Classical Quarterly **55.1** 277–292 (2005) *Printed in Great Britain*
doi:10.1093/cq/bmi020

PORPHYRY AND GNOSTICISM

The recent publication of a new edition of the Nag Hammadi Gnostic text *Zostrianos*[1] and a recent study by Zambon[2] on Porphyry and Middle Platonism provide an opportunity to take a new look at the philosophical influences on three of the so-called 'Platonizing' texts in the Nag Hammadi Library: *Zostrianos* (NHC VIII, 1), *Allogenes* (NHC XI, 3) and *The Three Steles of Seth* (NHC VII, 5).[3] The debate on influence has been divided among those who think that the philosophical vocabulary common to these texts derives from a general Middle Platonic background[4] and those who argue that the influence is Neoplatonic.[5] What complicates this picture is that Gnostic texts with the titles *Zostrianos* and *Allogenes* are also mentioned by Porphyry in his *Life of Plotinus* (*Plot.* 16). Porphyry indicates that these and other Gnostic works known to Plotinus and his circle were in the possession of 'Christian heretics'.[6] If so, one would expect these texts to be Christianized in one form or another. But this is not the case with the three tracts mentioned above,

[1] C. Barry, W.-P. Funk, P.-H. Poirier, and J. D. Turner (edd.), *Zostrien* (NH VIII, 1) BCNH, Section Textes 24 (Quebec, Louvain, and Paris, 2000).

[2] Marco Zambon, *Porphyre et le moyen-platonisme* (Paris, 2002).

[3] The fourth of these 'Platonizing' texts is *Marsanes*, which has also been recently published in a new edition by W.-P. Funk, P.-H. Poirer, and J. D. Turner (edd.), *Marsanès* (NH X) BCNH, Section Textes 27 (Quebec, Louvain, and Paris, 2000).

[4] John D. Turner has written extensively over the years on the Middle Platonic influences in these texts. His latest work on this subject is *Sethian Gnosticism and the Platonic Tradition*, BCNH, Section Études 6 (Quebec, Louvain, and Paris, 2001).

[5] See L. Abramowski, 'Marius Victorinus, Porphyrius und die römischen Gnostiker', *ZNW* 74 (1983), 108–28; R. Majercik, 'The existence–life–intellect triad in Gnosticism and Neoplatonism', *CQ* 42 (1992), 475–88. Turner (n. 3), 209–31, and (n. 4), 582–8, now suggests that *Marsanes* may have been influenced indirectly by Iamblichus and/or Theodore of Asine.

[6] *Plot.* 16.1–2: γεγόνασι δὲ κατ' αὐτὸν τῶν Χριστιανῶν πολλοὶ μὲν καὶ ἄλλοι, αἱρετικοὶ δὲ ἐκ τῆς παλαιᾶς φιλοσοφίας ἀνηγμένοι. Of particular concern is the phrase πολλοὶ μὲν καὶ ἄλλοι, αἱρετικοὶ δέ, which has been variously translated as 'many and others' or 'many others' or 'the many and the others', and the word αἱρετικοί translated either as 'sectarians' in the ordinary Greek sense or as 'heretics' in the Christian heresiological sense. Some have pointed out that Porphyry's Greek is not that unusual and give examples of similar constructions in other Greek works. There is an extensive literature on this subject which has been compiled into an annotated bibliography by M. Tardieu: 'Répertoire chronologique (1933–1990): des publications relatives au chapitre 16 de la *Vie de Plotin*', 547–63. This bibliography is an appendix to his article 'Les gnostiques dans la *Vie de Plotin*: analyse du chapitre 16', in L. Brisson et al. (edd.), *Porphyre*: *La Vie de Plotin* 2 (Paris, 1992). To my knowledge, what has been overlooked in this debate is that Plotinus uses virtually the same phrasing in *Enn.* 2.9.10.1 when he refers to the 'many other' doctrines of the Gnostics: πολλὰ μὲν οὖν καὶ ἄλλα, μᾶλλον δὲ πάντα ('There were many other [doctrines], rather all …'). It seems that Porphyry, then, when composing chapter 16 of the *Life*, found it useful to consult Plotinus' treatise *Against the Gnostics.* In this instance, he borrows what Plotinus says about the teachings of the Gnostics and applies this terminology to the Gnostics themselves. In doing so, he also lets us know that these Gnostics were 'Christian heretics': 'At his time, among the Christians, *there were many others, indeed heretics.*' On αἱρετικοί as a technical term borrowed from the Christians, see Tardieu, 'Les gnostiques' (cited above), 513–15; M. J. Edwards, 'Neglected texts in the study of Gnosticism', *JThS* n.s. 41 (1990), 34–5. In a recent work, Edwards also notes the connection between *Plot.* 16.1–2 and *Enn.* 2.9.10.1. See *Neoplatonic Saints* (Liverpool, 2000), 28, n. 155.

Classical Quarterly 55.1 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/bmi020 Published online by Cambridge University Press

which are all now considered by the majority of scholars as examples of a non-Christian form of Sethian Gnosticism.[7] Thus it is unlikely that the texts mentioned by Porphyry in *Plot.* 16 are the same as those discovered at Nag Hammadi.[8] Zambon's contribution to this debate is his detailed analysis of the continuing Middle Platonic influences on Porphyry throughout his career — in addition to the influence of Plotinus — and his demonstration, in particular, of how both are combined in Porphyry's *Commentary on the Parmenides.* In this regard, Zambon both confirms and strengthens Hadot's thesis that Porphyry is the true author of this otherwise 'anonymous' commentary.[9] This is of particular importance, since this commentary is one of the principal philosophical sources utilized in the aforementioned Gnostic texts. But this is not all. The authors of these texts have also borrowed material from other writings of Porphyry and, as a consequence, these texts display a wide range of Porphyrian themes, doctrines, and terminology. The purpose of this paper is to demonstrate this Porphyrian influence and to suggest the circumstances in which these texts may have been written.

ZOSTRIANOS

Zostrianos is the longest of the aforementioned texts and contains the greatest number of borrowings from Porphyry. Throughout the text, this Porphyrian material is regularly inserted into a series of revelatory speeches given by various angelic figures to Zostrianos, as seer, in the context of a heavenly ascent through the aeons.[10] An exception to this pattern is found at the beginning of the tract (2.13–20) when Zostrianos first reflects on 'that which he seeks'. What follows is a list of terms probably drawn from the *Sentences* and *Isagoge*: 'thought and sensation, species and genus, part and whole, contains and contained, corporeal and incorporeal, substance and matter'.[11] This list is subsequently followed by a question concerning the first principle (3.6–13):

> How, being a simple one, does It differ from Itself, in that It exists as *hyparxis*, form [εἶδος], and blessedness, and giving power is alive with life? How is it that the *hyparxis* which does not exist has appeared from a power which does exist?

[7] See Turner (n. 4), 57–125 and *passim.* For a comprehensive view that all forms of gnosticism are Christian or 'Valentinian' in origin, see S. Pétrement, *A Separate God*, trans. C. Harrison (San Francisco, 1990).

[8] For the view that the Nag Hammadi versions of *Zostrianos* and *Allogenes* were the same as those known to Plotinus and his circle, see Turner (n. 4), 198–9 and 709–24.

[9] See P. Hadot, *Porphyre et Victorinus*, 2 vols (Paris, 1968); hereafter cited as PV I and PV II; Zambon (n. 2), 35–41, who also provides a comprehensive overview of the scholarship on this subject. In a recent article, I have also presented additional evidence for Porphyrian authorship of this commentary. See R. Majercik, 'Chaldean triads in Neoplatonic exegesis: some reconsiderations', *CQ* 51 (2001), 266–86. Additional evidence is also presented in this paper. For a recent view that the 'Anonymous' commentary is Middle Platonic or Neopythagorean in origin, see G. Bechtle, *The Anonymous Commentary on Plato's Parmenides* (Bern, Stuttgart, and Vienna, 1999). For critical comments on this work, see Zambon (n. 2), 40, who underscores the doctrinal and linguistic weaknesses in Bechtle's arguments. Cf. Turner (n. 4), 724–44, who also argues that the 'Anonymous' commentary is Middle Platonic. Zambon's critique of Bechtle is also applicable here. For the view that the 'Anonymous' commentary may be the work of a follower of Porphyry, see A. Smith, 'Porphyrian studies since 1913', *ANRW* 2.36.2 (Berlin and New York, 1987), 738–41.

[10] On other aspects of *Zostrianos* (style, genre, dramatis personae, Gnostic myth, and ritual), see the 'Introduction' to *Zostrien* (n. 1), 1–157.

[11] On thought and sensation, see *Sent.* 16 Lamberz; on substance, see *Isag.* 4.21–5.6 Busse; on matter, *Isag.* 11.12–17 Busse. For the remaining terms in this list see below, sections (b) and (d). For a recent English translation and extended commentary on the *Isagoge*, see J. Barnes, *Porphyry*: *Introduction* (Oxford, 2003).

