

Society of Biblical Literature



TEXTS AND TRANSLATIONS
GRAECO-ROMAN RELIGION SERIES

edited by
Hans Dieter Betz
Edward N. O'Neil

Texts and Translations Number 14
Graeco-Roman Religion Number 5

ZOSIMOS OF PANOPOLIS ON THE LETTER OMEGA
by
Howard M. Jackson

*ZOSIMOS OF PANOPOLIS
ON THE LETTER OMEGA*



edited and translated by
Howard M. Jackson

Scholars Press

ΤΟΥ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΖΩΣΙΜΟΥ
ΠΕΡΙ ΟΡΓΑΝΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΚΑΜΙΝΩΝ
ΓΝΗΣΙΑ ΥΠΟΜΝΗΜΑΤΑ ΠΕΡΙ ΤΟΥ Ω ΣΤΟΙΧΕΙΟΥ

1. τὸ ω στοιχεῖον στρογγύλον τὸ διμερές, τὸ
ἀνῆκον τῇ ἑβδόμῃ Κρόνου ζώνῃ κατὰ τὴν ἔνσωμον φράσιν·
κατὰ γὰρ τὴν ἀσώματον ἄλλο τί ἐστὶν ἀνερμήνευτον ὁ
μόνος Νικόθεος <ὁ> κεκρυμμένος οἶδεν. κατὰ δὲ τὴν
5 ἔνσωμον τὸ λεγόμενον Ὠκεανός, θεῶν, φησί, πάντων
γένεσις καὶ σπορά· καθάπερ φησὶν, αἱ μοναρχικαὶ τῆς
ἐνσώμου φράσεως. τὸ δὲ λεγόμενον μέγα καὶ θαυμαστὸν
ω στοιχεῖον περιέχει τὸν περὶ ὀργάνων ὕδατος θείου
λόγον καὶ καμίνων πασῶν μηχανικῶν καὶ ἀπλῶν καὶ
10 ἀπλῶς πάντων.

- Tit. 2-3: verba ita dividunt Scott, Fest.; ΠΕΡΙ ΟΡΓΑΝΩΝ
ΚΑΙ ΚΑΜΙΝΩΝ ΓΝΗΣΙΑ ΥΠΟΜΝΗΜΑΤΑ · ΠΕΡΙ ΤΟΥ Ω ΣΤΟΙΧΕΙΟΥ
Ruelle, Ruska.
1.1 in margine M atramento cano ὁ λγ (λόγος coni. Ruelle)
μῦθος scriptum sign. Ruelle. τὸ ante στρογγύλον add.
Reitz., Fest.; στρογγύλον <ὄν καὶ> (τὸ exciso)
διμερές Scott.
1.3 ὁ Reitz. et omn. edd.: ὁ Ruelle.
1.4 fort. leg. κεκρυμμένως Ruelle; acc. Bidez-Cumont;
<ὁ> κεκρυμμένος Reitz., Fest. δὲ codd.; δὴ Fest.
1.9 καὶ ἀπλῶν secl. Ruelle.
1.10 πάντων corr. Fest. Zosimi tractatu (Berthelot text.
gr. 247.1-2) collato tit. ΕΡΜΗΝΕΙΑ ΠΕΡΙ ΠΑΝΤΩΝ ΑΠΑΩΣ
ΚΑΙ ΠΕΡΙ ΤΩΝ ΦΩΤΩΝ inscripto: πασῶν M.

BY THE SAME ZOSIMOS
ON APPARATUS AND FURNACES
AUTHENTIC COMMENTARIES ON THE LETTER OMEGA

1. Round Omega is the bipartite letter,¹ the one that
in terms of material language² belongs to the seventh
planetary zone, that of Kronos.³ For in terms of the im-
material it is something else altogether, something inex-
plicable, which only Nikotheos the hidden⁴ knows. In ma-
terial terms Omega is what he calls "Ocean,"⁵ it says, "the
birth and seed of all gods," as he says, "the governing
principles of material language."⁶ What he calls⁷ the
great and wonderful letter Omega heads the section on
apparatus for the liquid of sulphur,⁸ furnaces of all
sorts, mechanical and simple alike, and all matters in
general.

2. Ζώσιμος Θεοσεβείῃ εὖ εἴη ἀεὶ. αἱ καιρικαὶ καταβαφαῖ, ὧ γύναι, εἰς χλευασμὸν ἐποίησαν τὴν περὶ καμίνων βίβλον. πολλοὶ γὰρ εὐμένειαν ἐσχηκότες παρὰ τοῦ ἰδίου δαιμονίου ἐπιτυχᾶναι τῶν καιρικῶν ἐχλεύασαν καὶ τὴν περὶ καμίνων καὶ ὀργάνων βίβλον ὥς οὐκ οὔσαν ἀληθῆ. καὶ οὐδεὶς λόγος αὐτοῦς ἀποδεικτικὸς ἔπεισεν ὅτι ἀλήθειά ἐστιν εἰ μὴ αὐτὸς ὁ ἴδιος αὐτῶν δαίμων, κατὰ τοὺς χρόνους τῆς αὐτῶν εἰμαρμένης μεταβληθεὶς, παραλαβόντος αὐτοῦς κακοποιοῦ δέ, εἶπεν. καὶ τῆς τέχνης καὶ τῆς εὐδαιμονίας αὐτῶν πάσης κωλυθείσης, καὶ ἐφ' ἐκότερα τραπέντων τῶν αὐτῶν τύχῃ ῥημάτων, μόλις ἐκ τῶν ἐναργῶν τῆς εἰμαρμένης αὐτῶν ἀποδείξεων ὠμολόγησαν εἶναι τι καὶ μετ' ἐκείνων ὧν πρότερον ἐφρόνουν.

2. Zosimos to Theosebeia, may it be well with you always! The matter of tinctures to be effected at propitious times⁹ has brought ridicule upon the book *On Furnaces*,¹⁰ lady. For many persons, once they have acquired the favor from their *daimon* to succeed with these tinctures, have ridiculed even the book *On Furnaces and Apparatus* as not being true. And no argument, however much proof it offers, convinces them that it is true; they do not admit it unless their *daimon*¹¹ itself tells them so--when it is transformed in the course of the changing times¹² of their fate¹³ and a maleficent one takes them over. And so, when their skill and all their success¹⁴ are frustrated, and the same formulas, whatever they might be, turn out first one way and then the opposite, then reluctantly, with clear proofs from their fate, they confess that there is some truth to it, even for those formulas they previously thought highly of.

1 εὖ εἴη ἀεὶ correxi: ευηγιαει M; εὐήει ἀεὶ K; fort. leg. χαίρειν Ruelle dubitanter; εὖ διδάγειν Fest.; εὐη<μερ>εἴ<ν> ἀεὶ Scott. καιρικαὶ corr.: κερικαὶ MK.
9 παραλαβόντος αὐτοῦς κακοποιοῦ δέ, εἶπεν: αὐτοῦς corr. Scott, Fest.: αὐτοῦ M; δέ M: δαίμονος Scott, Fest.; εἶπεν correxi: εἰπεῖν M; ἔπεισεν corr. Fest.; παρέλαβεν αὐτόν, κακοποιούσαν δὲ εἰπών Ruska emendatione Pfeiffer accepta.
14 ἐφρόνουν M: κατεφρόνουν Scott, Fest.

3. ἀλλ' οἱ τοιοῦτοι οὐκ ἀποδεκτοί οὔτε παρὰ θεῶ οὔτε φιλοσόφους ἀνθρώποις· πάλιν γὰρ τῶν χρόνων σχηματισθέντων κατὰ τοὺς λεπτοὺς χρόνους καλῶς καὶ τοῦ δαιμονίου σωματικῶς αὐτοὺς εὐεργετοῦντος, πάλιν μεταβάλλεται ἐφ' ἑτέραν ὁμολογίαν, τῶν προτέρων ἐναργῶν πραγμάτων πάντων λελησμένοι, πάντοτε τῇ εἰμαρμένῃ ἀκολουθοῦντες καὶ εἰς τὰς λεγομένας καὶ εἰς τὰ ἐναντία, μηδὲν ἕτερον τῶν σωματικῶν φανταζόμενοι, ἀλλὰ τὴν εἰμαρμένην.

4. τοὺς τοιοῦτους δὲ ἀνθρώπους ὁ Ἑρμῆς ἐν τῷ Περὶ φύσεων ἐκάλει ἄνοας, τῆς εἰμαρμένης μόνους ὄντας πομπάς, μηδὲν τῶν ἀσωμάτων φανταζομένους, μήτε αὐτὴν τὴν εἰμαρμένην τὴν αὐτοὺς ἄγουσαν δικαίως, ἀλλὰ [τοὺς] δυσφημοῦντας αὐτῆς τὰ σωματικὰ παιδευτήρια, καὶ τῶν εὐδαιμόνων αὐτῆς ἐκτὸς <μηδὲν> ἄλλο φανταζομένους.

3. But people like this are unacceptable both to God and to men of philosophy.¹⁵ No sooner do the times¹⁶ take on favorable forms with the passage of minutes and their *daimon* treats them to some material advantage, than they change¹⁷ to the other opinion again, forgetting all the former clear proofs. They are always following Fate, now to this opinion and then to its opposite. They have no conception of anything other than the material; all they know is Fate.

4. In his book *On Natural Dispositions* Hermes calls such people mindless, only marchers swept along in the procession of Fate, with no conception of anything incorporeal, and with no understanding of Fate herself, who conducts them justly. Instead they insult the instruction she gives through corporeal experience, and imagine nothing beyond the good fortune she grants.¹⁸

- 3.3 λεπτοὺς M: fort. leg. ἐκλεκτοὺς Ruelle.
 3.5 μεταβάλλεται M: fort. leg. μεταβάλλονται Ruelle; acc. Scott.
 3.7 τὰς λεγομένας (scil. ὁμολογίας ut vid.) M: fort. leg. τὰ λεγόμενα Ruelle; an τὰ <ὕφ' ἡμῶν> λεγόμενα? Scott.
 4.2 ἄνοας M: fort. leg. ἄνους Ruelle. μόνους M: μόνον Reitz.
 4.3 πομπάς M: fort. leg. πομπέας Ruelle. μήτε M: μηδὲ Reitz.
 4.4 τὴν αὐτοὺς corr. Reitz.: τοὺς αὐτοὺς M. αὐτὴν... δικαίως M: <περὶ> αὐτὴν...δικαίους Keil apud Reitz.; αὐτὴν...δικαίως <ὑπολαμβάνοντας> Scott.
 4.5 τοὺς secl. Reitz., Fest., recte.
 4.6 an εὐδαιμονίων? Fest. μηδὲν ins. Reitz., Scott, Fest.; cf. 16.7.

