the procession with the Ark to the temple (26:1-8), and the beginning of reign with the victory feast upon the mount (Isa 25:6-8).**

It is also now clear that the dream-vision of Dan 7, an example of full-blown apocalyptic, reflects ancient Canaanite myth. The picture of the transcendent God, the Ancient of Days, has been presented in El-language, while the one like a son of man, the symbol for the true Israel in v. 27, has been presented in Baal-language.*** However, the pattern remains the same.** The threat to the divine council is present in the emergence of the four beasts from the sea (vv. 3-8). The victory occurs through the judgment and destruction of the beasts (vv. 9-12). The enthronement of this one like a son of man and the manifestation of his reign occur through his presentation to the Ancient

** Hanson, The Dawn of Apocalyptic, 307.
*** Specifically, he sets forth its pattern as follows in The Dawn of Apocalyptic, 315f:
Conflict-Victory (vv. 1-7)
Temple Secured (8)
Victory Shout and Procession (9)
Manifestation of Yahweh’s Universal Reign (10)
Salvation: Captives Released (11-13)
Theophany of Divine Warrior (14)
Sacrifice and Banquet (15)
Fertility of Restored Order (16-17)

*** Emerton, "The Origin of the Son of Man Imagery"; Colpe, διδάσκαλος τοῦ θεοῦ: Cross, Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic, Essays, 16-17.
** Hanson, "Old Testament Apocalyptic Reexamined," 474ff.
occurs in Ezekiel the Tragedian, probably an Alexandrian dramatist of the 2d c. B.C., wherein Moses recounts to his father-in-law a dream that he has had:

> Methought upon Mount Sinai's brow I saw
> A mighty throne that reached to heaven's high vault,
> Whereon there sat a man of noblest mien
> Wearing a royal crown; whose left hand held
> A mighty sceptre, and his right to me.

> Made sign, and I stood forth before the throne.
> He gave me then the sceptre and the crown,
> And bade me sit upon the royal throne,
> From which himself removed. Thence I looked forth
> Upon the earth's wide circle, and beneath
> The earth itself, and high above the heaven.
> Then at my feet, behold! a thousand stars
> Began to fall, and I their number told.
> As they passed by me like an armed host:
> And in terror started up from sleep.

The biblical starting point for this composition by Ezekiel is obviously the ascent of Moses on Mt. Sinai to receive the Law from God (Exod 19:1 and 24). However, equally clearly, Ezekiel has expanded upon that biblical incident by presenting God there as sitting upon a throne with crown and sceptre and by portraying Moses as receiving these emblems of royalty, a vision of the universe and the homage of the stars. Cerfaux has seen in this passage an influence from Orphism. However, in the proposed Orphic fragments there is neither...
a parallel in form nor in content. On the other hand, the influence of biblical and apocalyptic tradition upon this scene is clear. Regarding the form of this passage, one should first note the dream with its interpretation by another person in Gen 37:9f (cf. the allusion here to Joseph's dream in the motif of the "stars" paying homage to Moses) and by an angel in Dan 7 as well as the dream-vision in 1 Enoch 14.

In drawing upon this form from biblical and apocalyptic tradition Ezekiel Tr has retained it here, since it is also appropriate to Greek drama. Concerning its content, like the apocalyptic seer, Moses after his ascent sees the divine throne and then receives as his revelation a vision of what is upon the earth, beneath the earth, and above the heaven (cf. 1 Enoch 14ff, 2 Enoch 3ff). Probably the motif of homage of the stars derives from Gen 37-9, while the motif of the stars which form the host of heaven and whose number can be told comes from Isa 40:26. In his wide-ranging study, Meeks has shown that the motif of Moses' ascent on Mt. Sinai as his enthronement as king occurs not only in intertestamental literature but also in Rabbinic and Samaritan literature and plausibly suggests an early exegetical tradition as the source of these disparate phenomena.

The function of the dream-vision is then made clear in the interpretation rendered by Moses' father-in-law:

---


The form of the Orphic fragments is not that of a dream as here in Ezekiel Tr. The Orphic fragments contain a vision of the Lord upon his heavenly throne; however, there is no enthronement of the seer.

A Kappelnacher in "Zur Tragödie der hellenistischen Zeit," Wiener Studien: Zeit für klassische Philologie 44 (1924-25) 781 has provided examples of the use of dreams in Greek drama (e.g. the dream of Atosia in Aeschylus, Persians) but also noted that interpretation of the dream by another person is not customary. Rather, dreamers usually interpret their own dreams. For interpretation by another person he can only point to one drama, Bruce of Aegaeus; in addition he refers to the Roman Petrarch and Gassier, De divinatione 1.4.4. Cf. also B. Snell, "Ezechiel's Moses-Drama," Anzhe und Abrteilung 13 (1967) 154-55, who points to the dream of Jacob or Joseph as the inspiration of this passage, since the dreams of Greek drama are those of ill fate rather than heavenly enthronement. Meeks, however, only points to Greek tragedy, The Prophets-King, 148.

Meeks, The Prophet-King, 144; cf. Dan 13:5 as a scriptural starting point for Moses as king. For the motif of sitting upon the throne of Yahweh, can the inspiration be such a passage as 1 Chr 29:23 (cf. 1 Chr 28:5), when transposed to a heavenly setting (cf. Dan 7)?
This sign from God bodes good to thee, my friend.
Would I might live to see thy lot fulfilled!
A mighty throne shalt thou set up, and be
Thyself the leader and the judge of men!
And as over all the peoples earth thine eye
Looked forth and under all the earth, and high
Above God's heaven, so shall thy mind survey
All things in time, past, present and to come."*8

Moses is to set up a "mighty throne." We suggest the hypothesis that this "mighty throne" represents not only the dynasty but also the kingdom or nation, which Moses is ultimately to found when he leads the people out of Egypt (cf. 2 Sam 3:10 and 1 Kgs 2:4). This throne is to be more than just the men whom he will "lead and judge"; it is to be the enduring Jewish nation, to which even the diaspora Jew was related.*9 For Ezekiel (cf. Tr, the Jewish people are not only God's chosen people (cf. "Praepar. evang. 9.92.8; Mnas GCS 43:1) 530.23-27), but also by the heavenly enthronement of Moses the nation is validated as divinely established. Although Moses sits upon the throne and receives the emblems of kingship, he does not receive the title king, probably in order to remain closer to the biblical text and also to reserve the title king for the king of Egypt (e.g. "Praepar. evang. 9.92.8; Mnas GCS 43:1) 530.30f.*10

---

* Text Mnas GCS 43:1 529-30; tr. Gifford, Eusebius Pamphili, 470.
* Cf. the similar idea in Aristophanes: ἡ Αἴγυπτου ἡ Αἴγυπτου τοῦ Ἐφραίμ, τῷ τῆς Ἡλέκτρας αὐτούς ἵππος—Eusebius, Praepar. evang. 11.21.1; Mnas GCS 43:1) 1901.
* And as over all the peoples earth thine eye: most probably the phoenix appears. It is difficult to find the exact reason for the appearance then of this bird, and thus various suggestions for it have been made in the past. R. Van den Broek on the basis of his extensive study, "The Myth of the Phoenix according to Classical and Early Christian Traditions" (Études Préliminaires aux Religions Orientales dans l'Empire Romain 24. Leiden 1972) 122, has offered the most plausible explanation, i.e. the appearance of the phoenix marks the beginning of a new era (this era, here, however, of the much later Coptic 'sermon on Mary as an interpretative aid is methodologically questionable). In support of this interpretation, one may point to the appearance of the phoenix as the re-accession of Seleucus I to power in 312 B.C. and the inauguration of the Seleucid era (cf. Pline, Historia naturalis 10.4.5; tr. H. Rackham, I.C.L., Cambridge 1940, 3. 984-95) and at the attempt to introduce a new calendar during the reign of Ptolemy III Euergetes (cf. Tactius, Annals 8.28; tr. J. Jackson, I.C.L., Cambridge 1971, 3. 200.8-1; cf. also Van den Broek, 115f.). If this interpretation is correct, it would seem to tie together the beginning (the enthronement scene) and the end of the drama. Although it is true that only in later literature does the phoenix appear in order to mark the accession of a new king (cf. Van den Broek, 115f.), yet here it is probably the installation of Moses as king, the choice of a people, and the foundation of the nation by the events of the Exodus, which together mark the inauguration of the new era. In "Praepar. evang. 9.92.16 (Mnas GCS 43:1) 538.29" this bird is described as the βαλλειάς ἐκ τῆς ἀποστολής, behind whom all the other
The interpretation, which Moses' father-in-law gives to the vision, also provides an insight into a further function of this scene. The vision by Moses of what is upon the earth, under the earth, and above the heaven is interpreted to mean that Moses' mind will survey "all things in time past, present, and to come." It is important to note the change in this interpretation from the vertical to the horizontal, from the cosmological to the historical. We suggest that Ezekiel has incorporated the apocalyptic tradition's interest in cosmological secrets in the dream-vision but re-interpreted that material and applied it to Moses' legacy to his people, the Law. As in a similar interpretation in Philo, which we shall show presently, "the things in time past" refer to Genesis; those in "the present" to Exodus through Deuteronomy; and those "to come" at least to the foretelling of his death in Deut 31 and the future events for the twelve tribes in Deut 33. Just as the vision of the apocalyptic seer validates not only himself but also his words and the books that circulate in his name (cf. Dan 12:4, 9; 1 Enoch 104:9-13; 2 Enoch 33:1-10; 36:1-2), so the vision of Moses authenticates him and the books that circulate in his name, i.e. the Pentateuch. Thus, through this scene of heavenly ascent and enthronement those whom Moses leads out of Egypt and their descendants are guaranteed to be the divinely founded nation and God's chosen people with His sacred scriptures.

The second instance within diaspora Judaism of the ascent and enthronement of Moses occurs in Philo's treatise De vita Mois 1.158:

Again, was not the joy of his partnership with the Father and Maker of all magnified also by the honor of being deemed worthy to bear the same title? For he was named god and king of the whole nation, and entered, we are told, into the darkness where God was, that is into the unseen, invisible, incorporeal and archetypal essence of existing things. Thus he beheld what is hidden from the sight of mortal nature, and, in himself and his life displayed for all to see, he has set before us, like some well-wrought picture, a piece of work beautiful and godlike, a model for those who are willing to copy it. Happy are they who imitate, or strive to imitate.

birds hovered in fear. Is this a symbolic statement that the new nation of Israel is to rule over the other peoples?

81 W. Meeks, in his essay "Moses as God and King," Religions in Antiquity: Essays in Memory of Erwin Ramadoff Gendronbaugh, ed. J. Neusner (Leiden 1988) 367-89, stresses the function of the ascent and vision as the validation of the prophet and the guarantee of esoteric tradition attached to his name. We would extend that insight and apply it to esoteric material as well as to books, which circulate in the prophet or seer's name. Thereby, the books, which diaspora Judaism particularly revered, the Pentateuch, are given the same guarantee.
that image in their souls. For it were best that the mind should carry the form of virtue in perfection, but, failing this, let it at least have the unflinching desire to possess that form.\textsuperscript{82}

Once again the biblical starting point is the ascent of Moses upon Mt. Sinai. As in Ezekiel Tr, this ascent of Moses is considered as his enthronement. Strikingly new is the fact that Moses receives a name and that name is "god." From De sac. 8f we can see that Philo's exegetical basis for attributing this name to Moses was Exod 7:1 "See I make you as God to Pharaoh."\textsuperscript{83} and that Philo attributed this name quite seriously to him.\textsuperscript{84} In De sac. 8f Philo argues against attributing to Moses the common biblical phrase "N. died and was added to his people." His reason is that since God cannot be added to and since Moses is God, therefore Moses cannot be added to. However, in Quod det. 161-62 Philo uses this same scriptural text to demonstrate that the usage here is not literal: "when Moses is appointed a god unto Pharaoh, he did not become such in reality, but only by a convention is supposed to be such."\textsuperscript{85} Rightly then can Meeks conclude from these passages as follows:

Furthermore, while the biblical text is used in "The Sacrifices of Abel and Cain" to show that Moses' translation was the return of the perfect soul to the One who is, Philo's other descriptions of Moses' assumption clearly depict the apotheosis of a divine man, not the return of an incarnate deity as Goodenough suggests. The distinction is important; while Philo does vacillate in his portrait of Moses, now elevating him virtually to a "second god" again restricting him to the sphere of the human, the vacillation remains with the compass of the θεόν ὑπόπ.\textsuperscript{86}

At his enthronement Moses is not only named god but also king. He was king of all the people who departed with him from Egypt, king of a nation destined to be consecrated above all others (De vita Moses 1.147f).\textsuperscript{87} But he is king also over the whole world:

And so, as he abjured the accumulation of lucre, and the wealth whose influence is mighty among men, God rewarded him by giving him instead

\textsuperscript{82} Test and tr. F. H. Cohen, LCL (Cambridge 1966) 6. 356-59.
\textsuperscript{83} LCL (1968) 2. 98-101. Philo's version of Exod 7:1 is δίκαιος θεὸς τοῦ σαβδών.\textsuperscript{84} Cf. also De poesir. C. 28; De gen. 47f; Quod quae immut. 23; De conf. 30f; Q. Exod 2. 40.
\textsuperscript{85} LCL (1968) 2. 309.
\textsuperscript{86} Meeks, The Prophet-King, 105. Goodenough refers to the incarnation of Moses in his An Introduction to Philo Judaeus, 2d ed. (Oxford 1982) 145.
\textsuperscript{87} "The appointed leader of all these was Moses, invested with this office and kingship." LCL (1966) 6. 355; cf. Ezekiel Tr above.
the greatest and most perfect wealth. That is the wealth of the whole earth and sea and rivers, and of all the other elements and the combinations which they form. For, since God judged him worthy to appear as a partner of his own possessions, He gave into his hands the whole world as a portion well fitted for his heir. Therefore, each element obeyed him as its master, changed its natural properties and submitted to his command.\textsuperscript{89}

As the basis for this gift of kingship to Moses, Philo offers three reasons, which Meeks has appropriately termed the haggadic, the philosophical and the mystic.\textsuperscript{90} The haggadic reason consists in the fact that Moses was destined to receive the kingship of Egypt and yet willingly renounced it for the sake of God’s people. Therefore, he was appropriately granted by God the kingship over them (\textit{De vita Moses} 1.148-49). Secondly, as the philosophical reason, Moses was appointed king "on account of his goodness and his nobility of conduct and the universal benevolence which he never failed to show."\textsuperscript{90} Thirdly, he was appointed king as the paradigm of all those \(\ldots\) who achieve the mystic ascent and vision.\textsuperscript{91}

In this respect, the tradition concerning the ascents of the seer is particularly significant. Like the apocalyptic seer, Moses ascended to heaven, but his vision here in \textit{De vita Moses} 1.158f is not of the throne of God and what is upon the earth and under the earth. Rather, Moses entered into the darkness where God was, "into the unseen, invisible, incorporeal and archetypal essence of existing things"; and thus he "beheld what is hidden from the sight of mortal nature." It is important to notice the dualism that is expressed in this passage. The divine realm is the realm of the essential over against which the earthly is merely "child’s play."\textsuperscript{92} However, although he considers the earthly of less value, Philo is not anti-cosmic as the gnostics. For him God is still the creator of the universe (\textit{De vita Moses} 1.212f).

The form which expresses this ascent and enthronement is no longer the dream-vision as in Dan 7 and Ezekiel Tr. The narrative description, which Philo employs for this scene, is due no doubt to the genre within

\textsuperscript{89} \textit{De vita Moses} 1.155-56; LCL (1966) 6. 356-57.

\textsuperscript{90} Meeks, \textit{The Prophet-King}, 188ff.

\textsuperscript{91} \textit{De vita Moses} 1.148; LCL (1966) 6. 353.

which he is writing, the treatise. Perhaps, it is due also to the desire
to stress the reality of Moses' own ascent and mystic vision as the
paradigm for others.

While Philo discussed Moses as king in his first book of the De
vita Mosis, in the second book he describes the other offices which are
proper to Moses, namely, legislator, high priest and prophet. His
editorial comments—such as, "And of them it may be justly said,
what is often said of the virtues, that to have one is to have all"
(De vita Mosis 2.7)\textsuperscript{63}—indicate that for Philo the enthronement of
Moses as god and king is equally his installation in these other
offices. As Goodenough has shown, Philo draws upon the Hellenistic
notion of the king as the "living law"\textsuperscript{64} in his portrayal of Moses as
legislator. For our purposes, it is of interest merely to note in addition
the distinction which Philo makes within the Law given through
Moses:

They (the sacred books) consist of two parts: one the historical, the other
concerned with commands and prohibitions, and of this we will speak
later, after first treating fully what comes first in order. One division of
the historical deals with the creation of the world, the other with particular
persons, and this partly with the punishment of the impious, partly with
the honouring of the just.\textsuperscript{65}

Again from the ideology of Hellenistic kingship, Moses is portrayed
not only as king but also as high priest.\textsuperscript{66} From Jewish tradition then
Moses is portrayed as a prophet (cf. Deut 18:15-22 and 34:10).\textsuperscript{67}
For our purposes, again, the distinction, which Philo introduces into
the oracles given through Moses, are of interest:

Now I am fully aware that all things written in the sacred books are
oracles delivered through Moses, but I will confine myself to those which
are more especially his, with the following preliminary remarks. Of the
divine utterances, some are spoken by God in His own Person with His
prophet for interpreter (ἀποφθέγματα), in some the revelation comes through
question and answer, and others are spoken by Moses in his own person,
when possessed by God and carried away out of himself. The first kind
are absolutely and entirely signs of the divine excellences, graciousness and

\textsuperscript{63} LCL (1966) 6: 453-55.
\textsuperscript{64} \varepsilon\iota\rho\omicron\upsilon\omicron\nu\omicron\zeta\omicron\sigma\iota\omicron\varsigma \omicron\nu \iota\omicron\nu \omicron\nu\omicron\zeta, cf. E.R. Goodenough, “The Political Philosophy of Hellenistic
\textsuperscript{65} De vita Mosis 2.46-47; LCL (1966) 6: 470-71.
\textsuperscript{66} Cf. Goodenough, By Light, Light, 390; Meeks, The Prophet King, 113-15.
\textsuperscript{67} Meeks, The Prophet King, 130, notes perceptively that the ideology of Hellenistic
kingship does not provide a parallel or basis for associating the king with a) prophecy
or b) heavenly enthronement.
beneficence, by which He incites all men to noble conduct, and particularly the nation of His worshippers, for whom He opens up the road which leads to happiness. In the second kind we find a combination and partnership: the prophet asks questions of God about matters on which he has been seeking knowledge, and God replies and instructs him. The third kind are assigned to the lawgiver himself: God has given to him of His own power of foreknowledge and by this he will reveal future events. Now, the first kind must be left out of discussion. They are too great to be taught by human lips; scarcely indeed could heaven and the world and the whole existing universe worthily sing their praises. Besides, they are delivered through an interpreter (ἐρμής), and interpretation (ἐρμηνεία) and prophecies are not the same thing.\footnote{De vita Mosis 2.198-91; LCL (1966) 6. 543.}

In his further presentation Philo characterizes the question-and-answer oracles as mixed (μικτὰς ἐρμηνείας δόξας).\footnote{De vita Mosis 2.192; LCL (1966) 6. 544-45.} Then, after various examples in which Moses foretold future events (2.246ff), Philo concludes with a reference to the oracles prophesied by Moses before his death (e.g. Deut 33-34) some of which have already taken place and others of which are awaited.\footnote{De vita Mosis 2.288-91; LCL (1966) 6. 591ff.}

If we reflect upon the function of the scene of the ascent, vision, and enthronement of Moses in the light of Philo’s total presentation of Moses, it becomes clear that this scene serves to validate that Moses is the paradigm of the mystic who ascends for the vision of God.\footnote{Cf. Meeks, "Moses as God and King." 369 Meeks is reluctant here to give complete assent to Goodenough’s view in By Light, Light, 205ff, concerning an organized Jewish, cultic mystery with Phallicic ideas. Cf. also A. D. Nock, “The Question of Jewish Mysteries,” Essays on Religion and the Ancient World, 1. 459-68, originally published as a review of By Light, Light in Gnomon 15 (1937) 156-65. However, Goodenough in his later reflections quite rightly stresses that by a Jewish mystery he means not distinct rites or initiations to which even Jews had to be especially admitted but rather a set of teachings which would re-interpret the normal Jewish festivals and consider them as leading the “initiate” out of matter into the eternal (cf. An Introduction to Philo Judaicus, 151ff).}

For Philo, the Pentateuch is particularly the divinely revealed document: although the prophetic and writings were also inspired, they were of less value.\footnote{Cf. Goodenough, By Light, Light, 771, and H. A. Wolfson, Philo (Cambridge 1947) 1. 140.}
For our comparison with the Sabaoth account we shall find it important to note that in this portrayal of Moses in Philo the two traditions of the ascent of the seer and heavenly enthronement are conflated, that the mortal figure who ascends receives the name god and the title king, that he sees what is not apprehensible by reason, i.e. the invisible, and that this ascent and vision function to validate the Pentateuch. Further, we note that Moses functions as a judge (De vita Mosis 2.214-18), although not while he is ascended.

As in 1 Enoch, Ezekiel Tr and Philo, so the Sabaoth account—but now as a part of a myth of origins within a revelation discourse—conflates these two traditions. We have already discussed the tradition of the apocalyptic seer with respect to the Sabaoth account. Concerning the tradition of heavenly enthronement we note first of all that Sabaoth ascends. However, due to the influence of the apocalyptic seer tradition, the term is ταυριν εγεραι ἀνέβαιρεν rather than πάω, ἀνέβαιρεν as, for example, in Ps 46(47) 6. Sabaoth’s enthronement—in the sense of installation in power rather than physically sitting upon a throne—is most clear in that he is placed in charge of the seventh heaven. The giving of a name to him in this context may also be part of his enthronement, as we shall discuss below. As in ancient Near Eastern myth and in Exod 15, the reference to the making of the symbol of authority occurs next. Although in these older materials one finds as this symbol either the temple or the throne, the identification of throne and chariot in Israelite tradition enables this change here simply to a chariot. We shall also see below that the separation into right and left and the immediate calling of right as life and the becoming of the left as a type of unrighteousness, can be considered as the beginning of or manifestation of Sabaoth’s rule. Thereby, Sabaoth is installed as king of the seventh heaven and all the heavens below as well as of all those on earth who are represented by him; the gnostics, meanwhile, remain as those not subject to his rule but rather belong to the “kingless race.”

As we return to the text from this lengthy discussion of the traditions involved in the Sabaoth account, we note that since Sabaoth is placed in charge of the seventh heaven the late Jewish and early rabbinic tradition of a plurality of heavens, more commonly seven,103 is thus

---

modified into an ogdoadic structure, which reserves the eighth heaven for the high god. This particular motif of the Ogdoad as opposed to the Ichthomad, is widespread in Gnosticism and probably derives from astrological speculation.104

Sabaoth is in charge of the seventh heaven but below the cosmic veil, which separates the infinite aeons from the lower aeons (94[142]. 9-12). This motif of the cosmic veil derives ultimately from the veil before the inner tent of the desert shrine (e.g. Exod 26:33) and then later from the veil before the Holy of Holies of the Jerusalem Temple (2 Chr 3:14). In intertestamental Judaism, this earthly veil was transposed into the cosmic veil, which separates heaven and earth and also has upon it the images of the universe (cf. especially Josephus War 5.212-14, 19; Ant. 3.180-81 and Philo De vita Moses 2.74; Q. Exod. 90). This motif of the cosmic veil is not clearly expressed in the NT. Thus when found in Christian gnostic documents, this motif provides a lucid example of the debt of Gnosticism to a Judaism that is not mediated to it through the NT.105

Since Sabaoth is just below the cosmic veil, he is now described as between “Above” and “Below.” From an astrological point of view, this realm of the universe would correspond to the realm of the fixed stars, which is above the seven planetary spheres.106 Whether or not Nagel is correct in assuming τὸ ὄσφος and τὸ κόρας as behind the Coptic,107 it is only in intertestamental Judaism that one finds the phrase used absolutely rather than as in the LXX ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ὄσφος καὶ ἐν τῷ γῆς κόρας (e.g. Exod 20:4; cf. Isa 8:21). Philo, for example, uses the phrase absolutely in Quod det. pot. insid. soleat 85.108 Similarly,


105 G. MacRae, Some Elements of Jewish Apocalyptic, 30-114. In the Synoptics (Mark 15:38 par.) the veil is spiritualized to represent the Old Covenant and in Heb (6:19f.; 9:1-14; 10:19f.) the veil is allegorized to refer to the death of Christ. There is a possibility that the author of Hebrews also had in mind the heavenly veil in his allegory. However, the motif is not presented so clearly that it could have functioned as the source of gnostic imagery. For the OT veil, cf. also F. M. Cross, Jr., "The Priestly Tabernacle," The Biblical Archaeologist Reader, ed. G. E. Wright and D. N. Freedman (New York 1961) 201-28.

106 Ballard, The Hypostasis of the Archons, 109. Note also that τὸ μέτωρ in Test Abr 12 (Rev. A) represents the realm for the soul that is neither totally good nor totally evil.

107 Nagel, Das Wesen der Archonen, 79.

in the NT τά ὄνομα and τά κύριον are contrasted in John 8:23 (σπάστα τοῦ κύριου τοῦ ἄνου πελάτοι). In this gnostic text, however, the contrast is no longer between heaven and earth as in the OT, or between the Father and the world as in John (8:23, 26), but between the infinite aeons and the seven heavens of chaos (96 [144] 10-11).

After installation, Sabaoth is given a name as part of his enthronement. In the OT reception of a new name was probably part of the ceremony of enthronement for the king of Israel. However, this aspect of enthronement was not mirrored in the psalms concerning the enthronement of Yahweh (e.g. Ps 47) nor in the later scenes of heavenly enthronement in apocalyptic (e.g. the Son of Man in Dan 7 or 1 Enoch 71) but is present in Philo’s portrayal of the enthronement of Moses (De vita Mosae 1:158). It appears appropriate here in NatArch, as in Phil 2:9, that the name is given after the ascent (cf. OnOrgWld 104[152]15). Yet, it cannot be argued that NatArch has influenced or been influenced by Phil 2:9, since there is no equivalence in the terminology used for the bestowing of the name.

In this case, the name given is, of course, drawn from the God of the OT. However, it appears here in the odd formulation, “the God of the Forces, Sabaoth,” rather than the expected “Lord of the Forces.” We shall see that this odd formulation is not by accident. Rather, the customary formula is altered purposely in order that the “God of the Forces” might indicate a second, lower God beneath the high God worshipped by the Gnostics.

The explicative αὐτός is then added and provides an opportunity to indicate the appropriateness of the name. Sabaoth is “the God of the Forces,” since he is spatially above them. These forces are not as in the OT the angelic host of heaven, which Yahweh has created (Isa 40:26), or the heavenly army, which accompanies him in war.