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/bmi020 Published online by Cambridge University Press

This question is a paraphrase of material concerning the One found in Porphyry's *Commentary on the Parmenides*, 14.4–16:

> And thus being one and simple, this Itself [*Parm.* 143A] differs from Itself in terms of act and *hyparxis*. In one respect, it is one and simple; in another, it differs from Itself. For that which differs from the One is no longer one and that which is other than the simple is no longer simple. It is then one and simple according to its first form [ἰδέαν], that is, according to the form of Itself taken in Itself—power—or because it is necessary to name it as an indication that it is ineffable and inconceivable. But it is neither one nor simple according to *hyparxis*, life, and thought [νοήσις].

Additional material drawn from the *Commentary on the Parmenides* focuses on the concept of 'preconception' (προέννοια). This is a Porphyrian hapax, attested in *In Parm.* 2.20 and in Latin (*praeintelligentia, praenoscentia*) in the Porphyrian texts utilized by Marius Victorinus (§§ 37, 43, 70–1 PV II). In *Zostrianos*, the Greek form is preserved in Coptic as ⲡⲣⲟⲡⲛ̄ ⲛ̄ⲉⲛⲛⲟⲓⲁ (=ἡ προέννοια) and thus confirms Hadot's reading of *In Parm.* 2.20 *contra* the correction of Usener.[12] As in the *Commentary on the Parmenides*, this term is linked with that of 'conception' (ἔννοια) and 'silence' (σιγή). It is also linked, as in Marius Victorinus (§§ 37 and 70 PV II), with what Hadot terms two 'modes of intellection': one 'by which we know God' and that which is 'proper to God'.[13] In *Zostrianos*, the terms *ennoia* and *sigē* also carry this same double meaning. The Greek form of *proennoia* is also preserved in *Allogenes* with the same double sense:

Zost. 20.15–18: The Invisible Triple Power, the *preconception* of all [of these], the Invisible Spirit, a *silence*[14] of all of these. . . .
Zost. 24.10–13: . . . through the *conception* which is now in *silence* and through the *preconception*. . . .
Zost. 60.12–13: . . . in a *conception* and a *preconception*. . . .
Zost. 65.7–8: [. . . he is the] *pre*[*conception* of] every *conception*. . . .
Allogenes 48.9–13: Since it is impossible for [entities] to grasp the All which is established in the place that is beyond perfect, they grasp it by means of a *preconception.*
Allogenes 64.34–6: . . . the Triple Power of the *preconception* of the Invisible Spirit.
In Parm. 2.19–21: . . . to stand[15] before the ineffable *preconception* of him that represents him through *silence*, without it knowing that it is *silent*. . . .
In Parm. 6.23–6: Therefore, it is not possible for one who aims at having a *conception* of him to grasp this *conception* while holding on to things which are alien to him.

Further, the concept of the first principle as 'the Pre-existent' (ἡ προϋπαρξις) — missing from the fragments of Porphyry's *Commentary on the Parmenides* — is also attested in Coptic in *Zostrianos*, where the Greek form is again preserved (ⲡⲣⲟⲡⲛ̄ ⲛ̄ⲩⲡⲁⲣⲝⲓⲥ = ἡ προϋπαρξις). In Marius Victorinus, this term is translated into Latin as *praeexsistentia* (§§ 37 and 43 PV II).

Zost. 84.15–22: The *knowledge* [*gnōsis*] *of the Preexistent* [*is*] *in* the *simplicity* of the Invisible Spirit *within the henad.* The *henad* is similar in *unity*—that which is *pure* and *formless.*
In Parm. 6.13–14: . . . the *knowledge* [*gnōsis*] *of* that one *exists in simplicity*. . . .
In Parm. 4.9–10: . . . *through his own henad* [διὰ τῆς αὐτοῦ ἑνάδος] and solitude. . . .

[12] See note ad loc. LSJ (1996) now lists Hadot's reading of προέννοια in its supplement of 'words' and lists Porphyry as the author of the 'Anonymous' *Commentary on the Parmenides* in its supplement of 'authors and works'.
[13] PV I.117, n. 6, 417–18.
[14] ⲟ[ⲩⲥⲓⲅ]ⲏ my correction; ⲟ[ⲩⲡⲏⲅ]ⲏ (edd.)
[15] On στῆναι, see Hadot, PV I.118, n. 2.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/bmi020 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In Parm. 6.33–34: . . . having filled himself *with his own henad* [*τῆς αὐτοῦ ἑνάδος*] [and *simplicity*][16]. . . .
In Parm. 9.3–4: . . . his power and intellect are *co-unifed* [*συνηνώσθαι*] *in his simplicity*. . . .

Similar terminology is found in the *Divine Names* of Ps.-Dionysius, where God is described as '*monad* and *henad* because of the *simplicity* and *unity* of his transcendent indivisibility'[17] and as a 'transcendent and *formless simplicity*'.[18] A direct dependence on Porphyry's *Commentary on the Parmenides* is possible here,[19] but it is more likely that this material was derived from Porphyry's *Commentary on the Chaldean Oracles*,[20] as Ps.-Dionysius mentions 'the divine *Oracles'* and 'the sacred *Oracles*', respectively, as his immediate source.[21] This would also be the case in the following passage, where Ps.-Dionysius again mentions 'the sacred *Oracles'* while, at the same time, citing virtually verbatim passages from Porphyry's *Commentary on the Parmenides*:

DN 588A, 108.6–9 Suchla: We *dare not speak or say anything about the superessential* [*περὶ τῆς ὑπερουσίου*] and *hidden divinity*[22] apart from what has been divinely revealed to us *by the*

[16] See note ad loc. for Hadot's reconstruction of a difficult lacuna in the text at this point. His conjecture of the word 'simplicity' (*ἁπλότητος*) in line 34 is now confirmed by the use of the same term, transliterated into Coptic (ⲙⲛⲧϩⲁⲡⲗⲟⲩⲥ), in the parallel passage in *Zost.* 84.17.
[17] *DN* 589D; 112.11–12 Suchla: . . . *μονάδα μὲν καὶ ἑνάδα διὰ τὴν ἁπλότητα καὶ ἑνότητα τῆς ὑπερφυοῦς ἀμερείας*.
[18] *DN* 592B; 114.5–6 Suchla: . . . *τὴν ὑπερφυῆ καὶ ἀσχημάτιστον ἁπλότητα*. . . .
[19] This is the view of S. Lilla, 'Pseudo-Denys l'Aréopagite, Porphyre et Damascius', in Y. de Andia (ed.), *Denys l'Aréopagite et sa postérité en orient et en occident* (Paris, 1997), 117–35, who notes numerous citations from this commentary in the *Divine Names.*
[20] See Marinus, *Vita Procli*, § 26, 30.17–19 Saffrey–Segonds, who mentions 'countless commentaries of Porphyry and Iamblichus on the *Oracles* as well as related writings of the Chaldeans'. These commentaries are lost. A few fragments from Proclus' *Commentary on the Oracles* are extant and are included in É. des Places's editions of the *Oracles.* See *Oracles chaldaïques* (Paris, 1971[1], 1989[2]), 206–12 (citations from the *Oracles* in this paper are from my edition, *The Chaldean Oracles* [Leiden, 1989].) On Ps.-Dionysius' connection with the Athenian School, see now I. Perczel, 'Pseudo-Dionysius and the *Platonic Theology*', in A.- Ph. Segonds and C. Steel (edd.), *Proclus et la théologie platonicienne* (Paris, 2000), 491–532; H. D. Saffrey, who has written frequently on various 'objective links' between Ps.-Dionysius and Proclus, most recently 'Le lien le plus objectif entre le Pseudo-Denys et Proclus', in J. Hamesse (ed.), *Roma, magistra mundi*: *itineraria culturae medievalis* (Louvain-la-Neuve, 1998), 791–810. For a comprehensive summary and analysis of the life and works of Ps.-Dionysius, see S. Lilla, 'Denys l'Aréopagite (Pseudo-)', in *Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques* 2 (Paris, 1994), § 85, 727–42.
[21] *DN* 589D; 112.7 Suchla: *πρὸς τῶν θείων Λογίων*; 592B; 114.2 Suchla: *διὰ τῶν ἱερῶν . . . Λογίων*, and *passim.* Cf. Synesius, *De insomn.* 135A, 155.13 Terzaghi: *ἀκουσάτω τῶν ἱερῶν Λογίων* = introduction to fr. 118 of the *Oracles*; Marinus, *Vita Procli*, § 26, 30.19–20 Saffrey–Segonds: *τοῖς θείοις Λογίοις*. It should be noted that Ps.-Dionysius uses the same terminology when citing words and phrases from the Bible, thus effectively 'harmonizing' the two traditions.
[22] The reference to God as 'the superessential and hidden divinity' probably derives, in part, from an interpretative reading of fr. 18 ('the hypercosmic paternal abyss') of the *Oracles.* On the word 'hidden', cf. fr. 198*: (*ὁ*) *κρύφιος* (*διάκοσμος*); Synesius, *H.* 1(3) 233: *κρυφίαν τάξιν*; 2(4) 21, 105: *κρυφίαν ῥίζαν*; 2(4) 70: *κρύφιον σπέρμα*; 2(4) 201: *κρυφίας μονάδος*; 4(6) 13: *τὸ κρυπτὸν . . . σπέρμα*; 1(3) 196–7: *σὺ τὸ κρυπτόμενον/φῶς κρυπτόμενον* (with reference to the 'ineffable abyss'); 6(7) 24: *ὁ κρυπτόμενος θεός*; Damascius, *De princ.* § 106, 3.90.22–3 W–C: *ἀπὸ τοῦ ὡς ἀληθῶς ὑπερκόσμου βυθοῦ, καὶ τὸν βυθὸν ἐκεῖνον κρύφιον κόσμον κεκλήκαμεν*; § 110, 3.107.20–2 W–C: *τὸν κρύφιον διάκοσμον . . . ὃν . . . ὑπέρκοσμον οἱ θεοὶ ἀνυμνήκασιν*; *In Parm.* § 151, 1.49.12 W–C: *εἰ γὰρ καὶ διάκοσμος, ὥς φασι, κρύφιος*. The term 'hidden' in these texts has been variously considered as Chaldean, Orphic, and Neopythagorean. See Westerink and Combès, note to Damascius, § 106 above.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/bmi020 Published online by Cambridge University Press