5. ὁ δὲ Ἑρμῆς καὶ ὁ Ζωροάστρης τὸ φιλοσόφων
γένος ἀνώτερον τῆς εἰμαρμένης εἶπον τῷ μήτε τῇ
εὐδαιμονίᾳ αὐτῆς χαίρειν, ἡδονῶν γὰρ κρατοῦσι, μήτε
τοῖς κακοῖς αὐτῆς βάλλεσθαι, πάντοτε ἐναυλίαν
5 ἄγοντες, μήτε τὰ καλὰ δῶρα παρ' αὐτῆς καταδεχόμενοι,
ἐπεὶ περ εἰς πέρας κακῶν βλέπουσιν.

6. διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ὁ Ἡσίοδος τὸν Προμηθεῖα
εἰσάγει τῷ Ἐπιμηθεῖ παραγγέλλοντα· τίνα οἶονται
οἱ ἄνθρωποι πασῶν μείζονα εὐδαιμονίαν; γυναῖκα
εὖμορφον, φησί, σὺν πλούτῳ πολλῷ· καὶ φησὶ μήτε
5 δῶρον δέξασθαι παρὰ Ζηνὸς Ὀλυμπίου, ἀλλ' ἀποπέμ-
πειν ἐξοπλίσω, διδάσκων τὸν ἴδιον ἀδελφὸν διὰ
φιλοσοφίας ἀποπέμπειν τὰ τοῦ Διὸς, τοῦτέστι τῆς
εἰμαρμένης, δῶρα.

5. But Hermes and Zoroaster say that philosophers¹⁹
as a class are superior to Fate because they neither
rejoice in her good fortune, for they are master over
pleasures, nor are they thrown by the evils she sends,
as they always lead an inner life,²⁰ nor do they accept
the fair gifts she offers, since they look to an end of
ills.²¹

6. This is also why Hesiod²² introduces Prometheus
offering this advice to Epimetheus: "What do men consider
a good fortune greater than all others?" "A shapely
wife," he replies, "along with great wealth." And he²³
says "not to accept a gift from Olympian Zeus, but to
send it back again," teaching his brother through philos-
ophy to reject the gifts of Zeus, that is, of Fate.

- 5.1 Ζωροάστρης corr. Ruelle (cf. ad 7.1): Ζωροάστρις MK
(an ferendum?).
- 5.4 βάλλεσθαι M: βλέπτεσθαι conl. Scott, Zuretti apud
Bidez-Cumont. ἐναυλίαν M, ἐναύλια K: ἐν αὐλίᾳ
Bidez-Cumont ad αὐλίᾳς (emendatione Kroll accepta)
in 7.4 conf., Scott, Ruska, Fest.; ἐν <έν>αυλίᾳ
Keil; acc. Reitz.; ἐναυλίαν (scil. ζῆν) L.S.&J.;
ἡσυχίαν conl. Ruelle.
- 5.4-6 πάντοτε...ἄγοντας et ἐπεὶ περ...βλέπουσιν membra
inter se permutat Fest.
- 5.5 ἄγοντες M: ἄγοντας Reitz., Scott, Bidez-Cumont,
Fest. καταδεχόμενοι M fort. ferendum: καταδέχεσθαι
Reitz., Bidez-Cumont, Fest.; 'possis et hoc et
ἄγοντες (5.5) servare, interpunctione graviore post
βάλλεσθαι statuta et lacuna post βλέπουσιν (5.6)
signata' ait Fest.
- 5.6 κακῶν M: κακὸν Reitz.; κακὰ (i.e., τὰ δῶρα) Bidez-
Cumont, Fest., *Mém.Lagr.*, p. 125.
- 6.2-4 τίνα οἶονται...πλούτῳ πολλῷ secl. Reitz.
- 6.4 μήτε M: μή<πο>τε Ruelle ad Hesiod. *Opera et Dies* 86
conf.

7. Ζωροάστρης δὲ εἰδήσει τῶν ἄνω πάντων καὶ
μαγείᾳ αὐχῶν τῆς ἐνσώμου φράσεως φάσκει ἀποστρέφεσθαι
πάντα τῆς εἰμαρμένης τὰ κακὰ καὶ μερικὰ καὶ καθολικά.
ὁ μὲντοι Ἑρμῆς ἐν τῷ Περὶ ἐναυλίας διαβάλλει καὶ τὴν
5 μαγείαν λέγων ὅτι οὐ δεῖ τὸν πνευματικὸν ἄνθρωπον τὸν
ἐπιγνόντα ἑαυτὸν οὔτε διὰ μαγείας κατορθοῦν τι, ἔαν
καὶ καλὸν νομίζεται, μηδὲ βιάζεσθαι τὴν ἀνάγκην, ἀλλ'
ἔαν ὡς ἔχει φύσεως καὶ κρίσεως, πορεύεσθαι δὲ διὰ
μόνου τοῦ ζητεῖν ἑαυτὸν, καὶ θεὸν ἐπιγνόντα κρατεῖν
10 τὴν ἀκατονόμαστον τριάδα καὶ ἔαν τὴν εἰμαρμένην ὃ
θέλει ποιεῖν τῷ ἑαυτῆς πηλῷ, τουτέστι τῷ σώματι.
καὶ οὕτως, φησί, νοήσας καὶ πολιτευσάμενος θεάσῃ τὸν
θεοῦ υἱὸν πάντα γινόμενον τῶν ὁσίων ψυχῶν ἔνεκεν ἵνα
αὐτὴν ἐκσπάσῃ ἐκ τοῦ χώρου τῆς εἰμαρμένης ἐπὶ τὸν
15 ἀσώματον. Ὅρα αὐτὸν γινόμενον πάντα - θεὸν, ἄγγελον,
ἄνθρωπον παθητόν· πάντα γὰρ δυνάμενος πάντα ὅσα
θέλει γίνεται καὶ πατρὶ ὑπακούει διὰ παντὸς σώματος
διήκων· φωτίζων τὸν ἐκάστης νοῦν, εἰς τὸν εὐδαίμονα
χῶρον ἀνώρμησεν ὅπουπερ ἦν καὶ πρὸ τοῦ σωματικῶν
20 γενέσθαι, αὐτῷ ἀκολουθοῦντα καὶ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ὀρεγόμενον
καὶ ὀδηγούμενον εἰς ἐκεῖνο τὸ φῶς.

-
- 7.3 τὰ om. Reitz. (an fortuito? Fest.), Bidez-Cumont.
7.4 ἐναυλίας Keil; acc. Reitz.: ἀναυλίας codd.; ἀϋλίας
corr. W. Kroll apud Pauly-Wissowa, *Realencyclopä-*
die VIII, col. 799; acc. Ruska, Scott, Bidez-
Cumont, Fest.; ἀναυδίας coni. Ruelle ad librum
Hermeticum (*Corp. Herm.* XIII, ut vid.) tit. ΠΕΡΙ
ΣΙΓΗΣ inscriptum conf. καὶ secl. Scott.
7.6,9 ἐπιγνόντα corr.: ἐπιγνῶντα codd.
7.6 οὔτε secl. Scott. κατορθοῦν corr.: καθορθοῦν codd.
7.7 καλὸν: κακὸν mavult Scott. μηδὲ codd.: μήτε Reitz.;
οὐδὲ Scott.
7.11 θέλει corr. Ruelle: θέλειν codd. τῷ ἑαυτῆς πηλῷ K
collatione sua Reitz.: τῷ ἔαν τῇ σπηλῷ M (sic
saltem Ruelle); fort. leg. τῷ ἔαν τῷ πηλῷ Berthe-
lot. τουτέστι Scott, Reitz., Bidez-Cumont: του-
τέστιν codd., Fest.
7.15-16 Ὅρα...παθητόν secl. Reitz. ut glossema Christianum.
7.17 καὶ πατρὶ ὑπακούει secl. Fest., *La Révéél.* I, p.
267, eadem ratione, Ὅρα...παθητόν tamen ret.
7.18 διήκων <καὶ> Reitz., Bousset, Jung. ἐκάστης codd.,
Scott, Jung: ἐκάστου coni. Ruelle; acc. Reitz.,
Fest.; an ἐκάστης ψυχῆς? Reitz., recte puto.

7. Now Zoroaster boastfully affirms that by the
knowledge of all things supernal and by the Magian science
of the efficacious use of corporeal speech one averts all
the evils of Fate, both those of individual and those of
universal application. Hermes, however, in his book *On*
the Inner Life,²⁴ condemns even the Magian science, saying
that the spiritual man, one who has come to know himself,
need not rectify anything through the use of magic,²⁵ not
even if it is considered a good thing, nor must he use
force upon Necessity, but rather allow Necessity to work
in accordance with her own nature and decree. He must
proceed through that one search to understand himself,
and, when he has come to know God, he must hold fast to
the ineffable Triad²⁶ and leave Fate to work what she will
upon the clay that belongs to her, that is, the body. And
with this way of thinking and of regulating one's life, he
says, you will see the Son of God²⁷ become everything for
the sake of holy souls, to draw her²⁸ up out of the realm
of Fate into the realm of the incorporeal.²⁹ See him be-
come everything! - god, messenger,³⁰ passible man;³¹ for,
being capable of everything, he becomes everything he so
wills³² and obeys the Father by pervading every body. He
enlightens the mind of each soul and spurs it³³ on up to
the realm of bliss, where it was even before it³⁴ was born
into corporeality, following after him, and filled with
yearning³⁵ by him, and guided by him into that light.³⁶

8. καὶ βλέψαι τὸν πίνακα ὃν καὶ Βίτος γράψας,
καὶ ὁ τρίσμεγας Πλάτων καὶ ὁ μυριόμεγας Ἑρμῆς, ὅτι
θαύστος ἐρμηνεύεται τῇ ἱερατικῇ πρώτῃ φωνῇ ὁ πρῶτος
ἄνθρωπος, ἐρμηνεύς πάντων τῶν ὄντων καὶ ὀνοματοποιὸς
5 πάντων τῶν σωματικῶν. οἱ δὲ Χαλδαῖοι καὶ Πάρθοι καὶ
Μῆδοι καὶ Ἑβραῖοι καλοῦσιν αὐτὸν Ἀδάμ, ᾧ ἐστὶν
ἐρμηνεία γῆ παρθένος καὶ γῆ αἱματώδους καὶ γῆ πυρρᾶ
καὶ γῆ σαρκίνῃ. ταῦτα δὲ ἐν ταῖς βιβλιοθήκαις τῶν
Πτολεμαίων ηὑρίνται· ὃν ἀπέθεντο εἰς ἕκαστον ἱερὸν,
10 μάλιστα τῷ Σαραπεῖω, ὅτε παρεκάλεσεν Ἀσενᾶν τὸν
ἀρχ<ιερέα> Ἱεροσολύμων πέμψαντα Ἑρμῆν ὃς ἡρμήνευσε
πᾶσαν τὴν Ἑβραϊδα Ἑλληνιστὶ καὶ Αἰγυπτιστὶ.

