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PREFACE

The following studies are from the notebooks of a student of the New Testament, and were undertaken from a desire to find firm footing in certain parts of that wide field which is commonly referred to as "the background of early Christianity". They are offered in the first place to my fellow-students of the New Testament, but not without the hope that they may be of use to others who are interested in the thought of the Graeco-Roman world in general. Much of the material here published was used in Grinfield Lectures on the Septuagint, delivered in the University of Oxford in the years 1927–31, but it has been worked over in the light of further study. Chapter V. was first published in the Journal of Theological Studies, Vol. XXXII., No. 128, and is reproduced by permission of the publishers. I am greatly indebted to Dr. H. Wheeler Robinson, Principal of Regent’s Park College, Reader in Biblical Criticism in the University of Oxford, for kindly reading Part I. in proof and making many valuable criticisms and suggestions; as well as to my wife and my son for help in preparing the Index.
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PREFACE TO SECOND IMPRESSION
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INTRODUCTION

In the period succeeding the conquests of Alexander the Great, the religions of the Near East learned to speak Greek, and in the process suffered more or less change through their exposure to Greek influence. Judaism was one of them. As the Hellenistic cult of Sarapis was not identical with the religion of Egypt under the Pharaohs, so Hellenistic Judaism was not identical with the religion of the Old Testament in general, nor yet with the Rabbinic Judaism which developed out of it. It is a distinct phenomenon.

The fundamental document of Hellenistic Judaism is the Greek translation of the Old Testament, commonly known as the Septuagint, which was made, to speak broadly, during the three centuries preceding the Christian Era. Translation is an impossible art, for the words of one language seldom or never convey precisely the same ideas as the corresponding words of another language. Besides philological differences in the words themselves, there are differences in the associations which the words have acquired in different contexts of thought and experience. Thus the words of the Hebrew Scriptures, in passing into Greek, partly lost one set of associations, and partly gained a new set, while at the same time the Greek words used in translation may have acquired something of the value of the Hebrew words they represent. If we can recover in some measure the associations of the Greek words, and compare them with the associations of the Hebrew words, we may do something towards fixing the meaning which the words would henceforth bear
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in Hellenistic Judaism, and wherever the influence of Hellenistic Judaism extended.

In the first part of this book I have taken a few outstanding religious terms which may be regarded as keywords in the vocabulary of Judaism, and attempted to determine their meaning in the Septuagint. For the text of the LXX I have used Swete’s Cambridge edition, and I have greatly relied on Hatch and Redpath’s Concordance to the Septuagint. For Greek versions other than the LXX I have turned to Field’s Origenis Hexapla.

The exact extent and nature of the influence of Hellenistic Judaism upon the Greek-speaking world in general is difficult to estimate. In the end it disappeared, absorbed into Christianity or into various Gnostic and syncretistic sects. What we know of the rise and spread of Christianity and the sects leads us to suppose that Judaism had already influenced the pagan public from which their converts were drawn. But direct evidence of such influence is not plentiful.\(^1\) In the second part of this book I propose to take one set of documents, the writings included in the Hermetic Corpus, and to study in detail the traces of Jewish influence in them.

A considerable body of Greek literature once existed, and has come down to us in more or less fragmentary fashion, under the name of Hermes Trismegistus. This Hermes passed for a sage who lived and taught in Egypt in remote antiquity, and after his death was deified. Actually he is the Egyptian god Thoth, identified with the Greek god Hermes, and euhemerized. Much of the literature under his name dealt with astrology and alchemy, and does not concern us. The documents with which I am to deal are theological tractates contained in the so-called Corpus Hermeticum. The Corpus, comprising about seventeen libelli,\(^2\) is contained in several MSS., none earlier

\(^1\) See Nock, Conversion, p. 79.
\(^2\) The numeration differs slightly in different MSS.
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than the fourteenth century. The editio princeps was published by Ficino in 1471 under the title Pimander. The title Ποιμάνδρης, however, belongs to the first libellus of the collection alone. In the MSS. the collection as a whole has no title. The name Corpus Hermeticum is used by modern editors. Scientific study of the Corpus made a fresh start with Reitzenstein (Poimandres, 1904), who did great service in investigating the relations of the Hermetica to the general religious history of the Graeco-Roman world. His work, however, though supported by immense learning, is at times suggestive rather than precise, and his combinations are not infrequently somewhat adventurous. We have now an edition of the Hermetica on a large scale by the late Walter Scott, who gives the text of the Corpus together with other Hermetic writings having a general affinity with it, accompanied by introduction and commentary. The introduction and commentary are scholarly and scientific, discussing the questions of chronology, sources, and literary relationship with sobriety, precision, and respect for the laws of evidence. Scott’s text, however, is difficult to work with. Recognizing, as any reader must recognize, that the MS. text is often corrupt, he came to the conclusion that it needed drastic emendation throughout. Many of his emendations are brilliant, and may well represent the original reading; but in countless places he has unnecessarily rewritten the text, treating the MSS. with a freedom which one can only describe as irresponsible. He gives a full apparatus criticus, from which the reader can always get at the MS. text, but in order to read it he has to make his way through a barbed-wire entanglement of sigla. It is easier to work with the admittedly bad text of Parthey (Berlin, 1854) which follows the MSS. in the main, though with too great respect for the readings of Patrizzi, who edited the Corpus in 1591. As for Hermetica not included in the Corpus, Scott’s edition is the only place where one can study
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them as a whole. In these studies, however, I shall not wander much outside the Corpus, which contains most of what is relevant for our present purpose.

Scott's discussion seems to me to have settled the date of the Hermetic Corpus within broad limits. The writings composing it were produced in Egypt mainly during the second and third centuries A.D. All are, in any case, quite certainly later than 100 B.C. It is not impossible that some of them may fall within the first century A.D., but except in one or two cases it is improbable. On the other hand, none are likely to be later than about A.D. 300. Reitzenstein agrees in placing the writings within the first three centuries, but inclines to date them in the first and second centuries rather than the second and third.

To Reitzenstein and Scott this book is immeasurably indebted. I shall have occasion from time to time to differ from some of their judgments, but my work rests upon theirs, and I frequently assume without further discussion the assured results of their investigations.

The Hermetic writers expound a philosophy, but they are really interested less in speculative philosophy than in religion; and it is a religion of a singularly pure and elevated kind. They believe intensely in God, the one God, who alone is good and wise; who demands from men no sacrifices except the λογικὴ θυσία of praise and thanksgiving, and no service but the practice of virtue. In their exposition of this ethical monotheism they frequently recall the teachings of Judaism and Christianity. It is conceivable that such a religion could have developed from the teachings of Plato (to whom most of these writers look back) without extraneous influence. But in point of fact it is clear that the Hermetic doctrines are eclectic or syncretistic in character, drawing upon the traditions of various religions. Christian influence, indeed, Reitzenstein holds to be non-existent, and Scott scarcely differs, allowing only some slight influence on two or
three tractates. It is in any case practically negligible. On the other hand, some measure of Jewish influence is acknowledged by both writers, and by all who have studied the *Hermetica*. My special object is to study the relation between the *Hermetica* and Hellenistic Judaism, using the Septuagint as a standard. Here some words of Reitzenstein are apposite: "It is hardly to be avoided that according to inclination and the direction his studies have taken, one writer claims too much as Egyptian, another too much as Babylonian, a third all as Persian, and that the individual worker contracts a kind of colour-blindness, which makes him insensitive to important distinctions. Only the combined work of many can bring us nearer the goal of an understanding of Hellenistic mysticism." Reitzenstein himself is disposed to emphasize Egyptian and (especially in his later works) Iranian influence. Scott lays the stress upon the Greek element, without denying other influences. If I have here concentrated on the Jewish affinities of some *Hermetica*, it is in the hope that by doing justice to this particular element these studies may contribute something to that "combined work of many" which Reitzenstein desiderated as the only way to the goal.

1 The following studies will lend support to this opinion, since they tend to show that features of the *Hermetica* in which Christian influence might be suspected, can be accounted for by reference to Hellenistic-Jewish ideas which lie behind both the *Hermetica* and the New Testament.
PART I

THE RELIGIOUS VOCABULARY OF HELLENISTIC JUDAISM
CHAPTER I

THE NAMES OF GOD

The personal name of the God of Israel, ֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֆ
of the Scriptures strengthened the growing conviction in Hellenism that the supreme God should have no name. Christian apologists laid much stress on the point.\textsuperscript{1} By merely eliminating the name of God the LXX contributed to the definition of monotheism.

In \textit{Exod. iii. 14} an etymological interpretation of the name הוא is suggested:

This is rendered in the LXX: \textit{\textgreek{\textepsilon\textgamma\textomega\varepsilon\imath\mu}} \textit{\delta \omicron \nu} . . . \textit{\omicron \upsilon\tau\omicron\omicron\omicron\varepsilon \tau\omicron\omicron\omega\omicron\omicron\upsilon\omicron\omicron\upsilon \textalpha\textomicron\textiota\textnu\textomicron\lambda\textomicron\nu\textalpha\textlambda\nu\textomicron\lambda\nu\textomicron\upsilon\omicron\omicron\nu}.\textsuperscript{2}

The meaning of this is that God has no individual name: He is simply "the Self-existent." Hellenistic Judaism was thus provided with a designation for the Deity of profoundly philosophical import. In Philo the form \textit{\delta \omicron \nu} alternates with the neuter \textit{\tau\omicron \omicron}. Thus while keeping close to Biblical language he was able to suggest the identity of the God of personal religion with the Absolute of philosophy. In \textit{Rev. i. 4} the designation is expanded into the form \textit{\delta \omicron \nu \kappa\acute{\alpha} \iota \delta \omicron \omicron \iota \kappa\acute{\alpha} \iota \delta \epsilon\textrho\chi\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\nu\omicron\nu\omicron\nu}, for which Greek parallels can be cited.\textsuperscript{3}

The Hebrew language has two words expressing the idea of divinity, which may or may not be etymologically connected: ק\textsuperscript{10}, plural א\textsuperscript{10}, and ב\textsuperscript{10}, plural א\textsuperscript{10}. The latter plural form is frequently construed as a singular

\textsuperscript{1} See Justin, Minucius Felix, and Clement of Alexandria, quoted by Scott in his note on \textit{Asclepius}, l.c., and cf. a prayer from the Leiden magical papyrus quoted by Reitzenstein, \textit{Piom.}, p. 15.

\textsuperscript{2} Norden, \textit{Agnostos Theos}, pp. 177–223, has discussed at length the formula \textit{\textgreek{\textepsilon\textgamma\textomega\varepsilon\imath\mu}}, showing that Jewish influence had much to do with its extremely frequent use in Hellenistic religious language, and that Jewish usage itself is of a piece with Babylonian, Egyptian, and Oriental usage in general.

\textsuperscript{3} Aquila and Theodotion render the Hebrew more literally, ἵσσομαι \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron αι, ἵσσομαι.
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(the so-called \textit{pluralis majestatis}). The use of these terms is somewhat complicated by the fact that while the Old Testament Canon in its final form is the sacred literature of a monotheistic faith, it includes large remnants of other stages of Hebrew religion which stood at a greater or less remove from strict monotheism. The LXX translation often represents an attempt to obliterate traces of polytheism in the Hebrew text.

(i) The \textit{pluralis majestatis} \text{מַלְכִּים, מַלְיָה}, whatever may have been its earlier history, stood in monotheistic Judaism of the post-exilic period for the one God, transcendent and personal, who made heaven and earth, revealed Himself to the patriarchs, gave the Law, and spoke by the prophets. It is regularly represented by the Greek \text{θεὸς}, with or without the article.\footnote{Of the occurrences of the word \textit{θεὸς} in the LXX the overwhelming majority represent either \text{יְהוָה} or \text{יְהוָה} with the vowel-points of \text{יְהוָה}. Where it represents \text{יְהוָה} with the vocalization of \text{יְהוָה}, we may fairly assume that a different \textit{Qere} prevailed in Egypt in the third to first centuries B.C. from that which was ultimately adopted in the M.T. \text{θεὸς} is, besides, used fairly often for \text{יְהוָה}, \text{יְהוָה}, (see below). It is also used sometimes to paraphrase various titles or epithets of God such as \text{יְהוָה}, \text{יְהוָה}, \text{יְהוָה}, but these are not really cases of translation.} The original and etymological meaning of \textit{θεὸς} is as obscure as that of \text{יְהוָה}. In its ordinary Greek use it is not an exact equivalent for \text{יְהוָה} in its developed sense. It is a generic term for a personal being superior to man, and as such takes a plural \text{θεοί}. But there was also an equally well-established usage, which is at least as old as Homer: e.g. \textit{Od.} XIV. 444, \textit{θεὸς} δὲ τὸ μὲν δῶσει τὸ δ᾽ εἴσει; \textit{Il.} XVII. 327, ὑπὲρ \textit{θεόν}. Cf. the common phrase \textit{σὺν θεόν}. In such cases \textit{θεὸς} is clearly not "a god", as distinct from other gods. Some vague idea of a unity of divine power seems to underlie such expressions. It is upon this ancient usage of \textit{θεὸς} for a vaguely conceived "supernatural" that the growing monotheistic or quasi-monotheistic use of \textit{θεὸς} and \text{i} \textit{θεοῖ} in Hellenistic Greek rests. For while
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"δ θεός may mean in a given context the particular god who is in mind at the moment, Zeus, or Apollo, or Sarapis, yet elsewhere it often implies no singling out of one individual god among many, but simply an appeal to the divine as such. Θεοῦ θέλοντος is nothing different from τῶν θεῶν θελόντων. The philosophers, and poets influenced by them, had much to do with turning this vague sense of a divine Somewhat within or beyond the gods of popular worship, into a real belief in one supreme divine Being. When Plato identified δ θεός with the ἴδεα τοῦ ἄγαθον, he took a step which was directed towards a monotheism not altogether unlike that of Judaism. In the Hermetic writings, largely influenced by Platonism, θεός is frequently used in a genuinely monotheistic sense, and δ θεός is distinguished from οἱ (λεγόμενοι) θεοί. At the same time this deepening or elevation of the connotation of θεός was accompanied in Greek thought by a weakening or loss of the sense of personality in the divine. Plato's God is perhaps personal only in metaphor. Again, when Sophocles says of the eternal laws

μέγας ἐν τούτοις θεός οὐδὲ γηράσκει,

whether we render "God is great in them", or "in them is great divinity", it is clear that the poet is speaking of an immanent and impersonal "God". For the Stoics the only God is the rational Principle (λόγος) immanent in the universe, which is at the same time Fate (εἰμαρμένη). More popularly, θεός is identified with τύχη: already in Plato's Laws (e.g. 757 e) we have θεός καὶ ἄγαθή τύχη. On the other hand, the anarchic individualism of Hellenistic Aufklärung is expressed in Menander's

βρότοις ἀπασών η ἱσυνεῖδησις θεός."
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Thus the tendency towards monotheism was accompanied by a view of the divine as immanent and impersonal which is foreign to the connotation of מֶלֶךְ in Judaism. Where a man sought a personal object of worship, he still turned to the multitude of gods, or satisfied the craving for divine unity by selecting out of the multitude a patron god to whose service he devoted himself, and who became for him in a special sense ש תεός. Other gods might be regarded as His subordinates, or as differing manifestations of His invisible power and deity.

It follows that while θεός, φ θεός, is the natural and inevitable equivalent of מֶלֶךְ as understood in post-exilic Judaism, it is not an exact equivalent. While the Hebrew form is incapable of a plural, and asserts the unity of the divine Being by attributing to Him personality, and denying the divinity of all other beings, θεός either admits of a plural or else escapes plurality by avoiding the problem of personality. Thus the substitution of θεός for מֶלֶךְ necessarily involves some readjustment of thought. On the one hand, it might lead to a far-reaching depersonalizing of the God of the Old Testament. Philo has not escaped this tendency, for while his writings give evidence of a personal piety which was true to his Jewish heritage, in very many passages θεός is used interchangeably with neuter expressions like τὸ ὄν, τὸ ἄντως ὄν. On the other hand, it might enrich the bald and abstract monotheism of Hellenistic philosophy with the personal religion of the Old Testament. We have an example of this in Paul, who frequently uses expressions about God closely similar to those of Hellenistic philosophy,¹ and yet leaves his reader in no doubt that he thinks of God always in vividly personal terms. In any case it is clear that to read the Old Testament with θεός in place of מֶלֶךְ both raises

¹ E.g. Rom. i. 19-20, xi. 36; 1 Cor. xii. 6; Eph. iv. 6. See Norden, Agnostos Theos, pp. 240-54.
problems and suggests fresh combinations of thought which were dormant for those who read it in Hebrew.

(ii) The word בּ, whatever its original relation to בּ, was in our period its synonym, and it is frequently rendered θεός. Some of the translators, however, have attempted to reproduce what they believed to be its specific meaning. Thus in Job frequently, and occasionally in other books, it is rendered ῥυρος, "the Mighty One". The translators evidently identified the word בּ, "God", with the word found in such expressions as γὰρ καὶ λόγῳ ἡ χεῖρ μου κακοποιήσαι σε; Deut. xxviii. 32, ἀνάμεσα ἐν τῇ ἀνθρώπου καὶ τῇ χείρ σου. Cf. Neh. v. 5 (2 Esd. xv. 5), ἐναὶ ἐστὶν δύναμις χείρος ἡμῶν. Thus the translators took בּ to describe God in His attribute of power.

Along with בּ and בּ we must consider the divine title נִוח. The term נִוח, as applied to men, means "lord", "master", "owner", "ruler", and is often

---

1 Num. xxiv. 4 (υ. 3θος, θεός ῥυρος); 2 Kms. xxii. 31, 32, 33, 48 (υ. 3θηλος), xxiii. 5; Neh. i. 5, ix. 31, 32; Ps. vii. 12, xii. 3 (βεθατ). In Is. ix. 6 the epithets have become somewhat confused in translation: בּ is not represented in B: Α render it by ῥυρος ἐξουσιαστής; but ος has θεός ῥυρος ἐξουσιαστής. Aquila and Symmachus both give ῥυρος δυνατός. Cf. the Christian liturgical phrase ἄγιος ῥυρος.

2 Whether ב, "God", and ב, "strength", are etymologically identical must be left to Semitic philologists to decide. But the use of the word ב for (a) "power" in general; (b) the "numinous" quality of mountains (Ps. xxxv. (xxxvi.) 7), stars (Is. xiv. 13), and great trees (Ps. lxxix. (lxxx.) 11); and (c) a divine being, could readily be accounted for if the word originally denoted the primitive idea for which anthropologists use the term "mana".
used as a respectful mode of address. Its nearest equivalents in Greek are δεσπότης and κύριος. In the plurals mood of address. Its nearest equivalents in Greek are δεσπότης and κύριος. In the pluralis majestatis ὁ ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ it is frequently used of God, and the vocalization of [God's name] in the M.T. shows that it was commonly read for the divine name. The LXX follows this usage.

The natural correlative of ὁ ἡ ὁ is ὁ ἡ, "slave", and the very frequent use of the verb ἔχει of the Israelites' relation to Jehovah fits the conception of Him as their "Lord". Thus we should expect to find in Greek a similar use of δουλος, δουλεύειν and their correlatives. The LXX translators do indeed render ὁ ἡ in the religious sense by δουλος, and ὁ ἡ by δουλεύειν, but they frequently give παῖς instead of δουλος, and they show a definite preference for λατρεύειν and λειτουργεῖν in translating the verb. Here they are in accord with normal Greek usage. Δουλος, δουλεύειν, are not used in a religious sense outside the Greek Bible. On the other hand, ἡ τοῦ is almost always either δεσπότης or κύριος, both of which are correlatives of δουλος.

ὁ ἡ is translated nine times δεσπότης. The word has in Greek the sense of "master", "owner", and is used as a title for kings and tyrants, and also for the gods, e.g. Euripides, Ἡρρ. 88, θεοὺς γὰρ δεσπότας καλεῖν χρεῶν: Xenophon, Ἀναβ. III. ii. 13, οὐδένα γὰρ ἄνθρωπων δεσπότην ἄλλα τοὺς θεοὺς προσκυνεῖτε. As a rendering of ὁ ἡ, therefore, it is entirely fitting and in harmony with Greek religious usage.

But in the overwhelming majority of cases ὁ ἡ is rendered κύριος. As an adjective κύριος means "having authority", and so of laws, contracts, and the like, "valid", of persons "authoritative", "supreme"; but generally with a genitive or some dependent clause indicating the scope of the authority. As a substantive κύριος means "a person in supreme authority", the head
of a house, the master of slaves, the legal guardian of a woman. In the Hellenistic period it is applied to the absolute monarchs who, though Greeks, ruled over Oriental kingdoms. Egypt was the household of the reigning Ptolemy, the Egyptians his slaves, and he their κύριος, their sovereign lord. The title κύριος, however, as applied to kings, appears in close connection with the Oriental, and especially Egyptian, deification of the reigning monarch, and it is a question whether we are to give priority to the political or to the religious use of κύριος. The latter does not appear to be Greek in origin. It is true that the term κύριος is occasionally applied to gods in classical Greek, e.g. Pindar, *Isthm.* 5 (4), 53, Ἴδες ὁ πάντων κύριος. But this is distinct from the use of the noun as a divine title, which appears first in Hellenistic Greek, and in the East. Papyri and inscriptions give numerous examples of this use, principally as applied to Egyptian deities, and it appears to have spread from the Hellenistic kingdoms of the Ptolemies and Seleucids westwards. It is noteworthy that it seems to be most frequent and characteristic in relation to Isis (κυρία) and Sarapis, i.e. to deities who were not merely the official deities of this or that city, but gathered in various places throughout the world groups of worshippers who felt themselves to be in a peculiar personal relation with the deity. It may be that Jews in the Hellenistic world felt themselves to be in an analogous relation to their own God, bound to Him by "covenant", and therefore adopted the current term κύριος to translate Ἰαχ.

We may put the matter thus: the use of Ἰαχ as a divine title corresponds to a Semitic conception of the relation of the worshipper to the deity (cf. the Phœnician Adonis, a title of Tammuz). A somewhat similar use of

---

1 See examples cited by M.M. s.v.
2 For the nature of these and similar cults, see Nock, *Conversion*, Chs. IV., VII., VIII.
κύριος grew up in the Greek East, which was not Greek in origin, but probably arose under Semitic or Egyptian influence. Thus the LXX translators found a translation ready to their hand, κύριος, meaning “sovereign lord”. But it must be observed that the absolute use of κύριος in the LXX differs essentially from such uses as κύριος Σαράπις, or κύριος βασιλεύς θεός used of a reigning king. In the one case the title is added to the name, and the name distinguishes its bearer from numerous other gods and men who may bear, or may have borne, the title. Thus there are (as Paul observed) κύριοι πολλοί (I Cor. viii. 5). In the other case the title is substituted for the name, and the implication is that the Bearer is “sovereign” in the absolute sense. There is no exact parallel to this in earlier or contemporary Greek. The complete disappearance of any personal name for God from the Greek Bible, and the substitution of the title κύριος, amounted in itself to a manifesto of monotheism.

The word הָיְאִ is sometimes found as an element in compound divine titles. Of these the most important are הָיְאִ and הָיְאִי.

(i) The divine title הָיְאִ is not peculiar to Hebrew. It is attested by Philo of Byblos (in the form 'Ελιων) as the name of a Phoenician deity, and rendered υψιστός. It is likely enough that הָיְאִ of Jerusalem (Gen. xiv. 18) was originally a Canaanite god, identified with Jehovah after the Hebrew conquest. The meaning of the word is

1 For κύριος as a divine title in the Hermetica, see pp. 128, 239.
2 Ap. Eusebius, Praep. Evang. I. 10–14. The name Al'iyán has recently been found in the Ras Shamra inscriptions. Bauer (Z.A.T.W. Neue Folge, Bd. x. 1933, p. 96) considers that this is the true original of the name given as 'Ελιων by Philo. It does not seem to correspond phonetically with הָיְאִי, but it must have been so understood in the time of Philo of Byblos.
"high". יְהֹיָ֑א is "the High God". The LXX translators render it υψιστός, θεὸς ὑψιστός. This is a natural rendering, the elative superlative representing the absolute sense of -יְהֹיָ֑א—" the High One " par excellence. But the Greek form taken as a true superlative expresses the idea of "highest" in a series. Thus used, it may signify either God as the Supreme Being, the highest of all beings, in a truly monotheistic sense, or "the highest of the gods". In Greek literature it early appears as an epithet of Zeus, the chief of the Olympian pantheon; e.g. Αἰσχyllus, Eum. 27–8:

Πλευστὸν τε πηγὰς καὶ Ποσειδῶνος κράτος
καλοῦσα, καὶ τέλειον υψιστὸν Δία

(as the climax of a long list of deities). There was a temple of Zeus υψιστός at Thebes, and in the Boeotian Pindar the epithet is a standing one. Ramsay gives examples which show that in the Near East in the Hellenistic period the chief god of a city, whatever his native name, tended to bear the title Zeus υψιστός or θεὸς υψιστός. Now the tendency to exalt and worship a supreme God above all other gods is one of the ways in which Greek religious thought approached monotheism. In the Hellenistic world it met Jewish monotheism halfway. The Jews were conscious of this. Cf. Epistle of Aristeas, § 16, where the Jewish writer, speaking in the person of a pagan, says, τὸν γὰρ πάντων ἐπόπτην καὶ κτίστην θεὸν οὕτω (οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι) σέβονται, δὲ καὶ πάντες, ἡμεῖς δὲ βασιλεὺς προσονομάζομεν ἐτέρως, Ζήνα καὶ Δία. So Philo, writing an apology for the Jews addressed to a pagan public, speaks of Jerusalem as τὴν Ἰεροτόλοι καθ’ ἥν ἰδρυται δ’ τοῦ υψίστου θεοῦ νεὼς ἅγιος (In Flacc. § 46).

Among the very frequent occurrences of the title in inscriptions of the Hellenistic period it is often difficult to

1 Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia, I. p. 33. He cites inscriptions from Laodicea, Miletus, Aizanoi, Palmyra, Mylasa, Iasos, Laguna, Stratonicea, Oenoanda, Cyzicus.
know whether it is Jewish or pagan. O.G.I.S. 96, οἱ ἐν Ἑλλάδι ἑιλαὶτοι τὴν προσευχήν θεῶ γυνιστῆ, is clear enough. So, too, a sepulchral inscription at Rheneia,\(^1\) invoking τὸν θεὸν τὸν υψιστὸν, τὸν κύριον τῶν πνευμάτων καὶ πάσης σαρκὸς, contains also a reference to the Day of Atonement and the Semitic name Μαρθίνη. Jewish probably is an inscription from the Fayyum\(^2\) containing a dedication, θεῶ μεγάλῳ μεγάλῳ υψιστῷ, and so also, according to Ramsay, a sepulchral inscription of Akmonia\(^3\) which has the usual curse upon the violator of the tomb in the form ἔσται αὐτῷ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν τὸν υψιστὸν. Pagan clearly enough, on the other hand, is the prayer for vengeance cited by M.M. after Preisigke, θεῶ υψιστῷ καὶ πάντων ἐπόπτῃ καὶ Ἡλίῳ καὶ Νεμέσεαν. But a large number of inscriptions have no clear mark to indicate them as Jewish or pagan. Jew and pagan could unite in the worship of θεῶς υψιστῶς, though the former might mean by it “God Most High”, and the latter “the supreme Deity”.\(^4\) Syncretistic sects actually arose in the name of θεῶς υψιστῶς.\(^5\)

(ii) The title רָעָשׁ, רַעַשְׁלָן, occurs chiefly in the priestly document of the Pentateuch and kindred late literature, but it is believed to be an archaism, a survival from

---

1 Cited by Wendland, Die Hellenistisch-römische Kultur, p. 194.
2 Cited by M.M. s.v. υψιστός, and by Deissmann, Licht vom Osten (1923), p. 229.
3 Cited by Ramsay, Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia, II. p. 652.
4 Cf. Aristeas cited above. The expression occurs also Es. D. 2 (xiv. 5), τὸν πάντων ἐπόπτῃν θεὸν; 3 Macc. ii. 21, ὁ πάντων ἐπόπτης θεὸς; cf. also 2 Macc. iii. 39, vii. 35. The word is not however used in the LXX where there is a Hebrew original. Symmachus renders Ps. xxxii. (xxxiii.) 13, ἡ οὐραίον ἐποπτεύων κύριος ὁ ρά (LXX, ἡ οὐραίον ἐπέβλεψεν ὁ κύριος, εἶδε).
5 In Mk. v. 7, Ac. xvi. 17, the references to θεῶς υψιστῶς are staged in a pagan environment. The use of υψιστῶς for Jehovah is confined in the N.T. to the Lucan writings (unless we except the citation of Genesis in Heb. vii. 1).
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an earlier stage of religion. This is, in fact, implied in Exod. vi. 3, where God says to Moses, “I appeared to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, but as to My Name יְהֹוָה, I was not made known to them”. Like מֹשֶׁה may have been originally a deity distinct from Jehovah.

The word יהוה was evidently something of a puzzle to the translators. There is no constant equivalent in the LXX. In Num. xxiv. 4, 16, Is. xiii. 6, the translators have been content with the colourless θεός. In Exod. x. 5 it is transliterated σαδδατ, as sometimes in the later versions. In Job the usual LXX rendering of יהוה is κύριος, of κύριον, κύριος παντοκράτωρ. In Job viii. 2 we find δὲ πάντα ποιήσας, in Ps. lxvii. 15, δὲ ἐποιήσατο, in Ps. xc. 1, δὲ θεὸς τοῦ ὄψανον. It is probable that in such renderings an appropriate and well-understood expression is substituted for the obscure archaic term, no longer understood, though it is possible that etymological theories lie behind some of them. It is certain that etymological theories lie behind two other renderings.

(1) In the Pentateuch יהוה is translated θεὸς μου, σου, αὐτῶν. Thus in the locus classicus, Exod. vi. 3, the LXX reads ὦφθην πρὸς Ἄβρααμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακώβ, θεὸς ὦν αὐτῶν. Apparently the translators took יהוה to be the relative pronoun יהוה, and as to mean “of me”, on the analogy of Aramaic (יְהֹוָה), so that יהוה would mean “the God who is mine”. As an attempt at

1 Thus it is possible that κύριος was suggested by a derivation from the root יהוה which may have meant “rule” (whence יהוה, which in biblical Hebrew is a “demon”); and παντοκράτωρ may imply a derivation from the root יהוה, which however connotes violence rather than strength (see B.D.B. s.v. יהוה). The explanation of the word which seems to find most acceptance among Semitic philologists is that which connects it with the Babylonian šadu, “mountain”, applied to deities.

2 Alternatively it is possible that יהוה was pointed as יהוה = “my ruler”; but in that case we should have expected κύριος μου.
scientific etymology it is idle, but it gives a good sense to יְשַׁנֶּה, which is thus made to express a special personal relation of God to the individual.

(2) In Ruth i. 20, i. 21 (B); Job xxi. 15, xxi. 2, xxxix. 32; Ezek. i. 24 (A), יְשַׁנֶּה is rendered יְסַפּוּס. This follows from the accepted rabbinic etymology, according to which יְשַׁנֶּה = יְשַׁנֶּה, or יְשַׁנֶּה, “He who suffices”. It is the regular rendering in the later versions of Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion.

It is probable that this rendering, or at least the etymology on which it rests, was known to Paul. In 2 Cor. iii. 5–6 he plays upon the words יְסַפּוּס, יְסַפּוּס, יְסַפּוּס:—וְעַ֖יִן אֲפֵ֗ן יְסַפּוּס יְסַפּוּס יְסַפּוּס שָׁמַ֣דֶּנֶּה לְגֶ֔שֶׁה שְׁמִ֖אֶה, אֲלֵ֖לָה יְסַפּוּס יְסַפּוּs 1 and read Exod. vi. 3 in that sense.

1 The LXX of Job was known to Philo, and therefore existed in Paul’s time, though he does not appear to use it. (In Rom. xi. 35 he appears to allude to Job xli. 11 (Heb., represented by xli. 2, LXX). But see Job xxxv. 31-34 (xl. 1-4 Heb.). In 32 Ἰκανός occurs, and in 34, ἐν ἑαυτῷ κρίνωναι; cf. Rom. iii. 7, ἐν καὶ ὃς ἀμαρτωλὰς κρίνοναι; and in 1 Cor. iii. 19 to Job v. 13, but in neither case does he quote the LXX.) Neither Paul nor Philo seems to cite Ruth or Ezekiel, but it is probable that the LXX of these books was in existence by the first century. No doubt it might be possible in one or two cases to suspect that the reading Ἰκανός crept into our text from another version, but it is not likely to have done so in all cases. We have therefore evidence for Ἰκανός = יְשַׁנֶּה in the first century.
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If so, then the "old covenant" was for Paul a covenant with God as "the All-Sufficient," and His "sufficiency" is likewise the ground of the "new covenant." It is further possible that the apostle, with his rabbinic methods, connected this passage with another passage. The covenant with Abraham entailed upon him and his posterity a κληρονομία (cf. Gal. 1.c.). Now Job xxxi. 2, LXX, reads—

καὶ ἐτι ἐμέρισεν ὁ θεὸς ἄνωθεν.
καὶ κληρονομίᾳ Ἰκανοῦ ἐξ υἱόστων.

Cf. Col. i. 12, εὐχαριστοῦντες τῷ πατρὶ τῷ ἰκανώσαντι υμᾶς εἰς τὴν μερίδα τῶν ἁγίων ἐν τῷ φωτὶ.

Thus a false etymology of an archaic divine name has provided Hellenistic Judaism, and through it Christianity, with a word which expresses a fine conception of the character of God in His relations with men.

5

A frequent title of Jehovah in the Old Testament is לוחה צבאות, also לוחה צבאות. The word צבאות means a "warlike host," "army" (from the root צב, expressing the idea of waging war). The title would seem to have originally denoted Jehovah as a war-god, the leader of the armies of Israel. Later it was taken to indicate His superiority over "the host of heaven" צבאות תבל הسفر, i.e. over all superhuman beings.

צבאות, in its proper meaning of "army," is commonly rendered in the LXX either στρατιά or δύναμις. As part of a divine title it is never rendered στρατιά. The intention was no doubt to avoid an expression which inevitably suggested the idea of a war-god. The expressions νῦν צבאות צבאות are rendered in three ways.

(i) Throughout Isaiah, and occasionally elsewhere, is given as κύριος Σαβαωθ. This seems to
represent the Massoretic pointing, in which יְהֹוָה has the vowels of אֲנִיָּן (not the construct アニヤ), as though the two substantives were in apposition. It is no doubt responsible for the treatment of סָב֑אָוֹת as a proper name, which we find in Gnostic writings and in magical papyri. The other two renderings presuppose the form אֱלֹהִים עַבְדָּוָה, parallel with אֱלֹהִים עַבְדָּוָה.

(ii) In 1-4 Kms., Psalms, Amos, Zech., Jerem., we have κύριος τῶν δύναμεων. Δυνάμεις, as we have seen, might mean "armies"; but since the translators seem to have pointedly avoided the rendering στρατιῶν, which would have been unequivocal, we may suspect that they wished to suggest some other of the possible meanings of δύναμις. It is a word of wide connotation. It may be a "property", "function", "attribute"; it may be "force", "power" in the abstract; an elementary "force" such as heat or cold; it may be applied to gods, as "agencies" in nature in a somewhat similar sense (see L. & S.). Thus δύναμις may be used of an individual divine being: cf. a Lydian inscription cited by M.M. s.v., where the god Μήν is described as μεγάλη δύναμις τοῦ ἄθανάτου θεοῦ. We recognize here the monotheistic tendency to represent the gods of polytheism as aspects or agencies of the one supreme Being. Cf. also the Paris magical papyrus cited ibid. In the Hermetica the δυνάμεις are existences of the super-phenomenal order, to which quasi-personal activities are attributed. ¹

Now we can trace in Hellenistic Judaism a tendency to rationalize the angels of popular mythology in terms of δυνάμεις, as divine agencies. In Test. xii. Patr. we seem to mark a transition from the sense of δύναμις as a "host" of angels to its sense as a divine "agency". Thus in T. Levi, iii. 3 we read of αἱ δυνάμεις τῶν παρεμβολῶν, οἱ ταξιθέντες εἰς ἕμεραν κρίσεως, where the word is ambiguous.

¹ In Corp. I. 7 they are constituents of the realm of light which is the κόσμος νοοτός. Ibid. 26, they praise God in their own proper language. See pp. 109-11, 176.
But in *T. Jud. xxv. 2* αἱ δυνάμεις τῆς δόξης are mentioned in a list along with ὁ ἄγγελος τοῦ προσώπου, heaven and earth, the sun, the moon and the stars (φωστῆρες). It certainly seems more natural here to understand the δυνάμεις as individual divine agencies. It is surely as such that they appear in lists of the angelic orders, along with ἀρχαῖ, ἥγεσις, κυριότητες. Thus we recognize a tendency in Judaism parallel with the monotheistic tendency which we have noted in paganism, to represent subordinate supernatural beings (the "gods" of paganism, the "angels" of Judaism) as "powers" or "agencies" of the one God, and in this sense δυνάμεις. In Philo we find a highly developed doctrine of δυνάμεις. On the one side they are attributes or qualities of God, on the other side they are emanations of the divine, operative in the universe (= λόγοι). He identifies them alike with the Platonic ἰδέαι and with the angels of Scripture.¹

Just how far this development had proceeded by the time when the LXX translation was made, it is difficult to say. But there are certainly passages where the Greek reader would naturally understand ὑψιτάται, even though it translates θεοί, in the sense of celestial "powers". Thus, in *Ps. cii. (ciii.) 21,*

εὐλογεῖτε τὸν κύριον, πᾶσας αἱ δυνάμεις αὐτοῦ, λειτουργοί αὐτοῦ ποιοῦντες τὰ θελήματα αὐτοῦ,

the Greek reader would think of a number of beings, each of which is both a δύναμις and a λειτουργός. Again, in *Ps. cxlviii. 2–3,*

αἰνεῖτε αὐτὸν, πάντες οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ, αἰνεῖτε αὐτὸν, πᾶσας αἱ δυνάμεις αὐτοῦ. αἰνεῖτε αὐτὸν, ἡλιος καὶ σελήνη, αἰνεῖτε αὐτὸν, πάντα τὰ ἄστρα καὶ τὸ φῶς,

he would inevitably think of a δύναμις as an individual divine "agency", like an angel, or like the sun and the

¹ See Ch. VI. pp. 109–11.
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moon. Whether this ambiguity was intended by the translators or not, it inevitably exists the moment $\text{ςυνήμες}$ is replaced by $\text{δύναμες}$. We may fairly suspect that the translators were willing to meet half-way a growing usage in paganism, by which the gods were reduced to powers or agencies of the one God, and that in the expression $\text{kύριος τῶν δυνάμεων}$ they intended to suggest an idea similar to that expressed in the phrases $\text{kύριος κυρίων, θεός θεών}.$

(iii) In various places in 2 and 3 Kms., 1 Chron., Hosea, Amos, Micah, Nahum, Habak., Zeph., Zech., Mal., Jerem., ἅλωξα is rendered παντοκράτωρ, with a variant παντοκράτων in Zech. viii. 2, 6. The equivalence of παντοκράτων and παντοκράτωρ points to the true meaning of the latter word. Κρατεῖν is "to exercise κράτος, power or might ", and so "to rule, control ". Thus κοσμοκράτωρ means "one who has power of control over the world ". It is thus applied to "heaven", to Ζεύς Μίθρας "ἲλιος, to the planetary gods (especially in astrology—see L. & S.). Παντοκράτωρ is coined on the same model, and means the One who controls or rules all things, perhaps with κοσμοκράτωρ in mind: the one God rules and controls all other cosmic powers. As these powers are δυνάμεις, κύριος παντοκράτωρ may be regarded as a paraphrase (rather than a translation) of ἅλωξα θεός in the sense represented by κύριος τῶν δυνάμεων.

We have considered above the regular rendering of $\text{κύριος, κυρίων, θεός, θεῶν}$ by $\text{θεός}$. But there are places where

$^1$ Not "almighty", which implies simply the possession of might (παντοδύναμος). Κρατεῖν implied the exercise of power, cf. inscription of Delos cited in M.M. s.v. Δά τῶν πάντων κρατοῦντι.

other renderings have been preferred, and some of these are significant.

(i) We have occasionally reverential periphrases, sometimes designed to avoid objectionable anthropomorphisms, or the suggestion of materiality in God.

The periphrasis "heaven" for God, so common in later Judaism, is found twice. *Is.* xiv. 13 has ἐπάνω τῶν ἀστέρων τοῦ οὐρανοῦ for μετὰ τοῦ θεοῦ ἀλήθειαν, and *Job* xxii. 26 has ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἑλαρῶς for ἡ ἁλέων ἀλήθειά ἐστιν. Evidently this usage was only beginning to establish itself in the Septuagintal period.

Again we have occasionally the adjective θείος: πνεῦμα θείον for ἡ ἁλέων, *Exod.* xxxi. 3, xxxv. 31 (BabAF); *Job* xxvii. 3, xxxiii. 4; διάθήκη θεία for βαθμὸς ἀλήθειας, *Prov.* ii. 17. Somewhat similarly, the adjective ἅγιος is substituted: ἁγία ἁλέων, *Lev.* xviii. 21, becomes πνεῦμα τοῦ ἁγίου.

In *Exod.* xxi. 6 the injunction to bring the slave, ἄνθρωπον γενόμενον, is explained by the paraphrase, πρὸς τὸ κρίσιμον τοῦ θεοῦ, and in *Exod.* xviii. 15, βαθμὸς ἁλέων becomes ἐκ ζητήσεως κρίσιν παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ.

In *Zech.* xii. 8 the statement, "the house of David shall be γενόμενον ἁλέων", is softened down to ὡς οἰκὸς θεοῦ. Similarly, in *Exod.* xix. 3, where we are told that "Moses went up to God", μετὰ τὴν ἁλέων ἀλήθειαν, this becomes ἀνέβη ἐν τῷ δρόμῳ τοῦ θεοῦ. Again, in *Exod.* xxiv. 10, Moses and his companions "saw the God of Israel", ἀνέβη τῶν ἐφορῶν ἡ ἁλέων ἀλήθεια. This could hardly be expected to commend itself to the Judaism of our period. It is rendered εἰς τὸν τόπον καὶ εἰστήκει τὸν θεὸν τοῦ Ἰσραήλ. Philo cites this passage in support of his doctrine of the λόγος as τόπος: *De Somn.* i. 62–3: "The word τόπος is used in three senses: first, space (χώρα) filled with body; secondly, the divine Logos, which God Himself has filled
THE NAMES OF GOD

completely with incorporeal powers; for he says 'they saw the τόπος where the God of Israel stood', in which alone he permitted him to perform the priestly office, and nowhere else. . . . Thirdly, God Himself is called τόπος, because He encompasses all things and is encompassed by nothing at all, and because He is the place of refuge of all beings, and because He is His own space (χώρα), containing Himself, and moving within Himself alone." Cf. De Fug. 75 (commenting on Exod. xxii. 13, δόσω σοι τόπον ὁφευξεται ἐκεῖ ὁ φόνεύσας): "By τόπος he means not space (χώρα) filled with body, but, by way of suggestion, God Himself, because He encompasses and is not encompassed, and because He is a place of refuge for all beings". Thus the LXX translation of Exod. xxiv. 10 would seem to have had influence on the development of the later use of Ἰάωρος as a term for God.¹

(ii) On similar principles, where the being described as ἐνθρονεῖ, ἐνθροτεῖ, ἐνθροτέω, has actions attributed to him which the Judaism of our period could not accept as appropriate to the one God, these words are rendered by ἀγγελος.

The Greek word ἀγγελος means a "messenger", whether a human messenger or a subordinate god deputed by a superior god, like Iris and Hermes in Homer. This use of ἀγγελος for a divine being might be without special significance, but for two facts: (a) The cognate word Angirah is used in the Vedic literature for "higher beings intermediate between gods and men"; (b) in later Greek ἀγγελος crops up sporadically as the title of a supernatural being (where the idea of a "messenger" is at any rate not prominent).² Thus according to Hesychius Artemis was called ἀγγελος at Syracuse. An inscription from Assuan of the time of M. Aurelius begins Μεγάλη τίχη τοῦ θεοῦ . . . τῶν ἀγγέλων τῆς ίερειας. Similarly,

¹ For this, see Strack-Billerbeck, Kommentar zum N.T. aus Talmud und Midrash, Vol. II. pp. 309-10.
² See M.M. s.v.
in the Hermetic tractate *Isis to Horus*, ap. Stobaeus, *Ecl.* I. 49, 45 (= Scott, *Exc. Stob.* xxiv. 6), ἀγγέλοι καὶ δαίμονες bring down ψυχάι βασιλικαί from God, whose ἀπόρροια they are. There seems no reason to suspect Jewish influence on this tractate. Thus there would seem to have been a Hellenistic use of ἀγγέλος which specially fitted it to be the equivalent of the Hebrew מֵלךְ, which also means “messenger”, and is used of intermediaries of Jehovah in His dealings with man and the world.

Once adopted into the religious vocabulary of Hellenistic Judaism, ἀγγέλος provided a useful paraphrase for לֶבֶן, אֲלֵחֶם, אֲנָוָא, where there was an objection to rendering them by θεός. There was Hebrew precedent for this. In *Hosea* xii. 4, the אֲלֵחֶם with whom Jacob successfully wrestled according to *Gen.* xxxii. 29–30 is called מֵלךְ, LXX ἀγγέλος. Thus in *Job* xx. 15, ἀνὰ νὰ shall cast them out of his belly” becomes εἴς οἰκίας αὐτοῦ ἔλκυσει αὐτὸν ἀγγέλος. In particular the term ἀγγέλος offered to the translators a suitable means of dealing with the polytheistic plural ἄλλων ἄλλων, where the beings so denominated are brought within the scope of the religion of Jehovah. Thus *Ps.* cxxxvii. (cxxxviii.) 1:

Josephus ἀνήρ ἀγγέλων ψαλώ σοι. *Ps.* xcvi. (xcvii.) 7: ἁγγέλων τῶν ἄνευ χρώματος αὐτῶν ἐπονομάζων. *Ps.* viii. 6: ἢλάττωσας αὐτὸν βραχὺ τι παρ' ἀγγέλων. Similarly, ברי אליים, meaning according to established Hebrew idiom “divine beings”, is translated ἀγγέλοι, *Gen.* vi. 2; *Deut.* xxxii. 8;¹ *Job* i. 6, ii. 1; and ἡμεῖς τῶν ἀγγέλων, ἔχουσιν ἀνήρ ἄλλων.

¹ M.T. reads לְפָרְרְךָ מִבְּרֵשָׁתֵךְ, for which the translators must have read לְפָרְרְךָ מִבְּרֵשָׁתִי, which is probably right. They render κατὰ δριθμὸν ἀγγέλων θεοῦ, introducing the idea of angelic rulers of the nations, which is found in *Daniel.*
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Dan. iii. 92 (25) is translated in the LXX ὁμοίωμα ἀγγέλου θεοῦ (Theod. ὁμοία νῦν θεοῦ).

(iii) There are many cases in which the words הָלְיוּ, נָחָלְיוּ, נָאָלְיוּ denote beings who are not only incapable of being identified with Jehovah, but cannot be brought within the scope of a monotheistic religion as His "angels"; i.e. they denote the false gods of the nations. In such cases, (a) the translators sometimes allow the word θεός to stand in what was after all its ordinary Greek sense, "a god";¹ the context usually guards sufficiently against any misunderstanding; (b) sometimes they use some such non-committal expression as ἀρχων (Ezek. xxxi. 11), πάτραρχος (Is. xxxvii. 38); (c) sometimes they conscientiously substitute εἰδωλον, γνωτίζω, βδέλυγμα, expressing the judgment of the strict monotheist on pagan religion. This may be compared with the practice attested by the M.T. of substituting the opprobrious word נָבֶשֶׁב for the divine title לְבָנָה, e.g. Hos. ix. 10; Jer. iii. 24, xi. 13. In the first two of these passages the LXX gives αἰσχύνη, in the third βαάλ. On the other hand, in 3 Kms. xviii. 19, 25, the LXX has αἰσχύνη, where the M.T. has retained לְבָנָה. Thus the LXX does not represent the same stage in the process as the M.T. But it is to be observed that the LXX regularly treats βαάλ as feminine, the gender of נָבֶשֶׁב, αἰσχύνη. This gives evidence of a Q're which has not survived in the M.T. We may also compare Dan. xii. 11, where שֶׁמֶנ שֶׁמֶנ, τῷ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἔρημώσεως, is clearly an opprobrious parody of לְבָנָה, Zeus Oυράνιος.²

In many of the passages cited the LXX has the character of a sort of monotheistic Targum on the Hebrew

¹ As they also occasionally use θεός to translate terms specifically denoting pagan deities, מָלָי, מָלָי.
² So Moore, Judaism, I. p. 367.
text, rather than a strict translation. It laid before the Greek-speaking public a body of religious teaching from which practically every concession to polytheism had been eliminated, and presented the Jewish religion as a monotheistic faith in a sense which was not true of any other religion of the Hellenistic world.
CHAPTER II

THE LAW

The most significant and characteristic term in the vocabulary of the Jewish religion as it was reconstituted after the Exile is הָנַח, which our versions render "law". This English rendering goes back through the Latin lex to the Greek νόμος, which is in the LXX the normal rendering of הָנַח.

Νόμος, however, is by no means an exact equivalent for הָנַח, and its substitution for the Hebrew term affords an illustration of a change in the ideas associated with the term—a difference in men's notion of what religion is. For developed Judaism there is no term which more adequately expresses the essence of religion than הָנַח. No Greek would have chosen νόμος to express what he meant by religion. Yet as the translation of הָנַח, νόμος occupied for Hellenistic Judaism the same regulative position among religious ideas as הָנַח did for Hebrew-speaking Jews.

Νόμος is fundamentally "custom", hardening into what we call "law". It does not necessarily imply any legislative authority. It is rather an immanent or underlying principle of life and action. Νόμος πάντων βασιλεύς, said Pindar: ¹ Custom is itself the sovereign power, meaning simply the established usage of civilized society. In a more exalted strain Sophocles ² speaks of νόμοι ύψιποδες οὐρανίων δι' αἰθέρα τεκνωθέντες, διν ὁ Ὀλυμπός
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πατήρ μόνος, "laws loftily marching, engendered in the celestial height, whose father is heaven alone". In spite of the reference to Olympus, these laws are surely for the poet rather the customs of the universe, so to speak, than a positive code revealed by a deity. They are the eternal principles of right and wrong as immanent in the universe. Philosphic form was given to this conception by the Stoics (who knew no God beyond the Λόγος immanent in the universe). Chrysippus 1 said, "The end is to live in accordance with nature, that is, according to one's own nature and that of the universe, doing nothing which is forbidden by the common law, which is the right principle running through all things" (τέλος γίνεται τὸ ἀκολούθως τῇ φύσει ζήν, ὅπερ ἐστὶ κατὰ τὴν ἐαυτοῦ καὶ κατὰ τὴν τῶν ὀλων, οὐδὲν ἐνεργοῦντας δὲν ἀπογορευένει εἰώθει ὁ νόμος ὁ κοινός, ὅπερ ἔστω ὁ ὀρθὸς λόγος διὰ πάντων ἐρχόμενοι).

Alongside of this development went another development by which νόμος came to mean "law", in the proper sense, i.e. either a single statutory enactment or the legal corpus of a given community, whether produced by the codification of existing custom, or laid down by a lawgiver, or enacted by a constitutional authority. This was the ordinary meaning of the term νόμος as current among Greek-speaking people throughout the world in the period with which we are dealing. It is defined in the pseudo-Demosthenic Contra Aristogitonem, 774, as follows: πᾶς ἐστι νόμος εὑρήμα μὲν καὶ δῶρον θεῶν, δόγμα δ' ἀνθρώπων φρονίμων, ἐπανόρθωσις δὲ πλημμελημάτων τῶν εἰς ἄμφοτερα, πόλεως δὲ συνθήκη κοινῆ, καθ' ἣν πᾶσι προσήκει ζήν τοῖς ἐν τῇ πόλει: "Every law is the invention and gift of the gods, the judgment of wise men, the correction of transgressions, and the common covenant of a state, in accordance with which all members of the state ought to live ".

For "law" in this sense Hebrew had its own proper terms. Thus the legal code of Deuteronomy is described in
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the familiar recurrent phrase "the commandment(s), the statutes, and the judgments", for which the LXX gives αἱ ἐντολαὶ καὶ τὰ δικαίωματα καὶ τὰ κρίματα. It will be well first to examine these terms.

1. ἁγγέλω is an edict or decree issued by a person possessing authority, such as a king. Its natural and usual equivalent in Greek is ἐντολὴ (occasionally ἐνταλμα), and of the scores of occurrences of this word in the LXX nearly all translate ἁγγέλω, except in the Psalms, where it frequently renders ἔφη, a synonym for ἀνέφη, found only in the Psalter. Another word for ἁγγέλω is πρόσταγμα, which occurs a dozen times or so, and there are odd passages where other readings are given, such as ῥήμα, λόγος, δικαίωμα. The sense which ἁγγέλω conveyed to the translators is therefore clear, and their renderings are true equivalents.

2. πάντα or πάντες is derived from πᾶν = to cut, because, it is said, statutes were engraved on tablets of stone or metal. The LXX translators as represented by A seem to have attempted an etymological rendering in a few places, giving ἀκριβασμὸς or διακρίβεια, as though they thought of a πάντα as something "cut fine", "clear-cut", "pre-cise", cf. also the rendering ὀριον in Job xxxviii. 10. But their ordinary renderings are δικαίωμα and πρόσταγμα. Both are frequent, but as πρόσταγμα also renders ἁγγέλω fairly often, δικαίωμα, which in the majority of its occurrences represents πάντα or πάντες, may be regarded as the characteristic rendering. Δικαίωμα belongs to a large class of substantives in -μα, which denote the concrete result of an action, while the corresponding substantives in -ος denote the action itself. But abstract and concrete are frequently interchanged or confused in usage. The verbs in -οω

1 Jud. v. 15 (where πάντα is used in a non-legal sense); 3 Kms. xi. 33, 34; 4 Kms. xvii. 15; Ps. viii. 29. These words do not appear in the original text of Ν or B in any of these passages.

2 See pp. 53-4 below.
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are causative, and so δικαίων should mean "to make or set right". It does very occasionally bear this meaning, and hence δικαίωμα is defined by Aristotle as meaning ἐπανόρθωμα τοῦ δικήματος, ¹ an act whereby wrong is righted. Here the substantive expresses not strictly the result of the act, but a concrete case of the action of the verb, not easily distinguished from δικαίωσις. The more common sense of δικαίων, however, is "to deem right" (usually with the infinitive), and most of the ordinary uses of δικαίωμα are derived from δικαίων in this sense. Then it may mean a claim, or the argument by which a claim is supported, the pièces justificatives in a process, or the like. In all these cases δικαίωμα is that which is deemed or declared right by the person concerned (or the act of maintaining that it is right). But the word might equally well be used of something deemed or declared right not by this or that individual, but by the community or its competent authority. Thus τὰ δικαίωματα Ζαμβρεί (Μιχ. vi. 16, ἦσαν τοὺς δικεῖν) may have been felt as meaning "that which Omri declared right", τὰ δικαίωματα τῶν ἑθνῶν (4 Κμ. xvii. 8, ἦσαν τοὺς δικεῖν) as "that which the Gentiles deem right". Thus τὰ δικαίωματα κυρίου, τοῦ θεοῦ would mean that which God declares right. In a considerable proportion of its occurrences the word is thus accompanied by the genitive—δικαίωματα μον, αὐτοῦ, etc. In about an equal number of cases it is used without a genitive, and here δικαίωμα no doubt stands for that which in an objective or absolute sense is judged right, without any conscious reference to the person judging. I am not aware of any exact parallel in profane writers to the LXX usage, but this usage is along the line of the development of the word, and entirely justified philologically, though we cannot say, in the absence of parallels, why the translators should have chosen this term to render ρή.

¹ E.N. V. vii. 10, p. 1135a.
3. "from root בָּתָשָׁה, to judge, is properly an act of judging, or its result, a judgment. Such judgments were given by אָתֶּל from root אָתֶל and kings, and also by the priests at the sanctuaries (cf. the LXX phrase τὸ κριτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ). Judgments given by competent tribunals became, among the Hebrews as among other peoples, the basis of subsequent judgments, and so formed a body of case-law. The old Greek term for such judgments was θέμουσες, but the word had passed out of use long before our period. The LXX translators, in a large majority of cases, render בָּתָשָׁה in accordance with its etymology as κρίμα, sometimes κρίως, and these words seldom represent any other Hebrew word. Κρίμα in ordinary Greek usage means generally the verdict or sentence of a court in a particular case, not considered as an element in the law of the community. But it occurs also in the sense of a decree or resolution of a legislative body. L. & S. cite from Dionysius of Halicarnassus κρίμα δήμου, and two or three similar examples. Such uses, though rare, provide a background for the LXX use of κρίματα in the sense of judgments which have passed into a corpus juris.

When בָּתָשָׁה is not rendered by κρίμα or κρίως (or occasionally other derivatives of κρίνειν), it is most often rendered (nearly forty times) by δικαίωμα, which is obviously fitted by etymology and usage to represent its sense. Elsewhere, very occasionally, we have ἐντολή and πρόσταγμα.

Thus the three constituent elements in Hebrew law are understood by the LXX translators to be (i) positive commands or decrees; (ii) declarations of right; and (iii) judgments or decisions. The terms used all imply more or less directly a legislator, and this is true to the Hebrew idea. The fountain of all law for the Hebrews was God, whether the immediate human author of the commandments, statutes, and judgments was judge,
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king, or priest. In our period the theory was that they had all been laid down by Moses. The various terms are to some extent used interchangeably in the LXX, and were clearly not regarded as mutually exclusive or even fundamentally different in meaning. All three Hebrew terms are occasionally represented, adequately enough, by νόμος in its ordinary political sense. It is indeed clear that the most natural Hebrew equivalent for νόμος in this sense would be found among these terms.

But νόμος for the most part, as we have seen, renders none of these terms. Out of about 320 places where it occurs in the LXX about seven-eighths have νήσις in the Hebrew. νήσις is from root נָהַשׁ which in the hiphil נָהַשׁ mean "to point out, show, direct, instruct". Where ordinary human relations are concerned, as where it refers to parents teaching their children, or to Job's comforters setting forth their theological views, the LXX often renders νήσις by διδάσκειν, which is its nearest equivalent. As a definitely religious term νήσις is used of priests and prophets giving direction or instruction regarding the will of God. In this sense, too, the LXX sometimes renders it by διδάσκειν, or by such synonyms as διήλθεν, δεικνύειν, συμβαδάζειν, ἀναγγέλλειν, which show that they were aware of the true meaning of the verb. The substantive νήσις accordingly means direction or instruction. Thus it is used of the instruction given by parents to their children or by wise men to their pupils. But it is most specifically used of guidance or instruction coming from God Himself; and chiefly in two ways, through the oracular utterances or responses of the priests at the sanctuary, and through the prophets. The priestly νήσις were primarily concerned with ritual and ceremonial observance, but they appear to have been given also upon points of individual and social morals. Thus the term νήσις could be used collectively both of the priestly code.
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of ceremonial observance (preserved in the priestly document of the Pentateuch known as P), and also, by an extension of meaning, of the code of commandments, statutes and judgments contained in Deuteronomy, since one principal source of these was actually the collection of priestly וְ֣דָמְלֵ֣ת at Jerusalem and perhaps at other sanctuaries. It is in this sense that וְ֣דָמְלֵ֣ת can fairly be regarded as equivalent to νόμος. It satisfies the pseudo-Demosthenic definition of νόμος; for it is the διάθεσις of the God of Israel, the δόγμα of Moses, the covenant (תֵּבֶרֶךְ, for which LXX uses διαθήκη 1 instead of συνθήκη) by which all Israelites ought to live.

The prophetic וְ֣דָמְלֵ֣ת however was of a different character. The prophet was not in a position to deliver positive pronouncements having the force of law, nor was his teaching confined to ceremonial or moral ordinances. In the prophets וְ֣דָמְלֵ֣ת is used in parallelism with וְ֣דָמְלֵ֣ת. The "word of the Lord" which the prophets uttered was concerned with the character of God, the interpretation of His past dealings with Israel and the declaration of His purposes for Israel in the future, with the call of repentance, and with the broad principles of morality, rather than with positive precepts. Take, for example, Is. i. 10 sqq. "Hear the וְ֣דָתָּה, ye rulers of Sodom, give ear to the וְ֣דָמְלֵ֣ת of our God, ye people of Gomorrah". There follows an eloquent declaration of Jehovah's disgust with a non-moral cultus, and an appeal for ethical religion—"wash you, make you clean", etc. This is the וְ֣דָמְלֵ֣ת: it is not "law": it is instruction in the principles of religion. Such was the וְ֣דָמְלֵ֣ת which Isaiah sealed up among his disciples (viii. 16). In the classical prophets this is probably the

1 וְ֣דָמְלֵ֣ת is in fact once rendered διαθήκη; Dan. ix. 13, LXX: κατὰ τὰ γεγραμμένα ἐν διαθήκῃ Μωσῆ; כְּאָמָרָם בְּרַבִּים בְּתוֹרָה מַשָּׂה
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sense usually intended by נָן; for though in many passages it is open to an interpreter to find an allusion, not to the teaching of the prophet himself, but to a code of commandments, statutes, and judgments which he may have pre-supposed, this is seldom the interpretation suggested by the context. נָן is for the prophets divine revelation in the widest sense, appealing to heart, mind, and will. It may include positive precepts, but it includes much more. Now among Jews who continued to speak Hebrew this wider sense of נָן was not forgotten. In Rabbinic Judaism נָן is not identical with הָלָל, the rule of conduct, but includes also השחת, religious teaching in a more general sense. The Pentateuch is properly described as נָן, even though it includes much more than פֶּסְחָה, for its account of God’s dealings with His people is a part of נָן in the prophetic sense.

The natural Greek equivalent of נָן in the more general sense would have been something like διδαχή, διδασκαλία or some other derivative of the verbs used to translate נָן. But such words are never used. In Prov. vii. 2 נָן, in the sense of a father’s instruction to his son, is rendered λόγοι. In Ισ. i. 10 (see above) λόγοι appears in the second part of the verse as well as the first, but this is probably a dittograph, and the corrector of Ισ. has given νόμον with all other MSS. In Job xxii. 22 נָן, in the sense of Divine guidance inwardly received, is rendered εξηγορία, “utterance”. These are the only places in the whole LXX where any sense of נָן other than the strictly legal is expressed in the translation. We have βιβλίον, διαγραφή, διαθήκη, τάξις once each, ἐντολή (four times), πρόσταγμα (three times), θεσμός (twice, of parental teaching), νομόθεσμος (once), νόμμα (six times), δευτερονόμιον (for נָן, twice), and for the
rest, between 250 and 300 times, νόμος. This type of rendering is used quite indifferently whether νόμος in the Hebrew has its wider and more original sense or its developed narrower sense. Thus a parent’s instruction is described as νόμος in Prov. vii. 23, νόμομα in Prov. iii. 1; a wise man’s instruction to his pupil is equally νόμος, Prov. xiii. 14. In Ps. lxxvii. (lxxviii.) 1, the poet begins “Give ear, O my people, to my νόμος: incline your ears to the words of my mouth”. The νόμος which follows is in fact a poetical recapitulation of the history of Israel down to the time of David. It is in no sense legislation, not even in the remote sense of moral exhortation. Yet the LXX reads προσέχετε λαός μου τὸν νόμον μου. Throughout the prophetic books the same translation is used, although in most cases, as we have seen, the prophet’s νόμος is in the broadest sense the revelation of God, His nature and character, His purposes and His mighty works. Similarly, when the verb νόμος is used of divine revelation the translators sometimes render it by νομοθετεῖν (which never in the LXX represents any other verb), and that even in passages where legislation is clearly an inappropriate idea in the context. Thus in Ps. xxiv. (xxv.) 8: “Good and upright is the Lord. Therefore will He instruct sinners in the way”, and ibid. 12: “What man is he that feareth the Lord? Him shall He instruct in the way that He shall choose”, νόμος is both times rendered νομοθετήσει: in Ps. xxvi. (xxvii.) 11: “Teach me Thy way, O Lord”, καθαρίζετε ἡμᾶς ὑδάτι, is rendered νομοθετήσον με Κύριε.