sacred Oracles [ἐκ τῶν ἱερῶν Λογίων]. For *ignorance* [ἀγνωσία] of its *superessentiality* [ὑπερουσιότητος] [23] is *beyond reason and intellect* [ὑπὲρ λόγον καὶ νοῦν] and being.[24]
In Parm. 2.11–12: (God is) *superessential* [ὑπερουσίος]. . . .
In Parm. 2.15–16: . . . *nor dare to attribute anything* to that one. . . .
In Parm. 9.24–6: Since that one remains *beyond all reason and all thought* [ὑπὲρ πάντα λόγον καὶ πᾶσαν νόησιν] in our *ignorance* [ἀγνωσίᾳ] of him.

Another passage in the *Divine Names* (attributed to 'the divine *Oracles*') describes God in terms similar to those found in the *Hymns* of Synesius. Synesius, in turn, is dependent on Porphyry's *Commentary on the Oracles* for this terminology.[25]

DN 589C, 112.2 Suchla: (God as) the principle of *simplicity* for those being *simplified* and principle of *unity* for those being *unified* [τῶν ἁπλουμένων ἁπλότης καὶ τῶν ἑνιζομένων ἑνότης].
Hymn 9(1) 58–62 Lacombrade: *Pure henad of unities* [ἑνοτήτων ἑνὰς ἀγνά], first *monad* of monads, the one who *unifies the simplicities of summits* [ἁπλότητας ἀκροτήτων ἑνίσασα] and engenders *superessential* [ὑπερουσίοις] births.

What these passages indicate is that Porphyry integrated material from his *Commentary on the Parmenides* into his *Commentary on the Chaldean Oracles.* The opposite is also true, as attested in *In Parm.* 9.3–4 (cited above), where Porphyry says of the Chaldean first principle that 'his power and intellect are *co-unified in his simplicity*'.[26] This statement is an interpretative reading of fr. 4 of the *Oracles*: 'For power is with him but intellect is from him.' [27] The naming of God as *prohyparxis* — preserved in Greek in *Zostrianos* and attested in Latin in the writings of Marius Victorinus — probably derives from Porphyry's *Commentary on the Parmenides.*

In sum, every term in *Zost.* 84.15–22 (knowledge, pre-existent, simplicity, henad, unity, pure, formless), as well as the structure of the passage as a whole, can be traced back to Porphyrian speculation about the nature of the first principle. These passages also indicate that Porphyry was the first to introduce the term 'henad' into Neoplatonic speculation about the One[28] as well as the consistent metaphysical usage of the term 'simplicity' (ἁπλότης).[29] The term 'superessential' (ὑπερούσιος) is also Porphyrian, attested for the first time in Greek literature in his *Commentary on the*

[23] The term ὑπερουσιότης is rare. It is otherwise attested only in Theodoret and Maximus the Confessor. See Lampe, *PGL* s.v.
[24] On variant readings of this line see S. Lilla, 'Zur neuen kritischen Ausgabe der Schrift *Über die göttlichen Namen* von ps. Dionysius Areopagita', *Augustinianum* 3 (1991) 443–4; Perczel (n. 20), 511–12.
[25] See W. Theiler, 'Die chaldäischen Orakel und die Hymnen des Synesios', in *Forschungen zum Neuplatonismus* (Berlin, 1966), 252–301; Hadot, PV I, esp. 461–74.
[26] See Hadot, PV II, note ad loc., who compares Marius Victorinus, *Adv. Ar.* 1.50.10 (=§ 41 PV II): '*simplicitate* unus qui sit, tres potentias *couniens*'.
[27] On the Chaldean triad father, power, intellect, see Majercik (n. 9), 266–78.
[28] This is the view of I. P. Sheldon-Williams, 'Henads and angels: Proclus and the Ps-Dionysius', *Studia Patristica* 11 (Berlin, 1972), 65–71, at 69. On the theory of divine henads in later Neoplatonism, see H. D. Saffrey and L. G. Westerink, 'Introduction' to *Proclus*: *Théologie platonicienne* 3 (Paris, 1978), li–lxxvii, who attribute this theory to Syrianus. For the view that Iamblichus introduced the theory of henads, see now J. Dillon, 'Iamblichus and henads again', in H. J. Blumenthal and E. G. Clark (edd.), *The Divine Iamblichus*: *Philosopher and Man of Gods* (London, 1993), 48–54.
[29] Plotinus was apparently the first to consider this term in a metaphysical sense; see *Enn.* 5.3.16.14–15: that which is 'truly One' is 'outside all multiplicity and simplicity'; 5.5.6.32: the name 'One' as ὃ πάντως ἁπλότητός ἐστι σημαντικόν; cf. Porphyry, *Hist. phil.* (220 F Smith = fr. XV Nauck): τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἐμφαίνει τὴν περὶ αὐτὸν ἁπλότητα.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/bmi020 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Parmenides[30] and subsequently found in the writings of the later Neoplatonists and commentators on Aristotle as well as in a wide range of Christian sources from the mid-fourth century onward.

But this is not all. Additional material in *Zostrianos* indicates that the author of this tractate was also familiar with other works of Porphyry, as demonstrated in the following passages.

(a) Saviour and saved, flee femininity, save yourself, true self as intellect

The concept of 'saviour and saved' and the admonition to 'flee femininity' are both found in Porphyry's *Letter to Marcella.* Although a condemnation of the feminine in one form or another can be found in other Nag Hammadi texts, the phrase 'flee femininity' has no parallel in either Greek or Gnostic sources.[31] It is a coinage of Porphyry. The theme of 'saviour and saved'—applied, respectively, to intellect and soul in the *Letter to Marcella*—is also found in the Porphyrian material utilized by Marius Victorinus, who applies it to the Son as Life (§ 51 PV II): *salvans et salvata a semet ipse.* The theme also appears in *Allogenes* and *Steles Seth.*[32]

Zost. 131.5–16: *Flee from the madness and bondage of femininity and choose for yourself the salvation of masculinity. . . . Save yourself so that the soul may be saved.* The kind father has sent you *the saviour* and has given you strength.

Zost. 44.1–4: The type of person *who is saved* is the one who *seeks himself and his intellect* and finds each of these.

Ad Marc. § 33 Wicker: Therefore, do not be overly-concerned about whether your body is male or female; do not regard yourself as a woman, Marcella, for I did not devote myself to you as such. *Flee from every feminine element of the soul as if you are clothed in a male body.*

Ad Marc. § 9 Wicker: Is it not, then, out of place for you, who are confident that there exists in you *the saviour and that which is saved* and the destroyer and that which is destroyed, wealth and poverty, father and husband, and master of all true goods, to yearn for the shadow of a leader as though you do not have the true leader within yourself and all wealth in your possession? This wealth you must lose and forget if you descend into the flesh at the expense of *the saviour and that which is saved.*

Ad Marc. § 26 Wicker: And Intellect itself becomes a teacher, a *saviour*, a nourisher, a guardian, and a guide which elevates the soul.