-
- 7.19 τοῦ corr.: τοῦτο codd., Scott; τοῦ τὸ corr.
Ruelle; acc. Jung (recte? cf. 14.7); τὸ secl.
Reitz., Fest.
7.20-21 an [ὕπ'] αὐτοῦ ὀρεγόμενον καὶ <ὕπ' αὐτοῦ> ὀδηγού-
μενον? Ferguson
8.1 καὶ Βίτος (καὶ βίτος MK) Reitz. et omnes: Κέβητος
emend. Ruelle, qui et Κέβης τε ἔγραψε conī.
γράφας codd.: ἔγραψεν Keil apud Reitz.
8.3 πρώτη secl. Reitz., Ruska, Fest., *La Révéél.* I,
p. 268, Schenke: an ἱερατικῇ <καὶ> πρώτη? Fest.,
Corp. Herm. IV, p. 119.
8.4 <ὁ> ἐρμηνεύς Reitz.
8.7 πυρρᾶ corr. Scott: πυρᾶ codd.
8.9 ὃν codd.: ὦν Reitz., Schenke.
8.10 παρεκάλεσεν codd.: παρεκάλεσαν emend. Reitz.
8.10-11 τὸν ἀρχ<ιερέα> Ἱεροσολύμων corr. Ruelle: τῶν
ἀρχιεροσολύμων codd.
8.11 πέμψαντα Ἑρμῆν ὃς ἡρμήνευσε (εἰρμήνευσε Ruelle
ex K, ut vid.: ἐρμήνευσε M): fort. leg. πέμψαντα
Ἑρμῆν ὁ ἐρμηνεύσας Ruelle; πέμψαι [τὰ] ἐρμηνέα
emend. Scott, qui et πέμψαι ἐρμηνέας οὗ ἡρμήνευσαν
ponit; πέμψαντα ἐρμηνέα Fest.

8. Furthermore, look also at the tablet that Bitos³⁷
wrote, and Plato the thrice-great and Hermes the
infinitely-great,³⁸ that in the original³⁹ hieratic lan-
guage the first man, the interpreter of all that exists
and the giver of names to all corporeal beings, is desig-
nated Thouthos. The Chaldeans, the Parthians, the Medes
and the Hebrews call him Adam, which means "virgin earth,"
and "blood-red earth," and "fiery-red earth," and "fleshly
earth." These interpretations are to be found in the
libraries of the Ptolemies; they laid it⁴⁰ away in each
sanctuary, above all in the Sarapeion, at the time when
he⁴¹ appealed to Asenas the high priest of Jerusalem to
send Hermes, who translated⁴² the whole of the Hebrew into
Greek and Egyptian.

9. οὕτως οὖν καλεῖται ὁ πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος ὁ παρ' ἡμῖν Θωδθ καὶ παρ' ἐκείνοις Ἀδάμ, τῇ τῶν ἀγγέλων φωνῇ αὐτὸν καλέσαντες. οὐ μὴν δὲ ἀλλὰ καὶ συμβολικῶς διὰ τεσσάρων στοιχείων ἐκ πάσης τῆς σφαίρας αὐτὸν εἰπόντες κατὰ τὸ σῶμα. τὸ γὰρ ἄλφα αὐτοῦ στοιχεῖον ἀνατολὴν δηλοῖ, τὸν ἀέρα· τὸ δὲ δέλτα αὐτοῦ στοιχεῖον δύσιν δηλοῖ, τὴν <γῆν> κάτω καταδύσασαν διὰ τὸ βάρος· ...· τὸ δὲ μ<ϰ> στοιχεῖον μεσημβρίαν δηλοῖ, τὸ μέσον τούτων τῶν σωμάτων πεπαντικὸν πῦρ τὸ εἰς τὴν μέσσην τετάρτην ζώνην.

10. οὕτως οὖν ὁ σάρκινος Ἀδάμ κατὰ τὴν φαινομένην περίπλασιν Θωδθ καλεῖται· ὁ δὲ ἔσω αὐτοῦ ἄνθρωπος ὁ πνευματικὸς καὶ κύριον ἔχει ὄνομα καὶ προσηγορικόν. τὸ μὲν οὖν κύριον ἄγνοῶν διὰ τὸ τέως· μόνος γὰρ Νικόθεος ὁ ἀνεύρετος ταῦτα οἶδεν. τὸ δὲ προσηγορικὸν αὐτοῦ ὄνομα Φῶς καλεῖται, ἀφ' οὗ καὶ φῶτας παρηκολούθησε λέγεσθαι τοὺς ἀνθρώπους.

-
- 9.2 τῇ <γᾶρ> Reitz.
 9.3 fort. leg. καλέσασιν Ruelle.
 9.6 δηλοῖ <καὶ> Reitz.
 9.7 δηλοῖ τὴν <γῆν> corr. Berth. apud add. et corr. (vol. III, p. 475 ad text. gr. 231.6): δηλοῖ τὴν codd.; δηλοῖ <καὶ> γῆν Reitz.; δηλοῖ <γῆν> τὴν Scott.
 9.8 post βάρος lacunam stat. Reitz., Scott, Schenke, quam τὸ δὲ δεύτερον ἄλφα στοιχεῖον ἄρκτον δηλοῖ suppl. Scott. δηλοῖ <καὶ> Reitz.
 10.2 αὐτοῦ secl. Bousset.
 10.3 καὶ κύριον ἔχει ὄνομα corr.: ονι καὶ κυρομα εχειον habent codd.
 10.4 ἄγνοῶν codd.: ἄγνοῶ Reitz., Scott; fort. leg. ἄγνοοῦμεν εἰς τὸ τέως Ruelle.
 10.5 ταῦτα: τοῦτο Scott.
 10.6 Φῶς (ita Ruelle, Ruska) vel Φῶς (ita Reitz., Scott, Fest.).

9. So, then, the first man among us is named Thouth, and among them Adam, a name from the language of the angels.⁴³ And not only that, but with respect to the body the name they refer to him by is symbolic, composed of four elements⁴⁴ from the whole sphere. For the letter A of his name signifies the *ascendant* east, and *air*; the letter D of his name signifies the *descendant* west, and earth, which sinks *down* because of its weight;⁴⁵ ...;⁴⁶ and the letter M of his name signifies the *meridian* south, and the ripening fire in the *midst* of these bodies, the fire belonging to the *middle*, fourth planetary zone.⁴⁷

10. So, then, the Adam of flesh is called Thouth with respect to the visible outer mould,⁴⁸ but the Man within him, the Man of spirit, has a proper name as well as a common one.⁴⁹ Now the proper name no one knows for the present, for only Nikotheos, the one who cannot be found,⁵⁰ knows it. But his common name is Phos, and from this it followed that men came to be known as "photos."⁵¹

11. ὅτε ἦν Φῶς ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ διαπνεόμενος, ὑπὸ
 τῆς εἰμαρμένης ἔπεισαν αὐτὸν ὥς ἄκακον καὶ ἀνενέργη-
 τον ἐνδύσασθαι τὸν παρ' αὐτῶν Ἀδάμ, τὸν ἐκ τῆς
 εἰμαρμένης, τὸν ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων στοιχείων. ὁ δὲ διὰ
 5 τὸ ἄκακον οὐκ ἀπεστράφη· οἱ δὲ ἐκαυχῶντο ὥς δεδου-
 λαγωγημένου αὐτοῦ.

12. τὸν ἔξω ἄνθρωπον δεσμὸν εἶπεν Ἡσίοδος ᾧ
 ἔδωκεν ὁ Ζεὺς τὸν Προμηθεά. εἶτα μετὰ τὸν δεσμὸν
 ἄλλον αὐτῷ δεσμὸν ἐπιπέμπει, τὴν Πανδώραν ἣν οἱ
 Ἑβραῖοι καλοῦσιν Εὐάν. ὁ γὰρ Προμηθεὺς καὶ Ἐπι-
 5 μηθεὺς εἷς ἄνθρωπος ἐστὶ κατὰ τὸν ἀλληγορικὸν λόγον,
 τοῦτέστι ψυχὴ καὶ σῶμα. καὶ ποτὲ μὲν ψυχῆς ἔχει
 εἰκόνα ὁ Προμηθεύς, ποτὲ δὲ νοός, ποτὲ δὲ σαρκὸς διὰ
 τὴν παρακοὴν τοῦ Ἐπιμηθέως ἣν παρήκουσεν τοῦ Προ-
 μηθέως τοῦ ἰδίου. φησὶ γὰρ ὁ Νοῦς ἡμῶν· ὁ δὲ υἱὸς
 10 τοῦ θεοῦ πάντα δυνάμενος καὶ πάντα γινόμενος, ὅτε
 θέλει, ὥς θέλει φαίνει ἐκάστω.

11. When Phos was in the Garden, spirited along on
 the wind,⁵² at the instigation of Fate they⁵³ persuaded
 him, since he was innocent and unactivated,⁵⁴ to clothe
 himself with their Adam, who comes from Fate, who comes
 from the four elements. But Phos, for his innocence,
 did not refuse, and they began to exult to think that he
 had been made their slave.

12. Hesiod called the outer man "fetter," with
 which Zeus bound Prometheus. Then, after this fetter,
 Zeus set yet another fetter upon him - Pandora,⁵⁵ whom
 the Hebrews call Eve. For Prometheus and Epimetheus are,
 by the allegorical method, a single man, that is, soul
 and body; and so Prometheus sometimes takes the form of
 soul, sometimes that of mind, and sometimes that of flesh
 because of Epimetheus' disregard when he disregarded the
 advice of Prometheus, his own foresight.⁵⁶ For our Mind⁵⁷
 says: "The Son of God, being capable of everything and
 becoming everything, when he wills, as he wills, appears
 to each."⁵⁸

-
- 11.1 Φῶς (ita Ruelle, Ruska) vel Φῶς (ita Reitz., Scott);
 <ὁ> φῶς Scott. διαπνεομένης Keil; acc. Reitz., Ruska,
 Jung, Schenke; διατετημημένος ἀπὸ (pro ὑπὸ) Scott;
 διακηλούμενος? Ferguson.
 11.2 ἔπεισαν <οἱ ἄρχοντες> Reitz.
 11.3 αὐτῶν corr. Reitz.: αὐτοῦ codd.; ret. Jung.
 11.4 τὸν corr.: τῶν in codd. scriptum sign. Reitz.
 11.5 οἱ corr.: εἰ Ruelle ex codd., ut vid.
 12.1 τὸν <γὰρ> Reitz. ᾧ corr. Reitz.: ὃν codd.
 12.2 μετὰ <τοῦτον> τὸν Ruelle; acc. Scott.
 12.3 Πανδώραν corr.: Πανδώρην Ruelle ex codd.; ret. Scott.
 12.4 γὰρ codd.: fort. leg. δὲ Ruelle.
 12.7 ὁ Προμηθεύς secl. Reitz.
 12.9 τοῦ ἰδίου <ἀδελφοῦ> Ruelle; τοῦ ἰδίου <νοῦ> Reitz.,
 Fest.; τοῦ ἰδίου <νοός> Scott: nihil est addendum.
 ὁ Νοῦς Reitz.: ὁ νοῦς Ruelle.
 12.10 ὅτε codd.: ὅτι (scil. ὅ τι: sic Bousset) Reitz.,
 Schenke; ὅσα Scott.
 12.11 φαίνει codd.: φαίνεται Scott (recte? cf. ἐφάνη 13.2).