Thus over a wide range the rendering of νόμος by νόμος is thoroughly misleading, and it is to be regretted that the English versions followed the LXX (via the Vulgate) in so many cases. But while the translation is often misleading as a representation of the original meaning, it is most instructive in its bearing upon Hellenistic Judaism.
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It is clear that for the Jews of Egypt in the Hellenistic period the developed meaning of נְרִית as a code of religious observance, a "law" for a religious community, was the normal and regulative meaning, and they made this meaning cover the whole use of the word in the Old Testament. Thus the prophetic type of religion was obscured, and the Biblical revelation was conceived in a hard legalistic way. In thus rendering the term the translators are no doubt reflecting the sense in which their community read the Hebrew Bible, but their rendering helped to fix and stereotype that sense. Where thinkers bred in Hellenistic Judaism sought to escape into a religion of greater spiritual freedom and spontaneity, it was not by any way of return to the prophetic idea of נְרִית, but by taking up a fresh attitude to religion conceived as Law. Philo accepted the Law as such and allegorized it: Paul declared that Judaism, being a legal religion, was superseded by the religion of the Spirit.

We may now turn to the New Testament, to examine the use of νόμος in those writers whose background is Hellenistic Judaism.

1. It is clear that Paul's characteristic use of the term νόμος is determined by the sense which the LXX shares with current Greek usage of the term to denote the law of a community. He is concerned with δ νόμος τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐν δόγμασιν, as he carefully defines it in Eph. ii. 15. Here ἐντολή is the familiar LXX reading of חומם, a commandment. Δόγμα occurs only once in the LXX, Dan. vi. 12, where it has no Hebrew equivalent. It occurs as a variant reading in Ezek. xx. 26 (for δόμα), and in two passages in Esther where it represents רֶשֶׁ. On the other hand, it is common in 3-4 Macc. and in the Theodotion version of Daniel, where it represents various Aramaic words meaning "statute" or "decree". It is not used in the Old Testament or
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Apocrypha of divine decrees, though it is so used by Josephus, e.g. Contra Apionem, I. 8, § 42. We may recall that δόγμα ἀνθρώπων φρονίμων is part of the pseudo-Demosthenic definition of νόμος, and in the Hellenistic period δόγμα is very common in the sense of "statute" or "decrees", being used, e.g., to render senatus consultum. Thus Paul is combining a Biblical word with a word current in secular use to define the precise sense in which he is using νόμος. In his careful discussion of the nature and effect of law in Rom. vii. ἐντολή alternates with νόμος. Similarly, he uses the Biblical expression δικαίωμα in the sense of a legal enactment: τό δικαίωμα τοῦ νόμου, Rom. viii. 4; τὰ δικαίωματα τοῦ νόμου, Rom. ii. 26; τὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ θεοῦ, Rom. i. 32.1 So far Paul might have said everything that he says about νόμος if he were writing purely as a Greek and had never heard the word ἡκτεν. At the same time it might be held that he betrays by such expressions as ὁ νόμος τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐν δόγμασιν, and τὰ δικαίωματα τοῦ νόμου a consciousness that there was a wider sense of νόμος = ἡκτεν, within which fell the narrower sense of "commandments, statutes, and judgments". A further indication in the same direction is the fact that Paul cites "ὁ νόμος" when the actual passages quoted are not of the nature of commandments, and are not even found in the Pentateuch. Thus in Rom. iii. 10–18 he cites a cento of Old Testament passages from Isaiah and the Psalms, and comments διὰ δὲ νόμος λέγει τοῖς ἐν τῷ νόμῳ λαλεῖ, and in 1 Cor. xiv. 21 he quotes Is. xxviii. 11 (in a Greek translation other than the LXX, substantially identical with that of Aquila, according to Origen),2 with the formula ἐν τῷ νόμῳ γέγραπται. That this corresponded with current rabbinic usage of ἡκτεν is proved by a host

1 Cf. τὰ δικαίωματα κυρίου = ἡκτεν ἡκτεν, Ps. xviii. (xix.), 9: see p. 27 above.

2 Philocalia, ix. 2, where the extended uses of νόμος in Paul are discussed.
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of citations from the Talmud in Strack-Billerbeck. No writer could have used νόμος in this way if the LXX had not adopted it as the rendering of נֵחָ֑מָ֖ה. Such passages, however, are not very frequent in Paul.

On the other hand, there are passages where Paul uses νόμος in senses not easily derivable from its use to translate נֵחָ֑מָ֖ה, but closely akin to purely Greek usage. Thus in Rom. iii. 27 we have διὰ ποιοῦ νόμου; τῶν ἐργῶν; οὐχὶ ἀλλὰ διὰ νόμου πίστεως: in Rom. vii. 23 and 25, νόμος ἀμαρτίας: in Rom. viii. 2, ὁ νόμος τῆς ἀμαρτίας καὶ τοῦ θανάτου. It seems difficult except by a very violent strain upon language to interpret such phrases from the use of νόμος = נֵחָ֑מָ֖ה, nor have they any parallel in the LXX. On the other hand, they are readily explicable upon analogy with common Greek uses of νόμος in the sense of "principle", cf. the not infrequent opposition of ἐν δίκης νόμῳ and ἐν χειρῶν νόμῳ. Again we have the remarkable passage about the Gentiles and the Law in Rom. ii. 14-15. The whole idea of these verses, according to Strack-Billerbeck, is strange to Rabbinic Judaism. On the other hand, the terms φύσις and συνείδησις, and the idea of the inner tribunal, are so strongly Stoic in colouring, that τὸ ἐργὸν τοῦ νόμου γραπτὸν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις reminds us less of Jeremiah’s Torah written on the heart, than of such Stoic sentiments as Plutarch, Moralia, p. 780 (Ad. Princ. Inerud. 3), ὁ νόμος ὁ πάντων βασιλεῖς...οὐκ ἐν βιβλίοις ἔξω γεγραμένος οὐδὲ τις ξύλοις, ἀλλ’ ἐμψυχος ὄν ἐν αὐτῷ λόγος. And εὐνοίᾳ εἰσὶ νόμος seems an echo of Aristotle, E.N. IV. 14, p. 1128a: ὁ δὲ χαριεῖς καὶ ἐλευθερος οὕτως ἔξει οἷον νόμος ὄν εὐαυτῷ. Thus while it is just possible to conceive

1 Kommentar zum N.T. aus Talmud und Midrash ad Jn. x. 34, Rom. iii. 19, 1 Cor. xiv. 21. Note especially Tanchuma, קָנָם, i. 19: “The transgressors of Israel say that the Prophets and the Writings are not Torah, but we do not believe them”—citing Dan. ix. 10, which speaks of Torah given בֵּית בְּנֵי רֵעֵי .

2 As abundantly illustrated by Wetstein, ad loc. Cf. Origen, Phil. l.c.
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Paul as saying "when the Gentiles who have no Torah do by nature what the Torah contains, they are a Torah to themselves", it is much easier to suppose that he was influenced, even unconsciously, by the purely Greek associations of νόμος. Similarly, ὁ νόμος τοῦ νόσου μου, Rom. vii. 23, is much nearer to the Greek conception of νόμος as an immanent principle than to νόμος = νόημα. In view of the passage just cited, the expression ὁ νόμος τοῦ πνεύματος (Rom. viii. 2) is perhaps better understood on the same analogy. It is not the Torah spiritually interpreted (cf. 2 Cor. iii.), or a Torah dictated by the Spirit or belonging to the realm of Spirit (cf. Rom. vii. 14, ὁ νόμος πνευματικός). It is rather an immanent principle of life, like the Stoic Law of Nature, but determined by the Spirit of Christ. If this is so, then it is possible that ὁ νόμος τοῦ χριστοῦ (Gal. vi. 2) is not the Torah of Jesus, i.e. His teaching conceived as legislation for His Church, but the same νόμος τοῦ πνεύματος τῆς ζωῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. And this is, I believe, the true interpretation.

In all these cases it is not denied that Paul had in the back of his mind the thought of νόμος = νόημα. But because he was using a Greek and not a Hebrew word he was able to use expressions which would have been impossible but for the fact that νόημα by becoming νόμος had entered into a new field of associated ideas.

2. In the Epistle to the Hebrews there is nothing to discuss. The usage of νόμος, as of religious language in general, depends throughout upon the LXX, though the author has no occasion to use it except as referring to positive statutory rules of religious observance, unless one excepts his citation (viii. 10) of Jerem. xxxviii. 33 (xxxi. 32) which represents the characteristic LXX legalizing of the prophetic νόημα.

3. There has been much discussion of the relative importance of Jewish and Greek or Hellenistic elements in the Fourth Gospel. A survey of its use of νόμος may
throw light upon the question. There is no passage where the word is used in a sense not directly derivable from the LXX use of νόμος = νόμος, i.e. there is nothing at all parallel to Paul’s Stoicizing use of the term. In the trial narrative the word is used perfectly naturally by Pilate and by the Jews alike (xviii. 31, xix. 7), of the law governing the administration of justice in the Jewish community. This is the sense which is common to ordinary Greek usage and to νόμος = νόμος in the sense of “commandments, statutes, and judgments”. Similarly, vii. 51, the law does not condemn a man unheard; viii. 17, the law prescribes that the evidence of two witnesses is required for a conviction. In vii. 19, 23, νόμος is similarly used of the νόμος, the code of religious ordinances traced back to Moses. Elsewhere, νόμος stands for νόμος in the sense of the Jewish religion as a whole: i. 17, the Torah was given by Moses: grace and truth came by Jesus Christ; vii. 49, δ οξ λος ω μη γενώσκων τόν νόμον, i.e. Torah in the wide sense. Again, in x. 34, xii. 34, xv. 25 we have, as in Paul, citations from parts of the Old Testament other than the Pentateuch under the head of νόμος. As we have seen, this way of referring to the Old Testament is consistent with the rabbinic use of νόμος, but νόμος could not have been so used if the LXX had not adopted it as the rendering of the Hebrew word. We may observe that this form of citation is not found in the Synoptic Gospels. Mark does not use νόμος, preferring ἐντολή. In Matthew and Luke, νόμος is the Pentateuch as distinguished from “the Prophets”.

4 Acts. There is little to discuss here. Νόμος is the Pentateuch as distinguished from the Prophets, or the civil and religious code of the Jewish community, or it is the Jewish religion in general, conceived after the manner of the LXX as a legal code. The ghost of νόμος haunts some passages, but there is no use which would
be unintelligible to a Greek reader accustomed to use νόμος for the law of a community.

5. The Epistle of James has been regarded as a product of primitive Palestinian Jewish Christianity. On the other hand, attention has been called to a strong Greek or Hellenistic strain in its language and ideas. An investigation of its use of νόμος may throw some light on this question. In iv. 11 νόμος is used of a law regulating conduct, a use equally congruous with the current Greek use of νόμος and with its use for ἡ λήγος in the sense of ἡλίκη.

Ja. ii. 8-12 deals again with νόμος as a legislative code for conduct, citing the commandments of the Decalogue and “Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself”, and applying the familiar rabbinic principle that an infraction of one commandment is an infraction of the whole law. So far we are in the sphere where νόμος is an exact equivalent for the halachic side of Torah. But we observe that the command “Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself” is described as νόμος βασιλικός. Such a phrase is no doubt conceivable as expressing the idea that the ἡ λήγος was given by Jehovah as king of Israel. But it is significant that the phrase itself was almost a commonplace of Greek political writers. It occurs in the Platonic or pseudo-Platonic Minos, 317c, and Epistles, viii. 354c, and in Xenophon. The meaning wavers between that of “a law given by or worthy of a king” (i.e. a true king as distinct from a tyrant), and “law which is itself the king”, with reference to Pindar’s oft-quoted maxim. Thus a reader of Greek political literature would have recognized and understood the phrase νόμον τελείτε βασιλικών more readily than one who thought in terms of νόμος = ἡ λήγος. At the close of the passage the readers are exhorted to live as those who are to be judged by νόμος ἐλευθερίας. The same phrase occurs in i. 25, ὁ παρακύψας εἰς νόμον τέλειον τῆς ἐλευθερίας. Here we may have an allusion to Ps. xviii. (xix.) 8, ἡ λήγος ἡ ἡ λήγος :
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if so James is not following the LXX, which has δ νόμος τοῦ κυρίου ἁμωμος. But his Old Testament quotations in general follow the LXX and show no acquaintance with the Hebrew text. On the other hand, we recall that the Stoics divided τὰ καθήκοντα into μέσα and τελεία, and said πάντα ποιεῖν τὸν σοφὸν κατὰ πάσας τὰς ἀρετὰς: πᾶσαν γὰρ πρᾶξιν τελείαν αὐτοῦ εἶναι.1 Similarly, the Stoics held that the σοφὸς is ἔλευθερος. Cf. Cicero, Paradox. 34, cited by Mayor ad loc. "Quid est libertas? Potestas vivendi ut velis: qui igitur vivit ut vult, nisi qui recta sequitur, qui gaudet officio, qui legibus quidem non propter metum paret sed eas sequitur atque colit quia id salutare maxime esse judicat?" The rabbinic passages associating freedom with the Torah are not nearly so close to James’ thought. On the other hand, Philo repeatedly applies to the Law the Stoic teaching about liberty, observing ὃσοι μετὰ νόμου ζῶσαν ἔλευθεροι (Quod Omnis, § 45). Thus James stands here with Hellenistic rather than with Rabbinic Judaism, and with that aspect of Hellenistic Judaism which is not biblical but Greek in origin. His use of νόμος is everywhere such as would be directly intelligible to a Greek. Its connection with ἀρτιος is never necessary to the sense. On the other hand, there are passages where the antecedents of his usage are to be sought in the purely Greek development of the idea of νόμος and not in the LXX.

The results of this investigation may be expressed as follows. ἀρτιος in its widest sense means divine teaching or revelation: νόμος in its widest sense means a principle of life or action. When divine teaching is of the nature of commandments regulating conduct, and when the principle of life is conceived as dictated by a legislative authority, then νόμος and ἀρτιος have approximately identical meaning. Νόμος is used in this sense in Matthew,

1 Stob., Ecl. II. 116, ap. R.P., § 522.
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Luke, Acts, and Hebrews. James uses νόμος in this sense, but also in a sense belonging to the wider Greek use of νόμος and not corresponding to הָרָה. In the LXX it is used both in its restricted sense and also to render הָרָה in its wider sense, thus giving a misleading legalistic tone to much of the Old Testament. The Fourth Gospel follows the LXX exactly. Paul uses the word predominantly in the sense which is properly common to νόμος and הָרָה, but also in two extended senses, the one corresponding to הָרָה as rendered in the LXX, the other corresponding to the purely Greek, wider sense of νόμος, for which הָרָה provides no parallel, and his leanings to the Greek side are more significant than his leanings to the Hebrew side.
CHAPTER III

RIGHTeousNESS, MERCY AND TRUTH

If there are any terms (besides נין) which more than any others may be regarded as key-words of Judaism as an ethical religion, they are קדוש, טוב, and רチーム, commonly rendered "righteousness", "mercy", and "truth". The ordinary LXX rendering of קדוש is δικαιοσύνη, of טוב, ἐλεος, of רチーム, ἀλήθεια. But these are not the only renderings. קדוש (or נין) is sometimes ἐλεημοσύνη, and טוב, δικαιοσύνη, while רチーム is sometimes πίστις, and may occasionally be δικαιοσύνη or ἐλεημοσύνη. The Hebrew terms, therefore, and their Greek equivalents, need some investigation.

I

Δικαιοσύνη is the standard Greek term for social righteousness or justice. Fundamentally it is acting in accordance with δίκη, that which is customary, sanctioned by social standards, or inherently right. Thus Aristotle says that in a general sense: πάντα τὰ νόμιμα ἐστὶ πῶς δίκαια, and so ἡ δικαιοσύνη ἀρετὴ μὲν ἐστὶ τελεία, ἀλλ' οὐχ ἀπλῶς ἄλλα πρὸς ἑτέρου.¹ But he recognizes also a narrower sense of the term, in which δικαιοσύνη is a virtue along with other virtues. This narrower sense may be compared with our term "justice" as distinct from "righteousness". Thus from Plato onwards δικαιοσύνη

¹ E.N. V. i. 3, 1129b.
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takes its place in the scheme of four cardinal virtues, along
with wisdom, courage, and temperance. The definition
from which the discussion in the Republic takes its start, το
προσήκων ἐκάστῳ ἀποδεδόναι,¹ may be taken as representing
popular Greek usage. Aristotle's treatment of δικαιοσύνη
as διανεμητική and διορθωτική ² is scarcely more than a
quasi-scientific restatement of the popular conception. The
Stoic definition is on the same lines—ἐπιστήμη διανεμητικὴ
τῆς ἐξίας ἐκάστης.³ Plato's own profound treatment of
δικαιοσύνη lifts the whole matter to a higher level, but had
little effect upon current usage of the term. We may take
it that the Greek-speaking public, on the whole, meant by
δικαιοσύνη doing the right thing by your neighbour,
however the right thing might be conceived; while if it
used the term in a narrower and more precise sense it
meant by it the virtue of acting towards your neighbour
with a strict and impartial regard to his merit. It
would probably be fair to say that the narrower sense
tended to colour the wider sense—i.e. that the Greek
tended to think of "righteousness" in terms of "justice".

A consideration of the Hebrew terms, other than those
from the root פֶּה, which are translated by δίκαιος and
δικαιοσύνη will serve to illustrate the connotation of the
Greek terms for the translators. Neglecting occasional
and insignificant cases, we may note the following.
Δίκαιος, δικαιοσύνη represent some eight times πίστις,
"trustworthiness" (see below). Δίκαιος is nine or ten
times יְשִׁיר (רָשִׁי), "straightforward", "upright" ("up-
rightness"), and δικαιοσύνη once מַשְׂבִּית. The words
represent some dozen times שׁוּב, "judgment". Δίκαιος
is four times יִשָּׁר, "innocent", and δικαιοσύνη once כְּפָרָן.
Several times the words stand for יִרְשׁ, which lies outside
the scope of what δικαιοσύνη meant to the Greek. To

¹ Rpd. I. 332c. ² E.N. V. ii.–iv. 1130b sqq.
³ Stobaeus, Ecl. II. 102, ap. R.P., § 517c.
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this we must presently give some attention. For the rest, the Greek terms δικαιος, δικαιοσύνη fairly bring out one or the other aspect of the Hebrew terms. The translators therefore understood δικαιοσύνη in its larger sense as including such ideas as trustworthiness, uprightness, innocence; in its narrower sense, the judicial character.

Now over a considerable portion of the field πράξ is a very fair synonym for ἡσαμφρίνης, μακρίνης. It stands for right conduct in general, and is fitly rendered by δικαιοσύνη. The actions attributed to the πράξ are often such as a Greek would recognize as δίκαια in the wider sense of the term. When the prophets call for πράξ they condemn such forms of unrighteousness as corruption in the law-courts, false measures in commercial dealings, the oppression of the poor, and so forth, which in Greek would rightly be described as ἀδίκια. Within this general idea of πράξ is included δικαιοσύνη in the narrower sense of justice. Thus, in Deut. xvi. 18–20 (κρίτας . . . τούς κρίσεις σεαυτῷ . . . καὶ κρινόντων τὸν λαὸν κρίσιν δικαίαν . . . οὐκ ἐπιγνοσθεὶς πρόσωπον δύναται δώρου . . . δικαίως τὸ δίκαιον διώξῃ), κρίσις δικαία adequately represents πράξ, and δικαίως πράξ is aptly rendered δικαίως τὸ δίκαιον διώξῃ.

Where within this field δικαιοσύνη differs from πράξ, it is not a matter of difference in the meaning of the terms, but of different conceptions of the content of "righteousness". Thus the fact that πράξ is always related to God and His law, rather than to social customs and institutions as such, or to abstract principles, gives a different colour to its use; and in general it would probably be true to say that for the Hebrew righteousness tends to be more inward, more humane, and more inclusive than for the Greek. Yet the content of δικαιοσύνη varies in different Greek writers, and of Plato in particular it may be said
that his conception differs from that of the average Greek largely in the very points in which the Hebrew conception differs from it. Where the Hebrew conception of righteousness differs from the popular Greek conception we may put it thus, that whereas for the Greek δικαιοσύνη is always being pulled over from the broad sense of "righteousness" to the narrower sense of "justice", the pull in Hebrew is in the opposite direction.

It may be due partly to a conception of the divine שים which must be considered hereafter, but also no doubt to something in the instinctive Hebrew attitude to life, that יראת always tends away from the more abstract and intellectual Greek conception of justice, in the direction of something warmer and more humane. In the prophets at least "the idea is far broader than what we usually mean by right or justice; it includes a large-hearted construction of the claims of humanity; it is, as has been said, the humanitarian virtue par excellence" (Skinner in H.D.B.). In later Hebrew יראת comes to denote "any exercise of benevolence which goes beyond a man's legal obligations", and it is thus contrasted with יראת, strict justice. That this meaning was already recognized during the period in which our translations were made is clear from Dan. iv. 24 (27):

LXX. πάσας τὰς ἁδικίας σου ἐλεημοσύναις λύτρωσαι.

Θ. τὰς ἁμαρτίας σου ἐν ἐλεημοσύναις λύτρωσαι καὶ τὰς ἁδικίας ἐν οἰκτιρμοῖς πενήτων.

To both translators יראת meant a benevolence going beyond strict justice.

Similarly, Ezek. xviii. 19, 21, יראת משפט = δικαιοσύνην καὶ ἔλεος. This may be the meaning in Ps. xxxii. (xxxiii.) 5,
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αρνέων Στράτης πιστεύω

—though there the ἀρνέω may be that of God Himself.

Here the pull away from the idea of "justice" has been so strong as to bring ἐνακτέω out of the field of δικαιοσύνη altogether.¹

But there is another line of development along which the Hebrew conception diverges from the Greek in still more remarkable ways. The verb ἐνακτέω seems to have for its primary meaning "to be in the right", rather than "to be righteous". The former meaning is best represented by δικαιοσύνη, to which we must presently turn. But it is also frequently represented by δικαιόω εἶναι. This translation, however, does not always do justice to its meaning. Thus in Gen. xxxviii. 26, Tamar has put Judah in the wrong (as we should say). He says ἐνακτήσα, "she is in the right over against me". The English rendering "she is more righteous than I", is absurdly astray. Here the LXX makes a better attempt at a true rendering—δικαιοσύνη Θαμάρ ἡ ἐγώ, though as Greek this is scarcely intelligible. Similarly, Job xi. 2, ἐνακτήσα ἠ Αἰλίς ἄφθονος ἵνα ἐνακτέω means "Is a man in the right because he can talk well?" It is not exactly rendered by the LXX, ἡ καὶ ὁ εὐλαλός οἰεῖται εἶναι δίκαιος. Again, Job xxxiv. 5, ἐνακτήσα ἡ Νήφας ἡ Παρθένος ἡ μαθήσει means "I am in the right, and God denies me justice".

The hip hop of the verb, ἐνακτήσα (less often the piel ἐνακτέω), having a causative force, does not mean "to make righteous" or even, fundamentally, "to declare righteous", but to put a person in the right. E.g.

¹ Cf. Matt. vi. 1–2, where δικαιοσύνην ποιείν and ἐλεημοσύνην ποιείν are synonymous.
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Ezek. xvi. 51–2, "Thou hast put thy sisters in the right by all thy abominable deeds, . . . . they are in the right against thee." (One does not make another person "righteous" by behaving like a scoundrel!)

Thus אֱיֶד often means "in the right" rather than "righteous". E.g. in 1 Sam. xxiv. 18, Saul, having been generously treated by David, exclaims שָׁם אֲשֶׁר מָצָא לָֽי, where neither the LXX δίκαιος εἰ ὑπὲρ με, nor the A.V., "Thou art more righteous than I", gives exactly the sense. Similarly, פָּס or פָּס may mean a man's "right" as status, rather than his "righteousness" as character. In 2 Sam. xix. 29, Mephibosheth confesses that he has treated David with base ingratitude, and ends, מְחַלֵּה יִמְּשָׁל תְּדוּ לְדוֹד אֲלִילְּשָׁלך, i.e. "What further right have I to appeal to the king?" The LXX here comes close to the meaning with δικαίωμα.

No doubt a person can be "in the right" in an absolute sense only if he is "righteous". Possibly it was in this way that פְּס came to mean "righteous"; but the more fundamental meaning is seldom forgotten by those who use Hebrew. When, however, פְּס becomes δίκαιος, the other meaning is out of view.

This has an important bearing upon the conception of פְּס as applied to God. The Hebrew conception of the function of a judge tends to be not so much to apply with strict impartiality an abstract principle of justice, but rather to come to the assistance of the injured person, and vindicate him. E.g. Ps. lxxxii. 3, שָׁם יְרֵשׁ נָֽדִיחַ. To act in this way is a manifestation of פְּס. Thus in the character of the ideal ruler Is. xi. 4, קְרַיְנָה לְיִשְׂרָאֵל, κρινεῖ ταπεινῷ κρίνων. Pre-eminently this is the character and the activity of God as ruler of His people and of the
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world: e.g. Is. 1. 8, "my vindicator is near". God confers πρεσ, a good standing (almost = success or victory), upon His people, and thereby displays His own πρεσ (righteousness). Such acts of vindication are called ηπελ (righteousness). Such acts of vindication are called ηπελ, e.g. Jud. v. 11:

where the ηπελ are victories granted to Israel over their oppressors. Thus, especially in 2 Isaiah, πρεσ or ηπελ is the virtual equivalent of ηεσή, deliverance, salvation. E.g. Is. xlvi. 13:

"I will bring near my vindication; it shall not be far off; and my deliverance shall not tarry". Here ηπελ is no longer the quality of a person, whether the subject or the object of the action, but it is the action itself.

The translations of πρεσ, πεσ, ηπελ, where this idea underlies, are interesting and significant.

The hiphil ηπελ is regularly rendered δικαιον, and in this sense πεσ is rendered by the passive δικαιοσθαι. The verb δικαιον is causative in form, and should by analogy mean "to make δικαιο (δικαιον)". In classical Greek, however, it never has exactly this force. Occasionally it has the sense "to set right". L. & S. cite one example from Pindar, νομος δικαιου το βιαιτατον.1 The Aristotelian definition of δικαιωμα as ἐπανόρθωμα του δικηματος (see above, p. 28) is agreeable to this sense of the verb. Its ordinary uses fall under two

1 Aesch., Ag. 393, which they cite under the same heading, does not appear to yield precisely this sense: κακον δε χαλκον τρόπον τρίβω και προσβολας μελαμπαγης πέλει δικαιωθης. The meaning is surely "tested", "proved", "judged".
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heads: (i) With an impersonal object it means “to deem or pronounce right”, normally with the infinitive, “to decide to do” this or that, or “to claim as a right” that such and such a thing should be done (cf. ἄξιον): e.g. Thuc. II. 41, δικαιοῦντες μὴ ἄφαιρεθήναι αὐτὴν: Pap. Ryl. 119, 14-15, ἐδικαίωσεν ἄποδοθαι ἦμας τὸ κεφάλαιον. (ii) With a personal object it means “to treat justly”, as opposed to ἀδικεῖν, “to treat unjustly”. Usually in the latter sense it refers to the condemnation and punishment of the guilty (like the Scottish “justify”), but this sense is not inherent in the verb, as appears from Aristotle, E.N. V. ix. 11, 1136a, where the question is raised, whether it is possible to suffer injustice voluntarily:

πότερον γὰρ ὡς ἀληθῶς ἔστων ἐκόντα ἄδικείσθαι, ἥ οὖ, ἄλλ' ἀκούσιον ἀπαν, ὡσπερ τὸ ἄδικείν πᾶν ἐκούσιον; καὶ ἄρα πᾶν οὕτως ἡ ἐκείνως [ὡσπερ καὶ τὸ ἄδικείν πᾶν ἐκούσιον], ἡ τὸ μὲν ἐκούσιον τὸ δὲ ἀκούσιον; ὠμοίως δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ δικαίωσθαι· τὸ γὰρ δικαιοπραγεῖν πᾶν ἐκούσιον· ἦστ' εὔλογον ἀντικεῖσθαι ὀμοίως καθ' ἐκάτερον, τὸ τ' ἄδικείσθαι καὶ δικαιοῦσθαι ἡ ἐκούσιον ἡ ἀκούσιον εἶναι. ᾿Ατοπον δ' ἄν δόξῃ καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ δικαίωσθαι, εἶ πᾶν ἐκούσιον· ἐνοὶ γὰρ δικαίωσθαι οὐχ ἐκόντες... ἄδικων γὰρ ἄδικείσθαι μὴ ἄδικουντος ἡ δικαιοῦσθαι μὴ δικαιοπραγοῦντος.

“Is it really possible to suffer injustice [or to be wronged] voluntarily? or is suffering injustice always involuntary, as doing injustice is always voluntary? Again, is suffering injustice always one way or the other (as doing justice is always voluntary), or is it sometimes voluntary and sometimes involuntary? Similarly, with regard to having justice done to you: doing justice is always voluntary [as doing injustice is], so that one might expect that there is the same relation in both cases between the active and the passive, and that suffering injustice and having justice done to you are either both voluntary or both involuntary. But it would surely be
absurd to maintain, even with regard to having justice done to you, that it is always voluntary; for some that have justice done to them certainly do not will it. . . . For to have injustice done to you implies some one that does injustice, and to have justice done to you implies some one that does justice” (Peters).

There seems indeed to be no actual example of the active of δικαίον in this sense, but Aristotle’s use of the passive is enough to prove that it was possible. It is to be observed that the relation of the verb to the adjective δίκαιος is different in the two uses of δικαίον. In the first the property, τὸ δίκαιον, inheres in the action: it is deemed right; in the second the property inheres in the agent, who acts rightly (as Aristotle indicates by using δικαιοπραγεῖν as the equivalent of the active of δικαιοῦσθαι, corresponding to ἀδικεῖν, the active of ἀδικείσθαι).

We must therefore recognize a neutral sense of δικαίον with a personal object: it means “to do a person justice”, whether to his advantage or to his disadvantage. If the person is in the wrong, then δικαίον means to condemn him and visit him with condign punishment, and this is the normal use of the verb, with reference to persons, in classical and Hellenistic Greek. If the person is in the right, and is being wrongfully treated, then δικαίον would mean to vindicate him; if, for example, he lay under a false accusation, δικαίον would mean to acquit him. But the lexica cite no examples from Greek literature or from papyri.

It is here, however, that we must find the basis for the LXX use of δικαίον to translate ρήψῃ, “to redress or vindicate”. E.g.

Ps. lxxx.i. (lxxxii.) 3, ταπεινὸν καὶ πενητὰ δικαίωσατε.
2 Kms. xv. 4 (Absalom), τίς μὲ καταστήσει κρίτην ἐν τῇ

1 Though his use of δικαιοπραγεῖν instead of δικαίον for the active shows that δικαίον in this sense was not normal.
RIGHTEOUSNESS, MERCY AND TRUTH

γῆ καὶ ἐπ᾿ ἐμὲ ἐλεύθεραν πᾶς ἄνὴρ ὦ ἐὰν ᾑ ἀντιλογία καὶ κρίσις καὶ δικαίωσω αὐτὸν; "I will do him justice".

Is. 1. 8, ἐγγίζει δικαίωσας με.

It is noteworthy that δικαίωσον is also occasionally used to render בִּרְי, which properly means “to contend” and especially “to conduct legal proceedings”. It is used both in a favourable and in an unfavourable sense: but in the two passages where it is translated δικαίωσον it bears the sense of “vindicate”.

Mic. vii. 9, ὠργὴν κυρίου υποίσω ὅτι ἡμαρτὼν αὐτῷ ἔως τοῦ δικαίωσαι αὐτὸν τὴν δίκην μου (εὐρεία ἐν ἱπτήρθ) καὶ ποιήσει τὸ κρίμα μου καὶ ἐξάγει με εἰς τὸ φῶς· ὀφομαί τὴν δικαίωσύνην αὐτοῦ (γέρα ἡ ἀνάτρηση).

Is. i. 17, δικαίωσατε χήρα.

Where δικαίωσον is used in the passive as the equivalent of ἐπτύ, it is closely analogous to the Aristotelian use (ἐκόντα δικαιοοθαί).

Is. xlv. 25:

ἀπὸ κυρίου δικαίωσονταί, καὶ ἐν τῷ θεῷ ἐνδοξασθῆσατε πᾶν τὸ σπέρμα τῶν νιὼν Ἰσραήλ

That is, they shall receive redress or vindication from Jehovah, and so enjoy honour instead of suffering shame in the eyes of their neighbours.

Here, then, we have an extension, but a legitimate extension, of the neutral sense of δικαίωσον attested by Aristotle's use of the passive.¹ That neutral sense bifurcates into the LXX sense, “redress” or “vindicate”

¹ This is not recognized as a LXX usage in the new L. & S., but it seems clear.
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(which would be a case of Aristotle’s ἐκόντα δικαιοῦσθαι), and the normal Greek sense, “condemn” or “punish”, which is not found in the LXX because ἐκτιμάω could not bear that meaning. To punish a person for his wrong-doing does not put him in the right, does not give him ἐκτιμάω, and that is the meaning of ἐκτιμάω. Nevertheless we are still within the sphere (or an extension of the sphere) of Greek usage.

On the other hand, there are passages where ἐκτιμάω means to put a person in the right by declaring or judging him righteous, and while the LXX sometimes renders this by δικαιοῦν ἀποφαίνειν or κρίνειν, in some cases where this meaning is required they use δικαιοῦν. E.g.

Ex. xxi. 7, οὐ δικαιόσεις τὸν ἁσβή ένεκεν διώρως
Is. v. 23, οἱ δικαιοῦντες τὸν ἁσβή ἐνεκεν διώρως.

Clearly the meaning here does not differ from that in Prov. xvii. 15, δικαιοῦν κρίνει τὸν ἁδικόν, ἁδικόν δὲ τὸν δικαίον

= מָצָר יָשׁוּב וּמִלְשׁוּת צְדָקָה

Similarly, in the passive, representing the qal of the verb:

Is. xliii. 9 άγαγέτωσαν τοὺς μάρτυρας αὐτῶν καὶ δικαιώθητωσαν

= בָּנָה שָׁרְתֵּם וּנְצָרֵם

Is. xliii. 26, λέγε σον τὰς ἀνομίας σοῦ πρῶτος ἵνα δικαιωθῆς

= מָשׁ יָשִׁיב לָמָּשׁ תָּשִׁם

This is a sense of δικαιοῦν strange to non-biblical Greek, in which δικαιοῦν τὸν ἁδικόν would mean “to condemn or punish the unjust”. It bears, however, a certain analogy with the common Greek use of δικαιοῦν for deeming a course of action right, and may be regarded as an extension of this use, with a personal object in place of an impersonal.
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It seems, therefore, that the use of δικαιοῦν in the LXX combines or confuses two different senses of the causative verb in Greek: in the one, the quality τὸ δίκαιον belongs to the act or the agent, in the other, to the object of the action: in the one sense it means to do a person justice; in the other, to deem a course of action right or righteous. Both of these usages are developed by the LXX in somewhat abnormal ways: the first, in that it is always used in a favourable sense, whereas in normal Greek it is all but confined to the unfavourable sense; the second, in that the LXX gives to the verb a personal object, which is not otherwise found with this sense of the verb. The Greek reader would constantly find something a little strange in the use of the word. Expressions, however, like ταπεινῶν καὶ πενήτα δικαιώσατε he would readily understand to mean "do justice to the lowly and poor"; and expressions again like δικαιώσαι τὸν ἀσεβῆ he would probably understand, with something of a strain, to mean "to declare the impious righteous".

But however the Greek is understood, the close connection of δικαιοῦν with the narrower sense of "justice" very largely obscures the full meaning of πράξεις, and gives to the Greek-speaking world a thinner and poorer substitute for this characteristic Hebrew idea.

It is in the light of the Septuagintal use of δικαιοῦσθαι for πράξεις and δικαιοῦν for πράξεις that we must consider a further use of δικαιοσύνη. It would have seemed natural that where πράξεις or πράξεις is used in a sense determined by this specific use of πράξεις, it would be represented by δικαίωσις or δικαίωμα. Δικαίωσις, however, is used only once, where it renders (not inappropriately), μακρο. Δικαίωμα renders πράξεις in the sense of "good standing", "just claim", "right", 2 Sam. xix. 29 (2 Kms. xix. 28, quoted above, p. 47), and in two places it occurs in
variant readings, viz. Prov. viii. 20, where B has ἡ ἀνὰ μέσον δῶν δικαιώματος ἀναστρέφομαι, ἀναστρέφομαι, more appropriately δικαιοσύνη, in the sense of "righteousness"; and Ezek. xviii. 21, ἡ ἰσχύς τῆς δικαιοσύνης, where A has τὰ δικαιώματά μου, B more appropriately δικαιοσύνη καὶ ἔλεος (for ἔλεος as a translation of νῦν see above, p. 45). Elsewhere δικαίωμα is generally appropriated to νῦν and its synonyms (see pp. 27-8 above). The regular rendering of τὸν καὶ τὴν, as we have seen, is δικαιοσύνη, and this is appropriate where these words stand for the moral quality of the νῦν. But they may also stand for the action denoted by τὸν καὶ τὴν, that is, they may mean "redress" or "vindication". Thus Is. xlvi. 13 (quoted above, p. 48) clearly means "I have brought near my vindication, or deliverance", but the LXX translators have rendered it ἡ γύναι τὴν δικαιοσύνην μου, which any Greek reader would take to mean "I have brought my righteousness near", i.e. "I have made accessible to Israel that kind of right character and conduct which is a property of My own divine nature". Cf. Is. li. 5, ἐγνώκει ταχὺ ἡ δικαιοσύνη μου (τῆς), καὶ ἐξελέησεται ως φῶς καὶ τὸ σωτηρίον μου (τῆς) . . . 6, τὸ δὲ σωτηρίον μου (τῆς) εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα ἔσται, ἢ δὲ δικαιοσύνη μου (τῆς) οὐ μὴ ἐκλίπῃ. Similarly, in Jud. v. 11 the sense of the original is altered in the Greek ¹: ἐκεῖ δύσοιν δικαιοσύνας. κύριε δικαιοσύνας αἰξησον ἐν Ἰσραήλ. The Greek reader could not but understand this to mean "Lord, increase righteousness in Israel". In such passages (and they are many) the translators seem to have been unaware of the specific meaning of the Hebrew words. For them καὶ καὶ νῦν had come to mean simply "righteousness" in its ethical or legal sense. When used

¹ The underlying text differs from M.T., but the essential word νῦν is there.
of God, they denoted His character as righteous; when used of men they denoted right conduct, i.e. primarily conformity to the Law. Hence δικαιοσύνη is used without discrimination in translating them.

It is probable that a similar misunderstanding underlies a familiar passage in the New Testament. Matt. v. 6, μακαρίοι οἱ πενθόντες καὶ δισφόντες τὴν δικαιοσύνην: to a Greek reader that naturally means "Blessed are those who ardently desire to be righteous". But if we put the saying back into its presumed original Aramaic, δικαιοσύνη would naturally be נִדַּם or נִדַנַּים = Hebrew נִדַּם or נִדָן. This might indeed mean "righteousness", but it might also mean "vindication", "deliverance". Those who hunger and thirst for נדָן would then be identical with the "elect" of Lk. xviii. 7, who cry to God day and night, and whom He will vindicate (πανθεὶ τὴν ἐκδίκησιν αὐτῶν). This may well have been the original sense of the beatitude.

There are, however, some passages where the translators seem to have been aware that δικαιοσύνη in this sense would be an inappropriate translation.

Ps. xxiv. 5.

Here the person described is, in ordinary Greek terms, δικαῖος: what sense then would there be in saying that he would receive δικαιοσύνη from God? The real meaning is that God will יֵדַע him—will grant him the status of נדָן, will in fact vindicate him by an act of grace. The LXX translators seem to have been unaware of this, but realizing that δικαιοσύνη would be an inappropriate rendering, they have taken their clue from the extended meaning of נדָן noted above, and translate:
Similarly, the LXX understood rightly or wrongly Deut. vi. 25, ἐλεημοσύνη ἡσταὶ ἡμῖν (ἄνεκος ἡ ὀρθή), and xxiv. 13, ἡσταὶ σοι ἐλεημοσύνη (ἄνεκος ἡ ἀληθής).

Similarly, Ps. cii. (ciii.) 6,

δόσα τῇ ἡτατῇ ἡμῶν

ποιῶν ἐλεημοσύνας ὁ κύριος καὶ κρίμα πάσι τοῖς ἀδικουμένοις.

Is. lvi. 1,

φυλάσσεσθε κρίσιν καὶ ποιήσατε δικαιοσύνην (ἡτῆς)

ἡγηκε γὰρ τὸ σωτηρίον μου παραγόνθεσθαι καὶ τὸ ἔλεος μου (ἄνεκος) ἀποκαλυφθῆναι.

Ps. xxxii. (xxxiii.) 5 :

ἡμεῖς ἐξακολουθοῦμεν

τῇ ἀγάπῃ ἐλεημοσύνη καὶ κρίσιν τοῦ ἔλεους Ἰησοῦ Κυρίου πλήρης ἡ γῆ.

We have already seen (pp. 45–6) that ἡτῆς, as a human virtue, is sometimes rendered ἐλεημοσύνη because the Hebrew word implied "an exercise of benevolence going beyond a man's legal obligations". We have now discovered that the divine ἡτῆς is also rendered ἐλεημοσύνη or ἔλεος because it implied a gracious act of God in the vindication or deliverance of His people. In the latter case the translation is not adequate, but it is less inadequate than δικαιοσύνη. Thus two aspects of ἡτῆς are polarized into δικαιοσύνη and ἐλεημοσύνη. In place of the comprehensive virtue of ἡτῆς, we have justice on the one hand, mercy on the other. Similarly, in reference to God, instead of thinking of a ἡτῆς which included
the element of grace, the Greek reader of the Old Testament was obliged to think here of justice, there of mercy. The idea is impoverished by the division of its two elements.

It is evident that this study of the Greek renderings of ἡστατία has an important bearing upon the uses of δικαιοσύνη, δίκαιος, δικαιοῦν in the New Testament. In particular, the Pauline use of these terms must be understood in the light of Septuagintal usage and the underlying Hebrew. The apostle wrote Greek, and read the LXX, but he was also familiar with the Hebrew original. Thus while his language largely follows that of the LXX, the Greek words are for him always coloured by their Hebrew association. Thus he was well aware that ἡστατία in God included both δικαιοσύνη and ἐλεημοσύνη, though Greek theologians who followed him were troubled by a supposed opposition of these qualities. Again, since the ἡστατία of God is that property which is exhibited in the act of ἰ噪声, Paul could speak of God as δίκαιος καὶ δικαιῶν (Rom. iii. 26) without the least sense of "paradox", such as many of his interpreters have found. His use of the term δικαιοῦν is not to be understood without reference to the linguistic phenomena studied above. As a Greek, he no doubt understood the term in the sense fixed upon it by the LXX, which, as we have seen, is a combination or confusion of two senses, both developed out of current Greek usage, but in neither case identical with it: "to do justice to", and "to deem righteous". Thus in forensic metaphor it means to "acquit". But Paul is well aware that in using such an expression as δικαιοῦν τῶν ἁσεβῶν (Rom. iv. 5) he was uttering a daring paradox, since the LXX uses precisely that expression in censure of unjust judges. The paradox was justified only because for Paul δικαιοῦν was haunted by the ghost of ἡστατία in its wider sense of "to vindicate", "redress". The Second
Isaiah spoke of God as thus vindicating and so delivering His people. What the prophet has never made perfectly clear is whether they are thus vindicated on their merits, or by the sheer grace of God. Paul puts the matter beyond question. God vindicated, delivered His people, while they were yet sinners (Rom. v. 6, iv. 5). He vindicated—the impious!—that they might become righteous. It is this act which is the δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ revealed (Rom. i. 18), for δικαιοσύνη carries with it the sense of ἡ ημέρα as we have observed it in Jud. v. 11, and in various passages of 2 Isaiah. It is to be observed that Paul does not mean by δικαιοῦν "to make righteous"; for this he uses, as a good Greek writer should, δίκαιον καθιστάναι. While the act of vindication or deliverance ("justification") has already taken place, the actual attainment of "righteousness" (δικαιοσύνη in the true Greek sense) is still future—δίκαιοι κατασταθήσονται οἱ πολλοί (Rom. v. 19). Since, however, Paul explains with emphasis how this attainment of "righteousness" is implicit in the initial act of God in "justification", it was excusable for his Greek commentators, who knew no Hebrew, to understand δικαίον in the sense "to make righteous". Thus Chrysostom in commenting on Rom. iii. 26 1 paraphrases Paul's meaning in the words δικαιοσύνης ἐνδειξις, τὸ μὴ μόνον αὐτὸν εἶναι δίκαιον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἑτέρους ἐν ἀμαρτίᾳ κατασταπέντας ἔξαιρης δίκαιος ποιεῖν. I am not aware of any place in a non-Christian Greek writer where δικαιοῦν has this sense, with one exception: Corp. Herm. xiii. 9, ἐδικασώθημεν, ὡ τέκνον, ἀδικίας ἀπούσης. Reitzenstein (Die Hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen, 1920, pp. 112-14), followed by Dibelius in his commentary on the Pastoral Epistles, has attempted to give to δικαίωσθαι a peculiar mystical sense which he finds also in 1 Tim. iii. 16: "das Wort δικαίωσθαι gibt die negative, θεωθῆναι die positive Bestimmung für das neue Wesen". But this does not

1 Hom. in Rom. VIII. (VII.), p. 485E.
do justice to the context. The writer is indeed describing the way in which the divine nature is implanted in man, who is thus "reborn" or "deified". But at each stage of the process an ethical change takes place, in which one of the vices natural to humanity is replaced by a virtue given by God. Thus ignorance is expelled by knowledge, ἀκρασία by ἐγκράτεια, and so forth. Among these changes is the substitution of δικαιοσύνη for ἁδικία, only instead of using the abstract noun the author, seeking variety of expression, uses the verb. Thus: ἡλθεν ἡμῖν γνῶσις τοῦ θεοῦ ταύτης δὲ ἐλθούσης, ὡ τέκνων, ἐξηλάθη ἡ ἁγνοία, and later, ἐδικασάθημεν, ὡ τέκνων, ἁδικίας ἀπούσης. Knowledge comes and ignorance goes, unrighteousness departs when righteousness comes. Thus the meaning is quite simply: "We have been made righteous, now that unrighteousness is away". The Περὶ Παλαγγελσιας is one of the few Hermetica, perhaps the only one in the Corpus, where it is possible that Christian influence may be traced. In that case the author must have been acquainted with Pauline language as interpreted by Greek commentators like Chrysostom. But this is uncertain. In any case the meaning of the verb δικαίωσθημεν has reached the predestined conclusion of its development. Δικαίωσθημεν should mean, etymologically, "to make righteous", as δουλωθημεν is "to make a slave", and ἰηλωθημεν "to make clear". Common-sense rejected this meaning, but religious experience affirmed that an unrighteous man may indeed be "made righteous"—by the grace of God.

is a characteristically Hebraic term for which we have no complete English equivalent. It is used of "kindness of men towards men, in doing favours or benefits" (B.D.B.). It is an attribute of God in relation to men, shown in delivering them from trouble, in forgiving their sin, in keeping covenant with them (and so
closely allied with ἐλεος. In this sense its natural translation is ἐλεος, which along with ἐλεημοσύνη, ἐλεήμων, πολυέλεος is its normal rendering in the LXX, whether it is used of God or of man.

The adjective ἅγιος has a different set of translations. Once only, where it refers to God, it is rendered ἐλεήμων (with v.l. ἔλεων). Where it is applied to men it is nearly always ὁσιος, once εὐλαβοῦμενος, once εὐσεβής (v.l. εὐλαβής). The LXX translators, therefore, took ἅγιος to mean "pious". What the original sense of the adjective may have been is a question upon which philologists are not agreed. Some suppose the adjective was passive, and meant the recipient of God's kindness; but it would then be difficult to account for its occasional application to God. Others suppose that a man is ἅγιος because he displays the divine character of which ἅγιος is the supreme attribute.

It may be that the common idea is that of loyal affection.\(^1\) Cf. Jerem. ii. 2.

ὁμοίως ἐργάζεται ἐν θεῷ, καὶ ἀγάπης τελεώσεως αὐτοῦ.

In that case we might compare the various senses of the Latin pius, pietas.\(^2\) These words have for their fundamental idea that of "dutifulness" or "loyalty". Pietas erga deos is "devoutness", "piety": pietas erga parentes, patriam, etc., is "loyal affection". But the word came

---

\(^1\) So Cheyne renders "duteous love", G. A. Smith, "leal love". Lofthouse (Hen and Hesed in the Old Testament, Z.A.T.W., Neue Folge, Bd. x. 1933, pp. 28 sqq.) says "Hesed: is not used indiscriminately, where any kind of favour is desired, but only where there is some recognized tie. It is indeed the very opposite of hen, which is in place just where there is no tie or claim. . . . We may compare it with the personal loyalty expected under the widespread feudal régime of the middle ages." Thus it would be a function of the "covenant" between Jehovah and His people.

to be used more generally of "kindness", "mercy", "clemency" (whence *pietà*, *pitié*, our "pity"). Finally it could be used of the mercy of God, as in the Vulgate. A Latin translator therefore might fitly have rendered רַחוֹם by *pietas*, רַצְדָּא by *pius*. Greek had no word which combined the ideas of "pity" and "piety", and the LXX translators were driven to split up the indivisible whole of רַחוֹם, denoting as it does the characteristic Hebrew conception of the supremely religious quality, into its various aspects, representing each by a separate word. Their renderings therefore call for investigation.

The normal renderings of רַחוֹם, ἐλεος, ἐλεημοσύνη, do partial justice to its meaning. These words are elsewhere used in the LXX to render Hebrew words from the roots ḫa ("to show favour"), ḫār ("to have compassion"), and the like, but in the vast majority of cases they stand for רַחוֹם. For רֵיחָנָי, רַחוֹם the translators have happily coined (as it seems) the adjective πολυελεος. Similarly, רַחוֹם is ἀνθρ. ἐλεημον (Prov. xi. 17, xx. 6). (Ἑλεημον, however, usually represents רַחוֹם, "gracious"). Other translations of רַחוֹם bear out the same idea. Once we have οἴκτειρμα (or οἴκτειρημα), thrice χάρις. This latter reading is peculiar to Esther and Sirach, i.e. to books which were translated relatively late. In the version of Symmachus (so far as we may judge from extant fragments), it was the preferred rendering of רַחוֹם. We may infer that the rendering χάρις was growing in popularity. In the N.T. period χάρις would be felt to have a close relation with רַחוֹם, and it is evident that the associations of that word have had influence in moulding the characteristic New Testament use of χάρις, which is different from any

---

1 Their occasional use to render פָּרוֹת, פֶּרֶשׁ has already been considered, see pp. 45-6, 55-7 above.  
2 For δίκαιος, δικαιοσύνη, as renderings of רַחוֹם see below.
ordinary Greek use, and not quite identical with the Septuagintal χάρος = ἡ ἔννοια.

The adjective ἡ ἔννοια is similarly rendered in Jerem. iii. 12, where God says ἡ ἔννοια, ἐλεήμων (ἐλεῶν) ἐγώ εἶμι. But this is an isolated case, and nowhere else in the whole LXX is ἡ ἔννοια rendered by words connoting kindness or mercy.

The normal rendering of ἡ ἔννοια is ὁσιος. The Greek word seems to mean sanctioned by divine law. It is used of sacred rites; then of persons, "religious", "devout", and occasionally of the gods, "holy". It has a somewhat faintly ethical implication, in so far as religion is ethicized in the Greek poets. In the LXX, in places where it does not represent ἡ ἔννοια, it renders Hebrew words from the roots ἡ ἔννοια ("pure"), ἔσχη ("upright"), ἵεμι ("holy"), ἱσχύς (the idea of integrity), or πλήρης (the idea of "soundness", "completeness"). It is thus perfectly clear that to the translators the Greek word suggested the ideas of piety, devoutness, or moral correctness, with no trace of the original idea of ἡ ἔννοια. Now we can recognize that in the Psalter, for example, the ἡ ἔννοια is pre-eminently the "devout" man, whose piety displays itself in love for God's law, and to that extent ὁσιος brings out the meaning. Yet the Hebrew writer was hardly unconscious of the fact that ἡ ἔννοια has a peculiarly close connection with kindness and mercy; but by the time the translation was made this aspect of piety seems to have fallen entirely into the background. For Hellenistic Judaism the religious man is simply ὁσιος, occupied with religious duties as such.

The term ὁσιος has further encroached upon parts of the field where it is not merely inadequate but obviously

1 Cf. Test. XII. Patr., T. Benj. v. 4, ἐλεήμων γὰρ ὁ ὁσιος τὸν λοίδωρον (the author wrote in Hebrew).
2 ἡ ἔννοια never becomes ὁσιότης (which is rare in the LXX, representing ὁσιότης, ἔσθη, ἵεμι), but once in Sir. it is ἐνθέβεια.
inappropriate as a translation of the Hebrew. Thus Ps. cxliv. (cxlv.) 17:

surely means "Jehovah is righteous in all His ways, and merciful in all His works". But the LXX renders—

Again 2 Sam. xxii. 26, surely means "To the kindly man thou wilt show thyself kind". The LXX renders μετὰ ὁσίου ὁσιωθήσῃ, an obscure expression which may mean "in the case of a pious man Thou shalt be hallowed". The same passage recurs in Ps. xviii. (xix.) 26, where B gives the same rendering, but N reads μετὰ ὁσίου ὁσίος ἐστί, "with a pious man Thou shalt be holy". In any case the true sense of the original is completely disguised.

Similarly, Is. iv. 3, must mean "the mercies guaranteed to David"; but it is rendered τὰ ὁσιὰ Δαυεὶδ τὰ πιστά. This could only mean something like "the trustworthy religious ordinances of David", i.e. presumably the religious institutions which he was supposed to have founded.

This thoroughgoing substitution of ὁσιός for πίστις is very remarkable, and calls for explanation. It is probable that similarity of sound had something to do with it. But a more important factor is a significant change in religious ideas. In the best Hebrew thought the character of God and of the religious man is marked by πίστις, the most outstanding ingredient in which is kindness or mercy. But the "religious" of the post-exilic period,
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calling themselves דודיד, ⁴ came to practise more and more a form of piety consisting in strict devotion to the Law. The law inculcated דודיד, in its true sense of mercy or kindness, but the essence of piety was to conform to the whole law, whether or not it had any particular relation to human kindness. Thus the דודיד were above all things ἁσιωτ —men who conformed to the divine Law. The LXX translation therefore represents what was at that period the most conspicuous aspect of Jewish piety, and stereotypes a colder, less humane aspect of religion than that which is represented by the Hebrew text. The term ἁσιωτ, being thus fixed as the equivalent of דודיד, is extended to passages where the character of God Himself is concerned, to the impoverishment of the prophetic conception of the Deity. It is noteworthy that the term ἁσιωτ is not one of the Septuagintal terms which became important in the vocabulary of the New Testament. It is absent from the Gospels and from Paul (apart from the Pastorals), and from Acts except in quotations from the Old Testament.

When דודי thus becomes the typical quality of the devout, it is very naturally identified with righteousness, that way of living according to the Law which became the distinguishing mark of the דודיד. Hence דודי is sometimes rendered δικαιοσύνη, chiefly in the Pentateuch, although in most if not all cases it is clear that the sense of "kindness" predominates.

¹ It has been suggested to me (by Professor L. W. Grensted) that the "religious" party among the post-exilic Jews was at first called εἰ δαιων, suitably enough, and that the assonance, ἁσιω — דודי, led to their appropriating the Hebrew appellation דודי. This suggestion seems worthy of consideration, though it might mean bringing more of the Psalter into the Hellenistic period than some critics would allow.
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Gen. xix. 19,

καὶ ἂν ἰδεῖ τό ἔλεος ἐναντίον σου καὶ ἐμεγάλυνας τὴν δικαιοσύνην σου.

Gen. xx. 13,

ταύτην τὴν δικαιοσύνην ποιήσον ἐπ’ ἐμὲ.

Similarly, in Is. lvii. 1, πρόσεβετε... κρύσταλλον is rendered ὁ δίκαιος ... καὶ ἄνδρες δίκαιοι.

The transition was no doubt easier because πρόσεβετε, as we have seen, is nearer to kindness than is δικαιοσύνη; but once turned into Greek, δικαιοσύνη carried with it ideas quite foreign to ἄνα.

This overlapping of δικαιοσύνη and ἐλεημοσύνη, both representing sometimes πρόσεβετε, sometimes ἄνα, is a curious linguistic phenomenon. It is explained partly by the lack of any quite exact equivalence between the Greek and the Hebrew words, but more significantly by the tension within Judaism between the older and more humane religion, of which the prophets are the leading exponents, and the growing legalism of the period in which the LXX translation was made.

As we have already observed, ἄνα frequently appears along with a companion term πρόσεβετε,1 commonly rendered either "truth", or "faith", after the LXX ἀλήθεια, πίστις.

1 E.g. Prov. iii. 3 (rendered ἐλεημοσύνη καὶ πίστεις), xiv. 22 (ἐλεον καὶ ἀλήθειαν, ἐλεον καὶ πίστιν), xx. 22 (28) (ἐλεημοσύνη καὶ ἀλήθεια); Hos. iv. 1 (ἀλήθεια οὐδὲ ἔλεος); Gen. xxiv. 49 (ἐλεος καὶ δικαιοσύνην), xlvi. 29 (ἐλεημοσύνην καὶ ἀλήθειαν); Josh. ii. 14 (ἐλεος καὶ ἀλήθειαι); 2 Sam. (2 Kms.) xv. 20 (ἐλεος καὶ ἀλήθειαι).
The word, with its cognates, דוד, הדרת, רַעַנְנָה, אַחֲרִית, is a substantive from the root רַעַנְנָה. The basic idea underlying the root is that of firmness or fixity. The Greek translators show themselves aware of this by occasionally translating words from this root by such expressions as στηρίζειν, στήριγμα. In the vocabulary of religion and ethics the verb is chiefly used (i) in the niphal participle, which bears the passive meaning "made firm", "confirmed", "established", and so "trustworthy", "faithful"; and (ii) in the hiphil, which means "to be convinced", "to trust".

For the sense of the hiphil the Greek translators found an appropriate rendering in πιστεύειν (ἐμπιστεύειν, καταπιστεύειν). This verb, from the same root as πείθω, means both "to give credence to", "to believe", and "to have confidence in", "to trust". Πιστεύειν with the dative adequately represents the Hebrew בָּשָׂם with a personal or an impersonal object, meaning "to have confidence in", "to believe in", "to trust", and πιστεύειν followed by a δι clause adequately represents the occasional בָּשָׂם, "to be convinced," "to believe that" so-and-so is the case. The only shade of difference is that the background of associations is more intellectual in the Greek. Thus to believe in the gods is for the Greek ordinarily to be convinced intellectually that they exist, e.g. Aristotle, Rhet. II. xvii., ἐξουσί πρὸς τὸ θείον πως πιστεύοντες διὰ τὰ γιγνόμενα ἀγαθὰ ἀπὸ τῆς τύχης. It could, however, take on a deeper meaning, which may be illustrated from Xenophon, Mem. I. i. 1–5. Socrates was accused of not acknowledging the gods, (οὐς μὲν ἡ πόλις νομίζει θεοὺς οὐ νομίζων). Xenophon defends him on the ground that he guided his own conduct and that of his companions by the intimations of his δαιμόνιον, which, like the omens observed by any pious Athenian, gave a sign from the

1 In Prov. xxvi. 25 מְשָׂפָה is μὴ πεισθῇς.
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gods. "You will surely agree", he proceeds, "that he did not wish to seem to his companions a fool or a charlatan. He would have seemed both, if he had foretold things as revealed by God and then appeared a liar. It is clear therefore that he would not have foretold them unless he believed that he would be speaking the truth (εἰ μὴ εἵποσεν ἀληθεύσεως). But who could have such belief in anyone other than God? (ταῦτα δὲ τίς ἀν ἄλλω πιστεύσειν ἢ θεῷ;) And believing in the gods, how can he be said not to have acknowledged that gods exist? (πιστεύων δὲ θεοῖς πῶς οὐκ εἶναι θεοὺς ἐνόμιζεν;)" Thus for Xenophon πιστεύων θεοῖς is something more than νομίζεω εἶναι θεοὺς. It is confidence in God, displayed in the acceptance of His revelation as true. Similarly, for the Hebrew יאמט בדבר יאמט (Ps. cv. (cvi.) 12). Socrates πιστεύων θεοῖς is not very different from Abraham, who ἐπιστεύσει τῷ θεῷ, βαβυλώνιον (Gen. xv. 6), for Abraham’s faith, too, was shown in accepting God’s promise as true. At most we may say that the intellectual moment of "belief" is somewhat stronger in the Greek, and the moral element of "trust" in the Hebrew. It is interesting to compare Philo’s treatment of the faith of Abraham. "Necessarily therefore the statement, ἐπιστευσεν Ἄβραμ τῷ θεῷ, is made πρὸς ἐπαινον τοῦ πεπιστευκότος. ‘Yet’, one might say, ‘do you judge this worthy of praise? Who would not pay attention to God when He speaks and promises, even if he were the most unjust and impious of men?’ To whom we will reply . . . ‘If you will make a deeper investigation, and not a very superficial one, you will clearly recognize that it is not easy μόνῳ θεῷ πιστεύσαι, without taking account of anything besides, because of our kinship with the mortality with which we are yoked together, which persuades us to trust (πεπιστευκέναι) in property, reputation, office, friends, health and strength of body, and many other things. But to eliminate all these things,
and to distrust (ἀπιστησαί) everything temporal, which is in its nature entirely untrustworthy, and μόνον πιστεύσαι θεῷ, who is in truth alone trustworthy, is the work of a great and celestial mind, which is no longer ensnared by anything in our world’” (Quis Rer. 90–3). Again, he asks, Πῶς ἂν τις πιστεύσαι θεῷ; and replies “By learning that all else changes, but He alone is changeless” (Leg. Alleg. II. 89). Thus we may say that in Hellenistic Judaism the expression πιστεύν θεῷ has a sense which carries over much of the meaning of יְהוָה בְּרוּ מִי, and strengthens and enriches one element in the meaning of the Greek phrase, which existed, but was not prominent, in ordinary Greek usage. Here we have the basis of the New Testament use of the word πιστεύν.

For the niphal the LXX uses πιστούσαθαι, in the sense of “to be rendered πιστός”, and so “to be confirmed”, “guaranteed”, and for its participle the adjective πιστός, “trustworthy”, nearly always of men, but in Deut. vii. 9, Ps. cxliv. (cxliv.) 14, Is. xlix. 7, of God, as worthy of men’s trust. So constantly in the New Testament, e.g. Lk. xii. 42, δ_ πιστός οἰκονόμος, “the trustworthy steward”; 1 Cor. i. 9, πιστός ὁ θεός ὑμῶν ἐκλήθητε, “God is trustworthy, by whom you were called” (so that the “calling” cannot be in vain); 2 Thess. iii. 3, πιστός δὲ ἐστιν ὁ κύριος ὃς στηρίζει υμᾶς, with a play upon the original sense of כַּלֶם. Cf. 2 Chron. xx. 20, הָאָשׁוּם בִּיהוָה אֶלֹהֵינוֹ וְאָשָׁם; Is. vii. 9, אָשָׁם לֹא הָאָשָׁם כְּכָל הָאָשָׁם. (In both cases the LXX misses the point. Paul was the better Hebraist.)

The substantives ἀπαθεῖς, ἀμαθεῖς, represent the sense of the niphal, “stedfastness”, “trustworthiness”, “faithfulness”. The active sense of the hiphil has in biblical Hebrew no corresponding substantive (such as is the Aramaic אֲמַסֵח, “faith”). These words are rendered by πίστος. Πίστος is almost always a quality of men, or their words and actions. It is never an attribute of God, directly, except in Lam. iii. 23, ἐπλήθωνεν ἡ πίστις
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\(\text{σοῦ} = \text{ῥῆφι ἁμαρτία} \) (omitted in BA), and in 1 Kms. xxii. 3 (1 Sam. xxii. 2), \(\text{θεοῦ \ πίστις} \), representing a Hebrew different from M.T. But cf. also Ps. xxxii. (xxxiii.) 4, \(\text{πάντα τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ \ εἰς \ πίστει} = \text{כללְּמִשְׁחָתָה \ בְּמִתְּמָנָה} \), Sir. i. 27 (34–5) \(\text{η ἐνδοκία αὐτοῦ \ πίστις \ καὶ \ πραότης} \) (no Hebrew extant).