De abst. 2.49.2 Bouffartigue–Patillon: The true philosopher . . . in every way *saves himself.*

De abst. 1.29.4 Bouffartigue–Patillon: For the ascent is to no other than the *true self.* . . . The *true self is intellect*, and thus the end is *to live according to intellect.*

(b) Corporeals and incorporeals

The distinction between corporeals or bodies (τὰ σώματα) and incorporeals (τὰ ἀσώματα) is treated at length in Porphyry's *Sententiae* (Lamberz). The Coptic forms of these terms are cited below in the passage from *Zostrianos.* In one instance, the text of *Zostrianos* supports an alternative reading of line 6 in *Sent.* 2.

[30] *In Parm.* 2.11. LSJ (1968) and (1996) omit this citation, although the editors of the latter now acknowledge Porphyry as the author of the 'Anonymous' commentary (see supplement of 'authors and works'). The adverbial form, ὑπερουσίως, is also a coinage of Porphyry, *Sent.* 10, 4.10. This form is not cited for Porphyry in either edition of LSJ.

[31] See F. Wisse, 'Flee femininity: antifemininity in Gnostic Texts and the question of social milieu', in K. King (ed.), *Images of the Feminine in Gnosticism* (Philadelphia, 1988), 297–307; repr. in E. Ferguson, D. M. Scholer, and P.C. Finney (edd.), *Studies in Early Christianity* (New York and London, 1993), 161–71.

[32] *Allogenes* 50.33–6: 'And you shall safely escape to that which is yours, which is *already saved and does not need to be saved*'; *Steles Seth* 125.19–21: 'You are that one who *will not be saved nor has been saved* by them.'

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/bmi020 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Zost. 21.3–19: . . . from them all in numerous places, *whatever place they please and whatever place they wish. They are everywhere and nowhere* and they contain Spirit. *For they are incorporeals* [ϩⲉⲛⲁⲧⲥⲱⲙⲁ] and are *superior to corporeals* [ϩⲉⲛ[ⲁⲧ]ⲥⲱⲙⲁ].[33] They are *undivided*, with living thoughts and a power of truth, and they abide with that which is purer than those. It is in this respect that they are purer, and not in the manner of *bodies* [[ⲛⲓⲥ]ⲱⲙⲁ] *which are in* a single *place.*

Sent. 1, 1.3–4 Lamberz: *Every body is in a place*, but *none of the incorporeals* by itself, as such*, is in a place.*

Sent. 2, 1.5–6 Lamberz: The *incorporeal* by itself, in that it is *superior to* every [*body* and][34] place, is present *everywhere*, not by extension, but *indivisibly.*

Sent. 3, 2.1–2 Lamberz: The *incorporeal* by itself, *not being present to bodies in terms of place*, is present to them *whenever it wishes.*

Sent. 27, 16.1–3 Lamberz: The substance of the body does not prevent the *incorporeal* by itself from being *where it wishes and as it pleases.*

Sent. 27, 16.11–13 Lamberz: Again (the incorporeal), *wherever it may be*, is found there by a certain disposition, since it is *everywhere and nowhere with respect to place.*

(c) Universal and particular, perfect and wholly perfect, part and whole, in common

In the following passages the term 'perfect' (τέλειος) is equivalent to 'particular' (μερικός) and the term 'wholly perfect' (παντέλειος) is equivalent to 'universal' (καθολικός, καθόλου). With one exception (18.13), the Coptic scribe of *Zostrianos* preserves the Greek form of these words:

Zost. 18.11–17: In relation to each (aeon) there exists a *particular* and [primary] form, so that they too might become *perfect* (entities). As for the aeons of Autogenes, they are four, *perfect* entities which *derive from the wholly perfect* (entities) [which are prior to] [the *perfect* entities].

Zost. 22.13–20: The same principle also applies to the aeons: to understand that these entities, in that they are *parts*, are *perfect.* Those which belong to *the whole*. . . become distinct, yet there is *a commonality*[35] which exists between them.

Sent. 22, 13.13–16 Lamberz: *Noeric* substance [ἡ νοερὰ οὐσία] is made of like *parts*, so that entities exist both in the *particular intellect* and in the *wholly perfect intellect.* But in the *universal intellect, particular entities* exist *universally*, whereas in the *particular intellect*, both *universal* entities {and *particular* entities} exist *particularly.*[36]

Proclus, *In Tim.* 1.422.14–19 (=fr. LII Sodano): Porphyry says that the reason why (the stars are beautiful) is that among them the *part* is a *whole.* For everything which is in the whole *completely* [παντελῶς] exists in each star *particularly*, on account of the unity of the intelligible forms. And it is certainly true that among the stars, each of the *parts* is in some way a *whole*, because each becomes a *whole* as a result of its *commonality with the whole* [τὰ πάντα κοινωνίαν].

Proclus, *ET* 64: . . . *the perfect proceeds from the wholly perfect.* . . .

(d) Species and genus, part and whole, contains and contained

These terms are drawn from the list in *Zost.* 2.13–20 cited above (p. 278) and probably derive from Porphyry's *Isagoge*:

[33] ϩⲉⲛ[ⲁⲧ]ⲥⲱⲙⲁ (my emendation).The scribe has committed an error of dittography which was not corrected by the editors of *Zostrien.* The manuscript reading is otherwise nonsensical: 'For they are incorporeals and are superior to incorporeals.' Turner, however, offers a possible interpretation. See note ad loc.

[34] Codex α of the *Sententiae* adds σώματος καί after ἐστι and thus concurs, in part, with the Greek original of *Zostrianos.* Lamberz: κρείττονα παντός ἐστι τόπου.

[35] ⲙⲛⲧϣ[ⲃⲏⲣ] = κοινωνία. See Crum 553B.

[36] On this passage, see Hadot, PV I.411–12.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/bmi020 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Isagoge 7.27–8.3 Busse: Thus the individual is *contained* by the *species* and the *species* by the *genus.* For the *genus* is a type of *whole*, but the individual is a *part.* The *species* is both a *whole* and a *part*, but a *part* of another and a *whole*, not of another, but in others. The *whole* is in the *parts.*

Isagoge 15.15–16 Busse: They differ in that the *genus contains* the *species*, but the *species is contained* and *does not contain* the *genera.*

Proclus, *ET* 66: Every existent is related to every other either as *whole* or *part* or same or other. For some *contain* but the remaining *are contained.*. . . But if something *contains* it must be a *whole*, but if it *is contained* it must be a *part.*

(e) Time and eternity

In *Zostrianos*, the Gnostic figure Barbelo functions as a complex aeonic entity situated second in rank after the Invisible Spirit.[37] In the following passages, her function is that of a metaphysical principle identified with Intellect and eternity in the manner that Intellect is identified with eternity in Porphyry's teaching. In addition, the appearance of the triad *hyparxis*–power–act in this passage also confirms a dependency on Porphyry, who was the first to introduce this and similar triads (*hyparxis*–power–intellect) into Neoplatonic speculation.[38] The linking of the triad with Intellect is found in Porphyry's *Commentary on the Parmenides*, 14.15–26.

Zost. 78.10–16: In terms of act, power and *hyparxis*, she (=Barbelo = Intellect) has not originated with time. Rather, [she has appeared] from eternity, having stood before it[39] eternally.[40]

Hist. phil. 223F Smith = fr. XVIII Nauck: But Intellect does not originate with time — and not even when time exists does time pertain to him—for Intellect is always without time and alone is eternal.

Sent. 44, 58.8–9 Lamberz: This, then, is eternity; it subsists along with Intellect.

Sent. 44, 58.23–5 Lamberz: Thus, as time subsists along with the motion of Soul, so eternity subsists along with the permanence of Intellect in itself; eternity is no more separate from Intellect than time is from Soul.

ALLOGENES[41]

A central theme in *Allogenes* is that of 'learned ignorance', an expression that is found in Porphyry's *Commentary on the Parmenides.* It is also attested by others who are either dependent on or familiar with Porphyry's writings, including Marius Victorinus,[42] Augustine,[43] and Ps.-Dionsyius.[44] The anonymous author of the *Tübingen Theosophy* is also familiar with this expression and directly attributes it to Porphyry.[45] This concept is also found in *Zostrianos* with reference to the

[37] On the role of Barbelo in *Zostrianos*, see Turner's discussion in *Zostrien*, 95–115.

[38] See Hadot, PV I.424–32.

[39] The use of the masculine suffix in line 15 for the pronomial form ⲛⲁϩⲣⲁϥ suggests an implied reference to eternity in the form of ⲉⲛⲉϩ, which is a masculine noun. The feminine form, ⲙⲛ̅ⲧⲱⲁⲉⲛⲉϩ, is otherwise found in lines 14 ('from eternity') and 16 ('eternally').

[40] For a different reading of this passage, see note ad loc.

[41] Editions of *Allogenes* (NHC XI, 3) consulted are those of J. D. Turner (Leiden, 1990) and K. L. King, *Revelation of the Unknowable God* (Santa Rosa, 1995).

[42] *Ad Cand.* 14.1 (=§ 19 PV II): *in ignoratione intellegibile* (with reference to knowing the Non-Being beyond being).