13. Ἀδὰμ προσῆν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς <ὁς> ἀνήνεγκεν
 ὅπου καὶ τὸ πρότερον διήγον φῶτες καλούμενοι. ἐφάνη
 δὲ καὶ τοῖς πάνυ ἀδυνάτοις ἀνθρώποις, ἄνθρωπος
 γεγονὼς παθητὸς καὶ ῥαπιζόμενος. καὶ λάθρα τοῦς
 5 ἰδίους φῶτας συλήσας, ἅτε μηδὲν παθὼν, τὸν δὲ
 θάνατον δείξας καταπατεῖσθαι καὶ ἐῶσθαι. καὶ ἔως
 ἄρτι καὶ τοῦ τέλους τοῦ κόσμου ἔπεισι λάθρα καὶ
 φανερὰ συνὼν τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ, συμβουλευὼν αὐτοῖς λάθρα
 καὶ διὰ τοῦ νοῶς αὐτῶν καταλλαγὴν ἔχειν τοῦ παρ'
 10 αὐτῶν Ἀδὰμ, κοπτομένου καὶ φονευομένου, παρ' αὐτῶν
 τυφληγοροῦντος καὶ διαζηλουμένου τῷ πνευματικῷ καὶ
 φωτεινῷ ἀνθρώπῳ, τὸν ἑαυτῶν Ἀδὰμ ἀποκτείνουσι.

-
- 13.1 <ὁς> ins. Ruelle; <ὁς αὐτὸν> Reitz. προσῆν...
 ἀνήνεγκεν: fort. leg. πρῶην...ἀνήνεγκε Ruelle.
 13.1-2 Ἀδὰμ...καλούμενοι secl. Reitz., Fest., Schenke
 ut glossema Christianum.
 13.2 τὸ secl. Reitz.
 13.2-6 ἐφάνη...ἐῶσθαι secl. Reitz., Fest., Schenke eadem
 ratione.
 13.4,7,8 λάθρα Reitz.
 13.5 συλήσας corr. Ruelle: συλλήσας codd.
 13.6 δείξας: fort. leg. δόξας Ruelle.
 13.7 ἔπεισι emend. Reitz., Fest., Schenke: τόποισι
 codd.; sec. Jung; τοῖς μὲν emend. Scott, qui et
 <τοῖς δὲ> post λάθρα ins.
 13.8 συνὼν conl. Reitz., Fest., Bousset, Schenke:
 συλλῶν codd.; fort. leg. συλλαλῶν Ruelle.
 13.8-9 λάθρα καὶ secl. Scott.
 13.9 καταλλαγὴν: ἀπαλλαγὴν emend. Scott. παρ' secl.
 Reitz., Scott.
 13.10,12 κοπτομένου καὶ φονευομένου παρ' αὐτῶν et τὸν
 ἑαυτῶν Ἀδὰμ ἀποκτείνουσι secl. Reitz., Fest.,
 Schenke ut glossemata Christiana.

13. Jesus Christ drew nigh⁵⁹ to Adam and bore him up
 to the place⁶⁰ where those named "photes"⁶¹ dwelt before.⁶²
 And he also appeared to very powerless men by becoming a
 man who suffered and was subjected to blows.⁶³ And he
 secretly carried off as his spoil the "photes," who belong
 to him, because he suffered nothing but instead showed
 death trampled under foot and thrust aside. And both now
 and until the end of the world he comes,⁶⁴ both secretly
 and openly, to his own and communes with them by counsel-
 ing them secretly and through their minds to get rid⁶⁵
 of their Adam. By cutting off and slaying their⁶⁶ Adam
 whose guidance is blind and who is jealous of the Man of
 spirit and light they kill their own Adam.

14. ταῦτα δὲ γίνεται ἕως οὗ ἔλθῃ ὁ ἀντίμιμος
δαίμων, διαζηλούμενος αὐτοῖς καὶ θέλων ὥς τὸ πρῶην
πλανῆσαι, λέγων ἑαυτὸν υἱὸν θεοῦ, ἄμορφος ὢν καὶ
ψυχῇ καὶ σώματι. οἱ δὲ φρονιμώτεροι γενόμενοι ἐκ
5 τῆς καταλήψεως τοῦ θύοντος υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ διδῶσιν αὐτῷ
τὸν ἴδιον Ἀδὰμ εἰς φόνον, τὰ ἑαυτῶν φωτεινὰ πνεύματα
σώζοντες <εἰς> ἴδιον χῶρον ὅπουπερ καὶ πρὸ κόσμου
ἦσαν. πρὶν ἢ δὲ ταῦτα τολμῆσαι τὸν ἀντίμιμον, τὸν
ζηλωτὴν, πρῶτον ἀποστέλλει αὐτοῦ πρόδρομον ἀπὸ τῆς
10 Περσίδος μυθοπλάνους λόγους λαλοῦντα καὶ περὶ τὴν
εἰμαρμένην ἄγοντα τοὺς ἀνθρώπους. εἰσὶ δὲ τὰ στοι-
χεῖα τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ ἑννέα, τῆς διφθόγγου σφζο-
μένης, κατὰ τὸν τῆς εἰμαρμένης ὅρον. εἴτα μετὰ
περιόδους πλεόν ἢ ἑλαττον ἐπτά καὶ αὐτὸς ἑαυτοῦ
15 φύσει ἐλεύσεται.

-
- 14.2 διαζηλούμενος corr. Reitz.: δι' οὗ ζηλούμενος
codd. ὥς τὸ πρῶην secl. Reitz. πρῶην: πρῶτον
Scott.
- 14.3 ὢν secl. Ruska, qui et ἄμορφος in ἄμορφος
emendare vult.
- 14.4 φρονιμώτεροι γενόμενοι corr. Ruelle: φρονιμώτερον
γενόμενοι codd.
- 14.5 διδῶσιν corr. Reitz.: δίδωσιν codd.; δώσουσιν
Scott.
- 14.7 <εἰς> ἴδιον χῶρον Reitz., Fest. ὅπουπερ: ὅπου
Reitz., Fest.
- 14.11-12 in margine M prima manu scriptum: ση' (sc.
σημαίνει), cf. Ant.Lib. I.10-11, ed. I. Cazzaniga.
- 14.13 ὅρον: fort. leg. λόγον Reitz.
- 14.14 περιόδους corr.: περίοδου (Ruelle) vel περίοδον
(Reitz.) codd. ἑαυτοῦ corr.: ἑαυτῷ codd.; <τῇ>
ἑαυτοῦ Reitz.

14. And this will go on until the Mimic *Daimon*⁶⁷
comes, since he is jealous of them and wants to deceive
them as before,⁶⁸ claiming that he is Son of God, ugly
though he is both in soul and body. But because they have
become wiser by their apprehension of Him who is truly Son
of God, they yield up to him their Adam, yield him up to
death, and save their shining⁶⁹ spirits by introducing
them into their own realm, where they were even before the
world.⁷⁰ But before the Mimic, the Jealous One, dares
these things⁷¹ he will first send his own forerunner from
Persia, telling deceptive, fabulous tales and leading men
on about Fate. The letters of his name are nine,⁷² if the
diphthong is preserved,⁷³ in accord with the pattern of
Fate.⁷⁴ Then, after seven periods, more or less, he⁷⁵
will come in his own person.

15. καὶ ταῦτα μόνοι Ἑβραῖοι καὶ αἱ ἱεραὶ
 Ἑρμοῦ βίβλοι περὶ τοῦ φωτεινοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ τοῦ
 ὁδηγοῦ αὐτοῦ υἱοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ γηϊνίου Ἀδάμ καὶ τοῦ
 ὁδηγοῦ αὐτοῦ ἀντιμίμου τοῦ δυσφημῖα λέγοντος ἑαυτὸν
 5 εἶναι υἱὸν θεοῦ πλάνη.

16. οἱ δὲ Ἕλληνες καλοῦσι <τὸ>ν γῆϊ<ν>ον Ἀδάμ
 Ἐπιμηθεά συμβουλευόμενον ὑπὸ τοῦ ἰδίου νοῦ, τουτέστι
 τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ, μὴ λαβεῖν τὰ δῶρα τοῦ Διός. ὅμως
 καὶ σφαλεῖς καὶ μετanoήσας καὶ τὸν εὐδαίμονα χῶρον
 5 ζητήσας, πάντα ἐρμηνεύει καὶ πάντα συμβουλεύει τοῖς
 ἔχουσιν ἀκοὰς νοερὰς· οἱ δὲ τὰς σωματικὰς ἔχοντες
 μόνον ἀκοὰς τῆς εἰμαρμένης εἰσὶ, μηδὲν ἄλλο κατα-
 δεχόμενοι ἢ ὁμολογοῦντες.

15.1 <οἱ> Ἑβραῖοι?

15.4 λέγοντος corr.: λέγωντος codd.

15.5 <καὶ> πλάνη Keil; acc. Reitz.

16.1 καλοῦσι <τὸ>ν corr. Reitz.: καλοῦσιν codd. γῆϊ<ν>ον
 corr.: γῆϊον Ruelle ex codd.

16.5 post ζητήσας lacunam sign. Reitz., qui et ...<ὁ δὲ
 Προμηθεὺς, τουτέστιν ὁ νοῦς suppl.; ita vel ...<ὁ δὲ
 Νοῦς ἡμῶν> suppl. Fest.; nihil est addendum.

16.7 εἰσὶ <πομπαί> Reitz.; εἰσὶ <δοῦλοι> Scott.

15. And only the Hebrews and the sacred books of
 Hermes⁷⁶ say these things, about the Man of light and his
 guide, the Son of God, and about the Adam made of earth
 and his guide, the Mimic, who blasphemously claims to be
 Son of God in order to deceive.

16. But the Greeks call the Adam made of earth Epi-
 metheus, who was counseled by his own mind, that is, by
 his brother, not to accept the gifts of Zeus. Since he⁷⁷
 fell, however, and had a change of mind,⁷⁸ and searched
 for the realm of bliss, he explains all and counsels all
 for those who have ears of the mind. But those who have
 only bodily ears belong to Fate, for they neither grasp
 nor confess anything else.