It is to be observed that the Greek word \(\text{πίστις} \) is ambiguous. It means both “faithfulness”, and “belief” or “trust”.\(^1\) As we have seen, the latter meaning does not attach to \(\text{תַמָּכָא} \), and there is no passage in the LXX where the context would naturally suggest such a meaning. Paul’s treatment of his proof-text, Hab. ii. 4, is arbitrary. \(\text{ἡ ἀλήθεια} \) clearly means “A righteous man will continue to live by virtue of his steadfastness”. The LXX, rendering perhaps a slightly different Hebrew, gives \(\text{δίκαιος \ εκ \ πίστεως} \ \text{μου} \ \text{ζήσεται} \), understanding \(\text{πίστις} \) in its rarer sense as the faithfulness of God. Paul ignores the pronominal suffix, and renders the passage \(\text{δίκαιος} \ \text{εκ} \ \text{πίστεως} \ \text{ζήσεται} \) (or follows a translation which so rendered it), making it clear that by \(\text{πίστις} \) he understands “faith”, a meaning possible in the Greek, but not in the Hebrew original (Rom. i. 17, Gal. iii. 11).

When once, however, the term \(\text{πίστις} \) had established itself in the religious language of Hellenistic Judaism it was natural that the Greek word should develop its own extended meaning, and thus we find Philo using \(\text{πίστις} \) in the sense of “faith”, or “belief”, and meaning by it sometimes rather a mystical apprehension of reality than a personal trust in God.\(^2\) Among New Testament writers, the author to the Hebrews stands closest to Philo. Paul, though he uses \(\text{πίστις} \) in its active sense, yet gives it a content directly derivable from the Hebrew \(\text{תַמָּכָא} \), “trust”, rather than “belief”. In the Gospels, where Greek influence is unlikely, the use of \(\text{πίστις} \) in the sense of

---

\(^1\) For examples of this sense see M.M. s.v. The Greek word has also other senses which are not important for our purpose.

\(^2\) For the Philonic use of \(\text{πίστις} \) see pp. 199–200.
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"faith", "trust" in God, probably presupposes the Aramaic ança, a natural derivative from the hiphil (aphel) of the verb, and it is likely that the Gospel usage, or rather the usage in primitive Christian tradition lying behind the Gospels, has helped to determine Paul's use of the term. Throughout the New Testament, therefore, the dominant use of πίστις is not directly derived from its use in the LXX, though the content of the idea is in most cases supplied rather by the Hebrew נָחַת than by the Greek πιστέυω.

Wherever the words πίστις, πιστεύω, πίστις, πιστοῦν, are used in the LXX, they always, with negligible exceptions, render Hebrew words from the root נָחַת. Nevertheless, they are not the dominant renderings of such words. While נָחַת, נִמְתוֹנָה, etc., are thirty times translated πίστις, they are translated 119 times ἀλήθεια, and ἀλήθεια very seldom represents any other Hebrew word. Similarly, these words are rendered by ἀληθής and ἀληθινός. The basic idea of the stem ἀληθ- (said to be

1 For the close connection of πίστις ("trustworthiness") and ἀλήθεια in Hellenistic Greek, cf. P. Oxy. I. 70: πάσα κυρία ἐνγραφὸς σναλλαγὴ πίστιν καὶ ἀλήθειαν ἔχει: ι Tim. ii. 7, ἐν πίστει καὶ ἀλήθειᾳ. See M.M. s.v. πίστις. It is noteworthy that in Ps. cx. (cxi.) 7 הָיְתָה is rendered ἀλήθεια, and מִיְּמָר, πισταλ. In Prov. xiv. 22 the MSS. of the LXX have admitted two different translations of the same Hebrew couplet: in the one מֵתָא is rendered ἀλήθεια, in the other πίστις.

2 Ἀληθής is also used to translate בְּנָחַת ("wise") once, נַחַת ("established", and so "correct") twice in one context (Job xlii. 7-8), בָּר ("right") once, וַשָּׁתי ("sound wisdom") once, and מִשָּׁה and its Aramaic equivalent מֵשָׁה ("truth") once each; also, in variant readings, בָּר and בְּנוֹחַ once each, but these may be neglected. These occasional renderings serve to illustrate the associations which the word carried for the translators.

3 Ἀληθινός also renders שָׁתָה ("upright") four to six times (in Job), בָּשָׁה (of "full" or "true" weights and measures) once or twice, נָחַת ("pure", "innocent") once, מַשָּׁה (having the quality of "integrity")
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from a privative and λαθ, the root of λανθάνων is "real", "genuine", "true", as opposed to that which is false or merely apparent. The Greek terms, therefore, have in their origin little in common with the Hebrew words which they are employed to translate. The common ground would seem to lie in the application of both sets of terms to words or thoughts. These may be described as ἀλήθεια if they are sure, certain, deserving of confidence, if they will stand investigation. They may be described as ἀλήθεια if they correspond with reality. But in the last resort, only such words and thoughts as correspond with reality are deserving of confidence. To this extent ἀλήθεια = ἀλήθεια. By a certain extension of meaning, ἀληθής or ἀληθινός may be applied to persons, if they are (a) veracious, or (b) sincere, and these meanings approximate to that of ἀλήθεια, "trustworthy". But in the passage from the Hebrew ἀλήθεια to the Greek ἀλήθεια there is a certain inevitable shift of meaning, which is sometimes negligible, but at other times may affect the substance of the matter. Thus in 3 Kms. x. 6, ἀληθινὸς ὁ λόγος adequately represents ἀλήθεια in you. In Gen. xlii. 16 Joseph proposes a test to his brothers "that your words may be proved, whether there is ἀλήθεια in you". The LXX renders εἴ ἀληθεύετε. Joseph wishes to discover whether they are honest, trustworthy men; but as the particular question is whether their words are to be believed, the verb ἀληθεύων, "to speak the truth", is in place. But where in Neh. vii. 2 (2 Esd. xvii. 2) Hananiah is described as a trustworthy and God-fearing man, ἀληθής ἄμας τὰ ἐν χελόν, there is a shade of difference in the LXX ἀνὴρ ἀληθῆς καὶ φοβούμενος τὸν θεόν, for ἀληθῆς would naturally suggest to once or twice, as well as the Aramaic בָּשָׂא ("sure"), and בָּשָׂא ("true") in Daniel; also בָּשָׂא in a variant reading, and בָּשָׂא probably mistakenly in Num. xxiv. 3, 15.
a Greek reader either "veracious" or "sincere", neither of which is precisely ἀληθινός. Again, where the term ἀληθινός is applied to God, a change of meaning is almost inevitable. In Exod. xxxiv. 6, Ps. lxxxv. (lxxxvi.) 15 God is described as ἀληθινὸς, "abounding in mercy and faithfulness". This is rendered, in both places, πολύελεος καὶ ἀληθινός. The Greek reader had a choice of two meanings for ἀληθινός: "veracious", or "real". That is, he might think of God either as giving true revelations, or he might think of Him as the real God, distinct from the idols of the nations, which are unreal. But neither of these is precisely what is meant by ἀληθινὸς, which means that God is entirely worthy of men's trust, to be relied on in all their need. Where ἀληθινός stands alone, the second meaning "real" becomes almost inevitable for a Greek reader. Thus in Is. lxv. 16 the LXX reads: εὐλογήσουσιν γὰρ τὸν θεὸν τὸν ἀληθινόν, καὶ οἱ ὁμολογοῦντες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ὁμολογοῦν τὸν θεὸν τὸν ἀληθινὸν. The Hebrew expression, according to M.T., is ἀληθινός. The form ἀληθινός is elsewhere found only as an adverb, generally used as a confirmatory response (LXX γένοιτο). If this reading is right, then the idea probably is that oaths are to be taken by the God whose character confirms or guarantees such oaths. It is likely, however, that we should punctuate ἀληθινός = faithfulness (as in Is. xxv. 1), giving the familiar sense "the faithful God". But the Greek reader could hardly fail to understand τὸν θεὸν τὸν ἀληθινὸν as "the real God". Ἀληθινός has this specific sense. See Aristotle, Pol. III. 6 (11), 1281b, 12, where τὰ ἀληθινὰ means real objects as distinct from their pictured copies τὰ γεγραμμένα: Plato, Rph. 499c, ἀληθινῆς φιλοσοφίας ἀληθινὸς ἔρως; and the astronomical use of the term for the real (as opposed to the apparent) risings and settings of heavenly bodies (see L. & S.). Similarly, in Test. XII. Patr., T. Ash. iv. 3, τὸ δοκοῦν καλὸν μετὰ
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tοῦ ἀληθινοῦ καλοῦ. Ἀληθινὸς has the same sense in the N.T., e.g. Jn. i. 9, vi. 32, xv. 1; Heb. viii. 2, ix. 24; i Jn. ii. 8. So Philo has ἀληθινὸς ἄνθρωπος (the real heavenly man, in God's image = the Logos), ἀληθινὴ ζωή, and finally ὁ ἀληθινὸς θεός, e.g. De Spec. Leg. I. 332: οἱ ἁγνοοῦντες τὸν ἐνα καὶ ἀληθινὸν θεόν πολλοὺς καὶ ψευδωνύμους ἀναπλάττοντες περὶ τὸ ἀναγκαιότατον τῶν ὀντων τυφλόττουσιν. Leg. ad Gaium, 366, προεληλύθεσαν ἱκετεύειν τὸν ἀληθινὸν θεόν, ἵνα τὸν ψευδωνύμου τὰς ὀργὰς ἐπίσχη. Cf. also 3 Macc. vi. 18, ὁ μεγαλόδοξος καὶ παντοκράτωρ καὶ ἀληθινὸς θεός. This is the sense of ὁ ἀληθινὸς θεός in the New Testament: 1 Thess. i. 9; Jn. xvii. 3; i Jn. v. 20. It is purely Greek, though by an accident of translation it finds a place in the Old Testament.

Ἀλήθεια exhibits a similar shift, or extension, of meaning. As we have observed, when ἐν is used in relation to words or thoughts which are certain, or sure, it approaches to the meaning "truthfulness" and where it is used of persons, "trustworthiness" may approximate to "sincerity" or "veracity". In such cases ἀλήθεια may be a fairly adequate translation. But the ideas of "truthfulness", "veracity", "sincerity" are not so prominent in the connotation of ἀλήθεια as that of "truth" as opposed to falsehood. There are many passages in the LXX where this latter idea would more naturally suggest itself to Greek readers. Thus in Ps. xxiv. 5, διήγησον με ἐπὶ τὴν ἀλήθειάν σου καὶ δίδαξόν με would naturally be taken as a prayer to be divinely taught and so led to a knowledge of "the truth"; Ps. cxviii. 160, ἀρχὴ τῶν λόγων σου ἀλήθεια would naturally mean "Truth is the beginning, the first principle, of Thy words"; the expression φυλάσσειν ἀλήθειαν (Ps. cxlv. 6, Is. xxvi. 2) would suggest "to preserve or defend the truth (against error)". The divine title ὁ θεὸς τῆς ἀλήθειας (Ps. xxx. 6), which suggests either "the God in whom resides the ultimate truth",
or "the God of reality". The proclamation (Ps. cxix. 90), "Thy faithfulness lasts from age to age", becomes εἰς γενεάν καὶ γενεὰν ἡ ἀλήθειά σου, a declaration of the eternity of "truth". In many such passages it is not easy to read in the Greek the true meaning of the Hebrew, and the result is a certain intellectualizing of religion. Not the "faithfulness" of God, but abstract "truth" in God becomes the supremely worshipful thing, and the pursuit of "truth" becomes a characteristic activity of the religious man. This intellectualizing tendency in Hellenistic Judaism reaches an advanced stage in Philo, for whom ἀλήθεια is "the power that brings revelation of things that were wrapped in shadow" (ἡ τὰ τῶν συνεκσκιασμένων πραγμάτων ἀνακαλυπτήρια ἁγιονα δύναμις, De Ebr. 6), and is contrasted with ἁγιονα (ib.) and with φαντασία καὶ δόκησις (Quod Det. 162).

It is interesting to observe how in various New Testament passages allusions to the Old Testament are coloured by this Hellenistic tendency. Thus Paul speaks of τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ θεοῦ (an expression implied in the extremely frequent LXX phrases, ἡ ἀλήθεια σου, αὐτοῦ), and contrasts it with ψεύδος, "falsehood" (Rom. i. 25). The meaning is "the reality of God", contrasted with the unreality of idols. In Ἰν. xvi. 13, διὰν δὲ ἐλθῇ ἐκεῖνος, τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας, διηγήσει υμᾶς εἰς τὴν ἀλήθειαν πάσαν, we have an echo of the prayer διηγήσον με ἐπὶ τὴν ἀλήθειαν σου (Ps. xxiv. 5: in both cases there is a varia lectio ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ). The meaning is "He will lead you into truth", though the Hebrew original נָרַרֶה meant rather "cause me to walk in Thy faithfulness", i.e. probably the faithfulness which is a property of God, and which He expects from men. Ἰν. iv. 24, ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ δεῖ προσκυνεῖν, recalls Ps. cxliv. 18, τοῖς ἐπικαλουμένοις αὐτὸν ἐν ἀληθείᾳ: the Hebrew נָרַרֶה meant "with faithfulness or loyalty", but "John"
read the LXX as meaning "in reality", as opposed to mere appearance or outward observance. In Jn. i. 17 we have clearly an echo of the frequent Hebrew collocation חַיָּה חָרֵדֶת קַאֵל חַרְבּוֹא דָּיָהוּ חָרוֹב חָכוֹב אֲשֶׁר הָיוּ. The whole tenour of the Gospel shows that the evangelist understood חַרְבּוֹא as the "truth" revealed by Christ.
CHAPTER IV

SIN

The most general term in Hebrew expressing the idea of "evil" or "badness", whether physical or moral, is the root בֵּר with its derivatives. The corresponding terms in Greek are κακός (κακία) and πονηρός (πονηρία). The LXX properly uses one or other of these words to translate בֵּר, בָּר, בַּר in almost all cases.

For the idea of "sin" Hebrew commonly uses words from the root נָשַׁן, which has for its fundamental meaning "to miss the mark", "to go wrong". Here again the Greek language offers natural equivalents: the verb ἀμαρτάνει (ἐξ-, ἐφ-, δι-ἀμαρτάνει), the nouns ἀμαρτία, ἀμάρτημα, ἀμαρτωλός. The fundamental idea is the same. Whatever differences there may be are not differences in the meaning of the words, but depend upon differences in the general background of thought.

A second root of almost equally general significance is דָּשַׁנ, expressing the idea "fault", "offence". The LXX sometimes renders דָּשַׁנ, ἀμαρτία, more usually πλημμέλεια (πλημμέλημα), with πλημμελεῖν for the verb. As these words are reserved for דָּשַׁנ (with only six exceptions) we may take it that the translators regarded them as specially appropriate renderings of דָּשַׁנ. Πλημμέλεια is properly a "false note" in music. It would suggest a somewhat lighter judgment upon an action than ἀμαρτία—a "slip", perhaps, rather than a dead failure. Possibly this lighter judgment is also suggested in the occasional rendering of דָּשַׁנ by ἄγνοια (ἀγνοεῖν).

The more specific words used for various aspects of sinful behaviour offer more interesting material for study.

1. The word נִשַׁן has for its primary meaning "weari-
ness", "trouble", and in this sense it is represented in the LXX by πόνος, κόπος, μόχθος. But it is very frequently used in a moral sense for "wickedness", especially with reference to idolatry. The LXX translators understood it to mean infraction of the divine Law. It is normally represented by ἄνομία (ἀνομος).

2. The root לֹא was understood by the translators to imply specifically injustice: they render words from this root usually by ἁδικος (ἁδικία).

3. The root מָרָס expresses the idea of rebellion. When it is used in a political sense the verb is properly rendered ἀφιστάναι (e.g. 2 Chr. xxi. 8, ἀπέστη Ἐδώμ ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἰουδα). Frequently it is used of rebellion against God, wilful and defiant wickedness. This idea the LXX translators have rendered by the verb ἀσέβειν, the noun ἀσέβεια, and occasionally the adjective ἀσέβης. The root σεβ- expresses the idea of "awe": σέβεσθαι means "to stand in awe" of the divine, and it occurs alternatively with φοβεῖσθαι as a translation of the Hebrew phrase הָרָה יְהוָה, "to fear the Lord". So (יהוה ירבי) הָרָה יְהוָה is εὐσέβεια (Is. xi. 2), εὐσέβεια εἰς θεόν (Prov. i. 7). εὐσπ. προς τὸν κύριον (Is. xxxiii. 6), or θεοσέβεια (Gen. xx. 11; Job xxviii. 28). Where this "fear of the Lord" is absent, there is ἄσεβεια, ἀσέβεια. The Greek translators, therefore, ignoring the etymological meaning of the word, have found a felicitous rendering for the idea. We have no good English equivalent: "impiety" or "godlessness" perhaps come nearest.

Thus we have three specific aspects of sin: lawlessness, injustice, and godlessness, corresponding to the Hebrew terms נְשָׁם, בְּשָׁם, עַשָּׁם. While, however, the terms ἄνομία, ἁδικία, ἀσέβεια must be regarded as normally the equivalents of these three words, it is noteworthy that they are used to render several other terms. Thus:

1 The LXX has expanded the Hebrew, and יְהוָה יְהוָא is represented both by φόβος θεοῦ and by εὐσέβεια εἰς θεόν.
(i) "Ανομος (ἀνομία) not infrequently represents ἁμαρτία, a word which originally had the neutral sense of "plan" or "device", but is used of evil devices, and in particular of unchastity. The rendering ἁμαρτία in one place (Ezek. xxii. 9) may be an attempt to do justice to its distinctive meaning. But for the most part the LXX translators have been content to bring it under the general heading of infraction of the divine law.

(ii) ἁμαρτία (ἁμορμία, ἁμομος) and ἁσέβεια are also used to translate ἁμαρτία, which means something abhorred, an "abomination," primarily as the object of ritual tabu (βέλυμα). The rendering ἁμορμία for this word is almost confined to Ezekiel, where it occurs twenty-five times. It represents a rationalizing of an originally non-rational concept. For the primitive "numinous" horror is substituted the idea of the infraction of legal regulations.

(iii) "Ανομος (ἀνομία), ἁσέβης, 1 and ἁμαρτωλος 2 are all frequently used to translate words from the root ἁμαρτα, 3 which seems to express nothing more specific than downright wickedness. To the translators it suggested either sinfulness in general, or specifically, "lawlessness" or "godlessness".

(iv) ἁδικία and ἁσέβεια frequently represent ἁμαρτία. The idea underlying this root is that of "violence", and it can be used of physical acts of violence, either to persons or to things. The translators seem to have been unaware of this specific meaning. For them ἁμαρτία is only another expression for "injustice" or "godlessness".

1 ἁσέβης is nearly always ἁμαρτία, though ἁσέβεια is nearly always ἁμαρτία.
2 ἁμαρτωλος is generally ἁμαρτία, though ἁμάρτημα, ἁμάρτια seldom represent words from this root.
3 An instructive passage is Ps. xxxv. (xxxvi.) 2, where both ἁμαρτία (here παράνομος) and ἁμαρτία (here ἁμαρτάνειν) are attributed to the man who has no fear of God (φόβος θεοῦ). This shows how natural it would be to understand both ἁμαρτία and ἁμαρτία in the sense of ἁσέβεια.
"Atikia, anomia (anomyma) frequently stand for ḥes. The distinctive idea of the word would seem to be that of "guilt". To the translators it suggests simply "injustice", or "lawlessness".

Thus ḥakia, anomia, and ḥsebeia do duty for a variety of Hebrew expressions. If we take into account not only the normal or regular renderings, but those which though not regular are sufficiently frequent to be significant, we must add that ḥakos (ḥakia) represents also ḥan, yesh, and yan, as well as ḥak, which is normally (and more appropriately) rendered Ṣedos (Ṣedos); that ḥanos (anomia) represents also Ṣan, Ṣev, and yesh; and that ḥsebeia sometimes represents Ṣan. The relations of these terms may be represented in the following table, where the first column represents renderings frequent enough in proportion to others to be regarded as normal, the second column renderings which are less frequent, but still frequent enough to be significant, and the third renderings which occur only very occasionally (in some cases only once). Renderings which have the appearance of mere caprice or eccentricity have been ignored.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ḥan</td>
<td>anomia (-os)</td>
<td>ḥakia (-os)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṣan</td>
<td>plhmélia (-ei, -en)</td>
<td>Ṣaartia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṣan</td>
<td>anomalia (-os)</td>
<td>anomalos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṣan</td>
<td>Ṣaartia (-ηma, -αnein, -wloes, ξτ, -ητ, -ρη-)</td>
<td>ḥsebeia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṣan</td>
<td>ḥakia, ḥsebeia</td>
<td>anomia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṣan</td>
<td>ḥakia, anomia (-ηma)</td>
<td>anomia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṣan</td>
<td>ḥsebeia (-ei, -ηma, -hs)</td>
<td>ḥkia (-ηma, -en), parapatuma, paránamos, Ṣaartia (-ηma), planav,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṣan</td>
<td>Ṣamartwlos, anomos (-iδ), ḥsebhs</td>
<td>Ṣakos (-i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṣan</td>
<td>Ṣedos (-os)</td>
<td>Ṣakos (-i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṣan</td>
<td>Ṣedon</td>
<td>anomia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 planav is the normal (and appropriate) rendering of Ṣan.
The facts which emerge are these: (i) The LXX uses a notably poorer ethical vocabulary than the Hebrew. (ii) There is a strong tendency to reduce all manner of evil behaviour to the concepts of ἀδικία and ἄνομία, and particularly the latter. This is one more symptom of the growing legalism which we have noted in other connections. The LXX version tended to stereotype this legalistic notion of sin in Hellenistic Judaism.

In the New Testament the use of ἁνομια, ἄνομία is notably restricted. Ἰνομία is found in Matt. (four times), in the Pauline corpus (six times), in Heb. (once or twice), and in Ἰ Jn. (twice in one verse). Ἀνομια is found in Mk. (once), in Lk. (once), in Acts (once), in the Pauline corpus (five times), and in 2 Pet. (once). Of these, the occurrences in Mk. and Lk. are citations of the LXX (= ἡμαρτία), as well as the occurrences in Rom. iv. 7 (= ἡμαρτία) and Heb. i. 9 (where Heb. like the LXX has v.l. ἀδικία = ἡμαρτία). Of the Pauline passages (not being citations), two are in the Pastorals, where a non-Pauline strain of neo-legalism is recognized. Of the remainder, ἱ Cor. ix. 21 uses ἁνομια (thrice) in its strict sense, "without law" (not "sinful", cf. also ἁνομια in ἱ Rom. ii. 12); and in 2 Thess. ii. 3, 7, 8, ὀ ἁνομια, ὀ ἁνθρωπος τῆς ἁνομίας, are technical terms for Antichrist, hardly of Paul's own coinage. It may be said that Paul himself only twice (Rom. iv. 7, 2 Cor. vi, 14) uses ἁνομία in its general LXX sense (= ἡμαρτία, ἁμαρτία, etc.). In Mt., with its legalistic strain, ἁνομια is more freely used in this general sense, in contrast to the other three Gospels. It is almost unknown to the rest of the N.T., apart from Ἰ Jn. iii. 4: πᾶς ὁ ποιῶν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν καὶ τὴν ἁνομίαν ποιεῖ. καὶ ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐστὶν ἡ ἁνομία. This explicit equation of sin and lawlessness is quite in the spirit of the LXX, and is exceptional in the N.T.

"Ἀδικος, ἀδικία are more freely used, but in a very large proportion of their occurrences, they have their properly Greek sense of "injustice", "unfairness", or "dis-
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honesty”, or else are required to provide an antithesis to δίκαιος, δικαιοσύνη.

’Ασεβεία, ἀσεβής, ἀσεβεῖν are used occasionally: ten times in 2 Pet. and Jude, eight times in the rest of the N.T. (not at all in the Gospels).

In contrast, ἁμαρτία, ἁμάρτημα, ἁμαρτωλός, ἁμαρτάνειν, are used over 250 times; and Paul, with his πάντες ἡμάρτον καὶ ὑστεροῦνται τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ (Rom. iii. 23), has suggested a definition of sin which, while entirely true to the original sense of θνητί, ἁμαρτάνειν, and to the uses of these words in the Hebrew and Greek O.T., leads to a profound and non-legalistic interpretation of the idea.
CHAPTER V

ATONEMENT

ONE of the leading terms in the cult-vocabulary of the Old Testament is רפא (E.V. usually, “to atone”, “make atonement”).

The etymological meaning of רפא is a matter of controversy, which does not concern us here. A study of the translations of the word in the LXX will throw light upon the sense in which it was understood by Hellenistic Jews in Egypt during the period in which the translation was made.

The stock rendering is ἱλάσκεσθαι, or ἱεράλάσκεσθαι, with the corresponding substantives ἱλασμός, ἱεράλασμός, ἱεράλασις, ἱεράλασμα. In classical Greek and in the Κοινε ἱλάσκεσθαι, ἱεράλάσκεσθαι, have regularly the meaning “placate”, “propitiate”, with a personal object. As a secondary meaning ἱεράλάσκεσθαι also bears the sense “expiate”, with an impersonal object; e.g. Plato, Laws, 862c, τῷ ἀπόνοιας ἱεράλασθεν, Ditt. Syll. 1042, ὅσ ὅν ἄν πολυπραγμονήν τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ ἢ περιεργάσσει, ἀμαρτίαν ὅφειλέτω Μηνὶ Τυπάνῳ ἢν οὐ μὴ δύνηται ἱεράλάσσασθαι. Thus the words are in themselves ambiguous, and a close study of LXX usage is necessary to determine which sense predominated in Hellenistic Judaism.

A. It will assist our enquiry to examine first the other terms used in the LXX to translate רפא and its derivatives.

I. In Dan. ix. 24 the Chigi and Chester-Beatty MSS. (87 and 968), supposed to represent the LXX of Daniel, render לָבָנָה, תַּתִּי יִשְׂנָה לֵבָנָה, τὰς ἄδικιας σπανίσαι καὶ
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ἀπαλείψαι τὰς ἀδικίας. A, representing here the (so-called) version of Theodotion, has τοῦ σφραγίσαι ἀμαρτίας [καὶ ἀπαλείψαι ἀδικίας] καὶ τοῦ ἐξιλάσασθαι ἀδικίας. The clause which I have bracketed surely represents an interpolation from the LXX text. Here the LXX translators would seem to have been influenced by an etymology of ἡπαρρυ which finds favour with some moderns, giving the sense "to wash away", as in the Babylonian κυρφυρυ.

2. In Exod. xxx. 10 we have two occurrences of ἐκκαθαρίζω and one of its derivative καθαρισμός. In the first case ἐκκαθαρίζω is rendered, regularly, καὶ ἐξιλάσασται περὶ αὐτοῦ Ἀραβῶν ἐπὶ τῶν κεράτων αὐτοῦ, while in the second case ἐκκαθαρίζω is rendered καθαρίζει αὐτό. The phrase ἐκκαθαρίζω becomes in B ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ, in A, ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν τοῦ ἐξιλασμοῦ, where once again we may fairly suspect a conflate reading.

The renderings καθαρίζειν for ἐκκαθαρίζω and καθαρισμός for καθαρισμός occur elsewhere, the former in Exod. xxix. 37, the latter in Exod. xxix. 36. Similarly, in Deut. xxxii. 43 ἐκκαθαρίζω is rendered ἐκκαθαρίζει Κύριος τὴν γῆν τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ (where the translators seem to have read ἄρμα τῆς τῆς). Again in Is. xlvii. 11, καθαρίζειν for καθαρίζειν is rendered ἦξει ἐπὶ σὲ ταλαιπωρία καὶ ὃν μὴ δυνήσῃ καθαρά γενέσθαι. Here a differently vocalized text seems to be implied, but the sense of "purification" is established.

3. In Exod. xxix. 33, 36 ἐκκαθαρίζω is rendered ἀγνάζειν, the object being in the former place the priests, in the latter the altar.

4. In Jer. xviii. 23,
is rendered

\[ \mu\eta\ \dot{a}b\theta\mu\omega\varsigma\ \tau\acute{a}s\ \dot{a}\delta\dot{i}k\lambda\acute{a}s\ \alpha\nu\tau\omicron\varnothing, \]

\[ \kappa\acute{i} \tau\acute{a}s\ \dot{a}\mu\acute{a}r\tau\acute{a}l\acute{a}s\ \alpha\nu\tau\omicron\varnothing\ \acute{a}p\delta\omicron\ \pi\rho\rho\sigma\omega\rho\omicron\upsilon\varpi\omicron\ \sigma\omicron\ \mu\eta\ \dot{e}\zeta\alpha\lambda\epsilon\iota\lambda\iota\upsilon\psi\varsigma. \]

\'A\theta\nu\omicron\nu\ properly means to declare or pronounce \( d\dot{o}\rho\sigma\),
free of guilt (cf. \( \delta\dot{i}k\alpha\omega\omicron\nu\)). Elsewhere in the LXX it always renders some form of the root \( \eta\nu\nu\ ), "to be clean", "pure", "guiltless". Thus the translators of Jeremiah understood \( \eta\nu\nu\ ), in the only place in that book where it occurs, to mean "to cancel sin", with God as subject—virtually = "to forgive".

To sum up: where the LXX translators do not render \( \eta\nu\nu\ ) and its derivatives by words of the \( \dot{i}\lambda\acute{a}sk\epsilon\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota\ ) class, they render it by words which give the meaning "to sanctify", "purify" persons or objects of ritual, or "to cancel", "purge away", "forgive" sins. We should therefore expect to find that they regard the \( \dot{i}\lambda\acute{a}sk\epsilon\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota\ ) class as conveying similar ideas.

B. We now turn to \( \dot{i}\lambda\acute{a}sk\epsilon\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota\ ) and words of the same class, and examine first the Hebrew words, other than \( \eta\nu\nu\ ) and its derivatives, which are rendered by these Greek words.

1. \( \dot{E}x\dot{i}\lambda\dot{a}sk\epsilon\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota\ ) in middle, with human subject = \( \dot{\alpha}m\eta\ ), "to un-sin", "cleanse from defilement", "expiate" (elsewhere rendered \( \kappa\acute{a}th\acute{a}r\acute{i}z\acute{e}w\ ), \( \dot{a}\dot{f}a\gamma\nu\acute{i}z\acute{e}w\ ), \( \beta\alpha\tau\acute{t}iz\acute{e}w\ ), \( \acute{a}p\dot{a}t\iota\nu\nu\acute{e}w\ ) ; in 2 Chron. and Ezek. pass. Similarly, Ezek. xliii. 23, \( \sigma\nu\nu\tau\acute{e}l\acute{e}w\sigmai\ ) \( \tau\eta\nu\ ) \( \dot{e}x\dot{i}\lambda\alpha\sigma\mu\omicron\nu\ )\n
So also Ezek. xliv. 19, \( \tau\omicron\ \dot{a}m\alpha\ ) \( \tau\omicron\nu\ ) \( \dot{e}x\dot{i}\lambda\alpha\sigma\mu\omicron\nu\ ) = \( \dot{\alpha}m\dot{\iota}m\ ) \( \dot{\sigma}\dot{t}\).

Under this head should probably be placed the two passages where \( \dot{e}x\dot{i}\lambda\dot{a}sk\epsilon\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota\ ), \( \dot{i}\lambda\alpha\mu\omicron\osigma\ ) represent the root \( \dot{o}\nu\nu\ ), Hab. i. 11, Am. viii. 14. The translation is mistaken, for \( \dot{o}\nu\nu\ ) = "be guilty", \( \nu\nu\nu\nu\ ) = "guilt"; but the translators seem to have been influenced by the close kinship of \( \dot{o}\nu\nu\ ) and \( \dot{\alpha}m\eta\ ).
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2. ‘Ιλάσκεςθαί in middle, with divine subject, = ἄφεσις, “to forgive” (elsewhere rendered ἀφίέναι, ἀφαίρεῖν, καθαρίζειν, οὖ μμηκεν, etc.).

4 Kms. v. 18, ἱλάσκεται Κύριος τῷ δούλῳ σου (bis).
Ps. xxiv. 11, καὶ ἱλάσῃ τῇ ἀμαρτίᾳ μου.
2 Chron. vi. 30, καὶ σὺ εἰσακούσῃ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ . . . καὶ ἱλάσῃ (R, ἱάση AB; but ἱάσθαι is nowhere else used to render ἄφεσις).

So εξιλασμὸς = ἔξωθή: Dan. (Theod.) ix. 9, τῷ Κυρίῳ ἡμῶν οἱ οἰκτηροὶ καὶ οἱ εξιλασμοὶ (LXX ἔλεος).
There is an illuminating passage in Sir. v. 5–6:

περὶ εξιλασμοῦ (ἐξωθής) μὴ ἄφοβος γίνο

προσθειναί ἀμαρτίαν ἐφ' ἀμαρτίαις.
καὶ μὴ εἴπης, 'Ο οἰκτήρας αὐτοῦ πολύς.
τὸ πλήθος τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν μου εξιλάσεται (Ῥημ.).

3. ‘Ιλάσκεςθαί in passive, ἴλεως εἶναι ορ γίγνεσθαι, εὐλατέευν, all with divine subject = ἄφεσις, “to forgive”.

Deut. xxix. 20, οὐ μὴ θελήσῃ ὁ θεὸς εὐλατέευν (A, -εσσαί B) αὐτῷ.
4 Kms. xxiv. 4, οὐκ ἡθέλησεν Κύριος ἱλασθῆναι.
Am. vii. 2, Κύριε ἴλεως γενοῦ.
So several times in 3 Kms., 2 Chron., Jer.
I have here separated ἱλασθῆναι from ἱλάσασθαί, but I shall raise the question later whether in fact ἱλασθῆναι was not felt as a middle rather than a true passive, as indeed the equivalence with ἴλεως εἶναι would suggest.
4. Ἰλέως γίγνεσθαι, εὐλατάτος γίγνεσθαι, with divine subject: = (ὅ) ἄφεσις.

Num. xiv. 19, ἄφες τῇν ἀμαρτίαν τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ κατὰ τὸ μέγα ἔλεος σου καθάπερ ἴλεως αὐτοῖς ἐγένου ἀπ' Αἰγύπτου ἔως τοῦ νῦν = σφαλήνα ἔστω ἦν τοίχος τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ἔστασαι τὸν νῦν = λέες τον θεον μεταβας ἐφικάθῃ.
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Ps. xcviii. (xcix.) 8, ὁ θεός εὐλατος ἐγίνον αὐτοῖς = ἀλλ' ἐματίσθαι τὸν λόγον.

Sir. xvi. 7, οὐκ ἔξιλάσατο περὶ τῶν ἀρχαίων γεγάντων = οὐκ ἐξαρίστηκεν λόγος.

According to B.D.B. τῷ ὄντω, [κηnb (sic. κηα)] = "to remove (iniquity)", cum. dat. comm., is used in E, where DP use ἐφαν and J both; and also in early prophets, Sam., Job, and earlier and latest Psalms. Thus the meaning is simply "to forgive", and this use may be regarded as a variant of 3.

5. Ἰλάσκεθαι in passive, ἴλεως γίγνεσθαι, with divine subject = ὅμοι ( niphal = "have compassion"), ὅτι ( piel = "have compassion").

Exod. xxxii. 14, καὶ Ἰλάσθη Κύριος = ἡρισθήσατο.

Exod. xxxii. 12, ἴλεως γενοῦ ἐπὶ τῇ κακίᾳ τοῦ λαοῦ σου = ἐχθρίσθη τῇ κακίᾳ σου.

Is. liv. 10, Κύριος ἴλεως σοι (NA: ἴλεως σοι Κύριε B) = ἡρισθήσατο.

6. Ἐξιλάσκεθαι in middle, with human subject and God as object = ἐκρή, "to appease", "pacify", "propitiate".

Zech. vii. 2, καὶ ἔξαπέστειλεν εἰς Βασίλη Σαρασάρ καὶ Ἀρβεσσεῖρ ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ οἱ ἄνδρες αὐτοῦ ἔξιλάσαθαν τῶν Κύριων.

Zech. viii. 22, καὶ ἤξουσιν λαοὶ πολλοὶ καὶ ἔθνη πολλὰ ἐκζητήσας τὸ πρόσωπον Κύριου Παντοκράτορος ἐν Ἰεροουσαλήμ καὶ ἔξιλάσαθαν τὸ πρόσωπον Κύριων.

Mal. i. 9, καὶ νῦν ἔξιλάσκεσθε τὸ πρόσωπον τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ δεηθήτε αὐτοῦ . . . εἰ λήμψομαι ἐξ ὑμῶν πρόσωπα ὑμῶν; λέγει Κύριος Παντοκράτωρ.

In these three passages, then, we meet for the first time with unmistakable examples of the ordinary classical and Hellenistic sense of ἔξιλάσκεσθαι = "to propitiate". In all other cases where ἐκρή occurs in the Hebrew the
translators have avoided the rendering ἐξιλάσκεσθαι: the usual rendering is δεῖσθαι (ten times); elsewhere we find ζητεῖν, ἐκζητεῖν, λιτανεύειν (once each), also θεραπεύειν, but not with the Deity as object. We may therefore ask whether there is not something exceptional about the usage in these three passages which accounts for the choice of a rendering otherwise avoided. In the first and third of the passages there is a distinct tone of contempt: it is useless to think of “placating” Jehovah! In Zech. vii. 2–14 we have a repetition of the old prophetic declaration—not sacrifice or fasting, but justice and mercy are Jehovah’s demands. The burden of Mal. i. 9 sqq. is “I have no pleasure in you, saith Jehovah Zebaoth, neither will I accept an offering at your hand”. Thus it seems clear that the translators have deliberately used ἐξιλάσκεσθαι with a note of contempt for its standard meaning in pagan usage, as unworthy of the God of Israel. In Zech. viii. 22 the case is not so clear; but it is noteworthy that here, not Israel, but pagan peoples are represented as coming to “propitiate” Jehovah, and this may have influenced the translators in allowing the ordinary pagan sense of ἐξιλάσκεσθαι to appear. The use is in any case clearly exceptional.

7. ἐξιλάσκεσθαι in middle, with human subject = ἰήσους, “to intercede”, “pray”.

Ps. cv. 30, καὶ ἔστη Φυεῖς καὶ ἐξιλάσατο, καὶ ἐκόπασεν ἡ θραύσις.

The verb ἰήσους, ἰησοῦς, which is extremely common in the Old Testament, is always rendered elsewhere by εὐχεσθαι, προσεύχεσθαι. It is difficult to see why the translators, who habitually, and very frequently, render ἰήσους by words meaning “to pray”, here and here alone substitute ἐξιλάσκεσθαι. The Psalm refers to an incident described in Num. xxv.; see especially xxv. 11, Φυεῖς νῦν Ἑλεαζαρ νῦν Ἀαρών τοῦ ἱερέως κατέπαυε τὸν θυμὸν μου ἀπὸ νῦν Ἰσραήλ. This result Phineas had produced by killing two
offenders against Jehovah. Thus the story is one of "propitiation" in the crudest sense. It may be that the translator of the Psalm had this passage in mind, and that he means us to understand "Phineas stood up and placated (the Lord)". But it would be a curiosity of translation if a sense of ἔξιλάσκεσθαι, which is elsewhere carefully avoided (δεῖσθαι or some such colourless word being used instead where the Hebrew suggested "propitiate"), were gratuitously introduced in this single passage, where there is nothing in the Hebrew to suggest it. It is to be observed that no object is expressed, and where ἔξιλάσκεσθαι is used absolutely elsewhere the meaning is invariably "to perform an act of expiation, or purification" (see C. 2 infra).

The only remaining occurrence of ἔξιλάσκεσθαι where it does not represent ἔξομι is 1 Kms. vi. 3, where it seems to correspond to יִשְׁכִּין. Either the translators are paraphrasing rather than translating, or they had a different text. In either case the passage gives no help towards determining the meaning of the word.

To sum up: where words of the ἰλάσκεσθαι class do not render ἔξομι and its derivatives, everywhere, except in the four cases last considered, they render words which fall into one or other of two classes: (i) with human subject, "to cleanse from sin or defilement", "to expiate"; (ii) with divine subject, "to be gracious", "to have mercy", "to forgive". It is noteworthy that in rendering words of the second class the passive and middle are used interchangeably. It looks as though there had been a development towards this use of the word along two lines: (a) the usual pagan use of ἰλάσκεσθαι gives it the meaning "to propitiate", "make propitious"; hence the passive means "to be propitiated", "to become propitious", and so of the Deity, "to be gracious"; (b) the less common pagan use of ἔξιλάσκεσθαι (as in Plato, Laws, 862e, and the Men Tyrannus inscription) gives it the meaning "to cancel sin", "to expiate", with a human
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subject. Where the subject is divine, as in many passages of the LXX, though apparently in no pagan writer, the act of cancelling sin is an act of forgiveness, and so ἰλάσκεσθαι and ἐξιλάσκεσθαι acquire the meaning "to forgive", which is substantially identical with that of the passive, "to be gracious towards". This seems to be an entirely new usage, with no pagan parallels. The development of meaning lies in the realm of religious experience and theology, not in the realm of philology.

C. To turn now to the very numerous instances where words of the ἰλάσκεσθαι class are used to translate ἀφέω and its derivatives:

I. ἰλάσκεσθαι, ἐξιλάσκεσθαι, in middle, with direct object = "to cleanse", "purge", "sanctify", "cancel sin", etc. (cf. καθαρίζεων, ἀγιάζεων, ἀθωοῦν, ἀπαλείφειν, A. supra). This is precisely the usage of the Men Tyrannus inscription.

Lev. xvi. 16, ἐξιλάσεται τὸ ἄρμαν.
Lev. xvi. 33, τὸ θυσιαστήριον ἐξιλάσεται.
Ezek. xlv. 20, ἐξιλάσεσθε τὸν οἶκον.
Et simm. passim in Lev. and Ezek.
Sir. iii. 30, ἐλεημοσύνη ἐξιλάσεται ἁμαρτίας.
Similarly in the passive (as in the passage from Plato's Laws),
Num. xxxv. 33, οὐκ ἐξιλασθήσεται ἢ γῆ ἀπὸ τοῦ αἴματος.
Deut. xxi. 8, ἐξιλασθήσεται αὐτοῖς τὸ αἷμα.
I Kms. iii. 14, εἰ ἐξιλασθήσεται ἀδικία οἰκοῦ Ἡλεί.
In all the above cases the expressed or implied subject is human. In one case the subject is God:
Ps. lxiv. 4, τὰς ἀσεβείας ἡμῶν σὺ ἰλάσῃ.
This is the reading of ΝΒ; A is missing here, but T, which usually agrees closely with A, has the dative ταῖς ἀσεβείας, and Νεα similarly ταῖς ἀσεβείας. If the ΝΒ reading is accepted, then we have an exact parallel to ἐξιλάσκεσθαι =
(B. 2 supra), and the meaning is simply "Thou wilt forgive our iniquities". If the dative is read, this example will come under 3 infra.

Under the present head come the uses of ἐξιλασμός, ἐξιλασία in the sense of "expiation", Exod. xxx. 10 (A), Lev. xxiii. 27–8, Num. xxix. 11, 1 Chron. xxviii. 11. Here also ἠλαστήριον = ἡσυχασμος passim, on which see Deissmann, Bible Studies, 124 sq.

2. Ἰλάσκεσθαι, ἐξιλάσκεσθαι, in middle with prepositional phrases (ἐπὶ, περὶ, ὑπέρ), with human subject. This is the most frequent use.

Exod. xxx. 15, 16, ἐξιλάσασθαι περὶ τῶν ψυχῶν ὑμῶν.
Exod. xxxii. 30, ἵνα ἐξιλάσωμαι περὶ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ὑμῶν.
Ezek. xlv. 17, τὸν ἐξιλάσασθαι ὑπέρ τοῦ οἴκου Ἰσραήλ.

Et simm. passim, chiefly in Ezek. and Pentateuch. This does not appear to differ essentially from the uses under C. 1, the variation in construction following (though not quite regularly) the varying Hebrew construction of הִשָּׁם with accusative or with לְ, רָפָא. The meaning is identical, "to make expiation for", "to expiate or cleanse".

3. Ἰλάσκεσθαι, ἐξιλάσκεσθαι in middle with dative, and with divine subject.

Ps. lxxvii. (lxxviii.) 38:

αὐτὸς δὲ ἐστὶν οἰκτίρμων
καὶ ἠλάσται ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις αὐτῶν,
καὶ οὐ διαφθερεῖ.

= ἡμῶν ῥήμα βιβλεῖ ὑφί σε ἑπτήθη

Εζεκ. xvi. 63, ἐν τῷ ἐξιλάσκεσθαι μὲ σοι κατὰ πάντα ὁσα ἐποίησας, λέγει Κύριος = ἡμεῖς ὑπέρ τῶν ἑαυτῶν (here the verb might also be passive).

The meaning is not different from that of Ἰλάσκεσθαι, with divine subject and accusative of direct object. The verb in the Hebrew of Ps. lxxvii. 38 takes the accusative.
ATONEMENT

The meaning is scarcely to be distinguished from "to forgive".

4. Ἰλάσκεσθαι, ἐξιλάσκεσθαι, in passive, Ἰλεως γίνεσθαι, with divine subject.

Ps. lxxviii. (lxxix.) 9:

Κύριε ῥόσαι ἡμᾶς,
καὶ ἱλάσθητι ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ἡμῶν =

2 Chron. xxx. 18-19, Κύριος ἀγαθός ἐξιλάσθω ὑπὲρ πάσης καρδίας κατευθυνούσης ἐκζητησούσης Κύριον τὸν Θεὸν τῶν πατέρων αὐτῶν.

Deut. xxii. 8, Ἰλεως γενοῦ τῷ λαῷ σου = כסר לְצָפָן.

Perhaps also Ezek. xvi. 63, see C. 3 supra.

I have classed these as passives because of the grammatical form, but they do not otherwise differ from the middle uses under C. 1, 3. How closely similar the uses are may be seen from a comparison of three passages already cited:

Ps. lxiv. (lxv.) 4:

NS τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν σὺ ἱλάσῃ καὶ ἱλάσθητι ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις αὐτῶν = כסר楽ם.

Ps. lxxvii. (lxxviii.) 38, καὶ ἱλάστει ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις αὐτῶν = כסר楽ם.

Ps. lxxviii. (lxxix.) 9, καὶ ἱλάσθητι ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ἡμῶν = כסר楽ם.

The difference between middle and passive in the Greek does not represent any difference in the Hebrew translated; it is not accompanied by any difference in construction; nor does it convey any difference of meaning. Again, there is no grammatical difference between the middle with a divine subject and the middle with a human subject, or between the Hebrew expressions represented by these uses. Thus the survival of the passive where
God is the subject cannot be held to indicate that the
sense of "propitiation" was still alive in such expressions.
To all appearance the aorist ἔλασθηναι was felt as a middle
—not "to be propitiated", but "to be propitious or
gracious towards", and so "to forgive" (cf. my obser-
vations in summing up under B.).

5. ἐξιλασκέσθαι in middle, with accusative of direct
object, and with human subject = "to appease",
"placate" (cf. ἐξιλάσκεσθαι as rendering of ᾨπη, B. 6
supra).

Gen. xxxii. 20, ἐξιλάσσομαι τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς
dώροις.

Prov. xvi. 14, θυμὸς βασιλέως ἥγελθος θανάτου,
ἀνὴρ δὲ σοφὸς ἐξιλάσεται αὐτῶν.

I can find no other example. It is noteworthy that no
instance of this class occurs where the object is the Deity.
This use therefore does not strictly belong to our present
subject, since ἐξιλασκέσθαι is not here a religious term.

6. Ἐξιλασμα twice = ἀφέναι.

1 Kms. xii. 3, ἐκ χειρὸς τινος ἐλήφα ἐξιλασμα.
Ps. xlviii. 8, οὗ δώσει τῷ θεῷ ἐξιλασμα αὐτοῦ.

ἀφέναι, usually rendered λύτρον, ἀντάλλαγμα, ἀνταπόδομα, is
not properly a religious term at all. It means "equivalent",
"compensation", and then especially "the equivalent of
a life", "ransom". Thus in 1 Kms. xii. 3 the speaker is
Samuel. That God is the recipient of the ἀφέναι in certain
cases is accidental, so far as the meaning of the word itself
is concerned; that is to say, the word does not, because
God is the recipient, acquire the sense of "propitiation".
The exact relation of ἀφέναι to the verb ἀφέναι is somewhat
obscure; but in any case the new Liddell and Scott is
wrong in giving the LXX meaning of ἐξιλασμα as
"propitiatory offering". ἀφέναι is never a propitiatory
offering, nor is there any ground for supposing that the LXX so understood it.

To sum up: the general usage of words of the ἱλάσκεσθαι class to render πρασσεῖν and its derivatives corresponds with the conclusions we have drawn from their use to render other Hebrew words, and from the synonyms used elsewhere to render the same Hebrew words, viz. that the LXX translators did not regard ἱλασσεῖν (when used as a religious term) as conveying the sense of propitiating the Deity, but the sense of performing an act whereby guilt or defilement is removed, and accordingly rendered it by ἱλάσκεσθαι in this sense. There is no exception falling under C.

Thus our three lines of enquiry lead to a common conclusion. There are only four passages in the LXX which could be made to support a different conclusion. Three of these (see B. 6) we have seen to be definitely exceptional, and to indicate that while the translators were aware of the meaning of ἱλάσκεσθαι = "to propitiate the Deity", they regarded it as inappropriate to the religion of Israel. In the fourth passage, Ps. cv. 30 (see B. 7), I should be inclined, in view of the weight of the evidence, to take ἐξιλάσατο in its usual sense of "made an act of expiation". For the rest, we have at the most faint echoes or reminiscences of a dead meaning. Thus Hellenistic Judaism, as represented by the LXX, does not regard the cultus as a means of pacifying the displeasure of the Deity, but as a means of delivering man from sin, and it looks in the last resort to God himself to perform that deliverance, thus evolving a meaning of ἱλάσκεσθαι strange to non-biblical Greek.

Finally, we may apply the results gained to the interpretation of certain passages in the New Testament.

1. Lk. xviii. 13, ὁ θεὸς ἱλασθητί μοι τῷ ἁμαρτωλῷ.

This follows closely the model of B. 3, 5, C. 4, where, as we have seen, the passive meaning has evaporated. The
meaning is not "be propitiated", but "be merciful to me", or "forgive me".

2. Heb. ii. 17, εἰς τὸ ἱλάσκεσθαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας τοῦ λαοῦ.

This is virtually a quotation of Old Testament usages falling under C. 1. Christ is represented as performing an act whereby men are delivered from the guilt of their sin, not whereby God is propitiated.

Heb. viii. 12, ὅτι ἱλεως ἐσομαι ταῖς ἁδικίαις αὐτῶν.

This is a quotation from Jer. xxxviii. 34 (xxx. 33) (ἡ λείψα τῷ λαῷ), falling under B. 3.

Heb. ix. 5; ἐπὶ τῷ ἱλαστήριῳ.

This is the familiar LXX rendering of该怎么办 = the lid of the ark, regarded as associated with the act of expiation (see under C. 1).

3. Rom. iii. 25, ὅτι προέβητο ὁ Θεός ἵλαστήριον.

Here it is unnecessary for our present purpose to decide whether ἱλάστηριον is an adjective in the accusative singular masculine or a neuter substantive. In any case the meaning conveyed (in accordance with LXX usage, which is constantly determinative for Paul), is that of expiation, not that of propitiation. Most translators and commentators are wrong.

4. I John ii. 2, αὐτὸς ἱλασμός ἐστιν περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν.

iv. 10, ἀπέστειλεν τὸν νῦν αὐτὸν ἱλασμόν περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν.

Here we have less confidence in appealing to LXX usage than in the case of Paul and Hebrews, for the Johannine Epistles are probably less influenced by the LXX than any other New Testament writings, nor does their language (unlike that of the Fourth Gospel) betray any substantial signs of Semitism. Thus we should not be surprised to find that the writer followed the prevailing non-biblical usage of ἱλαστήριον, and used ἱλασμός in the sense of "a propitiatory offering". This view might find some support in the context of ii. 2, where Jesus Christ is
not only ἱλασμός but also παράκλητος πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα. But the expression ἱλασμός περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν does certainly suggest that here at least the LXX lies behind. ἓνεξή is variously rendered ἱλασμός and τὸ περὶ ἁμαρτίας (cf. B. 1). The Johannine expression looks like a combination of these alternative translations. Cf. also i. 7, τὸ αἷμα Ἰησοῦ τοῦ νιότι αυτοῦ καθαρίζει ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ πάσης ἁμαρτίας.

We may therefore with some confidence regard ἱλασμός here as based on the sense of ἱλάσκεσθαι = καθαρίζειν (see A. 2, B. 1). Christ is a "sin-offering", a divinely supplied means of cancelling guilt and purifying the sinner. The Johannine usage thus falls into line with biblical usage in general. The common rendering "propitiation" is illegitimate here as elsewhere.
PART II

HELLENISTIC JUDAISM AND THE HERMETICA
CHAPTER VI

THE COSMOGONY OF POIMANDRES

The first tractate of the Hermetic Corpus is entitled Poimandres, from the name of the God whose revelation it purports to convey. It tells how the God revealed to His prophet in ecstasy the divine origin of the universe and of man, and commissioned him to preach the way of salvation to mankind in general. It makes use of various forms of religious appeal familiar to us from the literature of Judaism and Christianity—the inspired myth of the beginnings of things, the doctrine of immortality, the divine promises and threats of judgment, eschatology, and the call to repentance, concluding with a hymn of praise and aspiration. Its actual teaching is of a type common to most of the Hermetica, but this teaching is presented in a more imaginative way than is usual, with more appeal to the emotions, and its address to all who will hear contrasts with the esotericism of some of the other Hermetic writings. There is no indication in the tractate itself that the prophet is conceived to be Hermes, but Corp. XIII. gives evidence that before the formation of the Corpus he was identified with Hermes, and the tractate was accepted as Hermetic scripture.

1 For the meaning of the term see Scott on Corp. I. 2. In spite of its form it probably has nothing to do with ποιμαντέα. The writer himself explains it as ὁ νοῦς τῆς αὐθεντιάς, "The Mind (or Reason) of the Sovereignty". With this clue, it seems best to accept F. Ll. Griffith's suggestion that it represents the Coptic π-ε-μ-ς-ρ-η, "the knowledge of the Sun-God". We may compare the Mandaean Manda d'Hayye (''Knowledge of Life'') used as a divine name.
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The tractate contains an account of the creation of the world and the origin of man, whose Jewish affinities have long been recognized. Two of the fourteenth-century MSS. of the Corpus contain a scholion, attributed in one of them to Michael Psellus, the reviver of Platonic studies in the tenth century, which begins as follows: "This wizard (γοης) seems to have been thoroughly conversant with Holy Scripture. He makes it his starting-point in undertaking his account of creation, not hesitating even to transcribe on occasion the actual phrases of Moses." The allegation of a biblical source for the more acceptable elements in pagan philosophy was a commonplace of ancient apologetic. But in this case the judgment of Psellus has commanded the assent of modern critical students of the texts. Scott, in his edition of the Hermetica, shows, with copious illustrations in his notes, that the use of biblical material here is certain, on grounds which may be summarized as follows:

(i) While the cosmogony of Poimandres is substantially a combination of Platonic and Stoic doctrines of a type familiar in the Hermetica, it is presented through the medium of a myth obviously similar to the creation-myth of Genesis.

(ii) While such a general resemblance might be accounted for by the use of other myths, Babylonian, Iranian, or Egyptian, such as might also have influenced the biblical writer, there are more specific agreements: in particular, (a) the order and arrangement of the mythical events are similar; (b) down to the creation of man there is little of the biblical narrative which does not reappear in one form or another in Poimandres, while characteristic features of other kindred myths are absent, such as the conflict with the primeval monster and the cosmic egg; (c) Genesis and Poimandres agree in attributing certain phenomena to direct creative acts, and others to the activity of the created universe itself under a divine impulse.
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(iii) There are, as the scholiast observed, certain resemblances of language which seem to go beyond the necessary resemblances of language dealing with the same subject-matter, and suggest a literary relation between the two writings. It will be useful to tabulate the most obvious of these resemblances at once:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poim.</th>
<th>LXX, Gen. i.–ii.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>τὸν ἐπιφερόμενον πνευματικὸν λόγον</td>
<td>πνεῦμα θεοῦ ἐπεφέρετο</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἰδοῦσα τὸν καλὸν κόσμον</td>
<td>ἴδεν ὁ θεὸς ὅτι καλὸν (καλά) septies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>διακεχώρισται ἀπ' ἄλληλων</td>
<td>διειχώρισεν ὁ θεός . . . (the verb 5 times)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἢ γῆ ἐξήνεγκεν</td>
<td>ἐξήνεγκεν ἡ γῆ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ζῶα τετράποδα ἐρπετᾶ θηρία ἄγρια</td>
<td>τετράποδα καὶ ἐρπετᾶ καὶ θηρία τῆς γῆς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ ἱμερα</td>
<td>ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς ἄνθρωπον κατ' εἰκόνα θεοῦ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ἀνθρωπος) τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς εἰκόνα ἔχων</td>
<td>ἐγένετο εἰς ψυχὴν καὶ νουν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁ ἄνθρωπος . . . ἐγένετο εἰς ψυχὴν ἔσσαν</td>
<td>ηὐλόγησεν ὁ θεὸς αὐτὰ λέγων, Αὐξάνεσθαι καὶ πληθύνεσθαι κατὰ γένος (septies, also κατὰ γένη)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁ θεὸς ἐπεν ἄγιον λόγῳ Αὐξάνεσθαι εν αὐξήσει καὶ πληθύνεσθε εν πλήθει εἰπληθύνθη κατὰ γένος</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The account of creation in Poimandres may be summarized as follows:

The seer, being in ecstasy, receives a revelation of the God Poimandres, and begs to be told the truth about the nature of things. He thereupon beholds a vision of Light infinitely extended. After an interval darkness enters, and this becomes a “wet nature” violently agitated. Then out of the Light comes a “holy word”. At this, fire leaps up from the “wet nature”, followed by air. These take their places in the upper region, leaving behind a mixture of earth and water, kept in motion by the “pneumatic” word.

This vision is then interpreted. The Light is Mind, or Reason, the Primal God. The Word is His Son. The seer, at the bidding of God, looks intently into the Light, and sees that a whole universe exists within it, but a universe as yet indeterminate. This, he is told, is the archetypal form of the visible universe, which existed
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before the Beginning. The elements came into being because the Counsel of God saw that beautiful archetypal universe and copied it. (Thus far the interpretation of the vision. In what follows the convention of a vision is forgotten, and the narrative proceeds.)

Next Mind, the Primal God, gives birth to a second Mind, the Demiurge, who creates seven Administrators [the planets], embracing in their orbits the visible universe. Their administration is called Fate (ἐμαρμένη).

The Word now ascends from the lower sphere and is united with the Demiurge. With its help the Demiurge sets the whole planetary system in revolution. This revolution causes the lower elements to bring forth irrational (ἄλογα) living things: air produces birds, water swimming things; earth, now separate from water, produces terrestrial animals. (Creation is now complete, with the exception of man, who may be left over for the present.)

Here creation is represented as occurring in five stages:

First: separation of light and darkness.
Second: separation of the upper elements from the lower.
Third: creation of heavenly bodies.
Fourth: production of birds and fishes.
Fifth: production of land animals.

This may be compared with the Hexaemeron of Genesis i.:

First day: creation of light and separation of light and darkness.
Second day: separation of waters above from waters below.
Third day: separation of land and water: production of vegetable life.
Fourth day: creation of heavenly bodies.
Fifth day: production of birds and fishes.
Sixth day: production of land animals.
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It will be seen that the order is identical except that the events of the third day, the chief of which is the separation of land and water, are omitted in Poimandres. Yet when the fourth stage is reached, we discover that at some prior point earth and water have already been separated. Evidently therefore the account which the Hermetist was following recorded this stage, and apparently he omitted it, either through inadvertence, or because he wished the creation of the heavenly bodies to follow immediately upon the separation of the upper and lower elements.

We may now compare the two accounts stage by stage, assuming, as we are justified in assuming, upon the evidence summarized above, that the Genesis account, in one form or another, lay before the Hermetic writer.

I. THE VISION OF LIGHT AND DARKNESS.

(Poimandres, § 4, with interpretation, § 6, and supplement, § 7: Gen. i. 1-5.)

The Mosaic account of creation postulates two pre-existent factors—the eternal God, and Chaos. It will be convenient, for reasons which will appear, to begin our comparison with the description of chaos.

A. Primeval Chaos.

According to the LXX “the earth was invisible and unformed, and darkness was over the abyss; and a breath (or wind) of God was rushing over the water” (ἡ γῆ ἦν ἄδρατος καὶ ἀκατασκεύαστος, καὶ σκότος ἐπάνω τῆς ἀβύσσου· καὶ πνεῦμα θεοῦ ἐπεφέρετο ἐπάνω τοῦ υδάτος). The picture of chaos conveyed by the Greek text is that of a turbulent ocean shrouded in utter darkness, and perpetually agitated by a wind which is the breath of God. For the Hermetist also chaos appears as “a horrible and sullen darkness” (σκότος φοβερόν τε καὶ στυγνόν),¹ which changes into a turbulent ocean. He

¹ Cf. Gen. xv. 12: φόβος σκοτίως μέγας.
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cannot speak of it as "water", any more than he can use the term "earth" at this stage, because for him earth and water are elements of the formed cosmos. It would therefore be "unscientific" to speak of the primeval ocean as θάλασσα. It is described as "a wet nature, unspeakably agitated, and giving off smoke as from a fire, and causing an unutterable, glamorous noise" (ὑπάρχει τὸς φύσις ἀφάτως τεταραγμένη καὶ καπνὸν ἀποδιδόσα ὡς ἀπὸ πυρὸς, καὶ τῶν ἥχων ἀποτελοῦσα ἀνεκλάλητον γυώδη). The description corresponds with that of the LXX, in terms at once more rhetorical and more "scientific". The "darkness over the abyss" is conceived as a thick smoke cast up by the "unspeakably agitated" ocean. There is indeed in Gen. i. no explicit equivalent for τεταραγμένη, but the phrase πνεῦμα ἐπεφέρετο ἐπάνω τοῦ θατος (which, as we have seen, is known to the author of Poimandres, though not employed at this point) suggests to the Greek reader the picture of a great gale. Philo, we may observe, explains πνεῦμα here as signifying (primarily) "air".¹ Ἑπιφέρεσθαι is used of swift rushing motion.²

The LXX is here no exact rendering of the Hebrew: בַּרְחַת אֶלְלָה חֲסִידָה עַל הַבָּגִדָה which is specifically used of a bird hovering over its brood.³ According to Gunkel and others the comparison is with a bird brooding over her eggs and so quickening them; and the passage is a reduced survival of a parallel to the Egyptian myth of the cosmic egg. If so, it is the more remarkable that the Hermetist, who wrote in Egypt, knows nothing of the egg-myth.

¹ De Gig. § 22: λέγεται δὲ θεοῦ πνεῦμα καθ' ἑνα μὲν τρόπον ὁ ρέων ἄρ̣ ἀπὸ γῆς, τρίτον στοιχεῖον ἐπογούμενον ὑδάτι—παρὸς φθονὸς ἐν τῇ κοσμοποίησι πνεῦμα θεοῦ κτλ., ἐπειδὴ περ ἐξωρόμενος ὁ ἄρ̣ κόθος ὡν ἀνὼς φέρεται ὑδατὶ βάσει χρωμένος—καθ' ἐτερὸν τρόπον δὲ ἡ ἀκήρατος ἐπιστήμη κτλ.
³ So Deut. xxxii. 11; cf. comment in Tosephta Chagiga quoted in full by Strack-Billerbeck, ad Matt. iii. 16. The same interpretation is cited in Origen's Hexapla: 'Ὁ Ζύρος τὸ ἐπεφέρετο φθονὸς ἐξωροῦμεν ἀνίκτου συνεβαλπε καὶ ἐξωγονεῖ τὴν τῶν ὑδατῶν φύσιν, κατ' εἰκόνα τῆς ἐπωλεξοῦσις ὄρνος καὶ ζωτικῆς τοια δύναμιν ἐνείσης τοῖς ὑποθαλμομένοις.
The LXX, however, follows an alternative exegesis, preserved also in the Targums: "a breath from before Jehovah blew upon the surface of the water", ἐν πρώτῳ ἀνείπερον ἐν ἀέρι προσέπνευσεν πάνω ἐπὶ τῆς ὕδατος. This, indeed, rather than the exegesis of Tosephta Chagiga, is in harmony with other allusions to chaos in the Old Testament. Cf. the following passages, where the LXX is not always a slavish rendering of the original, and for that reason all the more significant for our present enquiry:

Is. v. 30 (the return of chaos): καὶ βοήσει δέ αὐτοῖς τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ὡς φωνὴ θαλάσσης κυμανούσης καὶ ἐμβλέψονται εἰς τὴν γῆν καὶ ἰδοὺ σκότος σκληρόν.