[43] *De ordine* 2.16.44, 131.15–16 Green: 'qui *scitur melius nesciendo*' (with reference to the highest god).

[44] *DN* 588A; 108.8–9 Suchla: *τῆς γὰρ ὑπὲρ λόγον καὶ νοῦν καὶ οὐσίαν αὐτῆς ὑπερουσιότητος ἀγνωσία* (with reference to 'the superessential and hidden divinity').

[45] *427F Smith = § 65 Erbse: 'Porphyry the Phoenician, the fellow student of Amelius and disciple of Plotinus, speaks thus: "Concerning the First Cause we know nothing; for he is the

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/bmi020 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Invisible Spirit (see below). As for 'the Unknowable' as a designation for the first principle in *Allogenes*, the Coptic form ⲡⲓⲁⲧⲥⲟⲩⲱⲛ is a translation of *τὸ ἄγνωστον*. The latter form is found in *In Parm.* 2.31. Although the term 'Unknowable' is found in other Gnostic sources as a name for the highest principle,[46] its repeated usage in *Allogenes* in connection with the theme of 'learned ignorance' suggests that the author of the tract most likely drew it from Porphyry's *Commentary on the Parmenides.*[47]

Of further interest in *Allogenes* is the utilization of the Porphyrian themes 'know yourself' and 'withdrawal to self'[48] in connection with the triad *hyparxis*, vitality, mentality. Specifically, Allogenes — during the course of a heavenly ascent — is instructed by various 'Luminaries' to 'know himself' by 'gazing on' or 'listening to' his own 'blessedness' and then to 'seek himself' by 'withdrawing' to aspects of the triad *hyparxis*, vitality, mentality. The triadic elements of this ascent seem to be modelled on the Porphyrian idea that the personal soul is the triadic image of the universal soul — a concept that is found in Marius Victorinus (§ 60 PV II) in connection with the triad being, life, intellect. If so, then we can suppose that Allogenes, by 'withdrawing' to elements of the triad as he ascends, effectively unites the triadic nature of his own soul with that of Soul above. The concept of 'standing' in connection with this ascent is probably modelled on a similar 'exercise' found in Porphyry, *In Parm.* 2.14–31.

(a) Learned ignorance

In the following passages, the Coptic form for 'be/was ignorant' (ⲁⲧⲉⲓⲙⲉ) is equivalent to *ἀγνοεῖν*; the form for 'ignorance' (ⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲧⲥⲟⲩⲱⲛ) is equivalent to *ἄγνοια*; the form for 'to know' (ⲉⲓⲙⲉ) is equivalent to *γιγνωσκεῖν*; the form for 'knowledge' (ⲧⲅⲛⲱⲥⲓⲥ) is a transliteration of *ἡ γνῶσις*.

Allogenes 59.29–32: . . . *the Unknowable*, that one whom if you might *know* him, *be ignorant* of him.

Allogenes 60.8–12: Do *not know* him [sc. the Unknowable], for that is impossible; but if by means of an enlightened conception you might *know* him, *be ignorant* of him.

Allogenes 61.1–3: [As though] I *were ignorant* of him [sc. the Unknowable], I [*knew*] him.

Allogenes 61.14–20: I was seeking the ineffable and *Unknowable* God, whom if one might *know* him, one would *be* entirely *ignorant* of him.

Allogenes 64.11–14: . . . the unknowable *knowledge* which alone belongs to him. And he is joined with *the ignorance* that sees him.

Zost. 80.18–21: The Invisible Spirit *was never ignorant* [nor did he *not*] *know*. . . .

In Parm. 4.34–5: . . . the one who *is never in ignorance* [*ἐν ἀγνοίᾳ*].

In Parm. 5.11–15: And how *knowing does he not know* [*γιγνώσκων οὐ γ*[*ιγνώσκει*]; and how *knowing is he not in ignorance* [*γιγνώσκων οὐκ ἐν ἀγνοίᾳ ἐστίν*]? That *he does not know* [*οὐ γιγνώσκει*] is not because he was originally *in ignorance* [*ἐν ἀγνοίᾳ*] but because he transcends *all knowledge* [*πάσης . . . γνώσεως*].

object of neither sensible contact nor intellectual knowledge, but knowledge of him is ignorance [*αὐτοῦ γνῶσις ἡ ἀγνωσία*]."' See H. D. Saffrey, 'Connaissance et inconnaissance de Dieu: Porphyre et la Théosophie de Tübingen', in id., *Recherches sur le néoplatonisme après Plotin* (Paris, 1990), 11–30.

[46] See Lampe, *PGL* s.v.

[47] Cf. Ps.-Dionysius, *DN* 593B; 116.7–8 Suchla: *τὸ ἕν*, *τὸ ἄγνωστον*, *τὸ ὑπερούσιον*.

[48] The themes of 'know yourself' and 'withdrawal to self' are also found in *Zostrianos*; see 17.15, 22.7–10, 44.17–22, 45.12. For a discussion of these themes, see Hadot, PV I.88–91 and esp. 91, n. 1; 327, n. 5; J. Bouffartigue and M. Patillon, *Porphyre, de l'abstinence* 1 (Paris, 1977), liii–lx; Zambon (n. 2), 47–51, 316–17; P. Courcelle, 'Le Connais-toi-même chez les néoplatoniciens grecs', in id., *Le Néoplatonisme* (Paris, 1971), esp. 155–6.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/bmi020 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In Parm. 9.24–6: Since that one remains beyond all reason and all thought *in* our *ignorance* [ἐν . . . ἀγνωσίᾳ] of him.

In Parm. 10.25–7: (The soul) has no means for judging *the knowledge* [τὴν γνῶσιν] of God; rather, what suffices for the soul is the image which constitutes *the ignorance* [τῆς ἀγνωσίας] that it has of God.

In Parm. 2.30–1: . . . (that one) whom we do not know but, perhaps, might know if somehow we become worthy of advancing towards ⟨*the*⟩ *Unknowable* [τὸ ἄγνωστον] itself.

(b) Know yourself, withdrawal to vitality and hyparxis

In the following passages, the Greek verb ἀναχωρεῖν ('to withdraw') is transliterated into Coptic as ⲁⲛⲁⲭⲱⲣⲓ. As in the previous section, the Coptic form ⲉⲓⲙⲉ (='to know') is equivalent to the Greek verb γιγνωσκεῖν.[49]

Allogenes 59.10–15: O Allogenes, gaze in silence on the blessedness that is yours, that by which you *know yourself* as you (truly) are, and seeking yourself, *withdraw to vitality*, which you will see moving.

Allogenes 59.18–23: But if you wish to stand, *withdraw to hyparxis*, and you will find it standing and at rest. . . .

Allogenes 60.16–20: I listened to the blessedness by which I *knew myself* as I (truly) am, and I *withdrew to vitality* while seeking ⟨myself⟩.

Allogenes 60.28–32: And when I wished to stand firmly, I *withdrew to hyparxis*, which I found standing.

THE THREE STELES OF SETH[50]

This tract consists of a sequence of three hymnic prayers addressed to God in terms of three aspects or phases of his divine nature. In his lowest phase he is praised as Autogenes or the Self-Begotten; in his middle phase he is Barbelo, the male virgin; in his highest phase he is glorified as the Unbegotten. Each phase, from highest to lowest, is also characterized as a movement away from unity to division, but a division that remains undivided: the Unbegotten is 'undivided', a 'pure monad', and an 'undivided triple power'; Barbelo is a 'great monad' as well as the 'first division' and a 'triple power'; Autogenes is 'divided everywhere yet remains one' and is also a 'triple power'. This concept of 'undivided divisions' is also found in the *Hymns* of Synesius, where it is applied to the first principle as monad and triad (*Hymn* 1(3) 210–16 Lacombrade): 'I praise you monad, I praise you triad. You are a monad although a triad, you are a triad although a monad. A noeric division holds that which is divided yet undivided.' For Synesius, each moment of the triad is manifested in Christian terms as Father, Will, Son and in Chaldean terms as Ineffable (=Paternal) Abyss, Centre, Craftsman.

In addition, *Steles Seth* also reflects material found in Macrobius' *Dream of Scipio*, where the 'Monad' is described as 'everywhere undiminished and always undivided' and is equated—following the Plotinian–Porphyrian order of hypostases—with the 'Highest God', 'Intellect', and 'Soul'.[51] In *Steles Seth*, the Unbegotten is equivalent

[49] Cf. *Sent.* 40, 50.16–20 Lamberz: 'For those who are able *to withdraw* [χωρεῖν] noerically into their own substance and are able *to know* [γινωσκεῖν] their own substance, take part in knowledge itself and the form of knowledge, because of the unity of knower and known.'

[50] Editions of *Steles Seth* (NHC VII, 5) consulted are those of J. M. Robinson and J. E. Goehring (Leiden, 1996) and P. Claude (Quebec, 1983).