---

109 Cf. Col. 3:1, 2 for τά ὄνομα.
110 G. von Rad, “Das judäische Königswesen,” Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament (Munich 1958) 205ff. Note that the terms used here in the Coptic language can translate σαλίας, ἐξωκλάτης, σεβόλη, ὀνομάζει (Crum, 1928) and that the major example pointed to by von Rad was καλόν (Isa 4:9b καλόν πάντα τό ὄνομα τοῦ ἄνου), although in the formula καλόν τό ὄνομα. In the NT, cf. Phil 2:9 where the formula is ἐνεργοῖς ἐν σμάς τό ὄνομα.

111 Cf preceding footnote.

112 Frequent, of course, in the OT is the liturgical address καλόν, θεὸς τῆς δόξας (e.g. Ps 89:9, 9). However, only in one instance is the trope omitted, Ps 79(80):14 ὁ θεὸς τῶν δοξασμοῖν Ελεήμονος λέγει. Similarly, at Qumran in one instance the phrase appears as ἐνεργοὶς ἐν σμάς τό ὄνομα (1 Qohb 4:25); cf. also 2 Enoch 52:1, Rec. A.
(Judg 5:14).¹¹³ The forces in this case are the demonic offspring of lilaklaban in the remaining six heavens and also in the nether world. In accord with the gnostic devaluation of the world, these regions together—rather than merely the nether world—are entitled chaos.¹¹⁴ This motif of one being “above the forces” is found also in the NT in the portrayal of Christ (Eph 1:20f. ἐπάνω ἐπὶ σαρκὸς ... δυνάμεις; cf. Rom 8:38; 1 Cor 15:24; 1 Pet 3:22) and thus cannot be used to establish the independence of the Sabaoth account from the NT.¹¹⁵

The pericope closes as the author adds again that it was Wisdom who installed Sabaoth. Thereby, his secondary importance is reinforced.

3. Creation of the Throne/Chariot of Sabaoth 95(143).26-28

Now (δε) when (ὅτε) these events had come to pass, he made himself a huge four-faced (πρόσωπον) chariot (ἄδημον) of cherubim.

The following pericope presents the creation of a chariot by Sabaoth and for himself. “Now when these events had come to pass” serves as a simple connective clause.¹¹⁶ This chariot is described by the adjective, four-faced, which derives from Ezek 1:6, 10 and 10:14, and by the formulaic expression, the chariot of Cherubim, which expression does not occur in Ezek 1 and 10 but does refer to the vision in these chapters.¹¹⁷ It should be noted that the presentation of Yahweh

¹¹³ Cross, Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays, 68-71. The term “host of heaven” can also mean in the OT the heavenly bodies, i.e. sun, moon, stars (2 Kgs 17:16; 21:3; 5: 23-4f; Ps 33:6; Isa 34:4; Dan 8:10). In intertestamental material, δοῦνας can refer to a class of angels (e.g. 1 Enoch 3:3; 3 Bar 1:8).

¹¹⁴ Cf. 95:14f. 11ff., which makes clear that the gnostic author’s world view in dependence upon Greek and Greek-speaking Jewish traditions conceives of Tartarus as the lowest, punitive place and the Abyss as the entire underworld (cf. Bauer, ad loc.) Chaos, which also denotes the nether abyss in Greek tradition (cf. Liddell/Scott, 1971) but which appears rarely in Greek-speaking Jewish literature (not in this meaning in the LXX and only twice in Philo, De aeris. mundi 17f.) is now applied by the gnostic to the whole world below the eighth heaven. In the NT, the term chaos does not appear.

¹¹⁵ One should note, as Grundmann has observed, that the idea of Satan in the NT is not associated with the term δοῦνας: W. Grundmann, δοῦνας, δοῦνας κτλ., TDNT 3 (1964) 808, n. 80.

¹¹⁶ The reading should be “when” (ὅτε) rather than “because” (ὅτι) these events had come to pass,” since the causal relationship is inappropriate. See Layton in “The Hypostasis of the Archons,” (1974) 419, ad loc.

¹¹⁷ Ezek 40:3 δ οί δύναμες τοῦ θεοῦ ὡς ἄνω, κατὰ τὴν ὅρασιν δέ εἶδον ὑπὸ τοῦ ποταμοῦ τοῦ γεωργίας τοῦ παραδίκημα τοῦ Ἰσραήλ. 1 Chr 2:18 τὸ παράδίκημα τοῦ δύναμες τοῦ γεωργίας, Στι 49:8 ἐξάθλημα ὡς ἄνω δύναμες δύναμις ὑπὸ τοῦ ποταμοῦ γεωργίας, Στι 48:4 ἐξάθλημα ὑπὸ τοῦ ποταμοῦ γεωργίας τοῦ ἔφεσου. 1 Enoch Mos 22:3; Test Ahit 9.10 (Rev. A).
upon the chariot of Cherubim in Ezekiel is a specifically Israelite feature in contrast with Near Eastern mythology.\footnote{118} In the Canaanite background El was pictured as sitting upon his throne, the throne of Cherubim, in the midst of the divine assembly.\footnote{119} It was Baal then who was portrayed as riding upon the war chariot, the defied clouds, toward the holy war.\footnote{120} In the vision of Ezekiel the presentation of the chariot is most influenced by Baal language. Baal’s war chariot predominates but it has been combined with El’s throne of Cherubim. Just as El epithets influenced the understanding of Yahweh in the early period, so the later resurgence of Baal material influenced the combination of these motifs of El’s throne of Cherubim and Baal’s war chariot and their application to Yahweh in the sixth century proto-apocalyptic of Ezek 1 and 10.\footnote{121} Yahweh was thus presented as warrior and king. This association of throne and chariot was maintained in Judaism, as is attested by 4Q SI 40.24.3 (“the structure of the chariot throne”)\footnote{122} and Apoc Abr 18 (“a chariot with fiery wheels … over the wheels was a throne”).\footnote{123} This gnostic document preserves the

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\item \footnote{118} I am indebted to Professor Cross for this basic insight, which was given in an oral communication.
\item \footnote{119} M. H. Pope, El in the Ugaritic Texts (IVTSup 2; Leiden 1955) 45-46.
\item \footnote{123} Box, The Apocalypse of Abraham, 82; cf. 1 Enoch 14:18. Professor M. Smith has graciously called my attention to the magical papyri, gems, and amulets in regard to this portrayal of Sabaoth. Within the magical papyri, Sabaoth appears frequently as a deity (some 82 occurrences) and is often invoked, but there is no presentation of Sabaoth with a chariot of Cherubim. Within the gems and amulets, there is indeed a gem in the British Museum (BM 56048) with a human figure driving a chariot, which is drawn by two serpents. Above the figure one finds inscribed Iao, and on the bevel there is written Abrasax. On the reverse of a bloodstone representing the Sun and the Moon in their chariots (BM 56147) one finds the inscription: Iao, Sabaoth, Abrasax, The Existent One, Lord, protect me. Further, in a gem published by King there is the solar deity, who is cock-headed and anguipede and who drives the chariot by four horses; underneath there is inscribed Sabaoth. While it is possible that magical traditions have influenced the presentation of Sabaoth in NaĂĄch, it is difficult to prove since such motifs as the four-faces and the myriads of angels in combination with the chariot of Cherubim are not found on the gems or amulets but rather in apocalyptic traditions and thus point to influence from there and since in the related OnTheWay
same feature in that Sabaoth, an El title, is associated not with a throne but with a chariot, the chariot of Cherubim.

Usually in the OT the motif that Yahweh sits upon his throne is part of the enthronement, after he has ascended—e.g. Ps 47:8. However, as we pointed out earlier, in ancient Near Eastern mythology and in Exod 15:17 the motif is rather that a temple or abode is built for the deity, again as part of the enthronement. The fact that Sabaoth makes the chariot (as Yahweh makes his abode in Exod 15:17), that the chariot is for himself, and that the chariot functions as the throne in Israelite and Jewish literature, indicates to us that Sabaoth is thereby being enthroned in this pericope.

The Cherubim are not here considered as a separate class of angels as in 1 En 61:10 (“the Cherubim, Seraphim and Ofanim”; cf. 71:7). To this expression, the chariot of Cherubim, is then added the adjective “huge.” This phrase is not found in the OT but in 1 Enoe 14:10, 16 the adjective “large” or “huge” is applied to the two houses within which the throne-chariot is kept.

This motif of the chariot of Cherubim has not influenced and cannot be derived from the NT, since there is no mention in the NT of the chariot of the Lord. Only the “throne” is presented (e.g. Rev 4:6f). Similarly, the term Cherubim occurs only once in the NT but in the description of the Holy of Holies (Heb 9:5). Lastly, although the four creatures are presented in Rev 4:7, it is striking that only one is said to have a πρόσωπον, the man; the others are merely said to be “like unto.”124

4. Creation of the Angels 95(143), 28-31

29 ἐνακάθιον ἐμπότις ἐνεποίησεν καὶ ετρούγει
30 προτεστατικῶς γῆν ἐφέπλατησεν ἡ ἐ̣
31 κοίλη

and infinitely many angels (βυγγέλοις),
to act as ministers (ἐξεπεκτεῖναι),
and also harps (ἠρεῖαν)
and lyres (σθῆμα).


124 E.g. 4:7 τοῦ πρόσωπον ἔργων κλειστος whereas in Ezek 1:6, 10 and 10:14 it is clearly τοσοῦτον πρόσωπον.
Angels are also fashioned and described as "many" and "infinite." If ἐκτοιτος μην translates ὄντως ἐκτοιτος as is probable, then it is noteworthy that this expression does not occur in the LXX or Philo or the NT in connection with angels but seems to derive from Jewish apocalyptic.127

The text draws upon the tradition whereby angels are presented as accompanying the chariot-throne (e.g. Apoc Moses 22) and portrays the function of the angels as to minister. If ὄντως ἐκτοιτος was in the Greek original, then it is significant that ὄντως ἐκτοιτος plays almost no role in the LXX or the NT. It does not occur as the term for the angelic service of God. Only with Philo are angels spoken of as God’s ὄντως ἐκτοιτος.127 Instead, the term for "the ministering angels" seems to have been ἑκτοιτος (e.g. T. Levi 3:5).128 a term which in later Greek translations of the OT can be rendered as ὄντως ἐκτοιτος (e.g. Num 4:22 Sym). Thus, again, the terminology used in NatArch appears to derive from late Judaism rather than the OT or NT. Created with the angels are also harps and lyres as the instruments for them. Although these instruments are frequently mentioned together in the LXX, they are not there associated with angels.129 In the NT the κύπερα are associated with the angels (Rev 5:8; 14:2).

5. The Instruction of Sabaoth 95(143),31-34

And Wisdom (prophet) took her daughter Life (God) and had her sit upon his right to teach him about the things that exist in the Eighth (heaven).

In resumption of line 25 the text presents Wisdom as taking her daughter Life and seating her in the position of honor, the right hand. Her task is specifically to teach Sabaoth. Here Life replaces the...

127 Heb 11:12, Sah., has ἐκτοιτος μην for ὄντως ἐκτοιτος. Curn, 527b gives ὄντως ἐκτοιτος for ὄντως ἐκτοιτος but does not list the expression ὄντως ἐκτοιτος.
128 Cf. 1 Enoch 40:1 “And after that I saw thousands of thousands, and ten thousand times ten thousand, I saw a multitude beyond number” (Charles, The Book of Enoch, 1012; 77); 4 Ezra 6:3 “numberless armies of angels” (Charles, 4 PSE 2: 374; cf also 2 Bar 21:6; 59:11. For the biblical background of this motif, one may consult the positive formulation in Isa 40:26: “Lift up your eyes on high and see: who created these? He who brings out their host by number, calling them all by name: by the greatness of his might, and because he is so strong in power not one is missing.” This reference was pointed out to me by Professor Cross in private communication.
130 Charles, The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, 34.
131 Gen 4:21; Job 21:12; Ps 56(55):8; Ps 106(105):2; etc.
angelus interpres found in apocalyptic literature in such a context (e.g. Uriel in 1 Enoch 19:1; Michael in Test Abr 10, Rec. A). It is indicative of the important role of Wisdom in the myth that it is she who does the placing. Further, it is significant that she places her daughter Life as the instructorless rather than an angel to represent righteousness, as in Test Abr 12 (Rec. A). As Böhlig has pointed out, the basis of the identification between Life and instructorless lies in a Semitic word-play. The name of Eve (אֱלֶה), which is related etymologically in Gen 3:20 to the word meaning "life" (תּוֹלֶד), has been associated with the Aramaic word of the same sound meaning "instruct" (תּוֹלֶד). Eve's name then is translated as zōē in the LXX, which in turn is here translated as Life.130

The significance of this "teaching about the things that exist in the Eighth" is signalled when one contrasts it with the mode and content of revelation to the apocalyptic seer. The main revelation for the apocalyptic seer is, of course, the vision of the divine throne and the Godhead upon it (e.g. 1 Enoch 14; 2 Enoch 20-22). Secondly, nothing remains hidden to the seer in heaven or in the cosmos; all the secrets of the universe are shown or laid bare to him (e.g. 1 Enoch 14:37; 2 Enoch 24:33), which revelation may later be communicated in special books (e.g. 1 Enoch 104:11-13; 2 Enoch 40:1-8; 54:1; 68:1-3). Here in this document the gnostic dualism makes its presence felt. Entrance into the divine world is not offered to Sabaoth since he is one born ultimately from evil matter. He must remain below the veil. Thus a vision as well as interpretation of a vision of the divine world are impossible; instead, Sabaoth receives instruction concerning the Eighth, the realm of imperishability (94[142].5). On the other hand, in this revelation to Sabaoth there is no mention of the secrets of the lower world. The total concern here is with the divine realm.

This pericope has neither influenced nor been derived from the NT.

130 The Semitic word-play is carried further to associate the serpent and the instructor, cf. Böhlig, Die logisch-gnostische Schrift ohne Titel, 73-74. Also B. Pearson, "Jewish Haggadic Traditions in The Testimony of Truth from Nag Hammadi (CG IX, 3)." En Oshe Religioani: Studia Geo Widengren oblata, ed. J. Bergman, K. Dyngeff and H. Ringgren (Leiden 1973), 1: 463-64.
6. The Separation into Right and Left 95 (143) 34-96(144) 3

And the angel (εγγέλος) [of wrath (ἀγγέλος)]
the placed upon his left. [Since]
that day, [his right] has been called

1. της ζωής γαρ τῷ φασματικῷ

2. η ζωή, η καιναθρότης (καινοθρότης)

3. καὶ τοῦραν διὰ τοῦτο

In this pericope concerning the separation into right and left, the
final elements in the ascent and vision of the apocalyptic seer and in
the enthronement scene have been conflated. First of all, in the descrip-
tion of the chariot/throne in late Jewish apocalyptic, a final ele-
ment is the portrayal of angels on the right and left. No doubt this motif
has its origin in the OT presentation of Yahweh as seated upon his
throne with the host of heaven on his right and left (1 Kgs 22:19/2 Chr
18:18; the tester who comes before the Lord should also be noted in
this passage). That this picture was still vivid in late apocalyptic is
shown in Adam and Eve 25:3: "And many thousands of angels were
on the right and left of that chariot."

In the OT the distinction between right and left can also indicate positive and negative value,
as in Ecd 10:2 ("A wise man’s heart inclines him toward the right,
but a fool’s heart toward the left"). Within late apocalyptic and
particularly in association with the vision of the divine throne/chariot,
this distinction and its valence was also kept. Thus in Apoc Abr. after
Abraham has received his vision of the divine throne/chariot (c. 17-18),
he sees mankind divided into multitudes of people on the right side
and on the left (c. 21 ff). Here the right side represents Israel and the
left side represents the heathen—some of whom are to be saved and
some damned:

And I saw there a great multitude—men and women and children half of
them of the right side of the picture and half of them on the left side of the
picture... These which are on the left side are the multitude of the peoples
which have formerly been in existence and which are after the destined...

---

133 Test Meyer, Vite Adam e Enos, 228; translation Charles, APO/P 2, 140. Cf. also
Adam and Eve 21:1 and the probable restoration in IQM 9:14f, although the throne
is not present here.

134 Cf. Ezek 4:4. Philo in Q. c. m. 7:9 (Colius Wendland 5.48) gives
a list of opposites interesting for our context here: ζωή-θανάτος, νοος-ήθος, λογική
μετάφ. διάλογος, διδασκαλία-θλίψις, αρετῆς-παρασυρίας.
some for judgment and restoration, and others for vengeance and destruction at the end of the world. But these which are on the right side of the picture, they are the people set apart for me of the peoples with Azazel. These are they whom I have ordained to be born of thee and to be called My People. 

In Apoc Abr the whole history of mankind is then told from this perspective of the division into right and left (c. 21-29). Similarly in Test Abr, another piece of late apocalyptic literature, this distinction and its valence is presented as a final element in the description of the throne. In this case, the throne is the one upon which Abel sits:

Between the gates there stood a fearsome throne which looked like an awesome crystal, flashing lightning like fire. And upon it was seated a wondrous man, looking like the sun, like a son of God. Before him there stood a crystalline table, all of gold and byssus. Upon the table lay a book six cubits thick and ten cubits broad. On its right and on its left stood two angels holding parchment and ink and a pen. Before the table sat a luminous angel, holding a scale in his hand. On his left hand there sat a fiery angel altogether merciless and severe, holding a trumpet in his hand, holding within it all-consuming fire for the testing of the sinners.

And the wondrous man who sat upon the throne was himself judging and sentencing the souls. The two angels of the right and of the left were recording. The one on the right was recording the righteous deeds, the one of the left the sins, and the one who was before the table who was holding the scale was weighing the souls, and the fiery angel who was holding in the fire was testing the souls.

Then Abraham asked the Archistrategos Michael, "What are these things that we see?"

And the Archistrategos said, "These things that you see, O holy Abraham, are judgment and recompense."

And behold, the angel who was holding the soul in his hand brought it before the judge and the judge said to one of the angels who were attending him, "Open this book for me and find me the sins of this soul."

And he opened the book and he found that its sins and righteous deeds were equally balanced, and he delivered it neither to the tormentors nor to those who were saved, but set it in the middle. 

Secondly and with respect to heavenly enthronement, as Mowinckel states it, a final element in the enthronement scene is the description of "the state of things, which will now come about, or in an ideal sense has already come about . . . his (Yahweh's) enemies are going to be struck with awe, whereas his people shall rejoice in his righteous

---

113 Box, The Apocalypse of Abraham, 67-69.
and luck-bringing rule." 135 That this element persisted in the enthronement tradition may be seen in Ps 47:8f ("God reigns over the nations; God sits on his holy throne. The princes of the people gather as the people of the God of Abraham"). Dan 7:14b ("his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom one that shall not be destroyed") and 1 Enoch 71:16 ("And all shall walk in thy ways since righteousness never forsaketh thee: With thee will be their dwelling-places, and with thee their heritage, and they shall not be separated from thee for ever and ever"). The final element in the enthronement scene could also be that Yahweh comes to judge (e.g. Ps 96:13).

In this pericope, then, we shall now see in detail that the motifs concerning the distinction between right and left as part of the description of the throne/chariot and the beginning of rule by the enthroned have been conflated and reworked to suit gnostic purposes.

Since Life's role at the right of Sabaith has already been expressed, the Angel of Wrath— as Layton has restored the text—is then simply placed at the left. Sabaith's right hand (in a probable restoration) is then given a name. Consistent with the myth, the name is Life, which results in this unusual contrast between ἐμαυ καὶ δικαιοσύνη. From Jewish literature and from the NT one would customarily expect the contrast between δικαιοσύνη and δικαιοσύνη or even between ἐμαυ and ἐμαυ. In the Wisdom tradition, when Wisdom leaves the world, then unrighteousness abounds (1 Enoch 42:3, 4; Ezra 5:10). Here Wisdom can also be identified with life (Zoc, Prov 8:35) but life is not hypostatized. Thus the Wisdom tradition is not the direct source of this contrast. Rather, the contrast here between Life and unrighteousness is probably a gnostic creation and the result of the hypostatization of Life and her role as instructress of Sabaith. 138

The left is then said to represent the unrighteousness or to be a type of injustice, a type not in the sense of a hermeneutical term or

---

136 Charles, The Book of Enoch (1912) 145. Once again I have followed the text with thy and thee rather than the emendation of Charles to the third person.
137 C. G. Schenck, δικαιοσύνη, TDNT 3 (1964) 1531ff; in the NT cf. John 7:18; Rom 3:5; 2 Thess 2:10; etc.
138 One could consider it from the other point of view, namely, that the expected contrast would be between life and death (Deut 30:15) or life and punishment (Matt 25:46). The change from one of these terms to δικαιοσύνη could perhaps then be seen as related to the "rulers of unrighteousness" (93:14ff) 1 and ?). However, this seems less likely since the interest of the author is focused upon Life and would more easily represent his own contribution than "unrighteousness."
heavenly original but in the sense of an image, a copy. It appears odd at first that the angel, who punished Ialdabaoh and therefore served the forces of good and is now associated with Life and the rehabilitated Sabbath, should be considered negatively in association with δικαιοσύνη. But note the change! The left rather than Sabbath's left, i.e. the angel, has become the image of unrighteousness. Sabbath's left is not called unrighteousness. Secondly, this association becomes understandable in the light of the angel of punishment in later apocalyptic; he too stands at the left of the chariot (e.g. Test Ab 12, Rec. A).

In other words, Sabbath and his angel are not unrighteous and thus Sabbath's left cannot be called unrighteous. Rather, one aspect of Sabbath's rule is to punish unrighteousness through this angel; Sabbath is, in effect, a righteous deity with a righteous angel. "The left" then becomes not a heavenly prototype but a copy, an image, of that original unrighteousness perpetrated by Ialdabaoh.

That the blasphemy of Ialdabaoh should be termed δικαιοσύνη is appropriate, since in the LXX it can represent unrighteousness in the sense of lying or untruthfulness (e.g. Ps 51[52]:5; 118[119]:69). As we have already mentioned, in the Wisdom tradition when Wisdom withdraws from the world, the world is said to be left in unrighteousness. Further, in Jewish apocalyptic, the whole period preceding the Messianic revelation can be summed up as a time of unrighteousness (e.g. 4 Ezra 4:51ff; 1 Enoch 48:7; 91:5ff). For the gnostic the interest lies in showing that the unrighteousness of the world is bound up with pre-historic events, with the tyranny of Ialdabaoh. That tyranny took place above, not in the sense of within the plerotic world but merely above the Abyss (cf. 95[143]:10-13) and in the presence of Wisdom and Life as well as Sabbath.

As his translation shows, Layton has correctly seen that the final line of this section, line 3, is a sentence in the second tense rather than a relative clause. With this final sentence, "it was before your time that they came into being," the angel Eleleth concludes one section of the myth of origins and resumes speaking directly to Norea. Thereby the dramatic setting of the dialogue between Eleleth and Norea is sustained and carried forth—cf. 95[143]:4, 11, 18; 96[144]:15, 19.

Again this pericope cannot be said to have influenced or to have been derived from the NT. To be sure, Christ appears enthroned in
the NT and separates the sheep from the goats, the former on the right and the latter on the left (Matt 25:33-46). The just sheep then are said to receive "eternal life" while the goats receive eternal punishment. However, the context is entirely different there. In the NT the scene is the coming of the Son of Man and therefore the final judgment, whereas in NatArch it is the pre-cosmic period and the establishment of the structures of the universe. Further, the motif concerning a heavenly figure or angel standing on the right and left of the Son of Man is missing. It seems more likely that both the NT and NatArch derive from a common Jewish background than that they are mutually related.

The sections of the Sabbaoth account when exeged show clearly that the material of the Sabbaoth account derives from Judaism. The terminology and the motifs can be explained as drawn from the literature of Judaism. The pattern followed here is the same as that pertaining to the apocalyptic seer in Judaism: ascent, vision (here: making) of the chariot, instruction or revelation, separation into right and left. Thus one is justified in concluding that the pericope uses the Jewish tradition of the ascent and vision of the throne-chariot by the apocalyptic seer. Similarly, the pattern and thus the Jewish tradition of heavenly enthronement are in evidence here: ascent, enthronement, and the beginning of rule.

Although the material used in the Sabbaoth account derives from Judaism, we shall argue subsequently on the basis of its function that the Sabbaoth account is a Christian composition. However, the Sabbaoth account itself has not been influenced by the NT. The Jewish traditions used in this account have not been mediated by or through the NT to the Christian circles responsible for the Sabbaoth account. There is no evidence that the ascent of Paul (2 Cor 12:2ff) or John (Rev 4:1ff) has influenced this account. Secondly, although the tradition of enthronement is applied to Christ in the NT, there is no indication that the NT has influenced the Sabbaoth account. In the NT Christ's enthronement is associated with his parousia (1 Cor 15:23ff; Mark 14:61ff; Matt 25:31ff) or with his resurrection/ascension (e.g. Phil 2:6-11; Rom 8:34; Col 3:1; Eph 1:20; Acts 2:33ff; John 12:32) and not with the creation of the world. Further, the determinative

\[\text{In Col 1:15ff Christ's rule over all things is presented in the context of creation but on the basis of his being the image of God and his mediation in creation rather than his enthronement. Then in v. 18 he is portrayed as "first among all" on the basis of his resurrection.}\]
motifs that are applied to Sabaoth are not in the NT applied to Christ. Repentance by Christ is not part of his enthronement. Nor is he "snatched up"; rather he ascends (σχηματίζειν e.g. John 20:17), is taken up (ἀναλαμβάνειν I Tim 3:16) or is exalted (ἐξαλλάττειν e.g. Phil 2:9; Acts 2:33; John 9:28). Nor is Christ placed in charge (καθιστάμετα) of the heavens; rather he sits at the right hand of the Father (συμβεβήκας e.g. Acts 2:34; Col 3:1). Nor is he given the name "God of the Forces"; rather he is called Lord (Phil 2:11). He is not given Life as his instructor nor is he instructed concerning the Ogdoad. Lastly, as we have seen, a number of the minor motifs found in the Sabaoth account are not present in the NT. These motifs are as follows: matter as mother, loathing (ἐκδιώκειν), seven heavens, the heavenly veil, chaos, the Cherubim-chariot which is four-faced, infinitely many angels, angels who minister (ὑπηρέτησαν), the harps of angels, a heavenly or angelic figure on the right and the left sides of the enthroned person, and the contrast between life and injustice.

These Jewish traditions concerning the ascent of the apocalyptic seer and heavenly enthronement have also been redacted in several ways by their re-use in the Sabaoth account of this document. First of all, the context has been changed. The ascent and the enthronement are placed within the account of the creation of the world. Secondly, the traditions are redacted in that the pattern is altered. The pericope concerning the repentance of Sabaoth is added as a preliminary to his ascent. Thirdly, the understanding of the world is different in the reuse of these traditions. Anti-cosmic dualism is clearly involved in the view that the world arose from the fall of Wisdom. Lastly, also strikingly new is the antipathy to the God of the OT that is expressed in the demonization of him on the one hand to the evil Demiurge Ialdabaoth and on the other hand to his repentant son Sabaoth.