¹The shape of the Greek letter omega (ω) suggests the descriptions "round" and "bipartite." The reason for their inclusion is not so obvious, but it is probably in anticipation of correlating the letter omega with Ocean. Ocean was conceived to be a river that encircled the world; Homer describes the shield made by Hephaistos for Achilles as depicting Ocean flowing around its outer rim (*Iliad* 18.607; cf. also Herodotus 4.8). This fact accounts for omega's being called στρογγύλον. The explanation for διμερές is perhaps that Zosimos held Ocean to be a hermaphrodite being. The alchemist Olympiodoros (who just may be identical with the Neo-Platonic commentator of Plato) cites Zosimos as saying that the sea is ἀρρενὸς ἡλυς (Berthelot II, iv, 32, texte grec 89.19). The background for this odd, un-Greek conception is supplied by a statement in Diodorus of Sicily (actually his source Hekataios of Abdera): the Egyptians say that "the ancients named the moist element 'Okeane,' which means 'Sustenance Mother'; but by some of the Greeks it is held to be 'Okeanos' (i.e., masculine)" (1.12.5). In classical Egyptian cosmogonies the primeval waters of Chaos are a divine syzygy, Nwn and Nwnt. Furthermore, Diodorus (1.12.6) goes on to say that the Egyptians consider Ocean to be the Nile, and the ancient Egyptians often depicted the god Nile as a man with pendulous breasts.

²Literally, "according to embodied speech," that is, the language of corporeal humans as opposed to that of bodiless celestials. Compare the statement in 9.2-3 that "Adam" is a name derived from the language of the angels, and in 10.2-4 that the spiritual Man within the fleshly Adam has a proper name, which only Nikotheos knew, as well as a common one. The similarity of all these passages leads one to conclude that Zosimos derived them all from Nikotheos. See also 7.1-2.

³That is, Saturn, each of the seven Greek vowels being paired, in ascending order, with one of the seven planets. Kronos and Ocean were brothers, both sons of Heaven and Earth (Hesiod, *Theogony* 132-138), and after his rebellious son released him from bondage, Kronos ruled over the heroes who dwell on the Isles of the Blessed at the ends of the earth "along the shores of deep-swirling Ocean" (Hesiod, *Works and Days* 167-173; cf. *Theogony* 215-216). Clement of Alexandria (*Stromateis* 5.8.50.1) informs us that the Pythagoreans call the sea "the tears of Kronos."

⁴See also 10.5. Nikotheos was a (second century?) Jewish-Christian or perhaps secondarily Christianized Jewish visionary and prophet of some repute in Gnostic circles for his revelations of heavenly secrets acquired during journeys into that realm. He was evidently considered to have traveled there at or in lieu of death, and, as the epithets *καρρυμμένος* here and *ἀνεύρετος* in 10.5, as well as *διὰ τὸ τέως* in 10.4, seem to intimate, Nikotheos was expected to inspire further revelations from his new home, and perhaps even eventually to return from his hiding place, probably in some eschatological context. The same traditions and expectations surround the figures of Enoch, Moses, and Elijah in intertestamental Jewish works of apocalyptic character, not to mention the New Testament. The work by or pseudepigraphically attributed to Nikotheos that Zosimos knew was plausibly the *Revelation of Nikotheos* mentioned by Porphyry along with those of Zoroaster, Zostrianos, Allogenes, Messos, and nameless others, in his *Life of Plotinus* 16. This lost apocalypse may originally have been Jewish (Sethian?) and only secondarily Christianized by Christian Gnostics (cf. sections 13 and 14 of our tractate), for Porphyry merely states that the Gnostic Christians against whom Plotinus taught boasted possession of it. The Nag Hammadi tractates *Zostrianos*, which also claims the authority of Zoroaster, and *Allogenes*, which often mentions Messos, are likely to be those very works named by Porphyry. They too are revelations of heavenly secrets, and they are not Christian. For translations of them see James Robinson, ed., *The Nag Hammadi Library* (New York: Harper & Row, 1977) pp. 368ff. and 443ff. Zostrianos and Allogenes are, like Nikotheos, seers to whom the revelations are made and who in turn reveal their secrets to the elect. Nikotheos is never mentioned in the Nag Hammadi codices; we know of his activities from the *Untitled Apocalypse* of the Coptic Gnostic codex Brucianus. There he is mentioned along with one Marsanes as one of the "perfect," one who had managed to speak--"with a tongue of flesh," it seems, though this is declared impossible--about the Father and his Monogenes who is Light (see 10.5-7 of our tractate). Nikotheos spoke about him; "he had seen him, for he is one who was there....He revealed the invisible perfect Triple-Power." See Charlotte Baynes, *A Coptic Gnostic Treatise contained in the Codex Brucianus* (Cambridge: the University Press, 1933) pp. 83-84 with note 7, which refers to Zosimos. Carl Schmidt, *Koptisch-Gnostische Schriften*, erster Band (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, ³1962) pp. 341-342, translates "Nikotheos hat...ihn geschaut, denn er ist jener," i.e., still there. There is an exceedingly fragmentary tractate under the name *Marsanes* in the Nag Hammadi library; it too, like the others mentioned above, is a revelation of heavenly secrets and, to judge from the remains, not Christian either. See Robinson, *Nag Hammadi Library*, pp. 417ff.

⁵The connection is not only that in Greek the word "ocean" begins with an omega, but also that in late antiquity the word *στοιχεῖον* had come to designate any primal or fundamental world-originating principle, as well as a letter of the alphabet (so again in 14.11-12). Here the word is used of Ocean from the classical Greek cosmogonies; 1.1-2 suggests the planetary rulers and demiurges; and 9 and 11.4 the four physical elements earth, water, air and fire. For this developed use of the word *στοιχεῖον* see Gal 4:3 and 9 and Col 2:8 and 20, to cite but the New Testament.

⁶The meaning of *καθάπερ...φράσεως* is quite obscure; even Festugière (*La Révélation* I, p. 264, note 6) despairs. This translation understands *Ὠκεανός, θεῶν...σπορά* and *αἱ μοναρχικαὶ...φράσεως* to be a citation by Zosimos from the Nikotheos source, to whom *καθάπερ φησὶν* is Zosimos' reference, and that *φησὶ* is the cited document's reference to an interpolated Homer (cf. *Iliad* 14.201, 246, and 302). Homer was well enough known not to need to be explicitly named; one might compare the 'ipse dixit' of the Pythagoreans. The description *αἱ μοναρχικαὶ* would be Nikotheos' explanation of the function of *γένεσις καὶ σπορά*, both feminine.

⁷Or, less probably, simply "what is called," "the proverbial." So also in 1.7.

⁸Or, "the divine water." There is a play here, common elsewhere in the writings of the alchemists, upon the words *θεῖος* "divine" (as Ocean was in ancient myth) and *τὸ θεῖον* "sulphur," for which the alchemists used omega as a sign. See the list of alchemical symbols and shorthand notations prefixed to the manuscript Venetus Marcianus 299, our M, printed in Berthelot, *Collection* I, p. 104, fig. 3, right hand column, the third entry from the bottom. What exactly "liquid of sulphur" was chemically is obscure to me; it seems to be sulphur in some fusible state, and its production required some apparatus because, whatever it was, it was "smelted from lead" (cf. the alchemical lexicon Berthelot I, ii, *sub voce* *θεῖον* ὕδωρ, *texte grec* 8.13). Whatever the connection between sulphur and lead was, it was strong enough to warrant assignation of the same sign to both substances--the sign for the planet Kronos. See the alchemical sign-list of the manuscript Parisinus graecus 2327, Ruelle's A, reproduced by Berthelot, *Collection* I, p. 114, fig. 7, lines 11-12. Lead was Saturn's metal; see Berthelot, *ibid.*, pp. 73ff. and, e.g., Origen's *Contra Celsum* 6.22. This "liquid of sulphur" or "divine water" effected the sublimation of metals from their ores; "it produces the transformation; by its application you will bring out what is hidden inside; it is called 'the dissolution of bodies'" (Berthelot II, iii, 6, *texte grec* 61.1-3). Hence the play on "divine." See also Berthelot II, iv, 38, 42 with notes

3 and 4, 43-44, 46-47; III, vii; viii; x, 2-3; xiv, 1; xv, 1-4; xvi, 10, 13; xvii; xxi, 1-2; xxv; xxviii, 8; lii, 2-4.

⁹That is, under the influence of favorable astrological conditions. See Ruska, *Tabula Smaragdina*, pp. 22-23 and Festugière, *La Révélation I*, p. 264, note 10, as well as what follows here.

¹⁰The reference is not, as Festugière (*La Révélation I*, p. 265, note 1) points out, to the present (Zosimos' own) treatise on apparatus and furnaces, but to a treatise already in existence. It may be identical with the *καμνογραφία* of Maria the Jewess referred to by the alchemist Olympiodoros (Berthelot II, iv, 35, texte grec 90.19). The treatise was evidently of some age, for Zosimos refers to it as a writing of the ancients, and demurs to Theosebeia's requests in her letters for information on apparatus by conceding his inability to treat the subject more authoritatively than this older treatise has, though he proceeds to set out briefly what he knows "in order that we may understand all that they (viz., the ancients) said" (Berthelot III, xlix, 13, texte grec 234.1-10, not included in this edition). This explains the respect that Zosimos shows for the treatise in the present section. Zosimos refers to this treatise with a fuller title in 2.5.

¹¹The conception of a personal genius in force here is astrologically conditioned in that the *daimon* governing the person and his success in enterprise--here alchemical--is considered to be influenced in its nature by the particular configuration, now beneficent, now maleficent, of astral forces in effect at any moment. See the following note and 3.2-4 below.

¹²The word *χρόνος* as used here and in 3.2 below is a technical astrological term and refers to the time taken by each of the 360 degrees of the zodiacal constellations to rise through ascendancy. The impact of each "time" was colored by the particular planet or decan, called in this respect the *χρονοκράτωρ*, whose power was aspectually dominant for the period during which that degree was in the ascendant. Zosimos' point is that his opponents only accept the validity of the procedures for *καίρινα* *καταβαφαί* set out in the book in question when their *daimon*, conditioned by or identical with a maleficent *χρονοκράτωρ*, impedes the success they had formerly enjoyed with their own methods under a beneficent one. When this latter condition returns, however, they revert to their former independent stance.

¹³Or, less personally, "of the Fate that is over them"--i.e., that controls them--or even, sarcastically, "of that Fate of theirs." In both these cases there would be a glance forward to what Zosimos says of these people in sections 3 and 4.

¹⁴The word play inherent in the use of *εὐδαιμονία* here, viz., with the proper meaning "the state of being blessed with a good *daimon*" and hence "happiness," "good fortune," "prosperity," cannot be preserved in English. Note the continuance of this theme in 4.6, 6.3, 7.18, and 16.4 below. The question of true happiness, one Fate-controlled versus Self-controlled, material versus spiritual, is the theme that links together all the various traditions that Zosimos cites in the rest of the tractate.