[51] *In Somn.* 1.6.7–9, 19.24–20.11 Willis. See J. Flamant, *Macrobe et le néo-platonisme latin, à la fin du IV siècle* (Leiden, 1977), 330–1, who suggests that this material was drawn from Porphyry's *Commentary on the Timaeus.* For a summary of Macrobius' borrowings from this and other works of Porphyry, see ibid. 646–80.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/bmi020 Published online by Cambridge University Press

to the Highest God (or the One), Barbelo to Intellect, and Autogenes to Soul. In terms of this vertical schema, the author of *Steles Seth* (120.23–6) describes Autogenes as the median between Barbelo and the sensible world of Nature: 'He [sc. Autogenes] came forth from that which is superior [sc. Barbelo] for the sake of that which is inferior [sc. Nature]. *He came forth in the middle.*' [52] In Synesius, *Hymn* 2(4) 106–11, virtually the same expression is applied to Will (='the outpouring') as the mean term between Father and Son: 'In order that the Father might be poured out on the Son, *the outpouring* itself has found a shoot. *It stood in the middle*, God issued from God.'[53] In this instance, 'will' functions like 'life' as the mean term in the horizontal schema *hyparxis*, life, thought/intellect. This triad is attested in Porphyry's *Commentary on the Parmenides* 14.15–16 as well as in *Steles Seth* 125.28–32. It is also attested in the Porphyrian texts of Marius Victorinus (§§ 10, 22, 25, 28 PV II). In §22 (=*Ad Cand.* 2.22–3, 29) the triad is schematized with 'life' as both the mean and end term: *exsistentia* (=ὕπαρξις), *vita, intellegentia*; *exsistentiam*, *νοῦν*, *vitam.* The schema with 'life'— rather than 'intellect'— as the end term is also found in *Zostrianos.*[54] Elsewhere, the placement of 'life' after 'intellect' (being, intellect, life) is attested in Proclus, *In Tim.* 3.64.28–65.7, for both Porphyry (=fr. LXXIX Sodano) and Theodore of Asine (=*Test.* 17 Deuse) in connection with a discussion of the movement of the planets.[55]

Of further interest in *Steles Seth* is the list of divine names which form part of the hymnic praises offered to the Unbegotten in 124.18–29. In each instance, a given name is attested for Porphyry either directly or through an intermediary.

124.18–19: The truly Pre-existent: ⲡⲏ ⲉⲧⲣ ⲱⲣⲡ ⲛ̄ⲛⲱⲟⲟⲡ ⲟⲛⲧⲱⲥ = *τὸ ὄντως προόν*.

The neuter form *προόν*—as applied to the first principle—is preserved several times in Greek in the Porphyrian material utilized by Marius Victorinus (§§ 2, 20–2, 41, 78 PV II). In *Zostrianos* 80.14–16, the Pre-existent is described as the one who is placed 'over all' (ϩⲓⲭⲛ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ). These terms are the Coptic equivalent of Porphyry's familiar reference to the God 'over all' (*ἐπὶ πᾶσι*), an expression which is found several times in the *Commentary on the Parmenides* and elsewhere.[56] Hadot considers this expression a 'virtual signature' of Porphyry. [57]

124.20–21: The Pre-eternal: ⲡⲓ ⲱⲟⲣⲡ ⲛ̄ⲱⲁ ⲉⲛⲉϩ = *ὁ προαιώνιος* or *τὸ προαιώνιον*.

This term is a coinage of Porphyry. See Proclus, *PT* 1.11, 51.4–10 S–W (=232F Smith): 'Porphyry ... in his treatise *On Principles* ... demonstrates that Intellect is eternal, yet none the less has ⟨something⟩ in itself that is *pre-eternal* (*προαιώνιον*), < and *that which is pre-eternal* [*τὸ ... προαιώνιον*] > in Intellect is united to the One'; *Hist. Phil.* 223F Smith = fr. XVIII Nauck: Intellect 'proceeds *pre-eternally*

[52] Cf. Plotinus, *Enn.* 4.1.1.45, where Soul is similarly said to be 'established in the middle' between Intellect and Nature. Plotinus' remarks are part of his commentary on Pl. *Ti.* 35A.

[53] Cf. lines 96–7: *γονίμον βουλάν/μεσάταν ἀρχάν*.

[54] *Zost.* 14.13–14: existence, blessedness, life; 15.4–17: life, blessedness, existence; 66.23–67.2 and 75.7–11: existence, vitality, blessedness; 75.16–18: divinity, blessedness, life. The substitution of blessedness for intellect is constant in *Zostrianos* and is also found in Marius Victorinus, §§ 41 and 44 PV II. See Hadot, PV I.292, n. 4, who compares Augustine, *De civ. Dei* 8: 'Nor is it one thing for him to understand, another to be blessed, as if he could understand and not be blessed; but for him, to live, to understand, to be blessed is to be.'

[55] Deuse provides a detailed discussion of the 'being, intellect, life' triad in his note to *Test.* 17.

[56] See *In Parm* 1.4 (and note ad loc.), 1.18, 10.14.

[57] See PV I.113.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/bmi020 Published online by Cambridge University Press

[προαιωνίως][58] from its cause, God'; Proculus, *ET* 107; 96.8: ὁ δὲ αἰων (ἀνήρτηται) εἰς τὸ ὂν τὸ προαιώνιον. The word 'pre-eternal' is not otherwise attested in pagan Greek sources.[59] Among Greek Christian writers, it appears frequently from the mid-fourth century onward, most often in connection with the Son as the 'pre-eternal' Logos.[60] In Victorinus, this term is translated into Latin as *praeaeternus* (§ 51 PV II).

124.26: The Non-substantial: ⲡⲓⲁⲧⲟⲩⲥⲓⲁ = ὁ ἀνούσιος or τὸ ἀνούσιον.

The term ἀνούσιος appears along with ἐνούσιος in Porphyry's *Commentary on the Parmenides* 12.5–6 (κἀκεῖνο μὲν ἓν ἀνούσιον, τοῦτο δὲ ἓν ἐνούσιον) in connection with his exegetical comments on the nature of the two 'ones' of Pl. *Prm.* 142b.[61] In Marius Victorinus, it is preserved in Greek (§§ 78 and 86a PV II) and in Latin translation (§ 36b) as the first term of the triad ἀνούσιος, ἄζων, ἄνους. The same schema with neuter terms (τὸ ἀνούσιον, τὸ ἄζωον, τὸ ἄνουν) is found several times in Ps.-Dionysius.[62] This term is also found in *Allogenes* 47.34 ('a nonsubstantial substance') and in 53.30–1 ('the non-substantial *Hyparxis*') with reference to the first principle. The latter expression is also found in *Zost.* 78.4–5 and 79.5–6 (in reconstructed lacunae). In *Zost.* 79.7–8, ⲁⲧⲟⲩⲥⲓⲁ appears with the term *prohyparxis.* The term ἀνούσιος is also attested in other Gnostic sources,[63] but its usage in *Steles Seth, Allogenes*, and *Zostrianos* most likely derives from the same Porphyrian source or sources in which the other divine names in this list were found.

124.26–7: The Existence which is prior to existences: ⲧϩⲩⲡⲁⲣⲝⲓⲥ ⲉⲧϩⲁⲑⲏ ⲛ̄ϩⲉⲛϩⲩⲡⲁⲣⲝⲓⲥ = ἡ ὕπαρξις ἡ πρὸ τῶν ὑπάρξεων.

Hyparxis also appears as a name for God in *Allogenes* and *Zostrianos*, as noted in the previous section. In Neoplatonic speculation, the name *Hyparxis* appears as a name for the first principle in a list preserved in Proclus, *PT* 3.7, 30.5–6 S–W: '*Hyparxis* which transcends all things.' In Victorinus (§§ 43 and 49 PV II) the Latin equivalent, *exsistentia*, is also used as a name for God. Both *Zostrianos* and Victorinus also attest to the usage of *prohyparxis* or *praeexsistentia* as a name for God and similarly utilize *hyparxis* or *exsistentia* as the first term of the triad existence–life–intellect (and variants). Since this triad is also attested in Porphyry's *Commentary on the Parmenides*,[64] it is possible that this is the source in which all

[58] προαιωνίως, cf. Hadot, 'La métaphysique de Porphyre', in *Entretiens Hardt* 12 (Geneva, 1965), 146, n. 4; MSS προαιώνιος. Hadot's conjecture has now been affirmed by A.-Ph. Segonds, 'Appendix: les fragments de l'*Histoire de la Philosophie*', *Porphyre: Vie de Pythagore, Lettre à Marcella*, ed. and trans. É. des Places (Paris, 1982), 193, n. 4. See also Zambon (n. 2), 288–90. The adverbial form is otherwise attested only in Ps.-Dionysius, where it is used in specific connection with material drawn from Porphyry's *Parmenides Commentary* (see below, n. 60).