B. Function

Concerning the function of the Sabaoth account in this document one should note first that the Sabaoth account is part of the pre-cosmic myth and second that the concern of the document is with the realm of imperishability and the origin, structure and ultimate fate of the entire cosmos. Within that framework then the reality of the rulers, among whom is Sabaoth, is presented.

The exact function of the Sabaoth account is not explicitly stated. In the further questions of Noreia to Eleleth, after the Wisdom myth
has been recounted, there is no added reference to Sabaoth. He does not appear to act as intercessor, mediator or revealer.

We propose that the Sabaoth account functions in a manner similar to the passages concerning Moses in Ezekiel Tr and Philo. Here, however, the account serves to authenticate not the prophet who composed but the God who revealed himself in the books of the OT. The books are validated as containing revelation about the realm of the Eighth because of the instruction of Life, even though the God who revealed himself was not from the Eighth. Secondly, the God of the OT is shown to be the one who rules this world and to be not completely evil, even though he is the offspring of an evil father Ialdabaoth. Thirdly, the Sabaoth account serves to evaluate theologically the Jewish people as belonging to this repentant ruler Sabaoth. In order then to support this interpretation of the function of the Sabaoth account, it will be necessary to consider some related gnostic literature and to observe the theological issues debated therein.

First of all, however, it must be said that the Nag Hammadi tracts have rendered suspect the clear differentiation of the gnostics into sects on the basis of distinct doctrines by the Church Fathers. Rather the documents contain within themselves teachings attributed to different sects and thereby indicate that the mythologogomena were widely shared among the various branches of Gnosticism. Publication of the entire corpus from Nag Hammadi and further analysis will be necessary before a new classification is possible.

In the meantime, F. Wisse has provided an acceptable working definition of at least one sect, the Sethians, within the branch of Syro-Egyptian Gnosticism. He derives his criterion from Epiphanius' presentation (Pan. 39) and characterizes their teaching as containing two basic elements: the evil origin of the world and of the non-gnostics and the heavenly origin of the race of Seth. These basic teachings

---

1 For example, the Apocryphon in its four versions (BG 8502; CG II. 1; III. 1; IV. 1) surpasses the bounds of the Barbelogogia when this sect is identified on the basis of Iren. Adv. haer. I.29. Cf. Wisse, “The Nag Hammadi Library and the Heresiologists,” 205-23.

2 F. Wisse, “The Sethians and the Nag Hammadi Library,” The Society of Biblical Literature, One Hundred Eighth Annual Meeting, Seminar Papers, ed. Lane C. McGoughy (SBL 1972) 2.601-07. He correctly dismisses the account in Epiphanius (Ref. 3.19-23) as an inadequate criterion for defining the Sethians. The very document which Epiphanius refers to as the source of their teachings, “The Paraphrase of Seth,” is probably mistaken named by him and should rather be entitled as “The Paraphrase of Shem” as CG VII. 1.
can then be expressed with a variety of mythologoumena by the different gnostic authors.

Natrach as a whole and the Sabaoth account in particular, if they cannot be characterized as stemming from the Sethians, at least belong to the circle of those gnostics who share common traditions with the Sethians. Thus, in order to present the function of the Sabaoth account within the document, we shall first consider the Sethian document, ApocAd (CG V, 5) and then the report in Iren. Adv. haer. 1.30, concerning unnamed gnostics, who nevertheless share some features with the Sethians, before considering NatArch itself. In considering these accounts we shall pay particular attention to their teaching concerning the God of Israel, the revelation in Israel’s sacred books, and the people of Israel.

ApocAd in its basic literary form is a testament, in which Adam instructs his son Seth concerning the revelation which he has received. The evil Demiurge according to this revelation will try to destroy the race of gnostics through a flood and then through fire and brimstone. In each case, however, they will be saved, and in a third event an Illuminator will come to redeem men.

The text is definitely Sethian and has been accepted as such by scholars. Discussion of the document, however, has led to divergence of opinion on two issues: first, whether the document presents an example of non-Christian Gnosticism and second, whether the document is early.

---

146 “The Sethians and the Nag Hammadi Library,” 606.
Our concern is particularly with the latter issue: whether the document is early. It is more probable that ApocAd is early since its speculation upon the gnostic hierarchy of beings is less elaborate, it stays mainly within the narrative framework, it does not try to explain everything, and its schematization is close to that of apocalyptic material. When taken together these indications point to an early date of ApocAd. Hopefully, our consideration of the Sabatha account will also reinforce this conclusion.

Before examining the ApocAd, we should first discuss the relationship...
between ApocAd and NatArch. There is no question of literary dependence here, but both tractates do share common gnostic traditions. For example, in names both tractates definitely call the evil Demiurge Saklas (ApocAd 74.3; 7; NatArch 98[143],7) and probably relate Seth to the gnostics (ApocAd 85.24; NatArch probably 91[139],31). Secondly, both tractates share common mythologoumena. Adam and Eve are androgynous at first and possess the divine element (ApocAd 64.6-12; NatArch 89[137],3-11). The separation of Eve from Adam causes the loss of the divine element (ApocAd 64.20-30; NatArch 89[137],3-11). Eve, as the spiritual woman, teaches Adam (ApocAd 64.12f; NatArch 89[137],11-22).

For our comparison with NatArch it is important to note the views of ApocAd on God—both the supreme God and the lower ruler. The supreme God is entitled God; God, the Eternal; the God of Truth; or the living God. On the other hand, the lower ruler, who is drawn from the deity of the OT, is also termed a God and receives the names: God; the God who made us; the Lord, the God who made us; God, the Ruler of the Aeons; God the Almighty (Pantokrator); Saklas, their God; the God of the Aeons; and the God of the Powers.

The lower God functions as the Demiurge of man (66.17-21) and probably implicitly also as the Demiurge of the world. In creating man the Demiurge has given him a spirit of life to make him a living soul (66.21-23; cf. Gen 2:7). However, ApocAd makes clear that this soul perishes and that there is another spirit from above, which brings eternal life (cf. 76.15-27; 77.7-15; 84.1-3).

At the flood, it is the same God, the lower God, who both destroys all flesh and yet quiets his anger and unexplainedly spares Noah (69.2-17; 70.6-15).

145 God (παντες θεοί): 72.14; 82.21; 83.13, 21; God, the Eternal (παντες θεοί): 64.13f; 76.22; 85.15; the God of Truth (παντες θεοί): 65.13; and the living God (παντες θεοί): 84.9f; and possibly also the God of the Aeons (παντες θεοί): 85.4f, unless the text is emended here to avoid attributing to the supreme God this title which also applies to the lower God and seems to connote the aeons of the evil creation.
146 God (παντες θεοί): 64.7; 66.28); 70.6, 16: 71.16; 78.15; 81.16; the God who made us (παντες θεοί): 64.17; 65.17f, 31f; 66.20f, 25f; the Lord, the God who made us (παντες θεοί): 66.14f; God, the Ruler of the Aeons (παντες θεοί): 64.20f; God, the Almighty (παντες θεοί): 69[46], 7: 72.25, 73.9; Saklas, their God (σακλας θεός): 74.3f, 7 (without the phrase “their God”); the God of the Aeons (παντες θεοί): 74.26f, and the God of the Powers (77.4).
After the flood Noah then divides the entire earth, in accord with Gen 9:18f, among his sons Shem, Ham, and Japhet, who are to serve the Pantokrator in fear and slavery (72.15-25). From the seed of Ham and Japhet some 400,000 men enter the land of the true gnostics and dwell with them (73.15-20). When the remaining seed of Ham and Japhet reproach the lower God for this event, he is entitled Saklas. On the other hand, the descendants of Noah through Shem have done the entire will of the lower God (74.17-21).153 Who in this context is named the Pantokrator (72.25; 73.9). There is only the one lower God, however, who is presented under these different titles (cf. 74.3-21 where Saklas is identified as the deity of Ham, Japhet, and also "of the son of Noah", i.e. Shem). It seems probable that the division of the peoples of the world into the descendants of Shem, Ham and Japhet and the particular dedication of the descendants of Shem to the lower God as the Pantokrator indicate that Shem represents the Jews and Ham and Japhet the Gentiles (cf. Gen 10f; Jub 7.8; 1 QM 2:13-14).154 The coming of the Illuminator then is to save the souls of those from among the seed of Noah and the sons of Ham and Japhet, who have thought the gnosis of the eternal God in their heart and received a spirit from one of the eternal angels (76.8-27).155

Finally, it is important for our comparison with NatArch to note how this knowledge is transmitted. It was not placed in a book nor written down (85.50) but rather angelic beings have brought these words to a rock on a high mountain (85.7-11).156 These words of imperishability and truth have then not been recognized by all generations of men (85.8-13); but they are the revelation, which Adam gave

153 The son of Noah here probably refers to Shem; cf. Belz, Die Adam-Apokalypse aus Codex F, 111.
155 It is probably no accident that the return of the gnostic men to the earth is not mentioned after their second delivery from fire (75.9-76.7). Rather, the emphasis in the treatise is upon the possibility of the remaining descendants of Shem, Ham and Japhet to receive gnosis and the spirit. Does this indicate a propagandistic purpose for the work?
156 ApocAd here uses the Jewish tradition that the revelation to Seth was engraved upon a stone to withstand the flood; cf. Jus. Am 1.88-70; Adam and Eve 50.3. Although the terms in Josephus are (origines/stone) and in Adam and Eve (tablets/tables), the terms stena/rock are equally acceptable in this context; e.g. Jub 8.7 the rock upon which the teaching of the Watchers was engraved. Cf. Perkins, "Apocalyptic Schematization in the Apocalypse of Adam," 593 and n. 23. The denial by Belz of this interpretation presses too far the phrase "not written." Is the sense not that the words were not written in a book but inscribed upon a rock? Otherwise, the reference to a rock is meaningless. Cf. Belz, Die Adam-Apokalypse aus Codex F, 192.
to Seth and which Seth gave to his seed, and the hidden knowledge of Adam which is the holy baptism of those who know the eternal gnosis (85.19-31). This hidden tradition of words then is the source of gnosia. It stands apart from the Law and the Prophets, and the whole question of the role of the Law and the Prophets is bypassed.

We shall contend in our discussion of Sabaoth in NatArch that these views were later developed further. When the issue of the value of the Law and the Prophets in addition to gnostic revelation was raised, the materials were at hand for a solution. The two different names, Puntokrator (-Sabaoth) and Saklas, were applied to two different rulers; and the former came to represent the God of the Jews, who was considered as not entirely evil and who saved his own people at the flood. Although he was not entirely evil, this God of the Jews could still not impart the spiritual principle from above which gives eternal life.

The second account to consider is Iren. Adv. haer. 1.30, before we consider directly the Sabaoth account in NatArch. As Bullard pointed out frequently in his commentary, Irenaeus' account here of the doctrine of an unnamed sect is also closely related to NatArch. The sect to which this teaching belongs has been generally accepted as the Ophites on the basis of the prominence of the serpent within the account and the descriptions of Hippolytus (Ref. 5.6) and Theodoret (Haereticarum fabularum compositum 1.14; ed. PG 83, 363-68), who identifies the Ophites with the Sethians. If the Ophites do not belong to the Sethians proper, they at least certainly share common traditions with them. For example, although the role of Seth is not greatly emphasized, yet those who have the particle of light ultimately derive from him.138

137 The Hebrew YHVH or Eloah is translated in the LXX in various ways: as kyrios sabaot throughout Isa and occasionally elsewhere; as kyrios tis dynamis in 1-4 Kgs, Ps, Amos, Zech and Jer; as panto克拉toς or kyrios pantokraτως in various places in 2 and 3 Kgs, 1 Chr, Hos, Amos, Mic, Nah, Hab, Zeph, Zech, Mal, Jer. Sabaoth is also maintained in transliteration in 1Th 1.30, 316: 1 Enoch 21-1: 52:1 as well as in the magical papyri and the curse tablets. Cf. C. H. Dodd, The Bible and the Greeks (London 1935) 16-19; Bouquet, Die Religion des Judenraumes, 312: n. 2; MacRae, Some Elements of Jewish Apocalyptic, 130: Bruegg. Walterbrueck, ad loc. It is doubtful whether Dodd's suggestion (17) is necessarily correct, i.e. that the translation into kyrios sabaot, as if the two nouns were in apposition, gave rise to the translation of Sabaoth as a proper name within the gnostic writings and magical papyri, since the other divine names from the OT are also treated individually as proper names (cf. Leo, Adonis; Iren. Adv. haer. 1.30).

138 In this respect F. Wisse's exclusion of Iren. Adv. haer. 1.30, from the Sethians may need to be modified. Cf. Wisse, "The Sethians and the Nag Hammadi Library," 160. In Irenaeus it is the harmonis hominis, which has fallen from above (103.2, ed.
In particular Iren. Adv. haer. 1.30 shares with NatArch the stress on Wisdom as the one from whom this world derives (30.2; ed. Harvey 1. 228f), the figure of Ialdabaoth (30.4; ed. Harvey 1. 230) and the sons whom he has generated (30.3f; ed. Harvey 1. 229f). In addition Irenaeus here also has the mythologoumena that Eve has a power which leaves her (30.6; ed. Harvey 1. 233), that the mother comes in the serpent (30.7; ed. Harvey 1. 234), and also that the serpent is Wisdom and the wisest of animals (30.14; ed. Harvey 1. 241).

For our purposes again it is important to note the teaching within this account concerning God. In addition to the supreme God who is called the First Man (30.1; ed. Harvey 1. 227), the lower deity Ialdabaoth also claims to be God (30.5; ed. Harvey 1. 232) and demands to be worshipped as such (30.10; ed. Harvey 1. 237). He resides in the seventh heaven, with his sons in the six heavens underneath. Together they rule both heavenly and earthly things (30.4; ed. Harvey 1. 20f).

He too breathes a spirit of life into Adam, which in this case serves to deprive Ialdabaoth of his power and to transfer it to Adam. Samael (who is also named Michael) then is the serpent offspring of Ialdabaoth who is cast down by him into this world. There Samael generated six sons in imitation of his father’s hebdomad, who together with him form the demons that afflict mankind (30.8; ed. Harvey 1. 235).

At the flood it is Ialdabaoth who seeks to destroy mankind while Wisdom saves those who are around Noah because of the light within them (30.10; ed. Harvey 1. 237). Who exactly is responsible for saving Noah is left unsaid, but probably Ialdabaoth is to be understood. After the flood Ialdabaoth chooses for himself Abraham and his seed, leads his descendants out of Egypt, gives them the Law and makes them Jews (30.10; ed. Harvey 1. 237). Ultimately then Christ comes to bring back the particle of light to the perfect Aeon (30.11ff; ed. Harvey 1. 238-40).

Harvey 1. 228) and ultimately needs to be reintegrated in the incorruptible Aeon (30.14; ed. Harvey 1. 241). By the creation of Adam and Eve this hemerometrica lumenis was transferred from Ialdabaoth to Adam to Eve and then back to Prometheus (30.5f; ed. Harvey 1. 232f). After they were driven out of Paradise, Adam and Eve received an odor hemerometricos lumenis in order to be reminded of their own (30.8f; Harvey 1. 235f). After the birth of Cain and Abel, it is through the providence of Prometheus that Seth and Noera are born, from whom come the rest of men (30.9; ed. Harvey 1. 236f). From their descendants many became subject to the lower hebdomad, but Prometheus saved his own, namely, those of the hemerometrica lumenis. At the flood Wisdom saved those who were around Noah in the ark because of the light within them (30.9f; ed. Harvey 2.26f). Then it is this light to which Christ is sent (30.11ff; ed. Harvey 1. 238f).
Unlike ApocAd the problematic of how this knowledge reaches one is resolved differently. A hidden, oral tradition, completely independent of the Law and the Prophets is not introduced. To be sure, the Law and the Prophets are attributed to Ialdabaath and his rulers:

Each of these receives his own herald for the purpose of glorifying and proclaiming God; so that, when the rest hear these praises, they too may serve those who are announced as gods by the prophets.

Moreover, they distribute the prophets in the following manner: Moses, and Joshua the son of Nun, and Amos, and Habakkuk, belonged to Ialdabaath; Samuel, and Nathan, and Jonah, and Micah, to Iao: Elijah, Joel, and Zechariah, to Bahaath; Isaiah, Ezekiel, Jeremiah, and Daniel, to Adonai; Tobias and Haggai to Elhi. Michaiah and Nahum to Oreus; Extras and Zephaniah to Astraphares.138

Nevertheless, this account considers that true knowledge still comes through Moses and the prophets because Wisdom also spoke through them without them realizing it. Thereby she was able to communicate something about the First Man, i.e. the Supreme God, and to prophesy concerning Christ:

Each one of these, then, glorifies his own father and God, and they maintain that Sophia herself has also spoken many things through them regarding the first Anthropos (man) ... The (other) powers being terrified by these things, and marveling at the novelty of those things which were announced by the prophets.139

Wisdom was even able to act through Ialdabaath without his realizing it in order to prepare for the descent of Christ.140

Primitius brought it about by means of Ialdabaath (who knew not what he did), that emissions of two men took place, the one from the barren Elisabeth, and the other from the Virgin Mary.

If we return then to the first section of Iren. Adv. haer. 1.30, we can see examples of the knowledge concerning the First Man which can be drawn from the Law and the Prophets and which was significant for gnostic mythology. The first light is incorruptible (cf. Gen 1:30). That light is called the First Man, but there is also a Second Man (cf. Gen 1:26), who came from him. The Holy Spirit, the first woman,

140 As Harvey notes in his edition, the phrase et incorruptibile. Acro is only attested in the Clermont manuscript and is probably a later addition: 218, n. 1. Thus the translator has consigned the phrase to a footnote: cf. 357, n 2.
is above chaos. From the union of the First Man and the Second Man with her the Third Male, Christ, issued forth (cf. Gen 1:2). She is also called the mother of the living (cf. Gen 3:20).

From this background the material in NatArch becomes much clearer. Here too there is, of course, the Supreme God, e.g. the Father of Truth 96[134]:21. The lower God Ialdabaoth (94[142]:21f) also creates offspring for himself to fill each of the heavens below him 95[143]:1-4. He is named Saklas as well as Ialdabaoth 95[143]:7f. Further, he is identified as Samael 94[142]:25f and thus the tradition associated with Samael, that he is a fallen heavenly being who is the leader of the demonic forces, is applied to Ialdabaoth as well. Therefore, Ialdabaoth is cast down to Tartaros below the abyss (95[143]:10-13), where he begets further offspring (96[144]:1-10). Within the myth then place is provided for Samael to assume the role of Ialdabaoth, to reign over the seventh heaven, and thereby to function as an intermediate deity. There he is given Life and is named the God of the Forces (95[143]:19-23 and 31-34).

The role of Samael is not restricted merely to the revelation of Eleleth; rather he functions as well in the Noah story (92[140]:4-21). Contrary to ApoexAd and Iren. Adv. haer. 1.30, NatArch distinguishes between the deity who seeks to destroy all men and the deity who seeks to save Noah. It is Samael, here entitled the Ruler of the Forces, who protects Noah, and Ialdabaoth as the Great One, who along with the other rulers causes the flood.162 Norea as the representative of

162 It is an indication of how carefully the myth is constructed that Ialdabaoth here creates seven sons and in Iren. Adv. haer. 1.30, creates only six. In Iren. Ialdabaooth remains in the seventh heaven; thus he and his six sons form the Hebdomad. In NatArch, since Ialdabaoth is cast out of the heavens, seven sons must be created in order to retain the Hebdomad. Cf. also OhrIregWld 101[149]:24-102[150]:2 and 106[154]:19-27.

163 It is clear that the Ruler of the Forces is equal to the God of the Forces, i.e. Samael, for two reasons. First, only in these two instances is the term "Forces" (έσωτης) used in a title and thus the two titles should be referred to the same person. Secondly, the narrative demands a distinction between the leader of the rulers and the Ruler of the Forces. In the narrative all the rulers plan to cause the flood and to destroy all flesh (92[140]:4-8). However, the Ruler of the Forces is against this plan (92[140]:8-14), insofar as he wants to protect Noah. Later, however, when the rulers come to Norea, there is no indication of division among them (92[140]:19-21). Rather their great One is among them and united with them. As 94[142]:27-31 shows, their great One is none other than Ialdabaoth, who alone claims to be the one God (cf. 94[142]:21-26; 95[143]:5-8). Although Bullard in his commentary alludes to the title of Samael, he fails to draw out fully the implications and rests with the assumption that the Ruler of the Forces equals the Demiurge, i.e. Ialdabaoth (cf. The Hypostasis of the Archont, 94). Cf. the commentary of Layton in "The Hypostasis of the Archont", (1975) ad loc.
the race of the gnostics is then associated with the heavenly angel Eleleth (92[140],32ff).

Concerning revelation it is said that when the True Man comes, he will teach the saved about everything (96[144],33-97[145],4), which knowledge will make them immortal 96[144],25-27. In the meantime, Norea has received a revelation from Eleleth but Sabaoth has also received instruction from Life concerning the Eighth, although he is below the veil in the seventh heaven (95[143],19-22 and 31-34).

It seems clear that the same problem is vexing the author of NatArch as vexed the author behind Iren. *Adv. haer.* 1,30, namely, how to account for the aspects of the Law and the Prophets which were acceptable to the gnostics and which taught them, when the texts were correctly interpreted, something about the pneumatic realm. Iren. *Adv. haer.* 1,30, had solved the problem by having Wisdom speak through the unknowing Ialdaaboth. NatArch has answered the same problem but with a different solution in that the God of the Law and the Prophets is another God than the evil Demiurge. To be sure, he is descended from the Demiurge and a God of fear (95[143],13-15) and yet not entirely evil since he has repented. His elevation to the seventh heaven and instruction then concerning the things of the Eighth make it possible for him to communicate this information to Moses and the Prophets, although he himself is fated never to enter the Eighth. Surely an appropriate tradition—the ascent of the visionary to the chariot and throne of God—has been drawn upon to solve this problem concerning the revelation contained in the books of Israel.

Insafar as Sabaoth saves Noah and is responsible for the revelation in the Law and the Prophets, he is the God of the Jews and they are his special people. That this assessment need not be a mere evaluation of the past people of the OT but could also involve an evaluation of contemporaneous Jewish people is shown by Origen's *Contra Celsum,* in which Origen makes frequent reference to his discussions and debates with Jews on the meaning of scripture. In contrast the true gnostics belong to the Father of the All 96[144],11-12 and 19-20.

In his commentary, Bullard has suggested that Sabaoth represents the situation of one group among the three possible types of men, namely, the psychics. He considers this passage from a Valentinian background with its three categories of pneumatic, psychic, and hylic men. We shall see that Sabaoth in OrOrgWid does indeed represent

the psychics. There the immortal Light-Man resides in the middle and represents the pneumatics (112[160] 10-22). Sabaoth dwells in the seventh heaven and signifies the psychics (104[152], 201); and Ialdabaoth and his offspring abide in the other six heavens and typify the choises or hylics (106[154], 19-27 and 122[170] 6-9). However, in NatArch the anthropology is less clearly organized and systematized. Further, in NatArch it is the psyche that is said to come from above, from the Imperishable Light, rather than the pneuma (96[144], 21f). To be sure, then, the spirit of truth will come and live within the soul and thus make the soul immortal (96[144], 22-26). The elements for the separation of men into these three anthropological categories are all present, but they are not systematized as in OnOrgWld or in Valentinianism. The only separation that we find is the separation into those who have true knowledge, those represented by Sabaoth, i.e. the Jewish people, and those represented by the rulers.

It is also appropriate to his purpose that the gnostic author has drawn upon the tradition of enthronement in portraying the role of Sabaoth. Sabaoth has been placed in charge of the seventh heaven and implicitly in charge of all below. In effect, he has been installed as king—although without the title. Thereby, the people of Israel are subject to him as their king as well as the remaining peoples and rulers. For the gnostic author, unlike Moses' enthronement in Ezekiel Tr or Philo, which established him as the divinely appointed ruler of the world and the leader of the divinely founded people, the enthronement of Sabaoth establishes his rule as part of the evil world and thus indicates the inferiority of him and his subjects to the true gnostics. Although Sabaoth has repented, he is still an offspring of Ialdabaoth, who remains below the veil.

This notion that the ruler below the Pleroma is a king is a familiar one in gnostic literature. In the TriProt (CG XIII, 2: 43.15-17) at the time of completion and at the time of the coming of the destroyer, the powers are disturbed and their "king" is afraid (cf. also 41.11f). יָד הָאָרֶץ also considers the Demiurge in the Valentinian system as a king in Frag. 40:

Heracleon seems to say that the "royal officer" (v. 4b) was the Demiurge.
"For he himself ruled like a king (βασιλεύει) over those under him. Because his domain is small and transitory he was called a royal officer," he says,

136 Cf also Apocryh BG 5302 41.11f in which Ialdabaoth appoints seven kings over the world and five over the underworld.
“like a petty princeling who is set over a small kingdom by the universal
ing.”

Further, in Iren. Adv. haer. 1.30.4-5, Ialdabaoth and his descendants sit in order. Therefore Ialdabaoth is at the top, in the seventh heaven. Together they are said to “rule” heavenly and earthly things, a verb which is appropriate to royal dignity (regnere).

In contrast, the author of NatArch states that the gnostics are those anointed with the anointing of eternal life from the “undominated race” (97[145]:2-5). The gnostics are themselves from the Above, from the Imperishable Light (96[144]:21-22). As here, so also in SJG BG 92.4.7, 10.11; 108.11-15 (cf. parallel in Eus III, 3), the “undominated race” are the pleromatic, divine beings. This negative motif emphasizes their radical freedom from entrapment in the evil rule of the world. By their origin and anointing, then, the gnostics are also radically free from the evil rule of this world.

There is a possibility that this negative motif implies its opposite, the positive motif, i.e. that the pleromatic beings are kings themselves and that the true gnostics are also the “undominated race.” Thus in OnOrgWild 122(170):6-8 it is stated that there are three men and their races: the pneumatic of the aeon, the psychic and the earthly. After discussing the sending of the innocent spirits into the world (124[172]:5-128[173]:3), the author turns to the true gnostics and states:

Therefore (διὸ) there are four
kinds (τρεῖς) Three belong
to the kings of the Eighth. But (δὲ) the fourth
kind (τέταρτον) is a perfect (τέλειον) kingless one, which is
above them all. For these will go
into the holy place (ναὸς) of their father
and will be at ease in rest (διάκοιλος)
with their eternal, unpeachable glory
and with an unceasing joy. But (δὲ) they are
kings among the mortal (θερατοι) as (καὶ) immortal.188


188 OnOrgWild 122(173):1-12; Böhm, Die koptische-gnostische Schrift ohne Titel, 100-03. Cf. 127[175]:4-14. The motif that the gnostics become kings is found in other circles of Gnosticism e.g. ApocryJan 3.25-27; 10.1-5; GTH Sayings 2, 81; ThCont 145:14; DuhSlav 138.11-15. While the highest God may not be named a king in gnostic documents, note that he or his spirit is termed a rejuvenes in ApocryJan BG 22:18, since no one rules (ἐγειρεῖται) over him. See also the Neasenes and the reference to being a king and kingless in Hipp. Ref. 3.8.2, 18, 30 (ed. Wendland; GCS 26; 89-94).
However, it is possible that this positive aspect of the motif is a later development, when it is applied to gnostics while they are in the world. In either case, the claim is made for the radical freedom of the gnostic from the evil rule of this world.