¹⁵I.e., alchemists, in this context. See also 5.1 and note 19.

¹⁶See note 12 above.

¹⁷Or perhaps "it (viz., these persons' *daimon*) changes their mind and they confess etc."

¹⁸I assume that the whole of this section is a citation from the Hermetic tract named in 4.2. The distinctly Stoic flavor of the passage argues in its favor; see note 2 to the Introduction, and with 4.6-7 compare 16.7-8, one of the Promethean sections. The passage 16.3-8 is Hermetic; it contains many close parallels to section 7. For parallels in the Hermetic corpus itself, see especially 4.5 and 7; 16.16; and *Asclepius* 7.

¹⁹See note 15. In late antiquity "philosopher" had come to encompass devotees of any mystical system of knowledge--Egyptian alchemists, Chaldean astrologers, Zoroastrian magicians; Neo-Platonists and theurgists; Gnostics and Hermetists: all were "philosophers." In fact, philosophy in the forms and traditions of classical Greece and religion in the late Roman period had totally coalesced.

²⁰The meaning of *ἐναύλιος* is literally "within the courtyard gate" or "in the court," the force of the expression being that philosophers, by their realization of kinship with God through mind, the divine element awakened within them, pass the whole of their lives in the court of their Father, the divine King who is Mind. They are at home with themselves, there.

²¹The gifts only seem fair, as Zosimos--or rather his Hermetic source--goes on to illustrate from the myth of Pandora.

²²See *Works and Days* 54ff., and the parallel passage *Theogony* 558ff. Only *μήτε...ἔξοπλω* 6.4-6 approaches citation of Hesiod (*Works and Days* 86-88); the rest derives ultimately from moralizing Stoic propaedeutic allegorization. The identification of Zeus with Fate, for instance, was made already by Chrysippus in his book *On the Nature of the Gods* (Cicero, *De Natura Deorum* 1.14.40-41; see also 2.24.63f.). Vergil (*Aeneid* 3.375-376) and the

author of the Hermetic *Asclepius* (27) follow this traditional exegesis. Cicero tells us that Zeno himself taught with respect to Hesiod's *Theogony* that Zeus and Hera and all the names of the other gods refer "per quamdam significationem to dumb and lifeless things" (*De Natura Deorum* 1.14.36).

²³Prometheus.

²⁴The text is insecure here. Most scholars accept W. Kroll's emendation ἀυλίας ("immateriality") for the manuscripts' ἀναυλίας. In view of the mention of an έναυλία (ζωή) in 5.4, however, it seems to me more plausible, and simpler too, to correct to έναυλίας here, and to consider sections 5 and 7.4ff. as citations from one Hermetic tract. If a Hermetic treatise *On Immateriality* were known, Kroll's suggestion would have greater weight.

²⁵The term μαγεία, like the μάγος who practices it, can mean either vile superstition and ground for opprobrium or theurgic power and mystic science, depending upon the user's viewpoint. A passage in Apuleius' famous *Apolo-gy* in defense of an accusation that he is a *magus* (25.5ff.) is particularly enlightening in this regard. Zosimos presents us with two assessments of magic in regard to its value in overcoming Fate. "Zoroaster," the Magus *par excellence*, not surprisingly endorses its use (7.1-3); Apuleius (*Apol.* 25.11) cites pseudo-Plato's *First Alcibiades* 121E and maintains in Zoroaster's name that μαγεία is "high-priestess of heavenly powers" (26.2). Zosimos' Hermetist condemns its use as needless (7.4-6) with a hint, perhaps, of the unstated purpose of making a virtue of legal necessity. In the eyes of Roman law, the practice of magic was either itself a crime or a seedbed for a variety of criminal activities, not the least of which was *lèse majesté*. Zosimos' own evaluation seems to match Zoroaster's; at least, the adverbial use of καὶ in 7.4 points in this direction. Egyptian respect for magic was ancient and quite ineradicable. Other documents from the Egypt of this period agree with Zosimos: the Hermetic extract 23 from Stobaeus (the *Kore Kosmou* 68) and a Berlin magical papyrus (*Papyri Graecae Magicae*, ed. Preisendanz, 1.127).

²⁶The Triad is evidently the Father, who is Mind, his Son the *Logos* born of Mind (see the following note), and either τὸ πᾶν, the material cosmos, or man as possessing mind. Such triadic formulations are common in the Hermetica; for other examples, compare *Corpus Hermeticum* 8.2-3 and 5: God the Father, the All, and man; 13.18: God, *Logos*, and the All; and *Asclepius* 10: God, world, and man. In another tractate (Berthelot III, vi, 18, texte grec 132.21-24) Zosimos illustrates an alchemical procedure in which "a compositional monad results in an inseparable triad" by remarking "and furthermore, a triad

in union which produces a triad in distinction constitutes the world by the providence of the primal creative Cause and Demiurge of creation. That is why he (Hermes) is called Thrice-greatest, because he envisioned the created and the Creator triadically." Trinitarian speculation was not exclusively Christian.

²⁷The "Son of God" is the *Logos*, who, as the expressed intention of the Creator's Mind, informs and suffuses the primal chaos of matter. In the Hermetic cosmogony *Poimandres* (6) Mind is the seer's God (cf. Zosimos 12.9) and the φωτεινὸς Λόγος born of Mind is Son of God. Elsewhere (*Corpus Hermeticum* 9.8 and 10.14) the world is called "Son of God," but that cannot be the reference here. The role of the *Logos* in Hermetism derives from Stoicism, and no influence from Christianity via the Prologue to the Gospel of John, for example, nor from Judaism via a passage like Psalm 33:6 (32:6 LXX), need necessarily be assumed, though it is not out of the question.

²⁸Each individual soul.

²⁹Or, perhaps, "to the Incorporeal One," i.e., God who is Mind.

³⁰The *Logos* is the messenger of Mind, sent to awaken the kindred faculty in men. Compare the role of Poimandres in *Poimandres* 2-3, and the result in 27f. The idea of the *Logos* as messenger of God in Hermetism may owe something to the function of Hermes as ἄγγελος for the court of Zeus in classical Greek mythology.

³¹That is, "man whose raw and inherent nature it is to suffer, to be passive," a nature the very opposite of that of Mind himself. Compare *Corpus Hermeticum* 12.11 and note the parallel with Phil 2:6-7. Although a comparable statement is made of Jesus Christ in 13:3-4 in reference to the Passion (cf. 13.4), one need not follow Reitzenstein in excluding this sentence as a Christian interpolation. There is nothing in it which is not in accord with Hermetic theology. Festugière, usually so wisely cautious in this regard, marks καὶ πατρὶ ὑπακούει in 7.17 out as Christian interpolation, thinking perhaps of dependence upon Phil 2:8, but the conjunction of the *Logos* with the Will of God in creating the world in *Poimandres* 8 argues against this supposition.

³²Or, possibly, taking πᾶντα as subject and not object of γίνεται, "all that he wills comes to pass." So Ruska; but this is less likely, as it does not accord with the context here and conflicts with the similar statement in 12.9-11.

³³Each mind.

³⁴Or, "where he (the Son of God) was before ever he etc."

³⁵Or translate passively "yearned after."

³⁶Either the author of the Hermetic document Zosimos is citing has already referred to a world of light (cf. *Poimandres* 4-5, 6, 7) in an earlier section, or ἐκείνο may simply look back to τὸν εὐδαίμονα χῶρον in 7.18-19. Compare also 11.1 and 14.6-7.

³⁷This Bitos is almost certainly identical with a Bitus twice mentioned by the late Syrian Neo-Platonist Iamblichus in his *On the Mysteries of the Egyptians*. In the first passage (8.4) Iamblichus remarks about their uranology that the Egyptians do not simply theorize, but "recommend that you make the ascent, by means of the sacred hieratic theurgy, through the higher and more universal regions that lie beyond Fate, to God the Creator, and have neither anything to do with matter nor any concern for anything else, except only observance of the appropriate moment" (cf. Zosimos 2.1 with note 9 and the danger implied by 2.8-9). "Hermes," Iamblichus goes on (8.5), "expounded this very way; the prophet Bitus found it inscribed in hieroglyphic characters in shrines round about Sais in Egypt, and translated it for king Ammon. He handed on the name of God that extends through all the world. And there exist," he adds, "many other (viz., other Hermetic) compositions on this subject." The Hermetic tracts from which Zosimos cites sections 4, 5, and 7.4ff., as well as *Corpus Hermeticum* 13, are examples of just such other compositions. In the second passage, in the context of discussion of the same "way"--liberation from Fate by ascension and union with the supracosmic God--Iamblichus adds (10.7): "What is Good-in-itself they (the Egyptians) hold to be, on the divine level, the God who exists beyond conception, and on the human level, union with Him, which is what Bitus says, translating from the Hermetic books." Bitos, or Bitus, if he existed, would have been, like Manetho or Chairemon, a Hellenized Egyptian priest and interpreter of native Egyptian traditions to the Greeks. The visionary author of the Hermetic tractate from which Iamblichus derived his information used Bitos' name as an authority to support the common Hermetic claim of derivation from long-lost or previously uninterpreted stelae of "Hermes," i.e., Thoth (the identification is implied already by Herodotus 2.138). Reitzenstein (*Poimandres*, pp. 106-8) entertains the possibility that our Bitos may be identical with a certain Thessalian king Pitus to whom three spells are ascribed by the great Paris magical papyrus (*Papyri Graecae Magicae*, ed. Preisendanz, 4.1928, 2006, 2140) and with the Bithus of Dyrhachium (in Illyria) mentioned by Pliny in his *Nat. Hist.* 28.23.82 for his recommendations on dealing with mirrors tarnished by the look of a woman during menstruation. Both identifications seem untenable to me. Reitzenstein (*Poimandres*, p. 104, n. 1) also suggests comparison of the tablet Zosimos claims Bitos to have written with the

"Ophite" diagram discussed by Origen in his *Contra Celsum* 6.30-32, and both Scott (*Hermetica* IV, p. 130) and Festugière (*La Révélation* I, p. 268, n. 1) assume that some sort of picture is meant here. But this need not be the case. Bitos "wrote" his tablet, and Iamblichus states that the prophet translated documents in hieroglyphic characters. Furthermore, Ruelle's emendation Κέβητος for the manuscripts' καὶ Βίτος, though unacceptable, is instructive for suggesting comparison with the *Tablet of Kebes*. That document poses as an interpretation of an ancient tablet with a strange scene depicted on it, but is not itself a picture. A πίναξ is, in any case, a writing board, and the word does not prejudice what is written upon it. It may be that "Tablet" was the title given the work written in Bitos' name--a title chosen to lend an air of hoary antiquity to the work.