Ps. lxiv. 8:

οἱ συνταράσσον τὸ ὕδωρ τῆς θαλάσσης,

Ps. lxxvi. 17–18 (of the Red Sea, but in terms clearly borrowed from cosmological mythology):

εἰδοσάν σε ὕδατα τὸ θεὸς,

εἰδοσάν σε ὕδατα καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν,

καὶ ἔταράχθησαν ἁβυσσοί,

πλῆθος ἡχοὺς ὕδατος.

Ps. xcii. 3–4:

ἐπῆραν οἱ ποταμοὶ κύριε,

ἐπῆραν οἱ ποταμοὶ φωνᾶς αὐτῶν,

ἀπὸ φωνῶν ὕδατων πολλῶν θαυμαστοὶ οἱ μετεωρισμοὶ τῆς θαλάσσης.

θαυμαστὸς ἐν ψυχλοῖς θύριος.

If the Hermetist was acquainted, whether directly or at second hand, with other parts of the LXX besides Genesis, he might well have found materials for his vision in such passages as these. We note in particular that in the passages quoted stress is laid upon the noise of the waters, as in Poimandres—ἡχοὶ ἀποτελοῦσα ἀνεκλάλητον γοῶδη.
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eιται βοη (sic MSS. βοη γάρ, Scott) εξ αυτῆς ἀσύναρθρως ἔξεπέμπετο. 1 Cf. two creation-passages in Jeremiah:

v. 22: τὸν τάξαντα ἄμμον ὅριον τῆς θαλάσσης, πρόσταγμα αἰώνιον καὶ οὐχ ὑπερβῆσεται αὐτὸ, καὶ ταραχῆσεται καὶ οὐ δυνήσεται, καὶ ἡχήσουσιν τὰ κύματα αὐτῆς καὶ οὐχ ὑπερβῆσεται αὐτό.

xxxviii. 36 (xxxi. 35): ὁ δὲ τὸν ἦλιον εἰς φῶς τῆς ἡμέρας, σελήνην καὶ ἀστέρας εἰς φῶς τῆς νυκτὸς, καὶ κραυγὴν ἐν θαλάσσῃ καὶ ἐβομβησει τὰ κύματα αὐτῆς.

Gunkel is probably right in deriving all such passages from the early creation-mythology of Israel, lying behind the restrained and sober creation-narrative of Genesis.2

The noise of the waves plays an essential part in the vision of Poimandres, where the Holy Word from the Light seems to be an answer to the ineffable, inarticulate, glamorous cry of Chaos. That is a finely imaginative touch.3

1 MSS. add ὡς εἰκάσασι φωνῆ τοῦ φωτός. Scott and Reitzenstein are surely right in associating this βοη with the sounding deep, for the ἄγος λόγος could hardly have been described as an inarticulate cry: no λόγος is ἀσύναρθρος. The words ὡς εἰκάσασι φωνῆ τοῦ φωτός must therefore be either corrupt or out of place in the MSS. Reitzenstein's remedy is to read πυρός for φωτός: but I can find no support in the tractate for his view that fire represents the evil principle adverse to light. His alternative φῶτος is possible, but leaves the expression “as it were the voice of nature” somewhat flat and redundant. Scott's suggestion seems better, to transpose the words ὡς εἰκάσασι φωνῆ τοῦ φωτός to the next sentence. See below.

2 The word δαλάχτω, used for the primeval ocean in Gen. i. 2, is derived by some philologists from the onomatopoeic root δαλάχτω, so that its primary meaning would be a sounding deep. No trace of that meaning has filtered through into the LXX of Gen., but it would be consistent with the other descriptions of chaos.

3 It is difficult not to trace the outcome of similar reflection upon the idea of creation out of chaos in the passage where Paul, himself a Hellenistic Jew, speaks of the groaning of the universe, and the στεναγμοί ἀλάχτου inspired by the Spirit in the heart of man, while both man and the universe wait for their redemption (Rom. viii. 22–3, 26). In many ways the Christian conception of redemption is the counterpart of the Jewish conception of creation.
THE COSMOGONY OF POIMANDRES

The Hermetist, then, is well within the limits of Jewish tradition in laying stress upon the confusion and noise of the primeval ocean. The LXX itself supplies the leading terms of his vocabulary—τεταραγμένη, βοή, ἡχος. Now he might well have learned from his Platonic teachers that the primal formless stuff of the universe was “never still, but in discordant and disorderly motion” (οὕχ ἴσωνχλαν ἀγών ἀλλὰ κινούμενον πλημμελῶς καὶ ἀτάκτως, Tim. 30a). But there are elements in his picture of the raging ocean of darkness which do not seem to come from Platonic sources, and are readily accounted for by familiarity not only with Gen. i. but with Hellenistic-Jewish cosmology as a whole.

B. Light.

So much then for the description of chaos. We now observe in Poimandres a characteristic departure from the biblical account. In Genesis, chaos is there, and at the word of God light appears. In the vision of Poimandres, light is there, and μετ’ ὀλγον darkness appears. The change is obviously deliberate, for in the interpretation of the vision stress is laid upon the fact that the light was πρὸ ὑγρᾶς φύσεως τῆς ἐκ σκότους φανείσης. The reason is clear. For the Hermetist the Light is God, and therefore existent from all eternity. Poimandres himself expressly says: τὸ φῶς ἐκεῖνο ἐγώ εἰμι, ὁ σῶς θεός. We need not here discuss whether this identification of light with the fons deitatis is due to Iranian influence, or whether the name Poimandres itself gives a clue, if it is derived, as Scott holds, following Griffith, from the Egyptian πειμε-ν-ρη, “the knowledge of the Sun-god”. In any case it is a widespread idea, and has not been without influence upon biblical tradition. The Old Testament writers, however, in their jealous insistence on the personal transcendence

1 Cf. Prov. viii. 24: Wisdom existed πρὸ τοῦ τᾶς ἀβύσσους ποιήσα, πρὸ τοῦ ἑλθείν τὰς πηγὰς τῶν ὑδάτων, in a passage where Wisdom corresponds in some sort to the δυνάμεις of the κόσμος νοητός in Poimandres (see below).
of God, are careful to avoid the identification, while using light in various ways as a symbol or attribute of Deity. The LXX translators are equally careful. In the one passage where the Hebrew might conceivably suggest an identification, Ps. xxvi. (xxvii.) 1, יְהוָ֑ה הָאָ֨זְנוֹת is rendered Κύριος φωτισμός μου (not φῶς—Dominus illuminatio mea, not lumen). Philo, drawn by his philosophical sympathies towards accepting the identification, hesitates on the brink, and falls back upon his Hebrew faith: "First, God is light; for in the Psalms it says, 'The Lord is my illumination and my saviour'; and not only light, but the archetype of every other light; or rather, older and higher than any archetype; for it says 'God said, Let there be light', and He is Himself like no created thing" (πρῶτον μὲν θεὸς φῶς ἐστὶ—"Κύριος" γὰρ, "φωτισμός μου καὶ σωτήρ μου" ἐν ὕμνοις ἔδειξαι—καὶ οὐ μόνον φῶς ἀλλὰ παντὸς ἐτέρου φωτὸς ἀρχέτυπον, μᾶλλον δὲ παντὸς ἀρχέτυπον πρεσβύτερον καὶ ἀνώτερον. . . . "Εἶπεν" γὰρ φησιν, "ὁ θεὸς, Γενέσθω φῶς",· αὐτὸς δὲ οὐδεὶς τῶν γεγονότων ὁμοιος, De Somn. I. 75). The Hermetist is up to a point in agreement with Philo, for his primal Light is not the light that is visible to our eyes (though in inspired vision it is beheld by the eye of the mind). It contains in itself, as we shall see, the κόσμος νοτός, or, put otherwise, it is itself the ἀρχέτυπον εἴδος; but while the Jewish writer hesitates to identify the eternal God even with the archetype of light, the Hermetist has no such scruples. For him the ultimate reality is in one aspect reason or mind, in another aspect it is pure archetypal light, and this ultimate reality is God, who manifests Himself in personal communion with His prophet.

C. Before the Beginning: the Archetypal Universe.

The Light, then, which is Mind or God, is first discerned as ἀόριστος θεᾶ, a boundless, or more properly indeterminate spectacle, which fills the beholder with love or joy: ἡράσθην (sic MSS.: ἡγάσθην, Scott) ἰδὼν, says the
seer. At the bidding of Poimandres he looks intently into the light, and then sees that it is not, as it had at first seemed, simple and homogeneous, but consists of countless "powers"—θεωρῶ ἐν τῷ νοῦ μου τὸ φῶς ἐν ἀναριθμητοῖς δυνάμεσιν ὅν—and these powers make up a universe. The God interprets this new vision: the universe which exists within the Light is the archetype of the visible universe as yet uncreated, τὸ ἀρχέτυπον ἐλθὸς προϋπάρχον τῆς ἀρχῆς.¹

The expression deserves attention. There has been no previous mention of ἀρχή, yet here it is assumed as a known term. The writer indicates that he is following his biblical source for what happened ἐν ἀρχή, at the beginning of creation; but he supplements it by describing something which was prior to the "beginning". We can therefore define the sense in which he understood the much debated term ἐν ἀρχή, ἡ ἀρχή, in Gen. i. i. The two main types of exegesis in antiquity were those represented by the Targum of Onkelos and the Jerusalem Targum respectively. The former, followed by the English version, renders ἡ ἀρχή, ἡ ἀρχή, "in the first times"; the latter, ἡ ἀρχή, "by wisdom". The second type of exegesis goes back to Prov. viii. 22,² which appeared to interpret ἡ ἀρχή in the sense of "a first principle", and to identify this "first principle" with wisdom. The

¹ ΠροὝπάρχων is the reading of Patrizzi, accepted by Parthey. MSS. προάρχων, accepted by Reitzenstein and Scott, who, however, translate it in the sense of προὕπαρχον ("which is prior to the beginning"). MSS. add τῆς ἀπεράντου. Scott emends τὸ ἀπέραντον, comparing Hippolytus, Ref. Haer. VI. ix., τὴν μεγάλην δύναμιν τὴν ἀπέραντον. This seems right. The ἀρχέτυπον ἐλθὸς is ἀπέραντον as it is ἀπειράματον.

² Κύριος ἐκτισεν μὲ ἀρχην ὄδων αὐτοῦ. This is applied to the Torah in Genesis Rabba ad init. "The Torah says, 'Through the ἡ ἀρχή God created heaven and earth,' and the ἡ ἀρχή is no other than the Torah, as it says 'The Lord created me as the τοῦ ὄσσου of His way'".
Hermetist, like Philo, knows nothing of it. But whereas Philo refuses to take ἀρχή in its current temporal sense (οὐχ ὡς ὄντας τινας τὴν κατὰ χρόνον, De Opif. § 26), and insists that the meaning is "God created first the incorporeal heaven and the invisible earth" (and then the visible), our author understands it, with Onkelos, in its plain meaning. At a point in time, traditionally called "the beginning", the visible universe began to exist; but before that time the invisible universe already existed in God, the eternal Light.

The general notion of an archetypal universe is, of course, Platonic (see Tim. 27d sqq.). We have only to ask whether the Hermetic writer found, or could suppose that he found, any attachment for it in his biblical source. The conception of divine δυνάμεις at any rate he shares with Hellenistic Judaism. In the LXX one of the commonest titles of God is κύριος ο θεός τῶν δυνάμεων. This renders the Hebrew לוחם (לוחם) with literal correctness, since לוחם means an "army", and δύναμις is used, chiefly in Hellenistic Greek, in the sense of a military force, though in other connections the LXX translators prefer to render לוחם by στρατιά. In the later stages of the Old Testament period, לוחם, originally meaning the tribal armies of Israel, came to be interpreted as meaning the multitude of heavenly beings subordinate to Jehovah. The choice of κύριος τῶν δυνάμεων as an equivalent for לוחם, involves an ambiguity which may have been intentional. For δύναμις has both the concrete sense of "army" and the abstract sense of "power". As a matter of fact there is evidence that there was in Hellenistic Judaism a tendency to oscillate between the abstract and the concrete in conceiving these heavenly beings. In Philo we find this tendency in full operation. On the one hand, the δυνάμεις represent

1 See Ch. I. pp. 16–19.
attributes of God, or modes of His activity; on the other hand, they are hypostatized as a spiritual hierarchy. For Philo it is by means of the δυνάμεις that the κόσμος νοητός is formed: "God, being One, has about Him innumerable Powers . . . and through these Powers the incorporeal and intelligible world, the archetype of the phenomenal, was formed" (ἐλεύθερος ὁ θεὸς ἀσωματικὸς περὶ αὐτὸν ἔχει δυνάμεις . . . διὰ τούτων τῶν δυνάμεων ὁ ἀσωματικὸς καὶ νοητός ἑπάγη κόσμος, τὸ τοῦ φαινομένου ἀρχέτυπον, De Conf. Ling. 171-2). So far the doctrine of our present passage is similar to the Philonic, and like it might claim support from the Hebrew Scriptures.

The Hermetist, however, does not follow Philo in the exegesis by which he finds the doctrine in Genesis. According to Philo, the clue to the meaning of the Genesis account lies in the phrase ἡ γῆ ἦν ἄορατος. This he takes to imply that the heaven and earth spoken of in Gen. i. 1 are the incorporeal heaven and the invisible earth; in other words, the κόσμος νοητός (De Opif. § 29). It hardly needs to be said that no hint of a κόσμος νοητός is to be found in the Hebrew text. The LXX ἄορατος καὶ ἀκατασκεύαστος is no real translation of ἡ γῆ ἦν (which Aquila renders, in accord with a different doctrine of creation, κένωμα καὶ οὐθέν). The LXX rendering is an exegetical paraphrase, possibly derived from reflection on the expression ὁφθη ἦ γῆ in i. 9, but more likely the product of Hellenistic Jewish speculation upon the creation-story. In that case it was probably meant to suggest the creation of the visible world out of pre-existent invisible elements. In that sense it seems to be understood by the authors of the Secrets of Enoch (the work, according to Forbes and Charles, of an Alexandrian Jew of the first half of the first century, A.D.): see xxv. 1-3: "I commanded . . . that visible things should come down from invisible . . . and a great light came out, and I was in the midst of the great light. And as there is born light from light, there came forth a great
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age, and I showed all creation which I had thought to create." ¹

There is no trace in Poimandres of any such exploitation of the term ἀόρατος. If the author read the word in his biblical source, we should expect him to find in it an allusion to chaotic matter, which his master Plato described as ἀνόρατον εἴδος τι καὶ ἄμορφον (Tim. 51a). He appears, however, to have ignored the term. It is tempting to suggest that his Greek translation may have read ἀόριστος. That would, in fact, be a better rendering of ἡμί (="confusion"); cf. Symmachus’s translation, ἄργον καὶ ἀδιάκριτον. In that case, the γῆ ἀόρατος of Gen. i. 2 would be represented by ἀόριστος θεός in the opening of the vision, by κόσμος ἀπερίοριστος in the continuation of the vision, and by ἀρχέτυπον εἴδος . . . ἀπέραντον (sic Scott for ἀπεράντου) in the interpretation. It is noteworthy that in Corp. Herm. III. 2 the phrase ἡμί ἡμί is represented by ἀδιορίστων ἄντων ἀπάντων καὶ ἀκατασκευάστων.²

But against this view stands the fact that the Hermetist, as we have seen, construed the phrase εν ἀρχῇ in a strictly temporal sense, as dating the beginning of the process of creation, and therefore presumably referred all that follows to stages in the process. But after the beginning of the creative process Reality is no longer ἀόριστον.³

The Hermetist, therefore, does not seem to have found his doctrine of the archetypal universe in Genesis along the lines of Philonic exegesis, and it is not probable that he is dependent on the De Opificio. His conception of a pre-existent universe is indeed closely allied to Philo's, but he identifies this universe with God in a way from which Philo, with his Hebraic regard for the personal

¹ Cf. also Heb. xi. 3 (another work based on Hellenistic Jewish thought of almost the same period. [But Secrets is probably much later.]
² See Ch. X. p. 234.
³ For Philo "boundlessness" or "indeterminacy" is characteristic of chaos or darkness, cf. De Praem. 36, πάσα ἡ αἰσθητῇ φύσις ἀόριστος· τὸ δὲ ἀόριστον ἀδελφὸν σκότους καὶ συγγενές.
transcendence of God, holds back. Like Philo, he has gone to the LXX for himself, but he is freer to “reinterpret” the Bible in terms of “science”, and consciously interpolates his Platonic doctrine into the material derived from his biblical source. He can do so without violence, because the Bible starts at “the beginning”, while he has to speak of that which was “before the beginning”, and the κόσμος ἀπεριόριστος of δυνάμεις within the aboriginal Light is actually hinted at in the biblical name for the Deity—κύrios τῶν δυνάμεων.

D. The Beginning: the Separation of Light and Darkness.

We now come to the transition from the primordial condition in which there is nothing but light eternal, constituting in itself an archetypal universe, to the beginning of the process which leads to a visible universe. As we have seen, Poimandres and Genesis alike assume chaotic matter (the ocean of darkness) as the raw stuff of creation. In neither work is any account given of its cause, but whereas in Genesis it is there before the creation of light, in Poimandres it enters the field of vision previously occupied wholly by light. The text is at this point somewhat obscure. The MSS. read (§ 4): καὶ μετ’ ὀλίγον σκότος κατωφερές ἦν ἐν μέρει γεγενημένον φοβερὸν τε καὶ στυγνὸν σκολιῶς πεπειραμένον ὡς εἰκάσαι με ἱδόντα.

The first point is that the darkness has a kind of inherent property of gravity which makes it tend downwards, away from the light. Cf. Secrets of Enoch, xxvi. 2: “An age came forth, very great and very dark, bearing the creation of all lower things; and I saw that it was good, and said to him, ‘Go thou down below, and make thyself firm, and be for a foundation of all lower things’. And it happened and he went down and became the foundation for the lower things, and below the darkness there is nothing else.”
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The next words, ἐν μέρει γεγενημένον,¹ may be understood from the classical use of ἐν μέρει = "in turn": "there was a downward-tending darkness which had come into being in its turn" (i.e. in succession to the light). Σκολιῶς πεπερασμένον, however, seems unintelligible. Many emendations have been proposed, most of them very far from the MSS., and, as it seems to me, hardly worth discussing. The oldest emendation is πεπερασμένον, proposed by Vergicius, who wrote the introduction to Turnebus's editio princeps of the Corpus in 1554. Scott has not thought it worth recording, but there is much to be said for it. The outstanding characteristic of the aboriginal reality is that it is ἀόριστος (§ 4), ἀπεριόριστος (§ 7), ἀπε- παντὸς (§ 8). The story of creation is the story of successive limitation and differentiation where originally all was indeterminate. Thus it is natural that when the field of undifferentiated light is invaded by darkness attention should be fixed upon the factor of πέρας. The darkness is already divided from the light: it is πεπερασμένον. The word would thus correspond to the LXX expression διεχώρισεν ὁ θεὸς ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ φωτὸς καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ σκότους. Whether σκολιῶς can be defended I am not so sure. "Crookedly defined" is perhaps a possible description of the vague edge of a darkness conceived as a smoky mass (καπνὸν ὡς ἀπὸ πυρὸς, § 4).

If this reading be accepted, then Poimandres and Genesis are found to agree in emphasizing the point that the first stage in actual creation is the separation of light and darkness; though in Poimandres the separation takes place through the appearance of a delimited darkness in the field of hitherto un-delimited light, whereas in Genesis it takes place through the dawn of light upon a chaos of darkness. According to both writings the dark ocean remains, delimited from the sphere of light, to be the object of further creative work.

¹ Scott emends ἐν μέρει τοι γεγενημένον, giving the sense "there had come to be in one part (scil. of the field of light) a downward-tending darkness". But this does not seem to me to be called for.
2. The Separation of the Elements.

(Poimandres, § 5, with interpretation, §§ 6, 7. Gen. i. 6-8.)

The first stage of creation, in Genesis and Poimandres alike, leaves us with light on the one hand and an ocean of darkness on the other. The second stage in both is a further process of differentiation, which results in the isolation of the terraqueous mass from the heavens above. The forms in which this process is described differ widely in the two writings. Genesis describes the formation of a solid firmament over the watery earth. The Hermetist speaks, in terms of his Stoic-Platonic metaphysics, of the separation of the finer elements from the grosser. In spite, however, of this wide difference of presentation, points of contact are plain.

A. The Holy Word.

The beginning of this stage is announced by the Hermetist in the words: ἐκ τοῦ φωτὸς τις ἅγιος λόγος ἐπέβη τῇ φύσει.1 The term λόγος is an ambiguous one. It may stand either for thought or for its utterance in speech. At a later stage of the creation narrative we have the expression, ὁ θεὸς ἐπεν ἅγιω λόγῳ. There the "holy word" is clearly a divine utterance. It is likely that this is at least the primary meaning here, where the ἅγιος λόγος is contrasted with the inarticulate βοή of chaos to which it is an answer. It is, in Old Testament language, "the voice of the Lord over the waters" (φωνὴ Κυρίου ἐπὶ τῶν ὕδατων, Ps. xxviii. 3).2 A very probable emendation

1 Scott inserts ὑγρᾶ, but this, though it makes the meaning more clear, is perhaps unnecessary, since no other φῶς has been mentioned.
2 The whole Psalm celebrates the power of God over nature. As constantly in Hebrew nature-poetry, there is a reminiscence of cosmo-logical mythology. The Flood, which is mentioned in v. 10, is a sort of double of the primeval ocean of chaos. Thus although v. 3 ostensibly describes a thunderstorm over the sea, yet it suggests the sublime scene of creation, when the Spirit of God moved over the waters, and God said "Let there be light."
of Scott's transposes the words ὅς εἰκάσαι φωνὴν φωτός, which are impossible as they stand in the MSS., to follow the word φῦσει. We may then translate the whole sentence, "Out of the light a holy word assailed the (wet) nature, as it were the voice of the light".

The beginning of creation, therefore, is a divine word, as in Genesis the repeated ὁ θεὸς ἐλπεν ushers in each successive stage of creation. The difference is that the first word in Genesis is γενηθήτω φῶς, whereas in Poimandres light is pre-existent, is in fact God, so that the word from which all things took their origin is the voice of the light. As we shall see in a moment, it is the second word in Genesis which corresponds in its effects to the "holy word" of Poimandres. But both writers hold that a divine fiat began the process by which a cosmos arose out of chaos. In later Jewish writers, where we have echoes of the creation story of Genesis, the word λόγος is used. E.g. Ps. xxxii. 6, τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ κυρίου οἱ οὐρανοὶ ἐστερεώθησαν; Wisd. ix. 1, ὁ ποιήσας τὰ πάντα ἐν λόγῳ σου. With this may be compared Poim. 31, ἄγιος εἰ, ὁ λόγως συστησάμενος τὰ ὀντα. But while the divine λόγος is a word, it is not a mere word, like the words of men which sound and then are silent, and exist no more. It possesses some sort of substantive existence. Not only does it "assail" the ocean of chaos, but it remains rushing upon or over it like a wind or breath (ἐπιφερόμενον), and when its work is done it leaps up to heaven again (ἐπιθύμησεν εὐθὺς ἐκ τῶν κατωφερῶν στοιχείων ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ λόγος εἰς τὸ καθαρὸν τῆς φύσεως δημιουργήμα, § 10). This conception of the divine word

1 See above, p. 106, n. 1.
2 Cf. also Corp. IV. 1, τῶν πάντα κόσμων ἐποίησεν ὁ δημιουργὸς οὐ χειρὶν ἄλλα λόγῳ. The creative λόγος is not found elsewhere in the Corpus, though it is alluded to in Hermetic fragments, ap. Cyril; see Scott, Fragmenta, 27-30.
3 Ἐπιθύμησεν with the dative means, according to the new L. & S., to board a ship, to make forcible entry into a house or city, to assault a person, and the like. The "word" therefore is an active power, in violent motion.
as in some sort a substantive power is familiar enough in Hebrew thought. The word of the Lord "is sent", "comes", "abides". Cf. especially Is. Iv. 11:

ούτως ἐσται τὸ ρήμα μου ὃ ἔδω ἐξέλθη ἐκ τοῦ στόματός μου · οὐ μὴ ἀποστραφῇ ἕως ἀν τελεσθῇ ὥσα ἡ ἡδέλησα,

and Wisd. xviii. 15-16:

δ Παντοδύναμος σου λόγος ἀπ' οὐρανῶν ἐκ θρόνων βασιλείων ἀπότομος πολεμιστής εἰς μέσον τῆς ὀλθρίας ἡλατο γῆς, ξίφος δὲ τὴν ἀνυπόκριτον ἐπιταγήν σου φέρων, καὶ στὰς ἐπλήρωσεν τὰ πάντα θανάτου · καὶ οὐρανοῦ μὲν ἡπτετο, βεβήκει δ' ἐπὶ γῆς.

So far, therefore, the language of Poimandres is agreeable to the Genesis account of creation and its development in later Judaism. A difficulty, however, arises when we come to the interpretation of the vision (Poim. § 6). Here the seer is informed, as we have seen, that the light of his vision is Noüs, that is, God. Further, the luminous word out of the light is the Son of God (ὁ δὲ ἐκ νοὸς φωτεινός λόγος, νιός θεόν). The sudden personification of the word is surprising. Yet, as we have seen, the idea of a divine word which leaps from heaven and marches upon earth like an armed warrior is natural to a Jewish-Hellenistic thinker at Alexandria. But the seer is frankly puzzled by the statement that the word is son of God. Τί οὖν; he asks. The god's reply is obscure, and the text doubtful. The MSS. read as follows:

οὐτώ γνώθι τὸ ἐν σοι βλέπων καὶ ἀκούων λόγος κυρίου ὁ δὲ νοὸς πατὴρ θεός, C
οὐτώ γνώθι τὸ ἐν σοι βλέπων καὶ ἀκούων λόγος κυρίου ὁ δὲ νοὸς πατήρ θεός, Q
οὐτώ γνώθι τὸ ἐν σοι βλέπων καὶ ἀκούων λόγος κυρίου ὁ δὲ νοὸς πατήρ θεός, cett.

The text of the majority of MSS. would give the sense: "learn thus: that in you which sees and hears is the
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λόγος of the Lord, and Νοῦς is God the Father”. That could only mean that the λόγος in man is the faculty of seeing and hearing, and it is the offspring of God. This, however, is irrelevant. It gives information regarding the relation of man to the Supreme Being. It is no explanation of the statement that the creative λόγος is the Son of God. But we are here concerned with cosmology; anthropology comes later. Reitzenstein, who accepts this reading, regards the passage (along with what follows) as an interpolation. But not only is it irrelevant here; it is not consistent with the general doctrine of the Hermetica. Λόγος as a psychological term does not denote the faculty of sense perception. It is either the organ of νοῦς in the apprehension of the highest truth, or it is subordinate to νοῦς, as the faculty of science and art (ἐπιστήμη καὶ τεχνή). It is difficult therefore to believe that the author of Poimandres described λόγος as τό ἐν σοι βλέπων καὶ ἀκοινοῦν. Scott seems almost certainly right in accepting the reading of C, supported partly by Q, οὕτω γνωθι, τό ἐν σοι βλέπων—“learn thus, by looking at what is within you”. Cf. Corp. XI. 19: οὕτω νόησον ἀπὸ σεαυτοῦ. The seer is instructed to look at the constitution of human nature and from it to learn by analogy what is meant by saying that the λόγος is son of God. Now Philo, in commenting on the (supposed) meaning of the name Abraham, πατὴρ ἐκλεκτὸς ήχους, “elect father of sound”, observes, “The uttered word sounds, and its father is the mind which has apprehended the good” (ἡχεῖ γὰρ ὁ γεγομένος λόγος, πατὴρ δὲ τούτου νοῦς ἐπειλημμένος τοῦ σπουδαίου, De Cher. § 7). Similarly, in Corp. XII. 14 λόγος, which, however, is there not uttered speech but the meaning behind it, is the εἰκών of νοῦς, and for the Hermetists “image” and “offspring” are closely related terms. We have here probably a clue to the meaning of the present passage.

1 Exc. Stob. XIX. (Scott), 5, and hence in Corp. XVI. 15, the λογικὸν μέρος τῆς φύσεως is ἐπιτήδειον εἰς ὑποδοχὴν τοῦ θεοῦ, καρακ Δεί.
2 Exc. Stob. IVb, XVIII. 5.
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Exactly how the text is to be emended to give this meaning it is difficult to say. Scott proposes to excise the words κυρίον and θεός as Christian interpolations, and this seems probable enough. His further emendations are more speculative: he excises καὶ ἀκοῦον, and reads ἐπεὶ καὶ ἐν σοι ὁ λόγος νῦς, ὁ δὲ νοῦς πατήρ. This is hardly what the Hermetist wrote, but it probably gives his meaning. We can then understand the sentences which follow: οὐ γὰρ διόταναι ἀπ’ ἀλλήλων· ἕνωσις γὰρ τοιῶν ἐστὶν ἡ ζωή. “For these are not apart from one another, for life is the union of these.” The creative Word is the offspring of the eternal Mind, just as articulate thought and speech in us are the offspring of the human mind; not that these are to be thought of, in either case, as separate entities; life, as a concrete activity, depends on their unity. For a mind not expressing itself is not really alive, and speech which is not the expressed thought of a permanent rational personality, is vox et praeterea nihil. Similarly, this living universe is such only as it is the expression of the eternal Mind.

The question which remains is, why this doctrine of the λόγος as Son of God is dragged in here. Nowhere else in the Hermetica have we such a doctrine (except in so far as it is implied in Corp. XIII., Περὶ Παλιγγενεσίας, which is dependent on the Poimandres). Nor is it present in the biblical source which the author is here following. It can only be that he was acquainted with such a doctrine, and

1 In view of Corp. XII. 14, ὁ οὖν λόγος ἐστὶν εἰκὼν τοῦ νοῦ, one might suggest that the reading here was something like, . . . τὸ ἐν σοι βλέπων· εἰκών νοῦ λόγος, ὁ δὲ νοῦς πατήρ αὐτοῦ. If the words ΒΛΕΠΟΝΕΙΚΩΝΝΟΥ became corrupted in the archetype, they might have been restored (with the common collocation of βλέπεω καὶ ἀκοῦειν in mind) as ΒΛΕΠΟΝΚΑΙΑΚΟΥΝ.

2 For the unity of νοὸς and λόγος cf. Corp. IX. 1, ἢ δὲ νόησις ὑπὸ τοῦ νοῦ (γίνεται), ἀνελθῇ οὕσα τοῦ λόγου, καὶ ὀργανα ἀλλήλων, οὐτε γὰρ ὁ λόγος ἐκφώνεται χωρὶς νοήσεως, οὔτε ἡ νόησις φαίνεται χωρὶς λόγου. For a similar form of expression cf. Corp. XI. 14, ζωὴ δὲ ἐστὶν ἕνωσις νοῦ καὶ ψυχῆς, θάνατος δὲ οὐκ ἀπώλεια τῶν συναχθέντων, διάλυσις δὲ τῆς ἕνωσεως.
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wished to harmonize his own teaching with it. Reitzenstein cites various parallels, more or less close, chiefly from Egyptian sources. There is, however, a parallel that leaps to the mind, in another Hellenistic author who wrote in Egypt, namely Philo, for whom the λόγος is the "first-born" or "elder" son of God (the κόσμος being the younger son). The Hermetist is not following Philo. For Philo the λόγος is the κόσμος νοητός. It is the thought of God, objectified in the universe, as the architect's conception of a building is objectified in the building. The λόγος of the Poimandres is the spoken word or command of God, the "voice of the light", although of course no Greek writer who used the term λόγος could dissociate the idea of "word" from the idea of the thought expressed in the word. The Hermetist therefore is nearer than Philo to the plain meaning of Gen. i. He is acquainted with the doctrine that the world was created by the Son of God, His Logos, and he is prepared to accept that doctrine, but only in the sense which he carefully defines, that a word is the offspring of a mind. The question of the ultimate origin of the doctrine of the Logos as Son of God, in Philo and the Hermetic writer alike, is a further question which we need not now discuss. Both wrote in Egypt; both were acquainted with Greek

1 Πρωτόγονος, De Conf. 146, De Agric. 51, De Somn. I. 215; πρεσβύτερος, Quod Deus 31.

2 De Opif. 24-5: οὐδὲν ἀν ἐτερων εἶποι τοῦ νοητοῦ κόσμου εἶναι ἡ λόγον θεοῦ ἡ δη κοσμοποιοῦτος . . . δήλον ὅτι καὶ ἡ ἀρχήνων αφράγις ὁν φάμεν νοητόν εἶναι κόσμον, αὐτός ἃν εἶ ὁ θεοῦ λόγος. Reitzenstein is certainly wrong in holding the identity of the Hermetic λόγος with the κόσμος νοητός, for this identification makes it necessary for him to suppose that in § 8 (see below) the Counsel of God, who receives the λόγος, receives the κόσμος νοητός into herself, whereas she is said to have seen and imitated that καλὸς κόσμος.

3 The ambiguity of the Greek term λόγος remains in all Hellenistic speculation, even though one side or the other may be more prominent in any given case. In a Semitic language the double sense may be expressed by parallelism, e.g. Od. Sol. xvi. 10, "The worlds were made by His word, and by the thought of His heart". مَكْتَعَبُ اَلْخَالَةُ مَكْتَعَبُ اَلْخَالَةُ. I20
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philosophy; and both had before them the Hebrew Scriptures in their Greek dress. Their doctrines are parallel developments from much the same roots.1 The interest of the present discussion is to show that the Hermetist is interpreting the creation story of Genesis along lines which might well have been followed by a Hellenistic-Jewish writer, though probably without direct dependence upon Philo.

B. The Emergence of the Higher Elements.

The immediate effect of the divine word in Poimandres is (not the creation of light, but) the separation of the higher elements from the lower. Here again the author makes contact with his biblical source. According to Gen. i. 6–7, after light and darkness had been separated, God uttered another word, γενηθήτω στερέωμα ἐν μέσω τοῦ ὕδατος, and by this means διεχώρισεν ὁ θεὸς ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ ὕδατος ὁ ἄνω ὕποκάτω τοῦ στερεώματος καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ ὕδατος τοῦ ἔπανω τοῦ στερεώματος. The idea has many echoes in other cosmological passages of the Old Testament, and later Jewish literature, e.g. Ps. xxxii. 6 sqq.:

Τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ Κυρίου οἱ οὐρανοὶ ἦσαν στερεώθησαν, καὶ τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ ιδίου αὐτοῦ πάσα ἡ δύναμις αὐτῶν συνάγων ὡς ἄσκον ὕδωρ θαλάσσης, τιθεῖς ἐν θησαυροῖς ἀβύσσους,

Prayer of Manasse (? i.–ii. p. C.), 3 :

*Ὁ πεδήσας τὴν θάλασσαν τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ προστάγματος σου ὁ κλείσας τὴν ἀβύσσον καὶ σφραγισάμενος τῷ φωτερῷ καὶ ἐνδόξω ὄνοματί σου,

and the cosmological passage quoted above from Jerem. v. 22. The ὕδωρ of Genesis, we must bear in mind, is the ὑγρὰ φύσις of Poimandres, the undifferentiated mass which is the material of creation. Now in Poimandres

1 It is therefore not necessary to suppose that the author of Poimandres was indebted to the Fourth Gospel or any other Christian source for his "Logos-doctrine," such as it is.

I2I
the effect of the word\textsuperscript{1} is to cause the chaotic "wet substance" to give off, first pure fire, light, keen and active—πῦρ ἀκρατὸν ἐξεπήδησεν ἐκ τῆς ύγρᾶς φύσεως ἀνω εἰς ύφος· κούθον δὲ ἤν καὶ ὀξύ, δραστικὸν τε ἁμα—and next air, which hangs suspended between fire on high, and watery earth below: καὶ ὁ ἄηρ, ἐλαφρός ὄν, ἦκολούθησε τῷ πνεύματι, ἀναβαίνοντος αὐτοῦ μέχρι τοῦ πυρὸς ἀπὸ γῆς καὶ υδάτος, ὡς δοκεῖν κρέμασθαι\textsuperscript{2} ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ. No mention has hitherto been made of πνεῦμα. Reitzenstein and Scott propose to read πυρὶ for πνεύματι. Two MSS. have the abbreviation \textit{PNI}, which might be a corruption for \textit{ΠΠΥΡΙ}. But in § 9 the upper sphere is described as that of πῦρ καὶ πνεῦμα.\textsuperscript{3} In Platonic-Stoic metaphysics the place of πνεῦμα among the elements is somewhat uncertain. It is defined as "air in motion" (ἀὴρ κινούμενος), but statements are made about it which are not applicable to air as an element. Chrysippus\textsuperscript{4} said "that the self-existent is πνεῦμα moving itself to itself and from itself, or πνεῦμα moving itself to and fro" (εἰναι τὸ ὅν πνεῦμα κινοῦν ἐαυτὸ πρὸς ἑαυτὸ καὶ ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ, ἡ πνεῦμα ἐαυτὸ κινοῦν πρόσῳ καὶ ὀπίσω); and Stobaeus, who cites this definition, adds "the term πνεῦμα has been adopted because it is said to be air in motion; and further to be analogous to αἰθήρ, so that both fall under the same definition" (πνεῦμα δὲ εἰληπταί, διὰ τὸ λέγεσθαι αὐτὸ ἄερα εἰναι κινούμενον· ἀνάλογον δὲ γίγνεσθαι κάπετα αἰθέρος, ὡστε καὶ εἰς κοινὸν λόγον πεσεῖν). Posidonius\textsuperscript{5} defined God as "intelligent and fiery πνεῦμα" (πνεῦμα νοερὸν καὶ πυρώδες). According to Zeno\textsuperscript{6} the human soul is πνεῦμα ἐνθερμόν, which Cicero\textsuperscript{7}

\textsuperscript{1} Scott has disintegrated the natural order of the MS. text by a quite unnecessary transposition.

\textsuperscript{2} Cf. Job xxvi. 7, κρεμάζουν γῆν ἐπὶ οὐδένος (sic B, κρεμνὼν A).

\textsuperscript{3} Scott's note on § 9 is based upon a rewritten text. Fire and πνεῦμα are again closely associated in § 16, where there seems no sufficient reason for taking πνεῦμα as = "air", with Scott.

\textsuperscript{4} Stob., Eel. I. 17.

\textsuperscript{5} Stob., Eel. I. 2.

\textsuperscript{6} See R.P., § 508a.

\textsuperscript{7} Tusc. I. ix. 19. The Stoic πνεῦμα is, as Scott puts it, a living and thinking gas.
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reports in the form, *Zenoni Stoico animus ignis videtur*. Thus the Hermetist would have precedent for associating *πνεῦμα* closely with the pure fire, which is the highest of the elements. It is possible that something has dropped out of the text, which would have made it clear that when the author speaks of fire he includes *πνεῦμα* with it. There is in any case no sufficient ground for removing *πνεῦμα* from the text.

We may now compare the picture of the inchoate universe at this stage in *Poimandres* with that in *Gen.* i. 8. In *Poimandres* there is a top stratum of fire and *πνεῦμα*, and a bottom stratum of mixed earth and water, with air hanging between. In *Genesis* we have the upper waters and the lower waters, with the firmament between. The lower waters conceal earth within themselves, and are therefore a fairly exact equivalent for the Hermetist’s mixture of earth and water. The upper waters, according to Jewish exegesis, are not like the waters below, being of a supernal nature. They are, in fact, frequently associated, or identified, with the divine spirit (*πνεῦμα*). When now we recall that the fire-*πνεῦμα* stratum is an emanation of the ἄγρα φύσις, the primeval “waters” of *Gen.* i. 2, we can see that the Hermetist could recognize in *Genesis* a cryptic presentation of what he believed to be the true state of affairs. The one important and irreconcilable difference is the substitution of air for the “firmament”. The Hebrew writer believed that a solid mass separated the upper stratum from the lower. The

---


2 It is just possible that a reminiscence of the solid firmament is to be found in an obscure phrase in § 7, which Scott conjecturally transfers to § 4: περισσότεροι τὸ πῦρ δυνάμει μεγίστη καὶ σταῖν ἔσχηκέναι κρατούμενον, "The fire was compassed by great power, and being subjected to force received a fixed position". But the parallel is remote. We might
Hermetist knew that this was not so. His Platonic-Stoic authorities placed air in the intermediate position. It was an element unknown to Hebrew thought. His air-stratum is a substitute, not an equivalent, for the firmament of Genesis.

C. The Residuum of Chaos.

With the description of the residuum of chaos, we return to close contact with Gen. i. After fire (with πνεῦμα) and air have been separated, "earth and water remained mixed together so that the earth could not be discerned from the water", says the Hermetist (γῆ καὶ ὦδωρ ἔμεινε καθ' ἑαυτὰ συμμεμεμγιμένα ὡς μὴ θεωρεῖσθαι <τὴν γῆν> ἀπὸ τοῦ ὦδατος).¹ This statement is easily inferred from Gen. i. 9: after the second day the lower water was collected into its assemblies, and earth became visible (συνήχθη τὸ ὦδωρ τὸ ὅποκάτω τοῦ οὐρανοῦ εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς αὐτῶν, καὶ ὄρθη ἢ ξηρά). Before this happened, therefore, the lower world must have been a mixture of earth and water, and the earth must have been invisible, which is exactly what the Hermetist says. We may compare the primeval slime of Phoenician cosmology—τὸ τῶν φασών ἡλὺν, οἷ δέ ὦδατῶδος μίξεως σῆμαν.² The Hermetist, however, adds that this slime was kept in motion "because of the pneumatic word rushing over it" (διὰ τὸν ἐπιφερόμενον³ πνευματικὸν λόγον). This is clearly perhaps more readily find a counterpart of the στερέωμα in the ἀρμονία of the created universe, or at least that part of it which is called ᾨ περιφέρεια τῶν κύκλων, and which can be "broken" (§ 13). But in fact the idea of a solid firmament in the Hebrew sense is strange to this philosophy.

¹ The insertion of τὴν γῆν is Reitzenstein's very modest proposal to make the sentence clear. Scott makes unreal difficulties, mutilates the passage, and finally gives it up as meaningless.
³ Reitzenstein, for reasons best known to himself, emends this to ἐπιφερόμενον. Τὸν ἐπιφερόμενον λόγον echoes the phrase λόγος ἐπέβη τῇ φύσει: both verbs express the onset of an active force.
his adaptation of the LXX phrase πνεῦμα θεοῦ ἐπεφέρετο ἐπάνω τοῦ υδάτος, "a wind (or breath) of God was rushing over the water". We have seen that in his description of chaos he did not introduce this feature, though he showed his consciousness of it by describing the ocean of darkness as τεταραγμένη. We can readily see why at that stage he could not, consistently with his own philosophy, speak of πνεῦμα and ὑδωρ; for both of these are discrete elements, neither of which could exist where there were only light and chaos. Now that the elements have appeared, wind and water are in place. But there is a further reason for this transposition. The πνεῦμα of Gen. i. has become πνευματικὸς λόγος. Since a word is produced by breath issuing through the larynx, the identification is easy. It is already suggested in Ps. xxxii. 6 (quoted above), where λόγος and πνεῦμα (in the sense of breath) stand in parallelism as the media of God's creative work. "Word", "spirit" and "wisdom" are conceptions lying very close together both in Hellenistic and in Palestinian Judaism, and the Philonic λόγος-doctrine has borrowed from Old Testament ideas of spirit. Thus in identifying the divine breath that moved over the waters with the word of God the Hermetist is well within the limits of Jewish ideas. For him, with his Stoic metaphysics, πνευματικὸς λόγος should mean a word which was in some sort material, consisting of the fire-like πνεῦμα which belongs to the higher elements. This, however, cannot be his meaning. In § 10 the λόγος is said to be "of one substance" (ὁμοούσιος) with the Νοῦς Δημιουργός, who is the offspring of the primal Νοῦς (see below). But νοῦς is essentially immaterial. The λόγος therefore is not made of any material element, not even of the highest element, πνεῦμα. The writer would seem to have taken over the language of his biblical source without sufficiently considering whether it is strictly consistent with his own metaphysics.

1 Aquila has the participle ἐπιφερόμενον.
D. The Counsel of God.

So far then the seer has been instructed, through the vision and its interpretation, in the first steps of the process by which the world came into being. But he feels a difficulty. At the word of God, he has been told, the elements separated themselves out of chaos. But why? If there was nothing but "a wet nature unspeakably agitated", how could it be that at the divine command it turned into fire, air, water and earth? "Whence", he asks, "did the elements of nature come into existence?" *(τα οὖν στοιχεῖα τῆς φύσεως πόθεν ὑπέστη;)*. The answer is "out of the Counsel of God, who received the Word, beheld the beautiful world, and imitated it" *(ἐκ θεου ἡμὶς λαβοῦσα τὸν λόγον, καὶ ἵδοῦσα τὸν καλὸν κόσμον, ἐμιμήσατο).*

That is to say, the personified Counsel of God beheld the archetypal universe, the κόσμος νοητός, and set out to make a universe like it, and in doing so, first brought forth the elements. In the words ἵδοῦσα τὸν καλὸν κόσμον we clearly have an echo of the repeated expression of *Gen.* i. : ἐπίθεν ὁ θεὸς ὅτι καλὸν. But there is a deliberate correction. Genesis speaks of this visible creation as καλὸν. The Hermetist will not have this: the universe which was seen to be beautiful

---

1 The MSS. add κοσμοποιηθεῖσα διὰ τῶν ἑαυτῆς στοιχείων καὶ γεννημάτων ψυχῶν, "being organized (or made into a world) by her own elements and offspring-souls". This, however, is hardly intelligible, and it is probable that the text is corrupt. If, however, ψυχῶν were omitted or replaced by some more appropriate word (though ψυλῶν, suggested by Flussas in 1574, is hardly satisfactory), we might make sense. The στοιχεῖα ἐκ βουλῆς θεοῦ ὑπέστη: they might therefore be described as her γεννήματα. Τὰ ἑαυτῆς στοιχεῖα καὶ γεννημάτα could then be taken as a hendiadys, and we might render the phrase "growing into a world through the elements which she produced". Κοσμοποιηθεῖσα might, however, mean simply "organized" or "adorned". Other Hermetic writers play upon the double meaning of κόσμος, "adornment" and "world", e.g. *Corp.* IV. 2; and L. & S. cite κοσμοποιά = κόσμημα from a papyrus. But in the context we should have expected κοσμοποίουσα. It may well be that the corruption of the text is more deeply seated, and it is difficult to feel confidence about the meaning of the phrase. Scott rewrites the passage in a way which goes beyond legitimate emendation.
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was the archetypal universe existing eternally in the Light, and the phenomenal world is only a faint copy of its perfect beauty. It is interesting to note that there were differences of opinion among Hermetic thinkers on this point. Thus Corp. XI. 7 uses the phrase "ο καλὸς κόσμος" of the visible universe, and this agrees with the general outlook of most writers of this school. Cf. the Hermetic Δόγος Τέλειος quoted by Lactantius, Div. Inst. IV. vi. 4 = Latin Asclepius, I. 8 (Scott): "ὁ κύριος καὶ τῶν πάντων ποιητής, ὃν θεὸν καλεῖν νενομίκαμεν, ἐπεὶ τὸν δεύτερον ἐποίησε, θεὸν ὀρατόν καὶ αἰσθητὸν . . . ἐπεὶ οὖν τούτων ἐποίησε πρῶτον καὶ μόνον καὶ ἕνα, καλὸς δὲ αὐτῷ ἐφάνη, καὶ πληρέστατος πάντων τῶν ἁγαθῶν, ἣγάσθη τε καὶ πάνυ ἐφιληθεὶν ὡς ἵδιον τόκον. We seem here to have a reference to Gen. i., whether the author knew it directly or through the Poimandres. In Corp. X. 10 the world is said to be καλὸς but not ἁγαθὸς. The writer of Corp. VI. exclaims, "I thank God who has put it into my mind, as touching knowledge of the Good, that it is impossible for it to be in the world. For the world is a totality (πλῆρωμα) of evil, and God the totality of good" (§ 4). The author of Poimandres, without going so far as this in dualism, is clear that the visible cosmos is imperfect, being evolved out of darkness, and that whatever goodness or beauty it has is a reflection of the "beauty old yet ever new" of the ἀρχέτυπον ἔδος. This is authentic Platonism.¹

Reitzenstein (who regards this passage as a part of an interpolation into the original Poimandres) finds here a doctrine of a female divine being who receives the word, as σπέρμα, into herself, and brings forth the world, and he connects it with widespread mythological ideas. But the whole of this is simply read into the passage, which contains not the remotest hint of a sexual process.²

¹ Cf. Tim. 29a sqq.
² The author's ascetic attitude to sex makes it extremely unlikely that he would introduce it into the supernatural world. But Reitzenstein does not attribute this passage to the original author.
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The idea of a secondary creative power forming the κόσμος αἰσθητός as a copy of the κόσμος νοητός is congenial to Platonic thought, and there is nothing surprising in it here. But nowhere else, so far as I am aware, does βουλή play this part. Elsewhere in the Hermetica we read of θεοῦ βουλήσις, ¹ θέλησις, ² or θέλημα, ³ and these correspond, as Scott observes, to the Stoic πρόνοια; but they are rarely hypostatized or personified as βουλή is here. In the present tractate the expression ἐκ βουλῆς θεοῦ recurs in § 18: ἐλύθη ὁ πάντων σύνδεσμος ἐκ βουλῆς θεοῦ, and in the hymn with which it closes we have the verse ἄγιος ὁ θεὸς, οὗ ἡ βουλή τελεῖται ἀπὸ τῶν ἰδίων δυνάμεων. ⁴ In neither case is the Counsel of God hypostatized. In § 14 the βουλή is that of the divine Ὀλυμπιαδής. Outside the Poimandres the Counsel of God appears only in Corp. XIII., which is dependent upon it. In Corp. XIII. 19 we seem to

¹Corp. IX. 6. The κόσμος is ὅργανον τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ βουλήσεως. In the Λόγος Τέλειος as cited by Lactantius, Inst. VII. xviii. 3 = Pseudo-Apuleius, Asclepius (Scott, Asclepius, III. 26a), βουλήσις is in some measure distinguished from God: τότε ὁ κύριος καὶ πατὴρ καὶ τοῦ πρώτου καὶ ἐνὸς θεοῦ δημιουργός . . . τὴν ἕαυτον βουλὴν, τοῦτ' ἐστιν τὸ ἄγαθον, ἀντερείας τῇ ἄταξίᾳ . . . = tunc ille dominus et pater, deus omnipotens et unius gubernator dei . . . voluntate sua, quae est dei benignitas, villis resistens . . .

²Corp. IV. 1. Τὸν πάντα κόσμον ἐποίησεν ὁ δημιουργός οὐ χερόις ἀλλὰ λόγῳ. ὅστε οὕτως ὑπολαμβάνει, ὡς τὸ πάροντος καὶ ἀεὶ ὄντος καὶ πάντα ποιήσαντος καὶ ἐνός καὶ μούνος, τῇ δὲ αὐτοῦ θελησε δημιουργῆσαντος τὰ ὅντα. The collocation of λόγος and θέλησις with reference to creation recalls the collocation of λόγος and βουλή in our passage. But neither term is hypostatized or personified. The meaning is similar to that of Corp. XIII. 21, σοῦ γὰρ βουλομένου πάντα τελεῖται, though the reference there is not to creation. Cf. also Corp. X. 2, ἡ γὰρ τούτου ἑνέργεια ἡ θέλησις ἐστι.

³Corp. X. 2, ἀναγκαζόμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ ἄγαθοῦ θελήματος, οὐ χωρίς οὔτε εἶναι οὔτε γενέσθαι ἐστιν δυνάτον. In Corp. XIII. 2 τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ is personified as the male "parent" in rebirth.

⁴Pap. Ox. 2074 contains an address to Wisdom (apparently): part of it reads as follows: οὔ εἰ τὸ ἀπαύγασμα καὶ ὄμοιον σάς τοῦ πατρός· οὐ εἰ τὸ διάδημα τοῦ φωτός, ὁ ὁ σύναξις τῶν φωτόρων . . . οὐ εἰ ἡ . . . καὶ τὴν βουλήν τοῦ πατρὸς τελείωσα προελθόθανα· οὐ εἰ ἡ τῷ σώματι αὐτοῦ περίβλημα γενομένη· οὐ εἰ ἡ τελειώσασα αὐτοῦ τὸ σοῦ σάμαμα δυνάμει τῇ σῇ. The papyrus is presumably Christian (it was written in the fifth century): the likeness to Hermetic language is striking.
have the creative θεός, as here: ἐν σετ θεον, ἀντί σε τὸ πᾶν, “Thy counsel proceeds from Thee; to Thee the All returns”.¹

I know of no occurrence of the expression βουλὴ θεοῦ in any document which can be supposed to be prior to the Poimandres,² except the LXX, where βουλὴ θεοῦ, κυρίον, and similar expressions (βουλὴ σου and the like) occur about twenty times. There are some suggestive parallels. The hymn at the close of Poimandres (§ 31) contains the verse “Holy is God, whose counsel is brought to pass by His own powers”. With this we may compare Is. xlvi. 9–10:

'Εγώ εἰμι ὁ θεός,
καὶ οὐκ ἔστων πλὴν ἔμοι,
ἀναγελλὼν πρότερον τὰ ἐσχάτα πρὶν γενέσθαι,
καὶ ἀμα συνετελέσθη.
καὶ εἰπα, Πάσα μου ἡ βουλὴ στήσετα,
καὶ πάντα δοσ βεβουλεμαί ποιήσω.

Again in Corp. XIII. 20 the re-born Tat confesses, “Thou art God. Thy man cries this through all Thy creatures. From Thee I have found the blessing of eternity, and the rest which I seek is mine by Thy counsel” (Σὺ εἶ ὁ θεὸς.

¹ The only other occurrence of the word θεός in Hermetic writings is in Isis to Horus, ap. Stob., Ecl. I. 49 (= Scott, Exc. Stob. XXVI. 9), θεος δὲ (βασιλεύς) ὁ πάντες πάντως, where θεος is, as Reitzenstein says, “die geistige Kraft, die φύσις oder σοφία”.

² Reitzenstein calls attention to the phrase Πτανός καὶ Ἡφαιστον βουλαίσ in Isis to Horus (Scott, Exc. Stob. XXIII. 6; R’s restoration of Πτανός, “of Ptah”, for MSS. ΣΠΑΝΟΣ seems certain and is accepted by Scott). This is a late Hermeticum, but Reitzenstein says the expression represents an ancient Egyptian usage. Clearly, however, it has no close relation to our passage. In Kittel’s Theologisches Worterbuch zum Neuen Testament s.v. βουλῆ, Schrenk speaks of the “Besinnung der βουλή θεοῦ in der hellenistischen Mystik”; but he cites no authorities except Poimandres and Corp. XIII., which is dependent on it. Apart from these there is in fact no evidence whatever that the conception played any part in “Hellenistic mysticism”, and in these the influence of Judaism is apparent.

³ Cf. Poim. 14, ἡ βουλὴ θη . . . καὶ ἀμα τῇ βουλῇ ἐγάνετο ἐνέργεια, of the divine Ἀνθρωπος.
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ο σὸς ἄνθρωπος ταῦτα βοᾷ... διὰ τῶν κτισμάτων σου.
ἀπὸ σοῦ αἱῶνος εὐλογίαν εὗρον· καὶ ὁ ἡττῶ βουλὴ τῇ σῇ ἀναπέπαυμαι). Cf. Ps. lxxii. 23–6:

καὶ ἔγω διὰ παντὸς παρά σοί,
ἐκράτησας τῆς χειρὸς τῆς δέξιάς μου.
ἐν τῇ βουλῇ σου ὀδὴγησάς με,
καὶ μετὰ δόξης προσελάβου με...
καὶ ἡ μερίς μου ὁ θεὸς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.

It is more difficult to point to any direct association of the Counsel of God with creation in the LXX. But in Ps. xxxiii., after the cosmological passage, vs. 6–7, already quoted (p. 121), the Psalmist continues:


Again, there are passages where βουλή is brought into contact with σοφία. Thus in Prov. viii. 12:

ἐγὼ σοφία κατεσκήνωσα βουλήν,
καὶ γνῶσιν καὶ ἐννοιαν ἐγὼ ἐπεκαλεσάμην.

There is indeed here no allusion to σοφία as a cosmic principle; but a few verses later comes the famous passage beginning κύριος ἐκτισεν μὲ ἀρχὴν δῶν αὐτοῦ, in which the personified Wisdom is set forth as the companion of God in creation. Again, in Wisd. ix. 13, 16–17, the Counsel of

1 With Corp. XIII. 20, βουλὴ τῇ σῇ ἀναπέπαυμαι, cf. Wisd. viii. 16, προσαναπάρομαι αὐτῇ (scil. σοφία); Sir. vi. 28, εὐρήσεις τὴν ἀνάπαυσιν αὐτῆς (scil. σοφίας).
God is brought together with both Wisdom and the Holy Spirit:

\[ T\acute{i}s \, \gamma\acute{a}r \, \alpha\nu\theta\acute{r}o\nu\tau\acute{o}s \, \gamma\nu\omega\sigma\epsilon\tau\alphai \, \betao\upsilon\lambda\nu\nu \, \theta\epsilon\omega\upsilon, \]

\[ \eta \, \tauis \, \varepsilon\nu\theta\nu\mu\acute{m}\nu\sigma\epsilon\tau\alphai \, \taui \, \theta\epsilon\ellei \, \delta \, \kappa\upsilon\mu\rho\iota\sigma; \]

\[ \mu\omicron\lambda\varsigma \, \varepsilon\iota\kappa\acute{a}\zeta\omicron\alpha\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu \, \tau\acute{a} \, \varepsilon\pi\iota \, \gamma\eta\varsigma; \]

\[ \kappaai \, \tauai \, \varepsilon\nu \, \chi\epsilon\rho\acute{e}i\nu \, \epsilon\upsilon\nu\acute{r}i\acute{a}\kappa\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma\epsilon\nu \, \mu\epsilon\tau\acute{a} \, \pi\omicron\acute{o}\nu. \]

\[ \tauai \, \varepsilon\nu \, \o\u\delta\iota\alpha\omicron\nu\iota\si\sigma, \]

\[ \betao\upsilon\lambda\nu\nu \, \delta\epsilon \, \tauis \, \varepsilon\gamma\nu\omega \, \epsiloni \, \mu\lambda, \mu\varsigma \, \upsilon \, \dot{\eta}d\omega\kappa\alpha\varsigma \, \sigma\omicron\frown\iota\acute{a}n, \]

\[ \kai \, \varepsilon\pi\epsilon\mu\acute{p}\acute{a}\iota\sigma\varsigma \, \tau\o\alpha \, \dot{\alpha}g\iota\omicron\nu \, \upsigma \, \upsi\nu\epsilon\mu\alpha \, \alpha\omicron\pi\omicron \, \upsi\acute{f}\omicron\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon; \]

The Counsel of God is that which lies behind His works in earth and heaven, and is known to man only by means of Wisdom or the Holy Spirit given from on high.

There is nowhere an exact parallel to the doctrine of the *Poimandres*; but there is evident affinity. In the LXX *bou\upsilon\nu \, \theta\epsilon\omega\upsilon* and *so\frown\iota\alpha* stand for the divine providence responsible for the creation and governance of the world. In Jewish thought *So\frown\iota\alpha* came to be hypostatized and personified as the divine agent in creation, the *t\epsilon\chi\nu\omicron\iota\tauis \, \pi\alpha\upiota\tau\acute{e}n* (*Wisd.* vii. 22).\(^1\) In this passage of the *Poimandres*, *bou\upsilon\nu \, \theta\epsilon\omega\upsilon* is chosen for a similar rôle. As Wisdom in *Wisd.* ix. 9 knows the works of God, being present when He made the world, and understands what is pleasing in His sight, so here the Counsel of God receives and obeys the word that comes out of the Light; and as in *Prov.* viii. 30 Wisdom is *\pi\upsilon\rho \, \alpha\iota\upsilon\tau\acute{o} \, \dot{a}\rho\mu\omicron\acute{o}\zeta\omicron\omicron\upsilon\sigma\alpha*, so here the Counsel of God forms the elements of the universe.\(^2\)

Strictly, this doctrine is an alternative account of how the elements came into being: either they separated

\(^1\) How far Reitzenstein is right in tracing here the influence on Jewish thought of Egyptian Isis-theology is a question apart from our present purpose. If so, that influence must have been exerted at a period long antecedent to the *Poimandres*.

\(^2\) Cf. the function of the second Wisdom (Achamoth) in the Valentinian system. As *bou\upsilon\nu* produces the elements in imitation of the *k\omicron\acute{o}\mu\rho\iota\sigma*, so from Achamoth proceed the three grades of being, *t\o\, \dot{\upsilon}l\acute{k}\omicron\nu*, *t\o\, \dot{\upsilon}h\upsilon\acute{u}\kappa\omicron\nu*, *t\o\, \pi\nu\epsilon\mu\mu\alpha\tau\acute{i}k\omicron\upsilon*; and she then produces the Demiurge, the image of the First Father, and through him a visible universe which is a copy of the invisible. Iren., *Adv. Haer.* I. iv.–v.
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themselves from chaos at the word of God, or they were formed by the Counsel of God. The two doctrines no doubt arose out of different trains of thought, yet they are complementary rather than contradictory. The problem which the Hermetist is facing is a real problem. Any theistic account of the universe which postulates at the beginning God on the one hand, and formless matter on the other, must meet the difficulty that there is nothing in mere matter which could ever respond to the will of God; or else it must give account of the potential properties of matter which made possible the emergence of a cosmos; but in that case it is not mere matter. The Hermetist has, not very satisfactorily, met the difficulty by assuming a Counsel of God, resident in or with matter, by which at His command the process of creation was begun. It is one more attempt to do justice to divine transcendence and immanence at once. We need not, therefore, with Reitzenstein, regard the passage as an interpolation. No doubt it originated from a point of view different from that of the passage about the Holy Word. But it is characteristic of the Hermetica in general that they put forward an eclectic philosophy, combining elements from widely different sources. Our passage is an excursus rather than an interpolation. The important point for our present purpose is that the excursus no less than the main argument shows definite contact with Hellenistic Jewish thought.


(Poimandres, §§ 9–11, cf. Gen. i. 9–25.)

The remaining stages of creation (excepting the creation of man) are attributed by the Hermetist not to the primal God, but to a secondary divine being, the Demiurge. Even in the separation of the elements the divine principles λόγος and βουλή have worked as intermediaries. But λόγος, though partly hypostatized, is really nothing more than the uttered word of God, and βουλή is His counsel,
an attribute or activity of νοῦς rather than a fully personal being. But at this point a ἕτερος νοῦς appears, to take over the work of creating living beings. The fresh stage is announced in the words: "Then Mind (or God), being bisexual, existing as life and light, generated another Mind, the Creator" (ὁ δὲ νοῦς, ὁ θεὸς, ἀρρενόθηλος ὁ, ζωὴ καὶ φῶς ὑπάρχων, ἀπεκύησεν ἑτερόν νοῦν δημιουργόν).