There are also practical, political implications in this view. Although the archai, exousiai and archontes are demonic powers, the terms also carry political references in late antiquity. It is difficult not to see in them and in the gnostic view a rejection of the legitimacy of the governmental system in which the gnostic lived, i.e. the Roman Empire. This rejection, however, would not imply a revolutionary drive to overthrow the government but rather to expose the false appearance and to establish the gnostics as an elite beyond the political system, as those who alone know the way to salvation.

C. Confirmation of the Function and the Date

We have proposed above that the name of Sabaoth has been chosen for this ruler of the seventh heaven in order specifically to represent
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*In his article, H. G. Kippenberg ("Versuch einer soziologischen Verortung des antiken Gnostizismus," *Numen* 17 (1990) 211-31) has proposed this view and noted that there is no explicit reference to the political power of the Roman Empire in the gnostic document (225). Since the evil ruler of the world is often portrayed as the God of the OT in gnostic documents, however, did Gnosticism begin as a rejection of the Jewish God and Jewish hegemony by people in the Syria-Palestine area, as Bousset has suggested in *Hauptprobleme* 321-25, which rejection then would have been secondarily applied to Roman rule when the Romans became the ruling power? However, this question must be considered in conjunction with the possibility that this negative portrayal of the God of the OT arose out of increasing pessimism towards the world and his creation or of reaction to his unfavorable traits (e.g. envy) rather than as a reaction to his unjust rule.

---

**Kippenberg, "Versuch einer soziologischen Verortung,"" 231. Cf. also the discussion in Origen *C. Cel. 8.48* (cf. Chadwick 504-05). Celsus, the pagan, maintains that all should uphold that there be one king, the one who has received the power from "the son of crafty Kronos," i.e. Zeus. Origen, the orthodox Christian, agrees that there should be one king but denies that he is appointed by "the son of crafty Kronos," since—as Origen relates—the Greek myths say that he drove his father from rule and cast him into Tartarus. Rather, the king is to be the one appointed "by God who governs all things and knows what he is doing in the matter of the appointment of kings." If he were to join in the discussion, the answer of the gnostic author of *Natarch* would seem to be that there is to be one king, the one appointed by Sabaoth, whose father was cast into Tartarus, but that he and his appointee belong to the evil realm of the world and have no ultimate authority over the gnostics. For the identification of Ialdabaoth Kronos—Saturn, see C. Cel. 6.31 and Bousset, *Hauptprobleme* 351-55. Sabaoth and Adonai are identified with Zeus by Celsus, but Origen denies that identification in C. Cel. 3.45 and 6.39. It deserves further study to see if the identification Sabaoth (or Adonai) Zeus—Jupiter is found in the gnostic documents themselves and to see how vital the discussion of the divine right of kings was in the time of Gnosticism's existence.
the God of the Jews. A consideration of the Gnostikoi, the Archontics, and the Severians—all sects related to the Sethians—makes this evident and also confirms our hypothesis that the basic theological issue involved in the Sabaoth account is the revelation contained in the books of Israel.

Concerning the Gnostikoi, Epiphanius states (Pan. 25.26)\(^{171}\) that this sect derives from the deacon Nicolas (Pan. 25.1.1); he claims to have encountered personally the sect as a young man and at that time to have read their books (Pan. 26.17.4-18.2). The presence of the mythological figures Barbelo (Pan. 25.2.2), Ialdabaoth (Pan. 25.2.2) and Prunikes (Pan. 25.3.2) indeed relates this sect to the Sethians. Their books further associate them with the Sethians. For example, some books are written in the name of Seth; there are *Apocalypses of Adam* (Pan. 26.8.1); there is a *Gospel of Eve* in which Eve received the food of knowledge through the revelations of the serpent (Pan. 26.2.6). Further, they have a book called *Norea*, the figure who is the wife of Noah and burned the ark three times, because she was refused admittance (Pan. 26.1.3-9). The list of rulers is also of interest to us, since Epiphanius reports a dispute concerning the occupants of the last two heavens (Pan. 26.10.2-3; cf. 25.2.2):

Now some of them say that Ialdabaoth is in the sixth heaven, but others say Elohael. Now they propose that there is another, seventh heaven in which, they say, Sabaoth is; now others say, “No! But Ialdabaoth is in the seventh.”\(^{172}\)

They also had a problem with the OT, although they continued to use it as a source of revelation since they found therein some words from the spirit of truth. Epiphanius expresses their problem in these words (Pan. 26.6.1-2):

Now they use both Old and New Testament but they renounce the one who spoke in the OT. And whenever they find a word able to have a sense inimical to them, they say that this is spoken by the worldly spirit. But if any passage is able to be formed into the likeness of their desire—not as the word says but as their deluded mind says—they change this into their own desire and say that it was spoken by the spirit of truth.\(^{173}\)

\(^{171}\) Ed. Hoff (GC5 25.1) 263-309.
\(^{172}\) Ed. Hoff (GC5 25.1) 287; translation mine. In contrast with NatArch, one notes that the myth related here by Epiphanius contains the figure Barbelo and the reference to the need to gather the power from bodies in order to return it to the above. On the other hand, the myth of Epiphanius contains no reference to Sabaoth’s repentance, ascent and enthronement in the seventh heaven.
\(^{173}\) Ed. Hoff (GC5 25.1) 292-93; translation mine.
In their resolution of the problem, however, these Gnostikoi maintained that the God of the OT was entirely evil. In particular, in Pan. 26.10.6 (cf. also 10.7-11) it is Sabaoth who is portrayed as the evil Demiurge and also as the God of the Jews:

Now some say that Sabaoth has the form of an ass; others say that of a pig. Therefore, he says, he commanded the Jews not to eat pork. And they say that he is the maker of heaven and earth, and of the heavens after him and of his own angels.174

In considering this report of Epiphanius, one should first note that it is late and compilatory, i.e. reflecting a number of views within the sect. Secondly, it is based upon the distant recollections of Epiphanius. Thirdly, the dispute concerning the occupants of the sixth and seventh heaven probably involves something deeper than just a name. It seems quite probable that this account of Epiphanius, with its dispute over the position of Ialdabaoth and Sabaoth, echoes attempts to associate the evil Demiurge of the world more clearly with the God of the OT, with the God of the Jews. Since his name appears within the pages of the LXX, Sabaoth could be more easily taken as the God of the OT and of the Jews than the enigmatic figure and name of Ialdabaoth. The reference to the spirit of truth as the author of acceptable portions of the Law and the Prophets is then an alternate view of solving the problem than that of NatArch, which view, however, is similar to that of Iren. Adv. haer. 1.30.

Similarly the Archontics consider Sabaoth as the God of the Jews. As Puech has suggested, the Archontics probably did not fashion a separate sect.175 At most the Archontics was the Palestinian name for Egyptian gnostics who were related to the Sethians. In our main source for the Archontics, Epiph. Pan. 40.176 it is stated that Sabaoth is the ruler of the seventh heaven who acts the part of the tyrant over the other rulers (Pan. 40.2.6), who gave the Law (Pan. 40.2.8) and who is thus the God of the Jews. He is also, however, the God of the Christians, who are not gnostics since baptism and the mysteries are associated with his name:

They consider as anathema the baptismal font, even if some among them have previously been taken and baptized. They reject the sharing and goodness of the mysteries as being alien and done in the name of Sabaoth.

174 Ed. Holl (GCS 25.1) 287-88; translation mine.
176 Ed. Holl (GCS 31.2; Leipzig 1922) 80-90.
For, in accord with some of the other sects, they want him to be in the seventh heaven where he is a tyrant and has authority over the others. But they say that if this (soul) is in gnosti, it flees the baptism of the church and the name of Sabaoth who gave the Law, it ascends through each heaven.  

Since the Law was associated with Sabaoth and thus evil, these gnostics found their revelation in another source. Like ApocAd, this revelation derives from Seth, who was brought up on high by the power above and his ministering angels. When he returned to earth, Seth then served the true God and made many revelations, which have been preserved in Books (Pan. 40.7.2ff).  

Lastly, the little known Severians, who are also associated with the Sethians, identify the chief evil ruler as Sabaoth or Ialdabaoth (Epiph. Pan. 45.1.4). Epiphanius reports that they use apocryphal books but that they also use canonical books, which they search out to interpret in their own distinctive way. Obviously then they found some value in the OT but it is not clear as to how they explained the presence of revelation in the OT. In the abbreviated report of Epiphanius there is then no explicit statement that Sabaoth is the God of the Jews.

To help us confirm further the function and also to determine the date of the Sabaoth account in NatArch, we turn our attention now to the Marcionites and Valentinians. The problem of the OT and the God of the OT was raised in a particularly acute fashion in the second century by Marcion. For him the sacred books of the Jews were to be rejected and replaced by a modified Lukan Gospel, a Pauline corpus, and his own Antitheses, which presented the good God who is unknowable, separate from the world and yet revealed in Christ. The God who is portrayed in the sacred books of Israel, on the other hand, is a second principle, the creator of the world, who is righteous (dikaios) but not good. The revelation contained

---

172 Epiph. Pan. 40.2.6 and 8. Ed. Holl (GCS 31.2) 82-83; translation mine.
173 Ed. Holl (GCS 31.2) 87-88.
174 Ed. Holl (GCS 31.2) 199.
176 Harnack (Marcion, 303 397) is correct in insisting that Marcion used the distinction between the two Gods, one agathos and one dikaios, and that this usage has been transferred to Cerdo by the heresiologists, who also consider him the teacher of Marcion (Iren. Adv. haer. 1.27.1 and 34.2; ed. Harvey 1, 214-15 and 2, 17; Tertullian Adv. Marc. 1.2; ed. A. Kö感情mann, Pars 3; CSEL 47; Vienna 1906, 202-97). Cerdo,
in these books is then considered by Marcion to be true in itself but related only to this righteous God and his world; there is nothing in these books concerning the good God. Even the prophecies about the Messiah can be considered as true by Marcion, but they again refer only to the Jewish Messiah and not to Christ, who reveals the good God. As the Creator, the God of these sacred books is the God of all men, but in particular he has chosen the Jewish people and through them desires to be known to all men. The world, however, over which he rules is evil since the matter from which it is formed is inherently evil.

Among the disciples of Marcion there are two of particular interest. Megethus and Apelles, because of their treatment of the righteous God and the Jewish people. Megethus alters the teaching of Marcion in one respect. He proposes instead of two principles a three principle system: namely, a good God, a righteous God and an evil God. To these Gods he then refers the Christians, Jews, and pagans. Although the pagans are related to the evil God, yet—as Harnack has observed—the main interest of Megethus was in the pagans rather than the Jews since the redeemer came to free men from this evil God.

Apelles, the disciple who broke with his master and founded his own sect, further altered the teaching of Marcion. For him there was only one God. The righteous creator was merely an angel, and the one who spoke to Moses was a further fiery, fallen angel. Similar to Megethus, Apelles refers these three heavenly beings to the divisions of mankind: Christians, pagans and Jews. However, in this case the Jews occupy the lowest place, and their sacred books are in turn further devalued as lies and fables.

The Valentinians, who drew upon and further developed vulgar,
mythological Gnosticism, share this same second century concern about the God of Israel, the revelation in its sacred books, and the people of the Jews. However, the Demiurge is not considered in Valentinianism to be holy and therefore entirely evil. Rather he is psychic and therefore capable of turning to the good. He is particularly presented as a righteous God. In contrast with Nazarens, Valentinianism presents a righteous creator rather than a repentant ruler.

In reference to the sacred books of Israel the Valentinian attitude to the Law is most clearly expressed in Ptolemy's Letter to Flora. There he distinguishes those parts of the Law that are to be attributed to God, to Moses or to the elders. Only those parts attributed to God are acceptable. He further divides the Law of God into three parts: the pure, the mixed, and the typic or symbolic. Such parts as the Decalogue are pure but need to be perfected. Other mixed sections, such as the law of talion—"an eye for an eye"—although righteous, were given because of the weakness of the people and thus ended by the Son. Finally, parts such as the Sabbath or fasting, are ended according to their visible or bodily fulfillment but retain a typic or symbolic significance insofar as they indicate the pneumatic realm. Thus the entire Law is not rejected by Ptolemy. Some elements retain their

fragments from Valentinus, which are contained mainly in Clement's Stromata; the doctrinal letter to Ephesians; Prie's Ptolemy's Letter to Flora; fragments from Heracleon's Commentary of John; and fragments from Marcus as representatives of the Italian school. The Excerpta ex Theodoto there are representative of the Oriental branch. Irenaeus in Adv. haer. 1.3.1-4 and Hippolytus in Ref. 6.29.1-30.4 offer the indirect accounts. The sources are conveniently gathered in volker's Quellen zur Geschichte der Christlichen Gnosis, 57-141. Scholarly discussion of the Nag Hammadi corpus has also proposed GTG, GTh and Ophes as derived from Valentinianism. Cf. also Jonas, Gnosis und spätantiker Geist, 1. 360-175; and F.-M. M. Sagnard, La gnoise valentinienne et le témoignage de Saint Irénée (Études de Philosophie Medievale 76; Paris 1947).

188 Cf. Jonas, Gnosis und spätantiker Geist, 1. 358ff; Wilson, The Gnostic Problem, 116ff; Sagnard, La gnoise valentinienne, 440 and n. 1. Note also that in Evc. Theod. 9 and Ire. Adv. haer. 1.7.5 the Valentinians are said to teach that mankind is divided into the descendants of Cain, Abel and Seth. It is Seth, who then represents the pneumatic.

189 Epiph. Pan. 3.3.5-7 (Völker, 87-88).
190 Epiph. Pan. 3.3.4 (Völker 89). As a forerunner to these and the following distinctions, cf. the distinctions that Philo introduces concerning the Law in his treatise De vita Moysis 2.188ff: some ordinances are from God, some are mixed, and some are from Moses in De vita Moysis 1.4. Philo states that he has gathered his information concerning Moses from the sacred books and also from the "elders" (prophetai) of the nation (ECC: Cambridge 1966: 6. 278f and 592ff). Cf. F. Fallow "The Law in Philo and Ptolemy: A Note on the Letter to Flora," JF 30 (1976) 45-51.
191 Epiph. Pan. 3.5.1-6.5 (Völker, 89-92).
value, although in need of perfection, while other parts maintain a
typic value.

An even more positive evaluation of the sacred books of Israel is
presented in the Valentinian discussion of the prophets. Irenaeus
presents their view in the following passage:

They maintain, moreover, that those souls which possess the seed of Acha-
noth are superior to the rest, and are more clearly loved by the Demiurge
than others, while he knows not the true cause thereof, but imagines that
they are what they are through his favour towards them. Wherefore, also,
they say he distributed them to prophets, priests, and kings; and they
declare that many things were spoken by this seed through the prophets,
inasmuch as it was endowed with a transcendently lofty nature. The
mother also, they say, spoke much about things above, and that through
him and through the sons which were formed by him. Then, again, they
divine the prophecies (into different classes) maintaining that one portion
was uttered by the mother, a second by her seed, and a third by the

Demiurge.192

Here one sees that the Valentinians again distinguish. Some prophecies
are spoken by Wisdom through the Demiurge and through the souls
fashioned by him. In these prophecies there is revelation concerning
the realm above. Other prophecies are spoken by the spiritual seed,
which comes from Wisdom. And lastly some prophecies are attributed
to the Demiurge. Those prophecies from the Demiurge do not reveal
the pleromatic realm since he is usually considered to be entirely
ignorant of that realm.193 Only when the Savior comes is he to be
instructed in the things above.194 Prophecies made by him concerning
Christ are only prophecies concerning the psychic Christ and not the
pleromatic Christ.195 In one interesting variant, Wisdom is also said to
have instructed the Demiurge previously about the Father and the
mystery of the Aeons. However, he has kept this mystery to himself and
revealed it to no one.196

his blasphemy but also continues the economy of the cosmos, since it is necessary
for the church and since he realizes that at the consummation he is to reach salvation
in the place of the Middle. Cf. the similar conception of Basilides in Hipp. Ref. 7:26:1-7
(Völker, 53-54).
196 Hipp. Ref. 6:36:2 (Völker, 135). The instruction of the Demiurge in this instance
then does not function to provide him with information that he might further com-
municate concerning the pleroma through the Law and the Prophets. Rather it seems
to emphasize his righteousness and his role in continuing the economy of the cosmos
In accord with this concern for the God of Israel and its sacred books, the Valentinians also manifest an interest in evaluating the people of the OT, the Jews. In their consideration of mankind as a whole, the Valentinians distinguish three categories: the hylic, those who are destined to destruction; the psychic, those who have free choice and can thus be either saved or destroyed; and the pneumatic, those who are saved by nature. \(^{197}\) The pneumatics then are derived from Wisdom and are the gnostics. The psychics, on the other hand, come from the Demiurge and are the Jews \(^{198}\) and also the orthodox Christians. \(^{199}\) The hylics then are the pagans who are related to the Cosmocrator, the devil. \(^{200}\)

In conclusion, then, the Sabaoth account in NatArch functions to show that the God of the OT, the ruler of the seventh heaven, is not entirely evil, that he was instructed in the realm above and therefore capable of making revelations concerning it, and that his people were the Jews who therefore were not perfect and thus could not enter the perfect realm.

In considering the date of NatArch, we should first note that the early tractate ApocAd shows no need to introduce a righteous God as the God of the OT. Secondly, the account in Iren. Adv. haer. 1.30, whose source must stem from prior to the middle of the second century and is closely related to NatArch, also shows no awareness of a righteous God in the OT. Thus one is led to suggest the middle of the second century as the terminus post quem for the Sabaoth account and NatArch.

Further, the influence of the Marcionites and the Valentinians, both of whom stressed the righteous God of the OT, was greatest in the second half of the second century. The issue of the value of the Law and the Prophets was also of central concern to the Marcionites and Valentinians of that time. The Marcionites, of course, rejected the Law and the Prophets while the Valentinians retained them and reiter-

\(^{197}\) Iren. Adv. haer. 1.6.1 (Völker, 112). On the meaning of the expression “saved by nature,” see the recent discussion of Schottroff, “Animae naturaliter salvandae,” 83-97 and F. Pagels, The Johannine Gospel in Gnostic Exegesis: Heracleon’s Commentary on John (SBL.MS 17; Nashville 1973) 90-113. They agree that the usage of this expression by the Fathers reflects their polemical interest but disagree over the Valentinian interpretation and application of it.


\(^{199}\) Iren. Adv. haer. 1.6.7 (Völker, 115).

\(^{200}\) Heracleon, Frag. 20 (Völker, 73-74).
preted them. For both heretical groups the Jewish people were associated with that righteous Demiurge. Again NatArch and its Sabaoth account with the same concerns fit most appropriately into this same time period, the latter half of the second century. However, this is not yet to say that Marcionite or Valentinian teaching has had direct influence upon NatArch. If that were so, one would expect the contrast between righteousness and unrighteousness rather than life and unrighteousness on the right and left of Sabaoth. Secondly, in neither Marcionite nor Valentinian teaching does the righteous Demiurge usually receive instruction concerning the upper realm. Thirdly, the proposed source of NatArch, the Revelation of Norea, as reflected in Epiph. Pan. 26.1.3-9, shows no awareness of a repentant, ascended and enthroned Sabaoth. We shall argue in reference to the Sabaoth account in OnOrgWld, on the other hand, that there is direct Valentinian influence in the document. Its date in the third century then will provide us with a *terminus ante quem* for NatArch and its Sabaoth account.
CHAPTER FOUR

THE SABAOTH ACCOUNT IN ONORGWLD

In OnOrgWld the Sabaoth account is also placed clearly within the cosmogony. The central theme for the treatise has been enunciated: that something did exist before chaos, namely, the light. From this came the shadow called darkness and also chaos (97[145].24ff; 98[146].26ff). From the darkness, in turn, came matter, the Demiurge and his archontic offspring, including Sabaoth. After the Demiurge’s blasphemy, he is reprimanded by Faith. In contrast to NatArch, however, a new element is introduced. The Demiurge is wrong in his claim to be alone since an immortal Light-Man existed before him. He is to appear in their fashioning and tread upon the Demiurge (103[151].19-28). After saying this, Faith revealed her image in the water and then returned to the light (103[151].28-32). Then there follows the account of Sabaoth’s repentance and enthronement in the seventh heaven. From his envy then came the demons (106[154].19ff). Later, that light does come from the Eighth, with the form of a man in it, and that angel is henceforth called the Light-Adam (108[156].2ff). After revealing himself upon the earth, the Light-Adam returns toward the light (111[159].29-112[160].1) but is unable to enter the Eighth because of the fault with which his light has been mixed. Therefore, he builds a great Acon which is in a boundless region between the Eighth and chaos (112[160].10-22), i.e. the middle. The treatise continues then with its re-interpretation of Genesis, the sending of innocent spirits into the world, and the eschatological restitution.

A. EXEGESIS

The Sabaoth account (103[151].32-106[154].19) forms a distinct unit within OnOrgWld, to such an extent that Böhlig has suggested that it is an interpolation. It is clearly a unit, since the focus of attention throughout is upon Sabaoth and his heavenly entourage, while previously in the treatise Ialdabaath has been at the center. After the Sabaoth account, the Archigeneros again returns as the subject (106

---

1 Böhlig, Die kepriache-gnostische Schrift ohne Titel, 49f.
As we have already remarked while comparing the Sabaoth account with NatArch and OnOrgWld and as we shall see in more detail in the course of this exegesis, the unit incorporates further material than what is found in NatArch.

1) The Repentance of Sabaoth 103(151), 32-104(152).6

The particle ἐκ introduces the change in focus from the preceding account of the blasphemy of Ialdabaoth. As in NatArch, Sabaoth is identified as the offspring of Ialdabaoth (cf. 101[149],30) and the portrayal of him here is also influenced by three figures: the God of the OT, a leading angel and the apocalyptic visionary. Sabaoth hears the voice of Faith and praises her (cf. NatArch 95[143],17). There is no account of an angel who casts Ialdabaoth into Tartarus as in NatArch 95[143],10-13. The view of the author is thus more in accord with the usual apocalyptic notion that it is at the end of time that Ialdabaoth will be cast into the abyss (103[151],21 ff). Rather, the “voice of Faith” refers to the rebuke of the Demiurge by Faith in which she stated that an immortal Light-Man existed before Ialdabaoth and his offspring. He will reveal himself in their creation and tread upon them as they go into the abyss (103[151],20-24).

In this pericope, then, the change to “hearing the voice of Faith” from “seeing the strength of that angel” is a reduction of the author, since the immortal Light-Man is part of the author’s own theology (cf. NatArch 94[142],25 f for the voice from above). As we presented earlier, the basic theme of the author’s theology is the contrast between light and darkness (e.g. 98[146],23-27); it pervades his treatise (e.g. 120[168],26-29). Related to this theme is the immortal
Light-Man, who descends from the Eighth and is called the Light-Adam (108[156];2-22). Because he cannot re-enter the light, on account of the fault mixed with his light, he builds a great Aeon in the middle (112[160];10-22) and is the type of the pneumatic men (122[170];6-9).

Faith is the figure Wisdom and can be called in this treatise either Faith alone or Faith-Wisdom (cf. 98[146];13f). As we remarked earlier, the use of Faith alone as a title seems to be a later development in contrast to the use of Wisdom alone or even Faith-Wisdom (NatArch 87(135);7f). In this document Wisdom alone could not be used here (as in NatArch 95[143];18), since that would designate a lower emanation (e.g. 102[150];26).

Faith had rebuked the Demiurge, revealed her image in the water and thus returned to the light (103[151];28-32). After hearing her voice, Sabaoth praises her and condemns the father and mother. As in NatArch 95(143);15-18, the father is probably to be identified as Ialdabaoth (101[149];23; 102[150];11ff) and the mother as matter or chaos (101[149];24). The redactor then adds that the specific reason for his action was “the word of Faith.” This action comprises the repentance of Sabaoth, although the term *pénvōv* does not occur in this pericope but only in 104(152);27.

The text then returns to Sabaoth’s relation to Faith. Now he is said to glorify her. The reason given is that she instructed them about the immortal Man and his light. One would expect the singular object “him,” referring to Sabaoth, in this context; but the plural refers back to the entire offspring of Ialdabaoth (103[151];21, 23). The content of the instruction is the immortal Man and his light.

While this figure of the immortal Light-Man is probably related to the *anthropos* figure in the male group of gnostic systems, the presentation of the immortal Light-Man in this pericope and in the remainder of the treatise shows influence from the Wisdom tradition within Gnosticism. The immortal Light-Man fulfills a function performed by Wisdom in NatArch 94(142);23-33. There, after the blasphemy of the ruler and his challenge that anyone before him should appear, Wisdom sends forth her light, runs after it to chaos, and then returns to her light (ταναχθέοιν). In OnOrgWld 103(151);15-32 after the blasphemy, Faith rebukes the ruler and tells of the immortal Light-Man who will reveal himself. Then, without any motivation for so doing, Faith revealed her image in the water and thus returned to

---

her light (anachôrêin). Later at 107(155.36ff the ruler utters the challenge that anyone before him should appear. In response to this, the light appears in which there is the form of a man, while there is no immediate concern with returning to the light. Since the motif concerning the descent of light in response to the blasphemy is applied consistently and coherently to Wisdom but not so to the Light-Man and since NatArch has been shown to represent the earlier stage of the Sabaoth account, it is clear that the motif is first applied to Wisdom and then is used to portray the descent of the immortal Light-Man.

Identification of this immortal Light-Man as the Light-Adam and as an angel helps to indicate some Jewish elements that probably contributed to the presentation of this figure. In rabbinic material there is speculation upon Adam as being a more than ordinary creature, a man of gigantic size.\(^1\) Secondly, the angel Michael in particular is presented in late Jewish literature as a light-man. As we have already seen, Michael is the “Prince of Light” and the “Spirit of Truth” at Qumran. He is opposed to the “Prince of Darkness” and the “Spirit of Error” (IQS 3:13-25); and one of his roles is to lead the righteous into truth (IQS 4:2).\(^2\) As the Light-Man in OnOrgWld 103(151) 20-24 will punish the evil ruler, so Michael plays a leading role in punishing the fallen angels in 1 Enoch 10:11-16. Further, in Test Abr 7 (Rec. A) Michael is clearly the angel who appears like the light man:

Isaac answered and began to say, “I saw, my lord, in this night, the sun and the moon above my head and it surrounded me with its rays and illuminated me. And while I saw these things thus and rejoiced, I saw the heaven opened and I saw a luminous man descending from heaven, shining more than seven suns. And this man of the sun-like form came and took the sun from my head and went back up into the heavens from which he had descended. Then I was very sad because he took the sun from me, and after a little time, while I was still mourning and distressed, I saw this man coming forth from heaven a second time, and he took the moon from me, from my head... The Archistrategos said, “Hear, O righteous Abraham! The sun which your child saw is you, his father, and the moon similarly is his mother Sarah. The luminous man who descended from heaven is he who is sent by God, who will take your righteous soul from you. Now know, most honored Abraham, that at this time you are going to leave the worldly life and depart to God.