³⁸This passage is difficult because it is so elliptical. It seems to be saying: Look at the tablet that Bitos wrote, and (what) Plato and Hermes (wrote, and you will find) that etc. Festugière (*La Révélation* I, loc. cit.) takes up Reitzenstein's proposal (*Poimandres*, p. 104, n. 1) to assume that a chain of dependence is implied here, viz., Bitos upon Hermes, and Hermes upon Plato. The first link is certain, but the second is not. In Zosimos' mind the dependence was of Plato upon Hermes (equals Thoth), not the other way round; the epithets "thrice-great" and "infinitely-great" attached to Plato and Hermes, respectively, indicate the succession Zosimos presumes. The author of the Hermetic tract in Bitos' name may actually have depended upon Plato, at least partially and perhaps explicitly, for the statement in 8.3-5. In the *Phaedrus* 274Cf. Plato has Socrates report that he has heard that "one of the ancient gods," Theuth, discovered the use of numbers, geometry, astronomy, and most importantly, the alphabet; in the *Philebus* 18Bf. alphabetic innovations are credited to "a god or some god-like man" whom Egyptian tradition says was Theuth. "Bitos" may have derived his equation of Thoth with the first man from Plato's reference to a "god-like man," but his knowledge that such was his designation "in the original hieratic language" (8.3) came from "Hermes." See the preceding note. Alternately, the reference to Plato and Hermes may be an aside by Zosimos.

³⁹The word "hieratic" (i.e., "sacred, priestly") refers, as the context here and the passage from Iamblichus in n. 37 show, to the most ancient form of the Egyptian language, the hieroglyphic pictographs, and not the script called hieratic derived from it. Egyptian is held to have been the first written language, because Thoth, as we saw, invented the alphabet.

⁴⁰That is, the books containing this information, specifically, as what follows shows, the Septuagint, in particular of the book of Genesis, and allegorical exegesis

based upon it. See, for example, Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities* 1.34 and Philo, *Legum Allegoria* 1.90. That the first man was "the giver of names to all corporeal beings" is reminiscent of Gen 2:19. It is possible that the Hermetic Bitos-document was the source of all this section and perhaps the following one as well, and not Nikotheos or one of Zosimos' "Hebrew" sources; see notes 2 and 5 to the Introduction. The Hermetic cosmogony *Poimandres* (18), after all, cites Gen 1:28, and Jewish influence elsewhere in the *Hermetica* is common.

⁴¹Evidently Ptolemy II Philadelphus, by whom, according to legend (the *Letter of Aristeas* especially) the translation known as the Septuagint was commissioned.

⁴²There is a play on words here impossible to preserve in English, namely, on the fact (noticed by Plato, for example: *Cratylus* 407E), that the name of the god Hermes is very similar to the verb ἐρμηνεύειν "to translate, to interpret." Hermes' Egyptian counterpart Thoth, a god of learning and skilled in speech, is described above as "the interpreter (ἐρμηνεύς) of all that exists" (8.4). See also 8.7 of Adam's name and 16.5 of Prometheus-Epimetheus. Festugière (*La Révélation* I, p. 268, n. 5) regards the manuscripts' Ἑρμῆν in 8.11 as impossible and adopts Scott's emendation ἐρμηνέα. Of course, in a purely Jewish context the reference to Hermes would be unthinkable, but if the source is Hermetic, the difficulty disappears. Hermes was the hermeneute *par excellence*. For an interesting parallel see Acts 14:11-12.

⁴³In late Jewish circles Hebrew was, not unnaturally, held to be the language spoken by the angels; cf. 1 Cor 13:1 and 2 Cor 12:4.

⁴⁴See note 5.

⁴⁵Unfortunately for the scheme of initial letters in force here, the word "earth" in Greek does not begin with a delta; hence the jugglery.

⁴⁶There must be a lacuna here, for four elements were mentioned in 9.4 and the explanation of the second A in the Greek form of Adam's name is missing. It must have involved correlation with the *arctic* north (ἄρκτος) and somehow with water, however an alpha might have been eked out for that element, since the Greek word for water (ὕδωρ) lacks the appropriate initial letter. Perhaps the scribe's eye jumped over the clause involving the second A, and it would thus only be coincidence that the Hebrew form of Adam's name lacks the very letter in question. The acrostic puzzle worked out here is in any case possible only in Greek. See also 2 (Slavonic) *Enoch* 30:8f.; Philo, *De Opificio Mundi* 51; and the *Sibylline Oracles* 3.24-26.

⁴⁷That is, the sun. The order of the planets followed here is the moon, Mercury, Venus, the sun, Mars, Jupiter, Saturn--the most common one.

⁴⁸That is, the body. According to Gen 2:7 God "moulded" (ἐπλασεν) Adam's body out of dust from the earth, and Hephaistos "moulded" the body of Pandora "out of earth" (Hesiod, *Works and Days* 70). Note also that Plato, in his famous image of the soul as comprising a man, a lion, and a many-headed beast (*Republic* IX, 588Bf.), repeatedly uses this verb to describe the various stages in the construction of his fantastic man, and then, at the last stage: "Now mould around (περίπλασον) them (the lion and the many-headed beast) on the outside the likeness of one, that of the man."

⁴⁹The inner Man, a purely spiritual being, naturally has a "real, true" name as well as the "common" name that tongues of flesh in our material world's language have named him. Compare the distinction made, evidently by Nikotheos, between an ἕνωμος and an ἀσώματος φράσις in section 1 with note 3 ad loc. Plato's distinction between names embodied in sounds and αὐτὸ ἐκεῖνο ὃ ἔστιν ὄνομα the "actual," "real," or "natural" name (*Cratylus* 389D-390A; cf. also 390D-E) and between what men call things and what gods call them (*Cratylus* 391D-E) may be the ultimate source for the idea. The Naassenes, according to Hippolytus (*Elenchos* 5.7.1f.), held that Kaulakau was Adamas, the primal, heavenly Man, Saulasau the mortal one below, and Zeesar the Jordan that flows upwards. The three names derive from Isaiah's mocking gibberish, Isa 28:10. "This," the Naassene account goes on, "is the hermaphrodite Man in all man, whom the ignorant call Geryone the three-bodied" (5.7.4). Compare also the Nag Hammadi *Gospel of Philip* (codex II, 3: p. 56.3-4) and the obsession with knowing the "authentic name" evident in the magical papyri.

⁵⁰See 1.4 and note 4 on Nikotheos. Our Naassenes (Hippolytus, *Elenchos* 5.7.2) spoke of "a kingless generation begotten above, where dwell Mariam the one who is sought for (ἡ ζητούμενη) and Jethor the great sage and Sepphora the one who sees and Moses, whose begetting was not in Egypt." These legendary seers and prophetesses, Moses and his family, are now, like Nikotheos, denizens of heavenly realms as members of "the kingless generation." Documents like the *Assumption of Moses* attest the early development of this pattern. Jesus' "resurrection" and continued inspiration of his followers by his spirit are on the same prophetic trajectory; that the Son of Man, like Enoch, or Moses, or Elijah, was "hidden"--in hiding--and "could not be found" was a common motif in Jewish Messianic speculation. See also Gen 5:24 LXX of Enoch: "he could not be found (οὐχ ὑβρίσκειτο), because God translated him." Deut 34:6 is the source of the legend in the case of Moses: his grave could never be found.

⁵¹There is once again a play on words here impossible to preserve in English. A common Homeric term for man, φῶς, is held to derive from the word φῶς, contracted from φῶος, "light." The derivation is significant for Gnosticism since the primal Man is commonly considered to be light as originating from the world of light, but etymologically the two words are unrelated. See also 11.1; 13.2, 5, 12; and 14.6.

⁵²Zosimos, or his Nikotheos-source, is playing upon the well-known triple significance of πνεῦμα, "wind," "breath," and "spirit." In the Garden of Eden Phos, a πνευματικὸς ἄνθρωπος (10.2-3), rides the wind whose nature is akin to his own. Spirits and unembodied souls dwelt in the air. Compare, for example, the complaint of souls about to be embodied in the 23rd Hermetic extract from Stobaeus (the *Kore Kosmou* 36): "What a wretched thing it will be for us to have to bear hearing our kindred spirits blowing (or, breathing: φυσῶντων) in the air!" The idea stems from Orphic conceptions of the soul; Aristotle (*De Anima* 410^b19) reports that in Orphic poems Orpheus is represented as teaching that "the soul of beings that breathe enters them from the universe borne along on the winds." The fact that in Gen 2:7 LXX God is said to have "breathed" or "blown into" (ἐνεφύσησεν) Adam's face "a breath of life" would, to one familiar with Hellenistic philosophies, stimulate such speculation, especially since the Gnostics interpreted Gen 3:21 of the embodiment. Compare also John 3:8 τὸ πνεῦμα ὅπου θέλει πνεῖ in its context, and Jesus' method of conferring the spirit upon his disciples in 20:22.

⁵³The only conceivable antecedent is τὰ στοιχεῖα, but here the "elements" are the four physical elements out of which Phos' body is composed (11.4). They must, as Reitzenstein saw, be the archons, the planetary rulers who are the agents of Fate. Perhaps Zosimos' Nikotheos-source mentioned them explicitly in a passage preceding that which Zosimos is citing.

⁵⁴The term ἀνεέργητος means "without ἐνέργεια" in the Aristotelian sense of that word, that is, "without expression in act," "unactivated," "unactualized." Here the meaning would be that Phos, before his embodiment, existed in a purely potential state and lacked the modes of self-expression proper to the planetary rulers and their body derived from the elements. In the *Poimandres* 24-25 the soul, in its reascent through the spheres at death, leaves behind it, "inactive" (ἀνεέργητον) now, every gross and vicious state of being with which the planets had clothed it in its descent through them into birth.

⁵⁵Hesiod (*Theogony* 521-522) says that Zeus "bound (δῆσε) wily-minded Prometheus with galling (or, possibly,

inextricable) bonds, grievous fetters (δεσμοῖς)" in reference to the Titan's crucifixion upon Caucasus. Pandora is never called a "fetter." After the account of her creation in 570ff., however, there is another reference to Prometheus' bondage. Zeus "confined him under constraint (ὕπ' ἀνάγκης: cf. Zosimos 11.1-2) with a great fetter" (615-616). This could be understood to refer to Pandora.

⁵⁶Prometheus' name means "Forethinker"; Aeschylus (cf., for example, *Prometheus Bound* 85-87) already plays upon its connection with προμήθεια "forethought," "foresight." Because of his brother Epimetheus' ("After-thinker's") disobedience of his advice in the matter of Pandora Prometheus falls into bondage to fleshly existence. But his fate serves as an exemplar to those that possess mind; see 16.3-5. The allegorization of the two brothers as two facets of the single man, hindsight flesh and foresighted spirit, follows naturally from the significance of their names.

⁵⁷See 7.12f. and notes 27 and 30.