A. Life and Light.

The description of the primal God at this point as being ζωὴ καὶ φῶς calls for some consideration. That God is Light we already know. That He is also Life is here stated for the first time, no doubt because the beginnings of created life are now to be described. We might translate "God being life as well as light." This is no casual collocation of divine attributes. The writer returns to it again and again, and he clearly regards the identification of the supreme Being with the union of Life and Light as a cardinal point of revelation. The Christian reader cannot but be reminded of the Johannine identification

1 So Reitzenstein. MSS. ἀπεκύησε λόγῳ B ἀπεκύησε λόγον. With the latter reading the meaning might be "generated another word, the creative mind"; but this is impossible: νοῦς and λόγος are not equivalent terms. The MS. text would mean that God brought the demiurge into being by uttering a creative word; but such a use of λόγῳ would be very confusing while the hypostatized λόγος is still in view, and, as both Reitzenstein and Scott observe, the statement that God is ἀρρενόθηλος is intended to justify the use of the verb ἀποκύησεν, so that the idea of divine generation is distinguished from the utterance of the divine word. Reitzenstein therefore excises λόγῳ. Scott notes, "perhaps Reitzenstein is right in striking it out; but how did it come to be there?" May it not have been inserted by a Christian scribe who recalled Ἰα. i. 18, βουλθεῖς ἀπεκύησεν ἡμᾶς λόγῳ ἀλληλείας? Scott's own suggestion is πρὸς τὸ λόγῳ, but this would suggest that the λόγος also was generated, whereas the author has been at pains to explain that it is "son" of God only in the sense in which any word is the offspring of a mind. Scott's further emendations do not seem to be called for.

2 Note especially § 32, where the seer, now initiated into the knowledge of God, exclaims, πιστεύω καὶ μαρτύρω· εἰς ζωὴν καὶ φῶς χωρῶ. The collocation is equally important in Corp. XIII., which depends on the Poimandres.
of the Λόγος as Son of God with Life and Light, and the union of the two concepts in the Prologue to the Fourth Gospel. The possibility must not be ruled out that there is literary relationship of some kind between John and Poimandres; but we may enquire whether this particular collocation of ideas can be traced to any common source behind both writers.

We have already seen that the identification of God with light is characteristically Iranian, though it has parallels in Egypt elsewhere. Hebrew thought associates God with light, though it stops short of identification. Platonism readily finds room for the identification, since Plato himself had pointed to the Sun as ἐκγενός τοῦ ἄγαθοῦ, and therefore the image of God. But the idea of God as life is foreign to the earlier Platonism. Some of the Hermetic writers, however, make much of life as a manifestation of the divine activity. Thus the author of Corp. XI. says that it is the ἐργον of God "to make life, soul, immortality and change". Without such activity He would not be God. "This is life, this is the beautiful, this is the good, this is God" (§§ 12-13). Again, in Corp. XII. life and immortality are "parts" of God, and the Κόσμος, the πληρωμα of life, is His image (§§ 21, 15).1 This interest in life corrects the intellectualism which the Hermetists carry over from Platonism. The close association of life with God may be due to Egyptian influence. Ankh = life is an attribute or epithet of various Egyptian deities.2 But in Hebrew thought also, though naturally God is not identified with life, yet θεὸς ζωήν, is one of His commonest and most significant titles, and He is glorified as the Source and Giver of life. Philo’s comment on Jerem. ii. 13 (ἐμε ἐγκατέλυπον πηγὴν ὀδατος ζωῆς LXX) is note-

1 Similarly in the Latin Asclepius, §§ 29–30, Deus ergo viventium vel vitalium, in mundo quae sunt, sempiternus gubernator est, ipsiusque vitae dispensator aeternus . . . In ipsa enim aeternitatis vivaci-tate mundus agitatur, et in ipsa vitali aeternitate locus est mundi.
2 See Scott's note on Corp. XI. i., Hermetica II. pp. 289–90.
worthy: *De Fuga*, § 198: “God is more than life: He is the everflowing fountain of life, as He Himself has said”\(^1\) This runs on parallel lines with what he says of light in *De Somn.* I. 75 (quoted above, p. 108).

God as source of light and life at once comes in *Ps.* xxxv. 10, to which Philo is referring in the passage quoted:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Παρά σοι πηγὴ ζωῆς,} \\
\text{ἐν τῷ φωτὶ σου ὀψόμεθα φῶς.}
\end{align*}
\]

This is probably as near as a Hebrew could get to saying \(\delta\ \thetaεὸς \ ζωὴ\ καὶ \ φῶς \ ύπάρχων\). Now in the creation-story of *Genesis* no attentive reader with such ideas in mind could fail to observe that God is there presented pre-eminently as the source of light and life. His first creative word is \(γενηθῆτω \ φῶς\): His last creative act is to breathe into man \(πνεῦν ζωῆς\). Philo finds the two ideas together at the very beginning of the story: *De Opif.* § 30: “He assigned precedence to spirit and life; the former he called ‘the spirit of God’, because spirit is the most vital of all things, and God is the cause of life; and of the light he says that it was exceedingly good” \((\text{προνομίας δὲ τὸ τε πνεῦμα καὶ τὸ φῶς ἥξιοῦτο · τὸ μὲν γὰρ ὄνομασε θεοῦ, διότι ζωτικωτὰτον τὸ πνεῦμα, ζωῆς δὲ θεὸς αἰτίος · τὸ δὲ φῶς φησιν ὅτι ὑπερβαλλότως καλὸν).\) His meaning is that the first two existences mentioned in *Genesis* are spirit and light, and these must be understood as life and light, the two fundamental manifestations of the divine. The very artificiality of the exegesis shows that Philo and his readers would expect a story of creation to have its central motive in the union of life and light. It is unlikely that he was himself the originator of the idea. It was scarcely forced upon him by his biblical text, although, as we have seen, the collocation is not alien from Hebrew thought in general, or from the creation story in particular. Whether it has more

\(^1\)This passage is recalled by *Jn.* iv. 14: \(πηγὴ \ δδατος \ ἀλλομένου \ εἰς \ ζωὴν \ ἀιῶνιον\).
definite antecedents in Egyptian thought I do not know. But as the Poimandres does not seem to be directly dependent on the De Opificio (as we have seen at several points), we may state the case thus: Philo and the author of Poimandres, both writing in Hellenistic Egypt, with the Hebrew creation story before them, have both brought together the ideas of life and light as a cardinal point in the story. Whether therefore the Egyptian or the Hebrew factor is predominant, both represent a doctrine already established by the beginning of the Christian era, where Jewish and Hellenistic thought met in an Egyptian environment, the doctrine that the union of the ideas of light and life gives the most adequate account of God in His creative aspect. As the author of the Fourth Gospel was familiar with Philonic ideas, if not with the works of Philo himself, as well as with the LXX, the coincidence between John and Poimandres in this point need not be explained by literary dependence on the one side or the other.

B. Origin and Nature of the Demiurge.

Already in Plato (Tim. 69c) a distinction is made between the supreme God who made θεία and His offspring (γεννήματα) who made θυτά. The term δημιουργός, however, is there applied to God Himself, as it also is by Philo, and by most of the Hermetic writers.  

1 E.g. Corp. IX. 5, ὁ μὲν γὰρ θεὸς πάντων δημιουργός. V. 7, τὸς πάντα ταύτα ποιῶσας; ποία μήτηρ, ποιῶς πατήρ, εἰ μὴ ἁφανὴς θεὸς τῷ ἑαυτὸν θελήματι πάντα δημιουργήσας; Sometimes we find polemic against the doctrine of a second creator; e.g. XI. 9, ἀδύνατον δῶ τὴν πλεοὺς ποιητάς εἶναι, ib. 14, οὐ γὰρ ἄλλον ἔχει συνεργόν, αὐτουργὸς γὰρ ὃν ἀεὶ ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ ἔργῳ. In Corp. VIII., and elsewhere, the δεύτερος θεὸς is the cosmos itself, e.g. VIII. 2, πρῶτος γὰρ πάντων ὄντως καὶ ἁίδιος καὶ ἄγεννητος ὁ δημιουργὸς τῶν ὄλων θεῶν. δεύτερος δὲ ὁ κατ' εἰκόνα αὐτοῦ ὁ κόσμος. Accordingly the cosmos can be called δημιουργὸς ζωῆς (IX. 6). In other libelli αἴων (Corp. XI.) or τόπος (Corp. II.) appear as intermediaries. In XII. νοῦς is the image, or the soul, of God, and rules over all things (§ 9). This approximates to the doctrine of Poimandres, where νοῦς being identified with the supreme God, a ἐτερος νοῦς appears as second god.
second-century Platonist Numenius it is reserved for the δεύτερος θεός. A Demiurge in this sense has a place also in Valentinus and other Christian or semi-Christian Gnostics from the second century onwards. In the creation-story of Gen. i. no subordinate creator appears, consistently with the severe monotheism of this writing. Nevertheless, in Jewish speculation of the Hellenistic period the growing emphasis on the transcendence of God led to the recognition of intermediate creative powers. Wisdom is such already in Prov. viii., and more definitely in the Wisdom of Solomon, and as we have seen, one line of Jewish exegesis interpreted the τριάς of Gen. i. 1 as meaning Wisdom, the “first principle” of the universe. In Philo the Logos is a divine hypostasis active in creation, and is called θεός. Moreover, Philo finds secondary creators implied in the creation narrative of Genesis. The use of the plural in Gen. i. 26, οὐσίωμεν ἀνθρωπον, indicates, he says, that God was assisted by His “powers”, and to them He assigned the task of making the mortal part of our soul. He thus read into the biblical narrative the doctrine of the Timaeus. The Hermetist is not


2 The restriction of the term δημιουργός to a single secondary god, on the ground that the supreme God does not create, appears first in these second-century writers. But the application of the term δημιουργός to a secondary creator is earlier. Philo calls the creative “powers” of God δημιουργοί (see note 3 below). Plutarch applies the term to the six divine hypostases of Zoroastrianism (the Amshaspands), Moralia, p. 370A (De Is. et Osir. 47): ... τῶν μὲν σοφίας, τῶν δὲ πλοῦτος, τῶν δὲ τῶν ἐπὶ τοῖς καλοῖς ἡδονῶν δημιουργῶν. As in Corp. IX. the κόσμος is δημιουργὸς ζωῆς, so in Tim. 40b-c Plato says the earth in its revolutions is δημιουργὸς νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας, and he uses the terms δημιουργία and δημιουργεῖν of the work of the secondary gods. The terminology of Poimandres 9, therefore, does not oblige us to suppose that the writer is dependent either on Numenius or on Valentinus. The materials of his doctrine and of its terminology alike are present in earlier thought.

3 De Fug. §§ 68–70: διαλέγεται μὲν οὖν ὁ τῶν ἑλών πατήρ ταῖς ἐαυτῷ δυνάμεσιν, αἷς τὸ θνητὸν ἡμῶν τῆς ψυχῆς μέρος ἐδωκε διαπλάττειν ... ἀναγκαῖον ὡς ἦγησατ τὴν κακῶν γένεσιν ἐτέρως ἀπονεῖμαι δημιουργοῖς, τὴν δὲ τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἐαυτῷ μόνῳ. See below, p. 155.
following Philo here, but he feels as free as Philo to introduce his doctrine of a second creator into an account of creation, in which he is following Genesis.

The Demiurge of the *Poimandres*, like the secondary creators of the *Timaeus*, is not a created being, but the offspring of God, generated by Him bisexually.¹ As such, he is, like his Father, both νοῦς and god—"the god of fire and spirit". The words θεὸς τοῦ πυρὸς καὶ πνεῦματος clearly do not mean that fire and πνεῦμα constitute his substance; for as the offspring of God he is of the substance of his Father, namely life and light, and not of any material substance, not even of the finest. The meaning is that the Demiurge exercises his divine prerogative over the highest sphere of material existence, the fire-πνεῦμα stratum. He is in fact the God of Heaven.² This is borne out by the description of his work which follows.

C. The Administrators.

The Demiurge first "fabricated" (ἐδημιούργησε) seven Administrators or Controllers—διωκηταί (the word was used to translate the Latin procurator). They were made of the substance of the highest stratum of material elements, ἐκ πυρὸς καὶ πνεῦματος (§ 16), over which, as we have seen, the Demiurge presided as θεὸς πυρὸς καὶ πνεῦματος. We have no difficulty in recognizing in them the living denizens of heaven, the seven planetary gods. Their administration is called εἰμαρμένη. The use of the term points to a Stoic background. Stoicism since Posidonius gave sanction to the widespread belief that destiny is controlled by the heavenly bodies.

¹ Reitzenstein cites Egyptian precedent for divine bisexuality. In Valentinus the primal God has a consort: ταύτην δὲ ὑποδεξαμένην τὸ σπέρμα τοῦτο καὶ ἐγκύμονα γενομένην ἀποκύψας νοῦν, ὅμοιον τε καὶ ἵνα τῷ προβαλόντι (Iren., Adv. Haer. I. i. 1). The Hermetist is clearly anxious to avoid any suggestion of sexual generation, consistently with his depreciation of the sexual life in man. See below.

² Similarly in Valentinus the Demiurge has his seat in the ἐπουράνιος τόπος, separated by the μεσότης from the πλήρωμα, which corresponds to the world of light in the *Poimandres* (Iren., op. cit. I. v. 2).
This passage is the equivalent of the statement in Gen. i. 16: ἐποίησεν ο θεὸς τοὺς δύο φωστήρας τοὺς μεγάλους, τὸν φωστήρα τὸν μέγαν εἰς ἰχθύας τῆς ημέρας καὶ τὸν φωστήρα τὸν ἐλάσσω εἰς ἄρχας τῆς νυκτὸς, καὶ τοὺς ἀστέρας. Genesis speaks only of sun and moon and the stars in general. But the Secrets of Enoch, expanding the creation story of Genesis, enumerates the creations of the Fourth Day thus (xxx. 2–7): the stars, Saturn, Venus, Mars, Jupiter, Mercury, Moon and Sun. Hellenistic Judaism, therefore, about the first half of the first century A.D., found the seven planets in Gen. i. 16. There is no hint of this in Philo, De Opificio.

The idea of the stars as administrators of destiny is strange to Genesis. Nevertheless, our author might well have found a hint of his doctrine in the repeated phrase εἰς ἅρχας τῆς ημέρας, τῆς νυκτός, ἄρχεων τῆς ημέρας (Gen. i. 16, 18): the heavenly bodies are created not merely to give light, but to bear rule. Philo (De Opif. §§ 56–7) makes nothing of this, observing merely that God gave power over the day (κράτος τῆς ημέρας) to the sun, οὰ μεγάλω βασίλει, and that the greatness of his power and rule (τὸ μέγεθος τῆς περὶ τὸν ἦλιον δύναμεως καὶ ἄρχης) is measured by the fact that one half of time is assigned to him, while the other half is shared by the moon and stars! This is mere embroidery, with no philosophical significance. But Philo does not merely ignore the doctrine of our passage: he has a definite polemic against the view that the heavenly bodies are διωκηταί, in De Conf. Ling. §§ 168 sqq. He is discussing passages like Gen. i. 26, which might appear to represent God as one of a number. The fundamental explanation of such passages is given in op. cit. § 171 (quoted p. 111), viz. that God being one, has innumerable "powers" about Him. Philo continues (§ 173):

¹ Theodotion has εἰς ἐξουσίαν, Symmachus εἰς τὸ ἡγεῖσθαι τῆς ημέρας, εἰς ἡγεμονίαν τῆς νυκτός, in i. 16. Aquila has ἐξουσίας τῆς ημέρας in i. 18. The heavenly bodies are ἄρχοντες, in the Gnostic phrase; or they are ἄρχαι καὶ ἐξουσίαι.
"Certain persons, impressed by the nature of each of the worlds, have not only deified them as wholes, but have also deified the most beautiful of their component parts, the sun, the moon and the entire heaven, which they shamelessly called gods".¹ Such polytheism is to be reprehended, for "no existing thing is equal in honour to God, but there is one Ruler and Leader and King, who alone has the right to preside over and control all things" —ἀλλ’ ἔστιν εἷς ἀρχων καὶ ἡγεμών καὶ βασιλεὺς, ὁ πρωτανεύων καὶ διοικεῖν μόνως θέμις τὰ σύμπαντα (§ 170). The implication of this passage is that in Alexandria in Philo’s day the sun and moon and the other heavenly bodies were regarded in certain circles as διοικηταῖ τῶν συμπάντων.² The same inference may be drawn from Wisd. vii. 29–viii. 1:

ἐστιν γὰρ αὕτη (scil. ἡ σοφία) εὐπρεπεστέρα ἡλίου, 
καὶ ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν ἀστρων θέων. 
φωτὶ συγκρινομένη εὐρίσκεται πρωτέρα · 
τοῦτο μὲν γὰρ διαδέχεται νῦς, 
σοφίας δὲ οὐκ ἀντισχύει κακία. 
διατείνει δὲ ἀπὸ πέρατος εἰς πέρας εὐρώστως, 
καὶ διοικεῖ τὰ πάντα χρηστῶς.

The term διοικηταί as applied to the planetary gods I have not been able to trace in any document earlier than Poimandres, but the use of the verb in these two passages suggests that it may go back to the beginning of the Christian era. To the doctrine of the stars as διοικηταί Philo opposes the doctrine of the one supreme God who, through His attendant "powers", διοικεῖ τὰ σύμπαντα, and the pseudo-Solomon, a doctrine of Wisdom as the supreme διοικητής. In less orthodox Jewish circles, however, astrological ideas obtained a hold, as Reitzenstein ¹ Cf. Wisd. xiii. 2, φωτόσηρας οὐρανοῦ πρωτάνεις κόσμου θεοῦς ἐνόμισαν. The author allows the stars the title "presidents of the world ", but blames the pagans for regarding them as gods. ² Cf. the polemic against current doctrines of εἰμαρμένη in Philo, Quis Rerum, §§ 300–2, De Migr. §§ 178–9.
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shows, and the powers assigned to the angels in Enochic literature is not uninfluenced by such ideas.

To sum up: at this stage of the narrative Poimandres departs more widely from Genesis than in the earlier stages, its material being drawn directly from Platonic and Stoic sources. Nevertheless, in intention the author was probably still following Genesis. He agrees with Genesis in placing the origin of the heavenly bodies at this point, and in making them the result of a direct act of creation (not simply of a creative word, like light in Genesis and the separation of the elements in Poimandres); and in regarding them as not merely lights but ruling powers. On the other hand, in interpreting the idea of their "rule", he follows a tradition known to Jewish writers like Philo and the author of Wisdom, but deliberately rejected by them as inconsistent with monotheism, though less orthodox Jewish minds were more hospitable to it.

D. The Origin of Animal Life.

The Demiurge, being θεὸς τοῦ πυρὸς καὶ πνεύματος, has now completed his direct work of creation by peopling the upper stratum of the material universe with living beings. The lower elements are still devoid of life. As he is not in direct touch with these lower elements, some further adjustment is required before these can be peopled. In Gen. i., while the heavenly bodies are brought into being by a direct creative act of God, terrestrial life is produced by earth and water themselves at the divine command. The Hermetist follows this suggestion, in a somewhat devious way. First, the λόγος, which after descending on chaotic matter at the beginning has remained moving over the face of the waters, ascends and is united with the Demiurge. This is a curious, and so far as I know, unique feature of the cosmology of Poimandres. At first

1 Reitzenstein (Pom. pp. 62–7) compares an Egyptian inscription, in which Thoth "united himself with Ptah, after he had brought forth
sigh it seems a mere simplification. Λόγος and Δημιουργός are in a sense doublets. Both stand for the power conceived to be intermediate between the supreme God and this world. The one is drawn from Hellenistic-Jewish thought, the other traces its descent from Platonism. The eclectic philosophy of the Hermetist has found a place for both. The fusion of the two at this stage gets rid of a somewhat awkward reduplication. Yet with Genesis before us we can see a subtle appropriateness in this ascent of λόγος to co-operate with the Demiurge. The λόγος, in Poimandres, in spite of partial hypostatization, remains essentially a "word" or command of God. As such a command is needed, according to Genesis, to enable the lower elements to bring forth life, it is natural that the "word" should be given a place in this stage of the work. Once united with the Demiurge it disappears as a separate factor, and the Demiurge, equipped with the power of the "word", acts as a Platonic creator should. He communicates to the planets—τά ἐαυτοῦ δημιουργήματα—a rotary movement, and this causes the lower elements to bring forth living things: ἥ δὲ τούτων περιφορά, καθὼς θέλει ὁ Νοῦς, ἐκ τῶν κατωφερῶν στοιχείων ζῶα ἔγεικεν ἀλογα.¹ Reitzenstein and Scott seem to me wrong in taking νοῦς here as = Δημιουργός, the ἔτερος νοῦς. The act is the Demiurge's, but the will is that of the eternal fons deitatis. It is in fact σὺν τῷ λόγῳ—with the aid of the Word of the primal God—that the Demiurge acts.

all things and all words of God; at the time when he had formed the gods, had made the cities, had settled the nomes, had placed the gods in their sanctuaries . . . "', etc. The parallel is not close, though it is no doubt possible that the Egyptian habit of identifying or fusing the personalities of different gods may have been an influence in the background of this writer's thought.

¹ This is the reading of the MSS., which both Reitzenstein and Scott emend, as it seems to me unnecessarily. The statement is quite intelligible, and though the theory is no doubt eccentric, it is not more so than some other features of this cosmogony. At any rate some explanation is called for of the means by which the Demiurge, assisted by the Logos, worked for the production of living things, and neither Reitzenstein's reading nor Scott's gives one.
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For, as Genesis has it, it was God who said "Let the waters bring forth".

Similarly, it was by the will of the primal God—καθὼς ἦθέλησεν ὁ Νοῦς—that earth and water had already been separated—διακεχώρισται ἀπ' ἄλληλων ἦ τε γῆ καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ. The use of the perfect shows that this separation did not take place in the sequence in which it is mentioned, but at an earlier point—at the point, therefore, at which it is given in Genesis. The primal Reason separated the elements by His word; fire and air first, leaving a slime of earth and water (= Gen. i. 7). Then He completed the work by separating earth and water (= Gen. i. 9), and so these elements were ready to produce life at His will and command, through the act of the Demiurge. First air produces flying things, then water swimming things, and finally earth produces quadrupeds and reptiles. Verbal echoes of the LXX are here exceptionally numerous:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LXX</th>
<th>Poimandres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>διεχώρισεν ὁ θεός (of upper and lower waters, but by implication also of earth and water).</td>
<td>διακεχώρισται ἀπ' ἄλληλων ἦ τε γῆ καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ καθὼς ἦθέλησεν ὁ νοῦς.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ εἶπεν ὁ θεός, Ἐξαγαγέτω τὰ ὕδατα ἔρπετα καὶ πετευμ.</td>
<td>καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ νηκτά.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ ἐξήνεγκεν ἡ γῆ βοτάνην . . .</td>
<td>καὶ ἡ γῆ ἐξήνεγκεν ἀπ' αὐτῆς ἀ εἰχε καὶ εἶπεν ὁ θεός Ἐξαγαγέτω ἡ γῆ . . . τετράποδα καὶ ἔρπετα καὶ θηρία τῆς γῆς.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. . . τετράποδα καὶ ἔρπετα καὶ θηρία τῆς γῆς.</td>
<td>. . . τετράποδα καὶ ἔρπετα καὶ θηρία τῆς γῆς.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Literary dependence is clear. There are certain differences: the Hermetist has omitted vegetable life, perhaps by an

1 Which Scott gratuitously excises.

2 There is a certain difficulty here. It is somewhat surprising to find air reckoned as one of the κατωφερή στοιχεία. In § 5, air being light, followed πνεῦμα upwards. But it is clear that fire and πνεῦμα together form the highest stratum, and air occupies an ambiguous position between the upper and lower sphere. It is never reckoned to the upper sphere, and in comparison with fire and πνεῦμα it may well be regarded as one of the κατωφερή. Reitzenstein has exaggerated the difficulty by identifying the πνεῦμα of § 9 with air, which seems clearly wrong.
oversight; he attributes the production of birds to air, while the biblical writer, who is not acquainted with that element, attributes them, along with fishes, to water; and the power of reproduction, which according to Genesis was given to animals at their creation, is in Poimandres postponed until after the Fall. But the points of agreement are more striking. In both, the beginning of animal life follows immediately after the creation of the heavenly bodies; in both, life originates out of the elements, and not by direct creation; in both, birds and fishes precede terrestrial animals. We may add that the separation of land and water, which in Genesis precedes the creation of the heavenly bodies, is only superficially in a different order in Poimandres.

At this point in both accounts comes the origin of man. In neither is he placed along with the other animals, as the offspring of earthy matter simply. Poimandres indicates that earth could not produce any but ἄλογα ζωα, because the λόγος had departed from it after the separation of the elements. Genesis similarly, after using the formula εἶπεν ὁ θεὸς, Ἑξαγαγέτω τὰ υδάτα . . . ἥ γῆ, turns to a new formula, εἶπεν ὁ θεὸς, Ποιήσωμεν ἄνθρωπον. In both, therefore, the origin of man is a new departure.

1 It is true that Genesis says (i. 21) καὶ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς τὰ θηρία κ.τ.λ., but this is clearly to be interpreted in the sense of the repeated statements, εἶπεν ὁ θεὸς, Ἑξαγαγέτω κ.τ.λ. Whether or not there were originally two inconsistent accounts of creation which have been fused together, as Gunkel holds, does not concern us: the Greek reader of the LXX would have no doubt what was meant.
CHAPTER VII

THE ORIGIN AND FALL OF MAN IN POIMANDRES

(Poimandres, §§ 12–19; Gen. i. 26–30, ii. 7–v. 2.)

The Mosaic account of the six days of creation is, as we have seen, fairly closely reproduced in Poimandres, down to the appearance of animals and planets. At this point both accounts take a fresh turn. At first sight the story of the origin of man in Poimandres differs widely from the story in Genesis. It will be well to summarize the myth at once. In detail there are some obscure points, and the text is certainly corrupt in places; but most of the details do not affect our present purpose. In outline the myth is as follows.

Creation being finished, the primal Mind, who is life and light, gave birth to a Man in His own image. He loved the Man as His own child, and gave him authority over all His creatures. Man conceived the desire to create for himself, and entered the created sphere. In his descent the various astral powers imparted to him something of their own nature (from § 25 we learn that man thus acquired the instincts which are characteristic of empirical humanity). He then broke a hole in the celestial framework (ἀρχαία), and looked through. Nature beheld him and loved the divine image in him. Man returned the love, descended into the irrational sphere (the world of earth, water and air, deserted by the λόγος, § 10) and consummated his union with Nature. Through this union man became a two-fold being, partly immortal,
partly mortal; lord of creation, and yet subject to its fate (εἰμαρμένη). From the union of Man and Nature sprang seven men: on the one side they were made of fire and πνεῦμα, which the archetypal Man had brought with him from the supernal sphere, on the other side of the grosser elements of their mother Nature. These seven men, like their father, were bisexual, and remained so for an age. At the end of that age, "the bond of all things was loosed through the counsel of God." Man was divided into two sexes, and with him all the other animals. Then God spoke with a holy word, "Increase in increase and multiply in multitude, all ye creatures, and let rational man recognize that he is immortal, and that the cause of death is carnal desire".

We have here an elaborate myth leading up to a clearly expressed moral, namely, that man is naturally immortal, but that through the attachment to matter which is involved in the exercise of the sexual instinct he has become mortal. Reproduction is the sign and result of a Fall which man must retrieve by denying the body and all its instincts. The doctrine is not that of the Old Testament, and the myth is a form of a widely spread myth of the Urmensch, or primeval Man, the origins of which are obscure. Nevertheless the numerous echoes both of

1 The myth of the Urmensch has been very widely discussed. Reitzenstein and Bousset trace it to the Iranian Gayomard, and farther back to a primitive Aryan myth which appears in the Rigveda, with influence from Babylonian mythology. Parallels can be drawn from even remoter regions, going as far as China on the one hand and Scandinavia on the other. I do not propose to discuss here the question of ultimate origins. That there was a widespread myth of the Urmensch is certain. It is enough for our purpose to show that the particular form which the myth takes in Poimandres is in contact at most points with the biblical narrative as currently interpreted in Hellenistic Judaism. Whether this Hellenistic Judaism itself was dominated by Iranian influence is another question, a question which for Reitzenstein is settled in the affirmative. But we may observe that the myth of Gayomard as it appears in really early Zoroastrian documents does not very closely resemble the *Avërapanos-speculations of Philo, the Hermetica, and the early Christian Gnostics, while the documents upon which Reitzenstein relies are in general no earlier in date, and often much
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language and of thought forbid us to suppose that the Hermetic writer's dependence on *Genesis* has ceased. There are the following verbal echoes: Man has the *eikón* of God; he became soul, *ēγένετο eἰς ψυχήν*; God said "be fruitful and multiply" (*LXX*, αὐξάνωσθε καὶ πληθύνεσθε, *Poimandres*, αὐξάνωσθε ἐν αὐξήσει καὶ πληθύνεσθε ἐν πληθεί); the animals multiplied *κατὰ γένος*.

In order, however, to appreciate the real connection between *Genesis* and *Poimandres*, we must be guided by later, than these writers. "Beide Arten der Untersuchung", he confesses (*Das Iranische Erlösungsmysterium*, p. 119), "stehen hier unter der besonderen Schwierigkeit, dass wir überall mit der Möglichkeit einer Einwirkung des Judentums und des Christentums auf die neuer­schlossenen Urkunden der iranischen Religion rechnen müssen." In particular, Reitzenstein's view that Mandaean and Manichaean documents may be used as evidence for "Iranian" ideas, their apparently Christian elements being of subordinate importance, is contested by competent authorities, as for example by F. C. Burkitt, for whom both are at bottom developments of Christian Gnosticism. (See his *Religion of the Manichees*, and *The Mandaeans*, in *J.T.S.* Vol. XXIX. pp. 225 sqq.). Similarly, S. A. Pallis, in *Mandaean Studies*, holds that Persian influence upon Mandaism is secondary, and not earlier than the Sassanids, the basis of the system being Gnostic (see pp. 50-114). On the other hand, it is not only Hellenistic Judaism which comes into comparison, but Rabbinic Judaism also, with its often fantastic teachings upon Adam the first man. In view of the state of the evidence it seems probable that even if Iranian mythology gave an impetus to such speculations, the *Ἀνθρώπος* doctrine in its familiar Hellenistic forms owes much to direct reflection by Jewish thinkers and others influenced by them, upon the mysterious story of man's origin told in *Genesis*, and possibly to more fantastic forms of that story handed down in Jewish tradition. Adam is probably more directly the ancestor of the Hellenistic *Ἀνθρώπος* than Gayomard.

The myth of the heavenly Man is not found elsewhere in the *Hermetica*. But the doctrine of which it is a symbolical presentation is found in several tractates, viz. that there is a true or essential humanity (ὁ ἀνθρωπός ἄνθρωπος, ὁ ὁμοίως ἄνθρωπος) which bears the divine image by virtue of partaking in νοῦς, and this true humanity is in some or all men. So *Corp.* IV., X., XII., and the *Λόγος Τέλειος*, represented by the Latin *Asclepius* (which may be dependent on the *Poimandres*). Man is also said to be sent down by God to the world (*Corp.* IV. 2), in some other tractates man is the offspring or image of the κόσμος, which is the offspring or image of God, e.g. *Corp.* VIII. The idea of a primeval Fall of Man is peculiar to the *Poimandres*, among Hermetic writings.
Hellenistic-Jewish exegesis. Philo found in Genesis two stories of the creation of man, therein agreeing with modern critics. But the conclusion he drew is naturally not that of the moderns: "There are two kinds of men. The one is heavenly man, the other earthly. The heavenly man, being in the image of God, has no part in corruptible substance, or in any earthly substance whatever; but the earthly man was made of germinal matter, which the writer calls 'dust'. For this reason he does not say that the heavenly man was created (πεπλασθαι), but that he was stamped with the image of God (κατ' εἰκόνα τευνώσθαι θεοῦ), whereas the earthly man is a creature (πλάσμα) and not the offspring (γένημα) of the Creator" (Leg. Alleg. I. 31). If the Hermetic writer was acquainted with exegesis of this type, he would have no difficulty in finding a basis for his myth in Gen. i. Philo may indeed have had the myth of the Urmensch in mind, but the way in which he works out the conception of the two men is quite different from that of the Hermetist, who appears to be giving an independent version of the biblical myth. He agrees with Philo that the heavenly man, unlike the earthly, is the offspring of God; but he does not regard the earthly man as His creature. He treats the biblical story of the Fall as telling how, given the existence of the heavenly Man, empirical humanity came into being, with its two-fold nature, mortal and immortal. But in order to provide, from his own point of view, a sufficient cause for this tragic two-sidedness of human nature, he transposes the order of the story. By this bold step he has simplified the whole matter, and escaped the confusions which beset Philo in his treatment of the Hebrew myth. Substantially he agrees with Philo,² that it is a story of how Mind (νοῦς) was misled by Pleasure (ἡδονή) into an unhallowed union with Sense (αἰσθήμα). It was because heavenly Man,

¹ This must, I think, be the meaning of οσπός here and in other places in Philo, though it is a meaning not recognized by L. & S.
² De Op. §§ 151 sqq.; Leg. Alleg. II.
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having left his native sphere, acquired passions and desires, and fell in love with material Nature, that man as we know him came to be. Thus the Hermetist solves the problem of sin and death by the doctrine of a pre-mundane Fall, a doctrine which bulks largely in Valentinus and other Christian Gnostics, and has from time to time found a footing in Christian orthodoxy.

Before going further into details, we may draw the conclusion that when these readjustments have been allowed for—readjustments quite natural to one who studied not the Hebrew text but the Greek version as currently expounded,—the divergence between the two accounts is not so great as it seemed at first. The Hermetist has dealt with his biblical source here substantially as he dealt with the Hexaemeron, though with a larger amount of imported matter. It is therefore worth while to examine his account step by step for further points of contact.


According to Poimandres, the first Man was not created by God, nor was he, like the animals, produced by earth. He was the child of God. "Mind, the Father of all, being life and light, generated a Man equal to Himself, whom He loved as His own child" (ὁ πάντων πατήρ ὁ νοῦς, ὃν ζωὴ καὶ φῶς, ἀπεκύησεν ἄνθρωπον ἑαυτῷ ἴσον, οὗ ἡράσθη ὃς ἴδιον τόκον). There is no hint of this in the Hebrew text, though Philo, as we have seen, regarded the heavenly man as a γέννημα, not a πλάσμα, of God. What the Bible does say is that man was made in the image of God—κατ’ εἰκόνα θεοῦ, as the LXX has it. And so the Hermetist: "He was very beautiful, having the image of his Father" (περικαλλής γὰρ ἦν, τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς εἰκόνα ἔχων). Philo is at pains to point out that this "image of God" is not to be understood in a crudely physical sense. "He says that man was made in the image and likeness of God;
and he says well, for there is no earthly being liker God than man. But no one must suppose that this similarity is in bodily shape; for God is not anthropomorphic, nor is the human body God-shaped. But the word ‘image’ refers to the mind which is the governor of the soul” (τὸν τῆς ψυχῆς ἤγεμόνα νοῦν) (De Opif. § 69). The Hermetist makes the same point by emphasizing the fact that the Father of all, who gave birth to man, is νοῦς, and by thereafter calling man ἐννοοῦς (§ 18, etc.).

The next point common to our two accounts is that Man is by divine appointment lord of creation. “For indeed”, says the Hermetist, “God loved His own form, and delivered to him all His own creatures” (ἀντωσ γὰρ καὶ ὁ θεὸς ἡράσθη τῆς ἰδιας μορφῆς, καὶ αὐτῷ 1 παρέδωκε τὰ ἑαυτοῦ πάντα δημιουργήματα). This may be taken as a curt summary of the language of Genesis, where God says to the man He has created, “Have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth” (Gen. i. 28). The idea is recurrent in Jewish literature; cf. Wisd. ix. 2: “By thy wisdom thou formedst man, that he should have dominion over the creatures that were made by thee”; Ps. viii. 6–7: “Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of thy hands, thou hast put all things under his feet—all sheep and oxen, yea, and the beasts of the field, the fowl of the air and the fish of the sea”. It is significant that this latter passage was taken by the author to the Hebrews, who stands in the Philonic tradition, to refer, not to empirical man, but to that heavenly Man, or Son of Man, whom he as a Christian believed to have been incarnate in Jesus Christ (ii. 9). Thus the Hermetist is well within the tradition of Hellenistic Judaism when he describes the first Man as “he who had all authority over the world of mortal

1 Sic B², κατὰ σύνεσιν: MSS. omit; αὐτῇ παρέδωκε, Patricius; φ παρέδωκε, Reit.; παρέδωκεν αὐτῷ πάντα τὰ δημιουργήματα, Scott.
THE ORIGIN AND FALL OF MAN

beings and the irrational animals” (ὁ τοῦ τῶν θνητῶν κόσμου καὶ τῶν ἀλόγων ζώων ἔχων πᾶσαν ἐξουσίαν,¹ § 14).

Further, the original Man is, according to Poimandres, bisexual, like his Father—ἀρρενόθηλος ἐξ ἀρρενοθήλεσ πατρὸς. This is not in the Genesis story, but it accords with a widely attested rabbinic tradition, and with Philo; cf. Leg. All. II. 13: “Having first formed the generic Man, in which he says are both male and female, he afterwards makes the species, Adam” (προτυπώσας γὰρ τὸν γενικὸν ἀνθρωπὸν, ἐν ὧν τὸ ἄρρεν καὶ τὸ θῆλυ γένος φησίν εἶναι, ὡστέρον τὸ ἐλδός ἀπεργάζεται τὸν Ἀδάμ); De Opif. § 134: “Man as moulded of the dust is already phenomenal, partaking of quality, compounded of body and soul, male or female, and by nature mortal; but man after God’s image is a (Platonic) idea, a genus, a type (σφαγίς), noumenal, incorporeal, neither male nor female, and by nature immortal”. (Asexuality is equivalent to bisexuality.) Thus it appears that Philo understood the LXX of Gen. i. 27—καὶ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἀνθρωπὸν, κατ’ εἰκόνα θεοῦ ἐποίησεν αὐτὸν, ἅρσεν καὶ θῆλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτοὺς—to mean, “God created man, like Himself, bisexual”, i.e. bisexuality (or asexuality) is a part of the image of God. The Greek might mean this, if one read αὐτὸν for αὐτοὺς at the end. The Hermetist’s view is the same. As we shall see, he took the story of Gen. ii. 21–2, which tells how a part of man’s body was made into woman, as the description of how man, originally bisexual, was divided into two sexes.

Finally, the original Man was, according to Poimandres, very beautiful—περικαλλῆς γὰρ ἦν, τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς εἰκόνα ἔχων, § 12; cf. § 14, τὴν καλὴν τοῦ θεοῦ μορφήν . . . ἀκόρεστον κάλλος . . . τῆς καλλίστης μορφῆς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. The only hint of this in the biblical text is the statement that after creation was completed God looked at everything He had made, and found all καλὰ λίαν; from which it might be inferred that man, the crown of the creation,

¹ Sic MSS. The various emendations of editors seem unnecessary.
was certainly very beautiful. Philo expatiates on the beauty of man as God created him, arguing that "the copy of a supremely beautiful model must itself of necessity be beautiful" (De Opif. §§ 136–9). Similarly, Secrets of Enoch, xxx. 11: "I placed him on earth, a second angel, honourable, great and glorious". There is much of the same kind in rabbinic tradition. It is to be observed that Philo refers to Adam, the γῆμος ἄνθρωπος. The Hermetist applies this tradition of great beauty to the κατ' εἰκόνα ἄνθρωπος, legitimately enough. It is important for his purpose in what follows.

2. The Fall of Man.

The story of the Fall of the heavenly Man is at the same time the story of the origin of earthly man. As we have seen, the moral of the whole story for the Hermetist is that it was love of material nature that caused man to become mortal in becoming sexual. This theory determines the sense in which he will read the story of the Fall in Genesis. That story tells how man, transgressing a divine command, ate of the Tree of Knowledge, and so became aware of himself as sexual. This is immediately followed by the consummation of the marriage of Adam and Eve and the birth of a son. Thus there was some basis in the Hebrew story for the idea that the sexual life of man is a sign and a consequence of his fall from some higher state. The Hermetist is indeed in line with some Jewish interpreters in finding a sexual motive at the centre of the story of the Fall. He read it as a story of how a "woman" enticed man to his destruction, and he found in the LXX version the note, "he called the name of the woman, 'Life'"—ἐκάλεσεν τὸ ὄνομα τῆς γυναικὸς Ζωή. The story, therefore, tells how "Life" allured man to love her, and so brought him low. Ζωή is here clearly not the transcendental life which is an aspect

1 Just as he applies the statement that the creation as a whole was seen to be good to the κόσμος νοητός (see pp. 126–7 above).
of God, but physical life. Thus in Poimandres, Life
becomes Nature, Φύσις, and as such plays the part of
temptress.

The Hermetist, however, cannot proceed at once to
retell the Genesis story. That story as it stands is about
Adam, the man made of the dust; and so it is in Philo.
The Hermetist wishes to apply it to man in the image of
God—ὁ κατ’ εἰκόνα ἀνθρωπος. But how could this Man
have evil desires, being like God? Already before he
came into contact with matter, man must have had the
potentiality of evil within him. He must, therefore,
have had something in him which was not directly divine
in origin, and the myth must account for this. Hence
an intermediate stage must be introduced. Between the
heaven of pure light which was man’s first abode, and the
terrestrial sphere where he now lives, lies the sphere of
fire and πνεῦμα, inhabited by the διωκταῖ or διωκτόρες,
the seven planetary spirits. They were created by the
Demiurge, the “God of fire and πνεῦμα”, and he, with
the aid of the Logos, imparted to them the rotary move­
ment which is the cause of all terrestrial life. Both
Demiurge and Logos are sons of the supreme God, and so
brothers of Man.

The story runs thus: “Having beheld the creation
of the Demiurge . . . he wished himself also to create.
Permission was given by his Father. Arrived at the
created sphere, to hold all authority, he beheld the
creatures of his brother (scil. the planets, created by the
Demiurge, § 9), and they fell in love with him, and each
of them gave him of his own order. Having learned their
substance, and having received of their nature, he desired
to break through the circumference of the orbits”
(κατανοήσας δὲ τὴν τοῦ δημιουργοῦ κτίσιν ἐν τῷ πατρὶ.

1 The words ἐν τῷ πατρὶ are difficult, and possibly corrupt, but neither
Patricius’ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ nor Scott’s ἐν τῷ πατρὶ seems satisfactory. The
meaning may be that Man while still in close union with his Father
looked down upon the heavenly orders, and cherished the legitimate
desire to create (whereas after he had left his Father he became the
What exactly it was that the planets gave him we are not here told, but later in the tractate (§§ 24-5), we are told how man, enlightened with the knowledge of his heavenly origin, ascended again to his Father. In passing through the spheres, he returned to each that of himself which belonged to it. The gifts returned are, falsehood, avarice, audacity, pride, desire, guile, and the power of growth. These are clearly related to popular beliefs about the influence of the planets on temperament and character (cf. our terms "jovial", "mercurial", "martial", "saturnine"). It is probably rather the potentiality of these evil dispositions that the author conceives as imparted to Man in his descent, for until his union with material Nature he still possesses the divine image. Thus the intention of the writer is to show that Man on his arrival at our heaven and earth was already capable of desire, cupidity, audacity, and pride, and therefore ready to fall a prey to the blanishments of Nature.

This stage of the myth seems at first sight to be entirely
alien from the biblical tradition. But others beside the Hermetist found a starting-point for such speculations in the Bible. We may begin with Philo’s comment (which we have already noticed in another connection) on *Gen.* i. 26–7: καὶ εἶπεν ὁ θεός, Ποιήσωμεν ἄνθρωπον . . . καὶ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεός τὸν ἄνθρωπον. The use of the plural in v. 26, says Philo, implies that God is conversing with His “powers,” to which He entrusts the task of moulding the mortal part of our soul, in imitation of His own art. He employed them for this purpose, because the soul of man was to know and follow evil as well as good concepts.

“He therefore judged it necessary to assign the origin of evil things to other creators (δημοουργοῖς), and that of good things to Himself alone. Wherefore, after the expression ποιήσωμεν ἄνθρωπον, in the plural, we have the expression ἐποίησεν ὁ θεός τὸν ἄνθρωπον in the singular. For of the real Man, who is pure Mind, One alone is the Creator, namely God; but the so-called man who is mixed with sense has a multitude of creators. For this reason the Man *par excellence* (ὁ κατ’ έξοχήν ἄνθρωπος) is mentioned with the article, but the other without this addition” (De Fug. §§ 68 sqq.). Philo therefore took the LXX text to mean: God said to His powers, “Let us together make empirical humanity”; whereas God Himself alone made the heavenly Man. This idea of inferior creators, to whom the supreme God entrusts the making of man, goes back to the *Timaeus*, and the Hermetist may well have got it directly from Plato. But Philo shows how easily the doctrine could be read into the biblical account, and if Philo attributes the work of creation to the δυνάμεις in general, and the Hermetist to the seven planetary spirits in particular, we may conclude that the two writers are applying the same method independently to the same material.¹

Along another line of Jewish tradition the plural

¹ See pp. 17–18 for passages in Hellenistic-Jewish literature which rank the heavenly bodies with the δυνάμεις.
ποιήσωμεν is accounted for by the theory that God called in the help of His Wisdom for the work of creating man. Thus Secrets of Enoch, xxx. 8: "On the sixth day I commanded my wisdom to create man from seven consistencies: one, his flesh from the earth; two, his blood from the dew; three, his eyes from the sun; four, his bones from stone; five, his intelligence from the swiftness of the angels and from cloud; six, his veins and his hair from the grass of the earth; seven, his soul from my breath and from wind". The idea that parts of human nature have affinity with the elements of the created universe is found in Philo and elsewhere, but it is noteworthy that 2 Enoch shows, within Hellenistic Judaism, the same tendency as Poi­mandres to bring these elements into a scheme of seven, though the Hermetist is philosophical where 2 Enoch is merely fanciful.

One further parallel. The Hermetist relates that when Man, in the beauty of the divine image, appeared to the astral powers, they were smitten with love for him, ἡράσθησαν αὐτῷ. We may compare the Jewish idea that Adam before his fall was an object of worship to the angels. See Life of Adam and Eve, xiii–xiv., where the devil says to Adam, "When God blew into thee the breath of life, and thy face and likeness was made in the image of God, Michael also brought thee and made us worship thee in the sight of God; and God the Lord spake: Here is Adam. I have made him in our image and likeness. And Michael went out and called all the angels, saying, Worship the image of God as the Lord God hath commanded. And Michael himself worshipped first." The same idea has left a mark upon a passage in the New Testament. Heb. i. 6 quotes a sentence interpolated by the LXX into the text of Deut. xxxii. 43: καὶ προσκυνήσανσαν αὐτῷ πάντες ἄγγελοι θεοῦ (νῦν θεοῦ LXX). In the LXX the Object of worship is doubtless God Himself; but in Hebrews it is the πρωτότοκος, i.e. the Son of Man, or heavenly Man (cf. ii. 5–9). This re-application of an Old
Testament saying can only have taken place under the influence of a tradition similar to that of the Life of Adam and Eve. There the angels worship Adam; in Hebrews they worship the divine Son of Man—a very close parallel to the passage of Poimandres, where the denizens of the upper world love the divine Man and make gifts to him.

It appears, therefore, that although this episode of the gifts of the Administrators is drawn from non-biblical sources, yet it has points of contact with Jewish thought, and the writer may well have felt that his extraneous material fitted aptly enough into the general framework of the biblical myth.

We now come to the actual fall of man, which is related as follows: “He who had all authority over the world of mortal beings and irrational animals, stooped through the frame, having broken the power of the orbits, and displayed to lower Nature the beautiful form of God; and when she saw him, having in him insatiable beauty and all the energy of the seven Administrators, and the form of God, she smiled with love, reflecting the shape of man’s most beautiful form in the water and its shadow on the earth.”

The divine image in man, as seen by Nature, is described by two Greek terms, ἐδόσ and οἰκία. Now in the Hebrew of Gen. i. 26 the divine image is also described by two terms דם נפשו and דם נפשו. These are rendered in the LXX εἰκὼν and ὄμολος. About the meaning of דם נפשו there seems to be no doubt. But on דם נפשו I find in Polii Synopsis the note “ם פ נ significat umbram seu adumbrationem; similitudinem umbra ticam; ut patet ex Ps. xxxix. 7, cii. 12, cix. 23”. The latter two passages cited, however, have דם נפשו, not דם נפשו. But Ps. xxxix. 7 reads דם נפשו and the R.V. margin renders “Every man walketh as a shadow”. B.D.B., however, do not recognize this meaning. I am not enough of a Hebraist to have any opinion whether in addition to דם נפשו from דם נפשו = “cut” there was also a word דם נפשו = “shadow”, cf. יֵלֵך. Nor is it of importance for our purpose to decide the philological question. But certainly there is an old exegetical tradition according to which דם נפשו and דם נפשו in Genesis mean “likeness” and “shadow” respectively, corresponding fairly with the ἐδόσ and οἰκία of Poimandres. Unfortunately, I cannot trace this tradition.
And he, seeing in her the form like himself, in the water, loved it, and willed to dwell there. With the will came the effective deed (ἐνέργεια). He inhabited 1 the irrational form. And Nature receiving her lover embraced him with her whole being, and they came together, for they were lovers” (καὶ ὁ τοῦ τῶν θητῶν κόσμου καὶ τῶν ἀλόγων ξών ἔχων πᾶσαν ἔξουσίαν διὰ τῆς ἁρμονίας παρέκυψεν, ἀναρρήξας τὸ κράτος, καὶ ἐδειξε τῇ κατωφερεί φύσει 2 τὴν καλὴν τοῦ θεοῦ μορφήν, ὥς 3 ἑώσφορον ἀκόρεστον κάλλος καὶ πᾶσαν ἐνέργειαν ἐν έαυτῷ ἔχωντα τῶν ἐπτα διοικητῶν τὴν τε μορφήν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐμειδίασεν ἐρωτί, ὡς ἀτε τῆς καλλιστῆς μορφῆς τοῦ ἄνθρωπον τὸ ἐίδος ἐν τῷ ὑδατί ἀναδιδοσά 4 καὶ τὸ σκίασμα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. ὁ δὲ ἴδιων τὴν ὁμοίαν αὐτῷ μορφὴν ἐν αὐτῇ 5 οὖσαν, ἐν τῷ ὑδατί, ἐφίλησε καὶ ἤδουληθε αὐτῷ οἰκείων. ἀμα δὲ τῇ βουλῇ ἐγένετο ἐνέργεια καὶ ὁκησε τὴν ἀλόγον μορφήν). The Hermetist, we observe, has neglected the fable of the fatal apple, regarding it as a mere symbol for sexual desire, and has interpreted the whole story in the light of its conclusion: “Adam knew his wife, and she conceived”. Man fell in love with Nature, das ewig Weibliche. In both forms of the story the initiative lies with the woman. As Eve beguiles Adam with the forbidden fruit, so Nature displays her charms to captivate farther back than the Jesuit Cornelius a Lapide, who died in 1637. Is there any evidence that it was known at a date which would make it possible that the Hermetist was acquainted with this interpretation, as well as with the regular LXX term ἐλκών?

1 There may be a reminiscence of Gen. iii. 24; καὶ ἔξεβαλεν τὸν Ἄδαμ καὶ κατώφκισεν αὐτὸν ἀπέναντι τοῦ παραδείσου. Vergicius and Patricius infelicitously emended ὁκησε to ἐκύψε. The ἀλόγος μορφή, though personified, is properly a region in the universe, and Man ἤδουληθε αὐτῷ οἰκείων (sic B αὐτῷ σειτ., αὐτῇ συνοικεῖν, Patr.).

2 So edd. for MSS., τὴν κατωφερεί φύσαν. It is the lower world composed of the κατωφερή στοιχεῖα, left behind when fire and πνεῦμα ascended, and now deserted by the λόγος, so that it is ἀλόγος μορφή.

3 Sic Turnebus, ἦτας B, ἧν MSS., ἦ δὲ Reit. and Scott.

4 Sic Scott, ἑώσφορο MSS., which merely repeats the verb of the preceding clause. In order that Man should see the form like himself in Nature, it seems necessary that there should be a reflection.

5 Sic Reit., εαυτῷ MSS. Scott omits.
Man. In *Poimandres*, the charm of Nature lies in her reflection of the human form divine. Similarly, *Genesis* lays stress upon the likeness of Life, the woman, to Adam the man. She is *βοηθὸς ὁμοιος αὐτῷ*, and when he sees her, he cries, "Bone of my bone, flesh of my flesh!" Philo expands this thought characteristically: *De Opif.* §§ 151 sqq.: "So long as he was one, he was in his solitude like to the universe and to God, and impressed upon his soul the characters of both. But when woman was created, beholding his brother-shape and kindred form, he was delighted at the sight and approaching greeted her". The similarity with *Poimandres* is obvious: cf. Philo’s ἄδελφον εἴδος καὶ συγγενῆ μορφήν with τὴν ὁμοιὰν αὐτῷ μορφήν in *Poimandres*.

Man is thus fallen from his high estate. The immortal partakes of mortality; the wielder of all authority becomes subject to fate (**εἰμαρμένη**); he who was above this universal frame (**ἐπάνω τῆς ἀρμονίας**) is a slave within it (**ἐναρμόνιος γέγονε δοῦλος**). The concluding sentence of this summary of the disastrous effects of the Fall is evidently corrupt in our MSS.: ἄρρενόθηλος δὲ ὦν, ζε ἄρρενοθήλεος ὦν πατρός, καὶ ἀυπνὸς ἀπὸ ἀυπνοῦ κρατεῖται. Editors have suggested various emendations. The general sense must be—man, the bisexual, became the slave of sexual passion; man, the sleepless, was overpowered by—what? The simplest answer is, by sleep: ἀυπνὸς ὑφ’ ὑπνοῦ κρατεῖται. This is the more likely because when the prophet of *Poimandres* turns to mankind with his call to repentance (§ 27) he addresses them in these terms: "O people, O earth-born men, who have given yourselves over to drunkenness and sleep and ignorance of God, be sober, cease revelling under the enchantment of irrational sleep". Thus it is very natural to suppose that the author regarded sleep as a sign of the Fall. We may then venture to recall that in *Genesis* the beginning of the whole trouble was the deep sleep that fell on Adam:

---

1 Cf. *Corp.* V. 6, τὴν καλὴν ταῦτην καὶ θελαν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου εἰκόνα.
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ἐξέβαλεν θεὸς ἑκτασιν ἐπὶ τὸν Ἀδὰμ καὶ ὑπνωσεν. As a result a part of him was separated and became woman, the woman beguiled him, and brought death into the world and all our woe.

It is not indeed clear that the original intention of the Hebrew myth was to teach that man was immortal as created, but lost his immortality through the Fall. The implication seems rather to be that having won knowledge he might have gone on to win immortality by eating of the tree of life (Gen. iii. 22). But the current Jewish interpretation was that which is stated in Wisd. ii. 23-24:

ο θεὸς ἐκτισεν τὸν ἀνθρωπὸν ἐπ’ ἀφθαρσίαν,
καὶ εἰκόνα τῆς ἴδιας ἰδιότητος ἐποίησεν αὐτόν.
φθόνῳ δὲ διαβόλου θάνατος εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον,
πειράζουσιν δὲ αὐτὸν οἱ τῆς ἑκείνου μερίδος ὄντες.

The same view was taken in Rabbinic Judaism. The Hermetist would therefore naturally understand the myth in this sense.

3. The Seven Ancestors.

That the loss of immortality is due to the fall of man into sexual relations is for the Hermetist the moral of the whole story. But I will postpone the further consideration of this point until the myth is complete. It goes on to relate how the marriage of Man with Nature had issue; just as in Genesis the Fall is followed by the birth of a son to Man and Life: "Αδὰμ δὲ ἐγνω Εὕαν τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ καὶ συνέλαβεν καὶ ἐτεκεν νῦν, καὶ εἶπεν, 'Εκτησάμην ἀνθρωπὸν διὰ τοῦ θεοῦ (iv. 1). In Poimandres, however, the issue of the union is seven sons, all bisexual like their father, and inheriting from him the nature of the seven Administrators. These men are apparently the direct

1 Symmachus, κάρον ("stupor"); ἔτερος, ὑπνὸν (Hexapla).
2 This interpretation is clearly reflected in Symmachus' version of Gen. ii. 17: οὗ μὴ φαγῇ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ· ἦ δὲ ἡμέρα φαγῇ ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου. θητὸς ὑπν.
ancestors of empirical humanity. We may perhaps suspect, with Scott, a reminiscence of Gen. vi. 1–4, where from the union of the sons of God with the daughters of men spring οἱ ἄνθρωποι οἱ ὄνομαστοι. But the allusion is in any case remote. Nor, indeed, is there any need to seek for a parallel in Genesis for this feature of the myth, since the Hermetist seems to announce it as the new and original element in his doctrine—τὸ κεκρυμμένον μυστήριον μεχρὶ τῆς ἡμέρας (§ 16). The implication is that the rest of the myth had been previously revealed, as, indeed, in the view of the Hermetist as of Philo, it had been revealed to “Moses”. We hear no more of the seven men after § 17, and the singular ὁ ἄνθρωπος prevails in the rest of the tractate.

The seven men stand for empirical humanity in its first state. As a result of the fall which brought about their birth, they have material bodies, composed of the elements, and brought forth by Nature according to the form of the archetypal man: ἐξήνεγκεν ἡ φύσις τὰ σώματα πρὸς τὸ εἴδος τοῦ ἄνθρωπου. But beside the body there is the “essential man” (οὐσιώδης ἄνθρωπος, § 15). This Man was originally of the substance of his Father, life and light. He now became “from life and light, soul and mind; from life soul, from light mind” (ὁ δὲ ἄνθρωπος ἐκ ζωῆς

1 Reitzenstein refers these words to the whole doctrine of the divine ἄνθρωπος, as being that part of the myth which is really new to Egypt (Poim. p. 69). But the words τοῦτο ἐστὶ τὸ κεκρυμμένον μυστήριον seem to point forward to that which is described as θαῦμα θαυμασώτατον, namely the birth of the seven men. So Scott. Reitzenstein (Poim. pp. 111 sqq.) suggests that there is an allusion to the seven races of mankind, each under its patron deity, but without citing any close parallel. Scott refers to the seven Titans, and other groups of seven, but admits that the actual doctrine of Poimandres has the novelty which it claims.

2 The text of § 17 is certainly corrupt at this point: MSS. read θελυκὴ γὰρ ἢν τὸ δὲ ὄνωρ ὅξευτικόν, τὸ δὲ ἐκ πυρὸς πέπειρον, ἐκ δὲ αἰθέρος τὸ πνεῦμα ἔλαβε. Reitzenstein reads γῆ for γὰρ, and this is probably right, but further emendation would be necessary to give any clear sense. In any case man’s body is said to be composed of the four elements, earth, water, fire and aether (? air).
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καὶ φωτὸς ἐγένετο εἰς ψυχὴν καὶ νοῦν, ἐκ μὲν ζωῆς εἰς
ψυχὴν, ἐκ δὲ φωτὸς εἰς νοῦν). We cannot be wrong in
finding here an echo of Gen. ii. 7: ἐνεφύσησαν εἰς τὸ
πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ πνεῦμα ζωῆς, καὶ ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐγένετο εἰς
ψυχὴν ζῶσαν. The doctrine of both writers is in effect
that the life which is in God is manifested in man as the
soul. The Hermetist adds that the light which is the
other aspect of the divine nature appears in man as mind.
Philo’s doctrine is similar: “The man of earth is to be
regarded as mind entering into combination with body,
but not yet fully combined. This mind is in reality earthy
and perishable, if God had not breathed into it the power
of real life; for it then becomes (not, is made into) soul;
and not inert or unshapen soul, but intelligent and truly
living soul; for he says ‘man became a living soul’”
(ἄνθρωπον δὲ τὸν ἐκ γῆς λογιστέον εἰναι νοῦν εἰσκρινόμενον
σώματι, οὗτῳ δὲ εἰσκριτόμενον. ὁ δὲ νοῦς οὗτος γεωδῆς
ἐστὶ τῷ ὄντι καὶ φθαρτός, εἰ μὴ δὲ θεὸς ἐμπνεύσειεν αὐτῷ
dύναμιν ἀληθινῆς ζωῆς· τότε γὰρ γίνεται, οὐκέτι πλάττεται,
eἰς ψυχὴν, οὐκ ἀργὸν καὶ ἀδιατύπωτον, ἀλλ’ εἰς νοερὰν καὶ
ζῶσαν ὄντως· “εἰς ψυχὴν” γὰρ φησιν “ζῶσαν ἐγένετο ὁ
ἄνθρωπος”, Leg. All. I. 32). The Hermetist, however, is
clearly not dependent on Philo, but has used the LXX in
his own way.

4. The Final Stage of Creation.

(Poimandres, §§ 18–19; cf. Genesis viii. 15—ix. 17.)

Man having taken his place in nature as a being of mixed
spiritual and material constitution, an age passes by.
Then comes a change. “When the period was complete,
the bond of all things was loosed by the counsel of God.
For all the animals, which hitherto were bisexual, were
split up, together with man, and the males became separate
and the females likewise. And immediately God spoke
with a holy word: ‘Increase in increase and multiply in
multitude, all ye creatures and things made; and let
rational man recognize that he is immortal, and that the cause of death is carnal desire. And when He had said this, Providence brought about sexual unions by means of destiny and the celestial frame, and established processes of birth, and all things multiplied after their kind' (τῆς περιόδου πεπληρωμένης ἐλύθη δὲ πάντων σύνδεσμος ἐκ βουλῆς θεοῦ. πάντα γὰρ τὰ ξώα ἁρπενοθῆλεα ὅντα διελύτο ἄμα τῷ ἁνθρώπῳ, καὶ ἐγένετο τὰ μὲν ἁρπενικὰ ἐν μέρει, τὰ δὲ θηλυκὰ ὁμοῖα. δὲ θεὸς εὖθὺς εἶπεν ἄγω λόγῳ, Ἀνήγαναθε ἐν αὐξήσει καὶ πληθύναθε ἐν πλήθει, πάντα τὰ κτίσματα καὶ δημιουργήματα, καὶ ἀναγνωρισάτω ὁ ἐννοοῦσ ἁνθρώπος ἐαυτὸν ὄντα ἅθανατον, καὶ τὸν αἰτίον τοῦ θανάτου ἑρωτα ὄντα. τούτου εἰσόντο τῇ πρόνοιᾳ διὰ τῆς εἰμαρμενῆς καὶ τῆς ἁμονίας τὰς μίξεις ἐπούσατο καὶ τὰς γενέσεις κατέστησε. καὶ ἐπληθύνθη κατὰ γένος τὰ πάντα).

1 Sic B², ἁρπενοθῆλυ MSS.
2 Reitzenstein (Pom. pp. 50–1, note 3) thinks that the God who speaks the holy word is an aboriginal God behind Νοῦς, and similarly in § 21, φησὶ γὰρ ὁ θεός. "Dass der Νοῦς von sich selbst berichtet ὁ δὲ θεὸς εὐθὺς εἶπεν ἄγω λόγῳ war von vornherein undenkbar." He cites the Λόγος Τέλειος, ap. Lact., Inst. VII. xviii. 3 (cited p. 128, note 1): τοῦ πρώτου καὶ ἑνὸς θεοῦ δημιουργὸς. But Scott in his note (Asclepius, III. 26a) shows that either the text is corrupt, or it will not bear the meaning that Reitzenstein attributes to it, which is indeed not the sense in which Lactantius himself understands it. If besides "the first and only God" there is an older and greater, words have lost their meaning. In the Poimandres it is clear that Light = Νοῦς is the aboriginal existence, even though in other tractates νοῦς is an emanation of the primal God (e.g. Corp. XII. 1). There is no hint in its cosmogony of a God who made the light, and to introduce such a Being in this casual way would be indeed "undenkbar". If we reflect that in § 6 the prophet is aware of two apparently distinct entities, the light which he beholds, and the God whose voice he hears, and is then told that these two are identical, we shall find no great difficulty in God referring to Himself in the third person. There are passages in the Old Testament where the introductory phrase "Thus saith the Lord" is followed by references to "the Lord" in the third person, e.g. Is. vii. 10 sq., viii. 5–7: Jer. iv. 3–4, xiv. 10; Amos ii. 4; Mic. iv. 6–7; Zech. i. 17. In § 21 ad fin. φησὶ γὰρ ὁ θεός can be taken quite naturally as the prophet's citation of the words of the myth.