---

\(^1\) B.R. 8:1, 21:2; Hag. 12a; PRE 11: as in L. Ginzberg, The Legends of the Jews (Philadelphia 1955) 1: 59 and 5: 79.

\(^2\) Cf. Betz, Das Paradies, 180-90.
Abraham said to the Archistrategos, "O strangest marvel of marvels!
And for the rest, are you he who is going to take my soul from me?"

The Archistrategos said to him, "I am Michael the Archistrategos who
stands before God." 1

It is to be noted in this passage that Michael appears as the angel who
is like a man, bears light, reveals the meaning of the vision, and will
finally lead the soul to God. Michael's main role is not a martial one,
i.e. to be leader of the heavenly hosts against evil forces. Further,
it is to be noted that in Rec. B this light man is described as "a very
large man, greatly shining from the heaven, like a light which is called
father of light." 2 Box even suggests that in these words Michael is
presented as the cosmic man. 3 The variant in Rec. B then shows a
number of motifs that are striking in comparison with gnostic material:

Do not weep because I have taken the light of your house, for it has
been taken up from the toils to rest and from lowliness to height. They
are taking him from the narrow place to the broad, they are taking him
from darkness to light. 4

In a remarkable passage in Joseph and Asenath (14:3-15:6), the angel
Michael is again presented as a man, as light, as a revealer, and as one
who instructs concerning the sacramental meal:

And lo! hard by the morningstar the heaven was rent and a great and
ineffable light appeared. And when she saw it, Asenath fell upon her face
upon the cinders, and straightway there came to her a man from heaven.

And he (the man) said: "I am the chief captain of the Lord God and
commander of all the host of the Most High: stand up and stand upon
thy feet, that I may speak to thee my words." And she lifted up her
face and saw, and lo! a man in all things like unto Joseph, in robe and
wreath and royal staff, save that his face was as lightning, and his eyes
as the light of the sun, and the hairs of his head as the flame of fire
of a burning torch, and his hands and his feet like iron shining from
fire. Be of good cheer. Asenath, the virgin and pure. For lo! thy name
hath been written in the book of life and shall not be blotted out for
ever, but from this day thou shalt eat the blessed bread of life and drink
a cup filled with immortality and be anointed with the blessedunction
of incorruption. Be of good cheer. Asenath, the virgin and pure. lo! the
Lord God hath given thee today to Joseph for a bride, and he himself
shall be thy bridegroom." 5

---

1 Stone, The Testament of Abraham, 14:17.
3 Stone, The Testament of Abraham, 45, n. 2.
5 Ed. M. Philonenko, Joseph et Asenath (SPB, 13; Leiden 1908) 176-83: translation
Since Michael here appears as the archetype and guardian angel of Joseph and since Joseph is portrayed as one powerful in wisdom and knowledge (4:9 ὁ δύνατος εῶς σοφία καὶ ἔστημα), one can also consider Michael as filled with wisdom and knowledge. It seems clear then that in late Judaism Michael was widely identified as an angel of light and a man of light, who revealed to men.

It is probable, then, that such material concerning Wisdom, Adam, and Michael has influenced the presentation of this mythological figure, the immortal Light-Man. However, in contrast to its Jewish background the material has been adapted. The motif of immortality is added to the description of the Light-Man. The context for his appearance is the creation of the world rather than the ascent of the soul at death or the rebirth of the soul, as with Michael. Lastly, the angelic Light-Man represents the pneumatic baptism and the pneumatic race (12[170].6-16). He is the type of a particular class of men, the pseudepigraphers, beneath whom stand the psychic and choric men (122 [170].6-9).

The figure of this immortal Light-Man is also free from influence of the NT. The term ἀθανάτος does not occur in the NT. Although Jesus is presented as the light of the world (e.g. John 1:4, 9; 3:19; 8:12), he appears as the Son of Man (John 3:13) rather than simply as Man, Light-Man, or immortal Man.

In response to Sabaoth's praise, Faith-Wisdom stretched out her finger (cf. NatArch 94[42].29ff) and poured some light upon him. In the OT and the NT the idiomatic expression “to stretch out the hand” rather than the finger (e.g. Gen 3:22 LXX and Matt 8:3 ἀπεκτάνα τῆν χερσίν). This usage is continued through the intertestamental literature as well, e.g. CD 12:6 ἀπεκτάνα τῆν χερσίν. However, the expression “to stretch out the finger” does occur in two passages of intertestamental literature: Jub 25:11 and 1QS 11:2, as well as in NatArch and here. Again we have a small motif drawn from inter-

---

10 Philo, Joseph et Asseuth, 88.
11 For a discussion of Hellenistic material which has influenced the presentation of the Light-Adam, see Tardieu, Trois mythes gnostiques, 85-99.
12 ἀπεκτάνα probably represents the Greek Verlag für ev to κεκτάνα. Cf. Crum, 366a.
13 In Philo neither the phrase to stretch out the finger nor the hand occurs. Cf. E. Fuchs, Φιλό, TDNT 2 (1964) 460-63.
testamental Judaism, apocalyptic Judaism, rather than the OT or NT. On the other hand, while the finger of God is also referred to in both the OT and the NT, there is never an emission coming from it.

The light, which represents the upper divine world (98[146,231f; 126[174,35f]), is in a figurative sense poured upon him from her light. This motif of “pouring light” also derives from neither the OT nor the NT but from Judaism. It is the light then which makes possible the condemnation of the father, a theme which runs throughout the work (cf. 117[165],28; 124[172],20).

As in NatArch, so in OnOrgWld the repentance of Sabaath, that is, his condemnation of chaos and praise of Faith, are a necessary preliminary to his enthronement.

2) The Ascend and Enthronement of Sabaath 104(152),6-31

Moreover when Sabaath received light, he received a great authority (δυναμεις) among all of the forces (δυναμεων) of Chaos (χαος).

From that day, he was called

---

14 John 25:11 “And thereupon she lifted up her face to heaven and extended the fingers of her hands (Charles, APOF, 2, 51; IQS 11:12 ἀνεπλήσθη τοὶ ἥρῴου). Perhaps the phrase echoes such a passage as Exod 8:17, 19, in which Aaron stretches out his hand with his staff and the Egyptian magicians exclaim to Pharaoh: “This is the finger of God.” Cf. also that a variant translation in the LXX for τοὺς ἥρῴους is ἐπέβαλλεν τὴν γῆν (e.g. Gen 22:12) and that in the NT one finds the phrase ἐπέβαλεν τὴν δαίμονας (Mark 7:31, John 20:25, 27).


16 In later Jewish material one finds this motif, e.g. J Exod 40:3: “And in the moment that they do not utter the Holy in the right order, a consuming fire goes forth from the little finger of the Holy One. Blessed be He... and consumes them.” (Odeberg, J Exod 126), and TB San. 38b, ed. L. Goldschmidt, Der Babylonische Talmud (Berlin 1904) 7. 156. However, it is not attested in the intertestamental period.

17 ἐκχάειν εἰς may well represent the Greek underlying παρὰ καθ’ εἰς. Cf. Crum, 394a. In the LXX and the NT ἐκχάειν εἰς is used both literally for the pouring out of foods and figuratively for spiritual gifts, e.g. Joel 2:28 (3,11) ἀργη; Lam 2:11 ἀργη; Sir 38:28 ἀργης and Matt 9:17 ἀργας; Tit 3:8 Μαρφά κἀνεν. But in neither the LXX nor the NT is ἐκχάειν εἰς “poured out.” In Philo, however, the verb is used in connection with the rays of light, although not with the light alone—De Abra 157 ἐκχαοῦτο συνετοι τῶν ἁπάντων αὐτῶν ἐκχαοῦς (Cohn-Wendland, 4. 36). Also De opif. mundi 71, De Abra 76. Cf. J. Behm. ἐκχάειν ἐγνώσθης, JDOT 2 (1964) 407-409.

18 Although NatArch uses καταγγέλλει (95[143],16) and κατανυστήσει (89[172],20), OnOrgWld employs both καταγγέλλειν in 103(151),35 and 107(155),3; καταγγέλλειν in 107(155),35 and 129(173),29; κατανυστητεῖν here, κατανυστήμαν 124(172),20, and κατασταθεῖν elsewhere 110(158),28; 120(168),34; 129(173),13.
"the lord of the powers." He hated his father, the darkness,
and his mother, the abyss. He loathed (παρεξάθη) his sister, the thought of the Archagene (οὐρανος).

The one who moves and fro over the water. Now (ἐκ) because
of his light, all of the authorities (ἐξορκος) of
Chaos (χων) were jealous of him. And when they
were disturbed.
they made a great war (πολεμος) in the seven
heavens. Then (τότε) when Faith (πιστις); Wisdom
(σοφία); saw the war (πολέμος), she sent to Sabaoth
from her light seven archangels (οὐρανος).

They snatched him up to the seventh
heaven; they stood before him as (ἐκ) servants
(δικαιομενοι).

Again (ἐκαθηρευσαν), she sent to him another three
archangels (οὐρανος). She established the kingdom
for him:
above every one in order that he might come to be
above the twelve gods
of Chaos (χων). But (ἐκ) when Sabaoth received
the place (τόπος) of rest (οἱμνημονει) in exchange for his reinstatement
(παρεξάθη).

Faith (πιστις) moreover (περι) gave him her daughter.
Life (ζωη). With a great authority (όφθαλμος) in order that she
might
instruct him about all those in the
eighth heaven.

Introduces the particle "then" (ἐκ), this next section presents
the ascent and enthronement of Sabaoth. In accord with his own
theology, the redactor states (cf. NatArch 95[143].19-25) that it is the
light, which Sabaoth receives, that is the source of his great authority
over all the powers of chaos. In contrast with NatArch 95[143].19f,
Sabaoth is given a name before he is raised up to the seventh heaven.
As we discussed earlier, NatArch retains the earlier tradition here,
both because the name-giving appears more appropriate after the
elevation (e.g. Phil 2:9) and because the redactor’s hand is visible
here in the motif of light. It is not Wisdom and Life who give the
name here, as in NatArch 95[143].22f; rather, the impersonal "from

that day he was called” is used (cf. OnOrgWld 106[154].14 and NatArch 95[143].35f). In accord with LXX usage, he is called “Lord of the Forces” rather than, as in NatArch, “God of the Forces.” By this return to the expected nomenclature, the original function of Sabaoth has been obscured, i.e. to be a second, lower God and the God of the OT. This change is a further indication that the concern of the author of OnOrgWld is not with the problem of the God of the OT but rather with the different types of men.

For a third time this account turns to the condemnation of the lower world. Its repetituous nature and also its motif of light versus darkness mark this condemnation as deriving from the reductus. On this occasion the condemnation provides an opportunity for taking Sabaoth by means of an exegesis of Gen 1:2: σκότος ἦν ἐπάνω τῆς ἀβύσσου καὶ πνεῦμα θεός ἐπιφέρετο ἐπάνω τοῦ ἄδαμος. Sabaoth hated his father, identified now not as Isdabaoth, but to fit the biblical text and the reductus’s theology as darkness.20 Also, he hated his mother, not matter (NatArch 95[143].16f) but the abyss (cf. NatArch 87[135].7; OnOrgWld 103[151].24).21 In contrast with NatArch 95[143].17, an extra motif of “the sister” is introduced in order to parallel the biblical text; he loathed his sister, a strange epithet. As Böhlig has pointed out, the fact that Spirit is feminine in Semitic determines the epithet “sister.”22 Perhaps it is also derived from consideration of Wisdom, who can be called sister (Prov 7:4),23 as identified with the Spirit (ApocJohn BG 44.19ff).24 The sister, then, is the thought of the high God but of the Archigenetor, which appeared in a Spirit going back and forth upon the waters (cf. 100[148].29-101 [149].9).25

The controlling motif for the following thought is the antipathy between light and darkness. Philo too in interpreting the same biblical text, Gen 1:2b, speaks about the war that arises when light invades darkness:

Right too is his statement that "darkness was above the abyss" (Gen 1:2). For in a sense the air is over the void, as much as it has spread over and completely filled the immensity and desolation of the void, of all that reaches from the zone of the moon to us. After the kindling of the intelligible light, which preceded the sun's creation, darkness its adversary withdrew: for God, in His perfect knowledge of their mutual contiguity and natural conflict, parted them one from another by a wall of separation. In order, therefore, to keep them from the discord arising from perpetual clash, to prevent war in place of peace prevailing and setting up disorder in an ordered universe. He not only separated light and darkness, but also placed in the intervening spaces boundary marks, by which he held back each of their extremities: for, had they been actual neighbours, they were sure to produce confusion by engaging with intense and never-ceasing rivalry in the struggle for mastery. As it was, their assault on one another was broken and kept back by barriers set up between them. These barriers are evening and dawn.13

Thus, because of the light which Sabaoth has received, all the powers of chaos envied him. It is not that they fought against Sabaoth but rather they envied him, a motif which probably derives from the cause of the fall of the angels. The source of their disturbance is the coming of light into the realm of darkness. However, again the war is not against the light or against Sabaoth but seems rather to be among the powers of chaos themselves. Thus the motif of the enmity between light and darkness is modified by another motif, namely, that of the mutual fighting among the offspring of the fallen angels as their punishment, e.g. 1 Enoch 10:9:

"And to Gabriel said the Lord. 'Proceed against the bastards and the reprobates, and against the children of fornication: and destroy the children of fornication and the children of the Watchers from amongst men: and cause them to go forth: send them one against the other that they may destroy each other in battle: for length of days they shall not have.'"14

lower and not the high god (70f). But he overlooks the gnostic reinterpretation when he identifies the thought as the intentional creation of heaven and earth (70f), since it is explicitly identified as the blasphemous thought that he alone existed in 108(148) 32:34. 13 Philo, De opif. mundi. 32:34; text Cohon-Wendland, 1. 10 and translation JCL (1962) 1. 24-27. 14 Tr. Charles, 1 Enoch (1917) 23f.
The same motif is represented as well in 1 Enoch 88:1-2. In this passage, then, the tradition is applied not to the offspring of the fallen angels but to the fallen angels themselves and indicates that the powers of chaos are judged by the advent of the light. Further, the war takes place now not on earth but in the seven heavens.

Such an exegesis of Gen 1:2 cannot be found in the NT. Thus it is clear again that with this pericope the author is using exegetical material from Judaism rather than material just from the OT or from the NT. He has taken over this material and inserted it into his own treatise because it suited his own theology with its antipathy between light and darkness. The occasion is thus given for Faith-Wisdom to take Sabaoth up to the seventh heaven. When she sees the war in the seven heavens, she alone—there is no mention of Life as in NatArch 95 (143).19—sends from her light seven archangels. As is the case with the visionary in apocalyptic and with Sabaoth in NatArch, Sabaoth here is also “snatched up”. He is brought by the arch-angels to the seventh heaven; but thereby Sabaoth is demoted in contrast to NatArch 95(143).19ff. In NatArch Sabaoth occupies the seventh heaven, which is the highest realm immediately below the veil. Here Sabaoth continues to occupy the seventh heaven, but there is a higher realm, the middle, between him and the veil. Since in OnOrgWld the immortal Light-Man rules over the middle (112[160].10-22) and since he typifies the pneumatics, Sabaoth then represents the psychics (cf. 122[170].6-9).

In contrast with this view, although he has not devoted a chapter to the Sabaoth myth, in scattered references Tardieu has considered Sabaoth as the type of the elect, the pneumatic; those who are definitely among the saved because of their repentance. However, this does not seem likely for the following reasons. First, it would be rather odd to have as the representative of the saved one who is the son of Ialdabaoth and thus ultimately descended from evil matter. Second, one would expect knowledge rather than repentance to characterize the elect. Third, Tardieu has located Sabaoth in an intermediary place, a place of rest above the seven heavens and below the ogdoad. Such a location would be appropriate, if Sabaoth represented the elect. However, as this pericope shows (cf. 104[152].29f), Sabaoth is in the seventh heaven, thus still within the realm of evil rule, and therefore

37 Cf. Rev 12:7 where, however, the war is a war between Michael and the dragon rather than among the forces of the dragon
38 Tardieu, Trois mythes gnostiques, 118, 221, 230.
39 Tardieu, Trois mythes gnostiques, 224.
a more appropriate representative of some other group than the elect. The place of Sabaoth is indeed termed a place of rest (104[152].26-27). But its identification as the seventh heaven indicates only that the notion of a place of rest has been reinterpreted rather than that Sabaoth is in the pleromatic realm or an intermediary place. Instead, it is the Light-Adam who is above Sabaoth, who occupies the intermediary place, and who represents the elect.

Next, in a phrase which derives from late Jewish apocalyptic, the seven archangels are said to "stand before him." They stand before him as servants (διάκονοι). In the following sentences concerning the further archangels, the enthronement of Sabaoth is made clear. First, three other archangels are sent to Sabaoth. The exact reason for this number, however, is not evident; it may be a remnant of other calculations. After sending these archangels to him, Faith established the kingdom for him, i.e., she installed him in kingly power or enthroned him, that he might be above the twelve gods of chaos. The twelve are the male and female deities of the six heavens underneath Sabaoth, among which deities Ialdabaoth is now found (106[154].19-27 and 107[155].14-17). Comparison with 106(154).9-11, as well as the motif of the twelve gods of chaos, shows that this motif of Sabaoth’s kingdom above the heavens of chaos probably stems from the author of OnOrgWld.

The seventh heaven is now identified as the place of rest, a motif which probably stems from the Wisdom tradition, in which Wisdom seeks a place of rest (Sir 24:7). For his repentance, i.e., his praise of Faith-Wisdom and condemnation of his father and mother, Sabaoth receives this place of rest.

Faith then gave her daughter Life with a great power to teach him about everything in the Eighth. As we discussed earlier, this is the first of two such pericopes in OnOrgWld on the instruction of Sabaoth. The name Faith alone and the phrase "with a great authority" (cf. 104[152].7 where "great authority" is associated with "the light")

---

80 E.g. 1 Enoch 14.22; 39.12f; 4 Ezra 8.21; Test Sol 24. It is also found in the NF, e.g., Rev 8.2 και εἶδον τοὺς ἅγγεις ἐκ τοῦ θόου ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ λαχείου τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ λαχείου τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ λαχείου. The Coptic aye may translate the Greek λαχείου, cf. C. E., 537b.

81 Cf. 2 Cor 11:34f of ἄρακος ἄρακος (i.e. Satan).

82 Cf. Apocryphal BG 39.10-19 and CG III.1: 16.8-11 in which each authority under Ialdabaoth has seven angels and three powers or hosts. In the Rabbite Wing the number of the angels is then given as 360, although the exact manner of tabulation is not clear.

mark this pericope as redacted by the author. NatArch thus probably preserved the original position of the pericope in the account. By this earlier instruction of Sabaoth, the reductor provides for the source of Sabaoth’s ability to create his throne, chariot and court (104 [152].31). As the reductor in 106(154).6-9 states, Sabaoth is informed about the Eighth so that he might make likenesses thereof in his realm. By specifically redirecting Sabaoth’s power and knowledge to this ability, the reductor again obscures the original function of Sabaoth. No longer is Sabaoth presented mainly as the God of the OT, who has received revelation concerning the Eighth and therefore can communicate some saving knowledge through the books of the OT. His knowledge enables him, rather, to create likenesses of those things above so that his kingdom might remain.

As in NatArch, so this pericope on the ascent and enthronement of Sabaoth betrays no influence upon or from the NT. Rather, further material from the heritage of intertestamental Judaism has been woven into the account without passing through the intermediary stage of the NT.

3) Creation of the Throne/Chariot of Sabaoth 104(152).31-105(153).16

Now (6c) since he had an authority (δυναστεία) he fashioned for himself at first a dwelling-place. It is great, very glorious;

[seven] times more glorious than (τούπα) all that are in the seventh heaven. Then (6c) before
his dwelling place he fashioned
a great throne (θρόνος), which was upon a chariot
(δρόμος);

it was four-faced (τρόμοντας) and called
Cherubim. Now (6c) the Cherubim
has eight forms (μορφήν) at each (κάθε)
of the four corners: lion forms (μορφήν) and
bull forms (μορφήν) and human forms (μορφήν)
and eagle (δεκτε) forms (μορφήν) so that (δέκε)
all of the forms (μορφήν) amount to sixty-four forms
(μορφήν)
and seven archangels (θυρανώσκοι) who stand
before him. It is he who is the eighth, since
he has authority (δυναστεία). All the forms (μορφήν)
amount to
seventy-two for (τρόμοντας) from this chariot (δρόμος)
the seventy-two gods received a pattern (τρόμοντας).
They received a pattern (τρόμοντας) to rule (δρομοῦντας) over
the seventy-two languages of the nations (δρομοῦντας).
As in NatArch, the next step in the enthronement of Sabaoth is his fashioning of a chariot. However, here Sabaoth first makes a dwelling place and throne and then the chariot. Thus, the motif in ancient mythology of building a temple or sanctuary as part of the enthronement pattern is recalled (cf. Yahweh in Exod 15:17 and Ps 102[103]:19); also here explicitly set forth is the specifically Israelite motif, which associates the throne of Cherubim and the chariot with one another. The source of Sabaoth’s creative ability is the authority brought to him by Life. The dwelling place, which he built for himself (line 32) with this authority, is then described as great and more glorious than anything in the seven heavens. Neither in the OT nor in the NT, but rather in Judaism, does one find a description of the dwelling place. For example, in 1 Enoch 14 the dwelling place of God is also described as great (vv. 10, 15) and glorious (v. 16).

Next, he built a great throne (cf. 2 Enoch 22:2), strangely in front of the dwelling place. The text does not state here explicitly that the throne is for Sabaoth himself nor that he sits upon it. Later, in 106(154) Sabaoth is said to sit upon “a” throne; however, there is no clear reference that it is “the” throne, which has previously been fashioned. Yet the context makes it evident that the throne is for Sabaoth himself. The dwelling place is for himself (104[152],32). The kingdom is established for him (104[152],23). He has the authority (105[153],12) over all the forms deriving from the chariot. Later, in 108(153),16-20 the Seraphim who are created upon the throne, glorify him. As we shall discuss later, the fact that in 106(154) Sabaoth sits on “a” throne, which is not explicitly identified as the throne he created, is due to the incorporation there of another piece of tradition by the redactor.

The throne is portrayed as on a chariot, which is described as in NatArch 9(143),26-28, i.e. it is four-faced and called Cherubim. The Cherubim then have eight forms in each of the four corners. As Böhl suggests, they are to be considered as male and female. There-

---

15 Cf. 1 Kgs 2:10, 19; 2 Chr 18:7, 18; Isa 6; Ezek 1 and 10; Dan 7:9ff.
16 Cf. 1 Enoch 14-18 where the adverb “therein” is missing in one of the Greek manuscripts (Charles, J. Enoch 159[1917],34).
17 Schmitz has remarked that there is no description of the divine throne in Hellenistic Judaism. However, 2 Enoch 22:2 contains the rudiments of such a description and thus indicates awareness of such a tradition. He is probably correct, however, in saying that Philo and Josephus avoid the idea of God’s throne as too anthropomorphic. Cf. O. Schmitz, Enoch, TDNT 3 (1965) 160-62.
fore, the sum of thirty-two can be doubled to reach sixty-four (line 9)."88

Further, as Böhlig also points out, the forms of lion, ox, man, and
eagle are drawn from Ezek 1 and 10; and taken over in Christianity by
Rev 4:7, which exhibits the same order as in OnOrgWld.89 Together
with the seven archangels and Sabaoth, the total of forms makes
seventy-two, but Sabaoth has power over all the forms.

The text here draws upon the tradition, found in late Jewish apoc-
calyptic literature, concerning the seventy angels in heaven, who are
each over a particular nation. In the OT the figure seventy is significant
in the seventy years of Jer 25:11; 29:10 and the seventy periods of
Dan 9:24ff. The figure of seventy nations derives from Gen 10, while
in the LXX it appears as seventy-two. In the intertestamental literature,
then, this figure is applied to the heavenly leaders of the nations — in
1 Enoch 89 to the shepherds who punish Israel. These seventy angels
who are over the gentile nations and also their languages (Targ Ps-
Jon Gen 11:8) are also considered as gods by their peoples in the late
Hebrew T Napht 8:4-5 and 9:1, 2, 4:

"For at that time the Lord, blessed be He, came down from His highest
heavens, and brought down with him seventy ministering angels, Michael
at their head. He commanded them to teach the seventy families which
sprang from the loins of Noah seventy languages ... And on that day
Michael took a message from the Lord, and said to the seventy nations,
to each nation separately: 'You know the rebellion you undertook, and
the treacherous confederacy into which you entered against the Lord of
heaven and earth, and now choose today whom you will worship, and
who shall be your intercessor in the height of heaven' ... and every nation
chose its own angel."90

They are also considered as gods in the Ps-Clem. Rev. 2.42, but
here the angels are numbered as seventy-two:

For every nation has an angel, to whom God has committed the govern-
ment of that nation; and when one of these appears, although he be
thought and called God by those over whom he presides, yet, being asked,
he does not give such testimony to himself. For the Most High God, who
alone holds the power of all things, has divided all the nations of the
carth into seventy-two parts, and over these He hath appointed angels as

88 Böhlig, Die koprophagnostische Schrift ohne Titer, 52.
89 Cf. also Apoc Ab 18 where only the position of ox and man has been reversed
in the order. Hag 13b has cherub, man, lion, eagle.
90 Charles, APOT 2. 96. In his discussion in The Greek Versions of the Testaments
of the Twelve Patriarchs, 342-43, Charles characterizes the Hebrew testament as late;
the manuscripts are from the 12th and 13th centuries.
primers. But to the one among the archangels who is greatest, was committed the government of those who, before all others, received the worship and knowledge of the Most High God. 41

The role of Michael is to be noted as well in this material. At first in Jewish tradition, the view is expressed that there is no angel over Israel. God alone would be their ruler (Jub 15:31). But Michael is presented in 1 Enoch 20:5 as the angel over “the best part of mankind”, namely, Israel (cf. T Dan 6:2). Michael also appears as the angel, who records the excesses of punishment by the seventy angelic shepherds in 1 Enoch 89:61.42 Thus, it is understandable that in T Napht Michael is expressly stated as the leader of the seventy angels, who are over the nations.

In this gnostic text, then, once again the tradition appropriate to Michael is associated with that of Sabaoth. As in the traditions of the LXX and of those circles represented by Pseudepigrapha. Rec., seventy-two are counted; they are designated gods; and they are formed in order to rule over the seventy-two languages of the world.

The tradition is modified by the novel association of these deities with the chariot. They are formed from the chariot in order to rule over the seventy-two languages of the peoples.

Again, this pericope is drawn from Judaism rather than simply from the OT or from the NT. Neither in the OT nor in the NT is there a description of the dwelling place of God. The four-faced chariot of Cherubim cannot come from the NT, as we pointed out in the discussion of NatArch. Nor is there mention in the OT or NT of the seventy (seventy-two) angels over the nations.