⁵⁸Or "reveals himself to each (viz., individual mind)." For another example of the use of an active form of φαίνω with middle meaning, see *Papyri Graecae Magicae* (ed. Preisendanz, 1.90), φαίνέ μοι, θεέ. The more normal middle form occurs in 13.2 from another source.

⁵⁹Or even "joined himself."

⁶⁰That is, back to Paradise. The first sentence of section 13 represents a form of the legend, best known from the version embedded in the *Acts of Pilate* (see Hennecke-Schneemelcher-Wilson, *New Testament Apocrypha* I, pp. 470ff.), of the rescue of Adam by the triumphant Christ in his *descensus ad inferos*. The original context for this late and watered-down orthodox version is the late Jewish soteriological Adam-speculation and ascensional mysticism that developed during the course of the Hellenistic period (compare the role of Sophia as liberator of Adam in Wis 10:1-2) and deeply affected incipient Gnosticism, as well as Paul (see Rom 5:12-21, 1 Cor-inthians 15, especially 20-28 and 44-57, and 2 Cor 12:1-6--his opponents boasted of the same experiences). In our Nikotheos document the Hades is our material world tyrannized by Fate and Adam is Phos, the inner Adam trapped in the body (note Paul's reluctance to specify whether his vision took place in or out of the body), not the corporeal Adam. The contrast of Adam to "very powerless men" in 13.3 makes this a certainty. Eric Peterson in a very interesting article ("La Liberation d'Adam de l'Ανάγκη" in *Revue Biblique* 55 [1948] pp. 199f.), shows that the Jewish prayer preserved in two recensions in Preisendanz' collection of magical papyri

(1.195f. and 4.1167f.) and the so-called "Mithras-Liturgy" (4.475f.: see now the edition by Marvin Meyer in this same Texts and Translations series) as well, stem from the same background. In the Mimaout papyrus (*Papyri Graecae Magicae* 3.144) the reference to Adam is explicit. Reitzenstein, Festugière, and Schenke all mark out much of this section as Christian interpolation, but, if there is any at all, it is better accounted for as a secondary christianization of the Nikotheos document itself by Christian Gnostics--a process to which the Nag Hammadi tractates (*Eugnostos the Blessed* and the *Sophia of Jesus Christ*, for example) have made us more sensitive--than as a later Byzantine Christian interpretation of Zosimos' work, as Reitzenstein (*Poimandres*, p. 105, n. 4) holds. The docetic character of the Christology of this section and the integrity of the following one both tell against such a supposition.

⁶¹The inner light-men, particles of Phos. See n. 51.

⁶²Before their embodiment. In the Hermetic version in 7.18f. Nous plays a personal (cf. "our Mind" in 12.9), salvific role analogous to that of Jesus Christ here. See also 14.6-8.

⁶³See 7.16 and n. 31. Here, however, παθητός is not a general description, but refers specifically to the Passion, as ἀπαυζόμενος shows: compare Mark 14:65 "the servants struck him blows" and 15:19 and parallels. In the *Acts of John* 96 Jesus tells his disciples: "Yours is this passion of the Man which I am about to suffer." The Passion was real, but only for the corporeal Jesus; the immaterial Jesus, the spiritual Man, suffered nothing (Zosimos 13.5). In the *Acts of John* John witnesses the crucifixion and runs away, but in a cave on the Mount of Olives hears the truth from his Lord's disembodied voice (97). Compare also the grossly docetic Christology offered in 93.

⁶⁴I have reluctantly accepted Reitzenstein's emendation ἐπεισι for the manuscripts' τόποισι, reluctantly because τόπος is a technical term in Gnosticism for the "regions" of the Demiurge's cosmos, or for the Demiurge himself: see, for example, Clement of Alexandria's *Extracts from Theodotus* 34.1-2; also 37.1 and 4.2. Such a reference would be quite apposite here, but I cannot work it in; the context seems to demand a verb.

⁶⁵Literally "to make exchange for." καταλλαγῇ cannot mean "reconciliation" here as it does in the New Testament.

⁶⁶The text has simply an indefinite παρ' αὐτῶν in both cases. The reference must be back to 11.3 where the same prepositional phrase occurs, that is, to the planetary archons. It is possible, but less likely, that παρ' αὐτῶν is equivalent to παρ' αὐτοῖς and means "that they (the 'photes,' the inner men) bear with them."

⁶⁷In Gnostic systems the evil Demiurge consistently imitates the patterns of the world beyond him. The root idea of imitation is Platonic, but for the Gnostics the Demiurge is not, as for Plato, good, but bent upon deception and enslavement. In the *Apocryphon of John* (I cite the long recension of Nag Hammadi codex II, 1 in Søren Giversen's edition *Apocryphon Johannis* [Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1963]), the "imitated spirit" stands in opposition to the "spirit of life" and leads the souls of men astray (74.7-75.11). Ialdabaoth creates Fate in jealousy of the world of light that surpasses him in knowledge and glory to deceive and enslave the cosmos to ignorance and oblivion. He seeks to destroy Noah and the whole generation "that does not waver" with a flood, but fails, and so sends his angels to the daughters of men to sow their evil seed in them. Failing again in their attempt, they create "a spirit which imitates the image of the spirit (of life) which came down (from the world above) in order that the souls through this might be defiled, and the angels changed themselves in their likeness according to the image of their (the women's) husbands, and filled them with the spirit of darkness and wickedness which they mingled in them....They took women and they engendered from the darkness sons after the image of their spirit, and they closed their hearts and they were hardened through the hardness from the imitated spirit until now" (75.31-78.11). From this passage it is obvious that this speculation about the evil, imitating spirit is a development of the post-Persian period Jewish concept of an "evil inclination" (יֵצֶר רָע) and a "good inclination" (יֵצֶר טוֹב) struggling for domination in the hearts of men. See, for example, Sir 33:13-14; *Testament of Gad* 5:3, *Asher* 1:3, and *Benjamin* 6:1f.; *Damascus Document* 2.14f.; *Bereshith Rabba* 27. In Judaism, however, both spirits are created by God--a problematic view, to say the least. The *Apocryphon of John*'s connection of the creation of the counterfeit spirit with Noah's generation is not fortuitous, but points up the original Jewish background of the idea, statements in Gen 6:5 and 8:21 that the "inclinations" or "intentions" in men's hearts were always evil. The *Pistis Sophia* preserves the Greek form ἀντίμιμον πνεῦμα. There, as in the *Apocryphon of John* upon which it is probably dependent, the "mimicking spirit" is an instrument of Fate in man (cf. Zosimos 14.10-11); its purpose is to awaken sinful desires (chaps. 111-112). It accrues to the soul by making itself a perfect resemblance (131).

⁶⁸In the Garden as the Serpent. The Serpent mimicked God (Gen 3:1 as against 2:16-17) to mislead Eve and so brought about Adam's fall. For the Antichrist as Deceiver see especially 2 John 7.

⁶⁹See note 51.

⁷⁰Either "before (the foundation of) the world" or "before (their coming into) the world," which amounts to the same. See 11.1 and 7.19-20.

⁷¹That is, before he comes claiming to be Son of God.

⁷²Reitzenstein and Festugière plausibly suggest *Μανιχαῖος* as the solution to the riddle. But why this caustic polemic against Mani? The explanation may be, in addition to the reason suggested in the Introduction (p. 5), that the community in which the Nikotheos document originated was connected somehow, if not identical, with the Babylonian Jewish-Christian baptist sect in which Mani had been raised and with whose members he suffered a violent breach over the revelations that formed Mani's independent calling. The Cologne Mani-Codex has revealed that this sect was Elchasaite (see Albert Henrichs' article "Mani and the Babylonian Baptists: A Historical Confrontation" in the *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 77 [1973] pp. 23ff.), and Elchasai has much in common with Nikotheos. Broadly speaking, both were visionaries and apocalyptists (for Elchasi see fragment 7 from Hippolytus, *Elenchos* 9.16.2-4 in Hennecke-Schneemelcher-Wilson, *New Testament Apocrypha* II, pp. 745f.); more specifically, both concerned themselves with escape from the evil influence of stars and Fate and communicated mysteries that could not be "interpreted" (Elchasai fragment 9 from Epiphanius' *Panarion* 19.4.3). Elchasai's teachings were carried to Rome by a certain Alcibiades, a native of Apamea in Syria; they had, he claimed, been delivered to Elchasai by a pair of gigantic angels, the Son of God and the Holy Spirit (fragment 1 from Hippolytus 9.13.1-3). The Nikotheos document might, then, have been a product of this evangelization of the west. The author of the Johannine Apocalypse was roughly Elchasai's contemporary--Elchasai began to preach in the third year of Trajan's reign (A.D. 101) according to fragment 2 (Hippolytus 9.13.3)--and perhaps Nikotheos' also. He, like them, was a seer and apocalyptist in the Jewish-Christian tradition. Compare the riddle here with that on the name of the Beast in the Apocalypse 13:18. Mani did indeed make great claims for himself, to be the Παράκλητος promised by Jesus in John 14:16-17 and 26, for instance (see Hegemonius, *Acta Archelai* 34), and the fantastic Manichaean cosmological system could easily be characterized as *μυθόπλανος* by an opponent.

⁷³The diphthong could be counted as one letter instead of two, especially since diphthongs were often written that way (-ε for ει, to choose but one example).

⁷⁴That is, "matching the pattern of the word 'fate'" which has nine letters in Greek (εἴμαρμένῃ), including a diphthong. The author may, however, also be continuing his effort to connect the deceptive teachings of his opponent Mani with the operation of Fate (14.10-11).

⁷⁵This must be the Mimic *Daimon*, not the Son of God; see the Introduction, p. 5 and note 21 there. The Anti-christ's forerunner comes first and initiates the period of "Messianic woes" (compare Mark 13:5-6, 14, 21-22 and parallels, and the Johannine Apocalypse 13), after which the Evil One comes himself, openly, with the same monstrous claim and purpose (see 2 Thess 2:3-12, especially 7-8, and the Apocalypse 20:7-8). The seven periods probably refer to the Iranian conception of the progress of creation in millenia of struggle between Good and Evil toward the final triumph of the former; see Plutarch, *De Iside et Osiride* 47 (370B-C) and the Pahlavi *Bundahish* 1.20. The ugliness of the Evil One in body as well as soul (14.3-4) is similarly Iranian (*Bundahish* 1.11 and 3.9 where his body is a lizard's).

⁷⁶See note 2 to the Introduction.

⁷⁷Prometheus, not Epimetheus. It is Prometheus, the spiritual man, who suffers bondage in the flesh for the stupidity of his mortal brother. See 12.1-9. No lacuna is necessary in 16.5.

⁷⁸Or, "repented," but μετανοήσας plays upon the fact that Prometheus is νοῦς and signifies not so much repentance here as a new orientation of mind, a concentration upon its original state that involves it in disenfranchisement from matter and a return to the "realm of bliss" beyond Fate.