3 Sic edd. ἐννοοῦς MSS., ἄνθρωπος (i.e. ἁνθρώπος) B³. In § 21 all MSS. have ὁ ἐννοοῦς ἁνθρώπος, which is certainly the true reading here.
4 Sic Scott. καὶ πάντα τὰ δύνα MSS.
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The essential thing here is the "holy word", which the scholiast Psellus recognized as a quotation from "Moses". The words *αὐξάνεσθαι* καὶ *πληθύνεσθαι* are found twice in *Gen.* i., once in *Gen.* viii. 17, and twice in *Gen.* ix. The same two verbs occur in combination in several other passages of the Old Testament. Nowhere have they the emphatic form given to them in *Poimandres*, which is clearly intended to represent the Hebrew infinitive absolute.¹ *Gen.* xvi. 10 has ἔστω ἕν ἁγία ἡ λέξη, which the LXX gives as πληθύνων πληθυνώ το σπέρμα σου. Similarly, *Gen.* iii. 16, xxii. 17, *Exod.* xi. 9 (where the infinitive absolute construction is not present in the Hebrew). *1 Chron.* iv. 38 has ἐπληθύνθησαν εἰς πλῆθος, representing προτεράτας λίβμα, which would be more accurately translated ηὐξῆθησαν εἰς πλῆθος, cf. *Gen.* xxx. 30, καὶ ἣυξῆθη εἰς πλῆθος = βιβλία λίβμα. There are thus analogies in the Old Testament for the form of expression chosen by the Hermetic writer, though there is no exact parallel. We may perhaps say that to a writer acquainted with the Old Testament in any form the emphatic mode of speech might have seemed proper to a "holy word". But the matter is complicated by the fact that the phrase *αὐξάνεσθαι* ἐν *αὐξήσει* καὶ *πληθύνεσθαι* ἐν *πλήθει* recurs in *Corp.* III. 3, in a passage where the author's dependence on *Genesis* is as clear as in *Poimandres*. I shall discuss in a subsequent chapter the question of the relation between these documents, and I will leave the matter here for the present.

If, however, the Hermetist has taken the words from *Genesis*, whether immediately or mediately, it is not in the context of *Gen.* i. 22, 28 that he has placed them. Scott calls attention to the fact that the same charge occurs thrice in the story of the divine covenant after the Flood, *Gen.* viii. 15—ix. 17, and makes the convincing suggestion

¹This is an unusual way of representing the Hebrew construction, though the simple dative is common enough.
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that for the Hermetist the Flood corresponded to the end of the first age of the world in the scheme which he derived from his Platonic and Stoic authorities. The story of the covenant runs as follows: God calls upon the occupants of the Ark to come forth. They include both Noah and his family and πάντα τὰ θηρία δόσα ἐστὶν μετὰ σοῦ, καὶ πᾶσα σὰρξ ἀπὸ πετεινῶν ἐως κτηνῶν, καὶ πᾶν ἔρπετον κυνοῦμενον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, and gives the command αὐξάνεσθε καὶ πληθύνεσθε. Man and the beasts come forth κατὰ γένος αὐτῶν. Noah sacrifices, and God blesses him, beginning again with the words αὐξάνεσθε καὶ πληθύνεσθε. He lays a ban upon the shedding of human blood, since man is made in the image of God, and ends with a repetition of the charge, αὐξάνεσθε καὶ πληθύνεσθε καὶ πληρώσατε τὴν γῆν καὶ πληθύνεσθε ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. Then God makes a covenant with Noah and the animals: ἐγὼ ἵδον ἀνίστημι τὴν διαθήκην μονὸν ὑμῖν καὶ τῷ σπέρματι ὑμῶν μεθ', ὑμᾶς, καὶ πάσῃ ψυχῇ ᾠδόσῃ μεθ', ὑμῶν, ἀπὸ ὅρνεων καὶ ἀπὸ κτηνῶν, καὶ πάσαι τοῖς θηρίοις τῆς γῆς.

The Hermetist treats the myth of the Flood as a sort of appendix to the creation story, and interprets it accordingly. It served his purpose, because it seemed to justify him in detaching the command to be fruitful and multiply from the original creation, and postponing it until after the Fall.¹ For him as for Philo, man in God's image could not be a sexual being. Both must explain away that element in the Hebrew myth. The grotesque idea of a bisexual being split into male and female is widespread.² The Hermetist might have derived it, through his Platonic teachers, from Plato's Symposium (pp. 189b sqq.). But he doubtless saw an allusion to it in the story of Gen. ii.

¹ In Gen. viii.—ix. the command is addressed to man alone, but it is associated with a covenant which includes the animals too; while in Gen. i. 22, 28 it is addressed to man and beasts alike; so that there seemed to be sufficient authority for addressing the "holy word" to πάντα τὰ κτίσματα καὶ δημοφυργήματα.
² Reitzenstein refers to passages in the Talmud which attest the idea in orthodox Jewish circles.
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21–2, according to which after the man of earth had become subject to sleep (a feature of the Fall in Poimandres, as we have seen), a portion of his body was removed and made into a woman. That he should have placed this episode after the end of the first period (after the Flood) is inherent in his reconstruction of the myth. Scott suggests that the repeated statement of Genesis that the beasts entered the Ark ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ (vii. 15–16, etc.) was understood by him as meaning that each individual was at that time both male and female, and that after the Flood divine sanction was given to sexual reproduction.

The "holy word" not only institutes reproduction among men and animals, but also contains an assurance of immortality to man. The writer may have found a hint of this in the Flood story, where we are told that according to the divine command and covenant (i) man must not be slain because he is in the image of God, and (ii) man and animals shall not henceforth die by a Flood (οὐκ ἀποθανεῖται πᾶσα σώρξ ἐπὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὑδάτος τοῦ κατακλυσμοῦ). But there are much more significant connections between the two documents in the treatment of the theme of death and immortality. For the Hermetist the real religious value of the myth of Creation and the Fall is the light which it throws upon this theme. Heavenly Man was immortal like his father, Mind, but he fell and became united with matter, "and for this reason man, as distinct from all other living beings on earth, is two-fold, mortal because of the body, immortal because of the essential Man" (καὶ διὰ τοῦτο παρὰ πάντα τὰ ἐπὶ γῆς ζώα διπλῶς ἐστίν ὁ ἄνθρω- 

πος, θνητός μὲν διὰ τὸ σῶμα, ἀθάνατος δὲ διὰ τὸν οὐσιώδη ἄνθρωπον, § 15). Cf. Philo, De Opif. § 135: "One may properly say that man is on the borders of mortal and immortal nature, partaking so far as is necessary in each, and that he has become mortal and immortal at once, mortal according to the body, immortal according to the intelligence" (κυρίως ἄν τις εἶποι τὸν ἄνθρωπον θνητῆς καὶ
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The way for the individual to regain the immortality which belongs to essential Man is to know his origin:

"The God and Father of whom man came is life and light. If, therefore, you learn that you are of life and light, and believe that you are of these, you will move into life again" (φῶς καὶ ζωὴ ἐστὶν ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ ἐκ οὗ ἐγένετο ὁ ἄνθρωπος. ἡν οὖν μάθης σεαυτὸν ἐκ ζωῆς καὶ φωτὸς ἄντα καὶ πιστεύῃς ὅτι ἐκ τοῦτων τυγχάνεις, εἰς ζωὴν πάλιν χωρῆσεις, § 21). To know that you are immortal is to be immortal. "He who has recognized himself has entered into the Good which is beyond essence, but he who has loved the body which is of the deceit of carnal desire abides in darkness wandering, suffering in his senses the experience of death" (ὁ ἀναγνωρίσας ἐαυτὸν ἐλήλυθεν εἰς τὸ περιουσιόν ἁγάθων, ᵃ ὃ ὅ ἀγαπήσας τὸ ἐκ πλάνης ἔρωτος σῶμα, οὗτος μένει ἐν τῷ σκότει πλανώμενος, αἰσθητῶς πάσχων τὰ τοῦ θανάτου, § 19). It is this conviction that gives to the *Poimandres* its note of high seriousness and moral urgency.

Now the theme of knowledge and immortality is obviously present in the myth of *Genesis*, though in its present form there is a notorious obscurity in its working out. God, we are told, caused all goodly trees to spring forth from the earth, "and the tree of life in the middle of the paradise, and the tree of knowing good and evil". He placed man in the paradise and bade him eat of all trees, "but of the tree of knowing good and evil you shall not eat; in the day when you eat of it you will die the

---

1 Reitzenstein adds πιστεύῃς according to the text of § 32: πιστεύω καὶ μαρτυρῶ· εἰς ζωὴν καὶ φῶς χωρῶ.

2 This I take to be the Good which is, in Plato's phrase ἐπέκεινα τῆς οὐσίας (Rbd. VI. 509b). For this writer it is the sphere of eternal light, above the highest of the material spheres.

3 Reitzenstein reads ἐκ πλάνης ἔρωτος τὸ σῶμα, "he who because of the deceit of error loves the body", but the MSS. give a good sense. The body did in fact come into existence because Man yielded to carnal desire: it is ἐκ πλάνης ἔρωτος.
death". Accordingly, when the serpent raises the question of eating fruit, the woman replies, "We shall eat of every tree in the paradise, but of the fruit of the tree which is in the middle of the paradise God said, You shall not eat of it nor touch it, in order that you may not die". The serpent asserts, on the other hand, that to eat of it will not be fatal, but will give knowledge of good and evil. Adam and Eve eat. They gain knowledge of good and evil, but are cursed with death by God, who observes, "Adam has become like one of us, to know good and evil; and now I am afraid he will stretch out his hand and take of the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever". To prevent this, man is driven out of paradise. Of which of the two trees did man eat? Eve speaks (iii. 3) of "the tree in the middle of the paradise". This, according to ii. 9, was the tree of life. But in the sequel it appears that man has eaten of the tree of knowledge, and is expelled to prevent him from eating of the tree of life. Clearly there has been some confusion, and the ingenuity of commentators is invited. Philo points out that the tree of knowledge is not said to be in paradise as the tree of life is; man's sin lay in choosing the tree of knowledge rather than the tree of life. "By the tree of life he indicates figuratively the greatest of the virtues, godliness, by which the soul is made immortal, and by the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, the intermediate virtue of prudence, by which things opposite by nature are distinguished. God placed these landmarks in the soul, and watched judicially to which it would incline. And when He saw the soul swaying towards villainy and despising godliness and piety, from which comes immortal life, He censured it, reasonably enough, and exiled it from paradise" (αἰὼντεται . . . διὰ τοῦ δένδρου τῆς ζωῆς τὴν μεγίστην τῶν ἀρετῶν θεοσέβειαν, δι' ἣς ἀθανατίζεται ἡ ψυχή, διὰ δὲ τοῦ καλῶν τε καὶ πονηρῶν γνωριστικοῦ φρόνησιν τῆν μέσην, ἣ διακρίνεται τάναντια φύσει. θέμενος δὲ τούτους τοὺς ὄρους ἐν ψυχῇ καθάπερ δικαστῆς ἐσκόπει πρὸς πότερον ἐπικλινώς ξει. ὥς δὲ εἶδε
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ρέπονσα'n μὲν ἐπὶ πανουργίαν εὐσεβείας δὲ καὶ ὀσιότητος ὀλυγωρούσαν, ἐξ ὧν ἡ ἀθάνατος ἀρχή περιγίνεται, προὐβάλετο κατὰ τὸ εἰκὸς καὶ ἐφυγάδευσεν ἐκ τοῦ παραδείσου, De Opif. §§ 154-5). All this is clearly read into the narrative of Genesis, which lays no stress upon the choice between the two trees, but rather implies, in its confused way, that both were forbidden. The Hermetist has in effect identified the two trees. For him, knowledge is not the worse alternative, and life the better. Knowledge is life. "You will not die", says the serpent, "for God knew that on the day when you eat of it, your eyes will be opened,¹ and you will be like gods, knowing good and evil." The Hermetist agrees with the serpent: the man who has knowledge is like God, and will not die. "This is the good end for those who have knowledge, to be deified" (τούτο ἐστι τὸ ἀγαθὸν τέλος τοῖς γνώσις ἐσχηκόσιν, θεωθήναι, § 26).

The knowledge with which Poimandres is concerned is not primarily knowledge of good and evil (though it brings such knowledge with it, cf. § 22, "they abominate the senses, knowing their activities, μυσάττονται τὰς αἰσθήσεις εἰδότες αὐτῶν τὰ ἐνεργήματα). It is primarily the knowledge of man's divine origin. It is self-knowledge which is at the same time the knowledge of God, from whom man is sprung.² It is to communicate such knowledge, and so to bring men to immortality, that the tractate is written.

¹ Cf. Corp. VII. 1 (a tractate closely connected with the Poimandres), ἀναβλέψατε τοὺς τῆς καρδίας ὀφθαλμοῖς.
² Philo also connects self-knowledge with the knowledge of God, though in a somewhat different way. See De Migr. Abr. §§ 184 sqq.
CHAPTER VIII

THE GOSPEL OF POIMANDRES

The myth of creation and of the origin of man is complete with § 19, and here the direct dependence of the writer on consecutive passages of the Old Testament ceases. Since, however, we now know that he was acquainted with parts at least of the Old Testament, and with Hellenistic-Jewish thought, it will be worth while to seek further evidence of such acquaintance in the latter part of the tractate.

§§ 20–3 are occupied with a dialogue between the God Poimandres and His prophet, in which the implications of the holy word, ἀναγνωρισάτως ὁ ἔννοος ἄνθρωπος ἑαυτὸν ὄντα ἀθάνατον, are explained with a fullness demanded by their importance in the writer's teaching. In §§ 24–6 the God reveals how enlightened man ascends to his Father (περὶ τῆς ἀνόδου), and ends by charging His prophet with a mission to the world.

Poimandres thereupon vanishes. The prophet gives thanks, and begins at once to preach repentance. Some despise his words, others come for further teaching; and so, says the prophet, "I became a guide of the human race, teaching them the words, how and in what manner they will be saved" (καθοδήγος ἐγενόμην τὸν γένος τοῦ ἄνθρωπίνου, τοὺς λόγους διδάσκων, πῶς καὶ τίνι τρόπῳ σωθήσονται, § 29). The prophet returns to contemplation, and the tractate closes with a hymn of praise to God.\(^1\)

\(^1\) Scott's transposition of §§ 27–9 and §§ 30–2 is uncalled for. The hymn forms a fitting conclusion.
I. Divine Grace and Judgment.

The proclamation of the grace of God to the good and His rejection of the wicked in §§ 22–3 invites comparison with the same theme as treated in many Old Testament passages: "I myself, Mind, am present (παραγίνομαι) with the pious and good and pure and merciful, those who are godly, and my presence is their help (ἡ παρουσία μοι γίνεται βοήθεια), and immediately they know all things, and propitiate the Father lovingly, and give thanks, blessing and praising Him, straining ¹ towards Him in tender affection. And before they deliver the body to its proper death (ιδίω ϑανάτῳ) they loathe the senses, because they know their activities (ἐνεργήματα). Or rather, I myself, Mind, will not allow the activities of the body which assail them to be accomplished. Being the gatekeeper I will shut up the approaches, eradicating the imaginations of evil and shameful things. But for the foolish and evil and wicked and envious and covetous and murderous and ungodly I am afar off, delivering them to the punishing demon,² who . . . arms them the more for iniquities in order that they may obtain the greater punishment ".

The general religious idea here expressed is familiar in the Old Testament. It is concisely enunciated, e.g. in Ps. xxxiii. 16–17:

\[ \deltaφθαλμοὶ Κυρίων ἐπὶ δικαίους, \\
καὶ ὅτα αὐτοῖς ἐἰς δέησιν αὐτῶν. \\
πρόσωπον ἐκ Κυρίου ἐπὶ ποιοῦτας κακά, \\
tοῦ ἐξολοθρεύσαι ἐκ γῆς τὸ μνημόσυνον αὐτῶν. \]

¹ Reading with Reitzenstein τεταμένου for MSS. τεταγμένος, Patr. τεταγμένοι. Cf. § 31, ἀπὸ ψυχῆς καὶ καρδίας πρὸς σε ἀναταμένης.

² Τιμωροί δαίμονες are known to other Hermetic writers. See Scott ad loc. The single τιμωρός δαίμων here has some resemblance to the Jewish Satan. The function of forcing the wicked to commit crimes in order that they may be punished is given to εἰμαρμένη in Corp. XII. 5–7. In Corp. X. 20–1 νοῦς becomes for the wicked a δαίμων to drive them into worse crimes. We cannot but be reminded of Paul's doctrine that God delivers sinners εἰς ἀδικίμων νοῦν, so that they sin more lustily and come to destruction (Rom. i. 29).
Cf. also Ps. xvii. 25-7, cxxiv. 4-5, etc. Further, certain of the expressions used in Poimandres are similarly used in the LXX. With παραγώγοιμαι \(^1\) αὐτὸς ἕγὼ ὁ Νοῦς τοῖς οὐσίων κ.τ.λ., cf. Exod. xix. 9, ἐπεξ ἐκ τοῦ Κύριος πρὸς ὦ Ζωῆν, Ἰδοὺ ἕγὼ παραγώγοιμαι πρὸς σε. Is. lxii. 11, ὁ σωτὴρ σοι παραγίνεται (sic A, παραγέγονεν B). Similarly of the divine being who appears to Joshua before Jericho: Josh. v. 14, ἔγὼ ἄρχωστρατηγὸς δυνάμεως Κυρίου νῦν παραγέγονα. The term βοήθεια again is constantly used in the LXX of divine assistance, especially in the Psalms. The phrase τὸν πατέρα ἱλάσκονται ἀγαπητικῶς has a certain resemblance to biblical language, but the verb ἱλάσκεσθαι is used in a non-biblical sense.\(^2\) Ἀγαπητικῶς, on the other hand, though it does not occur in the LXX, connects itself with the use of ἀγαπᾶν for the love of God, which is characteristically biblical. The adverb itself, which is very rare, occurs in Philo, De Spec. Leg. I. 31: ἄρ᾽ οὐχ οὐτὸς ἐστὶν ὁ τρισμακάριος καὶ τρισευνδαίμων βίος, ἀγαπητικῶς ἔχεσθαι τῆς θεραπείας τοῦ πρεσβυτάτου πάντων αἰτίων.\(^3\) In the striking expression, πυλωρὸς γὰρ ὁν ἀποκλείσω τὰς εἰσόδους τῶν κακῶν καὶ αἰσχρῶν ἐνεργημάτων we might discern echoes of the language of Ps. cxx. 2, 5: ἡ βοήθεια μου παρὰ Κυρίου τοῦ ποιήσαντος τὸν ὄφραν καὶ τὴν τὴν . . . Κύριος φυλάξει σε ἀπὸ παντὸς κακοῦ . . . Κύριος φυλάξει τὴν εἰσόδον σου καὶ τὴν ἐξόδον σου. The term πόρρωθεν is used of God in Jerem. xxiii. 23: θεὸς ἐγγίζων ἕγὼ εἰμὶ καὶ οὐ θεὸς πόρρωθεν; None of these, however, even suggest any direct literary dependence of the Hermetist upon the Old Testament. Similarly, the verbs εὐχαριστεῖν, εὐλογεῖν, ὑμνεῖν are all common in the LXX, but are not peculiarly or even characteristically biblical. The verb ἐξομολογεῖσθαι, which

---

1 Observe how παρουσία naturally corresponds to παραγώγοιμαι. This term therefore, so common in early Christian literature, follows upon the specific use of παραγώγοιμαι for a divine intervention.

2 See Ch. V. pp. 82-95.

3 And we may recall that Philo repeatedly contrasts the love of God as the higher way with the lower way of fear.
The true state of affairs is best revealed if we study in detail the ethical vocabulary of this section. The terms for virtues and vices are in every case found also in the Greek Bible: ὅσιος, ἀγαθός, καθαρός, ἐλεήμων, εὔσεβεῖν—ἀνόητος, κακός, πονηρός, φθονερός, πλεονέκτης, φονεύς, ἀσεβής, ἀνομία. Of these we may neglect ἀγαθός, κακός, πονηρός as being too common, and too general in meaning, to have any significance for our enquiry. The facts regarding the other terms may be stated as follows:

ὅσιος is extremely common in Psalms and Proverbs, almost always rendering τῷ. It is found three times in Deuteronomy, once in 2 Kings, once in Amos, once in Isaiah, rendering various terms. For the rest it is confined to Wisdom (in which it is very common), Sirach, 1 and 2 Macc., and the Greek part of Daniel. It is no adequate translation of τῷ, and has the aspect of an essentially Greek term imposed upon Jewish thought in the Hellenistic period.

καθαρός as a close equivalent of τῷ is common all through the LXX, of ritual or moral purity. Cf. Ps. xxiii. 3–4, ἔσεσθαι εἰς τὸ ὅρος τοῦ Κυρίου; ... ἀθίως χερσίν καὶ καθαρὸς τῇ καρδίᾳ. The idea, however, is common to most religions, while they differ in the connotation they give to the term.

ἐλεήμων, in LXX only of God, except in Prov. (usually = ἡμῖν). In Philo also only of God.

εὔσεβής, fifteen times in Sirach, translating, nearly always, πρεσβύτερος; thirteen times in Macc.; ten times in the rest of the Greek Bible, representing πρεσβύτερος four times, τῷ once, ἐνεργεῖα once; in other cases without any

1 See also Chs. III–IV. pp. 42–81.  
3 See pp. 60–2.
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Hebrew equivalent. The verb ἐσεβέων only in Susanna and Macc. The abstract ἐσεβεία very common in Macc., only seven times elsewhere, generally representing יְרֵא. Thus these terms belong chiefly to the vocabulary of those books of the Bible which were composed as well as translated in the Hellenistic period, and whose Greek translation is comparatively late. It is clear that the words, and the idea they represent, are characteristically Greek, and in Hellenistic Judaism replace Hebrew terms of a different colour.

ἀνόητος occurs twice in Sirach, thrice in 4 Macc., twice in Prov., representing יָרָא, יְרוֹא, once in Deut., once in Psalms, in both cases without Hebrew equivalent. Again, it belongs chiefly to the vocabulary of the later translations and compositions.

φθονερός occurs in Sirach; φθόνος only in Sirach and Macc.

πλεονέκτης occurs once in Sirach (no Hebrew equivalent). The noun πλεονέξια occurs once in Wisdom, once in 2 Macc., and six times in the rest of the Greek Bible, translating יִשָּׁר, which properly means "plunder", "unjust gain". It is therefore not a real translation of the Hebrew word, and it occurs mainly in books which were composed (either in Hebrew or in Greek) in the Hellenistic period. Again we have a characteristically Greek term intruded into the religious vocabulary of Judaism.

φωνέας occurs once in Wisdom.

ἀσεβής is very common in most parts of the LXX, generally representing יְשָׁר ("guilty", "criminal"). Ἀσεβεία usually, and more appropriately, represents יְשָׁר ("rebellion", "defiance of God"). Both are used to render several other words.¹ These terms, therefore,

¹ See pp. 77-9.
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are more firmly rooted in the vocabulary of Hellenistic Judaism than their contraries εὐσεβής, εὐσέβεια, but the variety of the Hebrew terms they are used to translate indicates that the Greek terms are not very closely related to Jewish ideas.

ἀνομία at first sight seems a characteristically biblical word, occurring with great frequency in most parts of the LXX. But it represents a wide variety of Hebrew words (twenty-four in all), chiefly יָוֶן, נָנוֹן, חָסִיב, none of which have any special reference to "lawlessness". The word therefore represents a uniformity imposed within Hellenistic Judaism upon an original variety of Hebrew ideas.

To sum up, the first impression, that the Hermetist is using a "biblical" vocabulary is seen on examination to be only partly true. The terminology belongs to a stage at which currents of Jewish thought, having their source in the Old Testament, were running in the same channels with currents of non-Jewish religious thought. These lists of virtues and vices are in fact, as has often been pointed out, characteristic of ethical teaching in the Hellenistic period, whether Jewish or Stoic and neo-Pythagorean. Nevertheless, the Hermetist does share an identical ethical vocabulary with parts of the LXX.

One more phrase in this section may illustrate the same point. God is said to bring help to the virtuous, by "eradicating their (evil) imaginations", τὰς εὐθυμήσεις ἐκκόπτων. This recalls 4 Macc. iii. 2, ἐπιθυμίαν τις ύμων οὐ δύναται ἐκκόψαι, ἀλλὰ μὴ δουλωθήναι τῇ ἐπιθυμίᾳ δύναται ὁ λογισμὸς παρασχέσθαι. But cf. Aristotle, De Part. Anim. II. 10, 656b, ἀποκόπτει γὰρ ἡ τῆς ἐν τῷ αἴματι θερμότητος κύνης τὴν αἰσθητικὴν ἐνέργειαν. The Jewish and the Hermetic writers alike have used in a psychological sense

---

1 See pp. 77–9.
2 See Von Dobschütz, Die Urchristlichen Gemeinden, pp. 282–3; Deissmann, Licht vom Osten (1923), pp. 267–70.
an expression already established in a physiological sense.

2. **Eschatology.**

The account of the Ascent\(^1\) of Man, §§24–6, is correlative with the account of the Fall of Man in the earlier part of the tractate, but has no biblical source. The general idea, however, of an ascent through successive planes of being has parallels in various Jewish apocalypses, and becomes extremely important in the Gnostic systems.

In the highest heaven the δυνάμεις are praising God, as they do in *Ps.* cii. 21, cxlviii. 2 (quoted on p. 18 above). They praise Him, according to the reading of MS. D, "in a speech proper to them", φωνῇ των Ιδίων.\(^2\) This is aptly illustrated by Reitzenstein\(^3\) from the Jewish-Christian Testament of Job, in which the various angelic orders praise God in their several dialects. This idea, however, as he points out, is not Jewish or Christian in origin. It arose naturally in a period when the cults of various countries, each with its own liturgical language, were being assimilated and synthetized. Once again, therefore, the Hermetist is moving on parallel lines with Jewish thinkers contemporary with him.

3. **The Prophetic Vocation.**

The climax of the *Poimandres* is the divine call and commission delivered to the prophet. The God, having finished His revelation of the way to immortality, addresses the seer: "And now, why delay? Wilt thou not,

---

\(^1\) *Peri tēs ánōdon.* Cf. *Acts of Thomas*, § 80: δόξα καὶ εὐφημία τῇ ἀνόδῳ σου τῇ ἐπὶ τούτων οὐρανοῦς· δε’ αὐτής γὰρ ἡμῖν ὑπεθείσας τὴν ἑδόν τοῦ ὑλους. In *Poin.* the ἀνόδος of the Man is our ascent on high.

\(^2\) The other MSS. read ἡδείᾳ. At the period to which the MSS. belong this is a mere difference of spelling, the two words being pronounced alike, and Reitzenstein and Scott are probably justified in accepting the reading of an inferior MS.

\(^3\) *Poin.* pp. 55 sqq.
as having received all things, become a guide to those who are worthy, in order that the race of mankind may through thee be saved by God? " With these words (the writer continues) " Poimandres mingled with the Powers; and I, having given thanks and blessed the Father of all, came to myself, by Him empowered and taught the nature of the universe and the supreme vision. And I began to proclaim to men the beauty of godliness and of knowledge. . . . And some of them babbled against me and went off, having committed themselves to the way of death; but others begged to be taught, throwing themselves before my feet. I raised them up, and became a guide of the human race, teaching the words, how and in what manner they shall be saved. And I sowed in them the words of wisdom, and they were nourished from the ambrosial water. And when evening came and the whole light of the sun began to set, I bade them give thanks to God. And when they had finished their thanksgiving, each turned to his own bed. But I recorded the benefaction of Poimandres within myself, and being satisfied with all that I desired I had fullness of joy. For the sleep of the body became the soberness of the soul, and the closing of the eyes became true vision. My silence became pregnant of the Good, and the barrenness of speech a brood of good things. This befell me because I had received the word from my mind, that is from Poimandres, the Mind of the Sovereignty (λαβόντι ἀπὸ τοῦ νοὸς μου,

1 ὡς πάντα παραλαβὼν. Cf. Matt. xi. 27, πάντα μοι παρεδόθη ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρός. This striking parallel is frequently cited by recent commentators, usually with the implication that the passage in the Gospel is a later Hellenistic intrusion into the original tradition. But the tendency of our investigation is to show that the conception developed within Judaism, as well as outside it, out of the old Hebrew prophetic idea.  

2 ἀνείθην, which Reitzenstein takes to mean " I was released " (from the state of κατοχή, ecstasy; cf. § 1, κατασχεθεῖσαν τῶν σωματικῶν μου αἰσθήσεων). Ἀνέσθαι can mean " awake " (L. & S.). But the meaning may be simply " I was dismissed ", " I was sent forth by Him " (so Scott).  

3 Reading ἀφορία with Scott for MSS. ἐκφορά. " Utterance of speech " would give no true parallel to οἰωνία in the previous clause.
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τούτ’ ἐστι τοῦ Ποιμάνδρου τοῦ τῆς αὐθεντιὰς νοὸς, τὸν λόγον). \(^1\)
Wherefore being inspired by God (θεόπνους γενόμενος)
I arrived at the truth.” \(^2\)

Here we clearly have a first-hand document of the
prophetic consciousness, which may fitly be compared
with the accounts given by Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and
other Hebrew prophets, of their call. There is the same
revelation of God in vision, the same constraining power
of the message, the same exalted sense of a mission to
mankind. Similar prophetic traits appear in other
religions of the Hellenistic world. They have been
amply illustrated by various writers, as by Reitzenstein
(Poimandres, pp. 200 sqq.) and by Dr. Edwyn Bevan
(Sibyls and Seers). Nevertheless, there are some features
of the present passage which seem to show some more
specific affinity with the Hebrew prophetic literature.
First, the style shows a parallelistic structure comparable
with that of the prophetic books of the Old Testament.

\[\text{εὐγένετο γὰρ ὁ τοῦ σῶματος ὕπνος τῆς ψυχῆς νήψις, καὶ ἤ κάμμυσις τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν ἀληθινὴ ὀρασίς, καὶ ἤ σιωπή μου ἐγκύμων τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ, καὶ ἤ τοῦ λόγου ἀφορία γεννήματα ἀγαθῶν.} \(^3\)

The sentences might, so far as their rhetorical structure
is concerned, represent a regular parallelistic quatrains of
Hebrew poetry. Not only so, but their purport is true to
Hebrew ideas. Reitzenstein cites Philo’s account of the
prophetic ecstasy in Quis Rer. §§ 249 sqq. It is in fact
very similar. Cf. especially § 257:

1 MSS. τούτ’ ἐστι τοῦ Ποιμάνδρου τοῦ τῆς αὐθεντιὰς λόγου. But Poimandres is the Νοῦς, not the Λόγος of the Αὐθεντία (§ 2). I read therefore τοῦ τῆς αὐθεντιὰς νοὸς, τὸν λόγον, following Scott so far, but not accepting his further emendations. Reitzenstein reads τούτ’ ἐστι τοῦ Ποιμάνδρου τοῦ τῆς αὐθεντιὰς λόγου.

2 τῆς ἀληθείας ἦλθον, MSS. The simplest restoration is to insert μέχρι. Reitzenstein and Scott emend more elaborately.

3 Cf. Hos. x. 12, φωτίσατε ἑαυτοῖς φῶς γυώσεως . . . ἔως τοῦ ἐλθεῖν γεννήματα δικαιοσύνης.
But Reitzenstein does not cite a much earlier, and genuinely Hebrew, parallel, Num. xxiv. 3–4:

φησίν Βαλαὰμ νῦν Βεώρ,
φησίν ὁ ἀνθρώπος ὁ ἀληθινῶς ὁρῶν,
φησίν ἰκόνων λόγια θεοῦ,
δοτὶς ὄρασιν θεοῦ εἶδεν,
ἐν ὑπνῷ ἀποκεκαλυμμένοι οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτοῦ.

The phrase καμμύειν τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς is used by Isaiah in mockery of the blind prophets of a degenerate people, xxix. 10: πεπότικεν ὃμᾶς Κύριος πνεύματι κατανύξεως, καὶ καμμύσει τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν προφητῶν αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν ἀρχόντων αὐτῶν, οἱ ὄρωντες τὰ κρυπτά, a gibe which is the more pointed since the “closing of the eyes” was the approved way of “ beholding secret things”.

4. The Kerygma.

“I began to preach to men the beauty of godliness and knowledge”, says the prophet, ἧργομαι κηρύσσειν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας καὶ τὸ τῆς γνώσεως κάλλος. The word κηρύσσειν is frequently used by the Old Testament prophets (representing κηρή), and was taken over by early Christianity. The substance of the κηρύγμα is given in this tractate in two brief exhortations, §§ 27, 28.

1. “O peoples, earth-born men, who have given yourselves over to drunkenness and sleep and ignorance of God, become sober, cease revelling under the enchantment of irrational sleep.”

2. “Wherefore, O earth-born men, have you given yourselves over to death when you have the right to partake of immortality? Repent, ye who have made error your road-fellow, and ignorance your partner. Depart from the light which is darkness. Partake of immortality, abandoning corruption.”
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The parallelized structure is here again well marked:

"Ω λαοί, άνδρες γηγενεῖς,
oi μέθη καὶ ὑπνῳ ἐαυτοῦ ἐκδедωκότες
καὶ τῇ ἁγνωσίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ,
nήψατε, παύσασθε κραταλάωντες,
θελομένοι ὑπνῷ ἀλόγῳ.

Τί ἐαυτοὺς, ᾧ ἄνδρες γηγενεῖς, εἰς θάνατον ἐκδεδωκατε,
ἐξοιτίαν ἔχοντες τῆς ἁθανασίας μεταλαβεῖν;
μετανοήσατε ἵ συνοδεύσαντες τῇ πλάνῃ
καὶ συγκοινωνήσαντες τῇ ἁγνωσίᾳ.
ἀπαλλάγητε τοῦ σκοτεινοῦ φωτός.
μεταλάβετε τῆς ἁθανασίας
καταλείψαντες τὴν φθοράν.

The following verbal parallels may be noted:

γηγενεῖς. Cf. Wisd. vii. 1, γηγενοῦς ἀπόγονος πρωτο-
πλάστου. But also in Ps. xlviii. 3, Jerem. xxxix. 20, for
κραταλάωντες. Cf. Is. xxiv. 20, ἔκλυνεν ὡς ὁ μεθύων
καὶ κραταλῶν: xxix. 9–10, ἐκλύθητε καὶ ἐκστητε, κραταλή-
σατε οὐκ ἀπὸ σίκερα οὐδὲ ἀπὸ οἰνοῦ: ὅτι πεποτικεν ὦμᾶς
Κύριος πνεῦματι κατανύξεως κ.τ.λ. (the mockery of prophecy
cited above, p. 179).

μετανοήσατε οἱ συνοδεύσαντες τῇ πλάνῃ. Cf. Is. xlvi. 8,
μετανοήσατε οἱ πεπλανημένοι, ἐπιστρέψατε τῇ καρδίᾳ =
השב מָשָּׁבַע לַלְילֶב. The single word
is represented by two verbs in the Greek. הבש is nowhere else
in the LXX of the Old Testament translated by μετανοεῖν.
The regular translation is ἐπιστρέφειν, which occurs in
almost innumerable passages where the prophets call for
repentance. In Sirach xlviii. 15, however, הבש is rendered
by μετανοεῖν. Similarly, Symmachus renders הבש by
μετανοεῖν in Job xxxvi. 10; Is. xxxi. 6, lv. 7; Jerem.
 xviii. 8 (LXX ἐπιστρέφειν in each case); Ezek. xxxiii. 12
(LXX ἀποστρέφειν). In Wisdom μετανοεῖν is the verb for
repentance. It is common in Philo and the Testaments of
It appears that this word came to be preferred by later Jewish writers and translators. As it is common in Greek writers, especially in the Hellenistic period, we may take it to be another of the Greek terms which were adopted into Hellenistic Judaism, giving a somewhat different turn of meaning to an established idea.

οἱ συνοδεύσαντες τῇ πλάνῃ καὶ συγκοινωνήσαντες τῇ ἁγνοίᾳ. Cf. Wisd. vi. 23, οὕτε μὴν φθόνῳ τετηκότι συνοδεύσω, ὦτι οὕτος οὐ κοινωνεῖ σοφία.


It is evident that the language of the Κήρυγμα has close contact with that of the literature of Hellenistic Judaism. Further discussion of the content I postpone for the present.

There is in the Hermetic Corpus another tractate which is so closely related to the κηρύγμα in Poimandres that we may treat it here as supplementing the brief summary in that work. It is No. VII, entitled in the MSS. "Of Hermes Trismegistus: That Ignorance about God is the greatest Evil among Men". In language, style and contents alike it resembles the hortatory part of Poimandres, and is in all probability by the same author. It is quite short, possibly a fragment of one of the prophet's sermons. In order to get a fuller view of his teaching it will be well to give it here in full.

"Whither are ye tending, O drunken men, having drunk the unmixed wine of ignorance, which you cannot endure, but are already even vomiting it? Stand and be sober. Look up with the eyes of the heart,\(^1\) if not all of you, at least those who are able. For the evil of ignorance is flooding the whole earth, and destroying the soul which is shut up in the body, not permitting it to ride at anchor

\(^1\) Ἀναβλέψατε τοῖς τῆς καρδίας ὀφθαλμοῖς. The expression ἀναβλέπειν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς occurs at least sixteen times in the LXX.
in the havens of salvation. Be not therefore carried away with the great stream, but making use of the upward current, do you who are able to attain the haven of salvation come to anchor there, and seek one to guide you to the doors of knowledge, where is the radiant light, that which is pure of darkness, where not one is drunken, but all are sober, looking in the heart to Him Who wills to be seen. For He is not to be heard or spoken of, or seen with the eyes, but with mind and heart.

"But first you must tear off the tunic which you wear, the texture of ignorance, the warp of vice, the bond of corruption, the dark vestment, the living death, the sensible corpse, the portable sepulchre, the robber within the house. . . . Such is the enemy which you have put on as a tunic. It presses you downwards to itself, that you may not look up and behold the beauty of truth and the good that resides in it, and hate the wickedness of the enemy, understanding the plot which it has plotted against you, making the organs of sense (as they appear to us and are esteemed) insensitive, fencing them off with the mass of matter, and filling

1 Reading with Scott, τὸν τῆς κακίας στήμωνα, for MSS. στήριγμα.
2 τὸν ζώντα θάνατον, τὸν αἰσθητὸν (sic MSS., better perhaps αἰσθητικὸν, as Patr.) νεκρὸν. Cf. Paul, Rom. vii. 24. But there are Platonic precedents.
3 τὸν περιφορητὸν τάφον. The cult phrase βαστάζω τὴν ταφὴν τοῦ Ὀσίφεως (quoted from a papyrus by Deissmann, Bible Studies, pp. 352 sq.) may have influenced such language. Cf. Paul, 2 Cor. iv. 10, πάντωτε τὴν νεκρωσιν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐν τῷ σώματι περιφέροντες. Philo. De Somn. II. 237, τοῦ νεκροφορουμένου σώματος.
4 MSS. τὸν δὲ ὄν φιλεῖ μισοῦντα καὶ δὲ ὄν μοιεῖ φθονοῦντα. I cannot give any clear sense to these words, as they stand. The idea seems to be that the " robber " (the body) has a kind of love for the soul which is really hatred, since it leads to its destruction. This might be expressed in the form τὸν ἐν ὃ φιλεῖ μισοῦντα: really it hates the soul because it envies it its celestial status, ἐν ὃ μοιεὶ φθονοῦντα. But this is not entirely satisfactory. Scott emends extensively and gives a different sense.
5 τοιοῦτος ἐστιν ὃν ἐνεδύσων ἐχθρὸν χιτῶνα. I take ἐχθρὸν as the subject of the principal clause, attracted into the case of the object of the relative clause, a common construction.
them with abominable pleasure, so that you may not hear of those things you ought to hear of, or see those things which you ought to see.”

We have now before us the message which the prophet of Poimandres felt himself impelled to give to the world. It is the burden of the Hermetica in general—that knowledge, and in particular the knowledge of God, is the way to immortality, and that love of the body and its pleasures is the way of ignorance and death. The way in which this message is presented in the two writings before us shows close affinity with what we may call the missionary preaching of Hellenistic Judaism. This will be made clear by comparison with a few passages from its literature.

The Hermetist characterizes the two ways of life and death by a series of antithetical terms. The way of death is σκότος, ἀγνωσία, πλάνη, μέθη, θυρά: the way of life is φῶς, γνώσις, ἀλήθεια, νήπις, σωτηρία: to pass from the one to the other is μετάνοια: and the prophet offers himself as καθοδήγος to the right way.

Similarly, the author of the Wisdom of Solomon complains, Μάθαιοι πάντες ἄνθρωποι φύσει, οἷς παρῆν θεοῦ ἀγνωσίά (xiii. 1), and makes the ungodly confess (v. 6):

άρα ἐπλανήθημεν ἀπό ὅδοῦ ἀληθείας
καὶ τὸ τῆς δικαιοσύνης φῶς οὐκ ἐλαμψεν ἡμῖν.

The reason for ignorance is that the corruptible body weighs down the soul (φθαρτόν γὰρ σώμα βαρύνει ψυχήν,

1 τὰ δοκοῦντα ἡμῖν (sic Parthey following B, but Scott does not cite this reading. δοκοῦντα καὶ μή, A; δοκοῦντα εἴμοι, QS) καὶ νομιζόμενα ἄλογητα ἄναγκητα ποιών ... ἵνα μήτε ἄκος ἥπερ ὁν ἄκος ἥπερ σε δει, μήτε βλέπετα περί ὁν βλέπετα σε δει. Cf. Is. vi. 10, ἐπαχύνθη γὰρ ἡ καρδία τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου, καὶ τοίς ὁσίοις αὐτῶν βαρέως ἤκουσαν καὶ τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς ἕκαμμυσαν, μὴ ποτε ἴδωσαν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς καὶ τοῖς ὁσίοις ἁκούσασαν. The language of Corp. VII. is a perfect paraphrase of this in philosophical terms. The addition that this blunting of the senses is due to the body, to ὑλή and ἡδονή, is in the spirit of the Hermetica in general. Cf. also Jerem. v. 21, ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτοῖς καὶ οὐ βλέπουσιν, ὅτα αὐτοῖς καὶ οὐκ ἁκούσουσιν.
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ix. 15). Vice, blindness, ignorance, are the same thing (ii. 21 sq.):

Taîta ἐλογίσαντο καὶ ἔπλανηθησαν,
ἀπετύφλωσεν γὰρ αὐτοὺς ἡ κακία αὐτῶν,
καὶ οὐκ ἔγνωσαν μυστήρια αὐτοῦ . . .
ὅτι ὁ θεὸς ἔκτισεν τὸν ἀνθρωπὸν ἐπὶ ἀφθαρσίᾳ.

The righteous man of Wisd. ii. 13, like the prophet of Poimandres, ἐπαγγέλλεται γνῶσιν ἔχεω θεοῦ. In Wisd. vii. the pseudo-Solomon tells how the spirit of wisdom came to him, and how in answer to his prayer God gave to him τῶν ὄντων γνῶσιν ἀφενδὴ (vii. 17); and so he will bring to light the knowledge of wisdom (θήσῳ εἰς τὸ ἐμφάνες τὴν γνῶσιν αὐτῆς, vi. 22)—just as the prophet of Poimandres tells how in answer to his prayer the supreme God granted him a revelation, in consequence of which he offers himself as a guide to the race. In Wisdom it is Wisdom herself who is the ὀδηγός (ix. 11, cf. x. 10, αὐτῇ . . . ὀδήγησεν ἐν τριβοῖς εὐθείας), while God is the Guide of Wisdom (αὐτὸς καὶ τὴς σοφίας ὀδηγός ἐστιν, vii. 15). Wisdom is the effulgence of eternal light (ἀπαύγασμα φωτὸς ἀδιόν, vii. 26), and gives immortality (ὡς δὶ αὐτῆν ἀθανασίαν, vii. 13, ὅτι ἔστιν ἀθανασία ἐν συνγενελαί σοφίας, viii. 18).

The same kinship of spirit, as well as similarity of language, may be recognized in the Testaments of the XII Patriarchs, representing (when purged of Christian and other interpolations) the Judaism of the late second century B.C.¹ Take, for example, the following passages:

ἡ γὰρ κατὰ θεὸν αληθὴς μετάνοια φυγαδεύει τὸ σκότος,
kai φωτίζει τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς,
kai γνῶσιν παρέχει τῇ ψυχῇ,
kai ὀδηγεῖ τὸ διαβούλιον πρὸς σωτηρίαν.

(T. Gad. v. 7.)

¹ The Testaments were apparently written in Hebrew, and the Greek is a translation. But they were composed at an advanced date in the Hellenistic period.
THE GOSPEL OF POIMANDRES

μὴ μεθύσκεσθε οἶνῳ
ὅτι ὁ οἶνος διαστρέφει τὸν νοῦν ἀπὸ τῆς ἀληθείας,
καὶ ὀδηγεῖ εἰς πλάνην τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς.

(T. Jud. xiv. 1.)

περιβάλλεται γὰρ αὐτὸν τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θυμοῦ τὸ δίκτυον τῆς πλάνης
καὶ τυφλοὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ,
καὶ διὰ τοῦ ψεύδους σκοτοῖ τὴν διάνοιαν αὐτοῦ,
καὶ τὴν ἵδιαν ὀρασίν παρέχει αὐτῷ.

(T. Dan. ii. 4.)

καὶ γε μετανοήσας ἐπὶ τούτοις,
οἶνῳ καὶ κρέα οὐκ ἔφαγον ἔως γῆρους μου.

(T. Jud. xv. 4.)

ὅπου γὰρ ἐστὶν φόβος ἀγαθῶν ἔργων,
καὶ φῶς εἰς διάνοιαν
καὶ τὸ σκότος ἀποδιδράσκει ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ.
ἐὰν γὰρ ὑβρίσαι ἄνδρα οἰνον, μετανοεῖ,
ἐλεεῖ γὰρ ὁ ὁσιος τὸν λοιδωρὸν καὶ σωπᾶ.

(T. Benj. v. 4.)

οὐ τέρπεται ἐν ὑδνῃ,
οὐκ ἐμπύλπλαται τρυφῇ,
οὐ πλανᾶται μετεωρίσμοις ὀφθαλμῶι.

(T. Benj. vi. 3.)

ὁ οἶνος διεστρεφέ μου τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς,
καὶ ἡμαύρωσέ μου τὴν καρδίαν ἡ ὑδνῃ.

(Jud. xiii. 6.)

A wealth of passages in the same sense might be quoted from Philo. Thus, commenting on Gen. vi. 12, κατέθευε πᾶσα σάρξ τὴν ὑδναν αὐτοῦ, he observes that the "way" of God is wisdom, "for the mind, led by this way, which is straight and smooth, arrives at the goal; and the goal is knowledge of God" (διὰ γὰρ ταύτης ὁ νοῦς πολληστούμενος εὐθείας
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καὶ λεωφόρου ὑπαρχούσης ἀχρὶ τῶν τεμμάτων ἀφικνεῖται·
τὸ δὲ τέρμα τῆς δόδου γνώσις ἐστὶ καὶ ἐπιστήμη θεοῦ, Quod
Deus, 142–3). To follow this way is "to die from the
bodily life in order to partake of the incorporeal and
incorruptible life with the Ingenerate and Incorruptible"
(τὸν μετὰ σωμάτων ἀποθνήσκειν βίον, ἵνα τῆς ἁσωμάτου
καὶ ἀφθαρτοῦ παρὰ τῷ ἀγενήτῳ καὶ ἀφθαρτῷ ζωῆς μετα-
λάχωσιν, De Gig. 14). For knowledge of God is the
climax of happiness and agelong life (τὴν ἐπιστήμην αὐτοῦ
tέλος εὐδαιμονίας εἶναι νομίζοντες καὶ ζωῆν μακραίωνα, De
Spec. Leg. I. 345). Such knowledge is also described as
seeing the νοητὸν φῶς, φῶς τῆς ἀληθείας, and the like, and
its opposite is σκότος. The language of Philo, however, is
far more elaborate than that of the Hermetist or of Wisdom
and the Testaments.

There would be no difficulty in making similar com­
parisons over a wider range of Jewish writings, and
early Christian writings which carry on the same tradition.
The kind of religious movement represented by these
Hermetic writings on the one hand and Wisdom and the
Testaments on the other overlapped the boundaries of
faiths. But it is necessary to observe that whatever other
influences may have been at work, the Old Testament
itself offered definite precedent for teaching of this kind,
and the vocabulary of the LXX is often similar to that of
the passages before us. The significance of such simi­
larities is not diminished by the fact that Hellenistic
thinkers, Jewish and others, often understood such

1 The contrast of φῶς and σκότος in a religious or ethical sense is
frequent. Light and life (which for Hellenistic readers, though not for
the Hebrew writers, would mean immortality) are juxtaposed. Terms
like σώζειν, σωτήρ, σωτηρία, are frequent. Cf. Is. li. 5, ἐξελεύ­
σται εἰς φῶς τὸ σωτηρίον μου (sic N; there are variants). It is
not without significance that μὴ, "to live", is sometimes translated
σώζομαι, and μὴ, μὴ, "to make alive", σώζων. See Gen. xlvii. 25;
Ps. xcv. 3; Ex. iv. 11; Pr. xv. 27; Ez. xxxii. 12. Again, the
prophets frequently call upon their hearers to "know the Lord";
and Jeremiah utters the great prediction, οὐ διδάξουσι πάντες ἐίδησον με (xxxviii. 34).
THE GOSPEL OF POIMANDRES

language in a sense different from that which was in the mind of its original authors. What ideas, for example, would such a passage as Is. xlii. 5–6 have suggested to a writer like the author of our two tractates, if he had read it? ὁ τῶν ὁ θεὸς ὁ ποιήσας τὸν ὄρανον καὶ πῆξας αὐτόν, ὁ στερεώσας τὴν γῆν καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ (the God, at whose word the universe came into being by the separation of the higher elements from the lower), ἐγὼ Κύριος ἐκάλεσά σε (as Poimandres called His prophet), καὶ ἐδωκά σε εἰς διαθήκην γένους (or in other words, to be ἀνθρωπίνου, ἀνοίξαι ὀφθαλμοῖς τυφλῶν (crying, Ἀναβλέψατε τοῖς τῆς καρδίας ὀφθαλμοῖς), ἐξαγαγεῖν ἐκ δεσμῶν (scil. from the δεσμὸς τῆς φθορᾶς) τοὺς δεδέμενους, καὶ εὲ σιλικον φυλακὴς καθημένους ἐν σκότει (to lead them, in fact, to the doors of knowledge, ὅπως ἔστι ὁ λαμπρὸν φῶς τὸ καθαρὸν σκότους). Or again, such a passage as Is. lx. 1 sqq., φωτιζοῦν, φωτίζον, ἥκει γάρ σου τὸ φῶς . . . καὶ τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ Κυρίου εὐαγγελιών . . . καὶ γνώση ὅτι ἐγὼ Κύριος ὁ σῶζων σε . . . ἐσται γάρ Κύριος σοι φῶς αἰώνων, would carry a significance somewhat different, it is true, from that intended by the prophet, but not altogether alien from his fundamental beliefs. The prophetic message is individualized and "spiritualized". The same method of "re-interpretation" has been applied to the prophets in Christian teaching down to the present day.

With these general observations in mind, we may examine some of the details of the Hermetic kerygma.

(i) Drunkenness as the symbol of mental darkness or ignorance. Poim. 27, οἱ μέθη καὶ ὕπνω ἐαυτοὺς ἐκδεδωκότες καὶ τῇ ἀγνωσίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ, νήσατε. Corp. VII. 1, ποῖ φέρεσθε, ὃ ἀνθρωποὶ μεθύνοντες, τὸν τῆς ἀγνωσίας ἀκρατοῦ οἶνον ἐκπίνουτε, δὲν οὐδὲ φέρεσθε δύνασθε, ἀλλ' ἡ ταυτὸ καὶ ἐμείτε; We may start with Philo. At the beginning of the De Ebrietate (§ 4) he says Moses treats unmixed wine (ἀκρατοῦ, as here) as the symbol of various things, as of

1 This phrase is from Plato, Clit. 407 b; cf. Epictetus. Diss. III. xxii. 26.
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complete insensitiveness (ἀναισθησία παντελῆς) and of insatiate greediness and reprehensible desire (ἀπληρσία ἀκόρεστος καὶ δυσάρεστος ἐπιθυμία). With such a maxim in mind, it would be natural to give an extended signifi-
cance to the not infrequent passages in which Old Testa-
ment writers denounce drunkenness and call to sobriety, e.g. Joel i. 5:

ἐκνήψατε οἱ μεθύοντες ἐξ οἴνου αὐτῶν καὶ κλαύσατε •
θρηνήσατε πάντες οἱ πῶνοντες οἶνον εἰς μέθην

But further, the prophets themselves do in fact often use μέθη in a figurative sense. E.g. Is. xxviii. 1, οἱ μεθύοντες ἁνευ οἴνου (cf. li. 21). Jerem. xxviii. 39, μεθύοσ αὐτῶν ὡπως καρφώσων καὶ ὑπνώσωσιν ὑπὸν αὐώναν (cf. Poim. 27, μέθη καὶ ὑπνω ἐμαυτος ἐκδεδωκότες). Cf. also Jerem. xxxii. 1-2, λάβε το ποτήριον το οίνου το άκρατου ἐκ χειρός μου καὶ ποτεῖς πάντα τά ἑθνή • • καὶ ἔξερονται καὶ μανῆσονται (cf. Corp. VII. 1, τὸν τῆς ἀγνωσίας άκρατον οἴνον ἐκπινότες, ὅν οὐδὲ φέρεων δύνασθε ἀλλ' ἢδι αὐτὸν καὶ ἐμεῖτε). Is. xix. 14, Κύριος γὰρ ἐκέρασεν αὐτοῖς πνεῦμα πλανήσεως καὶ ἐπλάνησαν Αἴγυπτον ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς ἐργοις αὐτῶν ὡς πλανᾶται ὑ μεθύων καὶ ὡ ἐμῶν ἀμα.

(ii) The Deluge, and the Haven of Salvation. Corp. VII. 1, ἢ γὰρ τῆς ἀγνωσίας κακία ἐπικλίζει πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν καὶ συμφθείσει τὴν ἐν τῷ σώματι κατακλεισμένην ψυχήν, μη ἐώσα ἐνορμίζεσθαι τοῖς τῆς σωτηρίας λιμείσι. Cf. inf. 2, λαβέσθαι τοῦ τῆς σωτηρίας λιμεός, ἐνορμισμένου τούτω. The metaphorical use of words like κατακλίζεων 1 is in itself too common to call for remark. But the picture of a deluge over "all the earth", in a writer who has already betrayed his acquaintance with the Hebrew Flood-story, arrests attention, and raises the question whether he has in mind an allegorical interpretation of that story. 2 Now

1 While the Hermetist deplores the "flood" of ignorance, Jesus ben Sirach anticipates a "flood" of wisdom, xxi. 13, γνώσις σοφὸς ὡς κατακλυσμός πληθυνθήσεται.

2 As the author of 4 Macc. uses the familiar figure of an overwhelming "flood" of troubles, but attaches it specifically to the Flood of Noah:
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Philo frequently uses the figure of a flood to express the condition of the unenlightened soul embarrassed by the passions of the body. Thus in De Somn. II. 237 he speaks of the mind “borne along as in a deluge, and swept down by the eddies, one upon another, of the body which is being carried as a corpse” (φορούμενος ὅσπερ ἐν κατακλυσμῷ καὶ κατασυρόμενος ταῖς τῶν ἐπιρρεόντων διὰ τοῦ νεκροφορομένου σώματος δύνασ ἐπαλλήλους. Cf. Corp. VII. 2, μὴ συνκατενεχθῆτε τοιγαροῦν τῷ πολλῷ βεύματι). There is, however, hope for the soul that is perishing in the waters. “Though I am in the flood, I am not swallowed up in the deep; but I open the eyes of the soul, which in my despair of any good hope I thought to be already blinded, and I am illumined by the light of wisdom” (καί τοί κατακλυζόμενος οὐκ ἐγκαταπώνομαι βύθίοις· ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς τῆς ψυχῆς ὀφθαλμοὺς, οὓς ἀπογνώσι τῶν χρηστῆς ἐλπίδος ὑήθην ἢ δὴ πεπηρώσθαι, διοίγω, καὶ φωτὶ τῷ σοφίᾳ ἐναυγάζομαι, De Spec. Leg. III. 6). Philo therefore is working with the same range of ideas as our author.1 That he had in mind the Flood of Noah is shown by a passage in De Fug. 192: “This is the Great Flood, in which the cataracts of heaven (i.e. of the mind) were opened, and the fountains of the abyss (i.e. of the senses) were uncovered” (Gen. vii. 11). For it is only in this way that the soul is flooded, when iniquities rush down from the mind as from heaven, and passions rain upward from the senses as from the earth (οὐτός ἐστιν ὁ μεγάς κατακλυσμός, ἐν καθάπερ γὰρ ἡ Νάω κιβωτός ἐν τῷ κοσμοπληθεὶ κατακλυσμῷ καρτερῶς υπήγεκεν τοὺς κλυδῶνας, οὕτως οὖ, ἡ νομοφύλαξ, παντοχέθεν ἐν τῷ τῶν παθῶν περιαντλουμένη κατακλυσμῷ. ... γενναῖως υπέμεινα τοὺς τῆς εὐσεβείας χειμῶνας, xv. 31–2. 

1 Cf. also De Virt. 14, ἤπο τῆς τῶν παθῶν φορᾶς κατακλύζεσθαι. De Post. 175–6 (on the drunkenness of Lot, Gen. xix. 31–5) ... μεθυσθήτως καὶ παραφόρου ψυχῆς δόγμα εἰσηγούμενε. νήφοντος μὲν γὰρ ἔργον λογισμοῦ. ... τὸν θεὸν ὁμολογεῖν ποιήσας καὶ πατέρα τοῦ παῦτος. ... πρότερον οὖν αἰ κακὰ γνώμα εἰς ὁμιλίαν οὖκ ἀφίζοντα τῷ πατρί, πρὶν ἐπιφορῆσαι τὸν ἀφροίσιν πολὴν ἀκρατον καὶ ἐπὶ τι συνετον ἤν ἐν αὐτῷ κατάκλυσι. ... ὅταν δὲ ὑποβεβεβγένει κραταλα μετα—combining the “drunkenness” and the “flood” motives.

189
THE BIBLE AND THE GREEKS

"ἀνεώχθησαν μὲν οἱ καταρράκτα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ", λέγω δὲ τοῦ νοῦ, "ἀπεκαλύφθησαν δὲ αἱ πηγαὶ τῆς ἀβύσσου", τούτωσι τῆς αἰσθήσεως. μόνος γὰρ οὖτως ἡ ψυχὴ κατακλύζεται, ἀνωθεν μὲν ὅπερ ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ τοῦ νοὸς καταρραγέντων ἀδικημάτων, κάτωθεν δὲ ὅπερ ἀπὸ γῆς τῆς αἰσθήσεως ἀνομβρησάντων παθῶν).

The refuge from the flood is the "haven of salvation", and when men cast their anchor there they find (by a mixture of metaphor) "one to take their hand and guide them to the doors of knowledge" (χειραγωγῶν τὸν ὀδηγησοντα ὑμᾶς ἐπὶ τὰς τῆς γνώσεως θύρας). Cf. Ps. cvi. 30, ὠδηγήσεν αὐτοῖς ἐπὶ λιμένα[1] θελήματος αὐτοῦ. This parallel might indeed seem at first sight quite insignificant. The psalmist is describing an actual storm at sea, and telling how the mariners call upon God, and by His providence are brought safe to harbour. Yet in the succeeding verses he appears to be drawing upon the story of the Flood. "He turned . . . fruitful land into salt sea, because of the wickedness of those who dwelt in it" (34); but afterwards, "they sowed fields and planted vineyards, and produced a crop of increase. And He blessed them and they were greatly multiplied" (ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ἐν ἀνύδρῳ, ὦδὸν πὸλιν κατοικητηρίου οὐχ εὐθον, 4); but they prayed to God, and He guided them into a straight way (ὁδηγήσεν αὐτοῖς εἰς ὦδὸν εὐθεῖαν, 7). They

[1] Sic Νοa ART. ἐπιμελητα, Ν, an obvious mistake.
were sitting in darkness and in the shadow of death (καθημένους ἐν σκότει καὶ σκιᾷ θανάτου, 10), but the helper (ὁ βοηθός, cf. Poim. 22) saved them, led them out of darkness, and broke their bonds (ἐσωσέν αὐτοὺς καὶ ἐξῆγαγεν αὐτοὺς ἐκ σκότους καὶ ἐκ σκιᾶς θανάτου, καὶ τοὺς δεσμοὺς αὐτῶν διέρρηξεν, 14: for our hypothetical reader the bonds are, of course, the δεσμοὶ φθορᾶς, as is indeed natural, since they are connected with the “shadow of death”). Again, “they were troubled and tossed like a drunken man, and all their wisdom was swallowed down” (ἐταράχθησαν, ἐσαλεύθησαν ὡς ὁ μεθύων, καὶ πᾶσα ἡ σοφία αὐτῶν κατεπόθη, 27). But God led them out of their troubles, and they rejoiced because they were quiet (εὐφράνθησαν ὅτι ἤσοχασαν, 30, cf. Poim. 30, τὴν εὐεργεσίαν τοῦ Ποιμάνδρου ἀνεγράψαμεν εἰς ἐμαυτόν, καὶ πληρωθεὶς ὧν ἦθελον ἡφράνθην). And so we return to the verse from which we started—καὶ ὁδήγησεν αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ λυμένα θελήματος αὐτῶ—which surely now appears in a more significant light. If our author had not read the Psalm, at least much of the language of the Psalm had passed into the religious speech with which he was familiar.¹

(iii) The χιτῶν. Corp. VII. 2, πρῶτον δὲ δεῖ σε περιρρήξασθαι δν φορεὶς χιτῶνα, τὸ τῆς ἄγνωσίας υφασμα κ.τ.λ. 3, τοιοῦτος ἐστιν ὃν ἐνεδύσω ἐξήρθον χιτῶνα, ἀγχων σε κάτω πρὸς αὐτὸν, ἵνα μὴ ἀναβλέψας καὶ θεασάμενος τὸ κάλλος τῆς ἀληθείας καὶ τὸ ἐγκείμενον ἀγαθὸν μυσθήσῃ τὴν τούτον κακίαν. What the χιτῶν is the reader is left to infer. It is the body with which the mind or soul is clothed, or in which it is imprisoned. Cf. Corp. X. 18: “When the mind has got rid of the earthly body, immediately it puts on its own tunic of fire” (ὅταν οὖν ὁ νοῦς ἀπαλλαγῇ τοῦ γήνου σώματος τὸν ἰδιον εὐθὺς ἐνδύεται

¹ To the parallels already suggested we might add 24, εἶδοσαν τὰ ἔργα Κυρίου, with 26, ἀναβαίνουσιν ἐως τῶν οὐρανῶν, which a reader with the prepossessions of our author might well have taken to allude to the doctrine that the man who knows ascends to God (Poim. 26).
χιτώνα τῶν πυρινῶν). To put off the tunic therefore means to forsake the body, not necessarily in the sense of dying, as in Corp. X., but in the sense of that "practice in dying" (μελετάν ἀποθνήσκειν), which was an idea familiar to Greek philosophy from the time of Socrates and Plato (cf. Phaedo, 67ε). The use of the term χιτών here is not identical with that in Corp. X. It is introduced without explanation, as though the reader could be trusted to jump to its meaning at once. We may therefore ask whether in the background of thought which this author shared with Hellenistic Judaism there is anything which might give a key to his meaning.

Philo uses the figure of the χιτών in a context containing ideas somewhat similar to those of our present passage, Leg. All. II. 56 sqq., where he is explaining the regulations for the dress of the High Priest. "For this reason the High Priest shall not enter wearing his long robe, but having stripped off the soul’s tunic of opinion and imagination (τὸν τῆς δόξης καὶ φαντασίας ψυχῆς χιτώνα ἀποδυναμένος), and having left it to those who love external things and honour opinion more than truth, he shall enter in unclothed ". Then, with a reference to Lev. x. 4–5 (ἦραν ἐν τοῖς χιτώσιν αὐτῶν ἐξω τῆς παρεμβολῆς), he comments (ibid. 58) χιτώνες δ’ εἰσίν τὰ μέρη τοῦ ἀλόγου, αὐτὸ λόγικον ἔπεσκιαζε. Philo therefore thinks of a "tunic" which might be described as τὸ τῆς ἀγνωσίας ὕφασμα, but here it is not the body, but the irrational parts of the soul, or the faculty of δόξα καὶ φαντασία, concerned with outward phenomena.