4) Creation of the Angels 105(153).16-106(154).3

2) ἐν τῷ πάροικων

νοσ. περὶ εὐνομίας ἀγαθομενίας πυγαμετε

λοις ὡμοφύλος γερακυῖς γυμνοῦτε ἐφο

οὐ καλοῖς εὐγενεῖς σώματι γεννήσειν

τὰς Νίκαιας ἡγεμονίας οὐκ ἔχειν

ὁ Πατὴρ ὁ θεὸς ἡ χάριτας εἴπειν

ὁ θεὸς ἀυγαμενός εὐεργετῶν ἐν τῇ


Then (ὁ) upon that throne (θρόνος)
he also fashioned angels (ἄγγελος)
in the form (μορφή) of a dragon (δράκοντα) who
were called
Seraphim (καλεῖς) who glorified him
continually. Afterwards, he fashioned an angelic
(ἄγγελος)
church (ἐκκλησίαν): thousands and myriads, infini-
tely many,
which was similar to the church (ἐκκλησία).

42 T. Charles, 1 Enoch [1972:201].
As in NatArch this next pericope relates the creation of the angels. Yet in contrast with NatArch, OnOrgWld adds at this point a reference to the angels who are called Seraphim. However, this reference is not clearly identifiable as the work of the redactor. Since Isa 6, Seraphim had also been connected with the throne. Thus, Sabaoth here also fashioned them as angels upon the throne. The strange motif is then added that they are in the form of a dragon, which draws upon an idea found only in 1 and 2 Enoch. They are then said to glorify him at every moment. Again, this material has neither influenced nor been transmitted by the NT since neither the motif of Seraphim nor that of their form as a dragon is found in the NT.

---

43 Isa 6:2; 6; Apoc Moses 33:3; 1 Enoch 61:10; 71:7; 2 Enoch 29:3B and probably also in 2 Enoch 12:1 and 19.6. In this pericope the Cherubim are not clearly identified as a separate class of angels, they are still only presented as the bearers of the chariot. In contrast, 1 Enoch 71:7 lists Seraphim, Cherubim and adds Ophanim as classes of angels.

44 1 Enoch 20:7 in a context of the seven archangels and Cherubim states: “Gabriel, one of the holy angels, who is over Paradise and the serpents and the Cherubim”; 2 Enoch 12:1 states: “And I looked and saw other flying elements of the sun, whose name are Phoebites and Chalkydri, marvellous and wonderful, with feet and tails in the form of a lion, and a crocodile’s head... their wings are like those of angels.” In the note on 2 Enoch 12:1 Forbes and Charles remark: “Chalkydri, seemingly a transmutation of galaktoun, brazen hyraxes or serpents. These are classified with the Cherubim in 1 Enoch 20:7, and so equal the Seraphim of Isa 6:2, 6. These then were perhaps conceived as winged dragons, as the analogy of the animal-like forms of the Cherubim in Ezek 1:5-11 would lead us to suppose” (Charles, APOT, 2:201 and 446).
As in NatArch Sabaoth next fashions “infinitely many” angels. However, again in contrast, he fashions here in OnOrgWld “an angelic church.” The angels are described as thousands and myriads, a motif customary in Jewish apocalyptic since Daniel. This angelic church is like the church in the Eighth, which suggests that more mythical elements concerning the inner life of the divine realm above the veil could also be aduced by the author, if he desired, beyond the bare statement that the aeon of truth is all light (98[146]23-36).

The text then adds that Sabaoth fashioned a first-born, called Israel, a motif which is not found in NatArch. Certainly this motif of Israel as a first-born is familiar in Israelite times (Exod 4:22) and in Judaism (Sir 36:11; Jub 2:20; 4 Ezra 6:58). However, in neither was Israel considered as a preexistent entity. In the NT the motif of Israel as the first-born is not found; instead, the term first-born is applied to Christ (e.g. Rom 8.29). The further explanation of the name Israel as “the man who sees God” draws upon an exegetical tradition, which is not witnessed in the OT or NT but well attested in Philo. Since Israel is a creation of Sabaoth, it is implicitly downgraded. Just as the realm of the Eighth is above Sabaoth, so those who belong to that realm are higher than Israel.

Similarly, within Valentinianism the Jews are considered as righteous and psychic, rather than pneumatic. They worship the Demiurge rather than the Father of Truth:

“The mountain represents the Devil or his world, since the Devil was one part of the whole of matter,” says Heracleon, “but the world is the total mountain of evil, a deserted dwelling-place of beasts, to which all (who lived) before the law and all the Gentiles render worship. But

---

44 I have not located this expression in biblical or intertestamental literature.
45 Dat 7:10; cf. 1 Esch 14:22; 60:1; 71:4; Rev 5:11. That ισός translates ἵππον, see Crum 549b; that ὕππος translates πολιον, see Crum 327a.
46 Tardieu states that the place of rest where the first Adam sojourns is the land of election, which the Naozi show identify with the angelic church. He further states that the angelic church refers to the place of sojourn which Sabaoth created for himself. Then he concludes to a cosmological proximity between the angelic church as the place of rest of Sabaoth and the angelic church as the land of election in which the pneumatic Adam rests (Traite mystère gnostique, 225). However, Tardieu misinterprets the passage. The Eighth in which the prototypical angelic church is found is the realm of light to which the pneumatic Adam could not return (112[160]10-13; cf. 124[173]5-13). Instead, the pneumatic Adam is in an aeon between the Eighth and the seven heavens below (112[160]13-22). Sabaoth then creates an angelic church in the seventh heaven in imitation of the church of the Eighth.

47 E.g. De potest. C. 93; De Abru. 57-59; Leg. Gar. 4; etc. As Böhm remarks (Die koptisch-gnostische Schrift ohne Titel, 54), the Hebrew presupposed is תול הדר הער.
Jerusalem (represents) the creation or the creator whom the Jews worship." But, in the second place, he thinks that "the mountain is the creation which the Gentiles worship, but Jerusalem is the creator whom the Jews serve. You, then," he adds, "as the pneumatic will worship neither the creation nor the Demiurge, but the Father of truth." 49

As we suggested earlier, the sentences concerning the creation of Jesus-Christ are part of the redactor's contribution to OnOrgWld. These sentences are unnecessary to the context. With them the pericope is overloaded with its second right/left schema. Jesus Christ is then like the Savior in the Ogdoad and sits at the right hand as do Life (NatArch 95[143].32ff) and Sabaoth (OnOrgWld 106[154].11ff)—but on an excellent throne (cf. Matt 19:28; 25:31). On Sabaoth's left there sits the virgin of the Holy Spirit. Evidently, as Jesus Christ is the image of the Savior above, so the virgin of the Holy Spirit is the image of the Holy Spirit above. She likewise sits on a throne and praises Sabaoth.

It is strange that Jesus Christ sits at the right of Sabaoth. More expected in gnostic thought is that Christ descends upon the human Jesus (e.g. the unnamed gnostics in Iren. Adv. Haer. 1.30.6 and Cerinthus in Iren. Adv. Haer. 1.26.1; ed. Harvey L. 238 and 211). Thus Christ himself is considered as coming from the pneumatic realm rather than from some realm below the veil. 50

However, within Valentinianism Christ is considered as the creation of the Demiurge, sits at his right, is the image of the savior in the

** 49 Heracleon, Frag. 30; text in Völker, 73.74; tr. Förster, Gnosis, 171. Cf. also Frag. 13 (Völker, 69-70) and Hipp. Ref. 6.34.4 (Völker, 133). In her study, The Johannine Gospel in Gnostic Exegesis, Pagels argues that for Heracleon in his commentary on John, the Jews represent consistently the psychics Christians and that Heracleon is not concerned with the actual members of the twelve tribes, the nation of Israel (67-68).

While it is clear that "the Jews" are used by Heracleon to represent the psychic Christians, I consider this fragment to indicate that the matter is not an either/or but both/and. Just as Heracleon in this passage can judge theologically as psychic those who in a temporal sense were "before the Law" as well as their successors the pagans, so here he judges theologically the historical Jews as psychic. In other passages, then, "the Jews" can be taken to represent their successors, the non-gnostic Christians, who are also judged as psychic. Pagels seems implicitly to grant as much when she comments upon this passage, "When the Savior says that Jerusalem is the topos where 'the Jews worship,' he refers even emphatically mine, N.B. rather than only to Christian worship that occurs on a psychic level" (89). This need not prove Heracleon inconsistent, since as Pagels points out (74-75), Heracleon can interpret terms on three levels. Just as the passover from the psychic level is the ancient festival of Israel and from the psychic level is a prefiguration of the passion and death of Jesus (74-75), so too I suggest that "the Jews" on different levels can indicate both the nation of Israel and the non-gnostic Christians.

eighth heaven and represents the psychic. For example, *Exc. Theod.* 62.1 expresses the following in this regard:

Now the psychic Christ sits on the right hand of the Creator, as David says, "Sit thou on my right hand" and so on. And he sits there until the end. 55

Jesus, then, who is from the Pleroma and who is also called the savior, puts on Christ at his descent into the world:

And when he came into Space Jesus found Christ, whom it was foretold that he would put on, whom the Prophets and the Law announced as an image of the Saviour. 55

However, Jesus can also be said to sit at the right of the Demiurge after his earthly ministry. He waits there with the pneumatic seed until the consummation and their re-entry into the Pleroma:

From thence Jesus was called and sat down with Space, that the spirits might remain and not rise before him, and that he might subdue Space and provide the seed with a passage into the Pleroma. 55

Therefore, we suggest that the inclusion of Jesus Christ as seated at the right hand of Sabaoth in the Sabaoth account reflects Valentinian influence. The fact that the name of Jesus Christ rather than Christ alone can probably be explained as a fusion of the motifs of Christ before the earthly ministry and Jesus after it, as seated beside the Demiurge. As in Valentinianism then Jesus Christ is the creation of the Demiurge and also the image of the Savior in the eighth heaven (OnOrgWld 10][153].20-27). In Valentinianism too not only the Jews but also the orthodox Christians are considered as psychic and thus as belonging to the Demiurge. 55 In the same way here in OnOrgWld, the fact that Jesus Christ and the virgin of the Holy Spirit are considered as creations of Sabaoth would place Christians on the same level as Israel—namely, psychics. 55

---


55 *Exc. Theod.* 58.5; Casey, *The Excerpta ex Theodoto,* 66-67. Casey has accepted the emendation of τρισμένος to τρισμενος, as his translation indicates.

56 *Iren. Adv. haer.* 1.6.2. "The psychic men have been instructed in psychic matters; they are strengthened by works and mere faith, and do not have perfect knowledge, and these, they teach, are set of the Church" (text Völker, 115; tr. Förster, *Gnosis*, 140).

57 CT. also *SJC* BG 123 [11f] which distinguishes mankind as well among the categories: gnostic, Christian, hyllic.
However, there is one difficulty with this solution. As we mentioned earlier, 117(165),28-118(166).2 is a summary statement which clearly belongs to the hand of the reductor. In these verses, then, the reductor distinguishes among the pneumatic Adam, the psychic Adam, and the choic Adam, whom he identifies as the man-of-law. Similarly, the author distinguishes three kinds of men and their races until the end of the world: the pneumatic of the Aeon, the psychic, and the choic (122[170].6-9). Since this “man-of-Law” clearly refers to the man of the Torah, the choic Adam and the choic race of men must encompass the Jews. It is difficult, then, or rather impossible to consider the Jews as both choic and psychic at the same time. Since the sentences concerning Jesus Christ are also clearly secondary and redactional in this context, we suggest that the reference to Sabaoth’s creation of Israel was part of the reductor’s inherited material, which he has not completely adapted to his own purposes. Thus, for the reductor, Sabaoth and the Christians are the ones who are truly psychic, whereas the Jews—as men of Law—are actually choic.

The reедакtion continues in the reference to the seven virgins, who stand before the Holy Spirit. That this sentence is also a redaction is clear since the παρθένοι stand before the παρθένος (hikades) but glorify Sabaoth (eustoeou naif). Secondly, the figure thirty is applied only to the lyres and not to the other instruments, and without explanation or evident connection. Also, if this sentence were part of the original, one would expect that the virgins would be the object of the verb ταμιό, which is stated consistently (104[152].32; 109[153].1, 17.20). It is unclear why the virgins are said to have specifically thirty of the lyres. It is possibly an echo of the Valentinian idea that there are thirty aëons in the Pleroma, which are also signified by the thirty days of the month.56

Besides having thirty lyres, the virgins are said to have harps, as in NatArch 95(143).30f.57 Trumpets, which are appropriate to a context of enthronement, are also added and said to render him glory.58 The pericope closes as all the forces of angels glorify him. It seems likely that before this redaction the passage simply continued after πάντα
εὐθαυσ ἐπινοῦτε with a reference to the lyres, harps, and trumpets and to the praise of Sabaoth.

Once again this section exhibits material that derives from neither OT nor NT but from Judaism and therefrom passes into Christian gnostic hands.

5) The Instruction of Sabaoth 106(154).3-11

But (8) he sits on a throne (θρόνος) in a great cloud of light that conceals (παρεξηγεί) him. And there was no one with him in the cloud except (ἐκτὸς ὁ μόνος) Wisdom (σοφίας) and Faith (πίστεως), teaching him about all those which exist in the heavens.

Eighth in order that there might be fashioned the thrones of those so that (ὑμῖν) the kingdom might remain for him until the consummation (συντελέσει) of the heavens of Chaos (χάος) and their Forces (δύναμεις).

As we presented earlier, this second account on the instruction of Sabaoth is another piece of tradition which has been incorporated into OnOrgWld. It is clearly another piece of tradition since it reduplicates a previous periscope, contradicts what precedes and follows, and uses the name Wisdom-Faith rather than Faith-Wisdom. However, this periscope has also clearly been incorporated by the author rather than inserted by a later interpolator, since the second purpose clause—"so that the kingdom might remain for him until the consummation (συντελέσει) of the heavens of Chaos and their Forces"—betrays the theological concern and the terminological usage of the author in the term συντελέσει. Thus, at least this second purpose clause stems from the redactorial hand of the author.

**The term συντελέσει occurs frequently throughout the treatise. Most often the term occurs in the phrase "the consummation of the Aeons": cf. 115(150).13; 114 (152).24; 112(116).26f; 112(117).6, 33; 121(171).30; 125(171).32. However, the term also occurs alone (117[165].1; 121(171).19), in the phrase "the consummation of the world" (112[170].7b), in the phrase "the consummation of your works" (119[151].26) and only here at 106(154).10f in the phrase "the consummation of the heavens of Chaos and their powers."

Use of the term συντελέσει for the consummation of the world is found within Valentinianism, e.g. Eus. Theod. 6.3.1 (Casey, The Excerpta ex Theodoto, 82-93) and Iren. Advers. Haer. 1.8.1 (Volker, 114). The term is also found in other strands of
In this piece of tradition Sabaoth is presented as sitting on a throne in a cloud of light, which covers him. He is alone except for the presence of Wisdom-Faith. Rather than simply an allusion to Exod 24:15ff, in which God is enclosed within a cloud of glory, the motif of a great cloud concealing Sabaoth is probably derived from late Jewish tradition, in which the theophanic cloud of Ps 18:11/2 Sam 22:12 and Ps 104:2 is associated with the heavenly veil.\footnote{For example, in Targ Jób 26:9 God sits on His throne within the cloud of His glory, which covers Him as a veil.\footnote{He sits alone within it, and the cloud prevents the angels from seeing Him.)}} It is probable that this scene concerning the instruction of the Demiurge by Wisdom-Faith derives from Valentinian influence. Usually in Valentinianism, the Demiurge is considered to be ignorant of the realms above him until the coming of the Savior.\footnote{However, in one report concerning the Valentinians the Demiurge is said to have been previously instructed by Wisdom:}

For the Demiurge was instructed by Sophia to the effect that he is not God alone, as he imagined with no other existing apart from him; but taught by Sophia, he recognized the higher (deity); for he was instructed, initiated, and indoctrinated into the great mystery of the Father and of the Son, and he disclosed it to no one.\footnote{The incorporation of this pericope into OnOrgWld serves to stress the role of Wisdom in instructing Sabaoth. A double purpose clause then explains the importance of this teaching. First, it is that likenesses to these things might be made; and second, that the kingdom might remain for him until the end. Thus the incorporation of this piece of tradition by the author adds another reason as to why the teaching comes prior to the creation by Sabaoth: because Sabaoth has made likenesses of what exist in the Eighth, he has authority over all below him; his kingdom extends over all below. Thereby, the kingly role of Sabaoth is again explicitly emphasized.}

\footnote{Gnosticism, e.g. \textit{GEgypt CG III}, 2: 61ff/IV. 2: 72ff and \textit{Panis Sophiae} 86 (tr. C. Schmidt and W. Till, \textit{Koptisch-gnostische Schriften GCS} 45, 2. Aufl., Berlin 1962, 123). Thus, while the use of the term in this sense is not specifically Valentinian, its use throughout the document is appropriate if one can detect other specifically Valentinian influence and thus supportive of that other evidence.}

\footnote{\textit{Sir} R. 1. 976.}

\footnote{\textit{Theon. Adv. Anv.} 1.5.4 (Völker, 109-10): 1.7.2 (Völker, 118); 1.7.4 (Völker, 119); \textit{Hipp. Ref.} 6.35.1 (Völker, 134).}

\footnote{\textit{Hipp. Ref.} 6.36.2 (text Völker, 135; tr. Förster, \textit{Gnosis}, 193).}
6) The Separation into Right and Left 106[154].11-19

As in NatArch, this last pericope concerning separation into right and left conflates the final element of the ascent and vision of the throne/chariot by the apocalyptic seer—i.e. angels on right and left—and the final element of enthronement—i.e. the beginning of rule. As we also previously discussed, this pericope presents a later stage in the tradition than NatArch, since “darkness” and “righteousness” reflect the hand of the redactor and since the pericope contradicts the previous narrative of the ascent of Sabaoth.

The particle “now” introduces the pericope, and Faith-Wisdom is then said to separate Sabaoth from the darkness. In contrast to NatArch, Faith-Wisdom assumes the middle position rather than Sabaoth. Also in contrast to NatArch she calls Sabaoth to her right and Ialdabaoth to her left rather than Life and the angel. From that day the right is called righteousness and the left unrighteousness.\(^\text{44}\)

In NatArch, on the other hand, the contrast is between life and unrighteousness. The change then from NatArch to OnOrgWld serves to emphasize particularly the role of Faith-Wisdom and the contrast between righteousness and unrighteousness.

One finds a similar conception within Valentinian circles. For example, there it is Wisdom who creates the Demiurges and the Ruler of the World, who are respectively related to right and left.\(^\text{45}\) The Demiurg in particular is considered as the God of righteousness while

\(^{44}\) Tardieu errs in ascribing righteousness and thus the creation of Paradise to Faith-Wisdom. Rather, it is Sabaoth who is related to righteousness and thus probably to the creation of Paradise (Trois mythes gnostiques, 225).

\(^{45}\) E.g. Thod. 33.3-34.1 and 47.2-3 (Casey, The Excerpta ex Thedoto, 64-65 and 70-73). Iren. Adv. haer. 1.5.1 (Völker, 106).
the Ruler of the World is unrighteous. Then the right represents the psychic and the left represents the hylic or choric. To be sure, however, one does not find within Valentinianism the scene in which Wisdom is seated with the Demiurge and the Ruler of the World beside her in one heaven. Rather, Wisdom occupies the middle; the Demiurge resides in the seventh heaven; and the Ruler of the world is in the cosmic realm.

Yet this pericope concerning the separation into right and left in OnOrgWld shows Valentinian influence. Valentinian conceptions have not been taken over directly. Rather this pericope of the Sabaoth account as found in NatArch has been adapted in the light of Valentinian influence. Now Faith-Wisdom—as Wisdom in Valentinianism—is placed in the position of prominence rather than Sabaoth. The contrast becomes righteousness versus unrighteousness rather than life versus unrighteousness; and Sabaoth represents the psychic type of man (122[170]9).

The fact that Sabaoth is here contrasted with Ialdabaoth rather than with an angel may also be partially explained by the tradition concerning the divine Middot. Following Palestinian exegetical tradition, Philo had ascribed the aspect of God's ruling power to the title κύριος and His goodness and creative power to the title θεός. That this tradition was known in Gnosticism is demonstrated by ApocryphBG 62.12ff:

One (μικρὸς) is righteous (δικαιοκριττός), but (δῶς) the other is unrighteous (δικαιουμένος).
Elohim is the righteous (δικαιοκριττός), Jave is the unrighteous (δικαιουμένος).**

In OnOrgWld, then, this same contrast is maintained between the righteous and unrighteous (although here in the nominal rather than

---

** Pletsch, Letter to Flora 3.5; 3.7; and 7.5 (Völker, 87t and 92).
** A. Marmorestein, The Old Rabbinic Doctrine of God; 1. The Names and Attributes of God (Oxford 1927) 41-53. As Marmorestein suggests, the latter reversal of rabbinic tradition so that Yahweh represents the merciful aspect and Elohim the judgmental may well represent an anti-gnostic reaction.
** Ed. Till (TU 60) 164-65. In the longer form of ApocryphBG II 1: 24/25:0ff (ed. M. Kranz and P. Latoh, Die drei Versionen des Apokryphen des Johannes im Koptischen Museum zu Ai-Karu; Abhandlungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts Kairo. Koptische Reihe 1; Wiesbaden 1962, 173ff) the association of names is reversed so that Yahweh is righteous and Elohim unrighteous. This fact makes it difficult to assess whether the gnostics are following the earlier tradition of the middot represented by Philo or the later Rabbinic reversal. For our purposes, it is sufficient to note that this tradition was known by the gnostics. Cf. MacRae, Some Elements of Jewish Apocalyptic, 207ff.
adjectival form) and applied to the archontic names Sabaoth and Ialdabaoth rather than the two names of God. 70 Again, as in NatArch, the beginning of rule is shown in that the names are said to be used “from that day”. Secondly, because of this separation into right and left, the world that exists below is then characterized as belonging to the church of righteousness and unrighteousness, since it stands over creation.

As in NatArch, so also here in OnOrgWld the Sabaoth account is derived from Jewish material, draws upon the tradition of the ascent and vision of the heavenly throne/chariot by the apocalyptic seer and upon the tradition of heavenly enthronement, and thus reducts these traditions by applying them to Sabaoth.

Specifically, apart from the small reference to Jesus Christ and the virgin of the Holy Spirit within the Sabaoth account (10[153] 26-31), the account in OnOrgWld stems from Jewish material. There is no discernible influence of this account upon the NT nor is there influence from the NT portrayals of the enthronement of Christ upon this account. Thus the Jewish material has been meditated by Christians other than those whose writings appear in the canonical writings. As in NatArch the determinative motifs applied here to Sabaoth are not ascribed to Christ in the NT: e.g. Sabaoth’s repentance, his being “snatched up” to the seventh heaven, his title specifically as Lord of the Forces, Life as his instructor concerning the Eighth. Although Sabaoth does sit at the right hand (10[154] 12f), this motif does not stem from NT influence but rather from the author’s desire to contrast Sabaoth and Ialdabaoth, right and left. Lastly, a number of the minor motifs and traditions stem from Judaism. There are those that are also found in NatArch: seven heavens, the heavenly veil, the four-faced chariot of Cherubim, infinitely many angels, the harps of angels. In addition there occur here the following: the stretching

70 Marmorestein in The Old Rabbinic Doctrine of God, 1: 90, has stated that these maddot were used by the gematriot to contrast the Highest God and the God of the Jews (cf. Iren. Adv. haer. 2:10:3). This passage in OnOrgWld, however, would suggest that the contrast was between two rulers both of whom were below the Highest God. Further, in both versions of Apocryphon (cf. the preceding note) the righteous figure is placed over fire and wind and the unrighteous over water and earth, which would suggest that they are in some way comparable, related to the cosmos, and less than the remote Highest God. Thus, OnOrgWld would reflect the earlier use of this tradition in its application of the maddot to both a positive and a negative ruler, who are rulers of the cosmos underneath the Highest God. Apocryphon, then, where the maddot are related to Cain and Abel, would reflect a later stage in which the application of the tradition to different gods or rulers has lost its original significance.
out of the finger, the exegetical tradition relating light and darkness to Gen 1:26, the description of the dwelling place of Sabaoth, the tradition of the seventy-two angels over the nations, the Seraphim as dragonlike, and Israel interpreted as “the man who sees God.”

B. Function

Professor Böhlig has perceptively noted that OnOргWld 103(151).30 would be most appropriately followed by 107(155).17, if the Sabaoth account were missing. Therefore, he proposes that the Sabaoth account is an interpolation in the original treatise. While we agree that the Sabaoth account is an identifiable unit of tradition, yet we consider it neither as a later interpolation into the text nor as a unit of tradition which has simply been inserted into the text. Rather, the Sabaoth account is a piece, which the author has redacted and integrated to serve a function in his treatise as a whole.

We have already shown that the author has redacted the Sabaoth account by means of his theology of the immortal Light-Man and the contrast between light and darkness (cf. 103[151].15-28 and 104 [152].2-11). Secondly, the further references to Sabaoth throughout the treatise indicate that Sabaoth has been integrated into the system of the document. In 113(161).12f Wisdom-Life is said to be with Sabaoth; in 114(162).16f the souls of Sabaoth and his Christ are referred to; and also in 122(170).22f the sun and moon are considered as a witness to Sabaoth.

The function of the Sabaoth account in OnOргWld then is related to the particular theology of OnOргWld. As we have shown previously, the Sabaoth account in NeArch functions to answer the theological

---

71 Bullard in The Hypostasis of the Archons, 111, suggested that the relationship of the Sabaoth account to Merkabah mysticism should be investigated by someone I have done that. As the detailed analysis of the motifs in the Sabaoth account has shown, however, almost all of the motifs can be found in intertestamental Judaism. The few remaining motifs, such as the consuming fire which proceeds from the outstretched finger, can be found in Rabbinic Judaism as well as in Merkabah material. There is no isolatable motif that is particular to these gnostic accounts and to Merkabah material. Thus, the demonstrable relationship of these Sabaoth accounts and the Merkabah material consists only in that they are both derived from the same matrix, late Judaism.

For an interesting study of the motifs of the throne and the chariot in Judaism and in Jewish esoteric, see J. Meir, Vom Kultus zur Gnosis: Budensklade, Gottesedem und Merkabah (Kateros, Religionswissenschaftliche Studien 1; Salzburg 1964).

72 Böhlig, Die koptisch-gnostischen Schriften ohne Titel, 49f.

73 Cf. supra 16:18 and also the commentary for further specific examples and argumentation.
problem concerning the God of the OT and the revelation contained in the books of the OT. Here, however, in OnOrgWid the Sabaoth account serves an anthropological rather than a theological function. At the very beginning of the cosmogony, the author indicates a major concern that he has—namely, men. For him the veil separates not the above and the aeons below (as in NatArch 94[142],8-10) but men and heaven (98[146],22f). Within this theology, then, Sabaoth represents one class of men, the psychics. We shall contend that in his use of the Sabaoth account the author has been influenced by Valentinianism. It is our view that the author has been subject to Valentinian influence and in the light of this influence has redacted the Sabaoth account and composed his treatise. However, he has not been bound by Valentinianism but developed further beyond it.