[59] LSJ (1968) and (1996) cite only the reference in Proclus' *Elements of Theology.*

[60] Of particular interest is its single usage as an adverb in Ps.-Dionysius, *DN* 817D, 183.8–10 Suchla: 'Rather, he is *the being* [τὸ εἶναι] for things which exist, and not existing things alone, but *even the being itself* of existents derives from *the one who exists pre-eternally* [ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ εἶναι τῶν ὄντων ἐκ τοῦ προαιωνίως ὄντος].' Cf. *In Parm.* 12.26–7: '… so that *even* (the One) *itself is being, that which exists before being* [ὥστε καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ εἶναι τὸ πρὸ τοῦ ὄντος]'.

[61] See Hadot, PV I.273–4 and n. 1.

[62] *DN* 697A, 146.7–8 and 732D, 177.12 and 14 Suchla; *MTh* 1040D, 148.1–2 Suchla

[63] *Untitled Text* in the Bruce Codex, chs. 2, 10, 17, 21, 22, as descriptive of 'the Father' as well as lesser entities; Hippolytus, *Ref.* 6.42, with reference to the 'First Father' in Marcus' system; 7.21 in connection with Basilides' Aristotelianism.

[64] *In Parm.* 14.15–16

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/bmi020 Published online by Cambridge University Press

these terms were found. This triad becomes commonplace in later Neoplatonism, notably as preserved in the writings of Proclus and Damascius.[65]

124.28–9: The Pre-essential which is prior to essences: ⲧⲡⲣⲟⲡ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲥⲓⲁ ⲉⲧⲣⲁⲑⲏ ⲛ̄ⲣⲉⲛⲟⲩⲥⲓⲁ = *ἡ προούσια ἢ πρὸ τῶν οὐσιῶν*.

Proousia is a hapax. The neuter form, *τὸ προούσιον*, is found in Porphyry, *In Parm.* 10.25, and in Synesius, *Hymn* 1(3) 222: *τὸ προούσιον ὄν*.[66] Iamblichus, *DM* 8.2 and 10.5, preserves the masculine form, *ὁ προούσιος*. The masculine form otherwise appears in a list of divine epithets in Didymus, *Trin.* 484A, 68(8) 1–3 Seiler, where God as 'Paternal Hypostasis' is praised as both *ὑπερούσιος* and *προούσιος*.

ARNOBIUS AND AUGUSTINE

In determining where and under what circumstances the authors of these Gnostic texts may have been influenced by Porphyry's writings, the *viri novi* or 'modern men' mentioned by Arnobius of Sicca in his *Adversus nationes*, 2.15, are of particular interest. Since Courcelle, the growing consensus of scholars has been that these opponents of Arnobius were a group of individuals influenced by Porphyry.[67] This consensus of opinion has recently been strengthened in an article by Beatrice[68] and a recent book on Arnobius by Simmons.[69] Beatrice points out that Eusebius, like Arnobius, uses the same expressions, *οἱ νέοι* ('the moderns') and *οἱ νεώτεροι τῶν φιλοσόφων* ('the more recent philosophers'), in his specific attacks on Porphyry. He further notes that Eusebius, like Arnobius, also uses the word *τῦφος* ('arrogance') to describe Porphyry, a Greek term first transliterated into Latin (*typhus*) by Arnobius and subsequently used in connection with the *viri novi* in 2.15 and elsewhere.[70] He also points out that Augustine, in *De ordine* 2.5.16.58, similarly describes as 'arrogant' (*superbia*) certain opponents who reject the Christian doctrine of the incarnation, a likely attack on Porphyry and/or his followers. As for Simmons, he argues that the *viri novi* are also the main focus of Arnobius' attacks in Book 1 of the *Adversus nationes* and demonstrates that Arnobius, in constructing his attack, utilizes the same methods against Porphyry and his followers that Porphyry had used against the Christians.[71]

Of further interest is Arnobius' repeated complaint that the *viri novi* depend upon themselves for the salvation of their souls. In 2.33 he sums up his critique in the following statement: 'You place the safety of your souls on your own selves and believe that by your own efforts you become divine.' This statement nicely summarizes Porphyry's teaching on the soul as reflected in his *Letter to Marcella* and treatise *On Abstinence*, and further attested now in *Zostrianos.* Indeed, in *Adv. nat.* 1.52 the

[65] See Majercik (n. 9), 278–86.

[66] Cf. *προανούσιος* in line 152 and *H.* 5(2) 52.

[67] See P. Courcelle, 'Les sages de Porphyre et les "viri novi" d'Arnobe', *REL* 31 (1953), 257–71; P. Hadot, PV I.83; E. L. Fortin, 'The *viri novi* of Arnobius and the conflict between faith and reason in the early Christian centuries', in D. Neiman and M. Schatin (edd.), *The Heritage of the Early Church* (Rome, 1973), 197–226; P. Mastrandea, *Un neoplatonico latino, Cornelio Labeone* (Leiden, 1979), 127–56 (argues that Porphyrian material in Arnobius is mediated via Labeo); Smith (n. 9), 766–8.

[68] P. F. Beatrice, 'Un oracle antichrétien chez Arnobe', in Y. de Andia et al. (edd.), *Mémorial Dom Jean Gribmont* (Rome, 1988), 107–29.

[69] Michael Bland Simmons, *Arnobius of Sicca* (Oxford, 1995), 216–17 and nn. 1–13.

[70] See L. Berkowitz, *Index Arnobianus* (Hildesheim, 1967), s. v. The term appears nine times.

[71] See Simmons (n. 69), 222–318 and *passim.*

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/bmi020 Published online by Cambridge University Press

name Zostrianos appears in a list of authorities which also includes Zoroaster and Julian. The name Zoroaster also appears with Zostrianos in the colophon at the end of the tract *Zostrianos.*[72] As for the name Julian, this is a reference to Julian the Theurgist, the purported author or compiler of the *Chaldean Oracles*, a sacred text among the later Neoplatonists on which Porphyry was the first to write a commentary. There are several allusions to the *Oracles* in the *Adversus nationes.*[73] To this evidence we can add mention of the names Plato, Cronius, and Numenius in *Adv. nat.* 2.11 and of Plato and Pythagoras in 2.13. As Simmons points out, the same names also appear as authorities in Porphyry's *Cave of the Nymphs.*[74] The name Zoroaster appears in this text as well.[75]

A further connection to Porphyry is found in *Adv. nat.* 2.19. Here, Arnobius accuses 'the moderns' of *typhus* because they claim that their skill in the liberal arts ('grammar, music, rhetoric, geometry', 'rules governing nouns', and 'the tonal intervals of sounds') makes them 'equals of God'. In 2.6, Arnobius accuses them of flaunting their 'wisdom and understanding' because they know how 'to inflect verbs and nouns through the cases and tenses'. On this last point, we can note the many instances in Marius Victorinus, *Zostrianos, Allogenes*, and *Steles Seth* where a method of paronyms is utilized in the construct of triads to describe different levels of ontic reality (to be–to live–to think; being–life–intellect; essentiality–vitality–mentality). This method is also discussed by Proclus in his *Commentary on the Parmenides* as one of three ways to describe divine reality. The other two methods include that of distinguishing between God and the state of being God and that method which understands God as the Cause who possesses all things within himself.[76] All three methods are found in the Porphyrian texts utilized by Marius Victorinus (§§ 20, 41, 77–8 PV II). As for Arnobius' remark associating 'the tonal intervals of sound' with becoming 'equals of God', it can be noted that the ascent of Philology in Martianus Capella's *The Marriage of Philology and Mercury* is exactly correlated with an ascending sequence of tones and half-tones, the culmination of which is Philology's deification.[77] The inclusion of references and allusions to the *Chaldean Oracles* in this text indicates dependence on a Neoplatonic author, generally agreed to be Porphyry.[78]

The liberal arts are also a major concern of Augustine in his *De ordine* 2.12.35–16.44. In a recent work, I.Hadot has persuasively argued that the cycle of seven liberal arts was first introduced by Porphyry. She also argues that the connection between these arts and the ascent of the soul in the *De ordine* was probably modelled on analogous material derived from Porphyry's treatise *On the Return of the Soul*, the likely source of this section of the *De ordine.* As such, mastery of these arts becomes linked with knowledge and contemplation of the highest realities.[79] In *De ordine* 2.5.16 Augustine specifically identifies these realities with Neoplatonic teaching

[72] On these names, see M. J. Edwards, 'How many Zoroasters? Arnobius, *Adversus gentes* I 52', *Vig. Chr.* 42 (1989), 282–9.

[73] See Courcelle (n. 67), *passim*; des Places (n. 20), 29–32; Simmons (n. 69), 168–71.

[74] See Simmons (n. 69), 160–1.

[75] *De ant. nymph.* § 6, 60.5 and 12 Nauck.

[76] See *In Parm.* 1106.1–1107.9 Cousin; Hadot, PV I.356–75.