For the χιτών in the sense of the body we may turn to the Christian Gnostic Valentinus, who has many points

---

1 Cf. Paul, 2 Cor. v. 1–3; 1 Cor. xv. 35–44. But the author of Poin. and Corp. VII. does not seem to know of any such "spiritual body" or "fiery tunic". When the enlightened mind arrives at its goal it is γυμνωθεῖς (§ 26), as Paul wished not to be (2 Cor. v. 3).

of contact with the Hermetic writers. The Demiurge, said Valentinus (Iren., Adv. Haer. I. v. 5), made first τὸν ἀνθρωπὸν τὸν χῶκὸν of invisible matter, then breathed into him τὸν ψυχικὸν, and finally clothed him with the tunic of skin, which is the sensible flesh (ὑστερον δὲ περιτεθεῖσθαι λέγουσιν αὐτῷ τὸν δερμάτινον χιτῶνα· τούτῳ δὲ τὸ αἰσθητὸν σαρκῖν ἐίναι θέλουσιν). This is a clear reference to Gen. iii. 21, ἐποίησεν Κύριος ὁ θεὸς τῷ Ἀδάμ καὶ τῇ γυναικὶ αυτοῦ χιτῶνας δερμάτινους καὶ ἔνδυσεν αὐτοὺς. Cf. also Odes of Solomon, xxv. 8:

"I was covered with the covering of thy spirit,
And I removed from me the raiment of skins."

Rendel Harris in his note on this passage traces the development of the idea from Gen. iii. 21.¹ There is clear evidence of a tradition that the "tunics of skin" with which God clothed man after the Fall were the garments of mortality. Philo, in Leg. All. III., which deals with Gen. iii. 3–19, breaks off after a comment on Gen. iii. 14–15 (the curse on the Serpent) to comment on Gen. xxxviii. 7, ἐγένετο δὲ Ἡρ πρωτότοκος Ἰουδὰ πονηρὸς ἐναντίον Κυρίου, καὶ ἀπέκτεινεν αὐτὸν ὁ θεὸς. The name Er, he says, signifies "made of skin", δερμάτινος (deriving ἐς from ἄρη = skin). "It is for this reason that God knew Er to be evil without any obvious reason. For He is not ignorant that the bulk of skin, our body, is evil, and a plotter against the soul, and is always a corpse and dead. For never suppose that each of us is doing anything else

¹ In the editio princeps of the Odes, pp. 67–71. In the later (Rylands) edition of the Odes (Harris and Mingana) he lays stress upon the connection of this part of the Ode with Ps. cxxxii., especially 9, οἱ ἱερεῖς σου ἐνδύσαντο δικασοῦν: 16, τοὺς ἱερεῖς αυτῆς ἐνδύσασα αὐτηρίαν: 18, τοὺς ἱερεῖς αὐτοῦ ἐνδύσα ἀσιγύρην. Note that this Ode is one of those quoted and "targumized" in the Pistis Sophia, which represents a development of Valentinianism.
but carrying a corpse, seeing that the soul arouses and carries without effort the body which in itself is a corpse"

(διὰ τοῦτο καὶ τὸν Εἰρ χωρίς αἰτίας περιφανῶς πονηρὸν οἶδεν ὁ θεὸς καὶ ἀποκτείνει · τὸν γὰρ δεμάτων νῦκον ἡμῶν τὸ σῶμα—Εἰρ γὰρ δεμάτων έρμηνευέται—πονηρὸν τε καὶ ἐπίβουλον τῆς ψυχῆς οὐκ ἄγνοει καὶ νεκρὸν καὶ τεθνηκὸς αἰεὶ · μὴ γὰρ ἄλλο τι νοῆσῃ ἐκατον ἡμῶν ποιεῖν ἢ νεκροφορεῖν, τὸ νεκρὸν εξ ἐαυτοῦ σῶμα ἐγειροῦσα καὶ ἀμοχθὶ φεροῦσα τῆς ψυχῆς, Leg. All. III. 69). Two inferences seem inevitable: (i) Since Philo mentions the ὅγκος δεμάτων, which is the body, in the course of his discussion of the events succeeding the Fall, he must have been acquainted with the interpretation of the χιτῶνες δεμάτων which we have traced elsewhere,¹ and this brings the tradition of that interpretation back to a period substantially earlier than Valentinus; (ii) the close agreement, in language as in idea, between this passage of Philo and our present passage, indicates that the Hermetist is working with conceptions which he holds in common with Hellenistic Judaism, and that these conceptions were related to the story of the Fall in Genesis, to which, as we have seen, he attaches great importance.

5. The Hymn.

The Poimandres closes (§§ 31–2) with a prayer to the supreme God, in the form of a rhythmical hymn,² which sums up the main ideas of the tractate. For the sake of

¹ According to Rendel Harris, Odes of Solomon, l.c., Philo explicitly identified the coats of skin with the human body in Quaestiones in Genesin, but he gives no reference, and I have not been able to trace the passage.

² The text of the hymn is given in a third-century papyrus (Pap. Berol. 9764) among a collection of Christian hymns. As the papyrus is some eleven centuries older than our earliest MSS. of the Hermetic Corpus, it is a valuable authority for the text. Its variations are in one or two cases apparently due to Christian adaptation, but in the main the text is close to that of the Hermetic MSS., confirming a belief in their essential soundness. Occasionally the papyrus offers a clearly superior reading. For full apparatus criticus see Scott.
completeness I will quote it in translation, though it adds but little material to our purpose.

Holy is God, the Father of all:
Holy is God, whose counsel is fulfilled by His own powers:
Holy is God, who wills to be known and is known to His own.

Holy art Thou, Who didst by Thy word constitute all things;
Holy art Thou, of Whom all nature is the image;
Holy art Thou, whom nature has not dimmed.¹
Holy art Thou, stronger than every power;
Holy art Thou, greater than all excellence;
Holy art Thou, better than praises.

Receive pure reasonable sacrifices from soul and heart strained upward to Thee, ¹⁰
O ineffable, unspeakable, named in silence.

Grant my prayer not to fail of the knowledge which is according to our essence;²
And empower me that I may enlighten with this grace those of the race who are in ignorance,
My brethren ³ and Thy sons.

¹ ἐμαύρωσεν for ἡμαύρωσεν, pap., ἐμόρφωσεν, MSS.
² τὴς κατ’ οὕτων ἡμῶν MSS., τῆς κατὰ ύφος ἡμῶν αὐτῶν, pap., " according to our texture " is perhaps a conceivable expression; but it is very strange, and the MS. text is probably to be accepted.
³ ἐνδυνάμωσον με καὶ τῆς χάριτος ταύτης φωτίσω, AB, pap. C has μοι for με, Q φωτίσων, and B marg. πλήρωσον με for φωτίσω. We may take it as certain that it is the prophet who is to "enlighten" the ignorant. Φωτίσων therefore is wrong. We might perhaps accept the suggestion of B marg. and read ἐνδυνάμωσον με καὶ πλήρωσον με τῆς χάριτος κ.τ.λ. So Reitzenstein, who also inserts ἵνα before φωτίσω. Scott reads ἐνδυνάμωσον με ἵνα τῆς χάριτος ταύτης τυχών φωτίσω. It is, however, perhaps not inconceivable that the author may have construed φωτίσω with the genitive. In any case the general meaning is doubtless that given above.
⁴ MSS. τοὺς ἐν ἀγνοίᾳ τοῦ γένους μοῦ ἀδελφοὺς. As "my brethren" is clearly parallel with "thy sons", the enclitic μοῦ cannot stand after γένους. Reitzenstein reads ἐμοῦ μεν ἀδελφοὺς, Scott ἀδελφοὺς ἐμοῖς.
Wherefore I believe and testify;  
I move into life and light.

Blessed art Thou, O Father!  
Thy man would be holy as Thou art holy,  
Even as Thou hast delivered to him all authority.

The rhythmical structure of the hymn is not unlike  
that of some Hebrew religious poetry, but the distinctively  
Hebraic modes of parallelism are absent, and the liturgical  
style of other religions can supply analogies at least as  
close. The following expressions may be noted:

1. δ πατήρ τῶν ὅλων. Extremely common in Philo.
10. λογικὰς θυσίας. The expression recurs in Corp. XIII. r8–r9. There it seems to be connected with the idea  
that when the reborn man worships God, the worship  
really proceeds from the indwelling divine Logos: δ ο ος  
λόγος δι' ἐμοῦ ὑμεῖ σε. This conception of the Logos is  
not found in the present tractate, and it is unlikely that  
the epithet λογικός carries this meaning. Λογικαὶ θυσίαι  
are no doubt implicitly contrasted with the material  
offerings of the popular cults. The epithet λογικός may  
imply that the words (λόγοι) of praise uttered by the  
worshipper are the “matter” of the offering (as Scott  
thinks), or, more probably, that the sacrifices are on the  
rational plane, offered by the λογικὸν μέρος τῆς ψυχῆς.  
Λογικαὶ θυσίαι are, in fact, such as might otherwise be  
described as νοηταὶ θυσίαι. Cf. Apollonius of Tyana, Περὶ  
Θυσιῶν, quoted by Eusebius, Praep. Evang. IV. r3: “It is  
in this way (in my opinion) that one would best perform  
one’s devotions to the divine, if one offered no sacrifice at  
all, nor kindled fire, nor gave to Him any name belonging  
to the world of sense, but employed in relation to Him  
only the higher Logos (I mean that which does not pass  
through the mouth), and besought good things of the  
Noblest of beings through the noblest thing in ourselves;  
and this is the mind, which needs no instrument’’, Οὕτως  
τοῖνυν μάλιστα ἀν τις οὖμαι τὴν προσήκουσαν ἐπιμέλειαν
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ποιοῦτο τοῦ θείου . . . εἰ θεῷ . . . μὴ θύου τι τὴν ἄρχην μῆτε ἀνάπτοι πῦρ μῆτε καθόλου τι τῶν αἰσθητῶν ἐπονομάζοι . . . μόνω δὲ χρῶτο πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀεὶ τῷ κρείττονι λόγῳ, λέγω δὲ τῷ μὴ διὰ στόματος ἰόντι, καὶ παρὰ τοῦ καλλίστου τῶν ὀντῶν διὰ τοῦ καλλίστου τῶν ἐν ἡμῖν αἰτοῖς τάγαθα· νοὺς δὲ ἐστιν οὗτος, ῥηγάνου μὴ δεόμενος. The prevalence of such polemic against material sacrifices in the higher paganism of the Hellenistic period is illustrated by Norden, *Agnostos Theos*, pp. 37 sqq. But the idea that spiritual or rational worship is itself the true sacrifice is best illustrated from Jewish sources. Several passages might be quoted in this sense from Philo. Thus in *De Spec. Leg.* I. 271–2, he says, “God is not pleased if one offers hecatombs; for all things are His possessions, and possessing all things He needs nothing; but He is pleased with God-loving sentiments, and with men who are athletes of piety, from whom gladly He accepts barley cakes and groats and the simplest things in preference to the most costly. And yet if they bring Him nothing else, in bringing themselves they offer the best sacrifice, a most perfect fulness of virtue, honouring God their Benefactor and Saviour with hymns and thanksgivings, it may be through the organs of speech, it may be without tongue or mouth, making mental (νοητάς) statements and appeals with the soul alone.” Again he says that Moses considered “that not the victims but the mind and intention of the sacrificer were the sacrifice” (οὐ τὰ ἱερεῖα θυσίαν ἄλλα τὴν διάνοιαν καὶ προθυμίαν ὑπολαμβάνει τοῦ καταθύνοντος εἶναι, *ibid.* 290). Behind Philo lies the prophetic teaching: “I will have mercy and not sacrifice”; “To obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams”. The Psalmists, in the spirit of this teaching, declare that the acceptable sacrifice is θυσία δικαιοσύνης ¹ (Ps. iv. 6).

¹ It may be doubted whether the Psalmists meant that righteousness was a substitute for material sacrifices, or that righteousness in the worshipper made such sacrifices acceptable to God. But to those who read the Psalms under the growing influence of more spiritual conceptions of religion the former meaning would commend itself.
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Cf. Ps. 1. 19, θυσία τῷ θεῷ πνεῦμα συντετριμμένον. Along a slightly different line the idea of sacrifice is sublimated by pronouncing the true sacrifice to be the act of worship itself, θυσία αἰνεσεως (Ps. xlix. 14, cvi. 22, cxv. 8). In Sir. xxxii. (xxxv.) 1–5 the true sacrifice is said to be the keeping of God’s commandments, and this is itself the θυσία αἰνεσεως.

'O συντηρῶν νόμον πλεονάζει προσφοράς, θυσιώζων συντηρίου ο προσέχων εντολαίς. ἀνταποδιδοὺς χάριν προσφέρων σεμίδαλω, καὶ ο ποιῶν ἐλεημοσύνην θυσία αἰνεσεως. εὐδοκία Κυρίου ἀποστήναι ἀπὸ πονηρίας, καὶ εὔσιλαμός ἀποστήναι ἀπὸ ἀδικίας.

In Christianity the sublimation of sacrifice is carried on along both lines. Paul’s λογικὴ λατρεία (Rom. xii. 1) may be said to follow upon the πνεῦμα συντετριμμένον of Ps. 1. 19, and the life of virtue inculcated by Jesus ben Sirach, since it consists in the submission of the self to the will of God. Similarly, in Heb. x. 1–10 the sacrifice of Christ is explained after Ps. xxxix. 7–9, as the doing of the will of God. In 1 Pet. ii. 5 the πνευματικαὶ θυσίαι (＝ νοηταί, λογικαὶ θυσίαι) take the form of proclaiming the ἀρεταὶ of God—the θυσία αἰνεσεως of the Psalms. This comes nearest to the λογικαὶ θυσίαι of Poinandrès.

15. Πιστεύω καὶ μαρτυρῶ. Cf. Ps. cxv. 1, ἐπίστευσα διὰ ἐλάλησα, followed by (ibid. 8) σοὶ θύσω θυσίαν αἰνεσεως. In Platonism πίστις is depreciated in comparison with knowledge, as being concerned with particulars of sense, whereas knowledge is of universals or noumena.3 In Corp. IX. 10, however, πίστις is associated with νόησις over against αἰσθήσεως. Τὸ γὰρ νοῆσαι ἐστὶ τὸ πιστεύσαι . . . περινοῆσας τὰ πάντα καὶ εὑρών σύμφωνα τοῖς ὑπὸ τοῦ

1 So B. In A - ζων is erased.
2 So N* (add -ζων, Νοι), θυσιαζων B.
3 Tim. 29c, διὰπερ πρὸς γένεσιν οὐσία, τοῦτο πρὸς πίστιν ἀληθεία. Cf. Rph. 511 d-e, νόησιν ἐπὶ τῷ ἀνωτάτῳ, διάνοιαν δὲ ἐπὶ τῷ δεύτερῳ, τῷ τρίτῳ δὲ πίστιν ἀποδός, καὶ τῷ τελευταῖῳ εἰκασιαν.
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λόγου ἐρμηνευθέων ἐπίστευσε, καὶ ἐν τῇ καλῇ πίστει ἐπανεπαύσατο. The present passage goes beyond this. The prophet does not mean simply that he has been convinced by what the God has told him. Πιστεύω clearly connotes a kind of spiritual or mystical awareness of the truth, which is at the same time an entrance into life and light (εἰς ζωὴν καὶ φῶς χωρῶ). Faith is, in fact, hardly distinguishable from the γνώσις through which man attains immortality. In a similar vein Philo speaks of “faith in God and apprehension of the unseen”. In De Praem. 26 sq. he takes the three Patriarchs as types of the small class of men (γένος ἀριθμὸς ὄλιγον) who attain to the highest life. “Possessed by un-speakable longing for vision and perpetual communion with divine things, when they have explored and passed through the whole visible nature, they immediately pursue the incorporeal and invisible, employing no one of the senses, but letting go all of the soul that is irrational, and using only that which is called νοῦς and λογισμὸς. The pioneer of the God-loving opinion (scil. Abraham), the first to turn from vanity to truth, using virtue as his teacher to bring him to perfection, bears away as a prize faith towards God (τὴν πρὸς θεόν πίστιν).” Isaac similarly wins joy (Ισαὰκ = γελῶς), and Jacob the vision of God (Ισραὴλ = ὄρων θεόν). “But one could not conceive anything more profitable or august than to have faith in God (τοῦ πιστευεῖν θεῷ) and to rejoice all through life, and always to see the Self-existent.” Thus faith is γνώσις εὐσέβειας, κλῆρος εὐδαιμονίας, ψυχῆς ἐν ἀπασω βελτίωσις (De Abr. 268). There is here a mystical strain

1 Scott misses the point in proposing to insert ὅτι. The seer does not mean “I believe that I am entering into life”, but “I have faith, and in having faith I enter into life”.

2 De Somn. I. 68: (ἀριστος τόπος) ὡ τὸ αὐτομαθὲς γένος Ἰσαὰκ ἐνδιατάται μηδέποτε τῆς πρὸς θεόν πίστεως καὶ ἀφανοὺς ὑπολήψεως ἀφαστάμενον. Ται ἀφανοὺς ὑπολήψεως as the genitive of ἀφανοὺς ὑπόληψες; cf. De Plant. 20, ἵνα τῷ φανερῷ τὸ ἀφανῆς ἑκόθλως καταλαμβάνηται. Cf. the definition of πίστις in Heb. xi. 1, πραγμάτων ἔλεγχος ὧν βλεπομένων.
of thought which is not Hebraic, but the basis of it is genuinely biblical. Cf. Is. xliii. 10, γένεσθε μοι μάρτυρες, καὶ ἐγὼ μάρτυς, λέγει Κύριος ο θεός, καὶ ὁ παῖς ὦν ἐξελέξαμην, ἵνα γνώτε καὶ πιστεύσητε καὶ συνήτε ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμί. It is probably due to Jewish influence that the concept of faith has been elevated to this lofty position in the religious life.1

17. Ἐὐλογητὸς εἶ πάτερ has innumerable parallels throughout the Old Testament.

18—19. Ὁ σὸς ἄνθρωπος συναγιάζειν σοι βούλεται, καθὼς παρέδωκας αὐτῷ τὴν πᾶσαν ἐξουσίαν. The implication seems to be that the prophet, having received τὴν κατ’ οὐσίαν ἡμῶν γνώσιν, has realized his identity with the heavenly Anthropos to whom all authority was delivered at the beginning (§§ 12, 14), the οὐσιωδὴς ἄνθρωπος (§ 15), who is the immortal part of every man. Συναγιάζειν must be used intransitively, "to become holy together with Thee". Cf. the repeated ἅγιοι ἐσεσθε ὅτι ἐγὼ ἅγιος of Leviticus, quoted in 1 Pet. i. 16.

Our review of the latter part of the Poimandres and the related sermon (Corp. VII.) has revealed far too many points of contact with the thought of Hellenistic Judaism to be accounted for by mere coincidence. Moreover, the ideas in question are in so many cases traceable to the Old Testament that it is not plausible to account for them invariably as due to external influence on Judaism. The Hermetist, therefore, is indebted to Judaism, not only for the creation myth, which he derives from Genesis, but also for a part of the substance of his religious experience and teaching. At the same time, the influence of Jew and Gentile is reciprocal, for our study has also thrown light from non-Jewish sources on the choice of certain words by the LXX translators, and further confirmed the view that that version is in itself a document of Hellenistic Judaism.

1 See also Ch. III. pp. 66–70.
CHAPTER IX

THE DATE OF POIMANDRES

The date of the tractate is difficult to determine. The question is discussed by Reitzenstein and Scott. The former would make the original author about contemporary with Philo, though he supposes the tractate as we have it to bear the marks of later manipulation. The latter inclines to bring the tractate down to the second century. It will be best to state concisely the broad limits of the period to which it must be assigned.

The terminus post quem Scott seems to have fixed by reference to the combination of Platonism and Stoicism which forms the philosophical basis of the teaching of the Poimandres. This he shows to be due to Posidonius, who flourished in the first century B.C. Reitzenstein's investigation of the Egyptian and other antecedents of the teaching of the tractate does not really conflict with this; for though he sets out to show, sometimes convincingly, that some of its ideas can be traced to very old Egyptian or Iranian tradition, yet for evidence of such ideas appearing in a Greek form comparable with that which we find in the Poimandres he is dependent upon authorities no earlier than Philo of Alexandria, Plutarch, and Philo of Byblos, and in fact he concludes that the fusion of Egyptian and Iranian ideas which he finds here took place about the beginning of the Christian era. The tractate, therefore, is not earlier than that date.

For the terminus ante quem we have the following data:

(i) The Poimandres was known to the author of Corp. XIII. The date of the latter treatise is uncertain. Reitzenstein dates it, with much hesitation, to the latter half
of the second century; Scott, with more probability, to the latter half of the third. In any case it is unlikely that Corp. XIII., or indeed any other writing in the Corpus, is as late as the fourth century.

(ii) Although the Poimandres cannot be proved to be earlier than other writings of the Corpus, apart from Corp. XIII., yet comparison suggests that it falls among the earlier rather than the later writings. The fact that it makes no claim to be by Hermes, but was attributed to him by later writers, may suggest that it was written before the emergence of a definitely Hermetic school, for which Hermes Trismegistus must be the source of all teaching of this kind.

(iii) There are some coincidences in thought and expression between the Poimandres and the Latin Asclepius, falsely attributed to Apuleius (cited by Lactantius as Δόγος Τέλειος), which suggest a literary relation between them; and if there is such a relation, it is probable that the Asclepius was dependent on the Poimandres rather than vice versa. Scott has made it probable that the Latin Asclepius is made up of three originally independent treatises translated from Greek. The third, and as he thinks the latest of the three, he dates, on the ground of allusions to contemporary events, to A.D. 268–78. The first of the three is the one which may be dependent on the Poimandres, and this, Scott thinks, must have been written before A.D. 250.

(iv) The Poimandres was known to the alchemist Zosimus, who wrote about the beginning of the fourth century.

(v) The hymn with which the Poimandres closes is given among a collection of Christian prayers in a third-century papyrus. That the hymn was written as part of the tractate scarcely admits of doubt. The papyrus therefore affords evidence that the tractate was known to a Christian reader before the end of the third century. To allow for such a writing becoming current in Christian
THE DATE OF POIMANDRES

circles we should probably have to put its composition some considerable time before A.D. 300.

(vi) Reitzenstein attempted to show that the Poimandres was a source of the Shepherd of Hermas, which is traditionally dated about A.D. 140. But his argument will not bear investigation. It rests mainly upon the assumption that Ποιμάνδρης is derived from ποιμαίνειν, which is probably not true. No doubt Zosimus assumed this derivation, and it is possible that the author of Corp. XIII. did so, but there is nothing in the tractate itself to suggest to a reader that the God was conceived as a shepherd in any sense; and Hermas, being acquainted with the Old and New Testaments, as well as with Jewish apocalyptic literature, certainly did not need to have recourse to a doubtful etymology in a pagan work for the conception of his angelic guide as a shepherd. Moreover, Reitzenstein supposes that Hermas knew, not our Poimandres, but an earlier and fuller form of the work, which is a pure figment. The few coincidences between Hermas and Poimandres amount to little more than the commonplaces of visionary literature, and afford no sufficient evidence of dependence on one side or the other.

Such definite evidence, therefore, as we possess justifies the conclusion that the Poimandres was written between the beginning of the Christian era and the first quarter of the third century. It does not give any closer dating. But if we consider the vaguer evidence afforded by comparison of its thought with that of other writings, we may record the following facts:

(i) The general philosophical basis of the teaching of Poimandres shows affinity with philosophers of the second century, as Scott’s notes show. Among these he mentions Numenius as standing nearest to our writer. Numenius, who wrote in the latter half of the second century, was a precursor of Plotinus and the Neoplatonists. Like our writer he is known to have consulted the Hebrew Scriptures, no doubt in the LXX version. He is also apparently
the first philosopher known to have used the term δημούργος to denote the "second God," mediating between the supreme God and this world, though in this he was anticipated by the Christian Gnostics Marcion and Valentinus. There is, however, no reason to suppose that our author is indebted to him for his doctrine of the Demiurge, as I have tried to show above. The tendency to ascribe material creation to secondary divine beings is as old as the Timaeus, and the term δημούργοι had already been applied to such beings. Numenius and the Poimandres may well represent in this respect parallel developments.

(ii) In its treatment of Hebrew traditional material the Poimandres is akin to Philo, the Wisdom of Solomon, and in certain respects the Secrets of Enoch, while it gives no evidence of dependence on any of these, not even on Philo, to whom it is most closely akin. These writings cover the period which may be roughly indicated as 50 B.C.—A.D. 100. It also shows some affinity in this respect as in some others with Gnostic writings of the second century.

(iii) The Poimandres shows no dependence on Christian writings, but its thought has affinities with some aspects of early Christian thought. In particular, it has several points of contact with the Fourth Gospel, the date of which may be taken to be not very far from A.D. 100. Such points of contact are the conception of the divine as Life and Light, of the creative Logos, of the heavenly Man who descends and ascends again, of immortal life as a return to the Father, and of knowledge of God as the condition of attaining immortality. These points of contact, however, are not such as to suggest a literary dependence of John upon Poimandres, or vice versa.

(iv) The Poimandres has even more striking affinities with early Gnosticism, as the works of Irenaeus and Hippolytus show it to have existed in the second century. The origins of Gnosticism offer an obscure problem—how
far it is to be considered as a by-product of Christianity, and how far a movement of thought which, originally independent of Christianity, adopted Christian ideas into its eclectic systems. But without entering into this question at large, we may observe that so far as common motives and conceptions can be recognized, underlying the bewildering variety of Gnostic thought, they are such as are also to be found in the *Poimandres*. The dominant religious motive of the Hermetic writer is that of the Gnostics—the liberation of the higher element in man from matter, and its elevation into union with the divine. What it offers is γνώσις through which such liberation may be found. It shares their interest in cosmology, particularly as explaining how man came to be imprisoned in matter, and how it is possible for him to be liberated. Like them, it places a series of intermediate powers between the supreme God and the works of men. Like them it works with interpretations of the Old Testament. This interest in the Hebrew Scriptures is evident even in Gnostic writings in which Christian influence is small or negligible, and where it is not likely to be due, any more than in *Poimandres*, to such Christian influence.

Thus the *Μεγάλη Απόφασις*,¹ purporting to represent the teachings of Simon of Gitta (the Simon Magus of Christian legend), is anti-Christian in tendency, though it betrays knowledge of the New Testament. But its debt to the Old Testament is large. It quotes freely from the Pentateuch and the Prophets; it sets out to explain the intention of the five books of Moses; and it interprets the Hebrew cosmogony, relating it to the doctrines of Greek philosophers. Its interpretations rarely agree with those of *Poimandres*, but the principles of interpretation are such as the Hermetic author must have recognized. Its system differs widely in detail from that of *Poimandres*, and yet in its general conception of the

relations of God and the universe it is not far removed from it. The Baruch-book of Justin,\(^1\) again, gives a system based upon a fantastic interpretation or adaptation of the Eden myth of *Genesis*, combining it with pagan mythology. The Christian element in the system is tacked on. Jesus appears as the first true Gnostic, but otherwise distinctively Christian ideas play no part. To take a third example, the Naassene document quoted by Hippolytus\(^2\) is, so far as we can judge from the fragment preserved, a prototype of Mr. Casaubon's unfinished *Key to All Mythologies*. It draws upon a wide range of mythology, including that of the Old Testament, and aims at showing the fundamental unity of it all. The divine figures of the various myths are treated as aspects of Attis, whose praise is sung in a hymn which is in some sort the "text" of the whole discourse. The extant fragment gives great prominence to the idea of the aboriginal Man, the divine "Ἀνθρώπος" of the *Poimandres*, who is here called Adamas. The name, which also occurs in the form 'Αδάμ, shows clearly enough the Semitic background of the idea, and the author finds allusions to the primal Man both in the cosmogony of *Genesis* and in other parts of the Old Testament. He also identifies him with "the Christ, the Son of Man". Reitzenstein regards this passage, with the other occasional allusions to the New Testament, as later Christian additions to an originally pagan document. Whether this is so or not, certainly the impulse to the composition of this piece of religious syncretism did not come from Christianity.

These three documents cannot be precisely dated, but all were current before the end of the second century. They all show the tendency to exploit traditional Jewish material, to combine it with mythical material from other sources, and in greater or less degree to give it a philosophical setting. The *Poimandres* shows the same tendency, but it is simpler, more philosophical, more

---

\(^{1}\) See Hippolytus, *Refut.* V. xxiii.-xxviii.
THE DATE OF POIMANDRES

"scientific" than the others. Unlike the Poimandres, the other three show in varying degrees the influence of Christianity, but in no case is this influence of decisive or formative importance.

Of definitely Christian Gnosticism, we may take the Valentinian system as a type. It is Christian in that it not merely introduces the figure of Christ into its mythology, as do "Simon", Justin, and the Naassene writer, and not merely exploits New Testament material for its own purposes, but places the centre of its religion in redemption wrought by Christ the Saviour. For the rest, the system into which this essentially Christian and evangelical teaching is fitted has striking analogies with that of the Poimandres, though it is vastly more elaborate. As in Poimandres the divine powers, \( \Lambda \gamma \delta \), \( \Theta \upsilon \lambda \), \( \Pi \nu \dot{o} \delta \), \( \Delta \eta \mu \omega \upsilon \gamma \eta \delta \), \( \Lambda \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi \omega \sigma \), intervene between the Father of all, who is Life and Light, and this world with its human inhabitants, so in Valentinianism we have a series of aeons emanating from the \( \Pi \rho \rho \alpha \tau \alpha \mu \pi \). Among them are \( \Pi \nu \dot{o} \delta \), \( \Lambda \gamma \delta \) and \( \Lambda \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi \omega \sigma \), while \( \Theta \upsilon \lambda \) has a distant but real parallel in \( \Sigma \phi \iota \alpha \), who is the cause of the existence of matter, as \( \Theta \upsilon \lambda \) of the elements. But \( \Sigma \phi \iota \alpha \) also doubles the role of the \( \Lambda \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi \omega \sigma \) of Poimandres, in that she falls from her high estate. As in Poimandres the human race as we know it is the consequence of a pre-mundane Fall, so in Valentinianism the whole world as we know it is the consequence of a pre-mundane Fall; but here it is also the consequence of a pre-mundane Redemption, for by the intervention of Christ the Saviour the monstrous offspring of \( \Sigma \phi \iota \alpha \), though she remains outside the Pleroma of

---

1 For a demonstration of the fundamental Christianity of Valentinus, see Burkitt, Church and Gnosis, pp. 42-53.

2 There are reminiscences of the language of Poimandres. With Poim. 9, \( \alpha \pi e k \eta \pi \alpha \varepsilon \tau e \rho o n \ \nu o \nu \ \delta \eta \mu \omega \nu \gamma \eta \delta \), 12, \( \alpha \pi e k \eta \pi \alpha \varepsilon \tau e \ \alpha \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi \omega \sigma \ \varepsilon \alpha \mu \tau \varepsilon \ \iota \sigma \nu \), cf. Iren., Adv. Haer. I. i. 1, \( \alpha \pi e k \eta \pi \alpha \varepsilon \tau e \ \nu o \nu \ \delta \mu o \iota \nu \ \tau e \ \kappa a i \ \iota \sigma \nu \ \tau \omega \ \pi r \nu \beta \alpha \lambda \nu \gamma \iota \tau i \). But the Valentinian doctrine of Syzygies, a spiritualizing of the divine marriages of mythology, contrasts with the severely asexual doctrine of Poimandres. See also pp. 131, 138, 193.
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divine powers, is made capable (as Achamoth, the lower Wisdom) of bringing a cosmos into being. It is she who produces the Demiurge, the image of the Father, and the Demiurge is the creator of all things outside the Pleroma, and the Lord of the seven heavens.\(^1\) There is an obvious analogy with the Demiurge of Poimandres, though the Valentinian Demiurge stands at a farther remove from the primal God, while, on the other hand, unlike the Poimandres, Valentinus regards the Demiurge as the creator of man as well as of the world. But not wholly so, for unknown to him his mother Wisdom inserts into the constitution of some men the \textit{πνευματικός ἀνθρωπός}, the antitype of the heavenly aeon \textit{'Εκκλησία}.\(^2\) It is this \textit{πνευματικός ἀνθρωπός} who will ultimately be released from matter and perfected by the knowledge of God. We have here a clear analogue of the \textit{ουσιώδης ἀνθρωπός} of Poimandres.

Without going further into detail, we may fairly conclude that the Valentinian system, apart from its definitely Christian elements, has the aspect of an elaboration of a system very like that of the Poimandres. There must surely be some relation between the two systems. Now it is conceivable that a student of Christianity in its Valentinian form might have simplified its enormously complicated theosophy, retaining so much of its outline as served to give force to his religious message. But it is hardly conceivable that in doing so he should have refined away every trace of its definitely Christian

elements, while bringing its Jewish elements into closer contact with the Old Testament. Moreover, the definiteness and consistency of the Valentinian system in all its parts contrast with the much looser and as it were tentative structure of the system of Poimandres. The Poimandres has the aspect, not of a simplification of something more elaborate, but of an experiment in the direction in which Valentinus travelled to a further stage. Now Valentinus, like the author of Poimandres, lived in Egypt. Their systems are products of a similar environment. In such a situation the natural inference is that the simpler system is the earlier. The occasional coincidences in language are not indeed sufficient evidence of literary dependence, and while the thought of Poimandres is earlier in character, we cannot be certain that the tractate was actually written before the work of Valentinus. Nevertheless, in default of any evidence pointing to a later date it is a probable inference. The accepted date for Valentinus is about A.D. 130-140.¹ The Poimandres is rather more likely to fall before than after this date, and there is no evidence which would conflict with a date early in the second century or even late in the first century.

The evidence, then, taken as a whole, still falls short of providing with anything like certainty a precise date for the Poimandres. Yet it does seem to justify fairly definite conclusions regarding the place of its teaching in the history of Hellenistic religious thought. These conclusions I will postpone until some consideration has been given to other writings in the Corpus.

CHAPTER X

THE SACRED DISCOURSE

The third tractate of the Hermetic Corpus has come down to us under the title *The Sacred Discourse of Hermes (Trismegistus).*¹ The MSS. text is somewhat obscure, and certainly corrupt at some points. Scott pronounces it "almost wholly meaningless", and proceeds to restore it extensively on an ingenious theory of the mutilation of the archetype. He does not claim that his restored text is "precisely what the author wrote", but only that in the main it "correctly represents his meaning". That may or may not be so; but I cannot think that such drastic treatment is really necessary. The style of the tractate is in any case crabbed and not always correct, and it may be doubted whether the writer was entirely at home in the Greek language. But the MS. text, with a few comparatively slight emendations, can be read and understood for the most part. There remain points at which we should do well to confess that we do not know what the author wrote or what he meant. But I do not think there is any real difficulty in getting the meaning of the text as a whole. The points at which the reading is seriously doubtful do not as a rule affect our present purpose, which is to trace the relation of this curious work with the creation narrative of *Genesis* and Hellenistic-Jewish thought, as well as with the *Poimandres*. I will begin by

¹ τοῦ τρισμεγίστου omitted in B. There is nothing in the tractate itself to indicate that it was intended to be attributed to Hermes, but it has a certain general affinity with the Hermetic literature, though it lacks some typical features; and it was adopted into the Corpus when the collection was made.
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giving the text of the tractate, in which I have followed the MSS. as closely as possible, accepting some few emendations of Scott and earlier editors, with a few unimportant suggestions of my own. For a full apparatus criticus the reader must be referred to Scott. For the purposes of the following discussion I have underlined all words which the discourse has in common with the creation narrative of the LXX. I append a translation, giving the sense as I understand it.

ΕΡΜΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΤΡΙΣΜΕΓΙΣΤΟΥ ΛΟΓΟΣ ΙΕΡΩΣ.

§ 1. Δόξα πάντων ὁ θεός καὶ θεῖον, καὶ φύσις θεία.

'Αρχή τῶν ὄντων ὁ θεός, καὶ νοῦ καὶ φύσεως καὶ Ἵλης, ὁ σοφία εἰς δειξιν ἀπάντων ὁμ. 

'Αρχὴ τὸ θεῖον καὶ φύσεως καὶ ἐνεργειας, καὶ ἀνάγκη καὶ τέλος καὶ ἀνανέωσις.

§ 2. Ἱν γὰρ σκότος ἀπειρόν ἐν ἀβύσσῳ καὶ πνεῦμα λεπτὸν νοερὸν, δυνάμει θεία ὅντα ἐν χάει.

'Ανείθη δὴ φῶς ἄγιον, καὶ ἐπάγη ἄμμω τὸ ὑγρᾶς οὐσίας στοιχεία φύσεως ἐνισθόρου. § 2. ἀδιορίστων δὲ

1 MSS. καὶ νοῦς καὶ φύσις καὶ Ἵλη. I accept this emendation from Scott. It would not, indeed, be impossible to find a Stoic writer identifying God, as ἀρχή, with νοῦς, φύσις and Ἵλη. But it seems more natural here to find an enumeration of the primary ὅντα of which God is ἀρχὴ. As the σκότος and πνεῦμα which represent here the aboriginal form of Ἵλη exist δυνάμει θεία, God may be said to be the ἀρχὴ of Ἵλη, in contrast to the doctrine of Poimandres, where the σκότος from which matter emerges stands over against God, who is light.

2 MSS. καὶ φύσις καὶ ἐνεργεια. I emend on analogy with the preceding clause. Scott rewrites the sentence. The nominatives ἀνάγκη, τέλος, ἀνανέωσις, however, should probably be retained. The divine is not only the origin of nature and its activity; it is also the necessity or fate (ἐίμαρμένη), by which they are directed; and as things take their origin from the divine, so they end in the divine and are brought into being again by it, as explained below, in harmony with Stoic teaching.

3 These words seem to make no sense here. Whatever words stood in the original text would seem to have been corrupted by the influence of ὑφ᾽ ὑγρᾶ ἄμμω below.

4 MSS. insert καὶ θεοὶ πάντες καταδιερώσι καὶ -αἰρώσι (μ for καταδιερωσί). But the gods do not appear until a later stage; and if at this point they “distributed” the elements, these could not still have been ἀδιόριστα.
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οντων ἀπάντων καὶ ἀκατασκευάστων, ἀποδιωρίσθη τὰ ἑλαιφρὰ εἰς ὕψος, καὶ τὰ βαρέα ἑθεμελιώθη ὑφ’ ὑγρὰ ἁμμω, πυρὶ τῶν ὀλων διορισθέντων καὶ ἀνακρεμασθέντων πνεύματι ὄχεισθαι.¹

Καὶ ὡφθη ὁ οὐρανός ἐν κύκλοις ἑπτά, καὶ θεοὶ ταῖς ἐνάστροις ἰδεῖς ὄπτανόμενοι σὺν τοῖς αὐτῶν σημείοις ἀπασί. καὶ διηθρῶθη «ἡ πυρών οὐσία» ² σὺν τοῖς ἐν αὐτῇ θεοῖς. καὶ περιελίθη τὸ περικύκλιον ἀέρι, κυκλώ δρομήματι πνεύματι θεῖω ὄχουμενον.

§ 3. Ἀνήκε δὲ ἐκαστὸς θεὸς διὰ τῆς ἰδίας δυνάμεως τὸ προσταχθὲν αὐτῷ· καὶ ἐγένετο θηρία τετράποδα καὶ ἔρπετα καὶ ἐνυδρα καὶ πτηνά, καὶ πᾶσα σπορὰ ἐνσπόρος καὶ χόρτος καὶ ἄνθους παντὸς χλόη, τὸ σπέρμα τῆς παλυγγενεσίας ἐν ἑαυτοῖς.³

Ἐσπερμολόγουν ⁴ τε τὰς γενέσεις τῶν ἀνθρώπων εἰς ἐργὼν θείων γνώσιν καὶ φύσεως ἐνεργούσης ⁵ μαρτυρίαν· καὶ πλήθος ἀνθρώπων εἰς πάντων τῶν ὑπ’ οὐρανὸν δεσποτεῖαν καὶ ἀγαθῶν ἐπιγνωσιν, εἰς τὸ αὐξάνεσθαι εἰς αὐξῆσει καὶ πληθύνεσθαι εἰς πλήθει· καὶ πᾶσαν ἐν σαρκὶ ζωήν διὰ δρομήματος θεῶν ἐγκυκλίων ἀπορροφιάς ἐν τερασπορίας ἀπὸ καταπτίαν οὐρανοῦ καὶ δρομήματος οὐρανίων θεῶν καὶ ἐργῶν θείων καὶ φύσεως ἐνεργείας, εἰς τε σημεῖαν ⁶ ἀγαθῶν, εἰς γνώσις θείας.

¹ This may be taken as a somewhat violent case of the "epexegetic" infinitive, a construction which tends to be overworked in the LXX.

² A feminine substantive is required by αὐτῇ following, and it must be some substantive denoting the upper, heavenly sphere, as distinct from the lower sphere (τὰ ὑπ’ οὐρανῶν), which is dealt with in the following paragraph. I have adopted Scott’s suggestion. Another possibility would be ἡ ἀνωθερ’ φύς.

³ Scott adds ἔχοντες, but in a writer so notably under Jewish influence an imitation of the Hebrew nominative absolute is not impossible.

⁴ Sic MSS. The word is not properly used; but so poor a Hellenist as our author may perhaps have taken ἐσπερμολόγου to mean "sowed" or "caused to germinate" (perhaps with σπερματικὸς λόγος in mind). Otherwise it would be easy to emend ἐσπερμοβόλουν or ἐσπερμογόνον.

⁵ Sic Scott for MSS. ἐνεργούσαν.

⁶ Clearly corrupt. Scott suggests παρασκευάσας, with "God" understood as subject. But all terrestrial things, including man, are the work of subordinate gods.

⁷ Sic Scott for MSS. σημεία. But the text remains doubtful.
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δυνάμεως, μοίρας ἡ ὀψιλομενὴς  γυναι ἀγαθῶν καὶ
φαυλῶν, καὶ πασῶν τεχνῶν δαιμόνιαν εὑρεῖν.

§ 4. Ἀρκεὶ τε αὐτοῖς βιώσαι τε καὶ σοφισθήναι πρὸς
μοίραν δρομῆματος κυκλών θεῶν, καὶ ἀναλυθήναι εἰς ταῦτο,
καὶ ἐσονται μεγάλα ἀπομιμημενέματα τεχνουργημάτων ἐπὶ
tῆς γῆς καταλυόντες ἐν ὑόματι <εἰς> χρόνων ἁμαύρωσιν.

1 Corrupt. Scott suggests κεχωρισμένας.
2 AB, according to Parthey (not so cited by Scott), read πασῶν
ἀγαθῶν, which is impossible. I suggest τεχνῶν, as a feminine substantive
which would give good sense. Scott reads πάσαν with Parthey and
excises ἀγαθῶν.

3 I suggest this, without much confidence, for MSS. ἀρχεῖται αὐτῶν.
It would be just possible to construe the MS. text either (a) on the
analogy of poetical expressions like ἀρχεῖαι Διός: "From them (scil.
the gods) begins man's life, wisdom and dissolution"); but the infinitives
would need an expressed subject; or (b) as ἀρχεῖαι τὸ αὐτῶν βιώσαι
κ.τ.λ., "Their (scil. men's) life begins". But neither of these is
satisfactory. Another possible emendation would be ἀρχή τε αὐτοῖς,
"and so there was for them a beginning of living", etc. Scott, ύπάρχει
τε αὐτοῖς.

4 Scott emends to ἀφανισθήναι. But this would anticipate ἀναλυθήναι.
As God is "wisdom for the showing of all things", as well as their
"beginning", so man is created not only to live but also to grow wise.
This, and this alone, distinguishes him from the beasts.

5 MSS. εἰς ὀ. This may be a remnant of a text meaning "dissolved
into that from which they came". I suggest εἰς ταῦτα, giving sub­
stantially that sense. Parthey, εἰς τοῦτο. Scott leaves a lacuna in
his text, and suggests εἰς τὰ στοιχεῖα in his note.

6 This sentence is very obscure, and probably corrupt, but with the
slight emendation I suggest, the insertion of εἰς it is possible to construe it.
If we suppose that ἐν ὑόματι is a Hebraizing construction, based on
the so-called Beth essentiae; e.g. הַנַּבֵּה, "as an inheritance", הַנַּבֵּה, "as
my helper", "I appeared to them הַנַּבֵּה", i.e. "in my character
as El Shaddai" (Ex. vi. 3), etc. The LXX usually disguises the
construction by substituting a good Greek idiom, but Ezek. xlvii.
14, ἐν κληρονομίᾳ, and similarly in a few other passages. Similarly,
Aquila has ἐν θεῷ ἴκανω for הַנַּבֵּה. For ὑόμα in the sense of
"renown", "reputation", "name and fame", there are numerous
Old Testament parallels: e.g. Gen. xi. 4, where the generation after
the Flood propose to build the Tower of Babel—καὶ ποιήσωμεν ἐναυὸν
ὄνομα (which in view of the context might conceivably have been
in our author's mind); 2 Kms. viii. 13, καὶ ἐποίησεν Δαυίδ ὄνομα,
et passim. The reading εἰς χρόνων ἁμαύρωσιν restores a construction of
which this writer is excessively fond, cf. εἰς δείξεων ἀπάντων, εἰς ἐργῶν
θεῶν γνῶσιν, εἰς πάντων δεσποτείαν, εἰς κατοπτίαν ὀφαροῦ, εἰς σημείων
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Καὶ πᾶσα γένεσις ἐμψύχου σαρκὸς καὶ καρποῦ σπορᾶς καὶ πάσης τεχνουργίας τὰ ἐλαττοῦμενα ἀνανεώθησεται ἀνάγκη καὶ ἀνανεώσει θεῶν καὶ φύσεως κύκλου ἐναριθμίου δρομήματι.

Τὸ γὰρ θεῖον ἡ πᾶσα κοσμικὴ σύγκρασις φύσει ἀνανεομένη ἐν γὰρ τῷ θείῳ καὶ ἡ φύσις συγκαθέστηκεν.

§ 1. "The glory of all things is God and the Divine, and nature is divine.

"God is the beginning of existent things, both of mind and of nature and of matter, being Wisdom for the showing of all things.

"The Divine is the beginning both of nature and of energy, and is both necessity and end and renewal.

"For there existed boundless darkness in the abyss and thin, intelligent pneuma, existing in chaos by divine power.

"A holy light sprang into being, and the elements of germinal nature were consolidated. § 2. And when they were all undefined and unformed, the light elements were separated into the height, and the heavy were laid as a foundation beneath wet sand, while all things were delimited by fire, and suspended so as to be carried by pneuma.

"And the heaven appeared in seven cycles, and gods were revealed in their starry forms with all their constellations, and the fiery substance was articulated with the gods in it. And the surrounding sphere was rotated in air, carried in a cyclic course by divine pneuma.

§ 3. "And each god through his own power caused to

ἀγαθὸν, εἰς γνῶσιν θείας δυνάμεως, but in the present case εἰς would have to be taken in a slightly different sense—"pending", rather than "with a view to". The genitive χρόνων may be taken as subjective. Thus the sentence might mean, "they will have left great memorials as a (means of perpetuating their) name, pending their obliteration brought about by lapse of time". But the Greek is extraordinary, and the text remains uncertain. Scott reads, τῶν δὲ πολλῶν τὰ ὀνόματα ὁ χρόνος ἀμαρωθεί, a reconstruction which departs too far from the MSS. to carry conviction.

1 In the Stoic sense of warm gas in motion.
spring up that which was appointed to him; and there came into being animals fourfooted and creeping and aquatic and winged, and every germinal seed and grass and the herbage of every flower, with the seed of reproduction in them.

"And they (the gods) sowed the generations of men, to know God and to bear witness to nature in its activity; and a multitude of men to rule all things under heaven and to know good things, to grow in growth and multiply in multitude; and every incarnate soul, by the course of the cyclical gods, to behold heaven and the course of the heavenly gods, and divine works, and the activity of nature, and for the signification of good things, for knowledge of divine power, to know the divisions of good and evil, and to discover the craft of all arts.

§ 4. "And it is enough for them to live and to become wise, according to the allotment of the course of the cyclic gods, and to be dissolved into the same thing (from which they sprang). And they shall leave great memorials of works of art upon earth for a name until time shall dim them.

"And every generation of animate flesh and of the seed of fruit, and all those works of art that diminish, shall be renewed by necessity of the gods and of nature in the course of the numerical cycle.

"For the Divine is the whole cosmic composition renewed by nature. For in the Divine, nature itself consists."

The Sacred Discourse is, as Scott rightly holds, complete in itself, short as it is, and not a fragment of a larger work. It is a summary of the writer’s cosmology. This is substantially Stoic in character,¹ with very little or no admixture of Platonism such as is found in most of the Hermetica. It shows considerable resemblance to

¹ As Scott shows with ample illustrations from Chrysippus and later writers of the school.
the cosmology of Sanchuniathon as given by Philo of Byblos, with the difference that whereas the latter is atheistic, as Eusebius observed,¹ the *Sacred Discourse* is written to show that the Stoic account of the universe is not incompatible with belief in God. "Sanchuniathon" himself is probably dependent on *Genesis*, while elements of a more primitive Semitic mythology may lie behind both. But Scott concludes that there is no literary relationship between "Sanchuniathon" and the *Sacred Discourse*. The resemblance may be accounted for by the fact that both writers combine Stoicism with the Mosaic cosmogony. For that the Hermetic writer was acquainted with Gen. i., in the LXX version (or some version hardly differing from the LXX), is clear from the numerous verbal echoes, as well as from the close parallel in the working out of the process of creation. The teaching of this tractate may be described, in Scott's words, as "Judaeo-Stoic".

This tractate, therefore, calls for comparison with the *Poimandres*, which, as we have seen, is also dependent on *Genesis*. *Poimandres* also has Stoic elements, but they are combined with Platonic elements which give a very different complexion to its philosophy. In the *Sacred Discourse* there is no transcendent God, no archetypal universe, and the immortality of man, which is the dominant religious interest of the *Poimandres*, is here emphatically denied. It is enough for man to live, to acquire such wisdom as the astral gods allow, and then to pass away. The divergence in philosophical principles, however, does not rule out the possibility that one writer may have been indebted to the other, and the question must be discussed whether the Hebrew influence is in one or the other at second hand. With this question in mind, we may turn to compare the treatment of the biblical material in this tractate with that in the *Poimandres*.

THE SACRED DISCOURSE

I

The tractate begins with three aphorisms which give the theistic background of the cosmology which follows. This is expressed all through in the mixture of polytheistic and vaguely pantheistic terms congenial to Stoic writers; but in the opening aphorisms the author indicates that in his own belief God, or the Divine, stands behind the whole process. The first words—δόξα πάντων θεός—are certainly not Stoic or Greek in spirit, but they echo the sentiments of many Hebrew writers, e.g. Is. vi. 3, πλήρης πᾶσα ἡ γῆ τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ; Ps. lxxi. 17, εὐλογητὸν τὸ ὄνομα τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ ἐις τὸν αἰῶνα . . . καὶ πληρωθήσεται τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ πᾶσα ἡ γῆ; Sir. xlii. 17 (in a long cosmological passage), στηριχθήναι ἐν δόξῃ αὐτοῦ τὸ πᾶν.

In the second aphorism, ἄρχη τῶν ὄντων θεός, we have an echo of the opening words of Genesis, ἐν ἄρχη ἐποίησεν θεός. Further this ἄρχη, which is God, is also Wisdom. Jewish writers do not indeed identify Wisdom with God, but short of this, the teaching of the "Wisdom" school approximates to that of the present passage.

Prov. viii. 22,

Κύριος ἐκτισεν με ἄρχην τῶν δῶν αὐτοῦ εἰς ἔργα αὐτοῦ, πρὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐθεμελιώσεν με ἐν ἄρχῃ.

1 Scott emends these words, observing, "I can find no meaning in the statement that God is the δόξα of things". I do not think that a reader familiar with Hebraic ways of speech would find any great difficulty about it. In the Old Testament God is called δόξα μου (Ps. iii. 4, Is. xii. 2), δόξα σου (Is. lx. 19), δόξα αὐτοῦ (scil. of "my people", Jerem. ii. 11); i.e. it is by virtue of their relation to God that His people are glorious. Similarly, that which gives significance, beauty, or sublimity to the universe is its divine origin, and so God is its glory. Moreover, in Jewish thought "the glory" came to be an expression for the revealed presence of the transcendent God as immanent in the world. Since for the Stoic writer the immanent divine is the only God, the glory resident in the universe is God, sans phrase.

2 The Hebrew is more impressive, and perhaps nearer to the meaning of our passage, מַלֶּא כּל־הָאֲרָ stripslashes, "the fullness of the whole earth is His glory ".
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Wisd. ix. 9,
kai metá sou ἡ σοφία ἡ εἰδυῖα τὰ ἔργα σου
kai paroúsa òte ἐποίεις τὸν κόσμον.

Sir. i. 1 sqq.,
Πᾶσα σοφία παρὰ Κυρίου, καὶ μετ' αὐτοῦ ἐστὶν εἰς τὸν
αἰῶνα . . .

protéra pánτων ἔκτισται σοφία
καὶ σύνεσις φρονήσεως ἐξ αἰῶνος . . .

κύριος αὐτὸς ἐκτίσειν αὐτὴν.
καὶ ἰδεῖν καὶ ἐξηρίθμησεν αὐτὴν,
καὶ ἐξέχεεν αὐτὴν ἐπὶ πάντα τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ.

Cf. also Sir. xxiv. 3–6.

If for the Jew, Wisdom = ἀρχή, and for the Stoic, God = ἀρχή, then in a Judaeo-Stoic scheme God is Wisdom. He is wisdom “for the showing of all things”, i.e. as we might put it, He is the causa cognoscendi, as well as the causa essendi, of all things, the God of revelation as well as of creation.

In the third aphorism we are told that God is not only the beginning, but also the end of the universe. Cf. Rev. xxii. 13, ἐγὼ τὸ Α καὶ τὸ Ω, ὁ πρῶτος καὶ ὁ ἐσχατός, ἡ ἀρχή καὶ τὸ τέλος. Such formulations of the eternity of the divine being are common in religious writings of the Hellenistic period, Jewish, Christian and pagan. In the Old Testament they have antecedents in such passages as Is. xli. 4, xliv. 6, xlviii. 12.

Turning now to the cosmology proper, we may begin by reviewing the stages of creation as set forth by the three writers before us:

1 Cf. Plat., Laws, IV. p. 715e (cited as “Orphic”), ὁ μὲν δὴ θεὸς . . . ἀρχὴν τε καὶ τελετὴν καὶ μέσα τῶν ἄντων ἀπάντων ἔχων; Josephus, Ant. VIII. xi. 2, § 281, ἀρχὴ καὶ τέλος ἀπάντων. See also passages cited by Reitzenstein, Poin. 277, 286; Erlösungsmysterium, pp. 174, 244, Lohmeyer on Rev. i.e.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genesis</th>
<th>Poimandres</th>
<th>Logos Hieros</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Separation of waters above from waters below the firmament.</td>
<td>Separation of upper from lower elements.</td>
<td>Separation of upper from lower elements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Production of birds and fishes.</td>
<td>Production of birds and fishes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Production of land animals. Creation of man.</td>
<td>Production of land animals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The stages are not so clearly marked in the Sacred Discourse as in Genesis and Poimandres, but they obviously follow the same general plan. Both Poimandres and the Sacred Discourse omit the beginning of vegetable life at a stage before the appearance of the heavenly bodies, clearly as being "unscientific". The Sacred Discourse brings all sub-human life into the same stage, while it separates man from the animals, like the other two. So far, therefore, the three accounts go closely together. In one point Poimandres and the Sacred Discourse agree against Genesis, in one point Poimandres and Genesis agree against the Sacred Discourse, but neither of these points is of great significance. We must now turn to details.

Poimandres begins with all-pervading light, which is God. Then the troubled ocean of darkness appears, and with the differentiation of light and darkness creation is set on its course. Genesis begins with God on the one hand and on the other hand σκότος ἐπάνω
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tής ἀβύσσου, with the divine πνεῦμα moving over the waters (i. 2). The Sacred Discourse, which with its ἀρχή τῶν ὄντων ὁ θεός, echoes the LXX ἐν ἀρχή ἐστιν ὁ θεός, then proceeds to describe primeval chaos in terms which are close to the LXX—σκότος ἐν τῇ ἀβύσσῳ, ὄδωρ, and πνεῦμα. Manifestly the Sacred Discourse is nearer than Poimandres to Genesis; and it follows the natural meaning of the LXX (whether or not it was the intention of the original Hebrew) in stating that the three primeval essences, darkness, water and πνεῦμα, were in chaos by divine power. Further, the πνεῦμα is described in terms which recall Wisd. vii. 22-3:

εἴστιν γὰρ ἐν αὐτῇ (Wisdom) πνεῦμα νου ὀφραῦ, ἁγιον, μονογενεῖς πολυμερές, λεπτὸν . . . διὰ πάντων χωρῶν πνευμάτων νου ὀφρά καθαρῶν λεπτοτάτων.

The next stage begins, as in Genesis i. 3, with the emergence of light; whereas in Poimandres light was there before the beginning, and "after a little" darkness came into being. In the Sacred Discourse light simply "emerged" (ἀνείθη), but as God is the ἀρχή of all things, we may fairly add that it emerged, as matter existed, θεία δύναμι. It is not identified with the divine essence, as in Poimandres. The Sacred Discourse is to that extent closer to Genesis.

The immediate sequel of the emergence of light is the concretion of the elements out of raw chaos. Hitherto chaos has been described in biblical terms. It is now described as ὑγρά οὐσία, which we may compare with the ὑγρά φύσις of the Poimandres. There is, however, no reason to suspect any dependence of the one writing on the other, since ὑγρός and its compounds belong to the scientific vocabulary of the Stoic physicists in general. We may observe that the author of Poimandres was careful to avoid the use of the term "water" in his
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description of chaos, on the ground that water is one of the
discrete elements. Our present author is less scrupulous.
He allows the biblical terms to stand, and then introduces
the term υγρᾶ οὐσία as a belated concession to scientific
accuracy.

The elements are at first "undefined and unformed ",
ἀδιόριστα καὶ ἀκατασκεύαστα. The similarity of this phrase
to the LXX ἄορατος καὶ ἀκατασκεύαστος (Gen. i. 2) is clear.
That the primeval state of things lacked definition is a
commonplace of Greek philosophy from early days, and
Poimandres, as we saw, makes much of the gradual process
of delimitation or definition as the essential feature of
creation. Thus the substitution of the idea "undefined "
for "invisible " may in both writers be the consequence
of their philosophical prepossessions. But once again we
may raise the question whether a form of LXX text (or a
slightly different translation) existed, in which the chaotic
earth was described as ἄοριστος καὶ ἀκατασκεύαστος. It is
not impossible.

In its application of this terminology, however, the
Sacred Discourse departs both from Genesis and from the
scheme of Poimandres. In Genesis the invisible and
unformed earth, and the darkness over the abyss, are
alike features of primeval chaos, and this condition
disappears at once on the creation of light. Similarly, in
Poimandres the dark ocean is at once resolved into
discrete elements at the "voice of the light ". But in
this tractate there are two stages, the chaos of darkness,
water and πνεῦμα, and then, after the emergence of light,
a world of elements in formless confusion.

5

The next step in Genesis is the divine word γεννηθῆτω
στερέωμα ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ ὕδατος (i. 6), which has the effect of
separating the primeval ocean into two strictly defined
parts, the waters above and the waters below the firma­
ment. Both our Hermetic authors have seen in this the
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Stoic separation of the elements. The agreement is striking, and there are certain verbal echoes which might suggest interdependence. "Ελαφρός, εἰς ὕψος, (ἀνα)κρέμα­­σθαι,¹ πῦρ, are all terms used by the two Hermetic writers without any LXX parallels. If one is dependent on the other, we should be led at this point to allow precedence to the Poimandres, which gives the fuller and clearer account, and the one which is closer to the LXX. In Poimandres, as in Genesis, a divine word sets the differentiation of the elements in process, while in the Sacred Discourse nothing is said of the way in which it came about. It is also noteworthy that the continuation of this process in Genesis, viz. the separation of land and water, is clearly referred to in Poimandres, but not in the Sacred Discourse. On the other hand, it is just in this section that the LXX term ἀκατασκεύαστος, which Poimandres does not use, occurs in the Sacred Discourse, proving that its author must have gone to the LXX for himself. Again, the verb θεμελιοῦν, though it does not occur in Gen. i., is very common in other parts of the Old Testament which speak of the creation of the world. Thus even if we supposed that the author was influenced by the Poimandres, we should still have reason to conclude that he also had independent knowledge of Genesis. And the hypothesis of dependence on the Poimandres is unnecessary, in view of the fact that this is one of the places where both authors are interpolating conventional Stoic material into the biblical account. No account of creation on Stoic lines could be given without finding a place for the differentiation of the elements, and this was the inevitable point in the Hebrew creation story at which to introduce it.

From the separation of the elements the Sacred Discourse passes on directly to the appearance of the heavens and

¹ But cf. Job xxvi. 7, κρεμάζων γῆν ἐπὶ οὐδενός.
the heavenly bodies. Its dependence on the LXX can be readily traced. After describing the separation of the waters by a στερέωμα, Genesis proceeds, καὶ ἐκάλεσεν ὁ θεὸς τὸ στερέωμα οὐρανόν (i. 8). Next, earth and water are separated, καὶ ὄφη ἡ ξηρά (i. 9). Then, after the interlude of the creation of vegetable life, which both Hermetic writers pass over at this point, Genesis records the creation of the heavenly bodies εἰς σημεῖα (i. 14). The Sacred Discourse, having related the separation of the elements, proceeds: καὶ ὄφη ὁ οὐρανός ἐν κύκλως ἑπτά, καὶ θεοὶ ταῖς ἐνάστροις ἱδέαις ὁππανόμενοι σὺν τοῖς αὐτῶν σημεῖοι ἁπασίν. We can readily recognize in this a "telescoping" of the biblical account. The frank polytheism is out of harmony with the spirit of Gen. i.; but we may recall that Jewish thinkers found in it a place for secondary creators,¹ and further that the "gods" of philosophical paganism were not very different from the angelic orders of some forms of Jewish thought. Now, in the Secrets of Enoch ² the creation of the angelic orders is interpolated into the story of creation derived from Genesis: (on the second day) "from the rock I cut off a great fire, and from the fire I created the orders of the incorporeal ten troops of angels," or as another version has it, "the incorporeal troops, and all the troops of stars, of Cherubim, Seraphim and Ophanim, I cut off from the fire". If Scott is right in his restoration of the text of the Sacred Discourse at this point: καὶ δημηρβᾶθη ἡ πυρῶν οὐσία σὺν τοῖς ἐν αὐτῇ θεοῖς, the parallel with the Secrets of Enoch is close. Orthodox Judaism was careful to avoid the use of the term "gods" for these beings, but after all the Old Testament spoke of them as כָּל הַגָּאוֹן or כִּסְאָרֵי הַמְּחָסְרָא, and although the LXX often replaced these terms by ἄγγελοι,³ we do not know that all

² Secrets of Enoch, xxix. 3. The two Slavonic versions, denominated by Forbes and Charles A and B, are quoted.
³ The LXX translators have been at pains to replace the plural כִּסְאָרֵי הַמְּחָסְרָא or כָּל הַגָּאוֹן by ἄγγελοι (see pp. 22–3), where these terms
Greek-speaking Jews were so scrupulous. To a Jew of the periphery, or to a philosophic pagan approaching Judaism from the outside, the distinction between θεοὶ and ἄγγελοι might well seem no more than a difference of terminology upon which it would be pedantic to insist.\(^1\)

The astral gods here correspond to the διωκηταί of the Poimandres, and both tractates refer to the seven circles of heaven.\(^2\) But of the elaborate scheme of the Poimandres nothing else reappears in the Sacred Discourse. If the latter were dependent on the former we should be hard put to it to explain how it had so simplified the matter as to restore something like the biblical account, using some biblical terms ignored by the Poimandres. On the other hand, it is equally difficult to suppose that the author of Poimandres was indebted solely to the Sacred Discourse for his knowledge of the biblical cosmology at this point. He has followed Genesis in making a break 3 between the creation of the heavens (the fire-pneuma stratum) and the creation of the heavenly bodies, while the Sacred Discourse runs them together.