We have already argued within the commentary that there is evidence of Valentinian influence in the Sabaoth account. The creation of Christ by Sabaoth to sit at his right hand, the instruction of Sabaoth by Faith-Wisdom alone, and the presentation of Wisdom surrounded by Sabaoth and Iadabaith, who represent righteousness and unrighteousness, are clear examples of Valentinian influence. Possibly the reference to the thirty lyres (105[153],33f) is also a result of Valentinian influence.

There is also evidence of Valentinian influence in the treatise as a whole. First the pneumatic figure must reside in a middle realm between the seventh heaven and the divine realm, until the consummation of the Aeons (112[160],10-22). He cannot enter the divine realm until then because of the stain with which his Light has been mixed (127[175],1-5). So, too, in Valentinianism Wisdom as the pneumatic figure resides in the μεσότητα until the consummation. However, the author of OnOrgWid has developed beyond Valentinianism in that he has associated Faith-Wisdom with Sabaoth and introduced another figure, the immortal Light-Man, as the resident of the realm of the middle. Secondly, in OnOrgWid 128[173],4f the seven heavens plus the middle are referred to as the Eighth. This designation is somewhat strange in that elsewhere in the text the Eighth refers to

---

4 The same redactional interest is seen in the serpent’s response to Eve. Contrary to the biblical account (Gen 3:5) and to NatArch (90[138],6-10), the difference for OnOrgWid is not the difference between good and evil but between evil and good men (104[156],5-11[107],6).

5 Cf. supra 104-15.

the divine realm (e.g. 112[160].12). Also in Valentinianism these lower realms are designated as the second or lower Ogdoad.\footnote{\text{Völker, 112. Cf. Exe. Thed. 54.1-2 (Casey, The Excerpta ex Thedato, 76-77) and Heracleon, Frag. 44 (Völker, 83).}} Thirdly, OnOrgWld 122(170).6-9 distinguishes three types of men: the pneumatic of the Aeon, the psychic and the earthly (πνευματικός, ψυχικός, χοίκιός). In Valentinianism as well there is a distinction among three classes of men. Usually the distinction is among πνευματικός, ψυχικός and ξυλικός (e.g. Iren. \textit{Adv. haer.} 1.6.1)).\footnote{\text{Völker, 112f and 70.}} However, the series πνευματικός, ψυχικός and χοίκιός is also attested in the account of Iren. \textit{Adv. haer.} 1.6.1 and in Frag. 15 of Heracleon.\footnote{\text{E.g. Iren. \textit{Adv. haer.} 1.6.1 (Völker, 112f); Heracleon, Frag. 44 (Völker, 83).}}

Fourthly, the passage in OnOrgWld concerning the creation of Adam shows Valentinian influence. There is a strange, apparent contradiction in OnOrgWld in that at 115(163).1 the creation of the Archigenetor and his rulers is said to be ψυχικός and yet at 115(163).10ff. 13f, 34 he is stated explicitly to have no ψυχή. If one compares the parallel passage in NatArch 87(135).23-88(136).16, there is no such contradiction. Within Valentinianism the psyche comes from the righteous ruler of the seventh heaven, the Demiurge; and those who possess the soul from the Demiurge, but not the Spirit from Wisdom, are ψυχικοί.\footnote{\text{This conception may be possible on the basis of a distinction between an earthly, material soul and a soul of that intermediate stuff between spirit and matter. Cf. Exe. Thed. 50.1-51.1 (Casey, The Excerpta ex Thedato, 72-75).}} On the other hand, those who merely receive matter from the world-ruler are ξυλικοί. In OnOrgWld then the author has accepted his inherited material, in which the Archigenetor and his rulers fashioned a man that was ψυχικός, but altered it in that this creature is said to have no ψυχή.\footnote{\text{Tardieu notes the parallel between the three lordships and the three races. Thus he relates the lordship of Sabaoth to the pneumatic, the lordship of the second Adam to the psychics, and the lordship of the \textit{psychus} to the hyliotes. However, he misinterprets the function of Sabaoth who represents the psychics (see supra). He also fails}}

\footnote{\text{Iren. \textit{Adv. haer.} 1.3.4 and 1.5.2 (Völker, 101 and 107) and Epiph. Pan. 31.6.1-2 (ed. Holl, GCS 25.1, 392-93).}}
Fifthly, Valentinian influence can be detected in the reference to a fourth race of men. Again a seeming contradiction provides our starting point. OnOrgWld had consistently maintained that there were three races of men: the pneumatic, psychic and the choric (e.g. 122 [170], 6-9). Then at 125(173), 3f one finds the unexpected statement: “Therefore there are four kinds.” The statement follows a discussion of the innocent spirits, i.e. the small blessed ones, and the angel who is manifest to them. Within Valentinianism Jesus as the fruit of the Pleroma can be entitled as Savior or Logos (e.g. Iren. Adv. haer. 1.2.6) and also as Angel. As the Angel of the Pleroma, Jesus has been granted all authority. He has also created other angels, who surround him and who are the counterparts of the pneumatic seed in the world. These angels then pray for their counterparts in order that they may be reunited and re-enter the Pleroma. This pneumatic seed is then identified as a τάξιον or φύσις and as τὸ διαφέρον πνεύματος. At the consummation then the angelic counterpart and its pneumatic seed are to be reunited, as the Savior is with Wisdom, and enter into the nuptial chamber of the Pleroma. Here too in OnOrgWld 124(172), 12-15 there is an angel who is not powerless before the Father, who is manifest to the innocent spirits, who possesses the entire gnosis and who can give it. Clearly here OnOrgWld is drawing upon the Valentinian notion of Jesus as the Angel of the Pleroma. The innocent spirits that are sent into the world are then identified as “your images”; they are the small, blessed ones.


to see this apparent contradiction between being φυσικὸς but not having a ψυχή. Since the ψυχή comes from Sabaoth, it seems more likely that the lordships of Sabaoth, of the second Adam and of the psyche all relate consistently to the psychics.

61 Völker, 99.

62 Ἀγγέλος τοῦ πλερώματος Eec. Thes. 33.1 (Casey, The Excerpta ex Thesaurio, 64-65); ὁ ἰδίου πνεύματος ἄγγελος Eec. Thes. 43.2 (Casey, The Excerpta ex Thesaurio, 70-71).

63 καὶ δόντις ἐπὶ τὸν ἐγκαταλείποντα τοῦ πνεύματος, συνένοιανος δὲ καὶ τοῦ πλερώματος διείσαθαν ἐκ πνεύματος ἄγγελος, καὶ γένεται πνεύματος τὸν δόμον μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος Eec. Thes. 43.1 (Casey, The Excerpta ex Thesaurio, 68-71).

64 Eec. Thes. 33.1-4 (Casey, The Excerpta ex Thesaurio, 64-67).


66 Eec. Thes. 64 (Casey, The Excerpta ex Thesaurio, 82-83).

67 Böhlig has suggested an allusion to Matt 18:10, particularly on the basis of the mention of the guardian angel in OnOrgWld 124(172), 12f—Die koptisch-gnostische Schrift ohne Titel, 190. However, the reference here is to one angel for all the innocent spirits rather than to a guardian angel for each individual person as in Matt 18:10.
They have been fashioned by the Savior (124[172].33f); and they, rather than the seed, are the ones who are κατὰ διαστορός (124[172].26f). Here too OnOrgWld is drawing upon Valentinian notions but also developing them further. The author has increased in his system the classes of men from three to four. Thereby he has made use of the notion of angelic counterparts, sent them into the world, and considered them as the fourth race, which is perfect and thus above the pneumatics. With this theologoumenon, the author is moving in the direction of Manichaeism, which also distinguishes the "elect" as more perfect than the catechumens or hearers.

Lastly, OnOrgWld possibly shows Valentinian influence in its conception of the consummation. In Valentinianism after separation from the body the pneumatists reside in the middle with Wisdom, and the psychics reside in the seventh heaven with the Demiurge. The consummation occurs when all the pneumatic seed has been perfected (τελειούν). At the consummation, which is expressed by the term συνεπλήρωμα, the pneumatists along with Wisdom enter the Pleroma while the psychics and the Demiurge enter the realm just vacated, i.e. the middle. In OnOrgWld the term used for the consummation is also συνεπλήρωμα (e.g. 125[173].32f), although the term is also used in other strands of Gnosticism and therefore not peculiarly Valentinian (e.g. GEgypt II, 2: 61.1ff/IV, 2: 72.10ff). Also here at the consummation the light returns to its root, the divine realm 127[175].4. Those who have entered the divine realm then are named the perfect (τελειοί; cf. 127[175].5-10). Those who are not perfect then receive their glories in their aenas and in their immortal kingdoms (127[175].10-13). Implicitly then Sabaoth would remain in his kingdom (cf. 104[152].23 and 106[154].9) along with those associated with him. In contrast, NatArch 97(145).5-21 presents a return to the light at the end but shows no concern for those who are less than perfect. The reference

---

90 Tardieu suggests Pythagorean arithmology as the background for the notion of the fourth as the designation for the elect (Trois mythes gnostiques, 81, n. 236).
92 Exc. Thesd. 34.2 and 63.1 (Casey, The Excerpta ex Theodore, 64-65 and 82-83); Iren. Adv haer. 1.6.1 and 1.7.1 (Volker, 112 and 117f). Cf. the discussion of Pages in The Johannine Gospel in Gnostic Exegesis, 94-97, who proposes that only those psychics who have not attained salvation remain in the middle.
93 Tardieu suggests that the kings of history and the prophets are those who do not enter kingsness but remain in immortal kingdoms (Trois mythes gnostiques, 82). However, there is no clear basis for this statement. 127[175].7 refers to the fulfillment of prophecy at the consummation; and the following verse seems to refer to the gnostics as kings rather than the kings of history (cf. 125[173].5-12).
to a heavenly marriage and to a movement of Sabaoth into the middle are missing in OnOrgWld, and yet the treatise may reflect Valentinian influence in its presentation of the return of the light at the σωρήλαμα and of immortal kingdoms for the non-perfect.

Since the Sabaoth account has been integrated into the treatise as a whole and since the account reflects Valentinian influence, it is clear that Sabaoth represents the psychic class of men. Because the perfect realm of the Eighth is light (98[146],23-26), the immortal Light-Man represents the pneumatic type of men and resides in the middle (112[160],10-22). Sabaoth is therefore placed below him in the seventh heaven (104[152],20f.). Iakabaoth then and his offspring in the lower heavens represent the choicest type of men (106[154],24ff).

In this midrashic reflection upon Genesis, the author has also presented three Adams—the pneumatic, the psychic and the choicest. In a clear systematization (117[165],28-35), which reflects the hand of the author, it is said:

Moreover the first Adam of the light
is pneumatic (ψυχικος). He appeared
On the first day. The second
Adam is psychic (συνεφθυκος). He appeared
on the fourth day, which
is called ‘Aphrodite’. The third
Adam is earthly (ζωικος).
That is, ‘the man of law’ (ονοματικος).**

In accord with this description of the three Adams, for the author there are also three kinds of men and their races until the end of the world: the pneumatic of the Aeon, the psychic and the earthly (122 [170],6-9). All souls are at first captured and enclosed in matter (114[162],14-24; 117[165],24-26). It is gnosis, however, which makes one aware of the true situation (119[167],12-15) and leads one, like Sabaoth, to condemn the authorities (110[158],24-29; 113[161],7-9; 120 [168],29-35). Just as there are three men and their races, so there are three Phoebines (the first is immortal, the second makes a thousand years, and the third is destroyed) and also three baptisms (the first is pneumatic, the second is fiery, the third is of water 122[170],6-16). We have already discussed how the author has then altered this system to introduce a fourth class of men, the perfect.

To whom then are the various classes of men ascribed? The reference to the third, choicest Adam as the man of the Law is clearly a reference

** Cf. Böhl, Die kopfisch-gnostische Schrift ohne Titel, 291 and 84f.
to the Jews. Since the author, in incorporating the Sabaoth account, has added the reference to Jesus Christ as a creation of Sabaoth (105 [153]:26), it is clear that the orthodox Christians are the psychics (cf. 114[162]:16). The gnostics then would be the pneumatics; and the elect among them are the perfect (124[172]:32ff).

Corresponding to this anthropological function are ecclesiological and political consequences of this Sabaoth account. The Jews and Christians form a church of unrighteousness and righteousness to which the world is subject (105[153]:20-21 and 106[154]:16-18). The gnostics, however, form the true church (105[153]:22-23 and 124[172]:25-35). For the gnostic author of OnOrgWld, then, the heavenly enthronement of Sabaoth is a validation that Sabaoth is a divinely appointed ruler but a ruler only over the church of righteousness and unrighteousness and the world below him. Neither Sabaoth nor his church nor his rulers have any authority over the true gnostics. Thereby, this version of the Sabaoth account must have arisen when the gnostics no longer felt themselves welcome within or attracted to their Jewish or Christian brethren.

The further significance of this account in OnOrgWld, in contrast to NajArch, is that it shows the development within this stream of Gnosticism. The trend is from the simple to the more complex. Further mythical figures are introduced, i.e. the immortal Light-Man; further traditions are incorporated with the result that inner contradictions within the account are possible (e.g. 106[154]:11-12 where Faith-Wisdom separates Sabaoth from the darkness, although he is already in the seventh heaven). From this single example, of course, one cannot generalize to the trend of all Gnosticism. However, further such studies in the Nag Hammadi corpus may serve either to verify or disprove such a general development.

The fact that the document as a whole is in the form of a treatise or tract should also not be overlooked. The conscious polemic against those who derive the world from chaos (97[145]:24-29) with its allusion to Hesiod, the reference to the blessed in each country (124[172]:25ff), and the form of a treatise or tract indicate a changed life-situation. No longer is the community merely an esoteric community. Rather, it is one conscious of a world-wide dispersion.

---

94 Sabaoth is also said to have created Israel. Since the author himself considers the Jews as related to the choic rather than psychic class of men, probably the phrase concerning Israel was part of his pre-existing source (105[153]:34).
Because this text is subsequent to NatArch, betrays Valentinian influence and shows a development beyond it, its date is probably in the first half of the third century. The treatise does not exhibit the wildly developed speculation of the end of the third century as witnessed in Pithis Sophia.

C. THE SABAOTH ACCOUNTS: REFLECTIONS THEREOF IN LATE Gnostic DOCUMENTS?

This same tradition concerning Sabaoth is found in another document from Nag Hammadi, GrSeth (CG VII, 2), although in this document the name of ruler is Adonaios rather than Sabaooth. GrSeth is a revelation of Jesus Christ, the Son of Man (69.20-22), which particularly polemicizes on the one hand against the orthodox Christian church and stresses on the other hand the unity within the true church of the gnostics. The tractate polemicizes against the orthodox Christian church by attacking its doctrine of the death of Jesus Christ upon the cross and by considering it as the product of the rulers (49.26f; 60.13-61.28). For the true gnostic, in contrast, Jesus Christ did not truly die (55.15-56.13), but his revelation effects a unity between him and those who have accepted this knowledge (67.19-68.16).

The tractate itself is comparatively late. This is clear, first of all, because of its nature as a compilation. Although there is no indication that the document is Basilidean in itself, yet it has taken over the tradition of the substitution of Simon of Cyrene for Jesus upon the cross (56.4-13), which is attributed to Basilides (cf. Iren. Adv. haer. 1.24.4 and Epiph. Pan. 24.3.2-5). Secondly, it is clearly late because of the persecution by the orthodox Christian church (59.19-60.12). Although there was polemical discussion between orthodox and gnostic, there is no evidence of persecution in the early stages of this confrontation. It should be further mentioned that it is impossible to locate this tractate within a particular gnostic sect.

Within the two parallel mythical cycles (49.10-54.14 and 54.14-59.19), which comprise the first part of the tractate and which treat of the heavenly origin of the revealer and his descent into the world, there appear the references to Adonaios (52.17-25 and 54.32-55.15). In

---

59.22-26: "... we were hated and persecuted, not only (οὐδὲν) by those who are ignorant, but (καὶ) also by those who think that they are advancing (εἰσερχόμενοι) the name of Christ."

58 In the following pages I am greatly indebted to the dissertation of J. Gibbons, *A Commentary on the Second logos of the Great Seth* (Ph.D. diss., Yale University
the first, an allusion is presented to the earlier flight of Adonaios:

And all those who have come down,
who belong to the same race (γένος) as he
who fled from the throne (θρόνος) (those of the race of Adonaios)
and to the Sophia (σοφία) of Elpis (Ελπίς),
since she had earlier given the sign
concerning us and all the ones with me.**

In the second reference (54.32-55.15), a disturbance arises at the
descent of the revealer, whom Adonaios knows because of Hope
(Ελπίς):

And (δὲ) there came about a disturbance
and a battle surrounding
the Seraphim and the Cherubim,

... and confusion around
Adonaios on both sides
with their dwelling to the Cosmoctor (κοσμοκτόρας)
and him who said,
‘Let us seize him!’; others
again: ‘The plan will certainly not materialize.’

For (ὡς) Adonaios knows me
because of Elpis (Ελπίς)
(And [δὲ] I was
in the mouth of lions) and

1972), for his analysis of the document as a whole and his examination of the
relationship between Sabaoth and Adonaios.

** γενος γενος της ελπης
εις τη επαγω Ελπίς
ης ηη
ον εν εστιν εις ελπη της
νομος γενος γενος γενος
κατοικησε της άσθενες
ονοματικης της
της θρονος της
ον σοφιας της
ονοματικης της

Text and tr. Gibbons, A Commentary on Gr.Seth, 103f. In his commentary (175-76)
Gibbons rightly proposes two emendations in this passage. As he states, the text at
present reads: “And they are fleeing, all those who have come down with the race,
from him who had fled from the throne (θρόνος) to the Sophia of Elpis, since she had
earlier given the sign concerning us and all those who are with me—the race of Adonaios.”
He suggests that the Greek Forlage must have been something
like και φυτούσαν της πάντων καταβάτης της γένεις (read: συγγενείς) τού φύλος του
θρόνου προς την σωμα της έλπιδος... του γένους Αδωναίου. Thus a mis-
reading of πάντων γένεων for an original συγγενείς by the translator and a mis-translation
of τού φύλος τού as the object of the verb φυτούσαν rather than a genitive modifying
συγγενείς produced the present faulty text.
the plan which they devised
about me to do away with
their Error (πάλην) and their senselessness.
I did not succumb to them as
they had planned.103
It is clear from the names and motifs involved that these pericopes
concerning Adonaios and his race reflect the same mythologoumenon
as that found in NatArch and OnOrgWld concerning Sabaoth. To be
sure, the name is changed to Adonaios, but as both GEgypt (CG
III, 2: 57.13f) and ApocryIn (CG II, 1: 10[58].33f) state, Sabaoth
is called or identified with Adonaios.104 In an earlier incident, Ado-
naios is said to have "fled from the throne" (52.20). The "throne" is
surely a metaphor for the Demiurge, Ialdabaoth (cf. ApocryIn CG
II, 1: 10[58].14-19), from whom Sabaoth also turns. Further, just as
Sabaoth is instructed by Life the daughter of Wisdom in NatArch

Text and tr. Gibbons, A Commentary on Gr-Seth, 108f. As he suggests in his commentary
(197), there must be a lacuna after the clause "since their glory will be dissolved," if we are to explain the following incomplete sentence. The scribe must have omitted
a line, which contained the beginning of the following sentence, such as: "Some fled
from the disturbance..."
103 This identification of Sabaoth and Adonaios occurs only in the codex II version
of ApocryIn and not in BG 8502, Codex III or Codex IV of Nag Hammadi. Since
this identification of Sabaoth and Adonaios would be a later development in the
simple listing of the archontic offspring of the Demiurge, it is another small indication
that Codex II represents a later version of ApocryIn than BG 8502 and Codex III.
Cf. Rudolph, "Gnosis and Gnosticism, ein Forschungsbericht." ThRu 34 (1906) 143-
47, for the present state of the discussion concerning the priority of the shorter or
longer recension.
(e.g. 95[143].18 and by Wisdom-Life the daughter of Faith-Wisdom in OnOrgWld (e.g. 113[161].12f), so Adonaios is instructed by Wisdom of Hope (52.21) or Hope (55.7f). One can see the Christianization at work in the change from NatArch and OnOrgWld. Rather than Life, Hope is the daughter of Wisdom, whose name probably stems from Wisdom’s action in 51.11-15, where she prepares men to receive the “life-giving word,” which will come from the revealer in the future. Secondly, the instruction is no longer concerning the eighth heaven, but rather concerning the future revealer, who is later identified as Jesus Christ, the Son of Man (69.21f).

In these pericopes not only the reference to the earlier flight of Adonaios but also the description of the later revolt of the race of Adonaios is drawn from the same tradition as the Sabaoth account. Here too at the appearance of a heavenly figure (cf. the light in OnOrgWld 104[152].5) there is a disturbance (γυρογυρίον) in the cosmos and a battle (54.27-33; cf. OnOrgWld 104[152].15f). There is an unexplained reference to the Seraphim and Cherubim in connection with Adonaios (54.34; cf. OnOrgWld 105[153].3f, 18f). There is the flight from the Demiurge and to Wisdom of Hope (52.20f). There is probably even a reflection of the division into right and left in the phrase that there was confusion around Adonaios “on both sides” (55.2; cf. NatArch 95[143].31ff and OnOrgWld 106[154].11ff).

In conclusion, then, one can say that the presentation of the earlier flight of Adonaios and the later revolt of the race of Adonaios in these pericopes is drawn from the same tradition as that of the Sabaoth account, even though the specific motifs of repentance and enthronement in the seventh heaven are missing. Gibbons has noted and detailed this relationship as well, and suggests that GrSeth is incorporating this myth into its descent of the savior myth. What is still puzzling, however, is the function of these pericopes within the document as a whole. There is no indication that Adonaios represents

---

102 The term in GrSeth is ἦν γόργος, πάλη and πολεμικός in the phrase χόρτασον ἰδον τῷ πτη (cf. Cumm. 395b); in OnOrgWld the term is πολιάς.
103 Gibbons, A Commentary on GrSeth, 175-80 and 196-200, to which I am happily indebted in the preceding.
104 Gibbons, A Commentary on GrSeth, 198. Gibbons suggests that in both cycles (49.10-54.14 and 54.14-59.19) an original descent of the savior myth has been Christianized and that the Sabaoth or Adonaios account has also possibly been interpreted into this myth (198ff). It is not more probable that the Wisdom myth plus Sabaoth account as we see it in NatArch and OnOrgWld has as a whole been Christianized and applied to the descent of the revealer/savior Christ?
an attempt to rescue a portion of the OT. The God of the OT is thoroughly evil and identified with Ialdabaoth (53.30-54.1), he is the chief ruler (64.18) and ruler of the seventh heaven (62.27-64.1) and implicitly also the creator (50.3f). The revelation in the Law and the Prophecies is denigrated entirely, for the revealer can state that the leading OT figures were “laughingstocks” (62.27-64.1) and that those “from Adam to Moses and John the Baptist, none of them knew me nor my brothers” (63.33ff). The Law itself is also dismissed as something which did not know truth, as a doctrine of angels and a bitter slavery in its observance of certain foods (64.1-6). The race of Adonaios at least in the present document represents the angels surrounding him and thus not the people of the Law and the prophets.\footnote{The only function then that these pericopes serve is the Christological one. Adonaios and his race no longer serve a representative function in themselves; rather their purpose is merely to point to the revealer-savior, who is identified as Jesus Christ. It seems that we have a piece of tradition which has lost its original mythical function and which is yet retained, since it can be slightly reworked and made to serve an external, Christological function. An indication of Adonaios’ original function, to represent an intermediate deity and thereby to rescue a portion of the revelation contained in the Law and the Prophecies, is still retained, however, in the motif that Adonaios has received instruction or revelation from Wisdom of Hope concerning a figure from the world above. Within this same stream of vulgar Gnosticism, as is evidenced by the fall of Wisdom and by the figures of Faith-Wisdom and Ialdabaoth, there is a group of writings that are closely related to one another, namely, the two Books of Jehem in Codex Bruciatus and Pistoia Sophia in Codex Askewius.\footnote{The studies of C. Schmidt have shown that the two Books of Jehem derive from the early third century Egypt, that...}

\footnote{Cf. Gibbon, A Commentary on GrSeh, 180, who correctly writes: “This would assume that the race of Adonaios equals the Jews, a quite possible secondary interpretation of the text. The text as it stands, however, refers to Adonaios’ race of angels.” In the development of this mythologismenon we might add that the race of Adonaios, as Adonaios himself, probably originally represented the Jews and only secondarily lost this association as here in GrSeh.}

\footnote{The texts are available in C. Schmidt, Gnostische Schriften in kopistorischer Sprache aus dem Codex Bruciatus (TU 8; Leipzig 1892) and C. Schmidt, Pistoia Sophia (Copistica, Consilio et Imperiis Instituti Rerum Orientalium Edita, 2; Haustein 1923). The translation used here is that of C. Schmidt and W. Till in Koptisch-gnostische Schriften (GCS 45, 3. Aufl.; Berlin 1962), where the German translation is referred to; the English translation, when provided, is my own.}
Book 4 of *Pistis Sophia* was originally a separate work from the first half of the third century in Egypt, and that Books 1-3 derive from the second half of the third century in Egypt. These writings are of interest to us in that they also contain the figure of Sabaoth.

First of all, we encounter the figure of Sabaoth in the *2 Book of Jeu*. Within the pleromatic world of this *Book of Jeu* there is the highest realm, the Second Light Treasury. Below this pleromatic world appear then the 14 Aeons with their rulers. Within the First Light Treasury the figure of the Great Sabaoth is placed in the following passage:

Again (πολλάκια) you will go to the inside, to the order (τάξις) of the great Sabaoth, who belongs to the Light. When you reach his order (τάξις), he will seal (σφαίρα) you with his seal (σφαίρα) and he will give you his mystery (μυστήριον) and the great name.[109]

The document also introduces another figure with the name of Sabaoth, i.e. Sabaoth-Adamas, who is less benevolent than the Great Sabaoth and probably resides in the twelfth Aeon as the leader of the evil rulers.[109]

Hear me and compel (δραματίζεσθαι) Sabaoth-Adamas and all his leaders (δυνάμεις) so that they will come and take away their evil (κακός) in my disciples (μαθητές).[110]

Within these *Books of Jeu* the problem of the OT is not posed. Sabaoth is not clearly identified as the God of the OT nor is he related to the revelation in the OT or to the people of the OT. In the only other reference to Sabaoth, Taricheus, the son of Sabaoth-Adamas, is said to be worshipped by some who falsely claim to have known the true knowledge and to worship the true God.[111] It is unclear as to who is meant by this polemical remark. Possibly orthodox Christians rather than Jews are intended.[112] The main concern of

---

[109] C. Schmidt (TU 8) 580-98. Schmidt's attempt to make precise the derivation of the *Books of Jeu* and *Pistis Sophia* as coming from the Severians, however, is unacceptable (598). His criterion, the ruler Sabaoth, is not limited to the Severians as NatArch and OnOrgWld demonstrate. His more general derivation from the large group of Barbelo-Geonitics, within which he includes Nicolaitians, Ophites, Cainites, Sethians and Archontics is more acceptable but in itself raises again the question as to whether the criteria for separation into sects are any longer valid.