[77] §§ 169–206, 49.14–55.19 Willis

[78] See S. Gersh, *Middle Platonism and Neoplatonism*: *The Latin Tradition* 2 (Notre Dame, 1986), 597–646, for a detailed analysis of the text and its sources.

[79] I. Hadot, *Arts libéraux et philosophie dans la pensée antique* (Paris, 1984), 101–36. Hadot (137–55) also argues that Martianus Capella's *The Marriage of Philology and Mercury* is dependent on Porphyry's *On the Return of the Soul.*

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/bmi020 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and Christian doctrine by stating that 'the principle of all things is one God all-powerful [*omnipotens*] and triple-powerful [*tripotens*], Father, Son and Holy Spirit'. In Marius Victorinus, *Adv. Ar.* 4.21.26 and 22.9 (§§ 76 and 77 PV II), God is also described as 'triple-powerful' (*τριδύναμος est deus*) and 'principle of all things' (*omnium principium).* Victorinus, however, does not then equate God's 'triple power' with the Christian Trinity but with the Neoplatonic triad 'to be, to live, to understand' (*esse, vivere, intellegere*). As 'principle of all things', Victorinus is specifically commenting on *Enn.* 5.2.1.1 (*ἀρχὴ πάντων*) in the context of a short commentary on this passage. This is the only place in Victorinus' writings where Plotinus is directly cited. However, it is clear from Victorinus' remarks that he is not commenting on the text directly, but is utilizing a post-Plotinian source—probably a short commentary or summary of Porphyry on this passage—in which the triad 'to be, to live, to understand' was also found.[80]

As for the term 'triple power', Victorinus translates it as *tripotens* in *Adv. Ar.* 1.50.4 with reference to God and in 1.56.5 with reference to the triadic nature of the human soul. It is only in these two passages in Victorinus and in Augustine's *De ordine* 2.5.16 that *tripotens* is attested in Latin.[81] Elsewhere, the Greek forms of this term, *τριδύναμος* and *τριδύναμις*, are frequently attested in the Gnostic texts *Pistis Sophia, The Books of Jeu*, and the *Untitled Text* in the Bruce Codex, where they are regularly used to describe various triple-powered gods and spirits. In none of these texts, however, are these terms linked with the Neoplatonic philosophical material found in *Zostrianos, Allogenes*, and *Steles Seth.* Although the word *hyparxis* is attested once in the *Untitled Text*, it is used here only in its ordinary sense of 'possessions'.[82] The word *τριδύναμος* is also found in the later Neoplatonic tradition, but is rare and never applied to the first principle.[83]

This suggests that Victorinus' usage of this word was found in a source or sources that combined both Gnostic terminology and Porphyrian philosophical ideas. We have already seen this combination of terms in *Zostrianos, Allogenes*, and *Steles Seth.* Victorinus, however, does not seem to be familiar with these specific texts.

Although he shares much of the same philosophical language and terminology found in these texts, what is missing in Victorinus are the various Gnostic elements. The one exception is his utilization of the word 'triple power'. Indeed, as Tardieu has recently demonstrated, sections of *Zostrianos* are, in fact, a Coptic translation of the same Greek source utilized by Victorinus in *Adv. Ar.* 1.49 and 50.[84] In analysing this material, Tardieu puts forward the following arguments: (i) that the gnostic work *Zostrianos* mentioned by Porphyry in *Plot.* 16 is the same as the *Zostrianos* found at Nag Hammadi; (ii) that the author of the common material in *Zostrianos* and Marius Victorinus must, therefore, be pre-Plotinian; (iii) that this individual must be 'a great figure in the history of Platonism'; (iv) that Numenius is the most likely

[80] See Hadot, PV I.419; cf. id., *Marius Victorinus* (Paris, 1971), 209–10. On Porphyry's 'commentaries' and 'summaries' of the *Enneads*, see *Plot.* 26. For a detailed analysis of this terminology, see M.-O. Goulet-Cazé, 'L'arrière-plan scolaire de la *Vie de Plotin*', in L. Brisson et al. (n. 6), 1.305–27.

[81] See A. Souter, *A Glossary of Later Latin to 600 A.D.* (Oxford, 1949), s. v.

[82] Chapter 15, 256.5 Schmidt and MacDermot

[83] See Majercik (n. 5), 480; cf. C. O. Tommasi, '*Tripotens in unalitate spiritus*: Mario Vittorino e la gnosi', *Koinonia* 20 (1996), 53–75.

[84] M. Tardieu, *Recherches sur la formation de l'Apocalypse de Zostrien et les sources de Marius Victorinus*, and P. Hadot*, 'Porphyre et Victorinus': questions et hypothèses*, Res Orientales IX (Burs-Sur-Yvette, 1996), esp. 112–13 and 123–5. For additional parallels and correspondences, see Abramowski (n. 5), 108–28, and Majercik (n. 5), *passim.*

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/bmi020 Published online by Cambridge University Press

possibility.[85] Hadot, in response to Tardieu, rejects this thesis in favour of a Christian or Gnostic intermediary, arguing that the presence of the term *pneuma* or 'spirit' in *Adv. Ar.* 1.50.4–5 (*tripotens in unalitate spiritus*) as descriptive of God makes it unlikely that Numenius was the author of these passages. Hadot notes that such a usage would be 'nearly impossible for a Platonist'.[86] Tardieu thinks that Numenius could have appropriated this term from his knowledge of the Bible.[87]

The strongest argument against Numenius, however, is the philological evidence. The terminology in *Adv. Ar.* 1.49 and 50 includes many of the same philosophical terms utilized in *Zostrianos, Allogenes*, and *Steles Seth* to describe the first principle: *unalitas* (=ἑνότης), *exsistentia* (=ὕπαρξις), *praeintellegentia* (=προέννοια), *praeexsistentia* (=προὔπαρξις), *simplicitas* (=ἁπλότης), προόν (Victorinus preserves the Greek). None of these terms is attested for Numenius.[88] Rather, this is the vocabulary of post-Plotininan Neoplatonism, initiated by Porphyry in his *Commentary on the Parmenides* and *Commentary on the Chaldean Oracles* and appropriated by the later Neoplatonists, Christian writers like Marius Victorinus, Synesius, and Ps.-Dionysius, as well as the Gnostic authors/redactors of *Zostrianos, Allogenes*, and *Steles Seth.*

It is from this common source, then, that Marius Victorinus most likely borrowed the Gnostic term 'triple power'. Since this source also contains a good deal of Porphyrian terminology, the author must have been part of a milieu in which Gnostic and Neoplatonic interests were viewed with equal interest. Such a milieu can be identified with the *viri novi* mentioned by Arnobius and would include the authors/redactors of *Zostrianos, Allogenes*, and *Steles Seth.* As Arnobius indicates, these 'moderns' were also familiar with the *Chaldean Oracles.* The same is true of Augustine and Marius Victorinus. Further, all these individuals were North Africans — an area in which Porphyry's writings were widely known and circulated. It is in North Africa as well that the Gnostic writings in the Nag Hammadi Library were collected and buried in the Egyptian desert some time in the mid-fourth century. Recent analysis has now demonstrated that other works in this collection were also rewritten or redacted in the light of contemporary fourth-century issues and debates.[89] It is in this time and context, then — congenial to a mix of Porphyrian and Gnostic elements — that the texts analysed in this paper were most likely written.

University of California, Santa Barbara RUTH MAJERCIK
rmajercik@earthlink.net

[85] Tardieu (n. 84), 110–13.
[86] Ibid. 114; see also 117–25.
[87] Ibid. 112–13.
[88] See É. des Places, *Numenius, Fragments* (Paris, 1973), 'Index Verborum.'
[89] See R. Mortley, '"The name of the Father is the Son" (Gospel of Truth 38)', in R. T. Wallis and J. Bregman (edd.), *Neoplatonism and Gnosticism* (Albany, 1992), 239–52. Mortley argues that § 38 of the *Gospel of Truth* (NHC I, 3), which deals with the problem of 'naming', is a late addition to the text influenced by Arian concerns at the time of Aetius and Eunomius, both of whom were influenced by the Neoplatonism of the day. Tardieu concurs with Mortley's argument in an addendum to the paper. More recently, F. E. Williams has argued that the final redaction of *The Concept of Our Great Power* (NHC VI, 4) can be dated to a period shortly after the death of Julian the Apostate (d. 363), who is cryptically alluded to in the text as the 'archon of the west'. See *Mental Perception, A Commentary on NHC VI*, 4: *The Concept of Our Great Power* (Leiden, 2001), lxii. On the general phenomenon of the 'rewriting' of many of the Nag Hammadi texts, see L. Painchaud, 'La classification des textes de Nag Hammadi et le phénomène des réécritures', in L. Painchaud and A. Pasquier (edd.), *Les Textes de Nag Hammadi et le problème de leur classification* (Quebec, Louvain, and Paris, 1995), 51–85.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/bmi020 Published online by Cambridge University Press