The next stage, the revolution of the heavens, is a piece of pure Stoicism, interpolated into the biblical account. Naturally it is given also in the Poimandres. No "scientific" cosmology could dispense with it. But there is no close contact between the two tractates in the way represent beings with a recognized status within the Jewish system, and to replace ἱλάτης, ἀλήθεια, ἀληθινός by εἰδώλων, γλυπτός, βδέλυγμα, in some places where pagan gods are meant, leaving the term θεοί in such phrases as θεὸς θεών, and elsewhere where no misunderstanding is possible as to their status. Even such survivals might seem to justify the recognition of "gods" subordinate to Jehovah.

\(^1\) The protest in Wisd. xiii. 1 sqq. against the deification of the κύκλος ἀστρων, the φωστήρες οὐρανοῦ, is directed against just the kind of teaching which we find in this tractate. Nevertheless, it might find a specious support even in Holy Writ.

\(^2\) The seven circles appear also in Secrets of Enoch, xxvii. 3.

\(^3\) In which we must place, though it is not mentioned at this point, the separation of land and water, which is not mentioned in the Sacred Discourse (see p. 143).
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in which it is described. The remaining stages of creation are given quite differently.

7

The origin of terrestrial life is attributed in the Sacred Discourse to the astral gods, each of whom has his appointed part in the work, and his own special power for carrying it through. We may take it that their rôle is "appointed" (προσταχθέν) by the supreme God (cf. Poin. § II, καθὼς θέλει ο Νοῦς). That a place could be found in the biblical account for secondary creators is shown by passages cited above (pp. 131, 137, 155). In the terms used for animal life the three cosmologies are in close contact:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LXX</th>
<th>Poimandres</th>
<th>Logos Hieros</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>θηρία τῆς γῆς, τετράποδα</td>
<td>θηρία ἀγρία καὶ ἣμερα</td>
<td>θηρία τετράποδα καὶ ἥπετα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κτήνη</td>
<td></td>
<td>τετράποδα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἥπετα</td>
<td>ἥπετα</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πετεινά</td>
<td>τοῦ οὐρανοῦ</td>
<td>πετεινὰ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἱχθύες τῆς δαλάσσης, κῆτη νηκτά</td>
<td></td>
<td>πτηνά 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The creatures, however, are differently grouped in the three documents. In the LXX (Gen. i. 20-5) water produces "creeping things" and birds (with fish and the larger marine animals), and earth produces quadrupeds and other land animals, and "creeping things". In Poimandres air produces flying things, water swimming things, and earth quadrupeds, "creeping things", and beasts wild and tame. In the Sacred Discourse they are all grouped together, and no indication is given which "god" was

1 The difference between πετεινά and πτηνά is little more than a difference of orthography.

1 Scott takes the creator-gods to be the elements themselves, but there is nothing of this, explicitly at least, in the text. The author speaks only of the astral gods, and in default of further evidence we must take these to be the creators of terrestrial life. Below we are told that it is through the course of the cyclic gods (i.e. the astral gods) that all flesh was generated, and in accordance with their course that wisdom comes to man.
responsible for each class. So far Poimandres is closer to Genesis, but in what follows the Sacred Discourse gives biblical material which is ignored in Poimandres, for it continues the catalogue to include vegetable life, of which Poimandres says nothing, and it does so in fairly close contact with the LXX (Gen. i. 11).

\[
\text{LXX:} \quad \text{Logos Hieros}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{βοτάνη} \chiόρτου, & \quad \text{πάσας} \sigmaπορα \varepsilonνα\sigmaς, \\
\sigmaπείρον \sigmaπέρμα \kappaατά \γένος, & \quad \chiλος, \tauο \σπέρμα \tauης \παλιγγενε\sigmaιας \varepsilonν \ἐαυτ/?\sigmaς \\
\varepsilonυλόν \κάρπιμον. & \\
\end{align*}
\]

Genesis gives the production of vegetable life at a point which is clearly "unscientific". The Hermetist places it along with the production of animal life.

8

We now come to the creation of man.\(^1\) Here Poimandres, following Genesis, made a definite break, refusing to associate man with the other animals, and emphasizing his specifically divine origin. The Sacred Discourse having grouped together all sub-human life, begins a new sentence, with a different verb, for the creation of man, but does not otherwise indicate any breach of continuity. The gods who had produced animal and vegetable life went on to produce man. The change of verb (\(\alphaν\varepsilon\kappaε, \varepsilon\sigmaπερμολόγου\)) does not appear to have any special significance. They "sowed" or "caused to germinate" the generations of man. Now Poimandres agrees that the mortal part of man came from the \(\deltaιοικη\tauαι\), the astral gods, and Philo found in Genesis a hint that it

\(^1\) Scott has a theory that the original account of the creation of man has dropped out, and that all we have left is an account of the perpetuation of the human race. I do not, however, see why we should make any such distinction. There is no evidence of a lacuna in the text, and the deliberate intention of the author seems to have been to teach that man is on a level with all other created things, except in "wisdom".
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was the work of the divine δυνάµεις, and not of God Himself. But both Genesis and Poimandres teach that man in his higher aspect is the image of God. This sublime doctrine is the climax of the biblical cosmology, and the determining motive of the Poimandres. The Sacred Discourse knows nothing of it. Nevertheless, the author follows the LXX as closely, from his point of view, as the author of the Poimandres does from his, and clearly independently.

The passage is obscure, but can be understood as giving three parallel descriptions of the human race (all in the accusative after ἐσπερμολόγον), associated with different aspects of the end for which man was created.

(i) The generations of men were created in order to know the works of God and to bear witness to the energizing of nature.

(ii) A multitude of men was created to rule over all things under heaven, and to know God, to increase and multiply.

(iii) Every incarnate soul was created to behold the heaven, the revolution of the gods, the works of God and the energizing of nature; to signify good things (?), to know the power of God, to recognize the apportionment of things good and evil, and to discover all arts.

There is some redundancy here. It is possible that the phrase ἔργων θεῶν καὶ φύσεως ἐνεργείας in (iii) has arisen from a dittography of the similar phrase in (i). But for the rest the threefold statement may be accepted as a summary of the ends for which man was created, viz.: (i) to know God in nature, (ii) to multiply and rule the earth, (iii) to study astronomy, theology, ethics and the arts—in other words, to become civilized.

This charter of humanity is similar in spirit to various passages in Hellenistic literature. Take, for example, Sir. xvii. 1–8:

1 See p. 155.
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Moreover, each of its three clauses has definite points of contact, in thought and language, with biblical documents, and in particular with the early chapters of Genesis and similar cosmological passages.

(a) The phrase τὰς γενέσεις τῶν ἀνθρώπων recalls Gen., v. 1, αὐτὴ ἡ βίβλος γενέσεως ἀνθρώπων. The phrase ἔργων θείων recalls the common Old Testament expression "the works of the Lord ", used with special reference to creation; cf. especially the conclusion of the creation narrative, Gen. ii. 2, κατέπαυσεν (ὁ θεὸς) ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ ὧν ἐποίησεν. That man was created to know the works of God is not explicitly stated in Scripture, but it might fairly be supposed to be implied in the statement that immediately after his creation Adam passed the creatures in review and gave them names, while in the prophets and the wisdom literature the knowledge of God is frequently associated with the consideration of His works.

(b) That man was created to increase and multiply, and to have dominion over the creatures is emphatically stated
in Gen. i. 28: ἡ γίνεσθαι αὐτῶς ὁ θεός λέγων, Αὔξάνεσθε καὶ πληθύνεσθε καὶ πληρώσατε τὴν γῆν καὶ κατακυριεύσατε αὐτής, καὶ ἀρχεῖ καὶ τῶν ἱχθύων κ.τ.λ., language which is distinctly echoed in the Sacred Discourse: πληθὸς ἀνθρώπων εἰς πάντων τῶν ὑπὸ οὐρανοῦ δεσποτεῖαν ... εἰς τὸ αὔξανεσθαι ἐν αὐξήσει καὶ πληθύνεσθαι ἐν πληθεῖ. For the term δεσποτεία in this connection cf. Wisd. ix. 2, κατεσκεύασας ἀνθρωπον ἵνα δεσπόζῃ τῶν ὑπὸ σοῦ γενομένων κτισμάτων. It is noteworthy that Poimandres also echoes this passage (and with a similar departure from the wording of Genesis, on which see below), but that it divides the charge into two parts. Man in his first state has authority over the creatures, but he is not charged to increase and multiply until after the Fall. Here the Sacred Discourse is nearer to Genesis, to which this ascetic depreciation of sex is strange.

(c) The expression πᾶσαν ἐν σαρκὶ ψυχῆν ¹ recalls the phrase of Gen. ii. 7, ἐγένετο ὁ ἄνθρωπος εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν, combined with the description of man’s mortal nature as σάρξ in Gen. ii. 23–4, vi. 3, and in the Old Testament in general (whereas Poimandres uses σῶμα for the material part of man). The phrase πᾶσα ψυχῆ happens to be used in Gen. i. only in reference to animals, but elsewhere in the LXX it is frequently applied to man. For the idea and the expression εἰς κατοπτείαν οὐρανοῦ cf. Ps. viii. 4:

ὅτε ὄψομαι τοὺς οὐρανοὺς, ἔργα τῶν δακτύλων σου, σελήνην καὶ ἀστέρας ἀ σὺ ἐθεμελίωσας,

in a context which associates man’s contemplation of God’s works in the heavens with his rule over His works below. For γνῶσιν θείας δυνάμεως cf. Ps. lxii. 3, ιδεῖν τὴν δυναμίν σου καὶ τὴν δόξαν σου: Ps. lxxvi. 15, ἐγκύρισας ἐν τοῖς λαοῖς σου τὴν δύναμίν σου. The idea expressed in μοίρας γνῶσιν ἀγαθῶν καὶ φαβλῶν was no doubt suggested by the language of Gen. ii. 17, about the tree τοῦ γνῶσκεν

¹ Scott reads πᾶσαν ἐναρκον ψυχῆν, cf. ἐνσοπορος, ἐμψυχος. This may be right, but the emendation is not entirely necessary.
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καλὸν καὶ πονηρὸν. According to Genesis such knowledge was a part of the Fall of man. According to Poimandres the attainment of knowledge is a remedy for the Fall. For our present author man was intended from the beginning to possess the knowledge of good and evil. Although this contradicts the myth of Genesis, it is in harmony with later Jewish thought. Cf. Sir. xvii. cited above; and Secrets of Enoch, xxx. 13–15: "And I appointed him a name . . . and I called his name Adam, and showed him the two ways, the light and the darkness, and I told him, 'This is good and that bad'." Thus, although the Hermetic writer here departs from his biblical model, he does so in company with Jewish thinkers of the Hellenistic period. The interest in the arts again is not characteristic of the Old Testament, but appears in Sirach.

We now come to the concluding paragraphs, in which the writer, repudiating the doctrine of man's immortality, asserts the Stoic doctrine of the cyclic dissolution and renewal of all things, including man. To live, to be as wise as fate allows, and then to die, is the destiny of man, βιώσαι τε καὶ σοφισθήναι πρὸς μοίραν δρομήματος κυκλών θεών, καὶ ἀναλυθήναι. The verb σοφίζεσθαι is common in Sirach, and is found not infrequently in other parts of the LXX. Cf. Sir. l. 28:

μακάριος δὲ ἐν τούτῳ ἀναστραφήσεται,
καὶ θείς αὐτὰ ἐπὶ καρδίαν αὐτοῦ σοφισθήσεται.

The idea that the chief value of human life lies in the acquisition of wisdom is the universal teaching of the Jewish wisdom literature (unless we include Ecclesiastes in it; in this book σοφίζεσθαι is a waste of time, ii. 15, etc.). Poimandres does not speak of σοφία, but only of γνῶσις. The Sacred Discourse is nearer to the language of Hellenistic Judaism.
THE SACRED DISCOURSE

The belief that man at death comes to an end and is resolved into that from which he came (which is probably the meaning of ἀναλυθῆναι εἰς ο...ο...) is the consistent teaching of most of the Old Testament, and is explicitly enunciated in Gen. iii. 19, γῆ εἰ καὶ εἰς γῆν ἀπελεύση. Similarly, in Sirach man returns at death εἰς μητέρα πάντων, for πάντα ὅσα ἀπὸ γῆς εἰς γῆν ἀναστρέφει (xl. i, ii). Sirach preserves the old Hebrew tradition, with which our writer's Stoicism is in harmony. Wisdom, like Poimandres, platonizes. The curious reference, again, to men who leave memorials on earth, which perish with lapse of time, finds a parallel in Sirach. Καὶ ἔσονται, says our author, μεγάλα ἀπομνημονεύματα τεχνουργημάτων ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς καταλυόντες εὖ ὑνόμαι εἰς χρόνων ἀμαύρωσιν. Cf. Sir. xlv. 8–9:

εἰσὶν αὐτῶν οἱ κατέλυσιν ὄνομα
tοῦ δημηγόρασθαι ἑπάνυσιν,
καὶ εἰσὶν δὲν οὐκ ἔστιν 
καὶ ἀπώλοντο ὡς οὐχ ὑπάρξαντες,
καὶ ἐγένοντο ὡς οὐ γεγονότες,
καὶ τὰ τέκνα αὐτῶν μετ᾽ αὐτοὺς.

We have already observed (p. 213, note 6) that the MS. text here gives a crabbed grammatical construction which is barely intelligible as Greek, but could be explained as an imitation of Hebrew idiom. The word ἀμαύρωσις is not itself Septuagintal, but Theodotion has ἀμαύρωσις εἰδώλων in Amos v. 26, for כְּתִי צֵל חַד (deriving כְּתִי from חַד). The verb ἀμαυροῦν is used in a sense approximating to that of the present passage in LXX of Lam. iv. 1, πῶς ἀμαυρωθήσεται χρυσόν, ἀλλοωθήσεται τὸ ἀργύριον τὸ ἀγαθὸν: as well as in Wisd. iv. 12, βασκανία γὰρ φαυλότητος ἀμαυροὶ τὰ καλά.

The Sacred Discourse, however, in accordance with the Stoic doctrine of cycles, contemplates a renewal of all things, including man, after their destruction. This is its
substitute for immortality. We shall not expect to find direct biblical warrant for this theory. It is possible that the writer, observing that after the destruction of living things by the Flood the primeval charge to increase and multiply is repeated, considered this to be such an ἀναβέσσις as he contemplates. It is possible, but there is no evidence in the tractate that it was so. In the Secrets of Enoch, however, the biblical tradition is reconciled with belief in an after life as follows (xxxii. i): "I said to him (Adam), 'Earth thou art and into the earth whence I took thee thou shalt go; and I will not ruin thee, but send thee whence I took thee; then I can again take thee at my second coming'". This is, of course, orthodox Pharisaic doctrine, and not identical with Stoicism, but a Stoic student of Jewish tradition might hardly be aware of the difference. It is in fact nearer to Stoicism than to the Platonism of Wisdom.

As for the language, πᾶσα γένεσις ἐμψύχου σαρκός may be regarded as an elaboration of the familiar biblical term πᾶσα σάρξ (= בְּנֵי-אָדָם), which in Gen. ix. 11, and other places, includes man and the animals, and the expression καρπὸς σπορᾶς may be compared with Gen. i. 29, καρπὸν σπέρματος.

Our examination of the Sacred Discourse has shown that it is in touch with the Old Testament and with Hellenistic-Jewish tradition, as Poimandres is, but often in different ways. Formally, this writer follows the creation story of Genesis more closely than the other, though he abbreviates it. We have found less occasion to refer to exegesis of the Philonic type to elucidate the relation of the Hermetic text to the biblical. It seems clear that each writer has gone to the biblical source for himself. Since first one and then the other shows closer contact with Genesis, and each introduces biblical elements at points where they are ignored by the other, it is
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impossible to suppose that either was dependent on the other for his knowledge of the Hebrew myth. It remains possible that one writer may have been acquainted with the work of the other as well as with the biblical source common to both. In that case we should be almost compelled to give precedence to the shorter and simpler tractate. But there is very little evidence for this. The agreements between the two where they are independent of Genesis are few, and can readily be explained as Stoic commonplaces natural to both. The only significant point where, following Genesis, they agree against the LXX text is in the emphatic form given to the divine command, αὐξάνεσθε ἐν αὐξήσει καὶ πληθύνεσθε ἐν πλήθει. It is almost impossible to suppose that they hit upon this identical modification of the biblical text independently. Either we must suppose that the author of Poimandres had the wording of the Sacred Discourse in mind when he wrote,¹ although he was following the LXX (of Gen. ix.), or we must suppose that both were using some form of the Hebrew creation story in which this peculiar form of the divine command occurred. This may have been either an unknown version of Genesis differing slightly from the LXX, or, as Scott suggests, "some document based on a Semitic original in which the words of Genesis were paraphrased or expanded". The difficulty of the latter form of the hypothesis is that both tractates have so many echoes of the actual text of the LXX; and indeed if we tried to imagine the nature of such a document, it might turn out to be something not very different from the Sacred Discourse itself. But it is certain that other versions of various parts of the Old Testament existed besides those to which we can give names. The Ἐτερός cited occasionally in the Hexapla must represent such versions. The variants in MSS. of the LXX are by no means always cases of simple textual corruption, but must

¹ But this is the less likely, since the Sacred Discourse alludes to the command in the infinitive, while Poimandres quotes it in the imperative.
sometimes represent alternative versions. What process of trial and revision went on before the received text of the LXX emerged we do not know. It is not impossible that a version of Genesis circulated for a time, otherwise closely similar to the resultant LXX version, but giving the divine command in this peculiar form.\(^1\) If so, then it is just possible that it rendered ἄρατος but ἀδριστὸς καὶ ἀκατασκεύαστος.\(^2\) But this is speculative. I cannot offer any certain, or even highly probable, explanation of this puzzling phenomenon.

The conclusion is certain, that in this tractate we have the work of a second author, among those whose writings are included in the Hermetic Corpus, who found in the Hebrew Scriptures an authoritative account of the creation of the world, and took pains to re-interpret it in terms of Greek philosophy for a pagan public. So much is clear. The writer himself we should naturally regard as a pagan, in view of his polytheistic language. But since we have seen reason to suspect that his knowledge of Greek was not perfect, and that some of his idioms may show Hebrew influence, it remains possible that he was himself a highly unorthodox Jew. In any case, the tractate has come down to us through pagan tradition, and it was one of the obscure channels through which Jewish influence entered into general Hellenistic thought independently of Christianity.

For determining the date of the tractate we have practically no material. So far as its type of philosophy is concerned, it might well go back to the time before Posidonius, since its Stoicism is uninfluenced by Platonism. No trace of it is to be found in any later work. Scott proposes to place it in the first century, along with the work of "Sanchuniathon", to which it is most closely akin.

\(^1\) The unauthorized introduction of the emphatic form would not be without parallel. As we saw, in Exodus xi. 9 the LXX give πληθύνων πληθύνω, where M.T. has the simple verb.

\(^2\) See p. 112.
CHAPTER XI

FURTHER TRACES OF JEWISH INFLUENCE IN THE HERMETICA

Beyond the tractates we have already studied the Hermetica do not afford certain evidence of direct dependence on the LXX. There are, indeed, numerous parallels of thought with the Hellenistic Judaism of Philo, but in the main these represent rather external influence on Philo than Jewish influence upon the Hermetic writers. But there are places where ideas or forms of expression occur which remind the reader of the language and thought of the Bible. Since we know that Jewish influence was a factor in some of the Hermetic writings, it is permissible to suspect that such resemblances are more than coincidence.

Corp. II.

This tractate teaches a peculiar doctrine in which τόπος appears as a mediating essence between the transcendent God, identical with the Good, and this world. It is described as θείον τι, and apparently identified with νοῦς. This recalls the use of the word τόπος in the LXX in a paraphrase for ἄνωθεν, on which Philo bases his doctrine of the λόγος as τόπος, as well as the Jewish use of דַּיֵּב as a periphrasis of the divine name. See Chapter I. pp. 20–1. But Scott cites from Eudemus the statement that the Persians gave the name Τόπος to the God (Zervan) who is in Greek more usually called Αἰών or Χρόνος (Κρόνος).¹

There is nothing beyond this which suggests a Jewish

¹ The term is used by Christian Gnostics. See Scott ad loc.
source, though the emphasis on the transcendence and the exclusive goodness of God, Who "gives everything and receives nothing", and the description of Him as Father, are in harmony with Jewish teaching.

_Corp. IV. Κρατήρ η Μονάς._

This important tractate, which like the _Poimandres_ was known to the author of _Corp._ XIII., sets out to explain how it is that some men, but not all, have νόος. God gave all men λόγος, but made νόος a prize to be contended for. He sent down a great bowl (κρατήρ) filled with νόος, with the proclamation, βάπτισον σεαυτήν ἡ δυναμενή (ψυχή) εἰς τὸ τοῦ τὸν κρατήρα. Those who have heard the call and responded receive the gift of νόος, and are united with God, in fact are deified.

The following points may be noted:

§ 1. The opening sentence, τὸν πάντα κόσμον ἐποίησεν ὁ δημιουργός, ὁ χρόνον ἀλλὰ λόγων, is good Jewish doctrine; cf. passages quoted on _Poim._ § 5. The doctrine of the creative word, however, is also found in ancient Egyptian religious thought, as Reitzenstein and Scott observe, and in this case the evidence of direct dependence on the LXX, which we found in _Poimandres_, is lacking.

§ 2. θεάτης γὰρ ἐγένετο τῶν ἔργων τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ ἀνθρώπως, καὶ ἑθαύμασε καὶ ἑγνώρισε τῶν ποιησάντα. This is the teaching of _Corp._ III., and has Jewish affinities. The expression τὰ ἔργα τοῦ θεοῦ is closer to LXX usage than the ἔργα θεία of _Corp._ III. See Chapter X. p. 228.

§ 9. The Good, which is God, is invisible to the eyes, οὐ γὰρ μορφὴ οὔτε τύπος ἐστὶν αὐτῷ. This is a commonplace of the higher paganism of the time. But it is certain that the mysterious God of the Jews, who dwelt in thick darkness, and of whom no image might be made, exercised a deep impression upon religious minds. See Norden, _Agnostos Theos_, pp. 58 sqq.

While the main doctrine of _The Bowl_ is certainly not Jewish, and there is not sufficient evidence of direct
dependence on the LXX, it would be unwise to rule out Jewish influence as a possible factor in shaping the writer’s thought of God.

Corp. V. "Οτι ἀφανὴς ὁ θεὸς φανερῶτατὸς ἐστὶν.

The general theme, that the supreme God, though invisible, is nevertheless to be apprehended in the universe, is congenial to Jewish thought. Scott notes, “The distinction between τὸ ἀφανὲς and τὸ φανερὸν corresponds to the Platonic distinction between τὸ νοητὸν and τὸ αἰσθητὸν. But the terms ἀφανὲς and φανερὸν are not thus used by Plato; the writer must have got them from some other source; and his use of these terms may possibly be due to Egyptian influence.” In that case, the same influence may account for Philo’s very frequent use of the same pair of terms. The occasional use of adjectives in the LXX is not closely similar.

In his account of the relation between God and the universe, the writer uses language which is scarcely consistent with itself. Sometimes he describes God as the Father and Maker of all things, and other times he uses the language of pantheism, πάντα γὰρ μόνος οὐτός ἐστιν. This pantheism, Scott thinks, is Egyptian rather than Stoic. The other strain in his teaching is presented in a form which strongly recalls passages in the Old Testament. "If you would see Him, consider the sun, consider the course of the moon, consider the order of the stars. Τίς ὁ τὴν τάξιν τηρῶν; . . . τίς ὁ ἐκάστῳ τὸν τρόπον καὶ τὸ μέγεθος τοῦ δρόμου δρίσας; ἄρκτος αὐτή ἣ περὶ αὐτῆν στρέφουσα καὶ τὸν πάντα κόσμον συμπεριφέρουσα, τίς ὁ τοῦτο κεκτημένος τὸ ὄργανον; τίς ὁ τῇ θαλάσσῃ τοὺς ὄρους περιβαλών; τίς ὁ τὴν γῆν ἐδράσας;" 1 ( §§ 3–4). And again, Μάθε τίς ὁ δημιουργὸς τὴν καλὴν ταύτην καὶ θείαν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου εἰκόνα. τίς τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς περιγράψας;—and so on through all the bodily organs, and finally, Τίς

1 Cf. Prov. viii. 25, πρὸ τοῦ ὧν ἐδρασθῆναι.
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πάντα ταῦτα ἐποίησε; ποιά μήτηρ, ποῖος πατὴρ, εἰ μὴ μόνος ὁ ἀφανὴς θεὸς τῷ ἐαυτοῦ θελήματι πάντα δημιουργήσας; (§§ 6–7). This appeal to the “vestiges of the Creator” in a series of rhetorical questions is to be found, for example, in Is. xl. 12:

Τίς ἐμέτρησεν τῇ χειρί τὸ ὕδωρ,
καὶ τὸν οὐρανὸν σπιθαμῆ,
καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν δρακί;
tίς ἐστησεν τὰ ὀργ σταθμῷ,
καὶ τὰς νάπας ξυγῷ;

and on a grander scale in Job xxxviii.

Ποῦ ἦς ἐν τῷ θεμελιωτεῖ με τὴν γῆν;
ἀπάγγειλον δὲ μοι, εἰ ἐπιστῇ σύνεσιν.
tίς ἐθετο τὰ μέτρα αὐτῆς, εἰ οἶδας;
ἡ τίς ὁ ἐπαγαγῶν σπαρτίων ἐπ’ αὐτῆς; . . .
ἐφραξα δὲ θάλασσαν πυλαῖς . . .
ἐδέμην δὲ αὐτῇ ὄρια . . .
tίς ἐστιν ὑπὸν πατήρ;
tίς δὲ ἐστιν ὁ τετοκῶς βύσιοι δρόσου;
ἐκ γαστρὸς δὲ τίνος ἐκπορεύεται ὁ κρύσταλλος;
pάχνην δὲ ἐν οὐρανῷ τίς τέτοκε;
. . .
συνῆκας δὲ δεσμὸν Πλειάδος,
καὶ φραγμὸν Ὄριωνος ἕνοικες; . . .
tίς δὲ ὁ ἄριθμὸν νέφη σοφία,
οὐρανὸν δὲ εἰς γῆν ἐκλινεν;

Cf. also Prov. xxiv. 27:

Τίς ἀνέβη εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ κατέβη;
tίς συνῆγαγεν ἀνέμους ἐν κόλπῳ;
tίς συνέστρεψεν ὕδωρ ἐν ὕματι;
tίς ἐκράτησεν τῶν ἄκρων τῆς γῆς;
tί ὄνομα αὐτῷ;
ἡ τί ὄνομα τοῖς τέκνοις αὐτοῦ;
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Job xxxiv. 13, Τίς δὲ ἐστιν ὁ ποιῶν τὴν ὑπ' οὐράνων καὶ τὰ ἔνοντα πάντα;

Clearly we must say either that a common Oriental religious style lies behind both the biblical and the Hermetic writers, or that the Hermetist was influenced by the LXX directly or indirectly.

Norden, Agnostos Theos, pp. 181 sqq., cites the concluding passage of this tractate, beginning Πότε δέ σε, πάτερ, ὑμνήσω, as an example of a widespread religious style with Egyptian, Babylonian and other models. The tone of that passage is markedly pantheistic. On the contrary, the passage I have cited is in harmony with the Hebrew doctrine of creation, and its style approaches more nearly to Hebrew models. It seems a reasonable inference that in addition to the general Oriental background of his thought and style, this writer had some specific acquaintance with the Hebrew Scripture, or writings based upon them.

§ 2. Ἐξειρ πρῶτον τῷ κυρίῳ καὶ πατρὶ καὶ μόνῳ . . . ἀφθονος γὰρ ὁ κύριος. The use of the term κύριος as a divine title is of uncertain origin. It is not Greek, more probably Semitic.¹ The Egyptian use of expressions like κύριος Σαράπις, attested by papyri, is less like the usage of this tractate than the LXX usage in which κύριος stands for the one and only God.²

§ 10. οὐ τόπος ἐστι περί σε. Scott (who emends the passage drastically) thinks this is a possible allusion to the Jewish use of τόπος to which we have referred. But the meaning is simple. God is omnipresent, hence there is no space to encompass Him. The same idea is in Philo, but it is not necessarily derived from the LXX.³

¹ See Ch. I. pp. 8-11.
² The term κύριος is similarly used in the Λόγος Τέλειος as quoted by Lactantius (see pp. 128, 163), and is represented by dominus in its Latin translation, the Asclepius (e.g. §§ 8, 10, 20, 26—i.e. in the first and third of the tractates which were combined in the Λόγος Τέλειος, according to Scott).
³ See Ch. I. pp. 20-1.
This important tractate, which has relations with *Poimandres* and with *Corp. IV.*, expounds the doctrine of rebirth, and offers some notable parallels with the Fourth Gospel. It is unlikely that the idea of rebirth has Jewish origins. Apparent allusions to the idea in Jewish sources are of two kinds: (1) The people is said to have been "born again" when it was delivered from destruction by God; (2) the proselyte is said to have the legal status of a new-born child within the Jewish community.\(^1\) The term Περι Παλιγγενεσίας is known to Philo (i) in the sense of resurrection from the dead, and (ii) in the Stoic sense of the renewal of the universe after a periodic cataclysm. There is therefore no ground for seeking a Jewish origin for the main doctrine of the tractate. A few expressions suggest possible Jewish influence. The word σωθήναι is used in a way parallel to that which Christianity took over from Judaism (μηδένα δύνασθαι σωθῆναι πρὸ τῆς παλιγγενεσίας, § 1). There is an emphasis on the mercy of God which is much more Hebraic than Greek (οὐ καταπαύσει τὸ ἔλεος εἰς ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ, § 8, ὅστις οὖν ἔτυχε κατὰ τὸ ἔλεος τῆς κατὰ θεὸν γενέσεως, § 10).

At the close, however, of the tractate a hymn is appended which has many points of contact with the LXX. The introductory verses show, sentence by sentence, striking similarities with biblical language (§§ 17–18).

\(^1\) See the material collected by Strack-Billerbeck on *Jn. iii. 3.*
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οὐρανόν, τὰ μέρη τοῦ παντός καὶ σύμπαντα τὸν κόσμον, ὁ μέγιστος βασιλεὺς, παρακαλέσαντες εἰς εὐχαριστίαν τὴν σήν ἦκομεν.

2. Μέλλω γὰρ ὑμνεῖν τὸν κτίσαντα τὰ πάντα, τὸν πήξαντα τὴν γῆν, καὶ ἐπιτάξαντα ἐκ τοῦ ὁκεανοῦ τὸ γλυκὸ ὦδωρ εἰς τὴν οἰκουμένην καὶ ἀοίκητον ὑπάρχειν εἰς διατροφήν καὶ χρήσιν πάντων ἀνθρώπων, τὸν ἐπιτάξαντα πῶς φανήσαι εἰς πᾶσαν πράξιν θεοῖς τε καὶ ἀνθρώποις.

There is no one passage which can be adduced as parallel, but there is a striking general resemblance to numerous passages in the Psalms, the Book of Job, and elsewhere, which celebrate the works of the Lord. Cf. especially Ps. ciii., Job xxxviii.

3. Δῶμεν πάντες ὅμοι (the creatures are addressed) αὐτῷ τὴν εὐλογίαν τῷ ἐπὶ τῶν οὐρανῶν μετεώρῳ, τῷ πάσης φύσεως κτίσῃ.

Cf. Dan. iii. 57 sqq., εὐλογεῖτε πάντα τὰ ἔργα κυρίου τὸν κύριον ὑμείτε καὶ ὑπερψυθότε αὐτῶν εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, and the whole of the Benedicite.

Ps. lxvii. 34, ψάλτε τῷ θεῷ τῷ ἐπιβεβηκότι ἐπὶ τῶν οὐρανῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, et simm. passim.

4. Αἱ δυνάμεις αἱ ἐν ἐμοὶ ὑμείτε τὸ ἐν καὶ τὸ πᾶν.

Cf. Ps. cii. 1, εὐλογεῖ ἡ ψυχή μου τὸν κύριον, καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐντός μου τὸ ὄνομα τὸ ἄγιον αὐτοῦ.

Thus practically the whole introduction to the hymn is composed of what we may fairly call biblical material. After the introduction it continues with material derived from the teaching of the tractate itself.

While, therefore, in the body of the tractate we have no more than general echoes of biblical ideas or language, such as may be found in Corp. II. and IV., the annexed hymn shows undoubted dependence on the poetry of the Greek Bible.

Finally, in some of the remaining tractates, we may perhaps discern traces of Jewish influence in the following turns of expression:
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(i) Δόξα is used in a Hebraic rather than a Greek sense in Corp. XIV. 7, μἷα γὰρ ἐστιν αὐτῷ δόξα, τὸ ποιεῖν τὰ πάντα (cf. Corp. III. 1); and Corp. X. 7, αὕτη ψυχῆς ἡ τελειοτάτη δόξα.

(ii) Νόμος is used in an unusual context, where we should rather expect δίκη or the like from a Greek writer, in Corp. XII. 4, ταύταις δὲ ὀσπερ τιμωρον καὶ ἔλεγχον ὁ θεὸς ἐπέστησε τῶν νόμων. But there is nothing specifically Jewish about this use of νόμος.

(iii) Corp. XI. 3, ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ σοφία, is an expression of a biblical rather than a Platonic or Stoic cast.

(iv) Corp XI. 5, μηδέποτε τῶν κάτω μὴ τῶν ἄνω ὀμοιόν τι ἡγήσῃ τῷ θεῷ, recalls fairly frequent biblical expressions. Cf. Ps. lxxxv. 8, οὐκ ἐστιν ὀμοίος σου ἐν θεοῖς κύριε, and similarly Ps. lxxxviii. 7–8, xxxiv. 10, lxx. 19, Exod. xv. 11, Is. xl. 18, τίνι ὀμοίωσατε κύριον, and similarly Is. xl. 25, xlvi. 5. Cf. also Exod. xx. 4, οὐ ποιήσεις σεαυτῷ εἴδωλον οὐδὲ παντὸς ἐμοίωμα, ὅσα ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ἄνω καὶ ὅσα ἐν τῇ γῇ κάτω.

To sum up: while in Corp. I., III. and VII. there is definite evidence of dependence on biblical sources, in the rest of the Corpus there are indications that among the variety of elements contributory to the Hermetic philosophy of religion Jewish influence is to be included. It will have been in most cases indirect, but in Corp. V. and in the hymn appended to Corp. XIII., direct influence of the LXX is probable.
CHAPTER XII

CONCLUSION: JUDAISM, THE HERMETICA AND CHRISTIANITY

Our investigation has been concerned with one particular phenomenon—the infiltration of Jewish tradition into one special current in the religious thought of the Hellenistic world, namely, that represented by the Hermetic Corpus. The limited range of the investigation does not justify conclusions of a general kind. Nevertheless, some attempt must be made to relate the facts before us to the history of religious thought in the period to which they belong.

The Hermetic writers were not the only pagan thinkers who showed an interest in Judaism. The Jewish religion drew attention to itself, in an age in which many religions sought to commend their teaching to the public, and there is a good deal of evidence of widespread curiosity about it. The Jewish insistence upon one supreme God, completely other than man, worshipped without images, in a temple where His presence was symbolized by darkness and silence, appealed to the best pagan thought of the time, which was all moving, along different lines, towards monotheism.¹ From the time when the Pentateuch, and later the other writings of the Old Testament, were translated into Greek, the fundamental documents of the Jewish faith were accessible to all whose curiosity, or whose zeal for truth, led them to explore the religious field. In the Jewish Diaspora there were many prepared

¹ On this point Norden, Agnostos Theos, offers interesting material in abundance.
to interpret and commend the teachings of these documents, meeting half-way the general tendencies of the thought of the time. One result of this was the gaining of proselytes, or semi-proselytes, to Judaism, and it is generally recognized that this was an important factor in preparing the way for Christian propaganda.1 But the names of such writers as Plutarch, Philo of Byblos, and Numenius may stand for a class of persons who never could have thought of attaching themselves in any way to the Jewish religion, and yet were interested in its teachings. The Hermetic writers belong to a similar class.

Their approach is typical of a special tendency in Hellenistic religious thought. In the widespread reaction against the pure rationalism of some schools of philosophy, there was a tendency to turn to religion as a way to higher knowledge, γνώσις, the direct knowledge of ultimate things. Philosophy was to be the handmaid of γνώσις, which itself was held to come from divine revelation preserved in various ancient religious traditions, or communicated directly to prophets. The philosophy which lent itself to such purposes was that which was derived from Plato, but it was Platonism treated in quite a different spirit from that of the Academy itself, Platonism with its mystical and theistic elements emphasized. With it was combined a revived Pythagoreanism, and Stoicism from Posidonius onwards assimilated itself to the same general tendency. This philosophy was employed to interpret or rationalize the mythology and ritual of various religions of the Near East, on the understanding that rightly understood they all communicated divinely revealed γνώσις. The Hermetica in general are documents of this kind of religious philosophy. They presuppose an original divine revelation given through Hermes Trismegistus and other mythical figures like Tat

(Thoth) and Asclepius. In the writings of the Corpus the mythological element is for the most part kept in the background, or severely rationalized, though in some other *Hermetica*, as in the *Isis to Horus*, it is more explicit.

Passages from the Hermetic writings are often cited, in a rather loose fashion, as evidence for the "Mystery-religions". But it should be clearly understood that we have no reason whatever for supposing that the writers of the Corpus at any rate were devotees of any of these religions in the sense of practising the ritual which was their essential feature. On the contrary, it is clear that the only kind of initiation which they recognize is a purely spiritual initiation into the truth about God, man and the world, revealed to prophets and seers; and the communion with the divine of which they speak is not sacramental but mystical. They offer the Vision of God to which the ritual of the Mysteries seems to have been directed, not through any sort of ritual observance, but through the discipline of an ascetic life and meditation upon high themes. They presuppose a higher synthesis of all religions, and are prepared to accept the witness of them all to the truth which makes man immortal and divine. What they profess to give is the truth itself, purged so far as might be from the sensuous forms by which in popular religions it was half revealed and half concealed. The instrument of such purgation is philosophy.

It is in this light that we must consider their use of Jewish religious tradition. In the Corpus at large, as we have seen, there is just enough to show that Judaism had not been left out of the large synthesis of religions which lies behind the γνώσις of the Hermetists, and in the *Poimandres* and the *Sacred Discourse* we have evidence of the direct employment of the Hebrew Scriptures in their Greek dress. It is significant that in both cases it is the Hebrew cosmology that has attracted attention. It is the general assumption of the *Hermetica* that in order to rise to the vision of God which is perfect γνώσις
one must know the truth about the nature and origin of
the universe and of man. Both these writers have found
in the Hebrew creation myth the clue to the truth. The
cosmology of the *Sacred Discourse* is indeed in all essentials
so purely Stoic that one might wonder why the writer
took the trouble to make it conform to the Hebrew model.
The answer is that he conceived himself as conveying not
philosophical speculation but \( \gamma\nu \omega\sigma\) divinely revealed.\(^1\)
It is revealed, however, in the Hebrew Scriptures
under the veil of myth, and philosophy must remove
the veil.

The *Poimandres* is a still more remarkable example of
the work of a pagan teacher whose access to the Old
Testament is direct. He is a teacher, profoundly religious
rather than philosophical, though well aware of the
instruments of thought offered by philosophy to religion.
He is not merely interested in Judaism, but selects the
Jewish myth of creation as the most adequate means
(when philosophically interpreted) of conveying the truth
about God, man and the world, and so leading to the
attainment of the \( \gamma\nu \omega\sigma\) by which alone man is truly
blessed. His approach to the Jewish Scriptures is guided
by the work of Hellenistic Jews who were themselves
under the influence of those general religious notions
which were widely current at the time. While Philo, for
example, is a teacher standing on the Jewish side of the
dividing line, who is glad to use all the resources of
pagan religious philosophy to elucidate the mysteries of
his own Scriptures, the author of *Poimandres* is a colleague
on the other side of the line who welcomes the wisdom of
the Hebrews as giving an august sanction to the doctrines

\(^1\) Cf. the stress laid upon the authenticity of the cosmology of
"Sanchuniathon", as derived from sacred Hebrew documents exhibited
by "Jerombalos the priest at Jerusalem", by Philo of Byblos \( \alpha\pi\nu\delta \)
Euseb., *Praep. Evang.* I. 9–10. This writer rationalizes away all re-
ligious belief, but the sanction of an immensely old religious tradition
still has force for him, or at least is expected to have force for his
readers.
of his own philosophy. Jew and pagan are working to the same end, and using largely the same means, though starting from different points.

With these examples in mind, we may reasonably conclude that Judaism had a larger part than is, perhaps, always recognized, in shaping the higher thought of paganism. It has been customary of late to emphasize the influence of Gentile thought upon Judaism, and that influence was unquestionably enormous. But it would not be safe to assume that where Hellenistic Judaism shows parallels with non-Jewish thought, the debt lies always and wholly upon one side. The Poimandres shows that it was possible for a thinker who remained quite outside Judaism to become steeped in ideas which go back by direct lineage to the Pentateuch and the Hebrew prophets. It was not wholly by its own native impulse that paganism moved towards ethical monotheism, and the spiritual worship of God.

It was into a religious world in which this kind of cross-fertilization of thought was going on that Christianity came. It started from the Jewish side, accepting the authority of the Jewish Scriptures as a divine revelation, and yet, by virtue of the original religious impulse from which it began, free to criticize, reinterpret and enlarge its Jewish heritage. Many of its early exponents were brought up in a Judaism which already, like that of Philo, had accepted contributions of thought from non-Jewish sources. Its creative theologians, Paul, the author to the Hebrews and the author of the Fourth Gospel, betray acquaintance with the generally diffused popular philosophy, partly Platonic, partly Stoic, whether this acquaintance was due to direct study of Hellenic thought or to its infiltration into their own Hellenistic Judaism. Thus the parallels between the Poimandres and the New Testament are explicable as the result of minds working under the same general influences. Within the New Testament, however, such influences are always secondary. The
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regulative motive is that supplied by the originating impulse of Christianity itself.

But early in its career Christianity attracted the attention of thinkers who stood in the line of development of which the Poimandres is a representative. This was natural enough. They were already interested in Judaism, and Christianity bore the aspect of a peculiar type of Judaism. If we could imagine a recension of the Poimandres in which the figure of Christ was introduced as an afterthought, either as identified with one of the divine powers—Logos, Demiurge or Anthropos—or as the medium or the original recipient of the revelation, then we should have a work strictly analogous to such early Gnostic teaching as that of Justin, or the Naassene, or even in part of Basilides. The more definitely Christian Gnostics of whom Valentinus is the type believed that acceptance of the central Christian doctrines supplied that which was lacking to complete the great synthesis to which religious thought was tending. They constructed vast systems on the basis of earlier speculations, in which the redemption wrought by Christ was made to provide the final clue to the mystery of things. But the central mind of the Church rightly judged that in these systems the distinctive truths of Christianity were swamped in alien speculations, and called a halt to the process of synthesis.

1 We may find their precursors within the Church in the "heretics" of Colossians and the Pastorals. The old question whether these heresies were of Jewish or pagan origin loses much of its point when we recall that Hellenistic Jewish thought and pagan thought of the Poimandres type were already drawing together.
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ήσονή, 148, 185.
'Ηρ, 193.
ήχος, ήχεω, 104-6, 118.

Θάνατος, 171, 182.
θεῖος, 20, 211, 212, 214, 235.
θέλημα, θέλησις, 128.
θεμελεία, 212.
θεός, 5-8, 23, 107-8, 211, 223-4.
θεός ἁληθινός, 72-73.
δεύτερος θεός, 136-7.
θεός τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, 14.
θεῷ θέλοντος, 6.
θέος υἱοτός, 11-13.
θεοσβεία, 77, 168.
θεονομά, 58, 169.
θεομός, 32.
θῆλυς, θηλυκός, 151, 163.
θηρίον, 101, 143, 165, 212, 225.
θνητός, 160, 166.
θυσία, 196-8.

'Ιδέα, 6, 18, 212, 223.
'ιγνίς, 123.
'ικάνος, 15-16.
'ιλάσκεθαι, ιλασμός, ιλαστήριον, 82-95, 172.
'ιλέως, 85, 86, 91.
'Ισαάκ, 199.
'Ισραήλ, 199.
'ισχυρός, 8.

Καθαρός, καθαρίζειν, καθαρισμός, 83, 84, 95, 173.
καθοδηγός, 170.
κακός, κακία, 76.
καλός, κάλλος, 126-7, 151, 179, 191.
καμμύνων, κάμμυνος, 178-9, 183.
κάρος, καρών, 160, 188.
καρπός, 212, 232.
κατακλύζειν, κατακλυσμός, 166, 188-90.
κατωφερής, 113, 142-3, 208.
κέντομα, 111.
κηρύσσειν, κηρύγμα, 179.
κηρύνομα, 16.
κόπος, 77, 79.
κοσμός, κοσμικός, 108, 111, 120, 126, 214.
κοσμοποιεῖν, 120, 126.
κραυτάλων, 180, 189.
κρεμάζειν, κρέμασθαι, 122, 222.
κρύμα, κρύος, κρυτήριον, 20, 29, 44, 46, 47, 52.
κτήνος, 165.
κτίσμα, 163.
κύριος, 9-11, 16-19, 127, 239.

Δαστερεῦειν, 9.
δειτουργεῖν, 9.
δεπτός, 211, 220.
διδαστάς, 40.
λιμήν, 188-91.
λογικός, 118, 196-8.
λογισμός, 199.
λόγος, 18, 27, 115-21, 124-5, 141-2, 163, 197, 207, 235, 236.
λύτρον, 92.

Μάρτυς, μαρτυρεῖν, 198-200.
μάταιος, 79.
μεθή, μεθέω, μεθύσκεσθαι, 180, 183-5, 187-9, 191.
μετανοεῖν, μετάνοια, 180-1, 183-5.
μορφή, 150, 151, 158-9, 236.
μύχος, 77, 79.
μυστήριον, 161.

Νεκροφορεῖν, 194.
νηστός, 143, 225.
νήφειν, νήφως, 178, 183, 187, 189.
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νομίζειν, 66–7
νόμος, 32, 42.
νομοθετεῖν, νομοθετήσ, νομοθετομός, 32, 33.
νοῦς, 37, 99, 118–19, 125, 133, 143, 149, 150, 162, 197, 199, 207, 211, 236.
Ψωλέ, 165, 189.

Ἐνρός, 124, 223.

‘Οδηγός, ὁδηγῶν, 73, 74, 130, 184–5, 190.
ὁδεία, ὁδείημα, 61.
ὁδος, 180, 185, 188.
ὁδος ὁμοίως, ὁμοίωμα, ὁμοίωσης, 157, 159, 242.
ὁμοόνοιος, 125.
τὸ ἄν, see elnai.
ὅμομα, 3, 20, 213, 231.
ὁρας, 178, 185.
ὁρνον, 27.
ὁρος τοῦ θεοῦ, 20.
ὁριον, ὁμότις, ὁμοθυμα, 62–64, 173.
ὁριον, ὁριόν, 20, 23, 212, 223.
ὁσια, ὁσιώδης, 161, 166, 167, 211, 223.
ὁσθαλμός, 178–9, 185, 187.

Παλιγγενεσία, 226, 240.
παντοκράτειν, παντοκράτωρ, 19.
παράβαίνειν, παράβασις, 79.
παραγίνεσθαι, 171–2.
παραδίδωναι, 150, 177.
παραλαμβάνειν, 177.
παράνομος, παρανομία, 79.
παράπτωμα, 79.
παρουσία, 171–2.
πατήρ, 117–19, 149, 196, 238.
πάτραρχος, 23.
περικαλλῆς, 149.
περιόδος, 167.
πετεινός, 143, 225.
πηγή, 134–5.
πίστις, πιστεῦειν, 66–70, 198–200.
πιστός, πιστοῦν, 68–69.
πίστις, pietas, 60–61.

πλανάν, πλάνη, 79, 167, 183–5, 190.
πλεονεκτεῖν, πλεονεξία, 174.
πλῆθος, πλῆθυνον, 147, 163–5, 212, 233–4.
πλημμέλης, πλημμέλως, πλημμέλεια, πλημμέλεως, πλημμέλημα, 76, 79.
πλήρωμα, 127, 134.
πνεῦμα, πνευματικός, 37, 103, 122–5, 131, 135, 138, 198, 208, 211–12.
Πομάνδρης, 99, 107, 203.
πολυέλεος, 61, 72.
ποιητός, ποιηρία, 76, 79.
πόνος, 77.
πόρρωθεν, 172.
πρόνοια, 128, 163.
προστάσσειν, προσταγμα, 27, 29, 32, 212, 225.
πτημός, 212, 225.
πύρ, πυρωνός, 122–3, 138, 192, 212, 223.

'Ραντίζειν, 84.
ῥήμα, 27, 117.

Σαβαωθ, 16–17.
Σαβδαί, 14, 16–17.
σάρξ, 214, 232.
σέβεσθαι, 12, 77.
σήμεειν, 212, 223.
σκία, σκίασμα, 157, 191.
σκότος, σκοτεινός, 103, 113, 181, 191, 211.
σπέρμα, σπόρα, σπόρας, 212, 226, 232.
σπερμολογεῖν, 212, 219.
στερεῶν, στερέωμα, 121.
στηρίζειν, στήριγμα, 66, 217.
στρατά, 16–17, 110.
στοιχεῖον, 126, 211.
συμβιβάζειν, 30.
συναγίαζειν, 200.
σύνδεσμος, 163.
συνείδησις, 6.
συνθήκη, 26, 31.
συντελεῖν, 129.
σωζεῖν, σωτηρία, σωτηρίου, 183, 184, 186, 187, 188, 240.
σῶμα, 161, 167.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek Word</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Τάξις</td>
<td>32, 104, 105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ταράσσειν</td>
<td>104, 105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τάφος</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τελείων</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τέλειος</td>
<td>39, 42, 128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τέλος</td>
<td>169, 211, 218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τετράπονος</td>
<td>143, 212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τέχνη, τεχνούργημα</td>
<td>213, 231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τιμωρός</td>
<td>171, 242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τόπος</td>
<td>20-21, 235, 239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τύχη</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἠγρός</td>
<td>104, 211-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὅδωρ</td>
<td>103-4, 121, 123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>νῖός θεοῦ</td>
<td>117-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὠλη</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὑμνεῖν</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὑπνεῖν, ὑπνέειν</td>
<td>159-60, 178-9, 187-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὑψιστὸς</td>
<td>11-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Φανερός</td>
<td>199, 237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φέρειν</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φθόνος, φθονερός</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φθορά</td>
<td>180, 183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φοβεῖσθαι, φόβος, φοβοῦ</td>
<td>71, 77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φονεύω</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φύσις</td>
<td>104, 115, 161, 211, 214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φωνή</td>
<td>115-16, 176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φῶς, φωτεῖνος, φωτίζειν, φωτισμός,</td>
<td>107, 115, 117, 133-6, 149, 162, 167, 181, 183-7, 199, 211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φωστήρ</td>
<td>139-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Χάρις</td>
<td>61, 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χειραγωγός</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χίτων</td>
<td>182, 191-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χὀρτος</td>
<td>212, 226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ψευδής, ψευδός</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ψυχή</td>
<td>147, 162, 212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὥν, ὁ ὦν</td>
<td>see  εἶναι</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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(i) OLD TESTAMENT AND APOCRYPHA

(Cited after Swete, *The Old Testament in Greek*; references to the Hebrew text in brackets.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genesis</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. 1-5</td>
<td>103 sqq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. 1</td>
<td>109, 111, 137, 217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. 2</td>
<td>106, 112, 123, 220-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. 3</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. 6-8</td>
<td>115 sqq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. 6-7</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. 6</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. 7</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. 8</td>
<td>123, 223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. 9-25</td>
<td>132 sqq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. 9</td>
<td>124, 143, 223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. 11</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. 14</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. 16-18</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. 20-5</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. 21-2</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. 21</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. 22</td>
<td>164-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. 26</td>
<td>137-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. 26-30</td>
<td>145 sqq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. 26-7</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. 27</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. 28</td>
<td>150, 164-5, 229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. 29</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. 2</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. 7-v.2</td>
<td>145 sqq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. 7</td>
<td>162, 229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. 9</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. 17</td>
<td>160, 229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. 21-2</td>
<td>151, 165-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. 23-4</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genesis</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>iii. 3-19</td>
<td>193 sqq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. 3</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. 14-15</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. 16</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. 19</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. 21</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. 22</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. 24</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 1</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 26</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi. 1-4</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi. 2</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi. 12</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii. 15-16</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii. 15-ix.17</td>
<td>162 sqq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiv. 18</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xv. 6</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xv. 12</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xvi. 10</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xix. 19</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xix. 31-5</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xx. 11</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xx. 13</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxii. 17</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxiv. 49</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxx. 30</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxxi. 29</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxxii. 20</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxxiii. 29-30</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genesis</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>xxxviii. 7</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxxviii. 26</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xlii. 16</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xlvi. 25</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xlvi. 29</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi. 3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi. 5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii. 9</td>
<td>164, 234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xi. 11</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xv. 15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xix. 3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xix. 9</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xx. 4</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxi. 6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxi. 13</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxiii. 7</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxiv. 10</td>
<td>20, 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxix. 33</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxix. 36-7</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxx. 10</td>
<td>83, 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxx. 15-16</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxxi. 3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxxii. 12</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxxii. 14</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxxii. 30</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxxiv. 6</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxxvi. 31</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Exodus |
|---------|------|
| iii. 14 | 4 |
| iv. 3  | 14, 15, 213 |
| x. 5  | 14 |
| xi. 9 | 164, 234 |
| xv. 11 | 242 |
| xviii. 15 | 20 |
| xix. 3 | 20 |
| xix. 9 | 172 |
| xx. 4 | 242 |
| xxi. 6 | 20 |
| xxi. 13 | 21 |
| xxiii. 7 | 52 |
| xxiv. 10 | 20, 21 |
| xxix. 33 | 83 |
| xxix. 36-7 | 83 |
| xxx. 10 | 83, 90 |
| xxx. 15-16 | 90 |
| xxxi. 3 | 20 |
| xxxii. 12 | 86 |
| xxxii. 14 | 86 |
| xxxii. 30 | 90 |
| xxxiv. 6 | 72 |
| xxxvi. 31 | 20 |

| Leviticus |
|----------|------|
| x. 4-5 | 192 |
| xvi. 16 | 89 |
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</tbody>
</table>
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</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>xiv. 19</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>x. 6</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxiv. 3</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>xi. 33-4</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxiv. 3-4</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>xvii. 19</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxiv. 4</td>
<td>8, 14</td>
<td>xviii. 15</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxiv. 15</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>xxiv. 4</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxiv. 16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxv. 11</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxix. 11</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxxv. 33</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deuteronomy</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
<th>4 Kingdoms (4 Kms.) = 2 Kings (2 Kgs.)</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vii. 9</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>v. 18</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xvi. 18-20</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>xvii. 8</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxi. 8</td>
<td>89, 91</td>
<td>xxvii. 15</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxii. 11</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>xxiv. 4</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxviii. 32</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxix. 20</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxxii. 1</td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxxii. 8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxxii. 43</td>
<td>83, 156</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Joshua</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
<th>2 Chronicles</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ii. 14</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>vi. 30</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 14</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>xxi. 8</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td></td>
<td>xxx. 18-19</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
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<th>Judges</th>
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<th>2 Esdras (2 Esd.) = Ezra &amp; Nehemiah</th>
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>v. 11</td>
<td>48, 54, 58</td>
<td>xi. (Neh. i.) 5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 15</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>xv. (Neh. v.) 5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>xvi. (Neh. vii.) 2</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>xix. (Neh. ix.) 31-2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Kingdoms (1 Kms.) = 1 Samuel</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>iii. 14</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi. 3</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xii. 3</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxi. 2-3</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxiv. 18</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2 Kingdoms (2 Kms.) = 2 Samuel</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>viii. 13</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xv. 4</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xv. 20</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xix. 28 (29)</td>
<td>47, 53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Psalms</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>iii. 4</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. 6</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii. 12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii. 4</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii. 6</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii. 6-7</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii. 29</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xvii. 25-7</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xviii. (xix.) 8</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xviii. (xix.) 9</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xlxiv. 8</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lxxvii. 7-8</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2 Kings (2 Kms.) = 2 Samuel</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>viii. 13</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xv. 4</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xv. 20</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xix. 28 (29)</td>
<td>47, 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xlvii. 5</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lx. 19</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lxvi. 15</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Kings (1 Kgs.) = 1 Samuel</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>iii. 14</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi. 3</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xii. 3</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxi. 2-3</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxiv. 18</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xlvii. 5</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3 Kingdoms (3 Kms.) = 1 Kings (1 Kgs.)</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>x. 6</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xi. 33-4</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xvii. 19</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xviii. 25</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2 Chronicles</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vi. 30</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxi. 8</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxx. 18-19</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2 Esdras (2 Esd.) = Ezra &amp; Nehemiah</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>xi. (Neh. i.) 5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xv. (Neh. v.) 5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xvi. (Neh. vii.) 2</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xix. (Neh. ix.) 31-2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Psalms</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>iii. 4</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. 6</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii. 12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii. 4</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii. 6</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii. 6-7</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii. 29</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xvii. 25-7</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xviii. (xix.) 8</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xviii. (xix.) 9</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xlxiv. 8</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lxxvii. 7-8</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Psalms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Psalm</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>xc. 1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xci. 3-4</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xcvi. (xcvi.) 7-8</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xcvi. (xcvi.) 8-9</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cii. 1</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cii. (ciii.) 6</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cii. 12</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cii. (ciii.) 21-28</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ciii.</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cv. (cvi.) 12</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cv. 30</td>
<td>87, 93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cvi. 4, 7</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cvi. 14</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cvii. 22</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cvii. 24, 27, 30</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cvii. 30</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cvii.</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cxx. 23</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cx. (cxi.) 7</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cxv. 1</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cxv. 8</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cxvi. (cxi.) 90</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cxvi. 160</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cxx. 2, 5</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cxxiv. 4-5</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cxxxi. 9, 16, 18</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cxxvii. (cxxxvii.)</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Wisdom of Solomon

### Proverbs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proverbs</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>viii. 30</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xi. 17</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiii. 14</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiv. 22</td>
<td>65, 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xv. 27</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xvi. 14</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xvi. 15</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xx. 6</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xx. 22</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxiv. 27</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxvi. 25</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Ecclesiastes

### Wisdom of Solomon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wisdom of Solomon</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vii. 1</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii. 13, 15, 17</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii. 17-19</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii. 22-3</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii. 22</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii. 26</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii. 20-8</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii. 16</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii. 18</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix. 1</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix. 2</td>
<td>150, 229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix. 9</td>
<td>131, 218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x. 10</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xii. 1</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiii. 15</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiv. 16-17</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 10</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Ecclesiasticus

### Wisdom of Sirach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wisdom of Sirach or Ecclesiasticus</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. 1 sqq.</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. 27 (34-5)</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. 30</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 5-6</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi. 28</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xvi. 7</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xvii. 1-8</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxiv. 3-6</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxxii. (xxxv)</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xl. 1, 11</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xlii. 2</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xliv. 8-9</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xlviii. 15</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. 28</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Wisdom of Solomon

### Esther

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Esther (Es.)</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>iv. 11</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xv. 5 = D2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Hosea

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hosea</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>iv. 1</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix. 10</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosea</td>
<td>PAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x. 12</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xii. 4</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. 4</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 26</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii. 2</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii. 14</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. 6-7</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi. 16</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii. 9</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. 5</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habakkuk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. 11</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. 4</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zechariah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. 17</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii. 2</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii. 2-14</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii. 2, 6</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii. 22</td>
<td>86, 87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii. 26</td>
<td>86, 87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii. 8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malachi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. 9</td>
<td>86, 87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isiah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. 2</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. 10 sqq.</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. 17</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii. 9</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii. 10 sqq.</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii. 5-7</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii. 16</td>
<td>31-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. 11</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix. 6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xi. 2</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xi. 4</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii. 16</td>
<td>31-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xii. 2</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiii. 6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremiah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. 2</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. 11</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. 13</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. 15</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. 24</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. 3-4</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 21</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. 57</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. 92 (25)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. 24 (27)</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi. 12</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix. 9</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix. 13</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix. 24</td>
<td>82, 89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xii. 11</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Maccabees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. 39</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii. 35</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maccabees</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
<th>Maccabees</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
<th>Prayer of Manasse</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ii. 21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>iii. 2</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi. 18</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>xv. 31-2</td>
<td>188-9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(ii) JEWISH NON-CANONICAL LITERATURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adam and Eve, Life of</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
<th>Philo of Alexandria</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
<th>Philo of Alexandria</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(ed. L. S. A. Wells in</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>Legum Allegoriae I</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>De Confusione Linguarum</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles: Pseudepigrapha, 1913)</td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>148</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiii.-xiv.</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>162</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aristeas, Epistle of</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Legum Allegoriae II</td>
<td>148</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enoch, Secrets of</td>
<td></td>
<td>56 sqq.</td>
<td>192</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ed. Forbes &amp; Charles</td>
<td></td>
<td>89</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Charles: Pseudepigrapha, 1913)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxv. 1-3</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxvi. 2</td>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxx. 2-7</td>
<td>139</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxx. 8</td>
<td>156</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxx. II</td>
<td>152</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxx. 13-15</td>
<td>230</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxxii. I</td>
<td>232</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josephus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ed. Naber, 1888)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antiquities</td>
<td>218</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII. xi. 2. § 281</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Apionem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. 8. § 42</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philo of Alexandria (ed. Cohn and Wendland, 1886-1915)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Opificio Mundi</td>
<td>24-5</td>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adversus Haereses I</td>
<td>207</td>
<td></td>
<td>i. 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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#### (v) PAGAN LITERATURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Hermetica</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Hermetica</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aeschylus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Agamemnon</em></td>
<td>393</td>
<td>I. 2</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>II. 10</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Eumenides</em></td>
<td>27–8</td>
<td>IV. 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>III. 2</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aristotle</td>
<td></td>
<td>II. 10, 656b</td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>De Partibus Animalium</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>II. 10, 656b</td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ethica Nicomachea</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IV. viii. 14, 1128a</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V. i. 3, 1129b</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V. ii.–iv. 1130b sqq.</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V. vii. 10, 1135a</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V. ix. 11, 1136a</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>III. 6 (11) 1281b</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Politica</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>II. xvii. 1391b</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Rhetorica</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cicero</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Paradoxa</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Tusculanae Disputations</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demosthenes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Contra Aristogitonem</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diogenes Laertius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>VII. i. 88</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epictetus</td>
<td></td>
<td>II. 136, 235</td>
<td>133</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Dissertations</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>III. 210–34</td>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hippolytus</em></td>
<td>88</td>
<td>IV. 1116, 128, 236</td>
<td>240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Hermetica</strong></th>
<th><strong>PAGE</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corpus Hermeticum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII. 18-19</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>128-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>129-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIV. 7</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI. 15 (Scott)</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Asclepius</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ed. Scott, Hermetica 1924)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-30</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Excerpta ex Stobaeo</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ed. Scott, Hermetica 1924)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ivb.</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xviii. 5</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xix. 5</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxi. 6</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxiv. 6</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxvi. 9</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fragmenta</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ed. Scott, Hermetica 1924)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-30</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Herodotus</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. 38</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Homer</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iliad XVII. 327</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odyssey XIV. 444</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Menander, Monostichoi</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>654, 671</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pindar</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isthmian Odes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5(4), 53</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apud Hdt. III. 38</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plato</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phaedo 67e</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symposium</td>
<td>189b sqq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clitopho</td>
<td>407b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic</td>
<td>322c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>499c</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>511d-e</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timaeus</td>
<td>27d sqq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29a sqq.</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29c</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30a</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40b-c</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51a</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69c</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minos</strong></td>
<td>317c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Laws</strong></td>
<td>715e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>757e</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>862c</td>
<td>82, 88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Plato</strong></th>
<th><strong>PAGE</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Epistles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii. 354c</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plutarch</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moralia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>370 (De Iside et Osiride, 47)</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>780 (Ad Principem Ine-ruditum, 3)</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sophocles</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oedipus Tyrannus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>865</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>871-2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stobaeus</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eclogae</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. 2</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. 17</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. 49</td>
<td>22, 129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. 102</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thucydides</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. 41</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Xenophon</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anabasis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. ii. 13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. viii. 20</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorabilia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. i. 1-5</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>