[111] 2 Book of Jeu 43. Tr. Schmidt (GCS 45) 394.

[112] In the 1 Book of Jeu 31 (tr. Schmidt, GCS 45; 258ff) Jesus contrasts his true
the 2 Book of Jeu is rather with the reception of the mysteries and the ascent of the soul through the Aeons after its separation from the body.113 Sabaoth then functions here not as the God of the OT. He has been released from his original function within gnostic circles and now merely represents a figure or figures in the celestial world. It is thus evident that the 2 Book of Jeu with its benevolent Great Sabaoth and evil Sabaoth-Adamas represents a late stage of development in which various traditions have been compiled, those considering Sabaoth, the God of the OT, as righteous or in some sense good and those considering him as thoroughly evil. However, the specific tradition that Sabaoth is the repentant son of Ialdabaoth, who is enthroned in the seventh heaven, is not reflected here.

Book 4 of Pistis Sophia presents an even more complex set of figures with the name of Sabaoth. But, first of all, its system is also more complex. The highest realm is that of the Light Treasury below which appear in descending order the Right, the Middle, the Left—which is comprised of 13 Aeons, the Heimarmene, the Spheres, and the Way of the Middle. Within this framework the highest God within the Light Treasury can be addressed in prayer by Jesus as ἀγαθός τῶν καθαρῶν.114 In the realm of the Right there appears the Great Sabaoth, the Good, who looks down upon the places of Parapex, the first ruler of the Way of the Middle, and thereby destroys his place of punishment for souls.115

Within the Middle, there also appears the Small Sabaoth, the Good, who plays an important role in establishing the planetary system and in effecting the salvation of the righteous soul, who has not received the mysteries. First, when Jeu was establishing the five planets in their position, he noticed that the rulers needed a star to direct the world and the aeons so that the rulers would not destroy the world in their evil. Thus he took a power from the Small Sabaoth, the Good, and placed it in Zeus.116 Secondly, the soul of a thief, when it comes from the body, is punished in the Way of the Middle, given a cup of forgetfulness, and reincarnated in a lame, curved, blind body.117 But the soul of one who has committed no sin,
performed good but not found the mysteries is placed by the Small Sabaoth, the Good, the one from the Middle. In addition to the cup of forgetfulness he is given by a ταπαλήματις of the Small Sabaoth a cup filled with thoughts, wisdom and sobriety and then sent back into a body which cannot sleep but which drives the heart to ask about the mysteries of Light until it finds them. Thus this soul will inherit the eternal Light.

Within the Left as the leader of six of the Aemons there is also Sabaoth-Adamas. In contrast to the preceding Sabaoths he is evaluated entirely negatively. While Jabraoth, the leader of the other six Aemons, has believed and ceased, Sabaoth-Adamas has persisted in sexual intercourse and thus been bound in the Sphere.\(^{114}\) In a recurrent refrain it is also Jahabam, the ταπαλήματις of Sabaoth-Adamas, who brings the cup of forgetfulness to each soul.\(^{119}\)

Lastly, within the realm of the Sphere one also encounters the planet Zeus, which receives a power from the Small Sabaoth, which thus can be named Sabaoth-Zeus, and which delivers the rulers from their own evil:

\[\text{He went into the middle (μέσος); he drew a force (δύναμις) from the small Sabaoth, the one from the middle (μέσος); he bound it to Zeus, since he is good (δоброт), to guide them with his goodness (δυναμικά), and he appointed the course of his order (τάξις) with these that he should spend thirteen months in each Aeon (οαν) as he is strengthening (εκμετάλλευσις) so that every ruler (δυναμικά) upon whom he comes should be released from the evil (καιρος) of their badness (σοφία).}\]\(^{120}\)

Secondly, when the planets Zeus and Aphrodite, which were considered as benevolent to men in ancient astrology,\(^{121}\) reach a favorable position, the places of punishment ruled over by the rulers of the Way of the Middle are destroyed and the souls undergoing punishment are released and cast into the Sphere.\(^{122}\)

---

\(^{114}\) P.S. Bk. 4:136. Tr. Schmidt (GCS 45) 234.

\(^{115}\) P.S. Bk. 4:144; tr. Schmidt (GCS 45) 247. Cf. c. 144 (p. 248); c. 146 (p. 249); c. 148 (p. 250); c. 147 (p. 252).

\(^{116}\) P.S. Bk. 4:137. Text Schmidt, Poesis Sophia (Coptic 2) 357; cf. Schmidt (GCS 45) 235. Cf. c. 136 (Schmidt; GCS 45; 234) for Zeus as a planet and c. 139 (Schmidt; GCS 45; 238) for the name Sabaoth-Zeus.


\(^{118}\) P.S. Bk. 4:139. Tr. Schmidt (GCS 45) 238; c. 140 (4.4.), tr. Schmidt (GCS 45) 238-41. Within these five occurrences, the planet is first named "the Small Sabaoth-Zeus," and then "the Small Sabaoth, the Good, who is named Zeus upon earth" (2.2.) and also "the Small Sabaoth, the Good, the one from the Middle, who is named Zeus
Although there are five figures who bear the name of Sabaoth in Book 4 of P.S., nevertheless the problem of the OT is not raised—as was the case in the Books of Jeu. Neither the God of the OT, the revelation in the OT, nor the people of the OT are considered. The closest approximation to raising the problem is the discussion concerning the righteous soul which has never sinned, constantly performed good but never received the mysteries. While one might consider this description as applying to the people of the OT, there is no clear reference or restriction to them. Rather, the concern within this book is with the various data of astrology, the punishment of sinners and the ascent of the soul, which has received the mysteries, to the Light Treasury.

As in the Books of Jeu, it is clear that Book 4 of P.S. represents a late stage of development in which various traditions about Sabaoth have been incorporated. In some Sabaoth represented a benevolent deity or ruler; in others he represented the evil ruler. Again the specific tradition of NatArch and OnOrgWd, that Sabaoth is the repentant son of Iakhabaoth, who is enthroned in the seventh heaven, is not reflected here.

The first three books of P.S. exhibit again a more developed system. In addition to the Light Kingdom, there are in descending order: the Light Treasury, the place of the Right, the place of the Middle, the place of the Left—which includes the 13 Aeons, Heirmarmene, the Sphere, the Rulers of the Middle and the Firmament—the Cosmos, and the Underworld—which encompasses Amente, Chaos, and the Outer Darkness.

Within this system there appear only two figures with the name of Sabaoth. First, there is the Great Sabaoth, the Good, in the place of the Right. He and the others in the place of the Right are there in order to gather up the particles of light from the Aeons; and at the end Sabaoth and those of the Right with him are to be kings. In the meantime, in place of a soul of the rulers a power has been taken upon earth (2x). It is clear that these passages speak about the planet Zeus—witness the association with the planet Aphrodite—rather than about the figure of Sabaoth from the realm of the Middle. However, since it is a power from the Small Sabaoth, the Good, the one from the Middle, which has been given to the planet Zeus, the planet Zeus in these passages has taken over the nomenclature proper to the figure in the realm of the Middle.

123 P.S. Bk. 4:147. Tr. Schmidt (GCS 45) 251-53.  
125 P.S. 86. Tr. Schmidt (GCS 45) 125.
by Jesus from Sabaoth and placed in Mary to provide for his soul.\textsuperscript{126} Thus Sabaoth can be identified as the father of Jesus;\textsuperscript{127} and the reference to Sabaoth in Isa 19:12 can be allegorically interpreted as applying to Jesus because of the power from Sabaoth within him.\textsuperscript{128}

The second figure with the name of Sabaoth is the Small Sabaoth, the Good, who is probably placed within the Middle.\textsuperscript{129} His only described function is to receive the power from the Great Sabaoth, which is the soul of Jesus, and to send it further into the matter of Barbelo.\textsuperscript{130}

Within the first three books of P.S., the problem of the God of the OT is not raised.\textsuperscript{131} However, the books of the OT and the

\textsuperscript{126} “It happened afterwards that by the command (κειμένος) of the first Mystery (αὐτηρίσμον) I looked upon the world (κόσμος) of mankind and found Mary, who is called my mother according (κατά) to the material (φυσικὰ) body. I spoke with her in (κατά) the form (κώσμος) of Gabriel, and when she turned to the height to me, I cast into her the first power, which I had received from Barbelo, i.e. the body (εὐφύα) which I bore (ἀποδύω) in the height. And in place of the soul (σώμα) I cast into her the power, which I received from the Great Sabaoth, the Good (δύναμις) who is in the place of the Right.” P.S. 8; text Schmidt, Pitus Sophia (Copistica 2) 13-14; cf. tr. Schmidt (GCS 45) 81. Cf. also the repeated use of this theme in the various evangelical interpretations of Pr 8:10-11, offered in c. 62 and 63; cf. tr. Schmidt (GCS 45) 79ff.

\textsuperscript{127} “But Sabaoth, the Great and Good (δύναμις), whom I have named my father, has come forth (προσώπωθα) from Jes, the overseer (ὑπηρέτα) of light.” P.S. 86; text Schmidt, Pitus Sophia (Copistica 2) 195; cf. tr. Schmidt (GCS 45) 121.

\textsuperscript{128} “Before you came, the power in the prophet (προφήτη) Isaiah prophesied (προφητεύειν) about you that you would take the power of the archons (ἀρχοντίσσα) of the aeons (αἰωνίον) and would change their sphere (κόσμος) and their fate (κοσμοποιών), so that from now on they would not know anything. Therefore, it has also said, ‘Then you will not know what the Lord Sabaoth will do,’ i.e. none of the archons (ἀρχοντίσσα) will know what you will do from now on, they are Egypt, since they are matter (φύσις). Now the power in Isaiah prophesied (προφητεύειν) at that time about you when it said, ‘You will not know from now on what the Lord Sabaoth will do.’ Because of the light power, which you received from Sabaoth, the Good (δύναμις), who is in the place (φυσικὸν) of the Right, and which is now in your material (αἰωνία) body (σῶμα), therefore you Lord Jesus once said to us, ‘Who has ears to hear let him hear,’ so that you might know whose heart is directed strongly to the kingdom of heaven.” P.S. 18; text Schmidt, Pitus Sophia (Copistica 2) 28; cf. tr. Schmidt (GCS 45) 17.

\textsuperscript{129} In P.S. one also finds the figure of Adamas over the 12 Aeons. However, he is not referred to as Sabaoth Adamas. Cf. P.S. 27; tr. Schmidt (GCS 45) 23.

\textsuperscript{130} “But the truth is the power of Sabaoth, the Good (δύναμις) which was joined to you and which you cast to the Left—you, the first mystery (αὐτηρίσμον) which looks down. And the Small Sabaoth, the Good (δύναμις), took it and cast it into the matter (φύσις) of Barbelo.” P.S. 63; text Schmidt, Pitus Sophia (Copistica 2) 127-28; cf. tr. Schmidt (GCS 45) 82.

\textsuperscript{131} As we indicated above, the Sabaoth passage Isa 19:12 in c. 63 has been referred to Jesus rather than, for example, to the Great Sabaoth or the Small Sabaoth as the God of the OT. It is further doubtful that P.S. would consider all references to Sabaoth in the OT as applying to Jesus.
pseudepigraphical Odes of Solomon are accepted as inspired and containing revelation concerning both Faith-Wisdom and Jesus. The power or light-power of Jesus is said to have prophesied through Moses, David in the Psalms, Isaiah and Solomon in his Odes. However, it is doubtful whether all parts of the OT were accepted as having equal value.

The place of the people of the OT in the divine economy is also considered within P.S. However, the contrast is not among Gentile, Jew, Christian and gnostic. Rather, the contrast is among sinners, the righteous who have not received the mysteries—which would include some of the people of the OT among others—and the gnostics. The righteous will be reincarnated in bodies, which will receive the mysteries, and thus the righteous will eventually be saved.

In P.S. then the problem of the God of the OT is not a concern, although the books of the OT and the righteous of the OT are considered. The main concern in P.S., instead, is focused upon reception of the saving mysteries, sinners, and the ascent of the soul through the Aeons after its separation from the body.

Once again, although the specific tradition concerning Sabaoth witnessed in NatArch and OnOrgWld is not encountered in P.S., this document incorporates previous speculation concerning Sabaoth in which he is evaluated as a good ruler, who is other than the high God.

---

132 E.g. concerning the repentance of Faith-Wisdom in P.S. 33; tr. Schmidt (GCS 45) 32ff.
133 P.S. 18; tr. Schmidt (GCS 45) 16f.
134 P.S. 45; tr. Schmidt (GCS 45) 45.
135 E.g. P.S. 36 and 38 inter alia; tr. Schmidt (GCS 45) 36f and 38f.
136 P.S. 18; tr. Schmidt (GCS 45) 16-17.
137 E.g. Odes Sol 19 in P.S. 58; tr. Schmidt (GCS 45) 73f.
138 Cf. P.S. 135; tr. Schmidt (GCS 45) 229f.
139 "When I came to the place (τόμος) of the aeons (ἀιώνες), I caused the other patriarchs (πατριάρχαι) and righteous (ἀγαθοί) from the time of Adam to (ἐκ) now, who were in the aeons (ἀιώνες) and orders (τάξεις) of the archons (ἀρχόντες), to return through the light-virgin (ἑγκαθένευς) to bodies (σώματα), which would be righteous (ἀγαθοί). Those which will find all the mysteries (μυστήρια) of light will enter and inherit (εἰσοδεύσουσι) the light kingdom." P.S. 135; text Schmidt, Pistis Sophia (Coptica 2) 351-52; cf. tr. Schmidt (GCS 45) 230.
CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSION

As a contribution to the scholarly discussion of the origins of Gnosticism, our analysis of the Sabaoth accounts in NatArch and OnOrgWld has shown indeed that they are examples of the contribution of Judaism to Gnosticism. Specifically, apocalyptic and sapiential Judaism are the segments of Judaism, which have mainly contributed to these accounts. We have seen that these accounts derive not just from the OT but from later Judaism and that they have neither influenced nor been influenced by the NT. The only specifically Christian element in these accounts is the reference to Sabaoth's creation of Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit in OnOrgWld. Our study has further shown that the traditions drawn upon for the presentation of Sabaoth are those of heavenly enthronement and the ascent of the apocalyptic visionary. Passages concerning the son of man in Dan 7, Enoch in 1, Enoch 69-71, and Moses in Ezechiel Tr and in Philo, provide the immediate and appropriate History-of-Religions background for understanding the composition and function of these Sabaoth accounts.

Since the editors of both NatArch and OnOrgWld had observed that these documents were related and called for a closer examination of that relationship, we compared in detail the two Sabaoth accounts. We found that the wording was identical in some portions and that the pattern in both accounts consisted of the same elements: the repentance of Sabaoth, the ascent and enthronement of Sabaoth, creation of the throne/chariot of Sabaoth, creation of angels, the instruction of Sabaoth, and the separation into right and left. From that analysis it is clear that the Sabaoth accounts in NatArch and in OnOrgWld derive from a common tradition. However, it is impossible to establish a literary dependency in either direction or to determine more exactly whether that common tradition was oral and/or written. From that examination it also became evident that the Sabaoth account in NatArch exhibits the typologically earlier stage. In contrast, the Sabaoth account in OnOrgWld exhibits inner contradictions, reduplications, and redactional features, which mark it as typologically later.
Since the Sabaoth account in NatArch showed forth the typologically earlier form, we then exegeted that account first. We discovered that the figure Ialdabaoth, the father of Sabaoth, derives from the God of the OT, the leader of the fallen angels, and the god 'Olam/Aïôn of ancient Canaanite myth. The figure of Sabaoth himself arises as a conflation of three figures: obviously that of the God of the OT, but also that of a leading angel (e.g. Michael) and that of the apocalyptic visionary (e.g. Enoch or Moses). It is odd within gnostic, mythological patterning to have three rather than two gods, i.e. the transcendent God, the evil god Ialdabaoth, and as his repentant offspring the god Sabaoth. However, the second century debate, particularly within Marcionite and Valentinian circles, over the God of the OT as a righteous deity and over the value of the OT provides a clue to the function of this Sabaoth account. Sabaoth, as a repentant deity with the angel of punishment at his left side, is the righteous God of the OT. Because he has been instructed by Wisdom's daughter Life about the Eighth, the books of the OT which derive ultimately from him are authenticated as possessing some truth about the perfect realm. The people of the OT then are associated with this god Sabaoth. In contrast, the true gnostics are associated with the highest God and know how to discover the true information contained in the books of the OT. Further, since Sabaoth is enthroned over the seventh heaven, he is king over all below. Thus his rule and the rule within the world are ultimately derived from evil matter and at best repentant or righteous. The gnostics, on the other hand, stem from the realm of imperishability and belong to the kingless race. This proposed function has been confirmed by an analysis of the views in other Nag Hammadi documents, among the Marcionites and Valentinians, and within related groups such as the Gnostic Gospels, the Archontics and the Severians. Because of the importance of this debate within the second century, a proposed date of the latter half of the second century has been offered for the composition of the Sabaoth account and NatArch.

In our analysis of the Sabaoth account in OnOrgWld, we have shown that the Sabaoth account is greatly expanded. The description of the chariot is amplified with material drawn from Jewish tradition; the author's own contribution is particularly visible in the motif of light versus darkness, which is part of the announced theme of the tractate. In terms of its function, the Sabaoth account in OnOrgWld serves an anthropological rather than a theological function. Three types of men have been enumerated in this tractate: the pneumatic,
the psychic, and the choic. Within this framework Sabaoth then represents the psychic. On the other hand, the immortal Light-Man represents the pneumatic, and Ialdabaoth symbolizes the choic. In another passage, the choic man is said to be the man of Law, i.e. the Jews. Sabaoth also fashions an angelic church as well as Jesus Christ and thus represents the orthodox Christian Church. Since the Jews and Christians form a church of unrighteousness and righteousness to which the world is subject, the world and the churches of Jews and orthodox Christians are rejected. The immortal Light-Man then typifies the gnostics, who are free from this righteous and/or unrighteous rule. Interestingly enough, in one passage a further, fourth category is introduced—that of the perfect. Thus the anthropology of this document seems to be moving in the direction of Manichaeism, which distinguished the elect from the remainder of the Manichaeans. Because of its developed mythology, its familiarity with other gnostic literature, and its proposed influence from Valentinianism, a date in the early third century has been offered as the time of composition for OnOrg Wld.

Lastly, further documents from Gnosticism have been considered to determine whether the specific tradition of these Sabaoth accounts is reflected in them. A positive answer to that question was found in the Second Treatise of the Great Seth (CG VII, 2). Here the figure is named Adonaios, however, and he is instructed by Hope rather than Life. The function of this Adonaios account is also less clear than that of the Sabaoth accounts; however, it appears to serve a christological purpose. Examination of the two Books of Jeu and the various books of Pistas Sophia, on the other hand, yielded only a negative answer. The figure of Sabaoth fulfills a variety of roles in these late works; and, indeed, there is a variety of Sabaoth figures in these documents. However, the specific tradition of a repentant Sabaoth who is enthroned in the seventh heaven is not mirrored in them.

In conclusion, the discovery of the Nag Hammadi documents has provided us with an opportunity for a greater understanding of Gnosticism itself, the religious world of antiquity, and also the development of early Christianity. As the documents are made available to the scholarly public, thanks to the labors of the editors, detailed analysis of them is necessary before their treasures can be assimilated. Hopefully our research into the Sabaoth accounts in NatArch and OnOrg Wld will make a contribution to that investigation.
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<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>73.15-20</td>
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</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
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</tr>
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</table>
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</tr>
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<tr>
<td>16.8-13</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.29-21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document</td>
<td>Indice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List 158:11-15</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng Cy III,3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esc. Theod. 23 33-34 34 35 37-38 38 41 43 50-51 54 59 62 63</td>
<td>108 112 119 118 87 108 118 117 85 117 108 108 110,119 118</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt III 2</td>
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</tr>
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</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>GrPw</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>122,125 122 126 125 125 122 128 125 126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heracleon, Frsg.</td>
<td>13 15 20 40 44 117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Jeu 3f</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Jeu 43</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 50</td>
<td>127 127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87,107 76 18 18 33 17,91 97 18 18 117 18 18 71 (2×) 71 95 18 116</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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</table>
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<td>128, 129</td>
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</tr>
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</tr>
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</tr>
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<table>
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</tr>
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</table>
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<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Greco-Roman Writings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cicero, De divinatione</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Hesiod, Theog. | 713-35 | 31 |
|               | 850-88 | 31 |

| Plato, Timaeus | 49A | 36 |
|               | 52D | 36 |

| Pliny, Historia naturalis | 10.4-5 | 48 |

| Sextus Empiricus, Adv. astro. | 29 | 129 |

| Tacitus, Annals | 6.28 | 48 |

### Modern Authors

| Albright, W. F. | 58 |
| Anderson, B.W. | 42 |
| Balzner, K. | 42 |
| Bauer, W. | 41, 57 |
| Behm, J. | 36, 95 |
| Belz, W. | 70, 72 |
| Bergman, J. | 61 |

| Belz, O. | 30, 34, 92 |
| Bianchi, U. | 1 |
| Böll, P. | 104 |
| Bölling, A. | 3, 5, 6, 7, 11, 15, 16, 61, 69, 70, 79, 89, 97, 106, 115, 118, 120 |
| Bonner, C. | 59 |
| Bouwer, W. | 1, 26, 27, 29, 45, 73, 80 |
BOX, G. H. 35, 39, 40, 58, 63, 93
van den Broek, R. 48
Brooks, E. W. 93
Bullard, R. A. 3, 4, 5, 7, 15, 26, 28, 31, 41, 55, 73, 76, 77
Burkitt, F. C. 1
Bury, R. G. 36, 129
Casey, R. P. 108, 112, 117, 119
Cerf, L. 46
Chadwick, H. 77, 80
Cain, J. E. 31
Charles, R. H. 27, 28, 34, 39, 45, 60, 62, 64, 95, 98, 102, 103, 104, 105
Clapham, L. R. 27, 29, 30, 31
Cohen, J. M. 32
Cohn, L. 37, 55, 62, 95, 97, 98
Colpe, C. 32, 44
Coulson, F. H. 37, 50
Crombie, F. M. 29, 32, 34, 35, 42, 43, 55, 57, 58
Crum, W. E. 4, 38, 95, 106, 125
Curmont, P. 55
Daniélova, J. 70
DeFaye, E. 1
Delfing, G. 37
Dodd, C. H. 73
Doelter, F. J. 55
Doressa, J. 5, 15
Dryj, K. 61
Elsaid, M. 32
Elsasser, W. 70
Emerton, J. A. 32, 44
Evelyn-White, H. G. 31
Fallon, F. 85
Fitzmyer, J. A. 29
Forster, W. 27, 38, 79, 107, 108, 111
Freedman, D. N. 43, 55, 58
Friedrich, G. 109
Fuchs, E. 94
Gibbons, J. 122, 123, 124, 125, 126
Gifford, E. H. 46, 48
Ginsberg, L. 92
Goldschmidt, L. 95
Goodenough, E. R. 47, 49, 50, 52, 59
Grant, R. M. 1
Gressmann, H. 26
Grundmann, W. 57
Gutterbock, H. G. 29
Hanson, P. 31, 42, 43, 44
Harnack, A. von 83, 84
Harrelson, W. 42
Harvey, W. W. 26, 74, 75, 83, 107, 109
Hengel, M. 30
Henricks, A. 59
Heylen, F. 8
Holl, R. 81, 82, 83, 84, 107, 117
Jackson, J. 48
James, M. R. 28
Jones, H. 1, 5, 6, 32, 37, 85, 91
Kapetanovic, A. 58
Kappelmacher, A. 47
Kanser, R. 3, 4, 70
King, C. W. 59
Kippenberg, H. G. 80
Kirsch, G. 28
Koester, H. 25
Krause, M. 3, 4, 5, 113
Kroll, J. 55
Kroymann, A. 83, 84
Labib, P. 3, 5, 59, 70, 113
Lambert, W. G. 29, 31
Layton, H. 3, 4, 5, 15, 37, 38, 57, 65, 76
Leite, H. B. 97
Liddell, H. 57
Lohse, E. 94
Luken, W. 34, 35
MacRae, G. 1, 6, 55, 70, 73, 111, 113
Magie, J. 8
Maier, J. 115
Marmernstein, A. 113, 114
McGaughy, L. C. 68, 69
Meeks, W. 46, 47, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53
Meyer, W. 27, 62
Michel, O. 30
Millar, W. 44
Minnemann, T. 84
Mowinckel, S. 63, 64
Mros, K. 46, 48
Mullenberg, J. 42
Nagel, P. 3, 11, 55
Neuner, J. 49
Nickelsberg, G. W. E. 42
Nock, A. D. 1, 53
Oldenburg, H. 58
Orbe, A. 70, 97
Olsenberg, H. 35
Pagels, E. 87, 107, 119
Peirce, B. 61
Perkins, P. 69, 70, 72
Philonenko, M. 28, 93, 94
Polotsky, H. J. 119
Pope, M. H. 58
Prentiss, K. 59
Punch, H.-C. 4, 6, 15, 82
Quispel, G. 118
INDICES

Rabin, B. 34
Rabin, C. 34
Rackham, H. 48
Rad, G. von 27, 54, 56
Rehm, B. 104
Reitzenstein, R. 1, 55
Rengstorff, K. H. 60, 94
Robertson, J. 46
Robinson, J. M. 25
Ringgren, H. 61
Rudolph, K. 1, 2, 69, 124
Sagnard, E.-M.-M. 85, 87
van de Sande Bakhuyzen, W. H. 84
Scheke, H.-M. 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 15, 70
Schmidt, C. 35, 111, 126, 127, 128, 129,
   130, 131, 132
Schmidt, F. 40
Schmidt, P. 30
Schmidt, O. 102
Schoedel, W. R. 100
Scholem, G. 1, 32
Schottroff, L. 69, 70, 87
Schrenk, G. 64, 65
Schulz, J. P. 42
Schwartz, E. 84

Scott, R. 57
Snell, B. 47
Stehrlin, O. 84
Strack, H.-L. 54
Stone, M. 63, 93
Strugnell, J. 46, 58
Smith, M. 58
Tardieu, M. 6, 94, 99, 106, 112, 117, 119
Till, W. C. 30, 35, 97, 111, 113, 126
Traub, H. 54
Völker, W. 79, 85, 86, 87, 107, 108, 109,
   111, 112, 113, 116, 117, 118, 119
Walcott, P. 29, 31
Walsh, H. B. 59
Wendland, P. 37, 55, 62, 79, 84, 95, 97,
   98
Whitaker, G. H. 37
Widengren, Geo. 42
Wickrama, U. 37
Wilson, R. McD. 1, 5, 79, 85
Wisse, F. 5, 68, 73
Wilkinson, H. A. 53
Wright, G. E. 42, 55, 58
Wüstermann, E. 36
Yadin, Y. 34, 35